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The Length of Tatar Vowels According to Instrumental-Phonetic Data\(^1\)

UZBEK BAITCHURA, Leningrad

The instrumental-phonetic study of the length of vowels in the Tatar language was first begun by Galimjan Šaraf in Bogoroditskij’s Experimental-phonetic laboratory at the Qazan Pedagogical Institute (then named Vostočno-pedagogičeskij institut) in the XXies, the results being published in a big article entitled “Sonornaja dlitel’nost’ tatarskih glasnyh” (with a subtitle “Čast’ I. Dlitel’nost’ glasnogo a . . .”) published in № 8 of the journal Vestnik Naučnogo Obščestva Tatarovedenija, Qazan 1928, and containing 88 pages. The work has not been reviewed by any specialist in instrumental phonetics; if not counting my remarks in the book Zvukovoj stroj tatarskogo jazyka (ěksperimental’no-fonetičeskij očerk, Qazan, 1959, part 1, pp. 14–16 and in some other of my works. Moreover, even in Bogoroditskij’s book Vvedenie v tatarskoje jazykoznание ..., Qazan, 1953 (which is a symposium of his articles mostly published before) in which Šaraf’s instrumental material was used, the references to Šaraf are reduced to two letters: “G.S.” (which speak nothing to a common reader), and this cannot be explained by political reasons (Šaraf was subjected to Stalinistic repressions in 1937), because in the same year 1953 I published the synopsis of my Candidate dissertation “Glasnye tatarskogo literaturnogo jazyka v svete ěksperimental’nyh dannyh”, Moscow–Leningrad, 1953, and referring to G. Šaraf, I gave his name in full, without abbreviations, which fact counterposed my clear and open position to suppressions in Bogoroditskij’s book. After 1956 Šaraf was rehabilitated.

Šaraf’s “Sonornaja dlitel’nost’ ...” has not been reviewed by any Turkologist either, if not counting the uncritical description of his views on stress (views based on acoustical perception) in M. Räšänen’s Materialien zur Laufgeschichte der türkischen Sprachen (Helsinki, 1949, Moskov, 1955, p. 35, 36, etc. of the Russ. ed.). But Räšänen was rather inattentiv, e.g., he declares that the author (G. Šaraf) “is evidently a representative of one of the Turkic peoples of the Volga region”, although Šaraf himself writes (on p. 5 of the separatum of his article) that he “used his own pronunciation”, and repeats it several times, whereas, on the other hand, it is nonsense to admit the possibility of the author to belong to “one of the Turkic peoples of the Volga region”, because hence it follows that also Čuvašs and Baškirs, who also live in the Volga region, could be informants to an instrumental study of the Tatar phonetics.

Besides, we can find in the modern literature (the period of Stalinistic suppressions having passed away after 1956) only casual references to individual figures

---

\(^1\) I express my thanks to the chair of the Latvian language of the Latvian University in Riga, and personally to Janis Kuškis for his help in organizing the registration on the oscillograph of the material on the Tatar language, and besides, to A. Laua, M. Rudzite, E. Liepa, J. Kuškis and others for reviewing and discussion of two of my monographs in 1960 and later.
from Šaraf’s work, and some general utterings praising the author but unsupported with arguments (as a rule belonging to non-experimentators). To such e.g., the following paragraph belongs: “In the field of the experimental investigation of the phonetic structure of the Tatar language fruitfully worked V. A. Bogoroditskij and his pupil G. Šaraf, whose works have not lost their importance up to the present time”. (In the article devoted to the development of Tatar philology during 1917–1977 – in the journal Sovetskaja Tjurkologija, 1977, № 6, p. 92.) The cited paragraph is all what concerns the experimental studies of Tatar in this jubilee article.

And the references to the literature given in this connection impose a wrong impression on the reader, greatly exaggerating the instrumental-phonetic production on Tatar belonging to these two authors. In reality all production of them in this field is reduced to three articles (but not books): (1) Bogoroditskij’s article of eight pages on intonation and stress in four would be Tatar words (registered in the pronunciation of one informant coming from Baškiria) plus a few figures obtained by his student G. Validov; (2) Šaraf’s article of 43 pages “Palatograms …” containing four palatograms of vowels and of the majority of consonants; (VNOT № 7, Qazan, 1927); (3) Šaraf’s article of 88 pages mentioned above – on the length of the vowel “a” (VNOT № 8, Qazan, 1928).2

By the paragraph cited above the Soviet Turkology achieves a twofold aim: first it imposes upon the reader that no other works ever appeared in this field; second, on those who do know that after 1950 scores of instrumental-phonetic studies were published both in the USSR and abroad by several Tatar linguists, the Soviet Turkology imposes – by the same hint – that all works (besides those by Bogoroditskij and Šaraf) in this field are not worthy even of mentioning, that is good for nothing. Thus a critique by means of hints and resorting to argumentum ad ignorantiam is used in order to reduce all achievements of the Soviet time in this field to the three articles by Bogoroditskij and Šaraf (of whom they dared not to speak before 1956), which works, in addition, are not free of serious defects and blunders (partly shown in my works).

Thus, concerning the material and method, it can be first of all mentioned that Šaraf’s last article is devoted to study of only one Tatar vowel – the vowel “a”, but not to study of all ten Tatar vowels as it is possible to infer from the title (which fact alone justified a subsequent study on this theme), although some casual data on other vowels and some consonants are also contained in the article: the experimental material is given in the following way:

“52) satuç – 3(28) – ‘let us sell’ –
   – (s), a – 15,1, t – 9,7, i – 12,5, (q); Σ = 37,3 σ”.

This material can be used if taken critically.

However there are defects of the method, e.g. the registration was carried out by means of “Rousselot’s laryngeal capsula” on the cymograph “Verdin” thus receiv-

(2) V. A. Bogoroditskij, “Dvizenie tona v slovah dvuslozhnyh i trehslozhnyh po eksperimental’nym dannym v tatarskom jazyke”, VNOT, Kazan’, 1926, republished many times, the last publication being in the symposium of Bogoroditskij’s former articles entitled Vvedenie v tatarskoe jazykoznание, Kazan’, 1934, 19532 pp. 57–66.
ing only the information about the vibrations of the vocal chords, which resulted in systematical ascribing of the voiced beginning of the next consonants to the length of the preceding vowel. L. V. Ščerba in his Risskie glasnye v kačestvennom i količestvennom onošenii (SPB, 1912) used a better method as he registered both the vibrations of the Larynx as well as the current of the air from the mouth and measured separately the length of vowels with and without the voiced beginning of the following consonant. My investigation proved that, according to Šarafi’s data, the voiced beginning was comparatively not very important in Tatar, and my data on the length of the vowel a little differed from his. However generally this voiced beginning can in some languages reach 50 or even 100% of the length of the following consonant (e.g. in Čuvaš – according to my data), not to speak of the cases with voiced consonants, etc. The other defect of Bogoroditskij/Šarafi’s method consists in the impossibility to draw a border line between voiceless consonants in clusters and to measure their length at the beginning or at the end of words, while registration both of Suffle and Larynx allows to escape such drawbacks.

Šarafi’s study on the length of vowels in Tatar has not been reviewed and investigated by a specialist in experimental phonetics (except some remarks in my works mentioned above) and I shall discuss it below before proceeding with the investigation of the vowel length in the Tatar language.

Šarafi’s investigation was a pioneer work in studies of the length of Tatar (and generally Turkic) speech sounds and this (together with a masterful reclam) can, at least partly, account for the enthusiasm with which it was met1. The work has two aspects: half of it contains the description of the method and the instrumental data obtained on the length of speech sounds in mono-, di-, tri-, tetra-, and pentasyllabic words (mainly with the vowel “a”, but often having also other vowels), while the other half (or aspect) of the article contains the conclusions and discourses on some theoretical problems, concerning stress, the connection between some phonetic and morphologic phenomena, etc., based on acoustical perception by ear and on various speculations.

As it was mentioned above, the experimental-phonetic material can be used in further investigations if taken critically; a number of deductions as, e.g., concerning the influence of the phonetic position to the vowel length in Tatar (the influence of the neighbouring consonants, of the stress and the structure of the syllable, etc.) are correct although not new on the level of general linguistics (cf. Rousselot’s, Ščerba’s, etc. works), e.g. such inferences as that the increase of the vowel length is favoured by (1) the position in the open syllable (especially at the end of words), (2) before spirants as compared to the position before stops, (3) under stress, (4) the position in the neighbourhood (before, if to be exact) of voiced consonants, etc. Šarafi’s achievement here consists in giving an experimental evidence that the phonetic regularities mentioned are not alien to the Tatar language, too. At the same time there are some serious mistakes and other shortcomings in the theoret-

(3) On the level of Turkology G. Šarafi was not the first experimenter. In 1926, another Tatar linguist, Prof. Gjybad Alpar, published some instrumental data – the photographs of the position of the lips during the pronunciation of nine Turkmenian vowels – see G. Alpar and M. Geldiev, Ucebnik po jazyku, Ashabad, 1926.
ical postulates and in the inferences and conclusions drawn from the material studied.

Some examples of the theoretical propositions kept to by the author. (1) On p. 81 the author writes about "the usage of the cases having no affixes", which belongs to unmorphological (semantical) definitions of morphological notions (for morphology deals only with *forms* as this term itself shows); (2) On p. 79, the synharmonism of the affixes is defined proceeding from the last sound of the root, whereas as long ago as in 1876 I. A. Boduin de Courtanaïs proved that it depends on the dominating, in the word, sound (or syllable) which can be in any syllable of the word; (3) It is assumed that every monosyllabic word, as well as every syllable of polysyllabic words, has an independent stress of its own (p. 64). Hence the question arises: what does the author mean by the term "stress" if (according to him) it is not the distinguishing of one syllable of a word from other syllables, whereas if it is, then how are we to understand the stress in a monosyllabic word? (4) It is correct that higher tones usually produce stronger effect, however in Tatar the tone of the last vowel in words is not falling (as is stated on p. 69): on the one hand, the stress, accent cannot be expressed by a lower or falling tone, on the other hand, this assumption is taken from Bogoroditskij's article on the tone movement mentioned above, which contains an essential mistake: as the sole informant here a Baškir, but not a Tatar was used. And Bogoroditskij himself admits that his informant comes from the Sterlitamak region. Meanwhile, this region is the centre of the Baškir land. And although his informant removed and settled in Qazan, he did not become Tatar. My instrumental studies of stress in Baškir showed that, in this dialect, there is a tendency to stress the initial syllable instead of the last one, whereas in Tatar words stressed at the end the tone is not falling in the last syllable of disyllabic words. (5) The expiratory stress is confused with the so-called dynamic one (e.g. on pp. 49–50), i.e. the force of expiration is mixed up with the sound intensity. Although the expiration is possible when there is no voice, as is known. In order to control the force of the expiration, the author turns to the examination of the amplitude of the vibrations ... on the laryngeal line(!). However, as is known from acoustics, the sound intensity is not directly connected with the amplitude of vibrations when registering on the cymograph or oscillograph: at a lower sound intensity a higher amplitude is possible, and v.v., and it can only be calculated according to a special physical formula. So it is when Souffle is registered, i.e. the current of the air from the mouth. However Šaraf's work being totally based on registering only of the laryngeal line (and on hearing), it was the amplitude of the vibrations on the laryngeal curve that Šaraf based upon. And he himself doubts in the correctness of his inferences and says that the amplitude "depends not only on the force of the syllable but to an important degree also on the articulatory openness of the vowel, more closed vowels usually giving a greater amplitude". In reality a greater or a lower amplitude of the vibrations on the laryngeal curve depend on the position of the laryngeal capsule towards Adam's apple to which this capsule is usually fastend: the capsule can fit to the apple more tightly or loosely depending on the position of the latter which, in turn, depends on the position of

(4) I. A. Boduen de Courtanaïs, "Rezja i rezjane", *Slavjanski sbornik* III, SPB, 1976.
other organs of speech, e.g., the body of the tongue, and when high (i.e. close) vowels are articulated, the Adam's apple and the capsula fit more tightly than during the articulation of low (i.e. open) vowels, and here the amplitude decreases independently of stress. I shall not continue this list of theoretical errors, because what is said sufficiently demonstrates the worth and the value of Šaraf's and his master Bogoroditskij's theoretical principles of studies of stress, while as to concrete figures on stress, they are totally absent from Šaraf's article, and the stress is established by means of hearing and basing solely on the data on the length of vowels, which is also incorrect, v.i.

The results. The conclusions on the varieties of the length of the vowel “a” in different positions can be accepted although they are not new on the level of general linguistics, as it was mentioned above. However there are also wrong inferences.

On p. 23 it is stated that the vowels u, i, o (i.e. y, b, o) of the neighbouring syllables do not influence the length of the vowel a, and “only the short vowel b/o (ɔ) of the next syllable, in some cases, seems to produce some lengthening of the vowel a of the preceding syllable”. The latter is right, but the former statement is not correct, because the short vowels, and to a lesser degree the high ones do favour an increase of the length of any vowel in the neighbouring syllables – in accordance with the general law established by me in 1955. Even Šaraf's own data refute this statement, cf., e.g. (p. 18): in the word atap ‘calling’ (2 m) the length of the first vowel is 10.7 ɔ, that of the second is 12.9 ɔ, while the respective figures for the vowels in the word atyp (2 m) are: a – 12.5 ɔ, ɔ – 8.6. If we represent the results in percents, we shall have

\[
\frac{10.7}{12.9} = 82\%, \quad \frac{12.5}{8.6} = 145\%.
\]

Thus, Šaraf has underestimated the influence of the neighbouring short vowel ɔ upon the preceding a although it is seen even from his own materials. But as to other short or high vowels in the syllables neighbouring to those with the vowel a, they are absent from his respective materials (pp. 17–21), this is why Šaraf's negation of the influence of other short vowels is not supported experimentally.

On p. 25 we find the inference that the vowel length in disyllabic words depends not only on the quality of the given syllable, however also on the open or closed character of the neighbouring syllable; the open syllable producing both in stressed and unstressed syllables a greater length than the closed neighbouring syllable. This inference is incorrect. Openness of a syllable denotes that its vowel is longer than in the closed syllable (under the same conditions). This is why openness of the neighbouring syllable favours a decrease of the length of the vowel of the other syllable, but not an increase of it. (While, on the other hand, an increase of the number of sounds in a word can lead to decrease of the length of them.) As an argument, Šaraf writes that if we take the length of vowels in the words of the type
ACCA'C for 100, the corresponding figures in the words of the type ACA' will be 126–171/in the type ACCA' 113–165 and in ACAC' 115–130/. However this increase of the vowel length in the last types is the result of the decrease of the number of sounds in the word, while the general length of a word vacillates in certain limits. And at last, Šaraf's statement here contradicts his own inference and figures according to which the length of the vowel a increases if in the second syllable there is the vowel ᄐ (u), that is a short vowel. But Šaraf does not take into consideration just the length of the neighbouring vowel and presumes that its influence upon the vowel a proceeds from it quality, but not the quantity.

3. The experimental data (they concern only the length) must be taken critically because of the following reasons. 

(a) The method of registration using only the laryngeal capsula was not up to date even at that time (1928), and, e.g., much earlier P. Rousselot, L. V. Šcerba, e.a. used a more perfect method, v.i. Šcerba, e.g., applied the Maray-tambourins for registering the current of air from the mouth (Souffle = S) besides using the laryngeal capsule (L), which gave more complete and more reliable data about the length of all speech sounds, while by means of Bogoroditskij–Šaraf's method the length of many speech sounds cannot be established in many positions, not counting other drawbacks of the latter method. 

(b) The measurements were primitive and the concrete data obtained for concrete elements of speech were less exact in comparison with those of Šcerba. Thus, the parallel registration of S and L gives the data on the length of vowels and consonants including the sonorous length of vowels and the voiced beginning of the generally unvoiced consonants, while when basing solely on the laryngeal curve (L), as Šaraf did, the voiced beginning of the next consonant will be always ascribed to the sonorous length of the vowel because of technical reasons, for it is impossible to draw a demarcation line between a vowel and a voiced consonant if basing solely on the laryngeal curve (L), vide the scheme

```
\[ S \quad L \]
\[ a \quad 1 \quad t \quad a \]
```

1 = the voiced beginning of the consonant t. 2 = the expiration of t.

In his calculations, Ščerba gives separately the data on the length of vowels including and excluding the voiced beginning of the following consonant, while according to Bogoroditskij–Šaraf's method, the voiced beginning of the consonant is simply ascribed to the sonorous length of the preceding vowel.

Meanwhile, in some languages, the voiced beginning can reach 50% and more of the length of the consonant (e.g., in Čuvaš). In Šaraf's case this voiced beginning appeared not very long, which fact explains why his data appeared near to mine. However it is impossible to deny that, in principle, the inaccuracy of their method can lead to essential errors.
(c) Calculations and linguistic material. The material on which Šaraf's average figures are based is not very uniform. Thus, e.g., when deducing the average figures for the length of the unstressed initial vowel \( a \) in various disyllabic words (1) the quality and hence the quantity of the vowel of the next syllable is not taken into consideration (pp. 17; 21 et passim), although the long vowel in the next syllable favours a decrease of the length of the investigated vowel and v.v., a short vowel in the next syllable favours an increase of the length of the other vowel of a disyllabic word. E.g., according to Šaraf's own data, in the word atap 'calling', 'naming' the length of the first vowel is 10,7 cs that of the second one 12,9 cs, while in the word atıp 'shooting' (with the second short vowel) the length of \( a \) is 12,5 cs that of \( ə(ø) \) is 8,6 cs. The relation in the first case is equal to

\[
\frac{10,7}{12,9} = 83\%.
\]

while in the second it is

\[
\frac{12,5}{8,6} = 145\%.
\]

(2) Sometimes into the average figures for the vowel \( a \) even the data for other vowels are included (e.g., for the vowel \( u \) – see p. 21, cf. p. 27). E.g., on p. 27 the average figures for the length of the vowel \( a \) in the first open stressed syllable of disyllabic words of the type ACA are deduced from the data for the following five words: ata 'name!', uta 'weed!', qasǝ 'combl!', tasǝ 'carry!', əša 'eat!'. Thus, into the average figures for the type ACA also the types UCA and CACCA are included.

(3) Thus, into the data for the initial vowel \( a \) also the data for the vowel \( a \) in the first covered syllable are included.

(4) Inclusion into the calculations of the data obtained ten years earlier (not in 1928, however in 1918) gives too great deviations of measurements, e.g., on p. 19, N° 59: in ata 'father', 'shoots' (6 meas.) registered in 1918 the length of the first vowel is 14,3 cs, that of the second is 30,2 cs, while in N° 60 in the same word registered in 1928, the respective figures for the two vowels are 11,6 and 19,4 cs (8 meas.). According to my observations, a slower pronunciation is characteristic of the beginners, while Šaraf, in his turn, admits (on p. 7, note) that in 1918 "the technics of the experiments was not yet sufficiently mastered" by him, and that is why he had to omit some of his material; however, evidently, still some imperfect data have penetrated into his work.

(5) As the material for some most important inferences rather often meaningless combinations of sounds are taken. E.g., on pp. 45–46, etc. appa, on p. 47 appa, apap are adduced which together with the word apa 'aunt' represent all material of "words" adduced when discussing one of the most important themes of the article, namely the force of syllables.

(6) The use, in the article, of imitation of speech of old men and of ill persons,
which imitation was produced by Šaraf and admitted by him on p. 54. Imitation can be used to acquire a preliminary notion, however it goes too far to include such material into a serious scholarly study.

In spite of all inexactitudes and drawbacks, Šaraf’s data allow us to some preliminary idea about the length of the Tatar vowel a and to draw some other conclusions about the regularities in Tatar vocalism, although no word can be of an overexactitude of his data and method.

To one of such conclusions belongs the inference about some dialectal peculiarities in Šaraf’s speech. These are certain words and forms of the subdialect of the Mountain region (Taū jag) of the Tatar ASSR (whence he comes – from the village Ak-su of the Bua region), as e.g., γοmbay/ds ‘sunflower’ (p. 95) (the literary form is künbey/ds), kitkán ijegeh ‘You were gone’ (p. 80) (the literary form is kitkän idöögeh); aqsaq – t̄uqsaq (tuqsaq) ‘lame’, ‘cripple’ (the literary form is tuqsaq; the historical development u > o(δ) has gone further in this vernacular than in Literary Tatar), etc.

In phonetics, which is most important for us here, his dialectism manifests in a more close connection of the length of vowels with the stress (the same I registered in the Low-land dialect of Čuvaš in comparison with the Mountain-Čuvaš and Literary Čuvaš, while Šaraf’s native village Ak-su of the Bua region is situated on the border of the land of Čuvaš and particularly those who speak the Low-land dialect).

According to my instrumental-phonetic data obtained from a score of informants coming from different regions, the length of vowels is less connected with the stress, except the material of the informants coming from the same region. Here are some figures.

According to Šaraf’s data, in disyllabic words with the initial stress and having the vowel a in both syllables or a in the first and i in the second, the length of the first vowel invariably surpasses that of the second in all types of syllables. E.g., in the word appaq ‘very white’ (3 meas.) the length of the first vowel is 10,3 cs, that of the second 9,7 cs and so on. And only in some individual cases waverings are registered, e.g., in combinations of two monosyllabic words or of a monosyllabic word with a particle, e.g., aq taš ‘white stone’ 13,2 cs is the length of the first vowel and 14,5 cs that of the second; as – ta ‘hang and’ – 17,9 and 15,1 cs. Whereas according to my data obtained from various informants coming from different regions the length of the second vowel in such cases is mostly longer, and only in the western (Mountain) reg. of the TASSR a closer connection of length with stress has been registered.

Thus, according my own pronunciation registered on the oscillograph, the length of vowels in the word appaq ‘very white’ comprised 11,4 cs for the first vowel and 13,0 cs for the second (3 meas.), the relation being 87,6% (I was born in Qazan in the family of a Tatar journalist, and up to school did not speak any other language except Tatar).

The peculiarities of Šaraf’s pronunciation and data result from two causes. If the first is his slight dialectism, the second is his way of registration and calculation when the voiced beginning of the following consonant is systematically ascribed to the preceding vowel. This is seen from the following.
According to the data of my informant Ahmetzjanov from the reg. Balyq bistäs3 (in the middle of TASSR), the length of vowels in the word appaq was equal to 11.8 cs for the first vowel and 14.2 cs for the second, while the voiced beginning of the consonant following the first vowel was 4.5 cs. Thus, if we add the figure for the voiced beginning to the cipher for the length of the first vowel, we shall have 16.3 cs, that is the length of the first vowel becomes longer than that of the second—just like in Šaraf’s material. However if we take the data of some other informants, the dialectal character of Šaraf’s pronunciation is revealed. Thus, according to the data of my informant Ajtoganov coming from the region Krasnyj Bor, the length of vowels in the word appaq is $a_1 = 8.0$ cs, $a_2 = 11.6$ cs, the length of the voiced beginning of the consonant $p = 1.6$ cs, thus the length of the first vowel together with the voiced beginning of the following consonant $p$ comprise only 9.6 cs and the length of the second vowel (11.6 cs) is still greater. Such examples are numerous, and I adduced the above figures only for illustration.

In other cases like in the 2.P. Imperative: barmal ‘do not go!’; aima ‘do not fire!’; etc. the vowel of the second syllable is still longer and can surpass that of the first by two times and more in contradistinction from Šaraf’s examples, v.i.

A greater connection of the length of vowels with stress is characteristic also of some Mišar-Tatar subdialects (e.g. of Penza) as well as of the Low-land dialect of Čuvaš (bordering with Šaraf’s native village)*.

Generally Šaraf must have well spoken the Tatar literary language, he lived much time in Qazan and was a cultured man (not mentioning that the vernacular of his native region on the whole not very much differed from the literary language, at any rate less than some Tatar dialects like Mišar or some Siberian ones), however the examples adduced above demonstrate what subtle peculiarities of speech of individual persons the experimental methods can reviel, even if they remained unnoticed by simple hearing.

In Šaraf’s article there are many statements, as a rule isolated, and often not new (at any rate from the point of view of general linguistics), unsupported by any instrumental data and only based on the perception by ear or borrowed from other linguists’ works, although represented, at least sometimes, as if they had been deduced from the instrumental data (e.g., the inferences about the role of the tone height). Here are some examples.

(1) On p. 16, it is said about “respective changes of the tone and the force of the voice which we noticed when direct investigation of some graphics by means of a microscope”. But no data were adduced in support. Such statements are encountered in the work not once (not mentioning that the author takes the amplitude of the vibrations as an indicator of the force of the sound). Experimental-phonetically unsubstantiated is also the reference to a “higher musical tone” at the beginning of a phrase and lowering it to the end, etc., etc.

(2) On pp. 43–44 it is stated that “voiced, voiceless, occlusive, fricative sounds differ from one another ... also by the length of the excursions and recursion, specific noises, the presence or absence of the voice ...”. Meanwhile, it is technically impossible to establish this by studies of only the laryngeal curve on the cymograph. The same refers to the statement that in the “word” appa (without meaning) the first $p$ has such “moments of articulation” as “excursion—occlusion...
accompanied (soprovoda-juščujušja)" "with a strong current of air". The laryngeal curve does not give such information because of technical reasons. Moreover, it is quite enigmatical how a "strong current of air" can accompany occlusion?

(3) On p. 46, the following quite isolated statement is suggested: "In the Arabian language in words pronounced isolated, the expiratory stress most often falls on the closed syllable; historically this phenomenon maybe also is explained by the greater force of the closed syllables". And no reference either to some experimental data or to any other author.

(4) On p. 66, with reference to experimental data, it is stated that "in di- and trisyllabic words stressed at the end, the stress is rising according to its force, i.e., the gradations of the force of the stress in individual syllables little by little gradually increase from the first syllable and reaching the maximum of the force in the last stressed syllable". In reality these problems have not been investigated experimental-phonetically and Šaraf's reference to the experimental data is unsubstantiated. He has in view the chapter V of his article, however there only the data on the vowel length are adduced, but he presumes that the force can be calculated basing on the data on the length, which is, however, wrong, v.l.

On the whole, when reading the article, one becomes a general impression that the author decided to include into his work all information which he had about all things more or less pertaining to phonetics, and even grammar, etc., eg., in the second half of the article he turned to syntax and its connection with phonetics, however not experimental-phonetically, of course. Inclusion of separate isolated statements either of his own or borrowed from the literature quite logically brought the author to contradictions and mistakes.

A special chapter V (pp. 38–51) is devoted to investigation of the "relative force of syllables" and expiratory stress. however it does not contain a single experimental-phonetic datum on expiration and the force of pronunciation: all experimental material of this chapter is reduced to a few data on the length of the speech sounds. The expiration and the force the author attempts to establish by means of calculations based on the data on the length in a few words, and this is why this chapter can sooner be defined as not an experimental-phonetic investigation, however as a, so to speak, speculative phonetics. And the author admits at the end of the chapter (on p. 51) that "much from what is said above is not so much solving as putting the question".

At the beginning (pp. 38–39) we are informed that the length of the closed syllable is less than that of the open syllable and that the numerical data comprise, for monosyllabic words, on the average, 19,3:31,3 cs (= 1:1,62) respectively. However, the comparison with p. 13 to which the author himself refers, reveals that these figures (as well as those for di- and trisyllabic words) denote the length of the vowel a but not the length of the syllables (tat, atta, a and the like).

According to Šaraf's pronounciation, the length of vowels in the stressed syllables of di- and trisyllabic words, as a rule, surpasses those of other syllables (cf. table on p. 38), and he takes the relative increase of the length for an indication to a more strong pronounciation (making an exception only for the position in the absolute end); the relation of the length of the vowel of the open syllable to that of the
closed syllable (the average figures calculated in general for many words) indirectly show the relative force:

\[
\frac{31.3}{19.3} = 1.62
\]

for monosyllabic words; 1:1.51 for the stressed final syllable of disyllabic words and 1:1.27 for the stressed final syllable of trisyllabic words. With the increase of the number of syllables in a word, the length of the vowels in it decreases, which can be seen from the diminishing of the second parts of the adduced proportions, and Şaraf interprets this as the decrease of the force of the respective syllables (39–40).

The calculations of the length of vowels are based on the average figures deduced for the first syllable of different words, then for the second syllable of different words, then for the third (the number of words being different in every of these three cases) and independently of the second and third syllables of the same individual words.

Having equalized the length to the force, the author states (p. 41) that the force of a syllable is increased if the neighbouring syllable is closed. In reality, it is the length that is increased. And not because of the closed character of the neighbouring syllable, however because vowels in claus ed syllables are shorter than in the corresponding open ones. The author substitutes one notion instead of the other, but in the end is forced to admit that “the sonorous length of the vowel ... does not always depend on the greater force of the pronunciation of the given syllable” (i.e. positional factors), which is correct, but contradicts all his “theory“ (41), as well as some of his own data on the length of vowels in the final syllable of di- and trisyllabic words.

Further on, having remarked (p. 42) that for the pronunciation of speech sounds (except stops) a phonatory current of air is necessary, the author states: “The phonatory current, when the pronunciation of a sound, can be stronger or weaker, longer or shorter; the length (t) of a non-stop sound, inclusive of the sonorous length of the vowel, as well as its relative force (f) will be in a direct dependence on the length of the phonatory current during its pronunciation, and on the relative force of this current which is measured by the amount of the air expired in a unit of time, e.g., in 1 s (0,01’); while the absolute force of a non-stop sound, i.e. the general amount of energy required for its pronunciation with this or that length and force will be determined by the general quantity of the air (Q) expired when the pronunciation of the sound; the quantity Q expressed in the respective units, e.g.

\[
\text{centilitres} \quad \text{in } 0.01”
\]

can be found according to the formula:
Q = ft".

First of all it should be remarked that Q ought to be expressed only in centilitres, because it refers to the whole sound but not to a part of it; moreover, as f represents an "integrated average force of the current in a unit of time" (p. 43), Q according to Šaraf's definition and formula cited above, will be equal to f, but not to f multiplied by t (t = time). As to the notion f, it is established according to the formula

\[
\frac{t^2}{t^1}
\]

where \( t^1 \) denotes the length of the first vowel in the "word" apa (it is a senseless combination of sounds), that is of the vowel of the closed syllable, while \( t^2 \) denotes the length of the first vowel in the word apa 'elder sister', that is of the vowel in the open syllable (cf. pp. 46, 48). Thus, the force is found out through the length. On the whole, after the substitution of the value of f

\[
\left( \frac{t^2}{t^1} \right) \quad \text{(i.e.} \quad \frac{t^2}{t^1})
\]

to the formula \( Q = ft \) (vide supra) we receive the formula

\[
Q = \frac{t^2}{t^1} \cdot t,
\]

that is the amount of the air in centilitres (or – according to Šaraf's formula – in centilitres in 0,01 second) is equal to a certain figure denoting the vowel length. But what length: sonorous or phonatory, is not mentioned here. (Although the sonorous length by no means coincides with the phonatory: it suffice to remind about the voiced beginning of the next consonant escribed by Šaraf to the vowel length, etc.). We can only learn here that the first a in the sound combination apa is shorter than the first a in the word apa ('elder sister' – translation of U.B.) But this is too abstractly formulated to be correct. The fact is that during different pronunciations and especially by different persons in different words, the results can be different, and even Šaraf himself does not deny such a possibility, e.g., by saying that sometimes the stressed vowel can be shorter than the unstressed one (p. 27).

Šaraf's abstract speculations lead also to some other mistakes. Thus, he assumes that the proportion \( t^2: t^1 \) (i.e. the relation of the length of the vowel of the open syllable to that of the closed syllable) "is an indicator of the relative force of the vowel of the respective syllable" (p. 48), which is unsubstantiated and wrong (v.s.). Referring to Șcearba's remark that the energy usually spent on individual elements of speech is constant, Šaraf assumes that, in his formula \( Q = ft \), the elements f and t
must be in an inverse proportion. In reality it is not proven that the quantity \( Q \) be constant, while practice does not corroborate this assumption (in the best case it can be a variable quantity tending to a limit). And both these assumptions, even if they had been correct, are inapplicable in practice because they are abstract.

In conclusion we read (p. 49) that “the vowel length generally cannot be a base for studies of the regularities of stress in this or that language”, although it can be one in the syllables of the same type and in analogous position. Thus, the author practically abandons his position based on speculations about force and stress and their connection with length.

According to my instrumental data, under equal conditions, the length of the stressed vowel somewhat increases in comparison with the unstressed. However the conditions are mostly unequal, and this is why stress cannot be directly connected with length; moreover, in the languages which have the division of vowels to the long and short ones according to their nature, like most of the Turkic languages including Tatar, there can be no word about a so-called “quantitative” stress, and even about inclusion of the length into the definition of stress.

The problem of stress is touched upon several times also in other paragraphs of the article. On p. 64ff, the stress in words, word combinations and phrases is discussed with remarks on the history of stress and its influence on the development of the vocalism of Tatar, but almost all only on the basis of Şaraf’s own hearing and some literature, if not counting individual references to the data and conclusions contained in the Vth chapter of his work under discussion. Here I shall limit myself to the investigation of the experimental-phonetic aspect, and should only remark that the non-experimental (e.g. historical) conclusions can (at least sometimes) be encountered in W. Radloff’s Phonetik der Nördlichen Türkischen, Leipzig, 1882 (e.g., the explanation of the vowel shift in the Volga Turkic languages), but it is hardly possible that Şaraf knew German and could use Radloff’s work named.

On pp. 49–50 the stress in Tatar is declared (with reference to the chapter V) to have “expiratory or the so-called dynamic character”, while “according to f” “we see a comparatively small difference between the stressed and unstressed syllables”. Thus, the expiration is confused with the sound intensity (dynamic), and both with the length

\[
(f = \frac{t^2}{t^1}, \text{v.s.})
\]

On p. 64 we find the following definition: “The stress in the Tatar language, as well as in other Turkic languages, is mainly expiratory (dynamic),¹ but it is closely connected also with the musical accent, especially notable during the pronunciation of words and their combinations with various intonations in which the live speech abounds”. And in the Note I we read: “The expiratory or the so-called dynamic stress, as is known, is formed with the relative force of the phonatory
current of air and all the energy used when pronunciation of these or those syllables and sounds of the word". (They are denoted above f and Q.)

Concerning the musical accent, the author gives no experimental data. While according to Bogoroditskij’s article, to which he refers on p. 65, the tone is falling in the last stressed syllable, which is wrong, because in reality, Bogoroditskij has registered the speech of a Baškir coming from the Sterlitamaq region of Baškir land (but not the speech of a Tatar), and in Baškir, according to my experimental data, there is a tendency to stress the initial syllable, not the final one, v.s.

CONCLUSION

Galimjan Šaraf belongs to the older generation of our linguists. He performed what he could in his time, and using the instruments accessible for him and received from his teacher V. A. Bogoroditskij, and thus it is Bogoroditskij to whom Šaraf is indebted for his achievements as well as for the defects of his study to a great extent. In spite of its serious shortcomings, Šaraf’s work was a contribution to science and welcomed as a pioneer work.

Unfortunately Šaraf could not continue his work because in 1937 he fell a victim to the repressions of Stalin’s time, being accused of nationalism (which now is estimated as patriotism), and died after ten years of imprisonment. His name was not mentioned in science. E.g., in Bogoroditskij’s book “Vvedenie … (v.s.), 1953, in which Šaraf’s data were used on a large scale, the name of Šaraf was not even mentioned.

After 1950 a new generation of scholars came into science. But only I dared to refer to Šaraf’s work and to say a good word about his contribution to science (in my Candidate dissertation Glasnye tatarskogo literaturnogo jazyka v svete eksperimental’nyh dannyh, Moskva–Leningrad, 1953 and in its synopsis published also in 1953 as well as Bogoroditskij’s Vvedenie …

After 1956, Šaraf was rehabilitated – posthumously. And little by little Šaraf’s name has found a broadway into the Soviet Türkologic literature (although no experimental-phonetic analysis of his works has taken place). The return of Šaraf’s name into the literature was normal and right. However Soviet administration (e.g. the Editorial Board of the journal Soviet Turkology, but not it alone) began using Šaraf’s name and his work against other scholars, turning Šaraf with Bogoroditskij into a cult and their three articles (of 8 + 37 + 88 pages) with many mistakes and errors, as is demonstrated above, into the work of century, while at the same time not only passing with silence the attainments of all other experimentators in Tatar belonging to a younger generation (four in all), but moreover, even denying their very existence by suppressing, thus, arbitrarily denying any progress in this field in our country and disinforming the readers. And this is in spite of the fact that the works of the latter linguists by far surpass, both in quantity and in the use of new methods, the general production of Bogoroditskij and Šaraf in this field taken together. E.g. the Candidate dissertations by Š. N. Asylgaraev, Sintagmatičeskoe členenie tatarskoj reči (an experimental study), Qazan, 1968; H. H. Salimov, Spectral’nyj analiz tatarskikh glasnyh, Qazan, 1975 and other works, not counting the Doctoral dissertation (1960–62) and many books and articles by U. Baitchura
which have been published since 1953 up to now both in the USSR and abroad. In short, the policy of the Soviet Turkology brings to mind the well known (since 1905) verses: Mertvyom svoboda, živyk pod arest, i.e. ‘Freedom for the dead, prisons for the live’. (See, e.g., soviet Turkology, N° 6, 1977, p. 92.) Considering this policy which first praised Šaraf without measure and sufficient ground, then denied the very existence of him as a scholar, proclaiming him as “vrag naroda” (i.e. “the enemy of the people”), and now again turned him, together with Bogoroditskij, into a cult, I decided to give an objective analysis of his scholarly attainments considering both the positive and negative sides, whereas some critical remarks concerning essential defects in Bogoroditskij’s and Šaraf’s methods were published in my experimental-phonetic study Zvukovoj stroj tatarskogo jazyka ..., vol. I, Qazan, 1959, pp. 14–16, vol. II, Qazan, 1961, pp. 167–169; 199–202 etc. and in some other works.

The sonorous length of the Tatar vowel a was investigated in 1931–32 by V. A. Bogoroditskij’s postgraduate student G. Validov, about which Bogoroditskij informs us in his book Vvedenie v taturskoe jazykoznanie, Kazan’, 1953, pp. 49–51.

Validov registered the work of the vowel cords by means of the “laryngeal capsule” (i.e. in the same way as G. Sharaf had done earlier) in the following eight words and combinations of sounds: a (interjection), ta – meaningless combination of sounds; at ‘horse’, tat – meaningless combination of sounds, ata ‘he shoots’, father’, ‘call’, ‘name!’, asa ‘he hangs’, atap ‘calling’, ‘naming’, asap – meaningless combination of sounds.

Every word was registered only once. Bogoroditskij does not give the translation of these words, all translation is given by me – U.B. The meaningless combinations of sounds are not very reliable, of course.

The results of the measurements were the following:

a) In monosyllabic words:
1) open syllables: a = 34,2 cs; (t)a = 35 cs
2) Closed syllables: a(t) = 24,4 cs; (t)a(t) = 23,4 cs

Here the figures pertain only to the vowel.

Bogoroditskij summarizes: “the length of the vowel in the open syllable perceptibly surpasses the length of the same vowel in the closed syllable”.

b) In disyllabic words:
1) Open syllables: ata = 17,2 + 16,1 + 33,1 = 66,4 cs
   asa = 16,6 + 17,7 + 31,7 = 66 cs
2) Final closed syllable: ata(p) = 15,9 + 14,6 + 30,5 = 61 cs
   asa(p) = 14,2 + 15 + 26,2 = 55,4 cs

Bogoroditskij draws the following conclusions.
1) “The length of the whole words with both syllables open surpasses the length of the corresponding words with the final closed syllable, however it should not be
forgotten that into the general length of the latter the time of the occlusion has not been included.” Thus, in the second part of the sentence, the author negates what is said in the first part of the inference. Then he continues:

2) “In the words with the closed final syllable, a decrease of the sonorous length of both vowels – the stressed and the unstressed – is registered in comparison with words having both syllables open especially concerning the final syllable and, at the same time, also the length of the inner consonants has decreased, and in this as well as in the other pair of words, the length of the spirant surpasses that of the plosive consonant.”

With this the material on experimental-phonetic studies of the length of Tatar vowels published before my works is exhausted.

I began studies of the length of Tatar vowels in 1951 when being a postgraduate student at the Institute of Linguistics of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR in Moscow.

My work was based on the data of two informants: the first informant was I myself, a Tatar by nationality born in Qazan in 1923 in the family of a well known Tatar journalist and interpreter Sharif Baitchura. I speak Tatar from childhood and, according to the evidence of the Institute of the Language, Literature and History at the Qazan Philiation of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR have a proper command of a correct literary Tatar language5. The second informant (for control), Sagitov, also a born Tatar, came from the Bua region of the Tatar ASSR, spoke Tatar from childhood, graduated from the Tatar Dept. of the Historical-Philological faculty of the Qazan University, was ca. 25 years old.

In my postgraduate work – the Candidate dissertation Glasnye tatarskogo literaturnogo hazyka v svete eksperimental’nyh dannyh, Moskva-Leningrad, 1953, consisting of five chapters not counting the addenda with the experimental-phonetic data, Tatar vowels were investigated from the qualitative and the quantitative points of view by using X-Ray, palatograms, oscillograms, partly spectrograms, and other methods.

As to the vowel length, the material obtained contained words, word combinations and sentences including all ten vowels of the Tatar language, and was registered by means of various apparatus, namely the following: (1) oscillograph (sound spectrograph) at the Laboratory of Experimental Phonetics and Psychology of Speech at the Pedagogical Institute of Foreign Languages in Moscow (1951–1952); (2) electrocymograph with the laringophone and ambuchure – at the same laboratory; (3) the big cymograph moved with a watch mechanism with a weight at the Phonetic Laboratory of the Leningrad University.

My way of deciphering the curves was different from those of the predecessors mentioned, because I measured the length of vowels according to the Souffle, i.e. basing on the mouth curve but not on the laryngeal curve, the latter being taken into consideration only as an auxiliary means.

The data on the length of the vowel a obtained by me were compared with those

(5) In 1954–59 I lectured Tatar at the Qazan University, at the Dept. of Tatar Language and Literature.
of G. Sharaf and G. Validov as it is represented in the table below: the difference of the results appeared unimportant.

The results of my investigation of the length of all other Tatar vowels are given in the next table containing the data on the absolute length of the vowels. These materials were included into the IVth chapter of my Candidate dissertation, v.s., while in the synopsis of the dissertation (Moscow–Leningrad, 1953, pp. 10–13) I gave the following description of the results obtained by means of registration on the big cymograph of the Leningrad Laboratory.

"Unstressed vowels have two degrees of length, while the stressed vowels have four degrees (non-phonologic length). Long vowels have four while short vowels have three degrees of length. The longest are the long vowels at the absolute end of disyllabic words and in monosyllabic words before spirants. The sound í (bun) is the longest, which is explained by its diphthongoidal character which, however, is evidently unimportant. The range of deviations of the length in short vowels is perceptibly less on the whole than the range of the deviations of the mean length for the long vowels in the corresponding positions. Especially great are the deviations at the absolute end, where the vowels are the longest."

"With the decrease of length in general, also the gradations of length diminish, which is evidently connected with the nêv processes – with perception, with the ability to distinguish the typical length. On the whole, as it is seen from the tables added, the length of the long vowels refers to that of the short ones as two to one, except the position at the absolute end, where the average length of the short vowels will be a little more and the Ratio will be 5 to 3."

"Most easily the high front vowels ú, i, û, û are deleted unrounded vowels ð, i fall out more often than the rounded ð, û, and probably the existence of two main articulations favours a better preservation of the length. The minimal average length belongs to the sound y, which is evidently connected with its non-rounded quality. However the cases of the deletion of y have not been registered. Among the short vowels the vowel ð is the longest, which can result from its recent development, in a number of cases from u, i. The connection between the quantity and the quality is reflected in the fact that the short vowels ð, ñ are less rounded in comparison with u, i. The quantity of the sound is connected not only with its own quality, however also with the quality of the surrounding sounds. The length of vowels is the greatest at the absolute end, a little less is it before spirants, the shortest is it before occlusive consonants. Unstressed long vowels are no less than by two times shorter than the stressed ones in similar phonetic positions, whereas the short unstressed vowels before stops have almost the same length as the respective short stressed vowels, while unstressed short vowels before spirants are approximately by 1/3 shorter than the respective stressed vowels. An exception is ð, where this difference is a little greater, however it does not reach the ratio 1:2."

"Hence the conclusion follows that the length changes depending on the neighbourhood of certain sounds (occlusive, spirant, etc.) and stands in a quite other relation towards stress than in the Russian language, where the stress is primarily quantitative. The stress is quantitative in Tatar only relatively, only in the second or third turn. The length of vowels in closed syllables is less than in the open (relatively open) syllables, however this difference is not important."
“As well as according to the vowel harmony (the qualitative opposition), there existed in Tatar the quantitative opposition of long and short vowels, as well as in the English and German languages. However, if in English and German the distinction between the long and short phonemes is primarily based on the quantity, in Tatar the priority in the function of sense-distinguishing has, in the course of the historical development passed, because of the inner laws, to the quality of the sounds, which favoured a further severance between the articulation of the long and short vowels. The transition of the function of sense-distinguishing evidently appeared possible because of old, as well as nowadays, vowels were distinguished according to several features both qualitative as well as quantitative.”

“The sounds which are now designated ū, ŭ are of heterogenous origin and came to existence in different ways. Thus, ū ascend to the short ē, to e < ē, to ȋ, ē ascend to ē̆ to śni < ē̆, to ȋ. Experimental-phonetically this is corroborated by a greater range of deviations of the measurements of these vowels: ē, ē ascends respectively to ē, ē̆. Long vowels (primary lengths) are shortened (unstressed u, ū are perceptibly shorter than a, ȋ, also the stressed ū is shorter than a at the absolute end), the short vowels change their quality (the closest intertanglement of the material and the social sides of the language) the number of long vowels is replenished at the expense of deleting of consonants (secondary lengths). It is just the high vowels that are shortened, but not the low ones, because there are no examples of the low short vowels, which physiologically is explained by the necessity of a more work of the articulatory apparatus for the production of high vowels and by the lax (loose) articulation. Evidently it is in this way that the process of historical development went on this case.”

After that I continued the investigation – including the investigation of the vowel length in Tatar, but now basing on the data of ca. 25 Tatar informants, and in comparison with the respective data obtained from douzans of my informants representing some other Turkic and the Fenno-Ugric languages. And in the years 1957–1961, published the results which were later, in 1962, reflected in the synopsis of my Doctoral dissertation as follows (I adduce here only the material concerning the Tatar language, while the data on the other languages can be found in the works mentioned).

“Every vowel can be completely or partially voiceless or voiced, nasalized or not nasalized – depending on the phonetic position, the devoicing and nasalization being favoured by the position in Auslaut and Anlaut as well as the neighbourhood of the respective consonants. The degree of palatalization or velarization can, to a certain degree, deviate depending on the quality of the neighbouring sounds. Diphthongs are not found in Tatar, because combinations of two vowels are subjected to syllabic metanalysis (division into two syllables) depending on the phonetic position and, besides, historically ascent to two different sounds but not to one (atā ‘hant’, cf. Khakas an ‘hant’, tātu ‘mountain’ – cf. Tur. dag ‘id.’ and with the possessive affix we have avy ‘his hant’, tawy ‘his mountain’, etc.). At the same time, some diphthongoid character of many vowels has been registered. According to the length, the vowels are divided into two groups, i.e. the long ones: o, a, ae (ā), u, ū, o, î, i, e and the short mixed reduced ones ū, ū, ū, ū. This length is qualitative, sometimes the intersection of the length of the short and
the long vowels is possible, however, on the whole, the ratio is 2:1 in the respective positions. The strong beginning is more characteristic of the short vowels, but can be encountered also in long vowels, especially in the emphatic speech. And this is characteristic of many Turkic languages, e.g., of Khakas, which, as is known, has never been subjected to Arabian influence, and this is why it is necessary to count hamza to original Turkic sounds although, in proper Turkic words, it does not always have a phonologic role.” (P.4)

“The character of the articulation of the vowel (the width in particular) is connected with the length: the longest is the vowel a, then comes o, then e, etc. The high vowels are shorter, and the reduction of the length of u, i, etc. to 7–8 sigmas gives ground to count them to be mixed to an important degree, because the quantitative reduction, as a rule, is accompanied by the qualitative reduction.” (P.6) “That the quantitative reduction leads to the qualitative one is supported also by the fact that in the Behind-of-Qazan subdialect, in the Northern Nurlats, etc., partly in Qazan itself, the quantitative reduction of the pretonic labial vowels θ, ß has now already brought to the fusion of them with the vowels θ, ß as well as in Chuvash.” (P.12)

“To other positional factors influencing the length of vowels the following belong: voicedness-voicelessness, fricativeness-occlusiveness, the aspirated or non-aspirated character of the neighbouring consonants as well as their strong or weak pronunciation, the length of the vowels of the neighbouring syllables, the general quantity of the sounds in the word, the stressed or unstressed pronunciation of the vowel in question, etc. In all discussed languages, the Turkic as well as the Feno-Ugric, all these positional factors influence to this or that degree the length of the vowels, and the strong articulation, voicelessness, occlusiveness, expiration of the neighbouring consonants (both preceding as well as the following ones), the increase of the length of the vowels of the neighbouring syllables, the increase of the number of sounds in the syllable (word), unstressed position, the closed character of the syllable in question are the factors which decrease the length of the vowels, whereas the contrary conditions favour its increase.” (Pp. 13–14)

“The shift of vowels in the Volga-Turkic languages was evidently the result of the quantitative reduction of the short vowels, which, in turn, was going on simultaneously with the levelling of the quantitative oppositions in vocalism – probably the result of the interaction (possibly the influence of the substratum) with the more ancient Feno-Ugric population of this area ....” (12)

“As stress it is understood here an increase of the sound intensity of the tone height and of expiration of vowels and of consonants, the latter coinciding with the increase of the force of the pronunciation of consonants, with the growth of the expiration and not seldom with their devoicing. In the stress the consonants also partake. As to the quantität, it is often counterposed to stress. At the same time, it is necessary to have in view that the length of the vowels is in a complicated dependence on the stress, and the character of the latter plays here an important role, because individual components of stress can differently influence the length: if the increase of the tone height and of sound intensity has a tendency to favour an increase of the vowel length, the reinforcement of the articulation, a growth of the expiration characteristic of the stress in a number of Altaic languages, sooner
favours devoicing of sounds and the decrease of the sonorous length of vowels. In this sense, the above enumerated conditions influencing the vowel length should be understood.” (P.13)

“In the full style of pronunciation, in which the registration took place, the deletion of reduced mixed, as well as of high vowels was registered first of all and mainly. Thus, in the Tatar language, the vowels o, o, ę, u, i, i, seldom a, à (e.g., bal(ă)lar ‘children’, tăr(ă)ză ‘window’) fall out. The deletion is registered in di-, tri-, and tetrasyllabic words, as well as in separate word combinations and sentences – in the first, second, third pretonic and in the first posttonic syllables. Examples: (u)saq ‘aspen’, p(ę)çaq ‘knife’, k(ę)çök(h)na ‘little’, bāx(ę)ta ‘his happiness’, ik(ę)ș sădă ‘both of them’, xal(ę)qəbəz ‘our people’, (ę)çənə ‘into’, (ę) çərəýən ‘totten’, k(ę)çərəitəp ‘having diminished’, kəɾəstjən(ę)na ‘to the peasant’, bus(ę) tartəm quşəmcəsəd ‘this is the possessive affix’, baq(ę)r aqçalar ‘copper money’, kuk(ə)ruz(ę) ‘maize’, etc. During the confluence of two vowels, ę, a and others fall out: fortəpjan(ę)xən ‘for the piano’, alm(ə)ayaq(ə) ‘apple tree’, etc. In the pronunciation of Russian words by Tatars, also the vowels e, e, a and even whole syllables (e.g., je) fall out.”

“In trisyllabic words of Qazan Tatar, predominantly the vowel of the initial syllable is deleted, while in Mishar Tatar and in Mountain Bashkir dialects more often the vowel of the second syllable falls out. Cf., e.g., Mish.-Tat. and Bashk. bûr dép bûrkə, Qaz.-Tat. hûrəyn ‘his fir cap’, etc. Mish.-Tat. kəş(ę)lər, Qaz.-Tat. k(ę)șlər ‘people’, etc. This is connected with the existence of two stresses in the dialects of Mișar Tatar and of Bașkır, whereas in Qazan Tatar there is usually only one stress at the end of the word” (not counting the cases with an initial stress).

“Reduction and deletion are favoured by acceleration of the speech, and this is why the cases of deletion occur often when whole sentences are registered, but not individual words. The process of reduction and of deletion are the strongest in the Behind-of-Qazan subdialect of Tatar, in which several vowels can fall out (or be devoiced) in a word, as well as the vowels of stressed Syllables (predominantly in the position between two voiceless consonants, which is connected with a quicker tempo of speech characteristic of this dialect.”

“The deletion of the final posttonic vowels is also registered in Tatar (e.g., bus(ę) ‘this’, etc.), however here (as well as in a number of other cases) we must sonner speak not so much of deletion as of devoicing (or nasalization) of vowels because, in many cases, the reflexes of the fallen out vowels are retained, these vowels are articulated (although partly, in a reduced way), which is corroborated by the examples of the type (i)kmək ‘bread’ in which the vowels at the absolute beginning before a voiceless stop are devoiced, but do not fall out, because when the cymographic registration a rise of the mouth curve is seen before the beginning of the occlusion of the consonant k (5–7 cs long) which, however, has no vibrations as well as the laryngeal curve.”

“Devoicing of the end of the final vowel at the absolute end is very characteristic of the Turkic languages ... Thus, in Tatar, according to the informant from Qazan, the devoicing of the final vowel ę up to 69.5% of all its length has been registered (ușəp çərtəşə ‘overflowed’); the sound ę is devoiced up to 66.6% (qəçəqərəşəp žəbərdə ‘cried out’), the vowel a is devoiced up to 67.7% (aşəp ərə ‘he is shooting’), in a
### Table 1. The length of the Tatar vowel a (in centiseconds = cs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>The conditions of the registration</th>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>In monosyllabic words (closed syllables)</th>
<th>In disyllabic words (the second syllable is open)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Before stops</td>
<td>Before spirants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unstressed vowel of the 1st syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stressed vowel of the 2nd syllable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pneumatic registration on the big weight cymograph, 1952–1953, Leningrad</td>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Pneumatic registration on the big weight cymograph, 1952–1953, Leningrad</td>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The registration on the electrocymograph with a laryngophone and the ambuchure, 1951, Moscow</td>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>The registration on the oscillograph (sound spectrograph), 1952, Moscow</td>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pneumatic registration on the spring-cymograph of the system “Verdin” with the laryngeal capsula, 1927, Qazan</td>
<td>G. Sharaf</td>
<td>16.8–20.0</td>
<td>19.7–28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2–13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Pneumatic registration on the spring-cymograph of the system “Verdin” with the laryngeal capsula, 1931–1932, Qazan</td>
<td>G. Validov</td>
<td>23.4–24.4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6–17.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. The General Table of the Sonorous Length of Tatar Vowels (in centiseconds = cs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sounds</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>ã</th>
<th>u</th>
<th>ã</th>
<th>i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stressed</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstressed</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ũ</td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>ũ</td>
<td>ã</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stressed</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstressed</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Sounds | ɐ | ũ | ʊ | ʊ | ɐ |
| Stressed | 26.2 | 16.0 | 22.2 | 17.8 | 9.0 | 12.7 | 15.7 | 7.3 | 12.0 | 17.4 | (6.0) | (9.3) | 20.9 | (8.7) | 14.4 |
| Unstressed | 8.2 | 13.3 | 17.8 | 9.0 | 12.7 | 15.7 | 7.3 | 12.0 | 17.4 | (6.0) | (9.3) | 20.9 | (8.7) | 14.4 |
separate word up to 43.4% (atna ‘week’), the vowel ə (æ) is devoiced up to 45.9% (asqa tēṣā ‘is descending’), etc. The devoicing of the vowel at the absolute end and in the absolute beginning is favoured by an increase of its length.”

“Besides devoicing, rather often a partial nasalization of vowels at the absolute end, at the absolute beginning and in the neighbourhood of nasal consonants is registered, which takes place as a result of assimilation according to the mode of articulation with the neighbouring consonants or with the indifferent position, and besides cymographic data is supported with X-Ray photographs, a minor degree of nasalization being characteristic of almost all vowels during all their articulation as is seen from the X-Ray data on Tatar. The final nasalization can reach 50% of the sonorous length of the vowel and appears, as is known, because of asynchronous work of the articulatory organs (as well as when devoicing, etc.) which, in turn, is the material physiological basis of the assimilative processes in the language. In certain cases, nasalization can lead to the reduction and complete deletion of the vowel.”

“This quantitative reduction is connected with the qualitative reduction, and this is why the high vowels of the type u, i, etc. are reduced and diminished, they approach, to this or that degree, to the mixed ə, ɔ, according to their articulatory position, that is to the indifferent position of the organs of speech, which is corroborated with the X-Ray data.”

“The role of the high short and mixed ‘reduced’ vowels in the modern Turkic languages is mainly reduced to that they constitute only a background for the pronunciation of these or other consonants, only some additional articulatory position for consonants and it is doubtful whether these vowels play an independent role in disyllabic and polysyllabic words, except in the position at the absolute end of the word, because, in many cases, the prothetic consonants of a perceptibly greater length are registered which, however, are not perceived by the speakers of the language.”

“The fall out and the prothesis (epenthesis, epithesis) of vowels represent two sides of one and the same process and only under certain conditions they can be counterposed to each other, because what is a prothesis, etc. (respectively – deletion) for one language can be a norm for another, and vice versa; it suffice to compare Turkmen araba and Tatar arba ‘cart’, Qazan-Tatar ištēm ‘I heard’ and Baškīr, Mišar-Tatar ištēm ‘id.’, etc. Prothesis and deletion can be separated from one another only on the historical level, and from this point of view, the prothetic vowel usually appears only in the borrowed words to eliminate consonant clusters, and here it is of importance the individual knowledge of the language from which the word is borrowed. Besides, some consonants cannot be at the absolute beginning, e.g., the voiced vibrant r, and as a result, e.g., the following forms of the word with the meaning ‘Russian’ appear: urōs, urās, ērūs, ērūs, etc. The word rajon ‘region’ can have the forms ērajon, araļon, etc. Rather often the condition of the voiced pronunciation of the initial z, ş is the existence of a preceding vowel, which results in the appearance of such forms as ēzeur ‘big’ (orthographic zur), ēzir ‘earth’ (orthographic ẓir), etc.”“It is the mixed (‘reduced’, short) vowels of the type ə, ɔ, ɔ, ş, less often the high vowels u, ü, i, etc., and most seldom the wide vowels that are reduced. The position of the additional vowel is not limited in the
word: it can be in different syllables of the word. Here are some examples of additional vowels which appear in the words borrowed from Russian or in Russian words when Tatars speak Russian Prothesis: školä ‘school’, ëstol/ëstil ‘table’; Epenthesis: gërst ‘melancholy’, çëkalëf ‘Chkalov’ (a proper name), fakët ‘fact’; Epithesis: bankë ‘bank’, karlë ‘Karl’ (a proper name), paka ‘pact’, etc”s.

THE RELATIVE LENGTH OF TATAR VOWELS

The relative length of Tatar vowels was investigated on the basis of the oscillographic data on di- and trisyllabic words and in combinations of two words registered in the pronunciation of the informant N° 1 at the Chair of the Latvian language of the Latvian University in Riga in 1957.1 Besides, an analogous material was registered by means of the cymograph of the firm Verdin in the pronunciation of 20 representatives of various regions of TASSR aged 18–20 years, students of the Qazan Pedagogical Institute, Department of the Tatar Language and Literature, and five informants aged about 30, who were students at the Qazan University (analogous department); the registration took place at the Laboratory of the Qazan Pedagogical Institute in the years 1954–1955 (some in 1956–1957). Thus, all our experimental material was obtained from the younger, next as compared with Sharaf and Validov, generation.

The results of the investigation of the oscillographic data obtained from the first informant are given below in the tables.

In five words (7 measurements = ms) with both syllables open: ata ‘father’, apa ‘aunt’, aça ‘opens’, baqa ‘frog’, aty ‘his horse’ – all stressed at the second syllable – the ratio of the length of the first vowel to that of the second comprised, on the average, 50%, the deviations in measurements ranging from 41,5 (ata ‘father’) to 56,4% (aça ‘opens’) i.e. in words with the vowel a in both syllables, while in the word aty ‘his horse’ – with the vowel a in the first syllable and the reduced vowel ý in the second, the ratio comprised 63,5%, that is the reduced vowel in the second syllable favours an increase of the ratio V₁/V₂.

In 12 words (22 ms) with both syllables closed, namely: batqaq ‘swampy’, taptap ‘trampling down’, pqçmaq ‘corner’, upaqy ‘pool’, qysqyc ‘tongues’, çypçycyq ‘sparrow’, tëççëk ‘little tooth’, qapçycy ‘bag’, qaşıyq ‘we were petrified’, taptiyq ‘we found’, açqyç ‘key’, kinç ‘we went’ – all stressed at the end – the ratio of the length of the first vowel to that of the second comprised, on the average, 111,6%, the deviations ranging from 22,2% in pqçmaq ‘corner’ to 194,3% in qapçycyq ‘bag’.

In words with both vowels of full formation (a) or with both vowels reduced (ý, ë) and stressed at the second (final) syllable, the ratio L₁/L₂ is, as a rule, less than 100%, that is the length of the second vowel surpasses that of the first. E.g., in the words batqaq ‘swampy’ (2 ms) and taptap ‘trampling down’ (2), the ratio is, on the average, equal to 78,9%, the deviations ranging from 65,2% (batqaq ‘swampy’ – 1 ms) to 97,1% (batqaq ‘swampy’ – 1 ms); in the words qysqyc ‘tongues’ (2 ms), çypçycyq ‘sparrow’ (2 ms), the ratio is, on the average, 66,0%, the deviations ranging from 50,6% (çypçycyq – 1 ms) to 77,9% (çypçycyq – 1 ms), while in tëççëk ‘little tooth’

(6) *Note: the sign ë is equal to ý.
(2 ms) the ratio is 93.8% (from 87.6 to 100%). And in the word pəcmaq ‘corner’ (2 ms) with a reduced vowel in the initial syllable and a low vowel of full formation in the second syllable, the ratio is 29.2% (from 22.2 to 36.1%).

In the words with a low vowel of full formation in the initial syllable: qaprəq ‘bag’ (1), qatttyq ‘we were petrified’ (1), tapttyq ‘we found’ (2), ačktəq ‘key’ (2), the ratio L₁/L₂ comprised, on the average, 171.9%, the deviations ranging from 141.1% (ačktəq ‘key’ – 1 ms) to 194.3% (qatttyq ‘we got petrified’). When the vowel of the initial syllable is a high one, the ratio diminishes, however mostly it is more than 100.0%: in the words kirtək ‘we went’ (2) and upgyn ‘pool’ (2), the ratio comprised, on the average, 120.3%, the deviations ranging from 98.6% (upgyn ‘pool’ – 1 ms) to 131.9% (kirtək ‘we went’ – 1 ms). This is an indirect indication at the fact that the high vowels of full formation, in all respects, take an intermediate position between the low vowels of full formation (a, ə) and the reduced vowels (the so-called “reduced” vowels).

In ten words with the first syllable open and the second closed atap ‘naming’, atyp ‘shooting’, qatyq ‘soar milk specially prepared’, qasəq ‘spoon’, taşyp ‘carrying’, açqyq ‘open’, açyp ‘opening’, dəγət ‘tar’, körəp ‘waiting’, pyçaq ‘knife’, the length of the first vowel appeared (avr.) 10.8 cs, that of the second vowel 9.8 cs, the ratio = 122.3%. However the words are not uniform. In the word atap ‘naming’ with one and the same vowel a in both syllables, the length of the first vowel was 11.5 cs, that of the second 18.0 cs, the ratio = 63.9%, that is the length of the second vowel surpasses that of the first. An analogous picture was registered in words with the vowels ə or ə in both syllables. E.g., in two words: dəγət ‘tar’ (3 ms) and körəp ‘waiting’ (1 ms), the length of the first vowel is (avr.) 7.5 cs, that of the second vowel is 12.0 cs, and ratio L₁/L₂ is 61.6%, the deviations ranging, for the first vowel, from 4.8 cs (körəp) to 11.4 cs (dəγət – 1 ms), for the second vowel – from 11.6 cs (körəp) to 13.6 cs (dəγət – 1 ms), the ratio being from 41.1% (körəp) to 94.9% (dəγət – 1 ms). Thus, in dissyllabic words with the first open and the second closed syllables with homogenous vowels in both syllables and the stress falling on the second syllable, the length of the second vowel surpasses that of the first vowel.

However, if the vowels are different, the picture can be another one. Thus, in six words (11 ms) with the first vowel a and the second vowel the reduced y: atyp ‘having shot’ (2 ms), qatyq ‘soar milk’ (2 ms), qasəq ‘spoon’ (2 ms), taşyp ‘carrying’ (2 ms), açqyq ‘open’ (2 ms), açyp ‘opening’ (1 ms), the length of the first vowel comprised, on the average, 13.4 cs, that of the second vowel 8.0 cs, the ratio L₁/L₂ = 172.0%, the deviations of the length of the first vowel are from 11.9 cs (qasəq ‘spoon’ – 1 ms from 2) to 15.2 cs (atyp ‘having shot’ – 1 ms); in the second vowel, the deviations are from 5.7 cs (taşyp ‘carrying’ – 1 ms) to 10.8 cs (açyp ‘opening’) the ratio ranging from 131.5% (açyp ‘opening’) to 242.1% (taşyp ‘carrying’).

And in the word pyçaq ‘knife’ in which the first vowel is a reduced one, and in the second syllable we have the vowel of full formation, namely a, the length of the first vowel comprised 1.0 cs, that of the second vowel 18.7 cs, the ratio being L₁/L₂ equal to 5.3%.

Thus, the relative length of the vowels in dissyllabic words with the first open and
the second closed syllables stressed at the end depends on the quality of the vowels in the word. This is why the length of the unstressed vowel can surpass that of the stressed vowel.

In nine words (16 ms) with the first syllable closed and the second one open, having the vowel a in both syllables, namely arpa ‘barley’ (2 ms), arqa ‘back’ (2 ms), arba ‘cart’ (2 ms), bazda ‘in the cellar’ (2 ms), atqa ‘to the horse’ (1 ms), taqta ‘board’ (1 ms), qapqa ‘gate’ (2 ms), baqça ‘garden’ (2 ms), aqqa ‘to the white’ (2 ms), the stress falling on the second (last) syllable, the length of the first vowel comprised, on the average, 11.0 cs, that of the second vowel was 24.5 cs, the ratio L₁/L₂ comprised, on the average, 44.8%; the deviations in the vowel length ranging for the first vowel from 7.0 cs (qapqa ‘gate’ – 1 ms) to 15.4 cs (bazda ‘in the cellar’), for the second vowel from 21.0 cs (qapqa ‘gate’ – 1 ms) to 28.4 cs (arpa ‘barley’ – 1 ms), while for the ratio L₁/L₂ the deviations were from 32.0% (qapqa ‘gate’ – 1 ms) to 62.7 cs (bazda ‘in the cellar’ – 1 ms).

Words and Word Combinations Stressed at the Initial Syllable

In four units: appaq ‘very white’ (3 ms), rusça ‘in the Russian language’ (1 ms), kicē ‘please, go’ (1 ms), tap di ‘he says: find!’ (1 ms) – on the whole 8 measurements – the average length of the first vowel comprised 12.8 cs, that of the second vowel was equal to 18.6 cs, and the ratio L₁/L₂ = 70.2%, the deviations ranging, for the first vowel, from 10.5 cs (appaq ‘very white’ – 1 ms) to 16.1 cs (rusça ‘in Russian’), for the second vowel from 12.5 cs (appaq ‘very white’ – 1 ms) to 21.8 cs (rusça), and in the ratio from 56.9% (tap di ‘he says: find!’) to 91.0% (appaq ‘very white’ – 1 ms from 3).

The phonetic conditions are unequal. Thus, in appaq ‘very white’ both syllables are closed, and here the ratio L₁/L₂ is, on the average, equal to 87.6%, the deviations ranging from 84.0% to 91.0%, while in the other examples the first syllable is closed, the second is open, and hence the ratio diminishes, it is on the average 64.3%, the deviations ranging from 56.9% (tap di) to 73.8 (rusça). However, in all cases, the length of the unstressed vowel of the second (last) syllable surpasses the length of the vowel of the first stressed syllable.

Trisyllabic Units

An analogous picture has been established for trisyllabic words and word combinations.

Here, in three words stressed at the end, namely çabata ‘bast shoe’ (2 ms), qedaça ‘sister-in-law’ (2 ms), kòckônä ‘little’, ‘small’ (1 ms), the average length of the first vowel comprised 5.4 cs, the deviations ranging from 1.8 cs (kòckônä ‘small’) to 12.0 cs çabata; the length of the second vowel was equal to 9.3 cs, the deviations ranging between 5.0 cs (kòckônä) to 12.3 cs (qedaça); and the average length of the third vowel was 21.4 cs, the deviations being from 20.2 (çabata) to 22.6 (kòckônä), whereas the ratio L₁/L₃ comprised, on the average, 26.9%, the deviations ranging from 8.0% (kòckônä) to 59.4% (çabata), the ratio L₂/L₃ comprised, in turn, 44.6%, the deviations ranging from 22.1% (kòckônä) to 59.4% (çabata – 1 ms).
Trisyllabic units stressed at the initial syllable have, in principle, the same relations in the vowel length as in the units stressed at the final syllable.

Thus, in three words and word combinations: qap-qara ‘very black’ (3 ms), tik-känä ‘simply’, ‘for no reason’ (3 ms), sap-sary ‘quite yellow’ (3 ms), the length of the first vowel comprised, on the average, 9.2 cs, the deviations ranging from 6.5 cs (tik-känä – 1 ms) to 10.9 cs (sap-sary – 1 ms); the average length of the second vowel was 10.6 cs, the deviations being from 4.9 cs (tik-känä – 1 ms) to 17.6 cs (sap-sary); the length of the third vowel appeared, on the average, equal to 17.4 cs, the deviations ranging from 8.0 cs (sap-sary – 1 ms) or 12.0 cs (sap-sary – the other ms) to 24.5 cs (qap-qara – 1 ms). The avr. ratio $L_2/L_3$ comprised 56.4%, the deviations ranging from 35.9% (tik-känä – 1 ms) to 101.2% (sap-sary – 1 ms); the average ratio $L_2/L_3$ comprised 70.9%, the deviations being from 27.1% (tik-känä – 1 ms) to 182% (sap-sary – 1 ms) or to 128.6% (sap-sary – another ms).

Thus, we can draw the conclusion that, in trisyllabic words, stressed at the first syllable, the length of the unstressed vowels of the following syllables, as a rule, surpasses that of the initial stressed syllable. The same refers also to tetrasyllabic words, as it is seen, e.g., from the data on the word tūp-tūyārāk ‘completely round’ (2 ms). Here the following figures were obtained for the length of the vowels: (1) 9.0 – 7.6 – 12.8 – 14.8 cs; (2) 7.3 – 7.0 – 13.5 – 15.7 cs. Thus, the length of the first vowel comprised, on the average, 8.2 cs, that of the second vowel 7.3 cs, that of the third 13.2, and of the fourth 15.2 cs, the ratio $L_1/L_4$ comprised 53.6% (46.5 and 60.8%), the ratio $L_2/L_4$ = 48.0% (51.4% and 44.6%), the ratio $L_3/L_4$ appeared equal to 86.2% (86.5% and 86.0%).

**Some Combinations of Two Disyllabic Words**

In 17 combinations of two disyllabic words, the length of the vowel of the last open syllable is the longest in the word and in the combination of words independently of the quality of the vowel, whereas if the last syllable is closed, the length of its vowel is usually submitted to the same regulieities which have been established above for disyllabic words.

Thus, in sixteen cases, the length of the second vowel of the second word of the combination (i.e. $L_1$ in the combination), usually presumed to be stressed in the word, is longer than the first vowel of the same word, the deviations in the Ratio $L_2/L_4$ ranging from 30.6% (čítkä čąqtə ‘went out’) to 78.5% (bäryp qąttıy ‘went and returned’) and only in one case it appeared more, comprising 111.0% (pè čän čąqaćqə ‘we mowed hay’), in which the last syllable is a closed one, whereas in the initial syllable of this word we have the vowel $a$ of full formation, and in the second syllable the “reduced” vowel $y$. Whereas in the expression bäryp qąttıy ‘went and returned’ (Nº 6) the length of the last vowel which is here in an open syllable, surpasses that of the first in spite of the fact that the former ($y$) is a reduced vowel, whereas the latter is even a diphthong, and diphthongs are usually longer than the longest vowels of full formation (under equal conditions).

Another picture is represented by the first word of the combination. Here the vowel of the initial (unstressed) syllable can be both longer or shorter in comparison with the vowel of the second (stressed) syllable, depending on the quality of the vowel and the phonetic position (the structure of the syllables). Thus, in numbers
1; 2; 13–16 (the words taptap, xa, pyçaq, cikä, bērāū, pəçän) the ratio L₁/L₂ is distributed from 6.6% (pyçaq – N° 13) to 97.0% (xa – N° 10) or to 90.9% (taptap – 1 ms – N° 2), whereas in numbers 3; 4; 5–9; 11; 12; 17 (the words täsäq, acyp, baryp, šüy, xiph, asqa, bərəp), the Ratio L₁/L₂ is distributed from 124.1% (asqa – 1 ms) to 285.4% (xiph) or to 270.0 (täsäq – 1 ms).

Thus, in the latter cases, the Ratio L₁/L₂ depends on the quality of the vowels: in the first series the vowel of the initial syllable is mostly reduced or it is a high one, or sometimes it is the same vowel a in both syllables (closed ones – NB), whereas in the second series it is the second vowel that is mostly reduced one or, at least, we have the same vowel a in both syllables, and the second a is in an open syllable before the following stop representing the initial consonant of the next word – the position favouring a decrease of the length of the preceding vowel which is the last one in the preceding word.

To this it should be added that the highest mean tone and the maximal mean sound intensity, in such combinations of two words, fall as a rule on the second or on the third syllable of the combination in Tatar and in some other languages as it was established by me experimental-phonetically as long ago as in 1961.

Thus, the experimental-phonetic data prove that the vowel length cannot be an indispensable component of stress. Only under certain conditions the increase of the vowel length can coincide with intensity stress and the tonic accent, and this regularity, to all appearances, concerns all languages of the world. And the notion of “quantitative stress” should be abandoned.

The material obtained from over twenty other informants corroborates the conclusions drawn from the data of the principal informant.

The pronunciation of the other informants was registered on the cyromgraph of the system “Verdin” (Paris), the very same which had been used by Bogoroditskij and his two students, v.s. The error of regiatratration comprised 2.0%, the admissable error being 5.0%. In the pronunciation of every informant ca. thirty or more words and word combinations were registered. In the table 3 the data on the length of the vowel a in four types of disyllabic words with the final stress are represented, namely (1) when both syllables are open (e.g. ata ‘father’); (2) when the initial syllable is closed and the second one is open (e.g. atta ‘on horse’); (3) when both syllables are closed (e.g. taptap ‘trampling’); (4) when the initial syllable is open and the second syllable is closed (e.g. atap ‘naming’). Here, in this series, according to the data of 22 informants (over 130 measurements), only in three cases the length of the first unstressed vowel surpassed that of the second stressed vowel: in the word qadaq ‘nail’ (2 ms, in the pronunciation of the 11th informant Huramšin from the Quqmar region) and in the word baqeq ‘swampy’ (1 ms from 2 in the pronunciation of the 12th informant Mullahmedova from the Agerže region), whereas in all other cases the length of the second (stressed) vowel exceeded that of the unstressed vowel of the initial syllable, the deviations in the Ratio L₁/L₂ being distributed between 96% for the word qadaq ‘nail’ (1 ms from 2 in the pronunciation of the informant Šarafeeva from the Jutaza reg.) and up to 27% in the word apa ‘aunt’ (1 ms in the pronunciation of the informant F. Zakirova from the Qyzyl Armija reg.).

In words with both syllables open, the deviations in the Ratio L₁/L₂ are distrib-
uted between 27% (apa ‘aunt’, informant 21, v.s.) to 80% (apa ‘aunt’, informant 19 Butulov, Čistaj region). Weighted average Ratio for all words ata ‘father’ and apa ‘aunt’ is 55% (for all informants taken together).

In words with the initial syllable closed and the second one open (atta ‘on horse’ – 19 words and tapta ‘ramble’ – 2 words) the distribution (in measurements) of the Ratio L₁/L₂ comprised from 23% (atta, inf. N° 21) to 80% (atta, inf. N° 5, Bua reg.). The word tapta ‘ramble!’ is the imperative form and must be pronounced with the initial stress. Nevertheless the relative length of its vowels is distributed within the data for the word atta ‘on horse’ having a final stress (v.i. where such cases are discussed). On the average weighted Ratio for the word atta ‘on horse’ comprised 52% (19 words) and for the word tapta ‘ramble!’ 55% (2 words, 4 ms inf. 18 and 22).

In words with both syllables closed: batqaq ‘swampy’ (11), taptap ‘trampling’ (6) the Ratio L₁/L₂ was distributed between 47% in batqaq ‘swampy’ (1 ms from 2, inf. N° 7) to 96% in batqaq ‘swampy’ (1 ms from 2, inf. N° 17), if not counting 1 ms from 2 of the word batqaq in the pronunciation in inf. 12 where the Ratio was 118%. And weighted average Ratio for the words taptap ‘trampling’ and batqaq ‘swampy’ comprised 79%.

In words with the initial syllable open and the second one closed the Ratio L₁/L₂ was distributed from 54% in the word atap ‘naming’ (1 ms from 4, inf. N° 8) to 97% in the word qadaq ‘nail’ (1 ms from 2, inf. N° 10) if not counting two exceptions: 102% and 142% in the word qadaq pronounced by the informant N° 11 Huramsin, Quqmara reg. Here the unstressed vowel of the initial syllable practically surpasses the length of the vowel in the second, stressed syllable. Weighted average Ratio L₁/L₂ for the words atap ‘naming’ (5), qadaq ‘nail’ (11) taqqaq ‘vessel’ (1) comprised 71%.

Thus, according to the data adduced, the phonetic position influences the length of vowels (e.g. the length of vowels in closed syllables diminishes in comparison with that in open syllables), however this does not change the general rule that the length of the vowel of the second (stressed) syllable usually surpasses the length of the vowel of the preceding (unstressed) syllable in disyllabic words, although some exceptions are also possible (cf. the data of the informant No 11 Huramsin from Quqmara region). Such is the picture in words with homogenious vowels in both syllables of a disyllabic word with a final stress.

However, quite another picture appears when we pass over to the words with heretogenous vowels. Thus, in disyllabic words with the vowels of full formation (“long”) in the initial syllable and a mixed vowel in the second syllable, the length of the first (unstressed) vowel, as a rule, surpasses that of the second stressed vowel when the second syllable is closed. E.g., in such words with the vowel a (or ā) in the initial syllable and the vowel y (or ţ) in the second, when the initial syllable is open while the second one is closed, the length of the first unstressed vowel mostly surpasses that of the second (stressed) vowel, the Ratio L₁/L₂ being distributed from 65% in ąckyç ‘key’ (1 ms from 2, inf. N° 16) to 434% in qašyq ‘spoon’ (1 ms from 2, Inf. N° 9), while the distribution of the average figures for every word (qašyq ‘spoon’ – 8, tašyp ‘carrying’ – 8, atyp ‘shooting’ – 6, iššk ‘door’ – 1) was from 101% in atyp ‘shooting’ (inf. 2) and in qašyq ‘spoon’ (inf. N° 17) to 360% in tašyp
‘carrying’ (inf. N° 7) if not counting two cases (out of 23), namely 86% in atyp ‘shooting’ (inf. N° 3) and 96% in kaşyk ‘spoon’ (inf. N° 20), while the weighted average of the Ratio L₁/L₂ comprised 140% for 23 words listed above.

When both syllables are closed (in the words qapcyq ‘bag’ and açqyç ‘key’), the Ratio L₁/L₂ in the word qapcyq ‘bag’ was distributed between 70% (inf. N° 7) and 172% (inf. N° 5), the average for 11 words comprised 111%, while in the word açqyç ‘key’ the Ratio was between 65% (inf. N° 16) and 166% (inf. N° 5), whereas the average Ratio for 11 words comprised 109%.

The words in which the Ratio was less than 100% appeared ten from 22, however only in three of the latter the Ratio was less than 82%, namely, in qapcyq ‘bag’ (70%, inf. N° 7), and in açqyç ‘key’ (71%, inf. N° 16). And as is known, the difference less than 20% usually is not perceived by our ear.

In disyllabic words with the initial stress, the length of the vowel of the unstressed second syllable mostly surpasses that of the vowel of the initial stressed syllable.

