STUDIES IN MODERN SYRIAC

H. J. Polotsky

ABBREVIATIONS

Al. = the NS dialect of Alqosh; Christian Fellihi generally.
Az. = the NS dialect of the Azerbaijani Jews. Biblical quotations (and words in Hebrew characters) refer to an Az. translation of the Bible, written down for Professor J. J. Rivlin, of the Hebrew University, and now the property of the Jewish National and University Library, Jerusalem.
AzT. = Azerbaijan Turkish (Azeri).
Brito = Brito d'qapitan, see p. 5.
Bruso d'ora, see p. 5.
Bruna, see p. 4.
Crist. = Xrestomatija d'saprajuta, see p. 4.
Coban = Coban d'Qurdjii, see p. 4.
Duval, see note 5, p. 2.
Gorqij, see p. 5.
Hajjitti, see p. 4.
Hysejnov = H. H., Azerbaizhansko-russkij slovar’ (Baku, 1939).
Imitatio = Bedjan’s NS translation of the Imitatio Christi (Paris, 1885).
IPA = International Phonetic Association.
J.A. = Journal asiatique.

Dictionnaire kurde-français (St Petersburg, 1879).
Kalaev, see note 1, p. 3.
KLS = Ktes d' kimo surai, see p. 4.
Maclean, see note 6, p. 2.
Manuel = Bedjan’s Manuel de pitii; references, unless otherwise stated, to the 2nd edition (Paris, 1893).
Marogulov, see p. 4.
Merr, see note 3, p. 2.
MF = Le Maitre Phonistique.
Mots de Marie, by Bedjan (Paris, 1904).
Noldke, see note 2, p. 2.
NS = Neo-Syriac, Modern Syriac.
Oraham, see p. 6.
OS = Old Syriac.
Osipoff (-pov), see p. 3.
Qabo d'grava, a NS monthly ed. by the Lazarists at Urmi; all references are to vols. II-III, 1898-1900 (paged consecutively).
Sal. = the NS dialect of Salamas (references are to Duval).
Socin, see note 4, p. 2.
Stoddard, see note 1, p. 2.

I.

I. suvri
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U. = the NS dialect of Urmi; Yaure, see p. 6.
standard literary NS.

Vies = Bedjan’s Vies des Saints
Z. = the NS dialect of the Zaxo
(Yaure, see p. 6). Jews (Jewish Fellihi).

The appearance of D. T. Stoddard’s Grammar of the Modern
Syriac Language in 1855 was a sufficiently important event for its
centenary to deserve some kind of commemoration. Noldeke’s
grammar belongs to a different order; but this first würdige
Lehrgebäude of a living Semitic language could hardly have been
erected, if the ground had not been thoroughly prepared by
Stoddard’s spade-work.

For an account and appraisal of the work of Nöldeke and of his
successors, especially A. Merx (1838—1909), A. Socin (1844—99),
R. Duval (1839—1911), and A. J. Maclean (1858—1943), the
reader may be referred to Franz Rosenthal’s chapter on Neu-
Ostaramäisch in his well-written and thoughtful history of
Aramaic studies. An earlier article by N. V. Jušmanov (1896—
1946) had called the attention of Western scholars to the un-
noticed or forgotten work of two Aysory (Transcaucasian “As-
nyrians”), A. I. Kalašev and S. V. Osipov: the former published
not only a collection of texts, but also an extremely valuable
Russian-NS and NS-Russian dictionary, the whole in narrow

1 Journal of the American Oriental Society, v, 1—180. On Stoddard’s life
(1818—57) cf. Joseph P. Thompson, Memoir of Rev. David Tappan Stoddard,
Missionary to the Nestorians (New York, 1858).

2 Grammatik der neusyrischen Sprache am Urmia-See und in Kurdistan
(Leipzig, 1868).

3 Neusyrisches Lesebuch. Texte im Dialekte von Urmia (Breslau: Tübinger
Universitätsprogramm, 1873). Reviewed by Nöldeke, Göttische gelehrte
Anzeigen (1873), pp. 561—71; Socin, Jenaer Literaturzeitung (1874), no. 514,
cols. 597—8.

4 Die neuenaramäischen Dialekte von Urmia bis Mosul (Tübingen, 1882).
Reviewed by Nöldeke, Z.D.M.G. XXXVI (1882), 669—82.

5 Les dialectes néo-araméens de Salamás (París, 1883). Reviewed by Nöldeke,
Z.D.M.G. XXXVII (1883), 598—609; Socin, Literaturblatt f. orient. Philologie, 1
(1884), 407—10, with “Berichtigung” II (1884), 32.

6 Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac as spoken by the Eastern
Syrians of Kurdistan, North-West Persia, and the Plain of Mosul (Cambridge,

7 Die aramaistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke’s Veröffentlichungen (Leiden,

8 “Assirijskij jazyk i ego pis’mno”, Pis’mennost’ i revol’ucija, 1 (Moscow—
Leningrad, 1933), 112—28.
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phonetic transcription (using the "Russian Linguistic Alphabet"); the latter, who in 1912 came into contact with Professor Daniel Jones, provided a short but excellent phonetic specimen of NS in IPA symbols; the outbreak of the First World War deprived us of what was presumably intended to become "A Syriac Phonetic Reader by D. Jones and S. Osipoff". References to Kalašev and to Osipov will occur frequently on the following pages.

The main theme of Juśmanov's article is the application of what was then the "New Alphabet" ("Novyj Alfavit", abbrev. "NA") to NS and a discussion of some of the linguistic problems connected therewith. The article (which is available in several Western libraries) will be read with interest and profit not only by students of NS, but by all Semitists interested in the problems of romanization.

The "NA" as applied to NS is of the same type as that with which scholars are by now familiar from such works as A. v. Gabain's Ózbekische Grammatik (Leipzig, 1945). As will be seen

1 Ajorskie teksty: Sbornik materialov dl'a opisanija mestnostej i plemen Kavkaza (Tiflis, 1894), vol. xx, part 2, pp. 33-96; Russko-ajorski/ i ajorsko-russkij slovar': Appendix to the Teksty, pp. 1-239, 241-420. A table of the "Russian Linguistic Alphabet" may be found, for example, in E. D. Polivanov, Vvedenie v jazykznani dlia vostokovednyx vuzov (Leningrad, 1928), pp. 184-5 (consonants), 212-13 (vowels).

2 Jones, The Phoneme (Cambridge, 1950), p. 37 with n. 1 reports an observation made to him in 1912 by "a remarkable linguist and phonetician, S[ergius] Osipoff", "a speaker of Urman Syriac". Although Urm is doubtless Osipov's ultimate home, it seems clear from the form of his name, from his knowledge of Russian and of Georgian (MF (1912), p. 122; (1913), p. 103), and from the fact that a poem by him is printed in the Tiflis fortnightly Mäzinca (Vostok) 1914, no. 4, p. 29 (this periodical, of which the British Museum has four numbers, was kindly brought to my notice by Mr C. Moss), that he was an "Ajor", presumably from Tiflis. Twenty years later we find him in Leningrad (see p. 10).

3 MF (1913), pp. 79-80. The text is a "translation of the Russian story in H. Sweet's 'Russian Pronunciation'". Sweet's text (Collected Papers, 464, printed in Visible Speech) is transcribed in IPA symbols by Osipov, MF (1913), pp. 102-3. Osipov's NS specimen called forth some queries by Paul Passy (ibid. p. 120) under the heading "Langue excentrique": this epithet refers to the bewildering abundance of aspiration marks in Osipov's text and to their occurrence in unexpected surroundings. Cf. next note.

4 Replying to Passy's queries (see preceding note), Jones (ibid. pp. 136-7) refers to "a work on Syriac pronunciation now being prepared by Mr Osipoff in collaboration with me".

below, my sources for Soviet NS stop at the year 1937. Since from the beginning of the Second World War all former "NA" orthographies were cyrillicized, it may be presumed that the same was done with "Assyrian". Although there is nothing to deplore in this change—at least for persons who happen to be familiar with the Cyrillic script, and at least as far as the basic Cyrillic letters are concerned—the old romanized "NA" of the thirties is typographically more convenient for a study written in a Western language; even if cyrillicized texts had been accessible to me, I should probably have preferred to use the old "NA" uniformly.

I subjoin a list of the Soviet books in my possession:

1. *Ktavo d qreta.* Elementary "Reading Book", transl. from a work by V. I. Borisova-Potockaja and others, by Qillete and Petrosov (Moscow, 1933).
2. *Ktavo d kipom suraQA,* 2nd part (3rd and 4th years), by S. Piraev and U. Bedroev (Moscow, 1933).
4. *Krestomatij qo saqrajuta* ("Literary Reader"), part 1, by Quarter Marogulov and D. Petrosov (Moscow, 1933).
5. Id. part 2, by S. V. Osipov (Moscow, 1933).
7. *Hagijti* ("Stories"), by I. Petrov and A. Isbax, transl. by A. Minasov and "a highlander" (Moscow, 1934).
8. *Ahval d' suraQA ge Iraq laikhet al domi gissQTT xarajtu u amal d imperialism inglismQTT* ("The situation of the Assyrians in Iraq with reference to the latest events and the activity of English imperialism"), by Sargis Bit Juxan (Moscow, 1934).
9. *B'urQa d' bahbewa* ("On the road to victory"), poems by Patrus-surt (S. Petrosov) (Moscow, 1933).

1 I received them (except the last two items, which I bought in Munich in 1957) as a private gift in 1936; I have reason to believe that they were selected by Juimanov.
2 A vividly written prose piece by this writer, "Flight from Urmi", is printed in *Chrest.* 1, 60-74.
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*Bruna d dora* ("A Son of the Age"), an epic by Patrus (D. Ja. Petrosov) (Moscow, 1935).

Huqistî ("Stories"), by Maksim Gorkij (Moscow, 1936).


I have no knowledge of any Soviet book in or on NS later than 1937, nor have I met with any NS material in any post-war journal devoted to linguistics or to Oriental studies. I trust the fault is mine. It is welcome news to read in *Voprosy jazykovznaniya* (1957), p. 166, that two works on NS linguistics are being prepared by K. G. Cereteli (Tiflis): ¹ "Formation of deverbal nouns in the modern Assyrian dialects", and "Sketches in comparative phonetics".

