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The annual meeting of the Society, being the one hundred twenty-fourth occasion of its assembling, was held in New York, N. Y., at Columbia University, on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of Easter week, April 9th, 10th, and 11th, 1912.
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The first session was held in Philosophy Hall on Tuesday afternoon, beginning at 3:10 p.m., the President, Professor George F. Moore, being in the chair.

The reading of the minutes of the meeting in Cambridge, April 19th and 20th, 1911, was dispensed with, because they had already been printed in the Journal (vol. 31, part 4, p. i-ix).

The Committee of Arrangements presented its report, through Professor Gotthell, in the form of a printed program. The succeeding sessions were appointed for Wednesday morning at half past nine, Wednesday afternoon at half past two, and Thursday morning at half past nine. It was announced that there would be an informal meeting of the members at the Hotel Marseilles on Tuesday evening, that a luncheon would be given to the Society by the local members at the University Commons on Wednesday at 1:15 p.m., and that arrangements had been made for a subscription dinner at the Hotel Marseilles on Wednesday evening at half past seven.

REPORT OF THE CORRESPONDING SECRETARY.

The Corresponding Secretary, Professor A. V. Williams-Jackson, presented the following report:

The Corresponding Secretary has the honor to report at the outset that he has received from President Nicholas Murray Butler of Columbia University a message of hearty greeting to the members assembled at this meeting. President Butler expresses his regret that his duties as presiding officer at a political convention held at Rochester, N. Y., deprive him of the pleasure of attending some of the sessions.

The regular correspondence of the Secretary during the past year has involved the writing of a large number of letters, to members and others, in regard to matters directly connected with the Society's work. The obligation has, however, been a pleasant one, for it has led to a number of interesting communications with fellow-workers, not only in America and Europe, but also in the East, including a remote corner of Kurdistan.

The formal invitation to participate in the International Congress of Orientalists at Athens was supplemented, during this last year, by further communications and bulletins, and it may be mentioned here that the President, Professor Moore, appointed Professors Hopkins, Jastrow, and Haupt to represent the Society at the Congress. Professor Hopkins, in a letter written in Athens on the eve of the Congress and received here yesterday, sends his cordial greetings to the members of the Society and his good wishes for the present meeting.

As instructed by the Directors, the Secretary attended the annual meeting of the American Year Book Corporation as the Society's representative. He welcomes the opportunity of mentioning the desire of all concerned in this enterprise to give appropriate space to Oriental matters and especially to Oriental scholarship in America.
It is a sad duty to record the loss of four members by death in the past twelve months.

Col. Thomas Wentworth Higginson, who had been a member of the Society since 1869, died on May 19, 1911, at the ripe age of eighty-seven years. His activities as a historian and essayist, as well as his achievements as a soldier, are too well known to need record here. Col. Higginson was a regular attendant at the Cambridge sessions and occasionally at meetings elsewhere. At the last meeting, being unable to be present, he sent a message of greeting, whereupon the Society directed Professor Lamman to express its appreciation and good wishes.

Lady Caroline De Filippi, née Fitzgerald, who died in Rome, Italy, on Christmas Day, 1911, joined the Society in 1886 and became one of its life-members. Her interest in the Orient, first aroused by Professor Whitney, continued throughout her life, and she traveled extensively in the East, particularly in Central Asia, Ladakh, and India.

Mr. Charles J. Morse, of Evanston, Ill., whose death occurred on December 6, 1911, had become a member in 1900. Mr. Morse, who was an engineer by profession, spent some time in Japan and became interested in the art of the Far East. He gathered a rich collection of Chinese and Japanese paintings, porcelain, and other works of art, together with a library of works relating to the subject. This collection is preserved in a fireproof room in the residence of his widow at Evanston.

Dr. John Orme, Curator of Arabic manuscripts in the Semitic Museum at Cambridge, has also been removed from our list by death. He had been for twenty-one years a corporate member of the Society and had regularly attended the meetings held at Cambridge.

In concluding this report the Secretary desires to express once again his appreciation of the willing co-operation of all who are associated with him in the work of the Society, and to renew a hearty wish for its continued welfare.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

The Treasurer, Professor F. W. Williams, presented his annual report, as follows:

RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS BY THE TREASURER OF THE AMERICAN ORIENTAL SOCIETY FOR THE YEAR ENDING DEC. 31, 1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance from old account, Dec. 31, 1910</td>
<td>$ 860.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual dues</td>
<td>$1,168.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales of the Journal</td>
<td>303.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State National Bank dividends</td>
<td>197.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution for the Library</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,747.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,908.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expenses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing of the Journal, Volume 31</td>
<td>$1,066.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sundry printing and addressing</td>
<td>53.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Editor's honorarium</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Balance to new account</td>
<td>1,358.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$ 2,908.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STATEMENT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bradley Type Fund</td>
<td>$2,914.35</td>
<td>$3,052.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coheal Fund</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
<td>$1,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State National Bank Shares</td>
<td>$1,950.00</td>
<td>$1,950.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut Savings Bank</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Savings Bank</td>
<td>$13.07</td>
<td>$20.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest, Coheal Fund</td>
<td>$284.71</td>
<td>$320.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$8,169.03</td>
<td>$8,383.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE.

The report of the Auditing Committee, Professors Torrey and Oertel, was presented by the Recording Secretary, as follows:

We hereby certify that we have examined the account book of the Treasurer of this Society and have found the same correct, and that the foregoing account is in conformity therewith. We have also compared the entries in the cash book with the vouchers and bank and pass books and have found all correct.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., April 3, 1912.  

CHARLES C. TORREY  
HANNS OERTEL  
\{ Auditors. \}

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN.

The report of the Librarian, Professor Albert T. Clay, was presented by Dr. Haas, as follows:

During the past year the books and pamphlets which have been received have been acknowledged and taken care of as previously. Aside from the cataloguing of serial publications no attempt has been made to classify the accessions.

I need not repeat what has previously been stated concerning the condition of disorder which exists in the Library, making it an almost impossible task to locate works, other than serial publications, desired by members. As the Society is aware, the serial publications have been catalogued by Miss Whitney and her associates under the direction of the former Librarian, Professor Oertel.

During the winter I began to solicit subscriptions from members of the Society to put the Library into shape. In answer to eight letters I received only two replies that seemed favorable, one of them being an inquiry; whereupon I concluded that if the money was to be raised, some other method would have to be adopted. I have brought this matter to the attention of the Directors, asking whether the funds of the Society will not permit appropriating a certain amount for the maintenance of the Library.

REPORT OF THE EDITORS.

The report of the Editors of the Journal, Professors Oertel and Jewett, was presented by Professor Oertel, as follows:
The date of publication of the four quarterly instalments has been changed from December, March, June, and September to January, April, July, and October, to make the publication of each volume fall within a single calendar year. The Editors respectfully request members of the Society to notify Professor J. C. Schwab, Librarian of Yale University, at once of any change in their mailing address. Failure to receive the current numbers of the Journal is in most cases due to neglect in keeping the mailing-list up-to-date. The Editors also request that all manuscript copy for the next volume of the Journal be handed to them immediately after the meeting. They further call the attention of contributors to the following rule adopted by the Directors: That each contributor to the Journal shall be allowed 10% of the cost of composition for author’s alterations in proof, and that all cost of such alterations in excess of this allowance shall be charged against the author.

ELECTION OF MEMBERS.

The following persons, recommended by the Directors, were elected members of the Society (for convenience the names of those elected at a subsequent session are included in this list):

CORPORATE MEMBERS.

Mrs. Justin E. Abbott
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Mr. Ronald C. Allen
Rev. Dr. Floyd Appleton
Mrs. Daniel Bates
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Rev. Mr. Wm. H. Du Bose
Mr. William T. Ellis
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Prof. Alexander R. Gordon
Mrs. Ida M. Handtett
Mr. Newton H. Harding
Dr. Archer M. Huntington
Mr. S. T. Hurwitz
Mrs. A. V. Williams Jackson
Dr. Hester D. Jenkins
Dr. Otto Lichti

Mr. H. Linsfield
Dr. Daniel D. Lackenbll
Mr. C. V. McLean
Rev. Mr. Elias Margolis
Prof. Samuel A. R. Mercer
Mrs. Charles J. Morse
Prof. George A. Peckham
Dr. Arno Poschel
Dr. Caroline L. Rankin
Mr. G. A. Reichling
Mr. Wilfred H. Schoff
Mr. Martin Sprengling
Mr. Emanuel Stierheim
Mr. David E. Thomas
Rev. Mr. LeRoy Waterman
Mr. Arthur J. Westermayer
Mr. John G. White

ELECTION OF OFFICERS FOR 1912-1913.

The committee appointed at Cambridge to nominate officers for the year 1912—1913, consisting of Professors Lanman and Lyon and Dr. Charles J. Ogden, reported through the chairman, Professor Lanman, and made the following nominations:

President—Professor George F. Moore, of Cambridge.
Vice-Presidents—Professor Paul Haupt, of Baltimore; Professor Robert F. Harper, of Chicago; Professor Morris Jastrow, Jr., of Philadelphia.
Corresponding Secretary—Professor A. V. W. Jackson, of New York.
Recording Secretary—Dr. George C. O. Haas, of New York.
Treasurer—Professor Frederick Wells Williams, of New Haven.
Librarian—Professor Albert T. Clay, of New Haven.
Directors—The officers above named, and Professors Richard Gutheil, of New York; Charles R. Lanman, of Cambridge; E. Washburn Hopkins and Hans Oertel, of New Haven; Maurice Bloomfield, of Baltimore; George A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr; Dr. William Hayes Ward, of New York.

After presenting this report, Professor Lanman, speaking for himself, made the following comment:

For the first 64 years of our Society's history, it was the actual practice of the Society (except for some special reason) to re-elect a President at the expiration of his term. During these 64 years the office was held by as few as 9 men: Pickering, Edward Robinson, Salisbury, Woolsey, Hadley, S. Wells Williams, Whitney, Ward, and Gilman. Pickering presided from the founding until his death in 1846; Robinson, for 17 years, from Pickering's death until his own, in 1863. The brief incumbencies of Hadley and Williams were terminated by death; that of Whitney, by illness; and Gilman's incumbency of 13 annual terms, from 1883 to 1906, by advancing years. Mr. Salisbury held the office from 1893 to 1896, and again from 1873 to 1881, and his retirement was in both cases due, as I believe, to his natural disposition to shrink from publicity. As to the character of these admirable men, the discriminating remarks of Dr. Ward in our Journal (vol. 16, p. lix) may be consulted.

At the Springfield meeting of 1905 the nominating committee named Mr. Gilman for the office of President and recommended (JAOS. 26. 423) "that in the 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 recommendation was adopted. In the report of the nominating committee at the New Haven meeting of 1906 (JAOS. 27. 470) we read as follows:

This Society has been peculiarly fortunate in its Presidents, and it has been accustomed to re-elect them from year to year as 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.

Professor Toy was elected President at that meeting. He was followed by Lanman in 1907, Hopkins in 1908, Ward in 1909, Bloomfield in 1910, and George F. Moore in 1911. It would manifestly have been most improper for me to say anything about this innovation at the time of my nomination or during my own incumbency; but now that I am not a candidate for re-election, I deem it to be for the interest of the Society that I should express my strong conviction about the matter.

The ability of the Society to command the unpaid services of a distinguished scholar who is at once an efficient chief executive and also a good
presiding officer is one of its most valuable resources. By handing around that office from one to another of all the more prominent members this valuable resource is, to my thinking, thrown away. Indeed, there is involved in this procedure a double loss: not only is the honor cheapened and lessened, but also the opportunity of the President to serve the Society effectively is reduced to the lowest limit.

The chief executive office, rightly administered, requires preparation and knowledge of the early history and precedents of the Society, such as it is by no means likely that a man chosen for one year will take the pains to acquire. He will think of the office simply as an honor, and of the service which it involves as confined to the sometimes exceedingly ill-performed duty of presiding for a dozen hours or so at our annual sessions. In fact, the President should be a watchful and active worker for the benefit of the Society throughout his whole term of office.

In a word, then, our recent innovation subordinates the best interests of the Society from the larger point of view, to considerations which must inevitably be primarily more or less personal and selfish.

To refer to the matter of the Vice-Presidency: it should be distinctly understood that the Constitution of the Society does not recognize any such thing as a First or Second or Third Vice-President and gives no countenance to the theory of promotion from the office of Vice-President to that of President, such as would seem to have been assumed in our most recent practice. On the other hand, the gift of the Vice-Presidency is indeed a recognition, on the part of the Society, of distinguished service to the cause of Oriental studies, such as it is altogether proper from time to time for us to bestow, and it is one which we can bestow without the serious disadvantage of the loss of continuity in the chief executive office.

It should also be added that other nominations than those presented may be made by any member; that the fullest weight has been given to the views of every member of the committee; and, in particular, that Professor Moore has been neither consulted nor informed concerning the intention of the committee to nominate him for another term.

At this point the President, Professor Moore, asked the Corresponding Secretary to take the chair and withdrew from the hall, in order that the Society might discuss the nominations without his being present. After discussion (remarks being made by Professors Bloomfield, Lanman, and H. P. Smith) the officers nominated were unanimously elected.

Professor Moore was then called in and again took the chair. Professor Lanman moved that it be recorded as the sense of the Society that the President should not be re-elected at the expiration of his term. [Note that the motion was made in a form adverse to his own recommendations.] Remarks on this motion were made by Professors Lanman, Barton, H. P. Smith, Bloomfield, Dr. Ogden, and Dr. Ward. It was decided to take a rising vote, the aye-and-no vote suggested by Professor Lanman being deemed needless. It appeared that 27 members were in favor of the resolution and 14 against it,
After a recess of ten minutes for tea, the President delivered the annual address, on "The Mediterranean Civilization," Vice-President Harper being in the chair. On the conclusion of the address, it was voted that the thanks of the Society be extended to Professor Moore for his interesting presentation of the subject.

The President again took the chair, and the Society proceeded to the hearing of the following communication:

Professor J. D. Parson, of Columbia University: A political hymn to Shamash.

The Society thereupon adjourned for the day.

SECOND SESSION.

The members re-assembled on Wednesday morning at 9:45 a.m. for the second session. The President, Professor Moore, was in the chair. The following papers were presented:

Rev. Dr. J. E. Abbott: The Marathi poet Takaram.—Remarks by Professor Lounan.

Professor G. A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College: An archaic tablet in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. F. A. Cossingham, of Merchantville, N.J.: Studies in the chronology of ancient history.—Remarks by Professor Moore.

Dr. F. E. Huxter, of Johns Hopkins University: Versions of the Vikramācarita.—Remarks by Professor Bloomfield.

Professor L. Friedlaender, of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America: Alexander the Great in the imagination of the East.—Remarks by Dr. Scott.

Professor M. L. Mangold, of Dropsie College: The mode of expressing the Hebrew "Wid" in the Greek Hexateuch.—Remarks by Professor Moore.

Mr. W. A. Gillot, of Oak Park, N.Y.: Remarks on a few Hebrew words.—Remarks by Professor Barton.

Professor M. Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University: On the supposed "Sreetedicht," RV. 4, 42.—Remarks by Professor Lounan.

Professor R. J. H. Gortzé, of Columbia University: Some Syro-Hittite figurines.—Remarks by Professor Max Müller and by Dr. Ward.


On suggestion of the Corresponding Secretary it was voted to send a greeting by cablegram to the International Congress of Orientalists, then assembled at Athens, and also to send the good wishes of the Society to a number of the oldest members: Professors Gildersleeve, Toy, and Goodwin, Mr. Van Name, and the Rev. Mr. Dodge.

At one o'clock the Society took a recess until half past two o'clock.
THIRD SESSION.

The Society met for the third session at 2:45 p. m. in the large lecture-room in Schermerhorn Hall, President Moore presiding. The following papers were presented:

Professor A. V. W. Jackson, of Columbia University: Notes on Baluchistan and its folk-poetry. (Illustrated with lantern photographs.)

Professor R. G. Kent, of the University of Pennsylvania: The Vedic 'path of the gods' and the Roman Pontifex.

Rev. Dr. J. P. Peters, of New York: The cock in Oriental literature.

At four o'clock the Society adjourned to the room in Philosophy Hall in which the previous sessions had been held. The reading of communications was then resumed, as follows:

Dr. G. F. Black, of the New York Public Library: The present state of the Gipsy question. (Read by Professor Gottheil.)

Professor C. C. Torrey, of Yale University: A remarkable series of word-plays in the Second Isaiah.

Professor J. A. Montgomery, of the P. E. Divinity School, Germantown, Pa: A magical text and the original script of Mani.

Professor W. Max Müller, of the University of Pennsylvania: The Kunjara language of Dür Fur.

Rev. Mr. J. B. Nix, of Brooklyn: The sign Geśpa (ṛ). — Remarks by Professor Max Müller.

At 5:50 p. m. the Society adjourned for the day.

FOURTH SESSION.

The fourth session was opened at 9:45 a. m. on Thursday morning, in Philosophy Hall, with the President in the chair.

The Corresponding Secretary reported for the Directors that the next annual meeting would be held at Philadelphia, Pa., on March 25, 26, and 27, 1913. He reported further that the Directors had appointed Professors Oertel and Torrey as Editors of the Journal for the ensuing year.

The President then announced the following appointments:

Committee of Arrangements for 1913: Professors Jastrow and R. G. Kent, and the Corresponding Secretary.

Committee on Nominations: Professors Montgomery, Gottheil, and Barret.

Auditors: Professors Oertel and Torrey.

Committee to prepare a resolution of thanks: Dr. Peters and Dr. Scott.

The Society then proceeded to the hearing of the following communications:

Dr. C. J. Oakes, of Columbia University: The story of Udayana as used in the dramas of Harsha.

Miss E. S. Oakes, of Albany: Notes on the so-called Hieroglyphic Tablet in TSB.A., vol. 6, p. 454.
Professor S. G. Oliphant, of Grove City College, Grove City, Pa.: Sanskrit devata = Avestan daena = Lithuanian dauną.

Rev. Dr. A. Yohannan, of Columbia University, and Professor Jackson: On four rare manuscripts of the Persian romantic poet Nizami.

At eleven o'clock the Society took a recess of five minutes, to permit the Directors to assemble for a brief meeting.

After the recess the Corresponding Secretary announced that the Directors recommended four additional persons for election to corporate membership, and these were unanimously elected. (Their names have been included in the list on p. v. above.)

The reading of papers was then resumed, in the following order:

Rev. Dr. F. A. Vanhorst, of Columbia University: Four Babylonian tablets from the Prince Collection of Columbia University.

Dr. A. Poebel, of Johns Hopkins University: The Sumerian incantation CT. 16, 7, 263—277.

Professor G. A. Barton, of Bryn Mawr College: Recent researches into the Sumerian calendar. — Remarks by Dr. Poebel.

Professor I. Friedlaender, of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America: Modern Hebrew literature.

Dr. F. Eucken, of Johns Hopkins University: Vedic sāhaba. — Remarks by Dr. Abbott.

Professor J. A. Montgomery, of the P. E. Divinity School, Germantown, Pa.: Some emendations to Sachau's Ahikar Papyri.

Through its chairman, Dr. Peters, the committee appointed to prepare an expression of the thanks of the Society presented the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted:

That the thanks of the American Oriental Society be extended to the President and Trustees of Columbia University for the hospitality of lodgment, to the Women's Graduate Club for its generous surrender of its spacious room for the sessions and for its kind ministrations, and to the Committee of Arrangements and the local members for the thoughtful provision they have made for the entertainment of the members.

The Society adjourned at 12:40 p. m., to meet in Philadelphia on March 25, 1913.

The following communications were presented by title:

Dr. F. R. Blake, of Johns Hopkins University: (a) The Hebrew Chatspeh; (b) Reduplication in Tagalog.

Professor M. Bloomfield, of Johns Hopkins University: (a) On the 'superfluous' r of Sanskrit chords; (b) On the theory of haplogy as an aid to text-criticism.
Dr. E. W. Burlingham, of the University of Pennsylvania: (a) *Dukkham uriyusaccam* quoted in Bidpai’s *Tales*; (b) Buddhaghosa’s Dhammapada Commentary.

Professor C. E. Conant, of Indiana University: Final diphthongs in Indonesian languages.

Professor R. J. H. Gootdeck, of Columbia University: An amulet from Irbil with a Babylonian and a Phoenician inscription.

Dr. Lucia Guarv, of New York: The Hindu goddess Devi.

Dr. Mary L. Hueser, of Cambridge, Mass.: Tablets from Drêhem in the Public Library of Cleveland, Ohio.

Professor S. A. B. Meeker, of Western Theological Seminary: The oath in Sumerian inscriptions.

Professor I. M. Pais, of the University of Chicago: The published texts from Drêhem.

Mr. G. P. Quackenbos, of Columbia University: The legend of the demon Mâhiśa in Sanskrit literature.

Rev. Dr. W. Rosenau, of Johns Hopkins University: (a) The argument *a fortiori* in Biblical and post-Biblical literature; (b) Old Testament sources of parts of the apocryphal Esther.

Mr. E. B. Soane, of Southern Kurdistan: Some investigations on the Iranian languages of Kurdistan.
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Page 97, l. 4 read: (cf. below p. 100).
- 100, l. 16 read: (cf. above p. 96).
Some Difficult Passages in the Cuneiform Account of the Deluge.—By Paul Haupt, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

I. — One of the most difficult passages in the cuneiform account of the Deluge is the beginning of the story of the Babylonian Noah, contained in lines 11—15 of my edition. This section begins: Al Šuripak, ḫu ša ša ti-tišu atta, i-na ki-adi nār Parāti šaknu, which is generally translated: The city of Suripak, the city which thou knowest, is situated on the bank of the Euphrates; see e. g. Geo. Smith, The Chaldean Account of Genesis, edited by A. H. Sayce (London, 1880) p. 279. Similarly Jules Oppert, Le poème chaldéen du déluge (Paris, 1885) p. 7 rendered: Il est une ville de Surippak, que tu connais; elle est située sur les bords de l’Euphrate. François Lenormant, Les origines de l’histoire (Paris, 1880) p. 601 has: La ville de Schourippak ville que tu la connais sur l’Euphrate existe.

The site of the ancient city of Surippak, the most primitive Sumerian settlement known to us, was discovered, eight years ago, in the ruins of Fāra, N of Warha — Erech, SE of Nuffar — Nippur. At the time of the Flood, Suripak was situated on the Euphrates, and the Persian Gulf extended as far north as Suripak. Just as the Crocodile Lake and the Bitter Lakes in Egypt formed the northern end of the Red Sea at the time of the Exodus, so Lake Nājaf, which is now practically dry, was the northern end of the Persian Gulf at the time of the Flood, or at the time when the story of the Flood originated in the third prechristian millennium (cf. UG 191). In bade Hasîn-attru float his ship near the sea, i.e. at the former northern end of the Persian Gulf, W of Suripak. The Euphrates emptied at that time into Lake Nājaf. Abûl-Fedâ states that according to the ancients the Persian Gulf formerly stretched up to Hirah on Lake Najaf, i.e. about 30 miles S
of Babylon. Hirah (cf. BL 118, n. 8) was situated at 32° N, 44° 20' E, about 4 miles SE of the modern town Najaf.

Jensen, in his Kosmologie der Babylonier (Strassburg, 1890) p. 369 translated: Surippak, eine Stadt, die du kennst — am Ufer des Euphrat ist sie gelegen. But this would be in Assyrian: ina kissadı (or axi) Purati sakın, not saknu. The final an in saknu shows that this is a relative clause (BA 1, 10). We have here two coördinated relative clauses: âlu sa tilâšu atta, the city which thou knowest, and sa ina kissadı när Purati saknu, which is situated on the bank of the Euphrates river; but the relative pronoun is not repeated before the second clause. Similarly we have in the last paragraph but one of the Code of Hammurapi: 8 cinma marca sa la īpašaxu, âsû qiribâ lu šûmadu, ina çamdi la màxnunu, kima nisâ mittu lâ innaqaxu, a malignant sore 9 which does not heal, whose nature a physician cannot learn, which he cannot soothe with a bandage, which like a deadly bite cannot be extirpated. 16 Tilâšu atta cannot be regarded as a parenthesis; 11 in that case we should expect tilâšu atta, not tilâšu. The rendering The city which, as thou knowest, lies on the Euphrates (RBA 493; cf. JAOS 25, 79) is therefore inaccurate.

II. — The following two lines, âlu sa lâbir-na ilâni qiribû ana šakân abûbi âbla libbašunu ilâni rabûti, are generally translated: That city was old, and the gods therein — their heart induced the great gods to make a deluge, or cyclone; 12 but ilâni rabûti; at the end, must be regarded as accusative depending on âblâ. The two lines are equivalent to libbu sa ilâni qirib al Surippak âblâ ilâni rabûti ana šakân abûbi, the heart of the gods in Surippak induced the great gods to make a cyclone. The great gods are here distinguished from the local gods of Surippak. 13 Ilâni before qiribû is a casus pendens; 14 the suffix of libbašunu refers to ilâni qiribû. 16 Ilâni rabûti, however, does not stand in opposition to ilâni qiribû, but is an accusative depending on âblâ. The queens induced the great kings to make a fight would be in Assyrian: sarrâti ana epēs tuqunti 14 âblâ libbašin sarrâni rabûti; and The queen induced the great king to make a fight would be: sarrâtû ana epēs tuqunti âblâ libbusa sarrâ rabâ.

The accusative ilâni rabûti is on a par with the suffix -ni in minâ libbaša ullaši. What does she want me to do? in the
Descent of Istar (obl. I. 31). 

Jensen (KB 6, 83) translates: Was hat ihr "Inneres (hervor)gebracht," was hat [ihren] Bau[ch bewegt]? and in the commentary (KB 6, 395): Was hat ihr Inneres mir hervorgebracht — Was hat sie gegen mich eronnen? Ungnad (TB 65) disregards the suffix -n, translating: Wozu hat ihr Herz sie veranlaßt, wozu hat ihr Sinn sie getrieben? Delitzsch (HW 231*) renders: Womit hat sich ihr Herz gegen mich getragen? d. h. Was will sie von mir? Übläni cannot mean carried against me, but only carried me. Similarly Nebuchadnezzar (iii, 19) says: ana ebēšu Esagila našāni ūbē, my heart induced me to build Esagil. Delitzsch (HW 484*; cf. 231*, 317*) has called attention to the fact that this phrase corresponds to the Biblical nesā'ā lūbī, his heart stirred him up (GB 518*, i). In ustābīt karassu (or qurrušu) we have according to Delitzsch (HW 7*) not the stem yihāšu, to bring, but the stem abālu (AJSI. 26, 235) to be full; see, however, KB 6, 320; SFG 66, 3. These phrases were discussed by Guyard in §§ 88 and 96 of his Notes de lexicographie assyrienne (Paris, 1883). Abālu and našā in this connection correspond to the Arabic hāmala (hāmatul uhā l-umri = 'agrāhu).

Winckler, Keilinschriftliches Textbuch (Leipzig, 1903) p. 84 renders: Surippal, die Stadt, welche du kennst, [welche am] Ufer des Euphrat gelegen ist, jene Stadt besteht seit alters, die Götter in ihr. Einen Flutsturm zu machen trieb ihr Herz an die großen Götter; hānā qirbāšu must be combined with the following line. Jensen (KB 6, 231) gives the meaningless translation: die Götter in ihr die Sturmslut zu machen "brachte hervor" ihr Herz, die großen Götter. The verb abālu does not mean to produce, but to induce. According to Jensen (KB 6, 320, below; cf. p. 316) lūbī in this connection does not mean heart, but abdominal cavity (cf. JBL 19, 76, n. 99). I have discussed some of Jensen’s peculiar renderings in JAOS 22, 19 (cf. also 16, exc; AJSI. 19, 199; 26, 15, 24; ZDMG 63, 517).

Ungnad’s die Götter stunden ihr nahe (TB 50; UG 53) is very improbable. Qarābu means in Assyrian to attack (cf. Syr. attagrab, to be attacked; contrast AJSI. 23, 243) and karrābu (= barāku) means to be propitious, to bless (GB 358*). Nor does Zimmer’s former reading là bir, corrupt, lit. impure, instead of làbir, old, commend itself (cf. KB 6, 482, l. 1). I pointed out
in BA 1, 325 that ḫābaru, old, was probably a compound with prefixed la, not; cf. barāru, to be bright (HW 1878) and Heb. bar, pure. I mentioned Zimmern's conjecture in my (unpublished) translation (printed in 1895) of the cuneiform account of the Deluge, which I had prepared for the third edition of Schrader's KAT, and Jastrow adopted it in RBA 495 (cf. JAOS 25, 70; ZDMG 64, 711, I. 18).

If my translation of II. 13. 14 of the Flood Tablet is correct, the great gods were induced by the local gods of Suripak to send a cyclone. Just as we have here the gods of Suripak, so we find the gods of Erech in the fragment K. 3200 (NE 51, 11) which I translated in JAOS 22, 8 (cf. ZDMG 64, 712, I. 8).24

III. — A desperate passage is the beginning of I. 15. This is preserved exclusively in the Babylonian fragment S. P. II, 360 (NE 124, 15) which I published thirty years ago, from a copy made by Pinches, in my inaugural lecture Der keilinschriftliche Sinfluthericht (Leipzig, 1881). I read there mālā basū, as many as there were; but basū would be written ba-ṣu-u, and if ilāni rabūti and mālā baṣū belonged together, ilāni rabūti would not stand at the end of the preceding line.

In his Kosmologie (1890) Jensen read ibāšū, there were their father Anu, &c; and Zimmerm made the same mistake in Gunnel's Schöpfung und Chaos (1895) p. 423. Even Ungnad (UB 50) rendered: und zwar waren es.25 Also R. W. Rogers, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria (New York, 1908) has: There were their father Anu, while he translates the preceding lines: Suripak, a city which thou knowest, which lies on the bank of the Euphrates. That city was very old, and the heart of the gods within it drove them to send a flood, the great gods. But ibāšū would mean they will be, not they were. The passage NE 67, 68,26 to which Jensen referred in his commentary, is quite different: there ibāšū means: they will be. Similarly kina ilī tabāši (NE 3, 7, 12, 34) means thou wilt be like a god, not thou art like a god, as Jensen (KB 6, 137, 34) and Ungnad (UG 12, 184) translate.27 I added the translation du wirst sein wie Gott (NE 12, below) in 1883, in order to call attention to the similarity with Eritis scit Deus in Gen. 3, 5.28 Jastrow has since shown that the story of Eabani (or Engidu; cf. ZDMG 64, 712, n. 9)
and the Woman is the prototype of the Biblical legend of the Fall of Man, which symbolizes the first connubial intercourse.

Nor can we read, with KB 6, 239, qir-ba-śu at the beginning of l. 15. In the first place, we should expect qirbāšu, as in l. 13, and then, the characters ba-śu are extremely doubtful. According to Iv R the two signs are is (qis) and mal (kit, bit). A. Jeremias, Isinbar-Nimrod (Leipzig, 1891) p. 33 supplied at the beginning of l. 15: es hielten Rat, they held a council, took counsel together, Heb. yāi-ṣumāṭi (2 Chr. 30, 23). This would be in Assyrian: imdālkā for intāliku. Ungnad (UG 53, below) is inclined to supply es treten zusammen, they assemble. But the traces preserved do not lend themselves either to imdālkā, intālikā, they took counsel, or to pazārā, sītāxārā, they assembled (NE 49, 197: 141, 162).

I am inclined to read u-ka-pid; the traces before mal = bit, pit may be the remnant of the Babylonian character for ka. Professor R. F. Harper, who is working in the British Museum at present, has been kind enough to re-examine this tablet, and he informed me (on April 4, 1911) that the reading [u-ka-pid] was at least as good as any other. Winckler Keilschriftliches Textbuch (1903) p. 84 read bit abīsumu, their family, which is impossible. Ukāpid, for ukappid, would mean he planned; so the meaning would be: It was planned by their father Anu (lit. es plante es ihr Vater. Anu). I have shown in JAOS 25, 73 (1904) that we must read in l. 5 of the Flood Tablet: guman kaptād] libbi ana epēs luqunti, 15 Whole is the striving of the heart to make war, or eager is the desire of thy heart to do battle.

Assyr. kāpādu means especially to plot, to conspire, to bring on some disaster. In Syriac this stem appears, with partial assimilation of the d to the p, as kappit; to knot, to tie in a knot. The Qal is used of plants forming knots; cf. German Fruchtknoten and Goethe’s translation of Cant. 2, 13: der Feigenbaum knotet (BL 105) for Heb. hat-ténāh hānêtāh pagēhā. German Knoten is connected with Knoten, Knosp, Knorren, Knödel, Knute. Luther has Ex. 9, 31: der Flache (hatte) Knoten gewonnen for Heb. hap-pastāh qirāt; A.V. the flux was bailed, the noun boll, which is merely an earlier spelling of bowl, denotes a rounded pod or capsule. For the semasiological development cf. Heb. qaṭar, to tie, to conspire. In post-
Biblical Hebrew this verb means also to resolve. For the post-Biblical noun qāḏ, knot, cf. Assy. ḳiṣrū, knot, Ethiop. qeṣṣ. In Arabic we find kābada, to plan (syn. qāṣaḍa) which may stand for kāpada with partial assimilation of the p to the d; it can hardly be a denominative verb derived from kābād, liver. The original form of kābīd, liver, was kābit, just as Heb. abād, to perish, was originally abat (BA 1, 2).

IV. — In ll. 19—22 of the account of the Deluge we read that Ea, the Lord of Unfathomable Wisdom, sat (in counsel) with the gods and revealed their plan to the reed-huts, saying: Reed-hut, reed-hut! brick-house, brick-house! Reed-hut, hear! brick-house, pay attention! This has been correctly explained in HW 327. The reed-hut denotes the hovels of the lower classes, and the brick-house represents the dwellings of the upper classes; so Ea announced the plan of the great gods to rich and poor alike, but only to Hasis-atra he gave in a dream special indications showing him how he might save himself. All people could see that a seismic catastrophe was imminent, but Hasis-atra was the only one who took the necessary precautions.

Assyr. qiqqišu is a synonym of xuṣṣu — Arab. xuṣṣ, cottage, cabin, booth (ZK 1, 347) and Assyr. ḫiṣar, brick-wall, stands for ḫiṣar (cf. Arab. ḫīṣr, wall, and ḫāṣr, stone). Also Assyr. aṣṣarru, or aṣṣar, burnt brick, which has passed into Arabic as ajūr (or ajūr), stands for ḫaṣar. Fränkel, Aram. Fremdwörter (Leyden, 1886) p. 5 pointed out that in the Kitāb al-Ąğānî (xvi, 43, 3; cf. Divan Ḥudil. 66, 10; Nābiga 7, 16) a hut of reeds (ṣuṣṣ) is contrasted with a house of brick (ajūr) and plaster, just as qiqqišu — xuṣṣu is contrasted with ḫiṣar (for ḫiṣar) brick-wall, brick-house, in the present passage of the Flood Tablet. Assyr. qiqqišu (for qiqqišu) is connected with Heb. qaṣ, straw, stubble, Aram. qaṣāḥ, which has passed into Arabic as qaṣāḥ; cf. the post-Biblical qaṣqaṣam, stubble, litter, shake-down, and qīṣīṣ (or qīṣāṣ) stalk of grain, straw.

CT 14, 48 (No. 36, 331) gives several Sumerian equivalents of qiqqišu. The first (Sum. gi-ru-a) means a structure (Assyr. tabānāt) of reeds. The second (Sum. gi-dim) has the same meaning (— Assy. rīṣat qanī). The third (Sum. gi-sik) designates the reed-hut as a slight, frail (Assyr. enṣu) struc-
ture of reeds. Assyr. enšu is used especially of tumble-
down (qaṭapa) buildings; so Sum. gi-sig is a mean habitation,
a humble cottage, a poorly constructed cabin, a frail thatched
structure. Sum. aš means also small, Assyr. čāwrū (— Heb.
čāwr) and qātnu (— Heb. qatān).

W. Andrae says that the walls of the “houses” of the
laborers at Kalah Shergat (Assur) consist of very light mats
of rushes; cf. Meissner’s remarks on the modern Babylonian
carifah, i.e. an arched structure of reeds and reed-mats, fenced
in with reeds, whereas the maštūl, a round tower where the
people seek refuge in times of danger, is built of bricks. The
reed-huts were especially endangered by a cyclone; the qipqip
are therefore mentioned first in l. 20 of the Flood Tablet,
but the tidal wave threatened also the brick houses.

The translation of this difficult passage, which I gave, 23
years ago, in RA 1, 123, 320, and which Jensen (KB 6, 483)
calls sanderbar, is still nearer the truth than the latest efforts
of Jensen, Ungnad, &c. Jensen’s idea that Ea spoke
to the wall of a reed-house, and that the wall communicated
this message in a dream to Hasis-atra, who slept behind the
wall, is untenable. Ea did not communicate in a dream the
decision of the gods to send a cyclone; this was made known
to all the people, both rich and poor; but the instructions
showing Hasis-atra how he might save himself were communica-
ted to him by Ea in a dream. The story of Midas’ barber
(who dug a hole in the ground, whispering into it: King Midas
has ass’s ears) affords no parallel.

The repetition of the words qipiq qipiq igar igar is equivalent
to every reed-hut and every brick-house (GK, § 123, c). The
“construct” in distributive repetitions corresponds to the
“absolute” state in Syriac and to the forms without nūnation
in Arabic phrases like bašṭa bašṭa, jauma jauma. I have
pointed out the connection between the “construct” in Assy-
rian and the “absolute state” in Syriac on p. 113, below, of
the Crit. Notes on Isaiah (SBOT).

V. — In my paper on the beginning of NE I stated
that parīsu in l. 65 of the account of the Deluge meant mast,
more accurately pole-mast, not setting pole. This interpretation
is not at variance with the tenth tablet of NE where we read
that Nimrod and the ferryman of Hasis-atra used 120 parīse,
each 60 cubits (about 100 feet) long, to get across the Waters of Death. Gréssmann’s idea (UG 138) that Nimrod built a hanging bridge of the 120 pole-masts is grotesque. How could Nimrod build a hanging bridge across the Waters of Death without fastening the end on the other side? A rope bridge of rushes would have been more natural than a hanging bridge of 120 enormous pole-masts. According to Gréssmann this hanging bridge served as a passageway between the boat and the shore of the Island of the Blessed; but this gangway would have been more than two miles long (cf. JAOS 22, 10, n. 6).

Nimrod did not construct a hanging bridge out of the 120 long pole-masts, but he used them as setting poles to push the boat through the Waters of Death (cf. ratem canto subigit, Virg., En. 6, 302). Setting poles are still employed in Babylonia. Meissner states that he was transported to Nippur in a boat by two boys who used bamboo stems, with an asphalt ball at one end, as setting poles. Bamboo stems may be over 100 feet long, and nearly 3/4 ft. thick. They are often used as masts. Nimrod, it may be supposed, could not sail across the Waters of Death because there was a dead calm. The water was nearly 100 feet deep, and whenever Nimrod touched the boggy bottom with one of his poles, he could not lift it up again, so that he was compelled to take a fresh pole. They stuck in the quagmire at the bottom of the Waters of Death; cf. Virgil’s lines, En. 6, 295–297:

_Hinc via, Tartarici quae sunt Acherontis ad undas,
Turbidus hic cano vastaque vertiginose gurguisse
asphaltum, atque omnem Cygto cruciat arcanum;

and 415–416:

_Tandem trans fluviorum incolumis rataque virisque
inomina liceasque exponit in aera._

Finally, when the 120 poles were gone, Nimrod unstepped the mast of his boat and used it as a setting pole. This enabled him to land at the Island of the Blessed.

The Ferryman was wont to take along a chest full of stones. In _sud_ abne the first word is connected with the Talmudic _siddeth_ chest, box. The stones in this chest were _meah_ which served as anchors. The most ancient anchors consisted of large stones. Ordinary stones, however, could not be used for this purpose; they had to be provided with holes to attach hawsers to them. He would attach a hawser to one of them.
and throw it into the bog as far away as possible from the bow of the boat; then he hauled the boat up to it. In this way he was able to warp the boat across the Waters of Death. Warping anchors (German Warpanker) are known as kedges, and the lawssers attached to them are called kedge-ropes. In the case of a large vessel the kedge is carried out in a boat, and then dropped overboard, and the vessel hauled up to it, but the Ferryman had only a small boat; so he was compelled to throw the kedges as far away from the boat as possible.

After Nimrod had smashed the stones in the Ferryman's chest, it was difficult to obtain new large stones provided with holes. Therefore the Ferryman told Nimrod to cut 120 pole-masts. These were, of course, not carried in the boat, but towed through the water by means of a rope attached to the stern of the boat. They probably used the kedging-rope for this purpose. This, I think, is the solution of the mystery of the stones and the pole-masts.

VI. — I have explained: some difficult passages of the Flood Tablet in my lecture on Purim (Leipzig, 1906) p. 3, ll. 18—20; p. 30, nn. 32—36; also in AJSL 24, 128, n. 1; 143, ad v. 3; 26, 15, 16, 24, 25, nn. 60—67; ZDMG 61, 276, ll. 20, 43; 63, 516, l. 42—517, l. 32: 64, 711, ll. 15—30; cf. 714, ll. 3, 8, 15. The first seven lines of the Flood Tablet were explained in JAOS 25, 68—75. For the phrase sirium nudata eli cirika, armor thou hast placed upon thy body, lit. upon thy back, we must remember that we use back in the same way. Shakespeare says: I bought you a dozen of shirts to your back; cf. our vulgar phrase to keep a person back and belly, i.e. to keep him in clothes and food. To back was formerly used in the sense of to clothe. Ungnad's renderings Günstlich ist dein Wesen dazu angefan zu streiten, und dennoch pflegst du, auf deinem Rücken liegend, der Ruhe! (TB 50) or Günstlich ist dein Wesen dazu geschaffen, Kampf zu führen; du aber bist müßig, auf deinem Rücken liegend (UG 53) are impossible.

Ungnad also adheres to the untenable rendering measures, although I showed 24 years ago that minâtî in the third line of the Flood Tablet means looks, appearance. This rendering has been adopted also by Jastrow (RBA) and Rogers. Lines 28, 29 should be rendered: The ship which thou art to build, let her lines be long, and let her width equal her depth.
—mindūdā, madḍudā, mitūdā, the reflexive stem of madḍānū, corresponding to Arab. imtādā, to be extended, to be long. Madḍānū, to measure, is a denominative verb which means originally to ascertain the extent of a thing. According to ll. 58, 59 both width and height of the Babylonian Ark were 120 cubits or about 200 feet, and the length was considerably more. Cf. my paper on the dimensions of the Babylonian Ark AJP. 9, 422.12

Notes.


(3) See OLZ 12, 245, 249, 251; ZDMG 63, 529, II. 6, 29.


(5) Despite the statement in l. 9 of the so-called Nippur fragment of the Babylonian Deluge story, cullû danna (ullil, Roof with a strong roof (JAOS 31, 31; UG 73, 212) we must translate l. 31 of the Flood tablet, [e]ma apš šāš cullûsī (NE 135, 31): Float her near the (fresh-water) sea, i.e. Lake Yajaf. Assy. callû is a synonym of utûlu (— madulû — natahullû). Cf. NE 50, 268: utûlu-ma ellû ma ma'āl mašin cullû. The men lay down and rested on the night couches. For utûlu and ma'āl see my paper on the Heb. stem nahāl, to rest, AJSL 22, 195, 199. For cullû cf. my remarks on Heb. callû (Ex. 15, 10) in AJSL 29, 162. Contrast KAT, 69, l. 5; UG 53, l. 31. Ena (HW 79) — Heb. 'im, Arab. ma'n (c. g. ma'n 'hā'iti, along the wall).

(6) See Gayard, *Geographie d'Abouïfsâda*, vol. ii, part 2 (Paris, 1883) p. 73. The Arabic text (p. 299, below, of the
Paris edition) reads as follows: the nunaqīf tumma diễn gurū is a noun that means dam, dike. Cf. OLZ 12, 251; ZDMG 63, 521, n. 42.


(9) Assyr. cimmu marṣu — Heb. maakhir naḥlah (Nah. 3, 19). Cimmu may be connected with Arab. čamma, to strike (cf. čamama 'ş-saifu). It could stand also for čim — Arab. qaim, hurt, injury, oppression; but this is less probable. Nor can it be combined with Arab. żūmah, ḥūmah, trouble, disease.

(10) For the omission of the relative pronoun cf. GK, § 116, x; Duval, Grammaire syriaque (Paris, 1881) § 401.

(11) Nor is tāmūr šāmār (KB 6, 265) in the last column of the twelfth tablet a parenthesis; see BA 1, 69, n. 36; GE 53, n. 6; TB 61; UG 66.

(12) Cf. HW 45; UG 53, 57, 59; E. Suess, Die Sintflut (Prag, 1883) pp. 23, 24, 44—49, 54, 68; also the remarks at the end of my paper The Dimensions of the Babylonian Ark in AJP 9, 424. Praetorius’ combination of abītu with Arab. hubb (KAT 2, 66, 19) may be correct (cf. Jensen, Kosmologie, p. 389). The catastrophe was caused chiefly by Enlil, and he was the god of storms. Ea, the god of the sea, saved Hasisstra, but he could not prevent the cyclone. Enlil — bēl šāri, lord of the wind; it does not mean lord of the plain; contrast PSBA 33, 78; cf. ibid. p. 80, and below, end of n. 20.

(13) The chief deity of Suripak seems to have been Sukkura: cf. MDOG, No. 16, p. 14, n. 4; Thureau-Dangin, Les inscriptions de Sumur et d’Alkad (Paris, 1905) p. 215, No. III; German edition (Leipzig, 1907) p. 151, below. This deity may have been the consort of Enlil; cf. BA 5, 537, l. 18; and p. 554, below; UG 79, below; RBA, German edition, p. 55. It is possible that Enlil was induced by his consort
to send the cyclone (cf. ll. 120—122 of the Flood tablet, UG 56) just as Anu was instigated by Istar to send the celestial bull (UG 33, l. 94). It is noteworthy that we find in ll. 118, 163 dingir max (not mag! cf. below, n. 39) the mighty deity — beštī īlānī, the lady of the gods. The name Istar (JAOS 28, 116) in l. 117 is a later adaptation. Cf. RBA, German edition, p. 82.

(14) See GK, § 143, b; WdG 2, 256; Driver, Heb. Tenses (1892) § 197.

(15) Qi̇rbašu is accusative, and libbašunu is nominative; cf. ippaš libbašunu, their heart feared; i̇kpuš libbašunu, their heart planned; kabbītaki lippaš. may thy mind be appeased; see HW 5266, 3464, 3177; AG7, pp. 188, 227.

(16) Tuqantu — tuqantu; cf. Heb. miq̄omēm. For secondary stems, with prefixed t see ZDMG 63. 518, l. 37; cf. below, n. 33.

(17) The second hemistic was, it may be supposed, mind kabassu iššānī.

(18) In the phrase Marduk uṣaddā-ni libba, Marduk stirred up my heart (HW 2163) the suffix -ni is dative (German, Marduk regte mir an das Herz). Cf. GK, § 117, x: WdG 2, 192, A. Gunzel, Genesis (1910) reads yaj-iāreq instead of yaj-iāreq in Gen. 14, 14, and combines this with the Assyr. deqū (cf. GB 7469). But Winckler’s reading deqū (with q) is as unwarranted as his reading nisiq, bite, instead of nišiq (see his edition of the Code of Hammurapi cited above, n. 8). If the Assyrian stem had a q instead of k, it might be identical with Arab. dārā, iādā; cf. ārāq (Jer. 10, 11) for ārāq, earth; Assyr. ruq̄u, evil — Heb. ra'; see WZKM 23, 361, n. 4. The synonym of ruq̄u, evil, ēnū means originally foolish; cf. Heb. nebalāh, folly, depravity, and ēnū, sheep — Heb. ẓān (ZDMG 65, 107, l. 9). For Arab. dārāa' claim, lawsuit, cf. Assyr. ruq̄unū (HW 612; AJSL 26, 7).

(19) Cf. MDog, No. 7, p. 2 and p. 3 of Meissner’s paper cited above, n. 4.

(20) Cf. Ex. 25, 2; 35, 21, 26, 29; 36, 2. In 2 K 14, 11, on the other hand, we must read ye-ḥiṣṣata lābēlā (cf. Ob. 3). Stade was inclined to read ye-ḥiṣṣa'aka. This hāṣṣa, to lead astray, must be derived from the stem of šay, vanity, falsehood (turtû Aleph). To the same stem belong Heb. šā'ōn (cf. JBL 26, 19, 44) and the Assyr. synonym of mešu, gale: šu (NE 140,
n. 11; BA 4, 134). Ittārik šā means: the storm abated (abate means originally to beat down). Another word for gale is kūku in ll. 46, 88 = Syr. kaqītā, whirlwind, tempest. Jensen (KB 6, 233, 235, 485) and Ungnad (UG 55) adhere to the translation darkness, which I suggested more than 22 years ago, but which I declared to be extremely doubtful (JHUC, No. 69, p. 18). I showed BA 4, 130 (printed in 1888) that we should restore at the beginning of l. 46: šā udānu šāmsa isākānu-ma, when the sun (not the Sun-god!) indicates the appointed time. The Sun-god did not reveal anything to Hasis-atra; contrast Zimmer n. Beiträge zur babyl Religion (Leipzig, 1901) p. 88, n. 2; UG 195, n. 6, also pp. 200, 209, 213. Muʾir kūši ina tilāti usaznakunniši samitu kībāti means: The Ruler of the Whirlwind will cause to rain upon you in the evening a downpour of destruction. Kībāti is the plural of kību, a fem. of kēbā, kēbu = Syr. kēbā, pain, grief; cf. Heb. ḫikāb in 2 K 3, 19. If kību were a derivative of the stem kābātu, to be heavy (HW 317*) the fem. plural would be kībāti, not kībāti. Jensen translates: Schmutz-Regen; Ungnad: · furchtbarer (?) Regen. C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, in thesis ix of his inaugural dissertation, derived kībāti from ṣāmān, to fall into decay, go to ruin (HW 583*). For muʾir = μυματα is see JBL 19, 58. The muʾir kūši is Enlil; cf. above, n. 12. For the correct translation of ll. 43—45, which Jensen (KB 6, 233) and Ungnad (UG 54) have misunderstood, see Haupt. Die akkadische Sprache (Berlin, 1883) p. xli; JHUC, No. 69, p. 18. These lines do not contain an infamous lie, as Jensen (Kosmol. 495)—says. At the beginning of l. 38 we may read esēb āši. For izirāni in l. 39 Jensen may compare Gk. § 106, g.

(21) If Ungnad and Grossmann had considered this passage, they would not have rendered (UG 27, 199): Schön ist ihr Schatten, ist-voller Jubel. I referred for malā ristāti to Lat. lucus lactissimus umbras &c. Nor does Ungnad (UG 8) seem to know my explanation of NE 8, 36, 37, given in BA 5, 471 (Friedrich's remarks in BA 5, 468—477 should have been cited in UG 1) and the interpretation of the description of the garden of the gods (UG 43, 164—167; cf. p. 163) which I gave in Proverbs 60, 39—40. For Grossmann's Brunnenwelle (UG 103) see AJSL 23, 234.

(22) UG 60, 224—229; 62, 262 (cf. p. 141) practically repeats Jensen's meaningless translations.
(23) Cf. là bandita, impurity (HW 180*) or là udditī (Zimmern, Surpu, p. 53, below) and Heb. lō-kēn &c.

(24) Gressmann’s idea (UG 123, n. 5) that this text belongs to the myth of Izza and Ênum (TB 71) is at variance with the line (NE 51, 17) Istar ana nakiru šu iskan qayquda, Istar cannot resist its (the city’s) enemy. Istar did not send an enemy against the city of Eresh, but Eresh was besieged by enemies for three years, and Istar could not make head (Heb. nāṭan rāʾ; cf. GB 524*, l) against them.

(25) The same reading was adopted by A. Jeremias in Das AT im Lichte des Alten Orients (Leipzig, 1906) p. 228.

(26) Cf. KB 6, 216, 28; UG 46, 78. The end of this line may be read iqqūṣa šigna, he plucks a thistly plant; cf. JAOS 22, 11, l. 4; KB 6, 250, l. 284; UG 62, 284. In Syriac, šigna denotes a artichoke. Pliny (19, 162; 20, 262) calls the artichoke carduncus (Greek κορδυλος). Carduncus benedictus, the blessed thistle, was held in high esteem as a remedy for all manner of diseases. In Arabic, jafina denotes leaves (of thorny gum- acacia, Arab. jibli) used as food for camels; see G. Jacob, Al-tarab, Beduinenteben (Berlin, 1897) pp. 13, 240. For the Assyrian stem lagātu see HW 378; also Zimmermann’s Beitr. zur bab. Rel. 176, 18. In S 2 (AL 17, 77) ligittu (for ligintu) appears as a synonym of nībittu (cf. NE 147, 295). Nībittu stands for marbattu, and means intercircumference, intertwinement, interwoven foliage; cf. Heb. 'ābōt, leafy tree; Syr. 'ābīt, dense woods.

(27) At the beginning of this line we may read: Là damqata, be good; cf. NE 42, 7–9 (UG 30). The preceding line (NE 12, 33) shows that there is space enough for tu-ša- dam before -qata in l. 34. The meaning of the line is: Be good, love me; then thou wilt be like a god.

(28) Cf. my remarks in JHUC, No. 163, p. 50, n. 9; JAOS 25, 71, n. 1; also RBA 476.


(30) See JBL 21, 66; ZDMG 63, 519, l. 22. Cf. Gunkel, Genesis (1910) p. 31, conclusion of §.

(31) Cf. the first line of the seventh tablet of the Nimrod
Cuneiform Account of the Deluge.

epic (NE 50, 212; KB 6, 179; UG 36) and Syr. ʾitmalāk (Heb. ʾay ĵimmalāk Neh. 5, 7).

32 Assyrian ḫapādu has no connection with Arab. qafāda; contrast Muss-Arnolt’s dictionary, p. 421; BA 1, 167, n. 9.

33 Read tašib (not tamel) For secondary stems with prefixed t cf. above, n. 16.

34 Qiqišu, at the end of l. 20 is an archaic plural in -a; cf. SFG 23, 5; AG², p. 192, 5. It could, of course, stand also for the gen. sing. (cf. e. g. NE 142, n. 7).

35 Cf. Amos 6, 11: For lo! Javv commands, and the great house is dashed to pieces, and the small house to splinters, which is a misplaced gloss to vv. 14, 15:

On the day when I punish her ivory houses go to ruin;
I’ll destroy the winter house along with the summer house.

36 There may have been minor preliminary seismic floods; see Snell’s work (cited above, n. 12) p. 68.

37 Cf. Proverbs (SBOT) 53, 34, and my paper on immuru, lamb ḫammar, ḫammal in ZDMG 65, 107.

38 Cf. SAI 692 s. v. lakišu.

39 For the final k in sik see ZDMG 64, 705, n. 1; cf. above, n. 13.

40 Cf. Is. 1, 8 and the cut on p. 162 of the translation of Isaiah in SBOT.

41 Cf. the conclusion of n. 20 (thesis ix of Lehmann).

42 See MDOG, No. 22, p. 70; cf. also No. 25, p. 74; contrast No. 31, pp. 8, 39, 44; No. 32, pp. 23, 25; No. 43, p. 19.

43 On p. 8 of the paper cited above, n. 4; cf. ibid. p. 12, l. 12.

44 See KB 6, 483; cf. UG 192.

45 See Duval (cf. above, n. 10) § 356, c; § 368, a; Nöldeke’s Syr. grammar, § 202, C.

46 See H. Reckendorf, Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen (Leyden, 1899) p. 444.

47 See also Kings 262, n. **.

48 JAOS 22, 10, n. 6; cf. ZDMG 63, 516, l. 42.

49 Contrast UG 194, l. 7.

50 See p. 9 of the paper cited above, n. 4.

51 Contrast Schneider’s explanation cited in UG 138, n. 3. As to the force necessary to pull out poles 120 feet long, after they have been imbedded in quagmire, I was informed by an engineer, who has had much experience in driving and subsequently pulling piles used for piers and wharves,
that a wooden pole, 120 feet long, having a diameter at the butt of 25 inches and at the point of 4 inches, would weigh, approximately, 5400 pounds. While such a pole can be readily driven, it requires a force equal to 25 horse-power to withdraw it when it is imbedded in mud and clay to a depth of 50 feet. Using a 25 horse-power engine to pull these poles, it is necessary to employ what is known as a triple rig or pulley. Of course, if such a rig were not used, the direct force necessary to pull the piles in question would be much greater, probably about 50 horse-power. I am indebted for information to Professor Gallert Alleman, of Swarthmore College.—The ancient cuneiform poet believed, of course that paddles and oars were unknown in the times of Ninurta. Cf. EB 4478, 1. 20.

(53) Not sûl! Contrast UG 137, n. 2; cf. also pp. 184, 207.
(54) UG 195 still thinks that Hasîs-atra gave the people of Suripak daily banquets while he was building his ship!
(55) Contrast UG 55, below.
(56) Cf. above, note 22.
(57) According to Jensen (KB 6, 488, below) these plugs were intended for holes in the bottom through which the ship was supplied with water! A. Jeremias, following Winckler, gives the meaningless translation: I poured water over the sikkat in its interior. Cf. above, n. 25.
(58) Cf. JAOS: 13, xxiiii., n. 14: 25, 71; 31, 37; BA 1, 124.
(60) Literally height. It cannot be length.
The five Assyrian stems la'u.—By Paul Haupt, Professor in the Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

I.—In my paper on Leah and Rachel (ZAT 29, 281) I showed that Leah meant cow, Assyr. lētu, feminine of lē, bull. Lē is a contraction of lē'ī, and corresponds to the Arabic lā'a' (for lā'āu’) wild bull. Lē'ū (for lē'ū, lē'ū, lā'ū) means originally, like Heb. abbēr, strong (cf. OLZ 12, 214, n. 18; UG 130). Arab. lā'a’ means also misfortune, lit. strength, hardship (cf. Arab. šiddatu’). This explains the meaning of Assyr. lā'ū (for lā'ū, lā'āu’) wretched (not lā'ū, HW 366) which means originally hard up. There is no connection between lā'ū, wretched, and the negative lā, not (contrast AJSL. 22, 261, n. 17). In Hebrew, we have the stem la'āh, to trouble oneself, lit. to try hard. Assyr. lū, bull (Arab. lā'a') appears in the story of Hagar (Gen. 16, 14) as rāj (for lē, lā, lū, lā’ū). See my explanation of this passage in ZAT 29, 284; contrast Gunkel’s Genesis (1910) p. 189; and Skinner’s commentary (1910) p. 288.

The name Bēnē Le'āh meant originally cowboys, and Bēnē Rahēl denoted the southern sheepmen. Westerners say, cattle and sheep do not mix.² There has always been more or less trouble between cowboys and sheepmen. Their interests can never be mutual, since cattle and sheep cannot thrive on the same range. The sheep absolutely spoil the pasturage for the cattle by cropping the grass so close that no sustenance is left to the bigger animal, and, besides that, they are supposed to leave a taint that is highly offensive to the bovines. The close nibbling of the herbage is not the only damage done by the sheep. They travel in dense formation, and their sharp hoofs cut the sod and pack it down so hard that it takes the range a long time to recuperate.

¹ For the abbreviations see above, p. 10, n. 1.
² Quoted from an article in the Baltimore American, Nov. 15, 1909.
The Assyrian stem lä'u, to be strong, means also to have power, to be able (HW 365a). ḫēḫ, he can, stands for ilâ'āj. II.—On the other hand, ilē'ā, he likes (HW 364b, below) stands for ilâ'hāj, and must be connected with Ar. lāhīja, dāhā, to like (syn. ahācba). Ethiopic alhāja, to cheer up, to comfort (Arab. alhā or lāhād) means originally to make pleased, satisfied, reconciled; cf. Ar. lāhīja 'an (contrast ZAT 29, 282, I. 10). Delitzsch (HW 365a) correctly derives lä'u, sensible, intelligent, wise, from this stem, pointing to Assy. tēmu (for ṭā'mu) which means will, mind, sense, intellect, intelligence, information, news. Similarly milku (HW 413b) means counsel, decision, deliberation, understanding, insight. Our mind, which corresponds to the Latin mens, means not only intellect, but also desire, intent, purpose, will. To have a mind means to be inclined, to intend, to like.

Assyr. tēmu, intelligence, message, appears in Aramaic as tibbā. This is often used in the Talmud in the sense of Heb. miṣpāṭ, the right way of doing a thing, the proper manner, German Art. Heb. miṣpāṭ may mean also skill, knack, just as Art is identical with our art (cf. AJSI 27, 20, n. 24). German artig means mannerly, well-mannered, well-bred. In Middle High German, Art denoted family, extraction. In Wagner's Lohengrin Lohengrin says to Elsa: 'Nie sollst du mich befragen, noch Wissens Sorge tragen, woher ich kam der Fahrt, noch wie mein Nam' und Art.

In the Syriac Bible, mā (tibbā;?) appears in Ruth 3, 9 as the equivalent of Heb. mi att, and in the shorter recension of Judith, published by Gaster in PSBA 16, 162, Seleucus says to Judith: Māh tēhēk. Gaster translates: What is it that thou wisiest? but it means: How art thou? Heb. mī att in Ruth 3, 9 has the same meaning; the rendering Who art thou? is incorrect (see BA 1, 17, I. 1; AJSI. 24, 127). The literal meaning of māh tēhēk is What is thy report, i. e. the report concerning thee, what is the news of thee? The suffix must be explained according to GK § 128, li; § 135, m.

The traditional Jewish pronunciation is ṭibā', for ṭēbā, not

---

1 HW 297; cf. Ezra and Nehemiah (SBOT) p. 34, l. 49. Syr. īḥēē (originally ṭēḥā) means message, news, tidings, rumor, fame, report.
2 For the Book of Judith, which is a Palestinian Pharisaic Purim legend, see Haupt, Purim (Leipzig, 1906) p. 7, ll. 38–39.
tibbā. Also the Aleph in Syriac ל"ח (Nöldeke, Syr. Gr. § 35) points to an original pronunciation tēbā. The Aleph in this case must be explained in the same way as in kēmēnā, nēkēdā, melēa, discussed in BA 1, 7, 166; BL 123, n. 7. The Syriac Pacl tābēb (cf. tēbēt, renowned, ṭēbētā, renown) is denominative, derived from tēbā — tēbā, tēbā — Assyr. tēmu — tāmu. For the interchange of m and b see Ezra and Nehemiah (SBOT) 67, 33. There is certainly no connection with Arab. 窟 grub, sūb, clamor, noise, injustice, violence, although Fleischer raised no objections to this etymology in Levy’s Talmudic dictionary (2, 153, 210). In his Targumic dictionary (1, 292) Levy reads tibbā, but in his Talmudic lexicon (2, 153) he has tibbā. Dalman’s Wörterbuch (p. 156) gives Heb. tēb (with suffixes tibbā, like tibbā, his heart) and Aram. tibbā, Art, Wesen, Ruf; but on p. 159 he gives Heb. tēb, Art und Weise. This would seem to be the original pronunciation. The form tibbā instead of tibbā — tēbā — Assyr. tēmu (for tāmu) may be influenced, not only by τέμος (which is used also in the sense of characteristic assemblage of particulars or qualities, character, quality) but also by dibbā; in Gen. 37, 2 some Targumic MSS read dibbēhon instead of dibbēhon. Tibbā, or rather tēbā, is the Assyrian tēmu (for tāmu) which was afterwards pronounced tēmu, ṭēmu, and dibbāh is connected with Assyr. dabāh which belongs to the same root (AJSL. 23, 252) as Heb. dibbār, to speak.1

Assyr. le'ni (not le'nu) wise, stands for lāju, láju, láhiu, láhiiu.

III.—Assyr. li'nu (not li'nū, HW 366) tablet, stands for ʿebu, which corresponds to Heb. lāju, just as we have in Arabic, rīh, wind, and rāḥ, spirit, whereas in Hebrew, rūḥ is used for both wind and spirit; cf. Kings (SBOT) p. 96, 1, 25.2

IV.—Assyr. lā'nu (lā'nu, HW 366) soiled, defiled, disgraced, may stand for lubhnu, and may be connected with Arab. lāḥdu, jāḥā, which means not only to blame and to curse, but also to disgrace, vilify, insult, (syn. qābāh). Assyr. lā'nu could be connected also with Arab. la'yatu", which is said to mean

1 Both Heb. doē, bear, and dibbāh, bee, mean originally Brummer (growler, humming). Cf. Heb. hamāh and ḥagāh, also the remarks in my paper on the trumpets of Jericho, WZKM 23, 380–382.

2 The phrase tē-rēh haṣṣōm (Gen. 3, 8) means according to Gunkel, Genesis (1910) at daybrrak; see BL. 74; contrast AJSL. 22, 353; 24, 136.
shame, disgrace, or Ethiopic *laŋqłu̇, perverse, depraved; but this is less probable.

V.—Assyr. *la⁴th, a kind of wine (HW 366*) may be compared with Syr. *lā⁴th, nīlā⁴th; to lick, to lap. Also the word *lā⁴th, discussed in HW 374*, iii, may be connected with this stem. This Assyr. *la⁴th may mean to sip, to swallow, and may stand for *laŋqłu̇; just as we have urē (cf. Heb. ʿūryāh, Arab. ʿūrjatu*), and āru (Arab. ʿāgratu*) shame; cf. ZDMG 65, 108, l. 14.

VI.—For the etymology of Heb. leq̄at, Levite, see OLZ 12, 163; ZDMG 63, 522, 1, 9; ZAT 29, 286.
Babylonian Legends, BM Tablets 87535, 93828 and 87521, CT XV, Plates 1—6. — By Rev. Frederick A. Vanderburgh, Ph. D., Columbia University, New York City.

Part XV of Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum contains twenty-four plates of "Early Sumerian Religious Texts." It also contains, at the beginning, six plates, entitled "Old Babylonian Legends." The religious texts are purely Sumerian, but the so-called legends are Assyrian. There are really three tablets of the legends, which, according to the publication, seem to be considerably broken. Yet cols. i and viii of the first tablet, cols. i and ii of the second tablet and cols. ii and vii of the third tablet furnish six interesting texts which may properly be called poems, a translation of which is given in the following pages.

I take great pleasure in acknowledging my indebtedness to Professor John Dyneley Prince of Columbia University for much valuable help in the translation of these difficult Old Babylonian unilingual poetic texts.

I.

Plate 1, Tablet 87535, Obverse, Col. 1.

This poem relates to the goddess Mama. Its language reminds us of the phrase in Psalm xix, 11: מַלְאֵךְ מָרָא נָגָם וַנִּשְׂפָּת "sweeter than honey and the honey-comb." The poet dwells on the pleasure of singing the song of the goddess Mama and the character of her maternal relations.

za-ma-ar iṣṣ bi-li-it ilī u-ra-ma-ar
The song of Behit ilī I sing.

ib-ra us-si-ra ku-ra-du si-me-a
O friend regard, O warrior listen!
The goddess Mama, her song more
than honey and wine is sweet;

sweeter than honey and wine;
sweeter than sprouts and herbs;
superior indeed to pure cream;
sweeter than sprouts and herbs.
The goddess Mama, one she hath brought forth,

who in the vanguard beareth the ivory of the king.
The goddess Mama, two she hath brought forth,
two by the god Zaribu, the god of that temple.
The goddess Mama, three she hath brought forth.

1. bi-li-it ilī (or belit ilāni): NLNI is a common compound ideogram for ilī “gods” (Br. 5356), probably derived from reading NLNI phonetically as i-li (Br. 5307 & 5309). That bi-li-it ilī is an epithet is shown by the fact that several goddesses bear the title. The consort of Ea, Damkina, for example, was called Belit ilāni: e-a mu-us-ti-sur nak-bi-šu bi-lit ilāni mu-rap-pi-sat-ta i-it-ti-šu. Cylinder of Sargon, line 70.

2. ib-ri (ib-ri): root literally — “surround, protect,” up-pi-ra (prob. up-pi-ra), II. 1. 2d. m. s. impv.

3. ma-ma, the name of a very ancient divinity, as is evinced by its appearance in personal names of early Babylonian times. It may be found in the name of a man who was an official (damkar) apparently before the days of Urn-
kagina. (*aššir-u) in-din-dug-ga ur-ma-ma (d)am-kar (*šu ešu-lil) (a-ma-na-šub). Pl. 43. No. 95. Old Babylonian Inscriptions, Part II. There was also a Patesi, before the days of the dynasty of Ur, bearing this name: *mu ur-ma-ma pa-te-si; Thureau-Dangin, *Récéherces sur l’origine de l’écriture cunéiforme*, No. 184. In later Babylonian times, beginning even with the period of Hammurabi this goddess seems to appear as Gula, which is evidently a form of Maima (*m = g, &c.*). Here her personality has developed into that of the consort of Nimb; *nin-ib šar šamē u iršītim u gu-la kaš-lat šar-ra*; Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar I, Col. ii, line 39. In union with Nimb she performs the function of life-giving: nin tin di̇b-ba (V R. 52, Col. iv. 7). She is called the great physician: *šat gu-la-a asitu gal-la-tu* (III R. 41. c. 11).

6. ha-na-na-bi-i-ma (really *hanabu*) exhibits a curious reduplication of the syllable *na*. It seems proper here to raise the question as to whether wine and herbs had any relation in thought to her art of healing. Wo know that these products were used to some extent in incantations: *šikari sa-kił-bir u šammi išteniš taballal šipti III-šu tamannu i-na ši-in-ni-šu tašakkan*. “wine of *sa-kił-bir* and oil together thou shalt pour; the incantation three thou shalt repeat; on his tooth thou shalt put it” (“Legend of the Worm,” lines 25 & 26, see Thompson’s Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia). *ar-su-up-pu šegu-šu in-nin-nu ša i-na ši-ir-*i-ša šin-ša kaš-da-at pur-šum-tu ina ḫalā-ša ellātī li-te-en-ma išteniš bu-tul-ma ina ḫal-ka-di-ša ṣu-ku “the ar-su-up-pu, šegu-šu and in-nin-nu which in its height its day has reached, let an old woman with her clean hands grind it, mix it together, on his head place it” (Headache Series, Tablet IX, lines 125—130; see Thompson), (diš-pu) bi-me-tu eli-šu šu-ru-up-ma “honey and butter upon it burn” (Fever Incantation, Plate 58, line 59; see Thompson).

9. u-bi-id-ma, I. 1. pret. This act of giving birth attributed to the goddess here may be the second birth over which she presided apparently even in earliest times as this song with this interpretation attests.

12. za-ri-bi “ferry one.” Nergal the war god sometimes is called *garbu.*
II.

"Plate 2, Tablet 87535. Reverse, Col. viii.

This plate being a part of the reverse of the same tablet as plate 1, must naturally present a phase of the same subject as that of the plate just read. While that one gave us a story of coming to life, this, however, contains a story of departing from life. The concrete factor here is that of the land of Sumer which seems to have been devastated by flood. Inhabitants were carried away to the lower world through the machinations of evil spirits. Some people remained in desolation.

\[ \text{ma i-ri} \]

\[ \text{an-nu-un ša-al-la-at šu-ni-ri} \quad \text{e-li ša a-a a-li} \]

On account of sin the booty of Sumer (is carried away);

\[ \text{šu-ba-ru-u-um lu-u ir-ši-id ša-sa-gi-im-ma} \]

Protection, let it be established because of diminution!

\[ \text{ša-at-ti-ša-am-ma šu-ni-ri-um li-ik-la-sa-ap-qi} \]

Yearly (they say), let Sumer be diminished!

\[ \text{iš-um-ma da-mu-u-ša ùt ištar u šu-u} \]

They seek its blood; Istar and he

\[ \text{ina pu-hu-ur ur-du-ni-i-im} \]

are among the assembly of those who go down (to trial).

\[ \text{ùt ištar i-ga-tu gi-ni-i-ša} \]

Istar, come to an end, hath her offering.

\[ \text{ù-li i-pa-sa-sa-am a-na-a-ma ù li-el-li} \]

"My woes are appeased, I repulse the divine Lelu."

\[ \text{i-hu-us-ma-šar-ra-di-i-ša} \]

He seized her strong ones.

\[ \text{še diššat i-na ku-ul-la-ti ši-pa-ri ši-ki-e-ir} \]

The river Tigris with the slain of Sippar was raised;

\[ \text{i-na ku-ul-la-ti ši-pa-ar-ri} \]

with the slain of Sippar

\[ \text{ši-ga-ri pi-ri-im še diššat ši-ki-ir} \]

a bar of ivory the Tigris ran high.
i-lu i-si-ku-ma a-li-šu-nu
The god, he forsook their city,

šu-ub-ti-šu-nu ma-zi-ti uš-bu
in their dwellings forgotten they sat.

3. an-ma-un, apparently accusative. šu-mi-ri: perhaps the idea is that the Sumerians are already feeling the overpowering effect of Semitic intrusion in the Euphrates valley. Sumer of course means Babylonia.

4. šu-ba-ru-un-un, same root as šu-ru, plate 1, line 2.  ša-ši-id.
I. l. pret. ša(KA)-ša(ZA)-ši(ZI)-im-ma, probably pl.

6. šu-un-ma = išu-ma from šu. da-mu-nu-si; the first sign seems to be id not da, no doubt a scribal error. šu ištar u šu-u: reference to Istar and Tammuz in the lower world.

7. ur-du-ni-im, I. 1. pret. m. pl. from arādu.

8. is-pa-tu, I. 1. pres. from katā. gi-ni-ša, Istar's offering for Tammuz.

9. u-li from alu "lament," i-pa-ša-ha-un seems to be f. pl.

a li-el-li, no doubt the same as the Sumerian lil-la (to which ḫaššiš must be related), mentioned in several lists of demons as litu, who are opposed to the gods and to whose devices the ills of human life are attributed; see Incantation K 3586 (IV R. 16.15—22) where litu is listed with the evil utukku and fourteen other demons. In hymns, however, we find litu (rather than litu); see K 4980 (IV R. 27.57). Hymn to Bēl: ša lit-im (Sum. ša-lil), where the phrase ša lit-im is attributively given to Bēl who was chief demon when the name on-lil lord of demons was first applied to him.

10. i-bu-uz-ma, I. 1. pret. 3d. per. m. s.; the subject is Lellu.

11. aš diklat: id or i (A.TUR) = nāru. idigna (BAR.TIG. KAR) = diklat; the derivation of the Semitic diklat from the Sumerian idigna is apparent, but some steps of contraction might elude us in tracing the derivation of idigna from the signs A.TUR.BAR.TIG.KAR (water-course-cutting-banks-powerfully). šu-ut-ša-ti, a rare word but having a meaning similar to kasušu. pi-pa-ri, also pi-pa-ar-ri in the next line: the more common spelling is Sippar, modern Abu Habba, situated between the Tigris and the Euphrates, north of Babylon, seat of the cult of Šamaš.  ši-ki-e-ir: I. 1. is unusual from this root.

15. uš-bu (ušabu), contracted form of I. 1. pret.
Plate 3, Tablet 93828, Obverse, Col. i.

Plate 3 gives us a prayer to a goddess for some king that he may have victory in conquest; the prayer is continued in plate 4, plates 3 and 4 forming successive columns in the obverse of the same tablet. In lines 1 to 7, the petitioner, whoever he may be, extols the virtues of the goddess and states his petition. Perhaps the petitioner is the king himself. Lines 8 to 14 seem to interrupt the prayer by giving us a picture of a council of war among the gods with whom the goddess is in communication, while the battle is already going on.

— — ši-e-me ik-ri-bi lu na-i-id
O hear my truly solemn prayer!

di-ti ši-e-me ik-ri-bi lu na-i-id
O my lady, hear my truly solemn prayer!

bar ku-um-mi a-na ši-ramani
O king of my habitation, on behalf of the divine Ramani!

ni-ši im-me-ir ni-ta šu-pi aš-ta-at
My prayer is pure; in attack, O my glorious one, thou art supreme.

5 i-ni-i-ma ma-ta-am la uš-ni-e-es
He repulseth the land, it resisteth him not.

ti-bi-e mi-si-i gi-bi-su li-iš-me
In attacks and conquests, to his word may he hearken!

a-ma-ta ak-li-ni i-ra-az-xu
The word our mighty ones obey.

the bēl pa-šu i-pu-šu-am-ma i-pu-ru
Bēl opened his mouth and took account;

ka-la i-li iz-za-ag-ga-ar
all the gods he mentions.

10 iš-ti-a-nim ša-du-u i-li ma-hu-ur
The mountain is sought, the gods are present.

ša-aš-ma-am il-gi-e-ma e su-lum-ma
The battle be begun, no quarter (is allowed).
bi-li-it i-li li-ib-bu-ka-nim
O lady of the gods, let them turn back,
li-si-ri-bu-ni iš-si a-na mah-ri-ia
let them enter with me in my presence!
bi-li-it i-li ib-bu-ka-ni-ma
For the lady of the gods they turn back

Bēl, unto her he calls:

1. ik-ri-bi, from ḫarābu with preformative mi or ni shortened to i. lu = adv. na-i-id = adj. from na-idū.
3. šar, probably the consort of the goddess. ku-um-mi (DID): the construct would be bām. "ramani": the aid of the storm-god might be essential, as kings often invoked the wrath of the storm-god on their enemies.
4. ni-si, from nāšu "lift up." im-me-ir, from namānu, I. 1. pregnant pret. ni-ta, i. noun, from same root as a-na-a-na, plate 2, line 9: aš-ta-at, from aššu "high," perm. form.
5. uš-ni-e-e, III. 1, with suf.
6. ti-bi-i, pl. mi-si-i, from mašu "find, take possession of by force."
7. ak-lī-ni "our mighty," probably from same root as aššu "food." i-ra-az-su, from rašu.
8. i-pu-ri (MED), word of rare occurrence.
10. iš-ti-a-nim, I. 3. ma-bu-ur; must be perm. for mahir.
11. il-gi-e-ma, from laḫā, I. 1. pret. e = "not," like ši. li-ib-
bu-ka-nim, I. 1. pret. 3d per. pl. with prec. li.
12. bi-li-ili ili suggests that the goddess addressed in this tablet is most likely Mama the object of praise in tablet 87535. We can see how Gala, being the lady of the gods and the goddess who giveth life as well as being the consort of Ninib who was considered a god of battle, could be properly invoked by a king for military achievement.

