

STUDIES IN MODERN SYRIAC

H. J. POLOTSKY

ABBREVIATIONS

- AL = the NS dialect of Alqoš; Christian Fellihi generally.
- Az. = the NS dialect of the Azerbaijan 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).
- Brta* = *Brta d qapitan*, see p. 5.
- Bruna d dora*, see p. 5.
- B'urxa*, see p. 4.
- Cbrest.* = *Xrestomatije d saprajuta*, see p. 4.
- Coban* = *Coban d'Qurdoji*, see p. 4.
- Duval, see note 5, p. 2.
- Gorqij, see p. 5.
- Haqjetti*, see p. 4.
- Hysejnov = H. H., *Azerbaidžan-sko-russkij slovar'* (Baku, 1939).
- Imitatio* = Bedjan's NS translation of the *Imitatio Christi* (Paris, 1885).
- IPA = International Phonetic Association.
- J.A.* = *Journal asiatique*.
- Jaba-Justi = Aug. J.-Ferd. Justi, *Dictionnaire kurde-français* (St Petersburg, 1879).
- Kalašev, see note 1, p. 3.
- KLS = *Ktavo d lišona suraja*, see p. 4.
- Lidzbarski = Mark L., *Die new-aramäische Handschriften der Kgl. Bibliothek zu Berlin* (Weimar, 1896).
- Maclean, see note 6, p. 2.
- Manuel* = Bedjan's *Manuel de piété*; references, unless otherwise stated, to the 2nd edition (Paris, 1893).
- Marogulov, see p. 4.
- Merx, see note 3, p. 2.
- MF = *Le Maître Phonétique*.
- Mois de Marie*, by Bedjan (Paris, 1904).
- Nöldeke, see note 2, p. 2.
- NS = Neo-Syriac, Modern Syriac.
- Oraham, see p. 6.
- OS = Old Syriac.
- Osipoff (-pov), see p. 3.
- Qala d srara*, 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.

- U. = the NS dialect of Urmi; Yaure, see p. 6.
 standard literary NS. Yohannan, see p. 6.
Vies = Bedjan's *Vies des Saints* Z. = the NS dialect of the Zaxo
 (Paris, 1912). Jews (Jewish Fellihi).

The appearance of D. T. Stoddard's *Grammar of the Modern Syriac Language* in 1855¹ was a sufficiently important event for its centenary to deserve some kind of commemoration. Nöldeke's grammar² 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),³ A. Socin (1844–99),⁴ R. Duval (1839–1911),⁵ and A. J. Maclean (1858–1943),⁶ the reader may be referred to Franz Rosenthal's chapter on Neu-Ostaramäisch in his well-written and thoughtful history of Aramaic studies.⁷ An earlier article by N. V. Jušmanov (1896–1946)⁸ had called the attention of Western scholars to the unnoticed or forgotten work of two Ajsory ('Transcaucasian "Assyrians"'), 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 Dialecte von Urmia* (Breslau: Tübinger Universitätsprogramm, 1873). Reviewed by Nöldeke, *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* (1873), pp. 1961–75; Socin, *Jenaer Literaturzeitung* (1874), no. 554, cols. 597–8.

⁴ *Die neu-aramaischen Dialekte von Urmia bis Mosul* (Tübingen, 1882). Reviewed by Nöldeke, *Z.D.M.G.* xxxvi (1882), 669–82.

⁵ *Les dialectes néo-araméens de Salamas* (Paris, 1883). Reviewed by Nöldeke, *Z.D.M.G.* xxxvii (1883), 598–609; Socin, *Literaturblatt f. orient. Philologie*, 1 (1884), 407–10, with "Berichtigung" II (1885), 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, 1895). Reviewed by Nöldeke, *Z.D.M.G.* l (1896), 312–16. *Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac* [...] (Oxford, 1901). On Maclean's life, cf. W. G. Sinclair Snow, *A. J. M., Bishop of Moray, Primus* (Edinburgh, [1950?]).

⁷ *Die aramaistische Forschung seit Th. Nöldeke's Veröffentlichungen* (Leiden, 1939), pp. 255–69.

⁸ "Assirijskij jazyk i ego pis'mo", *Pis'mennost' i revol'ucija*, 1 (Moscow–Leningrad, 1933), 112–28.

phonetic transcription (using the "Russian Linguistic Alphabet");¹ the latter, who in 1912 came into contact with Professor Daniel Jones,² provided a short but excellent phonetic specimen of NS in IPA symbols;³ 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".⁴ References to Kalašev and to Osipov will occur frequently on the following pages.

The main theme of Jušmanov'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 *Özbekische Grammatik* (Leipzig, 1945).⁵ As will be seen

¹ *Ajsorskie teksty: Sbornik materialov dl'a opisanija mestnostej i plemen Kavkaza* (Tiflis, 1894), vol. xx, part 2, pp. 33-96; *Russko-ajsorskij i ajsorsko-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 jazykoznanie dl'a 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 Urmian Syriac". Although Urmī doubtless was 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 *Modinco* (*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 "Ajsor", 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".

⁵ Cf. now Johannes Friedrich, "Neusyrisches in Lateinschrift aus der Sowjetunion", *Z.D.M.G.* cx (1959), 50-81.

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 cyrillized, 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 cyrillized 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

Ktwa d qreta. Elementary "Reading Book", transl. from a work by V. I. Borisova-Potockaja and others, by Qilleta and Petrosov (Moscow, 1933).

Ktwa d liṣṣa surja, 2nd part (3rd and 4th years), by S. Piraev and U. Bedroev (Moscow, 1933).

Grammatiqij qə mdrasi d gur ("Grammar for Adults' Schools"), by Q. I. Marogulov (Moscow, 1935). Very valuable.

Xrestomatija d saprajuta ("Literary Reader"), part I, by Q. Marogulov and D. Petrosov (Moscow, 1933).

Id. part II, by S. V. Osipov (Moscow, 1933).

Coban d'Qurdaji ("The Kurdish Shepherd"), by Arab Šamilov [Ərəb Şəmo] (Moscow, 1933). A Russian translation from the Kurdish original (Moscow, 1935) is listed in Harrassowitz's *Litterae Orientales*, 65 (January 1936), no. 6848. The Kurdish text published in Beirut (the year is variously given as 1945, 1946, 1947; an extract in K. K. Kurdoev's *Grammatika kurdskego jazyka* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1957), 311–15) is not the original, but a retranslation of B. Nikitine's (apparently unpublished) French translation of the Russian translation: cf. B. Nikitine, *Les Kurdes* (Paris, 1956), pp. 44, 324.

Haqjatti ("Stories"), by I. Petrov and A. Isbax, transl. by A. Minasov and "a highlander" (Moscow, 1934).

Abval d suraji go Iraq lnxbat al dinni qissatti xarajb u əməl d imperializm inglismaja ("The situation of the Assyrians in Iraq with reference to the latest events and the activity of English imperialism"), by Sərgis Bit Juxən (Moscow, 1934).

