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Editorial Note

From this volume and forward I have taken over the responsibilities as editor of this Journal from Dr. Frithiof Rundgren, my predecessor on the chair for Semitic Languages at Uppsala University.

It is, accordingly, incumbent on me to express here a most heartfelt debt of gratitude to Professor Rundgren, who has carried out all editorial tasks pertaining to Orientalia Suecana for the entire period 1965 to 1989, the only exception being vol. XXXIII–XXXV (1984–1986), edited by myself and Dr. Eva Riad.

Due to Dr. Rundgren's constant diligence and strenuous efforts the Journal has been stamped with scholarly perfection and outstanding technical quality. It is my hope to be able to uphold the excellence thus established.

The present volume of Orientalia Suecana is a double issue. It is my intention to let the Journal mainly appear on a yearly basis in the future.


TRYGGVE KRONHOLM
D.D., Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages
UNIVERSITY OF UPPSALA
Preface

A great number of the contributions contained in this double issue of *Orientalia Suecana* derive their origins from papers read at the Second Scandinavian Symposium for Semitic Studies, a conference organized and headed by Professor Vitestam, which was held in Kivik, Sweden, on 16–18 August, 1990.

Some scholars that took part in the Kivik Symposium later wrote a particular study in honour of Professor Vitestam on a topic other than the respective one treated at the conference. This applies to the articles by Dr. Eskhult from Uppsala, Professor Knudsen from Oslo, Professor Kripp from Lund/Schwetzingen, Professor Retsö from Gothenburg, and Dr. Witakowski from Uppsala, as well as to my own two contributions.

A few other articles were, likewise, written especially in view of this tributary volume by colleagues of Professor Vitestam unable to attend the Kivik Symposium, viz. Associate Professor Pedersén of Uppsala, Associate Professor Riad of Uppsala, Professor Rundgren of Uppsala, and Professor Toll of Copenhagen.

The study by Dr. Lundquist was presented to the research seminar at the Institute for Middle East Studies, Lund University, in the spring term of 1988. The article by Associate Professor Isaksson of Stockholm, is based on a public lecture held at Uppsala University in June 1988.

With regard to the remaining two contributions, the study by Dr. Baitchura from Leningrad, was submitted to the previous editor, and the one by Dr. Török from Budapest, was sent to the present editor by courtesy of the Institute for Classics at the University of Bergen, Norway.


*The Editor*
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The Length of Vowels and the Tone Movement in Udehe Words According to Some Instrumental-Phonetic Data

UZBEK SH. BAITCHURA, Leningrad


Instrumental-phonetic studies of Udehe were first begun by E. R. Schneider in 1933 at the Experimental-phonetic laboratory of the Leningrad University. He obtained cymograms of a number of individual words and of some sentences in the pronunciation of two Udehe informants, then students in Leningrad. However Schneider was subjected to Stulin’s repressions, and could not, for this reason, decipher his cymograms. They were deciphered and worked on by me. In the preceding (of 1979) and present articles the results are given.

ABSOLUTE LENGTH OF VOWELS*

According to the data obtained from the first informant, the length of vowels in open syllables of disyllabic words is distributed as follows.

In the initial open syllable the length of the vowel o is equal to 12.7 cs (6 measurements = m) in the words bono ‘hail’ (3 m); mono ‘maple’ (tree) (3 m), the distribution is from 11.6 to 14.8 cs; the length of a is 13.2 cs in the word nogo ‘to put back’ (2 m); the length of u is 13.2 cs in the word buta ‘to preserve’ (1 m); the length of o is 13.2 cs in the word kask ‘jerky’ (3 m); the length of ă is 32.7 cs in the word nani ‘Nanai’, ‘earth’, ‘land’ (1 m); the length of ü is 33.0 cs (1 m) in the word duni ‘four’, ‘to dig ice’; the length of the diphthong eu is equal to 32.7 cs in the word geula ‘on the oar’ (1 m).

In the second open syllable we have the following data. The length of the vowel o is 16.5 cs (6 m) in the words bono ‘hail’ (3 m) and mono ‘maple’ (3 m); the length of a is 16.5 cs in the word nogo ‘to put back’ (2 m); the length of the vowel u is 17.0 cs in the word kasu ‘jerki’ (3 m; from 14.8 to 21.5 cs); the length of the vowel a is 19.8 cs in the words buta ‘to preserve’ (1 m: 24.8 cs), geula ‘on the oar’ (1 m: 14.8 cs); the length of the vowel i is 17.3 cs in the words nani ‘Nanai’ (1 m) and duni ‘four’, ‘to dig ice’ (1 m) (the distribution is from 13.2 in duni to 21.4 in nani). These data are summarized in table 1. The figures lead to the following conclusions.

1) In Udehe there is the opposition of short (or normal) and long vowels, the ratio

* The length of vowels was measured in the words which had been subjected to investigation in the preceding article, and with the degree of accuracy equal to 1.65 cs (to which the space of 2.5 mm corresponds on the cymograms).
Note: M: 1 mm = 1.65 cs. Dotted (stroke) line denotes the mean tone.
comprising ca. 1 to 2.5 (\(a : \ddot{a} = 40.4\%\); \(u : \ddot{u} = 40.0\%\)) in the first open syllable of disyllabic words.

2) When both syllables are open and both vowels are normal, the length of the second vowel surpasses that of the first, the ratio being from 53 to 90%.

3) However, when the first vowel is a long one, while the second is normal, the relation of the length of the first vowel to that of the second is from 153 to 250%.

4) When in the initial syllable there is a long vowel, the absolute length of the second (normal) vowel diminishes in comparison with the case when both vowels are short (normal) in the word. This is the manifestation of the general trend to quantitative unity of the word first noticed by me in 1955.**

According to the data obtained from the second informant, the absolute length of the vowels is a little less, however the relations in length are analogous.

Thus, the length of the vowel \(a\) in the first syllable of the word \(tada\) ‘arrow’ (1 m) is equal to 9.9 cs; the length of the vowel \(i\) in the word \(gida\) ‘spear’ is 8.2 cs (1 m), while the length of the long vowel \(\ddot{a}\) is equal to 20.4 cs (weighted average) in the words \(bata\) ‘boy’ (1 m) and \(anta\) ‘southern slope of a mountain’ (2 m). The length of \(a\) in the second open syllable is equal to 8.2 cs in the words \(gida\) ‘spear’ and \(tada\) ‘arrow’ (in each), while the length of \(a\) in the second syllable of words with the first long vowel (or a diphthong) is, on the average, 5.0 cs, the figures being distributed as follows: \(bata\) 5.0 cs, \(anta\) 3.3 cs, \(anta\) 6.6 cs.

These are normal quantitative relations in vocalism for a language having the opposition of long and short vowels: the former surpass the latter by 2 or 2.5 times. The reduced vowel \(\ddot{a}\) and the vowels near to it in their articulation (e.g., \(o\)) tend to be the shortest; the high vowels (\(i, u\)) are longer; while the vowel \(a\) is usually the longest, however the difference is, as a rule, unimportant: as it is seen from the table, the length of the short vowels is distributed from 12.7 (0 – avr.) to 13.2 cs (\(a,\ u,\ \ddot{a}\)) in the initial syllable, and in the second syllable from 16.5 (\(o,\ \ddot{a}\)) to 19.8 (\(a\)), see table 1.

The data on the absolute length of vowels in trisyllabic words yield the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№ of the syllable</th>
<th>Vowels</th>
<th>The length of the vowels (Inf. 1)</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Deviations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>13.2 (3 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>13.2 (1 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>12.7 (6 m)</td>
<td>11.6–14.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>13.2 (2 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ã</td>
<td>32.7 (1 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ù</td>
<td>33.0 (1 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>eu</td>
<td>32.7 (1 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>19.8 (2 m)</td>
<td>14.8–24.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>u</td>
<td>17.0 (3 m)</td>
<td>14.8–21.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o</td>
<td>16.5 (6 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>16.5 (2 m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td>17.3 (2 m)</td>
<td>13.2–21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

results. In the word toködu ‘to the cloud’ (3 m), the length of the first vowel o comprised, on the average, 11.0 cs (deviations being from 8.2 to 14.8 cs), thus a little less than in the first syllable of disyllabic words bona ‘hail’ and mono ‘maple’ (12.7 cs, the deviations are from 11.6 to 14.8 cs), which is normal. The length of the final vowel u in this trisyllabic word appeared to be equal to 13.7 cs (from 11.6 to 14.8 cs), while in the disyllabic word kasu ‘jerky’ (3 m), the length of u comprised, on the avr., 17.0 cs (from 14.8 to 21.5 cs). The length of the vowel ō in the word toködu is 16.5 cs avr. (3 m distributed from 13.2 to 19.8 cs), but I did not find disyllabic words with this vowel in Schneider’s materials. On the whole, the absolute length of vowels in polysyllabic words diminishes in comparison with the length of the same vowels in disyllabic words. This is most clearly seen from the examples of words containing diphthongs: in the word geulini ‘along the oar’ the length of the diphthong eu is 28.0 cs, while in the word geula ‘on the oar’ it is 32.7 cs; moreover, the sum of the lengths of all vowels in the first word (a trisyllabic one) is equal to 49.4 cs, whereas the sum of the lengths of vowels in the disyllabic word geula is equal to 47.5 cs. And in the word moutulu ‘kerchief …’ the sum of the lengths of the vowels is 47.5 cs. Thus, the same or nearly the same quantity of the vowel length is distributed between two vowels in disyllabic words and between three vowels in trisyllabic words, whence it follows that the absolute length of the vowels in polysyllabic words must be diminishing in comparison with disyllabic ones.

According to the data of the second informant, we have an analogous picture. E.g., the length of the vowel a of the initial syllable in the word tada ‘arrow’ is 9.9 cs, while in the word tadaži ‘with the arrow’ it is 5.8 cs (2 m: from 5.0 to 6.6 cs); the length of the final vowel a in the words gida ‘spear’ and tada ‘arrow’ is equal to 8.2 cs, while the length of the final vowel a in the word bugasa ‘isle’ is 5.0 cs (2 m: 3.3 and 6.6 cs). The length of the vowel i in the word gida ‘spear’ is 8.2 cs, while in the
Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disyllabic words and translation</th>
<th>The length in centiseconds</th>
<th>Ratio $L_1/L_2$ in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel $L_1$</td>
<td>2nd vowel $L_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant № 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. kasu 'jerky'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a. kasu 'jerky'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b. kasu 'jerky'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N°N 1-1b)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. buta 'to preserve'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bono 'hail'</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. bono 'hail'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. bono 'hail'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N°N 3-3b)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. mono 'maple'</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. mono 'maple'</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b. mono 'maple'</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N°N 4-4b)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. nago 'to put back'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. nago 'to put back'</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N°N 5-5b)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. nāni 'Nanai', 'earth'</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. dūni 'four', etc.</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. geula 'on the oar'</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant № 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. gidaži 'with the spear'</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. tada 'arrow'</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. bāta 'boy'</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ánta 'southern slope of a mountain'</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a. ánta 'southern slope of a mountain'</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N°N 4-4a)</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The word gidaži ‘with the spear’ its length comprises 7.4 cs avg. (2 m: 6.6 and 8.2 cs). The sum of the lengths of the vowels in the word tada ‘arrow’ is 18.1 cs, while in the word tadaži ‘with the arrow’ it is 20.6 cs. Thus we see here the manifestation of the tendency to quantitative unification of the word although it seldom reaches its final limit.

The sum of the length of vowels in tetra-syllabic words comprised respectively: bugasadu ‘to the isle’ (5 m) 25.4 cs; gadakčaini ‘I took’ (2 m) 23.1 cs, gidatidi ‘to the spear’ (2 m) 22.4 cs; montoloko ‘wheel’ (5 m) 23.1 cs; in the word gadakčanami (4 m) we have 25.4 cs, while in tri-syllabic words (pronounced by the same second informant) we have respectively: bugasa ‘isle’ (1 m) 21.4 cs; gadami ‘he takes’ (2 m) 24.8 cs; sugasa ‘axe’ (1) 26.4 cs; gidaži ‘with the spear’ (2 m) 24.7 cs; tadaži ‘with the arrow’ 20.6 cs. Thus, the length of triteta- and penta-syllabic words tends to be equal, whence it follows that the length of sounds tends to diminish with the increase of the number of syllables in the word. Individual cases corroborate this, too, cf., e.g., tada ‘arrow’ 18.1 cs and tadaži (2 m) 20.6 cs (18.2 and 22.1).

As to disyllabic words, there are only five of them in the pronunciation of this
Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trisyllabic words and translation</th>
<th>The length in centiseconds (cs)</th>
<th>Ratio in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$L_1$</td>
<td>$L_2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informant № 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. toködu ‘to the cloud’</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a. toködu ‘to the cloud’</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b. toködu ‘to the cloud’</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N’N’№ 9-9b)</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. gəulini ‘along his oar’</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. moultulu ‘kerchief used as</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>protection against mosquitoes’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Informant № 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. bugasa ‘isle’</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a. bugasa ‘isle’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. gadami ‘he takes’, ‘gathers’</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a. gadami ‘he takes, etc.</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N’N’№ 6-6a)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. sugasa ‘axe’</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a. sugasa ‘axe’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. gidağı ‘with the spear’</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a. gidağı ‘with the spear’</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N’N’№ 8-8a)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. tadağı ‘with the arrow’</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a. tadağı ‘with the arrow’</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average (N’N’№ 9-9a)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

informant, and only two of them can be compared here: gida ‘spear’ in which the sum of the lengths of the vowels is 16.4 cs and tada ‘arrow’ 18.1 cs, while the three other examples contain long vowels in the initial syllable, and this is why we have here bigger figures: băta ‘boy’ 24.8 cs and ānta ‘southern slope ...’ (2 m) 25.6 cs. And last: in words with short (normal) vowels in both syllables as gida ‘spear’, tada ‘arrow’, the length of the second vowel is 8.2 cs, while in words with the first long vowel as băta ‘boy’, ānta ‘southern slope of a mountain’, the length of the vowel $a$ of the second syllable is equal to 5.0 cs (in individual cases even 3.3 cs), that is the length of the second vowel diminishes both absolutely and relatively. This is also a manifestation of the general tendency to a quantitative unity of the word.

RELATIVE LENGTH OF VOCALS

According to the data of the first informant, when both vowels of a disyllabic word are normal (short) and both syllables are open, the length of the second vowel invariably surpasses that of the first from 61 to 90%. But when the vowel of the initial syllable is a long one or a diphthong, then, of course, the first vowel is longer, comprising from 153 to 250% of the second.

The same tendency is registered according to the data of the second informant. There is however a difference consisting in that, according to the data of the second
Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nº</th>
<th>Words and Translation</th>
<th>Vowel length in centiseconds (cs)</th>
<th>Ratio in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(L_1)</td>
<td>(L_2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>bugasodu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a.</td>
<td>bugasodu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b.</td>
<td>bugasodu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c.</td>
<td>bugasodu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d.</td>
<td>bugasodu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>gadađanči ‘I took’</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a.</td>
<td>gadađanči ‘I took’</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>gidaditdi ‘to the spear’</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a.</td>
<td>gidaditdi ‘to the spear’</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>sigilinku ‘poker’</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>tadatidi ‘to the arrow’</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a.</td>
<td>tadatidi ‘to the arrow’</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>montołokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a.</td>
<td>montołokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b.</td>
<td>montołokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c.</td>
<td>montołokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d.</td>
<td>montołokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>gadakćanami – a participial form of the verb gadađani ‘to take’.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16a.</td>
<td>–“–</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16b.</td>
<td>–“–</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16c.</td>
<td>–“–</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (Nººº 16-16c).</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in informant, the length of the vowel of the initial syllable tends to be longer than that of the second when both vowels are short (normal).

In trisyllabic words we have the following picture according to the data of the first informant. In the word tokodu ‘to the cloud’ (3 m), the longest is the vowel of the second syllable, comprising 124% of the third, while the shortest is the vowel of the initial syllable. However in words with a long vowel or with a diphthong in the initial syllable, the picture is changed: while the second vowel is the shortest and even reduced, the longest is the vowel of the initial syllable.

According to the data of the second informant, in words with short (normal) vowels as gadami ‘he takes’ (2) sugasə ‘axe’ (1) gidaği ‘with the spear’ (2), the second vowel is the longest, while the length of the vowel of the initial syllable is either shorter or equal to that of the third vowel. And in two words we have
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Disyllabic words and translation</th>
<th>The mean tone height (Hz)</th>
<th>The interval in tones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel (t₁)</td>
<td>2nd vowel (t₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>kasu ‘jerky’</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1a</td>
<td>kasu ‘jerky’</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b</td>
<td>kasu ‘jerky’</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°N° 1–1b)</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>buta ‘to lay in’</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>bono ‘hail’</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a</td>
<td>bono ‘hail’</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b</td>
<td>bono ‘hail’</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°N° 3–3b)</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>mono ‘maple’</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a</td>
<td>mono ‘maple’</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b</td>
<td>mono ‘maple’</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°N° 4–4b)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>naga ‘to put back’</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5a</td>
<td>naga ‘to put back’</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°N° 5–5a)</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>nuni ‘Nanai’</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>duni ‘four’</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>guula ‘on the oar’</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weighted average (for 8 words/15 measurements) 222 253 −1 ½

deviations: in bugasa ‘isle’ (1) the vowel of the initial syllable is the longest, whereas the vowels of the second and third syllables are on the same level, while in tadaži ‘with the arrow’ (2), on the contrary, the vowel of the last syllable is the longest and the first vowel is the shortest.

As a rule, the deviations do not depend on the quality of the vowels.

In tetrasyllabic words we have the following picture (2nd inf.) In the word bugasadu ‘to the isle’, the second vowel is the longest, the first one is the shortest; in the words gadakčani ‘I took’ (2) and gidatidi ‘to the spear’ (2), the third vowel is the longest (i.e. the last but one), while the first vowel is the shortest (in the latter word it is equal to the second vowel). And in the word montolokto ‘wheel’, the length of the last vowel is the longest, that of the second vowel is the shortest.

In the pentasyllabic word gadakčanami (4) the longest is the last but one vowel, the shortest is the second vowel.

Thus, the general tendency is seen to pronounce the last but one vowel as the longest.
Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Disyllabic words and translation</th>
<th>The mean tone height (Hz)</th>
<th>The interval in tones (a' = 435 Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel (t₁)</td>
<td>2nd vowel (t₂)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>gida ‘spear’</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>tada ‘arrow’</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>bāta ‘boy’</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>ānta ‘southern slope of a mountain’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4a.</td>
<td>ānta ‘southern slope of a mountain’</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°N° 4–4a)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average (N°N° 1–4a)</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE TONE MOVEMENT IN WORDS

On the basis of numerical data, the tone movement in Udehe words discussed was described in the preceding (1979) article. Here I adduce the tables showing the intervals in tones between the vowels in di-, tri- and tetrasyllabic words and schemes (absent from the preceding article) of the tone movement in the words, and draw some general conclusions.

1. In disyllabic words the mean (and the maximal) tone height of the second vowel invariably surpasses that of the first according to the data of both informants. According to the first informant, weighted average for 8 words (15 measurements) comprised -1½ tones, the deviations being distributed (in measurements) from Zero (mono ‘maple’, 1 m. from 3, avr. is -½ t.) to -1¼ tones (kasu ‘jerky’, 1 m. from 3, avr. is -1½ t.). According to the second informant, weighted average for 4 words (5 m) comprised -3 tones, the deviations being from -1 tone (gida ‘spear’) to 4½ tones (ānta ‘southern slope ...’), 1 m. from 2, avr. is 3½ t.). Thus, the tonic accent in disyllabic words is more strongly marked in the speech of the second informant.

2. In trisyllabic words, according to both informants, the tone of the vowel of the final syllable also invariably surpasses those of the preceding vowels. According to the first informant, in 3 words (5 m), the mean tone of the last vowel is higher than that of the first on the average, by -1½ tones (the deviations in measurements are from -1 in geulini ‘along his oar’ to 2½ t. in tokōdu ‘to the cloud’, 1 m. from 3, avr. is -1¼ t.); the tone of the last vowel is higher than that of the second by -1 tone (the deviations being from -¾ t. in tokōdu, 1 m. from 3, to -1½ tones in moutulu ‘kerchief ...’).

According to the data of the second informant, the tone of the last vowel surpasses that of the first in 5 words (9 m), on the average, by 2½ tones (the deviations in measurements being from -¾ tone in sugasa ‘axe’, 1 m. from 2, avr. is -1¼ t.) to -3¾ tones (tadaži ‘with the arrow’, 2 m). And the mean tone of the last vowel surpasses that of the second by 3½ tones avr. (the deviations are from -¾ tone in sugasa ‘axe’, 1 m. from 2, avr. is 2½ t., to -4½ t. in tadaži, 1 m. from 2, avr. is 4 t.).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Informant No 1</th>
<th>Trisyllabic words and translation</th>
<th>The mean tone height (in Hz)</th>
<th>The Interval (in tones)</th>
<th>1st vowel</th>
<th>2nd vowel</th>
<th>3rd vowel</th>
<th>( t_1 )</th>
<th>( t_2 )</th>
<th>( t_3 )</th>
<th>( t_1/t_3 )</th>
<th>( t_2/t_3 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>toködu ‘to the cloud’</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a.</td>
<td>toködu ‘to the cloud’</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{3} )</td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{3} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9b.</td>
<td>toködu ‘to the cloud’</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{3} )</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>gølün 'along his oar'</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>236</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>moutulü ‘kerchief …’</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average for 3 words (5 meas.)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>242</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informant No 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>bugasa ‘isle’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>gødami ‘he takes’</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td>-3( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a.</td>
<td>gødami ‘he takes’</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°6-6a)</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>sugasa ‘axe’</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td>-3( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7a.</td>
<td>sugasa ‘axe’</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{4} )</td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{4} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°7-7a)</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>-( \frac{1}{4} )</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>gidaq ‘with the spear’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8a.</td>
<td>gidaq ‘with the spear’</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°8-8a)</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td>-3( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>tadaq ‘with the arrow’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-( \frac{3}{4} )</td>
<td>-3( \frac{3}{4} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9a.</td>
<td>tadaq ‘with the arrow’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-( \frac{3}{4} )</td>
<td>-4( \frac{3}{4} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N°9-9a)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>-( \frac{3}{4} )</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average for 5 words (9 measurements)</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>-( \frac{2}{3} )</td>
<td>-3( \frac{1}{2} )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we see that there is a difference between the data of the two informants, and it consists in that, if according to the first informant, the lowest is the tone of the first vowel, the data of the second informant show, in contrast to this, that the lowest is the tone of the second vowel. This circumstance can influence the character of phonetic processes, e.g., the reduction of vowels, which can more easily take place in the first vowel in the speech of the first informant, however in the second vowel according to the second informant.

3. Tetrasyllabic words were registered only in the pronunciation of the second informant. According to the average figures for 6 words (17 measurements), the mean tone of the last vowel surpasses the mean tone of the preceding vowels more than by 2 tones.

Thus, the mean tone of the last vowel is, on the average, by \(-2,1\) tones higher than that of the first, the deviations ranging from Zero (montololko ‘wheel’, 1 m. from 5, avr. is \(-1\frac{1}{3}\) t.) to \(-4\frac{3}{4}\) tones (gadakčanin ‘I took’, 1 m. from 2, avr. is \(-3\frac{3}{4}\) t.). The mean tone of the last vowel surpasses that of the second by 2,3 tones on the
Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N°</th>
<th>Tetrasyllabic words and translation</th>
<th>The mean tone height of vowels (in Hz)</th>
<th>Interval in tones (a¹ = 435 Hz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1st vowel</td>
<td>2nd vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>bugasadu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>bugasadu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10b</td>
<td>bugasadu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10c</td>
<td>bugasadu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10d</td>
<td>bugasadu ‘to the isle’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N° N° 10–10d)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>gadakčaini ‘I took’</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11a</td>
<td>gadakčaini ‘I took’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N° N° 11–11a)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>gidatidī ‘to the spear’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12a</td>
<td>gidatidī ‘to the spear’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N° N° 12–12a)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>sigilinku ‘poker’</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>tadašidī ‘to the arrow’</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14a</td>
<td>tadašidī ‘to the arrow’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N° N° 14–14a)</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>montolokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15a</td>
<td>montolokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15b</td>
<td>montolokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15c</td>
<td>montolokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15d</td>
<td>montolokto ‘wheel’</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average (N° N° 15–15d)</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Weighted average for</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

average, the deviations ranging from +1 tone (montolokto ‘wheel’, 1 m. from 5, avr. is -1½ t.) to -4½ tones (tadašidī ‘to the arrow’, 1 m. from 2, avr. is -4½ tones).

And the mean tone of the last vowel is higher than that of the third, on the average, by 2½ tones, the deviations being from Zero (montolokto ‘wheel’, 2 m. from 5, avr. is -1½ t.) to -3½ tones (gadakčaini ‘I took’, 1 m. from 2, avr. is -3½ tones).

The positive interval is registered only in 2 measurements (from 5) of the word montolokto ‘wheel’ (2nd vowel), average for the 5 measurements of this word comprising -³/₄ tones for the relations between the second and the fourth vowels.

Thus, we can draw the general conclusion that the mean tone of the last vowel, as a rule, by far surpasses the mean tones of the preceding vowels according to the data of both informants, and the same refers to the maximal tone height of vowels.

Another general regularity consists in that the highest mean tone tends to coincide with its rising movement, which is illustrated with the schemes: here the last vowel is higher in its tessiture in comparison with all other vowels of the word, and at the same time it has a strongly marked rising movement which only at the end is followed by a final fall, while the tone movement in all other vowels is, as a rule, of various character.
Khāssa and ‘āmma
On Slogans, Concepts and Social Settings in Islamic History

Jan-Olav Blichfeldt, Lund

In Arabic literature a recurrent pattern of the two antithetical terms al-khāṣṣa wa’l-‘āmma may be discerned. The terms, which also in the plural al-khawāṣṣ wa’l-‘awāmm, denote, in a general way, ‘the elite and the commonalty’ or ‘the aristocracy and the masses’. The use of these two terms, however, by both ancient and modern writers, clearly conceals a much more differentiated social reality than is evident from the terms themselves. What is, for instance, the significance of applying this pair of opposition to describe the distinction of some and particularity contrary to the rest, the commoners, or what is the social implication of the two concepts whenever applied? Or is it the aristocratic spirit of the Arabs which is to account for this dichotomy?

A thoroughly reading of the texts where the two terms appear does not, however, prove particular successful for the understanding of their usage. Ibn al-Muqaffa (d. AD 757), for instance, talks about members of the khāṣṣa understood as comprising people of merit and quality and the attitude which one should adopt towards them. Then there is the idea that khāṣṣa signifies the group containing the confidants of the rulers. Historians often mentioned persons who were closest (khāṣṣa) to the caliphs and sultans. Another and maybe related group was the persons around the ruler which had the right to intervene in the affairs of the state, as to participate in the designation of an heir or to install a new caliph by giving their oath of allegiance, bay‘at al-khāṣṣa, or sitting in the tribunal of mazālim al-khāṣṣa set up for them. The criterion and the criterion for membership or function of the members in this khāṣṣa are nevertheless ill-defined.

This confusion is maintained by modern scholars. Michael G. Morony simply states that the khāṣṣa was an elite group living with the people, ‘āmma, in the garrison cities, and that this formation was achieved by the time of Mu‘āwiya. Thereafter the author does not mention them at all. W. Montgomery Watt claims that when the Imámites think of themselves as khāṣṣa and the sunnites as the common people, ‘āmma, it is probably due to the fact the Imamite sect in its earlier form was a political party whose aim was to promote the interests of the wealthier members of the community. No explanation, then, is given for the appearance of these two terms. They seem to appear out of nowhere to describe an already existing social landscape, but apart from marking out the names of two basic groups they do not denote any group of persons or groups of interest. Once introduced, the two terms found their way into the Arabic literature but with different connotations and different functions.

In the Arabic literature the Islamic consciousness is to a large extent expressed by means of concepts or terms. Their meanings have for the most been fixed by the
Islamic theological tradition and as a consequence, rather reflect the process of shaping the system of a new cultural awareness than the actual conditions under which these terms became operative. In order then, to decode such concepts and thereby understand their transformation into the established Islamic society, it is necessary to place them within the same social context which the proper text itself is aiming at describing. Such a conceptual approach which is sociologically oriented, may also prove successful when trying to work with an overall problem. The study of Islamic institutions is particularly worth mentioning in this context. In the following we will make an attempt to decode the above mentioned antithetical pair khāṣṣa and ʿāmma. By means of the social setting in the historical literature we intend to establish their actual purport and course of transformation into the Islamic cultural history.

The word-set khāṣṣa and ʿāmma appears among the earliest features of the Arab expansion, e.g. in the so-called ridda-wars. For the sake of our argument it is necessary to outline the existing background.

In the battle of Aqrabā‘ at the end of the year 11 (633) or the beginning of 12 (633) the Medinan alliance met the last obstacle to its control of Arabia, the tribe of Hanifa under the command of Maslama b. Ḥabib. With an army of allegedly 40,000 men, who had previously engaged successfully with the Medinan forces, and an aim which apparently was to establish a trade monopoly, built on the Ḥanafis of al-yamāma and an effective control of the surrounding group of tribesmen, there can be no doubt that Maslama’s movement represented the most serious threat throughout the ridda wars. Nevertheless, when Khalid b. al-Walid and his Medinan bands of tribesmen defeated the tribe of Hanifa, we were faced with one huge tribal movement signaling to the other and non-engaged arabs to submit and participate in the future action. More important, however, were the new social layers which, as a result of the victory, were emerging. First and on the top of the pyramid, we have the ruling group which was the same as under Muhammad and was made up of by those who had faithfully served under Muhammad. With the Quranic words itself they were the ones who had been upright and done the good and rewarding deeds, such as the muhāḍarān, ansār and the tribal allies who had proven themselves reliable in thick and thin. To this group did also the stationary and influential groups from Mecca and Tā‘if belong, regardless of their previous controversies with Muḥammad. Below them were all those to whom Muḥammad had appealed for support and submission and who, when they were compelled to choose sides, had decided to back Medina against the murtaddīn. These two groups, despite their differences, were the real victors. Beneath them, forming the bottom layer, were all those Arab tribesmen who had been subjugated during the ridda wars. In contradistinction to those who had remained faithful and to whom were the rights and rewards, and the second group mentioned above, were the back benchers. They were – whatever their social standing might have been – second-class Arabs, whose designation, murtaddīn, cannot have sounded much better than the Quranic slogans kāfirun or munāfiqūn, and as such they were not permitted to re-enter the fold of the victors and so kept from any participation in the future activities, such as the coming campaigns.

It is under these very early circumstances that we first run across the pair khāṣṣa
and 'āmma. For instance, in the Kāmil of Ibn al-Athir we read wa-’rtaddat kull qabila ‘āmmatun ‘aw khāṣṣatan illā qurayshan wa-thaqīfan. Now, the term khāṣṣa apart from the above given renderings may also mean chief men. Based on the above mentioned social context, the tribal categories emerging out of the ridda wars, the passage at hand could, then, be taken to mean that apart from the qurayshi and thaqafi tribesmen, both the men of renown (khāṣṣa) and all the others ('āmma) seceded from the Medinan alliance. Still, there were those who kept themselves aloof or even decided to remain within the fold of Medina. In Muslim historiography they have also been designated as the khawāṣṣ the men of fame’, despite the fact that most of them did not belong to the Arab chieftainry. Indeed, they were considered so because they had supported the new movement in word and action. Such a case we have among the banū Ghaṭafān about which we read that they (i. e. the tribe) withdrew their pledge of allegiance “except those who were among the braver and prominent men without social standing”. Behind the term khāṣṣa we thus find that it, at this crucial moment of melting rhetorical slogans into hard hammered socio-politico concepts, conveys two distinct groups of people. On the one hand we find the traditional meaning of the Arabs of rank and social leadership as opposed to the tribal group; and on the other, the new group of fame, containing the less-to-do who had chosen to stand with the people of Mecca, Medina and Tā’if.

As the new Muslim state expanded its territory in the north, the heros of Aqrabā’ and core of the fighting tribesmen became known under their newly won name of social class, al- khawāṣṣ. In this capacity, they appeared as and represented, in spite of their low or insignificant tribal standing, the new political elite. On a level with other arabic terms of old, then, al-khāṣṣa was given a new meaning covering the loyal members of the Medinan community.

Once rooted the term developed further. During the controversy over the governor of Kūfa, al-Walīd b. ‘Uqba b. Abī Mu‘ayt, governor between 646 – 649, Sayf b. ‘Umar reports that the ‘āmma was supporting al-Walīd while the khāṣṣa were against him.11 In the broadest sense, Sayf’s use here of the term khāṣṣa should be taken to mean the early comers to the town, i. e. the very same group of tribesmen who had fought victoriously at Aqrabā’ and later at Qādisiyya and who now enjoyed all privileges promised. But more particularly it covered those who represented the groups whose socio-genealogical standing was insignificant and relatively speaking, small in numbers. Fearing al-Walīd’s increasing control and his introduction of measures to ensure the murtaddūn their shares of the conquest, they began to defend their newly acquired privileges. They succeeded in troddling al-Walīd and, as time went by, succeeded in establishing themselves as the channel for various kinds of oppositional agitation. By the term ‘āmma, on the other hand, Sayf b. ‘Umar meant all sort of people including the ‘apostates’, the murtaddūn, who did not sit on these privileges and whose socio-economic situation al-Walīd tried to improve at the expense of the khāṣṣa’s.12 It is hardly surprising why the khāṣṣa, the earlycomers with seniority and maximum stipends, sharaf al-ātā, were agressed by al-Walīd.13

Again it is the same khāṣṣa group that ‘Aisha adresses to give her and her Meccan companions support in her struggle against ‘Alī, which was eventually
leading of to the battle of the Camel (AD 656). As it turned out, however, these khawāṣṣ were among ‘Ali’s strongest back-ups in his struggle for the leadership and remained so even after his death.

As the political culture developed in the new Muslim state so did the designation of khāṣṣa and ‘āmma. This was not the least due to the men known as the khawāṣṣ. In the town of Kūfā, for instance, these people more and more frequently fell out with the local authorities there. The reason for this was the same as under al-Walīd b. ‘Uqba; the increasing member of measures to balance their social and economic benefits with the demands of the growing members of the immigrating Arabs from the south, the so-called newcomers or ar-rāwāḍif. The solution of the political activism of the khāṣṣa came with the killing of al-Ḥusayn. They were no longer a loose group struggling for their own claims by revenging the murder, the dam al-Ḥusayn. Their first opportunity that presented itself was to join the revolutionary movement of Sulayman b. Șurad, but he neither had the vision nor the practical knack to implement the aspirations of the khawāṣṣ. So when Ibn Șurad and a group of his companions fell fighting a 30,000 strong Syrian army at ‘Ayn al-Warda in 684, the movement faded away. Not long afterwards, however, they found the right man to support. His name was al-Mukhtār b. Abī ‘Ubayd ath-Thaqafi, and he had arrived in Kūfā just to build up a general dissident movement through the Kufan khāṣṣa as a nucleus. He claimed to be a representative of one Muhammad b. al-Ḥanafiyya, who was the son of another spouse of ‘Ali than Fāṭima. He was his confidant (amīn), helper (wazīr) and commander (amīr). Now, when a group of people in Kūfā wanted to assure themselves of the sincerity of al-Mukhtār’s claim they went to Ibn Ḥanafiyya himself and asked him about his support. There, during the conversation Ibn Ḥanafiyya is reported to have said wa ‘āmma-l-musiba bi-Ḥusayn fa-qad khaṣṣat ‘ahlāhū wa-‘ammat al-muslimīn, “regarding the disaster of al-Ḥusayn being murdered, may this deed bestow special honours upon his people and may it prevail among the muslims”.

We are here able to have a glimpse of a new stage of development. The khāṣṣa, and the ‘āmma for that matter, are no longer terms covering social groups, but reflects the initial efforts under way to formulate some principle relation between the ruling class or the class of merit and the others – a discussion which would characterize the emerging Muslim society in the decades to come. Indeed, we can here witness how the slogans so abundantly represented in the Quran and the earliest historical records, are transformed and rooted in the society, its social practice. First then, and only then, acting upon the social forces, it was possible to create institutions, and setting up the elements of a new way of functioning. But all this in view of the social datum. It is significant that it is the movement of the khawāṣṣ utilized and directed by al-Mukhtār, that may be considered the actual forerunners of the ṣaḥ’a.

This new concept of the antithetical set khāṣṣa and ‘āmma was not in any way restricted to the political milieu of Iraq. Once in motion it was admitted into the melting of sunni islam. Thus it was taken to design the category of the special privileges, khaṣṣa‘is, of the Prophet. Originally the term originated in connection with the discussion over what should be the normative principle in the Muslim’s
life. Already at the end of the first Muslim century the principle that was formed was that the sunna was to be the judge of the Quran and not vice versa. The problem here was that in several hadiths there were decisions of the Prophet which later traditionists, such as az-Zuhri (d. 741), considered too faulty in the sense of being too lenient, to have general application. Thus his special privileges (al-khāṣṣa) as a prophet stood in contradistinction to the sunna, (al-‘ūmma), the applicable norm in general. This concept is often repeated. The khasāiṣ of the Prophet in their older versions do not attribute particular powers to the Prophet but point rather to his religious and social life where certain limitations are waived for him, or they deal with favours which were shown to him before all other men. He was not to be distinguished more than other prophets. There were only two points concerning his personal capacities: that in contrast to other prophets he was not sent to only one nation but to mankind as a whole, and that he alone could be intercessor with God on behalf of his believers. As time went on, however, the khasāiṣ of the Prophet were extended. His strictly personal privileges, as for instance, in the matter of polygamy, did definitely place him above the common law. An even further development of this concept of the khāṣṣa may be viewed in the popular concept of Muḥammad’s prophethood.

It is not the purpose of this paper to give a full scale picture of the concepts. We will, however, point out its frequent usage as a technical expression distinguishing the exclusive from the common. For instance, al-Mawardi distinguishes between two types of judgeship: one in which the authority is general and absolute, ‘ʿūmma muṭlaqa, and the other in which the authority is special and limited, khāṣṣa. The chief duty of the qāḍi of the first class consisting in deciding cases, acting as guardian for orphans and minors, administering pious foundations and imposing punishment to mention some, while the second class judges had their power restricted in accordance with the record of appointment from his superior, the caliph, wazīr or governor.

Another example is found in the Safavid administration system. Due to small and inadequate amount of cash in the royal treasury the shāh ‘Abbās the Great (1588–1629), to be able to maintain a standing army of some 40 000 men, had to divide vertically a number of mamālīk or ‘ʿūmma, i.e. ‘state’ provinces into khāṣṣa or crown provinces to relocate the country’s treasures.

It is hardly surprising to see that the set khāṣṣa and ‘ʿūmma has reached its fullest development within the shīʿa. Here it formed an intrinsic part of other notions such as taqiya, ‘dissimulation’, the practice of hiding or denying one’s true beliefs, zāhir and bāṭin, literally ‘outside’ and ‘inside’, usually translated ‘exoteric’ and ‘esoteric’, and taʾwil, customarily translated as ‘allegorical interpretation’. In short, it contains the idea that those initiated into this particular system of beliefs, form an elite (khāṣṣa) to whom alone that system can be reaveled, and that the majority of Muslims form a misled and unenlightened mass (ʿūmma). With the social context remaining structurally unchanged the set khāṣṣa and ‘ʿūmma is still intact, significantly representing notions central to shīʿa. As to the actual context it was adjusted to its new function. Thus, all the shīʿa, designates themself as khāṣṣa being distinguished not so much by past merits as by having close ‘proximity’ to the sunna.
of the Prophet. The ‘āmma, on the other hand, were the commoners or the other Muslims. Sailing in the past to recognize the men of priority, ahl as-sabiqa\(^9\), the other Muslims were nothing but inferior masses unable to understand the claim and status of the khāwaṣṣ.

A final aspect of the antithetic terms khāṣṣa and ‘āmma is the scheme of correspondence between this lower and higher world upon which we shall, in this context, refrain from commenting.

The present paper has tried to demonstrate the significance of socio-political concepts as a wheel to uncover important and vital aspects in early Islamic history. Furthermore, it shows the significance of applying a sociological framework in analyzing such concepts in order to understand the forces at work, the scenery and the nature of cultural transmission. As to the study of this particular set of terms, it is evident that a fully appreciation of concepts such as these can only be achieved from studying the cultural inside.

The application of khāṣṣa and ‘āmma in Kūfa was no doubt essential to the formation of the Islamic self-expression.

NOTES
2. As such, they were called wuzara', ʿumāra, ʿumānā, and awsiya’.
4. W. Montgomery Watt, The Majesty that was Islam, p. 171.
5. See for instance, the treatment of al-gurrah, the so-called ‘qurānic reciters’, in J-O Blichfeldt, Early Mahdism, p. 81ff.
10. wa-riidat Ghuṭṭān ʾillā mā kānā min ʿashdījā wa-khwawṣṣ min al-afnā ( = min ʿafnā an-nās) ,
    - At-Tabari, Tariikh, I: 1871.
11. At-Tabari, Tariikh, I: 2849.
13. At-Tabari, Tariikh, I: 2849; also 2813, 2840, 2850.
15. At-Tabari, Tariikh, II: 534.
19. R. Savory, Iran under the Safavids, p. 184.
20. The heterogenous nature of this elite is reflected in the different terms used for its members, such as wudājah, ‘outstanding people’ and sulahā, ‘upright people’. In a historical perspective it is evident that these terms have their bases in the daʿwa culture of the Quran.
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Remarks on Poetical Functions of the Genitive in Some Northwestern Semitic Poetry

KERSTIN EKSELL, Stockholm

Few syntactic relationships are as vague and elusive as the one between a noun and its genitival modifier. It is hardly possible to limitate its potential semantic functions to a few basic patterns. On the contrary, the very richness of varieties seems to be a true and elementary property of the genitive and different logical categorizations of the type of relationship will be simultaneously valid. During my studies of ancient Semitic poetry, I soon found that the poetical function of the genitive emerged as an independant phenomenon of importance and complexity. The following remarks are as yet somewhat preliminary but present essential qualities of the poetical genitive in a few selected texts from Hebrew, Ugaritic and Mandaic.

Syntactically, a genitival relationship in Semitic is characterized by the juxtaposition of two nouns, the second noun being the genitival modifier of the first one. The juxtaposition is obligatory and a number of rules defines the two terms as inseparable from each other. Even if analytic genitive markers are used, such as the *d* in Mandaic, this does not really alter the logical vicinity of the two terms of the construction.

In contrast to the severity of the word order, the semantic connection between the two terms is remarkably unstable and wide. The modifier preserves its status as a substantive, instead of changing into an adjective, and the two terms remain separate entities. If the modifier is abstract or denotes a quality, the noun may seem to fuse partly with the modifier, but in principle, the genitival relationship establishes a forced and temporary connection between two equally independant concepts. Furthermore, the semantic types that may potentially occur as nouns or as modifiers are probably innumerable, i.e., the genitival relationship itself does not generate patterns of combination. This vagueness in the construction acts as an encouragement towards semantic innovations. Since it is strongly at variance with the dense and economical word order, a contrast arises between the semantic and the syntactic levels of the construction and consequently, genitival relationships are always characterized by a dynamic tension.

More often than not, the genitival relationship contains a verbal potential: it denotes or connotes an action or an activity taking place and does so in a condensed or elliptic way. This is of course very clear when the noun is an infinitive or a participle and the genitive is used to express an action influencing an object or an action being carried out by an agent. But the genitival relationship has a potential of process or action which goes beyond that. Brooke-Rose says: "All Genitive relationships are activity relationships ..."1 and: "This genitival or provenance relationship between the two nouns is essentially a verbal one ... the preposition of or whatever other link is used, stands for a verbal idea which can also be expressed verbally"2. The verbal potential is perhaps most easily discernable when the mod-
ifier is animate and preferably individual: an individ is always a potential agent and his relationship to the noun will be one of control—he possesses or masters or produces or whatever the noun. Relationships denoting place may also be rather obviously verbal, either because the existence of something in something else connotes an impression of movement, or because a part of the whole may form a hierarchical contrast similar to a relationship of possession.

On the syntacto-semantic level, relevant logical principles underlying different genitival constructions are discussed in a very stimulating way by Helmut Gätje in “Strukturen der Genitivverbindung: Untersuchungen am arabischen Genitiv”. Gätje also refers to Reckendorf, who already in 1895 made his well-known attempt to structure genitival relationships in Arabic into corresponding sentence patterns3. Comparing Gätje’s conclusions p. 72f. with the paragraph above, it would seem that genitival relationships with a /strong/ verbal potential at least roughly correspond to those falling into Gätje’s logical category of “spezifischer ontologischer Relation”, i.e., relationships in which the two terms do not assume “Teilidentität” but maintain a “limitativer Divärsität”4.

For the purpose of the present study, I shall also make use of a small group of opposites in order to establish a spatial orientation between the two terms of any genitival construction. Moving from syntax to semantics proper, I have found the following contrasts to be operative:

- concrete versus abstract
- animate versus inanimate
- narrow versus wide

Both the noun and the modifier may be qualified by either of these concepts and all three bilinear pairs may be simultaneously applicable to one genitival construction.

To these pairs we shall add a fourth one:

- vicinity versus distance

This qualification is of a different character, since it does not describe the terms as such but the relationship between them. If the two terms belong to the same domain of thought and share the same qualifications, their relationship is one of vicinity, and if the terms are widely apart semantically, their relationship is one of distance.

Every conceivable genitival construction is of course not poetical. We want the poetical effect to be more specific and agreeable and somehow striking because it mixes the familiar with the unexpected. A poetical genitive is deliberately chosen by the poet for aesthetical reasons, whereas an abundance of genitives is produced merely in order to give information. Since these remarks deal with poetical functions, many general aspects of the genitive will not be considered any further5. At present, I also have to omit the interesting study of poetical genitives as part of the structure of the whole poem, since this would necessitate an extensive analysis of the poetry in question. Thus, the attention is focused on the poetics of the genitival relationships per se.
The material consists of the poetical texts of Isaiah, the Song of Deborah (Judges, ch. 5), part of the Keret legend and the short poem “Nikkal and the Kathirat” edited by Driver, and Lidzbarski’s edition of “Mandäische Liturgien”. The choice of material may seem arbitrary but could hardly be otherwise. However, there is quite a satisfying number of genitives in all the texts and the findings show a certain consistency. The corpus of genitives amounts to about 350 phrases, most of them from Isaiah. Constructions with pronominal suffixes as the second term are not included in this study, but it may be noted that such constructions are extremely frequent and of poetical importance. They have the same function as constructions with an animate modifying noun but the effect is weaker because of the shortness of the suffix and its weak semantic load. On the other hand, the suffix constructions occur more frequently, since it is easier to insert a suffix in a short line than to insert the more expansive noun. — More than 75% of the corpus belong to one of the three types of genitival relationships described below. The remaining examples are scattered among several other types, some of which are diffuse and others rather too conventional to be of interest, e.g. constructions with numerals.

CONSTRUCTIONS WITH AN ANIMATE MODIFIER

The modifier is a person, an inanimate object personified, or a deity. This person or personification somehow dominates, controls or directs the noun. The poetical function generally is to increase the vivacity by creating an impression of verbal activity and to do this in a dynamical way because the relationship is expressed in the dense, economical construction of two juxtaposed terms. Secondary effects may be achieved depending on the semantic load of each specific construction.

In the song of Deborah, this acting modifier is often the name of a hero, a legendary person or someone of historical importance:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bimē šamgar bān-wnāt} & \quad \text{(In the days of Shamgar the son of Anath, in the days of Jael)} \\
\text{bimē yāḇēl} & \quad \text{(Judg. 5:6)} \\
\text{biplaggōt r'ūbēn} & \quad \text{(For the divisions of Reuben there were great thoughts of heart)} \\
\text{g'dōlim hiq'qē-leb} & \quad \text{(Judg. 5:15)} \\
\text{t'ēbōrak minnāsim yāḇēl} & \quad \text{(blessed above women shall Jael the wife of heber the benite be)} \\
\text{'ēset hēbēr hāqqēnī} & \quad \text{(Judg. 5:24)}
\end{align*}
\]

The nouns of these constructions are common and neutral words. The phrase is coloured by the modifier which is specific and individual. All those names serve a main purpose of the song which is to glorify this event and its heroes in the history of Israel. The treatment of names is similar to the one in memorial inscriptions. Names of places are used analogously, to colour a neutral noun and to emphasize the historical importance of those places, making them “coagents” in the epos:

\[
\text{b'sād'kā miś'sē dē 'dōm} \quad \text{(when thou marchedst out of the field of Edom)}
\] (Judg. 5:4)
A frequent device is to make deities appear as genitival modifiers. Not only do the gods in this way seem to perform as human agents in the mortal world – as indeed they usually do in all those texts – but the genitival construction forms a bridge between the material noun of this world and the god transcending from spiritual spheres:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'áz nilh'mú malké k'na'zan</td>
<td>(then fought the kings of Canaan in Taanach by the)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b'ta ḫnák al-mé m'giddō</td>
<td>waters of Megiddo )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Judg. 5:19)

Incidentally, we note that the first genitive in the passage is the second member of a climactically organized parallelism and that the second and third genitives balance each others as members of another parallelism; the phenomenon is important but outside the scope of this study, since it belongs to the structure of the poem.

The main theme in the passage is the weeping of Keret. The poet describes the weeping and asks for the reasons. The elaborate answer follows in a way vaguely paralleling the question. However, by using the genitive, the poet introduces a secondary theme, that of the acting god. The nouns of the genitival constructions apply to Keret himself: he is a “servitor” and he may demand a “kingship” or a “dominion”. The genitival modifiers “El”, “the bull your father”, “the father of mankind” are not really necessary for the main course of events but they help to broaden the perspective, to vitalize and colour the image and to create the impression of yet another figure moving about in the narrative, this figure furthermore being as strong and powerful as a bull.

In Mandaic poetry, the combination of a noun from the material world with a modifier from the spiritual world is extraordinarily common and reflects gnostic principles of Mandaism. Here are two charming examples of a personified divine spirit:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pindur kušta</td>
<td>(die Zither der Kušṭā) (Li. 221)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zuadia kušta</td>
<td>(/die/ Reisezehrung der Kušṭā) (Li. 161)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The precise concreteness of the nouns produce a pregnant and intimate vision and supports the impression of an active modifier. All personifications, divine or not, serve to increase the vivacity of the image. Constructions such as the following are frequent in Mandaic poetry:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qalaiun d mia hiia</td>
<td>(die Stimme des lebenden Wassers) (Li. 187)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nsibta d hiia</td>
<td>(die Pflanzung des Lebens) (Li. 219)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bit kukkan</td>
<td>(/das Haus/ der Sterne) (Li. 201)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
bit tabia (/das Haus/ der Guten) (Li 197)

In the first examples, the modifiers are personifications of divine spirits or principles and the genitival relationship connects the material with the spiritual. In the last example, the modifying, plural/collective noun replaces an adjective and the construction corresponds to a noun + attribute: “the good house”. The use of persons instead of an adjective makes the expression more vivid; the scene is not blank and immovable as it would have been with an adjective but connotes a crowding of active individuals.