Thus, in the word appaq ‘very white’, ‘quite white’ (with the initial stress), the Ratio L₁/L₂ is distributed in 16 cases of the word between 28% (inf. 10a) to 97% (inf. N° 12) if not counting two exceptions: inf. N° 22 gave 104% and 101% (average for two measurements 102%) and N° 4 who gave 121% and 93% (average for two measurements 114%). Thus, the length of the unstressed vowel practically always surpasses the length of the stressed vowel.

An analogous picture has been registered also in some other disyllabic words with the initial stress, namely barma! ‘do not go!’ (2 ms, inf. N° 2), tapta! ‘trample!’ (1 ms, 84%, inf. N° 3), kitma! ‘do not go away!’ (2 ms, 79%, inf. N° 6), kaçan? ‘when?’ (1 ms, 65%, inf. N° 18).

In trisyllabic words with the final stress and homogenous vowels in all three syllables, the length of the final stressed vowel can surpass or sometimes be less than the length of the preceding vowels (cf. in the table the length of vowels in the words bayana ‘pillar’, daladan ‘from the dale’ and baryllar ‘they went’).

However, if the vowel of the final stressed syllable is a mixed one (“reduced”), and the syllable is closed, while the vowels of the preceding unstressed syllables are “of full formation” (the long ones), then the vowel of the final stressed syllable is shorter than the vowels of the preceding unstressed syllables (cf. the word batqaqlyq ‘swamp’ in the table).

And in words with non-final stress, e.g., bardyma? ‘did he go?’ and zāp-zargār ‘quite blue’, the length of the final unstressed vowel surpasses those of the preceding vowels, including the stressed vowel.

When passing over to investigation of the length of vowels in combinations of two words, it is necessary to take into consideration that (as it was proved in my instrumental-phonetic studies), the highest pitch of the basic tone and of the sound intensity in such combinations usually falls on the second or the third syllable of the combination. And just in these syllables the vowel length is mostly the shortest as it is seen from the figures adduced in the table.

The length of the vowel of the last open syllable in the combination always surpasses the lengths of the vowels of the preceding first, second and third syllables according to the data of all informants. However the relations between the first and
the second vowels of the first word in the combination are different, and here both cases are possible: when either the first vowel is longer or the second one.

In 13 cases from 36 the length of the first unstressed vowel surpasses that of the second stressed one, i.e. in more than one third of all measurements. And if we add to this four cases when the ratio \( L_1 / L_2 \) is 90% and higher, while in one case it is 87%, we shall see that at least in half of all measurements the length of the stressed (second) vowel practically does not partake in forming the accent in the first word of the combination.

### Table 3. Disyllabic Words Stressed at the Final Syllable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels</th>
<th>Ratio ( L_1 / L_2 ) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel ( L_1 ) (cs)</td>
<td>2nd vowel ( L_2 ) (cs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Both Syllables are open</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ata ‘father’</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Average (No 2–3)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>aça ‘opens’</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>baqa ‘frog’</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>baqa ‘frog’</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a</td>
<td>Average (No 5–6)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>aty ‘his horse’</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a</td>
<td>Average (No 1; 3a; 4; 6a; 7)</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| II. Both Syllables are closed |                       |                          |                            |
| 8  | batqaq ‘swampy’       | 8.8                      | 13.5                     | 65.2                      |
| 9  | batqaq ‘swampy’       | 10.0                     | 10.3                     | 97.1                      |
| 9a | Average (No 8–9)      | 9.4                      | 11.9                     | 81.2                      |
| 10 | tapatap ‘trampling’   | 8.8                      | 10.4                     | 84.6                      |
| 11 | tapatap ‘trampling’   | 8.9                      | 13.0                     | 68.5                      |
| 11a | Average (No 10–11)    | 8.8                      | 11.7                     | 76.6                      |
| 12 | ḗxμμαq ‘corner’       | 5.2                      | 14.4                     | 36.1                      |
| 13 | ḗxμμαq ‘corner’       | 2.4                      | 10.8                     | 22.2                      |
| 13a | Average (No 12–13)    | 3.8                      | 12.6                     | 29.2                      |
| 14 | upqym ‘pool’          | 6.8                      | 6.9                      | 98.6                      |
| 15 | upqym ‘pool’          | 10.8                     | 8.2                      | 131.7                     |
| 15a | Average (No 14–15)    | 8.8                      | 7.6                      | 115.2                     |
| 16 | qysqyc ‘tongues’      | 8.0                      | 10.7                     | 74.8                      |
| 17 | qysqyc ‘tongues’      | 7.0                      | 11.5                     | 60.9                      |
| 17a | Average (No 16–17)    | 7.5                      | 11.1                     | 67.8                      |
| 18 | cyqvqv ‘sparrow’      | 6.7                      | 8.6                      | 77.9                      |
Table 3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels</th>
<th>Ratio (L_1/L_2) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel (L_1) (cs) 2nd vowel (L_2) (cs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>çypçyq 'sparrow'</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19a</td>
<td>Average (N° 18–19)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ıśqcıqk 'little tooth'</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>ıśqcıqk 'little tooth'</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21a</td>
<td>Average (N° 20–21)</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>qaşcyq 'bag'</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>qaşyq 'we were petrified'</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>taptıq 'we found'</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>taptıq 'we found'</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25a</td>
<td>Average (N° 24–25)</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>ıścıqıq 'key'</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>ıścıqıq 'key'</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27a</td>
<td>Average (N° 26–27)</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>kitıq 'we went'</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>kitıq 'we went'</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29a</td>
<td>Average (N° 28–29)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29b</td>
<td>Average N° 9a; 11a; 13a; 15a; 17a; 19a; 21a; 22; 23; 25a; 27a; 29a</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. The First Syllable is Open, the Second is Closed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels</th>
<th>Ratio (L_1/L_2) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel (L_1) (cs) 2nd vowel (L_2) (cs)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>atap 'naming'</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>atıp 'shooting'</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>atıp 'shooting'</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32a</td>
<td>Average (N° 31–32)</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>qaşıqıq 'sour milk'</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>qaşıqıq 'sour milk'</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34a</td>
<td>Average (N° 33–34)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>qaşıqıq 'spoon'</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>qaşıqıq 'spoon'</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36a</td>
<td>Average (N° 35–36)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>tasıp 'carrying'</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>tasıp 'carrying'</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38a</td>
<td>Average (N° 37–38)</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>açıqıq 'open'</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>açıqıq 'open'</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40a</td>
<td>Average (N° 39–40)</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>açıqıq 'opening'</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>dııçıqıq 'tar'</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>dııçıqıq 'tar'</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>dııçıqıq 'tar'</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44a</td>
<td>Average (N° 42–44)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>kıtıp 'waiting'</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>pyçaqıq 'knife'</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 3. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels</th>
<th>Ratio L1/L2 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel L1 (cs)</td>
<td>2nd vowel L2 (cs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>arpa ‘barley’</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>arpa ‘barley’</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48a</td>
<td>Average (№ 47–48)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>arqa ‘back’</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>arqa ‘back’</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50a</td>
<td>Average (№ 49–50)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>arba ‘cart’</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>arba ‘cart’</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52a</td>
<td>Average (№ 51–52)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>bazda ‘in the cellar’</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>bazda ‘in the cellar’</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54a</td>
<td>Average (№ 53–54)</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>aiga ‘to the horse’</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>aiga ‘to the horse’</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>qapqa ‘gate’</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>qapqa ‘gate’</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58a</td>
<td>Average (№ 57–58)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>baqqa ‘garden’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>baqqa ‘garden’</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60a</td>
<td>Average (№ 59–60)</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>aqqa ‘to the white’</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>aqqa ‘to the white’</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62a</td>
<td>Average (№ 61–62)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4. Disyllabic Words and Word Combinations Stressed at the Initial Syllable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels (in cs)</th>
<th>Ratio (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel L1</td>
<td>2nd vowel L2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>aappq ‘very white’</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>aappq ‘very white’</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>aappq ‘very white’</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>Average (№ 1–3)</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>rusqa ‘in Russian’</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>kieq ‘please, go!’</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>tag di ‘he says: find!’</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>tag di ‘he says: find!’</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>tag di ‘he says: find!’</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Average (№ 6–8)</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8b</td>
<td>Average (№ 3a; 4; 5; 8a)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Table 5. Some Trisyllabic Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio (in %)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
<td>3rd Vowel L₃</td>
<td>L₂/L₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>çabata 'best shoe'</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>çabata 'best shoe'</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Average (No. 1–2)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>qxdaça 'sister-in-law'</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>qxdaça 'sister-in-law'</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Average (No. 3–4)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>këjkëñä 'little', 'small'</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Words with the Initial Stress**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio (in %)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
<td>3rd Vowel L₃</td>
<td>L₂/L₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>qap-qara 'very black'</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>qap-qara 'very black'</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>qap-qara 'very black'</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a</td>
<td>Average (No. 6–8)</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>tuk-këñä 'simply', 'for no reason'</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>tuk-këñä 'simply', 'for no reason'</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>tuk-këñä 'simply', 'for no reason'</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>Average (No. 9–11)</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>sap-sary 'very yellow', 'quite yellow'</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>90.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sap-sary 'very (quite) yellow'</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>sap-sary 'very (quite) yellow'</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>101.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>Average (No. 12–14)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14b</td>
<td>Average (No. 12–13)</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14c</td>
<td>Average (8a; 11a; 14a)</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6. The Vowel Length of Some Combinations of Disyllabic Words**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio (in %)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
<td>3rd Vowel L₃</td>
<td>4th Vowel L₄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>tapiap kütş 'went trampling'</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>tapiap kütş 'went trampling'</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a</td>
<td>Average (No 1–2)</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>tuxyp çiyor 'overflooded'</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>tuxyp çiyor 'overflooded'</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>Average (No. 3–4)</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>açyp çiyor 'went out opening'</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>baryp qütty 'went and returned'</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>šușy k2ëñ 'this man'</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>šușy kitap 'this book'</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 6. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The length of the Vowels (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel</td>
<td>2nd Vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>xəp bara ‘is flying’</td>
<td>13,7</td>
<td>4,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>xəp bara ‘is flying’</td>
<td>12,2</td>
<td>12,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>asqa tıkä ‘is descending’</td>
<td>14,2</td>
<td>10,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>asqa tıkä ‘descending’</td>
<td>14,4</td>
<td>11,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>puçaq birda ‘he gave the knife’</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>12,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>çikä çapqa ‘went out’</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>12,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>bərəu kikä ‘one went’</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>17,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>pəçən çapqa ‘we moved hey’</td>
<td>4,2</td>
<td>14,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>borəp birda ‘gave have rolled up’</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>4,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7. The Length of the Vowel a in Some Disyllabic Words with the Final Stress (According to the Data Obtained from Different Informants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants N°</th>
<th>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The Vowel Length (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel</td>
<td>2nd Vowel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dubjaz (Jusupova)</td>
<td>ata ‘father’</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>18,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘father’</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>17,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8,7</td>
<td>17,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘on horse’</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>16,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘on horse’</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>18,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>17,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap ‘trampling’</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>12,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap ‘trampling’</td>
<td>8,0</td>
<td>11,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>11,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atap ‘naming’</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>10,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atap ‘naming’</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>11,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>10,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Turoj (Halikov)</td>
<td>ata ‘father’</td>
<td>10,8</td>
<td>20,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘on horse’</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>12,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap ‘trampling’</td>
<td>11,6</td>
<td>12,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap ‘trampling’</td>
<td>11,4</td>
<td>12,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (taptap)</td>
<td>11,5</td>
<td>12,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atap ‘naming’</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>10,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants</th>
<th>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his surnames</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The Vowel Length (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Qajbyğ – Bua (Muhammedzjanova)</td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>15,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>15,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>15,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>8,2</td>
<td>13,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>15,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>14,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>11,0</td>
<td>12,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>12,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td>12,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Muhammedqulova)</td>
<td>atta ‘father’</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>16,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘father’</td>
<td>12,8</td>
<td>17,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12,0</td>
<td>17,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>10,3</td>
<td>13,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>14,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td>14,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>19,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>10,4</td>
<td>15,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>15,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>10,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>11,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>11,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>12,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>16,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>14,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Valeeva)</td>
<td>atap ‘naming’</td>
<td>9,1</td>
<td>12,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arça (Galljamova)</td>
<td>atta ‘father’</td>
<td>10,1</td>
<td>18,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>17,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>15,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (atta)</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>16,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>11,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>15,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>13,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>12,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>8,7</td>
<td>13,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>13,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td>13,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants N°</th>
<th>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The Vowel Length (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 8</td>
<td>Saba (Galiullina)</td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>9.2 14.0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>9.0 13.6</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>9.6 14.0</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>9.6 15.6</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>10.4 20.4</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.1 15.5</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap 'trampling'</td>
<td>11.6 12.4</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap 'trampling'</td>
<td>11.3 12.4</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.4 12.4</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atap 'naming'</td>
<td>8.8 15.6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atap 'naming'</td>
<td>9.6 17.6</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atap 'naming'</td>
<td>9.6 12.4</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atap 'naming'</td>
<td>9.4 11.2</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.4 14.2</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Balyq Bistăşi (Ahmedzjanov)</td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>11.2 19.4</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa 'aunt'</td>
<td>11.8 24.0</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'on horse'</td>
<td>10.0 16.4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq 'nail'</td>
<td>9.8 14.8</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mamadyş (M. Zakirova)</td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>9.6 15.8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>8.7 18.8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.2 17.3</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'on horse'</td>
<td>5.2 13.4</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'on horse'</td>
<td>8.4 13.8</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.8 13.6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq 'nail'</td>
<td>9.8 11.0</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq 'nail'</td>
<td>11.4 11.8</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.6 11.4</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a (Valiśina)</td>
<td></td>
<td>apa 'aunt'</td>
<td>10.6 26.8</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'on horse'</td>
<td>4.8 18.4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq 'swampy'</td>
<td>14.0 17.2</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Quqmara (Huramsin)</td>
<td>ata 'father'</td>
<td>13.0 19.8</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa 'aunt'</td>
<td>6.7 19.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata 'on horse'</td>
<td>9.8 16.1</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap 'trampling'</td>
<td>12.0 13.4</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq 'nail'</td>
<td>18.8 18.5</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq 'nail'</td>
<td>17.3 12.2</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (qadaq)</td>
<td>18.0 15.4</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informants No</td>
<td>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</td>
<td>Words and Translation</td>
<td>The Vowel Length (in cm)</td>
<td>Ratio $L_1/L_2$ (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel $L_1$</td>
<td>2nd Vowel $L_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Agærzê (Mullahmedova)</td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (atta)</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Çûrilê (L. Habibullina)</td>
<td>atta ‘father’</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Muslim (Hamatullina)</td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (batqaq)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Qyzyl Jar (Ajitu anov)</td>
<td>atta ‘father’</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atta ‘on horse’</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informants N°</td>
<td>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</td>
<td>Words and Translation</td>
<td>The Vowel Length (in cs)</td>
<td>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jutaza (Šarafeeva)</td>
<td>ata ‘father’</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (apa)</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘on horse’</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘on horse’</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘on horse’</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Qandry (Baškir ASSR)</td>
<td>ata ‘father’</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apa ‘aunt’</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘on horse’</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ata ‘on horse’</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (ata)</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qadaq ‘nail’</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaq ‘swampy’</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (batqaq)</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Čüpräldä (Aįįjatov)</td>
<td>ata ‘father’</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tapta ‘trample!’</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tapta ‘trample!’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (tapta)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap ‘trampling!’</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taptap ‘trampling!’</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ataup ‘naming’</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informants No</td>
<td>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</td>
<td>Words and Translation</td>
<td>The Vowel Length (in cs)</td>
<td>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Çistaj (Bulatov)</td>
<td><em>apa 'aunt'</em></td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>apa 'aunt'</em></td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>atta 'on horse'</em></td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>atta 'on horse'</em></td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>batjak 'swampy'</em></td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>batjak 'swampy'</em></td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>kadak 'nail'</em></td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Qyzyl Armija (Sulejmanova)</td>
<td><em>apa 'aunt'</em></td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>atta 'on horse'</em></td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>kadak 'nail'</em></td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>tabak 'vessel'</em></td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(F. Zakirova)</td>
<td><em>apa 'aunt'</em></td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>atta 'on horse'</em></td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>atta 'on horse'</em></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (atta)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>batjak 'swampy'</em></td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>batjak 'swampy'</em></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Qazan Arty (Fahreddenov)</td>
<td><em>apa 'aunt'</em></td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>apa 'aunt'</em></td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>atta 'on horse'</em></td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>atta 'on horse'</em></td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*tapta 'trample!'</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*tapta 'trample!'</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*taptap 'trampling!'</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*taptap 'trampling!'</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informants N°</td>
<td>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</td>
<td>Words and Translation</td>
<td>The Vowel Length (in cs)</td>
<td>Ratio ( L_1 / L_2 ) (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Åtnâ (Ganieva)</td>
<td>qaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>11.2 8.6</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>9.6 10.1</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.4 9.4</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taşyp ‘carrying’</td>
<td>11.6 9.3</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taşyp ‘carrying’</td>
<td>11.1 10.6</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.4 10.0</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dubjaz (Jusopova)</td>
<td>atyp ‘shooting’</td>
<td>8.4 10.4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atyp ‘shooting’</td>
<td>9.2 7.6</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.8 9.0</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuqaj (Halikov)</td>
<td>atyp ‘shooting’</td>
<td>8.4 9.4</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atyp ‘shooting’</td>
<td>7.2 8.0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bua – Qajbyç (Muhammedzjanova)</td>
<td>qaşcyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>10.9 8.7</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşcyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>11.3 7.1</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşcyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>9.2 7.8</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.5 7.9</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>açqyç ‘key’</td>
<td>9.6 6.4</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>açqyç ‘key’</td>
<td>9.8 6.0</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.7 6.2</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Muhammedquolova)</td>
<td>qaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>13.3 5.6</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taşyp ‘carrying’</td>
<td>12.4 7.1</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşcyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>8.6 5.0</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>açqyç ‘key’</td>
<td>11.6 7.0</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>açqyç ‘key’</td>
<td>9.6 6.9</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (açqyç)</td>
<td>10.6 7.0</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Valeeva)</td>
<td>atyp ‘shooting’</td>
<td>10.4 9.6</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>işêk ‘door’</td>
<td>10.6 8.6</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arça (Galljamova)</td>
<td>qaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>10.6 6.6</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>10.5 6.8</td>
<td>154</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.6 6.7</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taşyp ‘carrying’</td>
<td>10.8 3.0</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>açqyç ‘key’</td>
<td>9.2 10.5</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşcyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>5.2 7.4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informants N°</td>
<td>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</td>
<td>Words and Translation</td>
<td>The Vowel Length (in cs)</td>
<td>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Saba (Galiullina)</td>
<td>atyp 'shooting'</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atyp 'shooting'</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atyp 'shooting'</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Balyq Bistasö (Ahmetjanov)</td>
<td>taşyp 'carrying'</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşyq 'spoon'</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşyq 'spoon'</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (qaşyq)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mamadyş (M. Zakirova)</td>
<td>taşyp 'carrying'</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taşyp 'carrying'</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşyq 'spoon'</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaşyq 'spoon'</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ouqmara (Huramsın)</td>
<td>atyp 'shooting'</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atyp 'shooting'</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ağırzö (Mullahmetova)</td>
<td>qaçyq 'bag'</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaçyq 'bag'</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaçyq 'key'</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaçyq 'key'</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (qaçyq)</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Çurilö (L. Habibullina)</td>
<td>qaçyq 'bag'</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaçyq 'bag'</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (qaçyq)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaçyq 'key'</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaçyq 'key'</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (qaçy)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>upgyn 'pool'</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>upgyn 'pool'</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (upgyn)</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Muslim (Hamatullina)</td>
<td>qaçyq 'bag'</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaçyq 'key'</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Qyzyl Jur (Ajtaganov)</td>
<td>qaşyq 'spoon'</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>taşyp 'carrying'</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informants No</td>
<td>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</td>
<td>Words and Translation</td>
<td>The Vowel Length (in cs)</td>
<td>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jutaza (SarafEEva)</td>
<td>qaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tasyp ‘carrying’</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>açaqyq ‘key’</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>açaqyq ‘key’</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (açaqyq)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaş EQ ‘bag’</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaş EQ ‘bag’</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (qaş EQ)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Qandry (BaškIr ASSR)</td>
<td>qaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Z. Habibullina)</td>
<td>tasyp ‘carrying’</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaş EQ ‘bag’</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaş EQ ‘bag’</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qaş EQ ‘bag’</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (qaş EQ)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>açaqyq ‘key’</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Çüprälē (Ajjzatov)</td>
<td>atyp ‘shooting’</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>atyp ‘shooting’</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Çistaj (Bulatov)</td>
<td>kapøyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kapøyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average (kapøyq)</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a kýq ‘key’</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Oyzył Armija (SulejmAnova)</td>
<td>kaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kaşyq ‘spoon’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tasyp ‘carrying’</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tasyp ‘carrying’</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(F. Zakirova)</td>
<td>kapøyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kapøyq ‘bag’</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a kýq ‘key’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a kýq ‘key’</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants No</th>
<th>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The Vowel Length (in cs)</th>
<th>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Qazan Arty (Fahreddinov)</td>
<td>qapçyaq ‘bag’</td>
<td>9,2 5,4</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>qapçyaq ‘bag’</td>
<td>8,0 4,8</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8,6 5,1</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aççyaq ‘bag’</td>
<td>17,2 13,6</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>aççyaq ‘bag’</td>
<td>11,8 8,6</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>14,5 11,1</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. The Length of Vowels in Some Disyllabic Words with the Initial Stress According to the Data Obtained from Different Informants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants No</th>
<th>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The Vowel Length (in cs)</th>
<th>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dubjaz (Jusupova)</td>
<td>barma’ai ‘do not go!’</td>
<td>11,4 16,8</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>barma’ai ‘do not go!’</td>
<td>12,8 18,4</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12,1 17,6</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuqaj (Halikov)</td>
<td>taptal ‘trample!’</td>
<td>10,6 12,6</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bua – Qajbyç (Muhammedzjanova)</td>
<td>appaq ‘very white’</td>
<td>10,8 8,9</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appaq ‘very white’</td>
<td>8,6 9,2</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,7 9,0</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Muhammedkulova)</td>
<td>appaq ‘very white’</td>
<td>5,6 9,4</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appaq ‘very white’</td>
<td>9,6 9,5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appaq ‘very white’</td>
<td>7,2 7,8</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7,5 8,9</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(Valeeva)</td>
<td>kitmäi ‘do not go!’</td>
<td>13,1 17,2</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kitmäi ‘do not go!’</td>
<td>11,1 12,8</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12,1 15,0</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arça (Galljamova)</td>
<td>appaq ‘very white’</td>
<td>4,8 9,6</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Balyq Bistäs (Ahmedzjanov)</td>
<td>appaq ‘very white’</td>
<td>11,8 14,2</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informants Nº</td>
<td>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</td>
<td>Words and Translation</td>
<td>The Vowel Length (in cs)</td>
<td>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mamadyş (M. Zakirova)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>(Vališina)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ouqmara (Huramšin)</td>
<td>barma! 'do not go!'</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Āgeržö (Mullahmedova)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Çurišö (L. Habibullina)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Muslim (Hamatullina)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Qyzyl Jar (Ajtyjanov)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jutaza (Sarafceeva)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Qandry (Baškir ASSR) (Z. Habibullina)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Çupralö (Ajzjatov)</td>
<td>kəčan? 'when?'</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Çistaj (Bulatov)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Qyzyl Armija (Sulejmanova)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>(F. Zakirova)</td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appaq 'very white'</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9. Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants N°</th>
<th>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The Vowel Length (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio L₁/L₂ (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Qazan Arty (Fahreddinov)</td>
<td><strong>appaq</strong> 'very white'</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>8,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>appaq</strong> 'very white'</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>10,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>9,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Bua (Süyitov)</td>
<td>** zrobić!** 'work!'</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>12,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>chestra</strong> 'work!'</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>10,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>chestra</strong> 'work!'</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>11,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>chestra</strong> 'work!'</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>10,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>10,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>készül</strong> 'neigh!'</td>
<td>8,4</td>
<td>10,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>készül</strong> 'neigh!'</td>
<td>3,6</td>
<td>12,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>11,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>aston</strong> 'eat!' (5 meas.)</td>
<td>16,0</td>
<td>19,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10. The Length of Vowels in Some Trisyllabic Words

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants N°</th>
<th>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his surname</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The Vowel Length (in cs)</th>
<th>Ratio (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel L₁</td>
<td>2nd Vowel L₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Words with the Final Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bua – Qajbyç (Muhammedzjanova)</td>
<td>batqaqlıq ‘swamp’</td>
<td>8,6</td>
<td>8,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>batqaqlıq ‘swamp’</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>8,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>8,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Muhammedqulova)</td>
<td>batqaqlıq ‘swamp’</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>10,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>baryana ‘pillar’</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>9,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arça (Galljämova)</td>
<td>daladan ‘from the dale’</td>
<td>10,8</td>
<td>9,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuqaj (Halikov)</td>
<td>baryallar ‘they went’</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>12,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>baryallar ‘they went’</td>
<td>9,3</td>
<td>14,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>13,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Words with the Non Final Stress</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dubjaz (Jusupova)</td>
<td>bardyyna? ‘did he go?’</td>
<td>8,0</td>
<td>6,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bardyyna? ‘did he go?’</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>6,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9,0</td>
<td>6,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Quqmara (Huramšin)</td>
<td>bardyyna? ‘did he go?’</td>
<td>13,5</td>
<td>12,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bardyyna? ‘did he go?’</td>
<td>13,4</td>
<td>8,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bardyyna? ‘did he go?’</td>
<td>11,2</td>
<td>6,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12,7</td>
<td>9,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Qazan Arty (Fahreddinov)</td>
<td>zäp-zängär ‘very blue’</td>
<td>14,0</td>
<td>7,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>zäp-zängär ‘very blue’</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>7,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>13,6</td>
<td>7,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informat</td>
<td>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</td>
<td>Words and Translation</td>
<td>The Vowel Length (in cs)</td>
<td>Ratio (in %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st Vowel</td>
<td>2nd Vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Dubjaz (Jusupova)</td>
<td>tapiap bara ‘is going trampling’</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tapiap bara ‘is going trampling’</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Tuqaj (Halikov)</td>
<td>tapiap bara ‘is going trampling’</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tapiap bara ‘is going trampling’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Bua – Qajbyc (Muhammedzjanova)</td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(Muhammedzulova)</td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Qama Tamary (Gafurova)</td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arç (Galljamova)</td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mamadyş (M. Zakirova)</td>
<td>kçêp toñ ‘is waiting’</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>Mamadyş (Vališina)</td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ouqmara (Huramšin)</td>
<td>tapiap bara ‘is going trampling’</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tapiap bara ‘is going trampling’</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ağørjö (Mullahmetova)</td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xçap cyqt ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informants No</th>
<th>The Region of the Informant (TASSR) and his sir name</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>The Vowel Length (in cm)</th>
<th>Ratio (in %)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Çürilö (L. Habibullina)</td>
<td>әәрәу әүтәү ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>әәрәу әүтәү ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Jutaza (Šarafeeva)</td>
<td>әәрәу әүтәү ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>әәрәу әүтәү ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>әәрәу әүтәү ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Qandry (Baškir ASSR) (Z. Habibullina)</td>
<td>әәрәу әүтәү ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Çупрало (Tatar ASSR) (Ağzhatov)</td>
<td>тәптәп күүтә ‘he went’ having trampled’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>тәптәп күүтә ‘he went’ having trampled’</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Çистaj (Bulatov)</td>
<td>үәлүп әүкә ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>үәлүп әүкә ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Qyzyl Armija</td>
<td>үәлүп әүкә ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>үәлүп әүкә ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Qazan Arty (Fahreddinov)</td>
<td>әәрәу әүтәү ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>әәрәу әүтәү ‘he flew out’</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>әәрәу бәлә ‘having long legs’</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>әәрәу бәлә ‘having long legs’</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Average</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
L’oiseau dans la cage: exemple éthiopien

EWA BALICKA-WITAKOWSKA, Upsal

à Allan Ellenius

Dans l’évangéliaire de Dâbrâ Maryam Qohayn exécuté en 1361, de chaque côté de l’arc couronnant la miniature ayant pour thème la Crucifixion symbolique avec l’agneau, on a représenté un oiseau dans la cage surmontée de la croix. Ces oiseaux sont affrontés et accompagnés tous les deux de la légende ‘of bâhtâwi – “l’oiseau solitaire” (fig. 1). Le même motif apparaît encore une autre fois dans ce manuscrit – à l’intérieur de l’architecture non remplie de texte qui appartient à la série des Canons d’Eusebe (fig. 2). Nous retrouvons ce motif une troisième fois dans l’évangéliaire de Hayq (Addis Ababa, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. no. 5), légèrement antérieur à celui de Dâbrâ Maryam Qohayn: il y figure sur une page des Canons (fig. 3A). Comme sur la miniature avec la Crucifixion, les cages sont placées en haut de la page, mais cette fois sans aucune légende.

Ainsi, la représentation de l’oiseau dans la cage apparaît-elle sur nos miniatures...
dans deux contextes iconographiques différents: une fois comme un élément du décor des Canons, une seconde fois associée à la scène de la Crucifixion. La question qui se pose est de savoir avec quelle signification ce motif peu fréquent dans l’art chrétien a été utilisé sur chacune des miniatures, si et dans quelle sphère culturelle de la chrétienté on peut lui trouver des parallèles.

Le thème d’oiseau dans la cage était connu de l’art chrétien de l’Antiquité où conformément à la pensée néoplatonicienne il symbolisait l’âme emprisonnée dans le corps humain. On trouve les anciennes représentations de ce type sur un vase en argile daté du IIIe siècle, trouvé dans les catacombes des Santi Martiri à Rome et sur une lampe provenant de Carthage du IIIe ou IVe siècle (fig. 4). Les exemples postérieurs du Ve et du VIe siècles sont attestés par les mosaïques de pavement de quelques églises paléochrétiennes: d’Élie, Marie et Soreg à Gerasa (Jordanie) (fig. 5), à Sabratha (Cyrénaïque, Libye) (fig. 6), dans la basilique de Palæopolis en Corfou, ainsi que par la mosaïque trouvée à Jérusalem près de la porte de Damas. Sur celle de Corfou l’idée de l’emprisonnement et du désir de libération de l’âme est exprimée d’une façon plus explicite: un grand oiseau tente de quitter une cage trop étroite et sort sa tête entre les barreaux.

Le motif de l’oiseau dans la cage possède aussi une variante, dans laquelle la
portes de la cage est ouverte. On peut supposer que dans ce cas il s’agit de l’âme libérée qui vient de quitter la vie terrestre et s’envole vers le ciel\textsuperscript{13}. Ce type de représentation se trouve sur un sarcophage du cimetière du Vatican daté de la moitié du IV\textsuperscript{e} siècle\textsuperscript{14} où l’oiseau déjà libre est assis sur la cage (fig. 7), sur une coupe en argent de Vrep (Albanie) datée du VI\textsuperscript{e} siècle (New York, Metropolitan Museum)\textsuperscript{15} et sur des mosaïques datant probablement de la même période: de l’église des Martyrs à Misis (Cilicie) et de l’église à Khirbet Asida (Palestine)\textsuperscript{16}.

Dans un grand nombre d’exemples cités, l’oiseau dans la cage fait partie de la composition plus large qui se compose des ornements végétaux encadrant les plantes, les animaux et les oiseaux. Ces éléments qui possèdent en eux-mêmes une symbolique assez particulière, comme p. ex. un rinceau de vigne, un lièvre, une poule\textsuperscript{17}, mis ensemble, évoquent le jardin du paradis\textsuperscript{18}.

Dans le domaine de l’art médiéval trois exemples de l’oiseau dans la cage sont connus – ils apparaissent sur les mosaïques dans trois églises de Rome: San Clemente, Santa Maria in Trastevere, Santa Maria Francesca\textsuperscript{19}.

À San Clemente le motif fait partie de la grande mosaïque de l’abside, exécutée
en 1128, qui représente symboliquement l'Église du Christ, plus précisément de ce fragment, qui montre figurativement l'introduction du fidèle dans la communauté chrétienne par les sacrements et l'enseignement des Pères et des Docteurs de l'Église (fig. 8). Dans ce contexte il symbolise, comme sur les monuments paléochrétiens, l'âme qui se soumet aux préparatifs indispensables précédant son existence céleste20.

À Santa Maria in Trastevere l'oiseau dans la cage est incorporé dans la mosaïque absidiale exécutée en 1140 et un peu plus tard fidèlement copiée dans Santa Maria Francesca21. Dans l'abside est figuré le couronnement de Marie, flanquée par Ésaïe et Jérémie présentés sur le mur triomphal. Deux cages avec les oiseaux sont suspendues devant eux (fig. 9). Les prophètes portent une banderole avec des textes de leur prophétie respective. Dans le cas d'Ésaïe c'est: Ecce Virgo concipiet et pariet Filium (8:14); dans le cas de Jérémie: XPCDNS captus est in peccatis nostris (Lam 4:20). Dans ce contexte iconographique et textuel l'oiseau dans la cage ne désigne plus l'âme mais doit être compris comme le symbole du Christ qui par l'incarnation devint prisonnier de la nature humaine22.

**Fig. 3 B. Évangélique de Hayq. Fontaine de Vie. f. 14r.**
Revenant aux exemples éthiopiens nous pouvons constater maintenant que la présence de l’oiseau dans la cage sur la page des Canons de l’évangéliaire de Hayq s’explique par référence à ces représentations paléochrétiennes où le motif en question est utilisé dans des compositions qui évoquent le jardin paradisiaque, ces dernières apparaissant surtout dans les mosaïques de pavement. On a remarqué en effet, que le décor des Tables des Canons s’est servi du même répertoire de motifs que certaines mosaïques de pavement. Cependant, dans le cas des premières, l’allusion au paradis est toujours beaucoup plus nette, car la faune et la flore qui y sont représentées forment une unité conceptuelle avec l’image finale de la fontaine, qui symbolise la Source de Vie qu’on situait justement dans l’Éden. Que l’oiseau dans la cage dans l’évangéliaire de Hayq soit un élément du paysage paradisiaque est d’autant plus facile à remarquer que la page des Canons où il figure fait face à celle de la Fontaine de Vie (fig. 3B).

Prenant en considération le fait que le manuscrit de Hayq était exécuté vers la fin du XIIIe siècle, on peut pourtant douter que son peintre pût s’inspirer directement d’une mosaïque de pavement. Il faut plutôt supposer, qu’à son époque le motif de l’oiseau dans la cage était déjà bien établi comme élément du décor des Canons dans l’Orient chrétien tout entier. Cette supposition semble confirmée par l’ê-
vangéliaire arménien d’Etchmiadzin (Matenadaran MS 2374, olim 229), dont les pages des Canons furent exécutées en 989, probablement d’après un modèle du Ve siècle. Sur l’une d’elles on voit un oiseau dans la cage, accompagné d’autres volatiles et de plantes stylisées (fig. 10).

On pourrait d’abord croire que la présence des oiseaux sur la miniature de la Crucifixion de l’évangéliaire de Qohayn doit aussi s’expliquer par le symbolisme paradisiaque. En effet, au-dessus de l’arc flanqué par les oiseaux, on a placé des branches d’acanthe stylisées. Qui plus est, sur la page voisine on retrouve la Fontaine de Vie entourée d’arbres, d’animaux et d’oiseaux des trois espèces. Et cependant l’emplacement du motif au-dessus de la Crucifixion, ainsi que le texte de la légende qui l’accompagne, font penser que notre représentation a reçu ici une signification nouvelle, différente de celles que possédaient les exemples cités jusqu’ici.

Les mots “oiseau solitaire” proviennent du Psaume 102 (101), vers 7-8 :

“Je ressemble au choucas du désert,
je suis comme le hibou des ruines.
Je reste éveillé, et me voici
comme l’oiseau solitaire sur un toit.”

L’exégèse biblique chrétienne, qui décelait dans les psaumes l’annonce de l’oeuvre de la rédemption, trouvait dans ces mots la référence spécifique au Christ souffrant, abandonné par les siens durant sa passion. L’origine de cette interprétation était dans une grande mesure liée au fait, que dans la langue de l’Église antique et des chrétiens de ce temps, l’oiseau fut très souvent considéré comme figure allégorique du Sauveur.

L’Évangile de Luc nous apprend que le Christ lui-même se comparait à un oiseau
(13:34) en disant que, ainsi qu’un oiseau rassemble et protège sa couvée sous ses ailes, lui aussi rassemble et protège ses fidèles\textsuperscript{26}.

Dans l’homélie \textit{In Evangelia} attribuée à Grégoire le Grand on lit: \textit{Avis enim recte appellatus est Dominus, quia corpus carneum ad aethera liberavit}\textsuperscript{29}. Suivant la même idée, le Christ ressuscité est appelé “oiseau” dans la liturgie arménienne de la Semaine Sainte\textsuperscript{30}. Cette figure allégorique devait également être familière aux théologiens européens du Moyen Age car au XIIe siècle l’archevêque de Tours Hildebert de Lavardin écrit tout simplement: \textit{Christus est avis}\textsuperscript{31}.

L’existence dans la langue ge’ez d’une homélie sur “l’Oiseau blanc dont les ailes sont argentées et les pennes couleur d’or”\textsuperscript{32} prouve, que cette comparaison devait être tout à fait compréhensible en Éthiopie\textsuperscript{33}.

Les psautiers à décoration se rapportant directement au texte, qui recouraient aux images inspirées par les commentaires des psaumes, illustraient le vers du psaume 102 de façon littérale par l’image d’un oiseau isolé. Nous voyons une telle figure p. ex. dans le Psautier de Stuttgart du IXe siècle (Württembergische Landes-
bibliothek, cod. Bibl. fol. 23\textsuperscript{34} (fig. 11) ainsi que dans le Psautier d’Utrecht (Bibliothek der Rijksuniversiteit, cod. script. eccl. 484)\textsuperscript{35} légèrement postérieur.

Dans le psautier dit de Chludov (Moskva, Istoričeskiy Musey, Cod. 129)\textsuperscript{36}, également du IXe siècle, on trouve à cet endroit deux oiseaux, chacun aux ailes déployées (fig. 12). Ici nous avons une allusion transparente à la croix et par
conséquent au Christ crucifié, allusion fondée sur l'explication typologique de la croix.

Tertullien dans De oratione compare les deux ailes d'un oiseau aux bras du Christ étendus sur la croix. Nous retrouvons une pensée analogue chez Hippolyte dans le texte De Christo et Antichristo, chez Saint Jérôme dans Expositio quatuor Evangeliorum et chez Grégoire d'Elvire dans De libris Sacrosanctorum.

Pour Ephrem le Syrien chaque oiseau aux ailes déployées devint une figure de la croix du Christ. Il écrit: "Quand il vole dans les airs, et c'est en forme de croix qu'il vient à déployer ses ailes ... Si les ailes de l'oiseau restent closes et se refusent au
symbole naïf de la croix, alors l’air aussi se refuse à lui et ne lui soutient pas à moins que ses ailes ne proclament la croix.\textsuperscript{41}

Dans l’hymne du chorévêque syrien Balaï, de la fin du IVe ou du début du Ve siècle, chanté le jour de l’Ascension, on lit le vers suivant: “Abrite ton troupeau sous les ailes de ta croix”\textsuperscript{42}, tandis que dans l’ode arménienne sur la fête de

Fig. 11. Psautier de Stuttgart. Stuttgart, Württembergische Landesbibliothek, f. 100v.

Fig. 12. Psautier dit de Chlodov, Moscou, Musée Historique, f. 100v.
l’Exaltation de la Croix on dit en parlant du Christ: “Oiseau lumineux, incomparable ... sur l’arbre de la croix ... (il) avait les ailes brillantes comme l’argent.”

On peut démontrer que cette typologie influait déjà l’art paléochrétien. En effet le motif d’oiseau aux ailes déployées apparaît sur les lampes africaines qui dans leur décoration utilisaient systématiquement la symbolique christologique.

Dans l’iconographie paléochrétienne il y avait encore des autres procédés pour illustrer l’idée du Christ crucifié à l’aide d’oiseau en tant que figure allégorique du Sauveur: on juxtaposait notamment l’oiseau à la croix. Les artistes appliquaient ici des solutions différentes. La plus simple consistait à mettre ces deux éléments côte à côte, comme on le voit p. ex. sur les bagues paléochrétiennes où la croix a très souvent la forme du christogramme et sur un grand nombre de lampettes africaines. Dans une autre variante l’oiseau est assis sur le bras de la croix, comme sur une gemme de British Museum ou sur un relief de l’église des Apôtres à Idjaz.
(Syrie)\textsuperscript{48}. Il peut également porter une petite croix dans son bec ou encore la croix est placée au-dessus de sa tête. À part les lampes africaines\textsuperscript{49}, de telles représentations sont fréquentes dans l'art copte et nubien. L'oiseau, généralement identifié à
l’aigle⁵⁰, y est toujours représenté aux ailes déployées⁵¹. En outre son attribut — la croix — est souvent multipliée. P. ex. sur la peinture murale de Baouit (chapelle 32) la croix est visible dans le bec de l’oiseau et sur son cou, pendant que sur le relief de la cathédrale de Qasr Ibrim elle figure au-dessus de la tête et au-dessus de chacune des ailes⁵² (fig. 13). Sur la peinture dans la grotte de la Montagne d’Athribis près de Sohag l’oiseau qui est représenté à côté d’une croix, porte la petite croix au-dessus de sa tête, dans son bec et en forme d’un médaillon sur sa poitrine⁵³.

Il existe aussi des figurations où l’oiseau est placé au-dessus de la croix. Sur le couvercle d’un sarcophage provenant du cimetière de Prêtèxtat on a représenté un oiseau perché sur une ancre⁵⁴ (fig. 14), sans doute conçue ici comme la croix⁵⁵. Les autres exemples anciens sont fournis de nouveau par un certain nombre des lampettes en argile trouvées en Afrique et en Italie⁵⁶. Il y avait aussi une lampe en bronze faite en forme d’un dragon qui était ornée d’un christogramme sur lequel reposait un oiseau⁵⁷ (fig. 15). Un monument postérieur — l’autel de Bagnols-sur-Cèze (Gard) du VIe siècle, conserve cette forme archaïque: l’oiseau est debout sur le sommet d’un monogramme cruciforme⁵⁸.

Une croix processionnelle surmontée d’un clipes dans lequel l’oiseau est enfermé se trouve sur le couvercle de la pyxide de l’Ermitage datée du VIe siècle⁵⁹ (fig. 16). Une représentation semblable est connue de la miniature du manuscrit copte exécuté environ 400 (New York, Pierpoint Morgan Library, G. 67) où, d’après une variante iconographique locale, la croix a la forme du ankh⁶⁰ (fig. 17).

Sur les monuments cités les croix accompagnées d’oiseau présentent des formes différentes: croix grecque, latine, monogrammatique, ansée. Elles possèdent
toutes quand-même un trait commun: leurs bras s’évasent aux extrémités. Cela indique, que ces croix ne sont pas conçues comme instruments de la passion de Jésus, mais qu’il faut y voir un symbole doxologique et tropaïque – le signe de la victoire du Christ sur le péché et la mort64. L’oiseau placé au-dessus d’une croix ainsi conçue n’est donc pas figure du Christ souffrant mais du vainqueur et du triomphateur.

À l’aide de ces deux symboles, croix triomphale et oiseau, l’idée de la Crucifixion comme révélation de la gloire du Sauveur, de sa victoire sur la mort et de sa prise de pouvoir sur le monde, a été le plus pleinement exprimée sur la mosaïque de pavement dans la catacombe de San Gaudioso à Naples65 (fig. 18). Nous voyons ici une croix triomphale en forme de croix latine aux extrémités évasées, ornées de pendyles en forme d’alpha et omega. Par la couleur d’or et le cercle bleu qui l’entoure elle rappelle en même temps la croix votive de Jérusalem, érigée par Théodose II, pour commémorer la staurophanie qui pendant le jour de Pentecôte en 351 aurait eu lieu entre le Golgotha et le Mont des Oliviers66. Au-dessus de la croix s’élève une grande figure d’oiseau aux ailes déployées. Il n’y a pas d’unité entre les savants quant à l’espèce d’oiseau qui est ici représenté67. Compte tenu du fait, qu’il s’agit certainement d’une figure allégorique du Christ, associée en plus à la croix qui par la forme de ses pendyles fait allusion transparente au titre divin

Fig. 18. Catacombes de San Gaudioso à Naples. Pavement.
attribué au Sauveur (Ego sum alpha et omega (Ap 1:8)), on peut poser avec une grande certitude qu’il s’agit de colombe. En effet, il faut se souvenir que d’après la mystique de chiffres la valeur numérique du sigle alpha et omega, c’est-à-dire 801, est la même que celle du nom grec de la colombe – πετρινήσα65.

Sur la miniature de l’évangéliaire de Qohayn tout comme à San Gaudioso les oiseaux ont été placés au-dessus d’une croix dorée figurant le monument du Golgotha. D’autre part, comme sur les exemples copytes et nubiens, ils sont doublement associés à la croix, car cette dernière surmonte également leurs cages. Une telle insistance sur l’instrument de la passion de Jésus, renforcée d’une part par la légende faisant allusion à la Passion, de l’autre – par l’intégration du motif dans la Crucifixion symbolique, permet d’interpréter ici les oiseaux dans les cages comme images du Sauveur emprisonné dans le corps et souffrant sur la croix. Ainsi, avons nous affaire ici à l’idée semblable que celle de la mosaïque de Santa Maria in Trastevere mais exprimée d’une façon hautement originale et plus compliqué. En effet, le message que l’artiste à Rome a transmis en ajoutant le motif de l’oiseau dans la cage aux citations bibliques présentées par les prophètes, est lisible chez l’artiste éthiopien surtout grâce à l’assemblage des figures iconographiques possédant des contenus symboliques complexes.

En terminant, il reste à expliquer la présence des oiseaux dans les cages sur la page avec l’architecture de l’évangéliaire de Qohayn. La légende “oiseau solitaire” exclut ici l’interprétation paradisiaque. Toutefois si nous prenons en considération le caractère grossièrement schématique du dessin et le manque de soin dans les détails – les cages sont accrochées directement à l’architrave et suspendues à l’endroit destiné au texte du Canon – nous sommes amenés à supposer, que les oiseaux ont été ajoutés après coup par l’un des propriétaires postérieurs du manuscrit. Ce dernier était suffisamment familiarisé avec le système décoratif des évangéliaires, pour situer correctement sur la page destinée aux Canons les oiseaux qu’il a empruntés à la miniature de la Crucifixion. Cependant le fait qu’il a copié aussi la légende prouve, que le sens profond du motif lui demeurait obscur.

NOTES


Abbréviations:
CA – Cahiers archéologiques
DACL – Dictionnaire d’archéologie chrétienne et liturgie
PG – J.P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca
PL – J.P. Migne, Patrologia Latina


2. Deux détails distinguent ces représentations: premièrement le type de la cage: pointue, couronnée de la croix sur la miniature de la Crucifixion; carré sur la page des Canons, voir aussi ci-dessous note 5; deuxièmement l’espèce des oiseaux: sur la miniature de la Crucifixion ils semblent appartenir à la

3. Dans l'état présent de sa préservation le manuscrit possède, à part la page avec les oiseaux, deux autres pages appartenant à la même série (elles ont reçu un texte sans connexion avec les Canons), ainsi qu'une page avec la miniature de la Fontaine de Vie, Heldman, op. cit., figs. 64, 72, 65.


5. Ici la forme des cages diffère de celles de Ms. de Qohayn. Elle est conique et couronnée d'une baguette; les oiseaux peuvent être identifiés comme *Francolinus coqui*, cf. Williams, op. cit., pl. 9:4.


11. *Byzantine Art an European Art: Ninth Exhibition Held under the Auspices of the Council of Europe, Athens 1964, no. 135; Grabar Oiseau, p. 10, fig. 1.


20. Hjort, op. cit., p. 27–28, fig. 3.
29. Homélie 29, PL 76, 1218 C.
31. Carmina miscellanea, carmen VIII De quatorio evangelistis, PL 171, 1390.
44. Delattre Lampes Cat., nos. 809, 815, 869.
45. Dans le cas de nombreux monuments l’oiseau est identifié comme la colombe ou la tourterelle. Sur ces oiseaux en tant que symboles du Christ voir Sühling, op. cit., p. 52–86, 209. Des exemples qui
 seront cités ci-après nous avons exclu les représentations où l'oiseau porte un rameau ou une couronne à cause de la possibilité des interprétations différentes de ce motif. Sur l'interprétation christologique voir Martigny, op. cit., p. 162; Sühling, op. cit., p. 252 et suiv.


47. Delattre Lampes Cat., nos. 224, 509, 600, 619, 800, 817 et 579 où la croix latine pattée est représentée au centre d'avers et un oiseau au centre du revers.


49. Delattre Lampes Cat., nos. 211 et 813 où ce type d'oiseau est représenté à trois reprises.


56. Delattre Lampes Cat., no. 839; Garrucci, op. cit., pl. 474:8; DACL 3:2, fig. 3128.

57. Aujourd'hui la lampe est perdue, cf. Garrucci, op. cit., p. 107; voir aussi la croix dite de Tebess, monogrammatique et surmontée d'un oiseau, S. Gsell, Musées de Tébessa, Musée et collections archéologiques de l'Algérie et de la Tunisie, Paris 1902, p. 86, fig. 12 et une croix latine reproduite dans DACL 3:2, fig. 3404.


62. U.M. Fasola, Le catacombe di S. Gennaro a Capodimonte, Roma 1975, p. 158; voir aussi un linteau de porte à Henchir Soltane où un oiseau est assis sur le bras d'une croix monogrammatique ornée d'alpha et omega stylisés, DACL 3:2, fig. 3132.


On the Length of Life According to Aristotle and the Arabs: A Preliminary Structuring

KERSTIN EKSELL, Stockholm

INTRODUCTION


There is an obvious connection between this article and Aristotle, first, because, as Ullmann mentions (op.cit., p. 127), Qustā ibn Lūqā quotes Aristotle as well as Hippocrates and Galen, but secondly and more important, because there exists an article by Aristotle with the corresponding title: “Περὶ μακροβιοτητος καὶ βροχθ-βιοτητος”.

It is part of the collection of small articles called “Parva naturalia” which also includes an article on physiognomy. I shall use here the edition of “Parva naturalia” by Loeb: “Aristotle. On the soul. Parva naturalia. On breath.” London/Cambridge, Mass. 1964; the article on longevity on pp. 394–409.

The article by Aristotle has furthermore been treated by Ibn Rushd in an article called “Fī ‘asbāb jūl al-‘umr wa-qisarihi” which is the third part of the “talḥīṣ kitāb al-ḥass wa-l-mahsūs li’Aristū li-l-qādī ’Abi al-Walīd Ibn Rushd”, edited by Abd ar-Rahman Badawi in “Aristītālis: fi an-nafs”, Beirut 19?, pp. 232–239.

The transference of texts from one language/culture into another during the Middle Ages is carried out in a variety of methods, ranging from close translation to free paraphrasing and summarizing. The independant and individual interpretation of the original was an ideal, not an accident or a mistake. Rita Copeland writes of the term interpret that in European Middle Age literature, it was "sometimes taken to mean 'expound', 'explain', or 'unlock the sense hidden in the words'" (Rhetoric, Hermeneutics, and Translation in the Middle Ages, Cambridge 1991, p. 90); that the paraphrase "consumes or envelops the text and can remake the text on many levels, from style to structure to conceptual orientation" (op.cit. p. 87ff); and that an actual ambition from the Roman age and forwards was "the displacement of the source" (op.cit. i.a. p. 30, p. 93ff).

Sometimes, deviations in the translation or the commentary from the original

(1) I am grateful to professor Gösta Vitestam, who draw my attention to the article of Qustā ibn Lūqā, and to Mrs. Margareta Svenssen, who undertook to correct the Greek part of the glossary.

(2) The part of the text dealing with physiognomy is not treated in the present article.
source may be due to defects in the text copies available, as Helmut Gätje points out in his article “Averroes als Aristoteleskommentator”, p. 63 (in ZDMG 114: 1964, pp. 59–65). In any case, a misunderstanding or accidental omission on the part of the interpreter should not be immediately suspected. For example, Qustā ibn Lūqā makes no use in his article of any term corresponding to Aristotle’s ψυχή (anima), which could have been expected from the contents, or even less of the equally relevant and connected term πνεῦμα (spiritus). However, this omission could hardly be accidental or a result of ignorance, because we know that Qustā ibn Lūqā himself wrote a treatise on the difference between those two concepts, an-nafs (soul) and ar-rūḥ (spirit) (See Gabrieli, G o. Guidi, Socio I: “La risalah di Qustā b. Lūqā ‘Sulla differenza tra lo spirito e l’anima’ in: “Beiträge zur geschichte der arabische-islamischen Medizin”. Aufsätze. Bd II., ed, Sezgin, F., Frankfurt am-Main 1987, pp. 60–93, and: H. Fähndrich: “Abhandlung ueber die Ansteckung von Qustā ibn Lūqā”, Stuttgart 1987 (= Abh. fuer die Kunde des Morgenlandes, Bd XLVIII, 2), p. 36, #37.)

The article by Qustā ibn Lūqā is called a “maqāla” (a wide term) in the Berlin manuscript last page, but is in the risāla form with a conventional letter formula to the anonymous reader in the beginning and end of the text. The article by Ibn Rushd is called talḥīs (see above). Neither of them claims to be a translation which would also be far from the truth; it soon appears that both Arabic texts differ in important aspects and to varying degrees from the Greek text. There is a common general correspondance in all three articles, viz regarding the primary cause for a long life. Furthermore, most of the material present in the Arabic articles but not in the Greek one is to be found elsewhere in Aristotle’s writings: the Arabs explain Aristotle by Aristotle, adding other Greek and Hellenistic sources, as well as explanations of their own, and restructuring at will the disposition of the text.

The following summaries of the three articles, comparison of concepts and dispositions and a selected, comparative glossary should provide a basis for a minor discussion of historical principles of interpretation of the scientific heritage in Classical Arabic culture.

SUMMARIES

Aristotle

I

Introduction: Why are some animals and plants long-lived while others are not? What is the connection between length of life and good or bad health? (A diseased person, for example, may be long-lived.)

Within physical philosophy, we have discussed sleep and the wake state and shall later speak of life and death, disease and health. Differences of longevity are found with regard to genus (e.g. man- horse) as well as with regard to species (e.g. specimens from the same race live longer in hot climates).

II

What causes natural objects to become destroyed? Fire, water and similar elements
are reciprocal causes of each other's generation or destruction. Other things, e.g. knowledge and health, can be destroyed even if their physical container still exists.

It is uncertain how the soul is related to the body and also how it can be destroyed.

III

Nothing can be destroyed which does not have a contrary, because a thing can only be destroyed by its contrary. Everything which possesses matter must have a contrary in some sense. Nothing can consist solely of one quality such as e.g. heat. The active and the passive are found together, the one acting, the other being acted upon, so that change takes place. If an object could expel all that is contrary to it, it would be indestructible but it is not.

Some actual contrary must be present and waste products produced. Everything is thus in a constant state of movement, being either generated or destroyed. The environment works with or against it. Contrarities of place, quantity and affection brings about changes of locality, growth/decay and state respectively.

IV

Characteristics such as size, animal or plant, sanguinous or bloodless, terrestrial or marine, are not mecanically related to longevity. However, the highest longevity is found among plants (e.g. the date-palm) and sanguinous, terrestrial and large animals often live longer than small, bloodless, marine animals.

V

The reason for all this is that life requires heat and moisture and when things grow old, they dry up. Fatty things may last long because they contain air which is like fire and does not become corrupt. If the moisture is of small quantity, it dries up; large animals tend to live longer because they have a bigger quantity of moisture. The moisture must also be hot.

Waste matter has a contrary force and does not resist destruction. Seed, e.g., is a waste product and causes dryness by its emission. This is why the mule lives longer than the horse and females longer than males. Toil, too, produces dryness. However, males live longer than females anyway, because they are warmer. Frost congeals moisture. (References to hot climate, snakes, lizards and reptiles).

Plants and animals die if they do not receive nourishment because in that case they consume themselves (nourishment functioning as a cooler: author's remark). Compare animals on land - in water, bloodless, fatty or sweet.

VI

Plants are less watery than animals, so that their moisture does not congeal easily, and they also have oiliness and viscosity. Furthermore, plants are always being reborn: roots, trunks and branches grow afresh independantly of one another and go on living even if they are separated from the main plant. This is because the vital principle exists in every part of the plant.

Heat resides in the upper parts of the body and cold in the lower parts. Males
tend to live longer because they have larger upper parts than females. In plants, the root is in fact the upper part and head of the plant and annuals grow downwards.

Qustā ibn Lūqā

This letter answers a demand to explain the reasons for length and shortness of life and the physiognomy of the long-lived according to philosophy and medicine.

The causes of destruction of any constitution may be natural or accidental. Accidental causes may be of two kinds: external, such as drowning or excessive eating, or internal, e.g. faults in the regimen. Accidental causes are innumerable. Instead, we shall study the cause of natural death.

The human being is derived from heat, cold, moisture and dryness, the primary and most distant elements of which are fire, earth, water and air. An analysis of the human body should proceed from the closest elements to the most distant ones.

The body is divided into five parts: the head, the chest, the stomach, the arms and the legs. Each one of these may be divided into smaller parts: e.g. the head consists of scull, brain, face, eyes, nose, etc.

Such parts of the body as bones, flesh, nerves, arteries, skin etc. are called “the homogenous parts” by Aristotle, because any part of them is called by the name of the whole; a piece of flesh is called “flesh”, a piece of skin is called “skin” etc. The substances of the homogenous parts are generated from blood and semen. Blood is generated from animals and plants (through nutrition?). Animals are generated from plants because they feed on them. Fire, earth, water and air, however, are produced only by God. Those four, then, are the most distant elements of man.

The close elements of the human body are semen and blood. They are hot and moist. Blood is heat, semen is heat mixed with smoke and air. Heat and humidity dominate over cold and dryness.

The mixture of blood and semen generates an element which contains the “image” (āy-šīra) (embryo). God causes the innate heat to become an active element which reduces the humidity of the “image” so that it can be shaped. Hippocrates compares it to bread being baked in the oven. The heat forms the dimensions and the forming faculty forms the limbs and organs.

The time of birth varies with the degree of moisture. According to Galen it varies from 184 to 304 days.

Humidity is so strong in the newborn baby that it cannot move. Then the innate heat which God has placed in its heart begins to lighten the limbs by reducing the humidity. The time for learning to crawl and walk depends on the degree of humidity.

In childhood, the innate heat is strong in quantity but not in quality. Then it continues to diminish in quantity and increase in quality, until the living creature reaches maturity. After that, the innate heat fades both in quantity and in quality and when the heat is quenched, death occurs. This is natural death and the process is also valid for plants.

Why do some people die in their sixties while others last beyond a hundred years? This follows from what has already been said. Since life depends on heat and humidity and death is a result of cold and dryness, those bodies live long in which
heat and humidity is strong and where the regimen is so organized as to preserve those two qualities. Baths and physical exercises are the best means, as the present writer has stated many times.

Is heat or humidity the most important factor for the preservation of life? Aristotle argued for humidity, because eunuchs live long and humidity, not heat, is predominant in eunuchs and women.

The kind of humidity which is abundant in young ages is the essential one. There is also a surplus and accidental humidity which is produced when the innate heat diminishes and is incapable of controlling the digestion properly. This surplus heat causes the eyes of old people to tear.

Aristotle believed that eunuchs and females principally (in reality/theory) have more humidity than male persons. He had made empirical (practical) observations on their softness and rich hair and attributed longevity to them by analogy.

Hippocrates was decisive that extremely fat and naturally fat persons die before lean persons, because fatness is generated from the blood when the innate heat is diminished. Galen, too, connects strong heat with emaciation and strong cold with fatness.

Appearances are deceptive. A fat person may live longer than a lean one, because his fatness may be accidental and the lean person naturally fat. Natural fatness is connected with a cold temper. Accidental fatness is produced by e.g. much food and sleep, little worrying and listening to music and accidental leanness by little food and much worrying etc.

**Ibn Rushd**

All aspects of existence or destruction of animals (al-hayawān) such as growth and decay, sleep and wake state and all aspects of change are dependant on four qualities (kayfiyyāt): heat, cold, humidity and dryness, not on quantity or any other quality such as e.g. heaviness or blackness. This was demonstrated in the book "Al-kawn wal-fasād".

Consequently, length and shortness of life are also dependant on those four qualities. Different comparisons can be made according to classifications of living beings: first, with regard to al-ğins: e.g. plants generally live longer than animals; secondly, with regard to an-naw: e.g. man lives longer than the horse and the date-palm longer than the fig tree; thirdly, with regard to as sanf: e.g. human beings in hot and humid countries live longer than human beings in cold and dry countries; fourthly, with regard to individual specima: e.g. Zaid lives longer than Khalid.

Existence is perfect when the active forces dominate over the passive ones: heat and cold (sic) over humidity (sic) and dryness. Destruction occurs if the passive forces become dominating. Heat is implied by cold and humidity is implied by dryness: the combination is the complete natural image (as-stūra).

As long as the natural heat (al-harāra at jabi’iyya) dominates the mixture, decay does not occur. If it becomes too weak to digest the mixture, corruption begins.

Fire and water must be stronger in the mixture than earth and air, because they contain the active qualities. – If the relation between the active and the passive
forces is stable, change from the outside can only influence the living organism if it is great and occurs over a long period of time, because change is nothing but a weakening of the active forces and a strengthening of the passive ones.

Secondly, the relationship between the two active forces and between the two passive forces respectively is important. There should be more heat than cold and more humidity than dryness. If this balance is disturbed, corruption occurs.

If humidity is not abundant, animals and plants quickly dry out, because heat adheres to humidity and causes it to diminish.

Living organisms have different life length by being differently gifted with heat and humidity and with different degrees of dominance of active forces over passive ones.

Destruction is caused either by nature, if the heat vanishes, or by accident, if waste products are produced, in which case the individuals become exposed to mortal diseases. Passive forces dominate in such individuals, because decay is generated from the interior and external causes could not alone influence the organism.

Appearances are deceptive. A person may have strong-looking and beautiful limbs and yet die in diseases before old age dries him out.

The mixture of youth is hot and humid, that of old age is cold and dryness. An argument for this is that sexually active persons live shorter and eunuchs longer. Fatty persons are also long-lived, because fattiness (al-lahm) is generated from heat and humidity. From lack of sexual intercourse, the mule lives longer than the horse and the ass. Females live longer than males, people in hot countries live longer than those in cold countries, snakes and reptiles on hot and humid islands live longer than those in places which are hot and dry, or cold and dry, or cold and humid. People on islands live longer than people on the main land and sea animals live longer than terrestrial animals, because sea water is hot and humid.

Among external factors of importance for the preservation of life are food, drink, surrounding air, sleep etc. A person with much heat and humidity can use these factors correctly and live long. Another person may die naturally from a badness in his body caused by his temper.

People who die before they have grown old seldom have enough humidity and they are particularly liable to die prematurely (unnaturally) if their regimen does not suit them. Often, physicians do not realize that the regimen of a person has been at variance with his temper, because physicians observe only external reasons of death. It may also be difficult to discern the /right/ temper. According to Galen, the balanced (muta'addil) temper is the best one but it is not easily identified.

A plant can decay or grow in its parts. It is able to benefit from its innate heat (al-harāra al-gariziya) produced by the sun better than the animals. It is very viscous. It is close to the simple image. Every time a composite image is fed on the simple images from which it is composed, this image becomes more contrary to the simple images and the simple components grow in it and its contrariety becomes heightened.

This is what Aristotle and natural principles say on the subject. The ancient wise ascribed longevity to accidental causes such as hot and dry places or much blood. But humidity can generate decay in hot places, so the place cannot be a primary
cause of life. E.g. size of the body is accidental; a small man may well live longer than a bigger animal. Abundance of blood, too, is accidental, since its quantity depends on an abundance of heat and humidity.

CONCEPTUAL CONTENTS

Comparison Ar-QL

Correspondances
- the introductory stating of the problem: some resemblance (Ar I)
- the mentioning of fire and water and “similar elements” (Ar II)
- waste products (Ar II)
- heat and humidity ultimate causes of life; old age = drying up (Ar V)
- fatness, mules, horses, males and females used as demonstrations in the argumentation (Ar V)
- nourishment and growth of plants (Ar VI QL in physiognomy part)

Present in Ar but absent in QL
- classification according to genus and species (Ar I)
- animals (Ar I i.a.)
- the principal system of contraries (Ar II, III)
- the characteristics “terrestrial”, “marine”, “sanguinous” (Ar I i.a.)
- the soul (Ar II)

Present in QL but absent in Ar
- natural vs accidental
- exterior vs interior
- primary—close—distant elements
- the parts of the body
- the “sūra” and the “baking” of the image/embryo
- humidity in the newborn baby, in the mature man and in the old man
- regimen, including practical effects such as food, sleep, listening much to music
- deceptive appearances, e.g. accidental fatness
- essential vs waste humidity

Comparison Ar – bR

Ar I Most of this is repeated in bR, although in a distorted form. bR adds the concept of the four “qualities” (elements). He extends the classification of genus and species (4 classes) and adds three examples of his own.

Ar II + III The two passages contain the most abstract part of Aristotle’s discussion. bR omits any form of translation. Instead, he transfers the Aristotelian theory to a simpler level, connected with the human body, and uses more concrete terms. The concept of contraries is explained as the balance between active and passive forces. bR elaborates this point, the relation between active and passive and between active and active, the importance of heat and humidity and the danger of the passive and
of dryness and cold. The opposition between natural and accidental is mentioned briefly in connection with natural destruction vs. accidental diseases. bR adds the concept of the sūra being composed of contraries; this, however, is hardly a simplification.

Ar IV This is not a separate passage in bR. He has already mentioned some of the contents in the introductory passage and touches the subject again in the following passage.

Ar V bR follows Ar closely: the importance of heat and humidity for longevity and the practical applications with regard to fatness, mules, horses, females, males etc. bR adds passages on regimen which have no correspondance in Ar.

Ar VI The first part follows Ar closely. Then, bR adds the concept of the simple vs. the composite sūra, the latter being nourished from the former.

bR does not mention the Ar idea of the upper and lower parts of the body.

bR adds a concluding passage on the historical development of theories of longevity which has no correspondance in Ar.

**Comparison QL – bR – Ar**

Present in Ar but absent in QL – bR
- the system of contraries
- the soul

Present in QL – bR but absent in Ar
- natural vs. accidental; external vs. internal (extensively in QL, marginally in bR)
- the sūra
- regimen; practical applications of food, sleep, much listening to music
- deceptive appearances

Present in QL but absent in Ar – bR
- primary – close – distant elements
- the parts of the body
- development of the human being from embryo – baby – mature man – old man
- essential vs. waste humidity

Present in bR but absent in Ar – QL
- elaborate treatment of active-passive relations between the four basic elements

**COMPARATIVE GLOSSARY ENGLISH - GREEK - ARABIC**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Aristotle</th>
<th>Quṣṭā ibn Lūqā</th>
<th>Ibn Rušd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>abundancy</td>
<td>συμβεβηκός</td>
<td>'araḍī</td>
<td>wulfūr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abundant</td>
<td>ποιεῖν</td>
<td></td>
<td>wāfīr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accidental</td>
<td></td>
<td>'araḍī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to act</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>being acted on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>active /factor/</td>
<td>تَوْطِينُ</td>
<td>فَىَل</td>
<td>فَىَل</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>actual</td>
<td>إِنْ-عَرْجَسُ</td>
<td>هَوَاءُ</td>
<td>هَوَاءُ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aim</td>
<td>ذَوُون</td>
<td>ْجَرَد</td>
<td>ْجَرَد</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>animal/s/</td>
<td>هَيَوَانَاتٍ</td>
<td>هَيَوَانَان</td>
<td>هَيَوَانَان</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anxiety, grief</td>
<td>هَمَّمٍ, ْأَمَم</td>
<td>شَهْوَة</td>
<td>شَهْوَة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appetite</td>
<td>شَهْوَة</td>
<td>شَاءُف</td>
<td>شَاءُف</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aspect</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ass</td>
<td>ْحِيْتِيُّهَل</td>
<td>هَيْتَر</td>
<td>هَيْتَر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assassination</td>
<td>اَدْرَك</td>
<td>رَادَّ</td>
<td>رَادَّ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attain knowledge, grasp</td>
<td>هَمْمَمَاتٍ</td>
<td>شَهْوَة</td>
<td>شَهْوَة</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad, vicious</td>
<td>ْأَشَلٍ</td>
<td>رَادَّ</td>
<td>رَادَّ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basic</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bath</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bee</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black bile</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yellow bile</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blood</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cause (reason)</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to change</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>change n.</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clime</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold/ness/, n.</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>completion</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composed</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composite</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/physical/ constitution</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consume</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contrary</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cook, digest</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>corruption</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courage</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cowardice</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>craft, art,</td>
<td>ْجِهَة</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
<td>وَاغْر</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
profession
lumina/creatures to ἔον
date-palm ὁ φοινίκης
become damaged ὁ θάνατος
death ἡ φθίσις
die, perish ἡ θάνατος
decay ἡ φθίσις
decide, give an opinion ἡθακαμ
decrease, be defective ἁθδίδ
definition be demonstrated, shown ὑθθαγγαν
be destroyed ὑθθείγεν
to perish ὑθθοδοκά
destruction ὑθθοδοκά
destroyable ὑθθμβαρτος
to differ ᾁθθταλαμ
difference ὑθθδιαφορά
digestive power ὑθθπεπετως
digestion ἱδάμ
distant ἱδάσκιν
distinction, separation ἱδάκαλαμ
be divided άθθηαζσαμ
dominate, overpower ἱδάμ
drink/ing/dryness ἵθθεθρότης
dry ἵθθεθρότης
earth ἱδάμ
eat/ing/eat ἱδάμ
eating/eat ἱδάμ
element ὑθθελέφας
elephant ὑθθελέφας
emaciated ὑθθμαχζομ
endurance, environment, surrounding ὑθθμαχζομ
error, mistake ἱθθάταμ
established, consolidated ἱθθάταμ
eunuch ἱθθάκαλα
examine, investigate search ἱθθάκαλα

şiña’a
al-mawğūd at-labē’ti
naḥla
talif
‘āfa, wafā’
‘āfa
halak
fasād
haḥam
naqās
taḥdīd
tabayyan
tabayyan
‘aṭīb
ṣihtalaf
‘aṭqasam
tamyīz
galab
galab
ṣarāb, maṣrāb
maṣrāb
yas, yabūsā
yabūsā
yābis
yābis
‘aṛd
‘aṛd
‘aṭām, maṭ‘am
maṭ‘am
‘unsur, ‘isṭiquss
mahzūl
‘iḥtīmāl
muhīf
muhīf
ḥaṭa’
mutamakkin
hasī
hasī
bahaṭ
fahās
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>be excessive</td>
<td>mutfīq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extent</td>
<td>hadd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>external</td>
<td>min ḥārīg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fatness</td>
<td>simān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fat, oily</td>
<td>duhni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feeling; sensual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perception;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>empirical knowledge</td>
<td>ḥass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female(s)</td>
<td>nisā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fig tree</td>
<td>šāgarat at-ṭīn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>nār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flame</td>
<td>ʿakl, ḥaʿām</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>food</td>
<td>qūwa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frozen</td>
<td>musawwir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generosity</td>
<td>kawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gender</td>
<td>saḥā'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to grasp, know</td>
<td>ṣaḥr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greed, avarice</td>
<td>nūṣa'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>growth</td>
<td>hadat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happen, occur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happening (by chance)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harshness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>good/health</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be heavy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heart</td>
<td>taqul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>innate —</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hot</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>homogenous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>humour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hunger</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hygiene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ignorance ή ἄγνοια
illness, disease ή νόσος
acute — maraḍ
image, "picture", maraḍ ḥādd
form, foetus stūra
indication, proof ʿāṣ-ṣūra
individual ʿistīdāl, dalīl
insect dāḥīl
instrumental min dāḥīl
internal min dāḥīl
knowledge ḥaṭṭīm
learning ḥāṭṭīm
length ṭūl
life ṭūl
limb ṭūl
lizard ṭūl
loaf of bread ṭūl
long-lived ṭūl
luxury, comfort ṭūl
male ḍakar
man/kind/ ṭīnsān
manner; way ṭīnsān
be marked, ṭīnsān
distincted madḥab, ṭariq
marine ṭīnsān
material ṭīnsān
matter madda
medicine, drug ḍawāʾ
moral naṣfāni
mental naṣfāni
middle age; height mukthahil
of life mukthahil
nature mukthahil
mixture; temper mukthahil
moderate, balanced mukthahil
moisture mukthahil
moiṣt ṭā ṭaḥālām
molluscs ṭā ṭaḥālām
movement ḍaḥāl
mule ṭā ṭaḥāl
nature ṭā ṭaḥāl
natural character ṭā ṭaḥāl
natural disposition ṭā ṭaḥāl
natural ṭā ṭaḥāl
narrowness ṭā ṭaḥāl
near, close ṭā ṭaḥāl
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nourishment</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be nourished</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ocean</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oiliness</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old age</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>old people</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organize (regimen)</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>organization;</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>structure</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oven</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>part</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upper parts</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lower parts (of body)</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>passive</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patience</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perdition, ruin</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perseverance, persistence</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>philosophy</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physician</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physiognomy</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plague</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plan, design</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plants</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>power, faculty, force</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prescribe, ordain preserve</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hafaz</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>primary</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vital principle</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>precaution</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pure; clean</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>put forward, propose</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quantity</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quench, extinguish</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>be realized</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reason, see cause</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recollection</td>
<td>ٌثَرْفَٰٰ</td>
<td>گاداّ</td>
<td>تُجَادّدَ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the Red Sea  ἡ ἡλάττα  ἡ ἐρυθρά
regimen  ῃδβὶρ ῃδβὶρ
remaining, lasting  ῃβαρ ῃβαρ
reptile  ἀμμα
ripen; be well-cooked  ἄδηγ ἄδηγ
root  ἡ ἀπα ἡ ἀπα
rotteness, decay  ῃυφάνα  ῃυφάνα
roughness  ἡ ἱσύνα  ἡ ἱσύνα
sanguineous  ἐναμοσ ἐναμοσ
science  ἢ Ἰλ μ ἢ Ἰλ μ
semen  τὸ ἕπερμα  τὸ ἕπερμα
short-lived  βραχύβιοσ βραχύβιοσ
shortness  ἡ βραχύτης ἡ βραχύτης
sign, indication  ἦ ἄλαμα ἦ ἄλαμα
similar  μυτασάβιχα μυτασάβιχα
simple (structure)  ἰβίτ ἰβίτ
size  τὸ μέγεθος τὸ μέγεθος
sleep  ὁ ἦπνος ὁ ἦπνος
sleeplessness, wakefulness  σαχρ σαχρ
smoke  ὁ κατνός ὁ κατνός
smoothness  λίν λίν
snake  ὁ δρισ σαλάβα
solidity, harshness  λ ἴνα ἴνα
soul  ἡ ψυχή ἡ ψυχή
sparrow  ἡ στροφώθης ἡ στροφώθης
species  τὸ εἶδος τὸ εἶδος
stalk  ὁ καυλός ὁ καυλός
steam be stretched out  ῃηράὶ ῃηράὶ
structure  σωνεστῶς σωνεστῶς
study, see examine  ῃνμα ῃνμα
substance  ἡ οὐσία  ἡ οὐσία
sun  '),'ςμαςς'
sweet  γλυκόσ γλυκόσ
temper, see mixture  ῃισμ ῃισμ
term  ἰσμ ἰσμ
terrestrial  πεζόσ; τῇ γῇ  πεζόσ; τῇ γῇ
testacea  τὰ ὁστρακόδεμα τὰ ὁστρακόδεμα
thickness  σμκ σμκ
toil  ὁ πόνος ὁ πόνος
transform, change  ἡχύαλ ἡχύαλ
treatise  ),'ςμαςς'
tree  τὸ δένδρον  τὸ δένδρον

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>Anglophone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tadbir</td>
<td>tadbir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baqaay</td>
<td>baqaay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nadiy</td>
<td>nadiy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ufuna</td>
<td>'ufuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>husuna</td>
<td>husuna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ilm</td>
<td>'ilm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minan</td>
<td>minan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qasr</td>
<td>qasr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'alama</td>
<td>'alama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutasabiba</td>
<td>mutasabiba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>basit</td>
<td>basit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nawm</td>
<td>nawm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sahr</td>
<td>sahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liyn</td>
<td>liyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malasa</td>
<td>malasa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>salaba</td>
<td>salaba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>buhari</td>
<td>buhari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ibrasat</td>
<td>ibrasat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binya</td>
<td>binya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gawhir</td>
<td>gawhir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gawhir</td>
<td>gawhir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sams</td>
<td>sams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barari</td>
<td>barari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sumk</td>
<td>sumk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hayyal</td>
<td>hayyal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maqala</td>
<td>maqala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Greek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trunk</td>
<td>τὸ στέλεχος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truths; true nature in reality (=in theory)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to use, apply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vanish, die; pass away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>viscosity</td>
<td>ἡ γλυκορύμης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waking state</td>
<td>ἡ ἐγγύηρος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>warmth: see heat</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>waste /product/(s)</td>
<td>περιττός,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water pl. περίττωμα</td>
<td>pl. fudūl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>watery</td>
<td>τὸ άθορ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to weaken</td>
<td>ὧδατῳδης</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>width</td>
<td>ἀρυθ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semantic Notes on Mandaic Poetry

KERSTIN EKSELL, Stockholm

THEORETICAL PRELIMINARIES

In the volume honouring Rudolph Macuch, "Studia semitica neenon Iranica; Rudolpho Macueh septuagennario ab amicis et discipulis dedicata" (Wiesbaden 1989), two articles deal with Mandaic poetry: "On Mandaic Poetic technique" by Jonas C. Greenfield (pp. 101-108) and "Parallelism in the Qolasta" by Stanislav Segert (pp. 283-297) and both authors also promise further research on the subject (op. cit. pp. 107, note 12 and 297). Greenfield underlines two poetic patterns of importance in Mandaic poetry: the use of paired words (complementary or contrastive) and the use of repetition (of words, phrases or verses, both devices among others in the early West Semitic poetic tradition, including Aramaic. Segert starts from the general term parallelismus membrorum and provides much information on examples of parallelistic syntactic or semantic structures. Segert limits his investigation to the Qolasta while Greenfield also seems to include the other parts of Mandäische Liturgien (M. Lidzbarski, Berlin 1920) in his material. In the article of Segert, the emphasis is on the practical analysis of the poems, while Greenfield stresses the relationship of Mandaic poetry to other forms of Aramaic poetry. However, Segert arrives at much the same general conclusion as Greenfield, stating: "In spite of its frequency parallelism is certainly not the dominant feature of Mandaic poetry represented in the Qolasta. Its function has to be evaluated in connection with the devices based on repetition, especially of that connecting verses like a chain (Mand. Lit. p. XIV). Parallelistic and repetitive devices often appear closely together" (op. cit. p. 296).

There are other obvious questions regarding the structure of Mandaic poetry, such as the relation between the 'iniana and the draša forms, the occurrence of strophic poems or part of poems, the state of the texts and the development of the very particular device of Verkettung (Mand. Lit. Einleitung). As is unhesitatingly recognized by Segert and Greenfeld, the problems have already been formulated and commented upon by Lidzbarski in his Einleitung to the Mandäische Liturgien.

The promised, forthcoming contributions on the subject will be much appreciated. In the meantime, I would like to make a few notes, mainly concerning the semantics of the poetry in the Mandäische Liturgien. First, there may be some need for stating more explicitly why repetition is not the same as parallelism. To define what is parallelistic poetry would be beyond the scope of this paper but very roughly, it is a poetical tradition, often called by one of its most conspicuous traits the parallelismus membrorum. The single verse consists normally of three terms, sometimes two or four, and it is semantically or syntactically paralleled in the following verse by at least one or several terms or somehow complemented without strict parallelism. The definition is rather vague and parallelism cannot for example be said to be an opposite of repetition; repetition is rather a subordinated device of
parallelism. Two other traits of traditional Northern Semitic parallelistic poetry should be mentioned: a) the syntactic economy of the verse and b) the importance of the verb or the action. Not only is the verse normally an independant syntactic unit but normally, it contains one separate action, expressed by a verb or a nominal phrase, which gives the poem an epical and dramatical character, also emphasized by the appearance of active agents throughout the poem. In good poems of this tradition, a dynamic force should be clearly discernable, because there is a constant variance of similarities and contrasts on different semantic and syntactic levels, a balance between the expected and the unexpected. Repetition in these ancient poems is certainly a recurrent device but one which is used sparsely.