IV.

Plate 4, Tablet 93828, Obverse, Col. ii.

Continuing the prayer of the preceding plate, in lines 1 to 6 of this plate, the petitioner appeals for divine aid on behalf
of the stricken in battle. Lines 7 to 13 touch upon the enhancement of the honor of divinity. Lines 14 to 19 renew the direct petition for the king's victory.

\[ \text{im-} \text{bu-ur-} \text{su-ma a-bu i-li} \]
He received him.

\[ \text{zi-ik-ri} \text{ ta-ni-it-tim iz-ga-ga-ur-} \text{su} \]
My name of majesty he names to him.

\[ \text{as-arid-a} \text{ ili-ta-i-ka} \text{ su-ur-} \text{sa ma-a-i} \]
O my leader! Turn thee to the woe-stricken ones, O my mighty one!

\[ \text{sa na-ap-} \text{za-ut ka-la ni-} \text{ti-i-ka} \]
Thou from whom cometh the life of all people!

\[ \text{im-ma-ti-ia} \text{ sa-bu-ur-ra ta-am-ta at-bu-uk} \]
My petition in the enclosure of the sea I pour out.

\[ \text{ku-} \text{ud-la-ut ta-at-mi ga-ab-la-ka im-ru-ur-} \text{ma} \]
All that thou sayest is bitter in the midst of thee.

\[ \text{us-la-at-li-im ku-un bi-li pa-ra-al-li} \]
It hath been given in the room of the lord of the shrine.

\[ \text{e-bi-} \text{a-tim a-na bi-ti-i-ka e-i-i-id} \]
Adornments for thy house are gathered.

\[ \text{im-ma-ti-ia} \text{ bi-ku-un su-pa-at-} \text{ka} \]
It is my petition, may thy dwelling endure!

\[ \text{ki u-mi ta-la-ka-am im mu-ut-ti} \]
When thou goest to the front,

\[ \text{pa-as-su-ra lu-u li-ri-ib u-um-su} \]
the festal table, may it be spread on that day!

\[ \text{sa-ar} \text{ su um-su ud-ab-bi-i-su li-li-la-} \text{ka} \]
The king on that day will beautify it, may he honor thee!

\[ \text{at-ta bi-me-e mi ik-ri-ib-i-su} \]
Do thou hearken to his prayer!

\[ \text{kau-kal-la-a-am su-uz-ni-na-am ma-ti-} \text{su} \]
With long life do thou adorn his land!

\[ \text{sa-at-ti-i-sa-am-ma si-im-ta-su wa-tu-ur} \]
Annually do thou increase his fortune!
ma-ta-i-tim šu-nu-ka-ša-am ši e-pi-is-su
The lands do thou subjugate! it is his work,
i-mu-ša ina ni-idd isi-ab-ba-ša-ni-ma
when in prayer he desireth it!
iš-ti-i-su a-li-ik tu-pu-un ma-bi-ir-su
From him do thou go, conquer his opponent!
ši e-pu-ud-su šu-nu-ka-ša-am ma-ta-am
That is his work: do thou subjugate the land!

2. ta-ni-it-tim, same root as na-i-id; plate 3, line 1.
3. ih-hi-i-ka (نسخ), I. 1. impr. with suf. -ka, ma-a-i, adj.
   from ma-a-u.
5. im-ma-ši-ia, same as amātu, with suf. ıa.
6. ta-at-mi, I. 1. pret. from tamā. im-rù-ur-ma, also pret.
   of I. 1.
8. e-bì-a-tim (ubern), "produce, gifts." es-si-id, probably for
   e-si-id.
9. ki u-mif — "according to the day, when." mu-ul-ti "front;"
   probably im-mu-ul-ti.
11. li-ri-ši, from root represented by šrushing.
16. ši, personal pronoun.
17. i-nu-ša, noun with suf. ıa.

V.
Plate 5, Tablet 87521, Obverse, Col. ii.

This plate seems obscure except in the light of plate 6
which gives the sequel. In plate 5, Bēl is incensed at a god-
dess; that goddess is evidently Istar who seems to be guilty
of an offense which cannot be condoned in the family of the
gods. According to plate 6, Istar becomes of child by her
brother Šamaš. The family relationships are as follows. Sin
is the offspring of Bēl; Ningal is the consort of Sin; Istar is
the offspring of Sin; Šamaš is the offspring of Sin.

Lines 1 to 3, the anger of Bēl. Lines 4 to 8, the exalted
position of Sin. Lines 9 to 11, interview of Sin with
Ningal.
i-na e-ir-si id-di i-ni-lu
On the couch he threw it, it lay.

\[ \text{i-n} \text{u-bél i-si-il} \text{r} \text{-hi-iš-gu i-k} \text{-ka-ar-si} \]
Bél hath abandoned her; his trust is estranged to her.

\[ \text{i-s} \text{-ba-am-ma wa-ta-ar-bi šal-ta-am} \]
He has become enflamed; he has begun the battle.

\[ \text{a-n} \text{u} \text{sin i-na bu} \text{-ka-ur} \text{a-n} \text{u bél ša-ni-ni la i-šu} \]
O Sin, as the first born of Bél, no equal thou hast.

5 a-wa-u-da-at i-ra-am an sin
Thou hast firmly fixed it; Sin has had compassion;

i-na ma-na ri-si-il-su ki-na-ši
by means of tribute thou hast fixed his power.

pa-si ka-az-su zi-nu-la-a i-na mu-ti-iš-su
My reign his hand apportions; not with his property,
e-li ba-e-rū-ti-im uš-ta-ab-ni-i-ma
among the hunters it is formed.

\[ \text{a-n} \text{a} \text{ši nin-gal iš-ta-ka-an u-zu-un-šu} \]
Unto the goddess Nergal he (Sin) giveth ear.

10 an sin ik-ru-uš a-na ka-rī-ši ik-ra-ab
Sin has brought her; at his summons she approacheth.

\[ \text{ši-i-ma u-ši i-sa-ul a-ba-šu} \]
She maketh no petition to her father.

1. i-ni-lu, from na'alu.
3. iš-bu-ba-am-ma, from šalabu. wa-ta-ar-bi, from erēbu. šal-ta-am, from šalū "shoot."
5. a-wa-u-da-at, root emēdu. i-ra-am from ramu.
6. ri-si-il-su from rašibu.
7. pa-si, root pāšu. ka-az-su "his hand" or "thy hand." zi-nu-zu, root zāzu. mu-ti-iš-su, root išu.
8. ba-e-rū-ti-im, from bāru.
9. an sin nin-gal: Ningal, "great lady," appears particularly in the time of Rim-Sin. The title "mistress of Ur" may be found several times.
VI.
Plate 6, Tablet 87521, Reverse, Col. vii.

Lines 1 to 6, confession of Ištar. Lines 7 to 12, reprimand of Bēl.

---

a-at-ma a-ha aštゥ na-aš

---

išt-ta-ri-i-tin išt-ta-na-al
The goddess Ištar hath gone to rest;
la išt-gi ir-bu-um े-kur
let not the turbulent enter the temple.

5 a-na-išu a-hi to-ri-a-ku a-hi
I, O my brother, am of child by my brother,
ša a-na a-hi-iša wa-ul-du
I who to my brother have borne a child.

as Bēl pa-a-šu išt-pa-a-ma
Bēl, his mouth he opened;
išt-za-iš-šari a-na la-pa-tim ubišt Ištar
He mentions the fall of Ištar.

a-iš-a-am a-ha-ki to-ri-a-at
Woe is me! by thy brother thou art with child,

10 a-ha-ki ša a-na a-hi i-na a-hi-i-ki wa-ul-du
by thy brother thou who by thy brother hast borne a child.

as išt-a-am ubišt nin-lil
O divine Išum! Belit

a-na šašaš u-li-id ma
unto the god Šamaš hath borne a child.

3. išt-ta-na-al, see išt-ni-išu, plate 5, line 1.
5. to-ri-a-ku, a perm. form from erū; in line 9 a noun from the same root.

8. la-pa-tim, root lapātu. ubišt Ištar, confirmation that išt-ta-ri-i-tim in line 3 is correctly rendered išt Ištar.
1. ḫa-iša-am: Išum was no doubt a local deity. The word Išum appears in proper names as early as the time of Hammurabi. In some inscriptions he appears as a sun-god brought into subjection to Samaš. He also appears sometimes as a servant or guardian (rabišu), a position which he seems to occupy in this tablet.

dat nin-lil, title applied to Ištar in about the same way that the name Bēl is applied to Marduk.
The Vedic Dual: Part VI, The Elliptic Dual; Part VII, The Dual Dvandva.—By Dr. Samuel Grant Oliphant, Professor in Grove City College, Grove City, Penna.

The purpose of this paper is to present various phenomena that are associated with the elliptic dual and the dual dvandva, to present for reference what is believed to be complete lists of these two species of the dual as found in the Rig and Atharva Vedas, and to propose solutions of the mooted problems of their genesis and relationship.

I.

The elliptic dual, or, as I should prefer to call it were it not the term so firmly established in its literature, the syleptic dual, is the dual of one substantive connoting both its own singular and another singular suggested by it. In its obvious kinship with such rhetorical tropes as metonymy, synecdoche, antonomasia, &c., and with such syntactical schemata as zepugna, ellipsis, sylepsis, &c., as well as in its possible relationship to the so-called σχήμα Ἀλεξανδρέων of Greek poetry (Vid. Fraser, Classical Quarterly, IV, 25 ff.), this dual is essentially artistic and poetic. This appears also from the fact that even the Vedic pitārā and māturā, though occurring eighty-five times in the Rig Veda alone, are used figuratively at least seventy-two times. In nine of the remaining instances the words may be duals in comparison with a dual antecedent and not elliptic duals at all and in at least three of these instances this would seem unmistakably the preferable interpretation.

The ratio of one hundred and twenty-nine instances (including the doubtful cases) of this dual in the Rig Veda to only sixteen independent examples in the Atharva Veda, would show that it is also essentially hieratic as well as poetic.

\[1\] See this Journal, XXX, 155 ff.
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These conclusions find additional corroboration in the infrequency of this dual even in the ancillary Vedic literature, in which except a mere handful of analogical growth, only a few stereotyped forms remain, reminiscental of the older hieratic and more artistic period, and also in its non-occurrence in the later poetic recrudescence.

In their use of the elliptic dual the rishis show in various ways that they are quite conscious of the syllepsis. In ninety-nine of the hundred and forty-five instances in the two Vedas they seem to have taken especial pains that others should not misunderstand them by taking the words too literally. Their methods show considerable variety and artistic skill and seem important enough to warrant a rather full presentation. They may be subsumed under eight classes, described as follows:

I. The dual of the unexpressed member of the syllepsis follows closely in the context the dual of the expressed member.

Thus mátārā in III, 7, 1st, referring to dyāvāprthivī as the parents of Agni is followed in the very next pada by pitārā with the same meaning and reference. In this instance there is the additional reinforcement of pitṛbhyaṁ in 6th. Similar are,

III, 5, 7th, mátārā, and 8th, pitrōr,
I, 140, 3rd, mátārā, and 7th, pitrōb,
I, 159, 2nd, pitārā, and 3rd, mátārā,
IX, 75, 2nd, pitrōb, and 4th, mátārā.

Thus this phenomenon is associated with eleven of the duals.

II. There is in the neighboring context either specific mention or suggestion, or both, of the unexpressed member of the syllepsis.

(a) Mention. In VIII, 27, 2nd—usásā nāktam ṣvadāsāh, the nāktam implicit in usásā is expressed immediately after it.

I, 155, 3rd, mátārā — dyāvāprthivī, 3rd pitūr — dyāús,
I, 140, 3rd, mátārā, 3rd pitūb,

1 The following have been noted in Panini, Hemachandra and the Asarvakṣa: anākhala, kukkaṭā, dyāṣā, pata, brāhmaṇa, brāha-taraṇa and çyaṣaṇa. There are probably a few others of sporadic occurrence.
2 See, e. g. under adhvaryu, usásā and pitārā in the appended list.
3 Ahant-alone of the Vedic elliptic duals is cited by PWB. for the Mahābhārata.
4 All references are to the RV. unless the AV. be particularly specified.
I, 140, 7<sup>4</sup>, pitrór, 9<sup>q</sup>, mātū,
IV, 5, 10<sup>q</sup>, pitrór, 10<sup>q</sup>, mātūs,
VIII, 25, 2<sup>s</sup>, mitrā (initial in pāda), 2<sup>s</sup> vārūno (also initial in pāda).

(b) Suggestion.
I, 31, 2<sup>s</sup>, the epithet dvimāta referring to the arāṣi as parents of Agni, suggests the member implicit in the pitrór of 4<sup>s</sup>
V, 3, 2<sup>s</sup> and X, 68, 2<sup>s</sup>,—the mention of Aryanā suggests marriage and the unexpressed member of dāmputi in 2<sup>s</sup> and 2<sup>s</sup> respectively.
VIII, 52, 1<sup>q</sup>,—kṣoni is followed in the same pāda by sāryam, suggestive, if not metonymic, of the connoted dyūus.
I, 146, 1<sup>q</sup>,—pitrór finds its connoted feminine amply suggested by eme in 2<sup>s</sup> and ahenā in 3<sup>s</sup>.

(c) Both mention and suggestion.
III, 1, 7<sup>s</sup>,—mātārā (= dyāvāprthivi) has its connoted masculine mentioned in pitūc in 9<sup>s</sup> and 10<sup>s</sup> and suggested by the divāh of 2<sup>s</sup>, 6<sup>s</sup> and 9<sup>s</sup> and both its members are explained by 3<sup>s</sup>—divāh subāndhur januṣi prthivyāḥ.

In addition to these twelve, three others are listed under class VIII.

III. The unexpressed member is sometimes represented by a heterogeneous adjective as an attributive of the expressed member. So pūrvajē with pitārā in VII, 53, 2<sup>s</sup> and pūrvajāvari, also with pitārā, in X, 65, 6<sup>s</sup>. Conversely we have the masculines ubhā, kṛṣṇaprūtān and sakṣītān with mātārā in I, 140, 3<sup>s</sup>.

As dyāvā is the masculine element in dyāvāprthivi, so it would seem preferable to take it when it is the elliptic dual as still masculine and explain māhine in III, 6, 4<sup>s</sup>, and ubhē in IX, 70, 2<sup>s</sup> as heterogeneous adjectives representing the unexpressed member.

In X, 76, 1<sup>s</sup> sacābhāvā and udbhidā, heterogeneous attributives to abhānī, seem due to the thought of the dual nāktā. In I, 118, 2<sup>s</sup>, the adjectives amṛte, anicēl and āminānē may be taken as neuters in a constructio ad sensum with dyāvā as equivalent to abhorātṛē.

IV. The implied member of the syllepsis is sometimes sug-
gested by a differentiating adjective, sometimes with a distinctly oxymoronic effect.

In I, 123, 7th and VI, 58, 1st, vīrūpe applied to āhāni differentiates between day and night. So vīrūpe as applied to uṣāsā in III, 4, 6th and V, 1, 4th distinguishes between the connoting and connoted members. The phrase vārum ... āmi-
nānē, attribute of dyāvā in I, 113, 2nd, has a similar function.

In the Atharva Veda we find nānārūpe applied to āhāni in XIII, 2, 3rd, sāmyataḥ to āhūnas in XVI, 8, 22nd and sām ca-
rataḥ predicated of uṣāsā in VIII, 9, 12th, all serving to mark a distinction between the expressed and unexpressed members of the syllepse.

V. The most frequent method is the use of distributive appositives or attributives.

(a) Distributive appositives.

I, 160, 3rd, pitro, 2nd, pitā mātā ca.
X, 32, 3rd, pitrōr, 3rd, jāyā pātim vahati.
(?) I, 36, 17th, mitrā, 17th, mēdhyaëithim + 17th upastutām.
X, 10, 5th, dāmpati = yamo yami ca.
X, 85, 32nd, dāmpati = sōmah sūryā ca.
X, 95, 12th, dāmpati = purūrāva urvācī ca.
III, 33, 1st, mātārā, 1st, vipāṭ chutndri.
III, 33, 3rd, mātārā, 3rd, sindhum mātṛtamām + 3rd, vipācām.
IV, 55, 3rd, āhāni, 3rd, uṣāsānāktā.
III, 31, 17th, kṛṣṇē, 16th, dyūbhīr ... aktabhīr.
I, 142, 7th, mātārā, 7th, nākoṣāsā.
IV, 22, 4th, mātārā, 3rd, dyām ... bhūma.
4th, dyānūr ... kṣāb.
V, 5, 6th, mātārā, 6th, dośām uṣasām.
VII, 2, 5th, mātārā, 6th, uṣāsānāktā.
VII, 7, 3rd, mātārā, 5th, dyāuç ca yām prthivi.
X, 1, 7th, mātārā, 7th, dyāvāprthivi.
X, 35, 3rd, mātārā, 3rd, dyāvā no adyā prthivi.
X, 64, 14th, mātārā, 14th, dyāvāprthivi.
I, 31, 9th, pitrōr, 8th, dyāvāprthivi.
I, 110, 8th, pitrā, 6th, pitūr + 8th, mātārām.
I, 121, 5th, pitrān, 11th, dyāvākṣāmā.
III, 3, 11th, pitrā, 11th, dyāvāprthivi.
X, 65, 8th, pitrā, 8th, dyāvāprthivi.
V, 65, 6th, mitrā, 1st, vārupo, 1st, mitrō.
4th, mitrō, 4th, mitrāsāya.
5¹, mitrásya, 5², várúna.
The A.V. instances belonging here are:
XIV, 2, 9¹, dámpatt, 9², vadhvāi.
  7¹, vadhū, 7², pātye.
  1¹, pātibhyo, jáyām.
  2², pātnim, 2², pātir.
XIV, 2, 64¹, dámpatt, 63¹, nārt, 63², pātir.
VI, 120, 3¹, pitárān, 1¹, mātāram pitāram va.
  2², mātā, 2², pitā.
XX, 34, 16¹, pitārāu, 14¹, dyāvā cid asmā prthivi.
(b) Distributive attributives.
VI, 58, 1¹, áhant, 1¹, chkrām ... anyād.
  1², yajatām ... anyād.
X, 120, 7¹, mātārā (= dyāvāprthivi).
  7², ávaram, páram.
I, 146, 1², pítrór (= dyāvāprthivi).
  1¹, cárato (dyāus), dhruvāsya (prthivi)
(c) The distributive appositives are sometimes suggested rather
than expressed.
VIII, 7, 22¹, ksoni, equivalent to dyāvāprthivi,
  22², apāh (prthivi), súryam (dyāus).
VII, 65, 2¹, dyāvā, 1¹, súra (dyāus), 2², kṣīthi (prthivi).
VIII, 31, 5¹, dámpatt, 6, 7, 8, 9, passim, suggest the mar-
ried pair.
X, 162, 4¹, dámpatt, all the poem suggests the pair, esp.
the wife.
A.V. V, 1, 4¹, mātārā, 2², dhásyur yónim.
(d) Two of the foregoing may be united.
 a + b. I, 113, 2¹, dyāvā = daily and nightly heavens.
  2², rucati cyvėyā, 2², kṛṣṇā.
  1¹, rātrī, 3¹, nāktosāsā.
I, 122, 4¹, mātārā = ahorātrē.
  2², uṣásanākta.
  2², starir (barren night).
  2², sudṛśi (fair morn).
 a + c. X, 37, 2¹, dyāvā, 2², ápo, súryaḥ.
  6², dyāvāprthivi.
I, 161, 10¹ and 12¹, pitārā = dyāvāprthivi.
  11¹, udvāt sv asmā akrotona tīnan.
  11², nivāt sv apāh (akrotona).
  11³, agohyasa gṛhē, 13¹, agohya.
12a. bhūvanā.
14a. divā ... bhūmyā.
AV. XIV. 2, 37a, pitārāṇu, 37b, matā pitā ca.
37a: mārya īva yōṣām.
37b: prajāṁ kruvāthām.

XII. 3, 7a
3, 14a dāmpati, 1a, pūṁśu, 1b, priyā.
3, 27b context of hymn passēm.
3, 35b

VI. The appositive is sometimes a collective dual.
III. 2, 2b, mātrōr, 2a, rōdast.
III. 26, 9a, pitrōr, 9b, rōdast.
VII. 6, 6a, pitrōr, 6b, rōdasyor.
IX. 68, 4a, mātāra, 3a, mahā apārē rājast.
IX. 70, 6a, mātāra, 2a, ubhē dyāvā.
5a, rōdast.
IX. 75, 4a, mātāra, 4a, rōdast.
IX. 85, 12a, mātāra, 12b, rōdast.
X, 11, 6a, pitrāra, 9a, rōdast devāputre.
X, 140, 2a, mātāra, 24, rōdast.

VII. The appositive sometimes refers only to the expressed member, by name or suggestion.
(a) By name.
I, 28, 8a, vanaspattā, 6a, vanaspate,
7a: āyañjī vājasātumā.
1a, 2a, 3a, 4a, 5a, ulūkhalī.
X, 79, 4a, mātāra, 3a, mātuh.
X, 8, 3a, pitrōr, 7b, pitūr pārasya.
X, 8, 7a
(b) By suggestion.
X, 39, 12a, āhāmi, 12a, duhítā divāh (uṣās).
12a: vivāsvalō (morning sun).
II, 16, 3a, kṣonibhyām, 3b, samudrāḥ pārvatāyāh.
X, 115, 1a, mātārāv, 1a, anūdhā.
I, 124, 5a, pitrōr, 3a, divō duhítā.
X, 31, 10a, pitrōr, 10b, çamām.

VIII. Two or more of the foregoing may unite into a complex.
I + II a.
I, 159, 2a, pitārā = 3a, mātāra.
2a, pitūr, 2b, mātūr.
1a, dyāvā yajñaḥ prthivi.
I + II a + III.

I, 140, 3a, mātārā = 7a, pitrōḥ.
3b, pītuh, 9a, mātū.
3a, kṛṣṇapritāṇu, saksītān.
3a, ubbā.

I + II b + VI.

IX, 75, 4b, mātārā = 2a, pitrōr,
2a, divāḥ.
4a, rōdastī.

II b + IV + VII.

I, 185, 1ā, āhant, 1ā, pūrva, āpārā.
4a, ubhāyebhir āhnām.
5a, saṁgāchamāne yuvati.
5b, svāsārā jāmi, sarā vṝcāvṣa with āhant as daughters of dyāvā- prthivi.

III + IVa + Va + b.

I, 123, 7a, āhant, 7a, anyā (attracted by usāḥ).
7a, visurūpe.
7a, apānyād ēty abhy ānyād eti.
7a, tāmo, 7a, usāḥ.

III + Va + c.

VII, 53, 2a, pitārā, 2a, pūrvajē.
1a, dyāvā yajñāḥ prthivi.
1a, dyāvāprthivi.
1a, mahī devāputre.

IV + Vc + VII.

V, 1, 4a, usāsā, 4a, virūpe.
2a, prātār, 2a, tāmaso.
4a & 5a, āgro āhnām.
1a, usāsām.

Va + VI.

VI, 17, 7a, mātārā, 7a, kṣām, 7a, dyām.
7a, rōdastī.

III, 6, 4a, dyāvā, 2a, divāc cid agne mahinā prthivyā.
2a, rōdastī.

IV, 56, 3a, dyāvā, 1a and 3a, dyāvāprthivi.
4a, rōdastī.

I, 185, 2a, 5b, pitrōr, 2a—8a, dyāvā rākṣatam prthivi.
11a, dyāvāprthivi.
10, pita mātā ca rakṣatam.
11, pitar mātar.
3, rōdast.
4, rōdast devāputre.

X, 12, 4, pitaśa, 4, dyavābhūmi.
4, rōdast.

X, 59, 8, mātāra, 7, prthivi, 7, dyāur.
8, dyāūḥ prthivi.
8, rōdast.

Ve + VI.
IX, 70, 2, dyāvā, 3, double ref. to gods and men.
1, purvyē vyomana.
4, madhyamāsu mātṛṣu.
5, rōdast.

The AV has the following:

IV + VA.
XIII, 2, 3, śāhāti, 3, nānārūpe.
8, cukrō, 8, tamo.
5, ahorātre.
XVI, 8, 22, āhnos, 22, sāhyatoh.
21, ahorātreyoh.

IV + VII.
VIII, 9, 12, uṣāsā, sāham carataḥ.
12, sūryapatnt.

Of the elliptic duals not listed in the foregoing classes, the unexpressed members of thirty in the RV. and of three in the AV, are clearly suggested by the general context, as in those instances in which mātāra or pitaśa is a term for the arāni as parents of Agni, or for dyavāprthivi as the parents of the Ribhus, &c. Of the remaining thirteen, ten are used in sīmiles with the Aṣvinī as the second member and one each in comparisons with kṣoni, rōdasi and indravāraṇā.

The irreversibility of the elliptic dual has been remarked by others. Only one member of each pair can, in general, be used. Pitāra and mātāra are the striking exception and are used in the RV, in the ratio of forty-nine to thirty-six, in the AV, of three to two. Another exception does not appear to have been noted. The compound is dyavākṣamā, but kṣamā is an elliptic dual. Here dyavā would suggest only the far
more frequent prthivé. The same is true of ksáma, though the compound is not Vedic.

§ 2.
Elliptic Duals.

The following alphabetic list of these duals is believed to be complete for both the Rig and the Atharva Veda.

RV.

adhvaryú (2) = adhvaryó + (pratiprastháti).
I, 16, 5; and to be supplied with dvá in VIII, 72, 76.
Cited also for CB. 4, 3, 4, 22 and Káti. CS. 5, 5, 24, 26.
áhaní (7) = áhan + (rááti).
I, 123, 76; 185, 14; IV, 55, 3; V, 82, 8; VI, 58, 1; X, 39, 124; 76, 1.
Cited also for MBh. I, 301.
udumbaláú (1), see under cabáláú infra.
X, 14, 12.4.
usásá (5) = uśás + (náktá).
I, 188, 6; III, 4, 6; 14, 3; V, 1, 4; VIII, 27, 2 (cf. Berg-gaighe, Rel. Ved. 1, 248, n).
Cited also for VS. 21, 50; 29, 6.
kryá́ (2) = kṛṣá́ + (vétá, cf. VII, 90, 3f).
III, 31, 17, kṛṣá́ vaisudhití = ahoráátré (Sáý.).
IV, 48, 3, kṛṣá́ vaisudhití = dyáááptáhí (Sáý.).
(VS. 28, 15, explains vásudhití as dyáááptáhí. As kṛṣá́
is not applicable to áhar or dyááá, we follow Berg-gaighe
in Rel. Ved. 1, 250, in taking it as an elliptic dual,—"la
noire et la brillante").
ksáma (2) = (dyááás) + ksám.
II, 39, 7; X, 106, 104.
(Both instances are in Áçvina similes. In both the Pada-páthá reads ksáma-iva and GWB, takes it as the sing. of
ksáma. Sáýána writes ksáma each time, but paraphrases the
former by réodasi, the latter by kṣáma gáuh. LRV and GRV
interpret the word differently in the two passages. ksáma in
X, 12, 1, is unmistakably a dual from ksáma
Dyááá ha ksáma práthamá rténa.

In a comparison with the Áçvina the law of numerical con-
cord holds with great strictness and almost of itself compels
us to take both instances as duals, elliptic duals equivalent to ṛodasi or dyāvaprthivi. This gives also a much better interpretation in each instance and has the added virtue of consistency. The sām ajataṁ rājāni of the former passage and the urjā sacelhe of the latter both become especially apposite. The second passage would mean—“As Earth and Heaven ye help strengthen with food from the grassy mead” or perhaps, better, “help with strength the creature that grazes the grassy mead”, comparing sāyuvasād in I, 164, 40 and Sāyana’s derivation of the word in our passage from the radical ad. In either case it becomes another allusion to the Ācūvina as the great succores).

kṣonī (4) = (dyāus) + kṣonī.
II, 16, 35; VIII, 7, 22v; 52, 10; 99, 6b.

(kṣona, “earth”, is cited for R. I, 42, 23 and Bh. P. V, 18, 28; VIII, 6, 2. So kṣonī in Bh. P. IV, 21, 35 and ḫāunī in Bh. P. III, 14, 3 and 24, 42. These seem to justify the inclusion of this word among the elliptic duals, a view supported by Naigh, 3, 30. The word presents also the phenomena associated with the elliptic duals).

dāmpati (7) = dāmpati + (dāmpatūti).
V, 3, 24; VIII, 31, 5v; X, 10, 5v; 68, 2v; 85, 32v; 95, 12v; 162, 4v.

dyācā (4) = dyāus + (prthivi).
III, 6, 4v; VII, 65, 2v; IX, 70, 2v; X, 37, 2b.

dyāvā (1) in sense of nākuvaśā, or the sky by day and the sky by night. See pp. 35 and 37.
I, 113, 2v.

dyāus (1) = dyāus + (prthivi).
IV, 56, 5v.

(Ilanman, NL 433v and Grassmann WB. agree that this anomalous āraḍ śīp̣nāvar is a neuter form).

pitārā (49) = pitā + (mātā).
I, 20, 4v; 110, 8v; 111, 1v; 161, 10v, 12v; IV, 33, 2v, 3v; 34, 9v; 35, 5v; 36, 3v (ṛbhuṇam).

I, 31, 4v; 9v; 146, 1v; III, 3, 11v; 5, 8v; 18, 1v; 26, 9v;
VI, 7, 5v; VII, 6, 6v; X, 8, 3v; 11, 6v; 31, 10v; (agnēs).
I, 121, 5v; (indrasya); I, 124, 5v (uṣāsas).
I, 160, 3v; (sūryasya); II, 17, 7v; (aparīntāyās).
IX, 75, 2v; (sāmasya); x, 8, 7v; (trītāsyā). X, 32, 3v; (kīsya cid); X, 61, 1v; (pakthasya).
I, 140, 74; 159, 2a; 185, 2a; 5b; III, 7, 1c, 6b; IV, 5, 10a.
VI, 7, 4b; VII, 53, 2b; X, 12, 4a; 65, 8b; (= dyāvaprthivi).
IV, 41, 7c, comparison with mitrāvāraṇā.
III, 54, 16a; 58, 2b; VII, 67, 14a; X, 39, 6b; 85, 14d; 106, 4a;
131, 5d, comparison with ačvinā.
Cited also from VS, 19, 11, and from the Kāthaka recension of the YV, 23, 12.

mithārā (36) = mātā + (pitā).
I, 122, 4b; 140, 3b; III, 1, 7b; 2, 2b; 5, 7b; V, 11, 3a; VII, 3, 9b;
7, 3b; VIII, 60, 15a; X, 1, 7b; 79, 4b; 115, 1b; 140, 2a, (agnés).
I, 142, 7c; V, 5, 6b; VI, 17, 7b; IX, 102, 7d; X, 59, 8b, (ptāsya).
IX, 7b, 4b; 85, 13a, (sōmasya).
I, 155, 3c; 159, 3b; III, 7, 1b; IV, 22, 4c; VI, 32, 2a;
IX, 9, 3b; 68, 4b; 70, 6b; X, 35, 3b; 64, 14b; 120, 7b, (= dyāvā-
prthivi).
IX, 18, 5b, (= rōdaṣa).
III, 33, 1c, 3b, comparison with vipat, chutudri ca.
VII, 2, 5, comparison with usāsānāktā.
VIII, 99, 6b, comparison with kṣoṇi.
mitrā (5) = mitrā + (vārūna).
I, 36, 17a, so Ludwig, Grassmann and Bergaigne (2, 116)
take it, but Sāyana takes it as mitrāṇi, plural. It may
be taken also as dual, "friends", in apposition to the
proper names immediately after it.
I, 14, 3b, if the Pidapātha is correct in its resolution of
mitrāṇim into mitrā-āṇim. The metre does not favor
this and the presence of āṇa ... mitrāsya in 10 below,
without any reference to vārūna makes it more doubtful
whether we have a dual here at all.
V, 65, 6b; VIII, 25, 2a.
X, 106, 5a, in comparison with ačvinā. Sāyana takes it as
equivalent to mitrāvāraṇā, but GWB. and LRV. take it as "freund".
vanaspalī (2), metonym = ulākhala + (mūsala).
I, 28, 8b and to be supplied also in 7a with the adjectives
āyajī and vājasaṭamā.
čabālā (1) = čabāla + (cyāmā).
X, 14, 10b; (see Bloomfield: "Cerberus, The Dog of Hades",
p. 32).
The foregoing equation is based on AV, VIII, 1, 9a. The
color of these hell hounds is stated in RV, X, 114, 12b to
be *udumbulāū*—evidently another elliptic dual. In VII, 55, 21, the colors *ārjuna* and *piṣāṅga* are used in reference to one of them.

*Aśvinī* and *vṛdasi*; the evidence seems too meagre to warrant the admission of these into the number of elliptic duals.

**AV.**

*aṃhnyāū* (1) = aṃhnyās + (aṃhnyā).

XIV, 2, 16* if a metaphor for the bride and groom; if, as

*Kāuḍa, 77, 15* takes it, the two oxen that drew the bridal

car, it is not an elliptic dual at all.

*aḥani* (2) = aḥan + (rātī).

XIII, 2, 3*; XVI, 8, 23*.

*uṣāsā* (1) = uṣās + (nākta).

VIII, 9, 12*.

*dāmpati* (7) = dāmpati + (dāmpatī).

VI, 122, 3*; XII, 3, 7*; 14*; 27*; 35*;

XIV, 2, 9*; 64*.

*pītārāū* (3) = pītā + (mātā).

VI, 120, 3*; XIV, 2, 37*; literal.

XX, 34, 16*, figurative = dyāvāprthīvī (indrasya).

*mātārāū* (I) = mātā + (pītā).

V, 1, 4*, figurative? = dyāvāprthīvī? (sūryasya)?

*aṃmātārāū* (1).

XIII, 2, 13*; if literal, dual is due to comparison with āntān

preceding; if figurative, perhaps alludes to the *arūṇī* as

parents of Agni.

The following are common to both Vedas:

dāmpati, RV. X, 85, 32* = AV. XIV, 2, 11*.

RV. X, 10, 5* = AV. XVIII, 1, 5*.

*pītārāū* RV. X, 11, 6* = AV. XVIII, 1, 23*.

RV. X, 13, 4* = AV. XVIII, 1, 31*.

*ṣabālāū* RV. X, 14, 10* = AV. XVIII, 2, 11*.

**II.**

The Dual Dvandva.

In our presentation of this dual we shall start with that
form which, from one view taken of its historical relationship
to other forms, may be called the tnietic dvandva, or, from an-
other view, the inchoative dvandva. In this there is an "alien intrusion" of one or more words between the parts of the compound. We may select as one extreme RV. VI, 42, 5—
\[\text{ā nāktā bharīḥ sadatām uṣāsā}\]
in which the members are, practically, at the opposite ends of a triśūbha pāda and separated by the maximum of five full syllables. To illustrate the other extreme we may select RV. V, 45, 4—\[\text{indra nu āgni}\], in which the intervening monosyllabic word coalesces in pronunciation with the second term and disappears as a separate entity.

The appended list of dual dvandvas shows that the RV. has thirty-five instances of this form, in only two of which five syllables intervene; in eighteen, three syllables; in eight, two syllables; in five, one full syllable, and in two a syllable that coalesces with the second term. The AV. has but one example of this class, in which a monosyllabic comes between the members of the compound.

That this class is of proto-ethnic origin is shown by the few parallels found in the Avestan and the Old Russian, in both of which languages, however, the degree of possible separation is narrowly restricted. The Avestan \text{haurvatūša no amārātāt}, in Vr. 9, 3 and \text{pāyuča ūvōrōtāra}, in Y. 42, 2, show that the limits for that language are one or two monosyllabic enclitics. The three examples given by Zubaty (\text{Věstník České Akademie}, X, 520) show that the Old Russian allows only a monosyllabic conjunction to come between the members of the dvandva, e. g. \text{perenesena vysta Borisa i Glēba}.

In the second form this foreign matter is extruded and the two duals stand juxtaposed but without any other evidence of incipient coalescence into a compound; e. g., RV. VII, 66, 1—\text{mītrāyor vārunayoh}, and I, 147, 1—\text{tōkē tānaye}. The RV. has four examples of this and the unique metrical "freak", V, 62, 3—\text{mītrājānā varunā}. The AV. has no example of this type. That it is at least 1 Aryan, however, is shown by the fact that it is the usual and final form of the dual dvandva in Avestan. A rather short search has yielded a full score of examples.

1 Since writing this I have somewhere seen a statement that Wackernagel has suggested this as an additional explanation of the much mooted Homeric \text{Alexiphave Metis} in A, 750. I regret I have no access to Wackernagel’s book.
such as pasu vīra (nom.), Yt. 13, 12; pasaṭā vīrayā (gen.), Yt. 13, 10; pasubhā yāvāvīrīya (inst.), V, 6, 32; antara aḍīya aḍhra-paiti (acc.), Yt. 10, 116; inveti utayūti (acc.), Y. 45, 10; &c., &c.

In our third type the two members, each preserving its own accent and dual form, coalesce into a compound. This doubly dualized dvandva is the prevailing type in either Veda, occurring 321 times out of a total of 487 in the RV. and 126 times out of a total of 237 in the AV. It is found, however, only in the strong cases, the nom., acc. and voc.; e.g. indrāvāruṇa, agnīsoma, indrābhīhaspātī, &c. In the weak cases one of the two concords is lost, either that of number or that of case. The loss of numerical concord occurs four times, only in the RV. dvāparthivīyōs; the loss of case concord occurs three times in the RV. and ten times in the AV.; e.g. dvāparthivibhyām, dvāparthivīyōs, &c.

In our next type the doubly dualized dvandva appears with only one accent, as that of the prior member is absent. Slight as this change is, it is very significant as it indicates a growing feeling of the compound. The RV. preserves only six examples of this type; the AV., thirteen; e.g. somāpūṣābhīyām, sūrya-candramāśīm, &c.

In our final type the two members are fused into a unit by the complete loss of inflection of the prior element; e.g., indravāya, pārjanyavātī (voc.), &c. The RV. has 120 cases of this, or nearly 25%; the AV. has 87 cases, or 33%. This is the regular dual dvandva of the later language. The other types are distinctively poetic and hieratic and hieratic conservatism seems to be shown in the eighteen instances of the metrical resolution of indrāgāni out of a total of eighty-nine instances in which the form is found.

There are some noteworthy phenomena associated with the hieratic types of the dual dvandva. Of the thirty-five examples of our first type, the prior members of thirty-two stand initial in their pādas and the other three are preceded only by a propositional particle.

The doubly dualized dvandva also has its favorite positions. Of the 321 in the RV., 119 are initial in their pādas; 30 stand second, usually preceded by a monosyllabic particle; 154 stand

---

1 The AV. shows in agnificasā, VII, 29, 14, 25, a metabolism in the stem of the prior element, due to analogy with the numerous a stems.
in the exact middle of a tristubh or jagati pāda and only 18 are final. This is not metrical cause as they would frequently scan as well in other positions, but seems due rather to an artistic desire to get the long compound into one of the two effective positions of the pāda, either initial or at its medial summit. It would seem to have been done for conscious effect as the instances seem too numerous to be accidental.

The dual dvandva resembles the elliptic dual in its general irreversibility. The appended list shows that in the Vedas only uṣadānādā, parjñāvātā and dyāvāpṛthivī can be reversed to nāktosāsa, vātāparjanyā and pṛthvīdyāvā respectively. The last of these is a āśeṣa ṣapumā in RV. III, 46, 5.

§ 2.

The Dual Dvandvas.

In the following lists we follow the order in which the various types were presented and give first the RV. and then the AV. examples of the respective types.

I. The mnemonic dvandva.

agni, see indrā.

indrā.

V, 45, 4r; VI, 59, 3r—indrā ny āgni.
VI, 60, 1b—indrā yó āgni.
VI, 57, 1v—indrā nā pūṣāṇa.
IV, 41, 1v—indrā kō vaṁ varuṇā.
IV, 41, 2v—indrā ha yó varuṇā.
IV, 41, 3v—indrā ha rātmān várunā.
IV, 41, 4r, 5b—indrā yuvām varuṇā.
IV, 41, 6r—indrā no átra várunā.
VI, 68, 5b—indrā yó váṁ varuṇā.

uṣāṇa and uṣāṇa, see nāktā.

ksāmā, see dyāvā.

dyāvā.

X, 12, 1v—dyāvā ha ksāmā.
I, 63, 1v—dyāvā jajñānāḥ pṛthivī.
I, 143, 2v—dyāvā coccīḥ pṛthivī.
I, 159, 1v; VII, 53, 1v—dyāvā yaññāḥ pṛthivī.
I, 185, 2v—dyāvā raksatam pṛthivī.
II, 12, 13r—dyāvā cīd asmaḥ pṛthivī.
II, 41, 20r—dyāvā naḥ pṛthivī.
V, 43, 2b—dyāvă vájāya prthivī.
VI, 11, 1c—dyāvă hotráya prthivī.
VIII, 97, 14a—dyāvă reje te prthivī.
X, 35, 3c—dyāvă no adyā prthivī.
X, 46, 9a—dyāvă yām agnīm prthivī.
X, 91, 3b—dyāvă ca yāni prthivī.
I, 61, 14b—dyāvă ca bhūmā.

nāktā.
I, 73, 7c—nāktā ca cakrūr uṣāsā.
VII, 42, 5c—ā nāktā barhiṣ sadatām uṣāsā.
pūṣāna, see indrā.
prthivī, see dyāvă.
bhūmā, see dyāvă.
mitrā.
VI, 51, 1—mitrāyóra śā ēti priyān várunayoh.
The AV. has its only example in
XVIII, I, 29a, dyāvā ha -ksāmā, = RV. X, 12, 1c.
II. Our second type, juxtaposition without composition, appears
in I, 147, 1c; VIII, 103, 7c,—toké tánaye.
IX, 58, 3c,—dhvāsāryoh puruṣántyor.
VII, 66, 1c,—mitrāyóra várunayoh.
V, 62, 3b,—mitrārājāná varuṇa, a unique variant and sort
of hybrid between the types.
III. The doubly dualized dvandvas.

*āgni-parjanya, VI, 52, 16c.
āgni-parjanya, I, 93, 1c, 5c, 10a, 11c.
āgni-parjanya, I, 93, 2c, 3c, 4c, 6c, 7c, 9c, 12c; X, 19, 1c.
āgni-parjanya, I, 93, 8c; X, 66, 7c.
*ārṇácitrārathā, IV, 30, 18c.
*āindrākutsā, V, 31, 9c.
āindrāpaṟravā, I, 122, 3c; 132, 6c.
āindrāpaṟravā, III, 53, 1c.
āindrāpiṣāṇa, VII, 35, 14c.
āindrābhyaspāti, IV, 49, 1c, 2b, 3c, 4c, 6c.
āindrābhyaspāti, IV, 49, 5c.
*āindrābrahmanaspāti, II, 24, 12c.
āindrāvarunā, I, 17, 7c, 8c, 9c.
āindrāvarunā, III, 62, 1c, 2c, 3c; IV, 41, 1c; 42, 9c, 10c; VI, 68, 15c.

* ārṇá; dhyāma in the Veda cited.
S. G. Oliphant.

II. 27, 5<sup>2</sup>; 29, 3<sup>2</sup>; 31, 1<sup>2</sup>; 41, 4<sup>2</sup>; III. 62, 16<sup>2</sup>; IV. 39, 2<sup>4</sup>, 5<sup>4</sup>; V. 47, 7<sup>2</sup>; 51, 14<sup>2</sup>; 62, 2<sup>2</sup>; 63, 1<sup>2</sup>; 4<sup>2</sup>, 5<sup>2</sup>; 7<sup>2</sup>; 64, 4<sup>2</sup>; 69, 3<sup>3</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>; VI. 67, 9<sup>2</sup>; VII. 36, 2<sup>2</sup>; 50, 1<sup>2</sup>; 52, 1<sup>2</sup>; 60, 2<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>; 61, 3<sup>2</sup>, 6<sup>2</sup>; 62, 5<sup>3</sup>; 63, 5<sup>2</sup>; 64, 2<sup>2</sup>, 4<sup>2</sup>; 65, 2<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>; 4<sup>2</sup>; VIII. 72, 17<sup>2</sup>; 101, 3<sup>2</sup>; IX. 51, 2<sup>2</sup>; 132, 2<sup>2</sup>.

mitrāvārnavu, V. 63, 2<sup>2</sup>.

mitrāvārnavu, I. 2, 9<sup>2</sup>; 23, 5<sup>2</sup>; 51, 14<sup>2</sup>; 75, 5<sup>2</sup>; 111, 4<sup>2</sup>; III. 20, 5<sup>2</sup>; 56, 7<sup>2</sup>; V. 46, 3<sup>2</sup>; 63, 2<sup>3</sup>; VI. 11, 1<sup>2</sup>; 49, 1<sup>2</sup>; 67, 1<sup>2</sup>; VII. 33, 10<sup>2</sup>; 41, 1<sup>2</sup>; 42, 5<sup>2</sup>; VIII. 23, 30<sup>2</sup>; 25, 4<sup>3</sup>; IX. 7, 8<sup>2</sup>; 97, 42<sup>2</sup>; 49<sup>2</sup>; 108, 14<sup>2</sup>; X. 61, 17<sup>2</sup>; 64, 5<sup>2</sup>; 93, 6<sup>2</sup>; 125, 1.<sup>2</sup>

mitrāvārnavu, I. 2, 8<sup>2</sup>; 122, 9<sup>2</sup>; V. 41, 1<sup>2</sup>; 62, 9<sup>2</sup>; 63, 6<sup>2</sup>; VI. 67, 2<sup>2</sup>, 11<sup>2</sup>; VII. 60, 12<sup>2</sup>; 61, 2<sup>2</sup>.

mitrāvārnavu, I. 35, 1<sup>2</sup>; 167, 8<sup>2</sup>; VII. 35, 4<sup>2</sup>; VIII. 101, 1<sup>2</sup>; X. 93, 10<sup>2</sup>.

*caṇāśira, IV. 57, 5<sup>2</sup>.

sūryāsana, VIII. 94, 2<sup>2</sup>; X. 64, 3<sup>2</sup>; 68, 10<sup>2</sup>; 92, 12<sup>2</sup>; 93, 5<sup>2</sup>.

sūnapāṣanā, II, 40, 1<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>.

sūnapāṣanā, II, 40, 5<sup>2</sup>.

sūmāruḍrā, VI. 74, 1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>, 3<sup>2</sup>.

sūmāruḍrā, VI. 74, 4<sup>2</sup>.

AV.

agnāśramā, VII. 29, 1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>.

agnisoma, I. 8, 2<sup>4</sup>; XVIII. 2, 53<sup>2</sup>.

agnisoma, VI. 93, 3<sup>2</sup>.

agnisomā, VI. 54, 2<sup>2</sup>.

agnisomā, III. 13, 5<sup>2</sup>; VIII. 9, 14<sup>2</sup>.

indrapāsana, VI, 3, 1<sup>2</sup>.

indrapāsana, XIX. 10, 1<sup>2</sup>.

indravārnavu, VII. 58, 1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>2</sup>.

indravārnavu, XIX. 10, 1<sup>2</sup>.

indrāsoma, VIII. 4, 1<sup>2</sup>—6<sup>2</sup>, 7<sup>2</sup>.

indrāsoma, XIX. 10, 1<sup>2</sup>.

usasānakta, V. 12, 6<sup>2</sup>; 27, 8<sup>2</sup>; VI. 3, 3<sup>2</sup>.

dyāvāprthivi, II. 29, 4; IV. 22, 4; 26, 1; VI. 40, 1.

dyāvāprthivi, II. 12, 5; 16, 2; IV. 26, 2—6; V. 14, 12.

dyāvāprthivi, II. 1, 4; 10, 1—8; 12, 1; 29, 5; III. 4, 5; 15, 2; 31, 4; IV. 6, 2; 26, 7; 30, 5; V. 12, 9; 23, 1; 24, 3; VI. 3, 2; 8, 3; 55, 1; 58, 1; 62, 1; 94, 3; VII. 30, 1; 82, 4, 5; 112, 1; VIII. 3, 14; 5, 3, 6, 18; 8, 21, 22; IX. 2, 20; 4, 10; X. 7, 35;
The Vedic Dual.

8, 39; XI, 3, 2; 7, 2; XIII, 1, 5; 6bis, 7, 37; 2, 26, 35; 3, 1, 4;
XIV, 1, 54; XIX, 10, 5; 14, 1; 15, 5; 20, 4; 49, 1; 58, 3.
dyāvābhūmā, XVIII, 1, 31b.
bhūvaçavān, IV, 28, 1a; VIII, 2, 7a; XI, 1, 21a.
mitrāvarūmā, VI, 97, 2a; IX, 10, 23a; XIX, 11, 6a.
mitrāvarūmā, IV, 29, 3a; 4b.
mitrāvarūmā, III, 4, 4a; 10, 1a; IV, 30, 1a; XIV, 1, 54a; XVIII
3, 12a.
mitrāvarūmā, I, 30, 21a; III, 25, 6a; IV, 39, 1a; VI, 32, 3a.
mitrāvarūmā, IV, 39, 6a; XIII, 1, 31a.
mitrāvarūmā, IV, 29, 7a; V, 24, 5a; 25, 4a; VI, 89, 3a; 132, 5a;
XIII, 1, 20a; XVI, 4, 7; XIX, 10, 4a.
sōmārudrā, VII, 42, 1a; 2a.
sōmārudrā, V, 6, 5a; 6a; 7a.

The instances in which there is a loss of numerical concord in
the weak cases are
divāsprthivyōs, RV. II, 2, 3a; V, 49, 5a; X, 3, 7a; 35, 2a.

Those in which there is a loss of concord in case are
agnisōmābhyyām, AV. XII, 4, 26a.

indrāvarunāyos, RV. I, 17, 1a.
dyāvāsprthivyēh, AV. V, 9, 7; VII, 102, 1; XI, 3, 33; XIX,
17, 5.
dyāvāsprthivyōs, AV. VI, 58, 2; XVI, 8, 23.
mitrāvarunābhyyām, RV. V, 51, 9a.
mitrāvarunāyos, RV. X, 130, 5a.
AV. X, 5, 11a; XI, 3, 44a; XVI, 8, 25a;
IV. Doubly dualized dyandvas with single accent.

RV.

*vañparjanyā, X, 66, 10a.
sūryācandramānī, I, 102, 2a.
sūryācandramānī, V, 51, 15a; X, 190, 3a.

Here, too, there is loss of case concord in the weak cases:
indrāpūrṇa, I, 162, 2a.
śomāpūsābhyyām, II, 40, 9a.

AV.

*bhuvarudrī, XI, 2, 14a.
bhūvaçarvā, IV, 28, 7a; X, 1, 23a; XI, 6, 9a; XII, 4, 17a.
vātparjanyā, X, 4, 16a.
sūryācandramānī, VIII, 2, 15a; XI, 3, 2b; 6, 5a.
Weak cases with loss of case concord are vītāparjanyāyos, VI, 93, 34.
sūryācandramāsābhyām, VI, 128, 34; XI, 3, 34.
sūryāmāsāyos, III, 29, 54.

The vocatives of these words are naturally not indicative of their accentual condition, so they are included in the longer lists preceding.

V. The dvandva in its final form.

RV.

indrāṇī, I, 2, 4, 135, 54; II, 41, 36; IV, 46, 36, 46, 54, 64, 74; 47, 46; VII, 90, 54, 64; 91, 24, 46, 54, 64, 66.
indrāṇī, I, 14, 3; 23, 24, 36; 139, 14; VII, 90, 74; 91, 74; X, 65, 94; 141, 44.
indrāṇī, I, 108, 134; 24, 36, 44, 54, 74—134; 109, 54, 64, 74, 86; VI, 59, 44; X, 161, 14.
indrāṇī, I, 21, 54, 64; 109, 14, 24, 44; III, 12, 14, 24, 54, 64—94; V, 27, 64; VI, 59, 134, 74, 104; 60, 84, 94, 154; VII, 94, 134—36, 74, 86; 94, 94; VIII, 38, 134—94.
indrāṇī, I, 21, 14, 24, 36, 44; 139, 94; III, 12, 14; V, 46, 36; 86, 24; VI, 60, 144; VII, 35, 14; VIII, 40, 44; X, 125, 14; 161, 44.
indrāṇibhyām, I, 109, 134; VIII, 40, 54, 124; X, 116, 94; 128, 94.
indrāṇīyos, VIII, 38, 104; 40, 94.
rhāmābhyām, X, 85, 114; 114, 64.
pārjanyavatā, VI, 49, 64.
viśvāmitrajanadagni, X, 167, 44.
suṣanunacanē, X, 90, 44.
satyāntē, VII, 49, 36.

In the following instances the double dual of indrāṇī is practically restored by the metrical resolution. A comparison of the numerical citations shows that the two forms sometimes exist side by side.

indrāṇī, VI, 60, 134.
indrāṇī, V, 86, 14; VI, 59, 36, 94, 94; 60, 74; VII, 93, 14, 44; VIII, 40, 14.
indrāṇī, V, 86, 44; VI, 60, 44, 54; VII, 93, 34; 94, 104; VIII, 40, 34; X, 65, 24.
indrāṇibhyām, V, 86, 64.

AV.

*akṣujalābhyām, VIII, 8, 184.
*aṅgačaṃsaduḥṣaṃvibhyām, XII, 2, 24.
*arākṣamedhāu, XI, 7, 74.

ahorātre, X, 7, 66; 8, 23; XI, 5, 206; 6, 5, 7; 7, 146; XII, 1, 95, 364; 526; 2, 496; XII, 2, 54; 326; XV, 6, 6; 18, 46.
ahorārāhīyām, VI, 128, 3; XIII, 2, 436; XIV, 2, 406; XIX, 8, 27, 76.

ahorātriyoṣ, XV, 6, 6; XVI, 8, 216.

*ādānasundānābhīyām, XI, 9, 346.

*indravāyā, III, 20, 64.

indrāṇī, III, 11, 146; IX, 1, 126.

indrāṇī, XIII, 1, 316.

indrāṇī, I, 35, 46; III, 3, 53; IV, 30, 146; V, 7, 656; VI, 104, 33; 132, 46; VIII, 1, 24, 164; 2, 216; IX, 2, 96; 3, 186; X, 1, 216; XI, 8, 56; XIV, 1, 546; XIX, 10, 16; 16, 26; 20, 16.

indrāṇībhīyām, V, 3, 106.

indrāṇyos, IX, 1, 126; XVI, 8, 246.

*uḥocanaśraparocanē, VII, 95, 16.

unocanaśraparocanē, V, 30, 26; 3, 46.

*pāṇābhīyām, XIV, 1, 116.

*kapotolukābhīyām, VI, 29, 26.

*pālālānapālāla, VIII, 6, 26.

*pītaputrāv, VI, 112, 246.

pānāpāṇī, III, 11, 54; 66; VII, 53, 326.

pānāpāṇī, II, 16, 16; XVI, 4, 56.

pānāpāṇī, V, 10, 326; VII, 53, 246; VIII, 2, 116; X, 7, 346; XI, 4, 136; 5, 246; 7, 256; 8, 46; 266; XVI, 4, 76.

pānāpāṇībhīyām, II, 28, 46.

*bodhapratibodhā, V, 30, 106.

*brahmarājanyabhām, XIX, 32, 8.

*rādhacakra, V, 1, 56.

vyānodānā, XI, 8, 46; 266.

vṛṣṭhyavā, VIII, 2, 186; XI, 4, 136; XII, 1, 426; XX, 129, 15, 16.

vṛṣṭhyavābhīyām, X, 6, 246.

*satyāntṛ, I, 33, 246.

*sadhavirāhānē, XII, 1, 386.

The number of ḍrav ḍrṇavā in this AV list is noteworthy as indicative of the freedom with which the unified dvandva is thus employed.
III.

Origin and Relationship.

What is the origin of the elliptic dual? What of the dual dvandva? What genetic relation, if any, exists between them? Diametrically differing answers have been given to these questions. The traditional and native theory seems to derive the elliptic dual from the dual dvandva. Such is the natural inference from the name—dvandva ekaçeṣa—given the former by the Hindoo grammarians. Such was the descent approved by G. Meyer (K. Z. XXII, 8 E.) and Wackernagel (K. Z. XXIII, 299). Bergaigne (Rel. Ved. II, 116) and Delbruck (S. F. V, 98), however, reverse the process and consider the dual dvandva a development from the elliptic dual. This view seems now the one more generally accepted.

It will be patent to the careful observer that we may begin with either the elliptic dual or the dvandva and work our way by successive stages to the mechanical evolution of the other, or that we may begin in the middle, e.g., with the doubly dualized dvandva, and work both ways. In either of the latter two methods, however, a practical test shows that we must make more assumptions and pass through more complex processes than in the case of the first. There are other difficulties also.

If we start with the elliptic dual we must first find an answer to our first question, the origin of this dual.

The fact that in the RV, pitārā and mitārā together stand in the ratio of 85 to 129, or almost exactly 2 to 3, to the whole number of its elliptic duals and the fact that these represent the one syllepsis, if any, that can be proved for Indo-European, as shown by the Avestan dual\(^1\) pitāra, the Greek dual ἐός ἑός, and the pluralized duals, Greek πατέρας, Latin\(^2\) patres, Lithuanian\(^3\) tėvai, Gothic berusjo, Greek γονεῖς, and ṛoṣa, Latin parentes, &c., all used to signify "father and mother" or the two parents, though in the strictest etymological sense applicable to but one of the pair, may warrant the

---

\(^1\) Yaj. 10, 117. — satāguṇa (or asit miṭrō) antaḥ pitāro (acc. du.) paṭiṁrō

\(^2\) Surviving in this meaning in the Spanish los padres, as Dr. C. J. Ogden informs me.

\(^3\) Shown by Joh. Schmidt (K. Z. XXV, 34) to be from *pćeis — (Greek ἐός).
assumption that this particular syllepsis was a nidus, if not the nidus, of the usage. Its extension to dāmpati, real or potential parents, which in the two Vedas stand next in numerical precedence, and then to other and personified couples exercising some real or fancied parental or generative functions, would be both easy and natural. The Adhvaryu and Prātiprasthātya by an easy figure may be the parents of the sacrifice. Morning and evening, a necessarily complementary pair, may be imagined as parents, and in fact are actually so called in more than one Vedic passage (e.g., I, 142, 7; V, 5, 6; VII, 2, 5; VIII, 99, 69). If Bloomfield is right in identifying the bounds of Yama with the sun and moon, the elliptic duals udāmbalā and gabatā, admit the same explanation. Only mitrā remains and IV, 41, 7 shows that mitrāvānum̄a are compared to pīturā.

Thus one syllepsis and its analogical and figurative inclusions account for every elliptic dual in the Vedas and also for the few others cited from the grammarians and lexicographers. This is the whole story for Sanskrit and for Avestan with its unique elliptic dual (see above).

There seems to be no other pro-ethnic elliptic dual. Sporadic instances in individual languages have been cited. Some of these are doubtful. This interpretation of the Homeric Aἴτης, so ingeniously supported by Wackernagel (KZ XXIII, 308), is not accepted by competent Hellenists. The Latin Gērēs and Castōres undoubtedly came to be used as the plurals of such duals, but the origin of the plurals can be explained otherwise. The Greek παρόντα and Latin sopcri are akin to and includible under the general syllepsis above. The Old Norse fedgar and mjóedgar, if genuine, are merely an independent syllepsis. Admitting all of these we have only a handful of isolated syllepases, a weak foundation for the Indo-Europeanism of the elliptic dual outside of the almost necessary syllepsis for parents and its kindred.

In the presentation of the phenomena of the elliptic dual we have shown how often, 99 out 145 instances, the elisit

---

1 There were, for instance, two Gērēs, one native, one imported. The former was the daughter of Caelus and Vesta and wife of Sicamus, king of the Siculi. She taught the Siculi the use of grain. Also Proserpina is called Gērēs inferna and Gērēs profunda. Again Gērēs was identified with Terra, Luna and Libera. Cf. also the Catullan plurals Venēres, Cupīdīna.
seem to make a conscious effort to mention or suggest the connoted member of the syllepsis, somewhere in the neighboring context. The degree of propinquity may vary from several stanzas to consecutive pādas. Assuming that form in which the connoted member is expressed in the dual, either by mere attraction or by a conscious effort to express the purity of the members, as a starting point, we may readily show the possible mechanical evolution of the dual dvandva.

An example like RV. III, 7, 16—

ā mātārā vīśāh saptā vānīh
parīkṣitā pitarā sau ca rete,

in comparison with VI, 42, 5—

ā nāktā bhūriḥ sadatam uṣāsā
will show how little these two duals may differ. Intermediate between these is such an instance as VI, 51, 16—

ud u tyāc cākṣur māhi mitrāyor ah
ēti priyāṃ vārunayoh adabāham,

which seems to partake almost equally of the characteristics of each. On its formal side the difference appears to be one of degree of propinquity. When the dual of the connoted member of an elliptic dual is expressed within some arbitrary limit,—as the pāda, the elliptic dual becomes a dual dvandva. Further increments of increase of propinquity will give the successive forms in the order presented above.

Such is an explanation of the dual dvandva consonant with the current view of its origin from the elliptic dual. Easy as this is on the formal side there seems to be ground for objection. It seems too mechanical, too wooden. It takes no account of the prevailing differencing content of these two species of dual. It divorces the origin of the dual dvandva from that of the other forms of the dvandva compound. The dvandva compound is undoubtedly, indisputably pro-ethic in Indo-European and has a far wider range than can be traced for the elliptic dual. Its obvious origin is a simple asyndeton. Its original type is represented by the Vedic turaçaṇa yadum, turaçaṇa yadiṣu, Avestan Vandarmainiś Arjataṣpō, Lithuanian tētēs mataš, Lettish mīsch-ānsas, Old Bulgarian bratu sestro, Latin pactum conventum, &c. Juxtaposition led naturally to composition. This in the case of two parathetic singulars gave either a dual or a dvandva singular. Both of these are Vedic. The latter is common to all the Indo-European group.
The general loss of the dual probably made the former less demonstrable.

We are prone to believe that the doubly dualized dvandva of Vedic and Avestan is but a hieratic variant of this former type. If we compare the contents of the lists of doubly dualized dvandvas and of completely unified dvandvas, given above, we see at once that with the exception of a half dozen ēkā́̄ṃdva, the former is made up of sets of names of pairs of associated deities. The latter list presents a marked contrast. It is a distinctively Atharvanic or demotic aggregation of associated pairs of various kinds, but has only three sets of deities. Of these indrāvyā is found only in this list. Purā́ṉavyāvītā occurs only once in this form. The numerous metrical resolutions of indrāgni shows that it is now in one class, now in the other, though prevailingly in the latter.

This hieratic variant is Aryan. Vedic confined it quite strictly to its hieratic character. In Avestan, of which only hieratic literature remains, it became propagative practically to the exclusion of other types. The double dual is not due to a mere grammatical attraction of number, but rather, we fancy, to a formalistic parataxis or a liturgical fulness of expression arising from a desire to magnify equally each of the associated deities somewhat after the manner of a dualis maiestatis or, at least, to express a formal parity between them. This could be effected by making both members either dual or singular, but the singular dvandva was too prone to be either collective or suggestive of a practical unity and too largely pre-empted by the neuter, to be appropriate. In other cases than that of associated deities there would not be the same formal scrupulosity. Hence the doubly dualized dvandva with its special range.

The genetic relation between the elliptic dual and the dual dvandva disappears in this view. The origins of the two kinds of dual become quite distinct. One is an evolution from asyndeton; the other from syllepsis. Thus both are rhetorical in origin. Both belong to the hieratic and more artistic sphere. On the side of form there are strong resemblances, but the genetic development from different sources shows these to be accidental. This hypothesis accounts for differing content, for relative age, for special ranges and for associated phenomena. It keeps together things that seem naturally to belong together. It presents no mechanical but an organic evolution.
The Dūṭāṅgada of Subhāta, now first translated from the Sanskrit and Prakrit.—By Dr. Louis H. Gray, Newark, N.J.¹

The chāyānātaka is a dramatic genre unrecognised by Sanskrit works on dramaturgy, yet to this category belong at least seven dramas, the Dūṭāṅgada of Subhāta, Rāmādeva's Subhadraparīnaya, Paṇḍavaśleṣyayugaya, and Rāmābhuyadaya, the anonymous Haridīṣyātā, Viṭṭhalā's chāyānātaka, and the modern Sāvitrīcarita (Schuyler, Bibliography of the Sanskrit Drama, 102). Of these the only one yet published is the drama here translated, the Dūṭāṅgada, edited by Durgāprasadā and Parab as the twenty-eighth volume of the Kāvyamālā (2d ed., Bombay, 1900; cf. also Schuyler, 85). This is the earliest extant play of its type. According to its prastāvā, it was produced during the reign of Trihitunāspalādeva, a Chaułukya king of the dynasty of Anhilvād or Anhilpūr, who ruled in Gujarāt in 1242–1243 (Bendall, JRAS, 1898, 229–230, Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the British Museum, 105–106; Duff, Chronology of India, 189). The play was presented at a festival in honour of Kumārapalādeva, a monarch of the same line who ruled from 1143 to 1172 (Bendall, opp. cit.; Duff, 149–159; Forbes, Rās Mālā, 138–157), the particular event commemorated being Kumārapalādeva's restoration of a

¹ This translation was originally presented to the Society in 1906. Almost immediately afterward I learned that Professor Richard Pischel was working on the drama, with special reference to the longer recension. Although he very kindly urged me to publish this present version of the shorter text, and most generously added: "I am ready to send you the various readings of doubtful or difficult passages," it seemed to me presumptuous to issue my translation, especially as he proposed to give one in his own edition. Professor Pischel's death—so sore a loss to Sanskritists—renders improbable any completion of his labours on the Dūṭāṅgada, at least in the near future. Meanwhile the present translation may serve to give some idea of Subhāta's literary worth.
Šaiva temple at Devapattan or Somnath in Kathiawar, Bombay (Bendall, JEBAS, loc. cit.: Forbes, 147—148). The exact time of year at which the play was produced is given by the reading gūtrāyān dolaṣārvānti in a manuscript recorded by Aufrrecht (although the Bombay edition omits the latter word). It was, consequently, given at the dhooly festival on the fourteenth of Phālguna (March 7), 1243.

In his Das altindische Schattenspiel (Sitzungsberichte der königlich preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1906, 482—502) Pischel has very pertinently remarked (p. 161f. of the offprint) that ‘there are almost as many Dūtāṅgadas as there are manuscripts’ (for a convenient summary of these cf. Aufrrecht, Catalogus Catalogorum, i, 257; ii, 55, 205; iii, 55); but in general two recensions, a longer and a shorter, may be distinguished. The shorter recension is that on which the present translation is based. Of the longer recension, as represented by a manuscript of the India Office, Eggeling writes (Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the India Office, vii, no. 4189): ‘not only is the dialogue itself considerably extended in this version by the insertion of many additional stanzas, but narrative verses are also thrown in, calculated to make the work a curious hybrid between a dramatic piece (with stage directions) and a narrative poem. This latter character of the composition is rendered still more pronounced by an introduction of 39 (12 + 27) stanzas in mixed metres (partly, however, placed in the mouths of Rāma and Hanumāt), referring to incidents which lead to the discovery of Sītā’s hiding-place.’ As the author implies in his closing stanza, he has not hesitated to draw on his predecessors for material, among his sources being, according to Pischel (17f.), Murāri, Rāja-śekhara, Bhavabhūti, and especially the Hanumāmātaka. The Dūtāṅgada is divided, at least in its shorter recension, into three scenes; and from a comparison of it with the corresponding portions of the Rāmāyana (vi, 41, 107—108, 123) it would seem that its action implies a period of three or four days.

The meaning of the term chāya-nātaka was long obscure. Wilson (Select Specimens of the Theatre of the Hindus, ii, 390) supposed it to denote ‘the shade or outline of a drama,’ and that the Dūtāṅgada ‘was perhaps intended to introduce a spectacle of the drama and procession, as it is otherwise difficult to conceive what object its extreme conciseness could
have effected.' Lévi (Le Théâtre indien, 241f.) dubiously suggests: ‘On serait tenté de l’expliquer par “ombre de drame” si les règles de la grammaire ne s’opposaient à cette analyse du composé chāya-nātaka. Elles admettent du moins une explication voisine et presque identique: “drame à l’état d’ombre.” Pischel originally held that chāyānātaka might mean a ‘half play’ (Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, 1891, 358f., Deutsche Literatur-Zeitung, 1902, 403); and in the earlier draft of this introduction I fancied that the word might mean a ‘play that is but a shadow’ (or, less probably a ‘play in shadow’ [= in miniature]; cf. for examples of these two types of compound Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, ii, a, 244—245, 250—253), my argument being that the chāyānātaka was, so to say, ‘a condensed yet complete drama, a “shadow” of the nātaka both in number of acts and in their length, although the general theme is the same in both. The Dūtāṅgada may thus not inappropriately be termed the “shadow” of, for instance, the Mahāvīracarita.’ All these views have been rendered nugatory by Pischel’s monograph already noted, in which he has shown that chāyānātaka means simply and solely ‘shadow-play.’ This form of drama is expressly mentioned by Nila-kaṇṭha in his commentary on rūpopajivānam in Mahābhārata XII, cxxv, 5: rūpopajivānam jalamandaṇapakēti dākenātyesu prasiddham, gatra sūkṣma vastraṃ vyayadhaṅga caramayau ākāraī rūpanātyadūnāṃ caryā pradarsyate. ‘rūpopajivāna is called jalamandaṇapikā among the Southerners, where, having set up a thin cloth, the action of kings, ministers, &c., is shown by leathern figures’ (for further details see Pischel, 4ff.). Of such a shadow play the Dūtāṅgada is at least the legitimate successor, and the oldest extant Indian specimen, whether it was presented after the fashion of ombres chinoises or by real actors (cf. Pischel, 19ff.).

The suggestion has been made by Rajendralalā Mitra (Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Library of his Highness the Maharaja of Bikaner, 251) that the Dūtāṅgada ‘was evidently intended to serve as an entr’act to a theatrical exhibition.’ If this be true, the Sanskrit chāyānātaka would correspond almost precisely to the English ‘interludes,’ which seem to have not unfrequently been produced to diversify or fill up the pauses of the banquets ensuing in great houses upon the more substantial part of the repast’ (Ward, History of English
Dramatic Literature, i., 108, 237—238; cf. also Gayley, Representative English Comedies, introd. 55—56), while in France they were sometimes acted in the intervals of the mysteries, and hence were called pauses. If the suggestion of Rajendra-lala Mitra be taken still more strictly, the chāyānātaka would find its European parallel in the Italian intermezzi of Cecchi and Boarhini, as well as in the Spanish entremeses of Timonedo, Cervantes, and Lope de Vega (Klein, Geschichte des Drama's, iv, 657, 674, 682—684; ix, 185—187, 375—412; x, 510—516). All this, however, is scarcely probable; for if the chāyānātaka is really a shadow play, as it almost certainly is, the universal mode of presenting such plays would forbid us to consider it as in any sense an interlude.

The Dātāṅgada has already been analysed by Wilson (loc. cit., on which is based the brief note of Klein, op. cit., iii, 369) and by Aufrecht (Catalogus Codicum Sanscritorum Bibliothecae Bodleianae, 139). It is, as its name implies, based on the Rāmāyana, and deals with the sending of the monkey Angada by Rāma to demand the restoration of the captive Sītā by Rāvana. A nātaka was composed on Angada by Bhūbhaṭṭa (Aufrecht, Catalogus Catalogorum, i, 4), but probably the closest analogue to the Dātāṅgada is to be found in the sixth act of Bhavabhūti's Mahāvīracarita, which was far anterior to Subhāṭa's play, and which may have served to some extent as his model.

Rāma plays have enjoyed a wide popularity throughout certain portions of the East. Originating in India, and comprising such dramas as Bhavabhūti's Mahāvīracarita, Rājaśekhara's Bālarāmāyana, Murāri's Anar Yārāghava, Jayadova's Prasannarāgava, and Rāmabhadrakītā's Jñānākīparīnāya (Lēvi, 267—295), they spread to Java, Bali, Malacca, Burmah, Siam, and Cambodia (Juynboll, Indonessische en achterindische tooneelvoorstellingen uit het Rāmāyana, in Bijdragen tot de taal-, land- en volkenkunde van Nederlandsch-Indië, 6th series, x, 501—565; Serrurier, De wajang poered, 171—172; Bastian, Reisen in Siam, 328, 503—504; Moura, Royaume de Cambodge, ii, 444—458; F. W. K. Müller, Nāṅg, siamesische Schattenspielefiguren, supplement to Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie, viii; Skeat, Malay Magic, 517—519). Angada himself, the hero of Subhāṭa's play, appears in Java, Bali, Siam, and Cambodia, although he is by no means the principal figure in any of
these dramas of Farther India. The source of the Rāma plays in Cambodia, Siam, Burmah, and the Malay Peninsula was doubtless Java (cf. Skeat, 503—521; Hazou, Bijdrage tot de kennis van het javaansche toneel, 28—36), while Java obviously received the Rāma legend from India. Yet from Java, despite its affection for the story of Rāma and the extreme elaboration of its dramaturgy, we gain little light on the Dūtāṃgada. In Java the Rāma cycle may be treated in the dramatic categories of the wayang purw, a shadow play produced by puppets of buffalo leather; the wayang topeng and the wayang wong, produced by masked and unmasked men respectively, and the wayang beber, in which pictures are unrolled and explained by the dalang (Juynboll, Internationales Archiv für Ethnographie, xiii, 4—5). In many respects the latter, as the manager of the puppets and the speaker of the dialogue, in which he modulates his voice according to the various characters of the drama (Serrurier, 95—96, 106—112; Hazou, 7—9), corresponds very probably to the Sanskrit sūtra-dhār, although his name seems to signify merely 'stroller, strolling player,' and it has been suggested that he was primarily a priest who rendered worship to the ghosts represented by the shadows cast by the puppets on the curtain in the wayang (Hazou, 23—24, 39—57). At all events, we are justified in seeing in the Javanese wayang purw, or shadow play, the analogue of the Sanskrit chāyānātaka, and both are without doubt the congener of the Chinese shadow play, the Turkish garagás, and the marionettes which, originating in India, have spread throughout Asia and Europe to be enacted at the present day (see, for example, Pischel, Heimat des Puppenspiels; Rehm, Buch der Marionetten; Jacob, Erwähnungen des Schattentheaters in der Welt-Literatur und Geschichte des Schattentheaters; together with the literature cited in these works).

In conclusion a word may be added regarding the remaining Sanskrit plays classed as chāyānātakas. The Harid(y)uta is anonymous and of uncertain date, but is clearly an imitation of the Dūtāṃgada (Bendall, Catalogue, 106). It is in three scenes, and is based on the Mahābhārata instead of on the Rāmāyaṇa. An analysis is given by Levi (p. 242), but Pischel (p. 14) doubts whether it can rightly be considered a chāyānātaka. Rāma-deva, the author of the Subhadrāparinaya, the Pndavābhīyudaya, and the Rāmabhyudaya, flourished in the
fifteenth century, the *Subhadraparinaya* being written between 1402 and 1415, and the *Ramabhuyudaya* dating from the middle of the same century (Bendall, *JRAS*, 1898, 231, *Catalogue*, 106—108). These two plays have been analysed by Lévi (p. 243); the *Ramabhuyudaya* is in two acts, and the *Subhadraparinaya* is still shorter. An analysis of the third *chāyānātaka* of Rāmadeva, the *Pundravindhuyudaya*, is given by Eggeling (*Catalogue*, no. 4187). Of the brief *chāyānātaka* by Viṭṭhila nothing is thus far known beyond the brief statement of Rājendralala Mitra (*loc. cit.*) that it is based on the history of the Ādil Shāhī dynasty, which ruled in Bijāpūr from 1489 to 1660. The *Savitricarita*, written by Maheśvaratmaja Saṅkaralāla, is an entirely modern composition, and, unlike the others of its class, is a long and dreary drama of seven acts (Lévi, 241).

THE DUTĀNGADA.

DRAMATIS PERSONAE.

IN THE INTRODUCTION.

The Stage-Manager.

Vilāsvati, an Actress.

IN THE PLAY.

Rāma, a Prince of India.

Lukṣmanu, Brother to Rāma.

Sugriva, a Monkey-king, ally to Rāma.

Aṅgada, a Monkey, messenger to Rāma.

Rāvana, Demon-king of Laṅkā.

Viṣhṇu, a Demon, brother to Rāvana.

Mālyavān, a Demon, counsellor to Rāvana.

Prahasta, a Demon, porter to Rāvana.

Hemāngada, a Gandharva.

Citrāngada, a Gandharva.

Sitā, Wife to Rāma.

Mayānaathili, a Demoness in the shape of Sitā.

Mandodara, Wife to Rāvana.

Celestial Bard.

A Rākṣasi.

Demons.
ACT I.

(Induction.—Invocation.)

May Śiva's trump bring safety unto you, All white with jasmine and with lotuses, Whereon the moon hath his abiding-place, And whose dread call doth loose the zones which deck The brides of them that war against the gods.

And, further,

How wondrous would great Rāma's nature seem Did all men know that he is Viṣṇu's self, And that he ever worketh for their weal; He brake Śiv's bow, and yet was not revealed, Slew Śakra's son, and still was unperceived, He built the bridge, nor then was recognized; E'en from the conference of Aṅgada His ways remain untraced by mortals still, For that he hath assumed the form of man.

(End of the invocation.)

(Enter the Stage-Manager, looking toward the wings.)

Stage-Manager. Dear Vilāsavati, hither now!

(Enter an Actress.)

Actress. Here I am, husband. May my lord tell what is to be done!