In the text of Isaiah, the conscious elaboration and the richness of vocabulary and rhetorical devices facilitate extensive variations of genitival constructions. To substitute a genitival modifier denoting individuals for an adjectival attribute is a beloved method and the effect is always one of increased activity and vivacity, a crowd of persons acting or moving:

\[
\text{zera}^\text{e}_{\text{m}'\text{re}^\text{e}^\text{im}}} \quad \text{(a seed of evildoers) (Isa. 1:4)} \\
\text{b'ar}^\text{e}\text{aes} \text{ha'hayyim} \quad \text{(in the land of the living) (Isa. 38:11)}
\]

A special case is the type of construction “son of those”. The noun in this type has a very light semantic load and leads to the modifier which is broad and colourful:

\[
\text{ben-}'\text{kamim} \quad \text{(the son of the wise) (Isa. 19:11)} \\
\text{ben- malk}^\text{e-qedem} \quad \text{(the son of ancient kings) (Isa. 19:11)}
\]

If the modifier is a single individual, the image appears to be at a closer range:

\[
\text{k'sire- yuleda} \quad \text{(as the pangs of a woman who travaileth)} \\
\text{(Isa. 21:3)}
\]

Numerous are the constructions in which God is the modifier, with a concrete or an abstract noun:

\[
\text{k'gan- Ywhh} \quad \text{(like the garden of the LORD) (Isa. 31:3)} \\
\text{uk'bod Ywhh} \quad \text{(and the glory of the LORD) (Isa. 60:1)}
\]

An adjectival expression, e.g. “the divine glory”, could never give this vivid impression of an active God constantly and directly interfering with the destiny of man in the material world.

An intense degree of action is implied in the following metaphorical expressions with an inanimate modifier treated as animate:

\[
\text{hem}^\text{eh} \text{app}^\text{o} \quad \text{(the fury of his anger) (Isa. 42:25)} \\
\text{wak'ezuz milham}^\text{a} \quad \text{(and the strength of battle) (Isa. 42:25)}
\]

The constructions are very similar to corresponding verbal phrases such as “his fury is burning”; “the battle is raging”. These metaphors have become worn out after
centuries of use. In this ancient poetry, however, they are not frequent from the beginning, even if we occasionally meet early examples:

šd ddh  
(the fields of her love) (Nikkal. 23)

CONSTRUCTIONS WITH AN ABSTRACT MODIFIER

This type is quite homogenous. The modifier is a noun categorically denoting a quality which might otherwise be expressed by an adjective. The verbal potential of this construction is small. The poetical function is defined by the opposite pairs listed above. Generally, there is a great difference historically with regard to its use. The type does not occur in the oldest texts examined here, the Ugaritic texts and the song of Deborah. In plain contrast to this, the type is abundant both in Isaiah and in Mandaic poetry. The modern reader will find it familiar and associate it with the Bible or any Christian text.

The most delightful of these constructions are some examples from Isaiah:

qaw-tōhū  
(the line of confusion) (Isa. 34:11)
weʿabnē-bōhū  
(the stones of emptiness) (Isa. 34:11)
bkūr sōnī  
(in the furnace of affliction) (Isa. 48:10)
bigdē nāqām  
(the garments of vengeance) (Isa. 59:17)
wkūbašt yśūša  
(and an helmet of salvation) (Isa. 59:17)

The poetical effect arises from a complex set of contrasts between the semantic loads of noun and modifier. The noun is concrete, narrow, very neat and precise, whereas the modifier is abstract and as wide as possible, since it denotes the category. Furthermore, the semantic domains of noun and modifier respectively are completely different from each other. The distance between the two terms is consequently extreme.

The construction is well established also in Mandaic poetry. However, due to a general poverty of vocabulary, it does not occur with the same poetical richness as in the Bible:

akla d ziua  
(eine Keule des Glanzes) (Li. 185)
ainia d šqra  
(Augen der Lüge) (Li. 198)
baba d nhura  
(das Tör des Lichtes) (Li. 193)
arqa d nhura  
(dis Lichterde) (Li. 253)
alma d hašuka  
(die Welt der Finsternis) (Li 159)

When the categorical modifier is added to a less precise or even abstract noun, the dynamic contrasts between the two terms is considerably weakened:

yōm nāqām  
(the day of ... vengeance) (Isa. 34:8)
ūfrūah mišpāṭ  
(and for a spirit of judgment) (Isa. 28:6)
FRAGMENTARIZED CONSTRUCTIONS

The third type of genitival construction to be treated here is what I call the genitive of fragmentarization. In its purest form, it is easily identifiable and closely related to the rhetorical figures of metonymy and synecdoche. Fragmentarization means that a concept of thought is split up into two terms, the concept itself being transformed into a genitival modifier and the first term of the new construction produced out of the same or neighbouring semantic domain. The dynamics of this construction is not very strong, nor is there any apparent verbal potential. However, the image thus brought into existence is considerably more vivid than the original single noun:

'āz tippāqāhānā ʾēnē ṣiwōrm (then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the
ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the
lame man leap as an hart, and the tongue of the
dumb sing.) (Isa. 35:5–6)

The simple information conveyed is that the blind ones shall see, the deaf ones shall hear, the lame ones shall jump and the dumb ones shall talk. By fragmentarizing the subjects into “eyes of the blind”, “ears of the deaf” and “tongue of the dumb”, the attention is focused on the precise and detailed nouns which colour and vitalize the image. An artificial contrast is created between the noun and the modifier, a kind of partitive genitive, since the noun is narrower than the modifier and from the same semantic domain.

In Isaiah 34:6, a sacrifice of animals is dramatized by the separation of “blood” and “kidneys” from the larger concepts of the animals in question:

middam kārīm wēqattūdim (with the blood of lambs and goats, with the fat of
meḥēlēb kilyōt ʾēlim the kidneys of rams) (Isa. 34:6)

How vivid and precise is the image of treasures carried

ʾal-kætæp ʾwarīm (upon the shoulders of young asses …
wēqal-dabbæsæt ʾgarmallim upon the bunches of camels) (Isa. 30:6)

Qualities may also be extracted. In the following examples, the negative impression is strengthened by fragmentarization:

gēqōn zēdim (the arrogance of the proud …
wēqagēwat ʾqārīsim and the haughtiness of the terrible) (Isa. 13:11)

Compare also the fragmentarizations in the vivid scene depicted in the Song of Deborah:

ʾiqbē-sūs (the horseshoofs) (Judg. 5:22)
pāʾmē markʾbōtāw (the wheels of his chariot) (Judg. 5:28)
Frequently, fragmentarization is used to visualize a territory or an architectural space by focusing on one of its details:

bšašrē šč ōl (to the gates of the grave) (Isa. 38:10)
bḥašrōṭ qodši (in the courts of my holiness) (Isa. 62:9)

Similarly from the Keret legend:

\[\text{‘rb}. hzl. hmt| (enter [the shade of the tent]) \]
\[\text{w}. l.lzr./mg/dl. rkb\]
\[tkmm. hmt[t.\]

\(\text{‘Go up ‘on to /the top of/ the tower.}\)
\(\text{‘and mount}\)
\(\text{‘the shoulder of the wall}\)

(Keret lii 21–22; p. 29, n. 14)

This detailed description is typical of the style of the poem: general and wide concepts are avoided, while narrow, precise and concrete concepts are richly used.

In the following similes, the mere mentioning of the goddesses’ names would have been sufficient to connote the significances of “grace” and “fairness”, but the elaboration lends colour to the images:

dk. n’m. ‘nt. n’mh (whose grace (is) as the grace of Anat)
km. tsm. ‘ttrt. ts[m]h (and) her fairness as the fairness of Athtart)

(Keret liii 41 f)

From Mandaic poetry, we may note two examples of constructions with parts of the body:

bšušraiun d tarmidai (im Sinne meiner Jünger) (Li. 198)
šudna d bhrai (Ohr meiner Auserwählten) (Li. 218)

The following examples are typical of Mandaic liturgical vocabulary and perhaps best regarded as borderline cases; the “radiance” is an inherent quality of those “wells” and this “staff”:

ziuahi d ainaniata (der Glanz der Quellen) (Li. 236)
ziu d margna
š manda d hiaa (/der/ Glanz des Stabes des M.) (Li. 238)

THE GENITIVE OF MATERIAL

Finally, I shall make two brief comments on constructions with a genitival modifier denoting the material of the noun. These constructions are very common. Prepositions are often used instead of the syntactic genitive. Closely resembling genitive
constructions are prepositional phrases used as nominal predicates or, rarely, as adverbs or objects of verbs of change.

First, this type of genitive may function as a fragmentarization:

.ēb.éeqné. sp. trml. (gems of sapphire bowls of onyx (?))
(Keret I iii 43 f.)
.ālp ksp.wrbt ḥ̱~rš. (a thousand (pieces)² of silver and ten thousand
(pieces) of gold.)
(Nikkal ... 20 f.)

The examples show the expected preference for an abundance of concrete details.

Secondly and more important, there is a similarity between the genitive of material and genitives with an abstract modifier. There is the same ability to produce striking contrasts between noun and modifier and of connecting two different concepts in an unexpected and delightful way. Although much – and sometimes most – of the poetical effect is derived from the semantic load itself, some of the effect is liable to arise from the linking of the two terms to each other.

In the following example, the effect is produced by the distance between the semantic loads: the noun denotes something which is heavy, concrete, thick and metallic, whereas the modifier has rather an abstract quality of radiance, colour and lightness:

šuslatah ū nura (die Ketten des Feuers) (Li. 259)

The examples below are mixed: noun + genitival modifier, noun + prepositional phrase, subject or object noun + nominal predicate. The poetical function of all of them is derived from two precise, narrow, concrete terms unexpectedly connected into one image:

kēmar middāli (as a drop of a bucket ...)
ukēshaq m awareness
kēsukkē bēkēram (as a cottage in a vineyard, as a lodge
kimlūnē bēmiqšā in a garden of cucumbers)

knife barzel  ClassNotFoundException (thy neck is an iron sinew, and thy
ūmīshēkā nēkhūsa brow brass)

wēkittētū ū harbotām lēittim (and they shall beat their swords into plowshares,
waḥnītōtēhām lēmāzmerōt and their spears into pruninghooks)
(Isa. 2:4)

NOTES
1. Brooke-Rose p. 149.
2. ibid. p. 147.
3. Reckendorf, “Die Syntaktischen Verhältnisse ...”
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Über einige hebräische Verben des Sprechens –
Etymologie und Metapher

MATS ESKHULT, Uppsala


Wenn im folgenden die Etymologie einiger Verben des Sprechens diskutiert wird – und dabei auch einer Anzahl mehr oder weniger erblaster Metaphern für die Rede –, so ist der Zweck hiermit nachzuweisen, daß eine noch lebendige Metapher ein gewisses Licht über noch unklare Etymologien werfen mag, und daß sogar durch dieses Verfahren einer gewissen Etymologie vor einer anderen der Vorzug gegeben werden kann.

direkter oder indirekter Rede, zu bezeichnen. Also heißt es waydabber... wayyōmar und waydabber... læmor ‘er redete... und sagte’ bzw. ‘er redete... also’; und in ähnlicher Weise begegnet es nach Verben wie qārā ‘rufen’, ‘ānā ‘antworten’, higgid ‘mitteilen’, šā‘al ‘fragen’ und šiwwā ‘befehlen’. Nie bedeutet ‘āmar ‘sagen’ ohne Angabe des Mitgeteilten (HAL). Es gibt also einen Unterschied zwischen ‘āmar und dibbār, nämlich daß bei ‘āmar das, was gesagt wird gewöhnlicherweise folgt, was bei dibbār gar nicht notwendig ist. Derselbe Unterschied zwischen Verben, die die Tätigkeit des Sprechens hervorheben, und denjenigen, die eher das Resultat des Sprechens als die Tätigkeit bezeichnen, begegnet uns in verschiedenen Sprachen, z.B. griechisch λαλεῖν und λέγειν, lateinisch loqui und dicere, englisch speak und say und deutsch reden und sagen. Es gibt aber, auch wenn diese Aufteilung im großen und ganzen zutrifft, einige Verben, die teilweise beide Sinne decken, wie z.B. sprechen, welches Verb zu Luthers Zeit oft bei direkter und indirekter Rede verwendet wurde.

Bei sipper ‘berichten, erzählen’ ist die Bedeutung ‘abzählen’ (im Qal sogar ‘zählen’) völlig lebendig; vgl. englisch count und recount. Es ist indessen von gewissem Interesse zu bemerken, daß das Erzählen auf hebräisch eigentlich ein Abzählen der verschiedenen Einzelheiten eines Hergangs bezeichnet.


fgären lassen' – nur in Spr. 1:23 'abbī‘ā lākām rūḥī 'ich will über euch strömen lassen meinen Geist' kaum metaphorisch). Ähnlich rāḥās 'wimmeln, brodeln', nur in Ps. 45:2 belegt: rāḥās libbī dābār tōb 'mein Herz siedet vor gutem Wort',12 wo das Bild eher Bezug auf den Strom des in Worten gekleideten Gedankens hat als auf die Bewegung der Lippen, auch wenn rḥs in nachbiblischer Zeit in solchen Wendungen vorkommt.13 Weiter mag nāzal 'rinnen'14 angeführt werden; von den 18 Belegstellen sind jedenfalls zwei metaphorisch: Deut. 32:2 tizzal kaṭṭal 'imrātī meine Rede riesele wie Tau' und HL. 4:16 yizzalū ḫṣāmāw 'der Duft seiner Gewürze ströme'.15 Eine arabische Analogie findet sich überdies in saffāh 'shredder of much blood', und auch 'fluent in speech'.16

Kehren wir jetzt zu higgid zurück, scheint es, als wäre die Etymologie nicht abgeklärt worden. Gewöhnlich schlagen Lexika eine Grundbedeutung wie etwa »eine Sache hoch und deutlich vor jmd hinstellen« vor17 – und haben wohl dann arabisch nagāda 'ul 'was, or became, apparent, manifest, conspicuous, or plain' und nagādīq, nagādīh, or elevated, land or country' im Sinn;18 oder es wird eher an hebr. nagaqd (eigentlich) das Gegenüber gedacht, weshalb also »jmd mit etwas konfrontieren« vorgeschlagen wird. Für die erstere Sprachsprache spricht u.a. die Wendung habeserik millin (in Hiob) 'Worte aufreihen', auch elliptisch, ohne Objekt, vorkommend (vgl. BDB s.v. 'rk 1f), für die letztere – wenn man nagaqd eine ursprüngliche Bedeutung, Vorderseite, Gesicht' zuschreibt19 – die Tatsache, daß viele verba denominativa von Worten für Körperteile gebildet sind (habesrin 'hören' – 'ozan 'Ohr', 'anef 'zürnen' – 'af 'Nase').20 Es ist jedoch völlig möglich, higgid (ngd) vom gemeinsamstädtischen ngd ziehen, führen abzuleiten: syrisch nqgād el po. 'ziehen, führen', nágōdā 'Führer', jūd. – aramäisch 'ziehen, leiten; nachfolgen' und auch 'fließen' (von Honig),21 luth. nqagad 'go on a journey, travel; travel on business, trade, go on pilgrimage, go abroad'.22 Offenbar ist dies auch die Ansicht von Jean-Hoftijzer (DISO), denn hier wird das Reichsaramäische Qal ptc pass nqidh 'decrét, rapporté' der Wurzel ngd = 'trainer' zugeteilt, während ngd 'officier' (Sefire III 10) von einem homonymen ngd abgeleitet wird.23 So können wir also vielleicht für higgid eine Entwicklung 'ziehen, führen' > 'anführen, vorbringen, berichten' ansetzen.24

Wenn möglicherweise bei higgid im entfernten ein Bild vom Vorbringen der Worte (oder des Wortschwalles) erkennbar ist, wie verhält es sich mit dībbār 'reden'? Dieses Verb bezeichnet, wie oben gesagt wurde, die Rede als solche und nicht in besonders hohem Grade den gedanklichen Inhalt des Geredeten. Deshalb könnte man sich denken, daß etymologisch mit einer ursprünglich mehr oder weniger lautmalenden Beschreibung der Rede zu rechnen wäre, wie etwa griechisch λαλεῖν klassisch 'plaudern', aber später 'reden', und russisch govorit 'speak with altkirchenl. goborī 'Lärm machen' zu vergleichen.25 In dieser Weise leitet HAL, zwar mit Vorbehalt, dbr11 'reden' von lautmalendem 'summen' ab, vgl. dxbārī 'Biene'. Unter dbr1 dagegen werden arabisch dabara 'hinten sein, IV 'den Rücken (dabr-) kehren', und das gemeinaramäische dbr 'führen, treiben' gestellt. Andere Lösungsvorschläge fehlen allerdings nicht. Zu nennen ist z.B. der von G. Gerleman, nämlich daß dbr 'reden' – nur im Nordwestsemitischen belegt – eigentlich eine Analogiebildung zu 'mr sei, und infolgedessen nur db etymologisch tragend wäre. Folglich hätten wir dann einen etymologischen Zusammenhang zwischen hebr. dībbār und akkadisch dabābu 'sprechen, reden', eine Wurzel, die


ANMERKUNGEN

6. Siehe den ausführlichen Artikel āmar von E. Wagner in ThWAT.
8. Siehe F. J. Stendebach, ‘ānāl in ThWAT.
9. Vgl. C. J. Labuschagne ‘nh’ antworten, in THAT.
14. Vgl. arabisch nāzala ‘hinabsteigen’
15. Qal pīl nāzūlim ‘Bäche, Rinnsale’.
17. Siehe HAL.


22. Leseu. *op cit.*

23. Übrigens ist die Lesung *ngdj* zugunsten eines *ngj* in Frage gestellt, vgl. G. F. Hasel, *ngd* in ThWAT.


31. Vgl. *lāāz* 'unverständlich reden', *ṣāḥal* 'weichern', *swāḥa*, *ṣārah* 'schreien' und lāhas 'flüstern'.
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De Karaitis Lithuaniae: Transcriptions of Recited Biblical Texts, Description of the Pronunciation Tradition, and Peculiarities of Shewa*

TAPANI HARVIAINEN, Helsinki

The early history of the Karaite movement has evoked lively attention among scholars. Since the middle of the last century P.F. Frankl, A. Harkavy, Samuel Pozniaski, R. Mahler, Jacob Mann, Leon Nemoy, Zvi Ankori and many others have contributed to this field of research in a significant way. A number of new discoveries as well as some other issues (the controversy over Abraham Firkovitz, the Cairo Genizah, the Damascus Document as well as the Dead Sea Scrolls, the Aleppo Codex, dissenting views on the origin of East European Jewry) have revitalized interest in the Golden Era of Karaism up until the 12th or 13th century. In contrast to this focus on early history, the more recent periods have received less attention, and the present condition of the Karaites as well as their cultural and religious activities lack adequate, up-to-date descriptions.

Although the founder of the Karaite movement, 'Anan ben David, wrote his Sefer ham-Mišwot in Aramaic in the end of the 8th century in Mesopotamia, Arabic and Hebrew have been the literary languages of the Karaites since the beginning of the 9th century. While Arabic was replaced by Hebrew and Greek (and, later on, by Turkish) among the Karaites in the Byzantine Empire, Hebrew has always retained its status as the language of the Bible recitation. Alongside of the Hebrew text, vernacular translations of the type of targum have been used in order to render the Biblical texts comprehensible to the congregations.1

KARAITES TODAY

Despite its spiritual power, the Karaism has never drawn large crowds into its realm. According to the estimates of Zvi Ankori, the total figure of Karaite residents in the Byzantine Empire at the end of the 11th century was 8500, i.e. approximately ten percent of all Byzantine Jewry. The data available for the Near East also leads to the conclusion that the number of Karaites has never amounted to more than some tens of thousand.2

* A version of this article was read in the Nordiska semitistsymposiet på Kivik 16-18 aug. 1990; our jubilant, Prof. Gösta Vittema has been the primus motor and main organizer of the first Nordic Semitic meetings in his native summer town Kivik.

Exactly 300 years ago the first Nordic publications with the Karaites as their topics were published: the travel account of Gustaf Peringer (Lilieblad) Epistola de Karaitis Lithuaniae was printed by Wilhelm Ernst Tenzel in the periodical Monatliche Unterredungen einiger Guten Freunde in Leipzig in July, 1691 (p. 572-575), and the magister thesis Bibberæum verporum. Sive De duabus nostri temporis Judeorum sectis Rabbanitis scil. & Karreis Dissertatio Philologica, sub directione M. Simonis Paulini, submissa á Severinus Ruisberg was presented at the Academy of Turku (Åbo) in September 9, 1691.
At present, the Karaites can be divided into two groups on the basis of their spoken language: (1) Arabic has been the vernacular of the Karaite living in the Near East where, in addition to Israel, Cairo in Egypt and Hit in Iraq were their last centres in this century; (2) in Turkey and Eastern Europe the Karaite population has spoken Turkic languages, Turkish and Karaite (also called Karaim). The first group consists of 12,000 members in Israel where Ramle is their capital city; the majority of them are emigrants from Egypt. In 1979 there were 40 Karaites left in Cairo, the other communities in the Near and Middle East having vanished. In Turkey the number of Karaites does not exceed 120–140, of which approx. 90 persons are members of the Istanbul community; the community possesses the only tenesa of the country in Hasköy.  

The East European Karaites live in the Soviet Union and Poland; their native language, Karaite (Karaim) is a member of the Kipčak-Polovtsian group of Turkic languages. According to the official census of 1979, there were 3,341 Karaites in the Soviet Union. However, only 16% of them claimed the Karaites (Karaim) language as their mother tongue (rodnoj jazyk). In the Taryby Lietuvos enciklopedija (Vilnius 1986) Romualdas Firkovičius gives 352 as the number of Karaites in Lithuania in 1979 and approx. 600 as the number of speakers of the Karaites language (incl. Crimean Karaites Krimtchak) in the U.S.S.R. Of the speakers, 258 lived in Lithuania in 1979. The number of Karaites in the Crimea was 1,151 according to the 1979 census. Twenty years earlier, in 1959, the official census had listed 5,700 as the total number of Karaites in the whole Soviet Union. If these official statistics are correct, the assimilation has taken place extremely rapidly.

In the Soviet Union the Karaites have lived in three main areas: (1) in the cities Feodosia, Eupatoria, Bakhchisarai (Chufut-Kale) and Staryi Krym in the Crimea, (2) in Luck (Luck) and Galich (Halicz) now in the Ukrainian SSR, and (3) in the Lithuanian cities Vilnius (Vilna), Trakai (Troki, Troch) and Panevėžys (Poniwiez). In Poland the number of Karaites does not exceed two hundred.  

KARAITHE HEBREW

The living pronunciation traditions of Karaites have received rather little attention. The Catalogue of the Recordings in the Tape-Archives in the Institute of Jewish Studies of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (The Language Traditions Project) includes no more than eight specimens of Karaite Hebrew: four of them are of Egyptian and Iraqi origin, two from Trakai (Troki), Lithuania, and two others from Halicz. The director of Research of the Project, Prof. Shlomo Morag, has been kind enough to place these East European recordings at my disposal.

As far as I know, the most recent article which – quite tangentially – deals with the East European Karaite Hebrew is ““Lešon Qedar” – netunim lešoniyyim ‘al mosha haq-qara’im we-toldotehem bi-Qrim u-b-Mizraḥ Eropa” published by Wolf Moskowitch and Boris Tukan in 1981. Moše Altbauer’s article “Al ha-‘ibrit Šeb-be-pi qara’e Lita we-‘al ha-yasodot ha-‘ibriyyim Šeb-bi-Išonam” which already appeared in Lešonéněu in 1957 and 1958 is still the main source in this field. The linguistic material used by Moskowitch and Tukan goes back primarily to the article by Altbauer. This, in turn, is based largely on the texts and glossaries published by
Tadeusz Kowalski in his book *Karaimische Texte im Dialekt von Troki* which appeared in Cracow in 1929. During my stay in Vilnius in October 1988 I recorded a number of specimens of Karaita Hebrew as well as translations of Biblical texts into the Karaita language recited by Mr. Mikhael Firkovitsh, a member of the famous Firkovitsh family. Mr. Firkovitsh (born in 1933, engineer, High School of Structural Engineering in Vilnius) as well as his wife, Mrs. Halina Kobjeckaitė, were born in Trakai; both of them are leading personalities of the Lithuanian Karaita community. Lithuanian and Karaita (as well as Russian) are the languages spoken at the home. My recordings include parts of Gen 22 and Gen 1, as well as some verses of Amos and Psalms, all of which constitute a cycle of prayers. The story of the offering of Isaac was selected by me to be read, since the recordings of The Language Traditions Project in Jerusalem mentioned above also include Gen 22.

TRANSCRIPTIONS OF RECORDINGS READ BY MR. FIRKOVITSH

Gen. 22 (a), read without recitation

va-yhî axár had-devarîm ha-ênêle va-ya-êlohim ñissá et ëf-arvâhám vay-yômer elâv avrâhâm vay-yômer hiinnêni vay-yômer kax-ná et ëni-ñexå et-ya-xîdêxå aßêr ahâvta et yicxâk ëv-lex ëlaê 'e'l êrec ham-môriiyå va-ya-alêyû sâm lo-oli al axâd ye-yarîm aßêr omâl (!) elêxa vay-ya-skêm avrâhâm bab-bôqer vay-ya-xabôš (!) et xamôrô vay-yiikêx et ëshê na arav it tô vê-ëf yicxâK bôno vay-yevaqqâ açê olâ vay-yaqam (!) vay-yélex el ham-makôm aßêr ãmar to ya-êlohim


Gen. 22 (b), recited

Gen. 1, recited

be-rešīt barā elohīm ef-yās-šāmāyim ėve-ēf-hārec va-ya-ārec yāyetā tōhu va-vōhu
vo-xōsex al- peppers-tohōm ėve-rūvax ēlohīm meraxēfet al- peppers-yam- māyim vay-
yōmer elohīm yihī ōr vā-yhi ōr vay-yār elohīm ef-ya-ārec ki-tōv vay-yāvedē elohīm
beḥ ha-ōr vu-vēn yā- xōsex vay-yiqrā ēlohīm lo-ōr yōm ėve-la-xōsex kārā lāyā
va-yhi ērev va-yhi bōqer (corrected later: vôqer) yōm exāT
vay-yōmer elohīm yihī raqi.a be-tōx -xam-māyim v-hī māvdiḥ beḥn māyim la-
māyim vay-ya.as elohīm ef-ha-raqi.a vay-yāvedē beḥn ham-māyim aṣēr mit-tāxat le-
(!) raqi.a vu-vēn ham-māyim aṣēr me-āl-e-la-raqi.a va-yhi-xēn
vay-yiqrā ēlohīm la-raqi.a šāmāyim va-yhi ērev va-yhi bōqer yōm šēnī
vay-yōmer elohīm yiqqāvū ham-māyim mit-tāxat yaḥ-šāmāyim ēl makōm exa...
el-makōm exād ve-terāʾe hay-yabbasa va-yhi-xēn
vay-yiqrā ēlohīm lay-yabbasa  ērec vu- t-miqvé ham-māyim qārā yāmīm (!) vay-
yār elohīm ki-tōv vay-yōmer elohīm taddēšē (!) ya-ārec dešē (!) šēv mazrī.a zēra
ec peri oṣē peri le- mi nō aṣē zarō bō al-ya-ārec va-yhi-xēn vat-toeḥ ha-ārec désē
šēv mazrī.a žēre (!) le-mi nēhu ve-ec oṣē peri aṣē zarō bō ... vō le- mi nēhu vay-yār
elohīm ki-tōv va-yhi ērev va-yhi bōqer yōm šelīsī

Amos 8:11, recited

hiṇnē yamīm ba.īm nu.ūm adonāy elohīm vi-hišlāxī la ... rá.ava ba-ārec lo- rá.ava
lal-lēxem ve-tō camā lam-māyim ki-īm li-šmōva eT-divrē adonāy

Verses of Psalms, recited:

119:1-4:

aṣē tenimē dárex  yā-yolexīm be-torāt adonāy aṣē noceythe-edotēxa be-xōl ūev
yīdēsūhu af lō-fa.alū avlā bi-draxāv halāxū attā čīnvīta pikkudēxa li-šmōr mo.ōT
99:2:
adonāy be-čiyyōn gadol ve-rām hu al- kol-ha-amīm
44:14:
barūx adonāy elohē yisra.el mē-yā-olām va-ād yā-olām amēn va-amēn
33:4:
ki yašār devār ādonāy ve-xōl ma.ašēhu be-emunā
119:160:
rōš-devārēxā ernēf vu-l-olām kol-mišpāt eITqēxa
119:4:
attā čīnvīta pikkudēxa li-šmōr mo.ōT
119:18:
gāl ēnv̄a va-aḥ̄bīta nišla.ōt mit-toratēxa
119:68:
tōv attā vu-nēfīv lammeđēnī xuqqēxa
119:72:
tōv li totorā pīxa me-alfē zahāv ve-xāsef
119:12:
barūx attā adonāy lammeđēnī xuqqēxa
119:142:
The vowel system consists of the five basic “Sephardi” vowels: a, e, i, o, and u. There is no quantitative distinction between the realizations of “full” vowels, shewa, and haṭafim. The vowel length is dependent upon the location of stress as well as the closure of syllables: in open syllables the stressed vowels, in particular, tend to be lengthened. The stress system does not reveal exceptional trends.

Peculiar features are the realization of the initial u- particle as [vu] (only in the recordings of Mr. Firkovitch, e.g. vu-t-olăm) as well as the employment of [v] as a glide between a labial vowel and patah furītīm, e.g. rūvax.

The lengthening (gemination) of consonants takes place in accordance with the Masoretic punctuation (dageš forte). Of the beqadkefat consonants only bet, kaf, and pe display two different realizations (b/v, k/x, p/f). While both tet and taw are pronounced as [t], qof has a more post-velar realization than kaf [k] in a considerable number of cases. However, I have not been able to delineate factors which would call forth [q] instead of [k]. Since the corresponding post-velar seems to have disappeared from the Karaite vernacular quite recently,17 we can conclude that a similar shift from [q] to [k] is also taking place in the pronunciation of Hebrew; this kind of delay and unconstancy is typical of liturgical reading traditions in general. Sade is affricate [c].18 ‘Alef and ‘ayin appear as a syllable boundary or, sometimes, as a weak glottal stop between two vowels.19 In other positions they usually have no sound value, e.g. no glottal stop after dalet in yadáḥi ‘I know’.

The dissimilation of lengthened (geminated) lamed into [n] goes back to the influence of the vernacular; however, the parallel treatment of lengthened waw is not mentioned in grammar books as a feature occurring in Karaites.20 As for the realization of he, I have not been able to find rules of the vacillation between [h] and [y]; in the vernacular they seem to be allophones in free variation and, as a consequence, in the pronunciation of the liturgical language as well.21 Similarly, palatalization is a feature typical of both the Lithuanian Karaite Hebrew and the vernacular. In the Karaites Hebrew it occurs in the majority of consonants before the vowels e and i, but after them it is perceivable solely with l, n, and t. However, the velars, r, h, and s are never palatalized.22

**SHEWAN**

In the Karaites Hebrew of Lithuania, shewa is read as a vowel (1) at the beginning of words, (2) as the second one of two shewas, (3) after a lengthened (geminated) consonant, (4) after a so-called long vowel,23 and (5) between two identical consonants.

In addition to these well-known cases, a majority of shewa medium occurrences have been realized as a vowel in my recordings as well as in those of The Language Traditions Project.24
As a rule, the realization of vocalic shewa is a (usually) short e vowel which does not deviate from the realization of šere and segol. Shewa preceded by yod tends to be centralized. By chance, shewa occurs before yod in my texts only once in the recordings of Dubinski and Abrahamowicz which I have received from Jerusalem in copies: Dubinski reads vî-išra.él (Ps. 51:12; in accordance with the Tiberian theory), but Abrahamowicz vê-yisra.él.

However, before a laryngeal (‘alef, he, het, and ‘ayin), the Lithuanian Karaite sound value of shewa is identical with that of the “full” vowel which follows the laryngeal.

A few examples from my recordings (cf. the transcriptions above):
Before ‘alef: va-anêni (and not *ve-anêni), mo.ôT, lo-ôr, nu.ûm. (pro *me ôd, *le-ôr, *ne-ûm), and vé-et (followed by vowel e).
Before he: va-ya-ârc, vi-hišlaxti, tohôm.
Before het: vo-xôšex.
Before ‘ayin: va-âd, na-arâv, lo-ôlô, lo-ôlêm; vé-êc.

It is important to note that, although both het and khaf are pronounced identically as a velar fricative [x], the assimilation of shewa does not occur before khaf: e.g. ve-xášef and be-xôl instead of *va-xášef and *bo-xôl. On the other hand, the assimilation takes place before [γ] which is a non-laryngeal realization of the laryngeal he. While the quality of shewa before ‘alef and ‘ayin could be interpreted to derive its origin from the loss of these laryngeals, this explanation does not suit the realizations of shewa before he ([h] and [γ]) and het ([x]). On the basis of these facts we must conclude that the assimilation of shewas is connected solely to the consonants which have been genuine laryngeals in Near Eastern Hebrew.

The same assimilation occurs in the recordings which Altbauer has transcribed and published. As I mentioned above, I have a copy of the tapes in my disposal. However, Altbauer has resorted to the neutral vowel a as the general transcription of shewas, and, as a consequence, the assimilation has escaped his attention. Nevertheless, the assimilation occurs four times in his transcriptions of the Song of the Vineyard (Isa. 5) and Ps. 81 in which the spellings bu-u-ûsim (= bê’ûsim, twice), ca-ak (= šê’aqâ), and ja-yal-le-yû (= yéhallékû; -yal- in Altbauer is a printer’s error) have been marked with exclamation marks without further comment; in addition, he also writes bayar (i.e. bê-har) in Gen. 22:14 with an exclamation mark.

Similarly, the book of Kowalski includes the names Lëcuđama (= Yêhûdâ), Ruuma (= Rê’ûmâ) and Pinchas (= Pinêhas) as well as the word maxabber (mêhabber) in which the assimilation has taken place. Kowalski does not deal with this phenomenon.

The written sources do not recognize the assimilation of Lithuanian Karaite shewa vowels. Nevertheless, they record a number of occurrences which accord with my recordings in a great majority of details. The same is true concerning the recordings of the Tape-Archives in Jerusalem.

The assimilation of shewa before a laryngeal to the quality of the following “full” vowel is a genuine feature of Tiberian Hebrew. The phenomenon has been mentioned in numerous treatises of early grammarians and it is perceptible in the vocalizations of various medieval manuscripts including the Aleppo Codex; among the early Karaite manuscripts written in Arabic script with Tiberian punc-
tuation signs the assimilation occurs twice in BL Or. 2581 A (Yisrê‘ālî and ha-
yisrê‘ālî, Lev. 24:10). 28

In living reading traditions of Hebrew the laryngeal assimilation of shewa vowels has been upheld by the Yemenite Jews and, although less consistently, by the Aramaic-speaking Jewish communities of western Kurdistan. 29 It seems probable that the Lithuanian Karaites now can be included in the group of the steadfast keepers of Tiberian Biblical Hebrew.

Additional recordings, discussions with informants, comparative research of the grammar books of Hebrew in possession of Lithuanian (and Crimean?) Karaites in manuscript form, as well as studies of the early Karaitse Bible manuscripts are required to shed light on the history of the East European Karaitse reading tradition of Hebrew. 30 The living reading traditions of Arabic-speaking Karaites communities should also be examined as long as reliable informants can be found. After these investigations quite a number of questions pertaining to the Masoretes, their working technique, the role of the Karaites as transmitters of Hebrew, 31 and the links between Karaites and Jewish communities may be in need of reconsideration.

NOTES
6. Тарбут Литовских энциклопедии (2. Vilnius 1986), entries “Karaimai” (p. 213) and “Karaimų kalba” (p. 213), and Литва – Краткая энциклопедия (научноредакционный совет И. Аничач…, Вильно 1989), p. 293.
7. Rabbiante Jews, the so-called Krymhchaks who – like the Crimean Karaites – spoke a dialect of Crimean Tatar as their native language, have lived in the Crimea. Until the first half of the 19th century both of the two “Tartarian” groups (Karaites and Rabbiante) were called Krymhchaks; originally the term excluded Ashkenazi Jews who had immigrated to the peninsula. The more limited usage with reference to the “Tatar” Rabbiantes solely was not coined earlier than a century ago. There are approximately 1800 Rabbiante Krymhchaks left in the U.S.S.R.: during the census in 1959 only 189 Krymhchaks identified Crimean Tatar as their mother tongue. The Rabbiante Krymhchaks have also read Hebrew with the “Sephardi” pronunciation which, however, differed from the Near Eastern “Sephardi” Hebrew. For details, see Wolf Moskowitz – Boris Tukan, “Quelques traits caractéristiques du parler des Juifs Krimtchaks de Crimée”, Massorot (Publications of The Hebrew University, Center for Jewish Languages and Literatures. Language Traditions Project), Vol. 2, Jerusalem, 1986, p. 113–122, as well as Anatoly Khazanov. The Krymhchaks: A vanishing group in the Soviet Union (Research Paper No. 71. The Marjorie Mayrock Center for Soviet and
6. During my stay in Vilnius in October 1988, I was told by Mrs. Kobeckaitė (Firkovitch) that there are 20 Karaites in Galich (Halicz) and none in Luck.
10. idem, p. 73. The readers are Mr. Alexander Dubinski (from Troki, read in 1956) and Mr. Zygmunt Abrahamowicz (from Halicz, read in 1956 and 1964). Some of the texts read by Mr. Dubinski have been published by Moše Altbauer in transcription and (partly) with musical notation in his article on Lithuanian Karaites Hebrew (Lėšonėnų, Vol. 22:4, appendix; see below, note 12).
11. Pe’amim, 6 (Mekhon Ben-Zvi, Jerusalem 1981), p. 79-106. Their more recent article “Quelques traits caractéristiques du parler des Juifs Krimtchaks de Crimée” (1986) has the Jewish - not Karaite - Krimtchaks (cf. note 5 above) as the main topic.
13. See above, note 1.
14. I am deeply indebted to Mr. and Mrs. Firkovitch for the pleasant cooperation and hospitality at their home. Unfortunately a new visit to Vilnius during the spring of 1990 was prevented by the political tension which the Soviet Union has directed against Lithuania.
15. Of transcription signs the following ones can need clarification:
- γ = voiced velar fricative.
- x = voiceless velar fricative.
- y = semivowel (j).
- n = voiceless velar nasal (ng).
- l = “dark”, non-palatalized velar lateral (not [w] as in Polish!).
- c = voiceless alveolar affricate.
- r = voiced apical trill.
- q = voiceless postvelar stop.
- â etc. = an overlong vowel lengthened by recitation melody.
- â etc. = an ultrashort vowel.
- an apostrophe on the top of a consonant indicates palatalization of the consonant.
- a full stop or a hyphen between two vowels (a,a or e-a etc.) indicates that the vowels constitute a part of two separated syllables although no glottal stop occurs between them.
- capital letters (K, T etc.) indicate semivoiced consonants.
An exclamation mark indicates a number of mistakes which occur in the reading.
16. I have dealt with the same recordings in a paper read in the IX Congress of the International Organization for Masoretic Studies (IOMS); the Congress (Section B) was held in Leuven, Belgium, in August 26. 1989. The paper will be published in the Proceedings of the Congress (ed. by Aron Dotan) in the series Masoretic Studies (Missoula, Montana) in the spring 1991. The title of my paper reads “The Karaites of Lithuania at the Present Time and the Pronunciation Tradition of Hebrew among them: A Preliminary Survey”.
18. According to the Karaites in Vilnus, a *shibboleth* of the Crimean Karait Hebrew is the pronunciation of *šade* as [ sessuali*.

19. For a similar phenomenon in Karaite (maru > maa ‘to me’ etc. not pronounced as a long vowel but two vowels which incline to be shortened into one single vowel, *ma* etc.), see Musaev (1964), p. 43–44.

20. E.g. ha-ʾ illah ‘these’ is pronounced as *[ha-čeile]* and sia wittah ‘you commanded’ as *[ciwίfty]*. According to Musaev (1964, p. 83) the dissimilation of *ll* into *nl* is typical of the Trakai and Vilnus dialect of Karaita. Altbauer (1958, p. 264) mentions the dissimilation of *ll*, *ww*, and *yy*; the last one is not found in my recordings.

21. For details, see my forthcoming article in the Proceedings of IOMS (above, note 16).

22. This observation does not accord with former descriptions, cf. Altbauer 1958, p. 263 & fn. 8 (Altbauer refers to the inconsistency of the phenomenon in Hebrew, but he does not go into details), and the partially mutually different lists of palatalized and non-palatalized consonants in Príšák (1959, p. 328), Musaev (1964, p. 65–66, and 1977, p. 13), and Baskakov (in Karaimsko-russko-pol’skij slovar’). Pol’ rešekhov N. A. Basakova, A. Zayonchkovskogo, S. M. Išaž’ala. Izdatel’stvo “Russkij jazyk”, M. 1974, p. 12; in particular, the non-palatalization of *k*, *r*, and *š* cannot be derived from the influence of the vernacular. Also this detail is in need of additional material and discussions with informants.

23. E.g. ḥayetah, ṭa-yolekh, nőctér, devařeṣah.

24. E.g. va-yevakkah, va-yelakh, va-yevuqqa, biheṣah; also shewa between two identical consonants (e.g. haheleḥ-laḥ) can be mentioned again in this context; in Ps. 119:4 Dubinski reads li-šemūr. Cf. also the transcriptions of Altbauer (1958, appendix): va-yevakka, va-yelakha, va-yevak, bi-širur.

25. Examples from Dubinski (Trakai): va-atuh, va-yarbah, mizboxot, ben-bo or vs. e.g. ve-xa-xol (= wē-ka-hol); from Abrahamowicz (Halicz): muhulḥil, lo-yosil, va-ad-oḥam alongside of a few exceptions, e.g. mam-mace-ul and mizboxot.

26. Kowalski (1929), p. 205, 246, 262, and 285 fn. 4. In Kowalski, counterexamples without the assimilation of shewa are Mεxiqel and Mεxiqel (= Mεhiya’el, Mεhiya’el, p. 233), while ludiš (= Yehudit, p. 205) can go back to the shortening of two similar vowels following one another (see above, note 19).

27. See the sources referred to in my forthcoming article (above, note 16) as well as those enumerated by Geoffrey Khan in his new edition and description Karaita Bible Manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah (Cambridge University Library, Genizah Series 9, Cambridge 1990), p. 109, fn. 98.


29. For details, see Shelomo Morag, ha-ʾIbrit šeb-be-pi yehude Teman (Jerusalem 1963), p. 167–174, and his encyclopedia entry “Pronunciations of Hebrew” (see above, note 8), e. 1137–1138.

30. I have outlined some thoughts on the origin of the East European Karaita communities as well as their links to the Tiberian Hebrew in the article mentioned above (see note 16).

31. The innovative article of Geoffrey Khan “Vowel length and syllabic structure in the Tiberian tradition of Biblical Hebrew” (Journal of Semitic Studies, Vol. 32, 1987, p. 23–82) is based on the evidence provided by the early Karaita Bible manuscripts.
The Public Debate as a Literary Genre in Arabic Literature

BO HOLMBERG, Lund

Man seems always to have been fascinated by struggle and competition. What I have in mind is not the struggle for survival, indispensable – according to Darwinian theory – for the evolution of species. Nor is it the struggle between the archetypal hero and the evil cosmic powers personified by dragons and other beasts, necessary for Jungian analytic psychology. What I do have in mind is struggle and competition as entertainment and pleasure. Perhaps this kind of rivalry is as important for man’s development as the Darwinian struggle for survival and the Jungian archetypal struggle between good and evil.

From my childhood in India I remember a popular amusement which always appealed to people passing by, who would halt and form a wide circle of enthusiastic spectators. The entertainment was provided by a serpent-charmer who set a cobra and a mungo at each other. Though the rat- and snake-catching mungo – familiar from Rudyard Kipling’s tale about the mungo Rikki-tikki-tavi and its glorious victory over the two cobras, Nag and Nagaina – almost always defeats its enemy in the end, one does not cease to be amazed by the lightning leaps of the mungo which succeeds in fending off the aggressive bites of the cobra, finally letting its piercing teeth work through the back of the serpent’s head.

This is only one example of struggle as popular amusement. To someone else cockfights, perhaps, would come to mind more immediately, or bullfights, in which one of the parties is a man – or rather men: toreadors, picadors, matadors; or medieval tournaments, or the duels of the ancient gladiators and the modern professional boxers who – even now – face the risk of lying dead in the arena while the crowd rises to cheer the champion.

A more tranquil and academic counterpart to these public amusements could be enjoyed at the medieval universities of Europe. What I have in mind are the disputations, which, with the lectiones, constituted the academic curriculum in the medieval universities. Besides the quaediones ordinae, i.e. disputations on a set subject, in Paris another kind of lively disputations were staged twice a year, before Christmas and before Easter. At these quaediones de quolibet, as they were called, a master undertook to treat of any subject proposed by anyone of the participants. In the course of the disputations anyone from the attendant crowd could enter into the debate in such a manner as to contribute to the liveliness and the entertainment of the disputations. In order to enhance the amusement of these performances even matters of mirth (quaediones iocosae) were treated of during the late Middle Ages. Afterwards these quaediones or disputations de quolibet were written down and spread in literary form.

From these medieval debates and their presentation in literary form, we may turn to what is our main concern here: the public debate as a literary genre in Arabic literature. As it is, we possess a considerable amount of testimonies of
different kinds of public disputations, discussions and debates among the Arabs during the Umayyad, and especially the 'Abbāsid, periods. Our knowledge of some of these debates is confined to the mere fact that they are supposed to have taken place. Others, though, have come down to us in written form, providing us with an idea of the substance and the conditions of the debates. Among these latter accounts of public debates there are some which exhibit such close parallels in the narrative structure, especially in the frame-story, that we may surmise a more or less fixed literary genre. It is the distinctive traits of this literary genre that I wish to capture. By epitomizing four instances of this genre I hope to be able to throw light upon this subject.

1 FOUR EXAMPLES OF THE DEBATE GENRE

1.1 The debate between Abū Bishr Mattā and as-Sirāfī in Baghdad in 320/932

In Kitāb al-imtā' wa-l-mu'ānasa by Abū Ḥayyān at-Tawḥīdī (d. 1018) the account has been preserved of a debate between the translator and logician Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus (d. 940) and the grammarian Abū Saʿīd as-Sirāfī (d. 979). This debate is supposed to have taken place in Baghdad in the year 320/932 in the presence of the vizier Ibn al-Furāt. The topic discussed was the relative merits of the two opponents' disciplines, i.e. logic and Arabic grammar.

at-Tawḥīdī introduces his account by describing the scene of the debate: where and when it took place, and what celebrities were present. He then points out the immediate reason for the debate: the vizier Ibn al-Furāt suggests that someone present should step forward and discuss the subject of logic with Abū Bishr Mattā, since he argues that it is impossible to distinguish truth from falsehood, right from wrong, except by means of logic. General silence ensues, and everybody bows their heads pretending to be busy with other matters. After another invitation from Ibn al-Furāt, as-Sirāfī steps forward to complain about how difficult it is to argue convincingly in the presence of so many listening ears, watching eyes and critical minds. To be victorious in front of such a crowd is not like wrestling in private. But as-Sirāfī nevertheless comes off victorious, being the hero of the debate who brings forth his evidence and makes his opponent speechless. This is clearly emphasized in the narrative when the vizier is now and then allowed to interrupt the debate in order to praise as-Sirāfī and encourage him. By and by Abū Bishr Mattā disappears and the dialogue turns into a monologue. The narrative is brought to an end with a description of how the meeting is suspended, while people admire as-Sirāfī for his caustic tongue, his radiant face and the flow of his reasoning. Even the vizier praises him enthusiastically and wishes him God's favour.

1.2 The debate in c. A. D. 820 between Abraham of Tiberias and several opponents in the presence of the emir 'Abd ar-Rahmān al-Hāshimi in Jerusalem

A debate is supposed to have taken place in Jerusalem around A.D. 820 between the Melkite monk Abraham of Tiberias and the emir 'Abd ar-Rahmān al-Hāshimi. During the course of the debate the emir turns into a listener, while especially
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three other figures, including a bedouin and a pilgrim, assume the roles of challengers of the monk.

The reason for the debate is given by way of introduction: the emir is astonished by the great number of Christians, and by their persistence – despite their good education – in their unbelief, alleging as they do that God is three hypostases and that Christ is the son of God. On hearing this a muaddib proposes that the emir should gather learned Muslims, Christians and Jews in order to discuss the matter. The emir agrees, and the monk Abraham of Tiberias enters the stage and is entrusted with explaining and defending the Christian faith. This he does properly, and in such a manner that the emir is obliged to confess that the monk’s arguments are convincing. Abraham’s reasoning is crowned with success, and he finally goes through certain ordeals (e.g. he drinks poison without getting harmed). This results in the conversion to Christianity of some listeners. The monk is put in jail, but the emir frees him and affirms his innocence. When, finally, the emir offers him certain benefits and the permission to remain in the country, the monk prefers, however, to withdraw.

1.3 The debate between George the Monk and three Muslim scholars in the presence of the emir al-Malik al-Mushammar in Aleppo in A.D. 1217

The third example of a public debate resembles the previous one. This time the debate is supposed to have taken place in Aleppo in A.D. 1217 between the Melkite monk George, from the monastery of St. Simon on the Mediterranean coast south-west of Antioch, and three Muslim scholars in the presence of the emir al-Malik al-Mushammar.

The account begins with an explanation of why the monk and the emir get together and why the debate is brought about; then follows a presentation of the monk. In the debate George the Monk argues his case with great success, and confounds his adversaries. As in the previous debate the opponents of the monk demand ordeals. But the monk and his antagonists cannot agree on what kind of ordeal they should resort to. Finally they come to terms with one another, and the Muslim scholars offer the monk to join them on the pilgrimage to Mecca. But the monk declines the offer, whereupon the Muslim scholars depart. They leave George the Monk in the hands of the emir, who praises the hero of the debate and grants him fish and a mule as a reward for his success.

1.4 The debate between the bishop Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and the philosopher as-Sarakhsi in Baghdad sometime between 860 and 872

As the fourth and final example of a public debate I have chosen the debate between the Nestorian bishop Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) and the philosopher al-Kindi’s disciple Ahmad ibn al-Tayyib as-Sarakhsi, which must have taken place in Baghdad sometime between 860 and 872.

According to the frame-story, the debate was the result of a meeting between al-Kindi and Elia of Damascus, the narrator of the debate. The philosopher has been informed of Bishop Israel’s expected visit to Baghdad. He calls into question the rumour of Israel’s great erudition. How can he be so learned, alleging as he
does that “three” equals “one” and “one” equals “three”? When Elia stands up for the bishop, al-Kindi turns to his most distinguished disciple, as-Sarakhsi, encouraging him to find out the true nature of the bishop’s alleged erudition. Subsequently the scene of the debate is pictured before our eyes. The meeting takes place in the Monastery of Mār Pathion, where Bishop Israel is sitting in the company of other bishops and people who have come to greet him. The philosopher’s disciple arrives together with Jewish, Muslim and Mu’tazilite debaters. Having saluted Israel, as-Sarakhsi takes his seat right opposite the bishop. Then the actual debate commences.

There is absolutely no doubt as to who is the protagonist and hero of the debate. No less then four times the narrator discontinues his account of the discussion with lavish descriptions of all the bishop’s merits. Time after time the listening crowd wonders at Israel’s methodical reasoning, which dumbfounds the great philosopher’s favourite disciple. Finally the debate is brought to an end by as-Sarakhsi and his companions, who suddenly withdraw under the pretext that they have to attend the midday prayer. The rumour of as-Sarakhsi’s utter defeat finds its way to al-Kindi, who becomes greatly concerned and forbids his disciple to engage in any further discussions with the bishop.

2 THE DISTINCTIVE TRAITS OF THE GENRE

In comparing these literary accounts of public debates, certain distinctive traits may be observed. These reveal a common narrative structure which justifies the claim that we are here dealing with a particular literary genre.