B'urxa d balbuba ("On the road to victory"), poems by Patrus-sur² (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 Jušmanov.

² A vividly written prose piece by this writer, "Flight from Urmi", is printed in *Cbrst.* I, 60–74.

Bruna d dora ("A Son of the Age"), an epic by Patrus (D. Ja. Petrosov) (Moscow, 1935).

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

Brəto d qapitan ("The Captain's Daughter", Kapitanskaja dočka), by Puškin, transl. by U. Bedroev (Moscow, 1937).

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 jazykoznanija* (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, I, 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" (*Mois 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 (1959), 702-3.

² On Bedjan's life (1838-1920), cf. Ad. Rücker, *Oriens Christianus*, n.s. x/xi (1923), 146-51 (contains also a list of Bedjan's publications); J.-M. Vosté, O.P., *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*, xi (1945), 45-102 (78-86 Bibliography; 88 ff. Documents relating to Bedjan's liturgical publications).

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.*

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 Manichaeism* (New York, 1932) are dedicated. His Ph.D. thesis (1900) was Part 1 of *A Modern Syriac-English Dictionary* [Alap only; 65 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.

The Rev. Lazarus Yaure (Philadelphia, Pa.) has published "A Poem in the Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Urmia", *Journal of Near Eastern Studies*, xvi (1957), 73–87, with an interesting introduction and useful notes. I am, moreover, personally indebted to the Rev. Yaure for kindly answering a number of queries of mine.

I. NOTES ON THE "NOVYJ ALFAVIT"

The following is the "Assyrian" NA, with Osipov's IPA equivalents added for phonetic explanation where necessary.

a	ɑ	e	(front) e, (back) ɛ
ə	a	g	ʒ
b		h	
c	tʃ ¹ ; tʃ ¹	i	ɪ
ç	dʒ	k	c ² ; c ²
d		l	(front) l; (back) l ³

1884, 1, 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; ʋ. L. G. Lopatinskij (the editor of the *Sbornik*) ap. Kalašev 103 equates ʋ with Armenian շ. But this is aspirated, [tʃh]; Ar. Garibian, *Kratkij kurs arm'anskogo jazyka* (Erevan, 1944), pp. 5–8 equates it with Russ. ʋ (contrast ʋ = "тш"); it is, in fact, used to render Russ. ʋ (Čexov, -vič, etc.).

² Kalašev ʋ; ʋ.

³ Kalašev l, л.

STUDIES IN MODERN SYRIAC

m	ṭ	t ⁴
n	u	(front) ü, (back) u
o (front) ö, (back) ɔ	v	
p p'; p ¹	x ⁵	
q k ²	z	
r	ʒ	
s	ʕ	(open syll.) i, (closed) ɯ
š	j	
t t ³		

For Soviet uj Osipov writes (front) üi, (back) ui; on Soviet ij, bj see below, § II.

Apart from the pair *t* [t']–*t* [t], continuing the old contrast of *ܬ* *ܬ'*, the Soviet alphabet takes no account of aspiration and non-aspiration, which Kalašev and Osipov mark also for *p*, *c* [tʃ], and *k* [c]. There exists combinative de-aspiration, which takes place after the spirants *s*, *ʃ*, *x* (; *z*, *ʒ*)⁶ (Marogulov 11), as well as independent non-aspiration (Marogulov 9). Combinative de-aspiration is disregarded by virtue of the “etymological principle”: inflection and derivation show whether in a given case absence of aspiration is conditioned or not, as, for example, in the Preterite (*ṣtīlī*), the Imperative (*ṣtīj*) and the Infinitive (*ṣtəjə*) as against the “First Present” (*ṣəti*) 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*, I (1933), 195–6.

¹ Kalašev ṭ; n.

² Kalašev k.

³ Kalašev ṭ.

⁴ Kalašev r.

⁵ Kalašev always *x* (there is no un-aspirated *x*).

⁶ The voiced spirants become unvoiced before the stops in question, for example, *maljəṣṣə* [maljastə] “hurry”.

⁷ Cf. *ṣtīl*, *liṣṭa-ja*, *bīṣṭaiva* as against *ṣat'jan* in Osipov's text. Unfortunately there are some misprints in Osipov's text: *sūrta* line 4 ought to have [t']; *cūle* line 10 ought to have [c'], cf. *c'ūli* 4, *c'ūl* 12; on the other hand, *p'aṭut'* line 29 ought to have [t].

⁸ Cf. *mac'ixta* Osipov, line 5. A special problem is presented by the word *bəxtə* “woman”, which keeps its *t* before the fem. plur. ending, *bəxtəti*. The conference reported by Alaverdov (*op. cit.* p. 193) decided, therefore, that the *t* should be regarded as radical and spelled as pronounced, *bəxtə*; but a later conference (*Koxə d mādinxə*, 5 September 1934, p. 3) ruled that the *-tə* in *bəxtə* should be regarded as the fem. ending and, therefore, spelled with *t*, ‘without regard to the pronunciation’.

The same conference discussed the desirability of introducing a special sign (𐤌) 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", hlaba "to vanquish" (halbuta "victory"); šuluxuta (*Bratā* 14) | šuluhuta (*Cbrest.* 1, 92) "prank"; -mæxxubi "to love"; -paxra | pahra "body" (ܦܚܪܐ); puləxə "division" (ܦܘܠܚܐ).

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 "Singarmonizm urmijskogo narečija".² 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.³ . . . 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*.⁴ 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* -ə, *i* -ɨ); in

¹ The treatment of real descendants of old 𐤌 may be seen, for example, in pəlla (Z. pe'la) "radish" (ܦܠܠܐ); narra (Z. nar'a) "axe" (ܢܪܐ); ləjna (Z. l'i:na) "vat" (ܠܝܢܐ); palluḡ (Z. mpalo'e) "to divide" (ܦܠܠܐ).

² *Pamjati akademika N. Ja. Marra* (1864-1934) (Akad. nauk SSSR. Institut jazyka i myšlenija imeni N. Ja. Marra) (Moscow-Leningrad, 1938), pp. 295-314.