There is no doubt that Mandaic poetry shows some of the traits significant for the ancient parallelistic poetry. One of these is the three-term stichos as the basic syntagmatical poetic unit. Others are the syntactic economy of the stichos and the importance of a kernel of activity in each stichos. And parallel phrases or terms between the stichoï do occur regularly, as Segert demonstrates. Many exceptions to the standard is not an argument per se, because the ancient poetry is also full of deviations or, perhaps rather, variations.

The dominance of the device of repetition is, however, untypical of the ancient tradition. Equally untypical is another phenomenon commented upon by Lidzbarski in the Einleitung: the occasional appearance of strophical organization. The best example is the wedding song quoted by Lidzbarski and the epical draša appearing in the same context. Many other poems show strophical elements resembling either the lyrical or the epical model presented in the Einleitung. Repetition is often important in connection with strophical organization. Although strophical and repetitional patterns appear in such ancient poetry as for example hymns, it is more plausible to ascribe the occurrence in Mandaic poetry to the influence of vulgar poetry. This is in fact what Lidzbarski does (Einl. p. IXf.) and further arguments in favour of vulgar influence is provided by the wedding songs collected by lady Drower (“Šarḥ d Qabin d Šišlam Rba”, Roma 1950)), some of which show correspondences with lyrical parts of Mandātische Liturgien. The dramatical character of Mandaic poetry is consistent with the ancient poetry but is also a typical property of vulgar Semitic poetry. The use of repetitional and different mnemonic devices for the ear is another phenomenon typical of vulgar poetry.

From the present stage of research, we may conclude that Mandaic poetry is somehow related both to the ancient Northern Semitic poetry which gradually ceased to be productive in the Near East and generally disappeared before ca. 300 a.D., and to vulgar poetry in the region such as we know it from the Middle Ages and today. However, we may take one step further and note that there is a significant feature of Mandaic poetry which is not shared either by the ancient poetry or by the vulgar one, and this is the poverty of the lexicon. It is natural to expect a certain consistency in the choice of terms and subject-matters, since liturgical-religious prescriptions must be fulfilled. It is also true that single poems or part of poems in all poetical traditions may be lexically poor. However, the poverty of vocabulary in Mandaic poetry is quite remarkable for such a large material, especially if we compare it to the vulgar poetry, which is usually very rich semantically.
It may be argued that the repetition typical for Mandaic poetry is a result of the semantic vocabulary; it is not a somehow chosen poetic device but a necessity, closely connected with the highly limited sources of expression. When the same words are used again and again, often in similar semantic environments, patterns of repetition are bound to appear. The process is reciprocal over a long period of time: words originally used fall into oblivion, the prosody becomes simplified, and the dynamic interaction of semantic and syntactic variables is replaced by a structure of mnemonic devices, which preserves the central and understandable words, deletes the incomprehensible ones and makes prosodic variants homogenous and uncomplicated. The dominant use of repetition in Mandaic poetry is a shadowy reflection of a more glorious poetic tradition. Mandaic poetry is a corrupted form of the Northern Semitic parallelistic poetry, although to a small extent enriched by a vulgar poetic tradition. Corrupted verses are by no means extraordinary anywhere: a relevant comparison would be the nonsense verses to be found in the vulgar Mandaic wedding-songs (Drower, op. cit.).

Nevertheless, poetic qualities exist in Mandaic poetry. In spite of its repetitive poverty, the organisation of its semantic properties reveals an opposition concrete vs. abstract which sometimes makes the poetry beautiful or even delightful.

**SEMANTIC INVENTORY**

The aim is to categorize relevant terms in a meaningful way, so that a semantic structure emerges and a representative picture of the different semantic fields is established. Not every single word in the texts appears in the following lists but they do cover a majority of the nouns found in the versified texts of the Mandäische Liturgien. In the microcosmos of the texts, we shall consider the following units: a) man and his close surroundings, b) nature, animate or immobile, belonging to the earth or to the sky, c) the work of man: professionals and objects in human society, and d) selected adjectives and abstract nouns.

a) the close, central circle of man:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>family relations</th>
<th>body parts</th>
<th>clothes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>aba</td>
<td>riša</td>
<td>Ŧarṭabuna turban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ṭma</td>
<td>anpa</td>
<td>lбуša dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ialda</td>
<td>aina</td>
<td>ūṣṭla dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bra</td>
<td>puma</td>
<td>stola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brata</td>
<td>ispa</td>
<td>himiana girdle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aha</td>
<td>šauara</td>
<td>knapa pocket</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ahua</td>
<td>liba</td>
<td>šaruala trousers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>aida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>draia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>burka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ligra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pagra</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>qala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
nišimta  soul

b) *nature:*

**vegetation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>asa</td>
<td>myrtle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gupna</td>
<td>palm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'lana</td>
<td>tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'mbia</td>
<td>grapes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marmahuza</td>
<td>Origanum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>margna</td>
<td>olive staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mrara</td>
<td>bitterweed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pira</td>
<td>fruit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rumana</td>
<td>pomegranate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uarda</td>
<td>rose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gida</td>
<td>absinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zida</td>
<td>thorn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>širša</td>
<td>root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šitla</td>
<td>plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gnina</td>
<td>garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nišba</td>
<td>plantation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**immobiles**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šamiš</td>
<td>sun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sira</td>
<td>moon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šsumia</td>
<td>heaven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kukba</td>
<td>star</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tura</td>
<td>mountain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iama</td>
<td>ocean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mia</td>
<td>water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aina</td>
<td>spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iardna</td>
<td>spring, river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hapiqia mia</td>
<td>brooks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

time and air

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qadim</td>
<td>morning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hasir</td>
<td>evening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iuma</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zibna,</td>
<td>time, period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nhura</td>
<td>light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hšuka</td>
<td>darkness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rima</td>
<td>wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'tula</td>
<td>shadow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anana</td>
<td>cloud</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>riha</td>
<td>smell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) the work of man: professionals and things in human society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mahzita</td>
<td>mirror</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taga</td>
<td>crown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drabša</td>
<td>banner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kursía</td>
<td>throne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hilia</td>
<td>jewels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dahba</td>
<td>gold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kasba</td>
<td>silver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manganita</td>
<td>pearl</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bit</td>
<td>house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baba,</td>
<td>door,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tira</td>
<td>gate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>binta</td>
<td>building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aqra</td>
<td>castle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit ama</td>
<td>people’s house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maška</td>
<td>temple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>urha</td>
<td>way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab Word</td>
<td>English Meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>şauta</td>
<td>gem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>şušlata</td>
<td>chains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ginza</td>
<td>treasure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ganzi bra</td>
<td>treasurer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pindur</td>
<td>zither</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šraga</td>
<td>lamp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šamuqta</td>
<td>candle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pasimqa</td>
<td>torch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silita</td>
<td>fishing net</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>iahba hamra</td>
<td>wine jar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nuna</td>
<td>fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rakša</td>
<td>horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kudka</td>
<td>milestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tatūra</td>
<td>bridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mamburta</td>
<td>ferry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit dina</td>
<td>court house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matra</td>
<td>watch house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit maksia</td>
<td>customs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rab maksia</td>
<td>customs officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agra</td>
<td>wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zibna</td>
<td>goods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tangara</td>
<td>merchant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āngirta</td>
<td>letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hatma</td>
<td>seal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zidqa</td>
<td>alms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zaina</td>
<td>weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qašta</td>
<td>bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marda</td>
<td>rebel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muzania</td>
<td>scales man</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amta</td>
<td>maid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šaraia</td>
<td>silk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

d) adjectives and abstract nouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjective</th>
<th>Noun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>dakia</td>
<td>hiia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zakia</td>
<td>muta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taqna</td>
<td>mamūla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranza</td>
<td>rušuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarīra</td>
<td>raṣa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šanāia</td>
<td>salma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sūla</td>
<td>haiła</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sapīra</td>
<td>srara,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>taba</td>
<td>kušṭa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biša</td>
<td>hakimuta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haška</td>
<td>tušlima</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zapra</td>
<td>'qara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tahma</td>
<td>rahma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nadua</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>haṭa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tigra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>šiqra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nsisa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- adjectives
- nouns
COMMENTARY

In the first group, family relations and body parts are established concepts occurring regularly. However, the group covers only the most frequent and expected terms in these fields, and the number of terms is small. The clothes are all related to the liturgical ceremonies, even if some of them occur occasionally in a profane context.

In the second group, the immobile parts of nature and the concepts of time and air are equally few in number and ordinary in occurrence. The concept of water in different appearances is particularly important in the liturgies but also the other immobiles are central concepts. Among the terms representing time and air, light, darkness and smell are elementary. The terms of vegetation are richer in number and much more precise, since they include several examples of proper species of plants, which connote colour and brightness.

Among the work of man, we observe a significant sub-group: those concepts related to court life and connoting glory, power, riches and perhaps a magical or mythological flavour (the concepts are not anachronistic but they are equally representative for ancient or mythical times). All of them furthermore share one characteristic, that of being shining, radiating light.

The most surprising result of this study is the extreme paucity of concepts related to ordinary life in society. Although a complete list would include a few more terms, this would do nothing to alter the general impression, because several of the terms occur only once and clustered three or more together in single poems. In fact, there is no society reflected in Mandaic poetry. There are a few terms which might indicate urban surroundings, such as merchant and goods and customs, and there are no clear terms which reflect an agrarian society or any social organization outside a town. Concepts related to fruit orchards are equally relevant to urban life and to the countryside, and the single occurrence of fishing proves nothing. The social background of Mandaic poetry is remarkably anonymous. From a literary point of view, this poverty of concepts does not add to the qualities of the poetry.

The abstract adjectives and nouns all reflect religious organization and can be divided into two groups: positive concepts and negative ones, in accordance with gnostic belief.

ON THE POETIC ORGANIZATION

The beauty of the poetry is derived from two features: a) the use of concepts from the vegetation and the court life and the terms for water and light, all of which produce an atmosphere of radiance and colours and b) the frequent combinations of noun + adjective or noun + genitival modifier, one of the two terms usually concrete and the other one abstract, which create a dynamic tension between two different categories and causes a transcendence from the phenomena of the human world into an abstract or immaterialized or heavenly world. I commented on this in my article “Remarks on the poetical function of the genitive in some Northwestern Semitic poetry” (Or. Suec. XXXVIII–XXXIX 1989–1990, pp. 24f.) and I would
like to conclude by giving additional examples of noun + modifier constructions
typical of Mandaic poetry:

ainaniata dziua  the fountains of radiance
zinaihun dainaniata  the radiance of the fountains
zua dtaga  the radiance of the crown
zua dmargna  the radiance of the staff
drabha dziua  the banner of radiance
anana dziua  the cloud of radiance
'uslahk dziua  the robe of radiance
šragia dziua  the lamps of radiance
kursia dziua  the throne of radiance
saptia dziua  the chains of radiance
almia dhura  the worlds of light
šamuktia dhura  the candles of light
šragia dhura  the lamps of light
atra dhura  the place of light
anana dhura  the cloud of light
pasimqia dhura  the torches of light
rih dhklila  the smell of the wreath
gadil klila  the binder of the wreath
'tula dklilb  the shadow of the wreath
nishta dhiia  the plantation of life
šautaihun dhiia rbia  the gem of the great life
atra dhiia  the place of life
bit hiia  the house of life
baba dhiia  the gate of life
pisnia tušbihta  the tones of praise
pindur kušta  Kušta’s zither
tira mruma  the door of the sky
naṭria dakia  pure guards
ginat adam  Adam’s garden
ainia dilia dukuša  the eyes of truth
drušia šadia  wonderful hymns
rušma diardna  the sign of Jordan
zuadia kušta  the provisions of Kušta
bit kukbia  the house of the stars
pira d’lana  the fruit of the tree
marganita dakita  pure pearl
širša dmiia hiia  the root of the living water
nura akla  consuming fire
zida biša  evil thorns
alma dhusrana  the world of destitution
atra dhšuk  the place of darkness
pagra zapra,  the stinking body
pagra saria  do.
dur bišia  the dwelling-place of the evil
baita haška  the dark house
alma dhašuka  the world of darkness
spia dšqrə  the lips of lie
Text Structure in Focus


MATS ESKHULT, Uppsala

Niccacci's new book *Lettura Sintattica* is primarily a revised abridgement of his *Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*¹ together with a broad application of his principles. In these two text-linguistically orientated investigations of Biblical Hebrew verbal syntax, as well as in some articles,² the author's point of departure is the linguistic theory presented by H. Weinrich in *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt* (1977). This means that the analysis is based on texts—not clauses and sentences. In other words, the subject of the analysis is what the various syntactic constructions signal in the texts of which they are a part. Traditional teaching, being based on paradigmatic relations—foremost the parts of speech—does not give much room for the study of syntagmatic relations, i.e. the study of the factors, which make the units, following one another in the chain of speaking, form a meaningful whole. Even less attention is paid to how texts are woven together. An obvious reason for this is that 'text' as a linguistic entity is not easily defined, to say the least. Weinrich states: "Ein Text ist eine sinnvolle (d.h. kohärente und konsistente) Abfolge sprachlicher Zeichen zwischen zwei auffälligen Kommunikationsunterbrechungen",³ a definition adopted and cited by Niccacci on p. 9.

A cornerstone in Weinrich's (and accordingly Niccacci's)⁴ system is that verbal forms and usages are entirely different in *narration* as compared to *discourse*. The two are said to represent "two worlds" in this respect. A similar distinction may help us to clarify this, namely the distinction between 'main tenses' and 'narrative tenses' in Classical Greek grammar. Another example is the narrative French *passé simple* as opposed to the discursive *passé composé*. The basic difference between narration N and discourse D (Sprechhaltung) is matched by a "throwing into relief" (Reliefgebung), a phenomenon which is apparent in the tension between the French *imparfait* and *passé simple*. Moreover, in this system 'time' is interpreted relatively (Sprechperspektive), which means that the 'time-indication' of a verb in a given context may be retrospective or prospective, or may take the zero-value, i.e. the 'now' of the time of the utterance.⁵ The concurrence of these three factors are pivotal to Niccacci in his sort of three-dimensional co-ordinate system.

First of all, one has to express one's great admiration for a man, who in a comparatively short time has gone far beyond the standard grammars, and in several works has presented a reappraisal of Biblical Hebrew prose syntax—the poetry, as he rightly says, follows its own rules and must be left aside. What one perhaps could have expected is some more attention given to the general text-linguistic literature with links to the Semitic languages,⁶ as well as mentioning some special treatises on Hebrew syntax.⁷
As appears from its full title, Lettura sintattica, is divided into two parts, principles and applications. In the first part, pp. 1-40, the author’s text-linguistic system is outlined, together with his conception of ‘verbal’ and ‘nominal’ clauses, the basic structures in N and D, the coherency of the verbal system, plus a post scriptum on the present reviewer’s thesis on verbal aspect and narrative technique in Biblical Hebrew prose.

Accordingly, in chapter 1 the reader is introduced to the notion attegiamento linguistico, that is: ‘narration’ and ‘discourse’ or ‘comment’. The last “or comment” is of some consequence, because ‘discourse’ is not an unambiguous concept. It indicates both the conversational parts and the narrator’s own comments. True, both kinds of discourse are an address, but as regards the overall function, and the value of the verbal forms in the two of them, they differ entirely. Other notions are messa in relievo, that is: ‘background’ and ‘foreground’, and, finally, prospettiva linguistica, that is: whether a form points forwards, backwards, or in neither direction (zero).

In chapter 2 the author presents his fundamental distinction between the verbal clause (VC) and the nominal clause (NC). The distinction is primarily formal: the VC has a verb in prior position, the NC has not. The functional description is, however, of almost equal importance: the VC indicates the principal line of communication, while the NC indicates a secondary, subsidiary line. Now, the priority of the formal definition forces the author to declare every clause, beginning with what he calls “circumstance”, be it a noun, an adverb or their equivalents, to be a NC – with the addition that a NC, which has a finite verb in 2nd position, is a compound nominal clause (CNC). Nevertheless – so we learn – there are two basic types of construction here: in the CNC proper ‘non-verbal element’ and ‘finite verb’ form a single, integrated clause, but if ‘non-verbal element’ and ‘finite verb’ remain two distinguished parts, they are said to form a ‘two-member syntactic pattern’. In this way, thus, adverbial clauses (conditional, temporal, causal) and relative clauses and nominal hal-clauses, and even fronted adverbs (of time), are all held to be tantamount to being a nominal clause, and accordingly on a subsidiary level – granted that no prefaced wayhi join them, and their connective clauses, to the main line of communication.

In chapter 3 the principles of N and D, and of sequential and interruptive (subsidary) clauses, are applied to the ‘text’, thus giving birth to the term catena narrativa for the narrative sequential clauses (almost entirely made up of chains of wayyiqtol-forms), and the term catena discorsiva for the discursive sequential clauses (almost entirely made up of chains of waqātal-forms). Moreover, we learn that sequential main-line narration can only represent the past, while all tenses (past, present and future) can be represented in dialogue on its main line of communication. However, in backgrounded accounts the two attitudes N and D merge, for here both may express what happened before (x-qātal), what happens for the time being (NC), or things to come (x-yiqtol).

The observation of the transition between foreground and background in texts gives rise to a discussion of ‘tense transitions’. It is explained that the transition from VC to CNC does not entail a disruption of a narrative, only a weak interruption to give a note on something anterior, concomitant or contrasting;
whereas, on the other hand, the transition: CNC to VC means a real break, or at least a considerable interruption in the narrative stream.\textsuperscript{16}

The narrator may interrupt his story, told in chains of \textit{wayyiqtol}-clauses, simply by using clauses of the type \textit{x-qātal}, \textit{waqātal}, \textit{x-yiqtol} or a (simple) NC. In this way he throws his own comments into relief against the running narration. Although those clauses represent ‘discourse’ in its extended sense, they have other temporal values entirely than corresponding clauses in “real” discourse.\textsuperscript{17} – This fact, actually, gives the impression that, in contrast, narration \textit{and} comment on the part of the storyteller constitute one category of the text and the conversational parts the other. – As regards dialogue between the figures, a series of \textit{waqātal}-clauses for future (continuing an \textit{x-yiqtol}-clause) is interrupted by \textit{x-yiqtol}, whereas a series of \textit{continuative}\textsuperscript{18} \textit{wayyiqtol}-clauses (following upon a \textit{x-qātal}) is interrupted by \textit{x-qātal}; accordingly, a catchword extended into a sequential account, is subject to the same rules as a narrative proper.\textsuperscript{19} At this point one is seized by the suspicion that ‘narrative proper’ is but a function of narration as such, sprung forth from its use in live dialogue, and that one should be careful about drawing too sharp a line between the literary use of these two kinds of ‘narrative’, even though the author is quite right in stating that continuative \textit{wayyiqtol} never operates on the event line of a story. In addition, one observes that the interruptive force of the compound and simple NC is very weak in dialogue. Often the pattern \textit{waqātal} – \textit{x-qyqtol} is only a matter of a stylistically conditioned chiasm, a phenomenon not, however, commented upon by the author.\textsuperscript{20}

Chapter four, on the main constructions in N, expounds on the ‘two-member syntactic pattern’, which consists of protasis + apodosis, or (\textit{wayhi}) adverbial element + connective clause.\textsuperscript{21} The protasis is nominal in nature, when made up of a substantive or a participle in extraposition, a relative clause or a NC (simple or compound). It is adverbial in nature when made up of an adverb, prep. + noun, prep. + inf. est., or an adverbial clause. The apodosis is frequently introduced by what is commonly called a consecutive form, and may however be introduced by an asyndetically conjoined \textit{qātal/yiqtol}, or \textit{wāw} + NC.\textsuperscript{22}

Due attention is paid to \textit{wayhi} in its capacity of being a macro-syntactic sign in the narration, joining a two-component sentence construction to the narrative sequential level, simply by rendering the first part of it verbal: \textit{wayhi} – adv. elem. – connective clause.

In the next paragraph the reader is confronted with the idea that all types of two-component sentence constructions may be viewed as a casus pendens. A certain problem lies in the distinction between casus pendens, thus understood, and the CNC proper, in the case that both are of the type noun + finite verb. According to the author, the CNC – in contrast to casus pendens – takes considerable emphasis. Moreover, we learn that in the CNC the preposed element is in reality what is new, thus reducing the verb to the role of theme, which is shown by the rendering through cleft-sentences.\textsuperscript{23}

Another paragraph clarifies the difference between narrative and continuative \textit{wayyiqtol}. The former is found in N, is neither retrospective nor prospective and hence always takes zero-value. The latter is found in both N and D, however never in prior position. It takes the tense values of the preceding verb.
Furthermore, the author stresses the necessity – from a text-linguistic point of view – of realizing that a subj-verb clause is not a stylistic variant of a verb-subj one.

Still another point made is the distinction between grammatically independent clauses (main clauses) and syntactically independent ones (finite verb in prior position).

Finally the author returns to ‘tense transition’ stating that the transition wāw-x-qāṭal to wayyiqtol, i.e. from antecedent to zero, and from wayyiqtol to wāw-x-qāṭal, i.e. from main line to background, are both (in Weinrich’s words) homogeneous with the narration, whereas the transition wayyiqtol to waqāṭal/wāw-x-yiqtol, or to wāw + simple NC, are all heterogeneous, since they entail a transition from pure narration to the comments made by the storyteller.24

Chapter 5, on main constructions in D, states that the yiqtol indicative occupies the second position in a clause and is followed by waqāṭal, while the jussive normally takes the first position25 and is commonly followed by another jussive. A switch-over to waqāṭal after a volitive form (juss., coh., imp.) marks sit venia verbo a psychological gap between command and consequence.

The end of this chapter is most important, for here the author concedes that in the ‘reporting perfect’ of the direct speech we encounter qāṭal AND x-qāṭal on the main line of communication. This gives rise to the question whether verb-second-position is a true touchstone for the distinction between the CNC and the VC. Apparently, it is not, especially since x-yiqtol (jussive or indicative) behaves like a VC. Therefore, the author states, x-qāṭal and x-yiqtol in direct speech are to be considered as verbal clauses.26

Chapter 6, the coherence of the verbal system, discusses firstly Gn 1: 1–3, where grammatically vv. 1–2 are analyzed as made up of NC’s, and where syntactically v. 2 is held to be the apodosis of v. 1, and where text-linguistically vv. 1–2 are considered to convey antecedent information to the narrative proper, beginning in v. 3. Secondly, there is a treatise on the temporal value of the different verbal forms in their various usages.

In a post scriptum, pp. 34–41, the author finally deals with the present reviewer’s thesis. Obviously, we share the basic ideas about N and D, foreground and background, and rightly it is said: “I due principi di base sono per Eskhult aspetto e linguistica, per me posizione nella frase e linguistica”, p. 35. Accordingly, instead of perceiving the notion of aspect as a fruitful contribution, through which it can be shown how, in a text-linguistic perspective, a narrator structures his story in main and subsidiary lines, by presenting clauses of motion (verbal clauses) as foregrounded and clauses of state and description (nominal clauses) as backgrounded, the author in the notion of aspect only sees an evasion from perceiving real tenses in verbal clauses and mode of action (i.e. prior or simultaneous, single or repeated action, plus emphasis) in nominal clauses. The position taken by the present reviewer is that, while ‘aspect’ is seen to be a sharp instrument to unravel the linguistic development not only in Hebrew, but also in Arabic, Ethiopic and Aramaic, ‘tense’ remains a deictic category, whose ‘now’ or ‘then’ appears from the context, or is enforced by adverbs and form-elements (such as wa in wayyiqtol).

The second part of Niccacci’s book, chs. 7–24, pp. 43–252, is a broad application
of the principles above. The texts used are Jos chs. 1–6, Jdc chs. 1–4, 6–8, and 2 Sam ch. 5, ch. 6 and ch. 7, synoptically arranged with 1 Chr chs. 11, 14 and 15, 16 plus 17, respectively. In addition, a final chapter is dedicated to a study of waqyihi in Ex 1–14.

The introductory chapter accounts for the typographical arrangement of the text: livello 1 = main narrative line, livello 2 = subsidiary line, livello 3 = direct speech. The author, thus, refrains from elaborating corresponding main and subsidiary lines of direct speech and from establishing a graphically observable difference between the narrator’s comments and other subsidiary material, antecedent and backgrounding.

Confining himself to the samples from Judges, the present reviewer wishes to make the following remarks:

In Jdc 1: 8 wayyakkitha lafi hareb: wa’et-ha’ir sillohu ba’eš the second clause is, as it seems, correctly put on livello 1, as it closely adheres to the first clause. On p. 51 it is said, concerning this verse, that due to a lack of syntactic criteria, one has to resort to literary and contextual ones. However, the rounding-off duty of this and other chiastically arranged verb–obj : obj–verb constructions (cf. Jdc 1: 25, 7: 25, 8: 17) favours the idea that we are dealing with a syntactic complex here, a construction per merismum, in which the two individual actions are construed as a unit.27

Furthermore, a number of clauses are held as being interruptive, merely according to the author’s definition of the nominal clause. One is Jdc 1: 9 wa’ahar yaradu Banē Yehudā (lahillāhem baKama’ni). Another is 1: 21 wa’et-haYbūsi ... lō’ hōritī Banē Binyāmin, where the grammatical object may be viewed as serving as theme and the rest as rheme.28

In addition, some passages are rightly considered as digressions from the narrative event line: 2: 15 bokol ʾašer yāsōr yad Yhwh hayattá-bbām lašar ... wayyyeser láhem māʾōd (NB the continuative wašr), plus 2: 17–19 and 6: 2b–5, a comment in which we meet with the habitual waḥayā ’im zāra Yisraʾēl ... followed by the continuative wayyakhni ʾalāhem wayyaḥšūt āvet-yābūl hāʾarēs (where, accordingly, walyhu and wayyishu take their habitual force from the preceding forms).29

Self-evidently, one finds on livello 2 a number of what is traditionally designed as circumstantial clauses, which sometimes only weakly interrupt the narrative chain: 1: 16, 36; 2: 10; 3: 17b, 20, 24, 26a; 4: 1b, 16a, 17; 6: 19aa; 7: 8b, 12. In some other instances the narrator tarries a bit longer on the subsidiary line by using continuative wayyiqtol-forms: 4: 4–5; 8: 30–31a.30

In 6: 33–35 the author, a bit strangely, does not see a descriptive digression (which in the economy of the Gideon narratives is both recapitulative and anticipatory), but instead four transitions between background and foreground, by which “l’autore sottolinea la rapidità e l’urgenza degli eventi”, notwithstanding that rapidity is commonly expressed by a number of short wayyiqtol-clauses.

In conclusion, as appears from the present review, although there are some vital points where it is difficult to agree with Niccacci’s discussion, on the whole one has to express one’s gratitude to him for his intensive and creative study of the Biblical Hebrew prose, in order to map an outline of its syntax from a text-linguistic
viewpoint. Without question, the work under review deserves to be studied thoroughly.

NOTES


5. This idea is critically examined by J. Lyons, *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, 1979 (1968), pp. 304ff.


8. Linguistic attitude (Sprachhaltung).

9. Highlighting or prominence (Reliefgebung).

10. Linguistic perspective (Sprechperspektive).

11. Obviously the noun-like character of the subordinate clause, being but a word in the shape of a clause, has guided the author to this standpoint.

12. That is to say, when no wayyih is prefixed, there is a break in the narrative chain.

13. The Italian has *forme di connessione*.

14. qatal = past, NC = present, x-qiqtol/waqāqāl = future.

15. *Transizione temporale* – a not very suitable term, inasmuch as it is mostly a question of transition from straightforward narration in the past to description in the past, though the transition sometimes corresponds to a change from e.g. English simple past to past perfect and *vice versa*.

16. That is, the transition from the opening of a story to the narrative proper.

17. In his *Syntax* etc., p. 122, Niecacci says: “the border between comment (linguistic attitude) and background (prominence) is fluid”.

18. The form *wayyiqtol* is continuous when carrying on a comment or a catchword, thus being by definition off the event line.

19. A ‘narrative in the form of direct speech’ may be referred to as ‘oral narrative’, or, as Niecacci prefers, ‘narrative discourse’ (*discorso narrativo*).

20. In Gn 12: 12, for instance: (they shall say: She is his wife) נֶחָרָגָה אָי וּדְתָק יָבִי, is in “Basic Principles” (see n. 2, above) interpreted as a foreground → background transition, expressing a contrast; the significance of the chiasm is not treated.

21. The remarkable decline in the use of *wayyih* before an adverbial element in the beginning of major and minor narrative units, together with an asyndetically conjoined qatal (instead of *wayyiqtol*) in the language of the Chronicler is not dealt with by the author.

22. Niecacci dedicates pp. 125–162 of his *Syntax* etc. to the two-component syntactic construction.

23. E.g. Jd 6: 8b ‘anoki he “lēi ‘etqem minMiṣrayim ‘It was I who made you come up from Egypt’, *Syntax* etc., p. 24 (cf. the Septuagint Codex Alexandrinus!). However, T. Muraoka, in his review of the Italian edition of *Syntax* etc., *Abr. Nahran*, 27/1989, objects saying that there are countless examples where such an interpretation is not appropriate.

24. He adds: “La durezza di questa rottura viene attenuata dal fatto che le due forme verbali discorsive assumono un valore temporale diverso nella narrazione: il weqatal e lo yiqtol indicano abitudine o
ripetizione (indicano il futuro semplice nel discorso), la proposizione nominale semplice indica la contemporaneità nella narrazione (indica il presente nel discorso)."

25. On the free jussive, conjoined (or indirect) jussive, and conjoined jussive versus perfect consecutive, see H.S. Nyberg, *Hebreisk Grammatik* § 87c, d and §86ff 5 Anm. 2.

26. A position very similar to the one taken by Niccacci as regards ‘verbal’ and ‘nominal’ clauses is presented by H.S. Nyberg, *op. cit.* § 85, defines a verbal clause as a clause that carries the action forward, and which is used to mark the main points in the chain of events; whereas a nominal clause introduces circumstances beside the main action, inasmuch as it characterizes situations etc. However, he does not let the noun-like character of subordinate clauses interfere with the concept of nominal clause. Also, fronted objects or prepositional phrases he considers as examples of emphatic isolation in a verbal clause, whereas a compound nominal clause has a principal subject in prior position, followed by a predicate clause, nominal or verbal. The subject of the predicate clause may be identical with the principal subject, and if not, the principal subject is picked up by a binder-pronoun. Nyberg treats both simple and compound nominal clauses in their capacity of forming independent statements, as well as in their more frequent use as circumstantial clauses. Moreover, §86t, he uses ‘verbal circumstantial clause’ for, commonly, negated clauses of the type Jdc 20: 16b wâlâ' yâla'tâ' ‘without missing’ (the affirmative clause would take the participle). As far as narration is concerned, Nyberg’s basic ideas are very helpful. But as he made no distinction between narration and direct speech, he came to the conclusion that clauses expressing completed action in the present (Swedish perf.) or future action from the viewpoint of the present (Swedish future) are commonly apprehended as an expression of state and thus are construed as compound nominal clauses, if the verb is in the indicative, § 85l. Besides the doubtfulness of the last statement, it is difficult to avoid E. König’s general criticism of ideas similar to the ones of Nyberg and Niccacci, as he says that: “der stativ Sinn, welcher der Aussage des richtigen Nominalsatzes wegen ihrer nominalen Natur zukommt, nicht mit der circumstantialen Funktion eines Satzes identisch ist”, adding: “Deshalb sind die Ausdrücke “Zustandssatz” und “Umstandssatz” nicht zu identifizieren”. Hist.-krit. Lehrgeb. III, §362v.

27. Accordingly, in the common chiastic pattern wayyiqtol–obj : obj-qatal, the second clause is thrown into relief against the first one; and thus it does not form a separate link in the narrative chain, but is incorporated side by side with the first clause. In a case like this this qatal is narrative inasmuch as it is equivalent to the preceding wayyiqtol, yet it is not sequential as it does not present a new link in the chain of events.

28. However, even from the standpoint of functional clause perspective, it can hardly be disputed that Hebrew would not let the *nota objecti* preface the theme, if the clause were intended to mark a break in the narrative chain.

29. The masoretic *wa*– (instead of *wa*) before a prefixed form of cursive value is questionable, though paralleled, cf. A. Sperber in *JBL* 62/1943, pp. 184ff. The cursive value demands the originally long prefixed form, which is not prefixed by *wa*.

30. In view of the author’s own discussion of the text, one would perhaps expect a similar *livello 2* placement of 6: 19 (hôšî šîm bsl wîhrq šîm bprwr) as well as of 6: 19bβ and 7: 1β.
Une courte présentation de la poétesse iranienne Forough Farrokhzâd et son œuvre

CHOKOFEH GHOBADI, Upsal

QUI ÉTAIT FORUGH

En 1935, à Téhéran, dans une famille moyenne naissait une petite fille qui allait susciter tant de réactions auprès de ses contemporains. Cette fille nommée Forough poursuivit ses études primaires (6 ans) dans le lycée Khosro Khâvar (3 ans). L'une de ses camarades de classe disait que pour elle le cours de dissertation était le plus dur des cours: “F. disait toujours qu’elle le détestait”. Car elle écrivait très bien et le professeur lui reprochait d’avoir pris ses écrits dans des livres. F. continua ses études dans une école d’art pour filles pour y apprendre la couture et la peinture. Pendant un temps, elle étudia les finesse de la peinture chez Potgar, le célèbre peintre iranien, mais très rapidement elle s’éloigna de la peinture scolaire et atteignit l’essence de la peinture de notre temps. Elle avait une bonne connaissance des couleurs et elle était habile en peinture et avant sa mort elle avait de nouveau montré de l’intérêt pour la peinture et même peint quelques tableaux.

F. se maria à l’âge de 16 ans et divorça 4 ans plus tard. Le fruit de ce mariage fut un garçon nommé Kâmyâr dont le divorce la sépara. À propos de son mariage elle dit dans une interview: “je me suis trouvée dans un milieu étrange et enfermée qu’habituellement l’on appelle la famille” (Harfhâyî bâ F. F., p. 11). La séparation de son fils l’a marquée et cela se reflète dans quelques uns de ses poèmes. Elle avait, en fait, commencé d’écrire de la poésie vers l’âge de 13–14 ans, mais c’est seulement en 1955 qu’elle publia son premier recueil de poèmes Câpit (Asîr). En 1956 son deuxième recueil de poèmes Le mur (Divîr) fut publié. Ces deux livres ont provoqué beaucoup de réactions contre elle. Car elle y écrivait librement sur la sexualité, le désir et l’amour physique.

En 1957 La révolte (Oysân) son troisième recueil de poèmes fut publié. Au sujet de ces deux derniers livres, elle dit dans une interview: “C’était une lutte désespérée dans une période de passage entre deux différentes étapes de ma vie. C’était les dernières respirations avant une sorte de libération.” (Harfhâyî bâ F. F., p. 11)

À 23 ans elle commença à s’intéresser à l’art du cinéma et en peu de temps l’a acquis. Car elle était non seulement intelligente, mais aussi très ouverte et avait beaucoup d’intérêt et de curiosité pour les nouveautés. Elle haïssait le fait de stagnner et de se taire. De ce fait, elle voyagea en Angleterre pour y étudier comment on produit des films et à son retour fit ses premiers pas dans ce domaine en faisant quelques films documentaires. Elle continua ses activités cinématographiques en participant à la production de films et en y jouant quelques rôles elle-même. Sur ce chemin, elle avait comme compagnon de route, Ebrâhim Gol-estân, le célèbre cinéaste et écrivain marié avec une autre femme et avec qui elle avait une relation amoureuse. L’un de ces films, La maison est noire (Khâne siyâh ast) un documentaire sur la vie des lépreux dans une colonie auprès de Tabriz, a
obtenu le prix de meilleur documentaire du festival d'Oberhausen en 1964. À propos de ce film, elle dit dans une interview: "Je suis contente d'avoir obtenu la confiance des lépreux. On les avait mal traités. Ceux qui leur avaient rendu visite avaient seulement regardé leurs défauts. Mais je me suis assise à leur table, j'ai touché leurs plaies, leurs pieds dont la lèpre avait rongé les doits. C'est ainsi qu'ils m'ont fait confiance. À mon départ, ils me bénissaient, et maintenant qu'une année s'est écoulée, quelques uns d'entre eux m'écrivent et me demandent de porter leur plainte auprès du ministre de la santé......, ils me considèrent comme une protectrice......". F. écrivit aussi un scénario de film sur la vie de la femme iranienne, et puis cette poète, artiste et infatigable chercheuse se tourna vers le théâtre et joua dans une pièce de Pirandello, Six personages à la requête d'un écrivain. En 1963, son quatrième recueil de poèmes Une deuxième naissance (Tavallodi digar) fut publié. Puis elle voyagea en Allemagne, en Italie et en France et apprit l'allemand et l'italien en plus de ses connaissances d'anglais et de français. F. avait traduit Sainte Jeanne de G. B. Shaw en persan et avait l'intention d'y jouer elle-même le rôle de Jeanne d'Arc. Elle a aussi traduit Colossus of Maroussi de H. Miller en persan.


Malheureusement le destin ni lui a permis de jouer le rôle de Jeanne d'Arc, ni d'aller en Suède, car elle a décédé à l'âge de 32 dans un accident de voiture le 14 Février 1967 à Téhéran.

F. a laissé derrière elle deux scénarios de film, un roman non achevé, un nombre de tableaux. Un certain nombre de ses poèmes laissés derrière elle furent publiés en 1974 dans Que nous croyions au commencement de la saison froide (Imân biyâvarim be aghâz-e fasl-e sard). (Javedâne F. F., p. 22-29)

FORUGH SELON SES AMIS

Voici ce que quelques uns de ses amis ont dit d'elle:

"F. était la réalisation même de la liberté, dans la prison. Si vous pouvez imaginer le maximum de la liberté et le maximum de l'emprisonnement, F. était cela même et toutes ses impulsions s'en inspiraient. Elle était l'être humain le plus gai et le plus triste que j'ai connu. Si la joie et le chagrin suivent chacun une voie différente et enfin ils se rejoignent, ce point de rencontre est F., oui, elle était le point de rencontre de la joie et du chagrin." (id., p. 28)

Ali-Akbar Kasmâi écrit dans un article sur F.: "Notre amitié et collaboration a commencé par la revue de Ferdosi dans laquelle, en plus de ses poèmes, elle écrivait son récit de voyage. Elle écrivait de temps à autre ses souvenirs d'enfance ... et j'aimais mieux sa prose que sa poésie....

Notre relation a débuté avec une amitié proche et s'est figée dans une amitié avec distance, car l'amour était deux choses différentes pour nous, ou bien nous parcourions deux chemin différents dans l'amour. J'y cherchais le calme pour apaiser mon corps et âme et me préparer pour pouvoir continuer à travailler et supporter la vie.
Mais elle y cherchait l’apaisement, le soulagement et en même temps l’excitation et l’agitation pour sortir sa vie de la stagnation et de la mélancolie et lui donner gloire et magnificiance. Donc ce qui pouvait rapprocher nos cœurs les éloignait l’un de l’autre, à tel point qu’on devenait encore plus éloigné l’un de l’autre qu’avant même de faire connaissance. ...

Quand elle parlait de son amour passé et à vrai dire se confiait à moi, je sentais un air enfantin dans son visage, le mouvement de ses lèvres et même dans sa voix, quelque chose comme la naïveté, la pureté et l’innocence et en un mot la nature d’un enfant qui fait ce qu’il veut et se casse même la tête, un enfant courageux et têtu qui n’a pas encore été obligé de mettre un rideau d’hypocrisie sur ses actes et paroles et de chercher des effets dans sa conduite et ses mots et les ornements de performance. L’on peut, du moins, prétendre que dans une société où tous les gens se voilent et sont hypocrites et jouent des rôles, F. était soi-même et jouait moins...

La poésie l’a emmenée vers un autre horizon, vers un rôle plus positif, le rôle d’une personne active et non celui d’une personne passive, le rôle d’un amoureux et non celui d’un adoré, le rôle d’un discrétionnaire et non celui d’un chercheur de secrets et en quelques mots le rôle d’un offensif et non celui d’un défendeur, le rôle d’un chasseur et non celui d’un gibier.” (id., p. 47-51)

FOROUGH DANS LES SOUVENIRS DE SA SŒUR PURÂN

Voici quelques extraits des écrits de sa sœur sur elle:

F. et moi, on aimait l’été, car on pouvait aller sur le toit de la maison ... . La nuit on dormait ensemble sur le toit fait de pailles et de terre. Nous mettions toutes les deux nos têtes sur un même traversin et regardions le ciel avec les yeux qui ne se mouillaient pas de larmes et ne se remplissaient pas de chagrins. Nous étions, toutes les deux, enfants, naïves, pleins d’excitation et sensibles. L’on allait sur le toit sous le prétexte de dormir, mais au lieu de dormir, on chuchotait sans arrêt:

– F., veux-tu que ta main devienne si longue qu’elle puisse atteindre le ciel?
– Oui, car alors je pourrais faire ce que je souhaite et je pourrais cueillir les étoiles par poignée.
– Qu’est-ce que tu veux faire avec des étoiles?
– Rien, peut-être que je les ferais pour voir ce qu’il y a dedans.
– Ma mère s’en allait et revenait et nous grondait:
– Les enfants, pourquoi hâverdez-vous tant? Pourquoi ne dormez-vous pas?
– Et mon grand frère arrosait le toit avec un arrosoir et faisait sortir l’odeur de paille et de terre. Mon autre frère pleurait sous la moustiquaire de ma mère et nous, on continuait à parler tout en regardant le ciel:
– Purân, je veux savoir ce qu’il y a au-dessus des étoiles.
– Moi je le sais. Notre professeur disait que là-haut il n’y a rien d’autre que de l’air.
– Votre professeur s’est bien trompé. Je suis sûr que là-haut il y a quelque chose, une chose que je ne sais pas ce que c’est.
– Je réfléchissais un peu et disais:
La grand-mère dit que la maison de Dieu est au dessus des étoiles. F. qui contemplait le ciel de ses yeux curieux disait:
- Je veux y aller et rencontrer Dieu.
De nouveau ma mère nous grondait:
- Les enfants, pourquoi ne dormez-vous pas?
On tirait le duvet sur notre tête et F. disait de nouveau tout bas:
- Eh bien, peut-être qu’enfin un jour j’irai là-bas et je verrai Dieu!

Depuis des années il y avait des arbres d’acacias des deux côtés du ruisseau qui traversait notre jardin. ... F. et moi, l’après-midi on mettait nos pieds dans le ruisseau ... et effeuillait les grappes de fleurs blanches d’acacias et les versait dans l’eau. ... Les pigeons gazouillaient dans les branches. Ma petite sœur somnolait dans son lit. Les marchands ambulants criaient dans les ruelles. Ma mère chantait dans la cuisine et nous, on continuait à jouer notre jeu. F. avec ses grands yeux penseurs regardait les fleurs effeuillées et moi sans penser, les versait dans l’eau. Dès fois ma mère se penchait de la fenêtre de la cuisine et criait:
- Les enfants qu’est-ce que vous faites? J’ai déjà dit mille fois que vous ne devez pas cueillir les fleurs.

On arrêtait toute de suite. Je me cachais et F. disait:
- Maman, on joue avec des fleurs.
Ma mère disait:
- Très bien, ne faites pas de bruit donc et ne touchez pas la terre!
Alors on versait les fleurs effeuillées sur un grand pot dans lequel mon frère avait enterré un pigeon mort et on pleurait toutes deux sur sa tombe comme les adultes ont l’habitude de faire. Et puis F. effleurait de ses mains les fleurs blanches et disait sur un ton doux:
- C’est comme si les fleurs blanches étaient seulement pour mettre sur les tombes.
Et puis toutes les deux, on se lamentait à nouveau. ...

Le mois d’Esfand (le dernier mois de l’hiver et de l’année, le jour de l’an, la plus grande des fêtes iraniennes est juste quand ce mois touche à sa fin) était toujours plein de joie pour nous. Maman sortait tous les jours les mains vides et revenait avec des paniers pleins de tissus, de dentelles et de fleurs. La maison se noyait dans les nouvelles et belles choses. Les servantes couraient à droite et à gauche. La couturière qui venait toujours à la maison pour coudre des vêtements, cousait à la machine sans arrêt. Maman préparait habilement de la pâte avec de la farine et de ses mains travailleuses et belles en faisait des formes différentes pour des gâteaux. F. et moi, on s’asseyait auprès de la machine à coudre. Et ma petite sœur qui était obligée de rester dans son lit, nous regardait tout le temps de ses yeux noirs. La couturière éparpillait au tour d’elle les tissus coupés et nous couissions des vêtements pour nos poupées avec des petits morceaux de tissus qui restaient et nous parlions sans arrêt de la fête, des visites, des cadeaux, des plateaux de gâteaux, des habits neufs et des rubans de couleurs.

Quelques jours avant la fête, quand nos habits étaient prêts, notre excitation et joie augmentaient. Nous accrochions nos habits neufs au mur à la tête du lit et les contemplions avec joie et hâte pendant des heures. ...
F. qui était toujours assoiffée de nouveauté, me disait tout le temps:  
- Viens on va mettre nos habits, en cachette et on va aller à l'école.
Et moi qui craignais la colère de maman essayais de la dissuader.
- Non F. J'ai peur de maman. J'ai très peur.
- De quoi as-tu peur? Supposons que maman nous punisse, ça vaut le coup quand même.

Mais maman venait à temps, accrochait les vêtements dans l'armoire en nous faisant des reproches et nous envoyait à l'école. ...

* * *

Nous grandissions ensemble et atteignions la puberté. Un ou deux ans de différences d'âge n'était pas assez important pour pouvoir dresser un mur entre nous. Au fur et à mesure que F. grandissait, elle devenait plus calme et plus posée. Ses grands yeux, qui étaient toujours pleins d'étonnement, changeaient de forme peu à peu et se remplissaient d'un chagrin inconnu et indéfini. Elle regardait toujours d'une manière étrange, comme si elle voyait une autre vie au-delà de cette vie. ... Elle voyait d'une manière voilée et claire cette vie lointaine, indéfinie, inconnue et enveloppée dans le brouillard.

À présent quand on s'asseyait au bord du ruisseau de notre jardin, on ne pensait plus à la tombe des pigeons morts et aux fleurs blanches sur la tombe. Un nouveau monde s'étalait devant nous et nous parlions avec hâbement et bétitude de cet inconnu qui prenait vie en nous et qui nous génait agréablement. Nous étions toutes deux naïves et simples et ne connaissions la vie et l'amour que par des livres. Pour cette raison, nos paroles étaient douces et fines comme si c'était deux papillons qui battaient leurs ailes l'un contre l'autre, ou bien comme si c'était une brise qui passait sur une fleur tout doucement.

F. qui semblait être toujours ivre du parfum d'acacia, allongeait ses pieds dans l'eau et disait en effeuillant des fleurs blanches:
- Ma sœur, peux-tu me dire ce que c'est l'amour?
Et moi qui étais plus ivre qu'elle disait:
- L'amour. Ça doit être quelque chose comme le printemps ou alors comme la tempête.

Alors F. fermet ses yeux brillants qui fixaient toujours un point lointain et murmuraient:
- Tu sais, je sens que mon cœur est grand comme le monde entier et que j'aime le monde entier et toutes les manifestations de vie.

* * *

Nous l'avions vue à la maison dès nos premières années de l'enfance. C'était une femme laide à la peau rouge et dure. Ses cheveux étaient noirs et volumeux comme ceux d'un cheval. Elle était d'un tempérament rude et violent et travaillait avec la force de dix chevaux.

Dans notre grande maison, elle était la plus démunie et la plus malheureuse. Les enfants se moquaient d'elle et les adultes la considéraient d'un regard méprisant. Elle mettait toujours une des vieilles vestes militaires de mon père. Avec son grand nez crochu et ses petits yeux, son menton poilu, elle avait un air si ridicule que le soir, les amis de mon frère se rassemblaient devant notre maison pour se moquer d'elle et s'amuser. Elle était très patiente et se contrôlait bien. Seulement quand les
enfants l’embêtaient trop, elle courait derrière eux, comme un animal sauvage et criait des injures. Elle adorait fumer et elle fumait avec un tel amour qu’on aurait dit que c’était un amoureux qui embrassait sa bien aimée. Si un jour elle n’avait pas d’argent pour acheter des cigarettes, elle gigotait comme un poisson sur terre et même pleurait. F. et moi, on recevait seulement un rial par jour comme argent de poche, mais quand F. la voyait pleurer, elle lui donnait en cachette son argent de poche et me disait:

- Tu sais, j’ai de la pitié pour elle. Elle meurt, si elle ne fume pas.

Et puis, nous, on grandissait et elle, elle vieillissait. Nos joues prenaient couleur et son dos se plissait et peu à peu elle était devenue si courbée que les enfants l’appelaient la bossue. Elle s’est peinée des années chez nous à tel point qu’elle est tombée malade et enfin on l’a emmenée à l’hôpital. Dans ce temps-là on était séparé F. et moi et chacune avait fondé son propre foyer. La bossue a souffert longtemps à l’hôpital. Je ne supportais pas de la voir, mais F. qui avait un cœur grand comme le ciel, allait chaque jour à l’hôpital, s’asseyait des heures durant à son chevet et pleurait pour sa solitude. … Le jour où elle s’est éteinte à l’hôpital, c’était un jour pluvieux d’hiver. Ce jour-là, F. était la seule personne qui a accompagné au cimetière la dépouille de cette malheureuse femme qui n’avait personne au monde. F. est allée à la morgue avec elle et l’a enterrée et versé bien des larmes sur sa tombe et de là est venue chez moi. Quand je lui ai demandé:

- F. tu n’as pas eu peur d’aller au cimetière avec elle? Tu n’as pas eu peur de l’embrasser? Tu n’as pas eu peur de …

F. a ri, elle a ri amèrement et a dit:

- Peur? Pourquoi? Je ne vois aucune différence entre la vie et la mort. La mort est une chose naturelle comme la vie.

Et il y a quelques jours quand je pleurais sur la tombe de F., j’entendais sa voie dire:

- Il ne faut pas avoir peur de la mort. … Crois-moi, la mort est une chose toute à fait naturelle comme la vie.

“Derrière cette fenêtre un inconnu nous attend”

Qamar-ol-moluk Vaziri venait de mourir. F. et moi, on s’est mis à table dans la cuisine. Maman était en train de servir le repas. F. feuilletait la revue qui se trouvait devant elle. Elle a regardé la photo de Q. un certain temps et puis a dit avec un sourire moqueur aux lèvres:

- Tu vois combien la vieillesse est effrayante. … Tu vois ce qu’elle a fait avec Q.?

Elle avait raison, car Q. avec ses yeux foncés et son visage plein de rides n’était plus Q., mais un être qui faisait pitié.

F. a dit de nouveau:

- Tu sais, à mon avis un artiste doit mourir quand il est au sommet, au sommet de la jeunesse et de l’art.

Ma mère a levé sa tête et a fixé F. un temps et j’ai dit:

- Tu as raison, comme ça il laisse un souvenir agréable dans la mémoire des gens.

Et puis on a parlé un moment de la mort. F. et moi, on parlait et maman de temps à autre nous coupait la parole avec une colère maternelle. On dirait qu’elle voulait à tout prix éloigner de nous l’idée de la mort et lorsque F. a dit d’un ton moqueur:
— Pourquoi as-tu peur maman? On va bien tous mourir un jour.

Soudain les yeux de maman se sont remplis de larmes et elle a éclaté en sanglots. Ce jour-là, F. et moi, on a bien ri de la naïveté de maman et puis on a repris les mêmes paroles. Un moment plus tard, F. a laissé la cuillère qu’elle tenait à la main et dit:
— La meilleure mort est la mort soudaine. Je supplie toujours Dieu qu’il me fasse mourir d’une mort soudaine et sans peine.

De nouveau maman lui a fait des reproches et nous avons ri de nouveau un moment. (id., p. 5–11)

FORUGH DANS SES LETTRES À E. GOLESTĀN

Voici quelques extraits de ses lettres à Golestān:

Je sens que j’ai perdu ma vie et que à l’âge de 27 ans j’en sais bien moins de ce que je devais savoir. Cela est peut-être dû à ce que je n’ai jamais eu une vie éclairée. Cet amour ridicule et ce mariage dérisoire à 16 ans ont ébranlé les piliers de ma vie future.

Je n’ai jamais eu de guide dans ma vie. Personne ne m’a donné une éducation mentale. Tout ce que j’ai, je l’ai obtenu moi-même et tout ce que je n’ai pas, c’est ce que j’aurais pu avoir, mais des faux pas, le manque de connaissance de moi-même et les chemins sans issu de la vie ne m’ont permis de les obtenir. Je veux commencer.

Ce que je fais de mal, ce n’est pas pour faire des méchancetés. C’est dû à ce sentiment intense des gentillesses inutiles.

J’ai toujours essayé d’être comme une porte fermée pour que personne ne voie et ne connaisse mon horrible vie intérieure. … J’ai essayé d’être un être humain, tandis que à l’intérieur de moi-même j’ai été un être vivant. … Nous pouvons seulement piétiner un sentiment, mais nous ne pouvons pas ne pas le ressentir.

Je ne connais pas la signification d’arriver, mais sans doute il y a un but vers lequel toute mon existence s’écoule. Si seulement je pouvaismourir et puis revenir en vie et voir que la vie était autrement. Qu’elle n’était pas si injuste et que les gens avaient oublié leur bassesse de toujours… et personne n’avait tracé de mur autour de sa maison.

Être habitué aux habitudes ridicules de la vie et se soumettre aux frontières et aux murs est contre la nature.

Si le dénûment me chagrine, il a aussi la qualité de me sauver du piège de toutes les manifestations trompeuses qui peuvent exister dans une relation et il me rapproche de la profondeur de cette relation qui est le centre des palpitations et évolutions essentielles. Je ne veux pas être rassasiée, mais atteindre la qualité de rassasiement.

Mes défauts que sont-ils, sinon la honte et l’impuissance? Ma bienveillance pour en parler, rien d’autre que le gémissement de sa captivité dans ce monde où l’on ne voit que des murs jusqu’à l’infini, des murs, des murs et des murs. Et où il y a la rationnement du soleil, la manque d’opportunité, la peur, l’étouffement et la bassesse.
Avant-hier dans la chambre à côté (à l’hôtel) une femme s’est suicidée. À l’approche du matin, j’ai entendu des gémissements de cette chambre. J’ai pensé que c’était un chien qui hurlait. Je suis sortie écouter. Les autres sont venus aussi et enfin ils ont cassé la porte et tout d’abord ils se sont mis à battre la petite femme laide qui était devenue grise et qui était évanouie sur le lit dans un état misérable et puis ils l’ont trainée dans les escaliers du quatrième étage jusqu’au premier. Elle était presque morte. Parmis ses habits on voyait des choses étranges, un tas de soutiens-gorge et culottes sales, des chaussettes déchirées, des papier de couleur et des poupées faites de ces papiers, des contes d’enfants, différents comprimés, l’image de Jésus et un œil artificiel.

Je ne sais pas pourquoi cette mort m’a paru si injuste. Je voulais la suivre à l’hôpital, mais tous les gens se comportaient si violemment avec ce cadavre gris que je n’ai pas osé montrer de pitié et compatisier. Je suis rentrée dans ma chambre. Je me suis allongé et j’ai pleuré.

Je suis contente que mes cheveux se sont blanchis et que j’ai des rides au front entre mes sourcils. Je suis contente de n’être plus rêveuse et fantasiste. J’ai bientôt 32 ans. Bien que 32 ans signifient avoir franchi et être venu à bout de ces 32 années, mais en même temps j’ai trouvé mon moi.

Je suis troublée et triste. J’en ai assez d’être une spectatrice. Dès que je rentre à la maison et que je reste seule avec moi-même, soudain je sens que toute ma journée est passée à errer et à être perdue parmi un tas de choses qui ne m’appartiennent pas et qui ne demeureront pas. ...

L’on ne peut atteindre rien avant d’atteindre son soi-même libre et détaché des captivants égos des autres. L’on ne peut réussir à créer sa propre vie que si on s’abandonne entièrement à cette force qui prend vie, de la mort et de l’anéantissement de l’homme. ... L’art est le plus puissant des amours et il ne permet à l’homme d’atteindre l’enticité de son existence que quand il se soumet à lui complètement.

Quel étrange monde! Je ne m’occupe pas du tout des affaires des autres et le fait que je ne dérange personne et que je sois avec moi-même éveille la curiosité de tout le monde à mon égard. Je ne sais pas comment affronter les gens. Je suis timide et engager la conversation avec des autres m’est très difficile, surtout quand ces autres ne sont pas intéressants pour moi. Passons.

Il y a un tableau de Leonardo dans National Gallery que je n’avais pas vu auparavant, c’est-à-dire durant mon dernier séjour à Londres. Il est sublime. Tout est résolu dans un léger bleu, comme l’homme plus l’aurore. Je voulais m’agenouiller et prier. La religion est cela même et je ne me sens croyante que dans les instants d’amour et d’adoration.
Si l'amour est l'Amour, le temps est un mot ridicule. (id., p. 14–17)

FORUGH ET SA POÉSIE

F. était une femme courageuse qui a osé parler ouvertement de l'amour et du désir, ce qui n'était pas permis aux femmes iraniennes. Mais malgré tout ses poèmes ont été publiés et ont provoqué l'hostilité des obscurantistes. Cela n'a pas duré longtemps et ses livres ont été édités plusieurs fois et ce n'est qu'au moment de la révolution islamique qu'ils ont été brûlés. Dans ces dernières années seulement deux de ses livres, Une deuxième naissance et Que nous croyions au commencement de la saison froide ont été réédités, mais ses autres livres dans lesquels elle a un language plus cru et manifeste sa colère contre la religion et Dieu restent toujours interdits. Quatre des poèmes de Une deuxième naissance ont été supprimés dans la nouvelle édition de ce livre. Parmi lesquels quelques unes des citations ci-dessous.

Dans cet article certaines des idées de F. seront présentées et pour cela que peut-on faire mieux que de donner la parole à ses poèmes?

Quant à la forme de sa poésie, elle est moderne et ne respecte pas la longueur des vers. Mais ses poèmes sont quand même très harmonieux et ont parfois des rimes. F. a un language simple et sincère, mais en même temps elle perfectionne l'art de la poésie avec l'emploi des symboles et des métaphores. Au sujet de la forme et du contenu de ses poèmes, F. dit dans une interview: " Il est naturel qu'avec la manière de penser que j'ai, je donne plus d'importance au contenu qu'à la forme. Je pense même que c'est le contenu qui crée la forme. ... Le contenu d'un poème ne voit pas jour parce que la forme existe, bien au contraire. Pour moi, la forme n'a guère d'importance." (Harfâyi bâ F. F., p. 3)

Un des thèmes abordés par F. est le désir et l'amour physique qu'elle décrit si sensuellement. Dans Captîf, p. 12–13, elle écrit:

Je désire qu'il me serre contre lui
Qu'il me serre contre lui, moi la folle
Qu'il se mêle très étroitement à mon existence
Qu'il m'entoure de ses bras chauds et puissants

Que la brise de son souffle
Se promène sur mon cou et dans mes cheveux
Qu'il me boive, oui qu'il me boive
Pour que je m'unisse avec mon ruisseau amer à sa mer

Qu'il m'enflamme, sauvage et brûlant, assoiffé et frémissant
Comme des flammes flamboyantes et folâtres
Qu'il m'enflamme dans un murmure
Et que mes cendres restent dans le lit

Plus tard dans Une deuxième naissance, p. 67, elle écrit:

À présent
Des pigeons volent
Dans la pointe de mes seins
À présent
Dans le cocon de mes lèvres
Les papillons des baisers pensent s'envoler
À présent
Le sanctuaire de mon corps
Est prêt pour le culte de l'amour
Et dans ce même livre p. 51-53, nous lisons:

Sur tout mon corps je l'ai senti ondoyer
Comme la chaleur rouge du feu
Comme le reflet dans l'eau
Comme un nuage sous la secousse des pluies
Comme un ciel sous le souffle des saisons chaudes
Il s'était répandu
Jusqu'à l'infini
Jusque par-delà la vie
...
J'ai senti la peau de mon corps dilaté d'amour se fendiller
J'ai senti mon corps de feu
Fondre lentement
Et couler, couler, couler
Dans la lune, la lune échancrée, la lune bouleversée et terne

L'un dans l'autre nous avions pleuré
L'un dans l'autre nous avions vécu follement
La plénitude du bref instant où nous ne faisions qu'un

De tel propos ont suscité bien des critiques à son égard et à ce sujet elle dit dans Captif, p. 20: “L'on m'a appelée une folle de mauvaise vertue”. Et elle continue à lutter et écrit dans le même livre p. 74-75:

Viens ô l'homme, ô être égoïste
Viens ouvrir les portes de la cage
Tu m'a captivée une vie entière
Laisse-moi maintenant pour un instant

Je suis cet oiseau, cet oiseau qui depuis longtemps
Pense à s'envoler
Mon chant devint un gémissement dans ma poitrine serrée
Ma vie s'acheva dans des languissements

Ne scelle pas mes lèvres par le silence
Car je dois prononcer mon secret
Je dois faire parvenir à tout le monde
Le retentissement de mon chant

Viens ouvrir la porte que je puisse m'envoler
Vers le ciel clair de poésie
Si tu me laisse m'envoler
Je deviendrai une fleur dans la roserie de poésie

À toi mes lèvres avec leurs baisers doux
À toi mon corps avec son odeur parfumé
À toi mon regard avec ses étincelles secrètes
À toi mon cœur avec son gémissement ensanglanté

Mais ô l'homme, ô l'être égoïste
Ne dis pas que c'est de la honte, c'est de la honte ma poésie
Sais-tu que l'espace de cette cage est étroit
Étroite pour des éperdus

Ne dis pas que ma poésie était entièrement des péchés
Donne-moi une coupe de cette honte et de ce péché
À toi le paradis, des houries et la fleuve de Kossar
Donne-moi une demeure dans la profondeur de l'enfer

F. dans ses poèmes parle aussi de déception et de la situation de vie des femmes.
Ainsi écrit-elle sur le mariage et la vie de couple dans Captif, p. 149–150:

L'anneau

La jeune-fille dit en souriant
Quel est le secret de cet anneau d'or
Cet anneau d'or qui étreint
Si étroitement mon doig
de secret de cet anneau dont le visage
Est si brillant et luisant
L'homme fut troublé et dit:
C'est l'anneau du bonheur, c'est l'anneau de la vie

Tous dirent: félicitation
La jeune-fille dit: hélas
Je doute toujours de son sens

Des années passèrent et un soir

Une femme fâchée regarda cet anneau d'or
Et vit sur son visage flamboyant
Les jours perdus
Dans l'espoir de la fidélité de son mari

La femme fut bouleversée et gémit:
Hélas, hélas, cet anneau
Dont le visage brille et luit toujours
Est l'anneau d'esclavage et de servitude

Et dans Une deuxième naissance, p. 123–124:

Couple

La nuit tombe
Après la nuit, l'obscurité
Et après l'obscurité
Les yeux
Les mains
Et les souffles et les souffles et les souffle ...
Et le bruit de l'eau
Qui goutte, goutte à goutte du robinet

Puis deux points rouges
De deux cigarettes allumées
Le tic tac de la pendule
Et deux cœurs
Et deux solitudes

Dans Que nous croyions au commencement de la saison froide, p. 56–57, elle écrit:

... Et ma sœur qui était l'amie des fleurs

... Sa maison se trouve de l'autre côté de la ville
Elle, dans sa maison artificielle
Avec ses poissons rouges artificiels
À l'abri de l'amour de son mari artificiel
Et sous les branches de ses pommiers artificiels
Chante des chansons artificielles
Et produit des enfants naturels
Elle
Chaque fois qu'elle vient nous voir
Et ses jupons se souillent de la pauvreté du jardin
Elle se baigne dans de l'Eau-de-Cologne
Elle
Chaque fois qu'elle vient nous voir
Elle est enceinte

Dans beaucoup de poèmes, F. exprime des critiques à l'égard de la religion et des religieux. Par exemple elle écrit dans le mur, p. 116:
Un front noirci de cautère de péchés
Est préférable à un front marqué de prières hypocrites
Ne jamais prononcer le nom de Dieu
Est préférable à murmurer Dieu Dieu pour tromper des gens

Cette lutte contre la religion se fait plus marquante dans la révolte où elle se bat ardemment contre Dieu et écrit p. 43–46:

Ô Dieu, si j'étais Dieu
Je n'aurais jamais eu seulement un mon dans le monde
J'aurais tourné le dos à ce trône de joyau
Mon cour aurait été silencieux retraite des cœurs

Ô Dieu, si j'étais Dieu
Je me serais détachée de moi-même un instant et je serais allée loin
Sur les routes en ruines de ce vieux monde
J'aurais marché sans mantel et verge

La crainte de moi n'aurait pas jeté l'ombre dans des cœurs
Je n'aurais pas menacé des révoltés par l'enfer
Ou j'aurais raccourci le chemin du jardin d'Eden
Ou alors j'aurais donné naissance à un nouveau paradis dans ce monde

Si j'étais Dieu, cette flamme de révolte
N'aurait plus seulement embrasé moi-même tout entier
Soudain elle aurait percé la prison de mon corps
Et aurait avancé et brûlé mon monde

J'aurais donné aux poitrines la force de crier
J'aurais moi-même crié dans des poitrines
Mon existence serait répandue dans “l’existence”
Honteux je me serais rappelé parfois de cette “divinité”

Mes poings, ces deux poings fort fébriles
N’auraient plus battu en vain des murs
J’aurais frappé la tête du monde si fort
Que “l’existence” serait morte dans des murs

J’aurais demeuré parmi les gens terrestres
Je leur aurais moi-même raconté mon secret
Je me serais assise avec des ivrognes
J’aurais chanté la nuit dans des ruelles

La chandelle du vin aurait brûlé jusqu’au matin dans ma retraite
Ivre d’elle j’aurais ordonné des affaires
J’aurais déchiré sur mon corps l’habit de vertu
Je me serais moi-même “purifiée” dans la coupe du vin

J’aurais laissé ces gens troublés
Se reposer un instant de la crainte de l’enfer
Boire une gorgée du vin d’existence
Et s’orner avec la parure d’ivresse

J’aurais été le message de l’union dans un regard espiègle
J’aurais été la salutation d’amour aux lèvres de la coupe
J’aurais été le vin de baisers, dans la nuit d’ivresse
J’aurais été entièrement l’amour, la jouissance, la jouissance

J’aurais parfois écouté
Dans mon palais le cri de mes pauvres créatures
Pour voir s’il existe un remède pour leur souffrance
Et savoir ce qu’ils demandent à leur Dieu

F. a aussi exprimé des critiques à l’égard de la société et la situation politique. Mais elle n’est pas unique en cela, tandis qu’elle est la première femme iranienne à oser crier tout haut ce que, pendant des années, ses consœurs avaient pensé en silence. Néanmoins l’on ne peut pas citer l’un de ses poèmes sur l’humanité, écrit dans Une deuxième naissance, p. 146:

L’oiseau n’était qu’un oiseau

L’oiseau dit: “quel parfum, quel soleil
Oh le printemps est arrivé
Et je vais partir à la recherche d’un partenaire.”

Du rebord du balcon
L’oiseau prit son encol et vola comme un message

L’oiseau était petit
L’oiseau ne pensait pas
L’oiseau ne lisait pas les journaux
L’oiseau n’avait pas de dette
L’oiseau ne connaissait pas l’homme
L’oiseau dans les airs

Volait par dessus les feux rouges
À hauteur de l’ignorance
Et vivait follement
Les instants bleus

Oh, l’oiseau n’était qu’un oiseau
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The Personal Markers in the Modern Arabic Dialects of the Arabian Peninsula

BO ISAKSSON, Stockholm

This study of the dialects in the Arabian Peninsula is made as part of my project to investigate the personal markers of the Central Semitic\(^1\) languages. It is mainly a collection of material accompanied by remarks and a preliminary analysis. Ultimately, the aim of my project is to elucidate the morphological development of the Semitic suffix conjugation from Proto-Semitic down to the historically attested languages. Such an investigation is bound also to involve comparative analyses of the personal pronouns (separate and suffixed) as well as of the personal markers of the prefix conjugation, and thus the data are exposed in comparative tables with four or five columns, exhibiting the independent personal pronouns, the suffixed pronouns, the personal markers of the suffix and prefix conjugations,\(^2\) and, in some instances, the imperative. By methodological reasons – in order to study the mutual influence and dependence of the personal markers in the two verbal conjugations and the personal pronouns (sometimes also the imperative) – I have found it preferable to display paradigms from one and the same dialect in a table. This means that many tables, each showing the forms of one sample dialect, are presented. The dialects that are represented in the following survey are chosen to reflect the main characteristics of the respective region. Unfortunately, the dialect geography of some regions is very insufficiently explored and so we are not in a position to decide whether the dialects that happen to be described in the available scientific literature are actually representative. At the present state of research this is a deficiency that cannot be completely remedied. In the following survey, dialects from the main linguistic regions of the Arabian Peninsula are picked out and displayed in schemes of paradigms. Regional deviations from a scheme will be commented upon in the remarks.

As for the prefix vowels of the PC there is a point in the statement of A. A. Bulos that the segmentation of the PC form “should occur at /y-/ and not at /ya-/”,\(^3\) since the prefix vowel depends on the following stem rather than on the prefix consonant. The prefix vowel bears no distinctive connotation as to person, gender, or number. My justification for including this vowel anyhow in the tables below is that the rule has an obvious exception: in the first person singular form the prefix vowel is always -a- in the simple verb, regardless of the vowel in the other PC forms of the paradigm.\(^4\)

1. NORTH ARABIAN (BEDOUIN) DIALECTS

1.1. Syro-Mesopotamian (Pre-ά-Anaze), Šammar and 'Anaze Dialects.\(^5\)

Sample dialect: Bani Ḥālid (Šammar)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms huwwa 6</td>
<td>C -o, V -b 15</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>yi-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparative remarks

1. Or "ana. With final imāla "āne in Ṣlūt (Šāmmar). "Umūr (Šammar) "āna. "āna (with variants) is the dominating form among the big cattle Bedouins of Nağd and their client tribes. "āni is the form among the small cattle Bedouins of Syria (the Pre-"Anaze tribes and some Šammar dialects, e.g. Raqqa and Manādīr). The latter is probably an analogical formation from the verbal object suffix. A form with final -i is found in most of the Pre-"Anaze tribes accounted for by Cantineau (Nēm, Faql, Hadidīn). The Mawāli form (also Pre-"Anaze) Cantineau describes as "āne < "āni with secondary diphthongization of the final -i.6

2. This is the dominating form in the dialects. ḫenna in Sirhān (Šammar), Sardiye (Šammar), Rwala ("Anaze). The form "āhne in "Umūr, Ṣlūt, Hadidīn, and the form "āhne in Nēm and Faql show imāla of the old final long -a. This form seems to stem from an Old Arabic "nāha, instead of Classical Arabic nānū, by dissimilation.7 The ḫenna might have been formed from "āhne by development of a disjunctive vowel between h and n, dropping of the beginning prosthetic syllable, and gemination of -n-. An "āhne is attested in Hadidīn (Pre-"Anaze). According to Cantineau ḫenna (ḫenna) is the form of the Nağdī big cattle Bedouins, whereas "āhne is the form used by the small cattle Bedouins of Syria.8

3. Bani Ḥālid also "ante, a form that is used in Ṣlūt and the Pre-"Anaze dialects Nēm, Hadidīn, Mawāli (but not Faql). "Umūr and Faql "ante. This variation Cantineau believes is due to an ances variation in the final vowel of the original form *"anta or *"inta.9 Forms with and without final vowel may coexist within one and the dialect with an "emphatic" difference: the one with final vowel having a more solemn, emphatic, connotation. Second person forms with a pure beginning "a- are found in Sba'a ("Anaze) and ar-Rass.

4. With diphthongization of the final -i to -o (Fischer-Jastrow: -ow10), by analogy from the corresponding SC ending.11 This form is found also in Mawāli and Nēm (both Pre-"Anaze). Faql (Pre-"Anaze) and Manādīr (Šammar) "ontom, Raqqa (or Raqqa, a Šammar dialect) "ontum. Hadidīn exhibits a perceptible h after t: "ontom.

5. This is the form in most Šammar dialects. Cantineau does not give a form for Bani Ḥālid. The Pre-"Anaze tribes show a tendency to gemination: "onten".

6. The Pre-"Anaze tribes studied by Cantineau (Nēm, Faql, Hadidīn, Mawāli) all exhibit a slight variant: hūwa. In "Umūr, Ṣlūt, Manādīr, and Sirhān (all Šammar) a short form is used: hū, hū".
7. A short form is used in ‘Umūr and Şlüt (ḥām, a variant of ham) as well as in Manādre and Sirhān (hom). Faḍl homna.

8. The Pre-‘Anaze tribes studied by Cantineau exhibit a slight variant: hiye. A short form (hi, hi’) is used in ‘Umūr, Şlüt, Manādre, and Sirhān.


10. From ‘antī or ‘inī’ with long final vowel. ‘Umūr (’ontē) and Sirhān (’ontē) exhibit diphthongization of the final long -i. This “diphthongization”, though, he suggests has a non-phonetic origin.

11. Thus also in ‘Anaze. I disregard in this instance the various shades in the pronunciation of the -k-. Faḍl has the form -kām (in Cantineau’s notation a denotes a posterior a). Seemingly, -kām is to be regarded as a phonetic variant of -kam, rather than of -kom (< -kum). In fact, -kām is often simply pronounced -kam, a form Cantineau finds difficult to explain. Most Šammar tribes have -a- (or -ā-) rather than -o-. -kam (or -kām) is found in i.a. ‘Umūr, Şlūt, Sardiye, Sirhān, Banī Šāhar, Raggā, and Faḍl.

12. Thus also ‘Anaze. Most Šammar tribes have -a- (or -ā-) rather than -o-. -ham (or -hām) is found in i.a. ‘Umūr, Şlūt, Sardiye, Sirhān, Banī Šāhar, Raggā, and Faḍl.

13. Goes back to a -ha that was anceps. Cantineau is probably right when he suggests that the alternation C-a/v -ha derives its origin from an alternation -hā after short vowel/-hā after long vowel. He maintains that -a/ goes back to a flexional -a plus -hā. In this alternation the Banī Ḥālid are exceptional. In the other dialects the 3fs suffix is usually either -hā (or -hāh) or -ah (regardless of the preceding phoneme). Among the small cattle Bedouins of Syria the 3fs suffix is -ha in all positions (the preceding phoneme being a consonant or not).

14. From -ki. The consonant alternation čk is due to a conditioned affrication, which was in force before front vowels (i, e, a). Šammar (of the Šammar confederation) and Gōf 2fs C-eč, V -č. Among the ‘Anaze tribes usually -č in both instances.


16. The same dialect may have both forms. This is the case in ‘Umūr, Şlūt, Manādre. If the survey of Cantineau were exhaustive, we might conclude that Ḥadīdīn, Raggā, and Faḍl have only -om; however, this is probably a premature conclusion (cf. pron. suff. -kām/-hām in Raggā and Faḍl). In Nī’em (Pre-‘Anaze), Banī Ḥālid (the sample dialect), and Sirhān only -o. For 2mp the Banī Šāhar show only -tom. The -tom form is older than the -to'. In 3mp the -to' variant is the older one, the -om being formed in analogy with the 2mp form of the suffix or with the corresponding independent pronoun. The habitual variants are -o/o/to, which constitute an important characteristic of the Bedouin speakers. According to Cantineau the -o should be interpreted as originating from an addition of final plural -u to the ancient singular form: 3ms -a + -u > 3mp -aw, -o, 2ms -ta + -u > 2mp -taw, -to. In this instance it should be noted that Cantineau has also heard the variant pronunciation -ām/-tām and -a (side by side with -om/-tom and -o).
17. The Šammar dialects have no b- prefix in the PC, as is found in the Syro-Palestinian group. As for the prefix vowel, only ʿUmūr and ʿLūt show one and the same prefix vowel -a- in all forms of the paradigm, corresponding to the habit in Classical Arabic.
18. The -n in 2fp, 3mp, and 2mp is a characteristic of the Bedouin dialects.
19. Many Šammar and ʿAnaze dialects have a plosive: -ken n.
20. In the Šammar dialect the -t tends to disappear in pause and become -h. Sometimes it is even replaced by a weak and very short j.26
21. Muṭair (ʿAnaze) -ik/-k. Among the ʿAnaze tribes otherwise usually -k in both positions.28
22. The imperative of the Bedouin dialects shows a remarkable morphological independence vis-à-vis both the PC and the SC.29 The plural -u is an archaic trait of the imperative. Cantineau is silent as to the other imperative endings.
23. As to a suffix -ye Cantineau suggests that it is only a phonetically conditioned variant that goes back to an ancient -ya.30
24. Šammar (belonging to the Šammar confederation) and ar-Rass (also a Šammar tribe according to Cantineau) show the form -an, originating from an -a- plus -ni. Among the people of ar-Rass it is reduced to a simple -n after vowel, whereas the Šammar speakers instead insert a connecting -n-, resulting in a 1cs suffix -nan, at least after long vowels. Probably, this -a- is derived from the final -a of the Old Arabic SC 3ms form qatala and the PC endings -ina and -ûna. Among the Šammar tribes ʿUmūr, ʿLūt, and Sirhān there is an alternation C -an/V -ni.31
25. According to Cantineau the gemination of n is “faible”, which he denotes -n n.32
26. The Pre-ʿAnaze tribes show final imāla: -ne.
27. Eaches represents an “a antérieur”, denoted ā by Cantineau.

1.2. Eastern Arabian (the Gulf Dialects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>hū 9</td>
<td>C -ih, -ah, V -h</td>
<td>-∅</td>
<td>ya-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>hi 10</td>
<td>-ha, -hā 15</td>
<td>-at</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>int 11</td>
<td>C -iK, V -k</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>inti</td>
<td>C -ič, V -č</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>ana 12</td>
<td>C -i, V -y</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ni (verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>hum 6</td>
<td>-hum</td>
<td>-aw 1</td>
<td>ya-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>(hin) 13</td>
<td>(-hin) 17</td>
<td>(-an) 8</td>
<td>(ya- -an) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>intu 7</td>
<td>-kum</td>
<td>-tu 18</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>(intin) 16</td>
<td>(-kin) 17</td>
<td>(-tin) 8</td>
<td>(ta- -an) 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>ġinna 14</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks
1. A common variant is -o (especially in Dubai), sometimes also -u (the regular ending of the plural imperative) is used. The 3mp ending is communis generis in Kuwaiti (rarely -u), in Bahraini (mostly -u, rarely -aw), and Dubai (mostly -o).
2. The prefix vowel is i if the stem vowel is a, otherwise it is a. The pattern yuful occurs however in Kuwaiti and yifil in Bahraini. An important feature of the Bahraini dialect is that the semivowel y- is usually dropped, making the PC prefix i- rather than yi- (except where the prefix carries stress). In Qatari also the pattern yafal occurs together with yifal.

3. Occasionally -in in all dialects. The parantheses indicate that the masculine plural (2mp, 3mp) form is usually used also for the feminine plural (thus also in Holes' "Educated Gulf Arabic"). In Qatari, Buraimi, and Abu Zahabi, though, the separate 3fp/2fp forms are frequent.


5. Free variant -on.

6. The 3mp form is communis generis in Kuwaiti and Bahraini. In Bahrain the forms uhumme, ohumme, humme (sophisticated people often ohumma, humma) are used, also for the 3fp.

7. This form is communis generis in Kuwaiti and Bahraini.

8. The parantheses indicate that the masculine plural (2mp, 3mp) form is usually used also for the feminine plural (Kuwaiti, Bahraini, and Holes' "Educated Gulf Arabic"). In Qatari, Buraimi, and Abu Zahabi, though, the 3fp/2fp forms are frequent.

9. In Bahraini shawah, huwwe (sophisticated people often shuwwa, huwwa). In Qatari sometimes huwwa. Holes adduces the form huwa.

10. In Bahraini ihyyee, hiyyee (sophisticated people often ihyee, hiyya). In Qatari sometimes hiyya. Holes gives the form hiyya.

11. In Bahraini the form inte (sophisticated people often inta) is used. In Qatari sometimes and Dubai always the form inta is used. Holes adduces the form inta.

12. In Bahraini ane (sophisticated people often anaa). In Dubai sometimes ana. Uneducated people sometimes distinguish gender: 1ms ana, 1fs anee.

13. In Bahraini (as well as Holes' "Educated Gulf Arabic") the same as 3mp. Holes notes that in the Lower Gulf there is the 3fp variant (also in educated speech) hin.


15. In Bahrain -he or -e. A variant in Dubai is -a.

16. In Holes' "Educated Gulf Arabic" the same as 2mp. He notes, however, the Lower Gulf 2fp variants (also in educated speech) intan, intin.

17. The parantheses indicate that the masculine plural (2mp, 3mp) form is usually used also for the feminine plural. This also pertains to the "Educated Gulf Arabic" described by Holes. According to Holes there are in the United Arab Emirates specific 3fp/2fp forms -hin and -kin.

