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Autographemes and Vowel Phonemes in Saidic Coptic

Abbreviations

V Central element, syllable nucleus (autographeme, vowel phoneme).
v Automatic do. (cf. §§ 5.2.2 and 6.2.3).
C Marginal element (syngrapheme, consonant phoneme).
B Do. belonging to the "Blemmar"-group (cf. § 4.2.0).
S Do. not belonging to the "Blemmar"-group.
Indicates primary syllable when necessary (cf. § 3.1).
* Between morphs when needed.
 Between morphs, of which the second is a suffixed pronoun.
+ Opposition.
 = No opposition.
| Delimits "configurative units" (cf. § 3.2.3).
| Delimits "microunits" (cf. § 6.1).
< > Graphemic transcription.
/ / Phonemic transcription.
[ ] IPA phonetic transcription.

Introduction

0.1. The sounds of Coptic have been treated by several authors from a phonetic and etymological point of view. In addition to the grammatical standard works there are numerous papers by Po洛rsky, Till, Vycichl, WORRELL and others, and two major works on Egyptian phonetics: WORRELL, Coptic Sounds, 1934, and Vergote, Phonétique historique de l'égyptien, 1945, both dealing with Coptic, the latter, however, only with the consonants. From a phonemic point of view the Saidie Coptic vowels have been treated by Erbe E. Knudsen in his paper Saidic Coptic Vowel Phonemes, 1962.¹

0.2.1. It is my aim in the present paper to investigate the vowel system of Saidic Coptic by ascertaining the grapheme inventory of the language,

¹ Phonemic points of view are also brought up by Po洛rsky in his critical remarks on the treatment of the supralinear stroke in Till, Koptische Grammatik, 1. Aufl. (in OLZ 52, 1957).
distinguishing the autographemes from the syngraphemes, investigating
which autographemes are in opposition in different positions and finally
ascertaining the underlying system of vowel phonemes. The solution of
the last-mentioned problem will—naturally—be very tentative.

0.2.2. In principle, I have aimed at making a synchronic study of the
Saidic dialect at the time when the classical orthography was established,
i.e. the period at which a close correspondence may be assumed between
speech and writing. Because of the insufficiency of the contemporary
sources, non-contemporary material, too, has, however, to be taken into
account, more especially Coptic transcriptions of Arabic words from the
nineth or tenth century.

I shall disregard the numerous foreign words, mostly Greek, that
abound in Coptic texts. They are as a rule borrowed in their Greek
orthographic form, thus giving little information as to how they were
adapted to the phonemic structure of Coptic.¹

0.2.3. I shall make no attempt to adhere to any definite school of
phonemics, except that I use the commutation test and consequently
regard meaning as known (to the extent, of course, that meaning may
ever be known in a dead language).² In addition, I regard Coptic grammar
as known, since it may—at least in theory—be induced from the graph-
types without previous graphemic or phonemic analysis.

With regard to graphemic methodology I have been guided by ALLÉN,
Grafematisk analys.

Coptic forms used as examples are taken mainly from CRUM, A Coptic
Dictionary.

0.3.1. Surviving Coptic manuscripts, which form the basis for our
knowledge of the Coptic language, are written in horizontal lines, with
the graphs proceeding from left to right. In the manuscripts written in
uncial or semi-uncial, the graphs are separated by sectures.³ Spaces are
not used, and consequently graphic words cannot be distinguished.
Punctuation is rare and—when it occurs—unsystematic.⁴

0.3.2. In modern editions punctuation is added, with the text in most
cases broken up into words, there being no generally accepted rules for

¹ Cf. WORREL, Coptic Sounds, p. 88.
² Cf. PILCH pp. 7 f., ELBERT § 1.2.
³ The terms “secture”, “space”, “graphic word”, see ALLÉN, Grafematisk analys
pp. 57 ff., 160 f.
⁴ TILL, G § 28.
such division.\(^1\) I have confined myself to printed texts, disregarding however the modern word division and punctuation.

**Graph-Type Classes**

*The Alphabet*

1.1. The traditional Saidic alphabet consists of 30 letters in the following order:\(^2\)

\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\alpha & A & \chi & L \\
\varepsilon & B & \mu & M \\
\upsilon & G & \nu & N \\
\Delta & D & \zeta & X \\
\epsilon & E & \omicron & O \\
\zeta & Z & \eta & P \\
\kappa & E' & \rho & R \\
\sigma & Th & \varsigma & S \\
iota & I & \tau & T \\
\kappa & K & \gamma & U \\
\end{array}
\]

The symbols to the right in the list constitute a transliteration, which will be used in the body of the text of this paper in order to simplify printing.

To this must be added the suprilinear stroke \(–\), written above another letter. Since such a group often alternates with \(E\) preceding the other letter, the suprilinear stroke is best regarded as preceding the letter above which it is written.\(^3\)

*Variants*

1.2.0. We may regard the 30 letters of the alphabet together with the suprilinear stroke as the graph-types\(^4\) of Saidic, taking them as our point of departure. The next step is to find the graph-type classes, i.e. classes of graph-types that appear in free variation and which are not in opposition.\(^5\)

---

\(^1\) Till, G § 27. Cf. Till, Zur Worttrennung im Koptischen.

\(^2\) Further Till, G § 11; Steindorff p. 11.

\(^3\) Till, G § 25; Steindorff § 9. The suprilinear stroke sometimes extends over the preceding letter too (or even further, see Polotsky, Till, Walter C. Koptische Grammatik. Bespr., OLZ 52, 1957).

\(^4\) The term "graph-type" denotes a class of typologically identified graphs. Allen, Grafematisk analys, pp. 80, 163.

1.2.1. G, D and Z appear almost exclusively in Greek words. In the rare cases of their use in Coptic words, they are mere facultative variants of K, T and S respectively, e.g. ANSE'BE or ANZE'BE ‘school’.1

1.2.2. The graph-type Th and the sequence TH are in facultative variation, and so are X and KS, Ph and PH, Kh and KH, Ps and PS as well as Ti and TI, e.g. ThE or THE ‘the manner’.2 There are two theoretically possible solutions. The single graph-types Th, X, Ph, Kh, Ps and Ti could be regarded as graphic realizations of the sequences TH, KS, PH, KH, PS and TI respectively, or the sequences could be regarded as realizations of the single graph-types. The first-mentioned solution is to be preferred, as, unlike the second, it permits every occurrence of one of the six single graph-types to be regarded as a realization of one of the six sequences, thus reducing the number of units by six. Morphological arguments in favour of the first solution could also be cited, such as the fact that the six simple graph-types occur regardless of morpheme-boundaries, as in the example given above or in P-HO or PhO ‘the face’. The second solution would lead to an unnecessarily complicated account of the morphology of the verb, too, e.g. qualitatives like ROKH or ROKh ‘be burnt’ could not be treated as a parallel to other qualitatives like SOTP ‘be chosen’.

1.2.3. EI and I are in facultative variation in many morphemes, e.g. EIOT or IO'T ‘father’, COEIS or COIS ‘lord’. There is, however, a tendency to complementary distribution; initially in a morpheme or a group of morphemes that belong very closely together, EI is the usual spelling; medially and finally I is more common, e.g. EIRE ‘do’, PIN ‘mouse’, PAI ‘this’.3

In other, considerably less numerous cases EI can be replaced by EEI, though the latter spelling is rare except in certain texts, e.g. PEI or (seldom) PEEI ‘this’.4 In no case can EI be replaced by either I or EEI. There is opposition or homonymy as the case may be between PEI or PI ‘kiss’ and PEI or PEEI ‘this’.

The simplest procedure would seem to be to regard I and EI as facultative variants (with a tendency towards complementary distribution) and EI=EEI as consisting of E followed by one of the facultative variants I and EI, this being born out by the fact that in EI=EEI

---

1 Steindorff § 12; Worrall, Coptic Sounds p. 85; Knudsen § 1.
2 Worrall, Coptic Sounds pp. 85 f.; Tell, G §§ 14, 17.
3 Tell, G § 15; Steindorff § 14.
4 Cf. Kahle pp. 78 f.
there may be a morpheme boundary after the initial \( E \), whereas this is never the case with \( EI = I \), e.g. \( E-I-SAN \) or (rarely) \( E-EI-SAN \) 'if I'. It may also be argued that since \( I = EI \) may be preceded by any other graph-type (except the supralinear stroke) it is likely upon occasion to be preceded by \( E \) too.

Now the question arises as to whether \( EI \) should be regarded as a variant of a unit \( I \), or \( I \) as a graphic realization of a sequence \( EI \). This cannot be resolved along the same lines as was the \( Th-TH \)-problem in § 1.2.2, because no reduction of the number of units is possible here, this argument being consequently not applicable. There will be two units in any case, either \( E \) and \( I \) (with the variant \( EI \)) or \( E \) and \( I \), the latter only occurring after \( E \) (with an alternative graphic realization \( I \) for the sequence \( EI \)). The latter solution imposes an awkward distributional restriction upon the unit \( I \), while the former solution allows both units an almost unlimited freedom of occurrence, besides being intuitively simpler, and is thus to be preferred.

1.2.4. \( OU \) and \( U \) have complementary distribution in "good" orthography. \( U \) is found following an \( A, E \) or \( E' \), within the same morpheme or group of morphemes that belong very closely together, while \( OU \) is found in all other environments; e.g. \( NAU 'for them', TE-UŠE 'the night', OUŠE 'night', HAROOU 'under them'. As is evident from the examples, the same morpheme is spelled sometimes \( OU \) and sometimes \( U \), depending on the preceding graph-type. Since \( OU \) and \( U \) also occur in the same environments—at least in manuscripts with a less orthodox spelling—it is preferable to regard them as variants.

\( OU \) and \( U \) should be considered two variants of a single unit according to the same reasoning that was applicable to \( EI \) and \( I \).

**Summary**

1.3. The inventory of graph-type classes now consists of the following 22 units—variants are separated by oblique strokes:

---

1. Loc. cit.
2. An \( EI \) that is not found to be in variation with either \( I \) or \( EEI \) may indeed be ambiguous, but there are certain practical clues; morpheme boundaries have been mentioned; in primary syllables (see § 3.1.2 below) \( EI = EEI \) does not occur (Steindorff § 48:2); inter-dialect comparisons may be helpful.
3. Pilch p. 28.
4. Till, G §§ 18–19; Steindorff §§ 13, 48; Knudsen § 1.
Variants of the sequences
t, k, k, k, k, k, k, k, k
are respectively
α, θ, θ, θ, θ, θ, θ, θ.

Allocation to Autographemes and Syngraphemes

2.1.0. In order to distinguish between autographemes and syn- 
graphemes,\(^1\) or, more accurately at this stage, between the corresponding 
graph-type classes, I make use of the combination diagram of SPANG- 
HANSSSEN.\(^2\) As has already been mentioned, Coptic manuscripts are 
written without word-division, so there are no graphic words to be used 
in the combination diagram. In the absence of words, I use single semantic 
morphs\(^3\) like PE ‘heaven’, ON ‘again’, SE ‘sixty’ etc. That is, I do not 
use graphic words but "would-be" graphic words, the hypothetical 
result of introducing word-divisions according to some principle or 
other. Since the application of different principles would result in dif-
ferent word-divisions, we are obliged to use only such forms as would 
obviously be considered to constitute words according to any reasonable 
method of word-division. However, it is possible that some forms in the 
diagram are open to criticism, albeit not, I am convinced, to the extent 
that the resulting classification into autographemes and syngraphemes 
would be altered.

2.1.1. Figure 1 shows the combination diagram as it appears when the 
empty space is made as large as possible. The original spelling is retained. 
The sign + denotes that although the combination in question, e.g. FA, 
does not occur, the inverted combination, in this example AF, does 
 occur. The combination diagram results in the classification of 8 graph-
type classes as autographemes\(^4\) and 14 as syngraphemes.\(^5\) In the fol-

\(^1\) For the terms "autographeme" and "syngrapheme", see DIDERICHSEN, Nye 
bidrag p. 10; cf. ALLÉN, Grafematisk analys pp. 48, 92 ff., 166.

\(^2\) SPANG-HANSSSEN, Analyse p. 22 ff.; SPANG-HANSSSEN, Probability and Struc-
tural Classification pp. 42 ff.; cf. ALLÉN, Grafematisk analys pp. 48, 91 ff.

\(^3\) For this term, see BORGSTROM p. 56.

\(^4\) Cf. KNUDSEN § 2.

\(^5\) It would be correct procedure to check that Saidic words really do contain at 
least one autographeme (SPANG-HANSSSEN, Analyse p. 24; cf. ALLÉN, Grafematisk 
analys p. 93). This cannot be done, since word-division is lacking. I have, however,
lowing, only the former will be dealt with, and for shortness sake they will sometimes be called simply “graph-type classes” instead of “graph-type classes that have been classified as autographemes”. The term autographeme should properly not be used until they have been proved to be graphemes.

2.2. The distribution of the graph-type classes \( I/EI \) and \( OU/U \) corresponds to that of the syngraphemes as well as the autographemes.¹ A few examples should suffice as an illustration:

3-lit. verbs of the scheme \( C_1VC_2C_3 \):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{\textit{coton}} & \quad \text{‘choose’} \\
\text{\textit{pok\_g}} & \quad \text{‘burn’} \\
\text{\textit{mov\_g}} & \quad \text{‘make salt’ (\( V \) is \( OU/U \))} \\
\text{\textit{ch\_\_m}} & \quad \text{‘stare’ (\( C_1 \) is \( I/EI \))} \\
\text{\textit{kos\_\_e}} & \quad \text{‘gather’ (\( C_2 \) is \( OU/U \))} \\
\text{\textit{\_\_\_m}} & \quad \text{‘send’ (\( C_1 \) is \( OU/U \))}
\end{align*} \]

2-lit. verbs of the scheme \( C_1VC_2 \):

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{\textit{\_\_\_t}} & \quad \text{‘build’} \\
\text{\textit{\_\_\_s}} & \quad \text{‘loosen’} \\
\text{\textit{\_\_\_e}} & \quad \text{‘remain’ (\( V \) is \( OU/U \))} \\
\text{\textit{\_\_\_m}} & \quad \text{‘desire’ (\( C_1 \) is \( OU/U \))}
\end{align*} \]

In its function as a syngrapheme \( I \) is sometimes written \( \bar{I} \), but the diacritical dots are not so consistently written that a separate syngrapheme \( \bar{I} \) can be distinguished.⁴

found that any morph consisting of at least two graphs contains at least one representative of an autographeme. The same is true of any sequence of morphs, in which every morph includes at least one graph. There exist only a very limited number of one-graph grammatical morphs that lack autographeme. However, it can be shown that the eight autographemes have a special distribution, even without reference to morphemes. Divide a Coptic text into sections of \( n \) graphs each. For \( n = 1 \), it is obviously true that the group of graph-type classes represented in each section of \( n \) graphs includes all the graph-type classes of Saidic. Trials will show that the same is true for \( n = 2 \) and for \( n = 3 \). But in the case of \( n \geq 4 \), the eight graph-type classes classified as autographemes, and only these, are included in the group represented in each section of \( n \) graphs. (In practice there is a limit to the value which may be assumed by \( n \), for with increasing values of \( n \) there is obviously an increasing probability that each and every graph-type class by itself be represented in each section of \( n \) graphs.)

¹ Cf. TILL, G §§ 15, 18; STEINDORFF §§ 13–15.
² STEINDORFF §§ 233–234.
⁴ TILL, G § 15; STEINDORFF § 14.
The fact that \(1/\ell\) and \(OU/U\) function both as autographemes and also as syngraphemes is not contradicted by their being classified as autographemes in the combination diagram, for a graph-type class with both functions is always classified as autographeme according to that method.\(^1\)

The present paper will deal only with those members of the graph-type classes \(1/\ell\) and \(OU/U\) that should in all probability be interpreted as having autographemic function. Whether they have this function or not is not always obvious. Sometimes inter-dialectal comparisons may be helpful. In what follows, doubtful cases will not be used as arguments without special mention.

\(^1\) **Allén**, Grafematisk analys p. 94.
As OU/U in autographemic function is not spelled U in “good” orthography, for the sake of simplicity I will write the graph-type class as OU instead of OU/U from now on.

The Configurative Unit

3.0. With the help of a few commutation list it can be proved that the 14 graph-type classes which have been classified as syngraphemes, together with I/EI and OU/U in their syngraphemic function, are all in opposition, i.e. that they are graphemes, more specifically syngraphemes. As such they may be symbolized thus: \(<B, I, K, L, M, N, P, R, S, T, OU, S, F, H, C, K’>\).

Our concern here, however, is with graph-type classes that have been classified as autographemes. Their distribution is more complicated and involves many restrictions which have to be accounted for.

The Choice of Unit

3.1.0. Every language is characterized by certain distributional restrictions, and it is important to find the units within which these restrictions operate.¹ I have chosen to take as my point of departure a unit which admits of definition and which is doubtless graphemically and phonemically relevant: the configurative unit, which is based upon the following argumentation.

3.1.1. If—in a Coptic sentence—every morph that contains a representative of a graph-type class classified as autographeme be replaced by morphs containing representatives of other such graph-type classes, we find that the number of possible graph-type classes is not the same in different positions in the sentence. Take a sentence, e.g.

\[\text{δούκανόοριτωάοοώούενονκονεμεγμοού}\]

‘One of our fathers sent his brother to fill up with water.’² If we try to exchange the morphs the result may look like figure 2. (For the sake of clearness each graph-type class has been given its own line in this figure,

¹ Pich, p. 28, mentions syllable, morpheme and word as examples of such units. An analysis with the syllable as unit would display very few distributional restrictions. Many restrictions would also pass unobserved with the morpheme as unit. Word-division is lacking.

² From Apophthegmata patrum (Zoega, G., Catalogus codicum Copticorum ... Roma 1810, 343b) except the Greek word \(MATHESIS\) that has here been altered to \(SON\).
and the morphs in the original example have been repeated on their proper lines. Some of the forms may contain more than one morph.)

It appears from this kind of example that in some columns all the eight graph-type classes may be represented, including $E'$, $O$ and $O'$, in other columns only a maximum of five, $E'$, $O$ and $O'$ not being among them.

The possibility of variation between eight graph-type classes applies only to one syllable nucleus of a single morph. This is immediately apparent from the fact that in one and the same morph there is never more than one representative of one graph-type class from the group $E'$, $O$, $O'$.

3.1.2. There are in other words in a Coptic sentence certain syllables that we may call primary syllables, each of which contains a single representative of one of the eight graph-type classes, while only five of the graph-type classes may be represented in the remaining syllables of the sentence, which may be called the secondary syllables. It is plausible that the primary syllables were characterized in speech by some culminating feature lacking in the secondary syllables, some kind of accent.²

The Delimitation of the Configurative Unit

3.2.0. Every Sa'dic sentence may now be subdivided into what we may call “configurative units”, each containing one primary syllable. It remains to discover where to draw the boundaries between the configurative units. To this end we may examine whether there are any limitations as

---

1. Disregarding the “double vowels”, treatment of which is deferred to § 8.
2. Borgstrom § 10.1.
4. Corresponds to the “Akzentleinheit” of Steindorff, § 71.
5. In theory. In practice it is not always obvious which syllables are primary syllables. Cf. Till, G §§ 49, 66; Till, Betrachtungen zum Wortakzent.
to what can precede the first or follow the last primary syllable of a sentence.¹

3.2.1. Several syllables and morphs may precede the first primary syllable, e.g.

\[ \text{εὐτεῖν-μᾶς-τῷ-σὺ-σῶ} \]

′If ye cannot ′² There seems to be no upper limit.

3.2.2. Following the last primary syllable, on the other hand, we do not find more than one secondary syllable—disregarding the copula PE, TE, NE. As to morphology, I have not found more than one additional morph following the morph that contains the nucleus of the primary syllable—still disregarding the copula. This additional morph is always a suffix. Examples of sentence terminations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>secondary syllables</th>
<th>additional morphs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( ποσ, qo )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ωρε, ωρῆγ )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ωυρ-ε )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ωυρ-η, ωρ-οηε )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ταειν-γ )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ποσηγ, παση )</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( ςιννοσσ )</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To this must be added, however, that the copula is sometimes found as a second secondary syllable and as a second morph, e.g.

\[ \text{ωυρ-ε-τε, ποση-νε, υσιν-γ-νε.} \]

The copula forms an exception to the rule that a maximum of one secondary syllable may follow the primary syllable and from the rule that a maximum of one morph may follow the morph containing the nucleus of the primary syllable, this morph being a suffix. As a matter of fact, the copula is not a suffix but an independent word.² Theoretically it might have been a primary syllable. This is however unlikely, as it is

¹ Or of a text, if we do not want to presuppose a division into sentences.
³ Till, G § 244; Steindorff § 301.
unaccented in metrics and the Bohairic forms, too, are \( PE, \, TE, \, NE, \) although Bohairic \( P \) and \( T \) generally become \( Ph \) and \( Th \) respectively when they precede the syllable nucleus of a primary syllable.\(^1\)

It seems, however, as if the description of the language would be considerably simplified if the copula were to be regarded as a separate configurative unit, so I choose this way of proceeding in spite of the fact that I am not fully satisfied as to the nature of the copula in this connection. The solution is confirmed by the fact that punctuation marks sometimes occur before the copula.\(^2\)

3.2.3. We are now able to postulate the following rules for determining the boundaries of the configurative units:

1. There is always a boundary somewhere after the nucleus of a primary syllable.
2. If the nucleus of a primary syllable is in a morph without suffix, the boundary immediately follows that morph.
3. If the nucleus of a primary syllable is in a morph followed by a suffix, the boundary immediately follows that suffix.
4. If a copula immediately follows such a boundary, there is a boundary after the copula too.

Rule number 4 appears to me to be necessary. If I decide to put a boundary before the copula, I am not by that allowed to assign the copula to the following configurative unit. A fifth rule might have been postulated: "There may be only one secondary syllable between the primary syllable and the following boundary." Such a rule would however be superfluous, because when the boundaries are determined according to rules 1 to 4 there will never be more than one secondary syllable following the primary syllable.

To indicate the boundary between two consecutive configurative units when necessary I shall use the symbol \( \| \).

3.2.4. The subdivision into configurative units may be exemplified by the sentence quoted in § 3.1.1:

\[
\| \, \alpha\upsilon\nu \| \, \pi\nu\chi\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\varepsilon \| \, \tau\iota\eta\mu\omicron\delta\nu \| \, \mu\nu\chi\epsilon\omicron\omicron \| \, \epsilon\omega\gamma\mu\omicron\omicron\nu \| 
\]

The Graph-type Classes in Opposition in the Primary Syllable

4.0. Within the configurative unit, the graph-type classes that have been classified as autographemes are represented in primary as well as

\(^1\) *Till, D* § 19; *Mallon* §§ 24–25, 356.

\(^2\) *Till*, G § 244.
in secondary syllables. The former case will be dealt with here, the latter
in sections 5 and 6. As has already been pointed out, all of the eight
graph-type classes are represented in primary syllables: \( A, E, E', I/\hat{E}I, O, \hat{O}U, O', - \).

**Final Position**

4.1. In final position the graph-type classes \( A, E, E', I/\hat{E}I, O, \hat{O}U, O' \)
are represented, all of them in opposition as is evident from the commu-
nation lists following.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{\text{ג}} & \text{ 'winnowing fan'} & \text{\text{מ}} & \text{ 'place'} & \text{\text{י\text{יא}}} & \text{ 'rise'} \\
\text{\text{גכ}} & \text{ 'fall'} & \text{\text{מכ}} & \text{ 'truth'} & \text{\text{י\text{וכ}}} & \text{ 'wood'} \\
\text{\text{גכ}} & \text{ 'fore part'} & \text{\text{مري}} & \text{ 'urine'} & \\
\text{\text{גש}} & \text{ 'thresh'} & \text{\text{ככ}} & \text{ 'come'} & \text{\text{י\text{וי}}} & \text{ 'measure'} \\
\text{\text{גו}} & \text{ 'face'} & \text{\text{מו}} & \text{ 'take!'} & \text{\text{ככ}} & \text{ 'be'} & \text{\text{יו}} & \text{ 'thousand'} \\
\text{\text{גו}} & \text{ ' better' } & \text{\text{מוכ}} & \text{ 'die'} & \text{\text{גי}} & \text{ ' what?'} \\
\text{\text{גו}} & \text{ 'suffice'} & \text{\text{וי}} & \text{ 'conceive'} & \text{\text{יו}} & \text{ 'sand'}
\end{align*}
\]

The opposition \( \hat{O}U + O' \) has a low functional load. Immediately fol-
lowing \( \langle M \rangle \) and \( \langle N \rangle \) the graph-type class \( O' \) is rare, while in other en-
vvironments \( \hat{O}U \) is rare.\(^1\) This holds good for non-final positions too.

**Non-Final Position**

4.2.0. When the nucleus of the primary syllable is immediately fol-
lowed by a syngrapheme, three relevant types of environments may be
distinguished:

1. The syngrapheme in question belongs to the so-called Blemnar-
group \( \langle B, L, M, N, R \rangle \)\(^2\) and is not in final position in the configura-
tive unit.
2. The syngrapheme is \( \langle H \rangle \).
3. Other cases.

(The position immediately preceding a syllable nucleus is disregarded.
It exists but is very rare.)

4.2.1. In the first case all the eight graph-type classes are represented,
though \( A \) is extremely rare.\(^3\) In the few words with known meaning
where I have found \( A \) it appears in free variation with \( - , E \) or \( O \):

---

\(^{1}\) Cf. Till, D §§ 29–31 for etymological background.
\(^{2}\) Cf. Steindorff § 18.
\(^{3}\) Cf. Till, G §§ 57–58 for etymological background.
μηνή or μηντε or μηνειε ‘her nose’

αιγ or οιγ ‘yard’

σαρτε or σαρτε ‘sword’

I have not found any case of opposition between - and E; they appear in free variation,\(^1\) e.g.

μη-με or μη-με ‘scale (of fish)’

δημε or δημε ‘forgetfulness’

κολε or κελε ‘bolt’ (n)\(^2\)

The following six elements are in opposition: E’, I/EI, O, OU, O’, -/E. Examples of minimal pairs for the 15 oppositions:

\( \mu = 1/ei: \) μινε ‘daily’

\( \mu = 0: \) περὶμ ‘red substance’

\( \mu = 0i: \) μενε ‘daily’

\( \mu = 0: \) ενεμ ‘be near’

\( \mu = -1/ei: \) ενε ‘swallow’

\( 1/ει=0: \) με ‘change’

\( 1/ει=0ι: \) με ‘sort’

\( 1/ει=0ι: \) ειμε ‘bring’

\( 1/ει= -1/ei: \) ειμε ‘woman’

\( o = 0ι: \) μολε ‘be salt’

\( o = 0ι: \) ει ‘be fixed’

\( o = -1/ei: \) μολε ‘plait him’

\( ov = 0ι: \) κονε ‘her bosom’

\( ov = -1/ei: \) μολε ‘make salt’

\( ω = -1/ei: \) γοπε ‘break’

\( ω = 0ι: \) μονε ‘sort’

\( ω = 0ι: \) νε ‘be spread’

\( ω = 0ι: \) μονε ‘remain’

\( ω = 0ι: \) γονε ‘approach’

\( ω = 0ι: \) ειμε ‘dates’

\( ω = 0ι: \) με ‘be changed’

\( ω = 0ι: \) μονε ‘remain’

\( ω = 0ι: \) ειμε ‘stone’

\( ω = 0ι: \) ειμε ‘appeal’

\( ω = 0ι: \) μονε ‘make salt’

\( ω = 0ι: \) αφε ‘fix’

\( ω = 0ι: \) μονε ‘ask for him’

\( ω = 0ι: \) κονε ‘kill’

\( ω = 0ι: μονε ‘salt’ (n) \)

\( ω = 0ι: \) γονε ‘form’ (n)

---

\(^1\) Knudsen (§ 4.5) regards - and E as separate phonemes here.

\(^2\) The doubling of the syngrapheme is automatic. A syngrapheme from the Blenmar-group is doubled, whenever it is immediately preceded by a supralinear stroke that constitutes the nucleus of a primary syllable, and is immediately followed by a syllable nucleus that is in final position. This doubling is predictable and consequently redundant. (In the numerous cases when the supralinear stroke is left unwritten, the doubling conveys the information contained in the supralinear stroke.) Cf. Till, G §§ 58–59; Steindorff § 27:1–2. The doubled syngrapheme could also be regarded as a sequence of two syngraphemes. In that case only the supralinear stroke would occur preceding two similar syngraphemes. That would imply an unnecessary restriction of the distribution of the remaining graph-type classes, which makes this solution less satisfying. Cf. Harris § 7.41 et passim.
4.2.2. In case no. 2 above, i.e. when the nucleus of a primary syllable is followed by the syngrapheme $<H>$, all of the eight graph-type classes are represented.

$O$ seldom occurs in this environment, as a rule in morphemes with metathesis, e.g. $OHSH\tilde{F}^\flat$ ‘reap it’, which also has the form $O\tilde{SHF}^\flat$. In some cases $O$ and $A$ appear in facultative variation, e.g. $LOHM\tilde{F}^\flat$ or $L\tilde{AHM}\tilde{F}^\flat$ ‘boil it’, but in other cases $O$ and $A$ are clearly in opposition, though this opposition has a low functional load.\(^1\)

The supralinear stroke is extremely rare, appearing only as a facultative variant of $E$, e.g. $N\tilde{H}$ or $NEH$ ‘oil’.

$E$ and $E'$ do not seem to be in opposition preceding $<H>$. $E'$ has defective distribution\(^2\) in relation to $E$. Preceding $<H>$+syngrapheme only $E$ occurs, e.g. $NEHPE$ ‘mourn’ (v). Both $E'$ and $E$ are found preceding $<H>$+syllable nucleus and $<H>$ in final position. I have found 6 morphemes that are only documented with $E'$ (e.g. $SE'\tilde{H}$ ‘be written’ (qual.)), 2 with $E$ only ($LEH$ ‘care’ (n) and $-K\tilde{EH}$ ‘arm’ in $KELEN\tilde{KEH}$ ‘elbow’), 7 with $E'$ or $E$ in facultative variation (e.g. $ME'\tilde{H}$ or $MEH$ ‘be full’ (qual.)).

The following six elements are in opposition preceding $<H>$: $A$, $E/E'$, $I/\tilde{EI}$, $O$, $OU$, $O'$. Examples of minimal—in some cases subminimal—pairs for the 15 oppositions:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{a} & + e/i: \text{meg} & \text{‘nest, brood’} & \text{meg/m\v{g}} & \text{‘be full’} \\
\text{a} & + i/ei: \text{tag\v{e}} & \text{‘be drunken’} & \text{\v{t}ge} & \text{‘become drunken’} \\
\text{a} & + o: \text{nag\v{e}} & \text{‘prey’} & \text{no\v{e}} & \text{‘be bitten’} \\
\text{a} & + o\v{v}: \text{na\v{g}\v{e}} & \text{‘be yoked’} & \text{no\v{g}\v{e}} & \text{‘yoke’ (v)} \\
\text{a} & + o\v{w}: \text{nag} & \text{‘earth’} & \text{no\v{g}} & \text{‘be envious’} \\
\text{e/i} & + i/ei: \text{\v{t}\v{g}e} & \text{‘be anointed’} & \text{\v{t}\v{g}e} & \text{‘spittle’} \\
\text{e/i} & + o: \text{neg\v{e}} & \text{‘waken’} & \text{\v{n}eg\v{e}} & \text{‘to reap you’ (subm.)} \\
\text{e/i} & + o\v{v}: \text{meg/m\v{g}} & \text{‘be waken’} & \text{mo\v{g}} & \text{‘fill’} \\
\text{e/i} & + o\v{w}: \text{neg/m\v{g}} & \text{‘be broken’} & \text{no\v{g}} & \text{‘break’} \\
\text{i/\tilde{e}i} & + o: \text{cig\v{e}} & \text{‘move’} & \text{co\v{g}e} & \text{‘set up’} \\
\text{i/\tilde{e}i} & + o\v{v}: \text{cig\v{e}} & \text{‘move’} & \text{po\v{g}e} & \text{‘evening’ (subm.)} \\
\text{i/\tilde{e}i} & + o\v{w}: \text{cig\v{e}} & \text{‘move’} & \text{co\v{g}e} & \text{‘weave’} \\
\text{o} & + o\v{v}: \text{otog\v{m}} & \text{‘be repeated’} & \text{no\v{g}\v{m}} & \text{‘save’ (subm.)} \\
\text{o} & + o\v{w}: \text{otog\v{m}} & \text{‘be repeated’} & \text{otog\v{m}} & \text{‘repeat’} \\
o\v{v} & : \text{po\v{g}e} & \text{‘evening’} & \text{po\v{g}e} & \text{‘wash’ (v)}
\end{align*}\]

\(^1\) Cf. TIL, G §§ 51, 52.

\(^2\) Pick p. 11.
4.2.3. In case no. 3 (§ 4.2.0 above), i.e. when the nucleus of the primary syllable is followed by one of the syngraphemes \(<I, K, P, S, T, OU, Š, Č, K>\) or by a member of the Blemmar-group in final position, all of the eight graph-type classes are represented. The supralinear stroke, however, is only found as a rare variant of other graph-type classes, e.g.

\(\sigma \alpha \lambda\) or \(\sigma \lambda\) ‘a weapon’

\(\mu \mu \mu\) or \(\mu \mu \mu\) ‘small’

Seven elements are in opposition: \(A, E, E’, I/EI, O, OU, O’\). \(E\) is comparatively rare, which makes it rather difficult to find unambiguous minimal pairs with \(E\) for the following list of the 21 oppositions.

\(| \begin{align*}
\alpha  \ +  \ e: \ & \text{pa} \kappa \bar{\nu} \text{c} \ ‘bent’ \ (n) \ & \text{pe} \kappa \kappa \bar{\nu} \ ‘bend \ her’ \\
\alpha  \ +  \ i: \ & \text{b} \alpha \lambda \ ‘eye’ \ & \bar{\epsilon} \nu \alpha \ ‘be \ loosened’ \\
\alpha  \ +  \ i/\epsilon i: \ & \text{k} \alpha \mu \ ‘reed’ \ & \kappa \mu \ ‘move’ \\
\alpha  \ +  \ o: \ & \text{b} \alpha \lambda \ ‘eye’ \ & \bar{\kappa} \alpha \ ‘outside’ \ (n) \\
\alpha  \ +  \ o/\epsilon i: \ & \text{m} \alpha \epsilon \ ‘young’ \ & \text{mo} \nu \epsilon \ ‘strap’ \\
\alpha  \ +  \ o: \ & \text{b} \alpha \lambda \ ‘eye’ \ & \bar{\kappa} \alpha \ ‘loosen’ \\
\epsilon  \ +  \ i/\epsilon i: \ & \text{k} \epsilon \tau \epsilon \ ‘other’ \ & \kappa \nu \ ‘be \ built’ \\
\epsilon  \ +  \ o: \ & \text{t} \kappa \epsilon \ ‘throw \ her’ \ & \text{to} \kappa \epsilon \ ‘strengthen \ her’ \\
\epsilon  \ +  \ o/\epsilon i: \ & \text{p} \kappa \epsilon \ ‘sailor’ \ & \text{mo} \nu \ ‘gold’ \\
\epsilon  \ +  \ o: \ & \text{t} \kappa \epsilon \ ‘throw \ her’ \ & \text{to} \kappa \epsilon \ ‘pierce’ \\
\iota  \ +  \ i/\epsilon i: \ & \text{g} \iota \nu \ ‘be \ near’ \ & \text{gi} \nu \ ‘vessel’ \\
\iota  \ +  \ o: \ & \text{b} \iota \alpha \ ‘be \ loosened’ \ & \text{b} \iota \nu \ ‘outside’ \ (n) \\
\iota  \ +  \ o/\epsilon i: \ & \text{m} \iota \ ‘be \ tied’ \ & \text{mo} \tau \ ‘tie’ \\
\iota  \ +  \ o: \ & \text{b} \iota \bar{\alpha} \ ‘be \ loosened’ \ & \bar{\kappa} \iota \bar{\alpha} \ ‘loosen’ \\
\iota/\epsilon i  +  \ o: \ & \text{m} \iota \bar{\epsilon} \ ‘bear’ \ (v) \ & \text{mo} \iota \ ‘be \ born’ \\
\iota/\epsilon i  +  \ o/\epsilon i: \ & \text{g} \iota \nu \ ‘vessel’ \ & \text{go} \iota \nu \ ‘inward \ part’ \\
\iota/\epsilon i  +  \ o: \ & \text{g} \iota \nu \ ‘vessel’ \ & \text{go} \iota \nu \ ‘approach’ \\
o  \ +  \ o: \ & \text{m} \nu \ ‘neck’ \ & \text{mo} \tau \ ‘call’ \\
o  \ +  \ o: \ & \text{b} \alpha \ ‘outside’ \ & \bar{\kappa} \alpha \ ‘loosen’ \\
o/\epsilon i  +  \ o: \ & \text{go} \nu \ ‘inward \ part’ \ & \text{go} \nu \ ‘approach’ \\
\end{align*} |}

The Graph-type Classes in Opposition in the Secondary Syllable Following the Primary Syllable

5.0. As has already been mentioned (§ 3.2.2), only one secondary syllable may follow the primary syllable within a configurative unit. As regards the graph-type classes in opposition, two relevant cases may be distinguished:
1. The nucleus of the secondary syllable is in final position within the configurative unit.

2. The nucleus is followed by a syngrapheme belonging to the same configurative unit.

Final Position

5.1. In final position two graph-type classes are represented as syllable nucleus: $E$ and $OU$. They are in opposition. Examples of minimal pairs:

- ṭe ‘thy (f) foot’ ṭo ‘their foot’
- ṭa ‘fragment’ ṭo ‘hinder part’

It should be noted, however, that it is not at all evident that $OU$ is to be regarded as a syllable nucleus in this position,¹ though cases like $TO’NE$ for $TO’NOU²$ make this view a rather plausible one.

Non-Final Position

5.2.1. As a syllable nucleus followed by a syngrapheme, three graph-type classes are represented: $A$, $E$ and $-$ . They are not found in opposition.³ The supralinear stroke is often left unwritten, i.e. it is in free variation with zero.⁴ $E$ and $-$ have a tendency to complementary distribution, $E$ in the environment CB–S, $-$ in other environments, e.g. $HOTBEF$ ‘kill him’ but $SOLTIP$ ‘break’; however, variant spellings like $HOTBEF$ and $SOLEP$ are common enough to make $E$ and $-$ facultative variants.⁵ In the environment B–<I>, the graph-type class $A$ is found as a facultative variant, e.g.

- ρωγ ‘live’ (v)
- ρογ ‘see’.

¹ In this position $OU$ is considered by Steindorff to be a vowel (cf. §§ 56–57), by Knudsen to be a consonant (§ 4.1). But it is not evident that vocalic and consonantal $OU$ were phonemically different.
² Till, G § 72.
⁴ The supralinear stroke is never or almost never written after the syngraphemes $<I>$ and $<OU>$. Cf. Knudsen (§ 4.1), who considers these cases to be consonant clusters, as opposed to the more common cases with intervening $A$, $E$ or $-$. As we shall see in § 5.2.2 below, the difference is graphic and possibly phonetic but not graphemic and consequently not phonemic—as far as we may judge in a dead language.
⁶ Cf. Till, G § 70.
5.2.2. As we have seen, there is only one graphemic unit in this environment. Zero occurs as a facultative variant of this unit. When the configurative unit does not end in a secondary syllable nucleus (the case dealt with in § 5.1 above), the nucleus of the primary syllable may be followed by three, two, one or no syngraphemes. In the case of one or no syngrapheme, there is no additional syllable nucleus. In the case of two, we find only -CVC and —less often—-CC, which are not in opposition, e.g. $\text{ĒRP}$ or $\text{E''RP}$ 'wine'. In the case of three, we find only -CCVC and as a less common free variant -CCC, e.g. $\text{K''OSK'S}$ or $\text{K'OŠK'S}$ 'dance'.

Since there is only one graphemic unit that can occur as a syllable nucleus in this case, the syngraphemes being given, no further opposition is possible. Consequently, a non-final nucleus of a secondary syllable following the primary syllable is redundant within the configurative unit.² It is an automatic syllable nucleus.

The Graph-type Classes in Opposition in the Secondary Syllables Preceding the Primary Syllable

Subdivision of the Configurative Unit

6.1. A primary syllable may, as mentioned in § 3.2.1 above, be preceded by an unspecified number of secondary syllables within the same configurative unit. As syllable nuclei the five graph-type classes $A$, $E$, $I/EI$, $OU$, — are represented. The distributional restrictions applying to these graph-type classes cannot be specified within the configurative unit. A subdivision is required.

¹ There is only one exception, the syllable $\text{M̄NT}$, which apparently has the structure CVCC. The $N$ is however predictable. In the environment between $\langle M \rangle$ and $\langle T \rangle$ in a secondary syllable (preceding as well as following the primary syllable), an automatic $N$ generally appears between the syllable nucleus — and the $\langle T \rangle$. (Cf. STEINDORF § 36; TELL, D § 17). The resulting syllable $\text{M̄NT}$ and the very much less common $\text{MT}$ are facultative variants. Examples: $\text{ŠOMNT}$ (rarely $\text{ŠOMT}$) 'three', $\text{M̄NTRÉ}$ 'witness'. If this $N$ were taken as representing the syngrapheme $\langle N \rangle$ or the phoneme /n/ respectively, the description of the syllable structure would be unnecessarily complicated. The same is true of morphology; $\text{M̄ET}$ 'ten' has the stat. constr. $\text{M̄NT}$, $\text{ŠOMNT}$ the fem. form $\text{ŠOMTÉ}$ etc. Phonetically an [n] may have been present, but it would probably not have contained any distinctive feature not already present in /m/ or /t/. The characteristics of the variant may be assigned to the environments (HOCKETT, Manual § 3222; PILCH pp. 72 ff.).

² In the case of sequences of configurative units, the syllable nucleus may function as a border signal indicating the exact position of the boundary between the configurative units.
It is often possible to divide a configurative unit into a final part that could constitute a configurative unit by itself, and an initial part without that capacity. In a long configurative unit, such a division could often be carried out at several points. If a boundary be drawn in at every point where the following part of the configurative unit could constitute a complete configurative unit, we obtain a subdivision of the configurative unit into smaller units, which I shall, for lack of a better term, call "microunits". The example quoted in §§ 3.1.1 and 3.2.4 may serve as an illustration. The microunit boundaries are indicated by a single vertical line.

\[ \text{α} | \text{εν} | \text{ηε} | \text{ειοτε} | \text{τυνοου} | \text{κ} | \text{με} | \text{κου} | \text{ε} | \text{με} | \text{κου} \]

It goes without saying that the conditions of distribution in initial position within these units are the same as for the configurative units as far as secondary syllables are concerned, but when we examine other positions within the microunit we find that the conditions of distribution are very similar in the corresponding position of different microunits and different in different positions within the same microunit. It seems in other words as if the distributional restrictions may be described to a considerable extent with the microunit as the unit, albeit a tentative one.

It should be noted that the case of three consecutive syngraphemes without intervening syllable nucleus (graphemic or automatic) is found only when there is a configurative unit boundary or a microunit boundary between the first and the second syngrapheme. In other words, three consecutive syngraphemes constitute a positive border signal.¹

**Opposition**

6.2.0. With regard to the distribution of the five graph-type classes \( A, E, /\text{E}/, O\), - in secondary syllables preceding the primary syllable, several relevant types of environment may be discerned within the microunit. For the sake of simplicity they will be dealt with in four groups:

1. Initial position.
2. Medial position except in the last syllable of polysyllabic microunits.
3. Medial position in the last syllable of polysyllabic microunits.
4. Final position.

¹ Cf. Pilch p. 27.
Initial Position

6.2.1. I/EI does not occur. OU is only found preceding a single syngrapheme that is followed by a non-automatic syllable nucleus; i.e. it has the same distribution as a syngrapheme (cf. § 7 below). Examples like PEUHOR 'the dog', where the definite article is of the form PE- as is the rule when two consecutive syngraphemes follow, indicate that OU has syngraphemic function here.

A and E are found in all environments. They are always in opposition.

The supralinear stroke is found followed by a syngrapheme from the Blemnar-group. It is always in opposition to A. When the following Blemnar syngrapheme is in final position or is immediately followed by a syngrapheme, E and - are facultative variants. The supralinear stroke is more common. Examples:

\( \text{ē} \) or \( \text{ē} \) - 'bring'
\( \tilde{\text{ē}} \text{tōu} \) or \( \tilde{\text{ē}} \text{tōu} \) - 'be at rest'
\( \tilde{\text{ē}} \text{pā} \) or \( \tilde{\text{ē}} \text{pā} \) - 'seed'

Followed by a Blemnar syngrapheme that is immediately followed by a syllable nucleus (automatic or not), E and - are in opposition in a few microunits, facultative variants in others, e.g.

\( \text{ē} \equiv \text{ē} \) - 'stone', \( \tilde{\text{ē}} \text{ē} \) - (verbal prefix neg. fut. III)
\( \text{ē} \equiv \text{ē} \) - 'po or \( \tilde{\text{ē}} \text{po} \) - 'king'.

The supralinear stroke is also found followed by a non-Blemnar syngrapheme in final position. In this case the supralinear stroke is a variant of zero, e.g. \( \tilde{\text{ē}} \text{F} \) or \( \tilde{\text{ē}} \text{F} \) - 'he' (pres. I), which is different from \( \text{EF} \) 'press' (v).

1 Steindorff § 137.
2 See also Kahle pp. 52 ff.
3 A microunit never commences with BC except as a free variant of BC, so - is not in opposition to zero. It may therefore be considered to be an automatic syllable nucleus (so Knudsen § 4.3). This solution has the advantage of eliminating the distributional restriction on the Blemnar syngraphemes, viz. that they do not occur initially followed by C. A disadvantage of the solution is that it imposes a restriction upon - , and consequently also upon its facultative variant E, viz. that it does not occur initially followed by BC, thus leaving A as the only graph-type class in this environment, a situation unparalleled in Sa’dic.

4 A Blemnar syngrapheme is automatically doubled, when preceded by an initial - of a secondary syllable and followed by any syllable nucleus, or preceded by medial - of a secondary syllable and followed by a non-automatic syllable nucleus. This doubling is non-graphemic. (Cf. § 4.2.1 note 2.)

