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A Distinguished Family of Fatimide Cadis (al-Nu'man) in the Tenth Century.—By Richard Gottheil, Professor in Columbia University, New York City.

I. Introduction.

In the whole of Mohammedan history there are few epochs quite as interesting as that during which the Shi'a propaganda manifested itself politically in Egypt, maintaining there for more than 200 years a kingdom which was a center of commercial and literary activity. The religious side of this propaganda was kept alive by the usual Alid turgiversations, and from out of this upbuilding came much of the turmoil in which Druze and Ismailian pretensions were hatched.

It seems to have been a somewhat simple matter for the people of Egypt to pass from one system to another. They were willing to take their religion as it was given to them, and at no time do they seem to have thought with Goethe:

“Was du erbäbt von deinen Vätern hast,
Erwirb es, um es zu besitzen.”

In spite of the large Coptic element in the population,¹ it had not been too difficult a task to impress the faith of the prophet upon the land of the Pharaohs. Egypt is the classic home of the corvée; and, whether used by an old Pharaoh in dragging his statue to the place of its permanent situation, or by 'Amr ibn

¹ This has been excellently set forth in Butler's Arabic Conquest of Egypt, Oxford, 1902.
al-Âsî in re-cutting the canal that once joined lower Egypt to the Red Sea, or by Ismail Pasha in helping the French to build a Suez Canal, it shows a more than ordinary apathy on the part of the inhabitants, and a singular willingness to acquiesce quietly in the stings and goads of fortune. In the same manner, it does not seem to have been too difficult for them to pass from the Sunnite faith to the Shi'ite (if faith it may be called), when Ja'far al-Kâ'id conquered the country in 969 for his master al-Mu'tizz; and they were as ready to fall back again upon the Sunna when the Kurd Saladin, in September, 1171, caused the Khûtbah to be pronounced in the name of the Abbâsid caliph, al-Musta'dî.

One reason for the case with which these changes were effected must be found in the small difference it made to the people at large whether in the official utterances Ali was blessed or cursed. That was food for the theologians and a tid-bit for the jurists. The lower classes had to live their every-day and humdrum life as they had done in the past; and the differences between Sunnite and Shi'ite actual practice seems to have been small—
to us they appear infinitesimal.¹ The geographical writer al-Mu'addasî has an interesting passage on the observances peculiar to the Fatimides.² He says: "There are three classes of Fatimide peculiarities. The first is one in which the (orthodox) Imams were also divided, as the long inserted or supererogatory prayer³ at the morning devotions and the audible recitation of

¹ This is due to the fact that the Shi'a system was developed at a time when the other and canonical legal systems were already in existence. Both the Sunna and the Shi'a, as regards their religious practices, are built up from one and the same basis. See Von Krenner, Culturge- schichte, vol. i, p. 501; id. Herrschende Ideen, p. 389.


³ De Sacy (Chrestomathie Arabe, vol. i, p. 102), says that the قنوت is the prayer containing the formula أئمّا لک فائتون; but see the tradition
the basmallah, the *witir* which goes with the rak'a, and the like. Their second peculiarity is to return to some of the observances of former generations, as the double repetition of the

The silent prayer between the rak'as is called (Goldziher, *Muhammedanische Studien*, vol. ii, p. 253). A. Querry, *Droit Musulman*, vol. i, p. 81, calls it "le recueillement," while Tornauw (l. c., p. 57) explains it thus: "le Kenut, qui consiste à élever les bras après l'accomplissement des pratiques muskerenot et à répéter des interjections ferventes. Le Kenut n'est point obligatoire." See, also, Hughes, *Dictionary of Islām*, pp. 101. 1; 482. 2. Curiously enough, Muhammad ibn Aḥmad al-Khwārazmī in his *Mafātīḥ al-'Ulūm* (ed. Van Vloten, 1895), p. 11, says

1 See the traditions on this point in al-Bukhārī, vol. i, pp. 197, 198, 201, and al-Nawā'ī, as cited by Goldziher, *Beiträge*, pp. 457, 532, and in Ibn Snud, vol. v. (Leiden, 1905) p. 266 (when Mohammed recited the first Sūra he was not heard to add the basmallah. Asked about this, he answered: (لو أسررتها يَجْهَرْتُ بِهَا). Until the year 258 A. H. the basmallah was recited aloud in Fustāṭ; then a change was made; but al-Jauhar reintroduced the older practice in 362 A. H.; see de Sacy, l. c., vol. i. p. 103. The Shāfiʿī practice was in this respect, as in so many others, in consonance with that of the Shī'a. See the quotation from Abu-1-Fidā on p. 220, n. 3; and Abū al Naṣīb al-Tantūrī (Kazan, 1899), p. 41. Al-Zamakhshārī (al-Kashfī, ed. Lees, vol. i, p. 5), has an interesting note upon the different usage in this respect. According to him, the difference depended upon the question whether the basmallah was or was not an integral part of the Sūra: the "readers" (قُرآء) of Medina, Bāṣra and Damascus held that it was not, and therefore did not read it aloud when it occurred in a prayer (وَلَذَلِكَ لَا يُجِهِرَ بهَا عند هم في الصلوة); but those of Mecca and Kufrā did. See, also, al-Baiqāwī, vol. i, p. 2.

2 The *witr* is a prayer accompanied by an uneven number of rak'as—from one up to eleven. See al-Shīrāzī, *al-Tanbīḥ*, p. 27. 5.
ikāma which the Banū Umayya had reduced to one;¹ the wearing of white, which the Banū al-‘Abbās had changed to black.²

The third peculiarity is to follow such customs as the Imāms had indeed not prohibited, though they had not been known before this time: e. g., to use the expression حَجِّي عَلَى الصَّلَاحُ "Come to prayer!" in the adhān;³ to celebrate that day as the first of the month on which the new moon is sighted;⁴ and to accompany the prayer said at an eclipse with five rak‘as and two sujūds to every rak‘a."⁵

The religious and juridic rite originally followed by the Mohammedans in Egypt had been that of Mālik ibn Anas;

¹ The āqāma is the call to prayer which immediately follows the adzān. See Dozy, vol. ii, p. 424; Tornauw, Le Droit Musulman, p. 57: "Après le azon on prononce l'ekomeh. Ce sont les mêmes paroles: Allah Akbér—seulement dans l'ekomeh on ne jette l'exclamation que deux fois, tandis qu'on la repète quatre fois dans l'azon." A. Querry, Droit Musulman, vol. i, p. 66.

² See the material upon the various colors affected by different Muḥammadan parties which I have collected in ZA., vol. xiii, p. 104, note 1, and vol. xiv, p. 228, note 7. The change to white dress was immediately introduced upon al-Jauhar's gaining possession of the mosque of 'Amr (الجَمِيعَةُ العَتِيقَةُ) in Fostūf. See Stanley Lane-Poole, History of Egypt, p. 108 and the following note.

³ According to Abu-l-Fidā the expression was حَجِّي عَلَى خَيْرِ العَمْلِ; He says (vol. ii, p. 498) وَفِي جَمِيعِ الْأَوَّلِ مِنَ السَّنَةِ تَسْعَ وَخَمِسِينَ وَنَثْلِيَاتُ قَدِمَ جَوَّهُ الْجَمِيعِ إِنَّ دُوْلَةَ وَأَمْرَ يَا ذُنْبِ بَعْضِهِ عَلَى خَيْرِ العَمْلِ. ثمَّ اذَنَ بَعْدَهُ فِي الْجَمِيعِ العَتِيقِ بِذَلِكَ فَجَوَّهُ الْجَمِيعِ عَلَى الصَّلَاحِ بِبَسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ. The same account is found in Ibn Sa‘d, ed. Tallqvist, p. 77. See, also, J.A. 1836, 3, p. 57, Ibn Khallikān, vol. i, p. 344, and Ibn Khaldūn, Kitāb al‘Ibar, vol. iv, p. 304; and especially al-Makrīzī, Khīṭat, vol. ii, pp. 340, 342, and the full account, ib. p. 269.


but when in 813 Muḥammad al-Shāfiʿī came to settle definitely in Fostāt, his legal doctrines commenced to gain prevalence and they remained prevalent until in the 16th century the Turks introduced the Hanafite system. Upon the arrival of al-Muʿizz, it was natural that this should be changed. But the Fatimides seem to have been rather large-minded in this respect, if not in others. They were sufficiently latitudinarian to allow all the four forms of Mohammedan canon law to be taught in the schools and to be used by the adherents of different parties. From the time of al-Mustansir on, we read of Shāfiʿite doctors being appointed to the chief cadiship. Al-Muʿizz himself seems to have gone slowly in forcing upon the country Shāfiʿite practices. The cadi whom he found in office, Aḥbāb Tahir, received permission to continue his functions. Probably he fitted himself conveniently into the changed circumstances; for it is related that he came to Alexandria and greeted the new caliph in a somewhat ostentatious manner. Al-Maqrizi is quite explicit in his statement that Shāfiʿite law was first taught in Cairo by the son of the Fatimide cadi whom al-Muʿizz had brought with him. “Fatimide law,” he says, “according to Shāfiʿite doctrine was first taught at the Azhar in Safar 365 (975), when ṢAli Ibn al-Nuʿmān, the cadi, sat in the Cairo mosque known as the Azhar and dictated a compendium of law composed by his father for the Shāfiʿites.” This work was called al-Iktisār.

---

3 See Guyard in J.A., 1877, 1, p. 335.
4 In the year 425 A.H. four cadis were appointed: An Imāmī, an Ismaʿīlī, a Malikite and a Shāfiʿite. See al-Maqrizi, Khīṭaf, vol. ii, p. 348 et seq.
5 The Shīʿa naturally looked with more favour upon the Shāfiʿite system, because of the position the latter took in regard to the use of the Qurān. See Goldziher, Beiträge, pp. 485, 500.
6 أهل البيت, a favorite designation with which the Shīʿa glorified its political leaders. They, therefore, speak of the سنة أهل البيت, see Goldziher in ZDMG., vol. xxxvi, p. 279.
7 I have the quotation from Muṣṭafā Bāiram’s رسالة on the Azhar Mosque (Cairo, 1321 A. H.), p. 28. [See al-Khīṭaf, vol. ii, p. 341.] The title of this work is said by Ibn Khallikān (vol. iii, p. 565) to have been ‘al-Iktisār;” see further on p. 228.
Ya'qūb ibn Killis (the renegade Jew and the first Fatimide vizier) went further than did his master. During the reign of al-'Azīz, the son of al-Mu‘izz, the Califh compelled—as al-Maḳrīzī also tells us—all the poets, philosophers, and learned men to come to his house and listen to the exposition of a little book that Ibn Killis had put together containing whatever of Isma'ili canon law he had heard from al-Mu‘izz and al-'Azīz. On Tuesdays and on Fridays he was accustomed to hold a special levee, at which he expounded Fatimide theories. The caliph made attendance at these levees compulsory upon the learned men and the doctors; a special building being erected for that purpose next to the Azhar. During the reign of al-Ḥākim, the people were in such dread of their ruler that they joined the Shī‘a in large numbers and ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Nu‘mān had to hold daily sessions, at which the initiated were received. The theologians had evidently gained the upper hand; and how stringent the spirit was liable to become may be seen from the fact that in the year 381 (991) a man was actually driven from the city because a copy of Mālik’s al-Muwaṭṭa had been found in his possession. In the year 380 (990) a special Jāmi‘—called al-Jāmi‘ al-Ḥākimī—was erected for the benefit of the Shī‘a propaganda; but it was not finished until the year 403 (1012).

As all Mohammedan law is really canonical law, the commander of the ship of state had to depend very largely upon his steersman at the helm. That steersman was usually and naturally the cadi, and the cadi at first had a position second only to that of the caliph himself. If al-Maḳrīzī is to be credited, al-Mu‘izz had no vizier at all; and the duty of spreading Shī‘a doctrine and of consolidating Shī‘a practices devolved upon the cadi. The position that he held was therefore an important one; and, in addition, at times the superintendency of the mint and of the bureau of weights and measures was also in his hands. After a while the cadi also became the chief

1 al-Maḳrīzī in Jamaeddnī Togri-Bardī Annales, ed. J. E. Carlyle (Cantab. 1792), Notes, p. 5.
2 De Sacy, Les Druses, p. ccxi.
preacher. 1 The holders of the office must therefore have been men of some significance, and their history is closely intertwined with that of the country itself. August Müller, in speaking of the Barmecides, and, the services that they rendered to the Abbāsid caliphate of Bagdad, calls attention to the fact that

1 Upon the various functions attributed to the cadi in addition to the judgesthip, see the instructive remarks of Ibn Khaldūn, MUKADDAŠIMAT, p. 192 below. Āḥmad ibn 'Ali al-Kallāshandī, in his work on the geography and administration of Egypt, (at least in the part translated by Wüstenfeld in Abh. der Königl. Gesell. der Wiss. Göttingen, 1879, p. 184) speaks only of the surveillance of the markets being at times in his hands. Happily, the whole of this informing work is in course of publication by the Khedivial Library in Cairo. The importance of the "Chief Preacher" in the Fatimide period is justly brought out by al-Maqrīzī (al-Khiṣṭāt, vol. i, p. 390; see, also, De Sacy, l. c., vol. i, p. 140); upon him rested a good part of the burden to propagate Shi'a doctrines. Al-Kalāshandī seems to know nothing of the union of the offices of Qāṣī billāh and dā'i al-dhu'afa' but al-Maqrīzī has the following:

... Theoretically, it was the vizier to whom the functions of the cadi belonged (see Mawardi, Constitutiones politicae, ed. R. Enger, Bonn 1853, p. 89, 1); if he was unwilling to exercise the functions he could appoint deputies. This must be the meaning of al-Maqrīzī (Khiṣṭāt, vol. i, p. 408):

... But historically, the union of the two offices (viziership and cadiaship) occurred only in a few cases; al-Kalāshandī, in his account of the wāzir (l. c., p. 181) knows nothing of it. Aḥmad ibn Sa'd al-Dīn al-Ghumrī in his al-Ifrīd al-'alām (Paris Ms. 1850) mentions the cases of Aḥmad ibn Zakariyā and Ibrāhīm ibn Kudaina. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Iyās recalls that al-Yaẓūrī, at the time of the Fatimid al-Mustānṣir, filled both offices:

... According to al-Shirāzī, the ultimate authority in the appointing of a cadi was vested in the spiritual or virtual head of the community:

...
for more than fifty years this family was in the service of the state. He adds: "Das ist meines Wissens sonst überhaupt nicht und anderswo selten genug dagewesen." It is therefore not without interest to see that in the early years of the Fatimides, and for a term covering more than eighty years, the office of cadi was held (with periods of intermission) by members of one and the same family, named al-Nu‘mān; and I have tried in the following paper to reconstruct the history of this family from both printed and manuscript sources.

In addition to the individual biographies of cadis in such dictionaries as that of Ibn Khallikān and its continuation by Muḥammad Ibn Shākir al-Kutubi, the history of the cadi in the chief Islamic centers formed a special branch of Mohammedan biographical science. In his chapter on 'Im al-Ta‘rifkh, Hājī Khalīfa divides this science into the following categories: 1, the general history of the cadis; 2, the history of the cadis of Egypt; 3, the history of the cadis of Bagdad; 4, the history of the cadis of Baṣra; 5, the history of the cadis of Cordova; and 6, the history of the cadis of Damascus.

The history of the Egyptian cadi seems first to have been written by Abū 'Umar Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kindī down to the year 246 A. H. (860). This was continued by Abū Muhammad Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Zūlāk, who carried it down to and through the biography of Muḥammad ibn al-Nu‘mān (386 A. H., i. e. 996). Hājī Khalīfa says that an appendix to this work of Ibn Zūlāk was written by Shihāb al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Ḥajār up to the year 852 A. H. (1448) under the title

2 Fawā'īl al-Wafayāt, Bālāk, 1388 and 1389 A. H.
4 A Ms. of this work is in the British Museum; see de Goeje in ZDMG. vol. 1, p. 741. Al-Kindī's Kitāb Maṣr ʿan Fadā'il-hāma was published in 1896 by J. Östrupp, (Bulletin de l'Académie Royale, Copenhagen, 1896, No. 4), who has made it probable that this little tract of Abū 'Umar was published by his son 'Umar al-Kindī.
5 Abū-l-Faḍl Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥajār was born in Ascalon (al-Askalānī) in 1372 and officiated as Chief Cadi in Cairo from 1424 to 1449. This will explain his interest in the history of his predecessors in office. He was a most fruitful writer on ḥadīth, and biography—as well as something of a poet. See a list of his works in
This work of Ibn Ḥajar seems to be more than a mere appendix. It is really a biographical dictionary, arranged in alphabetical order, and probably contains all the data to be found in the preceding works. The *Raf' al-Iṣr* was continued by the author's pupil, Shams al-Dīn Muhammad ibn ʿAbd al-Rahmān al-Sakhawī, who entitled his work *Būghiyat al-ʿulūmāʾ wa al-rara* (That which is desired in regard to the, etc.). It seems a pity that the work of Ibn Zūlāk has not come down to us; al-Siyūṭī and Ibn Khallikān evidently made use of it, as they cite it several times. Nor has Ibn Zūlāk's other work, *Tārīkh Māṣr wa Fāṣaṣālāhā* (Chronicles of Egypt and its Kingdoms), shared a better fate. I cannot believe that the Paris Ms. 1817 is really the work of so


1 Those portions which deal with the family al-Ḥurmān will be found below, both in text and in translation based upon the Paris Ms. No. 2149. A second (and more correct) Ms. has lately been added to the same collection from the library of the late Ch. Schefer. It is numbered 5893. No. 2152 of the same collection, containing the *Jāmīʾ al-Raḥiḥ wāt takhīṣ* (Chronicle of the Cairo) by Ibn Ḥajar's grandson, Jamāl al-Dīn Yūsuf ibn Shāhīn, is practically identical with the work of Ibn Ḥajar; despite the author's remarks in the preface that his grandfather's work was incomplete because death prevented him from making a thorough revision. The two Mss. of Ibn Shāhīn that I have examined (Paris 2152 and Berlin 9819) are very similar and are evidently of the same provenance. They are very correct, the Paris Ms. having been revised by the author; though they are difficult of use for text-critical purposes, as the discrimitational points are wanting for the most part and the script is minute.

2 A *mukhtasar* of this was composed by ʿAlī ibn al-Luṯf al-Shāfīʿī. See Hājī Khalīfa, vol. iii, p. 473; vol. iv, p. 561.


4 On Ibn Zūlāk see Ibn Khalīkān (de Slane's translation) vol. i, p. 388—who mentions only his topographical description of Egypt and his history of the Egyptian cadis. The latter, it is known, was merely a continuation of a work with the same title by al-Kindī.
important an authority as Ibn Zālāk seems to have been. It is hardly of more worth than Ms. 1816 of the same library, and of which the compilers of the catalogue very properly say "cect opuscle ne renferme que des fables." I may also mention Ms. 1819, which the catalogue describes as identical with Ms. 1817. At a later date Aḥmad ibn Saʿd al-Dīn al-Ghumrī al-Shāfiʿī wrote a history of Egypt down to the year 1640 in double ṭujuz verses, with the dates given in the form of chronograms. To this he appended a list of the cadis. To write such and many other things in verse was often an affectation of an Arab writer. Even before the time of al-Ghumrī, a similar thing had been done by one Abū Ḥabdallāh Muḥammad ibn Dāniyāl al-Manṣūlī al-Khuwāṇī (died November, 1310), an oculist in Cairo, dealing specifically with the cadis of Egypt in ninety-nine verses of a like kind; to which al-Siyūṭī added those who had officiated from the time of Badr al-Jamāʿa up to his own day (1481). Probably more important than these works must have been a history of Egypt written by Muḥammad ibn Abī-

---

1 Catalogue, p. 380. كناب فضلائل مصر وأخبارها وخواصها 
جواعي البحور ونتائج الأمور وعجائب الدهم وأخبار الديار. 
المصرية

2 Another Ms. of this work is described in Flügel, Die arabischen... Handschriften der k. k. Hofbibliothek zu Wien, vol. ii, p. 148. See, also, Blochet in Revue de l'Orient Latin, vol. vi, p. 480. A renewed examination of Paris Ms. 1816, 1817, 1818, 1819 and 1820 has convinced me that not one of them can really claim to be the work of Ibn Zālāk. Nos. 1817, 1818, 1819 and 1820 exhibit practically one and the same text; 1817 and 1819 going back to one and the same Ms. As these discuss events as far down as the Ottoman invasion, it is impossible that 1817 is by Ibn Zālāk. Nos. 1816 and 1818 are for a great part merely a shorter and a longer recension of one and the same treatise. No. 1816, fol. 45b mentions the 'Ukūd al-Durūṣya of al-Jazzār, who died in 1281 A.D. I hope to return to Ibn Zālāk upon another occasion.

3 Brockelmann, l. c., vol. ii, p. 287. There are some 9,000 verses in the Berlin Ms. of this work. See Ahlwardt's Catalogue, No. 9881. I have given, further on, that portion which deals with the al-Nuʿmān family, taken from Paris Ms. No. 1850.

4 Brockelmann, l. c., vol. ii, p. 8. They form the basis for Ibn Ḥajar's Ṭafṣīr al-Īṣr, and are there cited in full.

5 Both are printed in al-Siyūṭī's Ḥusn al-Muḥāḍara (Cairo, 1821), vol. ii, pp. 117–131.
1-Ḳāsim ‘Ubaid Allāh ibn Ahmad al-Musabbiḥī (976–1029). This work, entitled كتاب اخبار مصر وفضاء لهم, is said to have comprised some 26,000 pages, and is frequently quoted as one of the best authorities; but only an occasional part has remained to testify to its worth. There are, of course, plentiful notices about the Egyptian cadis in the monumental work of al-Maqrizī (1364–1442; al-Khiṭṭat); and al-Siyūṭī in his Ḥusn al-Muḥādara has a special chapter, headed ذكر قصة مصر. The material for this present study has been gotten chiefly from the dictionary of the Egyptian cadis by Ibn Ḥajar, from the biographical dictionary of Ibn Khalilikān, from the Khiṭṭat of al-Maqrizī, and from the short notices on the family to be found in Ibn Khalidun’s Kitāb al-Ifbar, vol. iv (p. 55). Ibn Khalilikān and Ibn Ḥajar have evidently used very much the same sources— Ibn Ẓālak and al-Musabbiḥī.

II. The Family of Al-Nu’mān.

Kāfūr the Irshād had placed Abū Tāhir Muḥammad ibn Ahmad ibn ‘Abdallāh al-Baghdādī al-Dīhī al-Malikī in office as cadi during the year 348 A.H. He remained cadi, some say for sixteen, others for eighteen years. When al-Mu’izz came to Egypt on Sha’bān 23, 362 (May 29, 973), he brought with him his own cadi, al-Nu’mān. The father of al-Nu’mān, Abū

---

1 His biography is given in Tallqvist, Fragmenta des Ibn Sa‘d, pp. 96–99; 102–104; Ibn Khalilikān (transl.) vol. iii, p. 87. He lived 976–1029. See, also, Becker, l.c., i, pp. 16, 32 et al. It is well known that the name is often found in Mss. as المسكي. For the correct pronunciation, in addition to the authorities quoted by Becker, l. c., p. 16, note 3, see Ibn Khalilikān, vol. iii, p. 90, and al-Dhahabī, al-Mustabih, ed. P. de Jong., 1881 p. 64.  
3 According to Abu-l-Maḥāsin (vol. ii, p. 488) al-Nu’mān was originally a follower of the Ḥanifite School. The nominal phrase ابن حمّد أبو الْحَنَيْفَة المِغْرِبِيَّ الباطنِيَّ قائَمِي مِلْكَةَ الْبَعْرُ وكان حَنْفِيَّ الْمَذَهِّبِ لأنّ العَرب كان يُؤمَّن ذاكَ غَالَبَةَ حَنْفِيَةَ إلاّ أنّ حَمْلَ النَّاسِ عَلَى مَذَهِّب مَالِك فَنَّطٍ. He is here designated as belonging to the Bāṭiniyya; which, I believe, is merely the equivalent of the ordinary term.
Hanifa, was himself a well-known littérateur, who had died at the advanced age of 104. Al-Nu‘mān had acted as cadi to the army of the Fatimides on its journey from the land of the Berbers; but Abū Tāhir came to Alexandria to meet al-Mu‘izz, and seems to have pleased al-Mu‘izz so much that he was allowed to continue in office. Ibn Nu‘mān had thus little to do; but occasionally he was called upon to revise the judgments given by Abū Tāhir. One of these cases must have occurred in the year 974, for he died before the case was concluded, either on Rajab 1, or on the last day of Jamāda 363 A.H. Al-Nu‘mān seems to have been a learned jurist. At first an adherent of the school of Mālik, at a later time he adapted himself to the Shi‘a teachings of his master, al-Mu‘izz. To his first period belongs a work کتاب اختلاف أصول المذاهب dealing with the different principles upon which the various schools founded their systems. He then became an ardent Fatimide, and placed his pen in its service, writing a work اختلاف الفقهاء upon the differences between the jurists, in which he defended the Shi‘a claims. To the same class belongs his كتاب ابتداء الدعوة العبيدية, an account of the first preaching of Fatimide doctrines. Two further juridic works written by him are mentioned: كتاب الانتصار and كتاب الأخبار (The Triumph or Vindicator); but to what subject they refer, we do not know; and a poetic piece (Choice Selection). Only one of his writings


See the case cited by Ibn Ḥajār. According to the latter, this occurred on the 25th day of the month: but the name of the month is not given.

Or, perhaps more correctly; كتب افتتاح الدعوة الطاغية كتب البقا as given by al-Makrīzī in his . A small extract from this work is given by Quatremère in J.A. 1886, ii, p. 128. See, also, Brockelmann, l.c. vol. 1, p. 188.
on law seems to have been spared on the excellency of the prophet and the claims of Ali, which may be the mentioned above; while of his three polemical work against Abū Hanīfā, Mālik, al-Shāfi‘ī and al-Surājī, one may be the. He is also said to have written a work on the “meritorious and disgraceful acts (committed by the Arabian tribes).” He is praised by Ibn Zālāk for his knowledge of the Koran, of Arabic poetry, philology, pre-Islamic history, and jurisprudence. He left several sons, two of whom followed him in the office of cadi.

Abū Tāhir was evidently growing old, and al-Mu‘izz gave him as assistant or associate the son of al-Nu‘mān, Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Ali. ‘Ali was born in Rajab 328 (940), probably in Mahdiyya, the city in which the dynasty took its rise. He officiated in the Jāmī‘ al-‘Āṭik in old Cairo, while Abū Tāhir had his own Majlis. When al-Mu‘izz died, in 365 A. H. (976), his successor al-‘Azīz confirmed the arrangement made by his father. In addition, Abū al-Husain was appointed over the mint, an office often committed to the care of the cadi in those days, as well as over the two mosques, probably the one in Fostāṭ and the other in Cairo. This double authority could naturally not last long. A case is mentioned where Abū Tāhir imprisoned certain persons, who however appealed to ‘Ali and were set free. As age and disease crept over him, Abū Tāhir had to be carried about; and one day he met the caliph at the Bab al-Diyāfa and asked him to

1 Berlin Ms. No. 9663, though this seems to contain only an extract from the larger work on “die Vorzüglichkeit des Profeten und die Berechtigung Ali’s auf die Nachfolgerschaft.”
3 Ibn Khalilikān, however, says Rabī‘ i. 329.
5 The Bab al-Diyāfa must have been near to the citadel. There was a palace called Dar al-Diyāfa. See Casanova, La citadelle du Caire in the Mémoires of the Mission archéologique française du Caire, vol. vi, p. 788, and Ibn Iyās, كتاب تاريخ مصر (Būlāk 1811, A.H.), vol. i, pp. 147, 4; 310, 18. Ibn Khalilikān says “near the Dar al-Ṣanā‘a” (al-Maqrizi, al-Khīṭat, vol. ii, p. 178).
appoint his son Abū al-ʿAlā as his substitute. This favor was denied and after three days he was deposed and the sole caliphship was given to Ali. It seems, however, that Ali’s power was at that time not quite complete. The friends and patrons of Abū Tāhir interceded for him, and he continued his functions in his own house, perhaps revising the judgments given in other courts. Ali was now publicly invested in the two mosques; in that of old Cairo it was his own brother Mohammed who read out his diploma. His appointment was complete not only over all Egypt, but over those countries also subject to the Egyptian Caliph. In addition he was appointed chief preacher, inspector of gold and silver, and controller of weights and measures. Ali, himself, soon needed assistance. His brother Mohammed was appointed to be his deputy in Tinnīs, Damietta and Faramā; while a second deputy was added in the person of al-Ḥasan ibn Ḥalīl. The latter was a follower of al-Shāfiʿī; but a special order was given him to decide according to the Shīʿa rite.⁷

In the year 367⁶ the caliph al-ʿAzīz was called to Syria to quell the revolt of the Carmathians, whom his lieutenant, Jauhar, had been unable to hold in check. He took his cadi, Ali, with him, and Ali’s brother Mohammed was appointed his substitute during his absence. Some enemies spread the report that he had in reality been superseded; and from where he was with the army he was forced to send word to the prefect of police, Ḥasan ibn al-Ｋāsim, asking him to deny the rumor and to strengthen the hand of his brother. Ali was upon very friendly terms not only with al-ʿAzīz, but also with his vizier, Jacob ibn Killis. It is said that he was the first to bear the title “Chief Cadi” in his diploma.⁴ Before his time the title had been granted only to the cadi at Bagdad. Ali died on

---

¹ Ibn Khallikān has "two days."
² See supra, p. 218, note 2.
³ Not 368, as Ibn Ḥajar has. See Wüstenfeld, Fatimiden Califen, p. 138-9; de Goeje, Mémoire sur les Carmathes du Bahraïn (Leiden, 1886), p. 192.
⁴ Ḫuşn, vol. ii, p. 101. He seems to have been recognized as chief cadi, though the title was not given to him in his diploma. According to Ibn Khallikān (vol. iv, p. 273), the celebrated Abū Yusuf Yaʿkūb al-Anṣārī, the author of the Kitāb al-Kharāj, was the first to have the title. قاضي الفضالة.
Rajab the 6, 374 (Dec. 3, 984). Al-‘Azîz, who was in camp at al-Jubb, a plain near Cairo, where all sorts of assemblies popular and military were held, came to the city, and himself said the prayers over the corpse, which was then buried in the Ḥamrâ." He was a well educated man, learned in jurisprudence, philology, polite literature and poetry. In fact, he was something of a poet himself, and a few of his verses are cited by al-Tha‘âlibî in his Yatîmat al-Dahr, by Abû al-Ḥasan al-Bakhrâzî, and by Ibn Zâliḳ.

Ali’s brother, Abû ‘Abdallâh Muḥammad, who had acted as his substitute while he was in Syria, was formally appointed cadi on Friday, Rajab 22, 374—the office having been vacant for 17 days on account of the sickness of the new cadi. Born in the Maghrîb, various stories are told that as a boy he had been singled out by Al-Mu‘izz for the position that he now occupied. He must have been a man of some abilities to have held so important a post. He was constitutionally weak-bodied and was compelled to ride about in a palanquin. In this manner he was carried to the camp of al-‘Azîz for investiture; and he was even unable to be present when his son ‘Abd al-‘Azîz read out his diploma in the Jâmi‘ al-‘Atîk at Fustâṭ. In this diploma he was appointed chief cadi over the whole of Egypt and the Syrian possessions of the Fatimides; he was also leader in prayer, inspector of gold and silver, and controller of weights and measures as his brother had been. Not being able to attend to all his duties, he devolved some of them upon his nephew, Abû ‘Abdallâh al-Ḥusain ibn ‘Ali, who was to hear cases in the Jâmi‘ al-Ḥâkimî. At the suggestion of the caliph himself, he appointed his son, Abû al-Ḳâsim ‘Abd al-‘Azîz to be his representative in Alexandria. He stood high in favor with the government; his son, ‘Abd al-‘Azîz being married to the daughter of

---

1 Really Jubb ‘Amîra, Yâḳût, vol. ii, p. 18, 4:  
2 بركة الجَبَر يبير بالبي الحُجَّ والعساكر is mentioned by al-Maḍîrî. Seb de Sacy, l. c., vol. i, p. 187.
3 Yâḳût, vol. ii, p. 333, 8 says simply  
4 It is remarkable that Ibn Ḥajār has nothing to say about his literary attainments.

5 Brockelmann, l. c., vol. i, p. 352.
Janhar the Kā'id, at a levee held by the caliph himself (Friday, Jumāda 1, 375 = September 19, 985). It is even related that upon one occasion (Jan. 5, 996) he accompanied the caliph into the pulpit; and when al-'Azīz died in 386 A. H. (996) Muḥammad had the honor of washing his corpse. This naturally excited the jealousy of the vizier Ibn Killis, who was afraid of the growing power of the al-Nu'ūmān family. Muḥammad, however, succeeded in maintaining his position even under al-Ḥākim, the successor of al-'Azīz; being high in the favor of the eunuch Barjawān, the tutor of the young prince. He was also quite intent to advance his own immediate family. In Jumāda 1, 377 (Sept. 7, 987) he removed his nephew Abū 'Abdallāh, to whom he had given over some of his functions, and placed in his stead his own son, 'Abd al-'Azīz, giving him authority to act as judge on Mondays and Thursdays. In Muḥarram 383 (Feb. 993), he increased the authority of 'Abd al-'Azīz by allowing his son to sit as judge on every day.

This power of the cadi was distasteful also to the theologians and the jurists; for he forced people to address him with the title سِيِّدُنا, "Our lord." Ibn Ḫajār seems to refer to some such dispute that occurred in the year 382. Muḥammad had appointed a certain Ja'far to publish the religious enactments in the Jāmi' according to the Meccan rite. To this the Fāqāhis objected; but their objection was overruled in a summary manner.

On account of his physical weakness he was unable to attend to much of his work during his latter years. He is said to have been of fine appearance, noble in his bearing and a ready giver of alms. Ibn Zulāk pays him the compliment of saying that he knew of no cadi, either in Egypt or in 'Irāk, who could be called his equal. Though learned in all the Moslem sciences, 1

---

1 When the Caliph al-'Azīz felt his end approaching, he recommended his son al-Ḥākim to Muḥammad ibn al-Nu'ūmān and to Abū Muḥammad al-Ḥasan ibn Ammār, the Amīr al-Daula. See Ibn Khallikān, vol. iii, p. 528.

2 On the use of this title, see Van Berchem, l. c., pp. 385, 386.

3 I am not certain to what rite reference is made here—probably to that of the Zaidite sect. The Sharifs of Mecca afterwards went over to Shāfī'ī practices. See Snouck-Hurgronje, Mekka, vol. ii, p. 251 f.

4 He lectured upon Shī'ī law and doctrine. So many people crowded to hear him upon one occasion that a number were killed in the crush.
he left no work behind him; but he followed the Arabic custom of writing poetry, a verse or two of which have been handed down. Al-Musabbīḥī, however, did not think much of his poetic talents. He died on Tuesday evening, Șafar the fourth, 389 (Jan. 25, 999), having been in office 14 years, 6 months and 10 days. Al-Ḥākim, himself, said the customary prayers over his body. He was buried at first in his own house and then on Ramaḍān the ninth (August) his corpse was transferred to the Karāfa cemetry.¹ His palace was given to one of the friends of al-Ḥākim, and all his possessions were sold in order to pay the money of orphans and minors that had been deposited with him.²

For some reason no chief cadi was immediately appointed to succeed Mohammed. According to Ibn Ḥajjar, who follows al-Musabbīḥī,³ the interregnum lasted for seventeen days; according to Ibn Khallikān for more than a month. On Șafar the 23,⁴ Abū ʿAbdallāh al-Ḥusain, the son of ʿAlī, who had held

Al-Maqrīzī, upon the authority of al-Musabbīḥī:

وفي ربيع الآخر سنة
خمسة وثمانين وثلثمائة جلس الفاضي ملك بن النعمان على
كرسي بالقصر لقراءة علمهم آل البيت على الرسم المعتاد المتقدّم
له ولايته بيصر ولاية بالمغرب فمات في الرحمه أحد عشر
(وعشرون) رجلًا فكفنهم العزيز بالله


² It was customary to deposit in the chancellery of the cadi moneys belonging to orphans or to persons who were absent. See Māwardī, l. c., p. 114, in the chapter headed في ولاية القضاء. Such moneys could not be loaned out; though this was, of course, occasionally done under pressure. Al-Maqrīzī relates one such incident in the life of Saladin. In the year 590 A.H. he needed money for one of his campaigns; so he forced the cadi Zain al-Dīn to take 14,000 dinars that were in his keeping and give them to him. See Blochet in Revue de l'orient Latin, vol. ix, p. 76.

³ He says expressly that al-Ḥusain was nominated on Șafar 27.

⁴ And not on Rabī' 6, as Ibn Khallikān says—who seems to know very little about this cadi.
partial office for a time under his uncle Mohammed, was appointed cadi by the all-powerful Barjawân. His diploma read that he was appointed to act for Cairo, Fostân, Alexandria, Syria, Arabia, and the whole West. He had been born in Mahdiyya in Dhuhiijja, 353. He does not seem at first to have exercised all the functions of his office, a certain 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz ibn Muhammad ibn al-Nu'mân having the authority over criminal cases. If this is his cousin, the Kunya "Ibn 'Umar" is wrong; perhaps it was some distant relative. A few years later, he placed Al-Husain ibn Muhammad ibn Tahir to be judge in Old Cairo, Malik ibn Sa'id al-Farikî in New Cairo, and his brother, who is called simply al-Nu'man, in Alexandria. It is not apparent why he should in this manner have delegated to others so many of his functions. But he was evidently harsh in his judgment, for in Safar 391 (1000), or 393 (1002), he was treacherously attacked and wounded in the Jami by a Spaniard, so that in future he had to be protected by a body guard. In spite of this, he seems to have been well in the favor of the caliph al-Hâkim, who gave him a house near to the Khalîj al-Hâkimî. He was the first Fatimide cadi to be appointed chief preacher; in addition, he was inspector of the mint and chief secretary. It was his own harshness of manner that caused his downfall. A man who brought a case before him had been wanting in due respect. At the order of the cadi the man was bastinadoed with 1800 strokes so that he died, and al-Hâkim commenced gradually to shear him of his prerogatives. According to Ibrahim Ibn al-Rakîk, it was his lust for money that really caused his downfall.

1 In the diploma of Muhammad ibn al-Nu'mân nothing had been said about the Maghrib. It is, however, mentioned in that of 'Ali. Of course, a cadi could exercise his functions only over the districts mentioned in his diploma. See Tornauw, Le Droit Musulman, p. 243. Al-Husain was the first to have the title تاضي القضاة given to him officially. He was also leader in prayer and surveiller of the markets. Al-Kalkashandi (I. c., p. 184) says: "at times the Egyptian provinces, the districts of Syria and the lands in the Maghrib were joined together under the jurisdiction of one cadi, and only one diploma was given him."

2 Though this was clearly within the rights of a cadi.

3 According to al-Musabbihi. In Safar 13 he is reported to have said the prayers over the body of the vizier Ja'far ibn al-Furat. Ibn Khalli-kân, vol. 1, p. 331.

4 Khita', vol. 1, p. 71.
In Rajab 393 (1003), though al-Ḥusain was confirmed in his office, his cousin ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was permitted to take testimony and to act as referee. This divided authority occasioned much difficulty for litigants. His continued haughtiness and harshness eventually robbed him of the caliph’s confidence, and he was finally removed from office on Ramadān 16, 394 (July 7, 1004). On Muḥarram 6, 394, he was imprisoned by the order of al-Ḥākim, and, together with two others, was beheaded at the beginning of 395. The bodies of all three were then burned.

The place of al-Ḥusain was taken by Abū al-Ḵāsim ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, who was invested cadi Ramadān the 16, 394.1 He had already held office under or together with his cousin al-Ḥusain. It is expressly stated that he combined in his person all the offices of cadi, even that of hearing complaints.2 He seems to

---

1 Born Rabiʿ 1, 394 (=March 7, 965) or 395. The authorities disagree.

2 Born Rabiʿ 1, 394 (=March 7, 965) or 395. The authorities disagree.

This office seems to have been in some manner similar to our court of appeal. Cases were also brought before the official holder of the appointment which could not, for one reason or another, be settled in the ordinary procedure. "On termes technique désignant les actes injustes et dommageables que les magistrats ordinaires se trouvent impuissants à réprimer, et dont on demande la réparation en s’adressant directement au Prince."—Léon Ostroog, El Ahkām es-Soulthāniye, Paris 1901, p. 209, note. Technically, again, the functions belonged to the vizier, though he might delegate them to a representative. Māwardī (l. c., p. 39, 3) says in this respect: وَكيْبْزائِن يَنْتَرُ فِي الْمَطَالِم وَيُسْتَنِبُ فِيهَا. Al-Makrīzī is more precise; according to him the vizier sat as appeal judge in case he was a military man. Khiṭṭaṭ, vol. i, p. 403, in the chapter headed جَلِّس النَّظَر فِي الْمَطَالِم: فَأَنَّ كَانَ وزِيرًا صاحِب سِيف جَلِّس المَطَالِم بِنفْسِهِ وَقَبَلَهُ تَقَاضِي القَضَاء. Generally, however, the head cadi was appointed by the caliph to hear such appeals, or an officer was especially designated for the purpose (see, also, ibid. vol. ii, p. 207). Ibn Khaldūn, Muṣṭaddāmat, p. 198: رَفَضَ كَانَ المَلِكُ مِنْ قَبْلِ يُجَلِّلُونَ لِلْقَابِضِ: والمُؤْتَمِثُ فِي الْمَطَالِم وَهِيَ رَقْبَة مُتَمَيْزَة مِنْ سَطْوَة السُّلْطَانة وَنَصْفَة القَضَاءَ وَتَتَجَمَّلَ عَلَى عَمَّالِ وَقَبْلَ كَبْرِ الْمَطَالِم مِنْ الخُصُصِ. See also, de Sacy, l. c., notes, vol. i, p. 133; ibn Khallikān, vol. i, p. 846, note 14.
have enjoyed unwonted honors at the hands of al-Hākim, being permitted on two occasions to enter the pulpit with the caliph—an honor, which, as we have seen, had also been accorded to his father. As a judge he was severe and firm. He is especially noted for his learning in the Canon law according to the Imāmī rite. He was appointed to be the head of the Dar al-'Ibn, where he collected a large library; he had the care of the mosques and of the pious foundations, (wakīf'), and was administrator for various estates. The marriage of his sons to the daughters of the Kā'id Faḍl ibn Śaliḥ was celebrated in the Kašr itself; but al-Hākim must in his madness have found some fault with him and he was deposed on Friday, Rajab 16, 398 (March 27, 1008). That he was married to a daughter of Jauhar has already been related. It was perhaps this fact that hastened his fall. On Sha'bān 7, 398, he and al-Ḥusain, son of Jauhar, the general in chief of the army, were ordered by al-Hākim to remain in their houses and not to show themselves in the market-places. This order was rescinded a few days afterwards, and 'Abd al-'Azīz was in office again in Safar 19, 400. But al-Ḥusain and 'Abd al-Azīz evidently did not feel themselves safe, and together with the wife of 'Abd al-'Azīz they fled from Cairo. They were lured back by the crafty prince, Muḥarram 4, 401 (1009), and the chief executioner, Rashīd al-Ḥakīkī, with ten Turks was ordered to put them to death. Their heads were then brought to al-Hākim. This occurred in Jumāda 2, 401 (Jan. 31, 1011).

Curiously enough, Ibn Khallikān asserts that with the death of 'Abd al-'Azīz "the office of cadi passed out of the family of al-Nu'mān;" but one more cadi was to come from the family—the son of 'Abd al-'Azīz, Abū Muḥammad al-Kāsim. Perhaps he is not mentioned by Ibn Khallikān since the exact date of his death is unknown. Yet this would not excuse his distinct statement in regard to the passing of the cadiship.

After the execution of 'Abd al-'Azīz, Mālik ibn Sa'd al-Fārīkī occupied the position. He remained in office until Rabī' 2, 405 (1011), when the functions were given to Abū al-'Abbās

---

1 De Sacy, Les Druses, p. cccxxxii, says in 399.
2 Al-Maḳrīzī in de Sacy, l. c., vol. i, p. 61. See, also, Ibn Khallikān, vol. i, pp. 353, 345. Even the position of the 'nāẓir fi 'l-ẓalāl was again given to him.
Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdallāh ibn Abī-l-‘Awwām, who held office until his death in Rabī‘ 418 (1027). Al-Siyūṭī affirms that al-Ḵāsim was appointed immediately upon the death of Abū-al-‘Awwām; but Ibn Ḥajar dates his first appointment from Jumāda 1. There may, therefore, have been another interregnum. In spite of the high-sounding titles attached to his name in the diploma, he lasted only a little over a year,¹ being succeeded by the son of Mālik, ‘Abd-al-Ḥākim ibn Sa‘īd. ‘Abd-al-Ḥākim was in turn deposed in Dhulka‘da 427 (1036);² and our Ḵāsim again returned to power, having jurisdiction over both civil and criminal cases, and being at the same time chief preacher. He had as assistant the historian Abu ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad ibn Salāma al-Ḵudāʿī.³ This second term of al-Ḵāsim lasted thirteen years, one month, and four days until Muḥarram, 441 (1049); but the historians do not speak with admiration of the manner in which he held his office. For short periods even he seems to have been replaced; at one time by Yahyā al-Shihābī, at another by al-Ḵudāʿī.⁴ He was followed in 441 by Abū-Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Yaẓūfī, who was in power for seven years and was the first to unite in his person the offices of vizier and cadi.⁵ The further history of al-Ḵāsim is unknown, and with him the glory seems to have departed from the family of al-Nuʿmān.

From the biographical data given in the texts, the following genealogical tree may be constructed:

---

¹ Ibn Ḥajar says: "one year, two months, and some days." Paris Ms. 1850 has "three months and a half."

² Al-Siyūṭī has 329.

³ Brockelmann, l. c., vol. i, p. 343.

⁴ Ibn Taḡhri Birdī (Abu-l-Maḥāsin), in his annals for the year 436 mentions the death of the Damascus cadi Muḥsin ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Abbās, who was the naʿīb of al-Ḵāsim ibn al-Nuʿmān for that city. Dr. Wm. Popper, who is preparing an edition of the latter part of Ibn Taḡhri Birdī's work, has been kind enough to give me this information.

⁵ See al-Ghumrī, below. The name occurs quite often in Mss. misspelled بارزنی.
III. The Arabic Text of Ibn Hajar from the Paris Ms. No. 2149.

النعمان بن مكحالة بن منصور بن أحمد بن حبُّون

الاسامي المغربي يكتب إباهنففة تقدمه نسبة في ترجمة

ولده علَّي. وكان كذمة صاحبة البعر من المغرب وهو يتولى

القضاء في عسكر البعرة فأتى البعر إبابة الطاعم على حالةٍ وازعّة ما

فُرّض للنعمان الحكم في الصيحة التي كان مكحَّل بن على الصادراي٥

حسنها. ثم بناها في المصادر فاشتراها منه عمر بن الحسن

العُباسي ثم بناها إلاده فاشتراها فرج الحكمي فثبيث أحمد

بن إبراهيم بني حماد بتحبيسها ثم أصل بالخصبي فحكم

1 Read الماذار، and see Yâkût, vol. iv, p. 381.

2 Ms. Paris 5893 has the better reading حبِّسه لها.
بأنها حبص... ثم أتصل ذلك بابي الطاهر فاحصى ذلك فتظاهر
خرج الطلب إلى المعلم فامرأ النعمة بن أحمد، ان ينظر في
امره فأتصل به شهاداً ابي طاهر بجميع ما في الكتاب أن كتاب
النحاس فشهد على الحسين بن كهش وعبد العزيز بن اعين
5 على شهاداً ابي طاهر بـ كـ ذكر فعجلت النعمة المنية قبل
اکمال القضية. وكانت وفاته في [؟] وكان يسكن مصر ويغدو
منه إلى القاهرة في كل يوم واستمرّ أبو الطاهر على حالة ولكن
اضاف اليه المعرّ على بن النعمة وكان يحكم بالجامعة يعني أيضًا
[ثم] بعد مرّة المعر وتبال الزيز ردة أمر دار الضرب والجامعة لعلي
10 بن النعمة بن حمّد فتضرج الجامعة وحكم وحضير أبو الطاهر في
جامعة على العادة وحكم وحضير معه جميع كثير من الشهداء
والقتلاء والتجار واعلموا بالدعاء لابي الطاهر [فاحضروا متوالٍ
لشرطة الذين اعلنوا بالدعاء لابي الطاهر] فاجهتهم فشفع
فيهم على بن النعمة فاطلقوا وأواصل أبو الطاهر الجموع
15 بالجامع. ولما ذهِل أمره مستقيماً إلى أنه حصلت له رطوبة
علمت شقة تفاجأ عن الحركة الأصحولا. فركب العزيز يومًا في
مستهل صفر سنة ستين وثمانية فتقرأ: أبو الطاهر وهو حمو

3 Read المعر.
عند باب الضايافة فسألته أن يأتين له في الخجلات ولده ابن العلاء ابن أبي الطاهر نبذة عنه بسبب ما به من الضعف.
فقال المعرّم ما بقى إلا أن يفداه ثم في ثالث يوم صرف ابن الطاهر وقّد على ابن النعمان كما سبق في ترجمته.

على ابن النعمان الاسماعيلي

على ابن النعمان بن حيّن بن منصور بن أحمد بن حيّن

البغربي القيروانى الاسماعيلي من المائة الرابعة يلتقى في رجب سنة ثمان وعشرين وثلاثمائة وتقدم مع المعرّم من المغرب فامرأته

بالنظر في الحكم. فكان يحكم هو وابو الطاهر والشهود

يشهدون عليه جميعًا وعندهم واجتماع عند ابن الطاهر.

فلما مات المعرّم أمير الجامعين ودار الضرب على ابن النعمان

فخطير إلى الجامع العتيق وحكم ثم واظب ابن الطاهر الحكم في الجامع

وعزل جماعة. ثم عرض له الفائض فقضى المعرّم الحكم إلى ابن

على ابن النعمان وذلك ليلتين خلختا من صفر سنة ست وستين

وثلاثمائة. فركب إلى الجامع الأزرع في جمع كثيم وعليه خلع

مقلدًا سيفا وبين يدية خلع في مناديل عدّتها سبعة عشر

---

1 Reading of Ms. Paris 2153, Ms. Berlin 9819. Ms. Paris 5808 has 

وعد الجماعة 249 وعهد;

1 Read the عربى as Ms. Berlin 9819.
وقريت سجينة بالجامع وهو قائم على تقدمب فكلاّما مرا دكر المعرّ اواحد من اهلته امثى بالجحود. ثم توجّه الى الجامع العتيق ببصر فوجد المطيع عبد السميع ينتظر بالجامع وقد كان الوقت ان يخرج فوق الجمعة وقري اخوه عثمان عهده وفيه اثنا 5 وفي القضاء على مصر وأعمالها وخطابة والإمام والقيام في الذهب والفضة والموازين والمكابل. ثم انصرف الى دارة فركب الية جماعة الشهراء والقضاء والتجار ووجهه البلد ولم يتأخر عنه احد وكان في سجينة اذا دعي أحد الخصبين اليد ودعى الآخر الى غير يدعوه اليد فعرف ان ذلك اشارة الى منع ابي الطاهر فيامنع من يوما حسن بلغه. فلم كان اليوم الثالث من ولايته ركب على بن النعمان الى الجامع العتيق وبنى يديه سلّمة حمراء وجلس في مجلس الصف عند حلقة الزوار وركب معه الشهراء والإضاء والفقهاء والتجار فكان الجمع وافرا جدًا فنظر بين الناس ودعا بالوكلاء وقرأ عليهم سورة العصر وحضهم على تقوى الله. ثم طلب الشهراء وسأل عن القاضي ابى الطاهر فقال له الحسين بن كهشم وكان وجه الشهراء حينذاك هو على حالة فقال ينظر في الحكم فدار الجلس في الجامع فبلغ ذلك ابا الطاهر فصرف الوكلاء وانقطع عن الحكم وعنى بعض اهل البلد بابي
الطاعم فتتَّجه لله توقيعًا بآن ينظر في الحكم على حالتة وجميع
الشهود وقرى عليهم، فبلغ ذلك إبا الطاعم فامتنع. وقال ما فعل
ولا شيء، فقال له الحسين بن كهمش جاز [٨] الله القاضي
وسكت على ابن النعيم [٨] طلب ديوان الحكم فلم يسأل عنه
ولا طلبته حسن عشرة وجميل فعل. ولما امتنع إبا الطاعم
ابسطت يد على ابن النعيم [٨] في الأحكام. واستسلم على إخاه
عماداً والحسن بن خليل الفقيه الشافعى وشرط عليه أن يحكم
بذهب الإسماعيلي لا بذهب الشافعى وكان يحكم إذا
اشتغل عماداً. واستسلم على إخاه عماداً على تنبيه ودمعه
وعلما وغيرها خروج إليها وترى فيها نواعمًا ثم عادوا وأخذ
علي في داره سحقاً، ولمبا سافر العزيز سنة ثمان وستين لحرب
لقرامة سافر صحبته واستسلم إخاه عماداً وعاش جماعة أن
العزيز [١٠] على ابن النعيم وكانب عماداً اخاه بذلك فتتَّجه توقيع
العزيز إلى متوسل الشرطة وهو حسن بن القاسم بالكشف عن ذلك
وتقدم إليه بعدم الحوض في ذلك وتقوى يد عماداً ابن النعيم.
وكانت الشهود يجلس في الجامع على رسم القضاة قبله في الشتاء في
المقصورة وفي الصيف عند الشباك ثم وضع الابعاد ان يجلس معه

في جلسه اربعة عن بيته، وعن يساره ويشاهدون ما يقم من احكامه وكان الذي كتب عنه التواقيع يأخذ عليها رسمًا فاترك ذلك على ابن النعمان بعد سنة من ولايته ومنعه، وارتدى في أيامه رجل واستأذن العزيز وضرب عنقه واحتبس ابن النعمان بالعزيز باختصاصه، ابه بالعذر. وكان يجالسَه ويبكيهُ ويركب معه ويسايره، وكان الوزير يعقب بن كلس يعارضه وهو يتفاقد عنه ورد به الامر الى ان كان لا ينفذ حكما ولا يعدل شاهدًا ولا يقلد ذاتياً إلا بعد مطالعة الوزير بذلك. وابطل القاضى الجلوس بالجامع لشبهة الوزير في اضعاف يده الى ان قضى على الوزير فعاد على ابن النعمان الى حالته. وكان اول من لقب قاضى القضاء بالديار المصرية لكنه كان في سجله ان جميع الأعمال داخلة في ولايته.

HashMap بن النعمان بن حمّد بن منصور بن احمد بن حسوب المغربي القباني ذئيل [القاهرة امامي من البائقة الرابعة ولد في الثالث عشر سنة اربعين وثمانية بالمغرب وقدم] القاهرة صاحبية والده مع المعترض وناب عن أخيه على ابن النعمان في آخر امره وويل العرب استقلالًا

1 Read حيّرون as in Ms. Paris 5893. 2 Mss. Paris 5893, 2152.

3 Read المعر. 4 Ms. Paris 5893.
بعد موت أخيه في يوم الجمعة في سنة 1422 هـ، وبعدها وقع عليه تقلد سيفاً ونزل إلى مصر في يوم 6 من يوليو في السنة 1422 هـ. ودخل الجامع فلم يقدر على الجلوس فرجع إلى الجامع. ونذكروه بوقفة في عصر الفضلة والذهب والمروزين والمكريين. ثم أرسل ابن أخيه الحسين بن علي إلى الجامع المحاكم 1 للحكم بين الناس وكاتب خلفاء الفوارق. فلم يكن يوم الجمعة الأول من سنة 635 هـ. وسبعين عقد أبناء عبد العزيز على بنت جوهر القائد في مجلس العزيز 2. وكان الصداق ثلاثة آلاف دينار. وشاحدود علي عبد الله عتقى عبد الله بن حمد بن عبد رجا. ودخل العزيز على الزنج وانصرف حمد بن النعيم في جمع كثير من الخواص ثم قرر ابن عبد العزيز في نياته وصرف ابن أخيه الحسين بن علي. قال المشكّي 3: كان حمد بن النعيم خبيرًا بالاحكام حسنًا.

---
1 Delete; not in Mss. Paris 5892, 2152.
2 Mss. Paris 5893, 2152.
3 Read "المشكّي".
الادب والعرفة بقاء الناس. قال العنفج في تأريخه أمر المعرفه وهو بالمغرب قاض بلاده النعمان بن محمد ان يعمل له اصطلاحات فضية وإن يجلس مع الصانع بعض ثقافته فاجلس النعمان ولده محمدزا. فلما فرغ توجه به إلى المعرفه فسأل منه اجلاست مع الصانع. قال ولدي محمد. 
قال محمد بن النعمان كان المعرف إذا رأى قال لولده وانما صبي هذا قاضي قال المسبكي وعدل محمد بن النعمان في ايامه ثورة من ثلاثين نفسا قال المسبكي كان محمد بن النعمان خبيير النظر في الحكما تقدمته الده امرة طالبة زوجتها بحقها فامتئع

10 من دفعه لها فسألت القاضي ان يحبسه فامه بذلك. ثم نظر اليها فوجدتها جميلة وظهر عليها السروى. فلما توجه إلى الحبس أمر القاضي يحبسه مع زوجها فغصب فقال لها حبسناه سالم وحبسه كحقه فلم بن حققت ذلك اطرقت عنه فلم توجحت قال القاضي رأيتها فرحت جبستها فخشيت انها تخاد بنفسها ل$v4$.

15 قال وكان الوزير ابن كلس كذلك المعارض لبني النعمان في احكامهم فاتفق ان الحسن بن الحسين بن علي بن يحيى الدقاق رضي

---

1 Read as Ms. Paris 5893.
2 Ms. Paris 5893 has العصبي: العتقى 2152.
3 Read/ms. Paris 5893 has لعيبة زوجها 2152.
ولده يتيمة تعرف ببنبد الفدبيجي، باذن عبد بن النعمان في ذلك. فقام بن أكثره المدرك، أحد الشهداء، وآلم في هامش عقد لكونها غير بالغ. وبالغ في ذلك فقال عبد بن النعمان: ثبت عندي بابارا انها بلغت فحصت إلى القصر ورفع أمرها إلى العزيز. كشف عنها ووجدت غير بالغ، فقمت إلى القاضي بيضح النكاح. فأحضر القاضي والشهود، وشهدهم وقال يتقدّم مولانا في بيضح هذا النكاح وبالوقوف عن قبول شهادة هؤلاء الشهداء. فعل وكتب بذلك، وصلت إلى رفعت ذلك وفية أن نبت عندها أنها غير بالغ. ثم بالغ الوزير في الانتكاز على الشهود في التساهل وكان ذلك في سلخ جمادي الأولى سنة حسین وسبعين، وامرأ� تحفظ مال الصحبة ثم ابتاع لها منه، ووقع إلى عقد بن النعمان أن نظراني اسلام ثم ارتدى وقد جاور الصبيان. فاستنبط فتى فاهى امره إلى العزيز فسلمه لوالها الشرطة. واسر الراضي ان يرسل إربعة من الشهداء ليستجيب، فإن تاب ضمن له معاه مائة دينار وأن اصر فليقتل فعرض على الإسلام فاتى بقتل، ثم اتمت بتفريقه في النيل. ورفع الله رجل من ولد عقيل بن أبي طالب زوجته ومعها ابنه لها جددها تلطف به.

1 Ms. Paris 5893
ابن النعمان فلمن يبد في حيلة فانهی امره الى العزيز فامره بالبلمانة بينهما وكتب في ذئ القعدة سنة ثمانين وسبعين الى الجامع العتيق فاجتمع الشهود ووعظ الزوج فابي الالعاس فلاعن بينهما ثم فرّا بينهما. ثم استخلف ولده عبد العزيز الحكم وكان ينظر كل اثنيين وخميس وفي اول سنة احدى وثمانين عدل جماعة من الاعشار وفي صفر سنة اثنين وثمانين رتب رجلا جعفر بالجلوس في الجامع للنفوذ على مذهب اهل البيت. فشغف عليه الفقهاء من اهل الجامع بلغ ذلك [الفاضي] فقبض على بعضهم وطوى بثاترة منهم على الجمال. وعلمت منزلة الفاضي عبد العزيز وقطع النزول إلى الجامع ونظر في الحكم في داره. ولم يكن أحد يخاطبه إلا بسيّدنا. فعندما توق العزيز سكن صمّد بن النعمان في دار بالقاهرة ورتب ابنه عبد العزيز كل اثنيين وخميس ينظر في الاحكام ببصر. قال ابن ذولاك، ما شاهدنا لقاض من القضاة بصر ما شاهدنا لحمّد بن النعمان ولا بلغنا ذلك عن قاض بالعراف. وكان مع ذلك مستحقاً لبا هو فيه من العلم والصيانة والتحفظ والهيئة والإقامة الحق وفيه يقول ابن عبد الله السرقندی:

1 Read as Ms. Paris 5898. 2 Ms. Paris 5898. 3 Read زولاقي.
حفظة في قضاياء غريب
كما يلتقي السيف الصقيل
ويقذى والسواقة له حليف
وأن حضر المشاهد فاعل ليل
قال المسيحي: والياً نظم كثيرة ليست بالقوية فين أجدود
لبيع وخمس مضت واثنتين
ويا كامل الحسن في نعته
فهل لي في فيك من مطعم
أياً مشببة البدر بدر السما
وشغلت فوايده واهرات عيني
والانصراف تحتي حنين
قال وف ولايته رحم رجلاً حبارة اصاب امرأة علماً من زنا. وكان
رجمه بسوق الدرب بقرب الجامع الطولوني وذلك سنة اثنتين
وتسعين. قال ولم حصل له التمكين الزائد وعلت رتبته لرمته
الامراض كالنقرس والقولونج وكان اكثر ايامه عميلاً. وولده عبد
العزيز ينصح في الاحكام ويستسلم في اثر ابنه وغيرها وكان يرجو ان
يعوده في كل خمس مع عظمة برجوان. قال وكان فيه احسن
لاعابة مع حسن الخلق والبراءة والمركبة وكثرة الطيب
والبضور إذا جلس في مجلسه وإذا ركب. وكان إذا أعطى عطايا كثيراً
وجلبه. وكانت وفاته وهو على القضاة في ليلة الثلاثاء الرابع من
المسبكي

1 Read
صفر سنة تسعمائة وثمانية عشرة. فكتب المحكّم فضائل عليّة في داره ودفنه تحت قبةٍ ثم نقل بعد الى القرافة. وكانت مدة ولايته أربع عشرة سنة وستة أشهر وعشرة أيام. ووجه عليه من اموال الإيتام وغيرهم ستة وثلاثون ألف دينار. فامّ الحكام برجوان أن يكون على موجودة فارسل كتبه إيا العلاء فهذا النصراني فاحتئوا عليه وشرعوا في البيع وفي تغريم الشهود الذين كانت الوثائق تحت إيداعهم. فمن احضر ورثة بخطّ القاضي ترك. ومن لام لم يحضر خطّ القاضي عزم الله أن تحصل تقدّر نصف الدين. فدفع للمستحقين بقدر النصف. وتقدّم امر المحاكم أن لا يودع بعد ذلك عند أحد من الشهود مال يتيم والاغائب. وافرد موضوع برتقاق القناديل يوضع فيه المال ويفتح عليه أربعة من الشهود لا يفتح [ألا] بحضور جميعهم فاستمر الامر على ذلك مدة. وكان محكّم بن النعمان سلم لعبد الله بن أحمد بن محكّم المدادي أحد الشهداء مال يتيم وأراد الاعتدال عليه بذلك فامتنع فقال محكّم ما كان بالذي يودع الأشهاد فاتفق أن المدادي مات في سنة تسعمائة وسبعين وعنته ودائع كثيرة فرَى فتى بن السندري كتب الحكم قبل أن

1 Ms. Paris 5893.
يموت حتى أشهد عليه بما عنده، فلمما مات لم يوجد اثنتان إثنتان
فباع القاضي دارة بمثابة آلاف دينار فوق بها الودائع.
المخسين بن علي بن النعمان بن حسس بن منصور بن
امحمد بن حيون بهملة ويا اخرى الخروف بهملة مضمونة، وآخرى دون
المغربية الإسماعيلية من المالكة الرابعة ولد لليمين بن يقيتا من
ذى الوجه سنة ثلاث وخمسين ولثمثين بالمهمية. وقدم مع أبيه
بالقاهرة وهو صغير محفظ كتابا في الفقه ومهم إلى إن صار من
اثنيات السبعة. واستحققه عمه محدث بن النعمان بالجامع في الحكم
ثم صرفة بابنه عبد العزيز، [بن] محدث. فلمما مات محدث بن
النعمان أقامت مصر بغدير قاضي لتسعة عشر يوما [ف] استدعاه
بوجوان بامر المحاكم فولاه القضا ووق المظالم ابن عمه عبد
العزيزي بن محدث بن النعمان وذلك في آخر شهر
ثبيع الأول سنة تسع وثمانين ولثمثين وجيزرة المسيحي في الثالث
والعشرين من صفر. قال فقتليه سيفا وخلع عليه ثيابا بيضاء
مقطوعة ورداء براءة وثينا عمامة مذهبين وحمله على بغلة
واقد بين يده بلعتين وحمل معه ثيابا حقيقية كثيرة. وتزوي
عهدته دولاب القضا بالقاهرة ومصر والاسكندرية والشام

والخريجين والمغرب وأعمال ذلك وهو قائم على تدفية. واضيفت اليه الصلاة والمساء. فركب إلى الجامع ووقعت عن قبول جماعة من
شهود عبده وعندتهم اربععة عشر [نفسا] والمسباكي اسمائهم. ثم
قتلهم بعد مدة شهر. واستضيف على الحكيم الحسين بن مهشيد
بن طاهر بمصر وبالقاهرة مالك بن سعيد الفارق وياثم النعيمان
فخاخ في المنظر في العين: فاضق الهمة قضا الإسكندرية وعلى
الفرش أحمد بن مهشيد بن العوام. وأين من ينظر في مال
الإيقام بعمل الحسابات.
فبينما هو في ثانين صفر سنة احدى وتسعين جالسا في
الجامع بمصر يقرأ عليه الفقة اقيمت الصلاة صلاة العصر فدخل
فيها اذ همجم عليه مغربي اندلسى فصربي بمنجل قيامي
ووجهه ورأى فامسك الرجل فقتل وصدب. وصار من ذلك
اليوم يكونه عشرة رجلا بالسلاح. وذكر المسبكي في تاريخه
ذلك في حوادث سنة ثلاث وتسعين في ثاني الحرم. وأقام الفاضى
ألى ان اندمل جرحه فركب إلى الحاكم وثبت عليه بلهة على
فيلة وقاذ بين يديه اخرى. وإن الحسين هذا جرح وهو راكع

1 Ms. من.
2 On margin احاتة النعيمان; in Ms. 2152 as a correction in the
author's hand.
3 Ms. Paris 5898.
4 Ms. Paris 5899.
5 Ms. Paris 5899.
في صلاة العصر. وكان إذا صلى بصف حلفته الحرس بالسيف حتى يفرغ فيصلونهم هم حينئذ.