Stage-Manager. At the command of the council of the great king, the sovereign lord, the glorious Triḥūvānapāladeva, a boar for the support and the like of the burden of all the earth, a royal swan of majesty swimming in the flood of the many tears fallen from the blue lotus eyes of the wives of whole hosts of enemies cloven by his own hands,

---

1 Rāma was one of the avatars, or incarnations, of Viṣṇu.
2 The bow given by Śiva to Janaka, but bent and broken by Rāma, who thus won his bride Sītā (see Rāmāyana i. 67).
3 Vāli, the brother of Sugrīva and father of Aṅgada (Rāmāyana iv. 16–22).
4 The modern Adam's Bridge between India and Ceylon.
5 The ējā, or allusion to the subject-matter of the entire drama (cf. Lévi, Théâtre indien, 54).
6 A Chaulukya monarch of Aghilvāḍ, who ruled for a year in Gujarat (1242–1243; see Introduction).
7 In other words, a quasi-Viṣṇu (alluding to this god's third-or boar-incarnation), and consequently a quasi-Rāma.
I have undertaken a pre-eminent production. What ho! ye members of the audience! hear ye attentively that today, at the festival of spring, at the procession of the divine and glorious Kumārapāladeva, a shadow-play is to be presented called The Messenger Angada, composed by a great poet, the glorious Subhāta, thoroughly versed in knowledge of word and phrase.

**Actress.** The undertaking is excellent, husband!

**Voice (within).** Upon Suvela's heights doth Rāma sport, Who crossed the sea and slew the simian king. Conferring all his realm on Tārā's spouse.

**Stage-Manager.** My dear, the actors have begun, for here are heard the conversations of the heroes attendant upon Rāma. Come, then! Let us both be ready for what must straightway be done!

(Exeunt.)

(End of the Induction.)

(Enter Rāma and Laksmana, sitting on a rock in the hills of Suvela. Sugrīva and others in order of rank as a retinue.)

Rāma (to Laksmana). Good Laksmana,

[3] The ocean's passed, and now the monkey-host Hath swallowed up the demon-capitol; While I that speak have played the man to-day, Aided by Fate, or by yon mighty bow.

Laksmana. Noble sir, what advantage is there in a fate subject to a coward's soul? Unto the man of deeds fair Fortune comes; 'Tis only cowards moan that 'Fate is Fate'.

---

1 Vasantiavana, formerly held on the full-moon day of Chaitra (March-April), but now on the full-moon day of Phalguna (February-March), and identified with the Holi festival (Apte, Sanskrit-English Dictionary, s.v.). See also Introduction.

2 A Chaulukya monarch of Tribhuvanapāla's dynasty, who ruled from 1143 to 1172 (see Introduction).

3 On the signification of this term, see Introduction.

4 One of the peaks of the mountain Trikūṭa, on whose central height Rāvana's capital was situated.

5 Vālī.

6 Sugrīva, who, after Vālī's death, married Tārā, his brother's widow.

7 The first scene, which begins here, is based on Rāmāyaṇa, vi, 81, 58-73.
Slay thou thy fate, and strive as heroes strive;
If then thou fall, not thine the dark disgrace.¹

And, furthermore,
While half thy brow alone be dark with frowns,
And while thy bow remaineth still unstrung,
Let him who ruleth o'er the fiends of night²
Bend low the roots of all the triple world,
And wax unceasing in his arrogance.

Therefore let Aṅgada be told his message.

Rāma (looking at Aṅgada respectfully). Good friend,
All words are dumb to tell thy father's deeds
Against that mighty fiend whose necks are ten,³
And yet this flesh our wonder doth reveal:⁴
But thou thyself, in reverence to thy sire,
Curtailst thine own prowess! Do not so!
Up! prove thee worthy of our trust in thee!

Aṅgada (bowing with both hands touching the circle of his head, speaks).

What message shall I bear to Lankā's⁵ gates?
Or shall I there raise mighty hosts for thee?

[4] Or ring the ocean through eternity
With all the lofty mountains of the world?
Tell me, O, King! what thou wouldst have me do,
And what the tasks that wait my sturdy arm!

Rāma. Friend,
Swift haste thee now, and unto Rāvana say:⁶

¹ A verse borrowed from the Pañcatantra (ed. Kiellhorn and Bühler, i, 361; ii, 130) or from the Hitopadesa (ed. Peterson, i, 22), and repeated in Sanskrit anthologies (see Böhtlingk, Indische Sprüche, 1255). Durgāprakāśa and Parab note that it is omitted in some manuscripts of the Dvārāgada.
² Rāvana.
³ Of course an allusion to the familiar 'horripilation' constantly mentioned in Sanskrit literature. The reference to Vāli's deeds of prowess against Rāvana seems to be a mere compliment of Rāma to Aṅgada, unless one may infer from the fact that both Rāvana and Vāli ruled in Lankā that there was hostility between them, so that Aṅgada, in a measure, inherited his father's feud.
⁴ Usually identified with Ceylon, although this is doubted by Jacobi (Das Rāmāyaṇa, 80—95), at least so far as the oldest portions of the Rāma-cycle are concerned.
⁵ Comp. the message given Aṅgada for Rāvana by Rāma in Rāmāyaṇa vi, 41, 61—72. The Bombay editors note that Kṛemendra, who flourished in the eleventh century (Auferecht, Catalogus Catalogorum, i,
Unwitting, or by kingly lust inflamed,
Thou stolen Sītā whilst I was afar;
Restore her unto me, or with thy sons
In Death's grim city thou shalt dwell ere long,
Thy royal parasol the crimson blood
Welling from wounds that Laksāman's arrows deal.'

Aṅgada. Sire,
If I be messenger in peace or war,
Full soon the spouse of mighty Rāvana
Shall fall, whether her fate be life or death.

Rāma. Good, O, son of Vāli, good! (So saying, laying his hand
on his back, he dismisses him. Exit Aṅgada, bowing.)

Sugrīva (gazing at the summit of the rocks of Lāṅkā). Look, sire, look!
Like to a tusker mad with must, the fiend
Doth gaze in deep disdain, as if he felt
The host of simian heroes captive made
And on his shoulder borne unto their doom.

Come then! Let us gaze upon the shores of the sea, adorned
by the forests on Suvela's cliffs.

(Exeunt.)

(Enter Rāvana, Mandodarī, and Vibhīṣaṇa and others as retinue.)

Rāvana (to Vibhīṣaṇa). Friend Vibhīṣaṇa,
Am I not Rāvan, Lāṅkā's lord, and these
The hands that cure great Indra's itching arms?\(^1\)

[5] I hear that Rāma bridgeth ocean o'er
And see the monkey-hosts invade mine isle,
E'en though no sound is heard, and naught is seen.\(^2\)
And, furthermore,
How comes it that this wanderer ne'er hath heard
Of my grim blade, that with resistless might
Could cleave the temples of Airāvata,\(^4\)
And that men name 'The Laughter of the Moon'?\(^5\)

---

135), ascribes this verse, with minor variations, in his Suvarṇatilaka (ii, 37
of the Kāpyamālā edition) to Bhavabhūti.

1 The second scene, which begins here, is based on Rāmāyana, vi,
41, 74–90.

2 An allusion to the defeat of Indra by Rāvana and his son Indrajit
or Meghamāda (Rāmāyana vii, 27–29).

3 Thus indicating his supernatural power.

4 The elephant of the god Indra.

5 Candrahāna, the sword bestowed on Rāvana by Śiva (Rāmāyana
vii, 16).
But lo, he findeth Lāṅkā's shores all bare
Of Meghamāda and his comrades bold,
Wherefore his death-doomed soul now wavereth.

Mine arms eclipse the moon of Indra's pride,
And unto holy hermits work dire woe.
Oh, portent dread of evil yet to come!

**Mandodarī** (ańda).

Even to-day envenomed arrogance
Pours from his throat as rain to wake the buds
Upon the tree of doom to all his kin!
(Aloud.) Look, husband, look! Wonderful, wonderful!
The surging cries of wrathful monkeys ring
Within thy house of dalliance, my lord!

Rāvana (contemptuously). O, queen, sweet is thy speech by
nature, but enough, enough of this terror at the sound of
these wretched apes! What further wouldst thou say?

Mandodarī.

Still, still thou may'st escape! give Sītā back
To Rāma's arms! I pray thee, hear my plea!

[6] Rāvana (with an angry laugh). My queen,
It may not be, since she by force was stolen
And was not given back to him straightway;
But lo, to-day the surging sea is bound,
And must I sue for peace by yielding her?
Therefore leave thou this pleasure-house. (Exit Mandodarī,
weeping.)

Rāvana (to Vibhiṣana). Friend Vibhiṣana, what speech is
thine?

Vibhiṣana. Sire, lord of Lāṅkā, consider well!
They twain be more than men, and these great apes
Be more than members of the monkey-folk;
Behind their guise lurks awful mystery
Pregnant with woe for Lāṅkā's mighty king.
Therefore set Sītā free, a night of doom for the race of
Rākṣasas!

Rāvana (angrily drawing his sword). Ah! knave, adherent of mine
enemy, brand of thy family, and scoundrel! with Canda-
hāsa shall I make thy head to fall! (Seizes him; Vibhiṣana
flies in terror.)
Mālyavān (standing between them). Sire, lord of Lāṅkā! consider well whether evil hath been spoken by prince Vibhiṣaṇa.

Rāvana. Ha! Art thou, too, like to him? (Mālyavān, in terror, stands silent.)

Rāvana (to Vibhiṣaṇa). Thou cursed kinsman! leave my capital, join that hermit, and make thy skill in ethics known! I will not slay thee again!

Vibhiṣaṇa. What needs must hap doth not happen otherwise!

(Exit. Enter a porter named Prahasta.)

Prahasta. Sire, at the door stands a monkey, saying: 'I am Rāma's envoy.'

[?] Rāvana (contemptuously). Let him enter then!

[?] (Enter Aṅgada with Prahasta.)

Aṅgada (looking at Rāvana, aside). Tis Rāvana, that fain would wreck the world! But in his groves shall Rāma launch his darts!

(Aloud.)

Ye Rāksasas, where stands curst Rāvana Who stole the gem that decks the moon and sun? He is a moth doomed unto Rāma's flame, That fills the threefold world with radiance.

(Several Rāksasas assume the form of Rāvana.)

How many Rāvans art thou, O thou fiend? In sooth we heard that thou wert multiform; The one subdued by Kārtavirya's arm; Another given as food to dancers vile By wanton slave-girls of the Daitya lord; And to a third 'tis direst shame to speak; Who art thou, if thou art not one of these?

Rāvana (assuming various forms, insultingly). Who art thou, ape? Whose messenger art thou?

---

1 Though no 'enter' is given this character, he was doubtless included among the retinue surrounding Rāvana at the beginning of the scene.

2 Rāma, in allusion to his exile from his native land.

3 Vibhiṣaṇa, if struck by Rāvana once, would never live to receive a second blow.

4 Comp. Mahāvīracarita vi (Pickford's translation, 131—133).

5 See Vīṣṇuparāja iv. ii. The allusion to the 'Daitya lord' (apparently either Bali or Pātañketa) is obscure.
Angada.
The son who shirks the deeds his father did
Could scarce instruct the elders of his house. 1
So be it, then,
Yet one hath come to earth to bear the woe
By demons wrought through all this mortal world;
And I, his envoy, stand before thee now,
Great Rāma's messenger, and Vāli's son.
And, furthermore,
I am the messenger of mighty Rām
That slew my sire, whose valor thou dost know.
[8] Rāvana (to Angada).
What doeth Rāma?
Angada. Naught.
Rāvana. And yet but now
He cometh unto ocean's shore!
Angada. 'Tis naught!
Rāvana. Why hath he bound the sea?
Angada. For kingly sport!
Rāvana. Doth he not know that Rāvan shieldeth it?
Angada. Vibhiṣana, thy brother, knows it well,
Who stands by Rāma's side on Lāṅkā's soil.
Rāvana (in alarm). What now is Rāma's course?
Angada. Upon his lap he takes Sugrīva's head,
Yea, and the foot of him who Aksa slew, 2
Then on a golden deer-skin soft reclines;
And glanceth at the arrow keen and straight
By Laksman made to slay the demon-host,
The while he hearkens to thy brother's words.
(Rāvana, gesticulating contempt, speaks thus and thus in the ear of Prahasta.)

Prahasta. As my lord commands.
(Exit Prahasta; enter a False Maithili 3 with Prahasta.)
False Maithili. Victory, victory, my spouse! (Thus speaking, she climbs to the lap of Rāvana.)
Rāvana (aside). Good, good, even though false! thou knowest how to please him of ten necks! 4

---

1 Probably meaning that if he fails, none will heed his words.
2 Aksa, the eldest son of Rāvana, was slain by Hanumān (Rāmāyana v. 47).
3 Maithili is only a synonym for Siṣa.
4 Rāvana.
Aṅgada (said, in sorrow)....daughter...sorrow)....would even Janaka's daughter...way of her who takes gain from a stranger? So be it! Let me consider now!

Rāvana. Lady daughter of Videha, answer thou this monkey, sent by Rāma!

False Maithili (looking at Aṅgada respectfully). Good Aṅgada, answer thou the son of Raghu in my words:

'O, Rāma, wherefore doth this cause thee woo?
Swift get thee home, for of mine own accord
And publicly I wedded this my lord.

Yea, more than this,
Like to a swan in Rāvan's lotus-lap
I sport the live-long day; so get thee hence
Unto thy realm where Bharata lies dead;
Within a land by demons devastate.'

Aṅgada (stopping his ears). Nay, lady daughter of Janaka!
Such words of shame fair Sītā never speaks,
For spotless purity adorns her soul,
And like the Ganges she doth cleanse the world.

(Enter, with a toss of the curtain, a Rākṣasī.)

Rākṣasī. Tidings of ill hath Rāma's captive spouse
Heard of her lord, and fain would end her days
Upon a slender cord of tendrils -wove.

Rāvana (in distress). Ah! Ill words and at a time unseemly!
Rākṣasas, protect, protect the daughter of Janaka!

(Disses the False Maithili.)

Aṅgada (joyfully). Through the glory of the true Maithili the blackness of the false Maithili is hid!

[10] Rāvana. What wouldst thou say, thou wrinkle-face?

Aṅgada. Disgrace comes not to thee from evil deeds,

Wherein thy hellish race its glory finds;
'Tis natural thou should'st steal another's wife
And think our warriors' wrath unjust to thee.

Rāvana (angrily). Thou knave of evil face! through the sight of thy calumny thou deservest nevermore the sight of Raghu's son!'
Aṅgada. Nay, consider thou another tale;  
Rāma hath passed the sea impassable,  
Fulfilling his great vow, and portions out  
Suvela’s forests: as thy many arms,¹  

Rāvana. Thou fool in understanding!  
The ocean is not crossed by simian hosts,  
Or they would swarm on every mountain-peak,  
Unless, forsooth, they lurk in coverts hid;  
But on the touchstone of the sword to-day  
Will I put Rāma’s valor to the proof.  

Nay, more than this, thou knowest not Rāvana!  
With Candrahāsa oftimes I have gone  
To fell the forest of the foemen’s throats,  
And lo, the bursting veins wept tears of blood,  
And choking sobs were hushed by Death’s chill hand;  
Lord Siva beareth witness to my words.²  

Aṅgada. Nay, what hath Rām to do with thy keen glaive?  
Thine arrows end the terror of the world,  
And, thanks to them, thou fool, thy severed heads  
Shall never rise to lofty majesty  
Like to the changing moon on Siva’s brow.  


Aṅgada (anxious to be gone):  
Set Sītā free, thou demon of the night!  
In vain thou prancest through thy valorous steps;  
Before thee standeth all the simian host,  
Dread with the might of their immortal king,  
And with their prowess hymned by kinnaras.³  

And, more than this;  
He will not give thee wives as Sīva did,⁴  
Though many be thy heads, for lo, he makes  
The sea a lake, thou soldier of Kailāsa;⁵  
Thou wert my friend when he did slay my sire—  

¹ Rāvana had twenty arms.  
² The deity who had given him his sword.  
³ Celestial musicians, dwelling in Kuvera’s paradise and having the form of a man with the head of a horse.  
⁴ An obscure allusion.  
⁵ An allusion to Rāvana’s victory over the semi-divine Yakṣas at Mount Kailāsa, a peak of the Himalayas (Rāmāyana, vii, 14—15).
O shaken pillar of fame! restore the spouse
Of Rāma, the noble kin of lotuses!

Nay, too,
He that lopped off the arms of Tātakā,¹
Yea, marred thy sister's wondrous loveliness;²
Destroyed thy soldiers in the forest-glades,
And bindeth now the sea, doth work thy doom;
Yet still to fond delusion thou dost cling.

Yea, furthermore,
Thou foolish fiend! trust not to Śiva's boon,
Since he is wroth with thee for Sīta's sake;
Else he had given back thy sacrifice
When he was girt with skulls that he did break.
Yet, more than this, we know the true nature of thine attachment to the service of the Lord,³ but thou art proud in vain!

Why dost thou vaunt thyself, Paulastya⁴ cruel:
Lo, I that speak brought joy to Śiva's heart
By gifts of his own beauteous lotuses:
[12] But on thee he bestowed thy blade divine
Through merest pity of thy penances,
And in remorse for the fifth head of Brahm,
Which he destroyed in olden days of sin.⁵

Hearken, thou ten-faced fiend! we shrink not in terror of the words which come from the hole within thy face!

(Exit Aṅgada.)

Voice (within).
Thou art the sovereign of the threefold world,
And yet the apes of Rāma slay thy hosts!
Swift to the fray! or hath thy valor quailed?

Rāvaṇa (anxiously). Alas! mightily wail our subjects that are being slaughtered!

(Enter Demon-Warriors with wounded limbs.)

¹ The demonic daughter of Suketu, slain by Rāma (Rāmāyana i, 26).
² Śūpanēkha, a hideous demoness, became enamoured of Rāma, who bade his brother Lakṣaṇa cut off her nose and ears (Rāmāyana iii, 18).
³ Śīva.
⁴ Rāvaṇa, as being the grandson of the rṣi Pulastya.
⁵ Alluding to the Puranic legend that Śīva pinched off the fifth head of Brahma.
Demons.
'Tis shame for us to die at simian hands!
If thou be lord, make not thy wisdom vain
While thou dost live and breathe in Lanka’s isle.

Rāvana (angrily calling Prahalāda in haste).
Arm swift my mighty demons for the fray!
What be these apes in cursed Rāma’s host?
Lo, in my hand doth Candrahāsa wake,
Grim ‘Laughter of the Moon’ to mourning brides.
Of the immortals falling ‘neath its blade.

(Exit.) To-day the world will be without Rāvana or without Rāma!
(Enter Hemānaga and Citrāṅga, two Gandharvas wandering in the path of sky phaal.)

Hemānaga. Good Citrāṅga,
With arms divine that cried ‘Earth, Ether, Sky’!
Great Rāma severed Rāvana’s ten heads,
Whilst an eleventh sun shone through the clouds;
And by Kakutstha’s wondrous scion slain,
Yea, killed by his swift dart that Brahma sped,
The lord of demons of the night doth lie
A headless thing upon a hero’s couch.

Citrāṅga. Good friend, long have we travelled fearless-
ly by this path of sky!

(Loud noise within.)
Crushed is the might of Rāvan, Lanka’s king,
He whose ten heads were made to rule the world,
Whose twenty arms gave him a strength tenfold;
Yet slain upon the field by Sita’s spouse
With crescent arrows radiant and keen.

Celestial Bard.

Hearken, Hemānaga! look, Citrāṅga, as on a picture!
With arrows tawny as great Canda’s gold

---

1 Celestial bards.
2 The third scene, which begins here, is based on Rāmāyana vi, 107—108. Comp. also the last scene of the sixth act of the Mahāvīracariita (Pickford’s translation, 133—148).
3 Bhar, bhurah, suah, a cry of mystic power as early as the Yajur Veda.
4 Kakutstha, king of Ayodhya, was the father of Rāghu, and thus an ancestor of Rāma.
5 A demon slain by Durgā.
All demons save Vibhiṣāṇa are slain
And set by Rāma in his precious store
Of boons to aid him through the lives to come;
Yet in their fear of Yama's conqueror 1
The timid gods shower no garlands down;
Nor dare to sound the drums of victory.

Citrāṅgada (to Hemāṅgada, wonderingly). Good Hemāṅgada, this victor over the rangers of the night and this diadem of heroes is this marvellous vessel of the sentiment of wonder, glorious through his love for the spouse of Bhavant, 2 before whom all gods and demons bow through the might of his exceeding majesty. But he who, in ages past, in his devotion to the foe of cities,
Paid ten-faced worship unto Śiva's bride,
Who thought the world, yea, and its Lord, 3 his own,
And fain would lay his hands on Brahm's five heads,
Doth roam no more on Durgā's mountain-heights. 4

(Beholding the might of kārma, anxiously.)

Look, Hemāṅgada, look!
What vengeance dread for ancient deeds of sin!
Great Śiva, see! the heads that once were thine 5
Are now defiled by loathsome birds of prey!

Hemāṅgada. Is not this exceeding clear, my friend? 'Where justice is, is victory', is a true saying of the text-books. 6 Therefore in this very instance is revealed the future of those who work good or evil by their bodies and the like. There Rāvana himself forms an example, for

[14] Lo, on this earth thy body is but wealth
To win thee everlasting righteousness,
And when 'tis gone it cometh nevermore;
So Rāvan gave his heads and worlds threefold
To Brahma for a wondrous lotus blue. 7

1 In allusion to Rāvana's victory over Yama, the god of death (Rāmāyana vii, 30–22).
2 The husband of Bhavant (Pārvatī) is Śiva.
3 Śiva.
4 The Himalayas, which include the Mount Kailāsa already mentioned.
5 An obscure allusion.
6 The same proverb occurs in the Dharmacīvēka and the Prasāṅgabhāratā (Indische Sprüche 2345, 5030).
7 See Rāmāyana vii, 10.
Voice (within),
Its banner-pole all gashed with Rāma’s darts,
Its charioteer a-faint in streams of blood,
The carrion vultures hovering o’er its path,
And with its axle broken ‘neath the fall
Of Rāvan’s headless corpse, his car now comes
To Laṅkā, swiftly drawn by whimpering steeds.
That would return to their remembered stalls.

(Again within.)
Come from your homes, ye brides of gods immortal,
And thou, mahout of our dread deities,
Fast tie thy mighty elephant divine;
Go forth, ye gods, as watchmen of the night,
And brighter, sweeter far be now the bloom
Of coral trees in Indra’s holy grove;
For at the eastern gate lies Rāvan’s head,
Defiled and branded by the hands of slaves.

And, more than this,
Girt round with fragrance showered from the hands
Of brides divine rejoicing in the fray,
Himself descended from his car of war,
And with his hand resting on Lakṣmaṇa,
His ears filled with the cry of ‘victory’
Torn from the prisoners’ reluctant lips,
Doth Rāma, Sītā’s mighty spouse, draw nigh!

Rāma (crowned with flowers, going to Ayodhya, to Sītā, pointing out the battle-field of Laṅkā).
Here Phanipāś yielded to Lakṣmaṇa’s might,
There, rent and torn, Dronāḍri once became
The captive of divinest Hanumāṇ;
Here by my brother Indrajit was slain,
And there did one whose name I may not tell
Hew Rāvan’s heads from his accursed frame,
Like some unholy wood, sweet Eyes ’o Fawn!

Joying the heart of Sītā with such words,
Whose sentiment is new to mortal ears,

1 The modern Oudh.
2 Rāma himself.
3 Comp. with this speech Rāmāyāna vi, 123, 3–15, and the last act of the Mahāvīra-carita.
His limbs a-thrill with beauty and delight,

[15] Let Rāma haste unto his capital;
And there rule o'er his land for evermore—
Guarding his realm and loyal citizens,
Whom he shall bless with bounties manifold.

By Subhāta this drama hath been writ
Upon a theme dear to the bards of old,
And to it he hath added his own words,
Commingling prose and verse in flavor sweet.
The Hebrew Metheg.—By Frank R. Blake, Ph. D.,
Johns Hopkins University.

The Traditional View.

The traditional views of the Jewish grammarians on the
sign Metheg are ably set forth by Baer in his article on "Die
Methegsetzung". In this article, which forms the basis of
the treatment of this subject in modern Hebrew Grammars,
Baer states that when any sound that does not bear the pri-
mary tone is to be emphasized, a Metheg is affixed to the
sign for that sound, the Metheg, conformably with its name
(bridle), indicating that the sign to which it is attached is to
be dwelt upon and not hastened over in pronunciation. He
divides the various Methegs into three classes, light, heavy,
and euphonic, with a number of subdivisions. His scheme is
in outline as follows.

I. The light Metheg (םעט).

A. The ordinary Metheg (םעט) indicating the secondary
tone, in the first open syllable two or more places from
the primary tone, as, e. g., in יָדֶּּ (Gen. 1, 27).

B. The indispensable Metheg (םעט).

a) with long vowel before Shewa, e. g., רָדֵּ (Gen. 1, 2).
b) with long vowel before Maqeph, e. g., לְרִשְׁ (Gen.
4, 25).
c) with Sere in Nasog Ahor, e. g., בֶּּ (Prov. 12, 1).
d) with a vowel before a Hateph, e. g., הָּדֶּ (Gen.
1, 26).

1 In the following article the primary accent or tone of Hebrew words
will be marked by the sign —, e. g., מֶּ, unless there is some special
reason for employing the proper accent marks. In the application of
Metheg, two or more words connected by Maqeph are treated as if
they formed one word.

2 S. Baer, Die Methegsetzung nach ihren überlieferten Gesetzen dar-
gestellt, in Marx's Archiv für wissenschaftliche Erforschung des alten
Testaments, Bd. 1, Halle 1869, pp. 55—57 and 194—207.
e) with the vowel before the initial consonant of וֹת, וֹת, e. g., וֹתֵי (Gen. 1, 29).
f) in the forms of the plural of נָב, e. g., נָבָב, and in מֶשֶׁךְ.

II. The heavy Metheg (שָׁבָב וָהָמָ).  

A. with vowels.

a) with the vowel of the article before a consonant with Shewa and without Dagesh, e. g., וּםָם (Lev. 3, 3).
b) with the Pathah of ה interrogative, e. g., וּמָן (Ex. 2, 7).
c) in certain forms with a short vowel (including Pathah, Segol, short Hireq, and short Shureq) three places before the primary tone, provided this is marked with a disjunctive accent, e. g., וּמָשַׁב (Gen. 3, 8).
d) in the second closed syllable before the tone with the vowels Segol, short Hireq or short Shureq, when the first syllable before the tone contains Pathah or Segol, and the tone is marked by a disjunctive accent, e. g., וּמָשַׁבָת (Gen. 3, 24).
e) with the first syllable of imperfects with Qames Ha-
  naph before Maqqeph, e. g., וּמְיַסָּה (Ps. 121, 8).
f) with the Pathah of the forms וּמָנָה, וּמָנָה with disjunctive accent,  
g) with the Pathah of וּמָנָה and וּמָנָה before Maqqeph and  
  when accented with Pashta.
h) with the vowel of the initial syllable of a number  
  of miscellaneous forms, accented for the most part  
  with Zarka.

B. with Shewa in the initial syllable.

1. in the metrical books.

a) with a Shewa three places before the tone, when the  
  word is marked by a disjunctive accent without pre-
  ceding conjunctive, instead of on the following open  
  syllable, e. g., וּמְיִשָּׁה (Ps. 4, 7).
b) with the Shewa of the divine names וֹדֶה (יִוֹדֶה) and

1 The Metheg with ה interrogative is regularly placed to the right of  
the vowel to distinguish the ה from the article, except in the poetical  
2 That Pathah is not entirely excluded is shown by יֵלֶדֶה (Hos. 4, 17).  
For the second Metheg cf. III, A. u.
when they are accented with great Rebia without preceding conjunctive accent, e. g., יָנָה (Ps. 25, 2).

c) with the Shewa of a word accented with Olevyored, Great Rebia, or Dehi, without preceding conjunctive accent, provided at least one vowel intervenes, and this has not already Metheg, e. g., יָנָה (Ps. 1, 3).

d) with בָּנָה when accented with Munah as conjunctive accent before Dehi.

2.—in the other books of the Bible.

a) with the Shewa of words accented with Gershaim or Pazer without preceding conjunctive accent, when at least two vowels lie between Shewa and tone syllable, and the first has not already Metheg, e. g., יָנָה (Gen. 10, 14).

b) with the Shewa of words accented with Darga as second conjunctive accent before Rebia, with Kadma as second conjunctive accent before Pashta or Tebir, or with Munah as third conjunctive before Telisha, provided that at least one vowel lies between Shewa and the tone syllable, and that this vowel has not already Metheg, e. g., יָנָה (Gen. 34, 21).

III. The Euphonic Metheg (הארק והקרוב והעב).

A. at the end of a word.

a) with a final מ preceded by Pathah in a word accented on the penult, when this word is connected by a conjunctive accent with a word accented on the first syllable, e. g., מָנָה (Gen. 24, 9).

b) with a final guttural consonant of a word closely connected by Maqqueph or conjunctive accent with a word beginning with a guttural, e. g., בָּנָה (Gen. 44, 2).

B. at the beginning of a word.

a) in the closed initial syllable of certain dissyllabic words, e. g., בָּנָה (Ps. 71, 11).

This classification is of course entitled to respect as representing the views of the native Jewish grammarians, but it must be remembered that they were not the same men who

* When Metheg is affixed to a composite Shewa, it is placed between Shewa and vowel as here, cf. Baer, op. cit., p. 299, n. nt.
invented the pointing, but later commentators on this pointing. They represent what they thought was the meaning of the various points at their time, basing their conclusions in all probability not only on tradition, but also on their own individual opinions. The body of rules for Metheg was a gradual growth, compiled from various sources. This is indicated by the variation of the manuscripts in its use, and by the fact that in the best and oldest manuscripts some of its most prominent uses are practically unknown, e.g., the use of Metheg before a Hataph (L. B. d). There is no reason, therefore, why the traditional view should be accepted simply because it is traditional, its acceptance or rejection will depend largely on its ability to explain the actual phenomena.

As a matter of fact the traditional classification of the uses of Metheg is not satisfactory. While there is a certain amount of justification for it in general, many of the details are not properly worked out and assimilated to the general scheme (e.g., II. A. h, III. B. a). We find uses separated that belong together, and those which are quite different placed under the same heading. For example the Metheg in such forms as הָסַר, and that in those like הָסַרְנָה, are placed in different sub-classes of the heavy Metheg (viz., A. c, and A. d), though they evidently belong together. On the other hand the Metheg in the forms of the verbs מַעַר and מַעַר, e.g., מַעַר, is placed under the same general heading as the Metheg in forms like מַעַר (viz., light Metheg B. d and B. c), though they are used to denote two entirely different things. Moreover the connection between the various kinds of Metheg is not made sufficiently clear, nor is the general principle underlying the use of the Metheg in all cases adequately emphasized. A more accurate and scientific classification of the various uses of Metheg is certainly to be desired.

The underlying Principle.

The general principle which underlies all the uses of Metheg, according to the traditional explanation, is that of emphasis, but the emphasis is certainly not always an actual emphasis.

---


as is indicated by Baer's statement, cf. I. B. b. The fundamental use of Metheg seems to have been, not necessarily to emphasize, but to call special attention to; it was thus a sort of nota bene. The fact that the majority of the syllables marked with Metheg bore the secondary tone led to the idea that emphasis or lingering on the sound in question was the underlying signification of the sign.

Considering this faculty of calling special attention to, to be fundamental, the chief uses of Metheg may be classed under three heads. It may be employed to call special attention to—

a) a consonant,

b) a vowel,

c) an accent, or accented syllable.

Metheg used to call attention to a Consonant.

This Metheg corresponds to Baer's III. A. a and b. In both these cases the Metheg is placed under a final guttural to call special attention to it in positions where it would be likely to be slurred over.

Metheg used to call attention to a Vowel.

This Metheg calls special attention to a vowel which is likely to be mispronounced in the form in question, or which is irregular or out of place in the form. The vowel which is thus marked may be long or short.

This Metheg is employed with a long vowel in the following cases, viz:

1. It is used with a long final vowel in a closed syllable before Maqeph, e.g., יָרֵשׁ (Gen. 4:25), יָרֵשׁ (Gen. 2:16), in the first case without Metheg the reading would naturally be בֹּשׁ-ל, while before Maqeph a Sere regularly becomes Segol: cases like יָרֵשׁ (Gen. 47:29) and יָרֵשׁ (Gen. 3:3), where there is no danger of a mistake without Metheg, have followed the analogy of the first two cases, the point of contact being that both sets of cases end in long vowels.

2. It is used with Sere which is to be retained in Nasog Ahor, e.g., יָרֵשׁ בַּשָּׁה (Prov. 13:1); without Metheg the reading would naturally be בַּשָּׁה.

1 op. cit., p. 59, § 1.
(3) It is used with a long vowel before Shewa, the Shewa being silent as in גּוֹ през (Gen. 46, 11), גּוֹ prez (Dan. 5, 12), or vocal as in גּוֹ prez (Gen. 1, 2), גּוֹ prez (Gen. 22, 12), גּוֹ prez (Gen. 3, 5). Here originally as in (1) the Metheg was used to prevent an improper pronunciation, e. g., גּוֹ prez or קְזָדִים; cases like גּוֹ prez are due to an extension of the principle to all long vowels. In cases in which the Shewa is vocal as it probably is in גּוֹ prez, גּוֹ prez, &c., the Metheg stands in the syllable which bears the secondary tone, and so came to be regarded as the sign of this tone. It is not impossible that the use of Metheg as an accentual sign originated with cases like these.

(4) It is used in the forms of גּוֹ prez and in גּוֹ prez to insure the pronunciation בּוֹitez, גּוֹ prez instead of בּוֹitez, גּוֹ prez.

This Metheg is employed with a short vowel in the following cases, viz.:

(1) It is used in the forms of גּוֹ prez and גּוֹ prez to call special attention to the i vowel before פ and פ where we should expect Segol or Pathah, e. g., גּוֹ prez, גּוֹ prez, &c.; the Metheg in forms like גּוֹ prez (Gen. 26, 3), גּוֹ prez (Gen. 12, 2), גּוֹ prez (Gen. 20, 7), is probably due to the analogy of the more numerous forms with Hireq.

(2) It is used to call special attention to an o vowel in a situation where it might be mistaken for י, e. g., גּוֹ prez (Nu. 23, 7), גּוֹ prez (Nu. 22, 11, 17), גּוֹ prez and גּוֹ prez in numerous instances. Here the Qames of the first syllable would naturally have been read י, as it stands in an open syllable. The use of the Metheg with Qames Ha-tuph was also extended to cases in which this vowel stood before Shewa. In certain imperative forms with o in the first syllable Metheg was employed to call attention to the unusual vocalization, o instead of the regular i, e. g., גּוֹ prez (Ps. 86, 2). In certain infinitive and imperfect forms with suffix י—, Metheg was used with Qames to call special attention to the fact that the regular o (Holem) of the infinitive had been changed to o (Qames

---


2) For a discussion of the pronunciation of the Qames in these forms cf. König, op. cit., pp. 114—111.
Hataph), e. g., יָנֶתָן (1 Sam. 15, 1), יָנֶהֲלוּ (1 Sam. 24, 11), יָנֵשָׁפ (Gen. 32, 18). The extension of this Metheg to the infinitive form יָנֶקָק (Jos. 4, 7) is apparently without special reason, as so is the regular vowel in such forms; possibly it is due to formal analogy with the imperatives like יָנֶקָק. The fact that Metheg was ordinarily employed to mark a long Qames before Shewa, would naturally lead to a confusion between so and sz, and this is doubtless the reason why the Metheg with so is preserved only in exceptional cases. The Metheg with so in forms like יָנֶקֲש, יָנֶקֲש does not belong here, but under the accentual Metheg (cf. below p. 85).

(3) In the forms of the divine name יָנָנ with prefixed particles, Metheg is used with the Pathah of the particle in all cases where the s is written without Hateph, to call attention to the fact that Pathah is the proper vowel here, and not Qames (so) even though the s has apparently quiesced, e. g., יָנָנ, יָננ, יָננ, &c.; so also with similar forms of מָל, viz., מָל, מָל, מָל, and other, because they were read יָננ, &c.

(4) In the word יָנָנ, a Metheg is employed after the Shewa to indicate that it is vocal, viz., יָנָנ (Ps. 1, 1), and elsewhere.

Accentual Metheg.

The third and most common use of the Metheg is to call attention, not to the vowel itself to which it is affixed, but to the fact that the vowel bears a special stress. This use may have originated from the fact that in certain forms the Metheg marked a vowel which bore the secondary accent (cf. above pp. 83, 80). This use may be subdivided as follows.

I.

It is employed with a full vowel in the first open syllable two or more places before the tone to denote a secondary accent. This is Baer's so called ordinary Metheg (I. A.). Exemples are מָנל (Gen. 1, 27), מָנָנ (Gen. 10, 18), מָנָנ

1 Baer-Delitzsch has יָנֶהֲל with Hateph Qames, this is an additional indication of the o quality of the preceding Qames.
2 For the Metheg with Pathah cf. below p. 94.
(Ezek. 42. 5), עַשְׂנַת (Gen. 7. 1), יִתְנָר (Gen. 35. 20). The vowel of the open syllable is usually long as in the examples cited, but it may also be short as in רֵעֲנֵי (2 Sam. 5. 11), יָמִי (Jos. 14. 1).

This ordinary Metheg, however, includes a great deal more than Baer states. He enumerates cases like רֵעֲנֵי (Gen. 4. 8) and יִבְּנֵי (Gen. 12. 2) under this head, but places cases like רַעֲנֵי (Gen. 4. 12) and יֵבְּנֵי (Gen. 22. 13) under the so-called indispensable Metheg. This latter class of cases, and all cases in fact in which Metheg is employed with a vowel before a Hategh such as e.g., רַעֲנֵי (Gen. 8. 5), יֵבְּנֵי (Gen. 18. 13), רַבְּנֵי (Job. 17. 9), &c., are simply examples of forms with the ordinary Metheg. These forms are to be read, תָּ-א-בּוֹד, נְ-כָּ-הָ-רָּ, הָ-א-סּ-רֵי, כָּ-הָ-ע-לָּ, עוֹ-ה-א-רָּ, &c.

In the case of forms beginning with copulative š the usage varies. Many such forms are without Metheg under š, as e.g., רַעֲנֵי (Gen. 1. 10), יֵבְּנֵי (Gen. 19. 15), יֵבְּנֵי (Gen. 19. 30), יֵבְּנֵי (Gen. 12. 16), &c. Other forms again, particularly those with sibilants after the š take the Metheg with š, the following consonant having Hategh Pathah, e.g., יֵבְּנֵי (Gen. 2. 12), יֵבְּנֵי (Lev. 25. 34), יֵבְּנֵי (Num. 23. 18), יֵבְּנֵי (Ps. 55. 22), יֵבְּנֵי (Ps. 28. 9), &c. In the first case the forms are probably meant to be read ע-מִי-גָּ-ה, ע-בּוֹ-מָו, ע-טּו, ע-סּוֹ-ה-לָּ, the š being regarded as short, and forming one syllable with the following consonant; thus there is no open syllable two or more places before the tone to receive Metheg. In the second case the forms, as is shown still more clearly by the use of the Hategh, are intended to be read ע-א-ה-בּו, ע-סּוֹ-דָּה, ע-גָּ-רָּ, ע-רּוֹ-אָ-יִ-מָו, the š being probably regarded as long, and forming by itself an open syllable, which being two places before the tone takes Metheg. The inconsistency in the use of Metheg with š may be due to the fact that it was pronounced š by some and ʷ by others, one tradition being preserved in one case, and the other in another, or it may be due to the fact that š was pronounced ʷ only before sibilants and certain other consonants.

Cases in which the vowel a of the article takes Metheg before a consonant with Shewa, and cases in which the a of the interrogative š takes Metheg are also to be classed here, the Metheg in all these cases marking the secondary tone in the first open syllable with full vowel two or more places back from the tone. Such forms as יֵבְּנֵי (Lev. 3. 3), יֵבְּנֵי (Lev.
25, 32), וּפְּלֶג (Ex. 7, 27), נָבָא (Jer. 31, 31), are to be read הָעָאָסָה, הָאֵלֶּה-יִמְּרָה, הָאָסָע-דָּאָה הָאָסָה; forms like וּפֶל (Gen. 18, 17), נָבָא (Gen. 34, 31), מַעֲשֶׁה (Ex. 2, 7), מַעֲשֶׁה (Job. 1, 9), are to be read הָעָאָסָה, הָאֵלֶּה-יִמְּרָה, הָאָסָע-דָּאָה, הָאָסָה-יִמְּרָה.

The Metheg is not used in the above cases when yod is the consonant immediately following the article or interrogative particle, e.g., וּפֶל (Gen. 33, 5), מַעֲשֶׁה (Gen. 29, 5), &c.: nor in cases like וּפֶל (Nu. 35, 8), מַעֲשֶׁה (Ps. 144, 1), מַעֲשֶׁה (Gen. 18, 13), מַעֲשֶׁה (Job. 22, 13), where the tone is on the syllable immediately following; nor in cases where the syllable adjoining the article or interrogative particle has already what Baer calls the usual Metheg as, e.g., לֹא-כִּי מַעֲשֶׁה (2 Ki. 9, 11), לֹא-כִּי מַעֲשֶׁה (Num. 32, 6).

In the first of these exceptions the yod forms a diphthong with the preceding a, viz., הָאָסָה-דָּאָה, הָאָסָה-דָּאָה-יִמְּרָה, so that we have what was regarded as a closed syllable two places or more before the tone, and hence no Metheg. In the second series of exceptions no Metheg is used because the a of הָאָסָה stands immediately before the tone; forms in which הָאָסָה precedes a consonant with Shewa are to be read as dissyllabic, viz., הָאָסָה-דָּאָה, הָאָסָה-דָּאָה-יִמְּרָה, &c. In the third series of exceptions, the Metheg stands on the syllable which was preferred as the place of the secondary tone: in the first example הָאָסָה probably forms a closed syllable, viz., הָגָא-וֹאָה, &c. In the second, הָאָסָה is only one place before the secondary tone. In the case of הָאָסָה interrogative, moreover, no Metheg is employed in those forms in which Dughesh is placed in the consonant following

1 It is not impossible to regard the first syllable of forms with the article like וּפֶל as having an initial closed syllable, viz., הָעָאָסָה; and forms like וּפֶל (Nu. 35, 8) in which the first syllable is certainly closed, viz., הָגָא-וֹאָה, and hence without Metheg, might seem to point that way. The Metheg would then belong under the second subdivision of accentual Metheg (cf. below). The difficulty with this view, however, is that it offers no explanation of the absence of Metheg in forms like וּפֶל.
2 Cf. above p. 70, 21. 17.
3 Written with Metheg, viz., מַעֲשֶׁה by Van der Hooght, 1705. This writing indicates the pronunciation הָאָסָה-דָּאָה, the Metheg being the ordinary accentual Metheg.
4 Van der Hooght has מַעֲשֶׁה with the second variety of accentual Metheg described below.
the 7. The θ in these forms was of course regarded as standing in a closed syllable, hence no Metheg.

II.

Metheg is employed in a number of cases in a closed syllable 1 with the vowels of the article, t consecutive, the preposition י, the reflexive prefix יְהַ, with a vowel before a doubled consonant, and with the vowel of certain particles and constructs before Maqeph; e. g., יְהִמֵּש (Gen. 10, 18), יְהַּחֲר (Gen. 3, 8), יְהַּנָּח (Gen. 17, 12), יְהַּשָּד (Ex. 14, 13), יְהַּשָּר (Gen. 32, 27), יְּהִמָּל (Ex. 16, 9), יְּהַּמָּר (Deut. 11, 14), &c. According to Baer this Metheg is used only in the third syllable before the tone with the short vowels a, i, e, u 2 when the first syllable before the tone has Shewa, and the word in question has a disjunctive accent. It is true that this variety of Metheg is used chiefly under the above conditions, but it does not seem to be confined to them, e. g., יְּהַּנָּו (Gen. 30, 16), יְּהַּסָּד (Ezr. 1, 4), יְּהַּסָּל (Ex. 29, 21), יְּהַּמָּת (Gen. 6, 6), יְּהַּמָּת (Job. 30, 14), &c.

This use of Metheg is probably due to the fact that a special stress fell on the vowel in each of these cases. That the article and t conversive bore originally a strong stress is indicated by the doubling of the following consonant. 3 It is also quite natural for a special stress to fall on the heavy prefix יְהַ and on the vowel before a doubling, and on the final syllable (i. e. the original tone syllable) of a construct. Why a special stress should fall on proclitic prepositions and particles, except in the case of י which for the most part comes under the head of a vowel before a doubled consonant, the nun being regularly assimilated, is not entirely clear.

1 Olschanski apparently regards this Metheg as accentual, cf. Lehr- 
2 According to Baer the vowel δ, Qames Hatuph, is not included 
3 Cf. C. Brockelmann, Grundriß der vergleichenden Grammatik der 

The fact that Metheg is not employed with the vowels in question in all cases would seem to indicate that they did not always bear a special stress. This stress was ordinarily preserved by tradition only in cases where the syllable in question was the only other syllable of special prominence in the word besides the tone syllable. No Metheg was employed when the accent of a word was a conjunctive accent, as in that case the secondary tone was not so prominent.

Whenever there is an open syllable two places from the tone in a word of the form prescribed above, it regularly takes the Metheg according to rule, but in this case the Metheg is also affixed to the preceding syllable, e.g., מִשְׁפָּחַת (Gen. 22, 9), מִשְׁפָּחַת (Hab. 3, 6), מִשְׁפָּחַת (Gen. 43, 16), מִשְׁפָּחַת (Gen. 32, 27), &c. The Metheg in the open syllable in these examples may be due to the fact that it has become a fixture with the vowel before a Hataeph, and so was retained in spite of the fact that the secondary tone falls on another syllable, or it may be that we have here a combination of two conflicting traditions, one school of Massorites preferring to place the secondary accent on the emphatic closed syllable, the other preferring the regular method of accenting the first open syllable two or more places back from the tone. When the Hataeph stands under a consonant which is not identical with the one that follows, and the vowel that precedes the Hataeph is Holam, no Metheg is employed in the syllable before Holam, e.g., מִשְׁפָּחַת (Gen. 24, 11), מִשְׁפָּחַת (Neh. 7, 64), מִשְׁפָּחַת (Gen. 19, 22). In this case there appears to have been no doubt as to the place for the secondary tone, the long vowel seeming to all the most emphatic element outside of the syllable with primary tone.

The forms with copulative נ which Baer includes here, e.g., מִשְׁפָּחַת (Gen. 13, 15), מִשְׁפָּחַת (Gen. 27, 29), מִשְׁפָּחַת (Deut. 6, 7), &c., are perhaps properly classed under this head, in taking the secondary accent for the same reason as the preposition נ: in this case the נ is short, and the forms are to be read עִזְּרָא-ה, עִמּ-חַ-רְ-וּ-קְ-ה, עִפּ-וֹ-קְ-ה, &c. It is also

\* That the Metheg in the closed syllable is the more original of the two is indicated by the fact that Metheg before a Hataeph is rarely used in the best manuscripts, while the other occurs in a number of cases. Cf. Ginzburg, op. cit. pp. 474, 675, 731.
possible, however, that the u is long, and that the Metheg marks the secondary tone in an open syllable, vix., 寤-le-zur-‘a-khâ, 寤-me-bâ-ra-khê-kha (cf. below p. 92), 寤-ne-sokh-be-khâ, &c.; if this is so these forms belong under (I).

III.

Metheg is employed in the first of two closed syllables connected by Maqeqph with a word accented on the first syllable, provided this accent is disjunctive, e.g., uestoù (Gen. 4, 16), uestoû (Gen. 4, 26), uestoù (Gen. 33, 11), &c. The Metheg seems to indicate that the secondary tone, which would naturally fall on the syllable which is accented when the word is autotone, i.e. on the last syllable, has been retracted to the preceding syllable in order to prevent the secondary and primary accents from standing in adjoining syllables. Cases like uestoù (Gen. 31, 32), uestoù (Gen. 7, 9), uestoù (Gen. 28, 4), &c. belong here; the secondary tone is retracted in spite of the syllable le before the primary tone, as is shown by the Segol for Sere. When the accent of the word after Maqeqph was a conjunctive accent, the secondary accent on the preceding word was not so prominent and so was not specially marked, e.g., uestoù (Gen. 6, 9), uestoù (Gen. 7, 22), &c.

Those forms of the Hithpaal which Baer includes here, e.g., uestoù (Gen. 3, 24), uestoù (Gen. 6, 6), &c., really belong under the preceding heading: forms with a copulative such as uestoù (Jer. 3, 25), uestoù (Is. 45, 14), &c. are perhaps best considered as belonging under (I), u being long and constituting an open syllable, vix., uesto-the-kas-se-anu, uesto-se-har-kîsh.

Under this head are also to be classed the forms uesto and uesto before Maqeqph, e.g., uesto (Gen. 1, 3), uesto (Gen. 1, 5), uesto (Gen. 5, 18).

Of a similar character, moreover, is the Metheg in the first syllable of an o imperfect followed by Maqeqph in which the o has been shortened to o, e.g., uestoù (Job. 24, 14), uestoù (Ps. 121, 8). In all such cases the o has lost the tone and the Metheg is employed to emphasize the fact that the secondary tone is on the first and not on the second syllable. In these forms, however, the Metheg is always employed without regard to the accentuation of the following word as it has come to be regarded as the regular sign of an imperfect with o in the second syllable, on account of the contrast
with the Metheg in such forms as נָבְוֶבֶנ (Jes. 18, 20), which calls special attention to the fact that the imperfect has an o in spite of the Maqqeph.

IV.

Metheg is employed with a syllable containing Shewa in a variety of cases (cf. II. B. above page 79 f.) to indicate that some special accentuation falls on this syllable. The reason for the special accentuation of such syllables seems to be entirely a musical one, and as the musical value of the accents is lost, it is, of course, useless to speculate as to the exact value of the Metheg. All that can be said is that it denoted a special stressing of a usually unstressed syllable in certain melodies.

Exceptional uses of Metheg.

The various uses of the Metheg enumerated above do not exhaust all the instances in which it is employed. There are a number of cases in which it is difficult to say what is the reason for the addition of the Metheg.

In the first place are to be noted the Methega used in an initial closed syllable immediately before the tone syllable, e.g., מִלְלָה (Gen. 36, 23), מִסְדָּה (Ps. 14, 1), מִשָּׁה (Ps. 71, 11), מֶסְדָּה (Ps. 65, 5), מֶשֶׁכָּל (Nu. 31, 12), מֶשֶׁךְ (Jer. 12, 16), מֶשֶׁכָּל (Ezek. 42, 13), &c. These Baer groups under the euphonic Metheg, but his explanation of their significance as a class is not satisfactory.

It is not impossible that in some cases the sign was used to call attention to a short vowel. This was perhaps the case in the Edomite proper names מֶלֶךְ, מֶלֶק (Gen. 36, 23; 40). Here some probably pronounced a long vowel in the first syllable as is indicated by the LXX equivalents of מֶלֶךְ, viz., מַלֶכֶה, מַלֶכֶה, מַלֶכֶה: the Massorites on this supposition would have used the Metheg to call especial attention to the fact that they preferred the pronunciation with short vowel.

In some cases, whatever was the original meaning of the sign, some Massorites undoubtedly regarded the Metheg as indicating a secondary tone in a closed syllable, as is shown by

the fact that the following consonant is in some MSS. pointed with a Chateph, e. g., רֶבֶן (Ps. 65, 5, Baer-Del.), הָלָה (Prov. 30, 17, Baer-Del.).

The Metheg in forms like יָרוּ is regarded by Baer as an additional sign of the absence of the Daghest in the initial consonant of the second syllable, which view is not impossible. The spirantice value of the third consonant, due to the vowel that originally stood before it, but which has been syncopated, would naturally lead to the idea that the preceding Sheva was vocal, and hence that the syllable before the Sheva was open. To indicate this view Metheg was employed.

The formsasan and יָס accented with Pashta are perhaps to be classed with these forms, if they indeed form one class, inasmuch as they have Metheg in what is apparently a closed syllable preceding the tone. It may be, however, that these forms, in the melody indicated by Pashta, were to be read יָס-יְהִי, יָס-יְהִי.

In the second place the words יָס, יַס take Metheg with the Pathah under ַ when the words have a disjunctive accent, viz. יָס, יַס. It is not impossible that this Metheg was employed to call attention to the short vowel of the first syllable, and to prevent the pronunciation זָו-רָא-קַה-א; -קָה-א, to which the combinations זָו-רָא-קַה-א, -קָה-א would tend to be reduced in order to obviate the difficulty occasioned by the occurrence of both ְ and spirated כ in close proximity.

Examples of individual forms with peculiar Methegs are, e. g., יָנָה (Job. 40, 4), יַנָה (Gen. 32, 18), יִנָה (2 Chr. 14, 6), יָנָא (Prov. 30, 33). In יִנָא the Metheg may have been placed under ַ to indicate that the accent is not on the syllable marked with the prepositive accent, but on the second syllable. In יָנָא the Metheg with ַ marks the short ִה; the Metheg in the first syllable is perhaps due to the irregular pronunciation of יָנָא. Several of the imperfect forms of דָּוָנָא have a spirated י, viz., דָּוָנָא and דָּוָנָא (1 Sam. 25, 29), doubtless following the analogy of the perfect where י regularly has this pronunciation, viz., דָּוָא. This pronunciation may have given rise to the Metheg in the first syllable just as the spirantie value of the third consonant may have done so in the forms like יְרוּ explained above. In דָּוָנָא it is not impossible that the Metheg, by an extension of the use of the accentual Metheg to a closed syllable, may be intended to mark the second-
ary accent in the second syllable before the tone. 1 In לְהֵת the Metheg is perhaps intended for the so-called euphonic Metheg (Baer III. A. b).

Repetition of Metheg.

In a number of cases two or more Methegs occur in the same word or series of words connected by Maqqueph.

When two or more syllables precede a Metheg denoting the secondary tone, the first open syllable two or more places before the syllable with Metheg takes an additional Metheg to denote what might be called a tertiary accent; e.g., "שְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Num. 26, 31), נָּבָיִם (Ezek. 42, 5), יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Gen. 12, 3), יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Gen. 24, 48), אֶפְרִיְשׁוֹ (Gen. 34, 25), &c.

When one of the elements discussed under the second subdivision of the accentual Metheg (cf. above p. 87 f.) occurs two places or more before a Metheg denoting the secondary tone, it may take a second Metheg just as if the first Metheg denoted the primary accent, e.g., בְּנַיְשָׁם (Is. 56, 9), דְּנַיְשָׁם (Ps. 18, 46), &c. This Metheg denotes a tertiary accent as in the first case.

A Metheg which for any of the reasons already stated falls on a short vowel in a closed syllable may be retained immediately before a Metheg which precedes a Hateph, e.g., יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Gen. 22, 9), יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Gen. 15, 1), unless the Metheg stands with Holom, e.g., יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Gen. 24, 11) [cf. above p. 11].

Occasionally an open syllable preceding a syllable with Metheg before a Hateph also takes a Metheg for one of the reasons just stated, e.g., יְשָׁמֵי (Ex. 23, 5, Mantua). In the form יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Ex. 22, 28, Mantua) both second and third open syllable before the tone are marked by Metheg, indicating doubtless a combination of two traditions with regard to the place of the secondary tone.

The Metheg that marks a long or short vowel as such without regard to tone may stand before a Metheg which marks the secondary tone, e.g., יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Deut. 29, 12), יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Deut. 26, 19), יִשְׁנִיְשׁוֹ (Ezek. 47, 12), &c. When, however, a syllable containing such a Metheg is preceded by a syllable which should take the Metheg denoting the secondary tone,

---

1 Cf. Breckelmann, Grundriss, p. 103, 9, 33.
the accentual Metheg is omitted, e. g., יְרָשָׁה (Nu. 9, 3), יָשָׁפָה (Gen. 9, 15), &c. The non-accentual Metheg is here apparently treated as if it had accentual value, these cases following the analogy of instances like יֵשֶׁת (Gen. 6, 13), where the Metheg, whatever it may have stood for originally, certainly marks the secondary tone.

Words ending in a final guttural and consisting of two closed syllables, which are joined by Maqqeph to a word with a disjunctive accent on the first syllable, may take an accentual Metheg with the vowel of the first syllable (cf. above p. 89), and a Metheg under the guttural (cf. above p. 82), e. g., יִשְׁפָּה (Gen. 34, 16), יִשְׁפָּה (Gen. 24, 7), יֶשֶׁת (Hos. 4, 17).

In מִשְׁפֶּת (2 Sam. 23, 5) the Metheg may in both cases mark the long vowel before Maqqeph; the one with ו, however, may be accentual. For the two Methegs in יָשֶׁת (Gen. 32, 18) cf. above p. 91.

Occasionally three Methegs are found in the same word, e. g., יִשְׁפָּה (Is. 22, 19, Mantua), יִשְׁפָּה (2 Ki. 5, 8). Here the Metheg nearest the end of the word indicates the secondary tone according to rule, and the preceding complex of syllables takes two Methegs just as if the secondary tone were primary (cf. above p. 92).

Confusion in the Use and Interpretation of Metheg.

The variety of uses to which the Metheg was put would naturally lead to a certain amount of inconsistency in its application to the text of the Old Testament, and also to a certain amount of confusion as to the meaning of the sign after its application, especially as this was not the work of one man working at one time, but of a large number working at different times and under various influences. Inconsistencies and misunderstandings, therefore, are to be expected, and in spite of the fact that the rules for its application were in all

---

1 This pointing is given by Oldhausen, Lehrbuch, p. 89. No Metheg is employed in either case in the Mantua edition, Van der Hooght, or Baer-Deitsch.

2 If this form is to be read יִשְׁפָּה (cf. Burney, Notes on Hebr. text of the Book of Kings, Oxford, 1903, pp. 208, 280; also Stade and Schwally, The Books of Kings in SBOT ed. by Prof. Paul Haupt, Leipzig, 1904, p. 291), then the Metheg of the first syllable is like the first Metheg in forms like יָשֶׁת above.
probability thoroughly worked over and systematized at a later period; some of these still remain.

From the fact that the Metheg was employed to call attention to both long and short vowels, it happens that it was used not only with a long Qames, but sometimes also with a Qames Ḥatuph (cf. above p. 83 f.). The Jewish grammarians, however, considered that every Qames marked with Metheg indicated an ā, hence they read Ḥa-a, Ḥa-a, Ḥa-a, Ḥa-a, &c., ma-a-tō, ma-a-tō, ma-a-tō, ma-a-tō, &c., respectively.

From the fact that it may stand in both open and closed syllables, it was sometimes doubtful as to which was the character of the syllable in which it stood when the vowel marked with Metheg was followed by a simple Shewa. Therefore it happens that a long vowel with Metheg before Shewa e. g., Ḥa-a, Ḥa-a, Ḥa-a, &c., is regularly considered by the Jewish grammarians as standing in a closed syllable, viz., Ḥa-a-thah, &c., though it is more likely that the syllable is open and the Shewa vocal, viz., Ḥa-a-thah, &c. On the other hand certain cases in which we have a closed syllable with short vowel and Metheg followed by silent Shewa are considered by the Massorites as open syllables, the Shewa being therefore vocal, e. g., ma-a (Gen. 18, 18) and ma-a (Lev. 7, 33), and certain of the forms mentioned on page 13 f., e. g., ma-a (Ps. 65, 5), ma-a (Prob. 30, 17), which are evidently to be read according to certain Massorites ti-he-jeh, ti-he-jeh, ti-na-hur, ti-la-ag. The fact that, in a combination of forms like ma-a, ma-a with a preceding word by Maqeph, no Metheg is used in the final open syllable of the first word, e. g., ma-a (Gen. 9, 15), seems to indicate that the Metheg in the second word was considered an accentual Metheg. That the Massorites were not always certain as to whether the Metheg stood in an open or closed syllable when the vowel was short is shown by the form ma-a, which was marked with Metheg in the first syllable; viz., ma-a.

Whatever may have been the original meaning of the Metheg here, it was considered as marking an open syllable by the Massorites, and a special Metheg was often placed after the

---

2 Gesenius-Kautzsch, op. cit., p. 68, e.
4 Cf. Beuer, op. cit., p. 65, ft. nt. 2.
Shewa to show without a doubt that the intended reading was 'a-s-rê' and not 'a-s-rê', as would be possible if the pointing were simply מָשָׁה.

Cases in which we have two accential Methegs in adjacent syllables, the second usually standing before a Hataf vowel, are perhaps, as we have seen, due to a combination of two traditions as to the proper place for the Metheg (cf. pp. 92, 88).

**Use of Hatafhs after Metheg.**

There seems to have been a tendency that was not completely carried out, to mark vocal Shewa after Metheg by a Hataph. This tendency seems to have originated from the close association of Metheg with a following Hataph in words where the Hataph stands under a guttural, where of course it is quite regular, as, e. g., in וָשָׂה (Gen. 1, 26), וָשָׂה (Gen. 14, 10), וָשָׂה (Gen. 18, 13), סָשָׂה (Gen. 4, 10), שָׂשָׂה (Gen. 42, 16), &c. From such cases it was extended to forms in which the consonant following the Metheg was not a guttural, Hataph Pathah being employed except in the vicinity of an u or o vowel or of a labial consonant, when Hataph Qames is used; e. g., וָשָׂה (Ex. 3, 18), וָשָׂה (Gen. 1, 18), וָשָׂה (Gen. 2, 12), וָשָׂה (Gen. 2, 24), וָשָׂה (Job. 17, 9), וָשָׂה (Ps. 39, 13), וָשָׂה (Gen. 29, 3), וָשָׂה (Gen. 27, 13). This use of Hataph we find extended by some authorities to cases in which the Shewa is certainly not vocal, e. g., וָשָׂה (Gen. 21, 6), וָשָׂה (Jer. 22, 18), וָשָׂה (Job. 29, 25), &c.

In the case of Shewa following non-guttural consonants, the Hataph is the rule according to some grammarians with a consonant which has lost the doubling preceded by Pathah, e. g., וָשָׂה (Jud. 16, 16), וָשָׂה (Ps. 113, 1), &c., and also with a consonant after any vowel, when the same consonant is repeated immediately, e. g., וָשָׂה (Ps. 68, 7), וָשָׂה (Gen. 27, 13), &c. Here the use of the Hataph has been carried to greater lengths than elsewhere, though even in this case there are exceptions.

---

1 These rules, though said to be rules of Ben Asher, are not supported by the evidence of the best manuscripts. Still they represent the ideas of certain of the grammarians, and as such are worthy of note: cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch op. cit. p. 55 foll., Ginsburg, *Introd.* p. 466; T. C. Foote, *Some Unwarranted Innovations in the Text of the Hebrew Bible*, JHU. Circ. No. 163, June, 1903, p. 71f.
Baer's rule that Metheg always stands with a vowel which precedes a Hatheph unless the consonant between them is doubled, results from the fact that in all cases except those in which the Hatheph follows a guttural, the Hatheph is due to the Metheg and not vice versa.

Relation between Metheg and Daghesh.

In a number of cases the Metheg seems to stand in some relation with Daghesh, particularly with the Daghesh which represents an accentual doubling, such as the Daghesh following the article. As both signs have a similar signification, both denoting an emphasis of some sort, a Daghesh does not usually follow Metheg, as in that case they would both emphasize the same vowel. The two signs are often mutually exclusive. This fact appears most clearly in the case of the interrogative. Here when the א is pointed with Pathah it regularly takes Metheg, e. g., ננה (Gen. 18, 17), &c. [cf. above p. 85 f.], but in a certain number of cases, chiefly with Sheva after the initial consonant of the word to which א is prefixed, Daghesh stands in this consonant instead, e. g., מָנָנָן (Gen. 18, 21), בּוּשַ (Lev. 10, 19), נָמָשׁ (Nu. 13, 20), מַעְשֵׁי (1 Sam. 10, 24), &c. A similar relation between the Metheg and the Daghesh was perhaps felt also in the case of the article and ג conversive. Compare for example ננה (Lev. 3, 3), מְנָשֶׁשׁ (Gen. 21, 14), with ננה (Ecc. 10, 18), מְנָשֶׁשׁ (Gen. 26, 29), &c.

We find Metheg instead of Daghesh also in some instances in which the Daghesh represents a real doubling. Compare, for examples, מַנָּנֶה (Jon. 4, 11), מַנָּנֶה (Ps. 113, 1).

In a number of cases, however, in spite of this antithesis we find both Metheg and Daghesh together, e. g., cases like בּוּשָ (Gen. 10, 18), מָנָן (Gen. 3, 8), in which both Metheg and Daghesh emphasize the same thing, viz., that the vowel of the article or ג conversive has a secondary stress, and cases like מָנָּשׁ (Gen. 32, 27), מָנָּשׁ (Gen. 19, 34), מָנָּשׁ (Gen. 4, 24), מָנָּשׁ (Gen. 23, 9), &c., in which the Daghesh indicated simply a doubled consonant and had no accentual meaning, and hence Metheg was affixed to the preceding vowel to indicate that it bore the secondary tone.

While it seems probably that this antithesis between Metheg and Daghesh was recognized, and made use of to a
certain extent, it was certainly never generally applied to the text of the Old Testament, doubtless because it served no special purpose. It is not impossible, however, that on this antithesis is based the use of the sign Raphé (cf. below p. 23).

Relation between Metheg and the Musical Accents.

One of the most important points of difference, according to Baer, between the so-called light and heavy Metheg is that the light Metheg may be changed into certain conjunctive accents, e.g., דְֹמָנָה (Gen. 2, 19) instead of דְֹנגָנָה, while the heavy Metheg is never supplanted in this way.

It is to be noted, however, that even when according to what appear to be the Masoretic rules, such change is possible, it is not by any means always made. Moreover the Metheg in a closed syllable immediately before the tone which may become a conjunctive accent as in מְכָּדָשׁ (Is. 26, 14), מְקָרָנָה (1 Chr. 28, 11), is certainly different from the ordinary accentual Metheg in an open syllable two or more places from the tone. So the fact that two Methegs may be replaced by a conjunctive accent does not necessarily show that they are of the same character.

The fact that the so-called heavy Metheg is not ordinarily changed to a conjunctive accent may be due to the difference in the character of the forms in which it is found. In most cases it occurs in a closed syllable, while the so-called light Metheg ordinarily occurs in an open syllable.

That the so-called heavy Metheg may occasionally become a conjunctive accent is shown by such forms as, מְכָּדָשׁ (Gen. 24, 7) for מְכָּדָשׁ, מְכָּדָשׁ (Ezra 4, 1) for מְכָּדָשׁ, מְכָּדָשׁ (Deut. 3, 24) for מְכָּדָשׁ, &c., where the Metheg is replaced by the so-called Methiga.

The difference between forms with Metheg and those with a conjunctive accent is probably one of a more or less musical recitation of the word; Metheg indicating simply a stress or emphasis of some kind, the conjunctive accent, a stress plus some musical modulation. It is not impossible that the reason

2 Cf. Winkes, Accent. of Prose Books, pp. 81, 82.
the Metheg is replaced by the conjunctive accent, instead of standing together with it, is in the first instance a mechanical one, to avoid the heaping up of diacritical points, as almost all these conjunctive accents are placed below the consonant in the same position as Metheg. Compare for example מִשְׁרָא with Metheg, with מִשְׁרָא, מִשְׁרָא, מִשְׁרָא, מִשְׁרָא, with Munah, Merha, Mehappakh, Mayela, and Azla respectively.

Other Signs derived from Metheg.

Numerous as are the uses of the Metheg which have been enumerated, the category of its activities has not yet been exhausted. There are several other diacritical marks which are identical with Metheg in form and which seem to be simply extensions of the uses of Metheg proper. These diacritical marks are Siluq, Paseq1, and Raphe (2).

The fundamental use of Metheg, as we have seen, was to call special attention to something, and the things to which it ordinarily called the attention were three in number, viz., a consonant, a vowel (long or short), and an accent.

The Siluq, which calls attention to the strong emphasis that rests on the accented syllable of the final word in a verse, is probably simply an extension of the accentual Metheg.

The Paseq2, in one of its uses, is practically identical with the Metheg that emphasizes a final guttural to prevent its being elided with the initial guttural of the following word, as, e.g., נְקִים נְקִים (Nu. 12, 5), שָׁא הָרִ י (Hos. 4, 4), בְּנֵי הָרִ י (Ps. 106, 28), הָרִ י נְקִים (Gen. 31, 41), מִי הָרִ י (Hos. 4, 19) &c. The Paseq in question is called paseq euphonicum, and is used occasionally without any regularity between two words, one of which ends and the other begins with the same consonant, e.g., נְקִים (Ps. 68, 21), נְקִים (Ps. 141, 4), נְקִימִם (Cant. 4, 12), &c. The chief differences between Metheg and Paseq in this case seem to be first that Metheg is used in the case of a guttural including י, while Paseq is used with other consonants including י; secondly that in the case of Metheg the two consonants are not necessarily identical, while in the case


of Paseq they are regularly so, though there is one instance in which this is not the case, the consonants however being both sibilants, viz., ה’ | צ’ (Deut. 8, 15). These differences, it is plain, are merely formal, perhaps accidental, and not differences in principle. It is not improbable that the Paseq originated from the Metheg used with consonants, which for some reason, perhaps by accident, was placed after the word instead of under the final consonant.

The chief use of the so-called ordinary Paseq, however, seems to be to call special attention to the word after which it was placed, e.g., ה’ | לב (Ex. 15, 18), חק | לְּבָנָה (1 Sam. 14, 45), יִנְחַנְתָּ | בְּשַׁלְמוֹ (Ezek. 33, 25), יִנְחַנְתָּ | לְּמַלְמוֹ (Ps. 66, 18). This is evidently an extension of the same general principle which lies at the basis of the use of Metheg.

From its position between two words or perhaps more especially because it was employed to prevent two identical consonants from being slurred together, Paseq came naturally to be used as a sign of separation. This is the principle at the basis of the paseq distinctivum, e.g., נֶ | רָפָה (Gen. 18, 15), which is marked with Paseq to denote that the two words are to be separated and not closely connected as in the identically sounding combination לוֹ | רָפָה (Jos. 15, 25), where the two words are to be treated as distinct names, &c. It also lies at the basis of paseq homonymicum, which is employed occasionally between two identical or similar words, e.g., בֹּ | בֹּ (Gen. 22, 11), נֶ | נֶ (Nu. 5, 22), לָד | לָד (Gen. 17, 13), ולְ | ולְ (Ezek. 3, 27). Here also belongs what is called paseq euphemisticum, which separates the divine name from a word with which it seemed improper to associate it, e.g., יִנְחַנְתָּ | בְּשַׁלְמוֹ (Deut. 4, 32), יִנְחַנְתָּ | בְּשַׁלְמוֹ (1 Sam. 18, 10), ה’ | ה’ (1 Ki. 11, 14), מָלְ | מָלְ (Ps. 10, 13).

Finally the Paseq implying separation was made a part of the system of musical accents. It was employed in some cases as a disjunctive accent to mark the dichotomy in clauses governed by certain of the minor disjunctive accents, though the principles that govern its application are the same as in the case of the ordinary Paseq; we have namely paseq distinctivum, emphaticum, homonymicum, euphonicum, euphemisticum.

Besides being employed as an independent disjunctive accent, Paseq is employed to transform a conjunctive into a disjunctive accent. In the prose books, when joined to Munah, it forms
Legarmeh or Munah Legarmeh. In the poetical books, from Shalsheleth, Azla, and Methuppah it forms Great Shalsheleth, Azla Legarmeh, and Methuppah Legarmeh. In the case of the prose accent Shalsheleth, the Paseq is added to an already disjunctive accent for the sake of conformity with the pausal Shalsheleth of the poetical books.

The upright line to the left of the two perpendicular dots in Zaqeph Gadol (工程技术) is possibly nothing but Paseq, which true to its emphatic nature indicates a fuller, stronger melody than Zaqeph Qaton with the two perpendicular dots alone.

The Raphe, which is a straight mark similar to Metheg, only horizontal instead of perpendicular, is possibly also simply Metheg in its origin. It has been shown that the antithesis of Metheg and Daghash was probably recognized by the Massorites, but that only an exceptional use was made of this principle (cf. above p. 19). It is not impossible that the inventors of the system of pointing, in casting about for a sign to mark the absence of Daghash, selected the Metheg for this use on account of its recognized antithesis to Daghash. To place the Metheg either before or after the consonant in which the absence of Daghash was to be noted would have led to great ambiguity, as Metheg in this position already had a well-defined positive signification, so it was placed above the consonant in question, and here, probably for reasons of convenience, it was written in a horizontal position.

Conclusion.

The results of the preceding discussion may be briefly summed up as follows. In general the traditional classification of the uses of Metheg as set forth by Baer, has been rejected and new principles of division set up. An attempt has been made to reduce all of the uses of Metheg to the same fundamental principle; to show what the relation between Metheg and certain diacritical marks is; and finally to prove that certain of these marks are simply extensions of Metheg.

Three chief uses of the Metheg are to be distinguished, viz.,

1 So Wickes, Accent. of Prose Books, p. 121.
2 Wickes thinks this is a doubled accent mark like Gereshim (”). Markha Kaphula (.), or Pazer Gadol (“), the sign “ standing for “; cf. Accent. of Prose Books, p. 18.
that which calls special attention to a consonant, that which
calls special attention to a vowel long or short, and that which
marks a secondary or tertiary accent, the accentual Metheg.
The historical development of these uses is perhaps to be
conceived of as follows. At first the sign was a nota bene
attached to a consonant or a vowel. From the fact that the
Metheg was often affixed to a vowel which bore the secondary
accent, the sign acquired an accentual meaning, and was em-
ployed to mark the secondary tone, regularly in an open syll-
able, as it was in such syllables that the accentual use ori-
ginated, and also to some extent in closed syllables. The most
important and most common use of the Metheg, viz., the
accentual use, would therefore not be the most original use
of the sign. An extension of its accentual use was to mark
an accent falling on a Shewā as the result of the musical
recitation of the text. A further extension of the accentual
Metheg is the use of the sign as Silluq to mark the tone
syllable of the final word in a verse. The Paseq seems to be
derived from the Metheg, being most commonly employed to
call special attention not to a single sound or accent, but to
a whole word. It originated perhaps from the Metheg affixed
to consonants. Its uses as a sign of separation, and as an
element of the system of musical accents are secondary. Finally
from an accidental opposition between Metheg and Daghesh,
the Metheg comes to be used in a changed position as Raphe
to mark the absence of Daghesh.

As the result of the varying uses of Metheg a certain amount
of confusion arises in the application of the sign, and its uses
have for the most part never been carried out to their logical
conclusion. This is particularly true of its minor uses, such
as for example its use to specially mark out a vowel, but it
is also the case even in its most important and most common
use, as the sign of the secondary accent. Here it is practically
confined to open syllables for the reason stated above, though
in a number of cases it is for special reasons extended to closed
syllables.

The same thing is true of the Paseq, the cases in which it
is omitted, when it might be applied according to rule, are
much more numerous than the cases in which it occurs.

From the fact that Metheg was very frequently used before
a Ḥateph in words containing a guttural has arisen a tendency
to use a Hattph in place of a simple Shewa after all Methegs, but here again the tendency after some development became abortive.

Metheg has come, probably through accident, to be regarded to some extent as the antithesis of Daghesh, hence the development of Raphe from Metheg.

The fact that a conjunctive accent is at times substituted for Metheg, does not necessarily show anything with regard to the value of the Metheg, it is simply the substitution of a sign denoting melody for a nota bene or accentual sign. The fact that Metheg is not retained in addition to the musical accent is perhaps due to the fact that in the great majority of cases the proper position of both was to the left of the vowel of the syllable to which they appertained, and so the less important sign was omitted.

Metheg has never been regarded as a sign which has everywhere the same meaning, but there has always been a tendency among grammarians to exaggerate the importance of the accentual Metheg which marks the secondary tone and hence an open syllable, at the expense of the less prominent varieties, and to ascribe to this Metheg cases which really belong elsewhere. Enough has been said, however, to show that in no case can the meaning of Metheg be considered as fixed a priori, it does not necessarily mark a long vowel, or an open syllable, nor is the Shewa that follows it necessarily vocal, its significance will depend on the character of the form in which it occurs.

Nevertheless in spite of this fact, Metheg taken in connection with the other pointing, and our knowledge of the forms derived from other sources, furnishes very useful evidence with regard to the traditional pronunciation of Hebrew, and is therefore quite worthy of the attention of those who make a study of Hebrew grammar.

Metheg is not the only sign, the conception of which is in need of revision; the last word has by no means been said as to the significance of a number of the marks used by the Massorites. A thoroughgoing investigation of the principles, fundamental and derived, of these marks would, I think, reduce to much smaller proportions the residuum of unexplained forms in the text of the Hebrew Bible.
A Conjectural Interpretation of Cuneiform Texts vol. V, 81—7—27, 49 and 50.—By ELLEN SETON OGDEN, Albany, New York.

The following text appeared in 1898, but no interpretation has yet been given beyond the more or less generally accepted opinions that the fragment is part of one of the so-called "practice-tablets", and that the older characters thereon are somewhat imperfectly executed Babylonian pictographs.¹ Against this hypothesis it may be urged, first, that the archaic signs do not have at all the peculiar genre of Babylonian writing nor do they resemble the Babylonian signs of any known period or locality with sufficient closeness to warrant calling them Babylonian; and secondly, that the marked diversity of characters in each case and under each heading still remains unexplained.

The present paper wishes to suggest that the fragment may be part of an Elamite-Babylonian syllabary in which the Elamite equivalents are given under a Babylonian or Neo-Babylonian denominative usually to be found at the left of each case. It will be noted that while the Babylonian signs are fairly homogeneous, the others seem to represent two distinct types of writing. One is partly linear and partly cuneiform but still pictographic; the other is partly cuneiform and apparently the style of a later period. It is with the archaic signs only that this paper is to deal, but the suggestion may be made that the later ones are likewise Elamite, since the Elamites developed a cuneiform system of their own probably parallel to that of the Mesopotamian Valley.

According to de Morgan, the proto-Elamite script appears for the first time in Susa during the period of archaic culture which ended about 4000 B.C. (dating Sargon at 3800 B.C.).