No account of NS ought to omit to mention the literary activity of Paul Bedjan, Lazarist, a native of Xosrava near Salamas.² While his numerous editions of OS texts are well known to Western scholars, his vernacular books have almost entirely failed to attract the attention of linguists. The only orientalist who has given proof of having read them is Duval; cf. his review of the *Imitatio Christi* (1885) and the *Manuel de piété* (1st ed. 1886) in *J.A.* 1886, 1, 371–5. Bedjan, who is reported to have been an outstanding preacher, handles the language with a mastery which raises his devotional books, especially the *Manuel*,³ far above the dullness of most NS writing. He was merely stating a fact, when he described one of his books as "le plus beau modèle du style néo-araméen" (*Mots de Marie*, xv).

The language of these books receives added interest from the circumstance that it was obviously none other than Bedjan (who lived in Paris from 1880 to 85) from whom Duval obtained the Christian texts published in his *Dialectes néo-araméens*.⁴ We thus

¹ K. G. Cereteli has now published a *Xrestomatija sovremennogo assirijskogo jazyka* ("A reader of the Modern Assyrian Language") (Tiflis, 1958), which I have not yet seen. Cf. *Archiv Orientalni*, xxvii (1919), 792–3.


³ I use this opportunity to thank the S. Congregatio pro Ecclesia Orientali and Can. Arn. van Lantschoot for presenting me with a copy of a recent photomechanical reprint of the 2nd edition of the *Manuel*.

⁴ Duval was not allowed to disclose the identity of his informant for "des raisons qui lui sont personnelles" (*Dialectes néo-aram.* p. v). This informant was "un missionnaire catholique" (*Mém. Soc. Ling.*, ix, 126). In *J.A.* 5
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have the unique opportunity of studying a NS writer’s handling of the standard literary language against the background of his regional dialect. Cf. below §vi.

Reference will further be made to the works of three American “Assyrians”:

Abraham Yohannan (1853–1925), Lecturer in Oriental Languages in Columbia University from 1893, to whose memory A. V. Williams Jackson’s Researches in Manichaeanism (New York, 1932) are dedicated. His Ph.D. thesis (1900) was Part I of A Modern Syriac–English Dictionary [Alap only; 63 pp.], which is worth consulting.

Alexander Joseph Oraham (b. 1898 near Urmia), Dictionary of the Stabilized and Enriched Assyrian Language and English (Chicago, 1943), 576 pp. The material to which the word “enriched” refers is of very questionable value, and etymologists had better avoid this dictionary. On the other hand, if used in reading NS texts, it will be found to contain many genuine words not in Maclean. The notation of the pronunciation possesses a valuable feature, on which see below, §1.


I. NOTES ON THE “NOVYJ ALFAVIT”

The following is the “Assyrian” NA, with Osipov’s IPA equivalents added for phonetic explanation where necessary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a</th>
<th>a</th>
<th>e</th>
<th>(front) e</th>
<th>(back) ε</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ə</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>tʃ</td>
<td>tʃ</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ș</td>
<td>dʒ</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>c’</td>
<td>c²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>(front) l; (back) l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1884, i, 278 Duval quotes “M. Bedjan, prêtre de la Mission” for information connected with the Salamas dialect. Duval tried to arouse the interest of his fellow orientalists in Bedjan’s Breviarium chaldaicum: J.A. 1884, 1, 106–8. In J.A. 1885, 1, 41 he states that the information about ancient tomb inscriptions at Xosrava, reported anonymously in Dialectes, p. iv, had been supplied to him “par le Père Bedjan”.

1 Kalašev ʋ; K. 2 L. G. Lopatinskij (the editor of the Shornik) ap. Kalašev 103 equates ʋ with Armenian ʋ. But this is aspirated, [tʃ]; Ar. Garibian, Kratkij kurs armenskogo jazyka (Erevan, 1944), pp. 5–8 equates it with Russ. ʋ (contrast ƙ = “fiw’”); it is, in fact, used to render Russ. ʋ (Cexov, -vič, etc.).

1 Kalašev ʋ; K. 2 Kalašev ƙ; K.
For Soviet uj Osipov writes (front) üi, (back) u; on Soviet i̯, 1̯ see below, §11.

Apart from the pair /tʃ/-ʃ [tʃ], continuing the old contrast of

š, v, š, the Soviet alphabet takes no account of aspiration and

non-aspiration, which Kalašev and Osipov mark also for p, c [ʃ],

and k [c]. There exists combinative de-aspiration, which takes

place after the spirants s, s, x († z, s) (Marogulov 11), as well as

independent non-aspiration (Marogulov 9). Combinative de-

aspiration is disregarded by virtue of the “etymological prin-

ciple”: inflection and derivation show whether in a given case

absence of aspiration is conditioned or not, as, for example, in the

Preterite (šiti), the Imperative (štij) and the Infinitive (šṯa) as

against the “First Present” (šti) of the First Conjugation;7 a

particularly frequent case is the fem. ending -ta.8 The question

whether special signs ought to be introduced for independent

non-aspirated stops was discussed and decided in the negative

(though not unanimously), by a Conference on Questions of

Assyrian Orthography held in 1933; cf. the report by K. A.

Alaverdov, Pis'mennost' i revol'ucija, 1 (1933), 195–6.

1 Kalašev š; n.
2 Kalašev k.
3 Kalašev š.
4 Kalašev r.
5 Kalašev always š (there is no un-aspirated ʃ).
6 The voiced spirants become unvoiced before the stops in question, for

example, mel'sčiš [mal'jaša] “hurry”.

7 Cf. štil, štil'ja, šil'taš as against šaš'jan in Osipov’s text. Unfor-

tunately there are some misprints in Osipov’s text: šūrṯ line 4 ought to have

[tʃ]; c'ulč line 10 ought to have [c], cf. c'ūli 4, c'ūli 12; on the other hand,

p'n'utš line 29 ought to have [ʃ].

8 Cf. mač'tuš Osipov, line 5. A special problem is presented by the word

baxša “woman”, which keeps its t before the fem. plur. ending, baxšat. The

conference reported by Alaverdov (op. cit. p. 193) decided, therefore, that the t

should be regarded as radical and spelled as pronounced, baxša; but a later

conference (Kvartal n medvinca, 5 September 1934, p. 3) ruled that the -nu in

baxša should be regarded as the fem. ending and, therefore, spelled with t,

“without regard to the pronunciation”.

7
The same conference discussed the desirability of introducing a special sign (°j) for the voiced velar (or uvular?) fricative, for which the Soviet orthography makes shift with x (sometimes also h); although the majority was in favour of the special sign (Alaverdov, op. cit. p. 195), it was never introduced. The sound in question occurs in a number of words of foreign and OS1 origin, for example, axa | aha “squire”, daxala “cheat”, otax “room”, hlab “to vanquish” (halsbuta “victory”); suluxuta (Brsto 14) | suluhuta (Chrest. 1, 92) “prank”; -maxxubi “to love”; -paxra | pahra “body” (נוס); puloxo “division” (נוגראפיה). Of special importance is the phenomenon of so-called “synharmonism”. Both the descriptive and historical aspects thereof have been admirably dealt with by Jušmanov in his article “Singarmorizm urmijskogo narečija”. Here it may be of some interest to quote a few extracts from Marogulov’s Grammar (13–14):

The sounds of the Assyrian language, vowels as well as consonants, have two modes of pronunciation: hard and soft. In most words of the Assyrian language all the sounds have one pronunciation, either hard or soft. If there is one hard sound in a word, all its other sounds, from the first to the last, are likewise hard; and thus also, if there is one soft sound in a word, all its other sounds are likewise soft. This is one of the general laws of the Assyrian language, and is called the law of synharmonism. The hard and soft pronunciation of the sounds in the Assyrian language has a very great significance. If we pronounce a soft word in the hard mode, it will appear ugly, outlandish, or even will become unintelligible. There are quite a number of words whose meaning depends solely on the hardness and softness of their sounds. Each sound in the Assyrian language, except the two vowels a and i, has only one sign for the two modes of pronunciation, i.e. for the hard as well as for the soft pronunciation. Only the vowels a and i have two signs each, one for the hard, and one for the soft pronunciation (a -o, i -a); in

1 The treatment of real descendants of old จำหนใจ may be seen, for example, in palla (Z. pe’la) “radish” (דַּלְפָּן); narra (Z. nar’a) “axe” (דַּלְפָּן); lajna (Z. l’ina) “vat” (דַּלְפָּן); pahira (Z. mpalo’e) “to divide” (דַּלְפָּן).


3 qisip and mokijko. Osipov (see p. 10) uses xbljna and naqijda, “thick” and “thin”, exemplifying the contrast by the names themselves. He seems to imitate the terms used in Turkic languages, in Turkey as well as in the Soviet Union, for example, Turkish kalın—ince.

4 Osipov writes ham-garmonija—half Persian, half Russian.
the Assyrian language there are almost no words in which one of these vowels, a or i does not occur.... The hardness and softness of the sounds is shown in writing with the help of these two vowel-letters: a, b. If there is in a word the soft letter a or i, all its other sounds are likewise soft; if there is in a word the hard letter b or a, all its other sounds are likewise hard. These letters are called pronunciation-differentiating (parsijr&tma) letters.