قال المسبح وهم أول قاضي فعل معه ذلك. وكان الحاكم قد امر أن يضعف للمهديين ارزاق عقية وصلاة واقتصادات وشرط علي عليه أن يتعرض من موارد الرعيّة للدراهم فما فوقه. وخلع عليّة وقلّده سيفا وحمله على بغلة وفوق اليد الحكم جميع المملكة وكذلك الخطة والامامة بالمجلسية الجامعية والنظام عليها وعلى غيرها من المساجد ووُلّى مشاركة دار الضرب والدعوة وقرة الجناس بالعصر وكتابتها. وهو أول من اضيفت اليد الدعوة من قضية الاعبدتيين. وكان الناس يطلبون أنه لا يترّى القضاس

لضعف حاله وان الولاية اثنا هي لعبد العزيز بن محيّدّ [ابن۱] عمه لما كان أبوته تدلّمه في الحكم في حبيته ورهبته. ثم رفع جماعة من الناس ابن لهم ودائما مرّدة في الدين الأخميني فأحضر القاضي ابن عمه عبد العزيز بن محيّدّ بن ואبّان وكاتب عمه ابنا طاهر بن المسندد وسألهم عن ذلك. فذكر أن عمه تصرّف في ذلك كله على سبيل الفرض. فأنكر عليهما ذلك واشتدا في المطالبة ووّلّى استرتفاع حسابهم فهد بن إبراهيم النصرانيّ كاتب برجوان [وفّل بهم]۲. وفتش عليهما والزم عبد

1 Ms. Paris 2152. 2 Ms. Paris 5893.
العسير ببيع ما خلفه ابنه. فباع الموجود فتحصل منه سبعة آلاف دينار وريادة. وحصل الكاتب قدرها مرتين، فاستدعى القاضي وهو جالس بالقصر احتجب الحقوق فوفاتهم وقرر في زفات الكنايف موضعا للمواثق المحكمة وإقام في عهدة خمسة من الشهر.  

5 يضطرون ما يخفش ويعرف. وهو أول من أفرد للمواثق المحكمة مكاناً معيناً. وكانت الاموال قبل ذلك تعود عند القضاة أو امنائهم. وباشر المحسن بصرامة ومهابة. وهو أول من كتب في سجله قاضي القضاء رابه أول من خوطب بها من قضاة مصر. وتقدم إليه المحسن المغربي خصومة فرّل لسانه بشيء خاطب به القاضي فاغضب به كالشرطة 1 فضربه بالف درّة وثاني مائة درّة بحكرة حاجب القاضي وطيف به فمات من يومه وخرجت جنازته خضرها أكثر أهل البلد وكرّموا تاربه والدعاء له وعلى من ظلبه. رندم القاضي على ما فعل وفاته. 

10 فلم كان في رجب سنة ثلاث وتسعين اذن المحكم لعبد العسير بن مصعب أن يسمع الدعوى بالبنية مع استمرار المحسن على وظائفها. فرّت عبد العسرة له شهوداً يتحضرون دجلة وشرط عليهم أن لا يحضروا جلس ابن عمه فقال الناس في الشرط. 

1 Ms.
أمر مريح. فرس رفع قضى إلى الحسين رفع عريمه نسجه إلى عبد العزيز. وإذا حضر عبد العزيز إلى الجامع فنقل دار الحسين فكتب الكلام في ذلك المندوب فيه. فكتب المحكم بنخطه سجلًا بانه لم يأذن لغير الحسين أن يشارك الحسين فيما فرض الله رميه بآن يمنع من ي migli على غيره في شيء من الاحكام. [40b] وان من دعا واحدا من الخصوم وكان قد سبق إلى الحسين أن لا يمكن واحدا منه. وقرى هذا اضجع على البلا وانشرح خاطر القاضي بذلك ولم ينزل على جلالته حتى أفرط في حجة الخذ في التعاظم والزم الشهود بحضور مجلسه في داره وبالجامع ومن غاب منهم لرما ججل حيد يقول منه. وكان يتتبع قراءة من يموم عليه عدد، قبل أن يشهد به على نفسه. وكان مع ذلك كثير الإفصاح على اهل العلم والأدب في التوثيق علية جميع جراحات نسبه والشعر مشاهدة غيرها وصلهم بالملابس وغير ذلك إلى أن خرج أمر المحكم بصرفه عن المكحم في شهر رمضان سنة أربع وتسعين. فلم يشعر وهو 15 بدار حتى دخل عليه من الأولمه بأن ابن عمه عبد العزيز ولّى القضا. فانكر ذلك إلى أن تحفته الفاقيق بابه ولزم بيته وشتقلْ

1 Ms. Paris 5893 منعاً
2 Ms. Paris 5893 for في الشروط has
خونه إلى أن كان في السادس من الحكّم فاضم الحاكم فاحضر
عال حمار نهارا وتمّ بحكيته إلى أول سنة حمس وتسعين.
فضربت عنقته هو وابو الطاهر المغازي ومودّن القصر واحترقت
جثة الثالثة عند باب الفتوح. وكان مهما اذكرُ الحاكم قضّة

5 الرجل الذي ضربه إلى الشرطة فمات كما تقُدّم.

وقد ذكر ابراهيم بن الرقيق في تاريخ أفريقية قضّة الحسين
هذا مع الحاكم فقال ما نصّه رقتل الحاكم قضّة حسين بن علي
النعمان فاحترقت بالنار. قالوا وكان من أسباب تلته آين الحاكم
كان قد ملا عينه وبدد وصرع عليه العفّة عن أمر الناس.

10 فرفع إلى الحاكم شخص مظلمّ رقعة يذكر فيها أن اباه مات
وترك له عشورون ألف دينار. وأنّها كانت في ديوان القضى
حسين، وكان ينفق عليها منها مداة معلومة محضر يطلب من
ماله شبيّة. فأعلمه القضى أن الذي له نفد، فاستدعى الحاكم
بالقضى فيرفع إليه الرقعة فاجابة بما قال الرجل وانتّ القضى

15 خلّفه أبوه استوفاه في نقّته. فاضم الحاكم بحضاير ديوان
القضى في الحال. فاحضر فتش فيه عن مال الرجل فظهم أنه
أنّها وصل إلى القليل منه. ووجد أكثر باتقه. فاعدّ على القضى
ما زربة واجرام عليه وكراهة اباه وما شترع عليه من عدم

1 Ms. Paris 5893.
التعِرّضٌ لِأموال الرَّعیةٍ. فَجَذَّبْ هُمْلاَهُ وُقِالُ العُفُوِ وَأَتْوُبٌ. وَانصَرَفَ بالرجل فَفَذَّعَ الیة طَیِّبَةٍ لِهَا وَشَهَّدَ علیهْ. فَهُمَّدَ الْمَلْکِ علیهِ ذلِکَ فَانْصُرَ بهُ. تَمَّ اخْرِجُ بعْدَ ذلِکَ علی حِمَارٍ ذَهَارٍ وَالنَّاسُ يَنظُورُونَ إلی انْ سَارَواً بهُ إلی المَلْکِ فَضَرَّبَ عِنْقَةٍ وَحَرَّقَ جِثَّتَهُ. وَكَانَتِ مِدَّةُ وَلَائِتِهِ الْقَضاَةِ خَمسَ سَنِينَ وَسَبْعَةَ أَشْهُرَ وَاحِدَةٌ عَشَرِ يَوْمًا. قَالَ الْمَسْتَحَقِّقُ لَأَمِينَ بِنْ رَجْلِ سَكْرِیٍّ وَامْرَأّتِهِ فِي الجَمِيعِ العَتَّیقَ وَلَمْ يَسْبِقَ لذَلِکَ يَعْنِی فِي دُولَةِ الْأَعْبَدَیْنِ. قَالَ وَأَقْطَلَ الْمَلْکِ الْقَاضِی الْمَذْکُورُ دَارَاً بِالْقَرْبَ مِنْ الخَلِیجِ الْمَخَاَبِی فِکَانَ فِی اِیامِ الْفِیلِ يَرْکِبُ فِی ] blank [ إلی هَذِهِ الدَّارِ وَیسَأَرُرُ الْشَّهْرِ الْعَشِیْرَةُ الیها ثُمَّ يَرْجَعُ إلی سَکِنَتِهِ بِالدَّارِ الْأَخَرَاءَ Abū azīz b. mukhtād b. al-nāman b. mukhtād b. al-nasīr b. aḥmad b. ḥiyūn al-mawrūtī al-qirwānī āsābīyān. مِنَ السَّمَّاءِ الْرَّابِعَةِ وَلَدَ فِی اَوْلِ رَبِيعِ الْأَوْلِیّ سَنَةٍ خَمْسِ وَخَمْسِينَ وَشَلَّیتَهُ. وَكَانَتِ وَلَائِتُهُ الْقَضاَةِ فِی يَوْمِ الْمُحِیْسِ السَّادِسِ عَشَرُ مِنَ الرَّضَمِ سَنَةٍ ارْبَعٍ وَتِسْعِينَ وَشَلَّیتَهُ وَأَضْفِی اِلیهِ النَّظَرِ فِی المَطَالِبِ وَخَلَعَتْ علیهِ المَلْکِ عَلَی السَّعَةِ وَحَمَلَ علی بِغلَةٍ وَنَبِّدَتَ

1 Ms. Paris 5893
2 Ms. Paris 5893
3 Ms. Paris 5893
بين يديه ثنتان وحمل بين يديه شفت ثياب ودخل إلى الجامع
فحضر في مركب حفل وقرى تقليلة عن المنبر. وكان أول
احكامه أئذى أوقف جميع الشهود الذين قلهم عمه الحسين ما
عداشرف ابن محتم المقرى فانه استكتب في الترتيب والقصص.
5 كتب له في الإنجاز عليه قاضي القضاة عبد العزيز قاضي عبد
الله ولئية منصور ابن علي الإمام الحاكم أمير المومنين صلوات
الله عليه وعلى ابنته الطاهرية على القاهرة المعرضة ومصر
والискندارية والحمضين واجناد الشام والموحنة والموارد
وعمالها وما فتحها الله وما يسر فتحه لأمير المومنين [من
10 بلدان المشرق والمغرب].

واستخلف عبد العزيز في الحكم مالك ابن سعيد الفارقي
وأبي العوام في العرض ولازم الشهود الذين لم يقلبهم
باباه. فارسل اليه الله حق كله متأخر حكم على يشفهم في
قبول الشهادة. فيلزم كله واحد منكم شفته فهم احتجزت
15 إلى شهادته منكم أتعدت اله فناصره عنده.

---

1 Ms. Paris 5898, 2152. At this point there follows, in the Paris Ms.
2149, a portion of Ibn Ḥajar's biography of 'Abd ar-Rahmān ibn 'Umar
al-Buldānī, † 824 A.H., which has been accidentally misplaced.
2 The following up to p. 260, line 13, is taken from Ms. Paris 5898.
فلمّا كان في السابع عشر من ذي القعدة طلبهم واستخفهم
أنهم ما كانوا سعوا في طلب الشهادة عند عمة ولا رشدة
ولا ادعوا له تخلفوا على ذلك فقدبهم. واصعد الحاكم عبد
العزيز معا، على المنبر في الجمع والاعيان على عادة من
تقدمته وامتدّت يده في الاحكام وعلت منزلته وجلس في
المجمع وابدأ في كتاب جده احتراف اصول المذاهب. وفي
ولايته فوض الحاكم البيه النظر على دار العلم التي انشأتها
وفك الحاكم منها واتقنها وجعل فيها من كتب العلم
شيئا كثيرا واباحها للفقهاء وأن يجلسوا فيها بحسب اختلاف
اعراضهم من دخول ومطالعة وقراءة بعد ان فرشت وعلقت
السورة على أبوابها ورتب فيها الخذام والقرية. وينقصص
عبد العزيز هذا لمجلسة الحاكم ومسايرته فاحتاج القاضي
إلى الاذن لولدة القاسم الآكر في الحكم بالجامع. وكان
يجلس فيه لسماع الاحكام وفصل بين الحصوم وصار الناس
يتدردون في أمورهم، مند إلى ابنه ومن ابنه الليه وامر ولهه.
الأصغر أن يثبت كتب الناس ويفصل بينهم في مجلس حكم
بمنزلته. وفروض البيا الحاكم أيضا النظم في تركة ابن عمه
حسين بن علي بن النعيم بعد قتله. فتسنّم جميع ما
وجد له. وكذا فعل في تركة ابن منصور الجوزي. وهو من
5 كبار دولته وتقدّم في الصلاة على جماعة من اوليائيهم.
جرت العادة بأنّه لا يصلّى عليهم إلا الخليفة وامرأة في يوم
عاشورا أن يمنع النساء والناس من المرور في الشوارع. وكانت
ستنهم أنّهم في يوم عاشورا يخرجون النساء وغيرهم للنحو
والبكاء على الحسين وينشدون المراثى. في الشوارع وتبّدّ
10 الغاعة ابنهم إلى أمتّة الباعة. فرفعوا ذلك إلى الحاكم
فامرأ القاضى بمنعهم من المرور في الشوارع وأن يختصّ النحو
والنشيد بالصحراء. واتفق أن بعض الكتاميّين كان عدده
حقّ فامتنعون من اداؤه وكان سنة سبع وقرّة فرفع
أمره إلى القاضي فانفرد إليه رسوله فاحنته. فرفع الامر
15 لحاكم فامرأ صاحب الكتاميّ مضروبًا إلى القاضي بمسير.
ثم احضر إلى القاهرة ماشيا والزم بالخروج ميّا عليه. وأمر
الحاكم بالنظر في المساجد وينقد إوتافها وجمع الريع وصرفه

1 Ms. Paris 5898
الجوزي 9
Ib. المراوي
Ib. الأولياء
Ib.
في رجوعه ففعل ذلك وباختهان رأزد للذؤب شاهدين يضطهاده.
وزرَّج القاضي لديه بابنتي القائد فضل بن صالح وكان الإملال بالقصر على صداق اربعة آلاف دينار انعم المحاكم بها من بيت المال. فتخلعت عليهما؛ ثوابان مفصلات وستة عشر قطعة من الثياب الملفوفة وحملة على بغلتين مسروجتين وقيّد بين يديهما. مثل ذلك. وصلب القاضي في احكامه وارتفعت كلمته ويفترز عليه جميع أهل الدولة.
وتقدم إلى جميع الشهداء أن من يدخل عن البكرة إلى حضور المجلس كل أثنيان وخمسين رم ببغرم ثقيل. وسأله خليفته في الحكم مالك بن سعيد أن يستخلف الخليل بن الحسين بن الخليف عنه إذ أطرفة أمير يمنعه من الركوب أو الوجه إلى مجلس الحكم. فاذن له ولم يعهد ذلك لفترة أن النائب يستتب عنه في المدينة. وذكر المسبكي في تأريخه في حوادث سنة سبع وتسعين وثلاثمائة ما حاصلة أن على ابن سليمان بن النجيم وكان من خواص قادة القرواد الحسين.

1 Ms. Paris 2152.
2Ms. Paris 5893.
3 Ms. Paris 2152.
4 Ms. Paris 5893.
5 From here on the text is from Ms. Paris 2149, compared with 5893 and 3152.
6 The reading of 5893 and 2152; Ms. 2149 has.
7 Ms. 2149.
ابن جوهرة اخبره ان القاضي زار الحسين بن جوهرة الفاقد
في داره 1 في يوم احد من صيام النصارى وكان عندته أبو
الحسين الريس ولكنه هم 2 ومن يحضرهم فدخل الغلام فقال
ابو يعقوب بن قسطس الطبيب بالباب فانه لا فدخل وهم
على المائدة فاظهم السرور به واحضر له عددا الوان ثم
رفعت المائدة وقدم الشراب وما يلبس من الفاكهة والممشوم
فافنروا على عملهم إلى ان سكنوا. فأما القاضي فانصرف
والميه الريس واستمر أبو يعقوب الطبيب بالطاهرته الذي
كان بناها في ذلك المكان وهي تطل على نهر كبير يشرب
10 ويطرب الى ان غلب عليه السكر. فخرج وطلب بغلهه
فقدمت له بغله الرس الامتنع من كومها فسأله المخيم أن
يعود الى مكانه الى ان تخضر بغلته فرجع الى المكان الذي
فنه الريس فنام الى جانبه فقام احد الفراءين فرفع الستارة
يتفقدهما. فراى الريس فلم ير ابا يعقوب فدخل وطلب
15 فلمع طرف ثوبه في الماء فاستدعى فرضا يعرف السباحة
فنزل الى النهر فوجد فيه النقات ثيابه على وجهه فغطس
في الماء فاعلم المئه الريس فاستدعى القاضي واحد الريس
1 Ib. > 2 Mss. 2149, 5893 والسبع 3 Ms. Paris 5893 . البشوعة 4 Ibid. رانتيه .
وشك عليهم ذلك لعلهم بنذرته من الحاكم، فسألوني أن أعلم الحاكم بذلك فدخلت اليه فذكرت له أنّ ابا يعقوب قام من الليل وهو دهش فسقط في النهر فلأني أن يصل اليه الفراش وجدته قد ظل في ثيابه فغطس فشقت عليه وأظهره الأسف وبحث عن الأمر فعُثرت بصورة الحبال فهزر رأسه، فإذا بالقائد والقاضي والرسى قد وصلوا إلى القصر مشاة بعمائم لطاف فاستدعاهم فصلفروا وأخذوا له الإيمان أن كان لهم في شئين استشهدنا القائد والقاضي بالرسى فشهد لهم بالبراءة من ذلك عامر بتكفينة ودفنه. وكان ذلك في أواخر سنة سبع وتسعين.

فلما كان في يوم الخميس النصف من شهر برجب سنة ثمان وتسعين شاع بين الناس أن عبد العزيز القاضى عزل وقرز خليفته مالك بن سعيد فارتفع النهار ولم ينزل إلى مجلس الحاكم إلى قرب ظهير. ثم ذُكر وحكم وصلى للناس بظهر إلى أن انصرف بفرده من غير حاسب ولا ركابي حتى دخل داره، فلما كان آخر النهار طاف جماعة على جميع أولياء الدولة بن اجتمعوا بالقصر بكرة فحضروا.

1 Ibid. 2 Ibid. 3 Ms. Paris 2152. 4 Ibid. 5 ترريب
فحاصر مالك بن سعيد فقَدَّد جميع ما كان بيد١ عبد العزيز وكانت مدة ولايته ثلاث سنين وتسعة أشهر وثمانية وعشرين يوما.

قال المسجون عزل عبد العزيز في أيام نظره في المظالم ٨ ثلاثية عشر نفساً في أيام قضاءه نفريين واستمرّ عبد العزيز بعد عزلة يتردد إلى القصر خالباً يترقب القتل إلى أن كان الحادي عشر من جمادى الآخرة سنة تسم وتسعين ركب القائد حسين بن جهر والقاضي على عادتهما فسلماً وانصرف فارسل اليهما فحاصمه عبد العزيز أولاً فأعتقل ٩ ورجع خادمه ببغضته واحتفى القائد وولده فكسر بابه وحرض المحاكم على تحصيله فتعبد عليه فاضمه بإطلاق عبد العزيز فرجع إلى منزله وقد اقاموا عليه العراء فسكنتهم وكان الباعة قد اغفلوا حوائجهم فأضرهم بفتكها. ثم بعد ثلاثة أيام حضر القائد بالآمان مخلع عليه وعلى عبد العزيز خلعاً ١٥ سنين وحملت قدامهما ثياب كثيرة وحملا على فرسين وقيّدت دين ايديهما عدّة خيول وأعاد المحاكم النظر في المظالم إلى القاضي عبد العزيز وترى سجدة مخلع عليه خلعا مقطوعة

١ Ms. Paris 5898
٢ Ibid
٣ Ms. Paris 2149
وطيلسان

وحل على بلدة ويبين يدائه أخرى وحمل بين يديه سفط ثياب فأستمر في تاسع عشر سنة اربع مائة. ثم تلقى على اقطاعة وضرب على باب دارا لروح باسم الديوان. وفي اواخر رمضان اعمر ولدى القاضي بابناتي القائد التي تقدم عقدتها عليها.

5

فلم كان آخر المحكم سنة احدى واربع مائة استشعر القاضي والقائد من المحكم الغد منهما. فلم كان في التاسع من صفر هرب القاضي وتقدم القواد حسين بن جوهر وتاباعهما وحصتهما جماعة ومعهما من الاموال شيء كثير وتوجها على طريق داره. فلم بلغ المحكم ذلك ختم على دربهما. وأمر مالك بن سعيد الفارقي بالركوب إلى دار القاضي وحسين وضبط ما فيها وحمله فلم يزل القاضي والقائد مسترين إلى السادس من المحكم سنة احدى واربع مائة فظهم الكتب لهما الامان من المحكم وخلع عليهما فلارضا الخدمة إلى ان كان يوم الجمعة ثاني عشر جمادي الآخرة منها حضرنا الخدمة وانصرف. فارسل اليهما في الحال فرجعا فقتل كلا منهما جماعة من الاتراك في الدهليز وบทความ واحد.
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وطيلسانا ؟
في الحق على دفعهما وذهب جمهورهم 1 هداة واحتش على درهمها 
في الوقت وتبين على كثير من اتباعهم وصدوهم.
وقال عبد العزيز علما بالفقه على مذهب الإمامية كَالبيتَة ولا سيما جدته وجد نسب الية الشيخ عمار الدين
ابن 5 كثيَر الكتب المسِّميَّة البلاذر الأكبر والناموس 6 الأعظم
في أصول الدين ووهم في ذلك وافنا هو تصنيف ابنه على
والده 7 النعمان. قال ابن كثير وقد ردا على هذا الكتاب
القاضي أبو بكر الباقلاني. قال ابن كثير وفية من الكفر ما لا
يصل إبليس مثله كذا قال.

8 قاسم بن عبد العزيز بن مكحَّد بن النعمان البقري الأصل
لاما من الباحة الخامسة يكنى ابن مكحَّد ولي بعد ابن أبي
العوام في يوم الأحد رابع جمادى الأولى سنة ثماني عشرة وترى
سجَّله بالقصر وبالجامع ببصر وألقب قاضي القضاة ثقة الدولة
امين الائمة شرف الاحكام وجلال الإسلام فباشرها إلى
155 أن عزل في [ يوم الأحد الخامس والعشرين من ] رجب
سنة تسع عشرة وكانت مدة سنة وشهرين واثام ما هذه

1 Ms. Paris 5898 7.
2 Ibid.
3 والقاموس.
4 Ibid.
5 Ms. Paris 5898, 2152.
الولاية الأولى. واستقرّ عودة عبد الحاكم بن سعيد بن
ماليك الفارقى. ثم عبد قاسم في السادس من ذي القعدة سنة
سبع وعشرين فنظر في الأحكام والنظائر والدعاء واستخلف
في هذه الولاية القضاة فناب عنه في هذه الولاية الثانية.
ولم يكن قاسم محصوم السيرة لأكثّه طالت مدّته إلى أن صرف
في المبكر سنة احد واربعين واربعستة وكانت ولايته الثانية ثلاث
 عشرة سنة وشهدوا واربعة أيام وقد تقدّم ذكر الإدبيات التي هجى
 بها هو وابن عبد الحاكم الفارقى. (ابو القسم) بن محصوم بن
النعمان هو ابن عبد العزيز المذكور قبله.

V. The Arabic Text of Ahmad ibn Sa’d al-Ghumri from
the Paris Ms. No. 1850, fol. 201b.

قضاة الدولة العبّديّة.

لمصر بالقضاة كلاً زميل
من بعد ثلاثينات معينة
وحكموا قضايا الشعبة
وكان قاضي واحد بمصر
وأوّلها فالمالكى في قضاة
وأوّلها فالمالكى في قضاة
وثاني نصيرى ثالث امامي

في حكمة دخلت بنو عبيد
عام ثمان بعد خمسين سنة
وأبطلوا قضاياه السنية
وأوّلها فالمالكى في قضاة
وأوّلها فالمالكى في قضاة
وأوّلها فالمالكى في قضاة
وأوّلها فالمالكى في قضاة
اول من جلس في مصر القضاة اربعه، دعا قاضي القضاة ودبلة القضاة من شيعتهم، اول قضاة مصر داني ثمانى السنين للشيعه. منهم على ولد النعمان وخمسة الاسهر في المروى، وثلاثي العام بمصر ذو سعة. مصموح احوا اعوام اربعة، وكان دا مذهب اسماعيلي. خلف السنن والتلاويل وابن اخى الحسين هو ابن للعثقال بالضرب والتمجر في مصر قتل. وجمسه حرق بنار تشتعل، وكان دا اول قاضي قتلا. تولى أبو القاسم هو عبد العزيز اربعة ايام، وشهد الإعريز اول قاض بالسيف قد جرر، ومنها صار دمه منبخس. وكان الموضع فيه اعتدا سبع سنين دون سدس قد بقي سبيًا لإحصاء النبي المجتبي، والسوت والمصانات والمجمع. ولفنة الله لين بغضهم، وضربه وعنفة فورا ضرب على القضاة لأنه صاحبه. وقتل معا حمزة ناشبة.
ثلاث عشر عام فيها اسمه
ولم يمضيفوا إذ عرفوه لومما
ثلاثة أشهر ونصف حاكما
تسعة أعوام وربعًا ونصف
وبعدة من القضاة قاماه
عشرة أعوام وسبسسة للمجهاب
كذا أمراء الأمراء داعي الدعاء
وأمراء يسمعون قوله
اقام عامه بلا نزاع
اقام عامه ذاهبا بالباعة
خلاع وبالسيف فغلقوا فامه
تاضي وزير سبعة أعوام حسن
مع القضاة بصر للإشارة
أول تاضي جمعا اليه
بصر في دمه فصار منجدلا
ولى أحمد ابن محتقد العوام
تنقص منها أربعون يوما
وأبي عبد العزيز قاسم
وأبي سعيد الفارقق علي الحكم
عاد له قاسم تم عماء
فجعل يبيي واسمه يا الشهابي
وزيد في الغابة تاضي القضاة
بل شرف الحكام ثقة الدولة
محتقد ابن سلامة القاضي
عاد له قاسم وهى الثالث
وكان ليس ضابطاً احكامه
محتقد البروزي وعزر أبو الحسن
أول تاضي قنولى الوزارة
بهما وبالقضاء اخلعوا عليه
وأول القضاة والوزر اقتل
III. THE TEXT OF IBN ḤAJAR IN TRANSLATION.

[p. 238] Al-Nu'āmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Mansūr ibn Ḥāmid ibn Ḥayyān' al-Ismā‘īlī al-Maghribī, called Abū Ḥanīfā. His genealogy has been given in the account of his son ʿAlī. He came to Egypt in company with Al-Mu‘izz from the Maghrib. He acted as cadi in the army of al-Mu‘izz; 2 but the latter allowed Abū Ṭāhir to remain in his position. The first appointment given to al-Nu‘āmān was to pronounce judgment in the case of the domain which Muḥammad ibn ʿAlī al-Mādhara‘ī had made a waqf. This he had sold to pay a debt, and ʿUmar ibn al-Ḥasan al-ʿAbbāsī had bought it. The sons of this one then sold it to Faraj al-Ḥakami. Ḥāmid ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥāmmād asserted that it was waqf. The matter came before al-Khaṣṣībī, who adjudged the property to be a waqf; [p. 239, 1.] This judgment was then brought to Abū Ṭāhir, who ratified it; but Faraj al-Ḥakami 3 appealed (from the judgment) to al-Mu‘izz, who commanded al-Nu‘āmān ibn Muḥammad to look into the matter. Al-Nu‘āmān caused the testimony that had been given to Abū Ṭāhir to be laid before him according to the contents of the book, i.e. the book containing the waqfs. Al-Ḥusain ibn Kaḥmash and ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn A‘yān testified to the statements made before Abū Ṭāhir and mentioned above. Death, however, overtook al-Nu‘āmān before the case could be finished. He died on the . . . 4. He lived in Miṣr, but went every morning from there to al-Kāhira.

Abū Ṭāhir remained in his position; but al-Mu‘izz gave him as assistant ʿAlī ibn al-Nu‘āmān, who rendered judgment in the Jāmi‘ ʿAlī ‘Atīk 5 also after the death of al-Mu‘izz. Al-ʿAzīz gave ʿAlī ibn al-Nu‘āmān ibn Muḥammad jurisdiction over the mint

---

1 Not Ḥayyān, as Brockelmann, I. e., vol. i, p. 187, has.
2 It was customary for the cadi to accompany an army in order to decide any case that might arise; see, e. g., al-Maḵrizi in Blochet, Rev. de l’Or. Latin, vol. ix, p. 188.
3 The Mss. have  coined money; I have ventured to read  at the mint; al-Dhahabi, Al-Tanbih, p. 188.
4 Mss. 2149 and 5838 have here a sign that looks like the Arabic numeral ل; but it may merely indicate a blank in the original. Ms. 2152 has, in fact, such a blank space. Ibn Khallikān says "the first of Rajab."
5 I. e., the mosque of ʿAmr ibn al-‘Āṣī, the oldest one in Fustāṭ.
and the mosque.\(^1\) Thereupon he came to the mosque and decided cases. Abū Ṭāhir was present in his own majlis and gave judgment there as was his custom. Many notaries, lawyers and merchants were there also who brought their cases before Abū Ṭāhir. These were conducted to the chief of police, who imprisoned them. 'Alī ibn al-Nu‘mān interceded for them and they were allowed to go free. Abū Ṭāhir continued the custom of sitting in the mosque; his health was good until he took cold and his side was lamed; he became also too weak to move around unless carried. One day at the beginning of Safar 366, al-'Azīz was out riding, and Abū Ṭāhir, having been carried [p. 240, 1] near to the Bāb al-Ḍiyāfa, met him. Abū Ṭāhir asked al-'Azīz to give his own son Abū al-'Alā al-Ṭāhir permission to act as his substitute, on account of his own weakness. But al-Mu‘izz\(^2\) answered: "There is nothing left but to dismiss him." Three days afterwards he deposed Abū Ṭāhir and appointed 'Alī ibn al-Nu‘mān, as is related in the history of that man.

'Alī ibn al-Nu‘mān, ibn Muḥammad ibn Mansūr ibn Ahmad ibn Ḥayyūn al-Maghribī al-Ḳairuānī al-Iṣmā‘īlī, of the 4th century, was born in Rajab 328, and came with al-Mu‘izz from al-Maghrib, and was ordered by him to preside as judge. He and Abū Ṭāhir acted in that capacity, the witnesses testifying before both; but the confrontation of the witnesses took place before Abū Ṭāhir.\(^2\) When al-Mu‘izz died, the jurisdiction over the mint and over the two mosques was given to 'Alī ibn al-Nu‘mān. He came to the Jāmi\(^1\) al-‘Aṭīk, and held judgment there. But Abū Ṭāhir continued to hold court in the Jāmi\(^1\) and he discharged some men.\(^4\) However, he became partially lamed, and

---

\(^1\) This ought probably to be "the two mosques"—as was the case with his son 'Ali, and as Ibn Khallikān says.

\(^2\) All the texts have "al-Mu‘izz." It must be "al-'Azīz." De Slane translates "to make cat's meat of." See his note to Ibn Khallikān, vol. iii, p. 573.

\(^3\) I imagine that this is the meaning of the phrase عند ابي الطاهر عند الجمعاء.

\(^4\) This might be the translation of the reading in Ms. 2149. Another possibility is the reading "and to arbitrate [in] the assembly."
al-Mu'izz turned over the (whole) office to Abū 'Ali ibn al-Nu'mān, two days before the end of Safar 366. Abū 'Ali then rode together with a large multitude to the Jāmi‘ al-Azhar, being clothed with the robe of office. He was invested with the sword, and before him were placed robes in covers to the number of seventeen. [p. 241, 1] His patent was read in the jāmi‘ while he stood upright. Whenever the name of al-Mu’izz was mentioned, or the name of one of his family, he gave a sign that all should bow low. Then he went to the Jāmi‘ al-‘Atīk in Miṣr and found the preacher, Abū al-Samī‘, awaiting him in the jāmi‘. The time had already come for him to go out. He then read the Friday prayers, and his brother Muḥammad published his diploma. In this, it was stated that he was appointed cadi over Egypt and its dependencies, preacher, Imām, inspector of gold and silver, of weights and measures. Whereon he returned to his house, and there came to him a multitude of notaries, claimants, merchants, and the chief men of the land. No one kept away from him. In his patent it was said: ‘When one of the parties to a suit brings a case before thee and the

---

1 So the Mss.; delete.
2 The khil’a of the cadi was made of wool, without any border; generally of white, the inside being of green (Quatremer, i. e., vol. ii, part 2, note 73). Al-Jauhar, when he came to Egypt, ordered the preachers to wear white, evidently an anti-Abbāsid practice. See Ibn Khallikān, vol. i, p. 844; JA. 1886, 3, p. 51, Abū-l-Maḥāsin, ii, 408. The Alīd colour was in reality green; but the Carmathians, also, adopted white. See de Goeje, Mémoire sur les Carmathes du Bahreïn, Leiden, 1886, p. 179. These garments were part of the insignia of office, and are even called خلقة Dozy, Dictionnaire . . . des noms des vêtements, p. 14. They were probably kept in the خرائط القسم, which was a separate department in the caliph’s palace. See al-Kalkashandi, i. c., p. 175.
3 Abū Yūsuf al-Anṣārī (see p. 230, note 4) is said by Ibn Khallikān to have been the first to give a distinctive dress to the learned (Ibn Khallikān, vol. iv, p. 273).
4 These numerous robes had probably no further significance; they were nothing more than presents.
5 The text has i. e. √ομώιοις “indicavit aliquem.” See Dozy, vol. ii, p. 844; de Goeje in the glossary to al-Tabarī, p. DXXVII. Al-Hākim ordered the people to stand up at the mention of his name. Ibn Iyās, Ta’rīkh Miṣr, p. 53.
other party brings it before some one else, do thou cause the two to come to thee.” He knew that this had reference to his withholding cases from Abū Tāhir. From that day he did so withhold cases from Abū Tāhir.

Upon the third day after his appointment 'Alī ibn al-Nu'mān rode to the Jāmi' al-'Atīk, with a red basket before him. He took his station where the people were sitting in rows near the Ḥalqat al-Zawālī. There came to him the notaries, the officials, the lawyers and merchants—a very great multitude. He acted as judge for the people, addressed the agents, and read to them the Sūra “al-'Āṣr” impressing upon them the fear of God. He then asked for the notaries and for the cadi, Abū Tāhir. Al-Ḥusain ibn Kahmash, the chief notary at that time, said: “He is still in office.” Ali replied, “Let him give judgments in his own house and not sit in the mosque.” Abū Tāhir heard of this; he discharged the lawyers and he was practically deprived of his functions. Some people, however, interested themselves in Abū Tāhir, [p. 242, 1] and procured an edict to the effect that he might still act as judge. The notaries were collected and the edict read to them. This intended action coming to the ears of Abū Tāhir, he forbade it, saying: “What can I do? All my strength is gone.” Al-Ḥusain ibn Kahmash answered him: “May God recompense the cadi.” ‘Alī ibn al-Nu'mān desisted from demanding the diwān al-ḥikm; and did not ask or demand it further—[thus showing] his good manners and his kind actions. When Abū Tāhir desisted, ‘Alī ibn al-Nu'mān had a free hand in his jurisdiction.

\[\text{footnote:} \]

\[\text{Footnote:} \]

1 I do not know to what this refers. Al-Shirāzī speaks of a قَبْطُ (kāmuṭra) being placed in front of the cadi, while he is holding court (al-Tanbīh, p. 318, 10; cf. 321, 5, 8). Does the text here refer to this?

2 وجلس في جَلِّس التَّصْف عند حلقة الْزوال. I am afraid that there are some technical terms here which I do not understand. حلقة the enceinte of a building or a gathering of students around a professor who is teaching them, or even the hall where such teaching is given (see Quatremère, Histoire des sultans Mamlouks, vol. i, part 2, p. 197). جَلِّس may mean “the afternoon.” “And he took his seat in the Majlis al-Ṣaff at the afternoon assembly.”

3 Sura 108.
Anī then appointed his brother Muḥammad and al-Ḥasan ibn Khalīl the Shāfiʿī jurist; the latter with the special provision that he was to deliver judgments according to the Ismāʿīlī rite, not according to the Shāfiʿī. This latter was accustomed to sit in judgment when Muḥammad was otherwise engaged; for Anī had placed his brother Muḥammad over Tunis, Damietta, Faramā, etc. Muḥammad went out there and appointed deputies; then they returned and Anī put up a curtain in his house.⁴ Now when al-ʿAzīz went forth in 368 to make war upon the Carmathians,⁵ Anī went along with him, putting his brother Muḥammad in his own place. Many people spread the report that al-ʿAzīz [had superseded him]. Muḥammad thereupon wrote to his brother about the rumor. Anī at once procured an order from al-ʿAzīz to the chief of police, Ḥasan ibn al-Kāsim, that he should look into the matter; but Ḥasan answered allaying his fear,⁶ and reporting that the position of Muḥammad ibn al-Nuʿmān was gaining strength.

Formerly the notaries had been accustomed to sit in the jāmiʿ, according to the prescription of the cadis before him—in winter in the maḳṣūra⁷ and in summer near to the window; but the

---

⁴ For what purpose this is mentioned here I do not know; the meaning of ـَكَـِ~

⁵ Reading ـَكَـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِ~

⁶ Reading ـَكَـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِـِ~

⁷ The maḳṣūra was a small space partitioned off by a grille and near to the minbar of the mosque, in which the ruling prince took his place to say his prayers and to hear the khuṭbah (Quatremère, Histoire des sulṭans Mammouks, vol. i, part i, p. 164; vol. ii, part i, p. 288). The 'Umayyid Caliph Muʾāwiyah preached from such a maḳṣūra (Goldziher, Muḥammadanische Studien, vol. ii, p. 41). On such a maḳṣūra in the Azhar, see Van Berchem, l. c., p. 47. A description of the maḳṣūra in the mosque of 'Amr in Fostāţ is given by Ibn Duʾmāl.
distance induced 'Ali to order that they should sit near to him, [p. 243, 1] two to his right and two to his left, and that they should thus see whatever judgment he gave. It was customary for his scribe to charge for the documents which he signed. But after 'Ali ibn al-Nu'mān had been in office for a year he grew to dislike this arrangement and forbade it. During his tenure a man apostatized. With the permission of al-'Azīz, 'Ali struck off his head.

Ibn al-Nu'mān was on very friendly terms with al-'Azīz, as his father had been with al-Mu'izz—sitting with him, eating with him, riding out with him, and conversing intimately with him. The vizier, Jacob ibn Killis, opposed him and the cadi tried to ignore the vizier. This went so far that 'Ali could not give any judgment, nor appoint an assessor to the cadi nor a deputy, without the vizier taking a hand in the matter. The cadi did away with the attendance (of litigants) in the mosque, because it enabled the vizier to decrease his power. When the vizier was put under arrest, 'Ali ibn al-Nu'mān returned to his former custom.

He was the first to have the title chief cadi over the whole of Egypt, because in his diploma it was stated that all the provinces (of Egypt) were under his jurisdiction.²

Muḥammad ibn al-Nu'mān ibn Muḥammad ibn Maṣūr ibn Ahmad ibn Ḥashāb ³ al-Maghribī al-Kairūnī the Imām, of the fourth century, born on the third of Ṣafar 340 [A.H.] in the

403) says: وَبِينَ يِدِيهِ خَسَةٌ مِنْ الْحُجَابِ أَثَنَانِ يَدٍ خِلَاطَةٌ إِثْنَانِ عَلَى بَابِ المَقْصُورَةِ. The place in which the vizier gave audience was divided by a grille into two parts. All who had business with him assembled in the Qa'at; but he sat in the maššara, which was separated from the rest of the room by a heavy grille. This was, no doubt, done to protect his person from sudden attacks. See Ravaisse, Essai sur l'histoire et sur la typographie du Caire in the Mémoires . . . de la Mission Archéologique Française du Caire, vol. i, p. 54.


² Ms. Berlin 9819 adds five lines of poetry by him on the authority of al-Musabbibī, part of which are given by Ibn Khallikān. It adds also that he died on Rajab 6th, 374 [A. H.]

³ Of course, the proper reading here is حسب حبون in place of حسب.
Maghrib. He came to al-Kūhira in company of his father with al-
Mū‘izz. He represented his brother Alī ibn al-Nu‘mān towards
the end of the latter’s incumbency. After the death of his
brother, al-‘Aḍīz endowed him with full powers, [p. 244, 1] on a
Friday, seven days from the end of Rajab 374. He received in-
vestiture and donned the sword. On the same day he went to Miṣr
in a palanquin, resting upon a mule because of a sickness from
which he was suffering. He entered the mosque, but was unable
to sit down; so he returned to his dwelling. However, his son,
‘Abd al-‘Aḍīz, the children of his brothers, and a large atten-
dance, remained seated in the mosque until, after the usual Friday
prayers, the diploma was read out appointing him cadi over the
whole of Egypt, Alexandria, the two sacred places, and the prov-
inces of Syria. He was also clothed with the functions of lead-
ing prayer, of assaying gold and silver, and of controlling weights
and measures. In his diploma both his father and his brother
were mentioned with praise. Then he sent his nephew al-Hāṣan
ibn ‘Alī to the jámiʿ to sit there as judge and informed the
lieutenants of the provinces (of this). On Friday, Jumāda
1, 375, he betrothed his son ‘Abd al-‘Aḍīz to the daughter of
Jauhar, the kāḍī, in the majlis of (the caliph) al-‘Aḍīz.
The gift to the bride’s parents amounted to 3,000 dīnārs. The
two witnesses were Muhammad ibn ‘Abdallāh al-‘Uṭakī and
‘Abdallāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Rajā. al-‘Aḍīz made presents to
the husband, and Muḥammad ibn al-Nu‘mān went away with a
large and select assembly of his friends. His son ‘Abd al-‘Aḍīz
was appointed his substitute, his nephew al-Husain ibn ‘Alī
being removed. Al Musabbiḥ says that Muḥammad ibn al-
Nu‘mān was a good judge, well educated, [p. 245, 1] and learned
in history. Al-‘Uṭakī, in his history, says while al-Mū‘izz was

1 On the kubba or palanquin, see Ibn Khallikān, vol. iii, p. 846,
note 10.
2 Syria was divided into five provinces (إ‌ّخِبَاد), to wit: Damascus,
Emesa, Ḳīnnesrin, Jordan, Palestine. See Lane, p. 470a.
3 خلفاء النراحي. On the meaning of Khalīfa (lieutenant), see the
article of de Goeje referred to in Van Berchem, l. c., p. 755. Al-Shīrāṣī
(al-Tanbih, p. 44) speaks of the Khalīfa of a cadi.
4 I have adopted the reading of Ms. 5893, and believe that the refer-
ence is to Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdallāh al-‘Uṭakī,
author of a Ta‘rīkh al-Maghribī; Al-Dhahabī, Mustabīḥ, p. 345. The
title alone is mentioned in Ibn al-Faraḍī, Kitāb ʿUlamāʾ al-Andalus
still in the Maghrib he ordered the cadi of his land, al-Nu‘mān ibn Muhammad, to make some silver astrolabes, (advising him) to seat some trustworthy person near the workman. Al-Nu‘mān placed there his own son Muhammad. When the work was finished, he gave it to al-Mu‘izz, who asked him, “Whom didst thou place by the side of the workman?” He answered, “My son Muhammad.” Upon this the caliph said, “He shall be the cadi of Egypt.” Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān related: “When al-Mu‘izz saw me—I was then quite a young fellow—he said to his son, ‘Here is thy cadi.’” Al-Musabbiḥī relates: “Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān during his term of office appointed thirty assessors.” He says further: “Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān was very subtle in his judgments. A woman once came to him demanding her rights of her husband, which he refused to render to her. She then asked the cadi to put her husband under lock and key, which he ordered to be done. Looking at her, he found her to be comely and in a gleeeful mood. When her husband went to the prison, the cadi ordered that she should be locked up with him. At this she was very angry; but the cadi said to her: ‘We have locked him up to satisfy your rights; we lock you up to satisfy his.’ When the woman found this out she withdrew the complaint, and as she went away the cadi said: ‘I saw that she was delighted at his being locked up, and I was afraid that she would have leisure for wrong-doing.’”

He adds: The vizier ibn Killis was much opposed to the sons of al-Nu‘mān in regard to their judgments. It happened that al-Hasan ibn al-Husain ibn ‘Alī ibn Yahyā al-Dakkāk married [p. 246, 1] his son to an orphan known by the name Bint al-Dībājī with the permission of Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān. One of the witnesses, Bakr ibn Ḍḥmad al-Mālikī, arose and charged that the contract was fraudulent, as the girl was not of age. He was persistent in this statement. Ibn al-Nu‘mān, however, decided “It has been proven by her own assertion that she is of age.” She was taken to the kāṣr and the affair was brought to al-‘Azīz. She

---

1 I suppose that this is the meaning of َلِحَدَة here. It might also signify “he reconciled,” i.e., litigants, which was one of the functions of a cadi.

2 Wards in chancery could be married only with the permission of a judge. Al-Shīrāzī, I. c., p. 19.
was examined and found not to be of age. The cadı was therefore asked to annul the marriage; whereon the vizier cited both cadı and witnesses before him and having sworn them, said:

"May his honor declare this marriage annulled and refuse to receive the testimony of these witnesses." The cadı did so, putting out a document to this effect. In it the statement was made that it had been proven to him that the girl was not of age. The vizier disapproved of the witnesses as they had been negligent in their conduct. This happened towards the end of Jumāda 1, 375. He (the vizier?) commanded that the property of the young woman should be placed in chancery, though he deducted from it a quarter for her maintenance.

(On another occasion,) it was reported to Muḥammad ibn al-Nuʿmān that a Christian had turned Mohammedan, that he had changed back again, though he had passed his 80th year. He was asked to recant, but refused. His case was reported to al-ʿAzīz, who had him turned over to the chief of police. He then ordered the cadı to send him four witnesses who should induce him to repent. Should he so repent he was to have (from al-ʿAzīz) 100 dīnārs; but if he persisted, he was to be killed. He rejected Islām and was killed, his body being cast into the Nile.¹

A man of the Walad ʿAṣīl ibn Abī Ṭālīb² once cited before him his wife who had a daughter with her, of whom the man declared he was not the father. Ibn al-Nuʿmān tried to dissuade him, but was unable to do so. [p. 247, 1] The case was brought before al-ʿAzīz, who commanded the cadı to have the

¹ On the treatment of apostates from Islām, as recommended by the various schools, see Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien, vol. ii, p. 215; Tornauw, l. c., p. 298. Al-Ḥākim, of course, handled with great severity those who were enemies of the Alīd pretensions. It is related that a Syrian once affirmed that he did not know who ʿAlī was. Muḥammad ibn al-Nuʿmān did the bidding of his master, had the man imprisoned and then sent four notaries to question him. After that, he was brought before al-Ḥākim, who had his head cut off. See de Sacy, Les Druses, vol. i, p. COXVIII.

² ʿAṣīl was a cousin of the prophet. See al-Nawāʾi, Ktāb Tēhdīb al-ʾHādī, ed. Wūstenfeld, p. 426; Wūstenfeld, Register zu den genealogischen Tabellen, p. 84; Sprenger, Mohammad, vol. i, p. 146; al-Dhahabī, al-Mushtabīḥ, p. 368.
li‘ān pronounced between them. The cadi cited them in Dhul-Ka‘da 378 to the Jāmī’ al-‘Atıq; the witnesses came and he warned the husband, who, however, insisted upon the li‘ān. 

So the cadi pronounced it between them and thus separated them. 

His son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was appointed judge in his place. 

He presided on Mondays and Thursdays. At the beginning of the year 381 he appointed many of the nobles his assessors; and in Safar 382 he appointed a man named Ja‘far in the jāmī’ to deliver fetwas according to the Meccan rite. But the fakīhs of the jāmī’ rose up in tumult against him. When the cadi heard of this, he took some of them and sent three of them around (the city) riding upon camels. 

As the position of the cadi, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz, became more secure, he ceased altogether to go to the jāmī’, holding court in his own dwelling place. No one spoke to him without addressing him as “Our lord.” 

Now when (the caliph) al-ʿAzīz died, Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān remained in his house in al-Ḳāhirah, and had his son ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz preside at the court in Mısır every Monday and Thursday. Ibn Zūlāḳ says: I have never seen of any cadi in Egypt what I have seen of Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān, nor have I heard the like of it in regard to any cadi in ʿIrāq. He deserved this reputation, for he was learned, careful and cautious, distinguished in bearing and in conduct. Abu ʿAbdallāh al-Samarḵandī says of him:

1 The li‘ān is the curse which the husband pronounces upon his wife if he suspects her of adultery, but has not sufficient proof to substantiate his charge, or if the fourth of the necessary witnesses is wanting. The formula that he uses is from the Koran, Sura xxiv, 4-9 لعنة الله علیها أن كنتم من الكاذبين, upon which the whole ordinance is based. The wife could do the same in regard to her husband. See the section باب اللعائ in al-Shirāzi, l. c., pp. 283 et seq.; al-Shа’rānī, Kitāb al-Mizān, ii, 111; Kashf al-Ghumma, ii, 86. A portion of the passage in Bukhārī’s Saḥīḥ is translated by Goldziher in his Muhammedische Studien, vol. ii, p. 235. See, further, Tornauw, l. c., p. 219; Querry, Droit Musulman, vol. i, p. 92, and Snouck-Hurgronje in ZDMG., vol. liii, p. 163.

2 Ibn Khallikān (vol. ii, p. 365) mentions the fact that in Jumāda 1, 880 (July-August 990) Muḥammad appointed the celebrated astronomer ʿAlī ibn Yūnus, the author of so-called Hākimīt Tables, to act as ‘adl. 

3 I suppose that this was considered degrading for a man of position. Only the poor and the Bedouin ride on camels. 

4 Ibn Khallikān has “Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ja‘farī of Samarcand; he, also, cites some more verses than ibn Ḥajar.
He was unique in noble qualities, he was illustrious in honorable deeds and excellent. His brilliancy gleamed and he pressed resolutely on, as gleams a polished sword. When he gave judgment rectitude was his companion, when he gave awards beneficence was his colleague. When he ascended the pulpit he was a veritable Kuss, when he was present at gatherings he was a true Khalil.

Al-Musabbihi says he wrote many verses, but they do not evidence much power. Among the best are:

O thou who are like the full moon of heaven, when seven and five and two days have passed;

O thou who art by nature perfect in beauty, thou engrossest my heart and keepest my eye from sleep.

Is there anything that is desirable in thy mouth for me? If not, I must go off with the sandals of Hunain.

He adds: During his term of office he had a brutal fellow stoned who had committed adultery with an Alid woman. The man was stoned in the Sūk al-Dawābb near to the mosque of Ibn Tulun in the year 392. But when increasing power came to him and his station became elevated, sickness took hold of him—gout and festering sores. He was ill most of the time.

---

1 Some readings in the Mss. are undoubtedly wrong: Berlin 9819 omits the lines altogether. In the first line of poetry, Paris 5893 has فضيلة, Ibn Khall. has فضيلة, Ibn Khall. has وحيد, Ibn Khall. has عيني.

In the second line for اعتراضا I have translated according to the emended text.

2 According to de Slane (Ibn Khallikān, vol. iii, p. 573/4) the references here are to Kuss bishop of Najrān, and to al-Khalīl ibn Aḥmad. Kuss was renowned for his eloquence, and the saying went: اخطب من (see Freytag, Proverbia, vol. iv, Index); Sprenger, Mohammed, vol. i, p. 102; Sprenger, El-Masūdī's . . . "Meadows of Gold," i, p. 138. Al-Khalīl was the founder of the science of prosody among the Arabs (Flügel, Die grammatischen Schulen der Araber, p. 87).

3 I. e., at the time of its fullness.

4 I. e., Can I expect any favour from thee?

5 I. e., disappointed. See the explanation in de Slane, l. c., vol. iii, p. 578, note 8.
so that his son ‘Abd al-‘Azīz performed his judicial functions, kept the registers in his father’s house and performed his other duties. Barjawān, in spite of his rank, visited him every Thursday. He was very well-mannered, of fine stature, stout, well ridden, well groomed and perfumed, whether sitting in his majlis or riding out. Whenever he had to make a gift he gave much and he gave quickly.

His death happened on Tuesday evening, Safar 4, [p. 249, 1] while he was still in office. Al-Hākim came, said the prayers over him in his house, and had him buried beneath its kubba. Afterwards his body was transferred to the cemetery. He had been in office fourteen years six months and ten days. There was found charged to him property to the amount of 36,000 динар belonging to orphans and others. The governor, Barjawān, ordered all that was found to be seized, sending his secretary, Abū al-‘Alā Fahl, a Christian, to seize this property, to give orders in regard to its sale, and to exact payment from the notaries in whose charge the property had been. He who could show a written document of the cadi was allowed to remain in possession of what he had; but he who could not show a written document of the cadi was fined, until half of the judgment was paid up. Then a settlement was made with the creditors at the rate of one-half. The judge further ordered that in future no money belonging to orphans or to persons absent should be deposited with any notaries. He then set apart a place in the Zukāk al-‘Kānādil where this money should be deposited. Four notaries were to put a seal upon it, and it was not to be opened except in the presence of all of them. For some time the matter remained in this fashion. Muḥammad ibn al-Nu‘mān, however, gave over to one of the notaries, ʿAbdallāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Mīdādī, the money belonging to an orphan, and demanded a notarial document in regard to it. The notary

1 On the eunuch Barjawān, the regent for the young caliph al-Hākim, see ibn Khallikān, vol. i, p. 253; Stanley Lane-Poole, History of Egypt, p. 124.
2 The term حاكم acquired the meaning “governor;” then it was used for any ruler. See Van Berchem, l. c., pp. 305, 420.
3 Read ﺑَﻌْرَم ﻟَغْرَم in the text.
4 Ibn Dukmāk, l. c., p. 13, mentions a ﺒِناء القناديل, but in Fustāt.
refused. Then Muhammad said: "He is not the one who ought to write out such a document." It happened that al-Miṣrī died in the year 379, while holding many such deposits. Yazīd ibn al-Sanādī, the secretary of al-Ḥākim, had sent to him before his death [p. 250, 1] to get a receipt in regard to the moneys that he held. After his death, the greater part of this money was not found. So the cadi sold his house for 5,000 dinārs and with this paid the deposits.

Al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Ali ibn al-Nu‘mān ibn Muhammad ibn Mansūr ibn Aḥmad ibn Hayyān (with unpointed ha, ya, silent waw with dama, and at the end a nān), al-Maghribī al-Islāmī of the fourth century. He was born in Maḥdiyya, two days before the end of Dhu-l-Ḥijja 353. When quite young he came with his father to al-Kīhirah. He learnt a book on law by heart, and was so able as to become one of the imāms of the Seveners.1 His uncle, Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān, appointed him judge in the jāmi‘. Then he was deposed in favor of the former’s son, ‘Abd al-‘Aṣīz ibn Muhammad. When Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān died, Egypt remained without a cadi for 19 days. Then Barjawān invited him by the order of al-Ḥākim and made him cadi; placing his cousin ‘Abd al-‘Aṣīz ibn Muhammad ibn al-Nu‘mān over cases in appeal. This occurred at the end of Ṣafar or at the beginning of Rabi‘ I, 389. Al-Muṣabbīḥī gives the corrected date as Ṣafar 23rd. He says: Barjawān clothed him with a sword and with white linen garments, he put on him a mantle and gave him a turban—both of them gilded.2 He caused him

---

1 If this translation is correct, it will be necessary to read السعيدة. On these "Seveners" see Macdonald, Development of Muslim Theology, p. 42. Perhaps the correct reading is الشيعية.

2 I have translated in this fashion because of the note in Dozy, Dictionnaire des Noms des Vêtements, pp. 180, 1, s. v. مقطع مقطع. But مقطعة may be the same as the more usual مقطعة, of which de Goeje (Glossary to Tabari, p. CXXXIX) has collected a number of instances in the sense "vestimenta consuta."

3 Read here مذهب. It seems that the turban worn by jurists was thicker than that worn by ordinary Muhammadans. For that reason, a jurist is sometimes called صاحب عمامة or رَبَّ الْعَمَامة (Dozy, Vêtements, p. 307). The طِبْلسان or طرَّمَة (a veil) was origin-
to ride upon a mule' with two mules going before him. Before him were borne many fine garments. The diploma, which created him head cadi in Miṣr, al-Kāhira, Alexandria, Syria, [p. 251, 1] the two sacred places, the West and its provinces was read out while he remained standing. He was appointed leader in prayer and controller of the markets. He rode to the jāmiʿ and he refused to receive a company of notaries who had served his uncle to the number of fourteen. Al-Musabbīḥ gives their names. After a month's time he received them and installed al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭāhir as judge in Miṣr and Mālik ibn Saʿīd al-Fārīkī in al-Ḳāhira. He made his brother al-Nuʿmān inspector of weights and measures. This last one was also made cadi in Alexandria and Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥī

ally worn only by the chief cadi, and became thus part of his investiture (ibid., pp. 255, 279). Al-Nuwairī (quoted by Quatemère, l. c. vol. i, part i, p. 21) says distinctly in speaking of Mālik Saʿīd, son of Baibars: خلِع على الأعيان والأكابر بالطراحات وما كان قبل ذلك يتخلع بالطرحة إلا على قاضي القضاة. See further citations ibid.; and cf. Sprenger, "Eine Skizze der Entwicklungsgesch. des muslimischen Gesetzes," in Zeitschrift für vergleichende Rechtswissenschaft, vol. x, p. 28. Evetts, Coptic Churches, ii, p. 120. This peculiar head-dress persisted down through Mameluke times, and is often referred to. See the account of Barbafella, secretary of the Venetian Ambassador in 1508 in Patton, Hist. of the Egypt. Revol. i, p. 62, and Joseph ibn Isaac Sambari's Hebrew account (end of the seventeenth century) in Neubauer, Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles, i, 115.

1 At a later time a special piebald mule was kept in the royal stables for the use of the chief cadi. See al-Kalkashandī, l. c., p. 184; al-Makrīzī, al-Khīṭāṭ: ويقَدِّم له من الأصباط برسم ركوبه على الدروهم بغلة شهباء وهو من شخصه بهذا اللون من البغال دون أرباب الدولة.

8 ָסָלָתָ may also mean "gifts," "donations." See de Goeje in the glossary to his edition of Balāḏurī, p. 108. "Controller of gifts and donations?"

9 L. e., مكتسب.

The correct reading is theμια as in Ms. 5893. Theμια in the other Mss. is a mistake forμια.
'Awwām responsible for the pensions. He who had charge of the property of orphans was also intrusted with the accounts.

On Ẓafar 3, 391, while he was sitting in the jāmi' of Miṣr expounding the law, the evening prayer was offered. It had just been commenced when a Maghrībī from Andalusia came and attacked him. With the knife of a basket-maker he gave him two cuts, in the face and on the head. The man was caught, killed and hung up. From that day on al-Ḥusain was guarded by twenty armed men. Al-Musabbiḥī mentions this matter in his history while discussing the events of Muharram 2nd, 393. The cadi waited until his wound was healed; then he went to al-Ḥākim. He received investiture, was carried upon a mule, while another was led before him.

This al-Ḥusain was wounded while performing a rak'a [p. 252, 1] during the evening prayer. For this reason the guards were accustomed to take their station back of him with drawn swords until he had finished; then they said their prayers. Al-Musabbiḥī affirms that he was the first cadi to whom this happened. Al-Ḥākim gave orders that double the salary, presents and appanages of his uncle should be given to al-Ḥusain. He made a condition, however, that al-Ḥusain should not touch even a single dirhem of money belonging to the people. 2 He put him in office, invested him with the sword, caused him to ride on a mule, giving him the care of justice over his whole kingdom. He made him preacher and imām in the chief mosques; 4 gave him the care of them and of other mosques; appointed him inspector of the mint, and of preaching, as well as chief reader and chief scribe at the evening levee. He was the first ʿUbaidi cadi to be preacher. On account of his poor health the people imagined that he would not preside at court, and that the

---

1 Read *إِنْتَام* with Ms. 5893.
2 * إِطْبَاعُ either "apanares" (Quatremère, l. c., ii, p. 200), or "the revenues of his estate" (Dozy, vol. ii, p. 374).
3 I. e. money of orphans and the like, placed for safety in the ḏīwān of the cadi.
4 If the correct reading here is, as I suppose, *المساجد الجامعِة*, the reference must be to the "cathedral mosques" (if such a barbarous term be permitted), where the Friday prayers were said. The older term was *masjīd*. In course of time, any mosque was called a *jāmi’*. See the learned notes of Van Berchem in his *Corpus*, pp. 178, 765.
appointment was really meant for the son of his uncle Muḥammad, ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, because his father had preceded him as judge and had instructed him during his lifetime. Then a number of people made the complaint that there were deposits belonging to them in the cadi’s dīwān. The cadi cited his cousin Ābd Al-‘Azīz ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Nu‘mān, and wrote to his uncle Abū Ṭāhir ibn al-Musnadī in regard to the matter. He was told that his uncle had made free use of all this money, regarding it as a loan. Their reply displeased him, and he made a further investigation, sending Fāhūd ibn Ibrāhīm the Christian, the secretary of Barjāwān, to examine into their accounts. So he took charge and investigated and compelled ‘Abd al-‘Azīz [p. 253, 1] to sell whatsoever his father had left. Then he sold all that he had, realizing from this more than 7,000 dīnārs. The secretary, however, had calculated the liability to be twice this sum. The cadi, sitting in the kāṣr, called the creditors and paid them the sums owed.

He then set apart in the Zuḵāq al-Ḵanādīl a special place for the moneys deposited with the cadi and placed there five notaries to register whatsoever was brought there and attested. He was the first to set aside a separate place for the care of moneys intrusted to the cadi. Previous to this all such property had been intrusted to the cadi in person or to his assessor. Al-Ḥusayn attended to all affairs with harshness and severity. He was the first one to have the title chief cadi in his patent; his father being the first of the Egyptian cadis to be addressed by such a title. Al-Ḥasan al-Maghribī once brought a law case before him; but his tongue slipped while he was addressing the cadi. This angered the cadi, who sent him to the prefect of police and he was punished in the presence of the cadi’s chamberlain with 1800 strokes. He was carried about the city in disgrace and died upon that same day. His bier was brought out, most of the people of the city came to see it, and honored his grave, praying for him but cursing the one that had done him injury. The cadi repented of his deed—but his repentance was too late.