³ qisjə and məkijə. Osipov (see p. 10) uses xləjma and nəqijdə, "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-garmonijə—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: *ə*, *ɛ*. If there is in a word the soft letter *ə* or *i*, all its other sounds are likewise soft; if there is in a word the hard letter *ɛ* or *a*, all its other sounds are likewise hard... These letters are called pronunciation-differentiating (*pəršijrətmā*) 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. Nöldeke, *Z.D.M.G.* xxxvi (1882), 670-1,¹ describes the difference between *ṭla* (Kalašev *тла*) "three" and *tləj* (Kalašev *тлāi*) "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):

FRONT	BACK
a	aa-, uC-
eu	oe-, oCe-
ue-, uCe-	oo

Examples (in parentheses the Soviet spelling):

pra-qa "finish" (<i>prəqə</i>)	plaa-taa "come out" (<i>płəta</i>)
ma-chue-khy "find" (<i>məcuxi</i>)	baa-qoo-ry "ask" (<i>baqurь</i>)
za-bue-ny "sell" (<i>zəbuni</i>)	shaa-doo-ry "send" (<i>šadurь</i>)
bar-bue-zy "scatter" (<i>bərbuzi</i>)	tur-too-my "grumble" (<i>ṭarṭumь</i>)
par-pue-ry "brandish" (<i>pərpuri</i>)	pur-poo-ry (1) "snort, bleat"; (2) "glitter" (<i>parpurь</i>)
map-rue-my "cause to be cut" (<i>məprumi</i>)	mup-roo-my "explain" (<i>maprumь</i>) ²

¹ Nöldeke'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 *prəmə* "cut" and of *parmuṣ* "understand" are "distinguishable...only by a

meu-ta "death" (motə)	goe-raa "man, husband" (gora)
meut-va "council" (motvə)	tore-baa "bag" (torba)
keukh-va "star" (koxvə)	dole-maa "stuffed food" (dolma)
tupe-ra "tail" (tuprə)	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 *Koxvə d Madinxə*, 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 *ham-garmonije* (read -jə), or write thick vowels (a, ɤ) instead of thin ones (ə, i) and *vice versa*."

A serious defect of the Soviet orthography, inherited from the missionaries, is its failure to recognize /uj/ as a distinct phoneme from /u/; see below §II. The conference reported by Alaverdov (*op. cit.* p. 194) resolved unanimously to allow u and uj on equal rights in words like nurə | nujrə "fire", zuzi | zuzji "money", tura | tujra "mountain".

A peculiar problem was presented by the forms spelled biprəqili and prijqili and their paradigms. In the Present Continuous and in the Present Perfect the unstressed vowel resulting from the fusion of the final -ə/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/ɤ, in order to keep e (stressed) for the possessive suffix 3rd plur., expressing the complement with those forms. Osipov's [bʊdʒræva] "was running" (line 13), [bʊdʒarəva] "was returning" (line 16), [fʊrʃit'evan] "I am tired" (line 18), [bʊʃtəjeva] "was drinking" (line 22, var.), [bʊdʒa:jevan] "I am rejoicing" (line 27, var.) would in the Soviet orthography be written бѣҗрајѣва, бѣҗарѣва, җурҗитивән, биҗтәјивә, бидәјивән. The spelling i/ɤ is proper with the Second Conjugation Infinitive and with the plur. Perfect Participle, both of which end in -i/ɤ. The conference reported by Alaverdov (*op. cit.* p. 196) arrived at

slight difference in pronunciation". In addition to the contrast of back *v*, front, parmuɣ and maprumɣ have unaspirated p, while prəmə (Kalašev does not give the causative) has pʰ.

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 /uj/ AND /ij/

A well-known feature of NS written in Syriac characters is the inconsistency with which the characters rbaša (waw with a point below, = ܐ, old [u:]) and rwaḥa (waw with a point above, = ܐ̇, old [o:]) are used. So far as common words and morphemes inherited (or borrowed) from OS are concerned (for example, ܕܢܝܪ "fire"; the ending of abstract nouns ܕܡܠܚܐ as against ܕܡܠܚܐ "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" [o:]. The problem is connected with the existence of the groups [uj] (Urmi) and [uɣ, ux] (Salamas), which the missionaries considered vulgar variants of [u:] and the use of which some of them seem to have discouraged among their native pupils. Nevertheless, [uj], spelled ܐ̇, 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 *uj* is found fairly frequently (in some books more than in others).

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

(a) On the assumption that *uj/uɣ, ux* is merely an "uneducated" and undesirable free variant of [u:], the simplest solution is to write ܐ for [u:] as well as for [uj/uɣ, ux], and ܐ̇ for [o:]. 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 ܕܡܠܚܐ ܕܡܠܚܐ (*Imit.* 146u), ܕܡܠܚܐ (*ibid.* 11, 14), with the same vowel-sign as in ܕܢܝܪ, be acceptable to speakers of dialects in which the vowel of the first three words has remained [o:].

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

(b) More satisfactory results would have been attained by first examining the phonemic status of [uj/uɣ, 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 Urmi Jews), would have revealed the all but regular correspondence of U. Sal. [uj/uɣ, 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 *ə* for spoken [uj/uɣ, ux], and *ô* for spoken [u:]. This rule would have ensured consistency as well as agreement 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. “û” and Sal. “ügh, ükh” (his “ü” represents *u* “as in *full*”) are pronunciations of rbaša “and similar sounds (as *ܪܒܫܐ* or *ܪܒܫܐ*)”, not of rwaḥa. 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 rbaša and rwaḥa is just as arbitrary as that of his predecessors. He has thus missed, for example, a criterion for distinguishing the noun-pattern U. CaCujCa *ܦܚܝܚܐ* from the *nomen agentis* U. CaCu:Ca *ܦܚܝܚܐ*, and it is by sheer luck that he has, in some cases, hit upon the correct spelling. Cf. the following example for CaCujCa (Oraham’s spellings are added for comparison):

	Maclean		Oraham	Fellihi dialects
	Gr.	Dict.		
əmujrə “dense, thick”	ə	ô	ô	—
bərujzə “dry” ²	ô	ô	ə	—
gərujsə “big”	ə	ə	ə	Al. Z. garu:sa
jaqujra “heavy, slow” ³	ô	ô	ə	Al. Z. jaqu:ra

¹ For example, the word for “wedding” *ܩܪܝܬܐ* is spelled with *ə* at Judges ix. 27 (Urmi 1852) and Matt. xxv. 10 (New York, 1874), but with *ô* by Barhebraeus, *Livre des splendeurs*, ed. Moberg, 233, 15 and, presumably on Barhebraeus’s authority, in the Mosul Pshitta (all these references are given by Brockelmann, *Lex. syr.*² 231a). The modern dialects, Al. xlu:lā (Lidzbarski 478), Sal. xlu:lā, U. xlu:lā (references below, note 3, p. 14) confirm *ə*; Maclean *ə*, Oraham *ô*.

² Sal. biruyz(a) Duval 17, 2.

³ Sal. jaquyra Duv. 11, 11.