Especially striking instances of this contrast have occasionally been noticed and more or less adequately rendered or described by most European students of NS. Noldeke, Z.D.M.G. xxxvi (1882), 670–1, describes the difference between ṭla (Kalašev ṭla) “three” and ṭloj (Kalašev ṭloj) “thirty” in a way which leaves nothing to be desired. Yet a sceptic may perhaps feel some doubt whether “synharmonism” is really so all-pervading a feature of U. NS as is claimed by the “Assyrians” of Transcaucasia. It is, therefore, of some importance to find independent testimony in Oraham’s Dictionary. At first sight Oraham’s notation of the pronunciation, using the ordinary alphabet with ill-defined values, does not look promising. On closer inspection, however, it is apparent that he has invented an ingenious method of expressing the contrast of front and back vowels. By using the devices of syllable division (marked by a hyphen) and of “silent e” he is able to distinguish between the following three pairs of vowels (letters not followed by a hyphen occur in both open and closed syllables):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FRONT</th>
<th>BACK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>aa-, uC-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eu</td>
<td>oe-, oCe-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uc-</td>
<td>oo</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples (in parentheses the Soviet spelling):

pea qa “finish” (prqa)       pla-ta “come out” (plaṭa)  
ma-chue-khy “find” (macuxi)   baa-qo-ry “ask” (baqrə)   
za-bue-ny “sell” (zobuni)    shaa-doo-ry “send” (ṣadur)  
bar-bue-zy “scatter” (barbuzi) tur-too-my “grumble” (taṛums) 
pax-pue-ry “brandish” (porpurī)    pur-poo-ry (i) “snort, bleat”; (i) “glitter” (parpurū)  
map-rue-my “cause to be cut” mup-woo-my “explain” (maprumi)  

1 Noldeke’s observations on NS pronunciation are excellent and suffice to disprove the myth that he was somehow constitutionally incapable of dealing with living Oriental languages (Rosenthal 264).
2 It was already observed by Stoddard 89 that the causatives of pram “cut” and of pamnji “understand” are “distinguishable...only by a
meu-ta “death” (mote)
goe-raa “man, husband” (gora)
meut-va “council” (motva)
tore-baa “bag” (torba)
keukh-va “star” (koxva)
dole-maa “stuffed food” (dolma)
tupe-ra “tail” (tupra)
toop-raa “nail” (tupra)

Speakers of other dialects than U. seem to find it difficult to acquire the “synharmonism” of the standard language. In the Kosxv d Medinx, 14 July 1934, p. 4, there is an article by Osipov “On some difficulties of the Assyrian School [apparently a Teachers’ Seminary] in Leningrad”. From his experience as teacher of methodology at that institution he mentions as the foremost difficulty the difference between the regional dialects of his students and the U. standard. “In Leningrad all the students speak in the language of the highlanders…. In writing they always make mistakes in the bam-garmonije (read -ji), or write thick vowels (a, b) instead of thin ones (a, i) and vice versa.”

A serious defect of the Soviet orthography, inherited from the missionaries, is its failure to recognize /u/ as a distinct phoneme from /u/; see below §11. The conference reported by Alaverdov (op. cit. p. 194) resolved unanimously to allow u and uj on equal rights in words like nurć | nuje “fire”, zuzi | zuje “money”, tura | tuje “mountain”.

A peculiar problem was presented by the forms spelled bipraqili and prijqili and their paradigms. In the Present Continuous and in the Present Perfect the unstressed vowel resulting from the fusion of the final -a/a of the First Conjugation Infinitive and of the Perfect Participle masc. sing. and fem. with the initial ij- of the copula is, or used to be, [e:]. In the Soviet orthography it is arbitrarily written i/b, in order to keep e (stressed) for the possessive suffix 3rd plur., expressing the complement with those forms. Osipov’s [budjareva] “was running” (line 13), [budjarjeva] “was returning” (line 16), [furjitevan] “I am tired” (line 18), [bistajeva] “was drinking” (line 22, var.), [bixdajjevan] “I am rejoicing” (line 27, var.) would in the Soviet orthography be written bixrajćva, budjarćva, sùšćtivuc, bástajivc, bixdajjevan. The spelling i/b is proper with the Second Conjugation Infinitive and with the plur. Perfect Participle, both of which end in -i/b. The conference reported by Alaverdov (op. cit. p. 196) arrived at slight difference in pronunciation”. In addition to the contrast of back s, front, parmujc and maprms have unaspirated p, while prmc (Kalašev does not give the causative) has p’.
no unanimous conclusion: some participants were in favour of a uniform spelling. On the whole, the “NA” provides a fairly good practical orthography and will be used as such in the present paper.

II. THE PHONEMES /ui/ AND /ij/

A well-known feature of NS written in Syriac characters is the inconsistency with which the characters rbaṣa (waw with a point below, = ۆ, old [uː]) and rwaḥa (waw with a point above, = ۆ, old [oː]) are used. So far as common words and morphemes inherited (or borrowed) from OS are concerned (for example, ܐܘܢ “fire”; the ending of abstract nouns ܐܕܟܠ as against ܕܬ “prayer”) the traditional OS spelling is usually followed; but in the very frequent case where OS offers no guidance, the choice between the two signs is quite arbitrary. A writer like Bedjan, although he aims at consistency within any one of his books, follows a different practice in each. The two letters are in fact said to “have the same sound” at Urmi (“u in rule”, Maclean), while in the dialects of the plain of Mosul, Christian (Maclean’s “Al.”) as well as Jewish (Maclean’s “Z.”), the rwaḥa “preserves its ancient value” [oː]. The problem is connected with the existence of the groups [ui] (Urmi) and [uy, ux] (Salamas), which the missionaries considered vulgar variants of [uː] and the use of which some of them seem to have discouraged among their native pupils. Nevertheless, [ui], spelled ۆ, is by no means rare in written texts (for example, in those published by Merx and by Socin) and even in printed ones. In the Soviet orthography ۇ is found fairly frequently (in some books more than in others).

There are two ways of settling the distribution of ۆ and ۆ on intelligible and practicable principles:

(a) On the assumption that ui/uy, ux is merely an “uneducated” and undesirable free variant of [uː], the simplest solution is to write ۆ for [uː] as well as for [ui/uy, ux], and ۇ for [oː]. Such is in fact Bedjan’s practice in his earliest books (Imitatio and Manuel, 1st ed.).¹ This method ensures consistency, but produces spellings which must be offensive to those who strive after agreement with OS; nor will spellings like ܐܠܘܐ ܐܢܘ (Imit. 146u), ܐܒܫܐ (ibid. 11, 14), with the same vowel-sign as in ܐܒܫ, be acceptable to speakers of dialects in which the vowel of the first three words has remained [oː].

¹ With the exception, however, of word final -un, which he spelled ۆ-

II
More satisfactory results would have been attained by first 
examining the phonemic status of \[uj/uy, ux\]. This examination 
would have shown that so far from being an "uneducated" free 
variant of \[u:\], it is a separate phoneme. A comparison with such 
dialects as Al. or Z., but even with Az. (spoken by the Urmis) 
would have revealed the all but regular correspondence of 
U. Sal. \[uj/uy, ux\] and \[u:\] to Al. (etc.) and OS \[u:\] and \[o:\] respectively. The practical orthographic rule for U. Sal. would then 
have been to write \(\alpha\) for spoken \[uj/uy, ux\], and \(\epsilon\) for spoken 
\[u:\]. This rule would have ensured consistency as well as agree-
ment with OS spelling (though not necessarily with Barhebraeus's 
rules), \(^1\) and produced spellings which could be read by speakers of 
all dialects in accordance with their phonology.

It is interesting to note that Maclean, in the Introduction to his 
Dictionary (p. xix), states quite clearly that U. "\(\ddot{u}\)" and Sal. "\(\dddot{u}gh, 
\dddot{u}kh\)" (his "\(\dddot{u}\)" represents \(u\) "as in full") are pronunciations of 
rbasa "and similar sounds (as \(\ddot{m}\) or \(\dddot{m}\))", not of rwaqa. Since 
it is hardly conceivable that Maclean should have failed to see the 
practical implication of this statement, we must probably assume 
that this insight came too late, when the body of the dictionary 
had already been printed. Actually his distribution of rbaqa and 
rwaqa is just as arbitrary as that of his predecessors. He has thus 
missed, for example, a criterion for distinguishing the noun-
pattern U. CaCuCa \(\ddot{e}\dddot{a}\ddot{e}\ddot{a}\) from the nomen agentis U. CaCu:Ca 
\(\ddot{e}\dddot{e}\ddot{a}\ddot{a}\), and it is by sheer luck that he has, in some cases, hit 
upon the correct spelling. Cf. the following example for CaCuCa (\(\ddot{O}\ddot{r}raham's spellings are added for comparison):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maclean</th>
<th>Gr.</th>
<th>Dict.</th>
<th>(\ddot{O}\ddot{r}raham</th>
<th>Fellihi dialects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\ddot{a}mujra) &quot;dense, thick&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>(\ddot{a})</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\ddot{a}borujra) &quot;dry&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\ddot{a}gorujsa) &quot;big&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Al. Z. garu:sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\ddot{a}jaqujra) &quot;heavy, slow&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Al. Z. jaqu:ra</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) For example, the word for "wedding" \(\ddot{e}\dddot{a}\ddot{e}\ddot{a}\ddot{a}\) is spelled with \(\ddot{a}\) at Judges ix. 27 (Urmis 1852) and Matt xxv. 10 (New York, 1874), but with \(\ddot{a}\) by Barhebraeus, \(\dddot{L}\dddot{a}r\dddot{e}\ \dddot{d}\dddot{e}\ dd\dddot{s} \dddot{p}\dddot{l}\dddot{e}\dddot{n}\dddot{d}\dddot{e}\), ed. Moberg, 233, 15 and, presumably on Bar-
hebraeus's authority, in the Mosul Pshitta (all these references are given by 
Brockelmann, \(\dddot{L}\dddot{e}\dddot{x} \dddot{g}\dddot{r}\). \(2\dddot{3}\dddot{1}\dddot{a}\)). The modern dialects, Al. \(\dddot{x}\dddot{u}\dddot{l}\dddot{a}\) (Lidzbarski 478), Sal. \(\dddot{x}\dddot{u}\dddot{l}\dddot{a}\), U. \(\dddot{x}\dddot{u}\dddot{l}\dddot{j}\dddot{a}\) (references below, note 5, p. 14) confirm \(\ddot{a}\); 
Maclean \(\dddot{a}\), \(\dddot{O}\ddot{r}raham \dddot{a}\).

\(^2\) Sal. \(\ddot{a}r\ddot{u}yz(a)\) Duval 17, 2.