Of course this must be considerably reduced if the conclusions of more recent writers be accepted in regard to Sargon. Père Scheil places the inscriptions of Karibu of Ṣušînâk in the middle or end of the fourth millennium B. C. It would be too hazardous to assign a date to the archaic forms of the present tablet without more data, but their general appearance would indicate that they are later than the proto-Elamitic of Karibu, and it is of course possible that the mixture of linear and cuneiform characters may be accounted for by a revival of archaic writing such as took place in Babylonia.

In working over the interpretation on these unfamiliar signs many suggestions were gleaned from a study of Cretan writing in Mr. Arthur J. Evans's Scripta Minoa. Mr. Evans himself has called attention more than once to the close resemblance between certain Cretan and Babylonian pictographs and this was found to be even more strikingly true of the Cretan and Elamitic. Of course it is impossible to claim identity when the resemblance can be accounted for by coincidence or the nature of the object represented, yet there are here definite characteristics in common which at least raise the question of

connection between the Minoan civilization of the Mediterranean basin, and the culture not only of the Mesopotamian Valley but also of the great "Hinterland" of Elam. The direction of the transmission of the culture and the possible part played in it by the Hittite civilization must be left to future investigation. All that the present paper wishes to call attention to in passing are certain resemblances of writing. To facilitate this the Cretan forms are included in the text.

Case A. The case sign is ə, NU, the original meaning of which seems to have been "to be hostile, to destroy" and as will be shown later its earliest form was the picture of a weapon or implement for cutting. For full assignment of meanings here and under succeeding signs see Meissner's Ideogramme and Brunnnow's Classified List. With regard to the Elamite characters it must also be remembered that the signs are reversible, pointing towards either right or left.

1. For identifications of forms see as follows. Elamite, Liste1, Nos. 408, 416, 417, 501. Babylonian, Rec2 Nos. 237, 517 bis. The Babylonian SU — abatu, to destroy, (Br. 8650) aḥāzu, to seize, (Br. 8651) saḥāpu, (Br. 8737) to overthrow, destroy. The origin of the pictograph is not clear.

2. See for Elamite Liste No. 412; for Babylonian Rec. No. 154. An analysis of the Semitic meanings of this sign leads to the conclusion that it is a pictograph representing two crossed arrows, hence the double meanings nakāru, nakru, to be hostile, enemy (Br. 1143—4), and našāra, to protect (Br. 1146). Compare also šanu (M. 654), šanlu (Br. 1148), to change, alter. In support of this origin may be quoted the crossed arrows of the Egyptian NEIT, to indicate hostility(?)2, and possibly the Cretan sign although Evans3 at present ascribes to it a different origin and meaning.

3. This sign is obviously late and has no exact counterpart. The nearest to it is perhaps the Neo-Babylonian form.

1 For Elamite characters when cited under this heading see De Morgan's Delegation en Perse, Paris, 1891—1900, Vol. VI.
2 For Babylonian characters when cited under this heading see Thuillier-Dangin's Recherches sur l'Origine de l'Ecriture cuneiforme, Paris, 1898.
3 Evans, Scripta Minoa, p. 114.
4 Evans, op. cit. List, 112a.
quoted, which is the usual sign for šalmu, statue, image. The customary reading for this in Sumerian is Al-an, but it is worth noting that šalmu is given as one of the Semitic meanings for NU (Br. 1963) and that this association with NU may account for its presence under this case-sign. Possible the form here found is a late Elamitic equivalent of the Neo-Babylonian.

4. This sign is clearly a compound, of which the first part apparently serves as a determinative.

a) This determinative suggests grain or a growing plant and finds a parallel in the Elamitic sign Liste 75 or in one of the groups 557—61 and 116—7, all of which are plant signs. For the Babylonian compare Rec. 140, where ŞE—plant or grain or wood; the Cretan (List 92, d), unmistakably a plant sign, and the Egyptian a clump of papyrus. The sign may be therefore tentatively read here as an Elamitic determinative for plant or wood comparable to isu in Babylonian.

b) The second part of the compound (see for Elamitic forms Liste 71—2, and for Babylonian, Rec. 19) has been already identified with NU = balu, to destroy (Br. 1961).

It is clear from the archaic form that this character and not = KUR, PAP (see above) was the original of the present case sign though both have the meanings “hostility, destruction” in common and seem to have been to a certain degree interchangeable. For its use with a plant determinative compare NU-U (isu) some kind of instrument for cutting (Br. 1993) and NU- (isu) SAR (amelu) gardner (Br. 1992).

5. Again a compound, but as yet unidentified.

Case B. The case sign is = 24 NA = abnu, a stone, (Br. 1582).

1. Père Scheil has already identified the Elamitic sign (Liste 373—7) with the Babylonian GAL-ZU (Rec. 98 + 188). ZU = ħurašu, gold (Br. 134) or šarpu, silver, (Br. 138), hence GAL-ZU would mean “a large nugget of gold or silver”.

2. Two Elamitic signs (Liste 19, 20, 22) may compared and also the group Liste 732—734 which suggests weights

---

1 Evans, op. cit.
with the amount or value marked thereon. The Cretan 𒇀 (List 53, 54) also suggests a weight though not so regarded by Evans. The Babylonian form is clearly that for NA = abnu, stone. (Rec. 13).

Case C. This is very difficult. The case sign may be read either 𒇀 MA or a variant 𒇀 of BA. If the former its archaic form was 𒇀 which Prince describes as "a representation of land, earth," and which is not unlike the character here found. If the latter, the primitive meaning would seem to have been "to cut, divide, apportion" and the pictograph some kind of an implement.

1. For possible Elamitic, see Lists 543—6 and for the Babylonian, Rec. 10, in which case it is the same as the case sign MA mentioned above.

2—4. Compare Liste 712 for the Elamitic; no similar forms in Babylonian.

Case D. The broken case sign permits only a conjectural reading, but 𒅀, DU, meaning duhādu, be plentiful (Br. 4474) is the best restoration.

1. With the Elamitic form (Liste 484) compare the Cretan 𒇀 (List 98) representing two palm branches. Evans has noted the resemblance to the archaic form of DU, be plentiful (see Rec. 64 and above) and the palm as a symbol of prosperity and plenty was probably not confined to Babylonian.

Case E. The Elamitic form is Liste 339, not identified.

Case F. The case sign is broken, but is probably 𒇀. The sign is here used with its double signification of kalbu, on the one hand and of amelu (Br. 11256), baltu (Br. 11258) and halatu (Br. 11257) on the other, the two latter being used instead of the more ordinary US. 𒇀, URU 𒇀, although the underlying idea of the case is clearly that of the organs of generation.

1. For the Elamitic and Babylonian see Liste, 201—3, and
Rec. 26. The latter equals US — ridū, (Br. 5401), GIS — rihū, (Br. 5042) and NITAḤ — zikaru (Br. 5048).

2. The Elamite form (Liste 195) corresponds to the Babylonian sign (Rec. 403) GA — alādu, to bear (Br. 5415).

3. The Babylonian is listed in Rec. as No. 438. LIK — Kalbu, dog.

Case G. The case sign is obliterated, but the contents of the case are clearly related to those of the preceding one in much the same way that Babylonian MAḤ and NITA are related to US.

1. Compare for Elamite Liste 197 and for the Babylonian Rec. 27. The latter equals NITA, zikaru, male (Br. 957) and URU, ardu, slave (Br. 956).

2. Compare for Elamite Liste 196 and for the Babylonian Rec. 20. GAN, an irrigated field. Pére Scheil has already identified this Elamite sign with the Babylonian GAN¹, but its presence here in this group is difficult to understand except by an association of ideas peculiarly Semitic. This interpretation is strengthened by the fact that one of its three sign names is GA-GUNU, viz. the gunu of the GA which here appears as No. 2 of Case F and which means alādu, to bear. Considering the late date of the tablet as indicated by the character of the case signs such a gunu-hypothesis is wholly tenable.

3. Seemingly a variant of No. 2.

Case H. Case sign lost and the signs late.

Case I. No case sign, though strangely enough in the usual place for it the tablet is unbroken. No identifications.

Case J. Case sign is 𒄗, inu, eye.

1, 2, 3. All variants of the same sign for which see for the Elamite Liste 612, and for the Babylonian Rec. 238. It represents the side view of the eye ball with the “eye-string”.

Case K. Case sign is 𒊒𒈻 — SIG. Its primitive meaning seems to have been “fresh, bright, pale, yellow or green”.

Later it has also a numerical value.

1. No. Elamite equivalent. The Babylonian form is Rec. 101, SIG, arku, pale, yellow. Barton also gives to it the numerical value 216,000.²

¹ Delegation en Perse, Liste, Nos. 372, 384.
² Origin of Babylonian Writing, No. 398.
2. This is the Elamite sign *Liste* 653 with numerals inserted. Barton has suggested that the original form was \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{\begin{tikzpicture}
    \node at (0,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (1,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (2,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (3,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (4,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (5,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (6,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (7,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (8,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
    \node at (9,0) {\text{\textbullet}};
\end{tikzpicture}}
\end{array}
\]
, viz. \[3600 \times 60 = 216,000\] and this corresponds to *Rec.* 491 which also equals 216,000 or 3600 \times 60.

3. Likewise a numeral.\(^2\)

_Case L._ Case sign is \(\Delta = \text{\textsc{SAR}}\), totality, completeness, also the numerical value 3600 (Br. 8234).

1. The Elamite form is given in *Liste* 653, with which compare also *Liste* 26, 27, 28, from which it will be seen that Père Scheil has already identified this sign with _Rec._ 206 (cf. also 476, 489) \(\text{\textsc{SAR}} = \text{gitmali, kisatu, etc.}\), and the numeral 3600 (Br. 8234).

2. For the Elamite see *Liste* 700, (cf. also 637), and _Delegation en Perse_, vol X, Pl. 4, D.

---

\(^1\) See _The Haverford Library Collection_, Pt. II, pp. 16, 17.

The Babylonian form is Rec. 490, to which Thureau-Dangin gives the numerical value 36,000.

On the reverse cases M-Q show late characters.

Case R. The case sign is broken away, but the general meaning of the signs contained in the case is "brightness, light".

1. The Elamitic form is given in List 832. A similar Babylonian sign (Rec. 549) remains unidentified, but a possible meaning for all three signs is suggested by than Cretan (List 561) which Evans interprets as an ingot of gold or bronze.

2. Compare for the Elamitic List 361—3, tentatively identified by Père Scheil with $\aleph$, isatu, fire, the archaic form of which is given in Rec. 82, suppl. 79, and which represents a burning torch.

3. Here the Elamitic is very close (see List 29) and has been identified with $\underline{\text{\textbullet}}$, AZAG (Rec. 252) silver.

4. The Elamitic form (List 97—8) has been already identified with $\alpha$, AN (Rec. 5). Compare the Cretan star or sun symbol $\star$ (List 1074).

5. No similar sign and no clue as to interpretation. The sign itself suggests a pair of polished metal mirrors.

Case S. and T. have only late characters.

Case X. Case sign is as follows, GLN, to go; TUM, to cause to go; GUB, to stand, to set up; Du and RA with somewhat undetermined force. The signs in this case clearly convey the idea of motion but with two exceptions remain unidentified.

1, 2, 5, 6, all unidentified.

3. Compare the Elamitic forms List 532—5. Also the Babylonian TUM (Rec. 310) meaning to approach violently.

4. No similar form known in Elamitic but Babylonian TUM (Rec. 311) means kahlu, loins (?) (Br. 4958) and bears the same relation to the previous Babylonian that the Elamitic does to the previous Elamitic sign.

Conclusions may be drawn as follows. First, that the cases are arranged after a definite plan according to which the general underlying meaning is given by the case sign. The

* Evans' Scripta Minoa.
remaining signs in each case are therefore more or less closely related to each other and either interpret or are interpreted by the case sign, after the manner of syllabaries. Secondly, there remains the subtle and yet irrefutable fact that the genre of the characters is not Babylonian. The broad general resemblance is very close, yet careful study will show that in the smaller though equally important details these signs correspond more consistently to the Elamite as far as it goes than to the Babylonian. From these facts it is reasonable to conclude that the tablet is a fragment of an Elamite-Babylonian syllabary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Tablet</th>
<th>Elamitic</th>
<th>Babylonian Ideographic value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ŠU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>KUR, PAP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>NU – salmu (ALAM)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GAL-ZU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MA (see J.A.O.S. XXIV, p. 369)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>Elamitic</td>
<td>Babylonian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case X</td>
<td>Tablet</td>
<td>Elamite Babylonian</td>
<td>Babylonian Ideographic value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image] TUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image] TUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image] TUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image] TUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image] TUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image] TUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image] TUM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image]</td>
<td>![Image] TUM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Name of the Red Sea.—By Sarah F. Hoyt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The name Red Sea is a translation of Ἴρυθρα θάλασσα, which is used in the Greek Bible for the Hebrew yam suph, that is, Bulrushy Sea. The Greeks used the name Erythrean Sea, not only of the Gulf between Arabia and Egypt, but also of the Arabian Sea between Arabia and India, including the Persian Gulf. At the time of the Exodus (c. 1200 B.C.) the Red Sea extended farther north, the Bitter Lakes and the Crocodile Lake north of them were then connected with the Gulf of Suez. When the Suez Canal was dug in 1867, beds of rock-salt and strata with recent shells and corals were laid open. The bed of the Red Sea is becoming shallower by the gradual rise of the land. We know that at the time of King Jehoshaphat of Judah (c. 850 B.C.) the Gulf of 'Akabah stretched up to Ezion-geber, some twenty miles north of 'Akabah. Similarly the Persian Gulf at the time of Sennacherib (c. 700 B.C.) extended so far north that the four rivers Euphrates, Tigris, Kerkha, and Karun, emptied separately into the Gulf.¹

Professor Haupt thinks that the ancestors of the Jews (OLZ 12, 163)² crossed the Red Sea at the small peninsula.

---

¹ See Professor Haupt's paper The Rivers of Paradise in JAOSt 16, ciui, and his note in the translation of Ezekiel, in the Polychrome Bible, p. 154, II, 33–51; also the conclusion of his article Wo lag das Paradies? in Ober Land und meer, 1894/5, No. 15; and his paper on Archeology and Mineralogy in JHUCh, No. 163, p. 52⁵, below; cf. Driver, Genesis (London, 1904) p. 60; Skinner, Genesis (Edinburgh, 1910) p. 55; also Ungnad and Grossmann, Das Gilgamesch-Epos (Göttingen, 1911) pp. 114, 162, 164.

² Note the following Abbreviations: AJSL = American Journal of Semitic Languages. — BA = Delitzsch and Haupt, Beiträge zur Assyriologie. — JAOSt = Journal of the American Oriental Society. — JHUCh = Johns Hopkins University: Circulars (Baltimore). — KAT² = Eb. Schrader, Die Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament, third edition,
seventy-five miles south of the northern end of the modern Suez Canal, between the larger and the smaller basins of the Bitter Lakes. The water northeast of this peninsula, it may be supposed, was driven by a strong east-wind into the larger basin of the Bitter Lakes, while the water in the shallow lower basin receded at low tide. Although the Bitter Lakes and the Red Sea are now connected only by the modern Suez Canal, the tide extends to the southern end of the Bitter Lakes. In the St. Lawrence the tide is noticeable as far as Three Rivers, about midway between Quebec and Montreal. The present northern end of the Gulf of Suez is practically dry at low tide. Major-General Tulloch observed that under a strong east-wind the waters of Lake Menzalah, at the northern end of the Suez Canal, receded for a distance of several miles. According to Exod. 14, 21, **JHVH** caused the Red Sea to go back by a strong east-wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided. But when the Egyptians tried to follow the Hebrews, the wind shifted, and the water, which had been driven away by the strong east-wind, came back, so that Pharaoh’s chariots were cast into the sea, and they sank as lead in the mighty waters (Exod. 15, 10).

Professor Haupt (OLZ 12, 246) has pointed out an interesting parallel to this catastrophe in Herod. 8, 129. Herodotus relates that after the battle of Salamis (480 B.C.) Xerxes’ general, Artabazus, besieged the Corinthian colony Potidae, on the narrow isthmus of the Macedonian peninsula Pallene. After the siege had lasted for three months, the water was very low for a long time, so that a part of the Toronic Gulf, on the eastern shore of the peninsula, was dried up. The Persian besiegers, therefore, attempted to advance to the peninsula Pallene through the Toronic Gulf, in order to attack Potidae from the south. After they had completed two fifths of the march, the tide overwhelmed them, so that those who


(1) See Professor Haupt’s papers on *Archaeology and Mineralogy* in JHUC, No. 163, p. 62; *Moses’ Song of Triumph* in AJSI 20, 149; The *Burning Bush and the Origin of Judaism* in PAPS 48, 968; *Midian and Sinai* in ZDMG 63, 529.
could not swim were drowned, while the others were slain by the Potideans. This flood was regarded by the Greeks as a judgment of the gods, just as the Hebrews attributed the annihilation of their Egyptian pursuers to a miracle of ḤHVH. The unexpected high-tide which saved the Potideans and the Hebrews seemed miraculous, just as Captain George E. Goddard, of the Lone Hill station, called the sudden floating of the North German Lloyd S. S. “Princess Irene” a miracle of good luck. The great ship had been held in the grip of the sand of the inner bar of Fire Island for more than three days, and for many hours 2,000 lives, and property worth nearly $2,000,000 had been in jeopardy; but on Palm-Sunday afternoon the ship was suddenly floated by an unusually high tide, stirred by a southeasterly storm at sea.

According to Strabo (779) the name Red Sea was derived from the color of the water, which was supposed to be due to the light of the sun, or to the reflex of the mountains surrounding the sea. Some said that there was a red spring whence red water emptied into the sea. Others derived the name from a Persian, Erythras, who was said to have been a son of Persians.¹ The famous German geographer Karl Ritter (1779–1859) thought that the name Red Sea was connected with the name of the Himyarites in southwestern Arabia. This view has recently been endorsed by Professor Martin Hartmann, of Berlin, in the second volume (p. 375) of his work on the Islamic Orient. But Himyar (حمير) does not mean red. Arabic āhmar (أحمر) does not denote a red-skin, but, rather, a paleface.² Arab hamrā'u denotes white non-Arabs in Syria and Mesopotamia; āhmar is opposed to āswad, black; āhmar wa-āswad means Arabs and negroes.

In his paper on Archaeology and Mineralogy (JHUC, No. 163, p. 52) Professor Haupt derived the Hebrew name yam sūph, Bulrushy Sea, from the bulrushes in the Crocodile Lake (Temsāh) which formed the northern end of the Red Sea at the time of the Exodus. Before the construction of the modern

---

¹ Strabo says: Ἄρα μέλας γὰρ λέγει τοις τῶν διάταγμάς ἀντὶ τῶν χρώματί τις ἐφωνωμένας κατ' ἀτελέσας, εἰς ἀντὶ τῶν ἀλλάς ἀκούγειν ἀπό τῶν ἀκούσαντων ἐκ τῶν ἀκούσαντων ἀκουστάραν τὰς ἀκούσας. Ἐνοχάς ἐκ τῆς Κάτω τῆς ἐκμεταλλευόμενη τελεσθέντας ἐν τῷ διάταγμα ἑρέθθηκα καὶ μεθῆθη ὁ θαρρόν.

² See Professor Haupt’s paper on the passage of the Hebrews the Red Sea in OLZ 19, 246.
Suez Canal, Lake Timsah was a shallow sheet of brackish water, full of bulrushes. Rameses II (c. 1300 B.C.) dug a canal from Bubastis on the Nile to Lake Timsah. This made the water brackish, while the Bitter Lakes south of it remained bitter owing to the large amount of bitter salt (magnesium sulphate) contained therein. Bulrushes, of course, do not grow in salt water, but marshes are full of them. Strabo (804) states that the canal from the Nile, which established a waterway between the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, made the Bitter Lakes sweet. Strabo confounds here the Bitter Lakes with the Crocodile Lake north of them.  

In his paper on *Archaeology and Mineralogy*, Professor Haupt connected the name Red Sea with the red color of the salt lagoons between the modern Suez Canal and the Bedouin Hill, northwest of Suez. These salt lagoons were originally a part of the Red Sea. The red color of their stagnant water is imparted by swarms of minute cladocerous, entomostracous crustaceans, apparently a variety of the common water flea (*Daphnia pulex*) which is attracting some attention in Baltimore at present, inasmuch as the water pipes in certain sections of the city are full of them.

But Professor Haupt has since come to the conclusion that the first explanation given by Strabo is correct. The name Red Sea is indeed derived from the color of the water. The water of the Red Sea is, as a rule, of a deep bluish-green color; but an article on red water, printed in the Berlin weekly *Das Echo*, March 24, 1910, p. 1093, states that the water of the Red Sea near the coast, especially in sheltered coves, has a red color, due to microscopic algae. The same phenomenon may be observed in the open sea, if the weather be perfectly calm. The sea appears then to be covered with a coat of reddish (or yellowish) color, so that the ship seems to ride through a mass of blood. This red color may be observed also near the western coast of British India, and some years ago the same phenomenon was noticed near Rhode Island in Narraganset Bay. If the water is covered with these algae, a great many fishes die. The algae are often decomposed, and the water becomes offensive. It has been suggested that the first Egyptian plague, as described in Exod. 7, 17-21, may have

---

(1) See Professor Haupt's paper on Midian and Sinai in *ZDMG* 63, p. 529, II. 14. 28; cf. *OLZ* 12, 251.
been due to these algae. A similar opinion was expressed by Prof. A. H. Mc Neile, of Cambridge, England, in his commentary on Exodus (London, 1908) p. 44. In the third part of his German translation of the Old Testament (Göttingen, 1787) J. D. Michaelis remarked on Exod. 7, 17, It is not impossible that God effected all this by a natural cause.

According to E. Wolf, the red color of the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean is due to Trichodesmium erythraeum (Cyanophyceae).

Postscript.—Since the above article was in type, Professor Haupt has called my attention to Alois Musil, Im nördlichen Hejaz (Vienna, 1911) reprinted from the Anzeiger der philosophisch-historischen Klasse der kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften, May 17, 1911. The distinguished explorer states there (p. 11 of the reprint) that the marshy plain, known as al-'Arabah, between Elath and Ezion-geber has two wide borders of luxuriant bulrushes, extending several miles north of Ezion-geber. These bulrushes are due to the presence of innumerable fresh-water springs. The marshy plain between Elath and Ezion-geber was formerly the northern end of the Gulf of 'Akabah, and the Hebrew name Bulrushy Sea may be due, not only to the bulrushes in the Crocodile Lake, north of Suez, but also to the bulrushes at the northeastern end of the Red Sea, north of Elath. Innumerable fresh-water springs, which are covered by the sea at high tide, are found also along the northeastern coast of the Red Sea, south of Elath.

(1) Die Wasserblüte als wichtiger Faktor im Kreislaufe der organischen Lebens in the Berichte der Senckenbergischen Gesellschaft in Frankfurt a/M. 1908, pp. 57—73; cf. the review in the Botanische Centralblatt, 1910, p. 170. I am indebted for this reference to Dr. R. E. Livingston, Professor of Plant Physiology in the Johns Hopkins University.
The Holy One in Psalm 16, 10.—By SARAH F. HOYT,
Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

According to the traditional view, the coming of Christ is predicted by the Old Testament prophets. But the alleged Messianic prophecies, as well as the so-called eschatological passages, have, as a rule, a definite historical background. Professor Haupt says in the notes to his new metrical translation of the Book of Micah,¹ There are no Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament, nor are there any Messianic psalms referring to Christ. We find Messianic prophecies both in Egypt and Babylonia,² and Eduard Meyer thinks that the ancient Egyptian prophecies are the prototypes of the Messianic prophecies in the Old Testament. He has discussed this question on pp. 451—455 of his work Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarvölker, also in § 297 of the new edition of the first volume of his Geschichte des Altertums (Stuttgart, 1909).

One of the most important of the so-called Messianic Psalms is Psalm 16, which is referred to Christ in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. We read there that Peter said on the day of Pentecost: My brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David; you know he died and was buried. Therefore, when he said, Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt Thou suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption, he cannot have spoken of himself, but only of the resurrection of Christ (Acts 2, 29—31). Like the modern higher critics, the Apostle deviates here from the traditional interpretation, but the quotation, Thou wilt not suffer Thy Holy One to see corruption, is not based on the Hebrew text, but on the Septuagintal mistranslation of this passage, ὅσον διώκειν τὸν ἄνθρωπον τὸν θάνατον τεύχειν.

¹ See Haupt, The Book of Micah (Chicago, 1910) p. 50, l. 11 (= AJSL 27, 50).
² See KAT, p. 380.
The Hebrew word "šāhat" does not mean corruption, but pit, i.e. the abyss of Sheol. It is not connected with the verb "šāḥēt" to corrupt, destroy; but with the stem "šāh" to sink. Even if the final t were a stem-consonant, "šāhat" would have to be connected with the Assyrian "šakētū", to be depressed, humiliated, humbled. Nor is the rendering "Thy Holy One" justified. In the first place, the Hebrew text has the plural "ḥasidēka", Thy Holy Ones; moreover, "ḥasid" does not mean holy, but pious. In the first Book of the Maccabees, the antagonists of the apostate Hellenizers, the pious Jews who faithfully adhered to the religion of their fathers, are called 'Aσκέλην, Heb. יְרוּם. The plural "יְרוּם" does not mean "Thy Holy One", referring to Christ, but "Thy pious ones, Thy faithful ones", and denotes the orthodox Jews in the times of the Maccabees.

The holy ones, on the other hand, which we find in the third verse of the present psalm, are the Greek gods of Antiochus Epiphanes. Hebrew יְשַׁיְדָב is repeatedly used of foreign deities. In Moses’ Song of Triumph (Exod. 15, 11) we must read with Professor Haupt:

Who is like unto Thee, JHVH, among the gods?
Who is like unto Thee in strength of the deities?

following the Septuagintal ἀνακαφείον ἐκ οὐλον (AJSL. 20, 161). Wellhausen says in his notes on Psalms 29 and 58 in the Polychrome Bible, Judaism has turned the heathen gods into angels, commissioned by JHVH to govern the foreign nations. The divinities worshiped by the heathen were placed by JHVH at the head of the nations.

At the end of his paper on Moses’ Song of Triumph, Professor Haupt has restored the first two couplets of Psalm 16 as follows:

Preserve me, O God? To Thee I flee;
Of JHVH I say: My boon thou art!
Inferior to Thee are the gods in the land;
And all superb ones in whom they delight.

We must read יִשְׁמַר, literally, Naught beside Thee, forsooth, are the holy ones; the prefixed 5 is the emphatic particle.

(1) For the abbreviations see note 2 to the paper on the name of the Red Sea, above, p. 115.
Professor Haupt states there that Psalm 16 was written about B. C. 167, at the beginning of the Syrian persecution. The first half of verse 3 is a gloss, and should be read as follows:

Numerous are their idols, they run after other gods.

Verses 5 and 6 have been restored in Professor Haupt's address on Purim (p. 18). In verse 5 we must not substitute הבש for the Masoretic הבש, but we must, with Professor Haupt, prefix הבש to הבש, or rather הבש, thus reading: יִלַּל הבש הבש הבש. Similarly, we must not read in the so-called Song of Derision upon Sennacherib, 2 Kings 19, 26, which is, according to Professor Haupt, a Maccabean Song of Derision upon Antiochus Epiphanes, instead of the Masoretic הבש הבש הבש הבש, but we must insert הבש הבש הבש after הבש הבש, or rather, הבש הבש הבש. The Masoretic pointing הבש הבש is a conflate reading, combining the vocalizations of both הבש and הבש.

The line יִלַּל הבש הבש הבש means Thou art for ever supporting my lot.

In an article published in the Palestine Exploration Fund Quarterly Statements for 1894, we are told that it is still customary at the allotment of land in Palestine to exclaim אלֹוהים יִשְׂרָאֵל, May Allah stand by my lot, i.e. May He stand up for it, uphold it, maintain it, defend it.

Time will not permit me to discuss all the textual details; but, before I present, in conclusion, a metrical reconstruction of the text according to the interpretation given in the Old Testament Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University during the present session, I should like to say a few words on the obscure term Michtam. Of course, Michtam cannot mean a golden psalm, or inscription, or humble and perfect. Nor can we assume, with Cheyne, that מִכְתָּן is a corruption of מִכְתָּן or מִכְתָּן, supplication; it is difficult to believe that this corruption should have occurred in the titles of half a dozen psalms (Ps. 16 and Psalms 56 to 60). It would be just as convincing to explain michtam as a slight modification of Jerahmeel!

In Assyrian, the stem katāmu means to cover and to close (synonym, edēlu, to bar, bolt). Katāmu, to cover, corresponds

---

(1) Paul Haupt, Purim (Leipzig, 1906) = BA 6, part 2.
(2) See Baethgen, Die Psalmen (Göttingen, 1904) p. xxxvii.
to Arabic kātama, to hide, conceal, while katāmu, to close, may correspond to Arabic kātaba, to bind up a skin-bottle, the edges of a rent being tied around with strings or small leather straps. In the story of the stratagem of the Gibeonites (Josh. 9, 4) skin-bottles, mended in this way, are called תודשנ וטניר. A number of allied stems would seem to show that the primary meaning of the stem מהו was to bind; the ת may be an infix, so that מהו is connected with the Assyrian kamū, to bind, to enclose. This may mean to put on bonds or fetters, or to restrain. According to Professor Haupt, Michtam may, perhaps, have the special meaning restricted by the meter, conformed to poetical measure, just as metrical compositions are called in German gebundene Rede, that is oratio numeris adstricta or vincula in distinction from oratio soluta — prose.

The meter of this psalm is the same which we have in Moses' Song of Triumph in Exodus 15, viz. 2 + 2 beats in each line; and like this famous Song of the Sea, the present poem, as Professor Haupt pointed out in note 135 to his lecture on Purim, consists of three sections, each of which comprises three couplets with 2 + 2 beats in each line.

The Hebrew text should be read as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>א</th>
<th>ב</th>
<th>ג</th>
<th>ד</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>שפרני של</td>
<td>אופורתי לודוה</td>
<td>אסער בראיר</td>
<td>זופרבס (לה)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>כנ쩐ה נומן</td>
<td>אסיפס הולס</td>
<td>לכל אסק</td>
<td>נבל אשק</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>והג יטס</td>
<td>היה ממק</td>
<td>אפק תמד</td>
<td>בוק בטיל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>נגיטיל钨</td>
<td>נגיטיל钨</td>
<td>לבליל</td>
<td>בוק בטיל</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>אספר אגריח</td>
<td>פורונ קלוחין</td>
<td>אספר אגריח</td>
<td>פורונ קלוחין</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This may be translated as follows:

**Michtam of David.**

A 1 Preserve me, O God, to Thee I fly.
2 To JHVH I say: My boon Thou art!
3 Inferior to Thee are the gods in the land; [ ] wherein [they] delight.9
And all that is grand
4 I will never pour out their libations and offerings,
Nor will I pronounce their names with my lips.

B 5 JHVH is my share, my portion, my cup.
Thou art forever upholding my lot.
6 Rich possession is mine, at Thy right, themost pleasant,
And this, my inheritance, greatly delights me.

JHVH I praise, who has given me counsel;
Even at night my thoughts exhort me.8

C 9 My heart was glad, my spirit rejoiced;
Even my flesh will remain in security.1

(1) Their heart was always glad, and their spirit rejoiced, at the beginning of the Syrian persecution. When the situation was most desperate, when the martyrs were subjected to unspeakable tortures, they cheerfully submitted to them. Their spirit could not be broken. But now they hope that their flesh, too, will remain in security, so that they will be able to defend themselves against their relentless persecutors.
10 Thou wilt not surrender my life to Hades, 
    Nor suffer Thy faithful to see the Pit.

11 Thou showest me, JHVH, the pathway of life, 
    Great fulness of joy before Thee for ay.

(a) 2 the Lord
(2) 4 They have many idols, they run after other gods
(3) 8 I have set JHVH before me forever, 
    With Him at my right I shall not be moved.
(4) 9 therefore
The Etymology of Religion.—By Sarah F. Hoyt, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

The Oxford Dictionary says, The connection of the word religion with religare, to bind, has usually been favored by modern writers.

This etymology, given by the Roman grammarians (end of 4th cent. a. d.) Servius (Religio, id est metus ab eo quod mentem religet, dicta religio) was supported by the Christian philosopher Lactantius (about 313 a. d.) who quotes the expression of the celebrated Roman philosophical poet Lucretius (c. 96 to 55 B.C.):—religionum animum nodis exsolvere, in proof that he considered ligare, to bind, to be the root of religio. Several commentators upon Lucretius, e. g. Merrill, Munro, Harper's Dictionary of Classical Literature and Antiquities (edited by Harry Thurston Peck, 1898) and also Joseph Mayor in his commentary (2, 186) on Cicero's De Natura Deorum, agree that this notion of binding was in the mind of Lucretius. St. Augustine, the most celebrated father of the Latin church, A.D. 354—430, makes this derivation. The Century Dictionary, though referring to the uncertain origin of religio, cites the English ligament as perhaps allied. So Harper's Latin Lexicon refers to Corsen's Aussprache (1, 444 sq.) as taking religio in the same sense as obligatio. Other Latin nouns like lictor and lex have the root lig.

Especially the rare English words religate, religation suggest religion as having the root religare, to bind; for Christopher

(1) See ad Vergil. Aen. 8, 349.
(2) See De Rerum Natura, 1, 931; 4, 7.
(3) In Institutiones Divinæ, 4, 29, Lactantius writes, Credo nonem religionis a vinculo pietatis esse deductum, quod hominem sibi Deus religaverit et pietate constrinxerit ... melius ergo (quam Cicero) id nonem Lucretius inter pretatus est, qui uit religionum se nodos exsolvere.
(4) See Merrill on T. Lucreii Car. De Rerum Natura, 1, 109, 932 (pp. 239, 388), and H. A. J. Munro on Lucretius (Cambridge, 1873).
(5) See Retractiones, 1, 13.
Cartwright (1602—1658) wrote: ¹ They are not religated (or united) within the same communion; and S. T. Coleridge (1772—1834): ² It is not even religion; it does not religate, does not bind anew; so W. E. Gladstone (1809—1898) said, ³ Religion ... with a debased worship appended to it, but with no religating, no binding, power.

But in De Natura Deorum, 2, 28, 72, Cicero derives religio from relegere, as meaning to go through or over again in reading, speech or thought. Cicero says, Qui omnia quae ad cultum deorum pertinent diligenter proractarent, et tamquam relegerent, sunt dicti religiosi ex relegendo, ut elegantex eligendo.

In the Noctes Atticae (4, 9, 1) of the Roman grammarian Aulus Gellius (2nd cent. A.D.) is preserved an old verse which supports this derivation, Religentem esse oportet, religiosum nefas.

Identical with relegere is the Greek ἡλεγχε, to heed, to have a care for; and in support of this derivation of the word religion, Geo. Curtius quotes the Iliad (16, 388): θεών δὲν ὑπὲρ ὁκ ἡλεγχε.

Professor Skeat, of the University of Cambridge, says in his Etymological Dictionary, p. 500, Religion seems to be connected with the English roch, to heed, to have a care for. From Teutonic base rak, Aryan rag, the derivation may be traced through Middle High-German, Middle English of Chaucer's time, and Anglo-Saxon. In Mark 12, 14 we find Bu ne recet, Thou carest not.

Our term religion is used also in the sense scrupulosity, conscientious scruple.

Ben Jonson (c. 1573—1637) says, ⁴ Out of a religion to my charge ... I have made a self-decréce ne'er to express my person.

In the Authorized Version, religion is used of outward forms rather than of the inner spirit. In the Century Dictionary the two passages, James 1, 26 and Acts 13, 43, are quoted. Religion was so used by Jeromy Taylor (c. 1613—1637) as meaning the rites and ceremonies of religion: What she was pleased to believe apt to minister to her devotions, and the religions

---

¹ See Certamen Religionum by Christopher Cartwright, published in 1849 by Thomas Baylie.
² Cottle, Early Recollections, 2, 84.
³ Gleanings of Past Years, 3, 130.
⁴ See New Inn, 1, 1.
of her pious and discerning soul.¹ Latimer (c. 1485—1555) in his Sermons,² writes, For religion standeth in righteousness, justice, and well-doing. In Shakespeare’s As you Like it (Act 4, Scene 1) Orlando says that he will religiously keep a promise.

Religious means originally observant, conscientious, strict. A religious Jew is a Jew who observes the rules of the Sabbath, the dietary laws, who does not neglect them. Religere is opposed to negligere, which stands for neclegere, not observe, not heed, not attend to, he remiss in attention or duty toward a thing. An irreligious Jew neglects the Law. Religion is akin to diligence, and opposed to negligence. The Greek ἀλέγεω is generally used with a negative, ἀν ἀλέγεω, equivalent to Latin negligere.

Strict observance of law and conscience, heed of duty, involves taking pains, painstaking scrupulosity. This explains the connection of religion with ἀλέγεω, pain, and δοκομείης, painful. But, as Walde says in his well-known Latin dictionary,³ an idea of choice and interest may be connected with religion. Lat. diligo (that is, dis + lego) may be associated with reckoning, electing. There may be a picking out, as in the German phrase, Soldaten ausleben, recruiting soldiers (so Walde).

If all points are carefully considered, Cicero’s view would seem to be preferable, so that religion is not derived from religare, but from religere. It is true that a clause from Cicero’s Oratio de Domo, 105 is cited, Nisi etiam multiebris religiobus to implicuisse, in proof that Cicero himself could not help connecting the word religio with the idea of obligation. So, in the Second Philippica,⁴ occurs religiones obernigere, and in De Domo, 106, 124 we find domum religiones obligare.

But inconsistency occurs in the writings of all great men,—the present, of course, always excepted. The commentator most sure of himself is usually the most mistaken—an ex-

---

¹ See the Works of Jeremy Taylor, I, 756 (London, 1835).
³ See Aloys Walde, Lateinisches etymologisches Wörterbuch (Heidelberg, 1866) pp. 176, 330.
⁴ See Oratio Philippica, 2, 33, 83: Obstrinxisti religione populum Romanum.
perience which has been brought home to me very forcibly in the Old Testament Seminary of the Johns Hopkins University.

I present this modest contribution to a most intricate problem before this galaxy of distinguished comparative philologists, in the hope of getting some illuminative suggestions on a subject in which I have always taken a profound interest.
Notes on a Collation of some Unpublished Inscriptions of Ashurnazirpal.—By W. E. M. Aitken, Ph. D.

While engaged in studying two copies of the "Standard Inscription" of Ashurbanipal, recently acquired by the Semitic Museum at Harvard University, and in collating them with the copy published by Layard on p. 1 of his Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character from Assyrian Monuments, London 1851, the writer's attention was drawn to the large number of errors they contained. Subsequently a copy of the same inscription in the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston was studied and similar errors therein recorded. To these errors the following pages are devoted.

The first of these (A) was inscribed on a well-dressed slab of dark grey alabaster, now broken into a dozen pieces. The inscription consists of thirty-two lines of rather irregularly written characters covering a space 45 cm. high and about 82 long. The second (B) is on a slab of light grey alabaster, and consists of twenty-six lines of beautifully inscribed signs, covering a space of 40 cm. in height and 100 in length. The signs and lines are somewhat crowded at the centre, three lines at top or bottom occupying the same space as four at the centre. The slab has been broken into some twenty pieces, but fortunately with but slight damage to the writing. The third (C) is an inscription of twenty-one lines, covering a space 40 cm. high and 140 long. It is written across the face of a beautiful bas-relief 210 cm. high and 130 wide, which one time adorned the wall on the left-hand side of some doorway, a point made clear by the fact that the writing goes on around the edge of the slab.

In A there are to be found about 20 errors, consisting for the most part in the addition or omission of a wedge. (It is not always easy to decide whether a case in point is a mere variant or an error; it is possible that I have omitted some
things as variants that might properly have been called errors. At the same time I have added under the general head of error some illustrations that are rather examples of other things.) Us, l. 2, is written as a; tukulti, l. 3, as b; ma, l. 5, as c; niš, l. 5, as es, d; (a variant noted by Budge and King, ni-es following šak, probably explains this); ha, l. 10, as e; hu, l. 10, as f; tik, l. 11, as g; ni, l. 14, as h; ik, l. 19, as i; la, l. 20, as j; is, l. 27, as k). Ekal še dap-ra-ni is written again after š urkarrini šd with ra, l. 27, written as l). Im, l. 30, is written as m). Two erasures are found: si, l. 30, is written as n), with one horizontal erased: a-na, l. 28, as o). The scribe's intention was to write a-na; he omitted a, wrote sa, and then erased all but the perpendicular. This stone cutter at least understood what he was writing for, if the correction were due to a reviser, he would doubtless have corrected some of the other errors. There are a number of omissions: ši, l. 28 (19a); is, l. 24 (15c) and l. 27 (18a, 19). isten (en) u-, l. 23 (14c); al-kan ur-du-ti u-pu-šu, l. 19 (11d. 12a); sameš šak-nu-te-Ja closes l. 18, the next line begins with the next sentence. The inference here too is that the stone-cutter could read.

Of the three inscriptions B is the most beautifully written, and is engraved on the finest stone. There are only half the errors, but these are of the same character. Adar, l. 1, is written as p); as, l. 2, as q); kul, l. 4, as r); šar, l. 6, as s); ad, l. 7, as t); mar, l. 13, as u); si, l. 18, as v); ra, l. 22, as w); lib, l. 23, as x); šar, l. 24, as y); si, l. 24, as z); with the last vertical erased, cf. n). The suffix of gimri, l. 19, referring to matte is šu. While this is not unheard of in Assyrian, it is significant here as proof that the stone-cutter understood what he wrote. Ina, l. 24 (20a), is written on the margin at the beginning of the line. Otherwise the lines begin perfectly regularly.

C, though so conspicuously situated, and though written over so beautiful a bas-relief, contains the largest number of errors.
Ru, l. 2, is written as z), with the centre horizontal, which has been very deeply cut, almost erased; ru, l. 9, is written the same way, but with no erasure. Hu, l. 4, is written as a\(\text{a}\); sar, l. 5, as s:\(\text{t}\); ha, l. 6, as e\(\text{e}\); su, l. 8, as h\(\text{h}\); alu, l. 10, as c\(\text{c}\); ja, l. 12, as d\(\text{d}\)); ur, l. 12, as e\(\text{e}\)); ilâni, l. 13, as f\(\text{f}\)); sum, l. 13, as g\(\text{g}\)); šid, l. 13, as h\(\text{h}\)); tukunti, l. 14, as i\(\text{i}\); da, l. 14, as j\(\text{j}\)); šar, l. 14, as k\(\text{k}\)); ki, l. 14, as l\(\text{l}\)); as, l. 15, as m\(\text{m}\)); lu-bur, l. 17, as n\(\text{n}\)); -pi ina, l. 18, as o\(\text{o}\)); ti, l. 18, as p\(\text{p}\)); ri, l. 18, as q\(\text{q}\)); mul, l. 19, as r\(\text{r}\)); a, l. 19, as s\(\text{s}\)); da, l. 19, as t\(\text{t}\)); ra, l. 19, as u\(\text{u}\)); te, l. 19, as v\(\text{v}\)); ma, l. 19, as w\(\text{w}\)); iz, l. 20, as x\(\text{x}\)); haspi, l. 20, as y\(\text{y}\)). In l. 19 tamâti is crowded into z\(\text{z}\), cf. i\(\text{i}\)). In l. 11 has is omitted.

Those ancient men whose business it was to write the cuneiform (they were not mere stone-cutters), to write the king’s inscriptions, joined the wedges together carelessly, made signs inaccurately, altered and omitted\(1\) signs, even to the extent of half a line. After I had finished my work I noticed that Budge and King has made a similar statement: “From the numerous mistakes and inaccuracies which are manifest in many of the copies, it is clear that the work was often done in haste and was entrusted to unskilled workmen and artisans, who were not infrequently unable to read the signs they were engraving”\(2\). The evidence of hasty and unskilled work is abundant; the errors in C constitute over three per cent of the inscription. But I would point out that they are due, in this inscription at least, to men who show some signs of being able to read what they wrote.

Lyon in Keilschrifttexte Sargon’s, Königs von Assyrien, so long ago as 1883 pointed out a considerable number of errors, especially in the Steuinschrift. Scheil, Délégation en Perse, Mémoires, Tome IV, has pointed out a number in the Code

---

1 This is probably not an error.
2 Layard, op. cit., gives a fine example of this, which Budge and King of course correct. In l. 8 one reads bi-lat-su takhâd (ud) šur-šu-ni kili-su-na i-pi-tu-su bi-lat-su-su i-mu-ru, etc. The scribe had not finished writing bi-lat-su (-su) when his eye caught the su of kat-su, l. 4, and he started over again, writing five words twice. Takhâd (ud) he wrote incorrectly first as a\(\text{a}\); the second time it is correct. In l. 13 the scribe’s eye fell from kibûtê to the quite similar ud of uš-šam-ma-du, and so he omitted kibûtê ti šarru ša kibût pi-su, and produced an untranslatable sentence. This is all correctly written in A, B and C.
of Hammurabi; Ungnad in *Hammurabi's Gesetz*, Leipzig, 1909, has added many more, and I suspect that all in the code have not yet been found. Others too have noticed errors here and there, yet the large number of errors in these inscriptions—and it is rarely that one may speak so surely concerning textual errors—comes to one almost as a revelation. Errors have occasionally been pointed out in writing on clay, as for example by Haupt, *Das Babylonische Nimrodepos*; but it is, as one would expect, in writing on stone that they are found in greatest abundance.

(Since writing the above (Jan, 1910) I have been interested to note errors in the clay tablet published in V R 47. In l. 40 ob. we read *ri-ša-a-tum* for *ri-da-a-tum*, and *ip-pi-e-ši* for *ip-pi-e-ri*. Cf. IV B., 60* B. ob., l. 11 (cf. Jastrow in J. B. L. XXV*, p. 160, n. 90). In l. 24 we read *šar ra ši ma*. Jastrow (op. cit., p. 148, n. 43), reads it *šar-ra ši-ma*, and translates "from a king, I became—". This is certainly ungrammatical. Is not *ši* an error for *ku*?—whether of the scribe or the modern copist I know not. For *šar-ra-šu-šma* cf. IR 17, 32, and Lyon, *Assyrian Manual*. § 22, bottom.)
Comparative Syntax of the Combinations formed by the Noun and its Modifiers in Semitic. — By Frank R. Blake, Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University.

Introduction.

The syntax of the several Semitic languages has been more or less exhaustively treated in the various Semitic grammars, but little attention has hitherto been paid to the study of Comparative Semitic Syntax. Numerous points, it is true, have been treated incidentally in the different Semitic grammars and other works of a grammatical character, but there is nothing whatever in the nature of a systematic Comparative Semitic Syntax on a par with Delbrück's treatment of Comparative Indo-European Syntax in Brugmann's great work, and very few monographs which discuss problems of this character.

Syntax, as seems to have been first expressly stated by the distinguished linguist the late Georg von der Gabelentz, may be treated from two different points of view, a formal and a logical. We may start from the grammatical forms and explain their uses, as for example in a discussion of the Latin or Greek cases, or we may start from the grammatical categories expressed in language generally, and describe the differ-

1 Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen (3 parts in 5 volumes + Indices: 3rd part = Delbrück's Vergleichende Syntax der indog. Spr.), Strassburg, 1886—1900: 2nd edition of first two parts, Strassb. 1897—1911. Brockelmann has promised a Comparative Semitic Syntax as Part II of his Comparative Semitic Grammar (Part I published in 1908, cf. p. 138) but it had not yet appeared when this article went to press. Since then the first fascicle, pp. 1—112, Berlin, 1911, comprising a portion of the discussion of the simple sentence, has been published.

ent ways in which they are expressed, as when we discuss the various methods of expressing the genitive in Semitic. The two English constructions 'man's disobedience' and 'the disobedience of man' would be treated under the same head in logical syntax, while in formal syntax one would go under the inflections of nouns and the other under prepositions.

In the present article the syntax of the nominal modifiers is treated in general from the logical point of view. Each of the ideas which can possibly be made to modify the meaning of a noun is taken in turn, and its expression in the various Semitic languages is discussed from a comparative point of view. The object of the article is to point out how the noun and the words that express these ideas are combined, what their relative position in the combination is, and how they are affected by being joined together.¹

The principal ideas which can modify the meaning of a noun in any language, with their most familiar means of expression in parentheses, are the following, viz.,

a) simple determination (definite article).
b) case determination (case ending or preposition).
c) simple indetermination (indefinite article).
d) simple qualification (descriptive adjective).
e) demonstrative qualification (demonstrative adjective).
f) interrogative qualification (interrogative pronoun or adjective).
g) indefinite qualification (indefinite pronominal adjectives).
h) numeral qualification (cardinal and ordinal numerals).
i) nominal qualification (noun in case form or after preposition).
j) personal pronominal qualification (possessive adjective).
k) nominal apposition (noun in apposition).
l) adverbial qualification (circumstantial expressions and adverbs such as 'also', 'only', 'indeed').
m) sentence qualification (clause, relative or other, modifying the noun).

To these may be added

n) nominal coordination (two or more nouns connected by 'and').

though it does not, strictly speaking, belong here, as the words do not modify one another but are simply joined together.

Two or more of these modifying ideas may be combined, e. g., simple determination with simple qualification, or demonstrative qualification with simple qualification, etc.¹

In the Semitic languages, these modifying ideas are not always expressed by an independent word, e. g., the idea of the possessive adjective is regularly indicated by a suffix, e. g., Hebrew יִשָּׁר יִשָּׁר ‘my dog’, nor is the element that expresses the modifying idea always grammatically dependent on the noun, e. g., ‘all men’ is expressed in general by the indefinite pronoun ‘all’ followed by the genitive of the noun, e. g., Hebrew כל גברים ‘all men’. Nevertheless in all cases the material will be arranged with reference to the modifying idea.

The following languages and dialects have been included in the present investigation (the abbreviation used for the language is given in parentheses), viz.,

a) Assyrian (Ass.)
b) Arabic, Classical (Arab. or Cl. Arab.)
   "  , Modern (Mod. Arab.; Eg., Pal., Tu., Tl., etc.),
   Lihtanic (Li.)
   Safaitic (Saf.)
c) Mineo-Sabaean (Min.)
   Mehri (Meh.)
d) Ethiopic (Eth.)
   Amharic (Amh.)
   Tigriña (Ta.)
   Tigre (Te.)
e) Hebrew, Biblical (Heb. or Bib. Heb.)
   "  , Post-Biblical (Mish.)
   Moabite (Mo.)
   Phenician (Ph.)
f) Aramaic of Zinjirli (Ar. Zinj.)
   Biblical Aramaic (Bib. Aram.)
   Christian Palestinian (Chr. Pal.)
   Jewish Palestinian (Jew. Pal.)
   Samaritan (Sam.)

¹ Some of the most important of these combinations of two or more modifiers have been discussed in connection with the combinations of the noun with single modifier. Material for their complete discussion is not at present available.
Malulun (Mal.)
Syriac, Classical (Syr.)
Aramaic of Babylonian Talmud (Bab. Tal.)
Mandaic (Man.)
Modern Syriac (Mod. Syr.)

All words except those written in Hebrew characters will be furnished with a transliteration, the transliteration being in Italic except in the case of Classical Syriac, where Hebrew is employed. Libyanic, Saffaitic, Phenician, Zinjirli, Samaritan, Christian Palestinian, and Mandaic words are written in Hebrew characters, Mineo-Sabean words in Arabic characters. Assyrian, Mehari, and Malulun appear only in transliteration.

Analogies in Egyptian and Coptic, Indo-European, and other languages, will be given in the foot-notes.

The chief works which have been employed in preparing this article, with the abbreviation by which each will be cited, are the following, viz.: 

C. Brockelmann, Grundriis der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen, Bd. 1, Berlin, 1908 (Brock. Comp. Gr.)

Ass. F. Delitzsch, Assyrische Grammatik, 2 Aufl., Berlin, 1906 (Del. Ass. Gr.).


F. Praetorius, Äthiopische Grammatik, Karlsruhe u. Leipzig, 1886 (Pract. Æth. Gr.).

A. Dillmann, Lexicon linguæ aethiopicae cum indice latino, Lipsiae, 1865 (Dill. Lex. Æth.).

Amh. F. Praetorius, Die amharische Sprache, Halle 1879 (Pract. Amh. Spr.).

I. Guidi, Grammatica elementare della lingua amarina, Roma, 1889 (Guidi, Gr. El. Amar.)


Ta. F. Praetorius, Grammatik der Tigriňaspache, Halle, 1871 (Pract. Tig. Spr.).


A. Geiger, Lehrbuch zur Sprache der Mischma, Breslau, 1845 (Geig. Spr. Misch.).

Siegfried-Strack, Lehrbuch der neuhebräischen Sprache, Karlsruhe u. Leipzig, 1884 (Sieg.-Str. Neuh. Spr.).


Mo. R. Smend and A. Socin, Die Inschrift des Königs Mosha von Moab, Freiburg i. B., 1886 (Sm.-Soc. Moab.).

Ph. P. Schroeder, Die Phönizische Sprache (Schroed. Phön. Spr.).

A. Bloch, Phoenisches Glossar, Berlin, 1890 (Bloch, Phoen. Gl.)


Aram. M. Lidzbarski, Handbuch der nordsemitischen Epigraphik, Weimar, 1898 (Lidz. Handb.).


G. B. Winer, Grammatik des biblischen und targumischen Chaldaismus, Leipzig, 1824 (Winer, Gr. Chal.).

F. Uhlemann, Institutiones Linguae Samaritanae, Lipsiae, 1837 (Uhlem. Inst. Sam.).

Th. Nöldeke, Beiträge zur Kenntniss der aramäischen Dialecte. II. Über den christlich palästinischen Dialect, ZDMG, 22, pp. 443—527 (Nöld. Chr. Pal.).

D. J. Parisot, Le dialecte néosyriaque de Malûla JA, sér. 9, tome 11, 1898, pp. 239—312, 440—519 (Parisot, Dial. Mal.).

R. Payne-Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, Oxonii, 1868—1901 (Smith, Th. Syr.).


C. Levias, *A Grammar of the Aramaic Idiom... in the Babylonian Talmud*, Cincinnati, 1900 (Levias, Bah. Tal.).


Other Languages.—Delbrück, *Vergleichende Syntax der indogermanischen Sprachen*, Strassburg, 1893—1900 (Delbr. Verg. Syn.).


**Simple Determination.**

The determinate or definite state of a noun is expressed in most of the Semitic languages by a demonstrative particle used as a definite article.

In Arabic, Hebrew, Moabite, Phenician, and Tigre (also in the Aramaic dialect of Tur-Abdin, cf. below), the definite article is indicated by preformative particles; in Classical Ara-

bic and its modern dialects, by *al;* in Tigré by *lā* or *la;* in the Arabic dialect of the Safaitic and Libyanaic inscriptions, and in the other languages, by a particle whose original form was probably *hā;* e.g.,

Arab. *al-mālik* 'the king.'
Te. *nānā* 'the people.'
Lih. *nab* 'the house.'
Heb. *nāqeb* 'the king.'
Ph. *rēṣēn* 'the gate.'
Mo. *tūbān* 'the high-place.'

In Phoenician and poetical Hebrew, however, the use of the article is much restricted, and it is not necessary to indicate a definite noun. In Aramaic in general, in Mineo-Sabean, and Amharic the definite state of a noun is indicated by affirmative particles. In Aramaic this particle is *ā,* e.g.,

Bib. Aram. *šālēn* 'the king.'

*šālén* 'the kings.'

In some cases in Western Aramaic, and in practically all cases in Eastern Aramaic, instead of the form in *ājā* formed by combining the plural ending *ā* with *ā,* a plural ending in *ē* is employed, e.g.,

---

1 Connected ultimately with the root of the plural of the demonstratives, *al-* *ālāt,* etc., cf. Brock. Comp. Gr. pp. 316, 317 (§ 107 c, f). In some Southern dialects of Arabic *al-* *ám,* *ám* is used as article instead of *lā,* but without assimilation of final *l,* e.g., *am-herēs* 'piety,' *am-fērēm* 'fasting,' this article contains the same demonstrative element as Assyrian *ama:* 'that'; cf. Brock. op. cit. p. 317 (§ 107c), p. 409 (§ 246 Baj); Wright-Det. Arab. Gr. I. p. 270.

2 Regarded by Littmann (Te. Pron. p. 390) as ultimately identical with the demonstrative root *al* (cf. preceding n.). It may, however, have been developed from the preposition *lā* used with a definite dependent noun as in Ethiopic *mā-yē:* *bālā* *lā* *mēyē* (cf. p. 145). Here the determination of *mēyē* is due to the combination of suffix and preposition, but in Tigré *la* itself was regarded as the cause of the determination, and so used as article in other cases. Closely connected with this phenomenon is the almost complete loss of *lā* as preposition. Cf. Brock. Comp. Gr. p. 470 (§ 246 Bca).


5 This *ā* is probably identical with the preformative article *hā;* cf. Brock. Comp. Gr. p. 316.

6 Probably the same plural ending that we have in Assyrian *lē:* 'lords,' cf. Brock. Comp. Gr. pp. 454, 455.
Syr. אֶלְגָּלַם 'kings.'

In the Eastern Aramaic dialects, and apparently also in Malulian, the definite state has lost its definite force, and has become the most common form of the noun, the meaning being either definite or indefinite, e.g.,

Syr. אֶלְגָּלַם 'king, a king, the king.'
אֶלְגָּלַם 'kings, the kings.'

In Syriac, Babylonian Talmudic, and Mandaic the absolute or indefinite form of a noun is comparatively frequent in certain constructions, but in Modern Syriac, with isolated exceptions, it has been completely lost.

In the Modern Aramaic dialect of Tur-Abdin a new preformation definite article has been developed from the demonstratives hay, hāq, hānōn, viz. m. ā, f. ā, pl. ān, e.g.,
ā ẖmōro 'the ass,'
ā šeke 'the woman.'

In Mineo-Sabean the definite state is indicated by a final n element, the so-called nunciation, e.g.,

The ending ā is apparently derived from the pronominal suffix of the third person singular (cf. below p. 144); ān contains in addition the two feminine elements ā and ān.

In Assyrian the final ān which is frequently added to nouns had originally in all probability a definite meaning, but this meaning had been lost as early at least as the time of Hammurabi (circa 1950 B.C.), just as the definite meaning of Aramaic


3 Of. Del. Ass. Gr. p. 189. This ān or nunciation is ultimately identical with the emphatic particle ān; cf. op. cit. pp. 189, 219—221, and also below under Adverbial Qualification. It is probably distinct from the ān or ān which denotes indetermination (cf. p. 160); Brockelmann, however, seems to regard them as identical, cf. Comp. Gr. p. 474 (bot.).
-ā was lost later in Eastern Aramaic (cf. above). Assyrian is therefore without article and a word either with the -m or without it may be either definite or indefinite, e.g.,

\[ \text{itu} \quad \text{itu-m} \]

'god, a god, the god.'

Ethiopic, Tigrinya, and Meheri are entirely without article, and a noun in its absolute form may be either definite or indefinite, e.g.,

Eth. ṭḥ-w: nējūs 'king, a king, the king.'
Ta. ḫa: sab 'man, a man, the man.'
Meh. ḫajj 'man, a man, the man.'

The Eastern Aramaic dialects, then, and Assyrian, Ethiopic, Tigrinya, and Meheri have no direct means of making a noun definite under all conditions, but they are able nevertheless by employing various constructions, to express the determination in certain cases. Sometimes a language which has a regular definite article possesses these definite constructions as well.

In Assyrian, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Tigrinya, and in Tigré in spite of the fact that it has developed an article, the pronominal suffix of the third person is employed in certain cases in the sense of a definite article. In Syriac this use seems to be confined to nouns after ১; in Ethiopic it is most common in repetitions; in Tigrinya, in time expressions, e.g.,

Ass. nēšu ša ḫir-išu ‘the lion of the desert.’
Syr. ܢܝ�tሮ ース, ܕܓ ܠܢ ܐܐ ܢܐ ܠܕ ܛܘ’rep ‘St. Simon of the pillar.’

Eth. ƛƛƛƛ: ḫalāq: soθ: ƛƛƛƛ: ƛƛƛƛ: ḫalāmka ḫelma ḫakamza ḫelm-ū ‘thou hast dreamed a dream, and thus (was) the dream.’
Ta. ḫokk: ḫal: ḫir: ḫbq ḫū ḫintu... ‘the time will come when...’
Te. ḫt: ḫt: ḫt: ḫt: ƛƛƛƛ: ḫatul ḫasal-ū ḫatul-q ‘about the parable they asked him.’

From this use doubtless originates the articular -ū, -ē, of Amharic.

The suffix in Assyrian expressions like ina umi-šu-ma ‘on that day,’ is to be classed here, tho the suffix has here a force more strongly demonstrative than that of an article.

¹ Brockelmann thinks the suffix here is simply possessive; cf. Comp. 
Gr. p. 479 (top).
In the case of a definite noun which is dependent on another word (noun, preposition, or verb) the definite state of this noun is often emphasized by a suffix attached to the governing word; the dependent noun, either alone or preceded by a preposition, standing as a sort of apposition to the suffix. The dependent noun usually stands after the suffix, but when it is governed by a verb it may stand before the verbal form. When the determination of the dependent noun is not indicated by a demonstrative adjective, or in some other way, the suffix may be regarded as taking the place of the article.

In Assyrian a noun depending on another noun is preceded by ǝ́; a governing preposition is repeated; a noun depending on a verb stands without preposition: e. g.,

\[ X \text{ ablū-su ša} \ X \text{ ǝ́ són of } Y. \]
\[ \text{ana šāšuma ana Izdubar ǝ́ 'to Izdubar.} \]
\[ I \text{'ušī šarrānī ... adī tamāl ēlīte lā ardi-sunūtī, 'sixty kings ... unto the upper sea verily I pursued (them)}. \]

In Ethiopic the dependent noun is preceded by the preposition ǝ́, e. g.,

\[ φρονί: ἀπα: qulām-hā la-tēbab 'the beginning of wisdom (its beginning to wisdom).' \]
\[ ἀπα: ἀπα: ἀτ: lā-lē-hū la-bālā bēt 'against the lord of the house.' \]
\[ ἀπα: ἄλλα: ἀλ: samāj-ō la-bērhān 'ēlāt 'he called the light day.' \]

In Tigrinya the dependent noun is regularly preceded by the preposition ǝ́, tho after another noun the genitive sign ǝ́: may be employed, e. g.,

\[ ἀλ: ἀλ: lētē-ō nē-jasūs 'the birth of Jesus.' \]
\[ ἀπογεύματα: ǝ́: ἀπογεύματα: majamarā-ō nāj šeṭrat 'the beginning of the creation.' \]
\[ ἀπα: ἀπα: ἀτ: kumā-ō n-tat sāb 'like this man.' \]
\[ ἀπα: ἀπα: ἀτ: yallād-ō nē-jeshaq 'he begot Isaac.' \]

In Amharic a noun depending on another noun is preceded by the sign of the genitive ǝ́, and usually stands before the governing noun, tho it may stand after; a noun depending on a verb takes nothing besides the regular accusative suffix ǝ́; the dependent noun is most commonly a proper noun: e. g.,

\[ ἀπηλλα: ἀπηλλα: ἀπηλλα: ἀπηλλα: ἀπηλλα: ja-labān zajāt-āqay 'the crown of the wise.' \]
Frank R. Blake,

**Ušašu-n ẓarā-n 'he called to Joshua.**

In Syriac the preposition  partisan after a verb; after a noun and a preposition  being employed: e. g.,

\[
\text{he the son of the king.}
\]

\[
\text{over the stone.}
\]

\[
\text{he built the house.}
\]

After a preposition, instead of , the same preposition may be repeated, and after a verb, instead of both suffix and  either may be used alone with the same meaning, e. g.,

\[
\text{over the stone.}
\]

\[
\text{he built the house.}
\]

Mandaic and the dialect of the Babylonian Talmud have the same constructions as Syriac, tho apparently the construction of suffix + noun without  does not occur in the latter. In Modern Syriac the construct of a noun preceding a definite noun rectum often has a special ending, viz.,  or , this is perhaps a contraction for , suffix of third person singular + sign of genitive (cf. prepositional forms below): e. g.,

\[
\text{Savior of the world.}
\]

Occasionally, however, the construction occurs as in Classical Syriac: e. g.,

\[
\text{from the hand of Satan.}
\]

\[
\text{the son of God.}
\]

The construction after a preposition  seems to be the only preposition that is thus used, tho the spoken forms  suffix,  are to be explained as contracted from preposition + suffix + , viz., , , , or verb, suffix (or in the case of the verb the equivalent + suffix) followed immediately by the dependent noun without anything before it, e. g.,

\[
\text{to the fish.}
\]

\[
\text{Nöldeke mentions only the first example, and here he thinks it is possible that was miswritten for the plural; but Maclean states that this construction is not uncommon. Cf. Nöld. *Newa. Spr.* p. 148 f.; *Mac. Verö. Sýr.* p. 56 (top).}
\]
Aaron lit. מָצָאָה pull-ah 'uit sůzē 'have you brought out the horse.'

חֶם לֶה הָו בַחְרָּא 'hold fast that light.'

In those languages which have developed a special definite article, similar emphatic constructions occur. When the governing word is a noun, this construction is found only in those languages which have developed a special genitive sign. It is found in the Western Aramaic dialects and in Post-Biblical Hebrew (here probably borrowed from Aramaic), but does not seem to occur in the Modern Arabic dialects. In Hebrew the article is omitted with a dependent common noun, being in this respect at least independent of Aramaic, e. g., Bib. Aram. מִלְּבַרְדִּירָה the god of Daniel,' אֶלְכַּלָּה 'the name of God.'

Jew. Pal. יָבֹא נְבֵי אֱלֹהָּם 'the father of the Ammonites.'

Sam. דֵּלַב יָבֹא נְבֵי 'the sons of thy servants.'

Mish. יְסַפָּדָה פָּרָלָא 'the fire of the wise.'

In Biblical Hebrew this construction occurs in one late passage, viz., קִוְם בָּלַשָּׁה the couch of Solomon.' (Cl. 3, 7).

When the governing word is a preposition or a verb, examples may occur in any language, but they are comparatively infrequent; when depending on a verb, the noun stands with the sign of the accusative; after a preposition, it stands either alone or with the preposition repeated; in Arabic the noun is in the case form corresponding to the case of the suffix; in Christian Palestinian after a verb the suffix stands after ב and the noun after ב: e. g.,

Arab. راَجَى رُثَاء أَصْلَعْرَا 'I saw Zaid.'

חֶטֶב יַבֳּעֵה 'marartu bi-hi zajda' 'I passed by Zaid.'

Ecc. 2, 6). I woe to him the one alone' (Ecc. 4, 10).

Heb. דַּלַּשָּׁה 'to the children of Israel' (Jos. 1, 2).

Sam. הָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה הָבָה H and the sparrow alive he took' (him).

Ch. Pal. יַבֳּעֵה נָמְתָד אֱלֹהָּם a man shall not rule over his brother.'

In Biblical Aramaic and Jewish Palestinian, and in Post-
Biblical Hebrew (here probably a borrowing from Aramaic) this construction after prepositions has come to be used to express the idea of ‘same,’ e. g.,

Bib. Aram. ֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֶֆ
members of the Semitic family, viz., Ethiopic, and its modern descendant Tigrina. Assyrian, in many respects the most primitive of the family, had developed and lost a definite article centuries before the oldest monument of Ethiopic was written. In order to represent the determinate state of a noun, two means were employed: a) pronominal elements, chiefly demonstrative, and b) the personal pronominal suffixes.

From pronominal elements in most of the languages, by a process of weakening, a real definite article was developed, viz., in Assyrian, and in the Arabic (North and South), Canaanitic, and Aramaic families of speech. In Phenician and archaic Hebrew, represented by the language of Hebrew poetry, the article is not yet absolutely necessary to denote determination. In Arabic (North and South), Aramaic, in Hebrew prose, and Moabite, the article is fully developed. In the Eastern Aramaic dialects its definite force has so faded out that these languages have practically returned to the articleless condition of the primitive language. In one of these, again, the dialect of Tur-Abdin, a new article has been developed from the demonstrative 'that.'

Parallel with this development of the demonstratives ran the determinative use of the pronominal suffixes. In some languages the suffix of the third person was used to determine the noun to which it was attached, at first with a force more demonstrative than articular, as in Assyrian, later with a real articular force. This later use is found chiefly in the Abyssinian group, tho' it also occurs occasionally in Assyrian and Syriac. In Tigré the development of a regular article has checked the growth of the construction; in Amharic a regular article is developed from it, which has, however, a somewhat restricted use. A suffix was also used to emphasize the determinative of a dependent noun by being placed with the governing word. This construction is found to a certain extent in all the languages, but is most fully developed in the Abyssinian and Aramaic groups. It occurs in Amharic in

languages, viz., Sanskrit, Avestan, and Latin, have never developed an article; in Old Bulgarian and Lithuanian the article is used only with the adjective modifying a definite noun; cf. p. 105, n. 1.

1 Whether the article-less condition of Mehri is a direct inheritance from primitive Semitic, or whether the language is to be regarded as having lost the article which appears in Mimeo-Sabean, is not certain.
spite of the fact that the language has an article; it is found in both East and West Aramaic, but reaches a higher development in the Eastern dialects, since here the emphatic state has lost its definite meaning. In Western Aramaic and Post-Biblical Hebrew, where the growth of these constructions has been checked by the development of a regular article, some of them have been adapted to indicate the emphatic idea 'same,' or 'the very same.'

In some languages the weakening of the force of the demonstrative pronouns, which process resulted in the development of the regular article, is still going on. So especially in article-less languages like Ethiopic and Tigrinya, but also in those with a special definite form such as Jewish Palestinian.

**Case Determination.**

Leaving aside the primitive case endings, which are an integral part of the noun, under this head are to be classed the various prepositions and postpositions which have been developed to denote case.

The nominative has developed no special case sign.

The genitive in primitive Semitic is expressed by the construct chain (cf. below), but in the later development of many of the languages special prepositions have been adapted to denote this case. They are as follows, viz.,

| Ass   | ?? |
| Eth.  | ??, ??; ??, ??; ??, ?? |
| Amb.  | ?_, ?? |
| Ta.   | ??, ??; ??, ?? |
| Te.   | ??, ?? |
| Arab. | ??, ??; ???, ??? |
| (Mod.) | ??, ??, ??, ??, ??, ??, ?? |
| Min.  | ?_, ?? |
| Meh.  | ??, ??, ?? |
| Heb.  | ??, ?? |

---


Ph. יָהִי, יָהִי
Mish. יָהִי, יָהִי
Syr. יָהִי, יָהִי, יָהִי
Man.
Bab. Tal. יָהִי
Mod. Syr. יָהִי
Bib. Aram. יָהִי
Jew. Pal. יָהִי
Ch. Pal. יָהִי
Sam. יָהִי
Mal. יָהִי, יָהִי, יָהִי

These genitive determinats all stand before the noun in the genitive. They may be divided into the following classes according to their origin, viz.,

a) those derived from relative or demonstrative pronouns, Ass. ьa, Min. ьa, Meh. ьa, ьa, Eth. ьa, Amb. ьa, Phen. יָהִי, יָהִי, Aram. ьa, ьa, ьa, Mod. Arab. ьa;
b) those derived from nouns meaning ‘possessions,’ Ta. and Te. נַה, Mod. Arab. נַה, נַה, נַה, נַה, Mal. נַה;
c) prepositions meaning ‘to, pertaining to, belonging to,’ Ta. לָ, Arab. לָ, Heb. הֶ, Aram. לָ, Mal. לָ;
d) prepositions meaning ‘from, part of, of,’ Eth. לָ, לָ, Arab. לָ;
e) combinations of class (a) with following preposition in Mod. Arab. לָ (a combination of a demonstrative element with לָ) לָ כ, Heb. לָ כ, לָ כ, Sam. לָ כ, Mal. לָ כ.

Determinants belonging to classes (a) and (b) are in some of the languages varied for gender and number to agree with

1 Closely connected with this class of determinants is the Arabic demonstrative לָ כ (with its full series of case, gender and number forms) which stands before a genitive in the sense of ‘owner, possessor,’ cf. Wright-Dew, Arab. Gr. I. p. 265 f.; II. p. 293. With these genitive determinants are to be compared the Egyptian and Coptic genitive sign מ (cf. Erman, Ägypt. Gr., §§ 217—219, 547; Steind. Kopt. Gr., §§ 161—169), the Modern Persian Izafet (cf. Salemann and Shukovski, Persische Gr., Berlin, 1889, p. 30 ff., § 16), and the ligatures in the Philippine languages (cf. my Contrib. to Comp. Phil. Gram., JAOS, vol. XXVII, 1906, pp. 315 ff., 328—340; also my article The Tagalog Ligature and Analogies in other languages, JAOS, vol. XXIX, 1908, pp. 237—236).

2 In Coptic the preposition כis originally ‘together with’ is also used as genitive determinant, cf. Steind. op. cit. p. 80.

3 The element לָ כ is identical with Ethiopic לָ כ, which is used with suffixes to form possessives, cf. Brock. Comp. Gr. p. 315, § 106 f.
the preceding noun. Assyrian șa has a plural šüt; Ethiopic ḫ has the feminine ḫ��t : ḫɛnta and plural /lists : ḫ̂la; Min. 3, fem. ˱ and pl. ˱li : 'li; Meh. da, de, ˱t, a plural la, le. In Assyrian and Ethiopic, however, șa and ḫ are ordinarily employed without regard to the gender or number of the preceding noun. In Syria, in Egypt, in Jerusalem ˱šibyt may have the forms, fem. ˱mât̂et, ˱mât̂et; pl. ˱sùwât, ˱sùwât (cf. under Nominal Qualification below).}

The following determinants are proclitic, being written as one word with their noun, viz., Eth. șa, 'em; Amh. șa; Ta. nê; Arab. li; Heb. le; Aram. le, de. The others stand as a separate word before their noun, the some of these, e. g., Mod. Arab. de, are certainly proclitic. In Assyrian and Classical Arabic the noun has the genitive ending, in the other languages the form is the same as the nominative, e. g.,

Eth. ḫ̂ła : șa-bêtèsî 'of the man.'
Heb. ḫ̂lī : șa 'of the king.'
Ass. șa amêli 'of the man.'
Arab. ˱l-malîk 'of the king.'
Mod. Arab. ˱l-bînt 'of the girl.'

For the various uses of these genitive determinants see the discussion of the noun modified by prepositional phrases below under Nominal Qualification.

The accusative is in many languages without special determining sign. The signs that have been developed are as follows, viz.,

Amh. -1, -n²
Meh. ta, te²
Heb. ṅ̂
Ph. ṅ̂
Syr.
Man.
Bab. Tal.

1 Similarly Egyptian ṅ is varied for gender and case, viz., f. at, pl. m. ṅ̂, pl. f. ṅ̂; cf. Erman, op. et loc. cit.
³ Cf. Jahn, Meh. Gr. p. 70; under just what circumstances it is employed does not appear.
Mod. Syr.  
Bib. Aram.  
Mal.  
Ch.  
Jew.  
Pal.  
Sax.  
Sam.  

These are regularly employed only with a definite object, an indefinite regularly stands without them. They are of three sorts, viz.,

a) Amb. -n, which is enclitic and is written as one word with the noun; after a noun ending in a consonant it develops an e before the n, or perhaps becomes an n vowel; e. g., ː lējōn 'filium.' It stands after the definite article and possessive suffixes, but precedes all other enclitics, e. g.,

ː lējōn n 'the son.'
ː sēl-lūn n 'the lady.'
ː lējōn n 'my son.'
ː sēl-lūn m 'and the lady.'

b) Aram. ls; this is proclitic and is written as one word with its noun. It is of course simply the dative preposition; the dative has encroached here upon the domain of the accusative just as it has in Modern Spanish.

c) Heb. rū, Phen. ūw, Aram. r, Meh. to, te; these particles are all derived from a noun meaning 'essence, substance,' and stand, in most cases probably as proclitics, before the noun; the Hebrew form īw is connected with the noun by Maqepheph. e. g.,

Heb. ː qēlōn rū ː qēlōn rū 'cecum.'

Sam. ː kēlōn r ː kēlōn r 'cecum.'

In Biblical Hebrew there are a few late passages in which īw is used before a nominative, e. g.,

---

1 Here objects denoting persons or animals are placed after the preposition ː to,' while those denoting things without, life are governed directly, e. g., edifico la casa 'he builds the house;' conozco a este hombre 'I know this man.' Cf. W. L. Knapp, A Grammar of the Modern Spanish Language. Boston, 1896, p. 374.

2 For the various forms of this particle and its distribution in the various languages, cf. Brock, Comp. Gr. pp. 313-315 (§106a-e).
and all of them were brave men (Jud. 20, 44, 46)"

and in Post-Biblical Hebrew, Christian and Jewish Palestinian, and Samaritan א, א + suffix has become a regular demonstrative pronoun which may stand before a noun in any case (cf. pp. 148, 175).

The vocative has a special case determinant in a number of languages.

In Assyrian the noun without case ending is ordinarily employed as vocative, but an affirmative particle א appears sometimes to be employed as a case determinant, e.g.,

"igur 'oh wall'.

בבל־מה 'oh Bel'.

In Ethiopic a few words take the ending א, e.g., אשה : egzi-א 'oh God,' אנה : תосновא 'oh woman,' אפ : 'emma-א 'oh mother.' The words for 'mother' and 'father' have the special vocative forms אמ : 'emma, א : 'abא. The most usual vocative determinant is a prefixed interjection א-א, e.g., אנה : תосновא 'oh man.' The prefixed א- and suffixed א-א are perhaps identical. Sometimes they occur together with the same word e.g., אנה : תopensource 'oh woman.'

In Amharic an interjection אפ is placed after the word, e.g., אפ : שני 'oh son.'

In Tigrinya a suffix י, י, ק is added to the noun, e.g., ינות : סבחא-ק 'oh woman,' ישת : 'חנין-ק 'oh demon.' This element may be ultimately connected with the י ka of the second person.