2.1 The reason for the debate

A first distinctive trait of the genre of public debates seems to be that the reason why the debate takes place is always given. In the first debate it is the vizier’s desire to have someone refute Abū Bishr Mattā’s insistence on the importance of logic. In the second and fourth debates the aetiology is that someone (the emir ‘Abd ar-Rahmān and the philosopher al-Kindi respectively) wonders how the high education of the Christians is compatible with their Trinitarian doctrine. As for the third debate, we learn that the monk visits the emir as a member of a delegation sent from the monastery to Aleppo in order to provide for the monastery’s material needs. This gives the emir the opportunity to inquire about the monastic way of life, which he chooses to do by means of a debate.

2.2 The description of the scene

Another distinctive trait which also belongs to the introduction of the account is the description of the scene of the public debate. This description is most detailed in the first and the fourth accounts. In the debate between Abū Bishr Mattā and as-Sirāfi, the narrator tells us both when and where the debate took place and what celebrities were present. In the debate between Israel of Kaschar and as-Sarakhsi the locality of the event is given, as well as information on the attendants and the position of the two antagonists during the discussion. As for the other two debates, we certainly know when and where they were supposed to have taken place.
place, though this knowledge is not given explicitly in the texts. In the case of the
debate between George the Monk and the Ayyubid emir, the date and locality is
explicitly stated only in the title, which presumably does not belong to the original
text. The date and place of the encounter between Abraham of Tiberias and ‘Abd
ar-Rahmān, must however, be deduced from statements in the text. In the actual
texts we have to be content with a description of the hero (in both cases a monk)
and his arrival to the emir.

2.3 The presence of an official person
As a third characteristic, though in some way connected with the description of the
scene, we may consider the fact that the public debate usually takes place in the
presence of an official person (an emir, a vizier or a caliph) who assumes the role
of supervisor without, however, becoming a passive auditor. In at-Tawhīdī’s narra-
tive it is the vizier Ibn al-Furāt who supervises the debate. In the two subsequent
accounts the emirs ‘Abd ar-Rahmān and al-Malik al-Mushammar, respectively,
appear as patrons of the debates. In both cases the emir from time to time partakes
very actively in the discussion. In the narrative of Elia of Damascus, there is no
official person who is present during the dispute between Bishop Israel and as-
Sarakhsi, but a person responsible for the occurrence of the debate is to be found in
the philosopher al-Kindī. Though not present during the controversy, al-Kindī has
taken the initiative in convoking the assembly, and he partakes in the results with
concern.

2.4 The hero throws his opponent into perplexity by means of his arguments and
is praised by the crowd and/or the narrator
When the aetiology of the debate has been given and the scene has been described,
follows the report on the actual discussion where one of the antagonists is pictured
as a hero who by means of his intelligent reasoning dumbfounds his opponent and
receives the commendation of the crowd and/or the praise of the narrator. This
may be considered as the fourth distinctive trait of the literary genre of public
debates. In the first account, the hero as-Sīrāfī is repeatedly interrupted by the
vizier, who commends his favourite and urges him on. In the second account, the
emir ‘Abd ar-Rahmān is laughingly obliged to confess to the validity of the monk’s
arguments. The most evident example of this trait is provided by Elia of Da-
mascus in his account of the debate between Israel of Kashkar and as-Sarakhsi,
where Israel as the unchallenged hero is extolled to the skies by the narrator.

2.5 The anti-hero is defeated and withdraws
The fifth distinctive trait of the public debate as a literary genre is the fact that the
victim of the hero’s overwhelming intellectual reasoning, i.e. the anti-hero, is
defeated and leaves the scene, sometimes in confusion. Though in the first debate
the withdrawal of the anti-hero, Abū Bishr Mattā, is not explicitly mentioned, his
part in the debate gradually diminishes. The dialogue turns into a monologue, and
the logician virtually disappears. In the two following examples of public debates
the anti-heroes are defeated and withdraw, leaving the hero behind in the company
of his patron. To be sure, in the account of the debate between George the Monk and the three Muslim scholars the Muslims leave the monk in mutual understanding in order to perform the pilgrimage to Mecca. At the same time, though, their defeat and their incorrigible depravation is underlined when they shamelessly try to entice the monk to join them on their way to the beautiful women of Hijāz, the questions of morality and the incompatibility of the spiritual life of monasticism and the materialism of Islam being the main topics of the preceding controversy. In the debate between Israel and as-Sarakhsi, the anti-hero and his companions leave their rival in possession of the field under the pretext of the midday prayer.

2.6 The hero is commended and rewarded by the supervising official person

The sixth and final trait to which I would like to draw attention is that the hero is praised and rewarded by the official patron of the debate. In the first case, Ibn al-Furāt’s reward to as-Sirāfi is not material, but is represented by the vizier’s wishing the hero God’s grace. In the second example, Abraham of Tiberias is offered certain material benefits if he wishes to remain in the country. In the third narrative, George the Monk is granted a quantity of fish and a mule in recompense for his success in the debate. In the dialogue between Israel and as-Sarakhsi this distinctive trait is obviously failing, since there is no official person who attends the debate. But if al-Kindī is regarded as a substitute for the attending official person, it is possible to interpret the fact that al-Kindī forbids his disciple to engage in any further dispute with the bishop as a kind of reward to Israel: the bishop will no longer be disturbed by the arguments of as-Sarakhsi (or al-Kindī). The failure of a reward in this latter case should, however, rather be correlated to the question of the function or Sitz im Leben of this particular literary genre, a topic which will be considered next.

3 THE FUNCTION OR SITZ IM LEBEN OF THE GENRE

In an article published in 1926 Georg Graf put forth the theory that when a hero in a Christian Arabic account of a public debate finally receives a material reward from the attending official person who represents the state (e.g. an emir or a caliph), this might indicate that such an account has been designed as a putative historical document with the function of legitimating and defending certain rights which at the time were endangered. Accordingly, when in the second account cited above ‘Abd ar-Rahmān al-Hashimi offers to allow Abraham of Tiberias to settle down and to enjoy certain benefits in a specific locality, this might imply that this particular document has been used to legitimate the existence of e.g. a monastery in that locality. In the case of the fish granted by al-Malik al-Mushammār to George the Monk, of the Monastery of St. Simon, this document could be interpreted as having been conceived in order to defend the monastery’s right to catch fish at a time when this right might have been endangered.

In the account of the debate between Israel of Kashkar and as-Sarakhsi the absence of a dignitary as well as of a reward, in this case rules out the function which the two previous accounts might have had. Consequently, we have to consider another function for this report. One possibility would be to regard the
account given by Elia of Damascus as having originally had the function of a propaganda pamphlet in support of Israel as a candidate for the election of a new catholicos. In those chapters in Māri ibn Sulaymān’s Kitāb al-Majdal where the history of the Nestorian church leaders are given, we meet with a vivid picture of the antagonism and the rivalry which could manifest itself when different parties supported their own candidates for the highest office in the church hierarchy. Not least was this the case when Bishop Israel of Kashkar (d. 872) was advanced as a candidate. In addition to this, the heavily idealized picture of Israel provided in the account of the debate would be given a plausible explanation if we regarded the text in its present form as a propaganda pamphlet.

When considering a third function which these accounts of public debates may have had, I think we are standing on firmer ground, though the above-mentioned functions need not be dismissed. Not only did the actual historical debate appeal to the fascination of the audience for suspense and entertainment, but also the written account as read or listened to may well have functioned as a story designed to amuse. Though the audience even from the very outset knows who the hero is, this does not reduce the suspense. It is still there. Though the mungo usually defeats the cobra, the audience will not leave until the expected victory has been won. Most obviously this function of entertainment is recognizable in the third debate, viz. the one in which George the Monk is the hero. The witticism which imbues this popular narrative, full of humorous remarks and allusions, clearly shows that whoever wrote the story did it with the view of entertaining.

Also the debate between Abū Bishr Mattā and as-Sirāfi is obviously meant for diversion, though this function does not exclude other possible functions. Here it combines with a didactic function as well. The author aims not only at recreation, but desires also to pass on to his readers or hearers some knowledge of the relation between logic and grammar. If a didactic element is recognized in the case of at-Tawhidi’s account, we may also reckon with this element as far as the other debates are concerned. And certainly, also the philosophical, theological and moral doctrines expounded by Abraham of Tiberias, George the Monk and Israel of Kashkar are of an instructive nature. In these latter cases, though, I think the entertaining function of the narratives combines more clearly with another element, viz. that of building up a sense of communal identity and self-consciousness within a religious minority, in this case Christians living in a society dominated by Islam. As a matter of fact, the two functional elements of entertainment on the one hand, and creation and maintenance of communal identity on the other hand, combine perfectly well. Here, though, I have stressed the entertaining element in the function of the genre of public debates, wishing as I do to regard this genre as a genre in Arabic literature conceived of in a broad sense, i.e. not as an idiosyncrasy in the literature of a minority.
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The Position of Ugaritic Among the Semitic Languages*

BO ISAKSSON, Stockholm

As we all know the ancient Ugarit, discovered by an Arab peasant in the spring 1928, was located at the coast of Northern Syria. Already in the Early Bronze Age it was a large city connecting the interior of Northern Syria with the Mediterranean coast via the Bdāmā Pass. It also was situated on the important coastal highway which led from Egypt to Anatolia. In the sixteenth down to the thirteenth centuries B. C., it was a flourishing and important city-state of medium-size by Syrian standards exerting its influence on a region much larger than its original territory which was defined by the Sea in the west, the mountain ridge of Bargylós in the east, the region of Rās el-Bussēt (later Posidéion in Cilicia) in the north and the plain of Čeble (Old Testament Gebal) in the South. The economic strength of the city was commerce. Its scope was international, situated as it was in the field of force between the Hittite kingdom to the North, Mitanni/Ḫurri to the East, and Egypt to the South. During most of the fifteenth century a large region around the territory of Ugarit, formed a neutral zone between Egypt and Mitanni which was evidently respected by both great powers. Later, in the fourteenth century, the king of Ugarit became first a vassal of Egypt, then a vassal of the Hittite king, but in neither case did it suffer heavily, apart from in the latter period the trade to Egypt (compensated by the access to Anatolian markets). In the following century Ugarit remained loyal to Ḥatti “to their common bitter end”, but fortunately 1284 Ramesses II of Egypt and Ḥattušiliš III of Ḥatti entered into a peace treaty which re-established the commercial relations with Egypt and the vassal states of Egypt in Phoenicia/Palestine.

Thus, when we encounter the texts found in Ugarit, we know that they are created (or at least written-down and used) near the northern borders of Palestine in the Late Bronze Age. This was a time of remarkable cultural and linguistic unity throughout the regions of Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine. As Kathleen Kenyon remarks, “the same basic culture grew up in an area stretching from Ras Shamra in the north to the desert fringes of Palestine in the south. Moreover, the culture now about 1900 B. C. introduced into Palestine was to have a very long life. In spite of the fact that a series of events took place of major political importance, there is no cultural break until at least 1200 B. C.”.

The geographical location of Ugarit in the far north, as well as the archaeological evidence of a cultural homogeneity in the regions of Syria/Palestine in the time when Ugarit flourished, is important when we are going to assess the distinctive character of the Ugaritic language. It is also important to account for the fact that the writing employed in Ugarit for its native tongue shows a remarkable blend of qualities: it employs cuneiform characters, but it is not the Akkadian syllabic

*This paper is a revision of my docent lecture given on June 9th, 1988, at the University of Uppsala.
writing: it is an alphabetic writing like the Phoenician, but the number of signs is 30,7 comparing with the 22 characters in the Phoenician alphabet. And although cuneiform in character, the signs of the Ugaritic alphabet are not found in the Akkadian writing. The signs may be regarded as new formations, although a similarity in form between some of the cuneiform letters and those in a number of linear Proto-Canaanite inscriptions is often pointed out.8

The order of the Ugaritic alphabet is interesting. The small tablets found in Ugarit exhibiting lists of the 30 alphabetic cuneiform signs show that the native order of the signs to a great extent conforms to that in the Phoenician alphabet.9 In the following transliterated list the signs that lack a counterpart in the Phoenician alphabet are put in square brackets:

\[
\begin{array}{lllllllll}
\text{a} & \text{b} & \text{g} & [\text{h}] & \text{d} & \text{h} & \text{w} & \text{z} & \text{h} & \text{t} & \text{y} & \text{k} & [\text{s}] & \text{l} \\
\text{m} & [\text{d}] & \text{n} & [\text{t}] & \text{s} & \text{p} & \text{s} & \text{q} & \text{r} & \text{t} \\
[\text{g}] & \text{t} & [\text{i}] & \text{u} & \text{s}
\end{array}
\]

Obviously, there is a connection between the two alphabets. But which? The most natural and straightforward conclusion is that the Ugaritic alphabet represents an adaptation of an already existing alphabet consisting of 27 letters and that three letters then was added at the end.10 Gordon maintains that the Ugaritic alphabet “is typologically, but not yet chronologically, earlier than the Phoenician-Hebrew alphabet”.11 His argument goes as follows: the five letters (plus the three at the end) that constitute the difference between the two alphabets “could only have dropt (sic) out of the longer to form the shorter version. If we try to make additions out of the five letters, there is no way (with reference to graphic form or phonetic description) to explain their haphazard insertion”.12

Carl Brockelmann on the other hand observed that one of the signs denoting a syllable beginning with a glottal stop stands at the head of the native alphabet, the other two signs at the end and concluded that the Ugaritic alphabet was shaped by supplementary insertion of signs for sounds that were felt necessary to convey the Ugaritic tongue, complementing the already known Phoenician alphabet from Byblos.13

Recent research on the origin of the alphabet seems to confirm the opinion of Gordon. In all probability the Ugaritic alphabet was the result of a conscious and official act in the middle of the fourteenth century, “since within a very short time all types of documents – administrative and legal, literary texts and letters – were written in this script”.14 There is no trace of a formative period, and so it must have been adopted from somewhere else. The source of the Ugaritic script is to be found in the Proto-Canaanite alphabet, which at the time of the formation of the Ugaritic alphabet may well have contained 27 letters since the Proto-Sinaitic alphabet from which the Proto-Canaanite may have been formed show this number of signs.15 There is no unanimity as to the chronology of the Proto-Sinaitic alphabet. Benjamin Sass, however, argues for a date during the reign of Pharaoh Ammenebes III (1859-1814 or 1817-1772) of the 12th dynasty.16 The earliest attested Proto-Canaanite inscriptions may be dated to the end of the Middle Bronze period, that is, early in the sixteenth century B.C.17 All this means that the Ugaritic alphabet most likely
was shaped in the fourteenth century “under Proto-Canaanite influence, but cuneiform shapes were adapted to it to suit the requirements of the Ugarit scribes”. The Proto-Canaanite alphabet was adopted “lock, stock and barrel, with the same letter names and order. Cuneiform shapes were given to the letters in conformity with local scribal tradition, and the three extra letters were added. Two of these, ‘i and ‘u, were intended to fill in some of the lack of vowels, which hampered the Akkadian-trained scribes,” and the third, a second samek, was, at least initially, used in writing foreign words.” Thus, the impetus behind the formation of the specific Ugaritic script is to be found in the south, in Phoenicia and Palestine.

Language relatedness is commonly defined as equivalent to the existence of a common source, from which the related languages are supposed to have developed. Two separate languages are related if they are “reflexes of a single parent language”. This definition may be expounded by the expectation that two related languages will share early rules of grammar (so-called “isoglosses”) — that is, those roles that are extant already in the common ancestor — and “differ only in those rules which have been added more recently”. Thus, Theodora Bynon says, “In general terms, the larger the number of such unshared changes the less closely related will be the two systems. Closeness of relatedness can therefore be seen to depend on the number of rules held in common”. It is also important to realize that linguistic relatedness implies that the speakers of the two languages somewhere in history or prehistory ceased to form a united speech community, which means that “language diversification can only be the result of the prior physical displacement of at least a portion of the speakers of the parent language.”

The origin of the Ugaritic script discussed above, is mainly an indication of cultural (rather than linguistic) dependence. The direction of the influence, however, gives us some hints as to the political and cultural position of Ugarit in the Fertile Crescent in the middle of the second millennium. The dependence may be summarized as follows: the scribal technique (cuneiform characters) was borrowed from the east (Assyria); the alphabet as such was borrowed from the south (Phoenicia) and supplemented with some local characters. This process J. C. Greenfield describes as “a Canaanite model was ‘cuneiformed’”. To a semitist, the Ugaritic phonological system conveys an archaic impression. It resembles the Arabic system and is obviously close to the Proto-Semitic stock of phonemes. We find in Ugaritic a rich variety of dentals and many spirants and laryngals, the latter fact immediately excluding the possibility that Ugaritic would be an Akkadian dialect. The scribes at Ugarit made use of a cuneiform technique to form the native characters, but this fact only testifies to the cultural and commercial importance of the Assyrian script at the time of shaping the signs.

In late and informal Ugaritic texts, found mainly outside Ugarit, the sign for t merges in that of s, the sign for h in that for h, d in z, g in t, and f in s. This concerns especially the so-called “mirror” tablets, found throughout Canaan as far south as Beth-Shemesh, which like the Phoenician texts are written from right to left. This short cuneiform alphabet seems to have developed outside Ugarit, probably in Syria or northern Palestine in the thirteenth century. In this region the Ugaritic cuneiform alphabet was preferred to the Proto-Canaanite, possibly because of an earlier tradition of cuneiform writing. As was the case with the Proto-Canaanite
alphabet itself in the south, the cuneiform alphabet in this intermediate region "was shortened in accordance with the merging of consonants in the spoken language."²⁹ There is no evidence that the short cuneiform alphabet was ever used in Ugarit itself, although a few such tablets has actually been found there. In all likelihood, this alphabet was identical with the 22-letter Phoenician alphabet.³⁰ Thus, "the conservative phonology of Ugaritic vis-à-vis Heb.-Phoen. is not merely chronological but geographical".³¹

When assessing the relative affinity between the Semitic languages a great obstacle is that they are attested in different periods of time. From the time of Ugarit (before ca. 1200 B.C.) very little is found of other Semitic languages except Akkadian. If we compare Ugaritic with later attested languages such as Hebrew or Aramaic, it should be held in mind that we know little of the state of these languages when Ugarit flourished. If the affinity of two languages is to be estimated that are attested from different periods of time, we have to take into account a reconstructed proto-form of the later attested language, in order to be able to perform a correct comparison. What do we know of the (Proto-)Hebrew language in the 13th century? Its stock of phonemes? Its verbal system? Not very much indeed, except for our own reconstructions out of the extant more recent texts. This situation means for all Semitic languages (except Akkadian) that we are forced to rely on texts that are several hundreds – in the case of Arabic and Ethiopic more than a thousand – years later than the Ugaritic literary corpus.³²

If two related languages are attested from different times, a rule of thumb may be formulated thus: when the later attested, but not the earlier attested, language shows linguistic traits that are found in their known or reconstructed common ancestor, then this is an indication of a less close relation between the two. Obviously, the opposite is not necessarily true. If the more ancient language shows archaic traits as against the more recent one, this does not permit any conclusions. Only if, in the latter case, it can be made plausible that also the proto-state of the later attested language did not show these traits, are we entitled to draw any conclusions.

To get a reliable estimation of relatedness it is of course necessary to take into account as many such indications as possible. If they pertain vital parts of grammar or vocabulary, however, already a few such differing characteristics might be conclusive, at least in questions of relative relatedness, that is, questions of the relative position of a language within a specific family or subfamily of languages. Is a given language more closely related to one (subgroup of) language(s) than to another? This is especially the question posed in the present article.

When the Ugaritic texts were presented to the learned world it was at first felt that they represented a language very close to the Hebrew of the poetic parts of the Old Testament.³³ Extensive parts of the texts could be read as a Hebrew consonant writing with a defective spelling and to a large extent common vocabulary.³⁴ When the traits of Ugaritic grammar became more pronounced, however, it soon became obvious that Ugaritic could not be a Hebrew dialect, perhaps not even a Canaanite one. Several scholars, one of which was A. Goetze,³⁵ meant it was not a Canaanite dialect, but a language close to the Amorite that can be traced in North-West Semitic personal names in Akkadian cuneiform texts.
In the discussion of the position of Ugaritic there are nowadays mainly two standpoints that have been maintained. Some scholars hold to the Canaanite character of Ugaritic, others propose that it cannot be classified as Canaanite, and should be distinguished as a separate unit within the North-West Semitic group together with the Aramaic and the Canaanite subgroup.

There are many features that Ugaritic has in common with the Canaanite languages as against Aramaic. Some of them are:

1) In Ugaritic as in Hebrew and Phoenician (but not in Aramaic) the common verb *hilik* shows secondary formations in imperfect and imperative: *ylk* and *lk* (=*lik* -), where the radical *h* is dropped. Cf. Biblical Aramaic *ylk*.

2) Both Hebrew and Ugaritic utilize the *pôlél* type instead of the *pi‘el* type to form the intensive stem of verbs *Ilh*; Ugar. *yknn* (Hebr. *ykwnn*) “establish” from the ideomorpheme *kwn*, and Ugar. *rmn* (Hebr. *rwmmn*) “raise” from *rwmn*. Cf. Syriac pael *kawweni/kayyen “correct, rebuke”.

3) Hebrew/Phoenician and Ugaritic are the only Semitic languages with two parallel forms of the 1. sing. personal pronoun: in Ugaritic the pair *aw/ank* corresponding to the Hebrew and Phoenician ‘ny/inky.

4) Many lexical correspondences including the masses of synonym pairs in poetry that Ugaritic and Hebrew have in common. “The great bulk of the vocabulary of Ugaritic, when not gemeinsemitisch (klb, bt, ‘kl, tbr), has its strongest links with Canaanite”.

5) Change of Proto-Semitic *d* to *s*.

6) The monophthongizations *aw > ò* and *ay > è*.

7) Dual and plural endings of nouns with -*m*.

8) The enclitic *mem* and the locative he is shared by Ugaritic and Canaanite.

9) The verbal syntactical sequences PC/SC and SC/PC.

10) The existence of the relative pronoun *atr* in Ugaritic. The use of the corresponding ‘*sr* as a relative pronoun has been attested only in Lachish, Biblical Hebrew, and in Moabitic.

Since the features stated above would provide a strong evidence that Ugaritic belongs to the Canaanite family, I will in the following examine the most common arguments against a classification of Ugaritic as »Canaanite«, and see if they nevertheless might constitute a decisive refutation of such a relationship.

1) In Canaanite, as against Ugaritic, the phonological system seems to be reduced by:

\[
\begin{align*}
h, \; h & \; > \; \text{Pha} \\
t, \; s & \; > \; \text{Phb} \\
\xi, \; \xi & \; > \; \text{Phq}
\end{align*}
\]

Evidently, the Phoenician alphabet is made up of 22 letters, which means that many Proto-Semitic phonemes are represented by the same graphic sign. However, as was observed above the Proto-Canaanite alphabet from which the Phoenician
one derives its origin contained 27 letters. Later, by the time of the thirteenth century, five of the letters of the Proto-Canaanite alphabet had disappeared through assimilation of some consonants. A parallel development may be observed in the texts written in the short cuneiform alphabet of Ugarit. The argument, therefore, presents no evidence against a classification of Ugaritic as a Canaanite dialect.

2) In Canaanite, Proto-Semitic ā has changed to ō. “This change has been widely regarded as the characteristic phonetic development of Canaanite”, being “one of the few changes which spread over all (or most) of the Canaanite area without being paralleled elsewhere”. Aramaic, on the other hand, has preserved Proto-Semitic ā. And with the exception of a few instances the latter is also the case in Ugaritic. An exception to the rule is Ugar. gen./acc. plur. tut = taʾōti, a plural (of tut “ewe”) ending in -āt- < -āt-, and probably also in Akkadian writing a-du-nu = ʾadānu instead of ʾadānu. Since this phonetic law was in force as early as the 14th century (it is attested in the Amarna tablets) it is usually held that “the preservation of ā cannot be ascribed solely to the earliness to the Ugaritic documents”. This is perhaps the most important argument against a classification of Ugaritic as “Canaanite”. However, it is important to account for the geographical position of Ugarit on the northern fringes of the Palestine-Syrian region. The habit of pronouncing the original ā as ō had not yet been fully established in Ugarit when the city perished about 1200 B.C. But Gordon remarks: “Perhaps with the passing of time the shift of ā to ō infiltrated the prose of Ugarit. Poetry is more resistant to change than prose is”.

3) Causative prefix in Canaanite is ha- but ša- in Ugaritic. This is not a strong argument. Causative prefixes in the verbal system seem to be distributed among the Semitic languages in a well-nigh haphazard manner, and it is obvious that the three causative prefixes ša (> sa), ha and ’a were used side by side also in a late stage of Proto-Semitic. Already in Canaanite, besides the Biblical Hebrew hi (< ha), the Phoenician language shows the causative prefix y < š; the prefix ’a has become established in Aramaic, North-Arabic and Ethiopian; h is used in the Epigraphic South Arabian (ESA) dialect Sabaean, whereas in Minaean and other ESA dialects the prefix s (< š) is utilized; except in Ugaritic the prefix ša is found in Akkadian and Aramaic. In fact, in Aramaic all the three Proto-Semitic causative prefixes have been preserved in various dialects. The distribution of the causative prefixes in the Semitic languages indicates that the causative formations crystallized relatively late, and only after the individual languages had been separated. The forms of the causative prefixes cannot, therefore, be used as an indication of relative affinity (or non-affinity) within the Semitic family of languages.

4) Ugaritic possessed no definite article. In view of the diverse forms of the definite article in the individual Semitic languages – including its absence in Akkadian, Yaʿudic, Ethiopian, and Ugaritic; it is obvious that Proto-Semitic did not possess a clearly circumscribed means of expressing the definite article, and that it evolved individually in the different languages. As Brockelmann, says, “In alien
sprachen, auch denen, die einen vollentwickelten bestimmten Artikel besitzen, finden sich deutliche Reste der Zeit, wo das Nomen an sich selbst scharfe demonstrative Determination enthalten konnte. The definite article evolved late in those Semitic languages that came to possess this feature. In the Biblical Hebrew poetry, for example, the article is not necessary to achieve determination, and its usage is limited; in Old Byblian the article was very rare. We cannot, therefore, be sure that there was a fully developed definite article at all in those proto-stages of the Canaanite languages that were contemporary with Ugaritic. Consequently, the argument that Ugaritic lacks the definite article is inconclusive. The absence of the article indicates nothing as to linguistic affinity; rather, it is most probably due to the relative antiquity of Ugaritic.

5) In Canaanite, the masculine suffix of the dual is -ayma (Hebrew -ayim), whereas Ugaritic shows more ancient forms of the suffix:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>abs.</th>
<th>cstr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>-âm-</td>
<td>-â</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen./acc.</td>
<td>-eem-</td>
<td>-ê</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Proto-Semitic dual endings were in all probability nom. -â, gen./acc. -ay (in the absolute state followed by nunation or mimiation and case vowels). In Ugaritic – disregarding mimiation and case vowels – the construct form of the Proto-Semitic dual suffix in gen./acc. coalesced with the absolute form due to the monophthongization of diphthongs. However, according to Akkadian transliterations of Canaanite words in the El Amarna tablets, the Old Canaanite dual of the absolute state ended in -ôma (nom.) and -êma (gen./acc.) respectively, which is very close to the Ugaritic forms, only that the Canaanite shift ă > ə has taken place. In this instance the biblical Hebrew retention of the diphthong -ay- in the absolute state of the dual (-aym > -ayim) and the use of this dual suffix in all cases, represents a separate development. Again we see that a disparity between Ugaritic and the attested Canaanite dialects is due to the great span of time in between the languages.

6) The form of the existence particle in Ugaritic, 'āt, is more similar to the corresponding particle in Aramaic, 'yt or 'yty, than in the Canaanite languages. This difference is not great, being one between ə and ı: Hebrew/Phoenician yš. Moreover, there are possible traces of a variant yš even in classical Hebrew.

7) Ugaritic possessed case endings. This is only due to the antiquity of the Ugaritic texts. Old Canaanite possessed case endings as late as in the Amarna time, since they are written in the Canaanite forms and glosses in the Amarna letters even where the cuneiform orthography did not require them, but they were lost at the beginning of the first millennium B.C., because of the general dropping of final short vowels. In a dissertation by S. Parker it is even held that it is possible to trace a breakdown of the case system as well as final short vowels in general in the prose texts of Ugarit.
8) In Ugaritic, the prefix conjugation (PC) was the straightforward narrative verb form. Therefore, according to Bertold Spuler, Ugaritic cannot even be a North-West Semitic language! This is, indeed, a remarkable statement. In the ancient Hebrew language which together with Moabite has preserved many archaic traits in the verbal system it is still the PC that functions as the narrative form par préférence. What is the so-called “imperfect consecutive” in biblical Hebrew other than a narrative verb form that due to its frequency in such contexts has become a syntactic “fossil” from a time when the PC was even more freely used? The ancient Hebrew verbal system rather indicates that Old Canaanite possessed a verbal system that was very similar to that in Ugaritic. Goetze even adduces the predominantly stative force of the SC as a non-Canaanite sign of Ugaritic, although such a SC form would be exactly what we would expect of an archaic Canaanite language in view of the Hebrew verbal system.

9) Merging of d with z in Phoenician, Hebrew and Moabite, but a change d > d in Ugaritic. The latter seems to be a northern trait that Ugaritic shares with Aramaic. It is, however, hard to determine when the change took place in Hebrew or Phoenician.

10) The conjunction pa. This particle occurs in Ya‘udic and Ugaritic (as well as in Arabic), but not in Hebrew or Phoenician. If it actually did occur in Proto-Hebrew, or was used in Old Canaanite in general we simply do not know. It is not attested, however, in the known Canaanite languages, and this is possibly one of the features that marks a distance to the Canaanite languages.

My conclusion is that the evidence against a classification of Ugaritic as close to Canaanite is meagre, although there are some uncertainties. A. E. Rainey and A. Goetze have maintained that “Canaanite” is a misleading term, since there is evidence that the inhabitants of Ugarit did not reckon themselves as “Canaanites”. This is a valid statement, but it does not alter the linguistic facts. Instead, it turns the whole question to “a matter of arbitrary definition”. The linguistic evidence, however, is not arbitrary. It rather indicates that whether the inhabitants of Ugarit would have liked to call themselves Canaanites or not, their mother tongue should be regarded as an ancient and peripheric Canaanite language, spoken on the northern fringes of the Palestine-Syrian region. This means that the cultural unity observed by Kathleen Kenyon in the whole Syro-Palestinian area also involved a linguistic unity that characterized the spoken languages for the greater part of the second millennium.
1. The destruction of Ugarit by the so-called sea peoples is assumed to have occurred during the reign of A'murapi in the beginning of the twelfth century, ca 1180 B.C., see O. Loretz, Ugarit und die Bibel. Kanaanäische Götter und Religion im Alten Testament (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1990), 7.

2. Comprising the region north of Sumur (thus named in the Amarna letters, Arabic Râs ez-Zêmara), west of the Baryglos mountains, and south of Alala (Tell el'Atšāne).

3. The political position of Ugarit is outlined by M. C. Astour in “Ugarit and the Great Powers”, in Ugarit in Retrospect. Fifty Years of Ugarit and Ugaritism, edited by G. D. Young (Winona Lake, 1981), 3–29. The citation is from p. 23. Recently, a brief survey of the commercial and cultural position has been given in O. Loretz, Ugarit und die Bibel, especially pp. 12, 175–180.

4. This is pointed out by i.a. L. M. Muntingh in “Israelite-Amorite Political Relations During the Second Millennium B.C. in the Light of Near Eastern Politics”, in Atti del secondo congresso internazionale di linguistica canitica-semiitica, Firenze, 16–19 aprile 1974, edited by P. Fronzaroli, Quaderni di semitistica, 5 (Firenze: Istituto di linguistica e di lingue orientali. Università di Firenze, 1978), 215 ff. Earlier W. F. Albright has pointed to the same fact: “From the geographical standpoint, there was a homogeneous civilization which extended in the Bronze Age from Mount Casius, north of Ugarit, to the Negev of Palestine, and in the Iron Age from north of Arvad (at least) to the extreme south of Palestine. This civilization shared a common material culture (including architecture, pottery, etc.), through the entire period, and we know that language, literature, art, and religion were substantially the same in the Bronze Age. From the twelfth century on we find increasing divergence in higher culture, but material culture remained practically the same in all parts of the area”, in “Some Canaanite-Phoenician Sources of Hebrew Wisdom”, Festschrift H. H. Rowley (Leiden, 1969, c. 1955), 2.


6. I disregard in this instance the mass of cuneiform tablets in the Akkadian and the Hittite languages found in Ugarit.


9. E.g. the texts KTU 5.4 (UT 320), KTU 5.6 (UT 401) and KTU 5.14 (UT 1189). The line division of the alphabetic list given above conforms to KTU 5.6. The order of the signs, however, is the same on all the alphabetic tablets. The pronunciation of the signs is indicated by Akkadian cuneiform syllabic signs on the tablet KTU 5.14. See Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook (= UT), § 3.1; M. Dietrich, O. Loretz, and J. Sammartin, Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit, Teil I Transkription (= KTU) (Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1976), S. Segert, A Basic Grammar, § 21.5.

10. This is, among others, the opinion of E. Lipiński, “Les phéniciens et l’alphabet”, 236, and A. R.


15. The number might even have been higher. Sass mentions 27–29 letters, *The Genesis of the Alphabet*, 106.


21. Dietrich and Loretz, however, without knowledge of the work of Sass maintain that the Ugaritic long alphabet is the result of an influence of two independent and simultaneous alphabetic traditions, the northern Phoenician/Canaanite and the southern Arabian, see *Die Keilalphabet*, 305. Their arguments are mainly typological and in many cases not very convincing. If a similarity is observed between letters in the Ugaritic alphabet and in the South Arabian script this might as well be due to affinity with a common ancient ancestor alphabet rather than to a direct influence on the formation of the Ugaritic letters. That both the South Arabian and the Phoenician script are descendants of the Proto-Canaanite alphabet (including the Proto-Sinaitic writing) is the standpoint of J. Naveh in *Early History of the Alphabet. An Introduction to West Semitic Epigraphy and Palaeography*, 2d revised ed. (Jerusalem, 1987), 27. A very ancient dating of the South Arabian alphabet is stressed by many scholars in recent times, mainly because of the discovery of a cuneiform alphabet tablet at Beth Shemesh near Jerusalem exhibiting an alphabetic order that corresponds to the South Semitic alphabet. See, apart from the work by Dietrich & Loretz above, A. G. Lundin, “L’abécédaire de Bet Shemesh”, *Le Musée* 100 (1987): 243–251; E. Lipiński, “Les phéniciens et l’alphabet”, 237; J. Ryckmans, “L’ordre alphabétique sud-sémitique et ses origines”, in *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Maxime Rodinson par ses élèves, ses collègues et ses amis*, edited by C. Robin, Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d’études chamiro-sémitiques, supplément, 12 (Paris, 1985). 358 f. The two different alphabets may indicate the existence of two scribal schools in Canaan in the Late Bronze Age. Ryckmans points out, however, that “La famille des alphabets sud-sémitiques est de toute évidence génétiquement apparentée à celle des alphabets linéaires nord-sémitiques (et même à l’alphabet cunéiforme d’Ugarit, à notre avis simple habillage cunéiforme d’un alphabet linéaire)”, op. cit., 356.


30. Thus Gordon, *Ugaritic Textbook*, § 14.5. In some of these texts the alphabet was not yet identical with the 22 letter alphabet of Palestine, as M. Dijkstra observes in “Another Text in the Shorter Cuneiform Alphabet (KTU 5.22)”, *Ugarit-Forschungen* 18 (1986): 123.


36. Thus, e.g., Z. S. Harris, Development of the Canaanite Dialects. An Investigation in Linguistic History (New Haven, 1939), 10 ff.

37. Thus J. Cantineau, “La Langue de Ras Shamra”, Semitica 3 (1950): 34. A criterion of this group, shared by Ugaritic, is that initial bilabial w– becomes palatal y. thus Ugar. yîl should be compared with Proto-Sem. *walaṭa, Arab., ESA and Ethiopic *walada, Akk. *aladdu (older *waladdu), but in North-West Sem.: Aram. *yîld, Syriac *yîld, Phoen. *yaladda, Hebr. yâladd. Cf. Cantineau, “La langue de Ras Shamra”, Syria 21 (1940): 53. Another characteristic of North-West Semitic found in Ugaritic is the so-called Barth-Ginsberg law: if the imperfect stem has vowel a, then the prefix vowel becomes i, yaqal– > yiqal–. Cf. M. Sekine, “The Subdivisions of the North-West Semitic Languages”, Journal of Semitic Studies 18 (1973): 210; and Harris, Development, 8. Harris also points out the assimilation of l to q in forms of the “root” lqîb, as peculiar to Canaanite and Aramaic, as well as the extension of the bi-vocalic stems with plural suffixes as the regular plurals of uni-vocalic noun stems (in Hebrew e.g. nîlakîm < malak- as plural form of malak < malık-, in Ugaritic râšm = ra’îsâmâ plural form to rîš = ra’ēs < ra’ēs-), op. cit. p. 9. It should be pointed out that the names employed for the subgroups of the Semitic languages refer to the commonly adopted classification advanced by T. Noldeke and C. Brockelmann and found in e.g. S. Moscati, An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages (Wiesbaden, 1969); for a refined discussion of the subgroups of the Semitic languages see R. M. Voigt, “The Classification of Central Semitic”, Journal of Semitic Studies 32, 1 (1987): 1–21.


39. This change took place before 1500 B.C., cf. Harris, Development, 33; Greenfield, “Amurrite”, 97.

40. This feature is pointed out by Greenfield, “Amurrite”, 97.

41. Sekine, “Subdivisions”, 211.

42. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, § 14.3–4; Segert, A Basic grammar, § 12.2 Strangely enough, Goetze refuses to accept this as a common feature, maintaining that the vocalization of ank and an “remains unknown”, see “Is Ugaritic a Canaanite Dialect?”, Language 17 (1941): 132.


44. These changes occurred very early; according to Z. S. Harris before 1500 B.C., see Development of the Canaanite Dialects, 29 ff.

45. This feature is pointed out by Greenfield, “Amurrite”, 97.

46. M. Held, “The YQTL-QTL (QTL-YQTL) Sequence of Identical Verbs in Biblical hebrew and in

47. This is pointed out by M. Dahood, “Linguistic Position”, 269. Also W. L. Moran, “The Hebrew Language”, 61, recognizes Ugaritic ayr as a relative pronoun. It should be noted, however, that A. F. Rainey in “Observations on Ugaritic Grammar”, Ugarit-Forschungen 3 (1971): 160, calls for great caution as to the relative function of this ayr.

48. One of the first to criticize the routine-like designation “Canaanite” for Ugaritic was Goetze in “Is Ugaritic a Canaanite Dialect?”. Many of his arguments came to be repeated in the subsequent debate and are therefore accounted for in the following discussion.

49. This argument corresponds to Goetze’s features (1), (2), and (4): “Is Ugaritic a Canaanite Dialect?” 128 f., 131.


52. C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen 1 (Berlin, 1908). § 51g. This is Goetze’s feature no. (3) of Canaanite, “Is Ugaritic a Canaanite Dialect?” 129, 131.

53. Harris, Development, 44.

54. In text UT 1153 from the royal palace of Ugarit.

55. Segert, A Basic Grammar, § 37.2. Additional examples of the shift in Ugaritic is given by Harris, Development, 43 f.

56. Brockelmann, Grundriss, I § 51g. The attestation in the Amarna tablets makes the standpoint of J. Blau less probable. He says, “it stands to reason that this feature did not arise in “Proto-Canaanite”, but developed in the various dialects independently”, Blau, “Some Difficulties”, 36.

57. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, § 5.17.

58. Gordon, Ugaritic Textbook, 31 note 2. In this instance it is interesting to note the hypothesis proposed by S. Segert that a language in the periphery of a linguistic group tends to be more conservative than the central sector which is characterized by greater innovation, Ugaritica VI (ed. by C. F. A. Schaeffer 1969), 468–473; the account is taken from Brent, “Placement of Ugaritic”. 98.


60. Brockelmann, Grundriss, I, § 257e. The derivation yi- < *hi-given as “Eine mögliche Erklärung” in J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, Phönizisch-punische Grammatik (Rome, 1970), § 147, is not likely.


63. This is one of M. Seckin’s major distinguishing features, see “Subdivisions”, 211. A. Dillmann, Ethiopic Grammar (London, 1907; reprinted Amsterdam, 1974), 424, argues, against D. H. Müller, that Ethiopic never possessed an appended definite article, not even in its earliest stages.


65. Brockelmann, Grundriss, I, § 246A.

67. Thus, Segert, A Basic Grammar, § 12.3.
68. Segert, A Basic Grammar, § 35.2.
69. Friedrich & Röllig, Phönizisch-punische Grammatik, § 216. In the construct state of the dual there was no case vowel or mimation (op. cit. § 226).
72. Harris, Development, 59.
73. Friedrich & Röllig, Phönizisch-punische Grammatik, §§ 91–92, 217; Moscati, Comparative Grammar, § 10.8; Brockelmann, Grundriss, § 430.
77. “A similar argument is suggested in Dietrich and Loretz, Die Keilalphabetene, 311, where the authors maintain that Ugaritic cannot be a Canaanite language.
79. This pertains also to the poetic language of Ugarit, in which the aspectual function of the SC and the PC agrees with that of the archaic Hebrew poetry, cf. Segert, A Basic Grammar, § 13.2.
80. In his study of the Ugaritic “tenses”, “The Tenses of Ugaritic”, Goetze makes many valuable observations; he notes that “the qal forms of Ugaritic have a descriptive stative connotation” (p. 284), and says: “This use of the qal seems very important. It makes us understand how, in West Semitic, the ‘perfect’ could acquire its familiar connotation, namely of past action. The difference between ‘he has an ass yoked’ and ‘he has yoked an ass, he yoked an ass’ is very slight. It is primarily a difference in focus” (p. 283). In his extensive study Das Verbum im Dialekt von Ras Schamra (Kopenhagen, 1941), E. Hammershaimb tries to modify Goetze’s results concerning the SC and maintains, not only that the SC in Ugaritic is narrative and “druckt blos aus, dass die Handlungen abgeschlossen ist”, but also that this feature is Proto-Semitic: “dass der S. Dialekt mit der Entwicklung und Bedeutung des westsemitischen und ar. Perf. auf einer Linie steht, dass ein Hinweis auf Permanenz irreführend ist”, 72, 75. In this instance, however, he is wrong, and the first scholar to have definitely clarified this fact is F. Rundgren. Cf. B. Isaksson, Studies in the Language of Qoheleth, 28 (and the bibliography). The Ugaritic verbal system has been extensively treated by E. Verreet in a series of studies: “Abriss des ugaritischen Verbalsystems”, Ugarit-Forschungen 18 (1986): 75–82; “Beobachtungen zum ugaritischen Verbalsystem”, Ugarit-Forschungen 16 (1984): 307–321, 17 (1985): 319–344, 18 (1986): 363–386, 19 (1987): 337–353.
81. This feature is considered by J. Blau the decisive reason not to designate Ugaritic as Canaanite, vide p. 39 in Blau, “Some Difficulties”. Cf. Harris, Development of the Canaanite Dialects, 36.
82. M. Sekine puts toward this distinguishing features as one of ten major criteria for a classification of the North-West Semitic languages, vide Sekine, “Subdivisions”, 210.
84. Greenfield comments, that “If, then, the term Canaanite as a general rather than a particular name does not fit the needs of our research any longer, let us seek out a better one – but one that is clear and unequivocal”, Greenfield, “Amurrite”, 101.
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Akkadian in Greek Orthography

Evidence of Sound Change in an Ancient Traditional Pronunciation

EBBE EGEDE KNUDSEN, Oslo

Akkadian and Sumerian texts in Greek orthography are very rare. Though known to specialists since the nineties of last century the total number of texts amount to only thirteen, all of them fragments. Very often the ‘Greek’ version has a cuneiform parallel, either on one side of the tablet or elsewhere in cuneiform literature. It is a fascinating thought that these ‘Greek’ texts constitute some sort of missing link between the Babylonian past and our own modern present, independent of the cuneiform system of writing, and even today one can appreciate Burkitt’s enthusiasm expressed at the beginning of the century that “in the fragments ... we have for the first time a transcript into a European alphabet of the still living language of Babylonia”. In fact, the most important linguistic aspect of the texts is the impression we get of a spoken form of written Akkadian in the last few centuries before the final extinction of the language tradition.

In 1962 E. Sollberger published a catalogue of all known ‘Greek’ texts or Graeco-Babyloniaca as he preferred to term them. The catalogue included copies and transliterations of old and several new fragments from the collections of the British Museum. Sollberger classified the small corpus of fragments listed in the catalogue as (A) Lexical, (B) Literary (in the widest sense of the term), and (C) Unclassified (p. 63). There were several literary texts, among others a fragment giving the opening lines of the so-called Description of Babylon and part of a Sumerian and Akkadian bilingual incantation against evil spirits. At least two of the group of unclassified texts can now be identified as lexical lists and assigned to group A. A recent addition to the corpus is a tablet in the collections of the Harvard Semitic Museum inscribed in cuneiform with a Greek transcription on the reverse. The text is a monolingual Akkadian incantation known elsewhere from a number of manuscripts. On the evidence of palaeography most scholars date the tablets from the second century B.C. to the first century A.D. Dr. M. J. Geller kindly informs me, however, that his palaeography colleagues at University College, London, assume some of the tablets “to be very late, even as late as 2nd century A.D.” (personal communication).

Having accepted an invitation from Professor Gösta Viste the present writer read a paper on Akkadian texts in Greek orthography at the Swedish symposium on Semitic studies held at Kivik, Skåne, August 5–6, 1988, of which an extended version was published two years later. There the interested reader will find a general discussion of the texts and the text tradition as well as references to the pertinent literature. The paper also treats at some length aspects of orthography and Aramaic influence. The main conclusion was that Babylonian students wrote the Greek texts and that their teachers used Greek orthography for pedagogical
purposes, very much as modern Assyriologists use transliterations. At the beginning
of the Christian Era spoken Akkadian, as distinct from written Akkadian, had
been a dead language for centuries. Therefore, this writer prefers to see in these
texts the evidence of a late Babylonian traditional pronunciation of Akkadian and
Sumerian (p. 151).

Since 1988 the Swedish symposium on Semitic studies has grown and become a
Scandinavian symposium, not the least due to the efforts of Professor Vitestam. He
has been organizer of the meetings and his house in Kivik overlooking the harbour
and the Baltic Sea has been the natural meeting place for the participants. In
appreciation of his efforts it is a great pleasure to present the following discussion
of sound change in the latest phase of Akkadian as a tribute to the Lord of the
Kivik Academy.

Greek orthography never became a standard orthography for Akkadian. Therefore,
any Akkadian text in Greek orthography presupposes some sort of cuneiform
‘Vorlage’. In many cases a cuneiform version appears on one side of the tablet,
otherwise we have to look for it elsewhere in cuneiform literature. The language of
this Vorlage is late literary Babylonian. As far as phonological form is concerned
late literary Babylonian is distinct from earlier stages of the literary language.
However, a truly synchronic description has never been attempted and in the
following discussion of the traditional pronunciation the better known Standard
Babylonian literary language will be used as a frame of reference. The Greek texts
will be quoted according to the numbering in Sollberger’s catalogue. The abbrevia-
tion Geller refers to the monolingual incantation from Harvard published by that
author.

**Rule 1:** \( e \rightarrow [e:] \) in unstressed open syllables.

In the article referred to above (note 4) the present writer pointed out that the
traditional pronunciation as reflected in Greek orthography had no short \( e \) in
unstressed open syllables. In this position etymologically short \( e \) appears as \([e:]\)
spelled \( \eta \). It was suggested that this is due to phonological interference from
Aramaic (p. 157). Contrast

1) \( \varepsilon \lambda \zeta < \text{ellis ‘above’} \) A 3.
2) \( \beta \\varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \theta < \text{belet (cstr.) ‘lady’} \) B 3.\(^6\)
3) \( \eta \upsilon \chi < \text{em\u03b1q (cstr.) ‘power’} \) B 1.
4) \( \mu \eta \lambda [\chi \chi (\chi)] < \text{mel\u03b1h\u03b9 ‘Meluhha date palm’} \) A 4, compare the corresponding
Sumerian entry \( \mu \eta \lambda \omega . \)\(^7\)

**Rule 2:** \( i \rightarrow [e]/ -h, r. \)

The orthography of the texts confirms the phonetic (i.e. non-phonemic) split \( i > i, e \)
and the merger of \( e \) with old \( e \) resulting from umlaut of \( a \) as assumed on the
evidence of cuneiform orthography. The Greek spelling has \( e \) irrespective of
etymology. A former version of the rule well-known from earlier Akkadian
converts \( i \) to \( e \) before \( h [x] \) and \( r \) in non-initial syllables. However, in initial syllables
and in particular in word initial position the rule does not apply as in Standard
Babylonian \( i r a t \) (cstr.) ‘breast’ and \( i h e r r i \) ‘he digs’. Inflected forms like \( i r t u \) and \( i h r i \)
are orthographically ambiguous. The late tradition has extended the environment of the shift $i > e$ to all positions before $h$ and $r$, even word initially, as in

5) μιτιð $<$ miṭirtu, mitertu 'a type of canal A 2.
6) βε $<$ birri (gen.) 'lattice' Geller.
7) εἴθερ $<$ ihri 'he dug' A 2.

**Rule 3:** $u : [o:] / - r$.

There are two reflexes of cuneiform ūū rendered by Greek $ow$ and $ow$. Spellings with $ow$ before $r$ suggest an allophonic alternation $u : ō$ paralleling $i : e$ in the same environment (Rule 2). Otherwise spellings with $ow$ and $ow$ contrast as $/u:/$ and $/o:/$.

Compare the following forms:

8) $βωθυ $<$ ina bīrtīi 'through the cistern' Geller.
9) σ[α] ωφσ[ν] $<$ ša ūršunu 'of their city' B 3.
11) $βιλιλωθο$ $<$ billudāšu 'its cult' B 1.⁸
12) $ow $<$ ūmī (gen.) 'day' Geller, $ωε $<$ ūmī 'days' B 4.

Due to the complete lack of relevant evidence from earlier stages of the language it is uncertain whether this rule represents an innovation of the language tradition. Outside the environment before $r$ spellings with Greek $ow$ and $ow$ can be explained by etymology. The reading of the divine name Nabū in (10) with final $u$ is supported by biblical evidence. In Babylonian personal names compounded with Nabū Hebrew has navū-$<$ nabū- (but once uncompounded Nāvō in Is. 46,1). The Septuagint has the same vowel in Naβou-. As shown by the genitive form billūde the stem is billūdā- and $/o:/$ in (11) reflects a merger of stem final $a + u$. In (12) it reflects the Proto-Semitic diphthong $aw$ of the proto-form *yawm-. The phonemic contrast $/u:/$ vs. $/o:/$ demonstrated by the Greek texts confirms a discovery made half a century ago by Arno Poebel.⁹ On the basis of spelling habits in Old Babylonian texts from Nippur he was able to prove the existence of final long $o$ in infinitives like qabū 'to say' $<$ *qabāḏum and petū 'to open' $<$ *patūhum as distinct from final long $u$ in rabū 'great, large' $<$ rabūm and rēū 'shepherd' $<$ *rāḏūm. The etymology of the divine name Nabū $<$ Nabium fits well into this pattern.

So far the evidence points to a distinction of long $/o:/$ and $/u:/$ on etymological lines. In this connection should be mentioned two fragmentary lines of text tentatively identified by Sollberger p. 72 as part of “a (verbal?) paradigm”:

13) $\alphaων/[v]$ $<$ /$\alphaων$ [v] C 4, the second $x$ being unfinished and corrected into $\chi$.

Provided they represent preterite forms of kānu 'to last, to endure', these spellings seem to contradict the neat etymological pattern suggested above. However, there is no context to support the analysis, let alone any evidence to prove that the language of the fragment is Akkadian.