2 مهابة i. e. he inspired fear among people.
3 Or “in his protocols.”
In Rajab 393 al-Ḥākim gave ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Muḥammad permission to try cases and to take testimony, though at the same time he confirmed al-Ḥusain in his positions. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz arranged that notaries should be present at his majlis, making the condition that they should not be present at the majlis of his cousin. In this manner the people were quite uncertain what to do. [p. 254, 1] If one party brought a case before al-Ḥusain, his opponent would bring the case before ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz. When ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz was present in the jāmiʿ, the place of al-Ḥusain was quite deserted, so that the matter was much talked about. Al-Ḥākim then wrote a diploma in his own hand to the effect that trial cases should be brought only before al-Ḥusain. He ordered that no one should register judicial decrees upon the authority of anyone else; and that if anyone summoned a litigant who had already brought his case before al-Ḥusain, no one else could take charge of it.1 This diploma was read before the assembly.2 At this the cadi’s heart rejoiced. His growing prominence did not cease until he reached the highest point of glory; so that he compelled the notaries to be present at his own house and in the jāmiʿ, and whenever one of them absented himself he had him punished.3 It was his custom to have the contents of the documents he was to sign read in his presence before he added his own signature.

In spite of all this (harshness) he was very kind to men of learning. He used to reward them with flour and barley, etc., and would send them garments and other things. This lasted until al-Ḥākim ordered him to be removed from office in Ramadān 394. He knew nothing of this, remaining in his house, until someone came and told him that his cousin ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz had been made cadi. He refused to believe it until it was substantiated. Thereupon he shut his door and remained in his house. His fear waxed [p. 255, 1] until on Muḥarram 6, al-

---

1 For the meaning of لا يبكي أحدا' see the instances cited by de Goeje in the glossary to Ṭabari, p. cdlxxxix.
2 ملأ, de Goeje, ibid., p. cdxc.
3 حبل؟ It is possible that the reading should be لازم جعل حبة تروخل منه, i. e., he imposed a small fine.
Hākim gave orders that he should be taken upon an ass in broad daylight and imprisoned; and at the beginning of the year 395 he was beheaded together with Abū Tāhir al-Maghāzī and the muezzin of the kaṣr. The bodies of the three were then burned near to the Bāb al-Futūh. One of the things that led al-Hākim to disavow him was the story of the man whom the chief of police had beaten so that he died, as related previously.

Ibrāhīm ibn al-Rakīk,¹ in his history of North Africa, has related the story of this al-Ḥusain and al-Hākim. He says (in the exact words): “And al-Hākim killed his cadi, Ḥusain ibn ‘Ali, and had him burned in fire.” It is said that one of the reasons of his killing him was that al-Hākim had been very liberal to him;² but had made the condition that he should keep his hands off the people’s money. A certain man who had a grievance sent a paper to al-Hākim, in which he told him that when his father died he had left him 20,000 dīnārs, and that it had been placed in the dīwān of the cadi Ḥusain. He (the son) was living for some time upon this money. He had come one day and asked for some of it; but the cadi told him that all that his father had left was spent. Al-Hākim summoned the cadi and showed him the complaint. The cadi answered just as the complainant had averred, adding that whatever had been left by the man’s father had been spent on the man’s living. Al-Hākim at once ordered the books of the cadi dealing with this matter to be brought. When this was done, al-Hākim looked up the accounts of the man, and it turned out that he had received only a little of the actual sum. Most of it was found to be still due him. Al-Hākim enumerated to the cadi the high offices he had given him, the various gifts and honors, and his having made the condition that al-Ḥusain should not touch the people’s money. He was afraid and terrified, and said, “Forgive me, and I shall do better.” He went away

¹ Abū Iṣḥāq Ibrāhīm ibn al-Kāsim al-Kātib al-Kairuānī al-Rakīk al-Nadīm (Brockelmann, i, 155). His Ta’rīkh Kairuān is not mentioned by Brockelmann; but it is cited by Nuwairī, ‘Idhārī, Maqrīzī, Maqrīzī, Ibn Khaldūn, Hājī Khalīfa, etc. See Carl H. Becker, Beiträge zur Gesch. Aegyptens, i, 9. The present citation shows that Becker is right in placing his death later than 388 A.H. (the date given by Brockelmann).

² Cf. the expression: مَكَّة عينه حلَبَة.

³ Reading with Ms. 5898 التعرّض.
with the man and paid him what was owing in the presence of witnesses. But al-Ḥākim bore him a grudge and had him thrown into prison. Then he was taken out upon an ass in broad daylight, the people looking on and following him until he came to the loggia, where he was beheaded and his body burnt.

He held the office of cadi for five years, seven months and eleven days. Al-Musabbiḥī says that he once pronounced the liʿār between a drunken ʿaman and his wife in the Jāmiʿ al-ʿAtīk, which was without precedent under the ʿUbaidites. ʿAl-Iḥākim gave to the aforementioned cadi as a fief a house in the vicinity of the Khāliḍ al-Ḥākimī. When the Nile was high he went (in a boat) to this house; the notaries came to him by land upon their donkeys. Then he rode ḍro from it to the ʿAṣr and returned; after which he went to his dwelling-place in the Dār al-Ḥamrāʾ.

ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Mūhammad ibn al-Nuʿman ibn Mūhammad ibn al-Manṣūr ibn Ahmad ibn Ḥāyyān al-Kairūnī was an ʿIsmāʿīlīan of the fourth century. He was born on the first of Rabīʿ 1, 355. He was appointed cadi on Thursday, Ramadān 16, 394, and the revision of judgments was given in his power. He was invested in the usual way, being carried upon a mule, while two other mules were led before him, and a trunk filled with garments was carried in front of him. He entered the jāmiʿ, a large assembly being present. His diploma was read out from the pulpit. His first act as judge was to dismiss all the notaries whom his uncle al-Ḥusain had been accustomed to receive, with the exception of Shāraf ibn Mūhammad al-Maḵrif, whom he appointed to write down his decisions and his law cases. In his protocols the following was his title: "The Chief cadi ʿAbd

---

1 The Great Canal, variously called Khāliḍ Miṣr, Khāliḍ Amīr al-Muʿminīn, Khāliḍ al-Ḥākimī, etc.; see al-Khīṭāt ii, 188; Siyyūṭī, ʿḤusn, i, 76; Ibn Iyās, Taʿrīkh Miṣr, p. 163, and de Sacy, Relation de l'Égypte par Abd-Allatīf, p. 419, note 11:

2 The titles here given are of interest. He is called the "Cadi of ʿAbd Allāh," with reference to the Shiʿite pretensions of descent from ʿAlī who is the ʿAlī al-ḥaḍrāt (Van Berchem, l. c., p. 48). Manṣūr is part of the caliph's name: Manṣūr abū ʿAlī. The formula ʿAlī al-ḥaḍrāt wa ʿAbd Allāh, to which is usually added ʿAbd Allāḥ al-ʾakhrīn (ibid., p. 25 et al.), has a like reference. When al-Jauhar came to Fustāṭ, he had the following words added at the end of the Khūṭba: "O my God! bless Muhammad the chosen, ʿAlī the accepted, ʿĀṣima the pure, and al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain, the two grandsons of the Apostle;
al-'Aziz cadi of 'Abdallāh and of his representative Manṣūr Abū 'Alī the Imām al-Hākim, commander of the faithful—may God bless him and his pure fathers—over Al-Kāhira of al-Mu'izz, Misr, Alexandria, the Two Holy Places, the districts of Syria, al-Rahlī, al-Raḳkā, the Maghrib, together with its provinces,

then whom thou hast freed from stain and thoroughly purified (الذين أذهب الله عنهم الرجس وطهرهم تطهيراً). O my God! bless the pure Imāms, ancestors of the Commander of the believers (اللهم صلى على الأئمة الطاهرين أبااء أبهم المومنين)." In the interesting bit of Genizah poetry by one Solomon ben Joseph ha-Kohen (published by Julius H. Greenstone in AJSL, January, 1906), the Fāṭimids are also called al-Mansūr al-Manīm (line 8). There are a number of such references to peculiar Muhammadan titles and expressions, e.g., l. 5 8a: al-laḥil 11 11c: al-qādī al-MMārūn = ḥādiyya ḍr marūdūm; amīr al-jībiw = ẓawār 12a: al-shaykh al-iṣlāḥ = ḍr 11 laḥil rāṣidann; cf. Sīf al-ʾālam, f. 30: laḥiliya bīn 13b: ẓawār; Sīf al-adill, f. 20a: al-laḥil 139b: al-qādī al-MMārūn = ḍr 11 laḥil rāṣidann; In a notarial document written for the Chief Cadi al-Kāsim ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn al-Nu'mān (an account of which will be published in the JQR. for April, 1907) and referring to the rebuilding of one of the old synagogues in Cairo, the full title of al-Mustansīr is given. It is interesting to compare the extent of the caliph's rule there mentioned with that to be found in the diploma of his cadi. He is described as:

as well as whatsoever God has given into his power, and he has made easy to be conquered by the Commander of the Faithful (in the countries of the East and West).”¹

And ‘Abd al-‘Azīz nominated to be his successor as judge Mālik ibn Sa‘īd al-Fārīkī, and in [matters relating to] petitions Ibn Abī ‘Awwām. The notaries whom he had not received hung around his door; so he sent to them [saying]: “Court duties have increased greatly upon me and I shall need your assistance in receiving testimony. Each one of you must attend to his business; and whenever I need one of you for testimony, I will make an appointment with him.” Then they left him. [p. 258, 1] But on the 17th day of Dhul-Ka‘da he had them come and made them take an oath that they had made no efforts to find employment as notaries under his uncle, that they had neither bribed him nor otherwise induced him to appoint them.² They took the oath in regard to this, and he received them.

Al-Ḥākim caused ‘Abd al-‘Azīz to mount the minbar with him upon Fridays and upon festive occasions, as had been the custom of his predecessors. His power in legal matters extended and his station became exalted. He took his seat in the jāmi‘ and commenced to expound the work of his grandfather entitled “The Basal Distinctions of the [Different] Schools of Law.” During his occupancy al-Ḥākim made over to him the care of the Dār al-‘Ilm³ which he had instituted. Al-Ḥākim [namely]...
had built and arranged it, and had placed in it many scientific works, throwing it open to the Fāklīs, allowing them to sit in it doing whatsoever they pleased—copying, studying or reading; after it had been furnished, the hangings placed upon the doors, and the necessary arrangements made for its attendants and for the servants in charge of the furniture.

This ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was appointed to sit and to converse with al-Ijākim. The cadi found it necessary to give his older son al-‘Kāsim permission to participate in his legal functions at the jāmi‘, where he sat to hear cases and to decide disputes. People were accustomed to take cases from him to his father and from his father to him. His younger son he ordered [p. 259, 1] to verify the documents which people brought, and to render decisions in a court held in his own dwelling. In addition, al-Ijākim appointed him (‘Abd al-‘Azīz) to administer the estate of his cousin Husain ibn ‘Ali ibn al-Nu‘mān, after that one had been killed; so he took charge of all his property. He did the same with the estate of Abu Manṣūr al-Jauzī, one of the prominent men of his reign. He preferred the cadi as prayer-leader over a number of his assistants; the custom having come into vogue that the caliph alone should lead them in prayer. He commanded him to forbid men and women to promenade in the streets on the ‘Āshūrā festival; it being their (i. e. Alid) custom to send out women and others who poured forth lamentations, who wept for al-Ḥusain, and who chanted dirges in the streets. The crowds were accustomed to stretch forth their hands to the goods of the merchants. This having come to the ear of al-Ijākim, he commanded the cadi to forbid their going about in the streets and [to order] that they should only lament and chant in the open country.

It happened that a certain Kutāmī 4 owed a certain sum but refused to pay it. It having been in his possession during a bad

---

1 Or "to register."
2 On the ‘Āshūrā festival, see the data which I have collected in the *Jewish Encyclopaedia* s. v.
3 I.e. the space between Cairo and Jabal al-Muṣṭāṣam, called in al-Maqrizī's time "The Smaller Kafrā." See *al-Khijaf*, ii, p. 455.
4 The Kutāmā were a Berber tribe. ‘Ubaid Allāh, the founder of the Fāṭimid dynasty, was a Kutāmī. See al-Istakhrī, ed. de Goeje, p. 30, below.
year," he had appropriated it for himself. The case came to the attention of the cadi, who sent a messenger to the man; but [the messenger] was spurned. The matter was then brought to the attention of al-Ḥākim, who ordered the Kūtāmi to be dragged before the cadi in Fusṭāṭ. Then he was brought on foot to al-Kāhirah and compelled to give up that which was due. Al-Ḥākim [also] entrusted to the cadi the care of the mosques, the handling of the wakfs, the collection of the products [belonging to them] and the application of them [p. 260, 1] as he should think well. This he did to the best of his ability, detailing for the purpose two tellers who should pass upon accounts.

The cadi betrothed his two sons to the daughters of the kā'id Faḍl ibn Śāliḥ. The ceremony was held in the castle, the marriage contract being for four thousand dinārs which al-Ḥākim accorded from the public treasury. He bestowed upon them ready-made robes of honor and sixteen double pieces of cloth. The two were carried upon saddled mules, similar ones being led before them.

The cadi was severe in his judgment; his authority was great, and he exercised authority over all the people of the kingdom. He gave orders that those notaries who should absent themselves in the morning up to the time of the majlis on Mondays and Thursdays should be mulcted in a heavy fine. His delegate at court, Mālik ibn Sa‘īd, asked him to appoint al-Khalīl ibn al-Khalīl in his place, as something had happened to him preventing him from riding or from going to court. This request he granted; though this had not been permitted to any other, that a delegate should name his own substitute in the city.

Al-Musabbiḥi relates in his history—when detailing the events of the year 397 [A.H. ]—the following circumstances, the gist of which is: 'Alī ibn Sulaimān al-Munajjim,\(^2\) one of the intimates of the commander-in-chief al-Ḥasan [p. 261, 1] ibn Jauhar, told him that the cadi was visiting al-Ḥusayn ibn Jauhar the kā'id in his dwelling upon one of the Christian's fast days. He found there Abū al-Ḥasan al-Rasī,\(^3\) al-Munajjim and their

---

\(^1\) The reading in the text is difficult. In lieu of it, I would suggest \(\text{ركزان علامة شدة باء وجرعة}\).

\(^2\) Or "the astrologer."

\(^3\) The reading of the name is not clear in the Mss.; but see al-Dhahabi, \(\text{al-Tanbīh}, \) p. 246; Kosegarten, \(\text{Chrestomathie}, \) p. 121.
attendants. A servant came in to say that Abū Ya‘kūb al-Kiṣṭās, the physician, was at the door. He was invited to come in, the company being at table. They made him welcome and a number of dishes were placed before him. Then the table was cleared and drinks were brought, also the fruits and scents belonging thereto. They fell to until they became drunk. The cadi then went away; while the kā‘id and al-Rasī fell asleep. Abū Ya‘kūb, the physician, remained in a portico which he had built in this place—the portico overlooked a large stretch of water—drinking and enjoying himself until he was overcome by drunkenness. They then went out looking for his mule. The mule of al-Rasī was brought, but he refused to mount it. The servants begged him to return to his place until his own mule should be brought. So he went back to where al-Rasī was, and slept at his side. Then one of the lackeys came and lifted the curtain, looking for the two. He saw al-Rasī but did not see Abū Ya‘kūb; so he entered and searched for him; and [in the end] caught sight of the tail of his garment in the water. He called a lackey who knew how to swim; this one jumped into the water, and found Abū Ya‘kūb with his garments rolled around his face and sunk in the water. The servants sent word to the kā‘id, summoned the cadi, and waked up al-Rasī. [p. 262, 1] The [whole] matter was most disagreeable to them, as they knew the consideration al-Hākim had for al-Ya‘kūb. They begged me to inform al-Hākim of what had happened. I went to him and told him that Abū Ya‘kūb had gotten up during the night while in a stupor, and had jumped into the river; and that when the lackey got to him he found him caught in his clothing and drowned. This grieved al-Hākim, who appeared to be very much affected. He had the matter looked into. The exact circumstances were related to him, but he shook his head.

The cadi, al-Rasī and the kā‘id, however, had come to the castle on foot with fine turbans on their heads. Al-Hākim summoned them [to his presence]. They swore and affirmed upon oath that they had had nothing to do with the whole affair. The kā‘id and the cadi called al-Rasī to witness, and he testified to their innocence. Orders were then given that the body should

---

1 The description confirms Dozy's suggestion (ii. 41) that the ٴ was a "portique ouvert."
be prepared and buried. This occurred towards the end of the year 397 [A.H.].

On Thursday, the middle of Rajab 398, the report was spread abroad that 'Abd al-'Azīz, the cadi, had been deposed and that his successor, Mālik ibn Sa‘īd, had been confirmed. When the morning came, he did not go to the court until near mid-day. Then he did go; held court, led the mid-day prayers and went off all alone, without chamberlain or footman, until he came to his dwelling place. As the day commenced to decline, certain people went around to all the chief men telling them to collect in the castle on the morrow. [p. 268, 1] So they all assembled before Mālik ibn Sa‘īd, who was invested with the various functions with which 'Abd al-'Azīz had been invested—whose term of office had [thus] lasted three years, nine months and twenty-eight days.

Al-Musabbiḥī says: 'Abd al-'Azīz dismissed from office thirteen persons while he sat as appeal judge, and two during his cadiship. After his deposition, 'Abd al-'Azīz was in the habit of going to the castle alone, though constantly expecting to be killed. On the 13th of the second Jumāda, 399 [A.H.], the kā'id Ḥusain ibn Janhar and the cadi went out riding according to their custom, and they came back without any incident having occurred.¹ Then [al-Ḥākim] sent for them; and 'Abd al-'Azīz going first, was clapped into prison. His servant returned home [alone] with his mule; whereupon the kā'id and his son hid themselves. But the door of their house was broken in and al-Ḥākim gave stringent orders that they should be brought. This being found impossible, al-Ḥākim gave word that 'Abd al-'Azīz should be released, who returned to his dwelling place. The people were already making preparations for his funeral, but he quieted them. The shop-keepers had also closed their booths; these he ordered to be opened again. After three days, the kā'id went to al-Ḥākim unmo-lested. Splendid robes were presented to him and to 'Abd al-'Azīz; before them many garments being carried. They were led [in state] upon two horses, many horsemen preceding them. Then al-Ḥākim gave back to 'Abd al-'Azīz the hearing of appeal cases. His certificate was read out; he was clothed with

¹ مسلم; or "having greeted" [al-Ḥākim.]
ready-made garments [p. 264, 1] and with the ταίλασάν. He was led riding upon a mule; before him was another and in front of him was carried a chest full of garments. He was [thus] confirmed on Șafar 9th, 400 [A.H.] The revenues of a fief were given to him, and upon the door of his dwelling-place a plaque was put with the name of the diwān. On the last days of Ramaḍān the cadi’s sons married the daughters of the kā’id to whom they had been betrothed.

In the latter part of Muharram 401 [A.H.] the cadi and the kā’id became suspicious of perfidy on the part of al-Ḥākim towards them; and on Șafar the 9th the cadi, the commander-in-chief Husain, their followers and their friends took to flight, carrying with them much of their wealth, and went in the direction of Dujwa. When al-Ḥākim heard of this, he put seals on their dwellings and ordered Mālik ibn Sa’īd al-Fārīkī to ride to the dwellings of the cadi and of al-Ḥusain, to seize whatever he might find there and to carry it off. The cadi and the kā’id kept in hiding until Muharram the 6th, 401 [A.H.] when they appeared, a safe-conduct having been written for them. They remained at their posts until Friday, the 12th of Jumāda, on which day they were present at their posts and then returned. At once al-Ḥākim sent to them and they came back; whereupon a band of Turks killed both in the vestibule. The seal was at once put [p. 265, 1] on their dwellings, their houses were immediately surrounded, and they passed away unavenged. Many of their followers were seized and fined.

‘Abd al-‘Azīz was learned in the canon-law of the Imāmī rite, as his whole family had been, especially his grandfather. The Sheikh ‘Imād al-Dīn ibn al-Kathīr attributed to him the authorship of a work entitled Al-Balāgh al-Akbar waL-Nāmūs al-A‘zām dealing with the principles of religion. But in this he was mistaken; for it was a work composed by his father giv-

---

1 Reading ٍبَسْتَقَر

2 Dujwa or Dijwa, six parasangs from Fustāṭ, Yākūt, ii, 555, in the Ṣahrqiyya province. This can hardly be the present جربة, marked in the Egyptian Postal Guide (Maṣlaḥat al-Busto, Cairo 1906, p. 208) as being in the Kalyūbiyya province.

3 Born 1301, died 1373. The reference may be to his large historical work, Al-Bidāya waL-Nihāya, Brockelmann, ii, 49.
ing the ideas of al-Nu‘mān, that one’s father. Ibn Kathīr says that the cadī Abū Bakr al-Bākīliāni wrote a refutation of this work. Ibn Kathīr adds “It contains heterodox ideas, the like of which Iblīs himself would not have conceived.” Such were his words.

Kāsim ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Nuʿmān al-Maghribī belonging to the Imāmī sect, of the fifth century. He was called Abū Muḥammad, and was put in office after Ibn Abī al-ʿAwwām on Sunday, the 4th of the first Jumāda, in the year 418. His diploma was published in the Ḷaṣr and in the Jāmiʿ of Fustāṭ. He received the title Kādī al-Quḍāt, Thīqat al-Daula, Amīn al-Aʿīma, Sharaf al-Aḥkām, Jalāl al-Islām. He exercised his functions until he was deposed on Sunday the 25th of Rajab in the year 419, he having lasted for one year, two months and some days. This was his first tenure of office. In his place was appointed ʿAbd al-Ḥakīm ibn Saʿīd ibn Mālik al-Fāriqī. On the 6th of Dhul-kāda, in the year 427, Kāsim was re-appointed to office, presided over civil [p. 266, 1] and criminal cases, and (also) over the preaching. In this period of office al-Quḍāʿī was appointed and became his locum tenens in this, his second period. Kāsim was not praised for his conduct, although his term of office lasted for a long time, until he

---

1 Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn al-Ṭayyib ibn Muḥammad ibn Jaʿfar ibn al-Kāsim al-Bākīliānī, died 1013. See Ibn Khalīkān, tr. de Slane, ii. 671. Perhaps the work referred to is his Kashf Asrār al-Bāṭiniyya mentioned by Hājī Khalīfa, v. 199.
2 I. e., Abū al-ʿAbbās ʿAbd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn ʿAbd Allāh ibn Abī ʿAwwām.
3 Al-Musabbībī, in treating of the year 415, mentions the fact that al-Ṭāhir had al-Kāsim ascend the minbar with him. He is here called only “Chief Preacher.” Becker, Beiträge, i, 72, 4.
4 The synagogue document above referred to (of the year 429 A.H.) gives his title as follows:
was deposed in al-Muharram 441; this second term having endured thirteen years, one month and four days.¹ The verses in which both he and Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥākim al-Ṭārukī were ridiculed have already been cited.²

Abū al-Kāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Nuʿmān is the same as Ibn 'Abd al-ʿAzīz previously mentioned.

AN ADDITIONAL NOTE AND SOME CORRECTIONS.

P. 224. I am not quite correct in saying that the history of the Egyptian cadis was first written by al-Kindī. Professor Torrey calls my attention to the fact that this was done before him by Abū al-Kāsim 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam (died 257 A.H.). This was not apparent from any of the reference books; but see now Torrey, "The Muhammedan Conquest of Egypt and North Africa," in Biblical and Semitic Studies (Yale Bicentennial Publications), N. Y. 1901, p. 279: "Appealed to the history proper is a collection of brief biographies of the qādis of Egypt, from the Conquest down nearly to the author's own time." It forms the sixth of the seven parts of the Futūḥ Mīr ā. As it stops at the year 246 A.H., it is evident that al-Kindī has based his treatise upon these notes of Ibn 'Abd al-Ḥakam. I purpose to edit al-Kindī’s account of the cadis.

P. 229, note 4 read Ravaisse.  
P. 239, 13 read السرعة.  
P. 240, 1 read إباه.  
P. 242, 1 read فتنحت.  
P. 242, 4 read وسكت.  
P. 243, 11 read القضاة.  
P. 245, 2 read قائل.  
P. 245, 8 read ثقائته.  

¹ Al-Maqrīzī (al-Khīṭat, vol. i, p. 355) says that he held office for fourteen years; but this is probably not meant to be absolutely exact.
² In some other biography of this same work.
Supplement to the Old-Babylonian Vocabularies.—By R. J. Lau, Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City.

In 1896 Columbia University in New York City came into possession of 455 Babylonian clay-tablets, 258 of which are a part of the so-called Telloh tablets, discovered by Ernst de Sarzec in 1894–1895. They can be assigned to the fourth dynasty of Ur (2750–2550 B.C.), both because of the given dates and for paleographic reasons; though a number of the tablets contain only the day and month, else no date at all.

While copying, transcribing and translating these inscriptions I met with some expressions which, I believe, have not yet been translated. And when I later compared the ‘Sign-List and Glossary’ of my book, Ancient Babylonian Temple Records (soon to appear), with George A. Reissner’s Tempelurkunden, I found that the Columbia University Collection contained words and phrases which have been left untranslated by other authors, or which do not occur on any tablets so far published.

I herewith offer the following list as a supplement to the existing vocabularies:

\[ \text{AD.E} (\text{𒀭𒀹}) \], 'father of the house,' i.e., 'major domus.'

\[ \text{A.TIR} (\text{𒈭𒅖}} \), 'plant which grows in the water,' i.e., 'rice.'

\[ \text{BA} (\text{𒉡𒃐}} \), 'a parcel of a field.'

\[ \text{BAU} (\text{𒆠𒃐}} = \text{erêbu}, 'go beyond, be in excess.' on

\[ \text{ŠE.BAU.BI} (\text{𒆠𒃐𒅖𒃐}}) \], 'excess of grain ...'
BAL. KU A (𒈨𒈨を見つけ), 'someone employed at a waterwheel (BAL. = dali, draw water).

DIR. DIRIG (𒉌𒉌), 'added, surplus'.

DUH PIRI K GA IGIG + GUNU (𒈵𒈵𒈵𒈵𒈵𒈵𒈵), karpat, 'pirketi arketi (P 7) + šigbu, green-colored libation-pots for milk'.

DUMU BA.MIL (𒈹𒈹𒈹𒈹), 'slaughterer'.

ERIM KU.MAL BAL. KU.A (𒈨𒈨𒈨𒈨), 'hired slave, employed at the waterwheel'.

ERIM ŠE KIN (𒈵𒈵𒈵𒈵), 'slave (ERIM), who cuts (kin = mabasu) grain (še = še 'u)'.

GEME DA (𒈹𒈹), 'female assistant'.

GEME HAR.HAR (𒈨𒈨), 'female cook'.

GIŠ GI.R.DU (𒈲𒈲𒈲), 'something made of wood (giš) on which to place (DU = nagâzu) the foot (GI.R. = šepu), i.e., 'foot-stool'.

HU KAK (𒈲𒈲𒈲), 'caretaker of the fowl'.

KA (𒈲), 'bequeath, partial payment'.
EGIR.KA = buṣuratu arḫatu, 
'the last partial payment.'

SI. KA = buṣuratu malitu, 
'a partial payment in full.'

KA. ŠU. GAB = mašû, 'official who lifted 
(GAB = mašû) with his hand (ŠU = katu) 
the KA measure, i.e., a grain-measure.

MÀ. A SI.GA = šippu malu, 'a 
full ship, cargo.'

MÀ GIŠ.NI = a cargo of sesame, oil.'

MÀ GUR KU. BABBAR TUR, 'a small barge of silver; i.e., an ornament.'

MAL DUB.BA = house (or temple)-list,' i.e., 'list of employees.'

MU...ŠU = aššu, not developed 
from ana šu, as has been supposed, but 
from ana šumi (MU = šumu, ŠU = ana); 
then ana šum, annum, aššum and aššu.
PB.S. UM (אֲרֵךְ תִּשְׁנַע) = arēc + unnoebē, tops of date-palm branches with their dates (fruit).

SAG NI.GA (elerikןא), 'total possession'.

SI NI.ID NIN SÈ.D.AG ([op. cit.]), 'settlement of an old account'.

SAG SÈ (-strokes) = bikbu.danku, 'offering, gift'.

SI + GAR AG DE (מְלֹא דֹּא) = skillful persons (DE = ummanu), engaged in (AG = apēšu) the work (SI + GAR).

TUR.RA (טֶהֶרֶא = seēbu, 'bring, repeat, ditto'.

UD.MA.A (עֵד מָא) = taśāmu, 'twin, the second'.

URU (ירע) = sēlu, 'company, band, from idea 'city, inhabitants of a city'; cf. Hebrew בְּנֵי and Arabic نَفَراً.
Abel (אֱָבֶּל) in the Bible.—By R. J. Lau, Ph.D., Columbia University, New York City.

Siegfried and Stade (Hebräisches Handwörterbuch, p. 5*) translate this word ‘grassy plain, pasturage (Aue, Trift);’ others have suggested that it should be read דֹּלֶנ.

It neither means ‘grassy plain,’ nor must it be changed to דֹּלֶנ for the following reasons:

1. On such an דֹּלֶנ the Israelites had placed the ‘Ark of Jahve’ (1 Sam. 6, 18: "הָאָרֶץ הַגְּרוֹמֶה לְאָחֵרֹת אֶרֶב נְהָרִים אֶת הָאָרֶץ גְּרוֹמֶה לְאָחֵרֹת häʾerakhōt ʾērēḵōt ʾērēḵōt Jāhve Jāhve Jāhve Jāhve Jāhve Jāhve). If this דֹּלֶנ had been a ‘grassy plain,’ the text would read דֹּלֶנ, instead of דֹּלֶנ; it must therefore have been an object higher than the ground itself.

According to verses 14 and 15 it was an לֶוֶנ, ‘a large stone,’ which still stood in the field of Jehoshua (v. 18, last clause) in the time of the writer of the book of Samuel.

2. Other passages in which דֹּלֶנ occurs seem to prove that these stones were placed in certain localities
   a) to commemorate well-known events of the past:
      a) the דֹּלֶנ מַעֲרִיש, ‘the דֹּלֶנ of the Egyptians,’ where the Israelites (called here Egyptians) mourned for Joseph; cf. Gen. 50, 11.
      β) the דֹּלֶנ של מַעֲרִיש, ‘the דֹּלֶנ of the dance,’ which had been placed in memory of a certain ‘great rejoicing’ of the people; Judges 7, 22; 1 Kings 14, 12; 19, 16.
      γ) the דֹּלֶנ בֵּית מַעֲרִיש, ‘the דֹּלֶנ at Beth Maacah;’ 1 Kings 15, 20; 2 Kings 15, 29; 2 Sam. 20, 14, 15.
   b) to mark possession; with a signification similar to that of the Assyrian kudurrus, ‘boundary-stone.’
      a) דֹּלֶנ מִים, ‘the דֹּלֶנ of (at) the water(s);’ 2 Chron. 16, 14.
β) נָּבֶל הָעַרְמִים, ‘the נַבֶל of (at) the locust-trees;’
   Nu. 33, 49.
γ) נָּבֶל הָבִין, ‘the נָּבֶל of (at) the vine-yards;’
   Judg. 11, 33.

This נָּבֶל stone was not merely a boundary stone, but one
that marked ‘possession.’ The fact that the word occurs only
in the singular goes far to prove, that

1. only one stone was placed on the land, at the waters, in the
grove of locust-trees, or in the vineyards, mentioned above;
2. that most likely it was larger than a common boundary-stone,
but lower than the cart on which the ‘ark’ was moved.
3. A further proof for this assertion can be adduced from
the Assyrian ablū, iblu:

a) Nebuchadnezzar styles himself (VR. 55, 5): nasîr
  kudurrēti, nukînu ablē, ‘protector of the boundary-
stones, and establisher of the ablē (stones).’ According
to this passage the kudurrû was different from
the ablū.
b) Nabopolassar says (OBI. I, col. II, 28–31: "nuš/DIM.
  G.A.L. E istattum (=ištēniš) iblē ukinnu‘ the mas-
ter-builders determined the iblē.’ Here iblē must
mean not merely the boundaries, but rather the extent
of the boundaries in either direction, that is they
determined where the iblē-stones should be placed,
which marked the extent of the boundaries.

According to these two passages the Assyrians made use of
more than one ablū or iblu, which were not the same as the
kudurrē, for the words occur only in the plural. The Hebrew
לָבֶל occurs only in the singular, and was placed 1) to comemm-
orate a certain event; or 2) to signify possession.
In the Semitic languages the great majority of words are derived from triconsonantal roots. There are a number of pluriconsonantal roots, e.g., רל (imperf. Qal with suffix Ps. 80, 14), 'eat off,' יר 'frog'; Arab. تعل 'sprout; be chief'; Syr. ית 'hasten'; Eth. עניב 'עניב (anbas 'lion,' etc.; but these are in nearly all cases derived from triconsonantal roots in various ways. According to some authorities all triconsonantal roots are in their turn derived from biconsonantal roots. The biconsonantal roots, however, they regard as altogether prehistoric, and all words in the historic stages of the languages are looked upon as derived from triconsonantal stems. The shorter biconsonantal form of the verbs יי and יי are thus considered to be the result of elision and contraction of triconsonantal ones.

1 The number of pluriconsonantal roots in Hebrew is small; in Syriac the number is larger, while in Arabic and especially in Ethiopic they are relatively numerous.
2 For the ways in which these formations are developed cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, §§ 30, p. q.; Dillmann, Aeth. Gram. Leipzig, 1890, §§ 71-78, 77, 78; Nödelke, Syr. Gram.; Leipzig, 1898, § 180; and the special treatises of F. G. Schwartzlose, De LINGUA Arabicae Verborum Pluraliterorum Derivatione, Berolini, 1854; Stade, Uber den Ursprung der Mehrzahligen Thatwörter der Ge'esprache, Leipzig, 1871; Martin Hartmann, Die Pluraliterbildung in Semitischen Sprachen, Halle, 1875 [only the Erster Theil; Bildungen durch wiederholung des letzten Radicales am Schluss und des ersten nach dem zweiten has appeared]; Siegmund Francken, Beiträge zur Erklärung der Mehrkrautigen Bildungen im Arabischen, Leiden, 1878.
3 Cf. Ed. König, Lehrgebäude der Hebr. Sprache, Leipzig, 1881, 1895, II, §§ 119, 3 b), c) (p. 370 ff.); and contrast Gesenius-Kautzsch, p. 99, n. 1. It is most likely that originally all roots were not biconsonantal, but that there were also triconsonantal ones; cf. Delitzsch, Studien über Indo-germanisch-Semitische Wurzelverwandtschaft, Leipzig, 1875, p. 70.
4 Verbs יי is used as a convenient symbol meaning verbs mediae u, mediae i, following König, who uses also יי similarly.
This view of these verbs is that of the national Arabic grammarians, and it is supported by the many secondarily regular forms in their language. In Hebrew, however, which is in some respects more primitive than Arabic, the conditions are different, and the earliest Hebrew grammarians and lexicographers of the Middle Ages did not hold this view. They believed that in Hebrew there are biconsonantal and even uniconsonantal roots in the case of certain weak roots like נִלּוּ, etc. The explanation that the shorter forms of the verbs יִלַע and יִלַע are contractions, is based on the Arabic view, and was first introduced in Hebrew by the grammarian and lexicographer Hayyuj, living at Cordova, Spain, in the latter half of the 10th century and early part of the 11th, who spoke and wrote Arabic, and applied to Hebrew the principles of the Arabic language and the methods of the Arabic grammarians. His view of these verbs prevailed until the last century, and is held even at the present time by such a prominent grammarian as Ed. König, as well as by others of less note.

1 Cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch1, § 1, n.
2 This is shown by the arrangement of their lexicons. Thus, e. g., in the lexicon of Menahem ben Saruk we find the root נֶלָע treated under the biconsonantal heading נֶלָע and נֶלָע both under נֶלָע: נֶלָע, showing that the ultimate root of many so-called weak roots was considered biconsonantal. See the edition of Menahem’s Lexicon by Herschell Filipowski, Antiquissimum Linguae Hebraicae et Chaldaicae Lexicon. . . . A Menahem ben Saruk . . . Londini et Edinburgi MDCCCLIV, pp. [168]a, [171]a, [144]a, and cf. J. Fürst, Zur Geschichte der Hebräischen Lexicographie, the Introduction to his Hebräisches u. Chald. Handwörterbuch, Leipzig, 1863 (2d ed.), p. xx.
4 His views on this subject are expounded in the two treatises called the Kitâb al-Asfâl dawât Hurât al-Lin, and the Kitâb al-Asfâl dawât al-Mithla’in; see the edition by Morris Jastrow, Jr., published under the title “The Weak and Geminate Verbs in Hebrew, by . . . Hayyuj,” Leide, 1897, Preface, p. xi, and cf. Fürst, l. c. c. pp. xxiv.
5 See his Lehrgebühde, I, §34 (p. 320 ff.), where the verbs י”’ל and י”’ל are treated under the heading of Contracted Verbs. Cf. also Vorrede VII, and pp. 479–81 with pp. 451–53. Of course the question of the ultimate origin of these shorter verbs is not affected by this opinion. Thus both
However, beginning with J. Fürst¹ and Ewald,² there has been a constantly growing number of scholars who have regarded the verbs ʾy/y and ʾyw/y as contractions of triconsonantal forms, but as developments of biconsonantal roots which were not expanded to the triconsonantal forms as in other cases. Thus Nödeke,³ Böttcher,⁴ A. Müller,⁵ Stade,⁶ de Lagarde,⁷ Friederich Delitzsch,⁸ Zimmern,⁹ Kautzsch,¹⁰ Wellhausen,¹¹ and others have

König (cf. p. 308, n. 3), and Mayer Lambert, who believes that the verbs ʾy/y and ʾyw/y are contractions of triconsonantal forms (cf. his article "La Trilittéralité des Racines ʾyw/y et ʾyw/y," in Revue des Études Juives [REJ], Tome xxxv, 1897, p. 208 ff.), consider that these verbs ʾyw/y and ʾyw/y as well as all other triconsonantal verbs are derived from original biconsonantal roots. Cf. Mayer Lambert's paper in Semitic Studies in Honor of Alex. Kohut, Berlin, 1897, p. 354–62, but contrast Gesenius-Kautzsch¹², p. 99, n. 1.

¹ Cf. Lehrgebäude der aramäischen Idiome, Leipzig, 1885, §§ 91 (p. 81), 158 (p. 158). As far as I can find, no credit has been given Fürst for postulating the theory that the verbs ʾyw/y and ʾyw/y are biconsonantal, as his name is omitted in everything on this subject which I have seen, Ewald and Böttcher being the first scholars mentioned as holding this view.


³ Lehrbuch, 1866-68, §§ 1116 f.; 1127 f.

⁴ In ZDMG. 33, 1879, pp. 698–700.


⁷ Assyrian Gram., Berlin, 1889, § 61, 1); § 115.


¹⁰ Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten, VI, Berlin, 1899, p. 250–255. This article Wellhausen says he wrote to explain especially the impf’s. of the so-called verbs ʾyw/y, e. g., בֵּית, הָבֵית. De Lagarde, however, had previously stated that these verbs were biconsonantal just as the verbs called ʾyw/y. In 1890 in his Orientalia, II., p. 6, he says: “die wurzeln יִבְּהָל und יִבְּהָל halte ich garnicht für dreiconsonantig, sondern—seit jaren habe ich dies öffentlich gelehrt—for zweiconsonantig,” and in his Über- sicht, p. 26, 27: “Ich glaube, dass es zweikonsonantige Wurzeln mit ursprünglich langem Vokale gibt: יִבְּהָל mit יִבְּהָל [. . .]. Ich führe jetzt hinzu, dass ich יִבְּהָל mit יִבְּהָל parallel setze, etc.” Apparently no notice has been taken of these statements. Wellhausen does not refer to vol. xxvii.
considered these verbs as biconsonantal. It is A. Müller, Stade, and Wellhausen especially, who have most consistently carried out the biconsonantal explanation.

According to their explanation, these verbs are derived from original biconsonantal roots with a short characteristic vowel between the two radicals, corresponding to the characteristic vowel between the 2d and 3d radicals of triconsonantal verbs. Under the influence of the prevailing triconsonantal types, the biconsonantal forms of the verbs יָּעַל and יָּעַל were usually amplified: the former, by lengthening the short characteristic vowel between the two radicals, e.g., in יָּעַל the א is from

Lagarde, nor does Nöldeke in the reprint of his paper Die Verba יָּעַל im Hebräischen in BzsS., p. 34 ff., although Lagarde refers (Uebers., p. 26 below) to Nöldeke's article (first published ZDMG. 37, 1888, p. 535 ff.), and Nöldeke accepts the explanation of Wellhausen (BzsS., p. 48). Lagarde's explanation, however, is based on the assumption that the verbs יָּעַל had an originally long vowel between the two radicals (cf. above). This same view is held by Ewald, Delitzsch, and Zimmern (cf. ll. cc.). Wellhausen, on the contrary, correctly explains these verbs as derived from biconsonantal roots with an originally short characteristic vowel, so that the א in יָּעַל is lengthened (under the influence of the longer, predominant triconsonantal forms) from א, just as the א in יָּעַל is from א, and the א for א in יָּעַל from א.

1 This lengthening takes place usually in forms in which the characteristic vowel stood originally in an open syllable, e.g., Arabic قَامَتْ، قَامَتْ، etc., from original قَامَ، قَامَ، قَامَ، etc. But in Hebrew this lengthening did not take place in the corresponding forms of the Qal perf., יָּעַל, יָּעַל (תָּעַל, שָּׁעַל), etc., being for כָּעַל, כָּעַל (מָטְל, בּוֹס), with tone-long vowels, and so really: כָּעַל, כָּעַל (מָטְל, בּוֹס), etc., with heightening (not lengthening) in the tone. The forms of the Qal act. part.: are the same as those of the 3d masc. sing. perf., hence כָּעַל, כָּעַל, although the vowels are unchangeable. Cf. F. R. Blake in JAOS. vol. xxii, 1901, p. 51, n. 8; Wellhausen, Skizzen u. Vorarb. VI., p. 252; and contrast Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 72 g.

In both Hebrew and Arabic an originally short characteristic vowel was retained without lengthening when it occurred in a closed syllable. Thus in the jussive and apocopated forms the original short vowel was not lengthened because in a form expressing a command or the like it was desirable to have as short a form as possible, e.g., יָּעַל= יָּעַל with later tone-long א from יָּעַל, יָּעַל= יָּעַל in which the original א
an original ָה, in יָהִי the ְה is from an original יַהַ ה, and in יְהִי the ַּ ה is for ָה from ַּה; the latter by doubling (not repeating) the second radical, e. g., יָבֵתַּ ה from an original סָבִּתַּ ה, etc., the doubling being secondarily omitted in Hebrew in forms in which the final vowels are dropped, e. g., לֶבֶן for סֵבֶן, cf. Arabic

farra, etc.

appears as ָה, יָビジ from יָビジ with tone-long ְה from יָビジ, etc.; Arabic يِقَل يِقَل_from יָビジ, etc. Also in forms having an affirmative beginning with a consonant, the characteristic vowel, occurring in a closed syllable with a second consonant immediately following the final radical, was not lengthened, no doubt on account of the firmness resulting from the juxtaposition of two consonants without intervening vowel, e. g., Arabic گَمَّتة, بَيْنَت, Hebrew גֶּמֶט, בִּמְתָה (with ָה heightened from ַּה in the tone): impf. يِقَل يِقَل_from יָビジ, يِقَل نَا, יָビジ נָא; Hebrew גַּבֶּל with ָה heightened (not lengthened) from ָה (if it were lengthened it would become ַּה as in

from يِقَل, يِقَل נָא with ְה from יַהַ ה, and يِقَل نَا with ְה (not ָה as is stated, Ges.-Kautzsch 31, § 72 k) obscured from ָה which was lengthened from an original ָה on account of the quiescing of the נ in an original tabָּ הַּ נָא. [In the rarer יָビジ נָא (cf. Ges.-Kautzsch 31, § 76 g) the יָビジ is also ָה for ָה; but here the ָה—as well as the ָה in יָビジ נָא and the ְה in

—arose through the lengthening of an original short vowel, ָה (ָה, ְה), under the influence of the prevailing triconsonantal type, since the root syllable is no longer closed when ְ ה intervenes before the affirmative יָビジ—.]

In such forms as these, in which the characteristic vowel occurs in a closed syllable, some (e. g., A. Müller, ZDMG. 33, p. 699) are inclined to think that this vowel was first lengthened and then shortened again in a closed syllable, so that יָビジ, e. g., is shortened from *גָּビジָּ ה, which arose from گَمَّتة. This is apparently supported by Syriac َمَدُّ, etc., Ethiopic ُمَدُّ, etc., with long vowel in a closed syllable. In Ethiopic, however, the long vowel in the closed syllable is contrary to rule. Cf. Praetorius, Gram. Aethiopica, 1888, § 15. The long vowel here must be explained. In both Ethiopic and Syriac the long vowel is best explained as due to the analogy of other forms in which the long vowel occurs regularly in an open syllable, e. g., ُمَدُّ, ُمَدُّ, etc.; ُمَدُ گَمَّة, ُمَدُ گَمَّة, ُمَدُ گَمَّة, etc. The Hebrew forms like ָהֵמ are then to be explained as preserving the originally short vowel unchanged, and are therefore more original.
This biconsonantal theory is the most natural explanation of these classes of roots, and is the one most in accord with philological principles. For if the prevailing triconsonantal type of root is in considerable part a development from a biconsonantal state, it is more than likely that remains of this former state should be preserved in the stages with which we are familiar. In language a new order of things is a growth, the older existing at least for a time beside the new, and it is not introduced by unanimous agreement, as it were, of those using it. In all languages in which a growth can be observed a certain number of older forms are preserved. These older forms appear irregular in comparison with the prevailing types. To consider the

This conclusion is supported by the corresponding Arabic forms ذيِّبَن، ذيِّبَنْ، ذيِّبَنْ e.t.c., in which the vowels are also short. The shortness is original. Their quality, however, is secondary. One would expect to find a in the root syllable, as in Hebrew. Wellhausen has correctly explained the ā and ū as due to the characteristic vowels ā and ū in the impf. يَبُسَ، يَبُسُبَن. Of course in the case of intrans. verbs like طَلَّسَ (اذِتْطِلَّسَ، طَلَّسَ، طَلَّسَتْ لَعْبَتْ) it should occasion no surprise that the original intrans. characteristic vowels are retained. Nöldeke, however, has questioned (BzS., p. 46, n. 2) in this connection: Why, if زَلَتْ zīlta is the intrans. form, do we not find زَلَتْ zīlta instead of زَلَتْ zīlta? By way of answer it will be recalled that such intrans. forms are actually found dialectically; cf. Wright-deGoeje, Arabic Gram. 8, I, 1896, p. 83 D. In general, however, this form (زَلَتْ) became the passive in the case of trans. verbs (cf. F. R. Blake's paper, The Internal Passive in Semitic, JAOS., vol. xxii, p. 51 ff.), and when this took place the act. form قَمَتْ prevailed also in the case of intrans. verbs in forms in which the characteristic vowel occurs in an open syllable (قَمَتْ qāmūt, قَمَتْ qāmūt, e.t.c.). In Hebrew also the trans. type ذيِّبَنْ prevailed in many verbs that must have been originally intrans. Only مَيْلَنَ، مَيْلَنَ، مَيْلَنَ occurs as intrans. forms in the perf. The trans. form prevailed to such an extent that we find the trans. vocalization in the case of forms of مَيَّلا having an afformative beginning with a consonant, e. g., مَيْلَنَ and not مَيْلَنَ. All the forms of the verbs مَيْلَنَ may thus be satisfactorily explained on the biconsonantal theory.

1 Cf. n. 8, p. 308.
shorter forms of the verbs י’י and י’י’y as contractions of regular ones is unphilological—they are original biconsonantal forms preserved in the historical stages of the Semitic languages.  

Accordingly, forms of these verbs with three distinct radicals are a relatively later development. In fact, in case of the roots י’י’y in Hebrew, verbal forms with consonantal י and ח are very

---

1 I retain the symbols י’י’y and י’י’y as being customary and convenient, although they are, of course, inaccurate since there was properly no radical in these verbs corresponding to י in יי’y.

2 In the case of the verbs י’י’y it is even impossible. For in the verbs that actually have י as 2d radical we find the י preserved as a radical consonant which does not suffer contraction, and that too in just those situations in which the advocates of the triconsonantal explanation of the verbs י’י’y say that י and נ were elided or underwent contraction e.g., יי’y, I Sam. 16. 23, beside forms like יי’y, etc., etc. Of verbs with י as 2d radical there occur (not including verbs יי’y) in Hebrew יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y. Cf. below, n. 4. Accordingly there is no reason why a contraction should have taken place in verbs י’י’y if י had been present originally as 2d radical any more than in the above verbs. We must therefore conclude that no י was present. These verbs (i.e., the so-called verbs י’י’y) were originally biconsonantal.

3 As Nöldeke pointed out as early as 1863, saying (Orient u. Occid. I, p. 760): “Wir betrachten eben Wurzeln wie qám, sab als werthvolle Überreste einer Zeit in welche die Dreikonsonatigkeit noch nicht bestand.” Accordingly these roots have only two radicals. In his more recent statement (BzS., p. 46 below, 47), however, viz., “Alle historischen semitischen Sprachen behandeln hier doch die Vokalbuchstaben י und ח als Radicale,” there is not a little inconsistency. According to this remark, there are practically three radicals. This is open to grave objections in fact, as Nöldeke himself must needs grant, since he admits that the Arabic forms cited by him in support of his statement may be considered secondary.

4 Of course, forms of triconsonantal roots with י as second radical are formed regularly, and in these י appears as a consonant throughout, e.g., יי’y, יי’y, יי’y, יי’y Is. 42, 11; etc., cf. n. 2. The gutturals in these roots have nothing whatever to do with the retention of the י as a consonant, as König (Lehrgeb. I, p. 453) followed by Mayer Lambert (ReU., xxxv, 1897, p. 211) supposes, since we find a large number of roots י’י’y which also have gutturals as radicals, and yet no consonantal י appears, as one would expect according to König, if it had once been
few, being limited to Pi’èls occurring only in the latest literature, so that they are really Aramaic forms and not Hebrew, e. g., יָני Ps. 119, 61; אֶלֶקֶט Esth. 9, 21, 29, 31; יִרְמַיְיוּס Esth. 9, 27, 31; דֵּסֲרִים Dan. 1, 10. In case of the verbs י”י the triconsonantal form with repeated second radical appears regularly in Hebrew in the 3d sing. mas. and fem., and 3d plu. of the Qal perf. as the trans. form, while the more original biconsonantal form is used as the form with intrans. meaning, e. g., רַכָּר ‘make narrow,’ but רַכַּע ‘be narrow.’ Also a considerable number of regular Pi’èl forms from the amplified triconsonantal stem—which, as we saw, are practically of non-occurrence in verbs י”י—are formed from roots י”י, e. g., יָנָה, יָנָה, יָנָה, יָנָה, יָנָה, etc.

It is clear from the foregoing that originally no Pi’èl intensive stem could be formed in the case of the biconsonantal verbs י”י and י”י, since the Pi’èl requires three radicals for its formation. It is not until these roots have been fully assimilated to the triconsonantal form that the Pi’èl can be made. In actual fact the Pi’èl of verbs י”י, as was stated above, does not properly occur in Hebrew. We find in its stead the Pi’tel. Also in the verbs mediae geminatae the Pi’tel occurs as the intensive stem, although some regular Pi’èls are found, e. g., יָנָה, etc.

With regard to the origin of the Pi’tel there have been a number of different explanations. In general, opinions as to its origin may be divided into two main currents according as it is supposed to have arisen independently in the verbs י”י and י”י, the agreement in final form being then accidental, or it

present, e. g., כִּבִּים, כִּבִּים, כִּבִּים, כִּבִּים (two gutturals!), etc., proving that if י was second radical the presence of a guttural in the root did not prevent contraction as is supposed. Roots like לְנִי (לְנִי) can, therefore, be explained only as a separate class distinct from the roots י”י. We cannot otherwise account for the difference in meaning between two roots, otherwise identical, like לְנִי, לְנִי (לְנִי: Is. 26, 10) ‘act unjustly, corruptly,’ and לְנִי (part. plu. fem. לְנִי) ‘suckle’—the former is triconsonantal with י as middle radical, the latter biconsonantal.

2 Thus Böttcher, Lehrgebäude, § 1016, § 1090, 2; Olshausen, § 251 b, 252, 254; König, Lehrgeb. I, pp. 451 and 849.
arose in the one class and was transferred to the other by analogy. The latter view, that the Pi'el arose in one class and was transferred to the other, is undoubtedly correct whatever explanation is otherwise adopted. It is the view followed by Ewald,1 Hartmann,2 Stade,3 and Barth,4 Ewald and Hartmann believing that the Pi'el arose in the verbs י"י, while Stade and Barth, although differing in other respects in their explanations of the form, believing that it arose in the verbs י"ז.

Stade's explanation, that the Pi'el arose from the Qal stem קָמָה by reduplicating the final radical in order to indicate the intensive stem, producing קְמָהָה, קְמַיּו, קְמֶה, is untenable especially because the Qal stem is not קָמָה, but קָמָה. The long א becoming ֑ in קְמֶה is thus unaccounted for.

Barth's explanation, which is based on the triconsonantal theory of verbs י"ז, has been accepted by Kautzsch (Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebrew Gram.5, § 72 m), although he follows the biconsonantal explanation of the verbs י"י (and י"ז, § 87). There are, however, certain difficulties in Barth's exposition, apart from the fact that it is based on the triconsonantal explanation, which render it impossible to accept his theory. His explanation is briefly as follows.

A weighty indication that the Pi'el (Po'el) did not arise in the verbs י"י is the fact that they can and do form a regular Pi'el, e. g., יִדְרֵל, etc., in Hebrew as in the other languages. In the verbs י"י, the Pi'el forms do not properly occur because of the difficulty of pronouncing an intervocalic [my italics] sharpened waw [as if a doubled j could be anything but intervocalic]; only the Pi'el with reduplicated final consonant, as in יִדְרֵל, is found. The reduplication of this final consonant in this stem of roots י"י is supported by a similar reduplication in certain nominal forms in Arabic and Hebrew. In Arabic no verbal form with this reduplication is made in verbs י"י,—only nominal forms occur. These nouns, in which no intensive meaning is present, are the peculiar inf's. like יִדְרֵל 'go away'.
(ban med. i), קִנְזָנָה 'be' (can med. u), etc.; the two inf's. סְדוּה 'rule', גֹּרְעָט 'be pregnant'; and the broken plurals גָּרְעָט 'pregnant' and הָרְקִיל 'barren for a long time (camels),' all from roots med. waw and med. yod. In the case of roots med. geminatae no corresponding formations occur. In Hebrew the nouns 'pleasure', (בֵּיתָר, קָד) 'spark' (Arabic 'emit fire') from roots י"ע have this same reduplication. Only י"ע 'spark' from לָנָה 'sparkle' is from a root ל"נ. This may be formed on the analogy of its synonym לָנָה. Except for this single instance, formations in Semitic corresponding to the Pi'el are always from roots י"ע.

The same result is, according to Barth, arrived at from a consideration of the Hebrew participles נֶאֵל, ישוב, etc., with which he says נָבֵל and the uncertain נָבֵל are connected as regards formation. On he lays little stress, since its meaning, and hence its root, is obscure. These participles are not intensive in meaning, but are simply Qal. Trans. in force, although having an apparently pass. or intrans. vowel י in the second syllable, they are really qattal forms represented in Hebrew by נָבֵל, etc., in strong roots; by נָבֵל in roots med. i. Accordingly from roots med. u of which no qattal form occurs the original form of these participles was qavewām. A "sharpened" w being avoided in Hebrew more than a "sharpened" j [?], the doubled w was given up, being replaced by the reduplication of the following radical, so that qavewām became qavemām, qōmām, the change of aw to 6 being similar to that in מֵחָל from רָיָם.

Like these participles the Pi'el is to be explained. From מֵחָל the qittel must originally have been qavewām with a for i in the first syllable. The intervocalic sharpened w was avoided by substituting the reduplication of the final radical so that from qavewām, qavemām becoming qōmām arose.

In this explanation there is little that is convincing. That the nominal forms like י"ע נָבֵל, etc., have in Arabic a reduplicated final consonant like the Pi'el proves nothing for this verbal stem in Hebrew since the origin of these forms is obscure
and a matter of dispute. Barth's explanation of them is no better than that of the grammarians which he rejects. He says
that בִּינְנוֹנָה, e. g., arose from בְּיוֹנָה, beside which it occurs, because the phonetic sequence -תָּגָה was unpleasant. This was
obviated by inserting a consonant identical with the last one after the א so that we get בָּגָנָה. In the first syllable of this
form, א was changed to א, and thus בָּגָנָנה arose. The changes
that Barth assumes here are all unsupported by similar phenom-
ena elsewhere, and are therefore entirely gratuitous. It may
be that the forms like בִּינְנוֹנָה arose from an analogical com-
bination of the two regular inf's. like בְּיוֹנָה and בְּיוֹנָה. If this
be true there is no organic reduplication in these forms. At
any rate there is nothing in forms like בִּינְנוֹנָה, about the origin
of which nothing is really known, that is like the פִּתְלֶל, except
the reduplicated final radical. Similarly the isolated forms
prove nothing.

In Hebrew the nominal forms לֶאָו, לֶאָו, לֶאָו, are entirely
too few to base any conclusions upon. Since לֶאָו is from a
root לֶאָו and there are only two other examples of this forma-
tion, it is just as possible to conclude that the formation origin-
ated in roots לֶאָו and were transferred to those med. u, especially since the root of לֶאָו, which occurs only in Job.
41, 11, does not occur as a verb in Hebrew.

Likewise the few forms לֶאָו לֶאָו, לֶאָו, לֶאָו, prove
nothing. Barth himself attaches no importance to לֶאָו. It
is most likely derived from a root לֶאָו. לֶאָו is usually
explained as having the adverbial ending מ, cf. Ges.-Kautzsch 86,
§ 100 g; Gesenius-Buhl 87, s. v. 2 There is no compelling reason
for regarding לֶאָו as anything but an adverb in the three pas-
sages that it occurs. In לֶאָו לֶאָו Hab. 2, 19 we must connect
לֶאָו לֶאָו with what follows, according to the suggestion made in
the latest (14th) edition of Gesenius' Dictionary. In Lam. 3;
26 it is difficult to see how not to make לֶאָו an adverb. A.V.

1 Die Nominalbildung in den Semitischen Sprachen, Leipzig, 1889,
1891, pp. 211, 212.
2 In the 18th ed. Barth's explanation was given.
translates, "It is good that a man should both hope and wait quietly (דָּחַר), etc." In Is. 47, 5, דָּחַר is clearly an adverb.
Moreover the change of ד to כ in דָּחַר which Barth assumes is unexplained. This leaves only the two forms וְלַעַר אֹרָב and וְלַעַר נִשְׁמַב upon which to base any conclusions. This would be precarious even if Barth had correctly explained them. But granting that they were originally qattâl formations as he says, there is no support for the supposition that the "intervocalic sharpened w," which must originally have been present, e. g., qawwâm, in verbs "med. w," was any more unpleasant to the ear or difficult to pronounce in Hebrew in case of forms "med. w" than in forms "med. j," e. g., יַעֲרָה, יַעֲרִר. We find a considerable number of forms with doubled ד, e. g., יַעֲרָה, יַעֲרָה, יַעֲרִר, etc., and in verbs ד"ו the first radical ד is regularly doubled in the Niph. impf., inv., and inf., e. g., יַעֲרָה, etc. In the case of forms like יַעֲרָה, יַעֲרָה, etc., Barth tries to obviate this difficulty by the remark "Wurzeln mit durchweg cons. behandelten w, . . . , gehören nicht hierher." There is, however, no reason why "die Wurzeln mit . . . cons. . . . w gehören nicht hierher." There can be no difference between original w in qawwâm, if such there was (which the biconsonantal theory denies; cons. ד that appears in roots יַעֲרָה is secondary), and that in יַעֲרָה, יַעֲרִר, etc., where ד appears everywhere as a consonant, cf. König, Lehrgebäude I, p. 453. The case of the Niph's. like יַעֲרָה Barth does not consider. Moreover even though a doubled w were objectionable in Hebrew, as the preceding shows it was not, there is no parallel for reduplicating a radical in compensation for the lack of doubling in another. The approved method of compensation for the omission of doubling is to heighten the short vowel preceding the doubled consonant, as is done in countless instances in the case of the article, the Niph. impf., inv., and inf. of verbs primae gutt., e. g., יַעֲרָה, יַעֲרָה, etc. Accordingly it is impossible to assume that an original qawwâm became qawmêm.
Similarly the Pîlîl stem cannot be explained as coming from an original qawwôm (qawwôm) becoming qômêm. In fact it is

1 Die Pîlîl-Conjugation, p. 90, n. 3.
absolutely impossible to assume such a verbal form as qaawo‘em in roots ʳ’y’y, as it was shown above that these roots had no middle radical. Consequently no form like qaawo‘em, etc., ever existed in Hebrew; the forms ר’y’y, ד’y’y, etc., with doubled ı and ́, are not Hebrew.

We must, therefore, look for the origin of the Pi’el elsewhere, and it is in the verbs ʸ’y that it is found, as Ewald and Hartmann saw. It is not necessary to assume with Hartmann that the Pi’el represents the III form of the Arabic. Ewald explained the ə in דבב, e. g., as due to the obscuration of ı’. This ə arose from ə in compensation for the difficult doubling of the second radical in דבב. To this explanation Barth objects that it presupposes an ə after the first radical of the root, which does not occur in the Hebrew period, the form being always sabbēb, although he assumes ə for ́ in his own explanation of qaawo‘em for qaawo‘em. See above, p. 312, ¶ 2.

In the imperfect, however, as well as the forms agreeing with it in structure, viz., the inv. and impf., the regular forms are דבב, etc. Here the original ə after the first radical is retained throughout. ʾsabbēb accordingly would become ʾsabbēb, with ə lengthened from ə in compensation, as soon as the doubling of the second radical is given up. The ə is then obscured to ə, as frequently in Hebrew, and hence the form דבב. From the impf. the ə was then transferred to the perf., e. g., דבב.

That there is a tendency to avoid the occurrence of three identical consonants in two successive syllables as in the Pi’el of verbs ʸ’y’, not only in Hebrew but in other languages, is seen from the fact that in classical Arabic beside such forms as مَدَّتْ, مَدَّتْ, etc., with doubled 2d radical identical with the 3d, we find مَدَّى, مَدَّى, etc., with the 3d radical replaced by the diphthong ə́q, on account of the

---

1 So also König, Lehrgeb. I, p. 349, in the case of verbs ʾyʾʾ; Bickell, § 116; and Land § 55 (two latter quoted by König).
2 In this explanation I have followed the principles established by Prof. Haupt, viz., that the impf. is older than the perf. (cf. his article in Jour. Royal Asiatic Soc., New Series X, 1878, pp. 244-253), and that the origin of verbal forms is to be sought in the impf. as the more original form.
"heaping up" of consonants. Cf. Fleischer, *Kleinere Schriften* I, p. 138; Wright-deGoeje, *Arabic Gram.* I, p. 69 C. In modern Arabic even the simple *Qal* forms like *מְדִיבָּה* with repeated consonant are given up, and forms like *מְדִיבָּט* only are used.¹ In fact modern Arabic goes even farther in the case of such forms, using the form of verbs *tertiae ṣ* instead of those *mediae geminatae,* e. g., *מְדִיבָּט* for *מְדִיבָּה.*

The *Pi‘el* is therefore formed on the basis of the *Pi‘el* of verbs לְלָלַע; the doubling of the second radical is given up on account of the tendency to avoid a succession of three identical consonants in two successive syllables, and the preceding short å is lengthened in compensation to ַו, and this is further obscured to ֻו. The corresponding passive form, the *Pi‘el,* has å in the second syllable, e. g., *מָלֵל בִּלְלָל.* The indication of the distinction between act. and pass. by å (å in Hebrew) and å, respectively, is regular in Arabic in the impf., not only of the intensive stems II, III, but also of the IV, VII, VIII, and X forms, e. g., II form יִכְּסֶל מְכָסֶל *act., יִכְּסֶל מְכָסֶל pass.,* etc.

From the verbs לְלָל the *Pi‘el* was transferred to the verbs לְלָל.

Contributions to Comparative Philippine Grammar.—By
Frank R. Blake, Ph.D., Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, Md.

INTRODUCTION.

The languages of the Philippine Islands so far as they are
known form a closely related group of tongues belonging to
the great Malayo-Polynesian family, which embraces the lan-
guages of practically all the islands between the east coast of
Asia and the west coast of America south of 30° north latitude,
with the exception of Papua and Australia, and also includes
the languages spoken on the Malay peninsula at the south-east-
ern extremity of the continent of Asia, and on the island of
Madagascar off the coast of Africa.