\(^3\) Sal. jaqu\ddot{y}ra Duv. 11, 11.
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Maclean  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gr.</th>
<th>Dict.</th>
<th>Orahám</th>
<th>Felléhi dialects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>jatújma &quot;orphan&quot;</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>Al. Z. jatúma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qalújla &quot;light, quick&quot;</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>Al. qalúla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xaru#:p &quot;sharp&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>Al. Z. xaru#:pa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pattern CCo:Ca fares even worse:

Maclean  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(Dict.)</th>
<th>Orahám</th>
<th>Felléhi dialects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>glúla &quot;round&quot;</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>puxa &quot;flat, broad&quot;</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smuqa &quot;red&quot;</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kuma &quot;black&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sura &quot;small&quot;</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other examples for Al. (etc.) u: = Sal. uy, ux; U. uj:

du:ša "honey" — du:ša7

guida "wall" guydani (pl.) 75, 16 gujdₐ,⁸ gujdani⁹

nu:na "fish" nuyra 12, 6 nujna¹⁰

nu:ra "fire" nuyra 30, 11 nujra¹¹

*nu:ta "petrol" nuxta 36, 1 nujta¹²

suse (susa) "horse" suxsавaih (pl.) 13, 3 sujši¹³ (sujša)¹⁴ (pl.) sujšavati¹⁵

54, 17

tu:ma "garlic" — tujma¹⁶

tu:na "straw" tynša 15, 2 tujna¹⁷

tu:ša "mulberry" тuxti (pl.) 14, 9 tujta¹⁸

тυra "mountain" tυra 28, 18 tujta¹⁹

zu:ze "money" zu:zi 13, 13 zu:zi²⁰

1 Sal. jatúymi (plur.) Duv. 76, 16.
2 Sal. qalújla Duv. 11, 11.
3 Maclean gives this form as Al.; the wrong Rwaha is the more surprising as his source (Lidzbarski) has, of course, the correct Rwaha; U. xaru#:pi (plur.) occurs Hqjʃši 39.
4 Sal. kuma Duv. 15, 8.
5 Sal. su:ra Duv. 2, 10; 29, 8.
6 Maclean wrongly "in Al. Z. also zúrₐ or z'úrₐ".
7 Socin 65, 11.
8 Socin 100, 3; Hqjʃši 27; 61; Cohan 27.
9 Hqjʃši 33; 65.
10 Kalášev 187a, 343b.
11 Mérx 23; Cohan 13; 34.
12 Hqjʃši 32.
13 Mérx 17; 18; 19; Socin 45, 17; 109, 11.
14 Kalášev 81b, 369b.
15 Mérx 7; Socin 45, 20.
16 Kalášev 233a, 380b.
17 Socin 77, 1.
18 Socin 7, 11.
19 Socin 106, 1.
20 Mérx 14; 17; 24; Socin 15, 10; 81, 17; Cohan 60.
STUDIES IN MODERN SYRIAC

hu:şya “Jew”
su:ra:ya “Assyrian”
kû:ta “writing”

stu:na “pillar”
xlu:la “wedding”
tanu:ra “oven”
xabu:ša “apple”

stu:na “pillar”
xlu:la “wedding”
tanu:ra “oven”

hu:şdai: (pl.) 82, 8 hu:şdai:1
suyrâ 86, 16; pl.

suyrâ 73, 12 suyro:2

ktuxa 59, 4

ktuxa 3

hujdaja

sujraja

k0u:ta “writing”

stujna4

xlujla5

tonuir6

xabujs7

stu:na “pillar”

stu:na 85, 7 duk6

šula “work”

šula 30, 15 šula

šu:qa “market”

šu:qa 85, 9 but šujqa8

Examples for Al. (etc.) /o:/ = Sal. U. /u(/)

(a) -ona, diminutive ending

?axona “brother”

bro:na “son”

sawona “grandfather”

(β) Pattern CiCCo:na

xiţbo:na “account”

(€) Pattern Ca(:)Co:Ca

?alo:la “street”

başo:ra “less, deficient”

kapo:ra “infidel, cruel”

naţo:ra “watchman”

xaţo:sa “apple”

xiţbo:na 27, 17; 41, 21 xiebu9

xulija 3, 3 xlujla5

tonuir6

xabujs7

xiţbo:na 27, 17; 41, 21 xiebu9

alula

basura

kapuro

naţura

Z. maqo:ze “to burn”

mbaqorre “to ask”

mzaborne “to sell”

Z. maqo:ze “to burn”

The relationship of Al. (etc.) /u:/ to /o:/ and of U. Sal. /uj, uy, ux/ to /u:/ is thus exactly parallel to that of Al. (etc.) /i:/ to /e/;

1 Kalašev 49a, 271b; plur. hujda: Socin 71, 12.
2 Merx 12.
3 Socin 19, 8; 37, 7; Higjitti 51; Coban 18; Osipov c't'ū'ta.
4 Socin 55, 12; Higjitti 46.
5 Merx 15; Socin 97, 19; Coban 4.
6 Coban 4; 15; Osipov line 7.
7 Merx 11; 19; Socin 75, 1.
8 Kalašev 187a, 406a; Maclean, Diet. xix.
9 Maclean 107b writes rba:ša, also for Al., although his source (Lidzbarski) has rwaha. Similarly, he writes 320b Al. ti/uklo:na “trust” with rba:ša (and transcribes tikluna) contrary to his source (Sachau; cf. Socin 147, 8).
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the U. Sal. correspondents of the last-named pair are in some sources distinguished as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Al. (etc.) /i:/</th>
<th>Al. (etc.) /e:/</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>/i/ (word final /i/)</td>
<td>/i/ (in open syllables)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osipov1</td>
<td>(front) /i;/ (back) /i/, word final also (front) /i;/ (back) /i;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet</td>
<td>(front) /i/; (back) /i;</td>
<td>(front) /i/; (back) /i; (open syll.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oraham</td>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>ee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaure</td>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>/i/ (word final /i/)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“beautiful”</th>
<th>“value” (Imp. sing.)</th>
<th>“stone”</th>
<th>“see”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Al. (etc.)</td>
<td>Az. /sbira/</td>
<td>Z. /time/</td>
<td>Z. /zi:/</td>
<td>Al. Z. /kipa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duval</td>
<td>/sipiri/ (pl.)</td>
<td>/tima/</td>
<td>/zi:/ (46, 2)</td>
<td>/kipa/ (56, 2; 73, 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osipov</td>
<td>/sipir/</td>
<td>/tilma/</td>
<td>/zi:/</td>
<td>/kipa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soviet</td>
<td>/sipir/</td>
<td>/tilma/</td>
<td>/zi:/</td>
<td>/kipa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oraham</td>
<td>/shapera/</td>
<td>/tyma/</td>
<td>/ke-zey/</td>
<td>/kipa/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaure</td>
<td>/sipir/</td>
<td>/tyma/</td>
<td>/zi:/</td>
<td>/kipa/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference between U. Sal. and Al. is the result of raising mid to high, high to fricative off-glide.

The spelling /hbasa/ in the usual Syriac orthography is not necessarily evidence for the sound /i/. In two important verb-forms the model of OS has led to the spelling with /hbasa/, although the sound is /i/:

(1) The fem. Perf. Part. of root-final /j/ verbs (First Conjugation).
Though -/ij- would agree with OS and most modern dialects (for example, Z. /ti:sa/, Sal. “/ita/”), U. /i/ is attested by Osipov,7

2 Maclean’s “first sound of long Zlama” (Gr. 8–9). The vowel-sign called Zlama /pa/ (or /pa/) at Urmi (Stoddard, Maclean Oraham) is called Zlama /pa/ at Mosul (Jérémie Makdasi, Grammaire chaldéenne [in OS] (1889), p. 13; A. Mingana, Clef de la langue araméenne (1901), p. 8) and vice versa.
3 Osipov’s stress-marks are omitted.
4 Once also /ulva/ (elsewhere /iva/) in harmony with /zulab/ (misprint for /zulab/).
5 In /zi:/ (the aspiration-mark preceding this form is a misprint for the stress-mark) “see”, alongside of /stf/ “drink” (Soviet /si:/), dill “know” (Soviet /dzi:/).
6 In c’il/t’a “standing”, see next note.
7 c’il/t’a (Si, with dotted i) “standing”, jfür/t’evan (no length-mark) “I am tired”, sit’a (no length-mark) “thirsty”.
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by the Soviet spelling (i),1 and by Yaure.2 The form in -ita probably arose through the analogy of the Preterite, the base of which is, in all other verb-classes of the First Conjugation, the same as that of the fem. Perf. Part.:  

priq-li : priq-ta :: xzi-li (Al. xze:-le): xzi-ta

This analogy is presumably responsible for the U. forms of the fem. Perf. Part. of the Second Conjugation (including root-final j verbs), sudbr-ta (Preterite sudbr-r,) as against (m)sudarta of the other dialects, and it is seen unmistakably at work in certain dialect-forms of the fem. Perf. Part. of the verb “to give”: U. jujil-to (masc. jujva, Pret. jujil-li), Z. hul-ta (masc. hi:wa, Pret. hul-le). Cf. below §vi (8).

(2) The 2nd plur. of the “First Present”.

Here again -ij-tun would agree with the probable OS prototype ջոิ (Nöldeke, Kurz gef. syr. Gr. §64; Duval, Traiti de gr. syr. §183), but the evidence of the modern dialects is divergent: Z. and Az., in any case, have parqe:tu(:)h, and the corresponding U. [i:] is attested by the Soviet spelling (psrqitun) and by the Rev. Yaure (personal communication).3 The shape of this ending is probably influenced by that of the 2nd masc. sing., parqit; cf. the corresponding possessive suffixes, 2nd masc. sing. -ux, plur. -oxun.

III. THE POSSESSIVE SUFFIX 3RD SING.

One of the strangest spellings invented by the missionaries is that of the possessive suffixes of the 3rd persons singular. Failing unfortunately to perceive the difference between -u (masc.) and -o (fem.) and believing that the suffix was -u in both genders, they seem to have been reminded of OS cases like եսու “his father” alongside of երու “her father”. It is presumably to this supposed analogy that we owe the spellings բետու (beta) “his house” and բետո (beto) “her house”, բետո (xizjuvin) “I have seen him” and բետո (bixzovin) “I am seeing her”.