Minimal pairs exemplifying the cases in which $E= -$ or only $E$ occurs (i.e. preceding V, S, B!, BC):

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha = c/ :- & \quad \text{ακι- 'meat'} \quad \text{εκι- 'press'} \\
\alpha - & \quad \text{we' (perf. I)} \quad \text{νι-/εκι- 'bring'}
\end{align*}
\]

Minimal pairs exemplifying the cases in which $E= -$ (i.e. preceding BV or Bv):

\[
\begin{align*}
\alpha = e: & \quad \text{αμε- 'herd'} \quad \text{εμε- 'hoe'} \\
\alpha = - : & \quad \text{ανι- 'I'} \quad \text{πιεκι- 'thou' (neg. fut. III)} \\
c = - : & \quad \text{εικι- 'stone'} \quad \text{νιεκι- (verbal prefix neg. fut. III)}
\end{align*}
\]

**Medial Position Except in the Last Syllable of Polysyllabic Microunits**

6.2.2. $I/EI$ and $OU$ are found preceding a single syngrapheme in final position or followed by a syllable nucleus (automatic or not), but they are not found preceding two consecutive syngraphemes.\(^1\) $A$ and $E$ are found in all environments.\(^2\) The four graph-type classes $A$, $E$, $I/EI$ and $OU$ are always in opposition to the extent that they occur in the same environment. Commutation list:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{αηι- 'speaking' (pe)} \quad \text{εηι- 'pierce', \, \text{ιιι- 'olive', \, \text{οιιιι- 'twenty'}}
\end{align*}
\]

The supralinear stroke is found in all environments where a syngrapheme follows. When this syngrapheme belongs to the Blemnar-group and is followed by a non-automatic syllable nucleus, $E$ and $-$ are in opposition in a few cases, facultative variants in others, e.g.

\[
\begin{align*}
\varepsilon = - : & \quad \text{θεε- 'repay'} \quad \text{ναιε- 'purify'} \\
\varepsilon = - : & \quad \text{νεε- or \, μιεε- 'turn'}
\end{align*}
\]

In all other cases $E$ and $-$ are facultative variants with a tendency towards complementary distribution: preceding a Blemnar syngrapheme immediately followed by a syngrapheme, $E$ is the more common variant; preceding a Blemnar syngrapheme in final position or followed by an automatic syllable nucleus, $E$ and $-$ are about equally common; preceding a non-Blemnar syngrapheme\(^3\) the supralinear stroke is more common;\(^4\) e.g.

\[\text{\footnotesize 1 Disregarding a few rather doubtful forms where initial K'IN- is not with certainty to be interpreted as a separate microunit.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 2 The position immediately preceding V is disregarded, because the material is too scanty.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 3 For the extra N in the syllable MΝΤ, cf. § 5.2.2. note 1.}\]

\[\text{\footnotesize 4 See STINERDORF § 68:4-5; POLOTSKY, Zur koptischen Lautlehre II, p. 129. Cf. KAHLE pp. 52 f.}\]
cēte- or cēkte- ‘prepare’
tē- or tēne- ‘shut’
nēptē- or nēptē- ‘pluck’
cēn- or cēn- ‘dip’
cēnc- or cēnc- ‘entreat’

Medial Position in the Last Syllable of Polysyllabic Microunits

6.2.3. Only E and - are found in this position. They are facultative variants. The supralinear stroke is more common.² Examples:

tēve- or tēve- ‘form’ (v)
gēve- or gēve- ‘examine’
gēve- or gēve- ‘join’

There is in other words only one graphemic unit in this position. It is only found preceding the final of two or three syngraphemes following the next to last syllable nucleus of a microunit that ends in a syngrapheme. Since it is not in opposition to zero either, this medial nucleus in the last syllable of a polysyllabic microunit without primary syllable is completely automatic, corresponding to the case dealt with in § 5.2.2.

Final Position

6.2.4. A, E, I/EI and OU are found in this position. They are in opposition.³ Examples of minimal pairs:

ä + e: ka- ‘place’ (v) ke- ‘other’
ä + s/ei: gā- ‘under’ ĝe- ‘on’
ä + ov: gā- ‘under’ ĝov- ‘day’
ce + s/ie: te- ‘land’ t- ‘give’
ce + ov: te- ‘land’ tov- ‘wind’
\(1/ei + ov: \tilde{\alpha}mu-\) T (neg. perf. I) \(\tilde{\alpha}nov-\) ‘they’ (neg. perf. I)

Syllabic Structure

7.1.1. A microunit contains a certain number of non-automatic syllable nuclei (V). Between two consecutive V there are 0, 1 or 2 syngraphemes (C). Preceding the first V of a microunit there are 0, 1 or 2 C. There is a

1. Applies in other words only to microunits without primary syllable.
2. For the extra N in the syllable MNT, cf. § 5.2.2. note 1.
3. The microunits A- (verbal prefix perf. I), E- ‘to’ and OU- (indef. art.) constitute a special case; they are at the same time examples of initial and final position.
restriction: when a microunit commences with CC, the first C cannot be a
Blemnar syngrapheme (B); it must belong to the remaining syngraphemes
(S). \[1\] Following the last V of a microunit there are 0, 1, 2 or 3 C. There is a
restriction: in a microunit with more than one V but no primary syllable,
the last V may not be followed by a single C. \[2\] When a microunit ends in
CC or CCC there is as a rule an automatic (non-graphemic) syllable
nucleus (v) preceding the last C. \[3\]

To this must be added microunits that are without primary syllable
and consist of a single C, sometimes preceded by v. \[4\]

7.1.2. The last microunit of a configurative unit contains one primary
syllable. If the last V is not in final position, it constitutes the syllable
nucleus of the primary syllable, here abbreviated \(\breve{V}\). If the last V is in
final position, either this V or the last but one constitutes the primary
syllable nucleus.

Formulae

7.2.0. The rules of syllabic structure may be summarized in a formula.
Optional elements are written within ( ), recursive elements, occurring
any number of times from zero upwards, are written within [ ]; mutually
exclusive elements are written above each other separated by a horizontal
line.

7.2.1. If we disregard the non-graphemic automatic syllable nuclei, the
microunit containing the primary syllable of any configurative unit may
be summarized in the formula:

\[
(S)[(C)V(C)][(C)\breve{V}(C)(C)\left(\frac{C}{V}\right)] \tag{1}
\]

and every microunit without primary syllable of any configurative unit
in the formula:

\[
(S)\left(\frac{(C)V(C)}{(C)\breve{V}(C)}\left[\frac{CC}{(C)V}\right]\right) \tag{2}
\]

Consequently every configurative unit may be written:

\[
\left[\frac{(S)(C)V(C)}{(C)\breve{V}(C)}\left[\frac{CC}{(C)V}\right]\right] \frac{(S)[(C)V(C)](C)\breve{V}(C)(C)}{(C)\left(\frac{C}{V}\right)}. \tag{3}
\]

\[1\] If an initial - followed by BC is not interpreted as automatic, cf. § 6.2.1 above
(with note 3).

\[2\] Since in that case it is interpreted as automatic, § 6.2.3 above.

\[3\] There is no graphic indication of an automatic syllable nucleus when one of the
last two C’s is I/IEI or OU in syngraphemic function. See Knudsen § 4.1.

\[4\] See § 6.2.1 above. The spelling is so varied that it is difficult to formulate a
rule.
7.2.2. It may be worth mentioning that, if the difference between \( \hat{V}, V \) and the non-graphemic \( v \) be disregarded and every syllable nucleus be written \( W \), and if we assume that \( v \) regularly occurs in every final sequence \( CC \) and \( CCC \), formula (1) may be simplified to:

\[(4) \quad (S)[(C)W(C)](C)W(C)\]

and formula (2) to:

\[(5) \quad (S)[(C)W(C)]\]

and formula (3) for the whole configurative unit to:

\[(6) \quad [(S)[(C)W(C)]](C)W(C).\]

Examples

7.3.0. An empty space indicates that no example has been found. A horizontal line is a positive statement that there is no such form in 
Crüm, A Coptic Dictionary.

7.3.1. Microunits containing a primary syllable (formula (1) above).

1. No secondary syllable preceding the primary syllable:

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\hat{V} & \epsilon & CV & \kappa & SCV & \gamma me \\
\hat{V}C & \alpha & CV\kappa & \kappa & SCVC & \gamma m\sigma t\iota \\
\hat{V}C & \nu & CV\kappa \kappa & \kappa & SCVC\kappa & \gamma m\sigma t\iota \\
\hat{V}C & \omega & CV\kappa \kappa \kappa & \kappa & SCVC\kappa \kappa & \gamma m\sigma t\iota \\
\hat{V}V & - & CVV & \tau & SCVV & \gamma t\iota \\
\hat{V}C & \nu & CV\kappa \kappa & \kappa & SCV\kappa \gamma m\sigma t\iota \\
\hat{V}C & \omega & CV\kappa \kappa \kappa & \kappa & SCVC\kappa \kappa \gamma m\sigma t\iota \\
\end{array}
\]

2. One secondary syllable preceding the primary syllable:

(Only what precedes the primary syllable has been taken into account.)

\[
\begin{array}{llllll}
\hat{V}V \ldots & \epsilon & CVV \ldots & \gamma \epsilon & SCVV \ldots \\
\hat{V}CV \ldots & \alpha & CV\kappa \gamma & \gamma \mu & SCVCV \ldots & \gamma m\sigma t\iota \\
\hat{V}CCV \ldots & \omega & CVCCV \ldots & \gamma m\sigma t\iota & SCVC\kappa \kappa \gamma m\sigma t\iota \\
\end{array}
\]

There are of course microunits with more than one secondary syllable preceding the primary syllable, but they will not be exemplified here.

7.3.2. Microunits without primary syllable (formula (2) above). All structures given in 
Crüm, A Coptic Dictionary are included.

1. No \( V \):

\[
C \quad \tau-\tilde{\tau}-.\]
2. One V; or two V, the latter of which is in final position:

V  e-  CV  ge-  SCV  e+
VC  ep-  CVC  wep-  SCVC  trep-
VCC  epî-  CVCC  setî-  SCVCC  rîwî-
VCCC  wîwî-  CVCCC  wîwîwî-  SCVCCC  wîwîwî-
VV  —  CVV  nac-  SCVV  —
VCV  eîce-  CVCV  nexe-  SCVCV  tocîxe-
VCCV  eîce-  CVCCV  meite-  SCVCCV  tebîe-

3. Two non-final V:

VV...  —  CVVCC  dîlâmî-  SCVV...  —
VCVCC  aîtêti-  CVVCVCC  wîaitêti-  SCVCVCC  tretêti-
VCCVCC  ïtêpî-  CVCCVCC  wîitêpî-  SCVCCV...  —
VCCVCV  ïtêpî-  CVCCVCV  wîitêpî-  SCVCCVC...  —

4. Three non-final V. Only one structure is found:

VCCVCVCC  ïtêpî-

Doubling

8.0. The automatic doubling of syngraphemes has been mentioned in § 4.2.1 note 2 and § 6.2.1 note 4, but up to this point only single representatives of the graph-type classes classified as autographemes have been dealt with. It remains to be investigated what position in the structure these graph-type classes occupy when doubled.

Relation to Single Graph-type Classes

8.1.1. Only five of the eight graph-types occur doubled: A, E, E', O, O'. In classical Saidic usage the doubling is found only in primary syllables. In such syllables, double and single representatives of the same graph-type class are generally in opposition, though there are cases of facultative variation too, especially in less "good" texts. Examples of minimal pairs:

raâc 'place her', raac 'bone'
weepone 'exclude', weone 'be ill'

1 The exceptions are apparent only, e.g., in MOOUT 'kill', the second OU functions as syngrapheme, cf. stat. constr. MEUT; in HIEIB 'lamb', the first I functions as syngrapheme, cf. the variety HIEIB and the fem. HEIABE.
2 TELL, § 33. See also Steindorff, Ergänzungen und Berichtigungen, to p. 111 (by Polotsky).
3 TELL, p. 46 note 4.
Examples of facultative variation:

 toxet or toxet 'be hard'
 tøoøe or tøø øe 'leaf'

8.1.2. In less classical usage double A and E are found also in secondary syllables preceding the primary syllable, but only as a facultative variant of single A and E,¹ e.g.

meet or meeet 'cut'
sect or seect 'defile'

Interpretation

8.2.1. We need now to find an interpretation of the five doubled graph-type classes in primary syllables such that we obtain a simple linguistic description with a few distributional restrictions as possible. To consider them simply as two consecutive realizations of the same graph-type class would, as should be evident from the preceding sections, imply a deviation from the whole structure outlined above and give rise to distributional restrictions of a type unparallelled in Saidic.² To consider the five doubled graph-type classes as five special graphemes would avoid these disadvantages but involve an unnecessary increase in the number of graphemes.

8.2.2. If the distribution of the five doubled graph-type classes is compared with the distribution of the syngraphemes and of those single graph-type classes classified as autographemes, it is evident that the doubled graph-type classes have the sequence VC as their closest equivalent. A doubled graph-type class may be preceded by any sequence that may precede a primary syllable nucleus, and it may—as is the case with the sequence VC—be followed by zero, -C, -CC or -CV but not by -CCC or -CCV;³ e.g.

¹ Especially in the verb classes described in Steindorff, §§ 235, 238.
² Either e.g. OO would be two primary syllables in the same configurative unit, or the first O would be a secondary syllable nucleus in opposition to other graph-type classes but with the distributional restriction that it only occurs when the primary syllable has O too, there being no syngrapheme inbetween; for OO and E'E' etc. is found, but no OE' or E'O etc.
³ Disregarding the peculiar forms BAAMPE 'goat' (trisyllabic?, cf. Bohairic BAĒMPI), KIRÓOMPE 'dove' (both two config. units?) and ŠAANT⁸ stat. pron. 'nose' (graphic contamination of the varieties ŠAAT⁸ and ŠANT⁸?). See also Fecht §§ 146–154 with notes.
If a doubled graph-type class is interpreted as a sequence VC, the number of graphemes is increased by only one unit, the C indicated by the doubling. The distributional restrictions are not significant: the C in question is only found after V and is not found immediately followed by final -V, although other sequences VC are, and the graph-type classes I/EI and OU are not found preceding this C. A further advantage of this interpretation is that the morphology is simpler than would be the case were other interpretations to be adopted.

8.2.3. With the help of minimal pairs of the type ŠOOP 'exist'—ŠORP 'first' it may be demonstrated that the element functioning as a syn

grapheme, indicated by the doubling of the graph of a primary syllable nucleus, is a syngrapheme in opposition to the 16 syngraphemes mentioned in § 3.0 above. The phonetic counterpart is supposed to have been a glottal stop, so the grapheme may suitably be symbolized (<P>).

The Graph-type Classes in Opposition Preceding (<P>)

8.3. The five graph-type classes A, E, E', O, O' that occur as primary syllable nuclei followed by (<P>) are all in opposition. Examples of minimal pairs for the ten oppositions:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{A} + \text{e} & \quad \text{мъщрс} \quad \text{‘smiter’} & \quad \text{мъщрс} \quad \text{‘daughter’} \\
\text{A} + \text{n} & \quad \text{овъдъ} \quad \text{‘be pure’} & \quad \text{овъдъ} \quad \text{‘priest’} \\
\text{A} + \text{o} & \quad \text{авт} \quad \text{‘make me’} & \quad \text{авт} \quad \text{‘snort’} \\
\text{A} + \text{o} & \quad \text{лъс} \quad \text{‘be bruised’} & \quad \text{лъс} \quad \text{‘bruise’} \\
\text{E} + \text{h} & \quad \text{дъщъ} \quad \text{‘pour forth’} & \quad \text{дъщъ} \quad \text{‘finger’ (submin.)}
\end{align*}\]

1 Till, Altes Aleph und ‘Ajin.
2 The supposed phonetic background may perhaps provide an explanation. If the C in question corresponded to a glottal stop, and there was an automatic glottal stop preceding every syllable which began with a vowel, the doubling would be superfluous with a V following.
3 E.g. verbs like SOO'E are included in the class 3-lit. of the type SO'TP, and MOONE in the class IV inf. of the type MOSTE (cf. Steindorff §§ 233, 238, 270); the morphographemic changes of the suffix pronouns become simpler; see Till, Altes Aleph und ‘Ajin p. 191.
4 Vergote pp. 89 ff.; Till, G § 33.
The Autographemic System

9.1. The results of the paragraphs 4–6 and 8.3 may be summarized in tabular form as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Graph-type classes in opposition</strong></th>
<th><strong>In primary syllables</strong></th>
<th><strong>In secondary syllables after primary syllables</strong></th>
<th><strong>In secondary syllables preceding primary syllables</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>In final position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding non-final B</td>
<td>$A - E$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding $B</td>
<td></td>
<td>S$ except $\langle H, P \rangle$</td>
<td>$A - E$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding $\langle H \rangle$</td>
<td>$A - E$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preceding $\langle P \rangle$</td>
<td>$A - E$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **In final position**               |                          |                                               |                                                   |
| Preceding $C||$                       | $E$                      | autom. syll. nucleus                          |                                                   |

| **In final position**               |                          |                                               |                                                   |
| In medial position except in last syllable of polysyllabic microunits: | $A - E$                  |                                               |                                                   |
| Preceding $BV$                      | $A - E$                  |                                               |                                                   |
| Preceding $SV, C||, C(v)C||$               | $A - E$                  |                                               |                                                   |
| Preceding $CCV, CC(v)C||$               | $A - E$                  |                                               |                                                   |

| **In initial position: | $A - E$                  |                                               |                                                   |
| Preceding $BV, B(v)C||$               | $A - E$                  |                                               |                                                   |
| Preceding $B||, BCV, BC(v)C||$               | $A - E$                  |                                               |                                                   |
| Preceding $S$                      | $A - E$                  |                                               |                                                   |

9.2. It is evident from the table that the eight graph-type classes classified as autographemes are all in opposition. The maximum number
in opposition in the same environment is seven, viz. all except the supralinear stroke. One might envisage the possibility of identifying the latter with some one of the remaining seven graph-type classes,¹ but this is not possible, because it is in opposition to each of the remaining seven in at least one environment.

The eight graph-type classes thus constitute the autographeme inventory of Saidic: \(A, E, E', I, O, OU, O' , \sim\). The autographeme \(I\) has two allographs, \(I\) and \(EI\). It should be noted that the functional load of the opposition \(E \pm \sim\) is very small within the microunits. If the boundaries of the microunits are disregarded, this opposition is more common, e.g.

\[\text{\textit{it}m\text{e} \text{‘}the villages\text{’}}, \quad \text{\textit{en\text{t}m\text{e}} \text{‘}to the villages\text{’}}\]

9.3. Although the number of autographemes is eight, the maximal autographic system, which is the ordinary system of primary syllables, consists of seven graphemes, as mentioned in the preceding paragraph. In two cases there are neutralizations leading to a system of six units, and preceding \(I\) we find a five-unit system due to the absence of \(T\) and \(OU\). A five-unit system is also found in secondary syllables preceding the primary syllable, as a maximal system. The two features neutralization of the opposition between \(E\) and \(\sim\) (or absence of the latter) and absence of \(I\) and \(OU\) lead to more common systems with four, three and two units in opposition. A minimal autographemic system with two units is likewise the only system in secondary syllables following a primary syllable.

The Graphemic System and the Phonemic System

10.1. We may take as our point of departure the assumption that a spoken language, for which an alphabetical writing system is introduced for the first time, is essentially spelled phonemically, i.e. every grapheme corresponds to one phoneme.² Phenomena that are not in accordance with this assumption are to be regarded as deviations in need of explanation.

When, as in the case of Coptic, the writing system has been borrowed from another language, there may be inconsistencies that have developed in the source language in the course of time and which are then borrowed

¹ Cf. Harris § 7.41.
² Hockett, Course § 62.4.
together with the alphabet.\textsuperscript{1} E.g. the Greek sequence ω ω corresponded to a unit phoneme /u/ and has thus become a unit grapheme in Coptic, and ι and ιι were counterparts to one Greek phoneme /i/ and consequently have become mere allographs of one grapheme in Coptic.

Inconsistencies may also arise from bad fit between the phonemic systems of the two languages. The graphemes of the source language may at certain points be too many, at other points too few. This may result in allographs in the borrowing language, as when Greek χ, the counterpart of /k/, and γ, the counterpart of /g/, become allographs of one Coptic grapheme, or in absence of counterparts to some phonemes, this lack being sometimes remedied by other means, like inventing new signs or borrowing from other sources.\textsuperscript{2}

It should be noted that neither phonemes with no graphemic counterparts nor distinctions between several phonemes with the same graphemic counterpart can be discovered by synchronic analysis of the distribution of graphemes alone.\textsuperscript{3} In this respect we may say that the phonemic analysis has already been carried out by the Copts, when they adapted the Greek alphabet to their language, and we are not always in a position to improve it.\textsuperscript{4}

10.2. The phonetic realization of the phonemes of a dead language can never be determined with accuracy. The phonetic values that may be arrived at are often only relative, e.g. the realization of Greek /ɛ/ had more in common with Latin /e/ than with Latin /a/; Greek /z/ was more open than Greek /ɛ/. The phonetic values are always approximative; we are ignorant of the exact pronunciation of both Latin /a/ and /ɛ/ and Greek /z/ and /ɛ/.\textsuperscript{5} When phonetic notation is used in the following pages, it should accordingly be taken as an indication of very approximative or relative values, not as an attempt to reconstruct the Saidic pronunciation, this not being my aim.

\textsuperscript{1} Bloomfield § 17.6; Hoenigswald § 2.3.
\textsuperscript{2} Saussure p. 49; Bloomfield § 17.6; Hoenigswald § 2.3.
\textsuperscript{4} Hockett, Manual § 3.0; Polotsky, Till, Walter C. Koptische Grammatik. Bespr. p. 221.
\textsuperscript{5} Loc. cit.; Knudsen § 3.5; cf. Sturtevant § 15.
The Greek Alphabet

11.0. It is reasonable to assume that, when Saidic spelling was fixed in the third century A.D.,¹ the Copts selected for every Saidic phoneme the Greek grapheme that corresponded to the nearest Greek phoneme. Then the phonetic values of the Greek autographemes at this period should give at least an approximate idea of the contemporary phonetic values of the Coptic autographemes.

11.1. The Greek vowel system² of the period looked like this:³

\[ /i/ \quad /y/ \quad /u/ \]

\[ /e/ \quad /o/ \]

\[ /a/ \]

There were no quantitative distinctions. As regards Greek, however, it is not in the first place the phonemics but the phonetic counterparts of the graphemes which interest us here. They may be summarized thus:

\( \varepsilon \) and \( \alpha \varepsilon \) were \( [i] \):

\( \gamma \) was also \( [i] \) in the vernacular in many areas, but a standard pronunciation \( [e] \) persisted at the same time. It is possible that the standard pronunciation of \( \gamma \) was closer than the pronunciation of \( \varepsilon \) and \( \alpha \varepsilon \), so that we must still reckon with two distinct phonemes, \( /e/ \) written \( \gamma \), and \( /\varepsilon/ \) written \( \varepsilon \) or \( \alpha \varepsilon \), in the standard usage, these phonemes having changed places, so to speak, with regard to quality, since the classical era.

\( \varepsilon \) and \( \alpha \varepsilon \) were \( [e] \) or perhaps better \( [\varepsilon] \).

\( \alpha \) was \( [a] \).

\( \sigma \) and \( \omega \) were \( [o] \).

\( \omega \) was \( [u] \).

¹ Till, G § 3.
² For Greek phonetics and phonemics, see Brandenstein pp. 38–40, 72, 74; Sturtevant §§ 16, 17, 28, 30, 31, 42, 45, 49, 52; Lejeune §§ 198, 214, 215, 225, 226; Mayser pp. 80, 85, 139; Blass p. 35; Debrunner §§ 161, 165.
³ See also Hockett, Manual pp. 86 f.
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11.2. According to the Greek values, we may expect the phonetic counterparts of the Saïdic autographemes to lie in the neighbourhood of the following values:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle I \rangle & \quad [i] & \quad \langle O \rangle & \quad [o] \\
\langle E' \rangle & \quad [i] \text{ or } [e] & \quad \langle O' \rangle & \quad [o] \\
\langle E \rangle & \quad [e] - [e] & \quad \langle OU \rangle & \quad [u] \\
\langle A \rangle & \quad [a] & \quad \langle - \rangle & \text{ not borrowed from Greek}
\end{align*}
\]

**Transcriptions of Arabic Words**

12.0. In "Coptic Sounds"¹ WORRELL analyses Arabic words transcribed into Coptic letters from a medical text found in Mashâyikh near Girga and published by CHASSINAT.² The text is written in Saïdic and dated to the ninth or tenth century. The Arabic words seem to be transcribed according to their pronunciation rather than transliterated.³

**The Arabic Vowels**

12.1. The phonemic system and phonetic character of Arabic in the ninth and tenth centuries were probably closer to classical Arabic than to the colloquial Arabic spoken in modern Egypt. HARRIS BIRKELAND has divided the development of the latter into five stages.⁴ Since stage III cannot have been reached before the 14th century,⁵ the Arabic of CHASSINAT’s text must be assigned to stage I or II.

The vowel system was the same as in classical Arabic:

- **Short:** /i/ /u/  
  - /a/  
- **Long:** /ī/ /ū/  
  - /ā/

(The development /ay/ > /ē/ and /aw/ > /ū/ had not yet taken place.⁶) The range of allophonic variation was wide in classical Arabic and still is in the Egyptian vernacular, though the scope of the long vowels is now more limited, because they are members of a five vowel system. With a certain exaggeration the allophones of the short vowels in modern Egyptian Arabic may be represented by dividing up the vowel figure as in fig. 3.

---

¹ § 12 is based to a large extent on WORRELL, Coptic Sounds, Part II, Chapter IV.
² CHASSINAT, Un papyrus médical copte.
³ WORRELL, Coptic Sounds p. 123.
⁶ WORRELL, Coptic Sounds p. 127.
The different allophones of /a/ (long as well as short) were—and still are—particularly clearly distinguished. In classical Arabic they were usually realized as front allophones like [æ], [e]. This phenomenon is called imāla. Adjacent to the emphatic consonants, to /q/, /y/, /g/ and in certain cases to /r/ and /l/ the imāla did not apply and long and short /a/ were represented by back allophones like [a].¹ In modern Egyptian Arabic, /ā/ is usually represented by [æ:] to [æ:], but in the neighbourhood of emphatic consonants—including /r/ and /l/ when emphatic—and the rare /q/, /ā/ is represented by the allophone [a:]. The usual allophone of /a/ is [æ] to [æ], but adjacent to /h/ and /c/ it is [a], and in the neighbourhood of the emphatics—including /r/ and /l/ when emphatic—and /q/, it is [a].² It is not possible to make use of our information concerning these two stages of Arabic to interpolate the pronunciation of /a/ and /ā/ at the time of Chassininat’s medical text. It can only be said that with a high degree of probability long and short /a/ were in most cases realized as front allophones like [æ]; and in some cases, at all events adjacent to the emphatic consonants and /q/, as back allophones like [a].

**Arabic-Coptic Equivalents**

12.2. The Saidic autographemes are used in the following way to render the vowels of the Arabic words quoted by Worrell³ from Chassininat’s medical text.

- <i>I</i> is used for /i/ and /i/, e.g. <i>minster</i> كبريت /kibrit/.
- <i>E</i> is used for /e/ and /e/, e.g. <i>Akhen</i> لبس /labis/; for /i/, e.g. <i>miqe</i> للملح /milh/; once for /ā/ (front), <i>koszad</i> كوشاد /kūšād/.
- <i>E</i> is used for /ā/ (front), e.g. <i>mēs</i> ماميثا /māmītā/; for /a/ (front), e.g. <i>nec</i> for بسد /basad/; once for /i/, <i>xe</i> لحتي /hilti/ (in this environment /i/ is realized as [e] in modern Egyptian Arabic);⁴ once for zero, <i>xe</i> كحل /kuhl/.
- <i>A</i> is used for /a/ (front and back), e.g. <i>noshad</i> نوشاد /nūšād/-dir/, <i>apak</i> for عراقي /'arāqi/; for /a/ (front and back), e.g. <i>alkammün</i> الكمون /alkammūn/, <i>antel</i> for صندل /sandal/.

¹ For classical Arabic, see Cantineau pp. 96–99, 110–112.
² For modern Egyptian Arabic, see Harrell pp. 45–72.
⁴ Harrell § 7.2.1 : A.3.
\[\langle O \rangle\] is only used once; it renders /u/ in \textsc{ka\l\l\l\l\l\l} for قلّة /qulla(t)/. (In this environment /u/ is realized as [o] in modern Egyptian Arabic.\textsuperscript{2})

\[\langle O' \rangle\] is used for /üt/, e.g. \textsc{anapou} for عنزروت /anzrat/; for /u/, e.g. \textsc{mop} for مر /murr/.

\[\langle OU \rangle\] too is used for /üt/, e.g. \textsc{ototia} for توتيا /tūtiyā/; for /u/, e.g. \textsc{coynovλ} for سنبل /sünbul/.

\[\langle \rangle\] is used for zero between the two last consonants of a word, e.g. \textsc{miρπ} for ملح /milh/; for /i/ in the corresponding position, e.g. \textsc{novμαιπ} for نوشادر /nušadir/; once for /i/ in another position, \textsc{guh} for هندي /hindī/.

\textbf{Conclusions}

\textbf{12.3.1.} It appears from the Arabic-Coptic transcriptions that the phonemically relevant difference between the Saidic graphophonemes\textsuperscript{2} was in the ninth or tenth century a difference of quality, not of quantity. Saidic \[\langle I \rangle\] and \[\langle E' \rangle\] are used for Arabic /i/ as well as /j/, \[\langle E \rangle\] and \[\langle A \rangle\] for /a/ as well as /ä/, \[\langle O' \rangle\] and \[\langle OU \rangle\] for /u/ as well as /ü/.

\textsuperscript{1} Op. cit. § 7.4.3:1.

\textsuperscript{2} “[…] the concept graphophoneme is defined as the class of phonemes (and, when applicable, sequences of phonemes) that corresponds to a grapheme. […] as a symbol for graphophonemic notation [I suggest] \langle \rangle.” ALLÉN, Grafiematisk analys p. 157, cf. pp. 38–40.
12.3.2. In figure 4 is a schematic summary of how the Arabic vowels are rendered by the Saidic autographemes. The placing of the cardinal vowels in the central column is of course very approximative. It should also be noted that the figure does not give the phonetic or the Arabic equivalents of the Saidic graphophonemes, but only within what regions the different Saidic graphemes were considered by the Copts themselves to be the nearest equivalents of the Arabic sounds. What can be read from the figure is in other words the relative order of the Saidic graphophonemes and within what limits their phonetic realization must be looked for.

12.3.3. In regard to \( \langle O \rangle \), Chassinat's text is rather inconclusive. In only one instance has \( \langle O \rangle \) been considered appropriate for rendering Arabic /u/. In the remaining cases, Arabic /u/ has been rendered by \( \langle O' \rangle \) or \( \langle OU \rangle \). It is obvious that the phonetic realization of the graphophoneme \( \langle O \rangle \) did not correspond very well with the realization of any Arabic vowel phoneme. A possible explanation is that the realization of \( \langle O \rangle \) was situated between Arabic /a/ and /u/, i.e. something like [ə]. This placing of \( \langle O \rangle \) between \( \langle A \rangle \) and \( \langle OU \rangle \), \( \langle O' \rangle \) is corroborated to a certain extent in Coptic loan-words in modern Egyptian Arabic.\(^1\)

\( \langle A \rangle \) /ā/ and /a/, e.g. ʿawāzī ‘oasis’ /wāba/ ‘oasis’

\( \langle OU \rangle \), \( \langle O' \rangle \) /ū/ (or /ō/) and /u/, e.g. hawār ‘the frog’ /ba'rūr/ ‘frog’, ʿalwūm ‘cheese’ /halūm/ ‘(a kind of) cheese’

\( \langle O \rangle \) /ū/ (or /ō/) and /u/ in some words, but in others \( \langle O \rangle \) /ā/ and /a/, e.g. nūqū ‘suppurate’? /nūsā/ ‘fever, typhoid’, nūs ‘large’ /nūs/ or /nūs/ ‘something very large’, but nūm ‘border’ /taš/ ‘border’, ʿawām ‘an epiph’ /wayba/ ‘dry measure = 33 litres’.

This vacillation between a- und u-phonemes in the identification of the Saidic graphophoneme \( \langle O \rangle \) renders an intermediate position rather probable. It is improbable that \( \langle O \rangle \) was realized as an essentially different kind of vocoid, say [ə] or [u], since after all it is once used to transcribe Arabic /u/ in Chassinat’s text.

12.3.4. As we have seen, in Saidic the supralinear stroke is in most cases a mere variant of \( \langle E \rangle \). Only in certain environments are \( \langle E \rangle \) and \( \langle E \rangle \) in opposition (§§ 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 above). In the transcriptions from Chassinat’s text quoted by Worrell the supralinear stroke only occurs

---

\(^1\) The examples are from Worrell-VycklL, Popular Traditions pp. 329-342.
in the kind of positions where it is a common variant of \( \langle E \rangle \) in Saidic. It appears in fact that \( \langle - \rangle \) in the transcriptions from Arabic is not found in environments where \( \langle E \rangle \) is not used too. The medical text of CHASSINAT is in other words rather inconclusive as far as \( \langle - \rangle \) as a separate graphophoneme is concerned.\(^1\)

The Phonemic System

**Relative Positions of the Phonemes**

13.1. According to the Greek evidence (§ 11.2 above) the graphophonemes \( \langle I \rangle, \langle E \rangle, \langle A \rangle, \langle O \rangle, \langle OU \rangle \) follow in that order (from close front, via open, to close back vowels). \( \langle O \rangle \) is adjacent to \( \langle O' \rangle \), \( \langle E' \rangle \) is adjacent to \( \langle I \rangle \) or to \( \langle E \rangle \). According to the Arabic evidence the order is \( \langle I \rangle, \langle E' \rangle, \langle E \rangle, \langle A \rangle, \langle O \rangle, \langle OU \rangle \) is adjacent to \( \langle O' \rangle \). \( \langle O \rangle \) is probably between \( \langle A \rangle \) on the one side and \( \langle O' \rangle - \langle OU \rangle \) on the other.

This leads us to arrange these seven graphophonemes in the order given in the following table,\(^2\) where the Greek phonetic values and the probable phonetic values of the Saidic graphophonemes according to the transcriptions of Arabic words have also been included, together with suggested phonemic symbols.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Graphophonemes:</th>
<th>Greek values:</th>
<th>Arabic evidence:</th>
<th>Phonemes:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( \langle I \rangle )</td>
<td>[i]</td>
<td>[i] - [e]</td>
<td>/i/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle E' \rangle )</td>
<td>[i], [ɛ]</td>
<td>[e] - [ɛ]</td>
<td>/e/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle E \rangle )</td>
<td>[ɛ] - [ɛ]</td>
<td>[ɛ] - [ɛ]</td>
<td>/ɛ/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle A \rangle )</td>
<td>[a]</td>
<td>[a] - [u]</td>
<td>/a/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle O \rangle )</td>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>[a] - [o] (?)</td>
<td>/o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle O' \rangle )</td>
<td>[o]</td>
<td>[o] - [u]</td>
<td>/o/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \langle OU \rangle )</td>
<td>[u]</td>
<td>[o] - [u]</td>
<td>/u/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) The same seems to be true of loan-words in modern Egyptian Arabic. I cannot find any difference in the treatment of \( \langle E \rangle \) and \( \langle - \rangle \) in the items listed in WORRELL-VYCHCHL, Popular Traditions. They both become /a/ and /i/.

\(^2\) This argumentation presupposes that among these seven Saidic vowels there were no central vowels, no rounded front vowels and no unrounded back vowels. There is no evidence that there were such vowels, and, furthermore, with the exception of \( \langle O \rangle \), the transcriptions of Arabic words make it probable that there were not.
The Phonemes in Primary Syllables

13.2.1. As we have seen, it appears from the medical text of Chassinat that the Saidic autographemes in the ninth or tenth century did not correspond to graphophonemes differentiated by the presence or absence of phonemic vowel length. Furthermore ⟨E⟩ and ⟨O⟩ in all probability corresponded to vowels that were more open than ⟨E’⟩ and ⟨O’⟩. It is reasonable to assume that the vowels in primary syllables may be arranged as a simple two-dimensional system with the axes open—close and front—back:

\[
\begin{array}{cc}
/i/ & /u/ \\
/e/ & /o/ \\
/e/ & /ɔ/ \\
/a/ &
\end{array}
\]

13.2.2. This does not necessarily mean that there was no phonemically relevant vowel length at the period when the Saidic spelling was being established. There is, however, an indication that ⟨E⟩ was more open than ⟨E’⟩ (and consequently in all probability ⟨O⟩ more open than ⟨O’⟩) even as early as in classical Saidic, viz., the tendency to write ⟨E⟩ in place of ⟨E’⟩ preceding ⟨H⟩, e.g. MEH for ME’H ‘be full’.\(^1\) There is, on the other hand, no indication of a phonemically distinctive difference in vowel length.\(^2\) Furthermore, if there was a difference of length as well as opening, the most natural interpretation would be to consider vowel quality as phonemic and length as non-phonemic. This results in a more symmetrical vowel system with fewer distributional restrictions,\(^3\) which

---

\(^1\) Examples like O’NAH for O’NEH ‘live’ prove that assimilation of a vowel to a following /h/ results in a more open vowel (§ 5.2.1 above). In Bohairic it is still more obvious that ⟨E⟩ and ⟨O⟩ were more open than ⟨E’⟩ and ⟨O’⟩. See Worrell, Vycichl, Popular Traditions p. 314; Vycichl, Zur Phonetik des Bohairisch-Koptischen; cf. Till, D §§ 28, 33, 39.

\(^2\) Primary syllables containing one of the graphophonemes ⟨I, E’, O’, OU⟩ seem to have developed from Egyptian open syllables, primary syllables containing one of the graphophonemes ⟨E, A, O⟩ from closed syllables (cf. Till, G §§ 48–61). If there was a difference in quantity or quality between the Egyptian vowels in open and closed syllables, that difference was consequently phonemically redundant (Knudsen § 4.2). When the Egyptian syllable structure subsequently changed, the allophones became different phonemes by secondary split (Borgström p. 128 Hoenigswald § 9.2). A difference of opening may then have become phonemic, as well as a difference of duration. For a different view, see Knudsen §§ 2 and 4.2.

\(^3\) Knudsen (§ 4.2) accepts the traditional view of the quality of Coptic vowels and, by postulating a special length phoneme, which reduces the total number of phonemes by one at the cost of considerable restrictions in the distribution of the
has also the advantage of being found in several living languages, such as Italian.\(^1\)

13.2.3. In the environments where there are fewer autographemes in opposition, we have to reckon with the corresponding reductions in the phonemic system. Preceding a non-final member of the Blemnar-group we thus find this system:²

\[
\begin{align*}
/\text{i}/ & /\text{u}/ \\
/\text{e}/ & /\text{o}/ \\
/\text{ɛ}/ & /\text{ɔ}/ \\
\end{align*}
\]

Preceding /\text{ʔ}/:³

\[
\begin{align*}
/\text{ɛ}/ & /\text{o}/ \\
/\text{ɛ}/ & /\text{ɔ}/ \\
/\text{a}/ &
\end{align*}
\]

The Phonemes in Secondary Syllables

13.3.0. In secondary syllables we meet with vowel systems with fewer units than in primary syllables. The identification of the units in the smaller and the larger systems has already been accomplished by the Copts themselves. Since we do not have access to the living language, we cannot form our own opinion as to what phonemes are lacking in a smaller system, or between what phonemes there is neutralization, but we have to accept the phonemic analysis by the Copts.⁴

13.3.1. The vowel system in secondary syllables after primary ones is reduced to a two-vowel system, provided that \langle OU\rangle is considered a vowel in this position:⁵

\[
/\text{ɛ}/ /\text{u}/
\]

vowel phonemes and the length phoneme, arrives at a rather unsymmetrical system for primary syllables, with four short vowels and four non-corresponding long vowels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Short:</th>
<th>/\text{ɛ}/</th>
<th>/\text{a}/</th>
<th>/\text{o}/</th>
<th>Long:</th>
<th>/\text{i}/</th>
<th>/\text{u}/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/\text{ɛ}/</td>
<td>/\text{ɔ}/</td>
<td>/\text{o}/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even in primary syllables Knudsen (§ 4.5) considers \text{E}, /\text{ɛ}/, as phonemically distinct from /\text{a}/.⁶

\(^1\) Hockett, Manual § 2443. The first to my knowledge to doubt the traditional conception of a difference of quantity between \text{E}, \text{O} and \text{E}', \text{O}' was Vycichl, cited by Worrell in Popular Traditions (AJSL 54, 1937); cf. Vycichl, Zur Phonetik des Boheirisch-Koptischen.

\(^2\) Cf. Hockett, Manual § 2442 (p. 86).

\(^3\) Op. cit. § 2442 (p. 85).


\(^5\) Cf. § 5.1 above (with notes 1, 2).
13.3.2. In secondary syllables preceding the primary syllable we find \(<\sim>\) as a separate phoneme. The sources used have proved to be rather inconclusive with regard to its position in the phonemic system (§ 12.3.4 above).

An animated discussion has been carried on concerning the nature of the supralinear stroke, especially from a phonetic point of view. It has been considered to represent a vowel, possibly a central vowel [ə] or [i] (TILL), or an indication of the syllabic function of a consonant (WORREL).¹

In this connection it is not the phonetic realization that is of primary interest, but the function. POLOTSKY has put forward the opinion that the supralinear stroke does not correspond to any segmental phoneme but indicates the existence of a syllable. The phonetic realization may have been the syllabic function of a consonant in some cases, in other cases perhaps a nonphonemic vowel sound.² This seems very convincing as far as automatic syllable nuclei (v) are concerned. But it would make the description of the syllable structure more complicated than necessary if no instances of the supralinear stroke were to be considered as indicating a segmental phoneme. As we have seen, the sequence C does not always correspond to vC in the syllable structure but sometimes also to VC. In the latter case the stroke is in opposition to other phonemic units.

The functions of the supralinear stroke may be summarized thus:

1. It may indicate an automatic syllable nucleus. Its phonetic realization is left out of consideration here.³

2. The supralinear stroke may indicate a syllable nucleus which is phonemic but which is only an allophone of /ə/. This occurs in primary as well as secondary syllables, usually preceding Blemmar consonants, only seldom preceding other consonants.⁴ The realization may have been the syllabic function of the consonant; there may also have been vocoid variants. In any case the phonetic realization cannot have been too different from the realization as a separate phoneme, since the same grapheme has been used.

¹ Bibliography in TILL, G § 25, note 8. See also KNUDSEN § 3.3.
³ Even the position of the automatic syllable nucleus seems to admit of variation. Cf. POLOTSKY, Zur koptischen Lautlehre II. However, this does not affect the phonemic structure of Saidic, since the automatic syllable nucleus is non-phonemic.
⁴ STEINDORFF § 68:4–5; POLOTSKY, Zur koptischen Lautlehre II p. 129, VII–VIII.
3. In some cases the syllable nucleus indicated by the supralinear stroke was in opposition to /ɛ/. This is only found in secondary syllables preceding the primary syllable, and only preceding Blemmar consonants. In corresponding cases the stroke is not used to transcribe any Arabic vowel in Chassiron's text, which points to the realization of the stroke not being the nearest equivalent to any Arabic allophone. It is possible that the supralinear stroke in this case was realized exclusively as the syllabic function of the consonant.\(^1\)

If we accept the view that the supralinear stroke was realized as a central vowel—at least as a variant of the syllabic function of the consonant—and symbolize it by /o/, the rather uncommon maximal system in secondary syllables preceding the primary syllable appears to be rather unsymmetrical:\(^2\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
/j/ \\
/ɛ/ \\
/o/ \\
/a/
\end{array}
\]

The more common system with the opposition between /ɛ/ and /a/ neutralized is more symmetrical:\(^3\)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
/j/ \\
/ɛ, o/ \\
/a/
\end{array}
\]
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The impetus for this particular study on the most popular Egyptian female saint was given by the publication of Motu Proprio "Paschalis Mysterii" of February 14, 1969, in which H. H. Pope Paul VI approved the new organization of the liturgical year and the new calendar. A significant point of the new calendar was the principle of the selection of those saints who are most important to the universal Church, as the Council ordered, so that other saints were left to a local cultus, whether national, regional, or diocesan.¹

The material of this study is arranged in four chapters: (1) St. Catherine of Alexandria and Sitt Dimiana, (2) A critical examination of the vita of Sitt Dimiana, (3) The emergence and the spread of the cult of Sitt Dimiana, and (4) The iconography of Sitt Dimiana.

1. St. Catherine of Alexandria and Sitt Dimiana

At first sight it appears as if the papal approbation has little if any relation to our exclusively Coptic virgin martyr Sitt Dimiana, whose name is neither mentioned in the Catholic, or for that matter Byzantine martyrologies, nor is referred to by the Bollandists. However, among the saints who are removed from the official calendar is St. Catherine of Alexandria, who is venerated by Catholic and Byzantine Christians on November 25. For an appreciation of the relationship of the Alexandrian apologist and virgin-martyr and the Coptic Sitt Dimiana, we shall turn to Mrs. E. L. Butcher. While some of her basic assumptions are sadly misleading, she, nevertheless, recognized a certain interrelationship between the two saints.

"At the present time the process of confusion of two saints one with another is going on in Egypt, and it is to be feared that the comparatively modern and doubtful personality will obliterate the other, for everyone

in the West has heard of St. Catherine of Alexandria, whereas few know the name of Sitt Dimiana, the most widely revered virgin-martyr of Egypt. Her picture is in every church, and there are few members of the Egyptian Church who cannot tell you her history. If St. Catherine existed at all, which is extremely doubtful, she is probably to be identified with Theodora, who was martyred at Alexandria about the date generally ascribed to St. Catherine. It is argued that Theodora before her conversion may have borne the name of Hecaterina, from the goddess Hecate, in which case she would have changed it at baptism. But this is pure assumption, and, so far as can be ascertained, the Egyptian Church never heard of St. Catherine till the Roman Catholics brought fame of her to her supposed native country centuries after her legendary martyrdom.”