**Rule 4:** $[+\text{voice}] → [-\text{voice}]/ - [-\text{voice}]$. 
The rule only applies to consonants and states that a voiced consonant is decoyed before a voiceless consonant. This is a very natural rule, well-known from many languages including several modern Semitic languages, and it very likely operated in earlier Akkadian as well. However, due to the highly conventional character of cuneiform writing evidence for voice assimilation is slight. A case in point is Old Babylonian šubtum 'dwelling, habitation' attested a number of times spelled with intervocalic -pa- as in šu-pa-at and šu-pa-as-sū. The spellings with -pa- for expected -ba- suggest a back-formation from šubtum pronounced with a medial cluster [pt] according to the above rule. In the Greek texts there is one instance of voice assimilation:

14) ana É-ti la te-r[lit-ub-sū (?)]
         [λ]α τήγοςς 'you shall not enter it (cuneiform version 'the house')' B 2.

Unfortunately a break appears at the end of the line in the cuneiform version leaving only a partial overlapping between the two versions. Correct Akkadian requires either ana bīt lā terrub 'you shall not enter the house' or lā terrubsū 'you shall not enter to him'. The student scribe committed two errors in his transcription. He mixed up the two idioms, and he misinterpreted the verbal form as preterite rather than as present. However, for the question under discussion here it suffice to state that the transcription τήγοςς reflects an earlier preterite tērubštū.

Rule 5: (...) V₁C₁C₂... → (...) V₁C₁V₁C₂... if C₁ is plosive and unless C₂ is t. It is a characteristic feature of the Akkadian texts in Greek orthography that a non-final syllable closed by a plosive consonant is made open by the insertion of a secondary vowel identical with the vowel of the preceding syllable. The rule does not apply wherever there is a long (double) consonant on the syllable boundary or the following consonant is t (in all documented cases the feminine ending). Compare

15) σαφαλες < šapiliš 'below' A 3 (2x).
16) αο[...]< Ana-sin-taklu B 4 (personal name).
17) ἰνακεθθ < ina ikleti (ekleti) 'by night' Geller, the spelling ik-le-ti being interpreted as ik-li-ti for /ikliːt/.
18) ναφατας < nappāši (gen.) 'loophole' Geller.
19) λαφατας < libattāša 'its brickwork' B 1.
20) ἱαφατ < ina apti (cstr.) 'through the window' 5x Geller.

A short secondary vowel is inserted in specific environments and all short vowels in these environments are secondary, except in a few instances before r as in nukurtu 'hostility, war', pl. nukuratā. After the introduction of the shift these short vowels including those before r were phonologically predictable and accordingly non-phonemic. For the late traditional pronunciation of Akkadian, then, the plural form just quoted should be rewritten as phonemic /nukraːt/. In his GAG 18d W. von Soden noted the existence of so-called 'Sprossvokale' in Neo-Babylonian and Neo-Assyrian letters without committing himself to the ques-
tion whether these vowels were actually spoken or they should be explained on a purely graphic basis. Several Assyriologists favour the latter view. The Greek texts demonstrate without a doubt that these vowels were spoken. The circumstance that there is no evidence for similar 'Sprossvokale' in Aramaic suggests that the development of these secondary vowels in Akkadian was an independent innovation of the language. A few spellings in the Aramaic cuneiform incantation from Uruk would seem to contradict the statement that there is no evidence for 'Sprossvokale' in Aramaic. However, the contradiction is only apparent, since all relevant spellings occur in broken plural forms of nouns and seem to represent the source of the entity known from Hebrew grammatical tradition as shewa medium, i.e., absence of vowel reflecting a former presence of vowel:

21) ga-ba-re-ē 'men' 12.37 (rev. 11),
    ha-ba-ra-an '(female) companions' 16.41 (rev. 15, partly broken).
    ru-ga-ze-e 'fury' 20.24, cf. 30 (rev. 4).

In later stages of Aramaic medial short a disappears as in Syriac gavrē, modern Turoyo gawre 'men'. The broken plural patterns with a after the second root consonant are cognate with the plural patterns of the so-called segolates in Hebrew and with Ethiopic patterns as in azān 'ears' (sg. azn) and abāw 'fathers' (sg. ab). The broken plurals of Arabic have different forms.

Rule 6:

a) \( m \rightarrow [w]/V - V \) if \( V \) is [-rounded],

b) \( m \rightarrow \text{zero}/V_{1} - V_{2} \) if \( V_{1} \) or \( V_{2} \) is [+rounded],

c) \( m \rightarrow \text{zero}/V - # \).

Another characteristic feature of the late tradition is so-called lenition of \( m \) to \( w \) and zero. Between unrounded vowels etymologically short \( m \) is rendered Greek \( v \) as in (10) above and (22, 23) below (Rule 6a). However, if the preceding or the following vowel is rounded, Rule 6b applies and \( m \) is rendered zero as in (3, 12) above. Initially \( m \) remains as Greek \( μ \) in (5) above and (24, 25) below. So does long \( mm \) in the broken passage (26):

22) σανας < Ṣamaš Geller.
23) σανη < Ṣāmē 'heaven' B 1 (3x).
24) μαα < mār (cstr.) 'son' B 4, Geller.
26) om[ ] < ummnānūtu 'erudition' B 4.

In two instances Rule 6b also applies across a word boundary in a construct chain, i.e. in an environment where Biblical Hebrew will use a conjunctive accent. Apparently lenition of \( m \) operated in Akkadian in very much the same way as did spirantization of \( b g d k p t \) in Biblical Hebrew.

27) ḫw[a][t] օ< < ina apti mubhi 'through the top window' Geller.
The reflexes of cuneiform m occur in specific environments none of which contrast. The entities [m], [w] and zero complement each other and we may assign them as variants of one phoneme /m/. Historically the zero allophone can easily be explained as a former glide [w] disappearing in the neighbourhood of rounded vowels. Thus in terms of relative chronology Rule 6a applies before Rule 6b, though without the qualification [-rounded]. The more general Rule 6a now converts all instances of intervocalic /m/ to [w]. Later Rule 6b converts intervocalic [w] to zero, if the preceding or the following vowel is rounded. The allophones of /m/ are the result of a phonemic merger of earlier m and w to be dated not later than the early Old Babylonian period. Though the majority of Old Babylonian spellings are etymologically correct, variation of m and w does occur and we find spellings like the personal name na-aw-ru-um-i-li UET 5,133,17 etc. varying with na-am-ru-um-i-li 599,13 etc. The earliest documented cases go back even to the Ur III period.17 Word initially graphic hypercorrections like Old Babylonian warhis for arhis ‘quickly’ and waspuram for aspuram ‘I sent’ would seem to indicate that a shift w to zero had already taken place in the underlying spoken language.18 Post-Old Babylonian cuneiform tradition treated the allophones [m] and [w] as the orthographic entity modern Assyriologists transcribe m, no doubt because cases of etymological m were more numerous than cases of etymological w. Thus the diachronic evidence of cuneiform tradition confirms the analysis arrived at on the basis of the synchronic evidence of the Greek texts.

Rather unexpectedly there is evidence that m shifted to zero in word final position (Rule 6c):

28) χ(hours) ounqov<β>o < qêmu u upuntu C1; cuneiform version has [Z]ID ū-pu-um-tu.

[χ]η θωσω[α] | < qêmu tasqû C 1; cuneiform version has [ZID A] l-a-sî TI[R]
(all denoting types of flour).

29) oun < rêm ‘have mercy on’ (imp.) B 4.

30) o < ūmi (gen.) ‘day’ Geller.

The text of (28) is in a very fragmentary state of preservation, but reading and interpretation as given here are supported by the cuneiform version. In his treatment of the private votive inscription from Leningrad, one of the few texts without a cuneiform parallel, Schleieco19 interpreted (29) as representing reî ‘des Hirten’, syntactically an apposition referring to the preceding personal name (10). Evidently this meaning of the passage does not suit the context very well. Shepherds are not expected to write votive inscriptions asking for “profound learning … scribal skill (and) erudition for ever”. Once the shift of word final m to zero is established an interpretation of (29) as from an imperative rêm almost suggests itself. The student scribe Nabû-ramaanni very likely asked his patron god for mercy, a long life (ω̄<ε̄>t οοωμο < ūmi urrik) and proficiency in scribal skills.

Rule 6c that reduces m to zero in word final position applies after the important
rule that reduces final short vowels to zero in Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian.\textsuperscript{20} The latter to be stated formulaically as

\begin{equation}
V \rightarrow \text{zero}/C - \#
\end{equation}

converts forms inflected for case like \textit{qēmu} and \textit{qēmi} ‘flour’ to \textit{qēm}, causing at the same time a morphologic merger with the old construct state form \textit{qēm}. Rule 6c then converts the noun \textit{qēm} to \textit{qē} (28) and the verb \textit{rēm} to \textit{rē} (29), or in phonemic terms /qe/ and /re/ vowel length being non-distinctive in word final position at this stage of the language. The sequence of rules in the generative statement corresponds to the actual sequence of historical sound changes. The loss of final \textit{m} occurred after lenition of \textit{m} in specific environments and after loss of final short vowels in Neo-Babylonian, since there is evidence for final [m] as well as lenition of \textit{m} to [w] in Aramaic transcriptions of Neo-Babylonian proper names:\textsuperscript{21}

32) \textit{rmškn} for \textit{Rēm(u)-šukun} (lit. ‘show mercy’) Delaporte No. 94, Millard p. 4, Vattioni No. 98, contrast \textit{qē} (29).

33) \textit{pnḫm} for \textit{Pān-nabū-tēm(u)} (lit. ‘before Nabū is judgement’) Delaporte No. 43,\textsuperscript{22} Vattioni No. 44.

34) \textit{nbwrwn} for \textit{Nabū-rīman(ni)} (lit. ‘Nabū, have mercy on me’) Millard p. 4, Vattioni No. 131, compare \textit{vāβō[v]quαv} (10).

The modern transcription of Akkadian as used in Assyriology is largely diachronic and conventional and does not reflect the important phonological change (31). The Aramaic transcriptions \textit{rm} (32) and \textit{tm} (33) represent spoken \textit{rēm} and \textit{tēm} with preserved final [m] rather than \textit{rēmu} (earlier \textit{rēma}) and \textit{tēmu}.

The reduction of final \textit{m} to zero is later than Neo-Babylonian and belongs to a phase of the traditional pronunciation in which Aramaic was the underlying spoken language. However, there is no evidence for a similar sound change in the roughly contemporary Uruk incantation. On the contrary, final \textit{m} is preserved in several passages:

\textit{qu-um} ‘rise’ (imp.) 18.43 (rev. 17).
\textit{\textsuperscript{[a]-na-a} ha-ki-mi} ‘I know’ 26 for \textit{/ana ha:kim}\textsuperscript{23}.

Since loss of final \textit{m} has no parallel in contemporary Aramaic, we shall have to look for an explanation within the language tradition itself. As is well known, spellings imitating Old Babylonian forms are often met with in official inscriptions of the Late Babylonian period. It is quite evident that Old Babylonian texts formed part of the school curriculum for the training of a scribe. Otherwise the use of the quasi-Old Babylonian \textit{aωω} [ωω] B 4 for \textit{ana si‘at ūmī} ‘for ever’ would be unexplained. The shift \textit{ia} > \textit{ā} already occurred during the Old Babylonian period. In Late Babylonian official inscriptions mimation is very common, as in \textit{a-bi-im} VAB 4,82,20,26 and \textit{a-ba-am} 72,30,45 ‘of my father’ (all gen., compare Aramaic \textit{abbā} ‘my father’). The ancient scribes must have been aware of an orthographic
rule similar to our Rule 6c which converted *abim to *abi. Then Rule (31) reduced final *i to zero. It is suggested that the rule which removed mimiation was extended by analogy so as to cover all cases of *m in final position, even after the reduction of final short vowels to zero.

The application of Rule (31) invites a few comparative comments. The loss of a distinctive feature of length in final vowels in Late Babylonian and in the traditional pronunciation is supported by several parallels from other classical Semitic languages. Compare, for example, the free pronouns for the second person singular masculine and feminine in Biblical Hebrew (36a), Syriac (36b) and Geez (36c):

36) a. attā, b. att spelled *nt, c. antā < *anta (masc.).
   a. att, b. att spelled *nty, c. anti < *anti (fem.).

The Hebrew version of rule (31) reduced final short vowels to zero, including *i of the Proto-Semitic feminine pronoun *anti. However, the final vowel of the masculine *anta survived the change, but the new phonological structure of the vowel system resulting from the change required it to be lengthened. The reason for the preservation of the vowel can only be guessed at. It may well have been a desire for maintaining the inherited gender distinction in the pronouns. In Syriac the masculine and feminine pronouns merged as att, but the conservative orthography preserved the old Imperial Aramaic spellings of the pronouns *nt (masc.) and *nty (fem.). In Imperial Aramaic the same rule (31) reduced final short vowels to zero, though in the feminine pronoun final *i was preserved as *i to maintain gender distinction. However, a variant spelling *nty shows that in the masculine pronoun a reflex of final *a survived as *ā. A subsequent Syriac rule requiring reduction to zero of all unstressed final vowels then shifted early Aramaic antā/attā and anttā/āttī to att.24 Classical Geez restructured the inherited Semitic system of vowel quantity into a system of vowel quality. The ancient long vowels *i and *u continued as /i/ and /u/, whereas the corresponding short vowels merged as /ɔ/. Word finally a remained, but at least in Post-classical Geez the new /ɔ/ was lost in this position. Instead of shifting final *i to *ɔ and later to zero the feminine pronoun anti preserved the final vowel as /i/ presumably on the analogy of the final vowel of the masculine form. On the other hand, classical and literary Arabic preserved the Semitic system of vowel quantity. Therefore, the pronouns under discussion appear in this language as anta (masc.) and anti (fem.). Today this historical analysis may seem commonplace, but in pre-phonemic Semitics it caused considerable difficulties and resulted in the reconstruction of double sets of protoforms, one with a final short vowel the other with a final long vowel.25

Let us return to the traditional pronunciation of Akkadian. An effect of rule (31) was that in word final position long and short vowels no longer contrasted. In this environment only long vowels remained. The few etymologically short vowels that survived the change presumably continued as phonetically long. There is only documentation for final /i/, spelled Greek ι, from the late incantation published by Geller:

37) υνανοθι < ina apti (cstr.) ‘from the window’ (5x),
οζον < uzn < uznu ‘ear’ B 4.
39) ϕολαγγ < palg < palgu a type of canal A 2.
40) χαβαρ (!) < qabr < qabri (gen.) ‘grave’ Geller.

CONCLUSION

During the last phases of its history sound change affected Akkadian on a number of points. To account for these changes seven rules were set up:

**Rule 1** lengthens e to [e:] in unstressed open syllables. The rule operates due to interference from Aramaic.

**Rules 2 and 3** lower the vowels i and u to [e] and [o:] respectively before r (and h). Lowering of i is well-known from earlier Akkadian, but the extension of the rule to apply to all environments before r and h, including word initial position, is an innovation of the late traditional pronunciation. There is no early evidence for u.

**Rule 4** devoices voiced consonants before voiceless consonants and is no innovation. It is a natural rule that can be traced back at least to Old Babylonian. Admittedly, however, documentation is slight.

**Rule 5** states the conditions for inserting so-called ‘Sprössvokale’ known from cuneiform orthography. The presence of these vowels in texts in Greek orthography proves beyond a doubt that they reflect a phonetic reality.

**Rule 6** refers to lenition of m to [w] or zero. A shift to [w] in intervocalic position is well-known from earlier Akkadian, whereas zero treatment is an innovation of the tradition.

**Rule 7** dissolves final consonant clusters through insertion of secondary vowels. The process is similar to segolization in Hebrew and Aramaic and due to interference from spoken Aramaic.

Rules 6 (zero treatment) and 7 apply after the dropping of final short vowels in Neo-Babylonian. Even though this important sound change dates to the pre-Hellenistic period, the word forms resulting from it constitute the most conspicuous
feature of the Akkadian texts in Greek orthography as seen by the modern Assyriologist accustomed to Akkadian texts in cuneiform orthography.

NOTES

1. F. C. Burkitt, PSBA 24 (1902) 143.
5. Stress in Akkadian refers to the state of evidence considered conclusive in the author’s treatment of the subject in JCS 32 (1980) 3–16, particularly p. 15.
7. For the reading melūhû for conventional meluhhaš, see Knudsen (ref. note 4) p. 158.
8. Conventional readings of bilataritha are allatû CAD N II 21a lexical section.
10. See W. H. Ph. Römer, Festschrift Adam Falkenstein 197 (Wiesbaden 1967). W. von Soden, AHw. 1257f. s.v. šubtu(m) mentions a few additional attestations.
11. For details, see Knudsen p. 158.
15. The term lenition was introduced into Semitics by Friedrich and used for describing the variation of orthographic m and b in Punic, see J. Friedrich and W. Röllig, Phönizisch-punische Grammatik, AnOr. 46 (1970) 55.
17. Cf. I. J. Gelb, MAD 2, 123.
20. For the treatment of final short vowels in Neo-Babylonian and Late Babylonian, see GAG 13c and the references to literature given by the present writer in BiOr. 43 (1986) 731 note 26.
23. For the phonological status of vowel length in early Aramaic, see Knudsen (ref. note 4) p. 155f.
26. See the discussion in Knudsen pp. 159–161.
Dedication and Devotion

The Introduction to the Kitāb al-Jalīs as-sāliḥ wa-l-anīs an-nāṣīḥ, Ascribed to Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzī (d. 654/1257)

TRYGGVE KRONHOLM, Uppsala

In a few previous studies I have presented various problems pertaining to an important adab work, of which I am preparing the editio princeps, namely the comprehensive mirror of princes entitled Kitāb al-Jalīs as-sāliḥ wa-l-anīs an-nāṣīḥ (see the adjacent bibliography: Kronholm 1984-1986; Kronholm 1990; Kronholm 1991).

This work was brought to my notice several years ago by courtesy of professor Gösta Vitemstam of Lund, who had consulted the Gotha manuscript thereof on preparing his editio princeps of Kanz al-mulāk fī kāfiyyat as-sulāk. The treasure of princes on the fashion of behaviour, ascribed to Sibṭ ibn al-Djauzī. Now edited for the first time from the two MSS Aya Sofya 2021, Istanbul, and Bibliothèque Nationale 3515, Paris. With an introduction and critical, philological and historical notes (1970).

It is, accordingly, most natural to treat a new problem related to this work in a tribute to my teacher, colleague and intimate friend professor Vitemstam on the occasion of his 70th birthday, in recognition of his dedication and devotion to classical Arabic literature, likewise in appreciation of his constant and generous endeavours to bring Scandinavian colleagues in the field of Semitic languages together in scholarly co-operation and understanding.

The problem under consideration is that concerning the dedication and devotion speaking out of the introduction to Kitāb al-Jalīs as-sāliḥ wa-l-anīs an-nāṣīḥ. True, the formal dedication of the work as represented by MSS A-C and MS D respectively, has been treated in a previous investigation (Kronholm 1991). Here the introduction by Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzī according to MSS A (fol. 1b/1-4b/8; mainly identical with MSS B and C) will be the object of a preliminary translation and an interpretation as regards the underlying ideas and the traditional material included.

"It should be observed", Jamāl ad-Dīn Abū l-Faraj ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Jauzī (d. 597/1201) remarks in his Kitāb al-Quṣṣāṣ wa-l-mudakkirīn, "that when the natural disposition was created, possessing as it did an inborn love for corroding pleasures and frivolous preoccupations which distract from those things that bring profit, it stood in need of a reformer, a teacher and a warner to restrain it. Metaphorically speaking [the natural disposition] is like water which flows [towards the lowest point]. However, when it is held back by a dam its flowing ceases but then continues again with the opening of the passage. Now, just as it is necessary that one give meticulous attention to the dam in the way of taking effective
measures to fortify it, so likewise it is necessary that one give diligent attention to [the control of] the natural disposition by means of constraining exhortations (zawājir)...For this reason the prophets were sent in order to draw peoples to the good and warn them against the evil. Sacred books were revealed to them for the purpose of training and instruction. These prophets were, at the same time, both bearers of good news and warners. Then after them came the learned ('ulamā'), all of whom were distinguished by their legal pronouncements (fāṭwāwā) and their learning ('ilm). Moreover, the storytellers (quṣṣāṣā) and preachers (wu‘āz) were also given a place in this divine scheme (amr) in order to exhort (ḥīṭāb) the masses” (ed. M. L. Swartz, Beyrouth 1971, 30f., English section, 106f.).

The ethical argument of spiritual exhortation, which Ibn al-Jauzī gives a general application, receives in the literary genre of the mirror of princes (Fürstenspiegel) a particular significance: the behaviour of the ruler – the head of his people – is not merely an example to the masses; it represents an organic government of the body of the nation (for an introduction to this genre, see spec. the classical study Richter 1932, further Gätje 1987:208-220, with numerous references to more recent contributions).

As indicated in my previous studies noted above, the specimen of this literary genre, which now is being edited for the first time, constitutes no exception to this rule.

Let it suffice to recall here that the work has come down to our time through at least four manuscripts, viz. MS Topkapi Sarayi Müzesi Küttüphanesi 8299, Istanbul, also known as MSS III. Ahmet 2622 (designated by me as MS A), MS Forschungsbibliothek Gotha – Schloss Friedenstein Orient. A 1881 (MS B), MS Dār al-kutub Taṣwuf [Taṣawwuf] 874, Cairo (MS C), and MS Niedersächsische Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek Göttingen Arab. 146 (MS D).

The relationship between MS D and the rest of the manuscripts is very complicated indeed, as I have pointed out in a paper presented to the 14th congress of the Union Européenne des Arabisants and Islamisants in Budapest 1988 (Kronholm 1991).

The Istanbul, Gotha and Cairo manuscripts are unanimous in presenting the work by the title of Kitāb al-Jalīs as-sāliḥ wa-l-anīs an-nāsiḥ (“The book of the good companion and advising friend”). These manuscripts are, likewise, unanimous in transmitting a text of this work divided into ten chapters (for a survey of the contents of these 10 chapters, see Kronholm 1984-1986), moreover in explicit remarks to the effect that the work was composed in honour of and to the exhortation of the Ayyūbīd al-Malik al-Aṣraf Abū l-Muẓaffar Müsa ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ayyūb (d. on Muharram 4, 635 / August 27, 1237; for source testimonies, see e.g. EI, New edition, 1, 796b-808a [Cl. Cahen]; Gottschalk 1958: 34-41; Hartmann 1975, s.v. al-Malik al-Aṣraf, 343).

The attribution of this mirror of princes varies partially between the manuscripts. However, on the basis of chronological and literary consideration the ascription of the work to Yūsuf Sībṭ ibn al-Jauzī (d. on Dū l-Hijja 21, 654 / January 10, 1257 must be deemed as ascertained (see Kronholm 1984-1986).

According to the colophon of the Istanbul manuscript, undisputably containing the text in its most original form, the work was initially composed in the city of
Damascus in 39 days, viz. from Muḥarram 1 until Ṣafar 10, 613 / April 20 until May 30, 1216 (MS A, fol. 218a/6-9). The manuscript was copied by Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbbās al-Ḥanafī in Mosul from an autograph by Sibṭ ibn al-Jauzī. The copy was concluded on Rabia I 14, 614 / June 22, 1217, i.e. merely one year after the initial composition of the work.

II

The introduction to the ten major chapters of Kitāb al-Jalīs as-sāliḥ wa-l-anīs an-naṣīḥī in MSS A-C (in MS A, fol. 1b/1-4b/8) contains in a traditional manner a ḥutba of an utmost elevated nature, followed by a formal and panegyrical dedication of the work and a description of its aims and contents, all of which reveals the author’s genuine devotion to the addressee as well as his humble devotion to God Most High.

The character of this introduction will be disclosed by means of the subsequent preliminary English rendering, essentially following the text of the Istanbul manuscript.

The first part (MS A, fol. 1b/1-2a/8)

In the Name of God, the Merciful, the Compassionate.

Praise belongs to God, the One, the Eternal, the Judge, the Glorious, the Mighty, the Benefactor, who wrote with the judging pens on the plates of souls the [Koranic] verses of oneness and faith, and kindled the lamps of hearts with the light of success and beneficence. He brought out the descendants of Adam in the land of Nūrī and divided them into those that are fortunate and those that are deprived. So many desponded people were raised, and many exalted were debased. He made pure the hearts of some, and rendered turbid the nature of others, and disfigured them. The people of turbidity are hostile to one another, whilst the people of purity call each other brethren. And they come together in their hearts, even though their dwellings are separated. And they seek each other’s advice about the hidden things, in order to remove shortcomings, even if the tongue does not speak. They approach one another to purify their hearts, albeit they live remote from each other. They warn one another concerning profit and loss. They call out each other like watchmen. The wakeful alerts the sleepy. Thus their Lord commanded them in what He revealed in the Koran: “Help one another to piety and godfearing. Do not help each other to sin and enmity” [Sur. 5.3].

Since He has bestowed favours and sustentation, I offer Him praise [as manifold as] the number of the leaves and the twigs, and I admit His oneness, an admission proceeding from evidence. I offer prayer for His Messenger Muḥammed, the most honourable creature that has ever been, and for his family and his companions, and their followers in beneficence. May God – He is high – make lasting the state of the ‘Abbāsides, and hoist its banner in every place. May everyone who is within the East and the West proceed in the obedience of [fol. 2a] the Imam an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh. May God make lasting the days of the Sultan al-Malik al-Aṣraf, the one who grants victory to religion, the strength [rizza] of time: He has watered the plant of justice with the water of grace, and so all his domain is a garden. He has levelled the country with his favourable management, and so his justice is the preserverance of equity. He has straightened matters, protected the border points, and opened the hearts of the believers, and so the mention of him is more fragrant in the noses of good people than the [odour of] sweet basil. He has given generously and supported liberally. He has freely spent his effort and endeavour, and he has prevented his army from oppression, as the soldiers follow the policy of the sultan. And so the hearts of good people love him, as love of that which is created is a token of the love of the Creator. May God unite the pleasure of his earthly life with the pleasure of his hereafter – and the world of the hereafter is truly the life.
The second part (MS A, fol. 2a/9-3a/15)

Now then [amman ba’datu], as God – He is praised and high – has bestowed His favours on those who are leaders and politicians, so He has conferred upon them the gift of reform and direction, and appointed them to be saviours of man and executors of His commands. And since guardianship is a means for the safety of people as regards their bodies, beliefs, possessions, nourishments, and the whole of their circumstances, the merit of the one who takes the responsibility for it is evident, as he is the means for the care of the souls and the setting up of rules: through him the iniquities are laid bare, the wronged is given justice from the wrong-doer, the learning is preserved, the obstinate gives in, forcibly [or] peacefully, and the country of God is protected from prattle and errors, as if he had worshiped God – He is praised and high – through the worship of each worshipper. May he develop the fear [of God], and sharpen it [fol. 2b] to the whole of his word [scil. Muhammed's] – God bless him and grant him salvation: “The justice of one hour is better than the worship of sixty years.”

If what we have said is proved right, it only applies concerning a man who combines two attributes: honesty and grace. For if guardianship is without grace, the guardian would not be good at managing, and if grace is without honesty, that which should be guarded would be lost. This is proved by what has come down in the Old Book: “[Yūsuf] said: ‘Set me over the storehouse of the land – I am a knowing guardian’ [Sur. 12.55].”

And God has actually combined the two attributes in the king of the time, and the reciter of the Koran, the posted [fighter], the [holy] warrior, the patient, the victorious, the triumphant al-Malik al-Aṣraf, who is the ruler of the rank of the religion of the [holy] warriors [i.e. the faithful ones], the winner of both secular and religious things, the comfort of souls, and the spirit of hearts. Abū l-Mūsā ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ayyūb. He has sparked the star of justice, so that its heat is blazing. He has closed the door of injustice, so that it became difficult to open. The provinces have come to order through his directions [lit. pens], and the widows have had no need in his days.

Poem:
He has got the wisdom of Lukmān,
and the appearance of Yūsuf,
the kingship of Sulaimān,
and the truthfulness of Abū Bakr.
He is a youth: the wrongs flee in front of his good reason,
as Satan flees in front of the Night of Power [cf. Sur. 97].

This [is so] in addition to that through which he is distinguished by preference of justice, rejection of injustice, love of beneficence towards man, and the abundance of piety, together with the attracting [i.e. patronizing] of scholars, the devotion to virtues, and the liberality which made true what we have been hearing about the ancient ones, and what we have been telling about those that are generous. On this path the predecessors have walked, and thereon the prominent masters have proceeded. So, how fortunate this nation is, as God has removed from it [fol. 3a] by his guardianship all griefs. And he is the pillar of Islam and the Muslims, because the strength [is based on] the pens of the learned. Now, the one in whom God has united these attributes He has safeguarded from deficiency and transgression, and He has directed the hearts of the subjects in affection towards him. He has actually given him generously His favours, as the unanimity of hearts to love someone is a proof of loving the True One. The proof of that is what we have been told by ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī l-Majd and Abū Tahir al-Harimi; they said: Abū l-Qāsim Hibbat Allāh ibn Muhammad ibn Husain told us; he said: Abū ‘Ali ibn al-Mudahhab told us; he said: Abū Bakr al-Qaṭṭāt told us; he said: ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ahmad related to us; he said: My father related to me; he said: Yazid ibn Hārūn related to us; he said: ‘Abd al-‘Aziz ibn ‘Abd Allāh told us; he said: Ismā’īl related to us that he had heard his father say: I heard Abū Hurairā – may God be pleased with him – relate to me about the Messenger of God – God bless him and grant him salvation – that he said: “If God loves a servant, He says: ‘Oh Gabriel, I love so-and-so; therefore: Love ye him!’ So Gabriel calls out in heaven: ‘God loves so-and-so; therefore: Love ye him!’ And then the love of him is thrown down upon the people of the earth, and so he is loved. And if [God] hates a servant, He says: ‘Oh Gabriel, I hate so-and-so; therefore: Hate ye him!’ So Gabriel calls out in heaven: ‘God hates so-and-so; therefore: Hate ye him!’ And then hatred is laid down for him in earth, and so he is hated.” This hadith is authentic: Ahmad [ibn Muhammad ibn Ḥanbal] has transmitted it in his Musnad.
There are five aims that have induced me to pick up these pearls and thread them in [fol. 3b] a string, embroidered with the chronicles and biographies: The first [aim] is to inform people about his [scil. the sultan’s] perfect conduct and his solid mind, and what God has endowed him with of wakefulness and care, in order that thereby the hearts of people might be strengthened. The second [aim] is that the recollection of the merits of this king should be immortal by means of the existence of this book; for as the prayer of the one who prays is cut off at his death, whilst his attachment to the virtues remains forever, so the scholar’s writings are his literary offspring: they are his immortalized children. The third [aim] is to recapitulate the biographies of the passed predecessors, the conduct of whom is to be followed up as an example. The fourth [aim] is that, since I have nothing to present to him in accordance with the extent of my belief in him, though he might be in no need of it, I have chosen to present to him an admonition, even though he might do without it, by means of what knowledge he has; yet the recollection is beneficial to believers. And the Messenger of God – God bless him and grant him salvation – said to Ibrāhīm ibn Masʿūd: “Recite to me!” And he said: “Should I recite to you? Why, it has been revealed to you!” He said: “I love to hear it from another than myself.”

And ʿUmar ibn al-Ḥāfiẓ – may God be pleased with him – said to Kaʿb al-ʿAbbār – may God be pleased with him: “Remind us!” And the grandees are still demanding reminder, and are looking for an admonition.

My grandfather [Abū l-Faraʿī Abd ar-Rahmān ibn ʿAllī ibn al-Jauzi] related to us: Ahmad ibn ʿAllī ibn ʿAṣāṭ told us, and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Māḥmūd al-Bazzār also told us: he said: [Mūḥammad] ibn ʿAbdād told us;Mahfūz ibn Ahmad told us; al-Hāzīri reported to us; al-Muʿāfī ibn Zakariyāʾa told us; al-Kaukābī reported to us; al-Faḍl ibn al-ʿAbdās ar-Rabīʿ reported to us; he said: Ibrāhīm ibn ʿIsa reported to us about his father; he said: al-Manṣūr said: “How much I am in need of four to be standing at my door [fol. 4a], and none to be at my door more virtuous than them.” It was said: “Who are they?” He said: “They are the pillars of kingship: and the kingship will be right only through them. As for one of them, he is a judge who will not adduce before God the reproof of any reproacher. The second is a head of the police who treats the weak with justice against the strong. The third is a tax-collector who does not suppress people, for I [scil. the ruler] am in no need of their suppression.” Thereupon he bit his index finger three times, saying every time: “Oh!” It was said: “Who is the fourth?” He said: “He is a postman who writes [his] reports in accordance with the truth.”

The fifth [aim] is to inform the High Council [of the ruler] of my allegiance and my affection, and also my constant prayer [for him], and my praise. And [the Messenger] – God bless him and grant him salvation – has said, according to what we were told by my grandfather, Abū l-Faraʿī ʿAbd ar-Rahmān ibn ʿAllī ibn al-Jauzi; he said: Abū l-Fāṭāh al-Karaḫī told us; he said: Ibn ʿAmīr al-Azīd and Abū Bakr al-Aurājī told us; they said: al-Jirāḥī told us; he said: Sīdār reported to us; he said: Yāḥyā ibn Sāʿīd al-Qattān told us; he said: Nār ibn Yazīd told us about Ḥabīb ibn ʿUbaid about al-Maṣqām ibn Maʿdīkarib; he said: [The Messenger] – God bless him and grant him salvation – said: “If one of you loves his brother, he should tell him [that he loves him].” at-Tirmidī said: “This hadith is authentic.”

I have divided this book into ten chapters; and if approval befalls it, this is in agreement with my good hope; and if not, I have done my utmost, and God is the giver of success.

Account of the titles of the chapters

The first chapter: On his [scil. the sultan’s] birth and origin.
The second chapter: Elucidation of the need of exhortation.
The third chapter: On what it behoves the sultan to employ [as regards means and persons].
The fourth chapter: The honour of leadership and its significance.
The fifth chapter: The benefit of justice and the help of the troubled [fol. 4b].
The sixth chapter: In dispraise of injustice.
The seventh chapter: On the holy war.
The eighth chapter: A selection from the biographies of the rulers.
The ninth chapter: A selection of stories about pious men and ascetics, and their utterances, and [about] those who have come to the rulers [to give advice and to ask for reward], and those who have not.
The tenth chapter: On the exhortation of the ancestors of the rulers, and [of] those who received their rewards, and those who did not receive it. This chapter is subdivided into two parts, the first we have mentioned, and the second is an account of a group of sultans and princes who have become ascetics. And when we have finished this second part, we have concluded the book with some little things and choice items, and ten chosen tales. By relating them we have aimed at the descending of the [heavenly] blessings.

Now we commence this book with the blessing of God – He is high.

III

These three different parts constituting the introduction to Kitab al-Jalīs aṣ-ṣāliḥ wa-l-anīs an-nāsīh, ascribed to Sībṭ ibn al-Jauzī (d. 654/1257), will be commented upon in subsequent order.

The first part (MS A, fol. 1b/1-2a/8)

This part consists mainly of a customary praise of God in an elevated, rhymed prose.

Its first subsection after the basmala (fol. 1b/1) is opened in a traditional manner with al-ḥamdū li-l-lāh (1b/2) and concluded by a Koranic quotation (Sur. 5,2).

The sentence aḥraja duriyyata Ādama bi-arḍī Nuʿmān (1b/4) is interpreted in the light of Yāqūt, Muʿjam al-buldān, 5/294a (cf. also Dozy 2/700a).

The second subsection is introduced by aḥmaduḥu (1b/12), and it is concluded by the phrase wa-inna d-dāra l-ḥājrata lahiya l-ḥaywān (2a/8). Here reference is made to the Imām an-Nāṣir li-Dīn Allāh (1b/15-2a/1), the ‘Abbāsid caliph (1180-1225; see in particular Hartmann 1975), and, naturally more eloquently, to the sultan al-Malik al-Asrāf (2a/1-8), in honour of whom Sībṭ ibn al-Jauzī has composed his Kitab al-Jalīs aṣ-ṣāliḥ wa-l-anīs an-nāsīh.

The presentation of al-Asrāf as ‘izzati z-zamān is based on the obvious reading of MS C and the probable reading of MS A; curiously MS B seems to read ‘urrati z-zamān, which is a reading so clearly contrary to the context that it must be an error of the copyst. In view of the dubious manuscript situation, even a reading like ġurrati z-zamān might be considered.

The second part (MS A, fol. 2a/9-3a/15)

The second part, the beginning of which is traditionally marked by annā baʿḍu (2a/9) and the end of which is apparent from the following faṣl (3a/15), aims at pointing out the true character of the guardianship (walāya; see further e.g. 2a/11 2b/3; 3a/1), which God has entrusted to the sultan, especially the two necessary attributes “honesty” (amāna, 2b/2) and “grace” (faḍl, 2b/2), which are said to have been united in al-Malik al-Asrāf, Abū l-Muẓaffar ibn Abī Bakr ibn Ayyūb (2b/5-8).

The argument of the author is supported by various kinds of material: parts of a ḥadīth (without any isnād, 2b/1); a Koranic citation from Sur. 12,55 (2b/4f.); a set of two verses (2b/10f.); and ultimately a second ḥadīth with a full isnād (3a/5-15).

The first ḥadīth quoted partially and lacking an isnād in 2b/1 is quoted again in
full in 18b/13-19a/5, where it is adduced on the authority of “my grandfather” (jādī) with a complete īsnād going back to Abū Huraira (ad-Dūsī al-Yamānī, d. 57 or 59 A.H.; see e.g. Ibn Qutaiba, al-Maʿārif, 277f.; Abū Nuʿaim, Hilyat al-auliyyāʾ, 1/376-385; Ibn Ḥajar, Tahdīb at-tahdīb, 12/262-267; and Ibn al-Jauzi, Ṣifat as-saʿafwa. ed. Haidarābād, 1/285-289; ed. Aleppo, 1/685-694; al-Qussas, 50). This ḥadīth is not included in the major, early compilations, but it is transmitted e.g. in Ibn Manqād, Lubāb al-ādāb, 35; and al-Mandārī, at-Tarīq wa-t-tarīq, 3/135; parts of it are also found in al-ʿAjlūnī, Kašf al-ḥāfa, 1/310 (No. 1004). It is noteworthy that Ibn al-Jauzi transmits this ḥadīth in his al-Miṣḥāb al-muḍī, 1/207, with an īsnād that goes from Zafar ibn ‘Ali back to Abū Huraira; it is also included in his as-Ṣifā, 45, though in a somewhat different form, with an īsnād going merely from ‘Ali ibn Tābit back to Abū Huraira. The opening text of this ḥadīth as transmitted here is attested by MSS A-C both here, in 18b/13-19a/5, and in the version of al-Miṣḥāb al-muḍī, 1/207, whereas the version included in as-Ṣifā, 45, opens with sāʿatu ’adlin min sulṭānīn ḥairun min ibīdati sittina sanātan...

The second ḥadīth (3a/5-15) is supplied with an īsnād, which goes from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī l-Majd [al-Ḥarībī] and Abū Tāhir al-Ḥarīmī back to Abū Huraira. It the text it is stated that this ḥadīth is authentic (ṣaḥīh) and transmitted by Aḥmad [ibn Ḥanbal] in his Musnad, where it is actually found in 2/509 in an almost identical textual form and with an accompanying īsnād going from ‘Abd Allāh [ibn Aḥmad] back to Abū Huraira (cf. also Musnad, 2/314; 2/341; 5/263). This ḥadīth is, however, included in varying form and sometimes as from an authority other than Abū Huraira in a number of other sources (cf. A. J. Wensineck, Concordance, 1/200b, incomplete), e.g. Muslim, Ṣaḥīh, Birr 157 = 2/448; translation 1385f.; al-Buḥārī, Ṣaḥīh, Tābīḥ 33 = 3/9173f. = translation 4/619 [see also ed. Leiden, Ḍab 4/122; Bad’ al-ḥalq 2/308]; at-Tirmidī, Ṣaḥīh, Taṣfīr Sur. 19 = 5/317f.; Mālik ibn Anas, al-Muwaṭṭa, Saʿar 15 = 953; see in addition Abū Nuʿaim, Hilyat al-auliyyāʾ, 3/258; 7/141; as-Sāʿātī, Minḥat al-maʾbūd, 2/46f., No. 2013. It is noteworthy that the first half of this ḥadīth is transmitted by Ibn al-Jauzi on the authority of Abū Huraira (although without any īsnād) in al-Miṣḥāb al-muḍī, 1/87; as well as in his Zād al-masīr, 5/266.

The third part (MS A, fol. 3a/15-4b/8)

The third and concluding part of the introduction (3a/15-4b/8) is devoted to a presentation of the five reasons that have induced the author to compose Kitāb al-Jalis as-sāliḥ wa-l-anis an-nāsiḥ (3a/15-4a/11), further to a survey of the contents of the ten chapters that constitute the work (4a/11-4b/8).

As regards the former subsection, it is noteworthy that the author elucidates the fourth reason adduced, viz. to admonish the sultan, by means of three minor pieces of tradition: one mirroring a conversation between the Prophet and Ibn Masʿūd, another one containing a dictum by ‘Umar ibn al-Ḥaṭṭāb to Kaʾb al-Ahbār, and a third one being an utterance by al-Manṣūr with a full īsnād, all of which are aimed at illustrating the need for admonition.

The first piece of ḥadīth is attributed without any īsnād to [Abū ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān ʿAbd Allāh] Ibn Masʿūd (d. 32 or 33 A.H.; see e.g. Ibn Saʿd, aṭ-

The subsequent brief story of the request of the caliph ‘Umar ibn al-Ḥaṭṭāb to Ka‘b al-ʿAlbārī is, likewise, adduced in order to emphasize the constant need for spiritual exhortation. Ka‘b al-ʿAlbārī (d. in 32 or 34 A.H.) was a Jew, well versed in the biblical scriptures and Jewish law and legend. He migrated from Yemen to Medina in the reign of ‘Umar and became a Muslim; he ultimately died in Syria (on his life and teaching, see e.g. Ibn Sa‘d, at-Tabaqat, ed. Leiden 7/2/156; Ibn Qutaiba, al-Ma‘arif, 430; Abū Nu‘aim, Hilyat al-auliya’, 5/364-391; Ibn al-Jauzi, Ṣifat as-safa, ed. Haidarabādī, 4/174-176; ed. Aleppo, 4/203-205; Salwāt al-ahzān, 123; Ibn al-ʿAtir, al-Lubāb, 1/522; ad-Dahābi, Tadmīrat al-luḥfāz, 1/52; Ibn Ḥajar, al-Isāba, 3/315-317; EI, New Edition 4/316b-317a). The formulation of the request of ‘Umar naturally suggests that Ka‘b ibn ʿAlbārī was on remarkably intimate terms with the caliph. The story accords well with the related, more comprehensive report concerning the conversation between Ka‘b and ‘Umar as transmitted by Ibn al-Jauzi in his al-Quṣṣāṣ, 33, § 55.

The positive values of admonition is further underlined by means of the quoted utterance by al-Manṣūr, the second ‘Abbāsid caliph (136/754-158/775). The dictum is transmitted e.g. in at-Ṭabarānī, Ta’rīḥ, ed. Leiden 1/398; at-Ṭarjūsī, Sirāj al-mulūk, 62, in slightly different formulations (on the Prophetic utterance referred to in 4a/2, see Ibn Māja, Sunan, Ḥudūd 3, No. 2540, 2/849). In our text the utterance is adduced on the authority of Ibn al-Jauzī (‘my [maternal] grandfather’, jaddī, 3b/12), who has included it e.g. in his al-Miṣbāḥ al-muḍī‘, 1/183f., where it is introduced merely by the phrase wa-kāna al-Manṣūr yaqūlū, whereas in our text an isnād is supplied, according to which Ibn al-Jauzī refers to the authority of (Abū Bakr) Ahmād ibn ‘Alī ibn Ṭābit (i.e. the famous author of Ta’rīḥ Baḍđādī, viz. al-Ḥaṭīb al-Baḍđādī, d. 463/1071; see e.g. GAL 2 1/400f.; GAL S 1/652; EI, New Edition, 4/111a-111b; Leder 1984: 101-107; among Ibn al-Jauzī’s works, see in particular al-Muntazam, 8/265-270). As regards the ultimate link of the chain of transmitters as given in our text, viz. Ibrāhīm ibn ʿĪsā, i.e. al-Manṣūr’s son ʿĪsā, see Ta’rīḥ Baḍđādī, 6/134.

In addition the author expounds the fifth reason for composing the book, viz. to inform the ruler’s High Council of the allegiance and affection of the writer, by quoting a hadith with full isnād, to the effect that one who loves his brother should tell him this, i.e. demonstrate his love by means of good and friendly conversation and pieces of useful advice. The Prophetic tradition is cited in our text with explicit reference to the authority of ‘my [maternal] grandfather [jaddī]
Abū l-Faraj ‘Abd ar-Rahmān ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Jauzī’, who is said to have learned it from Abū l-Fatḥ (Abū l-Malūk ibn Abī l-Qāsim ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sahīl al-Qāsim ibn Abī Maṃṣūr) al-Karūjī (d. 548 A.H.; see e.g. Ibn al-Aṭīr, al-Lubāb, 3/39; Ibn al-Imām, Ṣadārāt ad-dahab, 4/148; and especially Ibn al-Jauzī, al-Muntazam, 10/154f.; Maṣāḥaṭa), under the supervision of whom Ibn al-Jauzī once had studied at-Tirmidhī’s Ṣaḥīḥ, and Abū Ismā‘īl al-Anṣārī’s Manāqib Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal (see Swartz 1971:19, note 2). In our text as well as in Ibn al-Jauzī’s at-Tabṣira, 2/299, where this ḥadīth is cited, the earliest authority is said to be al-Maqdām ibn Ma‘dīkarīb; the ḥadīth is also quoted in Ibn al-Jauzī’s Manāqib al-Imām Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal, 282. This ḥadīth, which according to our text is attested by at-Tirmidhī as being authentic (ṣaḥīḥ, 4a/11), is found not merely in that source (Ṣaḥīḥ, Zuḥd 54), but also in other compilations of Prophetic traditions (cf. A. J. Wensinck, Concordance, 1/406a; 4/327a), e.g. in Ahmad ibn Ḥanbal’s Musnad 4/130.

As concerns the second subsection, finally, it is to be pointed out that the formulation of several of the titles of the ten chapters appears to be dependent on the headings found in Abū l-Faraj ‘Abd ar-Rahmān ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Jauzī’s al-Miṣbāḥ al-muḏī and as-Sīfā (for particulars, see Kronholm 1984-1986, 251f.).
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»Dann senke das Haupt und gib ihr nicht im Zorn!«

Eine testamentarische Verfügung des Königs ʿAmdā-Šəyōn aus dem Archiv der Hs. London, BM, Or 481

MANFRED KROPF, Lund


Bung muß gleichzeitig oder sogar vor der inhaltlichen Auswertung erfolgen; beide bedingen einander und oft ist der Bearbeiter auf eine glückliche Intuition zur Auflösung einer Abkürzung, Deutung eines elliptischen Syntagmas oder ähnlicher Texträtsel angewiesen.


der Beute der Engländer nach dem Fall von Maqdala kamen dann diese ungewollt zusammengestellten Teilarchive nach Europa.\textsuperscript{15}

Die Hs. BM Or 481 ( = WrBM II, Ib-6b) ist ein Teil dieser einzigartigen Sammlung. Ihre reichen Illustrationen belegen, daß sie vom Hofe, oder aber aus einem sehr reichen Kloster oder Kirche stammt. Ein Besitzvermerk besagt: \textit{Orit żä-Mädhane-‘Aläm = »Altes Testament der Erlöserkirche«}, eben der Kirche in Maqdala, die Tewodros II. als Bibliothek diente. Dies war die vorläufig vorletzte Station dieser Prachthandschrift von 209 folia im Format von 14\frac{3}{4} auf 14 inch = ca. 37,5 \times 35,5 cm. An ihr ist das in der Einleitung Gesagte schon zu verdeutlichen; gleichzeitig soll in einem Beispiel aus dem Schatz ihrer über 50 eingeschriebenen Urkunden der Wert dieser Texte für die historische Forschung verdeutlicht werden. Dies Dokument erlaubt uns darüberhinaus einen Blick auf die menschliche Seite eines sonst nur aus der offiziellen Hofgeschichtsschreibung und deren Komplement, der klerikalen Kreisen entstammenden \textit{Kurzen Chronik} bekannten Herrscher.\textsuperscript{16}


Der Haupttext einer Handschrift hat in der Zeit nur eine Dimension: den Zeitpunkt der Abschrift (das ist auch der Zeitpunkt an dem die Vorlagen noch existierten). Die zeitliche Tiefe, etwa der Vorlagen, ist lediglich hypothetisch und textkritisch zu rekonstruieren; spätere Änderungen des Textes spielen im Allgemeinen nur eine geringe Rolle. Lediglich wechselnde räumliche und institutionelle Bezüge können sich in verschiedenen, z. T. auch gelöschten Besitzvermerken dokumentieren. Was die eingeschriebenen Dokumente betrifft, so sind hier drei Dimensionen und die verschiedenartigsten Bezüge zu Institutionen und Orten zu unterscheiden. Ein derart in eine Handschrift eingeschriebenes Archiv kann drei Schichten haben:


Blickwinkel gilt es die erhaltenen Sammlungen zu betrachten: Nicht unbedingt die Authentizität solcher Urkunden, die auf Könige aus der aksumitischen Zeit zurückgehen wollen, verteidigend, möchte ich doch zu bedenken geben geben, daß dies nicht unmöglich, vielleicht nicht einmal unwahrscheinlich ist; sicher aber ist der größte Teil des Materials von der Zagw-Zeit an authentisch. Gelingt es nun, die drei Schichten des Archivs der Handschrift BM Or 481 bestimmen?


Der Schreiber des Kodex oder dessen Veranlasser schließt fol. 154 r die Evangelien und einige Dokumente darauf mit einem persönlichen Hymnus auf Maria ab,


Von Zār’a-Zaqob sind Schenkungsbriefe an das erwähnte Kloster mit der Benennung zahlreicher Reliquiengeschenke erhalten: Teile des Kreuzes Christi, sein Lendenschurz und der Essigschwamm, aus dem er am Kreuze trank, sowie Reliquien acht weiterer Heiligen.32 Daneben die schon erwähnten Paralleltexte zum Ṣaṛṭā ḡabr.

Von ‘Amdā-Ṣyōn finden sich in der Sammlung eine Reihe Feudalurkunden über Belehnung von Vasallen und die Aufzählung der jeweiligen Abgabepflichten. Die zahlreichen und z. T. noch unverständlichen Fachtermini, die sicherlich nicht mehr anfangs des 17. Jh. im Gebrauch waren, lassen keinen Zweifel über die grundsätzliche Echtheit dieser Texte aufkommen.33

Als Beispiel für den großen Quellenwert und die starke Aussagekraft dieser nun als Originale durch ihren Überlieferungsweg wahrscheinlich gemachten Texte wähle ich eine knappe testamentarische Verfügung des ‘Amdā-Ṣyōn, die in ganz

»Dies ist die Niederschrift einer (letztwilligen) Verfügung Seiner Majestät 'Amdā-
Šayon an die Nachkommen seines Hauses:

Sollte sich nach unserem Tode Unsere Gemahlin in ihrem Fleisch als stark erweisen, so möge sie auf Unsere Kosten ihren Unterhalt finden. Sollte sie sich aber in ihrem Fleisch nicht stark erweisen, so senke man das Haupt (aus Scham) und gebe ihr (ihren Unterhalt) nicht im Zorn!