1 klita, šuršita, šita (Gorgij 71, 10), etc.
2 kliten (= klitivan) “I am standing” 13c.
3 I permit myself to quote his own words: “All verbal forms like երու are in Urmiya pronounced with a long and plain i, which, being the penult, carries also the tone: parqitun. But the 3rd p. pl. has the diphthongal i: pärqi, with the tone again on the penult. The same rule applies also to the verbs tertia 2, for example, galfut “you reveal”; but we say gali “they reveal”.
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Although the true form of the feminine had been made known by Merx, and confirmed by Socin, Nöldeke (1882, after he had had an opportunity of acquainting himself with the spoken language), and Duval, yet Maclean remained faithful to the original American spelling and did not so much as mention the phonetic difference. To Bedjan belongs the merit of having at least differentiated the vowel of the fem. form by writing it ɸ. As regards the masc. form, the letters -whj of the American spelling were to receive support from a theory of Nöldeke’s (78–81), according to which the NS possessive suffixes reflect those forms which the OS suffixes assume when joined to the plural noun (1st sing. -aj, etc.). This theory is based on undeniable facts in Babylonian Aramaic, but whether it is true of NS, is not certain at all. In any case, in Nöldeke’s own opinion the derivation suggested by him is “immediately evident” (“auf den ersten Blick klar”) only so far as the 3rd person sing. is concerned; yet it is precisely for this person that it can be shown to be unsatisfactory. A necessary prerequisite for his theory is the phonetic identity of the two genders, or rather the loss of a distinctive fem. form. By the discovery of the fem. -o an essential prop is removed from under his construction, since -o cannot possibly be derived from OS ɸ—certainly not by reference to the interchangeability of yod and waw (Maclean 19).

A rather different approach was suggested by the Az. forms masc. -ev, fem. -av. Although Nöldeke rejected a connexion between Az. -ev, -av and U. Sal. -u, -o, I cannot but think that Duval was right in maintaining it (Mém. Soc. Ling. ix, 134): as shown by the Jewish dialect of Erbil, the -v goes back to -w (-e:w, -a:w); of these diphthongs the U. Sal. forms are the regular contractions. The nature and origin of -w remains obscure; in any case it is added, as Nöldeke did not fail to see, to the old suffixes -e (πɛ) and -a (πɛ), which in U. Sal. are preserved only after the enclitic preposition -l- and after kull-. Under such circumstances it would certainly have been wiser to refrain from pseudo-historical spellings.

It may occasionally be doubtful whether a final -u is or is not the

---

1 “Zu den Formen von Urmia und Salamäa m. St. f. ḫ (pl. ḫt) gehört dies -u, as sicher nicht” (Z.D.M.G. xxxvii, 604).
2 It may, however, be asked why these contractions did not develop the palatal or velar off-glides discussed in the preceding paragraph, and I must confess that I am at a loss for a satisfactory answer. In Sal., at any rate, this development would have made the 3rd masc. sing. homonymous with the 2nd masc. sing. (-ux).
possessive suffix. While a phonetic spelling would not be affected by such a doubt, a would-be historical one forces a decision for which the necessary evidence may be wanting. Nöldeke 285 quotes from the translation of The Pilgrim’s Progress the phrase tilb (sic) lango langu (spelled وَلَانْتَكِي) “(and Ignorance) he came hobbling after.” The possessive suffix with a Persian adjective used adverbially seemed to him “auffällig” and he was inclined to think that the -u might be a non-Syriac ending. Maclean, perhaps influenced by Nöldeke’s scepticism, spells the word with an ordinary ئ (Dict. 149 b). The spelling of the -u thus involves a point of syntax.

NS possesses a great number of onomatopoetic names for noises, of feminine gender, probably of Kurdish origin or at least formed on Kurdish models. They are formed by reduplication, with the connecting vowel a/a. Such words may be used adverbially, or, with the copula, predicatively, and when so used take a possessive suffix agreeing with the subject; whether such a use exists in Kurdish, I do not know. The following examples illustrate -u as well as -o (3rd fem. sing.) and -e (3rd plur.):

cikka-eik, cf. ćakcuki “creak, crunch, grate”, etc.
qarto cikka-cikkova Čhrest. II, 44.

Pejgho-cin
mazraja cinna-cinnuvo “the field was silent” Marogulov 102; and bliglij b...pokarga d l xadavranan, d ijla xamš-cinna-cinnu “I busied myself with...looking at our environment, which was soundless and silent” Čhrest. II, 82.

Čivva-civ “chirp”; Az. چېږل Is. x. 14 (شامب); cf. Kurdish “tebi-tebi, tebi-tebi gazouillement” Jaba-Justi 143 b
Sipri civy-civve tivlun al iljani “the sparrows settled chirping on the trees” KLS 65; sipra...čivva-civvu bar seda prixli “the bird flew chirping after the prey” Bruna d dora 55.

1 Professor Franz Rosenthal has kindly looked up the passage in the Library of the American Oriental Society: it runs, u Nazzan tili (nir) linga lingu (nir) bare.
2 K. Kurdoev, Grammatika kurdskogo jazyka (Moscow-Leningrad, 1917), §§204, 260.
3 For example, čerqa-cir (1) “scream”; (2) “grinding” (Oraham 238 b); čerqa-cir “squeak; sound as of wheels turning on dry axles” (Oraham, loc. cit.); mauna-mat “murmur, grumble” (Oraham 315 b; fem. Yohanan 43 b); mauna-mat “mumbling” (Oraham 314 b); qura-qur “croaking (of ravens)” (Kalašev 63, 10; fem. 64, 4); qeza-qeza “cluck (brooding hen), cackle” (Oraham 450 b); qeza-qeza “sound of falling rain” (Oraham 467 b); qeza-qeza “sound of falling or pouring water” (Oraham 125 b); teška-teška “grum-
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kirra-kir “sounds made by domestic fowl”
Ktaji, ordagi, gaza / Kirra-kirre b cijmai “Hens, ducks, geese... in the meadows” Cbrest. 1, 29 = B’urwa 39.

kissa-kiss
Xa qaza xvarneta... kissa-kissu bitojivu duz l gono “A whitish goose... was coming hissing (Sp’a) straight towards her (‘Kashtanka’)” Cbrest. 1, 7.
mirca-mirc1 “smacking of lips” (fem.) Yaure 14d
mirca-mircö-la “she is (in the act of) smacking (her lips)” (kindly supplied by the Rev. L. Yaure).
nikka-nik, cf. naknuki “groan” (Maclean 183 b); “stutter*, etc.” (Oraham 337a)?
u av nikka-nikku vilifi poltuši go abbu “and he began to fumble... in his breast-pocket” Cbrest. 11, 33.
vista-vist, cf. vaevusi
Duli xa kalba, b įpuru šiša qarva d prizlo, vista-vistu u binvxo matruj min go alula “Suddenly a dog, an iron pot tied to his tail, rushed yelping and barking out of a street (lit. Lo... is rushing)” Cbrest. 1, 73.

Although linga ling- obviously differs from these expressions in not being onomatopoetic, it is build on the same pattern and its syntactic function is the same. It would, therefore, seem that the spelling of Nöldeke’s source need not be dismissed on syntactic grounds.2

IV. THE POSSESSIVE SUFFIX 1ST PLUR. -enij

For the possessive suffix 1st plur. several dialects have alongside of the normal -a/an, a form -enij, which seems to deserve closer attention than it has received in the existing grammars.3 Whatever may be true of other dialects,4 in U. at any rate -enij has a specific meaning of its own: the possessors denoted by this suffix bling” (Oraham 193 b); xalsa-xal “rustling” (Kalashev 51, 3). From such expressions quadriliteral verbs may be derived: Marogulov 82; for a list of onomatopoetic quadriliterals see Maclean, Gr. 270-2.

1 Mirca-mirc or marca-marc?
2 Kalashev 214a, 381a gives a word xalsa-xal “jostling (tolkot’a)” which looks relevant to the question under discussion. The Rev. L. Yaure kindly informs me that the true form is xal-sul-sul; the word is an invariable noun of fem. gender: nišul xul-sul go alma u duşulqan udah “the crowd started to press and push and they trampled upon each other”. He quotes similar formations, for example nišul śruq śruq go alma “sauve qui peut”;
vla déq déq “they started trampling each other”.
3 Stoddard 25; Nöldeke 79; Maclean 18.
4 In Z., for example, -an and -eni seem to be free variants.
are the family or the village community to which the speaker belongs. The “exclusive” character of this plural is best seen in the example for atrenbj quoted below, where Marieken van Nijmegen announces to the Devil her decision to part company with him and to return to “our, i.e. my family’s, country”, the interlocutor being clearly excluded from “our”.

Examples:

ahenbj “our squire” Chrest. 11, 44.
atreνbj “our country” Moïs de Marie 130, 9.
betenij “our house” Socin 25, 14; Manuel 151, 8; 227, 14; Coban 51; Brato 7, 19.
dostenij “a friend of ours” Chrest. 1, 91.
kilpattenij “our family” Coban 8; 51; 76; Brato 119.1
kaltenij “our kinsman’s wife” Chrest. 1, 61.
matenij “our village” Socin 25, 3; 87, 5; Chrest. 11, 81.
qatunenij “our cat” Marogulov 12.
rabjtenij “our schoolmistress” Coban 21; 22 (but 20 rabjta d’dijan).
svavenij “our neighbour” Chrest. 1, 61.
svotenij “our female neighbour” Chrest. 1, 72.
xizmenij “our kinsman” Brato 119.

If we read in B’urxs 66, in a militantly patriotic context, of tuc, pulad, komur, nutenbj “our [the Soviet Union’s] bronze, steel, coal, and oil” (with -enbj belonging to all four products), we are obviously beyond the narrow and homely circle of persons and things to which -enij was originally restricted. Still, this suffix lends to the expression a truculent “exclusiveness” which would not have been conveyed by the colourless -an.