1 In the spelling of Philippine words in this paper, \( k \) is used instead
of the older \( c \) and \( qu \); \( g \) instead of \( gu \) before \( i, e \); \( w \) instead of conso-
nontal \( u \) before a vowel; \( i \) for initial \( y \) before a consonant; but with
these exceptions it has seemed best to retain the traditional orthography.
As in most of the languages the accent of words is not given, the accent
marks have been omitted throughout, except where they indicate a dif-
ference in meaning, and in the case of \( ^{\wedge} \) and \( ^{\acute{\text{c}}} \) in Tagalog, which indi-
cate a final glottal catch (cf. below, p. 335). For the reformed spelling
in Tagalog, cf. the foot-notes to my paper, The Expression of Case by
the Verb in Tagalog, in this volume of the Journal.

2 The languages of the Negritos, the diminutive black people who
live in scattered tribes in the interior mountain ranges of the larger
islands, and who are probably the remnant of the aborigines of the
Archipelago, are said by certain Spanish authorities (cf. El Archipiélago
Filipino, Washington, 1900, vol. 1, p. 229; Lacalle y Sánchez, Tierras y
razas del archipiélago filipino, Manila, 1886, p. 246) to be entirely dif-
ferent from those of the other inhabitants of the islands. These author-
ities state furthermore that the idioms of all the Negritos practically
constitute one language, and that this language is of monosyllabic struc-
ture as opposed to the disyllabic structure of the Malay tongues. How-
ever true this may have been originally, at the present day it is certain
that those Negrito dialects about which anything is known are very
similar in vocabulary and grammatical structure to the other Philip-
pine languages. It is probable, however, that the Negritos have in such
cases more or less completely adopted the languages of the neighboring
Malay tribes (cf. A. B. Meyer, Die Philippinen, II. Negritos, Dresden,
It is perhaps useless to hazard any conjectures as to the primitive seat of the Malayo-Polynesians, whose ancient history is practically a sealed book, but it seems most likely that the cradle of the race was on some of the numerous islands which it now inhabits, possibly some of the large islands in the vicinity of the Malay peninsula.

From this birthplace the ancient Malayo-Polynesians, forced doubtless by the increase in population, must have spread out in a series of waves or swarms, just as in the case of the primitive Indo-Europeans and Semites. Crossing at first by means of their canoes over the comparatively short stretches of sea between their home and the neighboring islands, they gradually pushed further and further out into the unknown, passing from island to island until they had occupied almost all the available land space of the Pacific. Some of the islands they probably found unoccupied, in others they must have come in contact with an inferior black race similar to that inhabiting Papua and Australia, as is shown by the remnants of this race which are found pushed back into the interior mountain ranges of some of the larger islands, notably the Philippines.

The peopling of the Malayo-Polynesian territory probably took place in three great waves or series of waves, to which correspond the three grand divisions of the Malayo-Polynesian languages, viz., the Polynesian, the Melanesian, and the Malay. The 180th meridian forms approximately the boundary between the Polynesian and Melanesian divisions from the north as far south as the latitude of the Fiji islands, practically all the languages spoken east of this line being Polynesian. Further south the line bends to the west, the native language of New Zealand belonging to the Polynesian division. West of the dividing line the Melanesian division extends in a north-westerly direction from the Fiji islands on the south, including the languages of the principal islands of Melanesia and Micronesia. The Malay embraces the languages of the Malay peninsula, the East India islands, the Philippines, and Madagascar.

The Philippine languages, then, may be more accurately defined as a subdivision of the Malay branch of the Malayo-Polynesian family of speech.

The estimated number of Philippine languages varies according to the different authorities. The well known Spanish Fili-
pinologist W. E. Retana, in his latest bibliographical work on the Philippines, enumerates twenty-five different idioms; the great Philippine specialist, Professor Ferdinand Blumentritt, of Leitmeritz in Bohemia, in his brief survey of Philippine races and languages, mentions at least thirty; while in an encyclopedic work on the Philippines prepared by the Jesuits, "El Archipiélago Filipino," the number given exceeds fifty.

Of many of the languages enumerated in the larger estimates, practically nothing is known but the name, and it is quite possible that many of these names are simply alternate designations of the better known languages, or, at most, designations of some slightly variant dialect. Beginning at the extreme north of the Archipelago, the languages about which anything definite is known are as follows.

Batan is the language of the Batan and Babuyan islands to the north of Luzon.

On the island of Luzon, Tagalog, the most important and best known of the Philippine languages, is spoken from coast to coast, in the middle region of the island, in the latitude of Manila Bay. On the west coast its territory does not extend north of the Bay, but on the east it reaches as far north as the province of Isabela, the most northerly but one of the provinces on the east coast, in which is situated the town of Palanan, where Aguinaldo was captured by General Funston. On the south and south-east it extends some distance down into what might be called the tail of Luzon, trenching on the domain of Bikol, which occupies the remainder of the southern part of the island. In the region north and west of the Tagalog district are spoken a number of languages. Ibanag prevails in the north-east, in the valley of the Cagayan river, the greatest tobacco-raising district in the island; Ilokan occupies the north and west coasts, extending as far south as the gulf of Lingayen, between which and the Bay of Manila are found Pangasinan, Tino or Zambal, and Pampangan. In the mountainous district of the interior are spoken the various Igorot dialects, among which

1 Catálogo abreviado de la biblioteca filipina, Madrid, 1898.
2 Cf. List of Native Tribes of the Philippines and of the languages spoken by them, trans. by O. T. Mason in Report of Smithsonian Inst. for the year ending June, 1899; Washington, 1901, pp. 527-547.
3 Washington, 1900; cf. vol. 1, pp. 1-148 passim.
it is probable that Gaddán, Ginaán, Ilongot, and Isinay are to be classed.¹

On the Bisayan islands, which lie between Luzon and Mindanao, and on the north and east coasts of the latter island, Bisayan is spoken in a number of different dialects.²

Sulu is used by the Moros of the Sulu subarchipelago, which extends from the western extremity of Mindanao towards Borneo. The Moro tribes of Mindanao, which occupy parts of the west and southwest of that island, speak two almost identical dialects, Magindanao and Malanao. Of the numerous other idioms reported as spoken on Mindanao, we know practically nothing about any except Bagobo, which is found near the great volcano Apo in the south-eastern part of the island, and Tiruray, which occupies a district near the Moro territory in the south-west.

The island of Mindoro, which lies to the south of Luzon and west of the Bisayas, forms the domain of Mangyan, about which, so far as I know, nothing has yet been published.¹ The principal language of the Calamianes and the long narrow island of Palawan, which form a chain stretching from Mindoro to the south-west towards Borneo, is Tagbanwa, of which the idioms of Agutaya and Cuyo, two small islands between Palawan and the Bisayas, are perhaps simply dialects,² though they are usually given as distinct languages.

The tribes that speak these languages fall into three general groups according to their religion. Those that speak Batan, Ibanag, Ilokan, Pangasinan, Zambal, Pampangan, Tagalog, Bikol, Bisayan, Agutayan,³ and Koyuan⁴ are Christians; the Sulus, Magindanaos, and Malanaos are Mohammedans; while the remaining tribes mentioned are still pagans.

Three different alphabets are in use in the Archipelago, viz. 1) that of the pagan Tagbanwas and Mangyans; ² 2) that of the

² Cf. my paper The Bisayan Dialects, JAOS. xxvi, 1905, pp. 120–136.
Mohammedan tribes, the Arabic alphabet with some additional signs to denote some peculiar native sounds;¹ 3) the Roman alphabet introduced by the Spaniards, in which all the languages of the Christian tribes, and all those of pagan tribes which have been reduced to writing by Spanish missionaries, are written.

At the time of the Spanish conquest, the principal of the now Christian tribes possessed alphabets that are practically identical with those of the Tagbanwas and Mangyans,² and it is probable that the Mohammedan tribes originally had similar alphabets. These ancient alphabets have in both cases been superseded by that of the race whose religion has been adopted. In the Mohammedan tribes no trace of them has been preserved, and their use in the Christian tribes seems to have died out about the middle of the eighteenth century.³

The archetype of these natives alphabets seems to have been of Indian origin. As in the Indian alphabets, every consonantal character without addition represents the consonant followed by the vowel a, the other vowels being indicated by secondary marks. There was no way of expressing a consonant without a following vowel, hence such a consonant was omitted in writing.⁴

¹ Similarly there are some additional characters in the Arabic alphabet adapted to Malay, Persian, Turkish, and Hindustani, cf. Marsden, A Gram. of the Malayan Language, London, 1813, p. 1 f.; Salemann und Shukovski, Persische Gram. Berlin, 1889, § 1; A. Müller, Türkische Gram. Berlin, 1889, § 5; Vinson, Manuel de la langue hindoustani, Paris 1899, p. 5. In like manner the Amharic alphabet is the Ethioptic with some additional characters to denote some peculiar Amharic sounds, while Coptic is written in the Greek uncial alphabet with seven additional characters borrowed from Demotic: cf. Praetorius, Die Amharische Sprache, Halle, 1879, p. 17, § 1 a; Steindorff, Koptische Grammatik, 2nd ed., Berlin, 1904, p. 5.

² Cf. Marcillo y Martín, Estudio de los antiguos alfabetos filipinos, Malabón, 1895.

³ Totanes in his Arte de la lengua tagala, Sampaloc, 1745, states that at his time very few natives could read this alphabet, and that hardly any could write it: cf. the later edition, Binondo, 1865, p. 1.

⁴ This defect was remedied by the Austin friar Francisco Lopez, who in his Ilokan catechism (1621) written in Tagalog characters made use of a diacritical mark, similar in its nature to the Sanskrit virīma or Arabic sukūn, to indicate a consonant standing alone; cf. El Archipiélago Filipino, vol. 1, p. 227.
The Roman alphabet, which is used in writing the native languages, was formerly conformed to the peculiarities of Spanish orthography, but lately a number of improvements in spelling have been introduced, the most important being the use of $k$ for $c$ and $qu$, and $w$ for consonantal $u$.

The Philippine languages have been influenced to some extent, principally in their vocabulary, by the languages with which they have come in contact. The vocabularies of some of them, notably Tagalog and Bisayan, contain, in common with the other Malayan languages, a number of Sanskrit words, e. g., Tagalog and Bisayan basa ‘read’ (San. bhāṣā ‘languages’), halaga ‘price’ (San. argha).\footnote{Cf. H. Kern, \textit{Sanskritische woorden in het Tagala}, Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde van Nederlandsch Indië, 4\textsuperscript{e} Volg., D. 4, 1880, pp. 533–564; \textit{Sanskritische woorden in het Bisaya}, ibid., 4\textsuperscript{e} Volg., D. 5, pp. 128–185; T. H. Pardo de Tavera, \textit{El Sanscrito en la lengua agala}, Paris, 1887: cf. also my paper, \textit{Sanskrit Loan-words in Tagalog}, JHU. Circs., No. 163, pp. 63–65.}

The languages spoken by the Mohammedan tribes, the most important of which are Magindanao and Sulu, contain a number of Arabic words, e. g., Magindanao and Sulu dunia ‘world’ (Arabic دنيا dunya), Mag. alatula, alahutaala, Sulu allahutaala ‘God’ (Arabic الله تعالى allahu ta’ālā ‘God, may he be exalted’).

The Christian tribes have adopted a considerable body of Spanish terms, e. g., Dios ‘God,’ pade, pare ‘priest.’

A few Chinese words are found in Tagalog as designations of things specifically Chinese, e. g., cha or sa ‘tea’ (Chin. tcha), miki ‘a kind of vermicelli’ (Chin. mi-ki).

At present the various languages are being subjected to the influence of English, and English words will probably be more or less extensively borrowed. Already in the northern part of Luzon the English phrase ‘no got’ is in common use.\footnote{Cf. A. E. Jenks, \textit{The Bontoc Igorot}, Manila, 1905 (=Ethnological Survey Publications, vol. 1), p. 158.}

Spanish, besides influencing to some degree the native vocabularies, has also left its mark in a few cases on the grammatical construction. In Tagalog, for example, the cumbersome native method of coördinating pronouns and numerals, as in kami niya ‘he and I’ literally ‘his we,’ has been more or less completely
driven from the field by the simpler Spanish construction with copulative conjunction. ¹

The materials for the study of the Philippine languages consist of texts, collections of conversational phrases, grammars, dictionaries, and vocabularies. Grammars and dictionaries of some sort exist of most of the languages mentioned; the others must be studied without these helps. The languages that are included in the following comparative studies are, viz., Tagalog, Bisayan (Cebuano, Hiligaynà, Samaro-Leytean, Haranay), Bikol, Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokana, Igorot (Nabaloí, Bontok), Ibanag, Batañ, Magindanao, Sulu, and Bagobo. ²

**GENERAL FEATURES.**

The most important characteristics which the Philippine languages possess in common are the following.

Words are made up of roots and particles. Roots are mainly dissyllabic and indicate nominal or verbal ideas; practically all


may be used unchanged as significant words; e. g., Tagalog tuwo ‘man,’ ibig ‘wish, want.’ Particles are mainly monosyllabic, some being independent words indicating pronominal and adverbial ideas, others being used only in combination with roots to form derivative nouns and verbs, e. g., Tagalog ka ‘thou,’ na ‘now, already,’ mag, a prefix used to form active verbs, e. g., mag-laró ‘play, sport’ from laró. From these ultimate components of the language other words are formed:
a) by reduplication of the root, e. g., Tagalog susulat ‘will write’ from sulat ‘write;
b) by the combination of two or more particles, e. g., Tagalog na-man ‘also,’ from na ‘now’ and man ‘even;
c) by the combination of the root with one or more derivative particles, e. g., Tagalog s-um-sulat ‘write (imper. and inf.), s-in-sulat-an ‘was written on,’ from sulat.

These languages are practically non-inflectional, there being no inflection except in some few instances in the pronoun and the verb, the variation being regularly at the beginning of the word. Pronouns are varied to express case, as a general thing three cases being distinguished, a nominative, a so-called genitive that is also the case of the agent and instrument, a so-called oblique that is used to represent all locative relations, place where, place whither, and place whence, including the dative and ablative of persons; e. g., Tagalog ito ‘this,’ nito ‘of this,’ dito ‘in or to this.’ In the verb differences in voice, mode and tense may be indicated by change of the initial sound of a form, e. g., Tagalog mag-laró ‘to play,’ naglaró ‘played,’ paglaró, passive stem of same verb, where m indicates the infinitive, n the preterit, and p the passive.

There is no formal distinction of gender even in the case of the pronouns of the third person. Whenever it is necessary to indicate the gender expressly, words meaning ‘male’ and ‘female’ must be used in connection with the epicene noun or pronoun, e. g., from Tagalog kabayo ‘horse,’ kabayo-ng ladaki ‘stallion,’ and kabayo-ng babayi ‘mare,’ except in the case of certain nouns of relationship, where different words are used to express difference in gender, e. g., Tagalog ama ‘father,’ ina ‘mother.’ Even with these nouns the same word often denotes a relative of either sex, and the words for ‘male’ and ‘female’ must be
used when it is necessary to avoid ambiguity, e. g., Tagalog *anak* 'son or daughter,' *anak na lalaki* 'son,' *anak na babayi* 'daughter.'

These languages possess what might be called personal articles, i. e., words of a particular nature which are placed before names of persons to denote case, e. g., Tagalog *si Pedro* 'Pedro,' *ni Pedro* 'of Pedro.' Many of them also have an article, the so-called inclusive article, which is placed before the name of a person to denote that with him are included those who are associated with him in any way, as his companions, friends, family, etc., e. g., Tagalog *sina Pedro* 'Pedro and his associates.'

The pronoun of the first person plural has regularly two forms, one of which includes, while the other excludes, the person addressed; for example, a Tagalog might say to a Spainard *tayo-ng kristiano* 'we Christians,' using the inclusive 'we' *tayo,* but *kami-ng Tagalog* 'we Tagalogs,' using the exclusive 'we' *kami.*

An extensive use is made of certain particles called ligatures to connect words, phrases, and sentences which stand to one another in the relation of modifier and modified. They stand for example between adjective and noun; verb and adverb; noun or verb and dependent clause, in this case playing the part

---


2 Personal articles are found also in Malay and Madagascan; in Malay it is *si*, cf. Favre, *Grammaire de la langue malaise*, Vienne, 1876, pp. 59, 92. The principal ones in Madagascan are *i* and *ra*, cf. Brandstetter, *Tagalen und Madagasssen*, Luzern, 1902, p. 79 f.; Parker, *A concise Gram. of the Malagasy Language*, London, 1883, p. 47.

3 The same distinction is made also in Malay between *kita* (inc.) and *kami* (exc.), and in Madagascan between *tsika* (inc.) and *tsahay* (exc.); cf. Marsden, *op. cit.*, p. 45; Parker, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

4 Traces of similar particles are found in Madagascan and some other Malayan languages, cf. Brandstetter, *Tag. u. Mad.*, pp. 76, 88. In languages of other families, similar particles are the connective *i* in modern Persian (cf. Salemann and Shukovski, *op. cit.*, p. 30, § 16), and the genitive sign *n* in Egyptian and Coptic (cf. Ermann, *Ägyptische Gram. 2te Aufl.*, Berlin, 1903, p. 64; Steindorff, *op. cit.*, pp. 79 f., 88).
of relative pronouns and subordinate conjunctions; e. g., in Tagalog tawo-ng mabuti ‘good man,’ mabuti-ng ginawa’d ‘well done,’ tawo-ng minamahal nang lahat ‘a man who is esteemed by all,’ the modifier and modified are connected by the ligature -ng.

The ideas of ‘to be in a place’ and ‘to have’ are not expressed by verbs, but by particles which may be called quasi-verbs, in Tagalog na, may, e. g., ang libro’y na sa lamasa ‘the book is on the table;’ ito-ng tawo’y may asawa ‘this man has a wife.’

Verbs are generally made by combining derivative particles with the root. These particles are very numerous and their uses very various. By means of them voice, mode, and tense are distinguished, and also a variety of other modifications of the verbal meaning, such as the causative, emphatic, etc.; for example from a root aral in Tagalog are formed,

um-aran ‘teach.’
mang-aran ‘study, learn.’
maññ-aran ‘preach.’
maññ-aran ‘be able to teach.’
maññ-aran ‘order, command to teach.’
maki-aran ‘join with someone in teaching.’
pa-aran ‘ask for instruction.’
mangi-aran ‘be taught.’
in-aran ‘was taught.’
pa-aran-in ‘be studied.’
ipa-aran ‘was studied.’

Perhaps the most salient feature of these languages is the prevailing use of the passive construction, active verbs not being used except when the agent is the most emphatic element of the sentence; for example in Tagalog in the sentence ‘he is reading a book,’ ‘he’ is more emphatic than the indefinite ‘book,’ hence the active is used, viz., siya’y bungmabasa nang libro, while in the sentence ‘he is reading this book’ the definite object is ordinarily more emphatic than the agent, hence the passive is employed, e. g., ito-ng libro’y binabasa niya.

In the present imperfect state of our knowledge of the Philippine languages any complete classification and subdivision is of course impracticable, but it is possible nevertheless to distinguish certain general groups.

\[1\] Cf. my paper, The Expression of Case by the Verb in Tagalog, in this volume of the Journal, pp. 188-189.
The most important of these is a Northern Group, including the principal languages of North Luzon and the islands to the north, viz., Batan, Ibanag, Ilokan, Pangasinan, and the Igorot dialects as far as they are known; and a Central Group, including Tagalog, Bikol, and Bisayan. Between these two groups lies Pampangan, which partakes in a measure of the peculiarities of both. In the south the dialects of the Magindanao and Malanao Moros belong together, while Bagobo and Sulu occupy isolated positions, Sulu being more like Malay than any of the other Philippine languages. The principal phonetic difference between the languages of the Northern and Central Groups is that the former have no $h$ sound (cf. below, p. 335).

The principal differences in grammatical structure between these two groups are the following.

In general the languages of the Northern Group form their plural by reduplication of the singular, e. g., Ilok. balay ‘house,’ balbalay ‘houses.’ The languages of the Central Group employ a special prepositional particle manγa for this purpose, e. g., Tag. bahay ‘house,’ manγa bahay ‘houses.’

The Northern Group possesses the ligature $a$ which is not found as such in the Central Group, e. g., Ilok. na‘imbay a tao ‘good man.’

In the Northern Group the personal pronouns have in general two forms of the nominative, an emphatic and a non-emphatic form; for example, ‘I’ in Ilokan is represented by siak when emphatic, by ak when not emphatic. In the Central Group as a regular thing only one form of the nominative is employed, e. g., Tag. ako ‘I.’ On the other hand, in the Central Group these pronouns have both a prepositional and a postpositive form of the genitive, e. g., Tag. aking ulo and ulo ko ‘my head,’ while in the Northern Group only postpositive forms are found, e. g., Ilok. balay ko ‘my house,’ aso-k ‘my dog.’

As a general thing the languages of the Northern Group distinguish only two tense forms of the verb, viz., a preterit and a form to represent all the other tenses, e. g., Ilok., manγaramid, pret. nanγaramid ‘do, make.’ In the Central Group as many as four tense and mode forms are distinguished, viz., a modal, used for infinitive, imperative, and subjunctive; a future; a preterit; and a present: e. g., Tag., maglaró ‘to play,’ naglaró ‘did play,’ maglaró ‘will play,’ naglaró ‘is playing.’
The languages of the Central Group possess three passive forms, by means of which not only the direct object of the verbal action may be made subject, but also words standing in other case relations of the verb, such as dative, instrumental, ablative, etc.  

In the Northern Group this function of the verb has been still further developed, the languages of this group possessing not only three passives, but also a number of other passive verbal forms called verbals, made on the basis of the verbal noun of action with prefixed pag, pan, etc. These take the place to some extent of the i and an passives of the Central Group. Examples of these forms in Ilokan are,

daytoy ti pagpunas-mo kadagiti pinggan 'wash the plates with this (this the washing-instrument thine to the plates).'
ania nga oras ti panagmiso ti pare 'at what hour does the priest celebrate mass (what hour the mass-celebrating-time of the priest)?'

asin ti pagsurataiyo (<*an-yo) 2 'to whom are you writing (who the writing-aim yours)?'

Pampangan, which, as was stated above, partakes in a measure of the peculiarities of both the Northern and Central Groups, agrees with the Northern Group in not having the consonant h, and in possessing the ligature a, both emphatic and non-emphatic forms of the nominative, and exclusively postpositive genitive forms of the personal pronouns; but with the Central in possessing more than two tense and mode forms of the verb, viz., future, present, and preterit, and in the absence of the verbals which are so characteristic of the languages of the Northern Group. The plural of the noun is indicated by a special form of the article as often in Ilokan, e. g., ing tavo 'the man,' ding tavo 'the men,' except in the vocative, where it is denoted by prepositional manga, e. g., manga tavo, as in the Central Group. A special characteristic of Pampangan is the large number of forms which the personal pronouns have in the genitive, e. g., under various conditions 'mine' is ko, koo, ke, kee, or da; 'his,' no, noo, ne, nne, or na.

---

1 Cf. my paper The Express. of Case by the Verb, cited above.

2 In Ilokan the passive endings en and an + the genitive yo 'you (pl.)' give etyo, ariyo. The phonetics of the process are not entirely clear. The spelling may represent an assimilation of n to y, or perhaps a nasalization of the vowels e and a.
Magindanao seems to be more closely related to the Central Group than to the Northern, forming the plural of its nouns with manga, and making three tense and mode forms, viz., present, preterite, and imperative, e. g., sumulat ‘writes,’ sinumulat ‘wrote,’ sulat or panulat ‘write (imperative).’ It is, however, apparently without l, and possesses the ligature a like the languages of the Northern Group. The most characteristic peculiarity of this language are the forms of the personal pronouns with prefixed or infixed l element (cf. below, p. 372), e. g., laki, salaki ‘my,’ salkitanu, lekitanu ‘we.’

Sulu, like Malay, possesses in the declension of its noun no special plural form or plural particle, and forms its tense by means of auxiliaries, e. g., tōg na aku ‘I sleep,’ bakas aku matōg ‘I have slept.’ The ligature, which is so characteristic of all the other Philippine languages, is here comparatively little used.

NOTES ON PHONOLOGY.¹

Original Philippine Sounds.

From a comparison of representative words in the various languages it is evident that the primitive Philippine language possessed the following sounds, viz.,

- Vowels a, i, u or o
- Labials p, b, m, w
- Dentals t, d, n, l, s
- Palatals k, g, y
- Gutturals ng²

Cf. the following comparative list of words in the principal Philippine languages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag.</th>
<th>daan</th>
<th>buwan</th>
<th>inum</th>
<th>luto</th>
<th>lima</th>
<th>walo</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bis.</td>
<td>dalan</td>
<td>bulan</td>
<td>inum</td>
<td>luto</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>walo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>dalan</td>
<td>bulan</td>
<td>inum</td>
<td>luto</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>walo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>dalan</td>
<td>bulan</td>
<td>inum</td>
<td>luto</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>walo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>dalan</td>
<td>bulan</td>
<td>inum</td>
<td>luto</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>walo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>dalan</td>
<td>bulan</td>
<td>inum</td>
<td>luto</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>walo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>dalan</td>
<td>tulan</td>
<td>inum</td>
<td>luto</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>walu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>lalan</td>
<td>inum</td>
<td>luto</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>walu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td>dan</td>
<td>bulan</td>
<td>hinom</td>
<td>lutoh</td>
<td>lima</td>
<td>walu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In general the vowels of Philippine words have the Italian pronunciation; the consonants are to be pronounced as in English unless otherwise stated.
² Written n̄g when it stands at the beginning of a syllable.
The diphthongs a\textsuperscript{i} and a\textsuperscript{u} also probably formed part of the primitive phonetic system; a\textsuperscript{i} is usually written ay, ai, and a\textsuperscript{u}, ao or au; cf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag.</th>
<th>Bahay</th>
<th>'house'</th>
<th>Aro</th>
<th>'day'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bis.</td>
<td>Balay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adlao</td>
<td>'lake'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aldao</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>Baley'</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ageo'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>Balay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aldao</td>
<td>Danao</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>Balay</td>
<td></td>
<td>Aggau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Walay'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bai</td>
<td>Adlau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lanau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To these sounds are probably to be added,

a) an indistinct vowel ė (cf. below, p. 331 f.),
b) r (cf. below, p. 333),
c) the glottal catch (cf. below, p. 335).

and perhaps h (cf. below, p. 335 f.).

Remarks on the Vowels.

The letters o and u are constantly interchanged in the same language in writing, e. g., Tag. otang, utang 'debt,' and according to the statements of the grammars this graphic difference is represented by a corresponding difference in the pronunciation. Hence it is hardly possible to distinguish between primitive Philippine u and o.

\footnote{1 For the significance of this spelling with e, cf. below, p. 331.}
There is also a similar interchange between the letters ī and ē, and the sounds represented by them, e. g., Tag. babayī, babaye 'woman,' but this interchange is so limited in scope, the ē corresponding to ī rarely occurring, that all such cases are most conveniently referred to primitive Philippine ī.  

The letters ē and o are sometimes used to indicate the contraction of the diphthongs aī and aē, but usually in these cases the origin of the ē or o is perfectly clear, and there is no chance of confusion with the other ē and o. In the Central Group this contraction seems to be sporadic and confined to the final syllable of certain very common words, e. g., Tag. and Bis. mēy 'have,' Bik. dēy 'not to have,' where the writing ey indicates the pronunciation ē; Tag. ikāoy for ikāo ay, where the elision of the a of the particle ay points to the pronunciation ikō. In Ibanag and Pampangan these diphthongs at the end of a word are regularly contracted before a possessive suffix beginning with a consonant, e. g., Iban. bale-k 'my house' Pamp. bale-mo 'thy house' from balay 'house'. In Ibanag the diphthong ay is pronounced ēi, i. e., the first element is pronounced ē and not a, e. g., patay 'dead,' ammoy 'rice;' in Pangasinan the first element of both the diphthongs aī and aē seems to be sometimes pronounced as ē, as is indicated by the spelling, e. g., balei 'village, house,' ageo 'day.'

Generally speaking, cognate words have the same vowels in all the different languages, a corresponding to ā, i to ī, o, u to o, u. In a number of words, however, the vowels vary from one language to another, in general, Tagalog ī being represented in Bisayan and Bikol by o or u; in Ilokano, Pangasinan, and Magindanao by ē; in Ibanag and Pampangan by ē; e. g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>‘rice’</th>
<th>‘hear’</th>
<th>‘room’</th>
<th>suffix</th>
<th>‘six’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>bigas</td>
<td>dinigī</td>
<td>silid</td>
<td>-in</td>
<td>anim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis.</td>
<td>bugas</td>
<td>dūngūg</td>
<td>silud</td>
<td>-on</td>
<td>unum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>dāngōg</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-on</td>
<td>anum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>bagas</td>
<td>dēngēg</td>
<td>silid</td>
<td>-en</td>
<td>innem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>dēngēl</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-en</td>
<td>anem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>begas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-en</td>
<td>anem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>baggat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>annam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-an</td>
<td>anam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ In this article, unless otherwise stated, o and u, and ī and ē, are respectively considered as equivalent.
It is quite possible that this varied vocalism is the representation of a fourth primitive Philippine vowel, an indistinct vowel like the Indo-European shewa, which in a similar way is represented by several different vowels in the various Indo-European languages.

In Sulu there is a vowel corresponding to the German ə, e. g., tūđ ‘very,’ būkūn ‘it is not.’ This, however, seems to be a secondary Sulu development, words containing it having in some cases by-forms with a or o, u, or corresponding to forms with these vowels in the cognate languages, e. g., maisūg, maisog ‘bold, intrepid’ (Bis. maisog); dakāp, dakap ‘embrace’ (Malay dakap).

**Remarks on the Consonants.**

**Labials.**

A final p in Ibanag regularly becomes the glottal catch (cf. below, p. 336).

In some of the languages of the Northern Group p and b pass at times into the spirants ʃ and v. In Ibanag this change regularly takes place when original p is followed by u or o, e. g., fulū ‘ten’ (Pang. and Bis. polo, Magin. pulu, etc.). In Nabaloi Igorot p and ʃ are often used interchangeably in the same word, e. g., apil or afil ‘different;’ in others the p or ʃ respectively are constant, e. g., palit ‘dear,’ anduʃit ‘soft.’

In Bontoc Igorot, and also in the northern part of the Nabaloi territory, there is a similar interchange between b and ʃ, e. g., Bont. babayi and ʃafayi ‘woman,’ Nab. balei and ʃulei ‘house.’

In Ibanag, just as pu becomes fu, bu becomes vu, the b, however, being still retained in spelling, e. g., buaya ‘cayman.’

The sound v occurs in the one word asivi ‘small’ in Sulu.

In Magindanao a b sometimes becomes v (written u), e. g., uato ‘stone,’ uata ‘boy,’ ualay ‘house’ (Tag. bato, bata, Bis. balay); but it is sometimes preserved, e. g., babay ‘woman,’ njibu ‘thousand’ (Tag. babayi, libo).

In Nabaloi Igorot original əa regularly becomes gua (written gua or goa), e. g., gualo ‘eight,’ asayoa ‘spouse’ (Tag. walo, asawo).

---

1 Cf. Brandstetter, Tag. u. Mad., p. 34.
Dentals.

In Ibanag the combination \( ti \) regularly becomes \( si \), e. g., \( sinakao \) 'robbed' from a root \( takao \) with infix \( in \). An original final \( t \) regularly becomes the glottal catch (cf. below, p. 336).

A \( d \) of the other languages is regularly represented by the affricative \( ch \) in Nabaloí Igorot, e. g., \( chalan \) 'road,' \( achalem \) 'deep' (Ilok. \( dalan, adalem \)), and in Bontoc Igorot the two sounds are used interchangeably, as in the place names \( Chakong \) or \( Dakong \), \( Pudpudchog \) or \( Pudpudlog \).

In Ibanag the combination \( di \) when not preceded by \( a \) (in which case \( d > r \), cf. below, becomes \( zi \) (written \( fi \)), e. g., \( jinakay \) 'leprous' from the root \( dakay \).

In Ibanag an \( s \) not followed by \( i \) seems to be regularly changed to \( t \), e. g., \( atawa \) 'spouse' (Tag. \( asawa \)), \( takit \) 'sickness' (Tag. sakit) \( tu \) 'to, in the, etc.' (Tag. \( sa \)); but \( si \) the personal article (Tag. \( si \)).

One of the most complex chapters of Philippine phonology is that which is concerned with the interrelations of the sounds \( d, r, l \).

In a number of words an Ibanag, Ilokano, Bikol, and Samaro-Leytean \( r \) corresponds to a Tagalog, Bisayan (except Sam.-Ley.), Pampangan Pangasinan, Magindanao and Sulu \( l \), e. g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>write</th>
<th>silver</th>
<th>thousand</th>
<th>how much?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>surat</td>
<td>pirak</td>
<td>ribu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>surat</td>
<td>pirak</td>
<td>ribo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>surat</td>
<td>pirak</td>
<td>ribo</td>
<td>pira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam.-Ley.</td>
<td>surat</td>
<td>ribo ('million')</td>
<td>pira</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>sulat</td>
<td>pilak</td>
<td>libo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis.</td>
<td>sulat</td>
<td>pilak</td>
<td>libo</td>
<td>pila</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>sulat</td>
<td>libo</td>
<td>pilan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>sulat</td>
<td>libo</td>
<td>pila</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>sulat</td>
<td>pelak</td>
<td>pela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td>sulat</td>
<td>pelak</td>
<td>pela</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As an original \( l \) is in general preserved without change in most of the languages, \( r \) is here probably to be regarded as the more original sound.

An original intervocalic \( l \) is lost in Tagalog and Sulu; in Tagalog it is represented by the glottal catch between the two vowels, or a secondary \( h \) or semi-vowel is developed between
them, e. g., daan ‘road,’ bahay ‘house,’ powo ‘ten’ (Bis. dalan, balay, polo); in Sulu the two vowels are contracted, e. g., dan ‘road,’ bai ‘house,’ poh ‘ten.’

In Batan such an l seems regularly to become y, e. g., ogo ‘head,’ pogo ‘ten,’ bagay ‘house,’ bugan ‘month’ (Bis. olo, polo, balay, bulan). The same change is perhaps illustrated in Ibanag, Pangasinan, and Nabaloi piga ‘how much?’ (Bis. pilu). This change from l to y probably passed through the intermediate stages, guttural r, and the guttural sonant spirant like y in the North German pronunciation of tage ‘days.’ The writing y, indeed, may be simply an imperfect attempt to indicate the latter sound.

In Nabaloi Igorot an l or r of the other languages is often represented by d, e. g., idoko ‘Ilokan’ (Ilok. idoko), mabadin ‘possible’ (Ilok. mabalin), sudát ‘write’ (Ilok. surat, Tag. sutat).

In Batan the change from l to d is also found, e. g., dima ‘five,’ tatdo ‘three’ (Bis. lima, taho).

An intervocalic d is in many of the languages often changed to r. So in Tagalog, Bisayan, Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ibanag, Nabaloi, Batan, and Sulu; apparently not in Bikol, Ilokan and Magindanao, cf.

Tag. narito ‘is here’ from dito ‘here.’
Bis. aruma, duna ‘have.’
Pamp. kareni ‘to these’ from deni ‘these.’
Pang. maronong ‘wise’ from root donong.
Iban. ikarua ‘second’ from root dua ‘two.’
Nab. marikit ‘pretty,’ cf. Tag. dikit ‘beauty.’
Bat. Icharua ‘second,’ cf. Iban. dua ‘two.’
Sulu ha ran ‘on the road’ from dan ‘road.’
Ilok. ida ‘they’ from da.

Palatals and Gutturals.

In Ibanag final k regularly becomes the glottal catch (cf. below, p. 336).

In Nabaloi Igorot k is often changed to the corresponding surd spirant like German ch, which may be represented by x, e. g., ixamen ‘mat’ (Ilok. ikamen), asiven ‘old man’ (Pang. asiken).

In Bontoc Igorot k and g are constantly interchanged, e. g., kulid or gulid ‘itch,’ yeka or yega ‘earthquake.’
In Batan a k in juxtaposition to an i sound either before or after it regularly becomes ch, e. g., icha- prefix which forms ordinals, machi- verbal prefix indicating accompaniment (Tag. ika, maki).

A g of the other languages is sometimes represented in Ilok'an by r, the change in all probability being the reverse of the process illustrated by the change from l to g (cf. above, p. 334), e. g., buro 'new,' rabiy 'night,' darat 'sand' (Tag. bago, gab-i, dagat 'sea').

In Nabaloí Igorot y becomes regularly dy, e. g., dyo 'your,' adyab 'call' (Ilok. yo, ayab).

**Laryngeals.**

Under this category the Philippine languages seem originally to have possessed the glottal catch or laryngeal stop, and perhaps the surd spirant h. The glottal catch is not recognized as a separate sound in any of the works on the Philippine languages, but its presence in many languages is indicated by the statements of the grammars, and it probably occurs in all. For example, the Tagalog grammars speak of final vowels with guttural accent, of vowels pronounced separately from the single consonant which precedes them, and state that two juxtaposed vowels stand in different syllables. These statements are to be understood as follows. The hiatus between the two vowels in such a word as doon 'there' is of course identical with the glottal catch: the fact that a vowel following a single consonant begins a new syllable, as for example in gab-i 'night,' indicates that between the two stands the glottal catch, which really begins the second syllable: the so-called guttural accent of a final vowel seems to be really a glottal catch after the vowel; when the final vowel has at the same time the stress accent, the vowel is marked with a circumflex, e. g., wald 'is, has not;' when it is unstressed, with a grave accent, e. g., wik 'word, language.' The glottal catch in Ibanag resulting from a final stop is of course secondary (cf. below, p. 336).

The spirant h does not occur in Ibanag, Ilokan, Pangasinan, Nabaloí, and Pampangan, but it may have been an original Philippine sound, as it is preserved in the other Philippine languages; cf.

---

1 Not given in the list of consonants.
In Sulu a word with vocalic initial sometimes takes a secondary 
*h* before it, e. g., *hinom* ‘drink’ (general Philippine *inum*).
In Tagalog, Bisayan, and Bikol an *h* is sometimes inserted
between a final vowel and the suffixes *an* and *in* (cf. below,
p. 337).

**Other Phonetic Changes.**

The final stops *k, p, t*, in Ibanag are, according to the state-
ment in the principal Ibanag grammar, not pronounced, but the
preceding vowel receives a peculiar aspiration.¹ This clearly
points to the fact that these consonants have become the glottal
catch, like the final *k* in Malay.² This pronunciation is indi-
cated in the grammar by placing a dash between the final con-
sonant and the preceding word, e. g., *a-k ‘I,’ taki-t ‘sickness.’
In the present article, however, the dash will be omitted for the
sake of convenience. Before this glottal catch the vowel *a* is
pronounced as *o*, though *a* is usually written (but cf. *so-k ‘I’*).

A characteristic feature of Ibanag and Ilokan is the doubling
of originally single consonants, e. g., Iban. *battu* ‘stone,’ *annam
six* (Tag. *bato, anim*), Ilok. *adda* ‘be’ (Malay *ada*).

In Ibanag the final consonants *b, d, g, n* are assimilated to an
initial consonant in a following word, e. g., *kanak ku* ‘my food’
<kkan ku; and all final consonants are pronounced in the
same syllable with an initial vowel of a following word, the
change from final surd stop to glottal catch not being made in

¹ ‘... quedan absolutamente sin sonido, y mudas; mas debe darse en
la vocal, que les precede, un golpe de aspiracion, que solo la voz de maes-

note that this final glottal catch is written *ق* (e. g., *أنا* ‘son’)
which in Arabic in general is equal to *k*+glottal catch, and which in
some modern Arabic dialects has become simply the glottal catch. Cf.
Gram. der neu-arab. Sprache, Giessen*, 1861, p. 11.
this case, e. g., melugak 'I want' < melug ak, ayata mapia 'great joy' < ayat a mapia.

In Tagalog after a final vowel the a of the particle ay and the conjunction at may be elided, e. g., ang turo'y mabuti (< turo ay) 'the man is good,' ama't ina (< ama at) 'father and mother.' This elision may also take place after a final n, the n being lost at the same time, e. g., iya'y mabuti (< iyan ay) 'this is good,' ama't uli (ama in at) 'uncle and aunt.'

Many contractions and elisions take place in Pampangan, but the statements of the grammar on this subject are very meagre and unsatisfactory; cf., however, kana kita for kana ku ita, iyeni for iya ini, meng for me ing, yang for ya ing, totita for toto ita.

In Tagalog the suffixes an and in are added directly to a word ending in a final vowel with glottal catch, e. g., turo-an 'be taught;' after other final vowels an h is inserted, e. g., sabi-h-in 'be said,' uma-h-an 'front part.' The same rule as regards the insertion of the h probably applies also to Bisayan and Bikol.

**Pronouns Derived from Particles.**

The Philippine pronouns with regard to their origin may be divided into two classes, viz.,

a) pronouns derived from monosyllabic particles,

b) pronouns derived from disyllabic roots.

To the second class belong the indefinite pronouns, except those derived from the interrogatives, e. g., Tag. kaunti 'a little' from the root untî, marami 'much' from the root damî; and the numerals, e. g., Tag. apat 'four,' lima 'five.'

To the first class belong

a) the ligatures,

b) the articles,

c) the demonstrative pronouns,

d) the interrogative pronouns,

e) the personal pronouns.

The present investigation will be confined to the pronouns of the first class, which will be treated in the order named.

Pronouns derived from particles consist either of a simple root particle, or of a root particle combined with other prefixed
and suffixed particles. The prefixes are usually articular in character, and are employed to express case; the suffixes are ordinarily derived from ligatures which stood originally between the pronoun and the following word. Those pronouns that are inflected distinguish in general three cases (cf. above, p. 324), though sometimes two cases have identical forms.\footnote{1}

**The Ligatures.**

The ligatures that occur in the various languages are the following, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>-ng</td>
<td>(-n)</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (in gen.)</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td>-ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td>(-ng)</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>-ng</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-ng</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ya</td>
<td>-y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>nga</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ig. (Nab.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ig. (Bon.)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-n</td>
<td></td>
<td>ay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i, the genitive determinative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i'</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{1}{In the paradigms of the pronouns all those forms that are not given as nominative or genitive in the grammars are grouped under the oblique. As the oblique is often used as the equivalent of the genitive, e.g., Tag. *ama nang batà=sa bata-ng ama* 'father of the boy,' forms that are really oblique are often given by the grammars under the genitive, but this will occasion little difficulty from a morphological point of view. Sometimes the oblique forms are not given by the grammars, in which case they are probably to be formed by prefixing the oblique of the definite article to the nominative.}

\footnote{2}{Not specifically mentioned as ligature by the grammars, though examples of both occur.}

\footnote{3}{Ka is also said to be a relative in the sentence *dini doon kagi ka diri nonjá olitan* 'here are words that it is not proper to reveal;' but it is here in all probability simply the genitive of the definite article used before the following clause, which modifies *kagi* 'words' just like a noun in the genitive.}
The forms with dash are used only after vowels, e. g., Bis. tavo-ng maayo ‘good man,’ the others, in general, after both vowels and consonants, e. g., Bis. tavo nga maayo ‘good man,’ maalum nga magtotoon ‘learned teacher.’ Tagalog ay, -y are used only to join together two elements that stand to each other in the relation of subject and predicate, and then only when the subject precedes, e. g., ang tavo’y mabuti ‘the man is good.’ Bisayan -y is also sometimes employed in this case, but is also used as the equivalent of the other ligatures.¹

The difference between -ng and -n in those languages which possess both is difficult to determine. Often they seem to be used interchangeably; in Pampangan -n is used especially before an indefinite noun, like the signs of the indefinite object in Bis., and Iban. (cf. below, p. 345); e. g., kuma ka-n danum ‘take some water.’ The choice of a and nga in those languages which possess both seems to be regulated by euphonic considerations: in Ilokano a must be used when the preceding word ends and the following begins with a consonant, e. g., toy a balay ‘this house;’ nga must be used when the preceding word ends and the following begins with a vowel a, e. g., dayta nga aso ‘that dog,’ otherwise the two are used indiscriminately. Ilokano -n is used before the adverbs sa and to, e. g., adda-n-sa ‘is there perhaps,’ adda-n-to ‘will there be,’ and has also various other uses.² In Pangasinan ya is used principally to join clauses, e. g., alam so libro ya wala-d² silid ‘bring the book which is in the room;’ -y is used as the equivalent of -n, and also as a substitute for the nominative and genitive of the articles, e. g., talo-ra-y silla=talora-n silla ‘three chairs,’ onla dia-y Antonio= onla dia si Antonio ‘come here Antonio.’ Otherwise the four forms are practically equivalent except that -n and -y are only

¹ Cf. my paper, Differences between Tagalog and Bisayan, JAOS. xxv, 1904, p. 167 f.
² Cf. Williams, Grammatische Skizze der Ilokano-Sprache (dissertation), München, 1904, p. 64 f.
³ Contracted from wala ed. In Pangasinan wala means ‘to be,’ in Tagalog and Bisayan it means ‘not to be,’ one being affirmative, the other negative. A similar difference in meaning is presented in Semitic by Hebrew יָרָנָנָנ ‘be willing,’ Arabic َبَذَ ‘abad, Ethiopic እንጆ : ‘abaña ‘be unwilling, refuse.’
used after vowels. In the meager specimens of Bontoc Igorot which are accessible -n is used after a vowel, ay after either vowel or consonant, e. g., chwa-n lanot 'two hundred,' chwa ay lilo 'two thousand,' siwm ay poo 'ninety' (nine tens). In Magindanao a is the usual ligature, i being used mainly after interrogative words instead of the article su, e. g., tinjìn i midolu salka 'who spoke to you?' In Sulu the ligature i occurs sporadically, e. g., pelu i ibulan 'how many months?' In Bagobo the ligature is used as relative.

All these ligatures seem to be derived from the four particles na, nga, a, and i. The forms -n and -ny are shortened respectively from na and nga; i after a vowel forms the second element of a diphthong and is then often written -y; ay and ya are probably combinations of the two particles a and i; nu and nga are perhaps simply two forms of the same particle.

The Articles.

The Philippine languages possess not only a definite and indefinite article, which are in the main equivalent to the corresponding English articles, but also a personal and an inclusive article (cf. above, p. 325).

Definite Article.

The forms of the definite article in the various languages are, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>ang</td>
<td>nang</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Ceb.)</td>
<td>ang</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Hil.)</td>
<td>ang (ing)</td>
<td>sang</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td>an (in)</td>
<td>san, nan, kanan sa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Har.)</td>
<td>ya, nan</td>
<td>sa, kan, et</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>an, si</td>
<td>nin, ninsi, sa, kan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>sg. ing</td>
<td>ning, king</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ding</td>
<td>(ding)¹</td>
<td>karing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>sg. so, say</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Doubtless the correct form (cf. inc. art.), though not given by the grammar.
Forms that are apparently root particles are ya, si, i, u, ti. Ya is probably identical with the ligature ya; si is the personal article used as definite (cf. below, p. 346); i is probably identical with the ligature i; ti is probably identical with the demonstrative root particle ti (cf. below, p. 353).

Pangasinan, Batan, and Magindanao su, so, may be a root particle, or u with an inflectional s borrowed from si, the nominative of the personal article. Nabaloi e may be a variant form of i, or a contraction of *ay identical with the ligature ay.

The forms ang, an, ing, in, yan seem to consist of the root particles i and ya just described, and a which is probably identical with the ligature a, followed by the ligature -ng, -n, which is regularly used in these languages between two words that stand to one another in the relation of modified and modifier, when the first of the group ends in a vowel. Originally the root particle was the article, and -ng, -n simply a connective, the -ng in Taga-

---

1 Also given as objective along with sun and chi.
2 The oblique case forms are given as du, lu, su, but this is almost certainly a mistake for du, l. u, su, l. being an abbreviation for ‘or,’ as in the nominative su l. u. No particle which could be connected with this apparent lu occurs in any of the languages, except, perhaps, in Magindanao (cf. below, p. 372) and there it seems to be a foreign element. As these forms are headed ‘dat., ac., abl.’ the forms u, su are probably nominatives used as accusatives (cf. below, p. 380, ft. nt. 1).
3 As these forms are given by Juanmarti in the paradigm only in connection with the following plural particle manğa, the u may be a modification of a due to the labial m.
4 Cf. Brandstetter, Tag. u. Mad., p. 78.
log a-\textit{ng tawo} ‘the man’ being no more a part of the article than the \textit{-ng} in \textit{ito-\textit{ng tawo}} ‘this man.’ The ligature, however, has become an integral part of the article, as is shown by the pronominal use of the article before an oblique case, e. g., Tag. \textit{ang sa tawo} ‘that of the man,’ where the ligature would ordinarily not be employed.

Pangasinan \textit{say} seems to be a combination of a root particle \textit{sa} and the ligature \textit{i}. Whether this \textit{su} is ultimately identical with the \textit{sa} of the oblique case (cf. below) is uncertain.

Harayan \textit{nan} is probably borrowed from the genitive, being doubtless identical with the Samaro-Leytean genitive \textit{nan} (cf. below).

Ilokan \textit{iti} seems to be a combination of the simpler form \textit{ti} with an articular prefix \textit{i} doubtless identical with Ibanag nominative \textit{i}, and ultimately with the ligature \textit{i}. This \textit{i} is to be distinguished from the prepositional \textit{i} which occurs in the identical oblique case \textit{iti} (cf. below).

The plural forms in Pangasinan and Ilokan contain a plural element \textit{da}, \textit{ra}, which is identical with the root particles \textit{da}, \textit{ra}, \textit{la} of the third person plural (cf. below, p. 381 f.). In Pangasinan \textit{ra} is always followed by the ligature \textit{i}, and it also may take the prefixes \textit{i}, \textit{sa}, and so \textit{sa}, \textit{i} being identical with the \textit{i} of Ilokan nominative \textit{iti}, \textit{sa} and so with the \textit{sa} and so of the Pangasinan singular. In Ilokan the plural is made by prefixing \textit{dog}, consisting of \textit{da}–an additional pluralizing element \textit{y},\footnote{Cf. my article, \textit{The Bisayan Dialects}, cited above, p. 127.} to the singular \textit{iti}. In Pampangan \textit{ding}, which like the singular forms \textit{ang}, \textit{ing}, contains the ligature \textit{-ng}, \textit{di} may be a modification of \textit{da} due to the influence of the \textit{i} of the singular, or it may be an independent root particle (cf. below, p. 348).

Genitive.

The genitive forms that are apparently root particles are \textit{sa}, \textit{et}, \textit{na}, \textit{ti}, \textit{ka}. \textit{Ti} is the same as the \textit{ti} in the nominative; \textit{sa}, \textit{et} and \textit{ka} belong rather to the oblique (cf. below); \textit{na} is probably identical with the ligature \textit{na}.

Batan \textit{nu} and perhaps Magindanao \textit{nu} (cf., however, p. 341, ft. nt.) may be a root particle, or it may be \textit{u} with an inflec-
tional \( n \) borrowed from \( na \). Nabaloí \( no \) is either a variant form of \( ni \), or \( na + \) the ligature \( i \). Bagobo \( ta \) has apparently no representative in any of the other languages, Ibanag \( ta \) (obl.) representing an original \( sa \).

The forms \( nung, nan, sang, san, \) consist of the root particles \( na \) and \( sa \) followed by the ligature \( -ng, -n \). The forms \( ning, nin \) consist of a similar combination of the ligature with a particle \( ni \), which may itself be a root particle, or the root particle \( i \) with an inflectional \( n \) borrowed from \( na \).

In Bikol \( ninsi \) the genitive is prefixed to the nominative. Sulu \( sin \) is probably the nominative \( in \) with an inflectional \( s \) borrowed from the genitive and oblique \( sa \) (cf. below, p. 354). The forms \( kan, kanan, kana, kanu, \) seem to be borrowed from the oblique (cf. below).

The plural forms in Pampangan and Ilokano are identical with the nominative. In Pangasinan the form \( day \) (=plural particle \( da + \) ligature \( i \)) is probably more original than \( ray \) of the nominative, where the \( r \) is doubtless due to the analogy of the other nominative forms (cf. below, p. 382): in the form \( na \) \( saray; na, \) the genitive singular, is prefixed as genitive case sign to the nominative.

**Oblique.**

The forms that are apparently root particles are \( sa \) (including Iban. \( ta \), cf. above, p. 333), \( et, ed, *di \) (Nab. \( chi \), cf. above, p. 333), \( ha, pa, ka \). \( Et \) and \( ed \) are probably identical, and are perhaps to be connected with \( di; di \) is doubtless identical with the Malay preposition \( di \) 'in'; Sulu \( ha \) is perhaps to be connected with the Sulu active verbal suffixes \( a, ha \) just as the \( i \) of Ilokano \( i-ti \) is probably identical with the active verbal suffix \( i \) of Malay (cf. below); Sulu \( pa, \) which indicates motion towards, is perhaps identical with the verbal prefix \( pa, \) which is used to form verbs of motion, e. g., Tag. \( pa-rito \) 'come here' from \( dito \) 'here,' \( pa-sa-Maynila \) 'go to Manila' from \( sa-Maynila \) 'in Manila;' \( ka \) is doubtless identical with the Malay preposition \( ka \) 'to, towards.' For Bagobo \( ta \) cf. under genitive.

The form \( kan \) consists of the root particle \( ka + \) ligature \( n; \) Pampangan \( king \) consists of the ligature \( ng \) and a root particle \( ki \) which is probably modified from \( ka \) under the influence
of the i vocalism of the other forms; Batan du is probably u with an inflectional d borrowed from the particle di; Nabalo sun consists perhaps of the root particle u with an inflectional s as in Sulu genitive sin, and ligature u; Ilokan iti consists of the root particle ti, and a prepositional i identical with the i of the Tagalog adverbs and prepositions su i-babao 'over, su i-tuas 'above,' su i-babā 'below,' su i-lalim 'underneath,' which consist of a root preceded by two prepositional elements i and su. This i may be identical with the prefix i of the passive, just as in Malay di is both preposition and passive prefix. The same preposition i seems also to occur as active suffix in Malay, where it is equivalent to the active suffix kau, connected with the preposition ka.

In Samaro-Leytean kanaan, Magindanao kanau, kau, ka is prefixed as oblique case sign to the genitive; in the plural of Pampangan and Ilokan to the nominative-genitive. In the Pagnasinan plural, ed is prefixed as oblique case sign to the nominative.

For the Batan forms u and su, which are identical with the nominative, cf. above, p. 341, ft. nt. 2.

Indefinite Article.

The idea of the indefinite article, whenever it is not indicated sufficiently by the nature of the construction, is expressed by the numeral one, which unlike the numerals from 'two' upward seems to be derived from pronominal particles. This numeral, however, is not inflected, but expresses its case by means of an inflected word placed before it. Its forms in the various languages are, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag.</th>
<th>Tag.</th>
<th>Ilok.</th>
<th>Meysa</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Ceb.)</td>
<td>usa</td>
<td>Igor. (Nab.)</td>
<td>Saxei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Hil.)</td>
<td>usa, usa</td>
<td>Igor. (Bon.)</td>
<td>Isa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td>usa</td>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>Itte, Tadday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>Saro</td>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>Isa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>Isa, metong</td>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td>Isa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>Isa, sakey</td>
<td>Bag.</td>
<td>Sabbad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3 Cf. Marsden, *op. cit.*, p. 56.
All of these forms except Pampangan metong, which is not clear, are derived from a root particle sa, which is used for 'one' in Javanese and Malay. The initial i of isa is probably the same articular i which has already been seen in Ilokano nominative iti, and which has an extensive use in the demonstrative and personal pronouns (cf. below).

Ibanag itte probably consists of *ittu + the ligature i, just as dua 'two' is probably equivalent to dua + i; *ittu is doubtless derived from *ita (=isa, cf. above, p. 333), with the doubling which is so characteristic of Ibanag (cf. above, p. 336). In Ilokano instead of the simple i, mey, contracted from mai, a combination of i and the adjectival prefix ma, is used, just as it is employed instead of the simple i of many of the other languages, in the formation of the ordinals, e. g., Ilok. maikapat 'fourth' (Tag. ikapat).

The u of Bisayan use is probably identical with Batan u (cf. also below, pp. 354, 361).

Ibanag sadday (<*sadday, cf. above, p. 333) is perhaps to be analyzed as root particle sa + da, root particle of third person plural, + ligature i, the doubling being phonetic. The second elements of Bikol sa-ro, Pangasinan sa-key, Nabalo sa-xei, Bagobo sa-bbad are, perhaps, similar in nature to the numeral coefficients of Malay.¹

Under the head of indefinite articles are best considered those particles which indicate the indefinite object of an action. In Cebuan these are ug, more rarely ak; in Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean sing and sin respectively: e. g., Cebuan kumuha ka ug tubig 'take some water.' The two last are probably identical in formation with sin, the genitive of the definite article in Sulu. In Ibanag a particle tu, perhaps identical with Batan and Magindanao su, Pangasinan so, is employed, e. g., apam mu tu kanak ku 'bring me something to eat.'

Personal Article.

The forms of the personal article in the various languages are, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag.</th>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>obl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>kay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>nan</td>
<td>ki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>nen</td>
<td>kan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>si, ni</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor. (Nab.)</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>nan, ne</td>
<td>sun, sikan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>ta, takkua, tak-kuani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat.</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ni, kani</td>
<td>kani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td>hi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag.</td>
<td>si</td>
<td>ni</td>
<td>kan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The usual nominative is the root particle *si*. In Pampangan *i*, identical with the root particle *i* of the definite article, is employed, and with this, Sulu *hi* is perhaps identical, as a secondary *h* is sometimes developed before an initial vowel (cf. above, p. 336). Ilokan *ni* is derived from the genitive (cf. below, p. 387).

The usual genitive is the particle *ni* (cf. above, p. 343). The forms *nan*, *kanan*, *ne* are to be explained like *nan*, *kanan*, *ne* of the definite article. Pangasinan *nen* seems to be the articulate root particle *na* + the ligatures *i* and *n*, *nain* being contracted to *nen* (cf. above, p. 331). Magindanao *kani* belongs rather to the oblique.

In the oblique case most of the forms are based on the articulate root particle *ka*: *kan* consists of *ka* + the ligature *n*; *kay*, of *ka* + the ligature *y*; Ilokan *ken* is probably to be analyzed, like Pangasinan *nen*, as *ka* + *i* + *n*; Magindanao *kani* consists of *ka* + the genitive *ni*: Nabaloj *sikan* is *kan* with what is apparently the nominative *si* prefixed. Bikol *ki* seems to be a modification of *ka* due to the influence of the *i* in the other case forms *si* and *ni*. Pangasinan does not distinguish between the

\[1\] Also given as objective along with *sun* and *sikan.*
definite and personal articles in the oblique case, ed serving for both, and in Ibanag the oblique case ta of the definite article is used either alone or in the compound forms takkua, takkuani as the oblique of the personal article. The kua in the compounds just mentioned is a noun meaning 'thing, possession,' which is used in Ilokano and Ibanag in conjunction with the post-positive genitives of the personal pronouns to form possessive pronouns, e. g., kua-k 'mine,' kua-m 'thine,' etc. 1; ni is the genitive of the personal article. Batan di is doubtless identical with Nahaloi chi, Malay di (cf. above, p. 343).

**Inclusive Article.**

The forms of the inclusive article, in so far as they are given by the various grammars, are as follows, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>obl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>sina</td>
<td>nina</td>
<td>kana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Ceb.)</td>
<td>sa</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>ka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Hil.)</td>
<td>sanday</td>
<td>nanday</td>
<td>kanday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sila nay</td>
<td>ila nay</td>
<td>sa ila nay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sila ni</td>
<td>ila ni</td>
<td>sa ila ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>sila si</td>
<td>nila ni</td>
<td>kanila ni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td>sila sa</td>
<td>nira</td>
<td>kanda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>sa, sainda sa, na, ninda na na, sainda na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>di</td>
<td>kari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>sara di</td>
<td>da di</td>
<td>ed sara di</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>da 2</td>
<td>da 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>da</td>
<td>takkuara</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Tagalog forms are compounded of a particle na, perhaps identical with the ligature na, and the case forms of the personal article, ka being used instead of ka-y.

---

3 Cf. Naves, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 121.
Cebuan and Bikol *sa*, which occurs also in Hiliguyna *silu* *sa*, seems to be a modification of *si*, a perhaps being borrowed from the plural particle *da*, where it was felt as a plural ending. The other case forms *na* and *ka* were then made on the basis of *sa*, the nominative case sign *s* being changed respectively to *n* and *k*.

In many instances the inclusive article is based on the pronoun of the third person plural (cf. below, p. 379 ff.). In Hiliguyna, *sunday* is the pronoun *sanda* 'they' + the ligature *i*; *nunday* and *kunday* are made on this basis by simply changing the case sign: *silu* *nay* and its declined forms is a combination of the pronoun *silu* 'they' with a particle *nay*, probably *na*, identical with *na* in Tagalog *si-na*, + the ligature *i*: for *silu* *sa* cf. below. The other Hiliguyna forms consist of *silu* followed by the nominative or genitive of the personal article.

Samaro-Leytean *sira*, *nira* are identical with the corresponding forms of the pronoun of the third person plural; the oblique *kanda* is to be connected with the stem of Hiliguyna *sunday*. The Bikol forms like *sinda* *sa*, *ninda* *na*, etc., and Hiliguyna *silu* *sa*, consist of the forms of the pronoun of the third person plural followed by the nominative or genitive of the inclusive article *sa*; *sainda* *sa*, if it is not a typographical error, owes its initial syllable *sa* to the influence of the inclusive article *sa*. Ilokan and Ibanag *da* is identical with the root particle *da* of the pronoun of the third person plural. The sign of the oblique case in Ibanag, viz., *taklua* is to be explained as in the case of the personal article. Pampangan *di* may be a modification of *da* due to the influence of the prevailing *i* vocalism of the articular forms, but the occurrence of *di* as the final element of the inclusive article in Pangasinan, where there is no such influence, seems to indicate that *di* is an independent particle: *kari* is *di* with prefixed case sign *ka*. In Pangasinan the inclusive article is made by prefixing to *di*, forms derived from the pronoun of the third person plural or from the plural of the definite article: *sikara* is identical with one of the pronouns of the third person plural; the other elements prefixed to *di* are the corresponding case forms of the plural of the definite article without the ligature -y.
Demonstrative Pronouns.

With regard to their meaning, the demonstrative pronouns may be divided into two general classes, A) the nearer demonstratives, which may be translated by 'this;' B) the more remote demonstratives, which may be translated by 'that.' Within these two general groups, especially in the second, there are in most of the languages further subdivisions of meaning. For example, in Tagalog, *yuri* indicates something that is nearer the speaker than the person addressed, *ito*, something that is near both, *iyun*, something that is nearer the person addressed than the speaker, and *yaon*, something that is distant from both.

These more minute distinctions, however, are of practically no importance from a morphological point of view, and even in the case of the two main semantic groups, we often find what is nearer demonstrative in one, used as remoter demonstrative in another, e. g., Tagalog *ito* 'this,' Samaro-Leytean *ito* 'that.'

In general the demonstratives are made up of three elements, viz., (a) demonstrative root particles; (b) prefixed particles, usually of articular origin, which denote case and sometimes number, and which will be known as case indicating particles; (c) connective particles or ligatures, which are of two kinds, those that connect case indicating prefix with the root particle, and those that are suffixal in character, representing what was originally ligature between the demonstrative and following noun. Sometimes a demonstrative seems to contain two root demonstrative particles, viz., in Magindanao *en-tu* and in the Ibanag forms ending in *ye*. In Bagobo an adverbial particle *go* appears as final element in some of the demonstratives.