Wenn ihre (eventuelle) Verfehlung bekannt wird und das Gerücht geht- sei es nun zu Recht oder aus Verleumdung: »Sie hat Unzucht getrieben!«, so soll man ihr (das Recht) dieser Verfügung trotzdem nicht versagen!«

Personalsuffix der 3. Pers. determiniert. Auch die folgende Periode, verschachtelt mit vorangestelltem Temporalsatz mit konditionalem Nebensinn und untergeordneter Gerundialkonstruktion (bəhilomu), in die eine direkte Rede eingebaut ist, trägt das Gepräge amharischer Rede.


Wir sehen hier die noble Geste eines Mannes, der moralische Schuld und Verfehlung bei sich selbst kennengelernt hat und weise seinen Nachkommen empfiehlt, solche Verfehlungen nicht zum Anlaß für kleinliche Vergeltung und zum Gegenstand rechtlicher Auseinandersetzungen werden zu lassen.

ANMERKUNGEN

1. Man denke etwa an die Möglichkeit der Erstellung von Königsitinerarien und Regesta mit Hilfe solcher Dokumente
2. Vgl. GARAb und GNAr. Die dort veröffentlichten Dokumente sind in die im Entstehen begriffene Datenbank zur äthiopischen Wirtschafts- und Sozialgeschichte bereits aufgenommen worden.
3. Vgl. CRLAx.
4. Vgl. HuLaCh.
5. Vgl. TTAbb; das Material mit vielen weiteren Dokumenten aus des Autors Handschriftstudien in
verschiedenen Klosterbibliotheken Äthiopiens verwertet in seiner äthiopischen Geschichte (TTCh).

6. Besonders in den ausführlichen Hofordnungen für das königliche Bankett oder Anweisungen für die Totenbankfeste (täzikar); vgl. KrSG s.u.

7. Die verwendete soft-ware, soweit mir bekannt ist Notebook II der Pro/Tem Software Inc.


10. S. KrHay.


15. Zu dieser Sammlung vgl. RPAlīTe.

16. Vgl. Perr' AS; BassEt; BēGCA.

17. Vgl. UIAthal 441; 449; 537–538.


19. Vgl. CREvDab.


21. Eine Verfügung von Sārās-Dangol findet sich auf fol. 20v und 132 r.


24. Vgl. KrHypKC; KrHay, PKA, bes. 245.


29. Vgl. GContr III.

30. Vgl. KrFas; es sei daran erinnert, daß zugleich nach Lehrern und Theologen gesucht wurde, und daß Peter Heyling im Zuge dieses »Regierungsprogramms« ins Land kam.


33. Wichtig ist hier schon der starke amharische Einfluss in der Sprache. Dies erweist einmal mehr die sogenannte Chronik des Ṭāmā-Šyson als einen literarischen Text, der keinesfalls die Wirklichkeit der Zeit wiedergibt. So ist es auch verfehlt, die Entwicklung des komplizierten Änterwesens am äthiopischen Hofe erst der Zeit danach zuzuordnen, nur weil diese Titel in der Chronik fehlen; dort sind sie in Ga′az übersetzt; die Originaldokumente sprechen eine andere Sprache.

34. Der Kanzler des Hofes schrieb ja nach Diktat; Einleitungsformeln in den Dokumenten der Handschrift, wie »Niederschrift tāzkara nāgār ṣā-taḥṣāfī am-qalā nāqūṣānā« sind durchaus wörtlich, und nicht als Schreiberfloskeln zu werten.

35. Herrn H. Kaufhold, München, danke ich herzlich für wertvolle Hinweise zur rechtlichen Seite des Textes!


37. BégCA 7–8; BassÉt 10; 100. Teilweise wird auch der Vorwurf der Blutschande mit der Schwester erhoben.


VERZEICHNIS DER BENUTZTEN ABKÜRZUNGEN UND LITERATUR
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A Misplaced Letter

EVA LUNDQUIST, Lund

INTRODUCTION

The MS I 704, preserved in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, was completed in 882/1477 by the copyist Badr al-Din Muhammad al-Akshafī. It consists of 252 folios and contains annals of the years 559–744/1163–1343. The title is Zubdat al-fikra fi ta’rikh al-hijra al-nabāwiyya, vol. IX. The author is designated as Amir Baibars ibn Muhayyīdīn. The handwriting of the title page is different from the handwriting of the text. This MS was always associated with Baibars al-Manṣūris historical work Zubdat al-fikra fi ta’rikh al-hijra. A short extract from the MS, covering the year 694 H., was edited in 1909 by K.V. Zetterstén who supposed the MS to be an abridgement of Zubdat al-fikra, and for a long time his supposition was not contradicted. In 1979 G. Vitesse was able to study the Bodl. MS more thoroughly in his Research concerning Arabic Manuscripts. Vitesse establishes that the Bodleian MS I 704 is an additional MS of the 27th volume of Masālik al-ābsār by al-‘Umarī.

Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad al-‘Umarī 700–749/1301–1349 was the author of several works. The most famous is Masālik al-ābsār fi manālik al-āmsār in 27 volumes. The last volumes form the historical section that deals with the history of the Arabs in Islamic times. A manuscript of the 27th volume is preserved in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi Mülzildil, Istanbul, formerly Aya Sofia, Stambul 1304 No 3439, (here called the Aya MS).

A comparison between the two MSS, the Bodl. and the Aya, covering the annals of the years 570–583/1174–1187 shows some differences between them owing to the copyists’ habits of marking or omitting diacritical dots etc. In some cases there is added information in the one or the other MS. The most interesting case is a long quotation from a letter written by al-Ẓādi al-Ḍā’il. It is inserted only in the Bodl. MS (fо 34 b, 35 a) in connection with the description of the occupation of Tiberias in 583/1187. Al-Ẓādi al-Ḍā’il was one of Saladin’s most trusted counsellors, chief of Saladin’s chancery at Cairo. He owed his extraordinary reputation among his contemporaries to the exceptional quality of his private and epistolary style.

The occupation of Tiberias is described in the Aya MS fо 44 b and in the Bodl. MS fо 34 b in exactly the same way: “The sultan took up quarters near Tiberias, he laid siege to the town and occupied it by force of sword, but the citadel resisted.” After a few lines about the count of Tripoli whose wife commanded the citadel, both MSS have: “and the Franks gathered to meet the sultan.” Here the Aya MS continues: “and the battle of Hattin took place”, but the Bodl. MS has: “On this occasion al-Ẓādi al-Ḍā’il wrote about Tiberias”. There follows a dramatic picture of a besieged fortress collapsing in a terrible fire, in all 26 lines, after which the Bodl. MS joins the Aya MS in: “and the battle of Hattin took place.”
TRANSLATION

Bodl. 34 b, line 7.

On this occasion al-Qādi al-Fādil wrote about the citadel of Tiberias: The combatants surrounded it at once from all sides, they followed the observance of the pilgrims and everyone had his arrow of fire like the thrower of fire. By name of arrows instant death crossed the stone-bridges in curved arches, and the fire-drills of the white soldiers sent forth deathly sparks of fire.

The tower looked as if it were tipped over by its armour, or as if it were flying on its wings thanks to the many feathers of the arrows, or as if the breasts showed nipples too full of milk, or as if the tower was a quiver with a swarm of arrows in it. Until the disease of hollowness reached the mortal point, the drunkenness of the tower invaded the joints between the levels of the sleeping walls, and the decline progressed in the remaining patient parts of the fortress. The fire under its outer garments made the look of it naked and shame was the filling of its cover. When it was noon Allah granted victory, but they were recalcitrant. The fortress fell down.

Bodl. 35 a.

The law was laid down and the work they had done was in vain. They protected themselves from the raging fire by making fires of fire-wood. The Muslims were cut off from them by a flood of fire. The fortress was a ship on the flood, though not a salvage ship but a wreck. Among the cursed Franks there was one who came to it at once, and actually there was no one who did not come, and he squeezed himself into it, and the leading ropes got around his neck.

The people spent the night walking around the fortress. The fires inside were extinguished but the fires outside surrounded the fortress. Tongues of fire hung like fringes over its front and fell down like tears behind the wall. The people and the stones were the fuel of this infernal fire. The distress cried out to Tiberias in the voice of its emotion: "I speak to you, hear oh neighbour!"

The fire penetrated into entrances by which the mind is oppressed and the command is held back. The infidels said that truly it is one of the most terrible things, and the saying of the proverb that happiness favours the stones was disavowed. The firelight dispensed everybody, whatever his language, from asking about the news until the morning became clear. It was as if the dawn took its light from the fire, and at daybreak it was as if the sunrise coloured the buds with the red dye of the safflower.

Then the servant came forward and pulled out with his hands the stones from the foundation of the fortress, and he razed to the ground the resistant part of the building with its whitewash. He made the cup of fate turn around in it fully, the heads were severed with a cut, and the necks were fastened with a chain.

COMMENTARY

Bodl.34 b.

The phrase introducing al-Qādi al-Fādil's letter says that he wrote it about Tiberias on this occasion, i.e. at the time of Saladin's conquest of the town of Tiberias in
له ٢٤
وفي هذه النوبة كتب القاضي الفاضل يعني حصن طبرية وفي الحال طافت به القاتلة من جميع أقطاره ولهو تلبية الهجيج وكل من جمرة
سهم كرامى جمارة وعبرت الأجال السماة سهماً على قناطر القسي
الحينة وتقدمت زنود البيض شرار جمر النية فصارت الابرة كأنها
مستمثيلة بسلاحتها أو كانتها بكتيرة ريش السهام طيرة بجناحها أو كأنها
صدور أظهرت حشش الصغاير أو كأنها لازدحام السهام بها كتلاين إلى
أن سرى هيال النقوب إلى القاتل ودب سكراً بين المنافق ورتب
الجدار ثايمة والبلا سار في اعتقبها متجددة والنار تحت تيابها عرَّة
لاظها والتيح خشو تيابها فلما كان وقت الظهر ظهر الله وهم كارهون
وربعت القلمة
بدل ١٦٠٠
فوقع الحق وبطل ما كانوا يعملون وتحزناً من نار الغضب بنيران
الحطب وقطعو بين المسلمين وبينهم بطولان نار كانت القلمة سفينته
الانها لا سفينة نجاة بل سفينة عطب ومن الفرنج الملاعين من وردوها
عاجلاً وان منهم إلا واردها واقحم نفسه فيها فذاحت بعثته متواردها
وبات الناس مطغين بالحصن والنشران به مطمئنة وعليه مشتملة
وعذابات السنتها على وجه مسدادة ومن خلفه مسبلة ولفحاتها جهنمية
وقودها الناس والحجارة والبلا ينادي طبرية بلسان مصابها اياك اعتى
واسمه يا جارة فولجت النار موالج يضيق عنها الفكر ويحجز عنها
الامر وقال الكفر انها لاحدي الكبر وجواب المثل في ان السعادة
لتخلق الحجر واغني ضو نهارها لسان كل أمة ان يسأل هذا وما
الخبر الى أين بدأ الصباح وكأنه امتاز منها الانوار وانشق الشرق وكانه
من عصفرها صبغ الاضرار فقينين تقدم الخادم فاقطاع بيد الإحجار
من أساسها ومصا حرون البنيان من طرسها وادار فيها كأس المنون
دهاقاً وحل الروس ضرباً وشد الاعتقاب وثقاً
The name of Tiberias is also mentioned in the nineteenth line of the letter in the Bodl. MS. It appears from the text that Tiberias is the neighbour who is called upon to help a fortress in distress, and thus it is not the conquest of Tiberias that is described in al-Fādil’s letter. Abū Shāma quotes this part of the letter but there is no mention of Tiberias.

The observance of the pilgrims refers to the pilgrims at Mecca who walk around the black stone, the Kaaba, calling out labbaika, here I am, at your service. Al-Fādil does not use the word labbaika, but by writing labū and talbiya he suggests it to the reader. Labū lacks an alif. There are several other cases in the MS where the copyist writes 3rd masc. pl. without an alif.

The word qala’a, fortress, citadel, is feminine and the fortress is compared to a woman. The towers are the breasts. The comparison continues in the text below where the feminine fortress is naked under her outer garments and is ashamed of it.

The thrower of fire is Sagittarius, 9th sign of the zodiac. He is under the sign of Jupiter and his element is fire. Burj means castle, also in the sense of a sign of the zodiac. It is possible that al-Fādil wanted to suggest the astronomic name of Jupiter, al-birjis. According to Lane burj can sometimes have the plural abrajā. The astrologic conception of the stars and planets was communicated by the Arabs to the western world. Abū Mas‘ar (d. 885 A.D.) was the author of Introduction to Astrology, which was much read in the Middle Ages.

The disease of hollowness was a very great danger to a besieged fortress. The assailant tried to make mines under the fortress. The mines were prevented from falling in by logs and wooden pitprops. When the mine was big enough it was filled with all sorts of wood and was set on fire. The wooden supports burned, the mine became hollow and could not bear the weight of the walls and towers above it. These parts of the fortress crashed down into the hollowness, one wall followed the other.

The walls were mutajallid, patient, tough, in so far as they were unusually strong and resistant. Abū Shāma has a quotation from al-Fādil where he says that the walls were more than ten ells thick and consisted of big blocks of stone, every block measuring seven ells the cube. The Franks had used twenty thousand such blocks to build the fortress, and the lime that they had poured over the blocks to make them hold together had given them more strength and solidity than they had in themselves. They resisted all attempts of an enemy to destroy them.

Bodl. 35 a.

The law was laid down, that is to say that by the fall of the fortress the Franks were punished for having violated the law when they broke their promise never to fortify Jacob’s Ford.

The leading ropes of a ship were the ropes by which the ship was steered from the helm.

Munsadila is an emendation. The MS has munshadila, Abū Shāma has musadila. The Bodl. copyist does not always distinguish between -s- and -sh-, cf. below where the MS has tars instead of tarsh.

I speak to you, hear oh neighbour (woman)! This is the last verse of a poem by Sahlus b. Mahlic Fesarita. It is used as a proverb and shows that you mean
something else than what you seem to say. Freytag says: Te dico et audi o vicina! ... proverbio desumum est. In eo adhibetur, qui verbis quae profert, aliam, quam verbiis inesete videtur, rem significare vult.

The saying, It is one of the most terrible things, is a textual quotation from the Koran LXXIV, 38. It stands for hell, and the Prophet puts these words in the mouths of the infidels who are terrified at the menace of hell.

*Umma*, people, is an emendation. The MS has *umaqa*, Abū Shāma has *umma*.

The safflower is a thistle-like plant (*carthamus tinctorius*) yielding red dye. The red dye-stuff is prepared from its petals.

Al-Fādil always refers to Saladin as the servant or your servant i.e. the servant of the caliph.

The Bodl. MS has *ḥarūn*, obstinate, resistant. The resistant of the building or construction, cf. English resistant, resistant, adj.s., resist, n. Composition applied to surfaces for protection from some agent employed on them.

The MS has *ṭars*, sheet of paper. The emendation *ṭarsh*, white-wash, is more compatible with the context, cf. above where al-Fādil mentions that the white-wash had made the stones more resistant than they were in themselves. The editor of Abū Shāma has *ḥurūf*, letter, consonant, instead of *ḥarūn*, which leads him to the following translation: il la détruit comme on efface les lettres d’un parchemin. In this translation the translator has omitted the Arabic word *bunyān*, and he has added a comparative sentence which has no equivalent in the Arabic text, *maḏah ḥurūf al-bunyān min ṭarsha*, which would give: he wiped out the letters of the building from its sheet of paper. The editor does not inform the reader if *ḥurūf* is authentic or if it is an emendation. The Bodl. MS has a clearly written *ḥarūn* which admits of a translation that follows closely the Arabic text. It is in accordance with the context and there is no need to add an explanatory comparative sentence.

Seven hundred of the defenders were taken prisoner and were sent to Damascus. Saladin gave order to execute the Frankish archers and the Turcopoles. These were Muslims who had been in Frankish service and they were punished for being apostates.

*Ḍīḥäq* is an emendation of *dahāf*, and *withāq* is an emendation of *waiāf*.

**SUMMARY**

It is obvious that al-Fādil’s description of this terrible fire does not agree with the context nor with the historical facts concerning the occupation of Tiberias. But in the history of the crusades there is actually a fortress that collapsed in a disastrous fire. This happened to the fortress at Jacob’s Ford in 575/1179, that is eight years before the occupation of Tiberias. Jacob’s Ford was the crossing at the upper Jordan where Jacob wrestled with the angel. The tomb of Jacob’s daughters in the neighbourhood was a holy place much visited by both Muslim and Christian pilgrims.

The Franks had promised never to fortify Jacob’s Ford, but at the instance of the Templars king Baldwin broke the promise and began to construct a fortress there in October 1178. Saladin offered the Franks 100,000 dinars to make them demolish what they had built and abstain from further building, but they refused. Saladin
then said: "Let them finish their fortress, we shall pull it down and no trace of it will be left." Six months later the fortress was finished and its defence was entrusted to the Templars.

In August 1179 Saladin attacked it. The siege lasted five days from 24 to 29 August. The defenders relied on the strength of the thick walls, they hoped to get relieved by the Frankish army, and they protected themselves from any Muslim gatecrashing by having fires burning permanently inside the gates. Thus the sultan's engineers could work outside the fortress without being harassed. They made a mine under the wall and set fire to it, but the wall held. The sultan gave order to extinguish the fire and promised to give one dinar to everyone who carried water from the Jordan.

When the fire was extinguished the engineers widened and lengthened the mine, they set it on fire and the wall collapsed. The fire spread and mingled with the fires at the gates into a sea of fire. Jacob's Ford is not very far from Tiberias, and the Franks who were gathering at Tiberias in order to relieve the fortress saw the smoke and fire rise to the sky. After the fall of the fortress the sultan prolonged his stay there in order to demolish every trace of it, and Jacob's Ford was again a place of pilgrimage.

When describing the events at Jacob's Ford, Abū Shāma in Kitāb al-raudatain, ed. RHC, refers to al-Fāḍil's letter: wa min kitāb Fāḍil ilā Baghdād, and wa minhi fi wasf al-nār. It is quite clear that the Bodl. MS and Abū Shāma quote the same letter written by al-Fāḍil. Parts of the letter are quoted by both the Bodl. MS and Abū Shāma, parts are quoted only by the Bodl. and other parts only by Abū Shāma. The letter describes the siege and capture of the fortress at Jacob's Ford in 575/1179.

In the Bodl. MS the quotation from al-Fāḍil's letter ends very abruptly without a conclusion and without an attempt to connect it with the following text. It is not likely that al-'Umarī himself should have made this misplaced and unfinished quotation. The Aya MS does not mention al-Fāḍil's letter, nor has Abū I-Fidā anything about it. The mistake of relating the letter to events of 583/1187 instead of 575/1179 has been made by a copyist, either the last one or an earlier copyist of a hitherto unknown MS. The insertion of al-Fāḍil's letter may have contributed to the Egyptian character of the Bodl. MS and later to the idea that Baībars al-Manṣūrī was the author of this MS.

The proper place of the quotation from al-Fāḍil's letter in the Bodl. MS is in the annals of 575/1179 and not in the annals of 583/1187.
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The Cultural Context of Arabic Epics and North Arabian Bedouin Poetry

HEIKKI PALVA, Helsinki

The lack of epics is a well-known characteristic of ancient Arabic poetry, pre-Islamic as well as virtually all poetry composed in Classical Arabic since then. This is, however, not the only existing form of Arabic poetry. During the 8th and 9th centuries A.D., along with the rise of a complex Islamic urban culture, a cultural dichotomy developed which also affected Arabic literature. The incipient diglossia of the pre-Islamic period deepened rapidly in the urban centres outside the Arabian Peninsula, and by the heyday of the ancient Arabic literature in the 9th and 10th centuries A.D., the use of Classical Arabic was restricted to literature and formal speech, and practically all groups of the Arabic-speaking population used dialects of the neo-Arabic linguistic type as their vernaculars. This development led gradually to a situation in which the literature written in Classical Arabic was almost exclusively the literature of the literate élite. For the illiterate masses, contact with Classical Arabic was chiefly confined to the sphere of religion; the only type of literature accessible to them was popular literature, mainly orally transmitted, and vernacular or sub-literary in its linguistic form. In the eyes of the literary élite, all literature that was not composed in Classical Arabic, was “illiterature” and not worthy of serious consideration. The only exception among medieval scholars was Ibn Khaldûn, who in his Muqaddimah (iii, 362) expressed his appreciation of popular poetry and clearly stated that good style is not dependent on the use of certain inflectional endings (fa-l-ṭābū lā madāla la 회 fi-l-balāgātī). Mainly due to a common disregard for popular literature by Arab scholars, very little is known about the early development of popular narrative art and poetry.

In light of recent investigations, it is beyond dispute that in contradistinction to Classical Arabic literature, Arabic popular literature does include epics. Inside the sīra genre, several popular narrative cycles with wide circulation are to be found: Sirat ʿAntar, Sirat al-Zāhîr Baybars, Sirat al-Amira Ḍâat al-Himma, Sirat Sayf ibn Dī Yazan, and Sirat Banû Hilāl. Over several generations, the first four of these narrative cycles have ceased to be living, orally transmitted traditions. The Banû Hilāl epic is an exception: it still exists in a living, fluid form occurring freely in a multitude of versions. Contrary to other sīra literature, the different versions of the Banû Hilāl epic are most often wholly independent of printed texts, so-called yellow books (kutub ṣafrah’), anonymous folk editions printed on cheap pulp paper. The oral Hilālī epic tradition is still alive in Egypt, especially Upper Egypt, as well as in the Sudan, Tunisia, Algeria, and certain regions to the south of the Sahara desert, the Shuwa region of Nigeria in particular. The tradition is generally known in the Arabian Peninsula, Iraq, Syria and Jordan as well, but for the most part in the form of prose narratives.1

In Western studies the sīyar are commonly called popular romances, a designation that well suits those sīra versions in which long prosaic parts are interspersed
with short pieces of poetry. However, as far as Sīrat Bani Hilāl is concerned, there are orally transmitted versions in which poetry plays a dominating role and is only interspersed with short passages of prose, or which lack prose passages altogether. In these versions, the chronologically proceeding narrative elements are woven into the poem, which thus functions autonomously and virtually has all characteristics of epic poetry. It is not only a long narrative in verse, but it also has other important traits typical of epics, e.g. central heroes who stand as symbols vital to the identity of the nation.

On the other hand, a close inspection of North Arabian Bedouin poetry, locally known as nabāṭ poetry, reveals the most significant fact that epics actually are alien to this old but still vigorous poetic tradition. It thus follows the vein of the ancient poetry of inner Arabia, of which it most probably is the organic continuation, an aspect stressed by Saad A. Sowayan with good reason. On the basis of a detailed analysis of a few representative poems of raiding and warfare (poems abounding in narrative elements published by Alois Musil), Michael E. Meeker convincingly shows that Musil's obviously unreflected characterization of the Bedouin qaṣīda as a poetic narrative in verses was misleading, as the narrative elements of the poems are only allusions to events which either are supposed to be known to the listeners or are explained in an introductory narrative in prose (sālfa). In the poems, all the narrative elements actually occur in disconnected blocks of a few verses, and the narrative continuity of the poem appears to be illusory. In addition to such allusions there are poetic evocations, descriptions of mounts, evaluative verses, threats and promises, panegyric elements, etc., arranged in a discontinuous, fragmentary order. Meeker's observations are not incidental but they hold true of nabāṭ poetry in general, at least as far as has been documented to date. The poems do not contain chronologically proceeding narratives which would provide the listeners with background information indispensable to the understanding of the allusions. Besides the lack of narrative, another important element of epics, the dialogue, is absent from nabāṭ poetry: there are neither dialogues nor monologues of the persons mentioned by name in the poems, but the only speaker is the poet.

The outlines of the contents of Sīrat Bani Hilāl – the migration of the tribe from its original habitat in Najd in several waves, beginning in the first half of the 8th century A.D. and culminating in an invasion of North Africa, opened by the conquest of Tunisia in 1051–57 – are rather well known among the Bedouin of Central and Northern Arabia, and many traditions about the early history of the tribe in the Arabian Peninsula and its neighbourhood are preserved among them. It is actually reasonable to suppose that much of the Hilālī tradition in this area originally had the same form as other local Bedouin traditions, viz. poems of nabāṭi type, introduced with prose narratives. Therefore, the question arises: How can it be explained that an epic tradition developed outside the area of nabāṭ poetry? and further, Why didn't epics spread to this area later on?

The prose passages of sirā literature and the sālfa narratives preceding nabāṭ poetry have the linguistic type in common. In their orally transmitted forms they mainly follow the structure of the vernacular dialect, whereas the poems abound in features – both lexical, phraseological and grammatical – of artistic language not found in the vernacular. When set down in writing, the language of the prose
passages is regularly “corrected”; the result is a kind of sub-literary Arabic. Apart from reasons associated with language attitudes, this practice is probably favoured by the fact that the narrative does not have any fixed form nor is it bound metrically. The poems, on the other hand, are usually written down in an unaltered, authentic form.\(^9\)

There are two substantial elements in the poems of Sirat Banū Hilāl which do not occur in nabāṭī poetry but which in the sālīfa narratives are characteristic stylistic traits: rapidly proceeding, straightforward narration with verbs mainly in the past tense (perfect), and close-up situations chiefly composed of breviloquent dialogue.\(^10\) There is one more major difference: while the subject matter of Sirat Banū Hilāl is a remote heroic epoch in the Middle Ages, nabāṭī poetry usually deals with contemporary or relatively recent events. Most nabāṭī poems containing narrative elements are composed to celebrate a specific event well known to the audience of the poet. Only when the poem becomes more remote in space and time, does the reciter have to provide the listeners with a circumstantial narrative in order to put the poem in its proper social and historical context.\(^11\)

The most appreciated poems, or more generally, parts of them have a wide circulation and may be preserved and orally transmitted for some generations, but only by way of exception more than two hundred years. The situation is well illustrated by the traditions of the northeastern Arabian tribe of Āl Ḍhafīr, a collection of which was recently published by Bruce Ingham. The oldest poems preserved in the traditions of the tribe come from the 17th and 18th centuries and only consist of one or two pairs of verses, and the earliest poem of some length, consisting of 9 + 8 couplets, is associated with events that took place in the last years of the 18th century.\(^12\)

Among the narrative prose of sīra some passages are recited in rhythmic and rhymed sajī prose.\(^13\) Perhaps it would be intriguing to suppose that this style was an historical link in a development during which narrative elements were interwoven throughout the poem. However, there is no evidence to support such a hypothesis. In the narrative prose associated with nabāṭī poetry this kind of intermediate form does not occur, but the feature seems to have developed under the influence of literary models, never finding its way to the Peninsular Bedouin culture area.\(^14\)

When trying to find an answer to the question of why an epic tradition did not develop in the area of nabāṭī poetry, it is of crucial importance to pay attention to the social context of the performances of nabāṭī poetry and the Hilālī epic. Musil already incidentally mentions that Abu Zēd and 'Alya – two central heroes of the Hilālī epic – “are heroes of stories that are told among the settlers”.\(^15\) This is actually in accord with other available information. To be sure, the main contents and the central heroes of Sirat Banū Hilāl are well known among the North and Central Arabian Bedouin, and allusions to them are made in their poetry, but it is significant that these traditions do not belong to the stock repertory of evening entertainments, and relatively few narrative poems are in circulation.

According to the classical description of the Cairo of the 1820s by E. W. Lane, reciters of popular romances used to sit on the doorsteps of public cafés, hired for “a trifling sum of money” in order to attract customers. The number of those poets
in Cairo who “recite nothing but the adventures related to the romance of Aboo-
Zayd”, “half prose, and half poetry; half narrative, and half dramatic”, is by Lane
estimated at about fifty. The reciters of Sirat Bani Hilāl are reported to recite
without book; the only other cycle of narratives still recited without books was Sirat
al-Zāhir Baybars, which was the specialty of about thirty reciters. All the other
reciters performed from books: “they chant the poetry, but the prose they read”.
The last-mentioned reciters were only six in number, and their public consisted
mostly of “persons with some education”. M. Villoteau in his report from the same
epoch adds the interesting fact that wealthy listeners, who did not frequent public
coffee shops, often commissioned recitations at home.

A good example of the life of a contemporary performer of the Hilālī epic is an
illiterate, professional poet and musician from Upper Egypt, described by Susan
Slyomovics. This sā'īr, whose father and grandfather also used to sing Hilālī epics,
works as an itinerant poet wandering to peasants’ doors, entertaining harvest workers
in the fields during rest breaks, and performing at various celebrations where he is
paid by a patron to recite portions from the Hilālī epic. Until 1975 he was also a
regular entertainer at a café in Edfu. The status of the vernacular-language folk
narratives that he and his colleagues recite is, as described by Connelly, ambivi-

tent: they are assigned high status as history in the oral culture, but low status in
the literate culture. Although the epic is esteemed highly as true history, the
social status of this kind of merchant of art, tājir il-fann, is low, and it is difficult to
find people who would carry on the tradition. Connelly reports that a man whom
she interviewed in Tunisia at the beginning of the 1970s, reported that ambulant
musicians, poets, and storytellers had been officially discouraged by the govern-
ment after the Independence, as signs of backwardness and illiteracy. On the
Arabian Peninsula the situation is quite different. As in pre-Islamic times, many of
the renowned poets of the 19th and 20th centuries have been princes and sheikhs.
In fact, as pointed out by Sowayan, in premodern Arabia “the gift of poetry
constituted an essential qualification for effective leadership.”

Also the Tunisian storytellers (fīdāwī) have traditionally been professionals. For
our subject-matter a most relevant piece of information is provided by Connelly,
who tells us that during the French protectorate in Tunisia the fīdāwī

“ensured a constant audience over a long period of time (and thus a steady
income) by presenting a serial-like continuation of particular tales at special
times and places each day over several months, or for as long as he could
maintain the interest of a tale. In the case of some narratives, such as Ḥantar or
the Hilālī tales, a skilled storyteller well versed in his tradition could stretch the
episodes out over a year, while maintaining an interested and paying audience.”

The audience of this storyteller, often as large as two hundred, was primarily
composed of poor, usually illiterate or semiliterate people as well as of children of
all social classes. Professionalism cannot, however, be regarded as a trait that
distinguishes the epic tradition from the poetic tradition of the North and Central
Arabian Bedouin. Among the latter there are poets who make their living by
composing panegyric poems in honour of tribal chiefs, town amirs, or any wealthy
patron, and entertaining people by going to their homes in the evening to chant their favourite poems.25

As a matter of fact, the difference between the sedentary and nomadic ways of life most relevant to the types of poetry seems to lie in the role of the patrons and the paying audience. In the cultural context of the Bedouin, tribal chiefs or other wealthy persons were and still are the only patrons of a poet, whereas in settled areas there also were different collective groups of paying public some of which furnished a constant livelihood. In the old urban environments, the ability of professional poets to attract audience evening after evening was of vital importance, especially for those hired by coffeehouse owners. However, since the 1940s, this tradition has been waning. The transition from the old society to modern times is dramatically described in the initial chapter of the novel Zuqāq al-Midaqāq by Nagīb Maḥfūẓ. The poet who during twenty years has recited Hilāli narratives and poems in a Cairo café is replaced by the radio: an-nās fi ayyāminā hādhihi lā yuridūna s-sā'ira wa-tālamā jālābūn bi-r-rādiyā, wa-hā huwa dār r-rādiyā yurakkab, fā-da'nā wa-riżqaka 'alā lāh.

Even if both nabātī poetry and Hilāli epics make abundant use of formulaic structure, according to the Parry-Lord theory one of the most characteristic features of epics, there seems to be a profound difference in their composition.26 As a matter of principle, nabātī poems have originally a fixed form – or at least a form which is intended to be fixed – which the reciters are expected to memorize. To be sure, there are innumerable different, not only shortened but radically altered, often confused versions of certain poems in circulation, but this does not affect the fundamental fact.27 As a result of the deep-rooted ancient tradition, various formulaic elements are readily at hand; in given rhythmic positions some formulas are interchangeable, which easily leads to slight changes or even to improvised transformations during the performance. As far as epic poetry is concerned, the formulaic elements play a still more important role, and due to the extent of the cycle, the length of the poems, the continuous narration, and the need for slowing down the tempo of the narrative now and then, the reciter can put together “new” verses during the performance or use repeated whole-line formulas.28

Harry Norris has correctly pointed out several generic features shared by Sirat ‘Antar, Sirat Sayf ibn Di Yazan and Sirat Bani Hilāl: for instance, they deal with Arab expeditions into Africa, they describe the Arab-Muslim founders of African kingdoms as civilizing heroes, and they all have a black slave hero.29 If Connelly's idea about the similarities of the stiyar as stemming from the common experience of Arab-Muslim identity formation30 and of the recitations as symbolic reenactment of the “genealogy” is correct, it is only natural to combine this background with the complex social structure of people living in settled areas, in urban centres in particular – and least of all with the Bedouin of Northern and Central Arabia, the core area of nabātī poetry. Thus the Hilāli tradition, associated with the Islamic conquests and the mass migrations of the Arabs, deals with the history and identity of the Arab nation, whereas the traditional Bedouin poetry reflects tribal history and tribal identity which are matters of more actual, more local and more individual concern.31

Although the Arabic epics have not been consciously created to meet immediate
commercial needs, these might have played a decisive role in the development of long narrative poems. In the traditional Bedouin culture there is no social context that would promote such a development, whereas in the sphere of settled culture, and urban culture in particular, different kinds of groups of paying listeners are found. In Bedouin culture the paying patrons are individual leaders of the group, and there is no need for the poet to attract an audience during a longer period of time, no matter whether the šā‘ir or rāwī belongs to his own tribe or is an itinerant poet. Furthermore, there is an essential difference in the performance situation: the audience is not gathered merely for the recital of narratives and poems, but people come together invited by the host, and the recital is only part of an evening entertainment arranged by the host; therefore the poet or reciter is expected to please his patron. This objective is often easily compatible with the satisfaction of the audience. The social context of nabaṭī poetry thus favours poems which extol the virtues of one’s own tribe and its leaders, an aim which is effectively attained by reciting poems of actual concern, preferably given historical depth with allusions to a glorious past.

NOTES

1. See Connelly, p. 6f, and references there. Examples of short poems from Sirat Bani Hilāl, recently recorded from northeastern Arabia are found in Ingham (1982), pp. 123 and 139f.
2. Svetozar Pantuček, who characterizes the sīra genre as a “folk-conceived historiography”, sees Sirat Bani Hilāl as a “Volksroman”, estimating “epic” as the best European term for it, Pantuček, p. 67. See further in Connelly, p. 33f.
4. Sowayan, pp. 165-167 and 192: he, however, points out that the paucity of sources makes it difficult to trace the gradual development of the poetic tradition in the Arabian desert. Al-Sa‘īd, p. 124f., calls attention to a linguistic difference between al-šīr al-šā‘bī bi` and al-šīr al-nabaṭī: the linguistic form of the former type of poetry is local vernacular dialect, whereas the latter has a relatively uniform linguistic form over the whole area where it is composed and recited.
6. Meeker, p. 119: the poems analyzed were published in Musil (1928).
10. A third important characteristic trait is brought about by interaction with the listeners: addressing the listeners, comparisons with persons or things present or well known to them, abundant use of demonstrative pronouns and particles, frequent use of ethical datives and descriptive imperatives.
11. For the character of the saif ā it is important to note that the Bedouin audience consider these narratives to be real history. Sowayan, p. 125. Remoteness, of course, favours pseudo-historical tendencies in all narrative cycles, see Gerhardt, p. 419.
13. Some illustrative examples are given by Connelly, pp. 95 and 99f. In the Tunisian version studied by Lucienne Saada, rhymed prose is only seldom used, Saada, p. 42.
14. The use of rhyming prose in works of higher literature, for instance by al-Harīrī and al-Jāhiz is well known: although a feature not properly belonging to popular story-telling, rhyming prose often occurs also in the 1001 Nights, especially in stock parts like opening and closing formulas, as well as in enumerative, descriptive and sentimental passages, Gerhardt, p. 46.
16. Lane, p. 398.
17. Lane, p. 419f. Rudi Paret, who attended an ‘Antar recitation in a simple café in Cairo in the winter
1924-25, relates that the reciter spoke Classical Arabic to his illiterate audience, but repeated his narrative in Cairo Arabic in order to make it understood to his German listener, who had spoken dialect to him. Paret, p. 134.

18. Villoteau, p. 232. Slymovics, p. 4, calls attention to differences between public and private performances. In the former the poet chooses to reduce his punning techniques and to eliminate confusing, multiple meanings, interruptions, and personal references.


21. Slymovics, p. 6f. Among the professional reciters of the epic, the subjectively determined status is dependent on the existence of rival groups. Thus, the poet described by Slymovics looks down on Hilālī poets who accompany themselves on the rābāh; he plays the fār drum himself. ibid., p. 19.

22. Connelly, p. 17f.


25. Sowayan, p. 102; examples of rewards for panegyrics are given pp. 108–110 (thoroughbred camel mounts). It is worthy of notice that panegyric poems are not only composed by poets seeking material reward, ibid., p. 110.

26. The term formula can be defined in different ways. Thus, Connelly uses a strictly semantic definition of the formula, whereas Michael Zwettler and James T. Monroe in their analyses of pre-Islamic oral poetry use a syntactic or structural definition. In a sample corpus of 54 hemistichs, 51 were wholly or in part formulaic. Calculated on a verbal basis, the method followed by Zwettler, the percentage of formulaic words in the cited passage would be 75.90 percent, but, Connelly adds, had she broadened the base of the referent body to comprise the about 4,500 verses scanned by her, the hemistichs would have been 100 percent formulaic, Connelly p. 46f.


28. For the use of whole-line formulas by an Egyptian Hilālī singer, see Connelly, p. 105.

29. According to Norris, these traits go back to some common pre-Islamic archetype, one important theme being demonstration of the common ancestry of Arabs and Ethiopians, Norris, pp. 19–22.


31. Sowayan, p. 192.

32. Connelly, p. 258; Sowayan, p. 110.
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Written and Oral Traditions: Mesopotamia Compared with Other Cultures

OLOF PEDERSÉN, Uppsala

Oral traditions, oral agreements, and oral communications have existed as long as there have been human beings who have been able to talk, and it is still one of the most common phenomena in our modern society today. Such phenomena as oral speech may however be complicated to handle, especially for older periods. Therefore the written documentation will be the point of departure for this discussion, and the oral traditions will be discussed as a contrast and supplement to the written.¹

1. THE BEGINNING OF WRITING

The first attestations of written texts can be found in Mesopotamia around 3100 BC. Before this we have, though a very long period, possible predecessors to writing in the accounting system used in large areas of the ancient Near East. The first use of writing in Mesopotamia was for administrative, economic and perhaps business purposes, and rather soon thereafter also for sign- and wordlists as working tools for the scribes. Only gradually, after some hundreds of years did literary and religious texts, as well as royal monumental inscriptions appear. Writing had a parallel or slightly later beginning in ancient Egypt, but the special problems there is not treated here.²

2. THE CUSTOMARY WRITING MATERIAL

With customary writing material in a culture I mean the material most commonly used for ordinary writing. In Mesopotamia with surrounding cultures like the Hittite empire or Elam, as well as the Indus culture and the bronze age cultures in the Mediterranean area, the customary writing material was clay tablets, a rather imperishable material. In most other areas, like ancient Egypt, Greece and Rome, as well as most Medieval and Modern societies the customary writing material was less durable, such as papyrus, parchment or paper. That which is written on the customary writing material of a culture is normally preserved in archives or libraries.

In addition to documentation on the customary writing material of a culture, writing was also done on more durable materials, such as stones or metals in the form of monumental inscriptions (monumental inscriptions are used here in a very wide sense including also e.g. inscriptions on clay pots). Essentially, the same materials are used for such inscriptions in a variety of different cultures, quite independent of the customary writing material of each respective culture.

In ancient cultures using perishable writing material, monumental inscriptions greatly dominate the written material preserved in original form to present day. In
addition we sometimes have later copies of traditions which may have been originally written in ancient times and are now a part of our own cultural heritage, like the classical Greek and Roman literary texts as well as the Bible. It is therefore very difficult to determine what was written down in ancient cultures with the practice of using perishable writing material.

On the other hand, ancient cultures that customarily used rather durable writing material, such as cuneiform clay tablets in ancient Mesopotamia, give us a much better possibility to study written traditions. When the documented areas of a culture are reasonably well established, it is possible to define oral traditions as such areas, which were not documented in writing or which existed as an oral tradition beside a written one. Therefore the relationship between oral and written traditions can most profitably be studied in ancient cultures which used clay tablets or in modern societies because all contemporary documentation is available. Let us first look at the written documentation in the Mesopotamian culture that had cuneiform clay tablets.

3. ARCHIVES AND LIBRARIES

First a distinction: a library I define as a collection of literary texts in a wide sense, i.e. such texts which in modern time are normally printed as books. Archives on the other hand contain administrative, economic and juridical documents as well as letters, which mostly existed in only one, sometimes a few, copies. Archives and libraries were often treated separately in antiquity, but not always.³

3.1. Archives

Throughout the centuries cuneiform texts were placed both in official and in private buildings. “Official” archives belong to institutions such as temples and palaces. These archives are found in all cities and in many of the official buildings. The number of texts in an archive could vary between a few and more than 10,000. The official archives concern the administration of the temple or palace referred to: incomes (e.g. taxes and gifts) and expenses were noted as well as the responsibility of the persons concerned. In addition to the administrative documents there were often letters concerning the administration of the temple or the palace, or in the royal palace concerning questions for the king or the country.

Family archives could be found in the private houses. In the rather extensively excavated areas with private houses in the cities Assur and Ur between 1/4 and 1/6 of the private houses still contained archives at the time of the excavation. The family archive was normally placed in an innermost room of the house. The archive contained, in addition to private letters, such documents which were of interest for the family members to preserve. The most common documents found in family archives are documents of loans, which should be considered valuable, sometimes concerning investments in business enterprises, but most often just simple loans given to private persons for interest and sometimes security. Rather commonly attested are also documents concerning the purchase of the house where the family lived or of a slave belonging to the family. With some families there are documents
concerning marriages, divisions of inheritance and legal disputes. Some persons having official positions also kept documents related to their work at home.

3.2. Libraries
Literary texts, in a wide sense, is a somewhat later phenomena than economic and other types of documents. During the first centuries after the invention of writing, religious and other similar traditions were probably still, to a large extent, transmitted orally. Even after hymns, prayers, myths, epos, etc., had been written down, they probably had to be memorized by heart in order to be used.

The most common type of library seems to be the private one. Usually a learned man or family had copied or collected texts, which were of professional importance - but individual taste may also, to some extent, have influenced the selection of texts in the library. Several such libraries existed in most cities. Some examples may be given from the city of Assur: the temple singers had in their library many hymns and prayers, the scribes had many lexical lists, astronomical and astrological texts, and the exorcists - who functioned as physician - had in their large library with about 800 hundred cuneiform texts a large number of incantations and medical prescriptions, which both were used by the exorcists to treat sickness.

Some libraries also belonged to temples or palaces. The most well-known is the library of the Assyrian king Assurbanipal (668–627 B.C.) in Nineve. The king, who was proud of his literary education, collected or copied literary texts from the different parts of his country - and especially from Babylonia. Another, somewhat later, large cuneiform library has recently been discovered in the Shamash-temple in the Babylonian city Sippar. This large temple library was found well preserved still on the shelves in one of the rooms of this large temple complex.

So far I have treated the libraries and the archives separately. This was often the situation with literary texts and documents in separate rooms of the same building. In other cases the library was combined with an archive, i.e. placed together in the same room.

4. INSCRIPTIONS ON IMPERISHABLE MATERIALS
A large number of cuneiform texts especially monumental inscriptions, often done on stones or other durable material, have never belonged to any archive or library. These were often royal inscriptions, which were the official historical records of the king that should be preserved for later generations. Such texts almost always dealt with a monumental official building, e.g. a temple, palace or town wall, which the king had built. These texts were either placed visibly on the walls of this building, or more often placed inconspicuously inside the walls to be found by later generations.

The Assyrians very often extended these monumental inscriptions by means of a long and detailed propagandistic account of their wars against their enemies, a theme also to be seen in their well known wall-reliefs in the palaces. The Babylonians on the other hand did not use such war accounts in their royal inscriptions, nor in their art, therefore giving the impression of a peaceful nation, which was hardly correct.
5. ORAL AND WRITTEN

The oral communication existed before the writing was invented and of course even after. In many Mesopotamian family archives important documents are missing. For example, many divisions of inheritance were made without documentation. About 2/3 or more of the private houses had no cuneiform documents. Perhaps all of the agreements were oral. Also within the official administration written documentation was limited to specific administrative routines whereas others were made orally. It should not be forgotten that also for official institutions with a large number of written texts, there were always the day-by-day oral communication and agreements.

Learned men, temples or palaces had sometimes large libraries, but literary and religious traditions on clay tablets were probably mostly learned by heart by those who used them. The written literary documentation was mostly for the purpose of studying and for preservation of part of the cultural and religious heritage. For example, the temple singers certainly did not sing their songs from clay tablets, but recited them by heart. For the majority of the people the oral literary and religious tradition was the only one, simply because they could not read.

In this way we can see that writing and oral traditions and agreements appear together in cultures using writing as a medium. The system of writing was used in administration, economy, business, private law, communication, literature, religion and propaganda. Furthermore the oral communication, agreement and tradition existed parallel to, supplementing or making it possible to use the writing. The division between them may vary, but the similar picture in ancient cultures with rather durable customary writing material, like the Mesopotamian cuneiform clay tablets, and our modern society makes it probable that the situation could be reconstructed along similar lines in all mature cultures which use writing: for example Mesopotamia, old and late Semitic cultures, ancient Greece and Rome and the medieval and modern western world.

NOTES

1. This paper was originally delivered at the conference of Near Eastern Studies at Uppsala, in January, 1989.

2. The general development of writing as presented in standard handbooks, e.g. I. J. Gelb, A Study of Writing, 1952, 2nd ed. 1963, and later reprints, has in principle not been challenged except for the beginning of writing, where studies by D. Schmandt-Besserat, partly summarized e.g. in: The Earliest Precursor of Writing, Scientific American, June 1978, pp. 38-47, has shown the probable invention of writing as a development from the token system used for accounting before the invention of writing in the ancient Near East.

3. The following description of archives and libraries is a generalized and simplified version according to the ways of presentation I have used for cuneiform texts especially from Assur in a series of studies: Olof Pedersén, Archives and Libraries in the City of Assur, A Survey of the Material from the German Excavations, Parts I and II, 1985 and 1986 (= Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis, Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 6 and 8); Olof Pedersén, The Libraries in the City of Assur, in: Keilschriftliche Literaturen, Ausgewählte Vorträge der XXXII. Rencontre Assyriologique Internationale, Münster, 8-12.7.1985, Berlin 1986 (= Berliner Beiträge zum Vorderen Orient 6); Olof Pedersén, Private Archives in Assur Compared with some other Sites, in: State Archives of Assyria Bulletin I/1 (1987)

4. The library of Assurbanipal has been discussed in every introductory work to Assyriology. However, it has never been completely reconstructed and there does not exist any monograph covering this most basic but difficult subject. For some basic information with further bibliography see e.g. A. L. Oppenheim, Ancient Mesopotamia, Chicago 1964, esp. pp. 15–18, S. Parpola, Assyrian Library Records, JNES 42 (1983) 1–30 and S. Parpola, The royal archives in Nineve, in: Cuneiform Archives and Libraries (see n. 2), pp. 223–236.

5. The temple library in Sippar, recently excavated by Iraqi archaeologists, is the first cuneiform library found with the tablets still in their original places on the shelves. For a preliminary summary of the mostly unpublished material see Walid al-Jadir, Une bibliothèque et ses tablettes, in: Archéologia 224, Mai 1987, 18–27.

6. The Mesopotamian royal inscriptions will within some years be completely republished in transliteration and translation in a series of volumes from the Canadian RIM (= Royal Inscriptions of Mesopotamia) project. The first volume in the Assyrian series is now published: A. K. Grayson, Assyrian Rulers of the Third and Second Millennia BC (= RIMA 1), Toronto 1987.
Zweisprachigkeit im frühen persischen *tašawwuf*

BERND RADTKE, Bergen

Für Gösta Vitemstam zum siebzigsten geburtstag


Die ersten zeugnisse zur sufik in persischer sprache stammen aus dem 11. jh.; das gilt sowohl für die poesie als auch für die prosa. Die poesie soll hier nicht weiter beachtet werden.1 Als älteste zeugnisse persischer prosa zur sufik seien zwei texte des 11. jh.s. betrachtet: Die *Tabaqāt us-ṣaḥīyya Anṣārīs*2 und Hujwīris/Jullābis Kašf ul-mahjūb.3 Auf die biografien der beiden autoren soll hier nicht näher eingegangen werden. Anṣārīs schrift ist eine sammlung von sufibiografien, Hujwīris werk ist ein handbuch zum tasawwuf. Die hauptvorlage Anṣārīs waren die arabischen *Tabaqāt us-ṣaḥīyya Sulamīs*.4

Sehen wir uns einmal an, wie Anṣārī einen text Sulamīs ins persische übersetzt! Wir wählen dafür die biografie des mystikers Abū Bakr al-Warrāq at-Tirmīdī.5 Sie befindet sich bei Anṣārī auf den seiten 261–266, bei Sulamī auf den seiten 221–226. Sulami baut seine biografien in der regel so auf, dass er zuerst einige lebensdaten gibt (herkunft, lehrer, reisen, todesdaten). Dann folgt oft die feststellung, dass der betreffende ḥadīth überliefert hat, was durch ein oder mehrere beispiele demonstriert wird; anschliessend dicta des mystikers.
Anşârî übernimmt (261,1-262,3) Sulamis daten und fügt einige neue informations hinzu. Er bringt Sulamiss aussage lahû l-kutub al-mashûra fi anwâr ar-riyâdat wa-l-mu’âmalat wa-l-‘adâb wörtlich mit einem zusatz: wayrâ kutub ast mashûr dar anwâr-i riyâdat wa mu’âmalat wa adâb wa zuhd (262,3). Es sei darauf hingewiesen, dass die arabischen begriffe (riyâdat, mu’âmalât) nicht übersetzt werden.


In der biografie Abû Bakrs finden wir eines der aus Anşârî bekannten dicta mit diesem wortlaut (179,14 ff.): gufs: an-nâs talâta al-‘ulamâ wa-l-fuqara‘ wa-l-umarâ fa-idâ fasada l-‘ulamâ fasada t-tâ‘a wa-idâ fasada l-fuqara‘ fasada l-aklaq wa-idâ fasada l-umarâ fasada l-ma‘âs. Das gibt Ḥujwirî persisch so wieder: mardumân xi gurîhand yakê ‘alimân wa digar faqirân wa sidigar amirân čôn umarâ tabâh šawand ma‘âs-i kalâtîq wa iktisâb-i ĕsân tabâh šawad wa čôn ‘ulamâ tabâh šawand
tā at wa barziš-i sāri at bar kalq tabāh wa šörida gardad wa čon fuqarā tabāh šawand koyhā bar kalq tabāh šawand. Es handelt sich also um eine mischung von wörtlicher übersetzung und parafrase. Hujwiri lässt (180,2–8) dann einen eigenen kommentar zu diesem ausspruch folgen.


Einige beispiele:

ḥāl ("zustand"); bei Sarrāj (Luma‘ 334,1–335,2/übersetzung Gramlich 472): wa-l-ḥāl nāzilatun tanzil bi-l-‘abd fi l-ḥin fa-yahill bi-l-qalb min wujūd ar-ridā wa-t-tafwīd wa-gayr dālika fa-yasfū laḥū fi l-waqt fi ḥālihi wa-waqtīhi wa-yazūl.