“When the European tourists came to see the Egyptian churches and asked for the picture of St. Catherine, the dragoman obligingly pointed out the picture of the only great virgin-martyr whom the priests knew anything about, Sitt Dimiana, with her palm-branch in her hands, surrounded by forty nuns. Some time ago, happening to be in one of the principal churches in Cairo, I overheard the priest describe the picture of Dimiana as that of Catherine. ‘What made you say that?’ I asked him. ‘Has not that always been a picture of Sitt Dimiana?’ ‘What can I say?’ answered the priest with a deprecatory gesture. ‘Your excellency knows that it is Sitt Dimiana, but the tourists know nothing of Sitt Dimiana, and when I tell them they do not understand. They say that it must be St. Catherine, and what do I know? It may be that Catherine is the English for Dimiana. So I tell them it is St. Catherine, and they are content.’ Since then I find that the picture in this church—almost the only one visited by the tourists—is always described as St. Catherine, and only the other day I found in Alexandria a further development. The Roman Catholics have dedicated a church here to their St. Catherine of Alexandria,¹ and the Egyptian Catholics have been made aware of her existence. I went into the only surviving Coptic church there, which has been restored of late years, and found a newly painted picture of Dimiana, represented, not with a palm branch, but with a wheel, in the midst of her forty nuns. The name Dimiana was painted on the picture, and I asked them why they had represented her with a wheel, as if she were

¹ This church was dedicated in 1850 and is maintained to this day by the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land. Cf. Un Secolo di Vita Parrochiale, Santa Caterina in Alessandria d’Egitto. Alexandria, 1950.
St. Catherine. ‘But the Frangis say she is St. Catherine’ they told me. ‘Catherine is the Frangi translation of Dimiana, so we have given Sitt Dimiana a wheel too.’

By commenting on Mrs. Butcher’s statement we may be able to clarify several important points regarding the relationship of these two saints. Mrs. Butcher is correct in saying that the apparent confusion of the two virgin-martyrs was accentuated by the increase of Western travellers who were ignorant of Sitt Dimiana. On the other hand, we shall show that the cult of St. Catherine of Alexandria preceded the cult of Sitt Dimiana by approximately four to five hundred years, and Mrs. Butcher was ill-informed when she referred to St. Catherine as a “comparatively modern personality”.

According to tradition, St. Catherine was a virgin-martyr at Alexandria in the early 4th century, but though she is among the most widely venerated women saints, she is not mentioned before the 10th century. According to the Roman martyrology and Simeon Metaphrastes, St. Catherine was a beautiful maiden of a noble family and of exceptional learning. She defended her Christian Faith in front of fifty pagan philosophers, demolished their arguments, and converted the Roman general and his soldiers who were straightaway beheaded. As a result of her protest against the persecutions of the Christians by Maxentius, she was tied to a spiked wheel; but it fell to pieces while some of the spectators were killed by flying splinters. Finally, St. Catherine was beheaded. From her severed veins there flowed not blood but milk. Her body was said to have been discovered around 800 on Mount Sinai, whither according to her acts it was transported by angels after her death. Another variation of the legend is that in which, having rejected many offers of marriage, she was taken to Heaven in vision and betrothed to Christ by the Virgin Mary. The wheel being her symbol, she is the patron-saint of wheelwrights and mechanics, as well as the tutelary saint of nuns and maidens, and of philosophers. The doubts of Mrs. Butcher regarding the historicity of St. Catherine are well founded, and the new calendar of the Catholic Church has removed the Alexandrian virgin-martyr from

---

the list of those saints who are to be universally venerated. On the other hand, her references to St. Theodora of Alexandria are misleading. It is most unlikely that the name Αἰκάτερινη was the native name of this virgin-martyr, who after her conversion to the Christian Faith adopted the name Theodora. Is it conceivable that parents would call their daughter "Hevaterina" from the goddess Hecate, who was a formidable figure associated with uncanny things and the ghost world, a bogy, and connected with sorcery and black magic? Neither do I believe that we can explain the Αἰκάτερινη by the contraction of the words Αἰκάτη and Αἰκατίνη, the peace of Hecate, as suggested by Mr. E. Sidawi. On the contrary, Mr. Nicolas J. Debanne is correct when he states that καθαρένη is the feminine diminutive of the adjective καθαρός, meaning pure, Αἰκάτερινη, therefore, being “the pure young virgin”.

Of course, it is incorrect to say that the Egyptian Church never heard of St. Catherine of Alexandria till the Roman Catholics brought fame of her to her supposed native country. Since the 10th century, the monastery at Sinai was known as the Monastery of St. Catherine; and in addition to Byzantine and Latin pilgrims, we know that monophysite pilgrims, Syrians, Ethiopians and Copts also went to Sinai to venerate the holy relics of St. Catherine. The large number of Arabic graffiti in the Chapel of St. Antony in the Monastery of St. Catherine is ample evidence of pilgrimages of Arabic Christians, presumably Copts.

There is no doubt that the mediaeval Copts were well aware of St. Catherine of Alexandria, and Mrs. Butler is ill-informed when she credits the Catholics with introducing the cult of the Alexandrian virgin-martyr to Egypt. Indeed, it would have been rather the other way around. Already in 1026, the celebrated St. Simeon of Mt. Sinai came to Europe where he was hospitably received by Richard II in Rouen. Simeon had gone to Europe to collect the annual alms for the monastery, leaving behind some of the distinguished relics of St. Catherine, and by

---

1 The Coptic Church commemorates an ascetic named Theodora on the 11th of Barmudah. She is said to have lived between 295 and 412, and several treatises on spiritual subjects as well as some sayings recorded in the Apophthegmata Patrum (201) are attributed to her. Reference to her is also made in the Historia Lausiaca, XL, 3.


3 Sidawi, Elie, op. cit., p. 78.

4 This was the Duke of Normandy (996-1026).

the latter part of the 15th century Felix Fabri had to remark that "so many of the relics of St. Catherine are taken, that only less than half of her sacred body is left".

2. A Critical Examination of the Vita of Sitt Dimiana

We must now attempt an analytical description of the vita of Sitt Dimiana. We shall rely upon the tradition by John, Bishop of Burullus and of al-Za'farān, according to an Arabic manuscript dated 1482 A.M. or 1776. According to E. Sidawi, Abū Yuhanna acquired the tradition from a monk of the adjacent monastery of al-Mima (?). This monk carried ancient liturgical books in Arabic and in Coptic, and among these books there was a vita of Sitt Dimiana by a certain Christodoulos, a scribe of Julius of Aqfahs. The reference to Julius of Aqfahs is interesting, for it provides the tradition with an alleged contemporary source.

The following story is based upon two recensions, namely the English translation by Iris Habib El-Masri and the translation of the "Maimar ash-Shahīdah Damiānah", edited by Girgis Filuthāus 'Awad.

Her name is given as Dimiana, the feminine form of Damian, a well-

---


2 Apart from the numerous relics of St. Catherine of Alexandria in the Western world, her skull and her right hand repose in the Church of the Metamorphosis of the Monastery of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai. A tooth is in the Monastery of Zoodochou Pigis on the Island of Andros and other parts are in the Serbian Monastery of Chilandari, Mount Athos; the Monastery of St. George, Malessina, Lokris; the Monastery of St. Anastasia Pharmakolytria, Vasilika, Salonica; the Church of St. Nicholas, Kato Palesia in Athens; the Monastery of Zerbitsa in Sparta; and the Monastery of St. George of Epanope, Monophtasiou, Heracleion, Crete.

3 Julius of Aqfahs, who is commemorated on the 22nd of Tūt, is not only credited for his interest in securing the relics of the martyrs, but also for his composition of martyrlogies. Towards the end of the Diocletian persecution, Julius inflamed with a desire to follow the martyrs' examples, went to the governor of Samanūd and confessed his faith. His martyrdom is legendary.
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known name among the Copts. She was the only child of Mark, the
governor of Burullus. Her father's name "Mark" infers the idea of a
conscious tradition of the importance of the name of the Evangelist
among the Egyptians. We must call to mind, however, that early authori-
ties such as Origen and Clement of Alexandria make no reference to St.
Mark as the founder of the Church of Alexandria. Eusebius gives it as a
general belief that "the same Mark they also say, being the first that was
sent to Egypt, proclaimed the Gospel there which he had written, and
first established churches at the city of Alexandria".

The martyrion of St. Dimiana is placed in the reign of Diocletian
and the region of Lower Egypt, where her father served as governor of
Burullus. It is well known that the persecutions of Diocletian, actually
the accession of the emperor to the imperial throne in 284 A.D. marks
the beginning of the Coptic Calendar; and, therefore, we should expect
her martyrdom to be placed into this, for the Copts, so significant period.
We are informed that both Mark and his wife were converted from pagan-
ism and endeavoured to raise their only daughter in the fear of God.
She was taught the Holy Scriptures from her earliest years. Knowledge
of the Holy Scriptures was an important aspect of holiness among the
early Copts, and her exposure to the written Word of God must be inter-
preted as supporting her upbringing in the fear of God. At the age of
fifteen she had grown into a very beautiful young woman, and her parents
were desirous to have her married to some rich nobleman of her rank.
The references to her physical beauty and the encouragement of her
parents to marry a wealthy person of rank, of course, increase the moral
value of her self-negation and her choice of the ascetic life. As in the
case of other virilae of virgin-martyrs, her deliberate turning away from
the world, from marriage and wealth is the commencement of her
martyrdom. She expressed her intention to dedicate her life to Christ to
her parents. Whereas we should expect her parents to be either sorrowful
or even displeased, they were, in fact, delighted and her father ordered

---

1 Damian (22 Hâetur), the brother of Cosmas is one of the unmercenary saints.
Damian (29 Masri) was a martyr in Antioch, and Damian (18 Baûmah) was the
thirty-fifth patriarch of the See of Alexandria. It is unlikely that the name is
derived from Damia, the goddess of fertility, who was worshipped together with
Auxesia in Epidaurus, Argina and Sparta.

2 EUSEBIUS PAMPILLIUS, Ecclesiastical History, II, xvi.

3 MEINARIDUS, O., Les Saintes Ecritures dans l’Eglise Copte, Bible et vie chré-
tienne LXXXII, 1968, pp. 74–86.
his men to build a palace in Za'farān at Wādī as-Sisban. It is altogether possible that the reference to Za'farān in this particular tradition is related to the Wādī Za'farān at the Red Sea, which leads to the Monastery of St. Antony. The Shrine of Sitt Dimiana used to belong to the archbishopric of Jerusalem and was administered by monks of the Monastery of St. Antony. It is conceivable, therefore, that these monks transferred the name of their wādi to the site of the martyrdom of Sitt Dimiana. She withdrew to the palace, which her father built for her, and adopted the ascetic and virginal life which the Copts consider morally superior to the state of matrimony. Soon the daughters of other noblemen followed the example of Sitt Dimiana, and she and Forty Virgins served the Lord. The reference to the Forty Virgins is important since until the Middle Ages the Coptic Church was without her own Forty Martyrs. True, the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste are commemorated by the Coptic Church, but the devotion and the piety to these Anatolian saints has never impressed itself very deeply upon the Copts. The Greek Orthodox monks of the Monastery of St. Catherine in Sinai venerate their own local Forty Martyrs of Tor, and the hagiologion of the Greek Orthodox Church includes altogether seven sets of different Forty Martyrs. Moreover, the Muslims of Lower Egypt venerate the Forty Martyrs who were soldiers in the Arab army of 'Amr ibn al-As, and who were killed in the course of the Arab Conquest in the 7th century. Lady Duff Gordon refers to a tradition in Upper Egypt according to which

---

1 The present village of az-Za'farān is situated 20 km west of the Shrine of St. Dimiana.
2 The consecration of the Church of the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste by St. Basil is commemorated on the 15th of Amshir. Significantly, the only Coptic Church dedicated to the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste is situated in the Monastery of the Syrians in the Wādī 'n-Natrün. Undoubtedly this dedication goes back to the Syrian occupancy of the monastery.
4 The Forty Martyrs of Adrianopulus (Sept. 1), the Forty Martyrs of Egypt and Palestine (Sept. 20), the Forty Children (Oct. 18), the Forty Martyrs of Sebaste (March 9), the Forty Martyrs of Anatolia (March 20), the Forty Roman Martyrs (June 16), the Forty Martyrs of Sophianae (Dec. 3).
5 In Orientalia Suecana vol. XIV, XV (1966), p. 56, I suggested that the Muslims adopted the cult of the Forty Martyrs from the Coptic cult of Sitt Dimiana and her Forty Virgins. In fact, Copts and Muslims alike borrowed the “Forty Martyrs” from the Byzantine tradition.
Forty Virgins resided in Kos, where they spent their life reciting the Qur'an.\(^1\) In view of these various heterodox companies of martyrs, it seems understandable that the Coptic Church longed for her own indigenous group of Forty Martyrs. On account of their social rank and moral status, all being virgins, they could even be considered as surpassing the other martyrs in holiness. It is understood that the number ‘forty’ should not be taken literally. On the contrary, in the Hebrew-Christian tradition this number stands for a mythologically significant, perfect as well as complete quantity.

The element of witness is included in the tradition when at the time of the Diocletian persecution Sitt Dimiana exhorts her father to remain faithful to Christ. Her father, who had surrendered his faith, returned to Christianity and was subsequently beheaded. Some time later, the truth of the story of Sitt Dimiana’s intervention was revealed to Diocletian. Hearing of her physical beauty and her religious zeal, the emperor commissioned one of his officers to win her over to the worship of the idols. The officer tried every means to dissuade Sitt Dimiana but his efforts were in vain. She refused to surrender her Christian Faith, and together with the Forty Virgins she suffered martyrdom.

Following the pattern of other 4th century martyrdoms, a large number of witnesses were converted by the steadfastness of the saint,\(^2\) and four hundred of them joined Sitt Dimiana and the Forty Virgins in their martyrdom.

The holy relics of Sitt Dimiana and her Forty Virgins were piously collected and arranged in the form of a bee-hive. After the persecutions had come to an end, the Emperor Constantine declared Christianity to be the state-religion,\(^3\) and the story of the martyrdom of Sitt Dimiana and her Forty Virgins was related to the righteous king. Thereupon, the emperor provided his mother, St. Helena, for the journey to Egypt; and the queen is said to have paid a visit to the site on which the palace stood, which Mark had build for his daughter. True, Byzantine and Western

---

2 Meinardus, O., Mystical Phenomena Among the Copts, Ostkirchliche Studien, XV, 4, 1966, pp. 148–149.
3 Though the edict of toleration (Milan) was issued in 313, motives of political expediency caused Constantine to delay full recognition of Christianity as the religion of the state until he became sole ruler of the empire.
traditions inform us that at an advanced age St. Helena undertook a pilgrimage to Palestine to visit the Holy Places; her subsequent travels to Egypt, however, must be attributed to the realm of local Coptic legends of a rather late date. In this connection, we must remember that according to Coptic tradition the Invention of the Holy Cross was the work of Eudoxia rather than St. Helena. At any rate, the queen is said to have found the bodies of the martyrs like a swarm of bees and they were not touched by any beast or any bird. The theme of the incorruptibility of the body of a saint by the forces of nature or the beasts of creation again follows the pattern of many 3rd and 4th century martyrdoms. Queen Helena is said to have entered and to have received a blessing from the holy relics, and came to the stairway and went up to the palace where she found the body of Sitt Dimiana sitting upon the throne which she used to occupy when she was in the flesh, and the queen kissed it. The practice of enthroning saints after their death is of Syrian origin. To this day, the Syrian metropolitan are buried fully robed and seated on the archiepiscopal throne. The queen assembled the workmen and architects and demolished the palace and built beneath it a strong vault and placed in it the bodies just as they were in the palace. Then she shrouded the body of Sitt Dimiana in a very costly shroud, and she made for her a magnificent couch of ivory fashioned with beautiful workmanship, and she placed the body of the saint upon it, and she made for it a curtain of costly silk after the fashion of Constantine, embroidered with Constantine’s handwriting in red and gold lettering. The reference to Constantine is of significance for it bestows the imperial stamp of recognition upon the saint and her relics. Then she built above the vault a fine church with one small dome, which

---

1 It is noteworthy that neither the Pilgrim of Bordeaux (333), Eusebius, nor Cyril of Jerusalem seemed to have been aware of the queen’s travels.


3 In the Syrian Orthodox (Jacobite) Monastery of St. Mark in Jerusalem, the deceased metropolitan are lowered into a vault underneath the altar where they sit enthroned until the death of a successor who then occupies the place of honour.

4 Following her practice in Jerusalem, the queen demolishes the “old buildings” to safeguard the relics of the True Religion.
father, the Patriarch Alexander (d. 328) consecrated on the 12th of Bashuns.¹

The *vita* and martyrdom of Sitt Dimiana follows in many ways the established pattern of the vast number of Egyptian martyrdoms in so far as the hagiologist has introduced and sufficiently described the necessary personages for a victorious martyrdom. First of all, there are the good and faithful parents who are first generation Christians. Then, there is the virgin-saint who is raised in the new faith and who witnesses fearlessly. She is arrested and instead of submitting to the demands of the evil king, she chooses to suffer the consequences of her refusal. Witnesses assemble and are converted by the faithfulness of the saint. Her martyrdom causes the incorruptibility of her bodily remains, which in turn produce faith in those who behold them. A good king or queen rescues the bodily remains and bestows imperial approval upon *vita* and martyrdom.

3. The Emergence and the Spread of the Cult of Sitt Dimiana

We must now ask the question for the reason of the widespread popularity and the very widespread veneration of Sitt Dimiana and her Forty Virgins among the Copts and Muslims. If we propose that her cult emerged and spread in the 16th or 17th centuries, we must ask for an explanation of this development at this rather late and otherwise unproductive time in the history of the Coptic Church. The fact that neither early nor mediaeval hagiography and art seem to have been aware of Sitt Dimiana or of any other Egyptian female saint,² suggests that at this given period a cultic need pressed for an indigenous virgin-martyr, whose *vita* and *martyrium* could successfully compete with the host of Byzantine and Latin virgin-martyrs. Is it not possible that un-

¹ Visiting the ancient churches and monasteries in the Delta and the Valley of the Nile, one receives a standard reply from the country priests and villagers with respect to the date of construction of the respective sanctuary: “Built by St. Helena!” “The History of the Patriarchs of the Egyptian Church” does not mention the consecration of this church by Alexander, which means that at the time of the compilation of “The History of the Patriarchs”, the cult of Sitt Dimiana had not been established.

² The majority of the female saints in the Coptic Synaxarium are of non-Egyptian origin. And whereas there are numerous women who entered the ascetic life in the Egyptian deserts under the pretence of being monks and gained holiness, this practice was condemned by the Synod of Gangra in 345 A.D.
pleasant incidents and misunderstandings\textsuperscript{1} between the Greek monks and Coptic pilgrims might have led to a temporary prohibition for the Copts to visit the Monastery of St. Catherine? Unable, therefore, to venerate the relics of St. Catherine,\textsuperscript{2} the Copts established their own local cult of a virgin-martyr in competition to that of St. Catherine and encouraged its rapid spread throughout Egypt. The centre of the cult was placed in a region easily accessible to large numbers of pilgrims.\textsuperscript{3} Moreover, the introduction of apparitions and miracles supported the validity of the cult. From the testimony of the travellers we gather that the new cult depended very heavily upon the manifestations of the miraculous. WANSLEBEN (1672) says that after having for three days carefully watched the apparitions, which are alleged to take place at certain times in one of its chapels, he concluded that they were merely the shadows of passing objects. The chapel receives light through openings in its cupola, and a faint image of any one passing the church at a certain distance opposite these openings is thrown on the wall. If a man on horseback happens to pass, the superstitious congregation beholds its favourite St. George. If a woman passes with a child in her arms, the appearance of the Holy Virgin with Child is greeted.\textsuperscript{4} Also Fr. CLAUDE SICARD, who visited the Shrine in 1714, testified to the many miracles associated with the cult.\textsuperscript{5} In May 1863 the Reverend GULIAN LANSING attended the annual pilgrimage at the Shrine of Sitt Dimiana and referred to the “visions of celestial riders that could be seen within its doors”\textsuperscript{6} and S. H. LEEDER referred to Sitt Dimiana for her ability to give fruitfulness

\textsuperscript{1} The situation with respect to the privileges for non-Byzantine Christians to worship in the Monastery of St. Catherine was very similar to that in the churches of Jerusalem, which substantiates my assumption of ecclesiastical conflicts between the Chalcedonian and non-Chalcedonian communities in the 15th and 16th centuries.

\textsuperscript{2} Moreover, there exists the practice among Byzantine monks to exhibit their treasures only to members of their own community.

\textsuperscript{3} The Shrine of Sitt Dimiana is situated north of the town of Bilqas, 22 km from Mansūra in the Nile Delta. The Shrine appears like a large farm and has an outer and an inner court. The southern buildings enclose four churches, while the northern and western buildings are used to accommodate the numerous pilgrims.


\textsuperscript{6} LANSING, G., Egypt’s Princes. A Narrative of Missionary Labour in the Valley of the Nile. Philadelphia, 1864, pp. 376–408.
to barren women or long life to children of a woman who had lost many in infancy.\footnote{Leeder, S. H., Modern Sons of the Pharaohs. London, 1918, p. 136.}

There is further evidence that the cult of Sitt Dimiana did not spread throughout Egypt prior to the 16th or even the beginning of the 17th century. In the account of the churches and monasteries of Egypt by the 13th century topographer Abû’l-Makârim, not a single monastery or church is mentioned which is dedicated to Sitt Dimiana.\footnote{Evettis, B. T. A., The Churches and Monasteries of Egypt and some neighbouring countries attributed to Abû Salih the Armenian. Oxford, 1895.} Al-Maqrizi, the 15th century Islamic historian, lists altogether eighty-six monasteries and seventy-two churches in Egypt, though again not a single church or monastery was named after Sitt Dimiana.\footnote{Wüstenfeld, F., Maqrizi’s Geschichte der Copten. Göttingen, 1845.} In fact, \textit{Wansleben} may be one of the first witnesses to a cult in honour of the virgin-martyr when in 1672 he visited the Shrine.

With respect to the Coptic \textit{Synaxarium}, Sitt Dimiana is neither mentioned in the 14th century recension\footnote{Basset, R., MS. B, No. 4869–4870, known as the Theban recension, Patr. Orient. I, III, XI, XVI, XVII.} nor in the 16th century one.\footnote{Basset, R., MS. A, No. 256, Patr. Orient. I, III, XI, XVI, XVII.} True, the commemoration of her martyrdom on January 21 (Tûbah 13) is referred to in the 1936 edition of the \textit{Synaxarium}. The important feast in honour of this saint, however, is celebrated on May 20 (Bashuns 12), when the consecration of the Church of Sitt Dimiana is commemorated. But again, the mediaeval recensions of the \textit{Synaxarium} omit this commemoration and only the above-mentioned 1936 edition and A. Mai’s edition of 1825 include it.\footnote{Mai, A., \textit{Scripторum veterum nova collecti.} Rome, 1825.}

In the last two hundred years the cult of Sitt Dimiana has rapidly spread throughout Egypt as far south as Luxor. This is evident from the numerous churches and altars which are dedicated to the virgin-martyr. In my travels through the Nile Delta and Nile Valley I have come across the following churches bearing the name of Sitt Dimiana although, undoubtedly, there are others which are named after her. There is a new church (1953) in Alexandria; a church in Kafr ‘Abd ash-Shahîd, Kafr Sakr; a church in Mansûra; a church in Bûlaq, Cairo; a church in Kôm Bûha, Dairût; a church in Banûb Zahr al-Gamal, Dairût; a church in al-Awâna, al-Badarî, Asyût; a church in Timâ; a church in Akhmîm; a
church in Naqāda. The monastery which used to be known as the Dair Abū Musis west of al-Balyânā, is nowadays known as the Monastery of Sitt Dimiana. In Jerusalem, the Coptic primary and secondary school for girls is named after Sitt Dimiana.¹

Moreover, in several Coptic churches throughout the Nile Valley one discovers that one of the three, five or seven sanctuaries is dedicated to this saint. This is the case, for example, in the Monastery of St. Mercurius, Tammūah; in the Monastery of the Holy Virgin, Bayad an-Nasara opposite Beni Suef; the upper church at Apa Hor at Sawâda opposite Minya is named after St. Dimiana; so is the northern haikal of the Monastery of Naga’a ad-Dair opposite Girga. Moreover, the ancient church in the Monastery of St. Palamon at Qaṣr as-Sayād is dedicated to the virgin-martyr. In the Coptic desert monasteries her influence is negligible with the exception of the Monastery of St. Antony in the Eastern Desert, where one of the sanctuaries in the Church of SS. Peter and Paul is dedicated to Sitt Dimiana.

The relics of Sitt Dimiana are venerated only in her Shrine near Bilqas in the Nile Delta and in the following Coptic Churches in Cairo. In the Church of as-Saydah al-Mu’allaqah, Old Cairo, there is a wooden bolster with some relics on a shelf beneath the icon of Sitt Dimiana and her Forty Virgins on the east wall of the inner court of the Church. In the Church of the Holy Virgin Qaṣriat ar-Rihān, Old Cairo, we find that among the five bolsteres placed beneath the icon of the Holy Virgin on the south wall of the Church, there is one small bolster with some relics of Sitt Dimiana. In the Church of St. Barbara, Old Cairo, the bolster on the shelf beneath the icon of Sitt Dimiana in the Shrine of St. Barbara contains some relics of the saint. In the Church of the Holy Virgin, Hārat Zuwaylah, Cairo, there is a shrine with six bolsteres, two of which are said to contain relics of Sitt Dimiana; and finally in the Church of the Holy Virgin ad-Darag, Old Cairo, there are two bolsteres with relics beneath the icon of the Holy Virgin which are said to belong to Sitt Dimiana.

Since the 17th century the Shrine of Sitt Dimiana in Lower Egypt served as the centre of the cult of the saint, and we can be reasonably certain that a widespread cult did not exist prior to the 17th century. The early cartographers were quite particular and very careful to indicate the monasteries and ecclesiastical centres on their maps, but none

of the 17th century maps show the Shrine of Sitt Dimiana. For that matter, the Shrine of St. Gemiana (sic) is first mentioned on the 18th century map of Bourguignon d’Anville of 1765. In the 19th century, we find the site indicated on the maps of John Wallis (“A Map of the Mouths of the Nile with the scene of action in Egypt”) and Enouy. Furthermore, if an important Christian pilgrimage centre had existed in the 15th century, we can be assured that such mediaeval pilgrims as Felix Fabri, Breydenbach or Walther would have mentioned it. Their silence can be legitimately interpreted as evidence of the non-existence of the Shrine at their time.

4. The Iconography of Sitt Dimiana

In Coptic art, Sitt Dimiana appears relatively late on 18th and 19th century icons, which, however, are very numerous. As we shall demonstrate, the iconography lacks a standardized and canonical arrangement of Sitt Dimiana and her Forty Virgins as we find it with respect to other objects in early Coptic and Byzantine iconographic art. Thus, for example, the principal icon of Sitt Dimiana in the “old church” of her Shrine in the Nile Delta portrays the Virgin-martyr surrounded by Forty-eight Virgins. Upon inquiry I was told that the artist was interested in the symmetry of the icon and thus just added another eight virgins. Apart from the 20th century mural painting of Sitt Dimiana and her Forty Virgins in the northern aisle of the Church of SS. Peter and Paul in Abbassiyah, Cairo, there exists no wall-painting or fresco of the saint, neither ancient nor modern.

Today, many of the more important churches in Cairo and elsewhere have acquired icons of Sitt Dimiana and her Forty Virgins, and although there are some very recent paintings of the saint, most of the icons ought to be assigned to the late 18th or 19th century. In addition to those icons in the churches of the Shrine of Sitt Dimiana near Bilqas, we find the better-known icons of the saint in the following churches: The Church of St. George, Mit Damsis, Mit Ghamr; the Church of St. Macarius in the Dependency of the Monastery of St. Macarius, Atrak; the Church of al-Mu’allaqah, Old Cairo; the Churches of the Holy Virgin and St. Theodore, Ḥārat ar-Rūm, Cairo; the Church of the Holy Virgin, Ḥārat Zuwallah, Cairo; the Church of St. Menas, Fūm al-Khalīg, Cairo; the Church of St. Shenute, Old Cairo; the Church of St. Mercuriosk, Old Cairo; the Church of St. Barbara, Old Cairo. A large icon of the saint adorns the iconostasis of the Cathedral of St. Mark in Alexandria.
For the purpose of introducing the iconography of Sitt Dimiana, we have selected nine 18th–20th century icons representing Greek-Arabophone, Coptic official and Coptic popular art. A closer examination of the icons betrays the distinct individuality of the iconographers which is typical of late iconography as well as of the fact that no iconographical canon beyond the bare minimum was ever established. As the bare minimum iconographical standard we must note the central position of Sitt Dimiana who is always adorned with the crown of martyrdom holding in either her right or her left hand a cross and palm-branch. The Forty Virgins showing iconographical similarities to the principal saint are arranged around her according to the individual design of the iconographer.
No. 1. Sitt Dimiana is seated and holds in her right hand a hand-cross. The cross has twelve points. In her left hand she holds a palm branch, the symbol of spiritual victory over physical death. On her head, which is slightly turned to the left, she wears a coronet; and in the background on her right and left there are the twenty-two domes of the Shrine of Sitt Dimiana near Bilqas, which were seen by Fr. Claude Sicard, when he visited the Shrine in 1714.\(^1\) Each of the Forty Virgins wears a coronet and holds in the right hand a hand-cross and in the left hand a palm branch. The Forty Virgins are arranged around the centre picture of Sitt Dimiana. The miniatures of the four virgins portrayed above the centre picture show in addition four churches, though it is impossible to identify them. They may be the four churches dedicated to Sitt Dimiana.

\(^1\) Sicard, Claude, loc. cit.
and the Holy Virgin. The text of the Arabic inscription below the centre picture reads as follows:

"Picture of Sitt Dimiana (and) her Forty Virgin Companions. Reward, O Lord, him who toiled in Thy Kingdom. Year 1185 A. H."¹

No. 2. The icons Nos. 2, 3 and 4 are the work of the 19th century Greek iconographer Astasi ar-Rûmi (Eustathius the Greek) of Jerusalem.²

No. 2 shows Sitt Dimiana seated on a throne holding in her right hand a palm branch and in her left hand a cross. On her head she wears a nine-pointed coronet. Her face is turned to the left. Forty Virgins are ar-

¹ I.e. 1771 A.D.
² Eustathius the Greek (arabophone) of Jerusalem has painted many icons for Coptic churches and monasteries, e.g. a chalice ark in the Monastery of St. Macarius, Wâdi ’n-Natrûn, dated 1864; two icons of the Holy Virgin and Child in the Monastery of al-Muharraq, Upper Egypt, dated respectively 1842 and 1870/71 as well as the so-called "miraculous" icon in the Church of the Holy Virgin, Gebel ’t-Tair near Minya, dated 1838.
ranged around the centre picture of Sitt Dimiana. Each virgin is a miniature of the principal Saint. The virgins whose faces are turned to the left hold in the right hand the palm branch and in the left hand a cross, while those virgins whose face is turned to the right hold in the right hand a cross and in the left hand a palm branch. The centre picture is set in an architectural frame with two columns on either side. The capitals are ornamented with a design similar to that of the points of the coronet.\(^1\) A simple arch connects the columns. There are two Arabic subscriptions. The text below the main picture reads:

“"The holy martyr Sitt Gimiana (sic), dwelling in the deserts."

The other text at the bottom of the icon reads as follows:

“"Remember, O my Master, Jesus Christ, the teacher George Abú Sa’ad, the provider for the icon of Sitt Gimiana (sic). A \textit{waqf} to the Church of the

\(^1\) This type of coronet is typical for the paintings by Eustathius. His icons of the Holy Virgin with Child show the same coronet.
Lady, the Virgin Damshariyah in the lane... in Old Cairo¹. Reward, O Lord, him who toiled in Thy Kingdom. By the hand of the wretched Eustathius of Jerusalem, the Greek, the painter”.

No. 3. This icon portrays Sitt Dimiana seated on a carved throne holding in her right hand a hand-cross and in her left hand a palm branch. Her head is turned to the right,² and on her head she wears a nine-

¹ This is one of the ancient churches of Old Cairo, which was demolished by the order of Ali ibn Sulaiman, the Governor of Cairo, in 785 A.D., though rebuilt during the caliphate of Harūn ar-Rashid (786–809 A.D.). The name of the church “ad-Damshariyah” originates from the name of a Coptic notable who undertook the restoration of this church in the course of the 18th century.

² In most instances the iconographers paid special attention to have the saint turned to the cross. If she holds the cross in her left hand, her head would be turned to the left.
pointed coronet (cf. No. 2). Above her head there are portrayed three angels, two of whom hold in their hands a cross and a palm branch respectively. The centre picture is framed by two columns on either side with Corinthian capitals, and an arch rests on the columns. The Forty Virgins are grouped around the principal saint in twenty miniatures, two virgins to each miniature. They are crowned with five-pointed crowns holding in their hands a cross and a palm branch. The Arabic text above the centre picture reads:

"Picture of Sitt Timianah (sic) and the Forty Virgins Yu'ngahrat" (?)

No. 4. This icon is in many ways similar to No. 2. Sitt Dimiana is enthroned, and her head is turned to the left holding in her right hand a small palm branch and in her left hand a large cross. Iconographically, this large cross is reminiscent of the pictures of the Invention of the Holy Cross. On her head the saint wears a nine-pointed coronet, which, however, has been obliterated at a later time by a triangular ornamentation. Two columns with capitals frame the centre picture. The Forty Virgins are portrayed in forty miniatures of which fourteen are arranged above and below and six on either side of the centre picture. The Arabic text below the icon reads:
"Reward, O Lord, him who toiled in the Heavenly Kingdom. 1569 A.M.\(^1\) By the hand of the wretched Eustathius of Jerusalem, the Greek."

No. 5. This icon shows Sitt Dimiana seated holding in her left hand a twelve-pointed cross and in her right hand a palm branch. On her head she wears a coronet. The Forty Virgins are arranged around the centre icon clothed in the monastic habit and holding in the right or left hands respectively only a palm branch. We should assign this icon to the last quarter of the 18th century.

No. 6. This late 19th century icon of Sitt Dimiana portrays the saint standing and holding in her right hand a cross and in her left hand a palm branch. On her head she wears a coronet. In the background there is shown the Shrine of Sitt Dimiana in Bilqas with one large and five small domes surmounted by crosses. The frame of the picture of the

\(^1\) I.e. 1853.
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virgin-martyr is oval-shaped. The Forty Virgins holding in their hands a cross and a palm branch are arranged around the centre picture.

No. 7. This is another late 19th century icon of Sitt Dimiana seated on an elaborately decorated throne holding in her right hand a cross and in her left hand a palm branch. On her head she wears a nine-pointed coronet and her head is surrounded by a nimbus. The Forty Virgins
Fig. 9.
clothed in the monastic habit hold only a cross in their hands. They are arranged around the centre picture.

No. 8. This 20th century icon of Sitt Dimiana is representative of Coptic popular art. It was painted by W. Kamel. The saint has her head turned to the left and wears a coronet. In her right hand she holds a palm branch and in her left hand a cross. The Forty Virgins are arranged around the centre picture.¹

No. 9. This is one of the very few icons which portrays Sitt Dimiana with the wheel of torture, the iconographical symbol of St. Catherine. This icon is located in the Church of St. George in Minya, and should be assigned to the late 19th century. The virgin-martyr is seated on a throne holding in her right hand a palm branch. In her left hand, which rests on the wheel, she holds a cross. On her head she wears a nine-pointed coronet. The inscription is in Greek and the letters H APJA are still visible. The Forty Virgins are arranged around the centre picture in the same manner as in No. 4.

In the foregoing pages we hope to have established the following points pertaining to the identity and the cult of Sitt Dimiana.

1. The need for an indigenous virgin-martyr created a cult around a virgin-saint.

2. The hagiography of the saint follows closely the typical 4th century hagiologies of the Byzantine and Latin churches.

3. The emergence of the cult is relatively recent and should be assigned to the 16th or the 17th century.

4. The iconography of the saint does not follow a strict or well established canon.

5. In many ways this saint fulfills the cult-functions of St. Catherine of Alexandria.

¹ I have published this icon in "Monks and Monasteries of the Egyptian Deserts". Cairo, 1961, p. 339.
Demotische Ostraka aus ptolemäisch-römischer Zeit


In Bezug auf den Inhalt der Texte handelt es sich vorzugsweise um Bescheinigungen über in Bargeld und in natura erlegte Abgaben².

In der ersten Gruppe (Bargeldzahlungen) sind die folgenden Steuerarten vertreten: τέλος (Nr. I–II), Salzsteuer (Nr. III), Kopfsteuer (Nr. IV–VIII), Dammsteuer (Nr. IX–X), Badesteuer (Nr. X), Staats-Steuer (Nr. XI), Forderung des Staates (Nr. XII), Diener(?)-Steuer (Nr. XIII) und eine nicht spezifizierte Abgabe (Nr. XIV).

Die zweite Gruppe (Einzahlungen in natura), die drei Dokumente umfasst (Nr. XV–XVII), besteht aus Quittungen über Weizenlieferungen. Auch in den drei nächstfolgenden Dokumenten handelt es sich um Getreide (Weizen). Der Abfassung nach sind diese Texte als Verzeichnis über Weizenlieferungen (Nr. XVIII), Zummessung von Weizen (Nr. XIX) und Abrechnung über Weizen (Nr. XX) zu rubrizieren. Die letzten fünf Dokumente sind bis auf eine Warenrechnung (Nr. XXI) Abrechnungen über bzw. Naturalien (Nr. XXII), Bargeld (Nr. XXIII) und nicht angegebene Objekte (Nr. XXIV–XXV).

¹ Photos: Staatliche Museen zu Berlin.
² Die Lesung der vorkommenden griechischen Aufschriften verdanke ich Herrn Prof. Leiv Amundsen.
I. DO Berlin 9708.

Abgaben in Bargeld

Steuer (τέλος)


Transkription
1. ḫā.t-sp 9 ḫp-htp(?)[s] P3-tj-Hr-m-ḥb(?) ḫt 14 šh Pa-Wm-nfr
2. [n] ḫā.t-sp 9 ṭpj šm(?) sw 2 šh P3-šr-Imn[s] S3-n-Wsr t ḫt 14
3. n ḫā.t-sp 9 ṭpj šm(?) sw 2

Übersetzung
1. Die Steuer für Jahr 9. Hapihotep(?), (Sohn) des Petchoremheb(?),
   14 Silberlinge. Es hat geschrieben Pauennofre
2. (im) Jahr 9, am 2. Payne(?). Es hat geschrieben Pshenamun, (Sohn)
   des Senuser, in Bezug auf 14 Silberlinge
3. im Jahr 9, am 2. Payne(?).

Bemerkungen

Z. 1. Das Wort tnj „Steuer“ liegt hier in einer von den üblichen Schreibungen stark abweichenden Form vor. Der Artikel (masc.) spricht aber dafür, dass es sich um das betreffende Wort handelt. — Der Name
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II. DO Berlin 9650.

Hr-ḥtp, Hapihotep (wörtl. „Apis ist gnädig“) ist m. W. früher nicht belegt.


— Das Datierungsjahr bezicht sich auf entweder Ptolemaios III. Euergetes I. 9 (= Jahr 239/38 v. Chr.) oder Ptolemaios IV. Philopator 9 (= Jahr 214/13 v. Chr.).

II. DO Berlin 9650. Grösse: 6,7 x 5,3 cm. Theben(?). Wahrscheinlich 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.

Transkription

1. ḫr-m-ḥḥ [sš³]f Pš³-sn-2 tb³ 3 1/2
2. ṭj = ṭnḥ ⟨n⟩ ḫḥ-2 ṣm ṣḥ ṭḥwtj-mn
3. ḫḥ-3 ṣm sw 24

Übersetzung

1. Horemheb, Sohn des Psensneu, 3 1/2 Obol,
2. seine Steuer (für) Payne. Es hat geschrieben Thothmen
Bemerkungen


Dass das Sigel ḫ, ḫ (ptol.) bzw. ḫ (röm.) geschrieben, als Bezeichnung für die Münzeineinheit Obol ist hier th² transkribiert. Die Lesung hmt, welche früher für sowohl „Kupfer“ als für „Obol“ bzw. „1 Obol“ verwendet worden ist, bleibt nur in Bezug auf die erste Be- deutung, d. h. „Kupfer“, in Geltung. Matthäus hat diese Tatsache in seiner Berichtigungsliste Notes and Remarks on Matthäus „Demotic Ostraka“ hervorgehoben und hat für „Obol“ bzw. „1 Obol“ die Lesung ṣ.t vorgeschlagen, welche Lesung er auf das hierogl. Wort ṣ t (WB 4, S. 418:4) zurückführen will. Das Sigel ist „the forearm with hand holding stick and the fem. t“. Das Sigel ist in der betreffenden Urkunde ḫ geschrieben. Obwohl die Lesung ṣ.t möglich sein könnte, wofür die Femininendes dem Sigel folgenden Zahlzeichens zu sprechen scheint, dürfte aber die von Hughes vorgeschlagene Transkription th², welches Wort das kopt. ṭaũe „Obol“ entspricht, am wahrscheinlichsten sein. Das Sigel ist die demotische Wiedergabe der Hieroglyphe ḫ, welche in der angeführten Form erscheint.

Z. 2. Wegen der Auslassung des Datierungsjahres ist eine nähere Zeitbestimmung nicht möglich zu geben.

Salzsteuer

III. DÖ Wien 129. Grösse: 12,2 × 9,8 cm. Theben. 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr.

Transkription

1. ṭn Ta-p₂-ḥ (? t) ḡm t šbj kt |<n> ḡt <n> ḡm
2. <n> ḡ₂.t-s p 3 šh Pa-Thwšt-ḥ (? <n> ḡ₂.t-s p 3 ḡt-2 šm sw 10
3. šh ṭs-šn šn ḡ₂-p₂-hr.t ž t |<n> ḡm <n> ḡ₂.t-s p 3 ḡt-2 šm sw 10

Griech. Text: ἐξηρωγραφήσεν

ῥόδων Λ

1 Bulletin of the Faculty of Arts, Cairo University, Vol. XVIII, Part 2, 1956, Cairo 1959, S. 59 ff.
2 Durch briefliche Mitteilung. Vgl. auch Pierce, Notes on Obols and Agios in Demotic Papyri (JE A 51, 1965, S. 155 ff.).
Übersetzung

1. Es hat bezahlt Tapooh(?), die Frau des Shebti, \(1/4\) (Silber)-Kite (als) Salzsteuer

Griech. Text: Eigenhändig verbürgt hat Herodon (für) \(1/2\) (Drachme)

Bemerkungen

Z. 1. Noch eine dieser Frau ausgestellte, vom Jahr 4 datierende Salzsteuerquittung ist von Matthäa veröffentlicht (Demotic Ostraka, Nr. 134).

Z. 2–3. Die Schreiber Pa-\textit{Thotj-\textit{Iph}}(?) Pathothiah(?), und Esmin

\(^1\) Der Steuerbetrag \(1/4\) (Silber)-Kite ist in Drachmen umgerechnet.
(S. des Enchpekhrat) erscheinen auch bei MATTHA. Der Name des erst-
genannten ist dort Pa-Thutj-p²-I[h] (?) geschrieben. — Jahr 3 kann ent-
weder Ptolemaios III. Euergetes I. 3 (= Jahr 245/44 v. Chr.) oder Pto-
lemaios IV. Philopator 3 (= Jahr 220/19 v. Chr.) sein.

Kopfsteuer

IV. DO BM 12614. Grösse: 9,3 x 7,5 cm. Theben (Karnak). Jahr 9/8 v. Chr.

Transkription
1. r.wj Lsjmsks s³ 3plw r
2. p² sḥn ḫr p² ḫt n ḫ.t n ḫ³.t-sp 22.t strr 2.t ḫn ḫ t 1
3. sḥ n ḫ³.t-sp 22.t n Gjsrs tpj ʾsm sw 17
4. sḥ 3pjkrts s³ Gphls

Übersetzung
1. Es hat bezahlt Lysimakos, Sohn des Apollo(?), an
2. die Bank für die Kopfsteuer des Jahres 22: 2 Stater und 1 Kite.
4. Es hat geschrieben Epikrates, Sohn des Kephalos.
V. DO BM 19994.

Bemerkungen

Z. 1. Lysimakos ist wahrscheinlich identisch mit dem in DO Uppsala 1451/1 (Jahr 4/3 v. Chr.) und DO BM 12579/1 (Jahr 1/2 n. Chr.) vorkommenden Steuerzahler gleichen Namens [S. des Apollo(?)]


V. DO BM 19994. Grösse: 13 x 12,3 cm. Theben (Karnak). Jahr 7/6 v. Chr.

Transkription

1. r.w₂ Hrj s۶ Hr₁ sn-I s r p₃ š hm
2. ḫr p₃ ḫt ñ p.t n h₃.t-sp 2₄ t str 2 t ḫn³ ẖt 1 š h n h₃.t-sp 2₄ t

VI. DO Berlin 6453.

3. n Gjsrs ḫbt-|= ṣm sw 20
4. ṣḥ ṣpjkrts [ṣ  Gph]vs

Übersetzung

1. Es hat bezahlt Herieu, Sohn des Harsene, an die Bank
2. für die Kopfsteuer des Jahres 24: 2 Stater und 1 Kite. Geschrieben im Jahr 24
3. des Cäsar, am 20. Mesore.

Bemerkungen


Transkription

1. ṭ.wt Pš-mnh sḥ Pš-ḥr-Īmn r pš šrn hr ṭt ⟨n⟩ ṣ.t
2. ⟨n⟩ ḫš.t-sp 36 sttr 2 t ṭt 1 šh n ḫš.t-sp 36 n Gjsrs
3. ḫbt-|= ṣm sw 2 šḥ Pš-tj-Īmn-ipj ⟨ṣ⟩ Gphls
Übersetzung

1. Es hat bezahlt Pemench, Sohn des Pshenamun, an die Bank für Kopfsteuer
2. des Jahres 36: 2 Stater 1 Kite. Geschrieben im Jahr 36 des Cäsar,
3. am 2. Epiphe(?). Es hat geschrieben Peteamenope, (Sohn) des Kephalos.

Bemerkungen

Z. 3. Der Schreiber Peteamenope (S. des Kephalos) erscheint bei MATHA, Demotic Ostraka, Nr. 36 (Kopfsteuer. Jahr 36 des Cäsar.).
Mit grösster Wahrscheinlichkeit ist Peteamenope ein Bruder des Epikrates und des Piko, welche vom Jahr 9 v. Chr. bis an Jahr 16 n. Chr.
bzw. vom Jahr 3 v. Chr. bis an Jahr 22 n. Chr. an der Bank in Theben
amtierten (vgl. WÄNGSTEDT, a. A., S. 13 f.).
VIII. DO Wien 50.