	Maclean		Oraham	Fellihi dialects
	Gr.	Dict.		
jətuymə "orphan" ¹	ܐ	ܐ	ܐ	Al. Z. jatū:ma
qəlujlə "light, quick" ²	ܐ	ܐ	ܐ	Al. qalu:la
xərujpə "sharp"	—	ܐ ³	ܐ	Al. Z. xaru:pa

The pattern CCo:Ca fares even worse:

	Maclean		Fellihi dialects
	(Dict.)	Oraham	
glulə "round"	ܐ	ܐ	Al. glo:la
pṭuxa "flat, broad"	ܐ	ܐ	Z. pṭo:xa
smuqə "red"	ܐ	ܐ	Al. Z. smo:qa
kumə "black" ⁴	ܐ	ܐ	Al. Z. ko:ma
surə "small" ⁵	ܐ	ܐ	Z. zo:ra ⁶

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

dū:ša "honey" ܕܫܐ	—	dujṣə ⁷
gu:da "wall"	guyda:ni (pl.) 75, 16	gujda, ⁸ gujdəni ⁹
nu:na "fish"	nuyna 12, 6	nujna ¹⁰
nu:ra "fire"	nuyra 30, 11	nujra ¹¹
*nu:ta "petrol" ܢܘܬܐ	nuxta 36, 1	nujta ¹²
su:se (su:sa) "horse"	suxsavaih (pl.) 15, 3; 54, 17	sujsi ¹³ (sujṣə) ¹⁴ (pl.) sujṣəvəti ¹⁵
tu:ma "garlic"	—	tujma ¹⁶
tu:na "straw" ܬܢܐ	tuyna 15, 2	tujna ¹⁷
tu:ṭa "mulberry"	tuxti (pl.) 14, 9	tujṭa ¹⁸
ṭu:ra "mountain"	ṭuyra 28, 18	ṭujra ¹⁹
zu:ze "money"	zuyzi 13, 13	zujzi ²⁰

¹ Sal. jatuyṣi (plur.) Duv. 76, 16.

² Sal. qaluyla Duv. 11, 11.

³ Maclean gives this form as AL; the wrong Rwaḥa is the more surprising as his source (Lidzbarski) has, of course, the correct Rbaṣa; U. xərujpi (plur.) occurs *Ḥəqjetti* 39.

⁴ Sal. ku:ma Duv. 15, 8.

⁵ Sal. su:ra Duv. 2, 10; 29, 8.

⁶ Maclean wrongly "in Al. Z. also zûrâ or z'ûrâ".

⁷ Socin 63, 11.

⁸ Socin 100, 5; *Ḥəqjetti* 27; 61; *Coban* 27.

⁹ *Ḥəqjetti* 55; 65.

¹⁰ Kalašev 187a, 345b.

¹¹ Merx 23; *Coban* 13; 54.

¹² *Ḥəqjetti* 32.

¹³ Merx 17; 18; 19; Socin 43, 17; 109, 11.

¹⁴ Kalašev 81b, 369b.

¹⁵ Merx 7; Socin 43, 20.

¹⁶ Kalašev 233a, 380b.

¹⁷ Socin 77, 1.

¹⁸ Socin 71, 22.

¹⁹ Socin 106, 1.

²⁰ Merx 14; 17; 24; Socin 15, 10; 81, 17; *Coban* 60.

STUDIES IN MODERN SYRIAC

hu:ša:ya "Jew"	huḡdaiḡ (pl.) 82, 8	hujdajə ¹
su:ra:ya "Assyrian"	suyrā 86, 16; pl. suyráih 73, 12	sujrəjə ²
kθu:ta "writing"	ktuxta 59, 4	ktujtə ³
𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤏𐤀 stu:na "pillar"	—	stujnə ⁴
xlu:la "wedding"	xluḡla 3, 3	xlujla ⁵
tanu:ra "oven"	tinuḡra 16, 18	tənujrə ⁶
xabu:ša "apple"	xabbuxši (pl.) 14, 7	xəbujšə ⁷

Exceptions

du:ka "place"	du:ka 85, 7	dukə
šu:la "work"	šu:la 30, 15	šulə
šu:qa "market"	šu:qa 85, 9	but šujqə ⁸

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

(a) -o:na, diminutive ending

ḡaxo:na "brother"	axu:na 83, 14	əxunə
bro:na "son"	bru:na 11, 6; 83, 13	brunə
sawo:na "grandfather"	savu:na 82, 19	səvunə

(b) Pattern CiCCo:na

xižbo:na "account"	xuḡbu:na 27, 17; 41, 21	xizbunə ⁹
--------------------	-------------------------	----------------------

(c) Pattern Ca(:)Co:Ca

ḡalo:la "street"	a:lu:li (pl.) 50, 7	alula
bašo:ra "less, deficient"	bašu:ra 56, 16	basura
kapo:ra "infidel, cruel"	kapu:ra 83, 17	kəpurə
na:ḡo:ra "watchman"	na:ḡu:ri (pl.) 32, 12	naḡura
𐤏𐤌𐤁𐤏𐤀 "tearing (beast of prey)"	paru:ṭi (pl.) 28, 19	paruṭa

(d) All Infinitives of the Second Conjugation

mbaqo:re "to ask"	buquri 71, 21	baqurə
mzabo:ne "to sell"	zubuni 59, 16	zəbuni
Z. maqo:ze "to burn"	muqudi 28, 21	məqudi

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. hujdaji Socin 71, 12.

² Merx 12.

³ Socin 19, 8; 37, 7; *Haqjetti* 51; *Coban* 28; Osipov c't'ūt'a.

⁴ Socin 55, 12; *Haqjetti* 46.

⁵ Merx 15; Socin 97, 19; *Coban* 4.

⁶ *Coban* 4; 55; Osipov line 7.

⁷ Merx 11; 19; Socin 73, 1.

⁸ Kalašev 187a, 406a; Maclean, *Dict.* xix.

⁹ Maclean 107b writes rbaša, also for Al., although his source (Lidzbarski) has rwaša. Similarly, he writes 320b Al. ti/uklo:na "trust" with rbaša (and transcribes tiklūnā) contrary to his source (Sachau; cf. Socin 147, 8).

the U. Sal. correspondents of the last-named pair are in some sources distinguished as follows:

	Al. (etc.) /i:/	Al. (etc.) /e:/
Duval	i (word final ih) ¹	i (in open syllables) ²
Osipov ³	(front) i; (back) ī, word final also (front) ij, ⁵ ij	(front) i:, i:; ⁶ (back) i:
Soviet	(front) ij; (back) ѣj	(front) i; (back) ѣ (open syll.)
Oraham	ey	ee
Yaure	i'	i (word final i)

Examples:

	"beautiful"	"value"	"see"	"stone"
Al. (etc.)	Az. šbi:ra	Z. ʔi:me	Z. ʔzi:	Al. Z. ke:pa
Duval	šipiri (pl.) (14, 4)	ʔima (38, 21; 55, 6)	ʔzih (46, 2)	kipa (56, 2; 75, 16)
Osipov	ʃapira	tīma	ʒziʃ	c'it'p'a
Soviet	ʃəpijə	ʔjma	ʒziʃ	kipə
Oraham	sha-pey-ra	tey-maa	khzey	kee-pa
Yaure	šāpi'ra	ʔi'ma	hzi'	kīpa
(Kalašev	ʃəpiirə	tīma	ʒzii (39, 12)	k'ūp'ə)

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

The spelling ܐ (hbaša) in the usual Syriac orthography is not necessarily evidence for the sound /j/ [i]. In two important verb-forms the model of OS has led to the spelling with hbaša, 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. -i:sa, Sal. "-ita"), U. [i:] is attested by Osipov,⁷

¹ Hbaša, ܐ. Cf. Duval, vi, vii; Nöldeke, *Z.D.M.G.* xxxvii, 599.