In Tigre the interjection י : יאה may be placed after the noun, or the interjection י י may stand before it, e.g., יאוביעל : יא : רמך יאה 'oh master.'

In Arabic the words א and א 'father' and א 'mother' have special vocative forms, e.g., אא 'abati or 'abata; אעמא or 'ummata; and several classes of words may make a special vocative form by a shortening at the end, e.g., תובה, תובה from א , תובה תובהו (man's name). Usually the vocative is preceded by an interjectional particle. The most common

2 Cf. Prac. Tig. Spr. p. 235
4 Cf. Wright-DeG. Arab. Gr. II. pp. 87—89.
of these particles are: 'a, jā, 'ajā; 'a'ījūhā, jā 'ajūhā. After all the vocative particles except 'a, the noun stands without article. In Classical Arabic, aside from special vocative forms, the noun is in the nominative without nunciation unless it is indefinite and not addressed directly by the speaker, or unless it is modified by a following genitive, accusative, or prepositional phrase; in these cases it stands in the accusative, with nunciation, except when modified by a definite genitive. When no interjection is used these same rules apply. After 'a, the noun stands in the nominative with article. E. g.,

jā 'abati 'oh father.'

jā ra'ījā 'oh man.'

jā rajula 'oh some man or other.'

jā saajida 'l-ynhūṣi 'oh lord of the wild beasts.'

jā 'alīrā' a-jabala 'oh thou that art ascending a hill.'

jā harā' a-min sajidī 'oh thou that art better than Zaid.'

'ajūhā 'l-maliku 'oh king.'

In Modern Egyptian Arabic, and probably also in all the modern dialects jā is the ordinary vocative particle, e. g.,

jā ra'ījā 'oh man.'

jā sahidī 'oh (by) sir.'

jā 'a'būjā 'oh my father.'

The particle jā is used also before a vocative in Syriac, Mandaic, Modern Syriac, and Malulian. To what extent its use is due to Arabic influence is uncertain.

In Syriac the particles el, l; el, l; el, l; are also used before the noun as vocative determinants, e. g.,

el el el 'hēl el el el 'oh evil world.'

el el el el el el 'oh men.'

In Hebrew and in Western Aramaic the definite state of the noun is used as a vocative, e. g.,

Heb. ḫā'el 'oh king.'

Bib. Aram. ƙięl 'oh king.'

Jew. Pal. ƙeñe 'oh land.'

Sam. ƙeñe 'oh heavens.'
In Samaritan in later texts a special interjectional determinant [assembly] is employed with the definite state, e. g.,

דַּלֵּא הָא ‘oh king.’

With the exception of the article in Hebrew (tho this is not strictly speaking a vocative determinant) and Tigriña ḫē, lāē, all the vocative determinants are of an interjectional character.

The other case relations are all represented by prepositions properly so-called,⁴ and their combination with the noun depending on them offers little worthy of special remark.

In the case of certain compound prepositions in Amharic, the noun stands between the two parts of the preposition, e. g.,

አ፡፡አ፡፡አ፡፡አ፡ объя : ḥa-katämā-y fit ‘before the city.’

አ.setHorizontalAlignment="center" /عال : ḥa-dāngiē ḫāj ‘on a stone.’

アルバム : ḥa-kē : ḫa-drop : ḫa-bāhhr-n ḫāt ‘into the sea.’

Cases in which the preposition has become a postposition occur in Ethiopic and Amharic. ²

**Indetermination.**

The indefinite state of a noun is indicated, a) by the absolute state of a noun, b) by the mimmination or nunnation, c) by a special word or indefinite article. The first method is the rule in all the languages except Arabic and Mino-Sabean. Mimmination, the addition of a final ṣ, and nunnation, the addition of a final n, ¹ are used in Mino-Sabean and Arabic respectively to indicate that a noun is indefinite, e. g.,

Arab. مَلِك malīku, ←ia', 'a', 'king, a king.'

Min. بَيْت-م bīt-m 'house, a house.'

The nunnation is used in triptote proper names in Arabic, but without indefinite force, e. g., ʿaḏār ʿayādh 'Zaid.'

¹ For the most important of these prepositions cf. Brock. *Comp. Gr.* pp. 484–499.
² In this construction the noun is regarded as a genitive depending on the second part of the preposition, which functions as a noun, the genitive sign saida' being omitted according to rule, after the element of the preposition which stands first: cf. under Nominal Qualification below, and Pract. *Amh. Spr.* pp. 404–413.
⁴ The -m and -n are originally identical and are derived from the indefinite-interrogative particle mā (cf. Brock. *Comp. Gr.* pp. 472-473). This mā is perhaps ultimately identical with emphatic mād (cf. op. cit. p. 326).
In Modern Arabic the nunation has been lost, the bare stem indicating the indefinite state, e. g.,

\( \text{رجل} \) rajul 'man, a man.'

In some of the languages the numeral ‘one’ may be used in the sense of an indefinite article. This is common in certain dialects of the Aramaic and Abyssinian groups, e. g.,

Bib. Aram. [Unit of a letter' (Ex. 4, 8).

Syr.  [Unit of a man, a certain man.]

Mod. Syr. laš hā ‘a man, a certain man.’

Eth.  [Unit of a man, a certain man.]

Ta.  [Unit of a man, a certain man.]

Amb.  [Unit of a certain maid.]

It is found also in Modern Arabic. So in Egypt, Tripoli, Tlemcen, and Morocco. The numeral precedes, usually in the masculine form for both genders. In Tripoli, Tlemcen, and Morocco the definite article is used with the noun. Generally speaking ٦٥٧, uahad, uahad is used, but in Tlemcen had (c'ahad) is also employed, e. g.,

Eg.  [uahad melik 'a king.]

Tl.  [uahad er-rājel, a man.]

ωάεδαλραβαλ [vahderrājel, a woman.]

With this use of the definite in connection with the indefinite article is to be compared the use of Amharic ٦٥٥: with article when ‘one’ out of a number is meant, e. g.,

[And-th a number 'one (one of a number mentioned).]

In Biblical Hebrew this use of the numeral is rare; it may stand before its noun: e. g.,

\( \text{אֵשֶׁר} \) er ‘a broom-plant' (1 Ki. 19, 4).

\( \text{שָׁרִי} \) šari ‘a holy one' (Dan. 8, 13).

---

1 So in Coptic (cf. Stehnl. Kopt. Gr. p. 75 f), and in general in those Indo-European languages which have developed an indefinite article, e. g., Eng. a, an, Fr. un, une, etc.

2 As a cardinal numeral it follows its noun (cf. p. 201).

It is more common in the later language; the numeral regularly follows its noun; e. g.,

DHABA MAMINA 'a philosopher,'

HIKHAT 'a skull.'

In the Arabic dialect of Tangier in Morocco, the word šī (šaj 'thing') is used as well as ِعَبَد for the indefinite article; it stands before the noun, which is without article, e. g.,

شي دار ِعَبَد 'a house,'

شي خاجة ši ḥaja 'a matter.'

In Mesopotamian Arabic the indefinite article is expressed by the adjective ِفَرَد, fard derived from a stem ِفَرَد 'to be separated' (cf. Brock, Comp. Gr. p. 473; Weissbach, ZDMG, 58, p. 938).

The Ethiopic demonstrative ِهِنَّ: is sometimes used with the force of an indefinite article, e. g.,

ِهِنَّ: ِفِنَّم: ِزِكَعُ كواکعُ 'a rock, a certain rock

(Enoch, 88, 47 [Laurence]; 89, 29 [Martin]).

Some of these indefinite articles, e. g., Mesopotamian ِفَرَد and Tangier šī, may be employed with the plural in the sense of 'some' (cf. p. 188).

Simple Qualification.

Position.

The regular position of the descriptive adjective in primitive Semitic was probably after its substantive, as is shown by the fact that this is the normal position in nearly all of the Semitic languages; e. g.,

Ass. šarru dannu 'mighty king,'

Arab. ملک عظيم maliku' asimu' 'mighty king,'

Min. لولدم هشام 'uld-m hu'-m 'healthy children,'

Meh. ِجَجِن reheim 'handsome youth.'

1 Cf. Dill.-Benz. Äth Gr. p. 266.
2 In Egyptian the adjective likewise stands after its substantive; cf. Erman, Ägypt. Gr. p. 110. In Coptic it has the same position; but is usually connected with its noun in a sort of genitive relation, the noun standing in the construct, or the two being connected by the genitive sign ِن; cf. Steinh. Kopt. Gr. pp. 82, 83. In Indo-European the original position of the descriptive adjective, as of the demonstratives, cardinals, and attributive genitives, seems to have been before the noun; cf. Delbr. Verg. Syn. III. pp. 89, 91, 93, 94, 162. In the later development of many of the languages, however, postposition is frequent.
Heb. בָּלָהֶוֹ מִלְפָּה 'good king.'
Ph. אֶלְגָּנָא דְוַ-קְרִיפָה 'the) holy gods.'
Bib. Aram. בָּלָהֶוֹ מִלְפָּה 'great king.'
Sam. בָּלָהֶוֹ מִלְפָּה 'great people.'
Mal. הַמָּרָא קַפָּא 'good wine.'
Syr. اَلِوُيُومُ مِلَفُنُ قُنُفُ 'good king.'
Bab. Tal. نَزَّرَ اَلْهَا 'great man.'
Man. مَسْحٍ وُسُرُقُ 'righteous man.'
Mod. Syr. بَاْتُا غِرَادًا 'large house.'

Postposition of the adjective is practically without exception in Classical Arabic, Mineo-Sabean, Mehri, Hebrew, Phenician, and the Western Aramaic dialects, except Malulian.

In Assyrian, Modern Egyptian Arabic, Christian Palestinian, Malulian, and the Eastern Aramaic dialects, adjectives are sometimes placed before their noun. In Assyrian the adjective in this position has a stronger stress; in Egyptian Arabic the street-hawkers usually place first, as the most important thing, the adjective describing their wares, the interjection $jâ$ standing between the two, or before the combination; in Aramaic, preposition is especially common in adjectives of praise and blame, which form a sort of title; e.g.,

Ass. $sagâ$ $jâ$ $lê$ 'exalted Ishtar.'

Eg. Arab. $tâbûnâ$ ja 'ee 'oh oven-baked bread.'

Syr. $râmî$ $hâlû$ 'of the polished soul.'

Man. $yâ$ $nî$ 'the pure sign.'

Mod. Syr. $cêpâlî$ $lû$ 'a good tree.'

Mal. $yâ$ $qâlê$ 'a saint Mary.'

In Ethiopic and Tigre the position of the adjective has become almost entirely free, the in Ethiopian in ordinary discourse the original postposition is more common, e.g.,

Eth. $sâdâ$ $sâdâ$ 'good land.'

Te. $sâdâ$ $sâdâ$ 'old man.'

In Tigriña, while the position of the adjective is free as in
Ethiopic and Tigre, preposition is considerably more common than postposition, e. g.,

\[ \text{Aleb: } \text{TA: } \text{màbíjí } \text{gadal } \text{a great abyss.} \]

\[ \text{Am: } \text{Tl: } \text{saib ḥâf } \text{a sinful man.} \]

In Amharic preposition has become the rule, tho postposition is not infrequent when the noun has other modifiers besides the adjective, e. g.,

\[ \text{Am: } \text{TP: } \text{tálåq } \text{manâyaf } \text{a great trembling.} \]

\[ \text{Am: } \text{L: } \text{La-yof } \text{quend } \text{'ynatânâ } \text{a true vine (stalk of wine).} \]

\[ \text{Am: } \text{L: } \text{and say lêlå } \text{an (one) other man.} \]

Concord in Case.

An adjective regularly agrees with its noun in case, gender, number, and determination.

The concord of case is of course confined to those languages which have developed special case forms. Leaving aside those languages which are preserved only in purely consonantal texts, such as Mineo-Sabean, Moabite, etc., in which the existence or non-existence of case endings cannot be determined, these languages are Assyrian, Arabic, Ethiopic: e. g.,

\[ \text{Assyr. } \text{sa-rř } \text{dannu, sa-rř } \text{danni, sa-rř } \text{danu.} \]

\[ \text{Arab. } \text{ملخ عللم } \text{maliku" } \text{'agimu", } \text{-r-i", } \text{-a-a".} \]

\[ \text{Eth. } \text{Pm. } \text{L: } \text{medr } \text{sanâj, Pm. } \text{L: } \text{medra } \text{sanâja} \]

In Assyrian there are many instances of lack of concord in case, e. g.,

\[ \text{malik } \text{thari } \text{a just king (acc.)} \]

\[ \text{sadâ } \text{marçu } \text{the inaccessible mountain.} \]

In Arabic an adjective modifying a vocative expressed by the nominative may stand in either nominative or accusative, e. g.,

\[ \text{jâ } \text{zaidu } \text{[`l-aqîlu } \text{[`l-aqîla } \text{oh Zaid, the intelligent.} \]

Concord in Gender.

The concord of gender is practically without exception save in South Semitic. In many cases, however, a feminine noun has masculine forms, and in some cases a masculine noun has

1 The adjectives in Egyptian have concord of gender and number (cf. Erman, *Aegypt. Gr.* p. 119). In Coptic the adjectives are usually invariable (cf. Steind. *Kopt. Gr.* pp. 82, 84).

2 Cf. Del. *Ass. Gr.* §§165, 92. Some of these at any rate are probably due to the fact that the final vowels were not pronounced; cf. Brock. *Copt. Gr.* p. 114 (§ 43 r, 5), p. 199 (§ 245 k)
feminine forms, so that while there is concord in gender itself, there is not concord in the gender forms. In Modern Egyptian and Tunisian Arabic and in Modern Syriac, the masculine is the only form of the plural, and is used as a common form for both genders. e. g.,

Assyr. naru narratu 'bitter river (Persian Gulf).
Arab. يد عطية 'adu 'asimatu 'mighty hand.'
Syr. ἱππίνη Ἐρμηνία 'long road.'
Heb. יְרוּם רָאוֹ 'great city.'

Mod. Syr. نقد حمست 'ajurad 'shina 'hot springs.'
Eg. Arab. ٌسِّجْرَات عَالِمَيْنُ 'sagarat 'aliyn 'high trees.'

In Arabic, the broken plurals are regularly treated as feminine, but sometimes when the noun denotes male persons it may take a strong masculine plural, e. g.,

ابناء ماضون abdu 'madâna 'ancestors of old.'

In Mehri an adjective agreeing with a masculine plural denoting things may stand in the feminine singular (cf. below), e. g.,

tahat (eg. tahat m.) saltet 'dark rooms.'

In Ethiopic the concord of gender, except in the case of nouns denoting persons has practically been given up, e. g.,

 forsk.: wser.: or wser.: médr 'sanät or 'sanäjt 'good land.'

In Tigrina the rule for the concord of gender is about the same as in Ethiopic. In Amharic there is no distinction of gender in the plural, and in the singular, unless the noun takes the definite article, the masculine is regularly employed with nouns of both genders; in the case of those few adjectives which have a special feminine form, this feminine may be used, but it has an archaic and biblical flavor; when a feminine noun is determined it takes the special feminine article -itu. e. g.,

Ta. ṣer: ṣer: or ṣer: 'amat cebiq or cebiq 'good year.'
Amh. ṣer: šer: kofu sêt 'a bad woman.'

Concord in Number.

In general noun and adjective agree in number, but there are numerous exceptions.1

---

Nouns with a collective meaning often take a plural adjective in Assyrian, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Hebrew, e.g.,

Ass. ʾičsur ʾsanāh muttaprisātāt 'winged birds (of heaven).
Arab. Qumma ṣālimīna 'violent people.'
Eth. ʾibārā : ʾābār sab 'many people.'
Heb. ḫāṭāb ʾibārāh ṣālimīna 'the people that walk in darkness' (Is. 9. 1).

In Hebrew the amplificative plural regularly takes a singular attribute, e.g.,

חָיָה הelves 'a just God.'

In Arabic the broken plurals, being originally collectives of the feminine gender, regularly take the adjective in the feminine singular, in Modern Arabic sometimes the strong feminine plural: e.g.,

مدومن muddanāt kabīratan 'great cities.'
جبل عاليات jebal alaijîāt 'high mountains.'

Sometimes, however, an adjective agreeing with a broken plural takes itself a broken plural form, or, when the noun denotes persons, stands in the strong plural, e.g.,

رجل كبار rijālāt kibārīt 'great men.'
اباإ مَلَائِمābāʿ mâliʿān 'ancestors of old.'

In Modern Egyptian Arabic when a broken plural or a strong feminine plural denotes persons, an adjective agreeing with them is put in the masculine plural in in, e.g.,

سَقَارْطَ عَالَمَ qāyarāt alaijīn 'high trees.'
النَّسَوَانِ النَّبَوْيَينِ en-nisyān al-mawdūmin 'the invited ladies.'

In Mehri the plural of nouns indicating objects may take its adjective in the plural with concord of gender, but, except in case of masculine plurals in -n, and feminine plurals in -t and -ten, the adjective may also stand in the feminine singular, e.g.,

taḥāt (sg. taḥt) qalal (f.sg.) 'dark rooms.'
haqīqā (sg. f. jīl) haqīt (f.sg.) 'black clouds.'

In Ethiopic the concord of number has to a large extent been given up, except in the case of nouns denoting persons; even here instances occur of a singular adjective agreeing with a plural noun: e.g.,

חָיָה הelves ḫāṭān ṣābh 'many sinners,'

Plurals of nouns which do not denote persons (including broken plurals) may be treated either as singular or plural, as masculine or feminine, though a singular adjective agreeing with a plural noun has usually masculine form; e. g.,

**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** qálāt ‘abjāt ‘loud voices.’
**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** ta’āmrāt ‘abjān ‘great signs.’
**ṣaḥā:  ẖāṣa:** mājāt bəzūḥ ‘many waters.’
**ḥādā:** ẖāzāḥ bəzūhān ‘many people.’
**ḥāzā:** ẖāzāḥ bəzūhān ‘many people.’
**ḥāzā:** ẖāzāḥ ‘many people.’

Broken plurals of adjectives, as in Arabic, are most usually, though not always, found in connection with broken plurals of nouns, e. g.,

**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** ta’āmr ‘abjāt ‘great signs.’

but also,

**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** bərhānāt ‘abjāt ‘great lights.’

In Amharic an adjective modifying a plural noun may stand either in the singular or plural, though the plural is more common, e. g.,

**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** tālāq sayād ‘great men.’
**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** hājālān sayād ‘strong men.’
**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** ṣaḥālāt ‘mājālāt ‘sēlōc ‘old women.’
**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** bərtōc ‘ahzāb ‘strong nations.’
**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** tālāq sayād ‘great men.’

In Tigrina such an adjective stands regularly in the plural, though the singular is also sometimes found, e. g.,

**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** bezūhāt ‘amsāl ‘many parables.’
**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** qaṭānti (pl.) kəḏāynti ‘fine clothing.’
**ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** qaṭānti (sg.) kəḏāynti ‘white clothing.’

An adjective modifying a noun which is at the same time modified by a cardinal (above ‘one’) regularly stands in the plural, even when the noun is singular, in Ethiopic and Modern Egyptian Arabic. In Classical Arabic, with any numeral between 11 and 99, the adjective may agree either grammatically with the noun or logically with the cardinal. e. g.,

Eth. **ṭaḥāl:  qaṭāl:** qaṭānti (pl.) kəḏāynti ‘fine clothing.’

Eg. Arab. اربعة عشر كتاب طيبين `arbaḥtāser kitāb faṣṣībīn ‘fourteen good books.’
Cl. Arab. ناصية Merchon دنادرا 'isrāna dināra' ناصية 'twentieth dinars of el-Melek, en-Naṣīr.'

A dual, if we except certain isolated forms in Ethiopic and Aramaic, is found only in Arabic, Classical and Modern, Mino-Sabean, Mehri, and Hebrew. In Classical Arabic an adjective modifying a dual stands also in the dual form; in Hebrew and in Modern Arabic the adjective, having no dual, is put in the plural: e. g.,

Cl. Arab. رجلان صلحةن 'two good men.'

Eg. Arab. البابين السرايين el-baab' el-barrāniin 'the two outer doors.'

البيتين الكبار el-bêtēn el-kubār 'the two large houses.'

Heb. עיניים קמה 'haughty eyes.'

**Determination.**

In those languages that have developed a definite or indefinite form of the noun, the modifying adjective has in general the same form as the noun; so regularly in Arabic, Hebrew, and Western Aramaic except Malulan: e. g.,

Arab. ملك عظيم 'azīmu 'azīmu 'mighty king.'

الملك العظيم al-malik al-'azīmu 'the mighty king.'

Heb. ממלך יהוה 'good king', 'the good king.'

Bib. Aram. בר בר 'great king', 'the great king.'

Sam. בר בר בר 'great people', 'the great people.'

In Eastern Aramaic and Malulan, the ending ḍ has lost its definite force, noun and adjective with few exceptions agree in state; in Modern Syriac and Malulan the absolute state is

---

1 The feminine ناصية agrees according to rule with broken plural Merchon implied in 'isrāna (cf. p. 169).

2 Hommel does not definitely state whether the adjective in Mino-Sabean has a dual form or not; cf. Sud.-arab. Chr. pp. 42 f, 47; the dual of the noun occurs sometimes in connection with 'two' (cf. following footnote and p. 292 f.).

3 The Mehri dual is found only in connection with the numeral 'two' (cf. p. 203).

4 In Greek the article is used with both noun and adjective when the adjective follows the noun, e. g., ἅ ἄρστη ἄρστη 'the wise man,' the construction with one article before the combination of adjective + noun, viz., ἅ ἄρστη ἄρστη, is the rule (cf. W. W. Goodwin, *A Greek Grammar*, Boston, 1893, p. 208, § 959).
comparatively rare, and all distinction between the states has been lost; e.g.,

**Syr.**  

['rich man, the rich man']

**Bab. Tal.**  

'a high roof'

**Man.**  

'great man'

**Mod. Syr.**  

'great stone'

**Mal.**  

'brilliant sun'

Instances occur, however, in which there is lack of concord in state, e.g.,

**Syr.**  

'these three true witnesses.'

**Bab. Tal.**  

'we witness the seven fat cows.'

**Man.**  

'an evil man'

**Mod. Syr.**  

'honest people'

**Mal.**  

'good wine'

In Phenician the article may stand with both, or only with the attribute, e.g.,

' the holy gods.'

In some languages the article is used only once with the combination of noun and adjective.

This is found as an exceptional usage in Hebrew both Biblical and Post Biblical, the more frequent in the latter; in Biblical Hebrew cases occur in which the adjective (in most cases a participle) alone takes the article; in Post-Biblical Hebrew instances occur in which the article stands only with the adjective or only with the noun; e.g.,

**Bib.**  

' the higher gate' (Ezek. 9, 2).

' the sword that oppresses.'

1 In Coptic the article stands only with the noun, e.g., p-rôme n-sâbe 'the wise man' (cf. Steind. Kopt. Gr. p. 81). In Indo-European, the article generally stands first before adjective and noun. In Old Bulgarian and Lithuanian the article stands after the adjective, e.g., Old Bul. dobro-to sîno 'the good wine', Lith. perûs-is tâmagû 'the good man'; cf. above p. 148, n. 2. In Greek the article may stand with the adjective only, when this follows the noun, e.g., neû ὅ τοῦ ἄνδρος 'the wise man', cf. Goodwin, Greek Gram. p. 208, § 959.

Mish. 'the great synagogue.'

In Arabic, both Classical and Modern, an adjective modifying a definite vocative without article takes the article itself, e.g.,

Cl. ِیا ِقائسَقَ البدلَ 'oh thou unrighteous man, the apostate.'

Eg. ِیا ِبنتَ البدلة 'oh white maiden.'

In Egyptian Arabic, however, the article may be omitted, and the vocative particle ِیا used before the adjective in its stead, e.g.,

ِیا ِبنتَ ِبيدة ِیا ِبيدة ِیا ِبنتَ ِبيدة 'oh white maiden.'

In Egyptian Arabic a definite noun at the beginning of a sentence modified by an adjective, stands without article, e.g.,

جبلُ الأحمر gebel el-ahmar 'the red mountain'

but,

لَميزٌ المبل الأحمر nerruh el-geb el-ahmar 'we went to the red mountain.'

In the dialect of Tunis the article may be used only once before the combination of noun and adjective, tho this construction is rare, e.g.,

3رَكَّزَ مَيوةٌ er-râkîz myshâh 'the avaricious man.'

In Tigre, this last construction is the regular one; e.g.,

مَكَانُ : َّنَّو : لَّ-ِوُنَاسِ ِساجَّب 'the old man.'

مَكَانُ : َّيَذ : لَّ-ِساجَّب ِوُنَاس 'the old man.'

In Amharic the defining suffix is regularly used only with the adjective, e.g.,

مَلَّلَ : َّقُر : تَلاَقُ-ِأَنَز 'the great river.'

مَلَّلَ : َّقُر : تَلاَقُ-ِأَنَز 'the great city.'

When noun and adjective are both indeterminate the accusative -ِی may be omitted; it is, however, usually employed, in case the combination is singular, standing ordinarily with the noun, in case it is plural, standing ordinarily with the adjective: if one or the other is specially determined, the adjective by the ar-

1 The example given by Caussin de Perceval (Gr. Arab. Vol. p. 84).

2 This is the usual construction in Indo-European, cf. p. 165, n. 1.

2 Cf. the use of the article in Old Bulgarian and Lithuanian (cf. p. 165, n. 1); in these languages, however, the use of the article is confined to the adjective.
article, the noun by virtue of being a proper noun, or by a suffix, this element takes the 1: if both are specially determined, both take 1. These rules apply generally speaking to the combination of the noun with pronominal and numeral adjectives as well. e. g.,

\[\text{-heq} : \text{bértu maqṣaf-[n]} \text{'a severe plague'}\]
\[\text{heq} : \text{hání} \text{'}adis qēn-[n] \text{'a new song'}\]
\[\text{heq} : \text{hání} \text{'ingēd-[n] \text{'amulik} \text{'}strange gods'}\]
\[\text{heq} : \text{hání} \text{heḏu ìmīl-[n] \text{'the living God'}\]
\[\text{heq} : \text{qal} \text{'}śēτāč lēyōč-[n] \text{'thy female children'}\]
\[\text{qal} : \text{bēx} \text{'}adis-[n] \text{daj} \text{'the new wine'}\]
\[\text{qal} : \text{bēx} \text{'}bdōq-[n] bēt \text{'the great house'}\]
\[\text{qal} : \text{bēx} \text{'}rajm-[n] lēbs-yā-[n] \text{'her long dress'}\]
\[\text{qal} : \text{bēx} \text{'}adis-[n] sēm-[n] \text{'}my new name'}\]

In Hebrew and less frequently in Syriac, an adjective modifying a proper name is sometimes without article. This is a relic of the primitive period of Semitic when there was no article. e. g.,

Heb. \text{heq} \text{'}Great Sidon,' \text{heq} \text{'}The Great Deep,' \text{heq} \text{'}Upper Bethhoron,' \text{heq} \text{'}The Highest God.'

Syr. \text{qal} \text{'}First Tishri,' \text{qal} \text{'}Second Kanon.'

**Double Qualification.**

When the noun is modified by two adjectives, the adjectives are joined by the conjunction 'and' in Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, Syriac, and Ethiopic. In Amharic the conjunction seems to be used when the two adjectives stand in juxtaposition, otherwise not. In Hebrew, if the noun is feminine, only the first adjective agrees with it, the other being masculine; in Ethiopic and Amharic, the two adjectives are often separated by the noun they modify or some other word; in Amharic, when the noun is determinate, the sign of determination may stand with both adjectives or only with the first. e. g.,

2. Sanskrit, like Arabic, employs no conjunction in this case; in Greek and Latin, cases both with and without conjunction occur; cf. Delbr. *Verg. Syntax.* pp. 215, 218.
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Heb. יְהוָה יִשָּׁב הַגָּדוֹל מָזַח 'the great, good God.'

Bib. Aram. הַר הַדָּוָל שְׁבֵּה 'a great strong wind.'

Syr. 'al-hašš šešay yôšan 'a good, upright man.'

Eth. ṣəʕə 'a good, strong wind.'

Aram. ṣešay yôšan 'a great evil plague.'

Aram. 㴊 'he is a righteous and perfect man.'

Amh. ṣeśay yôšan 'the strong female lion.'

Eth. ṣešay yôšan 'the proud and delicate woman.'

In Arabic and Tigriña no conjunction is used; in Tigriña the noun often stands between the two adjectives as in Ethiopic and Amharic: e. g.,

Arab. الكوكب النجم الأحمر al-kaykabu an-najīru al-aḥmarnu 'the bright red star.'

Bismi 'l-rahmān 'l-rahim 'in the name of God, the compassionate, the merciful.'

Ta. ḥaṣ 'ḥatr ḥalā 'wicked, slothful servant.'

ḵә́ә 'much good work.'

In Assyrian, at least in elevated style, the noun is repeated with each adjective, e. g.,

ṣarru rabū. ṣarru ṣarru 'great, mighty king.'

Construct Chain.

Sometimes a noun and its adjective are joined together in a construct chain.

In Arabic and Hebrew the adjective may govern the noun, e. g.,

Arab. فعال jamīlu fīlika 'thy handsome behavior.'

Heb. יַסְכָּת הָאָמָן 'smooth stones' (1 Sam. 17:40).

In all the principal languages except Aramaic, viz. Assyrian, Arabic, Ethiopic, and Hebrew, the noun may govern the adjective; in Hebrew the adjective always stands in the masculine: e. g.,

With this is to be compared the Coptic construction of noun in construct + adjective. The more usual construction with ṣ is perhaps a development of this; inasmuch as ṣ is also the sign of the genitive. Cf. Steinm. Kopt. Gr. pp. 82, 83.
Ass. ašar ruqi ‘distant place.’
arrat limitti ‘the evil curse.’
Arab. نَبْتُ السَّمَكَ ‘the holy house, temple.’
Eth. ṣer : ṣer : majay ṣām ‘sweet water.’
Hob. ṣa ṣa ‘an evil woman.’

To be compared with this last case is the Amharic construction according to which certain adjectives are connected with the noun they modify by the genitive sign, e.g.,

אַדְמֶלֶךָ : אָדָם ‘Ja-kō-gi ‘Emēdēlēk (acc.) ‘the Cushite Ebedmelek.’

In Assyrian, Hebrew, Moabitic, Phoenician, Libyan, and Mehri, the demonstrative adjective stands regularly after the noun, e.g.,

Ass. šarru annu ‘this king.’
Hob. ṣa ṣa ‘this man.’
Mo. מָעָה ‘this high place.’
Ph. ןב ‘this stone.’
Lih. יָה ‘this house.’
Meh. jaij dōm ‘this man.’

In Post-Biblical Hebrew, however, the demonstratively used

אָדָם ‘that day.’

in the various Aramaic dialects its position varies. In the inscription of Zinjirli and in Samaritan it is postpositive, e.g.,

Zinj. יָה ‘this house.’
Sam. יָה ‘this land.’


In Biblical Aramaic it regularly follows, though in some passages, it also precedes, e. g.,

ןנה נני י方が 'that city,'

טוחט ינה 'this building' (Ez. 5, 4.).

In Syriac, Christian and Jewish Palestinian, and the dialect of the Babylonian Talmud, it may be indifferently either prepositive or postpositive, e. g.

Syr. לַאָן מָלֵא אֱלֹהִים 'this king.'

Jew. Pal. מְדַבֵּר בְּנֵי 'this occurrence.'

Bab. Tal. תַּקְוֵב 'this house.'

In Mandaic the rule is about the same as in Syriac, though preposition is more common; in Malulan usually, in Modern Syriac, always in the spoken language, and usually in the written, the demonstrative precedes its noun; postposition in the modern dialects is due to the influence of the Classical Syriac: e. g.,

Man. אלֶת אָלֶם 'that woman.'

Mal. ההד שְׂמִית 'this woman.'

hun-ah hammâ 'thy brother this.'

Mod. Syr. ℓוֹכֶד tê-hô gêdâ 'on that side.'

In all the South Semitic languages, except Libyanic and Mehri, the demonstrative is regularly prepositive, e. g.,

Arab. الطاحنا hâtnâ 'r-rajulu 'this man.'

Min. סְטִיר עֲשֶׂה 'on stîn this inscription.'

Eth. hêt: nûn 'sentâ bêstâ 'this man.'

Amh. stê: sâm 'dâ sêt 'that woman.'

Ta. yêt-kâhôh 'that star.'

Te. מָתַר: מָתַר 'elâ bâhâl 'this commandment.'

In Amharic preposition is apparently without exception. In Tigre it is without exception as far as the most common demonstrative א_vote: is concerned, but the less frequent א dhcp: 'that' stands after the noun, e. g.,

אָבָה: בָּלֶכֶת גלֶס lâ-ênâs lâhâj 'that man.'

אָבָה: אָלַד: לִנְעֹד lâ-pâld lâhâ 'that prayer.'

In Arabic and Ethiopic the demonstrative may follow the noun in the sense of an apposition or a locative adverb. In

1 This is true at least of the texts examined by Littmann, cf. Te. Pron. pp. 297-299.
Arabic a demonstrative modifying a proper noun has always this position. Postposition of a demonstrative sometimes also occurs in Mineo-Sabean, perhaps with a similar meaning. e.g.,

Arab. الرجل هذا ar-rajulu hādā 'the man here'.

Eth. vi7: hāl.0-0p1: vi7: hagara 'itábaséyôn záti 'the city of the Jebusites here'.

Min. مكسد نن 4h7d-n 4n 'this (?)'

In Modern Arabic, preposition of the demonstrative is regular except in the case of the monosyllabic forms without -ha, which regularly follow the noun; the demonstrative هذا hādā may follow a noun already modified by preceding هل hal: e.g.,

البيت ذلك el-bêt dāk 'that house.'

المدينة تل el-medîne dî 'this city.'

هل كتاب هذا hal kitâb hādā 'this book here.'

In the dialect of the Egyptian Fellahin and in some provincial cities the monosyllabic demonstratives regularly precede the noun with article, except dól, which always follows, e.g.,

الولد dâl-unnâd 'this boy.'

di'll-murar 'this woman.'

الناس dól 'these people.'

In the standard dialect this construction is preserved in the expression,

di'll-nagît 'this time, now.'

In the dialect of Tlemcen all the demonstratives, including the short forms, seem regularly to precede the noun, e.g.,

دا الرجل der-râjel 'this man.'

داك الرجل dâker-râjel 'that man.'

هذا الرجل hâder-râjel 'this man.'

In Tigrina the longer demonstratives may stand after a noun already modified by a preceding short demonstrative, e.g.,

:**khawākh:** 'ez-nagar 'ezîy 'this speech.'

**khm**: 'ez-nagar 'ezîy

It is difficult to say what was the position of the demonstrative in primitive Semitic. It seems most likely that both positions were allowable originally, and that after the separation of North and South Semitic, the former for the most part adopt-

---

1 In Egyptian the older demonstratives follow, the later ones precede, as the demonstratives do in Coptic; cf. Erman, Ägypt. Gr. pp. 86-92; Steind. Kopt. Gr. p. 45f. For the position of the demonstratives in Indo-European cf. p. 158, n. 2.
ed postposition, while preposition, in the main, prevailed in the latter. If this is true, the older Aramaic dialects represent most closely the status of the primitive language. When the demonstrative follows in Arabic and Ethiopic, it has a special meaning. In some of the modern dialects the law of the more ancient languages of the same group is reversed. The modern Aramaic dialects prefer preposition, while in Modern Arabic postposition of certain demonstratives is the regular rule. Modern Arabic and Tigrina have developed an emphatic demonstrative construction in which a noun may be modified by two demonstratives, one before and one after.\footnote{A similar construction is common in Tagalog, the most important of the languages of the Philippine Islands, viz., itö-ng dawo-ng itö 'this man.'}

**Concord.**

A demonstrative adjective regularly agrees with its noun in case, number, and gender.

Concord of case is confined to those languages which have case forms of the demonstratives, viz., Assyrian, Arabic, and Ethiopic, e. g.,

Ass. šaru annū 'this king.'
šarri annī 'of this king.'

Arab. هذان الرجلان hāšānī 'r-rajulānī 'these two men.'
هذين الرجلين hāšāni 'r-rajulāni (gen. and acc.)

Eth. ᵇᵘᶠ : ᵇᵃᶜ : zāntu gēbr 'this thing.'
ᵇᵘᵗ : ᵇᵃᶜ : zānta gēbra (acc.)

The concords of gender and number are practically without exception in all the languages except Arabic, Ethiopic, and Tigrina, e. g.,

Ass. šarrānī annūtī 'these kings.'
šarrātī annātī 'these queens.'

Heb. הַנַּ֣שָּׂ֑ה 'this woman.'
נַ֣שָּׂ֑ה 'these men.'

Bib. Aram. תי עְמֵ֣ר 'that city.'
יהָֽנָּה 'those men.'

Syr. مَلَكُ الْمَلَأِ urush 'these kings.'

Min. َه َن 'these regions.'

Meh. qanett dīmē 'this little girl.'
bijūt liēk 'those houses.'

In Arabic the plural of a demonstrative may stand with a strong masculine plural, or a strong feminine plural, a collect-
tive, or a broken plural that denotes persons; a strong feminine plural and a broken plural that denote things, regularly take the demonstrative in the feminine singular: e. g.,

الرجال " " 'r-rijalu 'these men,' 
الناس " " 'n-nāsu 'these people,' 
البنات " " 'l-banātu 'these girls,' 
هذة البلدان hādīhu 'l-mudānu 'these cities,' 
القلاع " " 'l-falayātu 'these deserts.'

In Modern Arabic the demonstrative is sometimes construed according to the sense; for example in Egyptian Arabic,

الناس دول en-nās dōl 'these people.'
الفجوات دي el-hujāt di 'these matters.'

In Ethiopic the demonstrative follows the same rules of agreement as the descriptive adjective, e. g.,

a) with nouns denoting persons,

\( \text{Nyf} : \text{ אל} : zēntū bāʾēsī 'this man.' \)
\( \text{Hy} : \text{ אל} : zātī bēʾēsit 'this woman.' \)
b) with nouns denoting things,

\( \text{Nyf} : \text{ גוד} : zēntū fērhat 'this fear.' \)
\( \text{Hy} : \text{ גוד} : wēʾētū qōlāt 'these voices.' \)
\( \text{ב} \text{ומ-גוז} : \text{ שתולא} : ba-uʾētū mawdīl 'in those days.' \)
\( \text{ב} \text{ומ-גוז} : \text{ שגדכ} : 'mānuṭu wajāt 'those waters.' \)
\( \text{ב} \text{ומ-גוז} : \text{ שגדכ} : 'ēllā raʾeqāt 'these visions.' \)

Tigrinya seems to follow in general the same rules of concord as Ethiopic.\(^1\)

**Determination.**

In parent Semitic, in all probability, a noun modified by a demonstrative adjective was determinate by that very fact, and needed no definite article. Assyrian, Ethiopic, and Tigrinya, which have not developed any definite article, represent this status, e. g.,

Ass. sarru annū 'this king.'

\( \text{םלני} : \text{ מל} : 'ālāni šumūṭi 'those cities.' \)

Eth. \( \text{Nyf} : \text{ אל} : zēntū bāʾēsī 'this man.' \)

Ta. \( \text{ב} \text{ומ-גוז} : \text{ מ} : 'ezāy sab 'this man.' \)

In those languages which possess a definite article, the combination of noun and demonstrative usually takes this article as an additional indication of definiteness.\(^2\)

---


\(^2\) In Egyptian and Coptic the demonstrative excludes the article (cf.
In Phenician the combination may stand without article as above, or the article may be used with the noun, e. g.,

1. רָפָע 'this stone.'
2. רְפָא 'this gate.'

In Amharic the combination may stand without further determination, or either the noun or the demonstrative may take the definite article, e. g.,

אא: קֹהֶל 'this boy.'
אא: יָרָדָה 'that inheritance.'
אא: זָה 'he is on this horse.'

The accusative 3 seems to be used either with the demonstrative alone or with both demonstrative and noun, e. g.,

אא: הוא 'these boys.'
אא: נֵגָע 'this thing.'
אא: יָרָדָה 'this Jordan.'

In Tigre the noun modified by the nearer demonstrative אא: stands without article, but with the more remote demonstrative אא: the noun takes the article, e. g.,

אא: אא 'this people.'
אא: אא: 'that prayer.'

In Arabic, Mineo-Sabean, Moabite, and Western Aramaic the noun stands regularly in the definite state, e. g.,

Arab. ﷽ ﷽ 'this man.'
Arab. ﷽ ﷽ 'this high place,'
Arab. ﷽ ﷽ 'this king.'
Jew. Pal. ﷽ ﷽ 'this occurrence.'

In Eastern Aramaic and Maluan, although the sign of determination has lost its definite force, the emphatic state, as the most common form, in Modern Syriac and Maluan as practically the only form, of the noun, is regularly employed in connection with a demonstrative, e. g.,

Syr. ﷽ ﷽ 'this king.'
Sometimes, however, in Syriac and Babylonian Talmudic especially, when the noun is also modified by a numeral, it may stand in the absolute state, e. g.,

Syr. שְׁאָר עַשְׁרִים "these four months."
Bab. Tal. בֶּלַש עַשְׁרִים "in these ten days."

שְׁאָר הַיָּמִים "this man."

The construction of the demonstrative without article with the definite noun, is found in a few cases in Biblical Hebrew chiefly with תָּה הָבָל and תָּה הָבָל, e. g.,

תָּה הָבָל "on that night."
תָּה הָבָל "that sacred prostitute."
תָּה הָבָל "this generation."

The regular construction, however, has the article with both noun and demonstrative, the demonstrative having been attracted to the construction of the descriptive adjective, e. g.,

תָּה הָבָל "this man."

In Post-Biblical Hebrew when a noun is modified by the nearer demonstrative תָּה, the article is omitted with both; instead of the more remote demonstrative תָּה, the accusative sign תָּה is used with the proper suffix before the noun with article: e. g.,

תָּה הָבָל "this plant."
תָּה הָבָל "that day."

This construction of תָּה is perhaps a survival of the primitive demonstrative usage as we have it in Assyrian, the Abyssinian languages, and Phenician, preserved by popular speech, just as the regular Mishnic relative כ, which is practically unknown in Classical Hebrew, is to be regarded as a survival of the כ which appears in the Hebrew of the Song of Deborah.

In Samaritan the noun stands in the emphatic state, and the demonstrative has in addition a prefixed demonstrative תָּה, e. g.,

תָּה מִי "this day."
תָּה מִי "this land."
תָּה מִי הֱעָלָה "these words."

2 This ת is not the Hebrew article the it is ultimately identical with it (cf. Brock. Comp. Gr. p. 316, § 107a). It is a demonstrative particle identical with the ת of Jewish Palestinian ת, ת and the כ, of Arabic אָבֶרֶד, which was employed in this and other cases in imitation of the Hebrew article. Cf. Uhlem. Isra. Sam. p. 116 f.
Demonstrative and Adjective.

When a demonstrative modifies a combination of noun and adjective it regularly stands outside of the combination, either before or after it according to the rules of the various languages, e.g.,

Ass. sarru rabā annū
Arab. ُهُذَا ِالمَلِكِ ِاَلْعَظِيمُ this great
Eth. ḤYP: ḤP*: ḪN.E.: zēntō nēgūs abīq king'
Heb. ָּךָּם יִשְׂרָאֵל ָּךְּלֵם this great
Syr. ِنُحَلَّة نُحَلَّة ِنِدَمُ ِنِدَمُ this great

In Amharic in this case only the adjective takes the determinative article, the even this may dispense with it. The accusative ֶָּמַלְיַּם may stand with both demonstrative and adjectival, e.g.,

Eth. ḤYP: ḤP*: ḪN.E.: ḪN.E.: ָּךָּם יִשְׂרָאֵל ָּךָּם יִשְׂרָאֵל ָּךְּלֵם this great power

Interrogative Qualification.

Adjectival.

A noun may be modified by the interrogative ideas expressed by 'which?,' 'what?,' 'whose?,' 'how much?,' 'how many?,' 'Which?' is expressed in most of the Semitic languages by the particle ָּהָי or some of its derivatives, viz.,

Ass. sg. ḥn, pl. ḥitti
Arab. masc.li 'aṭtā\textsuperscript{a}, fem. 'aṭtāt\textsuperscript{a}
Eg. Arab. ָּשֶׁנֶּחָו 'enhū, 'enihū, pl. 'enhum and li 'aṭtā, 'aṭtā'
Tun. Arab. sg. and pl. šna
Ti. Arab. ָּשָׁטַן 'asmen
Eth. sg. ḤN.E.: 'aṭ, pl. ḤN.E.: 'aṭāt

\footnote{1 In cases like Heb. ḤYP: ḤN.E.: ḪN.E.: 'aṭāt (2 Ch. 1, 10) the adjective modifies not simply the noun but the combination of noun and demonstrative 'this people of thine, the great people.' Cf. Ges. Heb. Gr. p. 427, n. 1.}

\footnote{2 In Palestinian Arabic the forms are in general the same as in Egyptian, but with numerous variations, cf. Bauer, Pal. Arab. p. 73.}
In Classical Arabic the feminine is little used, the masculine being the regular form before all nouns singular and plural. In Ethiopic the forms given are used only of things. The interrogative word regularly stands before its noun, and is treated as an adjective, except in Classical Arabic, and in the case of Egyptian Arabic یَا, where it takes the modified noun in the genitive. Egyptian Arabic مَعْلَى, مَعْلَى may follow their noun. The concords of gender and number are as indicated; Ethiopic has also concord of case. In those languages which distinguish definite and indefinite states, the noun is indefinite: in Christian Palestinian apparently either the emphatic or the absolute state may be used; in Eastern Aramaic the emphatic state as the most common form of the noun is regularly employed, the occasionally the absolute state is found in Syriac. e. g.,

Ass. ำ١ُ َ١١١ ‘which god?’

Eth. ำ١ُ : ى١١ِ ‘which hour’?

Ta. ى١١ِ : ى١١ِ ‘at what time?’

Te. ى١١ِ : ى١١ِ ‘which saying?’

Syr. ى١١ِ : ى١١ِ ‘which commandment?’

Mod. Syr. ى١١ِ : ى١١ِ ‘which spirit?’

Chr. Pal. ى١١ِ ‘which commandment?’

Heb. ى١١ِ ‘which way?’

Cl. Arab. ى١١ِ ‘which thing?’
Frank R. Blake.

The personal interrogatives are derived from a stem *man*, except in Hebrew and certain Modern Arabic dialects where they are formed from a stem *mi* cf. Brock. Comp. Gr. p. 326 f. (§110 c, d).
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Amb. erver: mān sayn ‘which man?’
Ta. erver: man manfas ‘which spirit?’

The neuter interrogative pronoun is used adjectively in most of the languages to express ‘what, what sort of?’ and sometimes also ‘which?’ The forms are, viz.,

Eth. erver: mūnt
Amb. erver: mēn
Ta. erver: mēntāj
Meh. erta: mēntāj
Te. ert: mi
Heb. nā
Syr. erta: mēntāj
Bab. Tal. nēm
Jew. Pal. nēm

Mān. nēm

Mod. Syr. erta: mūnt

In Amharic the same idea is also expressed by adjectives derived from the personal interrogative, which are, however, used with both persons and things. They agree with their noun in gender, viz.,
masc. erva: mānāchāy
fem. erva: mānāchājīṭū

These interrogatives regularly precede the noun. In Ethiopian there is concord of case, e.g.,

Eth. erva: mēnt ‘what reward?’
erva: mēnta sanāja ‘what good (acc.)’

Amb. erva: mēnta tēsāz ‘which order?’
erva: mēnta fērat ‘what sort of a creature?’
erva: mēnta negū ‘which king?’
erva: mēnta tēsāz ‘which commandment?’

Ta. erva: mēnta: bē-mēntājāl jīrān ‘by what power?’
Te. erva: mēnta: ‘by my parable’

Heb. erva: ‘what advantage?’
Syr. erva: ‘what punishment?’

Man. erva: ‘what power?’
Mod. Syr. erva: ‘to what city?’
Meh. da' hāṣan ṭāhan dā 'what dish is this?'
da' hāṣan jambījēt dī 'what dagger is this?'
da' hāṣan mījīr liē 'what mirrors are these?'

Possessive.

'Whose?' is expressed by treating the personal interrogative like a noun indicating the possessor.

In Arabic, both Classical and Modern, Ethiopic, Tigrina, Hebrew, Samaritan, and Mandaic the interrogative may form the nomen rectum of a construct chain, standing in the nominative form, e.g.,

Arab. bātu man 'whose house?'
Eth. ḏūt : ṣam bēta maunū 'whose cup?'
Heb. ẖān 'whose son?'
Mod. Pal. Arab. ḥiḥaṭ ṯānū 'whose cup?'
Man. ḥar bāt man 'whose daughter?'
Ta. ḫāt man 'whose son?'
Sam. ḥar bāt man 'whose daughter?'
Jew. Pal. ḥāt man 'whose son?'

In those languages which have developed a special preposition to indicate the genitive, the interrogative may stand after this preposition. The prepositional phrase usually follows the modified noun in all the languages except Amharic, where it regularly precedes. e.g.,

Eth. ḏūt : ṣam bēta maunū 'whose house?'
Amh. ḫāt : ṭānū 'whose son?'
Jew. Pal. ḥāt man 'whose daughter?'
Syr. ḫāt : ṭānū 'whose house?'
Mod. Syr. ḫāt : ṭānū 'whose ox?'
Meh. (da') ḥabīt da' man (dime rejeimet) 'whose daughter (is this pretty girl)?'

Quantitative.

The ideas 'how much,' 'how many?' are expressed in Arabic,

1 For this da' compare following n.
2 Just what this da' is which occurs at the beginning of interrogative sentences (cf. above) is uncertain. Jahn thinks it is a demonstrative (cf. Meh. Gr. p. 29). In this case this sentence would be literally 'this one, daughter of whom this pretty one.' So in the sentences above 'this, what sort of a dish is this?' etc.
3 With regard to the material available for the study of the expression of this idea, the same statement may be made as in the case of the indefinites; cf. p. 182, n. 2.
Classical and Modern, Hebrew, Syriac, and Mehri by the neuter interrogative combined with *ka* 'like.' To express 'how many' this combination is placed directly before the noun, which stands in the plural in Hebrew and Syriac, in Arabic, Classical and Modern, in the singular, which singular is accusative in the Classical language. In Syriac the noun stands sometimes in the absolute, sometimes in the emphatic state, without difference of meaning. e. g.,

Heb. בֵּית הָאָרֶץ how many times?
Syr. بیت مالک 'how many wanton men?'
Arab. كم رجلا* how many men?*
Eg. Arab. كم بيت 'how many houses?'
Pal. كَم يُصَب 'akam bêda 'how many eggs?'
Meh. َکَم ُحُبَ (pl.) 'how many men?'

In the languages of the Abyssinian branch, Tigrinya and Tigre form similar words for this idea by prefixing a word meaning 'as, how' to interrogative elements, while Ethiopic and Amharic express this idea by words meaning 'measure' or the like, either with or without an interrogative element. viz.,

Eth. ይስ попу : nima[:a]n

أم. ሐጥት : sën't, ሁንጥት : ēsent

Tä. ኪንዳይ : ኩንዳይ

Te. ከበይ ም : akel'at, ከበይ ም : akel'mii

These words are used as adjectives before the noun, e. g.,

Eth. ይስ попу ኃ ያር : nima[:a]n 'anqet 'how many springs?'

Eth. ይስ попу ኃ ያር : nima[:a]n 'amaz'a (acc.) 'how many baskets?'

Amb. ሐጥት ጋ : sën't sau 'how many men?'

Amb. ሐጥት ጋ : sën't sayd 'how many years?'

1 In exclamations the genitive of the singular or broken plural is used after *κα*, e. g., *καμ* rajula* 'how many men' cf. Wright-DoG. Ar. Gr. II. p. 196.


3 Except in Amharic no statement as to the concord of these words is given by the grammars. In Amharic the noun stands in the singular; the only case in which it stands in the plural is the one here, given by Abbad. Dict. Lang. Amic. p. 187: in Ethiopic the noun seems to stand in the plural; in Tigrinya, in either singular or plural; in Tigre in the example given it stands in the singular.
Ta. בִּנְדָּא: ומְכֶ: 'קְנֵדַאי גָּבָתִּו (pl.) 'how many workers?'
בִּנְדָּא: זְמֵר: 'קְנֵדַאי 'זָּכָלָט (pl.) 'how many persons?'
בִּנְדָּא: שוֹדַת: 'קְנֵדַאי וֹרֵאלָט (sg.) 'how many days?'
Te. אַבּאָי: אַלְלָה: 'אַקְלַעִי 'גֶּנְגֶּרָה 'how much bread?'

Sometimes these expressions for 'how many?' are used also for 'how much?'

The idea of 'how much?' may also be expressed in some of the languages by the words just given followed by the noun governed by a preposition having a partitive force, e. g.

Arab. كم من المخبز 'كم مِن المَفْهُوم 'how much bread.'
Heb. (Mod.) מַעֲלָה יִשְׂרָאֵל 'how much bread?'

Indefinite Qualification.

A noun may be modified by various indefinite pronominal ideas indicating quantity, number, or sort. The principal ideas are, viz., all, every, each, no, some, any, a little, few, much, many, a certain, same, self, other, various, both, such, enough.

All, Every.

'All, every' is expressed in all the Semitic languages by pronouns derived from a root בָּלָל. In general the pronoun may stand in the construct state before the noun, or it may take a possessive suffix referring to the noun, and be placed either before or after the noun.

The first construction is found in Assyrian, Arabic, Classical and Modern, Mineo-Sabean, Tigrina, Hebrew, Moabite, and in all the dialects of Aramaic. It is rare in Tigrina; in Moabite, Phenician (?), and Biblical Aramaic it is the only construction found. In Modern Syriac, where the construct chain has been lost, the pronoun is rather to be considered an adjective than a nomen regens; here בָּלָל always means 'every.' In Syriac and Mandaic either absolute or emphatic state may be used after the pronoun without difference of meaning. In those langua-

1 No example occurs in Biblical Hebrew.
2 The material for the discussion of these important modifying ideas is exceedingly meager; in no Semitic grammar are they fully and satisfactorily treated.
3 Just what the constructions of Mehri כּוֹל, Malulian קָפַל are is not certain; cf. Jahn, Meh. Gr. p. 80; Parisot, Dial. Mal. p. 312.
4 In Egyptian אָל 'all, every' stands after the noun like an ordinary adjective. In Coptic כּוֹנֵנִי has the same construction; מָמ + suffix stands after the noun like בָּל + suffix; cf. Seindl. Kept. Gr. p. 84.
ges which distinguish between definite and indefinite nouns, the
pronoun followed by singular noun denotes ‘every’ when the
noun is indefinite, ‘all, whole’, when it is definite; on the Moabite
stone it occurs only with a definite noun (ll. 4 (bis), 11, 20, 24, 28);
in Syriac when the noun is not specially determined by a
possessive suffix, following genitive, etc. the pronoun denotes
‘every,’ e. g.,

Ass. kal mâlkê ‘all princes.’
Arab. كل مدينة kullu madinatî ‘every city.’
كل المدينة kullu ‘l-madinatî ‘all the city, the whole
city.’
كل البلدان kullu ‘l-muduni ‘all the cities.’

Ta. מִלִּי : מֶת : kuellê dôqi ‘every sick man.’
Heb. לְכָל ‘every city.’
дарקינא ‘all the city.’
(fields) לְכַל ‘all the men.’
Mo. כָל ‘all the people.’
ןְכָל ‘all the attackers.’
Ph. כָל ‘every offering.’
עם כָל ‘all people.’

Syr. κελ κλεφ ‘every city.’
κελ κλεφ ‘all possessions.’
κελ κλεφ ‘all believers.’

Bib. Aram. כל מלך ‘every king.’
מלך ‘the whole kingdom.’

Bab. Tal. כל ‘every slave.’
מלכ ‘all things.’

Mod. Syr. כָל kal nâša ‘every man.’

The second construction is found in Assyrian, Arabic, Ethiopic, Amharic, Tigriña, Hebrew, Syriac, Mandaic, Babylonian Talmudic, and Modern Syriac. In Ethiopic and Amharic it is the only, in Tigriña, the usual construction. In Assyrian, Ethiopic, Syriac, and Mandaic the pronoun may stand either before or after the noun. In Tigriña, Babylonian Talmudic, and Modern Syriac it regularly precedes, though some instances of postposition are found in Tigriña and Talmudic. In Arabic and Hebrew it always, in Amharic it almost always follows. The suffix of the pronoun usually agrees in gender and num-

ber with the noun, but in Ethiopic and Amharic the suffix of the masculine singular is most frequently used for both genders and numbers. In Arabic and Hebrew the noun is always definite, in Syriac and Mandaic, always in the emphatic state; in Amharic the noun may take the definite article. When the combination stands in the accusative, the modifier in Ethiopic has a special accusative form in the masculine singular; in Amharic, -3 is regularly used only with the noun, tho occasionally it is found with both. e.g.

Ass. matāti kalisiya ‘all lands.’
kalisiya matāti

Arab. al-maḏdinatu kulluhā ‘all the city.’
al-mudunnu kulluhā ‘all the cities.’
al-baitu kulluhu ‘the whole house.’
al-nāsu kulluhum ‘all mankind.’

Eth. ḫwā : ḫwā : kuellā bēṣṭ ‘every man, all men.’
ḥlū : ḫwā : bēṣṭ kuellā
ḵwā : ḫwā : kuellā mēdr ‘all the earth.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : mēdr kuellā

ḵwā : ḫwā : kuellomum nagaṣṭ ‘all (the) kings.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : nagaṣṭ kuellomum
ḵwā : ḫwā : kuellomu mangesṭ ‘every kingdom.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : kuellom cējāt ‘all (the) flowers.’

Ta. ḫwā : ḫwā : kuellā ‘ādi ‘every city.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : kuellom hēḏanāt ‘all children.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : kuellom aḥmilat ‘all plants.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : kuellom dējāt ‘all the sick.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : ḫwā : nābe ḫwā kuellā ‘in this whole land’ (Matt. 9, 27).

Amh. ḫwā : ḫwā : nagar hūlu ‘every thing.’
Ḵwā : ḫwā : mangesṭ hūlu ‘every kingdom.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : sēṭō hūlu ‘all the women.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : ‘agar-ittā hūlu ‘the whole city.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : nagar-n hūlu (acc.) ‘every thing.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : ālam-en hūlu-n (acc.) ‘the whole world.’

Heb. ḫwā : ḫwā : ‘all Israel.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : ‘all the city.’
ḵwā : ḫwā : ‘all the men.’

Syr. ḫwā : ḫwā : ‘all the city.’
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'all the men.'

Mod. Syr. *kullēh tajlá* 'the whole night.'

Bab. Tal. *bālālām ūltēmē* 'all the world.'

*Kullāh ērē* 'the whole earth.'

*Kallēh ērē* 'the entire city.'

In the Modern Arabic of Tlemcen and Tunis the article may be used with *kull* after a noun instead of a suffix, e.g.,

*الناس كل* *en-nūs ēl-kull* 'all the people.'

*البلاد كل* *el-blād ēl-kull* 'all the land.'

In Post-Biblical Hebrew the two constructions of *יל* are sometimes combined, e.g.,

*יל כל ימי* *yīl ēl yēmī* 'the whole day.'

*יל כל נחל* *yīl ēl nāḥāl* 'the whole field.'

Sometimes other words are employed with the same meaning and in the same constructions as *יל*; the most important of these are Assyrian *gimru, gabbu, Arabic جمِيع jamīn*. In Assyrian *gimru* is most commonly employed with a suffix after its noun, tho it may stand before the noun in the construct; *gabbu* regularly stands after, but rarely takes a suffix. e.g.,

*ilānī gimrasīn* 'all gods.'

*gimīr ilānī* 'all gods.'

*mātātī gabbu* 'all lands.'

*mātu gabbīsa* 'the whole land.'

In Arabic, both Classical and Modern, جمِيع (Eg. Arab. *jamīn*) has the same constructions as *كل*, e.g.,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cl.</th>
<th>jamīn 'tālānī</th>
<th>Mod.</th>
<th>jamīr el-tālām</th>
<th>'all the world.'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clausive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distributive idea of 'each, every, one by one, one after another' is expressed in many of the Semitic languages by repetition of the indefinite noun; in the Abyssinian languages this is comparatively rare, except in Amharic. In Syriac and Mandaic the noun most frequently stands in the absolute state, e.g.,

Cl. Arab. *kitābu* *kitābu* 'every book, one book after another.'

Eg. Arab. رنَال رياَل *rijāl rijāl* 'dollar by dollar.'

---

1 Said by Marçais to be common to all the dialects and not unknown in the classical language, cf. Arab. Tr. p. 178.
Heb. דָּבָי יָהוּ 'every day.'
Syr. ܐܒܝܠܐܒܝܠܐ 'every seven.'
Man. ܡܠܚܐܡܠܚܐ 'from time to time.'
Sam. ܒ耧ﹸܒ耧ﹸ 'city by city.'
Amh. ወንት : ወንት 'ʾlatʾ ʾlatʾ 'every day.'
Ta. ወንት : ወንት 'ʾlatʾ ʾlatʾ 'every day.'

Sometimes the two nouns are connected by a conjunction or a preposition. The most usual preposition is ב; the conjunction נ appears to be used only in Hebrew: e.g.,
Heb. דָּבָי יָהוּ 'every day.'
Syr. ܠܠܐܠܠܐ 'all generations.'
Man. ܒ耧ﹸܒ耧ﹸ 'from day to day.'

In Ethiopic and Tigrinya this idea is most commonly expressed by doubling the preposition on which the noun depends; in Ethiopic the prepositions that are chiefly so employed are נ 나- and נ זא-; in Tigrinya the chief reduplicated forms are ננ ננ 'babē-' or ננ ננ 'babē-' נננ נננ 'ba-nag' נננ נננ 'nabab'; in Amharic when the noun depends on the preposition נ, the whole combination is doubled: e.g.,
Eth. אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא 'sissā-na za-lala ʾlatē-na 'our food for every day.'
Ta. אֵלֶּא אֵלֶּא אֵלֶּא אֵלֶּא אֵלֶּא אֵלֶּא אֵלֶּא 'sissā-nā nānā-ʾlat-nā 'our food for every day.'

The indefinite idea of 'some, any' in many of the languages, probably in all, may be expressed simply by the indefinite noun, singular or plural, in certain constructions, e.g.,
Heb. יָדָו יָדָו 'I have some wine' (Jud. 19, 19).
סָרָקָר סָרָקָר 'and some men left some of it till the morning' (Ex. 16, 20).
אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּלֶּא אֵּleton ayeron 'is there any iniquity in my tongue?' (Job. 6, 30).
Arab. هل عندهك دراهم $	ext{حلا}^	ext{inda-ka} 	ext{درأهام}^	ext{darahim} + 'have you any money?'

Eth. אֲנָה, אָנָה + 'adays' + manā'el + 'after some days.'

In Assyrian and the Abyssinian languages (very rarely in Ethiopian), this idea may be expressed by pronominal adjectives identical with or derived from the interrogatives, viz.,

Ass. manman (in their various forms)

manma, aumma

aumma, aumma

Eth. אַלָּה, אָלָה: manmū, mēnt (usually with ל, ל, ה, µ added; manmū ordinarily takes ה, and mēnt,mēnt, viz., manmūhi, mēnthi)²

Amh. ከጎቻች: mānāča (and its feminine forms)

Ta. ፊን, ፋን: man, mentaż

Te. ፋን: manma

E.g.:—

Ass. ሰርሃ አምምስ + 'some king or other.'

Amh. ከጎቻች: ግትና ግትና mānāča qaadafaqānā + 'any plague.'

ጎቻች: ግትና: mānāqøntu najš + 'any soul.'

Ta. ከጎቻች: ከጎቻች: hagh- man + 'any strong man.'

Te. ከጎቻች: ከጎቻች: ከጎቻች: dib-manmā bêt + 'in any house.'

In Syriac the interrogative adjective + + personal pronoun of the 3. sg. is used as an adjective before or after the noun in the sense of 'any, any at all'; both the interrogative and the personal pronoun agree with the noun: e.g.,

ጎቻች ከጎቻች ከጎቻች 'about any matter at all.'

ጎቻች ከጎቻች 'any city at all.'

ጎቻች ከጎቻች + 'and any death.'

Special words for the idea of 'some, any' outside of the class just considered have been developed in some of the languages.

In Amharic ከጎቻች: 'andāč, ከጎቻች: 'andānd or ከጎቻች: 'andād, and ከጎቻች: 'agāle; in Tigriña ከጎቻች: and ከጎቻች: kēndāj; in Tigre ከጎቻች: gale, are used as adjectives in this sense; all the Amharic words except ከጎቻች: have a plural meaning and are employed with nouns in the plural, tho the singular may also be used; in Tigriña and Tigre the singular is apparently employed. e.g.,

Amh. ከጎቻች: ከጎቻች: 'andāč nagor + 'any opportunity.'

² Very rare in affirmative sentences.
In Arabic the noun بَعْضُ some vessels, بَعْضُ some people, بَعْضُ some days, بَعْضُ some evils are easier to bear than others.

In Hebrew the plural of the numeral יֵשׁ 'one' is sometimes used with a plural noun to express 'some', e. g., יֵשׁ 'some days' (Gen 27:44; 29:20).

In some Modern Arabic dialects the indefinite article may be used with a plural or collective in the sense of 'some' (of p. 158), e. g.,

Mesopotamian ِفرقُ أَوْلاَد فِرْقُ أَوْلاَد 'some children'.

Tangier ِقَوْمُ قَوْمُ 'some people'.

In Syriac ِكَلِّمَةُ ِكَلِّمَةُ is used as an adjective with either singular or plural nouns in the sense of 'some'; it may stand either before or after the noun, e. g.,

أَمْشَى أَمْشَى 'some men'.

نَبَتُنَّ نَبَتُنَّ 'some advantage'.

سَجَّرُ 'among some corpses that'.

Words meaning 'some' may in many cases be connected with the noun they modify by a partitive preposition, e. g.,

Amb. ِمُلْكُ الْمَلَائِكَةَ ِمُلْكُ الْمَلَائِكَةَ 'some of the people of the city'.

Ta. ِمَلْكُ الْمَلَائِكَةَ ِمَلْكُ الْمَلَائِكَةَ 'some of the Pharisees'.

Arab. بَعْضُ منِ النَّاسِ بَعْضُ منِ النَّاسِ 'some of the people'.

Syr. بَعْضُ مِنِ النَّاسِ بَعْضُ مِنِ النَّاسِ 'in some of the books'.

The partitive idea 'some of' with a definite noun may be

---

1 In Mehri ِفِرحُ is said to be used in this sense with a following plural, cf. Jahn, Meh. Gr. p. 30.

2 Compare with this the use of the plural of 'uno' in Spanish, e. g., ِعَلَّامَة ِعَلَّامَة 'some cakes'; cf. Knapp, Gram. of Med. Span. p. 159.
expressed by the proposition מ "from" used before the definite noun, rarely the indefinite, as a sort of partitive article like the French de. So in Arabic, Ethiopic, Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, Samaritan, Syriac, and Mandaic, e. g.

Arab. מ'ד-דדניר 'some of the denars.'
Eth. אמ 'ensēd 'some of the beasts.'
Heb. אמ 'qēb 'something difficult.'
Bib. Aram. אמ 'some of the elders of Israel' (Ex. 17,5).
Sam. אמ 'some of the blood of the sin-offering' (Lev. 5,9).
Syr. אמ 'some of his disciples.'
Man. אמ 'some of thy spirit.'

No.

The adjectival idea מ" is expressed in general by an indeterminate noun in connection with a negative, most usually with the negative meaning 'there is not,' e. g.,

Arab. מ" to מחוס "he had no way of escape.'
Heb. מ" to מחוס "there is no bread in the house.'
Bib. Ar. מ" to מחוס "you will have no part.'
Syr. מ" to מחוס "he is no god.'
Man. מ" to מחוס "there is no cure for him.'
Bab. Tal. מ" to מחוס "in a place where there is no man.'
Eth. מ" to מחוס 'alējā metā 'I have no husband.'
Amh. מ" to מחוס "b-ogar-ācyan yag jallam 'in our land there is no law.'
Ta. מ" to מחוס 'berhān-mā jallan 'ābār 'for there is no light there.'

In Assyrian and the Abyssinian dialects the idea of מ" is emphasized by the indefinite adjectives (cf. p. 187 above) in connection with a negative. In Ethiopic they usually have מ"—before them in addition to the other negative; in Tigrinā they may be preceded by מ"— e. g.,

\footnote{No examples are available in Amharic and Tigrinā; cf. Prat. Amh. Spr. p. 426 (§ 325a); Prat. Tigr. Spr. pp. 342, 344.}
Ass. ilu manaman ul... 'no god.'
šarru jaummu ul... 'no king.'

Eth. Ḃētā : Ṯḥ : 32 : 'tānuša mēntani gora ye shall not bear any burden.'

Hūw : Ḃ. Ṯḥ : Ṯḥ : ḫāla : kama 'i-wūna mēnta-ni bē obstacles that he should take no wife.'

Hūw : Ḃ. Ṯḥ : Ṯḥ : ḫāla : 'tēgbaru uāš-mēntani ḫaməd 'do no harm.'

The negative idea is sometimes emphasized by some other modifier of the noun. In Hebrew, the Western Aramaic dialects, and Ethiopian, such a modifier is בַּל, e. g.,

Heb. בַּל בֵּין לֶמֶנֵה יָד 'ye shall not eat of any tree of the garden.'

Bib. Aram. בַּל בֵּין מַקְּרֵה יָד 'no work shall be done.'

Jew. Pal. בַּל בֵּין לֶמֶנֵה יָד 'ye shall not eat of any tree.'

Sam. בַּל בֵּין לֶמֶנֵה יָד 'and no place was found for them.'

In Syriac stddef 'some' is used in a similar manner, e. g.,

| 'no advantage is in them.'
| 'no unclean thing comes into their mind.'

In Modern Syriac the idea of 'no' is regularly expressed by hic and ěn used as adjectives, in connection with a negative, e. g.,

| hic 'urhā la maŋa 'uŋa 'no road was found.'

| la mich ěn qenam 'from no person.'

A certain.

In a number of the languages the idea of 'a certain' as distinct from the simple indefinite idea 'a,' has special forms of expression.

In Arabic it may be expressed by the particle ـ after the indefinite noun, e. g.,
To be compared with this are the groups,

Ph. דק "a certain man."

Heb. יִרְאָה יִרְאָה "if he shows me anything (I will tell you" (Nu. 23, 3).

In Arabic the noun بّدُ "part" followed by the genitive of a plural or a collective may also be used in this sense, e.g., بّدُ "a certain one of the pupils."

In Ethiopic it is expressed by the word for 'man' or 'woman' in apposition to the noun, by the numeral 'one,' or by the adjective יִרְאָה: יִרְאָה, e. g., בִּלְבָּד: be'esi 'b'rąsit 'a certain Hebrew woman.'

The word יִרְאָה: יִרְאָה is used also in this meaning in Amharic and Tigrina. In Tigrina יִרְאָה: יִרְאָה 'one' may be employed in this sense, e. g.,

In Syriac it is expressed by בְּפֶלּ וֲשֶּׁ פֶלּ כְּ בְּ הפֶלּ כְּ בְּ 'a certain onmy.'

In the Babylonian Talmud it is expressed by the demonstrative יִרְאָה before the noun, e. g., יִרְאָה יִרְאָה "a certain man."

In Modern Syriac it is expressed by בְּפֶלּ וֲשֶּׁ פֶלּ כְּ בְּ הפֶלּ כְּ בְּ "at a certain time."

A Little, Few,

The ideas 'a little,' 'few' are expressed by the following words, viz.,

Ass. יִרְאָה: יִרְאָה, Mod. יִרְאָה: יִרְאָה 1

---

1 Some prefer to read יִרְאָה 'men' in the only passage in which this occurs, cf. Schroed., Phila. Spr. p. 166.

2 Cf. Praet. Arab. Spr. p. 130; Tig. Spr. p. 304 (n. 2); in the examples given it appears only as substantive; in Tigrina texts it occurs only once.

3 With this indefinite use of the demonstrative יִרְאָה is to be compared the use of the Ethiopic יִרְאָה: יִרְאָה as indefinite article (cf. p. 158).
The Assyrian, Arabic, Hebrew, and Syriac words may be inflected, tho the Syriac is usually employed without variation. The plurals of the Assyrian, Arabic, and Hebrew words used as adjectives denote 'few,' 'a little' is denoted by the singular of these adjectives; in Hebrew, however, most frequently by יָם יִשָּׁם in the construct before the noun. In those languages in which the word is employed without variation, it is used with both meanings. Ordinarily these words take the same position and construction as descriptive adjectives. The Aramaic words, however, have a tendency to precede the noun, and in Ethiopic and Tigrinya preposition is the rule. The Samaritan forms stand before the noun and are probably in the construct like Hebrew שָׁם. In some of the languages the words may be followed by the definite noun after a partitive preposition, e. g.,

Ass. itti uqu ici 'with few people,'

גָּבֶּהּ יִשָּׁמ 'few warriors,'

Arab. مَال قَمْل 'a little property,'

رَجَال قَمْل 'a few men,'

قَمْل مِن النَّاس 'qamal mina n-nasi 'a few people.'

Eth. רָמִית: hêdât mayâl 'a few days.'

Amh. תְּגִית: { תְּגִית: תְּגִית: 'few men.'

סְוָאָב: 'few men.'

Ta. נָטַע: 'a few fishes.'

חִוָּרָב: ma-êlti 'a few days.'

Heb. לַמָּע 'a little water,'

לַמָּע 'a little help,'

לַמָּע 'a few men,'

לַמָּע 'a little sun,'

לַמָּע 'a little comfort.'
The ideas 'much,' 'many' are expressed by the following words, viz.,

Ass. mádu
Arab. kāthiru: Mod. kāthār
Meh. mākūn (with sg. and pl.)
Eth. { bēzūh
Ta. Amh. bēzū, አይት : 'jég
Heb. ְבֵאוּ
Bib. Aram. ܡܥܳܥܳﭻ
Ch. Pal. ܡܥܳܥܳܥܳञ
Jew. Pal. ܡܥܳܥܳܥܳܐ
Syr. ܡܥܳܥܳܥܳܐ
Mod. Syr. ῥάβα
Man.

In Amharic, Christian Palestinian, Modern Syriac, and usually in Mandaic, the words are invariable, and in Syriac it may remain without inflexion. Where singular and plural forms are distinguished, the singular denote 'much,' the plural 'many.' These words have in most cases the position and construction of the descriptive adjective, but occasionally the Hebrew word precedes its noun, while in Aramaic there is a strong predilection for this position, and in Tigrina preposition is the rule. In some languages the words may be followed by a definite noun after a partitive preposition, e.g.,

Ass. šarrānì mádātu 'many kings.'
Arab. mālu kāthiru 'much property.'
    kilābu kāthirāna 'many dogs.'
    kāthiru mina 'kīlābi' 'many sinners.'
Eth. bēzūh bēzūhān 'many people.'
Ta. }<b>领导干部</b> haben 'many people.'
Amh. }<b>领导干部</b> geba 'much work.'
Heb. }<b>领导干部</b> 'many men.'
Syr. }<b>领导干部</b> 'many men.'
Bib. Aram. }<b>领导干部</b> 'many great gifts' (Dan. 2.48).
Jew. Pal. }<b>领导干部</b> 'much silver.'
Man. }<b>领导干部</b> 'much evil.'
Mod. Syr. }<b>领导干部</b> 'many years.'
In Arabic the idea of 'many a' is expressed by }<b>领导干部</b> followed by an indefinite substantive in the genitive, or followed by a suffix and the noun in the accusative; this suffix is usually -<b>领导干部</b>, but it may agree with the following noun: e.g.,
Ass. }<b>领导干部</b> rajuli 'many a noble man.'
Arab. }<b>领导干部</b> 'aharun' 'many a woman.'
Meh. }<b>领导干部</b> 'aharun' 'many a woman.'
Eth. }<b>领导干部</b> 'aharun' bared
Amh. }<b>领导干部</b> 'aharun' 'many men.'
Heb. }<b>领导干部</b>

'Other' is expressed by various adjectives, many from the stem }<b>领导干部</b>, which in Arabic and Hebrew have the sense of 'another' in the indefinite state, and that of 'the other' in the definite state, e.g.,
Ass. }<b>领导干部</b>
Arab. }<b>领导干部</b> 'aharun'
Meh. }<b>领导干部</b> 'aharun'
Eth. }<b>领导干部</b> 'aharun' 'aharun'
Amh. }<b>领导干部</b> 'aharun'
Heb. }<b>领导干部</b>
Bib. Aram. malikat 'aharu 'another king.'
Ch. Pal. malik 'the other king.'
Jew. Pal. malik 'the other king.'
Syr. malak 'other gods.'
Man. 'another man.'

These adjectives follow the construction of ordinary adjectives except in the case of Syriac, where it regularly precedes the noun, e.g.,

Arab. malik 'another king.'
Heb. 'the other man.'
Eth. man 'another man.'
Amh. lel 'another man.'
Syr. 'another parable.'

Various.

The idea of 'various, different kinds of' is sometimes expressed simply by repetition of the noun. So in Hebrew and some of the Aramaic dialects, in Hebrew and Samaritan the two nouns are connected by $\lambda$, in Syriac, Mandaic and Modern Syriac no connective is used; in Syriac and Mandaic the noun stands most frequently in the absolute state, e.g.,

Heb. 'different weights' (Deut. 25. 13).
Sam. 'different ephahs.'
Syr. 'with various tongues.'
Mod. Syr. rangä ranga 'various colors.'
Man. 'of various kinds.'

In Amharic this idea is usually expressed by the repetition of the adjectives $\lambda:\lambda$: a preposition is repeated before the second $\lambda:\lambda$: but stands only once before doubled $\lambda:\lambda$: The noun seems to stand usually in the singular, tho the plural also occurs, e.g.,

$\lambda:\lambda: \lambda:\lambda:$ 'lél̄a lél̄a 'various, different gods.'
$\lambda:\lambda: \lambda:\lambda:$ 'lél̄a lél̄a 'with various kinds of disease.'
Similarly in Syriac repeated דַּבֵּר (ḥabar), either with or without preceding preposition מִי (mi), may be used in this sense as an attribute of a plural noun, which it regularly follows, e. g.,

違うים 'various causes.'