VII. DO BM 12601. Grösse: 7,6 x 7,3 cm. Theben (Karnak). Jahr 10/11 n. Chr.

Transkription
1. r.w.t P:3-ij-Hasu s; Pa-n3-nht.(w)? r P:3 shn
2. hr P:3 ht n 3p.t n h3.t-sp 39 strr 2.t h3n kt 1 sh n h3.t-sp 39
3. n Gjsr ibt-3 šm sw 23 šh P:3-j-k3
4. s3 Gphls

Übersetzung
1. Es hat bezahlt Petechons, Sohn des Panechate(?), an die Bank
2. für die Kopfsteuer des Jahres 39: 2 Stater und 1 Kite. Geschrieben im Jahr 39
3. des Cäsar, am 23. Mesore. Es hat geschrieben Piko,
4. Sohn des Kephalos

Bemerkungen
VIII. DO Wien 50. Grösse: 11,6 \times 10,6 \text{ cm}. Theben. Jahr 52 n. Chr.

Transkription

1. Ns-n\dagger j = w-Hmn-tw s: P\dagger 2-sr-Imn-tpj irm P\dagger 2-sr-Hnsw s: P\dagger 2-tj-njr-htp
   n\dagger 2 ntj dd n
2. 3 sn.wv s: P\dagger 3 Ij 2-twv = n mh n str 2.t i\nu p\dagger j = k ht n
3. p.t n h\dagger 2.t-ss [12] n Tjbrjs Glwjs
4. Gjsrs Sbts Grmnjs
5. ãtwyrter d'b 4 pr sw 27 sh 1 mn-rw\dagger s
6. P\dagger 2-sr-Hnsw r hrw = w n h\dagger 2.t-ss 12

Übersetzung

1. Esnachomneu, Sohn des Pshenanomenope, und Pshenchons, Sohn des Petenehotep, sind es, die sagen zu
2. Khemtsneu, dem Sohn des Palil: „Wir sind vollbezahlt mit 2 Stater von deiner
4. Cäsar Sebastos Germanikos
5. Autokrator, am 27. Pharmuthie. „Es hat geschrieben Amunrash, Sohn
6. des Pshenchons, auf ihr Geheiss, im Jahr 12.

Bemerkungen

Z. 1–2. Sowohl die Erheber als der Steuerzahler sind bei Matthä
belegt (Demotic Ostraka, Nr. 66. Kopfsteuer. Claudius 7.). — Der Name
P\dagger 2-tj-njr-htp, Petenehotep, ist dort P\dagger 2-tj-njr-htp geschrieben.
Z. 5–6. Amenrash (S. des Pshenchons) hat auch das von Matthä ver-
öffentlichte Dokument geschrieben. — Jahr 12 des Claudius = Jahr
52 n. Chr.

Dammsteuer

IX. DO Wien 63. Grösse: 9,2 \times 5,6 \text{ cm}. Theben. Jahr 21/22 n. Chr.

Transkription

Griech. Text (umgekehrt): ἡφεσσων ζ φανηξίζης
1. r.wt P\dagger 2-sn-2 s: Pa-irj r p\dagger 2 shn ht \langle n \rangle nbj
2. n h\dagger 2.t-ss 7 str 2 k\l 1 bâ 4 irm wt r h\l tbâ 1 1/2 sh \langle n \rangle h\dagger 2.t-ss 8 t
3. \langle n \rangle Tbjrs Gsrs ntj hwj p\dagger z ibt
4. n-mâj ntj hwj sw rkJ sh âintrus
5. \langle s \rangle P\dagger 3-j-kâ
Übersetzung
1. Es hat bezahlt Psensneu, Sohn des Paere, an die Bank Dammsteuer
2. für Jahr 7: 2 Stater 1 Kite 4 Obolen, mit Zuschlag gemäss 1 1/2 Obo-
len. Geschrieben im Jahr 8
3. des Tiberius Cäsar Augustus, in dem neuen
4. ehrwürdigen Monat, Tag 30. Es hat geschrieben Andrus,
5. (Sohn) des Piko.

Bemerkungen
Z. 1. ḫt (n) nbj „Dammsteuer“: Über diese Abgabe vgl. MATTHÄ, Demotie Ostraka, S. 51 ff.

Bade- und Dammsteuer
X. DO BM 43560. Grösse: 11 × 9,6 cm. Theben (Karnak). Jahr 11/10
v. Chr.

Transkription
1. r.in Gmt s3 ʾj-m-ḥtp s3 Pa-Mnt
2. r pš šhn ḫr ṭs t-st-iwən
3. n ḫt-sp 20 t ʾkt 1/2 r ʾkt 1/4 r ḫt 1/2 n n ḫr (ḥt) (n) nbj ḫt 1/2 ṭb 5.t
4. ṭb 5.t ʾkt 1/2 r ḫt 1/2 ṭb 5.t ṭn šh n ḫt-sp 20 t ibl-3 šm sw 20
Übersetzung

1. Es hat bezahlt Gemt, Sohn des Imhotep, des Sohnes des Pamonth,
2. an die Bank für das Bad
3. des Jahres 20: 1/2 Kite, ihre Hälfte macht 1/4 Kite = 1/2 Kite wiederrum; ebenfalls für Dammsteuer: 1/2 Kite 5 Obolen,
4. ihre Hälfte macht 5 1/2 Obolen = 1/2 Kite 5 Obolen wiederum. Ge-
schrieben im Jahr 20, am 20. Epiphe.

Bemerkungen

Z. 2. s.t-ıwen „das Bad“, als Bezeichnung für Badesteuer. Über diese
Abgabe vgl. Mattha, Demotie Ostraka, S. 57 f.
„Obol“ vgl. Nr. II/1, Bem.

Staatssteuer

XI. DO BM 19524. Grösse: 10,1 × 6,2 cm. Theben (Karnak). Jahr 30/31
n. Chr.
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XI. DO BM 19524.

Transkription
1. r.wt Llw s: Pa-irj r p: shtn p: tnj Pr.
2. n h.t-sp 15 kt 1 tb 3 r k 1 2/1 1 2 r kt 1 tb 3 irm wt r h tb 1 1/2
3. sh n h.t-sp 17 Tbro Gsrjs nfr hujj ibt-2 sb sw 19
4. [sh] ḫntrws
5. <s> P: jk

Übersetzung
1. Es hat bezahlt Lilu, Sohn des Paere, an die Bank die Staatssteuer
2. für Jahr 15: 1 Kite 3 Obolen, (ihre Hälfte macht) 1/2 (Kite) 1 1/2
   Obolen = 1 Kite 3 Obolen, mit Zuschlag gemäß 1 1/2 Obolen.
4. [Es hat geschrieben] Andrus,
5. (Sohn) des Piko.

Bemerkungen

Forderung des Staates

XII. DO W 140\(^1\). Grösse: 10,6 × 8,5 cm. Theben. Jahr 7/6 v. Chr.

Transkription

1. \( r.wf \ H^c-Hr(\text{?}) \ s\text{\^{}} Thwjt-stm r \ p\text{\^{}} \ shn \)
2. \( h\text{\^{}} \ swn \ sw \ n \ mt \ Pr-\text{\^{}} \ n \ p\text{\^{}} \ sm \ n \ h\text{\^{}} t-sp \ 23.t \ sw^3 \)
3. \( [\text{\^{}}D] \ 1/3 \ st.tr \ 3.t \ kt \ 1/2 \ sh \ n \ h\text{\^{}} t-sp \ 24 \ n \ Gjsr\)
4. \( [\text{ibt-}2] \ sm^3 \ sw^3 \ [s\text{\^{}}] \ sh \ \text{\^{}} \ sh\text{\^{}} \ text{pikrts} \ s\text{\^{}} \ Gphls \)

Übersetzung

1. Es hat bezahlt Chahor(?), Sohn des Thothsotem, an die Bank

\(^1\) Im Jahr 1967 in Kairo erworben.
2. für (den) Wert des Weizens der Forderung des Staates in Bezug auf
die Ernte des Jahres 23: Weizen
3. 4 1/3 (Artaben) (macht) 3 Stater 1/2 Kite. Geschrieben im Jahr 24
des Cäsar,

Bemerkungen

des Staates” vgl. Matthäa, Demotic Ostraka, S. 49. — sw 4 1/3 strr 3:t kt
1/2 ,,Weizen 4 1/3 (Artaben) (macht) 3 Stater 1/2 Kite”’. Chahor(?), der
als staatliche Abgabe 4 1/3 Artaben Weizen einliefern soll, zahlt den
entsprechenden Wert in Bargeld. Dieser beläuft sich auf 1 1/2 Kite pro
Artabe, und dürfte der für das betreffende Jahr festgestellte Preis sein
(vgl. Matthäa, Demotic Ostraka, Nr. 83). — Jahr 24 des Cäsar (Augustus)
= Jahr 7/6 v. Chr.

Z. 4. Zu dem Schreiber Epikrates (S. des Kephalos) vgl. Nr. IV/4,
Bem.

Diener(?)-Steuer

XIII. DO BM 5712. Grösse: 8,3 × 5 cm. Oberägypten. Ptolemäische
Zeit.

Transkription

1. in İmn-htp ś: Pa-rṯ
2. kt ı n hte ⟨n⟩ bk n h₃:t-sp 12
XIV. DO BM 43621.

3. sh Thwtj-ir-rh = s ⟨n⟩ h₂ t-sp 12
4. ḫbt-4 ḫ sw 24

Übersetzung

1. Es hat bezahlt Amenhotep, Sohn des Paret,
2. 1 Kite für Diener(?)-Steuer für Jahr 12.
3. Es hat geschrieben Thetharrehe(s) (im) Jahr 12,
4. am 24. Thoth.

Bemerkung


Geldeinzahlung

XIV. DO BM 43621. Grösse: 8,8 × 6,6 cm. Oberägypten. Ptolemäische Zeit.

Transkription

1. in ḫmn-ḥtp sʒ ḫr ḫt-ḥt 4 ⟨r⟩ sṭtr 2 ⟨r⟩
2. \(<ht>\)-kt 4 'n [sh] \(\text{\AA}j\)-\(\text{\AA}\)tp n \(\text{\AA}\text{\AA}t\)-sp 22.t ibt-4 \(\text{s}\)m(?) sw 11 sh
3. \(\text{Pr-\text{\AA}m}\)m n \(\text{\AA}\text{\AA}t\)-sp 22 ibt-4 \(\text{s}\)m(?) sw 11

Übersetzung

1. Es hat bezahlt Amenhotep, Sohn des Hor, 4 Silber-Kite (=) 2 Stater (=)
2. 4 (Silber)-Kite wiederum. Es hat geschrieben Imhotep im Jahr 22, am 11. Mesore(?). Es hat geschrieben
3. Pakhnum im Jahr 22, am 11. Mesore(?).

Bemerkungen


Quittung über Weizen

XV. DO Berlin 8757. Grösse: 8,7 \(\times\) 7,3 cm. Gebelên. Jahr 93/92 v. Chr.

Transkription

1. ...
2. \([r]\) \([p]\) \(\text{\AA}n\) \(\text{Pr-\text{\AA}t-\text{\AA}r}\)

\(^1\) Scherbe aus Kalkstein.
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3. hr p³ s³ n h³.t-sp 22 sw 1'2
4. r 1'4 r sw 1'2 'n st śp n ip
5. s'h Pa-t³-s.t-³.t n h³.t-sp 22
6. iht-2 śm sw 9

Übersetzung

1. ...
2. [an] den Thesaurus (in) Pathyris
3. für die Ernteabgabe des Jahres 22: 1/2 (Artabe) Weizen,
4. ihre Hälfte macht 1/4 = 1/2 (Artabe) Weizen wiederum. Sie ist gut-
geschrieben.
5. Es hat geschrieben Patseo im Jahr 22,

Bemerkungen


Quittung über Weizen

XVI. DO Berlin 892. Grösse: 9,8 × 9,7 cm. Theben. Jahr 6/7 n. Chr.

Transkription

1. r in Pa-Wn s³ Hr <n> tr.t Hr-s³-I s
2. r p³ r³ n n³ śh.(w) n ntr n ...
3. n h³.t-sp 35 sw 7 1/2 1/4 r sw 3 1/4 1/8
4. r sw 7 1/2 1/4 'n n h³j n ijp.t
5. <n> wš n śp šh n h³.t-sp 35 iht-4 śm sw 5
6. s'h Mn-k³-R³ s³ Pa-Db³
7. n h³.t-sp 35 iht-4 śm sw 5

¹ Rec. de Trav. 31, 1909, S. 102.
² ZÄS 42, 1905, S. 50.
Übersetzung

1. Es hat bezahlt Pauon, Sohn des Hor, durch Harsiese
2. an den Thesaurus für die Äcker des Gottes in ...
4. = 7 3/4 (Artaben) Weizen wiederum, mit dem Οιων-(Mass),
6. Es hat geschrieben Menkare, Sohn des Padjeme,

Bemerkungen

Z. 2. 3h(w) n ntr „Äcker des Gottes“ als Bezeichnung des den Tempeln gehörigen Ackerlandes.
Z. 4. Der Οιων(-Mass) entsprach in ptolemäischer Zeit, nach der Einführung einer neuen Teilung der Artabe, 1/6 Artabe.
Z. 7. Jahr 35 = Augustus 35 = Jahr 6/7 n. Chr.
Quittung über Weizen


Transkription
1. ḫt-sp 39 ⟨n⟩ Gjsrs ibt-2 pr
2. sw 21 wt Pǎ-bk s; Pǎ-‘f
3. $\sigma$ Sus $\delta$m n Th; sw 1
4. ḫt-sp 39 ibt-2 pr sw 21 sw 1

Übersetzung
1. Jahr 39 des Cäsar, Mechir,
2. Tag 21. Es hat bezahlt Pebek, Sohn des Peat,

Bemerkungen
Z. 2. Dieser Pebek (S. des Peat) erscheint in mehreren Quittungen aus Edfu, die meisten unveröffentlicht. In zwei von Matthä publizierten (Demotic Ostraka, Nr. 40 und Nr. 40A) ist nur in der ersten das Zeichen für „Sohn“ ausgeschrieben (vor dem Namen Sus). In dem vorliegenden Dokument steht das Zeichen auch vor dem Namen Pǎ-‘f, weshalb es sich um zwei verschiedene Namen handelt und nicht, wie Matthä vermutete, um einen zusammengesetzten Namen (Pǎ-bk-Pǎ-‘f).

Verzeichnis über Weizenlieferungen

XVIII. DO Berlin 6570. Grösse: 10,2 x 8,7 cm. Theben. Römische Zeit.

Transkription

1. ibt-3 šm sw 13 r p3 r
2. <n> Pr.3 N.t Ḥr-wd(1)
3. si 1mn-htp rtb n sw 3
4. sw 18 r p3 r <n> Pr.3 r Pr-Mnt
5. ... si P3-wr-ḥbt sw 1 1/2
6. sw 20 r p3 r <n> Pr.3 n N.t
7. P3-wr-ḥbt sw 1
8. wn n3 j rtb n sw 5 1/2

Übersetzung

2. des Königs in Theben: Haruodj(3),
3. Sohn des Amenhotep, 3 Artaben Weizen;
4. am 18. An den Speicher des Königs in Hermontis:
5. ..., Sohn des Pueriebt, 1 1/2 (Artaben) Weizen;
6. am 20. An den Speicher des Königs in Theben:
8. Sie sind (da) diese 5 1/2 Artaben Weizen.

Bemerkungen


Z. 5. Der Schreibung nach sw 1/2 „1/2 (Artabe) Weizen“ zu lesen. Der letzte senkrechte Strich in \( \gamma \omega \) sw „Weizen“ steht aber hier und in der folgenden Zeile auch für die Ziffer 1.

Zumessung von Weizen

1. ....
2. ....
3. ....
4. ḫ3.t-sp 2 íbt-3 pr sw 8 ḫ3j <r> P3-tj-Wsír
5. s3 Hwn p3 hp n p3 wn n <n3> pr.w n p3 šm
6. <n> ḫ3.t-sp 2 pr.w sw 9 1/6 sh Hj₃rgl(?)
7. sh P3-tj-Hr-sm3-t3.wj s3 P3-šr-1ḥj sw 9 1/6
8. r ḫ p3 nτj sh ḫrj

Übersetzung

1. ....
2. ....
3. ....
4. Im Jahr 2, am 8. Phamenoth ist zugemessen Petausire,
5. dem Sohn des Hune, das Recht des Getreideanteils der Ernte
   Hj₃rgl(?).
7. Es hat geschrieben Pethaharemntou, Sohn des Pshenihi: Weizen 9 1/6
   (Artabben)
8. gemäss dem, was oben geschrieben ist.

Bemerkungen

Z. 5. ḫ3 hp n p3 wn n <n3> pr.w n p3 šm „das Recht des Getreide-
anteils der Ernte“. Der Ausdruck ist wohl so zu verstehen, dass Pe-
tausire als Pächter oder als Verpächter seinen Anteil des geernteten Ge-
treides (im letzteren Falle den Pachtzins) erhalten hat.

Z. 6. Jahr 2 ist entweder Ptolemaios IX. Soter II. 2 (= Jahr 116/15
v. Chr.) oder Auletes 2 (= Jahr 80/79 v. Chr.). Die erste Alternative
scheint mir die wahrscheinlichste zu sein.

Z. 8. P3-šr-1ḥj, Pshenihi (wörtl. „der Sohn des Ihi“). Der Gott Ihi ist
als Sohn der Hathor von Dendera und des Horus von Edfu in dem er-
genannten Ort heimisch. Diese Tatsache deutet ihrerseits darauf hin,
dass Dendera den Herkunftsort des Dokuments sein könnte.

Abrechnung über Weizen

XX. DO BM 31283. Größe 8 x 7,2 cm. Oberägypten. Römische Zeit.

Transkription

1. P3-šr-Mn <s3> ...  ṛḥ <n> sw 1 1/6
XX. DO BM 31283.

2. P²-sr-Thwtj [s³] Hr-hj(?) rtb ⟨n⟩ sw 1 1/6
3. P²-tj-Wsir s³ Pa-n³-nḥt.t.w rtb ⟨n⟩ sw 1 1/6
4. P²-sr-Mn ⟨s³⟩ P²-tj-Mn rtb ⟨n⟩ sw 1 1/6

Übersetzung

1. Pshemin, (Sohn) des ..., 1 1/6 Artaben Weizen.
2. Pshenthoth, [Sohn] des Harbi(?), 1 1/6 Artaben Weizen.
3. Petensire, Sohn des Panechate, 1 1/6 Artaben Weizen.
4. Pshemin, (Sohn) des Petemin, 1 1/6 Artaben Weizen.

Bemerkungen


Warenrechnung

XXI. DO A 51. Grösse: 9,5 × 9,5 cm. Oberägypten. Jahr 120/19 v. Chr.

Transkription

1. h₂.t-sp 51 n³ nkt.w ntj iw= w wh³ n ibt-2 pr sw 11 wp.t
2. tm(t) w⁺ t ht 1 kt 5 (supra lin.) wj n 'r' 1 ht 1 kt 5 (supra lin.) dp
   3 ht 1 kt 5 (supra lin.)
3. "t; 1 ḫt 12 ḫt 5 (supra lin.) ḫt ḫt 10 ḫb ḫt 1/2
4. ḫm; 1/6 [ḥt] (i) 16 (supra lin.) ḫḏb ḫt 4 ḫh ḫ
5. ḫt 15 ḫlm ḫt [15] ṣr
6. ḫt 6 ḫršn 1/6 ḫt 5 ... ḫt 1
7. rtb ⟨n⟩ ḫḏj 10 ḫt 7 ḫt 5
8. n; wn.w ḫt 10 ḫ; sp ḫw
9. ḫt 20
10. [r ḫt] '126'

Übersetzung

2. eine Matte 1 Silberling 5 (Silber)-Kite (supra lin.); ein Kübelschrank
   1 Silberling 5 (Silber)-Kite (supra lin.); drei Schalen 1 Silberling
   5 (Silber)-Kite (supra lin.);
Demotische Ostraka aus ptolemäisch-römischer Zeit

3. ein Esel ... 12 Silberlinge 5 (Silber)-Kite (supra lin.); Holz 10 Silberlinge; Honig 1/2 Silberling;
4. Salz 1/6 (Artabe) 16 [Silberlinge] (?) (supra lin.); ḡḏḥ.-Frucht 4 Silberlinge; Öl
5. 15 Silberlinge; ein Kranz [15] (Silberlinge); ṻw'
6. 6 Silberlinge; Linsen 1/6 (Artabe) 5 Silberlinge; ... 1 Silberling;
7. ḍḏ 10 Artaben 7 Silberlinge 5 (Silber)-Kite;
8. die Schreinöfner 10 Silberlinge. Die übrigen Unkosten
9. 20 Silberlinge;
10. [macht] 126 [Silberlinge].

**Bemerkungen**

Z. 1. Jahr 51 = Ptolemaios VIII. Euergetes II. 51 (= Jahr 120/19 v. Chr.).


Z. 4. ḥm3 1/6 „Salz 1/6“. Man hat sich hier die Artabe als Mass hinzudenken, und die Quantität entspricht dem Scheffel (وها), eine Fraktion der Artabe. — ḡḏḥ, wahrscheinlich eine Art Frucht oder Kraut.

Z. 5–6. Ṽr, griech. ḡpox, eine Hülsenfrucht. (Vgl. SCHNEBEL, Die Landwirtschaft im hellenistischen Ägypten, S. 185 ff.) — Ṣrশn 1/6 „Linsen 1/6“. Zu dem Masse vgl. Z. 4, Bem.

Z. 7. ḍḏ, wahrscheinlich eine Art Frucht o. ä.

Z. 10. Von der Summe ist das Zeichen für „100“ deutlich erkennbar.
Abrechnung über Öl verschiedener Art nebst anderen Erzeugnissen

XXII. DO BM 66325. Grösse: 7,7 × 7,6 cm. Abydos\textsuperscript{1}. Römische Zeit.

Transkription

1. nh\(h\) n m\(m\)\(\textup{3}\) 1/4; nh\(h\) n tkm
2. 1/8 ... kt 4.t ibj 1/16(?)
3. hl kt 2.t mnh kt 8.t m\(h\)
4. kt 4.t tp.t kt 3.t \(\textup{t}\)
5. ntm kt 4.t smf kt 4.t

Übersetzung

1. Echtes Öl 1/4; tkm-Öl
2. 1/8; ... 4 Kite; Honig 1/16(?);
3. Mürrha 2 Kite; Wachs 8 Kite; Salböl
4. 4 Kite; tp.t.-Öl 3 Kite; Süßes
5. Fett 4 Kite; Augenschminke 4 Kite.

\textsuperscript{1} Aus dem Scheingrab des Seti I. (Eg. Expl. Soc., Mem. 39:2, Pl. 93:8.)
Bemerkungen


Abrechnung

XXIII. DO BM 12464. Grösse: 8,2 × 5,8 cm. Oberägypten. Römische Zeit.

Transkription

1. krkr I (ht) 240

1 Möglicherweise Elephantine.

7 – 693290 Orientalia Suecana. Vol. XVIII
2. Smn3 krkr 1 ū 10
3. Bji-nḫ ūt 145
4. Tšš-r.t-ns-mtr 〈ūt〉 130
5. 〈r〉 krkr 1 〈ūt〉 275

Übersetzung

1. Ein Talent 240 (Silberlinge).
2. Semne: ein Talent 10 Silberlinge.
4. Tshenesmet: 130 (Silberlinge).
5. Summe ein Talent 285 (Silberlinge).

Bemerkungen

Z. 2. Smn3, Semne, griech. Σεμνη.


Z. 5. Vor dem Wort krkr „Talent“, das hier in abgekürzter Schreibung erscheint, ist das Zeichen für „Summe“ zu ergänzen. Auch das Zeichen für „Silberling“ ist, wie in Z. 1 und Z. 4, ausgelassen. In der Schluss-Summe — zum grössten Teil ausgetilgt — sind die Beträge in Z. 2, 3 und 4 zusammengezählt,
Abrechnung

XXIV. DO Wien 329. Grösse: 10 × 6,2 cm. Oberägypten. Römische Zeit(?).

Transkription

1. sw 14 P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{hm} s\textsuperscript{3} Hr-\textit{kn} 1
2. P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{hr}-\textit{hj} s\textsuperscript{3} P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{bj} 2
3. P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{hr} s\textsuperscript{3} \textit{pjkrts} 1
4. P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{hm} s\textsuperscript{3} Pa-hj s\textsuperscript{3} \textit{ask\textsuperscript{3}s} 2
5. P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{tj}-Hr-sm\textsuperscript{2}-\textit{wj} s\textsuperscript{3} Pa-t\textsuperscript{2}.wj p\textsuperscript{3} \textit{hm} 1

Übersetzung

1. Tag 14. Peakhem, Sohn des Harken, 1
2. Pshenihi, Sohn des Pebo, 2
3. Phatre, Sohn des Epikrates, 1
4. Peakhem, Sohn des Pachi, des Sohnes des Askas. 2
5. Peteharsemtou, Sohn des Patou des Jüngerer, 1

Bemerkungen

Z. 3. Die Schreibung des Namens P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{hr}, Phatre (wörtl. „der Zwilling“) ist ungewöhnlich.

Z. 4. \textit{ask\textsuperscript{3}s}, Askas, griech. Ασκαζ. Ασκαζ.

Z. 5. Für die Lesung Pa-t\textsuperscript{2}.wj, Patou, vgl. die Schreibung des Wortes t\textsuperscript{2}.wj in dem Namen des Vaters.

Abrechnung


Transkription

x + 1. ... s\textsuperscript{3} P\textsuperscript{3}-tj-\textit{Sw} 1
2. Ns-\textit{Sw}.T\textit{tnw.t} 1
3. P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{hr}-p\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{bk} s\textsuperscript{3} Hr-bk 1
4. P\textsuperscript{3}-\textit{mr}-\textit{ih}(?) 1
5. r 13
6. ... 1/2
7. ...

Übersetzung

x + 1. ..., Sohn des Peteshu, 1
XXV. DO W 87.

2. Esshutefnut 1
3. Pshenpebek, Sohn des Harbek, 1
4. Pleche(?) 1
5. macht 13
6. ... 1/2
7. ...

Bemerkungen


Third person singular pronoun suffixes in Proto-Semitic.

(With a theory on the connective vowels in Tiberian Hebrew)

1. The two allomorphs in Biblical Hebrew. Biblical Hebrew object suffixes of the 3rd person singular are known to have two allomorphs. For Sg. 3 m. there is 'ennā and 'ēḥū (or -ō after consonant and -ḥā, -w after vowel); for Sg. 3 f. there are 'ennā, and 'ēḥā (or -āḥ after consonant and -ḥā after vowel). The first allomorphs contain a geminate n, hence we shall call them "n-suffixes". The other allomorphs contain several sub-allomorphs.

The n-suffixes have been explained by most scholars as containing the energetic morpheme of Semitic (attested in Arabic, etc.) -an or -anna. Only Barth (1907, pp. 2 ff.) contested this explanation on phonetic grounds,—the connective vowel -e- that corresponds to Aramaic -i- in -in-, according to him, cannot be derived from the Arabic -a- of -an(na), (see also Barth, 1913 p. 14 for further arguments).

Mayer Lambert (see his 1903) was the first scholar to examine closely the distributional rules between the two main allomorphs mentioned above. While the sub-allomorphs of the second main allomorph obey distributional rules of a purely phonetic character, both main allomorphs may occur in apparently the same position, e.g. yišmar-'ennā and yišmar-'ēḥū. The distributional rules of the two main allomorphs are of

---

1 This is an extended version of a paper read in the 178th meeting of the American Oriental Society, Berkeley, March 19–21, 1968. I also take this opportunity to thank my chairman Dr. Harry Steinhaus for reading my manuscript and for making some interesting comments on it.

2 See for instance C. Brockelmann 1910, p. 153: "Des restes de l'énergique, ayant perdu sa signification originelle, se trouvent aussi à l'imparfait avec les suffixes; par ex. ʾiqqāḥannā de *ʾiqqāḥēnhā, 'il le prendra'..."

3 Lambert mentions in his quoted article that the idea to wonder about the existence of such distributional rules came from Berliner, in his "Beiträge zur hebr. Grammatik" (1879) p. 46, where he arrived at approximately correct conclusions.
morphological (and not phonetic) character. Let us see what LAMBERT says about the 3rd person Sg. suffixes (p. 138): "1° au futur indicatif [=Imperfect] on emploie les suffixes -ennū, -ennā; 1 en poésie on emploie quelquefois -ēhā, -ēhā. 2° Avec le vav conversif on emploie -ēhū, -ēhā ou -ēhū. 3° Au futur impératif [=Jussive] on se sert toujours de -ēhū, -ēhā à la 2e et à la 3e personne; à la 1re on emploie plutôt -ennū que -ēhū et toujours -ennā. (...) 6° Les suffixes de l'impératif sont -ēhū, -ēhū, plus rarement -ēhā, -ennū, -ennā."

These definitions of LAMBERT's are valid for those persons of the prefix-conjugations that do not require any special suffix, thus not for Sg. 2 f. (-ū), Pl. 2/3 m. (-ū) and Pl. 2/3 f. (-nū). On the other hand, after forms that had presumably had the yaktūb-u pattern with a final -u (all the other persons of the Imperfect), there are n-suffixes, whereas after forms that had had the yaktūb pattern (the same persons of the Jussive and the Prefix-Perfect after waw conversive), there is no -nū. The first persons of the latter group, however, behave as if they had belonged to the first pattern,—in other words, after 1st persons of Jussive and Prefix-Perfect one finds n-suffixes.

The first impression we can get is that n-suffixes are used after an original *-u. 2 After original long vowels (Sg. 2 f., Pl. 2/3 m./f.), consonants (other persons of the Jussive and the Prefix-Perfect), and presumably after the *-n of the Imperfect in Sg. 2 f. and Pl. 2/3 m./f. *taktubī-u and

1 My transcription. Henceforth, quotations originally in Hebrew characters will be transcribed.
2 In yeṣnū "there is", the suffix -nū can be explained by assuming that the original form of yēṣ, as suggested by Akkadian, was *yiṣu. In Akkadian (see von Soden 1952, § 78b), this verb uses a form of the Imperfect in the functions of a Stative, išu "er hat". After this -u, an n-suffix is expected in Hebrew, hence -nū. Similarly for qobnū "curse him!", Num. 23: 13 (root *qbb). This form is supposed to represent *qubb-ennū. If this reconstruction were correct, the ending -nū could not be explained, there is no change *-ennū = -nū. The original form of the Imperative could be *qubb- with a homorganic, euphonic -u (after final gemination) that required n-suffixes. Then, the short -u disappeared and a contraction took place. The reason why *-ennū had yielded here -nū, and -ennā as elsewhere, is that in all the other cases -u was a final indicative marker, while in *yiṣu it was part of the stem and in *qubb a euphonic vowel. When final short vowels began to disappear, those final vowels that constituted an independent morpheme were most probably slower to yield than these two, less functional -u's. Thus, -nū could be an earlier contraction and -ennū a somewhat later one.
3 Arabic and ancient Canaanite documents suggest that this ending originally was -na with a final -a. Northern Gurage, however, (see HETZRON 1968) indicates -n only. Probably, one more factor must be taken into account. Arabic had -ni after dual
*yaktubā-n (see Table 2 below, with reservations) as well as after other
consonants, the allomorphs *-ḥā/-ḥā were used. After Perfect, no n-
suffixes were used (see Section 4 below).

According to the second part of Lambert’s definition 3°, after 1st
persons of the second pattern (Jussive and Prefix-Perfect) n-suffixes
are used. If we posit original forms Sg. lec. *aktub, Pl. lec. *naktub, the above
rule does not seem to be valid,—after consonant we have n-suffixes.

Yet this divergence of the first persons from the general pattern
tallies with another one. The Sg. lec. Jussive forms, and to a lesser extent
Pl. lec., tend to be augmented by a final element -ā. This element was also
identified with the energetic ending -an (according to Barth 1907, p.
12, fn. 2., the originator of this explanation is Stade). Birkenland (1940,
p. 14) objected to this etymology on the ground that the change -an → -ā
is not attested in Hebrew. The other explanation (Bauer-Leander
1922 § 36d and Jonen 1923 p. 315, fn. 1) equates -ā with the subjunctive
ending of Arabic yaktub-a. In this case, however, final short -a ought to
disappear in Biblical Hebrew. Birkenland (p. 14) suggests that the final
-ā in Hebrew was borrowed from a neighbour-dialect that had not lost
final short vowels, and Hebrew lengthened it to make it fit the require-
ments of Hebrew phonetism. Moran (1960) has brought up very strong
arguments in favour of the identification with the Arabic subjunctive.
He has found a form yaktuba in ancient Canaanite expressing wish (his
pp. 2–5) or used in subordination in purpose clauses (p. 6 ff.). He has even
established a rule of “modal congruence” for the latter use. This means:
“if the verb of the first clause states a fact (perfect, indicative), then in
the purpose clause the verb is in the indicative; if the verb of the first
clause is an imperative, a jussive or a yaqtula expressing a wish, etc., then
in the purpose clause the verb is a jussive or yaqtula” (p. 9). Moran
further says that the functions of *yaktuba in Biblical Hebrew are fairly
similar to his ancient Canaanite (of Byblos): “In independent clauses in

indicative: yaktubā-ni “they both write” and nothing after Pl. 2/3 f. t/yaktubna + O.
We suggest that the original indicative marker after long vowels was -n. This would
have created a final closed syllable with a long vowel, which is impossible in Arabic.
Then a final euphonic vowel was introduced to make the syllable with the long
vowel open. The choice of the euphonic vowel followed the principle of contrast,
-na after -ā and -i, and -ni after -ā. Thus, the final -a and -i after -n- must not be
taken into consideration in establishing Proto-Semitic allomorphic conditioning:
they are later developments. Unfortunately, neither Hebrew nor any Ethiopian
language shows traces of dual in verbs to enable us to check the extent of the rules
of contrastive euphonic vowels posited for Arabic.
the rare third person it expresses a wish (...), in the first person determination, exhortation, self-encouragement, etc.; in purpose clauses it is governed by the rule of modal congruence" (p. 12). This suggests that *yaktuba had had a meaning very close to, if not identical with, that of the Jussive. Moran declares himself (on p. 19) that it is impossible to decide whether it had the same meaning as the Jussive or not.

A very important fact is that while yaktuba freely occurs with a neatly volitive value in ancient Canaanite, Hebrew has very few occurrences of it outside of the first person (and the masculine singular imperative). This may give us a clue as to its original meaning.

If not governed by a grammatical construction (e.g. after the prohibitive particle ud, in purpose clauses according to the modal congruence, in conditional), the subject of yaktuba seems in ancient Canaanite to be always the King. This suggests that yaktuba is a very polite way to express request or wish (see Moran, p. 2), while Jussive may express plain order. In other words, yaktuba is a cohortative expressing exhortation or strong urging to do something rather than giving an order. For Hebrew -ā, the cohortative meaning was recognized quite early.

Unless it is governed by a syntactic construction, the primary function of the Jussive is to give an order. While order and request are conceivable in the second and (indirectly given) in the third persons, and furthermore in Pl. le (order or request directed to a group of which the speaker is a member), a Sg. le order or request, literally interpreted, is hardly plausible. First person orders may represent either self-encouragement (as also stated by Moran) or a question asking for instructions "Shall I ...". The cohortative form *aktuba implying "to urge, to encourage" could have come to express self-encouragement, and as such, to replace the hardly plausible Sg. le Jussive in part of its functions.1 Although a Pl. le order/request is plausible, the analogy of the singular could be a serious factor in adopting naktuba, cohortative, instead of the plain Jussive naktub. Furthermore, the Prefix-Perfect, that had most often become homonymous with the Jussive, also adopted the ending -ā, partially, in the first persons.

Consequently, combinations of the Jussive/Prefix-Perfect first person

---

1 Another example of a language's reacting differently to first person Jussive than to other persons: the interrogative imperative of the third person is in French Qu'il s'en aille? "Shall he leave?" with the subjunctive, while the use of the indicative Est-ce qu'il s'en va? "Is he leaving?" is a question requesting information. In the first person, however, the question is Est-ce que m'en vais? "Shall I go?" with indicative for requesting instructions.
forms and object suffixes of Sg. 3 m./f. do not come from *aktub + -hā, but from the longer form *aktuba—and then the n-suffix, yielding etshevenū. The rarer uses of the n-suffixes after the Imperative Sg. masc. also reflect the older, extenuating, polite, cohortative ending -ā. The only question still left open is, how the final -a of *aktuba had become long in Biblical Hebrew. It seems to be originally short, because it became reduced before the n-suffixes, leaving its indirect trace in the choice of the n-suffixes. Probably, to save the decadent final vowel that still had a morphological function, this vowel was stressed,—and this unusual stress lengthened it.

All this means that we have to modify our rules given above to a little extent. Correctly stated, the n-suffixes were used after the original short vowels -u (Indicative Imperfect Sg. le., 2 m., 3 m./f., Pl. le.) and -a (Jussive/Prefix-Perfect first persons and sometimes Imperative masculine singular) only, while -hū/-hā were used everywhere else: after long vowels and after consonants. Poetry sometimes deviated from this rule and tended to generalize the latter allomorphs, maybe to compensate for the fact that in biblical times the Indicative Imperfect had lost its final -u, so that the originally phonetic conditioning had become arbitrary, only morphologically motivated.

2. The energetic in Biblical Hebrew. Even the establishment of the above distributional rules by Lambert did not modify the generally adopted theory about the origin of the n-suffixes. Lambert says about the origin of -nn-, himself (p. 183): “il correspond à l’énergique arabe et se rattache très vraisemblablement à la particule nā.”

Several objections may be brought against the identification of the -nn- of the n-suffixes with the energetic morpheme. First of all, the Arabic energetic is usually dubbed a “mood”, but it is not. It is a category superposed on moods. Thus, Arabic yaktuban(na) may represent either the Indicative yaktubu or the Jussive yaktub. Consequently, there is no structural reason why one mood should adopt and generalize the energetic in Hebrew, whereas the other mood would completely dispense with it. The connection with the Hebrew cohortative particle nā is even less plausible. This particle may be associated with Jussive and Imperative only,—just the opposite of -nn-.

The other, very weighty objection is that Biblical Hebrew does have a few occurrences of the energetic in combination with object suffixes, and they differ in form and in distribution from our n-suffixes.
The partial survival of the energetic in Hebrew was recognized by scholars, but only before object suffixes. It is not impossible, however, that part of the instances with nun paragogicum found after Sg. 2 f. and Pl. 2/3 m. prefix forms is not a survival of the ancient *-na, the indicative marker after -t and -ū (see fn. 3, p. 102), but of the energetic. There are quite a few occurrences of such a final -n after verbs that reasonably represent the Jussive. For instance, Ex. 34:13 contains three subsequent emphatic orders, using the prefix-conjugation (and not the Imperative) with final -n; in Ruth 2:8 two negative orders are followed by a positive order, prefix-form with -n; on the other hand, in purpose clauses Deut. 6:2 after lama'an "in order that", and in Ps. 104:9 twice after bal "lest" where Jussive or Subjunctive is expected. These occurrences look more "energetic" than anything else.

We are here interested in energetic forms followed by an object suffix. Curiously enough, we find them before singular object suffixes only. Here are the attested forms:

**Table 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sg. 1c.</th>
<th>2 m.</th>
<th>2 f.</th>
<th>3 m.</th>
<th>3 f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ūnū</td>
<td>-(ū)nū</td>
<td>-n(k?)bā</td>
<td></td>
<td>-(e)nhū</td>
<td>unattested, see Table 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Ps. 50:23)</td>
<td>(Jer. 23:24, in pause)</td>
<td>unattested, see Table 2</td>
<td>(Ex. 15:2, in pause, Jer. 5:22)</td>
<td>unattested, see Table 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After subjects of Pl. 2/3 m., the situation is ambiguous. The extra n appearing between the plural marker -ū and the object suffix may either be the energetic -an- or the original indicative marker -n (the other allomorph of which is -n). The attested forms after Pl. 2/3 are:

**Table 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sg. 1c.</th>
<th>2 m.</th>
<th>2 f.</th>
<th>3 m.</th>
<th>3 f.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-nūn</td>
<td></td>
<td>-n̄gā</td>
<td></td>
<td>-n̄k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Pr. 1:28 three examples, one in pause, Hos. 5:15 in pause)</td>
<td>(Ps. 63:4, in pause and Ps. 91:12 in questionable pause)</td>
<td>(Jes. 60:7, both in secondary pause)</td>
<td>(Jer. 5:22, in pause)³</td>
<td>(Jer. 2:24, in pause)³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The connective vowel -ū- is certainly a survival of the original vowel of *-an-.
² Most scholars prefer the second explanation; see for instance BAUER–LEANDER, p. 388, § 48 p. See also here below.
³ Once there is -nū in yilkeš̄nu. Prov. 5:22. Since there is an explicit object beside this verb, the object suffix does not seem to be legitimate. There must be some mistake in the text.
In Job 19:2, the n seems rather to be part of the plural marker. The preceding verb in the same verset is tōgyān, containing the archaic plural marker -ūn. The probability is that the two verbs have parallel forms. On the other hand, we may also consider that the energetic morpheme is used in both cases, once with and once without an object suffix.

On the other hand, the example from Jer. 5:22 looks like a genuine energetic plural. The pausal verb ya‘ābrūnḥū is preceded by ya‘ābrēnḥū (in secondary pause). The probability is that both verbs ending in -nhū contain the energetic morpheme.

At any rate, it seems that the combination of the energetic morpheme and the Sg. 3 m. object suffix yields -nhū while the n-suffix of the same person is -ennū. It is also true that in the Bible one can find enough morphological doublets, but this is not one of them. The proportions of occurrence contradict it. The energetic form is fairly rare in the Bible. There is no doubt about the forms’ contained in Table 1 being energetic and probably most of Table 2 are also energetic. The number of occurrences of the Sg. 3 m./f. endings -nhū/-nḥū corresponds neatly to the number of the energetic with other persons of object. If -nhū and -ennū were stylistic or dialectal variants, their distribution should be different. While -nhū is as rare as the energetic with other persons of object (the undoubtedly energetic forms), -ennū is a very current form, depending on the syntactic status of the verbal form to which it is suffixed, and possesses no energetic connotation.

Furthermore, the distributional features definitely invalidate any identification of -nhū and -ennū. The energetic -nhū may occur after any person, with a neat preference for pausal positions. On the contrary, -nḥū is only used after Sg. 1c., 2 m., 3 m./f., Pl. 1c. of the Indicative Imperfect compulsorily, and almost compulsorily after Sg./Pl. 1c. of the Jussive and the Prefix-Perfect, both in context and in pause.

Consequently, we must look elsewhere for the origin of the n in the n-suffixes -ennū/-ennū.

3. Outer South-Ethiopic Heavy and Light suffixes. The Outer South-Ethiopic languages are divided into three groups: Gafat (recently extinct), Northern Gurate (the relatively most archaic group, most probably the direct survival of the common stock from which the rest had split off) and Western Gurate (three subgroups: Māsqan, —Central Western Gurate with Cāha, Eza, etc. and —Peripheral Western Gurate with Gyeto, Ennāmor, etc.). They have conserved a number of very
archaic features of Proto-Semitic, especially Northern Gurage. All these languages have at least two sets of complement suffixes, called Heavy and Light (see Polotsky 1938, p. 160 ff., and 1951, p. 29 ff.). Roughly, Heavy suffixes are used after original long vowels and Light ones elsewhere. As vocalic length ceased to be relevant in these languages, these distributional rules, originally phonetically conditioned, became arbitrary. Here is a table of the singular object suffixes\(^1\) in a Northern Gurage language: Soddo.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Heavy</th>
<th>Light</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sg. 1 c.</td>
<td>-yy&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-e&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 m.</td>
<td>-kkä&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-hā&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 f.</td>
<td>-kk&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-h&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 m.</td>
<td>-u&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-u&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 f.</td>
<td>-a&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>-wa&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Heavy suffixes are used after Sg. 2 f., Pl. 2 m./f. and Pl. 3 m./f. of both tenses (Imperfect and Perfect) and the Jussive (after original *-ī/-ū/-ā*). Light a suffixes are used after all the other persons of the Imperfect and the Jussive; the symbol "::" marks that the preceding consonants become geminated. Light b suffixes are only used after Sg. 3 f. of the Perfect (e.g. sábbāratt- "she broke"), and Light c after Sg. 2 m. and 3 m. of the Perfect.\(^2\) (In Western Gurage, suffixes of Light c-type replaced Light b completely.)

We can see that in Light c suffixes there is -nn- in the second and third persons. The Sg. 3 m. form can be reconstructed as *-nuu* (see Polotsky 1938, p. 161). In Peripheral Western Gurage, Enār and Endāgān still have -nu.\(^3\) The element -nn- in the second persons seems to be a secondary development, by the analogy of the third persons. This can be proved the following way.

First of all, the connective vowel between -nn- and the second person

\(^1\) The plural object suffixes are parallel in most respects with the singular ones.

\(^2\) After the Perfect Sg. le. Heavy suffixes of 2nd and Light c of 3rd persons are used. In languages other than Soddo, Heavy suffixes are used exclusively after Pl. le. of the Perfect. For details, see Hetzron 1968, Section 2.

\(^3\) From an older *-nnum, while older *-num became -n.
marker may be $a$ (in Central Western Gurage and in the Northern Muxor), $i$ (in Peripheral Western Gurage) and $a$ (in Soddo and Gogot of Northern Gurage)—and probably $i$ in Gafat. This heterogeneity already proves the relative recentness of these suffixes.

Moreover, there is another, stronger proof. In Light $a$ (used after Imperfect) the gemination represents an older $n$ that became assimilated to the preceding consonant: $^*yəsəbər-\rightarrow yəsəbərr$. Muxor still has, besides the assimilated form, a free variant $yəsəbrənn$. In languages other than Soddo and Gogot, an “Internal Labialization” takes place before this Sg. 3 m. suffix that proves that the original form must also have been approximately $^*-nu$, e.g. $^*yəsəbər-nu-\rightarrow yəsəbərr$. This also happens in the Perfect in Māsqq̱ and Central Western Gurage: $səbbərənn$—“he broke him”. In Sg. 3 f., the $^-a$ after Imperfect also represents an older $^*-nnā$ (Polotsky, *ibid.*). Muxor, besides $yəsəbrərrə$ also admits $yəsəbrənna$—“he breaks her”. At the same time, there is no trace of such a $n$ in the second persons of the object suffixes after Imperfect (Light $a$). We contend that the suffixes after the Imperfect represent a more archaic situation than those after the Perfect (see Section 4 below).