² Maclean's "first sound of long Zlama" (*Gr.* 8-9). The vowel-sign called Zlāmā pšiqā (or pšūqā) at Urmi (Stoddard, Maclean Oraham) is called Zlāmā qašjā at Mosul (Jérémie Makdasi, *Grammaire chaldéenne* [in OS] (1889), p. 13; A. Mingana, *Clef de la langue araméenne* (1905), p. 8) and *vice versa*.

³ Osipov's stress-marks are omitted.

⁴ Once also wīva (elsewhere īva) in harmony with za:lum (misprint for za:lum).

⁵ In ʒziʃ (the aspiration-mark preceding this form is a misprint for the stress-mark) "see", alongside of ʃti "drink" (Soviet ʃtij), dīl "know" (Soviet dšj).

⁶ In c'lit'a "standing", see next note.

⁷ c'lit'a (sic, with dotted i) "standing", ʃürʃit'evan (no length-mark) "I am tired", sīt'a (no length-mark) "thirsty".

by the Soviet spelling (i),¹ and by Yaure.² The form in -itə 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-tə :: xzi-li (Al. xze:-le): xzi-tə

This analogy is presumably responsible for the U. forms of the fem. Perf. Part. of the Second Conjugation (including root-final j verbs), šudər-ta (Preterite šudər-rē) as against (m)šudarta 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. juvil-tə (masc. juvə, Pret. juvil-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 ܡܝܩܝܬܘܢ (Nöldeke, *Kurzgef. syr. Gr.* §64; Duval, *Traité de gr. syr.* §183), but the evidence of the modern dialects is divergent: Z. and Az., in any case, have parq:tu(:)h, and the corresponding U. [i:] is attested by the Soviet spelling (pərqitun) and by the Rev. Yaure (personal communication).³ The shape of this ending is probably influenced by that of the 2nd masc. sing., pərqit; 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 ܡܝܩܝܬܘܢ "his father" alongside of ܡܝܩܝܬܘܢ "her father". It is presumably to this supposed analogy that we owe the spellings ܡܝܩܝܬܘܢ (betu) "his house" and ܡܝܩܝܬܘܢ (beto) "her house", ܚܝܙܝܘܢ (xizjuvin) "I have seen him" and ܚܝܙܝܘܢ (bixzəjovin) "I am seeing her".

¹ klitə, šurqitə, sətə (Gorqij 71, 10), etc.

² kliten (= klitivən) "I am standing" 13c.

³ I permit myself to quote his own words: "All verbal forms like ܡܝܩܝܬܘܢ are in Urmia 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': pārqī', with the tone again on the penult. The same rule applies also to the verbs tertiae ܝܬܝܢ, for example, galitun "you reveal"; but we say gali' "they reveal".

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 ܐܝܐ. 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 ܐܝܐ—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,¹ 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.² 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 (ܐܝܐ) and -a (ܐܝܐ), 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 Salamâs m. ܐ, f. ܐ (pl. ܐܐ) gehört dies ev, av 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 *tilā (sic) lāngā lāngu* (spelled **لنگه لنگو**) “(and *Ignorance*) he came hobbling after”.¹ 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 **q** (*Dict.* 149b). 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.² They are formed by reduplication, with the connecting vowel a/ə.³ 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.):

cikkə-cik, cf. cəkcuki "creak, crunch, grate", etc.

qərtə cikkə-cikkovə *Chrest.* II, 44.

cinna-cin

mazraja cinna-cinnuvā "the field was silent" Marogulov 102; ənə bliglij b...pəkərtə d l xadərvanan, d ijlə xaməş-cinna-cinno "I busied myself with...looking at our environment, which was soundless and silent" *Cbrest.* II, 82.

civvə-civ "chirp"; Az. چيڤ چيڤ Isa. x. 14 (چيڤ چيڤ); cf. Kurdish "tchiwe-tchiw, tchiwte-tchiwt gazouillement" Jaba-Justi 137b

Sipri civvə-civve tivlun al ijləni "the sparrows settled chirping on the trees" KLS 65; siprə...civvə-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 (*sic*) lingu lingu (*sic*) bare.

² K. Kurdoev, *Grammatika kurdsogo jazyka* (Moscow-Leningrad, 1957), §§ 204, 260.

³ For example, *cirra-cir* (1) "scream"; (2) "grinding" (Oraham 238b); *c̣̣̣ra-c̣̣̣r* "squeak; sound as of wheels turning on dry axles" (Oraham, *loc. cit.*); *ṃ̣̣ra-ṃ̣̣r* "murmur, grumble" (Oraham 315b; fem. Yohannan 43b); *ṃ̣̣ra-ṃ̣̣ṛ̣̣* "mumbling" (Oraham 314b); *q̣̣̣ra-q̣̣̣r* "croaking (of ravens)" (Kalašev 63, 10; fem. 64, 4); *q̣̣̣ra-q̣̣̣ṛ̣̣* "cluck (brooding hen), cackle" (Oraham 450a); *q̣̣̣ra-q̣̣̣ṛ̣̣* "sound of falling rain" (Oraham 467b); *q̣̣̣ra-q̣̣̣ṛ̣̣* "sound of falling or pouring water" (Oraham 525b); *ṣ̣̣̣mma-ṣ̣̣̣m* "grum-

kirrā-kir “sounds made by domestic fowl”

Ktāji, ordāgi, gazā / Kirrā-kirre b cjmāni “Hens, ducks, geese... in the meadows” *Chrest.* I, 29 = *B'urxā* 39.

kiššā-kiš

Xā qaza xvarneta... kiššā-kiššo bitājiwā duz l gāno “A whitish goose... was coming hissing (*šip'a*) straight towards her (‘Kashtanka’)” *Chrest.* I, 7.

mirca-mirc¹ “smacking of lips” (fem.) Yaure 14d

mircāmircō-la “she is (in the act of) smacking (her lips)” (kindly supplied by the Rev. L. Yaure).

nikkā-nik, cf. nāknuki “groan” (Maclean 183b); “stutter, etc.” (Oraham 337a)?

u av nikkā-nikku vili pātuši go abbu “and he began to fumble... in his breast-pocket” *Chrest.* II, 33.

vistā-vist, cf. vāsvusi

Duli xā kēlbā, b ṭupru sājra qavva d prizlā, vistā-vistu u binvāxā maṭrujā min go alulā “Suddenly a dog, an iron pot tied to his tail, rushed yelping and barking out of a street (lit. Lo... is rushing)” *Chrest.* I, 73.

Although lingā ling- obviously differs from these expressions in not being onomatopoeic, 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/ān, 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 195b); xāššā-xāš “rustling” (Kalašev 51, 3). From such expressions quadriliteral verbs may be derived: Marogulov 82; for a list of onomatopoeic quadriliterals see Maclean, *Gr.* 270-2.