Bei Qušayrī (Bāb tafsīr alfāz/übersetzung Gramlich 109 ff.): wa-l-ḥāl ‘inda l-qawm mā nan yarid ‘alā l-qalb min ṣayr ta’ammad minhum wa-lā jīlāb wa-lā kīsāb lahum min ʿarāb aw ḥuzn aw qaḥd aw šawq aw inzāj aw hayba aw ḥālījāf.¹⁴

Bei Hujwiri lesen wir hingegen (482,12 ff.): wa ḥāl wāridē buwad bar waqt ki warrā muẓayyin kunad ʿanāniki rūḥ fāsād-rā wa la maḥāla waqt ba-ḥāl muḥtāj bāsad ki sfāy-i waqt ba-ḥāl bāsad.

Nehmen wir als zweiten begriff maqām ("standplatz"). Dazu sagt Sarrāj (Luma‘ 335,4 f./übersetzung Gramlich 472 f.): wa-l-maqqām huwa llaḍī yaqūm bi-l-‘abd fi l-awqāt miîl maqām aṣ-ṣābirin wa-l-mutawakkilin wa-huwa maqām al-‘abd bi-zāhirihī wa-baʿiḥīhi ...

Bei Qušayrī (Risāla, Bāb tafsīr alfāz/übersetzung Gramlich 109):
wa-l-maqqām mā yataḥqaqqb bihi l-‘abd bi-munāzalatihi min al-ādāb mimnā yatawassāl ilayhi bi-nawī ṣāṣaruf wa-yataḥqaqqq bihi bi-дар bīṭalāb wa-muqāsāt takalluf...

Und bei Hujwiri (Kaʃf 484,6): maqām ‘ibāratēst az iqāmat-i tālib bar aḍā-i ḥuqūq-i muṭāb ba-ṣiddat-i jīhād wa-ṣīḥat-i niyyat-i way.

Versuchen wir zunächst eine wertung der letzten zitaten. Es ist ohne weiteres klar, dass unsere drei quellen von einander unabhängig sind; das gilt sowohl für die beiden arabischen untereinander als auch für die persische, obwohl diese wie eine übersetzung aus dem arabischen wirkt: Nur das grammatische "knochengerüst" ist persisch (... kunad, ... buwad, ... bāsad), die terminologie vollständig arabisch. Das gibt uns die Möglichkeit einer allgemeinen charakterisierung aller unserer texte, auch der zu beginn besprochenen: Wir haben es mit einer fast ausschliesslich

Eines ist somit sicher: Um die sprache des persischen tašawwuf zu verstehen, ist eine gründliche kenntnis der arabischen quellen notwendig.


Oder hat Tîrmaidsj nur arabisch geschrieben, im lehrvortrag jedoch persisch gesprochen, wovon die persischen übersetzungen in seinen schriften eine reminiscenz sind? Fragen, die vorerst nicht geklärt werden können, deren beantwortung jedoch aufschluss über die sozio-kulturellen verhältnisse Ostirans des 9. jh.s geben könnte.

Sehen wir uns zum schluss einige übersetzungen Tîrmaids an.18
fıl = kār
fikra = isgāliš
nafs = kām²
tawahhum = andēša.

Die Liste könnte fortgeführt werden. – 150 bis 200 Jahre nach Tirmidi war es offensichtlich nicht mehr notwendig, arabische termini zu übersetzen; die arabische terminologie wurde durch sich selbst verstanden.

Diese aforistischen Ausführungen können und sollen nur ein Versuch sein. Gründliche Forschung wäre notwendig und lohnend.

NOTES
2. Gest. 1089; vgl. Lazard, Langue 109 ff.; jetzt Utas, Munājāt 84.
3. Gest. 1064 oder 1073; Lazard, Langue 88 ff.
4. Gest. 1021; GAS 1,672.
5. Gest. 906–7; vgl. Radtke, TM 546; jetzt Meier, Bahā 73, anm. 10.
7. Variante im Apparat al-fuqārā.
10. GAS 1,666, nr. 45.
11. Vgl. die in anm. 6 angeführte Variante; der Lesung al-fuqârâ ist der Vorzug zu geben.
15. HT 58.
16. Vgl. die Liste HT 137f.
18. Vgl. die Liste HT 137.
22. Hier 3.
23. Eine eigenartige Übersetzung; man würde eher als arabisches äquivalent šahwa oder hawā erwarten.
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The Earliest Arabs

JAN RETSÖ, Gothenburg

1. DOCUMENTATION
In the Old Testament we find several instances where ‘Arabs’ seem to be mentioned. The designations used are for single individuals a nisbah-adjective, whereas for the plural a collective noun alternates with the plural of the adjective. The forms are the following:

Sing.
Plur./coll.

It is possible to derive all these forms from an original bisyllabic base *arab. That (2) and (4) are derived from such a bisyllabic form may be concluded from the fricativized b. It should, however, be noted that (2), (3) and (4) are not the expected Biblical Hebrew forms of *arab*/arabî, and that only (1) is the regular formation. The others are in fact the forms of the qatal-pattern expected in Aramaic. Of these, (3) can, however, represent a qatal pattern as well, since these have coincided in Aramaic.1

The OT documentation is, however, not the earliest. We find a similar word in several passages in the inscriptions and letters of the kings of Assyria and Babylonia from Shalmaneser III (858-24) even down to the Achaemenids:2


wa’arba-a-a: Tiglath-Pileser III (ND 2644, Harper 414), Sennacherib (Rechtsurkunden 124:3),7 Esarhaddon (Harper 512, 773, 1422), Assurbanipal (Harper 273, 543, 1108, 1244; Rechtsurkunden 552:1, 6, 9).8

wa’aralitub: Tiglath-Pileser III (Rabenou-stele 1, 2, 19,9 Annals154, 213, 240,10 Summary Inscription 19),11 Sargon II (Annals 97, 162,12 Display-inscription 27),13 Sennacherib (Records A1 28,14 H5 22),15 Esarhaddon (Hedel-prism II:45),16 Assurbanipal (all annalistic texts, passim),17 Nebuchadnezzar (Chronicle 5:10),18 Nabonaid (Harran 2:43),19 Darius I (Bisutun 6).20

wa’arab: Sargon (Nimrud-prism D IV 25–36),21 Esarhaddon (Nineveh AIV:1–31),22 Nebuchadnezzar, Nabonaid.23

In the Akkadian texts we thus find both a monosyllabic and a bisyllabic form. The vowel in the second syllable of the latter is usually variable depending on the suffixed case-vowel, thus arubu, aribi, araba. These Akkadian forms, like the Hebrew ones, can be derived from a common origin, viz. a bisyllabic base *arab.
In that case the monosyllabic *arb-* may represent the same Aramaic form as we find in BH, since the *begdêket*-shift is not reflected in the cuneiform writing. The fact that nisbah-adjectives in the Akkadian passages are formed by the *-ây* suffix and not by the normal Akkadian *-î*, thus *arbây*, also speaks for the Aramaic origin. As is well known the normal nisbah-suffix in Aramaic is *-ây*. The bisyllabic form in Akkadian can be a reflex of an Aramaic form similar to the one we find in Hebrew. But it can also represent a genuine two-syllable word, thus *‘arab*.

The bisyllabic designation is also the one found in the Achaemenid inscriptions from the reigns of Darius I, Xerxes I and Artaxerxes II or III. The Old Persian *a-ra-ba-ya* is to be read *arabâya* (not *arbâya*) judging from the rendering in the parallel Akkadian and Elamite texts. This is confirmed by the form *araboi* found in Herodotus, who undoubtedly reproduces the Persian term (probably via Hecataeus).

In Akkadian documents from the period 850–500 B. C. as well as Biblical texts from ca. 600–400 B. C. we thus have two forms of the word ‘Arab’: one monosyllabic that could represent an Aramaic pronunciation, and one bisyllabic, preserving, as it seems, the original bisyllabic structure.

2. MEANING

The term ‘Arab’ in these sources has been interpreted along two different lines. According to one, it is a socio-economic term: ‘tent-dweller’, ‘pastoralist’, ‘camel-breeder’, ‘nomad’, ‘beduin’. According to another, it is a geographical name: ‘dweller in the ‘Arâbâ’, i.e. the steppe or the desert.

The discussion of this problem is usually characterized by a lack of distinction between etymological and denotational/connotational meanings. First of all, it should be kept in mind that etymological and denotational/connotational meanings do not necessarily coincide. To take a related example, the etymology of the word ‘Jew’ is not much help in establishing the denotational meaning of the word: Jews are not (any longer) identical with the inhabitants of Judaea or members of a tribe with that name. Jews can be defined as members of a religious community and/or a nationality where membership is constituted by birth or conversion. This means that knowledge of the etymology of the word ‘Jew’ does not necessarily lead us to its actual meaning. In the same way knowledge of the etymology of ‘Arab’ may give some information about the past of the people designated as such, but definition of the historical content of the term must be based upon analysis of the actual use and occurrence in historical sources, not on etymology.

The claim that ‘Arabs’ means ‘nomad’ etc. is based upon an association between Arabs and nomadism etc., i.e. a connotation of the term, which may be not wholly out of the air. But it does not follow from this that ‘Arab’ actually is a term for ‘nomads’ etc. The Lapps in Scandinavia have traditionally lived by reindeer pastoralism and many of them still do, but this does not mean that the signification of the word ‘Lapp’ is ‘reindeer pastoralist’. The Lappish people must instead be defined mainly in terms of language and descent, not in terms of culture.

An even more serious objection is that tent-dwellers, camel-breeders, pastoral-
ists, nomads and beduins are in no way synonymous. The use of the term bedouin for the pre-Christian millennium is an anachronism since bedouin culture emerges during the centuries immediately before Islam. As far as the other sociological terms are concerned, the ‘Arabs’ often appear as camelbreeders in the sources. This does not necessarily imply that they are nomads or live in tents. In fact, we do not know for sure if they did. Further, we do not know for sure if the ‘Arabs’ were the only camelbreeders in the Syrian desert in this period or if all ‘Arabs’ were camelbreeders. At least from later periods we know that they can be farmers. \(^3\)

The etymological derivation of ‘Arab’ from a word meaning ‘desert’ is evidently based on the presumption that ‘Arab’ is synonymous with ‘desert-dweller’ or ‘tent-dweller’. Now it is very unlikely that ‘Arab’, as it is actually used in our texts, should mean ‘tent-dweller’ or ‘desert-dweller’ even if they often happen to be living in the desert, since all the ancient languages have other special terms for this. \(^3\) A remaining possibility is that the root ‘rb originally had such a meaning. It must, however, be underlined that there is no evidence whatsoever for such an etymology, or the use of the the word with such a meaning.

The derivation of ‘Arab’ from ‘Arābā is linguistically possible at first sight. It becomes, however, unlikely when one considers that fact that ‘Arābā, which is only used in the Old Testament in this period, is a term for certain specific areas around the Dead Sea. \(^3\) If Hebrew ‘arbā etc. is identical with the similar word in Akkadian, which is the connection between the arbāyārar in Akkadian texts and the areas around the Dead Sea? Since this etymology in fact claims that a geographical term is the base for a gentile derivation, it presupposes that the peoples in question, at least from the beginning, had special links with that area. Considering what we know about the use of the term ‘Arābā in the Old Testament it is plainly evident that there is no proof for any connection of this kind. \(^3\) Even if it should be possible to show that ‘Arabs’ originate from the areas called ‘Arābā (which is not possible!), this does not necessarily tell us anything of the meaning of the term in the texts from 850–400 B.C.

In scholarly literature the concept ‘Arabs’ thus turns out to be rather hazy. In spite of this, it tends to be used as if its meaning and definition were completely evident and unproblematic although the definitions presented are of very different kinds. This modern haziness of national terms is, however, dangerous when dealing with ancient history: all evidence gives testimony to the fact that in ancient times nationality was not a general concept defined loosely as cultural heritage, feeling of cultural affinities etc. It was clearly defined in terms of jurisdiction and religious cult. To a large extent it is still so in the Middle East.

There is no indication in the sources that ‘Arabs’ during this period was a general vague term for desert-dwellers, tent-dwellers or nomads. During the 1st millennium B.C. the Syrian and North Arabian deserts were populated by several groups with different names, among which we find the arābāyārar. It deserves to be underlined that when tribes and peoples are never called Arabs in the sources we have no reason to believe that they were considered ‘Arabs’ by themselves or others. \(^3\) If we choose to call them Arabs we must be aware that we apply a modern concept of nationality on ancient peoples— a concept on which they would probably not agree. E. g. Saba (Sheba) appears for the first time in the Annals of Tiglath-
Pileser III from the year 734 B. C. together with other tribes. Most scholars see this as a documentation of ‘Arabs’ in the 8th century B. C. But this people is never called or considered Arabs in any of the Akkadian or Biblical sources. On the contrary, from an unprejudiced reading of these texts nobody would get the idea that they were ‘Arabs’. In much later Greek sources they are designated by this term, but this is another problem altogether. For an historian it is important to see what the sources say; it is also of equal importance to see what they do not say.

It is thus necessary to look for the meaning of ‘Arabs’ elsewhere. Now we have another derivation of the same root in Hebrew, viz. ‘erēb/’erēb, the meaning of which is ‘mixture’. In the OT it is used in several passages with the meaning ‘mixed people’. There are, however, a few passages where it is used as a parallel or, as it seems, as a synonym for ‘rāb, viz., Jer. 25:24 ‘and all the kings of ‘rāb, and all the kings of ‘erēb that dwell in the desert’. Further, we find that 2 Chronicles 9:14 has malkē ‘rāb (viz. the kings who bring tribute of gold to Solomon), whereas the parallel passage in 1 Kings 10:15 has malkē hē‘erēb. In this latter passage the Peshitta has malkē ‘arbāyē and the Vulgate has reges Arabiae. The Greek Bible shows traces of replacing ‘erēb with ‘rāb. Thus Symmachos has Arabia in Ez. 30:5 as well as in Jer. 25:24, in the latter followed by Theodotion. Aquila has Arabia in Jer. 25:20. The Peshitta too has ‘arbāyē in Ez. 30:5 and Jer. 25:24.

The root ‘rb in Arabic, apart from its usual meaning ‘Arab’, also means ‘be pure’. It is thus likely that we have a so-called didd-word, i.e., a root with two opposite meanings. This shows that the Biblical writers may have had a point in their identification of the two terms. In fact, the passage in Jer. 25:24 indeed looks as an early gloss: ‘the kings of ‘erēb’, = the Arabs’. During a certain period (at least after 600 B. C.) the Israelites evidently considered the two terms as having identical meanings.

The identification of ‘erēb with ‘rāb, which we find as early as in some passages in the Bible, and which tends to be expanded in the versions, may also be supported by other arguments. The onomasticon of the ‘Arabs’ that can be gleaned from the Akkadian sources very clearly shows that they were of mixed origin. We find Syrian and Akkadian names as well as names from both the north and the south of the peninsula among them. To this comes the remarkable fact that the Biblical genealogies do not mention an eponymous father for the ‘Arabs’, although these groups must have been well known to the writers. As a matter of fact, ‘Arabs’ are never mentioned in the Pentateuch or in any Biblical genealogy. This indicates that the term is not on the same level as the other designations for peoples that we find in the genealogies of the Priestly Code and the Jahwist. The ‘rāb were, at least by the Israelites, considered ‘erēb, ‘mixture’, and did not belong to any of the established peoples in the system of the Biblical genealogists.

3. HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION

Even if the etymological meaning seems to have some relevance for the period in question, it cannot yet be stated that ‘Arab’ meant ‘mixed people’ during the centuries covered by the sources. The attempt to identify the ‘Arabs’ in the oldest sources must instead take its starting point in the distribution of terms in the
Akkadian texts. The form *arbây* occurs mainly in letters, often as an apposition to a personal name or as an independent attribute without a name, i.e. ‘the Arab’. It is also clearly connected with Syria. The first ‘Arab’ in history, Gindibu *arbâya*, appears together with the Syrian kings at Qarqar in 853 B. C. Tiglath-Pileser III establishes *Arbây* as mercenaries in the Homs-area. Sargon II settles *Arbây* in Samaria in 715 B. C. *Arbây* are further found as functionaries in Esarhaddon’s palace as well as military commanders under Assurbanipal.

The bisyllabic *arab-* on the other hand always occurs together with the mentioning of rulers, mostly female ones. We know the names of six queens of the *Aribi* from Tiglath-Pileser III to Assurbanipal. The two ‘kings of *Aribi*’ are in other passages called kings of Qedar, whereas the queens of the *Aribi* are never called anything else. Further, the geographical location of most of them is Adummatu which is identifiable with Duma in the southern Syrian desert. There are good reasons to presume that all the queens mentioned were located in this oasis. We also know that the gods of the *Aribi* in Duma played a crucial role in their warfare with Assyria, and that at least some of the queens had a special title, *apkallu*, designating some kind of priestly function. Was Duma originally a place of refuge, offering protection for people who for different reasons had left ordinary life?

An unprejudiced reading of the texts suggests that the *arbây/arab* complex is one of several tribal groups in the Syrian desert and adjacent areas during this period. Since the two terms are derivations of an identical word it can be supposed that they were closely related, perhaps identical and distinct from other nationalities. There is, however, one tribe which has a closer relationship to the *Aribi*, viz. Qedar. Already in their first appearance in 738 B. C. both *Qidâ* and *Aribi* are found together in a list of tributaries to Tiglath Pileser III. During the first half of the 7th century B. C. two kings of Qedar, Hazael and Yaute, took part in the wars against Assyria. In Sennacherib’s time Hazael appears together with the queen of the *Aribi*. In the inscriptions of Esarhaddon, Hazael is even called king of the *Aribi*. In the same manner his successor and son Yaute is mentioned in a group of inscriptions by Assurbanipal equipped with the same title. In other texts from Assurbanipal they are called kings of Qedar. This suggests some kind of alliance between the *Aribi* and Qedar that is documented from at least Sennacherib’s reign.

In the 6th and 5th centuries B. C. Qedar became a major power in north-western Arabia, due to their control of the emerging frankincense trade from South Arabia. We have clear signs of their expansion from the Syrian desert (Wâdi Sirhân?) towards the south-west where they established control of Dedan and probably the Negev as well as the eastern Nile delta. We also know that Nebuchadnezzar undertook a campaign against them in 599 B. C. In the record of this expedition preserved in the Old Testament, they are still called Qedar, but in the king’s own official version they are called *kor Arbâu*. We find a similar dichotomy in that Geshem in Nehemiah is called ‘the *arbî’*, whereas he is called *mlk qdr* on the Tell al-Maskhuta bowl. At this time, ‘Arab’ seems to be their official designation whereas Qedar is their own.

The conclusion is that there were at least two different groups of ‘Arabs’ during this period as reflected in the Akkadian sources. The monosyllabic *arbây* appears mainly in Syria as mercenaries but also as individuals in Assyrian service. The
'bisyllabic' *arab* with their centre in Duma and with an independent cultic and political organisation show signs of expanding westwards through the alliance with Qedar. In the Achaemenid period they are the Arabs *par préférence*, and the bisyllabic form enters the Greek world via the Achaemenid terminology and Herodotus. The monosyllabic form, on the other hand, is from the beginning used for groups in Syria who have a relationship to the empires different from that of the 'bisyllabic' ones. Their status as mercenaries under Tiglath-Pileser III raises the question whether this type of service was not a Syrian institution taken over by the Assyrians. That would explain why the Assyrians used the Aramaic term *arbāy*. The monosyllabic pronunciation was, of course, preserved in Aramaic, but the bisyllabic form became the internationally recognized term from the middle of the 6th century B.C.

In the light of this it is remarkable that the Old Testament clings to the monosyllabic *'arbi*-form. In fact, the only two unambiguous instances of the bisyllabic form in the Old Testament are found in a context that appears to be a fixed phrase. We may further note that the nisbah-adjetive *'arbi* is the prevalent form in Chronicles and Nehemiah, i.e., the so-called Chronist (C). The Arab-passages here have usually been seen as reflecting conditions in the 4th century B.C. even when they appear to deal with conditions under the Israelite kings. It might however be asked if the consistent use of the monosyllabic form for Arabs at the borders of Israel during the monarchy indeed reflects an old source used by C which had the Aramaic form of the word which was thus borrowed into Hebrew. Its use in C is strikingly parallel to the appearance of *arbāy* in the Assyrian texts. If this be so it would shed new light on the Arab-passages in Chronicles and increase their value as a source for the early history of the people called 'Arabs'.

NOTES

1. Segert, Grammatik 200-201.
2. For a complete survey of the instances and references in Akkadian texts, see Parpola, Toponyms 34-35 supplemented by Eph'āl, Arabs 188-191. For the different spellings see Eph'āl, op. cit. 6.
4. For the Harper letters see Waterman, Correspondence.
5. Winckler, Keilschrifttexte 20.
10. Rost, Keilschrifttexte 26, 36.
11. As reconstructed by Eph'āl, Arabs 33-35.
14. Luckenbill, ANNALS 51.
17. Piepork, Prism 82 (VIII:4, 8); Bauer, Inschriftenwerk 35 (K 2664:1v 6); Streck, Assurbanipal II 376-78, 196-206 (The Asshur letter), op. cit. 216-18, 222-24 (The Ishtar letter), op. cit. 64-84 (The Rassam cylinder).
25. Segert, Grammatik 156.
26. Darius I: Bisutun I:14-15 (Kent 117); Persepolis E 11 (Kent 136) Naqsh-e-Rustam A 26-27 (Kent 137); Susa E 26 (Kent 141); Susa M 7 (Kent 145); Susa ab 5b:18-20 (Yoyotte, Inscriptions 258).
27. Xenicles I: Persepolis H 25 (Kent 151); Artaxerxes II or III Persepolis 18 (Kent 156).
28. Cf. Weissbach, Keilschrifttexte 10-11 (Darius Bisutun 6); Kent, Grammar 16.
29. A complication is the initial laryngal 'ayn which should appear as h in Akkadian (cf. hmu-im-mu < *omri, a-ra-nu < *uram). The rendering of the West-Semitic laryngals is, however, inconsistent in the Akkadian writing.
32. See Retsô, Xenopophon 130 n. 19 for references.
33. Akkadian: ašš kustani, Hebrew: šokne 'oḥel, Greek: skēnitai etc. For a criticism of this definition of 'Arabs' see Retsô, Xenopophon 120-30.
34. Axion, Arabah. The etymology of the word is far from clear. The common meaning 'arid steppe' seems indeed to be the product of a circular argument.
35. H.-P. Müller's analysis of the word (Arabien 571) is most unconvincing. He seems to see a difference between 'rabî' derived from 'rubā' 'steppe', 'Wüste', whereas 'arbî' from 'rub' 'entspricht unserem Begriff 'Araber'. The latter claim is, of course, completely out of the question. In some curious way, 'rub' is also said to mean 'Wüste'. From these the derivations are said to 'appellativisch' mean 'Beduine', 'Wüstenbewohner'. For a rejection of this etymology see also Eph'al, Ishmael 228.
36. Winnett, Genealogies uses a concept of Arabs which has no support in any source. He is followed by many, e.g. Eph'al whose Arabs are as hazy as those of Winnett, cf. the typical stand in Arabs 115 n. 389.
37. Rost, Keilschrifttexte 37 (= Annals 219).
38. Eph'al, Arabs 87-90.
40. LXV reads toāl pērān 'the kings from the other side', thus reflecting a Hebrew 'eber.
41. The Greek Bible shows traces of ample use of Arba in passages where the Masoretic text either has 'esrub or something else, a usage which has then been reduced in the Origenic and Lucianic revisions. Remarkable survivals are Zep. 3:3, Hab. 1:8, Gen. 45:10, 46:34, Is. 10:9, 11:11.
42. Lane, Lexicon s.v.
43. Cf. still Noldeke, Neue Beiträge 67-108; Cohen, Etudes 79-100. The root 'rub is usually not included in this group. H.-P. Müller rejects this meaning without any argument (Arabien, loc. cit.). It should be noted that the root exists not only in *aramaïsch-syrisch* but also in Hebrew. It is also likely that Akkadian erēbum 'enter' is from this root, as is Ugaritic 'rub 'enter', 'enter as a pledge' (Gordon, Textbook 461). Cf. Ancient South Arabian 'rb 'guarantee with a pledge' (Beeston, Dictionary s.v. II).
44. Cf. the list of names in Weiss-Rosmarin, Aribi 28-37. Not all of them belong to aribi-people but the mixed character is apparent.
45. Winnett's concept of Arabs in Genealogies is completely untenable. For a clearer idea see Noth's remarks in Casket, Bedeutung 26-27.
46. Eph'al, Arabs 93-100.
47. Harper 512, 773, 1422; 273, 543, 1108, 1244.
49. Cf. further Knauf, Ismael 81-88.
50. The Aribe are called a’lu ša Atarsamain ‘the people of the god Atarsamain’ in the Assur letter III:1 (Streck 198).
51. From the passage in Sargon Annals 94-95 (Winckler 20) it is not selfevident that the Ar-ba-ai ru-u-qi-t a-ti-bu-ut ma-d-ba-ri etc. is a summary of those tribes (Tamud, Ibadidi, Marsimani, Haila) mentioned before. If one has not preconceived the idea that everybody in the Syrian desert automatically are to be called ‘Arabs’, the plain reading of the passage suggests a list of five separate tribes.
52. The Rabbenou-stele. Qidri is not apposition to Aribi, see Weippert’s commentary ad. loc.
53. See the analysis of the sources by Eph‘al, Arabs 46–52, 142–69.
54. Luckenbill 92 (C.II 23).
56. The Rassam-cylinder. the Assur letter.
57. Cylinder B (= Pieppkorn 81–87), The Deller-Parpola treaty.
58. For the role of frankincense and the ‘Arabs’ in Achaemenid time see Herodotus III 97.
60. Jer. 49:28–33; Grayson, Chronicle 5:10. For this expedition see Dumbrell, Jeremiah.
61. Dumbrell, Tell-el-Maskhuta 36.
62. Eph‘al’s claim that the ‘Arabs’ used this term for themselves (Arabs 7) is most unlikely in the light of this. It may also be added that the word used as a self-designation is not found in any inscription on the Peninsula until 328 A. D.
63. Is. 13:20: ‘Neither shall the ‘rābī pitch tent there (i.e. in Babylon), neither shall the shepherds make their fold there’. Jer. 3:2: ‘In the ways thou (= Israel) hast set for them as the ‘rābī in the wilderness’.
64. C.f. c. g. Alt., Nachbarn 343–345.
65. Israeli scholars seem to value Chronicles higher as a historical source for earlier periods than others, cf. Eph‘al, Arabs 60–72. At least as far as the Arab-passages are concerned, there are also other valid arguments for this than those presented here. This will be returned to by the author in a forthcoming study.
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Deux détails de la préface du Kitāb adab al-kātib
d'Ibn Qutayba

EVA RIAD, Uppsala

La préface du Kitāb adab al-kātib d'Ibn Qutayba a suscité l'intérêt des chercheurs. On la cite souvent et Gérard Lecomte lui a consacré une analyse approfondie dans l'article "L'Introduction du Kitāb adab al-kātib d'Ibn Qutayba". L'intérêt s'est concentré sur ce que la préface dévoile de l'atmosphère qui régnait dans les cercles culturels dans lesquels se mouvait Ibn Qutayba et des opinions générales de ce dernier ainsi que de ses accusations "contre les faiblesses et les insuffisances du personnel administratif contemporain" (Lecomte, op.cit., p. 48), les kuttāb. Plus particulièrement, on a souligné la position ferme que prenait Ibn Qutayba contre les mutakallimin et les falsāfiya maintenant avec force son adhésion à ahl al-hadīt. Or, un des reproches que l'auteur adresse aux kuttāb est leur faiblesse pour la science grecque qu'il stigmatisait en ces termes: "Le kātib se détourne des sciences religieuses/ pour se diriger vers une science que certains lui offrent toute prête, à lui et à ses semblables, et où peu de gens sont aptes à discuter; une science consistant en une adaptation admirable, mais ne voulant rien dire, et possédant un nom formidable, mais ne recouvrant aucune réalité concrète. Lorsque l'individu sans expérience et le petit jeune homme facile à éblouir entendent parler de 'L'Existence et de la Corruption', de la 'Physique', des 'Noms incomplexes', de la 'Qualité', de la 'Quantité', du 'Temps', de la 'Démonstration', des 'Complexes énonciatifs', ils s'ébaubissent et pensent que ces vocables recouvrent toutes sortes de choses pleines d'intérêt et d'élegance'; etc. Il cite nombre d'expressions bien connues sur la même gamme et qui remontent à Aristote ou à ses commentateurs (trad. Lecomte, op. cit., p. 53). La falsāfa et le kālām suscitent la méfiance et la colère d'Ibn Qutayba surtout parce qu'ils détournent les kuttāb de leurs obligations et les amènent à mépriser les sciences arabes traditionnelles et à critiquer les traditions et le livre de Dieu. Les accès de colère contre la tendance "philosophisante" des kuttāb et les exemples cités pour illustrer celle-ci qui apparaissent dans la première partie de la préface du Kitāb adab al-kātib sont intéressants par ce qu'ils nous révèlent de l'espèce de "philosophie" qui était répandue au temps d'Ibn Qutayba, ce que c'était dans la philosophie grecque qui captivait l'intérêt des savants et littérateurs arabes et influençait leur pensée, et quelles en étaient les expressions courantes. Chez Ibn Qutayba, il ne s'agit pas d'un exposé philosophique méthodique mais d'une œuvre d'adab. Adab al-kātib fut écrit avant 850. Le vocabulaire logique et philosophique n'était pas encore fixé à cette époque. C'est l'époque que Zimmermann appelle "the incubation period of logic in the Arabic language" qui se termine avec al-Farābī (Some observations, p. 536). C'est pour cette raison qu'il y a intérêt à étudier les termes employés pour des notions philosophiques et logiques aussi dans les œuvres non-philosophiques. Ils peuvent refléter la terminologie des traductions ou des œuvres logiques perdues ou encore une tradition orale. C'est dans la première partie de la préface qu'apparaît la
critique de la tendance hellénisante chez les kutāb. Je viens de citer la traduction du début du passage en question et je choisis maintenant pour une analyse le onzième exemple que donne Ibn Qutayba dans les termes suivants: wa-l-kalāmū arba'ātun: amrun wa-xabarun wa-stixbārūn wa-rağbatun ṭalāṭātun lá yad-xulūhā ṣ-sīdqū wa-l-kīḏbu wa-hiyya: l-amrū wa-l-istixbārū wa-r-ragbatu wa-wāḥidun yad-
xtuluhu ṣ-sīdqū wa-l-kīḏbu wa-huwa l-xabarū (éd. Grünert, p. 4, 5–7; éd. 1986, p. 7, 11–13). “Le discours comporte quatre genres: commandement, proposition (énonciatif), question et demande. Trois de ces genres n’impliquent ni vrai, ni faux: ce sont le commandement, la question, et la demande; le quatrième implique soit le vrai, soit le faux; c’est la proposition (l’énonciatif)”. Comme nous allons le voir, ces paroles ont une histoire au sein des commentaires grecs de l’Organon d’Aristote, dans la tradition syriaque, et dans celle des Arabes. La distinction entre l’énonciatif et trois (ou quatre) autres genres de discours a son origine dans les commentaires du Peri Hermeneias. La façon de les citer ici montre qu’elles devaient être bien connues au temps d’Ibn Qutayba. L’auteur pouvait sans doute être sûr que ses lecteurs, c’est-à-dire les kutāb, les reconnaîtraient. Avant d’en examiner l’histoire, nous allons porter notre attention sur un autre passage de la préface. Dans la dernière partie de celle-ci, après avoir stigmatisé la tendance “philosophisante” futile des kutāb, l’auteur se met à donner des conseils et des leçons au kātib. Un de ses enseignements est que l’auteur d’une lettre ou d’un livre doit toujours faire attention au caractère, à la capacité et au rang du destinataire aussi bien qu’à sa propre capacité et à sa position vis-à-vis de celui-ci et adapter son style en conséquence. Or, Ibn Qutayba, pour illustrer ce point, se sert des mêmes paroles au sujet des quatre genres de discours qu’il vient de condamner quelques pages plus haut. Ces paroles, qui étaient la première fois citées comme un objet de ridicule, sont ici citées en tant qu’enseignement très sérieux à l’intention des kutāb. Apparemment, l’auteur n’est pas conscient qu’il s’agit du même adage dans les deux cas. La teneur du passage est la suivante, Ibn Qutayba citant les paroles d’Abrāwīzūi que celui-ci adresse à son kātib: innāmā l-kalāmū arba'ātun su'ālūka š-say'ā wa-
al-Muqaffa' ou du fils Muhammad Ibn 'Abdallā Ibn al-Muqaffa' ('Uyun I, p. 46, 9–11; voir aussi Lecomte, Ibn Qutayba, pp. 188–189) avec l'introduction suivante: wa-lam anna gumā'a ikalāmi kullahu xsāšul arba'un "Sache que la totalité de tout discours consiste en quatre caractéristiques".

Regardons maintenant l'arrière-plan de ces citations. Elles remontent en dernier lieu aux commentaires du Peri Hermeneias d'Aristote 17a 2–3 où Aristote dit: "Pour tout discours n'est pas une proposition (ἀποφαντικός), mais seulement le discours dans lequel réside le vrai ou le faux, ce qui n'arrive pas dans tous les cas: ainsi la prière est un discours, mais elle n'est ni vraie ni fausse. — Laissons de côté les autres genres de discours: leur examen est plutôt l'œuvre de la Rhétorique ou de la Poétique." (trad. Tricot, p. 84). L'affirmation: vrai-faux ne s'applique, comme nous le voyons, qu'au ἀποφαντικός. Les autres genres de discours n'appartiennent point à la logique. Aristote renvoie l'étude de ces genres de discours non-énoncia- tifs à la Poétique et à la Rhétorique. Dans la Poétique (1456b), il renvoie l'étudiant à la Rhétorique pour apprendre quoi dire et comment le dire dans chaque situation. Ce sont les commentateurs du Peri Hermeneias qui introduisent les genres du discours non-énonciatifs. Le nombre de ceux-ci varie entre quatre et cinq dans les commentaires de la tradition péripatéticienne selon que l'on considérait le vocatif équivalent à une phrase complète ou non. Ainsi nous avons, par exemple, parmi les commentateurs grecs et latins:

2. Stephanus avec les mêmes cinq (Comm. du Peri Herm. CAG 18:3, p. 19, 11s.)
3. Ammonius(2) avec quatre = ci-dessus à l'exception du λόγος κλητικός (Prooe- mium et comm. des Premières Analytiques CAG 4:6, pp. 2; 15; 26).
4. Boethius avec quatre i.e. oratio deprecativa, imperativa, interrogativa, enuntiativa (Migne LXIV, 553ss.)
6. Simplicius avec quatre = Ammonius (2) (Comm. de la Physique CAG 9, p. 91, 19).

Parmi les commentateurs syriques nous avons la même répartition:

1. Probus, par exemple, compte avec cinq genres: paqǒdā, mašaʾ ʾelānā, maşisānā, qārōyā, pāsōqā (Hoffmann, p. 66s.; cf. aussi p. 115).
2. Paulus Persā a les mêmes cinq que Probus avec la différence que Paulus appelle le premier puqədānā. (Logica, éd. Land, p. 10, 24 et p. 11,13).
3. Athanasius de Balad a cinq: mašallyaʾnā, maşāʾ ʾelānā, qārōyā, paqǒdā, pāsōqā (p. 732, 7–9).
4. Sergius de Rēšʾaynā par contre a quatre: paqǒdā, mašaʾ ʾelānā, mašallyaʾnā, haw
Les Arabes avant Ibn Qutayba sont particulièrement intéressants pour notre sujet. J'ai trouvé:

1. Muhammad Ibn ‘Abdallâ Ibn al-Muqaffa’ avec quatre: *amr, su’îl, ma’s’ala, xabar* (Zimmermann, Some observations, n. 65, citant Maṭṭiq Arisṭū, paraphrase des œuvres logiques d’Aristote, p. 163,2


Muhammad Ibn ‘Abdallâ Ibn al-Muqaffa’ se joint à la liste de ceux qui comptent avec quatre genres de discours, soit Ammonius dans son commentaire des Premiers Analytiques, Boethius, Philoponus, Simplicius et Sergius de Rêşâyân. Al-Kindî de son côté a la liste stoïcienne de 10 (9) genres de discours. Il ressort du nombre de genres et aussi de la terminologie qu’Ibn al-Muqaffa’ et al-Kindî représentent deux traditions différentes ici. Il reste à voir si celles-ci sont comparables à celles que nous trouvons exemplifiées dans les deux citations d’Ibn Qutayba. Pour commencer avec la deuxième citation d’Ibn Qutayba, la terminologie est pratiquement identique à celle d’Ibn al-Muqaffa’ dans Maṭṭiq Arisṭû la seule différence étant su’îl ‘an (I. Q.) contre ma’s’âla (M.) ce qui n’est pas une grande différence. L’argument faisant d’Ibn al-Muqaffa’, père ou fils, la source de la deuxième citation d’Ibn Qutayba est encore appuyé par la référence au roi perse Abrâwûz aussi bien ici que dans ‘Uyûn et au Kitâb at-Tâq que l’on attribue justement à Ibn al-Muqaffa’. Le contexte dans lequel les paroles se situent dans le texte cité dans ‘Uyûn est le même ici. Il fait partie d’une longue citation du Kitâb at-Tâq consistant en les paroles d’Abrâwûz à son secrétaire. Le raisonnement d’Ibn Qutayba et d’Ibn al-Muqaffa’ avec l’exhortation aux *kuttâb* d’adapter leur style à la personnalité et au rang du destinataire et ne pas s’adresser aux personnalités importantes avec des mots vils et simples et vice versa, ainsi que l’application de ce raisonnement aux genres de discours est présent in nuce déjà chez Ammonius et à un moindre degré chez Probus et se trouve plus tard chez al-Fârâbî dans le commentaire du Peri Hermeneias. Dans le commentaire d’Ammonius du Peri Hermeneias 5, 1–17 nous lisons: “On dit que notre âme a deux genres de facultés, les cognitives et les vitales ou appétitives (…), les quatre genres de discours à côté de l’énonciatif émanent des facultés appétitives, (quand l’âme n’est pas active en elle-même mais tend vers quelqu’un d’autre qui semble apte à contribuer à la satisfaction de son désir; ou bien elle cherche des paroles de celui-ci comme dans ce qui s’appelle question ou interrogation, ou bien une action; si c’est une action, elle essaie d’atteindre la personne même à laquelle s’adresse le discours comme au cas du vocatif, ou d’obtenir une action de celle-ci; dans le dernier cas, c’est ou bien
d’un supérieur comme dans la prière, ou bien d’un inférieur comme dans l’impéra-
tif proprement dit.) Seuls les énonciatifs émanent des facultés cognitives ... et ils
sont pour cette raison susceptibles d’être vrais ou faux, les autres non”. Ainsi Ibn
Qutayba exploite ici une tradition logique et rhétorique grecque qui remonte à
Aristote et dont nous avons des raisons de supposer qu’elle lui est parvenue par
l’intermédiaire d’Ibn al-Muqaffa’. Quant à la première citation où Ibn Qutayba
énumère quatre genres de discours elle apparaît simplement comme un exemple
parmi d’autres de la tendance “hellénisante” des Kuttâb que condamne Ibn Qu-
tayba. Ce passage n’est pas intégré dans un contexte littéraire. Quant aux termes
employés, il y a des ressemblances avec le début de la liste d’al-Kindi: al-muxbir
min al-qawl (K.) – xabar (I. Q.); istixbâr (K.) – istixbâr (I. Q.); râgib (K.) – râgba
(I. Q.). Il y a une différence pour le du ‘â d’al-Kindi qui semble correspondre au
amr d’Ibn Qutayba. du ‘â signifie “supplication” (à Dieu) ou “appel” et non pas
“ordre” qu’on s’attend à trouver ici. C’est le mot employé dans la traduction
d’Ishâq Ibn Hunayn du Peri Hermeneias pour e̲v̲î̲z̲î̲. Dans la liste d’al-Kindi
l’équivalent semble être plutôt ar-râgib. Ainsi le terme du ‘â devint libre pour servir
to rendre un autre concept ici et l’exemple donné pour illustrer le terme indique
qui il s’agit d’un ordre ou d’une combinaison du vocatif et de l’ordre: ka-qawlîka
va fulânîn iqbal. Le vocatif, c’est-à-dire λογὸς χαρτικὸς, était parfois inclus parmi
les genres de discours, parfois pas. Le restant de la liste d’al-Kindi offre des res-
semblances avec la deuxième partie de celle de Paulus Persâ (voir ci-dessus p. 4
et note 7). Elles constituent des variations de la longue liste des stoïciens qui regar-
daient les genres de discours et leur relation avec la logique d’une façon différente
de celle des péripatéticiens. Al-Âtabâluî (d. 1127), dans son commentaire du Adab
al-kâtîb, parle d’une grande variation d’opinion parmi les savants quant au nombre
des genres de discours non-énonciatifs. Certains comptent avec dix, d’autres avec
neuf, huit, sept, six, cinq, quatre ou trois avec des combinaisons d’éléments
variées. Quant à Ibn Qutayba, c’est le nombre quatre qu’il a connu et qu’il cite
dans les deux cas. A part la différence du nombre, il semble néanmoins qu’Ibn
Qutayba dans sa première citation au sujet des genres de kalâm suit la même
tradition de traduction que représente al-Kindi et qui différe de celle d’Ibn al-
Muqaffa’. Le xabar pour λογὸς ἀποφαντικὸς qui sert à distinguer les énonciatifs
des autres genres de discours que nous avons trouvé chez Ibn al-Muqaffa’ est
ancien. On trouve l’équivalent al-muxbir min al-qawl chez al-Kindi. Il fut remplacé
par qawl ǧâzim chez la plupart mais figure souvent dans les textes pour expliquer ce
dernier terme. Il ne rend pas le syriaque mêmârâ pâsogâ. Cela pourrait indiquer
qu’Ibn al-Muqaffa’ ait traduit du grec sans l’intermédiaire syriaque. Al-Kindi de
son côté révèle une connaissance des raisonnements logiques en syriaque puisque il
parle de la maqâlatu ‘âlal ǧuzim et du qawl laysa bi-ǧazim, ce qui est une traduction
exacte du mêmârâ pâsogâ syriaque et non du λογὸς ἀποφαντικὸς.10 Plus tard Ishâq
Ibn Hunayn écrit aussi qawl ǧâzim dans sa traduction du Peri Hermeneias 17a pour
rendre λογὸς ἀποφαντικὸς /mêmârâ pâsogâ (Badawi, Manṭiq, Dir. Isl. 7, p. 63;
Hoffmann, p. 58).11 Nous trouvons qawl ǧâzim également chez al-Fârâbî dans le
commentaire du Peri Hermeneias faisant partie d’un nouveau vocabulaire forgé
pour les cinq genres du kalâm soit: amr, talab, taqarrî, nidâ, qawl ǧâzim (Kutsch-
Marrow, p. 51; Zimmermann, 1981, p. 43 n. 4). Les Ixwân aṣ-Ṣafâ’ ont des termes
plus proches de ceux d'Ibn Qutayba soit: 


Pour conclure, il semble bien qu’Ibn Qutayba pour la question des genres du discours eût accès à deux traditions à la terminologie différente, une qui apparu à l’auteur comme un élément étranger, hellénisant, faisant partie d’une science sans substance ou valeur contre laquelle il met en garde les *kuttāb*, l’autre remontant, il est vrai, aux Perses Abrawizu et Ibn al-Muqaffa’ mais acceptée et intégrée dans une tradition arabe au point qu’elle peut servir à l’instruction de ces mêmes *kuttāb*.


Par ces deux exemples, j’ai voulu montrer l’intérêt qu’il peut y avoir à examiner les réalisations littéraires des idées d’origine logique ou philosophique dans les premières œuvres d’adâb. On peut y trouver des traces des premières traductions arabes du grec qui peuvent contribuer à clarifier les voies par lesquelles les premiers spécimens de l’héritage grec sont arrivés jusqu’aux Arabes.

NOTES
1. i.e. Khusrû, le second de ce nom avec le surnom Abharvez “le victorieux”, c’est-à-dire Kishrâ II Perviz, roi Sassanide.
2. Les mots fa’idâ talabta fa-asgâli se sont frayé un chemin jusqu’aux dictionnaires, par ex. le Sihah
d’al-Gawahari, fa-tidā sā’ alta fa-asgi’ih, cité par Lane et traduit par lui “when thou askest (or beggest), then make thy words, (or expressions), easy, and be gentle”.

3. Les stoïciens n’appliquent pas la même division du discours que les peripatéticiens. Ils comptent avec plus que cinq genres. A côté du ḍājima qui correspond à ἐποφθαντικός et auquel on applique la notion vrai – faux, il y a un nombre d’autres genres de discours (de phrases) qui participent, mais seulement en partie, au jugement vrai – faux. D’un autre côté, ils divisent le λόγος en λόγος ἑνδιθέτος qui appartient à la logique et λόγος προφορικός qu’ils réfèrent à la grammaire et à la rhétorique, ce qui correspond avec la division peripatétique des genres de discours. Nous trouvons une combinaison de la doctrine du λ. ἑνδιθέτος ἐποφθαντικός des stoïciens et celle des quatre ou cinq genres de discours des peripatéticiens chez Paulus Persa. Celui-ci ajoute aussi cinq autres genres de discours (voir ci-dessous, n. 7).


5. Je n’ai pas accès au commentaire de Paulus Persa sur le Peri Hermeneias. Pour une analyse plus poussée il faudra explorer à fond tous les témoignages existants. – Pour la transcription du syriaque j’ai suivi le système introduit par F. Rundgren, voir que le j étymologiquement long s’écrit j simplement et que la prononciation frictive des b, g, d, t, k n’est pas marquée. p fricatif = f. Le ĝ de Brockelmann est rendu par ĺ. Je rend les textes selon la pratique nestoriene.

6. C’est dans la risālah contenant les écrits d’Aristote que figurent ces paroles. L’auteur annonce neuf genres à côté du muṣbir ‘an al-qawl. Il en manque un dans l’ensemble ce qui est sans doute dû au fait qu’il est impératif et le vocatif sont tous les deux exprimés par un seul terme dī’ā.


9. Paralèlement, Ammonius dit dans le commentaire de Isagoge, p. 43, que λόγος ἐποφθαντικός est ο ἕγγερος de la faculté cognitive tandis que les autres appartiennent à la faculté appétitive. Le même souci de diviser les phénomènes et de les placer dans l’un des deux domaines, celui de la logique et celui de la réalisation ou l’application, se produit aussi chez certains rhétoriciens qui réfèrent les trois genres de discours: le délibératif, le judicieux et le démonstratif aux trois facultés de l’âme d’une façon qui varie d’un auteur à l’autre (voir Rabe, Prolegomenon et mon The Syriac preface, p. 69) Je reviendrai à cette question.

10. Est-ce d’ailleurs forcément ἐποφθαντικός qui est la seule base conceivable ici? Ne pourrait-on aussi bien penser que le δηθής de la Poétique de (1456b) qui figure dans la liste: ἐνοτλή “commandement”, ἵκχη “prière”, δηθής “narration”, ἀποθή “menace”, ἰδρύης “interrogation”, ἰδαχθής “réponse”, ou le δηθής “narration” de la Rhétorique, ou le δηθής “proposition logique” de Zenon (Stoic. vet. 1, 23) aient contribué au choix initial du xabor? – Abu Bîr Mattā rend le δηθής de la Poétique par ḥadīṯ et les autres genres par amr, salāt, ḥarād, sūṭāl, gawāb.

11. Pour ἐποφθαντικός dans la Rhétorique, nous trouvons qaṭiyya, ce qui est considéré par certains comme étant une traduction du ἅξιομα stoïcien.
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Arabische Beiträge zur Geschichte des Stoizismus

FRITHIOF RUNDGREN, Uppsala


Bei der Rezeption dieser Art von griechischer Philosophie behandeln nun die Araber gewisse Probleme – zustimmend oder ablehnend – bisweilen eben im Lichte eines bengalischen Feuers, insofern als sie dabei nicht nur sehr ausführlich sind – denn sie haben sich häufig den verwickelten und nicht selten langweiligen Stil der Aristoteles-Kommentare irgendwie angeeignet –, sondern auch weil sie ihre eigenen, von ihrer Religion, dem Islam, diktierten und gefärbten Akzente so plazieren, daß diese auch auf die spezifisch griechische – und besweilen sogar lateinische – Problematik ein Streiflicht abwerfen, so daß wir unsere altphilosophischen Streitfragen bisweilen besser beurteilen können. Es ist dies eine Frage von dem, was ich den hermeneutischen Horizont der Araber nennen möchte. Damit führe ich meinen ersten Araber ein, nämlich Abū Naṣr al-Fārābī (gest. 950), der zweite Lehrer genannt, d.h. der zweite Aristoteles.


Aus der Vereinigung von Platon und Aristoteles ergab sich die Möglichkeit, das eklektische System des Neuplatonismus in beiden Richtungen zu gebrauchen sozusagen: der Platonisch-arietotelische Weg führte den Menschen aufwärts zu dem
Einen, und infolge des so geschaffenen neuplatonischen Monismus konnte jetzt derselbe Mensch die Rückfahrt zur Erde antreten.


Eben in dem hier in Rede stehenden Zusammenhang haben die Stoiker für uns ein besonderes Interesse, zumal da wir wissen, daß sie als solche den Arabern bekannt gewesen sind, die sie ar-Riwaqiyin benannt haben, eine schon an sich interessante Benennung, die von einem riwaq abgeleitet ist, das das griechische otoq «Säulengang» lediglich übersetzt, wobei riwaq nur als ein iranisches Lehnnwort ganz verständlich wird, vgl. Pehlevi ravan «Gang».

Frage wir so, warum eben die Stoiker für die Dogmengeschichte des Islams von Bedeutung sind, möchte ich – dies im Anschluß an Alexandre Kojève – die folgende, allerdings vorläufige Antwort geben. Der authentische Aristoteles, wenn ich mich so ausdrücken darf, hatte zwar manches festgestellt, das für die Folgezeit als maßgebend übernommen wurde. Bisweilen hatte er (vielleicht) sich aber mehr
in diskursiver Form ausgedrückt, die verschiedentlich interpretiert werden konnte. Die Leistung des Stoiker scheint nun unter anderem die gewesen zu sein, den Aristoteles dogmatisiert zu haben, und zwar von ihren eigenen Ausgangspunkten aus, dem dialektischen Materialismus, so daß wir durch eine Entdogmatisierung den authentischen Aristoteles bisweilen herstellen oder doch feststellen können, wie die Stoiker den Aristoteles verstanden haben.

Schon im Anfang seiner »Harmonie« erwähnt nun al-Fārābī die Hauptfrage der islamischen Theologie, die Frage vom ḥudūṭu ʾalāmi wa-qidamhu »die zeitliche Entstehung der Welt und ihre Ewigkeit«, und hier führe ich jetzt den Dialektiker Ibrāhīm an-Naẓẓām (gest. in Bagdad um 840) ein. Von ihm wird folgendes erzählt:

»Er pflegte zu behaupten, Gott habe die Menschen, das Vieh und die wilden Tiere, die Minerale und Pflanzen auf einmal erschaffen (xālaqa), wobei aber die Schöpfung von Adam nicht vor der Schöpfung seiner Nachkommen geschehen sei und die Schöpfung der Mütter nicht vor der Schöpfung ihrer Kinder; Gott habe nämlich einen Teil der Dinge in anderen verborgen (akmana), so daß Anteriorität und Posteriorität erst beim Erscheinen der Dinge (zuhūr) an ihren verschiedenen Orten zustande gekommen sind, ohne (erst zur Zeit des Erscheinens) erschaffen und hervorgebracht zu sein .... Und trotz seiner Äußerung, Gott habe die Welt (duynyā) auf einmal erschaffen, hat er (an-Naẓẓām) behauptet, Gott habe die Wunder (āyāt) der Propheten erst zu der Zeit geschaffen, als er jene (die Wunder) durch seine Gesandten in die Erscheinung treten ließ« (Al-Xayyāt, Kitāb al-ʾIntiṣār, ed Nyberg, pp. 51–2).