In the second and first persons of object suffixes, there is a contrast between Heavy and Light suffixes, namely Sg. 1c. Heavy $^-n$n vs. Light $^-e$ and Sg. 2 m./f. Heavy $^-kək$/$^-kk$ against Light $^-häh$/$^-hā$ (communicated through a secondary $^-mn$ in Light $c$). On the other hand, in the third persons Light $b$ and the Heavy suffix seem to agree, m. $^-u$ and f. $^-a$/$^-wa$ (at any rate with no trace of $n$ in an apparently Light position) against Light $a$ and $c$ that had reconstructibly been $^-nnā$ and $^-nnā$ with the $n$. This indicates that there were two different allomorphic splits in different periods that have led to the present situation.

Light $b$ and Heavy suffixes of third person agree against Light $a$ and $c$. Let us try to find out what the original environment had been, what features were shared by the positions of Light $a$ and $c$ against the other two (or vice versa).

To reconstruct the development of these suffixes, we must go back to Proto-Semitic. Northern Gurage has “Main Verb Markers” (see Heitzron 1968) etymologically corresponding to the Arabic indicative markers $^-u/-na$, namely $^*-u$ in a Light position and $^*-n$ in a Heavy one (the same distribution as in Arabic). Today, these markers are $^-u/-n$ in Soddo and Gogot, and $^-u/-tt$ in Muxor. In the article to which I refer above, I reconstructed Proto-Gurage $^*-nt/-nt$ with a final $^-t$, a special Ethiopian development from the original $^-u/-n$ (cf. fn. 3 on p. 102). Besides actual
functions, a difference between the Arabic morpheme and the Northern Gurage one is that the first precedes eventual object suffixes, while the latter follows them. Thus, we have in Arabic *yalabbis-u-ki* “he clothes you (f. sg.)” with an object suffix -ki at the end, while the corresponding Soddo form has -h₂ (from an older *-ki*) in a penultimate position: *yalabbis-h₂*-u. Our assumption is that Proto-Northern Gurage had originally had the same order as Arabic.

Thus, we start out from a Proto-Semitic situation. The indicative morpheme was then *-u/-n*. Proto-Semitic had two allomorphs for Sg. 3 m./f. object suffixes, *-nnâ/-nnâ* vs. *-hâ/-hâ*. The first ones were used after short vowels, such as the indicative marker -u (and subjunctive -a), and the second one after the rest. The Sg. 3 m. Imperfect in Northern Gurage is still *yosâbr*-u. Probably, the second radical was once geminated: *yosâbr*-u, cf. F. Rundgren, Erneuerung des Verbalaspekts im Semitischen (1963) p. 70–72. After this short -u, the Sg. 3 m. object suffix used was -nnâ, thus *yosâbr*-u-nnâ for “he breaks him”.

The original conditioning of the appearance of *-nnâ/-nnâ* limited it to the position after short vowels of the Imperfect (see Section 4.). In Proto-Ethiopic these allomorphs, the n-suffixes, were also adopted after the short vowels of the Perfect, namely Sg. 2 m. *sâb(b)ârkâ-*, and Sg. 3 m. *sâb(b)ârâ-. This is the origin of Light c in Table 3. After long vowels as well as consonants of the Perfect, the allomorphs without n, namely -hâ/-hâ were used (subject to further phonetic changes). Thus, *sâb(h)râtt*-u- for “she broke him” and *yosâbr*rôma*-w- “they (f.) break him”, *sâb(h)râm*-w- “they (f.) broke him”. Consequently, the same allomorph was used after a consonant and a long vowel. The corresponding feminine object suffix *-hâ* later adopted a -w- after consonant, --*wa*, probably through the metanalytical analogy of what had happened after long *-ā*, where the vowel was reduced into a labial appendix. The form *yosâbr*rôm*-w- + -a- “they (m.) break her” was misinterpreted as if it were composed of *yosâbr*rôm*- + -wa-.

We have assumed that the original order in Proto-Gurage was “indicative marker–object suffix”. The later transfer of the indicative marker -u to the end brought the final radical and the n of the object suffix in contact: *yosâbr*-u-nnâ → *yosâbr*-u-nnu → *yosâbr-nnu*-u. This is still a very early stage. The Proto-Ethiopic extension of the indicative morpheme from *-u/-n* to *-ut|-nt* must have either taken place afterwards, or else it had originally been reserved to word-final positions (*yosâbr*-ut “he breaks” and when there was an object suffix following,
no t appeared, *yśābbār-u-nnā). At any rate, after the transfer of this morpheme to a final position everywhere, even with object suffixes, the t (re)appeared. From this *yśābbār-nu-wt, after the reduction of the gemination of the Mid radical and the assimilation of the n, Muxær yielded yśābbwr-ra-t through a further transfer of the labiality from a full-fledged vowel in the suffix to an Internal Labialization in the stem, and Soddo and Gogot, by completely dropping the labiality, yielded yśābbwr-ra-t.

Since after the transfer of the -u behind the object suffix the original phonetic conditioning of the allomorphs with n became invalid, the Jussive imitated the similar Imperfect by using the same object suffixes, in the same distribution. Thus, yśābb(r)w-r- for the indicative Sg. 3 m. “he breaks him” and yśābb(r)w-r- for the Jussive “let him break him”. This took place despite the fact that the latter form had originally ended in a consonant (originally requiring hū) unlike the first one. What happened was that the prefix-conjugation Jussive joined the other prefix-conjugation form, the Imperfect, that also came to be ended in a consonant in certain persons. The Imperfect, in spite of the changes, maintained the original n-suffixes and the similar Jussive adopted them.

So far, the distribution of the allomorphs of the 3rd person object suffixes had been established, *-hū in a Heavy position and after consonant in the Perfect, and *-nnū elsewhere (also after consonants of the prefix-conjugations). After this another allomorphic split took place. After long vowels (Sg. 2 f. -ī, Pl. 2/3 m. -ū and Pl. 2/3 f. -ā), initial consonants of suffixes became geminated, maybe to compensate for the loss of the relevance of vocalic length, thus -ū + -kā → -u-kkā. After the still remaining final short vowels (Perfect Sg. 2 m. *sābbārūt- and Sg. 3 m. *sābbārā- only), the n of the 3rd person object suffixes (already a later extension) was not only maintained (while assimilated after consonants), but also extended to objects of second person: *sābbārā + -kā → sābbārā-nnāhā- “he broke you (m. sg.)”. As an intermediate stage, we may posit *sābbārā-hā to justify the weakening k → h after a short vowel. This is still the form in one Peripheral Western Gurağ language: ʒndāgān-sapūrā-hā (and -n- appears in the third person objects only). The heterogeneity of the vowel after nn- (see above, after Table 3) suggests that the weakening did not take place because of this vowel.

As a conclusion, the distribution of the allomorphs of the object suffixes of 3rd person was still fixed in Proto-Semitic, *-nnū after the final short vowels of the Imperfect and *-hū elsewhere (after long vowels,
consonants and any Perfect form). This underwent later some modifications (Jussive adopted *-nnā). The distribution of the allomorphs of the second persons is already a later, Ethiopian development that took place when the vocalic length ceased to be relevant. At the first stage (Proto-Semitic), the final short vowels (Light₁, Sg. 3 m./f. object suffix with n after the Imperfect only) were opposed to the rest (Heavy). An intermediate (Proto-Ethiopian) stage was to generalize the n-suffixes after any short vowel, in other words to extend them to the Perfect. At the final stage, final decadent long vowels (Heavy₂) were opposed to the rest (Light₂) with a further split: this Light₂ mainly meant “after consonant”, and for the still remaining final short vowels (in the Perfect only) the n was extended to the objects of the second person too (except in 3ndāgān). The first stage left its imprint on the distribution of the 3rd person object suffixes, and the final one on the second persons.

We do not intend to deal here with the Sg. lc. object suffixes. They probably represent a Proto-Semitic distribution (see later the end of Section 8). The Pl. lc. object suffixes behave like the 2nd person suffixes.

4. The suffixes after verbs. Both Biblical Hebrew and Outer South-Ethiopic seem to indicate that after the -u of the Light persons of the Imperfect (those that do not require long vowel-suffixes), and in Hebrew also after short -a, the Proto-Semitic Sg. 3 m./f. object suffixes were *-nnā/-nnā,—and *-hā/-hā elsewhere. The latter allomorphs were used after long vowels: Sg. 2 f. and Pl. 2/3 m./f. of the Jussive, and the Prefix-Perfect; after consonants: the other persons of the Jussive and the Prefix-Perfect and probably after the -n of the Heavy persons of the Imperfect (see fn. 3 on p. 108). The allomorphs *-hā/-hā thus had a larger distribution, the n-suffixes being used for certain persons of the Imperfect only. Therefore the more often used suffixes tended to be generalized. In all the Semitic languages other than Biblical Hebrew and Outer South-Ethiopic they managed to eliminate the n-suffixes almost completely.

In Biblical Hebrew no n-suffix is used after the Perfect. On the other hand, in Outer South-Ethiopic, after those persons of the Perfect that end in a short vowel, in addition to adopting the n-suffixes of 3rd person, the element n was extended to the 2nd person objects too. In other persons of the Perfect, the Heavy suffixes are mainly used.

This confrontation suggests that Proto-Semitic had no n-suffixes after the Perfect, and that in Outer South-Ethiopic it is a secondary development. The reason must be the following.
The Perfect form conjugated by means of suffixes is, according to most Semitists, a relatively late development. Most probably, Akkadian Prefix-Perfect (preserved after waw conversive in Biblical Hebrew) was the original Semitic Perfect. The original function of the suffix-conjugation must have been similar to the Akkadian suffix form Permansive, a nominal form with no tense implication. If the suffixes were added to a verbal noun (in Akkadian they can be added to any type of noun), they still remained nominal forms, just as well as participles and infinitives did. As a matter of principle, if these verbo-nominal forms had pro-nominal objects, they could be expressed by means of possessive endings. This, however, was ambiguous, it could also indicate the subject: Arabic qatli “my killing” may either be a nominalization of “I kill” or of “X kills me” (cf. Rundgren, Orientalia Suecana 13, 1965, p. 75 and p. 83). Another, safer solution was to use Independent object pronouns, a conjugated form of tōl-ṭeš in Hebrew, iyya- in Arabic, kiya- in Gə'oz, etc.

When the Suffix-Perfect had been admitted into the verbal system by obtaining its tense-value, it was entitled to get real object suffixes. Since the n-suffixes for the third person were decadent even in Hebrew (the poetic language could already dispense with them), it is no wonder that the new Perfect adopted the more productive Sg. 3 m./f. suffixes -ḥā/-ḥā (that were also homonymous with the possessive endings, the original pronouns affixed to the still nominal suffix-conjugation). On the other hand, in Proto-Outer South-Ethiopic, the n-suffixes of the 3rd person singular were not decadent,—they were generalized after the short vowels of any verbal form including the Perfect, and later also after the consonants of the Jussive. A further development in Western (but not Northern) Gurage generalized the n-suffixes after all the consonants, so that after the Imperfect (that had transferred its final -u after the object suffix and came to end in consonants) and Jussive,—Sg. 3 f. Perfect also adopted them, e.g. ḏa sabbūračč-amu- “she broke him” against sabbārutt-u-/ sabbūračč-u- of Northern Gurage. The n-suffixes, unlike elsewhere, remained very vigorous in Outer South-Ethiopic.

In Gafat, however, the n-suffixes did not turn out to be so productive. This Outer South-Ethiopic language maintained a clear trace of the n in the Imperfect (see Loebl 1956, p. 59 ff.), ymdqur-si “he finds him” and ymdqur-su “he finds her”, the gemination of the last radical representing *n, in older *-ni/-na (for *-nu/-na). The -u of *-nu that usually became dissimilated into i, left its trace in the occasional labialization of the preceding consonant, e.g. tib “you give” and tib*i “you give him”. After the
Perfect, the n-suffixes do not seem to have been adopted, we have dārāśo “he found him” (from *dārāsī-u). However, Perfect had been affected because the only non-assimilated survival of n is after the Perfect Sg. le.: dārāšu-nnī “I found him” and dārāšu-nnā “I found her”.

What has been said now is valid for the Gafat described in Leslau 1956, based on his investigation with the last speakers of this now extinct language. However, in 18th century Gafat described in Leslau 1945, we can find further, rather precarious evidence of the old use of n-suffixes after the Perfect, that was dropped later. This evidence is provided by a unique form found on p. 125, Col. 8(23) of Leslau 1945: yādārāsānīhu erroneously translated “if you meet”. In European languages, the government of the verb “to meet” is such that the protagonist of the story is the subject and the new participants the complement: “I met a man”, etc. In Ethiopian languages, however, the newcomer is the subject and the original protagonist the complement. “I met a man” must be translated into Amharic by sāw agāppānp, literally “A man found/met me”. Thus, yādārāsānīhu is literally “if (yā) he finds you (pl.)”, with -nīhu containing the n.

The corresponding Gurge suffix (Pl. 2 m. in Gurge, as there is no gender distinction in the plural in Gafat) is -nnahu/-nnāhu in most Western Gurge languages and Muxor with a connective vowel a/ja, and -nnahmu in Soddo and Gogot, with a closed connective vowel ə. Thus Gafat -nīhu with its closed i is closer to the latter type. This perfectly matches our previous assumption (see Hetzron 1968) that while Northern Gurge is the direct survival of the common stock, Western Gurge split off from the dialect group represented now by Muxor, and Gafat from the dialect group represented today by Soddo and Gogot. This suffix also joins the list of isoglosses that constitute the foundation of this division.

However risky it is to accept the evidence of a hapax legomenon, the testimony of the connective vowel makes it plausible that -nīhu, an innovated n-suffix similar to Gurge, was used after the Perfect in an older stratum of Gafat.

5. Conjugated adverbs in Biblical Hebrew. In addition to the verbal system, the Sg. 3 m./f. suffixes -nnā/-nnū also occur in certain conjugated prepositions and adverbs.1 In these cases, the Sg. le. ending is also -nī, a  

---

1 Bauer-Leander quote Brockelmann (Z.A., 14) for the explanation of the -nn- as representing the Proto-Hebrew equivalent of Arabic anna “that” (conjunction).
"verbal" suffix, instead of the expected -i. Yet, while the use of -nnā/-nna in the 3rd person singular presupposes -nī in the first person, this is not true conversely. We have kamō-nī "like me", but kamō-hū "like him" (see end of Section 8).

The negative particle rycyn is used as a negative copula (also with participles). For its conjugated form, it has two variants in Sg. 3 m./f., either rycyn-ā? rycyn-āh with Possessive endings or rycyn-ennā? rycyn-ennā with n-suffixes. One could argue here that since this particle may be used as a predicate, the function mainly reserved for the verb, it has optionally adopted verbal suffixes, by analogy. But this cannot be said about the next element.

The preposition min has a complicated conjugation. "From me" is mimmiennā, then mimmiennā/mimmiennā for "from him/her". No analogy with verbs can be posited here to justify the use of the n-suffixes.

A solution to this problem is offered by the behavior of the adverb rādāl "still, more". When conjugated, the Sg. 3 m. form is rādennā "he still ..." and Sg. 3 f. rādennā.1 On the other hand, when this adverb is preceded by a preposition, the suffixes without n appear: Sg. 3 m. ba?rādāl "while he ..." and mērādāl "ever in his life", etc.2 It is reasonable to posit that the verb rādāl had originally ended in the adverbial-accusative ending -a, namely *awda (but the possibility of the locative-adverbial ending -n is not excluded either). After a preposition, however, the ending became -i, genitive, like in the Arabic compound prepositions tahat "under" vs. min tahiti "from under". Thus, after original *hi, *auḍi- and *min *auḍi- the Sg. 3 m./f. suffixes -hā/-ha were selected. After the bare adverb that ended in -a (or -u), the n-suffixes were used. As there is no verbal form ending in short -i, it is impossible to check the distributional features.

1 P. H. Müller (as quoted by Bärth 1907, p. 9, fn. 1) says that rādāl is a "verbal noun", hence the use of object suffixes. The sentence hereunder contradicts this explanation.

2 There are contradictory examples in the Bible, due, in my opinion, to later confusions. Ewald (1838, p. 297) found a semantic distinction between ba?rādennā "as long as I am" against "the poetic innovation (das dichterisch erneute)" ba?rādi "in my life". Cf. also in Bauer–Leander § 80v. ba?rādi "mein Leben lang", ba?rādennī "während ich noch war", etc. This may be descriptively correct.

As for the concrete examples: there is one occurrence of rādī (Ps. 139: 18) against the two instances of rādennī. There is once ba?rādennī (Dt. 31: 27) vs. two ba?rādi (Ps. 104: 33 and 146: 2) in exactly the same context. rādennī occurs twenty times and there is no *rādī. There is one ba?rādennī (Gen. 26: 6) in exactly the same context as ba?rādennī above (before hay "alive"), this confirms Ewald’s distinction. There is no n-suffix after mērādī.
rules of the allomorphs in a verbal environment. The case of this adverb suggests that the n-suffixes were used after short -u and -a, but the other allomorphs after short -i, long vowels and consonants.

In the light of this, it is likely that the survival of the n-suffixes after min is due to its older ending *-a. In Arabic, the usual final euphonic vowel is -i, e.g. ‘an + r-rağuli = ‘an-i-r-rağuli. After min, however, we find an unusual euphonic -a, e.g. min + r-rağuli = min-a-r-rağuli that can be the trace of an older *mina only (cf. end of Section 7). The corresponding Go‘az preposition is smennū with final -ū (short a, further preceded by a gemination). For Proto-Hebrew, we must posit *mimmīa- as one of the possible forms of the preposition. LAMBERT (1892, p. 302) posits *minnennū where the first -nn- became -mm- under the assimilatory influence of the preceding m. This allows us to reconstruct Proto-Semitic *minna, the gemination of which also tallies with Go‘az and with the form of “from me” in Arabic, minni analyzed into min + i.

Since prepositions and adverbs do not usually behave morphologically like verbs, but take nominal, possessive pronouns, we may wonder whether the n-suffixes were not used after real nouns as Possessive endings of Sg. 3 m./f.

Here I adhere to UNGNAD’s theory recently modified by DIAKONOFF. UNGNAD posited no case-endings at all for the construct state (1906, p. 174 ff.). According to DIAKONOFF (1965, pp. 60–1, status pronominalis), Proto-Semitic construct state nouns distinguished only between two cases; they had a genitive ending in -i and a “direct case” with no case ending for all the other syntactic functions. It is obvious that Possessive endings are added to construct state nouns, even in Arabic which has all the three cases in construct state. If originally Possessives were added indeed to construct state nouns, they could be preceded by -i (genitive, -i- in Akkadian), long vowels (plural, certain short nouns) and consonants (most nouns in the singular “direct case” nominative-accusative) only, so that there was no final -u or -a governing the n-suffixes in the nominal system, even if later there were connective vowels between noun and Possessive having the sound [a], etc. The choice of the connective vowel was conditioned by the subsequent consonant, and it consequently could not condition the choice of the same subsequent consonant: the suffix (see UNGNAD, p. 178). This is the situation in Akkadian. Already in Akkadian we can see that the eventual connective vowels between noun and Possessive (e.g. after gemination libb-) tend to become the same as the case endings in the given context, thus libbu-ka “your heart”
for nominative and \( \text{libba-ka} \) for accusative.\(^1\) This connective vowel established complete case-marking for certain nouns (with final geminates) before Possessive, and as further consequence of this, full case-marking before Possessive was introduced for all the nouns in Arabic,\(^2\) Proto-Ethiopic and possibly Ugaritic (see Harris 1939, pp. 41–2). The lack of case-marking before Possessive of Sg. lc in all these languages but not in Akkadian and Phoenician, and the partial case-marking “genitive vs. the rest” after Sg. lc in the latter two languages (Harris 1936, p. 48)\(^3\) confirm this hypothesis: before the Sg. lc ending starting in a (semi-)vowel no connective vowel had to be admitted, thus no full case-marking was developed. The old two-case marking was maintained in Akkadian and early Phoenician, but dropped in Arabic\(^4\) and in Go‘az.

Adverbs, unlike nouns, did end in a constant -\( \text{a} \) and had no construct state forms, so that when they admitted pronoun suffixes, they had the proper conditioning for the choice of the \( n \)-suffixes.

As for the prepositions other than \( \text{min} \), the situation must have been the following. According to the testimony of Arabic, there were three morphological preposition classes: 1) primary, monosyllabic prepositions such as \( \text{b-} \), \( \text{l(a)} \); 2) prepositions ending in the adverbial -\( \text{a} \), e.g. \( \text{tahta} \)

\(^1\) Ungnad (p. 177) states that the original connective vowel could be \( \text{a} \), \( \text{i} \) or \( \text{a} \) indifferently in the nominative and accusative, but in the genitive there is mostly, but not always, -\( \text{i} \). This supports Diakonoff’s later theory about the originality of the -\( \text{i} \) here. See also Ungnad, p. 181: “Als Hilfsvokal findet sich \( \text{a} \) (besonders im Gen.) und \( \text{a} \) (im Nom. und Akk.), nie im Gen.” The secondary character of the connective vowel can be proved by the fact that it appeared after the undissolvable consonant clusters, the geminates, only,—the other consonant clusters were dissolved, cf. \( \text{ka1ab-ka} \) “your dog” (direct case) and \( \text{ka1b-i-ka} \) “of your dog” from \( \text{ka1b} \) vs. \( \text{libbu-a-ka} \) and \( \text{libb-i-ka} \) from \( \text{libb} \).

\(^2\) Ungnad, p. 177: “Wir sehen nun, daß in späteren Perioden der babylonischassyrischen Sprache, wo die Kasusendungen noch strenge unterschieden werden, als Hilfsvokale mit Vorliebe gerade die Vokale des betreffenden Kasus genommen werden, eine Eigentümlichkeit, die sich im klassischen Arabisch durchweg eingestellt hat.”

\(^3\) Akkadian has \( \text{ka1b-i} \) “my dog” direct case vs. \( \text{ka1bi-ya} \) “(of) my dog” (gen.). Phoenician has the graphemic representation \( \text{b} \) for “my father”, direct case, and \( \text{by} \) for the genitive. There is only one instance of other case-distinction for Sg. lc. Possessive: in Eastern Gurage. For example, Salji has \( \text{gar-e} \) “my house” for the common case, vs. \( \text{gar-á-ya} \) “my house” in accusative. This is a later development.

\(^4\) Akkadian has \( \text{-i} \) “my” for nominative and accusative, and \( \text{-ya} \) after the -\( \text{i} \) of the genitive. Arabic reorganized these allomorphs to fit another phonetic conditioning. -\( \text{ya} \) is used after long vowels (or reduced long vowels: \( \text{mu’alli1miyya} \) “my teachers”), and -\( \text{i} \) elsewhere.
"under", and 3) prepositions ending in -ay, such as 'alay. The final -y of the last type is preserved (though unpronounced) in the Arabic orthography, and also in the poetic variant of the preposition in Hebrew 'alay. It seems that the final diphthong -ay was considered either as a long vowel or as a final short -i (= -y), since there is no trace of n-suffixes after this type in Hebrew.

The final -y ceased to be pronounced quite early. Arabic pronounces 'ala where it writes 'alay, and the corresponding Go'ez preposition is la'lā (-ā for short -a, older *-ay). This made these prepositions similar to the tah'ta-type that had genuine -a endings. All the final -a's (both from *-a and *-ay) were dropped in Hebrew. In spite of the phonetic identity of the final -a from *-a and *-ay, Arabic maintained the morphological differentiation between them, before suffixes: tah'ta-ka “under you (sg. m.)” but 'alay-ka “on you” with a restitution of the -y. In Go'ez, however, these two classes merged: tah'te-kā and la'le-kā for both, with a false restitution of -ay→-e for the first one. Similarly, Hebrew has tah'te-ka “under/ instead of you” as well as 'alē-ka. While -a(y) in Go'ez -e and in Hebrew -ē) is historically justified after “on”, it is by no means legitimate after “under”.

We contend that the -y- in “under” is due to a late merger of two preposition classes and tah'ta- in Proto-Hebrew had other suffixes.

A few survivals in Biblical Hebrew still show the older n-suffixes that were appropriate after short -a. In Sg. 1c. there is tah'tēnî in 2 Sam. 22:37 against the usual tah'tay; then Sg. 3 f. tah'tennā “instead of her” Gen. 2:21, for tah'tēnā. The alternation between Pl. 3 m. tah'tân and the more recent tah'tēhem also belongs here. No analogy can explain the use of n-suffixes here. They must be survivals. The first variant of the Pl. 3 m. form is derived from *tah'ta still unaffected by the analogy of the *-ay class. Likewise, Ps. 139:11 has ba'sadēnî “about me” instead of ba'ādi from ba'ad. Arabic shows the older form ba'da “after” with an original final -a. All the same, this preposition had not joined the *-ay class in Hebrew, but adopted the usual Possessive endings as used after singular nouns. The Sg. 3 m. form is ba'ādu in Hebrew. The reason for this may be that the initial b- was misinterpreted as the preposition b-. Consequently *ba'da became *ba'dî and no n-suffixes on the one hand, nor suffixes used after the *-ay- type (identical with those used after plural nouns) on the other could be adopted. This assumption is confirmed by

---

1 The usual explanation for the suffixes of “under”, probably BARTH’s, is that this preposition imitated its antonym “on”.

2 Usually explained as necessitated by the rhyme with yosēdēni.
the actual independent form of the preposition: *bɔ'ad* against the form *ba'ad*- before prepositions and *məb-ba'ad* “from behind”. The latter bound forms correspond better to Arabic *ba'da* with a vowel *a* after the first consonant. The independent form *bɔ'ad* cannot be a construct state form either. It must be explained as a result of the curtailment of the *a* of the first syllable that took place when the initial *b-* was mistaken for *b(ə)- “in”.

6. Conclusions. The preceding reconstructions suggest that Proto-Semitic had two allomorphs for the Sg. 3 m./f. pronoun suffix, *-nnû/-nnâ* and *-hû/-hâ*. The first ones were used after the short vowels *-u* and *-a*, and the latter ones everywhere else. There was probably no essential difference between Possessive endings and Object pronouns. However, for purely phonetic reasons, *n*-suffixes could not be used after nouns,—they originally never ended in short *-u* or *-a* before Possessives. Adverbs and prepositions, however, did end in *-a*, hence the survival of the *n*-suffixes in certain Hebrew conjugated adverbs. If these adverbs came to be preceded by a further preposition, their *-a* was replaced by an *-i* (genitive) and the *n*-suffixes could not be used anymore. The only preposition that originally ended in *-a* but admitted the other allomorphs is *l(ə)- “to”. In Arabic, it is *lî-*, but has an *-a* before pronoun suffixes: *laka* “to you” vs. *bika* “by you”, and it is *lā-* in Gôʻâz and *lākâ* for “to you” vs. *bôkâ* “in you”, from *bā*-.* It is possible that the final short *-u/-a* governing the *n*-suffixes had basically to be an independent morpheme (see however fn. 2, p. 117) that was not the case for *lā-*. After the Perfect, only the other allomorphs were used, owing to the fact that the Suffix-Perfect comes from a nominal form. When it was admitted to the verbal system, it was entitled to get object suffixes, and it adopted the latter allomorphs that, having a wider distribution, were becoming more productive.

The *n*-suffixes were completely eliminated by the other allomorphs in Semitic languages other than Biblical Hebrew and Outer South-Ethiopic, and possibly Aramaic (see Section 8).

Biblical Hebrew maintained *-nnû/-nnâ* after original *-u* of the Imperfect and after the *-a* used after first person Jussive and masculine singular Imperative. These suffixes also survived after a few adverbs and conjugated prepositions that had ended in *-a*. Most prepositions ending in *-a*, however, joined another class of prepositions, those that had originally ended in *-ay*, and the *n*-suffixes were subsequently eliminated.
In Outer South-Ethiopic (Gafat, Northern and Western Gurage), -nnū/-nnā were maintained after short vowels of the Imperfect. By generalizing the distributional rules, they were also adopted after the final short vowels of the Perfect. In the latter case, the n of the 3rd person suffix was transferred also to objects of the 2nd person. Then the indicative marker -u, which had stood before object suffixes, was shifted behind them (with modified functions), but the old n-suffixes were maintained. They were no longer motivated phonetically, because through the displacement of the connecting -u- they came in contact with the last consonant of the verb. By analogy, the Jussive also adopted the same suffixes as the Imperfect, in the same persons, since it also ended in the same consonant. The n of the suffix became assimilated to the last consonant, and -u of the masculine (in *-nnū) more or less reduced. After long vowels as well as consonants of the Perfect, developments of the latter allomorphs *-hū/-hā, namely -u/-wəa, were used. Western Gurage partly reorganized the system, it generalized the n-suffixes after all the consonants (also after Sg. 3 f. of the Perfect) and limited the use of the other allomorphs to the case after original long vowels.

A special Outer South-Ethiopic development took place later. After final decadent long vowels, initial consonants of suffixes became geminated. Since 3rd person suffixes had -u/-a after long vowel, starting with a vowel, no gemination was possible. In other persons, however, there was an initial consonant. The initial -k- of the second person suffixes was geminated after original long vowels, V-k- → V-kk-, while the same k was spirantized in all the other positions, k→x→h.

Thus, we find in Outer South-Ethiopic two distributional boundaries for the allomorphs of the object suffixes. One for the 3rd person perpetuating the Proto-Semitic situation: n-suffixes after original short -u (and -a) vs. all the rest. One for the other persons,—as a compensation for the loss of relevant vocalic length there is a division: gemination after original long vowels vs. non-gemination (and spirantization) for all the rest.

7. The connective vowel in Tiberian Hebrew. In Biblical Hebrew, according to the Tiberian vocalization system, the suffixes -nnū/-nnā are connected with the verbal stem by the vowel -e-. This -e- also occurs elsewhere as a connective vowel. The usual explanation for it is that this vowel is the result of a metanalysis in IIIy verbs (see for instance Jouon 1923, 61 f.): yīlwe-nnū “he will borrow it” interpreted as yīlw-ennū. Bauer-Leander
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§ 48r think that it is a development of the energetic ending -an→-en. Barth (1907, p. 2) objects to this that parallel forms in certain Aramaic dialects have the connective vowel -i-, and while -e- may be a development from -i-, both -e- and -i-, and especially the more original -i-, cannot go back to -a. Our explanation is laid on a completely different basis.

The term “šwa” in Hebrew is primarily the name of a diacritic symbol, two vertically aligned dots under a consonantal letter. It may represent zero (lack of vowel) or a neutral, ultra-short vowel ə. In linguistics, the term “šwa” designates the neutral, characterless vowel that is the result of the degradation of a full vowel that cannot be reduced to complete zero. It is the latter definition that should be applied to the Hebrew šwa (not the graphemic symbol that also marks lack of vowel): namely, šwa is a vowel that results from the attempt to reduce a vowel to zero (except in c below). Our hypothesis is that in different conditions such a šwa was realized through different vowels, at least in the Tiberian system.

We do not know whether a vowel, except in a final position, could be reduced to complete zero in Biblical Hebrew or not. A form like *šamarat “she guards” yielded, according to the Masoretes, šāmarā with a vowel ə. Although a šwa is traditionally not considered as a center of syllable, its occurrence must still be determined in terms of the syllable of which the šwa is the peak. The rules to be given here are approximate and require further refinements. We are not going to deal here with šwa in contact with a laryngeal that has the allophones [a] end [ɛ] in distributions different from that of b and c below, and the hatap-vowels as representatives of our a.

a) The šwa is [ə] when it constitutes an open syllable (followed by *CV...), e.g. šāmarā “she guarded” and ba-ḥayit “to a house”.

b) The šwa is [i] in a non-final closed syllable, e.g. gišmor from both *yašmaru “he guards” and *yašmur “let him guard”, and also when pre-

1 Probably, the problem of the šwa Medium can be solved by adopting this statement. This šwa represents a reduced vowel in positions where, if it were reduced to complete zero, a consonant cluster would be possible, cf. Lambert 1895, p. 228 (*məkāy). When such a cluster is not possible, there is a šwa anyhow, and nobody wonders why.

2 See Lambert 1895, p. 230: “On peut bien admettre (...) que le scheid ná lui-même est une voyelle ...”
ceding another šwa of the above type a, e.g. li-zəkūt “to the merit of” (dissimilation?).

c) A šwa is [e] in a final closed syllable, e.g. šmārātek “she guarded you (f. sg.)”, way-y’ibhen “he built”. The proof that [e] represents a šwa here is that the parallel form of a verb which has a stop in the final position, e.g. way-yešṭ “he drank”, does contain a grapheme šwa = zero in the same position (see also d below). Here the šwa is not the result of a reduction. It represents a genuine consonant cluster in a final position when ending in a liquid. Such a cluster is always dissolved in a final position, whatever the final consonant is, in the so-called segolate nouns, with the expected [e] for šwa: m’elek for *malk “king”, s’eper for *sipr “book” and b’odeš for *huds “month”.

In rules a and b, šwa represents a reduced vowel. This vowel may be reduced because it bears no stress. Stressed vowels are more resistant to change. Later reorganizations of the system, however, may drive the stress to the syllable created or rescued by the šwa. Rules a-b-c refer thus to unstressed syllables, and for the stressed ones, the following rules are given:

d) The šwa is [e] in a final stressed syllable, e.g. possessive ending of Sg. 2 f. -eč, way-y’eč “he bent”, šem “name”, way-y’ešṭ “he drank”. (A case contradicting the last example is way-y’ish “he captured” with [i] instead of the expected [e].) The proof that [e] represents šwa is that the allomorphs of the word šem illustrate rules a, b, c and d in an eloquent way. There is a) šem- with [a] before vocalic suffixes (open syllable, e.g. šmēnek “your (f. sg.) name”), b) šim- with [i] before consonantal suffix (closed syllable, e.g. šimkā “your (m. sg.) name”), c) construct state šem with [e] (unstressed final syllable,—unstressed by position), all these bearing no stress,—and d) the stressed form šem (final stressed syllable). The corresponding Arabic word is ism with no vowel between s and m; Go’ez has sam. This makes the reconstruction *šem as the basis for all the above allomorphs very plausible. See also Lambert 1895, p. 230.

e) The šwa is [e] in a non-final stressed syllable, 1: when it is closed, our n-suffixes -ennā/-ennā, etc., 2: before final -ā, e.g. Sg. 3 f. object suffix -ēhā, Sg. 2 m. possessive ending -ēhā.

f) The šwa is [e] in a non-final stressed open syllable, except when the final vowel is -ā (see e2 above), e.g. Sg. 1. object suffix -ēnū, Sg. 3 m. -ēnū, Pl. ic. -ēnū, etc.

Furthermore, connective vowels may be the survival of an older vowel
(cf. Section 5 above for Arabic min(a)-), e.g. šmūr-a-nī “he guarded me” from older *šamara later šāmar, šmār-t-ī-nī “you (f. sg.) guarded me” from older *šamarti later šāmart, etc.

In our case, the object suffixes of Sg. 3 m./f. are -nnā/-nnā. A morphophonemic rule of Tiberian Hebrew is that when verbs are followed by an object suffix, the stress never falls on the verbal stem. Since the object suffixes Sg. lec. -nī, Pl. lec. -nā and Sg. 3 m./f. -nnā/-nnā (in other words, suffixes containing an n) may, for obscure reasons, never carry stress, and since the stress cannot be relegated to the verbal stem,—an anaptyctic ū vowel is created between the verbal stem and the suffix that serves as a support for the stress, realized [ɛ] and [ɛ] according to rules e and f above.

8. Survey. The present study has dealt with 3rd person singular pronoun suffixes only. Another type of Sg. 3 m. suffix (still contested by certain scholars) is attested after verb, noun and adverb: *-mu, that is -mō in Hebrew and -m in Phoenician (see Albright 1966, pp. 34–5). As for 3rd person plural suffixes, Hebrew shows no allomorphs with n. Outer South-Ethiopic, however, has Pl. 3 m./f. -nnāmu/-nnāma after the Perfect and -āmu/-āma after the Imperfect with the gemination that represents an assimilated n. The contradiction between these languages and Hebrew prevents us from drawing conclusions about Proto-Semitic. Since the 3rd person plural endings -mu/-ma for masc./fem. are Outer South-Ethiopic innovations, maybe the preceding n is also an innovation. Let us remember, however, that Hebrew has no occurrences of the energetic -n before plural suffixes either (see Table 1). This would suggest that before the bisyllabic plural suffixes (against monosyllabic singulars) every inserted n had been completely eliminated. Phoenician (see Harris 1937, pp. 49–50 and 57) has a possessive/object suffix of Pl. 3 m. -nem used after vowel only. After a consonant, there is -em. This may be an extension of a Proto-Semitic allomorph originally reserved to a position after short -u/-a, and generalized after vowels. Harris explains -nem by a metanalysis of the plural ending -ūn+em yielding -ū+nem, and the latter -nem is generalized after a vowel both in the verbal and the nominal system.

In certain Aramaic dialects (Barth 1907, p. 3), after the Imperfect

---

1 In the Perfect, it may fall on the subject suffixes too. This morphophonemic rule suggests that object suffixes had once been independent words with their own stress.
and later also the Jussive, suffixes containing -in- were currently used after any person (but no suffix of 2nd person plural is attested). One should investigate further the extent of the use of these suffixes. They also may be a survival of the n-suffixes, generalized after all the persons of the prefix-conjugations and for all the persons of object. In another dialectal distribution (partly coinciding with the above-mentioned phenomenon), we find in Aramaic Pl. 3 m. object suffixes -innān/-inhō, indiscriminately used after any tense and also the infinitive (Barth 1913, p. 70). In the first case, the common denominator was “after prefix-conjugations: Imperfect and Jussive”; here it is “Pl. 3 m. of object after any tense”, that is, one person. It is obvious that the two cases are not comparable. *Barth* (1913, p. 39) did not realize the difference between them. The latter Pl. 3 m. suffix still requires an explanation. Probably it is the independent pronoun of Pl. 3 m. used as a suffix.

The suffixes brought forth by *Barth* (1907, p. 6 and 1913, p. 56) from Omani Arabic -(in)no “him”, -(in)he “her” and -(in)nek “you” must be later innovations because they occur (exclusively!) after original participles used now as a Perfect.

Another interesting point is the occurrence of a Sg. 3 m. suffix -nu in a type of Baghdad Arabic (in this person only) after vowels, in verb, noun and preposition. *Barth* (ibid., pp. 10–12) thought that this -nu was nothing but the dialectal Sg. 3 m. independent pronoun hinu “he”, used as a suffix. According to him, the -nu in hinu would come from the Syriac Imperfect prefix of 3rd person n-,—a rather farfetched explanation. Apparently unsatisfied with it, later (Barth 1913, pp. 18 and 55), he suggested that -nu would be identical with the Agaw 3rd person singular independent pronoun ni (correctly yi). This is not plausible either. *Blanc* (1964, p. 64 ff.) also mentions -nu after a vowel (against -u after a consonant) in the Jewish and Christian (but not Muslim) dialects of Baghdad Arabic, and further in Mosul and in “some Central Asian dialects” (p. 66). As independent pronoun “he”, he gives huwēi/ huwē in the Baghdadi dialects but mentions “the usual Mosul form /hinu/” (p. 60 and also p. 164). He explains it (p. 192, fn. 90) as the result of a metanalysis of hiyā “she” into a basis hi- and the Sg. 3 f. pronoun suffix -ya (properly -a, but after -i there is a hiatus sound -y-). Then, “he” is accordingly reshaped as basis hi-+Sg. 3 m. pronoun suffix -nu “his, him”. This explanation is much more plausible than *Barth*’s. Today the occurrence of hinu “he” is geographically more limited (in Mosul only) than that of -nu “his, him” itself, but *Blanc* indicates (pp. 60 and
that it may have been more widely used in older times than today.

The question is whether this -nu may be related to Proto-Semitic -nnū or not. If it is, it must be a borrowing from the Aramaic substratum. It is less likely that this suffix is the survival of a Proto-Arabic form lost elsewhere. There are two arguments against the Proto-Semitic origin: 1) n occurs in suffixes of the Sg. 3 m. only, while, according to Proto-Semitic, we would expect it in Sg. 3 f. too; 2) a weaker argument is that -nu occurs mainly after long vowels, while -nnū is legitimate after short -u and -a only. This second counter-argument can easily be discarded by positing a generalization of -nu after every vowel, and after the reduction of final short vowels, only long vowels could maintain it. Thus it is impossible to decide now whether Baghdadi -nu is connected with Proto-Semitic -nnū or not. (See further G. Oussani, JAOS, 22, pp. 104–6, 1901).

As for the second person singulars, Biblical Hebrew (or shall we say Tiberian Hebrew?) does have a Sg. 3 m. object suffix -'ekkā, besides the usual -kā. The first allomorph is usually interpreted as the result of an assimilation from *-en-kā, the energetic form (or for Barth, the deictic inna). However, the energetic morpheme combined with Sg. 2 m. yields the curious form -en(uk?)kā in Table 1. On the other hand, all the examples brought forth by Lambert (1903, p. 182) prove, against Lambert, that -'ekkā is nothing but a pausal allomorph of -kā. It does not obey any particular distributional rule and appears indiscriminately after the Imperfect, Jussive and Prefix-Perfect, after the regular Perfect (e.g. Dt. 24:13, etc.), Infinitive (e.g. Hi. 33:32), Participle (e.g. Dt. 8:5) and after an adverb (Prov. 25:16) always in pause. Barth (1907, p. 5) did not realize that his "n-haltige Suffixe" used after an Infinitive and Participle in Hebrew all belong to Sg. 2 m. -'ekkā in pause; there is no -'ennū after these forms. Therefore, our dissociation of -'ekkā from -ennū is imperative. Thus, -'ekkā must be interpreted the following way. Pausal forms often tend to contrast contextual ones by changing their stress. Because of the morphophonemic rule, which does not allow stress on the verbal stem itself (see end of Section 7), the only contrast that could be established was by means of a šwa between the stem and the suffix to support the transferred stress. Then, according to rule e in Section 7, either -'ēkā or -'ēkkā was obtained. According to the Masoretic interpretation, the second one is rather reserved to verbs but it may occur after non-finite verbal forms too. The first one is used after a noun, but it may also occur after verbs, and it is the normal allomorph for the non-finite
verbal forms. This imperfect differentiation may be due to the fact that final short vowels of verbs did not disappear at the same time as similar vowels of the nouns, so that -ēkā and -ēkkā were introduced in two different periods.

The first person singular pronoun suffixes are more complicated and deserve a special study. There usually is -nī after verbs and -ī/ya after nouns (cf. ins. 3, 4 on p. 117). The distribution of the form with n is by no means the same as for the Sg. 3 m./f. n-suffixes. As a preliminary presentation we suggest that in Proto-Semitic there was *-ni(ya) only. Later the n was dropped (assimilated?) after a consonant and after -i (through n → y?), while it was maintained elsewhere. Since the noun could only offer positions after a consonant and -i, the n was altogether dropped here. As -nī had thus become a symbol of “non-noun”, it was generalized after a verb, even following a consonant (or a long -i of Sg. 2 f.). Old Assyrian (see von Soden § 84e) still maintains the old distribution, -i after consonant (iktašu- “er erreichte mich”) and -nī after long vowel (imxurē-nī “sie wandten sich an mich”). Outer South-Ethiopic also maintains both allomorphs after verbs, -n in a Heavy position (for *-ni after original long vowels) and -e (from *-ya, in Gafat -(ā)y) in all Light positions: after consonants, but also after short vowels unlike what we posit for Proto-Semitic. The actual cases where -e is used after a short vowel is in the Perfect (after -ā). Since, as said in Section 5, object suffixes after the Perfect are a relatively late development, this anomaly vis-à-vis Proto-Semitic is understandable.

The first person plural suffixes are the least problematic in the whole pronominal system of Semitic.

In addition to presenting a theory on Proto-Semitic pronoun suffixes, the aim of this study has been to remind Semitists of the importance of the Ethiopian languages spoken today for reconstructing Proto-Semitic.
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Notes on the Alleged Coptic Morphological Influence on Egyptian Arabic

Coptic and Arabic lived in conjunction in Egypt for several centuries after the Arab conquest of the country in A.D. 642.¹ It is only natural that Egyptian Arabic could not be wholly uninfluenced by Coptic, but the extent and nature of this influence still remain a controversial question. The existence of a lexical influence is certainly beyond dispute,² but no consensus has been reached as regards a Coptic phonological and grammatical substratum in Egyptian Arabic. While SPITTA had to state that he could not find any grammatical feature in the dialect which could with some certainty be considered as a Coptic influence,³ PRAETORIUS proposed as such the peculiar word order in interrogative sentences,⁴ and, a little later, LITTMANN brought up two further instances, the use of positive plus 'as as a comparative pattern side by side with the more common elative plus min, and the use of dem. pron. plus pers. pron. for adverb plus pers. suff.⁵ GALTIER could not accept any of these; in a short comparative study he came to the conclusion that the grammatical

¹ DE LACY O'LEARY, Notes on the Coptic Language, Orientalia n.s. III (1934), pp. 243–58, estimates the duration of the living contact as six or seven centuries (p. 247 f.).

² WILHELM SPITTA-BEY deals with the subject briefly in his Grammatik des arabischen Vulgärdialectes von Ägypten, Leipzig 1880, p. x, Note 2. It is also treated by O'LEARY, pp. 256–8, and more comprehensively, although not without considerable exaggerations and rash propositions, GEORGY SORHY BEY, Common Words in the Spoken Arabic of Egypt, of Greek or Coptic Origin, Le Caire 1950 (Publications de la Société d'archéologie Copte). A sober and reliable study is WILSON B. BISHAI, Coptic Lexical Influence on Egyptian Arabic. JNES 23 (1964), pp. 39–47. Coptic words often occur in place names; most loan-words are technical terms such as words connected with Christian worship, names of tools, animals, plants etc.

³ SPITTA, p. x.


Coptic influence was only a hypothesis and far from being proved. This stand was also taken by O’Leary. More recently, Munzel denied the alleged Coptic influence on the word order in interrogative sentences and regarded it as a result of an internal development of Arabic. Brockelmann’s opinion was cautious: Coptic did not give anything new but it directed the course of development of Egyptian Arabic in cases where hesitation prevailed between different unestablished usages.