In Arabic and Syriac special adjectives have been developed for this idea, viz.,

Arab. متغاليف 'various books.'
Syr. mutagājiru 'various times.'

the noun stands in the plural, e. g.,

In Arabic the idea may be expressed by انواع 'kinds' + the 

genitive, e. g.,

أنواع الفواكه 'various kinds of fruit.'

Both.

'Both' is expressed in various ways. In Assyrian it is indicated by קיללן, kilālān, kilālē used as an adjective after the noun, e. g.,

ינא יבאל קיללן 'on both sides.'

In Arabic it is expressed by the dual קלא in the construct before the dual of the noun with article, or it may stand after with the dual suffix, e. g.,

'both men.'

In a number of languages, perhaps in all, it may be expressed by the numeral 'two' + suffix in apposition either before or after the noun; in those languages which have a special definite form, as Hebrew, the noun takes the article: e. g.,

Ar. نال ، אִשָּׁה 'both his hands.'

Eth. כֹּל אַחֲרֵי 'both these children of mine.'

In many of the Semitic languages there is no special word for 'same,' the simple demonstratives having this meaning.
In those languages which have special emphatic particles, at least\(^1\) in Assyrian and Ethiopic\(^2\) (cf. Adverbial Qualification below), these particles may be used with the demonstratives or a pronominal suffix or its equivalent, to express this meaning; in Ethiopic this is especially frequent with \(\text{ḥ.s}\), which may also stand alone in this sense (cf. below): e.g.,

Ass. \(\text{ina šatti-ma šiáti} \) ‘in that very, same year.’

\(\text{ina ûmi-ša-ma} \) ‘on that same day.’

Eth. \(\text{ḥ.l} : \text{ḥ.ś} : \text{ḥ.ō} : \text{ḥ.ò} : \) \(\text{kiiâ-hâ-ma fênûta ūhauér̂u} \) ‘they go the same way.’

\(\text{ḥ.ś} : \text{ḥ.ū} : \text{ḥ.ò} \) \(\text{p̂ū̄p̂ūt̂} : \) \(\text{kiiâ-hâ kēma mašyart̂a} \) (acc.) ‘the same sacrifice.’

In some of the languages special constructions have been developed to express this idea, tho they often express rather ‘self’ than ‘same’.

In Ethiopic the emphatic pronouns formed by adding the suffixes to \(\text{ān} \) and \(\text{ḥ.s} \) may stand before a noun in the sense of ‘self, same,’ \(\text{ān} \) is used with a nominative, \(\text{ḥ.s} \) with an accusative; e. g.,

\(\text{ān} : \text{ḥ.ś} : \text{ḥ.ō} : \text{ḥ.ò} : \) \(\text{lulû-hâ fênût̂-omû} \) ‘their path itself.’

\(\text{ḥ.ś} : \text{ḥ.ū} : \text{ḥ.ò} : \) \(\text{kiiâ-hâ mēd̂ra} \) ‘the land itself.’

\(\text{ḥ.ū} : \text{ḥ.ò} : \text{ḥ.ò} : \) \(\text{kiiâ-hâ mən̂f̂aŝa} \) ‘the same spirit.’

In Arabic these ideas may be expressed by \(\text{dâl} \) ‘substance,’ \(\text{ نفس} \) ‘soul,’ or a similar word + suffix, standing as an appositive, or in a prepositional phrase introduced by \(\text{ب} \) after a definite noun, e. g.,

\(\text{الكتاب بذاته} \) \(\text{al-kitâbu bi-nātî-hi} \) ‘the book itself, the same book.’

\(\text{جاجد الرجل بنفسه} \) \(\text{jâla’ ṛ-raju lu bi-nâfsî-hi} \) (or \(\text{nâfsu-hi} \)) ‘the man himself came.’

The idea of ‘same’ is sometimes expressed by \(\text{ذك} \) or a similar word as \(\text{nomen regens} \) before the noun, or by the pronoun the 3. sg. standing in apposition to a noun modified by a demonstrative, e. g.,

\(\text{ذت الرجل} \) \(\text{ḥāt ṛ-raju lu} \) ‘the same man.’

\(\text{على ذلك الغدير} \) \(\text{alû Sâlika ‘l-qadri huna} \) ‘at the same distance.’

\(\text{ذئب الرجل} \) \(\text{ḥāt ṛ-raju lu} \) ‘the same man.’

In Biblical Hebrew in a few passages the noun \(\text{בע} \) ‘bone’ occurs in the construct before a definite noun in the sense of ‘same, self,’ e. g.,

\(^1\) \(\text{ḥ} \) is apparently not used in this way in Syriac (cf. below).

\(^2\) Cf. Ditt. \(\text{Lat. Aeth.} \) cols. 142, 722, 690, 699, 918, 919, 967.
Frank R. Blake.

... 'on the same day.'
... 'like the heaven itself.'

In one passage the plural of יָמָה is used for 'same,' viz., יָמִים 'the same words' (Gen. 11,1).

In Post-Biblical Hebrew יָמִים + suffix may stand as an apposition after a noun in the sense of 'self,' e.g., יָמִים תָּנוּ 'the fruit itself.'

In Post-Biblical Hebrew, Samaritan, and Christian and Jewish Palestinian, יָמִים or יָמִים = suffix is used before a definite noun in the sense of 'same' (cf. above p. 148).

In Western Aramaic, and in Post-Biblical Hebrew (here probably borrowed from Aramaic) a noun depending on a preposition may be given the added meaning of 'same' by the construction described p. 148 above.

In Syriac the idea of 'same' may be expressed by a repeated personal pronoun, independent or suffix, with מַצַּה between, used in apposition before the modified noun, e.g., מַצַּה יָמִים 'the same nature.'

לֵית מַצַּה יָמִים יַלְדוּ יַלְדוּ 'to his same disciple.'

מַצַּה יָמִים יַלְדוּ יַלְדוּ 'in that same wagon.'

The idea of 'self' in apposition to a noun is expressed by מַצַּה 'soul' or מַצַּה 'person' with suffix, e.g., מַצַּה הָאָדָם הָאָדָם 'the king himself.'

מַצַּה הָאָדָם הָאָדָם 'Fate itself.'

In Amharic יָמִים = 'master of the house' and יָמִים = 'head,' in Tigre יָמִים = 'soul,' + suffix, are used as appositives in the sense of 'self,' e.g.,

Amh. יָמִים : יָמִים : יָמִים 'their king, himself.'

Yi : Yi : Yi : Yi 'Jesus himself.'

To. Yi : Yi : Yi : Yi 'David himself.'

Such.

'Such' is ordinarily expressed by some combination of the particle קָ, או 'as, like,' and a demonstrative pronoun; the Ethiopic form is sometimes preceded by the relative, the Syriac...
form is regularly so preceded; in Amharic the idea may be expressed by a relative clause consisting of the adverb 'thus' + relative + verb 'to be'; generally speaking the word for 'such' may precede or follow; e. g.,

Arab. رجل كيدأ "rajuhe" ka-hâdā  
Eth. ṣâli: hâdâ kama-sé  
Aḥâ: hâdâm kama-sé  
Ta. ṣâli: hâdâm: sah kâmaxy  
Amh. ḥâkítə: ṣâli: ṣâli: "andēh jalla-u-n' māman (acc.)  
'such faith.'

Te. : ḥâlā tāhālā: ">
Heb. 'eb'akiiellī garār 'with such shrieks.'
Bib. Aram.  
Syr. ṣâli: hâdâm: sah kâmaxy  
'such pains.'
�_false28 Ātu  
'such oppressions.'

In Modern Syriac the old demonstratives ､ hâdā ､ hādāk and hâkha (prob. ､ + ､ = ṣâli) are used as adjectives before the noun in this meaning, e. g.,

hâdâ ､ hâdâ  'such people,
hâkha ､ hâdâ  'such signs.'

In Christian Palestinian the phrase ──────── 'of the kind (γένος) of these' is used as an adjective in this sense; is seems usually to precede its noun; e. g.,

'Enough.'

'Enough' is expressed in various ways; 2

In Arabic it is rendered by  "bi-l-kitābati 'in the sufficiency,' e. g.,

1 Cf. under Sentence Qualification below.
2 In Modern Syriac it is expressed by  used as an adjective after the noun (cf. Neld. Neus. Spr. p. 159); in Mohri by the verbal expression ḫesēdā 'it is enough' used attributively with the noun (cf. Jahn, Mehl. Gr. p. 121); in Syriac,  and  (?) mean 'enough', but they do not seem to be used attributively; in Ethiopic the idea may be expressed by a relative clause with the verb ḫâs : 'akhkāl 'to suffice;' (Harr.:  matam 'measure' + genitive also seems sometimes to have this meaning (cf. Dill. Lex. Aeth. col. 222); in Amharic the idea is expressed by ḫakhāq 'which suffices' used as an adjective (cf. Isenb. Amh. Dict. I, 89; II, 75.)
In Hebrew it is expressed by the noun נך 'sufficiency' in the construct before its noun, the most of the examples that occur in Biblical Hebrew mean 'enough for,' e.g.

נֶךְ נִנְשׁ 'enough for one sheep.'

סִפְרָא בֵּית נִנְשׁ 'enough goat's milk.'

(To be continued.)
Comparative Syntax of the Combinations formed by the Noun and its Modifiers in Semitic (Conclusion). — By FRANK R. BLAKE, Ph. D., Johns Hopkins University.

Numeral Qualification.

Construction of Cardinals.

The Semitic numerals from 'three' to 'ten' possessed originally the peculiarity that feminine forms were used with masculine nouns, and masculine forms with feminine nouns. This reversed concord is preserved in most of the Semitic languages, but in some either the feminine or the masculine forms have become the prevailing type. In Ethiopic, although the comparatively rare masculine forms are regularly used with feminine nouns, the feminine has become the usual form with all nouns, whatever the gender. In Tigrinya and Amharic these cardinals (including 'two') have only one form, which is in Tigrinya always feminine, in Amharic, feminine from 'two' to 'eight', 'nine' and 'ten' being masculine. In Modern Syriac as spoken in the lowlands, the masculine form has been entirely lost, though the two sets of forms are still preserved in the dialect of Kurdistan. In Modern Palestinian Arabic the feminine forms are giving way to the masculine. In Modern Egyptian Arabic the masculine and feminine forms are used without distinction of gender. In the dialect of Tenimken there seems to be only one series of forms, which are feminine, except 'one' 'two' and 'nine' which are masculine.


In Arabic the constructions of the cardinals may be divided into four classes.

a) 'one' is an adjective and follows the rules of position and agreement of other adjectives, e.g.,

\[ \text{رجل واحد} \]

'one man.'

'\text{اثنان} two' is also sometimes rarely used as an adjective with the dual, e.g.,

\[ \text{رجلان اثنان} \]

\[ \text{رجلان اثنان} \]

'\text{رجلان اثنان} two men,' but usually the dual alone is sufficient.

b) The numerals 'three' to 'ten' take the modified noun in the plural; they may stand after it like adjectives, or before it in the construct state. The plural is regularly a broken plural if there is one, and in preference a pluralis paucitatis. The numeral agrees with the gender of the singular, and not with the feminine gender of the broken plural. e.g.,

\[ \text{بنون ثلاثة banīna thalāthatu} \]

\[ \text{ثلاثة بنين} \]

'\text{ثلاثة بنين} three sons.'

\[ \text{ثلاثة بنات banītā} \]

\[ \text{ثلاثة بنات} \]

'\text{ثلاثة بنات} four daughters.'

\[ \text{ثلاثة رجال} \]

\[ \text{ثلاثة رجال} \]

'\text{ثلاثة رجال} three men.'

Contrary to the regular rule these numerals are followed by the genitive singular (in poetry sometimes by the genitive plural) of the word for 'hundred,' e.g.,

\[ \text{ثلاثون مئات thalāthu mi'ātī} \]

'\text{ثلاثون مئات} three hundred.'

c) The numbers from 'eleven' to 'ninety-nine' are followed by the noun in the accusative singular, e.g.,

\[ \text{ثلاثون رجل} \]

\[ \text{ثلاثون رجل} \]

'\text{ثلاثون رجل} thirty men.'

d) The 'hundreds' and 'thousands' are followed by the genitive singular, e.g.,

\[ \text{عشر مائة رجل} \]

\[ \text{عشر مائة رجل} \]

'\text{عشر مائة رجل} four hundred men.'

\[ \text{ألف رجل} \]

\[ \text{ألف رجل} \]

'\text{ألف رجل} a thousand men.'

In compound numerals the construction of the modified noun is that demanded by the preceding adjacent numeral; the noun, however, may be repeated with each numeral. The intermediate numbers above 'one hundred' may stand after the noun like the numerals from 'three' to 'ten,' e.g.,

\[ \text{اربعون سنة} \]

\[ \text{اربعون سنة} \]

'\text{اربعون سنة} 4741 years.'

\[ \text{الحادي} \]

\[ \text{الحادي} \]

'\text{الحادي} 3304 years.'
In rare instances we find an accusative plural for a genitive after the numerals ‘three’ to ‘ten’: an accusative plural for an accusative singular after the numerals ‘eleven’ to ‘ninety-nine’, an accusative singular or genitive plural after the ‘hundreds’ and ‘thousands’, e.g.:

خمسة أرواياُ 'hamsatu' 'athyaba' ‘five pieces of cloth.’

اثنَتِنِ عشَرَة إسْبَاطَ ithnataj 'asratu 'asbata’ ‘twelve tribes.’

مائتين عاماُ mi'atatni (acc.) ‘ama’ ‘two hundred years.’

ثالَاثَة سُنَينُ thalatha (acc.) mi'ati sinina ‘three hundred years.’

In Modern Arabic the constructions of the numerals are the same as in the Classical language except in the following cases.

When the numeral ‘two’ is employed with a noun the latter regularly stands in the plural, rarely in the dual, e.g.,

Eg. Arab. اثنين أولادَ ‘etnën władz ‘two children.’

اذنلاين بيوبث ‘etnên biyût ‘two houses.’

With the numerals from 2—10 the singular is sometimes found, e.g.,

Eg. Arab. ثلاثَة قرَشَ ‘telätî qirâs ‘three piastres.’

اربع عجَينَ ‘arbâ‘a ginêh ‘four pounds.’

Any numeral may be placed after the noun in apposition, when the meaning is definite, the noun in this case standing in the plural. For examples cf. p. 212 below.

In Mineo-Sabean the numerals seem regularly to precede their noun. After ‘two’ the noun seems to stand in the dual, after the numbers from 3—100 (exclusive), in either singular or plural; after ‘100,’ in the singular: the noun has in many cases the indefinite -m affixed. The numeral is probably sometimes in the construct, certainly so in the case of the forms of the ‘tens’ other than ‘twenty’ in ٠. e. g.,

एحَدُ ثَورَ ‘hd thuyr ‘one bull.’

ثنى مَليَنْيُ ‘thui mi‘înî (du.) ‘two watch posts.’
In Mehri the numerals from 'two' to 'ten' stand before the noun, which is regularly in the plural, tho the singular also occurs. The numerals from 'eleven' up take the noun after them in the singular, e. g.,

'rbêt yaiyêten (m. sg. yaiyâ) 'four baskets.'
'hôba ajêten (f. sg. aîn) 'seven eyes.'
'arôa 'sama' (sg.) 'four candles.'
'témantâsar hajûbit 'eighteen female-camels.'
'asrin qarš 'twenty dollars.'

The numeral 'two', however, ordinarily stands after the dual in -i, e. g.,

'qarši tru 'two dollars.'
'jûnîlî hît 'two sacks.'

In Hebrew 'one' is an adjective, e. g.,

'גס נל 'one man.'
'גס נל 'one woman.'

'Two' has been attracted to the construction of the numerals 'three' to 'ten' without, however, conforming to the reversed concord of gender. The numbers 'two' to 'ten' regularly take the object numbered in the plural; they may stand either before or after it as adjectives, or before it in the construct. e. g.,

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{םנפ} \, \text{םנפ} \\
\text{םנפ} \, \text{םנפ} \\
\text{םנפ} \, \text{םנפ} \\
\text{םנפ} \, \text{םנפ} \\
\end{array}
\]

'two men.'

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{םנפ} \, \text{םנפ} \\
\text{םנפ} \, \text{םנפ} \\
\text{םנפ} \, \text{םנפ} \\
\text{םנפ} \, \text{םנפ} \\
\end{array}
\]

'two women.'

* For the few cases in which the noun stands in the singular, cf. Ges. Heb. Gr. p. 454 (§ 184 e.).
The numbers from 'eleven' to 'nine-teen' usually take the plural, except with certain frequently counted nouns; the numeral regularly precedes, but sometimes also follows, especially in later texts: e.g.,

םננפ רֵעָה רָאָה 'eleven sons,'
דּוֹרְקַן רֵעָה מִשְׁנָה 'twelve bullocks,'
רֵעָה מִשְׁנָה לֶאֶל 'twelve rams' (Nu. 7, 87).

וֹי יְרָעֲה רָאָה 'eleven days.'

The 'tens' may stand before or after the noun, which is regularly plural except in the case of certain frequently counted nouns after the numeral, e.g.,

טִוְרִי נְמוֹץ 'forty cities,'
דִיוֹרְקַן תָּהָם 'twenty cubits,'
טִוְרִי לֶאֶל 'sixty rams,'
שִּׁטְף טִוְרִי 'thirty men.'

Numbers intermediate between the 'tens' take the noun after them in the singular, even when the unit immediately precedes the noun, or before them in the plural, e.g.,

אֶלֶךֶל הֶשְׁבָּל נְמוֹץ 'sixty two years' (Gen. 5, 20).
הֶשְׁבָּל נְמוֹץ הַצָלֵפָא 'thirty-eight years' (Deut. 2, 14).

גָלָל הֶשְׁבָּל נְמוֹץ 'sixty-two weeks' (Dan. 9, 26).

The various forms of the numerals 'hundred' and 'thousand' take the noun after them, sometimes in the singular, sometimes in the plural; all forms may stand in the absolute state,


1 These are סָמ day, נָב year, שָׁנ man, נִש person, נְכו tribe; גָלָל pillar, and less regularly in the singular, נָב cubit, שָׁנ month, יַע city, נָב shekel.

2 These nouns are in most cases the same as those mentioned in the case of the 'teens,' viz., נָב, שָׁנ, נָב, לֶאֶל, and נָב thousand, 3000 (a certain measure).

* The noun, however, sometimes precedes as, e.g., סָמ גָלָל גָלָל גָלָל 3000 sheep' (1 Sam. 25, 2).

* The nouns which stand in the singular are in general the same as those which are placed in the singular with the 'teens' and the nouns, viz., נָב, נָב, נָב, שָׁנ, לֶאֶל, and נָב foot soldier, נָב yoke, נָב talent; cf. Ges. Heb. Gr. p. 454 (§ 134 g).
and some forms of both 'hundred' and 'thousand' may stand in the construct: e. g.,

| דעְנֵא | 'a hundred years.' |
| דעְנֵא | 'a thousand men.' |
| שָׁלְשָׁא | 'six hundred men.' |
| שָׁלְשָׁא | 'two hundred (loaves of) bread.' |
| דעְנֵא | 'a hundred bunches of raisins.' |
| דעְנֵא | 'three hundred foxes.' |
| שָׁלְשָׁא | 'a thousand goats.' |
| שָׁלְשָׁא | 'six thousand camels.' |

Numerals intermediate between the 'hundreds' and 'thousands,' when they follow the noun take it in the plural, when they precede the noun, it takes the form required by the immediately preceding numeral, e. g.,

שָׁלְשָׁא יִרְבּוּ | '1290 days.'
כָּלְשָׁא | '666 talents of gold.'

In the compound numerals made by addition, excepting the 'teens,' the noun is often repeated with each numeral in the required form, as in Arabic, e. g.,

שָׁלְשָׁא יִרְבּוּ | '75 years.'
כָּלְשָׁא | '127 years.'

In Phenician the noun modified by the numeral usually stands before it in the plural, tho some cases occur in which it is found after it in the singular, e. g.,

עֶשֶׂ' לֶשֶׂ | (pl.) 'fourteen years.'
עֶשֶׂ | (pl.) 'one hundred pounds.'
(סֶג.) | (pl.) 'sixty years.'

In Jewish Palestinian and Samaritan 'one' is an adjective and follows the noun. The numerals 2—10 rarely stand before the noun in the construct, usually before or after the noun in apposition; the noun stands in the plural. In Pal-

1 The forms that may stand in the construct are the singular of 'hundred' and the plural of 'thousand,' viz., דעְנֵא and דעְנֵא: the form of the singular of 'thousand,' viz., שָׁלְשָׁא is indecisive, it may be either absolute or construct; probably one form was meant in some cases and the other in other cases. The other forms are always in the absolute, viz., שָׁלְשָׁא, שָׁלְשָׁא, שָׁלְשָׁא. The form שָׁלְשָׁא, however, is not used as a regular numeral, but only in the indefinite sense of 'thousands.'

2 This statement is made by Winer, Grunw. Chal., but all his examples in which the numeral follows are taken from Biblical Aramaic, cf. p. 111-
estian the higher numerals stand before the plural of the noun, tho they may be placed after in lists. In Samaritan the higher numerals stand before the noun, which is plural except in the case of certain nouns (about the same as those which stand in the singular with the 'teens' in Hebrew). In Samaritan the 'hundreds' and 'thousands' take the singular, e.g.,

Jew. Pal. שבעה ימים 'seven days.'
ששה עשר בנים 'fifteen sons.'
רביעי סמלצ 'forty sockets.'

Sam. שבעה ימים 'seven days.'
שבעה שנות 'ten years.'
שבעה עופות 'two bulls.'
שבעה בני 'two sons.'
שבעים ימי אים 'twelve men.'
שבעים עשר עצי חרוב 'seventy palm trees.'
שבעים אמות 'four hundred men.'

In Biblical Aramaic 'one' is an adjective and follows the noun, which stands in the singular, e.g.,

ידש 'one side.'

The numerals from 'three' to 'ten' take the noun in the plural, except, as in Arabic, in the case of המ 'hundred,' as in Arabic and Hebrew they may stand before or after the noun, before it usually in the construct state: e.g.,

שבעה ימים 'seven councillors.'
אפרים ארבעה ויתר 'the four winds of heaven.'
אפרים ארבעה 'three men.'
אפרים ארבעה 'four hundred.'
אפרים ארבעה 'ten kings.'

The higher numerals also take the noun in the plural, but stand without exception as adjectives after the noun. e.g.,

עשר ימים 'twelve months.'
עשרים ימים 'thirty days.'

אפרים ארבעים 'a hundred and twenty princes.'

The numerals are regularly used as adjectives in Syriac, Mandaic, Modern Syriac, and Malulan. In Syriac and Mandaic the numeral stands either before or after the noun, preposition being more common; in Modern Syriac and Malulan (apparently...
it always precedes. Except with 'one' the noun stands generally speaking in the plural; in Mandaic, however, some instances of the singular are found, and in Malulian the singular is perhaps as common as the plural. In Malulian the original absolute form of the noun seems to be regularly used; in Syriac the absolute state is often found, but the emphatic is just as common; in Mandaic, the emphatic state is the usual form; in Modern Syriac it is the only form used. e. g.,

Syr. מְלַחְיָהּ שְׁעִירִים מִגְּדֹלִים = מֵעַיְמָתָא שְׁעִירִים = מֶלֶכָּא שְׁעִירִים 18 kings.

Man. מְלַחְיָהּ שְׁעִירִים = מֶלֶכָּא שְׁעִירִים 'the two angels.'

Mal. מְלַחְיָהּ שְׁעִירִים '67 daughters.'

Mal. מְלַחְיָהּ שְׁעִירִים 'seven figures.'

Mod. Syr. מְלַחְיָהָא 'an hundred people.'

After compound numbers ending with 'one' in Syriac and Mandaic the singular may be used as well as the plural; e. g.,

Syr. מְלַחְיָהָא שְׁעִירִים = מֶלֶכָּא שְׁעִירִים = מֶלֶכָּא שְׁעִירִים 21 days.

Man. מְלוּכָא שְׁעִירִים 'in seventy-one years.'

The numeral 'thousand' is regularly followed in Mandaic by a genitive construction; in Syriac also it sometimes takes its noun after it; e. g.,

Man. מֶלֶכָּא שְׁעִירִים 'a thousand years.'

Syr. מְלוֹכָא שְׁעִירִים = מֶלֶכָּא שְׁעִירִים 'six thousand years.'

In Syriac the construct of the numeral is preserved in a few standing expressions, e. g.,

Syr. מְלוֹכָא שְׁעִירִים = מֶלֶכָּא שְׁעִירִים 'the ten cities, Dekapolis.'

Syr. מְלוֹכָא שְׁעִירִים = מֶלֶכָּא שְׁעִירִים 'the four winds.'

In the languages of the Abyssinian group also the adjectival construction has become the regular one. It is the only construction in Amharic and Tigrinya, and the usual one in Ethiopian. The numeral regularly precedes the noun in all three languages. The reversed concord of gender, as we have seen, has been given up, except in comparatively rare instances in Ethiopian. With the numerals from 'two' upwards the rules for the concord of number are as follows. In Ethiopian

---

1 According to Maclean, in Modern Syriac כַּשְׁעִירִים מֶלֶכָּא '10,000', and sometimes מֶלֶכָּא take a before their noun. cf. Verl. Syr. p. 67.
the noun stands most frequently in the singular though the plural may also be used; in Tigriña either singular or plural may be used without distinction; Amharic follows in general the rule of Tigriña, but with the numerals from 'hundred' upwards the singular is more common, and with the lower numerals, living beings stand somewhat more frequently in the plural, things somewhat more frequently in the singular. e. g.

Eth. ኣወርታ: መዓልቲ: ከስር: 'oארגታ ላለ-አልስታ አስገር 'thirteen cities.'

የሱት: እወል: ከስር: እርስት መእት ቦርሱት '100 sheep.'

ሆራት: የሱት: እወል: ከስር: እርስት መእት ቦርሱት '600 men.'

ልስ: እወል: 'ሬት ቦርሱት '1000 men.'

የና: ከስር: ከስር: ዋላስ 'አስገር 'three cities.'

Amh. ከግለት: እወል: ከስር: ከStroke 'two eyes.'

የሱት: ከስር: ከስር: ይሬት ሕቦታት 'two swords.'

ኩንት: እወል: ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ 'three women.'

ምት: እወል: ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ 'a hundred boys.'

Ta. ከስር: እወል: ከስር: ከስር: ከስር: ከስር: ዋላስ ዋላስ ዋላስ 'five sparrows.'

ልሱት: እወል: ከስር: ከስር: ከስር: ከስር: ከስር: ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ 'five birds.'

In Ethiopic and Amharic the numeral may stand after the noun in the enumeration of chapters, &c., e. g.

Eth. እርስት: ከስር: ቤት-ስመት 500 'in the year five hundred.'

Amh. ከስር: ከሱት: ከስር: በሉ ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ 'chapter one.'

Some relics of the ancient construction with numeral as nomen regens of a construct chain are found in Ethiopic in the case of those numerals which are without the suffix መ, e. g., ከስር: እወል: ዋላስ ዋላስ ዋላስ ዋላስ ዋላስ 'five men.'

ስቃው: ከሱት: ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋላስ ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ ዋልስ 'seven days.'

In Assyrian እወል may precede or follow its noun, ዋልስ regularly precedes: 'two' takes the plural: e. g., እወል ዋልስ 'one man.'

አሁ እወል 'one hero,'

ነአ ዋልስ ዋልስ 'in one day,'

ስ። ዋልስ ዋልስ 'two days.'

The constructions of the other numerals are not entirely clear, as they are usually not written out, but the following points seem to be certain.

a) The numerals may stand in the construct or as an adjective before a following plural, the reversed concord of gender being apparently observed, e. g.,
ana irditi šārē 'to the four winds.'
irdi naymade 'team of four.'
šēlātī ūmē 'three days.'
b) The numerals may follow the noun in the plural, the relation being apparently either adjectival or that of a construct chain; the reversed concord of gender is apparently not always observed: e. g.,
kibrāt irditi
kibrāt
kibrāt arba'i
kibrāti arba'i (genitive)
"the four regions."
c) The higher numerals seem to take the noun in the singular, e. g.,
10,000 qaštā '10,000 bows.'

In parent Semitic, therefore, the cardinals had in all probability the following constructions.

The first two were originally adjectives as is shown by their regular concord of gender. The remaining numerals might stand before the noun, governing it in a dependent case, or they might stand, before it or after it as an appositive or adjective.

The plural was probably always used whenever the noun preceded the numerals 'three' and upwards, or when it stood after them in the partitive genitive. The singular of the noun seems to have been used when the numeral governed the noun in the accusative, indicating that with respect to which the enumeration was made. Parent Semitic may have possessed a living dual like Arabic, in which case 'two' was probably not employed as a nominal modifier; but it is more

---

1 In Old Egyptian the cardinal ordinarily stands after the noun, which is usually in the plural; in the Pyramid texts the cardinal may stand in apposition before the noun; in New Egyptian the cardinal usually stands before the noun, to which it is joined by the genitive as; similarly in Coptic; cf. Ehrman, Ḥgypt. Gr. p. 130; Steind. Kōpt. Gr. pp. 88, 89. In Coptic the noun stands usually in the singular, as a special plural form is ordinarily not made, cf. Steind. op. cit. pp. 68–72.

In Indo-European the usual position of the numeral was before the noun (cf. p. 188, n. 2). Originally the numerals from 1–19 had the construction of adjectives, those from 20 up the construction of substantives; the adjectival construction gains on the substantive construction in the development of the individual languages; cf. Delbrück, Verg. Spr. I. pp. 521–536, espec. 522.
likely that originally 'two of anything' was indicated by the
numeral adjective following a noun in the plural.
In general the lower numbers seem to have preferred a
plural noun, the higher numbers, a singular noun.
The original status of the numerals has been best preserved
in Arabic and Hebrew, and many traces of it are found in
the other languages, but in the Aramaic and Ethiopic branches
the numerals have passed over more or less completely to an
adjectival construction. The common use of the genitive sin-
gular after the higher numbers, and the rare use of an accu-
sative plural after certain numbers which we find in Arabic,
are probably due to the mixing of the original constructions
with genitive plural and accusative singular.

**Determination of Cardinals.**

The combination of noun and cardinal is made definite in
those languages which distinguish between the definite and
indefinite states of a noun, by the use of the definite article.

In Classical Arabic when the article is applied to the 'teens'
it is used ordinarily only with the unit, tho it may stand
with both; when it is applied to the numbers intermediate
between the 'teens' it stands with both parts; when it is applied
to multiples of 'hundred', it stands before the unit: in Egyptian
Arabic it is used only once with the first part of a compound
numeral: e. g.,

**Cl.**

اثث-ثلاثة عشر - ath-thalāṭha 'aṣara 'the thirteen.'
ثلاثة عشر - 'aṣara 'the thirteen.'
سبعة والسبعون - as-sab'atu wa-sab'āna 'the seventy-
seven.'
ثلاثة عشر - ath-thalāṭha 'aṣara 'the three hundred.'

**Eg.**

الخمسة عشر - el-hamāstāsar 'the fifteen.'
الواحد وعشرين - el-wāhid wa-'ashūn 'the twenty-one.'

In Classical Arabic when the relation between the two is
adjectival, both take the article, e. g.,

الرجل الواحد - ar-raji'l al-wāhid 'the one man.'
الرجال الممتسة - ar-rijalu al-hamsatu 'the five men.'

When the two are joined in a construct chain, the article
stands usually only with the *nomen rectum*, the cases occur
in which it stands before the *regens*, in which case the com-
bination has become practically a compound, e. g.,

When the noun follows the numeral in the accusative, the article is used only with the numeral, e.g.,

السبعة والسبعون جملة
'seventy-seven camels.'

الثامنة عشر جملة
'thirteen camels.'

In Modern Arabic when the numeral precedes it alone takes the article; when the noun comes first the article is used with both; the first construction is the usual one: e.g.,

الكراسي العشرون
'the twenty chairs.'

البيوت الثلاثة وعشرين
'the thirty-three houses.'

القرص الستون
'the fifty piastres.'

الثمانية فضة
'eight piastres.'

الخمسة وعشرين حمار
'twenty-five asses.'

الاربعين صندوق
'the forty chests.'

الألف دينار
'the thousand dinars.'

In Minco-Sabean the definite -n seems to be used sometimes with the noun alone, sometimes with both noun and numeral, e.g.,

אربع עמים
'four cubits.'

אربع עמים ומשרטיים אסכול
'four and twenty images.'

In Hebrew the article is regularly used only with the noun, whatever the construction, e.g.,

'קְפִים חָשְׂנֵי
'five men' (Jud. 18, 7).

'קְפִים סֵנֵי
'thirty days.'

'קְפִים שַׁנִּים
'the three sons of Anak.'

'קְפִים שְּלֹשָׁה
'the ten shrines.'

The first cardinal usually takes the construction of a

1 This expression is translated simply 'four cubits' by Hommel, but the n of עמים seems to be the definite article.
descriptive adjective, tho in a number of cases it stands without article like the other cardinals, e.g.,

\[ \text{םיךָ יִין} \] 'the one sea.'
\[ \text{םיךָ שֶּׁכֶנֶּה} \] 'the one lamb.'

In Jewish Palestinian the definite state of the noun may be employed with the numeral, e.g.,

\[ \text{םיךְּרָאָרֵּבּ} \] 'the two rivers.'

In Amharic, as with the descriptive adjective, the cardinal alone takes the definite article; in the case of numerals compounded by multiplication the definite article stands only with the first. The accusative — כ is used according to the rule for descriptive adjectives (cf. p. 166 f.), e.g.,

\[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: סְבָאָטָא} \] 'the seven stars.'
\[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: עַנָּדָה: עַנָּדָה} \] 'the twelve soldiers.'
\[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: הָוָדָה: הָוָדָה} \] 'the four hundred men.'
\[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: גֶּזֶּכֶּכ} \] 'the two blasphemers.'

In Syriac and Ethiopic and apparently also in Assyrian the determination may be expressed by adding the suffix of the third person to the numeral. In Syriac the suffix is plural and agrees in gender with the noun; in Ethiopic the suffix may stand in the plural agreeing in gender with the noun, or in the masculine singular, e.g.,

Syr. \[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'these three views.'

Eth. \[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'the two worlds.'

Eth. \[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'the five kings.'

Eth. \[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'the three men.'

Eth. \[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'his two hands.'

Eth. \[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'the seven heavens.'

Eth. \[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'the nine tribes.'

Eth. \[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'the seven evil spirits.'

This construction is found also in Biblical Aramaic in one passage, viz.,

\[ \text{םיךְּטָא: יִסְדָּה: יִסְדָּה} \] 'these three men' (Dan. 3, 23).

Many of the Aramaic dialects have developed a special form of the numeral to indicate the determination; so in

2 The numerals above 'two' take an if before the suffixes just like a plural noun.
Christian and Jewish Palestinian, Modern Syriac, and to some extent also in Samaritan; in Mandaic, only the numeral 'two' has such a form. In Western Aramaic the modified noun has the definite form, e. g.,

Mod. Syr. مَتَّک أَرْبَعَةٍ یَدَوْنَ 'the two days, both days.'
Ch. Pal. مَرْسِلُ ۙاَمِّیل 'the four winds.'
Sam. مَرْسِلُ ۙاَمِّیل 'the five loaves.'

'arba'ntātā kālātē 'the four daughters in law.'

 sangatā 'the seven altars.'

Ordinals.

Special forms for the ordinals usually occur only for the first ten numerals, in Modern Syriac only for the first two. They are treated in general like ordinary adjectives in all the languages; in Assyrian they may stand either before or after the noun, and in the Abyssinian languages they regularly precede. In those languages which distinguish between the definite and indefinite state of nouns, the noun modified by the ordinal is regularly treated as definite. e. g.,

Ass. "ina šanti šaniti 'the second time.'
Arab. "ina šalik šam 'on the third day.'
Arab. al-ba'itu al-'awwalu 'the first house.'
Meh. "al-mar'atu al-'aslā 'the first woman.'
Hob. "gajen 'ollit 'the third boy.'
Eth. "bašal'hit 'at 'on the third day.'
Aml. "baštew : ūmat 'in the fourth year.'
Ta. "bārātanā-y : ūmat 'the tenth hour.'
Bib. Aram. "bēbāhā yāh 'the fourth beast.'


2 In Egyptian and Coptic the ordinals may stand either before or after the noun; in Coptic the two are joined by the genitive sign a; cf. Erman, Aggpt. Gr. p. 131; Steind. Kopt. Gr. p. 90.
Sam. דֶּבֶר מַהַשָּׁא 'the fifth son.'

Syr. láqiṭ ʿāmē 'the second day.'

Mod. Syr. مََُّ تُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُُﱡ ﻤَ ﻤَ "the first part."

In Modern Arabic, the masculine form of the ordinals may be followed by the genitive of their noun. In Classical Arabic أول 'first' has the same construction,² No article is used with the combination in Classical Arabic, and usually none in the Modern language. In Egyptian Arabic when the article is employed it stands before the ordinal, the whole combination being treated as one idea.³ e. g.,

Cl. أول بيت 'ayyalu baʾṭi 'the first house,'

Eg. أول مرة 'ayyal marra 'the first time.'

تُوَاَدَاَا مَرَّةَ تُوَاَدَاَا مَرَّةَ tānī nōba 'the second time.'

تُوَاَدَاَا مَرَّةَ تُوَاَدَاَا مَرَّةَ tālīt iʾām 'the third day.'

et-tālīt iʾām 'the third day.'

Sometimes in those languages which possess a special definite form of the noun, the article may be omitted either wholly or partly. So in Hebrew with the noun or with both noun and ordinal:² in Amharic with the ordinal; in Amharic the ordinal in this case stands very frequently after the noun. This omission is especially frequent in the enumeration of days, chapters, or the like. e. g.,

Heb. הבשׂשׂ שׂשׂ 'day second' (Gen. 1, 8). שׂשׂ שׂשׂ 'day the sixth' (Gen. 1, 31).

Amh.ונִּסְתָּנָדָא: וֹזַזְזָזְזָא qan 'on the third day.' וֹזַזְזָזְזָא: וֹזַזְזָזְזָא: מַרְדָּא זַזְזָזְזָא 'chapter ninth.'

The cardinals are frequently used for the ordinals, not only when the corresponding ordinal does not exist, but also often when the corresponding ordinal is in use. The cardinal may be used as an adjective, or it may stand in the genitive.

The first construction is found in Arabic, the Abyssinian languages, Hebrew, Jewish Palestinian, Samaritan, and Man¬daic. In Arabic the cardinal follows the noun; in Ethiopic and Hebrew it may precede or follow; in Samaritan the noun usually follows either in the absolute or the emphatic state;

¹ In Coptic likewise the first ordinal may stand in the construct before its noun; cf. Steinl. Kopt. Gr. p. 90.
² To be contrasted with this is the Amharic construction of the ordinal 'first' as genitive to its noun (cf. p. 217).
in Amharic, Tigrinya, and Mandaic the cardinal regularly precedes. The noun is usually in the singular, but in Mandaic and in a few cases in Amharic the plural is used. In Arabic the cardinal takes the article like an ordinal; in Hebrew the article appears to be used with the cardinal after the noun.  

 Arab. 

 al-baita l-qisra ‘the 20th house.’

 Eg. Arab. 

 el-bet el-hamastalar ‘the 15th house.’

 Eth. ba-amet va-asart u’amat ‘in the 110th year.’

 ‘ba-amat va-asart meret ‘in the year 1000.’

 Heb. ‘on the seventeenth day.’

 ‘on the forty-first day.’

 ‘on the twenty-first day.’

 ‘in the fourteenth year.’

 Sam. ‘on the seventeenth day.’

 ‘in the fortieth year.’

 ‘on the first day.’

 ‘on the fourth day.’

 Amh. ‘and ‘amet ‘in the eleventh year.’

 ‘on the twelfth day.’

 ‘ba-asrat haqel qan ‘at the eleventh hour.’

 Ta. ba-asart budde suvat ‘at the eleventh hour.’

 The construction with cardinal in the genitive is found in Arabic, Classical and Modern, Hebrew, Phoenician, Biblical Aramaic, Syriac, and Modern Syriac; no article is employed except sometimes in Hebrew: e. g.,


 2 In all the examples given by Nöld. Man. Gr. p. 841f., except this one, the numeral precedes and the noun has the plural form as in the second example. With this plural is to be compared the plural which is occasionally found in Amharic; cf. last example here and Pract. Amh. Spr. p. 329 (top).
Arab.  في سنة الف من الحجرة
Eg. Arab. عرفية ثلاثين
Heb. ב华南 ולאמ "in the third year."
Ph. "in the 14th year."
Bib. Aram. "until the second year."
Syr. "the second day."
Mod. Syr. "the second day."

In Hebrew in a few passages an ordinal with article is used in the genitive after a noun, the ordinal agreeing with the noun in gender. Here we have a mixing of the regular construction of the ordinal with the construction just described, e.g., תשייח תשע 'in the ninth year' (2 Ki. 17, 6).

Similar, tho not directly allied with this, is the Amharic construction by which the ordinal 'first' is placed in the genitive after its noun (cf. p. 169 above), e.g., אמא פטוי : שְׁלֹא : יא-סילותא-ע 'the first man.'

Nominal Qualification.

Construct Chain.

The representation of a genitive relation between two nouns by what is called a construct chain is one of the most characteristic and primitive features of Semitic speech. It is found in all the branches of the family but not to the same extent

---

1 In expressions in which the cardinals stand in the sense of ordinals after ב, e.g., יִשָּׁבָה בְּוָי יִשָּׁבָה in Gen. 1, 5; יִסְדַּבָּה בְּוָי 2 Chr. 29, 17, it is not impossible to consider the cardinal a genitive as here; but it is also possible to consider it an adjective as in the preceding case.

2 The construct chain is found also in Egyptian and Coptic. In Egyptian the relation between the two nouns is not so close as in Semitic, as they may be separated by other words; in Coptic this construction has in most cases given way to the one with genitive sign: cf. Erman, "gypt. Gr." p. 115; Steind. Kopt. Gr. pp. 79, 82, 83, 89, 90. It occurs moreover in Malay and Javanese; cf. A. Seidel, Prakt. Gram d. Malayischen Spr. (Hartleben) p. 19; H. Bohatta, Prakt. Gram d. Javanischen Spr. (Hartleben) p. 82.
in all. It is the regular rule in Arabic, Mineo-Sabean, and Hebrew; in Assyrian, Ethiopic, Amharic, Tigriña, Tigre, Phenician, and Aramaic, and in Modern Arabic and Mishnic Hebrew, it is more or less completely replaced by other constructions; in the Eastern Aramaic dialects the use of the construct is more restricted than in the Western, and in Malulan, Modern Syriac, and Amharic it has been practically lost, occurring only in a few standing expressions. The two words of the construct chain form one idea, and cannot be separated by another word except in certain special cases. The first word loses its primary accent, and usually suffers a modification in form. The second word stands logically in the genitive, but it is only in Assyrian and Arabic that it is also genitive in form; in the other languages it is the same as the nominative. In those languages which have developed a determinate form of the noun, this combination is made definite by using the second noun in this form; the first noun can never take the determinate form, except in certain cases in Arabic. In those languages which do not distinguish between definite and indefinite nouns (including the Eastern Aramaic dialects), the combination may be either definite or indefinite. When the combination is definite, both nouns are definite. It is not possible to combine an indefinite regens with a definite rectum


2 This is almost the only species of nominal compound known to Semitic, tho even here no real compound is formed save in exceptional cases (cf. pp. 211 ff., 219, 220; also Phil. *Stat. Con.* pp. 44–54; *Del. Ass. Gr.* p. 202 f.) A second kind of compound is found in Assyrian, and consists of noun + adjective, e. g. ḫep arīk ‘long-foot (a bird)’, ulptu rāpāu ‘great-hearted.’ These compounds are equivalent in meaning to adjective + noun in the genitive, such as rāpāu urai ‘far reaching of mind.’ Delitzsch explains the noun before the adjective as an accusative dependent on the adjective, e. g. ‘long with respect to foot’ (cf. *Ass. Gr.* p. 203), but it is not impossible that these formations may be possessive compounds like the Sanskrit bahuudhriha, viz., ‘having a long foot,’ etc. (cf. W. D. Whitney, *A Sanskrit Grammar* 3rd ed, Leipzig and Boston, 1896, pp. 501–511). With the paucity of nominal compounds in Semitic is to be contrasted the exuberance of such formations in the Indo-European languages, particularly in Sanskrit; cf. Delb. *Verg. Sym.* III. pp. 200–215, 217–229; Whitney, op. cit., pp. 485–515.

3 For cases in Hebrew in which the article seems to stand with a construct cf. *Ges. Heb. Gr.* pp. 431, 432 (§ 127 f., g).
or vice versa, these combinations must be effected with the help of the prepositional phrases described below (p. 225 ff.). e. g.,

Ass. 狒狒狒狒 'a house-door, the door of the house."

Arab. ⵍ завис 'alms, the door of the house.'

Min. עולם 'a king's daughter, a princess.

Eth. ממלכת 'bit mik-n 'the king's house.'

Ta. ימלכ 'yaqd qawwâq 'a, the king's son.'

Te. רכז 'yalad rabbi 'son of God.'

Hob. ש"ך 'a king's daughter.'

Ph. ש"ך 'the king's daughter.'

Bib. Aram. ה"ך 'a man's heart.'

Syr. א"ך 'false money.'

When the second noun of the chain is a proper name or a noun with a possessive suffix, the combination is necessarily definite, e. g.,

Hob. יְבִיק 'the son of David, David's son.'

Šebä 'the gods of my fathers.'

The second noun may also be made definite by a following definite genitive, e. g.,

Hob. יֵחֶש 'the days of the years of thy life.'

Arab. עלון 'alā qatl rasūli 'llâhi 'for killing the apostle of God.'

In Arabic an adjective modifying a definite noun, and hence with article, may stand in the construct before a noun indicating with respect to what, e. g.,

Ar-rasul al-maṣṣūn al-ωγέθ ος. 'The man of the beautiful countenance.'

Here, however, the combination ἡσανος 'l-ωγέθ ος.

1 The article legate, legate is regularly written as one word with the construct, tho of course it belongs to the second noun; cf. Lattm. Te. Prec. p. 800.

2 Strictly speaking the properties of adjectives and participles do not come under the head of the present discussion, but these points are added here for the sake of completeness.
is treated as if it were a simple adjective, taking the article according to rule after a definite noun.

An Arabic participle followed by a genitive may also take the article, e.g.,

القاتل الناس al-qātilu ‘n-nāsi ‘he who kills people.

This, however, is probably due to a mixture of constructions. A participle may take its object in either genitive or accusative, and before the accusative object, of course, the article is admissible with the participle, viz.,

(a) qātilu ‘n-nāsi (gen.)
(b) qātilu “n-nāsa (acc.)
(c) al-qātilu ‘n-nāsa (acc.)

The anomalous construction al-qātilu ‘n-nāsi is due to a confusion of (a) and (c).

In Modern Arabic and Tigre certain construct chains have come to be regarded as one word, and so may take the article before the first element, e.g.,

Eg. Arab. الساور el-mā-yard ‘the rose water.’
Te. 000א: 0ת :la-ba’āl-bēt ‘the master of the house.

Under ordinary circumstances a proper name can not stand as the first member of a construct chain, but in Arabic and Hebrew a genitive is sometimes added to a proper name in order to distinguish between persons, places, etc., with the same name, the proper name becoming, for the time being, common, e.g.,

Arab. ربيع الخرسان rabru ’l-farasa ‘Rabia of the horse.
حبارة ’n-nu’māna Hira (capital city) of Numan.

Heb. יבש הירמ א ‘Bethlehem in Judah.’

In Ethiopic and Syriac such expressions are regularly rendered by the circumlocution with the relative (cf. pp. 226, 230 f.).

In certain cases the two nouns of the construct chain do not stand in immediate juxtaposition.

In Arabic, Syriac, and Tigriña certain particles or parenthetical expressions may intervene between them; e.g.,

---

1 Cf. n. 2 of pag. 219.
2 Cf. also article which compound numerals p. 211.
4 In this case Coptic employs the genitive case sign -e, cf. p. 151, n. 2.
Arab. ان الشیة تسمع صوت والله ربه 'the sheep hears the voice, by God, of its master.'

Syr. هم آئسین بره اب ب و ب 'the sons, indeed, of Bala.'

'That they are the sons of the righteous.'

Ta. بومانسکین بسحاکین 'elijás 'in the spirit and in the power of Elias.'

In Ethiopic certain modifiers of the genitive, particularly the demonstratives and ככ may stand between genitive and construct. e. g.,

חַּ֬תְּם : מִשְׁמַר : מִשְׁמַר : חַּ֬תְּם : יְדֵה יְדֵה יְדֵה יְדֵה 'the door of that house.'

In: פְּלָשֶׁת : פְּלָשֶׁת : פְּלָשֶׁת : פְּלָשֶׁת : פְּלָשֶׁת 'the king of the whole land.'

When two nouns are modified by the same genitive it is possible to form a construct chain by placing the two nouns in the construct state connected by 'and' and following them with the genitive. In Ethiopic in this case only the second noun has the construct form, the first standing in the absolute; such a construction is, however, comparatively rare, a circumlocution being ordinarily employed. e. g.,

Arab. قطع الله يد ورجل من فعل هذا 'God cut off the hand and foot of this.'

Eth. יָדָא : מִשְׁמַר : מִשְׁמַר : יָדָא 'the tribes and people of Israel.'

Heb. בְּכֵן יָדָא 'the choicest and best of Lebanon.'

Syr. مَلَک مَلَک مَلَک مَلَک مَلَک 'those who write and read their own names.'

The circumlocutions which are usually employed to express this combination are of several kinds, viz.:

a) the genitive may be used with both nouns;

b) the genitive may be used with the first noun and the second noun take a suffix representing the genitive;

c) one of the other means of expressing the genitive may be employed (cf. pp. 225—238). e. g.,

a) Eth. יָדָא : מִשְׁמַר : מִשְׁמַר : יָדָא 'the tribes and people of Israel.'

b) Arab. צִבָּא צִבָּא צִבָּא צִבָּא 'Zaid's sword and spear.'
Eth. נָשָׁט : בַּעֲבָרָה : נָשָׁט : 'the tribes and people of
nagada' 'isrā'el va-hēṣb-ū | Israel.'
Heb. יֵשָׁבֶר וַעֲבָרָה לַעֲבָרָה : 'to the prayer and supplication
of thy servant.' (1 Ki. 8,28)

When one noun is modified by two genitives, the combina-
tion is quite frequently expressed by a construct chain, the
modified noun standing in the construct state and the two
other nouns following the genitive connected by 'and'; e. g.,
Ass. ēkal šamē u ērgiti 'the temple of heaven and earth,'
Arab. Sultan al-adār al-bahri 'Sultan of the land and sea.'
Heb. רֹאשׁ וְשָׁמְיָה רֹאשׁ 'the captains of thousands and
hundreds' (Nu. 31, 54).

Eth. אֶבַּטְנָה : יָבָטְנָה : וּפֶּה לָכָהוּ | 'the God of heaven and earth.'
'andāka samāj wa-mēdr'

This combination may also be expressed in several other
ways, viz.:

a) the nomen regens may be repeated before each genitive;
b) the nomen regens and the first of the modifying nouns may
form a construct chain, and the second stand after a par-
ticle indicating the genitive;
c) the genitive of both nouns may be indicated by such a
particle; e. g.,

a) Heb. נַעֲבָרָה יְרוּם נַעֲבָרָה לַעֲבָרָה 'the God of heaven and earth.'
b) Eth. אֵדְסֶה לַעֲבָרָה : נָשָׁט : אֵדְסֶה : 'the treasuries of the
mazāqībta dahār wa-zā-narî sun and moon.'
c) Ass. ilāni ša šamē u ērgiti 'the gods of heaven and earth.'

Eth. אָבָט : אָבָט : אָבָט : אָבָט : 'the shepherds of Lot
nālot za-lōt wa-zā-ābrām and Abraham.'

The plural of the idea expressed by a construct chain is
indicated sometimes by pluralizing the construct, sometimes by
pluralizing the genitive, and sometimes by pluralizing both,
e. g.,

Assyr. bit nakamāti 'treasure houses,'
abnā nisqiṭi 'precious stones.'

Eth. אֵדְסֶה : פָּדָה : אֵדְסֶה : אֵדְסֶה : 'arayîta mēdr 'wild animals (animals
of the land),'
םלט : יָבָט : יָבָט : יָבָט : יָבָט : 'aṣma gabayāt 'ribs (bones of the side),'
אָבָט : אָבָט : אָבָט : אָבָט : 'abāta krestijānāt churches (houses
of Christians).'
Heb. יִבְנֵי בֵּית "Benjamites."
תֹּבֵּ wk "families (fathers' houses)."
ָוֹדָוֹ כַּהַל "heroes of valor."
Syr. φιλοκροτοι ὀποιαὶ ἀφήματα "graves (houses of burial)."
καλλύματα μᾶς "words (daughters of the voice)."

When the nomen regens of a construct chain is logically modified by a possessive adjective idea, if the possessive suffix is used, it must stand with the rectum and not with the regens, e. g.,
Arab. كَسْيَنَّ فَضْتَهِ "his silver cup."
Eth. צִיבָתָהְוֹ בָּשָׁאתוֹ "thy field-instrument, weapon."
Te. ו-ל-ס : ל-7-ו "his disciples (children of his teaching)."
Heb. יִיָּד תְּרֶס "my holy mountain."
Jew. Pal. כְּעָלִי לְבָנָכִי "your enemies (possessors of enmity)."
Sam. הָוָה יִשָּׁרָה (ת suffix) "his right hand."

When the nomen regens is modified by a descriptive adjective the adjective stands after the rectum in Arabic, Hebrew, and Aramaic; in Ethiopic it may stand either before the regens or after the rectum. In Assyrian the adjective either precedes the regens, or the circumlocution with ָו is used. When the construct chain is definite, the adjective has the definite form in those languages which distinguish between definite and indefinite. e. g.,
Arab. بِنْتُ مَاكَمَ جِميِئة "a beautiful princess (king's daughter)."
בֵּית הָלַכָה הָעָם "the spacious palace (king's house)."
Heb. נְלֹלָה נְדָבָה "a great crown of gold."
םְרָשָׁה נְדָבָה "the great work of JHVH."
Bib. Aram. סְדֹר יָּשָׁבָה "the great temple."
Sam. הָוָה יִשָּׁרָה מֶלֶךְ מְנַשָּׁה "in the great law of thy truth (thy great and true law)."

1 In Coptic when the nomen regens of a genitive combination is modified by an adjective or another genitive, this additional modifier is added after the genitive sign ente, cf. Steind. Kopt. Gr. p. 81.
2 Altogether this passage, Ezra 5, 8 is usually translated ‘the temple of the great God,’ [so A. Bertholet, Die Bücher Ezra und Nehemia (Abl. XIX of Marti's Kürzer Handbi, zum AT.) Tübingen & Leipzig, 1902, p. 21] the similar phrase יִפְעָל יָּשָׁבָה "this temple" makes the connection of הָוָה with הָוָה not unlikely.
Eth. ḍəḻə: ḍəḻə: ḍəḻə: abīj ‘açađa yaīn’ ‘a great
vinyard (garden of wine).’

Ass. rapšāti matāti Nairī ‘the broad lands of Nairī.
Ambiguity sometimes arises in this construction from the fact
that the adjective may in many cases be referred to either
nomen regens or nomen rectum. In Classical Arabic ordinarily
no ambiguity is possible on account of the case endings; in
Modern Arabic and the other languages the ambiguity may
be prevented by using some circumlocution for the construct
chain (cf. pp. 225—238). These circumlocutions are employed
even in those languages which have the property of placing
the adjective before the construct, e. g.,

Cl. Arab. bābu baštīn kābirīn ‘a large
house-door.’
bābu baštīn kābirīn ‘a door of a
large house.’

Eg. Arab. bāb el-bēt el-kābir
bāb el-bēt el-kābir

Heb. bēt hašān ‘the door of the
house.’

Ass. ṣangū čīru ša Bēl ‘high-priest of Bēl.’
namčaru zaqtu ša epēš tāhāzi ‘the sharp battle-
sword.’

Eth. noːtː ḡaːntː ʁətː ba-čelat ‘āḇāj ‘on the great day of judgment.’
entu kuːnane

When the nomen regens is modified by a demonstrative, the
demonstrative has in general the same position as the adjec-
tive, tho in Ethiopic it stands more frequently before the
regens. The article required by the demonstrative is taken of-
course by the rectum; in Hebrew the demonstrative itself has
the article, as it has after a simple definite noun; on the
other hand the Samaritan demonstrative is without the prefixed
n. which it takes when modifying a simple noun, e. g.,

Arab. bāitu t-malīkī hāšā ‘this palace
(king’s house).’

بيت الملك هذا

Frank R. Blake, [1912]
Heb. הָלֹּס יָסְּפִּים, 'this good-for-nothing man (man of no account).'

Bib.Aram.הַמָּר יָסְּפִּים 'this temple (house of god).

Sam. חָיָם יָסְּפִּים 'this camp of God.'


**Prepositional Phrases.**

Case relations between nouns may also be denoted by prepositions, the noun and following prepositional phrase being often equivalent in meaning to a construct chain. These prepositional phrases, in the course of the development of the Semitic languages, have encroached more and more upon the domain of the construct chain, until in some of the modern dialects, viz., Amharic and Modern Syriac, they have driven it entirely from the field.

The principal prepositions that are used in this way are, viz.: a) prepositions derived from the relative pronouns; b) prepositions derived from nouns meaning property, possession and the like; c) prepositions indicating a dative; d) prepositions indicating a partitive genitive; e) other prepositions, which play a comparatively insignificant role.

These phrases are in many cases the exact equivalent of the genitive in a construct chain. This is true not only of those languages in which the construct chain is obsolete or obsolescent, but also to some extent in those languages in which it exists in full vigor. In these latter languages, however, they are usually employed only when for some reason the construct chain is awkward or inadmissible.

(a)

The first class of prepositions is found in Assyrian, Ethiopic, Amharic, Mineo-Sabean, Mehr, Phenician, and Aramaic.

[1] Cf. p. 218, n. 1. In Coptic the genitive sign n is employed not only to indicate a genitive but also to connect noun and attributive adjective, cardinal, or ordinal; cf. Steind. Kopt. Gr. pp. 88, 89, 90. Similarly the so-called ligatures in the Philippine languages are employed both in genitive and adjectival relations; cf. my article The Tagalog Ligature and Analogies in other Languages JAOS, vol. 1, c., 1906, pp. 297—331.
In Assyrian the relative ša + dependent noun may be employed as follows:

a) as the exact equivalent of the genitive in a construct chain, with or without suffix on the nomen regens, referring to the genitive, e. g.,

\[
\text{ina šilti ša Uramazda } \text{in the protection of Ahuramazda.}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mutu ša aššati} & \quad \text{the woman's husband;} \\
\text{mussu ša aššati} & \quad \text{the gods of heaven and earth.}
\end{align*}
\]

b) necessarily for the simple genitive when the nomen regens is modified by a possessive suffix, following adjective or other modifier, e. g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{andulla-šunu ša šalāme } & \text{'their safe protection (protection of safety).'} \\
\text{šangku šitu ša Bēl } & \text{'high-priest of Bel.'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{šarrāni kali-šunu ša Nairi } & \text{''all the kings of Nairi.'}
\end{align*}
\]

c) for emphasis at the beginning of a sentence with retrospective suffix on the following dependent noun, e. g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ša NN . . . . . . . . abīkta-šu aštakan } & \text{of so and so . . . . . I accomplished the defeat.'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ša maš Madaa mandatta-šunu amhur } & \text{of Media . . . . . I received the tribute.'}
\end{align*}
\]

In Ethiopic the relative pronoun is usually employed in the masculine form š.; the position of the phrase is entirely free, it may stand either before or after the modified noun, and it may be separated from it by other words.

These phrases may be used as the exact equivalent of the genitive in the construct chain, e. g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ša ša-nēguš } & \text{the king's son.'}
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{šat 'enta kuqanē } \text{the day of judgment.'}
\end{align*}
\]

Usually, however, they are employed when for one reason or another the construct chain is ambiguous or impossible, viz.: a) after proper names which cannot stand in the construct state, e. g.,

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ša ša-lēḥem za-ṣhūdā } & \text{Bethlehem in Judah.'}
\end{align*}
\]

b) after words ending in a long vowel that have no special construct form, and after an accusative, e. g.,
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when the nomen regens is modified by a suffix, or following adjective or other modifier, e. g.,

\[ \textit{dámé-ja zá-hádis sér-at \text{"my blood of the new covenant."}} \]

\[ \textit{ba-člat \text{"day of judgment."}} \]

\[ \textit{la-búl zá-abú-ka \text{"the Baal-altar of your father."}} \]

to avoid a long succession of construct states, e. g.,

\[ \textit{koła hagl zá-yalde-kî \text{"thy son's mandrakes."}} \]

d) when a noun is modified by more than one genitive; in this case the governing noun may stand in the construct before the first dependent noun, and the second may take H, or the governing noun may stand in the absolute form, both dependent nouns taking H: e. g.,

\[ \textit{mažúgbta dähaj yá-zú-yarh \text{"the treasuries of the sun and moon."}} \]

\[ \textit{na-čót yá-zú-a-brúm \text{"the herdsmen of Lot and Abram."}} \]

In Amharic the construction with the relative ɪa has completely replaced the construct chain. In the older texts the position of the phrase introduced by the relative is free, as in Ethiopic, but in the modern language its position is regularly before the noun, except with the genitives of geographical names modifying the name of a person, which may stand either before or after. In the modern language the relative phrase and its noun stand regularly in immediate juxtaposition, ordinarily no word except the enclitic particles ñ, ñ, being allowed to stand between them (cf., however, below). e. g.,

\[ \textit{ia-čágà lēj \text{"son of grace."}} \]

\[ \textit{ia-náčérét-ú-n iású-s-čn \text{"Jesus of Nazareth (acc.)."}} \]

\[ \textit{jású-s ia-náčérét-ú \text{"Jesus of Nazareth."}} \]

Sometimes, as in Assyrian and Aramaic, the nomen regens has a possessive suffix referring to the nomen rectum, e. g.,
When two or more genitives depend on the same noun, all the genitives connected by ² or ⁷ may stand before the noun; but frequently only the first is placed before the noun, the others following: e. g.,

\[
\text{αἱ ἁγίου τῆς κυρίας τῆς καθαροῦς}: \text{ἡ αἰ̂ μύμα ἡ αὐτοῦ τῆς κυρίας τῆς καθαροῦς} \quad \text{ἡ αἰ̂ μύμα τῆς κυρίας τῆς καθαροῦς}
\]

And the throne of God and the lamb.

\[
\text{ἡ ἀγία τῆς μισθοῦ τῆς μακροδοτῆς}: \text{ἡ ἀγία τῆς μισθοῦ τῆς μακροδοτῆς} \quad \text{ἡ ἀγία τῆς μισθοῦ τῆς μακροδοτῆς}
\]

The brother of Jacob, Josu, Judah, and Simon.

When two or more nouns are modified by the same genitive, the genitive as usual stands first, the modified nouns connected by ² following; usually the last nomen regens, and in a series of more than two, several of the last, take a suffix referring to the genitive: e. g.,

\[
\text{ἡ ἁγία τῆς ἀγίας τῆς μακροδοτῆς}: \text{ἡ ἁγία τῆς ἀγίας τῆς μακροδοτῆς}
\]

The hope and belief of the saints.

The sign of the genitive ² is quite frequently omitted, the preceding genitive being then practically an adjective modifying the noun. This is always the case when the nomen regens depends on a preposition or the sign of the genitive ², but it is also found outside of this construction, especially in titles, geographical names, and standing expressions: e. g.,

\[
\text{ἡ ἁγία τῆς μακροδοτῆς}: \text{ἡ ἁγία τῆς μακροδοτῆς}
\]

The commander of a hundred.

\[
\text{ἡ ἁγία τῆς μακροδοτῆς}: \text{ἡ ἁγία τῆς μακροδοτῆς}
\]

The commander of a hundred.

\[
\text{ἡ ιδα τῆς μισθοῦ}: \text{ἡ ιδα τῆς μισθοῦ}
\]

The house of the king.

\[
\text{ἡ ἀγία τῆς μισθοῦ}: \text{ἡ ἀγία τῆς μισθοῦ}
\]

The land of Agam.

\[
\text{ἡ μακροδοτή τῆς μισθοῦ}: \text{ἡ μακροδοτή τῆς μισθοῦ}
\]

The kitchen (house of sauce, cookery).

When the nomen regens is itself in the genitive, it and its preceding nomen rectum are placed before the new nomen regens, one ² standing at the beginning instead of two; this new nomen regens may itself be placed in the genitive in the same way, and so on indefinitely, the ² of the subordinate

\[\text{This ² connects the whole expression with what precedes, being placed with the second instead of the first word of the element it connects with something preceding: cf. Pract. Amh. Spr. p. 394 (§ 296b).} \]
genitive being regularly dropped after that of the governing noun, so that no more than one suffix stands at the beginning of such a chain of successively subordinated genitives. If the last nomen regens of such a chain is governed by a preposition, the preposition stands first and even the single suffix is lost. e.g.,

\[ \text{genitive} : \text{possessive} : \text{nominal} : \text{prepositional} \]

ja-mēdēr nagaṣṭāt-em 'alaqā 'and the prince of the kings of the earth.'

\[ \text{genitive} : \text{possessive} : \text{nominal} \]

ja-ṣgrābayēr īēg yarājēl majamārîāk 'the beginning of the Gospel of the Son of God.'

\[ \text{nominal} : \text{positional} \]

ba-bābîlōn (for ba-ia-b-) mērēkō gīsē 'at the time of the Babylonian captivity.'

Some instances of this peculiar genitive construction occur also in Tigrina and Tigre,1 due doubtless to the influence of Amharic.

Ta. ḫāra : ṭaṣṣēn : ṭurē : 'enklāh ĵōrdānōs (for nāj ḫō-) mādō 'from the other side of Jordan.'

Te. ḫēr : ḫēr : ḫēr : 'ēb dīmā (for nāj dī-) khājōt 'in the life of eternity.'

With regard to the application of the article and the accusative -i, the genitive phrase is treated just like an adjective (cf. p. 166 f.). When both elements of the combination, however, are indeterminate the accusative -i is usually placed with the genitive, rarely with the regens. e.g.,

Art. ṭāmātan : ṭurē : ja-maṭō-y 'alaqā 'the commander of a hundred.'

\[ \text{genitive} \]

ja-tigrē-y ťēstā 'the rebel of Tigre.'

Acc. ṭāmātan : ṭurē : ja-bēṭēl-y lākēn 'the priest of Bethel.'

\[ \text{genitive} \]

ja-saun lēj-yēn 'the son of man.'

\[ \text{genitive} : \text{positional} \]

ja-bāṣ̄aṭa-anā-n mēt 'the death of a sinner.'

\[ \text{genitive} : \text{positional} \]

ja-darat lēb-yēn 'his upper garment (his breast-clothing.)'

\[ \text{genitive} : \text{positional} \]

ja-darat-ēn lēb 'the clothing of his breast.'

\[ \text{genitive} : \text{positional} \]

ja-bāṣ̄aṭēl-yēn lējōe 'the sons of Uziel.'
In Mineo-Sabean the relative is in certain constructions employed to indicate a genitive relation, e.g.,

\[ \text{thorn} \sim \text{gold} \]

The goodness of God.

In Mehri the genitive is regularly expressed in this way, e.g.,

\[ \text{habor} \text{daughter of the king} \]

\[ \text{door of the house} \]

\[ \text{snake's head} \]

\[ \text{baskets for dates} \]

In Aramaic the use of the relative dependent noun has encroached greatly upon that of the construct chain. It may be used for the construct in almost any case. In Western Aramaic the two constructions are used side by side, in Biblical Aramaic, with about the same degree of frequency, while in Jewish Palestinian the relative construction has gained considerably on the other; in Syriac and Mandaic the relative

\[ \text{Cf. Homm. Súd-arab. Chr. p. 14.} \]

\[ \text{Closely connected with these South Arabian constructions is the construction of Arabic demonstrative in the sense of 'owner, possessor,' e.g., Wright-Def. Arab. Gr. I. p. 272f. This } \]

\[ \text{may be used in position to a preceding noun, in which case it is very much like a genitive sign, e.g., Wright-Def. Arab. Gr. II. p. 203.} \]

\[ \text{man of wealth (a man, a possessor of wealth).} \]

\[ \text{land covered with thorns.} \]

On the other hand Ethiopic, Tigre, and occasionally Mineo-Sabean are used absolutely like Arabic, e.g.,

\[ \text{a relative.} \]

\[ \text{intelligent people.} \]

\[ \text{unjust people.} \]

\[ \text{something mortal.} \]

\[ \text{the believer.} \]

\[ \text{she of N. = Goddess of N.} \]

construction is by far the more frequent; in Modern Syriac it has completely replaced the construct chain. In Modern Syriac the nomen regens may take the ending -it, after which the relative is usually dropped.\footnote{For an explanation of this ending cf. p. 146.} In Biblical Aramaic the nomen regens without suffix stands in the absolute or emphatic state according as it is definite or indefinite; in Syriac and Mandaic it stands regularly in the emphatic state, though the absolute is also used in rare instances. In practically all the Aramaic dialects when both nomen regens and nomen rectum are determinate in sense, the nomen regens may take a suffix referring to the nomen rectum (cf. p. 145 ff.). As in Ethiopic, the position of these phrases in Syriac and Mandaic is very free; they may stand not only after, but also before their noun, and other words may stand between them, e.g.,

**Bib. Aram.** रामीहै ‘a stream of fire.’
नामियेहै ‘the head of gold.’
सिदियेहै ‘the name of God.’

**Syr.** ܐܠܘ ‘false money.’
ܐܒܘ ‘the king of Babylon.’
ܐܒܘ ‘the son of God.’
ܐܒܘ ‘every military (Roman) office.’

**Mod. Syr.** ܒܝܓ ‘forgiveness of sins.’
ܒܝܓ ‘the suffering of our Lord.’
ܒܝܓ ‘the son of God.’

When the nomen regens of a construct chain is modified by another genitive the paraphrase with the relative must be used, e.g.,

**Bib. Aram.** बिबिहै ‘the gold and silver vessels of the temple.’

**Syr.** बिबिहै ‘Adam’s breaking of the covenant.’

In Phenician the relative plus dependent noun is quite frequently used as the equivalent of the genitive of a construct chain, e.g.,

\[\text{जन्नतेहै अलैन ‘the grave of Athan.’}\]
\[\text{यत अलोनिम अलोनूथ इ स्मूक स्यथ ‘the gods and goddesses of this place.’}\]
The second class of prepositional phrases is found in Tigrinya, Tigre, and Modern Arabic, in all of which they are used alongside of the construct chain, as the equivalent of the nomen rectum.

In Tigrinya and Tigre the word CELE: nāj (Eth. ṢE: nayâd 'possession') is used to introduce phrases of this type. In Tigrinya the order of the phrase is free like that of the relative phrases in Ethiopic and Aramaic, the natural position is after the modified noun; it may stand before or after the noun, and other words may intervene between them; in its use it corresponds closely to the use of the phrase introduced by the relative in Ethiopic; in Tigre the phrase stands regularly before the noun, and it may follow; e.g.,

Ta. addAll: CELE: Ḥanif: gatilâ nāj 'āhzâb 'Galilee of the heathen.'

CELE: Ḥanif: nāj 'ēzâ labbêr qēdūs 'a saint of God.'

An: CELE: Ḥanif: 'an-ēs dēmâ 'Ījō nāj-zâchâunî 'I, however, am the voice of one crying.'

Te. CELE: Ḥanif: nāj rabbâ qēdūs 'a saint of God.'

CELE: Ḥanif: nāj dimâ khâqît 'the life of eternity.'

In the Modern Arabic dialects, the genitive of a construct chain may be replaced by a noun meaning 'possession' governing the genitive and standing in apposition to the nomen regens. These nouns are the genitive signs'MATTACH (Syria and Algeria), Shimi (Egypt and Palestine), Mal (Baghdad), Ḥaqa (Yemen) (cf. p. 150). These are ordinarily invariable for gender and number; occasionally, however, Egyptian, Syriac, and Jerusalem Shimi have the plural forms MATTACH, MATTACH, MATTACH, MATTACH. Shimi, Shimi, Shimi, Shimi after a plural noun; and more rarely the Egyptian and Syrian words have a feminine form MATTACH, MATTACH, MATTACH, MATTACH, after a feminine noun. The nomen regens regularly takes the article, but in Egypt at least, it may also stand in the indefinite form, e.g.,

الدار ماتع شريك ed-dâr mētā ḫarîkî 'the house of my companion.'

الكتاب مال التلميذ el-kitâb māl et-talmîd 'the pupil's book.'
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Here is also to be classed the similar use of the demonstrative ال in North Africa, e. g.,
كتاب دا البتنت kitab del-bint 'the book of the girl.'
سحور دا الزيتون sajara dez-zaitun 'olive tree (tree of olives).'

(c)

Prepositional phrases of the third class are found in Arabic, Ethiopian, Tigrina, Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, Samaritan, and rarely in Syriac.

In Arabic the preposition ل is used to express the genitive relation between an indefinite nomen regens and a definite nomen or pronomem rectum, e. g.,
ابن للملك ibnu l-l-malik 'a son of the king.'
أخ لك 'ahu la-ka 'a brother of thine.'

In Ethiopian phrases introduced by ا are employed as follows, viz.:

a) as the equivalent of a genitive in a construct chain, especially when the genitive has rather a dative force, e. g.,
ة: لدودا (acc.) la-labá-lómì 'children of your father' (Matt. 5, 45).

b) to modify an indefinite noun after a negative, when the nomen or pronomem rectum is definite, e. g.,


after ا: ل: ل: م: و: M

with pronominal suffix in the place of a possessive suffix (cf. below, p. 244 f.).

1 Coptic ene has a similar use; cf. p. 220; n. 4.
2 Strictly speaking this belongs to the discussion of the pronoun and its modifiers, but it is added here for the sake of completeness.
c) above all in connection with a suffix on the nomen regens to indicate that the idea expressed by the combination is definite; this construction may also be used even when the determination is already indicated by the determinate character of the nomen rectum (cf. p. 145): e. g.,

\[\text{m€.c.:} \text{m€.t}: \text{taʃàr-à la-λαòò 'the roof of the ark.'}\]

\[\text{m€.c.:} \text{m€.l}: \text{vàlåd-ù la-nègùs 'the king's son.'}\]

\[\text{Z.€.c.:} \text{Z.€.c.:} \text{mèhrát-ù la-éøerabbèr 'the mercy of God.'}\]

\[\text{m€.c.:} \text{m€.c.:} \text{yàrg-à la-jèëti mèdr 'the gold of that land.'}\]

\[\text{m€.c.:} \text{m€.c.:} \text{som-ù la-àbù-ka 'the name of thy father.'}\]

In Tigrinya a phrase introduced by the preposition 'I nè 'to' is quite frequently used to express the genitive, usually, tho not always, in connection with a suffix on the nomen regens referring to the nomen rectum, e. g.,

\[\text{m€.l.:} \text{m€.c.:} \text{lèdè-ù nè-jàsùs 'the birth of Jesus.'}\]

\[\text{Z.€.c.:} \text{Z.€.c.:} \text{nè-éøerabbèr mìl'ìk 'the angel of God.'}\]

\[\text{m€.l.:} \text{m€.l.:} \text{sahàjì nè-ùryàd 'the wife of Uriah.'}\]

In Hebrew phrases introduced by 7 are used in the sense of a genitive; sometimes when a construct chain would be equally suitable, e. g.,

\[\text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{the watchmen of Saul' (1. Sam. 14, 16); but ordinarily when for any reason a construct chain would be difficult or impossible. The principal uses}^1 \text{ of such phrases are, viz.}:\]

a) to express a determinate genitive which depends on an indeterminate noun, e. g.,

\[\text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{a son of Jesse' (1. Sam. 16, 18).}\]

\[\text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{'a psalm of David' (Ps. 3, 1).}\]

b) to modify a noun which is already modified by a genitive or a possessive suffix, e. g.,

\[\text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{Boaz' portion of the field' (Ru. 2, 3).}\]

\[\text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{'in the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel' (1. Ki. 14, 19).}\]

\[\text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{mì. à. j. y.} \text{'thy emission of seed' (Lev. 18, 20).}\]

c) to modify substantives accompanied by numerals, especially in dates, e. g.,

^1 For exceptional cases in which 7 is used as genitive sign cf. Ges. Heb. Gr. pp. 439, 440 (§129 e. g.)
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'on the twenty-seventh day of the month' (Gen. 8, 14).
'in the second year of Darius.'
'on the third day after my giving birth' (1 Ki. 3, 18).

In Biblical Aramaic and Samaritan the use of phrases with ָ is in general the same as in Hebrew; they are employed, viz.:
a) to express the genitive of a determinate noun modifying an indeterminate, e.g.,

Bib. Aram. ָלשתלמך ָלשתלמך 'a king of Israel.'
              ָלשתלמך 'for burnt offerings for the Lord of Heaven.'

Sam. אכיבאכיבא 'a servant of the chief cook.'

b) after a noun modified by a numeral, in dates, e.g.,

Bib. Aram. ָבָּשתלמך ָבָּשתלמך 'in the first year of Bel-
              'shazzar.'

Sam. שָּׁלֶחַתלמך 'the third day of the month Adar.'

In Syriac, phrases with ָ are sometimes used to express the genitive after expressions of space and time, e.g.,

Sam. שָּׁלֶחַתלמך 'the family chief of the family of Kohath.'

In Malulun ָ is a common genitive determinant, e.g.,

derrarqet ָלשתלמך 'the convenst of Malulun.'

pait ָלשתלמך 'the house of the king.'