The forms of the demonstrative pronouns in the various languages are, viz.:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tag.</th>
<th>Class A</th>
<th>Class B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. yari, yiri, yeri</td>
<td>ito</td>
<td>iyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. nirí</td>
<td>nito</td>
<td>yaon, yoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. dini</td>
<td>dito</td>
<td>niyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Ceb.)</td>
<td>kari, diri, dari, ari kana</td>
<td>diyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. niini</td>
<td>niana</td>
<td>nion, noon, niyaon, niyoon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. kanini</td>
<td>niarí</td>
<td>doon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Hil.)</td>
<td>N. ini</td>
<td>kadto(t), adto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. O. sini, sa sini</td>
<td>niarí</td>
<td>kitot, itot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td>N. ini</td>
<td>niaadto(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. O. sini, sa sini</td>
<td></td>
<td>niitot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Har.)</td>
<td>N. dia</td>
<td>yana, ina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. karìa, kadìa</td>
<td></td>
<td>yado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>N. ini</td>
<td>sana, sina, sa sina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. kainí</td>
<td></td>
<td>sadto, sa sadto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>sg. N. ini</td>
<td>iyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. nini</td>
<td>iti</td>
<td>yado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. kanini, keni</td>
<td>niti</td>
<td>sadto, yado</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kaniti, keti</td>
<td></td>
<td>adto, sadto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. N. G. deni</td>
<td>iyan</td>
<td>sado, sa sadto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. kareni</td>
<td>ita</td>
<td>sitio, sa sito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kareti</td>
<td>kaidto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sg. N. saya, aya, ia; so saya</td>
<td>iyan</td>
<td>ito</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>G. tonia; na saya</td>
<td>kiyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O. 'ed saya</td>
<td></td>
<td>kaidto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pl. N. saraya, raya, iraya; so saraya</td>
<td>iyan</td>
<td>iya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>karean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>satan, itan, atan; so satan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tan; so satan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tontan; na satan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ed satan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>saratan, iratan, ratan; so saratan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Form 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. dania; na saraya</td>
<td></td>
<td>dantan; na saratan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O. 'ed saraya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>sg. N. G. daytoy, toy</td>
<td>dayta, ta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O. itoy, iti daytoy</td>
<td>ita, iti dayta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. N. G. dagitoy</td>
<td>dagita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O. kadagitoy</td>
<td>kadagita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor. (Nab.)</td>
<td>saidiai, sadiai, iai</td>
<td>satan, sutan, suta, itan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>sg. N. yau, au</td>
<td>yaya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. nau all</td>
<td>yajje</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O. tau declined</td>
<td>yatun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. N.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>danau in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>annau same</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. danau way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>takkaranau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>takkuaranau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat.</td>
<td>nooya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>inia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag.</td>
<td>ini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>uri</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ien</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>toy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>iaun</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The adverb 'to day' makes case forms like the demonstratives, viz., nom. karon, gen.-obl. niaron.
2 Given in the Cebuan paradigms in Mentrida and Aparicio's Hiligayna Grammar, p. 250f.
3 In these forms can represents a contraction of *aiyan, intervocalic y becoming the hiatus or glottal catch as perhaps in sia for siya; cf. below, p. 981.
4 The form dia is given in the paradigms as the equivalent of ed in the ablative case, but this is simply the adverb dia 'here' + ed.
5 Given by Williams, op. cit. p. 59.
The root particles of the demonstrative are *di, ni, to, ya, *an, na, ti, ta, ma, an, and possibly a (cf. below, under ya and na). The particles ya, na, a are probably identical, respectively, with the ligatures, ya, na, a.

*Di, which when intervocalic appears in many languages as ri, is found in Tag. ya-ri, yi-ri, ye-ri, ni-ri, all the forms of Ceb. ku-ri, Iban. ya-ri, yu-ri, Bat. u-ri, Ilok. day-di, de-di-
ay, and in Nab. sa-i-di-ai, sa-di-ai. The root particle is found uncombined only in Ilokan. Ilokan dediay is daydi + the double ligature ay, day being contracted to de. In Ibanag the forms yad and yud seem to to shortened from yari and yuri respectively; and these shortened forms were then augmented by the addition of a, probably the ligature a, viz., yara, yura, and ye, probably contracted from the ya which occurs as the pronoun of the third person + the ligature -y, viz., yajje (<*yad-ye), yujje (<*yud-ye).

*Ni occurs in Tagalog oblique di-ni and all the forms of Cebuan k-i-ni, Hiliguyna, Samaro-Leytean, Bikol, Pampangan, Sulu, and Bagobo i-ni, and Magindanao i-ni-a.

To occurs in all the forms of Tagalog i-to, Cebuan k-i-to-t, Hiliguyna i-to-n, Samaro-Leytean i-to, Ilokan day-to-y, Ibanag ya-tu-n, ya-tu-n-ye, in Bagobo to, to-y, to-i-go, probably in Magindanao en-tu, Sulu ie-tu, and in all the forms derived from the stems, Cebuan, Hiliguyna, and Samaro-Leytean ad-
to, Harayan ag-to, and Bikol id-to. The second t of the Cebuan forms kitot, etc.; kadlot, etc., is probably due to incomplete reduplication. The final ye of the Ibanag forms is to be explained as the ye in yajje (<*yad-ye). Bagobo-go is an emphatic particle which is also used in sentences with non-verbal predicate, e.g., si kona mapia-go manobo ‘you are a good man.’ The en- of Magindanao entu seems to be the same as the en in Sulu i-en.

Ya occurs in all the forms of Tagalog, Bikol, and Pampangan i-ya-n; of Pangasinan sa-ya; in the Ibanag final syllable ye for ya-i in yoye, yajje, yujje, yoije, yatunye; and perhaps in Harayan dia (all forms), Nabaloai ia-i, Batan nooya, and Bagobo yango. Harayan dia probably stands for *di-ya (cf.

\[1\] Ny, the definite article in Madagascan, is probably identical with this root particle, cf. Parker, op. cit., p. 48.
sia = siya, p. 381, below). Nabaloi iai may be simply a shortened form of saidiai, sudiai; or it may be analyzed as ia + ligature i, or as a root particle a preceded by articular i, and followed by the ligature i. Bagobo yango contains the particle go and an element yan which is probably ya + the ligature n.

Au occurs in Tagalog y-a-o-n, ni-y-a-o-n, and in all the forms of Ibanag y-a-u, yoye (*y-a-u-ye), Batan au, and Sulu i-a-u-n. In the Tagalog forms yoon, niyoon, the first element of the a of ao seems to have been assimilated to e; nion is contracted from niyoon; noon and doon seemed to be formed on the basis of yoon, the case signs n and 0 being substituted for y. The Ibanag forms yod, yoyje (*yod-ye), yora present a blend of yau and the forms with 0, having the vocalism of yau, and the 0 of the latter forms:

1. Na is found in all the forms of Cebuan ka-na, Hiliguayna ya-na, Magindanao a-na-n, and perhaps of Harayan dan if it is a shortened form of *da-na. In the Harayan forms, however, the root particle may be a, identical with the root particle of Tagalog ang.

Ti, identical with the ti of the Ilokano definite article, occurs in all the forms of Pampangan i-ti.

Tu occurs in all the forms of Pampangan i-ta, Pangasinan su-ta-n, Ilokano day-ta, and in Nabaloi sa-ta-n, su-ta-n and i-ta-n.

Mu occurs in all the forms of Pangasinan and Nabaloi sa-ma-n, etc.

En occurs in Sulu i-en and Magindanao en-tu, the tu of the latter form being the demonstrative root particle to.

The case indicating prefixes of the demonstratives are, in Tagalog i, ni, n, di, d; in Cebuan k, sa, s, di, d, i, kan, ni; in Hiliguayna and Samaro-Leytean i, s, sa; in Harayan a, di(?) ka, k; in Pampangan i, ni, ka, da; in Pangasinan sa, a, i, to, da, so, na, ed; in Ilokano i, da, dag; in Nabaloi sa, su, i; in Ibanag i, n, i, da, an (?), takka, takku; in Batan u; in Magindanao a, i, in Sulu and Bagobo i.

The prefix i (y before a vowel) which is found in most of the languages as the sign of the nominative case is apparently identical with the articular root particle i. 1 The i of the oblique

---

1 This i is found also in the Malay demonstratives i-ni 'this,' i-tu 'that;' and in all the demonstratives in Madagascan, e.g., i-ty 'this, cf. Parker, op. cit., p. 41.
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singular in Ilokan, however, is probably a prepositional particle (cf. above, p. 344). Batan *u* is identical with the *u* of the definite article; *ni*, the most common sign of the genitive, is identical with the *ni* of the personal article: *sa*, *ka*, *kan*, *di* and *takkua* are identical with articular oblique forms *sa*, *ka*, *kan*, *di* and *takkua*; *da* is the root particle of the third person plural that has already been met with in the articles; in Ilokan the *da* seems to have lost its plural force, being used as a simple initial demonstrative element in both singular and plural, the plural being indicated by *da* with an additional plural sign *g*, viz., *dag*; Pangasinan *so*, *na*, *ed* are case forms of the definite article; Pangasinan and Nabaloi *sa* is identical with the *sa* of the article *say*; Pangasinan and Magindanao *a* is probably the same *a* as in Tagalog *ang*; Pangasinan *to* is the genitive of the pronoun of the third person singular; Nabaloi *su* is to be connected with the articles, Pangasinan *so*, Magindanao *su*; Pampangan *ke* and *de* are contracted respectively from *ka-i* and *da-i*, with articular *i*; Ibanag *takka* is a double oblique sign, standing for *ta-ka < *sa-ka* (cf. above, pp. 333, 336); for *an* of the Ibanag nominative plural, cf. below, p. 356 f.

When the case sign consists of a single consonant it is usually to be explained as derived from forms with a fuller case sign under the influence of proportional analogy. For example, the *s* of the genitive-oblique in Hiliguyna and Samaro-Leytean is probably derived from *sa*, a series like Samaro-Leytean *udto*, *sadto* (*<sa-adto*) giving rise to forms like *sini*, *sito* on the basis of *ini*, *ito*. Similarly Tagalog *n* and *d* in the forms *noon*, *doon* are probably derived from the fuller forms *ni* and *di*; Cebuan and Harayan *k*, *sa*, *s*, and *d* of the nominative are probably based on the articular oblique forms *ka*, *sa* and *di* (for the use of these oblique forms in the nominative, cf. below, p. 388); Harayan *k* in *kagto* is certainly derived from the oblique form *ka*; Ibanag *n* and *t* of the genitive and oblique respectively seem to be derived from the articular forms *na* and *ta*.

Sometimes the case signs are prefixed to a case form, sometimes directly to the demonstrative root particle, sometimes to a demonstrative stem consisting of a root particle combined with a prefix, usually articular in character. These prefixes are *a*, *i* and *u* identical with articular *a*, *i* and *u* (cf. below, p. 381), and *ad*, *id*, *ag* of uncertain origin. It is not impossible that
ad, id and ag contain the articular particles a and i followed by a connective g, which is preserved in Harayan, and which is perhaps related to ug, the sign of the indefinite object in Cebuan; Cebuan and Bikol d representing a partial assimilation of this g to the following dental t. Bikol id is probably modified from ad under the influence of the initial i of the other demonstratives ini, iyan.

In Tagalog the case signs are usually prefixed directly to the demonstrative root particle, e.g., ito, ni-to, di-to. In the nominative y-a-ri, y-i-ri, the case sign i is prefixed to the stems a-ri, i-ri; yeri seems to be a modification of yiri due to the r;¹ in the genitives ni-yaoon, ni-yoon the case sign is prefixed to the nominative; for other forms of yaoon, cf. above.

In Cebuan the case signs are all prefixed to demonstrative stems, viz., a-ri, i-ni, i-tot, ad-to, a-na, except in the nominatives itot, diri, where the case signs i, di are prefixed to the root particle. The forms ari, adto are without case signs.

In Hiliguayna the nominative case sign is prefixed to the root particle in i-ni, i-na and i-ton, but to a demonstrative stem in y-anu, y-adto; the genitive-oblique sign s is prefixed to the first three nominatives; in the others, it replaces the nominative case sign; another series of genitive oblique forms are made by prefixing sa to these forms with s.

In Samaro-Leytecan the nominative case sign is prefixed to the root particle in i-ni, i-to, but to a demonstrative stem in y-adto; the form adto, as in Cebuan, is without case sign; the genitive-oblique case sign s is prefixed to the nominatives ini, ito, adto, the genitive-oblique sign sa, as in Hiliguayna, to the forms with s.

In Harayan the nominative is made by prefixing d to the stems an (cf. above, p. 353) and ag-to, and di to the root particle in dia (cf. above, p. 352); the genitive-oblique is made by prefixing the case sign to the nominative, except in kagto, where the nominative case sign is simply changed to k.

In Bikol the nominative case sign is prefixed to the root particle in i-ni and i-yan; the i in idto is probably not the prefix i, but is due to analogical influences (cf. above); the genitive-oblique is made by prefixing the case sign ka to what is apparently the nominative.

¹ Cf. Nabalois era 'they' for *ira, p. 388.
In Pampangan the articular particles of the nominative and genitive singular are prefixed directly to the stem, e. g., \(i\)-ni, ni-ni; that of the oblique singular, to either the genitive or nominative, e. g., ka-nini, keni (\(<^*\text{ka-ini}\)): to form the nominative-genitive plural the plural particle \(da\) is prefixed to the nominative singular, e. g., deni (\(<^*\text{da-ini}\)), and the oblique plural is made from this form by prefixing \(ku\), e. g., ku-reni.

In Pangasinan the nominative singular may begin with the stem as in Samar-Atande adto, or may take the articular prefixes sa, a, and i, e. g., tan, sa-tan, a-tan, i-tan; the nominative plural is formed by prefixing to the stem the particle \(da\) or its combinations with the articular prefixes sa and i, viz., sara, iri, e. g., ra-tan, sa-ra-tan, i-ra-tan: the genitive, singular and plural, is formed by prefixing to the stem the genitive singular and plural, respectively of the pronoun of the third person, the two elements being joined by the ligature \(n\), e. g., to-n-tan, da-n-tan: the oblique, singular and plural, is always, and the other cases may be, indicated by the nominative with initial sa preceded by the forms of the definite article, e. g., ed satan, ed saratan; so satan, na satan, so saratan, na saratan.

In Ilokano the nominative-genitive singular may begin with the root particle, or may take the prefix day, a combination of the plural particle \(da\) and the articular prefix \(i\), e. g., toy, da-y-toy; the nominative-genitive plural is formed from the nominative singular by substituting for \(da\) a particle day consisting of plural particle \(da\) + a pluralizing \(g\); the \(da\) of the singular is borrowed from the plural, where it has apparently lost its plural significance, owing to the presence of an additional plural sign \(g\); the oblique singular is made by prefixing a positional particle \(i\) (cf. above, p. 344) to the short form of the nominative, e. g., i-toy, or by placing the oblique of the article before the long form of the nominative, as in Pangasinan, e. g., iti daytoy; the oblique plural is formed by prefixing \(ka\) to the nominative-genitive plural, e. g., ka-dagtoy.

In Ibanag the case signs of the singular are prefixed directly to the root particle as in \(y-au\), or to a demonstrative stem as in y-a-ri, y-u-ri; in the plural the case signs are prefixed to the genitive singular, the sign of the nominative being the plural particle \(du\), or a particle \(an\) of uncertain identity, that of the genitive, the particle \(da\), that of the oblique one of the com-
pounds takbara, takkvara, equivalent to the particle da preceded by the oblique case sign takka, takkua. In the nominative singular there are also a series of forms without the case sign y, e. g., au: it is not impossible that the plural forms like annan may have been made from plural forms like danau by dropping the initial d after the analogy of pairs like yau, au in the singular; in this case the doubling of the n would be phonetic.

The declension of the demonstratives in the remaining languages is not given in the grammars. The cases are probably indicated by the forms of the definite article. The nominative case signs a, i and u occur prefixed to the root particle in Nabaloi i-tan, i-man; Magindanao, a-nan, i-nia; Sulu and Bagobo i-ni, Sulu i-en, i-ann; Batan u-ri: Sulu ietu is perhaps a modification of *i-tu with articular i, due to the influence of the initial ie of the synonymous ien: for Nabaloi iai, Bagobo yango, cf. above, p. 352 f. The nominative case signs sa and su are found in the remaining Nabaloi forms prefixed to the root particle except in saidiiai, which probably contains sa prefixed to a stem beginning with articular i.

The connective particles which are used in the formation of the demonstratives are n, i (y), a and ai (ay).

N occurs as final in all the forms of Tagalog, Bikol, and Pampangan iya-n, Tagalog yao-n, Hiliguayna ito-n, Pangasinan satu-n and sama-n, Ibanag yatu-n, in Nabaloi sata-n, suta-n, ita-n, sama-n, ima-n, Magindanao ana-n, and Sulu iau-n: the same n occurs followed by another element in all the forms of Ibanag yatu-n-ye, and in Bagobo ya-n-go. This n is also used in Pangasinan to connect the genitive case signs to and da with the root particle (cf. above, p. 356). The n of all the forms of Harayan dan may also belong here (cf. above, p. 353).

I, or as it is usually written y, occurs as final element in all the forms of Ilokano dayto-y, in all the Ibanag forms with final element ye (<'ya-i, cf. above, p. 331), and in Nabaloi ia-i, Bagobo to-y; it occurs followed by another element in Bagobo to-i-go, and in the double ligature ai.

A seems to occur as final element in Magindanao ini-a, and in the double ligature ai.

Ai, a combination of the two ligatures a and i, occurs as final element in all the forms of Ilokano dedi-ay, and in Nabaloi saidi-ai, sadii-ai, and perhaps iai (cf. above, p. 353).
Interrogative Pronouns.

The interrogative pronouns are of three kinds:

a) The personal interrogative 'who?' referring to persons;
b) the neuter interrogative 'what?' referring to things;
c) the individualizing interrogative 'which?' referring to either persons or things.

In general the interrogatives consist of root particles, some of which seem to be of adverbial origin, combined with prefixes and suffixes similar to those of the demonstratives.

Case, in those interrogatives which are inflected, is indicated by the prefixes. The plural is indicated sometimes by the articular prefix, sometimes by reduplication, or by both together; sometimes by the suffix.

Some of the interrogatives cannot be broken up into monosyllabic particles, but for the sake of completeness they are all included in the discussion.

The forms of the interrogatives in the various languages are, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tag.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>gen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sg.</em> sino</td>
<td>nino, kanino (sa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pl.</em> sinosino</td>
<td>ninonino, (sa) kanikanino</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bis. (Ceb.)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Bis. (Hil.)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>sin-o</em></td>
<td><em>kansa</em></td>
<td><em>sin-o</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(kansa, kansalan sakansa)</td>
<td>unsa, unsalan</td>
<td>kay sin-o ano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kay sin-o, kalin-o kalin-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kanin-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kanin-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kanay, nin-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kanay, ano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sa kanay,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>san kanay,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sin kanay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Bik.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pamp.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Pang.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>sg.</em> siisay</td>
<td>nino, kanino</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> siopa, opa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pl.</em> saisay</td>
<td>naisay, kaisay</td>
<td><em>pl.</em> siopara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kaisay</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keno</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dinino, deno</td>
<td>opa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>karen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ed siopa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>anto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>opara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ed siopara</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Little used.
Ilok. asino, asinno, asin

Igor. (Nab.) sepa, sepay

Iban. sg. sinni nini takkuanini anni
   pl. dani, danirani dani takkuarani rani

Mag. tingin, antain nγain, antuna
Sulu sio, hisio uno
Bag. sadan andin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIV. INTER.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor. (Nab.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the case forms of the interrogatives are comparatively few, they will be analyzed in connection with the discussion of the root particles.

A root particle no is found in all the forms of the personal interrogative in Tagalog, Hiligayna, Samaro-Leytean (except kanay and derived forms), Pampangan, and Ilokano; in the individualizing interrogative in Pampangan and Ilokano, and

¹ The initial in in these forms is without doubt the article ina; in this the most common case form of the word, ng has been partially assimilated to the following s, a change which has apparently not taken place in the other case forms.
perhaps in the neuter interrogatives ano, uno. The glottal
catch in Bisayan -n-o is probably secondary. In Ibanag, no
occurs in the form ni, in the personal, and perhaps in the neuter
interrogative, the i of which is due to the influence of final i
of the individualizing interrogative yasi.

The nominative singular of the personal interrogatives derived
from no is made by prefixing the personal article si to the parti-
cle, except in Pampangan, where ni, ordinarily a genitive sign,
but also used for the nominative in Ilokan, is employed. The
initial a of Ilokan a-sino is perhaps due to the analogy of the
neuter interrogative ania; asin is a shortened form of asino.
The doubling of the n in Ilokan asinno, Ibanag sinni, is pho-
etic.

The genitive singular is made with the case signs ni and ka.
Ni is prefixed directly to the particle no in Tagalo nino; Sam-
aro-Leytean nin-o, Pampangan nino, Ibanag nini; in Hili-
guayna ni sin-o it is prefixed to the nominative. Ka is prefixed
to the genitive with ni in Tagalog, Pampangan, and Hiliguayna.
Hiliguayna kalin-o seems to be derived from kanin-o by dissimi-
lation, the first n being changed to the related sound l. Hili-
guayna also possesses a form made by prefixing kay, the oblique
of the personal article, to the nominative, viz., kay sin-o.

The oblique case in Tagalog is identical with the genitive
form with case sign ka, or is made by placing the oblique of
the definite article before this form; in Hiliguayna it is identi-
cal with the genitive forms beginning with k; in Pampangan
the oblique keno is probably a modification of ka-no with case
sign ka, based on the analogy of the oblique cases with initial
ka in the demonstrative and personal pronouns; in Ibanag the
oblique case sign takkua (cf. above, p. 347) is prefixed to the
genitive.

In Tagalog the cases of the plural are made by reduplicating
two syllables of the corresponding singular form. In the Pamp-
gangan nominative-genitive plural there are two forms, viz.,
dinino, made by prefixing di, the root of the inclusive article,
to the singular nino, and deno, probably modified from di-no
after the analogy of the plurals of demonstratives with initial
de. The oblique is made by prefixing ka to deno. In the
Ibanag plural, dani consists of ni with prefixed plural particle
da, danirani is a reduplication of this form, and the oblique forms consist of the case sign takkua prefixed to these two forms.

It is not impossible that the neuter interrogative ano is a combination of no with an articular prefix a, but it may also be explained as containing the root particle an. The u of Sulu uno, if it is to be analyzed as u-no, and is not simply a phonetic modification of ano, is probably the same u which is used in Batan as definite article.

No also occurs as the final syllable nu, no of the individualizing interrogative in Pampangan and Ilokan.

This stem no is perhaps identical with the particle no which is the word for ‘if,’ in Ilokan, Ibanag, and Pangasinan, the ideas of ‘doubting’ and ‘questioning’ being very similar.

A root particle sa occurs in all the forms of the personal interrogative in Cebuan, Bikol, and Bagobo, the neuter interrogative in Cebuan, and the individualizing interrogative in Pampangan.

The initial k of the Cebuan personal interrogative forms is probably the same which occurs as the sign of the nominative in the demonstratives. The case in this pronoun seems to be indicated not according to the usual rule by initial inflection, but by the difference of the vowel after the initial, i indicating the nominative, a the genitive-oblique. The particles in, an, un, which precede sa in Cebuan and Pampangan, seem to consist of the articular particles i, a, u + the ligature; this seems to be shown by the fact that the in of the Pampangan forms is declined like the definite article. The final element lan of the Cebuan forms is perhaps to be connected with Tagalog alin, Bikol arin. The nu of insanu is to be connected with the stem no. The case forms of the Pampangan individualizing interrogative all consist of sa or sanu preceded by the proper case form of the definite article, except in the oblique singular, where additional forms are made by prefixing ka to the genitive, following the analogy of the plural.

The forms of the Bikol personal interrogative are based on an element isay, composed of sa with prefixed articular i and following ligature i. To this stem the case forms of the personal and inclusive articles are prefixed in singular and plural respectively, ka being equivalent to Cebuan ka (cf. p. 348).
In Bagobo sa-dan, dan seems to be the genitive plural of the third person, just as the din of an-din 'what?' is the genitive singular (cf. below).

This interrogative root particle sa is perhaps identical with the adverbial particle sa which means 'perhaps' in Ilokano, and in Tagalog is equivalent to the modal adverb sama which imparts to verbs the idea of 'should, would.'

The forms of the personal interrogative in Pangasinan and Nabaloi are clearly connected with Malay apa 'what?' siapa 'who?' Pa may be root particle and the prefixes articular; o of the Pangasinan forms being equal to Batan u; se of the Nabaloi forms, to sa-i, as in saidi'ai 'this;' a of Malay apu, to the a of Tagalog ang. The si of the Pangasinan and Malay forms is of course the personal article, and it is also not impossible that Nabaloi se may be some modification of si. The final y of Nabaloi sepay is ligature. In Pangasinan the form without si is used as genitive, and the oblique is made by placing the oblique of the definite article ed before the nominative. The plural is made by adding ra (<da) to the forms of the singular.

The root particle of the neuter interrogatives in Pangasinan, Ilokano, and Bagobo is an, and the same an is perhaps the root particle of all the other neuter interrogatives except the Cebuano and Sulu, and the forms nγaramto(i), nγanto, nγain; Sulu uno, however, may be a modification of ano (cf. above, p. 361).

The o, u of Tagalog, Bisayan, and Bikol an-o, Pampangan nan-u, Nabaloi dya-an-o, according to this view, is probably due to the analogy of sino or some other interrogative form containing the particle no; the initial n of the Pampangan form is doubtless derived from nino; the initial dy (=*y) in Nabaloi is probably articular. The final i of Ibanag anni, in which the doubling is phonetic, is probably due to the same cause as the final i in sinni.

In Pangasinan an-to and Bagobo an-din (cf. inter. sa-dan, above) the second element is apparently the genitive of the pronoun of the third person, literally 'its what?' just as in Nabaloi the common word for 'what' is nγaram-to 'its name?' The first part of Magindanao an-tu-na seems to be identical with Pangasinan anto; na is perhaps identical with the genitive of the definite article, the root particle in this case being followed
by a double genitive. Ilokan ania is to be analysed in the same way, as an + an element ia equivalent to the ya of the third personal pronoun.

The stem an seems also to occur in some of the personal and individualizing interrogatives, viz., in Magindanao antain, Pangasinan di-n-an, Nabaloí chi-n-an.

This an is perhaps identical with the locative suffix an of nouns and verbs.¹

For Nabaloí njaramto, cf. above; the i of njaramto-i is ligature; njanto is contracted from njaramto, m being assimilated to the following t.

Tagalog alin (<*arin cf. above, p. 333), Bikol arin seems to be based on a stem ar, the ending in being probably the same as the in in Bisayan hain, and perhaps Magindanao tingin, antain, njain. This suffix in is different from the in of Tagalog ak-in 'mine' (cf. below, p. 368), as this in would appear in Bisayan and Bikol as on, un, in Magindanao as en (cf. above, p. 331). The same stem occurs perhaps also in the Cebuan forms kinsalan, kansalan, unsalan which may be contracted from *kina-alan, etc., al (<*ar) being in this case combined with a suffix an identical with that in Tagalog haan 'where?' which bears the same formal relation to hain as *alan does to alin. This suffix an is doubtless ultimately identical with the locative suffix an.

The Ibanag individualizing interrogative is clearly connected with the interrogative adverb dasi, the element asi being the same. This element asi forms its cases like the demonstrative pronouns (cf. above, p. 356 f.).

The idea of 'which?' is closely related to the idea of 'where?' as we see in the two practically synonymous expressions 'which is the road?' and 'where is the road?' Hence it is not surprising that the two ideas are sometimes expressed by the same word, as in Bisayan hain, Nabaloí twa, twai, Sulu hadien, which mean both 'which?' and 'where?'

As 'where?' is practically an oblique case, we might expect the initial syllables to be identical with the oblique case signs in these individualizing pronouns, and so they seem to be. The

¹ Cf. my paper, Analogies between Semitic and Tagalog, JHU. Circs., No. 163, p. 65.
ha of Bisayan ha-in, Sulu ha-dien is to be connected with the oblique of Sulu definite article ha. This ha also occurs in Tagalog in ha-an 'where?' The in of Bisayan hain is difficult (cf. above, p. 363). For the dien of Sulu hadien see below.

The di of Pangasinan di-nan, Nabaloi chi-nan (<*di-nan), Ilokan a-di-no, etc., and Sulu ha-di-en is probably identical with the oblique Articular form di. The nan of the Pangasinan and Nabaloi forms is probably the interrogative stem an with preceding ligature n, used to connect the prefix to the root particle as it is in the genitive of the demonstratives in Pangasinan (cf. above, p. 356). The initial a of the Ilokan forms is to be explained like the a of asino; the doubling in adine is phonetic; adin is a shortened form of adino, like asin from asino. The final no of these forms is probably identical with the interrogative root particle no.

The en of Sulu hadien is probably connected with the demonstrative particle en (cf. above, p. 353).

Nabaloi tua is perhaps identical with Cebuan tua 'be there;' the i of tua-i is ligature.

The remaining interrogative forms, Samaro-Leytean kanay, Magindanao tingin, antain, ngain, Sulu sio, hisio, are not clear. Kanay contains, of course, the case sign ka or k; its ending suggests a comparison with the Bikol forms; in the oblique it may be preceded by sa and san, respectively oblique and genitive of the definite article, and by sin the sign of the indefinite object. The Magindanao forms all have the ending in (cf. above, p. 363); antain probably contains also the interrogative stem an; ngain may be a combination of nga identical with the ligature, and the suffix in. Sulu sio seems to contain the personal article si, which, however, is not used as such in Sulu; while hisio has prefixed, in addition, the regular Sulu personal article hi.

Personal Pronouns.

The personal pronouns are of three persons, first, second, and third; each person has two numbers, a singular and a plural, and the plural of the first person again distinguishes two series of forms, an exclusive and an inclusive series (cf. above, p. 325); the first person in some languages possesses also a dual which is
closely related morphologically to the inclusive plural; there is
no distinction of gender even in the third person.

Case is indicated partly by prefixes similar to those of the
demonstratives and interrogatives, partly by using different root
particles and stems.

The personal pronouns consist of simple root particles, modified
forms of root particles, and forms derived from the root
particles by the addition of prefixes and suffixes.

First Person.

The forms of the personal pronouns of the first person in the
various languages are, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>obl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td>sg. ako</td>
<td>akin, ko, (nakin)¹</td>
<td>sa akin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. kami</td>
<td>amin, namin</td>
<td>sa amin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. tayo</td>
<td>atin, natin</td>
<td>sa atin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du. kita, kata</td>
<td>ata, kanita; ta</td>
<td>sa ata, sa kanita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Ceb.)</td>
<td>sg. ako</td>
<td>áko, nako, ko, ta</td>
<td>kanako, sa ako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. kami</td>
<td>amo, namo</td>
<td>kanamo, sa amo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. kita</td>
<td>áto, nátó, ta</td>
<td>kanató, sa áto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du. kitá</td>
<td>ató, nató, ta</td>
<td>kanató, sa ató</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Hil.)</td>
<td>sg. ako</td>
<td>akon, nakon, ko, ta</td>
<td>kanakon, sa akon, dakon, karakon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. kami</td>
<td>amon, namon</td>
<td>kanamon, sa amon, damon, karamon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. kita</td>
<td>aton, naton, ta</td>
<td>kanaton, sa aton, dathom, karaton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td>sg. ako, si ako</td>
<td>akon, nakon, ko</td>
<td>sa akon, dakon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. kami, si kami</td>
<td>amon, namon</td>
<td>sa amon, damon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. kita, si kita</td>
<td>aton, naton, ta</td>
<td>sa aton, dathom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Har.)</td>
<td>sg. ako, akota</td>
<td>akon, nakon, ta</td>
<td>kanakun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td>sg. ako</td>
<td>ko, niako, sako, sakoya</td>
<td>sako, sakoya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. kami</td>
<td>niamo, samo, samoya, mi</td>
<td>samo, samoya²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. kita</td>
<td>nfató, sató, satoya, ta</td>
<td>sato, satoya</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Used only in the phrase a-nakin 'inquam.'
² Written damoya, evidently a mistake, in San Augustín.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>obl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td>sg. ako, ko</td>
<td>ko, koo, ke, kee, da</td>
<td>kanako, kako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. ikami, ike, kami, ke</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>kekami, keke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. ikamo, ita, katamo, kata, tamo, ta</td>
<td>tamo, ta</td>
<td>kekatam (sic), kekatam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du. ikata, kata, ta</td>
<td>ta, tee, too</td>
<td>kekata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td>sg. siak, ak</td>
<td>ko, -k</td>
<td>ed siak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. sikami, kami</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>ed sikami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. sikiti, sikatayo, iti, itayo</td>
<td>ti, tayo</td>
<td>ed sikiti, ed sikatayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du. sikata, ita</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>ed sikata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td>sg. siak, ak</td>
<td>ko, -k</td>
<td>kaniak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. dakami, kami</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>kadakami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. datayo, tayo</td>
<td>tayo</td>
<td>kadatayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du. data, ta</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>kadata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor. (Nab.)</td>
<td>sg. sikak, ak; nak, ko, -k, na, ta na</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. sikame, kame</td>
<td>me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. sikatayo, tayo</td>
<td>tayo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td>sg. sakan, sok, ak</td>
<td>ku, -k, ta</td>
<td>niakan, niok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. sikami, kami</td>
<td>mi</td>
<td>nikami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. ittam</td>
<td>tam</td>
<td>nittam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>du. itta</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>nitta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat.</td>
<td>sg. yakin, ako</td>
<td>niakin, ko</td>
<td>diakin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. yamuen, kami</td>
<td>niamuen, namin, namuen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. inc. yaiatin,² ta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td>sg. saki,aku</td>
<td>ku, salaki, laki</td>
<td>salaki, sa salaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl. ex. salkami, kami</td>
<td>salkami, nami, lekami</td>
<td>salkami, sa salkami</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Written *iamo*, evidently a mistake, in Bergaño.
² Perhaps a mistake for *yatin*, cf. *yamuen*. The forms given as genitive and oblique of this pronoun evidently belong to the pronoun of the second person. The Batan grammar from which these paradigms are quoted by Retana (cf. above, p. 323, ft. nt. 2) is in manuscript, according to Retana (p. xi) probably a copy of the original. The personal pronouns are given in the order, 1st sg., 1st exc. pl., 2nd sg., and then follows a paradigm headed 'Plur. de yo inclusivo,' but with genitive and oblique apparently belonging to the second plural; no paradigm of the second plural is given. The copyist has evidently mixed up the paradigms of the 1st inc. pl. and 2nd pl. The forms that we should expect in 1st inc. pl. gen. and obl. are *niatin, diatin*. 
The pronouns of the first person singular are practically all based on one of the root particles *ak*, *ko*, or *ta*.

*Ak* is found uncombined as nominative in Pangasinan, Ilokan, Nabaloi, and Ibanag: also in Tagalog, Bisayan, Bikol, Pampangan, Batan, Magindanao, and Sulu nominative *ako, aku*; in the *ako, aku* of the genitive and oblique cases in Bikol and Sulu, and in Harayan *ako-ta*; in the Tagalog and Batan stem *ak-in* and Bisayan stem *ak-on, ak-o* and their derivatives; in the nominatives, Pangasinan and Ilokan *si-ak*, Nabaloi *sik-ak*, Ibanag *s-ak-an, s-ok* (cf. above, p. 336), Bagobo *s-ak-kan*, and the oblique forms derived from them; in the Magindanao secondary stem *aki* in *s-aki*, etc.; in Nabaloi *n-ak*.

The nominative *ako* may represent a blend of the two root particles *ak* and *ko*, or it may be *ak* with an analogical *o* as in *itkau* ‘thou’ (cf. below, p. 375), due to the influence of other nominatives in *o* like *tayo* ‘we,’ *kayo* ‘you.’ In Harayan *ako-ta* the genitive *ta* is added to this form, probably for the sake of emphasis* (cf. Nab. *sikam* ‘thou,’ p. 375, below).

The Magindanao stem *aki* probably owes its final *i* to the analogy of the forms of the exclusive plural *kami*, etc. The *n* of Nabaloi *n-ak* is not clear; the form *na*, which seems to be

---

1 The noun *paték* ‘slave’ is also used for ‘I,’ as in Malay.
2 These pronouns as given together in the paradigms as the equivalent of *nosotros* ‘we,’ but there is probably the same distinction here as in the other languages; for *ke* as exclusive plural cf. Pampangan.
employed principally before verbal forms beginning with \( k \), e. g., na-kaama-nunu 'I am killing,' is probably a modification of \( nnak \), due to the fact that the final \( k \) of the pronoun and the initial \( k \) of the verb coalesce.

The Tagalog, Batau, and Bisayan stems \( ak-in, ak-on \) are made by adding the suffixes \( in \) and \( on \) to the root particle. These suffixes, which are variants of the same original form (cf. above, p. 331 f.), are found also in the passive, and in nominal derivation. When applied to a noun they express the idea of 'like, similar,' e. g., Tag. \( uvaakin \) 'cock black as a raven' from \( uvak \) 'raven,' \( polotin \) 'honey (pet name),' from \( polot \) 'honey,' when applied to a verb they form passives that denote to be directly affected by the action of the root, e. g., Tag. \( inuvin (inum) \) 'that which is drunk.' The meaning of the suffix in the pronouns is perhaps nearer that of the verbal suffix, Tagalog \( ak-in \), for example, signifying 'that which is affected by me, that which pertains or belongs to me.' In the Cebuan stem \( ak-o \), the final \( n \) was dropped, doubtless because it was regarded as ligature. The \( ako, aku \) of the genitive and oblique forms in Bikol and Sulu may be either the nominative \( ako, aku \), or may correspond to the Cebuan stem \( ak-o \) derived from \( ak-on \). The element \( ya \) of Bikol oblique \( s-ako-ya \) is not clear; it may be the demonstrative root particle \( ya \) (cf. above, p. 352).

The stems of Ibanag \( s-akan, Bagobo s-akkan \), are probably identical, the doubling in the latter being phonetic, and consist of the root particle with a suffix \( an \), doubtless the same as the nominal and verbal suffix \( an \), which expresses the idea of place, e. g., Tag. \( sagi\-gan \) 'banana grove' from \( sagin \) 'banana,' \( inuman \) 'vessel (drinking place)' from \( inum \) 'drink.' These forms would therefore mean literally 'the I place.'

The particle \( ko \) occurs uncombined as genitive in all the languages except Harayan, and apparently as nominative in Pampangan and Sulu. In Pampangan it may be a shortened form of \( ako \). In Sulu it is genitive used as nominative (cf. below, p. 388). The -\( k \) of Pangasinan, Ilokan, Nabalo, and Ibanag is a shortened form of \( ko \). The Pampangan form \( koo, ke \) and \( k\-ee \) are modifications of \( ko \) (cf. below, p. 387).

The particle \( ta \) occurs uncombined as genitive in Bisayan (except Samaro-Leytean), Nabalo, and Ibanag. Pampangan \( da \) is probably a modification of this particle. It is found also in the Harayan nominative \( ako-ta \) (cf. above, p. 367).
The pronouns of the exclusive plural of the first person are practically all based on a particle *mi*, which occurs uncombined as genitive in Bicol, Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokano, Nabaloi, and Ibanag. It also occurs in Magindanao genitive *na-mi*, and in the nominative *ka-mi* of all the languages, and its derivatives with the various articulare particles, viz., Pampangan *i-kami*, Samaro-Leytean, Pangasinan and Nabaloi *si-kami*, Ibanag *si-kami*, *ni-kami*, Ilokano *da-kami*, Magindanao *le-kami*, *sal-kami*, *sa sal-kami*, and the oblique forms derived from them in Pampangan, Pangasinan, and Ilokano. The element *ka* of *kami* is perhaps due to the analogy of other plural forms like *kayo* 'you,' *kata* 'we all, we two.'

In Tagalog, Bisayan, Bicol, Batan, and Sulu, there is apparently a root particle *am* that forms in general the same combination as the *ak* of the singular; for example, in Tagalog, *amin* corresponding to *akin*. It is very likely, however, that all these forms with *am* are simply made on the basis of *mi*, after the analogy of the forms of the singular. The final *uen* of the Batan forms is simply the representation of *in* after the labial *m*, cf. *inuinuen* = Tagalog *inumin* 'drink.'

Pampangan and Bagobo *ke* in *ke*, *i-ke* is not clear. In Bagobo a particle *de* with the same vocalization, perhaps a modification of the plural particle *da*, is used as genitive.

At the base of the forms of the inclusive plural, and of the dual when it occurs, lies the particle *ta*, doubtless identical with the *ta* of the singular, which is found uncombined as genitive plural in Bisayan, Bicol, Pampangan and Bagobo; as genitive dual in Tagalog, Cebuan, Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokano, Ibanag, and Magindanao; and as nominative plural in Batan, nominative dual in Pampangan, Ilokano, and Magindanao. The Pampangan forms *teo*, *too* are secondary modifications of *ta* (cf. below, p. 387). For Pangasinan *ti*, cf. below, p. 371.

*Ta* occurs also, combined with articulare prefixes only, in Tagalog genitive dual *ka-ni-ta* and the oblique derived from it; Pampangan nominative plural, Pangasinan nominative dual *i-ta*; Ibanag dual forms *i-tta*, *ni-tta*, in which the doubling is phonetic; and in Bagobo *ni-ta*, Ilokano *da-ta*, and the oblique forms derived from them. It is found also in Tagalog genitive dual *ata* and the oblique derived from it, where the initial *a* is prob-
ably due to the analogy of the other genitive forms of the first person. For Pangasinan *i-ti*, cf. below, p. 371.

It occurs also combined with a following root particle of the second person, which probably emphasizes the inclusive signification of the pronoun, the combinations meaning literally 'your we,' 'the we of which you form a part,' in *ta-yo, ta-mo,* and *ta-nu.* *Ta-yo* occurs as nominative inclusive plural in Tagalog, Ilokan, and Nabaloil, and as genitive in Pangasinan, Ilokan, and Nabaloil. It also occurs with various case indicating prefixes in the nominatives Pangasinan *i-tayo*, Ilokan *da-tayo*, Pangasinan and Nabaloil *sika-tayo*, and the oblique forms derived from the last two in Ilokan and Pangasinan. *Ta-mo* occurs in Pampangan uncombined as nominative and genitive, in the nominative *ka-tamo,* in which *ka* is doubtless due to the analogy of plural and dual forms with initial *ka,* like *kayo* 'you,' and the oblique *ke-ka tam* in which the final *o* of *ka-tamo* is dropped; it is found also without *o,* in the Ibanag forms *tam, i-ttam, ni-ttam,* the doubling in the last two forms being phonetic. *Ta-nu* occurs only in Magindanao: as all the forms of the inclusive plural have a corresponding form in the dual without *nu,* it seems more likely that *nu* was added to what are now the forms of the dual, but which had originally both inclusive plural and dual meaning, in order to differentiate between the two numbers, than that the inclusive forms were made independently upon a base *tanu.*

*Ta* also occurs in the plural and dual forms *ka-ta* and *ki-ta:* *ka* is probably to be explained as the *ka* in *ka-mi;* *ki-ta* perhaps represents a blend of *ka-ta* with *i-ta,* which occurs as nominative dual in Pangasinan and Ibanag, nominative plural in Pampangan. *Kata* occurs uncombined as plural nominative in Pampangan, and as dual nominative in Tagalog and Pampangan. It is found in combination with articular prefixes in Pampangan nominative dual *i-kata,* oblique dual and plural *ke-kata,* Pangasinan nominative dual *si-kata* and the oblique derived from it. *Kita* occurs uncombined as nominative plural in Bisayan, Bikol, Sulu, and Bagobo, and as nominative dual in Tagalog and Cebuan: with articular prefixes in Samaro-Leytean and Bagobo *si kita;* in Magindanao, where it is the basis of most

---

1 In Ilokan the pronouns of the first and second persons plural *datayo, tayo, dakami, kamiti, dakayo, kayo,* often drop their final vowel in the middle of a sentence: cf. Naves, op. cit., p. 49 f.; H. W. Williams, op. cit., pp. 55, 56.
of the forms of both dual and plural (cf. below, p. 373); and
in Pangasinan si-kiti (cf. below), and the oblique derived from it.

In Tagalog, Bisayan, Bicol, Batan, and Sulu plural there is
apparently a root particle at which is made on the basis of ta,
after the analogy of the singular, in the same way as the am
of the exclusive plural. The forms based on at are made in
the same way as those based on am. In Cebuan the forms
based on at are used also as dual, with, however, a different
accent.

The Pangasinan plural forms ti, i-ti, si-kiti seem to be modi-
fications of ta, i-ta, si-kita; the final i being probably due to the
influence of the exclusive forms mi, kami, etc.

The case indicating particles which are found in the pronouns
of the first person are, in Tagalog n, su, kani, in Cebuan n, sa,
ka(n), in Hiliguayna n, ka, ka(n), d, sa, in Samaro-Leytean
si, n, d, sa, in Harayan n, ka(n), in Bikol ni, s, in Pampang-
gan i, kan, k, ke, in Pangasinan si, i, ed, in Ilokan si, da,
kani, ka, in Nabaloi si, sika, sik, in Ibanag si, s, i, ni, in Batan
i, yai(?), ni, n, di, in Magindanao se, s, le, l, sal, na, sa, in
Sulu ka, kan, in Bagobo si, s, ni, kan, ka.

The prefixes i, ni, n, sa, ka, di, d, da, ke, ed, and the oblique
case sign s of Bikol have already been explained in connection
with the demonstratives (cf. above, p. 353 f.); kani is a combina-
tion of the two articular particles ka and ni. In the Bisayan
sign ka(n) it is difficult to say whether the n belongs to the case
sign or the following stem, i.e., whether forms like Cebuan
kawato are to be analysed as ka + the genitive forms like nato,
or as kan + the genitive forms like ato. Si is identical with the
si of the personal article, and s in Ibanag s-akan, Magindanao
saki, Bagobo s-akkan, is doubtless based upon it; Magindanao
se also is probably based on si, the e being due to the influence
of the case sign le. Pampangan k in kuko is derived from ka,
a having coalesced with the a of ako. Nabaloi sika, sik in sika-
tayo, sik-ak are based upon a wrong division of forms like sikami,
a combination of the stem kami with the case sign si; in sikak
the a of sika coalesces with the a of ak. The apparent case sign
yai in Batan yaiatim, if it is not simply due to a typographical
error, is the result of the reduplication of the first syllable ya of
yatin, a combination of the stem atin and case sign i. Magind-
anao na of na-mi is identical with the genitive of the definite
article: since Magindanao has been strongly influenced by Ara-
bio (cf. above, p. 322), the case sign te, l, which occurs in none of the other languages, may be the Arabic preposition J li, which is used to express a dative and sometimes a genitive idea; sal is a combination of this element with the case sign sa.

In the formation of the cases these particles are added, sometimes to a root particle, sometimes to a modified form of a root particle or to a secondary stem, sometimes to another case form. The forms of the nominative and genitive are often without case sign.

In the nominative, Samaro-Leytean has si in all numbers in the forms si ako, si kami, si kita: Pampangan has i in the plural and dual forms i-kami, i-ke, i-ta, i-kamo, i-kata: Pangasinan has si in all numbers in the forms si-ak, si-kami, si-kiti, si-kata; sika in sika-tayo; and i in inclusive plural and dual in the form i-ti, i-tayo, i-ta: Ilokohan has si in the singular si-ak, and da in the plural and dual forms da-kami, etc.: Nabaloj has si in si-kame; sika, sik in sika-tayo, sik-ak: Ibanag has si in si-kami; s in s-akkan, s-ok; and i in i-tam, i-ta: Batan has i(y) in all three numbers in y-akin, yaiatin (cf. above, p. 366, ft. nt.), y-amuen: Magindanao has s in s-aki; se in se-kitanu, se-kita; le in le-kitanu; and sal in plural and dual sal-kami, sal-kitanu, sal-kita; the forms with le and sal are genitive-oblique forms used as nominative: Bagobo has s in the singular s-akkan; si in the plurals si kami, si kita. Nominative forms without case sign, consisting of a root particle, a secondary stem, or some modification of these, are found in all the languages, Tagalog, Bisayan (except Samaro-Leytean), Bikol and Sulu having only forms of this kind.

In the genitive in Tagalog, Bisayan, and Batan there are a number of forms made on the basis of stems derived from the root particles ak, am, and at by the addition of the suffix, in, en, on. For the analogical character of the forms of the plural cf. above, pp. 369, 371. These stems occur in Tagalog and Bisayan both uncombined, and with case sign n, e. g., Hil. ak-on, n-ak-on, in Batan only with the case signs ni or n, e. g., ni-amuen, n-amuen.

In Bikol the case signs of the genitive ni, s are prefixed in the singular to ako, which is either nominative or identical with Cebuan genitive ako, in the plural to the stems amo, ato, made after the analogy of ako. In Sulu the stems aku, amu, atu, to
which the case signs ka, kan are prefixed, are susceptible of the same two explanations as the Bikol forms. The double n in kunnamu is perhaps due to the analogy of forms like kan-nia 'his' (cf. below, p. 385).

In Magindanao in the singular the case signs l and sal are prefixed to the secondary stem aki; in the plural and dual the case signs are all prefixed to the stems kami, kitamu, kita except in na-mi, where na is prefixed to the root particle. In Bagobo the case sign ni is prefixed to the root particle in ni-ta. Genitive forms without case sign, consisting of a root particle or secondary stem, or of some modification of these, are found in all the languages, Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokan, Nabaloi, and Ibanag having only genitives of this kind.

In the oblique, Tagalog prefixes sa to the forms of the genitive beginning with a, and in the dual also to the genitive with case sign kani: Cebuan has two series of forms, one in which sa is prefixed to genitive forms with initial a, one in which ka(n) is prefixed to genitive forms (cf. above, p. 371): Hiliguayna has four series of forms, two like those in Cebuan, one in which the case sign d is prefixed to forms with initial a, one in which an additional case sign ka is prefixed to the forms with initial d: Samaro-Leytean has two series of forms identical with the Hiliguayna forms with initial sa and d: Harayan has apparently only one series; identical with the series with initial k: the Bikol oblique forms are identical with the genitives with initial s: Pampangan makes its oblique singular by prefixing kan and k to ako, probably the nominative, the oblique of the other members by prefixing ka to the nominative with articular i, ka + i becoming ke: Pangasinan prefixes ed to the nominative with articular si: Ilokan makes its oblique singular by prefixing kani to the root ak, the oblique of the other numbers by prefixing ka to the nominative with initial da: Ibanag substitutes ni, Batan di, for the case signs of the nominative: in Magindanao, the oblique case signs sal or sa sal are prefixed to the same stems as in the genitive.

Second Person.

The forms of the personal pronouns of the second person are, viz.:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ikao, ka</td>
<td>iyo, mo (niyo)¹</td>
<td>sa iyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> kayo, (kamo)</td>
<td>inyo, ninyo</td>
<td>sa inyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Ceb.)</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ikao, ka</td>
<td>inyo, ninyo</td>
<td>kanimo, sa imo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> kamo</td>
<td>inyo, ninyo</td>
<td>kaninyo, sa inyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Hil.)</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ikao, ka</td>
<td>imo, nimo, mo</td>
<td>kanimo, sa imo, dimo, karimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> kamo</td>
<td>inyo, ninyo</td>
<td>kaninyo, sa inyo, dinyo, karinyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ikao, ka, si ikao</td>
<td>imo, nimo, mo</td>
<td>sa imo, dimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> kamo, si kamo</td>
<td>iyo, niyo</td>
<td>sa iyo, diyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Har.)</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ikao; kao, ka</td>
<td>imo, nimo, mo</td>
<td>kanimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ika</td>
<td>mo, nimo, saimo, simo</td>
<td>saino, simo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td><em>pl.</em> kamo</td>
<td>nindo</td>
<td>saino</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ika, ka</td>
<td>mo, moo, me, mee²</td>
<td>keka²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> ikayo, kayo, iko, ko</td>
<td>yo, yoo, ye, yee</td>
<td>kekayo, keko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> sika, ka</td>
<td>mo, -m</td>
<td>ed sika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> sikayo, siki, kayo, ki</td>
<td>yo</td>
<td>ed sikayo, ed siki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilok.</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> sika, ka</td>
<td>mo, -m</td>
<td>kenka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> dakayo, kayo</td>
<td>yo</td>
<td>kadakayo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Igor. (Nab.)</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> sikam, ka</td>
<td>mo, -m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> sikayo, kayo</td>
<td>dyo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iban.</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> sikau, ka</td>
<td>mu, -m</td>
<td>nikau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> sikamu, kamu</td>
<td>nu</td>
<td>nikamu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bat.</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> imu, ka</td>
<td>nimo, mo</td>
<td>dimo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*pl.*³</td>
<td>ninio, nio</td>
<td>dinio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mag.</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ka, saleka, seka</td>
<td>nengka, saleka, sa salka, leka, ka</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> kanu, salkanu</td>
<td>salkanu, sa salkanu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulu</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> ekau, kau, nio</td>
<td>mu, kannio, kanio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> kamu</td>
<td>kaimu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bag.</td>
<td><em>sg.</em> kona, ka</td>
<td>niko, no</td>
<td>kaniko, niko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.</em> kio, ko, si kio</td>
<td>nio</td>
<td>kanio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Used only in the phrase *a-niyo* 'inquis.'
² In place of the genitive and oblique forms, which are given elsewhere in the text.
³ the forms of the pronoun of the first person singular are repeated in Bergaño's paradigm.
⁴ Cf. above, p. 366, ft. nt. 2.
The root particles upon which the pronouns of the second person, singular and plural, are based, are ka, mo, yo, and nu.

Ka occurs uncombined as nominative singular in all the languages except Bikol and Sulu, and also as genitive in Magindanao. It is found also in the nominatives, Sulu and Harayan, kau, kao, and with articular prefixes, Bikol and Pampangan i-ka, Pangasinan and Ilokano si-ka, Tagalog and Bisayan i-kao, Sulu e-kau, Ibanag si-kau, Nabaloi si-ka-m; in the oblique forms Pampangan ke-ka, Pangasinan ed si-ka, Ilokano ken-ka, Ibanag ni-ka; in all the forms with case signs in Magindanao. The forms in o, u, probably owe this final element to the analogy of other pronominal forms ending in o, u, like tayo, kayo. The final m of the Nabaloi form is probably an added genitive element of the same person, like the ta in Harayan ako-ta (cf. above, p. 367). In the Bagobo genitive and oblique forms ni-ko, ka-ni-ko; ko probably represents a modification of ka due to the analogy of the genitive no. The particle ko which is found in Pampangan and Bagobo in the plural forms ko, i-ko, ke-ko, is probably a blend of the singular ka with the final o of the plural form kayo, which o was felt as a sign of the plural. Similarly Pangasinan ki in the plural forms ki, si-ki, ed si-ki, is probably a blend of ka with the final i of plural forms of the first person, viz., kami, sikiti, etc.

Ka occurs also in the plural stems ka-yo, ka-mo, ka-nu, which are made up of two root particles of the second person. Kayo is found uncombined as nominative plural in Tagalog, Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokano, and Nabaloi, and with articular prefixes in the nominatives, Pampangan i-kayo, Pangasinan and Nabaloi si-kayo, Ilokano da-kayo, and the oblique forms derived from them. Bagobo kio in kio, si-kio, is, perhaps, a modification of kayo, due to the analogy of the genitive nio. Kamo occurs uncombined in Bisayan, Bikol, Ibanag, Sulu, and in certain dialects of Tagalog, and with articular prefixes in Ibanag si-kamu, ni-kamu. Kamu is found only in Magindanao both uncombined and with articular prefixes. Bagobo kono in kono, si-kono, may represent a metathesis of *ka-no. The ka of Pampangan katamo 'we,' and of the Pangasinan and Nabaloi case sign si-ka, is an analogical element based on forms like ka-yo, ka-mo 'you,' where ka is root particle.
Mo occurs uncombined as genitive in all the languages except Magindanao and Bagobo. The genitive -m of Pangasinan, Ilokano, Naboloi and Ibanag is a shortened form of mo: it is found also in Naboloi nominative si-ka-m (cf. above). Pamangan moo, me, mec, are secondary modifications of mo (cf. below, p. 387). Mo also occurs with case indicating prefixes in the Bisayan genitives i-mo, ni-mo and the oblique forms derived from them, in Bikol ni-mo, si-mo, sai-mo, Batan i-mu, ni-mo, di-mo, and Sulu kai-mu; it is used, moreover, in the formation of the plural stems, second person ka-mo (cf. above), first person ta-mo (cf. above, p. 370).

Yo occurs uncombined as genitive plural in Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokano, and Naboloi (dyo < *yo, cf. above, p. 333). Pampangan yoo, ye, yee are secondary modifications of yo (cf. below, p. 387). With case indicating prefixes, yo is found in the genitives, Tagalog singular, Samaro-Leytean plural i-yo, ni-yo, Tagalog, Cebuan, and Hiligaynua plural in-yo, nin-yo, and the oblique forms derived from them; and in the Batan plural forms nin-io, din-io (i0 = yo); it is also used as an element of the plural stems, second person ka-yo (cf. above), first person ta-yo (cf. above, p. 370).

Batan, Magindanao and Bagobo genitive, Sulu, nominative niu, nio, which is found also in Sulu ka-nio kan-nio, Batan ka-nio, is probably to be analysed as case sign ni + yo, the form representing either a different spelling of niyo, or a phonetic variant, with y changed to the hiatus or glottal catch (cf. forms with ia for iya, below, p. 381). Bikol nindo, saindo, are probably modifications of forms identical with Tagalog ninyo, sa inyo, the d being due to the analogy of the corresponding forms of the third person plural, viz., ninda, sa inda.

The particle no occurs uncombined as genitive plural in Ibanag and Magindanao, and as genitive singular in Bagobo. It is also used in Magindanao in the plural stem of the second person ka-nu (cf. above) and as a final element of all forms of the first person inclusive plural. It is not impossible that this no is a modification of mo or yo, the n being due to the influence of other pronominal genitive forms with initial n.

The case indicating prefixes which are found in the pronouns of the second person are, in Tagalog, i, n(i), in, sa, in Cebuan i, n(i), in, sa, ka(n), in Hiligaynua i, n(i), in, sa, ka(n), d(i), ka,
in Samaro-Leytean i, si, n(i) sa, d(i), in Harayan i, n(i), ka(n), in Bicol i, n(i), sa, s, in, in Pampangan i, ka, in Pangasinan si, ed, in Ilokan si, da, ken, ka, in Nabalo si, in Ibanag si, ni, in Batan i, n(i), d(i), in, in Magindanao se, sal, sale, le, neng, sa, in Sulu e, ka, kan, i, in Bagobo si, ni, ka.

The prefixes i (of nom.), si, se, da, ni, sa, s, (of gen.-obl.), sal, le, ka, ka(n), kan, ke, ed, have already been explained (cf. above, pp. 353 f., 371). The prefix i in the Tagalog and Bisayan genitive forms i-yo, i-mo is probably the same as the prepositional i in Ilokan oblique of the definite article i-ti. Whether the i in Batan nominative i-mu is this prepositional i or the articular i of the nominative is difficult to say. The e of Sulu ekau, though long, seems to be identical with articular i (cf. pēla 'how much?' = Bis. pila). In the Tagalog, Bisayan, Bicol, and Batan case signs n(i) and d(i) it is uncertain whether the i is this prepositional i, or the final i of the case signs ni and di, i. e. whether the forms niyo, nimo, diyo, dimo, in Tagalog, Bisayan, Bicol and Batan, are to be analysed as i-yo, i-mo with prefixed case signs n and d, or as ni-yo, di-mo, etc. The case signs n and d would of course be derived from ni and di (cf. above, p. 354). Ilokan ken is probably contracted from *ka-i-n with the two ligatures i and n. In Magindanao, sale is a fuller form of sal; neng contains the ligature ng; the e is an indistinct vowel, as is shown by the spelling ngka;¹ and not the result of the contraction of a diphthong; ne may, therefore, represent a reduced form of nu, the genitive of the definite article. The Tagalog, Cebuan, Hiligayna, Bicol, and Batan prefix in, which occurs both as initial and with additional prefixed case signs, is not clear. It may be the prepositional i of iyo followed by the ligature n, the prefix being thus similar to the prefixes an, in, un, of the Cebuan and Pampangan interogatives. In the forms with compound prefix like nin-yo, din-yo, the i is of the same ambiguous character as in forms like ni-yo, di-yo (cf. above).

In general the case signs are used in the formation of cases as in the first person.

In the nominative Tagalog, Bisayan and Bicol have i in the singular forms, i-kao, i-ka: Samaro-Leytean has si in the forms

¹ Cf. Porter, Primer of the Moro Dialect, Washington, 1908, passim.
si ikao, si kamo: Pampangan has i in both singular and plural in the forms i-ka, i-kayo, i-ko: Pangasinan, Nabaloi and Ibanag have si in both singular and plural in the forms si-ka, si-kayo, si-ki; si-kam, si-kayo; si-kan, si-kamu: Ilokan has si in singular si-ka; da in plural da-kayo: Batan has i, whether articular or prepositional i is doubtful, in singular i-mu: Magindanao has se and sale in the singular se-ka, sale-ka; sal in the plural sal-kanu: Sulu has e=i, in e-kaw: Bagobo has si in the forms si kona, si kio. Nominative forms without case sign, consisting of a root particle or plural stem, or some modification of these, are found in all the languages.

In the genitive in a number of languages secondary stems are made by prefixing prepositional i and the particle in to the root particles, viz., Tag. i-yo, in-yo, Bis. i-yo, i-mo, in-yo, Bik. i-mo, in-do (cf. above, p. 370), Batan i-mo, in-io, Sulu i-mu. In Tagalog and Bisayan these stems occur both uncombined and with the prefixed case signs n, e. g., Tag. inyo, n-inyo. In the other languages they are found only with case signs, Bikol n(t), n, sa, s in nimo, n-indo, sa-mo, s-mo; Batan n(i), n in nimo, n-inio, Sulu ka in ka-imu. In Magindanao the case signs are prefixed to the nominatives ka and kanu; neng, le, sale, sa sal to ka; le, sal, sa sal to kanu. In Sulu the case signs ka and kan are prefixed in the singular to the form nio, which though used as a nominative is formally a genitive; in the plural, ka is prefixed to the secondary stem imu. In Bagobo, ni is prefixed to the root particle in nio=ni-yo, and ni-ko, in which ko is a modified form of ka (cf. above, p. 375). Genitive forms without case signs, consisting of a root particle either unchanged or in some modified form, are found in all the languages, Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokan, Nabaloi, and Ibanag having only forms of this kind.

In the oblique Tagalog prefixes the case sign sa to the genitives with initial i; each of the Bisayan dialects has the same series of forms based on the genitives as in the first person, the analysis of the forms with initial kan, di, and kari being ambiguous. In Bikol in the singular, as in the first person, the oblique forms are identical with the genitives with initial s, in the plural the case sign sa is prefixed to the secondary stem indo. In Batan in the plural the case sign d is prefixed to the secondary stem inio; the singular dimo has the case sign d(i).
In Bagobo the case sign *ka* is prefixed to the genitive in *ka-niko, ka-nio*; the genitive *niko* is also used as oblique. In Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokan, Ibanag, and Magindanao the case signs are prefixed to the nominative. In Pampangan, *keka, kekayo* and *keko* are derived from the nominatives *ika, ikayo* and *iko* by prefixing *ka*; *kai* becoming *ke*. Pangasinan forms its oblique by prefixing *ed* to the nominatives with case sign *si*, Ibanag changes this *si* to *ni*. Ilokan forms its singular by prefixing *ken* to the nominative *ka*, its plural by prefixing *ka* to the nominative with case sign *da*. In Magindanao, *sal* and *sa sal* are prefixed to *ka* and *kanu*.

**Third Person.**

The forms of the personal pronouns of the third person are, viz.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>nom.</th>
<th>gen.</th>
<th>obl.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tag.</td>
<td><em>sg. siya</em></td>
<td><em>niya</em></td>
<td><em>kaniya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl.¹ siila</em></td>
<td><em>nila</em></td>
<td><em>kanila</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Ceb.)</td>
<td><em>sg. siya²</em></td>
<td><em>niya,² iya,² na</em></td>
<td><em>kaniya,² saiya,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl. siila</em></td>
<td><em>nila, ila</em></td>
<td><em>kanila, saila</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Hil.)</td>
<td><em>sg. siya²</em></td>
<td><em>niya,² iya</em></td>
<td><em>kaniya, sa iya, dia,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl. {silai</em></td>
<td><em>nila, ila</em></td>
<td><em>kani, sa ila, dila,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>sanda</em></td>
<td><em>nanda, anda</em></td>
<td><em>sang ila</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Sam.-Ley.)</td>
<td><em>sg. siya</em></td>
<td><em>niya, iya</em></td>
<td><em>kaniya, diya,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl. sira</em></td>
<td><em>nira, ira</em></td>
<td><em>dira, sa ira</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bis. (Har.)</td>
<td><em>sg. tana</em></td>
<td><em>ana, na</em></td>
<td><em>kana, kanana,</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl. sanda</em></td>
<td><em>anda, nanda</em></td>
<td><em>kananda</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bik.</td>
<td><em>sg. siya</em></td>
<td><em>niya</em></td>
<td><em>saiya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl. sinda</em></td>
<td><em>ninda</em></td>
<td><em>sinda</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pamp.</td>
<td><em>sg. iya, ya, na, ne no</em></td>
<td><em>na, ne, nee, no,</em></td>
<td><em>keya</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl. ila, la, no</em></td>
<td><em>da, de, dee, doo</em></td>
<td><em>karela</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pang.</td>
<td><em>sg. sikato</em></td>
<td><em>to</em></td>
<td><em>ed sikato</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>pl. sikara, ra, ira</em></td>
<td><em>da, ra</em></td>
<td><em>ed sikara</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The forms of the plural may also be reduplicated, e. g., *silasila, kanikanita*.
² These forms are also written with *ia* instead of *iya*. 
The pronouns of the third person singular all appear to be based on one of the particles *ya, na, to, su,* and *nin.* *Ya* and *na* are probably identical respectively with the ligatures and articular and demonstrative particles *ya,* *na;* *to* is probably identical with the demonstrative particle *to;* *su* with the Batan and Pangasinan article *su,* *so;* *nin* is perhaps the demonstrative root particle *ni* + the ligature *n.*

*Ya* occurs uncombined in the nominative in Pampangan, Ibanag, and Batan; with case indicating prefix in the nominative in Tagalog, Bisayan (except Harayan), and Bicol *si-ya,* Batan and Sulu nominative *sia* (for *si-ya,* Pampangan *i-ya,*)

---

1 These case forms are headed ‘Dat. ac. abl;’ *sia* doubtless belongs to ac. = accusative; cf. above, p. 341, ft. nt. 2.

2 Probably a mistake for *da, ra,* cf. oblique, and Pangasinan and Nabaloi genitive. The use of a reduplicated form in the plural, however, is a priori quite natural, and is found in Tagalog (cf. above, p. 379, ft. nt. 1), hence it is possible that the form is correct.