V. THE TENSE-SYSTEM OF NS

Our admiration for Nöldeke’s grammar must not prevent us from realizing that in the light of the material at our disposal some of his views, not only on small matters of detail, stand in need of thorough revision. This applies in particular to his treatment of the tenses, which Rosenthal (264) has singled out for praise: “Die Syntax zeichnete sich besonders durch eine treffliche Herausarbeitung der Tempuslehre aus, bei der Noldeke in dem sichtbaren Uberwiegen nur zweier Verbalbildungen die Neigung zur Rückkehr zum semitischen Sprachcharakter erkannte.”2 The

1 The original has the singular possessive: “vse moe semejstvo”.
2 Nöldeke does not actually speak of “Rückkehr” (which would imply that there had been an earlier state in which NS had in fact strayed from the “semit. Sprachcharakter”). His own words are (314), “Die altsemit. Zweiteilung zeigt sich also auch hier wieder, wenn auch in anderer Form”.
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purely statistical preponderance of the forms priqli and ki pariqlı is a matter of \textit{la parole} and justifies no such conclusion as to their status in \textit{la langue}. Having to work on texts of uncertain authenticity and being at that time unacquainted with the spoken language, Nöldeke was inclined to doubt the genuineness of phrasal verb-forms which failed to conform to his notions of linguistic efficiency and economy, conceived in terms of bulk and complexity. Even where the genuineness of a form could not possibly be doubted, he would criticize it on the score of “clumsiness” (“plump”, “ungelenk”, and the like); the form qam pariqlı is “jedenfalls etwas plump” (297); the Present continuous bipraqıli, which Nöldeke considers the only worthwhile addition to the tense-system, is allowed to pass as “nicht eben weitlaufig” (314). “Weitläufigkeit” is, in his judgement, too high a price to pay for any gain in semantic precision (313). Nor does he do justice to the semantic precision achieved by NS: he lays too much stress on the time-sphere and regards semantic differences within each time-sphere as superfluous (“durchaus kein Gewinn” 313). He therefore describes as equivalent (=), or at least “fast gleich” (304, last line) the forms which appear in the same line in the table below: priqli = vili bipraqa (310), bipraqıvin = ki pariqlı = ki pariqlı = ki pariqlı = ki haviq bipraqa (313), bipraqıva = ki pariqlı = ki pariqlı = ki haviq bipraqa (306). It must, of course, be remembered that in

1 Nöldeke himself states (306; after Stoddard 41) that the function of qam pariqlı is to supplement the Preterite priqli for the expression of the pronominal complement (cases of qam pariqlı without -do, however, occur in Socin’s texts: 35, 12/5; 65, 8. 18; 67, 10; 100, 12. 22; also Mæx 13, 4, by the same informant). It is true that qam pariqlı (and Conjugation) is practically equivalent to parqıli and qam pariqlun to parqıli [Sal. parqıli, see below § vi (1)], but for the 1st and 2nd persons the only alternative to qam pariqlı is the addition of the enclitic pronouns to the Preterite base: 1st masc. sing. parqılini, 1st plur. parqılin, etc. (Nöldeke 312-4). To some dialects, for example Sal. (and Bedjan’s written language) and Z., these forms are quite unknown, and even a native grammarian (from Salamas?) finds that they are complicated and difficult (Marogulov 72). In Sal. and Z. qam pariqlı is the only, and not merely a convenient, way of expressing the pronominal complement of the 1st and 2nd persons; it is, therefore, indispensable.

2 Nöldeke also minimizes the difference between the subjunctive pariqlı and the indicative ki pariqlı, and blames Stoddard for setting up a strict and consistent distinction between indicative and subjunctive forms: “ein offenbarer Fehler” (313). Nothing could be less justified than this criticism. In this respect Nöldeke’s grammar clearly marks a retrogression from Stoddard’s. The instance of bajızi “wishes” alongside of ki bajızi (but in the negative always le bajızi) can probably be accounted for by special reasons, cf. Wackernagel, \textit{Vorlesungen über Syntax}, 1, 60-1.
1868 aspect and "Aktionsart" had not yet become commonplaces of grammatical parlance; but chronology is not really an essential factor: Jespersen, Nöldeke’s junior by twenty-four years, concluded his chapter on the "Expanded Tenses", *Mod. Eng. Gr.* iv, 13.7 (8), with remarks in a vein rather similar to Nöldeke’s. Nöldeke’s unconcern for system finds characteristic expression in his nomenclature. If anything is certain it is that priqil and bipraqi are syntactic counterparts and ought therefore to be made to correspond to each other in a nomenclature using numbers; yet Nöldeke calls the former "1. Praeteritum" and the latter "2. Praesens".

The tense-system of NS may be set out in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>SIMPLE TENSES</th>
<th>COMPOUND TENSES</th>
<th>&quot;TEMPS SURCOMPOSÉS&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Praeteritum</td>
<td>priqil</td>
<td>vii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praeteritum in praeterito</td>
<td>priqvi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praesens</td>
<td>ki qoriq</td>
<td>ji</td>
<td>biqijji/bijjiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praesens in praeterito</td>
<td>ki qoriqvi</td>
<td>ji bovio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futurum</td>
<td>bit qoriq</td>
<td>bit hovi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Futurum in praeterito</td>
<td>bit qoriqvi</td>
<td>bit hovivo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Simple Tenses are so called with reference both to their structure and to their meaning: they are tenses and nothing else. The Compound or Phrasal Tenses have temporal as well as aspectual and "Aktionsart" meaning. The use of any Compound Tense involves, in the first place, the choice between two forms which the verb-root itself can assume, namely, either the Infinitive (preceded by bi- "in" with First Conjugation verbs) or the Perfect Participle. These two forms express the contrast of Dynamic vs. Static, or Process vs. Result. Since this contrast (1) cuts across all Compound Tenses, (2) refers to an "objective" quality of the "action", and (3) is expressed in the verb-root itself, it is essentially distinct from the semantic modifications expressed, in addition to tense, by the auxiliaries with which the two root-forms have to be compounded in order to become predicative expressions. The contrast between (bi-)Infinitive and Perfect Participle belongs to the category of "Aktionsart", while the auxiliaries take care of "aspects".

The auxiliaries are the copula and the Simple Tenses of the
verb h-v-j “to be”. In the Present Indicative the copula contrasts with ki ḫaviv. The copula denotes either an action going on (“Present Continuous”), or a state achieved, at the moment of speaking (synchronous Present/Perfect); ki ḫaviv expresses either an action in progress, or a state achieved from time to time, as occasion arises. This distinction depends upon the particle ki; if ki is replaced by bit (future) or by zero (subjunctive) the contrast of synchronous v. general is neutralized. The compound bit ḫaviv plus Perfect Participle deserves special mention. As regards form it is a “Future Perfect”; as regards meaning it is for the most part what in Hindustani grammars is called a “Past Presumptive” or “Presumptive Perfect”.

Both Simple and Compound Tenses (with the exception of the auxiliary vili) can be put back into the past by the addition of va. With the copula we thus obtain a tense denoting either an action in progress (“Past continuous”, “was ...-ing”), or a state achieved, at a stated moment in the past. Ki ḫaviva, on the other hand, denotes incessant, habitual, regularly repeated action (“used to...”) during an indefinite period. In addition we have the Simple Preterite of h-v-j: vili plus (bi-)Infinitive combinesgressive with durative meaning; when the latter prevails, it is sometimes hard to perceive a difference from ki ḫaviv; vili seems to be the appropriate tense when a definite period is spoken of.

The “temps surcomposés” (in which the auxiliary is itself in a Compound Tense) are liable to be “seized upon with more enthusiasm than discretion by the makers of grammatical systems” (T. B. W. Reid, Archivum Linguisticum, vi, 1954, 151). I must specify that I have no more than one example apiece for biwajili priqqa and vijjili priqqa, and no example at all for biwajili biperqa, while vijjili biperqa is adequately, though not abundantly, attested. It corresponds approximately to the English “He has been ...-ing” and to the Persian mikarda ast.¹

VI. NOTES ON BEDJAN’S LANGUAGE

Bedjan’s intention is to write literary U., “chaldaicum, idiomatic Urmae Persidis” (title-page of the Imitatio), but his native dialect is sometimes allowed to break through. To illustrate his practice,

¹ I venture to believe that this tense is better described as the Perfect karda ast modified by prefixing ml- (“Continuative Perfect”, St Clair-Tisdall and Phillott; “perfekt dlitel’nyj”, Rastorgueva) than as the Imperfect mikard made “compound” by substituting -karda ast to -kard (“Imparfait composé”, Lazard).
we chose eight points of verb morphology, of which four show Sal. giving way before the U. standard, while the other four exhibit Sal. or at least non-U. features; the attempt to give Sal. forms a U.-like appearance sometimes results in hybrids which exist only on paper. There are considerable differences between the various books, and also between the two editions of the Manuel. But it is not possible to discern a uniform trend either towards or away from Sal.: the former trend is exemplified by point (8), the former as well as the latter by point (7).

(1) The plural base of the Preterite

In U. the nominal plural ending (absolute state) -ij, preserved in Sal., is replaced by the possessive suffix 3rd plur. -e (spelled -ē2), presumably on the analogy of the Infinitive and the Perfect Participle, which take the possessive suffixes to express the complement. Cf. dviqijlē Duval 50, 9 as against dvijqelun Vies 322, 7 “they seized them” (on Sal. -lē v. U. -lun see below, point (3)); cf. the form šviqiqlon “we left them”, quoted by Nöldeke 222 n. 1. In Manuel, 1st ed., 24, 4 from below Bedjan has permitted himself šurkijlux “thou hast associated them”, duly corrected in the 2nd ed. to šurkelux (27u).