(d)

Prepositional phrases of the fourth class are found principally in Arabic and Ethiopic.

In Arabic, phrases with the preposition من are used in the sense of a partitive genitive as follows, viz.:

a) to express the genitive of a determinate noun modifying an indeterminate, e.g.,

حى من الجين hajju* min ِl-jinni ‘a tribe of Jinn.’
جِماعة من كُفده jami‘atu* min hadami-hi ‘a company of his servants.’

b) to express the genitive of possession after an indeterminate noun, the object of the preposition in this case being the plural of the governing noun followed by the genitive of the possessor, e.g.,

قصر من قصور ملك qaçru* min quçuri maliki* = qaçru maliki* ‘a royal castle.’
قصر من قصور الملك qaçru* min quçuri ‘l-maliki = qaçru ‘l-maliki ‘a castle of the king.’
ملك من مملوك فارس maliku* min mulûki fârisa ‘a king of Persia.’

(c) to modify a noun already modified by a suffix, e.g.,

اصيارة من الجين ‘achâru-hu min al-jinni ‘his relatives of the Jinn.’

In Ethiopic a phrase after እንዓን: or እናም:- sometimes stands for a partitive genitive, e.g.,

አስናር : ይኑትኩ : እንዓንበለል : ያትዳ ፕግኝሰን ِ ‘em-צ’av’e ‘the children of the watchers among men.’

It may also, like the phrases with ב in Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic, depend on a noun modified by a numeral, e.g.,

ከሆ : ከ : እሎውን : እናም : ውቡ : ‘ama köna 601 ገመታ ይመት-ሆ la-nôk ‘in the year six hundred and one of Noah’s life (when it was six hundred and one years of Noah’s life).’

Phrases of this sort also occur occasionally in the other languages, e.g.,

Sam. ከክን ኪ ያስ ም ዳ ይ ዪ ‘water of the river.’
Eth. ከት ኪ ያስ ም ዳ ይ ዪ ‘part of thy excellence.’

Bib. Aram. ከም ያስ ም ዳ ይ ዪ ‘chaff from the threshing floors of summer.’

The use of other prepositional phrases as nominal modifiers is comparatively rare; examples are,

Arab. زرتنيك من بعدهك šurriçaatu-ka min ba’dika ‘thy posterity after thee.’
Eth. נֶגֶר - מַדְּבֵּר - אַבָּדָה 'false witness (heard falsely).

Heb. מַדְּבֵּר - מַדְּבֵּר - אַבָּדָה 'sorrow for his mother.'

עֹדִית 'her husband with her' (Gen. 3, 6).

עֵדְקָנָה 'king in Jerusalem' (Ecc. 1, 1).

סְמָעַה 'prince among thy people.'

Other Forms.

Instead of the simple juxtaposition of noun and modifying phrase, the two may be more closely joined in several ways.

Sometimes the noun and the following prepositional phrase form a construct chain, the noun standing in the construct state; so in Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, and rarely in Assyrian: e.g.,

Heb. יְזִקְנָה 'joy in the harvest.'

Bib. Aram. יַעֲשָּׁרָה 'the kingdoms under the whole heaven' (Dan. 7, 27).

Ass. הֶמֲ אֶבֶר 'news of the Arabs.'

Sometimes the two are joined together by the relative pronoun, the prepositional phrase forming the predicate of the relative clause. Such a construction is of course possible in all the languages, but sometimes the relative has practically lost its force as such, and simply serves to connect modifier and modified more closely. So in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Ethiopic. In Ethiopic this is the ordinary way of joining a noun and a prepositional phrase that modifies it. Here is also to be classed מָגִירִבָּה which is a combination of a demonstrative element + the preposition 'ל. Some of these combinations have become practically genitive determinants. In Hebrew יְזִקְנָה is practically equivalent in meaning to the simple יְזַקְנָה when it indicates possession; Post-Biblical יְזַקְנָה takes its noun without article, and the governing noun usually has a suffix. e.g.

Eth. מַדְּבֵּר - מַדְּבֵּר - אַבָּדָה 'his sister according to the flesh.'

בָּדָה - בָּדָה - אַמְּלָא - אַמְּלָא 'there is no other God beside thee.'

Bib. Heb. יְזַקְנָה 'the flocks of her father.'

יַעֲשָּׁרָה 'the butler and the baker of the king of Egypt.'

יְזַקְנָה 'Solomon's song of songs.'

יַעֲשָּׁרָה 'to Jerusalem in Judah.'

יִבְּנָה 'the water under the firmament' (Gen. 1, 7).
Personal Pronominal Qualification.

Simple.

The idea expressed in English by the possessive adjectives is regularly rendered in all the Semitic languages by the possessive suffixes. The combination really forms a construct chain, the suffix, which represents a personal pronoun, being added

to the construct state of the noun. The noun is made definite by the addition of the suffix and can, of course, not ordinarily have the determinate form. e. g.,

Ass. mât-su
Arab. 'ardu-hu
Eth. מֶּּדִּּרְּ-֜וּ 'his country.'
Heb. מֶּּדִּּרְּ-֜וּ
Syr. סֶּדִּּרְּ-֜וּ

In those languages which have a preformative definite article, a participle may take the article and the suffix at the same time; the suffix in this case, however, is not possessive but represents an accusative: e. g.,

Arab. al-qātīlu-hu 'the one that killed him.'
Heb. נְבִּּטִּּו 'the one smiting him' (Is. 9, 12).

In Tigre, however, and in the Arabic dialect of Malta an ordinary noun with a possessive suffix may take the article, e. g.,

Te. .comments: la-bēʾēs-ā 'her husband.'
Malt. lil-hint-u 'to his daughter.'

In Modern Arabic the possessive pronouns (originally a noun meaning possession + possessive suffix) may take the definite article, e. g.,

المتاء al-metāt 'mine.'

A noun with possessive suffix is definite, and an adjective modifying it stands ordinarily in the definite state when one is distinguished. So in Arabic, Hebrew, and probably in Western Aramaic. In Amharic the article may stand with the adjective, especially if it is a cardinal, but it may also be omitted. e. g.,

Arab. اخوة الصغير 'ahūku 'e-ṣayfīru 'his little brother.'
جِبَّاتُها الزَّرَقة jubbatuhā 'e-zarqāʾu 'her blue jacket.'
Heb. נְבִּּטִּּו 'thy strong hand' (Deut. 3, 24).

Amh. ያObsolete: ፊ: ከጃጆ-ብ.U lēj-ā 'my little daughter.'
አጃጆ-ብ: ከጃጆ-ብ: 'arāt-ū lējā-ā 'his four sons.'

---

1 Contrast with this the use of the article with noun modified by possessive adjective or pronoun in Greek and Italian; e. g.,

Gr. ἄνδρα πατέρα 'thy father;' Ital. il tuo padre 'thy father.'


3 Cf. p. 219, n. 2.

* In Maltese this is probably due to the influence of the Italian construction, e. g., la sua figlia; cf. Brock. Comp. Gr. p. 470, n. 2.
In Assyrian an adjective modifying a noun with suffix often stands before it, e. g.,

*ina enqi lubbišu 'in his wise heart,'*

*aqratı nāpātīsīmu 'their precious life.'*

In Modern Arabic an adjective without article may stand before a noun with suffix, e. g.,

*galî selāmat-kum 'your dear health.'*

When a demonstrative modifies a noun with possessive suffix, its construction is in general the same as when it modifies a *nomen regens* in a construct chain. In Hebrew, however, no article is used with the demonstrative, and the Samaritan demonstrative is without the prefixed ِن which it takes when modifying a simple noun. e. g.,

Arab. ِنختنا هذة 'our sister here, this sister of ours.'

Amb. ِنن: ِنن:ِنن: ِنن: 'is dāqū ḫājī 'this great power of thine.'

Ta. ِنن: ِنن: 'ezom ḫāq-āi 'these my children.'

Heb. ِنن: 'this matter of ours.'

Sam. ِنن: 'these signs of mine.'

Syr. ِنن: 'these words of ours.'

Mod. Syr. ِنن: ِنن: 'āhā šeyānā 'this neighbor of mine.'

Just as it is impossible to express the combination of indefinite *regens* with definite *rectum* by a construct chain (cf. p. 218f.), so ordinarily the combination of indeterminate and personal pronominal qualification can not be expressed by noun + suffix; one of the circumlocations for the genitive must be employed (cf. pp. 225–238): e. g.,

Arab. ِنن: ِنن: *ahū* laka 'a brother of thine.'

In Modern Syriac, however, this idea is rendered by placing the indefinite article ِن: ḫā before the noun with suffix, 2 e. g.,

*āhā dōst-ā 'a friend of mine.'*

**Emphatic.**

The idea which is expressed by the possessive suffix may also be indicated in various other ways, originally with em-

---


2 This un-Semitic construction is probably borrowed from Turkish, cf. Nädl. Nemas. Spr. p. 278.
phasis on the possessive, though in some cases these constructions have become practically equivalent to the noun + suffix.

(a)

An independent pronoun corresponding to the suffix may be used with the noun + suffix.

In Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, Samaritan, Classical and Modern Egyptian Arabic, the nominative corresponding to the suffix is used in connection with the suffix,¹ either before or after the noun in Hebrew and Egyptian Arabic, after the noun in Classical Arabic; e. g.,

Heb. יִרְאָה לְשׁוֹנַי ‘my own death’ (2 Sam. 19, 1).
               יַעֲקֹבַּעַל ‘thy own blood also’ (1 Ki. 21, 19).
               יַעֲקֹבִּין ‘in my own heart’ (1 Ch. 28, 2).

Bib. Aram. אֶל תָּנָא ‘my spirit’ (Dan. 7, 15).

Sam.² בֵּיתָהּ יִשְֹרַך ‘and your own bodies.’

Eg. Arab. بَيَّنَحَا ‘her own house.’
               אָנָא ‘my body.’

Cl. Arab. رَأَيْهَا هُو ‘his opinion.’
               نِصِيبُ أَنَا ‘my share.’

In Assyrian the independent genitive and accusative forms are used either absolutely or after ša in connection with the suffix; they regularly precede the noun; e. g.,

kāṭu ʾamāt-ka ‘thy own command.’
šāṣu mašak-šu ‘his own skin.’
ša lášu … qurdī-ku ‘thy might.’

(b)

The emphasis may be expressed in those languages which

¹ This construction is not confined to possessive suffixes, but is just as frequent with suffixes after verbs and prepositions; cf. Ges. Heb. Gr. p. 459; Uhlem. Inst. Sam. p. 148; Wright-De G. Arab. Gr. II. p. 282. In Mehri the independent pronouns are used to emphasize suffixes after a verb or a preposition, but not a nominal suffix; cf. Jahn, Meh. Gr. pp. 28, 130.

The cases in Tigrinya in which an independent pronoun is placed absolutely at the beginning of a sentence referring to a following suffix, e. g., ḫaštā ḫaṭṭāṭ : ṭān : ḫāṭṭāṭ : ḫāṭṭāṭ : ṭān : ḫāṭṭāṭ : ḫāṭṭāṭ : ‘abārān ‘abārān ‘as for us, Abraham is our father,’ do not belong here, cf. Præst. Tig. Spr. p. 291.

Similar to this is the Coptic construction of absolute personal pronoun after a noun with possessive article (cf. p. 242, n. 1) for the sake of emphasis, e. g., pa-eśēt anok ‘my father,’ cf. Stein. Kopt. Gr. p. 44 f.

² As this is the only example given by Uhlemann it is uncertain whether the pronoun may precede the noun.
have developed an independent possessive form, by using this form either alone or in connection with the corresponding suffix.

Sometimes the possessive stands after the noun in the construct state; so in Ethiopic and Syriac (rarely): e.g.,

Eth. ḫáṭá: niṣṭá: bērās zā'ā:ra: 'my husband.'

Syr. Ṗup: Ṣup: niṣṭá: sa:la:ni: 'their own person.'

Usually, however, the possessives are treated as adjectives or prepositional phrases, and may stand either before or after the noun, which may or may not have the corresponding suffix.

---

1 The independent possessives are formed in almost all the languages which make them by adding the suffixes to certain forms connected with the sign of the genitive. These forms are, viz.,


Meh. da: cf. Jalm, Meh. Gr. p. 90; it is not stated whether they are used attributively.


In Amharic they are formed by prefixing the genitive sign Ṣ to the independent pronouns; cf. Præct. Amh. Spr. p. 119.

In Tigre Ṣáṭá: and in Amharic, Ṣáṭá: Ṣáṭá: 'possession' and Ṣáṭá: 'side' are employed with suffixes to form possessive pronouns, but these are used only absolutely; cf. Lüttm. Te. Præm. p. 291; Præct. Amh. Spr. p. 119.

In the Assyrian of the Amarna letters a particle Ṣá (probably connected with the demonstrative anān) + suffix is employed as a possessive.

For these possessive pronouns in general, cf. Brock, Comp. Gr. pp. 315, 316, (§ 198, 5, g). Coptic possesses a series of possessive pronouns always used as substantives, and also a so-called possessive article consisting of the article with possessive suffixes which is used before the noun as the equivalent of the old possessive suffixes, which are obsolete; e.g., Ṣek-sun 'thy brother,' Ṣek-sun 'his sister,' Ṣek-wët 'their parents,' cf. Steinl, Kopt. Gr. pp. 43, 44.

In Ethiopic the possessive may stand before or after the noun; the noun may have the suffix, or the possessive may be preceded by the sign of the genitive h-. The stem of the possessive pronoun (not the suffix) agrees in gender and number with the *nomen regens*, e. g.,

\[
\textit{IGD} : \textit{AYED} : nafê-d 'ent'ahu 'his own life.'
\]

\[
\textit{AMP} : \textit{AKA} : la'-ell'ahu 'arda'-hù 'for his own disciples.'
\]

\[
\textit{AMP} : \textit{HAJMA} : b'èsit sa'-ent'aka 'thy wife.'
\]

In Tigrinya the possessive stands either before or after the noun without suffix, e. g.,

\[
\textit{ALS} : \textit{GFL} : 'adgi nājātu 'his ass.'
\]

\[
\textit{GFL} : \textit{OF} : nājātu bōtā 'his place.'
\]

In Amharic it precedes the noun, which may or may not have a suffix, e. g.,

\[
\textit{FL} : \textit{MFO} : iand lēbb-ā 'my heart.'
\]

\[
\textit{OF} : \textit{MFO} : iand gāl 'our word.'
\]

In Syriac, Babylonian Talmudic, Mandaic, and Modern Syriac, it regularly stands after the noun; the noun may be with or without suffix in Syriac and Mandaic, always without in Modern Syriac, and apparently also in Babylonian Talmudic; 2 in Syriac when the noun has a suffix the possessive sometimes precedes: e. g.,

\[
\textit{Syr}.
\]

\[
\textit{MFO} : lehī ṣalā'ī ṣallī 'his own girdle.'
\]

\[
\textit{MFO} : ṣallā bar ṣallā ṣallī 'his own zeal.'
\]

\[
\textit{MFO} : ṣallī ṣallī ṣallī ṣallī 'thy own dwelling.'
\]

\[
\textit{Man}.
\]

\[
\textit{MFO} : ṣallū lebīd 'in our splendor.'
\]

\[
\textit{MFO} : ṣallū Ṣallū mace Ṣalā 'our clothing.'
\]

\[
\textit{Bab. Tal.}
\]

\[
\textit{MFO} : ṣallū Ṣallū mace Ṣalā 'my mansion.'
\]

\[
\textit{Mod. Syr.}
\]

\[
\textit{MFO} : ṣallī Ṣallī Ṣallī Ṣallī 'his gold.'
\]

\[
\textit{MFO} : ṣallū Ṣallū Ṣallū Ṣallī Ṣallī 'my father.'
\]

In Phenician and Post-Biblical Hebrew it stands after the noun in place of the suffix; in Biblical Hebrew, in the few cases in which it occurs, after the noun with suffix: e. g.,

1 In Ethiopic an objective suffix may be emphasized by ḫ + suffix, cf. Dill.-Bes. Ath. Gr. p. 363; Pract. Ath. Spr. p. 23; e. g., ḫ. ṢH : ṢL NTH : ṢL ḫNTH : kisā-ka tašhulā-ka 'amālāk 'thee God has bents.' With this is to be compared the use of Arabic ṣā in similar cases, e. g., ṣā'ajtā-ka ṣā'ajtā-ka 'I saw thee,' cf. Wright-De. G. Arab. Gr. II. p. 283 (top); and also the use of the Assyrian independent genitive and accusative forms, e. g., ukallim-anni ḫā 'he showed me,' kāša luṣbū-ka 'thee will I tell' (cf. Del. p. 361). Morphologically the -ḏā of kisā, the ḫā of ḫā, ḫā, and the Arabic ṣā are identical; cf. Brook. Comp. Gr. p. 314 (§ 160 b, d).

Ph. ṣawr by-marob syllohom ‘through their protection.’
Mish. nefer ‘through his help.’
Bib. Heb. כִּי יַעֲמֵד אֶחָד ‘my word.’

In the Modern Arabic dialects the possessive pronouns are used in apposition to a noun with the definite article, the whole combination being practically equivalent to a noun with the suffix; e.g., in Egypt, and in Syria and probably in Egypt, and in Syria and probably are varied to agree in gender and number with the preceding noun; the forms in the other dialects are invariable: e. g.,
egypt.  el-kitāb betā‘i ‘my book.’
el-benduqie betā‘etak ‘thy flint-lock.’
el-bujūt butīri ‘my houses.’
Alg.  el-kutub metā‘i ‘my books.’
el-qizāsa metā‘ak ‘thy bottle.’
Bag.  es-sāf diāli ‘my sword.’
es-sāf māli ‘my sword.’

In Assyrian the word atti with suffixes may, like the possessive pronouns, be used before or after the noun, which may or may not have the corresponding suffix, e. g.,

$\text{abī’a attī’a ‘my father.’}$
$\text{atti’a abī’a ‘our father.’}$

$\text{hitā attīnu (acc.) ‘our house.’}$
$\text{atti’ī aśābāni ‘our remaining.’}$

Similar is the use in the Assyrian of the Amarna letters of an (probably connected with demonstrative amnu) + suffix, instead of a simple possessive suffix; the modified noun seems to stand in the construct: e. g.,
$\text{mārat aniṣa ‘my daughter.’}$

In Ethiopian sometimes, instead of a simple possessive suffix, the preposition ḳ + suffix may be employed, e. g.,

$1$ Whether the preposition ḳ + suffix may also follow its noun does not appear from the examples given by Dill-Bex. p. 416. With this usage are to be compared the so-called mediate (mittelbar) suffixes in Tigrinā, Tigre, and Amharic. These are composed of prepositions (in Amharic ḳ, ḳ; in Tigrinā ḳ; in Tigre ḳ, ḳ ‘in’, ḳ) + suffix. They are employed, however, only with verbs: cf. Pract. Amh. Spr. p. 116 f.; Pract. Tig. Spr. p. 162 f.; Litimm. Te. Prot. pp. 226–229.
Nominal Apposition.

A noun may be modified by another noun standing in apposition in the same case; in Arabic a noun in apposition to a vocative in the nominative case form may stand in either nominative or accusative. Both nouns may be common, or one may be a proper name. Sometimes the first of two nouns in apposition is to be regarded as the modifier, but usually the second is subordinate to the first.

A common noun may be used in apposition to another common noun to denote class, quality, material or content. The appositives that denote class are the most common, but examples of all the others are found in some of the languages. In Assyrian an appositive indicating material precedes its noun; when the first noun is plural the second noun is regularly put in the singular. e. g.,

Ass. ëkallu ṣubat ñarritisu 'the palace, his royal abode.'
erinu zulu 'cedar roofing.'
harâçu ihzu 'a golden setting.'
álânišu dannüti bit niçirišu 'his strong cities, well guarded places.'

šarrâni álik mahriša 'the kings my predecessors.'

Eth. ñarëli : ñarëli : yelüd ywaït 'giant sons.'

Tmpl. : ñarëli : yalehnam 'esät 'the fire of hell.'

ñarëli : ñarëli : bešëte négëša (acc.) 'a man. a king.'

Amb. ñarëli : ñarëli : bârôc-ê nabišât 'my servants the prophets.'

To : ëlëb : ñarëli : ñëh derim bër 'a thousand dirhems of silver.'

1 A somewhat similar indecision with regard to the concord of an apposition to a vocative appears in Sanskrit and Greek, where such a noun may stand either in the vocative or the nominative: cf. Delbr. Verg. Syn. III. p. 196 f.

2 In Indo-European, apposition is mostly of the second variety, cf. Delb. op. cit. p. 185.

3 Appositives of this character are found in Egyptian, but apparently not to any extent in Coptic, cf. Erman, Ägypt. Gr. p. 113; Steind. Kopt. Gr. p. 78.
When one of the two nouns is a proper noun, the modifying
common noun usually stands second, but sometimes it precedes
the proper noun, especially when it is a common epithet or title.
In Assyrian the same rule of concord holds good as in the
preceding case, e. g.,

Ass. Astartarikkku hiratsu 'A. his consort.'
Šamaš u Ištar gis šaššu 'S. and I., his own offspring.'
bēl ilāni Marduk 'Marduk, the lord of the gods.'

Eth. הַַָ: עִַַ: sôdôm hagar 'the city of Sodom.'
מֶַַ: מַלֶַּ: tilâš bêhêr 'the land of Tyre.'
מַלֶַּ: מַלֶַּ: heqân bê'ēsit-û 'Eve his wife.'

Amh. እするために: እのために: qéqé-itô xätô 'Queen Vashti.'

Syr. zipcode: 'aster negocié-ittô 'Esther the queen.'

Arab. .sparse: 'ahû-ka xâidû 'thy brother Zaid.'

Farsi 'umaru 'ahû-ka 'Umar thy brother.'

Ya ṣamudû muhammaddû 'n-nabiyyûn, n-nabiyyûn'

Oh Mo-

hammed, the

prophet.'

1 Similarly common epithets often precede in Indo-European, e. g. Sanskrit râja sarunâb 'king Varuna,' M. H. Germ. der herre Sîfrît 'the lord Siegried.' Of Delbr. Verg. Syr. III. pp. 196, 199.
Hebr. דוד המלך 'David the king.'

King David.'

Syr. Αναστάσιος ο Βασιλει 'King Anastasius.'

Anastasius the king.'

When a preposition stands before the first of the two nouns it is, in all the languages except Amharic, ordinarily not repeated. Cases of repetition, however, occur in several of the languages. E. g.,

Eth. מתי אל 'to my lord'

Abraham.'

With Mary his mother.'

Heb. יוחנן בעני 'his brother Abel (acc.).'

Heb. יוחנן בעני 'his brother Abel (acc.).'

Man. הבניתק הנ.goto 'his father, ... the spirit by which he was begotten (acc.).'

In Amharic the matter is somewhat complicated. When both nouns are determined, the preposition is usually repeated; when only the first noun is determined, the preposition is sometimes repeated and sometimes not; when the first noun is indeterminate, the preposition is used almost always before this noun only: e. g.,

אשת לאשה 'to Esther the queen.'

ענר 'friend of thy father Naod.'

לעבד 'to his servants, the prophets.'

למלך 'of king Theodore.'

עת 'to a harlot woman.'

Adverbial Qualification.

Circumstantial.

A noun or adjective is used in what may be called circumstantial or adverbial apposition to another noun in order to indicate the condition of that noun when the action of the sentence is performed. In Assyrian the appositive is represented by the adverbial derivative in -s: in Arabic the indefinite accusative of the appositive is employed; in Ethiopic the appositive, which stood originally in the accusative as in Arabic, may stand in either nominative or accusative when the governing noun is a
nominative; a suffix referring to the governing noun is most commonly added to the appositive: in Tigriña the appositive takes a suffix as in Ethiopic, and stands thus, or is placed after the preposition ə: in Amharic the suffix is employed with a few special words used as appositives, sometimes with accusative determinant ə; otherwise the appositive stands absolutely: in the other languages the noun or adjective is regularly used without change of form: in Hebrew instead of the adjective ם, an adverbial form ס is employed: the appositive adjective or noun usually agrees in gender and number with the governing noun; the adverbial forms are invariable; hence sometimes by analogy the noun or adjective is uninflected. 

Ass. bərru əltiš šittallak ‘the king went as a ruler.’

Sarru ñid ñipparsid ‘the king fled alone.’

Arab. سارة mutayyajjiba ‘ila l-madinat ‘he journeyed, going towards Medina.’

Aša ədəs Zaid ‘Zaid came weeping.’

LaqṣaLtum əmrə laynta ‘I met Amru weeping.’


Ipu : ənə : L-7p : naqha bəši dęŋuq-ʊ ‘the man awoke terrified.’

Ch-8nə : 8nə : 8nə : rakabəlequmı fəstənumi-homu ‘I found them joyful.’

R-8n : 8n : 8n : or 8n : rəfrə ‘adam yahieda beznana or beznun ‘Adam and Eve shall remain behind sad.’


Ta. P-8n : H-8n : rərəh-ʊ hədam ‘he fled naked.’

T-8n : H-8n : 8n : 8n : rərə-h-ʊ sadadə ‘they drove him forth naked.’

D-8n : H-8n : bə-tər-ʊ zə-taualdə ‘who was born blind.’

M-8n : H-n : M-8n : M-8n : kəqəlam bəz-bəmən-ʊ ədəbi ‘all the people were praying in a multitude before the door.’

2 Examples in which a noun is modified by the appositive not being always available, cases in which the appositive modifies a pronoun are added to show the construction.
A noun may also be modified by the adverbial ideas "also", "only, alone", "indeed (simple emphasis)" which belong to the same general class of ideas as the preceding.

Also.

"Also" is expressed by the following words, viz.,

- Eth. --xl, -pnt, -h
- Amb. -wv: dàgmō
- Ta. -avn, hÍÎ: -yēn, kā'am
- Arab. ايدا "aîdā"
- Heb. כב, נפ
- Syr. ܣ": (so Aramaic in general).
- Mod. Syr. ܪ": אפ

The Ethiopic, Tigrinya, and Arabic forms stand after the modified noun, -xl, -pnt, and -avn being enclitic; in Ethiopic אפ may precede the modified noun in addition: the Hebrew and
Aramaic forms precede; in Hebrew, however, it is more common to place אב after the noun with a pronoun referring to the noun following it. e.g.,

Eth. יוחס: jasus-hi
ארה: ya-jasus-hi 'Jesus also,'
נאספ: ya-ba-midr-ni 'and in the earth also,'
איה: ya-imsa-hi 'and the beasts also.'

Ta. נכרט-ט: ne-sanbat-ven 'of the Sabbath also.'
פאת: narr: garacat ka'am 'the publicans also.'

Arab. الكلب (אֶז) al-kalb 'aida' 'the dog also.'
האֶז: havid 'aida' 'Abel also.'
Heb. והים 이름 'the man also.'
אֶז: is Saul also among the prophets?
Syr. אֶז: הָד 'David also.'

*Only.*

The idea 'only; alone' is expressed by the following words, viz.,

Eth. בֶּהֶט: bethit
Ta. בֶּהֶט: behet
Amb. בֶּה: bēhā
Arab. فقط: faqat, فقط לְ: lā gajru
Eg. Arab. بس: faqat, bess.
Heb. בֶּה: beh, בֶּה: bēh
Syr. بِذ: hāh
Mod. Syr. אֶז: 'arēt

All these words except the Arabic, Modern Syriac(?), and Hebrew ב and ב, take a suffix referring to the noun they modify, and follow their noun; 2 classical Arabic faqat, which means literally 'and that's enough,' or 'and that's all,' and lā gajru 'not besides,' 3 regularly stand at the end of the sentence; in Egyptian Arabic the words may precede or follow their noun: Hebrew ב and ב precede the noun. e.g.,

Eth. בֶּהֶט: בֶּהֶט: bethit-'the man alone, only the man.'

*Only.*

1 In Assyrian the idea 'alone,' and probably also 'only' is expressed by אינש + suffix, viz., אינש, cf. Del. HB. p. 20.
2 Compare with these Coptic eina 'alone' + suffixes, Steind. Kopt. Gr. p. 84.
3 With these are to be compared the Modern Persian و بس va-bis 'only (and enough),' and the Spanish no was in such expressions as dos libros no was 'two books only.'
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Ta. "םענ" : בֵּ֫ chipset-om 'the people alone.'
Amh. የዕ/ት/ : ከንሹው : ከዕ/ : ከ-ንሹ/ ብሆን 'except the tribe of Judah only.'
Cl. Arab. قات : la-ሽ-ን/ ትክን 'to the priests alone.'
Eg. Arab. فقط خمسة قروش : faqaṭ ḥamās qurūs 'only five
خمسة قروش فقط : ḥamās qurūs faqaṭ piasters.'
Heb. תקנ 'Jacob alone, only Jacob.'
Syr. המנהיג יומם 'only Noah.'
Syr. המנהיג יומם 'only the priest.'

Simple Emphasis.

In some of the languages a special adverbial particle of pronominal origin is employed to emphasize the noun. Such particles are found in Assyrian, Ethiopic, Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, and Mandaic, viz.,

Ass. -ma
Eth. -ma, ὶ Ῥώμα
Te. ℓ tā
Syr. מז: Man. מז
Arab. -la-
Hob. יה

Except in Arabic and Hebrew these particles regularly follow their noun; e. g.,

Ass. sar Assur-ma 'king of Assyria,'
ina ṣatti-ma њ� 'in that very year.'
ina girrija-ma 'on my campaign.'

1 The preposition ka is here repeated before the apposition bečč (cf. p. 247).
2 These particles are employed to emphasize not only nouns: but all parts of speech. In Mandaic ka seems to be used chiefly with pronouns.

Similar emphatic particles are found in most of the Philippine languages, e. g., Tagalog ng'a, Bisaya man, etc.

2 Used chiefly with verbs, but also with other words, probably including nouns, tho no examples are given by Littmann. As an example of its use will serve Ἀρα: ℓ : ὃ-κα tā 'in thee indeed;' cf. Te. Pron. pp. 301—303.
Eth. ḫāš: ḫāš: yēsta matākṣi-hō-ma 'on his own shoulders.'

Hām: hām: hējāyān kēma 'the living (not the dead),'

 לעומת: hām: yēsta karē kēma 'merely into the belly,'

 הל: חל: חל: הלה: שים: 'akkō ba-hēhēbōt kēma 'not by bread alone,'

Syr. שים: שים: שים: שים: 'for she is like a building.'

'עָבִיק: שים: שים: שים: to evil.'

The Arabic and Hebrew particles precede the noun, e. g.,

Arab. māla la-l-mautu 'death itself.'

Heb. התי 'verily a dead dog' (Ecc. 9, 4).

In Syriac a somewhat similar emphasis is conferred by placing the personal pronoun of the third person before the noun or a noun with modifiers; the pronoun agrees with the noun in gender and number: e. g.,

שנים: שנים: שנים: שנים: 'he, Jeremiah.'

שנים: שנים: שנים: שנים: 'the law of the watchman.'

שנים: שנים: שנים: שנים: 'these blessed ones.'

שנים: שנים: שנים: שנים: 'this blessing.'

With this construction is to be compared the Biblical Aramaic

שנים: שנים: שנים: שנים: 'that image, with regard to that image' (Dan. 2, 32),

and the cases in Mandaic in which the personal pronoun of the third person is used before a noun, e. g.,

שנים: שנים: שנים: שנים: 'they, the angels.'

שנים: שנים: שנים: שנים: 'she, the Ruha.'

Sentence Qualification.

A noun is often modified by a whole sentence. This sentence may be a relative clause with or without connecting relative pronoun; or the sentence, with or without connecting relative
pronoun, may stand as a sort of nomen rectum after the construct state of the noun.

The first construction is found in all the languages. The relative pronoun regularly stands at the beginning of its clause except in Amharic and Tigré; in Amharic it always, in Tigré it usually stands immediately before the verb.¹ The relative clause regularly follows its noun in Assyrian, Arabic, Hebrew, and Aramaic, though in Assyrian, Syriac, and Mandaic instances of preposition are sometimes found; in Ethiopic, Tigriná, and Tigré it may either precede or follow; in Amharic long relative clauses usually follow, while with short clauses preposition is the regular rule, tho even in this case the relative clause often follows when its antecedent has another modifier. In Arabic, and usually in Methri, the relative pronoun is used only when the modified noun is definite.² In Mineo-Sabean a relative clause is extremely rare, its place being taken by a

¹ In compound verbal forms in Amharic and Tigré, the relative regularly stands with the auxiliary (cf. Pracet. Amh. Spr. p. 255); Littim. Te. Pron. p. 306 [L’s statement as to Amharic is a mistake].
² This is also the rule in Coptic, cf. Steind. Kopt. Gr. pp. 219—221.
clause standing as nomen rectum to an antecedent (cf. below); e. g.,

Ass. mātu ša aksudu ‘the land that I conquered.’
ša epūš-šuniti dunqu ‘the favor that I showed them.’

Eth. οὐκέτι: ἢςται: ὑπερ: mar’at za-mōla mēl-dā ‘a bride whose husband is dead.’

Arab.  stabilization: stabilization: sa-luṣilī wāḥēṣ lēqṣa-bbār ‘God who holds all things.’

Meh. nuzīr di-shūṭ habunīje ‘the vizier who killed my children.’


Te.  οὐτά: εἰπός: ἔργον: valat... māriā la-tēlahal ‘a maiden who was called Mary.’

Amh.  ሓንድ: ንግር: ልካバル-ልナ ‘a matter which is honorable.’

Bib. Aram.  the man who came here.’

Syr.  ܐܦܪܝܐ ܐܝܘܠ ܐܢܬ ܐܢܘ ܐܐ ܐܘܢ ܐܡ ܐܢܗرا ‘the word of God which he had received.’

Man.  that image which he saw.’

A relative clause has in many cases, especially if it is short.

1 The relative pronoun in Mineo-Sabean is practically always a compound relative including its antecedent, cf. Homm. Süd-arab. Chr. p. 15.
become simply an adjective; this is particularly true in Ethiopic, Tigrinya, Tigre, and Amharic; when the noun depends on a preposition the preposition may stand before the relative clause, the relative pronoun being omitted in Amharic (cf. below). e.g.,

**Eth.** ḫun : ṣawi : ra-jei-abi bērhān ‘the great light (light that is great).’

**Meh.** : ḫal : ḫal : ba-ēnta ḫalafāt miḥt in the night which has passed.’

**Ta.** ʾēnhīb ʾet-maṣā Ṣōdāt ‘from the wrath to come.’

The relative clause may stand after the noun without relative pronoun in Assyrian, Arabic, Mehri, Hebrew, Samaritan, and Modern Syriac, and less frequently in Biblical Aramaic, Jewish Palestinian, Syriac, and Mandaic. In Arabic no relative is employed when the noun is indefinite: in Mehri the relative is regularly omitted in this case, but also at times when the antecedent is definite: in Hebrew the use of the relative clause without relative pronoun is more common in poetry: in Modern Syriac this omission is very common in relative sentences whose subject is a noun with suffix, and whose predicate is an adjective; in such relative clauses the copula is also omitted. e.g.,

**Ass.** lītu ṣpušu ‘the house that I built.’

**Arab.** rajulu *jugālu* lāhu zādi ‘a man who was called Zaid.’

**Meh.** ṣhit tetēḥ hābū ‘a snake that eats men.’

**Heb.** ḫāk‘er biḥōr ‘the man that trusts in him’ (Ps. 34, 9).

**Bib. Aram.** ʾal ʾal ‘a golden image whose height was 60 cubits.’

**Sam.** ’alāl ḫāl ‘in a land which is not theirs.’

**Syr.** ’alāl ḫāl ‘a man whose name was Job.’

**Man.** ’alāl ḫāl ‘a man whose name was Ram.’

---

2. The relative may be omitted in both Egyptian and Coptic, in the latter as in Arabic; cf. Ermam, *Agypt. Gr.* p. 281; Steind. *Kopt. Gr.* pp. 219—221. Omission of the relative is also common in English.
3. The omission of the relative is specially frequent in Mandaic in clauses which give the name of a person as here; cf. Nöld. *Man. Gr.* p. 460.
Mod. Syr. ː瞭解 ː Oslo ː hā 'nāšā pāt-ū ṣāḥibtā 'a man with a handsome face.'

In Amharic the relative particle (the 9° of 90° is retained) introducing a preceding relative clause, is omitted like the sign of the genitive (cf. p. 228 above) whenever the modified noun is governed by a preposition or the sign of the genitive; e. g.,

או.כ: הור: (for נח-) הו: yada kabbāra (for ja-ka-) says 'towards a man who is honorable.'

הע: רחא: (for וול- לוח: kabro ja-mintu (for ja-ja-mi) dastā 'the joy of those who beat drums.'

במר: נטוש: (for וול- לוח: ba-lāt ba-mintu (for ba-ja-ja-mi) rad'dē laz 'against the help of those who do iniquity.'

רמאפס: (for נח-) עפר: ba-taqammaa-bat (for ba-ja-ja-la) 'ōj 'in the hand of the one who sat upon him.'

In Amharic the relative clause is treated as a unit and may take the sign of determination (ו, ו; or after ו, ו or ו) and the accusative ו, just like the genitive phrase (cf. p. 229 above), e. g.,

לאמ: ניר: jārafe-y 'abālēh 'your deceased (who has died) father.'

סאת: לאט-לט: ya-taqaddal-t sādē 'the who-were-killed men.'

שintendo: פנק: jāzasa-y-ën quērbān-ū-n 'the sacrifice (acc.) which he ordered.'

In Tigre a relative clause modifying a noun with article either stands after the noun or (rarely) is placed between the article and the noun, e. g.,

אָבִּי: אְלָא: אֲלָה: (or לא: אתה:) la-akān la-dib-ā karuq-ō (dib-ā lā-karaq-ō) 'the place in which they laid him.'

סנה: נאף: ביג: oq-ט: mēs-lō (article) sukeb-'ētā la-ālō (relative + auxil. verb) 'arūṭ 'with which-he-was-lying-upon-it bed.'

Examples in which a sentence depending on a noun stands as nomen rectum after the construct state are found in Arabic, Ethiopic, Hebrew, and Mineo-Sabean. In the first three languages they are comparatively rare, being most frequent when the modified noun denotes a division of time, but in Mineo-Sabean this construction takes the place of the relative clause introduced by relative pronoun.1 e. g.,

Arab. ِلا ِلاَن ِبَعِثَوْنَى 'till the day when they shall be raised up.'

Eth. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'at the time when Hajaj was emir.'

Eth. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'the custom of eating together.'

Eth. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'the days when David reigned.'

Heb. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'by the hand (of him) thou wilt send' (Ex. 4, 13).

Heb. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'at the time when JHVH spoke to Moses' (Ex. 6, 28).

Min. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'from the tower (that) he built.'

Min. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'after the accident (that) happened.'

Arab. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'the token (that) he saw.'

In Hebrew a sentence in this construction is often introduced by a relative pronoun; in Arabic, sometimes by a subordinate conjunction. In Hebrew this is especially frequent after the noun ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ 'place,' e. g.,

Heb. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'all the time that the plague is upon him' (Lev. 13, 46).

Heb. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'the place where the king's captives were imprisoned' (Gen. 39, 20).

Arab. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'at the time that he hid himself.'

Nominal Coordination.

Two or more coordinated nouns may in some languages be joined together without conjunction; so in Assyrian, Amharic, Tigrinya, Babylonian Talmudic, Modern Egyptian Arabic, and Modern Syriac: e. g.,

Ass. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'of heaven and earth.'

Ass. ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ ِمَهُان ِعَلَيْهِ 'tribute and offering.'

Nabû Mardûk 'Nebo and Marduk.'

1 Asyndeton is found also in Egyptian (cf. Erman, ِبِنَزْنِم ِعَلَيْهِ Gr. p. 113): in Indo-European it also occurs in a number of languages, viz., Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, and Russian; cf. Delbr. Verg. Syn. III. pp. 181–194. In Sanskrit two such nouns often form a compound (deanda), cf. op. cit. pp. 190–192.
Ordinarily, however, they are joined together by a conjunction meaning 'and'. In all the languages except Amharic and Tigrinya the construction is simple, and consists in joining the different words together by some form of the conjunction ya. If there are three or more words so connected, the conjunction may be omitted before all but the last two; so in Ethiopic, Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, Syriac, Babylonian Talmudic (here apparently the regular construction), and Mandaic, e.g.,

Ass. ęa šamē u ecīlm 'of heaven and earth.'
ardu u amtu 'manservant and maid.'
Nabu u Marduk 'Nebo and Marduk.'
Arab. abīhu ya-ummhu 'his father and his mother.'
kullu șaf’in mina ’s-tā’i ya-n-na’ami ya-n-nahl li ya’z-zar’i 'all kinds of flocks and camels and palms and grains.'
Eth. Ment: mešš : hēḇēst ya-yain 'bread and wine.'
Ment: fom : šōmōn ya-abūha ya-’mmi 'Samson, his father and his mother.'
Ment: šal : mishār : mangēst hajl ya-sēbbat the kingdom, the power, and the glory.'

What the construction is in Tigre does not appear, as Littmann in his two articles on Tigre discusses only the pronouns and the verb.
Heb. 'heaven and earth.'
'of and men-servants, and maid-servants.'
'in cattle, silver and gold.'

Bib. Aram. 'the dream and its interpretation.'
'gifts and a reward and great
honour.'
'the kingdom, power,
glory, and honor.'
'to Hananiah, Mishael and
Azariah.'

Syr. 'heaven and earth.'
'the land, the vine
and the olive.'

Bab. Tal. 'a cock, an ass, and a candle.'

Man. 'from snares, punishments, and chains.'

'with sword, fire, and burning.'

Mod. Syr. 'light and warmth.'

Sometimes with groups of more than three nouns the con-
junction is used in more than one case, tho not in all. This
is due ordinarily to the fact that all the elements are not
coordinate, but that some are more closely connected than
others; it may in some cases be due to textual corruption.
This phenomenon is probably found in most if not all of the
languages. Examples are available in Hebrew, Biblical Ara-
maic, Mandaic, and Egyptian Arabic, e. g.,

Heb. 'to Baal, to the sun, moon, constellations, and all the
host of heaven.'

'new moon and sabbath, the
calling of an assembly.'

'myrrh, aloes, and cassia.'

'Eliphaz the
Temanite, Bildad the Shuhite, and Zophar
the Naamathite.'

1 Perhaps the first two are to be considered as more closely connected
with one another than with the third element. This is indicated by the
fact that in three of the four passages in which the word for 'aloes'
occurring it is preceded by יִּ֣שָּׁר as here (Ps.45, 9). It is not impossible, how-
ever, that the order of the words is wrong; and that the reading
should be יְשָׁרָה יִּ֣שָּׁרָה (so Haupt).
Bib. Aram. סֵלָה אָפְרְבִּיטָ פְּלוֹגְדוֹמִי ‘the king and his councillors, his queens and his concubines; ministers of the kingdom, the governors and the princes, the councillors and the satraps.’ לַאֵלֵין תּוֹיכְכָא נָבְשֹׁא ‘to gods of gold and silver, of bronze, iron, wood and stone.’

אֶלֶף אֶסְמֵתֶּה ‘the kingdom, power and strength, and glory.’

מִרְּכָּבָה פְּלוֹגְדוֹמִי, ‘in their mantels (?)’, their cloaks (?) and their hats, (and their clothes)’ [Dan. 3, 21].

Man. מְאָמָא מִשְׁמֶס ‘the instrument, the foot-block, the torture and the twisting, and the fettering and racking.’

אָוָי יָאוּאָא אֲמוּרָא ‘wild animals, cattle, and fish and birds.’

אַאֹוָא אֲיוּא ‘magnificence, splendor, and light and honor.’

Eg. Arab. الوحد قميسم وواحد لباس وواحد عريه وواحد طروض. yáhid qamís ve-yáhid lúbás yáhid 'iríe ve-
yáhid tárbus ‘a shirt and a pair of drawers, a cloak and a fez.’

In Amharic and Tigrina, when a copulative conjunction is used to connect the nouns, the construction is somewhat more complicated than in the other languages. In Amharic — is employed like between the words to be connected: — is ordinarily added to a word which is to be connected with a preceding word, too, it is sometimes employed also with the first of two nouns; when the element to be connected by — consists of two or more words, the conjunction is not necessarily added to the first element, but may be taken by one of the others. When more than two words are to be connected they may be placed together without connective (cf. above), or one or more pairs may be connected by one or the other of the conjunctions —, —; these conjunctions may be used together in the same chain of coordinated nouns, but not to connect the same pair of words. e. g.,

1 The last element is probably a gloss, explaining the unusual terms preceding.
In Tigrinya each element to be connected, including the first, is ordinarily followed by enclitic —�-', or —˒; in any one chain of nouns the connectives may be all the same, or both may be used. Sometimes —�- or —˒ is used like Amharic —rather only after the element to be connected, especially if it consists of more than one word, e.g.

ándose yën 'ôyë-yën 'ôyë-yën 'father and mother.'

دم-ën màij-n 'blood and water.'

Mangal-yën 'ôyë-yën 'ôyë-yën (or 'ôyë-yën) the road, the truth, and the life.'

Nejëjëdë-yën nejëjëdë-yën nejëjëdë-yën 'to Judah and his brethren.'

Nejëjëdë-yën nejëjëdë-yën nejëjëdë-yën 'to the child and its mother.'

Jesus and his disciples.'

Conclusion.

The various qualifications of the noun in Semitic, then, are expressed in general as follows.

1 No example of —˒ in this use is available, but the rule in all probability applies to it as well as to —�-.

2 The preposition on which the first noun depends is almost always repeated as here, cf. Pract. Tig. Spr. p. 340 f.
Both simple determination and simple indetermination are often without special means of expression. Generally speaking the Semitic languages have developed two ways of indicating simple determination, viz., by article and by possessive suffix. Simple indetermination is expressed by indefinite articles derived in some languages from an indefinite enclitic particle ma, but more frequently by the numeral 'one'.

Simple qualification is expressed by the descriptive adjective, which agrees with its noun in general in case, gender, number, and determination; sometimes the two are joined together in a construct chain.

The demonstrative pronouns used as adjectives express demonstrative qualification; they have rules of concord similar to those of the descriptive adjective, but tho they require their noun to be in the definite state, it is only in Hebrew that the demonstrative itself takes the definite article.

The interrogative 'which' is ordinarily expressed by an adjective: 'whose', by the genitive of 'who'; 'how much', in most cases by a word formed of a preposition meaning 'as, like' + the neuter interrogative 'what'.

Indefinite pronominal ideas are expressed sometimes by adjectives, sometimes by substantives followed by the genitive or a prepositional phrase, sometimes in other ways; at times they are expressed simply by the construction itself.

Numeral qualification is expressed by the cardinal and ordinal numerals. The cardinals may stand as adjectives or appositives, or they may take their noun in the genitive or accusative. The numbers from 'three' to 'ten' have what might be called a reversed concord of gender. The noun is sometimes singular, sometimes plural, the number depending in some cases on the numeral, in others on the noun. The ordinals may be expressed either by the ordinals proper, or by cardinals in the ordinal construction or after the noun in the genitive.

Case relation between two nouns may be expressed by the construct chain, by joining the two nouns by a preposition, by a combination of these two methods, or by using instead of a simple preposition, a combination of relative pronoun and preposition. The construct chain is the oldest method, the others become more common in the later development of the individual languages, in some of them completely replacing the construct chain.
Personal pronominal qualification is expressed by possessive pronominal suffixes added to the noun.

Appositives are of two kinds, viz., (a) a common noun denoting class, measure, content, etc., standing as appositive to another common noun; (b) a common noun used as an appositive to a proper.

Adverbial qualification is expressed by an appositive in accusative or nominative, or by certain adverbial and pronominal particles.

A noun may be modified by a relative clause either with or without relative pronoun, or it may stand in the construct before a following sentence which takes the place of a genitive.

Nouns may be coordinated by asyndeton, by using connectives between each two, or by using the connective only with certain pairs.

The most characteristically Semitic of these constructions are, viz., the use of the possessive suffix to express determination; the use of the article with both adjective and noun, and not once with the combination; the use of the article with noun modified by a demonstrative; the reversed concord of the cardinals from 'three' to 'ten'; the use of the cardinals in the genitive in the sense of ordinals; the construct chain; prepositional phrases derived from elliptical relative clauses; appositives denoting measure, content, and the like; the use of a whole sentence as a genitive after the construct of a noun. Generally speaking the more modern languages have, as was to be expected, given up many characteristic old Semitic constructions and adopted many new ones. To judge from the constructions treated in the present paper, the members of the Abyssinian group have departed farthest from the ancient Semitic norm, Amharic being the most extreme example of this phenomenon, while in Arabic and Hebrew, we have, all things considered, perhaps the truest picture of the syntactical conditions of the primitive Semitic speech.

Addenda.

References.

C. Brockelmann, Grundriss der vergl. Gram. der semitischen Sprachen, Bd. II. Syntax (Lief. 1. u. 2, 1911) [Brock. Syn.]

The statements with regard to Modern Hebrew are made
on the authority of Dr. Aaron Ember of Johns Hopkins University.

Transliteration.

In the modern Abyssinian languages, the transliteration is not meant to give an absolutely accurate representation of the pronunciation, but is intended chiefly to show what characters are employed; it is the same as in Ethiopic for the characters which these languages have in common with Ethiopic, e. g., ᵁ is transliterated ṣ (not s as pronounced), and the vowel written ē appears as ē (pronounced iē in Amharic).

Add the modern Aramaic dialect of Tur-Abdin to the list of languages appearing only in transliteration, cf. p. 138.

Determination.

The determinative construction with pleonastic suffix described on pp. 145—148 is found also in Tigre, at least when the determining word is a noun or verb; the preposition ḥā : is used here just as ḥ is in Ethiopic (cf. Littm. Te. Pron. p. 225, n. at end): e. g., ṕāḥ : ḥāː ṭuḥā ṣegē-lā dakhārā 'the son of the praised-one.'

ḥā : ṭāː ṭāː ṣegē ṭemn-lā ṭēl-ā 'to her mother she spoke.'

In Ethiopic a suffix after a preposition is sometimes resumed by the same preposition, just as in Syriac [cf. pp. 146, 151], instead of by ḥ, e. g., ṭē : ṭērāḥ ṭē ṭē ṭēnēn-hē ṭē in (it in) his purity.'

On page 149 in the second paragraph, South Arabic is to be understood as meaning Mineo-Sabean, Mehari, of course, having no article.

Simple Qualification.


An adjective of praise or blame may precede its noun in Classical and Modern Egyptian Arabic; the Assyrian adjectives that precede the noun seem also to belong to this class, cf.

In Coptic a pleonastic suffix is sometimes employed, as in Semitic to specially determine a dependent noun. When one of the few nouns which still take possessive suffixes is followed by a genitive, the noun usually takes a pleonastic suffix, cf. Steind. Kopt. Gr. pp. 40, 80.


For cases in Classical Arabic in which the determination of noun + adjective is apparently indicated by the article with the adjective alone, cf. Brock. Syn. pp. 208, 209 [cf. pp. 165, 167].

In Tigre the article is sometimes employed with both noun and adjective, sometimes only with the second of the two [cf. p. 166], e. g.,

\[\text{ما:النور} : \text{سأ-ناد} \text{لا-ناد} \text{لا-ناد} 'the poor man.'\]

\[\text{ما:النور} : \text{بلا-ناد} \text{لا-ناد} 'their second ploughing.'\]

In Biblical Aramaic as in Hebrew and Modern Arabic an adjective modifying a dual stands in the plural [cf. p. 164], e. g.,

\[\text{نا:النور} \text{ما:النور} 'and it had great iron teeth' (Dan. 7, 7).\]

**Demonstrative Qualification.**

A demonstrative adjective in Mehri sometimes precedes its noun, e. g., \(\text{ديم:ريهيمت 'this pretty girl'}\) (cf. pp. 169, 180).

**Indefinite Qualification.**

In Mehri the word for 'all' seems to stand after the noun with or without suffix. In Tigre it stands with suffix before or after the noun. e. g.,

Meh. \(\text{ها:بانه καλι 'all his daughters.'}\)

\(\text{ها:καλ 'all people.'}\)

Te. \(\text{نا:نا: κατ:κατ 'all night.'}\)

\(\text{ما:النور:كاب:كاب:كاب 'all the hillocks there.'}\)

In the dialect of Tlemsen \(\text{كلا:كلا 'all the people.'}\)

With this construction is to be compared the Biblical Aramaic \(\text{ما:كلا:كلا 'all hail'}\) (Ez. 5, 7).

In Biblical Hebrew the pleonastic Mishnic construction [cf. pp. 185] occurs in at least one passage, viz.,

\(\text{ما:كلا:كلا 'all the kings of the Gentiles'}\) (Is. 14, 18).
In Hebrew the idea of ‘self’ may be indicated by a personal pronoun in apposition to a preceding noun, e. g.,

‘therefore my Lord himself will give you a sign’ (Is. 7, 14).

In Modern Hebrew the idea of ‘various’ is indicated by the participle מיוחש, e. g.,

‘various things.’

**Numeral Qualification.**

In Modern Hebrew a noun modified by the cardinals from ten’ (inclusive) upward, stands in the singular [cf. pp. 205, 206]. To examples of the omission of the article with ordinals (cf. p. 215), add,

Bibl. Aram. אָנהָּלָה נָנַלָה ‘a third kingdom.’

**Nominal Qualification.**

In Tigre, as in Ethiopic, it is possible to insert a modifier of the nominum rectum between the regens and the rectum [cf. p. 221]. It is also possible for a construct governing a definite noun to take an article itself [cf. pp. 218, 219, 220]. e. g.,

marath la(relative)-hallét ‘étá bêt ‘at the door of
the-in-which-the-bride-is house.’

לאהלאח : לאהלאח : la-selet la-ya’at ‘the placentas of the cow.’

In Amharic an adjective modifying a noun with preceding genitive may stand before the genitive or between genitive and noun (cf. p. 227), e. g.,

כלוזא : כלוזאָלוּפֶל : נופָלֶל : תלאָק ‘a great heap
כלוזא : כלוזאָלפֶל : נופָלֶל : תלאָק kőmr |of stone.’

In the Modern Arabic of Hadramaut a noun modified by a determinate genitive is not necessarily determinate, and may take the indefinite article, e. g.,

אָנהָה בְּתָתֶסֶבָע ‘a daughter of the old man’ (cf. Brock,
Synt. p. 236) [cf. the Mod. Syr. construction, p. 240].

In the genitive combination in Syriac, מ. + suffix may be used instead of, or in addition to the pleonastic suffix on the regens; in this case the rectum has usually the added meaning of ‘the well known,’ ‘already mentioned.’ e. g.,

לָאָלָת, לָאָלָת, לָאָלָת, לָאָלָת הָאָלָת ‘the brethren of the cloister itself.’

לָאָלָת, לָאָלָת, לָאָלָת ‘the court of the (already mentioned) temple.’
In addition to the ways of expressing nominal qualification already enumerated, viz., the construct chain, various kinds of prepositional phrases, and combinations of these constructions, a noun may be modified by another noun standing in the accusative. The accusative form is apparent only in Arabic, but there are a number of passages in Hebrew which are probably to be classed here, tho they are hardly to be distinguished from cases of apposition, e. g.,

Arab. al-badru lajlata tamâmihi 'the moon on the night of its fullness'  
Heb. ḥâzâ 'thy jocket of silk.'  
raqûdu 'a vessel of vinegar.'  
'on the way to Timnath' (Gen. 38, 14).  
'three seahs of meal' (Gen. 18, 6).

Personal Pronominal Qualification.

In the Aramaic dialect of Tur Abdin a noun with suffix may take the article as in Tigre and Maltese, cf. Brock. Syn. p. 259 [cf. p. 239].

Nominal Apposition.


An appositive does not necessarily agree with its noun in determination, e. g.,

Arab. 'an sulajmâna... rajuli 'min 'ahlî makhtat 'from Suleiman ... a man of the people of Mecca.'

'îlâ cirātî 'mustaqîmi 'cirātî 'îlāhi 'to a straight path, the path of God.'

Adverbial Qualification.

In addition to the adverbial ideas described above, a noun in Semitic is sometimes modified by an adverb of place, e. g.,

Arab. 'alâ talli 'âlit hunâka 'on a high hill there.'
Das Sendschreiben des Patriarchen Barschuschan an den Catholicus der Armenier. By Otto Lichyi, Ph. D., Ansonia, Conn.


1 An investigation which was completed in May 1911, at Yale University.
scheint überhaupt ein sehr schreibseliger Mann gewesen zu sein, da er eine Ummasse von Schriften, alle kontroversieller Natur, hinterließ.


An dieser Stelle möchte ich auch meinem verehrten Lehrer, Prof. C. C. Torrey, für seine freundlichen Winke, womit er mich von Zeit zu Zeit bedachte und für seine Bereitwilligkeit, mir allezeit mit Rat und Tat beizustehen und über die schwierigsten Klippen hinwegzuhelfen, meinen herzlichsten Dank aussprechen.

Einleitung.

Wir haben zunächst die Überschrift, die nicht vom Verfasser des Briefes stammt, sondern jedenfalls von dem Abschreiber.


1° bringt dann eine Ausainandersetzung über die hl. Dreieinigkeit, die mit dem Schlagwort zusammengefaßt wird:

„Eins in Drei und Drei Eins.“ Dabei warnt der Verfasser fleißig vor Sabellianismus, Arianismus und Judaismus, welche alle drei die hl. Trinität leugnen, wie er sie versteht. Auf Paulus und das Nicäum, wie auf Gregor den Theologen begründet er seine Lehre. Er bediente sich dabei der sonderbarsten Bilder. Die Trinität wird erklärt, wie schon von andern vor und nach ihm, durch Bilder, die uns heute kindlich (um nicht kindisch sagen zu müssen) vorkommen, wie dies: Es sind drei Personen, wie z. B. Adam, Seth und Eva; oder die Sonne, ihr Licht und ihre Hitze; oder Verstand, Vernunft und Geist; oder die Pflanze, ihr Duft und ihre Farbe. (1º).


3° wird zuerst die Benützung von Salz und Öl und dann
Dass Sendschreiben des Patriarchen Barschuschan, &c. 271


8° folgt dann eine Notiz über das Wasser, das wir im Weinbecher mischen.

9—10 wendet sich dann gegen die Unsitte des Taufens der Kreuze und Nakuschen, oder Schallbretter-Klingel weihen, wie andere übersetzen. 10 spricht vom Sündenbekenntnis, das bei den Armenier nicht richtig geübt wird.

Sodann wird darüber gehandelt, ob man den Tag am Abend oder am Morgen beginnen sollte. Die Syrer, wie die Juden, rechnen vom Abend, deshalb fasten sie auch schon Donnerstags; die Armenier dagegen fasten nur Freitags, da sie den Tag am Morgen beginnen, was nach Barschuschan’s Ansicht zu verwerfen ist. 11°—13° ist nach Ansicht von Ter-Minassiantz, (Texte und Untersuchungen zur altchristlichen Literatur, Bd. 26: „Die Armenische Kirche“, von E. Ter-Minassiantz p. 100, 4) das letzte Stück des Briefes des Patriarchen Barschuschan an den Catholicus; dem ich auch gerne beistimme, da, wie auch er bemerkt, die nun folgenden Beschuldigungen nicht unbeantwortet geblieben wären, wenn der Catholicus sie gelesen hätte, d. h. wenn sie im Briefe des Barschuschan gestanden hätten.

Armenier und des geisteshergnadeten Philosophen, Antwort auf
den Brief des syrischen Patriarchen Johannes. Daß dieser
Brief eine Antwort auf unsern Brief ist, hat Ter-Minassiantz
bewiesen durch seine Parallelstellen aus beiden Briefen, von
welchen ich hier nur zwei folgen lasse.

α Johannes X. Barschuschan.
Ihr fragt wegen des Sauerteigs,
den wir wie alle christlichen Völ-
ker gebrauchen (in der Eucha-
ristie), was das bedeuten solle,
und auch das Salz und das Öl... So nehmen wir Wasser
als Zeichen des ursprünglichen
Wassers; Mehl als Zeichen des
Staubes; Sauerteig als Zeichen
der Luft; und Salz als Zeichen
des Feuers.

β Georg, Catholicus der Ar-
menier. Denn Ihr habt ge-
schrieben wegen des Sau-
erteigs, des Salzes und des Öls
(in der Eucharistie), und nach
Schaffung Adams ans vier Ma-
terien sagt Ihr, daß Ihr den
Leib Christi vollkommen macht,
und nehmt als Zeichen des
Wassers, Wasser; als Zeichen
des Staubes (Erde) Mehl; als
Zeichen der Luft, Sauerteig;
und als Zeichen des Feuers,
Salz.

11β—13β handelt von dem Fest der Geburt Christi, welches
die Armenier nicht so feiern, wie alle Völker der Welt. Der
Verfasser versucht zu beweisen, daß die Sitte, das Fest der
Geburt am 25. Dezember und Epiphanion am 6. Januar zu
feiern, die einzig richtige ist, und daß die Armenier keine
Argumente aufbringen können für ihre Sitte, die beiden Feste
an einem Tag, am 6. Januar, zu feiern.

Wie oben bemerkt, hat hier wohl der Brief des Barschus-
chan geschlossen. Was nun noch folgt, ist jedenfalls Zusatz
von Issak von Antiochien, dessen Unterschrift unser Schreiben
trägt. Außerdem ist es ja auch aus dem Schreiben selbst er-
sichtlich, wie auch schon T. M. bemerkt hat, daß der letzte
Teil nicht von Barschuschan stammt. Da heißt es nämlich
auf Blatt 20*: „Wie wir durch das Sendschreiben des Patriar-

Wie auch schon T. M. bemerkte, wird nun die ganze Schreib-
weise anders. Barschuschan war ein gemäßiger Apologe, da-
gegen tadelt der nach Blatt 13 schreibende Verfasser, wo er
nur etwas zu tadeln weiß; sucht scheinbar nach Mißbräuchen
in der armenischen Kirche, um dagegen losziehen zu können.
So ähnlich meint wenigstens Ter-Minassiantz. Ich kann mich
der Ansicht nicht so ohne weiteres anschließen. Lassen doch
die Mißbräuche, die in den Schriften verschiedener Patriarchen, Lehrer und Väter gerädert werden, nicht den Schlüß zu, daß die Unsitte wirklich nicht in der armenischen Kirche Eingang gefunden hatten. Daß ganz haarsträubende Dinge zu gewissen Zeiten, die nur durch obige Schriftstücke näher bestimmt werden können, in der armenischen Kirche verübt wurden, ist wohl Tatsache.

Für die Zusammenstellung der syrischen Dokumente dieser Art darf ich jedoch keinen Kredit beanspruchen, da sie von Professor Brockelmann gesammelt wurden, welcher sie mir vorletzten Winter (1916) nach Berlin schickte. Ich habe sie nur übersetzt und auf die freundliche Aufforderung von Professor Brockelmann hin nun veröffentlicht, was ich von Herzen gern getan, und Professor Brockelmann hiermit gebührend danken möchte.


Aus diesen Zitaten und den übrigen Zeugnissen dieser Patriarchen und Lehrer geht doch wohl hervor, daß die Beschuldigungen nicht so ohne Grund gewesen sein können, wenn man vielleicht als guter Armenian auch nichts davon weiß! Man kann doch kaum annehmen, daß diese sonst ehrenwerten Patriarchen und Lehrer sich in leeren Phrasen ergangen haben.

---

1 Siehe Wright, A Short History of Syriac Literature, p. 146, unten.
Ich meine, die von Professor Brockelmann mir überlassenen Zeugnisse beweisen aufs klarste, daß der Verfasser des zweiten Teiles unseres Briefes nicht ins Blaue geredet hat, und daß wirklich Tieropfer bei den christlichen Armeniern stattfanden, um die besagte Zeit.


Von 13³—15³ ist die Rede davon, "wie die Alten den Palmsonntag, das Passah und die Taufe nicht jedes Jahr, sondern alle 30 Jahre feierten."

Nun geht der Verfasser auf ausserkirchliche Sitten über, die er scharf tadelt. 15³—16³ "darüber, daß der Priester den Bischof segnet, obgleich dieser doch höher steht, als jener." Es ist bei ihnen auch ein anderer hütlicher Gebrauch; d. i. "wenn ein Bischof und ein Priester sich treffen und der Priester vom Bischof gesegnet wird, so wendet sich sogleich der Priester, segnet den Bischof und legt die Hand auf seinen Kopf." Diese Sitte wird natürlich von Ignatius verworfen, denn nach den Kanones kann ein Bischof wohl einen Priester ordnen, aber ein Bischof darf jedoch nur ordiniert werden, wenn ein Patriarch oder Metropolit mit zwei Bischöfen zugegen ist. Darf aber ein Priester nicht helfen, einen Bischof zu ordnieren, so hat er kein Recht, ihm die unheiligen Hände aufs würdige Haupt zu legen. Nach Ter-Minassiantz ist dieser Bericht recht eigentümlich; seines Wissens haben wir in der armenischen Literatur kein Zeugnis für die genannte Sitte. T. M. fragt, ob dieser Vorwurf vielleicht ein Irrtum sei? Ich glaube nicht. Jedenfalls hat diese Sitte bestanden, sonst würde Ignatius sie nicht so scharf angegriffen haben. Übrigens wird man auch über manche der übrigen, genannten Gebräuche unter den Armeniern kein Zeugnis finden; um so mehr aber bei den syrischen Patriarchen und Lehrern, wie Professor Brockelmanns Zeugnisse zur Genüge beweisen. Ter-Minassiantz wird
schwerlich zugestehen, daß in der armenischen Kirche auch Tieropfer gebracht wurden, und doch liegt das klar auf der Hand, wenn man die oben genannten Sätze liest (v. p. 273). Ein argumentum e silentio hat wenig Wert, einen Beweis zu liefern, oder Hypothesen aufzubauen. Hierauf wird die Disziplin in der armenischen Kirche gerügt, die sehr disziplinloses gewesen sein muß. T. M. meint hierzu, „wenn man dem Verfasser Glauben schenken wollte, so müßte der Zustand der armenischen Kirche damals trostlos gewesen sein. Es ist zwar nicht zu leugnen, daß die noch zu nennenden Mißbräuche vorkamen (Also doch!), bedingt durch die unruhige Lage des Landes und der armenischen Catholici; wir können aber doch den syrischen Schriftsteller von Übertreibungen nicht freisprechen.“ Wie steht’s damit? Zuerst gibt T. M. zu, daß die Mißbräuche wirklich gang und gäbe waren, und dann meinte er, er könne doch den Verfasser nicht freisprechen von Übertreibungen. Also bestanden diese Unsitzen doch! Und wenn man alles wüsste, dann wäre die Sachlage jedenfalls noch viel trauriger und trüber darzustellen, als dies schon so der Fall ist. Die Intrigen, die damals in der Kirche gespielt wurden, und auch heute noch gebraucht werden, würden jedenfalls noch ein viel schieferees Licht auf die Kirche werfen, wenn sie alle bekannt wären.


17* wird dann die erbliche Succession der Catholici in Armenien getadelt, weil diese Sitte bei keinem andern Volk der Erde gefunden wird, außer bei den Arabern, deren Kalife auch erblich aufeinander folgen.

Ter-Minassiantz meint hierzu folgendes: Zur Zeit des Johannes Barschuschan (1064—1073) war erst der erste Pahlawani,
Wahram, der Sohn des Gregor Magistros, auf den Catholicus-
thon erhoben worden, und er regierte bis 1105, nach der ge-
wöhnlichen Annahme, die freilich nicht ganz einwandfrei ist.
Sicher ist dagegen, daß zur Zeit Johannes X. (Barschuschan)
noch kein zweiter aus dem Geschlechte Gregors des Erluechters
(die Pahlawanier ließen sich von ihm ableiten) auf den Thron
erhoben worden ist. Die Art und Weise aber, wie der Syrer
diese Sitten tadeln zeigt uns, daß mindestens 2—3 auf einander
gefolgt sein müssen aus demselben Geschlecht. Ist dem so,
dann kann dies Stück erst in der zweiten Hälfte des 12. Jahr-
hunderts geschrieben worden sein.

So weit T. M. Ich möchte nur darauf erwidern, daß (1)
Barschuschan hier gar nicht in Betracht kommt, da ja Ignatius
von Antiochen dies geschrieben hat, wie T. M. auch schon
früher zugestanden hat; und (2) hat jedenfalls Ignatius die
Verhältnisse besser gekannt, als wir.

17a handelt von dem Mißbrauch, „daß Priester ordiniert
werden, ohne daß sie eine Stelle haben.“ Von diesen wird
auch Bestechung genommen.

18a handelt von dem Sündenbekenntnis der Armenian, siehe
alda (p. 293).

19a wird die Heuchelei der Armenian gerügt, die hauptsäch-
lich in Selbstgerechtigkeit besteht. Die Armenian beteiligen
sich nicht am Abendmahl, wenn sie Mönche werden. Das
Mönchtum wird auch scharf mitgenommen. „Vollkommene
Mönche, bei ihnen ist unter tausend nicht einer zu finden . . .“
Das Patenamt bei der Taufsalbung wird von den Armeniern
nicht gebührend beachtet, usw.

19a—20b wird noch einmal klar dargelegt, daß nur die Ar-
menier unter allen Völkern das Weihachtsfest und Epiphanien
am 6. Januar feiern. Selbst wenn man früher das Weihachts-
fest am 6. Januar gefeiert hat, so haben die hl. Väter dieses
Datum, wie so viele Dinge, geändert: z. B. durften die Bischofe
früher heiraten, wie auch „ener“ Gregorius, jetzt nicht mehr,
usw. 20a—23a wird die Bewahrung jüdischer Gesetze behan-
delt. Noch einmal kommt Weihachten und Epiphaniens auf
Tapet. Christus ist wirklich am 25. Dezember geboren und

Damit schließt unser Schriftstück. Man sieht, daß um die
Mitte des 12. Jahrhunderts in Armenien und Syrien die Ge-
müter erregt waren. Bar Hebräus berichtet aus dieser Zeit

Syrische Texte

A. Sendschreiben des Barschuschán (Cod. Berlin. Sachau 60)

§ I.

1 Siehe darüber Ter-Minnassianz, p. 113 f., in Texte und Untersuchungen zur altchristlichen Literatur, Bd. 26.
§ II.

1 Randglosse: لا يعد بالعربية، لا يعد بالعربية، لا يعد بالعربية.
§ III.

لا يُنفِّذ قائم enumerate أمر معجمتكم بحروف الألفية المذكورة مشابهة. فلا أعدوا مجمع صبياناً يستطبع مخرج حرف سلام، وأعدهم من قبل مخلصًا لهم. فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام. أمكن أن يكون ماجعًا من سلام، فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا للفعل، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام. أمكن أن يكون ماجعًا من سلام، فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا للفعل، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام.

لا ينفِّذ قائم enumerate أمر معجمتكم بحروف الألفية المذكورة مشابهة. فلا أعدوا مجمع صبياناً يستطبع مخرج حرف سلام، وأعدهم من قبل مخلصًا لهم. فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام. أمكن أن يكون ماجعًا من سلام، فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا للفعل، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام. أمكن أن يكون ماجعًا من سلام، فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا للفعل، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام.

لا ينفِّذ قائم enumerate أمر معجمتكم بحروف الألفية المذكورة مشابهة. فلا أعدوا مجمع صبياناً يستطبع مخرج حرف سلام، وأعدهم من قبل مخلصًا لهم. فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام. أمكن أن يكون ماجعًا من سلام، فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا للفعل، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام. أمكن أن يكون ماجعًا من سلام، فلا تُهِّجوا مجمعًا للفعل، ولا تُحمَّلونه في مجمع سلام.
§ IV.

على مقربة من المعمل، وسعتها الأفعى، وكَبْرِيَّة الضباب، ونصلت أقدامها لحافة السحاب.

هكذا انتقلت السمعة بصدور سيدة مجهولة، فلقد دفعتها هقارية جلائها نحو السراج الموعود.

معتزلة بعيدًا، تتجلب ضباباً، وتمسك بيدها الصغيرة، وتحتضن رحمتها الأدنى.

أما الآن فقد سقطت، وتلقت نورها الأخير من الأمل، وتبدى ملامحها القوية على سطح الظلام، وهي تبدو كال[src]

1 Ms. o[rigin].
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1 Mrs. Lermusse.
2 Mrs. Lermusse.
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Otto Lichti,

fol.

62

fol.

72

Fehlt im Ms.
حَسَبَ حَدِيثًا، رَّكَّزَ وَنَجَّى نَفْسَهُ فِي مَعَالَةِ يَمِينٍ. حَمَّلَ بِالْكَنُوْسٍِ، وَهُوَ رَكَّزُهُ يَمِينًا، وَهُوَ يَكْسِبُ، وَهُوَ يَطْهُرُ، وَهُوَ يَلْبِسُ النَّحْلَةَ، وَهُوَ يَكُونُ لَهُ. مَنْ يَقْرَرُ وَهُوَ خَيْمَةُ، وَهُوَ يَقْرَرُ، وَهُوَ يَسُبُّ، وَهُوَ يَكُونُ لَهُ. مَنْ يَقْرَرُ وَهُوَ سَيْنُ، وَهُوَ يَقْرَرُ، وَهُوَ يَسُبُّ، وَهُوَ يَكُونُ لَهُ. مَنْ يَقْرَرُ وَهُوَ وَسَطُ، وَهُوَ يَقْرَرُ، وَهُوَ يَسُبُّ، وَهُوَ يَكُونُ لَهُ. مَنْ يَقْرَرُ وَهُوَ سَبْطُ، وَهُوَ يَقْرَرُ، وَهُوَ يَسُبُّ، وَهُوَ يَكُونُ لَهُ. مَنْ يَقْرَرُ وَهُوَ وَسَطُ، وَهُوَ يَقْرَرُ، وَهُوَ يَسُبُّ، وَهُوَ يَكُونُ لَهُ. مَنْ يَقْرَرُ وَهُوَ سَبْطُ، وَهُوَ يَقْرَرُ، وَهُوَ يَسُبُّ، وَهُوَ يَكُونُ لَهُ.

1. مِّلْ شَفَاء، لَا تَعْجِل.
2. رَنْدِيْزِسْ:
§ V.

مللما ملتًا وقشعًا حinem هيبه مشهودل صحبا. متح الال محلا معي محسنلا الحكم نفس من اللهد. بثا ميل من صفاء في مخلصاته. في ململه الاعمال. متحملها معيشًا حنمًا، حنمًا معيشًا حنمًا، حنمًا معيشًا حنمًا، حنمًا معيشًا حنمًا.

§ VI.
§ VII.

Μηδέ μετασχηματισμένος ἢ ἔστιν ὁ ἱερός Μεσσατικός. Αὐτὸς οὖν ἵνα ἐστὶν ὁ ἱερός Μεσσατικός, ἵνα ἐστὶν ὁ ἱερός Μεσσατικός. Αὐτὸς οὖν ἵνα ἐστὶν ὁ ἱερός Μεσσατικός, ἵνα ἐστὶν ὁ ἱερός Μεσσατικός.
§ VIII.

[النص غير قابل للقراءة بشكل طبيعي]

۱ مراجع:...

۲ مراجع:...

۳ راندغليس: ...
§ IX.

عما إذا كثرت العربية في هذه المقالة، فإننا نأمل أن نتمكن من تقديمها بدقة وإيجادها في المستقبل.

إلى أسد، أود أن أذكر أننا كنا معًا في موقف معقد. فإننا جربنا في محاولة لتحديد حقيقة ما يحدث. إذا كانت هناك حاجة إلى دراسة أكثر، فلدينا عواطف معقدة.

نأمل أن نكون قد اكتشفنا بعض الحقائق في هذا السياق. إننا نأمل أن نتمكن من تقديم نتائجنا في المستقبل.

*ملاحظة*

*ف. م. حضري*
§ X.

[Text in Arabic]

[Fehlt im Ms.]
§ XI.

[النص غير قابل للقراءة بشكل طبيعي]
§ XII

لا في الحضرة المكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثفة، فيصلين في حفلة مكثفة، مكثفة.

لا في الحضرة مكثфа
§ XIV.

§ XV.
§ XVI.

Die Reise des Patriarchen Barschuschan

[Text in German]

\[\text{Ms. 18}\]
§ XVII.

§ XVIII.

§ XIX.

§ XX.
§ XXI.

1 Ms. Lathas.
§ XXII.

لا إشكال بحجة صعوبة أخلاقية، بل...

1 Ms. للتحديث.
2 Irrtümliche Wiederholung im Ms.
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B. Zusätze aus verschiedenen Quellen.

1. (Cod. Bibl. Medic. Palat. fol. 139 v. b.)


2 Im Kodex steht hier 

3 Im Kodex steht hier 

4 v. a. beginnt nun.
... نعمة مع بكسر لولا نقص في مكانها.
لا أنه وجد في أحد من ناسك معكم.
سوى هذا لا يتذكر حسناء...
فميث كأنه استحد لكم كلامه.
أنا أستحتر ما صح في كلامه.
لقد وجد في أحد من ناسك معهم.
...
...
...

1 كودекс bat da مصادر.
2 v. b. beginnt nun.
3 Im Kodek steht مصادر.
4 Im Original مصادر.
5 Im Original مصادر.
... mit Unterbrechung der hier angedeuteten Tageszählung

2. (Cod. Bibl. Medic. Palat. fol. 140 v. b.)

.. Fol. 140 r. a. beginnt nun.  
.. Fol. 149 r. b. beginnt nun.


5. (Cod. Bibl. Medie. Palat. fol. 140 v. a.)


1. Überschrift ist in Rot geschrieben.
2. Überschrift ist in Rot geschrieben.
3. Fol. 140 v. a. beginnt hier.
4. Ebenfalls rot.
5. Ebenfalls rot.
7. (Cod. Bibl. Medic. Palat. fol. 140 v. a.)


---

1 Rot.
2 Fol. beginnt hier.
3 Rot.
4 Im Kodex end.
5 Rot.


1. Rot. 2. Im Kodex tomm. 3. Rot.
5. Kod. fügt hinzu مهذب.
6. Im Kodex مهذب.
7. Fehlt im Kod; dafür: مهذب.
11. Fehlt im Kod.
12 (Cod. Bibl. Medic. Palat. fol. 141 r.)