3 These forms are given under the head of ‘Acus.' = accusative.
Sulu nia (borrowed from the genitive), in the genitive in Tagalog, Bisayan (except Harayan), and Bikol ni-ya, Batan and Sulu nia (for ni-ya), Bisayan (except Harayan) i-ya; and in all the oblique forms in Tagalog, Bisayan (in Harayan only in kani-ya), Bikol, Pampangan, and Batan. In the forms written with ia for iya we have either a variant spelling, or the intervocalic y has been changed to the hiatus or glottal catch (cf. nio for niyo above, p. 376).

Na occurs uncombined as genitive in Cebuan, Harayan, Pampangan, Ilokano, Ibanag, and Batan, and as nominative in Pampangan. In Harayan it is the root particle of the pronoun in all its forms with the exception of the oblique kani-ya. The ta of the nominative tana is perhaps to be connected with the demonstrative root particle tu. The initial a of the genitive ana is probably due to the analogy of the plural form anda (cf. below). Na also forms the basis of the Ilokano oblique forms kenkua-na, kania-na. The Pampangan forms ne, nce, no, noo, are probably secondary modifications of na (cf. below, p. 387). It is not likely that no has any connection with the particle mu, no of the second person.

To is found only in Pangasinan and Nabalo, both uncombined, and with prefixed case signs in Pangasinan and Nabalo sika-to, Pangasinan ed sika-to.

Su occurs only in Ilokano singular i-su with articular i, and in isu, a prefix of the nominative plural (cf. below).

Nin forms the basis of all the forms of the pronoun in Magindanao. With this nin the particle din which forms the basis of the pronoun in Bagobo is perhaps to be connected, the initial d being due to the influence of the plural dan.

What Ibanag sa represents is doubtful. An original s seems to be preserved in Ibanag only before i, otherwise becoming t (cf. above, p. 333); hence sa can hardly be connected with the articular sa of the other languages. It may be contracted from *sia < *siya just as perhaps sakan 'I' from *si-akan, though it is difficult to see why such a form should be used as oblique.

The pronouns of the third person plural, with the exception of Batan sa, which is perhaps identical with the inclusive article of Bisayan and Bikol, are all based on one of the particles da, ra; la, which are perhaps ultimately identical.
Da occurs uncombined as genitive in Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokan, Nabaloi (cha < *da) and Ibanag; as nominative in Ilokan; and as oblique in Batan. Pampanagan de, dee, doo are secondary modifications of da (cf. below, p. 387). Bagobo dan in dan, kan-dan, si kan-dan, is probably da+the ligature n. Da is found also with case indicating prefixes in Hiliguayna and Harayán stem an-da, the Bikol stem in-da, and in the Ilokan forms isu-da, i-da, kania-da, kulakua-da, and in the compound case sign ka-dakua of the last (cf. below, p. 384). It also forms the first element of Batan genitive da-ru (cf. above, p. 380, ft. nt. 2). The an and in of the stems an-da, in-da are probably to be explained as articular i, i+ligature n, like the prefixes an, in, in, of the interrogative pronouns (cf. above, p. 361).

The particle ra occurs preceded by case signs ending in a vowel in Samaro-Leytean, Pangasinan, Nabaloi, Ibanag and Batan: la is found in Tagalog, Cebuan, Hiliguayna, Pampanagan, Magindanao, and Sulu under similar conditions; the final n of the Magindanao forms is probably due to the analogy of the singular. Ra occurs uncombined in Pangasinan genitive and nominative, Nabaloi genitive, and Batan oblique, and in Batan da-ru (cf. above). La occurs uncombined as nominative in Pampanagan.

It is difficult to determine with certainty the exact relation of the three particles da, ra, la. Ra seems almost certainly to be simply a phonetic modification of da, in all the languages in which it occurs. This is indicated by the following facts. In all these languages da and ra occur alongside of one another (in Samaro-Leytean cf. the forms of the inclusive article), and as the change of intervocalic d to r is a common phenomenon of these languages (cf. above, p. 334), and as they seem to present no change from r to d, the supposition lies near at hand that the two are simply different forms of the same particle, da, being the more original form. This supposition is strengthened by the evidence of Ilokan, which does not change intervocalic d to r, where the form corresponding to Pangasinan and Ibanag ęra, Nabaloi era, is ida. According to this explanation the r of the uncombined form ra of Pangasinan, Nabaloi, and Batan would be due to the analogy of forms like ęra, where the r is organic.

The particle la is perhaps a further phonetic modification of this ra resulting from original da after a vowel. It is true that
\( r \) resulting from intervocalic \( d \) is regularly retained in these languages, but as words of very frequent use often suffer special phonetic changes, it may be that in these pronouns the secondary \( r \) became \( l \) just as original \( r \) became \( l \) in these languages (cf. above, p. 333). In this case the uncombined \( la \) of Pampangan would be analogical like the uncombined \( ra \).

It is also possible, however, to suppose that \( la \) is a particle distinct from \( da \). If so it can hardly represent an original \( la \), as in that case the intervocalic \( l \) would have been lost in Tagalog and Sulu, but as in the languages where \( la \) is found \( l \) often represents an \( r \) of the other languages (cf. above, p. 333), the original form of the particle was perhaps \( ra \). If this supposition is correct, the \( ra \) in some of the forms may be referred to the same original particle, as original \( r \) is usually retained in these languages, but in just which forms, it would be difficult to say.

The case indicating prefixes that are found in the pronouns of the third person are in Tagalog \( si, n(i), ka(n) \), Cebuan \( si, n(i), i, ka(n), sa, in Hiligayna si, s, n(i), n, i, ka(n), d(i), ka, sa, sang, in Samaro-Leytean si, n(i), i, ka(n), d(i), sa, in Harayan s, n, ka, ka(n), kan, in Bikol si, s, n(i), n, sa, in Pampangan i, ka, kare, in Pangasinan sika, i, ed, in Ilok an i, isu, kenkua, kadakua, kania, in Nabaloi sika, e, si, in Ibanag i, n(i), (for the case sign of sa, cf. above, p. 381), in Batan si, n(i), d(i), in Magindanao salka, seka, leka, sa, na, kana, si, salki, n(i), ka(n), in Sulu si, n(i), ka, ka(n), kan, in Bagobo kan, si.

The signs \( i \) (of nom.), \( si, s \) (of nom.), sika, \( i \) (prepositional), in, na, n(i), n, sa, d(i), ka, ka(n), kan, ed have already been explained (cf. above, pp. 353 f., 371, 377).

The ambiguous signs are found in the following forms: \( n(i) \) in niya, nia, nilan, nir, in Tagalog, Bisayan, Bikol, Ibanag, Batan, Magindanao, and Sulu; \( ka(n) \) in kaniya, kani in Tagalog, Bisayan, and Magindanao, in kananda in Hiligayna and Harayan; \( d(i) \) in dia, dila, dira in Hiligayna, Samaro-Leytean, and Batan. \( i \) in Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilok an, and Ibanag is articular (cf. above, p. 358); in Bisayan, prepositional (cf. above, p. 344); Nabaloi \( e \) is probably a modification of articular \( i \) due to the following \( r \); Hiligayna \( sang \) is the genitive of the definite article; Pampangan \( kare \) is probably borrowed from the oblique plural of the demonstratives karen, kare, etc.; Ilok an
isu is the pronoun of the third person singular used as case sign; kemkua and kada are the noun kua (cf. above, p. 347) and the case signs ken (cf. above, p. 377), and kada, which is derived by a wrong division from the oblique plural forms of the first and second persons, e. g., ku-dutayo, where the da belongs to the stem and not to the oblique case sign; kanu in the forms kanund and kaniada is a combination of the particles ka and ni with an a which is probably due to a wrong division of the case signs containing kua, viz., kada-anu, kada-anu. In Magindanao, kana is the genitive and oblique of the definite article; the ka of seka, leka and salka is probably due to a wrong division of forms like sal-kana 'you' where the ke belongs to the pronominal stem and not to the case sign; salki may be borrowed in the same way from forms like sal-kitu, 'we two,' or it may be the case sign salka with the a changed to i before la after the analogy of the other forms of the plural; for the elements se, le, sal, cf. above, pp. 371, 372.

In general the case signs are used in the formation of cases as in the pronouns of the first and second persons.

In the nominative, Tagalog, Cebuan, Hiligaynana, Samaro-Leytean, Batan, and Sulu, prefix si to the root particles ya and la, ra in both singular and plural, in si-ya (sia), si-la, si-ra. In Hiligaynana and Harayan plural the case sign s is prefixed to the stem anda. In Bikol, si is prefixed to the root particle ya in the singular, s, to the stem inda in the plural. In Pampangan, i is prefixed to the root particle in singular i-ya, plural i-la. In Pangasinan and Nabaloi in the singular, sika is prefixed to the root particle in sika-to; in the plural both prefix sika and i, e to the root particle da or ra, and Nabaloi makes an additional form by prefixing si to the form with case sign e. Ilokano prefixes i to the root particle in singular i-su, plural i-da, and also makes a plural form by prefixing isu to the root particle. Ibanag has i in the plural i-ra. In Magindanao in the singular the signs seka, salka are prefixed to the root particle nin; in the plural si and salki are prefixed to lan, the root particle la with an analogical n derived from the singular. In Sulu the case signs si and ni are prefixed to the root particles in singular and plural, sia and nia being equivalent to si-ya, ni-ya: the forms with ni are borrowed from the genitive (cf. below, p. 388). In Bagobo the nominative of both numbers seems to
be identical with the oblique; the nominative, however, may take the additional case sign si.

Nominative forms without case sign are found in Harayan (tana cf. above, p. 381), Pampangan, Pangasinan, Ilokano, Nabaloi, Ibanag, Batan and Magindanao, consisting, with the exception of Batan sa (cf. above, p. 381) of a root particle, two root particles (tana), or a modified form of a root particle.

In the genitive, Bisayan (except Harayan), as in the pronouns of the second person, makes genitives by prefixing prepositional i to the root particles, viz., i-ya, i-la. It is not impossible that the genitive forms niya(nia), nila of Tagalog, Bisayan, Bikol, Batan, Magindanao, and Sulu are based on this stem, the case sign being n, but it seems more likely that they consist of the case sign n* + the root particle. Hiliguayna, Harayan, and Bikol prefix in the plural the case sign n to the stems anda, inda. In Magindanao in the singular, the case signs leka, salka, na salka, sa salka, are prefixed to the root particle nin; in the plural the forms are based on lan (cf. above), the case signs being n(i), ka(n), and sa ka(n). Sulu kanila has the case sign ka(n); in kan-nia, kan is prefixed to the genitive; in kan-sia, kan-sila, to the nominative. Genitive forms without case sign, consisting of a root particle or stem, or some modification of a root particle, are found in all the languages except Tagalog, Samaro-Leytean, Bikol and Sulu.

In the oblique, the Tagalog forms may be based either on the genitive or the secondary stem with initial i, the case sign being ka(n). Each of the Bisayan dialects has in general the same series of forms as in the pronouns of the first and second persons; the forms with case sign sa are based on the secondary stem with initial i; the forms kaniya, kanila, kananda have the case sign ka(n) as in Tagalog; the forms with initial d and kar have the case sign d(i); in Harayan, oblique forms are made from the genitives na, ana by prefixing ka and kan respectively. In Hiliguayna there is an additional series of forms made by prefixing sang, the genitive of the definite article, to the stem with initial i; in Samaro-Leytean, in addition to the regular series, there is the form kaniya with case sign ka(n). The Bikol forms are made by prefixing sa to the stems with prefixed i and in. Pampangan makes its singular by prefixing ka to the nominative with articular i; in the plural we
should expect *kela, but the form has become karela under
the influence of the demonstratives. In Pangasinan, ed is
prefixed to the nominative with case sign si. In Ilokan the
case signs are prefixed to the root particles, kenkua and kadakua
in the singular and plural respectively, kania, to both numbers.
In Ibanag the plural nira contains the sign n(i); for the singu-
lar sa cf. above, p. 381. Batan has the forms dia, dira with
sign d(i), also sia and siru identical with the nominative. In
Magindanao all the forms are identical with genitive forms,
except kana salkanu, in which kana salka is prefixed to the
root particle. In Bagobo kan is prefixed to the genitive. The
only oblique forms without case sign are Batan da and ra, which
are given as accusative forms (cf. above, p. 380, ft. nt. 3).
These forms may be really genitives, their presence under the
head of accusative being due to a mistake of the grammarian
or copyist (cf. above, p. 366, ft. nt. 2).

General Remarks on Case Formation.

Generally speaking, the inflection of pronouns in the Philip-
pine languages is initial, and is based on the forms of the arti-
cles. The nominative is often without case sign, especially in
the personal pronouns, but is also frequently indicated by initial
i, si, which are identical respectively with the i of the nomina-
tives, Ibanag i, Pampangan i-ng, etc., of the definite article,
and si of the personal article; it is also sometimes indicated by
s derived from si.

The genitive is most frequently characterized by an initial n.
As the ligatures na, n, are still often used between two nouns
that stand to one another in the relation of genitive and modi-
fied noun, e. g. Tag. bahay na bato, 'house of stone,' baro-n
kastila, 'a shirt of Spain, Spanish shirt,' it is very likely that
the genitive sign n is derived from them.

In the personal pronouns there are a number of genitive
forms without case sign. These forms, which are usually root
particles, are placed after the modified word, the genitive being
originally indicated simply by the postposition. Doubtless in
some primitive stage of the Philippine languages, any root par-
ticle might be thus used as a genitive, but in the course of
time, however, certain root particles were adapted to this use
(so with ko and mo of the first and second persons respec-
tively), others being excluded.
In Pampangan the number of genitive forms of this kind has been greatly increased by modifying the final vowel of the root particle. There are five series of these forms, the endings being $a$, $o$, $e$, $oo$, $ee$. Of the forms in $a$, all are unmodified root particles except $da$ (1. sg.) [cf. above, p. 368]. Of the forms in $o$; $ko$, $mo$ and $yo$ are root particles; $no$ (3. sg.) is modified from $na$ on the analogy of these forms. The forms in $e$, viz., $ke$, $me$, $ye$, $ne$, $de$, are all secondary; the $e$ may have arisen from the combination of a root particle ending in $a$, e. g. $na$ (3. sg.) with ligature $i$, and then have been extended to the other forms. The forms in $oo$ and $ee$ are derived from the $o$ and $e$ series respectively by repeating the final vowel. The repetition seems to be emphatic, these forms being used when the subject of the verb of which they are the agent, is omitted.

This expression of the genitive by simple postposition has been extended in Ilokan to the other pronouns, e. g. $ti$ balay ti tao, 'the house of the man,' $iti$ atep toy a balay, 'the thatch of this house,' so that the genitives of the various pronouns are always identical with some form of the nominative.

The oblique case is never without a case indicating prefix, except in the doubtful Batan forms $da$, $ra$ (cf. above, p. 386). It is usually characterized by an initial $d$, $s$, or $k$, derived respectively from the oblique case forms of the articles $di$, $sa$, and $ka$. These oblique case forms are prepositional in character, but have this peculiarity, viz., that they denote not only the case, but also the idea of the definite, personal or inclusive article before a following noun. For example, 'in the house' is in Tagalog not literally $sa$ ang bahay, but simply $sa$ bahay, the oblique $sa$ expressing both the idea of 'in,' and that of the definite article.

It is quite common for forms which have oblique case signs to be used as genitives, as, for example, in the Sulu personal pronouns, and instances also occurs in which forms with genitive case sign are used as oblique, for example, in the Cebuan demonstratives and Ibanag personal pronouns.

The identity of nominative and genitive forms in Ilokan has already been mentioned. Other instances of this identity are found, especially in Pampangan and certain languages of the Northern Group, and there especially in the inclusive article,
and the plural of other pronouns. In the Sulu personal pronouns the use of genitive forms in the nominative is probably due to the fact that both nominative and genitive forms are found after the case sign kan, e.g. kan-sia, kan-nia, thus giving rise to the idea that the forms like sia and genitive forms like nia are equivalent.

Oblique case forms are found in the nominative in the Magindanao personal pronouns, the Cebuan demonstratives and interrogatives with initial k, the Harayan demonstratives with initial d, and the Bagobo pronouns of the third person. In the Magindanao personal pronouns the case forms are very much confused, some forms being used for all three cases. In the demonstratives, the use of the oblique forms in the nominative is probably due to the fact that certain adverbs of place, identical with the oblique forms of the demonstratives, were used as simple demonstratives, ‘the there man,’ or ‘the man there,’ being used as the equivalent of ‘this man,’ (cf. the use of the Cebuan adverb karon, above p. 351, ft. nt. 1.) The oblique case signs thus introduced into the nominative became the regular nominative case signs of the demonstratives, and in Cebuan, were also extended to the interrogatives. The nominative forms of the Bagobo pronouns of the third person are possibly to be explained in the same way, inasmuch as pronouns of the third person and demonstratives are very closely related.

The nominative forms given under the oblique in Batan are probably used only in the accusative (cf. above, pp. 341, ft. nt. 2, 380, ft. nt. 3). The difficult Ibanag oblique sa (3. sg.) seems to have a nominative case sign (cf. above, p. 381).

List of principal Elements used in the Formation of the Pronouns.¹


ad—elem. of dem. stem adto, cf. p. 354 f.


¹ For elements of inc. art. not included here, cf. p. 348.
ak₂—sign of indef. object in Ceb., cf. p. 345.
al—cf. ar.
am—elem. of prons. 1. exc. pl., cf. p. 369.
an₂—prefixed elem. in nom. pl. of Iban. dems., cf. p. 356 f.
an₅—suffix of prons. 1. pers., cf. p. 368.
asi—stem of indiv. inter. in Iban., cf. p. 363.
at—elem. of prons. 1. inc. pl., cf. p. 371.
bbad—final elem. of Bag. numeral ‘one,’ cf. p. 345.
chi—Nab. form of di₁.
d₁—obl. case sign in Tag. dems., cf. p. 354; in prons. 1, pers., cf. p. 371; and in Bat. du, cf. p. 344: [cf. also d(i)].
d₂—nom. case sign in dems., cf. p. 354.
dday—final elem. of Iban. numeral ‘one,’ cf. p. 345.
dag—prefix of pl. in Illok. def. art. and dems., cf. pp. 342, 354.
day—prefix of dems. sg. in Illok., cf. p. 356.
dₑ₁—gen. of pron. 1. exc. pl. in Bag., cf. p. 369.—Pamp. de gen. of pron. 3. pl. is not identical with this de, though both are probably modifications of da.
dₑ₂—prefix of Pamp. inter. pl. de-no, cf. p. 360.
3) elem. of indiv. inter. in Pang., Ilok., Nab., and Sulu, cf. p. 364. 4) obl. case sign in Batan prons. 1. pers., cf. p. 371.—[cf. also d(i)].

di,—root part. of pl. of def. art. in Pamp., cf. p. 342.
2) root part. of inc. art. in Pamp., and elem. of inc. art. in Pang., cf. p. 348.
3) prefix of pers. inter. pl. in Pamp., cf. p. 360.—perhaps a modification of da.
d(i)—obl. case sign, may be di, or d(i), in prons. 2. and 3. pers., cf. pp. 377, 383.
ding,—in Pamp., stem of pl. of def. art., and elem. of pl. of indiv. inter., cf. pp. 342, 361.
e,—nom. of def. art. in Nab., cf. p. 341.—e in Sulu ekau is identical with i, cf. p. 377.
en,—cf. uen.
et—obl. and gen. of def. art. in Har., cf. pp. 342, 343.
g,—pluralizing infix in Ilok. dems., cf. pp. 354, 356.
go,—final elem. of Bag. dems., cf. p. 352.
ha,—1) obl. of def. art. in Sulu, cf. p. 343. 2) initial elem. of indiv. inters. in Bis. and Sulu, cf. p. 364.
hi,—in Sulu only, pers. art. and prefix of pers. inter., cf. pp. 346, 364.
p. 341; and pers. art. ı and perhaps hi, cf. p. 346. 5) artic-
ular prefix or nom. case sign in Ilok. def. art., cf. p. 342;
in the forms of the numeral ‘one,’ cf. p. 345; in the dems.,
cf. p. 353; in the Bik. inter. stem isay, cf. p. 361, in
Iban. indiv. inter., cf. p. 363, and in Nab. inter. sepa(y) if
it is equivalent to *sa-i-pa(y), cf. p. 362; in the pers. prons.
of all persons, cf. pp. 371, 372, 376, 377 f., 383, 384.—The
root part. ya, ia, 3. sg. is perhaps a combination of a with
this prefix. 6) elem. of in.
i,—prepositional prefix or obl. and gen. case sign in Ilok. def.
art. and dems., cf. pp. 344, 353 f., 356; and in prons. 2. and
ia—cf. ya.
in,—prefix in inters., Ceb. k-in-sa, Pamp. ino (in<ing), cf.
p. 361, and in the stem inda, 3. pl., cf. p. 382.
in,—suffix of gen. and obl. forms, prons. 1. pers. (=on, un,
and en), cf. p. 372.
in,—suffix of inters., cf. p. 363.—not identical with in.
k,—obl. case sign in inc. art., cf. p. 348; in Pamp. king, cf.
and in Pamp. k-ako, cf. p. 373.
ka,—root part., 2. sg., cf. p. 375.
ka,—1) obl. and gen. of def. art. in Bag. 2) obl. and gen. case
sign in def. art., cf. pp. 342-344; in pers. art., cf. p. 346;
in the inc. art., cf. p. 347 f.; in dems., cf. p. 353; in the
inters. in Tag., Hil., and Pamp., cf. p. 360, and probably
in Sam.-Ley. kanay, cf. p. 364; in the prons. of all three
persons, cf. pp. 371, 376 f., 383. 3) elem. of ka(n), kan,
kay, ken, kana, kani, kare and takka.—The ka of the inc.
art. in Ceb. does not belong here, cf. k, and ka.
ka,—elem. of the Mag. case signs saika, seka, leka, cf. p. 384,
and of sika.
ka,—in Ceb., obl. of inc. art., and in Bik., obl. case sign of pl.
kan—1) obl. and gen. of the def. art., cf. p. 343 (bis); of pers.
art., cf. p. 346. 2) obl. and gen. case sign in pers. prons. in-

ka(n)—obl. and gen. case sign, may be ka or kan, in the pers. prons. of all three persons, cf. pp. 371, 376 f., 383.

kana—in Mag., gen. and obl. of def. art., and gen. case sign in prons. 3. sg., cf. pp. 343, 344, 383.

kani—1) gen. and obl. of pers. art. in Mag., cf. p. 346. 2) obl. case sign in Ilok. kaniak, cf. p. 373. 3) elem. of case sign kania in Ilok. prons. 3. pers., cf. p. 384.


kay—1) obl. of pers. art. cf. p. 346. 2) obl. and gen. case sign in Hil. pers. inter., cf. p. 360.


ke,—nom. pron. 1. exc. pl. in Pamp., and Bag., cf. p. 369.

—Pamp. ke, 1. sg. does not belong here, being a modification of ko, cf. p. 387.


key, xey—elem.—of numeral ‘one’ in Pang. and Nab. respectively, cf. p. 345.

ki—in Bik., obl. of pers. art., cf. p. 346, and obl. case sign in pers. inter., cf. p. 361.—probably a modification of ka₂; not identical with Pang. ki, 2. pl., which seems to be a modification of ka₁, cf. p. 375.


kua—a noun meaning ‘possession’ used in Iban. in the obl. case sign takkua, and in Ilok. in the obl. of the prons. 3. sg. and pl., cf. p. 384.


mey—prefix of Ilok. numeral ‘one,’ cf. p. 345.


mo—root part., 2. sg., cf. p. 376.

n,—1) lig., cf. p. 338. 2) final elem. in def. art., cf. p. 341 ff.; in pers. art., cf. p. 346; in the dems., cf. p. 357; perhaps
in prons. 3. pl. in Mag. and Bag., cf. p. 382 (bis). 3) between prefix and root part. in the gen. of Pang. dems., cf. p. 356; in indiv. inters. in Pang. and Nab., cf. p. 364; in the elems. an, in, un. 4) in case signs kan, ken.


na,—in Bik. and Ceb, gen. and obl. of inc. art. and gen. case sign of pl. of pers. inter., cf. pp. 348, 361; and final elem. of inc. art., cf. p. 348.

ne,—1) gen. of def. and pers. arts in Nab., cf. pp. 343, 346. 2) gen. of pron. 3 sg. in Pamp., cf. p. 381. 3) elem. of Pang. gen. of pers. art. nen, cf. p. 346.

neng—gen. case sign of pron. 2. sg. in Mag., cf. p. 378.


n(i)—gen. case sign, may be n, or ni, in prons. 2. and 3. pers., cf. pp. 377, 378, 383, 385.

no,—inter. root part., cf. p. 359 f.


nu—in nu, ka-nu of def. art. in Bat. and Mag., cf. p. 342 ff.


nga—lig., cf. p. 338.


pa,—obl. of def. art. in Sulu, cf. p. 343.


ri—= di intervocalic.

ro—final elem. of numeral ‘one’ in Bik., cf. p. 345.


s,—nom. case sign in Ceb. sini, cf. p. 354 (=s).

s,—nom. case sign in inc. art. sa in Ceb, Bik., and sanday in Hil., cf. p. 348; in pers. prons. 3. pl., Bat. sa (?) Hil. and Har. sanda, Bik. sinda, cf. pp. 381, 383, 384; and in prons. 1. sg., cf. p. 371.


sa,—root part. of numeral ‘one,’ cf. p. 345.


sa,—1) nom. of inc. art. in Ceb. and Bik., and of pron. 3. pl. in Bat., cf. pp. 348, 381. 2) in Bik., nom. case sign of inc. art. and of pl. pers. inter., cf. pp. 348, 361. 3) final elem. of inc. art., cf. p. 348.
sa,—nom. case sign in Ceb. sa-ini, cf. p. 354 (=sa,).
sa,—obl. of pron. 3. sg. in Iban., cf. p. 381.
san—in Sam.-Ley. only; 1) gen. of def. art. 2) obl. case sign in pers. inter. Cf. pp. 343, 364.
sang—in Hil. only; 1) gen. of def. art. 2) obl. case signs in prons. 3. sg. and pl. Cf. pp. 343, 385.
se,—case sign in Mag. pers. prons., cf. references under sale.
se,—initial elem. of pers. inter. in Nab., cf. p. 362.
ta,—in Iban. only; equivalent to sa, cf. p. 333. 1) obl. of def. and pers. arts., cf. pp. 343, 347. 2) elem. of obl. case signs takka, takkua.
ta,—gen. and obl. of def. art. in Bag., cf. p. 343; probably not identical with ta.
ti—root part of def. art. in Ilok., cf. p. 341, and of Pamp. dem. 


tu—sign of indef. obj. in Iban. = so, su, cf. p. 345.


uen—suffix of gen. and obl. forms, prons. 1. pers. (=$i\,a$, and on, un), cf. p. 369.


un,—cf. on, un:

y—cf. $i$.


ya,—suffix of prons. 1. pers. in Bik., cf. pp. 368, 369, 371.

Notes on some Palmyrene Tesserae.—By Hans H. Spoer, Ph.D., Jerusalem, Syria.

For the opportunity to describe Nos. 1 and 2 I am indebted to Mr. Herbert Clark of Jerusalem. The remainder are in my own possession.

I. This tessera is a quadrangular oblong.

Obverse. Near the upper margin the inscription

בלחל

A well-known name. Below it is a sun in splendor, surrounded by circles and upturned crescents.

Reverse. The inscription runs the long way:

ירחי
בלחל

Yarhai. Kalbā.

ירחי is a name of frequent occurrence. בלחל occurs here, so far as I can discover, for the first time in a Palmyrene inscription, although known as a Syriac name, בֵּלְחָל, and as Hebrew, (בלח) Num. 132) and Nabatean (Eut. 2132).

II. This tessera is circular.

Obverse:

ירחי
בלחל

The name בלחל should perhaps be read ירבלחל, for there seem to be traces of a yod. This name, as I believe, occurs here for the first time. For ירחי see No. 1.

Reverse. This shows the portico of a Greek temple. On either side is a palm-branch. The door is double, each leaf having two panels, the upper trellised, the lower decorated with an outline like a Latin Μ. Some traces of characters in the gable may be read as

 jel

my brother

In this case the tessera would commemorate the death of the brother of Yathbelit. However, the reading may also be

ירא.

III. This tessera is sexangular.
Obverse. A figure, reclining upon a funerary couch, dressed in tunic and mantle, the head covered with the modius. The bare right arm is stretched out, to receive a cup offered by a boy, who in the other hand (left) bears a pitcher. Above, a medallion, the bust of a man, in a beaded frame. (Cf. with tessera described by the author in this Journal, xxvi, p. 114.) The inscription is hardly legible:

*** לינור

Reverse:
Three busts in a row, a fourth above, in the middle flanked on either side by a sun in splendor. Between the busts are small bosses.

IV. This tessera is a rectangular oblong, one side only having been used, the reverse being rough and shapeless.

Obverse. Between a row of bosses, above and below, the word

לבית

A name which occurs also in I. To the left a rayed star.

Reverse. None.

V. Small, square and of a terra cotta color.

Obverse. A reclining figure on a funerary couch. Below:

נירבל

A name which is known; cf. Lidzbarski, Ephemeris I, p. 203, 206.

Reverse. A winged female genius with a trailing garment holding a chaplet in her extended left hand. On the left margin, לנה, known as a Nabatean proper name.

VI. Square. Figures as described by me in this Journal, xxvi, p. 115, Ill. 5.

Obverse.

חיוון

The form of the last letter is unusual (but see Lidzbarski, Schrifttafel II, Rom. 1). The name is known as Nabatean n.p.r.m., חיוון. The third letter is evidently not ו, so that we have not here the well known name חיוון.

Reverse. Below the couch:

לכלל

The last letter may possibly be נ.
Three letters, barely legible, occur near the left margin:

ٍٜםٗ

VII. A rectangular oblong inscribed on both sides. There are no figures.

Obverse. Much worn:

יֵאֶל
יִשְׁמֶשׁ

The third letter is partly erased. Unless the deity be referred to (Vog. No. 138), the name ֶםֶש does not elsewhere occur alone, but only as compounded with other names.

Reverse.

[וּה

Beni Bezbol

This is one of the many names compounded with ָבּ, but I have not elsewhere met with this combination.

VIII. Of the form of an olive.

Obverse. In the center a bust, perhaps of a deity; below it a large boss, and above an ill-preserved inscription which I read

** בלעדיה

Bël-Sedeq

A name which occurs for the first time. Cf. the Hebrew מְלָכִי, Gen. 14a.

Reverse. The field is occupied by a horse, saddled, the saddle supporting a rod crowned by a five-pointed star. Before the horse is a boss, and beneath, a curious symbol which may be described as a crutch-head enclosed in an arch. May this be the fragment of the Swastika, which occurs not unfrequently in association with Apollo? The star symbolises Istar=Venus. The horse is sacred to the sun-god ֶםֶש, 2 Kgs. 13b. That this belief was held by the inhabitants of Palmyra seems to be borne out by another tessera in my possession, which bears on the one side the sun-god and upon the other a horsed chariot with its driver. Unfortunately the head of the man is worn away, and the tessera somewhat mutilated.

Three Objects in the Collection of Mr. Herbert Clark, of Jerusalem.—By George A. Barton, Professor in Bryn Mawr College.

No. 1.

This little weight, in bronze, in the form of a turtle, came, Mr. Clark said, from Sebastiyeh. The drawing is about its actual size. It is inscribed with old Hebrew letters: יִנַּן, evidently standing here for the “fifth” of a shekel. The weight is $2\frac{1}{2}$ grams, or 58 grains. At this rate the shekel of which it was a fraction consisted of 290 grains. A series of half-shekel weights found at Tell Zakariyeh weighed 157.5 gr., 146.7 gr. respectively (Bliss and Macalister, Excavations in Palestine 1898–1900, 146 ff., and Clermont-Ganneau, Recueil d’arch. orient., 25 ff.), and one in my possession weighs 153.5 gr. (cf. JAOS. xxiv, 386 ff.). The limits of variation of the Hebrew shekel have never been determined, but it is evident that there was a shekel which approximated 300 grains. Mr. Clark’s turtle weight is one-fifth of that. The turtle form of this weight is, so far as I know, unique.

No. 2.

This object, cut out of a blackish stone, bears on one side a face; on the other, pictures of two birds accompanied by certain marks. The face, which the drawings exhibit in profile as well as in full view, has a physiognomy which resembles the faces on two Hittite monuments published by Messerschmidt,
Corpus Inscriptionum Hittitarum, II, Tafel xxxiv, A and B. The resemblance to the profile of A is particularly striking. One of the bird figures resembles a figure on Tafel xlvi of the Nachtrag of Messerschmidt's work. I am of the opinion, therefore, that the object may be Hittite, and put forth the suggestion in hope that some one who has given more attention to the decipherment of Hittite may be able to throw further light on it. The object may have been used either as a weight or a seal.

No. 3.

This little stone duck, found at Sebastiyeh, was perhaps a weight, though this is by no means certain. It weighs 39 grains. If it were intended for a weight, it was probably an eighth of a shekel, since eight times its weight would be 312 grs. Since the shekel varied so much, however, it may have been the seventh of a shekel, since 273 grs. is almost equal to 277.8 grs. —the smallest of the shekels found by Bliss at Tell Zakariyeh.
Studies of Sanskrit Words.—By Edwin W. Fay, Professor in the University of Texas, Austin, Texas.

I. Arváṅc-

In his German etymological dictionary (English translation, s.v. Erde) Kluge, with some hesitation, connects Lat. arvum ‘field, ploughed land’ with Gr. ἐπάλει ‘earthwards.’ In his English Etymology, s.v. earth, all this hesitation disappears, in view, I take it, of ON. jǫrví ‘ground,’ not cited in the former work among the cognates. It is also to be noted that Vergil (Aen. 12,681) uses arvis as a virtual rendering of Gr. χαμάλει ‘to the ground.’

There is a very obvious difficulty in the comparison of arvum with ἐπάλει, viz., the vocalism. This difficulty may be surmounted, to the best of my knowledge, in but one way, by assuming a base ēr- ‘arare,’ to which the European base ar- (from ēr-) would belong. This solution I have offered in my essay entitled A Semantic Study of the Indo-Iranian Nasal Verbs (Am. Jr. Phil., 26,389). There is, it must be admitted, not very much to justify a base ēr-. Skr. ārú ‘awl’: Gr. ὄρις ‘anger’ is dubious because of OHG. āla. Latin ēra ‘edge, point,’ is also ambiguous, and so is ēr ‘stachel-schwein,’ which may well be for ‘her’, if Hesychian χρό is genuine Greek, with a genuine χ. Not very conclusive is Skr. ēriṇam (? from ēr-) ‘bruchiges, unfruchtbares land.’ A vague connection with the root might be made out for Gr. ἐφαίδος ‘kid’ (if = ‘pricket’): Lat. aries ‘ram’ (cf. Umbr. erietu): Lith. ėras (with ė) ‘lamb.’ But in any case, the vowel relations of arvum and ἐπάλει are no harder to admit than those of Lat. aries: Umbr. erietu.

As a means of testing the correlation of arvum with ἐπάλει I have made a study of the Sanskrit word arvāṅc-, as it appears in the Rig-Veda, and I attach some importance to the isolation of its formation, with the adverbial suffix -āṅc-, as compared with the isolated Greek word ἐπάλει. I conclude from the data that follow that arvāṅc- and the adverb arvāk do mean ‘earthward(s).’
1. The Petersburg Lexica define our word as follows: a) herwaerts kom mend, hergekehrt, zugekehrt, entgegen-kom mend: b) diesseitig (only in grammatical and lexicographical sources, save the adverb arvák, which has literary attestation): c) unterhalb befindlich, nach unten gerichtet: d) in der nähe von (advb. only). The earliest citations for the sense e) are from AV. and SB., and consist of passages in which arváνc- is contrasted with ūrdhváς. This contrast I would, however, see in RV. vii. 78. 1bc (P₃)¹:

ūrdhvá asyā aिनjáyo vī śrayante,
ūso arváच bṛhatā rāthena—vāmám asmābhyaṁ vakṣi,
“On high her rays are spreading abroad,
<Now> Usas earthward in thy mighty car wealth to us fetch.”

This hymn may belong to a late middle period of RV. tradition as Arnold believes (see the table in PAOS. xviii. 353, and KZ. xxxiv. 341), but the chronology of the Vedic hymns can hardly tell against a word proved to be proethnic; and a hymn of the earliest period, if liable to popular rather than hieratic use, may have retained in all its working-over very early linguistic material (cf. Bloomfield, Proceedings, xxi. 41 ff. pace Arnold, ibid. xxii. 309 ff.).

2. Contexts are not wanting in RV. where a special sense seems warranted for arváνc-. Thus in i. 92. 16 (A),

—vartír asmáḍ² ā . . . arváг rátham . ni yachatam
“unto our house—earthward—your chariot bring”,

arváг might well be taken as a mere adverbial repetition of vartír, and passages are still to be pointed out in which arváк seems to mean “ad nostrum fundum.” In some of these contexts previous translators have recognized the sense I would give to arváνc-, and Sāyana glosses arvák in v. 45. 10 (see 5 below) by avāṁmukhāḥ ‘face-downwards.’

¹ After each hymn I put Arnold’s indication of its age: A, archaic: B₁, early middle period: B₂, late middle period: C₁, early late period: C₂, later late period.
² This takes asmáḍ as a poss. adj. = ‘nostrum’, identical with the compounding stem asmad.
viii. 14. 8 (B₄):

úd gá ájad ángirobhya ávís kṛṇván gūhā satīh
arvāṇcaṁ nunude valám,

"Showing the hidden, he drove forth the cows for the
Aṅgirasas,
And Vala he cast headlong down" (so Griffith).

That arvāṇcam nunude means 'struck to the ground' = ('to his
feet,' cf. RV. i. 32. 8, B₄) seems to me most probable. Note
the combination of the root nud with ārdhāṁ 'upwards' in i.
85. 10 (B₄); i. 88. 4 (A).

Wilson, cited by Griffith, paraphrased x. 71. 9a (C₃),
imé yé nárvāṁ ná parás' cárantı,
by "Those who do not walk (with the Brahmans) in this
lower world, nor (with the gods) in the upper world.'

3. In the following passages arvāṇe- is combined with the
root sad 'to sit,'

iii. 4. 8cd (B₄): sárasvatī sárasvatédbhīr ārvāk
     . . . barhfr édám sadantu,

"May Sarasvati and her confluent rivers earthward
(come) . . . and sit down upon this grass."

x. 15. 4a (C₁): bárhiṣadāḥ pitarāḥ úty ārvāg,
"Grass-sitting Manes come earthward to our aid (or
with aid)."

4. In the following the contrast of earth and heaven is clear.
i. 45.10ab (A): arvāṇcaṁ dāivyāṁ jānam āgne yáksva,

"Fetch-by-sacrifice to earth the celestial kind, O Agni."
v. 83. 6cd (C₃) arvāṅ eténa stanayitúnéhy
apó nisīñcām āsurāḥ pitá nah.

"Earthward in this thunder come,
   dripping water, god our father."

vi. 19. 9cd (B₃): ā viśvāto abhí săm etv arvāṅ
   ñdāryumnāṁ svār̥vad dheby asmē,
   "From every side let him come earthward:
   Indra, bestow upon us heavenly glory."

¹ On parás, see 6 below.
viii. 83. 3 (B₂) : sām bhūmyā āntā dhvasirā adhyāṣata
indrāvaruṇā divi ghōsa āruhat
āsthur jānānām úpa mām ārātayo
arvāg ávasā havanaśrutā gatam.

"The earth-ends were seen dust-bewhirled;
Indra-Varuna, my cry mounted to heaven:
My enemies among the peoples encompassed me:
Earthward with help, hearing my cry, ye came."

x. 83. 6a-c (C₃) : úpa méhy arvān—mányo vajrīn—
"Come earthward to me, lightning wielder, Manyu."

5. In the large majority of instances arvāṇc- is of vague
significance. The gods are called upon to come and bless the
worshipper. Obviously "come hither" makes a satisfying render-
ing for arvāṇ yāhī, but "come down, come earthward" were equally satisfying. Arguing from the antiquity of the agricul-
tural rites of worship, attested for instance at Rome in the
ritual of the Fratres Arvales, and mindful of the etymological
sense of 'ploughland' found in arvum, one might feel disposed
to make something of

iv. 57. 6ab (C₃) : arvācī subhage bhava śīte vāṃdāmahe
tvā,

"Earthward, gracious one, turn thou, Furrow, we greet thee."

Still, as so many other deities are summoned earthward, we can
hardly lay much weight on the summoning of the "Furrow"
earthward.

The following passages, though vague, have seemed, for one
reason or another,1 worthy of consideration.

ii. 37. 5ab (B₂) : arvāṇcam adyā yayāṁ nṛvāhaṇaṁ
ráthaṁ yuñjāthām ihā vāṁ vimočanaṁ.

"To come earthward to-day your man-bearing
Car hitch up; here is your unhitching."

Here arvāṇcam is not attributive, but predicative, a sort of
factitive to yuñjāthām; unless construed closely with yayāṁ.

---

1 Chiefly because they show arvāṇc- in combination, not directly with
a verb of motion, but with one equal, by a sort of zeugma, to a verb of
motion.
iv. 4. 8a (B₃): árcāmi te sumatīṁa ghōṣy arvāk, "I sing thy grace; sound it <back> to earth."

v. 45. 10cd (B₃): udnā ná návam anayanta dhīrā āśrṇvatār ā.po arvāg¹ atiṣṭhan,
"Like a ship in water the wise launched him (the sun); The hearkening floods <of light descended> to earth and stood <there>.

vii. 18. 3c (B₃): arvācī te pathyā rāyu etu,
"Earthward (?) ad fundum nostrum) come thy path of wealth, <Indra>.

vii. 28. 1b (A): arvāṅcas te hárayāḥ santu yuktāḥ,
"Earthward be thy steeds yoked, <Indra>.

viii. 61 (50). 1 (A): ubhāyaṁ śrṇāvac ca na īndro arvāg idām vácaḥ
satṛcyā maγhāvā sōmapitaye dhiyā śāviṣṭha ā gamat.
"Let Indra hearken earthward to this our double song; <Moved> by our unanimous prayer, let Maghavan, the mighty, come hither to drink soma."

x. 89. 5d (B₃): nārvāg īndraṁ pratiṃānāni debhuh,
"Nor have any counterfeits decoyed Indra to earth."

x. 89. 16d (B₃): tirō viśvāṁ ārcato yāhy arvān,
"Past all (other) praisers (?), come down to earth"
(ad fundum nostrum: cf. vii. 18. 3, and paragraph 2, above).

x. 129. 6c (C₅): arvāg devā asyā visārjanena.
"The gods are later than this world’s production"
(Griffith).

No translation of this passage is likely to win conviction, even from its proposer, but I venture on
"<There came> gods to earth at its creation."

6. I have reserved two passages for separate treatment.

i. 164. 19ab (C₅): yē arvāṅcas tāṁ u pārāca āḥur yē pārāṅcas tāṁ u arvāca āḥur,

¹ Note the gloss of Sāyaṇa, mentioned above at the beginning of 2.
"The down <on the earth> they call the up <in the sky>;
The up <in the sky> they call the down <on the earth>.
"

In this stanza we have some astronomical or cosmogonic riddle, and a real solution I do not pretend to offer, but it is probable that pārāṇc- here repeats pāra- in stanzas 17 and 18, where pāra- connotes ‘heavenly,’ as in the same stanzas āvara-, echoed in stanza 19 by arvāṇc-, connotes ‘earthly.’ This interpretation shows points of agreement with Wilson’s paraphrase of x. 71. 9a (see in 2 above).

viii. 8. 23 (A): triṇi pādāny aśvınor āvñh śænti gūhā parāh
ekāf ṛtāsyā pātmabhir arvāg jīvēbhyaṃ pári,

“The three regions of the Aśvins are revealed
<which were> in hiding in-the-far-heaven;
The two seers of righteousness wing-their-way earthward unto the living.”

The translation of parāh by “in-the-far-heaven” (= German “jenseits”), rather than by “before,” seems to me beyond question; and this would seem to fasten the sense of “earthward” upon arvāk.

After the above tests of the special applicability of the rendering “earthward,” it seems not amiss to regard Skr. arvāṇc- as a cognate of Gr. ἐπάς, Lat. arvis (in Aeneid 12. 681).

Postscript.

The editors have asked me to add, for completeness’ sake, a word on (1) arvācna- (arvācna-) and (2) arvāvāt-. It is habitual to render (1)—construed like Lat. sublimis (Gildersleeve-Lodge’s Gram. §325. 6)—by ‘hitherward’ (= ‘to the worshipper, to me’), rather than by ‘earthward,’ and in all the usage of the word (fifteen cases) there is nothing, as Professor Hopkins observes, to prove the inadequacy of the usual rendering. The

1 But we may note the Vergilian usage, Aen. 6. 481, of superi = ‘qui in terra (supra terram) sunt,’ for the usual superi = ‘caelestes.’
2 See Grassmann’s Lexicon, s.vv. pāra-, paramā-.
one difficult use is RV. vi. 25. 3 (A, in Arnold's system of dates):

इद्र जामाया उत्ये ये 'जामयो
'र्वाचिनासो वनुशो युयुज्रे
त्वाम एसाम विथुरासवायः
जहि विस्नुयानि क्रृणहि पारुकाः,

as to which Grassmann remarks in his Lexicon that here alone arvācīnā- is used of other than friendly approach. But there need be no question of approach at all, for we may well take jāmayaḥ and ājāmayaḥ as adjectives and arvācīnāsaḥ as a substantive, in formation something like arvāles, but in sense like vicini (finitim) or Landsleute. The stanza does not lose in point thereby:

Indra, our kindred and non-kindred
Neighbors, that as enemies have united,—
Do thou in sunder their mightiness
Rive, their prowess; make them as strangers (=drive them afar).

In the study of arvāvāt 'proximity,' the salient fact is that it is never used save as an antonym of parāvāt 'distance;' but, after a consideration of all the examples in RV., I feel free to say that 'distance' is not the only signification of parāvāt (and its kin). Grassmann's Lexicon s.vv. para-paramā-, suggests 'heaven' as a rendering, and renders parāstāt by 'oberhalb'; while both Grassmann and the larger Petersburg Lexicon interpret tisrās parāvātaḥ by 'the three regions' (sky, air, and earth).

The connotation of 'sky' or 'air' ('aloft, on high') seems to me probable—what connotation is mathematically demonstrable?—for this group in the following instances. In iv. 26. 6 (B2) the falcon brings the soma-stalk from the parāvāt (a-b), having taken it divō amūsmād uttarāt 'from yon remote sky' (d), and-pādas ab, without the interpretative clause d, recur in substance in x. 144. 4 (A). In iv. 21. 3 (A), Indra is besought to come from (1) divāḥ 'the sky,' (2) prthivyāḥ 'the land,' (3) samudrād . . pūrīśat 'the sea-of-air,—i. e., from the three regions already mentioned: the stanza then adds (4) svāṁnātāt 'from the light-realm' and (5) parāvātō vā sādānārd tāśya; I interpret (4) as a substantial repetition of (1) and in (5) I take sādānārd tāśya, which Sāyaṇa glosses by meghalokāt 'from the cloud-space,' as a synonymous (explanatory) apposition with
parāvātah (which Ludwig renders by an adjective): thus (5) = 'from parāvāt, the cloud-space.' In vi. 8. 4 (B) Mātariśvan is said to have brought Agni down from (his hiding place in) parāvāt, while in x. 187. 5 (B) Agni's birthplace is given as pāre rājasāh 'in the far-off of the air.' In v. 53. 8 the Āsvins are summoned from the sky (divāḥ), the air (antārikṣāt), and from here (amāt), and besought not to remain afar, parāvātah 'from (=in) the parāvāt. Further, note viii. 12. 17 (A):

yād vā śakra parāvāti samudrē ádhi mãndase
asmākam śt sutē raṇā sām īndubhiḥ,

"Whether, O Might, thou joyest in parāvāt in the sea
<of air> [So Griffith supplies]
Delight in our pressing," etc.

In addition to these examples of the connotation 'sky' (air) for parāvāt (pārām), we may note the contrasting pair ávara-lower (and) paramā- 'highest,' especially in i. 164. 17 (C) avāḥ páreṇa parā enā 'vareṇa.' In the light of such instances we may note that in the remote Celtic branch Ir. eross, which Stokes (Fick's Woert. II. p. 37) gives as a cognate of Skr. parā-, means 'height,' which would tend to vindicate the sense of 'high' for proethnic pero-.

If parāvāt means 'sky,' what of its antonym arvāvāt? Note viii. 13. 15 (A):

yāc chakraśi parāvāti yād arvāvāti vṛtrahan
yād vā samudrē ándhaso vītēd āsi,

"Whether, O Might, thou art in parāvāt, or in arvāvāt,
Vṛtra- slayer,
Or else in the sea <of air>, thou art the protector of the
Soma-stalk."

If we are right in taking samudrē of the 'air,' then parāvāti and arvāvāti are the sky and earth, respectively.1

1 [Observe, however, that the same words are repeated in viii. 97 (86). 4, but filled out (after the invitation is given) in 5 as follows: yād vāsi rocāṇē divāḥ samudrāsyaḥ 'di viṣṭāpi, yāt pārthive sādāne vṛtrahan tama yād antārika śa gāhi, "or if thou art in the sky's brightness, (or) on the sea's expanse, (or) if on earth's seat, (or) if in the interspace (air), do thou come hither," where 'sea' is distinct from air, and earth and sky are separately contrasted. Ed.]
The semantic problem may be stated as follows: pará- meant (1) 'distant, far' but came, by a connotation which may have been proethnic, to mean (2) 'high, in the sky;' its antonym, arváné-, meant (1) 'earthwards, towards (on) the ground' but developed, under the influence of pará (1), the meaning (2) 'near.'

The following illustration furnishes an approximate parallel. In Latin, domi (domum) and apud me (ad me) became, in a restricted sense, synonymous: 'at (to) my house.' These synonyms must have played a rôle in the upgrowth of domo doctus and of domi habeo aliquid for mihi est aliquid (cf. Lorenz ad Mil. Glor. 194), wherein the sense of 'domus' has nearly vanished. Similar is the generalisation of bi̯pa̯an 'out,' French fors / hors ('Lat. foris), from which the sense of 'door' has vanished, almost or wholly; and in French chez the sense of Lat. casa is all but gone; and we no longer think of a hill when we say down or adown. In general, on such prepositional words (direction adverbs) derived from nouns, consult Steinhals-Misteli, Abriss der Sprachwissenschaft, II, § 4, p. 11 ff., noting especially Skr. párśvam párśve- 'adversus, ad, apud, prope.'

To say briefly what I think of the morphology of the group under discussion, I explain arváné as a terminal accusative *arvam (or plur. *arván) + a deictic particle *c(a), comparable with Gr. -s; *c(a) may be compared with Lat. -ce, and if it belongs to a different guttural series, the reason is that *arvané has been attracted into a group with the other direction adverbs in -ánce. Alongside of arváné RV. exhibits a pretty large group of which prácina and práciné may be taken as representatives; arváné is not to be explained as from arváné, but merely as a counterpart of parávát.

2. Náhus.-

In RV. viii. 8. 23 (above), the words tráni padáni call for interpretation: what are the three padas? Sáyana interpreted them as the three wheels of the Ásvins' chariot. Griffith says heaven, firmament, earth. But the hymn itself mentions three places from which the Ásvins come, viz., náhus- (stz. 3), antáríksa- (3, 4), dyáns (4, 7). Dyánus we know and antáríksa- we seem to know, but what is náhus? I believe náhus to be 'the night,'
cf. Gr. νόχα - νόκτωρ, ἕννυχος. This interpretation yields good results when applied to

vii. 6. 5bd (Bz): yó aaryaapatnīr usāsaś cakāra
sá nirādhyā nāhuṣo yahvó agnīr
vīśaś cakre balihṭatāh sāhobhiḥ,
“`Agni made the dawns noble-spoused,
Driving off the nights, strong Agni
Made the peoples tribute-bringers by his might.”

Here note the opposition of usāsas and nāhusas.

The base to which I ascribe Gr. νόχα and nāhus is s)nō(y)-gh-, alternating with s)nē(y)-gh-, and refer for my conception of the phonetic problems involved to Am. Jr. Phil. xxv. 371 ff. 379 ff. Stripped of “root-determinatives,” the base in simpler form is s)nē(y)-/s)nō(w)-, and meant “to wrap,” cf. Skr. snāyati ‘wraps,’ Lat. nuit glossed by operuit, texit.’ The word nāhus belongs more closely with nāhyati ‘binds, wraps,’ while Gr. νόχα has the vowel color of nuit. Lat. niger ‘black’ and noegeum ‘amiculi genus’ attest the -ēy- diphthong. In all this it has been assumed that the night was the “binder” or “wrapper up” of the day (cf. Am. Jr. Phil. xxv. 386, note 2). The base for “snow,” with a different final guttural, s)nē(y)-gwh-, has a cognate meaning, snow being conceivable as that which “wraps” (covers) the earth: cf. also Avest. vafrā-: ‘snow’: the root vap- “to strew, weave.”

3. vedhās, ‘worshipper, pious; faithful, true.’

Uhlenbeck in his etymological lexicon groups together vidātham (with deaspiration) ‘congregation, assembly,’ vidhāti ‘worships, honors, dedicates (to a god),’ and vedhās as defined above. For none of these words does he suggest further cognates, not even Avestan ones.

In view of the uncertainty in some few Sanskrit words, even the oldest (cf. Whitney, Verb Roots, sub the root vrḥ, and Wackernagel, Altind. Gram., § 161), between b and v, we may provisionally etymologize on our words as though they began with b. Then if we set down *bedhās- ‘fidus, pius,’ it becomes immediately apparent that *bedhās and fidus are etymological cognates, which differ only in their stems, the former being an -es/-os- stem, the latter an -e/-o- stem. However, it must be observed that in AV. xix. 3. 4 the stem vēdha is found in a
variant reading for वैद्या, while in old Latin fidusta (from *fidos-to-) occurs, defined by Paulus as "a fide denominata, ea quae maximae fidei erant," a definition that would lead us to infer an Italic stem *fidos-: cf. also foedus and confoedusti.

The derivation of vedhās here suggested also accounts for vidātham, if etymologically defined by "federation." But vidhāti presents a harder problem. It would not be very well defined by πειθα, but is fairly well matched by Germ. betet, beten and bitten, being, according to many,¹ cognate with πειθα, fidit. But if Kern is right in referring these German words to Skr. bādhate 'premit' (cf. the citation of the footnote), then it might be necessary provisionally to separate vidhāti from vedhās, and rather put it in a group with bādhate. I have tried, however, in Am. Jr. Phil. xxvi. 179 ff., to reunite πειθα and bādhate under the still remoter base bhē(y)-d(h) 'to split' < splice. The semantic questions involved will now justify, I hope, a somewhat more detailed treatment, à propos of the problem presented by vedhās for bedhās.

Beside the root bheidh 'to convince'—though this meaning is far from being primitive—stands a root bheid 'to split.' My thesis is that these roots were originally but one. The variation of aspirate and sonant at the end of roots with nasal infixes is far too common a phenomenon to be called in question, and the nasal inflexion of Lat. findit 'splits,' Skr. bhīnātī, bhīndānti² fulfills the conditions. Further, a nasal inflexion of bheidh seems attested by Alb. bint 'I persuade,' if they are right who connect it with Gr. πειθα.³

If thus on the formal side we may regard bheidh-/ bheid as one root, it remains to bring in accord the figurative meaning of bheidh 'to convince' and the direct sense 'to split' attested for

---

¹ E. g., Osthoff, cited in Uhlenbeck's got. Woert, s. v. bidjan; Brugmann, Grundr. i. § 589; Kluge, Etym. Woert. s.vv.; Skeat's Concise Etym. Dict., s.v. bid.

² It is entirely within the bounds of probability that bheid- 'to split' has been affected by a group-association with the root of Lat. scindit, Skr. chinātī, chindānti.

³ So, among others, Brugmann, in his Grundriss, and Prellwitz, Woert., s.v. πειθα. G. Meyer, Alban. Woert., s.v. bint, derives from bhendh, which is, in my opinion, itself but a derivative of bhē(y)dḥ-; see Am. Jr. Phil. xxvi. 181.
bheid. If we define Lat. fidus by ‘open(ed), frank, sincere, loyal’ we see how it may be cognate with findit ‘splits, opens.’ Similarly we may define the Homeric idiom πείθειν φρένας (θυμόν) των (των) by ‘to open one’s mind, convince,’ comparing our own idiom ‘to open one’s eyes;’ findit and πείθωθε may be rendered by ‘opens (one’s own heart) to (another), trusts.’ The concrete sense of ‘splits’ is perhaps retained in Iliad 15, 26 πειθοῦσα θυλλᾶς, which may also be defined by ‘findens procellas.’ The location μισθός πείθειν ‘to bribe’ is very like the Sanskrit compound dāna-bhinnās ‘bestochen, bribed.’

To Lat. foedus I assign a semantic development somewhat different from that exhibited by fidus ‘true.’ In Sanskrit the ptc. bhinnās means not only ‘split, opened,’ but is defined in the lexicon of Boehltingk by ‘verbünden mit, hängend-, haftend an;’ cf. vi-bhinnās ‘unzertrennlich verbünden mit,’ sambhnattī ‘zusammen bringt, in Berührung bringt, verbündet, vermenget, sich zu jemandem gesellt,’ bhiduras ‘in nahe Berührung treten—sich vermenget, sich vermiscend mit,’ bhittīs ‘a woven mat’ (= Lat. fides ‘strings, a lyre’). With these words Lat. foedus ‘truce, league, compact’ accords in definition and they show that in Sanskrit derivatives, at least, the root bhid- has developed the connotation ‘to join.’ Similar is Eng. splices ‘joins (split rope-ends),’ whose derivation from splits is clear; also, in the language of weavers and rope-makers, Germ. scheren ‘to cut, shear’ has acquired the sense of ‘spannen,’ cf. also Eng. pieces ‘to join <pieces> together.’ The semantic opposition of ‘to split’ and ‘to join’ is only apparent, and comparable with the conflict found in the pair sticks ‘stecht’ and sticks ‘steckt’ (cf. also stitches ‘stecht, stickt;’ and see Kluge’s Woert. s.v. stechen).

But in demonstrating a root bheid(h) ‘to split,’ with the connotation ‘to join,’ the last word has not yet been said for foedus ‘truce.’ Touching foedus, I think of some primitive form of contract by indenture, some breaking of a tessera hospitalis, in which the breaking of the token was the chief symbolic act of

---

1 I share Uhlenbeck’s doubts whether Goth. beidan can be directly connected with Lat. fidit ‘trusts.’ But in view of MHG. stecken ‘to remain fast, stick, bide’ we may connect beidan, Eng. bide directly with bheid(h) to split, pierce.

2 Cf. Fr. résoudre ‘to persuade,’ from Lat. resolvere ‘to open up’ (?).
the treaty-making. Thus do we best account for the idiom ἄρκνα πιετὴ ταμείν ‘foedus ferire, icere, percutere,’ which lends itself to the interpretation “symbola <pactionis> fissificare” rather than to “foederis causa <hostiam> sacrudicare” No doubt, however, the cutting up of the animal sacrificed for distribution among the compact-makers was a part of the ceremonial (cf. Aristophanes, Lysis., 192; ? Vergil, Aen. 8. 641).

Returning now to vedhás ‘fidus,’ I conjecture that its orthography with v for b was primarily due to the association of forms of b(h)eidh ‘to split, pierce’ (cf. Goth. beidan, Eng. hide, Gr. πεσιθοίου, as explained above) with forms of the Sanskrit root vyadh vidh ‘to pierce’ (cf. Lat. di-vidit); or, to put it concretely, I conjecture that *bedhás ‘apertus, aperto <pectore>, ‘fidus’ has been assimilated to viddhás ‘di-visus, apertus;’ though it is of course not to be denied that vedhás, defined by ‘apertus, etc.’ is susceptible to immediate derivation from vidh-yati ‘peirces.’

4. vádhri.

The close kinship of vádhri and its Greek synonym ἰθρᾶς ‘τομᾶς, castratus’ is not to be called in question, despite their phonetic divergence. The phonetic difficulty is resolved by deriving vádhri from the Sk. root vadh ‘to beat, slay,’ and ἰθρᾶς from a base widh-, found in Skr. vidhyati ‘pierces,’ Lat. di-vidit ‘divides,’ and further attested, I believe, in ἱσθμός (from *widhtmos, with -tmos from the root tem), ‘(mare) dividens.’ The parallelism of vádhris (*wádhris) and ἰθρᾶς (widhris) throws light on the Skr. root vyadh (not attested in RV.), which I take to be a blend of the root viddh (with grade forms in vedh) and the root vadh.

5. sprṣáti ‘touches, grasps, feels, besprinkles.’

Uhlenbeck (ai. Woert. s.v.) finds no sure cognates for sprṣáti, but mentions the possibility that Goth. faurhte ‘fearful’ (without s-) is identical with the ptc. sprṣá ‘touched, stirred, moved.’ [Professor Hopkins calls my attention to the fact that sprṣá appears as ṁṛṣṭá in RV. i. 98. 2.] I doubt not, however, that

1 On the close correspondence of Latin and Sanskrit in parts of their vocabulary, see Kretschmer, Einleitung, 125, ff.
Gr. ἐπαράσεως 'tears, rends, mangles; mulcat' is cognate with sprśāti 'touces; mulcet;' cf. Lat. tangit 'mulcet, mulcat.' Goth. faurhts leans to the violent sense of 'mulcat;' as a semantic parallel we may compare Gr. ἔκπλαγης < 'terror-> smitten.'

Wharton (Etyma Latina) sets down spurcus as a cognate of sprśāti, and I believe this to be correct. We may again illustrate by derivatives of tangit, viz., contaminat, contingit 'defiles,' contactus 'defiled; cf. also tangit 'smears.' The German word ferc 'dung' (without s-) perhaps belongs more closely with spurcus. With these we might group Lat. porcus, supposing the pig to have been named (1) 'the dirty creature,' and not (2) 'the rooter' (porca 'furrow'). Still another possibility for porcus is (3) 'spotted, dark,' cf. Skr. pṛśni 'spotted, a cow,' Gr. πέρκος, πέρκνος ('spotted), dark,' πέρκη 'perch' (a dark or spotted fish, cf. our fish-name of "spot"). There is no inconsistency between (1) and (3), 'dirty' and 'spotted' being closely related notions, as Lat. maculosus, e. g., shows. And if porcus meant 'rooter' (2), it may still be a cognate of ἐπαράσεως 'tears, rends.' I see no reason to doubt, either, that pṛśanī, defined by Boehdtingk as "sich anschmieegend, zärtlich" (mulcens) belongs with sprśāti (cf. also Whitney, Roots, Verb-Forms, etc. etc., sub pṛś), cf. upa-prśāti "zärtlich berührt, liebkost." With this group we may classify the cognates of Lat. procus 'suitor,' precatur 'entreats;' presses (a suit, request); laccisit, flagitat.'

6. khudāti 'futuit.'

Uhlenbeck defines khudāti by "stösst hinein (kaprthám, sapam), and (s)khidāti by "reisst, stösst, drückt." No cognate of khudāti seems to have been pointed out. If the long diphthong gradation -ē(y)/-ō(w), already referred to in this paper, is correctly assumed, then khudāti and khidāti go back to a common root (see Am. Jr. Phil. xxvi. 396). So far as signification goes, khudāti would seem but a specialization of khidāti, and we might explain its vocalism as something individual, due, to use the metaphor introduced by Bloomfield (IF. iv. 78), to a blend of khidāti and its synonym tudāti 'stösst, sticht, stachelt.'