Wie wir sehen, wird hier für »verbergen« das Verbum akmana gebraucht, das mit dem Terminus kumūn »das Verborgensein« (eines Teils der Schöpfung in einem anderen Teil) zusammengehört. Diese Lehre an-Naẓẓāms ist den Muslimen besonders anstößig gewesen. Sie machte ja geltend, Gott habe die existierenden Dinge, so wie sie uns tatsächlich entgegentreten, Metalle, Pflanzen, Tiere und Menschen mit einem Male geschaffen, wobei die Schöpfung Adams der Schöpfung seiner Kinder nicht vorangegangen sei, so daß ein Frühersein und ein Spätersein sich lediglich auf das Hervortreten aus ihren Orten der Verborgenheit (kumūn) beziehe, nicht aber auf das Entstehen und die Existenz selber.

Hierzu bemerkt nun der Theologe und Doxograph as-Sahraštānī (gest. 1153), an-Naẓẓām habe diese Lehre denjenigen Philosophen (falāsifa) entlehnt, welche das kumūn (Verborgensein) und das Hevortreten (zuhūr) lehren, wobei er jedoch mehr zu den Ansichten (madāhib) der Naturalisten (tabīʿīyūn) als zu denen der Metaphysiker (ilāḥiyūn) neige (Kitāb al-Mīlal wa-nniḥal, ed. Cureton, p. 39).

bisweilen auch die Stoiker zu verstehen haben. Hierzu kommt nun auch die oben angedeutete Tatsache, daß wir in gewissen Fällen dazu berechtigt sind, die Stoiker als eine Art Neo-Aristoteliker zu betrachten. Es sind namentlich solche Fälle, in denen wir feststellen oder doch vermuten können, die Stoiker hätten einer im Grunde aristotelischen Lehre eine besondere Prägung oder Formulierung gegeben. Zu diesen Fällen gehört, so weit ich sehe, die von an-Nazzām vertretene Lehre vom kūmūn »das Verborgensein«.

Ich habe schon die von den Arabern übernommene griechische Philosophie auch als eine Existenzphilosophie bezeichnet, und so finden wir in arabischen Schriften häufig den Gegensatz zwischen al-waġūd bi lqūwa »die Existenz durch Kraft« und al-waġūd bi lfi? l »die Existenz durch Tat, Handlung« erwähnt, die aus der mittelalterlichen Scholastik so bekannte Opposition zwischen in potentia und in actu, wobei potentia wohl meist durch »Möglichkeit« wiedergegeben wird. Das arabische qiwaṭ- »Stärke, Kraft« übersetzt das zunächst aristotelische δύναμις »Vermögen, Kraft, Stärke«. Wenn nun an-Nazzām den spezifischen Terminus kūmūn gebraucht, um eine Funktion auszudrücken, die jedoch ohne Zweifel an die Funktion des aristotelischen δύναμις erinnert, wie sich der Gegensatz zuhūr auf das aristotelische évēγερα sehr wohl beziehen kann, so bleibt uns nur daran zu erinnern, daß eben das Wort δύναμις bei Poseidonios eine Rolle spielt, die dazu geeignet zu sein scheint, unser kūmūn als ein stoischer terminus technicus erscheinen zu lassen. Nach der Auffassung Karl Reinhardts ist eben δύναμις, das Reinhardt durch »Kraft« übersetzt, den Stoikern ein Grundbegriff gewesen, durch den sie den dynamischen Charakter der Wirklichkeit darstellen, sei sie dann auf der Ebene der physischen Elemente, auf der der organischen Strukturen oder auf dem Niveau der Seele anzutreffen.

Nun sahen wir, daß der schon erwähnte aš-Šahrastānī der Meinung war, an-Nazzām habe seine Lehre von kūmūn den »Naturalisten« entlehnt. Aus seiner doxographischen Darstellung über Anaxagoras aus Klazomenai geht hervor, daß seiner Ansicht nach »es dieser war, der als erster die Lehre von kūmūn und zuhūr vorgetragen habe, nämlich, daß alle Dinge im ersten Körper verborgen seien und ihre Existenz nur beim Hervortreten aus diesem ersten Körper vorliege, nach Gattung (naω), Art (sinj), Maas (miqār), Gestalt (šakl), Dichtheit (takātu) und Porosität (uxalxul), ganz so wie die Ähre aus dem einzigen Samenkorn (ḥabba) erscheine, die hohe Palme aus dem kleinen Kern, der an Form vollkommene Mensch aus dem winzigen Samentropfen, der Vogel aus dem Ei. Und dies alles ist Hervortreten (zuhūr) zu Verborgensein (kūmūn), Handlung/Wirklichkeit (fīl) aus Kraft (qiwaṭ-) sowie Form (şurāt-) aus Bereitschaft der Materie (maddat-) und das Hervorbringen ist ein und dasselbe, ohne daß es für eine einzige Sache etwas anderes gegeben habe außer diesem ersten Körper«. (p. 257). Wie wir sehen, steht hier unmittelbar nach an-Nazzāms »zuhūr aus kūmūn« das aristotelische »fīl aus qiwaṭ«, was darauf deuten kann, daß es sich um eine spätere doxographische Harmonisierung zweier voneinander verschiedener Lehren handelt, wobei den Ausgangspunkt für diese Harmonisierung die οπέρματα des Anaxagoras (der nach aš-Šahrastānī aus Mityā stammte) und der λόγος οπέρματικος der Stoiker gebildet haben. Die Vergleichsgrundlage scheint dann lediglich auf dem Wort οπέρματα gegründet zu sein, ein Wort, das von den Stoikern sehr wohl aufgegriffen sein
kann, um dann mit einem neuen Wert versehen zu werden. Denn nach den Stoikern sind ja auch die Individuen im voraus bestimmt. In jeder künftigen Weltpériode werden dieselben Personen auftreten wie in der vorhergehenden, z.B. ein Sokrates, eine Xantippe etc., genau so wie sich bis ins Einzelne ganz dieselben Vorgänge abspielen werden. Dazu stimmt nun irgendwie die Behauptung an-

Ich greife daher gleich ein anderes Beispiel auf.

Besonders in ihrem Kampf gegen das Christentum wollten die Neuplatoniker ihre Lehre als die Wahrheit par excellence, als die wahre Philosophie darstellen. Schon al-Fârâbis Definition der Philosophie in der oben erwähnten Schrift zeigt uns nun, daß er, genau wie Aristoteles, von dem wirklich Existierenden ausging, wie dieses Existierende nun auch aufzufassen sein mag. So definiert er die Philosophie als al'îmu bi lmawqûdâtî bi-mâ hiya mawqûdatun, d.h. »das Wissen von den existierenden Dingen, insofern sie existieren«. Nach dem Buchstaben genommen konnte ja eine derartige Philosophie auch von der islamischen Orthodoxie akzep
tiert werden, da sie ja sich einfach auf die natürliche Welt und auf die Menschen in dieser Welt zu beziehen schien. So weit gab es wohl kein Problem.

Nun fährt aber al-Fârâbi unmittelbar in der folgenden Weise fort: »Nun haben diese beiden Weisen (ḥakîmâni) die Philosophie begründet und ihre Prinzipien (awâ'il) neu aufgestellt sowie ihre Grundsätze (uşûl) und ihre Schlüsse (awâxîr) und Konsequenzen (furû') vollendet. Auf ihnen beiden beruht somit das Vertrauen im Großen wie im Kleinen, und zu ihnen nimmt man im Wichtigen wie im Unwichtigen seine Zuflucht. Was immer, in allen Wissenschaftszweigen, von den beiden ausgeht, das ist ein Grundsatz (aşl), auf dem man sich stützen kann, weil er von jedem Flecken und Schmutz frei ist. So sprechen (nataqa) die Zungen und bezeugen (şahîda) es die Intellekte, wenn nicht aller, so doch der meisten von denen, die reinen Herzens und lauteren Intellektes sind.«


Es unterliegt nun keinem Zweifel, daß dieser Ausdruck mit dem griechischen *ζώον λογικόν* identisch ist. Da aber *λόγος* »Rede«, »Rechnung« und »Vernunft« bedeutet, kann es dem Araber nicht so ganz leicht gefallen sein, diesen Ausdruck sinngemäß zu übersetzen. Wie wir sahen, bedeutet nun das arabische *nātāqa* »artikulieren« und zwar hier den *λόγος* προφορικός hervorbringen, der gewissermaßen nur als ein Spiegelbild der artikulierten διάλεκτος, der inneren Rede sozusagen (Festschrift Løkkegaard, p. 327) bezeichnet werden kann. So scheint das partizipiale Adjektiv *nāṭiq* auch die volle Rede im stoischen Sinne bezeichnet zu haben, d.h. auch den *λόγος* ἐνδιάλεκτος


Auf diesem Wege hat also maniq »artikulierte Rede« die Bedeutung »Logik« annehmen können.

Was dann schließlich der schon erwähnte Ausdruck mutakallimin für »Theologen« anbelangt, bleibt hier einerseits zu bemerken, daß in der arabischen Nationalgrammatik der Singular mutakallim die erste Person Singular bezeichnet, andererseits aber, daß nach Sextus Empiricus die Stoiker auch »die Dialektiker« schlechtweg genannt werden, so daß wir also dazu berechtigt sind, sie »dialektische Materialisten« zu benennen, eine eben in diesen Tagen bemerkenswerte Tatsache. Vor allem aber, wenn die islamischen Theologen mutakallimin genannt werden, d.h. »Dialektiker«, was zunächst für die Mu'tazila passend wäre, ist dies wohl ein terminologischer Stoizismus, der später vermutlich lieber mit kalâm »Theologie« assoziiert wurde.


So vereinigt das Element harf in sich auch sowohl die Idee des σύνδεσμός »Konjunktion« als auch die des ὑπόθεσις »Artikel«, hinter welchen das platonische μετάξις und das aristotelische μέσον noch durchschimmern. Termini, die in der stoischen Philosophie der Körperlichkeit gerne als ἰδέας »Band« erscheinen.


Damit habe ich einige Beispiele herausgegriffen, die mir dazu besonders angebracht zu sein scheinen, die Bedeutung des Arabischen für die weitere Erforschung des Stoizismus zu illustrieren. Das hängt natürlich damit zusammen, daß das griechische Material so fragmentarisch ist, während das lateinische Material, wie es z.B. bei Cicero und Seneca vorliegt, auf einer spezifischen Rezeption beruht, die weitgehend von der Praktik des Stoizismus ausgegangen ist und nicht immer die wahrhaftig systematische Koherenz der stoischen Philosophie in genügender Weise beherrzigt hat.

Überblicken wir so eine Zeitspanne etwa von Etienne Vacherot bis zu Alexandre Kojève, finden wir, daß auf dem Gebiete der Stoiker-Forschung sehr viel geleistet worden ist – wer kann z.B. Max Pohlenz je vergessen! Vacherot galten zwar die Stoiker als die letzten Systematiker, aber als eine Art Hegelianer konnte er ihren Materialismus in keiner Weise dulden. Dem genialen Kojève (gest. 1968) war der Stoizismus hauptsächlich ein »Aristote dogmatise«, eine Art Neo-Aristotelismus. Ich kann hier nicht auf die Frage nach dem wahren Sinn der stoischen Philosophie eingehen, sondern stelle nur fest, daß das wirklich Signifikative in dieser Philosophie ohne die Hilfe arabischer Quellen kaum gänzlich ins Reine gebracht werden kann.
Alexander Outwitted by the Amazons

GERHARD SVEDLUND, Stockholm

The story of the study of the Galilean dialect, the language of the Master from Galilee, is a very peculiar one, perhaps even unique.

The Grammar of G. Dalman, Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramaisch, appeared in 1905. W. B. Stevenson’s Grammar of Palestinian Jewish Aramaic was published in 1924, and H. Odeberg’s, A Short Grammar of Galilean Aramaic, which also contained a syntax, in 1939.

Although the three grammars were widely used, as was also the extensive critical edition of Bereshit Rabba with Notes and Commentary by Theodor-Albeck, there was a growing feeling among the scholars interested in Galilean Aramaic that the text material which had been used as a basis by the grammarians mentioned above, had not been investigated according to the usual procedures for language research, the establishment of a correct text with due consideration given to the historical sequence and the development of other Western Aramaic dialects (see for instance Kutscher, 1952, p. 3, H. L. Ginsberg, 1934, p. 383, S. Lieberman, 1932, p. 456: n 3).

Kutscher exhibits (1952, p. 9 ff) sufficient evidence to prove the very poor reliability of the Galilean text material used by Dalman, Stevenson and Odeberg for their grammars. It would not be totally untrue to say that with regard to Galilean Aramaic, the grammars were based on a dialect that had never existed as a language. The reason was that from sometime during the later part of the first millenium and until the printing began around 1445, the Jewish European copyists, familiar with the Eastern Aramaic of the Bab. Talmud, continously changed the structure, spelling, forms and endings of the Galilean dialect in the MSS they were copying. The intention was to “correct” it and make it look like the Aramaic dialect they knew and believed to be the correct one, namely the Babylonian Aramaic. Consequently they would add a determining å to a word in status indeterminatus, a final å, mostly indicated by he in the Galilean dialect, would be altered to alef, final nün of verbal forms, of place names, of the conditional ‘yn would be apocopated, the conjunction kd became ky, tryyhwn “both of them” was spelled trwywyhw, pym “mouth” was changed into pwn.

The construction mn + participle which served as a predicative in the Galilean dialect, and in other Western Aramaic dialects as well, was not understood and therefore altered in various ways, mn would become mh “what” or an independent my “who”, at other times it was changed to mn “who”. This construction confused not only the copyists but also Dalman (see “Dialektproben. p 26,6 mny, vocalized by Dalman mnn, a corruption of mynpq “while leaving”).

The important work of Kutscher “Studies in Galilean Aramaic” (Hebrew) has led to a better understanding of several of the problems connected with Galilean Aramaic. The Galilean text material published by Kutscher (An Aramaic Handbook, P.L.O, 1967, I/1 pp. 51–70), the discovery of a complete copy of the Pal-
The story of Alexander meeting King Kašia,* ruler of a country situated behind the “Dark” mountains, appears in many versions. Fortunately, there is a version of this Alexander legend among the Geniza findings (see Kahle, 1959, and 1958, pp. 100 ff.). The version appears in “Fragments of Wayyiqra Rabbah from the Geniza” edited by M. Margulies, Jerusalem 1960, p. 82 f. Considering the fact that this Geniza fragment cannot have been manipulated by European copyists, it is of interest to compare its readings with the readings of the same version “König Alexander in Afrika”, Midrasch Vajjikra Rabbah nach Add 27169 (A), G. Dalman, Aramäische Dialetkproben, Darmstadt 1960 (reprint), a MS from the 13th century.

There was no doubt a serious break in the transmission of traditions as a result of the destruction of Jerusalem in 70 A. D. After this date we know that academies were set up. From then on traditions were again handed down, both orally and in writing, until they were redacted. With regard to Bereshit Rabbah and Wayyiqra Rabbah, it seems they were edited in Palestine in the fifth and sixth centuries. Consequently we have a fragment of the Alexander story copied towards the end of the first millenium and a manuscript copied several hundred years later of the same story.

The Geniza fragment = G. Addit. 27169 = DP. (Restorations within brackets by Margulies).

*Perhaps the king Kašia appearing in numerous encyclopedic works never existed, and that the meaning is “the king of the country at the end of the world”, cf. qš, qšš “end”.

---

*Estinian Targum (Targum Neophyti I), the analysis of the outstanding MS Vat. Ebr. 30 to Bereshit Rabbah by L. Barth and the numerous editions of the Aramaic portions of the Geniza fragments, all give us reason to believe that a more distinct comprehension of the Galilean dialect will be reached in the near future.
NOTES

1. Alexander, one of the greatest leaders and generals of all time. A whole literature of romance grew up about him. To him must be credited the spread of Hellenism and profound changes in the Near and the Middle East (see Lieberman, 1942). He early passed into legend.

2. DP lgby which equals gby. The sing. form is frequently used with sing. suffixed pronouns and the plur. form with plur. suffixed pronouns, but there are exceptions, e.g. lgby rbnw.

3. DP qyf. The European copyists frequently changed the indicator for final ă from he to alef under the influence of the Bab, Talmud and TO. Out of 16 final ă indicated by he in G there remain 4 in the later MS of DP, hry hwšk (H.), cf Jastrow, pp. 365, 511 “Dark Mountains”.

4. DP ’zl. The text of G “Alexander went to … (and) came to … seems better from a linguistic point of view.

5. Both MSS show mdyh, in most later versions and printed editions “corrected” to mdyn’. It was generally believed (cf. Dalman, Gr. pp. 121 and 188) that the determinate state had lost its force in Galilean Aramaic just as in the Eastern Aramaic dialects. But as Lieberman (1932, p. 456) and Kutscher (1952, p. 7) have shown, even in the common speech of Palestine the distinction between the absolute and the emphatic states was maintained.

6. DP qrtyynh (both the spelling with ă and t occur), the town Carthage. Qartigna or Qartagene, derived by folk-etymology from Aramaic qarta “town” and Greek gunē “woman”.

7. DP wht. Plene spelling with waw and alef occurs frequently in reliable Galilean texts. (For reliable texts, see Kutscher 1952, p. 4).


9. DP dnyh, a reading employed in most later versions including printed editions. The spelling with m here could be due to Hebrew influence or the fact that in Galilean Aramaic in certain circumstances měm was pronounced like nīn (see Kutscher, 1972, p. 2). On the other hand we know that there was a phonetic change m > n that spread from Palmyra to Gaza as shown by inscriptions, place names, and Galilean texts, and perhaps also in the language of the Koran and in today’s spoken Arabic, cf. Kutscher 1952, p. 38 ff.


13. DP qbr’, see note 5.

14. DP wnsht, a case of the likely or possible condition introduced by ’yn, with part. act. in the Protasis and the perfect in the Apodosis. G apparently employs a part. both in the Protasis and the Apodosis.

15. DP dnhwz d’nsy’. One would expect dnhwz. The unfortunate restoration md(yn’) by Margulies is based on other (later) MSS.


17. DP qbr’, see note 5.

18. The part. with suffixed pronoun had only a common masc. fem. form. Consequently wšhyn here equals wšhwn due to the preceding ’bdnn.

19. A sentence missing in G. “Your name will go out in the world (and it will be said) that you made war against women and they defeated you”.

20. DP wtwb ’b “and you will never again be able to …”

21. DP bhv’ ’nt ’pk pwy “in that moment his countenance fell”. G employs ’myk, afel of mwk.

22. G wpnq lỳ “and he left”.

23. mynpq equals mn + the participle, see Kutscher 1952, p. 51 ff. DP mny is a corruption of mn npq > mynpq which often was changed in various ways by the copyists as they did not understand the construction.
24. Apparently from Greek πύλη (preceded by τά “entrance, gate of a town”). However, there is an Aramaic word פִיל (Akkadian piru) giving the meaning “at the elephant gate”. In Galilean Aramaic we find a large number of borrowings from Greek, e.g. λυσμός “robber”, ἱπρία “prefect”, μωρος “stupid”, μνήμα “decoration”, ψυρό “air, weather”, τύμη “price”. There are also Latin words that came into Galilean Aramaic via Greek, such as λυγυμί “legion”, ἱρώνη “tax, duty” (to supply grain to the Roman troops) also spelled ἰρώνη (berührungsdissimilation, see Růžička, p. 66). ἡμίψω (note 15), see Svedlund, 1974, App IV.

25. DP kmlk šty “(I have been) like a foolish king”.


27. 'd d... “until the moment when (I came to ...)”.

28. DP dylyt. It is true that verba geminata employ on the analogy of verba mediae wāw forms like 'yyl, gyll, etc. The problem with Dalman's pael vocalization here is that pael has the meaning “come habitually or frequently”, which cannot possibly be correct here. G reads dylyt. the expected form.

29. “to the town of Carthage”. G spelling mistake. DP “called Carthage”.

30. DP ἱργ which equals ἱργ “another”.

31. The same type of construction as the one we found in the beginning of the first part of the story. Still, Dalman did not realize the inconsistency between his vocalization of the first occurrence as a participle and the second as the perfect.

32. DP reads correctly ἱζωργιν. There was however, a word ἱζωργιν (the name of a wine of inferior quality), but the following dhllb shows that ἱζωργιν is the right word.

33. One would expect ἱζωργιν (= DP).

34. “What? Is gold eaten in your country?” DP “Is this what is eaten in your country?”

35. Dalman apparently misunderstood the word kn (vocalized as “here”). kn, kyn appears frequently meaning “so, like that”, e.g. w'yn kn “but if this be so”, kyn hy > kyny “it is so”. The Hebrew expression kn (see Segal, Gr. p. 136) is sometimes rendered in Aramaic by kn, for instance mk'n w'yly “from now on” in Galilean Aramaic mbkyn wllh. The reading kn in DP could be a phenomenon analogous to the Syr. kyn (kën, kn), see Brockelmann, Syr. Gr., p. 7).

36. Also spelled ῥτ, ῥτt.

37. Equals lhwn.

38. Error for 'wtrykn (DP 'trkwn).

39. The word ῥ is missing: ῥ 'tyt.

40. Concerning the infinitive, the reliable texts indicate (contrary to Dalman, Gr., p. 279) that the form was ῥτμου only, and that even in unvocalized texts when no ῥ was written, the pronunciation was ῥτμου (๔). Here we have ῥμhé (verba tertiae alef).

41. “I only came to see your administration of the law”.

42. ‘d d... functions here as a predicative like mn + participle. “While they were sitting there ...”

43. “Two men came before the king for judgement”. DP ῥτμ “cause to come” (alef).

44. Both ῥτριη and ῥτβτ show the peculiarity of Galilean Aramaic, the vowels o and u induced, the first by the influence of r, the second by the influence of a labial (see Svedlund, 1974, p. 31).

45. Equals ῥθγρθ “and I cleaned it”. DP ῥπτ “I dug”.

46. “in it”. DP ῥκγ “inside it”.

47. ῥρρτ ρλ “and I told him”.

48. Both MSS show the correct use of the determinative state “I have sold the ruin to this man” (pael).

49. “All that is in it I sold to him”. DP “it, and all that is in it, I sold to him.

50. Error for brt (both MSS).

51. “Marry them to each other”, ἱσβ corresponds to ns*, ἱσβ “marry”, alef “give in marriage”.

52. Both MSS show the correct Galilean spelling as opposed to the Eastern ῥτρθγρθ, frequently appearing in corrupt Galilean texts.


54. One would expect ῥτμth. DP reads correctly tmth.

55. “Did I not judge well?”

56. Corresponds to Hebrew 'n lnw. “If this case had happened in your country, how would you have decided it?”

57. A confusion between ἵληθν ρρθ and ἵληθι ρρθ (cf. DP).
BIBLIOGRAPHY

Dalman, G., Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch (includes Dialektproben), 1960, reprint, Darmstadt.
Ginsberg, H. L., Tarbiz V, 1934, Jerusalem.
Kutscher, E. Y., Meḥqarim ba-arammit ha-gelilit (offprint from Tarbiz 21–23), 1952, Jerusalem.
Lieberman, S., Tarbiz III, 1932, Jerusalem.
Růžička, R., Konsonantische Dissimilation in den semitischen Sprachen (Beiträge zur Assyriologie und semitischen Sprachwissenschaft, Bd. 6:4), 1909, Leipzig.
A Persian Astrolabe from A. H. 1187/A. D. 1773–74

CHRISTOPHER TOLL, Copenhagen

In the 1930's the well-known Swedish archaeologist Professor T. Arne bought two astrolabes in Persia. One of them now belongs to the Royal Swedish Academy of Science, Stockholm. The other one was in Lund in 1936 when it was examined and photographed by the architect to the Cathedral in Lund, Th. Wåhlin. It then belonged to the "Kooperativa Förbundet" (the Swedish Cooperative Association). After having been in Lund it disappeared, but thanks to Wåhlin's photographs it could be described by Mayer, who remarks "present owner unknown", whereas it was registered by Price as belonging to the Building Office of the Cathedral in Lund.

My enquiries after the astrolabe in Lund in 1977 and with the "Kooperativa Förbundet" in Stockholm in 1983 were of no avail. Then, unexpectedly, in 1986, a newspaper notice informed me that the astrolabe had been donated by a private person to the "Sjöhistoriska Museet" (Museum of Naval History) in Stockholm (Inv. No. 25.456).

My description of this former "Lund astrolabe" follows the general description of the Islamic astrolabe by Hartner.

1. a) [Fig. 1–2] The kursî is decorated with a cartouche containing the appropriate words wasi'a kursiyahu s-samawâti wal-arâda "His throne comprises the heavens and earth" (Arberry's translation) from the famous "Throne verse", Sûra 2:256. On the back there is a decorative foliage.
   b) – c) [Fig. 1–2] Handle and ring as usual.
   d) [Fig. 9] Through the ring runs a woven silk ribbon, length 1,4 m without tassels, width 2 cm, with inscriptions, here numbered 1–13 beginning with the one nearest to the knot of the ribbon, Nos. 1, 2 and 8–13 being in Persian, the other ones in Arabic: 1) Mubârak bâd "May it be blessed", 2) id., 3) nâdi 'Aliyan mu'âzhîr al-'agîb "invoke 'Ali who does wonder", 4) taqidhu 'awnan laka fî n-nawâ'ib "and you will find him a help for you in adversities", 5) kull hammâ wa-'âmm sa-yâqî bi-'azamatika, yâ "every care and sorrow will disclose your majesty, o", 6) Allâh, bi-nubuwatika, yâ Mu'âmmad, bi-wilâyatika, yâ 'Ali "God, your prophethood, o Mu'âmmad, your holiness, o 'Ali", 7) mà sâ' Allâh, lâ ḥawla wa-la qîwata illâ bi-il-lâh al-'alî al-'azîm "whatever God intend, there is no power and no strength save in God, the High, the Great", 8) naqš-e in âyin be-mânad sâhâ "the embroidering of this decoration will remain for years", 9) zamânî ḥâk dar ufîûde gâhî "for some time the exalted will be fallen in the dust", 10) magar sâheb-deli rûzî be-rahmat "but one day a pious man in compassion", 11) kunad dar ḥaqq-e darwîshân du'â'î "will offer a prayer for the poor", 12) mubârak bâd "may it be blessed", 13) mubârak bâd 1313 (?) "may it be blessed 1895/96(?)".

A similar woven silk ribbon belongs to the other astrolabe purchased by Profes-
sor Arne (the one in the Royal Academy of Science) – otherwise astrolabes with preserved cords are seldom met with, Gunther⁷) mentioning only 8 such astrolabes.

2. a) [Fig. 1] The outer rim is graduated from $0^\circ$ to $360^\circ$, each degree being marked
by a stroke at the innermost part of the rim. Every fifth degree is marked by a small circle over the stroke. The outer part of the rim is divided into 24 fields, each one corresponding to 15 degrees and marked by *abgad*-letters 5–10–15, 20–25–30 etc., clockwise from 12 o’clock (S), beginning again after 100 with 5–10–15 etc., and likewise after 200 and 300, 100, 200 and 300 also being marked by *abgad*-letters.

The *umm* contains eight circular bands, here numbered from the outermost inwards I–VIII. I has no inscriptions. II–VII are divided by 24 radii resulting in $6 \times 24$ fields. The 6 fields to the left of the *mumsika* (S) contain the captions of the six bands: II *al-bilād* “the towns”, III *atwāl* “longitudes” (reckoned from the Eternal Islands, the Canaries, “from which Ptolemy began the determination of geographical longitude”), IV *‘urūd* “latitudes” (from the equator), V *inhirāfāt* “inclinations” (the arc of the horizon between the meridian of the town and a vertical circle passing through the zenith of the town and that of Mecca), VI *gihāt* “directions” (towards Mecca), VII *bu’dūhā* “their distance” = from Mecca). VIII has as only inscription *bil-farāsīh* “in *farsāhs*” (one *farsāh* being 5,985 km), in continuation of the caption in VII. Longitude, latitude and inclination are given in *abgad*-letters, the direction is abbreviated as *ggi* (gā’iibiyā gānūbiyya) “W” or *ggi* (sārqiyya gānūbiyya) “ES”, and the distance is given in numerals.

The towns with these data are clockwise from the captions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>II</th>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
<th>VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Rayy</td>
<td>86 20</td>
<td>35 0</td>
<td>38 27</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Mawsil</td>
<td>77 20</td>
<td>34 30</td>
<td>0 40</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Nalḥ̣uwan</td>
<td>81 15</td>
<td>28 40</td>
<td>12 55</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>39(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>al-Maraga</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>37 20</td>
<td>16 17</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Tabriz</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>38 20</td>
<td>15 39</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Ardbil</td>
<td>82 30</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>57 18</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Baṣra</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37 51</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Śīrāz</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>29 26</td>
<td>33 33</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Yazd</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>43 33</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Hamadān</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>35 10</td>
<td>22 16</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Makka</td>
<td>77 10</td>
<td>21 40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Kāšān</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34 33</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Isfahān</td>
<td>86 40</td>
<td>32 35</td>
<td>40 31</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>34(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Kufta</td>
<td>79 30</td>
<td>31 30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>144 (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Bağdād</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>33 25</td>
<td>21 13</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Samnān</td>
<td>88 5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36 17</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Bīsṭam</td>
<td>89 30</td>
<td>36 10</td>
<td>40 32</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Šīrīn</td>
<td>91 30</td>
<td>35 5</td>
<td>44 3(?)</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Madina</td>
<td>75 20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37 10</td>
<td>ES</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Tūs</td>
<td>92 30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>45 4</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>46(0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Harāt</td>
<td>94 20</td>
<td>34 30</td>
<td>50 26</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Qandahār</td>
<td>84 40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>71 44</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Quzīwīn</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>27 34</td>
<td>WS</td>
<td>352</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The names Baṣra and Madina without article and the spelling Isfahān (Arabic Isbahān) make it probable that the astrolabe is a Persian one.
Note to 5: The inscription has Nayriz, but Nayriz is, according to Yaqūt\textsuperscript{10}, near Širāz, whereas Tabriz is near al-Marāqa and better fits in with the data given.

2. b) [Fig. 2] The *zahr* is divided into quadrants. The outer rim of quadrants I and II is each divided from 0° to 90° beginning from E and W. As on the front every 5th degree is marked by a small circle. Above every 5th degree are the corresponding *abgād*-numbers 5–10–15 etc. ending with 90 at both sides of S.

Quadrant I is divided by radii from every 5th degree and by horizontal lines from the same points as the radii. Quadrant II is empty.

Quadrants III and IV contain the shadow squares surrounded by four semicircular bands, leaving spaces to the left and right and below the squares. To the left of the squares is engraved *zill aqādām ma’kūs “umbra versa of /the gnomon reckoned in/ feet*”, and to the right *zill aṣābi’ ma’kūs “umbra versa of /the gnomon reckoned in/ fingers*”.

The space below the squares is divided into two by a cartouche. To the left and right of the cartouche is engraved the word *mustawī*, meaning *zill aqādām mustawī “umbra recta of /the gnomon reckoned in/ feet*” and *zill aṣābi’ mustawī “umbra recta of /the gnomon reckoned in/ fingers*”, respectively. The cartouche is inscribed 1187 *ṣan`at Muḥammad Hāšim Narāfī(?) “1187/1773–74 the work of M. H. N.*”.

To the left, below and to the right of the squares runs a band divided into sections numbered in *abgād* numerals, left, corresponding to the feet of the *umbra versa*: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7; below left, corresponding to the feet of the *umbra recta*: 7, 6, 5, 4, 3, 2, empty, 1; below right, corresponding to the fingers of the *umbra recta*: empty, 3, 6, 9, 12; and right, corresponding to the fingers of the *umbra versa*: 12, 9, 6, 3.

Of the four semicircular bands of quadrants III and IV the outermost has to the left the caption *zill aqādām* followed by the numbers 24, 18, 12, 6 in *abgād* numerals, and to the right the caption *zill aṣābi’* followed by the numbers 42, 36, 30, 24, 18, 12.
in abgad numerals against a decoration of foliage and flowers which takes up the rest of the band containing no numerals. The next band is graduated - over some of the strokes there is a small circle. The other two bands are empty. The shadow squares are headed by the caption arbâb al-muqallâb bin-nahâr wal-layl "The Lords of the triplicities by day and by night". The shadow squares are divided into 4 horizontal bands, headed right by the captions nâr "fire", turâb "earth", hawâ’ "air" and mā' "water", indicating the four triplicities, which in their turn are divided by altogether 9 vertical bands, making a total of 40 small squares, including the captions. The three following vertical bands contain the signs of the zodiac of the triplicities, the signs being marked by abgad-letters from Ø (zero), i.e. a h with the upper ends forming a horizontal line (as explained by al-Biruni 12) but on this astrolabe actually rather with a vertical line above the h; δ or ι, as also in the list of towns, above p. 165), to 1. The next three bands contain the planets which are lords by day and the last three those which are lords by night of each triplicity. The names of the planets are abbreviated, the last consonant of the name of each planet being used for abbreviation. That there are three lords by day and three lords by night is according to a more popular doctrine (called haswîya by al-Biruni 13 - otherwise, according to the orthodox doctrine, the first two are the lords by day and night, respectively, and third is the companion both by day and night).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tripl.</th>
<th>Signs of the zodiac</th>
<th>Lords of the day</th>
<th>Lords of the night</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nâr</td>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fire</td>
<td>hamal asad gaws</td>
<td>sun</td>
<td>mustâri zuhal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>turâb</td>
<td>h t r</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>earth</td>
<td>Taurus Virgo Capric.</td>
<td>zuhara qamar mîrîh</td>
<td>qamar zuhara mîrîh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hawâ’</td>
<td>b w y</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>air</td>
<td>mîzân dâlîh</td>
<td>zuhul 'uţarîd mustâri</td>
<td>'uţarîd zuhal mustâri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mî</td>
<td>g z y</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>water</td>
<td>Cancer Scorp. Pisces</td>
<td>Venus Mars moon</td>
<td>Mars Venus moon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. a) [Fig. 3–4] On the ‘ankabît each sign of the zodiac is divided into five subdivisions marked in abgad-letters 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, each subdivision thus consisting of 6 degrees, showing a sexpartite (studsî) astrolabe. Several of the pointers marking the fixed stars have no names ingraved upon them, and in some cases a name could refer to more than one pointer. Following fixed stars are marked on the ‘ankabît:

1. ‘uqâb (al. danab al-‘uqâb) = ζ Aquilae (Kunitzsch, Sternnamen 14 156 No. 84).
2. hawwâ (al. ra’s al-hawwâ) = α Ophiuchi (81 No. 51).
3. tâ’ir = α Aquilae (81 No. 54).
4. marfiq (al. marfiq al-hawwâ’) = λ Ophiuchi (176 No. 120).
5. wâqi’ = α Lyrae (81 No. 53).
6. *fakka* = α Corona borealis (79 No. 45). Wählin read *qubba* and identified it with α Corona borealis, but *qubba* is, according to as-Ṣūfī, Corona Austrina (Kunitzsch, Untersuchungen 95 No. 231).

7. *matn fāras* = π Pegasi (Kunitzsch, Untersuchungen 56 No. 89).

8. *qā'id* = η Ursae maioris (Kunitzsch, Sternnamen 123 No. 30, Untersuchungen 91 No. 213).


11. *ʾayyūq* = α Aurigae (71 No. 20). The pointer has two points – the left one is meant.

12. *ʾayn* (al. *ʾayn at-tawr = ad-dabarān*) = α Tauri (Kunitzsch, Typen 32 n. 3).


15. *safina* (al. *taraf as-safina*) = θ Puppis (74 No. 27). Also this pointer has more than one point.

16. *qalb asad* = α Leonis (76 No. 30).

17. *fard as-suġā* = α Hydrae (76 No. 29).

18. *gūrāb* (al. *šrā al-gūrāb*) γ Corvi (166 No. 103).


20. *qalb al-ʿaqrab* = α Scorpionis (Kunitzsch, Sternnamen 80 No. 48).

3. b) There are four disks, engraved on both sides.

   1a) [Fig. 5] *liʿ-ard ld* “for latitude 34” is inscribed between the true horizon and the northern tropic to the right of the meridian. To the left of the meridian: *as-sāʿāt ydyz* “the hours are 14 17” (in the longest day of the year). Between the true horizon and the straight horizon the words *al-magrīb* “the West” and *al-maṣriq* “the East” are inscribed to the right and left. These three inscriptions are against a
background of decorative foliage. In the bottom half the hours are marked from W
to E 1-12 with $ab\acute{g}ad$-letters for the unequal hours, and 1-14 with numerals for the
equal hours, adding 17 in $ab\acute{g}ad$-letters for the remaining minutes.

The degrees of the almacanths are marked from E and W 6, 12, 18, 24, 30, 36
and from S 42, 48, 54, 60, 66, 72, 78, 84 and 90 in the zenith. There are thus 15
circles indicating every 6th degree, the astrolabe being sexpartite ($s\dot{u}d\dot{s}\ddot{i}$).

The azimuths are numbered from E and W to the meridian 10, 20, 30 etc. to 90
along the true horizon and continuing higher up 40, 50 etc. to 90 on both sides of
the meridian at S.

I b) [Fig. 6] $li'-\acute{a}rd$ $lb$ “for latitude 32”, $s\acute{a}'\acute{a}tu\acute{u}h\ddot{u}$ $yd$ $z$ “its hours are 14 7”. “The
East” and “The West”, the degrees of the almacanths and the unequal hours are
marked. The execution of the inscriptions is less decorative than in 1 a.

II a) $li'-\acute{a}rd$ $l$ “for latitude 30”, $s\acute{a}'\acute{a}tu\acute{u}h\ddot{u}$ $yg$ $nw$ “its hours are 13 56”. “The East”
and “The West” are not marked, otherwise as I b.

II b) $li'-\acute{a}rd$ $m$ “for latitude 40”, $s\acute{a}'\acute{a}tu\acute{u}h\ddot{u}$ $yd$ $n$ “its hours are 14 51”. Otherwise as
I b.

III a) $li'-\acute{a}rd$ $lw$ “for latitude 36”, $s\acute{a}'\acute{a}tu\acute{u}h\ddot{u}$ $yd$ $kh$ “its hours are 14 28”. Otherwise
as I b.

III b) $li'-\acute{a}rd$ $lh$ “for latitude 35”, $s\acute{a}'\acute{a}tu\acute{u}h\ddot{u}$ $yd$ $kb$ “its hours are 14 22”. Otherwise
as I b.

IV a) [Fig. 7] A disk of horizons ($s\acute{a}f\acute{i}h\dot{a}$ $\acute{a}f\acute{\acute{a}}q\acute{i}ya$), as described by Morley. It is
divided into quadrants by means of two diameters and into three circular bands.
Each following quadrant can be read by turning the disk 90°. Placed in
the astrolabe, quadrant I is bottom left. Under the horizontal diameter the outermost
band is divided into four parts numbered 6, 12, 18, 24 – the individual degrees not
being marked. Four curves at the bottom of quadrant I are marked 27, 37, 47, 57,
and four curves through the middle and innermost bands are marked 36, 46, 56, 66.

Quadrant II top left has in the same places 6, 12, 18, 24 – 36, 46, 56, 66 – 27, 37,
47, 57. Quadrant III top right has the series 6, 12, 18, 24 – 27, 37, 47, 57 – 20, 30,
40, 50.
Quadrant IV bottom right has 6, 12, 18, 24 under which the words *mayl kullī* “total/Southern/obliquity” are written. Now also in quadrant III can be read in the middle band below the horizontal diameter the series 6, 12, 18, 24 under which likewise the words *mayl kullī* “total/Northern/obliquity” are written. Thus, as Morley states, every horizon from 6° to 66° is found on the tablet.

IV b) [Fig. 8] *li-‘arḍ ld* “for latitude 34”, *sāʿātuḥū yd yz* “its hours are 14 17”. “The East” and “The West” are marked. Equator and tropics, horizon and meridian are marked. The remaining lines divide the firmament into “houses” (*buyūt*), marked from E against the clock *fālī* “ascendant”, “horoscope”, *tānī* “second” etc. to *tānī ‘asār* “twelfth”.

3. c) The alidad is lacking.

d-c) The pin and horse are preserved.

NOTES

1. Letters from Wöhl to R. T. Gunther, April 30th and May 23rd, 1936, Museum of the History of Science, University of Oxford; Beskrivning av ... arabiskt astrolabium av år 1773, 1936, Lunds Universitetsbibliotek.


6. I am obliged to Dr. F. Vahman, Senior Lecturer in Iranian philology, University of Copenhagen, for valuable help with the Persian inscription.


10. EF s.v.


15. As-Sūfī, Description des étoiles fixes, tr. H. C. F. C. Schjellerup, St.-Petersbourg 1874, pp. 252 sq.


18. Description, p. 28 to pl. XV, and following him by Wöhl, Beskrivning, p. 8.
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In the notes.
Augustus and Meroe

LÁSZLÓ TÖRÖK, Budapest

The only vulnerable point of the frontiers of Egypt was at the First Cataract of the Nile, in the region of the so-called Dodekaschoinous or Land of The Twelve Miles¹ (fig. 1). The ownership of the Dodekaschoinous caused conflicts between Egypt and Meroe ever since the early 4th century B.C.² It belonged during the last decades of Ptolemaic rule to Egypt,³ but in 30 B.C.⁴ it was occupied by Meroe. One of the first tasks to be solved by Egypt’s first Roman praefect, C. Cornelius Gallus,⁵ was therefore the establishment of a safe frontier district in the region and the settling of the relations with Meroe. Meroe was regarded in Egypt as a difficult neighbour and as a country rich in gold and exotic wares; thus the settlement was not without importance. It was reached through a series of encounters that took almost ten years between 30 and 21/20 B.C. The story is told by Strabo,⁶ Pliny⁷ and Cassius Dio⁸ and further documented by inscriptions of Cornelius Gallus⁹ and Augustus himself.¹⁰ Apart from doubts concerning details, Meroitic scholars generally accept this, from the point of view of Meroitic studies, uniquely rich and comprehensible, first-hand evidence.¹¹ The bias of the Roman interpretation of the Meroitic war was recently analysed by Inge Hofmann¹² and by myself, but our attempts were unfavourably received.¹³ When I return here to the issue, it is because I regard the discussion initiated by Hofmann as unfinished and because I hope that my readers will share the view of the eighteenth-century German writer Lichtenberg, according to whom it is first of all common opinion, and matters taken by everybody as settled, that deserve our closest scrutiny.¹⁴ Finally it appears that the war of Augustus against Meroe and the resulting establishment were in some respects an organic continuation of Ptolemaic policy towards Meroe: therefore this episode of the history of Roman Egypt my be of some interest for the students of ancient history.

In the following I shall give a short chronological account of the war. It will be based on the texts and inscriptions referred to above, the deliberate and undeliberate limits of which I shall try to point out as far as possible in the framework of a short paper. The criticism of the sources has the aim to give an idea of the vanity of round and comprehensive reconstructions of the war of Augustus against Meroe, and to define, or at least circumscribe, its probable significance within the course of Meroitic – Ptolemaic – Roman contacts. Then I shall proceed to a discussion of some features of the Augustan Peace in the Twelve Mile Reach and to the interpretation of two art objects connected to the person of Augustus and found in Meroe. Finally I shall try to illustrate through the fate of one of the latter the ambiguity of the Meroitic attitude towards Rome in the 1st century A.D.

Shortly after the annexation of the new province, Egypt’s first praefect, C. Cornelius Gallus, friend of Octavian and Vergil,¹⁵ poet of renommée,¹⁶ was confronted with an insurrection in Upper Egypt.¹⁷ It was explained by Strabo as a consequence of the imposing of the laoographia i.e. poll-tax, a burden unknown to Egyptians under the Ptolemies.¹⁸ The rising could in fact have been triggered by the
appearance of Roman tax collectors, but it was probably prepared already in the turbulent period before 30 B.C.; moreover, it was not independent from the next conflict to be faced by Cornelius Gallus. The latter occurred in connection with the Meroitic-Egyptian frontier, that lay at the southern end of the rising Thebaid. There can be no doubt that the pacification of the frontier region was decided in the moment when the scheme of the military defence of Roman Egypt was created. Yet
the inscription erected by Cornelius Gallus on April 17, 29 B.C. in Philae commemorates the victory over the insurrection and the pacification of the frontier together, and in a way which suggests either that the Theban revolt was prompted by a Meroitic advance, or that the Meroites were encouraged by the insurrection in Upper Egypt. The praefect relates that he crossed the First Cataract with his army, received the envoys of the Meroites in Philae, admitted their king to protection and appointed a tyrannos of the Triakontaschoinos or the Thirty Mile Reach, being a district in Meroe, or, as the Latin version of the trilingual inscription puts, tyranno Triakontaschoeni in fine Aethiopiae constituto. The pacification thus went beyond the actual Egyptian border at Hiera Sycaminos, the southern end of the Dodekaschoinos. The appointment by the Roman praefect of a tyrant over the whole territory between the First and Second Cataract means no less than the forcible establishment of a vassal chiefdom. Military success of Cornelius Gallus must also explain what he records with these words: legatis regis Aethiopum ... auditis, eodem rege in tutellam recepto. The vassal Triakontaschoinos and the protection of the Meroitic king were beyond doubt the first steps towards the establishment of a client-kingdom and, eventually, the later annexation of the whole or a part of the kingdom of Meroe.

These aims may explain, why we don’t find the terminology of bellum iustum in the accounts of Cornelius Gallus and Augustus.

Although the vainglorious tone of his trilingual inscription forecasts Gallus’ hybris which will lead to his disgrace and suicide, there can be no doubt that in the Triakontaschoinos he acted according to Octavian’s orders and in the spirit of Roman frontier policy of the day. The inscription reveals that at the same time he was aware of the way the Ptolemies had solved same frontier problem. The region had been conquered by Meroe in the early 4th century B.C., but occupied in ca. 274 B.C. by the second Ptolemy, who must have considered its ownership to be the only safe basis of contacts with Meroe. Meroe succeeded, however, in recon-
quering it for two short periods in the course of the late third and early second century B.C. (between 207/6 and 18624 and between 181 and 165/5). Remarkably enough, Meroitic success was secured both times by rebellions in Upper Egypt. After 165/4 the Triakontaschoinos was for some five decades firmly under Ptolemaic rule. As it seems, the administration of the region was unusual insofar as it was based on Ethiopian communities subordinate to an Ethiopian eparch,26 who was controlled presumably by the strategos of the neighbouring Thebaid. This establishment must have been due to the ethnic composition of the region, i.e. to a non-Egyptian,27 majority of southern origin. It can be presumed that the native organization continued its existence also after the late 2nd century B.C. when Ptolemaic control seems to have been restricted on the Dodekaschoinos (cp. fig. 2). We have good reason to believe that Cornelius Gallus found the territory to be inhabited by a similarly composed population. Although there were also other patterns, according to which the government of the pacified Triakontaschoinos could have been constructed, the institution of a native tyrant and the – at least nominal – double, Roman and Meroitic, authority was (to an unfortunately unknown extent) a revival of the Ptolemaic administration.

It is needless to stress that the establishment intended not only to obtain security at the frontier, but also control of the trade in the adjacent Red Sea region on the one hand and ownership of the gold-mining area of the Wadis Allaqi and Gabgaba, on the other.29 Firm control over the Triakontaschoinos meant furthermore that the shortest and safest desert road from Meroe City to Lower Nubia and Egypt ended at Korosko in the vassal territory. Later development will nevertheless have demonstrated to Augustus (as previously to the Ptolemies) that all these advantages could also have been achieved with much less effort and without entailing the ambition of maintaining a vassal chieftainship that deeply disturbed Meroitic interests or even of preparing the way towards a client-kingdom or a province Meroe. But in order to realize this fact, he had first to fight a difficult war and also to change his entire foreign policy. Yet around 29 B.C. the vassal Triakontaschoinos and the development inherent in its establishment were most logical. The menace of barbarian countries along the frontiers could, according to Republican policy, be prevented only by annexation; this maxim was to be repeated also long after Augustus had begun to enforce what we call summarily, and with frequent misunderstanding, his Peace.30

After his success in the south, Cornelius Gallus lost a sense of proportion, assumed royal airs, thus impardonably offending Octavian who accepted full royal honours in Egypt. He started to set up statues of himself throughout Egypt.31 A head in Cleveland (fig. 3) is probably a fragment of one of these and may illustrate by its size and style that he was justly accused of hybris. But, when analysing the reasons for his disgrace,33 it cannot be forgotten that Augustus declared the renuntiatio amicitiae only in the spring of 27, i.e. after the Restoration of the Republic, when he received the cognomen Augustus and unlimited power over a vast provincia including Egypt. It is likely that the disgrace was also prompted by plans of Augustus concerning government of Egypt. However, between the summer of 27 and the summer of 25 he was occupied in Spain and seems not to have dealt with affairs of, and around Egypt, apart from routine matters. In the summer
25 he ordered Aelius Gallus, second prefect of Egypt, to launch an expedition against Arabia Felix. To a certain extent this expedition, insofar as it also concerned Red Sea trade, was an extension of the scheme to which the pacification of Meroe belonged. At the same time a new praefect was appointed in the person of C. Petronius. Aelius Gallus left first for Arsinoe to prepare the expedition, and from there – after some months – to Leuke Kome. He took with him almost half of the forces stationed in Egypt. Following his withdrawal Meroitic troops crossed the First Cataract, ravaged Philae, Syene and Elephantine, and carried off prisoners and statues of Augustus. In a later phase of the war they were asked by Petronius about their motives: the answer was that they were mistreated by the nomarchs, i.e. tax-collectors. This detail suggests that the case was in reality a popular rising in the vassal Triakontaschoinos. Also Strabo’s description of their primitive equipment and insufficient army organisation speaks for the hypothesis that the first act of the war was an insurrection against vassallage. Petronius appeared within some weeks with 10000 infantry and 800 cavalry, drove out the invaders and, pushing on towards south, met the army sent from the south by the queen who ruled together with her son at Pselchis/Dakka. Here he destroyed the Meroitic forces, advanced to Primis/Qasr Ibrim which he took. According to Strabo, Pliny and Cassius Dio he marched thence to Napata; this detail seems to be supported by the Res Gestae, too. According to these sources Napata was conquered and destroyed, in spite of the fact that, as Strabo relates, the queen offered to give back the prisoners and the statues of the emperor. On the way back
Petronius refortified Primis and provided it with a garrison of 400 men and food for two years. On his return to Alexandria he dispatched one thousand Meroitic war prisoners to Augustus, who, so Strabo, had recently returned from Spain to Rome. The actual success of the expedition was presumably humbler than put by the sources. The following details indicate that they described an ideal development of the war in the terms required by the expansionist spirit of contemporary literature and demanded by popular propaganda. According to Pliny, Petronius took the towns of Pselchis/Dakka, Primis/Qasr Ibrim, Bocchin/Ballana, Forum Cambusius/Faras, Atteniam/Mirgissa, Stadissim, where the rushing waters of the Nile deaen those who live in the neighbourhood, i.e. Saras at the Second Cataract. To these he adds: and Petronius also sacked Napata. The list creates the impression that it was in reality the Triakontaschoinos that was re-conquered: the addition of Napata stands there inorganically, the more so as all our sources are silent as to how Petronius overcame the difficulties of the further distances? If he took the desert road (the fearfulness of which was known to every reader of Herodotus), he had to return from Stadissim (cp. fig. 1). Travel along the Nile was practically impossible. The relevant sentence of the Res Gestae only supports our doubts: “At my command and under my auspices two armies were led almost at the same time into Ethiopia and Arabia Felix: vast enemy forces of both peoples were cut down in battle and many towns captured. Ethiopia was penetrated as far as the town of Napata which adjoins Meroe; in Arabia the army advanced into the territory of the Sabaecans to the town of Mariba”. Yet the Arabian campaign was a failure. Mariba is an unimportant town and not identical with the capital of the Sabaecans, as Augustus would like to make us believe, and Napata does not adjoin Meroe. Aelius Gallus failed because he was unable to conquer a barren country of roadless deserts. As to Petronius, a sentence of Cassius Dio, slightly varying a sentence also to be found in Strabo’s account, is highly significant: after the capture of Napata he “found himself unable either to advance farther, on account of the sand and the heat, or advantageously to remain where he was with his entire army, [thus he] withdrew, taking the greater part of it with him”. It is tempting to believe that this decision was really made in the region of the Second Cataract, after the Triakontaschoinos was secured. In this way the Res Gestae would allude at two failures that had identical causes, circumstances and outcome. Considerations concerning the length of the expedition further support this hypothesis. The Meroitic attack on Syene, Elephantine and Philae could have started shortly after the withdrawal of half of the Roman forces by Aelius Gallus, an event that can be dated to the summer or autumn of 25 B.C. As to the end, Augustus, who allegedly received the Meroitic prisoners in Rome at his return from Spain, departed from Cantabria in the winter of 25, but, delayed by illness, he arrived in Rome in the spring of 24. However, the Temple of Janus was closed already in the late winter of 25. Although the closing was ordered in connection with the Cantabrian victory i.e. the end of the war in Spain, we may assume that it also meant the end of the war in Meroe. At this time Augustus was expected in Rome, and it is rather likely that Petronius sent the news of his victory and dispatched the prisoners to Rome before the actual arrival of the emperor. Accordingly, the expedition from Alexandria and back lasted at the maximum 6 or
7 months, at the minimum 4 or 5, and the latter variant is the more probable. Yet the march from Syene to Napata alone would have taken more than two months. The expedition as recorded by Strabo could be managed in 6 or 7 months, though only under extremely favourable conditions; while 4 or 5 months would by no means have been sufficient for anything more, than the occupation of the Triakontaschoinos.