¹ Mircā-mirc or mārca-mārc?

² Kalašev 214a, 383a gives a word xāsa-xāsu “jostling (tolkotn'a)” which looks relevant to the question under discussion. The Rev. L. Yaure kindly informs me that the true form is xāsu-xāsu; the word is an invariable noun of fem. gender: npillā xāsu xāsu go alma u dušdiṣlun udalā “the crowd started to press and push and they trampled upon each other”. He quotes similar formations, for example npillā šrqu šrqu go alma “sauve qui peut”; vilā dēšu dēšu “they started trampling each other”.

³ Stoddard 25; Nöldeke 79; Maclean 18.

⁴ In Z., for example, -an and -e:ni 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 *atren̄j* 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:

ahen̄j “our squire” *Chrest.* II, 44.

atren̄j “our country” *Mois de Marie* 130, 9.

beten̄j “our house” *Socin* 25, 14; *Manuel* 151, 8; 227, 14; *Coban* 51; *Brat̄* 7; 19.

dosten̄j “a friend of ours” *Chrest.* I, 91.

kilp̄atten̄j “our family” *Coban* 8; 51; 76; *Brat̄* 119.¹

k̄alten̄j “our kinsman’s wife” *Chrest.* I, 61.

m̄aten̄j “our village” *Socin* 25, 3; 87, 5; *Chrest.* II, 81.

qaṭunt̄en̄j “our cat” *Marogulov* 12.

rab̄jten̄j “our schoolmistress” *Coban* 21; 22 (but 20 *rab̄jta d’dij̄n*).

ṣv̄aven̄j “our neighbour” *Chrest.* I, 61.

ṣv̄oten̄j “our female neighbour” *Chrest.* I, 72.

xizmen̄j “our kinsman” *Brat̄* 119.

If we read in *B’urx̄* 66, in a militantly patriotic context, of *tuc, pulad, komur, nuṭen̄j* “our [the Soviet Union’s] bronze, steel, coal, and oil” (with *-en̄j* belonging to all four products), we are obviously beyond the narrow and homely circle of persons and things to which *-en̄j* 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 Nöldeke in dem sichtbaren Überwiegen 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. Zweitheilung zeigt sich also auch hier wieder, wenn auch in anderer Form”.

purely statistical preponderance of the forms *priqli* and *ki pəriq* is a matter of *la parole* and justifies no such conclusion as to their status in *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 *qəm pəriqli* is “jedenfalls etwas plump” (297);¹ the Present continuous *bipraqili*, which Nöldeke considers the only worthwhile addition to the tense-system, is allowed to pass as “nicht eben weitläufig” (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).² 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 bipraqə* (310), *bipraqivin* = *ki pərqin* = *ki həvin bipraqə* (313), *bipraqivə* = *ki pəriqvə* = *ki həvivə bipraqə* (306). It must, of course, be remembered that in

¹ Nöldeke himself states (296; after Stoddard 41) that the function of *qəm pəriqli* is to supplement the Preterite *priqli* for the expression of the pronominal complement (cases of *qəm pəriq* without *l-* do, however, occur in Socin's texts: 13, 12/3; 65, 8. 18; 67, 10; 100, 12. 22; also Metx 13, 4, by the same informant). It is true that *qəm pəriqlə* (2nd Conjugation) is practically equivalent to *purqəli*, and *qəm pəriqlun* to *purqəli* [Sal. *purqijli*, see below § VI (1)], but for the 1st and 2nd persons the only alternative to *qəm pəriql-* is the addition of the enclitic pronouns to the Preterite base: 1st masc. sing. *purqinni*, 1st plur. *purqəxli*, etc. (Nöldeke 222–4). 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. *qəm pəriql-* 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 *pəriq* and the indicative *ki pəriq*, and blames Stoddard for setting up a strict and consistent distinction between indicative and subjunctive forms: “ein offener 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 *bajjə* “wishes” alongside of *ki bajjə* (but in the negative always *lə bajjə*) can probably be accounted for by special reasons, cf. Wackernagel, *Vorlesungen über Syntax*, I, 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 *priqili* and *biprəqili* 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:

	SIMPLE TENSES	COMPOUND TENSES	"TEMPS SURCOMPOSÉS"
Praeteritum	<i>priqli</i> (<i>qəm pəriql-</i>)	<i>vili</i>	
Praeteritum in praeterito	<i>priqvəli</i>	—	
Praesens	<i>ki pəriq</i>	(general) <i>ki həvi</i> (synchronous) <i>ijli</i>	<i>bivəjili/vijjili</i> (<i>ijli vijje</i>)
Praesens in praeterito	<i>ki pəriqvə</i>	<i>ki həvive</i> <i>ijvə</i>	
Futurum	<i>bit pəriq</i>	<i>bit həvi</i>	
Futurum in praeterito	<i>bit pəriqvə</i>	<i>bit həvive</i>	
		<i>biprəqə</i> (Progressive) Dynamic	<i>prijqə</i> (Resultant) Static

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 *v.* Static, or Process *v.* 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 həvi. The copula denotes either an action going on ("Present Continuous"), or a state achieved, at the moment of speaking (synchronous Present/Perfect); ki həvi 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 həvi 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 və. 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 həvivə, 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 combines ingressive with durative meaning; when the latter prevails, it is sometimes hard to perceive a difference from ki həvivə; 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 bivəjili prijqə and vijjili prijqə, and no example at all for bivəjili biprəqə, while vijjili biprəqə is adequately, though not abundantly, attested. It corresponds approximately to the English "He has been ...-ing" and to the Persian mīkarda ast.¹

VI. NOTES ON BEDJAN'S LANGUAGE

Bedjan's intention is to write literary U., "chaldaicum, idiomatis Urmiae 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 mī- ("Continuative Perfect", St Clair-Tisdall and Phillott; "perfekt dlitel'nyj", Rastorgueva) than as the Imperfect mīkard 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.¹ -e (spelled ܐܝܬܐ), presumably on the analogy of the Infinitive and the Perfect Participle, which take the possessive suffixes to express the complement. Cf. *dviqijlê* Duval 50, 9 as against *dviqelun* *Vies* 322, 7 "they seized them" (on Sal. -lê v. U. -lun see below, point (3)); cf. the form *ṣviqijlən* "we left them", quoted by Nöldeke 222 n. 1. In *Manuel*, 1st ed., 24, 4 from below Bedjan has permitted himself *ṣurkijlux* "thou hast associated them", duly corrected in the 2nd ed. to *ṣurkelux* (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. -äj).³

(3) *U. -lun v. Sal. -lê*

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 -lê, 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 *katvij*) Duval 68, 20; *hāvē* 22, 18; *xāzē* 37, 15, etc.; Second Conjugation *tinē* 12, 6; 69, 3; 85, 16; *rippē* 28, 9; *ṣillēla* 69, 2; *sippēvālē* 52, 20; *mizdēla* 79, 20, etc.