(2) The plural of the “First Present” of verbs with last radical j

In U. the 3rd plur. of the “First Present” of verbs with last radical j ends in -ij, following the analogy of the other verb-classes, while Sal. preserves the older ending -ē2 (Al. -āj).3

(3) U. -lun v. Sal. -lē

After the enclitic preposition l- U. uses a special form of the suffix 3rd plur., -un (with the Preterite -lun expresses the actor, with the “First Present” and the Imperative the complement, with ‘it’ and ‘lit’ the possessor). Sal. has -lē, with the ordinary form of the possessive suffix 3rd plur.4

1 Thus rightly Maclean 137 against Nöldeke 221.
2 For example, qārē (by the side of ḫārīj) Duval 68, 20; ḫāvē 22, 18; xāzē 37, 11, etc.; Second Conjugation tinē 12, 6; 69, 5; 85, 16; rippē 28, 9, sīlēla 69, 2; sippevalē 52, 20; mizdēla 79, 20, etc.
3 In Z. this -āj is contracted to -ē2 with the unfortunate effect of making the plural fall together with the singular.
4 Nöldeke 81 quotes this form from his Sal. texts (“Cat. und Röd.”). Cf. from Duval vīlē “they became” 22, 5; rupilē “they threw” 33, 13, etc.; axcu nāpārmēlē ki darēlē “when they cut them, they put them” 53, 12, etc.; uñina nāsilē “those are the ones who have” 16, 21; an nūlē “those who have not” 17, 1, etc.
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(4) *The verb mttiv “to put***

This verb has, in U., a curious by-form which Maclean describes, not quite accurately, by saying “sometimes α drops” (Gr. 133), “in some parts of the verb α is often silent” (Dict. 205 b). In Kalašev’s texts and in the Soviet books forms of both types, (a) and (b), occur side by side. Bedjan writes only the standard forms (a), while Sal. has the (b)-forms, except in the 3rd masc. sing. of the “First Present”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.</th>
<th>Sal. (Duval)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“First Present”</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc. sing.</td>
<td>mttiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem. sing.</td>
<td>mtva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur.</td>
<td>mtvij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp. sing.</td>
<td>mttiv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur.</td>
<td>mtvun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preterite</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc. base</td>
<td>muttivli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem. base</td>
<td>mtvali</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plur. base</td>
<td>mtvili</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Perfect Participle</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>masc. sing.</td>
<td>mutva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fem. sing. (a)</td>
<td>muttita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>mut(t)avta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infinitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom. act.</td>
<td>muttovta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mtuvia</td>
<td>muttui, 49, 19/20; 58, 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>muttuvi</td>
<td>74, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mtuvi</td>
<td>mittayl(-t-) 77, 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In U. mtti is treated throughout as a last radical j verb of the Second Conjugation, second division; it is inflected like rapt, “to throw”, the characteristic forms of which are given by

---

1 See however below the comments on the Sal. forms.
2 I have no reference for *matta.
3 Fellihi (Z.) mutwi:le.
4 This is Bedjan’s written form: Vies 325, 14.
5 The v of this form is not identical with the radical v of U. (a); it is a glide which appears in Sal. (huquvi 65, 5/6; mumuvi 33, 5; rupuvi 33, 10; tunuvi 78, 21, etc.), as in U. (Stoddard 85; Maclean 105), in Second Conjugation infinitives of verbs with root-final j. Bedjan wrote it in his earlier books =, but later substituted Yod.
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Nöldeke 241–2: “First Present” fem. sing. rappa (Chrest. 1, 39; Qoli d’šara 321 b, 15), but also rapja (Bedjan, Vies 35, 21), Nomen agentis rappana (Hagjatti 119); Preterite, fem. base ruppa-lb (Chrest. 1, 18; Kalašev 49, 3), but also rupja-lb (KLš 63, and thus Bedjan: rupja-lb Vies 42, 11; 515, 4), plur. base ruppe-lb (Marogulov 101; Broto 106), but also rupje-lb (Chrest. 1, 42, and thus Bedjan, Vies 65, 10); Perfect Participle, masc. sing. ruppa (Stoddard 91; Kalašev 359 b; Gorqij 83), but also rupja (Chrest. 1, 71, and thus Bedjan, Mois de Marie 378, 16), plur. ruppy (Chrest. 11, 46), but also rupjb (Chrest. 1, 65; 67), fem. (a) ruppyta (Hagjatti 65), (b) ruppeta (Bedjan, Manuel 385, 9).

In Sal., on the other hand, muttux reflects faithfully the primitive form (cf. Fellihi mattu:), and the 3rd plur. of the “First Present” mittij differs characteristically from rippě (28, 9; rippěva 65, 21), cf. above under (2). The plur. base of the Preterite, muttij-li, likewise shows that, in Sal., the transition of m-t-v to the root-final j class is not complete. In Duval’s texts I find no example of a root-final j verb to set against muttijji; Maclean 138 is silent about Sal., but his “K. Al. Z.” form, minus m-, is what we should expect: (from tunuvi = U. tonuji) tuně-li (cf. Al. mšuray “they were begun”, Rhétoré, Gr. de la langue soureth 143); Bedjan wrote tune-lan (←) in the 1st ed. of the Manuel 214, 1; 370, 3, and changed it to U. tunje-lan in the 2nd ed. (257, 4 from below; 475, 13). Of the Sal. forms mittij and muttijji it is indeed enough to say, as Maclean did of U., that “v has dropped”; they remain outside any normal verb-class.

(5) psrqittij v. U. porgitiłj

The l- introducing the pronominal complement after the “First Present” is in Sal. assimilated to the t of the personal ending (enclitic pronoun) of the 2nd sing., masc. -it, fem. -at. Bedjan writes paṟqîtij (broad Sal. paṟqîtij) as against U. porgitiłj (already noticed by Duval, J.A. 1886, 1, 374; cf. Nöldeke 263 n. 3).

(6) The fem. form of the Perfect Participle, Second Conjugation

It is a peculiarity of U. for the penult radical of the fem. Perfect Participle to have the same vowel as in the Preterite (and, in Ptaša verbs of the Second Conjugation, in the masc. Perfect Participle). In Sal., as in most other dialects (especially Fellihi), the penult radical has a (mušlamta Duval 80, 17 by the side of masc.
The Imperative pl. in -mun

In standard U. the Imp. plur. has the ending -mun with root-final j verbs of all conjugations: xzi-mun "see", qn>-mun "read", vi-mun "be", du-mun "know", haqi-mun "tell", taš-mun "hide", rapp-b mun "throw", madd-b mun "inform", sas Đảng-mun "examine", te-mun "come", me-mun "bring", etc.

Stoddard 56-7 gives for paruqi (Second Conjugation, 1st division) the forms parqun and parqimun, and adds: "The second form given above, parqimun, may be used with other verbs, but is not so common, and is now omitted in our books."—In Haqjists we find parqimun and paqdimun (16), mscximun "find" (21), såximun "take off (a garment)" (56)—all belonging to the same class.

In Sal. -mun is used, in addition to the root-final j verbs, with all Second Conjugation verbs, including the causatives (Maclean 90-4); moreover, the verb "to give" has hállêmux (Duval 13, 9 hállêmuxsij "give me"; Nöldeke 226 n. 1 quotes from "Röd." hállêmuxsij).

In the 1st ed. of the Manuel Bedjan used the Sal. forms, but replaced them by the U. forms in the 2nd ed.; cf. (in parentheses the corresponding places in the 2nd ed.): gasqemun "look" 69u (gašqun 81, 17); šblemun "bring" 80, 10 (šblun 93, 18); marmemun "raise" 20, 4 (marmun 22, 13); mskemun "cover" 368, 14 (mskun 452, 1); paltêmun "bring forth" 255, 19 (paltun 309, 21); qblemun "receive" 28u (qblun 32pu); šqilemum "tarry" 256, 10 (šqilun 310, 16); pörpilmun "beseech" 21, 20 (porpilun 24, 13); målvišemun "clothe" 255, 20 (maálvišun 309, 21); manjișemun "rest" 154, 3 (manjišun 185, 3); hallemun "give" 23, 19 (halun 26, 20). In Mois de Marie the U. forms are used, but in Bedjan's last NS book, Vies des Saints, the Sal. forms reappear: máksibimun "love" 67, 13; 72, 17; maknbžmum "preach" 48, 13; kąśkizimun "set (wild animals) to fight" 72, 20. The vowel preceding -mun is spelled -e- (ዜ) in the Manuel, -i- (ዜ) in Vies, -e- (ዜ) and -ij- (ዜ) in Mois de Marie.

An ingenious explanation of this -mun was given by Jušmanov

1 Cf. in Coban: muttetuTO 15; durbantiv 18; supeti 41; hudartu 47; mudtvu 47; çummetiva 67; mutu 80.
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in his article “Zagadočnoe -m- novosirijskogo imperativa”.

According to him the pair sing. qu (with loss of final -m)-plur. qumun “rise” gave rise to an imp. plur. morpheme -mun. This -mun was transferred to the root-final j verbs (xzij, plur. xzimun — Jušmanov writes xzijmun) in replacement of the somewhat aberrant old forms (Al. xzi:, pl. xzo:; cf. Z. xzi:, pl. xza:wun). As to qablumun (Jušmanov writes qablijmun), etc., he suggests that three factors, namely, (1) the imperative-like meaning of the Subjunctive 2nd plur. qablitan (Jušmanov writes qablijtan), (2) the identical shape of the stem in qablitan and in the distinctive Second Conjugation imp. plur. porqun (as against First Conjugation pruqun), (3) the functional insignificance of the “connecting vowel” -i- (J. -ij-) in qablitan, made it possible for -mun (already “metanalysed” as an imp. pl. morpheme) to be substituted to -tun. Factor (2) would explain the restriction of this substitution to the Second Conjugation. It would, however, be interesting to know the facts concerning stress: in qsblitun the stress is on the penult, while qablumun, to judge by analogy, ought to bear the stress on the first syllable.

A different explanation, though likewise based on qumun, was suggested by Brockelmann: according to him -mun was not transferred from qumun, but is actually a remnant of this very form, which originally was added to an imp. pl. and subsequently lost its first syllable; in the first instance this happened, “by haplology”, after root-final consonant. While qumun in itself is likely enough as a “strengtheness” of the imp. plur. (but why is

1 Jazgk i myšlenie, v (1931), 93–6; this article is quoted by Rosenthal 268 n. 5 (his only reference to Soviet NS).

2 In Az. the vowel is really the same in the sing. as in the plur.: xzii—xzimun(Jaure, J.N.E.S. xvi, 83 quotes in support of Jušmanov’s explanation U. (“in careless colloquial speech”) tumun “sit down” (for example, Kalašev 67, 6); this form likewise occurs in Az.: jtu:mun. Brockelmann (see note 4 below) quotes from Merx 43, 11 hajjunum (hα-?) “come here”.