1 Eng. entersct. derives from Lat. tractat 'handles;' cf. further, Goth. bidjan: Skr. bâdhate 'premit' (supra, p. 412).
2 But now cf. Prellwitz, Woert. s.v. κόθος; I would derive κόθος from khudhtos, Lat. cunnus from khudhmos or khudnos: base khud(h).
But the infection of khidáti by tudáti may as well have begun in the primitive period as in the separate life of Sanskrit. Uhlenbeck remarks s.v. khidáti, "verwandtschaft mit chinátti is nicht undenkbar." In Latin both (per-)scindere (= chinátti) and per-tundere occur in the special sense of khudáti, 1 the former in Priap. 15. §, 54, 77. 13, and the latter in Catullus 32. 11. If scindit and tundit thus cross meanings in Latin, we have some confirmation of the supposed association of ideas that changed khidáti to khudáti under the influence of tudáti.

If Lat. códit 'strikes, beats' corresponds with Skr. khudáti 'stössst hinein,' the recognition of the Italic cognate would forbid us to regard khudáti as khidáti inflected by tudáti. It would not forbid us to suspect that primitive khudéti is khidéti, with the vowel color of tudéti, though we should be bound to admit three roots meaning 'to strike, thrust, pierce, split,' whose weakest forms are; 1) (s)khid1, 2) (s)khud, 3) (s)tud, (cf. Uhlenbeck, op. cit., s. v., tomáras). The derivation of (2) from (1), inflected in its vowel color by (3), is purely glottogonic; not in any case a phonetic question, but rather a psychological question. Provisionally, leaving out the possibility that khudáti is cognate with Lat. códit ( : Germ. hauen, cf. Brugmann, Grund. 1 2 § 639), we may include khudáti/khidáti among cases like those pointed out by Bloomfield in the essay referred to. Ultimately, perhaps, a psychological treatment of the vowel alternation in the spirit of Wundt's Die Sprache (I', p. 335 ff.) may be arrived at.

7. Skr. ámbaram.

Uhlenbeck asserts that no satisfactory explanation has been advanced for ámbaram, but it seems to me that an easy one lies at hand. The meanings we have to account for are (1) ambitus, vicinia, (2) amictus. It is phonetically allowable to connect amb- with áμφι, Lat. ambi-, cf. Skr. ámbu / ámbhas 'water' for the variation b / bh after nasals. By this explanation ámbaram (subst.) is morphologically comparable with ávara-

---

1 Cf. Gr. κροβες, which occurs in the same special sense.
2 Strong form (s)khyéd (: Lith. skédziu, Lat. caedit, see Hirt, Ablaut. 67) : cf. Amphitrueo, 159, quasi incudem caedant, where incudem caedant partakes of the nature of the etymological figure, as does the commoner locution incudem tundere.
'lower,' ámbara- 'further' (adj.): ámbara- means 'the surrounding.' For the sense 'amictus,' note the "roundabout" of the sailor, and the style of cloak called "circular." Compare too Sanskrit vásah paridhánam.

8. Pratícēḥ in RV. iv. 3. 2d (B1).

Agni is summoned in this stanza to a fire kindling. The general purport is clear, but there is a verbal difficulty in the last pāda,

imā u te svapāka pratícēḥ,

to wit, as to what substantive is to be supplied with pratícēḥ. Sāyaṇa supplies 'flames' or 'hymns,' Ludwig 'gentes' or 'cives' or even the 'ladies of the sacrifice,' and Grassmann supplies 'libations,' while Griffith follows Sāyaṇa. In support of the native interpretation I cite vii. 39. 1b (A)

pratícē jūrnīr devātātim eti,

"The toward flame goes to the godhead."

Here the situation is that the fire has been kindled and the flames ascend. In iv. 3. 2, Agni is invited to come and kindle the fire and the 'toward <flames>' are the 'expectant flames' unless, instead of jūrnāyāḥ, we supply samidhāh 'kindlings, faggots.' As to svapāka, Ludwig's 'selbst garei' suggests to me 'self-cooker, self-kindler.'
Notes on the Mṛcchakaṭīka.—By Dr. Arthur W. Ryder, The University of California, Berkeley, Cal.

The following notes serve as a supplement to my translation* of the Mṛcchakaṭīka, recently published as Volume ix of the Harvard Oriental Series.

The method of citation here adopted is a slight modification of that explained on pages xv-xvi of the edition and translation of the Karpūramaṇṭi, Volume iv of the Harvard Oriental Series. The verses are cited by the act and the number of the individual verse within the act. The citation for prose gives the number of the act, the number of the last preceding verse, and the number of the prose speech counted from the last preceding verse. The following abbreviations require explanation:


Poona, 1890.


St. Petersburg, 1877.

Calcutta commentary. The commentary of Śrīrāmamayaśarman, found in the Calcutta edition of 1870. This commentary I have been obliged to take at second hand.


HOS. Harvard Oriental Series.


LD. The commentary of Lallādīkṣīta, as given in Godabole’s edition.


P. The commentary of Prthvīdhara, as given in Parab’s edition.

---


It is greatly to be regretted that we have, no old and full commentary on the Mṛchakaṭika. The only comment which may be earlier than the nineteenth century is the meager gloss of Prthvīdhara, who gives us no information about his date; it is interesting to note (see Parab, 37. 25) that he knew the Brhadatkāṭa. But Prthvīdhara builds upon previous commentators; he refers to a prācīnāṭikā (e. g. 40. 28), to ke cit (e. g. 7. 25), to eke and apare (e. g. 26. 25–26). Unless this previous exegesis should come to light, we must remain in doubt about many points, especially in the Prākrit of Saṁsthānaka and the Cāṇḍālas. Yet, even so, the Mṛchakaṭi is one of the easier of the works of the classical Sanskrit literature. Śūdraka’s vocabulary is not very large, his sentence-structure is simple, and his thought is rarely involved or difficult. Inasmuch as the action of the play continues for only five or six days, the author does not use the Viṣkambha or the Praveśaka.

In HOS. ix, p. xix, I have called attention to the fact that Śūdraka does not slavishly follow the canons of dramaturgy as laid down in the technical works which we possess. It is worth while in this place to give examples proving that his grammar also conforms less closely to the norm than that of Bhavabhūti, for example.

(a) In i. 14, under stress of meter, he uses nīdhanatā in the sense of nīrūdhana. JV. warns us that we must pardon the

---

1 See HOS. ix, pp. xxvi–xxix. There is nothing to show whether the action of the tenth act occurs on the same day as that of the ninth act. Windisch, Berichte der philol.-histor. Classe der Königl. Sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften 1886, pp. 474–479, allows only four days for the action of the play. But the speech of Viraka, ix. 23, shows that a night had passed between the strangling of Vasantanā (Act viii) and the trial (Act ix).
blemish, because Śūdraka is a great poet: nidhanasabdho marāṇe
raudhāh, atra tu dhānasānyatve prayuktatvat prasiddhivirodhā-
khyaodosah sōdhavyah, mahākaviṣpranītatvād iti bodhyam. Cf.
Hit. i. 138 (134), where this verse reappears with variants but
with nidhanatā. In i. 37, nirdhanatā is used.
(b) In i. 32, he uses the causative form nāmyati. This does
not prevent his use of the normal nāmayati in prose, at viii. 46*.
Compare the causative form unnamya, used by Bhavabhūti in
Mālatimādhava, ix. 31.
(c) iii. 18*. The masculine singular desakālaḥ is curious;
we should expect either desakālau or desakālam.
(d) v. 30. Here it is hard to parse yadvaṭ, though the
meaning is plain enough. But this case is complicated by the
reading of the second line; see the note on this verse, below.
(e) vii. 4. sa tāvaḍ asmād vyasanāryavottthitam. If this
reading is correct, we have the ablative asmāt agreeing with
the prior member of the compound. Compare, in vii. 8, the
curious use of asmin without a noun: so etasmin in Ratnāvalī,
i. 19.
(f) viii. 38. The use of āśraya as a feminine is, so far as I
can find, elsewhere unparalleled.
(g) x. 27. The phrase dūṣitaṁ yasaḥ is logically coordi-
nate with maraṇat, and should therefore be in the ablative.
Such instances might be multiplied. In the structure of his
verse, also, Śūdraka permits himself some libertics. Instances
in point are i. 30, where the third pāda is in a different meter
from the rest; iii. 7 (fourth pāda); iv. 17 (second pāda). Lévi
has shown (pp. 206–208) in a masterly fashion that such con-
siderations have little value for the dating of the play; but they
are of real importance in the exegesis of cases less certain than
those given.

Act i.

i. 1. It is of negative interest to observe that Śūdraka’s
Nāndi invokes the favor of Śiva. Of course, this is the case
with the great majority of the plays whose authors are without
sectarian bias, and regard their works as pieces of literature
without didactic purpose. The sequence of thought in the
first three lines is rigid. Line 1 suggests the physical means
employed by Śiva to plunge himself into trance; line 2, the con-
sequent numbing of the organs of sense; line 3, the resultant insight into things as they are.

In line 4, the long compound sūnyekṣaṇaghaṭita layabrhamalaganaḥ is not wholly simple. The commentators and translators differ widely in their interpretations. It seems to me that the Calcutta commentary offers the best explanation: sūnyam, prapañcābhāvāḥ: tasya yad ikṣaṇaṁ darsanaṁ tena ghatito jāto yo layaś cittākāgratā tatpravaṇatāviseśo vā, etc. The line may then be literally translated: "May the meditation of Sāmbhu protect you, which is fixed on the supreme being with an intensity sprung from his insight into the emptiness of the material world."

i. 4. The information here given about the life of Śūdraka is tantalizingly imperfect. P. tells us that the phrase agnim praviṣṭaḥ means that he made a sacrifice of his body in the fire, as did the old sage Śarabhaṅga: see Rāmāyaṇa (Bombay ed.) iii. 5. 38, pravivaśa hutāśanam or Raghuvāṇa, xiii. 45, ciraya saṁtarpya samīdhir agniṁ yo mantrapūtan tanum apī ahaṁṣit. Similar phrases are used in the Mudrārākṣasa, where Viṣṇudāsa is reported to be burning himself alive from grief at the loss of his friend Candanaḍā: vi. 151 jalaṇaṁ pavesidukāmo; vi. 152 agnipraveśe; vi. 161 hutabhuji pravesahetuḥ; vi. 171 jalaṇaṁ paviśāmi.

i. 7. See note on iii. 30, below.

i. 81. For the expression añamaṁ jīloam pekkhāmi compare Nāgānanda iv. 132: putta ahaṁ kkuh tujjha maraṇabhādī savvāṁ pi jīloam garuḍamaṁ pekkhāmi.

i. 82. This speech is interesting in showing how the meaning 'cut' may have come to attach itself to the causative of klp. Kappijjantaṁ plainly signifies here 'cut to pieces, killed,' in its application to Jūrnāvṛddha; but it also means 'arranged' as applied to the young bride's hair. Both meanings are included in the English 'fix.' The secondary meaning of 'fix' in such slang phrases as "I'll fix him," is quite like the secondary meaning of kalpayati. This explanation seems more natural than that of the PW.1 The word is used in the sense of 'cut' again in i. 30 and in iii. 21b4.

---

1 For a parallel in the development of meaning, compare sūd (arrange, 'fix,' kill). En]
i. 12. The phrase dāsīe. puttā atthakallavattā has been, I think, quite misinterpreted by the translators. Wilson has: "The sons of slaves! your guest is ever ready to make a morning meal of a fortune." Regnaud: "Ah les fils d’esclaves! Ils font un déjeuner de votre bien." Böhtlingk: "Diese Söhne von Schläfern mit ihrem Bischen Gelder." These translations assume that arthakalyavarta is a bahuvrīhi: 'whose breakfast is money;' but the same word in ix. 22 must mean 'a trifle of money': compare strīkalyavarta in its Prākrit form in iv. 5, 'a mere trifle, namely a woman;' at ii. 12 b 13 the word kalayavarta also means a 'trifle.' These translations also miss the point of khajjanti; it is not supposed guests, but the money itself, which makes itself at home only where it isn't used for food (khajjanti), like the cattle-boys who stay only where they are not eaten up (khajjanti) by wasps. The correct interpretation is found in JV., who says: dāsyāḥ putrā ity anena caī śām (i. e. arthānām) atihetvā sūcitā. In other words, dāsyāḥ putrāḥ is merely a humorous epithet of arthakalyavarta: 'this damned money-trifle.' The phrase dāsyāḥ putrāḥ is in Prākrit not infrequently applied to things, with the same illogical humor found in the corresponding use of 'confounded' or 'damned' in English. Compare also "You son-of-a-gun of a fool" (confounded fool). In iii. 6 it is applied to the gem-casket; in v. 47, to the storm. In Śāk. vi. 20 (Pischel) and in Nāgānanda iii. 2, it is applied to bees. It will be noticed that in all these cases the phrase is used by the Vidūsaka.

i. 14. This verse reappears as Hitopadesa i. 134 (Godabole and Parab) with the following variants: line 1, sattvāt paribhraṣyate for prabhraṣyate tejasāḥ; line 2, niḥsattvāḥ for niste-jāḥ; line 3, sōkanihataḥ for sōkaplihitāḥ.

i. 15. The phrase vāiram aparam means 'another (form of) hostility (with mankind)'; the figure is striking. In the second line svajanajana- must mean 'kinsmen and strangers,' as the commentators say. The ca in the third line is difficult: P. and LD. say cačāro hetāu; Böhtlingk and Regnaud adopt this suggestion. But this meaning for ca can hardly be found elsewhere; is it not better to understand it in the sense of 'if' (cet)? Then the line means: "(it is the part of) wisdom to go into the forest if (ca) there is (bhavati) contempt from his wife."

i. 22. Śūdraka uses viṣeṣayati in the meaning of 'surpass' again at iv. 4.
i. 23. It cannot be doubted that Saṁsthānaka’s arithmetic is at fault here; the ‘ten names’ are really eleven, and are not to be reduced by combination; daśe ’ti vyartham, says P. tersely.

i. 30*. With the expression na puṣpaṃoṣam arhaṭy udyāna-latā, compare iv. 6: no muṣṭśāmy abalām vibhūṣaṅvatām phul-lām ivā ’haṁ latām.

i. 30*. The phrase śavāmi bhāvaśa śīṣām attaṅakehiṁ pāde-him is repeated almost exactly at viii. 37*. In spite of the differences in case, it can hardly be doubted that Saṁsthānaka means ‘I swear by the gentleman’s head and by my own feet,’ not k . . . schwöre ich . . . mit meinen Füssen beim Haupte dieses klingen Herrn,’ as Böhtlingk translates.

i. 31. The last line is repeated at viii. 17*.

i. 32. For the form nāmyati see above, page 420. [It may be due to confusion with -am roots of the ya-class (tāmyati, etc.). The middle (passive) nāmyate also suggests the form.

—Ep.]

i. 32*. One of the subtlest points in the character of the ignorant and conceited Saṁsthānaka is the fact that he permits the Viṣṇu to apply to him repeatedly the drastic epithet kāṇelimātrā, apparently never realizing the gross insult.

i. 34. Quoted in Daṇḍin’s Kāvyādarśa, ii. 226, 362.

i. 34*. It seems as if the grammar would be better if bhūṣaṅsaṁdham and mālyagandham were in the nominative.

i. 41. The initial esā ’śi harks back, with humorous effect, to the esā ’śi of the preceding verse.

i. 45. Parab’s nirmitāḥ is apparently a mere misprint for nīrjītāḥ.

i. 46. For the form śuṣkavān, see Pāṇ. viii. 2. 51.

i. 50*. The word kākapadaśīśamaśtaka, which Saṁsthānaka applies to Mātreyya again at ix. 30* receives two explanations from the commentators. It is said to mean either (1) chief of the princes of sharpers, or (2) whose head-pate is like a caret. The first explanation seems forced and unnatural, the second quite in keeping with Saṁsthānaka’s character; śīśamaśtakā iti śākāravāṅitvena punaruktatvaṁ na doṣaḥ (P.).

i. 50*”. This speech (repeated at i. 55*) contains, so far as I know, the only reference to a female stage-manager (śūtradhārī). For a word like tāṇḍavasūtradhārī (comm. nartane kuśalā) in Cāurapañcāśikā 7 is obviously without bearing on the history of
the drama in India. The expression in our passage cannot be used as direct evidence, since it may be nothing more than another absurdity of Sāṁsthānaka's.

i. 51. The words līṣe a vele have received a double Sanskritization from the commentators; either as līṇāyāṁ sa velāyāṁ, or as ṛṇāṁ ca vaiśram. The sense which Böhtlingk and Regnauud extract from the second interpretation is excellent: "a pumpkin stalk . . . , debts, and enmity never rot"; but the construction is very strange, with a string of nominatives followed by na khalu bhavati pūthiḥ. Unless we are willing to take the ungrammatical and illogical form of statement as a part of Sāṁsthānaka's dialect, we are forced to adopt the first explanation: "a pumpkin-stalk . . . do not rot, even when a long time has passed" (JV.: velāyāṁ samaye līṇāyāṁ atītāyāṁ api).

i. 52. What does nirvālkalam mean as applied to a sword? It seems to me that the word is used in an extravagant sense; the sword is barkless, i. e., it has no time to gather mould, it is always busy. JV. suggests that it means 'out of its sheath' (vālkālaṁ tarutavak, lākṣaṇāyā tannirmitāṁ kośam, tasmān nir-gatam; niśkośam ity arthaḥ). This seems quite out of accord with kośasuptam in the next line; but perhaps, after all, Sāṁsthānaka would speak of a 'naked' sword as one 'ungarmented,' and if so, the immediate contradiction of kośasuptam would be but another absurdity of the speaker. Sāṁsthānaka seems interested in radishes; cf. viii. 3'.

i. 52'. Böhtlingk supplies rohasenam as object of praṃṇoti; but there is no indication of Rohasena's actual presence, nor is there any reason why she should do this apavāritakena. Surely, we have to supply ātmānam, as in the common stage-direction apavārya: she wraps herself in the mantle, without letting Cārudatta see. Indeed, Böhtlingk supplies ātmānam with praṃṇoti below at ii. 20'.

i. 56. The phrase bhāgyakṛtāṁ daśāṁ probably refers to Cārudatta's poverty, not to Vasantasena's profession, as Böhtlingk takes it. Cārudatta deplores, almost too frequently, his plight, but he does not often refer to the fact that Vasantasena is a courtezan. Besides, this fact surely would not prevent her from entering the house. The two concluding lines are difficult. They seem to mean: "and because of her acquaintance
with men, she does not speak impudently, even though she speaks many things.” But Vasantasenā has not spoken a word aloud since her entry into the house; so that perhaps we have to understand ‘a man’ as subject of bhāṣate. This seems to be Wilson’s understanding of the verse; he renders:

“Nor makes she harsh reply, but silent leaves
The man she scorns, to waste his idle words.”

i. 56’. The sense seems to require at the end the phrase utthēdha tti which is found in Stenzler and Godabole, but is lacking in Parab and JV.

i. 57. The striking expression timiranikara, ‘multitudinous darkness,’ is used again by Bhavabhūti at Māl. viii. 1. Nikara, ‘heap,’ corresponds exactly to the negro use of heap, in ‘heap dark,’ etc.

Act ii.

ii. 0’. The verb ālikh is explained by LD. as meaning ‘to yearn’ (abhilaṣ); Regnaud and Böhtlingk follow this explanation, the former reading kaṁ pi, the latter, kim pi. Perhaps the verb, in combination with hṛdayena, does acquire this meaning; but it seems more natural to take it in its ordinary meaning of ‘draw, paint’: “she is painting something (or ‘somebody,’ if we read kaṁ pi) with her whole heart.” The something is, of course, a picture of Cārudatta, perhaps the one which she is gazing at in iv. 0’. A lovelorn heroine in Indian drama has no more familiar occupation than painting the picture of her beloved.

ii. 0”. The text is doubtful; my translation simply attempts to make the best of Parab’s text, but the result is not wholly satisfactory. The reading which JV. offers deserves consideration: ko kkhu nāma ajja attabhodhī anugahido mahāsave taruṇajaṇo—What young person now receives my mistress’ favor in the great festival (of her joy; mahān utsava ānandasvarūpas tasmin)?

ii. 2’. We may read devī bhaviśṣaṁ as two words ‘I will turn goddess,’ or devībhaviśṣāṁ as one word, ‘I will turn god.’ The situation is reproduced in Kipling’s Krishna Mulvaney.

ii. 4’. Parab’s reading krīḍataḥ seems inferior to krīḍatah of Stenzler and Godabole, and seems to have no Ms. authority.
ii. 6th. The chāyā should read dhūrtye instead of dhūrtayāmi.

ii. 9. In Parab’s text, tretāśrītasārvasvāḥ should be printed as one word.

ii. 10th. In this speech and in ii. 11th the word tapasvī seems to be used in a double sense; on the one hand it means ‘poor, unfortunate (varāka)’ and on the other hand, ‘saint.’ The second meaning is made almost certain by the fact that each of these speeches is followed by a verse describing ascetic practices. Then ayaṁ tapasvī, like ayam janaḥ, will refer to the speaker, not to Māthura, as LD. and the translators understand, and the little speech will mean: “and yet, what more should a poor saint like me do? for I, etc.” This is the view which JV. presents: tapasvī varāko nirīdoṣo 'kṣama iti vā: ayam ity ātmanirdeśo dādurakāḥ kiṁ kariṣyati karotv ity arthaḥ.

ii. 13th (just before ii. 14). The word tulidaṁ is difficult; probably it means ‘proportioned (to her innocence),’ as the same word in ii. 14 means ‘proportioned (to his strength).’

ii. 14th. Godabole’s suggestion that lakkhidaṁ mhi represents in Sanskrit rakṣito ‘smi is worthy of consideration.

ii. 14th. Read kaṁ for the kiṁ of Parab’s text.

ii. 14th (just before ii. 15). The phrase kudo so dhanio is intentionally ambiguous. On the one hand, it means: “Where is your creditor (i.e. Māthura)?” On the other hand, it means: “How can he (Cārudatta) be a rich man?” The shampooer is shrewd enough to see that it is the hidden meaning which really interests Vasantasena, and answers accordingly.

ii. 15. Both the meter and the interpretation offer difficulties. On the meter, see Stenzler, pp. 257–258. The meaning of lines 3 and 4 depends on the presence or absence of na, given in Parab’s text and assumed as present by P., but having very little Ms. support. If na be kept, then we must, with P., assume that the last line contains a rhetorical question; and so I have translated. But I confess that the latter half of the verse puzzles me greatly.

ii. 16th. The reading naṁ is preferable to Stenzler’s na, and has more Ms. authority.

ii. 16th. Here Parab’s reading seems inferior to the ajjo bandhuvāṁ samassāsidūn of Stenzler and Godabole.

ii. 16th. The phrase is one of exaggerated courtesy: “mistress, if it may be, then let this art remain in the hands of a
servant (of yours)," that is to say, "take me into your service." Regnauad translates: "... permettez-moi d'exercer mon art à votre service," which renders the idea freely; but Böhtlingk seems to me to miss the point with his translation: "... ge-statte, dass ich diese meine Kunst den Händen deiner Diener-schaft anvertraue." JV. is very clear: parijanahastagata pari-janasya posyajanasya mame 'ti bhāvaḥ ... sevakatvena mām anumanyasve 'ti bhāvaḥ.

ii. 17. Doubtless Stenzler is right in printing bhaccahaṁ (bibhatsam). It is hard to see how vihaftaṁ could represent a Sanskrit vihastam, and the efforts of the commentators to explain the latter word are far from satisfactory.

ii. 18. The edi (eti) of the other texts seems preferable to Parab's ehi.

ii. 19. Parab's tac ca seems inferior to the taṁ ca of Stenz-
ler and Godabole.

ii. 19'. The phrase vāmacalanena jūdalkkhaṁ ughusia ughusia has caused commentators and translators considerable difficulty. It is plain from the word dyūtakkhaka that the monk is none other than the shampooer; this much P. has seen. The word lekhaka is used in ii. 2, where it plainly has the meaning 'a (gambling) score.' Stenzler's chāyā is right, I think, in taking ughusia as the representative of udghṛṣya rather than of udghusya. The phrase then becomes simple enough: "stumbling with my left foot over a gambler's score." The suddenly metamorphosized shampooer has forgotten to rid himself of his gambling paraphernalia, which he drops when attacked by the elephant.

ii. 20. The custom of marking a garment with the owner's name is referred to again in viii. 43'.

Act iii.

iii. 2. For Parab's annapasattakalatte we have another reading anṇakalattapaṣaṭte. Either gives a good sense.

iii. 3. LD. suggests that priyatamā virahāturāṇām may be taken as one word: 'of those sick because of separation from the beloved.'

iii. 8'. The svapitaḥ of Stenzler and Godabole is better than the svapiti of Parab and JV.

iii. 12. P. and LD. explain darśanāntaragata as meaning
'found in the treatises on robbery,' and this, I think, is correct: cf. darśitaḥ in iii. 12'. Regnaud also follows the commentators on this point.

iii. 13. The commentators take viśīrtmaṇa as a separate form of breach, and so obtain seven forms in all, according to the passage from the Cāurādāraśāna which they quote. This is a point on which it is best to follow their authority, but Böhltingk (p. 190) states the objections.

iii. 14. Regnaud and Böhltingk take viṣāmāsu in the sense of 'difficult'; but I think LD. is right in giving it the meaning 'unsuccessful' (viparītāsu). The epithet then anticipates and explains the doṣānu of the fourth line.

iii. 16'. The words cikitsām kṛtvā are better taken as part of the text, not of the stage-direction.

iii. 17'. Parab's na in the phrase kva na khalu salilam bhāviṣyatī is apparently a mere misprint for nu.

iii. 18'. It seems to me that the translators miss the point in tan mamā 'pi nāma śarvilakasya bhūmiṣṭham dravyam when they interpret: "whatever is underground is my property" (Wilson). Does not the speaker rather mean: "well, the property belonging to me too, to Śarvilaka, is underground," that is, "I have no property?" If this is correct, the clause is merely a humorous afterthought to the preceding sentence.

iii. 18'. Apparently Parab's kim na is a misprint for kim nu.

iii. 18'. On desakālaḥ, see above, p. 420. The construction of dhikṛtam andhakāram (bīs) is quite unclear to me; the translators take dhik kṛtam as two words: 'fie on the made darkness.' This construction seems very forced and awkward, but I can offer nothing better. I think, however, that a mark of punctuation should precede bhadrapiṇḍena: 'fie on the darkness caused by the bhadrapiṇḍa; or rather, fie on the darkness caused by me,' etc. The reading asmaṣṭrāḥmaṇakule of Stenzler and Godabole seems better than the -kulena of Parab and JV.

iii. 19. The word anirveditapāuruṇam is very curious; we should expect anivedita-, 'to which manliness is unknown,' and this is what JV. reads. Perhaps we have to parallel this form with nidhanatā for nirdhanatā in i. 14 (see above, p. 419), but the meter does not demand the form anirvedita- here.

iii. 20. Read in Parab's text vāg desa-.
iii. 21\textsuperscript{a}. It is strange that Māitreyā should quote the words dudiaṁ via duāraṁ ugghaḍidaṁ, when Radanikā has not used the expression in what precedes.

iii. 24. This verse is repeated as v. 43.

iii. 26\textsuperscript{a}. The sentence beginning bhaavaṁ kaanta is repeated almost literally at vi. 0\textsuperscript{a}, this latter time in Vasantasaṁ's mouth.

iii. 29. This verse is repeated as v. 7.

iii. 29\textsuperscript{b}. With asmac harātrasprśtikā (a gesture of solemn asseveration). cf. the expression mārjāro bhūmiṁ spṛṣṭvā karṇāṁ spṛṣṭati in the fable of the cat and the vulture in the first book of the Hitopadesa. JV. has: gātrasaṁsparsena śapatakaraṇaṁ lāukikaprasiddham eva.

iii. 30. In the second half of this verse the words na yasya rakṣāṁ are difficult of interpretation. This difficulty doubtless explains the presence of the variant nṛpasya rakṣān, which Stenzler adopts. This latter reading gives a good sense, and forms the basis of the translations of Regnaud and Böhtlingk. But the large majority of the Mss. have na yasya rakṣān; and as this is the lectio difficilior, we are bound to make what we can of it. It is easy to see how na yasya rakṣāṁ might be altered by a puzzled reader into nṛpasya rakṣān, while the reverse process is almost inconceivable. The commentators give little help. P.' and LD. are silent. JV. has: yasya sandhe rakṣāṁ na pariharāmi na tyajāmi satatam eva sandhiṁ rakṣāṁi 'ty arthaḥ. This reads almost like nonsense, for it makes the second half of the verse contradict the first half; the last thing which Cārudatta desires is the preservation of the breach. The Calcutta commentary is hardly more successful; yasya sandhe rakṣāṁ rakṣāṇaṁ svarūpenā 'vasthānam iti yāvat: na pariharāmi no 'pekṣe sandhiṁ rakṣitaṁ na śaknomi 'ty arthaḥ. Here the explanation of rakṣāṁ as "the preservation (of the breach) in its present form" is ingenious enough; but the commentator is forced to give to na pariharāmi a meaning exactly the reverse of that which the phrase should have. Surely na (sandheḥ) rakṣāṁ pariharāmi must needs mean: "I do not avoid the preservation (of the breach) in its present form," which is precisely the opposite of what the speaker wishes to say. Wilson translates as if the na were absent: "we'll leave no trace to catch the idle censure of men's tongues." The translation of Wilson and the brave attempt of the Calcutta commentary point the
way, I think, to the solution of the difficulty. Obviously, the trouble lies in the na. The clause becomes plain enough if we read nayasya, which involves no change in the Ms. reading. The verse may then be translated: "Quickly close up the breach with these bricks; I avoid the preservation of justice, because of the abundant evil of scandal." The word naya occurs once more in the play, in i. 7: nayapracāraṁ vyavahāra-duṣṭatām. In this passage the words naya and vyavahāra are used, it seems to me, with a slight double entendre. The line means, on the one hand, "the practice of legal justice, and the vicious quality of a legal process," as illustrated in the ninth act of the play, and, on the other hand, "the practice of justice (referring to Čāruḍatta) and viciousness of conduct (referring to Saṁsthānaka)." This affords a further suggestion for iiii. 30. Čāruḍatta means to say: "I am willing, under the circumstances, to thwart the law," and perhaps he wishes his auditors to understand nothing more than this; but to himself he means to say: "Scandal is such a dreadful evil that I am justified in departing from the course of conduct which strict justice demands." The word naya, with its more specific and its more general meaning, like "justice" in English, is admirably adapted to express both the artha and the bhāva, the superficial and the deeper meaning.

**Act iv.**

iv. 1. We should surely read rakṣān instead of rakṣyān.

iv. 3. The second line is explained by iii. 12; it was unlucky for a thief to see a woman during his expeditions. JV. remarks that the cāuraśāstra forbids a thief to enter such a house as that here described.

iv. 7r. Delete the mark of punctuation after alaṁkārao in Parab and Godabole.

iv. 7r. Stenzler is right in printing the iti as part of the stage-direction.

iv. 14. The slight illogicality in the singular -sumanāḥ is doubtless owing simply to the stress of meter, and is not worth the trouble which the commentators give themselves to explain it.

iv. 17. The meter is irregular (12. 11: 12.12).
iv. 20. In the third line, vā has more authority than ca, and is probably the correct reading; it seems to be used in the sense of eva (JV. has vā avadhrāne).

iv. 24. JV. takes rāṣṭriya to mean chief-of-police (rāṣṭr-pālāḥ: nagarakrākṣāyāṁ niyutko rājaipuruṣa ity arthah), rather than brother-in-law of the king; and I think he is right, for Saṅsthānaka nowhere appears as a government officer, giving sensible orders in Sanskrit. On the other hand, rāṣṭriya is used at ix. 384 and x. 514 in the meaning ‘brother-in-law of the king.’ As Bōhtlingk remarks (p. 192), we should have an iti at the end of the speech.

iv. 255. This is the only indication in the play that Śarvilaka is the son of Rehhila.

iv. 27. There seems to be a pun on puspaka, and I have translated accordingly. The reading ṇaṇaṇārī is better than Parab’s ṇaṇaṇārī.

iv. 27. The pompous language of this description of the portal makes one wonder whether it is not an intentional travesty. In the long compound beginning with toraṇa-, JV. explains -vedā- as ‘pedestals’ (talasthābadhāḥapradeśāh).

iv. 27. There is doubt about the form and meaning of kūraccuatellamissām. If the second element represents Sanskrit -cyuta-, perhaps it means ‘drippings.’ P. has bhaktatāilaghrātamiśrapinḍam; but JV. analyses quite differently: kūrād davyaviserēc cyutam nīṣṭhyūtaṁ yat tālaṁ tena míśraṁ yuκ-tam. The word kūra is used again in x. 29.

iv. 27. If sāhīna- really belongs here (it is lacking in many Mss.), it probably means ‘own’; the whole word will then mean ‘possessed of its own dice, made out of gems.’ Read paribbhamanti in Parab.

iv. 27. Here pagidāo must be used in an active sense, ‘singing’ (prakarṣaṇa gānāparā ity arthah: JV.). Sasiṅgārao (saṣṭṭgāraḥ) is impossible; we must read either sasiṅgārao (fem. plu.) or sasiṅgāraaṁ.

iv. 28. On the tame madanasārikā, see HOS. iv, page 229, note 8. To pesianti LD. supplies yoddhum, ‘are provoked to fight.’ In Parab’s text, pāṇḍikīdā is a misprint for pīṇḍikīdā.

iv. 29. This passage (mā dāva . . . loassa) is printed by Stenzler, Godabole, and JV. as prose; only Parab regards it as a verse. The matter is of a sort which the Vidūṣaka would be
apt to put into verse; it is not narration nor description, but a kind of humorous moralizing. If we regard the passage as verse, it falls into five pādas, the scheme of which is 12, 17: 13, 14, 15. Now if we disregard the fifth pāda, and apply the rule pādāntasthaṁ vikalpena (Śrutabodha 2) or vā pādānte (Vṛttaratnakara, i. 9), we obtain the scheme 12, 18: 12, 14, which makes a pretty fair āryā; and it seems to me that Parab is right in assuming that the Vidūṣaka speaks here in verse. But what becomes of the words anāhigamaṇio loassa? It is of course possible that they were intended by Śūdraka as a prose remark following the verse; but this is improbable. The words add nothing to the sense of the passage; they are merely an explanation of the comparison of Vasantasenā’s brother with a graveyard champak. Is it not probable that these words were originally a gloss? It would be natural for a reader to add the marginal comment anābhigamanīyo lokasya; the next scribe might easily incorporate the remark into the text, and the easy change into Prākrit would naturally follow. We have an interesting parallel in vi. 20. Here Cāndanaaka, after his Prākrit speech, adds in Sanskrit: kiṁ śabdavicāraḥ: strīpunnanuprāṣaka-vyākhyānam aprastutam. “Why consider the words? An exposition of feminine, masculine, and neuter is irrelevant.” Although all the Mss. give this matter, it is rendered very suspicious by the unmotivated change into Sanskrit, and has all the appearance of being a gloss. Parab omits it; and JV., omitting it in the text, gives it as a part of his comment. I think there can hardly be a doubt that JV. has correctly preserved the original division between text and comment; and if this is true, it seems probable that the same process has taken place in iv. 29, with the added step of changing the isolated Sanskrit words into Prākrit.

iv. 29. The commentators take phullapāvāraa- to mean ‘a garment embroidered with flowers;’ and in view of the variant pūpphapāvāraa-, this is perhaps to be preferred to the meaning ‘expanded, baggy.’

iv. 29. The correct reading of the word which Parab gives in the form kavaṭṭhadāṁśe is doubtful; and P.’s interpretation of kavaṭṭha- as = kapardaka does not help. We can hardly do better than read karaṭṭa- and adopt the explanation ‘dirty.’

iv. 30. Read in Parab’s text accharia- (āścarya-) for accharīdi-, and write rovidā aṇeapādavā as two words.
iv. 32. As soon as the conversation becomes familiar, Vasantasena reverts to Prākrit.

**Act v.**

v. 2. The compound in the first line is thus analyzed by LD. and JV.: jalārdramahīśasyo ’daram bhrīgaś ca tadvan nilāḥ.

v. 5. To the word patrachedya (cf. chedya ‘engraved’) the commentators unite in giving the conventional (rūdha) meaning ‘picture,’ and we can hardly doubt that they are right, as patra is used in the same way with other words implying marking upon a (leaf) plate.

v. 6. In the second line, vā = iva. In the third line adhvānam means ‘road’ in reference to Yudhiṣṭhira, but ‘silence’ (a-dhvāna) in reference to the kokila.

v. 7. This verse is the same as iii. 29.

v. 7. LD. has an artificial explanation of the last clause, according to which duṣṭāḥ = doṣāḥ, and the whole is to be taken as ironical. The translators seem to follow his lead. Böhtlingk, however, points out (p. 196) that duṣṭāḥ should be neuter, if this explanation is right. But a simple, literal translation gives better sense and better humor: “there even rogues are not born,” i. e. a courtezan, an elephant, etc., make it impossible for anything, even a rascal, to flourish. This is also JV.’s understanding of the passage: duṣṭāḥ sadośā api janā na jāyante na tīṣṭhantī ’ty arthaḥ: doṣātirekasyā ’vaśyambhāvād iti bhāvah.

v. 9. In kāmo vāmo, the Vidūṣaka makes use of his third homely prose proverb in this scene. This is one of the touches which make Māitrēya a living character, very different from the stock Vidūṣaka.

v. 9. Stenzler and JV. are wrong in rendering avedha by apeta (= apagacchata). Of course, it represents aveta, ‘understand.’

v. 11. This little scene is imitated by Harṣa in the Ratnāvali, ii. 6.

v. 11. We would welcome an a (ca) after andhaāre. But compare duddināndhaāre in v. 38.

v. 11. The verb kākāasi shows pretty plainly that indama-hakāmuko here means ‘a crow’ (so P. and JV.), not ‘a dog.’
v. 11\(^{st}\). Parab's punctuation, with the mark after teña hi, is suggestive. The expression seems very colloquial: "first guess it, man; then (you may do as you like)."

v. 11\(^{st}\) (just before v. 12). In Parab's text, suvassabhaṇḍaṁ is, of course, a misprint for suvaṇṇa-.

v. 15. The word nirantarapayodharayā is used in a double sense. In reference to the night as a natural object, it means 'whose clouds are close together'; in reference to the night as a rival wife, it means 'whose breasts are close together (i. e. swelling).'

v. 15\(^{st}\). In my translation, I have taken strīsvabhāvadurvidadaghayā to mean 'ignorant of woman's nature,' because this meaning seemed to fit the context better than 'obstinate because of her woman's nature'; but the latter meaning, I now think, seems more natural to the word, and is probably correct.

v. 18. The commentators are doubtless right in taking proṣitabhartṛ as a feminine, 'whose husbands are distant,' though in prose we should expect proṣitabhartṛkā.

v. 19. In Parab's text, balākāpāṇḍuroṣṇiṣam should be printed as one word.

v. 20. JV. explains prosārya by apasārya: 'the clouds have driven away and captured the moonlight.'

v. 30. Parab's reading nirapekṣa seems to me better than niravekṣya, especially as I find no other instance of the compound niravekṣ. The construction is elliptical, but easily intelligible: "as (was thy grief when) thou didst speak falsely ..., such is my grief also; O cruel! Let the cloud be restrained."

v. 36. In the fourth line, Parab's reading -mukha- seems to me much better than the -sukha- of the other editions. The genitives then modify -mukha-, as if we had dākṣīnyapanyasya mukhasya niṣkayasiddhir astu. The verse may be literally translated: 'May you have success in the sale of your face, the birthplace of fraud, deceit, and lies, together with pride; consisting of perfidy, in which love-sports have made their home; the courtezan's stock-in-trade, the compendium of amorous festivals; the price of which is courtesy.'

v. 40. The use of ādīta eva is unusual; it is precisely equivalent to our colloquial 'from the start,' 'from the word go.'

v. 42. The commentators are sorely troubled by dṛṣṭapūrvāsāṃgamavismṛtānām, and offer very forced and artificial expla-
ations. Does it not mean simply ‘forgotten in the gatherings of their former associates’?

v. 42¹. The bath-clout is that mentioned in iii. 18⁴.

v. 43. This verse is the same as iii. 24.

v. 50. The compound prcalitavedisāṃcayāntam is difficult, and the commentators not wholly satisfactory. Probably vedi means ‘pedestal’ (cf. note on iv. 27⁴); saṃcaya (aggregation) perhaps means ‘a construction of closely-joined bricks (L.D. militābhir istsikābhir nirmāṇam): then vedisaṃcaya will mean ‘the brick-work of the pillar-pedestals.’ The whole compound will therefore signify ‘by which the edges of the brick-work of the pillar-pedestals are shaken.’ In other words, the awning, flapping in the wind and rain, threatens to tear out by the roots the pillars to which it is fastened. In the fourth line, Parab’s text should read saṅklinnā for saklinnā; the word ‘means ‘soggy.’

Act vi.

vi. 0⁵⁴. The words bhaavaṁ . . . purisabhāadhehiṁ are repeated almost literally from iii. 26⁴.

vi. 0⁴⁴. The chāyā should read tvarate for tvarayati; the latter would be in Prākrit tvarādi.

vi. 1. It is possible to understand the long compound in the first and second lines in either of two ways: ‘the great ocean of misery and woe, called (apadeśa = vyapadeśa) the king’s prison’; or ‘the great ocean of woe resulting from misery under the guise (apadeśa = miśa, L.D. or chala, JV.) of the king’s prison.’ The slight awkwardness observable when Śūdraka attempts to form long compounds, as in this verse (twice) and in v. 24 (see note on that verse, above), serves at least to help our appreciation of Bhavabhūti’s exquisite skill in handling them.

vi. 1¹. The use of viśasane is curious; either we must understand the word as an adjective (vināśajanake, JV.; mörderisch, Böhtlingk), or else take the word as a locative of purpose (Vārttika on Pāṇini, ii. 3. 36, quoted by L.D. and the Calcutta commentary). The difficulty of taking the word as an adjective has led me to adopt the second interpretation, as does Regnau also; but the case does not fall exactly under the Vārttika, because there is no karmasāmyoga, i.e. the thing sought after is not
connected with the object of the action (see Kielhorn’s Grammar, § 633 a).

vi. 2. The last two lines are puzzling; the difficulty lies partly in the sequence of thought, partly in the word gamya ‘approachable.’ For ‘approachable’ may mean either ‘capable of being pacified’ (gatvā sandheyaḥ saṅtvaniya ity arthāḥ, JV.; sarvesām sevyah, P. and the Calcutta commentary) or ‘capable of being attacked’: so Böhtlingk (einem Könige kann man wohl beikommen), and my translation. Besides, gamyo may represent agamyah out of sandhi. Then who is the balavant—Pālaka, or Fate, or Āryaka? And finally, does dāivī siddhiḥ mean ‘success (in attaining the throne) due to fate,’ or is it merely a circumlocution for dāivam? The translation of Böhtlingk, which mine closely resembles, gives a reasonable sense, but involves an awkward shifting of the point of view. Regnand is ingenious, but hardly convincing; he takes dāivī siddhiḥ to mean ‘fate,’ and regards fate as identical with the king and the powerful one; the change of gender makes this very harsh. I would suggest another interpretation, without very much confidence in its correctness. “Even success (in attaining the throne; rājapraptir api, JV.) cannot be avoided; a king (i.e. I myself, destined to become king) must be appeased; for who can fight with him who is powerful?” That is, he cannot prevent my becoming king, for fate wills it; he had better make terms, for I am potentially more powerful than he. This interpretation is rather subtle and tortuous for Śādraka; but it saves api from being a mere verse-filler, and preserves the same logical subject throughout the verse. On the other hand, it seems irrelevant to the following prose.

vi. 3. The reading adattaṃdo, found in Parab and JV., gives better meter than the anāyatārgalam of Stenzler and Godabole.

vi. 6. I think we have to take viṣatthā (viṣvastāḥ) as a vocative: ‘my trusty men.’

vi. 7. The word sahāsu (sabhāsu) probably refers here to gambling dens, dives.

vi. 15. It seems probable to me that pūrvavārī and pūrvabandhuḥ mean ‘enemy in a former life’ and ‘friend in a former life’ rather than ‘former enemy’ and ‘former friend.’ In the play itself, there is no indication of any previous acquaintance of Āryaka’s with Vīraka or Candana.
vi. 16. In Parab's text, read eka- for ekā-.
vi. 18'. There is no other allusion in the play to the fact that Sarvilaka had 'given life' to Candanaka.
vi. 20'. See note on iv. 29.
vi. 22. I think it can hardly be doubted that Parab's chāyā interprets correctly the puzzling word kucecagantuḥ- as = Sanskrit kārcegranthi-. The word then means 'beard-knots, scruffy beards'.
vi. 23'. In Parab's text, tathā should be printed as part of the stage-direction. See Shankar Pandit's edition of the Mālavikāgnimitra, page 168, note 51.

Act vii.

vii. 1'. In Parab's text, read vadhāhamāṇa for vadhāhamāṇaa.
vii. 2. Parab's reading karmāntojjihita- seems preferable both to Stenzler's karmāntotthita- and the vartmāntojjihita- of Godabole and JV.; for the -uttihita- of Stenzler must be rather forced to give a meaning, and so must the -anta- (= madhye LD.; madhyabhāge JV.) of the other texts. Parab's reading means of course 'left at the end of work.'

vii. 3. For the fourth line, compare D. D. Cunningham, Indian Friends and Acquaintances (New York, 1904), pp. 64-65: "The order of events is this: when everything is ready and a desirable nest has been chosen, the cock-koil, conspicuous in his shining black plumage and crimson eyes, seats himself on a prominent perch, whilst the hen, in modest speckled grey garb, lurks hidden among dense masses of neighbouring foliage. He then lifts up his voice and shouts aloud, his voice becoming more and more insistent with every repetition of his call, and very soon attracting the attention of the owners of the nest, who rush out to the attack and chase him away. Now comes the chance for his wife, who forthwith nips in to deposit her egg. Very often she does this successfully before the crows have returned, but every now and then she is caught in the act and driven off like her husband, uttering volleys of shrill outcries.'

vii. 4. Parab's reading asmād vyasanāraṇavotthitam has rather more authority than Stenzler's asmād vyasanān navotthitam, and is a more forcible expression; Godabole and JV. have the same reading as Parab, though LD. seems to explain the
other reading. If Parab’s text represents the original, we have an example of loose grammatical structure, inasmuch as asmāṭ must modify the prior member of the compound: cf. above, p. 420.

vii. 5. JV. and the Calcutta commentary are quite right in pointing out that the reading nigādayugam contradicts the ekacaraṇalagnanigaḍāḥ of vi. 6th (shortly before vi. 1) and the pādāgrasthitanigaḍāikaśakāraḥ of vi. 1 (also the caraṇaṇa nigāḍām apanaya of vii. 6th and the nigāḍām of vii. 8; on the other hand, the plural is used at vii. 6th); no doubt the reading nigāḍām ekam of Parab and JV. or the nigāḍāpanḍam of the Calcutta commentary is in itself preferable; but the reported manuscripts all read nigādayugam.

vii. 6th. The expression saṃgacchehi niaḍāim is very curious. If this represents saṃgacchasva nigāḍāṇi, as it seems to, both the construction and the sense are difficult; for nigāḍāṇi ought to be in the instrumental, and there seems no reason why Māiḍreya should say “be united with the fetters.” Commentators and translators are alike unsatisfactory. It is just possible that there is a smuttty pun in saṃgacchasva, that Māiḍreya means to hint that Cārudatta, not being able to be united (sexually) with Vasantasenā, must be content to be united with what has actually come in the cart, namely the fetters. But this does not explain the case of niaḍāim.

vii. 6th. The word before gatiḥ is given in the following forms; atilaghusaṃcārā, alaghusaṃcārā, alaghusaṃvārā (Godbole reads laghusaṃcārā). Doubtless alaghusaṃcārā gatiḥ yields a good meaning most easily: “your progress is one whose movement is not easy,” i.e. “you will find walking difficult”; but the lectio difficillior alaghusaṃvārā (Parab’s reading) has a good deal of authority. If it is correct, it seems to mean “whose concealment is not easy”; in this case, Cārudatta means that Aryaka would probably be detected if he left the cart. The reading -saṃcārā may have crept in from the -saṃcāre in the next clause.

vii. 7. It is a not uncommon stylistic device in Indian dramas to divide a verse. Sometimes the different parts are spoken by different characters, as here and at Uttararāmacarita i. 33; Mālatināḍhava iii. 18; x. 8; sometimes the same character speaks the whole verse, but is interrupted by prose speeches from others, as at i. 44; Muḍrārūkṣasa vi. 16; Ratnāvali iv. 19;
Venisaṁhāra vi. 16; Prasannarākhava v. 35. A peculiarly elaborate case is Uttararāmacarita iv. 24–25, where a verse is interrupted by a prose speech and by a second verse, this latter verse being itself divided between two characters.

Act viii.

viii. 1'. There is some doubt about the reading, but that given in Parab’s chāyā ( . . . kevalam . . . śaraṇam asmi) has the most authority and is easier than . . . naraḥ . . . śaraṇe (gacched iti śeṣah LD.). With the accepted reading, the line means: “Having seen (mundane things: saṁsāram JV.) from the standpoint of transitoriness, I am now the abode of virtues only.”

viii. 2. In the third line, we should probably read a (ca) for Parab’s ka (kva); then the jena of the first line governs lines 1–3. If we read ka (kva), it must mean, I suppose, ‘in whom.’

viii. 3'. Apte (s.v. apa-vah) gives to apavāhayati in this passage the meaning ‘cause to carry the yoke,’ while JV. gives it the meaning ‘beat’ (tādayati). At any rate, it seems as if the causative should mean a little more than ‘chase away’ (Böhtlingk), especially in consideration of the case of gonaṁ. For the accusative shows that the action of the verb as well as that of the gerund should be appropriate not only to the monk, but also to the bullock. At viii. 44' we have a parallel passage, in which vāhitah (P., however, takes vāhida to represent bādhitah) is used without apa; here too, JV. explains vāhitah by tāditah.

viii. 3'. The word āpānaka is used in the same sense of ‘drinking party’ at Nāgānanda iii. 2'. For the red radish, compare the note on i. 52, above.

viii. 4. Böhtlingk’s interpretation of the fourth line is, I think, correct: “(der Garten . . .) kann wie ein neu angetre-tenes Königsthum genossen werden, ohne dass man es sich erst zu erobern brauchte”; but his interpretation of upabhogyā (in the PW.) as a noun seems unnecessary. It is more natural to take anirjiptopabhogyam as a karmadhāraya ‘to be enjoyed without having to be conquered (by one’s own efforts).’ Perhaps LD. is right in thinking that the viṭā intends to rebuke Saṁsthānaka’s brutal conduct by contrasting it with the gentle invitation of the park.
The word dhanya means 1. blessèd, 2. infidel; puṇya means 1. virtuous, 2. a brick water-trench. This accounts for Śaṃsthānaka’s blunder in thinking that he has been called a materialist (cārvāka) and a brick trench (koṣṭhaka); but why should he add kumbhakāra, I am unable to see. The word is omitted by some authorities and is not present in LD.’s comment.

In Parab’s text, delete the marks of punctuation after pianti and nhūmi; for tahim must refer back to jahiim. The reading -savalam (-sabalāni) of Stenzler and J.V. seems preferable to the -savanālim (-savarnāni) of Parab and Godbole, and has considerable authority. The expression in the last clause ‘I will make you a man of one blow’ seems very idiomatic; in x. 3510 we have the expression ekkappahālena mālīa.

The phrase dūram nigudhāntaram is very puzzling and the commentators are unsatisfactory. Perhaps it modifies vastrāntam and means ‘(the hem of the garment) by which the middle part is quite (dūram) concealed’, that is, he has thrown the end so clumsily over his shoulder that it hides the greater part of the garment: but this seems very awkward. Assuming this explanation, the last two lines may be literally translated: “and he has not learned the (proper) arrangement of the yellow robe; and the hem of the garment, by which the middle part is quite concealed, loose because of the bagging of the cloth, does not fit on his shoulder.”

We should expect vrksamānsāiḥ, to correspond in formation with śilāsakalavarsmabhīḥ; the epithets are curious enough.

This is one of the rare cases in which Śaṃsthānaka’s mythology is correct.

Instead of ayam āgataḥ, we should expect idam āgatam, since pravahana is neuter in Sanskrit; perhaps ayam refers to Sthāvaraka.

The expression hagge attanakelake na huviśsaṁ is unusual; it seems to mean ‘I shall not be my own any longer,’ ‘I shall be dead.’

The quotation is the last line of i. 31.

J.V. takes dasanahuppalamanḍalehīṁ as a bahuvarhi, ‘whose lotus-heaps are ten finger-nails’ (daśa nakhā utpalamaṇ-
dalāny utpalasamāhā yayos tābhyaṁ); but it seems more natural to take it as a karmadhāraya, 'having ten finger-nails and discs like those of lotuses.' In the next line, cādusadatādana- is a karmadhāraya; JV. analyzes cātuṣatāṇi priyavadacāsātāṇi 'va tādanāni prahāraḥ.

viii. 22. JV. gives to the words tuṣṭi kādaṇī the meaning 'to do me a favor,' which is ingenious, and possibly correct.

viii. 22'. Here gandha means 'a mere smell,' 'a particle'; cf. the kāsikā on Pāṇini v. 4. 136: alaparyāyo gandhasabdāḥ. The same use of the word is found in Yogahāṣya i. 48: na tatra viparyāśagandho 'py asti and iv. 15: nā 'nayoḥ saṅkara-gandho 'py asti; while Regnaud and Böhlingk see the same meaning in raktagandhānuliptam in x. 3: compare the note on that verse, below. Regnaud has called attention to the meaning 'a certain perfume' (caṇḍā) which the PW., on the authority of Amara and the Medini, gives: for rākṣasī, and sees a deliberate pun on the part of the author; the suggestion is both ingenious and convincing. JV. adds a further point by suggesting that Saṅsthānaka misunderstands the viṭa's use of akāryam; the viṭa means 'something that must not be done,' 'a sin,' but Saṅsthānaka takes him to mean 'something that cannot be done,' an impossibility, and so declares that it is not a witch after all.

viii. 24. Compare Manu viii. 86.

viii. 24'. Read pahiliśśam for pahiliśsam.

viii. 28'. The word mallakka- (if, indeed, this be the correct spelling) here and at ix. 5" has caused a good deal of trouble. The 'earlier commentary' (prācinatitkā) quoted by P. gives it the meaning 'a small vessel made of a leaf' (patraputitkā), and this is adopted by LD. JV. reads gallakka- and offers the meaning 'cur' (kukkura), but he quotes no authority, and on ix. 5" he says that gallaka is a dialectic word for wine-vessel. In Māitreya's speech at the very beginning of act i, and in v. 6" we have the same word, with the same Ms. variations between initial m and initial g, and between single and double k; in both places it must mean some kind of dish, and in v. 6' it must mean 'a drinking-vessel'; and that is doubtless the meaning which we have to accept in this passage.

viii. 29. This verse is repeated at ix. 7, with nitarām for sutarām.
viii. 30. The Prakrit ṇāśena represents Sanskrit nyāsena and also nāśena. The pun is obvious.

viii. 31. The words ṣēvaāṃ and kaśṭamaā are doubtful. Stenzler prints ṣe vaaṃ as two words, but in his chāyā gives te vayaam; te would of course be de in Prakrit, and this Böhtlingk conjectures (p. 204). But the authorities speak overwhelmingly for ṣe vaaṃ, Sanskrit sevakaṃ. Then Stenzler's chāyā understands kaśṭamaā as equal to Sanskrit kāṣthamayaḥ rather than kaṣṭamayaḥ. Of course the t speaks against this, but the meaning to be extracted from the words (te vayaāṃ kāṣṭhamayaḥ) would then have to be that given by Böhtlingk, "Are we to you men of wood?" This seems an unnatural rendering in itself, and has no support in the context. Certainly Vasanta- senā understands the speaker to make a comparison between himself and Cārudattā, to the disadvantage of the latter. Her sevitavyaḥ (vs. 33) takes up the sevakam of the present verse, and her daridraḥ (vs. 33) refers back to kaṣṭamayaḥ. Saṁsthānaka asks her why she does not desire him, and why she prefers a poor man; she answers that the poor man's character is good, while his is bad. Probably, then, we must read kiṃ sevakaṃ kaṣṭamayaḥ manusyaḥ, and render: "why are poor men the object of (your) devotion?" True, the matter would be simpler if we could read sevyante or sevyāḥ.

viii. 32. Stenzler prints the entire first line as one word; Jv. divides khaḷa caritanikṛṣṭa jātadoṣaḥ, though his comment offers the option between this division and that found in Parab's text. Godabole, as also P. and L.D., prefer the division found in Parab. That this is the intention of the author is made probable by the parallelism between khalacakita and sucaritacaritam.

viii. 33. Of course the palāśa and the kīṁśuka are the same; the blunder on Saṁsthānaka's part is like that found in the last line of i. 41. I do not believe that the author intends a pun on the name of the demon Palāśa, as P. and L.D. say; Böhtlingk (p. 204) argues effectively against this view.

viii. 34. I have taken some liberties with this verse in my translation, in an effort to preserve something of the grim humor of this critical scene. I am afraid that it is rather risky to assume that the author, in using the name Dhundhumāra, plays on the other meaning of the word, namely the insect called indragopā.
viii. 35*. Parab’s chāyā should read mriyasva garbhadāsi mriyasva. In Sanskrit, as in English, we lose the assonance of mala gabbhadāsi mala following śu-mala gabbhadāsi śu-mala in viii. 35*.

viii. 36. This verse and the next contain numerous difficulties. The second line means: “who (really) came to her death (kāla-) when, being in love, she came (thinking) to sport with him when he had come.” In order to justify the accusatives of the first two lines, we must supply hatvā, as the Calcutta commentary and JV. observe. In the fourth line, the chāyā in Parab and Godabole renders niḥśāse by niḥśvāsa, and it is this rendering which is represented by my translation; but in Stenzler and JV. the chāyā has niḥśvāse, and that is of course what we should expect from the Prākrit form of the word. The phrase then means: “(Why do I boast of my strength of arm?) She dies merely at my breathing.” The chāyā in Parab, Godabole, and JV. takes amba to represent Sanskrit ambā, nominative, and this is precisely what we should expect; ambā or ambikā ‘mother’ is used as a term of endearment, so e. g. at viii. 17th. But the short final vowel of the Prākrit makes a difficulty, and this difficulty is not avoided by the reading of Stenzler’s chāyā, ambasmarā.

viii. 37. The third line is desperate, so desperate that Regnaud does not attempt to translate it. Probably mādeva represents māte ‘va (not mātāi ‘va: Stenzler), as Parab’s chāyā has it; the iva probably goes with draupadi (draupadisadṛś mātā, JV). We may tentatively translate the line: “my brother was disappointed of his honor, and my father, and my mother (who in this respect is) like that Draupadi.” This translation assumes the word-division sēvāvaćīda bhāduke, as Parab prints; but the line seems nearly hopeless.

viii. 37*. This speech of the viṣa’s is very strange indeed, and I do not see that the matter is helped by the reading pāda-yoh for pādapāh. The speech illustrates Böhtlingk’s excellent observation (Vorwort, p. i): “Als eine Eigenthümlichkeit ist . . . auch dieses hervorzuheben, dass er . . . den Zuhörer oder Leser . . . auf bevorstehende wichtige Begebenheiten vorbereitet und dadurch die Ueberraschung zwar einigermaassen abschwächt, auf der anderen Seite aber auch die Neugier in hohem Grade reizt.” But it seems as if this end were attained in the present case with unwonted awkwardness.
For the expression, compare i. 30º.

JV. takes dākśīṇyodakavāhīnī as an adjective modifying ratiḥ and suggests that the ‘own region’ (svadeśa) is the south (dākśīṇa), because it is well known that rivers run south. On the feminine form āśraye, see above, p. 420.

This matter is printed by Stenzler as prose, by the other editions as a verse; if it makes a verse, as seems most probable, the readings of the other three editions are nearer the intent of the author than those adopted by Stenzler, since these latter destroy the meter. The text is desperately bad. In the second line, the editions all read sāvoḍiaṁ (or śabo-), but the explanations differ widely. Parab's chāyā has sāvoḍiṇam and P. says that a vodi is a coin of less value than a kārsāpana; Stenzler's chāyā reads puṣṭim and JV.'s sapoṇam; Godabole's chāyā reads saveṣṭikam and LD. explains veṣṭikā as meaning either ‘turban’ or ‘join-cloth’; in this explanation he agrees with the Calcutta commentary. One is tempted to prefer to all these readings and interpretations the reading of Stenzler’s Ms. B.: sākoṭiam (sakotikam); in this case, Saṅsthānaka is made to say: “I’ll give you wealth a hundred-fold, (I’ll give you) a gold-piece, I’ll give you a penny, (I’ll give you) ten millions.” In the third and fourth lines, my translation follows Parab’s chāyā, except that it is necessary to read sāmānyakam to agree with dōṣasthānām: “Let this heroism of mine be a cause of censure common to (all) men,” a roundabout way of saying “Let the perpetrator of the deed remain unknown.” But there is rather more authority for the reading of Godabole (with which JV. practically agrees): duṣaddāṇa phalaikkame = duḥṣabdānām phalakramāh. Then the two lines mean: “Let this continued reward of evil words (due) to me be common to (all) men.”

The two readings thus give, at bottom, about the same sense.

I have taken jano 'yam in the ordinary sense of ayaṁ janaḥ: “I think myself unworthy, etc.” JV. takes it to mean ‘the average man’ (sādhāraṇamāna), and the translators take it similarly; very likely they are right.

-vam: voc. fem., JV.; loc. neut., Regnaud, Böhtlingk.

I understand anāṁ as a Sanskrit anyām, modifying velām understood. Stenzler’s chāyā has anyas (supply alaṁ-kāraḥ), the other editions have ājūḥ; yet Parab’s punctuation seems to indicate that he understands the Prākrit as I do.
viii. 43-11. As Böhtlingk points out (p. 205), we probably should read -kavadavālīae (as in i. 51') instead of -padolikāe. JV. attempts to explain the reading of the Mss., but his attempt serves to confirm the suspicion that the Mss. are wrong: prāsūdasya bhadaṭṭalikāyā bālāyām abhinavanirmitāyām agrapratolikāyām pradhānārathyañām.

viii. 46. I have taken pattra in the meaning 'leaf' in each of its three occurrences in the verse; this seems to be the understanding of P., who says pattrāny eva, 'like the leaves they are.' But the Calcutta commentary, LD., and JV. give to the words vistirñapatṭrāṇi . . . pattrāṇi 'va the meaning 'like birds whose wings are spread out'; it would be hard to find another instance of pattra meaning 'bird.' Böhtlingk takes a middle course in his translation: "diese ausgebreiteten Blätter regen sich, so meine ich, wie Federn hin und her." It is perhaps impossible to decide which interpretation is correct; the only thing that is certain is that there is a play on the word pattra.

viii. 46'. According to LD. and JV., the fact that Vasanta-senā remembers the monk but does not remember her own benefaction to him, shows the nobility of her nature.

viii. 47. This matter (hattha- . . . piccale) is printed by Parab as a verse; also by JV., who however gives it no verse-number. The nature of the matter (cf. note on iv. 29, above), and its position at the end of the act, make it a priori probable that it does form a verse. The text printed by Parab scans 15. 17: 12. 18; the last two lines form half of a regular āryā. If we read, with Stenzler and Godabole, hatthaśāṇjadamuhaśāṇjada-, we obtain the scheme 13. 17: 12. 18. Thus we have the correct number of syllabic instants, which are irregularly distributed in the first half of the verse. In spite of this irregularity, it seems most probable that we have to do with a stanza in the āryā meter.