18. Holes adduces the ending -taw.

2. HIJAZI DIALECTS

2.1. Meccan Dialect

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suffix. pron. 3</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC 12</th>
<th>Imp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>huwa 1</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>V 4</td>
<td>-y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Orientalia Suecana XL (1991)
Remarks

1. As we have seen above, among the North Arabian Bedouins both a short form hū and a long form huwaa (hūwa) occur, and likewise for the other forms of the third person (3fs, 3mp, 3fp) the North Arabian Bedouin dialects exhibit both long and short forms, e.g. 3fp hi and hiya. In Yemen the short forms of the third person dominate (see below).

2. As far as we know, the distinction of gender in the plural is dropped only in the Meccan, Aden, and Riyād dialects.45

3. In square brackets is given the connecting vowel that is used when the preceding form ends in a vCC (short vowel and geminated consonant) or vvC (long vowel plus consonant) syllable. Some suffixes also have allomorphs used in complementary distribution, some after consonant, the others after vowel. This convention is used also in the following paradigms.

4. Unlike most other Arabian dialects the final -h is dropped in Mecca.46 The allomorph used after a vowel consequently only consists of a stress on this final vowel.

5. -ha is the most common form among Arabian dialects. The allomorph after vCC- and vvC-syllables is -aha.47

6. Instead of -ya in some dialects -yi or -y.

7. This is the most common 1cs ending among the t-dialects. In some Yemenite dialects there is also -tu (cf. Yaṣī and al-Ḥugarīyeh below).

8. According to M. H. Bakalla the form nihna is also used in Mecca, although less frequently.48

9. According to Schreiber a contamination between old 3mp -hum and 3fp -humna.49

10. According to Schreiber a beginning hamza is always pronounced “wo dieses zur Wurzel gehört.”50 Against the notation of Fischer-Jastrow I therefore include the hamza in the transcriptions.

11. Before object suffixes -ō-.51

12. According to B. Ingham the third person prefix has the allomorphs ʿi- (initial utterance), yi- (post-vocalically), i- (post-consonantically), and y- (prevocally). However, in verba primae h or g the prefix is exclusively yi-.52

13. Evidently formed in analogy with the singular forms ʿinta, ʿinti and the verbal flexion (plural suffix -u in both conjugations).53
2.2. Dialects of Saudi Arabia studied by T. Prochazka

Type I: Dialects of Southern Hijāz and Tihāmah

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pronoun</th>
<th>Suffix</th>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>PC</th>
<th>Imp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>huw 10</td>
<td>-ah 20</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>yi-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>hiy 11</td>
<td>-ha</td>
<td>-at 1</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>ḍanṭa 14</td>
<td>-ak 23</td>
<td>-t 7</td>
<td>ti-</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>ḍanti 15</td>
<td>-ki 24</td>
<td>-ti 4</td>
<td>ti-…-īn, -īn</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>ḍanā 18</td>
<td>-i, -ya 27</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ʕa-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ni (verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>hum 12</td>
<td>-hum 21</td>
<td>-aw 2</td>
<td>yi-…-ūn, -un</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>ḍunna 13</td>
<td>(-hunna) 22</td>
<td>(-na) 3</td>
<td>(yi-…-nah) 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>ḍantu 16</td>
<td>-kun 25</td>
<td>-tu 5</td>
<td>ti-…-ūn, -un</td>
<td>-u 28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>ʕantu 17</td>
<td>(-kunna) 26</td>
<td>(-tunna) 6</td>
<td>(ti-…-nah) 9</td>
<td>(-nah) 29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>ḍanhin 19</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks

1. One dialect, Bal-Qarn, shows the ending -an, which is found also in Yemen, cf. Al-Mahābšehe7 and the Coastal Plane,58 below. The dialect is communal. Al-Qahabah -u, Ṣabyā -o.
2. In most dialects this ending is communal. Al-Qahabah -u, Ṣabyā -o.
3. In al-Qahabah, -nah and -n in Gāmid. In the other dialects the same as the 3mp form.
4. Ṣabyā -ūn.
5. Al-Qahabah and Gāmid -tum. Al-Qauz -tun, Ṣabyā -tun. In most dialects this ending is communal.
6. Thus al-Qahabah. Gāmid -tunna. In the other dialects the same as the 2mp form.
7. -ta is attested in the Mahāyil region.
8. Usually the same as 3mp. -nah in Gāmid. -na in al-Qahabah.
9. Usually the same as 2mp. -nah in Gāmid. -na in al-Qahabah.
10. There is some variation among the dialects and the same dialect may have several variants. In al-Qahabah and Abha huwwa is also used, in Rufaidah also huwwa, in Bal-Qarn also hūwa which is the only form in Gāmid, huh in al-Qauz, hū in Ṣabyā.
11. In al-Qahabah and Abha ḥiyya is also used, in Rufaidah also hiyye, in Bal-Qarn also hiyya which is the only form in Gāmid, hī in al-Qauz, hī in Ṣabyā.
12. him in Tānūmah and Bal-Qarn, hun in al-Qauz and Ṣabyā.
13. In al-Qahabah. hunna in Gāmid. In the other dialects the same as the 3mp form.
17. Usually the same as 2mp. *antunna in al-Qahabah. *intunnah in Gāmid.
18. Al-Qauz *āna.
20. Other forms in this dialect group: -ih, -uh, -ûh, -hu, -h.\(^59\)
22. Thus al-Qahabah. Gāmid hunnah. In the other dialects the same as the 3mp suffix.
23. Other forms in this dialect group: -ik, -k, -ka.\(^60\)
24. Thus al-Qahabah. Other forms in this dialect group: -iš, -š, -ič, -č, -ik’, -k’, and -k’i.\(^61\)
25. In al-Qauz and Ŝabŷâ kun. In most dialects this suffix is communis.
26. Thus al-Qahabah. Gāmid kunnah. In the other dialects the same as the 2mp suffix.
27. A variant -y only in Rufaidah and Abha.
28. In most dialect this ending is communis.
29. Usually the same as mp. nah only in Gāmid.

### Type II: Nağdi and Eastern Arabian Dialects\(^62\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suff. pron.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC(^63)</th>
<th>Imp.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>huw 10</td>
<td>-ih 20</td>
<td>-ø 32</td>
<td>ya-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>hiy 11</td>
<td>-ha 21</td>
<td>-at 1</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>int 14</td>
<td>-ak 24</td>
<td>-t 31</td>
<td>ta-</td>
<td>-ø</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>intay 15</td>
<td>ič 25</td>
<td>-ti 4</td>
<td>ta- ... in</td>
<td>i 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>*āna 18</td>
<td>-i, -ya 28</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>*a-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ni (verb) 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>ham 12</td>
<td>-hum 22</td>
<td>-aw 2</td>
<td>ya- ... -ün</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>(hin) 13</td>
<td>(-hin) 23</td>
<td>(-an) 3</td>
<td>(ya- ... -in) 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>intam 16</td>
<td>-kum 26</td>
<td>-tu 5</td>
<td>ta- ... -ün</td>
<td>-u 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>(*intan) 17</td>
<td>(-čin) 27</td>
<td>(-tin) 6</td>
<td>(ta- ... -in) 9</td>
<td>(-in) 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>hinna 19</td>
<td>-na 30</td>
<td>-na 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks**

1. Häyil before suffixes -at-, in the free form, however, -eh.\(^64\)
2. In most dialects this ending is communis. Rwailī am and aw.
3. Rwailī -in or -an. The -in suffix is explained by Prochaska as *-na *-n > -in. Häyil, al-ʿAsīm, Sudair -an.\(^65\) In the other dialects the same as the 3mp form.
4. Rwailī -tiy or -tay, Hofuf -tay. In Maḡmaʿa of Sudair -tiy.\(^66\)
5. In most dialects this ending is communis. Rwailī -tam, -taw, -tum,\(^57\) and -tuw. Hofuf -taw. In Maḡmaʿa of Sudair -taw.\(^68\)
6. Rwailī -tan or -tin. Häyil, al-ʿAsīm, Sudair -tin.\(^69\) In the other dialects the same as the 2mp form.
7. Hofuf -ne.
8. In most dialects the same as 3mp. Rwaili, Ḥāyil, al-Qaṣīm -in, Sudair -an.70
9. In most dialects the same as 2mp. Rwaili, Ḥāyil, al-Qaṣīm -in, Sudair -an.71
10. In Ḥāyil and al-Qaṣīm hu, in Bīṣah huh.
11. In Ḥāyil and al-Qaṣīm hi, in Bīṣah hih.
12. In al-Qaṣīm, Bīṣah, and Hofuf hum. In most dialects this form is communis.
13. Thus Rwaili, Ḥāyil, al-Qaṣīm. In the other dialects the same as the 3mp form.
14. In al-Qaṣīm, Bīṣah, and Naqrān 'ant. According to P. Abboud 'ant is also the form used in Ḥāyil.72 In most dialects this form is used as a communis form.
15. Thus only Rwaili and Hofuf. Riyāḍ 'inti. Ḥāyil according to Prochazka 'inti but according to Abboud 'antay,73 in al-Qaṣīm, Bīṣah, and Naqrān 'anti.
16. In Rwaili also 'intum and 'intaw. 'intaw is also found in Hofuf. In al-Qaṣīm 'antum. In Ḥāyil according to Abboud 'antam.74
17. Thus in Rwaili, Ḥāyil. In al-Qaṣīm 'antin (according to Abboud also Ḥāyil75). In the other dialects the same as the 2mp form.
18. In Hofuf 'āne.
19. In Hofuf 'ihe.
20. Other forms in this dialect group: -ah, -uh (thus in Ḥāyil after consonant76), -h (in Ḥāyil after vowel), -w, -wh.77 In Mağma'a of Sudair -h after vowel, -ih after consonant.78
21. Other forms: -ah (thus Ḥāyil79), -he.80 Abboud posits an original long vowel (-ha) in order to explain that the vowel was not dropped.81
22. Ḥāyil -ham. In most dialects this suffix is communis.
23. Thus Rwaili, Ḥāyil, al-Qaṣīm. In the other dialects the same as the 3mp suffix.
24. Other forms in this dialect group are -ik, -k (thus in Ḥāyil after vowel).82 In Mağma'a of Sudair in all positions -k.83
25. Other forms are -ic, -iš, -ac, -as, -ē (thus in Ḥāyil after vowel84), -ē, -ś. 25. In Hofuf -ic and -iš. In Mağma'a of Sudair -ē < -ki.85
26. Ḥāyil -kam. In most dialects this suffix is communis.
27. Thus Rwaili where also the suffix -kin is used. In Ḥāyil, al-Qaṣīm -kin. In the other dialects the same as the 2mp suffix.
28. Other forms are -yeh, -yi.
29. Other forms are -anyeh, -nyeh, -an, -nan, and -n.
30. Hofuf -ne. Abboud posits an original long vowel (*)-nā in order to explain that the vowel was not dropped86.
31. Naqrān -hant. In Mağma'a of Sudair -ta, a unique feature among the Naqdi dialects.87
32. Abboud adduces some evidence that the zero morpheme of the 3ms goes back to an "underlying" -a.88
33. Rwaili and Hofuf -ay.
34. Rwaili and Hofuf -aw.
35. Usually the same as mp. Rwaili, Ḥāyil, al-Qaṣīm -in.
3. SOUTH-WESTERN ARABIAN

3.1. Yemenite Dialects

3.1.1. Northern High Plateau

Sample dialect: Yašīrī

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suff. pron.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms hū</td>
<td>C -eh, V -h</td>
<td>-ə</td>
<td>yi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs hi</td>
<td>-hā</td>
<td>-at</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms ūant</td>
<td>C -ak, V -k</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs ūanti</td>
<td>C -ik, V -ki 11</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>ti- ... -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs ūanā</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-tu 2</td>
<td>ʔa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ni (verb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp him 3</td>
<td>-him 7</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>yi- ... -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp hinna 4</td>
<td>-hinna 8</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>yi- ... -na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp ūantu</td>
<td>-kum</td>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>ti- ... -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp ūantnna 5</td>
<td>-kunna 9</td>
<td>-tinna 10</td>
<td>ti- ... -na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp ūnna 6</td>
<td>-[a]nā</td>
<td>-nā</td>
<td>ni-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Remarks

1. The prefix vowel (except in 1cs where it is always a) is conditioned by the stem vowel: it is u before stem vowel u, and i otherwise.
2. In Ḥamīr, Wādi Ḥamīr, Im-Gūleh, Raideh, Āmrān, Āzzīleh, and Sinnatain -t. The distinction between 2ms and 1cs - in spite of the general tendency to drop final short vowels in all modern Arabic dialects - is upheld also in the qalṭu dialects of the Mesopotamian domain.
3. Im-Gūleh, Raideh, Āmrān, and Ḥamīdeh hum.
4. Im-Gūleh and Ḥamīdeh hin. Raideh and Āmrān have both forms.
5. Im-Gūleh and Ḥamīdeh ūantin. Raideh and Āmrān have both forms.
6. Im-Gūleh and Ḥamīdeh have a form with a diachronically long final vowel: ūnā (pronounced short).
7. Im-Gūleh, Raideh, Āmrān, and Ḥamīdeh -hum.
8. Im-Gūleh and Ḥamīdeh -hin. Raideh and Āmrān have both forms.
9. Im-Gūleh and Ḥamīdeh -kin. Raideh and Āmrān have both -kin and -kinna. These four dialects thus show no levelling of the stem vowel (in the other dialects influence from the 2mp form. This pertains also to the third person plural forms. 10. Im-Gūleh and Ḥamīdeh -tin. Raideh and Āmrān have both forms.
11. Ḥamīr, Sinnatain, Raideh, and Āmrān have the forms C -ič, V -č, as well as the secondary forms C -iš, V -š. The rural country dialects all have C -ik, V -ki.
   Āzzīleh shows C -ik, V -č.
### 3.1.2. Southern High Plateau

Sample dialect: Ḍafār

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suff. pron.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>hū</td>
<td>-eh, V -h</td>
<td>3-φ</td>
<td>yi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>ḥi</td>
<td>-ha</td>
<td>-at 7</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>ḍantu</td>
<td>-uk, 2 V -k</td>
<td>-t 17</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>ṭanti</td>
<td>-iš, V -š</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>ti- ... -i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>m ˈana, f ˈani 8-i</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-a-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-ni (verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>hum 11</td>
<td>-hum 13</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>yi- ... -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>hın 12</td>
<td>-hin 14</td>
<td>-ayn 5</td>
<td>yi- ... -ayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>ḍantu 9</td>
<td>-kum 15</td>
<td>-tu 18</td>
<td>ti- ... -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>ḍantayn 10</td>
<td>-kin 16</td>
<td>-tayn 6</td>
<td>ti- ... -ayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>ʾibna</td>
<td>-na 4</td>
<td>-na 19</td>
<td>ni-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Remarks

1. The prefix vowel (except in 1cs where it is always a) is conditioned by the stem vowel: it is u before stem vowel u, and i otherwise.
2. Diem is unsure as to the origin of the -u- vowel. In Iryān, ad-Dāmiḡaḥ, and Bainūn the forms are C -ak, V -k. 95
3. In Iryān the forms are C -ah, V -h.
4. In Iryān, Dafinah, Māriyah, and Damār the allomorph after vCC- and vvC-syllables is -ana.
5. In Damār the morphemic variant before object suffix is -ann-, as in Ṣanṭā. The suffix is formed by influence from the flexion of verba tertiae infirmae.
6. In Damār the morphemic variant before object suffix is -tann-, as in Ṣanṭa. In ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn dialect II -tin, in pause -tinneh.
7. In Radār, ad-Dāmiḡaḥ, and Bainūn dialect I -it if the stem type is fr'il.
8. In ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn there is no special feminine form.
9. In ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn dialect II that is a Bedouin dialect closer to Classical Arabic, the forms ʾantum (context) and ʾantummeḥ (pause) are used. The latter is historically a pausal form of *antumma. 96
10. In ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn dialect II the forms ʾantin (context) and ʾantinneḥ (pause) are used.
11. In ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn dialect II the form hummeḥ is used in pause. This is historically a pausal form of *humma, cf. the long form of the Meccan dialect. Corresponding long forms with gemination are found also in Bahraín, Baghdad, Haurān (Syria), Palestine, and Cairo.
12. In ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn dialect II the form hinneḥ is used in pause.
13. Ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn dialect II in pause -hummeḥ.
15. Ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn dialect II in pause -kummeḥ.
17. Ad-Dāmiḡaḥ and Bainūn dialect I -ta.
18. Ad-Dāmīgah and Bainūn dialect II -tum, in pause -tummeh.
19. Ad-Dāmīgah and Bainūn dialect II in pause -neh.

### 3.1.3. The Coastal Plane (Tihāmah)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suff. pron.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>ḥū</td>
<td>-oh, -uh</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>yi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>ḥī</td>
<td>-?</td>
<td>-an 1</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>ʻanta</td>
<td>-ak</td>
<td>-ta</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>ʻanti</td>
<td>-ik</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ti- ... i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>m ʻana, f ʻani</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ʻa-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suff. pron.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>hun 3</td>
<td>-hun</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>yi- ... -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>hin</td>
<td>-hin</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>ti- ... -na 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>ʻantun</td>
<td>-kun</td>
<td>-tun</td>
<td>ti- ... -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>ʻantin</td>
<td>-kin</td>
<td>-tin</td>
<td>ti- ... -na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>ʻihna</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>ni-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks**

1. Diem cannot explain this suffix. He suggests influence from the 3fp suffix -na. The ending -an as a 3fs mark of the SC is found also in Bal-Qarn of Saudi Arabia and in Al-Mahābēh of Yemen.
2. Thus Diem, who does not comment the prefix of this form.
3. A characteristic of the Coastal Plane, as is in fact the ending -un in general for 3mp and 2mp of the pronouns and 2mp of the SC.

### 3.1.4. Al-Mahābēh

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suff. pron.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>ḥū</td>
<td>C -eh, V -h</td>
<td>-Ø</td>
<td>yi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>ḥī</td>
<td>-ha</td>
<td>-an 1</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>ntā</td>
<td>C -ak, V -k</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>ntī</td>
<td>-ki</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>ti- ... i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>ʻana</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ʻa-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suff. pron.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>-hum</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>yi- ... -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>hinna</td>
<td>-hinna</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>yi- ... -na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>ntum</td>
<td>-kum</td>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>ti- ... -u</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>ntinna</td>
<td>-kinna</td>
<td>-tinna</td>
<td>ti- ... -na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>ḫnā</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>ni-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks**

1. -an also in the Tihāmah of Yemen and Bal-Qarn of Saudi Arabia (near the Tihāmah of Saudi Arabia).
3.1.5. Southern Part of the Western Mountain Chain

Sample dialect: al-Mahall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Suff. pron.</th>
<th>SC 20</th>
<th>PC 102</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>hū</td>
<td>C -oh, V -h</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>hī</td>
<td>-[a]ha</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>ūnta</td>
<td>C -ak, V -k</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>ūnti</td>
<td>C -iš/V -š</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-š</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>m ūna/f ūnī</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ni (verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|   | 3mp | hum | -[o]hum | -u 17 | yī- - u |
|   | 3fp | han 10 | -[a]han 12 | -ayn 3 | yī- - ayn 9 |
|   | 2mp | ūntum | -[o]kum | -kum 2 | ti- - u |
|   | 2fp | ūntum 5 | -[o]kum 7 | -kum 8 | ti- - ayn 9 |
|   | 1cp | iḫna 14 | -[a]na | -na | ni- |

Remarks

1. In al-Hadiye V -ho, and the C form after u becomes -woh. Qafr V -h after u and a, -hu after i. Taʿizz -uh.
2. Taʿizz -tum (before 2/3 sing. object suffixes -tunn-, otherwise -tū-). The form before object suffixes becomes in al-Hadiye -kū-, and in al-ʿUdain -kumū-.
3. Before object suffixes -ann-. Al-Hadiye and al-ʿUdain show the form -ēn, which before object suffixes becomes -inn-. In Taʿizz before suffixes -inn-, although the form without suffixes is -ayn.
4. In al-Hadiye ʿa- only if the prefix is stressed, otherwise the zero mark.
5. Al-Hadiye and al-ʿUdain ʿantum. ʿĪblah intan (below). Qafr and Taʿizz ʿantin.
6. The al-Hadiye form is not known. Al-ʿUdain C -ik/V -ki, Taʿizz only -ik. The -ki ending (instead of -š) is a trait of a southern group.
8. Before object suffixes the final -n is geminated: -kunn-. The al-Hadiye form is not known. Qafr -kin, Taʿizz -fin (before object suffixes -tinn-). Al-ʿUdain -kēn, which before object suffixes becomes -kinn-. Ibb also -kēn.
10. Qafr and Taʿizz hin.
11. Qafr V: -h after i and a, -hi after u. C: -eh. The gender distinction in the third person singular is thus upheld by the opposition -hu/-hi, rather than -hu/-ha, a consequence of the analogical force of the opposite pairs hū/hī, ūntum/ʿantin, -kum/-kin, etc. in Qafr. The al-ʿUdain form is not known. Taʿizz -ih. The suffix -eh (-ih) is a trait of a southern group of the dialects, -ha of a northern group.
13. Qafr and Taʿizz -ah (before object suffixes -(a)t-). Al-ʿUdain shows both -at and -ah, of which Diem regards -at to have been borrowed from other dialects. Before object suffixes the form in al-ʿUdain is always -(a)t.
14. Al-ʿUdain also, but rarely, hīna. Taʿizz also nīhna, which is an innovation.
15. Al-'Udain and Ibē -ku. Taʿizz -tu. Taʿizz belongs to a k-group of dialects but contact with people of t-groups has caused a change from k-suffixes to t-suffixes in the SC.¹⁰⁶

16. The al-Hadiye form is not known. Al-'Udain -ki. Taʿizz -ti. The -ki ending (instead of -s) is a trait of a southern group.

17. Ibē -um as in Ġiblah (below). In Taʿizz the ending before 2/3 sing. object suffixes is -unn-, before other suffixes -ū-.

18. Taʿizz only -ak.

19. Taʿizz -t.

20. The k-suffixes of the SC is a characteristic of this dialect group.

Sample dialect: Ġiblah¹⁰⁷

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sep. pron.</th>
<th>Succ. pron.</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>PC 25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>huwa⁰</td>
<td>C -uh, V -h 4</td>
<td>-∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>hiya⁰</td>
<td>-ih 5</td>
<td>-ah 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>inta’ 15</td>
<td>C -ak, 7 V -k</td>
<td>-k 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>inti</td>
<td>-ik 8</td>
<td>-ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>m ana'?f ani 2 -i,</td>
<td>-k 27</td>
<td>-a-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-[a]ni 11 (verb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>hum 3</td>
<td>-[a]hum</td>
<td>-um 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>han 13</td>
<td>-[a]han 6</td>
<td>-ēn 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>intum 16</td>
<td>-[a]kum 9</td>
<td>-kum 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>intan 14</td>
<td>-[a]kan 10</td>
<td>-kan 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>ihni⁰</td>
<td>-[a]na’ 12</td>
<td>-na’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative remarks

1. As second person independent pronouns Diem adduces forms beginning with an a vowel: ʿanta, ʿanti, ʿantum, ʿantan (he retains initial hamza in transliteration). The 1cp form is according to Diem in context ihna, the third person singular forms (also context) hu, hi.¹⁰⁸ He gives no forms for the PC.

2. The morphological expression of the distinction of gender in the first person sing. of the separate pronouns is found in numerous dialects of Yemen. It is also upheld by unlearned categories of people in the Gulf states. In the rest of the Arabian Peninsula the gender distinction is not upheld in the first person.

3. In North Yemen as well as Ḥadramaut, Ḍofār, and Oman we encounter short forms of the third person,¹⁰⁹ whereas in Mekka and many North Arabian dialects long forms are formed by gemination of the middle consonant and addition of an ending -a. The North Arabian Bedouin dialects exhibit both types of third person forms (cf. above).

4. The allomorph after final vowel is -h, common in all Arabian dialects.

5. Some North Arabian Bedouin dialects instead -ah (e.g. Bani Ḥālid above).

6. The Gulf dialects all have -hin without allomorphs (if not the 3mp suffix is used), the North Arabian Bedouin dialects -hin (in Cantineau’s notation -hen⁰).
7. In Dūsīria and the Gulf -ik (Eastern Arabian above), in Yarīm and Ḍafār (both on the Southern High Plateau, see above) -uk.
8. According to Diem the form is -ki after vowel. The suffix is affricated or spirantized in most Arabian dialects, e.g. the Southern High Plateau of Yemen C -iš/V -š, the North Arabian Bedouin dialects (above) C -iē/V -ē (Cantineau C -ēē/V -ē).
9. In Tiḥāmeh (the Coastal Plane above) -kun.
10. The most common Arabian form has an -i- (-e-) vowel, -eʃjkin (Ṣanīʾa below), -kin (Southern High Plateau), affricated -čenn (Banī Ḥālid above).
11. In Aden, in analogy with the independent pronoun, a differentiation as to gender has developed: 1ms -na, 1fs -ni. The 1ms form -na became possible by the substitution of the 1cp form with -nihna, cf. remark 12.
12. In Aden and some Yemenite dialects the independent form is used: -nihna (even sometimes after nouns).
13. This form is hard to explain. Fischer and Jastrow regard it an Old Arabic form. On the Southern High Plateau (e.g. Ḍafār) hin.
14. On the Southern High Plateau (e.g. Ḍafār) ʾantayn in analogy with the regular verbal flexion, which in its turn has been influenced by the verbs III inf.
15. On the Southern High Plateau (e.g. Ḍafār) we have the series 2ms ʾanta, 2fs ʾanti, 2mp ʾantu, and 2fp ʾantayn (see remark above), with the old vowel maintained in the prefix.
16. Among the North Arabian Bedouins ʾontom (thus e.g. Manāḍre) and ʾontow (e.g. Mawāli), the latter form probably in analogy with the 3ms form.
17. Influence from the pronominal (-)hum and from 2mp -kum (as against singular -k). The allomorph before object suffix lacks the final -m. In the Gulf dialects (Eastern Arabian, see above) and Southern Ḥiḡāz -aw, in the North Arabian Bedouin dialects often -aw < -aw. The Southern High Plateau of Yemen -u. The -um suffix has been formed in analogy with the personal pronoun hum and is then also taken over by the corresponding PC forms.
18. -en < -ayn; monophthongization of diphthongs is a common phenomenon in the dialects of the western mountain chain. On the Southern High Plateau (e.g. Yarīm) -ayn, a generalization of the ending in verbs III inf. The Gulf dialects have -an (if not the same as 3mp). In the north of Yemen (Northern High Plateau, see above) and in Tiḥāmeh (The Coastal Plane above) the Classical Arabic ending -na is preserved.
19. On the Southern High Plateau (e.g. Yarīm and Ḍafār), Mecca (cf. above) and the Gulf dialects -tu, which is the dominating ending among the t-dialects. Other attested forms of the 2mp ending are -tam (e.g. al-Hugariyyeh) and in the North Arabian Bedouin dialects sometimes -tam (thus Fischer & Jastrow, Cantineau -tom, see above). In Tiḥāmeh (the Coastal Plane of Yemen and also al-Qauz of Saudi-Arabia) -tun in analogy with the independent pronoun ʾantun (al-Qauz ʾintun). The k-dialects uniformly show the ending -kum.
20. On the Southern High Plateau (e.g. Ḍafār) and Ṣanīʾa -tayn (in analogy with the 3fp form and the verbs III inf.). The Gulf dialects -tin. The most frequent Arabian forms of the ending are -tan and -tin. In the k-dialects -kan and -kin are found, in some dialects the analogical formation -kayn (or contracted -kēn).
21. Suffixes with -k- instead of -t- are found in some Western Yemenite mountain dialects (e.g. al-Maḥall above), but -t- is the more common element among the Arabian dialects. Besides -t there is in Tihāmah (e.g. Maḥāyil in Saudi Arabia and the whole Coastal Plane of Yemen) and some other Yemenite dialects (ad-Dāmi- gah, Bainūn) also the SC ending -ta.

22. In the North Arabian dialects, some Ḥiḡāzi and Naḡdi dialects as well as Dūbḥān of Southern Yemen the suffix -in is used.

23. In the North Arabian dialects, some Ḥiḡāzi and Naḡdi dialects as well as Dūbḥān of Southern Yemen the suffix -un is used.

24. In the North Arabian dialects including Sudair of Eastern Saudi Arabia -an is used.

25. The prefix vowel of the PC is most often i if the PC stem has not an u vowel, in which case it is u. In ‘Umār and Slūt of Ṣammar, Dōsiri and the Gulf dialects the prefix vowel is a. The prefix vowel varies considerably among the dialects and is usually conditioned by the PC stem vowel.

26. -ah is the dominating 3ths suffix in the -k- dialects (al-Maḥall and most southwestern mountain dialects however -at). Before object suffixes there is the allomorph -(a)l. The ending -ah is probably due to analogy with the feminine ending of the noun.\footnote{114}

27. With change of the stem vowel to u: 1cs katubk against 2ms katabk, a change that was caused by assimilation to the (later dropped) final -u in "ku.\footnote{115} In the k-dialects the most frequent form is -ku\footnote{110} (cf. al-Udain and 1bb of the southwestern mountains of Yemen), which is the original ending. This -u manifests itself in the assimilation of the stem vowel, katubk instead of katabk, although the vowel ending itself was later dropped.

### 3.1.6. Al-Hugariyeh (southern part of Yemen)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3ms</th>
<th>hū, huwa</th>
<th>C-oh, V-uh 5</th>
<th>-∅</th>
<th>ya-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>hi, hiya</td>
<td>C-eh, V-ih 6</td>
<td>-at</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>ḍantä</td>
<td>C-ak, V-k 4</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>ḍanti</td>
<td>C-ik/V-k</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>ta- ... -i 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>m-ana/f-ani</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-tu</td>
<td>ɐ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ni (verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>-[o]hum</td>
<td>-u</td>
<td>ya- ... -u 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>hin</td>
<td>-[e]hin</td>
<td>-ayn</td>
<td>ya- ... -ayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>ḍantum</td>
<td>-[o]kum</td>
<td>-tum</td>
<td>ta- ... -u 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>ḍantin</td>
<td>-[e]kin</td>
<td>-tin</td>
<td>ta- ... -ayn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>nahnu, nihna</td>
<td>-[a]na</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>na-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks**

1. huwa is the older form, the short form is due to later influence from other dialects.
2. hiya is the original form of the dialect.
3. nahnu is the original form of the dialect.
4. -k after u, -uk after a and i.
5. -u after a, -uh and -h after i.
6. -ih after u, -i after a.
8. In Dubhān -ūn.

### 3.1.7. Ţan‘ā

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>hū 1</td>
<td>C -ah, V -h</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>ya-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>hi 2</td>
<td>C -ahā, V -hā</td>
<td>-at</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>õant</td>
<td>C -ak, V -k</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>õanti</td>
<td>C -iš, V -š</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ta-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>õanē 3</td>
<td>C -i, V -ya</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>õa-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ni (verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3mp        | hum         | [-o]hum     | -u  | ya-  |
| 3fp        | hinn, hin   | [-e]hin     | -ayn | ya-  |
| 2mp        | õantu       | [-o]kum     | -t  | ta-  |
| 2fp        | õantæyn     | [-e]kin     | -ty  | ta-  |
| 1cp        | hñæ 4       | [-a]na      | -na |      |

**Remarks**

1. Unlearned people (that have not studied literary Arabic) hūh.
2. Unlearned people hīh.
3. Thus (in pause with imāla) in Ţan‘ā and its neighbourhood. On the rest of the high plateau Ţanā.[120] In the western lowland a gender distinction is observed. 1ms Ţanā, 1fs ‘anī or ‘anī (according to Rossi in analogy with the gender distinction of the second and third persons[121]).
4. Thus (with imāla) in Ţan‘ā and its neighbourhood. On the rest of the high plateau hña.[122]

### 4. ŢOMĀNI ARABIC

Sample dialect: Bāni Ḥarūs[123]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3ms</td>
<td>hũwe 1</td>
<td>C -o 10, V -h</td>
<td>-ø</td>
<td>yi-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fs</td>
<td>hiye 3</td>
<td>C -ha 6</td>
<td>-it</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2ms</td>
<td>nté 4</td>
<td>C -ak 7, V -k</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>ti-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fs</td>
<td>ntī</td>
<td>C -iš, V -š</td>
<td>-ti</td>
<td>t(‘)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cs</td>
<td>ene 5</td>
<td>C -i 8, V -yi</td>
<td>-t</td>
<td>e-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-ni 9 (verb)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3mp</td>
<td>hum</td>
<td>-hum</td>
<td>-o</td>
<td>y(·) - ... -o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3fp</td>
<td>hin</td>
<td>-hin</td>
<td>-en</td>
<td>y(·) - ... -en 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2mp</td>
<td>ntu</td>
<td>-kum</td>
<td>-to</td>
<td>t(·) - ... -o -o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2fp</td>
<td>nten</td>
<td>-ken</td>
<td>-ten</td>
<td>t(·) - ... -en 13 -en</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1cp</td>
<td>ḫnē 2</td>
<td>-ne 11</td>
<td>-ne</td>
<td>ni-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Remarks**

3. Before negation with final -ā: hiyā-šī “not she”.
4. Before negation with final -ā: ntā-šī “not you (m.)”.
5. Before negation with final -ā: enā-šī “not I (m.)”.
6. Thus after emphatic consonants and laryngals, otherwise -he. Before negation (-śī) always -hā.
7. Thus after emphatic consonants and laryngals, otherwise -ek.
8. Emphatic form ine, to be analyzed as the normal suffix -i plus sep. pronoun ene. Before negation (-śī) the form is -i. Before negation (-śī) -inā.
9. Or -ine. Emphatic form nine, to be analyzed as the normal object suffix -ni plus sep. pronoun ene.
10. Before negation (-śī) -ū.
11. Before negation (-śī) -nā.
12. The prefix vowel as well as the stem vowel of the PC seem to be phonetically determined by the following radical. The prefix vowel can be i, o, ẹ, u, ā. However, it is never a except in the 1cs form where it is always e- (< ’a-).
13. If the third radical is h, ḥ, g, q, c, or r the suffix changes to -an.

**OBSERVATIONS**

#1. One fundamental opposition in the paradigmatic tables established above is that between masculine and feminine gender. In fact, a rewarding subgrouping within a table is a division of the forms in masculine/feminine pairs, huw/hiy, int/intay, -at, ya/-ta-, etc. The presence of masculine and feminine forms in most positions of the table, might be taken to indicate that a masculine form would possess (or be) a masculine morphological mark and that a feminine form in a similar way would possess a feminine mark. This is not true. If, for a moment, we consider the morphological marks of the prefix conjugation, the third person forms look something like this: 3ms ya/-3fs ta-, 3mp ya-...-un/3fp ya-...-in. Here, the 3fp form ya-...-in shows that y- cannot reasonably be a positive mark of the masculine gender. Rather, the presence of the ya- prefix in the forms above should be attributed to another circumstance, which can only pertain to the prefix conjugation as such. The distinguishing mark of the PC is the presence of a prefix before the stem. Every form of the PC must have this mark. The ya- prefix, used in both

---

A similar argument, based on Classical Arabic, is found in A. A. Bulos, *The Arabic Triliteral Verb*, 37f.
masculine and feminine forms, is a positive mark of the PC as such, but as to
the gender distinction it is a neutral mark. ya- (or yi-) in the paradigms is not a mark of
the masculine, rather it is to be regarded as a zero sign (as to gender). In particular,
the 3ms form of the PC paradigm (ya-...) should be considered zero signalized, or
unmarked. The y- prefix is not a masculine mark, nor is it a mark of singularity or
of the third person. It is just a zero mark as to the gender, number, and person, and
this conclusion is valid not only for the Arabic dialects, but for Afroasiatic as a
whole.\textsuperscript{129} This means that whereas 3ms yaktib (Rwaili) is zero signalized in regard
to all the three fundamental categories within the paradigms displayed, 3fs taklib
bears a distinctive mark of the feminine, which in this case is the prefix consonant
t-. Likewise, yaktibun (< *yaktibûn) bears a distinctive mark of the plural, in this
case the suffix -ûn, and so on.\textsuperscript{130} The trebly unmarked state of the 3ms yaktib
constitutes the linguistic foundation for its treatment as a kind of base form for the
prefix conjugation. Even more, an unmarked form is also a frequently used base
form for innovations, as will be illustrated below.

\#2. What is stated in \#1 accords well with the paradigm of the suffix conjugation,
where the 3ms form is distinguished by a zero signalization (Rwaili kitab).
This form, which is designated "3ms", is in fact zero signalized as to gender,
number, and person. It may be considered the base form of the suffix conjugation.
Its feminine counterpart, in Rwaili kitabat, is feminine signalized but lacks number
and person signalization. Its plural counterpart (3mp), Rwaili kibliaw, is plural
signalized, and the suffix may be interpreted as being formed from an ancient
ending -a and the plural sign -û, a phenomenon that might be identified as a general
tendency to produce new marked formations starting from an unmarked form.
At the same time, however, the 3mp ending -aw must be considered in the light of the
general tendency in the Arabic dialects to confuse (or merge) the flexion of verba
tertiiae infirmae with that of the regular verb. This will be elaborated below (\#5).
Although kibliaw has a plural mark it is unmarked as to gender and person. This
unmarkedness as to gender the SC 3mp form shares with the other 3mp forms in
the tables (separate pronouns, suffix pronouns, the PC). The same holds true for
the 2mp forms. This is the foundation for their use as communes in some of the
dialects (e.g. Mecca). The need for a gender distinction was felt less urgent than in
the singular. The former "masculine" unmarked form thus in those dialects came to
be used also for the feminine plural. In the singular it was more important to
distinguish gender, and so in the singular this distinction has been everywhere
upheld.\textsuperscript{131}

\#3. Due to the general loss of short final vowels in the dialects, the final -a of
Old Arabic ʾanta (also ʾinta?) should have been generally dropped. In many
dialects, though, the -a is retained, or is sometimes (within the same dialect)
retained. When the -a is preserved as a variant form within a dialect it is in some
instances used to achieve emphasis. In such a case the ʾant (or ʾint) form is quite
unmarked as to emphasis. However, the acceptance of a form ʾant without -a also
constitutes an indication that the ending -a in the gender opposition ʾanta/anti
was dispensable. The 2ms form ʾant retained its functions without the ending. Regard-
less of the designation "2ms", the form ʾant, and also the form ʾanta, is in reality
unmarked as far as gender is concerned. If, now, the 2ms independent pronoun is
unmarked, its counterpart in the gender opposition must retain its state of markedness, and this is also shown in all the dialects, where the ending -i of the Old Arabic ʾanti (ʾinti) is everywhere retained. This retention of the final -i is probably not a consequence of a supposed long -i in Proto-Semitic. Instead the final -i was lengthened in many dialects to preserve the feminine mark when short final vowels fell. In the privative opposition the signifier level of which is represented by ʾanti/ʾant(a), only the marked term had to retain (or alternatively, renew) its mark, whereas the unmarked term constantly exhibits zero signalization, whether it ends in a short -a or not. A cursory observation might give rise to the assumption that -ta (or -t) is a masculine mark and -ti the feminine mark. Further analysis, however, forces us to conclude that the masculine form is unmarked and that the ʾVnta (or ʾVnt) form in fact represents zero signalization. This unmarked state of the 2ms form implies that it may take on two values, non-feminine = masculine, or non-feminine = neutral. Obviously, this potential gender neutrality of the 2ms form ʾVnta (or ʾVnt) is shared by all masculine forms in the tables.

#4. In some Nağdi and Eastern Arabian dialects studied by T. Prochazka we encounter the 2fs form ʾintay (or ʾantay see remark above), which may be interpreted as the ancient unmarked form ʾinta supplied with a feminine mark -i: ʾinta-i > ʾintay. However, as with the SC suffix -aw, influence from verba tert. inf. must be given due consideration, because where the 2fs sep. pron. ʾintay is used (Rwaili, Hofuf), we find also the 2fs SC suffix -tay. As far as we know this form is used only in Rwaili and Hofuf (and possibly Hâyil). The rest of the Arabian dialects uses the regular form ʾVnti. Although ʾintay is obviously a new formation it conforms to the general structural pattern that in the gender opposition ʾVnt(a)/ʾVnti of the second person singular the ʾVnt(a) form represents zero signalization and the ʾVnti form positive feminine signalization. This means that the marked form ʾVnti should be regarded as the unmarked form ʾVnt(a) supplied with the feminine mark -i. As can be seen from the tables -i (or -i-) is a generally used mark in the singular and it is frequent also in the plural.

#5. In the North Arabian and Hiğazi dialects a very frequent 3mp ending of the suffix conjugation is -aw or -ow (Cantineau: -oë). The form katabaw (Rufaidah) is marked as to number (however unmarked as to gender). It may be interpreted as an internal Arabic development, where the old unmarked 3ms form kataba became the starting point for a new plural formation by addition of the general ending of the masculine plural, -u (or -ü). Thus -a + -u > -aw. The -ow ending is the result of a phonetic change of the pronunciation (assimilation to w). Frequently, -ow is even reduced to -o (Bani Ḥālid, Sirḥān, Wild ʿAli; sometimes ʿślūt), or -ā. An analogous development is to be assumed for the 2mp SC ending -taw, e.g. Hofuf kitabtaw, which under influence of the change of the 3mp form was formed from the old 2ms ending -ta (the Classical Arabic form) by addition of the plural ending -u (-ā): -ta + -u > -taw (> -tow in some dialects).

#6. In the Šammar dialects ʿUmūr and Sirḥān the 2fs form of the independent pronouns is ʾontel (Sirḥān ʾontele) instead of the usual North Arabian ʾonti. Cantineau gives no 2ms form for Sirḥān but in ʿUmūr the form is ʾontel. The -e ending of the 2fs form he explains as a diphthongization of the old long -i, but he suspects that this “diphthongization” must have a non-phonetic origin. This form is to be
explained in accordance with #4 above. The marked form ʿont̪e is an innovation based on the unmarked form ʿont̪e which simply has been supplied with the commonly used feminine mark -i: ʿont̪e-i > ʿont̪e).

#7. ʿana (ʿana, etc.) is the most widely used form of the independent 1cs pronoun. The small cattle Bedouins of Syria, especially the Pre-ʿAnaze tribes, instead use the form ʿâni (communis) with final -i, probably in analogy with the object suffix form -ni. The speakers of most Yemenite dialects as well as some (unlearned) speakers of the Gulf dialects, distinguish between a masculine form ʿana and a feminine form with final -i, ʿani. Naturally, this distinction is not found in the mouth of one and the same speaker, but is a trait of the socio-linguistic phenomenon of female language. However, the feminine form ʿâni as such is not due to analogical influence from the communis suffix -i (or -ni), but is caused by the analogical force of the second person singular forms. The pair ʿVnta/ʿVnti made a new feminine formation possible in the first person by the analogical opposition ʿana/ʿani, where the unmarked, zero signalized, term was ʿana.138

#8. The force of analogy is everywhere perceptible in the stock of forms of the dialects. Among the third person independent pronouns there are a long and a short type (sometimes within the same dialect), both types occurring with a frequency that indicates that this variety probably is inherited from Old Arabic. The Classical Arabic form huwa is found only occasionally among the studied dialects. It is attested in the Gulf Dialects,139 in Saudi Arabia (Bal-Qarn) and in Yemen (al-Hugarîyah). The short type predominates in Yemen, whereas the long form is more frequent in the North Arabian dialects.140 Therefore it would be premature bluntly to regard the forms of the dialects as innovations from the Old Arabic huwa. Only a few dialects have retained the ancient difference in length between short unmarked (as to gender) forms (hum, -hum, ʿantum, -kum, etc.) and long marked forms (hunna, -hunna, ʿantunna, -kunna, etc.), e.g. al-Qahâbah (hum/hunna, etc.) and Gâmid (hum/hunnah, etc.) of Saudi Arabia, most dialects of the Yemenite Northern High Plateau (him/hinna, or hum/hinna), and al-Mâhâbîs (also Yemen, pattern: hum/hinna). In most dialects, the variation between long (huwa, huwwa) and short forms (hu) is consistent as to the individual language: if there is a short form in one position of the system then in the same dialect short forms are found also in the other positions of the scheme, and vice versa. This variation may occur among dialects of the same group. Thus, in the Šammar dialect Bani Ḥâlid long forms of the separate third person pronouns occur (huwwa, hiyya, hunna, henna), whereas the Šammar dialects ʿUmûr, Ṣlût, Mnâdâr, and Sirhân all use short forms (hu, hi, hom, hen). In the dialect of Qatar both long and short forms occur, at least in the singular: hu/huwwa, hi/hiyya. G. Schreiber explains the long communis form hunna in the Meccan dialect as a “contamination” of the Old Arabic forms -hum and -hunna,141 and such a mutual influence between the masculine and feminine pronouns can be traced in many instances. Already in Old Arabic some dialects came to change the Proto-Semitic vowel -i-, a characteristic of the feminine, to -u-, by influence of the corresponding masculine form. Thus the masculine hun[u] (hum[u]), ʿantun[u] (kun[u]) caused the following changes of the feminine forms to occur in some Proto-Arabic dialects: *hinna > hunna, *hinna > hunna, *antinna > ʿantunna, *kinna > kunna. This change was
possible because of the double signalization of the feminine forms: 1) the vowel -i-, 2) the consonant n (in the forms inherited from Proto-Semitic probably already geminated). By this change, the feminine forms preserved only one feminine (plural) mark, the -n(a). The force of analogy caused this change to permeate all the corresponding forms, the separate pronouns, the suffix pronouns, the endings of the suffix conjugation. In the singular pronouns huwa/hiya, -hū/-ha such a levelling of the feminine signalization could not occur without loss of the gender distinction, and so was not permitted. Some Old Arabic dialects, however, must have retained the Proto-Semitic vowel -i- in the feminine plural pronouns, because in the North Arabian dialects, in Yemen (the Northern High Plateau) and in Ḫūmān such forms dominate, either as long (hinna, ʿantinna) or short (hin, ʿantin) variants.

#9. The vowel opposition u/i that serves to distinguish the genders in the singular (hū/hī, huwa/hiyya) in some dialects is levelled out in the plural as has already been observed for Classical Arabic (#8). We encounter in many dialects of Saudi Arabia the Classical Arabic opposition hum/hunna, in the Northern High Plateau of Yemen instead him/hinna. It cannot be regarded an established fact that – as Fischer and Jastrow maintain – hinna of the modern dialects has developed from Old Arabic hunna. It is more probable that hinna is an archaic form considering its predominance in the modern dialects exhibited above (when a gender distinction is at all upheld).

#10. The n of the feminine plural form – in oppositions such as ʿintam/ʿintan (Rwaili, Ḥayil) to be recognized as a feminine plural mark – is sometimes by analogical “Ausgleich” transferred to the masculine form, reducing the distinctive features of the feminine plural form to only one mark, the vowel i (the unmarked masculine form showing u). As in the singular the gender distinction in the plural is achieved by only one mark, whereas in most dialects of the Arabian peninsula the feminine plural form is distinguished by two marks, the vowel i and the consonant n (geminated or not), e.g. hum/hin, ham/hin, and, with a slight phonetic variation, in the North Arabian dialects hom/hen or humma/henna. Examples of a single feminine-plural signalization are found in the Tihámah of Yemen, 3mp hūn/3fp hin, 2mp ʿantun/2fp ʿantin, suffix pron. -hūn/-hin, -kūn/-kin, SC endings 2mp -tun/-tin. Of course, an unmarked form such as hun may also develop into a communis form in spite of its seemingly “feminine” element -n, as in al-Qauz and Ṣabyā (both in Saudi Arabia). Thus we are able to state that if a communis form has emerged in a dialect – a rather frequent phenomenon (cf. #4) – it is always the former unmarked “masculine” form that has been used. Furthermore, the “Ausgleich” concerns all paradigms in the tables, separate pronouns, suffix pronouns, SC and PC. Examples: hum (Kuwait; Bīšah and Hofuf in Saudi Arabia), humme (uhumme, ahumme, Bahraīn), humma (Mecca), hin (Tanūmah and Bal-Qarn in Saudi Arabia), hun (al-Qauz, Ṣabyā), ham (Sudair, Nağrān).

#11. The prefix conjugation 3fp/2fp suffixes used in the dialects are interesting. Whereas some show the Classical Arabic suffix -na (Saudi Arabia type I, Tihámah and the Northern High Plateau of Yemen), others have an ending -an. The latter in all instances corresponds to an identical 3fp SC ending -an, the origin of which however remains obscure. Many Yemenite dialects show a 3fp/2fp PC suffix
-ayn, or the contracted variant -ên (e.g. Ğiblah). This suffix has been formed by analogy with the corresponding 3fp SC suffix -ayn (sometimes even a SC 2fp -tayn suffix is used due to the influence from the 3fp suffix, cf. Ɗafār). Thus, whereas the prefixes of the PC remain stable, its suffixes vary considerably, because of influence from other morphological subsystems, such as those of the SC and the personal pronouns. Especially in the 3fp forms the correspondence between the PC and the SC is noticeable. In the North Arabian dialects a 3fp PC suffix -an always corresponds to a SC suffix -an,\(^{153}\) and a PC 3fp suffix -na (in Gāmid -nah) likewise corresponds to a SC suffix -na (Gāmid -nah). Similarly, a PC suffix -ayn (3fp, 2fp)\(^{154}\) always corresponds to a SC 3fp suffix -ayn.\(^{155}\) If, on the other hand, the gender distinction is lost in the plural forms of the PC, then as was noted in #10 this is the case also for the pronouns and the SC.\(^ {156}\)

NOTES


2. Henceforth abbreviated SC and PC.


4. W. Fischer, and O. Jastrow, eds., Handbuch der arabischen Dialekte (Wiesbaden, 1980), 44, explain the prefix vowel a in the 1cs form as due to analogy with the personal pronoun an. This is possible, although it should be noted that there are no other traces of an analogical influence from the personal pronouns on the prefix vowels of the PC.

5. My main source has been J. Cantineau, “Études sur quelques parlers de nomades arabes d’Orient,” Annales de l’Institut d’Études Orientales 2 (1936): 1–118, 3 (1937): 119–237. It has not been suitable on the ground of Cantineau’s material to establish separate tables for each of the three main dialect groups. The rather minute differences that regard the forms in the tables are accounted for in the remarks. Mostly I conform to the habit of Cantineau (and many other scholars) to represent a beginning hamza in the transliteration, although it is only an unstable word limit mark, Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 106 f. However, I do not regard Cantineau’s phonetic distinction between consonants that are pronounced with ta’ fim and such that are not (op. cit., 12 ff.). It should be noted that the study of Cantineau treats the speech of nomads over a large territory as far south as Nagh and thus partly overlap regions covered in later sections. Among the tribes treated by Cantineau Banī Ɗalīd, Banī Ɗaṣṭar, ʿUmār, Ɗlīṯ, Ɗanāḍr, Ɗardīyā, Ɗarqā, and Sīrīhān belong to Ɗammār (however, Cantineau, op. cit. 202, seems to regard Ɗarqā as belonging to the Pre-ʿAnaze small cattle Bedouins of Syria), Nīm, Ɗafāl, Ɗāḍīn, Mawālī belong to Pre-ʿAnaze, and Ɗawāl, Ɗbaʿa, Ɗuṣṭār, Ɗiṣẹn, Wild ʿAli belong to ʿAnaze.


10. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 112.


12. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 112.

13. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 112, give the form hin.


17. Cantineau, “Études,” 202. It seems that both -kām (or -kam) and -kom are attested in some
dialects, e.g. in Faḍl, cf. op. cit. 72.
18. Cantineau, “Études,” 202. It seems that both -kām (or -ham) and -hom are attested in some
dialects, e.g. in Faḍl, cf. op. cit. 72.
23. Cantineau, “Études,” 76. The usage of the various forms of this suffix is outlined op. cit. 180 ff.
25. Cantineau, “Études,” 80 f., 186. On pp. 47, 186 he concludes that the “diphthongization” of final
-a has a non-phonetic origin. It should be noted in this instance that the diphthong -aw in these
dialects is generally reduced to -ō” (Bani Ḥalid, Sirṭānīn, Wild ‘Ali; sometimes Șlīt) or -ō, op. cit.
47. Note, however, the same endings in verb tert. inf., “Études”, 91.
32. Cantineau, “Études,” 21, 73.
33. My main sources have been: T. M. Johnstone, Eastern Arabian Dialect Studies (London, 1967),
and C. Holes, Gulf Arabic (London and New York, 1990). The latter work, which is mainly a
syntax (even in the “morphology” chapter), concerns a koine of the Gulf states which Holes calls
“Educated Gulf Arabic”. If nothing is said in the remarks the forms adduced by Johnstone and
Holes are identical. According to Johnstone “hamza is not usually present in absolutely initial
positions” (20) wherefore it is omitted in the paradigms. The Sultanate of Oman is excluded since
the dialect spoken in its settled regions is considerably different (it is separately treated below).
34. Johnstone, Eastern Arabian, 71.
39. Holes, Gulf Arabic, 204.
40. Holes, Gulf Arabic, 204.
41. Holes, Gulf Arabic, 159.
42. Holes, Gulf Arabic, 159.
43. Holes, Gulf Arabic, 171.
34. Main sources: W. Fischer, and O. Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 112 ff.; G. Schreiber, Der arabischen
Dialekt von Mekka (Münster, 1970); B. Ingham, “Some Characteristics of Meccan Speech,”
45. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, § 8.2.1.1.
46. Schreiber, Der arabischen Dialekt von Mekka, 7.
47. The example abṣartaha “you (m.) saw her”, given by Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 113,
might be a hint that the -a- has originated from the Classical Arabic 2ms ending -ta in the SC,
which has lost its final -a in most dialects. Cf. the allomorphs -ahum, -akum in both Mecca and
Gīblah. In some dialects, however, the quality of the connecting vowel seems to be phonetically
conditioned by the vowel in the suffix: Yarim 3mp -ahum, 3fp -ihin, 2mp -ukum, 2fp -ikin (but: 1cs
-[an] which indicates that the -a- is here an inherited vowel). It should be noted that in the cases
when the quality of the connecting vowel is not identical with that in the suffix, it is always a, as in
San’a:-ahin.
48. M. H. Bakalla, The Morphological and Phonological Components of the Arabic Verb (Meccan
Arabic) (Beirut, 1979), 16.
49. Schreiber, Der arabischen Dialekt von Mekka, 22.
50. Schreiber, Der arabische Dialekt von Mekka, 9.
51. Schreiber, Der arabische Dialekt von Mekka, 36, 85.
53. Schreiber, Der arabische Dialekt von Mekka, 22.
56. The vowel of the prefix varies considerably between the dialects.
58. Diem, Skizzen, 69.
59. Prochazka, Saudi Arabian Dialects, 126. Prochazka does not distinguish postvocalic and postconsonantic allomorphs.
60. Prochazka, Saudi Arabian Dialects, 126.
61. Prochazka, Saudi Arabian Dialects, 126.
63. The vowel of the prefix varies considerably between the dialects. According to P. Abboud, in Ḥayil (Abboud: Ḥā’il) the prefix vowel of the regular verb is a, except when the first radical is a velar or post velar fricative, P. Abboud, “Some Features of the Verbal System of Najdi Arabic,” 157, more details in Abboud, “The Verb in Northern Najdi Arabic,” 490.
65. In Maǧma'a of Sudair the “underlying” form is -anma according to Abboud, “Verb Suffixation in Najdi Arabic,” 3, which is shown before object suffixes.
69. In Maǧma'a of Sudair the “underlying” form is -inna according to Abboud, “Verb Suffixation in Najdi Arabic,” 3, which is shown before object suffixes.
70. In Maǧma'a of Sudair -ann (“underlying” is -an= the form before object suffixes) according to Abboud, “Verb Suffixation in Najdi Arabic,” 1, 3.
71. In Maǧma'a of Sudair -ann (“underlying” is the form before object suffixes, -anna) according to Abboud, “Verb Suffixation in Najdi Arabic,” 1.
76. Abboud, “The Verb in Northern Najdi Arabic,” 495.
77. Prochazka, Saudi Arabian Dialects, 126.
80. Prochazka, Saudi Arabian Dialects, 126.
84. Abboud, “The Verb in Northern Najdi Arabic,” 495.
89. My main source has been W. Diem, Skizzen jemenitischer Dialekte (Beirut, 1973).
90. Yašī‘, Hamir, Sinnatain, Wādi Ḥamīr, im-Gūleh, Ḥamīdeh, Raideḥ, Amrān, Azzīleh.

92. According to Diem, Skizzen, 30, the latter forms are possibly due to influence from the dialect of Sanā'ī.

93. Ḍafār, Yārīm, Iryān, Damār, Dafinah, Māriyah, Radī, Gaifeh, Sībāh, Mīṣal, ad-Dāmīgah, Bainūn.

94. Diem, Skizzen, 42.

95. According to Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 112, this is the case also in Yārīm.

96. Diem, Skizzen, 59.

97. The prefix vowel (except in 1cs where it is always a) is conditioned by the stem vowel: it is u before stem vowel u, and i otherwise.

98. Diem, Skizzen, 69.

99. Diem, Skizzen, 70.

100. The prefix vowel (except in 1cs where it is always a) is conditioned by the stem vowel: it is u before stem vowel u, and i otherwise.


102. The prefix vowel (except in 1cs where it is always a) is conditioned by the stem vowel: it is u before stem vowel u, and i otherwise.

103. Diem, Skizzen, 90. Diem mentions also some other Yemenite dialects with this feminine suffix.

104. Diem, Skizzen, 90 ff., 95.

105. Diem, Skizzen, 104.

106. Diem, Skizzen, 105 f.

107. Sources: Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 112 ff. Diem, Skizzen, 99 ff. The pausal forms are given according to Fischer and Jastrow. This distinction is upheld in the forms with the ending -t, which is dropped in context, Handbuch, § 8.1.6.


109. According to Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, § 8.2.1.2, they go back to the old short forms huwa, hiya, hum, 'bin, and 'han.

110. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 112.

111. O. Jastrow, "Die Struktur des Neuarabischen," in Grundriss der arabischen Philologie, vol. 1 (Wiesbaden, 1982), 137, rather argues that we have here a rare example of influence from the 2mp form.

112. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 103.

113. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 120.

114. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 119.

115. Diem, Skizzen, 100, 112.

116. Thus Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 120.

117. The prefix vowel (except in 1cs where it is always a) is conditioned by the stem vowel: it is a before stem vowel u, and i otherwise.

118. My source is E. Rossi, L'arabo parlato a Sanā'ī (Roma, 1939).

119. The prefix vowel (except in 1cs where it is always a) is conditioned by the stem vowel: it is u before stem vowel u, and i if it is i, and i, o, or a otherwise.

120. Rossi, L'arabo parlato a Sanā'ī, § 4.

121. Rossi, L'arabo parlato a Sanā'ī, § 27.


126. The forms are taken from a randomly chosen dialect. Rwa'ili in Saudi Arabia.

127. In most dialects there is no such distinction in the first person. As will be pointed out below, some dialects (e.g., Mecca) has lost the gender distinction in the second and third persons plural.

128. The forms taken from the Rwa'ili dialect.

130. Because of the morphemic merging of the old modes of the PC in one form the classical indicative ending -ma became -n in some dialects, or disappeared completely in others. Thus we encounter in the Arabian dialects both -in/-ún and -u-ú, the former type being found only in Bedouin dialects, Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 118. This change has taken place without any influence as far as we can see from the personal pronouns or from the SC flexion.


132. The i was seemingly ances in Proto-Semitic, cf. Ethiopean *ani, Akk. atti.


134. From my sources I have not been able to determine whether in some dialect there are both a communis form and a specific feminine form.

135. -u recognized as such in W. Fischer, ed., Grundriss der Arabischen Philologie, vol. 1, Sprach- wissenschaft (Wiesbaden, 1982), 137. The term “masculine” is used in the meaning unmarked as to gender in opposition to the marked (feminine) term.

136. Cantineau, “Études,” 47, 80 f., 186. A similar development already in Proto-Arabic gave rise to the regular ending in verba tert. inf.: -a+û > -aw, cf. W. Fischer, Grammatik der klassischen Arabisch, 2nd ed. (Wiesbaden, 1987), § 252e. It must be assumed that the ending of the “weak” verb has facilitated the change in the “strong” verb.


138. This statement is not meant to be a suggestion as to the age of a form *ani as such, attested elsewhere in Semitic (Samaanite!). Only that *ani as a specific feminine (1fs) form constitutes an innovation of some dialects in the Arabian Peninsula.

139. Holes, Gulf Arabic, 159.

140. Cf. however the Sammar dialects ’Umár, Sñät, Marádré, and Sirhan, in which the short form is used. It would be premature, though, bluntly to regard the forms of the dialects as innovations from the Old Arabic huwa. The question of origin is not settled, since the short form hu is sometimes used in the poetry of Classical Arabic, and there are traces of a long form huwwa or huwwa in early Arabic, S. Hopkins, Studies in the Grammar of Early Arabic: Based upon Papyri Datable to before 300 A.H./912 A.D. (London, 1984), 7, note 1.

141. Schreiber, Der arabische Dialekt von Mekka, 22.

142. The question whether there was a form with a geminated n already in Proto-Semitic is not settled. Moscati adds the element *-ina without gemination as the Proto-Semitic pattern because of the evidence from Akkadian, Moscati, ed., Comparative Grammar, 102. Many other scholars suppose *-inna to be Proto-Semitic, thus Brockelmann, Grundriss, 1, 301; Bauer and Leander, Historische Grammatik, § 28 p. q.

143. A stable form *huwa is not probable. Phonetic assimilation would give rise to either hiya (the present feminine) or huwa (the present masculine).

144. The extensions of the pronouns by the additional -w (-wa, -wwa) and -y (-ya, -yya) do not possess distinctive power. Their function is to render the pronouns dissyllabic due to an analogical tendency (cf. humma/hina) or to achieve greater emphasis. The semi-vowels w and y in the 3ms/3fs separate pronouns are phonetically conditioned by the preceding vowel. Formations such as *huwa or *hiwa would have been unstable. Phonetic assimilation would give rise to *hiya < *huwa and *huwa (or *hiya < *hiwa, the present masculine and feminine forms.

145. Fischer and Jastrow, eds., Handbuch, 79. However, they seem to regard the short 3fs hin (together with a 3ps ban) as an ancient form, op. cit. 112.

146. Al-Qasim in Saudi Arabia; in Yemen im-Guleh and Hamideh (Northern High Plateau), the Southern High Plateau, Qafir and Tarif (Southern part of the Western Mountain Chain), and al-Hugariye; Omán, and some Gulf dialects.
147. Rwaili and Háyil of Saudi Arabia.
148. ‘Umūr, Ślāt, Manādir, and Sīrāh (all Šamar dialects).
149. Most other North Arabian Bedouin dialects.
150. Commented upon by Fischer and Jastrow as an “Ausgleich in Richtung auf das Feminimum”, Handbuch, note 116.
151. The examples are taken from the third person plural of the separate pronouns, for further examples, see the respective paradigms and remarks.
153. In the Gulf dialects there is also a less frequent 3p variant suffix -in in the PC.
154. In the Southern High Plateau and the southern region of the Western Mountains of Yemen, except al-Hadiyeh, al-Uḍain, and Giblah where a contracted form, -in, is used.
156. As for the Saudi Arabian dialect Sudair the 3p ending is -an in both conjugations. Háyil and al-Qaṣīm have the SC ending -an, but the PC ending -in, and in Rwaili the 3p SC ending may be both -in or -an, whereas the PC ending is only -in. The vowel change a > i is phonetically conditioned. This is the only discrepancy between the PC and the SC in this respect I have been able to discover. Most of the Saudi dialects in fact conform to the general pattern.
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A Note on Qarauna

GUNNAR JARRING, Lund

Paul Pelliot in his Notes on Marco Polo¹ says: "This problem is a very difficult one. It is a correct transcription of Qaraunas, used by Persian historians of the Mongol Period for a particular group of troops living then in Persia. Qara'una (> Qarauna), pl. Qara'unas is a true Mongolian name. The name of the Qaraunas is not known in Mongolia nor does it occur in the Far Eastern texts; the first mention of a Qarauna occurs in 1270 and the least (sic) mention of the Qaraunas in 1547. Herat in Horasan is the region where we hear most of the Qaraunas".²

In his Notes, Vol. 1 (1959), pp. 183–196 Pelliot deals in full detail with the problem of the Qaraunas. I would like to refer, in this connection, also to Jean Aubin's article "L'ethnogénèse des Qaraunas"³ and to Ishwari Prasad's History of the Qaraunah Turks.⁴

I have no contribution to make to the solution of the problem of the history and origin of the Qaraunas in this article. I just want to draw attention to some terms which might throw light on the tribal or ethnic name qarauna which seem to have been overlooked in the discussion which has taken place.

The word qarauna has the following meanings:

1. name of a tree; cf. Pelliot, Notes, 3, p. 221 "Qaraun", "Qaraut"; (= Qaraunas) derived by Berezin either from Mong. qarau, qara'u or from qarayuna name of a tree; same page qarayuna: name of a tree, from which a mountain mentioned in "Sanang Stesen" (sic) derives its name; p. 229 "Qarônas: late spelling of Qaraunas in the Zajar-name, has no primary authority. In Notes, 1, p. 187 Pelliot develops his ideas on qarauna; "At the present stage of our information, I am inclined to think that the name of the Qaraunas, Qara’una, is really identical with the word qarayuna which is not only the name of a tree, but is also used as an epithet for a water-fowl with black markings (but I have no information on the real pronunciation of that common noun written qarayuna, that is to say I do not know whether it is qarayuna or qara’una. Both the proper and the common nouns must have originally meant "black" or "blackish", like qara’un".

2. name of a water-fowl. As to the meaning of qarauna as an epithet for 'a water-fowl' Pelliot gives no indication of his source. Probably Pelliot had a Mongolian form in mind. I refer to Lessing, Mongolian-English Dictionary,⁵ p. 933 Xarayun-a a bird resembling the crow with a bald spot on its head and a white beak; coot. I omit here the forms karâwanâs, kurânas, karnas as being doubtful names for the qarauna.⁶

Qarauna as a bird name is however quite common in Eastern Turkestan (Xinjiang). It was noted by R. B. Shaw⁷ as kharuna (qaruna) the water hen, Gallinula chloropus (also called godan); in the so far unpublished materials of G. Ahlbert⁸ as
Karaiue ~ qaruna the moor hen, Gallinula chloropus chloropus; and by E.N. Najip8 qaruna as a dialect word for qorultaz (p. 602) griffon-vulture, the steppe eagle.

But above all qaruna appears in numerous entries in the diaries (written in Swedish) of the Swedish explorer Sven Hedin.9 The excerpts I have made from the diaries and which I reproduce below were written down by Hedin during his research in mainly the Lop-nor area of Eastern Turkestan in 1899–1902. The majority of them appear in his report10 on his journey in Central Asia in modified forms compared with the original entries in the diaries. These are in the following indicated by the number of the diary in question and page (thus for example 88: 3170).

It is of interest to note that S. E. Malov11 who in 1914 did linguistic research in the Lop-area also notes qaruna ~ qajuna (with the common Eastern turki r ~ j alternation) a black bird with white neck (the size of a hen), also as a place-name (pp. 124–125) qajuna name of a lake and place. Malov’s recordings all belong to the same geographical area as Hedin’s.

I now list the entries containing qaruna made by Hedin in his diaries (with my phonetic interpretations within brackets):


2. As component of place-names:
   1. karaune-tshekesi [qarauna čekeši] river loop, “the promontory of the black goose” HC II: 505, the same Karuna-tjekesi 88: 3170.
   8. Karaunte-tokkanlik-köl [qarauna toqcanlik köl] lake, ‘the lake where the black geese are used to breed’ HC II: 512, kauna-tokkanlik-köll 88: 3184–kauna [gauna] with the common r-drop.
   9. Karaunelik [qarauneliq] name of a lake, ‘the place of the black geese’ HC
II: 335, Karunalik [qarunaliq] 88: 1139 – it can also mean ‘the place where the black geese breed’.
12. Karaunelik-köl [qaraunaliq köl] lake, ‘the lake of the black geese’ HC I–II pass. – more exactly ‘the lake where black geese are to be found, or breed’; Karunalik-köl 88 pass.
14. Karunalik-köl-üji [qarunaliq köl üji] ‘the house at the lake where the black geese are to be found’ 88: 1125.

Qarauna is furthermore noted by Hedin in another connection, namely, with the word daj, meaning the young of the karauna 88: 691, 776; kara-daj [qara daj] a young black bird of the Karaune 88: 776; daj = karaunelik balasi [qaraunaliq balasi] 88: 3170 ‘the young of the black goose-place’. It appears in several place-names as an independent component.

From the frequent use of qarauna in Eastern Turki place-names I conclude that this bird must have been very popular in the eyes of the native population. It must have been a bird worthy of attention and admiration.

For a tribal name one would normally have expected a term or an epithet for an animal with some dramatic signification. From this starting-point Najip’s qaruna = qorulaz meaning ‘griffin-vulture’, ‘steppe-eagle’ has a certain advantage over qarauna meaning ‘black goose’. On the other hand, Najip’s recording is a solitary instance, compared with the frequent occurrence of qarauna in Hedin’s diaries.

Finally – Pelliot’s statement that qarauna is a true Mongolian name does not exclude its appearance in a border area such as Lop-nor where Mongolian and Eastern Turki in its Lop-form exist together.

NOTES
5. Originally cited by Quatremeré from the Tarikh-i-Wassaf and discussed by N. Elias in A History of the Moghuls of Central Asia being the Turkh-i-Rashidi of Mirza Muhammad Haidar, Dughlat ... London 1898, pp. 76–77, 491–492, and more in detail by Pelliot, Notes, 1, pp. 183–196.
7. In the Lund University Library.
9. In the National Archives of Sweden, Stockholm.
Holy Adultery

The Interpretation of the Story of Judah and Tamar (Gen 38) in the Genuine Hymns of Ephraem Syrus (ca. 306–373)

TRYGGVE KRONHOLM, Uppsala

On account of You [Oh, Son of Mary], / women rushed after men. / Tamar desired [rgt] the widowed man [gbr' d'rm], / Ruth loved the aged man. / Even Rachab who captured men, / became captured by You.

Tamar set out; / and in darkness she stole the light [gmbt nwh], / in impurity she stole holiness [gmbt qwds'], / and in nakedness she entered as a thief / unto You, Oh, Honourable One [yqyr'], who make pure / the licentious.

Satan saw this; / he came in haste and alarm, in order to prevent it. / He pronounced the sentence, but she was not alarmed; / [he advocated] stoning and sword, but she did not fear. / The Master of Adultery [mlp gwr'] tried to prevent adultery, / in order to prevent You.

Verily, it was a holy thing, [qwds' hw' gyr] / the adultery of Tamar [gwrh dtmr], on account of You [mltk]. / She thirsted for You [lk shy' hwr], Oh, Pure Source. / She stole from Judah the drink of You. / The thirsty spring stole the drink of You [gmbt šwŷk] / from his source.

She became a widow [hwt 'rlt'] / on account of You [mltk]. She yearned for You [lk hw rgt], / she rushed away and turned even a prostitute [twb znyt'] / on account of You [mtwlk]. She waited eagerly for You [lk hw hwšl], / she kept watch and became [mrīt ṣhwṭ] a hierodule [qwdš']. / She was in love with You [lk hw ṭml].

Ruth brings the good tidings / that she was searching for Your richness. Moab went therein, / Tamar should rejoice! Her Lord came, / He who pronounced her name.
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The Son of her lord went in. / And her byname [ʾp kwnyḥ] cried to You / that You should come to her [dʿtʾ sʿdyḥ].

On account of You they became licentious [bk ʾzdll] /, the honourable ones, You who make all chaste. / [Tamar] stole You at the crossroad [byt ʾwrḥḥ', Gen 38,14], / where You prepared the way towards the Kingdom [of Heaven]. Since she had stolen life [dḥyʾ gnbʾ] the sword [ṣypʾ] was unable / to kill her.

In these verses from his hymn De Nativitate (IX,7–13), the Syrian Church Father Ephrem (ca. 306–373), gives us in condensed form an expression of his conception of the story of Judah and Tamar and, in particular, of the adultery of Tamar.

In its tune and details, although not in its Christology, this poetic exposition deviates considerably from the more restrained and sober exegesis of Gen 38 displayed by Ephrem in his well-known prose commentary on Genesis and Exodus (Sancti Ephraem Syri in Genesim et in Exodum commentarii, ed. R.-M. Tonneau. Louvain 1955 [Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, vol. 152; versio, vol. 153], Syriac text, 96–98; cf. Hidal 1974). In his hymns Ephrem explicitly advocates the idea that Tamar’s adultery in reality was something holy, since the measures she was taking were performed solely with an end to the coming of the Messiah.

Christologically inclined expositions of Gen 38 of this nature are found scattered in many of Ephrem’s genuine hymns, above all in the collections De Ecclesia, De Nativitate, and De Virginitate.

Superficially seen, such an interpretation of the story of Judah and Tamar is remarkable, in some respects even astonishing, for neither the ancient Syriac Church in general nor Saint Ephrem, its foremost poet, are particularly remembered for their tolerant attitude towards adultery. Rather, it appears that adultery in these circles was normally considered as one of the most wicked of sins against the divine commandments, not seldom the gravest one of all mortal sins. The question naturally presents itself: What are the roots of this opinion of Tamar’s adultery? This appears to be worth discussing for a number of reasons.

In the first place, exegetical research concerning Gen 38 during the past century has resulted in a general perplexity regarding the story of Judah and Tamar, both as to its position within the framework of the patriarchal narratives in Genesis, and as to its own meaning and function as intended by the redactors of Genesis (see especially the contributions by Luther 1906; Cassuto 1929; Pfeiffer 1930; Th. H. Robinson 1933; Noth 1934; Ben-Mordecai 1939; Zimmermann 1945; Mendelsohn 1948; Simpson 1948; Kuhl 1952; Strauman 1956; Bloch 1958; G. R. Driver 1958; Fensham 1962; Aharoni 1963; Astrour 1966; Blenkinsopp 1966; Leach 1966; Kaiser 1968; Moretti 1968; Redford 1970; Coats 1972; Emmanuelli 1972; Martin-Archard 1972; de Vaux 1972; Emmanuelli 1973; Lipinski 1973; Ymauchi 1973; Emmanuel 1974; Hoogewou 1974; Thompson 1974; Diebner-Schulte 1975; Emerton 1975; Gilad 1975; Westermann 1975; Emerton 1976; Pennacchini 1976; Buss 1977; Goldin 1977; I. Robinson 1977; Westermann 1977–81; Rogerson 1978; Emerton 1979; Niditch 1979; Westermann 1981ff.; with further references).
Secondly, recent contributions to the history of the exegesis of Gen 38 in early Jewish and Christian sources have revealed a similar, and it some respects more fundamental, perplexity in antiquity in relation to this text (see e.g. Ginzberg 1909–38; Belkin 1969/70; Johnson 1969; Hidal 1974; Hultgård 1977; and Petit 1987).

Thirdly, it is often argued that the early Christian understanding of Gen 38 in Messianic/Christological categories constitutes a radical break with the early Jewish interpretation. For instance, in her fresh and insightful survey, entitled “Exploitations non bibliques des thèmes de Tamar et de Genèse 38. Philon d’Alexandrie; textes et traditions juives jusqu’aux Talmudim”, Madeleine Petit adduces and discusses briefly the relevant texts in the works of Philo of Alexandria and the major rabbinic sources, leading her to the conclusion: “L’identification de Jésus au Messie est alors cause de la rupture totale entre l’exégèse juive et l’exégèse chrétienne” (ALEXANDRINA. Hellénisme, judaïsme et christianisme à Alexandrie. Mélanges offert au P. Claude Mondésert, Paris 1987, 77–115; quotation, p. 113; I am indebted for this reference to Dr. Sebastian Brook, Oxford). Being of the conviction that the early Christian identification of Jesus with the Messiah led by necessity to basing the Christological message essentially on extant Jewish Messianic interpretation, I consider even such a late specimen of Christological exposition of the Old Testament as the poetical interpretations a 4th century Church Father an excellent point of departure in order to illustrate the dependence of the Early Church on prevalent Messianic exegesis in the ancient Jewish community.

I

The major features of Ephrem’s conception of the story of Judah and Tamar are the following:

Tamar did really disguise herself, she did act as a prostitute, and she did commit adultery, but all this was done out of love for the King, the Messiah:

Since the King was hidden [ks’ hw’] in Judah, / Tamar stole him from his loins [gabth tmr mn hsḥ].

Today the splendour shone forth, / the beauty embraced by her love [rḥm’]

(Nat I,12).

Ephrem admits that Tamar wandered along ways of darkness with respect to Christian ethics, but she did so, he asserts, in order to steal the Messianic light (Nat IX,7–13). Since her two previous husbands – Er and Onan – had died, Tamar took, out of fidelity towards her family, the disgraceful place as a prostitute at the cross-road. Through this apparent disgrace, nevertheless, she contributed to removing the disgrace of the human family. Tamar’s connivance was exposed, to the profit of men: as she believed that the King was to descend from Judah, she stole His seed, taking His symbols as a pledge (Virg XXII,19f). Tamar went forth in impurity in order to steal holiness. She clothed herself in nakedness in order to find the Honourable One. She acted as a licentious woman, but only for the sake of Christ. She was eagerly rushing towards Christ. Sitting as a sacred prostitute,
she awaited His coming. On the cross-road she was a stealer of Christ, who is Himself the way to the Kingdom of God. She thirsted for the Pure Source. She was sitting as a widow for Christ, yearning for him (Nat IX,7–13).

Ephrem also interprets the courage of Tamar in this light: she was not afraid of the imminent death sentence (it is of note that Ephrem states that she feared neither stoning nor sword, although the Biblical texts themselves speak of burning). The sword, Ephrem asserts, was no longer able to kill her, for she had stolen life itself. (Nat IX,7–13). Admittedly, Tamar was a thief, but she stole the Medicine of Life from the merchant (the idea of Judah as being a “merchant” is obviously taking from the fact that he “married a Canaanite”, interpreted as a “merchant”; cf b Pes 50a). She had even stolen righteousness from sin itself: sin had been a thief, but the sentence ultimately pronounced actuated the defeat of sin and took its victory away from it (Eccl XI,10).

Ephrem further notes that Tamar was justified through the confession of Judah (Nat XV,8). She had, moreover, taken from him the sweet perfume – in contrast to Potiphar’s wife, whose garment did not convey any smell at all of Joseph, the chaste one (Nat XVI,14).

In this drama Ephrem even sees a role for Satan, whom he styles “the Master of Adultery”. He notes ironically that the master sought to prevent this very act of adultery, in order to prevent the advent of Christ (Nat IX,9). Ephrem also sees Death: although wakeful, Death was bereaf of its wages by the Lord (Eccl XI,10).

These are some prominent features in Ephrem’s hymnic interpretation of the biblical story of Judah and Tamar. Even to a cursory reader it is immediately striking that Ephrem’s understanding of this story cannot be taken as merely a piece of poetic exposition. Rather, it leaves the impression of being a specimen of consistent exegesis. Where do we find the origins of such a positive attitude towards Tamar’s adultery with Judah?

II

At a first sight it might be held that Ephrem’s treatment of Gen 38 is aimed at integrating a disputable Biblical text smoothly into its proper place in the framework of Christian morals, as his interpretations are akin to those found in many comments by the Church Fathers on the story of the wife of Potiphar, the story of Rachab, the story of Ruth, the story of Bathsheba, the story of the Samaritan woman in the Gospel among others. Confronted with Ephrem’s positive treatment of the Judah-Tamar story, we might be tempted to suppose that he merely develops the elements of the genealogy of Jesus according to the Gospel of St. Matthew (1,1–17), where four women of discrepable character or origin are listed as ancestors of the Messiah, namely Tamar, Rachab, Ruth, and Bathsheba (the latter merely styled “the wife of Uriah”, v 6).

What may be easily forgotten, however, is the fact that the problem of the presence of these women in the genealogy of the Messiah had long since been debated within the mainstream of ancient Judaism. Thus, both in pre-Christian Jewish sources and in the traditional rabbinic literature, we encounter numerous
references to Tamar, designed to emphasize her supernatural motives and her righteousness.

Since Petit has already adduced the relevant texts in Philo and a number of rabbinic texts (1987:78-88 and 88-112 respectively), I will merely present the problem by focusing on a few rabbinic texts having a Messianic understanding of the pericope, with a systematic rather than historical approach.

To the rabbis, Tamar was the daughter of Shem, identical with Melchisedec of Salem, the priest of the Most High. It is unclear, whether “daughter” is to be taken in the literal sense, or merely as meaning “descendant”. Now, this Shem was not merely a priest. He was also the head of a court. Accordingly the punishment applicable to a priest’s daughter taken in adultery was not strangulation/stoning, as in normal cases, but burning. It was also before the Court of Shem that Tamar eventually receives her right (see e.g. b Abodah Zarah 36b; Makkot 2a, 23b; Yebamot 34ab; Ketubim 67b). To judge from the rabbinic literature, the significant point in Gen 38 is the confession of Judah: the rabbis are keen to note that Tamar most justly left it to Judah to make the confession (b Megillah 25a; Baba Mesiah 59a, cf also Sotah 10b; Ketubim 67b; Berakot 43b).