The accounts do not leave any doubt as to the nature of the outcome: the vassal Triakontaschoinos was not restored. It seems that the territory was annexed to the Empire. The fragments of a miniature tropaeum representing Nubian prisoners (fig. 4) belong perhaps to the commemorations of this event. Two years later, however, in the late winter of 22/23 the queen of Meroe approached Primis with her army, but Petronius arrived there before her. The queen did not risk battle and sent envoys to negotiate. These envoys were escorted to Augustus who stayed on Samos. Since he spent the winter of 21/20 on the island, it seems probable that the encounter of Petronius and the Meroitic army occurred some time in the spring or summer of 21. At this point Strabo inserts one of his most pointed allusions at the barbaric intellectual niveau of the Meroites, saying that when Petronius bade them to go to Caesar, they asserted that they did not know who Caesar was and where to go to find him. All previous Meroitic actions show a fairly clear knowledge of what was going on in Egypt; Strabo’s remark is in accordance with his interpretation of the conflict as justified self-defence of the Empire against the barbarian menace.

Negotiations on Samos resulted in the following: Augustus remitted the tribute imposed upon the Meroites and gave up the region south of Hiera Sycaminos. On the other hand, he fully annexed the region north of this point, i.e. he restored the Ptolemaic frontier at the southern limit of the Dodekaschoinos. The vassal chieftain of the Triakontaschoinos and presumably the idea of the client-kingdom of Meroe, too, were given up. They proved to be unprofitable and certainly also
untenable. Nevertheless, real political power relations are to be judged on the basis of the annexation of the Dodekaschoinos and not on an apparent compromise. The terms of the Samos treaty are determined by the new foreign policy of the emperor which we usually interpret as the manifestation of the *Pax Augusta*. As opposed to Republican policy, which still dominated around 29, wars in the late 20’s were intended to ensure security within the existing frontiers: they were defensive, not expansive. Augustus regarded world hegemony as achieved and not as something yet to be realized. Although this policy was not consistent with popular expectation, which he prudently met half-way in his *Res Gestae*, Augustus tried to conduct events in this spirit and did not let popular aggressiveness prevail. This is exemplified in the sphere of religious ideology by the dedication of the standards recovered from the Parthians in 20 B.C. to Mars Ultor, whom Augustus declared on this occasion to be the preserver of peace. Yet security within the frontiers means in practice appropriate frontiers: the occupation of the Dodekaschoinos, which was mainly inhabited by Meroites, is indeed a very good example of Pax Augusta on its practical level.
Fig. 6. Augustus, British Museum. After Hinze.

Fig. 7. Silver cup from Meroe, Boston, Museum of Fine Arts, detail. After Dunham.

Fig. 8. Silver cup from Meroe, detail. After Dunham.
Augustan policy in the Dodekaschoinos was tactful and circumspect insofar as it did not disregard the ethnic composition and the past history of the region. It may be illustrated by two cults that were especially supported by the emperor.

Mandulis, a decidedly non-Egyptian deity, seems to have been introduced there between 207/6 and 186 B.C. by the Meroitic king Arqamani, who dedicated a chapel for him in Kalabsha. Around the middle of the 2nd century B.C. there was a temple of Mandulis in Philae. The latter was supported by the Meroites living in the Dodekaschoinos, and its foundation was in all probability connected with the native administration maintained by the Ptolemies. The Kalabsha chapel was magnificently enlarged by Augustus, but at the same time the figure of the deity was essentially re-shaped. On the one hand, he was genealogically connected to Horus (in the first generation), Isis and Osiris (in the second generation); on the other, he was, through an interpraetatio Graeca, identified with Apollo. Thus his cult became affiliated to the great Egyptian cults of Philae, was drawn nearer to those of the Egyptians settled in the region, and could at the same time also meet the religious demands of the Roman military forces stationed there.

The temple of Dendur was dedicated by Augustus to the deified brothers Peteisis and Pahor (P3-dj-lst and B3-n-Hr), sons of Ouper (Owpr or Opr). Their historicity is very likely, and it is also likely that Ouper was none other than the tyrant appointed in 29 B.C. by Cornelius Gallus. If this assumption of Cyril Aldred is right, the cult of Peteisis and Pahor not only attests the promotion of another specifically Nubian cult but also gives a good illustration of the prudence of Augustan policy. For, if we are not mistaken, the cult was not only meant to flatter the Meroites of the Dodekaschoinos but also explicitly to remind them of the
political reality and to warn them against illusions; moreover, it would lend a religious expression to the connections between conqueror and conquered, between past and present (fig. 5). 73 It is to be regretted that Aldred's hypothesis cannot be proved and that we do not know, by what kind of priesthood and for what kind of demands the archaeologically attested oracle in the temple was managed. 74

I turn now to the two art objects discovered in Meroe City, which are connected to Augustus. The first is the famous monumental bronze head (fig. 6) 75 which originally belonged to a cuirassed statue. The portrait belongs to the Primaporta type. 76 With the exception of Inge Hofmann, 77 scholars of Meroitic history generally maintain that the statue belonged to the booty taken by the Meroites in Syene in the autumn of 25 B.C. This opinion disregards the view of iconographic literature on Augustus, in which, ever since Kähler's study on the Primaporta statue, 78 the development of the type is dated in the period between ca. 27–25 and 23 B.C. Recent research by U. Hausmann 79 has demonstrated that it emerged first on coin series issued in the East in 27/6 in connection with the Restoration of the Republic, but did not become dominant before 25–23. Even if we suppose an earlier date for the distribution of the Primaporta portrait type than suggested by Hausmann, 80 it seems unlikely that an example of it existed in Syene as early as 25 B.C. It is perhaps nearer to the truth that the head belonged originally to a statue which was erected after the re-occupation of the Triakontaschoenos by Petronius, some time
between 25 and 22. If so, it could have been set up in the fortress of Primis/Qasr Ibrim where we may suppose the existence of a sacellum and where the statue could receive the homage of the troops and the submissive natives.

The other object, a fine gilded silver drinking vessel was unearthed in the pyramid of the 1st century A.D. ruler King Amanikhabale. The repoussé decoration consists of the representation of an enthroned king in a judgement scene, in front of him a basket (fig. 7), an executioner with his axe (fig. 8), two children clutching the knees of a suppling woman (fig. 9), a gesturing man and a chopping block behind him (fig. 10). The scene was interpreted as an episode in the Hellenistic legends about Bocchoris (the historical Bakenranef), who was characterized by Diodorus as great law-giver. In the face of the king (fig. 11) C. Vermeule discovered the features of Augustus, as they appeared on cistophori issued in eastern mints in 19/8 B.C. It seems to me that if we are allowed at all to make such comparisons, a better analogy can be found on an eastern aureus issued probably in commemoration of the Ludi Saeculares in 17 B.C. (fig. 12).
Since the identity of the king with Augustus must remain hypothetical and since the actual scene does not occur among the preserved Bocchoris legends, also the idea that the scene hints at the Augustan solution of the conflicts between Meroe with Egypt and Rome must remain hypothetical.\textsuperscript{88}
The bronze head was found buried in a pocket of clean sand in front of a flight of steps leading to a chapel in the Royal Enclosure.\textsuperscript{89} This chapel was of considerable antiquity\textsuperscript{90} and was rebuilt in conjunction with the burying of the head. At the same time its interior was decorated with mural paintings.\textsuperscript{91} The style and details of the iconography date these latter and, consequently, the burying of the head, to around the middle of the 1st century A.D.\textsuperscript{92} Photographs and water colour drawings made by the excavators allow a partial reconstruction of the figure of a prince (fig. 13)\textsuperscript{93} and of a scene in which a king and a queen, accompanied by princes, adore deities (fig. 14).\textsuperscript{94} The two enthroned male deities (two forms of Amun?) have warrior qualities, which are stressed by the decoration of their footrests.\textsuperscript{95} The burying of the Augustus head must have had a hostile magic significance, and the connection between this magic act and the particular chapel could not have been by chance. However, these data are all that we know of the building.\textsuperscript{96}

Art and culture in general after the Samos treaty show a dependence on Roman Egypt.\textsuperscript{97} The import of objects of art, of architectural plans, religious texts, artists and workmen leads not only to borrowings, imitations and adaptations but also to syntheses of Meroitic tradition with Roman cultural elements.\textsuperscript{98} Contacts with Roman Egypt around and after the middle of the 1st century A.D. seem to have been especially manifold.\textsuperscript{99} Between 61 and 63 even envoys from Nero are received as friends by the king in Meroe City.\textsuperscript{100} Yet the burying of the Augustus head in front of a chapel of triumphal character occurred just in this period. The act of hostility celebrated with the ritual burying of the portrait appears to reveal another, deeper-lying stratum of Meroitic political awareness. It was certainly not the usual burial of damaged sculpture: this is rendered improbable by the presumable origin and the object of the representation. More likely it was done in revenge for the occupation of the Triakontaschoinos, the ensuing loss of the Dodekaschoinos and was perhaps intended to prevent similar catastrophes by magically binding the representative of the greatest known foreign kingdom.

Roman writers, when describing the outcome of the war with Meroe, not only put arguments of \textit{bellum iustum} into the foreground but also stress Augustus' clemency.\textsuperscript{101} His policy in the Dodekaschoinos was indeed tactful. As an involuntary consequence, we tend to believe that the advantages of Augustan Peace were extant and evident for both partners. The head buried in front of the chapel in the Meroitic Royal Enclosure grants a rare glimpse into Meroitic perceptions and
warns us that ideology concerning the external world and practical contacts main-
tained therewith only rarely tally with each other.

May-June, 1985.

NOTES
2. According to his annals, King Harsiyotef (first half of the 4th c. B.C.) subjected a number of chieftoms in Lower Nubia and his expeditions in connection with these chieftoms reached the area of the First Cataract. See his inscription Cairo Mus. 48864, N.-C. Grimal: Quatre stèles napoléoniennes au Musée du Caire, JE 48863–48866, Textes et Indices. Le Caire 1981.
3. For the data supporting this view (which is, in my opinion without proper arguments, frequently rejected in literature on Lower Nubia), see Desanges 1978 (note 1) 285ff.
4. See below.
14. I have borrowed the quotation from Hofmann 1977 (note 12) 189. It reads in the German original: Die gemeinstein Meinungen und das, was jedermann für ausgemacht hält, verdient oft am meisten untersucht zu werden. – In writing this paper I was stimulated by said, and other, papers of Prof. Hofmann; I hope, she will excuse me that I also have appropriated her motto.
17. Strabo, XVII. 1. 53 records before the rising in the Thebais an insurrection in Heroonpolis, at the eastern edge of the Delta; its causes are unknown.

19. The remarkable sequence of the narrative hints at this possibility. Gallus records: 1) he crossed the First Cataract and penetrated into a territory which was inaccessible for armies before his day; 2) subjugated the whole Thebaïd; 3) received the envoys of the Ethiopians in Philae.

20. However, the frontier was not at the First Cataract, but at the southern end of the Dodekaschosmois, cp. notes 1 and 3.


22. Diodorus, I, 37, 5; for the date cp. Theocritus, Idyll., XVII, 87; cp. further Callixenos in Athen, Deipn., V, 25, 196a-35, 203b.

23. Large-scale commercial contacts, centered around the import of Ethiopian elephants to Egypt, could not be maintained without this kind of initial intimidation of Meroe, especially since the commerce could not have been carried on without establishing traders' settlements on, and near to, Meroitic territory.

24. For the data see the recent survey and analysis by E. Winter: Ergamenes II, seine Datierung und seine Bautätigkeit in Nubien. MDAIK 37 (1981) 509-513; further Török op. cit (note 13) and id.: Der meroitische Staat I. Untersuchungen und Urkunden zur Geschichte des Sudan im Altertum. Berlin 1986 sources Nos 29ff.


27. For the ethnic history of the region cp. W. Y. Adams: Meroitic North and South: A Study in Cultural Contrasts. Meroitica 2. Berlin 1976 illf.; id.: Kush and the Peoples of Northeast Africa. Meroitica 5 (1979) 9-13. However, his dating of the “resettlement of Lower Nubia” must be regarded with caution, since Adams does not accept the evidence of Lower Nubian toponyms preserved in the lists of Bion, Juba and in the Ptolemaic nomos lists in Philae, he dates it much too late. It seems that – as also attested by above quoted inscriptions, to which can be further added the text of the Famine Stela – the Trikontaskosmois was populated by “Meroites” already in the 2nd century B.C.; however, the eventual continuity of the settlement since Harsiyotef’s time is entirely obscure. – For the written evidence see recently L. Török: Economy in the Empire of Kush: A Review of the Written Evidence. ZAS 111 (1984) 45-69.


29. See Strabo, XVI, 4, 22; Desanges 1978 (note 1) 143.


37. For his person and chronology cp. the remark in P. A. Brunt: The Administrators of Roman

38. For the history of the abortive expedition see Anderson op. cit. (note 36).

39. Before 23 B.C. there were stationed 16 800 men in the three legions and 5 500 men in auxiliary forces in Egypt. Ca. 8 000 men were taken to Arabia, see Anderson op. cit. (note 36) 250.


41. According to Jameson op. cit. (note 37) the expedition of Aelius Gallus started in the spring or summer of 26; this is unlikely on account of Jos., Ant. Iud., XV, 9, 2, cp. Desanges 1978 (note 1) 308 and does not fit into the chronology of Augustus between 27 and 24, cp. Schmithüsen op. cit. (note 33) 442ff. – The march of Petronius from Alexandria to the First Cataract took only some weeks; if Aelius Gallus withdrew the forces from the Cataract region in the summer of 25, then the Meroitic attack could occur already in the late summer – early autumn and Petronius could arrive in the autumn of the same year.

42. They were identified by Hintze op. cit. (note 11) 1959 25 with Amanirenas and Akinidad. Hintze’s reconstruction of the events in Meroe and of the ruler chronology after 29 B.C. was partly rejected by I. Hofmann: Beiträge zur meroitischen Chronologie. St. Augustin b. Bonn 1978 92ff. I have identified the queen of the conflict and her son with Queen Naytal and King Agakaramani of the demotic inscription Dakka 15/17, see Torök op. cit. (note 1) and id.: op. cit. (note 27) 60.

43. The existence of the garrison in the years preceding 21 B.C. is attested by a rich archaeological material, unearthed by excavations of the EES in recent years, to which also belong numerous papyri. The finds are, with a few exceptions (see note 16), unpublished. The study quoted in note 16 also mentions a papyrus in Greek, found together with the Gallus ms. and dated 22/21 B.C. – For the archaeological finds see recently the preliminary excavation reports of J. M. Plumley, W. Y. Adams et al. in JEA 60 (1974) 30–59, 212–238; 61 (1975) 5–27; 63 (1977) 29–47; 65 (1979) 30–41; 69 (1983) 43–60.

44. For a thorough analysis see Meyer op. cit. (note 30).

45. Pliny, N. H., VI. 181ff.


47. Ibid. s. v.

48. Ibid. s. v.


51. For the traditional interpretation of the Ethiopian relation of the sentence see S. M. Burstein: The Nubian Campaigns of C. Petronius and George Reisner’s Second Meroitic Kingdom of Napata. ZAS 106 (1979) 95–105, 103ff.

52. See Anderson op. cit. (note 36) 250ff.


54. Strabo, XVII, 1, 54 (Jones): “he turned back again with the booty, having decided that the regions farther on would be hard to traverse”.

55. Cassius Dio, LIV, 5, 4–6 (Cary).

56. According to Cassius Dio, LIII, 28, 1, he was near to Rome on January 1 of 24: his presence in the City can be attested between 6–12 June 24, cp. Schmithüsen op. cit. (note 33) 45938.


59. Jameson op. cit. (note 37) 83 suggests that after Petronius’ first expedition the entire kingdom of Meroe was annexed. This seems to be based on the credence given to the sources about the capture of Napata. However, we do not know of any military safeguarding of the annexed country, apart from Prims/Qasr Ibrim, which unambiguously figures in the sources as the only garrison established by Petronius on the territory that formerly belonged to Meroe.

60. Berlin (East) Staatliche Museen Misc. 10485–86; K. A. Neugebauer: Aus der Werkstatt eines

61. This dating follows from the fact that Cassius Dio records the wars in his annals under the year of their end; he recounts the war of Petronius among events of the year 22 B.C. However, this date seems too early in view of the fact that the envoys of the queen of Meroe met Augustus on Samos where the emperor stayed in the winter of 21/20. Since there were no armed conflicts preceding their journey to Samos, the period 22-winter 21/20 is too long for Petronius' march from Alexandria to Primis, for his preliminary talks with the Meroites before he sent them forth to the emperor, and for the latter's journey to Samos. It may perhaps be supposed that Cassius Dio is not correct as to the date or that the envoys were first sent to Rome, whence they had to follow the emperor to Samos.

62. This was a consequence of it being the right of Augustus to make treaties with foreign countries. This right doubtless goes back to the authority received in 27 B.C. Cp. H. S. Jones in: CAH X. Cambridge 1966 140ff.; Strabo, XVII, 3, 25.

63. For the policy of the late 20's see Meyer op. cit. (note 30) 3ff.

64. Ibid. with sources and further literature.

65. The military safeguarding of the territory evidently took priority over the civil administration. Unfortunately Roman forces in the Dodekaschoinos after 21/20 are only imperfectly known (cp. Anderson op. cit. (note 36) 243ff., 246), especially because the mud brick forts along the west bank of the Nile were merely noted by archaeological surveys before the building of the first and second Aswan Dam but not measured or excavated. Cp. U. Monneret de Villard: La Nubia romana. Roma 1941.


67. A. Bernard op. cit. (note 26) No. 12bis; B. Porter – R. L. B. Moss: Topographical Bibliography of Ancient Egyptian Hieroglyphic Texts, Reliefs and Paintings VI. Oxford 1939 202ff., 254. The origin of the deity is obscure, the professional literature generally maintains that he was originally a Blemmy deity, but this is in fact a hypothesis that is improvable. He was regarded both as god of the west, hmtj3 jmnn, which would speak against a Blemmy origin; and as god of the east, jwjm t3 ntr, which would support it. It is significant that he appears for the first time in a temple that was built by a Meroitic ruler. He became the local deity of this temple (i.e. Kalabsha), although it seems that later his cult spred not from there, but from Philae (certainly as a consequence of Ptolemaic policy in the Dodekaschoinos) to Aujala, Dendur and Maharraqa. – For literature on Mandulis see E. Henfling: Mandulis in: LdA III 1177–1179.

68. Henfling op. cit. (note 67) 1178f.

69. H. Gauthier: Le temple de Kalabchah I. Le Caire 1914 214 No. 4(a).


71. According to F. Ll. Griffith: Catalogue of the Demotic Graffiti of the Dodekaschoenos. Oxford 1937 33, the father and his sons fought against the Meroitic invasion into the Egyptian Dodekaschoinos in 30 B.C. and Augustus rewarded their pro-Egyptian and pro-Roman behaviour with the cult. This hypothesis cannot be proven. More probable, but similarly unprovable, is the assumption of Bresciaini op. cit. (note 70) 1064 that the temple was built over a grotto housing the cult of a local “saint” since the 26th (?) Dynasty.


73. Aldred op. cit. (note 72) fig. 22.

74. Aldred op. cit. (note 72).


80. Ibid. 571f. – I cannot however, follow, Hofmann op. cit. 576f., in his assumption that the Meroe City head belonged to a statue that was made after the Primaporta statue, around 17 B.C. This dating is based on his view that the statue was set up in Meroe after the Samos peace treaty. It is dangerous, however, to date the head (and, consequently, the development of the Primaporta type) on the basis of the historical circumstances supposedly connected to it. It is entirely obscure where it was set up, whether only in Egypt, or in Egypt and also in Meroe, or only on conquered Meroitic territory, and in what condition it found its way to the chapel in Meroe City, as a complete statue or only as fragment. The existence of the head (or of the complete statue) in the region of Meroe is only a supplementary argument for the late distribution of the type, and only if the late distribution is supported by independent iconographical arguments. Furthermore, I am unconvinced by Haussmann’s suggestion that the statue was presented to Meroe as a sign of reconciliation and was, accordingly, set up, in Meroe City. There are two circumstances speaking against this assumption. Augustus was not only Roman emperor, but, in Meroitic terms, king of Egypt. It is unlikely that the statue of the king of Egypt would have been set up in Meroe, the presumable character and function of the statue of the ruler in Meroe could hardly have permitted it. But also from the Roman point of view it would have been a great risk, in view of the cultic significance of the statue of the emperor, to deliver it to conditions in Meroe, a country that was shortly before still regarded as barbaric foe. – For principles of the treatment of the statues of emperors see H. Kruse: Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Reich. Paderborn 1934 (reprint 1968) 9ff., 51ff.
82. Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 24.971. For the context of the find see D. Dunham: Royal Tombs at Meroe and Barkal. The Royal Cemeteries of Kush IV. Boston 1957 106 Pl. LIII/A-D. For the dating of the pyramid see Hofmann op. cit. (note 42) 103ff. Huntz op. cit. (note 11) 1959 33 dated the reign of Amanikhabale between 65–41 B.C., S. Wenig: Nochmals zur 1. und 2. Nebendynastie von Napata. Meroitica I (1973) 147–160 157 between 50–35 B.C., which is, in view of the presence of the cup in his pyramid, untenable. Hofmann op. cit. loc. cit. proposed a date in the first half of the 1st c. A. D.
84. Diodorus, I. 79; 94.
86. In the case of the Hobo cups Vermeule, op. cit. (note 83) 1968 134ff., suggested that mythological figures represented on them bear features of members of the Julio-Claudian House; his interpretation was rejected, as exaggerating resemblances between coin portraits and profiles on the cups and also as iconographically improbable. Zs. Kiss: L’iconographie des princes julio-claudiens au temps d’Auguste et de Tibère. Varsovie 1975 107ff. seems, hesitatingly however, to accept Vermeule’s identifications at least as far as Germanicus is concerned. – For the opinion contra Vermeule see U. Haussmann in Göttinger Gelehrte Anzeigen 223 (1971) 107–108.
91. For the paintings see P. L. Shinnie – R. J. Bradley: The Murals from the Augustus Temple, Meroe.
In: Studies in Ancient Egypt, the Aegean, and the Sudan. Essays in honor of Dows Dunham... 

92. For dating see Shinnie-Bradley op. cit. (note 91) and (on basis of the iconography of prisoners under the footrests of the enthroned deities) Török op. cit. (note 13) Excursus: Representations of the enemy in Kushite art.

93. Shinnie-Bradley, op. cit. (note 91) fig. 4, reproduce a water colour drawing made by Schliephack, artist of the Garstang expedition. I reproduce a more detailed copy, presumably made by Schliephack, after a photocopy kept in the Garstang Collection of the School of Archaeology of the University of Liverpool. I am greatly indebted to Prof. A. F. Shore for granting me access to the Collection. – Shinnie-Bradley compare the fringed piece of cloth behind the uplifted arm of the figure to a similar detail in the representation of Prince Arka on the Lion Temple at Musawwarat es Sufra (F. Hintze: Die Inschriften des Löwentempels von Musawwarat es Sufra. Berlin 1962 Pl. 5), but suggest that in case of the Meroe painting it is not a part of the dress but a “fringed shield slung over one arm”. This is impossible, for the “shield” on the painting is made of the same patterned textile as the patterned robe. Also other representations, such as the one quoted above, in pyramid chapels e.g., render it probable that a shawl is meant. – Shinnie-Bradley overlooked an analogy of the representation of the prince on a lotus blossom in Musawwarat es Sufra, see Hintze, op. cit. Pl. II a, King and Prince in adoration scene.


95. For their iconography see my study quoted in note 92.


97. See in more detail my study quoted in note 13 and literature cited there. A detailed study of the period of Natakamani and Amanitore is being prepared by C. Berger and J. Yellin.

98. See note 97.


100. Plin., N. H., VI, 181; 184ff.; XII, 19; Seneca, Q. N., VI 8, 3f.; Cassius Dio, LXIII. 8, 1. – For the date of the expedition cp. W. Schur: Die Orientpolitik des Kaisers Nero. Leipzig 1923 52; Desanges op. cit. (note 1) 1978 325; Hofmann op. cit. (note 42) 132ff. – Similarly to these writers, I disagree with F. Hintze, who in op. cit. (note 11) 1959 29 suggests that Nero sent two expeditions to Meroe.

101. In spite of the fact that there is a rich and fascinating literature on aspects of Meroitic history around 30–20 B.C., the problems touched upon in the present paper require further investigation. The bias of the Roman sources underlying my study could not be discussed in detail; for a more detailed discussion see my monograph mentioned above in note 24.
Syrian Influences in Ethiopian Culture

WITOLD WITAKOWSKI, Uppsala

Within scholarly literature on Ethiopia's contacts with other lands much is still missing. In the case of more remote countries, contacts with for instance India and Armenia have been the object of articles and books, but no study of the Syro-Ethiopian relations, at least to my knowledge, has ever come into being. It is true that evidence of such contacts and, more precisely, of Syrian influences on Ethiopia can be found in the relevant literature, but scattered over many different publications. Yet the theme deserves more than casual attention from scholars, and in due time should result in a comprehensive monograph. For, as it seems, in the early history of Ethiopia as a Christian country and in the Middle Ages these contacts and influences were far more important for Ethiopian culture than those with India or Armenia.

Such a monograph cannot be attempted in the present state of research, and many subsidiary studies will have to be done before it is possible. The present paper, however, does not present any particular analyses and its aim is only to provide a sort of base from which to start further investigations. It is the hope of the present writer that the paper will mark off the field of research and review the problems involved, obviously without any claim of completeness. Further investigation will certainly provide more material testifying to the contacts in question. It will also corroborate or reject the suggestions presented here only tentatively.

Traces of Syrian influences can be found in many branches of Ethiopian culture. Here we shall try to point to some of them in the Old Ethiopic (Ge'ez) language (part I), in the Ethiopic Bible translation (II), in religious literature (III), in church liturgy (IV) as well as in architecture and art (V). Also some possible paths of contact will be indicated (VI).

I. Like every language which has come into contact with Christianity Ethiopic had to create its specific terminology for that religion. It could do so by adapting the native stock of its vocabulary to new ideas, and/or by loan-words. Naturally, many specifically Christian words in Ge'ez are Greek loan-words, but Syriac ones feature there as well.

Hiob Ludolf, the father of Ethiopian studies, was the first to draw attention to them. Carlo Conti Rossini gave an impressive list of these loans, among which some of the most central notions of Christian faith and church life could be found, e.g. hāl/əyəmənät - 'faith', Syr. haymānūtā; 'arami - 'pagan', Syr. 'armāyā; mal'ak - 'angel', Syr. mal'ākā; takansa - 'to be assembled for religious purposes', Syr. etkənšes. H. J. Polotsky demonstrated that many of the loan-words should actually be attributed not to Syriac but to Hebrew or Jewish Aramaic. Nevertheless, as has been pointed out by Edward Ullendorff, who, as it seems, was the last to analyze these loan-words, there still remains a Syriac residue.
Ullendorff's purpose was the demonstration of Jewish roots in Ethiopian culture, for which he used inter alia linguistic arguments. In this he certainly succeeded, but in doing so he claimed some items for Hebrew and Jewish Aramaic which can perhaps be retrieved as evidence for influence from Syriac. He regards only the following words as having come into Ethiopic from Syriac: ḫoʿonāše – 'pagan', Syr.: hanpā; qasis – 'priest', Syr.: qaṣṣiṣā; salaba – 'to crucify', Syr. ṣalab, id.; qwrbān – 'offer, Eucharist', Syr.: qrbānā (on phonetic ground, since Aramaic has qrbānā).

Items which, according to Ullendorff, can be of either Syriac of Jewish Aramaic origin include: ḥaʿaymānōt – 'faith'; 'Orīt – 'the Law, Tora', Syr. ʿOrāyta; sīl – 'Sheol, the nether world', Syr. ṣayāl; Masiḥ – 'Messiah, the anointed', Masīḥā; nabīyy – 'prophet', naḥīyā; ḫafʿa and ḫāṭat – 'to fail, sin' and 'sin' respectively. Syr. ḫafʿat, ḫḥāṭāt; malakōt – 'divine rule, divinity', Syr. malkūtā – 'kingdom, reign, (royal) rule'; ṣallāyā and ṣalāt – 'to pray' and 'prayer', Syr. ṣallāt and ṣalātāt respectively; som – 'fasting', Syr. som (ṣawmā); gazar – 'to circumcise', Syr. gazar; sagada – 'to prostrate oneself', Syr. ṣagad; qob – 'priestly headgear', Syr. qub (ḥb)ā.

Further research may very well win over some of the above items for Syriac, but it is also possible that some of the words which Ullendorff considered Hebrew or Aramaic loans may, notwithstanding their Jewish origin, bear witness to Syriac influence as well. It is quite conceivable that in the first place a word was borrowed from a Jewish source and yet later obtained a specifically Christian meaning under the impact of Syriac usage. This may turn to be true in case of e.g. turgwāme – 'explanation, commentary', Syr. turgāmā, madrās – 'treatise, commentary', and other derivatives of the same ideomorpheme ('root'), Syr. madrāṣā.

Some other words beside those already listed by Nöldeke, Conti Rossini and Ullendorff may turn to be of Syriac origin, e.g. mazkar, or mazakkar – 'keeper of records, recorder', Syr. madkārānā – 'recorder, chronicler', harāwi – 1. 'soldier', 2. 'freeborn, nobleman', Syr. hirāyā – 'free, well-born, noble', sutāf(e)i – 'companion', Syr. šawtāpā. Other to all appearances purely Ethiopic words may in fact be Syriac calques, as e.g. bəsra – 'Gospel, good news', cp. Syr. šbērātā – id.: tasabā' – 'to become man' is derived from sab – 'man' just as Syriac 'etbarnaš' – 'to become man' is from barnāš – 'man, human being', the derivatives in both languages belonging to the passive-reflexive conjugations.

Once an acceptable list of Syriac loanwords in Ge'ez is established it will be possible to go further in search of possible phonetic regularities which in their turn may shed some light on the phonetics of Ge'ez, for instance on the history of its sibilants.

II. It is generally accepted that the Bible was translated into Ethiopic in the fourth-sixth centuries by different translators and on the basis of texts in different languages. The question whether the underlying text was in this or that language must be answered separately for each Biblical book or group of books. Beside this early translation work, later revisions must be taken into account, since at least some manuscripts of Biblical books provide readings which are not in accordance with what is assumed to be the Vorlage for the book in question. It is also
conceivable that the same book was translated twice, i.e. from two different languages, and then, in the process of transmission, mutual contamination of the manuscripts of both traditions took place.

Generally, the Syriac Bible is taken into account as a possible Vorlage for some books. So far as the Old Testament is concerned it is not clear whether the Syriac traces found so far point to the use of the Peshitta alongside the Septuagint, or to later (medieval) revisions made on the basis of the Syro-Arabic version.

There is more evidence for the Syriac influence in the Ethiopic New Testament. Ludwig Hackspill, who analyzed the first ten chapters of the Gospel of Matthew, came to the conclusion that the underlying text of the Gospel was Greek but not in the recension used in Alexandria, as could be expected a priori from the dependence of the Ethiopian Church upon the patriarchal see of Alexandria, but in the so-called Syro-Western recension used in both Antioch and Latin West. It was Syrian monks, according to Hackspill, who brought to Ethiopia Greek Gospel manuscripts used in the patriarchate of Antioch, and subsequently translated them into Ethiopic.

As against this, Arthur Vööbus was of the opinion that the Syriac monks would not have taken any Greek Gospel manuscripts to Ethiopia, but only Syriac ones, and consequently the underlying text of the translation was according to him Syriac. Later it was adjusted to the Greek text, but traces of the primary translation have remained. Moreover Vööbus tracked down Gospel quotations in Ethiopic religious literature which reflect a Syriac Vorlage, having, unlike the text of the Gospel itself, not been subjected to the purging process. He found that these quotations betray the Old Syriac translation of the Gospels and not the Peshitta. However, Vööbus’s assertions will have to be scrutinized again since they were based mostly on examples from the Miracles of Jesus, which has turned out to be of Syriac origin (vide infra). Recently Josef Hoffmann analyzed some personal names in the Ethiopic Gospels and found a mixed stock in which some clearly correspond to Greek forms and some do not. The former are more or less correctly transcribed, sometimes together with Greek case endings, as for instance in Bara-ban (Mt 27,16) where the Greek has Βαραβάν, i.e. with the accusative ending. Here there can be no question of any other underlying text than Greek. Also Ethiopic Bartalomewos seems to fall back upon Greek Βαρθολομαῖος. This name is given in Syriac as Bar Tohmāy, and thus for the Ethiopic with its -os ending a Syriac original cannot be claimed. However, one is confronted with the opposite situation in the case of Gr. Βαρθωλόμας. It is rendered in Peshitta as Bar ḍo-Yōnā and in Ethiopic we find Walda Yōnā, the Aramaic bar – ‘son’ not being transcribed, as in the two examples above, but translated (most probably under the influence of the Syriac genitive preposition ḍo-), thus betraying a translator conversant with Syriac.

More puzzling are forms like Yohannis. As J. Hoffmann remarked, of Greek Ιωάννης only the ending -as remains. The initial iota is not rendered as a vowel, which is usual otherwise (as in ‘Iyarušalem), but as a consonant, which is in accordance with the Syriac Yōhannān. In addition the Ethiopic form owes its hawt to the Syriac het, as it cannot be attributed to Greek.
III. A similar situation to that of the Bible translation, i.e. with the use of a Syriac text beside a Greek one, is also met with in some pseudepigrapha. Such is the case with the Ethiopic version of the Lives of the Prophets. Some textual accordances between Syriac and Ethiopic texts as against the Greek, as well as some mistakes which can be explained by a Syriac Vorlage, point to the conclusion “that the Ethiopic translator of the Lives of the Prophets made use of a Syriac version as well as of a Greek text”.18

The Conflict of Adam and Eve with Satan, known also as the Acts of Adam,19 a medieval Ethiopian composition, is based on two pieces of Christian apocryphal literature – the Greek Life of Adam and Eve on the one hand, and the Syriac Cave of Treasures20 on the other. Here the Syrian influence does not amount to the whole work being translated into Ge‘ez but to it borrowing the theme, which on Ethiopian ground developed further.

This motif of the Cave of Treasures is not limited to the Acts of Adam but can also be found elsewhere, e.g. in another apocryphal story of Adam and Eve in an unpublished manuscript in Vienna.21

But the Cave of Treasures itself, or at least a part of it, has also entered Ethiopian literature. The part22 is contained in a larger composition called Qalembontos attributed, as the title suggests, to Clement of Rome, the disciple of St. Peter.23

Also the Testament of Adam, another piece of Syriac apocryphal literature, is incorporated into the same composition.24

Beside the material just mentioned, Qalembontos bears further testimony to its being derived, at least partly, from Syriac sources. It states, namely, that the Lord’s language in the work of creation and Adam’s in paradise was Syriac.25

Qalembontos, itself a composite work, is often treated as a part of an even more comprehensive collection. In the authoritative church law texts, like the Synodicon (Senodos), where the content of the Ethiopian canon of the Bible is stated, mention is made of eight books of Clement.26 Naturally one feels tempted to connect them with the so-called Octateuch of Clement.27 However, while the idea of an octateuch being composed by Clement may very well be borrowed from a Syriac source, the Ethiopic and the Syriac collections are not identical. The analysis made by Roger Cowley shows that the Ethiopians filled up the number of eight books with a content differing in part from that of the Syriac Octateuch.28

The Ethiopic fourth book of Clement is the Rules of Zion (Sor’ata Sayon) known also as the Canons after the Ascension. This is a collection of 30 pseudo-apostolic canons, forming part of the Ethiopic Synodicon, but originally an Edessene composition, known in Syriac as the Teaching of the Apostles.29

An interesting collection of apocryphal Gospel material, which in several ways testifies to Syriac influence, is formed by the Miracles of Jesus (Ta‘ammura ‘Iyāsus). Basically this is a translation of the apocryphal Gospel of John preserved otherwise only in Arabic30 but, according to the colophon of a manuscript, the Arabic text is a translation from Syriac. The reliability of the colophon is however doubtful,31 and it seems more probable that the Gospel was not translated from but rather based on Syriac sources.32

On Ethiopian ground the Gospel of John has been supplemented with other texts concerning Jesus, but not all the manuscripts of the Miracles of Jesus contain the
additions. One of the appended texts is the *Infancy Gospel of Thomas* known in many versions both Oriental and European. In Ethiopic there are two recensions of the *Infancy Gospel* of which the fuller “corresponds most closely to the old Syriac version of the Gospel of Thomas” although the transmission may have not been direct.

The third piece of literature of Syriac origin which is included in some of the manuscripts of the *Miracles* is the *Legend of Abgar*. There are however also two other, independent, versions, which together with that of the *Synaxarium* makes four different redactions of the *Legend* in Ethiopic. None of them however seems to be directly derived from that form which is known from the Syriac *Teaching of Addai*.

Thus the legend of the Edessene king and his correspondence with Jesus must have been very popular in Ethiopia. Another trace of this popularity seems to be the former name of the capital of the country during the rule of the Zagwe dynasty. Before it was changed to Lalibela in honour of the Zagwe king Lalibela, who later became a saint of the Ethiopian Church, the name of the city was Roha, i.e. Edessa.

Two other New Testament apocrypha: the *Book of Mary’s Birth* (*Masha’fa lalatar la-Maryam*), which is the Ethiopic version of the *Protoevangelium Jacobi*, and the *Transitus Mariae* (*Falatat la-Maryam*) are in fact compositions known throughout the Christian Orient. It seems that the Ethiopic version of the two originated in Syria, as Hugo Duensing suggested.

Also the literature of the Falashas, which for the most part is borrowed from their Christian neighbours, although their religion is Judaistic, contains a work of Syrian origin. It is the *Apocalypse of Gorgorios* (i.e. Gregorios). This monk, a Persian by birth, spent some time in Edessa before he settled on Cyprus. His vision, according to Jean Doresse, was composed in Syria.

A more complicated connection with Syriac culture lies behind the *Glory of the Kings* (*Kohra nagaš*), a national epos of Ethiopia, which glorifies the until recently ruling dynasty of the country by creating for it a legendary pedigree going back to Menelik, the son of Solomon and Sheba. In its present form the *Glory of the Kings* came into being in the fourteenth century, but it contains traditions of a much earlier date. Irfan Shahid drew attention to connections of the *Glory* with the Syriac *Apocalypse of Pseudo-Methodios* from the end of the seventh century. The roots of the two are to be sought in the Syro-Ethiopian contacts which took place in connection with the Axumite king Kaleb’s rescue expedition at the beginning of the sixth century for the sake of the Himyare Christian kings who were being persecuted by a Jewish king. In the Ethiopian epos Kaleb is one of the more important figures beside Menelik and his parents, whereas in the Syriac composition a Roman emperor of Ethiopian extraction is given a key role in defeating barbarians. Common to both works, although differently elaborated, is also the idea of the alliance between Rome and Ethiopia, most probably a reflection of the historical alliance between Kaleb and the emperor Justin (who also features in the *Glory of the Kings*) with the purpose of eliminating the Jewish king of Himyar. The Syrians, who seem to have played a role in establishing diplomatic contacts between Byzantium and Axum, must have been impressed by the mighty Mono-
physite king’s victory over the persecutor of their coreligionists in South Arabia. This gave the impulse for the glorification of the Ethiopian royalty, the traces of which can be found in Syriac apocalyptic literature and in Ethiopian political mythology. The whole problem requires however further investigation.

Somewhat peculiar are the vicissitudes of Aphrahat’s writings in Ethiopic. At least some portions of his Demonstrations were translated, of which the fifth, On Wars, is in Ethiopic attributed to Jacob of Nisibis, whereas a fragment of the eighth, On the Resurrection of the Dead, is contained in an Ethiopian fourteenth century treatise under the same title.

The Ethiopic Qeratlos is a collection of sundry treatises and homilies in Christology, but not all of them were penned by Cyril of Alexandria, as might be expected from the title. The collection was translated from Greek but by Syrian missionaries, as Bernd Manuel Weischer believes. This is supported by the fact that in Cyril’s dialogue Quod Christus sit unus, which also exists in Syriac, there are passages in which the Ethiopic text agrees with the Syriac against the Greek. The whole collection must have originated in Syria, as can be inferred from its being strongly anti-Nestorian, whereas in Ethiopia there were never any Nestorians to oppose.

The Faith of the Fathers (Hāymānota ’abaw) is a large collection of Monophysite patristic writings. This was compiled in Egypt ca. 1000 in Arabic and translated into Ethiopic ca. 1500. In this florilegium so far unpublished, there are included writings of Syrian and Syriac fathers (Ephrem, Jacob of Serug, Sever of Antioch and other Antiochene hierarchs). Incidentally, one which has been published is the Confession of Jacob Baradaeus, the founder of the second generation of the Monophysite hierarchy in Syria.

In the same epoch the collection of ascetic literature called Books of the Monks (Mašāḥafat manakosāt) reached Ethiopic via Arabic. This consists entirely of writings of Syrian ascetics and ecclesiastics: John Saba (’Aragāwi manfasāwi – The Spiritual Old Man), Isaac of Nineveh (Mār Yashaq), and Filoxenus of Mabbug (Filkayos).

As regards hagiographic literature let it suffice to say that lives of many Syriac saints are included in the Ethiopic Synaxarium, e.g. Ephrem’s (15th Ḥamle), Jacob’s of Nisibis (18th Ḥarr), Simeon the Stylite’s (3rd Nahase).

IV. The liturgy of the Ethiopian Church is traditionally considered to belong to the Alexandrian sphere but there are many liturgical items of non-Egyptian origin.

The Ethiopian version of the well known Graeco-Syrian Anaphora of St James the Brother of the Lord is based on the Syriac text. Another Ethiopian anaphora, the so-called Hosanna Liturgy of St. Gregory “represents the Syriac and not Alexandrian type”, according to Ernst Hammerschmidt. A less clear Syrian influence, namely in its free treatment of the Institution Narrative, may be seen in the Anaphora known under the name of a Syriac father Jacob of Serug. The Syriac anaphora bearing the same title is however a different composition.

Other Ethiopian liturgical texts which have more or less close Syriac parallels include the Mystagogia or the Teaching of the Secrets (Tomhārta ḥabu’āt). It is in fact the 22nd chapter of the Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, but it has an
independent liturgical life. Out of the versions in three other languages it comes closest to the Syriac. Possibly Syriac influence was also exerted on an Ethiopic Litany to Christ, each verse of which begins with ba'anta – 'by, via'. In the Syriac litany, which is believed to be the model of the Ethiopic, the counterpart of ba'anta is 'al.

V. Also Ethiopian architecture and art provides material testifying to Syrian influence. Ugo Monneret de Villard asserted that all early Ethiopian church types were derived from Syrian ones. The French archaeologist Francis Anfray, who excavated the Axumite sites Adulis and Matara (sixth-eighth centuries), also perceived resemblances between Ethiopian and (especially North) Syrian (Massif Calcaire) architecture. He finds them both in residential houses and in religious buildings: basilicas with rectangular apses, flanked by two side-rooms (e.g. the basilica of Matara is practically a copy of that of Karratin in North Syria, sixth cent.), baptisteries on centralized plans (Matara = Qal’at Sim’an) and ecclesiastic complexes with auxiliary buildings adjacent to the church.

Detecting Syrian influence in Ethiopian miniature painting is more complicated due to the fact that there are no Ethiopian manuscripts dating from the first millennium, and thus there is a time gap between the Ethiopian and Syrian items. The oldest known illuminated Ethiopian manuscript, the gospels of the Abba Gārima monastery (eleventh-twelfth centuries?) includes cards with architectural frames for the Eusebian canons which, according to Jules Leroy, were most probably painted in Syrian centres. Such half ready cards were exported inter alia to Ethiopia where the local scribes wrote on them the text. They became a source of inspiration for illumination of later Gospel books.

These books, beside the canon decoration, included series of miniatures with christological cycles. It has been pointed out that both the composition of the cycles and the iconography of the particular scenes in many cases display similarity to those early Christian cycles and their iconography which were created in Syro-Palestine. The problem awaits however a more comprehensive analysis.

VI. The question which finally arises is: How did all these influences reach Ethiopia?

It is only very seldom that we can put our finger on concrete cases of transmission, but in a general way some paths of contacts can be named.

In fact the evangelization of Ethiopia may be regarded as the first known such contact since Frumentius and Aedesius, who persuaded the king of the country to accept Christianity, came from Tyre, i.e. a city within the realm of the patriarchate of Antioch.

The next known direct contact was established in the second half of the fifth century by the coming to Ethiopia of the so-called Nine Saints, who, as it seems, accomplished the christianization of the country, giving it a Monophysite character. According to Ethiopian tradition, preserved in some vitae and in the Synaxarium, they came from the Byzantine empire, but as C. Conti Rossini showed on the basis of their names, which reflect the names of Syrian monasteries, they were
Syrian monks.\textsuperscript{74} They went to Ethiopia partly with missionary aims and partly to escape from the precarious conditions in which the Monophysites in Syria found themselves under the sway of the emperors devoted to the Chalcedonian confession.\textsuperscript{75} Tradition attributes to them missionary activities and monastic establishments in Northern Ethiopia, not to mention counselling the kings on various matters, etc.\textsuperscript{76}

Only one case more of direct contact between Syrians and Ethiopians can be referred to here. During the reign of Yekuno Amlak (1270–85) a Syrian became, exceptionally, the head of the Ethiopian church,\textsuperscript{77} the rank with which only Coptic monks could be vested. His enthronement was caused by special circumstances – a temporary difficulty in obtaining a “proper” metropolitan from Egypt – and does not seem to entail any increase in Syro-Ethiopian contacts. Rather, its importance lies in the fact that it proves the presence of Syrian ecclesiastics in Ethiopia at that time.

Contacts through which the Syrian influences reached Ethiopia took place also outside the country, e.g. in Egypt. In the Desert of Scete (Wadi Natrun) Syrian and Ethiopian monasteries existed side by side.\textsuperscript{78}

An even more important place of contact was Jerusalem where likewise the Ethiopian Church had a pied-à-terre, a monastic house (Dayr as-Sultān), shared with the Copts.\textsuperscript{79}

As the material presented suggests, Syro-Ethiopian contacts were most intensive in the early history of Ethiopia. Moved by the missionary spirit Syrians, who seem to be on the more active side, spread the Christian faith in the country, shaped the Monophysite character of the Ethiopian Church, participated in translating the Bible and religious literature, contributed to creating Christian vocabulary, established monastic centres, and built churches. The existence of contacts between the two regions in question is in fact quite a natural occurrence. After all the West Syrian (Jacobite) and the Ethiopian are sister churches, both of them belonging to the Monophysite family. During the heyday of Axum with the culminating point of the intervention on behalf of the South Arabian Christians, the country impressed the Syrians as the only one kingdom in which Monophysitism, i.e. the same form of Christianity as theirs, was the state religion. In later epochs, i.e. after the Muslim conquests, the direct contact diminished, although it never totally ceased. Rather, the Syrian influence continued to make its contribution to the development of the Ethiopian culture indirectly, through the intermediary of the Arabic translations of Syriac writings.
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**CURRICULUM VITAE**

Dr. Nils Gösta Vitestam, Professor of Semitic languages at the University of Lund, was born in Vitaby in the South-Eastern parts of Scania, Sweden, on March 2, 1921. His parents were Farmer Sigfrid August Nilsson and Wife Hanna Nilsson.

In 1944 Gösta Vitestam began his academic career at Lund University. He received his B.A. in 1947, his M.A. in 1953. He obtained in 1957 the licentiate degree in Semitic languages, and in 1960 he defended his doctoral thesis *Kitāb ar-radd ʿalā I-ḡahmiya des Abū Saʿīd ʿUṭmān b. Saʿīd ad-Dārīmī nach der in der Körprülībibliothek aufbewahrten Handschrift (Cod. 850) zum ersten Male herausgegeben und mit Einleitung und Kommentar versehen. Lund – Leiden 1960.*

Immediately after being created a Ph.D., Dr. Vitestam was appointed Associate Professor (Docent) of Oriental languages. From 1960 until 1968 he occupied various posts in the field of Oriental languages at the University of Lund, acting for long periods as the chief professor in the field.

*Finally, in 1968 Dr. Vitestam was appointed the successor of Sven Dedering as Professor of Semitic languages at Lund University, being thereby professor No. 19 on a chair established as early as in 1668. Professor Vitestam retired in 1987.*

All the way throughout his academic career Dr. Vitestam took upon him a number of additional obligations. He served as a teacher at the Hermod’s Institute, Malmö, in 1948–53. He acted as a teacher of languages, in particular Latin, at the secondary school of Trelleborg in 1954–57. Furthermore, several official responsibilities in the town of Lund were entrusted to him, e.g. as a Member of the Board of the City Council in 1962–67.

Dr. Vitestam was the chairman of the Philological Society of Lund in 1967. He was employed as a Philological Expert in the Swedish Bible Commission in 1975. He has been the Inspector of the Students’ Nation of Southern Scania in Lund all the time since 1967; in addition he became an Honorary Member in 1968.

Professor Vitestam was elected Member of the New Society of Letters at Lund (Vetenskapssocieteten i Lund) in 1967, Member of the Union Européenne des Arabisants et Islamisants (UEAI) in 1968, Member of the Royal Society of Letters at Lund (Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund) in 1973, and Member of the Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft (DMG) in 1975. He is moreover a Member of the American Oriental Society.

Dr. Gösta Vitestam’s literary production covers not merely scholarly works within the sphere of Semitic languages – especially classical Arabic text editions – but also popular studies on Oriental topics. In addition he has written a number of memoirs, local and personal studies pertaining to his native area of Sweden.

The subsequent bibliography is essentially based on professor Vitestam’s own registration of his literary works.
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