Similarly, opinions differ as to the extent of the Coptic phonological influence. Praetorius considered the abundance of vowel colours in Egyptian Arabic a possible Coptic influence, but Littmann thought this was improbable, mainly because the vocalism of Palestinian Arabic is almost as rich as that of the dialect spoken in Egypt. Prince attributed the phoneme g to Coptic influence, but this proposition has not been accepted. According to O’Leary, ‘as far as phonology is concerned nothing in modern Egyptian dialect can be traced with confidence to the influence of Coptic;’ Worrell believed that the Coptic sounds became arabicized during the contact between the two languages and not vice versa.

The most recent study of the Coptic substratum is Bishai’s dissertation, also published in concise form in four separate articles. The author considers that Cairene is not phonetically and phonologically influenced

---

2 O’Leary, p. 252 f.
4 Carl Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen II, Berlin 1913, § 116 b.
5 Praetorius, p. 145.
6 Littmann, p. 681.
8 O’Leary, p. 256.
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by Bohairic in any way; in Upper Egyptian dialect, on the other hand, no phonemic change can be attributed to Coptic influence, but three allophonic changes can be regarded as Sahidic influence, viz. the lack of aspiration of voiceless stops, palatalization of velar sounds (e.g. \( k \rightarrow k' \)), and fronting certain points of articulation (e.g. \( j \rightarrow q, q \rightarrow g \)).

In the grammar of Egyptian Arabic, BISHAI regards as a certain Coptic substratum both the peculiar word order in interrogative sentences and the use of dem. pron. plus pers. pron. for adverb plus pers. suff., and as an uncertain substratum the use of positive plus 'an as a comparative pattern for the usual elative plus min. In addition to these three instances given earlier by LITTMANN, BISHAI proposes two further features as certain Coptic influence: the use of mā as an imperative prefix, and the use of 'a plus pronoun plus perfect as a past tense form. The author assigns these two instances to morphological interferences. It is well-known that this kind of interinfluencing is not unparalleled, but most instances are rather lexical, e.g. the analogical transition of a suffix indicating agent from loan-words to native words. The two examples given by BISHAI show, however, a more deep-reaching influence of one foreign language on the structure of another. It would, therefore, be necessary to reconsider the tenability of the hypothesis.

mā as an Imperative Prefix

Beside the normal form 'iktib, the imperative 'write' is also sometimes rendered in Egyptian Arabic by mā plus imperfect: mā tiktib. This usage does not seem to have any parallel in classical Arabic. Having itemized all the cases where mā is used in classical language, BISHAI states quite categorically: 'it is rather inconceivable to think of a negative construction changing into an imperative one through an internal development in the language, especially when no other Semitic language or dialect has exhibited a similar feature.' He finds the only possible source in Coptic where ma- appears as an imperative prefix, e.g. mat(s)bbo 'become clean', matamio 'make'. It should be noticed, however, that in Coptic the prefix ma- is not very widely used but appears solely with t- causatives. In Coptic, original imperative forms are rare; the impera-

---

1 BISHAI, JAOS 80, p. 227.
3 BISHAI, JAOS 82, p. 288.
4 J. MARTIN PLUMLEY, An Introductory Coptic Grammar (Sahidic Dialect). London 1948 (p. 113).
ative is usually rendered by an infinitive. Thus, the form with ma- is not the only imperative form, not even the commonest, but only used in one verb class, and there, too, side by side with infinitive forms (tābbī, tamyā). The meaning given by the prefix ma- is probably optative.

BISHAI's argument may convince, but only cursorily. A similar feature, it is true, cannot be found in any other Semitic language, but the historical development of the negative mā already forbids the introduction of rash assertions concerning Arabic. As a matter of fact, the negative particles mā and lā are used in classical Arabic with the imperfect in a function not far from imperative, viz. as ḥarīf t-taḥḍiti wa-l-ardī, particles of requiring with urgency, or with gentleness. Yet there is an essential difference: in classical Arabic mā and lā are in this case connected to other particles, e.g. laumā, laulū, hallā, 'allā. It is, however, noticeable that 'amā, which is usually a ḥarīf t-tanbīhi, a particle of drawing attention, is also used to denote requiring a thing in a gentle manner, i.e. as a ḥarīf l-ardī: 'amā taqūmu 'why don't you stand up?', 'amā taf'alu 'why don't you do?' According to WRIGHT, "in later times the simple mā is so used; as mā taqūmu 'dost thou not stand up?' or 'thou dost not stand up!' equivalent to 'pray, stand up'."

The feature also seems to appear in Palestinian Arabic, e.g. walak inte biti'ab lamā, ma yit'ab abu līlē? 'Du, für wen muhst du dich ab? Soll sich denn der Vater der Familie nicht auch abmühn?' The question is

1 PLUMLEY, p. 112; WALTER C. TILL, Koptische Grammatik (Südlicher Dialekt) mit Bibliographie, Lesestücken und Wörterverzeichnissen. 2. Aufl., Leipzig 1961 (pp. 150–2).

2 L. TH. LEFORT, A propos de syntaxe copte. Le Muséon 60 (1947), pp. 7–28 (p. 23 f.).

3 PLUMLEY, p. 113, TILL, p. 151.


5 Edward William LANE, Arabic-English Lexicon. London and Edinburgh, I 1863 (p. 92). Michel Eghali, Syntaxe des parlers arables actuels du Liban, Paris 1928 (Bibliothèque de l'École des langues orientales vivantes, 9), p. 222 f., deals with the affirmative and energetic use of mā in Lebanese Arabic deriving its origin from 'amā. This is possibly true, but the development 'amā > mā cannot have been purely phonetic as Eghali believes, since mā is similarly used also in those dialect areas where a has been preserved in unstressed open syllables. The reason for the absence of 'a- is more probably grammatical: the interrogative particle 'a- is not used in the dialect in question.

6 WRIGHT II, p. 211 A.

clearly rhetorical and emphasizes what actually or better should be done. The sentence ya ɣärna ma tōhād haz-zalame ma’ak ḫallīh yuḥruš ‘uḵbe ‘uḵbe ma’ak balitš t’allam ‘Nachbar, willst du nicht diesen Mann mit dir nehmen? Lass ihn ein kleines Weilchen mit dir pflügen. Vielleicht lernt er’ begins with a negative question denoting a request, which is in continuation rendered with an imperative (ḥallīh). Similarly, mā is a harfu l’-argi in the following instance: wi’i ɪḏ-ḏēj it-tāni kal-le: ya amir int kā’id ḫamīš ji ḥatub u-ǧalle ta-ti’mal ḳahwi? ma ṭnabbih ʿabdak? ḥallīh isawwī badālak! “Der andere, der Gast, erwachte, er sprach zu ihm: ‘Du Emir, du sitzt da und sammelst Reisig und trocknen Mist, um Kaffee zu machen? Willst du nicht deinen Knecht aufwecken, lass es ihn doch an deiner Stelle tun!” One of the commonest uses of rhetorical questions is in reproaches, where the meaning of mā plus imperfect is nearly the same as that of imperative, but more affective, e.g. ya ’ebbak ma tistahi bida’kk ji mart aḥāk ‘O Schande über dich, schämst du dich nicht? Du greifst nach der Frau deines Bruders?’

Often mā plus imperfect is no more a negative question but rather an urgent demand, tahšid, e.g. ya ‘amm bībī had-diikk? kāl: lá, ya șidi! kal-le: mā-thī’e? ‘Onkel, willst du mir den Hahn verkaufen? Er sprach: ‘Nein, mein Herr!’ Er sagte zu ihm: ‘Willst du ihn nicht verkaufen?’’ The context shows that the buyer necessarily wants to buy the cock, and that mā-thī’e means ‘won’t you sell it (for any price)?’, or better, ‘you must sell it’.

It is worth noting that the negative affirmative -š does not occur in the given instances, although it is regularly, even if not obligatorily, suffixed to negations in the dialect in question. The modal nature of the question is also clearly shown by the simple imperfect form: the syntactic contrast between b-imperfect and the simple (y-)imperfect in Palestinian Arabic is primarily indicative vs. modal.

A similar instance is given by BAYER: ma tšušk ‘alēna ‘besuch uns doch’ “im Sinne eines dringenden Wunsches, ursprünglich verneinende vorwurfsvolle Frage und daraus der Wunsch: tu es doch!” The expres-

1 SCHMIDT-KAHLE, 1, 30, 5.
2 Ibid., 2, 110, 5.
3 Ibid., 1, 38, 11.
4 Ibid., 2, 121, 5.
sion is also used in Damascus, and in 3. pers., too, e.g. *ma y’ūm yrūh ’ala bêto ba’a* ‘Er soll doch endlich nach Hause gehen!’

Examined side by side with the above instances the Egyptian Arabic forms given by Spitta appear to be of exactly the same character, e.g. *mā t’rūḥ or mattrāh* ‘wirst du nicht gehen?’, i.e. ‘so geh doch!’, *ma tigī* ‘wirst du nicht kommen?’, i.e. ‘so komm doch!’, *gal-li mā t’sūq* ‘er sagte zu mir: so treib doch (die Esel) an!’, *inte mā ḥadīt el-kirē mā tāḥod et-jehein iṭhānok* ‘du hast doch den Lohn genommen, so nimm doch auch das Korn und mahle es!’, *macqām terāḥ warāh lammā tešāf yrūḥ lḥuddā* jēn ‘steh doch auf und gehe ihm nach, damit du siehst, wohin er geht’, *mā tākli yā bint* ‘ammi ‘so iss doch, Cousine!’, *wā-ḥatt el-bēda ji ‘ibboh gālī-loh mathallīha hene lamma tir̄γa* ‘und er steckte das Ei in seine Tasche: sie sprachen zu ihm: lass es doch hier, bis du zurückkehrst!’ These instances show that the Egyptian Arabic expression has parallels in other dialects, but it must also be noticed that the feature seems to be more common in Egypt, and, besides, in some idiom has developed further, e.g. *galli: ’mātyalla ḫal-balad it-tānỳa*...’ *gut: ’yalla* ‘’Damn sagte er: ’Los! Gehen wir ins nächste Dorf ...‘ Ich sagte: ’Gehen wir!’” According to Abul-Fadl, *mātyalla* is a contamination of the words *mā ti’mil* and *yalla*.

If the use of *mā* plus imperfect as an expression of an urgent demand outside Egypt were limited to adjacent areas only, it might be possible to suppose that the feature there be an Egyptian Arabic influence, but its general occurrence also outside this area renders this presumption impossible. The expression belongs especially to a vivid colloquial, and therefore is not frequently found in published texts. The following Baghdadi Arabic lines are very typical of vulgar conversation: *lak, matqullī intī hiṣat ē?* ‘He! Was bist du denn für ein Kreatur?’, i.e. ‘tell me etc.’, *ē, yirḥāma labāk, matqullī gābil āni da agāddī* ‘gott erbarme sich deines Vaters! Sag, bin ich denn ein Bettler?’

It is, then, impossible to regard this expression as an exclusive Egyptian Arabic feature influenced by a relatively rare Coptic imperative.

---

1 Ariel Bloch und Heinz Grotfeld, Damaschenisch-arabische Texte in Transkription mit Übersetzung und Glossar hrsg. AKM 35, 2, Wiesbaden 1964 (p. 126, 24).
2 Spitta, p. 344.
5 Ibid., p. 71, line 2.
form. In all probability it is the result of an internal development of Arabic, most likely traceable to negative affective rhetorical questions.

The Pattern ‘a plus Personal Pronoun plus Perfect

In Egyptian Arabic a particular type of past tense is rendered by the pattern ‘a plus personal pronoun plus perfect, e.g. ‘a hu seme ‘he heard’. According to BISHAI, this construction has no parallel in any other Arabic dialect, but an equivalent pattern is found in Coptic: a + f + sōtm =prefix a plus sing. 3. masc. pers. pron. bound form plus verb ‘to hear’, probably in infinitive form.1 BISHAI does not think it possible to trace the feature to an internal development of Arabic, ‘since there is no apparent source in the Semitic morphological structure from which it could have sprung.’2 He supposes that the Coptic pattern was transferred into Egyptian Arabic so that ‘the Egyptians apparently borrowed the Coptic prefix a together with its grammatical function and joined it to their native stems.’3 Thus, BISHAI seems to regard the feature not as a substratum but as a superstratum. Actually, this development would have been rather strange. BISHAI gives as a parallel case the borrowing of the Turkish suffix -çı and its joining to native Arabic words. However, these two cases are quite different: the borrowing of the prefix concerned would involve both the straight borrowing of the prefix a- and the translation borrowing of the pattern. In addition, no such loan-word which might have given the source to the analogical transferring of this verbal prefix is to be found. A more natural way would, in my opinion, have been that those Copts who became bilingual identified an Arabic form resembling the Coptic pattern a plus pers. pron. plus verb, and then began using this pattern in Arabic in the sense of the Coptic pattern.4

Compared with classical Arabic, the Egyptian Arabic pattern is undoubtedly different. But does the Coptic pattern really furnish the only possible source for the development of an outwardly corresponding pattern in Egyptian Arabic? The construction ‘a plus pers. pron. is in fact not uncommonly used in Egyptian Arabic as a demonstrative particle, e.g. hene áhó ‘hier da’, d’ana áhó ‘das bin ich hier’, áhó di el-maţlāb ‘siehe da, das ist der Gesuchte’.5 This ‘á cannot be but a variant of the common

1 Till, p. 159.
2 BISHAI, JAOS 82, p. 289.
3 Ibid.
5 SPITTA, p. 76.
Semitic demonstrative interjection ḫā'ā. As to its use with a personal pronoun (‘āhāwā, ‘āhiya, ‘āhumma; more common: ‘āhū, ‘āhi, ‘āhum; ‘āhō, ‘āhē ‘āhōm), there are two peculiarities: (1) It is used with 3rd person only, (2) its occurrence is not bound to the beginning of a sentence. The former of these peculiarities distinguishes the use of the pattern from most Arabic dialects, but also from Coptic. In perf. I, all the persons occur after the prefix a- in Coptic. The latter peculiarity is by no means associated with perfect forms only, but concerns similarly all uses of 'a plus personal pronoun. Thus, neither of these peculiarities suggests Coptic influence.

Moreover, it is noteworthy that the pattern 'a plus personal pronoun plus perfect is not unknown in Arabic dialects outside Egypt. For comparison, the most suitable instances are perhaps to be found in Djidjelli, Algeria, where such forms as /animations:αu, animations:αi and animations:αm are used side by side with hāhu, hāu, hāi, hāhum, hāhom, hām, etc. as actualizing particles in the beginning of a sentence, e.g. hāhu bēntēk ‘voici justement ta fille’, animations:αm wāldikum ‘ils sont vos parents’, animations:αu rāqēd ‘il est à dormir’, but also with perfect form: animations:αu tjāni ‘il a commencé et continue à me faire mal’, .animations:αi tmēshrēt bik ‘elle a commencé et continuent à se moquer de toi’, animations:αm khāwē ‘ils ont commencé et continuent à me manger (mon bien)’, animations:αm hāllīg l-hād ‘ils vont avoir achevé la moisson’, animations:αu rōght ‘je vais incessamment être parti’. The 3rd persons have partially superseded the other persons. This clearly shows an intermediate stage in the development concluded in Egyptian Arabic. In Djidjelli it is impossible to think of Coptic influence. Thus it seems necessary to regard this feature also as the result of the internal development of Arabic both here and in Egypt.

Summary

In both cases of the alleged Coptic morphological influence on Egyptian Arabic the development can justifiably be explained as an internal development of Arabic. Besides, neither of the two peculiarities is un-

---

1 WOLFDIETRICH FISCHER, Die demonstrativen Bildungen der neurarabischen Dialekte, ’s-Gravenhage 1959 (pp. 167–71).
2 ibid., p. 169, Anm. 1.
3 TILL, p. 159.
paralleled in other Arabic dialects. However, it would be too daring to maintain that Coptic had nothing to do with these features; nothing can prove this. But the greatest contribution Coptic may have made to Egyptian Arabic morphology in the cases so far discussed is the preference of certain patterns over some other because of an accidental identification of an utterly similar pattern in Coptic by bilingual speakers during the transition period. This may also have influenced both the meaning and frequency of the Egyptian Arabic 'imperative' mā plus imperfect and the pattern 'a plus personal pronoun plus perfect.

Im Hebräischen entspricht ḥorāp „Herbst“, „reifes Mannesalter“ mit dem Denominativ tāhbrāp „den Herbst (und Winter) zubringen“ (Jesaja 18, 6) zu einem *yḥrap.


Im Aramäischen findet sich schliesslich ḥurpā, ḥurpastā „Lamm“, nach Brockelmann „annicula unius anni (ovis)“ (Lexicon Syriaeum, s. v.), vgl. ḥurrītā „(einjähriges) Lamm“ bei Dalman, Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch s. v. und Nöldeke, Mandäische Grammatik S. 60.

Eine ausgezeichnete Parallele zur Bedeutungsentwicklung des arab. xarif- und des akkad. xarpū gewährt uns nun das deutsche „Herbst“,


Wenn *xarīf* von Pferden gebraucht wurde, hat man es vielleicht mit

Was nun xarîf- „junges Schaf, Lamm, Hammel“ betrifft, so herrscht unter den Arabern eine ganz andere Auffassung. Nach den arabischen Lexikographen ist hier von xarafa „abpflücken, abweiden“ auszugehen, vgl. z. B. alxarîfî yusammâ xarîfîn l’annahu yaxrifu min hâkûnâ wa hâkunâ ,xarîf wird so genannt, weil es diese oder jene Stelle abweidet“ (Maqûyîs allûga s. v.); alxarîfu: wa ladu ḥamâni wa ẓinâ huwa dina lâuda’i mina dâ’i ni xâssatan ... wa štiqâqihu ’annahu yaxrifu min


CHRISTOPHER TOLL

Einige metrologische und metallurgische Termini im Arabischen


1. Qafla

Das Wort qafla kommt als Adverbial vor: wa-kāna laʿallahu yanṭaṣṣu min as-ṣurra al-kabīra al-talāta ad-darāhim qaflatan 27b und wa-kāna waṣṣiṣu qaflatan arbaʿa darāhim 46a, mit der Bedeutung „auf einmal“, „alles in allem“, „in summa“. Das Wort ist in dieser Bedeutung wohlbekannt — im Lisān steht s.v. ṣaʿuqa insānān šaiʿan bi-marrā: aṯāḥu alfan qaflatan.

Ferner kommt das Wort im Ausdruck dirham qafla vor, wie fa-kāna yaqaʿ al-muṭawwaq min al-ṣidqaʾ ʿisrīn dirhaman qaflatan „und 1 [dīnār] muṭawwaq (siehe unten sub 2.) entspricht in Silber 20 dirham qafla“ 25b, yaḵkūn waṣṣiṣu min dirham qafla ʿlā miṯqāl 34b, mā yanqūṣu min kull miʿa dirham qafla dirham 43b. Der Ausdruck heisst im Plural darāhim qafla: yuḥallīṣu minḥā ʿaṣara dirāhim qafla 61a, wa-amnu rubʿ ḥabba fī ḍamāʾ al-ʿiyār al-ladʿi ḥwaqa arbaʿa darāhim qafla „und was [einen Mangel von] 1/4 ḥabba vom ganzen Standardgoldstück betrifft, das 4 dirham qafla ist“ 47a. Im ersten Beispiel könnte qafla allerdings auch als Adverbial aufgefasst werden. Eindeutig ist das Wort aber, wenn der Ausdruck in bestimmter Form steht: saʿat ad-dirham al qafla 51b, ḥilāz ad-dirham al qafla 29a, „die Weite“ bzw. „die Dicke einer dirham qafla [Münze]“.

Dass das ḥā’ zur Wurzel gehört, bedeutet natürlich, dass es nicht als Femininendum aufzufassen ist, was auch richtig ist, da dirham maskulin ist. Qafla steht also nicht als Attribut von dirham, sondern ist ein Substantiv, das als Apposition zu dirham steht (s. H. L. Fleischer, Kleine Schriften 2:1, Leipzig 1888, 44 ff.). A. Grohmann (Südarabien als Wirtschaftsgebiet, 1, Wien 1922, 201 Fussn. 1, übers. aus al-Hamdānī, Ṣifat ḡazirat al-ʿarab, hrsg. von D. H. Müller, Leiden 1884, 1:194) hat dirhamu qaflatin gelesen, aber diese Lesung ist unmöglich, weil es im Ack. dirhaman qaflatan und in bestimmter Form ad-dirhamu’l-gaflatu heisst.


Dirham qafla bedeutet also ein dirham im ganzen, ein vollständiger dirham ohne Mangel. Die Bedeutung steht derjenigen nahe, die Beeston (in Arabie and Islamic studies in honor of H. A. R. Gibb, Leiden 1965, 103) für das aus Sura 12:20 bekannte darākim muʾadda zeigt, aus ḥāfṣa muʾadda vumīṣmaṭa. Vgl. damit die Ausdrücke dinār ʿaddad und ʿain muʾaddad (A. Grohmann, Einführung und Chrestomathie zur arabischen Papyruskunde, 1, Praha 1955, 187). Die gezählten Münzen wurden aber auch gewogen (Grohmann ibd.), und auch dirham qafla wird im Lisan etc. (s. oben) mit wūzin erklärt.

Was zuletzt den Wert eines dirham qafla betrifft, so erhält man eine relative Schätzung durch die Bemerkung al-Hamdānīs in Šīfā ʿājarat al-ʿarab 194: „man bekommt 6 raḥ Honig für 1 dirham baqīātī aber 7 oder 8 für 1 dirham qafla“. Vgl. auch unten unter dinār muṭawwaq.

2. Muṭawwaq

10 dirham, Silber. Wegen der schweren Dürre 290/903 wurde das Verhältnis 1 dinár mutfawwaq = 20 dirham Silber wiederhergestellt. Ähnliche Schwankungen gehen aus der Tabelle bei Grohmann, Einführung 190 f., hervor.
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dirham 'alā waṣṭhaihi bi-taṣq wa-kataba fi-taṣq al-wāḥid ... Auf Münzen heisst taṣq also der Rand für die Umschrift (Randlegende), eine Bedeutung, die das Wort wiederholt im K. al-Ǧauharatayn (74 b f., 77 b) und auch heute noch hat (N. M. An-Naqṣbandī, ad-Ǧīnār al-islāmī fī Mathāf al-‘irāqī, 1, Bağdād 1372/1953, 56), als Gegensatz von markaz und Synonym zu hāmiś ('A. Fahmī, Munṣīṭ an-nuqūd al-‘arabiyya, 1, Kairo 1965, in den Münzbeschreibungen im Katalog).


Auch den anderen semitischen Sprachen scheint die Wurzel TWQ zu fehlen. Meines Erachtens handelt es sich hier um ein iranisches Lehnwort, und zwar eine Nebenform zu ṭabaq „Pfanne“ aus pehl. ṭāpak, neupers. ṭaba (P. Horn, Grundriss Nr. 372, und H. Hübshmann, Persische Studien 46), das wohl ursprünglich eine runde Schlüssel bezeichnet, vgl. ṭūd&taccent; dan „drehen“. Der Übergang ab > au (wie kakak > kaukak) wird bestätigt durch das Vorkommen desselben Wortes in den beiden Formen im Syrischen: ḫāṣjav und ṭāṣjav, beide mit der Bedeutung „Schüssel“.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jahr</th>
<th>Durchmesser (mm)</th>
<th>Gewicht (g)</th>
<th>Quelle (Nr. im Münzkatalog)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>222</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3,45</td>
<td>FAHMİ 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3,225</td>
<td>ibd. 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>20,6</td>
<td>4,154</td>
<td>NĀQŠBANDĪ 141a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>19,4</td>
<td>3,48</td>
<td>ibd. 141b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224</td>
<td>18,5</td>
<td>3,34</td>
<td>G. C. MILES, Rare Islamic coins, New York 1950, Numism. notes and monogr. 118, 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>228</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,87</td>
<td>FAHMİ 2047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229</td>
<td>20,5</td>
<td>3,48</td>
<td>MILES 143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3,16</td>
<td>Berlin, NÜTZEL 1462, „stark beschnitten“</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,87</td>
<td>BN LAVOIX 973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>249</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,91</td>
<td>BN 974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>17,5</td>
<td>2,95</td>
<td>Berlin 1527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>256</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>BN 991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>257</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,91</td>
<td>MILES 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>259</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>ibd. 157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>265</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,915</td>
<td>BM 9:69, 355k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>280</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2,86</td>
<td>FAHMİ 2393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>283</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2,9</td>
<td>BM 378</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Das Normalgewicht eines Dinaris ist 4,25 g. In der Periode 222–238 der Übersicht erreicht keiner der Dinaris dieses Gewicht — die meisten zeigen ein erhebliches Untergewicht. Zwischen 238 und 249 wurden die muṭawwaq-Dinaris eingeführt, welche das Gewicht des Dirhams haben, d. h. 2,98 g. Das Flächenmass bleibt aber ziemlich unverändert — die Verminderung des Durchmessers ist durchschnittlich 0,75 mm. Die Münzen weichen nur wenig vom Dirham-Gewicht ab. Ab 307 werden diese muṭawwaq-Dinaris von Dinaris abgelöst, die alle unter 2 g wiegen und deren Durchmesser noch 1 mm geringer ist (die Münzen im British Museum haben im Katalog die Überschrift „half-deenärs“, aber in der Legende steht duriba ḥādaʾil-dinār, nicht ḥādaʾn-nisf). Ob die Gewichtsverminderungen nur dadurch zustande gekommen sind, dass die Münzen dünner gehämmert worden sind, wie nach al-Hamdāni zu verstehen ist, oder aber dadurch, dass ihr Feingehalt verändert worden ist, kann natürlich nur durch eine Untersuchung der Münzen selbst beurteilt werden.

Zuletzt soll die Mitteilung al-Muqaddasis erwähnt werden, nach der die muṭawwaqa den 'at[t]arīya gleich sein sollten (Aḥsan al-taqāḥim 99, vgl. Ibn Ḥauqal, BGA 2, 20, beide Stellen übers. von Sauvaire Nr. 90, vgl. Löfgren in El² s. v. 'Athr, und Arabische Texte, Glossar s.v.). Da mir aber nur zwei 'at[t]arī-Dinaris bekannt sind (aus dem Jahr 342, 2,47 g, BN 1268, und aus dem Jahr 348, 16,5 mm, 1,3 g, BM 478), ist aus dieser Mitteilung nichts zu schliessen.
3. Saqūm

Das Wort saqūm ist mir nur aus zwei arabischen Texten bekannt. In K. al-Gauharatan 50a heisst es: Al-wazn yaṣīḥhu ‘alā waqlain: immā bi-ra‘sain wa-imma bi-saqūm ... wa-amma’s-saqūm fa-in la ṭakūnūl-māl immā yataqassamun miḥ al-qiṭ’a al-wāḥida wa’d-dīnār al-wāḥid wa’d-dirham al-wāḥid, wa’l-wāḥī fī ḍalīka an ta‘mida ilā tilka’il-qiṭ’a min al-māl jā-tuṣayyirāh fi’il-kiffa al-yamnū wa-ta‘q’ala mitgālahā fi’il-kiffa al-lānīya mā taṣā‘u min auzūn au ḥadid au ḥiṣāra au miḥ au ḍair ḍalīka min ar-raṣās wa’s-sufr wa-mā amkan. Fa-ṣādā qāma’l-mulassan au i’tadala ’amūd aš-ṣāhin wa’sṭawat wa-waqa’at al-kifjahā minhū aḥraṣīta qiṭ at al-māl wa-nazartā mā yaqūmū maqāmahu fi’ll-mīzān min al-auzūn al-ma’rūfa fi-al-mūkāna yahwa waṣawwār fī al-dīnār taṣhirā kā-annāhā tilka’il-auzūn fi kifjahā wa’ilāḏī fi’ll-kiffa al-uχrā wa’l-waqa’at wa-bibī sabbāhā rummānūt al-qarəsdfān. „Das Wiegen ist auf zweierlei Weise richtig: entweder mit zwei ‘Hauptteilen’ oder mit saqūm ... Und was as-saqūm betrifft, so ist das, wenn das Geld zu dem gehört, was nicht geteilt werden kann, wie eine einzige Münze und ein einziger Dīnār und ein einziger Dirham, und die Art ist in diesem Falle, dass man dieses Stück Geld nimmt und es in die rechte Waageschale legt, je nach Wunsch in Gewichten oder Eisen oder Steinen oder Salz oder etwas anderem wie Blei oder Kupfer und was noch möglich ist. Und wenn die Zunge aufrecht steht oder der Balken der Waage im Gleichgewicht ist und die beiden Waageschalen von ihm [gleich] herabhängen, nimmt man das Geldstück heraus und untersucht was ihm in der Waage von den bekannten Gewichten entspricht, und was da ist, ist sein richtiges Gewicht, denn dieses Geldstück wird wie jene Gewichte in seiner Schale, und was in der anderen Schale ist, das ist as-saqūm, und mit ihm kann man das Laufgewicht der Schnellwaage vergleichen.“


Es heisst nach der Pariser Handschrift Bl. 182a: Fa-in kāna’s-si‘r agall min ‘aṣarat darāhim bi’d-dīnār tarakna’il-kiffa allaṭi hiya’r-rummāna
'alā dālīku'l-miqdār min al-'amūd wa-ğ'a'īlnā ji'l-kifṣa al-latīfa allātī ji'l-ṭarāf al-aṭṭawāl min as-saqūm mā ya'tadilu mā'ahu'l-kifṣa al-kabīra wa'l-āmūd. Tumma taḏ'ul-dāhab ji'l-kifṣa allātī hiya'r-rummāna wa-taḏ'ul ji'l-kifṣa al-kabīra min ad-darāhīm mā yaṣṣaqīmu mā'ahu'l-aważu wa-yūzūl'i'amūd li'l-ażq. „Und wenn der Kurs weniger als 10 Dirham für 1 Dinar ist, lassen wir die Waageschale, die als Laufgewicht dient, auf jenem Mass (= 10 Dirham) am Waagebalken (der also nach Dirham eingeteilt ist) und legen in die kleine Waageschale, die am längeren Arm ist, so viel von as-saqūm, dass die grosse Waageschale und der Balken damit ins Gleichgewicht kommen. Dann legst du das Gold in die Waageschale, die als Laufgewicht dient, und legst in die grosse Waageschale so viel von den Dirham, dass das Gewicht damit ins Gleichgewicht kommt und der Balken horizontal steht.‘‘ Und ferner Bl. 183a: Tumma aḥriq ad-darāhīm min al-kifṣa wa'zilā wā'q'al al-kifṣa allātī hiya'r-rummāna mā'ahu'l-'alā.'alāmat tamām mablaq as-sīr' wa-'addilā bi's-saqūm. „Nimm dann die Dirham aus der Waageschale und lege sie zur Seite und setze die Waageschale, die als Laufgewicht dient, auf das Zeichen am Balken, das den vollen Betrag des Kurses bezeichnet, und stelle das Gleichgewicht mit as-saqūm wiederher.‘‘


Die Lesung der Konsonanten des Wortes scheint unzweideutig zu sein: die Hamdānī-Handschrift (Uppsala Nov. 551, Zetterstéens Katalog 204) hat allerdings zweimal aber dreimal saqūm und die Iliyā-Handschrift sogar beide Male saqūm — auf die Vokale komme ich zurück: die Lesung saqūm wäre an und für sich auch möglich.

Es gibt im Arabischen ein Verb saqima/saqima, Inf. saqūm, suqūm und saqūm[a] (aber kein Inf. suqūm), das „kranke sein“ bedeutet (Lane, Līṣān s.v.). Es gibt ferner ein saqūm, das „Sykomenfeige“ bedeutet (Dozy s.v.) und bei Lane saqūm und in Landbergs Glossaire daţinois suqum heisst.

Unser Wort scheint also nicht echt arabisch zu sein. Da Termini auf dem Gebiet des Gewichtes oft dem Griechischen entlehnt sind, liegt es


Im Unterschied zum Syrischen scheint das Arabische kein Verb zu saqūm gebildet zu haben — jedenfalls ist ein Verb saqama mir nicht bekannt (über eine II. Form im Dialekt s. unten). Zu einem saqama hätte man aber saqūm als Inf. auffassen können, und das Verb selbst wäre als Kausativ zu qūma zu verstehen mit ähnlicher Bedeutung wie aqīma (sc. waznahu) „wiegen“ (K. al-Ǧauharatain 45a ff.). Eine VIII. Form von saqama und X. von qūma würden einander sehr ähnlich sein — einige sa-Kausative sind ja auch Rückbildungen aus der X. Form (Brockelmann, Grundriss 1:522). Das Verfahren, mit saqūm zu wiegen, wird taqsīm genannt (K. al-Ǧauharatain 46b, 50a). Es mag Zufall sein — der Gedanke liegt aber nahe, dass zu saqūm ein Denominativ in der II. Form (wie im Syr.) hätte gebildet werden können, da diese Form ja oft zur Bildung von Denominativa und um ein technisches Verfahren zu bezeichnen benutzt wird (die II. Form existiert im magrib. Arabisch mit der Bedeutung „ordnen“, ptep. pass. auch „richtig“, M. Beaussier, Dict. pratique arabe-français, Alger 1887, s.v.). Das Verfahren würde dann tasqīm heissen, was mit Metathese taqsim ergeben würde, ein Wort, das gewöhnlicher und vertrauter klingt, und dessen Sinn einigermassen in diesen Bereich passt.

4. Zarsīm

Im K. al-Ǧauharatain kommt an mehreren Stellen ein Wort vor, das der Schreiber offensichtlich nicht verstanden hat, da er es abwechselnd درست حمل, رسوم, رسوم wiedergibt.

Das Wort ist zarsīm zu lesen, zusammengesetzt aus den beiden per-
sischen Wörtern zur „Gold“ und sīm „Silber“. Eine ähnliche Zusammensetzung — allerdings mit dem ersten Glied übersetzt — findet sich im syr. ܐܠܡܐ; für ἡλεκτρον wieder.


Der Wechsel z/s hindert die Identifikation der beiden Wörter nicht, da dieser Wechsel im Arabischen häufig vorkommt. K. al-Gauharatain selbst zeigt zwei Beispiele: saḥqa 54a = saḥqa 66a, 68a „pulverisieren“, und ḫālīzaq 29a = ḫālīṣqa ibd. (eben zu laziqa|laṣqa|laṣqa siehe A. Fischer in WZKM 29:433 ff.; viele Beispiele in Brockelmann, Grundriss 1:156; H. Fleisch, Traité de philologie arabe 1:80; Landberg, Glossaire Daτinois 401, 1815, 1833; Lane sandūq/zandūq|sandūq).

On the Etymology of Slav. sani, Ural. *śona, Alt. čana “sledge”

Slav. sani, plur. tantum, fem. i-stem, originally probably dualis, “sledge”, OChSl., ORuss. (MIKLOŠIC, LexPSLGrLat., 822; VASMER, RussEtWb., II, 576 f.) is a difficult etymon. It has by some been considered an Uralic loanword in Slavic, while VASMER and others prefer to assume genuinely Slavic origin. Moreover, this word has some relation to one of the Altaiic etyma for “sledge”. It is a common-Slavic etymon, well attested for in all Slavic languages, and its oldest occurrence, as far as known, is in the Old-Russian Igor-Tale and in an entry s.a. 1015 in the Povest’ Vremennyx Let (Nestor-Chronicle), as quoted e.g. by ČIŽЕVSKA (Glossary of the Igor Tale, p. 305). The different forms from the other Slavic languages are listed by VASMER I.e. The Polabian and Kašubic forms are not quoted by VASMER and seem to be unknown. MIKLOŠIC adduces (l.c.) zohněu from the Drevjaniec language, probably after Dobrovský’s Slowanka (P. Rost, “Die Sprachreste der Dravåno-Polaben im Hannöverschen”, Leipzig 1907 is not available to me here): this form in a German spelling with z- for initial unvoiced s- and h for vocalic length seems to mean *sōnāu and might well be a gen. loc. du. *sānju. As a metaphor, the direction of which is not clear, this etymon may designate, in some Slavic languages, “cheek-bone, lower chin-bone, jaw-bone”, as e.g. in Russian dialects: dim. sg. sanka “skūla, čeljust” (Dal’, IV, 30), pl. sānki “id.” in Pskov, Tveń, likewise “the breast-bone of birds” (the same metaphor is found also with the synonym salázki, f/pl., in the dialect of Tambov: “cheek-bone, jaw-, chin-bone”, and as a pejorative for “face”: “sysala, susala; ‘mug’” (Dal’, IV, 11), the same in Čech: sání “sledge; upper and lower chin-bone; cheek-bone”. According to Dal’, IV, 30 f., sání in general means, besides “sledge”, “polóžja, the runners of a sledge”; in Ukrainian, the diminutive sánka means “runner”. VASMER lists, together with all the forms of sání, also OChSl., ORuss. čanə f., “snake”, Če. sání, f., “dragon, serpent”, as if this were
one and the same etymon. He based himself, apparently, upon the semantic varieties of derivatives from the Slavic root *polz- “to creep” as found in Russian póløj “runner (of a sledge)” and its exact equivalent in Če. plaz “reptile”, but while in Russian polóža may be used as a pars pro toto designating “sledge”, i.e. may stand for sání, the derivation of OChSl., ORuss. saní, Če. saň “snake, dragon, serpent” and sání “sledge, runners of a sledge” from one and the same etymon is obviously very questionable and, as it appears in connection with the Uralo-Altaic relatives of this etymon, probably erroneous.

As Russian póløj “runner” and Če. plaz “reptile” belong to one semantic group or family, Vasmer sees in this fact an argument in favor of genuine-Slavic origin of sání, at least he considers genuine-Slavic origin as “more probable than borrowing”. Then, Vasmer adduces Indo-European etyma which so far had been quoted as possible or probable relatives of sání: Lith. sónas “Seite; side (also side of the body)”, Latv. sāns “id.”, originally “rib”—very improbable, although, in view of the semantic features of “sledge” ~ “cheek-bone, chin-bone, ‘mug’”, one of “side, rib” > “sledge” might not appear too far-fetched; “whether Gr. σώνις, -ιός f., “pole, block, board” (possibly with *ks-) belongs here, is uncertain”, says Vasmer, and compares, further on, Gr. σωνίης τροχος ἄρμα, according to Hesychios, a word which was considered, by Hirt, Schrader-Nehring, Rozwadowski and Jacobsohn as “East-European” (exact quotations of the sources are always given). Then, he states, “the attempts to consider saní as a loan from Finno-Ugrian (Kola-Lappic čionne “kind of a Lappic sledge”, Vogul šun) are to be rejected (against Kalima and himself—Räänen’s article in Uralaltaiische Jahrbücher, XXV, 1953, pp. 19-27, should also have been mentioned here—KHM), also the similarity with Qazan čana, Mongolian čana, Burat sana, Qalmyq tsan “sledge, snow-shoe, ski” (Vasmer quotes the dictionaries) are probably accidental only (against P. Schmidt in JSFOu., XLII, 5). Forms such as Suomi sanä, Estn. sän, Liv. zän, Hung. sän, sönkä, Latv. sānas, sanas, Ruman. sanie, all loanwords from Slavic, are not dealt with by Vasmer.

Saní is genuinely-Slavic, perhaps—however doubtfully so—Balto-Slavic, but not Indo-European, and this is probably not only for geographical and climatological reasons, but also on account of the more archaic and conservative state of Balto-Slavic within Indo-European—as e.g. compared to that of Germanic. Greek σώνις does not fit on account of its semantics, and Boisacq is certainly right when rejecting a rela-
tionship with the Slavic word. Different is the matter with στρογγυλος διμόχαξι which may very well belong here, both phonetically and semantically. The word is not listed by Boisacq and is perhaps not of Greek origin. It will recur later in the discussion. Vasmer is certainly right in declining a possible borrowing of sanī from Finno-Ugrie, as the phonetics of either etymon show. Inasmuch as the similarity of sanī with the Altajic etymon, čana etc., is concerned, it is hardly accidental, as Vasmer is inclined to assume, for the agreement between the two etyma is too considerable. But the initial s- in Slavic against initial c- in Altajic (and perhaps even Ural-Altajic) exclude any borrowing. Even if we assumed a proto-Ural-Altajic loanword in proto-(Balto-)

Slavic, the initial Ural-Altajic affricate would not appear in (Balto-)

Slavic as a mere sibilant, s-. Räsänen (I.C., p. 23) and Collinder (Fenno-Ugrie Vocabulary, pp. 76; 147, no. 54) are right in putting the Uralic forms, Kola-Lappic ēyěmne, Máňši (Vogul) šun, sun “sledge” together with the Altajic ones, Turkic čana (and variants), Mongol. čana > cana. In Altajic, the vocalism is more consistent and conservative than in Uralic, as also seen in this example. With regard to the vocalism, the agreement of the Altajic forms with those of Slavic is considerable.

In Altajic, the basic form is čana, appearing in both Turkic and Mongolian, and its meaning may either be “sledge” or “runner(s)” and “ski(er)”: Tar., Qn., N.-Uj., Özib., Qy., Qmq., čana (Qy. also čanä, Jüd., 842 f.), “sledge”, Tel., Leb. “runners, skier”; šana: Šor “skier”, Qq., Qqbpq., Noyaj “sledge”; sana: Baxq, “sledge”; cana: Kūārık “skier, runners”, Mišar “sledge”; čana, Qaračaj “id.”; in his article (in UAJbb., XXV, p. 23) and his “Türkische Mischellen” (Stud. Orient. Soc. Or. Fernn., XXV, 1; 1960; p. 10) Räsänen lists Türkmen šuna, taken from Alìjev’s and Börjev’s Türkmen Dictionary of 1929, considered by him as loanword from Qazaq *šana, šana “sledge”, but the length is not attested for in Qazaq, so that Tkm. šuna is due to contamination of Qq. šana with a Tkm. *čana which must have been lost; also šuna does not figure any more in the Türkmen dictionaries (e.g. in Xanzejev’s) which means that it is not considered literary; in its stead, one has Russ. sani or the queer circumscriptio jăr arabsù “snow-car”; saya: Šor (Verbickij) “skier”; saya, Sayaj “id.”; čanaq < *čana(-aq), with suffix -(aq), usual with diminutiva: Alt., Tel., Leb. “sledge” (Ča. čanaq “stirrup”, listed in WB under this entry, is to be put under the following, together with Osm., Qrm. čanaq “earthen cup, plate, dish”), šanaq, Šor, “sledge”, Lit.-Soj. (Tuva) “id.”; a sanaq “sledge”, quoted by Radloff as Čayatal
after Vámbéry is due to an error, probably on Vámbéry's part; canaq, Bar., Kūä., Qom. "sledge"; syyū́x, Jakut., “runner(s)” (Pekarski, 2470), while “sledge” is syṛγa, syyṛγa, sōṛγa (op. cit., 2425) < Mong. ćirγa “id.”; šuna, šona, Tāvaš, < *čana-q, “sledge”. Morphologically unclear derivatives are Qn. canya, Qq. šαγγy, N.-Uj. ćαγγu, Bšq. sαγγy “skier”; Sαγaj sαγa and Sōr sαγa might go back to *čαγγa and not have alternation of intermediary -n/-γ-, which seems to be present in Jakut. The word is—so far—not attested in the ancient Turkeic languages; it is apparently absent in Qoman, against Radloff's statement (Qom. canaq “sledge”) which may actually refer to Qārā'im. Lit.-Mong. has čana (> cana) “snow-shoes, sleigh, ski”; Xalja cana “id.” (Lessing, 164), Burat sana, Qalm. can “id.” (Ramstedt).

Neither from Samojed, nor from Tungus, cognate etyma have become known so far. They seem to be lacking also in Korean. The Ewenik dialects of the Stony Tunguska and the Sym have the Russian loanword čαŋki < sάŋki, since these dialects have no s- (Stony Tunguska has only h- < s-, Sym only š-), Russian s- being replaced by č-; čαŋki means there “rózval'ni”, a type of sledge with sides curved outward (Vasilevič); and the derivative čαŋkí, haplographically from *čαŋkí-ki₂t, in the same dialects, “sanna doroga; sledge-way”, instead of the genuinely-Tungus tolγo-dó-ki₂t. The common-Tungus etymon for “sledge” is Ewenki tolγoki and its relatives, as e.g. Nánaj toq, a cognate of A.-Mong. tälgǎn “cart, carridge”. The common-Samojed etymon for “sledge” is e.g. Tavgy (Nanasan) kanta, Jenisej (Eneč) kodo, Jurak (Neneč) han, Ostjak (Selqup) kanč, kαŋţe etc. (Castrén, Wyz., 272 f.) which seems to have a counterpart in Mari (Čeremis) kiąńţ “vectura” so that it may be considered as common-Uralic, as done by Collinder (op. cit., p. 30).