Curiously, the rabbis ascertain that Tamar had so far remained a virgin, in spite of having been married to two men. The problem with these men was that they had indulged solely in unnatural intercourse. The rabbis claim to know that Tamar exercised friction with her finger, so as to destroy her virginity and be able to conceive from a first contact with Judah (b Yebamot 34ab). They also interpret the concluding phrase, “And he knew her again [no] more” (Gen 38:26) as actually meaning “and he knew her again without ceasing”, i.e. in a kind of coitus perpetuus (b Sotah 10b).

The significant aspects of the rabbis’ appreciation of Gen 38 in our context are, however, the connexions between the story and the Messianic expectations. These are extracted by the rabbis from several minutaie of the text. When it is said, for example, that Tamar’s father-in-law was “going up to Timnah” (Gen 38:13), this formulation is connected with the opposite one in Judges 14:1 where Samson is described as “going down to Timnah”. From this the rabbis conclude that Samson went to Timnah to be disgraced, whereas Judah went up to Timnah, “since he was going to be exalted in it” [as Perez was born there, and from him later on King David] (b Sotah 10ab; Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,6). In the same Talmudic context there is included a dialogue of homiletic nature between Judah and Tamar. It runs: “When [Judah] solicited her, he asked: ‘Art thou perhaps a Gentile?’ She replied: ‘I am a proselyte!’ – ‘Art thou perhaps a married woman?’ She replied: ‘I am unmarried.’ – ‘Perhaps thy father has accepted on thy behalf betrothals [so that thou belongeth to another man]?’ – She replied: ‘I am an orphan!’ – ‘Perhaps thou art unclean?’ She replied: ‘I am clean!’” (b Sotah 10a; Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,7). This dialogue might be seen as alluding to the adultery’s being committed with a view to the Torah, although naturally contrary to the Torah. This is in fact underlined in several other Talmudic texts. Repeatedly, it is stated that “every bride who is modest in the house of her father-in-law is rewarded by having kings and prophets among her descendants” (b Megillah 10b); it is even stated by R. Ulla,
Babylonian Amora of the third generation, that “Tamar committed adultery and gave birth to kings and prophets” (b Nazir 23b; cf. Hor 10b).

This idea is connected with the conviction that Tamar’s adultery was nothing like a common case of adultery. Tamar’s deed “was actuated by a pure motive” (Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,2). R. Nahman b. Isak (BA 4) commented: “A transgression with good intention is more meritorious than the performance of a commandment with no intention...” (b Horayot 10b). Here we come across the idea of Tamar’s intent: she acted as she did in view of the House of David. Similarly, it is stated that Judah, on seeing Tamar, wished to go on without touching her, but the Holy One, Blessed be He, made the angel who is in charge of desire appear before him, and say to him: “Whither goest thou, Judah? Whence then are kings to arise, whence are redeemers to arise”. Thereupon, he turned unto her – “in spite of himself and against his own wish” (Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,8).

This concept is even further developed in the traditional Midrash, where we find the following dictum by R. Samuel b. Nahman: “When the tribal ancestors were engaged in selling Joseph, Jacob was occupied with his sackcloth and fasting, and Judah was busy taking a wife, the Holy One, blessed be He, was creating the light of Messiah” (Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,1). In addition it is stated: “Before the last one who was to enslave [Israel] was born [i.e. Pharaoh], the first redeemer was born [i.e. Perez].” The rabbis also connect the words “Wherefore hast thou made a breach for thyself” (Gen 38,29) with the Messiah, according to Mich 2:13: “This one is greater than all who will make breaches, for from thee will arise [he of whom it is written], ‘The breaker is gone up before them’ (Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,14). Moreover, the rabbis ascertain that the pledge given to Tamar was in reality “a holy spirit enkindled within her”, the signet referring to royalty, the cord to the Sanhedrin, and the staff to the royal Messiah (Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,9). With the rabbis we also find the idea of Satan’s interest in this case of adultery. Thus, R. Eleazar (PA 3?), claims that “after [Tamar’s] proofs [the signet, the cord, and the staff] had been found, Samael [the angel of evil, later identified with Satan] came and removed them, and Gabriel [one of the four Archangels] came and restored them, while Tamar herself remained “a silent dove” (Sot 10b).

However, the attempts to understand the story of Gen 38 in a morally favourable light are even older. We know that scribes and scholars of Judaism in antiquity were greatly concerned with this story from the outset. Let us look at a few of them.

III

Even the modern reader of the Book of Genesis is likely to find the story of Judah and Tamar – its nature as well as its function – greatly puzzling. The immediate impression evoked is that Gen 38 stands out as a Fremdkörper among the narratives of the Joseph cycle (Gen 37–50). Moreover, the actual character of the account of Judah’s intercourse with Tamar, his daughter-in-law, and the consequent birth of their sons Perez and Zerah, is far from obvious in the biblical text. Is it merely an entertaining novel – fictitious or semi-fictitious – on a beloved theme of ancient Near Eastern tales, that of the younger son (Perez) being preferred to or
chosen over the older one (Er/Onan)? Is it a story of the rehabilitation of a mistreated woman? Or is it a pious tale about the religious efficacy of final and full confession, here to Judah's confession? Or is the theme, as often in the Book of Genesis, to delineate the workings of the hidden guidance of God, i.e. eine Führungsgeschichte? Or: the crucial narrative might be regarded as basically a piece of tribal history, mirroring events in the expansion of the clan of Judah, even in the prevalence of the Perezzite branch, possibly a specimen of a Familienerzählung, somehow related to the House of Jacob? The scholarly suggestions go even further. Was the story perhaps originally a non-Israelite tale, e.g. a Canaanite story of the heroine Tamar, that was later Judaized by redactional means? Indeed, it has even been mentioned that the story might be an Israelite transformation of Mesopotamian mythological vestigial motifs from the sphere of astral speculations (Istar-Tamar) or from the field of cultic prostituion (Tamar the qedesha).

In the Masoretic text, the story of Judah and Tamar is inserted in the Joseph cycle (Gen 37–50) between the account of Joseph's dreams and subsequent sale into Egypt (Gen 37) and the story of Joseph's temptation (Gen 39). That the story is an insertion is seen from many details. In particular it is obvious that the redactors are picking up the narrative thread from Gen 37:36 at the beginning of chapter 39: “When Joseph was taken to Egypt...” (cf. Emerton 1975:349 [Haran]; Goldin 1977:27, note 4; 28, note 5).

In our context it is rewarding to note the difficulty felt by the rabbis as regards the inclusion of Gen 38 in the Joseph cycle. The Midrash records three major different solutions to the problem why Gen 38 was placed between Gen 37:36 and Gen 39:1.

1. The first opinion is attributed to the Tanna (?) R. Leazar: “[Gen 38 was inserted there] in order to bring ‘descent’ in connexion with ‘descent’” (kdy lsmwk yrydh lyrydh, Genesis Rabbah LXXV,2). This statement obviously alludes to the Stichwort-arrangement found in the relation between Gen 39:1 (“When Joseph had been taken down to Egypt”, we-Yosef hurad misrayma), and Gen 38:1 (“And Judah went down”, way-yered Yehuda), most probably, however, also to the moral parallel between the bringing down to slavery in Egypt of the innocent Joseph and the going down to a Canaanite woman of the self-degrading Judah.

2. The second opinion recorded in the Midrash is expressed in a statement by the Palestinian Amora R. Johanan b. Nappaha (c. 180–279). R. Johanan argues fairly similar to R. Leazar, but he points to another pair of Stichwörter as motivation for the Pentateuchal position of Gen 38: “[The story was inserted] in order to bring ‘Do you recognize’ in connexion with ‘Do you recognize’” (kdy lsmwk hkr n’ lhkr n’, Genesis Rabbah, loc. cit.). This explanation, referring to the correspondence between the exclamation hakkaer-nâ, uttered by the sons of Jacob to their father (Gen 37:32) and the same expression in Tamar’s words to her father-in-law (Gen 38:25), though primarily aiming at the Stichwort-arrangement, probably bears the additional connotation of Judah as being met by a divine jis talionis (cf. the
3. The third, and final, view of the inclusion of Gen 38 transmitted in Midrash Rabbah is advanced by R. Samuel b. Nahman, active in Tiberias in the third century: “[The chapter was inserted] in order to bring ‘the story of Tamar’ in connexion with ‘the story of the wife of Potiphar’, teaching that as the former was motivated by the sake of Heaven, so was the latter” (kdy lsnwk m’sh tmr lm’sh ’št pwtypr mh zw lšwm šnym ’p zw lšwm šnym, Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,2). In R. Samuel’s opinion, to which a kind of literary Gattung argument is basic, the inclusion of Gen 38 in immediate relation to Gen 39 expressed a redactional intent to emphasize the motif similarity and the moral contrast between the two stories. Notwithstanding the fact that the three views referred to above exhibit the normal rabbinical mixture of sound and speculative exegesis, they are unanimous in testifying to a clear awareness of the peculiar nature and role of Gen 38.

However, in the pseudopigraphic Book of Jubilees, which seems to have been composed sometime between 175 and 100 B.C.E., the story of Judah and Tamar (roughly corresponding to Gen 38:6–18, 20–26, 29–30, though in a more pronounced moral tone that in the Masoretic text) was inserted immediately after the tales of Pharaoh’s dreams and the elevation and marriage of Joseph to the daughter of Potiphar (Jub 40:1–21; cf. Gen 41:1–5, 7–9, 14ff. 25, 20–30, 34, 36, 38.43, 45–46, 49) and before the announcement that the seven years of fruitfulness had been fulfilled, of which Joseph had spoken to Pharaoh (41:22; cf. Gen 41:51), i.e. in a place roughly corresponding to Gen 41 in the Masoretic arrangement. However, before the thread of the Joseph story is taken up again by the report of Jacob’s sending his sons to Egypt for corn (Jub 42:1–4; cf Gen 41:54, 56; 42:1–4), we find a strongly moralizing account of the confession of Judah that he had lain with his daughter-in-law, including accounts of his repentance. While we are told that Judah received forgiveness because of his confession, it is obvious that the sens moral is a general warning against illicit sexual intercourse between a man and his daughter-in-law (or mother-in-law): such an offense is to be punished by burning with fire. The problem of why the seed of Judah and Tamar had not been destroyed is solved simply by the supposition that the two previous husbands of Tamar (Er and Onan) had never slept with her (Jub 41,23–28). Thus, the episode of Judah and Tamar in the Book of Jubilees testifies to a scholarly struggle with the questions of the character and role of the story in the Hellenistic Judaism of the second century B.C. The ethically dubious nature of the narrative was felt to be in need of moral adjustment, and the apparently unsatisfactory relation between the story and the Joseph cycle led to a replacement, obviously questioning the traditional function of the story.

The various comments by Philo Judaeus (c. 20 B.C.E. – 50 A.D.) on the story of Judah and Tamar evidence a consciousness of difficulties of a similar nature (see esp. De Virtutibus CCXXI–CCXXII; further e.g. De somniis II,44; De Mutatione Nominum XXIII,135; Hypothetica CXXV–CXXVI; cf. Petit 1987:78–88). On the
whole, Philo is forced to make use of the most extreme allegorical interpretations in order to find the story meaningful: Judah stands out as “the investigator, the lover of learning, who refuses to leave aught of the things that are veiled, unexamined and unexplored”, while Tamar is understood as “the art or science that is studied”, positively seducing Judah, “the chief captain”, to become her lover. There can hardly be any doubt that Goldin (1977) is justified in posing the conjecture that “such rarefied interpretation reflect Philo’s reaction to the peculiar position of the chapter, as thought to say, The literal sense and arrangement must mean more that meets the eye”.

It is also worth noting that there is hardly any reflection of the tale of Judah and Tamar in the New Testament, although we might point to minor allusions to Gen 38 in the controversy between Jesus and the Sadducees on the consequences of the levirate marriage (recorded in the synoptic gospels: Matt 22:24; Mark 12:19; Luke 20:28), although of course, the reference to Deut 25:5–10 is much more obvious. Moreover, be referring primarily to 1 Chron 2:3–4, the notice in the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew’s version (1:3) – probably dating from the 60’s A.D. – that “Judah was the father of Perez and Zarah [their mother was Tamar]”, in one way or other “reveals its relationship with rabbinical speculation on the ancestry of the Messiah...drawn from a tradition which was aware of the stories in Gen 38 concerning Tamar’s harlotry and Judah’s illicit relationship with her” (Johnson 1969). Additional allusions to Gen 38 might be present in John 8:41 (Gen 38:24) and Luke 3:33 (Gen 38:29).

A strikingly positive view of the role of Tamar is found in Pseudo-Philo’s Liber Antiquitarum Bibliarum, probably compiled shortly after 70 A.D. In a little paraphrase to the Tamar episode – curiously treated in connexion with traditions recorded in the beginning of the Book of Exodus and not with the Jacob or Joseph cycles – Pseudo-Philo styles Tamar mater nostra, putting into her mouth an idealizing and moralizing dictum: “Melius mihi est socero meo commixte mori, quam genitus commisceri” (IX,5).

In the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs – the original Jewish material of which might derive from the first half of the 1st century B.C., though its present Christian redaction probably dates from the 2nd or 3rd century A.D (cf. Hultgård 1977) – we come across a very elaborated account of the relation between Judah and Tamar (Test Judah 8; 10–17). The extremely moralizing tone of the account suggests that it was mainly used as a means of condemning fornication, drinking, avarice etc. It is difficult to decide the corresponding Pentateuchal context, into which Test Judah inserts elements of the story of Judah and Tamar. Chapter 8 of Test Judah is preceded by a narrative of the battle of Judah and Dan against the king of the city of Gaash, maintaining that Judah built the city of Themna at the age of twenty, while his father built Paba. Chapter 9, on the other hand, gives an account of the war between Jacob and Esau (cf. Jub 37:1–38:14). The latter section of Test Judah contains various admonitions, and it concludes with a description of Judah’s death and burial at Hebron (26:2–4).

It is also obvious that the early rabbis, viz. the Tannaim, were greatly confused by the position, nature and function of the biblical narrative of Judah and Tamar. The well-known Mishnaic decision to the effect that “the story of Tamar be read
out and interpreted” (ma’ase Tamar niqra u-mittargem, Megillah IV,10) naturally reflects a fierce debate on Gen 38 in Tannaitic times. And the corresponding Gemara (b Megillah 25a) as well as a number of other Talmudic comments on the story (spec. b Sotah 10b; Baba Qammah 92a; Baba Mešiah 59a; Makkot 11b. 23b) make evident that the rabbis regarded the biblical confession of Judah as the central issue of the narrative, this confession being taken i a twofold sense: an acknowledgement of sin and proclamation of the name of YHWH (the latter leading to a connexion between the name of Judah (yhwdh) and the Tetragrammaton (YHWH, b Sotah 10b). This conclusion concerning the central position of the confession of Judah in the rabbinic understanding of the contents of Gen 38 is strongly brought out by the fact that this is the main theme also in the Targum Neophyti I and the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, both of which contain an rather expanded commentary on Gen 38,25. Even in the traditional Midrash great emphasis is laid on the confession of Judah (Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,11—12). However, the Midrash also suggests a further central theme, viz. that “the Holy One, blessed be He, was creating the light of the Royal Messiah” (hqb”h bwr ’www šl mlk hmşyh, LXXXV,1, a dictum attributed to R. Samuel b. Nahman, a Palestinian Amora of the third century; cf. b Sotah 10b) – a theme which more frequently takes the form of stressing Judah’s role as an ancestor of the House of David (e.g. b Megillah 10b; Yebamoth 76b; Nazir 23 b; Sotah 10-ab; Horayot 10b).

Moreover, while pious Jewish and Christian poems of antiquity (such as the Carmina Ephraemi of the fourth century and Piyyute Yannai of the fifth through seventh) sing the praise of the righteousness of Judah and the sanctity of Tamar, obviously solving the enigma of Gen 38 by regarding Perez a kind of Messianic type – more critical exegeses of the Middle Ages, like Rashi (1040–1105), Ibn Esra (1089–1164), and Obadiah ben Jacob Sorno (c. 1470 – c. 1550) resisted solving the difficulties of Gen 38 solely by means of edifying interpretations. Rather they formulated anew the never solved problem. As Rashi poses it: “Why was this section [Gen 38] inserted here so as to split the section of Joseph?” (lmh nsmky pršh zw lк’н wʰpsq bpršw šl wesp, ad Gen 38:1). Similarly, Ibn Ezra gives a notion of the chronological difficulties involved (ad Gen 38:1), and Obadiah Sorno feels compelled to explain the position of Gen 38 by referring to the parallel between Jacob’s loss of his son Joseph on account of Judah’s counsel and Judah’s loss of his two own sons (Er and Onan). It is not difficult to see that none of these medieval exegetes find themselves comfortable with the solutions attempted.

IV

Ephrem’s Christologically inspired interpretation of the story of Judah and Tamar as a story of holy adultery is in principle founded on early Christian tradition, as apparent in the genealogy of Jesus according to St. Matthew. But this tradition is rooted in a Messianic exegesis prevalent in ancient Judaism, as preserved particularly in the rabbinic sources, despite the fact that some of the relevant dicta derive from rabbis of the 4th century C.E. and that several of the sources were compiled after the time of Ephraem Syrus. From the sources alluded to above, it is evident that there was such a positive interpretation of Judah and Tamar long before
Ephraem. The basis of this appreciation is, of course, the role of Judah as the ancestor of the House of King David. Accordingly, the story, much like the stories of Ruth and Bathsheba, must be regarded as a kind of Führungs geschichte, in which the real actor is the Holy One himself, who by way of the apparent adultery of Judah and Tamar was in fact generating "the light of the Royal Messiah" (Genesis Rabbah LXXXV,1).

This is precisely the major point in Ephrem's hymns. He readily admits the adultery of Judah and Tamar, but insists that Judah was driven by the Holy Spirit. As was Tamar; she desired the Messiah and longed for his light so that her adultery was a holy act, and she a saintly woman:

Since the King was hidden in Judah,
Tamar stole him from his loins (Nat I,12).

This is to Ephrem holy adultery. But so it also was long before in the synagogue, and so it continued, as we see from the Piyyute Yannai. Thus, once again it has turned out that Ephraem Syrus – the pronounced Anti-Semite – was a disciple of Jewish tradition, whether directly or indirectly. In this case he presents two of the forebears of the Jewish people as being united in holy adultery out of love for the Royal Messiah.
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Zeitgenössische Begebenheiten in der Volksfrömmigkeit der Kopten

OTTO F. A. MEINARDUS, Ellerau


die Kirche durch das Votum eines ihrer Bischöfe diese ungewöhnliche Begebenheit bestätigt. Die angeführten Lithophanien fallen in das weite Gebiet der unbestätigten Frömigkeitspraktiken und müssen als solche bewertet werden. Dasselbe gilt auch für die Verbreitung der 'Foto-Amulette', die sich seit einiger Zeit einer gewissen Popularität erfreuen.

Die sechs Beiträge sind eigenständige Aufsätze, die in keiner Weise miteinander verbunden sind. Ihre Gemeinsamkeiten ergeben sich lediglich aus der angegebenen Zeitspanne der letzten dreißig Jahre.

ZUR RENAISSANCE DER HEILIGEN-VEREHRUNG


Die urchristliche Vorstellung des corpus incorruptus findet neue Bestätigung in

dem unversehrten Leichnam des hl. Bisada und zeichnete sich auf der Hülle des hl. Domatius ab. So die Aussagen des Abtes, des Bischofs Basilius as-Samwili.3


von den Gläubigen verehrt. Als Wanderheiliger erschien Abûnâ 'Abd al-Masih vielen Ägyptern aufgrund seiner unzähligen Wunder apostelgleich.10


ZU EINIGEN BESONDEREN PHÄNOMENEN VON HEILIGENERScheinungen


Periodisch, so das Zeugnis der koptischen Gläubigen, verläßt der knabenhafte Blutzuge seine Ikone über dem Reliquienschrein an der Nordwand des Kirchenschiffs und gesellt sich zu den Kindern, die im Innenhof der Wallfahrtsanlage spielen. Im Innenhof befindet sich auch jener Brunnen, der der hl. Familie Wasser spendete, als sie auf der Flucht vor Herodes im Nil-Delta Schutz suchte und in Samannud rastete.


ZUR LICHTERSCHEINUNG ÜBER DEM PAULUSKLOSTER


Im Zuge der Renaissance des koptischen Mönchentums, besonders in den vier Klöstern im Wadi 'n-Natrün, ergab sich die Notwendigkeit auch für die Mönche des Paulusklosters sich dieser Wiederbelebung bewußt zu werden. So wurde das Pauluskloster einbezogen in die von Papst Shenute III. gesteuerte Bewegung die spirituellen Qualitäten des Mönchentums in die koptischen Kirchengemeinden einfliessen zu lassen. Das bedeutete, daß auch das Pauluskloster für Pilgerinnen und Pilger geöffnet werden mußte. Nicht mehr Abgeschiedenheit von einer teuflischen Welt, sondern Aufgeschlossenheit für die geistlichen Bedürfnisse einer im islamischen Raum lebenden Kirche. War im Februar 1904 die Koptologin Agnes Smith Lewis und ihre Begleiterin Margaret Dunlop Gibson noch in einem Netz eingeschnürt mit einer Winde auf die Klostermauer hochgezogen worden, so können heutzutage Frauen in besonderen Gästequartieren außerhalb der Klostermauer übernachten.


Diese klösterliche Renaissance, so glauben die Mönche, erhielt durch die Lichterscheinung göttliche Bestätigung der lokalen Erneuerungsbestrebungen. Es ist bemerkenswert, daß die Lichtkuppel weder über der Michaeliskirche noch über der MerkuriusKirche (Abū 's-Saifain), sondern über der alten, unterirdischen Pauluskirche mit dem Sarkophag des ersten Eremiten erschien. Somit erhielt durch dieses Lichtwunder der von vielen Christen fast vergessene Urvater des christlichen Mönchentums eine zeitgenössische Aufwertung.

Zum ersten Mal, m.W., berichten die Paulusmönche auch von einem aus Palmenfasern hergestellten wundertätigen Gewand. Diese Palmenfasern-Tunika, einst vom hl. Paulus getragen, ging nach seinem Tod an den hl. Antonius über, der

ZUR SCHWIMMENDE BIBEL IN MA’ADI


1. Zur Tradition des Auffindungsortes


Zusätzlich wird diese Stätte mit der biblischen Überlieferung der Flucht der heiligen Familie nach Ägypten in Zusammenhang gebracht. So berichtet der o.g. armenische Historiker, daß einstmals an diesem Ort die Israeliten, die in Ägypten in Knechtschaft lebten, hier ein Gotteshaus hatten. Als die heilige Familie nach Ägypten floh, rastete sie hier und bestieg ein Segelboot mit dem sie nach Oberägypten segelten. Die Kopten errichteten zu Ehren der Gottesmutter eine Kirche und nannten sie »al-Martūtī«, eine Verballhornung des griechischen Wortes »mater theou«, Mutter Gottes.4

Beide Traditionen, sowohl die Errettung des Findelkindes Mose, als auch die Rast und Einschiffung der heiligen Familie an diesem Ort sind integraler Bestandteil der örtlichen koptischen Tradition.5 Die alten steinernen Stufen, die vom

Christus Bildnis in der St. Mark's Coptic Church, Agincourt, Toronto.
Kirchengelände zum Nil führen haben nicht nur der Pharaonentochter, sondern auch der heiligen Familie und dem koptischen Diakon gedient, um an den Nil hinunter zu steigen.


2. Zum Termin der Auffindung


Baûnah (Paoni) bis zum 10. Bâbah (Paopi) geht diese Bitte auf das maßvolle,
segensreiche Steigen des Nils.
Dachte man eventuell sogar an eine Wiederbelebung der alten koptischen Nil-
wasserweihe durch das Wort Gottes? Diese ursprüngliche Nilwasserweihe dürfte
bei den Kopten gegen Ausgang des 12. Jahrhunderts nicht mehr praktiziert worden
sein.9 Im Rahmen der koptischen Renaissance hat sich eine weitgehende Be-
sinnung auf ur-koptische Sitten und Gebräuche ergeben. Wäre es denkbar, daß
durch das vorsätzliche Eintauchen und Auffinden des Wortes Gottes dem Nil und
damit Ägypten gewisse Weihen zugesprochen werden könnten, die für alle Ägypt-
ter, aber besonders für die Kopten, von großem Segen sein würden?

3. Zur Schwimmenden Bibel
Eine der ersten Fragen bezüglich der schwimmenden Bibel bezieht sich auf die
Schwimmfähigkeit eines so großen und somit auch schweren Objekts. Man kann
davon ausgehen, daß die Bibel mit Einband an die 4 kg wiegt, und somit beim
Eintauchen wohl sofort untergegangen wäre.

So wie Jesus Christus auf dem Wasser wandelte (Mt 14,25) meinten auch seine
Jünger und die ihn später folgten, die Naturgesetze für sich ausser Kraft setzen zu
können. Obwohl Petrus, der seinem Herrn nahefierte, zu sinken begann (Mt
14,30), gibt es dennoch in den christlichen Legendensammlungen eine Vielzahl von
Geschichten über Märtyrer und Bekenner, die über die Fluten wandelten. Die
Märtyrer Secundus, Nazarius, Eugenia, Savinian, Blasius, Patroclus, Felix von
Sciglio schritten trockenem Fußes über Flüsse und Meere. Zahlreiche Bekenner
taten es ihnen gleich, so z.B. Maria Ägyptiaca, Bessarion, Felix, etc.10 Aber auch
außerhalb des spezifisch christlichen Kulturkreises berichten Sagen über vergleich-
bare Begebenheiten. Der Riese Orion hatte von Poseidon die Gabe erhalten über
das Meer hinzuschreiten (Apollodor I 4,3). Athene und Hermes wandelten auf
goldenen Sohlen über Wasser (Odyssey 1,97; 5,44f). Apuleius und Lukian wissen
von Zauberformeln die es ermöglichten, auf Wasser wie auf festem Boden zu
gehen (Philostratus, Christl. Leg. 64).

Ikonen, die nach orthodoxer Vorstellung die Kriterien und Eigenschaften ihrer


Vielmehr sollte man dieses wundersame Ereignis als eine heilsgeschichtliche Begebenheit im Rahmen der koptischen Renaissance deuten.


ZU DEN KOPTISCHEN LITHOPHANIE N IM QASR ASCH-SCHAM' (ALT-K AIRO)

Bei der an der südlichen Seite der Säule sich darstellenden Gottesmutter handelt es sich um die auffälligste Lithophanie. Sie mißt von oben nach unten 31.5 cm und 'zeigt' eine Maria, die sich liebkosend ihrem Sohn zuwendet, der sich an sie schmiegt, ähnlich dem byzantinischen Typus der Elëusa-Glycophylousa. Die an die Säule gelehnte Ikone stellt die byzantinische Gottesmutter der Passion dar, auch bekannt als die Strastnaja. Diese Ikone hat keine Parallelen in den ikonographischen Mariendarstellungen der Kopten.

An der Nordseite der Säule wird dem Besucher eine kleine, 7,5 cm große, schwer erkennbare Lithophanie des Papstes Kirillus VI. gezeigt. Der Kult um den 1971 entschlafenen Papst Kirillus VI. übersteigt an Intensität und Popularität alle Heiligenverehrungen in der koptischen Kirche. Seine letzte Ruhestätte in der Krypta der St. Menas-Basilika zu Marieotis ist eine der volkstümlichsten und hochgeschätzten Wallfahrtsorte für die Kopten. Das Christusbildnis (8 cm) nach dem Turiner Leichentuch wird an der bevorzugten, zum Altar gewandten Ostseite der Säule gezeigt. Auch diese Lithophanie ist nur erkennbar, wenn der Ortspriester einen Druck des traditionellen Leichentuches daneben hält.

besonders die der Gottesmutter, natürlich auch unter dem Hintergrund der Kai-
rener Gottesmuttererscheinungen von Zeitūn im Jahre 1968 und von ‘Ard Baba-
deblu im Jahre 1986 zu sehen und zu bewerten haben.
Offensichtlich sind diese Lithophanien unter den weitgehend christlichen Be-
wohnern der Umgebung in den letzten Jahren bekannt geworden, so daß der
Ortsgeistliche und der Kirchenvorstand die Notwendigkeit eines Schutzes der
Säule in Erwägung ziehen mußten. Innerhalb kürzester Zeit wurde dementspre-
chend diese Säule in eine viereckige gläserne Vitrine eingeschlossen um zu verhin-
dern, daß Gläubige die Lithophanien der Heiligen berühren oder durch Abkratzen
beschädigen.

ZU KOPTISCHEN FOTO-AMULETTEN

Aufgrund der neuzeitlichen fototechnischen Erkenntnisse und Erfahrungen haben
besonders die koptischen Kioskhändler das Feld der ‘Heiligen-Fotografie’ nach


Marina-Fruchtbarkeitskult aus Athen nach Kairo übertragen haben. Die Mehrzahl der Besucher sind Frauen, Christen und Muslime.


NOTEN

»Zur Renaissance der Heiligen-Verehrung«
8. Cf. »Zu koptischen Fato-Amuletten«, Nr. 2.

»Zu einigen besonderen Phänomenen von Heiligen-Erscheinungen«
5. Diese Ikone ist ein Werk der Kopten Bidur Latif und Yussuf Nâssif in der St. Marks’s Coptic Orthodox Church zu Agincourt.

»Zur Lichterscheinung über dem Pauluskloster«

»Zur Schwimmenden Bibel in Ma’adi«

2. Ibid., 53b.
6. »The Holy Bible, which was found floating on the River Nile, by the ancient steps, on March 12, 1976.«

»Zu den koptischen Lithophanien im Qasr asch-Scham’ (Alt-Kairo)«

2. Höhe des Kapitells 17 cm, der Säule 141.5 cm und der Basis 69 cm.

»Zu koptischen Foto-Amulettren«

The Domestication of the Camel and the Establishment of the Frankincense Road from South Arabia

JAN RETSÖ, Gothenburg

INTRODUCTION: THE PROBLEM

‘Frankincense was brought from South Arabia to the Fertile Crescent on the camel’s back by Arab tribesmen.’ Thus one may summarize a long held traditional view on the economic role of the Arabian peninsula in antiquity. In older works on the history of the Middle East, this scenario is seen as more or less continuous from the earliest days of history down to the beginning of Islam.¹

An element of historical dynamism was introduced by W. F. Albright already in the 1940s. On several occasions he pointed out that the transport of goods across Arabia was impossible without camels and that there is clear evidence that the camel, i.e. the one-humped dromedary, had not been effectively domesticated before the 12th century B.C.² Consequently, the overland frankincense trade cannot have existed before this time, the main means of transportation then being the donkey. Albright’s basic argument for his dating of the introduction of domesticated camels was the absence of references to them in texts earlier than the Old Testament text Judges 6. There, the Midianites, the Amalekites and the ‘sons of the East’ are said to have had camels when invading Palestine, an invasion which took place around 1100 B.C.³ The Midianites and their colleagues would thus be the first documented camel bedouins in history. Albright did not exclude sporadic domestication before the 12th century B.C., but claimed that extensive use of the dromedary for riding and transport did not begin until that date. The story of the queen of Sheba’s visit to Solomon and the ample use of frankincense in the Israelite cult show that the trade with South Arabia was in full swing in the 10th century B.C.⁴

The ensuing debate was concentrated on the question whether there is evidence for domesticated camels earlier than 1100 B.C. This was claimed by Free (1944), Pohl (1950, 1952) and Epstein (1955), who alleged that there exists evidence from Egypt and Mesopotamia of the use of dromedaries for riding and transport long before the 12th century B.C.⁵ Their interpretation of the adduced evidence was rejected by de Vaux (1949), Walz (1954) and Mikesell (1955).⁶ In 1958 an important distinction was introduced by Dostal, who pointed out the importance of different types of saddles. The saddle which enables the rider to sit over the hind legs of the animal would be the oldest, dating from as early as 2500–2000 B.C. The cushion saddle, which makes riding on the hump possible, is not documented before the 9th century B.C.⁷ Dostal, like the others, did not challenge Albright’s dating of the appearance of large-scale camel-holding to the 11th century B.C. or its connection with the frankincense trade.⁸ At this time agreement had been
reached that the domestication of the camel must have been a long process corresponding to different degrees of tameness: from hunting to camel-herding for food, then transport and finally riding, where the development of more and more sophisticated saddles lasted for several centuries. The bone of contention was whether or not there are indications of use of camels for riding and transport before the 12th century B.C. The view that domestication and riding started already in the 4th millennium B.C. was put forward anew by Brentjes (1960), whereas von Wissmann (1960) stuck to Albright’s view. Zeuner (1963) claimed that the camel was used for riding and transport around 1800 B.C. In 1967 Dostal repeated his opinion, claiming that the oldest type of saddle was in use already in the 3rd millennium B.C.

As far as the incitements for the use of the camel for riding and transport are concerned, the summing up of the discussion undertaken by Bulliet in 1975 was a reaffirmation of Albright’s opinion. Bulliet also emphasizes the necessity of distinguishing degrees of domestication. The earliest form of human use of the camel would be for milk and primitive transport, as can be observed today in Somalia. This use may reach back to the beginning of the 2nd millennium B.C. and may first have been developed in South Eastern Arabia. Camel breeding then received a decisive impetus in the 12th century B.C. because of the demand for South Arabian frankincense. From the 9th century there is documentation of the cushion saddle which also made the camel useful in military combat.

Ripinsky’s (1975) attempt once more to push back the decisive domestication of the camel to the 4th millennium B.C. was repudiated by Zarins (1978). According to Zarins, unequivocal evidence for domestication of camels does not exist from before 500 B.C. even if it is likely that it took place long before that. In 1978 the important new evidence from Umm an-Nār in the eastern Persian Gulf was summarized by Compagnoni and Tosi, indicating East Arabia as the origin of the domestication of dromedaries. The importance of these finds has been increasingly recognized by scholars. According to Köhler’s thorough investigation (1981), the earliest exploitation of the camel was use of its dung for fuel. In the latest summary of the question, Zarins (1989) claims that domestication began somewhat earlier than indicated by the Umm an-Nār evidence, viz. in the late 3rd millennium B.C. The claim is based on evidence from the rock art of Arabia. Domestication is loosely defined as ‘human association with the camel’.

By and large, the view that the 13th/12th centuries constitute *a terminus a quo* for large scale camel-herding and riding has not changed considerably since Albright’s time. The most important result of the debate is the separation between domestication in itself and the use of the animal for transport and riding. The exact time for domestication thus depends on what is meant by the term. Since also the archaeological evidence is scanty, opinions still differ among scholars. The attempts to interpret the archaeological evidence from before the 12th century B.C. as indications of the use of the dromedary for riding and transport from the early stages of the domestication process have not convinced the majority of scholars. On the other hand, it is clear that man, in certain areas, has used the meat, milk and dung from the animal long before the beginning of the Iron Age. But the
appearance of the Midianites and their allies in Judges 6 is still seen as representing the crucial turning point in the relationship between man and camel.

Recently, however, N. Groom and P. Crone have, en passant, voiced doubts about the antiquity of frankincense trade with South Arabia, claiming that the earliest reliable references to frankincense in texts are from the 7th century B.C. The camel is not commented upon by them. Further, in his study of the history of Midian, E. A. Knauf has challenged the validity of the story about the Midianites in Judges 6–8 for such an early period. But he adduces new archaeological evidence for camelholding in Midian in the 12th century B.C., thus reconfirming Albright’s opinion.

Of the different perfumes included in the term incense, frankincense is the most famous one. It grows in the Dhofar area in South Arabia, on the island of Socotra and in Somalia. In Egypt, incense of different kinds from the Bab al-Mandab area is documented from the Old Kingdom and onwards. Down to the end of the Ramessid period it was carried mainly along the Red Sea shore by ship or overland through Eritrea and Nubia. Aromatics from South Arabia may even have reached Mesopotamia and Syria in the 2nd millennium B.C. Some may have come from Egypt, some via Oman and the Persian Gulf. There is no direct evidence that camels were involved in this traffic during the Bronze Age. Both these routes avoid the main obstacle, viz. the deserts of the Arabian peninsula. But the classical frankincense road runs through the Western Arabian desert areas and was, according to received opinion, possible to establish through camel caravans. It thus presupposes, not only camel domestication, but also know-how of handling it as a means for transport and, possibly, riding. We have seen that there is a general consensus among scholars since Albright’s time that these prerequisites were at hand at least from the 12th century B.C. and that, in fact, the demand for frankincense was the main reason for the development of large-scale camel-herding at this time.

It is obvious that the encounter between the camel, domesticated for riding and transport, and frankincense from Dhofar is an event of crucial interest for the history of the ancient world. It was this traffic that made frankincense available on a large scale to the homes and temples in the Middle East as well as in Greece and Rome. The transport overland from South Arabia to Syria of frankincense (and myrrh) was one of the major routes of trade in antiquity. The goods were in great demand and the prices were high. The control of the traffic was a central issue on the agenda of several ancient empires during many centuries. The process of its establishment is thus well worth investigating. For a picture of the interaction between camels, frankincense and the peoples along this road during the period 1200–500 B.C., the Syro-Palestinian evidence is crucial. The incense-road as described by Pliny in the 1st century A. D. starts in Yemen and ends in Southern Syria. The evidence from Yemen and the Arabian peninsula from the period is still too scanty and difficult to interpret. Since we have ample textual evidence from Palestine through the Old Testament and from Assyrian accounts together with well-dated archeological evidence, every attempt of tracing the development of the import of aromatics from South Arabia to Syria by camels must rely heavily on the Old Testament texts as well as the archaeology of Palestine.
The problem to be discussed in this study can thus be narrowed down to the questions concerning the establishment of the incense-traffic between South Arabia and Syria, the role of the camel in this period and the ethnic groups involved. If frankincense from South Arabia cannot be documented earlier than the 7th century B.C., as alleged by Groom and Crone, the question of camel domestication deserves to be reviewed. Was there a caravan traffic to South Arabia in the beginning of the Iron age? If the caravan traffic to South Arabia did not include frankincense before the 7th century what was its function? Which was the role of the camel during this period? When did the frankincense trade through Western Arabia start?

SOURCES AND METHOD

The sources are of two kinds: archaeological and textual. Among the archaeological sources we may include the pictorial ones where camels and sometimes also incense utensils are pictured. The texts consist of archaeologically recovered inscriptions in cuneiform writing in Akkadian, texts in Egyptian, and the Hebrew texts of the Old Testament which are the result of centuries of interpretation of traditions and copying by scribes.

The Akkadian texts and pictures from this period can often be dated with accuracy. In many cases we know the year when the texts were written. Furthermore, they have not been tampered with after being written but have remained as they were. The propagandistic distortions and tendencies in them notwithstanding, they have a great source value for the problem dealt with in this study.

In the Old Testament we have some texts which can be dated with a fair degree of accuracy. This especially holds for some of the prophetical books, where some passages can be dated to a definite year. Most other texts, however, are very difficult to date and scholarly opinion is divided. This is true e.g. for the Pentateuch and the Psalms. The historical books are the result of redactions during the Babylonian exile in the 6th century B.C. or later, when older sources were included and rearranged according to interpretative patterns which often differed widely from that of the source itself. In most Old Testament texts we thus have to try to discern several layers originating in different epochs.

Since our main concern in this study is chronology, we must start the investigation with an analysis of the source material which can be dated with a fair degree of accuracy. The resulting picture will then be compared with material of uncertain and debated date. Hopefully, it will be possible to relate information from the chronologically uncertain material to the more certain dates.

FRANKINCENSE

The Semitic word for the resins from different trees of the family *Boswellia*, especially the species *Sacra*, *Frereana*, *Papyrifera*, and *Carterii*, is in all languages a derivation from the root *lab* ‘white’, Hebrew *labôná*, Akkadian *labanátum*, Ancient South Arabian *lbny* and Arabic *lubân* as well as Greek *libanós*, *libanós*.

These species grow only in Somaliland and Dhofar in South Arabia and all testimonies of
frankincense from the Eastern Mediterranean area thus indicate import. The Greek form may, in fact, reflect an original South Arabian form *libān*. It is thus very likely that the use of the root *lnb* for frankincense is of South Arabian origin and has spread from there together with the material itself.

In Akkad, its occurrence is rare and only two instances are reported, one in a handbook of oneiroromancers found in fragments from Assurbanipal’s time and one in an Assyrian medical book, dated from before 722 B.C. The dream-book gives an omen: “if it rains *lubbuniium* (sic) from the heaven upon the man; this man will fall (?) in the desert.” The medical book mentions both *labanātu* and *murr* (myrrh) as means of curing headache.

The extent of the use of frankincense in Egypt is difficult to grasp because of the debated meaning of the terms employed. In Egyptian we find two terms for aromatics: *ntyw* and *sn̂r* (Coptic *sonq*). Most scholars now agree that *ntyw* is myrrh. The word *sn̂r* may be a general term for aromatics since it stands for materials imported from Nubia and Punt as well as from Syria. It is, however, fairly certain that in reference to the two former areas it stands for frankincense proper. There are, e.g., good reasons to assume that frankincense trees were brought from Punt by Hatchepsut’s expedition. Since Egyptian does not know the term *lnb* for frankincense, it can be assumed that Egypt knew frankincense from an area which did not use this word. It is then likely that most of the Egyptian frankincense before the 1st millennium B.C. came from Somaliland and not from South Arabia.

The use of frankincense in the ancient Middle East, Egypt and Israel is part of a greater complex of use of aromatic materials of many kinds. A comprehensive term for different aromatics is *bosem* in Hebrew and *riqqu(m)* in Akkad. The process that we will focus on here is the burning of aromatics, since this is the main way of using frankincense. There exist no comprehensive studies of the burning of aromatics in Egypt or Mesopotamia. For Southern Syria, which is the area of main interest for this study, both archaeological and textual evidence is extant and easily accessible.

In both Hebrew and Akkadian, the terms for burning, both verbal and nominal, are derived from the root *qr̃*, *‘smoke*, which in English is rendered by ‘incense’. At least in Hebrew, the derivations of *qr̃* stand not only for burning of aromatics but also of parts of animals. In many instances in the Old Testament where burning of *qoret* is mentioned, the meaning is the burning of fat from a sacrificial animal. Also the burning of vegetable matter, such as bread, is referred to by these terms. Incense is thus a more comprehensive term than frankincense. The Hebrew terms *bosem* and *qoret* as well as the Akkadian *riqqu(m)* thus include aromatics of different kinds, both domestic and imported ones. Since frankincense was an imported, expensive and exclusive form of incense it can be assumed that when *riqqu(m)* and *qoret* are mentioned in the texts they do not include frankincense.

In order to get a picture of the introduction and use of frankincense in Syria it is necessary to establish the development of incense burning on the whole in the area. This is necessary in order to find out which of the different types of burnings include frankincense and consequently to trace the development of its use. To start with archaeological evidence for incense burning, three types of artifacts may be connected directly with burnings of different kinds in Syria and Mesopotamia.
during the Old Testament period. The first is the rectangular altar table with a high foot, often with horns.\textsuperscript{40} This vessel, which is mainly documented from Palestine, belongs to the period 1400–500 B.C.\textsuperscript{41} The second is the incense-cup, mostly made of clay, with a handle and often perforated with holes.\textsuperscript{42} Its occurrence in Palestine is dated ca. 1100–600 B.C. with singular finds from northern Syria (Ugarit) dating from 1600 B.C.\textsuperscript{43} The third is the small, cubic structure with a depression on the upper side and a small leg in each corner.\textsuperscript{44} It is found sporadically in Anatolia already in the 3rd millennium B.C. and more amply in Babylonia from the 13th century onwards.\textsuperscript{45} In Palestine it appears rather suddenly just after the year 700 B.C.\textsuperscript{46} It also occurs in South Arabia but the dating is difficult. It is probably not earlier than the 6th century B.C.\textsuperscript{47}

Descriptions of several rituals of cultic burning is found in the Old Testament. The most well-known is the holocaust sacrifice, \textit{ôlâ}, in which an animal was completely burnt on an altar. It seems, however, that derivations from \textit{qtr} are not used for designating the burnt-offering and that, consequently, \textit{qteret}, ‘incense’, never stands for this sacrifice. It was not the ordinary sacrifice in ancient Israel during the monarchy. It is evident from the descriptions outside the Priestly Code that the holocaust sacrifice originally had an emergency character and was performed on extreme occasions.\textsuperscript{48} It was probably introduced as a regular cult in Jerusalem at the time of Ahaz around 730 B.C.\textsuperscript{49} As far as is known, no altar for regular holocausts was in use before the end of the 8th century B.C.\textsuperscript{50}

Of the \textit{qtr}-sacrifices, the first is the burning of the fat from the sacrificial animal, the earliest textual documentation of which is found in 1 Sam. 2:12–17.\textsuperscript{51} This rite was part of the ritual of slaughtering animals in order to get meat. It turns out that originally every slaughter was a cultic act, \textit{zebah}, in which part of the animal was given to the god. The meat of the animal was eaten and the fat was burnt. There are good reasons to assume that the horned altars mentioned above were used for such burning. On the altar of this type found in the sanctuary in Arad, traces of burnt fat was found which confirms that burning of fat was an ancient custom in Israel.\textsuperscript{52} The horned altar for the burning of fat would therefore be a regular utensil at every place where slaughtering of animals took place.

A variant of the burning of animal fat on a small altar was burning of vegetable materials. Burning of bread is explicitly mentioned in Amos and Jeremiah and may be inferred from several other passages, among them also one in the Priestly Code, P. The term in the Priestly Code for this sacrifice is \textit{minhâ}, ‘gift’, which, however, does not seem to be exactly identical with the sacrifice described in the historical and prophetic books.\textsuperscript{53} We do not know for sure if aromatics were added to these sacrifices. No such material is explicitly mentioned in connection with them. Even in the P-passage aromatics are added only to one variant of the \textit{minhâ}.\textsuperscript{54}

In Jerusalem the burning of fat on a special altar ceased when the holocaust was introduced as a regular sacrifice in the reign of Ahaz around 730 B.C. From now on, everything was burnt on the new, large altar of burnt-offerings, both the holocausts and the parts of other sacrifices which were to be burnt. Jerusalem’s monopoly of animal sacrifice was then established by Josiah’s reform around 610 B.C., which abolished all sacrifices of animals outside Jerusalem.\textsuperscript{55} The burning of fat on horned altars thus ceased completely. The only place where fat was burnt
ritually was on the altar of burnt-offerings in Jerusalem, where also all other sacrifices were performed. The consequence was that slaughtering for meat was separated from the sacrificial cult. It was now possible to eat meat without making a sacrifice. The blood of the animal should, however, be poured out on the ground. What should be noticed is that in the prescriptions in Deuteronomy demanding this centralisation of the sacrificial cult, the ordinary vegetable minḥā is not included or even mentioned. The impression is that the burning of bread and other vegetable materials was still allowed and practiced at local sanctuaries.

The second ancient ritual is the burning of aromatics with an incenser held in the hand ‘before a god’, i.e. before his statue or some other representation of him. The verb derived from qfr is used for this rite as for the preceding one. In the Deuteronomistic writings and in sources close to them, this rite is explicitly mentioned in connection with the cult of foreign gods and is rejected. In several passages where incensing before Baal is mentioned, this may be the rite referred to, although we cannot always distinguish between this rite and the burning of fat, since the same terminology is used. From the passage describing incense-burning before Nehuštân in the Jerusalem temple it is, however, apparent that the rite originally also was part of the cult of Yahweh. This is confirmed by some passages in the Priestly Code dealing with incense. Unlike the burning of vegetable material, mentioned rather incidentally, and the burning of fat on the horns of the altar, not mentioned at all, the priestly authors have a lot to say about the burning of incense before a god. In Numeri chapters 10 and 16 we have three stories dealing with the regulation of this ritual. The starting point for one of the stories in Numeri 16 is that the burning of incense before Israel’s god is a right for all the chiefs (nšīm) and leading men in Israel. This claim is rejected by the author who reserves the incense-burning for the priests. The story about Qorah rejects the right of the Levites to incense, reserving it for the priests. There is thus in the Priestly Code an ambition to limit the use of incense and restrict it to the priests. In Numeri 7 we see how the chiefs of the tribes, the nšīm, behave according to the regulations: they obediently bring qṭoret to the priests but do not burn it themselves. The final stage is the story in Leviticus 10 about the sons of Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, the point of which seems to be the rejection and abolishment of the rite altogether.

The Priestly Code describes two further rituals, not mentioned anywhere else, where aromatics are burnt. The first one prescribes that once a year, on the Day of Atonement, the High Priest shall enter the Holy of Holies and fill it with the smoke of incense. The relationship between this rite and those described in the stories in Numeri 10 and 16 is apparent. This is also obvious from the theological motivation for the rituals indicated by the priestly writers: it serves as protection from the Divine power, warding off his wrath. In an older period it may have served as a means of calling forth the presence of the god. The idea that “the Lord is in the cloud” is very much alive in Israel.

The last ritual is the burning of incense every morning in front of the parokhet dividing the Hēkāl from the Holy of Holies. The incense is called qṭoret tamūd, ‘perpetual incense’. The burning is to take place on a special altar. An altar for burning of aromatics is mentioned in the non-priestly descriptions of the temple of Solomon. It is said to be made of cedar-wood unlike the incense altar of P which is
of acacia-wood. The custom of burning aromatics inside the Hēkal is thus ancient but originally perhaps not exactly identical to the one prescribed by P.68

In the Priestly Code the utensil used for incense-burning by the nṣrīm and the priests is called māḥtā. In much later Jewish sources the māḥtā is a small metal shovel held in the hand. That this also holds for the Old Testament is evident from the story in Numeri 16.69 We do not know exactly what it looked like.70 It must, however, have been rather light. In a passage in Hezechiel we have a story of illegal burning of incense by elders.71 The utensil is here called miqṭeret. The same word is used in the story in 2 Chronicles about the illegal incense sacrifice performed by king Uzziah.72 The impression from these passages is that the miqṭeret is a utensil rather similar to the māḥtā. If the māḥtā which the elders and nṣrīm use is made of metal, the miqṭeret could be of clay and in fact be identical with the incense cups amply documented by archaeology in Palestine down to ca. 700 B.C.73 The restrictions against the use of incense, reflected in the “anti-incense” stories already referred to in the Priestly Code as well as in the difficult passage in 2 Chronicles about the abolishment of mquaṭṭrōt in the time of Ezekiah, may be connected with the disappearance of the incense-cups in the 7th century B.C.74

Of the originally common cultic practices of burning animal fat, vegetable matter, and incensing before gods, which we see documented in Deuteronomistic texts as well as in the polemic stories in the Priestly Code, only the burning of the mīnḥā sacrifice and the incensing once a year on the Day of Atonement remain in the priestly legislation. We can clearly see an ambition to reduce the scope of incense burning.75 The reduced incense cult prescribed by P must then represent a later stage than the practices described in extra-P texts and in the polemic stories. This is also confirmed by the fact that the cultic practices in the Second Temple, at least principally, is founded upon the regulations of P.76 The abolition of the burning of fat can be dated to 610 B.C. The time for the disappearance of the burning of aromatics by the nṣrīm and other priests than the Aaronids is more uncertain. But if the incense-cups are identical with the māḥtā and/or the miqṭeret we have archaeological evidence for a dating of an effective struggle against it to roughly the same time, i.e. during the last decades of the monarchy.

We do not know which kind of aromatic was used in the incense rite connected with the miqṭeret. It must be underlined that it may well have been aromatics of local production and we have no explicit indication that frankincense was included. In the two rites described by P, the incense used, called q̄ṭoreṯ sammīm, is a mixture of several spices, among them frankincense.

Having established this general background we are now ready to survey the occurrences of frankincense in Israel.

In the Old Testament the passages that can be dated with a reasonable degree of certainty are the following:77

Jeremiah 6:20 “To what purpose cometh there to me frankincense from Sheba // sweet cane from a far country?”

Jeremiah 41:5 “After he had slain Gedaliah ... there came certain from
Shechem ... with offerings (minḥā) and frankincense in their hand, to bring
to the house of the Lord."

The events referred to in these two passages can be dated to the years around 600
B.C. The murder of Gedaliah occurred in the year 586. The passages themselves are
roughly contemporary. They are the earliest instances that can be dated with
certainty.

Isaiah 43:23 "Thou hast not brought me the small cattle of thy burnt offerings
(ʻōlā) / neither hast thou honoured me with thy sacrifices (zebaḥîm i.e. slaugh-
terings) // I have not caused thee to serve with an offering (minḥā) / not
weared thee with incense (lēbônā, i.e. frankincense)".

This passage is attributed to Deutero-Isaiah, thus composed in the years around
550–540 B.C.

Jeremiah 17:26 "And they shall come ... bringing burnt offerings (ʻōlā),
sacrifices (zebaḥ), and meat offerings (minḥā), and incense (lēbônā), and bring
sacrifices of praise (tōdā) unto the house of the Lord."

Isaiah 60:6 "The multitude of camels shall cover thee / dromedaries (bekarîm)
of Midian and Ephah // all they from Sheba shall come / they shall bring with
gold and frankincense / and they shall show forth the praises (tōdā) of the
Lord".

Isaiah 66:3 "He who kills an ox is a manslayer ... / he who burns frankin-
cence blesses an idol // yea, they have chosen their own ways / and their soul
delighteth in their abominations".

Jeremiah 17:26 is usually attributed to the later Deuteronomistic redaction of the
book and may be dated to the late 6th or the 5th century B.C.\textsuperscript{76} The Isaiah passages
belong to the so-called Trito-Isaiah layer and are somewhat later than Deutero-
Isaiah, usually dated to the end of the 6th century B.C.\textsuperscript{79} The last passage is difficult
but can be interpreted as a criticism against those who perform legal rites together
with ‘abominable’ ones.

Nehemiah 13:5 "And he (Eliashib, the High Priest) had prepared for him
(Tobiah) a great chamber where aforetime they laid the meat-offerings
(minḥā), the frankincense, the vessels, and the tithes of the corn, the new
wine, and the oil ... "

1 Chronicles 9:29 “Some of them (the Levites) also were appointed to oversee
the vessels, and all the instruments of the sanctuary, and the fine flour, and the
wine, and the oil, and the frankincense, and the spices (bsaṭîm)”.

Both these texts deal with the conditions in the Second Temple during the late 6th
and 5th centuries B.C. All the texts treated so far can thus be dated within a timespan of ca. 200 years (600–400 B.C.).

Frankincense is further mentioned three times in the Song of Songs:

3:6 “Who is this that cometh out of the wilderness // like pillars of smoke // perfumed with myrrh and frankincense // with all the powders of the merchant?”

4:6 “Until the day break // and the shadows flee away // I will get me to the mountain of myrrh // and to the hill of frankincense”.

4:14 “Thy plants are an orchard of . . . spikenard and saffron // calamus and cinnamon // with all trees of frankincense // myrrh and aloes // with all the chief spices”.

The dating of the Song of Songs is one of the most tricky in the Old Testament. Suggestions range from the time of Solomon in the 10th century B.C. to the 3rd century B.C.⁸⁰

In the Priestly Code we find references to frankincense in four rituals. Two of them are part of the qtoret-complex treated above. The first is the burning of qtoret sammîm with a censer (maḥṭā) in the Holy of Holies once a year on the Day of Atonement.⁸¹ The second ritual is the daily burning of qtoret sammîm on the incense-altar in front of the veil (paroket) dividing the Ħekal from the Holy of Holies.⁸² Both these rites are to be performed with a special blend of aromatics, qtoret sammîm, the recipe of which is given and which includes frankincense.⁸³

The third one is in connection with the shewbread, on which pure frankincense (Iḇônā zakkā) is to be strewn.⁸⁴ The fourth one is in connection with the minḥā-sacrifice. When the minḥā consists of flour, oil and frankincense are to be added and burnt on the altar. This is the rule both for voluntary sacrifices and the sacrifice of firstlings.⁸⁵ Certain minḥā-sacrifices do not take the addition of frankincense.⁸⁶

If we first take a look at the non-priestly passages quoted above, we get a clear impression that ʿọlā, minḥā and frankincense are mentioned as separate sacrifices. The terminology in the texts suggests that frankincense is a sacrifice independent from the two others. Even if frankincense and minḥā are mentioned after each other, there is no indication in these texts that they are parts of the same sacrifice.⁸⁷

The original existence of a separate frankincense sacrifice is confirmed by the Elephantine documents from the beginning of the 5th century B.C.⁸⁸ From these documents it is evident that, originally, ʿọlā, minḥā, and frankincense were sacrificed on the altar in Elephantine and that the ʿọlā later was prohibited by the authorities in Jerusalem. The others are not mentioned. The fact that the sacrifices of minḥā and frankincense obviously were allowed in Elephantine by the authorities in Jerusalem is a strong indication that they were also allowed in Palestine outside Jerusalem in accordance with the impression given by the Deuteronomistic legislation.⁸⁹

The frankincense sacrifice is thus documented from ca. 600 B.C. and obviously
continued for a long time. We have seen that as late as in the 5th century B.C. the authorities in Jerusalem had no objections. We do not know when it disappeared.\textsuperscript{90}

If we compare the frankincense-rules in the Priestly Code with the other passages, we note that in the P-legislation there is no sacrifice consisting of frankincense only; it is always connected with vegetable sacrifice or used mixed with other aromatics. In the regulation of the minhā sacrifice in P, frankincense is an obligatory ingredient.\textsuperscript{91} Frankincense is included in the vegetable minhā and no separate pure frankincense sacrifice is prescribed by P. The result is that the burning of matter including frankincense is reduced to two rituals administered by the priests and one ritual performed by the High Priest only. The laymen, including the Levites, have no share in incense burning, i.e. rites including frankincense, in P’s ritual system.

The use of frankincense in P appears reduced compared to the testimony of the texts from 600–400 B.C. P has abolished the separate frankincense sacrifice. Instead frankincense is used as an addition to already existing rituals: the vegetable sacrifice (minhā and the shewbread) and the incense burning of the High Priest on the Day of Atonement. We have seen that the latter ceremony probably is a survival of an earlier rite of incense burning performed by anyone, or at least the leaders of the tribes, by use of a special utensil. As far as the daily incense burning in P’s sanctuary is concerned, it is performed on a special altar similar to the one used for burning of fat and vegetables before 610 B.C. In both these sacrifices frankincense is only one of the ingredients. This might indicate that it is a later addition to burning rituals that originally were performed with other combustible materials.

It seems reasonable to assume that at least the realization of the regulations of the use of frankincense in P must be later than 400 B.C. since the clergy in Jerusalem at this time still allowed the separate frankincense sacrifice. At least from the 7th century down to this period frankincense was offered as a separate sacrifice in Israel. P’s regulations must represent a later stage than the customs reflected in the non-priestly traditions. We want to know when this sacrifice was introduced and, consequently, when frankincense was available.

The juxtaposition of frankincense and the minhā-sacrifice in texts from around 600 B.C. and onwards, indicates that they had a special connection without being identical as they became in the later P-regulations. The connection must be the result of the abolition in 610 B.C. of the animal sacrifice outside Jerusalem together with the burning of fat on special altars. This created a need for a substitution. Since the burning of vegetable materials was not prohibited by the Deuteronomistic reforms, spices could replace the former animal fat. The Deuteronomistic reforms thus created a vacuum that was filled by the frankincense sacrifice. That the frankincense sacrifice replaced the burning of fat is also indicated by the description of the incense altar in Exodus 30. This altar, in fact, is of the same type as e.g. the one found in Arad which was used for burning of fat. We have already seen that q'oreth-burning was performed inside the temple before the introduction of frankincense.\textsuperscript{92} The same type of altar was then used for the new frankincense sacrifice.

The frankincense sacrifice introduced after 610 B.C., replacing the burning of fat
at local sanctuaries and being performed there together with the minhā, was then later abolished by the priestly writers. Cultic burning was confined to the temple only. There, daily burning was performed before the paroket every morning. It was no longer a pure frankincense sacrifice since it was mixed with other aromatics. This mixture was allowed to be burnt inside the temple only. Frankincense was also added to the incense burning on the Day of Atonement.\textsuperscript{93} The association between frankincense and the vegetable minhā sacrifice was preserved by using frankincense as a perfume added to the flour and to the shewbread.

There are thus good reasons to assume that frankincense was introduced into the Israelite cult at the end of the 7th century B.C. There are further reasons to suppose that this was contemporary with the spread of frankincense in Syria and the eastern Mediterranean in the same period. In Greek literature the earliest occurrence of frankincense is in two passages in Sappho which can be dated to the end of the 7th century B.C.\textsuperscript{94} Its absence in the Homeric poems can only be interpreted in the way that it was unknown among the aristocrats in Ionia in the 8th century. In Sappho we see how frankincense is used for secular purposes like perfuming of private houses etc. The same use is described in the Song of Songs. Sappho and the Song of Songs represent a similar aristocratic milieu. They might also be roughly contemporaneous.\textsuperscript{95}

This is the context of the cuboid altars which appear suddenly in Palestine in the 7th century. It is most likely that these altars are connected with the introduction of frankincense into private houses. We do not know if the altars were used in a private cultic context from the beginning or if they are domestic utensils only. The domestic use is amply documented from Babylonia at this time and also most of the Palestinian cuboid altars are found in private houses.

It follows from what has been concluded that all passages in the Old Testament mentioning frankincense must be dated from ca. 600 B.C. onwards. No one is older than the end of the 7th century B.C. The absence of references to frankincense in the texts about Solomon as well as in the prophets earlier than Jeremiah is a strong indication that it was unknown to their authors. Especially remarkable is their absence from the story about the queen of Sheba. It is most unlikely that its author would have missed this exquisite spice if it had been known to him, this the more since Sheba was known as frankincense-land from the time of Jeremiah and Trito-Isaiah. The queen of Sheba-story must thus be older than 600 B.C.

It is not impossible that frankincense was known in Israel before the end of the 7th century although we have no certain documentation of it. But it must have been very rare. It could have been used as an aromatic or in the domestic cult or both. Judging from the passages in Sappho as well as what we know of its later use in Babylonia, one can assume that the use of frankincense in private houses precedes its use in the cult.\textsuperscript{96} Also archaeological evidence from Palestine suggests that connections with South Arabia were established in the 7th century at the earliest.\textsuperscript{97} The main conclusion from all this must be that the frankincense road from South Arabia through ʿAṣīr and Ḥiḡāz to southern Syria was established in this period, i.e. ca. 650 B.C.\textsuperscript{98}

To summarize: frankincense from South Arabia is found sporadically in Mesopotamia in Neo-Assyrian times. It may have arrived via Oman and the Persian
Gulf. In Egypt frankincense had been in use for a long time but it was imported from Somaliland, not from Dhofar. In Syria/Palestine there is no certain textual documentation before 600 B.C. The cultic changes in Israel around 610, the occurrence in Sappho as well as archaeological evidence for contacts between Palestine and South Arabia in the 7th century B.C. suggest that frankincense may have reached the area in the middle of that century. The incense-road from Yemen through Western Arabia to Syria was thus established around 650 B.C.

CAMELS

The one-humped *Camelus dromedarius* L. is probably a secondary differentiation from the two-humped *Camelus Bactrianus* L. Originally a two-humped variety existed not only in Asia but also in North Africa. It seems to have disappeared from Africa at the beginning of the Neolithic period. One-humped camels are archaeologically documented in the Middle East from the end of the fourth millennium B.C. and onwards. The main problem concerning their origin is whether the one-humped race is the result of domestication of the two-humped one or if there originally existed wild dromedaries. The Middle Eastern documentation from before the Iron age is as follows. Camel-bones are attested from Ain al-Assad in Jordan, and Shaar Ha-Golan, both from the Neolithic period. Further, from Bir Resisim and Arad in the Negev, both Early Bronze Age sites. From the same period are the important finds in Umm an-Nār in Oman with more than 200 bone-fragments of the one-humped camel. Parts of a skeleton found in Cyprus is from ca. 2000 B.C. The earliest specimens in the collection of camel bones from Tell Jemmeh in south-western Palestine belong to the Late Bronze Age.

In the rock art of Arabia we find scenes of camel-hunting. The dating of this material is, however, very uncertain and no picture of camel-riders can safely be attributed to a period before 500 B.C. The earliest terracotta figurine from the Obed-period in Uruk, thus the 4th millennium B.C., is followed by reliefs in Tell Asmar and Lagash from the 3rd millennium B.C., a Minoan seal from Crete ca. 1800–1400 B.C., a statuette from Byblos 2100 B.C. (?), a Mycenaean vase painting ca. 1500 B.C., a statuette from Hama from the 2nd millennium B.C., a painted sherd from Deir Allā in Jordan from the Late Bronze age (1500–1200 B.C.).

None of these finds provides a certain indication that the animal was used for transport. The small elevation seen behind the hump on some of the terracottas from Uruk could perhaps indicate a burden but this is far from certain. The Hama-camel is a vessel for some liquid or aromatic and is no certain proof of domestication. On some statuettes, e. g. the oldest one from Uruk and the Byblos camel, there are cuts on the muzzle which have been interpreted as showing a bit. Also this seems uncertain although not impossible. The finds only inform us that the ancients were familiar with the dromedary. The bones are no proof for herding of the animal. At most they show that camels were eaten. It may be supposed that they were hunted and eaten and perhaps used for some primitive transport. The camel from Tell Asmar is said to have a rider, and the same has been claimed for a figurine from Taanach in Palestine but this seems to be highly doubtful. Since there are no certain traces of mounted one-humped camels in the archaeolo-
tical material before 900 B.C. it can be concluded that its usefulness for transport also was rather limited. The only example of a laden camel that has withstood criticism is the Egyptian figurine from Rifeh-Gizah from the 19th dynasty which probably is imported to Egypt from somewhere else. The most important insight gained from the discussion that followed Albright’s thesis was that the dividing line between domestication and wild stage is not distinct. The picture that emerges from these archaeological finds is similar to the kind of camel utilization in present-day Somalia with the difference that in the ancient Near East, unlike in present-day Somalia, the camel seems to have played a marginal role.

A special complication is the documentation from Egypt. Several finds from the Predynastic period down to the Ptolemaic era have been interpreted as camel-bones and -pictures. It has been claimed that this proves that the animal was used by man in Egypt. Very few of the specimens, however, if any, are certain indications of domestication. They show at best that camels may have reached Egypt sporadically, probably from the Middle East. Even the famous rope of camel’s hair from the 3rd or 4th dynasty is no proof of domestication.

From the Iron age we have further archaeological evidence similar to the preceding periods. There is a concentration of osteological remains from Tell Jemmeh in south-western Palestine which, starting in the preceding Late Bronze Age, reaches a peak in the 7th century B.C. From the Early Iron Age there are camel bones from the copper works in Tell Menešiyye in the Wadi Arabah. Bones are also found in Aror (Har Saad) in the Negev dated to ca. 900 B.C. 36 clay figurines are found in Uruk from ca. 1000–500 B.C. Figurines of a very similar kind have been found in Yemen but these are more difficult to date. In Gerar one of the clay figurines found by Flinders Petrie and dated to the 10th century B.C. could be a camel. On one of the cuboid limestone altars from the same site, dated 550 B.C., there is a picture of a dromedary. There is also a fragment from Iron Age Hama. From Transjordan we have five figurines from Busayra and one from ‘Ammān. They can be dated between 700 and 400 B.C.

This material is of the same kind as that from before the Iron Age and gives no hint of the degree of domestication. Undisputable and well-dated pictorial examples of mounted camels with rider and cushion saddle are the two reliefs from northern Syria from the beginning of the 9th century B.C. at Carchemish and Tell Halaf. The former undoubtedly shows a warrior armed with a bow riding the camel. The latter has a rider with a stick. On the bronze gates from Balawāt we see both one- and two-humped camels used by the Assyrian army for transport during one of the campaigns of Shalmanassar III in Syria in the middle of the 9th century B.C. One-humped camels next appear on the reliefs which show the submission of Samsi, queen of the ‘Aribi’, to Tiglath-Pileser III in 733 B.C. In these pictures we see in a battle scene how a woman (= queen Samsi?) rides on a camel on a cushion saddle. In another, we see an ‘Aribi’ fleecing on a camel before the Assyrian attack. In a third sequence, three camels are led forward as tribute to the Assyrian king. On Sennacherib’s reliefs showing the siege of Lachish in 701 B.C. we see camels used for transport, this time by the locals. Finally, on the reliefs from room L in Assurbanipal’s palace in Nineveh we have a sequence of pictures showing the campaign against the ‘Aribi’ shortly before 652 B.C. The
‘Aribi’ have dromedaries on which two men armed with bows are mounted. A remarkable bronze statuette of a camel with a rider on a cushion saddle has been found at Kameiros on Rhodos but is of Assyrian provenience and probably made in the late 7th century B.C. On several of the figurines from Uruk there are evidence for a saddle of the cushion type.

The pictorial documentation of dromedaries in Assyria from ca. 850 and onwards is complemented by ample textual references from the time of Shalmaneser III and onwards in the Assyrian royal inscriptions and in some letters. There are no known textual references to dromedaries before this period. The words used are, apart from gammalu, ibilu, anāqatu and bakru. It is quite possible that all these words are borrowings from a proto-Arabic language in northern Syria since we find them much later in the rich camel-vocabulary of the ‘Arabiyya poetry. The first occurrence in Shalmaneser’s Monolith inscription, where Gindibu the Arbaya takes part in the battle of Qarqar in Syria in 853 B.C. with 1000 camels, is followed by references by Tiglath-Pileser III, Sargon II, Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, and Assurbanipal. In almost every case, the references are to the use of camels in war by the tribes in northern Arabia, mostly the ‘Aribi’ but also others such as the Nabatu etc. The Assyrians take camels as booty or receive them as tribute but nothing is said about how the Assyrians used them. Judging from the pictures, the Assyrians used camels only for transport of military goods, not for riding in battle. As we have seen, the reliefs only show ‘Aribi’ riding camels in combat. That the Assyrians did not have the know-how of camelbreeding and camel use is shown by the fact that Esarhaddon had to call in the ‘kings of the Aribi’ in order to get transport camels for his Egyptian campaign in 671 B.C. In some of the Assyrian letters preserved we find camels used by the ‘Aribi’ for the Assyrians.

It thus turns out that we have undisputable archeological and textual evidence for the use of the camel for riding and transport in the Fertile Crescent from shortly after 900 B.C. and onwards. Both Assyrians and the inhabitants in Lachish used it for transport, whereas the ‘Aribi’ and perhaps Syrians are the only ones shown as riders of the animal. Almost all instances are in connection with military activities.

In the Old Testament we must distinguish between passages mentioning camels with foreigners and with Israelites. Among the former are texts datable from between 600 and ca. 500 B.C., all in the prophetic books. In an oracle dealing with the Babylonian campaign to Transjordan in 599 B.C., Qedar is mentioned as camelbreeders. In Hezechiel the bné Qedom, ‘the Sons of the East’, i.e. tribes in the Syrian desert, are said to have camels. A passage in Isaiah, probably from the middle of the 6th century B.C., associates camels with undifferentiated strangers. Related to these are prophetic texts from the postexilic period mentioning Ephah (one of the tribes in Midian) as camelholders. A later passage speaks about camels with unidentified strangers. To these texts also belong the passage in the Joseph story about the Ishmaelites who use camels for transport from Transjordan to Egypt. Ishmael is a name that is used by the Priestly Code for a group of tribes in the Syrian desert which occurs in Assyrian texts from the end of the 7th century onwards. Among these are Dumah, behind which hide the ‘Aribi’ of the Assyrian texts and reliefs. Ishmaelites and camels are thus documented in extra-biblical sources from at least the 7th century B.C. The passage about the
Ishmaelite camel caravan in the Joseph story could then be the earliest of the texts treated so far.

In Israel there is a ruling in the laws, both in the Priestly Code and Deuteronomy, that the camel belongs to the unclean animals. It belongs in fact to the group of four animals which are unclean because they do not fulfill the demand of being cloven-footed and at the same time chewing the cud. The other three are the coney (ṣafān), the hare (ʿarənv), and the swine (ḥazīr). It is most likely that this taboo is very ancient. The Israelites are not allowed to eat them or to touch their carcasses. This gives the impression that they were mainly hunted animals when the taboo was formulated. This would indicate that the camel was a wild animal to the Israelites until very late.

The taboo does not, however, rule out the possibility for Israelites to employ the animal for riding or transport. Thus, the Mishna often speaks about Jewish camel-drivers in the late days of the Second Temple. If we then go backwards in history we find that, in the Chronicistic history, the Israelites are said to have brought camels with them when returning from Babylon. It is evident that for the Chronist, writing perhaps in the 4th century B.C., it was normal that the Israelites had camels, at least for transport. The question is if this was normal from earliest times.

The Chronist tells how the Israelites in the reign of Asa in the 9th century B.C. took camels as booty in war with the Cushites. These camels may be historic substance. According to the record of the Chronicler, the battle took place in an area not far from present-day Tell Jemmeh where, as we have seen, we have ample evidence of camel-holding from the Iron Age. But the point in the story is that the Israelites did not have camels: they took them as booty, and we do not know what they did with them. We can see on the reliefs from Sennacherib’s siege of Lachish one hundred years later that the local inhabitants used camels for transport. This, together with the archaeological evidence from Tell Jemmeh, suggests that the southern Shephelah was a camel-breeding area during the Israelite monarchy. The breeders were probably non-Israelites.

The Chronicler also reports that David had camels, which were tended by a non-Israelite, the Ishmaelite Ḥīḇil. This is in accordance with a passage in the Deuteronomistic history-book which says that David took camels as booty from the Amalekites. In the Chronicler, the taboo of the laws is reflected in the fact that David is provided with a non-Israelite camel-tender. As far as the Amalekite wars are concerned, there might well be a historic memory preserved in the statement that Saul put an end to them. The fact that David is said to have fought them as well might indicate that he had to be given a victory over Israel’s arch-enemy when Saul already had one. David’s Amalekite war is probably a calque on that of Saul. The story of Saul’s victory is, however, in its present shape so theologized by the Deuteronomistic writers that we cannot discern much of what really happened. For our purpose we notice two things in both versions: the Amalekites are said to possess camels, and they dwell “from Hawilah until thou comest to Shur, that is over against Egypt”. This formula is well known: it designates the dira of the Ishmaelites according to the Priestly Code. Disregarding the geographical details, it is most likely that the original context of the formula is with the Ishmaelites. As we have seen, there is also ample documentation of camels with
the Ishmaelites, both in contemporary Assyrian sources and the Old Testament. The passage about the Amalekites fleeing before David’s attacks reads as a commentary on the reliefs from the Assyrian palaces showing the flight of the ‘Aribi’. It is thus most likely that the geographical and military characteristics of the Amalekites in connection with Saul and David reflect those of the tribes in the Syrian desert which by the Priestly Code are called sons of Ishmael and which are documented from the end of the 8th century B.C. The Amalekites thus tend to be a disguise for the Ishmaelites, and most of what is told about them reflects later periods. There are thus no certain proofs for the use of camels in Southern Palestine in the time of Saul and David.

Camels play a prominent role in the patriarchal stories. Abraham and Job have them.\(^{165}\) In the Rebecca story, the ten camels function as currency as well as riding animals. Of the 55 references to camels in the Old Testament, 19 occur in this story.\(^{166}\) Among Jacob’s herds we also find camels.\(^{167}\) An interesting feature in the Rebecca and Jacob stories is that these are the only instances were camel riding by Israelites is explicitly mentioned in the Old Testament. Further, the animal is ridden by women and children only.\(^{168}\) Unfortunately, it is not possible to discern which type of saddle is intended.\(^{169}\) The point is that the camel is a means of transport of property including women and children.

It is most unlikely that the camels in the patriarchal stories belong to the oldest layers.\(^{170}\) The general opinion among scholars today is that these stories are creations of much later times than the “patriarchal age” and that they contain rather few historic memories from the Bronze Age. As far as the camels are concerned, it seems much more likely that they belong to a layer originating during the monarchy or later. The patriarchs were not Israelites and did not live under the law. Therefore they could be equipped with camels as a sign of their richness. This indicates a period close to Trito-Isaiah, when camels are explicitly said to be signs of blessings and richness.\(^{171}\) From that period we also have evidence of the use of the animal for transport. Job’s camels fit well into this picture, since the book has to be dated to the 6th century B.C. and he is said to live in the land of Uz, i.e. close to Midian, which was known in Israel as camel land in the 6th century.\(^{172}\)

From the texts hitherto considered the impression is that the employment of the camel is a late phenomenon in Israel. Before the exile the animal was considered non-Israelite, as shown in the texts from the 6th century.\(^{173}\) We have also been able to relate the camels of the Ishmaelites in the Joseph story to the 7th century B.C. Their occurrence in the patriarchal stories is a back-projection of the conditions in Israel during or after the Exile, when the camel was employed for transport.

There now remain two texts in the Old Testament that are crucial for the earlier history of the camel. Both of them deal with camels with non-Israelites. They are the story of the queen of Sheba and the story of the invasion of the Midianites and others in northern Palestine around 1100 B.C. The latter was, as we have seen, Albright’s main argument for his dating of camel domestication to that period.

As far as the queen of Sheba story is concerned, it cannot be taken as a reliable source for the reign of Solomon. The story has too many inconsistencies with known historical facts about the time of Solomon. There is no evidence for the existence of a Sabaeian kingdom in the 10th century B.C.\(^{174}\) From the later Sa-
baeans we have no evidence for queens. Queens are known among the ‘Aribi’ in the Syrian desert but the earliest one is documented 200 years after the time of Solomon.\textsuperscript{175} It also deserves to be pointed out that the Sabaecans are never identified as Arabs in this period.\textsuperscript{176} Terminology in the text indicates late Assyrian times.\textsuperscript{177} It goes well with the theology in Psalm 72, where the king of Israel is praised by the kings of the ends of the world. It might be underlined once again that frankincense is not mentioned in connection with the queen of Sheba. This might indicate a time before 600 B.C. for the concept of the story but not before 730 B.C. For this also speaks the figure of a queen as ruler which we find among the ‘Aribi’ in this period. The reign of Ezekiah could be a good guess, when we have a revivification of Israelite kingship ideology as expressed in Psalm 72, influence of Assyrian terminology, queens in the Syrian desert, the Sabaecans somewhere further south in Arabia and camels among Israel’s neighbours but as yet no frankincense.

This leads us to the Midianites in Judges 6–8. The story of the invasion by Midian, Amaleq, and the ‘Sons of the East’ bears all the characteristics of a complicated evolution: the hero has two names, Gideon and Yerubbaal; the two chiefs of the enemy appear with different names: Oreb and Zeeb or Zebah and Salmunna; the final battle takes place at two different places: in Transjordan ‘by the road of the tent-dwellers’ or in the Jordan valley ‘by the Rock of Oreb’. In his recent study of the text, Knauf has convincingly argued that behind the text lies a memory of a war in Galilee before 1000 B.C., but that most of the present details are much later accretions. The war is identical with ‘the Day of Midian’ alluded to by Isaiah around 700 B.C.\textsuperscript{178} This becomes even more likely in view of the archaeological evidence from the north-western Hijaz which shows that the area had a cultural flowering in the centuries around 1200 B.C.\textsuperscript{179} In the earliest dated text referring to the event, viz. the Isaiah passages, there is no mentioning of the hero(es) Gideon/Yerubbaal or camels. Neither are Amaleq nor the Sons of the East mentioned. It is also evident that these two names did not belong to the most ancient tradition behind Judges 6–8.\textsuperscript{180} The question which should be posed is the following: are the camels of the Midianites part of the original tradition about ‘the Day of Midian’?

It is quite obvious that they are not. The Midianites are said to have penetrated even to Gaza, which points to conditions in the 6th century B.C. or later, when so-called Ishmaelite tribes reached the Mediterranean. We have already seen that the Amalekites in Deuteronomistic history tend to be a disguise for Ishmaelites. The connection between Midian and Ishmael is found also in the Joseph story, where there is a certain discrepancy in the present text about who took Joseph to Egypt. It is obvious that we have a gloss: originally the Ishmaelites were the tradesmen but later Midianites were introduced for theological reasons: as Midian saved Israel when they left Egypt they also saved them when descending into Egypt. But if the Ishmaelites represent the original layer of the text we are already in the 7th century B.C. or later. The subsequent introduction of Midian into the story was perhaps facilitated by the fact that tribes in the Midianite area, like Ephah, were involved in camel traffic immediately after the Exile.\textsuperscript{181} The presence
of camels in Judges 6:2 is thus easily explicable as reflecting conditions in the 7th century at the earliest.\textsuperscript{182}

Just like the camels in the patriarchal stories, those in Judges 6 are literary ornaments from the time when the stories were formulated in their present shape, a time when camels had become important as status symbols of richness as well as means for transport.

The Midianites in Judges 6–8 cannot be adduced as representing the emergence of large-scale camel herding in the 12th century B.C. Everything indicates that the text is much later that the events it purports to depict and that the camels are not part of the original tradition.\textsuperscript{183} The fact then remains that the earliest datable appearance of camels in the Old Testament is with the Ishmaelite tribes in the 7th century B.C. Apart from the prohibition for the Israelites of eating camel meat, which represents an ancient taboo, there are no weighty arguments for dating any other camel passage earlier.