³ In Z. this -äj is contracted to -e, 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 *vilē* "they became" 22, 5; *rupilē* "they threw" 33, 13, etc.; *axcun dparmijlê ki darēlê* "when they cut them, they put them" 53, 12, etc.; *anijna ditlê* "those are the ones who have" 16, 21; *an dilitlê* "those who have not" 17, 1, etc.

(4) *The verb mattiv "to put"*

This verb has, in U., a curious by-form which Maclean describes, not quite accurately,¹ by saying "sometimes \Rightarrow drops" (Gr. 133), "in some parts of the verb \Rightarrow 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".

	U.		Sal. (Duval)
	(a)	(b)	
"First Present"			
masc. sing.	mattiv	mätti	muttux 7, 19; 42, 21
fem. sing.	mätvə	— ²	mitta 32, 13; 60, 18
plur.	mätvij	mättij	mittij 23, 2; 48, 18
Imp. sing.	mattiv	mättij	
plur.	mätvun	mättimun	
Preterite			
masc. base	muttivli	muttili	
fem. base	mutvəli	muttəli	
plur. base	mutveli ³	mutteli	muttijli 88, 7
Perfect Participle			
masc. sing.	mutvə	muttə	
plur.	mutvi	mutti	
fem. sing. (a)	muttivtə	muttitə	
(b)	mut(t)əvtə ⁴	muttətə	muttēta 42, 15
Infinitive	mättuvi	mättuji	mutūvi ⁵ 49, 19/20; 58, 11
			muttuvi 74, 13
Nom. act.	mättəvtə	mättətə	mittayā(-t-) 77, 7

In U. mätti is treated throughout as a last radical j verb of the Second Conjugation, second division; it is inflected like rapp̄ "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 *mättə.

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; mumṭuvi 33, 5; rupūvi 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 \Rightarrow , but later substituted Yod.

Nöldeke 241-2: "First Present" fem. sing. rappa (*Chrest.* 1, 39; *Qala d-šrara* 321b, 15), but also rapja (Bedjan, *Vies* 35, 21), *Nomen agentis* rappana (*Haqjetti* 119); Preterite, fem. base rappa-lb (*Chrest.* 1, 18; Kalašev 49, 3), but also rupja-lan (*KLS* 63, and thus Bedjan: rupja-lb *Vies* 42, 11; 515, 4), plur. base ruppe-lb (Marogulov 101; *Brata* 106), but also rupje-lb (*Chrest.* 1, 42, and thus Bedjan, *Vies* 65, 10); Perfect Participle, masc. sing. rappa (Stoddard 91; Kalašev 359b; Gorqij 83), but also rupja (*Chrest.* 1, 71, and thus Bedjan, *Mois de Marie* 378, 16), plur. ruppъ (*Chrest.* 11, 46), but also rupjъ (*Chrest.* 1, 65; 67), fem. (a) ruppъta (*Haqjetti* 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 rippē (28, 9; rippēva 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 muttijli; Maclean 138 is silent about Sal., but his "K. Al. Z." form, minus m-, is what we should expect: (from tunuvi = U. t̄nuji) tunē-li (cf. Al. mšurāy "they were begun", Rhétoré, *Gr. de la langue soureth* 143); Bedjan wrote tune-lan (تُنْ) in the 1st ed. of the *Manuel* 214, 1; 370, 5, and changed it to U. tunje-lan in the 2nd ed. (257, 4 from below; 455, 13). Of the Sal. forms mittij and muttijli it is indeed enough to say, as Maclean did of U., that "v has dropped"; they remain outside any regular verb-class.

(5) *parqittij* v. U. *parqitlij*

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 *parqittij* (broad Sal. *pirqittij*) as against U. *parqitlij* (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 Ptaḥa 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.

muṣlimma 79, 13; xuḥbanta 42, 17; buraxta 3, 14; ṭuraṣta 24, 4; mumpaltēla 12, 10; puqāttēla 21, 20, etc.). Bedjan invariably uses the Sal. forms.¹

(7) *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”, qṛḡ-mun “read”, vi-mun “be”, dḡ-mun “know”, haqi-mun “tell”, ṭaṣḡ-mun “hide”, rappḡ-mun “throw”, maddḡ-mun “inform”, saḡṣḡ-mun “examine”, te-mun “come”, me-mun “bring”, etc.

Stoddard 56–7 gives for pəruqi (Second Conjugation, 1st division) the forms pərqun and pərqimun, and adds: “The second form given above, pərqimun, may be used with other verbs, but is not so common, and is now omitted in our books.”—In *Haqqetti* we find pərqimun and pəqdimun (16), məcximun “find” (21), ṣəlximun “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 hāllēmux (Duval 13, 9 hāllēmuxlij “give me”; Nöldeke 226 n. 1 quotes from “Röd.” hallimuylij).

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.): gəṣqemun “look” 69u (gəṣqun 81, 17); ləblemun “bring” 80, 10 (ləblun 93, 18); marmemun “raise” 20, 4 (marmun 22, 13); məksemun “cover” 368, 14 (məksun 452, 1); palṭemun “bring forth” 255, 19 (palṭun 309, 21); qəblemun “receive” 28u (qəblun 32pu); ərqilemun “tarry” 256, 10 (ərqilun 310, 16); pərpilemun “beseech” 21, 20 (pərpilun 24, 13); məlviṣemun “clothe” 255, 20 (məlviṣun 309, 21); mənjaxemun “rest” 154, 3 (mənjaxun 185, 3); həllemun “give” 23, 19 (həlun 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: məxxibimun “love” 67, 13; 72, 17; makṛḡḡmun “preach” 48, 15; kəṣkiṣimun “set (wild animals) to fight” 72, 20. The vowel preceding -mun is spelled -e- (ܐܝ) in the *Manuel*, -i- (ܝ) in *Vies*, -e- (ܐܝ) and -ij- (ܝܝ) in *Mois de Marie*.

An ingenious explanation of this -mun was given by Jušmanov

¹ Cf. in Coban: muttetuvə 15; durbəntivə 18; supetə 41; hudartəla 47; mudəvtilə 47; ḡummetəva 67; mutəvtə 80.

in his article “Zagadočnoe -m- novosirijskogo imperativa”.¹ 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)² in replacement of the somewhat aberrant old forms (Al. xzi:, pl. xzo:; cf. Z. xzi:, pl. xza:wu:n). As to qəblimun (Jušmanov writes qəblijmun), etc., he suggests that three factors, namely, (1) the imperative-like meaning of the Subjunctive 2nd plur. qəblitun (Jušmanov writes qəblijtun), (2) the identical shape of the stem in qəblitun and in the distinctive Second Conjugation imp. plur. pərqun (as against First Conjugation prūqun), (3) the functional insignificance of the “connecting vowel” -i- (J. -ij-) in qəblitun,³ 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 qəblitun the stress is on the penult, while qəblimun, 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:⁴ 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 “strengthened” of the imp. plur. (but why is

¹ *Jazyk i myšlenie*, v (1935), 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.: xzi:–xzi:mü(:)n. Yaure, *J.N.E.S.* xvi, 8; 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.: jtū:mū:n. Brockelmann (see note 4 below) quotes from Merx 43, 11 hajjumun (hə-?) “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 və 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; 109, 4), in Z. it causes the shortening of [e:] to [ɪ], exemplifying what has been called “Kürzung durch Tonanschluss”: Debrunner, *Idg. Forschungen*, XLIV (1927), 116; cf. Jespersen, *Lehrb. d. Phonetik*, 12. 22; *Mod. Eng. Gr.* 1, 4. 71 (“three-syllable rule”).