In the distribution of the etyma for “sledge” etc. we find, on the one hand, in Uralic, a number of different etyma designating different types of sledges, while in Altajic, Turkic and Mongolian possess one etymon, čana, for “sledge” as well as “snow-shoe, “ski” and “runner(s)”, and another one for “sledge”, čirγa in Mongolian which also occurs in Tungus, although Tungus prefers the etymon (Ew.) tolγoki as the generic term. In no Tungus language one of those etyma seems also to signify “snow-shoe” or “ski(er)”. The Jenisejic languages have different terms, one of which, Kott. čugar, čukar, was borrowed by Turkic, Madur and Sōr as šor, Saŋaj and Qojbał sōr “id.” and is identical with the tribe name of the Sōr (cf. A. J. Joki, Die Lehnwörter des Sajansamojedischen, MSFOu., CIH, 1952, p. 295 f., and K. H. Menges in CAJ, II, 1955, pp. 171 ff.).
Turkic and Mongolian ė ana was borrowed by a number of peoples who apparently did not know sledges or had lost the word for it together with its use. The source of all the borrowings following was without doubt Turkic: Täźik ė ana “sledge”, Pers. ė ana, ë ana “id.”, apparently occurring here only in some historical texts, as e.g. with Rašidu’d-Din, in the description of the Mongolian Urjaŋqat (quoted in extenso by Doerfer, Türk. und Mong. Elemente im Neu-Pers., III, 105 ff.), otherwise it is little known and usually not listed in the dictionaries, so that it is questionable whether it may be considered an actual loanword. Persian possesses a word ë ana “lower jaw-bone, chin; jaw, jabber, talk; a dropping, distilling; a lump of dough, enough to make a cake; a cup” (Stein gass, 387) which was borrowed into Čayataj where it is to be read ē ya or ĕ yä, not only ē ya, as Radloff lists it (III, 1851), Osm. ë anä and ē yä, Az. ë anä “lower jaw-bone, chin” which, on its part, has been re borrowed into Persian as Ĉ ē na, only in the meaning of “lower jaw, chin” (Stein gass, 401). The Turkic word for “sledge” is also found in Caucasian, as I quote from Doerfer, i.e.: Georgian ë ana, Avar. ė anay, Andi ė anayi, Abaza ğ anax—the latter three probably < Turk. ě naq. Doerfer considers Oset’i ʒ onyg, ʒ onuy, ɕ onay, ɕ onuy “id.” as “possibly borrowed from the last-quoted words”, but as “hardly belonging here (against Abajev) Armenian sahnak”, “id.”. Concerning the Armenian word, he is right, since it is a derivative of Arm. sahel “qajdur to have slide”, sahec’mel “id.”, sahil “qaj-., zalq et.; to glide, slide” (cf. sastik sahel قیزاقی کلی قیزاقی “to glide like a sledge”—Běros Zek’i Garabedjan, Armen.-Osman Dict., 726, Osman-Armen. Dict., 624). Neither sahel nor sahnak-1 are listed by Hübschmann, and they are probably not of Indo-European origin. The Oset’i forms show some digression in both consonantism and vocalism. Initial ě ‘ is regular for common-Iranian ě , but not initial ď ; while in Oset’i o in position before nasals goes back to a/ā and, therefore, ɕ onay may be the regular result of *Č ē na, as Abajev (i.e.) says, the vacillation of the initial ě ‘/ď remains unexplained. The varying Oset’i forms point to either a different but cognate source or to one or several intermediaries between the Oset’i forms and their source which might not have been Altajic ė ana or ě anaq, but the Uralic etymon underlying Lappic ĕ yenne and Vogul şun, sun. This latter assumption becomes more probable in view of the ancient close contacts of the north-

1. Under a consonant means glottal occlusion.
ern Iranian nomad groups with Uralic peoples, particularly those of the Alanoi-Aorsoi complex with both the Ugrians and, probably somewhat later, the Volga-Finns.

The Hesychian gloss σρυκτης έτρογυς ἄμαξα resembles Arm. sahnak more than Slavic sami. Without doubt, σρυκτη stems from an ancient North-Eurasian complex to which Uralic Lapp. ĕyenne as well as Altajic čana belong; its initial σ- may not necessarily mean s-, but another sound which the Greeks could not write, in this case perhaps ē-. Armenian sahnak might very well be due to an adaptation, under the stress of popular etymology, to the base of sahel, salah. It does not seem to be known from the literature or the traditions of the Caucasian peoples whether the sledge is genuinely Caucasian or whether they became acquainted with it in relatively late historical times, as e.g. Altajic čana with the above-mentioned four Caucasian languages would suggest. In this connection, Abajev’s remark is valuable when he says that in the language of the Svaneti, the western K’art’velian neighbors of the Osseti on the southern side of the central range of the Caucasus, the word sav means both “sledge” and “Osseti”—with a differentiation only in the pl.: sav-ar “sledges”, sav-iar “Ossetians”—, and that with the Balqars, their northwestern Turkic neighbors who live in the valleys of the north side of the central range, near the Elbrus, the ethnikon of the Digor, Dīgār, means “Digor(ian)” as well as “transom, crossbeam in a sledge” (i.e. and his “Ossetinskij jazyk i fol’klor”, 302, n., 280 f.), wherefrom he concludes that the Osseti is or their Alanic ancestors brought about a technical innovation in the construction of sledges. It might, however, also mean that the Svaneti and Balqars did not possess the sledge or this particular type of sledge. Also Abajev seems to have no closer knowledge of the realia than we Westerners do. From here, then, more detailed research has to start. But this fact at least hints at the priority, in the Caucasus, with the Osseti of the acquaintanceship with the sledge and its construction. Osseti offers an interesting semantic parallel to Čeh sáně and sání, sanki in Russian dialects, “sledge” and “lower jaw, chin (bone)” in zonyy jisár “jaw, chin of the sledge” for “runner(s)” and the occasional use of zonyy for “lower chin, jaw-bone” (Abajev, ibidem, without reference to Russian and Čeh), but to assume, as Abajev does, basing himself upon Pers. čána “lower jaw-bone” which he erroneously connects with Turkic źanax, jának (to be read žyqaq/ žayax, žayaq “cheek”), that the sledge was so named after its similarity to the lower jaw-bone, is not at all convincing.
Altajic čana, with its few derivatives in Turkic, čanoq and čanyu, čanyu, čanyu, čanyy, is an etymon by itself and cannot be linked with any other stem, nominal or verbal. Doerfer (op. cit., III, 108) tried to derive it, in Turkic, from a verbal stem *čan- which, as he says, does not seem to be attested; he thinks, however, it might be found in Kāš. čantor-, causat., which is rendered in the New-Osman translation of Kāš. (passing under the name of B.ATALAY) by ǰaǰdyr- "to cause to renounce, to refuse", so that on this basis Doerfer assumes a simplex *čan- "to renounce" as having semantically developed from "to slide away, to recede (?)"; this is not convincing, in spite of another derivative of this hypothetical *čan-, Kāš. čanac "fearful, lax, weak; coward". Brockelmann renders čantor- as "to cause to refuse", and in addition to it čandyš- as "sich beseiden; to become enemies, to act as enemies", while the meanings given in the Drevne-Tjurtjkskij Slovär (Leningrad, 1969, p. 138 f.) are "to cause to blame, vituperate, scold" for čantor-, and "to be rough with somebody" for čandyš-, both quotations being only from Kāš., while the Taškent Kāšyari-editon (vol. "Indeks", 1967) renders the latter as "sostjazat'sja v spore; to contend, compete, in a quarrel, an argument" and the former as "zastavit' sportit', poricat'; to cause to quarrel, argue; to cause to blame, vituperate". Whatever the exact interpretation of Kāšyari's Arabic explanation be, it does not fit in with the semantics of "sledge, snow-shoe, runner, ski". The same is true for čanac, also if it derives from another etymon than *čan-. The New-Osman translation of Kāš. čantor- by ǰaǰdyr-, WB, IV, 6: "otgovarivat' ot čego-libo, jemanden von etwas abbringen; to deflect somebody from, dissuade, talk sb. out of", causative of ǰaj- "to deviate, decline (intr.), aberrate; be deflected, to renounce" (WB, IV, 2 f.) would suggest the etymological identity of both words as going back to *ǰańh.—as an alternate of AT. jań-, later > jaj- "to expand, dissipate" (WB, III, 5 f.)!—, so that the form with Kāšyari should be read with ǰ, not ħ-, this being one of the rare examples with ancient-Turkic ǰ- preserved from common-Altajic. A combination of this etymon with that of čana "sledge, etc." is impossible.

Russ. süni, pl., "Schlittenkufen, Schlittschuhe aus Holz; runners; skates from wood" (VASMER, III, 46), attested in the dialect of the T'ereck region only, is compared by VASMER with Tav. śuna which it resembles most, and with Qn. čana "sledge"; furtheron, VASMER refers to the alternate cúni, čúni, pl., also čúnki "Rentierschlitten mit hohem Ständer; reindeer-sledge with a tall stand", known in the dialects of
Kola, Keń, Mezeń, Šenkursk, Olonec, Arxangel'sk, Vologda, as "sledge" in those of Čerepovec, Jaroslavl', Vladimir, the Don region, and čuni, čūńki, pl., "id." in Kargopol'. Dal' lists only čūńki, Arxangel'sk, Olonec, Novgorod, Vologda, Don region, and čūński, pl., "id.", Voronež (IV, 1263). Concerning čuni, čuni Vassmer assumes, with Kalima and Itkonen, a borrowing from Lappic Kildin čuname "Lappic sledge", Kola čioinne "id." for the North-Great-Russian dialects, but considers it "extremely improbable" for the Don region for which he thinks of a borrowing from Turkic, adducing Ťav. šuna and from other Turkic languages čana.

As we have seen, sání neither can go back to common-Turkic čana, nor to Ťav. šona, šuna. While sání, čuni etc. is quite close to Ťav. šuna, the initial does not agree, for, Ťav. š- is in Russian never represented by an affricate, but always by a sibilant, usually, in agreement with its nature in Ťavaš, a palatalized one, š-. This has correctly been stated by Doerfer (op. cit., III, 107), who furtheron says "that the area of the Ťavaš, while not so far away as that of Lappic, still is 500 km distant from the Don region and somewhat more from that of the Terek", and asks whether it might not be preferable to suppose North-Great-Russian settlers to have brought this Lappic loanword from their old home to the south. Doerfer's assumption is quite convincing and explains well this far-reaching migration of a Lappic term. A few Altajic words have migrated very far in the opposite direction, into the basin of the Northern Dvina as well as to the region of Leningrad or Pskov. In the instance of sání, the anlaut may have been influenced by the analogy with sání.

One of the Uralo-Altajic etyma for "sledge" has its counterpart in Slavic in two different varieties, the one as a genetically related common-Slavic, perhaps also common-Balto-Slavic, sib, that of OChSl., ORuss. sani etc. and in the Hesychian gloss σιβίκα, and the other as an Uralic loanword, čuni, čuni, etc. and sání. While the first one, the genetically related term, is an ancient North-Nostriatic etymon, the Uralic loanword was locally borrowed into Great-Russian only. In accordance with the reconstruction of Nostriatic as proposed by V. M. Illič-Svityč (cf. Materialy po srežitel'nomu slovarju nostriatšekh jazykov, in Etimologija 1965, Moscow 1967, pp. 321 ff.), the Nostriatic forms would have had an initial affricate, *č-, *č-, *č- or *č- (p. 323), whose results were, in the various constituent language groups, as follows:
*ć> IE *(s)k-, *(s)q- (!), Alt. ć-, Ural. ś- (!), K’art’v. ć-, Sem.-Hamt. ś-, Dravid. (?) (no clear examples);
*ć> IE *(s)q-, *(s)k- (!), Alt. ć-, Ural. ś-, Drāv. ę-, K’art’v. ĉ-, Sem.-Ham. ś-;
*ć> IE ?, Alt. ć-, Ural. đ-, Drāv. ē-, K’art’v. c₁-, Sem.-Ham. ś-;
*ć> IE sq-, sk-, Alt. ć-, Ural. đ-, Drāv. ē-, K’art’v. c₂-, Sem.-Ham. ś-.

As the affricates constitute by their very nature an intricate phonological series, a number of correspondences could not yet be clearly established so that it still is impossible to assign sani, čana, čənne, sun a definite place in one of the four rows. The Uralo-Altajic evidence would favor *ć- or *č-; for the former, Indo-European correspondences have not been established by Illič-Svityč, so that, in this instance, IE *(s)q-, *(s)k- might tentatively be posited; for the latter, IE had *(s)q-, *(s)k-, while the IE correspondences of the non-palatalized affricates *ć- and *č-, are *(s)q-, *(s)k-, but it is well-known how considerable the vacillations of these initial groups in IE are. The assumption of Uralic *ś- (*šona; Collinder, op. cit., p. 147) would favor Nostratic *ć- or *č-.

Thus, in Indo-European, Slavic sani would go back to either *skān-ei or *(s)kān-ei where with the Satem sound-change the initial *ss- would have become simplified to ś-. During the Nostratic period, the root-vowel might have been o that yielded Altajic ă, but was preserved in Uralic (cf. Illič-Svityč, l.c., p. 324 f.; Collinder, l.c., assumes *o), however, it is likewise possible to suppose an ancient Uralo-Altajic ablaut a//o//u to have been present in this root. In the light of this theory the above Caucasian forms—the Oset’i ones excepted—, if they be ancient, might very well be genuine descendants from the Nostratic proto-language.

This ancient North-Nostratic etymon was lost in the majority of the Indo-European languages, without doubt after their migrations to areas on which sledges etc. became impracticable, while in Uralo-Altajic it has been preserved in Finno-Ugric and in Turkic and Mongolian.

A parallel relic from Nostratic times which survived in Russian folklore, at least in older times, seems to have been the custom of carrying the dead for burial upon sledges even during the snowless seasons, mentioned by Vasmer, II, 577 with reference to Srelnesvuki, Mal., III, 258, and for which Dal’ (IV, 31) quotes an example, скилм на камькък from the words of Vladimir Monomax, “sitting upon the sledge”, with the meaning of “lying on the death-bed”. A similar custom is found with
subarctic peoples, but they are of lesser significance, since these peoples have, or, until recently had, no other means of transportation than sledges (or boats), the wheeled cart having until quite recently been unknown to them. With the ancient Russians who already had wheeled carridges, this custom has nevertheless been practiced in its original Nostratic, neolithic, form.
DAVOUD MONCHI-ZADEH

Contributions to Iranian Dialectology

Explanation of Verses in Old Tabari

To Stig Wikander on his 60th birthday

Of the Northern Iranian dialects, it would seem that Mazandaraní has preserved a long written tradition. Thus, Marz(û)bân-Nâma was compiled at the beginning of the 11th C. by Ispahbad Marzbân b. Rustam b. Šahryâr b. Šarvin and now exists in two New Persian translations: the 1st by Sa’d i Varâvînî from Azerbaijan, 1225, and the 2nd entitled Rauqat al-’Uqîl by Muhammad b. Ğâzî from Malatya, vizir of the Seljuks in Anatolia at the end of the 13th C. We also possess a Turkish M.-N. translated from the Persian version and an Arabic one based on the Turkish version (cf. Marzbân-Nâma, Preface XIV f.).

The same prince has compiled in Tabari (older Mazandaraní) a divan called Nikiye-Nâme (Pers. Nêki-Nâma), of which it is said to be the rule of versification of Tabaristan’ (T. Tab. 1, 137; cf. Browne, Hist. of Tab. 86).

The existence of another book in Tabari verse called Bâvande-Nâme (Pers. Bâvand-Nâma) may be supposed from this notice, in T. Tab. 1, 4

Networks: My transcription is schematized for better comprehension although according to W. Geiger, GfrPh I, 2, 348, ‘Der Vocalismus dieser Mundart ist characterisiert durch eine auffallende Unbestimmtheit und Farblosigkeit’. For reasons of commodity I write Tabari and Mazandaraní in the English text and not Tabari and Mazandaraní. Variants A, B, C in the apparatus refer to Browne’s mss. and Iq to Târîx-i Tabaristan ed. ‘A. Iqbal. I thank Mrs. Judith Josephson for her precious collaboration especially in correcting my English.
Ş. Kiyā has carefully collected the Tabari-Mazandarani verses and sentences scattered throughout the Pers. literature in the introduction to his edition of Nişāb i Tabari. This edition with glossary etc. is called "Vāža-Nāma i Tabari". According to Kiyā, V.-N. Tabari 13, there exists in the Kitāb-xīna i Millī i Malik in Tehran a translation of Maqāmāt Ḥarirī (completed 1110–11) from the 13th century (20 × 28 cm pp. 286, every page contains 8 lines in Arabic and 8 lines of translation into Tabari with notations in Arabic).

The translations of the collected Tabari verses and sentences given by Kiyā seem to me to be sometimes unsatisfactory, while his etymological explanation ungrounded. However, his merit in giving the modern Mazandarani forms of the words occurring in Nişāb and especially in pointing out the unreliability of Mīrzā Šafī’s translation is undisputable (V.-N. Tabari, 22). In the following pages I propose my own solutions:

I. Concerning two poems from the poet Diwār-vaz, also called Masta-Mard, I quote Browne, Hist. of Tab., 87 ff. (cf. T. Tab. I, 137): "The following account is given of the manner in which this poet obtained these titles. He came from Tabaristan to Baghdad to visit the Shāhinshāh 'Aḍudu 'd-Dawla ... sought the assistance of his compatriot 'Alī Pirūza, who, however fearful lest his eloquence and wit might make him a dangerous rival in that prince's favour, made excuses for delay, hoping that the new-comer would weary of waiting and return home. After a while, however, Diwārwaz formed some idea of the truth; and, when 'A.-D. was one day drinking in a garden with some of his friends, he climbed over the wall and approached him. Some of the attendants, thinking him to be a robber or assassin, rushed upon him with blows and cuffs. 'A.-D. hearing his cries, caused him to be brought before him and questioned him, whereupon he told the story, and how 'A. P. has treated him, after which he recited a qasida which he had composed. 'A.-D., charmed with its grace and sweetness, expressed a doubt as to whether he was really its author, and, to prove him, bade him to extemporize some verses on a singing-girl clad in blue silk who happened to be near. Thereupon he recited the following verses in Tabari:

---

a N. i T. was completed in 1264 H. / 1847–48.

b One has the feeling while studying Mīrzā Šafī’s translations that he had tricked B. Dorn. I am preparing a longer article on this subject.

c 'A.-D. the Buid (949–82) was in Baghdad in 977.
کودو سدرا تیله، بدایه آین
وادیم کتی، دیم ای مردمونه وشاوی
خیبری بنهون گردوئ لرگیس لعی
ای خوی دادستی 10 وار این
کوئی 12 خوره شی باین
امیداین
ای دریا و میسو و نیومه 16 آین

7. B Iq گردوئ 8. Iq لرگیس
15. Iq پینوه 16. B این
17. B یومه

'A.-D. was delighted, and gave him gifts, and caused his name to be
described in the register of his poets, and he received the title of Diwâr-
waz.

After the death of 'A.-D. he came to Ámul, when Shamsu’l-Ma’álí
Qábúš was still reigning over Tabaristán. One day he had been
drinking with his friends, and, while returning home, passed the gate of
the shrine of Nâṣir-i-Kâbir, whence the clergy and eustodians, seeing
his state, came forth, seized him, beat him and cast him into prison.
Thence he made his escape, came to Gurgán, and described his
adventures in the following
Tabarí verses, which he laid before Qábúš, who honored and rewarded
him, and gave him the title of Masta-mard.

دا1 گیهون ای خور خورویی وندا
مست 3 آی و مستو آتشت بنی نام
دا2 شاه گیهون سایه سری دلشا
پریه و کت 7 انورا که خور ها
آوی داد از ائین آ این
شر ای والک وارسته گیهون و جا
مردم خوروم 10 ای خور ایرونه بوری
زنش پم جون 11 کتی گیهون 12 شوی
آین 12 یم بسکی 12 شو مست 13 موی مو لس

11 یم بسکی 12 شو مست 13 موی مو لس
بدرای شمعی ۱۶ دل ۱۷ دن‌هاراسن ۱۷ ای کس
ناغاه ۱۸ بمن او کتتن یکی دو ۱۹ نا دون
ه‌ا کتتن برون ۲۰ زن ۲۱ پنپدون


Kiya, V.-N. Tabari ۲۲۶ f., proposes the translation in Pers. for the 1st poem:

دختر سدره نیلی به آواز (۲) آیان
با صورت، بزرگ صورت مربان از پوشان (۴)
خبری پنهان کرد و نگنسمایان
از خبری خود است (۴) به آستین پوشان (۴)
گوئی خورشید به این بوم است آیان
از دریا نمی (۴) ...

and for the 2nd:

تا گیبهمان از خورم خرمی یافت
مست آب و مست باد و آتش
تا شاهگیبهمان سیله سر است (۴) دلشاد (۹)
...

بیداد (۴) ... نبود (۴) آیین
...
...
 ...
...
...
سردم ایران بوم خرم از خور
زنش شویی کیوان (۴) بمن چون اقتاده است
آیان بودم یکی شب مست و لی مونس
As far as we can see, no explanation has been given of how a Tabari verse really functions. If we go through the Pâzavârî divan (Dorn Maz. I–II) we can establish a simple regularity: each hemistich is made up of 12 syllables and disregards the question of quantity, which in general is very fluctuant in the Caspian dialects. As to the qualities, I am unable to give any indications. Thus, I read the 1st poem:

korû sedre nila péda vâ-âyan  
vâ dim kat e dim ay mardomân vesûyan  
xîrî pa-nihüm kard o nargûs namâyân  
i xirîye xoy e da ostî var-âyan  
gû xor e shî ba-âyan o bûm da-âyan  
ay daryô vîn’me o na bô me ô âyan

The small girl in a blue shirt becoming visible,  
(Her) face covered (lit. on (her) face is fallen (the veil)), she turns away  
(her) face from the people.

She hides the xîrî-flower (i.e. the face) and shows the narcissus (i.e. eye)  
This is the twig of xîrî coming out from the sleeve.

It seems (lit. you say), that the sun itself is coming and rising over the  
roof.

I see again and again the sea but the water is beyond my reach (lit. is  
not coming to me).

kor-u, texts KWW; Kurd. kor ‘son, boy’, Gil. kor ‘young girl’ (cf. Farhang  
i Gilakî); -u dim.

sedre, Pers. sudra (Ar. sudra) ‘vêtement court, sorte de tunique’  
(Zenker); sedre ‘white shirt’ of Zoroastrians (Farhang i Bihdinân).

vesûyan, texts -š-, Pers. gusânîdan caus. of gusîstan  
xîrî ‘hesperis tristis, mallow rose’  
ôstî, Pers. âstîn, ûstîm ‘sleeve’

xo, Pers. xau ‘plant, grass’  
var-âyan Pers. bar-âyân ‘going up’  
ey, Tehrânî hey ‘again and again’
And the 2nd, with 11 syllables in every hemistich:

\[ \begin{align*}
\text{vā geyhūn ay xore xorrāmī-vandā} \\
\text{mast' ō o mast' vā o taš an be-y-anbā} \\
\text{vā šah' ba geyhūn sāye-sar e del-sā} \\
\text{barnā o kat ūn rā ke xor hā-bar-ā} \\
\text{avī-dād ar venā bayye āyīnā} \\
\text{šer ay varka wā-rast e geyhun ve jā} \\
\text{mardom xorrām ay xor irūne būm e} \\
\text{zaneš ba man čūn kanne keyvūn šūme} \\
\text{āyan bīm' yakī ū mast mo bī mānas} \\
\text{be ay šams-i del da-na-h'rāsān ay kas} \\
\text{nāgā ba man okattan yāk do nūdūn} \\
\text{hā-gittan o bardan zanan ba zīndūn}
\end{align*} \]

Within the world, o prosperous Sun (i.e. Šams al-Maʿāli)
Furious water, furious wind and fire are piled up.
Through the king's protection are rejoicing (in their) hearts
The young and the old in the same way (as under) the rising sun.
If injustice was his mode (of rule),
The lion on his own account (lit. in his place) would have cleaned the world of lambs.
(While) the people of the Iranian country are glad because of the Sun (Šams [al-Maʿāli]),

How can the ominous Saturn strike me?
I was walking one night, I myself (lit. we), without companion
Not fearing anyone except a Šams.
Suddenly a few ignorants fell upon me
They caught and carried (me), beating (me), to prison.

xorrāmī-vand, Pers. xorrāmī-mand.
ba-y-anbā, Pers. bi+anbārdā, anbūṣṭā.
barnā, Pers. burnā, texts BRBH, BRYH.
kat, Pers. gut(a) 'large, big, old'; Teher. kat in kat o koloft 'big and thick'.
ūn rā, Pers. ūn rā (mānād ki) 'resembling that'.
hā-bar-ā, Pers. (hā)-bar-āyanda 'going up'.
avī-dād, Pers. bē-dād.
varka, Pers. bar(r)ā, texts W'K (cf. V.-N. Tabari 208).
be ay, Mp. bē hač 'except' (see also V.-N. Tabari 228).
II. A certain Tabari poet, Ibrāhīm Mu'inī, says in his dialect about the *Nīkīye-Nāme* mentioned above

\[\begin{align*}
\text{B} & \text{ omits this line, } C \text{ in } 5-5. \\
\text{A} & \text{ in } 6. \text{ A, B, C and Iq's 2 mss. omit this line.}
\end{align*}\]

(Browne, Hist. of Tab. 86; T. Tab. 137; V.-N. Tabari 14 and 232.)

\begin{align*}
\text{canīn gotte dūnāye zarrīn katāre} \\
\text{ba nīkīye-nāme ke } \text{še(r) jā diyār e} \\
\text{īn pīrīya ba-pā cē andāhen kār e} \\
\text{ba-pā cē kam āzarm bard e īn pātyāre}
\end{align*}

Thus has spoken the sage with golden dagger,

In N.-N. which occupies a place all of its own (lit. apparent on its own place):

Watch this old age because it is a sorrowful thing;

Watch, because it is a shameless ugly one!

\[\text{še(r) jā diyār e, Pers. (dar) jā i xʷad dīdār ast; see also Dorn, Maz. II, 112:}\]

\[\text{rūjāye šō-āhang ke } \text{še jā diyār an} \\
\text{unhā hame te kōš ra dast hā-īt dārān}\]

The shining (lit. drawing) stars of the night which are visible in their own place

They hold, all of them, your shoes in their hands.

\[\text{kam āzarm bard, Pers. kam āzarm burd(ə) 'the one with little shame, the shameless'; texts —'RZM—.}\]

\[\text{pātyāre, texts YP'RH.}\]

III. About a verse occurring in T. Tab. I, 89 I quote Browne, Hist. of Tab. 41 f.:

"Anecdote of the Dragon and Sām-i-Narimān. The poet of Ṭabaristān (B. adds in the footnote 'probably Abū'l-'Amr ...') says:

\[\text{بدليري ای سوم}
\]

\[\text{Iq: 1.}\]

\[\text{بزر. 2 - تنها '1.}\]
There once appeared in Shahriyār-Kūh a dragon fifty thousand cubits in length, and in that region, as far as the sea-cost, no animal dared pass through plain or mountain for fear of it, so that they abandoned that district, whereupon it advanced as far as Sārī. Then the inhabitants besought Sām to help them, and he came forth, saw it from afar, and said, ‘With this weapon I can do nothing’. By the time he prepared suitable weapons, ... The dragon, on seeing Sām, rushed upon him. Sām smote it on the head with his mace, so that it fell asunder, ... It then strove to encircle Sām with its tail, but he sprang back forty paces. It continued to move for three days and then died, ...”

'A. Iqbal, the editor of T. Tab., renders the verse into Persian (loc. cit. footnote)

Az Deliriyi ayn Sām Tneh arodr br zemin est

and following him, Kiyā, V.-N. Tabari 231,

Tneh arodr br Bum

Iqbal's translation presupposes

tane ye haštar bar (i) bām (8 or 9 syl.)
ba delirīye ī sūm (7 syl.)

while Kiyā's reading of the 2nd part, which is different from Iqbal's, is

ba delirī ayy sūm (6 syl.)

But the dragon was twisting for 3 days and that is an important fact for understanding what the poet meant. So, 'Tneh should be read tane equivalent to Pers. tanad: tanīdan 'to twist; to be twisted, ...' Thence:

tane haštar bare bām (7 syl.)
ba delirīye ī sūm (7 syl.)

The dragon twists (moves, winds) on the ground
Through the bravery of this Sām.

IV. When Ustāndār Kai-Kāns, with the approval of his chief judge, Qādi Serom i Rūyānī, revolted against Ispahbad Rustam Sāh Ġazı (1141–65) and burned his palace (kōšk) in Xarrāt Kalāta, Rustam marched to Rūyān to meet him, devastating and setting fire to the whole country. To commemorate this the Ispahbad Xuršid b. Abūl-Qāsim Mamlīrī composed the following verses in the dialect of Tabaristân (Browne, Hist. of Tab. 60; cf. T. Zahir 43):
The cadi counselled to burn the pavilion
(Of) one who possesses thirty pavilions (filled) with silk up to the opening
in the roof.
Now, see the country burning (and) the world in flames
The plotting cadi teaches (even) the devils!
dīvāhā, texts DYRH’, DYRM’.

Concerning Rustam’s love for silk and his accumulation of it, we have
a clear passage in T. Zahir 45:
‘Such was the rule and the habit of Šāh Ğāzī, that when he stood up
(to leave) the banquet of amusement and joy, he opened the treasury
to be plundered by (his) companion in the assembly. (Thus things went
on) until one night when, according to his habit, he gave the treasury
over to be plundered and Amir ‘Ali Sābiq ad-Daula and ‘Ali-Riḍā came
in. When they arrived they found nothing but an ass-load (xarvār) of
silk. Each one took (then) what he could carry on his back (puṇṭvāra)
of that silk.’

V. T. Tab. I, 137 names the poets of Ṭabaristān. I quote BROWNE,
Hist. of Tab. 87: “Ustād Alí Pīrūza (mentioned above), the panegyrist
of Aḏūdu ‘d-Dawla Shāhīnshāh Fānākhusraw. Hamadān is said to have
been given to him in fieff.” Furthermore, BROWNE renders into English
“The following verses in Ṭabar dialect is by him”.

(BROWNE, Hist. of Tab. 61; T. Tab. 108; V.-N. Tabari 12 and 229.)
	tadbīr karde kādī ke kuśka ba-sūjan
	unī ke si kuśk parand e tā ba lūjan
	ün̄n keśvar ba-viṇ sūjan gehūn orūjan

tadbīr-gar kādī ye dīvāhā ra mūjan
but T. Tab., loc. cit., has

وشعري طبري ميگويد باستزادت

'and a certain poet of Ṭabaristān in order to request more favour (from the king) says'.

It is only this sentence that makes it possible to understand the above-noted verse, which I read:

\[
\text{pīrūje ke xorde hamayūn sē dārū}
\]
\[
\text{ay vey ba sakhūn kamtar me yā ba neyrū}
\]

P. who has food even from Hamadān (or: from the purse)
Am I less than he in word or in power?
sē, texts SY.
\text{hamayūn}, could also be 'a long hanging purse', Pers. \text{ham(a)yān}. The poet is making a play on words.
dārū, for dār(n)e very usual in Maz.

VI. T. Tab. II, 115, cf. T. Zahir 177, reports an account of Gerda-Bāzū Yazdgird the eldest son of the above-mentioned Ispahbad Rustam Sāh Ǧāzū: 'He (G.-B.) was a prince endowed with poetical genius and a knower of the science of songs. There is no archer like him in our time. He used to draw (his) crossbow and until now his hand bow, with which he shot the deers, has lain on his tomb ... it is one \text{fitr} (the distance between the thumb and the index) thick ... until the day (his) father, at the instigation of the people, became angry with him ... The son was afflicted by (his) father's fury, and an illness with a hectic fever appeared and turned to cholie ... His illness increased day by day. In Tabari dialect he sang, discribing his condition:

\[
\text{جِل وا من كرد این تکردنه وا یکی بو}
\]
\[
\text{ور اورد بناز هو برد بخا که واشو}
\]
\[
\text{بوست و پنج سال می تن می بلا بو}
\]
\[
\text{کاشکی پیکی بازدو نیاور دادو}
\]
(T. Tab. loc. cit., cf. V.-N. Tabari 12 and 230.)

\[ \text{čal vā man kurd in na karde vā yaki bū} \\
\text{var-āvurd ba nāz hū-bard ba xāke rāšū} \\
\text{ba vist o panj sāl mī tan piye balā bū} \\
\text{kāški ba yaki bār ve bi-yōre dārū} \]

What the destiny (lit. sphere) has done with me, should not have been done with anyone!

Brought (me) up in grace (and) plunged (me) into the black dust. At the age of 25 my body should be ground by calamity!

Would that it (i.e. destiny) bring a remedy at once!

*bū*, Pers. *bū*, *buvad* (*buvad*). The 3rd hemistich has PW.

*hū-bard*, Pers. *-bard*. The preverb *hū-* and *hā-* occur often in Pāzavārī for ex. DORN, Maz. I, 144 *har kas tane xidmat ra kaj hū-kaše dam.*

*rāšū*, text *WSW*, Pers. *rāš* 'a kind of dark coloured date' (STENGASS);

Kurd. *rāš* 'black'; DORN, Maz. II, 22 *yā dūnasse hū-kurd e, me rūz ba-vū rāš(t)* (*t* is added for rhyme). For *-ū* supra.

*piye*, V.-N. Tabari *piyā*, *peha* 'flour'; cf. Qābūs-Nāma 1 *پیش از آنکه* 1

*دست زمانه ترا نرم کند* ...

*آسایی چرخ* 'the mill of the sphere'.

*bārū*, text BZW

*dārū*, text D'DW

VII. T. Tab. II, 97 has the following account of the mighty vizir of the same Ispahbad: "During his reign the vizirate of Māzandarān reached such a degree (of power) that neither before nor after him was there a vizir to the Bāvands, whose commands were more obeyed. It is said the Ispahbad entrusted a sum of 400,000 *dīnārs* to him. When the time of (his) death came, they said to the Ispahbad: 'The vizir is about to die.' He sent (people) to him (to ask him) where he had put the deposit. He sat up while in agony and said: 'Tell the Ispahbad, I am still alive and shall not die. When I get up (from the illness), I shall tell (it) orally (to him).' As soon as the couriers had left the house, his (last) breath came out and the sum was not to be found ... When Mujir died (one of) the poets of Sāri composed this verse:

\[ \text{مجر توجنا با بر نه اون مجیری} \\
\text{mojir, to jennae per na ūn mojir i} \\
\text{ke gottan: ba tī saze ažd'ha ba mīrī.} \]
The context gives us a picture of a terrifically authoritative and greedy man for whom these affronts and insults were written:

O Mojir, you son of a whore, are you not that M.
Of whom the people said: a dragon is better than you for governing?
jenna, I take it for Pers. jinda 'whore'.
per (see Pers. text), Pers. pūr, cf. Pāzavārī divān (Dorn, Maz. 1) 501
ān per ke mā ra halqe da-karde ba gūš and 500 pere gāleš 'cowboy'.
zae, Pers. sazād: sazīdan 'to fit, to be suitable'.

VIII. “The Bāvand prince (Šams al-Mul.uk Ardašir 1249–65) and the Gāvbārā prince (Ustāndār Šahrākîm 1242–73) … obeying the … order of (Hūlagū) Xān (1251–65) went together to besiege the fortress Gerda-Kūh (Pers. Gīr-Kōh). This fortress is situated in Dāmghān in a village known as Manṣūr-Ābād. When the spring came and the conquest still had not been carried out, a certain poet called Qūţb i Rūyānī … composed in Tabari dialect a tarzī describing spring, hunting and the like. He presented it to the prince. This qaṣīda enjoys a wide reputation in Ţabaristān. Its initiatory verse is

تارهز، وشرى بنجاش شم ای شیم
و ای گرد، نیاز دشکست و هار نیچره دیم

The meaning of this couplet is: When the sun went up from Pisces to Aries, at the foot of Gerda-Kūh the flowers blossomed

چون از حوت آفتاب بعمل رفت باز [یبی]
کرده که بهاره شکفتگه است

Because vara is bara, allegorically used for Aries
čale šam is šam' i čax ... for the Sun
and šim in Tabari dialect is māhī ... for Pisces.

Its refrain is:

های گیر کرده کووه، دژه بریو و نیرنگ
یا بیل اندیج که نیمی آن، یکی سنگ

Variants according to V.-N. Tabari 1.: او 4. – بينه. 3. – در. 2. – کووه.

This bait presents no difficulties and its meaning is clear.” (T. Zahir 60; ed. Dorn 86.)

Browne, Hist. of Tab. 260 f. gives 3 strophes of this poem. I quote here the 1st of them with my translation:
When the sphere's candle (i.e. the sun) went up from Pisces to Aries
At the foot of Gerda (-Kûh) fortress the flowers blossomed.
It seems (lit. you say) that the warm wind has attacked the body of the cold:
Look at Rūbār (Rūdbār)’s water, it is mixed with snow.
The fog (or: cloud) sprays dew (i.e. tears) for fear of the sun of Virgo (sunbula).
The gazelle entrusted to the hyacinth the secrets of (his) heart,
Narcissus drew out the golden cup, marygold scattered coins:
As donation coins (dīnārs) it pours out waxen (i.e. soft) gold money.
The violet shot up with grace and sprang (from the ground),
It made (its) scarf from a blue (cloth) and robe from the (green) leaves.

The refrain (does not occur in BROWNE):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{hā-gīr gerda-kūh dez ra ba ŭiv o neyrang} \\
\text{yā be-hel andāj ke bine ŭn yakī sang}
\end{align*}
\]

Take the fortress (dez) of Gerda-Kūh with stratagem and trick
Or, give up the attack and let the stone (i.e. G.-K. and its fortress) stand there.

The 2nd mīrā (miṣrā) of this strophe is badly corrupted, and it is only with the help of T. Zahir’s explanation that the reconstruction and translation have been possible.

napār, T. Zahir-DORN 86 NB’Z; V.-N. Tabari nafār, napār ‘a high platform for watching a field’; DORN, Maz. I, 132 translates (II, 523) into Pers. tābār and II, 572 simply as bālā-xāna.

vahārīm, Pers. bahār-an ‘flowers’; cf. pl. ending -ēn in NW dialects plus the change from -n to -m for ex. Maz. andarīm: Pers. andarōn etc. — Between vahār- and -īm is an intercalation certainly not belonging to the verse.

veškat, Pers. bi-š’kuft, bi-šikaft.
kālim, I take it to be a variant of kālūn, V.-N. Tabari 177 ‘husk, rind, bark’; DORN, Maz. II 99; cf. Pers. kālū ‘model, mould, body’.

varjālim, Pers. barf-ālōd, barf-ālōn; ālōdan like farmūdan, āzmūdan ... has two pres. st. ālā/ālōn-, farmā/farmān-, āzmā/āzmān- ... Here -ālōn: Maz.-ālīm.

rāẓim, Pers. rāz-ān.
da-hit: Pers. āheztan ‘to draw’.
zaryū: Pers. ādar-gōn(-yōn), zarr-gōn.
danērē mīyāz, for Pers. dinār i mīyāz (with usual imāla); see Pers. text.
balgān, Pers. barg-ān; texts BKLWN.

andāj, Pers. andāz, MP. handāčišn ‘attack, intention’.

IX. T. Zahir quotes three du-baitis in Tabari from Kiyā Afrāsiyāb Čalābī (Čalāvī) † 1358. Two of them present some difficulties and we treat them here. One is written on the occasion of the defeat of Kiyā Jalālī Matimar (? perhaps Māmaṭīr, Bāfurtūğ-Deh, now Bābul). “Afrāsiyāb has marched many times to conquer the fortress of Firūz-Kūh with Amul’s army. He was not able to free it. A sole time he met and defeated K. J. in the field and the mentioned Kiyā retired to a fortress. A. composed a Tabari on his flight.

The two editions I have used have the following variants:

and this Vima is a place near to the fortress Firūz-Kūh.” Op. cit. 243 f.

ēdī man ba vime lašgar-gāh be-dime
lirīnā aždahā ra ba dom ha-kašime
ēdī man vā-boste payān be-dime
ēdī man šoma-y-a bū zanan ba vime

Thus I saw the battle field in V.;
I pulled the roaring dragon by (his) tail;
I saw my enemy as having been broken in pieces;
Thus, I am (the one) having beaten you at V.

ēdī, Pers. ēdōn ‘so, in this manner’.

vā-bost, Pers. vā-gusast(a), vā-gusḵt(a), cf. V.-N. Tabari
bū, man ... bū Pers. bavam/buvam.

On Vima we possess an interesting notice in Yāqūt, Mu’jam al-Buldān:

The 2nd du-baiti is about the dervishes who molested the Kiyā greatly, after he entered their order (op. cit. 246 f.): “... At the time of...
the rice harvest (the dervishes) used to go to the private field of K. A. and beg for rice, saying: ‘The dervishes have not planted (any field) and make a petition to you to grant (them) some bundles of rice.’ K. then also obligingly used to say: ‘Give some bundles (sing. *kar*) to the dervishes!’ (But) they themselves went to the field and bound together some loads (sing. *pašta*) and called every load one bundle ... K. A. concerning this matter composed in Tabari:

درودیش بدرویشی نبستی نواین کر این کر نه این لبهره مه وشا پر
اين اون کره که دو نبري يكي يخ

کر اونکه اون به 1–1

*darvīš ba darvīšī na bastī to in kar
in kar niye in lambar e hā-vešā par
kar ūn e būe ba dastūre in ūr
(or: *kar ūn ke ūn bū ...*)
in ūn kar e ke do na bare yakī xar

O dervish, you have not bound this bundle in the manner of dervishes
(or: in poverty).
This is not a bundle, this is (as large as) a full opened skirt.
A bundle is that which accords with religious rule.
This bundle is such that an ass could not carry two.

*lanbar / lambar* ‘skirt’ (cf. V.-N. Tabari) the same as Pers. *lumbar / lumbar*
‘buttocks’.
*par*, Pers. *pur(r)*.
*šar*, Pers. *šar*.

X. Further, Zahir ad-Dīn reports two Tabari *du-baiūs* in T. Zahir 392 f. from a curious person among the notables of the country contemporary with the author, who completed his history 1476–77. The poet was a descendant of Sayyid Qawām ad-Dīn the Great. He is described as follows (T. Zahir 389): ‘When Sayyid Šā‘īd was murdered, his brother, Mīr ‘Abd al-‘Azhīm, a learned man ... of powerful frame, intrepid and renowned for his generosity, revolted in the forest of Āmul to take revenge ... His (only garments were a black *kalā-pušt* (a special jacket of goat’s hair worn in Māzandarān and Gilān) and black woollen trousers, without
a shirt. He lived in that forest with a magnificent sword and a huge superb shield. In rain and snow he stuck 3 sticks into the ground, put the shield on top of them and sat himself beneath it ...” He composed these verses after his brother had been murdered:

نا نديمه نی تی چر تر و خور رنگ
کلا پشته سی پوشت گلمن می ینگ
یا بدمنم چش کنمن خاک یکی چنگ
یا دشنمن بپی خون کنی جامه را رنگ

(Cf. V.-N. Tabari 19 and 224.)

تَا نَا دَیمِه تی چِرَه تَر و خُور رَنگ
کَلَا پَشش تی پوشت گَلَمَن مَی یَنگ
یَا بَنَشمن چَش کَنَم ِخَاک یَکَی چَنگ
یَا دَشِمن ِبی خَوَن کَنی ِعَامه رَا ِرَنگ

Since (the day) I have not seen your fresh and sun-like face,

Kalā-pašt is my dress, the bow is my walking stick.
Either I throw a handful of dust in the enemy’s eye
Or the enemy dyes his gown in my blood.

 pang, Pers. pang ‘rod, stick, baton, …’ (Steingass).

من دوام بیخواهانگو میر بهسومون
انگو میر کی کوی مریکه بگی خومن

ارسی بری کوی مریکه بگی خومن

تجن بکنار چاک بره تا بدامون

man dūm ba daryō angūmme mīr ba sūmūn
tajn ba kanār čāk beze tā ba dūmūn
esrī be-reše kūkar vemči(k) beq’re xūn
angūme reze kōk ba mašq viyābūn

d Pāzavāri divan (Dorn, Maz. II, 70) has a variant of this du-baštī

تا نویمچی چررا خور رنگ
کلا پشته مه پوشت کمر منه چنگ
تا کنمن چشم دشمن را خاک یکی چنگ
با مه دشمن خیین کنی شه جویمه رنگ

12* - 693290
I throw a net over the sea (i.e. I catch it) and death over the land,
Having split the bank of the Tajan (river) (i.e. entering into it) up to
the height of my skirt.
*Kukār* (a certain bird) pours tears, sparrow weeps blood
And partridge strips turmoil in *Mūskīn-Dašt*.

*angūma:* (da-y-) *angūn* ‘to throw’.
*mīr,* Pers. *mīr* ‘death’.
*kūkar,* Gil. *kūf-kar* ‘a certain bird living at the water’s edge’, Farhang i
Gilaki.
*kūk,* text KW, Pers. *kāk*
*vemēči(s)k,* text has DMYK, I connect it with Pers. *gunjišk,* *bīnēšk* ...
‘sparrow’.
*angūme,* Pers. *hangāma*
*ba-g’re,* text BKW, Pers. *bi-giryād*
*sāmān,* text SMWN, Pers. *sāmān* ‘boundary, foundation of a house, ...’
*mašge viyābūn,* is most probably the true Maz. form of *Mūskīn-Dašt,*
a locality in Nūr not far from Āmul (cf. RABINO, Maz. and As. 111).

XI. The chapter XX of *Qābūs-Nāma*⁶ begins with the sentence

"Once you engaged in battle ... but take no precautions for your
own life; he that is destined to sleep in the grave will never again sleep
at home. This I have expressed in the following quatrain":⁷

variants according to V.-N. Tabari
بين 3 - وری مبر 2- ص 1.

Even though the enemy resembles a roaming lion
I don't fear (him), even if he is the sun of the revolving universe.
Thus says the wise man: 'See, the one
Who is destined to sleep in the grave, he will (never) sleep at home.'

 tö-där, Pers. tab-där 'roaming'; šēr tab karda 'st 'the lion roams'.
da-mūne, text RMWNH.
gehūne vardūn, Pers. jihān i gardān.
mēr, Pers. mīhr 'sun' and not Pers. mīr/mēr 'lord', which could imply a
blasphemy.
har ūn-e, for Pers. har ūn-e (ki).
ba-gūr-xuft, Pers. ba-gūr-xuft (xuft pres. st.) the same as ba-gūr-xusp 'the
one who ought to sleep in the tomb'.

Additional Notes

(1) Curiously enough the name of the small fortress Gird-Kūh occurs
in Chinese historical literature as Ki-du-bu-gu (Ch‘i-tu-pu, Pelliot) in
Ch‘ang Tê’s account on his journey in 1259. Bretschneider, Medi-
aeval Researches from Eastern Asiatic Sources, London 1888, I, 133 and
in Yuan Che (ed. Kouo-tseu-ki’en de Nankin des Ming) 147, 6 a. Cf.

(2) pang 'stick, baton' occurs in Gardēzī, Zain al-Axbār, ed. ‘A. Ḥabībī,
Teheran 1347/1967, 287: In Čandālān hamē raveand ū andar dast MKY
(YKY?) dārand ū andar sar i ān čob ḡalqa-ē ... Minorsky, Gardēzī on
India in Iranica (200–215 = BSOAS. 1948, XII/3, 625–40), 202 gives the
following translation: 'These Chandala go about with a piece (of wood)
in their hands; at the end of that piece of wood there is a ring ...'

Thus M. sees in both mss. (King’s College 213, Cambridge and Ouseley
240, Bodleian Lib., Oxford) a form like YKY (and not Ḥabībī’s MKY)
which he presumably has read yak-ē and translated with 'one piece
(of wood)'. It is quite obvious that neither yak-ē nor muk-ē (muk
'a javelin, short spear' Steingass) gives a satisfactory meaning to the
passus.
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R. P. KANGLE

Once Again Meghadūta, st. 25

In the Orientalia Suecana, XVI/1967, pp. 215–219, Dr. G. Liebert has written in refutation of some remarks which I had made on his interpretation of Meghadūta, st. 25, that had appeared in an earlier issue of this Journal. That calls for further comments.