This changes the picture of the use of camels around 1000 B.C. The Midianite camels in Judges 6 were one of Albright's strongest arguments for the existence of large-scale camel herders around 1100 B.C. But since they have to be removed from the debate, the remaining argument for the Midianites as the pioneers of camel herding is archaeological. It turns out, however, that those arguments are very weak. It is most doubtful that the camel-bones in Tell Mene\textsuperscript{iyye in Wadi Arabah from around 1100 B.C. prove that the Midianites were large-scale camel- holders.\textsuperscript{184} They show, at most, that camels were used for food which was nothing new: such camel bones are found at several sites during the Bronze Age. The fact that emerges from our investigation is that the earliest proofs for the use of the camel for other purposes than food, i.e. for riding and transport, are the pictorial evidence from Syria and Assyria from the 9th century B.C. This must be the starting point for a reconsideration of the early history of the camel as a domesticated animal.

FRANKINCENSE, CAMELS AND THEIR EARLY USERS

We have seen that evidence points to the introduction of frankincense in Palestine (and Greece) not before the end of the 7th century B.C. Since this frankincense with all probability came from South Arabia, there is every reason to believe that the camel traffic through Western Arabia was established in this period. We know that in the Achaemenid period, the Arabs around Gaza delivered frankincense as tribute to the Persian king.\textsuperscript{185} We also have Old Testament evidence for the connection between camels, frankincense and Sheba from the same period.\textsuperscript{186} But we have to go down to Eratosthenes in the 3rd century B.C. and Pliny in the 1st century A. D. for the first description of the Western Arabian frankincense road.\textsuperscript{187}

From our present knowledge there is no reason to assume the existence of frankincense traffic through Western Arabia from Yemen as early as before 1000 B.C. The camel route to South Arabia through Hīgāz and ʿAṣīr, which played such an important role in antiquity, was probably not established before the middle of the 7th century B.C. Before that time, frankincense reached the Middle East and adjacent lands with utmost sporadity. Some may have come via Egypt which had
access to frankincense from the African shore of the Red Sea. Some may have come via the Persian Gulf and Oman from Dhofar. The new incense road through Western Arabia did, as it seems, oust the others and became the main route for import of the expensive aromatic. 188

This sheds new light on the problem of the use of domesticated camels. We have seen that undisputable evidence for the use of the dromedary for transport and riding dates from the 9th century B.C. and onwards. But it follows from what has been said that the frankincense traffic cannot have been the main impetus for the employment of the animal in the period before 650 B.C. With this goes the fact that the earliest documentation for camel transport and riding comes from Northern Syria, not from Arabia. If we take a comprehensive look at the documentation from the period 900–650 B.C., there is no doubt which was the main function of camel use during the Neo-Assyrian period: nearly every instance represents a military context. It is used by the Assyrian army for transport and it is ridden by the bowmen of the ‘Arabs’ in combat.

It is important to notice that the two earliest representations of camel riders are from Northern Syria before it was conquered by Assyria. Obviously the rulers in Tell Halaf and Carchemish had already experimented with camel riding before the arrival of the Assyrians. We also see that, when the kings of Syria confronted Shalmaneser III at Qarqar in 853, they had a contingent of 1000 camels on their side. The use of the dromedary for military purposes must thus have been developed in Syria around 900 B.C., i.e. just after the fall of the Solomonic empire. That empire was built on horse-chariots and we do not hear anything from it about camels.

For the Assyrians the need for this new means of transport must have become urgent when they started the Syrian campaigns in the 9th century B.C.: in order to reach Syria, they had to cross semi-desert areas which required the transportation of more foodstuffs and water than earlier. The earliest Assyrian documentation of camels on the Balawāt-gates shows camels used in the Syrian campaigns for transport only.

But the main invention made around 900 B.C. which launched the camel’s military career was riding on the hump, not behind it. 189 The technique was, according to the pictures, of two kinds: riding bare-back or only with a horse-rug, and on a cushion saddle, kept in position with two straps. If one compares with the pictures of horses from Northern Syria and Assyria during the period, we can see that the emergent horse-riders use the former way only; there are no traces of any saddle-construction for horses until late antiquity. But the camel could be ridden either as a horse or with a special device, viz. the cushion saddle. The ‘Arabs’ had the cushion saddle without stirrups and also without reins: the pictures show one of the riders steering the camel with a stick. An efficient bit was not yet developed and the position of the rider cannot have been very stable.

In spite of this, the elevated position must have been advantageous. The camel riders were extremely mobile and had the upper hand, literally speaking, when confronted with infantry. They could also make a swift retreat into the steppes and deserts, where the infantry and even the emerging horse cavalry had difficulties in pursuing them. These advantages outweighed the disadvantages of the early riders:
their primitive bow and deficient riding technique. The bow of the ‘Arabs’, which was made from one piece of wood, could obviously make life uncomfortable for the Assyrian infantry in spite of the fact that it was much weaker than the larger and more long-shooting composite bows that the Assyrians had.  

The parallel appearance of riders on camels and horses in the 9th century B.C. makes it likely that they are connected. The fact that camel-riding is documented from Northern Syria leads us to the conclusion that it was developed there and was inspired by the horse-riding developed in the lands north of the Fertile crescent.  

The saddle was, however, an invention that did not come from horse-riding. One can speculate that it was a development of older pack-saddles which could be put over the hump as well as over the hind legs. The word *kar* used in Genesis as a designation for the saddle in which Rachel hides the *teraphim* of her father indicates some kind of pack-saddle. Later the word *kūr* or *karr* is used in Arabic for the riding-saddle. But still in classical Arabic terminology, the word *haqība* is used for the cushion under the wooden saddle, a word which designates some kind of sack for goods.

The 1000 camels present at Qarqar imply large-scale herding and, possibly, breeding. It seems that the Assyrians never developed this practice themselves but always remained dependent upon the ‘Arabs’ for supply of camels for transport. It seems that ‘Arabs’, i.e. ‘arbāy and ‘Aribi’ people, were involved in the business from the beginning. From the list of the participants at Qarqar in 853 it seems that the arbāy king Gindibu is listed with the kings from Transjordan. It is tempting to look towards the present Azraq oasis as the home for these camelbreeders. This has not been archaeologically verified, but evidence points to the Syrian area as the cradle of large-scale herding and breeding of the dromedary starting around 900 B.C.

The background for this process was of course that there were people who had been acquainted with the camel for a long time. This acquaintance consisted mainly of exploitation of the camel’s milk and dung and, sporadically, meat. It is possible that the earliest primitive use of the camel was initiated by a dryer climate that hit the Middle East in the 3rd millennium B.C. As the desiccation proceeded, man and camel met at the sources of water. This made it possible to use its dung, milk, and meat. A further step was taken when man could attract camels by digging wells. The animal thus became more and more dependent upon man for its survival. The archaeological evidence from Iran and Oman points towards Iran as the origin of the described form of domestication of the Bactrian camel, and that it spread from there to Eastern Arabia. The finds at Umm an-Nār from ca. 2500 B.C. are decisive. From there it spread slowly into South Arabia and Mesopotamia, a process which took place during the 2nd millennium B.C. It may have been used for transport before 900 B.C., although we have no evidence for this.

According to this picture, the domestication was the work of settled people, not nomads. However, this kind of domestication remained peripheral and could never become the basis for a society. The camel is an animal that is difficult to handle. It cannot be panned. It needs very large pasture grounds since it tends never to overgraze but keeps on moving while pasturing. It has an extremely low fertility rate due to the short mating season.
difficult to replace. Planned breeding demands great attention and a lot of time.\textsuperscript{202} The consequence is that a society based on camel herding has need of large pasture grounds not limited by agriculture since you need at least 20 camels to feed a tent, i.e. a family.\textsuperscript{203} One must then have strong motivations to venture the hazards of the life of a full camel nomad.

The northern Syrian steppes fulfill the ecological demands for the rise of such a society, having large areas with rainfall too scanty for successful agriculture but sufficient for good pasturing. We do not know if there were people here who had already started a career as camel-nomads in the beginning of the 9th century B. C. The inspiration to ride the camel on the hump may well have come from the riding of horses. Since the riding of horses was definitely connected with its military use it is likely that riding the camel horse-wise had the same purpose. It can then have been the demand for riding animals for use in battle that triggered off the development of camel herding and, as a result of that, the rise of groups willing to specialize in herding and breeding the animal.

The need for camel-riders in wars ought to have increased the motivation for valiant souls to start a new life based on the camel. These people at once became totally dependent upon the animal (as well as the animal upon them). At the same time this was their strength: the dependency was the only means for acquiring the know-how of breeding and training the camel. Since this meant living with it in steppe areas, it also included freedom from control from the empires. The relationship between the camel herders and governments became different from that of small-cattle nomads. When the camel very soon became militarily useful, it was evident that the camel herders had, so to speak, backed the right horse.

We cannot decide the ethnicity of the riders on the reliefs from Carchemish and Tell Halaf, nor of the riders on the Balawāt-gates. But the camel was obviously handled by the people known as ‘Arabs’, if not from the beginning then very soon as seen from the Assyrian texts. We have suggested elsewhere that ‘Arabs’ at this time is not a general vague term for nomads or bedouins but designates an institution, a kind of legionary troops developed by the Aramean kings in Syria in the 9th century B. C.\textsuperscript{204} But whoever invented the art of handling the dromedary, it brought the peoples and tribes in the Syrian desert into the mainstream of history. These people, among which we find the ‘Arabs’, and later the Sabaeans, started camel breeding on a larger scale than was hitherto known. And due to the special conditions for use of the camel, it was fairly easy to establish a monopoly for the use of the animal.

The great expansion of camel breeding among the tribes in Syria also provided possibilities for civil transportation of goods. We do not know much about how and when this started since the Assyrian evidence is somewhat one-sided. It is likely that also the use of the camel for transport was developed in a military context.\textsuperscript{205} Then there must have been a continuous expansion of camel herding in the Syrian desert until the 7th century B.C. It is not impossible that the frankincense road to South Arabia was established from the north and not from the south. Growing evidence shows that South Arabian material culture has received main stimuli from the north. There is also a linguistic influence which conventionally is connected with Saba. The Sabaean dialect differs from the other ones in South Arabia and
shows affiliation with the languages in Syria and Western Arabia. We also have
textual evidence that Sabaeans were in the north in the 8th century but in Yemen in
the 6th. All these factors together make it likely that the establishment of the
incense road is connected with a general expansion of tribes from Syria south-
wards.206

The people called arbay or arab in the Akkadian sources played a central role in
the development of handling camels. They did not, however, deal with frankinc-
ence in this period. That trade was developed by others. The ‘Arabs’ instead
became engaged in a prolonged conflict with the Assyrian empire. The advantages
of their monopoly on camelbreeding was shown by the fact that it took the
Assyrians nearly 200 years to reach the stronghold of the ‘Arabs’ in Dumah. And in
spite of this, the ‘Arabs’ survived the downfall of the Assyrian Empire and devel-
oped their techniques of riding and warfare through the centuries, until one day
they were able to establish themselves as worthy successors to the Assyrians.
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139. See von Soden, Handwörterbuch s.vv. There exists no comprehensive study of these words in Akkadian.

4305 rev. 21 = Wiseman, Inscription 126, 124; Sargon II: Annals 125 = Lie, Annals 23 (= 715 B.C.). Sennacherib: Campaign A1 57 = Luckenbill, Annals 54, Record of campaigns rev. 23 =
Luckenbill op. cit. 92; Esarhaddon: Heidel-prism III: 65 = Heidel, Prism 20; Borger, Inschriften
54 (A IV 21); Assurbanipal: Prism B VIII 12-22. 36 = Piekorn, Prism Inscriptions 83, 84;
Assur-letter: VAT 5600 II 1-5, 13, K 2802 IV 17, 22, V 13, VI 36 = Streck, Assurbanipal 376-379,
200-205; the Rassam-cylinder VIII 114, IX 5, 36, 42-49, 65-67 = Streck, op. cit. 72-79.
141. Sennacherib campaign loc. cit.
142. Fragn. 5 Rs. 2 = Borger, Inschriften 112.
144. Jeremiah 49:29, 32.
146. Isaiah 21:7. For the dating see Galling, Jesaja.
147. Isaiah 60:6.
149. Genesis 37:25.
150. See Knauf, Ismael 56 ff.
152. Leviticus 11:4; Deuteronomy 14:7.
153. The camel chews the cud but does not have a cloven hoof.
154. E.g. Shabat XV: 1-2; Erubin III: 4; IV: 10; Ketuboth V: 6; Qiddushin IV: 14.
156. 2 Chronicles 14:15. The Cushites are most likely a tribe from Midian.
157. The camel in the Lachish relief (Room XXXVI slab 8) is part of the procession of local inhabitants
carrying booty to the enthroned Assyrian king (Paterson, Sculptures, plates 71-73).
158. 1 Chronicles 27:30.
159. 1 Samuel 27:9.
160. 1 Samuel 15.
161. 1 Samuel 27:8-9; 30:1-20.
162. 1 Samuel 15:3; 30:17, 15:7 repeated in 1 Samuel 27:8.
164. The identification must come from the fact that Ishmael originally belonged to the Negev as did
probably Amaleq. The later Ishmaelites lived east of Palestine in the Syrian desert and are
identified with ‘the Sons of the East’ (see below). Why Ishmael was transferred to the eastern
tribes by the Priestly writers we do not know. It must in some way be connected with Hagar which
originally was a tribe in northern Transjordan. In order to solve the problem we must find out how
Transjordanian Hagar became the mother of Negevite Ishmael.
166. Genesis 24.
169. In Genesis 31:34 Rachel sits on a kar in her tent. In Arabic kār or karr is a camel’s saddle as
distinguished from a sarg which is that of a horse (Jacob, Beduinenebenen 81). Cf. note 193 below.
170. Free’s attempt to verify Abraham’s camels by referring to Egyptian evidence has been refuted, cf.
Walz, Problem 32 note 2. This also excludes the Egyptian camels in Exodus 9:6 as part of a genuine
tradition from the time of the Exodus. Bulliet, Camel 36 ff., 67 seems not to exclude the
possibility.
172. Isaiah loc. cit.
173. This is also reflected in Ex. 9:3 where the Egyptians are said to have camels at the time of the
Exodus but the Israelites do not.
174. The earliest datable reference to Saba is from 733 B.C. (Tiglath Pileser III: Annals 219 = Rost 36).
We do not know for suer whether this Saba is situated in Yemen or further north. The comments
ary about Sheba in Gray, Kings 258 ff. are outdated.
178. Isaiah 9:4, 10:26-27. The passage in Psalm 83:10-13 is dependent upon the story as we know it from Judges 6-8. See Knauf, Midian 31-42. For a similar judgement of the story see de Vaux, Histoire 119-125.
179. See Knauf, Midian 6-8, 15-26.
180. Knauf, op. cit. 35.
183. This also implies that there is no reason to use the absence of camels among the Midianites in Numeri 31 as an argument for dating that passage before 1100 B.C. Of the Midianite tribes, Hayappa (= Ephah) is mentioned for the first time by Tiglath Pileser III in 732 (Annals 219 = Rost 36). It cannot, however, be proved that the camels mentioned in the booty list (I. 223) are from them. There are seven other tribes in the list, among them Thamud and Saba, who could have provided them. Camelbreeding in Midian is thus not definitely confirmed in texts before the time of Isaiah 60:6.
184. Thus Knauf, Midian 14-15.
185. Herodotus III 97.
188. This rules out the hypothesis advanced by Finkelstein, claiming the frankincense trade from Arabia to be one of the main reasons for the increased settlements in the Negev in the 12th and 11th centuries B.C. (Finkelstein, Trade esp. 246-247). The changing patterns of settlement there must have other causes.
189. For the riding behind the hump see the illustration in Bulliet, Camel 69.
190. Rausing, Bow 84-88.
191. For the riding of the horse see Hančar, Pferd 551 ff. For influences of horse-riding technique visible in early pictures of camel riders see Dostal, Frage 6.
192. Genesis 31:34.
193. In modern Arabic ḥaqıba has been reused as ‘suit-case’.
194. Köhler, Domestikation 119.
196. Mikesell, Notes 241; Zarins, Pastoralism 147; Köhler, Dromedary 204; ead., Domestikation 50; Nielsen, Frankincense note 141.
197. Köhler, Domestikation 89-92, 116-122; Potts, Gulf 129-130.
198. Köhler, Domestikation 122-123.
199. Cf. Mikesell, Notes 242; Köhler, Dromedary 203; ead., Domestikation 118-120.
201. Gauthier-Pilters/Dagg, op. cit. 93 f.
203. Gauthier-Pilters/Dagg, Camel 141.
204. See Retsō, Arabs.
205. The notice in 2 Kings 8:9 about the ten camel-loads of gifts given by Ben Hadad in Damascus to Elisha around 840 B.C. may give a glimpse of the emergent use of the camel as pack-animal.
206. The complicated question of the origin and early history of the civilization in South Arabia cannot be discussed at length here. But it is evident from this study that the establishment of the frankincense road through Western Arabia goes together with the rise of the Sabaean kingdom in Yemen according to the short chronology of the ‘French school’ (Cf. Pirenne, Überblick 122-126). The result of the present investigation may thus be seen as a support for the short chronology, at least as far as the rise of the Sabaean kingdom is concerned. It also seems that the appearance of the monumental South Arabian script belongs to the sixth century B.C. (Sass, Studia 31). In a recent study, Sass has surveyed a fairly large corpus of short inscriptions in an archaic form of the South Semitic alphabet, mostly from North Arabia, dating them 8th and 7th centuries B.C., i. e. the two centuries before the rise of Sheba according to the short chronology. From the shape of the letters in these early inscriptions, Sass concludes that the South Semitic script was derived from the
Phoenician around 1000 B.C. (Sass, op. cit. 86–90). According to him “the starting point of this development in South Arabia must have been the accumulation of wealth as a result of the increasing trade in incense (sic) and other luxury goods with countries to the north” (op. cit. 29). The link is the camel-traffic that was established in the end of the 2nd millennium B.C. (op. cit. 30). But if, as has been shown here, this traffic did not exist before the 6th century B.C., the derivation of the South Semitic alphabet from the Phoenician one as early as 1000 B.C. becomes a problem. If one accepts Sass’ dating of the earliest South Semitic script, one has to explain how this was possible without the regular caravans between Yemen and Syria. Now we know that there were connections between Phoenicia and the lands around the Red Sea, probably including Yemen, in the 10th century B.C., viz. by the ships of Hiram of Tyre (1 Kings 10:11, 22). These trading conditions may well be the canal through which the alphabet was introduced in South Arabia, just like it was introduced in Greece somewhat later. But the frankincense-carrying camels had nothing to do with it since they did not yet exist.
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In Daniel 2,14 we read: ḍēqayin Dānī’el h’rūb ḍēqā ū-t림 l'-Aryōk rab-ṭabbāhayyā di malkā di nṣaq l'-qatālā l'-ḥakkimē Bābūl “Then Daniel answered with counsel and wisdom to Arioch the captain of the king’s guard, who was gone forth to slay the wise men of Babylon” (here and below in the main according to the King James Version). The reasons I have for considering rab-ṭabbāhayyā a “loan translation” are the following. 1. Ṣar here translates the Hebrew šar in the expression šar-ḥa-ṭabbāhīm; for the etymology of šar cf. OS, 36–7/1989, pp. 91–3. 2. The word rab in turn renders the Greek ἀρχη- in several titles of various origin. 3. As for ṭabbāḥ we are here, as we will see, confronted with what I would call the deconstruction of the signification (cf. below, p. 222). On the one hand we are dealing with a connection with an old Hebrew usage, and, on the other, also with a foreign influence, Mesopotamian in general, Iranian, or, as I am inclined to believe, Hellenistic.

The Septuagint has for ...rab-ṭabbāhayyā... etc. ἀρχη τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως, while Theodotion, who, by the way, here more follows the Hebrew text than does the Septuagint, gives us the rendering τοῦ ἀρχη τοῦ ἀρχηγοῦ τοῦ βασιλέως ὃς ἔξελθεν ἀνωτέρω τοῦ σωροῦ Βαβύλωνος (ed. A. Rahlfs). According to Liddell-Scott-Jones (LJS) the word ἀρχηγοῦς in Genesis 39,1 – and then also 37,36 – means “chief cook”, but in our Daniel-passage it is said to designate “title of a great officer in Oriental courts”. Moreover, in his narrative about Daniel Josephus says that Daniel “went to Arioches, to whom was entrusted the command (ἀρχή) of the king’s bodyguard” (ἐπὶ τῶν σωματοφυλάκων τοῦ βασι- λέως), Antiquitates, X, 10,3, ed. R. Marcus, 1937 (Loeb); H. Clementz translates: “begab er sich ... zu Ariochus, dem Befehlshaber der königlichen Trabanten” (Des Flavius Josephus Jüdische Altertümer, 10. Aufl., Wiesbaden 1990, p. 632). It should be noticed that Gen. 40,3f. šar-ḥa-ṭabbāhīm in the Septuagint is rendered, on one hand, by δεσμοφυλάκης “gaoler”, and, on the other, by ἀρχηγοῦς and Gen. 39, 21.22 by ἀρχηγοῦς ἀρχηγοῦς “chief gaoler” (LSJ, p. 380b and p. 251b); in II. Kings 25, 8–10 and Jeremiah 39,9–52,30 we find rab-ṭabbāhīm translated by ὁ ἀρχηγός; cf. A Patristic Lexicon, ed. G. W. H. Lampe, 1972, p. 240a.

Now, while Biblical Hebrew shows a uniform designation for an official who must have had various functions, all according to time and place, the versions present various designations for the official in question, cf. for instance Gen. 37,36:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MT</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pəṣîṭṭā</td>
<td>sōrīs</td>
<td>šar ṭabbāhīm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sperber</td>
<td>rabbā</td>
<td>rab daxšā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mahaymanā</td>
<td>rab qatólayyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Here (I) refers to the rank in relation to the ruler and (II) refers to the name of the function of the keeper of the rank.

In this connection I shall only deal with Old Syriac *daxšā*, a word that seems difficult to interpret etymologically. It occurs however only as a plural, *daxšā*, which seems to indicate that we are dealing with a collective, a group of functionaries, and that of a kind of which the etymology might give us an idea, if we knew it. However even so only an idea. For we should not be astonished if, within the framework of the organization of the court in the various states of Antiquity, we find “the butcher and the baker and the candlestickmaker” as high officials; for *hdrpt*, the title of a Persian court official, cf. OS, 12/1964, p. 93 and F. Vattioni, Le iscrizioni di Hatra (1981), No. 83,2, p. 52: sacerdote del fuoco. An interesting question is how this kind of symbolism has come about and to what extent cultural influence has given rise to identifications of the kind we also meet with later in history (e.g. maréchal and the like). Now we also find a sort of learned identification, namely with Dean Payne Smith, who in his monumental “Thesaurus Syriacus”, I, Col. 867 lists *daxšā* as “lictor, satelles” – unfortunately two, likewise, etymologically obscure words – and who without hesitation places Syriac *rab daxšā*, Imperial Aramaic *rab-jabbāhayā* as well as Hebrew *šar ha-ṭabbāhīm* on a par with *praefectus satellitum praetorianorum*.

Now we must ask the following question: What is the etymology of *daxšā*? In his Lexicon Syriacum¹ (1895; below LS), p. 70b Brockelmann lists only the singular *daxšā* “satelles, lictor” with a reference to Lagarde but with a “pers.?”; of non-biblical authors he here had Afrāhāt 38,3 and Aftrām 1,91D. The reason for the question-mark was perhaps that he shared Lagarde’s doubt about his own combination of Armenian *dahic* – with which he compared OS *dxš* – with Persian *dāh* = Sanskrit *dāsa-* (“mag verwandt sein”) in Gesammelte Abhandlungen (1866), p. 31, No. 78. With this *dahic* Lagarde combined, of course, also *dahēcapet = ḍeχματέγεωτος*, Gen. 37,36; II. Kings 25, 8.10.11.

According to Hübchmann, who among his “Persische Wörter” has taken over Lagarde’s etymology as well as his biblical passages, *dahic* means “Scherge, Polizeisoldat, Henker”, while he only lists OS *daxšā* “satelles, lictor” as singular, saying that this word “nicht echt syrisch ist und aus dem Pers. stammen könnte”; for *dahēcapet* he quotes Gen. 39,1 ḍeχματέγεωτος (Armenische Grammatik, I, 1985, p. 133, No. 159). In LS² (1928), p. 149b the sing. *daxšā* recurs with a “pers.?!” and a reference to Lagarde’s *dahic* and to Hübchmann, AG 133, No. 159; of non-biblical authors are now added Narsai, 1, 333,5 and a *daxšāyā* “uxor summi satellitum” from Bābāi in Euagrius Ponticus, 214,5 (ed. W. Franklinberg, 1912), a form presupposing a *daxšāyā*, a fact to be considered below, p. 64. For further references cf. Payne Smith, Thesaurus, Col. 867, where several Arabic equivalents also are quoted: *a’wān*, *sūra*, *xadam* ~ *xuddām*, *fuyūq* = *paygā* to Pahlavi *pāy* “footsoldier, courier”, cf. rahāhā = *daxšā*, Bar Bahlūl, Col. 225, 14-15 and 552, 1–6. In A Compendious Syriac Dictionary, ed. J. Payne Smith (1903/1979) *daxšā* is found,
however, only as a plural: daxšā “the guard, guardsmen; attendents, yeomen, warders, apparitors of a tribunal” (p. 88a). It may be mentioned that in G. H. Bernstein’s “Das Heilige Evangelium des Johannes syrisch in Harklenscher Übersetzung” (1858) we find instead of daxšā-焉ɲɲɛtɛu the word for “servant”, mšammɔmɔnà (cf. LS, p. 788b “spec. judicis lictor”): 7, 32.45.46; 18, 3.12.18.22 and 19.6.

As we see, it is extremely difficult to decide on the etymology of our daxšā as an Iranian loanword on the basis of such variegated acceptations. Thus Henning’s dlnyɛ “Scharfrichter” (Gnomon/195, 479 = Acta Iranica, W. B. Henning’s Selected Papers, IU/1977, p. 441) that recalls Hübschmann’s “Henker” is based on an interpretation of the meaning in a certain text in which “Scharfrichter” then appears as a plausible acceptance. We are here dealing with what I call the pragmatic referent, the meaning in casu, so to say, of the linguistic sign (dlnyɛ = expression ~ DLYĆ = content). Now there is also a vertical relation between the expression and the content, but this kind of relationship can only exist within the framework of the text, the metareferent of which is “communication in the world about the world to someone (the receiver)”. As for our (daxšā ~ DAXŠA) the invariant is the expression or the semiotics, while the variant or the semantics is the content, depending as it is on time and place and constituting the “Sitz in der Welt”, so to speak; cf. Kratylos, 36/1991, p. 180. The phenomenon we are confronted with in the present case I have called the deconstruction of the signification (p. 220), implying the task of interpreting the deconstruction, a rather difficult task, I think.

Now groping here in the dark it is appropriate to consider the results arrived at by J. C. Greenfield in an interesting and rewarding article, “Nergol DHŠPT” (A Green Leaf, Festschrift Jes P. Asmussen, 1988. pp. 135-143). In Vattioni’s “Le iscrizioni di Ḥatra”, p. 62, No. 140, 4-5 we find the passage ...’b’ / rb dhšjìh “’b’ / capo delle guardie”, which would be equivalent to OS ’b’ rab dxšwiy / rab daxšaw / from a rab daxšā, occurring in Daniel 2, 14: rab daxšā dɔ-mɔlkɔ, cf. II. Kings 25.8: Nhūzardān rab daxšā ‘abdeh dɔmɔlkɔ “Nebuzar-adan, captain of the guard, a servant of the king”; cf. 25, 10.11 and Greenfield, op. cit., p. 140.

Now before presenting our stance on some of the results obtained by Greenfield we shall consider some passages taken from the narrative about Bar Samyā (Baumstark, Geschichte der syrischen Literatur, 1922, pp. 28f.). Thus we read: qām-wā dāyānā bɔ-šạfrā wa-nxet lɔ-dyqṣyn dîlēh a(y)k dɔ-neʃmɔ-hwā lɔ-Barṣamya. wa-fqad-wā dāyānā w-aytɔyỳ(hy) men bāt astrā. wɔ-’al-wā wɔ-qām qɔdɔmaw(hy). ʃakɔ bàn: hɔ qā-em qɔdɔm rabbûtāk “The judge rose up in the morning and went down to his court of justice, in order that he might try Barsamya; and the judge gave orders, and they brought him from the prison; and he went up and stood before him; and the staff said, Behold, he standeth before your lordship” (Ancient Syriac Documents, ed. W. Cureton, 1864, p. 65, 15-18; translation, p. 65). Here it is the office, ʃaksā, which utters the words in question, probably through a rab ʃaksā, perhaps in the capacity as a primus inter pares or “lictor primus”. For on p. 75, 6-8 we read in the narrative about the deacon Xabbib (Baumstark, op. cit., p. 29): w-ezdal-wā leh [hɔ]-barrāyty lɔwɔ T’ʃn’ sābā aynā dɔ-rēšā-wā dɔ-ʃaksā dɔ-hgmwɔn w-emaw-wā d-enā-nà Xabbib dɔ-men Tîsh’ dɔ-baṭṭîn li “And he went alone (év ɛŋmûiq) to Theoctena, a veteran, who was the chief of the governor’s
band, and he said to him, I am Habib of Telzeha, whom ye are seeking” (translation, p. 74).

The expression *faksā ʿamar recurs p. 77, 18 as “the band said” (trans., p. 76) but now with the remark that *faksā < τάξις corresponds to Latin officium (notes, p. 188), with which we can compare Payne Smith, Thesaurus, I, Col. 1466 “comitatus officialis, satellites, judices”: ‘am *faksā, cf. Matthew 26, 58 ‘am daxšā = μετὰ τόν ὑπηρετόν.

Considering the already mentioned ῥέσα dā-faker sā da-hégemônā we may say that the name of the title réš *faksā is in the last resort determined by the content of the expression hégemônā (according to LS, p. 171 a “dux, praetor, praefectus”), a word the connotations of which can probably be ascertained by an investigation of ἴγεμων. In this connection we may be satisfied with “provincial governor” placing at the same time rab daxšā on a par with a τάξιαρχος. In itself τάξις is an abstract noun here used as a collective of ὑπηρετῶν of various kinds, the sing. ὑπηρέτης being an “officer attached to τάξις” (LSJ, 1872b) or in any case an official of some kind, constituting a member of a τάξις in a collective sense = daxšā.

Now I have already pointed out (p. 221) that daxšāytā “uxor summi satellitum” presupposes a daxšāyā, a member of a daxšā < *faksā, that is, a τάξιαρχος “officer of a magistrate, sergeant, commissary etc.”, “member of the militia palatina” (LSJ, 1756a); cf. OS ἀρκεσθεόια “cohortalis, officialis procuratoris” (LS, p. 1756a). Thus a rab daxšā < daxšā is a τάξιαρχος “a commander of a τάξις”, in one of the functions listed in LSJ, 1756, a–b. To this daxšā may, as far as I can see, also Armen. dahēcep belong.

All this seems to mean that Greek τάξις lived on in Old Syriac, on the one hand as a “mot savant”, i.e. in teksā in the West and in faksā in the East (Nöldeke, Kurzgez. Syrische Grammatik, 1898, § 25), and, on the other, as a “mot populaire” in daxšā < *faksyā, in which an unaspirated τ is realized as a voiceless ẓ instead of the usual τ > ẓ (Kurylowicz, Lingua 1:1, pp. 77–85), and, in which the -siyā > -syā in *faksyā has caused the palatalization to -ṣa: daxšā. However, the designation of our daxšā as a “mot populaire” has its complications, for, on one hand, this word might have assumed its form on Iranian soil, and, on the other, the original language might have been Greek or Aramaic, that is, τάξις or *faksā.

Now, if this is correct also Nrgl ḏḥṣpt’ in Hatra would represent a Nergal ταξιαρχος, for the word τάξις is also used of certain very specific bodies, e.g. of several orders of ministry, particularly of apostles, prophets, bishops, monks, OThigh-priesthood, and of angels (Lampe, op. cit., p. 1373a); cf. ταξιαρχος also of a monastic official, a steward seeing to order, especially in choir and refectory (op. cit., 1372b); cf. als LSJ s.v. “centurio”, tribunus militum”, “legatus legionis”, and Vattioni. Le iscrizioni di Hatra, pp. 109–110 as well as OS ḏaksā “cohors lictorum”, ḏaks “cohors” (L.S, p. 274a; 275a). Thesaurus, Suppl. ed. J. P. Margoliouth (1927), pp. 143b–144a has: ʿaddar hgmwn’ rhōmāyā w- ḏaksīs dileh “the governor sent soldiers and his own guard”.

Now Vattioni has in his appendix, No. 4, 7–9, p. 106: dnrgwīl / ḏḥṣps’ (that he places in n. 8 on a par with ḏḥṣpt’, usual in these inscriptions) ḏṣr’ / bmlh’ “di Nrgwīl / delle guardie che abita / nelle salina”. However, Greenfield here suggests “that this may be an interpretation of the title ḏḥṣpt’ (he adopts Caquot’s reading) based
on Iranian *daxši* (op. cit., p. 139, n. 28), which might then be explained as a case of haplography, possibly including also haplology, facilitating the acceptance of the alleged interpretation. In this connection A. Haldar's book "The Notion of the Desert in Sumero-Accadian and West-Semitic Religions" (1950) would then also assume a certain importance. In the light of such an interpretation our *dhšpṭ* would have the meaning of "Lord of the desert". Now this interpretation gives us a new problem to solve, and, as far as I can see, a difficult one. Let us therefore take a look at Iranian *dhšr* "desert, steppe". I have already dealt with this word in OS, 22/1974, pp. 72–3, unfortunately overlooking at the time Greenfield-Shaked's treatment of the word in ZDMG, 122/1972, pp. 38–9.

In Hilfsbuch, II, (1931), p. 50 Nyberg had listed a *dašt* "Wüste, Steppe, Ebene", correctly combining it with Sogdian *daxšī* with the same meaning. As the original form of Pahlavi *dašt* he posited "nach Ausweis des Sogdischen" a *daxšī*- to Avestan *dag-* "brennen", *daxšī*- "Brand". What gave rise to this acute interpretation was, however, the indeed remarkable idea that this *daxšī*- appears as an Iranian loanword in Armenian *erašt* "Regenmangel, Trockenheit, Düre", adj. "regenlos, nicht feucht, trocken", a word that he found in Hübschmann, Armenische Grammatik, p. 442. With an arbitrary inversion of the meanings found in Hübschmann into "trocken, Trockenheit, Düre, Regenmangel" he derived Armen. *erašt* from an Iranian *dašt*- . Now, however the relationship obtaining between the orthographic doublets *d* and *ð* is to be understood in Sogdian, one is hardly allowed to pass over the following circumstances. 1. For the probably genuine Armenian *erašt* Hübschmann has quite another etymological suggestion, which should by no means simply be ignored; cf. Nyberg, Hilfsbuch, II, p. V.2. Lagarde had already pointed out that both Persians and Armenians have *daštī* and *dašt* ("campestre") respectively "auf dem Felde wachsend" Ges. Abhandlungen, No. 89, pp. 34f. (cf. however Hübschmann, op. cit., p. 134: i-*dast-*n "der in der Ebene"), and Hübschmann has listed Armen. *dašt* "Feld, Ebene" as an old Iranian loanword, comparing NP *dašt* "Feld, Ebene, Wüste" (op. cit., p. 134, No. 166). However, in Manual, II (1974), p. 59 Nyberg has listed a *dašt* "plain, steppe, desert" but now we hear nothing more about an Avestan *dag-* "burn" etc. And quite rightly Greenfield and Shaked say about our *dašt*: "The etymology of the word in Iranian has been established by Nyberg as from the base *dag-* ‘to burn’. But this explanation is perhaps not above suspicion, as the word seems to signify ‘plain’ or ‘open, uninhabited place’ rather than ‘scorchend land’" (op. cit., p. 39). Thus the etymology of the word in question seems to be unknown.

As I have pointed out in OS, 22/1974, p. 73 Szemerényi has already rejected Nyberg’s *erašt* < *dašt* < *daxšī*- but he nevertheless accepts Nyberg’s opinion that it is Sogdian *daxšī*- that settles the etymological question (*dašt*) through its alleged identity with Avestan *daxšī*- "fire" to *dag-* "burn" (Orbis, 19/2/1970, pp. 511–512). Moreover he finds a semantic parallel in OCS *pust-* “waste, desert, empty”, assuming a semantic development "burnt up" > "desert" > "plain" and analysing the Slavonic word as an IE *po-us-to-*, *ěbo*, *těřo* etc. and thus rejecting Vasmer, Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch, II, p. 467 (Common Slavonic *pustiti* "lassen"), in my opinion unjustly, for cf. Swedish *låta* "let go". For a much better semantic parallel to Iranian *daxšī* we find in Hebr. *mīdbār* "wilderness" < "tracts
of land, used for the pasturage of flocks and herds” (Brown-Driver-Briggs, p. 184b), to a dbr “let go”, cf. German Trift “Ort, wohin man treibt (die Herde)”, “weide” (Kluge-Mitzka, 1960, 791); Hebr. dâbîr “speech, word” (= Arabic lafûd < παῦμα ρύο); OS dâbrâ “ager, campus, desertum” etc. We should also observe Arabic dâbr “back” as well as zahr “back” and the Hinterseite of a house, cf. Akkadian šēru “back” and “open country, fields, plain, steppeland”.

Now from this point of view one might perhaps be justified in thinking, for Iranian *daxšā-, of a distant, in any case semantic relative in Latin, namely tractus, *-ās “Landstrich, Gegend, Gebiet mit Hervorhebung der Längenausdehnung” (Menge-Güthing, 761), although the IE etymology of this word seems to be very unclear: thus *daxšīa- < *draxša-, where dr ~ dhr might have been a voiced counterpart of Old Persian č- < tr- > dag-šīa- ~ dag-ša- > daxša- “extension, open plain”, with -š as in Avestan dax-ša- “fire”, cf. Mayrhofer, A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary, II, p. 11; Szemerényi, Orbis, 19:2, p. 511 and n. 7.

However that may be, we should understand the steppe as opposed to the town or the stronghold, as the hinterland of the town. On the other hand, we should observe that the Mesopotamian edin-sēru also designated “the haunt of demons” (CAD, 16/1962, p. 145) and its equivalents may also have been understood in Hatra as “the nether world”. Thus it is perhaps in the light of this ideology that we should look at the passage so acutely discussed by Greenfield, that is, Nrgwī dḥṣpī· dhr· bmlḥ’ (cf. OS mālxā = Hebr. mōlehā, and mālaxtā “terra salsa”). Thus either “Nergal the rab daxšā, the tāγiαγες over the demons”, or, as a dḥṣṭ-pī “the Lord of the desert”, in any case then with haplogy. One could perhaps compare OS ’yzpī’ in Bar Bahlūl, 122 listed by Duval as the plural ’izpētā = daxšā, but according to Lagarde containing a “paitī” (Ges. Abh., p. 187), cf. ’ynbd, corrected by Brockelmann into a ’yzbd “lictor seu magister equitum” (LS, p. 16a), cf. LS1, p. 8b ’ayenbd (= āynpat “master of ceremonies”?) corrected to ’yzbd “magister equitum”. Here we probably have to do with some confusion, and I would venture an ’izpētā = ’izp-paṭā < izb-paṭā < asp-pat “magister equitum”; cf. OS pyšspg < pēš-aspāk, plur. pyšspgn < pēš-aspakān “outrider”; the form pyšṣpyg as well as the two other forms are explained by Brockelmann as pēš-asb-pāyān “praeceptor” (LS, 613b), cf. above p. 62 pygā! However that may be, haplogy is in any case possible in Greenfields interpretation.

The results of all this may appear somewhat meagre. 1. I agree with Greenfield and Shaked in thinking that Avestan dag- “burn” in connection with daxšē- “desert” is not above suspicion. 2. I think that OS daxšā conceals a case of Hellenistic influence of some sort, an influence Greenfield also mentions (Festschrift Asmus- sen, p. 135).
An Alleged “Canaanite” Name

TORGNY SÄVE-SÖDERBERGH, Uppsala

In “Studies in Egyptology presented to Miriam Lichtheim” Rostislav Holthoer touches on problems in which I have been interested on different occasions, i.e. the formula used to combine foreign and Egyptian names of foreigners in Egyptian context (see Scandinavian Joint Expedition to Sudanese Nubia. Publ. V, pp. 205 f.). He republishes a number of membra disiecta belonging to a sculptor called Pagerger and suggests that this man has a foreign name in syllabic orthography and that “it could well be a Canaanite name ending with -el” (p. 456). “Albright (1934, p. 31) provides support for this”.

This is however not the case. The names with -el (Albright, p. 34B) are written न or ना, never ना or similar as in the name of Pagerger. Moreover, the rest of the name is certainly not written with syllabic orthography.

Ranke, Personennamen p. 120; 16 reads P3grgr which I think is the correct reading. According to Holthoer “the most common writing is Pagerer”. Disregarding the gratuitous vocalization, this statement is a simplification of the evidence. As far as I can see it is only on monument No. 1 (fig. 2) that the name is written न in a very short text, where the available space invites to an abbreviated form. On the same monument the longer texts write P3grgr, and it seems obvious that this reading should be preferred to the P3gr of the short text where has been left out. न with variants is the normal writing in the other texts. Holthoer, I am convinced wrongly, regards the sp smw as applying only to the final r. In any case, the writing P3grgr excludes any syllabic writing and any connection with the “Canaanite” -el.

According to Holthoer P3grgr “could have been an acclimatized foreigner (which) is indicated by his “Egyptian” name: Hy-pa-šemes-nefer” appearing on the apron of stela No. 2”. This is also presumably wrong. The text reads, not the expected ddw.n-f, the usual formula when an Egyptian and a foreign name are combined, but न (with - not न, a writing of sm not attested in the Wb). The name proposed by Holthoer does not occur in Ranke, Personennamen. The text is rather a sentence parallel to the wishes ending the texts on figs 6 and 7 on the frame of the naos, and it means “May thy following (of the gods) be good”, or sim., and is in any case not an “Egyptian” double name of a foreigner.

The discussion (p. 457) whether P3grgr was married or not neglects the statement that “his sister” was also nb(t) pr “mistress of the house”, i.e. his wife in marriage.

When dealing with the texts of this man a few additional remarks may be added.

The title of the man त्रष मद्र, not “त्रि (m) मद्र” as on p. 457, is better rendered “sculptor” (Gardiner, Onomastica I, 711f.) than “chiseler”, and I see no proof that the title “the sculptor of the Lord of the Two Lands” should imply a higher rank than “chief sculptor”.

Finally, some corrections of the translations of the texts:
p. 440, No. 2 (fig. 5) (sim. p. 448). Read *m sh3 mn tp t3* “like one whose memory remains upon earth” as Boeser 1912, Pl. cix, not *sn* as on fig. 5 with Madsen (1910), Sphinz XIII, pp. 52f.

p. 441. For “… frankincense which come forth … “read” … and what comes forth …” – the usual phrase.

p. 445 (fig. 8). For “Ambrosia” read “cakes, loaves”.

(fig. 9) In line 2 add “in heaven (and) on earth”.

(fig. 10) For “who exist in every suite” read “who are in your suite”, reading *k* not *nb*.

p. 447 (fig. 5). A wish for “winds coming from the south” (disregarding also the suffix *f*) would be very unconventional; read: “… coming in front of him (*m hnti.f*) …”.

For “… on the eddy? shores … “read” … from the eddy of the river …” (written *bbyt*) and for “bed” read “beer”.

(on No. 10) read in the last three lines: “… bread and beer, meat and fowl to the ka etc.”.
In 1971 Professor Hjalmar Frisk sent me a photograph of a Coptic papyrus in the possession of Director Bertil Thorburn, Gothenburg. It is said to have been acquired in Cairo by the Swedish Ambassador Harald Bildt in the 1930's. Nothing is known about its provenance.

Mr. Thorburn kindly authorized me in 1973 to publish the document, but owing to other duties I have not found time to do so until now.

The text offers a series of difficulties, a fact which has been an additional reason for me to postpone the publication. Even if I cannot give an entirely satisfactory interpretation, I think it is time to communicate the text to others with better qualifications than mine, as it belongs to the relatively rare group of Fayyumic documents. It also contains some hitherto unknown words.

I have consulted a number of Coptologists, and Professor Hans Martin Schenke in 1981 with kind generosity sent me his interpretation which has been of great help to me. He had also consulted several colleagues, among others Professor Fritz Hintze. With gratitude I have taken over a number of Professor Schenke's suggestions and without his assistance I would hardly have dared to expose my ignorance. As a consolation in my failure I quote the master of Coptology, W. E. Crum, in *Varia Coptica* (1939), p.5:

"Coptic documents, whether contracts or letters, even when flawlessly preserved, seem fated to remain here and there obscure. If that is true of Sa'edic texts, far more it is so of Fayyumic".

In view of some very erratic spellings and corruptions in Fayyumic letters (e.g., Crum, op. cit., No. 116) some rather hazardous guesses in my interpretation may be excused.

The papyrus consists of a single sheet, 33 x 24 cm. The first two lines have been detached from the rest and the three first lines are very fragmentary. The papyrus is wrongly mounted, leaving too little space for line 3. This has been corrected in the facsimile.

The palaeography seems to indicate the 8th century AD. Compare the documentation in the paragraph on palaeography with V. Stegemann, *Koptische Paläographie* (1936) and, e.g., A. A. Schiller, *Ten Coptic Legal Texts*, (1939).

The dialect is Fayyumic, but as is often the case there are traces of other dialects and the lambdicism does not occur regularly. The orthography is often inconsistent and unorthodox (see analysis, below, based on Crum, *Coptic Dictionary*, quoted Crum).
TRANSLATION

(1) ↑...↑........ I greet and adore for the health of your [brotherly] Lordship and ....
(2) and I greet your entire...our entire famous and imperishable (?) place of the Lord...
(3) ... and ... (traces only) ...
(4) to do forced labor after this, my [brotherly] Lordship, disturbs our 70 days
(5) in our vigil with one another. Lo, (it is) a lot of time of silence (?) for our
(6) tongue. Lo, Leontios (? α?), our brotherly, pitiful Lordship, you don’t come like the people of Armau came
(7) <to> the village. And what they did (was); they tried to kill us, Leontios (? α?),
our brotherly Lordship. They...
(8) took our cattle with them, they imprisoned us and they took away my baskets (?)
to
(9) Fayyum. I have not accepted a(ny) man who delivers (to deliver) the dues (?) outcome for our work except you, Leontios (? α?). He wants (perhaps a mistake for <and>)
(10) if it (this affair) satisfies you so that you accept them, give us our (?) food which
is with you, and we
(11) shall feed them until we see how the affair turns out. And my brotherly Lordship,
make a rampart (?) = be a protection for
(12) the man (who is) with them, because it is a day of need. And lo, you know
yourself that we do not disregard (?)
(13) your decision (prop. answer). Being under titolis (=δουλεία = in (your) service ?)
and thanking you I greet you,
(14) (and ? or I ?) Kolluthios (?) and the rest of all our brethren. Be safe in the Lord
Jesus
(15) And if truth is with you, (there is) sagacity with our scribe of the village. Should
you respect emptiness (vanity)
(16) towards (more than ?) your iton (?), tell me your opinion and I shall order (?)
them.

NOTES ON TRANSLATION

Line 1
The first sign is probably the cross to judge from the typical loop. The next signs which
can be read with certainty are τιμή “I greet” which is repeated in line 2. Before this
one expects the usual introduction to letters ωφινη ηνι (σωδη ηνι), but this is hard to
reconcile with the existing traces. A stroke above the line looks like part of a χ or κ,
followed by a doubtful η ligated with the τ of τιμή, and preceded by illegible traces of
two or three signs, a φ, as well as the unidentified ↑. This would suggest another type
of introduction to letters such as, e.g., ξανη ηπαξαξε (Crum, Varia Coptica, Nos. 37-
39, 54, 72; Short Coptic Texts, 1921, Nos. 192, 217, 252, 346). But here again the traces and length of the lacunae offer difficulties.

For the abbreviation ἱππιος see, e.g., Kahle, Bala'izah (1954), p. 694.

The reading of the rest of this line is evident from the context except for the short lacuna of some four or five letters after ἁγιος.

Line 2
A very uncertain suggestion is to fill the lacuna τῳδῖνι ἐπεκ. ὡλαξαξει “I greet your dwelling place (?)” as a parallel to the following ἐναξαηι “place of your Lordship”. Cf. ὡλαξει, ὡλαξ. (Crum 508a).

The reading at the end of the line and the beginning of line 3 ΤΑΤΤΗΛΙΠΚΩΛ “imperishable” leaves a hasting here unexplained.

Line 4
῾ΙΚΕΕΒ as a variant of ἹΚΕΑ, ἹΚΕΩ. “do forced labor” is not attested in Crum 99b.

For the following ἘΜΕΝΣΑΙΝΕΠΗΙ Schenke suggests ἘΝ ἘΠΗΙ “ist zwar gut”, but one would rather expect a negative “is not good” and the ἘΝ can hardly be this negative. I prefer ἘΜΕΝΣΑ ἘΠΗ “after this” with a regular ἘΠ form.

The traces of the verbal prefix to ...ἐπαξατεῖ “disturb” are not readable with any certainty.

The reading “70 [days]” I owe to Schenke. I have been unable to find the background to the vigil of 70 days, which according to my reading of the end of the line περονιν ὡπες ἐλεον, καταιστατέαν (Crum 289a) would be combined with silence.

Line 6
῾ΕΠΙΕΙκ here and in lines 7 and 9 is according to Schenke, with all reservations, perhaps “Leontios”, the receiver of the letter. The name occurs in Coptic documents, but then written plene.

ἘΝΑΗΤ is a misspelling for ἘΠΑΗΤ (= ἘΝΑΗΤ), explained byiotacism; cf. line 12 ἘΝΑΝΙΚ.

I have not found the place name elsewhere; it can hardly be Armant.

Line 7
Read <ἘΠΙΤΙΜΙ.

ἈΠΟΥΚΑ is a strange form parallel to the perf. in ἄγιοι in line 7 and line 9 ΝΙΠΕΙ.

ΜΟΥ poss. pronoun for ΜΕΝ.

ΧΩΛΑΧΑ for ΧΩΛΑΧΑ (F), ΧΩΛΑΧΑ (S). Schenke “einsperren”; Westendorf 1977, 422 “einschliessen, versperren”.

Line 9
ὁι “accept” rather than “seize” according to the context.

ΤΩΝ according to Crum 410a a noun in F of unknown meaning in account without context. Could it be a noun connected with the preceding verb ὀλλω “deliver” and mean something like “outcome”, “dues”?

ἸΩΥΕΠΙΨΩΜΙ at the end of the line makes no sense. Schenke suggests a mistake for ἁγιος ἐγρωτομί.
Line 10
Read **καὶ καὶ ἰδία (ὡ)μὴ "give us our food"**.

Line 11
Schenke suggests with reservation the B word **ῬΩΝ** (Crum 298b) "rampart" and translates "es ist die Schutzwehr (?) des Menschen mit ihnen wegen eines nötigen Tages". Could it not rather be an imperative "make the rampart for (= protect) the man (who is) with them because it is a day of need"?

Lines 12/13
The context demands something like "we do not fail (i.e., to act according to) your answer (or decision)". The verb form must be neg. cons. and **κω** with direct object can mean "fail, quit, abandon" (Crum 95a, f), here maybe in the sense of "neglect". **κω** with prep. ε- means "rely upon" (Crum 96a), thus the opposite of what is expected. Hence **ΜΑΝΙΚΑ** stands for **ΜΑΙΚΑ** with an abnormal form (cf. **ΚΑΙΚΑ** A²).

Line 13
Hintze suggests that, if the last letter in the unknown word **ΤΥΧΑΙΚ** could be a ι, it could be a writing for **δοξαίοι** "servitude", thus meaning "(I) being your servant (and thanking you)". In fact the letters c (written with two strokes) and ι are rather similar. The preceding τι would then be the demonstr. article for the det. article.

Line 14
For **ΚΑΛΤ** Schenke suggests "(ich) Kolluthios (?)". This abbreviated writing is to my knowledge not known elsewhere. It is doubtful, whether Kolluthios would be the sender of the letter or is being greeted "together with the rest of the brethren" ("<and> K."). If he would be the sender one would expect something like **ἈΝΩΚ ΚΑΛΤ ΚΑΙΝΗΝ ΕΡΑΚ**.

Lines 15/16
The lines are an addition to the letter in the same handwriting as the rest of the text. It is difficult to translate because of unknown or rare words.

**ΜΑΝΗΣ** "truth" and **ΜΑΝΙΚΑΣ** "sagacity" are undoubtedly abstracta with **ΜΑΝ** (usually prefix for **η** loci) for **ΜΕΤ** (ΜΗΤ); thus **ΜΕΤΗ** (SBF - Crum 157a "truth, righteousness" and **ΜΕΤΗΛ** (B) "sagacity").

**ΝΗΝΙΚΑΝΚΑΝ** for **ΝΗΝΙΚΑΝΚΑΝ** (F - Crum 384a "alone as a title"); "Great Scribe" or "village scribe".

A new sentence probably starts with **ἘΚΟΝΤΑΧΕΙΑ** as a condition preceding the imperative in the last line "tell us your opinion in this affair".

**ΠΙΧΕ** probably for **ΠΙΧΕI** (F) "emptiness, vanity". If instead **ΧΙ** (Crum 747b), as suggested by Schenke, the meaning would be the same.

Line 16
**ἈΘΡΙΣΤΟΣ** is a crux. Neither **ἸΤΕΝ** "ground, rubbish" (Crum 87b) nor **ΤΩΝ** for **ΤΩΝ** "rising, resurrection" (Crum 446b) make any sense. To connect it with **ΤΩΝ** in **ΠΤΩΝ** "dispute" (Crum 418a) would be more plausible, but would still be a very uncertain
guess. The meaning would then be something like: “If you respect emptiness more than dispute”, i.e., “if you prefer to leave the matter alone without dispute”.

For the following cf. Crum 85a (F) ταμιαν επεκινωε εβλα γενεικε γιω “tell us your opinion in this affair”. (Cf. Crum, Varia Captica No. 114 (F)).

The end of the letter seems to be corrupt, but reasonably clear. An emendation ἕνακελεγε or similar “I shall order” would be hazardous, but it would suit the context.

**PALAEOGRAPHY**

| Α | 22, λυμ | Ρ | Ρ |
| B | δβ | C | ζο |
| E | εε, εεμ, ςβ, ετ, ς, ευ | T | Τ |
| H | Ηη | Y | Υ, λυς |
| I | 1, εες | X | Χ |
| K | Κ | Ω | Ω |
| Λ | Λ | Τ | Τ |
| Μ | Μμ | Υ | Υ |
| Ν | Ν | Ζ | Ζ |
| Ο | οο | Ξ | Ξ |
| Π | Π, φ | Ω | Ο |

**NOTES ON VOCABULARY**

**NON-FAYYUMIC WORD FORMS**

- ἀρε- for Φελι
- Κάλα- for Κάρα-; cf. Καλ- Α²
- κεεε in ἕκεεε for ΠΚΕΑ Σ; cf. κεεε Σ “compel”
- λαε ΣΒ for Φλεε
- Με Σ for ΦΜΕΙ
- Μίτ- ΣΑΑ² for ΦΜΕΤ-
- ΝΜΑ- for ΜΜΟ- object
- ΝΟΝ for ΝΕΝ
- ΟΝ for ΦΑΝ

on ΣΒ for ΦΑΝ
NEW WORDS AND DOUBTFUL

ἈΜΛΩY... place name

των (?)

ΜΑΝΩΛΩΣ for ΜΕΤΙΟΡΩΣ "sagacity"

ΜΥΝ for F ΜΕΝ

ΝΑΥΤ in ΓΙΝΑΥΤ; cf. ΜΗΝΗΑΗΤ

ΝΥΠΡΑ for ΝΥΠΡΑ

ΝΗΧ for F ΝΗΧΕΙ "emptiness"

ΤΑΙΩ "outcome (?)", "dues (?)"

ΤΗΝΑΗΕΙC for ΤΗΝΑΗΕΙΣ ΣΟΥΛΕΙA "servitude"

NOTES ON GRAMMAR

NOUNS

Prefix: ΜΗΤ-, ΜΑΝ- (abstracta), ΡΕΜΗΑΝ- nn loci

Articles: Π-, Τ-, ΟΥ-

PRONOUNS

Suffix: Ι-, Κ-, Β-, Ν-, Υ-

Demonstrative: ΝΕΙ

Possessive article: ΝΑ-, ΝΕΚ-, ΤΕΚ-, ΝΕΝ-, ΤΕΝ-, ΝΑ-, ΝΕΚ-, ΝΕΝ-, ΝΩΝ- (?) ΝΙΝΙ- (?)

Relative + perf. I: ΕΤΑ-, ΝΤΑ-

VERB

Imperative: ΑΡΕ-, ΚΑ-, ΤΑΜΑ-

Pres. I: د-، د-، ت-، تن- (conj. ?)، ق-

Neg. cons. ΜΑΚ-, ΜΑΝ-

Pres. cons. II + relative: ΕΥΑΒ (cons.), ΕΥΑΣ (rel.)

Conditional: ΕΚΩΑΗ-

"until": ΟΛΑΗΕ-

Perf. I: Λ-، ΛΥ-، ΑΡΟΥ (?)

Neg. Perf. I: ΗΤΙ-

Conjunctive: ΤΕΚ-، ΤΕΝ-، ΝΤΟΥ- (?)

Circumstantial: ΕΙ، ΕΥ-
Die sog. Schreibfehler im Altaramäischen und ein bislang unerkannter Lautwandel

RAINER VOIGT, Berlin

1. In der Inschriftenkunde muß die Annahme von Schreibfehlern die letzte Erklärungsmöglichkeit bleiben. Es ist methodisch sinnvoll, bei schwierigen Textstellen eher im Rahmen der bestehenden Grammatik mit ihrem Regelwerk und bei behutsamer Vorgehensweise über diesen Rahmen hinaus nach einer Lösung zu suchen, als die Schuld auf den antiken Steinmetzen zu schieben.

Mit diesen Vorüberlegungen wird man einige der bei Degen (1969: 25) angeführten »Schreibfehler« in altaramäischen Texten in einem anderen Licht sehen. So sind die Schreibungen $hbd$ (Sf. II C5) 'ich will vernichten' anstelle von $h\breve{b}d$ (Sf. II C4) 'id.' und $yskr$ (Sf. III 3) 'er wird ausliefern' anstelle des in derselben Zeile vorkommenden $yhskr$ gleicher Bedeutung sicherlich Fehler im Sinne der Schriftnorm. Sie verweisen aber auf mundartliche Strukturen, die entweder – wie so oft in der Sprachgeschichte – später verbindlich werdende Neuerungen vorwegnehmen oder ein anderes Sprachsystem widerspiegeln. Man denke nur an die dialektbedingten schulischen Fehlleistungen von Kindern in Regionen mit ausgeprägtem Dialekt. Wenn z.B. im bairischen Sprachraum im Schulaufsatz Formen wie »Bedrolium« und »mit die Händ« erscheinen (s. Zehetner 1985: 199), erfahren wir daraus einiges zur Phonologie (Konsonantenschwächung) und Morphologie (unterschiedliche Deklination) des Bairischen. Was zeigen uns nun die altaramäischen Schreibungen $h(\breve{a})bd$ und $y(h)skr$? Sie belegen den mundartlichen Schwund der ohnehin schwachen Konsonanten $h$ und $\breve{a}$ in bestimmten Positionen. Wenn man die Verbalformen nach dem Akkadischen ($lu\breve{s}aprî$) und Arabischen ($ju\breve{f}cîl, ju\breve{a}fâcîl$) vokalisiert, ergeben sich in der Schriftnorm:

$\breve{u}ha\breve{b}d(u)$ 'ich will vernichten'
$yuhaskiru$ 'er muß ausliefern'

Die Frage, ob im Aramäischen das Präformativ der Präfixkonjugation in diesem Stamm bereits reduziert war oder eher mit $i$ angesetzt werden soll, spielt in diesem Zusammenhang keine Rolle.

In der Umgangssprache neigt offensichtlich das Kausativmorphem $h$ in intervokalischer Position zum Schwund, wie in:

$yskr$ [jåskiru] ($<ju\breve{h}askiru$).

Diese Kontraktion begegnet im späteren Aramäisch (wie auch in allen späteren semitischen Sprachen), z.B. syr. $nak\breve{t}eb$, mand. $nap\breve{r}iq$. Im Mandäischen ist in der

Die Form ḥbd zeigt keinen Verlust des Kausativmorphems, sondern des ersten Radikals der Wurzel. Bekanntlich gehen im Aramäischen die Wurzeln primae hamzatae im Kausativstamm in Wurzeln primae y und i über. Deshalb ist die Schwäche des Hamz in dieser Form nicht verwunderlich. Es bleibt unklar, ob hier ein Vokalklassenwechsel stattgefunden hat oder einfach das Hamz unter Dehnung des vorangehenden Vokals geschwunden ist:

ḥbd [uḥābid] (< uhaḫbid).

Die Interferenzerscheinungen zwischen dialektalen Formen und der Standardsprache können sich per definitionem nur in einigen Fällen zeigen. Bei einem Auftreten in allen Fällen würde es sich nicht mehr um Interferenzerscheinungen, sondern um Erscheinungen der Norm handeln.


2.

Unter den von Degen (a.a.O.) verzeichneten »Schreibfehlern« sind acht Fälle, in denen nichts weiter vorliegt, als daß ein Konsonant verwechselt bzw. ausgelassen wurde. In einem Fall liegt Haplographie vor, die sich auch lautlich erklären läßt. Wird nämlich die Wortfolge

hin ... yasubbi, yařēth ... (Sf. I B 28) ‘wenn (einer von den Königen kommt und) mich belagert, so muß (dein Heer) kommen’ (Sf. I B 28)

mit Sandhi gelesen, verschmilzt der vokalische Auslaut mit dem Anlaut des folgenden Wortes, so daß die Schreibung mit nur einem <y> (w-ysbn-yth) im Anlaut der Silbe der defektiven Schreibung eines inlautenden Langvokals entspricht (z.B. mlkn [malikin] ‘Könige (st. abs.)’).

Von den sieben verbleibenden Beispielen finden sich fünf in Sf. III (3, 6, 13, 17, 22). Sfere III enthält also so viele »Fehler«, daß man überlegen muß, ob nicht Merkmale des dialektalen Sprachsystems solche der hochsprachlichen Norm ver-
drängt oder beeinflußt haben. Diese Vermutung wird umso wahrscheinlicher, je besser es gelingt, die sprachlichen Erscheinungen, die in den Schreibfehlern zu erkennen sind, einem dialektalen Sprachsystem zuzuordnen.

a) Zu *yskr (Sf. III 3) s.o.


Bei der vorliegenden Schreibung handelt es sich also um eine auf lautlicher Prolepsis beruhende Haplographie.

Die Pluralform des Imperatifs, über die mehrere Bearbeiter gestolpert sind, bezieht sich entweder auf mehrere Adressaten (Gibson 1975: 53) oder ist unpersönlich gemeint (‘man besämtige <sie> dort’).


Diese Hypothese würde an Wahrscheinlichkeit gewinnen, wenn sich andere Belege für eine Akkusativpartikel *y= finden ließen. Der Hinweis von Jean/

d) Zu khsʾy (Sf. III 17) ‘mein Thron’ s. unten § 3.


\[
\begin{align*}
w-l-ṭḥḥ lšn b-ḥyy & \quad \text{‘du sollst dich nicht einmischen in mein Haus} \\
w-bnḥ bnh & \quad \text{und zwischen meine Söhne} \\
w-bnḥ ʕḥy & \quad \text{und zwischen meine Brüder} \\
w-bnḥ jqr & \quad \text{und zwischen meine Nachkommen} \\
w-bnḥ ʔmy & \quad \text{und zwischen mein Volk} \\
w-tmr lḥm & \quad \text{und zu jemandem sagen:} \\
\text{»qtlw } mṛ(22)km & \quad \text{»Tötet euren Herrn} \\
\text{w-hwyl ḫḥph} & \quad \text{und tritt du an seine Stelle!«,} \\
k\.y l-ṭb ḥʾ `<\(\)\(\text{>}\) mk & \quad \text{denn das wäre nicht gut für dich} \\
w-yqm ḫḏ [dmy] & \quad \text{und jemand wird mein Blut rächen}
\end{align*}
\]

'l tžhl
ky 'nh hm[tk]

‘fürchte dich nicht,
denn ich habe dich zum König gemacht’

Der syntaktische und semantische Zusammenhang verlangt also an der umstrittenen Stelle eine Interpretation, die dem ‘nichts Gutes’ verhießt, der die Warnung in den Wind schlägt: ‘denn das wäre nicht gut für dich (d.h. das würde dir nicht gut bekommen)’.

Es erhebt sich nun die Frage, ob die neue Auffassung der Textstelle mit der üblichen Emendation von mk zu m<nt>k vereinbar ist. Es muß hier eine andere Präposition, nämlich 'm, angesetzt werden. Das hat außerdem den Vorteil, daß man den orthographischen Fehler (<mk) vielleicht in lautlicher Hinsicht durch die Nachbarschaft des Hamz (vulgo Alef) erklären kann.


3.

Eine Art von «Fehlschreibung» verdient eine besondere Behandlung, weil hier ein nicht-hochsprachlicher Lautwandel r > h zu erkennen ist.


Wahrscheinlicher ist es jedoch, in dem h die Schwachstufe des durch Dissimilation entstandenen r zu sehen.


Manche Bearbeiter haben eine Verbindung von dbbh mit dem Bienenwort abgelehnnt und statt dessen das Wort für ‘Bär’ (syr. debbā, j.-aram. dubbā, hebr. doy, pl. dubbīm, arab. dubb) ins Spiel gebracht (Fitzmyer 1967: 48, Gibson 1975: 40, u.a.). Die Hauptschwierigkeit bei dieser Identifizierung stellt das doppelte h

\[
\begin{align*}
[y\acute{\text{k}}l\ p] & (31)m\ \text{hh} \\
\text{w-pm} & \text{ qrb} \quad \text{und der Mund des Skorpions} \\
\text{w-pm} & \text{ dbh\ h} \quad \text{und der Mund der Wespe} \\
\text{w-pm} & \text{ nm\ h} \quad \text{und der Mund der Ameise} \\
\text{w-s\ s} & \quad \text{und die Motte} \\
\text{w-qnl} & \quad \text{und die Laus} \\
\text{w-[}\text{rbh}\] & (32) \quad \text{und die Heuschrecke}. \\
\end{align*}
\]


Daß hier nur kleinere Lebewesen genannt sein können, ergibt sich auch daraus, daß eine Liste von Wirbeltieren (Säugetieren und Vögeln) – auch wieder sieben an der Zahl – in der übernächsten Zeile (33) folgt:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{w-thwy} & \text{ rpd t l [-rbq ...]} \quad \text{‘und A. werde zum Schutthügel, zur [Lagerstätte für] ...’} \\
\text{ (33) sby} & \quad \text{die Gazelle,} \\
\text{w-\text{fr}l} & \quad \text{und den Schakal} \\
\text{w-\text{rn}b} & \quad \text{und den Hasen} \\
\text{w-\text{frn}} & \quad \text{und die Wildkatze} \\
\text{w-\text{yd}h} & \quad \text{und die Eule} \\
\text{w-[-...]} & \quad \text{und } [ \quad ] \\
\text{w-\text{qr}h} & \quad \text{und die Elster’.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

Zwischen den beiden Wunschsätzen (30/31 und 32/33), die die beiden Listen der Schädlinge (31) und Säugetiere/Vögel (33) enthalten, steht – nach Degen 1969: 126 – ein weiterer Wunschsatz (*y\acute{\text{s}}\text{frh} l-\text{ymn} \text{hh} \ ‘sein Pflanzenwuchs werde zur Einöde [ver]wüsten’), dessen Anfang trotz der anzunehmenden Ergänzung festzustehen scheint. Es verbleiben somit am Anfang von Zeile 32 die Konsonantenfolge ‘\text{hq}b\text{bn}’ sowie am Ende von Zeile 31 ein oder zwei zu ergänzende Buchstaben. Die von Lemaire und Durand (1984: 134) zusammengetragenen Ergän-

Nach unserer Einteilung des Textes gehören Ende von Zeile 31 und der Anfang der folgenden Zeile zusammen:

\[
\begin{align*}
& (32) \text{ ‘lh qahtn } / & \text{ jṭḥ l-yšmn } \text{ ḫwh}
\end{align*}
\]


\[
\begin{align*}
& (w-)yʃ(32) \text{ ‘lh qaḥb } / & \text{ ṭn jṭḥ l-yšmn } \text{ ḫwh} & \text{ (und) es möge dahin eintreten das Perlhuhn,}
& & \text{ es soll } ... (?) & \text{ sein Gras möge nicht gedeihen’}
\end{align*}
\]


c) Es müssen nun die Bedingungen für den bei den beiden Wörtern eingetre- nen Lautwandel festgestellt werden. Im Falle von

\[
\begin{align*}
& khs’y \text{ [kuḥ’isiʔ] } \leftarrow krs’y \text{ [kur’isiʔ]}
\end{align*}
\]

ist dies leicht getan. Der schwache Laut r steht nach einem u-Vokal in geschlos- sener Silbe vor einem stimmenlosen Konsonanten:

\[
r > h / u - \text{ŞK}_{\text{stimmlos}}
\]

Bei dem zweiten Beleg ḏbhḥ scheinen diese Bedingungen nicht zuzutreffen. Die Endung des st.abs.f. geht zwar auf einen Dental (<-atV) zurück, der in manchen Fällen noch als solcher erscheint, sie kann aber wegen der vorliegenden Lautung
-āh nicht die Verhauchung des r bewirkt haben. Ein Kontakt des Feminin-t mit dem dritten Radikal der Wurzel ist nicht in der Absolutusform, sondern vielmehr in der Emphatikusform gegeben. Die Endung des femininen st. emph. setzen wir für dieses Lexem in der Form -tā' (und nicht -atā') an. Damit ergibt sich die Vokalisierung dabbūtā', welche die zum Lautwandel erforderlichen Bedingungen enthält. Der ursprüngliche Langvokal des Lexems muß in geschlossener Silbe verkürzt worden sein; denn nur aus einem kurzen u kann das o z.B. des Syrischen (deborā) entstanden sein. Wir hätten also bei diesem Wort im Paradigma der Statusformen zwei unterschiedliche Ausprägungen des Lexems:

fem. st. abs. *dbrh [dabburā]
st. emph. *dbhr' [dabbuhtā] ← [dabburā]

Im Status absolutus hat dann eine Angleichung (paradigmatischer Ausgleich) an die Form des st. emph. (mit Abschwächung des r) stattgefunden (*dbrh [dabburā] → dbhr [dabburā]).


Die drei im Aramäischen belegten Varianten des Inurta-Namens lassen sich in natürlicher Weise von der angesetzten sumerischen Form Nin-uṛta (Borger 1961) oder Nin-uṛta' ableiten:

nin-uṛta → ʾnwšt (s. Fitzmyer 1967: 56)
   ʾnrt (Avigad 1965: 224, Tadmor 1965)⁶
   ↓
   ʾnht (Sf.)

Dem hebräischen Nimrod liegt die Form Nimrut (vgl. נברום) zugrunde, die sich durch Metathese mit dem Ninurta-Namen verknüpfen läßt. Das abweichende m findet seine Erklärung möglicherweise in der unterschiedlichen Etymologie (< «nin+š3m/wruta», Meißner/Oberhuber 1967: 154).

e) Mit dem Namen Inuhta (für Inurta) hätten wir den dritten Beleg für den dialektalen Lautwandel r > h in silbenschließender Position nach einem kurzen u-Vokal. Der die folgende Silbe eröffnende Konsonant ist entweder ein Dental (t) oder ein sibilantischer Affrikat (s, d.i. s3 [š]). Da beide Konsonanten dentalisch anlauten, kann die Verhauchungsregel noch genauer formuliert werden: [uṛt] > [uṛt] oder:

r > h / u—is-[t]

ANMERKUNGEN


3. Bei einem Zusammentreffen von ʾ und ʾ sollte sich eher der stärkere Laut durchsetzen (vgl. ugar. šb’d neben šb’d ’siebenmal‘). Man beachte, daß die auch nicht unproblematische Lesung m<n>k keinen akzeptablen Sinn ergibt.


7. Dabei kann sich r in dieser Position zu einem Laut entwickelt haben, der größere Ähnlichkeit mit h als mit r aufwies. So könnte r stimmlos geworden sein:

\[ r > ʾr (ʾh) \]

Das aspirierte rh des Griechischen, das nebenbei auf sr- oder yr- zurückgeht, läßt einen an eine mögliche Entwicklung \[ r > rh (ʾh) \] denken.
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Materialism as Expounded in the Mañimēkalai, the Nilakēci and the Civañāṇacittiyār

RUTH WALLDÉN, Uppsala

The sixth century Mañimēkalai, ¹ ² the tenth century Nilakēci ³ ⁴ and the thirteenth century Civañāṇacittiyār, ⁵ ⁶ all three of them famous works in the Tamil literature, have this in common that they all contain an exposition of the contemporaneous philosophical systems current in South India. Since they appeared with an interval of 300–400 years and were written from widely different points of view – the Mañimēkalai being Buddhist-influenced, the Nilakēci Jaina-influenced and the Civañāṇacittiyār Śaiva-influenced – it may be of some interest to make a comparison between the treatments in the three works ⁷ of a subject common to all of them.

In the present case Materialism will be considered.

Many scholars have dealt with Indian Materialism, ⁸ mostly in connection with the treatment of other Indian philosophical systems. However, no original and authoritative work representing the materialists’ own point of view is extant. Information about their system thus has to be gleaned from various sources where representatives of other systems strongly reject and refute Materialism and its spokesmen, whether they are called bārhaspatya-s, nāstika-s, lokāyata-s, cārvāka-s or bhūtavādīn-s.

For the purpose of the present investigation I propose to follow von Glasenapp’s account of Indian Materialism. ⁹ He defines Materialism in general as follows (my translation): “As Materialism is designated the philosophical theory to which matter alone is real and which therefore also derives everything spiritual from bodily functions”. After discussing the age of Indian Materialism ¹⁰ he mentions some of the Indian sources and the different terms for Indian materialists given above, and finds that Indian Materialism is best designated by the term ‘bhūtavāda’, since it teaches a plurality of eternally existing elements (bhūta-s) which produce everything through combining with each other. A summary of von Glasenapp’s criteria of Indian Materialism follows.

1. Indian materialists admit only one means of knowledge (pramāṇa) vis. pratyākṣa, i.e. direct perception, and reject all others.

2. They recognize as reality and as the basis for everything perceptible the four elements: earth, water, fire and wind/air.

3. The bodies of all living beings arise through a combination of these four eternal elements. The self (ātman) is nothing but the body, and what is spiritual in the individual likewise arises through a combination of the elements. This is illustrated by pointing out how the betel-chewer’s saliva becomes red or how the mixture of fermenting ingredients gives the intoxicating force of alcohol.

4. Indian materialists acknowledge just this one existence; they maintain that there is no existence after death and no karma, i.e. the fruit of good or evil deeds in this life.

5. Through death good and evil people alike are liberated from all suffering,
therefore life can have no rational goal other than sensual pleasure. Although in this life pleasure is mixed with pain, one should not desist from seeking pleasure. This is exemplified by pointing out that nobody would hesitate to take the grain although it is surrounded by the husk.

6. Some materialists assume five elements, i.e. besides the four already mentioned also ākāśa, space. According to this theory the five senses and their objects (colour etc.) develop out of the five bhūta-s, whereas thought, feelings etc. are produced through combinations of the bhūta-s.11 von Glasenapp’s description and criteria – numbered by me for practical purposes – can, I think, be endorsed by most scholars, and they will be utilized in the discussion of our three Tamil passages.12

Our first passage is from the Mañimēkalai.

Mañimēkalai XXVII: 262–277

262. At once when [Mañimēkalai was] saying to the pūtavāti [bhūtavādin, materialist]: “You tell!” [he said:]

265. “As when, after having poured Tātaki [Bauhinia] flowers and jaggery when adding other things as well a drink causing intoxication will be produced [so also] uṇarvu [consciousness] arises in the combined pūta[-s] [bhūta-s, element-s].

In the exhaustedness of each of these pūta[-s] that consciousness wears away like the drum-sound which disperses differently [in various directions?].

270. Both pūtam [bhūta-, body/bodies] with consciousness joined with life and pūtam [bhūta-, body/bodies] without consciousness [and] not having life, those will arise from each of the pūtam [bhūta-s, element-s] [or: from those element-s].

This only is the truth; a different exposition is imagination/fancy and the true matter of importance is just ulōkāyatan’s [lokāyata-, materialist] uṇarvu [consciousness/sense perception]. Not kaṅkātu [pratyakṣa-, direct perception] but the karuttu [anumāna-, inference] means of knowledge will err.

275. This life and the fruit of action[-s] done in this life is [belong to] this birth only, and speaking of another life [or: the next life] coming into existence [or of] the experience of action[-s] [done, i.e. karma] is falsehood”.

Next we turn to the Nilakēci.

Nilakēci X: 854–860

854. She [Nilakēci] made the vētavātam [vēdavāda-] [seem] ignorance. A pūtavāti [bhūtavādin, materialist] was bubbling there. While [she] went on thinking: “There will be no disadvantage if one subdues that ignorant one”, she herself [said:]

855. “You stay! Now tell the truth as you have seen [it]!” and “Tell it to the girl here!” would say the elephant-possessing one with shoulders rising like bullders, [he] called Matanacīttan, with the strength-possessing army.

856. When the ornamented-necklace-having king’s council said: “Listen!” [or: when the ... king said: “I will hear those things!”] the affliction-showing face-having Picācaṅ began saying: “Since I am not one proclaiming the
so-called kunikunam [quality-possessor and quality], my firm opinion is [that there are] just the five pūta-s [bhūta-s, elements]. I will tell the [their?] function.

857. Through fire, earth, water, wind and space – said to be permanent – when combining at a determined time, the eye together with the nose, the tongue, the body [and] the ears having come into existence, colour, smell together with taste, touch [and] sound will be acquired.

858. All the five having combined and having appeared as knowledge, pleasure etc. – like the strength from the intoxication of liquor [and] like the movement of the sun to the west daily in the evening – they will, if spent, disappear and join the [each their] kind.

859. The whole world is just those; the saying: ‘There is a soul’, is like the word of people of no avail; being clear and steadfast while taking part even in many debates they will [however] obtain no result; even though they be learned men giving up is proper then and there.

860. In time[-s] past and present and even in coming time[-s] the event is the same; this world is always of just this character. Those who say it is not so are just weak-minded.

Finally the passage from the Civaṇāṇacittiyār which runs as follows.

Civaṇāṇacittiyār, Ulakāyatan matam: 12–17

12. In the sea-girdled world the Lokāyata – while fragrant garlands glitter on his sandal-paste-touched shoulder – would speak without either wisdom or mercy [and] without mentioning [divulging?] the device of the treatise produced by Indra’s priest.

13. “Here the means of knowledge is direct perception; maṇam [manas, mind] and the other 2 times 3 [= 6]13 are necessary; anumāṇam [inference] and the many others are not needed; the essential thing taken up is pūtaṃ [bhūta-, element-s]. They are just the group [possessing?] the well-known hardness, coldness, heat – difficult to touch – and movement.

14. Those having the said properties may be called earth, water, fire and further wind. If [their] capacity to combine is mentioned [again?, is kept in mind?] they will become smell, taste, colour/shape and the useful touch. These praised ones [i.e. the bhūta-s] are eternal; their combining is [their] nature.

15. From an appropriate combination there will come into existence many shapes – just as there will appear many storing pots etc. from the clay. putti [buddhi, intellect, knowledge], kuṇam [guna-, property, quality],14 the useful organs of sense, the perceptions – all these will appear from this [combination] like the bubble rising from the water.

16. When one of the pūta[-s] departs, the sense perception will cease; if the process of combining wastes away, the – according to nature – immovable or movable things which have come into existence in the aforesaid manner will become the original ones [i.e. the pūta-s, elements]. To know this is knowledge indeed.

17. If it is not so, what fault have the human beings committed against those who speak saying that there is karma, soul [and] God besides? Those have spoken
[as of] an incomparable barren woman's son's blameless plucking of a skyflower after having ascended the horn of a hare!"

Let us begin with the passage from the Manimēkalai while keeping von Glasenapp's criteria in mind.