Act ix.

ix. 1. In the fourth line, the reading of Parab and Godabole does not scan correctly; if the first word is to be read gandhav- vehi, it seems as if the second should be śuvihidehiṁ. This is the text reproduced in my translation; but I have taken gandhav- vehi as the representative of Sanskrit gāndharvāḥ, "with gandharvic, well-turned limbs." The fact that the Gandharvas
are male creatures and the persons mentioned in the third line female, need not trouble us, as the blunder may be attributed to Sainsthânakâ's ignorance. The reading of Parab and Godabole is better supported than the gandhayve via śuhidehiṁ of Stenzler (with which JV, practically agrees). The latter reading also gives a good sense, if we may take suhītiṁ to mean subhūsitāṁ (JV.) or sōbhitāṁ (Calcutta commentary), or as the representative of sukhitāṁ (Böhtlingk, page 205).

ix. 2. In Parab's text, khala- is apparently a misprint for khaṇa-. I think it is better to take mukke (muktāḥ) in the sense of 'hanging loose' (bandhanād bhrauṣitāḥ, JV.) than in the sense of 'pearls' (Regnaud, Böhtlingk).

ix. 21. In kivinaceśṭāṁ (bis) there is perhaps a pun; the word means of course 'a wretched business,' but also perhaps 'a worm's business,' with reference to the kīḍāena above. The possibility that kṛpana may here mean 'worm' is increased by the reading kimiṇa- (apparently = kṛmiṇa-) given by four MSS. and by P.

ix. 3. In commenting on the third line, JV. says that the king's judgment is confused by the exaggerations of the two parties, that he is therefore likely to decide a case wrongly, and that then he is subject to the penalty set forth in Manu viii. 128 (disgrace and hell).

ix. 4. In the second line, I have translated as if nasta dhruvam were the beginning of a new principal clause, but I am not at all certain that this is correct.

ix. 5. In the last line, dvārbhayeva is puzzling. JV. takes it as a locative absolute, supplying sati, 'there being an expedient'; Böhtlingk interprets similarly. I have taken it as two words: 'a door (dvār, nom.) to truth,' but this is very doubtful. Godabole's Ms. K. has the reading dvābhīyāṁ vai, which is much easier: 'his heart devoted to others' interests) in behalf of both parties (plaintiff and defendant)'.

ix. 51. For mellakkappamāṇāha, cf. note on viii. 281.

ix. 7. This verse is repeated from viii. 29, with nitarām for sutarām. Parab, Godabole, and JV. print spītā for spītāḥ; this perhaps indicates that the reading vipine (given by a majority of the MSS.) for suṣṭre was the original reading, and that suṣṭre has crept in from viii. 29.

ix. 71. JV. explains the curious word pāyasapiṇḍālakeṇa thus: pāyasapiṇḍāṁ dugdha-pakvam annam paramānnam ity arthāḥ,
tad ṛechati prāṇottī 'ti tena pāyasūmillabhine 'ty arthaḥ: pāyasūnāpṛapṭaye lobhād yathā kriyate tathā mayā 'pi 'ty arthaḥ.

ix. 72. With the Calcutta commentary, I take -sthāna in moghasthānayā as an abbreviation for alañkārasthāna; compare sunāyāṁ āharaṇaṭṭhānāṁ in ii. 20.

ix. 11. I take ghoram asaṁśayam as a little clause by itself:

the dreadful thing is certain.'

ix. 14. P. seems to have read cintāmārga-. I have followed LD. in taking dāta- to mean 'attorney.' In the third line -vāsaka- is doubtless used with a double meaning. In reference to the herons, it means 'screaming,' and in reference to court-officers, it means 'slanderers, pettifoggers.' LD. has vāsakāḥ, sābdaṁ kurvāṇāh karṇējapāḥ piśūṇa eva; similarly JV., who says: vāsakāḥ sābdaṁ kurvāṇā dhanapratāpāraṁ vacanaca-turāḥ khalā eva. I have adopted the reading -rucirām, which seems better than Parab's -racitam.

ix. 19. The verse is desperately hard, and no comment or translation is satisfactory. My translation aims to make sense, but does violence to the text. JV. makes the sense-connection between lines 2 and 3 by saying: cāṣāgrapakṣo hy upari vārīvar-śānena malinībhavati tava mukham tu tadabhāve 'pi malināṁ drśyata iti bhāvah. Accepting this, we may translate the verse thus: "You are not, like the wing-tip of the cāsa, thoroughly wet by the waters of the clouds in the sky; (yet it seems so, because) this (accusation is) false—for (see!) this face of yours attains lacklusterness like the winter lotus." But this is sadly unsatisfactory.

ix. 22. The same conceit of leaving the ocean bare of gems by reason of great riches occurs in the Meghadūta, in the verses following i. 31 (regarded by Mallinātha as spurious).

ix. 23. The analysis which P. gives of the long compound is to be preferred to that of the other interpreters: pādaprakahā-rena paribhava ākramaḥ sa eva vimānanā tayā baddhagurukavārasya.

ix. 24. The present participle viluppantaṁ (viluppyamānam) does not seem to correspond to the facts of the case; the reading viluppam (viluptam) given by some Mss., seems preferable.

ix. 24. Probably there is a little pun in lokavyayahārasya, which may mean 'the conduct of men,' or 'a law-suit in the world.' This I have tried to indicate in my translation.
ix. 29. The word paravyasanena causes difficulty. LD. (followed by Regnaud) interprets 'although beset' by terrible misfortune': pareṇa vyasaneno 'palaksito 'pi; similarly the Calcutta commentary. JV. interprets 'with mere childish amusements': pareṇa kevalena vyasanena bālyasulabhena krīḍanena. Böhtlingk adopts this unusual meaning for vyasana, and accepts the alternative reading bata for para, which is mentioned by the Calcutta commentary and JV. I have taken paravyasanena to mean 'with the misfortune of another,' but this is certainly doubtful.

ix. 29'. The translators have, I think, missed the point of imassa. Of course, this masculine form cannot refer to Vasantaśenā, in spite of the chāyā in Parab and JV. The little clause means: "it was right (for her) to give him the jewels (to stop his crying, LD) but not (for me) to receive them."

ix. 30. Compare ix. 38.

ix. 30'. There should be a mark of punctuation after hetubhūṭāḥ.

ix. 30'. I have taken anīso (which is not found in all the Mss.) to mean 'not master (of himself), mad'; but JV. explains it as aksamo daridra ity arthaḥ. The Prākrit bhanda may represent Sanskrit bhāṇḍa (chāyā in Stenzler, Godabole, and JV.) or bhāṇḍa (chāyā in Parab, and P.); if the former be intended, then kidajanasabhaṇḍā must be a compound, meaning 'receptacle of crimes imputed to people'; if the latter, we may take the expression as two words (or as a karmadhāraya; so P.) meaning 'imputer of crimes to people, and buffoon.' The latter seems preferable to me.

ix. 33. The last pāda is found also in Kumārasambhava ii. 32. Whether this fact is or is not of importance in determining the relative dates of Kālidāsa and Śūdraka, I do not venture to say.

ix. 33'. I have taken the first two words as an impatient exclamation: I do not believe that we have a play on words, as LD. and Regnaud suggest. My view is perhaps supported by JV., who prints 'ābharaṇāni 'a-, without sandhi.

ix. 36. JV. and Böhtlingk takes the fourth pāda to mean that the wishes of the speaker will fall to the ground (be disappointed) when the lashes fall on Čārudatta; Wilson and I have understood the pāda to mean that the lashes descend together
with (in accordance with) the wishes of the speaker. I think now that the former interpretation is the better; a similar play on the root pat is found in ix. 31.

ix. 38. Compare ix. 30. In the third pāda, Parab's reading is excellent; but we must take stri ratnam as two words. Then the pāda means: "a woman, and especially a jewel (of a woman)."

ix. 39. As Böhtlingk points out (p. 209), the tti ought to stand at the end of the speech.

ix. 41. Although LD. says that ambām refers to Čārudatta's mother, it seems more probable that it refers to his wife, Rohasena's mother; for there is no reference elsewhere in the play to the mother of Čārudatta.

Act x.

x. i. The difficulties of this verse are diminished if we can regard kālaṇa as the representative of the Sanskrit kāraṇām 'pain.' We may then translate: "What then! Do not consider (kalaya = vicāraya, JV.) the pain; being adepts in the new-fangled managing of executions and fetterings, we are skilful in cutting off heads and impaling in short order."

x. 3. JV. explains raktagandha- by raktaecandana-, and Regnaud's note (iv. 87) has the same suggestion. Böhtlingk takes -gandha- in the sense of 'trifle,' as above at viii. 22, 24. I have supposed the word raktagandhāṇuliptam to contain a rather mixed, but striking, metaphor, 'anointed with the odor of blood.' Of these three interpretations, that of JV. and Regnaud is perhaps the best.

x. 11. This speech is quoted at Daśarūpa i. 46 (ed. Parab), and at Sāhityadarpana 384; in both places there are many, but unimportant variants.

x. 12. Quoted at Daśarūpa i. 46; ii. 4; Sāhityadarpana 384, with two variants; line 1, yat for me; line 3, nīdhanā- for maraṇa-. The commentary on the Sāhityadarpana passage explains nibidcāityabrahmaghośāih as follows: nibidāni lokāir ākūrṇāni yāni cātyāni: cātyam āyatanaṁ tulye ity Amarah pūjādyāyatanaśthānāni teṣu ye brahmaghośā vedavādās tāiḥ.

x. 12. The reading udvīṣya can hardly be a mere blunder, as it is explained by P., but it is surely inferior to the udvīṣya of the other texts.
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x. 14. JV. reads āsuvanñamaṇḍanaṁ as one word, and explains it as an adverb ‘without any golden ornament’; but this reading hurts the meter.

x. 17. Much better than the -bhojanam of all the editions is -bhājanam, conjectured by Bohtlingk (p. 209), and read by two of Godabole’s Mss.

x. 19. Stenzler and JV. are doubtless right in reading padicechidām (pratistam). JV. glosses the word with yathābhibhāṣitam.

x. 20. The first line is desperate. My translation is based on Parab's text, accepting P.'s explanation of pradesāḥ by aṅgūni, and presupposes the following literal translation: "his limbs are parched (i.e. he is as good as dead); why need he conduct himself with bended head?" This is obviously most unsatisfactory. Somewhat better are the readings and suggestions of JV., who agrees in part with LD. and the Calcutta commentary. He reads: sukkhā vavadesāḥ ē kīṁ paṇamia matthae na kāavvaṁ and explains: asya cārudattasya ... vyapadesāḥ kulanāmādayaḥ sūskā luptāḥ? asya ca kīṁ guṇādikam ity arthaḥ praṇamya mastake na kartavyam? api tu sarvam eva praṇatyā śīrodhāryam ity arthaḥ: atha vā vyapadesāḥ vasantasenavadhajānitāpavādāḥ sūskā mithyātvād āropitā ity arthaḥ.

x. 25. I interpret the second line as follows: "in which this death is actually (api) a gain." In the fourth line, the reading tvayā of Stenzler and Godabole is better than the mayā of Parab and JV. (but cf. the mayā in x. 33).

x. 25; 28; 29. For pāśādabālaggapadolīkā, cf. note on viii. 43; 11, above.

x. 26. Cf. x. 38.

x. 27. For the construction, see above, p. 420.

x. 31. It is possible to separate niśkūraṇopagata bāndhava, as Bohtlingk does, or, with JV., to take the word as a karmadharaya.

x. 32. I have followed Stenzler’s chāyā and Bohtlingk in taking śaṅkhaleṇa as the representative of Sanskrit śṛṅkhaleṇa; but LD. and JV. translate it by saṅkhaleṇa (śaṅi-), which they explain to mean ‘a drum-stick.’

x. 33. There is nothing to show whether Cārudatta here repeats ix. 30 or ix. 38.
x. 33. In my translation, I have substituted the name Goha for its synonym Viraka, as this is the only place where the latter is used.

x. 35. I think that Böhtlingk is right (p. 211) in making veṣaṁ = Sanskrit veṣaḥ. Cf. also JV., who says: veṣa iva paricchada iva.

x. 35*. The matter from uthānasa- to attānaṁ is printed by Godabole and JV. as a verse. The nature of the material makes it probable that they are right, though our text (11. 17: 10. 17) does not quite fit the scheme of an āryā.

x. 35**. In spite of the tradition, Böhtlingk is probably right in thinking (p. 212) that cvāśoṇṇadalā represents ekapārśvonnatā; but it does not seem necessary to substitute, with him, nāuḥ (as at ii. 20) for vasūndhāra.

x. 35***. The phrase uthāna bhavia must mean 'lie flat,' not 'stehe gerade' (Böhtlingk) or 'tenez-vous bien raide' (Regnau). The word uthāna means 'supine,' not 'erect;' besides, the erect position would be unnatural for the operation proposed. Then, at x. 40, Carudatta stands up (sahaso 'tthāya), which he could not do if he were already erect; and Vasanta-senā, who had fallen on his breast at x. 37, rises (utthāya) at x. 40.

x. 38. Cf. x. 26.

x. 41. Here vidyā means 'a spell for bringing the dead to life' (LD., JV.), i.e. vidyā saññīvanī, as it is called in the Mahābhārata.

x. 43. It is interesting to note that Jīmūtavāhana, in the fourth act of the Nāgānanda, uses the red marriage garments as the insignia of death. Perhaps this passage and Mrceh. x. 43 stand in some connection with each other; if so, we have a suggestion for the placing of the Mrcehakaṭiķa.

x. 46. Very likely there is a puñ in the word śeṣābhūtām; the word may mean 'last,' and also 'being sacrificial flowers.'

x. 47. Stenzler's reading surārēḥ is supported by only one Ms., so that the reading balārēḥ is doubtless correct. LD., JV., and the Calcutta commentary explain vasudhādhirājyaam as a bahuverhi; 'in which there is sovereignty over the whole world.' The last half of the verse means then: 'he has obtained the entire kingdom of his enemy, implying sovereignty over the world, like the kingship of Indra.'
x. 47. Böhtlingk suggests (p. 213) that we read ayi for api (apikāra 'tra praśne, J.V.).

x. 48. The reading nirirkśe is surely better than nirikṣye.

x. 48'. The words atha vā-should be printed as part of the text, as in the editions of Stenzler and Godabole.

x. 51. The authorities read without exception tatrabhavān; but it seems as if we must change it to atrabhavān.

x. 53. I take pāurāh, with the other editions, as part of the stage-direction.

x. 54'-57. For the sake of completeness, I give a translation of Nīlakanṭha's interpolation, which may be inserted between lines 23 and 24 on page 174 of my translation.

(Loud outcries are heard behind the scenes.)

Voices behind the scenes. See! The wife, the lady-wife of noble Cārudatta thrusts back her little son, who clings at every step to her garment's hem. The tearful bystanders would prevent her, yet she mounts the blazing pyre.

Śarvilaka. (Listens and looks toward the back of the stage.) Ah, Candanaka! what does this mean, Candanaka? (Enter Candanaka.)

Candanaka. Do you not see, sir? A great crowd has gathered to the south of the Royal Palace. The wife, the lady wife of noble Cārudatta thrusts back her little son, who clings at every step to her garment's hem. The tearful bystanders would prevent her, yet she mounts the blazing pyre. I said to her: "Madam, you must not act too hastily. The noble Cārudatta lives." But when the heart is full of sadness, who will listen, who will believe?

Cārudatta. (In distress.) Oh, my beloved! what would you do, while I yet live? (He looks up and sighs.)

Although thy life upon the earth,
My virtuous wife, seem little worth,
Yet joy in heaven thou canst not find,
If thou dost leave thy lord behind.

(He swoons.)

Śarvilaka. What madness is this?

Yonder we needs must be so soon,
And here her husband lies in swoon;
Alas! we must confess it plain,
That all our efforts are in vain.
Vasantasenā. Oh, sir, come to yourself. Go and bring her back to life. Otherwise a calamity will be begotten of this want of steadfastness.

Cārudatta. (Comes to himself and rises hastily.) Oh, my beloved, where are you? Give me answer.

Candanaka. Follow me, sir. (All move about. Enter Cārudatta's wife, as described; Rohasena, who clings to the hem of her garment; Māitreya; and Radanikā.)

Wife. (Tearfully.) Let go, my child. Do not hinder me. I am fearful lest I hear of ill that happens to my lord. (She rises, frees the hem of her garment, and moves toward the pyre.)

Rohasena. Oh, mother, think of me! I cannot live without you. (He runs up, and seizes again the hem of her garment.)

Māitreya. The sages declare it a sin for you, a Brāhmaṇ's wife, to mount the pyre without your husband's body.

Wife. Better to commit a sin than to hear of ill that happens to my lord.

Śarvilaka. (Looks ahead.) She is near the flame. Hasten, hasten! (Cārudatta does so.)

Wife. Radanikā, you must support my child, while I do what I purpose.

Radanikā. (Mournfully.) I too shall do what I have learned from my mistress.

Wife. (Turning to Māitreya.) Then you must support him, sir.

Māitreya. (Impetuously.) That your purpose may bear fruit, a Brāhmaṇ must take the lead in this action. And so I shall precede you.

Wife. They both refuse me! (She embraces Rohasena.) My child, you must care for yourself, that you may give us the sesame and the water of sacrifice. Of what use are wishes, when one is gone! (Sighing.) For my lord will not care for you.

Cārudatta. (Hears the words and hastens forward.) Yes, I will care for my boy. (He raises Rohasena in his arms, and clasps him to his breast.)

Wife. (Discovers him.) A miracle! I hear the voice of my lord. (She looks more closely. Joyfully.) Thank heaven! It is my lord himself. Now heaven be praised!
Rohasena. (Perceives his father. Joyfully.) Oh, oh! It is my father that embraces me. (To his mother.) Mother, now you are happy. Father will care for me. (He throws his arms about Cārudatta.)

Cārudatta. (To his wife.)

While he thou lovest more than breath
Was yet reprieved from jaws of death,
Whereto this mad emprize?
Before the sun sinks in the west,
Why are the lotus' petals prest
Upon her sleeping eyes?

Wife. My lord, it is just because she is so thoughtless that she is kissed.

Māitreya. (Discovers Cārudatta. Joyfully.) Hurrah! These eyes see my friend. What power a faithful wife enjoys!
The mere purpose to enter the fire brings a reunion with her love. (To Cārudatta.) Victory, victory to my friend!

Cārudatta. Come, Māitreya! (He embraces him.)

Radanikā. What a wonderful providence! Sir, I salute you. (She falls at Cārudatta's feet.)

Cārudatta. (Lays his hand upon her.) Rise, Radanikā! (He helps her to rise.)

Wife. (Perceives Vasantasanā.) Thank heaven! My blessèd sister.

Vasantasanā. Now am I blest indeed. (They embrace.)

Śarvilaka. Thank heaven! You live, with all your friends.

Cārudatta. Yes, through your gracious aid.

x. 54. On pade, J.V. says: pade pratipada ity arthaḥ.

x. 56. On bhīṇātattāpena, J.V. has: bhīnнатvena prthaktivena: tad uktam Uṣanasā yathā: prthak cītiṁ samāruhya na viprāgantum arhati: anyāsām eva nāraṇāṁ strīdharno 'yam paraḥ smṛtataḥ iti.

x. 57. We should expect the dual: tān cāṇḍālāu . . . bhavaṭām.

x. 59. Under stress of meter, I have omitted the words kāṁś cint nayaty ākulān, which mean 'keeps some in suspense,' and applies, like the other expressions of the first two lines, both to people and to buckets.
The Buddhistic Rule Against Eating Meat.—By E. Washburn Hopkins, Professor in Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

The fact asserted in Mr. H. Fielding Hall's *People at School* (1906) that, although in the old days "it was immoral to take life, wicked to eat meat and connive at butchery," it is now the custom for Burmese Buddhists to do as they like in regard to eating ("Every one eats meat, even the monks," p. 257), is explained by the author as a new departure, due to the stimulating effect of the presence in Burma of the British beef-eater. Is it not, in reality, a reversal in favor of a rule of greater freedom? Perhaps it is true that the Burman has but lately found out for himself that the "religion of Necessity" is better than the religion of Buddha as hitherto understood, for a progressive Burman may have to eat well to compete with British energy; but it is matter of interest to inquire just how strict in ancient times was the law against eating meat.

The great Protestant of India was no formalist. According to the Vinaya, which seems rather to reflect the Master's attitude than really to give his words as it pretends to do, Buddha was perpetually harassed by imbecile friars, whose childish questions he always answered in a spirit of liberality and common sense. Even later works show that to observe the spirit and not the letter was the Buddhistic ideal. What is said of verse may be applied to law,

\[
\text{atthaṁ hi nātho saraṇam avoca} \\
\text{na bhyañjanaṁ lokavidū mahesi,}
\]

"The all-wise Lord declared that salvation lies in the spirit and not in the letter" (Comm. Khuddaka Pātha, v). Thus, for example, the general rule against suicide emanated from the view that a saint ought to remain on earth as a good example; yet, in special circumstances, Buddha is represented as approving of suicide, as in the case of the Elder Godhika. Here it is only the Evil One who objects to the act, on the ground that to cut one's own throat argues a perfected saint (one indifferent
to life), and that it is undesirable for the Evil One thus to lose possession of the good Elder. 1

So also the early Church, in the case of killing and eating, appears to have been less strict than the later. The later Brahmanic law, like that of the Jains, was very particular in regard to these points. Except for sacrifice, to kill no sentient thing and to eat no meat were absolute priestly laws. Even starvation was barely an excuse for breaking these regulations, though the class that did as it pleased despite the priests was reluctantly conceded the right to hunt wild animals, and the priest even found mythological reasons which made it meritorious for a ‘king’s man’ to kill deer as well as men. People outside the pale of respectability, fishers, fowlers, tanners, etc., were also contemptuously permitted to remain in their odor of non-sacri
ty. But for a priest even necessary agriculture was deprecated, ‘because the plough hurts living things.’ That this ‘non-
injury’ rule was Buddhistic in origin is contrary to the evidence. Even the oldest Brahmanic law, which is at least as venerable as any Buddhistic literature, inculcates the general moral rule of doing as one would be done by in the matter of injuring, killing, and eating one’s brother-animal.

Nevertheless, there are traces of a condition of things much freer than this in the Brahmanic circle of a still earlier day. In Aṅ. Br. iv. 3, man is said to eat, as well as rule over, cattle: puruṣah paśuṣu pratiṣṭhito ‘tī cānān adhi ca tiṣṭhati (on paśu as implying cattle, cf. vi. 20). It is a Brahman priest who says that he eats beef if it is off the shoulder (āhāsalam, Sat. Br. iii. 1. 2. 21). The common people are said at the same period to be omophagous, āmād (Kāṇva text, ib. iv. 5. 2. 16), and the king has at least no scruples in regard to wearing leather sandals, vārāhyā upānahā, ib. v. 4. 3. 19. Leather fastenings are also alluded to in Aṅ. Br. v. 32. Brahman butchers are well known, even in the Buddhistic period. 2 The formal law-books permit the eating of many animals, birds, and fishes, although they denounce the sin of eating meat (see particularly Gāutama,

---

1 For the rule, see the Pātimokkha and Rhys-Davids on the Questions of Milinda; for the case of Godhika, Warren, HOS 8, p. 381.

xvii, Baudh. xii, and Manu v). But perhaps casual allusions reveal more than do the law-books. Convincing, for example, is Tândya Br. xvii. 13. 9: "Clothed in a fresh garment he comes up from the initiation-bath and during four months neither eats meat nor has intercourse with a woman." That is as much as to say, when not in a state of special purity one is expected to eat meat. Compare Sat. Br. x. 1. 4. 13.

Similarly, although the Buddhist accepts and further promulgates, in his own decrepit dialect, the law "not to kill and not to cause killing," it is evident that the law, if not late, was at first not taken very strictly. Possibly, just as the Brahmanic classes ('castes') were recognized, but without the Brahmanic rigidity, which did not usually distinguish between letter and spirit, so Brahmanic morality was, as an inheritance, not disregarded; but at the same time it was not so narrowly interpreted. Among the many things which, according to the Buddhists' scriptures, "people" (that is, non-Buddhist people) objected to in the conduct of the Buddhists was disregard of the life of sentient beings. According to the same indisputable testimony, people once found a Buddhist friar killing—of all animals—a calf, and several times they complained that "followers of the Buddha" hurt and killed living things. Even as an artistic background to the introduction of stricter rules, these tales, preserved in the Buddhists' own books, can scarcely be supposed to be made of whole cloth. There was some reason for the tale and for the introduction of the more stringent rule. And the reason was probably that, while Buddha really endorsed the rule Na hauaye na ghâtaye, "Let one kill not, nor cause killing," neither he nor the early Buddhists interpreted it so strictly as the Brahman was inclined to do. It is very seldom, for example, that we find the addition "nor approve of others killing" (Dhammika Sutta). To the Buddhist of the early days, meat was not forbidden, though it was a work of supererogation to abstain from it. Meat was a delicacy and it was not proper for an abstemious friar to indulge in any delicacies. On the other hand, to take a vow not to eat meat was unusual; it was distinctly an extra effort in 'acquiring merit.' The house-holder is

1 The Pâtimokkha prohibits meat and fish merely on the ground that they are delicacies. The rules for novices contain no injunction against eating meat. On the early usage among the friars, see Professor Rhys-Davids' Buddhism, p. 164.
distinguished from the ascetic in this, that the latter has no wife and does not destroy life, while the former has a wife and does destroy life (Muni Sutta). The rule of the ‘King of Glory’ is not a narrow one against meat; it is one of extreme liberality, ‘Eat as you have been accustomed to eat.’ There is a whole sermon devoted to the expansion of the text, ‘defilement comes not from eating meat but from sin’ (Āmagandha Sutta), which, as it seems to me, rather implies that meat was pretty generally eaten (though the practice was looked upon by the stricter sort as culpable) than that it was not eaten at all. Buddha himself (perhaps) died of eating pork, the flesh of a wild boar, an idea so abhorrent to later Buddhism that the words sūkaramaddava, ‘boar-tender’ (-loin ?) was interpreted either as a sauce or as a vegetable eaten by a boar; some said bamboo-sprouts, other said a kind of mushroom, although no sauce or vegetable is known by the name of ‘boar-tender.’

It is in the light of such facts as these that the oft-repeated rule “not to keep a stock of raw meat” is to be interpreted. The rule is generally given in connection with other purely sumptuary regulations, such as not to keep a store of raw rice, and far from seeming to prohibit meat it appears to imply its use; the real prohibition being not against meat (any more than against rice), but against the possession of a superfluous store. Thus in the Gandhāra Jātaka, No. 406, it is said that a store of salt and sugar even for one day, punadiva, used to be condemned, but now Buddhists hoard even for the third day.

Notable examples of freedom in respect of eating meat are to be found in the Mahāvagga, which gives other illustrations of liberality. Thus, as to the other, we are told that, in the northern country, for Buddhists to bathe more than once a fortnight is a sin, but in the southern country they may bathe more frequently, because it is the custom of the country. Here there is no climatic necessity for the change, since what is called

1 Literally, “Ye shall eat as has been eaten” (Mahāsudassana Sutta).
2 Compare the Questions of Milinda, iv. 8. 22 and the discussion as to bamboo, mushrooms, or sauce, Sacred Books of the East, xxxv, p. 244. Boar flesh is common village-meat. Compare what the pigs say in Jāt. No. 388: maṁsatthāya hi posiyāmase, “we are fattened for our flesh” (p. 289), and further references below, p. 463. Still, some plant-names begin with ‘boar-,’ and Buddha ought to have the benefit of the doubt.
'northern' and 'southern' is practically in the same clime. A still better case is afforded by the similar regulation as to coverlets. In the northern and middle part of the country, because it is there customary to have coverlets made of vegetable matter, the Buddhists are to follow this custom; but when they go south, where (as in Ujjain) people use animal skins as coverlets, there they may use animal skins—a tacit condonation of the slaughter of animals. As a medicinal remedy the Buddhist may take intoxicating liquors1 and the flesh and blood and fat of bears, alligators, swine, and asses. But a rule found in the same work, vi. 31. 14, goes much further than this and really gives the gist of the whole matter in permitting the use of meat, if not killed for the express purpose of feeding the Buddhist. The same rule holds as to fish. The Buddhists may eat it if they 'do not see, do not hear, do not suspect' that the fish was caught especially for their use (ibid.). Elephants' flesh and that of horses may not be eaten in time of famine, but this is because they are parts of the "attributes of royalty";2 nor that of dogs and snakes, but because such meat is disgusting. Absolutely forbidden at such a time is only the flesh of human beings3 and of other carnivora (ib. vi. 23. 9 ff.).

In regard to hurting sentient things, Brahmanism holds theoretically that even trees, plants, and grasses are kinds of animals. They differ only in being stable (fixed) instead of mobile; but a long argument which I have cited elsewhere from the Great Epic shows that plants really see, hear, feel, and smell, as well as possess the more obvious sense of touch, and that, therefore, they are living, conscious things, endowed like other animals

1 A century after Buddha's death the Buddhist church (according to tradition, Cullavagga, xii. 1) discussed the question whether it was permissible to drink unfermented toddy. The Buddhist was a teetotaller, as was (ordinarily) the Brahman priest, but in this regard the church as a whole appears to have been much stricter than the orthodox Hindus (not of the priestly caste), who have always been addicted to intoxicants. Even Brahman priests, north of the Nerbudda, were rum-drinkers. Bāndh. I. 2. 4.

2 Compare Jātaka No. 397, p. 322, assā nāma rājabhogā, "horses are kings' property."

3 Cannibalism has left its trace in India in the stories of flesh-eating Yakkas and Piśācas, natives of the Gilgit region (Dr. Grierson, in JRAS. Jan. 1906; Jātaka, 537).
with their own part of the *anima mundi*. This, sociologically, is the older view as contrasted with that of the Buddhists, who hold that a tree, for example, is ‘conscious’ only as containing a living being (a dryad). Plants in themselves possess only one organ of sense (feeling). So there is naturally less horror of injury to plant-life (as plant) among Buddhists than among non-Buddhists (the Brahmans and their followers), though rebirth as a plant is more a theoretical possibility than an actual probability to both parties of believers in *Karma*. According to a rather late compendium of heresies, the Brahmanjāla Sutta, the Buddhist recluses, despite the tightening bonds of conventional friarhood, still continued to injure growing plants, though it was wrong to do so, as it was wrong “to accept raw meat” and to kill living things. This reveals that raw meat was accepted often enough to make it worth while to animadvert upon the practice. But even this Sutta (like the rules for novices) does not prohibit the eating of meat.

In the Edicts of Asoka there are several injunctions against cruelty, but it is ordered merely that (even for sacrifice) no animals be killed “in future,” with a recommendation to respect the sacredness of life. Yet it is evident from the Fifth Pillar Edict that the killing of animals was not unusual. Certain animals in the twenty-seventh year of Asoka’s reign were made exempt from slaughter, as were “all quadrupeds which are not eaten or otherwise utilized by man,” a clear intimation that previously the slaughter of animals was not uncommon and that “the more complete abstention from injury to animate creatures and from slaughter of living beings” was, as proclaimed in the Seventh Pillar Edict, brought about by Asoka, that is, a couple of centuries after Buddha’s death.\(^1\)

1 There is, unfortunately, no common name for the Brahmanized horde as there is for the followers of Buddha. I have sometimes for the horde used ‘orthodox,’ as the Brahmans (i.e. the priests) use heterodox (‘unbelievers’) especially of the Buddhists; but the orthodox were anything but a united fold, though they called themselves all, as against Buddhists, ‘believers.’ On plants as ‘having only one organ,’ see Mahāvagga iii. 1. 2.

2 The Edicts, however, are not for Buddhists alone but for all the realm and in this particular may be aimed against Brahmanic (now heterodox! see the last note) rather than Buddhistic practices. Nevertheless, as no party distinction is made it may be presumed that the Buddhists also needed a stricter rule. In connection with Brahmanic practices, it must be noticed that beef-eating in the Mahābhārata, though common, is confined to ceremonial (sacrificial) consumption.
The Jātakas contain numerous instances revealing great freedom in respect of flesh-eating. For example, the Bodhisat as Śakka, in the Kumbha-Jātaka, forbids the use of intoxicants, but permits the enjoyment of flesh (mānasodanaṁ sappipāyāsaṁ bhūñja; No. 512, p. 20). So in Jāt. No. 528, p. 235, the Bodhisat as a mendicant, mahābodhipariibbājako, eat the flesh of a monkey, makkhaṁmaṁsaṁ khādītvā, and uses its skin as a robe, though only in order to inculcate a lesson. In its Sanskritized form, in the Jātakamāla, this monkey appears as an illusion (perhaps because of the audience; much as the "fatted calf" is discreetly omitted from another parable in India at the present day) and the Bodhisat merely "removes a skin made by himself" and then wears it, after causing the flesh to disappear (cārmaṁpaniśaṁ antardhāpayāṁ āsa; sa tannirmittain vāna-racarmā bibhrat, etc. IOS. 1, p. 147, l. 19). That the deer is a warrior's natural food is admitted in a casual remark addressed to a priest, Jāt. No. 483, p. 273, annaṁ migo brāhmaṇa khattiyassa; but though a king hunts it is meritorious to renounce the sport and devote oneself to charity. In No. 504, p. 437, the king hunts not only deer but wild boar, migasākarādayo vadhitvā, and eats broiled venison, āngārapakkaṁ migamaṁsaṁ. In No. 315, the Bodhisat gets a wagon-load of venison as a gift; but he takes the hunter from his cruel occupation, luddaka-kamma. In No. 12, a king is persuaded to stop killing deer and all other animals. To eat the flesh of a golden peacock, moro, which gives eternal youth and immortality (ib. 159 and 491) is perhaps too great a temptation to allow of its being cited as an example; yet the peacock was not forbidden food either to the Brahma (Bāudh. I. 12. 7) or to the pre-Asokan Buddhist (v. note, loc. cit. S.B.E). Jāt. Nos. 451 and 496 reveal that meat-eating is almost a matter of course, even on the part of the Bodhisat, who in No. 199 eats beef, gomamaṁsa; while the forest-ascetic (No. 496, p. 371, st. 280) says "I eat meat," just as he speaks of eating jujubes, lotus, etc.: sākaṁ bhisaṁ madhum maṁsaṁ badarāmalakāni ca, tāni ābhavata bhūnjāmi atthi me so pariggaho. In the introduction to the Sulasā Jātaka, No. 419, we have a scene depicting a pleasure-garden, where thieves and servants indulge in fish, flesh, and intoxicants, macchaṁmaṁsasurādīni, which shows the vulgar popularity of flesh-food. But in No. 436 a noble lady of Benares is fed on ghee,
rice, fish, and flesh (p. 527, l. 22) by the demon who would woo her. Compare No. 434, where meat is eaten as a dainty.

Large bags of leather,¹ mahante cammapasibbake, to hold money, are referred to in No. 336. Leather is used to make chariot-harness (No. 22) and the clothing of a mendicant, cammasāṭako paribbājaka, in No. 324. Roast pig is used to celebrate a marriage-feast (Nos. 30 and 286) and roast lizard is recognized as good food (in No. 333); though it is a false Buddhist ascetic, dussīḷatāpaso, who in Nos. 138 and 325 is fond of such diet. But crow’s meat is sent (as earnest of better) to the Bodhisat by the king in No. 214, and in No. 220 the scholiast tells a story (to illustrate a Jātaka verse) which implies that a king regularly ate meat (animals might be slaughtered in Benares any day except on fast-days). No. 241, p. 245, even notes the occasion on which, according to tradition, men who had eaten all the fresh meat they could, first began to dry it: tasmiṃ kilā käle vallīrakāraṇaṁ udapāditī vadanti. A very good example of the casual, matter-of-course way in which meat-eating is referred to will be found in Jātaka No. 106 (p. 417), wherein a young man is advised by his father, the Bodhisat, not to marry, simply because he will have to run errands for his wife: “When she wants to eat fish or meat or has need of ghee or salt or rice, etc.” (and sends you to do her errands), yadā macchamāṁsādīni vā khāditukāmā bhavissati sappiḷoṇataṇḍulādīhi vā paṇ’ assā atttho bhavissati. Here the worldly fat girl is imagined as eating meat as naturally as salt, etc.

The whole matter of meat-eating is epitomized in the verse ascribed to the Bodhisat in the Telovādo Jātaka (No. 246):

bhunījamāno pi sappañño na pāpena upalippati,

that is, according to the context, if one who has divine wisdom eats fish or meat, even when he knows it is prepared for him, he does no wrong.² Not meat-eating per se, not the fact that meat

¹ The common use of leather, as Prof. Bloomfield remarked when this paper was read, has been recently exemplified by excavations made in the Northern deserts. Leather nooses are made in Jāt. 296 (p. 158).

² In the exaggerated language of the Bodhisat, one may even eat the flesh of the donor’s wife or child. Only the slayer is sinful, not the eater. The comment is: samsāraṁ bhāttaṁ adāsi . . . samapo Gotamo jānaṁ uddissa-kaṇṭhaṁ mānasāṁ bhunījati, “He gave meat-food . . . Gotama the ascetic knowingly eats meat prepared especially for him.” Buddha here accepts in full the precepts of the Bodhisat.
was prepared especially for the eater, not even the fact that the latter knows of the circumstances, makes the eater guilty of sin. But he must eat with no evil in the heart, no indulgence of appetite. With the same liberality, which distinguishes the ethics of Buddha from that of his ascetic rivals, we find the rule that no evil Karma attaches to an act of unintentional wrongdoing, as laid down in the Kuru-dhamma of Jātaka No. 276 (p. 377), acetanakaṃ kammaṃ na hoti, the Brahmanic rule being that there must be expiration for unintentional as for intentional sin. Devadatta, Buddha’s rival, permitted no eating of flesh-meat; Buddha permitted it with restrictions as to the spirit in which it was eaten. In other words, early Buddhism was opposed to this form of asceticism as to other austerities, which in themselves are valueless. The great distinction between killing and eating may seem rather pharisaical, but it existed. To kill an animal, to be butcher, fowler, or fisher, was wrong, and to connive at slaughter in order to gratify appetite was also wrong. But when the beast had been killed without prior connivance on the part of the Buddhist the flesh might be accepted and eaten. The early Buddhist seems to have thought that, as the animal was dead anyway, he might as well make use of it and did not trouble his conscience with questions of ‘tainted’ offerings. If uncommonly ascetic he might refuse it as being a delicacy, but not because meat as meat constituted sinful diet. Probably the later accession of Brahmanical converts tended to the greater strictness of the Buddhist in this regard, until he came to say

---

1 Compare the passage (cited by Mr. Rouse at this place in his translation) from Hardy’s Manual, p. 327: “Those who take life are in fault, but not the persons who eat the flesh. My priests [in contrast with those of Devadatta] have permission to eat whatever is customary to eat in any place or country, so that it be done without the indulgence of appetite, or evil desire.” The Cullavagga on this point, vii. 3. 14, mentions only fish, but the contention is the same.

2 Compare with this No. 528 (p. 287): akāmakāriṇāyasmī hi kuv-iddha pāpama lippati. For the Brahmanic rule, see JRAS. July, 1906, p. 584.

3 See the Majjhima Nikāya, pp. 77-8, for a catalogue of useless austerities.

4 Compare Jāt. No. 506 (p. 458), where the king-snake refuses to eat frogs especially killed for him, with the idea “n’esa maṃ nissāya māressaṇī” (na khādati), “not for my sake shall he kill.”
with St. Paul 'If eating meat my brother do offend I will eat no more meat.' The theory of transmigration had, I imagine, little to do with the matter either with Buddhists or with Brahmans; though Buddha admits that a man may be reborn as an animal, for, in speaking of the death of a perfected saint, he couples together, as the fruit of such saintliness, the destruction of "hell and rebirth as an animal." The Jātakas, too, recognize man's rebirth as a beast, but these are not of the earliest Buddhistic era, and, generally speaking, the primitive Buddhist is reborn as man and, if not, he is more likely to reappear as an unfathered divinity in consequence of virtue than as an animal in consequence of evil.1 At any rate, man's rebirth as an animal (with a possible cannibalism) is never suggested as a reason why a Buddhist should not eat meat, although the Brahmanic view was that the animal later would eventually take revenge by eating (in another life) the former eater. Yet even here the idea is not that one should abstain from flesh through fear of eating a reincarnated relative.

To take life, in distinction from eating meat, results in going to hell or in rebirth either as an animal, a ghost, pettivisaye, a demon, asurakāye, or a human being of short life, appāyukasam-vattanikāni (hotī ti, 'said the Bodhisat'), Jāt. 55 (p. 275).

---

1 On the knotty question as to how a future Buddha could be born as an animal, cf. Jātakamāla xxxiii. st. 8. Despite his sufficient wisdom dharmasañjñī 'pi, he had acquired "bits of (evil) Karma," karmalesāṁs tāṁs tāṁ samāśādyā, which reduced him to a beast. The Bodhisat himself explains rebirth in animal form as due to neglect in a previous life to perform good works (kusakakammasa akattatā), as he says Jāt. 31 (p. 205, lines 1 and 7, to Sujātā): tvāṁ pana kusalāṁ akatvā tiraçchānayoniyaṁ nibbattā. The same question arises in regard to the sins committed by Bodhisattas, such as reverting to sensuality (Jāt. 251), keeping and knocking down his wife (No. 199), seducing a girl (No. 62), or even leading a band of robbers. In the last case the Jātaka-maker ascribes such faults rather vaguely "to the stars," nakkhattadosena, Jāt. No. 279 (p. 389), apparently forgetful of the Bodhisat's own words, kim karissanti tārakā (No. 49, Nakkhatta-Jāt.). Rather an interesting statement is made in Jāt. 481 (p. 499), to the effect that on some (unexplained) occasions, ekaccesu tāneva, Bodhisats may destroy life, commit adultery, and drink intoxicants, surā; but they may not tell deceitful lies, musāvādo, which destroy the reality of things. Truth is the highest virtue. In mediaeval Sk. literature abstention from meat is a sign of virtue, as in the Hitopadesa, where, more specifically, eating meat "on the Lord's day" (1. 3) is unlawful.
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The annual meeting of the Society was held in New Haven, Conn., on Tuesday and Wednesday of Easter week, April 17th and 18th, in the Library of the Classical Club, in Phelps Hall.

The following members were present at one, or more of the sessions:

Allen, F. S. Carus
Allen, Miss Currier
Arnold, W. R. Gottheil
Barton Gray
Blake Grieve, Miss L. C. G. Lannan
Blodgett Haas
Bloomfield Harper
Bolling Haskell
Brown Hock
Campbell Hopkins
Jackson, A. V. W. Morris, Miss
Jackson, J. D. Muller
Jastrow
Jewett
Quackenbos
Lilley
Lyon
Moore, G. F.
Moore, J. H.
Moore, Mrs. G. F. Ward, W. H.

Ropes
Torrey
Toy
Van Name
Total 40.

The first session began on Tuesday morning at eleven o’clock, with President Gilman in the chair.

The minutes of the last annual meeting, held in Springfield, Mass., April 27th and 28th, 1905, were read in abstract by the Recording Secretary, having already been printed in the twenty-sixth volume of the Society’s Journal.

The Committee of Arrangements, through Professor Hopkins, presented its report in the form of a printed programme. Professor Torrey announced that the Graduates’ Club extended its privileges to the members of the Society during their stay in New Haven; that a luncheon would be given by the New Haven members of the Society on Wednesday at one o’clock,
to the men, at the Graduates' Club, while the ladies in attendance on the meeting would be entertained at the same time, at the Country Club, by Mrs. Hopkins and Miss Whitney; and that arrangements had been made for a dinner on Wednesday evening at half past seven, at the Tontine Hotel.

The succeeding sessions of the Society were appointed for Tuesday and Wednesday afternoons at half past two o'clock, and for Wednesday morning at half past nine.

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor E. W. Hopkins, reported as follows:

Letters of acceptance have been received from all those elected to membership at the last Meeting. Greetings were sent to Dr. James C. Hepburn and a reply received.

In response to an invitation from the Philosophical Society to send a delegate to represent this Society at Philadelphia during the Franklin Bicentenary exercises, President Gilman consented, at the Secretary’s request, to act as our representative.

In accordance with the order of the Directors, the Journal of the Society has been copyrighted.

The Ethnological Survey P. I. has been added to the list of exchanges.

The death of the following members of the Society was reported:

HONORARY MEMBERS.

Professor Jules Oppert.
Professor Friedrich von Spiegel.

CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Mr. Clarence H. Clark.
Dr. P. L. Armand de Potter.
Samuel Fales Dunlap.
President William Rainey Harper.
Rev. Lauren P. Wolfe.

MEMBER OF THE SECTION FOR THE HISTORICAL STUDY OF RELIGIONS.

Professor George S. Goodspeed.

CORRESPONDING MEMBER.


Tributes were paid to Professor Oppert, by Professor Gottheil; to President Harper, by Professor Toy; and to Professor Spiegel, by Professor Jackson.

The report of the Treasurer, Professor F. W. Williams, was read by Mr. J. D. Jackson.
RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS BY THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY FOR THE YEAR ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1903.

The Treasurer in presenting his report makes mention of the fact that he has been obliged again this year to draw upon the reserves of the Society by withdrawing $500 to meet the cost of the annual volume from the accumulated interest of the Coheal Publication Fund. The Society in order to get upon a safe basis should either increase its income or reduce its present expenditure by about three hundred dollars annually.

RECEIPTS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance from old account, Dec. 31, 1904</td>
<td>$ 772.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues (179) for 1905</td>
<td>$895.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; (47) for other years</td>
<td>235.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; (19) for Hist. S. R. Sect.</td>
<td>38.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$1,168.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of publications</td>
<td>120.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Nat. Bank Dividends</td>
<td>108.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Suffolk Savings Bk.</td>
<td>11.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Prov. Inst. for Savings</td>
<td>52.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; National Savings Banks</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscriptions collected for Subvention</td>
<td>95.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1537.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$2,329.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXPENDITURES.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T., M. &amp; T. Co., printing vol. XXVII</td>
<td>$572.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; &quot; vol. XXVII</td>
<td>772.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; paper</td>
<td>87.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; sundry printing</td>
<td>36.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>21.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library cards and stamp</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvention to Orient. Bibliographie</td>
<td>95.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honoraria to editors</td>
<td>200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian, postage and express</td>
<td>20.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer, Balance to general account</td>
<td>19.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>482.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$2,329.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STATEMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1905</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Bradley Type Fund (N. H. Savings Bank)</td>
<td>$2,192.52</td>
<td>$2,297.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Coheal Publication Fund (Pr. Inst. Savings).</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. State National Bank Shares</td>
<td>1,950.00</td>
<td>1,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Life Membership Fund</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Connecticut Savings Bank deposit</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>5.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. National Savings Bank deposit</td>
<td>10.50</td>
<td>10.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Accrued Interest in II</td>
<td>516.12</td>
<td>69.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. &quot; &quot; IV</td>
<td>69.98</td>
<td>81.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. &quot; &quot; VI</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Cash on hand</td>
<td>67.68</td>
<td>331.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$6,087.82</td>
<td>$6,046.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-
The report of the Auditing Committee, Mr. J. D. Jackson and Mr. A. P. Stokes, was presented by Mr. Jackson, and is as follows:

April 16th, 1906.

In the absence of my colleague, Mr. Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., I have made the audit of the accounts of the American Oriental Society and hereby certify that I have examined the account book of the Treasurer of the society and have found the same correct, and that the foregoing statement is in conformity therewith.

I have also compared the bills and vouchers and statement of balances accompanying the same and have found them to be correct.

JOHN DAY JACKSON,
Auditor for the Society.

The Librarian, Professor Hanns Oertel, presented his report, as follows:

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN.

In the past winter foundations were laid on the University Campus for a new building planned as the beginning of an eventual complex of University library buildings. It immediately adjoins the present Chittenden Library and will occupy the space between the latter and the Old University Library. The new building covers some fifty thousand odd square feet, will accommodate at least four hundred thousand books and will also contain the executive offices of the librarians and a number of consultation rooms. The main part of the building will consist of a compact book stack of six tiers, arranged on the one hand to be accessible to the various reading rooms and consultation rooms, and also arranged that parts of the stack can be sectioned off and used for the deposit of such works as from their value or character need not be open to the general body of students for consultation. It is proposed thus to create a section of the stack for the library of the American Oriental Society, insuring the Society's books being kept together under lock and key, and still readily accessible to its members. The stack will of course be absolutely fire-proof, well lighted during the day by natural light from the west, and by electric light during the evening hours. Well-lighted tables will be placed in the stack and in immediate proximity to the books, where the members of the Society may consult its books free from interruption. The expansion of the library will be provided for, so that as long as the books of the Society are in deposit in the University Library they will be kept together and separate from the University's books.

The impending transfer of our books from their present cramped quarters emphasized with particular force the need of cataloguing the Society's Library; for without a catalogue it is practically impossible to administer properly or use conveniently a large collection of books such as our library now holds. However, with the chronic deficit in our treasury, such a plan would have remained a pious wish had it not been for the most generous offer of Miss Margaret D. Whitney to undertake the cataloguing of the Society's library without compensation and as a labor of love. Miss Whitney, who is a trained librarian, undertook the work with characteristic energy and I hope to be able to report at
the next meeting that the greater part of the Society's library has been competently catalogued. A new and heavy indebtedness will thus be added to the many and important obligations which our Society, since its inception, owes to the name of William Dwight Whitney. The thanks of the Society are due to John C. Schwab, Esq., Librarian of the Yale University Library, for many favors and valued assistance, and to Henry Gruener, Esq., of the Yale University Library, who, as in previous years, has rendered much assistance to the Librarian.

Respectfully submitted,

HANNS OERTEL,
Librarian.

April 16, 1906.

On motion of Professor Bloomfield the Society expressed its thanks to Miss Margaret Whitney for her services in preparing a catalogue of the library.

The report of the Editors of the Journal, Professors Hopkins and Torrey, was presented by Professor Torrey, and is as follows:

REPORT OF THE EDITORS.

The twenty-sixth volume of the Journal was issued in two parts, the First Half appearing in August, 1905, and the Second Half in March, 1906. The volume contained 468 pages in all; or 416 pages exclusive of the Proceedings, List of Additions to the Library (covering the period April 1898—April 1905), List of Members, and Notices.

The late appearance of the Second Half of this volume was due chiefly to a printers' strike, which continued for a long time and reduced our publishers to straits. It is likely that the effect of this same strike will be felt in the publication of vol. xxvii; but probably the delay will not be great.

The following persons, recommended by the Directors, were elected members of the Society:

HONORARY MEMBERS.
Professor Ferdinand Justi. Professor Ignaz Goldziher.

CORPORATE MEMBERS.
Harold Herman Bender. Francis Branch Blodgett.
Franklin W. Hooper. Alonzo A. Madsen.
Nicholas A. Koenig. Martin A. Meyer.
Benjamin W. Robinson. Gilbert Campbell Scoggin.
MEMBERS OF THE SECTION FOR THE HISTORICAL STUDY OF RELIGIONS.

Rev. W. A. Shedd.  
Rev. G. E. White.

The committee appointed at Springfield to nominate officers (Messrs. Moore, Jackson, and Jastrow: see Journal, vol. xxvi, p. 435) reported through its chairman, Professor Moore, as follows:

At the last meeting of the Society, Mr. Gilman, who has filled the office of President most acceptably since 1893, having expressed his desire that he should not be asked to serve after this year, a committee was appointed to nominate officers at the present meeting, with the understanding that the election would be held at the first session, so that the President should take his seat at the meeting at which he was elected; and it was voted "that in future the President be requested to prepare an address on some phase of the progress or significance of Oriental studies to be read at the annual meeting." This Society has been peculiarly fortunate in its Presidents, and it has been accustomed to re-elect them from year to year so long as they were willing to serve it. In most of the other American learned societies the presidency is an honor which is annually conferred upon some distinguished scholar, and it was plainly in the mind of the Society in the plan which it adopted at Springfield that it should in future be so among us also. It is not proposed that any new rule be made, but merely that the usage hitherto prevailing shall not be regarded as having the force of prescription.

The committee nominated the following officers, who were unanimously elected:

President—Professor Crawford Howell Toy, of Cambridge, Mass.
Vice-Presidents—Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York; Professor Charles R. Lanman, of Cambridge; Professor Maurice Bloomfield, of Baltimore.
Corresponding Secretary—Professor E. Washburn Hopkins, of New Haven.
Recording Secretary—Professor George F. Moore, of Cambridge.
Secretary of the Section for Religions—Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of Philadelphia.
Treasurer—Professor Frederick Wells Williams, of New Haven.
Librarian—Professor Hanns Oertel, of New Haven.
Directors—The officers above named; and President Daniel Coit Gilman, of Washington; Professor Robert F. Harper, of Chicago; Professors Richard Gottheil and A. V. Williams Jackson, of New York; Professor Paul Haupt, of Baltimore; Professor Henry Hyvernat, of Washington; Professor Charles C. Torrey, of New Haven.
Professors G. F. Moore, A. V. W. Jackson, and M. Jastrow, Jr., were appointed a committee to nominate officers at the next annual meeting.

At twelve o'clock President Gilman delivered his address, on "Recent Contributions by Americans to the Knowledge of the Orient."

The second session of the Society began at half-past two o'clock, with President C. H. Toy in the chair, and proceeded to the reading of papers. The following communications were presented:

Dr. F. R. Blake, of Johns Hopkins University, Contributions to comparative Philippine grammar.

Dr. J. C. Ferguson, of Shanghai, China, The abolition of competitive examinations in China.

Professor Gottheil, of Columbia University, Muhammad Abdu, late Mufti of Egypt.—Remarks were made by Professor W. M. Müller.

Dr. L. H. Gray, of Newark, N. J., The Dūtāṅgada of Subhāṭa, now first translated from the Sanskrit and Prākrit.

Mr. G. C. O. Haas, of Columbia University, Dhanika's commentary on the Daśarūpa.—Remarks were made by Professor Lanman.

Professor Hopkins, of Yale University, On the Buddhist rule against eating meat.—Remarks were made by Professors Bloomfield, Lanman, and Toy.

Professor Bolling, of the Catholic University of America, A plan for an edition of the Atharva Veda Parisiṣṭas.—Remarks were made by Professor Bloomfield.

Professor Jackson, of Columbia University, Indo-Iranian notes (read by title); The Zoroastrians of Yezd.

Professor Jastrow, of the University of Pennsylvania, Did the Babylonian temples have libraries?—Remarks were made by Professors W. M. Müller, Barton, and Gottheil.

Professor Jewett, of the University of Chicago, Announcement of a new series of Arabic texts.

At a quarter past five the Society adjourned to half past nine Wednesday morning.

The Society met on Wednesday morning at half past nine o'clock, with President Toy in the chair. Professor Toy expressed his appreciation of the honor the Society had done in electing him to the Presidency; in following a line of eminent predecessors he should rely on the co-operation of the members of the Society to maintain its high standard of efficiency.

The reading of papers was resumed. The following communications were presented:

Professor Lanman, of Harvard University, Twin consonants at the junction of two consecutive words.—Remarks were made by Professors Jewett, Jastrow, and Bolling, and Dr. Ward.
Professor Moore, of Harvard University, on a leather garment from an Egyptian tomb, now in the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, which has been described as an "ephod."—Remarks were made by Professor W. M. Müller and Dr. Ward.

Professor Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University, Some emendations of Vedic texts.—Remarks were made by Professor Lanman.

Dr. Lucia C. G. Grieve, of New York, Demonstration of a Brahman woman's daily worship in the house.

Miss Margaretta Morris, of Philadelphia, Race and custom in the Malay archipelago.—Remarks were made by Professor Jastrow.

Mr. J. H. Moore, of Columbia University, Onomatopoetic words in Sanskrit.—Remarks were made by Professor Bloomfield.

Professor Fay, of the University of Texas, Studies of Sanskrit words (presented by Professor Bloomfield).

Professor W. M. Müller, of Philadelphia, The goddess of the Carthaginians.—Remarks were made by Professors Gottheil, Torrey, Jastrow, and Moore.

Professor Torrey, of Yale University, The last sentence of the Tabnit tomb inscription.—Remarks were made by Professors Gottheil and Arnold.

Professor Haupt, of Johns Hopkins University, Semitic verbs derived from particles; The etymology of Hebrew mōḥēl, "circumciser;" The Talmudic passage, Succah 45b, and Psalm cxviii. 27; Some Indo-European etymologies (read in abstract by Dr. Blake).

Dr. Lau, of Columbia University, 'āḇēl in the Bible; A supplement to the Old Babylonian vocabulary (read by title).

At half past twelve the Society took a recess till half past two.

The Corresponding Secretary reported for the Directors that the next annual meeting will be held in Philadelphia, Penn., beginning on April 4, 1907. A committee of arrangements was appointed, consisting of Dr. Talcott Williams, Professor Jastrow, and Professor Müller.

The Directors further reported that they had appointed Professor E. Washburn Hopkins and Professor Charles C. Torrey Editors of the Journal for the ensuing year.

On motion of Professor Hopkins the following resolution was unanimously adopted by a rising vote:

The members of the American Oriental Society desire to express to their retiring President, Dr. Daniel C. Gilman, their appreciation of the services rendered during the thirteen years of his Presidency, and to record herewith their heartiest thanks for the zeal and devotion he has always shown to the interests of this Society.
The following communications were presented:

Professor Jastrow, of the University of Pennsylvania, The story of Tabi-Utal-Bel.

Professor Lyon, of Harvard University, Abbreviated legal expressions in early Babylonian contracts; Seal impressions on early Babylonian contracts.—Remarks were made by Messrs. Jastrow, Arnold, Gottheil, and Allen.

Professor Gottheil, of Columbia University, A distinguished family of Fatimide Cadis (al-Nu’mān) in the tenth century.

Professor Lyon, of Harvard University, The date of the Babylonian king Immeru.—Remarks were made by Messrs. Allen and Jastrow.

Professor Toy, of Harvard University, The decay of totemism.—Remarks were made by Professor Hopkins.

Dr. F. R. Blake, of Johns Hopkins University, Comparative syntax of the noun and its modifiers in Semitic; The expression of case by the verb in Tagalog (read by title and abstract).

The following resolution of thanks was unanimously adopted:
The American Oriental Society desires to express its thanks to Yale University for the use of the Library of the Classical Club as a meeting place; to the Graduates’ Club for the privileges of its Club house; to the resident members of the Society and the ladies for their hospitality; and to the Committee for the arrangements, which have contributed much to the success of the meeting and the pleasure of those in attendance.

At five o’clock the Society adjourned, to meet in Philadelphia, Penn., April 4th, 1907.

The following communications were read by title:

Mr. Aaron Ember, Modern additions to the Hebrew language; A new Modern Hebrew-English and English-Hebrew dictionary.—Dr. T. C. Foote, The metrical form of the Songs of Degrees, —Mr. L. B. Wolfenson, The Pi’lel in Hebrew; The infixes ta, ta, and lo in Tagalog.—Professor Christopher Johnston, Egyptian chronology.—Professor D. G. Lyon, Female votaries in the days of Hammurabi.—Professor Oertel, Contributions from the Jāmīniya Brāhmaṇa, sixth series; A Greek inclusive (elliptical) plural and a Sanskrit inclusive singular.
LIST OF MEMBERS.

REVISED, DECEMBER, 1906.

The number placed after the address indicates the year of election.

I. HONORARY MEMBERS.

M. AUGUSTE BARTHE, Membre de l’Institut, Paris, France. (Rue Garancières, 10.) 1898.

DR. RAMKRISHNA GOPAL BHANDARKAR, C.I.E., Dekkan Coll., Poona, India. 1887.

JAMES BURGESS, LL.D., 22 Seton Place, Edinburgh, Scotland. 1899.

DR. ANTONIO MARIA CERIANI, Ambrosian Library, Milan, Italy. 1890.

PROF. BERTHOLD DELBRÜCKE, University of Jena, Germany. 1878.

PROF. FRIEDRICH DELITZSCH, University of Berlin, Germany. 1893.

PROF. ADOLPH ERMAN, Steglitz, Friedrich Str. 10/11, Berlin, Germany. 1903.

PROF. RICHARD GARBE, University of Tübingen, Germany. (Biesinger Str. 14.) 1902.

PROF. KARL F. GELDNER, University of Berlin, Germany. (Luebecker Str. 40, N. W.) 1905.

PROF. M. J. DE GOEJE, University of Leyden, Netherlands. (Vliet 15.) 1898.


PROF. IGNAZ GOLDSCHMIDT, vii Holló-Utca 4, Budapest, Hungary.

PROF. IGNAZIO GUIDI, University of Rome, Italy. (Via Botteghe Oscure, 24.) 1893.

PROF. FERDINAND JUSTI, Marburg, Germany.

PROF. HENDRICK KERN, University of Leyden, Netherlands. 1893.

PROF. FRANZ KIEHLHORN, University of Göttingen, Germany. (Hainholzweg, 21.) 1887.

PROF. ALFRED LUDWIG, University of Prague, Bohemia. (Königliche Weinbirge, Kramerius-gasse 40.) 1888.

PROF. GAUTON MASPERO, Collège de France, Paris, France. (Avenue de l’Observatoire, 24.) 1898.

PROF. THEODOR NOELDEKE, University of Strassburg, Germany. (Kalbsgasse 16.) 1878.

PROF. RICHARD PISCHEL, University of Berlin, Germany. (Halensee, Joachim Friedrichstrasse 47.) 1902.

PROF. EDUARD SACHAU, University of Berlin, Germany. (Wormser Str. 12, W.) 1887.


PROF. EBERHARD SCHRADE, University of Berlin, Germany. (Kronprinzen-Ufer 20, N. W.) 1890.
II. CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Names marked with † are those of life members.

Rev. Dr. Justin Edwards Abbott, Tardeo, Bombay, India. 1900.
Miss May Alice Allen, 397 Elm St., New Haven, Conn. 1906.
Prof. Edward V. Arnold, University College of North Wales, Bangor, Great Britain, 1896.
Mrs. Emma J. Arnold, 275 Washington St., Providence, R. I. 1894.
Prof. William R. Arnold, Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. 1893.
Dr. Kanichi Asakawa, Publishing Dept., Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan. 1904.
Hon. Simon E. Baldwin, LL.D., 44 Wall St., New Haven, Conn. 1898.
LeRoy Carr Barrett, Box 86, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1903.
Prof. George A. Barton, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1888.
Prof. L. W. Batten, 232 East 11th St., New York. 1894.
Prof. Harry P. Beach, Yale University, 70 Howe St., New Haven, Conn. 1898.
Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D., Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y. 1900.
Harold H. Bender, Johns Hopkins Univ., Baltimore, Md. 1906.
Dr. William Sturgis Bigelow, 60 Beacon St., Boston, Mass. 1894.
Prof. John Binney, Berkeley Divinity School, Middletown, Conn. 1887.
Dr. Frank Ringgold Blake (Johns Hopkins Univ.), Dixon Park, Mt. Washington, Md. 1900.
Rev. David Blaustein, Educational Alliance, 197 East Broadway, New York, N. Y. 1891.
Frederick J. Bliss, Clifton Springs, New York.
Francis B. Bledgett, General Theological Seminary, Chelsea Square, N. Y. 1906.
Prof. Carl August Blomgren, Augustana College and Theol. Seminary, Rock Island, Ill. 1900.
Prof. Maurice Bloomfield, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md. 1881.
Prof. Charles W. E. Boyd (General Theological Seminary), 9 Chelsea Square, New York, N. Y. 1897.
Dr. Alfred Boissier, Le Rivage près Chambésy, Switzerland. 1897.
Dr. George M. Bolling, Catholic Univ. of America, Washington, D. C. 1896.
Prof. James Henry Breasted, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1891.
Prof. Chas. A. Briggs (Union Theological Seminary), 700 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1879.
Prof. C. A. B. Brockwell, Univ. of Kings College, Windsor, Nova Scotia, Canada. 1906.
Dr. Paul Brönnele, 73 Burdett Ave., Westcliff-on-Sea, England. 1908.
Prof. Francis Brown (Union Theological Seminary), 700 Park Ave., New York, N. Y. 1881.
Prof. Carl Darling Buck, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill. 1892.
Dr. Paul Carus, La Salle, Illinois. 1897.
Miss Eva Channing, Hemenway Chambers, Boston, Mass. 1883.
Dr. Frank Dyer Chester, United States Consulate, Buda-Pesth, Hungary. 1891.
†George Wetmore Colles, 62 Fort Greene Place, Brooklyn, N. Y. 1882.
Prof. Hermann Collitz, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, Pa. 1887.
Miss Elizabeth S. Coltson, Easthampton, Mass. 1896.
C. Everett Conant, Translator-Interpreter Executive Bureau, Manila, P. I. 1905.
William Merriam Crane, 16 East 37th St., New York, N. Y. 1902.
Prof. John D. Davis, Princeton Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J. 1888.
Lee Maithe Dean, Westbrook, Maine. 1897.
Prof. Alfred L. P. Dennis, 5735 Washington Ave., Chicago, Ill. 1900.
James T. Dennis, University Club, Baltimore, Md. 1900.
David J. Doherity, M.D., P. O. Box 727, Manila, P. I. 1905.
Dr. Harry Westbrook Dunham, 5 Kilsyth Road, Brookline, Mass. 1894.
Wilberforce Eames, Lenox Library, 890 Fifth Ave., New York, N. Y. 1897.
Mrs. William M. Ellicott, 106 Ridgewood Road, Roland Park, Md. 1897.
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ARTICLE XI. This Constitution may be amended, on a recommendation of the Directors, by a vote of three-fourths of the members present at an annual meeting.
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TO CONTRIBUTORS.

Fifty copies of each article published in this Journal will be forwarded to the author. A larger number will be furnished at cost.
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GENERAL NOTICES.

1. Members are requested to give immediate notice of changes of address to the Treasurer, Prof. Frederick Wells Williams, 135 Whitney avenue, New Haven, Conn.

2. It is urgently requested that gifts and exchanges intended for the Library of the Society be addressed as follows: The Library of the American Oriental Society, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, U. S. America.

3. For information regarding the sale of the Society's publications, see the next foregoing page.

4. Communications for the Journal should be sent to Prof. E. Washburn Hopkins or Prof. Charles C. Torrey, New Haven.

CONCERNING MEMBERSHIP.
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Persons interested in the Historical Study of Religion may become members of the Section of the Society organized for this purpose. The annual assessment is $2; members receive copies of all publications of the Society which fall within the scope of the Section.
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