3 This point does not seem essential for Jušmanov’s argument. The “connecting vowel” has at least a morphophonemic function in that it marks the base boundary beyond which the stress cannot move towards the end of the word when the morphemes -l- (plus suffixes) and/or vo are added. While in U. the addition of these morphemes seems to leave the length of [i] unaffected (cf. Socin 33, 17, 18, 20; 35, 13, 15; 93, 20; 209, 4), in Z. it causes the shortening of [e] to [i], exemplifying what has been called “Kürzung durch Tonanschluss”; Debrunner, Idg. Forschungen, xliv (1927), 116; cf. Jespersen, Lehre d. Phonetik, 12, 22; Mod. Engl. Gr. 1, 4, 71 (“three-syllable rule”).

4 In Spuler’s Handbuch der Orientalistik (Leiden, 1914), iii, 161.
there no trace of qu in the sing. (?), it ought to precede rather than follow it; the order postulated by Brockelmann is, I believe, contrary to usage.

As yet, the facts concerning the incidence and dialectal distribution of -mun are very imperfectly known. It is, for example, of some interest, though of uncertain import, that in several, if not in all, Jewish dialects of Southern Kurdistan¹ all verbs take -mun (qšumun, etc.).

(8) The verb “to give”

For a historical analysis of the U. forms see Nöldeke 254-6; for the dialect forms, Maclean 126. For our present purpose we need only consider the Preterite and the Perfect Participle:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PRETERITE</th>
<th>PERFECT PARTICIPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.</td>
<td>juvil-li</td>
<td>juvā-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jivil-li</td>
<td></td>
<td>jivā-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bedjan (a)</td>
<td>jivil-li</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>hiv-li</td>
<td>hijvā-li</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sal.</td>
<td>hux-le</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The forms used by Bedjan in his earlier books (a) are those of the ordinary U. orthography, apart from the non-U. vowel of the penult radical in the fem. Perfect Participle, see above, point (6): the form jivvā probably corresponds to no linguistic reality at all and exists only on paper. The later forms (b) represent, in their Syriac spelling, the ancestors of the Sal. forms. If hivli and hivte are intended to be read as they are written, they are the forms which would have resulted, if iwCV (< išCV) had in Sal. developed to ivCV, as in U.,² instead of being contracted to u:CV (prior to the shift of w to v) and undergoing the further Sal. development to uxCV.

A characteristic feature of Bedjan’s language is his discreet use of OS words. He limits them mainly to the religious sphere, while freely drawing upon Persian and Turkish (AzT.) for the

¹ I use this opportunity to point out that J. de Morgan’s “dialecte israélite de Sihneh” (Mission scientifique en Perse (Paris, 1904), v, 312-22) was recognized as NS by F. Perles Orientalistische Literaturzeitung (1904), pp. 483-6.

² There is, however, some room for doubt whether U. iv#, ivCV are not, at least originally, spelling pronunciations for uj#, ujCV, cf. Nöldeke’s observations, Z.D.M.G. xxxvi (1882), 670.
ordinary vocabulary. The following are some of the Turkish words (including Arabic-Persian words with Turkish endings) not in Maclean’s Dictionary:

axranda “in the end” Imit. 67, 20; Vies 146, 1; 221 u; 502, 15; 541, 6 from below. Also Qeb d’srara 415 a, apu.

başsbitun “completely” Imit. 213 u; Manuel 1st ed. 32, 14 (in the 2nd ed. 37, 7 replaced by xo b-xo); Duval 64, 10; 67, 8; Kalašev 250 a (bitun alone is common: Maclean 324).

capaql “robbery, raid” Vies 237, 14 (Latrocinium Ephesinum); Duval 70, 1; 71, 4; cf. Oraham 233 b capaqol “Forayer; one who ravages in search of spoils, from e., from the falling of huge rocks”: “raids” or “raiders”?). On the word, cf. Bang, Vom Köktürk. zum Osm. 215 (Abb. Berl. Akad. 1919, Nr. 5), 59, where the NS form could have provisionally filled a gap in the evidence.

daldalams vaja “to seek shelter” Vies 456, 12; 638, 8; Kalašev 262 b daldalams vatta “to give shelter”, daldalams vatta “to seek shelter”. Maclean 66 a has dalda.


qjit (قبه) “few and far between” Manuel 210 u (opp. pnrja “plentiful”); Qeb d’srara 541 b, 5 from below; Duval: qit 17, 16; “qituva” 17, 7 (“manque”), “qituva(-)” 16, 15 (“défaut”).

talasug “quick” Vies 503, 17; -uta ibid. 309, 1; common in Az. (ارطه); Azt. talsik.

tazadan “anew” Imit. 161, 4 from below; Manuel 249, 15; 334, 6; 484, 9; 487, 12; Duval 11, 4; 81, 12; Kalašev 376 a; cf. min tazadan (sic) Qeb d’srara 243 a, 4 from below; 300 a, 4.

tazalams vada “to renew” Imit. 212, 9; Manuel 54, 2; Mais de Marie 270, 8; Vies 105, 5; 135, 19; Kalašev 376 a tazalams vada (tazalams vata “to renew oneself”).

Bedjan also uses an Armenian word which I have not read elsewhere: xipart “arrogant”, Arm. hpart: Manuel 432, 7; -uta ibid. 197, 6; 433, 12; Mais de Marie 87, 1.


3 Kalašev is always careful to provide the Turkish verbs with the appropriate suffixes of the deverbal verb-stems. This is a peculiarity of his, which does not seem to be confirmed by actual usage. So far as I can see, NS is invariably content with the basic verb-stem, the distinction between intransitive-reflexive-passive and transitive-causative (factitive) being taken care of by the Syriac auxiliaries vaja “to be” and vada “to make” respectively. To take Stoddard’s (126) example of “the Turkish perfect participle...dragged
This lack of purism, especially in respect of Turkish, seems to have displeased some members of the educated younger generation. Their criticism is reported and refuted by a young Chaldéan living in Paris, a former pupil of the Lazarists, Jacques Babakhan (Mirza Jaqu bar Babaxan), in *Revue de l'Orient chrétien*, IV (1899), 439 n. 1. A few extracts may be of interest:

Nul mieux que M. Bedjan n’est à même d’enrichir son style de termes syriaques et d’en exclure tout ce qui sent l’élément étranger: en recourant au turc, il a montré qu’il a admirablement compris sa mission de prêtre, qui consiste avant tout à faire mieux comprendre les principes enseignés... Supposez un moment qu’au lieu de parler au peuple la vraie langue populaire, M. Bedjan, jetant par-dessus bord son vieux jargon syro-turc, si tant est que la langue de notre savant compatriote mérite pareille injure, s’attaquant à la langue savante ou à la terminologie scolaistique, quel eût été pratiquement le résultat d’une pareille méthode? Nul, puisque personne n’y eût rien compris; seulement au lieu d’être blâmé par une douzaine de jeunes prétentieux, notre auteur eût été alors dénigré, voire même exécré, par la population des trois districts réunis: de Salmas, d’Ourniah et de Souldouze.

**VII. PECULIARITIES OF SOVIET NS**

It would need a native speaker of NS to detect finer points of usage in which Soviet NS may possibly deviate from the U. standard. An outsider must necessarily content himself with tangible features. Of such I have noticed no more than two.

bodily into a Syriac sentence", *inčimis vili* “he became injured” (for example, *Merx* 32; *Imit*. 55, 16; Bedjan even derives an abstract substantive from *inčimis*: *inčimisjuta* *Imit*. 126, 3), the replacement of vili by vidli suffices to change the meaning to “he injured (him)”. This is stated by Yohannan 44-3, and confirmed, for example, by *inčimis la vidla qa Petrovi* “(the Secret Police) did not hurt the Petrovs”; *Hajjati* 15; KalaSev 293a, on the contrary, gives *inčimis vatta* alongside of *inčimis veta*. *His aspaplanmș veta* “to arm oneself” and *aspaplandtms vatta* “to arm” (244a) is at variance with *gane aspablamș vijdova* “they had armed themselves” *Coban* 70.

1 Bedjan’s freedom from linguistic Turkophobia is further evinced by the fact that he has included in the *Manuel* 601-5 six hymns in Azeri Turkish. He prefaced them with the curious footnote, “Perhaps some of these hymns were composed by those Mongols [Tatars] who became Christian. See Barhebraeus’s Chronicle”; at any rate this note seems to suggest that the hymns are not Bedjan’s own work.

2 He was employed as an assistant by Mgr R. Graffin, the editor of the *Patrologia Syriaca* and co-editor of the *Patrologia Orientalis*. Some articles by Babakhan may be found in the *Qob d prara*: 237a–238a (a letter on his success in Paris, especially his being made Officier d’académie); 293a–297b (on meteors).
STUDIES IN MODERN SYRIAC

(1) The Infinitive of “to give”

Alongside of the normal Infinitive jāvā (cf. Z. jhā:wa), the Soviet books also use jāvulī, which I have not read in other sources. This form goes merely one step beyond the standard form of the noun of action jāvulē (contrast Z. jho:uš), which exhibits the characteristic pattern of the Second Conjugation.

(2) The Infinitive of “to bring”

While the Infinitive of “to give” has assumed the Second Conjugation pattern, the opposite process has taken place with the verb “to bring”: alongside of the primitive form māvī we find māvā (thus also Oraham 288a). The -v- of māvī represents the last trace of [uː] plus the glide v (see above, note 5, p. 25): *māu:vī (cf. Fellhī me:thō:ye, maθō:ye). The characteristic Second Conjugation pattern CaCu:Ci was thus altered beyond recognition; māvā is an assimilation to the First Conjugation pattern CCa:Ca.

In the field of lexical phraseology we meet calques from Russian, which will hardly be intelligible outside Russia. Thus, mərətə matətə, which can only be understood as something like “rural ownership”, means “agriculture”, sel’skoe xoz’ajstvo. Saprajuta sajjareta does not mean “painters’ literature” but “belles-lettres”, xudozestvennaja literatura, lit. “artistic literature”: xudožnik means “artist” in general and “painter” in particular, but sajjara can only mean “painter”. Such calques are the ineluctable fate of all diaspora NS.