First of all we note — to our regret — that the elements are not enumerated anywhere in the text. As the five-elements system is sometimes regarded as older than the four-elements system — the element 'space' being discarded as impossible to perceive with the senses — it might have been of interest if the number of elements had been stated here.16

Otherwise we find criterium No. 1 in line 274 of our passage, No. 2 in lines 266–267 and 269ff., No. 3 in lines 266–267, No. 4 in lines 275ff. Altogether Nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 are applicable.

In the Nilakēci passage the — in this case — five elements are clearly mentioned in stanza 856 and enumerated in stanza 857, where von Glasenapp's criterium No. 2 can be applied. In the same stanza we recognize criteria Nos. 3 and 6, and No. 3 in stanza 858 as well. In stanza 859 criterium No. 4 can be applied, which means that altogether criteria Nos. 2, 3, 4, and 6 are applicable.

Turning to our Civanāṇacittiyaś passage we find that the number of elements mentioned is four as enumerated in stanza No. 14. If we use the criteria in the same way as before, Nos. 1 and 2 can be applied in the case of stanza No. 13, whereas No. 3 is applicable i.a. in the same stanza and No. 4 in stanza No. 17. Thus criteria Nos. 1, 2, 3, and 4 find their application in this passage.17

To sum up we find criteria Nos. 2, 3, and 4 clearly satisfied in all three text passages; No. 1 both in the Manimēkalai and in the Civanāṇacittiyaś, and No. 6 is patently present in the Nilakēci.

What we do not find anywhere in the texts is a presentation of sensual pleasure as the only goal of life (criterium No. 5). It is not improbable that the materialists in our texts carefully avoided this point as a rock of offence since it must have provoked strong opposition.

von Glasenapp's presentation does not include a feature which is very clearly present in our three passages: the description of the process of exhaustion sets in and a reversion to the original elements takes place.18

The purpose of this study was to compare the presentations of Materialism in three Tamil literary works ranging from c. the sixth to the thirteenth century A.D. The conclusions drawn could be summed up as follows.

In the Manimēkalai, presumably the earliest work, no authoritative source is mentioned, nor is the representative of the system named. The passage is the shortest of the three; the language is terse. Yet the essential characteristics of Indian Materialism are present.

In the Nilakēci the representative of the materialist system is named — although perhaps not with the most flattering of names, Picāca, 'one possessed by an evil spirit', 'person of an evil disposition'. The relevant text passage is much more elaborate than the one in the Manimēkalai. While the materialist's usually accepted means of knowledge, direct perception, is not mentioned, other important features characteristic of the system are there. Assuming five basic elements from which the
five sense-organs arise, with the sense perceptions arising from the combining of the five elements the materialist in the Nilakēci presents a description of his system which is both consistent and detailed.

In the Civaṇāṇacittiyār, finally, an authoritative treatise no longer extant of Indian Materialism is referred to in the expression "the treatise produced by Indra's priest" [i.e. Brhaspati, hence one of the designations, bārhaspatya-s for Indian materialists]. The representative of the system is not named here. The passage gives a full description of the system in a vivid language and with expressive examples. The basic elements here being four no proper correspondence with the five senses or the sense perceptions could be easily established.\(^9\)

Hopefully this little investigation will inspire further research on the Indian philosophical systems current in South India in olden times.

NOTES


4. Zvelebil, K. V., op. cit. p. 175 to which I refer for the dating and for a description of the contents of the epic etc.

5. The text available and used by me is: Tirutturaiyār Arunanticevācāriyār, Civaṇāṇa cittiyār parapak- kum. Tattuvappirikācar uraiyutan. Madras 1968.


8. Cf. e.g. for an exhaustive account Dasgupta, S., A History of Indian Philosophy. Vol. III. Cambridge 1952, pp. 512ff., with a wealth of references to sources and works on the subject, many of which were consulted by me.

9. von Glasenapp, H., Die Philosophie der Inder. Stuttgart 1958, pp. 126ff. with literature and references - even to one of our Tamil works, viz. the Nilakēci.

10. Scholars agree that traces of Materialism can be found very early in India, see Dasgupta, op. cit.
but von Glasenapp is of the opinion that as a system it belongs to a later era, and he refers to
11. Finally von Glasenapp mentions yet another school designated as suśikṣita-, ‘well-instructed’, in
contrast to the earlier mentioned ones which are called dhīrta-, ‘deceptive’.
12. Only the materialist’s own presentation of his system is taken up in the three works, not the
refutations of the opponents. – I am indebted to Professor A. Velupillai of Jaffna University for
discussing my translations and for many helpful remarks.
13. In the commentary available to me as well as in Schommerus’ translation, op. cit. p. 390 the following
six are enumerated, viz. manakkāṭci (or aiyakkāṭci), váyikāṭci, vikarpakkāṭci, anvayakkāṭci,
vyatirēkkakkāṭci (or vetirekkakkāṭci), and tiripukkāṭci.
15. In Indian literature this is quite a common way of showing the absurdity in the reasoning of
opponents.
16. Although I have referred to the dating of the Manimēkalai by K. V. Zvelebil (see note 2), a dating
which I find reasonable and which agrees with my own opinion at least as far as regards the date of
passages treated by me, cf. my article in Kalyānānamārāgaṇam. Essays in honour of Nils Simonsen.
Ed. E. Kahrs. Oxford 1986. I am fully aware that there is a controversy going on on the
subject. – N. Balusamy, op. cit. p. 95, when summarizing this passage in English unhesitatingly
mentions the five elements. I can find no correspondence to this in the text.
17. Criterium No. 6 could have been applied in this passage as well, but the author, Arunanti, holds on
to the four basic elements. Therefore, when he enumerates the sense perceptions (in stanza 14) we
find only four – hearing being omitted. When mentioning the organs of sense (in stanza 15) he does
not enumerate them.
18. This feature, although not present in von Glasenapp’s presentation, is common enough in other
descriptions of Indian Materialism.
19. The terms used here remind us strongly of terms used in the Sāmkhya-system.
Sources of Pseudo-Dionysius for the Third Part of his Chronicle*

WITOLD WITAKOWSKI, Uppsala

The division of the Chronicle of Pseudo-Dionysius (henceforth: PD) into parts by the author himself differs from that of the modern scholars. The work itself does not divide into any “parts”. It is only in the so-called “introduction”, placed however not at the beginning of the Chronicle but before the part which is presented as the original contribution of the author,¹ that one gets the idea that the historiographic material may be divided into four parts. The chronicler presents there his three main sources (PD II,145,22–146,3): “… (1) Eusebius, for from him we have taken the material for this book up to the years of Constantine the Believer; from that (time) up to Theodosius the Younger – from (2) Socrates, who is of the Novatianist confession; from Theodosius then to the emperor Justinian – from the holy (3) John bishop of Asia.” After that PD, as he says, had no written source. Thus when J.-B. Chabot published his early edition and translation of the original part, he called it the “fourth”.² His later standard edition made for the Syriac series of the CSCO contains the whole of the Chronicle in two volumes (PD I & PD II).³ Since the second of them contains both new text and what he had previously published as the “fourth” part (PD II,145,17–381), it has become natural to understand the new text in the volume (PD II,2,1–145,16) as the “third” part and, consequently, the contents of the first volume (PD I) as part 1 and 2. Parts 1–3, understood as suggested, can however be regarded only as very rough equivalents to Eusebius’, Socrates’ and John of Asia’s material respectively.

In what should be understood as part 2 Socrates’ material seems to end with the lemma of the year 747 Sel. (PD I,213,15). Thereafter comes material of varying origin, and the part (= PD I) ends with the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite. Historiographic material taken from John of Asia or of Ephesus (henceforth: JE) occurs already in the second part, but trying not to prejudice the problem of exactly where it starts, we may safely admit that at least it covers most of what Chabot would (and the present writer does) call the “third part”.

This covers the time span from three last years of the emperor Zeno to the fourth year of the reign of Justin II, i.e. roughly 489–569.

In what follows we shall try to find – so far as is possible – the source of each lemma of the part of PD’s Chronicle in question, or at least to point to parallel material in other Syriac historiographic or non-historiographic works, which procedure may help eventually to trace the source. Our aim is to identify PD’s (supposedly) direct sources, but often even further identification, i.e. the source of PD’s

*Research for the present article has been made possible by the financial support of the Humanistisk-samhällsvetenskapliga forskningsrådet. Sweden.
source, will be provided as well, especially if the direct source is lost or if such
identification may have some bearing on what that direct source was.

We shall omit here any presentation of the state of research on the topic since one
was given in our previous work. Let it suffice here to name the more important
studies made so far by François Nau (1897),5 A. D’yakonov (1908),6 the most
comprehensive of them, and Felix Haas (1916),7 as well as J.-B. Chabot’s notes in
his translation of the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian (t. II, 1901). Since all the
scholars named worked before the publication of the text of the third part of the
Chronicle (1933), and since moreover the objects and the extent of the analyses as
well as the methods used varied, it seems necessary to do the analysis again and in
full scale.

As was suggested above JE’s work will be the one which we shall meet most
often in the present study. Out of his Church History, for this work is meant here,
only the third (i.e. the last) part has survived in independent manuscript tradition.8
This however was unknown to PD. The first is completely lost and was so already in
Michael the Syrian’s epoch, i.e. in the twelfth century.9 PD does not seem to know
it either, but a closer analysis of this question (as pertaining to that of the sources of
the second part of PD) will have to be postponed to a future study. The second part
is known from some separate excerpts and from quotations in later Syriac histori-
ographic works, among which PD is a major witness. As we know from Michael
the Syrian (hereafter: MS), this part began with Constantine the Great10 and, as we
know from JE himself, it followed the course of events up to the sixth year of Justin
II.11

The identification of the material taken from JE can be direct only for the parts
covered by the fragments published by J.P.N. Land (henceforth: Land) from two
manuscripts of the British Library.12 JE’s authorship of the excerpts in the manu-
script Add. 14647 (Land 385,2–391,20) is confirmed by PD himself who attributes
one of them (Land 387,5–388,13 = PD 139,14–141,10) to JE (PD 140,5), whereas
the excerpt itself does not do this.13

The material of the other manuscript (Add. 14650, Land 289,1–329,22) is attributed
to JE in the title (“By the same holy Mar John of Asia, from his book of
Church History on the persecution ...”, Land 289,1f) and in the colophon (“The
stories which we have gathered from John of Asia are finished”, Land 329,21f).
However, it was suggested by H. G. Kleyn14 and later by A. D’yakonov15 and E.W.
Brooks16 that Land’s excerpt in this manuscript had not been drawn from JE’s
Church History, but from PD, since the two texts in question seemed to resemble
each other very closely, to the point of containing the same faults. Thus in order
not to beg the question in further analysis we have to review the arguments
advanced.

It seems today that they were partly based on an insufficient textual basis, for the
text published by Chabot does not confirm them. Merely from the differences
between the two texts which Chabot gave in the apparatus of the CSCO edition it
appears that the texts are not so nearly identical as it may have seemed to the
students named above. Let us however check the cases which were used by the
critics. Chabot reads ’pyr’ (PD II,38,24), not ’phna’ (as Land 294,7) and mūšṭn (PD
22,9), not mūṣyyn (Land 290,5, this however seems to be Land’s misreading). The
name Euphrasius is most often rendered as ['wprws (PD 26,3; 47,2; 50,14,18; 51,20; 53,4) and once ['wpwrs (47,18) but never 'opyws as Kleyn asserts (p. IV). The presence of the word sāmmāśa in the margin of the two texts (PD 42,17; Land 297,5) is a correction which in both cases might have been supplied independently, assuming that JE was quite a well-known figure. If the excerptor had been copying PD he would have inserted the word into the text, as was often the practice.

One can add some further arguments against the assertion that the excerpt was a copy of PD; for instance the title of the chapter in Land 312,11f (see below the remarks to the lemma of the year 855 Sel.) could not come from PD, since he does not have it. Neither could the title of the excerpt have been copied from PD. Even if it could be inferred from the "introduction" quoted above, which in itself does not seem very probable, this supposition could not account for the word 'cglesyas- tiqi (spelled: qlystq', Land 289,2) which it contains, but which PD does not seem to have ever used. Moreover the first lemma of the excerpt dealing with the persecution of the Monophysites by Paul the Jew (= PD 21,1–24,11) is dated to 831 Sel., whereas in PD it has no date of its own, and is placed after lm 837.

Thus it would appear that the excerpt was not drawn from PD. However, there remains the problem of the dated lemmas in the excerpt which in fact are equal to their counterparts in PD (those for 836, 837, 850, 851, 852, 854, 855, 866, 870, 879, the captions of which are listed by Brooks in PD II,413–415). Although JE provided dates, he did not – so far as we can judge from the part of his work preserved separately – apply the method of organizing historiographic material into dated lemmas. Consequently one can suppose that those occurring in the excerpt do not come from him, and this makes probable the dependance of the excerpts on PD.

If we disregard the hypotheses that (1) notwithstanding what was said above the extracts have been drawn from JE, and that (2) they have been drawn from a better manuscript of PD providing more information on what was taken from JE, both of which seem less probable, two solutions remain which fit not only the facts in this case but also what is generally known about Syriac chronicle writing.

First: the excerpt may have been drawn from PD's text by an excerptor who knew the work of JE separately and thus was able to draw from PD those lemmas which he recognized as JE's material. This would account for his supplementing the information pertaining to it which he could not have found in PD.

Second: the excerpt has been drawn from PD's text by an excerptor who only thought that all he copied had originated from JE. He must have known that some of the lemmas (e.g. the story of the persecution and that of the plague) were JE's material, and having recognized them in the text of PD, he also copied further material found in between them which he supposed to belong to JE as well.

According to the first alternative the excerpt would not lose its value as control material for the text of PD which it covers. Since, however, we cannot be sure of this, it is the second supposition which will have to be admitted as a working hypothesis. This means that for every lemma in question we must search for additional confirmation of its originating from JE.

Other control texts for the material of JE's Church History being in PD are provided by the known witnesses of the former, of which the most important is MS,
which has even more of JE’s material than PD, but occasionally also the Chronicle to the year 1234 will be used. To these two we shall add—as a working hypothesis—the Chronicle to the year 846, since it contains material which seems to be derived from JE.

JE, as was shown elsewhere, had excerpted the Byzantine Chronicle of John Malalas. This is seen from the presence of Malalas’ material in both PD and MS. Since we do not know of any other Syriac historian who might have excerpted Malalas (henceforth: Mal), the latter’s Chronicle will constitute additional control material. Consequently if Mal as the source is identified in PD, even if the relevant lemma is not found in Land or in MS, we may assume that the missing link, i.e. PD’s direct source, is JE.

However, as was also pointed in our previous article, JE is a witness to the original, fuller form of Mal’s Chronicle, a fact which explains the actual differences between the text of JE in PD and the extant, shortened text of Mal’s work as preserved in the Oxford manuscript (the so-called Baroccius). Since the testimonies to the original Mal have recently been gathered in the apparatus to the English translation of the Chronicle no special comparison needs to be undertaken here of JE’s material in PD with the other witnesses to the original Mal.

A similar situation occurs in the case of the so-called Original Chronicle of Edessa (henceforth: OXE), that is, PD excerpted this chronicle (the existence of which was postulated by us in a previous article22) and not the extant Chronicle of Edessa (henceforth: XE). The latter will however remain the control material for OXE, together with other Syriac short chronicles which bear testimony to it: the Chronicle to the year 819 (henceforth: X819), the Chronicle to the year 846 (henceforth: X846), and the Chronicle of Jacob of Edessa († 708) (henceforth: JacEd).

One more working hypothesis has to be made here, namely that JE used the Church History of Pseudo-Zachariah of Mitylene (henceforth: PZ). Consequently that material in PZ which will turn out to be parallel to that in PD will also be regarded as the testimony to JE’s being the link between the two and thus PD’s direct source.

The lemma of the year (henceforth: lm) 800 Sel. (PD II,2,1f/1): the destruction of the School of the Persians in Edessa – XE, 8,18f/35), verbatim; X846 (217,4f/165) – this is a witness to both OXE and JE; here however it seems to copy the lemma from the former, since we do not find it in any other witness to the latter.

The list of ecclesiastical hierarchies (2,3–24/1) – it combines two different lists known from other sources: that of the bishops under the emperor Leo in the Church History of Pseudo-Zachariah of Mitylene, (hereafter: PZ, I,205,33–206,14/99ff) and in MS (248c, the new chapter, 1–249,25/II,141ff) and those under Zeno in PZ (II,15,15–16,3/143ff) and in MS (256,10–20/II,153ff).

The burning of a synagogue by the Greens (2,25–3,6/1) – MS (254a,16–22/II,149a); he attributes this piece of information (together with the other combined in this column of this – the sixth – chapter) to John of Antioch, i.e. Malalas (MS 254a 26–31/ibid.) and in fact we find it in the latter’s Chronicle (389f/218f).

lm 808 (3,7–9/1): the enthronement of Anastasius – MS (256a, ch.(apter) 7, 2–4/II,154a), who gives the year 805 Sel. and 539 of the era of Antioch (= 802 Sel.
= 490/91 A.D., i.e. the correct date). To the same year and era this event (or more exactly the death of Zeno) is dated by Mal (391/219); the Chronicle to the year 1234 (henceforth: XI234) dates it to 803 Sel. (1,186,22–24/147), whereas X846 (218,14/166) and the Nestorian Chronicle of Elias of Nisibis (1,116,20–23) with reference to Jacob of Edessa (313, in fila regnorum, after anno 166/233) date it to 802 Sel.

Lm 809 (3,10–12/1): the sending into exile of Euphemius of Constantinople – XE (9,1–3) has it under the date 810, but nothing is said there of Euphemius’ exile, only of his deposition, which might suggest that the lemma comes from the OXE; more probably however it comes from JE as both Mal (400/224) and MS (256c,3–6/154f) have it.

Lm 810 (3,13–25/2): locusts, the earthquake in Nicopolis, a sign (darkness) in the sky, the warm springs of Abarne stop flowing – XE (8,23–9,1/36), also X846 (218,25–219,4/166f) and MS (257a,2–9/154). PD also has information on the Euphrates’ stopping its flow and the fall of the church in Arsamosata (3,22–25) which cannot be found in the sources known to be used so far; this additional information cannot be attributed to the OXE either, since no other witness of this otherwise lost composition has it. It is however to be found in the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite (hereafter: JshSt) copied in its entirety by PD (1,259,20/24 – Euphrates; 261,13–262,6/25 – Arsamosata, and all the matters named previously, PD 1,259,1–19/23f). Obviously PD did not copy for the second time a source he just had copied, but rather took it from JE who, as it seems, used Joshua’s work as well although not copying it in toto, as PD did, but excerpting, like his other sources. PD is conscious that he has given the information earlier and adds: “This was as we have recorded above” (3,14f).24 Also MS must have taken the lemmas in question from JE and not from JshSt, whose work he does not seem to have known.

Lm 811 (3,26–4,19/2): the darkening of the sun, the breach in the wall of Edessa, signs in the sky in November and January – the whole date lemma is of the same origin as the additional information to the previous lemma, i.e. JshSt (PD 1,262,15–26; 262,26–263,6; 263,17–22; 22–26 respectively), excerpted by JE. Also after this lemma PD adds that he recorded it previously (4,17). MS has the eclipse of the sun and the sign in January which he interprets as a comet (256a, ch.7,8f & 257a,10f/154)

Lm 812 (4,18f/2): famine, locusts and plague – a summary of JshSt Lm 812; since he however does not write anything about the locusts in his Lm 812 (but in an earlier place) it seems that JE’s lemma was simply the beginning of Joshua’s next date entry (re-edited by JE) which reads: “After these afflictions of locusts and famine and pestilence …” (PD 1,270,28f/34); MS (257a,11–15/154).

Lm 813 (4,20–25/3): the earthquake in Ptolemais, Tyre etc., a synagogue destroyed and fire in the sky – JshSt (PD 1,273,24–274,18/36f); from Joshua we learn that the destroyed synagogue was in Beyrouth; MS – fire in the sky (257a,16–19/154).

Lm 814 (4,26–5,14/3): the conquests of Kawad – a summary of JshSt’s narrative on Kawad’s campaigns in Byzantine Mesopotamia (PD1,274,18–275,4): Theodosiopolis, (276,6–280,22): Amid. MS’s account of the campaign of the Persians follows PZ.
The killing of 90 monks in the School of the Iberians (Urṭāyā) (5,4–8/3) – John of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints* (henceforth: JE, *Lives*; III.219); although no parallel text in MS can be found, it seems probable that rather than directly from the source named, PD has this lemma from *Church History* of JE, who had the habit of repeating in the latter work the same pieces of information from his other writings (cp. below, the lemma on the persecution of Monophysite monks, PD 38–44).

The battle at Tel-Beshmai and the march of the Persian army against Tellah and Edessa (5,8–11/3) – JshSt (PD I,276,6–291,20/38–54).

A sign in the sky (5,12f/3) – source unknown, unless it is an inadvertent repetition of the information on the sign from Lm 810 (3,18; darkness in both cases).

Famous bishops (5,14–23/3) – source unknown; it is probably JE’s or PD’s own compilation as it contains *inter alia* Felix of Rome and Sallustius of Jerusalem who have already been named in the previous list of bishops after Lm 800, whereas almost all of the Syrian bishops are on the list of the expelled ones which follows soon (see below, the non-dated lemma after Lm 829).

Lm 815 (5,24–6,3/3f): the earthquake on Rhodes – ultimately from the original Mal (cp. 406/227f), since PD (after JE) provides more information than *Bacocianus* (bk 16:18); MS shortens JE’s account (260a,31–34/II,160a).

Lm 816 (6,4–10/4): the ravaging of the Persian territory by Roman troops – JshSt (PD I,298,17–25/61; 301,10–302,1/63).

Thomas becomes bishop of Amid by deceit (6,10–16/4) – JshSt (PD I,304,18–305,14/66).

Lm 817 (6,17f/4): the fortification of Dara – JshSt (PD I,309,22f/70); PZ II,34,21–39,4/164–168; MS (260a,3–21/159fa); XJ234, I,190,11–24/150). The accounts of JshSt and PZ differ, but PD is here too laconic for us to decide from whom JE drew his account, not to mention that he might have followed Mal 16:10 (399/224) as well. It is also possible that PD had yet another source than those named, of the nature of a short chronicle. In fact both XJ24 (149,28/115) and Elias of Nisibis (1,117,17–19) have it, both *sub anno* 820. The difference in date may be due to that the two followed JacEd (316,7f/238, s.a. 179 = 815 Sel.) where this lemma is written just above the date 820.

Celer’s coming to make peace with the Persians (6,19f/4) – JshSt (PD I,312,10–12/72).

Lm 818 (6,21–8,23/4–6): riot against Anastasius because of his acceptance of the “Monophysite” addition to the *Trishagion* – the original Mal; *Bacocianus* 16:19 (407f/228) has shortened the story. PZ has a different account telling only about the introduction of the addition to the *Trishagion* (II,48,11–49,25/177f) whereas MS combines PZ’s and JE’s accounts (256c, ch.7,16–258,20/155c–157 & 261, ch.9,1–9/162f).

The banishment of Macedonius, the patriarch of Constantinople (8,24–9,23/6) – it is a fragment, perhaps the most dramatic one, though in no way explanatory, of the “Letter of a presbyter Simeon on the expulsion of Macedonius” quoted in full, as it seems, by PZ bk 7:8 (II,47,3–19/175f); MS (261, ch.9,15–262,24/163–165) shortens PZ’s account leaving out the fragment copied by PD.

Lm 821 (9,24–10,15/7): Simeon of Beth Arsham’s converting two Persians into
Christianity – an excerpt from the *Life of Simeon of Beth Arsham* by John of Ephesus (JE, *Lives* 1,141).

The “heresy” among the monks of Perrhe of eating the Eucharist as a meal (10,16–11,17/7f) – it is a summary of the so-called Letter of Rabula, bishop of Edessa, to Gemellinus, bishop of Perrhe. Its fuller form is preserved in PZ (II,178,11–189,2/303–310) and in MS (298b, ch.27–304,end/224–233). As such (Rabula died in 435 A.D.) the story is chronologically misplaced in PZ, from whom JE seems to have extracted it,25 as well as in PD and in MS.

Lm 822 (11,18f/8): the revolt of Vitalian – XE (9,26f/36); here it is dated by the years of the reign of Anastasius; MS (260a,35-end/160) has more information to hand.

Lm 823 (11,20–12,14/8): the synod in Sidon and the election of Severus for the patriarchal see of Antioch – it is a composite lemma of unknown direct source, compiled either by JE or by PD himself, who also used some material which did not pertain here. The account of the synod is possibly based on PZ bk 8:10 (II,50,1–51,11/179f) and MS seems to follow PZ here (261, ch.10,1–262,6/162f), but the two are too different from PD’s account for one to be sure about this parentage. The list of the main participants is at least partly wrong (e.g. it is more than probable that the pope Symmachus was not present at the synod). PD may have drawn it from some source in which the list was a simple “famous hierarchs” lemma, placed just after the lemma on the synod and taken by mistake as belonging together with the latter. The information on the election of Severus corresponds to MS (260c,12–24/161), and that on Severus’ grandfather (12,8–11) to the *Life of Severus* by John of Beth Aptonia.26 This comes probably from JE but PD may also have found it in some other source of the short chronicle character, for it features in the X724 (143,28–144,1/111) as well. The explanation of the identity of Sidon and Saidon may be PD’s own addition or simply a marginal note of a scribe drawn into the main text.

The appearance of Severus as a new patriarch in Antioch (12,14–13,25/8f) – this comes, except for the very first words, from the *Life of Severus* by John of Beth Aptonia.27

Lm 826 (13,26–14,14/9f): the synod in Tyre – PZ (II,55,18–56,10/183f), the information in PD is somewhat distorted, but we do not know whether the changes are PD’s or JE’s. MS (264, ch.10,1-end/165f) follows PZ but abbreviates greatly.

Lm 827 (14,15–18/10): the revolt of Ilmarqios (= Theodoric) – a summary of PZ (II,56,12–21/184f).


Hierarchs under Anastasius (15,3–14/10f) and Justin (PD: Justinian the Elder) (15,15–22) – PZ (II,59,13–24/187 & 83,4–14/212f); MS (264c, ch.11,1–265,7/168 & 276c, last line –277,23/189f) seems to have another source since he gives the number of years the hierarchs officiated.

Lm 829 (15,23–16,20/11): the enthronement of Justinian the Elder (i.e. Justin) and the beginning of the anti-Monophysite policy – MS, in an abbreviated form (265a, ch.12,1–266,4/169a), and XI234 (1,191,1–4/150). Both date it to 832 Sel., whereas PD’s date agrees with that of PZ (II,60,20/189). JE, who seems to be the
common source of the Syriac chronicles, used in his turn Mal (410/230). The Syriac witnesses preserve even some traces of the physical description of the emperor, known to be a characteristic of Malalas.28

The empress Lupicina forces John the patriarch of Constantinople to reintroduce (the participants of) the Council of Chalcedon into the diptychs (16,20–17,1/11f) – MS (271c,27–32/180) in a shortened form.

The decapitation of two officials Amantius and Andreas (17,1–4/12) – MS (271c,9–15/180); PZ in 8:1 (II,61,18–62,5/189f) has a longer account where the reason of the execution is explained as political. Likewise in Mal 17:2 (410f/230f), whereas MS gives a religious cause. This must have come from JE, whose account PD shortened to the point that it is suggested rather by the context than by actual text. Also a religious cause is given byJacEd (317, left, last three lines/239, s.a. 195 (= 831 Sel.)).

General remarks on the disturbances within the Church (17,5–11/12) – these seem to be of an “editorial” character and may have had their origin either in JE or PD.

Severus’s departure from Antioch (17,12–14/12) – MS (265c,1–7/169).

The list of the Monophysite bishops deposed by Justin (17,16–18,27/12f) – the same list, with some comments which PD seems to have dropped, may be found in MS (266b, new ch.9–267,28/171–173) and in X846 (225,24–228,7/171–173); both MS (266c,7–10 & 266b, the title of the new ch. [=13])/170c & 170b respectively) and X846 attribute it to JE quoting also his introductory remark on his personal acquaintance with many of the expelled bishops (“...some of those whom we saw and in acquaintance with whom we were for a long time, we list as follows...”, 225,22–24/171; similarly in MS 266c, new ch.,5–7/170f).

Lm 831 (19,1–20/13): Paul the Jew, the new patriarch of Antioch – this is in fact the beginning of a longer narrative of the persecution initiated by Paul (see below, Lm 837:2), which certainly comes from JE’s pen. Therefore the present introduction to the narrative, although it is not preserved in any of the known witnesses to John’s text, is most probably by JE too. The information on Paul’s having previously been the warden of the Euboulos hospice in Constantinople has been taken by JE from Mal (411/231f).

Lm 836: the appearance of a comet (19,21–20,15/14) – JE; this is the first lemma for which Land’s excerpts perhaps provide direct confirmation that JE’s Church History is the source (Land, 298,17–28); MS (265b,20–266,4/170). The extant Mal has it in a shorter form in 17:4 (411/231).

Lm 837 (20,16–27/14): fire in Antioch – JE (Land 298,28–299,9); MS has a summary (266c, ch.12,9–18/169f). The ultimate source is the original Mal 17:44 (417/236).

The persecution launched by Paul the Jew (21,1–24,11/14–16) – JE (Land 289,4–291,23); here it is dated (in the title) to 831 Sel.; MS (267b,25–268,7/173fc, sic!), shortens greatly.

Paul of Edessa’s departure from his see and Asclepius’s accession (24,12–26,2/17f) – MS summarizes (286b,8–23/174fc, sic!); XE (10,3–23/37), s.a. 831, contains a somewhat different story. This is followed by X819 (8,18–28/5) and X846 (229,2–9, the beginning in lacuna/173f).29
The death of Paul the Jew, the enthronement of Euphrasius in Antioch and his ordination of Asclepius for Edessa (26,2–7/18) – MS (270c, ch.16,1–13/179 & 271c,20–23/180).

The death of Jacob of Serug (26,7–27,2/18) – summarized by MS (268b,30–269,13/175fc).

The persecution of the monks of the Monastery of the Easterners in Edessa (27,3–30,20/19–21) – JE (Land 291,23–294,5); summarized in MS (269b,15–270,13/176fc). Land’s excerpt ends in PD 29,26, and has a somewhat different conclusion – it does not name Belisarius. MS does not either, but it seems hardly possible to assume that PD here used another source. PD’s continuation (29,27–30,20/21) on the dissent among the persecuted monks has its counterpart in MS (270b,13–end/177fc), as usual shortened.

The story of Thomas, Nonnos and Mara, the bishops of Amid (30,21–32,16/21–23) – PZ (II,78,21–80,11/208f), whom MS (267b,37–268,14/173f) summarizes. PD’s account does not agree completely with those of PZ and MS, following JE who most probably based his story on own memory – the lemma concerns his native city – or oral sources.

The persecutions by Abraham Bar Kaili, bishop of Amid (32,17–34,19/23f) – This story must have come from JE as can be inferred from personal statements (eg. “All these things (happened) in our presence and we saw it with our eyes”, 34,3f), which on chronological grounds cannot be PD’s but must have been taken over by him from John, a habit PD also displays elsewhere. MS has a different account (296b,7 from the bottom-297,end/221f) which is perhaps based on another fragment of JE’s story on or PZ. The latter wrote about it in his bk. 10, ch. 2 but this has not been preserved.

Other events during Bar Kaili’s persecution: the martyrdom of the priest Cyrus and the sending of lepers against Monophysites (34,20–38,21/24–27) – summarized by MS (272c,16–273,19/181f). Although the story of Cyrus was present in PZ, bk. 10, ch. 3 (today lost, cp. PZ II,173,15f/296), it seems quite probable that JE had his own independent account of the burning of the priest, which can be inferred from what is undoubtedly his remark in PD 37,1–4 where he gives the impression (by quoting 1Jn 1,1) of having been an eye-witness to the persecution; at least he must have heard about it from many eye-witnesses. In any case the story of Bar Kaili’s sending the lepers does not seem to have featured in PZ and thus at least the account of these deeds of Bar Kaili’s may very well be JE’s Sondergut.

The persecution of the Monophysite monks by Ephrem patriarch of Antioch (38,22–44,8/27–31) – JE (Land 294,5–298,17). Also this lemma provides a partly autobiographic narrative as is seen from the author’s stating that during the hardships experienced by the monks he received priestly or diaconal ordination (syām ṭdā d-kāhnūtā ‘īt (h)wā lan; 42,17f, but in the margin: šammāsā). MS confirms JE’s authorship but terms him (in accordance with the marginal note in PD), a deacon, not a priest (275b,8/186b); the whole story is, as usual, shortened by him (274b, new ch.-275,23/185–187b). It seems from JE’s metahistoriographic remark that the whole lemma is an excerpt from another work of JE: “The Book on the Whole Persecution” (Kiṭābā ’al kullāh rdupūyā; 39,7). This work of John’s has not survived but is also known from another mention, in JE’s Lives (II,607).
Lm 833 (44,9–11/31): the death of Jacob of Scrug – source unknown. It is hardly from JE since the story of Jacob’s death was already told by PD after Lm 837 (26,7–27,2), admittedly (since it comes from a narrative source) on JE’s authority, and this suggests that the present lemma must have another source. The shortness of the entry points to a so-called short chronicle. Of those known XE does not have the lemma, X724 dates it to 830 Sel. (144,11/111), X819 (8,29–31/5) to 832 Sel., whereas X846 (228,14f/173) shows full accordance with PD as to the date. So does the Nestorian Chronography of Elias of Nisibis (11th century). In fact the latter has two lemmas concerning Jacob of Scrug’s death: “The year 832 – in this (year) Jacob the Teacher of the Jacobites (mallpānā d-Ya'qūbītā) died. Thus he had been bishop for two years and a half. The year 833 – in this (year) died Jacob of Scrug” (118,18–20.23f). Elias, although a Nestorian, used Monophysite sources as well. Apparently for the two lemmas he had two different sources, which did not agree as to the date of Jacob’s death. Elias copied them not knowing that Jacob “the Teacher of the Jacobites” and Jacob of Scrug were the same person. Although Elias knew John of Ephesus, under the name of John the Jacobite (Yōhannān Ya’qūbīyāt),31 neither of the lemmas seem to be taken from him.

Perhaps it is OXE (since both X819 and X846 depend on it) or some other short chronicle unknown to us which is the ultimate source of the lemma in PD and of the two in Elias, but further transmission of the lemma by two paths seems to be the cause of the double entry in the latter. One of the intermediary links between the source and Elias’ Lm 832 must be the same as the one behind X819 since the two share the information on the two-and-a-half-year duration of Jacob’s episcopacy. It is not clear however what common intermediary source – if any – would lie behind PD, X846 and Elias’ Lm 833. Perhaps it could be Jacob of Edessa, whose Chronicle is known to be Elias’ source. It is true, we do not find the lemma in the extant JacEd, but this is merely an extract, and a badly preserved one, from the original more extensive chronicle.

Lm 836: the flood in Edessa (44,12–46,15/32f) and the story of Asclepius the bishop of the city (46,16–47,9/33f) – JE, to whom the general style of the lemma points. The story in a shortened form and differently edited is also present in MS (270b, ch.14,1–272,4/179–181). XE agrees with PD as to the date (10,27–11,9/37) whereas JacEd has the flood s.a. 196 = 832 Sel. (318, left, 6f/240), and X724 (150,6/115) dates it to 835 Sel.

Famous ascetics and hierarchs (47,10–20/34) – a composite lemma, no parallel found. It seems however that it should again be attributed to JE, and less probably to PD himself, since the ultimate source seems to be JE’s Lives. Thus Abraham of Anzitene should be identified as the archimandrite of the convent of John the Iberian (‘Urṭāyā) in Amid, who later became bishop in the region of Anzitene (Lives, III, 211f); Maron the Stylite is known from the life of “the saints Abraham and Maro[nl]”,32 the reason why Maron was singled out of these two is most probably the fact that in his childhood John of Ephesus’s life was saved by this ascetic (p. 61–64). Simon and Sergius his disciple, Addai of the convent of Pardaisa and John of Zuqnin are also known from the Lives (respectively: III,84; III,124f; I,36–55). As for Mara of Ġurtha I have been unable to find the source, but since JE did write the life of Paul of Surtha (Lives, III,111–118), it is possible that the latter
is meant here, the name Mara being PD’s or a copyist’s mistake. Also the Monophysite patriarchs Severus, Theodosius, and Anthimius named in the same lemma may possibly come from the Lives II,684–690; the patriarchs Sergius and Paul, also named there, are merely successors of Severus and Theodosius, respectively (ibid., p. 689). The list of the “heretic” (i.e. Chalcedonian) patriarchs may be composite; it partly repeats the names which were already listed above.

Lm 837 (47,21–50,13/34–36): the earthquake in Antioch (the fifth collapse), the burning of the Great Church there and the appearance of a cross in the sky – JE (Land 299,9–301,3); the record of the earthquake is taken from (the original) Mal 17:16 (419–421/238–241), as is in fact stated by John (in PD) who refers to Malalas as John of Antioch (Yōhannān ʾAnṭyākīyā, 49,13, Land 300,17). MS, under the date 840, abbreviates (272b,11–273,4/181f). JacEd mentions the earthquake s.a. 198 (= 834 Sel.), and the fire and the cross s.a. 199 (318, left,10–13/240).

The death of Euphrasius the patriarch of Antioch (50,14–51,21/37) – MS (273b,4–13/182f) has this lemma, shortened as usual, as a continuation of the previous one. MS writes that both Euphrasius and Asclepius (the bishop of Edessa who had fled from his see to Antioch) died in a cauldron of pitch during the earthquake, whereas according to PD (47,6f) it is true that Asclepius died in Antioch, but not necessarily in the same accident as Euphrasius. It seems that it is MS who deviates from JE’s account. We know namely fromXE (11,5f/37) that Asclepius died on the 27th of June 836 Sel., whereas Euphrasius died in 837 (11,30f & 12,7f/38), and it seems thus that MS jumped to a conclusion and attributed to both hierarchs death in the same manner and at the same time.

The earthquake in Seleucia and Daphne (51,22–52,17/38) and the rebuilding of the cities – MS (273b,14–18/183), briefly; the lemma must originate from JE, since it is based on Mal 17:16f (421f/241f), the longer redaction.

Lm 840 (52,18–26/38) – the earthquake in Dyrrachium – JE, cp. Mal (417f/236f), and MS (273b,18–20/183), abbreviated.

Lm 841 (52,27–29/39): the earthquake in Corinthus – JE, cp. Mal (418/237) and MS (273b,20f/ibid.).

Lm 842 (53,1–3/39): the earthquake in Anazarbos – JE, cp. Mal (418/237), MS (ibid.).

Ephrem of Amid’s accession to the see of Antioch (53,4–7/39) – Mal 17:22 (423/243); MS (271c,32–272,15/181f).

Lm 842 bis (53,8f/39): Justin makes Justinian co-emperor – Mal 17:18 (422/242); MS (276a, new ch.,1–277,2/189).

Lm 843 (53,10–12/39): Rufinus’ peace with the Persians and the “leaping” stars in the sky – the first part of the lemma may be derived fromOXE for its three witnesses have it:XE (12,29–13,2/38), X819 (9,14–20/5f) and X846 (229,14–21/174). The second part, however, does not feature in any of them, and is to be found only in PZ (II,100,11–13/231) in a chapter (book 9:7) dealing in fact with the Roman-Persian peace made by Rufinus. The account of peace negotiations in PZ is however too detailed (not to mention the presence in PZ’s account of another Roman negotiator by the name Hermogenes) to be regarded as the source of the whole lemma. On the other hand, the proximity of the lemmas with these pieces of information in Malalas’ Chronicle bk 18:72 & 75 (477/282) makes the following
stemma more probable: the two lemmas of Mal were used by JE, but he worded his account in accordance with PZ. Mal wrote only about “the race (or: run) of the stars” (ἄστερον) whereas the word “leaping” features both in PZ (dāysin, II,100,12) and in PD (mdayyin, 53,12).

Lm 844 (53,13–23/39): the conversion of the Heruls to Christianity – JE from whom MS (278b,5–13/192) took it. Ultimately it comes from Mal 18:6 (427f/247), but from the original form of the Chronicle, since the Syriac witnesses have additional information on Justinian being king Grepes’ godfather.

Lm 845 (53,24–54,12/39f): the conversion of Grod the king of the Huns – likewise JE, on the basis of Mal 18:14 (431–433/250f), cp. MS (278b,13–28/192f). Both Syriac witnesses have shorter accounts than Mal, which suggests that the cuts were made by JE.

Lm 846 (54,13f/40): the death of Justin and the accession of Justinian – MS (277a, new ch.,1-end/190) dates it to 840 Sel. (October 528–September 529 A.D.). X1234 (I,191,21f/151) gives 841 Sel. MS gives also the time of the whole reign of Justinian as 38 years, 7 months and 12 days, which must have come via JE from Mal 18:1 (425/244). XE (12,17–21/38) dates it to the 10th of August 838 (= 527 A.D.), which is almost the correct date (1st of August 527, as in Mal 18:1; 425/245, with the difference that the latter dates it according to the era of Antioch).

The conversion of the “Indians” i.e. the Abyssinians (54,15–56,19/40–42) – Mal 18:15 (433f/251f); MS divides this story in two parallel chapters (273b, new ch.,1–274,9 & 273c, new ch.,1–15/183b–185 & 183fc).

The persecutions of the Christians of Himyar by the Jews (56,20–57,3/42) – this is merely an introduction to the Letter of Simeon of Beth Arsham, which follows directly thereafter. It seems to originate from JE’s pen. MS has it incorporated in what corresponds to the previous lemma. According to the Letter of Simeon (see next Lm) the persecution took place in 835 Sel. (i.e. during the reign of Justin, not Justinian, as the place of the lemma in PD would suggest), a date which is repeated by X819 (9,11f/5) and X846 (222,15–17/169); JacEd gives the date 196 (= 832 Sel.) (318, left,5f/240).

The Letter of Simeon of Beth Arsham on the martyrdom of the Himyarite Christians (57,4–67,12/42–50) – This is the “shorter redaction” of the (“first”) Letter of Simeon, of which both the “longer” and another still shorter redaction exist. The same redaction as in PD is in PZ (II,63,23–74,13/192–203). MS has it too, slightly abridged (273c,15–276, end/184–189).

The later vicissitudes of the boy who bit the Himyarite king-persecutor (67,12–68,15/50f) – JE, which can be seen from the autobiographical remark (68,2) saying that the author, while staying in Constantinople, knew the boy who had been sent there by the Christian king of Himyar. MS (although he does not quote the lemma) confirms that John knew the boy (276c, three last lines/189).

The Abyssinian expedition against the Jews of Himyar (68,16–69,6/51) – JE, but hardly on the basis of Mal 18:56 (456–459/268f). Rather, John had another, as yet unknown, source; MS (274b,9–22/184f) abbreviates, but seems to have retained more details of JE than PD, e.g. the name of the Alexandrian patriarch, Timothy.

Lm 850 (69,7–20/51f): the attack of the Persians on Antioch and Ephrem’s flight – MS (287a,27-end/206); X1234 (I,192,29–193,6/152).
Lm 857 (69,21–24/52): the death of Timothy, patriarch of Alexandria, and the accession of Theodosius – MS (277c,10–14/190).

Lm 841 (chronologically misplaced together with 8 following dated lemmas): the obstruction of the flow of the Euphrates (69,25–70,22/52) – MS (280b,16–22/195), shortens; X1234 (1,199,1–11/156f) shortens too; here the lemma is dated to 861.

Lm 843 (70,23–71,2/53): the eclipse of the sun for “one and a half years (śā(n)ittā ḥdā w-pelgāḥ) that is 18 months” – MS is surprised at such a long period of eclipse but since he found it in more than one source he repeats the information (296a,10-end/220f) dating it to 848 Sel. The author of X1234 (1,199,11–13/157) shows more perspicacity and without much ado finds that the eclipse took one hour and a half (śā’ā tā ḥdā w-pelgāḥ, 199,12) and the astonishing phenomenon is thus reduced to some early scribal mistake, the letters ’ē and nūn being in fact sometimes hard to discern in Syriac script. The chronicle repeats however that the eclipse influenced the vegetation to the point that the fruits and grapes did not become ripe that year.

Lm 849 (71,3–7/53): the death of Severus of Antioch, John Bar Qursos, i.e. the bishop of Tella, and John Bar Aphtonia – in MS: Severus, 850 Sel. (308c, ch.29,1–6/243), the other two men, “the same year” (310c,9–13/245). X819 (9,21–29/6) gives the same date for Severus’s death as PD, but “the next year” for the other two churchmen. X724 (144,5–9/111) dates the death of Severus and John Bar Qursos to 848; there is no mention of John Bar Aphtonia; JacEd writes only about Severus, s.a. 215 = 851 Sel. (320, right,7/242). This lemma in X819 is in fact the first to follow after the material corresponding to XE has come to an end. Consequently it is probable that the common source for this lemma was OXE, which was probably continued after the excerpts (i.e. XE known to us) had been made.

Lm 850 (71,8–27/53): the earthquake in Pompeiopolis – the lemma comes through JE (Land 301,3–19) from Mal 18:19 (436f/253). Through the same mediator it must have reached MS, with the difference that he has it twice (278b, last line–279,11/193 and 308b, ch.29,16–25/243f). It follows that MS took it over from two different sources. Both MS’s lemmas are shortened as compared with JE and PD, but some details (the use of the word “Sheol” and the next lemma being on the earthquake in Antioch) would suggest that it is the former of the two which comes from JE. The origin of the latter remains unexplained (perhaps the original JacEd), unless it is a simple inadvertent repetition.

Lm 851: the earthquake in Antioch, the sixth collapse (72,1–73,9/54f), the cold winter (73,10–25/55), the vision of a believer in Antioch and the reconstruction of the city (73,26–74,23/55f) – JE (Land 301,19–303,8). Land’s excerpts come to a halt in what corresponds to PD 74,6, but there is little doubt that also the rest of this date lemma (74,6–23) comes from John’s pen. MS has it in shortened form (279b,11–280,16/193–195) and X1234 (1,194,17–195,3/153) likewise. The ultimate source is the original Mal bk. 18:27 (442f/256f).

Lm 852 (74,24–75,15/56): the earthquake in Laodicea – JE (Land 303,8–21), from Mal (18:28; 443/258); MS twice (280b,22–27/195b & 308b, ch.29,12–16/243), abbreviated in both cases.

The burning of Manicheans in Constantinople (75,16–76,15/56f) – MS (279a,4–9/191a) greatly abridged; here it follows the information on Manicheans in Persia (278fa/190f), also present both in Mal Barocciānus (18:30; 444/258f) and in X1234...
Neither of the two however has the events in Constantinople and thus their account seems to be JE's *Sondergut*.

The pagans in Constantinople (76,16–77,7/57f) – JE, inspired perhaps by Mal 18:42 (449/262f), but independent of him; this is missing from Land's excerpts but the lemma is autobiographical – it was due to John's instigation that the pagans in the capital were investigated (76,18f). MS has it in shortened form (287c,23–33/207c); X1234 (I,193,11–23/152) confirms John's role in the affair (I,193,20).

Lm 853 (77,8–78,15/58): the extinction of paganism in Asia, Caria, Lydia and Phrygia – an autobiographical lemma of JE, cp. 77,11f; this is in fact one of the three places (apart from the introduction) where PD states his source by giving John's name. MS (287c,33–288, end of the ch./207f) relates this mission quite briefly and confirms John's authorship of the lemma and his missionary activities (287c,36–38/207 & 288c,7–9/208).

Lm 854 (78,16–79,2/59): the earthquake in Cyzicus – JE (Land 303,21–24); Land's excerpt ends in what corresponds to PD 78,20. The lemma comes partly from Mal 18:93 (482/287) but is expanded by JE's own comments on the state of Cyzicus as seen by him when he passed through the city "in that time" (78,20f); MS (320a,31–33/262).


Lm 855 (79,16–109,29/59–82): the bubonic plague "all over the world", i.e. the so-called Great Plague – JE (Land 304,98–325,23); Land's excerpt omits the text of PD 89,7–91,22 & 107,24–109,16, but it can be safely affirmed that the rest comes from JE's pen as well. The story seems to have been divided in JE's *Church History* into at least 5 chapters or sections (šarbā), which were supplied with separate titles. Of these PD has kept four: the one at the beginning of the lemma, the second in 86,26f; the third is preserved in Land's excerpt (312,11f), but not in PD (its place would have been before PD 91,23). The fourth is again preserved only in PD, called now rešā (94,15–18), and the fifth once more called šarbā in 102,21f = Land 321,5, though here the number is in a lacuna. The story is lengthy and verbose but it apparently struck PD's fancy and he copied it – as it seems – verbatim. The story has some autobiographical elements. We learn, for instance, that John was ill too, and was even close to death (87,13–16/65). His authorship of the account is corroborated by a sort of colophon (109,27–29): "The story of the violent plague is finished, as holy John, bishop of Asia, wrote it". MS (305b & c-308, the end of the ch./235–240) copied, as it seems, the entire account of JE together with the beginning concerning the plague in Alexandria (305c,1–306,23/235–238b sic!), which PD omitted. MS also quotes a fragment of PZ's account of the plague (307b,36–308,11/240c). X1234 (I,197,3–198,24/155f) gives a summary also containing information on the plague in Alexandria. It is probable that "The Story of the Violent Plague" was once a separate book written by JE, who later drew all of it into his *Church History*.

Famous persons of the epoch: patriarchs, bishops, kings (110,1–22/82f): this is a composite lemma, which has no exact equivalent in other chronicles, although many of the persons named can be found in MS, bk 9, ch. 24, (col. b & c 286f/206f) and ch. 29 & 30 (col. c, 308–319/243–261). The list of the kings is patterned on Mal
18:9 (429/248) although the names of the rulers are partly different. Among the famous ecclesiastics John of Asia (i.e. of Ephesus) is named, with the remark: “... he who has written this” and thus the lemma seems to be taken from him but probably edited by PD.

The story of Constantine, bishop of Laodicea (110,22–111,11/83) – MS has it exceptionally in a fuller form (312c,17–313,8/249f).

The lack of bishops in Ethiopia, Himyar and “India” (111,12–112,11/84) and the heresy of Melchizedekians there (112,11–20) – source unknown; although I have been unable to find any witness of this lemma in other relevant sources, it most probably comes from JEl, since the lemma ends with information that “some Phantasiasts from among Julian’s and Gaianus’ followers arrived in those countries and corrupted them” (112,18–20) and thus forms a sort of introduction to a longer account of the spread of the Phantasiast heresy (see below, Lm 860).

Lm 858 (112,21–115,7/84–86): famine and plagues in Beth Nahrin – no doubt JEl, to judge on the basis of the style and metahistoriographic remarks like: “It is meet and right that we should introduce those matters into the record of our story” (113,1–4). MS, very shortly (322b, new ch.,1–323,4/267).

Lm 871 (115,7–119,1/86–89): the plague of madness in Amid – MS (323b,4–29/267f); XI234 (1,199,18–200,14/157), abridged in both; Elias of Nisibis (1,121,24–122,2).38

Lms 855, 858, 867 (119,1–7/89): the pestilence, the famine and the plague of madness – these lemmas contribute only the duration of the misfortunes already described, and a new date for the madness; source unknown.

Lm 869 (119,8–27/89f): the return of the pestilence to Amid – JEl; the lemma is signed: “These things were written by holy John, bishop of Asia, who saw them” (119,25–27/90), which remark refers not to this lemma alone but rather to all the accounts of the disasters which befall Amid. This long narrative must be JEl’s and is interrupted, it seems, only by the three lemmas stating the duration of the calamities. The date of the present lemma comes from the same unknown source. The summary of it in MS (323b,29–31/268) directly follows the account of the madness and thus is more likely to have taken place after 871 Sel. This latter date is also corroborated by an account “from the (anonymous) Church history” of Amid,39 the author of which must have used JEl.

Lm 857 (119,28–120,28/90): the controversy in Constantinople and Alexandria about the date of Lent – Mal 18:96 (482f/287f); MS (325b,3–15/271c, sic!).

Lm 860 (120,29–125,11/90–94): the non-canonical transfer of episcopal office by the Julianists (Phantasists) in Ephesus and the spread of this heresy – the indignant style is no doubt JEl’s, here even more understandable as coming from an author who writes about the vicissitudes of his own (nominal) see. The bishop Procopius, says JEl, became a Julianist, then recanted his adherence in a libellum, but later “he erred again and returned, like a dog to its vomit, to the same heresy” (122,14f). MS shortens the story of the events in Ephesus (319b, new ch.,1–322, end of the ch.,263–267), but continues JEl’s record of further vicissitudes of the Julianists, which PD has omitted.

Lm 861 (125,12–19/94): the flood in Tarsus – MS (308b, new ch.,9–12/243); Elias of Nisibis (1,121,1–4).
Montanists in Asia (125,20–27/94) – JE; the lemma contains autobiographical elements; it is shortened in PD in comparison with MS’s story (323c, new ch.,1–325, end of the ch./269–272b, sic!), unless the latter used another source, as S. Gerö thinks.40

Lm 862 (126,1–127,2/94f): the earthquake in Constantinople and Nicomedia – JE (Land 325,23–326,14) from the original Mal, as Baroccianus 18:118 (486f/293f) has nothing on the commemoration of the earthquakes; MS (309b,35–310,5/245).

Famous hierarchs (127,3–13/95) – the source unknown; compiled most probably by JE; the names of the Monophysite hierarchs are partly repeated from the previous list in PD 110,1–22, whereas the Chalcedonian hierarchs are those who participated in or accepted the Fifth Ecumenical Council in Constantinople (see Lm 872 below) and whose names in MS feature in the account of the Council (313c,5 from the bottom – 3 fr.b./252).

Lm 863 (127,14–128,11/95f): the revolt of the Samaritans and the Jews – JE from the original Mal 18:119 (487f/294f); MS (319a, new ch.,1–320,8/262), abbreviated. Lm 864 (128,12–22/96): earthquakes in Syria and Phoenicia – Mal 18:112 (485/291); MS (308b,25–309,5/244) omits some of the cities destroyed; see also below Lm 876.

Lm 865 (128,23–129,18/96f): “assembly” of patriarchs, bishops and monks in Constantinople – JE (Land 385,22–386,13); JE writes that he is not able to give details of the assembly (128,26f); MS abridges still more (285b,7 from the bottom–5 fr. b./204).

Lm 866 (129,19–131,17/97f): the fire of the temple in Ba’albek – MS (320a, last line – 321, end/262f) abbreviates; XI234 (200,21–24/158) is very concise.

Lm 867 (131,18–132,16/98f): the fall of the Great Church in Constantinople and its reconstruction – the dramatic tone is JE’s, so it is probably his own report of the event, but perhaps based on or at least inspired by Mal 18:128 (489f/297); MS has a joint account of this and a later quake, cp. below Lm 875; for the reconstruction – MS (320a,34–43/262a).

Lm 868 (132,17–133,10/99): the earthquake in Botrys in Phoenicia – according to Mal 18:112 (485/291) the same earthquake extended to the provinces of Palestine, Arabia, Mesopotamia and both Phoenicias, but both Syriac witnesses, PD and MS, (310b,36–311,8/246f, shortly) seem to treat them separately (see above Lm 864). Lm 869 (133,11–16/100): the gathering of the Egyptian monks in Constantinople “in the matter of the faith” – JE (Land 390,14–17); MS (285b,5 from the bottom – 4/204).

Lm 870 (133,17–136,12/100–102): the earthquake in Beirut – JE (Land 326,15–328,18); MS (311b,8–30/247) much shorter.

Lm 871 (136,13–138,6/102f): Justinian’s attempt to bring the Egyptian Monophysites to Orthodoxy by discussions held in Constantinople – JE (Land 390,17–391,20). JE was present at the discussions (137,12); MS (285b,3 fr.b./286,21/204f).

Lm 872 (138,7–139,13/103f): the synod in Constantinople (i.e. the Fifth Ecumenical Council, 553 A.D.) – JE (Land 385,3–22). MS has another more comprehensive source (313c,34–319, end of ch./251–261); he quotes even anathemas of the Council. JacEd s.a. 227 (= 863 Sel. = 552 A.D.) is closer to the correct date (321, right,9–15/243).
Lm 874 (139,14–141,10/104f): the summoning of the Eastern archimandrites in Constantinople by Justinian after the death of Theodora – JE (Land 387,5–388,13); autobiographical data: JE refused to collaborate with the emperor (140,17–22); MS (312c,1–11/248f).

Lm 875 (141,11–17/105): an earthquake felt in the Great Church (in Constantinople) and the destruction of half of the city of Cyzicus – it is another destruction of the church than that related in Lm 867. MS describes both in one account (320a,11–31/262a). The earthquake in Cyzicus seems to be a repetition of Lm 854.

Lm 876 (141,18–142,2/105): the earthquake in Phoenicia – this is repetition of Lm 864 in 128,14–22.

Lm 877 (142,3–5/105): the death of Theodosius of Alexandria – MS (323c,18–23/268).

Lm 879 (142,6–143,22/106f): the earthquake in Constantinople, the fall of its two walls etc. – JE (Land 328,18–329,21); Land’s excerpts end in PD 143,16; the lemma comes ultimately from Mal 18:124 (488f/295f); MS (310b,6–36/245f).

Lm 882 (143,23–144,3/107): list of hierarchs – there is no exact equivalent to this list; the closest perhaps is that in MS 322c, last two lines – 323, end of ch./267f.

Lm 883 (144,4f/107): the deposition of Eutychius of Constantinople and the enthronement of John – the lemma comes from the original Mal, preserved in Theophanes (Mal 18:149; /305). MS (312c,11–16/249) gives (against PD and Mal) the cause of the deposition – the Sabatian heresy.

Lm 884 (144,6–23/107): Justinian’s becoming a Phantasiast – MS (325b, new ch.,1–17/272 and 331c,1–4/281) devotes the whole chapter to it and has many more details.

Lm 885 (144,24–145,9/107f): a fiery lance in the sky – MS (325b,15–17/271c, sic!); Elias of Nisibis has this and the next lemma s.a. 877 (122,3–7).

Lm 885 bis (145,10f/108): the death of Justinian and the accession of Justin II – MS (331a,1–4/282); X1234 (200,29–201,4/158). These two chronicles give the dates 878 (= 566/7 A.D.) and 874 (= 562/3 A.D.) respectively and are thus closer to the real date (565 A.D.) than PD.

Lm 889 (145,12–16/108): successions in the sees of Edessa, Amid, and Antioch – source unknown.

What general picture of source dependencies of the Chronicle of PD does result from the above analysis? Does it confirm what PD says himself, namely that JE is his principal source?

The question may be quite safely answered in the affirmative.

Firstly, the dependence on JE is confirmed by the testimony of Land’s excerpts or at least of that in the ms Add. 14647. Also the other excerpt (in Add. 14650) seems in the light of our analysis to contain JE’s material, albeit edited and furnished with dates by PD. All the doubtful lemmas have been found in other witnesses to JE (mostly in MS), and thus one may say that the excerptor really did know what he was doing when in the title he described his excerpt from PD as being from JE’s Church History.

Secondly, there are several autobiographical lemmas, e.g. Lm 852:3 (the pagans in Constantinople), 853 (the mission in Asia Minor), 854 (the earthquake in
Cyzicus), 855 (the Great Plague), 869 (the plague in Amid), 861:2 (the Montanists), 871 (theological disputes), 874 (Eastern archimandrites in Constantinople), etc., which either name John of Asia, or by using the first person in the verbs of the narrative imply that he is the author.

Thirdly, we have the evidence of later chronicles which used JE’s work: MS, X1234, and X846. The first two expressly state JE to be one of their sources, but as to the third, we admitted only hypothetically that it had been a witness to JE. However the analysed material – Im 829:6, the list of the expelled Monophysite bishops (PD 17,16–18,27/12f), which is avowedly taken from JE – proves that X846 did use the latter.

To accept the testimonies of these chronicles as valid we must be sure that JE’s material in them has not come via PD. Again the analysed material confirms our assertion. The list of the expelled bishops, just referred to, contains moreover some remarks (practically the same in both MS and X846) which are missing in PD, and thus the list must have come directly from JE to the two chronicles, or at least not via PD. Another confirmation of this fact, for MS alone, can be seen in the story of the Great Plague – both PD and MS copy JE’s account, but whereas PD has dropped the beginning (on the plague in Alexandria), MS did not, and consequently no mediation of PD can be accepted. Also X1234 contains, though in brief, information on the plague in Egypt.

The final testimony to JE’s material in PD is his use of Mal, JshSt and PZ.

For Malalas let it suffice here to refer to our previous article and to point to the crucial testimony in the material analysed above, in Im 837 (PD 49,13/36), where Malalas is named.

As to the presence in PD of separate lemmas the origin of which is the Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite, in addition to the Chronicle itself having previously been copied in full, the existence of an intermediary source must be admitted. It does not seem possible that PD first copied JshSt in full and then excerpted. Since some of the entries in question are present in MS, the intermediary source is almost certainly JE, who must have used JshSt but only as a source to be excerpted, not quoted at length. PD has taken over many of these lemmas, and having discovered that the pieces of information they bring have already been reported, shortened them.

Let us check now whether our working hypothesis on Pseudo-Zachariaiah of Mitylene’s being a source for JE has possibly been confirmed. Undoubtedly the works of the two historians display much similarity. Both have for instance the Henoticon (in PD, part 2), the Letter of Simeon of Beth Arsham, and some lists of ecclesiastical hierarchs. The question who used whom (both historians are practically contemporary) has been a matter of controversy, some scholars arguing for the priority of JE (Th. Nöldeke, W. Wright, L. Hallier, E.W. Brooks), some for the resemblance between the two being the result of the use of common sources (G. Krüger), and others for the priority of PZ (A. D’yakonov, N.V. Pigulevskaya). Thus a fresh look at the problem on the basis of the evidence gathered here may not be out of place. In fact, our hypothesis concerning JE’s use of PZ seems to be confirmed.

One argument is provided by Im 818:2 on the banishment of Macedonius; this
seems to be derived from a document which PZ has in full, and JE only in extract. Another argument is based on Lm 821:2 on the “heresy” of the monks of Perrhe: PZ has the whole letter of Rabbula to Gemellinus, whereas JE again has only an excerpt from it. Further, Lm 827 on the revolt of Theoderic is a summary of PZ’s account.

Also the Letter of Simeon on the martyrdom of the Himyarite Christians provides support for our conclusion. It is true, the philological comparison of the text in both historians is inconclusive, having shown only slight differences which can be found in any two manuscripts of a given text. However JE also provides information from his personal acquaintance with one of the protagonists of the circum-Erythrean affairs, whom he met in Constantinople. This is missing in PZ; if he had copied JE, he would have taken over this information as well. Neither do we find in PZ any other lemma which tells about JE’s personal experiences or activities (e.g. the christianization of provinces in Asia Minor, or the persecution of the Eastern monks).

Thus the conclusion must be that it was JE who used PZ and not vice versa, and consequently the presence of PZ’s material in PD testifies to the latter’s use of JE.

To sum up the results of the argumentation so far, JE is the most comprehensive source of PD for the part in question. More often than not the lemmas analyzed corroborate this conclusion. With due reservation, this fact justifies the hypothesis that even the lemmas for which we have not been able to establish the source may come from JE.

Obviously this does not mean that the third part of PD’s Chronicle is simply identical with the second of JE’s Church History. Although PD copied long passages from JE, keeping sometimes his personal style and wording (statements in the first person), he did not copy all of it, as we already know from the three later chronicles (see the arguments on their being independent of PD).

On the other hand, PD used, just as he did in previous parts, other sources in addition to JE. He must have used sources of the short chronicle type. One of them has been identified as OXE, but it seems that it was not the only one. The other may have been the Chronicle of Jacob of Edessa but due to its state of preservation it is impossible to be sure. Perhaps some of the faulty dates of PD come from his using a source of the type known from the preserved JacEd, i.e. one which was written in the tabular form (the so-called canon). Since the place provided for the spatiun historicum by the fila regnorum was limited, events of a year had quite often to be written at a distance from the corresponding dates in the fila regnorum. Consequently later copyists or other chroniclers who used such canon(s) were likely to attribute faulty dates to the lemmas they derived from the spatiun.

Another source of PD’s false dates seems to be his unsuccessful attempt to press the historiographic material from narrative sources (Church Histories of Socrates Scholasticus and John of Ephesus) into the chronicle scheme which demanded dating. Since these sources did not provide dates PD felt compelled to assign them somewhat arbitrarily himself. In accordance with his general view of the historiographic task he did not regard precision in chronology as being necessary.51

One example – the three subsequent lemmas on the earthquakes in Dyrrachium, Corinthus and Anazarbos (PD 52,18–53,3/38f) – should suffice to illustrate his
procedure. The ultimate source of the lemmas, Malalas, has them undated but placed just after a lemma (18:13, 417/236) which contains the date 568 (of the era of Antioch, i.e. = 519/20 A.D. = 831 Sel.). Then Mal introduces the lemmas in question (17:15, 417/236f) with dating: “In that year .. (Dyrrachium) ..”, “In that year Corinthus ..”, “In the next year Anazarbos ..”, which suggests the dates 831, 831, 832 Sel. respectively. We do not know how the lemmas read in JE; he may have left them the way they stood in Mal, i.e. assigning no dates to them. This is perhaps why we do not find any in MS who gathers all three lemmas into one: “In that time Dyrrachium .. collapsed. Also Corinthus metropolis of Hellas and Anazarbos of Cilicia fell in this earthquake.” (273b,1–20/183). In any case PD treated them as if they happened one after the other and accordingly assigned them dates in sequence: 840, 841 & 842.

Another hypothesis trying to explain PD’s false dates was propounded by A. D’yakonov who suggested that PD took his dates from an annalistic source which had combined 3 further sources –XE and two other chronicle type sources of which one was faulty by 3-4 years in both directions and the other basically by 8 years, plus 1-3 years by additional fault in both directions, i.e. by 5-11 years. Although it seems difficult to explain such regular (or rather irregular) faults by any source which otherwise did not leave traces of this dating in any other chronicle (and thus we keep our opinion as presented above), the hypothesis should not be simply rejected. Recently Michael Whitby has found in PD traces of the era of Philip of Macedon, known otherwise only from the Byzantine Chronicle of Theophanes. Consequently it should not be totally excluded that also some other dates in PD may turn out to have been motivated by similar reasons. The problem of PD’s dates requires however a separate study.

Not clear is the source or sources of the quite frequently occurring lists of bishops. Some of the lemmas of this type equal exactly those in PZ, and thus one would think again of JE being the direct source. Quite often however we do not find counterparts in PZ or MS, which fact suggests another source for PD. On the other hand lists of bishops are quite common in Syriac chronicles. They may have circulated independently of historiographic texts; perhaps their origin was simply church diptychs.

One remark of a more general nature remains to be made. Many results of the present investigation should be treated as to some extent preliminary. We know too little about the source relations among the short chronicles (in particular a study of the relation between JacEd and other short chronicles is badly needed), and therefore we cannot be sure about some of the source dependencies which have been indicated in the present article. In order to be able to draw more secure conclusions about the source chain of PD similar analyses should be undertaken for every one of the chronicles in question. The present paper should be understood as only an initial attempt to make clear the historiographic ambiance of PD and thereby the source dependencies of Syriac historiography in general.

Finally for clarity’s sake we shall try to show graphically the source dependencies between the chronicles involved.
ABBREVIATIONS

In text references the first numbers refer to the text of an original work (pages, columns, lines) and those after the oblique stroke to a translation (pages only).


CSCO SS – Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium, Scriptores Syri.


JE – John of Ephesus or of Asia.


JshSt – Joshua the Stylite: the Syriac text of his Chronicle is quoted according to PD I (see below); the translation: W. Wright (ed. & tr.), The Chronicle of Joshua the Stylite Composed in Syriac A.D. 507: with a translation into English and notes, Amsterdam 1968 [= Cambridge 1882].

Mal – Malalas, Chronographia, ed. L. Dindorf, Bonn 1831; the Engl. tr.: The Chronicle of John Malalas: a translation by E. Jeffreys et al., (Byzantina Australiensia 4), Melbourne 1986; the division into paragraphs according to the translation.


PD – Pseudo-Dionysius.


PO – Patrologia Orientalis.


s.a. – sub anno.


X – Chronicon (from: Χρονικόν).


NOTES

3. Conventionally Chabot called the volumes ‘parts’ (pérgwãaî on the Syriac title pages).
9. “John of Asia says in the beginning of his book that when Constantine...” MS 121a, 10-12/1, 239.
10. Ibid.
11. Johannis... pars tertia (see n. 8), 4, 11-14/3.
12. Add. 14647, f. 136ra-139va and Add. 14650, f. 189ra-206ra; W. Wright, Catalogue of Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum Acquired Since the Year 1838, vol. 3, London 1872, p. 1098f & 1106f, respectively. The text from the first manuscript has been republished by E. W. Brooks in PD II, 404-412.
13. D’yakonov, p. 203, who did not know PD’s text proved it by the attribution of the fragment to JE by MS.
15. D’yakonov, p. 205f.
17. I have been unable to find the relevant place in Land’s text.
18. On the other hand it is impossible to admit that the excerpt was the source for PD, since the latter has much more material than the excerpt can account for.
19. Unfortunately the part of XI234 dealing with ecclesiastical history during the period covered by the third part of PD is lost. Bar Hebræus does not seem to contribute anything more than MS for the part in question.
21. See: E. Jeffrey, Malalas in Greek, ibid., p. 245-250.
23. The dating system JacEd applies (in addition to the years of rulers) is his own era. Its beginning falls at the 21st year of Constantine the Great, in accordance with that the Chronicle is a continuation of Eusebius’s. To obtain the years of the Seleucid era one should add 636 to the number of the year of Jacob’s era. However, because of the complicated graphic representation of the work it is very often uncertain to which year of Jacob’s era (given in the table of the fila regnorum) lemmas of the spatium historicum refer. Since the CSCO edition does not eliminate this uncertainty we follow E.W. Brooks in matching the dates with the lemmas in his English transl.: The Chronological Canon of James of Edessa, ZDMG 53 (1899), p. 261-327.
27. Ibid., 241,3-243,7.
28. E. & M. Jeffrey, Portraits, [in:] Studies in Malalas..., (see n. 20), p. 231-244.
31. His Church History (qāsqa) was Elias’ source for the preceding lemma (831 Sel.) on the incursion of Mundhir into the Byzantine limes; this is missing in PD, but present in MS (270a, ch.14,1-271,21/178f).
32. E.W. Brooks renders this name (Syr.: Mrwn) as Maro, JE, Lives, II, 56,1 et passim.
33. The translation by E. Jeffrey et al. reads: “the great shower of stars”, p. 282.
34. V. Grumel, La chronologie, (Traité des Études Byzantines 1), Paris 1958, p. 356.
36. Not knowing that JE had a heading for the fourth chapter Van Douwen and Land supplied in their translation the word “fourth” in the lacuna, Land, transl., p. 238.
41. MS in the introduction (I,2), p. 377,1.23,41f/355–357 & passim, XI234 II,244,2/183 & 257,4f/193; J.M. Fiey, the intr. to XI234, II, p. IX.
42. See above, n. 20.
46. L. Hallier, Untersuchungen über die Edessenische Chronik, Leipzig 1892, p. 67.
47. In his introduction to the English translation of PZ, p. 6f.
50. N.V. Pigulevskaya, Siriyskiye istochniki po istorii narodov SSSR, Moskva 1941, p. 23f.
51. Witkowski, Syriac Chronicle, p. 137.
Reviews


The preceding monographs in this renowned Heidelberg series, edited by Professor Anton Schall of Heidelberg, include mainly Arabic and Islamological studies, the only exceptions being Ephrem Malik’s Die syrische Handschrift Berlin Sachau 220 (1984) and Manfred Kropp’s Die äthiopischen Königsschroniken in der Sammlung des Däggazmæc Haylu (1989). The majority deal with Arabic language, literature, and historiography.

The present investigation, devoted to the Libanese author and critic Mārūn ‘Abbūd, is based on Dr. Choulhod’s doctoral thesis, submitted to the Fakultät für Orientalistik und Altertumswissenschaft der Ruprecht-Karls-Universität Heidelberg in 1988/89 under the supervision of Professor R. G. Khoury.


The study by Dr. Choulhod is not at all a full scale investigation of the life and literary work of Mārūn ‘Abbūd, but is, instead, rather selective. The study is admittedly based on the collected works of Mārūn ‘Abbūd (al-Maḥjul ilā muʿallafat Mārūn ‘Abbūd al-kāmilah, mentioned above), and, accordingly, leaves a number of lesser known works by ‘Abbūd out of consideration (these works are conveniently listed on pp. 30f.). It is thus chiefly concerned with Mārūn ‘Abbūd’s literary criticism. Since, however, this was of a very special and all-embracing nature, Dr. Choulhod has found himself obliged to discuss it in a much wider context, including the world view of Mārūn ‘Abbūd, discussing not merely his concept of culture, but his social and political thinking as well, attempting in particular to understand ‘Abbūd as an Arab thinker, and member of an Oriental society.

The introductory chapter offers an historical and biographical framework (“Historische und biographische Grundlagen”, pp. 35–51). Chapter 2 (“Literaturkritik”, pp. 53–100) places ‘Abbūd in his general context of literary renaissance in Lebanon, and delineates Mārūn ‘Abbūd’s own general views concerning the novel and poetry. The third chapter concerns ‘Abbūd’s social criticism (“Gesellschaftskritik”, pp. 103–155), the fourth one deals with Mārūn ‘Abbūd’s political concepts (“Politische Vorstellungen”, pp. 157–196), and the fifth major chapter depicts a portrait of Mārūn ‘Abbūd as thinker (“Der Denker”, pp. 197–220), followed by an epilogue (“Schluss”, pp. 221–226), a bibliography (pp. 227–240), and indices of persons and subjects (pp. 241–244).

The investigation is carried out in an erudite and commendable manner, based on a solid knowledge of primary sources and of the secondary literature pertaining to the subject. The methodological awareness of the author is striking, and his presentation of the material is clear and lucid. Indeed, this portrait of literary critic and thinker Mārūn ‘Abbūd, will serve not merely as a standard monograph on his life and work; it will also give the public of today surprising insight into the present crisis in Lebanon, as this is discernible in the fragments of Mārūn ‘Abbūd’s literary and social criticism over several decades.

Uppsala

Trygve Kronholm

This work, which consists of two volumes, is an extensive and rich anthology of modern and classical Balochi literature, both poetry and prose, together with a short grammatical sketch of the different dialects of Balochi and a glossary.

In the first volume a wide selection of Balochi literature from different periods of time, representing different literary genres is transcribed and translated into English. The texts are divided into seven groups, namely modern short stories (pp. 7–127), modern poetry (pp. 129–255), classical poetry by known poets (18th–19th centuries) (pp. 257–328), traditional ballads from the classical heritage (pp. 329–398), a one-act radio play (pp. 399–407), essays on various subjects (pp. 409–433), and miscellaneous prose (pp. 435–465) containing traditional folktales, riddles, proverbs etc.

For each of these texts the editor adds a series of notes on the author and the place and date of publication of the text in question. Often there are also comments on the published manuscript and a description of how the edition of the particular text was carried out. Sometimes the sole source for the edited version of a text has been the published manuscript (see e.g. pp. 39, 45, 71), sometimes this manuscript has been revised in co-operation with the author or the editor of the journal where the text was published (see e.g. pp. 17, 55, 91, 147), and sometimes the editing work has been done from an unpublished manuscript which only later has been published (see e.g. pp. 113, 183, 191). In some cases it is not totally clear whether the edition is based on the published text or if some other manuscript or variant of the text has been used (see e.g. pp. 61, 131, 151, 165). Most of the modern literature found here has thus been published in Pakistan from 1951 onwards although for some pieces there is no mention made about publication (see e.g. pp. 31, 69, 159, 455, 461). Several of these pieces are probably still unpublished (see e.g. pp. 173, 179, 187).

The classical poetry is partly anonymous and partly attributed to more or less well-known classical poets. Attribution of orally preserved poems to a certain author is, of course, often difficult, something which the editor also notes (see e.g. pp. 257, 275). Some of the classical poems in this edition are unpublished and the editor has taken them down from oral recitation (see e.g. pp. 297, 299, 301, 331, 359). Several of the poems, however, have been published by the Baloch themselves and/or by M. Longworth Dames in *Popular Poetry of the Baloches*, vol. I and II, London 1907 (see e.g. pp. 259, 263, 267, 347, 353, 365, 369, 375). This applies both to attributed and anonymous poems.

A comparison of the transcribed texts here with the original text published in Balochi often reveals some discrepancies between the two. In text no. 1, Šāto, for example, all the endings in the first person singular, present tense, are written -ān in the text but transcribed -īn (copula -ānī) to conform to the author’s native dialect. (For the dialectal variants of the ending in the first person singular, present tense, see Jahani, C., *Standardization and Orthography in the Balochi Language*, Uppsala 1989, p. 116.) There are, however, also other forms in the text that are not found in Rakhšhāni, e.g. kurtān (p. 10, l. 3), ṛt (p. 10, l. 1.5, transcribed ṛtī, but the original has ṛtī), and the ergative construction (p. 10, l. 1), but here the editor has decided to keep the form of the original manuscript.

Sometimes the editor changes the grammatical forms used in the original text. This is done in e.g. no. 20, Kowl, where the original in the second verse has singular oblique forms mardā, šērā, and pādā, but the transcription has plural oblique forms, i.e. mardān, šērān, and pādān (wrongly transcribed pādān) (p. 134). Also in no. 71, Peš guftār, there are several such changes which also distort the meaning. Drustān ought to be drustān (p. 426, l. 1), zānkārānīe should be zānkārānī (l. 1), and zindage is wrong for zindagī (l. 6).

Furthermore, in a work where transcription plays such a crucial part it might have been advantageous to give an introductory explanation of the system of transcription that is used in the work. It may also be noted that the editor has made an attempt at transliteration of proper names, unfortunately with rather confusing results.

As for the translations, they are generally reasonably correctly and carefully done. Sometimes, however, one may feel that the editor has tried too hard to keep the original rendering, which has resulted in idiomatically poor English. There are also a few cultural misunderstandings to be found, such as when the translation indicates that the girl Shato is hitting the boy Dīl Murad (p. 9, l. 31). There
is no distinction of gender in the 3rd person pronoun in Balochi, and the text is not totally clear as to who hits whom, but anyone who has some knowledge about family quarrels in the Middle East knows that it is totally out of question that the girl or wife should hit the boy or husband.

Sometimes the translations are also inexact or completely wrong. The words be-nokar-int (wrongly transcribed be-nokar-int) and nokariye (wrongly transcribed nokariye) on p. 70, l. 27-28 and 29 are translated ‘he has no manservant’ and ‘a servant’ when they actually mean ‘he is unemployed’ and ‘a job’. In the same text the word labzānk is translated ‘prose’ (p. 69, last line), whereas it means ‘literature’ in general, including both prose and poetry. In the translation of Bām (p. 17) the word loyā ‘home’ (2nd line in the text) is left out, and in Baločistān, Baločistān the noun sān (1st line in the text) is translated ‘admired’ as if it were an adjective (p. 163). Burzen sān could be translated ‘exalted fame’ which also agrees with the exact meaning of the words. On page 427 the first line in the translation of Peš gusfār ought to read: ‘According to the best and most progressive group of literary scholars...’ These are only a few examples of inexact or incorrect translations. On the whole, though, the quality of the translation appears good, especially when it comes to the poetry.

The editor is also inexact about the publication of the various texts he uses. For texts published in magazines normally only the year of publication is given. It would have been helpful and not very space-consuming if the exact reference had been given, e.g. Māhiāk baloči, Jan. 1957, pp. 56-59 (instead of only Baloči 1957) for the very first text in the anthology (p. 17). It should likewise be noted that Māhiāk baloči was started in 1956, more exactly with the June issue, and ran up to 1958, where the April/May issue was the last one. During this time Āzāt Jamādīnī lived in Karachi, from where he published the magazine (p. XII). The magazine was revived in 1978, this time in Quetta, to which place the editor now had moved. (See also Jahani, C., op. cit., p. 25.)

It is often difficult to ascertain the exact birth dates even of now living authors, since no exact birth records have been kept in Balochistan, but the year when the contemporary authors here mentioned passed away can be ascertained with certainty. Muhammad Husayn ‘Anqā did pass away in 1977 (p. 131) and Āzāt Jamādīnī in 1981 (p. 137, he was not born in the same year, however). Gul Khān Naṣīr with whom the editor worked very closely together, did, however, not pass away in 1981 (p. 163), but rather in 1983, more exactly on Dec. 6 of that year. In fact, I happened to be in Quetta when he was commemorated three years after his death, and that was in 1986. The close co-operation between the editor and his friend Gul Khān Naṣīr has, on the other hand, resulted in a possibly unproportionally large selection of his poems (pp. 158-255) even if no-one questions his leading role among contemporary Balochi poets.