⁴ In Spuler’s *Handbuch der Orientalistik* (Leiden, 1954), 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 (šqulmun, etc.).

(8) *The verb "to give"*

For a historical analysis of the U. forms see Nöldeke 254²-6; for the dialect forms, Maclean 126. For our present purpose we need only consider the Preterite and the Perfect Participle:

	PRETERITE		PERFECT PARTICIPLE	
	Masc. base	Fem. base	Masc. sing.	Fem. sing.
U.	juvil-li jivil-li	juvə-li jivə-li	juvvə	juviltə
Bedjan (a)	jivil-li	—	jivvə	jivəltə
(b)	hiv-li	hijvə-li	hijvə	hivtə
Sal.	hux-le	—	hijv(a)	huxta

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 jivəltə 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 hivtə are intended to be read as they are written, they are the forms which would have resulted, if iwCV (< iβCV) 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.¹ The following are some of the Turkish words (including Arabic-Persian words with Turkish endings) not in Maclean's *Dictionary*:

ax̄r̄nda "in the end" *Imit.* 67, 20; *Vies* 146, 1; 221 u; 502, 15; 541, 6 from below. Also *Qəb d ʃrara* 415 a, apu.

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

capaql "robbery, raid" *Vies* 237, 14 (Latrocinium Ephesinum); Duval 70, 1; 71, 4; cf. Oraham 233 b capaql "Forayer; one who ravages in search of spoils, a cheater"; plur. capaqilb Coban 39 ("we guarded the sheep from wolves, from c., from the falling of huge rocks": "raids" or "raiders"?). On the word, cf. Bang, *Vom Kōktürk. zum Osm.* 2/3 (*Abh. Berl. Akad.* 1919, Nr. 5), 59, where the NS form could have provisionally filled a gap in the evidence.

daldalam̄š v̄əjə "to seek shelter" *Vies* 456, 12; 638, 8; Kalašev 262 b daldalam̄š v̄əttə "to give shelter", daldalanm̄š v̄əttə "to seek shelter". Maclean 66a has dalda.

nəqap̄ldan² "unexpectedly, suddenly" *Vies* 562, 11; Az. ܢܩܦܝܠܢ [naqafilda:n] Mal. iii. 1; Job ix. 23; Eccl. ix. 12. For the illogical nə- cf. Kalašev 107b, 342a nəqapu/ɫ; for the ablative, Soviet AzT. (Hysejnov) qəfildan.

q̄jt (ܩܝܬ) "few and far between" Manuel 210 u (opp. p̄rja "plentiful"); *Qəb d ʃrara* 541 b, 5 from below; Duval: qit 17, 16; "q̄ituva" 17, 7 ("manque"), "q̄itu:v̄ə(t-)" 16, 15 ("défaut").

təlsug "quick" *Vies* 503, 17; -utə *ibid.* 309, 1; common in Az. (ܬܠܫܘܬ); Azt. təlsik.

təzədən "anew" *Imit.* 165, 4 from below; *Manuel* 249, 15; 334, 6; 484, 9; 487, 12; Duval 11, 4; 81, 12; Kalašev 376a; cf. min təzədən (*sic*) *Qəb d ʃrara* 243 a, 4 from below; 300a, 4.

təzələmis v̄ədə "to renew" *Imit.* 212, 9; *Manuel* 54, 2; *Mois de Marie* 270, 8; *Vies* 105, 5; 155, 19; Kalašev 376a təzələtm̄š v̄əttə (təzələnmiš v̄əttə "to renew oneself").³

¹ 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; *Mois de Marie* 87, 1.

² For the disharmonious vowels I rely on Kalašev. Persian nā-ṣāfil ("modern colloquial and vulgar": Phillott, *Colloquial English-Persian Dictionary* s.v. Suddenly; *Higher Pers. Grammar* 166).

³ Kalašev is always careful to provide the Turkish verbs with the appropriate suffixes of the deverbial 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 (factive) being taken care of by the Syriac auxiliaries v̄əjə "to be" and v̄ədə "to make" respectively. To take Stoddard's (126) example of "the Turkish perfect participle . . . dragged

This lack of purism, especially in respect of Turkish,¹ seems to have displeased some members of the educated younger generation. Their criticism is reported and refuted by a young Chaldean living in Paris, a former pupil of the Lazarists, Jacques Babakhan (Mirzā Jəqu bar Babaxan),² 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'attaquât à la langue savante ou à la terminologie scolastique, 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'Ourmiah 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", inçimiş vili "he became injured" (for example, Merx 32; *Imit.* 55, 16; Bedjan even derives an abstract substantive from inçimiş: inçimişutā *Imit.* 126, 3), the replacement of vili by vidli suffices to change the meaning to "he injured (him)". This is stated by Yohannan 44-5, and confirmed, for example, by inçimiş lā vidlā qə Petrovi "(the Secret Police) did not hurt the Petrovs" *Həqjətti* 15; Kalašev 293a, on the contrary, gives inçitmiş vətə alongside of inçijmiş vetā. His aspaplanmēš vetā "to arm oneself" and aspaplandərmēš vətə "to arm" (244a) is at variance with gəne aspablamēš vijdovā "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 prefaces them with the curious footnote, "Perhaps some of these hymns were composed by those Mongols [Tatars] who became Christians. 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 *Qələ d şarar*: 237a-238a (a letter on his success in Paris, especially his being made Officier d'académie); 295a-297b (on meteors).

(1) *The Infinitive of "to give"*

Alongside of the normal Infinitive *jəvə* (cf. Z. *jha:wa*), the Soviet books also use *jəvuli*, which I have not read in other sources. This form goes merely one step beyond the standard form of the noun of action *jəvəltə* (contrast Z. *jho:ta*), 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 *məvi* we find *məvə* (thus also Oraham 288a). The -v- of *məvi* represents the last trace of [u:] plus the glide v (see above, note 5, p. 25): **mau:vi* (cf. Fellihi *me:θo:ye*, *maθo:ye*). The characteristic Second Conjugation pattern *CaCu:Ci* was thus altered beyond recognition; *məvə* 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, *mərutə mətetə*, 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", *xudožestvennaja 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.