To dispose of a point of grammar first. Dr. Liebert remarks that praudhappaspatih could as well be a substantive determinative compound as a Bahuvrihi and adds that this difference plays no role. There is, of course, no doubt that theoretically praudhappaspatih can be looked upon as a Karmadhāraya compound. However, it is not possible to do so in the present instance. For, as a Karmadhāraya, the word would be a new substantive in addition to the substantive kadambaiḥ which is already there. That would mean that we have to understand a ca 'and' as a conjunctive to join the two substantives. Further, the question would arise what 'full-blown flowers' are these over and above and independent of kadambaiḥ? The two translations of the expression referred to with approval by Dr. Liebert show that praudhappaspatih is understood there as a Bahuvrihi. And to say that the difference between the two kinds of compounds plays no role, i.e. has no significance shows, to my mind, unawareness of the nature of these two different types of compounds.

Dr. Liebert refers me to Whitney for loose constructions with compounds. He has done well to state Whitney's criterion in that respect: 'a word in composition has an independent word in the sentence depending upon or qualifying it alone rather than the compound of which it forms a part' (§ 1316). Whitney has given some examples of such loose constructions. Most of the compounds in the examples given are either Tatpurusa or Karmadhāraya; the only instance of a Bahuvrihi compound that is given is syandane dattadṛṣṭiḥ from the Śākuntala. There is no doubt, however, that this has been erroneously included by Whitney among his examples of compounds with a loose construction. For, it does not fulfil the criterion laid down by himself. Neither datta
nor drṣṭi (a word in composition) has syandane (an independent word in the sentence) depending upon or qualifying it alone. We, therefore, do not have here a compound with a loose construction. In fact, the very nature of a Bahuvrihi compound is such that the words forming it constitute a compact unit, so that it is not possible to construe syntactically any member of that compound with a word outside it. In the present instance, neither praudha nor puspa, which form the Bahuvrihi compound, has kadambaiḥ (which is in the Instrumental case) depending upon it alone or qualifying it alone. It must, therefore, be asserted once again that grammatically kadamba and puspa cannot be construed together to form a single idea, viz., the plant Kadambapuspā.

Dr. Liebert reminds me that his interpretation of praudhapuspaiḥ kadambaiḥ in the sense of praudhābhiḥ kadambapuspābhiḥ contains only a concealed or veiled (versteckt) allusion and adds that this allusion has taken the form of a pun in which the expression actually used is substituted by another construction, viz., praudhābhiḥ kadambapuspābhiḥ. Assuming for the moment that a pun is intended in the stanza, one should like to know how Dr. Liebert would understand the expression praudhapuspaiḥ kadambaiḥ before the pun supposed to be contained in it is thought of. Surely the expression conveys an un concealed meaning before one can think of a veiled meaning on the basis of a possible pun? What is this un concealed, open, primary meaning, according to Dr. Liebert?

Ordinarily it might be expected that the un concealed meaning of the expression as understood by all commentators and as found in the translations quoted with approval by Dr. Liebert himself, viz., ‘because of Kadambas, whose flowers are full-blown’, where Kadamba stands for some tree, would be acceptable to him. But apparently Dr. Liebert will have nothing to do with the Kadamba tree so far as this stanza is concerned. For, he asserts that the discussion started by me has led him to the conclusion that ‘whatever plant Kālidāsa may have had in mind in st. 25, it has not been the Kadamba tree’. One must naturally ask what plant must Kālidāsa be supposed to have had in mind when he used the word kadambaiḥ? Dr. Liebert’s rejoinder leaves no room for doubt that, according to him, Kālidāsa had in mind only the Kadambapuspā plant when he wrote the stanza. For, although in the opening paragraph he has stated that the allusion to the Kadambapuspā is only concealed (versteckt), the rest of the article makes it abundantly clear that he would regard the supposed reference to the Kadambapuspā as not only
the unconcealed, open meaning, but probably the only possible meaning of the expression used. His refusal to accept Kadamba as the name of the well-known Kadamba tree is one indication of this.

A rather curious reason why Dr. Liebert would not think of the Kadamba tree in st. 25 is the circumstance that, according to him, the real Kadamba tree is already mentioned under the name of Nipa in st. 21 and is described there as having had only buds. Is it likely, he asks, that Kālidāsa would come back again to the Kadamba tree a few lines further on and describe its flowers as fully blossomed? Falling in line with this piece of reasoning, one could perhaps point out that in the interval between the two stanzas the cloud was expected to spend some time on each mountain on the way, kālakṣeṇam kakubhāsurabhau parvate parvate te (st. 22); might not the time so spent be considered sufficient to allow the buds to blossom? Let us hope that Dr. Liebert does not inquire how much time in days, hours and minutes the cloud was expected to spend on the way in this manner.

Dr. Liebert is now prepared to grant that the stanza in question is in its proper place and need not be transferred to the Himalayas, as he had originally suggested. However, he now thinks that Kālidāsa had known the Nard plant only from hearsay and had not himself seen it. Even the great 19th century Orientalist, Sir William Jones, knew this plant only from hearsay and was mistaken about the source of its perfume, we are told by Dr. Liebert. So it is no wonder, according to him, that Kālidāsa too learnt about it from hearsay. Nevertheless the description of the plant in this stanza as interpreted by Dr. Liebert, that its flowers are carried away by the rains, leaving only hair-like filaments visible on the ground (Orientalia Svecana, XIII/1964, pp. 126 ff.) is such as to satisfy the most exacting modern botanist. An amazing feat indeed by a poet who, Dr. Liebert now asserts, knew the plant only as a perfume!

Proceeding on the assumption that Kālidāsa knew the Nard only as a perfume, Dr. Liebert thinks that the poet believed the Nard plant to be a general mountain plant, not restricted to the Himalayas, that he, therefore, planted it wherever it suited him, on a poetical mountain, and that he furnished this mountain, covered with Nard plants, with caves for the perfume-loving courtesans. Now, if the allusion to the Nard plant in the stanza is to be understood as only veiled, what need is there for these suppositions? Is it possible to suppose that the mountain Nileira is a poetical invention of Kālidāsa and that he invented it just in order that a veiled allusion may possibly be made to the Nard plant? Does
not Dr. Liebert accept the fact that all places mentioned in the Meghadūta, beginning with Rāmagiri and ending with Alakā on the Kailāsa, whether the places are real or imaginary, bear names by which they were already known when Kālidāsa wrote and that none of them can be regarded as poetically invented by him? In this particular case, moreover, the mountain is referred to as Nīcāirākhya giri 'the mountain bearing the name (ākhya) Nicaira'. That clearly shows that it was known to the people living nearby by this name and that therefore the name cannot be looked upon as that of a mountain invented by the poet. When Dr. Liebert refers to the ‘perfume-loving’ courtesans, he apparently has in mind the perfume of the Nard proving an attraction to them. But if the courtesans’ love of perfume is suggested to him by the word parimala used in the stanza, it must be pointed out that the word has nothing to do with the perfume of any plant growing on the mountain. In his enthusiasm for the Nard plant Dr. Liebert has obviously lost sight of the fact that even according to him the allusion to that plant is only veiled and is not to be understood as the directly expressed, primary meaning of any expression in the stanza.

An additional reason why Dr. Liebert rejects the Kadamba tree in favour of the Kadambapuspā plant is stated by him in this way: the cloud is asked to take rest on this mountain (vis’rāmahetoḥ); for that purpose the hair-like filaments of the Kadambapuspā plant would provide a more soft, a more pleasant and a more suitable bed for the cloud to lie down upon for taking rest than the knotted branches of the Kadamba tree. Evidently the assertion made in the beginning that the allusion to the Kadambapuspā is only veiled has been completely forgotten, and Kadambapuspā is understood as primarily meant in the stanza.

Because I do not see any pun in this stanza, Dr. Liebert seems inclined to think that according to me there is no pun anywhere in Kālidāsa. He is welcome to such thought.
**Book Reviews**

**Karl H. Menges, Tungusen und Lhao.** Wiesbaden 1968. 60 S., 1 Ausschlagtafel. (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, im Auftrage der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft herausgegeben von Anton Spitaller, XXXVIII, 1).


**Lars Johanson**


This book is a pioneer work. The author has produced the first edition and a study of an early Braj text in prose, dating from the beginning of the seventeenth century. It is self-evident that a prose text might be expected to give us more positive knowledge of the syntax of Braj than what can be deduced from the artistic verses of Surdas or Tulsidas. However, the prose studied in this book proves to be of a special kind. It is a rather meagre commentary on a number of Sanskrit verses, the Nītiśataka of Bhartṛhari. The largest portion of the commentary on each verse consists in showing the syntactic connection, the anvāya, of the Sanskrit words. This is done mostly by lemmata being taken out of the Sanskrit text (mūla) and put in an order that facilitates the analysis of the mūla. The lemmata are translated into bhāgā with the additions that are required in Braj to show the syntactic
function of the Sanskrit words quoted. In this way the commentator often succeeds in forming phrases that at times convey an impression of genuineness, but quite often they unveil their dependence on Sanskrit syntax by peculiarities of word order. Sometimes a lemma is not translated at all, but is put into the syntactic order in its Sanskrit form or in a slightly altered form. Now and then the commentary does not offer anything that can be qualified as a lemma, and in such cases the impression of genuineness may be particularly strong. But it is often a false impression. The editor has italicised the words he considers to be lemmata. It would have facilitated the reading and the judgment of the dependence or independence of the commentary considerably, if also those words that translate a word of the mūla directly, without an intervening lemma, had been marked in some way (e.g. 1b ⟨11⟩ \textit{pramāṇa} = \textit{māna} in the mūla, 2a ⟨2⟩ \textit{vrahmā} = \textit{vrahmāpi} in the mūla, etc.). Generally speaking, it would have added considerably to the value of the edition and of the study contained in the second part of the book, if the author had made an attempt to keep apart those highly technical sections which are closely dependent on the Sanskrit text and on a possible Sanskrit commentary from those—to my mind small—sections which are less technical and are likely to be genuine. But such a partition is hardly to be expected in this book in view of the fact that the author has a totally different opinion of the general character of the commentary, as expressed e.g. on p. 14: “The style of the commentary is for the most part relatively fluent and selfconsistent. The material is also extensive enough and in general independent enough of the Sanskrit text to make it probable that it represents a genuine sample of a Sanskritised, educated style of language current in Orchā in Indrajit’s time”. The impression I have won after a thorough perusal of the material is that Indrajit’s āśrama is even less an exponent of a natural and fluent style than the style of Sanskrit āśramas generally is. On the following pages I shall give several examples that are likely to show that Indrajit’s technique is more or less the same as that to be found in most Sanskrit commentaries of this kind. But as a sample of technical prose this commentary is of considerable interest, and it is well worth being studied by those interested in the development of Indo-Aryan. It is the importance of the material presented in this book that accounts for the extensiveness of the critical examination given below.

The present reviewer often finds it difficult to determine how the editor analyses the text, and would have welcomed a more thorough commentary, or perhaps even a translation of the whole text. The extensive insertion of commas and semi-colons does not make up for this deficiency; on the contrary, it is disturbing and often shows an erroneous analysis. (In the sequel I shall ignore these insertions and restore the punctuation of the MS.) Finding out what exactly the opinion of the author is, often requires some work, now and then fruitless. One example: 1b ⟨13⟩ \textit{ihiḥ prakāra bharty hari mangalācarana karikai prathama hiṃ nitisata kari tatra loka kauṃ kahata hai}. A note on \textit{kari tatra} first directs the reader to 3: 169, where he finds that \textit{kari} ‘possibly’ functions as a genitive particle. This seems to imply other possibilities. But they are not mentioned or rejected at 3: 179 and 3: 180. We find the whole
phrase quoted at 1b 〈6〉, note, but the discussion there is too vague to give any definite idea of what it means, i.e. what function it fulfils in the context. Is this a possible literal translation: "Having in this way made maṅgalāca-rana, Bhartrhari first, by making the Nitiśataka, teaches tatteva to the world"?

An attempt to translate the whole text would undoubtedly have saved the author a mistake in the discussion of the Sanskrit text on p. 12 sq. Discussing three verses whose commentary is introduced by the words yā śloka kau yaha artha the author says that one of the verses, viz. 64, is introduced by the final sentences of the commentary on verse 63. But this is true also of the two other verses, i.e. the one which has the number 23 and the one which stands between 52 and 53 and is marked 1. The commentary on verse 22 is introduced by these words 7a 〈9〉: yā saṁśāra viṣai dhana aśau vaḍau hai jā kai āgaiṁ na jāti ganiṣṭa. na ganiṣṭa ganiṣṭa na śīlu ganiṣṭa. yaha yā śloka viṣai kahījatu hai. "In this world wealth is so important, in the presence of which (i.e.: that in the presence of it) birth is not considered, quality is not considered, moral is not considered. This is told in this śloka". After the commentary proper, these words follow: jau dhanu hai tau jāti koū na pūchatu, aru jāti hai dhanu nāṃhi tau jāti tana dhanu vina kau nāṃhi citavatu. aiseṃ hi aurasah guna akele dhanu vina kacchā kāmmā kau nāṃhi. yaha bhartharhi kahi āgaiṁ kahi hai. "If there is wealth, then nobody asks for birth. And (if) there is birth, (but) not wealth, then no one looks at birth, without wealth. In exactly the same way [aiseṃ hī] also (in) other (cases) [auruā]; there is no use of all qualities, excepting wealth alone. This (which) is said by Bhartrhari, is said below (āgaiṁ = skt. agr, viz. verse 65: yasyāstī vittam sa narāh kulānḥ, etc.)." Thereafter Indrajit quotes this very verse 65 yasyāstī vittam, etc., and introduces his commentary on it with the words yā śloka kau yaha artha, "of this śloka this is the meaning". It is clear from this that the verse yasyāstī vittam, etc., with its commentary, in this context originally formed part of the commentary on verse 22, where it functions as an illustration. The same is true of the verse sahasā vidadhiḥ, etc., which is a part of the commentary on verse 52. The quotation of this verse is accounted for by these words, 14b 〈4〉: yaha aura hū grantha viṣaiṁ kahi hai. "This is said also in another book".

It is obvious that the reason why Indrajit uses the phrase yā śloka kau yaha artha in connection with these three verses is that he wanted to show that they were quotations and that they were appropriate. The explanation given p. 13 is out of place.

In the commentary on verse 41 we find a Sanskrit pāda quoted in exactly the same way, but being easy to understand it is not translated by INDRAJIT. The context runs 11b 〈14〉: sahasra daśa kau doṣu akeloī lobha hai. yaha aura hū grantha viṣai kahi hai lobhamālānī pāpānī. "The sin of thousand sins is greed alone. This is said also in another book: sins have their root in greed".

What the author says about this on p. 14 is misleading.

The vigrahā of the bahuvrihi presupposes the reading 1b 〈7〉: svānabhūtiye-kamānāya, not -aika:- swa kahetiṁ apamoi ju anubhūti kahi anubhavaḥ soī eka musya hai pramaṇa jīnī viṣai [aise haim]. For the interpretation
eka = musya cf. 4b (9). anubhātī, which is explained by the more common Sanskrit term anubhārā, is preceded by ju, which makes it clear to the Braj reader that he has to understand a “non-oblique” form (function). The bahuvrīhi is interpreted in the “nominative case”: aise haiṁ. The dative gets its expression line 12: aise [īsvar] kaṁhaṁ [namaskāra].

1b (15): aru viśeṣajñāḥ viśeṣa kau jānanahārā ju hai. paramacatur ... The editor has deleted the danda after hai and put in a comma before ju. In my opinion the punctuation of the MS is correct. ju hai shows that viśeṣajñāḥ and its gloss viśeṣa kau jānanahārā are non-oblique. Thereafter follows, parenthetically, an explanation: paramacatura. Practically all occurrences of ju hai in the book should be interpreted after this pattern.

2a (1): jñānalavavadurvidadgāṁ. gyāna ke lana kuri ju durvidadgāṁ haṁ kāha mahādūrāgārha hai su etādṛśa nara (read: naraṁ) maṁṣayāhāṁ. The tatpurusā compound in the accusative is dissolved in the nominative case, marked first by the relative construction ju [durvidadgāṁ] hai (with a parenthetical gloss kāha dūrāgārha hai), and then by the demonstrative su. Consequently, a break should be made after su. The connecting link between this tatpurusā, presented in the nominative case, and the principal noun in the accusative (oblique in Braj): naraṁ maṁṣayāhāṁ, is etādṛśa. This word is to be understood as oblique. The principle, then, for this kind of dissolution of a Sanskrit compound is first to dissolve it in “un-inflected” form (nominative) (marked in Braj by hai or su); thereafter it is re-introduced into its syntactic relation. This is true also of the second instance treated at 3: 58. But there we have one single Sanskrit word in the instrumental case, 7b (11) kāndhā, which is first analysed in the nominative: atībhūṣa ju lagī su, thereafter put into its proper place syntactically by tā taiṁ. Consequently, none of these two instances treated at 3: 58 supports the author’s explanation “su may be a colloquialism, introduced by analogy with the frequent cases where it occurs correctly as a correlative to preceding ju”. It is, on the contrary, a highly technical use of su.

Paragraph 3: 58 is on the whole too short and unsatisfactory in its treatment of this important word. In fact, a correct understanding of su and ju often gives the clue to many technical constructions. I shall analyse a section of the commentary on verse 100 to show this. (The interpolation and other devices are my own.) Mūla: kiṁ kūrmasya bhūrayathā na vaṃṣiṣa kṣāmā na kṣipaya esa yāt, kim vā nāsti pariśramo dinapate āste na yān nisclāh. Tiṅka: eṣaḥ = yaha kūrmu, yat = ju; [apani pitha para taiṁ] kṣāmā na kṣipati = pṛthvīhitām nāṁhi dṛi detu, su ko yaha jānī jānahaṁ kī kūrmasya = kūrma ke vaṃṣiṣa = śarira viṣyām bhūrayathā na = [pṛthvī ke] bhāra kī vihā nāṁhi. kiṃtu vihā bahuta hota hai, aru [dinaṇați] ji hai = sūrya, su niscalo yat nāste = nisclāa havi ji nāṁhi baṭhā rahatu, su ko yaha jānī jānahaṁ kī dinapate = sūrya kai pariśramo nāsti = [rāṭi dinu phirvai kau] śramu nāṁhi. śramu tāu aṭi hotu haiṁ. The two yat of the Sanskrit text mean “because”, and so do the corresponding Braj translations: ju. The corresponding su is consequently to interpret as “therefore”, and the context should be interpreted as follows: “eṣaḥ = this, (viz.) the
tortoise, yat = because [from its own back] kṣmāṇa na kṣēpalī = it does not throw the earth, therefore no one should think this, namely: kūrmasya = on the tortoise’s vāpuṣī = body bharavyathā na = the pain of the burden [of the earth] is not. On the contrary, the pain is great”. The rest after this pattern. It should be noted that kim is paraphrased by koī yaha janī jānāhum.

It is obvious that su under certain circumstances functions as Sanskrit tad (= therefore, so), and, for that matter, as modern Hindi so. Only the context or a Sanskrit original may perhaps remove all doubts. The following I regard as a rather sure instance, considering the context: 20b <9> su hama jau namra na hampīhge tāu sāva koī hamāre phala-phāla torata atiduśi hevaihīṃ. Also this one: 22a <11> su rājāni kī sevā karata jīni kai itane sātaguṇā nāṃhi upajata tīna kauṃ rājasevā tain kacchū kārya nāṃhi bhayau. (This at first sight appears to be a conclusion which is independent of the wording of the Sanskrit text. But the words karata jīni kai raise one’s suspicion and, in fact, the construction is understandable only as a translation of the mūla: yesaṃ ... sātaguṇā na pravrītās teṣaṃ ..., as follows: “for whom (jīni kai = yesaṃ), doing service of the kings (rājāni kī sevā karata) these many six qualities (sātaguṇā = sātaguṇās) do not appear (nāṃhi upajata = na pravrītās), for them (tīna kauṃ = teṣaṃ) of king’s service there is no need”. It should be noted that na pravrītās was not commented upon in the preceding section of the commentary. The technique is actually somewhat free here, and it is noteworthy that the editor has not been able to mark any word as lemma. But the absence of lemmata in a pure Sanskrit form is no proof of genuineness or independence.)

Especially in those cases where su is connected with an oblique form of the same or of another pronoun, and where su cannot correspond to a ājī, the meaning “therefore” or “so” seems to deserve consideration, e.g. 16a <14> su tā tain iṇḍra kauhā pauruṣa na kinau hatau, pai hoi kauhā jītivai kau ḍhāya nāṃhi. “So therefore would Indra not have shown manliness? But [this is not meant, for] what is said is: he was not destined to conquer”.

I think hoi kauhā corresponds to the phrase so common in Sanskrit commentaries: uktam bhavati. This interpretation, which is in fact the one required by the context, removes the complication which Mcgregor is led into by his translation “what could it avail him” (p. 95). The form kauhā is—I think rightly—accepted by McGregor at 3:126 and 3:239.

However, in those cases where su is followed by a non-oblique form of a pronoun and the meaning “so, therefore” does not fit into the context, the collocation might imply reinforcement: su yaha = tad etai. I shall discuss some instances below, and two of the cases seem quite sure. Since the crucial point, which has been misunderstood by the author, becomes clear only in its context, the discussion of the first case must needs be extensive. The line commented upon is this: 19a <15> na ko’pi camḍakopānām āṭmiyo nāma bhābhujām, and the ṛṣṭanta that follows shall also be quoted since it contributes to the understanding of the commentary: hotāram api juvaṃtāṃ (sic!) sṛṣṭo dhātai pāvakah. Commentary: bhābhujām rājāni kai, ko’pi āṭmiyo na, koī apaṇam rāṇhī, taisoi apaṇau taisoi paravyau, rājā kaise haṁ. camḍakopānām. pracoṃda hai kopa jina kau. aice haṁ, jaba rājā kopa
karata hain tabu parāyeni hiṃ para koro karata hai. apanaiṃni para nāṃhi karata. Su yaha rājāni kai nāṃhi, rājāni kai jaisoi apanau taisoi parāyau. ‘bhūbhujāṃ for kings ko’pi ātmīya na there is no ‘his own’. [‘His own’ would imply this behaviour] ‘His own like that, the stranger like that’ [i.e. they are treated differently]. How are the kings [who are mentioned in the verse]? cāmpjakopānāṃ: whose anger is violent. Such are they. [One would believe that] ‘when a king is angry, then he is angry only with strangers, with his own he is not’. [But] exactly that (su yaha) is not [the behaviour] of kings. Of kings [the behaviour is this:] ‘as his own, so the stranger’.

The same collocation at 24b (10) at first sight gives the impression of meaning tad etal, but the context and the relation to the Sanskrit text cause some doubt: tā taim prati pannavastuni nīrvāhāḥ apanaiṃ amgikta kau nivāhivau ju hai su yaha, satāṃ vađeni ke, gotravratāṃ, kula kau vratā hai. It is fairly sure that su corresponds to nivāhivau ju hai in the usual way and that yaha translates etal, which is in the mūla but has not been quoted as a lemma. So if a comma is necessary, it should be put after su, not before su. (The reading etalāhī of the MS should of course have been retained in the verse, not changed to etal hi (sic!).) An analogous problem arises at15b (6), where su yaha mūna seems to translate tat sasūnam. But su may correspond to a preceding ju.

16a (7) su yaha maināka pareata gāyāra kīni: according to Mcgregor su yaha is “an introductory phrase: ‘in so doing’ “. For my part I do not really know what to do with the phrase beginning with ju and ending with āyau, unless the punctuation after kīni be deleted and a pause be made after āyau: su yaha maināka pareata gāyāra kīni ju pita himacalakin tusa ke kleśa hi madhya chādi āyau, su muku indra ke vajra kai māraim mari jaivau bhalau hato pai yaha bhāgi vacivau bhalau nāṃhi. “This the mountain Maināka did wrong, that it left Himālaya, the father, in the pain of the snow. Even this, (viz.) to die because slain by Indra’s vajra, would be better than this, (viz.) to run away”. mari jaivau paraphrases the gloss line (4) prāṇa nikasi jaivau = prāṇacchedo, and yaha bhāgi vacivau is identical with the gloss line (6) yaha bhāgi vacivau, which is a rather free rendering of asau sāmpūtaḥ. So there is no doubt that su and yaha have the function ascribed to them in my translation. Therefore it is also clear that the phrase ju … āyau corresponds to the collocation su yaha, and the function of the collocation most naturally is that of reinforcement.

Without any other plan than the order of the Sanskrit verses I shall continue my discussion of some of the points where I disagree with the author or where I have not been able to ascertain his opinion. In order to make the discussion less verbose I shall make use of brackets and various typographical devices, which are hoped to be understood without further explanations.

3b (9) lakṣmiḥ (sic!) samāviṣatu, samputi [susu pāikai ḍha viśai āvati hai tāu] samāviṣatu, ābahu vā, atha vā, [duṣa pāikai jo choḍi gāyau cāhai tāu] yatheṣṭaṃ. apani icchā gacchatu. jū. As will be seen I have removed the daṇḍa of the MS between gāyau and cāhai, thus solving the alleged problem of note 3b (10), and split samputisusu in order to remove the
problem of note 3b 〈9〉. The additions made by the commentator are put in brackets, and their meaning is: “[if], bringing happiness, it [viz. sampati = lakṣñi] comes into the house, then …” and “having brought unhappiness, if one wishes it to leave (the house), then …”

4b 〈6〉 bahuta kahām laun kahējāi hardly means “how far, to what extent can it be said that (the light) is great” (note). I suggest that it be understood as corresponding to Sanskrit ॐ kiṃ bahunā uktena or something of that kind. It seems to fit quite well after an enumeration. A comparison with the context in which the same phrase occurs in Indrajit’s commentary on Śrīgāraśāstaka (acc. to Appendix I, p. 236) might be expected to confirm or disprove this suggestion.

The long vyūha of the bahuṛhi 4b 〈11〉 unmattebhavibhimnakumbhakavalo graśaikabaddhasphāh at 4b 〈8〉 ummaṭa ju ibha, etc., is not complete. It lacks what would mark the compound as a bahuṛhi, viz. a relative pronoun. Since the reading spṛhāi according to footnote 5, p. 24 is not without certain problems and the construction bāmāhi hai spṛhāi also causes problems p. 225, note 3, I suggest that one reads spṛhā [i]hējāi.

8b 〈3〉 aisau should be emended to aṣau, being a lemma, glossed by vaha = mānyāru sarpa.

It is impossible to accept the analysis of the commentary on verse 30 which one can infer from the notes. The emendation of 8b 〈9〉 MS samāna to samāna is out of place. The line is an explanation of what is meant when it is said that the milk gives its qualities to its friend the water. 8b 〈8〉 dūda apaññai samasargi jala sauñ aiśī priti kīñi ju apuna samāna kinaññi — “The milk felt such affection for the water which was mingled with it, that it made (the water) like itself (the milk)”. 8b 〈10〉 dugdhaḥiṃ autaṭa jala sauṣyau jāta hai cannot mean “the milk is unhappy at the water’s boiling”, which is completely out of the context. It is an explanation of what is implied when the verse and the commentary say that the water sacrifices its essence (svatmā) to the fire when it sees how its friend the milk is tormented when it is being boiled (8b 〈9〉 jaba otiyau hai). So what the phrase says is this: “When the milk is boiling (dugdhaḥiṃ autaṭa), the water (jala or, as MS, jalu) gets dry”. As will be noted, I consider dugdhaḥiṃ to play the rôle of subject of the verb autaṭa. This interpretation might be contested, since also “when one is boiling the milk” would be possible—somewhat complicated, though. But the reason why I think my suggestion is worth discussing are the following instances. In the conclusion, in which the friendship of good people is compared with that of the milk and the water, it is said: 8b 〈13〉 mitrahiṃ vinu deśaṁ mariyau hai. aru mitrahi deṣata kiṁ jiāijau hai, which I find it natural to translate: “Without being seen by the friend, one is killed, and as soon as the friend sees (one), one is brought to life”. Also in this case one could possibly turn it the other way, but then jiāijau should be interpreted otherwise (“keep alive”) and one would perhaps have to reconsider the meaning of imperfective participle + kiṁ established by McGregor 3: 227 (and confirmed by constructions in the modern dialects, cf. e.g. Jaiswal, A Linguistic Study of Bundeli, p. 166; hamāe atāi bō bhaga gaő „as soon as I came he ran away”. Note hamāe, to be compared with the
constructions with genitive below.) The construction aurahi deśata hiṃ in the immediate context 11b 〈5〉 nāṁtara eka asādhī aise hota hai ju aurahi deśata hiṃ amīc caughi vaithatu hai. sūdhi aise hai ju pata kahām namratā hiṃ kari amīc hvai baithatu hain. I certainly find it natural to interpret as “as soon as another looks at him”, but in the wider and rather difficult context of the Sanskrit text and the rest of the commentary, the interpretation appears to present difficulties which it would take too much space to discuss at length here. So this instance shall not be insisted upon.

It is quite easy to subscribe to the general principle expressed by McGregor on p. 8 sq.: “As far as has been practicable the language of the text selected has been analysed in its own terms, with the aim of avoiding false equations between its grammar and that of the standard poetic language, or other extraneous forms of speech”, but I cannot abstain from adding two instances from Sursagar as parallels to the interpretations suggested by me: ika larihā abahān bhaji ḍīgau, rovata dekhīyau tāhi (838), where I suggest the interpretation tāhi rovata dekhīyau “I saw him crying” (lit. him crying he was seen), and mo dekhīta kānhara ihīm āṃgana paga dhāi dharani dharāhīm (693), where mo dekhīta means “when I am looking”.

Another point is that the construction dugahāhin aʊtātā, interpreted as “when the milk is boiling”, has a parallel in the construction yā kai deśata a few lines below, 9a 〈12〉: yaha nāṁhī sakucatu ki mohi indra deśata hai. haum yā kai deśata yaḥa karma na karāum = “This he does not consider, viz. Indra is looking at me. I should not do this action while he is looking (at me)”. (Incidentally, 9b 〈4〉 indra hotaɪm not “in a king’s presence”, but “in Indra’s presence.”) 19a 〈9〉 naṁka hi kai cehwata hīṁ should perhaps also be adduced here. The translation given 3: 203 “on being touched by” is unsatisfactory and does not agree with the one given in note 8, p. 99: “as soon as he touches it”. If this is a parallel to yā kai deśata it would mean: “as soon as even a good person touches it”, and it would be an absolute construction inserted parenthetically between vaḥi and jāraḥi hai. Differently McGregor 19a 〈8〉, note.

My last observation on verse 30 concerns 8b 〈13〉 su yaha jugatu āhi. McGregor translates: “and so a means is found (of restoring the union)”. But this of course renders yuktum in the mūla (just as 16a 〈10〉 yaha jugata hai renders idam eva yuktum). The commentator’s interpretation might seem forced, but it has parallels, see e.g. the South-Indian commentary published by Kosambi in the edition of the Southern archetypal (Bharatiya Vidya Series No. 9, 1946, p. 38), where yuktum is glossed sthāne. So su yaha jugatu āhi would mean “therefore, this (= the following) is adequate”.

9b 〈8〉, note, is totally unnecessary. It is obviously based on the false reading kyudhā śōntaye, both in the Sanskrit text and as lemma, instead of kyudhāśōntaye.—10b 〈4〉: aisi in concord with smātā, not with muktā, as said in the note.

The argumentation in the note on 10b 〈10〉 for the view that the repetition of the lemma visnuḥ is suspect, is not convincing. Since Indrajit’s commentary has several interesting technical aspects, I shall discuss the whole context, which is a relative phrase. Sanskrit: visnuḥ yena daśāvatāragahane
samanke viṣṇi gahī ārī dae haiṁ. [viṣṇuh.] Everything that is not in brackets
has its correspondence in the Sanskrit text. So one can see that the dissolu-
tion of the tatpuruṣa compound daśavatāragahana is made according to the
rules, but also that gahana has been interpreted as if it were graham (ren-
dered by dhariva). This in turn would imply, either that the commentator
did read graham in his Sanskrit text, or that he made a mistake, because of
his dialect. The locative is rendered by kāri, but this obviously does not
necessarily presuppose another case form in the Sanskrit original. What
Indrajit wants to say is that Viṣṇu by adopting ten avatars is thrown into
a great disaster because of his karma. It is possible that the Sanskrit form
viṣṇuh was added at the end of the gloss in order to make it clear that dae
haiṁ had Viṣṇu as its subject, since the initial bhāṣā form viṣṇu was at some
distance and in addition might perhaps by a reader be mistaken for an
oblique form to be connected with dhariva.

11a 〈13〉 dārataś cet, etc., means: "If he stays away, then everybody says
this, viz.: ayaṁ apratibhā that one is a great coward, who is not (= be-
cause he is not) near (ju lagatu nāṁhi). He is able to come, but he remains
far away." Cf. 25a 〈5〉 aparāsadbahinī ... lagatu nāṁhi jātū (so, no comma
after nāṁhi!) "not going near abuse", paraphrasing aparāsadbām dārataḥ
tyaktaṁ.

12a 〈2〉 read: jana ju hai: sevakāni kahā lauṁ kivāi. This is short for
expected *jana ju hai, sevaka, tīni, etc. (Cf. passim, practically on every
page, e.g. 12a 〈8〉 ambhojini ju hai, kamalini, tīni ke.) The argumentation
12a 〈2〉, note, demonstrates the absurd consequences of the punctuation
jana, ju hai sevakāni, kahā lauṁ kivāi.

Verse 42: The compound ambhojivinaninivāsavilāsam is dissolved very
elegantly 12a 〈8〉: ambhojini ju hai, kamalini, tīni ke vana viṣṇīju
[hanṣa kau] nivāsāru vitāsu, su, tā hi. Sanskrit nivāsavilāsam is inter-
terpreted as a dvandva, marked by ju ... su, the accusative is marked by tā (hi).

The double negation 12a 〈10〉, and note, is not so difficult to account for
as it might seem at first. yaha nāṁhi glosses na of the Sanskrit text. There-
after follows an explanation of the two remaining Sanskrit pādas which is
comparatively long. Therefore it is natural that the negation otherwise
is not marked the reader might lose sight of it; cf. the shorter expression line 7:
yaha kau nāṁhi ju vāhi kī kīrtti meṭī jāī. So 12a 〈10〉 yaha nāṁhi ju may be
rendered "Not this, namely", whereafter follows: dūdha aru jala kau [ju]
bhinakāriva. (= dugdhaśaḷabhedavidhi-) [tā] kī (= trans. of loc. viḍhōau)
caṭuri kari (= vaidagīhyā, instr.) hanṣa kī (= asya) kīrtti (= kīrtti-) vaḍhi
rahi hai (= prasiddhā? perhaps *prapāṭhā) tā kiratiṁ (= kīrtti, repeated)
meṭivāi kalum (= apaharttum) vidhātāā (= asa) samarthā nāṁhi (= na ... samarthakā). I would suggest that the reason why kīrtti- is repeated,
in the oblique form, is that the commentator did not use a construction with ju
before the nominative kīrtti. So I do not think it is necessary to assume
omission of ju here (cf. note). My interpretation presupposes a pause after
vaḍhi raḥi hai.
12b (11) read: savaryasya, sūratā kau. 13b (6): what would be expected as translation of praṇāyati is prasanna karaṇa hau, rather than prabhā k. h. 14b (7): I suggest that one reads dhari instead of gharī. It is easier to connect dhari rakatu hau, = hold, with Sanskrit vṛñcate, interpreted by Indrajit as “surround”. 

Verse 53. 14b (10): the reading of the MS should be retained: keśavo vā śīvo vā, kai keśavaḥ, kīmayā śīvaḥ. The difficulty, which Indrajit wants to remove for the Brāj reader, is the dissolution of the sandhi. That is why he repeats the Sanskrit names in their pausa form, with visarga and sanda. He seems to have viewed a difficulty of an analogous kind in bhūpatirvāya-tirṇa, which ought to have been what he found in his text. Here he made use of a different device to make the reading clear: kai bhūpati rājā, kīmayā jai viraku. Whether bhūpati should be termed lemma or not, I do not dare to decide. In my judgment McGregor too often deletes a visarga in order to arrive at a clean partition into Sanskrit lemma and bhāṣā gloss. It might be doubted that Indrajit was equally dogmatic. It would take too long to enter deeper into this matter. Suffice it to refer to the commentary on verse 49 for further examples. 

16a (3) read: ju maṅghava iva īndru.
17a (12) jāī rakata haim. The translation “they go off (cease their efforts) and remain (in peace)” is contrary to the thought expressed in the Sanskrit verse. It is enough to quote the context to show this: kiṃ tvā jāna vaṁceti vastuhi pāta haim taba jāī rakata haim = “On the contrary, when they are trying to obtain that wished-for thing, then they continue going (until they find it)”. Cf. 17a (14) jāba jāya parama suṣa paṇyau taba samudra kau mathivau echāṃṣi dayau = “When, having gone (= persisted) they had obtained supreme happiness, then they left the churning of the ocean”. The emendation suggested in the note is out of place. 

18a (3) yat. ju. nīrabhālapaṭṭalikhitam. jiva (sic!) kau [ju] bhālu [bhāl提naṃ bhālu] [soī ju] paṭṭa [khetem paṭonā] [māya] līṣya dinau hau. The subject of līṣya dinau hau is the first ju (not soī ju . . . , as said in the note). soī corresponds to ju bhālu and connects this with ju paṭṭa. This is the technical device to denote that bhālapaṭṭa is interpreted as a descripti ve compound. The locative case in the vigrahā is denoted by māya, but without a demonstrative pronoun. All this is well-known in Sanskrit commentaries. 

Verse 87. The almost too literal translation of the idiomamvam-ṇa (better than) by “good ... not good” is worth noting: 21b (7) muku itani vāṭaim karī bhāli paṇī apanau śīla cēṇāvau bhalaṇu nāṃhī . . . 9) tāku tāku muku hau gaṇau bhalaṇu ... 10) hāthu nāyaṇu muku nikaṇu ... āgi māṇjąha parivau muku bhalaṇu ... śīla kau cēṇāvau bhalaṇu nāṃhī. It is easy to see that the construction of all these phrases is the same as in cēṇāvau bhalaṇu nāṃhī, i.e. the form of bhalaṇu, bhāli, nikaṇu is determined by a nominal form: cēṇāvau, gaṇau, nāyaṇu, parivau. (Further examples verse 59, quoted above, and verse 62.) As a consequence of this, the translation of 21b (7), note, muku itani vāṭaim, etc., as “even if these many things are done they may turn out well” is difficult to accept as an analysis of the construction. Similarly 21b (9), note, “even if it is shattered, it does not matter” as a translation of
The editor is not seldom misled by his efforts to arrive at a fluent syntax. However, since he has been careful in indicating where he has deleted dandas, it is possible to restore the wording of the manuscript. P. 67, line 3 danda must be retained after hai, in spite of the fact that a relative subordinate clause ends there. Indrajit begins by giving a word-by-word interpretation of a relative clause, 22a 14: yā kau yaha arthu. ju puruṣu uttama upadesu daikari duṣṭahim sādhunī hai mārga caliṇa cāhata hai. “The meaning of this (word-by-word commentary) is the following: the man who, giving the best instruction, wishes to lead a wicked man on the way of the good”. The phrase yā kau yaha arthu obviously functions analogously to Sanskrit ity arthaḥ. The editor appears to treat this as a “second gloss”, for he says in his note: “Indrajit loses sight of the pl. number of khaḍan after his first gloss, duṣṭa janam”. Now when giving the artha, a commentator is freer in relation to the wording of the text he is commenting on, and may well allow himself to use the singular instead of the plural number in a general statement like this one. It should be noted that explanations of this very kind may possibly represent genuine language, provided it is possible to prove that the whole is not a slavish adaptation of a Sanskrit commentary.

The emendation 22b 13 rahata tu from MS rahai tu is not wholly convincing. tu does not seem to fulfil any function in the context. Would not rahatau (= rahata-u) be better? Cf. 8a 6 paratau, utkhatau, and 3: 229.

The note 23a 5 is not comprehensible to me. I cannot see that asadīhāraya is a wrong gloss for nīja, on the contrary. The analysis of the dissolution of the bahuvrihi daivā vāptavihava- is too complicated to be plausible. If one abstains from extorting a fluent phrase, the analysis is fairly simple: daivāt. [kaunam hūm aparain] adṛṣṭa laim, avāpita [kolo] pāyau [hai] vāihava [yihim]. Before presenting his viṣṇhara the commentator asks kaunam hūm “exactly what (or: whose) [daiva]”, and gives the answer aparanīm “his own”. This shows, as do many other traits in this commentary, that the lemmata are an integral part of the commentary text, and consequently it is wrong to leave them out and read the bhasha text only. Indrajit’s main purpose must be assumed to have been to facilitate the understanding of the Sanskrit text, not to create a literary work in its own right. Moreover, he must have taken for granted a certain amount of Sanskrit knowledge at the disposal of his readers, since he now and then does not give any gloss at all, or he uses unusual Sanskrit words as glosses, e.g. 21b 4 dedīpyamatā (glossing sphurat). The curious 9a 7 karttum anyathā karttum has not been commented upon by the editor. As it stands it does not make sense. A small emendation will change it into an elegant half-Sanskrit gloss on bhagavatīm. This is the context: phuni kriyā kaisi hai. bhagavatīm, karttum anyathā karttum samartha hai. (Edition: karttum; asamartha hai.) “Further, how is the action? bhagavatīm. It is capable to create and to change.”
23a (11) arū videskagamane. videsa gaye taiṁ. vidyāi paraṁ daivatam. vaṁau devatā. In my opinion taiṁ cannot have the unique meaning of “in the case of” (note, and 3: 176). Indrajit has certainly misunderstood the Sanskrit text, but his own gloss is in itself understandable, literally: “Knowledge is a deity, higher than to have gone to a foreign country” — knowledge is a great thing, a deity, more difficult to reach than it is to go to a foreign country. Consequently, the function of taiṁ is to express comparison in connection with an adjective (3: 176).

23b (9) read a compound: vijayibhujayoh, because of the gloss vijayi purusa ke bhujani kan.

23b (15), and note: saca is not a bhāṣā word meaning “truly”; it is the lemma sa ca, glossed [sakala prāvē sahita] vaha [śeṣanāgu].

Indrajit’s commentary on verse 103 is somewhat confused, because he has misunderstood the text and strained Sanskrit grammar. Nevertheless, it is possible to arrive at a more accurate understanding of the commentary than the interpretation given in the notes. 25a (15) upanayet. [adṛṣṭa] pahumeti hīm rahatu haiṁ. This does not mean “fate brings it and remains (omnipotent),” but simply: “fate keeps bringing it.” The daṇḍa must be retained after this gloss, for what follows belongs to the sequel. maṇāg api. kīve thoran. maḥān vā. kīve vādau. upāśrayah (McGregor’s emendation of MS upāyāh) kāraṇam na. [vā vastu ki prāpti kaḥuṃ.] [parāyau] aśraya kāraṇa nāmāḥ. [kīntu adṛṣṭa hi dei ju rahau hai. aśraya kāraṇā pājau nāmāḥ.] maṇāg api: either small maḥān vā: or great upāśrayah kāraṇam na: [for the attainment of that thing.] [another’s] receptacle is not the cause. [No, fate indeed is (the cause), which (or: because it) keeps giving. Even if there is a receptacle, it ( — what one wants) is not reached.]” What Indrajit wants to say is that the receptacle may be small or great, what it gets depends on fate (karma). 25b (3) su cātaka kahā jalāhara kau aśraya thorau karatu hai paim karai kahā. adṛṣṭa jīvau ku divāvatu hai titanaṃ pāvatu hai. “Therefore, does the cātaka-bird make (= represent) a (too) small receptacle for the cloud? (No!) but what can it do? Just as much as fate causes (the cloud) to give, that much (the bird) receives”.

25b (7), text and note. It is highly possible that Böhtlingk is right in ascribing the meaning “opposing armies” to kula in the Sanskrit verse. But I fail to see that this fits into the context of the commentary: vā sūra ke ubhaya kula ki ju sādhuvaśa kahaṭaiṃ saśarānam saha hona hai. The natural interpretation of the first five words seems to be: “the two families of that hero.” Otherwise it will not be easy to account for ke. I do not dare to form an opinion as to whether “a Sanskritised, educated style of language” was current in Orehā in Indrajit’s time round A.D. 1600 (p. 14). Possibly it was, but it is hard to accept that the small phrase 25b (13) ju vāni sanskritam līṇai haiṁ “confirms the existence in his time of a recognised Sanskritised style of speech of high prestige” (25b (13), note, repeated pp. 10 and 15). This is a translation of Bhārtṛhari’s [vāni] yā sanskṛtā dhārayate, and I cannot see why it should be considered to be an incorrect gloss (p. 15). The grammar—and the context—is not simple, that is true, but it is much easier to account for the translation “the speech which is kept adorned” than for “speech
embellished with Sanskrit". Why should Indrajit, who seems usually to reason soundly, be assumed to have at this point formed the strange idea that Bhartṛhari was talking about vernaculars?

This examination of Indrajit's commentary has convinced me that it is a work on a par with Sanskrit āṅgikās, and consequently of a rather technical character. So my conclusion differs decidedly from that of the editor, who considers the style to be for the most part fluent, selfconsistent and independent of the Sanskrit text. My conclusion is that the style is no more natural than the poetical language is. And since the technique of the commentary follows an old Sanskrit tradition, minute philological work much more extensive than that done as yet will be required before a linguistically reliable material is brought about. Therefore it might have been better if the author of this book had taken upon himself "the determination of historical sources for the contents of the commentary" (p. 9.) in connection with the editorial work. Such a study is likely to shed light on many difficult details, of which it has been possible to treat only a sample in this review.

The second part of the book consists of a very useful descriptive study based on the material of the first part. Also here the almost total absence of translations makes the reading troublesome for the reader who has become aware of the difficult technicalities of the text. As a whole, though, the second part is a fine piece of work, clearly organized, and bearing witness of sound judgment. The whole book is a very important contribution to Indian studies, offering a large quantity of completely new material. The critical observations given in this long review should not convey the impression that we are dealing with an insignificant work. The contrary is true.

Nils Simonsson
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