On p. 169 Josef Ellenbein states that “the printing of Šap Girok marked the first attempt to write Balochi (in Arabic/Urdu character) as it is pronounced, ignoring etymological considerations for Arabic words as well as the use of final -ḥ to indicate a final vowel. The attempt had no sequel.” A very brief look at the orthographical systems used for Balochi at present reveals that this is not a correct statement, since the very idea of Sayyid Hashimī’s is to get rid of Arabic etymological spellings in Balochi. (See Jahani, C., op. cit., p. 137.) His followers are still active in the Sayyid Hashimi Academy, Karachi.

In volume two one first finds some dialectal notes, which consist of a revised version of Josef Ellenbein’s earlier book The Baluchi Language, A Dialectology with Texts, London 1966. In the grammatical sketch the oblique case (used after prepositions and as the agent in the ergative construction) and the accusative case are brought together without obvious reason. For the personal pronouns (used in the 1st and 2nd person) the oblique case form is in fact identical with the nominative (or direct) case, whereas the oblique form of the demonstrative pronouns (used also as a personal pronoun in the 3rd person) in the singular is identical with the genitive (occasionally with the accusative) and in the plural with the accusative. As for nouns, they have an oblique form that is identical with the accusative.

The nominative (direct) case in the third person plural has no ending -ān in dialects spoken in Pakistan, and it is only in certain dialects of Iranian Balochi, due to influence from the Persian plural ending -ān, that both nouns and demonstrative pronouns use the plural ending -ān also in the nominative.

The glossary, which constitutes the main part of volume two, will prove very useful to any student and researcher working on Balochi, especially since there as yet does not exist any comprehensive Balochi-English dictionary. There are etymologies given for many of the words and also sometimes notes about in what dialect or dialects the word is to be found. The Ar/NP (Arabic/New Persian) etymology could,
of course, be added for several other words, too, such as *inkār* ‘refusal’ (p. 10), *istumārī* ‘colonialist’ (p. 11), *maalāt* ‘postponement, delay’ (p. 97) and *nā balīg* (or probably rather *nā balīg*) ‘immature’ (p. 105). As for words like *rad* ‘error, mistake’ (p. 124) and *rikeb* ‘stirrup’ (p. 125), they are also of Arabic origin, even though they are only given the NP/Ur (New Persian/Urdi) etymology here. Likewise, *īkrār* ‘confession...’ (p. 10) and *intizār* ‘wait, delay’ (p. 10) are found not only in Arabic, but also in New Persian, and ought to have been marked Ar/NP. Another interesting problem with etymologies is to ascertain the source language when closely related languages, such as New Persian and Balochi, have common lexemes. Why is e.g. *mardum* ‘human being, man’ (p. 100) noted as being of New Persian origin but not *marg* ‘death’ (p. 101)?

In spite of certain critical comments, it must be stressed that Elfenbein, J., *An Anthology of Classical and Modern Balochi Literature* is a rich and unique treasure of Balochi literature made available to European readers and scholars. It is the result of many years of hard work on part of the editor, and its value to the study of the Balochi language and its literature in Europe can in no way be overestimated.

Uppsala

Carina Juhani


The *De ceremoniis*, or Book of Ceremonies, compiled by the Byzantine Emperor Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus (913–959), is a mine of information not only on Byzantine imperial ceremonies and other *restitus* but also on the development of the Greek language during the Middle Ages. In the 19th century this important document was edited and translated into Latin by J.J. Reiske, the famous Arabist and classical scholar. Reiske also wrote a learned commentary, in which his command of the Arab language was of good use, since many terms for clothing and other matters occurring in this text are of Arab origin; this was printed in 1830. Reiske's work is still useful, although after more than two hundred years it needs revision. The project of preparing a new edition and commentary has therefore been initiated by the Austrian Byzantinist O. Kressen. The present volume, in which J. Haldon, lecturer at the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies at the University of Birmingham, examines, edits, translates and annotates a small dossier of texts published by Reiske as an Appendix to Book I of the *De ceremoniis*, gives a foretaste of the edition of the *De ceremoniis* proper.

In the Introduction H. demonstrates that the dossier in question consists of three separate though related parts, namely (A) a list of *aplēkia* or field camps in *Asia Minor*, (B) a brief treatise on the preparations for an imperial military expedition, and (C) a more comprehensive treatment of the same topic; to this a description of the Emperor's triumphal return to Constantinople has been added together with two examples from the reigns of Theophilus (829–42) and Basil I (867–86). He further shows that (A) probably consists of notes made for a treatise never written, that (B) was originally compiled by the *magistros* Leo Katakylas at the behest of Constantine's father Leo VI (886–912) and that (C) was written by Constantine himself; the main part was intended for his son Romans, the future Romans II, whereas the miscellaneous material appearing toward the end may have been destined for a different work. In the 960's all this was brought together in the manuscript known as Cod. Lipsiensis Rep. 17. The military expeditions, the organization of which was outlined in these treatises, were directed against Syria. Much light is therefore shed on the Byzantine defence against the Arabs, who threatened *Asia Minor* from the 7th through the 10th century.

H., who is a historian rather than a philologist, has already published an impressive number of studies on various aspects of the Byzantine administrative and military machinery. The latest is a thorough examination of the transformation of the Late Roman Empire in the East into a medieval Byzantine state which appeared in 1990 under the title *Byzantium in the Seventh Century. The Transformation of a Culture*. In one year he has thus produced two books of considerable size and complexity, which is an unusual achievement. As might be expected, the most important parts of the publication under consideration are those concerned with the historical analysis, the interpretation of technical terms and the discussion of *restitus* in general. Haldon here demonstrates his familiarity with the relevant sources
and his command of a vast range of secondary literature, which on occasion he also subjects to sober criticism. As an example of his sound historical judgment I should like to quote his remark on page 250 that “modern western notions of the rigid stratification of ranks and the division of responsibilities associated with military forces may not be entirely adequate to describing the structure of the medieval Byzantine military organization. Some anomalies and contradictions ... may have been part and parcel of the Byzantine establishment”.

If H’s historical discussion and treatment of the realia are first-rate, he appears to have paid less attention to the philological aspects of his undertaking, the question of the genesis of the Lipsiensis material excepted. It is true that the chapter on the language contains useful remarks on the confusion of cases and the frequency of copulative compounds and of Latin, Iranian, Arabic, Turkic and Slav loan-words. H. also rightly stresses the illuminating contrast between the irregular orthography and the fact that the manuscript was written in an imperial scriptorium at the height of the so-called Macedonian renaissance (p. 74). But there are also deplorable omissions – in the paragraph on morphology there is no mention of επιθήματα = επιθήμαν (C)742 or of the metaphoricative τέντον = τέντας (C)745 – and one highly questionable statement, namely that the combination of a preposition with a substantive, written in one word by the copyist, should be regarded as a copulative compound adverb. H. thus creates a number of new words such as κατασκευήματος (‘per pack-animal’), καταθετείαν (‘absent without leave’), διαμερίσσων (‘by the hand [of]’) and ειστομή (‘for fodder’), which he reproduces in his text and includes in his indices. This innovation causes great confusion in the text (for instance, κατασκευήματος alternates with κατά σκευήματος, ειστομῆ with εἰς τοκήν) as well as in the indices, and is to be regretted.

In the Greek text some contract verbs have been wrongly provided with a τ subscript, see (A)11 ἔρησταν, (B)74 κατασκευήσαν, (C)656 διαπεραί; at (C)434 ὑπομονήσαντα would have been better off without a τ subscript. Sometimes the reader may feel detained by a superfluous or even misleading comma, as at (A)5, (B)43, (C)262 (after μικράραμα, cf. 288) and 543. More serious, however, are the false readings συναγωγάων at (B)8 and φροντίζον τινα (C)158. Strangely enough, in these cases H. does not translate his own text but that of Rieske, which correctly has συναγωγάων (‘gathered together’) and φροντίζον (‘load up’), respectively. An interesting passage inadequately handled is (C)270–2 Ὀρίζεται δὲ γίνεσθαι λάκκος ἔρημος αὐθαίρετος δύο, καὶ ἕνα σκεπάζονται ἐπάνω τῆς γῆς ὑπὸ πετάλων χαλκών κοινωνίας, and καὶ συμπαγόμεναις αὐτάς πρὸς ἑνὸς ἐκ τούτων κριόνισμα, which H. translates thus: ‘And there should be trenches (presumably: trenches) two spans deep, covered at ground-level with sieved bronze plates; and there should be placed together in each one three wax candles’. But λάκκος, a singular, cannot reasonably be rendered by the plural ‘trenches’, nor can it be taken as the subject of σκεπάζονται, and the αὐτάς (after συμπαγόμεναις) has not been translated at all. Judging from (C)304–7 I assume that something like ἑνὸς αἱ κανδήλαι ἀπτώνων should be supplemented after σκεπάζονται δύο; this would give σκεπάζονται a natural subject and αὐτάς a fitting noun to refer to. Thus an error of the copyist has been glossed over with the help of a free translation instead of being pointed out in the critical apparatus and discussed in a note. There are also other instances in which the edition would have profited from a closer critical examination of the transmitted text. It is unfortunate that the critical apparatus, which is full of useless homophonous spelling variants, has not been used for this essential purpose.

Sometimes the translation is not as accurate as one might wish. Thus at (B)55 the translation ‘to those whom he commands’ is less satisfactory than Reiske’s ‘quibus ipse velit’. There are many other instances, e.g. (C)312, 320, 406, 407, in which ‘wish’ would be a better translation than ‘command’ or ‘give orders’. – At (B)178f. τῶν μὲν τὴν ἄγνωσιν, τῶν δὲ τὰς τοιούχους παιονίαν H. translates ‘the former stemming indifference, the latter the disturbances’. But, like σφυροφθινόντων line 75, the participle παιονία refer to τῶν ἐκ προοίμου and the meaning is therefore that the Emperor’s representative should be ‘stemming the indifference of some and the disturbances of others’. This is also how Reiske understood the sentence. – (B)102: ψωμίον ‘bread’ seems to have been confused with ὁρίζον ‘provisions’. – (C)7: μέλλοντος has not been rendered. – 9: φῶτα has been rendered ‘by nature alone’, although ‘alone’ is not in the Greek. – 120f.: ὁμοίους ... προοίμια has been omitted in the translation. – 141: the translation ‘table requirements’ of ὁρίζον is less precise than the ‘conditions and seasoning’ given in the note ad loc. – 313: if καταβιβάζει is translated with ‘transfer’, one runs the risk of thinking that the animals of the baggage-train were shipped to Pylai by boat; better, therefore, to translate ‘bring down’ (from the pastures), as at (C)75. – 230: ἀνελευθερών εἰσιν
can hardly mean ‘a selection of different hues’, but rather ‘selected (garments) of different hues’. 317: ‘and then on to Leukatás to see the ships off from there’ does not correspond to the probably corrupt sentence ὧς εἰς τὸν Ῥεακάτον κύκλον τοὺς ἔξωλαν τὰ καράμματα πρὸς τὸν Ῥεακάτην, although it makes sense in the context. 435: και εἰ τι κελέει ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ is an elliptic phrase which is better rendered by ‘and it is done to him as his majesty thinks best’ than by ‘and asked what his majesty commands’; cf. e.g. the Life of St Andrew the Fool, PG 111, 781C και εἰ τι κελέει ὁ θεός ‘and God’s will be done!’ 551: σατράπητων means ‘saddle-blankets’, not ‘pack-saddles’, cf. note p. 197. 608.: ‘the minds of those who attain knowledge through diligent study of what is necessary are ignorant of nothing’ is not a good translation of τῶν διδάκτων τῶν ἐχόντων διὰ σοφοῦς τῶν προσωπικῶν μηθών ἀγωγῶν. I suggest ‘the mind of those who endeavour never to be ignorant of relevant things’. 613 πατήρων means ‘obeying’ rather than ‘placing trust in’. 619: Reiske translated the sentence τὸ κύκλον τοῦ λουλούν θυσίαν ἐν περίπτωσι προσφέρειν ἔβαλε θεόν by ‘laternam accendebat castrum Lulum dictum, in edito et conspicuo loco situm’, which seems more convincing than H’s ‘the fortress called Loulon ... lit a beacon in a conspicuous place nearby’. It is a pity that he does not argue for his interpretation in a note.

So much useful information is contained in the notes that I hesitate to complain about details. In my opinion, however, more comments on the Greek text or on the translation chosen would have been welcome. Why, for instance, is ἔβαλες = ‘return’ at (B)29 or ἐποιεῖ εἰκός at (C)269? Has not an εἰς been omitted before τα in the sentence ἐκ τοῦ κύκλου τις σοφοῦς τα σῖκοιμαν πυρόληγαν at (B)63f.? I also wonder whether the seals mentioned at (C)338 refer to the loads, as indicated in the note. The passage says that when a pack-horse dies, the seals are returned to the komēs and the chartoularios. According to an earlier passage (lines 75–80) the komēs and chartoularios of the stable brand the mules and the pack-horses with the imperial seal on both sides of the forequarters. Thus, is it not more natural to assume that when an animal died these seals were cut out from the carcass and returned as proof that the animal had not been stolen?

There are two indices, one of the names and terms occurring in the texts and one of the names and terms discussed in the Introduction, Translation and Notes. In the former index I miss (C)156 etc. ἀποβολή, ἀποβολλόν in the sense of ‘expedition, march into’, (B)29 ἕβαλες in the meaning ‘return’ (if this is what it means), (C)627 ἡμικάτο ‘balcony’, or in H’s etymologically attractive translation ‘solar’, and (B)44 κεφαλί ‘imprison’. Since an edition is destined to serve many different purposes, also words which cannot be classed as names and terms in the strict sense should have been included, such as for instance the rare adverb ἅνάστησα (C)16, the adjectives ἀνάκτητος for the usual ἀνάλατος (C)230 and πτερός ‘thin’ (C)173, and the verb ὑποκεφαστήρι ‘keep back, put aside’ (B)67 and 81.

To sum up, this is an impressive, valuable and welcome publication, although in my view it has not received the philological finish it deserves.

Lennart Rydén
The accessibility of the information contained in the book is somewhat impaired by the loose organization of the chapters as regards subject, and by the lack of coordination between the bibliographical data given in the different chapters. The chapters will be reviewed below, not necessarily in the order in which they are printed, but according to three main divisions: (1) The history of language and dialectology, (2) Lexicography and the language reform, and (3) Contemporary Turkish grammar.

1. The history of language and dialectology. The first two chapters in the book, “Die Stellung des Osmanischen im Kreise des Oghusischen und seine Vorgeschichte” (pp. 13–34), by G. Doerfer, and “Untersuchungen zur Turksprache Kleinasiens vom 13. bis zum 16. Jahrhundert” (pp. 35–62) by V. G. Guzev, focus on the growth of the Ottoman literary language. Doerfer presents his own classification of the Turkic languages and Oghuz dialect groups. This is followed by some comments on the “olga bolga dili” as well as other instances of language mixture and interference with respect to the dialects that occupy an intermediate position between western Oghuz (Turkish, Azeri) and eastern Oghuz (Turkmens). He considers this to be a good basis for further progress in the study of the history of Ottoman Turkish. The chapter by Guzev contains a survey of works on old Ottoman Turkish arranged in chronological order. There is also a brief summary of various theories concerning the development of literary Turkish, the main difference between them being the relationship of this language to Old Turkic and the Middle Turkic languages as well as the conditions under which Ottoman Turkish developed into a more independent language.

Other chapters related to the history and development of Turkish are concerned with the study of transcription texts, loan-words from Turkish, and dialectology. In a short article entitled “Die Denkmäler des Osmanisch-Türkischten schriften in nichtarabischen Schriften” (pp. 63–73), the editor, G. Hazai, defends the role of transcription texts as valid sources for the history of language. With reference to opinions advanced for and against the documentary value of such texts in linguistic research, Hazai himself advocates a middle course according to which, among other things, a text would be related to the non-Turkish background of its author as well as to the Turkish dialect spoken in the region where it was written. Most of the transcription texts originated in the Istanbul area and in the Balkans. Given this standpoint, transcription texts would be important complements to texts in the Arabic script inasmuch as they offer more detailed information about Ottoman phonology. Ottoman Turkish words borrowed by other languages would also, as A. Tietze reports in “Der Einfluss des Türkischen auf andere Sprachen” (pp. 119–145), be a valuable source of similar information.

Z. Korkmaz gives an account of dialectology reports from around 1940 onwards. They are divided into “general studies” from different regions in Anatolia and “comparative studies”, which discuss linguistic issues, mainly phonetic, with respect to the “Anatolian Dialects” (pp. 388–413). Besides such traditional dialectological work, she also regards collecting words within the framework of the Turkish language reform as part of this field of research. E. Tryjarski reports on the expeditions and work of different dialectologists in various parts of the Balkan countries, above all Bulgaria (“Balkan Dialects”, pp. 414–453). In both these chapters, the different dialect studies are presented from the point of view of interest and the organization of the field work. On the other hand, little is said about the dialect material itself and what conclusions have been drawn from it. It is therefore not clear how much Turkish dialectology in its present state could contribute to the question of the origin and development of Ottoman and contemporary Turkish. Both Korkmaz and Tryjarski point to the dilemma created by slow research in rapidly changing environments. Korkmaz stresses the importance of paying attention to migrations and ethnic structures and is somewhat critical of certain dialectologists, among others Caferoglu, in this respect.

In his general survey of “Historische Grammatik” (pp. 74–103), L. Johansson is rather pessimistic about the research under review, the reasons being insufficient coordination between synchronic and diachronic analysis and the absence of a theoretical basis. On several occasions the author stresses the need for broad, systematic and statistically supported accounts based on sound theoretical principles. Most of the work has been carried out on Old Ottoman morphology and phonetics. Historical Turkology would thus be almost exclusively on an observational-descriptive level of limited scope. What remains to be done in the future is to raise the accumulated data to a higher level of synthesis and explanation. Furthermore, research ought to be broadened both as regards language periods and the different components of grammar. As the article also points out, the explanation of morphological
functions is dependent on the analysis of syntactic and semantic functions, to which very little attention has so far been devoted.

2. Lexicography and the language reform. Turkish lexicography has never been in a position where, in any simple sense of the word, it could aim at registering a “typical” Turkish vocabulary. It could hardly do so even today. The great difference between vernacular and educated language, and probably also the gap between spoken and written language on all levels, made such a task impossible in the Ottoman era. Dictionaries appearing during this period reflected first and foremost a highly formal literary language dominated by foreign lexemes, viz. word forms and expressions mainly from Arabic and Persian. Since the foundation of the republic, Turkish lexicography in Turkey has had as its main aim the organization and launching of substitutes for elements judged not to be legitimate members of the Turkish language, and it thus constitutes a dominant part of the language reform. In “The Turkish Language Reform and Language Policy in Turkey” (pp. 454–493), B. Brendemoen gives a competent and balanced account of the agitated language-reform work in Turkey from World War II up to the middle of the 1980’s, with a critical eye on tendencies towards extremism – very often with strong political undertones – among both antagonists and protagonists.

The chapter on “Die fremden Elemente im Osmanisch-Türkischen” (pp. 104–118) by A. Tietze is on the development of modern Turkish etymology, which, according to the author, began towards the end of the 19th century and was given new shape when the collecting of dialect words began in the 1930’s under the supervision of Türk Dil Kurumu. This vast material has been documented, inter alia, in the Türkiye de Halk Ağızından Derleme Sözlüğü 1963–1982. The weaknesses of the latter undertaking have often been pointed out, and Tietze is, of course, aware of them. However, he stresses the richness of the material and goes on to list etymological works inspired by this newly-awakened interest in dialects and non-standard varieties of Turkish. A few recent references have also been added to studies of the Turkish spoken by immigrants in Europe and foreign influences on present-day Turkish, a field of research that has expanded considerably during the last few years, but which is not covered by this volume due to the great delay in publishing the book.

H. Stein examines dictionaries and word lists produced after the adoption of the Roman alphabet in 1928 (“Lexikographic”, pp. 335–370). Among the basically monolingual dictionaries produced in Turkey, the Türkçe Sözlük receives an especially favorable mention. It is stated to be very well organized with excellent explanations. At the same time it is, in contrast to bilingual dictionaries, a tool that serves the language reform program aimed at introducing Öz Türkçe vocabulary and cannot therefore be expected to represent any sort of standard Turkish, to whatever extent such a language may be said to exist today. Even in recent editions of the Türkçe Sözlük there are words which have never come into active use. Bilingual dictionaries, on the other hand, tend to devote their energy more to registering those Turkish words that are in actual use. Not unexpectedly, Stein refers to the Redhouse Yeni Türkçe-Ingilizce Sözlük (1968), the Türkisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch by Steuerwald (1972), and the Russian Turecko-russkiy slovar’ (1977) as the acme of Turkish lexicography abroad. With certain differences, all three of them pay due attention to neologisms.

In her survey, Stein also comments on the large number of booklets containing Öz Türkçe word lists paired with lists of rejected Ottoman and foreign words. The so-called “terminology lists” for special fields of science or activities (medicine, philosophy, journalism, theater, football, etc.) belong to this category. In Stein’s article, however, there are only a few references to such lists. A more comprehensive enumeration can be found in the bibliography to Brendemoen’s previously mentioned article on the Turkish language reform. An impressive amount of work has gone into these vocabularies. Most of them do not explain the words they contain, and this may cause much uncertainty regarding the extent to which there is semantic correspondence between the old and the new words. Naturally, the greatest risk of confusion and inadequacy occurs in cases where words with deep historicocultural roots are to be replaced. The work on scientific and technical vocabularies has been easier in this respect, because the semantics of such terms is more restricted and related to highly specific contexts. Öz Türkçe vocabularies of this type often contain foreign language equivalents.

3. Contemporary Turkish grammar. The most extensive chapter in the present volume is “Studien zur türkentürkischen Grammatik” (pp. 146–301) by L. Johanson. This is indeed a very informative chapter, due to the author’s broad knowledge of research and studies of contemporary Turkish in different parts
of the world, not least in the former Soviet Union. His survey covers traditional Turkology as well as modern Turkish linguistics. As regards general linguistic analyses of Turkish, the author expresses throughout the chapter his concern about the risk of superficiality and of drawing erroneous or misleading conclusions regarding Turkish grammar. Nowadays, more than a decade later, such worry is less justified, as Turkish linguistics has grown much stronger and undergone considerable improvement since this chapter was written (see, for example, *Turkish Linguistics Today*, ed. H. Boeschoten and L. Verhoeven. Brill, Leiden 1990).

Johanson discusses different aspects of morphology and syntax. As far as general grammars are concerned, he states that the syntactic component has received too little attention and is often treated without much sophistication merely as an extension of morphology. The rich system of suffixion has apparently caused confusion as to the relationship between morphology and syntax in Turkish, especially among grammarians brought up in an Indo-European language tradition.

In the section on morphology, Johanson examines different attempts to identify grammatical surface forms in Turkish, such as “morpheme”, “word”, and “prefix”, as well as lexical categories, such as “adjective” and “adverb”, regarding which it is uncertain whether or not they constitute word classes of their own in Turkish. In this connection he considers semantic analyses of grammatical morphemes in terms of “basic meaning”, mostly referred to by the author as “Gesamtbewertung”. Turkish cases, for example, have been the subject of such analyses. Johanson is rather sceptical of the idea of ascribing any basic meaning, or “Monofunktionalität”, as it is also called, to a morpheme. In his comments on various interpretations of the verbal suffix -miş, he doubts whether it would be possible to define any fundamental feature present in all the uses of this suffix. In current linguistic research, such semantic notions as “Gesamtbewertung” and “Grundbedeutung” operating within morphological paradigms are more or less outdated, as semantic analysis in general has been increasingly directed towards syntactic structures and textual strategies.

The section on syntax deals mainly with matters pertaining to hierarchical sentence analysis. It discusses such issues as the relationship between the predicate and other constituents of the sentence, primarily the subject, NP functions and valence, the nature of non-finite sentences, including so-called relative clauses, as well as the combination of finite sentences and the question of coordination versus subordination. Formal syntactic criteria are as far as possible kept apart from notional ones. Semantic aspects are largely ignored in this section. At the same time, the author shows a growing interest in discourse grammar, which necessarily involves conceptual and communicative features. Except for studies on word order in Turkish surface structures, which are duly reviewed by Johanson, not much grammatical analysis on Turkish at the textual level had been done when this chapter was written. The author ends his survey by saying that, in the future, linguistic Turkology has a great deal of important work to do in this field.

Johanson’s account of contemporary Turkish grammar does not include Turkish phonology, which is dealt with by J. Krámský in a separate chapter, “Phonetics and Phonology” (pp. 302–334). After a brief comment on phonemic representations in grammars and handbooks of Turkish, Krámský addresses himself to two interesting issues in Turkish phonology: firstly, the relationship and interdependence between vowel harmony and consonant harmony, a topic that has been much neglected in standard descriptions of Turkish, and, secondly, the phonological relevance of stress and intonation, a problem about which varying opinions have been expressed, and which still needs further instrumental phonetic investigation.

The only chapter with a title referring to a special method of research is “Quantitative Studies” (pp. 371–387) by L. Hřebiček, which is about the first attempts at Turkish computer linguistics. In the 1960’s, large-scale frequency counts were carried out on the lexical and morphological levels with the object of comparing spoken and written Turkish. Summary lists from these investigations are evaluated in the present chapter. Most of the other quantitative studies on Turkish mentioned by Hřebiček relate to phonology with, among other things, analyses of Turkish words in terms of phoneme exploitation and probability values of vowel sequences.

The final editing of the book seems to have been done in great haste. There are many misprints and, in some chapters, numerous non-idiomatic sentences. This is unfortunate but also astonishing in a book of this dignity, with contributions from several distinguished scholars of Turkology. Furthermore, would it not have been worth the effort to check the bibliographical data in order to avoid repetition and confusion, and to make these data more easily available to the reader? Sometimes references are not
even given in alphabetically arranged bibliographies, but embedded in the text, between paragraphs (Doerfer, pp. 13–34, Tietze, pp. 104–118, 119–145) or in a list of notes after the main text (Guzev, pp. 35–62).

Stockholm

Birgit Nilsson Schlyter


'Phan-yul Na-lendra was an institution of the Sa-skya school of Buddhism, situated only one day’s journey from Lhasa. It was founded by Rong-ston Shes-bya kun-rig (1367–1449) and was one of the most renowned monasteries in Tibet in his lifetime. It went through a crisis in the late 15th century and was almost destroyed. Finally it survived, but it was completely destroyed during the chaotic situation in the 1960s and 70s. Consequently few remains are left to help us to trace the history of this once important institution. It was difficult to trace even the abbatial succession of the monastery. No lineage of abbots (gdan-rabs) has been published.

In 1982 David Jackson discovered in India an early source establishing the chronology of Na-lendra’s first eight abbots and its crisis in the late 1480s. The main part of this small book is the description and analysis of the text found in comparison with other relevant material.

The text was found in the Bihar Research Society in Patna and consists of only 10 folios. The author of the text is Nam-mkha’ dpal-bzang, who was a disciple of Rong-ston and later a teacher at Na-lendra. The work is partly a biography of Rong-ston, but it also tells the story of the monastery up to mkhyen-rab chos-rje (1432–1497). It tells about the disaster too and the renewal of the monastery in the 1480s. The text establishes the important dates of Na-lendra from 1435 to 1491. Jackson discusses the contents on the basis of an edition of the text. He also compares it with other sources available to him, by giving details about every abbot. One of them, mkhyen-rab chos-rje (1456–1497), was also a famous adept of the Kàlacakra tantric system.

For anyone who has tried to study lineages of schools and monasteries at this epoch, Jackson’s work is almost exemplary. It extracts the important information in the short text which is the object of study for this book, and completes it with other information. The final result is as thorough a picture as it is possible to get of Na-lendra and its abbots during the 15th century, which was a time of political instability and unrest in Tibet.

The study may serve as a model of how to clarify the history of other monasteries. The commentaries also show the wide scope of references that Jackson has used. The Tibetan text is given in an appendix but is not translated word by word. This is no disadvantage in this case, because the information collected and displayed in the discussion by Jackson is of much greater value than a mere literal translation.

Academic works of this kind are quite rare and therefore this book is welcome. It contributes substantially to the hitherto quite unknown history and biographical chronicle of this Sa-skya-pa monastery. More studies of this kind would give a much better basis for our knowledge of the Buddhism of Tibet in these crucial centuries of Tibetan religious history.

Uppsala

Urban Hammar


It is generally recognized that Dr. Henrik Samuel Nyberg, Professor of Semitic Languages at Uppsala
University 1931–1956, was one of the leading orientalists of this century (cf. the Nachruf in Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1975).

From his early years and onwards, Nyberg was extremely prolific, as the bibliographies hitherto published make evident (in particular Professor H. S. Nybergs författarskap. Bibliografi av Christopher Toll. Uppsala 1959; later supplemented as regards the years 1959–1974 by C. Toll in Bibliographie H. S. Nyberg, Monumentum H. S. Nyberg = Acta Iranica 4. Leiden 1975; Uppsala Universitets Matrikel 1951–1960 (1975); G. Widengren, H. S. Nyberg and Iranian studies in the light of personal reminiscences. Monumentum H. S. Nyberg. 2 = Acta Iranica 5, 1975; S. Kahle, H. S. Nyberg. En kort bildningsroman, Västmanlands-Dala nations skrifterserie 13, 1977, 11–61; cf. also the most recent biography with some bibliographical notes, viz. Chr. Toll’s article on Henrik Samuel Nyberg in Svenskt Biografiskt Lexikon [1991]). A final and detailed bibliography, however, covering also articles in dictionaries, further reviews, and contributions in various Swedish journals etc., remains a desideratum.

It is a matter of course that Nyberg was elected member of numerous academies and learned societies both in Sweden and abroad. The most prestigious of all such honours bestowed on him was doubtlessly that of being one of the 18 members of the Swedish Academy during the years 1948–1974, the body universally known for awarding the Nobel Prize for literature. It is an accepted custom that a special monograph is devoted to each member of this academy upon his or her decease.

The biography here presented by Mrs. Sigrid Kahle, B.A., an author and expert on the modern Arab World, is unique in one respect: it is the only specimen in this renowned series of monographs on the members of the Swedish Academy to have been written by a descendant of the member in question. This state of affairs may very well stir up a fair amount of criticism, raising questions of the soundness of the present Academy’s decision to entrust to a daughter the task of writing her father’s, as it were, official biography.

Such criticism, however, founders in the case of this particular biography, both in view of its objective, strictly factual tone, and with regard to the very special and frequently fresh source material used. Mrs. Kahle, who is the wife of John Kahle, the former German ambassador to Tunisia, himself the son of a famous orientalist, Professor Paul Kahle of Bonn, has already demonstrated her skill and competence in describing her father’s work and character in an admirably objective and even critical manner in her first minor sketch of his life in 1977 (see above). Her ability is even more clearly shown in the present superb biography.

This independent biography is a major critical study as well as a literary work of high quality. The source material utilized by Mrs. Kahle is not merely the bulk of all extant printed works by and on Nyberg, but also a remarkable number of manuscripts of various kinds, mainly belonging to the collections of Uppsala University Library, such as a series of letters to and from colleagues – among them his predecessor, Professor K. V. Zettersten, Bishop Tor Andræ, Professor Jarl Charpentier, Dr. Johannes Kolmodin, Count Carlo Landberg, and others, further manuscripts of many unpublished lectures, as well as several personal letters by Nyberg to his father Anders Fredrik Nyberg, to his father-in-law, Carl J. E. Hasselberg, to his daughter Sigrid etc. Further manuscript sources belong to the University Library of Lund, e.g. Nyberg’s letters to Professors Axel Moberg and Johannes Lindblom, others are the letters preserved in the Royal Library of Stockholm, e.g. to Professor Nils Ahlund and to authors Bo Bergman and Sven Lidman. In addition, Mrs. Kahle has made Herculean efforts to trace letters from her father in various libraries and private collections abroad, especially in Germany, France, England and the other Scandinavian countries. With indefatigable energy, Mrs. Kahle has ambitiously essayed an evaluation of Nyberg based on his own literary works and letters as well as on a reading of many of his critics. She has studied official documents, appraisals and reports in the archives of Uppsala University, and traced thousands of relevant notes in daily newspapers. She has conducted interviews with scholars in the disciplines covered by Nyberg’s interests, and has sought after personal reminiscences of great orientalists, “thereby attempting at weaving it all together – by means of a creative intuition and feeling for history – in a mixture of criticism and love, that affection, without which no one should take upon himself the task of describing another human being” (p. 558).

The result of these endeavours is truly rewarding. This huge biography will remain the standard life of Professor H. S. Nyberg, even though scholars might contribute new details and new evaluations.

It might, of course, be claimed that Mrs. Kahle is herself no specialist in many of the scholarly disciplines discussed, mainly in the spheres of Semitic languages (although she does speak Arabic), Islamology, Old Testament exegesis and Iranian studies, and this fact has caused occasional blurs in
details. To this we may respond, first, that Mrs. Kahle has clearly demonstrated her eagerness to search for and acquaint herself with the scholarly literature and discussion in these fields, and has done so in a critical manner. Secondly, it must be pointed out that, regardless of the specialty of any scholar who might have liked to undertake the same task, nobody could possibly be a specialist in all these areas. Thirdly, it is clear that Mrs. Kahle has had access to much material otherwise inaccessible to the general public: manuscripts, letters, and, above all, personal memoirs. And finally, being an author by profession, Mrs. Kahle has a special talent which the majority of scholars lack. She has indeed written a most vivid and fascinating biography, reminiscent of the classical Arabic *adab*, where knowledge was never presented in a dry manner of fact style but in an entertaining and truly enjoyable manner. This biography is as easily read as a biography of a statesman, actor, author or other artist. At the same time, it is full of insights into the world of Western Oriental studies of this century. These insights are not presented in school-book fashion, but in an intellectually engaging way, recalling the most outstanding international biographies.


It is, of course, not possible to review here the individual parts of this great biography. Every reader is certain to find various sections particularly stimulating, in accordance with personal interests. For my part, I gained much fresh insight from Mrs. Kahle’s treatment of H. S. Nyberg’s early and late years, as well as from her delineation of the complex traits of Nyberg’s personal character, including a fine description of her father’s fierce opposition to Nazism both before and during the Second World War, in a period when many Swedish scholars were still unaware of what was really happening in their beloved Germany. On the other hand, I feel that some of the sections devoted to Nyberg’s work in the fields of Semitic languages and Old Testament studies, will, for natural reasons, hardly satisfy the specialist.

In his review of Mrs. Kahle’s book (Svenska Dagblader, 6 June, 1991), Professor Thure Stenström, Uppsala University – in my estimation the leading literary critic of Sweden today – rightly observed: “The book is written in a condensed and full-bodied style. Moreover, this biography is fascinating throughout, sometimes touching, sometimes brilliant. The lifestory of a researcher of enormous dimensions, the story of a human being, including details both tragic and comical, is narrated with detachment and love at the same time. The history of Swedish linguistic research and oriental studies are unveiled in a professional manner, which is likely to make the historians of scholarship green with envy. This chronicle is evidently based upon decades of studies in collections of yellowed letters and forgotten archives.”

I would add that it is always a difficult task to present a biography in Swedish of a scholar of international dimensions to an international public unable to read the whole of the work in question. Thus, the intention behind this review is two-fold: (1) to point out the existence and character of this biography, and (2) thereby to indicate the need for a translation into an international language, perhaps in a somewhat condensed version by reducing the material mainly interesting to a Swedish academic public.
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Stefan Leder, Das Korpus al-Hātam ibn ‘Adī (st. 207/822). Herkunft, Überliefe-

rung, Gestalt früher Texte der Aḥbār Literatur. Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klo-

termann 1991 [Frankfurter Wissenschaftliche Beiträge, Kulturwissenschaftliche

The author of this broad study, Dozent Dr. Stefan Leder of the University of Frankfurt am Main, was educated in the field of Oriental studies, especially Arabic and Islamic, at Mainz, Tunis and Frankfurt. In 1982 he received his Ph.D., with a dissertation entitled Narrative and ethical writing on love and passion. His Habilitation in Oriental languages and Islamic Civilisation followed in 1989, with a study on the Origin, transmission and narrative form of texts attributed to al-Haṭṭāb ibn ‘Adī.

After a series of different positions as teacher and researcher at the Bourguiba Institute of Tunis (1974–75), the University of Darmstadt (1978–79), the Max Planck Institute for European history of law at Frankfurt am Main (1983–84), Deutsche Orientinstitut at Beirut (1982–84), and Oriental department at Frankfurt (1986–89), Dr. Leder was appointed Reader (Dozent) of Oriental Studies at the University of Frankfurt am Main in 1990.


The monograph under review is an enlarged and revised work based on Dr. Leder’s Habilitation dissertation from 1988. In it Leder devotes himself to the investigation of more than 130 sources from classical Arabic literature in which the renowned Iraqi author al-Haṭṭāb ibn ‘Adī at-Tājī. He was born at Kufrīb. 1207/378 and died at Fām as-Shārā, probably in 207/822 (or perhaps in 206/821 or 209/824). He is said to have attended the court of the ‘Abbāsid caliphph from the reign of al-Mansūr (136/754–158/775) until Hārūn ar-Rašīd (170/786–193/809) and to have been temporarily imprisoned by the latter. He is also alleged to have had some disputes with poets, notably Abū Nuwas, for having composed his own false genealogy. Ibn an-Nadīm in his Fihrist, along with Yūqūt in his Irād al-wadābā, mention al-Haṭṭāb ibn ‘Adī as having written some 50 works, principally in the field of history. The later classical historians commonly use al-Haṭṭāb ibn ‘Adī as a source, some of them (e.g. Muṣrīṣ aq-Disāh)” considering him well informed, others (e.g. Kitāb al-Buḥrālā”) censuring him for unreliability.

The 130 sources from which the textual extracts are taken are written by the following authors in chronological order: al-‘Abbās ibn Bakrār (died 222/837), Abū Ubayd (d. 224/839), Ibn Sa’d (d. 230/844), Ḥiṣn ibn Haiyāt (d. 240/854), Muḥammad ibn Ḥabīb (d. 245/860), Pseudo-Ibn al-Kalbi = Ibn Abī s-Sarīr (d. 247/861), Ibn Zangāwaih (d. 257/865), Ibn an-Nāṭṭār (d. 252/868), al-Jāhiz (d. 256/869), Pseudo-al-Jāhiz = Muḥammad ibn al-Hārīt (Ṭājī), Pseudo-al-Jāhiz (Aḍḍād), az-Zuhayr ibn Bakrār (d. 256/870), Ibn Qutayba (d. 276/880), Pseudo-Ibn Qutayba (Imāma), al-Baladūrī (d. 279/892), al-Ṭābihi (d. 272/885–6), Ibn Ṭayfūr (d. 280/893/94), Ibn al-Faqīh (3rd/9th century), ad-Dinawari (d. 282/895), Taḥlīb (d. 291/904), Bahšal al-Wāṣītī (d. 292/905), Wākī (d. 306/918), al-Mufaddalī ibn Salama (3rd/9th century), al-Mufaddalīyyāt recension by Qāsim al-Anbārī (d. 304/916), Ibn Abī l-Ḥaṭṭāb (d. beg. of 4th/10th century), at-Tabarī (d. 310/923), Ibn Aṭā’ (d. 314/926), Ibn Durayd (d. 321/933), ar-Raqāqī (d. 320/932), al-Bayhaqi (d. after 320/932), al-Wāṣā (d. 325/936), al-Harūṣī (d. 327/938), Ibn ‘Abdarrabbi (d. 328/940), Ibn al-Anbā’ī (d. 328/940), ad-Dinawari (d. 330/941), al-Azdi (d. 334/945), Abū l-‘Arab (d. 334/945), az-Zajjājī (d. 337/949–52), Ibn ad-Dāyā (d. 334/946), at-Ṣūrī (d. 345/956), al-Maṣʿūdī (d. 345/956), Abū l-Faraj al-Islāfānī (d. 356/967), Ḥamza al-Islāfānī (d. before 360/971), at-Ṭabarānī (d. 360/971), Abū Aḥmad al-Aṣkārī (d. 382/994), Abū ‘Ali at-Tanūḥī (d. 384/994), al-Marzūbānī (d. 384/994), ar-Raqīq (d. 388/998), al-Ḥaṭṭābī (d. 388/998), al-Muḥāfīz (d. 390/1000), Abū Hilāl al-Aṣkārī (d. 395/1005), al-Ḥusnī (d. 413/1022), al-Tawhīdī (d. 414/1023), al-Ābi (d. 421/1030), al-Samḥī (d. 427/1036), at-Tālībī (d. 429/1038), al-Murtadā (d. 436/1044), al-Maṣrūqī (d. 453/1061), Ṭaḥīrah al-Ḥulafāʾ (anonymous from the 4th/11th century), al-Ḥaṭṭīb al-Baḏādī (d. 463/1071),
Ibn 'Abdalharr (d. 463/1071), al-'Uyûn wal-ḥadâ‘iq (anonym.), as-Shirâzî (d. 476/1088), Gars an-Nîma (d. 480/1088), as-Sarrâj (d. 500/1166), al-Maydāni (d. 518/1124), al-Sam‘âni (d. 562/1166), Ibn 'Asâkir (d. 571/1176), Usâma ibn Munqîd (d. 584/1188), Ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597/1201), Ibn Badrûn (d. 603/1211), Yâqût (d. 626/1229), Ibn al-Ītîr (d. 630/1234), an-Nawawî (d. 676/1278), Ibn Ḥâlîkân (d. 681/1282), Ibn Manzûr (d. 711/1311–12), al-Mizzi (d. 742/1341), ad-Dahâbî (d. 748/1348), Ibn Qâyîm (d. 751/1350), Pseudo-Ibn Qâyîm, Ibn Ḥuḍayl (d. 763/1361), as-Sahâlî (d. 764/1364), Ibn Katîr (d. 774/1373), Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852/1449), al-Fâsî (d. 832/1249), and Ibn Tağribîrî (d. 874/1269).

From these authors Dr. Leder adduces no less than 1365 various textual extracts (altogether roughly corresponding to 600 printed pages). Leder readily admits that the classical Arabic literature might very well contain considerably more material deriving from al-Hâjîm ibn 'Adî than he presents, both because such material might have been transmitted more or less anonymously in sections lacking proper isnâd and because it might be found in sources not yet edited.

This latter point might easily be illustrated by means of the hitherto unpublished mirror of princes by Siâh ibn al-Jawzi (d. 654/1257), entitled Kitâb al-Jalts as-sâlih wal-anîs a-nâjih, of which I am preparing the edith princeps based on ms. Topkâpi Sarayi Müzesi kütüphanesi 8299 (III Hmet 2622) by comparison with ms. Forschungsbibliothek Gotha Orient. A 1881, ms. Dâr al-kutub, Cairo, Taşawwuf 874, and ms. Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen Arab. 146. In this work there is an extract from correspondence between the Umayyad caliph 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz (99/717–101/720) and 'Adî ibn Arťât al-Fazârî al-Baġdâdî (d. 102/721), governor of Başra, supplied with an isnâd, going all the way from "my grandfather", i.e. Abû l-Faraj 'Abd al-Rahmân ibn al-Jawzi (d. 597/1201), until al-Hâjîm ibn 'Adî (MS. Topkâpi Sarayi Müzesi kütüphanesi 8299, fol. 30b4/4–30b7/1). Moreover, as Dr. Leder correctly notes (p. 22), the tradition for the ultimate authority of al-Hâjîm ibn 'Adî is found in Abû l-Faraj 'Abd al-Rahmân ibn al-Jawzi's Miṣbâh al-mutdî fi ḥilafat al-Mustâdî, ed. Nâjiya 'Abd Allâh Îbrâhîm, 1–2, Bağdâd 1396/1976–1397/1977, vol. 1, pp. 299ff. It is, though, additionally found e.g. in the same author's Sirât 'Umâr ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz ed. Muĥîb ad-Dîn al-Ḫâbîr, Cairo 1331/1912, p. 84. At an earlier stage in the history of Arabic historiography/biography, extracts of the same correspondence are preserved, e.g. in Abû Na‘aym al-İsfahâni’s (d. 430/1037) Hîlâyat al-awliyâ‘ wa-jâbaqît al-ašîyâ‘, 1–10, 3rd ed. Beirut 1400/1980, vol. 5, p. 275; in Ibn 'Abd al-Hakâm’s (d. 257/871) Sirât 'Umâr ibn 'Abd al-'Azîz, ed. Âḥmâd 'Ubayy, Cairo 1373, p. 65; cf. also an author contemporary with, and possibly even prior to al-Hâjîm ibn 'Adî, viz. Abû Yûsûf Ya‘qûb ibn Îbrâhîm ibn Habîb al-Înshârî (d. 182/798) in his Kitâb al-Ḫarâj, Cairo 1382, p. 119.

In spite of the incomplete state of edited sources, Dr. Leder carries out his investigation in a marvellously elucidating and methodological way. In the first chapter he deals with some general considerations concerning "Einzeltraditionen in der Literatur" (pp. 1–16), concluding with a series of observations on the transmission from al-Hâjîm ibn 'Adî in the ahbâr literature. The second chapter is devoted to a survey of "Hâjîm’s Werke und Hâjîm-Texte" (pp. 17–51), containing a list of all relevant source texts, the various bibliographical references, themes and forms in the texts according to al-Hâjîm ibn 'Adî, and finally his transmitters and teachers. The third chapter treats of the "Divergenz und Authentizität in parallelen Hâjîm-Texten" (pp. 53–139), with a concordance of parallels, a comparison between the source texts, a discussion on the transmission, revisions, and dubious attributions. In the fourth chapter a concrete example is subject to treatment, viz. "Eine historische Erzählung: Die Ermordung des Hâlid al-Qasîrî" (pp. 141–195). The fifth chapter is devoted to "Rang und Achtung: Hâjîm’s Namenlisten" (pp. 197–243) and the sixth to "Hâjîm’s Geschichtswerk – Namen und Lebensdaten" (pp. 245–283). The concluding chapter summarizes the observations made in the preceding chapters in an attempt to delineate the "Leben und Wirken von al-Hâjîm ibn ‘Adî" (pp. 283–315). The picture that emerges is carefully designed and extremely well founded, solid and reliable. It might appear to be almost superfluous to mention in a review of a monograph by Dr. Stefan Leder that the work is perfectly finished by a well chosen, up-to-date bibliography (pp. 315–342) – the only drawback of which might be that it does not separate primary sources from secondary literature – and indices of proper names, titles of works, and Stichworte/Orte (pp. 343–358). In sum: a masterly study.
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The origins of this book are to be found in university lectures delivered by the author at the university of Lund in 1977–78 and 1982, at Sorbonne (II) in 1973, at the university of Acelonas in 1971, at the Oficina internacional de información del espanol of the University of Madrid, in 1979 and in 1984. Professor Malmberg has also presented various papers pertaining to the subject matter at scholarly conferences, e.g. in Paris, Strasbourg, Aix-en-Provence, Bloomington (Indiana), Las Palmas, San Juan de Puerto Rico, Rio de Janeiro, Sao Paulo, Bucarest and Berlin.

The result is a comprehensive, well-structured and consistent study of the history of linguistics in 20 chapters, generally arranged in accordance with historical development: Introduction (pp. 5–11); 1. La Chine, le Japon et autres régions est-asiatique (pp. 13–21); 2. Le pays des deux fleuves. Les Sumériens. Langues sémitiques. Les hiéroglyphes d’Egypt et des Aztèques. L’Inde (pp. 23–43); 3. L’analyse linguistique dans l’Antiquité. Remarques générales (pp. 45–48); 4. Les Grecs (pp. 49–90); 5. Les Romains (pp. 91–109); 6. Le Moyen Âge (pp. 111–146); 7. La Renaissance (pp. 147–181); 8. La période des grands philosophes (le XVIIe siècle) (pp. 183–209); 9. Les encyclopédies et le siècle des Lumières (pp. 211–252); 10. Wilhelm von Humboldt (pp. 253–279); 11. Les premiers contacts avec les langues de l’Inde et la naissance du comparatisme, surtout indo-européen (pp. 281–308); 12. L’établissement définitif d’une science comparatiste de l’indo-européen. L’école de Leipzig (pp. 309–345); 13. L’application des principes du comparatisme en dehors des langues indo-européennes (pp. 347–362); 14. Le débat autour des thèses néo-grammairiennes. La dialectologie. La tradition humboldtiennne (pp. 363–375); 15. Naissance et évolution d’une science phonétique indépendante (pp. 377–404); 16. Le “Mémoire” de Saussure. La tradition française jusqu’à Meillet. Précurseurs de nouvelles tendances (pp. 405–419); 17. Les concepts et les thèses du comparatisme traditionnel modifiés ou mis en question (pp. 421–432); 18. La création d’une linguistique comparée des langues romanes (pp. 433–451); 19. Linguistique américaine de Whitney à Boas et à Sapir. Peirce (pp. 453–464); and 20. Vers une différenciation de la linguistique. Débuts d’écoles modernes (pp. 465–480), followed by an Index des noms (pp. 481–491).

In his clear-sighted introduction Professor Malmberg describes the emergence of the science of linguistics in its present, chiefly technical sense of the term during the 19th and 20th centuries. Malmberg rightly underlines that after the appearance of the linguistic system of Ferdinand de Saussure and the development of structuralism between the two World Wars, the modern concept of linguistics, interpreted in its cultural and philosophical context, has made it natural and necessary to include a discussion of the general history of linguistics in its broadest meaning: “Le rapport entre la pensée et la langue se trouve maintenant, comme pour les Grecs, au centre des préoccupations des linguistes. Il est donc devenu incorrect de voir dans le comparatisme et l’historicisme du début du siècle dernier également le début d’une science de la langue. Il faut par conséquent chercher ce début à une époque où il est possible de documenter les premiers essais de préoccupation théorique avec le langage et les langues. La linguistique a en réalité un âge qui est égal à celui des premiers document témoignant de l’existence de descriptions de langues et de réflexions autour de leurs mécanismes. La philosophie du langage a continué, depuis, les plus anciens philosophes grecs, à se développer en dehors et au dessus de la recherche diachronique. Le rôle des philosophes dans l’évolution de la linguistique ne cesse pas d’augmenter. Une conséquence en est que non seulement Platon, Aristote, les stoïciens, saint Augustin, Isidore de Seville, Bacon, Descartes, Maupertuis et Condillac mais aussi Charles Sanders Peirce, Rudolph Carnap, Michel Foucault, Jean-Paul Sartre, Jean Piaget, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Jacques Lacan et bien d’autres doivent être inclus dans une histoire de la linguistique. Ceci implique une expansion considérable du domaine de cette science par rapport à sa délimitation traditionnelle” (p. 6).

In pursuing this program for a history of linguistics, Dr. Malmberg allows himself to be relatively brief as regards the most recent developments, as he has already contributed greatly in recent decades to the description and discussion of these later phases, especially in *Les nouvelles tendance de la linguistique*, 3e éd. 1972, and again, in a new shape, *Analyse du langage au XXe siècle*, 1983; cf. also his *Signes et symboles*; *les bases du langage humain*, 1977).

Now, as one makes his way through this lucid and elegant presentation of the extremely complex and entangled history of linguistics, one recalls the wise words written by Professor Bertrand Russell in his
famous and penetrating History of Western Philosophy and its connection with political and social circumstances from the earliest times to the present day (London 1946), stating: "Apology is due to the specialists on various schools and individual philosophers. With the possible exception of Leibniz, every philosopher of whom I write is better known to some others than to me. If, however, books covering a wide field are to be written at all, it is inevitable, since we are not immortal, that those who write such books should spend less time on any part than can be spent by a man who concentrates on a single author or a brief period. Some, whose scholarly austerity is unbinding, will conclude that books covering a wide field should not be written at all, or, if written, should consist of monographs by a multitude of authors. There is, however, something lost when many authors co-operate. If there is any unity in the movement of history, if there is any intimate relation between what goes before and what comes later, it is necessary, for setting this forth, that earlier and later periods should be synthesized in a single mind" (5th impr., 1955, p. 5).

In a review of Dr. Malmberg's work within the frame of an orientalistic forum, the focus will automatically be placed on chapters 1–2, and a Semitist is predestined to scrutinize especially the major parts of the second chapter, which are devoted to Mesopotamia, the Sumerians, and the Semitic languages (spec pp. 23–25, 29–38). In this context Dr. Malmberg succinctly reviews the development of the Sumerian and Akkadian languages (pp. 23–25), the role of the Phoenicians in the creation of and influence on the emergence of many alphabets (e.g. the Greek and the Arabic), and the Ugaritic, Punic, Aramaic, Mandaean, Hebrew, and Arabic languages. It is, of course, possible for the specialist to detect minor factual errors (e.g. the name of the father of the great Arab grammarian Sibawaih was not "'Uthman", but "'Uthman", p. 36; and the caliph, who took measures to erect the "House of Wisdom" in Baghdad was not called "al-Hamoun", p. 37, but al-Ma'mun (198/813–218/833); his institute was not styled Dar al-hikma but Bayt al-hikma, the former designation being more correctly applied to the institute established by al-Hākim in 395/1005 (cf. The Encyclopaedia of Islam, New Ed., vol. 1, 1979, col. 1140). The specialist is also likely to hold that the studies, on which the discussion is based, are occasionally somewhat outdated. In particular the discussion of the Sumerian and ancient Semitic languages might have profited from a consultation of a recent general survey, namely W. von Soden's Einführung in die Altorientalistik, Darmstadt 1985, and even somewhat older collections of linguistic and philological material of relevance, like Handbuch der Orientalistik, hrsg. von B. Spuler, and Current Trends in Linguistics, ed. Th. A. Sebeok, vol. 6, The Hague-Paris 1970, which deals with all the Semitic languages, including Hebrew and Aramaic in their various periods. As regards Arabic linguistics the present standard manual is Grundriss der arabischen Philologie. Band I, Sprachwissenschaft, hrsg. von W. Fischer, and Band II, Literaturwissenschaft, hrsg. von H. Gätle. Wiesbaden 1987 (the latter volume contains all relevant studies concerning Arabic Sprachwissenschaft in the classical period, pp. 136–176). Nonetheless, it is obvious that Dr. Malmberg, who himself is not a Semitist, has succeeded in giving a very valuable and experienced introduction to the history of Semitic linguistics, full of useful information and prudent judgements.

The sections dealing with oriental languages are a good indication of the excellent standards of Professor Malmberg's work as a whole. The strength and lasting value of this history of linguistics – admittedly a most bold project – is to be found in its total conception of linguistic development. Dr. Malmberg's unique grasp of his vast material repeatedly demonstrates his experience as a general linguist, his skill as a teacher, and his professionalism as an internationally leading scholar in the field.

Trygve Kronholm


Kirsten Nielsen's There is Hope for a Tree involves research into metaphor theories and interpretation of OT text-imagery delicately balanced on the borderline between literature and religion. Taking a prophetic text to be an act rather than speech converted into a written message, is, regardless of the method employed, a matter of belief. Is it possible to analyse the imagery in Isaiah as elements of fiction
written and redacted by a human author? I believe that Nielsen rejects this, to any literary analysis vital option.

I may not possess all that experience and the skill involved in Nielsen's thorough study, but my own study of Biblical metaphors reused in modern Israeli poetry opens an interesting possibility to explore the literary side of reuse, a challenge difficult to resist. Intentions attached to Biblical metaphors have been inverted to reform fictitious poetic "worlds" where the modern poet experiments with intended meanings to mark the increase of information in line with his changing intention. This involves "inversion" of intention by means of rearrangement (through transposition) of metaphoric segments—elements of imagery, a term not far from Nielsen's "elements of meaning"—within a fictitious model. Inversion, the new information and the result of the rearrangement of metaphoric elements within a model, is a direct result of the author's wish to mark a change by means of fiction and not of performative powers of an image. The impact on the reader results from the reader's individual reaction to that redactional operation. I prefer 'inversion' to Nielsen's 'conversion' because of the far too performative-magnetic powers ascribed to imagery according to Nielsen's term (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 51).

Thus, having read Nielsen's outstanding study I found it most rewarding to look into Nielsen's "toolbox", suggesting some complementary tools and analysing different views on the functions attached to metaphor. Unfortunately this direction does not allow much space for detail-study of how Nielsen applies her ideas to the numerous case-studies.

In this short review of some of Nielsen's ideas concerned with the use/reuse of metaphor I wish to briefly contrast my own perception of Nielsen's ideas as a somewhat contradictory description of metaphorical reuse against the idea of metaphor as a fictitious model or network of interrelated images, the function of which is to mark relations within the model. Nielsen's imagery interprets situations and is given a performative character. I would like to emphasize the implied author's use of imagery from within the written piece of fiction, to according to his perception of God's word mark a change of intention. It is noteworthy that "images describe" in p. 227 is an exception to Nielsen's characterisation of image functions; the one closest to the redressive role I wish to ascribe inversion, the result of a metaphorical process. I support my reading of Nielsen's work with the following sources: Ricoeur, P., The Rule of Metaphor. London 1977; Tzvetan, T. Symbolik och Tolking. Stockholm 1989; Booth, W. C., The Rhetoric of Fiction. Chicago [1961] 1983; and Luriya, B., Kadmut Ha'ivrim. Jerusalem 1977.

Internal relations within the model teach us about the possible intention of the implied author. In The Rhetoric of Fiction, pp. 74-5, Wayne C. Booth presents his alternative term for the 'Persona' of the poem. This suggested approach does not have to result in a radical diversion from Nielsen's general conclusions as to the end affect of metaphorical intention in the OT (with the exception of my different approach to solving the problems posed by Nielsen in point c, p. 65 and points 6-7, p. 67), but it suggests a framework that may include even the type of metaphorical means/segments that mark an intention too vaguely. It is an interesting line of reasoning, claiming that a metaphorical segment that has lost its metaphorical function on the statement level (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 51), might get such a function through the interrelation offered within a fictitious network. Having been placed into the right place within the mashal, an additional metaphorical segment might function, or in Nielsen's term: "succeed". In short: I presume that sometimes, when reading a text, we fail to place a metaphorical segment 'right' in relation to the relevant piece of fiction (its context, or reference) only because we access that imagery on a less integrative linguistic level i.e. the statement level instead of as a segment related/rearranged within a model. Nielsen's remarks on the functional state of the word leg/foot (in Hebrew) confirms that such metaphorical segment as the foot of the mountain (in Hebrew) and 'arm's length' (in Hebrew) may reach a higher level of redressive functionality in new arrangements than as isolated metaphorical statements (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 51)

"The book of Isaiah is...", writes Nielsen, "...nor a literary fiction, in the sense of an author's free creation of a fictitious prophet." (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 17.) Wayne C. Booth in The Rhetoric of Fiction may suggest a literary way out of this limitation: "The implied author chooses, consciously or unconsciously, what we read; we infer him as an ideal, literary, created version of the real man; he is the sum of his own choices." (The Rhetoric of Fiction, pp. 74-5.) We may consider it a fact that an OT author's choice to redescribe the story of Bat-Sheba through a fictitious model inevitably excludes from our sympathy and interest some other politically important characters and events. The roles of other warriors that had to sacrifice their lives together with Bat-Sheba's husband and significant historical
facts about that particular war along with the right of kings seem to have been outweighed by that poor-man's lamb piece of fiction (2 Samuel 12; 1-4). Could anybody reassure us beyond any doubt that the prophet's words to the king had not been chosen by an implied author, to function not as the most topical, reusable "living word of God" (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 17), but rather as the most skilfully deployed piece of fiction to help "camouflage" his "real" intention with (The Rule of Metaphor, p. 243, Toulmin's "systematic deployability" of the model "as a metaphorical network and not an isolated metaphor")?

I suggest that what Nielsen calls "a certain element of literary fiction" (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 17) plays a far more important role in determining the process of redecision/change of intention within fictitious models used in Isaiah than what Nielsen's point of view allows for (The Rule of Metaphor, p. 240 presents Mary Hesse's definition: "a heuristic instrument that seeks, by means of fiction, to break down an inadequate interpretation and to lay the way for a new, more adequate interpretation.") I suggest that the implied author might serve as such instrument (even Ricoeur's extended metaphor, pp. 243-4.).

Two essential points need to be discussed more thoroughly. The difference between 'linguistic levels' and Nielsen's "linguistic dimensions". The latter term together with Nielsen's statement "it is not reality and language which are interacting" come too close to what I call fiction. The same goes for Nielsen's 'the world' that obviously is not to be taken for the real world but rather as 'the world of a poem' that is widely accepted as a fictitious world. Furthermore, it is fiction and fiction alone that deals with "something different and something more" than the real world; that is unless we believe in miracles or support the existence of "conventional" realities only (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 53-4.). Nielsen keeps beating about the bush when describing the result of functioning imagery as a creation of cosmos "...to point out a series of contexts..." (p. 227), even p. 23: "new context" looks like the new metaphor and not an external reality.

In Isaiah 28:5 we find the reuse of metaphor in 'Ateret Zvi' placed and deployed along with "Ateret" and 'Tiferet' as integrated literary segments in a metaphorical network redescribing chosen characteristics of the changing tree anatomy of the kingdom of God in different states of sovereignty, or if you wish, - states of health or strength. Zvi might be used/reused with rearranged metaphorics segments to change the meaning of the same basic metaphorical construction: of a brave man (from Ugaritic), deer (in Hebrew): crown, garland on the head of the brave, of the deer, or like the foliage of a tree (Kadmut Ha'ivrim, p. 23). This, I suggest, is equivalent to Nielsen's metaphorical narratives that include individual metaphors (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 62), named narrative, or composition level. This is what I call the fictitious model, as a composition is an arbitrarily composed piece of fiction. It is the implied author's literary skills alone that form the message conveyed to us by that very piece of fiction. The word "Ateret" for garland; a crown on the head of a brave man or foliage of a tree, gets its shift of meaning or transposition according to its relational placing within that fictitious model. Place the crown of a tree together with a fading flower to redescribe the crown of pride as related to the drunkards of Efraim and you let that crown drawn in wine; according to Todorov you get a metaphor by ascribing two entities a common trait (Symbolik och Tolkning, p. 144), but it does not mean that these 'entities' have ever possessed any obvious common traits.

I suggest that the implied author in Isaiah ascribes two or more entities a common trait by skilfully rearranging these entities (that I chose to call metaphorics segments) within a fictitious model in a combination that suits his metaphorical intention best. The fact that the implied author keeps to formal literary traditions or conventions and uses the imported (initial) meaning of "Zvi" inverted, only enforces my case: the sublime choice of words regarding traditional or conventional use and the intentional rearrangement of these words (within a new model) into groups is the very process of redecision that generates new information about the author's changing of intention. Besides the need to limit an analysis to either an act of speech or written text, it is the author's written intention and not that of the spoken statement that comes through to the reader (providing that reading a text and listening to an act of speech are different activities.). "A new design for understanding reality, and thereby relating oneself to reality" is, in my opinion, a form different from the reality you are relating yourself to (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 47). The new design is a fictitious model, or a piece of fiction. It is up to the hearer or the reader to accept or reject the intricate literary exercise needed to present the intention of God mediated through fiction. If Nielsen's claim that the reason for absence of tension in the case of the 'dead metaphor' is to be "sought outside the metaphor, not in the metaphor" holds valid,
it should be applied to the case where that tension is present, too. It is the same rule of convention that Nielsen asserts that forms the reader's attitude towards the text in both cases, albeit in opposite directions. If my line of thought holds valid, Nielsen's statements such as "imagery interprets" or "threatened by the prophet's imagery" are contradictory to another of her own concepts of metaphorical function: "in his imagery he provides an opportunity for interpreting events through the images"—an author as the source of intention, unless it is the prophet himself that had put pen to paper. This inconsistency can be solved by introducing Isaiah (or an implied author) as the one who acts "by providing an opportunity" for the reader, mediated through fiction. Imagery does not act. In my opinion Nielsen does not act consistently in stipulating the roles of the 'intention-producer' Vs. his 'production design'—the actual piece of fiction. (There is Hope for a Tree, pp. 53, 46, 56.)

That is, if the hearer is educated enough to read; illiteracy does not mean that words get performative powers! In Symbolik och Tolknings pp. 152-3, Todorov recites Spinoza on that the holy scripts are to be seen as a narrative adapted to the comprehension-level and prejudices/preconceptions of ordinary people who can only learn through narration, as definition and deduction prove too complex. Furthermore, the narrative's aim is to argue towards obedience and not to spread knowledge or truth. I suggest that the reader does not have to understand but rather to accept the rearrangement of images and metaphorical segments as a 'reliable' combination of related segments that again, are the result of the narrator's/implied author's narrative skills and intention to persuade towards obedience. Nielsen seems to suggest that a sort of interpretation may exist that does not involve the process of decoding on the first place but instead asserts the reader's adaptation of responsibility to what others had said. This "transference of judgement" from the hearer/reader towards the author/implied author/speaker that holds the initial responsibility for that intentional use of imagery simply denounces the right of free human thought to exist (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 58 - Funk's term.). In this light I welcome Nielsen's statements that "Whether we are in the presence of literal language or imagery is, in a number of cases, a matter of opinion" and that "this is sometimes more a psychological question than a literary question" (There is Hope for a Tree, pp. 58-9). I wish, on the other hand, to assert that what Nielsen classifies as "an psychological question" is a question already included within the realm of literary analysis as the intention behind the placing of elements that form a piece of fiction, reflected through the rearrangement of metaphorical segments. I shall go a step further and suggest that the "transference of judgement", describing the hearer's progress towards conviction as an act of interpretation fulfilled (and as more essential a process than decoding) along with the notion that a message borne by imagery, and for that matter imagery itself, has not "succeeded" until its performative side has been fulfilled, only emphasizes the presence of typological longings towards one basic literal meaning according to Luther's way (There is Hope for a Tree, pp. 64-5, even Symbolik och Tolknings, p. 145.). I suggest that despite typological elements such as the idea that images had been mediated to "safeguard one specific interpretation of it" Nielsen's comment according to Eduard Nielsen about the fable of Jotham only enforces the idea of the redactor as a skilled fiction-maker or implied author who is the sum of his own choices (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 19, the application of mashal as an expression of a redactional interpretation).

Christian typology and fictitious models are totally opposed directions of research as the former points backwards towards the literal meaning whereas the latter points forwards, towards a changed/inversed meaning. In Symbolik och Tolknings, p. 145, Todorov quotes Grant and John Colet: after the separation from Rome (1517) Luther ceased to use allegories and the only solid meaning was to be the literal meaning. I wish to argue in favour of literary analysis, to establish the value of metaphor as a fictitious world or a theoretical model (The Rule of Metaphor, pp. 243-4). A model is not a metaphorical statement but an "extended metaphor - tale, allegory," rather than interpretations derived from the relation between statements or loosely linked classes of imagery and a context with historical characteristics. I suggest that Nielsen's "new context" may serve as a parallel term to the rearranged metaphorical segments within a fictitious model that is the new metaphor and not as an external reality (There is Hope for a Tree, pp. 23, 53-4).

I agree with Nielsen's conclusion of Chapter one, asserting that we cannot achieve more than a partial understanding of the possible meaning in use. The meaning, may it be classified as initial or a final meaning, is in my opinion the aim and result of literary means skillfully used to lay the way for a change of intention within a model.

I wish to emphasise the interrelational, change-marking function of (images) metaphorical segments
within a model by posing anew questions of general character that I find essential to the study of metaphor-reusage in written literary passages. I hope this may be a useful complement to Nielsen's study of the reused biblical metaphor.

1. Does our study analyse a direct "act of speech", a situation where a speaker and a hearer face each other, or does it deal with analysis of written/redacted texts as pieces of fiction/extended metaphors (There is Hope for a Tree, pp. 56-7)? Hearers' participation in the image's performative world described by Nielsen as a precondition for a metaphorical statement to 'succeed' as an act of speech does not apply, in my opinion, to written fiction.

2. A sharper distinction between linguistic levels, fictitious elements, typological elements and "linguistic dimensions" (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 53), terms used in There is hope for a tree, is called for. My feeling is that Nielsen's choice is to stay within the statement level (There is Hope for a Tree, pp. 61, 65), despite steps taken into the realm of the narrative and composition that in my opinion are metaphorical networks or fictitious models.

Generalisations such as "The whole of the New Testament's reinterpretation of the Old Testament is clear evidence that events turned out differently in practice" (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 235) still derive from interpretative attempts at keeping the "living word of God" always topical, which practically resulted in staying on the level of literal meaning. Nielsen's arguments through pp. 234-5 tend to counteract Nielsen's own intentions as summarised in "Exegete Consequences", point No. 2 (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 66), especially considering Nielsen's own reservation against the misleading influence of tradition on our judgement (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 65.). I fail to see how a new bearer of information (a metaphor), which, at the same time, is the bearer of "an actual communication of Yahweh's intention", could convey new information as to God's initial (and final, holy) intention (a 'living' metaphor bears new information) without changing its meaning; that is if any meaning has solid historical value. This, I suggest, is a good argument in favour of the choice of literary tools when it comes to analyses of OT texts, as the literary approach offers a safe passage to avoiding the influence of intentions that derive from sources other than those that had shaped the narratives/fictitious models used/reused in the written OT.

3. What established/conventional usage of a certain word/metaphoric segment is believed to have existed prior to author X's use of that metaphor?

4. Who is the mediator of change and what is the role of the redactor/author/implied author X in marking a change of intention within a given text/piece of fiction? Nielsen's case-study cannot give a definite answer to this question (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 44.) On p. 67 we meet a reserved attitude to 'the redactional context' of imagery which in my eyes actualises the need for a clearer distinction between the role of speech Vs. fiction.

5. What is the relation of a certain metaphorical segment to the whole of the actual (mashal) network? (There is Hope for a Tree, p. 67, point 7) – relating a metaphorical segment to "literal language" seems easier than studying its possible placing within the model or 'composition'. Are all seemingly initial meanings in seemingly dead metaphors to be taken as "literal language"? I suggest that whenever a metaphor/segment could be reused to fit into a model, it is not to be taken literally but metaphorically, due to its given function.

6. What function does a particular metaphorical segment mark within the fictitious model that is the extended metaphor/metaphor network?

7. Do metaphors within the chosen piece of fiction have any reference in the surrounding fiction? In that case it could be recognized as a fictitious model with marked internal relations and cross references between metaphorical segments/images. Nielsen's "associated literary context" is by definition not at all far from what I describe as a fictitious network or a piece of fiction (p. 23, 53-4).

8. What change of intention towards a prevalent convention (i.e. 'reality' redescribed/reused by the implied author) does the new fictitious model mark? To what extent has that particular metaphor been inverted in relation to an established usage?
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This work by Dr. Magnus Ottosson, the successor of Helmer Ringgren to the chair of Old Testament studies at Uppsala University, and formerly the successor of Arvid S. Kapelrud to the parallel chair at the University of Oslo, constitutes the first volume in a new series of exegetical monographs published at Uppsala and edited by Professors René Kieffer and Magnus Ottosson. This recent monograph testifies to Dr. Ottosson's broad knowledge and experience as a biblical archeologist, like many of his earlier studies (among his more comprehensive contributions: his doctoral thesis Gilead. Tradition and History. Lund 1969 [Coniectanea Biblica, Old Testament Series 3]; The archeology of Palestine: Bronze Age and Iron Age [type-written handbook in Swedish for university students]; and Temple and Cult Places in Palestine. Uppsala 1980 [Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis. Boreas 12. Uppsala Studies in Ancient Mediterranean and Near Eastern Civilizations]).

This comprehensive study has been published in Swedish, with an English summary (pp. 260–274), essentially identical with a lecture given by Dr. Ottosson at The Annual Meeting of Japan Old Testament Society, in Tokyo, on June 12th, 1989. This is likely to cause some surprise among scholars, since the theme is in itself of an international interest, and since the secondary literature discussed is mainly of an international character. As the Swedish title of the monograph is apt to discourage foreign scholars from approaching it, I find it necessary to give at least a brief introduction of it to the international public.

The work consists of an introduction and thirteen chapters. In the Introduction (pp. 11–37), Dr. Ottosson discusses the various concepts of land in the book of Joshua, the Land of Canaan, the origins of the ideal nation, the relationship between Moses and Joshua, the literary structure of the book of Joshua, the relationship between the book of Joshua and the books of Numbers and Deuteronomy respectively, the role of the Priestly Collector, and, lastly, the date of the composition of the book of Joshua.

The 13 chapters are devoted to the following themes: 1. An introduction to the Book of Joshua (pp. 38–42); 2. The spies and Rahab (pp. 43–53); 3. Victory – Defeat – Victory. The building of altars (pp. 54–80); 4. The subtlety of the Gibeonites (pp. 81–85); 5. Wars of conquest in the South and North. Southern coalition (pp. 86–92); 6. The geography of the conquest (pp. 93–99); 7. The defeated kings east and west of the river Jordan (pp. 100–104); 8. Chapter 13 (pp. 105–114); 9. The allocation of Canaan (pp. 115–132); 10. Josh. 20 and 21 (pp. 133–142); 11. Covenants (pp. 143–159); 12. The geography of the allocation (pp. 160–228); and 13. The conquest and the archaeology (pp. 229–259).

It has long since been recognized by Old Testament critical scholarship that the description given in the book of Joshua of a pan-Israelite conquest of the Land of Canaan, followed by a divinely inspired allocation of land to the tribes of Israel, is neither designed to be historical in the modern sense of the word, nor can be brought into harmony with known archaeological facts concerning the transition from Late Bronze Age to Iron Age. The latter problem is thoroughly and competently discussed in chapter 13. In the light of such criticism, Dr. Ottosson undertakes an investigation of the geographical data contained in the text of Joshua. His investigation deals especially with the numerous cities mentioned there, previously described by A. Alt and M. Noth as Grenzpunkte treten. Working with a concordance, Ottosson has studied the altogether 358 city names in the book of Joshua, by constant comparison with the 388 names of cities or places mentioned elsewhere in the Hebrew Bible. He observes that 198 names out of a total 358 in the book of Joshua are hapax legomena, whereas 243 names out of 388 outside this book are hapax legomena. Most of these 198 names can no longer be localized with any certainty. Ottosson takes considerable pains in discussing all these toponyms and in surveying them in tables. Further he aptly compares them with their parallels in city lists of other traditions inside the Old Testament (e.g. Judg 1; 1 Sam 30:25–31; 1 Kings 4:7–14; Is 10:28f.; Mich 1:10–16; 1 Chron ch. 2, 4, and 7; 2 Chron 11:5–10; 28, 18; Ezra, Neh). However, he also adduces much extrabiblical material for comparison, such as Egyptian and Akkadian city lists, ostraca texts etc. In this context it might have been helpful if the concluding bibliography had been divided so as to offer a list of all these important primary sources separately, and then all secondary literature). Through a closer examination of the various texts of the book of Joshua, with a heavy reliance on the concordance, Dr. Ottosson finds himself justified in concluding that the book is a Deuteronomistic composition. He is of the conviction that the redactor (called "Dtr") has employed and re-arranged ancient local traditions that concern the allocation of land and cities—a bulk of traditions to which Ottosson assigns elsewhere established abbreviation "P". This composition was allegedly created in order to constitute a program for the Davidic restoration. It appears to Ottosson that the redactor was influenced by the traditions of King
David's Cisjordan wars and struggle with King Saul and the tribe of Benjamin. He contends that the redactor was active at the time of the Josiahic Reformation. Accordingly, Josiah is in this book portrayed as the perfect king of Israel, entirely obedient to the Torah of Moses. Josiah's keeping of the divine law, asserts Ottosson, constitutes a guarantee for the people's holding of the Promised Land. It is, therefore, only natural that the book of Joshua opens with a description of precisely this land (Josh 1:4; cf. Gen 15:18ff.). Further, the book of Joshua according to Dr. Ottosson, marked by the conception of the Kingdom of David, headed by the tribe of Judah. Consequently Shechem, the city where Abraham once received the divine promise of the Land (Gen 12,6ff.), constitutes the pivot point of the Book of Joshua (ch. 24; cf. 1 Kings 12).

The great and lasting value of this monograph lies first and foremost in the impressive amount of biblical and extrabiblical material amassed and scrutinized by Dr. Ottosson, secondly in the archaeological experience and skill present in the analysis. It is to be regretted that this collection of relevant source material and archaeological knowledge, available only in Swedish, will remain basically inaccessible to international scholars. This is even the more to be regretted, since the highly clear exegetical conclusions drawn by Dr. Ottosson are destined to cause an intense debate, a debate that is bound to renew the consideration of Hexateuchal literary problem. In so far as Dr. Ottosson might be prepared to undertake the task of translating his great monograph into an international language, he would be wise to make a fresh check of the data included, especially the Hebrew transliterations.
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This voluminous work is the doctoral dissertation of Per K. Sørensen presented to the University of Copenhagen. It offers for the first time a comprehensive study and a critical edition of the famous songs of the Sixth Dalai Lama. The sixty-six songs have been edited and translated many times before into several languages, but they have not previously been analysed in a systematical way. Earlier editions have mostly given the text and a translation only.

The Sixth Dalai Lama is a very popular figure in Tibetan history. The prime minister (SDe-srid) of the Great Fifth Dalai Lama had concealed his death for fifteen years. In 1697 it was discovered that he really was dead and at that time the Sixth Dalai Lama Tshang-dbyang rGya-mtsho was installed. It was the first time that the system with a reincarnated Dalai Lama had been tried in a political context. The fifth reincarnated Dalai Lama was the first to gain political power. This is the method of ruling the state which has survived to our day. The weakness of rule by incarnation is precisely this regular need of one or more Regents during the eighteen years of the incarnated Dalai Lama's minority. The Regent and former prime minister's initiative in concealing the death of the Great Fifth Dalai Lama was therefore an understandable action, but nevertheless it met with great suspicion from the people when it was discovered. The Regent Sangs-rgyas rGya-mtsho furthermore kept the real power in his hands after the installation of the Sixth Dalai Lama, something that aroused a feeling of bitterness in the young leader. He did not have the real power but acted more as the puppet ruler of the Regent. This might have contributed to his choice of the unconventional, worldly lifestyle that did not suit a leader who was supposed to live as a monk. He went out disguised in the nights to the popular parts of Lhasa in order to see women and to drink. Then he wrote poems to his beloved girls. This situation came to a violent end in 1706 when the Qoshot Mongol Lhazang Khan with the moral support of the Manchu emperor of China, invaded Lhasa, captured and executed the Regent and was going to take the young Dalai Lama into exile in China after having in vain tried to persuade the leading lamas of Lhasa to declare that he was not a true incarnation. The Sixth Dalai Lama finally died on that journey and we cannot exclude the possibility that he was murdered.

Despite, or perhaps because of, his unsuitable behaviour Tshang-dbyang rGya-mtsho was very popular among the people. One of the reasons for that was surely his famous songs. They are a very
good example of popular love poetry. As Sørensen points out, the motifs in the songs can be found in folk poetry. In fact, there are so many similarities with the popular folk songs that Sørensen presents two solutions to the problem of their authenticity. Either the songs influenced the later folk poetry to such an extent that almost all the motifs of the songs spread to other poetry or the songs were the products of several anonymous writers who have wished to celebrate the Sixth Dalai Lama. Sørensen leans towards the latter conclusion. A source of inspiration is also the popular drama play Nor-bzang. The Regent Sangs-rgyas-rGya-mtsho is likened to this ruthless ruler and in that respect does not give the Dalai Lama any share of the political power. These political implications can be seen from the songs which in many cases show a great discontent with the Regent. In this context, it is tempting to see the songs as an expression of popular dissatisfaction with the political situation at this time.

The book is divided into three parts. An introduction explains the background of the songs and places them in their context. Then there follows an analysis of the different editions of the songs. Finally, the bulk of the book consists of the edition and translation of the songs, supplemented with a very detailed and well researched commentary on each line of the songs, including an analytical commentary on each song as a whole. Then there are two long appendices, the first being the Tibetan text of a manuscript which contains no less than 450 songs ascribed to or dedicated to the Sixth Dalai Lama. Among these songs are to be found 54 of the songs traditionally ascribed to him. The second appendix is an introduction to the latter and a great deal of commentary on them. This collection of songs is unique and the only known copy of it is kept in the Tibetan Language Section of the Central Academy of National Minorities in Beijing. Finally there is an elaborate bibliography.

Each song is presented in the following way. First the Tibetan text is given in a critical edition, and then the English translation and different readings from the eleven editions available are presented. After that follows a commentary on notable words in each line of the song. Finally Sørensen’s interesting and clarifying analysis of the whole song is given. This is a very pedagogical and instructive way of writing commentaries. One can easily follow every step in the work. An example can be taken from song 55:

"My passionate sweetheart lies waiting on the bed, with a body tender and soft; Have you perhaps come to web sly lies. In order to bereave a young man of his dearest possessions?" This is, according to Sørensen, an example of a song that can have a meaning both as a love poem and as a political poem directed against the hated Regent. This is made possible by giving the song a figurative interpretation. The girl is here a provocation to the author. She is full of deceit and wants to take the possessions of the young man. The girl can here be identified with the Regent who lies and does not give to the Sixth Dalai Lama what belongs to him, namely the full power to rule the state of Tibet.

To conclude, this book gives a great amount of new material and new perspectives on these songs. It satisfies a need to place the songs ascribed to the Sixth Dalai Lama in a wider context than they have had before. It will be necessary reading for anyone interested in the person of the Sixth Dalai Lama and his historical epoch and finally for everyone who wishes to study Tibetan folk songs in general.
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