1 Im P eingescbrieben.
2 Fehlt in P; dafür: مبب مبب.
3 Fehlt in P.
4 P hat hier مبب.
5 P hat hier مبب + مبب.
6 Rot geschrieben.
7 Rot geschrieben.

1. Kodex hat.
2. Gewöhnlich.
5. Kodex hat.
7. Rot geschrieben.
8. Sonst Aristakes genannt.
Übersetzung


§ 1.

Erstens, über den Glauben des orthodoxen Volkes der Syrier.

Johannes, ein Knecht Jesu Christi, durch die Gnade Gottes Oberhirte und Herr der Gemeinde, das heißt, durch das erlösende Blut Patriarch geworden, sendet Eurer Heiligkeit einen heiligen Gruß.


Es ist ein Gott, der überall und in uns allen ist, o geistlicher und heiliger Vater! und ein Herr, Jesus Christus, in welchem alles beschlossen ist, nach den Apostolischen Definitionen des göttlichen Paulus und der heiligen Väter des Nicaenum²; und ein Heiliger Geist, der überall ist. Einer und einer und einer, also drei; nicht in allem; wohl in Namen und Hypostassen, in den Prosopen, in charakteristischen Eigenschaften der heiligen Personen; aber eins dem Wesen (νοεσις) nach. Nicht von gleichem Wesen in allem, damit nicht ein-

---

1 Konzil von Nicaea (325).
2 Wir haben hier jedenfalls eine Anspielung auf Gregor des Großen Wort: Wenn Gott und Gott und Gott ist, sagen sie (die Arianer und die Eunomianer), sind dann nicht drei Göter? Und: verehren wir nicht eine göttliche Vielherrschaft? (Orat. XXXI. 139, 14).
dringe bei uns der heidnische Wahn des Sabellius\(^1\)), und wir
am Ende gar tun nach Art der Juden. Auch nicht drei nach
dem Schisma des Arius\(^2\); oder nach Stufe und Maß von groß,
größer, am größten. Das Böse ist gleich frevelhaft, und Ge-
danke und Wille sind gottlos. Also ziemt es sich zu kennen: fol.
Eins in drei, und drei sind Eins, wie Gregorius der Theologe
lehnte.

Der Vater ist Vater ohne Anfang, das heißt ohne Zeugung.
Der Sohn ist Sohn und nicht ohne Anfang; denn er ist vom
Vater gezogen worden. Der Heilige Geist ist ausgegangen vom
Vater und mit dem Sohne. Ein Wesen, eine Gottheit, ein
Reich, eine Ohrigkeit, ein Wille, (und) eine Macht und eine
Tätigkeit.\(^3\) Nicht drei Substanzen, oder drei Götter, oder drei
leitende Prinzipien, oder gar verschiedene und sich gegenein-
ander; sondern es ist ein Gott nach Natur und Wesen\(^4\);
aber drei ὁμοιόμενα, i. e. getrennte Eigenschaften der heiligen
Persönlichkeiten; wie ja auch Adam und Seth und Eva, zum
Beispiel; und die Sonne, ihr Lich und ihre Hitze; und Ver-
stand und Vernunft und Geist; und die Pflanze, ihr Duft und
ihre Farbe usw.; obwohl es gibt nichts in den natürlichen Bei-
spielen, das dem Herrn ähnlich wäre oder sich verglichen

---

\(^{1}\) Sabellius (ca. 235).

\(^{2}\) Arius (256–336).

\(^{3}\) Eigentlich sagt Gregor so: Die Eigenschaften (Gottes) sind: des
Vaters, daß er ohne Prinzip und Anfang ist und heißt Prinzip als das
Ursächliche, als die Quelle, als das ewige Licht; des Sohnes, daß er zwar
keineswegs ohne Prinzip, aber doch das schöpferische Prinzip des Welt-
alls ist. (Orat. XX. 8 p. 380.)

Bezüglich des Heiligen Geistes lehrte Gregor, indem er Johannes 1:9
auf die drei Hypostasen der Gottheit anwandte, und sagte: Es war Licht
und Licht und Licht, aber ein Licht, nämlich ein Gott. Was auch dem
David verschwieg, wann er sagt: In dem Lichte sehen wir das Licht.
Denn jetzt schauen und verkündigen wir es auch, indem wir aus dem
Lichte, dem Vater, das Licht, den Sohn in dem Lichte, dem Heiligen
Geist erkennen. (Ullmann, Gregorius von Nazianz; Orat. XXXI. 3 p.
557.)

\(^{4}\) Gregors Definition hierzu ist folgende: μὲν φῶς ἐν τῷ πάντι ἰδρύει, εὐ-
πρεπεῖ, ἀληθεῖα, εἰπάντ' ἀκριβῶς ἐφεκτὸς, αὐθεντική, εἰπάντ' ἀκριβῶς ἐθεωρητός, in
welcher zugleich der Ausdruck ἀκριβῶς durch die Worte καὶ ἀκριβῶς ἐφεκτῷ-
σεος seine beste Erklärung findet. (Orat. XXXIII. 16 p. 614.)

\(^{5}\) Einen ähnlichen Ausdruck finden wir in Gregors Reden: „Wir wollen
eine und dieselbe Natur der Gottheit festhalten, welche in dem Hervor-
gehenden erkannt wird, wie unser Inneres in dem Verstande, der Ver-
nunft und dem Geiste“. (Orat. XXIII. 11 p. 491.)
ließe, unter den Söhnen der Engel, wie der Prophet David sagt. Dies sind in kurzen Worten die charakteristischen Merkmale, wie die herrliche Trinität beschaffen ist.

§ II.

Einer aber von dieser heiligen Dreieinigkeit kam vom Himmel herab, unverändert, nämlich der Sohn, der vom Vater gezeugt war im geistlichen Sinne. Er ward Mensch, gleich wie wir, um uns entwillen ohne Unterschied, da er seiner Natur nach Gott blieb und bewahrte so die Jungfrau jungfräulich, wenn er auch von ihr an sich nahm menschliches Fleisch. Er, der auch die Gestalt unserer Leiden annahm, nach den prophetischen und den apostolischen Zeugnissen, da er litt und gekreuzigt wurde, und starb in derselben Weise, wie er gezeugt worden war. Auch ist er auferstanden und aufgefahren in die Herrlichkeit zum Himmel; und mit diesem selben Leib wird er wiederkommen, zu richten die Lebendigen und die Toten, wie die Stimme des Engels den heiligen Aposteln verkündigte; wie dies ja in der Schrift der Acta Apostolorum geschrieben steht.


2. Handlos: „Darüber, daß eine Natur in 3 Qhômen ist; eine Herrschaft; aber einer in drei und die 3 sind eins."

2. Über die Menschwerdung sagt Sahak III, nach Ter-Minaasiantz p. 137: Er (Christus) stieg hinab in den Mutterleib der unverderbten Jungfrau, und von ihr menschlichen Leib und Seele und Verstand annehmend, mischte und vereinigte er sie mit dem Feuer seiner Gottheit UND MACHT SIE VOLLKOMMEN ZU GOTT UND ZUR GÖTTLICHEN NATUR. Nicht, indem er ihn (den Leib) aufhielt oder vernichtete und nicht, indem er ihn in Unleiblichkeit verwandelte, sondern er ließ den Leib in seinem Wesen, so daß die Apostel ihn betasten konnten; aber er machte ihn im Mutterleibe der Heiligen Jungfrau vollständig nach der Natur seiner Götlichkeit, und er ließ den Leib nicht nach seinem Wesen bleiben in der Mischung und Vereinigung, in ihr schwach und kraftlos, wie manche in falscher Meinung glauben, sondern in unverständlicher und unaussprechlicher Eilegkeit verwandelte er ihn von der irdischen zum heiligen, von der menschlichen zum göttlichen, von dem geschaffenen zum schöpferischen..., von dem sündigen zum sündlosen, und von dem verderblichen zum unverderblichen... (Buch der Briefe, p. 421.)

§ III.

Darüber, daß bekannt werden soll eine Natur des göttlichen Logos, welcher Fleisch geworden ist.

Nicht zwei Naturen und Personen, nach dem Frevel des Nestorius, des Theodorus und ihrer Konsorten; die nämliche Gott und Mensch vereinigen in einer zufälligen Union und zwei Naturen einführen; verehren das Geschöpf mit dem, Schöpfer, und den Knecht mit dem Herrn; und achten den Menschen, Gott zu sein; machen also die Trinität zu einer Quartenheit, und erneuern damit die jüdische und heidnische Religion. Noch bekennen wir eine Person des einen Christus mit zwei Naturen, zwei Willen und zwei Funktionen, wie die gottlose Schrift Leo's* lehrt, und die verbrecherische Synode von Chalcedon⁴ bestimmte; noch akzeptieren wir eine Person und eine Natur in Wesensgleichheit und Vermischung, wie der ruchlose Eutyches⁵ sagt und eine Schar fanatischer Gotteslästerer.

Aber es gibt nur einen Christus, einen eingeboren Sohn, einen Logos, der Fleisch geworden ist, eine zusammengesetzte Natur und Person (Qnom), in welcher bewahrt wurde das Merkmal der natürlichen Verschiedenheit der Personen, die ungeteilt und unberechenbar, unvermischt, und unverflüchtigt waren; ebenso wie auch die Seele und dieser unser Menschlein; wie der heilige Cyrill⁶ lehrt, und ebenso alle die heiligen und rechtgläubigen Väter. Denn die Union des Logos⁷ mit

---

¹ Nestorius, ↓ 451.
² Theodorus von Mopsueste (350—428, o. 429).
³ Papst Leo I. (440—461).
⁴ Konzil zu Chalcedon (451).
⁵ Eutyches, ↑ 458.
⁶ Cyrill ↓ 444.
⁷ Auch hier ist unser Autor wieder Gregor gefolgt, der an zwei verschiedenen Stellen ungefähr dasselbe sagt: „Der LOGOS Gottes, der ewige, unsichtbare, unbegreifliche, unkörperliche, das Grundwesen aus dem Grundwesen, das Licht aus dem Licht, die Quelle des Lebens und der Unsterblichkeit, der Abdruck der urbildlichen Schönheit, das feste Siegel, das unwandelbare Bild, die Begrenzung und das Wort des Vaters — ER läßt sich herab zu seinem eigenem Bilde, nimmt das Fleisch an sich um des Fleisches willen, das Gleiches durch das Gleiches reinigend, und wird Mensch in jeder Beziehung, ausgenommen die Sünde; er ward empfangen von einer Jungfrau, nachdem die Seele und der Körper derselben vorher gereinigt war durch den Geist; dann auch die Geburt mußte gesehrt, die Jungfräulichkeit aber höher gesehrt werden; und so ging er Gott hervor mit dem Angenommenen: Eines aus zwei Entgegengesetzten, dem Fleische
dem Fleische der Heiligen Jungfrau ist nicht eine der Majestät und Macht, sodass man an ihm zahlt die Naturen und Personen, die Willen und Funktionen, sondern es ist eine persönliche und natürliche Verbindung, da ja auch Seele und Leib nicht vor der Vereinigung zwei und nicht nach der Vereinigung zwei waren; aber der Logos ist nicht Fleisch worden, wenn man zwei Naturen an ihm bekennt nach der Verbindung. Denn nicht vier verehen wir, sagt der heilige Grégorius Thamaturgus: Gott und den Sohn Gottes, den Heiligen Geist und den Menschen von der Heiligen Jungfrau; sondern wir verdammn jene, die so gottlos reden und den Menschen zu göttlicher Ehre erheben. Dies denn ist für uns Syrer die Definition des christlichen Glaubens.


§ IV.

Über den Sauerteig, Sals und Öl, welche wir in der Eucharistie verwenden.

Ihr fragt, was das gesäurte Brot symbolisiere, welches wir, wie alle christlichen Nationen, machen; und das Salz und

und dem Geiste, von denen das Eins vergrößelte, das Andere vergrößelte wurde. O der neuen Verbindung, o der wunderbaren Vermischung (Orat. XXXVIII 18. p. 671; XLV. 9 p. 831.)

1 Gregorius Thamaturgus (210—270).

2 Bei den Armeniern wird beim Abendmahl Ungesäuertes (Brot) ge- nossen. Man gebraucht meistens kleine, runde Cakes, mit der Figur
Öl, welches wir beim Opfer verwenden d. h. in der Eucharistie; und die andern Fragen, welche unten angegeben sind.

Wir sagen also zu Eurer mathematischen Weisheit, daß, wie das Alte das Neue symbolisiert; ich meine, wie das Volk der Juden die christlichen Völker; der Sabbat den Sonntag; die Beschneidung die Taufe; süßes Brot das gesäunte; das Passahlamm Christum, und der Rest des Gesetzes Mosis; und wie auch der erste irdische Adam, welcher von Erde ist, den zweiten Adam symbolisiert, welcher der Herr vom Himmel ist, sagt Paulus; aus diesem Grund ist der Logos Fleisch geworden, d. h. Mensch, wie Adam, damit er im Leibe Adams rettete den Adam, der gesündigt hatte. Und weil Adam aus vier Substanzen oder Elementen (ich meine: Erde, Wasser, Feuer und Luft) und einer vernünftigen Seele bestand, so, daß seine ursprünglichen Bestandteile fünf waren, so auch Christus, der ein Mensch war wie Adam, wurde notwendigerweise und wahrhaftiglich erfunden als einer, der aus fünf Bestandteilen zusammengesetzt war, wie Adam; damit Christus nichts fehlte von dem, was Adam hatte. Wenn jeder Leib aus vier Substanzen besteht, wie ist es dann möglich, daß Adam aus vier Substanzen vollkommen war? Da er doch an der vernünftigen Seele allein anderen Wesen, den lehendigen und den nicht lehendigen, überlegen war. Also bringt die Kirche den Leib und das Blut Christi dar zum Gedächtnis seines Todes, wie er im Obergemach zeigte, und seinen Jüngern offenbarte. Wohl und geziemend also nehmen wir Sauerteig, Salz und Öl in Mehl und Wasser, damit nicht der Leib Christi der Vollendung ermagenge, und wir Mangel hätten am Heil Christi; denn Wasser und Mehl bilden noch nicht den Leib Christi in der Vollständigkeit. Auch nicht die beiden Elemente, Staub und Wasser, konnten oder können den Leib Adams dar-

Christi aufgestempelt, die vom Priester am frühen Morgen gebacken werden. Dafür ist ein kleiner Ofen an die Kirche angebaut. Wenn der Bischof die Eucharistie feiert, baut die Cakes einer der Diakonen.

Der Wein, der beim Abendmahl gebräucht wird, ist der persische Schiraz-Wein, der reiner, vergorener Traubensaft (nicht mit Wasser gemischt) ist.

Die Eucharistie wird nicht am Nachmittag oder Abend gefeiert, sondern am Vormittag; außer am Weihnachts- und Ostersonntagabend und am Gründonnerstag Nachmittag.

1. Kor. 15: 47; Rom. 5: 12 f.


---

1 Ephraim Syrus (306–373 e. 379).
2 Joh. 12:32.
4 Joh. 3:16.
5 Sonderbar ist das an seiner Statt. Ich weiß nicht, in welchem Texte das zu finden wäre.
6 Matt. 5:13.
7 Lev. 2:13.
8 Mk. 9:50.
lebendigen und lebengebenden Opfer, das Salz, das Vorbild seiner Liebe, hineingesetzt sei; mehr als bei den unvernünftigen Opfern vom Gesetz Mosis, welche überhaupt nicht die Opferden sühnen (entsündigen) konnten. So sind auch diejenigen töricht, die ein Opfer ohne Salz darbringen, und fern sind ihre Opfergaben von der Liebe Christi und von dem Vorbild der heiligen Apostel. Denn nicht soll man unschmackhaft, ohne Salz essen, sagt Hiob. Ich aber sage: Kein gekochtes Essen ohne Salz ist angenehm, ebenso kein Wein ohne Wasser; ebensowenig ist ein Opfer ohne Salz annehmbar; nicht im alten Gesetz Mosis, welche die heilige Eucharistie symbolisiert, und auch nicht in diesem neuen (Gesetz), das Christus seiner Kirche überliefert hat. Denn sie erlaubt nicht, daß wir verlassen irgend etwas von dem, was er bestimmt hat, — es sei denn, daß derjenige, der opfert, Jude sei und kein Christ. Denn in den Bestimmungen der heidnischen Weisen und Philosophen gebräuchlich man hier den Terminus: "definita affirmativa (προθεσμοπαρακαταφανὲς) universell einschließend. Denn hull und là kull sind große Definitiones, allgemein und einander entgegengesetzt, gerade wie auch had und là had partiell sind. Also sagt Christus unser Herr zu seinen Jüngern: "Sagt und lehrt alles, was ich euch befohlen habe". Da er nun "alles" sagt, so schließt er damit all die Kanones und Gebote ein. Dies ist alles, was er sagte über das Opfer, das gebracht wird. Es gibt also keine geschmacklosere Opfergabe (Oblate), als die, woran kein erfrischendes Salz ist. Diese Worte nun — wenig anstatt viel — über diesen Gegenstand mögen genug sein.

Über Olivenöl.

Wir gebrauchen Olivenöl auf den Oblaten als Symbol der Barmherzigkeit Gottes zu uns Sündern; denn so meint (tut) es auch das alttestamentliche Gesetz mit den ungesäuerten Brotzen, welche mit Öl bestreichen wurden, und mit den Leuchtern und den Lichtern. Ebenso war das Olivenblatt, welches die Taube dem gerechten Noah zur Abendzeit brachte, ein Zeichen des Endes der Flut. Die Kinder, welche ihm

---

1 Hiob 6:6.
2 Nämlich in der Terminologie der Logik.
3 Matth. 26:19.
4 Ex. 29:2.
5 Gen. 8:3.
6 Matth. 21:15.

Über das alttestamentliche Ungeäuerte, welches unser Herr ab und abschaffte und mit einem neuen Sauerteig begann.


1 Luk. 10:33.  
2 Luk. 10:34.  
3 Joh. 12:3.  
4 Daß Maria, die Mutter Jesu, ihn salzte, nimmt unser Autor jedenfalls aus obiger Stelle, wo Jesus im Hause der Martha ist, und es nun heißt: Da nahm Maria ein Pfund Salbe von echter, sehr kostbarer Narde und salzte die Füße Jesu und trocknete sie mit ihren Haaren.  
5 Luk. 4:37—38.  
6 Matt. 26:36.  
7 Luk. 22:8.  
8 Luk. 22:16, 37.
das alte Bündnis. Darauf nahm er das Brot in seine Hände, und nachdem er gedankt hatte, brach er es, aß, und gab seinen Jüngern auch zu essen. Siehe, er nennt es „Brot“ (lahmā), nicht „Ungesäuertes“ (paltīrā); denn wie es geschrieben steht, also ziemt uns zu glauben, damit wir ohne Fälschung erscheinen. „Brot“, sagen die Heiligen, die Evangelisten, die Apostel und Paulus, nicht „Ungesäuertes.“ Brot (Hamādā) wird nicht Ungesäuertes genannt, und das Ungesäuerte nicht Brot. Ich habe nicht ausgeschrieben das Zeugnis der heiligen Lehrer, um die Sache nicht zu sehr in die Länge zu ziehen. Wenn Ihr aber sagt, daß unser Herr Ungesäuertes gegessen und das A. T. erfüllt hat, und daß er dann, Ungesäuertes essend, mit dem N. T. angefangen hat, so geht das nicht an. Ungesäuertes im A. T. und ebenso im N. T.? Wo ist also das Neue in Christo? Da er aber „alles“ sagte, so ließ er nichts ohne es in dem Wort einzuschließen. Wie entkommt dies Ungesäuerte, welches in Christo nicht erneuert worden ist? Das alttestamentliche Lamm ist abgeschafft worden darin, daß wir fortan keine Tiere mehr opfern, nachdem das Lamm Gottes selbst abgeschafft hat alle Opfer mit seinem Opfer, welches für die Welt ist. Wenn Moses abgeschafft ist mit Christo, und die Torah mit dem Evangelium, und der Sabbat mit dem heiligen Sonntag, so ist notwendigerweise auch Ungesäuertes abgeschafft worden. Wenn Ungesäuertes besteht, und das Lamm noch Berechtigung hat, so ist also bis jetzt der Gesalbte Gottes noch nicht getötet worden, und redet Paulus falsch, wenn er sagt: „Unser Passahlamm ist Christus, geschlachtet und geopfert für uns.“ Wenn jetzt noch das jüdische Ungesäuerte besteht, so ist unser A. T. nicht erneuert worden, und der erste Adam ist noch in seiner Sünde. Und wahr würde das schriftliche Wort der Juden, Töter Gottes, daß bis jetzt Christus noch nicht gekommen ist. Für Christen ziemt es sich, einem zu folgen: entweder Mose mit Opferlamm und alttestamentlichem Ungesäuerten, oder Paulus mit Brot und Wein im N. T. Wenn Ihr nun sagen solltet: Woher hatten sie gesäuertes

1 Vgl. auch die Argumente p. 116 ff.
2 Randglosse: „Diese wurden erneuert, Und Verheißung auf Verheißung wurde uns gegeben. „Abgeschafft“ steht geschrieben in der Stelle wo: „Erneuert ist das Alte.“
3 Dies deutet doch wohl auf Lammopfer hin.
4 Kor. 5:7.

§ V.

Über das Wasser, das wir im Kelch mischen.

Über das Wasser, das wir im Kelch des Blutes mischen. Also lehrte uns Christus, und der Apostel Johannes, der Theologe, daß aus des Herrn Seite Blut und Wasser floß. Blut bedeutet sein Leben, Wasser aber seinen Tod. Wenn wir also durch seinen Tod erlöst worden sind, und die gläubige Gemeinde das Gedächtnis seines Todes in der Eucharistie feiert, wie er auch sagte: 'Dies tut zum Gedächtnis meines Todes', dann verleugnen diejenigen, welche nur reinen Wein machen und auf dem Altar darbringen, seine Leiden und seinen stellvertretenden Tod, da sie ja nur sein Leben predigen. Denn die Heiden Harans und die Juden allenthalben opfern reinen

1 Dtn. 16:3. 2 Gal. 5:2. 3 Joh. 19:34. 4 Meinem Todes steht nicht dabei.

§ VI.

Wegen der Taufe von Kreuzen und Nakuschen.  


1 Sancti Ephraem Syri Opera Tom. I. p. 13 f.
2 Das Nakuscha ist ein dickes Brett mit Löchern, das mit einem Schießgesteinspieren wird um die Leute zum Gebet zu rufen. (Miss. Herald, 1848 Dez. p. 416.)
3 Mat. 28 : 19.
4 Gal. 3 : 27.
5 Joh. 3 : 5.
6 Auch wieder so eine rabbinische Schlüsselung. Welche Spiegel lichte dabei die Polemik erzeugt!

§ VII.

Über das Bekenntnis der Sünde, d. h. ḥos dovānuṭūn.

Ist es nicht schön, sogar sehr lieblich? Aber nur wenn es nach seiner Ordnung vollführt wird. Johannes der Täufer zeigte dies, wo er die Pharisäer und die Sadduzäer taufte zur Buße. „Bringet“, sagte er, „würdige Früchte der Buße“, usw. Denn wenn ein Mensch sündigt und sich bekehrt, und aufstehen und fallen, und bauen und wieder einreißen, und sich vom Klot der Sünde baden und wieder zurückkehren sollte, so ist in ihm die Eigenschaft des Schweines, sagt die Heilige Schrift, und des Hundes, „der sich zu seinem Auswurf wendet“. Wenn einer sich gereinigt hat von einem Toten und geht wieder zu ihm zurück, was nützt das? Der Prophet David sündigte und bekehrte sich, und die Art seiner Buße zeigt er

1 Die Salbung mit Chrisam (heiligem Öl) bedeutet, daß der Getauftes teil an der Salbung des gottmenschlichen Hauptes und zum ausserwählten, priesterslichen Volke Gottes berufen ist. Diese Salbung soll gegen Verderbnis der Sünde schützen und Bewahrung der Taufgnade wirken.
2 Armenisch für die Beichte.
3 Mat. 3: 8.
4 2 Petri 2: 22: „Der Hund kehrte um zu seinem eigenen Gesopf, und die gewaschene Sau zum Wälzen im Kot“.
5 Sirach 31 (34): 30.
durch den Ernst des Gebetes, welches er darbrachte. 5 Simon Petrus verleugnete und bekehrte sich und ward wieder ange- nommen. 6 Und es heisst nicht, dass er nochmals sündigte, so die Zöllner und Huren und der Räuber, 7 der sich am Kreuze bekehrte, siehe das sind Vorbilder und Exempla für den, der sich in Wahrheit bekehrt. Verlaß dich nicht auf die Vergebung, 8 sagt die Schrift, welche nur im Wort ist, damit du nicht Sünde auf Sünde häufst. Also ist die Beichte nicht schön, welche nicht aus der Wahrheit, sondern aus der Falschheit ist. Diese zielt sich weder den Priestern, noch den Dia- konen, noch den Laien. Dies genügt uns soweit.

§ VIII.

Über den Abend des Mittwoch und Freitag.

Wegen des Abends vom Mittwoch und Freitag. Das ist eine toerichte, in der Schrift nicht vorgeschriebene, Gewohnheit. Denn alle Tage sind gleich geachtet in Berechnung und Herrlichkeit der Schöpfung, und keiner von ihnen ist herrlicher, als der heilige Sonntag. Wenn auch Heiden ihn verehren wegen des Zeichens der Sonne 9, so doch die Christen ob des Glaubens. Denn an ihm war alles im Anfang geschaffen, und an ihm war alles erneuert in der Vollendung, da er auferstand aus dem Grabe. 9 Daß einer faste an diesen Abenden, oder esse, ist Sache der Gewohnheit, nichts mehr, und nicht der klugen Berechnung. Denn Speise erhebt uns nicht zu Gott, sagt der Apostel. Wir profitieren nichts, wenn wir essen, und verlieren nichts, wenn wir nicht essen. 7 Darüber nun, daß wir daran festhalten, daß der Anfang des Tages vom Abend und nicht vom Morgen ist. Es ist zu ersehen aus dem, das

1 2 Sam. 12 : 16.
2 Mat. 26 : 70.
3 Luk. 23 : 42.
4 Sir. 34 : 23; Röm. 8 : 2 f.
5 Randglosse: „Die Magier aberachten, der Sonntag sei genannt nach der Sonne, welche über die ganze Schöpfung ist; der Montag nach dem Mond; der Dienstag nach dem Mars; der Mittwoch nach Merkur; der Donnerstag nach Jupiter; der Freitag nach Venus; und der Samstag nach Saturn. Diese Notiz ist von freundschaftlichen Werten.“
6 Luk. 24 : 1 f.
7 Paulus sagt etwas anders: „Speise aber empfiehlt uns Gott nicht; weder sind wir, wenn wir nicht essen, geringer, noch sind wir, wenn wir essen, vorzüglicher“. (1 Kor. 8 : 8).

§ IX.

Über das Fest der Geburt, welches sie nicht feiern wie alle Völker der ganzen Erde.

Über das heilige Weihnachtsfest und Epiphanien, welches Ihr an einem Tage feiert, nach alter Gewohnheit. Wisse,

1 Mat. 12: 40.

Sitte beobachten das ganze Morgenland und der Norden, mit Ausnahme der Armenier, jener dickköpfigen und hartnäckigen Leute, die nicht zur Wahrheit überredet werden; so daß sie nach der alten Sitte am 6. Januar die beiden Feste begehen“. (Assemani, BO, II, S. 163 f.)


Die Armenier feierten nach alter Sitte, Geburt und Epiphanien am selben Tage. Der Vortrag ist der Verkündigung und Empfängnis gewidmet, die Nachtfeier der Geburt, der Haupttag der Taufe. (v. Usener: Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen I, 206 ff.)

1 Luk. 1:36. 2 Luk. 1:36.
sie feiert, bis zur Zeit des Königs Arkadius, der Mar
Johannes Chrysostomos, welche zur selben Zeit lebten. Auf
einmal nun wurde ein großer Untersuchung darüber veranstaltet.
Die heiligen Väter urteilten richtig, daß zuerst das Fest der
heiligen Geburt, und dann das der Erscheinung sein sollte.
Von damals bis heute wurden die heiligen Feste der Geburt
und der Erscheinung festgestellt, jedes für sich, nach der
schönen Sitte, welche die heiligen Väter bestimmten durch den
Einfluß des Heiligen Geistes, welcher sie lehrte und weise
machte, nach der Macht der Wahrheit und der Genauigkeit
des Geheimnisses; wie ja auch bestimmt war die Zeit der Ge-
burt unseres Heilandes, und die göttliche Erscheinung. Dies
ist das Argument für das heilige Fest der Geburt und der
Erscheinung (Weihnachten und Epiphanien), welche wir
feiern jedes für sich. Diese schöne Sitte ist wohl begründet
und in der katholischen Kirche aller Völker akzeptiert.

§ X.

Darüber, daß die Väter viel Pausendes an der kirchlichen Ord-
nung veränderten und in der Kirche ohne Verweis zur Geltung
brachten.

Darüber, daß sie früher nicht feierten das Fest Palmarum,
und nicht das Osterfest in jedem Jahr, und die Taufe nur alle
30 Jahre; während das Fest Palmarum zu keiner Zeit ge-
feiert wurde. Deshalb verfaßte der heilige Gregorius, der
Theologe, keine festliche Predigt darüber (Palmarum), wie er
tat über Weihnachten und Epiphanien. Nicht einmal die
heilige Charwoche und das Osterfest hielten sie zuerst, außer
alle 30 Jahre einmal. Auf einmal verordneten es die Väter
jedes Jahr am Ende des Fastens; das war sehr schön; ebenso
das heilige Fasten von 40 Tagen, jederann, wann er wollte,
und in welcher Zeit er’s gerade wünschte. Die Sache der
Mehrheit siegt; und siehe, alle christlichen Völker feiern das

1 Römischer Kaiser (383—408 A. D.).
2 Chrysostomos (345. 347—407).
3 Epiphanien wird zuerst von Clemens von Alexandrien genannt als
das jährliche Gedächtnisfest der Geburt und Taufe Christi, welches am
6. Januar gedeiht wurde. Im Oecident wurde es später ein Fest für ver-
schiedene Ereignisse — Anbetung der Magier, Hochzeit zu Kana, Speisung
der 5000 usw.
heilige Fest der Geburt, und sie gießen Wasser in den Abendmahlsspeis, indem sie den Kelch der Danksagung mischen; auch nehmen sie Wein und Salz in der Eucharistie. Eins von diesen tun jene nicht, mit vielen andern Dingen. Nicht nur feiern sie das Fest nicht an seinem Tage, sondern sie feiern es am Sonntag. Es ziemt sich aber gar nicht, daß an ihm noch ein Fest gefeiert werde, außer dem Gedächtnis der Auferstehung. Deswegen ist dieser Tag groß und namhaft, heilig und herrlich. Wenn aber an diesem Tag ein anderes Fest veranstaltet wird, so werde es gefeiert nach der Ordnung der Auferstehung; Dienst und Gedächtnis der Auferstehung sollen nicht aufhören an ihm. Wegen der grobärtigen und herrlichen Auferstehung ist es, daß wir ihn beobachten und feierlich und lobpreisend verehren. Also auch in diesem Stück sind sie nicht treu, daß sie das Fest am Sonntag feiern. Wenn wir aber die heilige Feier am Schlüß des Mittwoch und Freitag anfangen, so haben wir dafür kräftige Beweise und wahrhaftige Zeugnisse. Erstens, daß das erste Volk, welches Gott kannte und sowohl nach der Ordnung, wie nach den Gesetzen wandelte, war das Volk der Kinder Israel. Vom Munde Gottes wurde ihnen anbefohlen durch Mose, daß sie am Abend anfangen sollten, ihr Fest zu feiern und ihre Sabbate zu halten, und so tun sie bis zum heutigen Tag. Zweitens aber, da der Sonntag der Tag der Auferstehung ist, und um 9 Uhr am Sabbat beginnt der Sonntag. Und das Licht, welches über Jerusalem herabfloß, zeugt und bestätigt es. Wiederum drittens, daß am Charfreitag der Kreuzigung, in der Nacht, in welcher der Freitag dämmt, alle Völker sehr früh aufstehen und Gebet und Andenken der heilbringenden Passion begehen; nicht in der Nacht, die den Freitag beschließt; weil die Nacht vor dem Sabbat die der Verkündigung heißt, wie die darauffolgende, vor dem Sonntag, die der Auferstehung. Also wahr ist es, daß wir vom Abend den nächstfolgenden Tag bestimmen. Viertens aber, daß alle Völker am Abend vor dem Fest, oder dem Sonntag anfangen, das Fest zu feiern und den Tag des Festes zu ehren. Also bestätigen wir, daß wir am Abend vor dem Freitag anfangen, den Tag der erlösenden Passion mit Fasten und Gebet zu feiern. Ebenso auch der König oder der Regent, wenn es gerade passiert, daß er in ein Dorf oder in eine Stadt einzieht, da ziehen die Leute aus ihm entgegen in feierlicher Prozession, mit Pomp und Pracht, und ehren so seinen Einzug.
Wenn er aber aufbricht, geht er ganz schlicht, nur wenige bemerken seine Abreise. Also tun wir wohl, daß wir zuerst den Einzug feiern, mehr als den Abschied. So wie wir auch die Geburt unseres Herrn sehr ehren und vorher fasten; sei es nun, daß man 40 Tage fastet, oder 30, oder zwei Wochen, oder 25 Tage; worüber eine Menge von Kanones, Lieder und Hymnen verfaßt sind, auch Predigten, und Homilien und Weisagungen, mehr als über den Tag der Himmelfahrt. Denn jener ist die Ankunft Gottes bei uns im Fleische; dieser ist der Abschied. Fünftens endlich, daß jeder vollkommene Tag aus Nachtzeit und Tageszeit besteht, und in 24 Stunden beendet wird. Wir feiern also den heiligen Tag Freitag in der ganzen Nacht- und Tageszeit von 24 Stunden; von Sonnenuntergang vor dem Freitag bis zum folgenden Sonnenuntergang vor dem Sabbat. Doch gibt es noch viele Gründe dafür, daß der Tag oder das Fest bei seinem Eingang mehr als bei seinem Ausgang gefeiert wird. Also haben wir Recht darin, daß wir die Feier des Freitags bei seinem Eintritt beginnen.

§ XL.

Darüber, daß ein Priester den Bischof segnet, obwohl der höher steht als jener.

Es ist bei ihnen eine andere häßliche Sitte, nämlich, wenn ein Bischof zufällig einem Priester begegnet, sobald der Priester vom Bischof gesegnet worden ist, segnet der Priester wiederum den Bischof und legt die Hand auf sein Haupt. Sag mir: Woher hat der Priester die Autorität, daß er dem Bischof etwas geben sollte? Und wenn ein Priester noch mangelhaft und bedürftig ist, daß er von einem Priester den Segen und Handauflegung empfange, wie denn weilt er Priester und Diakonen, und heiligt den Myron und den Altar und die Kirche? Das ist eine häßliche Sitte, und ganz fremd der priesterlichen Ordnung. Der Bischof mag wohl den Priester segnen, sagen die Kanones; aber es ziemt sich nicht, daß er vom Priester gesegnet wird; aber noch mehr: Nicht einmal von seinem bischöflichen Genossen, sondern nur von Patriarchen, welcher größer ist als er; weil ein Bischof einen andern Bischof nicht ordiniere kann; nicht einmal ein Patriarch kann allein ihn ordniren, wenn nicht ein anderer Bischof, oder zwei mit ihm sein sollten, wie es in den Kanones befohlen ist. Ein
Bischof wird von drei Bischöfen ordiniert, oder von zweien, mit welchen entweder ein Patriarch, oder Metropolit sein soll. Ein Bischof kann viele Priester und Diakonen allein ordihieren, wenn kein anderer Bischof in seiner Nähe ist. Deswegen ist er befugt, Priester und Diakone usw. zu segnen und die Hände auf sie zu legen. Der Priester hat aber keine Befugnis, den Bischof zu segnen. Das ist häßlich und verkehrt.

§ XII.

Darüber, daß ihre Bischöfe durch Geld und Bestechungen eingesetzt werden und einer überbietet den andern, und sie jagen einander von der Herde weg.

Wiederum haben sie was anderes, welches am aller schlimmsten ist. Wenn ein Sprengel eines Bischofs bedarf und derjenige, der kandidiert, nicht viel Geld gibt, so wird er nicht ernannt. Derjenige, welcher Geld hat, wenn er auch schlecht ist in seinem Lebenswandel, wird berufen und erhält eher, als der, welcher fromm und tugendhaft ist, aber kein Geld gibt. Nachdem jemand berufen und erhält und zum Sprengel gegangen, legt man jedes Jahr eine beliebige Summe Tribut auf ihn; und nachdem er ein Jahr oder zwei oder ein wenig mehr in dem Sprengel gestanden ist, kommt ein anderer, und wenn er ihm 10 oder 20 Denare überbietet, wird der erste vertrieben und der andere eingesetzt. Und ebenso wird dieser über ein Weilchen vertrieben; ein anderer kommt, jagt ihn fort und nimmt seinen Sprengel. Und so geschicht es, ohne Hindernis, daß ein Sprengel eine Menge Bischöfe hat; und wenn einer den Sprengel erhält, da überlaufen die anderen andere Sprengel, damit sie andern ebenso tun.

§ XIII.

Auch die Aufsicht der Klöster und Konvente ist ebenso beschaffen.

Irgendein Mönch geht und gibt dem Ortsvorsteher Geld, ob der Machthaber ein Heide oder ein Christ ist, und reißt an sich das Archimandritenamt, das heißt, die Aufsicht des

---

1 Noch im 15. Jahrhundert wurden die Bischöfsstühle an den Höchstbietenden verkauft. Die Kleriker erpressten Geld vom Volk, um die
Klostern, was es auch sei, und ist fortan Herr des Platzes und Machthaber in allem. Er kauft und verkauft, baut und zerstört, und er macht zu seinem Erben, wen er will. Er unterwirft seine Mitbrüder wie Sklaven, so daß sie überhaupt keine Autorität mit ihm haben in der Leitung des Klostern. Aber jeden Tag wird jedem für seinen Bedarf Speise gegeben, einfach und kärglich. Der Abt behält, wen er will, und jagt fort, wen er will. Und die Brüder selbst, weil sie im Kloster nichts gelten, laufen beständig von einem Ort zum andern und wechseln von einem Kloster zum andern. Wenn aber über ein Weilchen ein andrer kommt, und dem Herrn des Ortes mehr Geld gibt, wirft er den vorigen hinaus und nimmt seine Stelle. Und so stecken sie in dieser Verwirrung ohne Ende.

§ XIV.

Über den Thron des Katholikats, welche sie durch erbliche sowohl Nachfolge einander übertragen, ebenso den erhabenen Thron ihres Pontifikats.


In den apostolischen Kanones war es nämlich verboten, daß ein Bischof seinen Stuhl irgend jemand vermachen kann.

§ XV.

Über Priester, welche ordiniert werden, ohne daß sie eine Stelle haben.

Ebenso, wenn sie einen Priester einsetzen, nehmen sie von ihm große Bestechung und entlassen ihn, daß er umherirre und diene, wo er will. Sie ordonieren also nicht über ein bestimmtes Heiligtum, wie es in den Kanones befohlen ist; auch ist seine Stelle ganz unbekannt.

§ XVI.

Über die Art des Bekenntnisses bei ihnen, welche nicht schön ist.

Wiederum aber bezüglich des Bekenntnisses, dessen sie sich nicht bedienen, wie es ordnungsgemäß ist. Aber es stehen da niedergeschrieben alle Arten der Sünde, welche in der Welt getan und auch nicht getan werden. Wenn jemand seine Sünden bekennen und sich bekehren will, so sitzt der Priester da und verliest ihm alle, die er je getan und auch nie getan hat, ja sogar solche, wovon er nie gehört und welche nie in seinen Sinn gekommen wären; und dabei kämpft mit ihm der böse Gedanke von diesen Dingen, welche er hörte, welche nun existierten und geschrieben standen, und die er auch lernte zu tun. Wiederum aber auch der Priester, der solch schändliche Arten von Sünden verliest, der überhaupt auch niemanden hat, der sie anhört, so kommen sie in seinen Sinn und Schaden ihm viel, indem sie seinen Sinn verstören, und beständig halten sie sich auf in seinen Gedanken.

Wiederum hat ihr Bekenntnis und ihre Lehre viel Ähnliches
mit der Häresie der Novatianer,\footnote{Novatian (c. 200–255).} welche nicht annehmen die Bekehrung von der Sünde. Und wenn irgendein Kleriker in Hurerei, im Betrug, oder in Begierde und Wollust des Leibes gefallen ist, wenn er, wie David und Manasse,\footnote{Manasse 2 Chr. 33 : 13.} Buße tut durchs ganze Leben, wird er doch nie wieder aufgenommen in das Amt, worin er einst stand. Wie (sagen sie) ein gläsernes Gefäß, wenn es zerbrochen ist, nicht wieder zusammengefügt und ineinander gepaßt wird, wie es einmal war, so ist's mit dem Menschen, der seinen Leib verunreinigt hat, er kann nicht wieder sein, was er war. So sagen sie. Es widerlegt sie die Sünderin, welche angenommen wurde, begleitete beständig den, der alles heiligt, und im Evangelium gerühmt wurde als Predigerin des Evangeliums.\footnote{Matt. 26 : 13.} Und der Zähler, welcher gerecht fertigt wurde, ward ein Apostel, und stieg auf und wurde erhöht zum Rang der Zwölfe, und schrieb das heilige Evangelium. Wiederum auch David, nach seiner unreinen Begierde, und seinem Ehebruch und verbrecherischen Mordtat, wurde durch die Buße erhöht zur höchsten Stufe der Prophetie, und er wurde genannt: Herz Gottes und Vater Christi. Und so auch die anderen Sünder, welche sich bekehrten und angenommen wurden, die wieder aufstiegen und ihren Rang und ihren Dienst einnahmen.

Aber eine Menge von ihnen erlauben nicht, daß solche (bekehrte Sünder) am Mysterion Christi teilnehmen. Also kommt es vor, daß einer eine Zeit von 20, 30, 40 und 50 Jahren bleibt, ohne überhaupt je teilzunehmen am heiligen Kelch. Auch von der Ordnung der Priester und Mönche, bleiben ebenso manche jahrelang, ohne daß sie teilnehmen: dazu viele der Bischofe. Wiederum gibt es viele Bischofe, welche kein Opfer bringen, oder teilnehmen an den heiligen Sakramenten; jedoch ordiniert man Priester, Kirchen und Altäre weilt man ein, man tauf, und segnet und auch das übrige. Diese große Dummheit ist doch wunderbar. Wer nicht wert ist, Gaben zu opfern, wie sollte der würdig sein, einen Priester zu ordnieren, daß er opfern kann? Oder einen Altar (einzuleiten), worauf das sühnende Opfer dargebracht und vollendet wird?

\footnote{Novatian (c. 200–255).} \footnote{Manasse 2 Chr. 33 : 13.} \footnote{Matt. 26 : 13.}
§ XVII.

Über die Heuchelei.

Wiederum ist bei ihnen ein Anderes, daß all ihr Verkehr, ihr Lebenswandel und ihre Tätigkeit mit Gepräge und Ostentation, nicht in Wahrheit und Aufrichtigkeit ist. Äußerlich und vor den Leuten zeigen sie sich gerecht, Abstinentier, Nazirier, keusch und heilig; aber inwendig ist ihre Lebensweise lieberlich. Über sie ist vollbracht die Beschuldigung, die im heiligen Evangelium steht.

§ XVIII.

Darüber, daß sie nicht teilnehmen am heiligen Abendmahl, wenn sie (Mönche) werden, wie wir tun.

Diese scheinbaren Mönche, in ihren Gewändern, sind eigentlich keine Mönche; man hält nicht einmal geistlichen Gesang und Gebet über sie. Aber jeder einzelne, wenn es ihm paßt, legt das Mönchsgewand an, und isst Fleisch zu jeder Zeit ohne Hindernis oder Maß. Aber vollkommene Mönche, nicht einer unter tausend ist bei ihnen zu finden; der den Talar genommen hätte mit Gebeten und geistlichen Lobgesängen nach der Ordnung der Tonsur.

§ XIX.

Darüber, daß sie nicht achten auf das Patenamt bei der heiligen Taufsalbung.


§ XX.

Über das Fest der Geburt.

Über das Fest der heiligen Geburt, welches sie nicht gleichwie jedermann feiern, sondern dabei ihre eigentümliche Sitte halten, apart von allen Völkern, welche den Gekreuzigten
verehrten. Sie waren nicht die ersten, die das Evangelium akzeptierten, daß sie nun wünschen, ihr Eigenes aufzurichten, und die Gewohnheit, welche sie empfingen von den Aposteln, preiszugeben. Sie waren im Gegenteil die allerletzten, die an das Evangelium glaubten, durch den heiligen Gregorius im Jahre 863 des Alexander. Nachdem sie Christen geworden waren, kamen viele Synoden zustände in der Welt; und alles was sie beschlossen und überlieferten, wurde angenommen und angeordnet in der Kirche der Syrer, Griechen, Römer, Ägypter, Araber, Äthiopier und Inder, der fernen Länder; wie auch bei den Anbaren, welche im Innern des Landes und ihre Nachbarn sind; und bei den Alaken, welche im Norden von diesen wohnen; bei den Chazaren und Russen (welche Skythen sind), und bei den Ungarn, Bulgaren und Balkern, und den übrigen Völkern und Nationen, welche glaubten an die evangelische Botschaft. All diese feiern das Fest der Geburt (Weihnachtsfest) am selben Tag, am 25. Dezember, und Epiphanien am selben Tage, am 6. Januar. Wie kommt es nun, daß jene (die Armenier) so verschieden sind von allen anderen? Nur sie feiern die Geburt und Erscheinung am selben Tag; und wenn sie behaupten, daß das eine alte Sitte ist, so auch die Altvorder gepflegt haben, so behaupten wir: viele von den früheren Gebrauchen sind von den Vätern und Lehrern geändert worden, wie wir oben zeigten im Briefe des Patriarchen, des Mar Johannes.1 Vieles ist abgeschafft worden, und vieles wurde erneuert. So hat man abgeschafft, daß man sich taufen läßt 30 Jahre alt. Auch dies, daß Bischöfe Weiber und Kinder hatten, als sie in der Welt (Laien) waren; späterhin schickten sie die Frauen weg und wurden Bischöfe, wie auch euer Gregor und viele. Und dies, daß sie dienende Frauen ordinierten, welche salbten die Frauen, welche mit uns waren, Und vieles wie dieses hat man auch erneuert. Zum Beispiel das, daß sie junge Kinder taufen; und das, daß sie jedes Jahr die Passion und Ostern (Passah) feiern; und dies, daß alle Menschen, welche das heilige Kreuz verehren, fasten sollen 40 Tage zusammen vor Ostern; da früher jeder 40 Tage fastete, wann es ihm beliebte im Jahr. Sie erneuerten auch Palmarum, welches überhaupt nicht mehr gefeiert wurde, und das Laub-

hüttenfest auf dem Berg Tabor. Auch das heilige Weihnachts-
fest ordneten sie in seiner Zeit, mit viel Examinieren, und
Forschen von vielen, und Berechnungen, welche mit größter
Genauigkeit und mit Erlaubnis des heiligen Geistes ausgeführt
wurden.

§ XXI.
Über die Währung des jüdischen Gesetzes.
Darüber, daß die ersten Christen viele Gebräuche der jüdi-
dischen Gesetzesbeobachtung hielten, welche die heiligen Apostel
und ihre Jünger aufhoben und entfernten sich von ihnen;
obwohl sie die Sitte dieses Festes, nach Berechnung des Mondes,
festhielten nach Ordnung der Juden, welche Mondmonate
haben, sie akzeptieren durch Tradition, daß unser Herr ge-
boren wurde am Sechsten im Monat Januar; und ebenso getauft
wurde am Sechsten des Monats Januar. Und sie feierten das Fest
des ersten Ortes, das Sechsten des Monats. Am Abend zwar feierten
sie das Fest in Bethlehem; und gleich darauf brachen sie auf von
Bethlehem und stiegen hinab zum Jordan, und die ganze
Nacht quälen sie sich mit Kälte und Regen und Schnee, wie
es im Winter an der Tagesordnung ist. Am Morgen feierten
sie dann Tauffest am Jordan. So taten sie bis zur Zeit des
Mar Johannes Goldmund (Chrysostomus), in den Tagen des
Königs Arkadius, des Vaters Theodosius, des Jünger.
In der Zeit wurden einige in Jerusalem vom Heiligen Geiste ge-
trieben, daß sie eine Untersuchung und ein Dokument über die
Geschichte der Feste verlangten, welche nicht geziemend ver-
vollkommnet seien; da man erstens das Fest der Geburt am
Abend in Bethlehem feierte, und dann in aller Eile und Er-
schöpfung aufbrach in derselben Nacht, bis zum Jordanfluß
(ging), und am Morgen Tauffest feierte, ebenso in Eile; dann
ließ man zurück nach Jerusalem, um das Fest des Stephanus
zu feiern, da, wo er gesteigert und begraben wurde; weil man
nach den herrlichen Festen der Geburt und Taufe das des
Stephanus feierte. Und sie forschten nach und stellten Unter-
suchungen an, über die Sache. Sie schickten daher Schreiben
an die Patriarchen, welche damals in Rom, Konstantinopel,
Alexandrien, Antiochien und den übrigen berühmten Orten
standen; und überall hatte man deswegen Synoden, und die
Sache wurde genau untersucht und sorgfältig darüber nach-

§ XXII.

Wiederum untersuchten und berechneten auch die heiligen Väter, daß unser Herr im 30. Jahr getauft wurde, welches das 339. der Griechen ist, und im 15. Jahr des Kaisers Tiberius, welcher die Stadt Tiberias am galiläischen Meer baute, wo der Jordan
ventspringt; darin hat er bildlich prophezeit über die feste Stadt der heiligen Taufe, welche zu jener Zeit gebaut und bestattet wurde am geistlichen Jordanflusse. Und sie fanden durch genaue Berechnung, daß in diesem Jahr der Anfang des Mond-Monats Januar mit dem des Sonnenmonats zusammen fällt, i. e., der Sechste nach dem Mond war gleich mit dem Sechsten nach dem Sonnenmonat. Da ordneten sie an, daß Epiphanien an dem Tag sein sollte, welcher der Sechste im Sonnenmonat Januar ist, und abgeschafl sei die Berechnung nach dem Monde (Mondkalender). Nachdem also festgelegt wurde, wie es sich gehört, genau und unübertrefflich, die Chronologie dieser heiligen Feste von den heiligen Vätern und den Patriarchen, welche versammelt waren mit Übereinstimmung des Heiligen Geistes, da schrieben sie und sandten nach Jerusalem und all den anderen Gegenden diese Bestimmungen, welche von ihnen unter der Mitwirkung des Heiligen Geistes verfaßt worden waren. Seitdem ist diese schöne Ordnung gefeiert worden in allen Kirchen aller Nationen und Zungen, ebenso auch das heilige Fest, Palmariun; damals wurde es festgesetzt, und angeordnet unter Mitwirkung des Heiligen Geistes.

Seit jener Zeit haben sich die Christen nie wieder des Mondkalenders bedient, um ein Fest zu bestimmen; das Osterfest ausgenommen, welches ohne Zweifel mit dem Passah der Juden übereinstimmte; i. e. der 14. Tag im Monat Nisan, der Tag, an welchem man feierte das Gedächtnis des Auszugs aus Ägypten, und des Würgengels, welcher schonend vorbeiführte, und an den Türen vorüberging, wo man ein Lamm geopfert hatte. Und man erinnert sich dieser Dinge am heiligen Sabbat des Passion, weil an ihm, am Passah der Juden und am 14. Tage, an welchem das Lamm geopfert wurde, wurde geopfert das heilige Lamm Gottes am Querbalken des Kreuzes.

Es geschah aber im Sonnenmonat am 25. März, an dem Tage, an welchem seine Empfängnis verkündigt worden war, da gab er seinen Geist auf. Und auch bei Römern und Griechen wird diese Geschichte aufbewahrt und niedergeschrieben im Kodex der Feste.

Unterschrift:

Ignatius, Patriarch von Antiochien, genannt Matthäus, im Jahr 1111 nach der Liste der 133. der Jakobitischen Patriarchen, Matthäus aus Mardin.
B. Zusätze aus verschiedenen Quellen.

1.

Wiederum eine Rede des Lehrers Mar Jdaqob über Wasser.

Die Lämmer verehren das lehendige Lamm Gottes, welches ein Opfer war, das sie von Opfern befreit. Gott hat vollendet das Sakrament (der Opfer) mit dem Opfer seines Sohnes, welches die Opfer und auch die Libationen der Völker symbolisierten. Nachdem er ein großes Opfer geworden ist für die Sünden, wird ein andres Opfer, von seiner Zeit bis jetzt, nicht angenommen.

Die heutige Kirche ist doch nicht jüdisch, daß sie Opfer brachte, außer das Opfer des Leibes und Blutes des Sohnes Gottes, wie sie belehrt wurde vom Eingeborenen, der seinen Leib brach. Und nicht wird wiederum ein anderes Opfer verlangt außer diesem. Die Sakramente sind vollkommen, und nicht sind wiederum heute Opfer (nötig), da der Sohn Gottes geopfert wurde auf dem Altar, am Quer balken (Kreuz). Wer aber ein anderes Opfer vertritt, ist nicht vom Herrn, da heute nicht mehr animalische Opfer gebracht werden sollen. Wenn nun ein Mensch sich verirrt und ein Opfer bringt wie der Jude, so verleugnet er also all die Passion des Eingeborenen.


Der Jude wartet bis jetzt, daß der Messias komme, und bringt Opfer, um mit einem Bilde darzustellen, wie er kommt.
2.

Von einer Anzahl von Lehrern und rechtgläubigen Vätern.
I. Mar Ephraim.


3.

Mar Ishaq.

Ein totes Opfer ist nicht lebendig machend für diejenigen, die in Christo schlafen. Ochsen und Schafe, die am Todes- tage für die Toten geopfert werden, gereichen denen, die sie essen, zur Verdammmnis, und den Verstorbenen bringen sie Qua- len. — Ein totes Opfer macht nicht lebendig die, die in Sünden gestorben sind. Mit dem Blute der Tiere werden heute die Verstorbenen nicht erlöst. — Und mit dem Priester, welcher Salz segnet, sollst du nicht im Gebet stehen, damit nicht die Engel dich schelten, wenn sie ihn in Gehenna stürzen.

4.

Von dem Lehrer Mar Jaqob.

Schlechter als ein Heide ist, wer heute ein Lamm opfert; oder Ungesäurtes als Hostie anfaucht am Opferheiligtum.
Jeder, der heute ein Lamm oder Ungesäubertes darbringt, verleugnet den Vater, welcher seinen Sohn opferte, damit er ein Opfer sei.

5.

*Der freudige Ignatius.*


6.

*Gregorius Thaumaturgus.*

Nicht kann ein Christ die Nacht des Mittwochs und Freitags aufgeben, ohne verdammt zu werden mit denen, die unsern Herrn fesselten in der Nacht des Freitags und ihn Pilatus überlieferten. Und die, welche die Nacht des Samstags wachen, werden verdammt mit denen, welche die Beine der Räuber brachen, damit der Sabbat nicht geschändet würde, und sie vom Gesetz verdammt würden.

7.

*Johannes sagt:*

Solange die Welt tot war, opferte man Ungesäubertes, weil Ungesäubertes tot ist. Seitdem aber Christus gekommen ist, welcher das Leben ist, opfern wir gesäubert Brot, welches Leben ist, zum Beweis der Wiederkunft Christi.

8.

*Dionysius sagt:*

Es findet sich durchaus nicht, daß eins von den Sakramenten des Priestertums vollkommen wäre, außer wenn die göttliche

9.

Mar Severus.

Hab Acht, o Christ, daß nicht dein Heil mit den Juden ist. Wenn du für einen Verstorbenen die Fläumis der toten Tiere issest, bedenke, mein Lieber, was Basilius der Große tat, mit dem Manne, der Fleisch essen ließ für seinen toten Sohn. Auch den Priester, der von jenem Ochsenfleisch aß, setzte er vom Priestertum herab, und legte auf ihn ein siebenjähriges Fasten; und auf den Gläubigen, der das Opfer brachte, ein dreijähriges; und auf jeden, der davon gegessen hatte, ein einjähriges Fasten. Also, es soll überhaupt nicht geschehen, daß ein Christ für einen Verstorbenen Fleisch ißt.

10.

Rabbula von Edessa.

Nicht sollen die Geistlichen, nämlich die Priester und Dia- konen und Gläubigen, beim Gedächtnis der Verstorbenen Fleisch essen, noch Wein trinken. Sonst, anstatt einer trauernen Seele, welche Gnade sucht für den Verstorbenen, lachen sie, scherzen und zürnen Gott. Anstatt, daß das Herz flieht, besitzen sie ein hartes und geiziges Herz, und werden Genossen der Juden, welche unsern Herrn gekreuzigt haben, damit er ihre Opfer nicht abschaffte. Denn die Juden, wie die Heiden,
nehmen den Gedächtnisritus ihrer Toten „Opfer“, wir aber „Wachen“, weil beim Wachen kein Fleisch ist, sondern Speise, welche den Christen zientes, wobei keine Fäulnis der toten Tiere ist. Und wie die Christen von den Juden und Heiden getrennt sind durch den Glauben, so ziemt es sich, daß bei ihren Gedächtnisfesten man sich trennt von ihnen; weil die Heiden und Juden Opfer, die Christen aber Vigilien und Opfergaben haben.

11.

Ja'qob von Edessa.


12.

Mar Johannes.

In diesen acht Tagen der Passion unseres Herrn ist es nicht recht, für den Christen, daß er Ungesänetes esse, (damit er

13.

Gregorius, welcher die Armenier belehrte.

Nachdem er Katholikus durch Leontius, Patriarch von Rom, geworden war, lehrte er viele Völker. Da nahm er Priester und Diakone von Sebast in Kappadokien und ging in alle Gegend und lehrte bis nach Tarün und allen Städten der Armenier; und er kam nach Amid und Nisibis und Persien und Chorasan, bis zu den Grenzen der Araben; und wenn immer er predigte, weissagte er über das Volk der Armenier, indem er sagte: „Nach kurzer Zeit werden zu ihnen kommen fremde Lehrer, die der Glaubenswahrheit abhold sind, und werden sie abwendig machen von der Predigt der Apostel; und, wegen ihrer Herzenshärigkeit, da sie sich von der Wahrheit nicht überzeugen lassen, wird es zum letzten schlimmer mit ihnen als zum ersten“. Und siehe da, seine Weissagung war aus der Wahrheit; weil er je 40 Tage fastete, wie auch Moses und Elias, und auf ihm war die Gabe der Weissagung. Zu seiner Zeit wurde auch Konstantin gläubig, der siegreiche König, und eins wurde der Glaube an Christum allerorts. Deshalb rühmten sich die Armenier des Gregorius, welcher sie belehrte, weil er von Eusebius in Caesarea gelehr't worden war; und die Handauflegung, welche er empfing von Leontius, dem Patriarchen, geschah in Rom. Der Sohn Gregors, Arystus, war auf der Synode der 318 Väter (Nicäa). Und er nahm von ihr die Kanones und die Glaubenssätze und kam, sie seinem Vater zu zeigen, und er freute sich über den wahren Glauben. Es steht aber nicht geschrieben, daß Gregor Lamm,
oder Ungesäueretes opferte, denn es kam keine Härse in den wahren Glauben hinein; und an vielen Orten verbot er den Kongregationen seines Volkes, den Freitag und Mittwoch frei zu geben, bis am Abend; und nicht hielten sie die Nacht des Donnerstag und des Samstag, wie sie die Armenier halten in ihrem Wahnsinn, indem er vielen von den Kongregationen des Volkes verbot, sich in der Nacht des Mittwoch und Freitag mit Fisch und Wein zu verunreinigen. Dies tat er allezeit.

Wenn in einem Lamm oder im Ungesäuereten die Kraft läge, Sünden zu vergeben und dem Übel der Welt zu widerstehen, wozu wäre dann Christus gekommen? Aber weil er sah, daß die Sünde sich mehrte, und Geiz an den Priestern klebte und die Opfer und Opferspenden nutzlos geopfert wurden, da verließ er seine himmlische Wohnung, stieg herab, sein Geschöpf zu erlösen; und anstatt eines Lammes, opferte er sich selbst, anstatt Ungesäuereten nahm er in seine heiligen Hände gesäuertes Brot und stellte dar seinen Leib: nahm Wein und Wasser und mischte sie, machte sie zu seinem lebendigen Blut, und gab sie als Leben für die Welt. Er schaffte ab das Passahlamm, Ungesäueretes, und den ganzen Gestank der Opfer.
Prefatory. — This third book of the Kashmirian AV. is edited in the same manner as were the first and second books (see this Journal vol. 26 p. 197 and vol. 30 p. 187). The same freedom has been maintained in regard to the form of presenting the material, but as heretofore the transliteration is considered first in importance. An effort has been made to reduce commentary to the smallest limits; and this may have produced an appearance of assurance regarding the emended text offered, but it is rather more appearance than reality. The text as constituted is a product of textual criticism solely, and only rarely has a purely conjectural reading been suggested or a venture made towards the higher criticism. Mutilated passages might sometimes be made intelligible by free guesswork, but even moderate assurance about a reading can be felt only if similar phraseology can be cited from other Vedic Texts.

Inasmuch as this is really preliminary publication it seems proper to put it in print now rather than hold it back on account of some unsolved difficulties. A revision and republication which would have some finality may properly be undertaken when the whole, or at least half, shall have been published in this manner. The fourth book will follow this one as soon as possible.

The transliteration is given in lines which correspond to the lines of the ms.; the division of words is of course mine, based on the edited text. The abbreviations are the usual ones; except that Q. is used to refer to the A.V. of the Çaunukiya School, and ms. (sic) is used for manuscript. The signs of punctuation used in the ms. are fairly represented by the vertical bar (= colon) and the “.” (= period): in the trans-
iteration the Roman period stands for a *virāma*: daggers are used to indicate a corrupt reading as they are used in editions of classical texts.

**Introduction.**

*Of the ms.* — This third book in the Kashmir ms. begins f. 49 a, l. 2 and ends f. 61 a, l. 3, — 12 folios: only one letter is illegible owing to peeling of the bark, on the last line of f. 52 a, and unclear signs are only four I think. It may be noted here that in this ms. a ligature which seems clearly trr appears very frequently but not always for tr: and one ligature seems regularly to serve for nn and *r n*. In this part of the ms. most of the pages have 18 or 19 lines of script.

**Punctuation and numbering.** — There are no stanza numbers, and only the most irregular punctuation to indicate the ends of stanzas or hemistichs: sometimes a visarga or anusvāra gives the hint. Except when a stanza is entirely rewritten I have not ordinarily mentioned corrections of punctuation. There are no accents marked in this book.

The grouping of the hymns in anuvākas is maintained in this book, eight anuvākas with five hymns in each; and all are correctly numbered except the first which is marked a 5, the 5 belonging to the fifth hymn which is not numbered. All the hymns save four are numbered correctly: for no. 5 and no. 11 the end is indicated but no number given, for no. 28 and no. 38 the end is not indicated.

**Colophons, glosses, &c.** — There are a few things of this sort that may well be recorded here. In the left margin opposite hymn 10 stands raksāmantram; in the left margin opposite hymn 34 stands somā rājānam acervacana (*sic*); cf. f. 63 b. In the text before hymn 11 stands atha raksāman- tram; then after the six stanzas which appear also as Č. 3, 23 there stands RV. 10. 87. 1 entire followed by the pratikā of RV. 10. 87. 25 (its last stanza) and the direction jāpet sar- vam; finally stands iti raksāmantram. This seems to be a clear case of intrusion of sutra into our text. And I incline to think that a bit of commentary has gotten in between stt. 10 and 11 of hymn 25, taken in possibly from a bottom margin. In hymn 34 between stt. 1 and 2 there stand 3 pādas which seem to be pratikas, and not constituent pādas of a stanza. In hymn 31 only the pratika of st. 1 is given followed by ity
eka to indicate previous occurrence in this ms.; the same practice is noted in Book 4. There are some corrections inserted between the lines and some in the margins: most of them are helpful, but self-evident.

**Extent of the book.** — This book contains 40 hymns of which 3 are prose; parts of 3 others are or seem to be prose. The normal number of stanzas in a hymn is 6, as it is in C, 3; 26 hymns have 6 stanzas each, and not one has less I believe. Assuming the correctness of the verse divisions as edited below we have the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26 hymns have</th>
<th>6 stanzas each</th>
<th>= 156 stanzas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>= 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>= 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>= 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hymn</td>
<td>10 stanzas</td>
<td>= 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>= 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>= 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 hymns have</td>
<td></td>
<td>= 274 stanzas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**New and old material.** — Estimating by stanzas which are new in structure we have just over 80 new stanzas; estimating by pādas which are not in the *Concordance* the total is slightly less, because some few pādas which do appear in the *Concordance* are parts of stanzas which may properly be called new. There are 14 hymns which may be called new, though some of them contain stanzas already known.

Of the 31 hymns in C, 3 sixteen appear here in fairly close agreement: this is the practically the same proportion of correspondence that was found in Pāipp. Books 1 and 2. There are here also 2 hymns each of C, 2 and 7, and 3 hymns each of C, 4 and 19, and a few scattering stanzas or pādas of C, 5, 6, and 9. Of other Vedic texts there are only a few scattered stanzas of RV, VS, KS, Kāuṇika: one hymn here is partly parallel to some mantras of MS, and one appears in a form which is closer to the form given in TS. that to the form given in C.
oṃ namo gāṇḍhipataye z z oṃ a tvā gni rāṣṭram saha varcasodhi
ṣ prāg viĉām patir ekarāt tvām vi rājā sarvās tvā rājan
pradīço hvaya-
ntūpasadyo namasyo bhaveha tvām viço vrnutām rājyāya
tvām imāḥ prā-
diĉaś paṇca devīḥ varṣma rāṣṭrasya kakudhi crayasvāto
vasūni vi bhajā-
my agrāḥ aĉchi tvā yattu bhuvanasya jātāgneñī dūto va
jarase dadhāti jāyā-
ṣ putrāḥ sumanaso bhavantu bahuṁ balim prati paĉyāma
ugrā z z
aĉnā tvāgre mitrāvaruṇobhā viĉve devā marutas tvā hva-
yantu | sajātā-
nāṁ madhyameśtheha ma syā sve kṣettre savite vi rāja |
ā pa drava paramasyāṁ
parāvataĉ ĉive te dyāvapṛthvī babhūtām | ud ayam rājā
varuṇas tathā-
ha sa tvāyam ahvat svenām ehi | indro idam manusya prehi
sah hi yaĉniyā-
s tvā varuṇena samvidānaḥ sa tvāyam ahvat sve sadhasṭhe
sa devān yakṣa-
t sau kalpayād diĉah | pathyā revatir bahudhā virūpāḥ
sarvā
s saṅgatyā varivas te akraṇ, tās tvā sarvās samvidānā
hvayaṇtu daĉa-
mim ugrās sumanā vaĉeta | yadi jareṇa haviṣā da tvā
gamayā-
masi | atrā ta ēndṛas kevalīr viço baliḥṛtas karat. z z

Read: a tvā gan rāṣṭram saha varcasodhi prāg viĉām patir
ekarāt tvām vi rāja | sarvās tvā rājan pradīço hvayaṇtūpasadyo
namasyo bhaveha z 1 z tvām viço vrnutām rājyāya tvām imāḥ
pradīcā paṇca devīḥ | varṣma rāṣṭrasya kakudhi crayasvāto
vasūni vi bhajasy ugrāh z 2 z accha tvā yantu bhuvanasya
jātā agnir dūto va jarase dadvāti | jāyās putrāḥ sumanaso bhavantu bahūṁ bāliṁ prati paṣyās ugrāḥ z 3 z aevāṁ tvā- 
atre mitra-varuṇobha viṣye deva marutas tvā havyantu | sajāta-

nāṁ madhyameṣṭha iha sa svaḥ sve kṣetre savīteva vi rāja z 4 
z 2 pra drava paramasyāḥ parāvatac ācive te dyāvāprthivi ba-
bhūtām | tad ayaṁ rāja varuṇas tathāha sa tvāyam ahvat ˹sve-

nam ehi z 5 z indra idam manusyāḥ prehi sam hy ajñāstha 
varuṇena samvidānaḥ | sa tvāyam ahvat sve sadhasthe sa devān 
yakṣat sa n kalpayāḥ dīcāḥ z 6 z pathyāḥ revatir bahudhā 
virūpāḥ sarvās saṅgatyāḥ vairyaḥ te akran | tās tvā sarvās sam-
vidāna havyantu daṇcamīm ugras suamanā vaçeṣa z 7 z yad 
ajareṇa haviṣādhi tvā gamayāmasi | atrā ta indraṇ kevalir viço 
ballhṛtas karat z 8 z 1 z

With the last stanza cf. RV, 10. 173. 6 and C, 7. 94.

In st. 3b jarasi would suit the verb better and might be 
read. Pāda 4c appears in several forms; cf. no. 33, 5. A 
possible reading for st. 5d is ˹sa evām loke ehi. The 
reading of st. 6a here is better than that of C, but it is en-
tirely possible that our ms. gives no real variant; in 6d vičāḥ 
as in C, would be better. The emendations in st. 8 are tentative.

2. [f. 49 a, l. 17.]

C. 3. 7.

hariṇasya raḥuṣyado dhi cīrṣaṇi bhēṣajam su kṣettriyaṁ 
viṣāṇa-
yād viṣucimān anīnaçat. | anu tvā hariṇo vesā padbhic catu-
[f. 49 b.] rbhir akrarnit. viṣāṇe vi cva cuspitam yadi kiṅ 
cit kṣettriyaṁ hrddi | a-
do yad avarocate catuṣpaksam iva čchati | tena te sarvam 
kṣettriyaṁ aṅgebyo nā-
çāyāmasi | ud agaṭāṁ bhagavati vicṛtāu nāma tārake | vi 
kṣettriyaṁ 
tvābhy ānaçe | vedāham tasmin bhēṣajam kṣettriyaṁ nāca-
yāmi te | apa-
vāse nakṣattraṇā apā statatosaśāṁ apassat sarvam āmayad 
apa kṣe-
ttriyaṁ akramit. āpa id vā u bhēṣajir āpo amīvacātaniṁ ā-
po viṣvasya bhēṣajis tās tvā muńcantu kṣettriyaṭ. z 2 z 
Read: hariṇasya rāghuṣyado dhi cīrṣaṇi bhēṣajam | sa kṣe-
triyaṁ viṣāṇaya viṣucimān anīnaçat z 1 z anu tvā hariṇo
From Q. I have supplied the end of st. 4 and the first hemistich of st. 5; the words supplied would occupy one line of our ms.

3. [f. 49 b, l. 7.]

Q. 3. 6.

| pumāṇ pum-as | parijāto aṭṭhattaḥ khadirād adhi | sa hattu caṭṭiḥ māma-kān yān-
| cāhām dveśmi ye ca mām |

In pāda c read hantu caṭrūn, in d mām.

tān aṭṭhatta niśnīhi caṭṭi mayi bādha todhata |
indreṇa vṛtraghna me mayād agnīnā varunena ca |

In pāda a read nić ṣruthi, in b caṭrūn and dodhataḥ; and I think we should read me bādha in b where Q. has vaiśbādha, tho mayi baddha seems to be possible. At the end of c vṛtraghna medi as in Q. is the only remedy that suggests itself.

yathācvattha

niśnāsi pūrvān jātān utāparān. evā prdanyatas tvam abhi tiṣṭha saha-sva tā |

In pāda b read nić ṣrutā; in c prtanyatas; and at the end of d read ca. This stamza is not in Q.

yathācvattha vi bhināçchañta haty arṇave | evā me caṭṭaḥ cittāni

viṣvag bhidhi mahasva tā z

In pādas ab we may read vi bhinatsy antar mahatya; this is close to our ms. and certainly as good as the troublesome Q. nir abhanas. In c read caṭroc, for d viṣvag bhindhi sa-hasva ca.
yas sahamānaç carati sāsahānāiva
ṛṣabhā tenāçvāttha tvayā vayam sapatnān samviśivahi

For pāda b read sāsahāna iva ṛṣabhaḥ. It seems probable
that at the end of d we must read sahiṣiṃahī as in C.
sinā
tv āinām nirṛtīṁ mṛtyoṣ pācaīr avimokyāir açvattha cātṛfn
māmakān yāṇc cā-
haṃ dveṣmi ye ca mām

In pāda a read enān nirṛtīr, in b avimokyaiḥ; in c read
catṛuṇ, in d mām.
adharāṃcch ca pra plavatām chinnā nor iva bandhanān na
nurbādaḥapraṇuttānaṁ punar asti nivartanām

For pādas ab read adharāṅcaḥ pra plavatām chinnā nāur
iva bandhanāt; in c nirbādhaḥapraṇuttānaṁ.
praiṇān nadāmi manasā pra
tṛtyena vrāhmaṇā praiṇān vrkṣasya cākhaḷāyā açvatthaśya
nudāma-

[f. 50a] si z 3 z

Read: praiṇān nudāmi manasā pracrṛtyāinān vrahmanā
praiṇān vrkṣasya cākhaḷāyācvatthasya nudāmasi z 8 z 3 z

In C, pāda b is pra cītenota brahmaṇa; I would not insist
on the emendation suggested, and yet it is close to the ms.

4 [f. 50 a, l. 1]
C. 3. 13.

yad adas sampratīr ahāv anadatā have tasmād a nudyā
nāma stha tā vo nāmānā sindhavah z

In a read samprayatīr, in b hate: in c ā nadyo.

yat prēṣītā varaṇenic
t sīhāṃ samavalgataḥ tad āpunor id indro vo yatiḥ asmād āpo
anu śthunā
t In the first hemistich read varaṇenic cluhūṃ samavalgata:
in c it seems necessary to read āpunod indro vo yatīr; in d
śthana.
apakāmām śindamanā avevrata vo hi kam. indro
vas saktabhir devaś tasmāra nāma vo hi kam

Read: apakāmān syandamanā avivarata vo hi kam | indro
vaç caktībhīr devaś tasmād vār nāma vo hitam.

This is the version of C. (and other texts), and I think the
Pāipp. has no real variant.
ekō na deva upātiṣṭha

tśindhamānā upenyah | ud ānisur mahīr iti tasmād udakam u-
cyate |

Pāda a may stand, and for b we may read with KS. syand-
amānā upetya.

āpo devīr ghṛtam itāpāhur agniṣomāu bibhraty āpa ityā
tivra raso madhupṛcchām araṅgamām mā prānena sā varcasā
grham |

The ms. corrects "prçā to "mrçā and grham to gām.

In pāda a we may read id āpa āhur, tho āsur with TS. would seem better; in b ityā seems possible, but all the other
texts have it tāh. In cā read madhupṛcchām araṅgama ā mā prānena saha varcasā gan.

yād ik paçyāmy uta vā çṛṇumy ā mā ghośo gacchad vāsy
āsām mene

bhejāno mṛtasya tarhi hiranyavarnaśyamām yadā vā z 4 z

Read: ad it paçyāmy uta vā çṛṇomy ā mā ghośo gacchad
vācy āsām | mene bhejāno mṛtasya tarhi hiranyavarṇā āsva-
dām yadā vaḥ z 6 z 4 z

All the other texts have atrpam in d. St. 7 of the Q. ver-
sion appears Pāipp. 2. 40. 5.

5. [f. 50 a, 1. 11.]

Q. 3. 2.

agnir no dūtaś praty ēta çatfn pratidahann abhiçastim arā-
tim sa ci-
ttām mohitu pariśām nihaustāc ca krñavaj jātavedaḥ ayam
agni

r amūmūhid yānī cittāni vo ĥṛdi vi vo dhamātv okasaḥ
pra bo dhamā-
tu sarvātā indra cittāni vohayārvāg ākūdyādhi agner vātasya
dhra-
jjā tāṃ viṣūco vi nācaya vi śām ākūtuyathāto cittāni
muhya-
tā | atho yad adresā hrta taresām pari vir jahi | amīśām
cittāni
pratimodayanti grhānāgany apve pareh | abhi prehi nir
daha
hrītu çokāir grāhyāmitrās tapasā vidhyā çatfn. | asū yā
senā
[f. 50 b. ] marutaḥ paresāṁ asmān abhedy ojasā spardhamānā
tāṁ guhata tapasā-
pavratena athāiśāṁ anyo anyāṁ vyārmanām. z a 5 z

Read: agnir no dūtas praty etu cātrūṁ pratidahann abhi-
caṣṭam arātim | sa cittā mohayatu paresāṁ nihastāṁ
cakrnavaj jātavedhāh z 1 z ayam agnir amūmahad yāni cittāni
vo hrdī | vi vo dhāmatv okasaḥ pra vo dhāmatv sarvataḥ z
2 z indra cittāni mohayārvāg ākūtyā adhi | agner vātasya
dhrājyā tāṁ visūco vi nācaya z 3 z vy esām ākūtyā itātho
cittāni mukhata | atho yad adyaśāṁ hrdī tad esām pari nir
jahi z 4 z amiśāṁ cittāni pratimohayante grāhāṅgāny āpve
parehi | abhi prehi nir dha hṛtsa cokāṁ grāhyāmitrāṁ tapasā
vidhīya cātrūṁ z 5 z asāu yā senā marutaḥ paresāṁ asmān abhī
ety ojasā spardhamānā | tāṁ guhata tamasāpavratena yathāi-
śāṁ anyo anyāṁ na jānāt z 6 z 5 z a 1 z

Perhaps we should read jānān in 6 d; VS. 17, 47 has yat-
hāmi ** jānān. The ms. gives mā above sa of paresāṁ in
f. 50 b, l. 1.

6. [f. 50 b, l. 2.]
C. 3. 1.

agnir no vidvā
n praty etu cātrūṁ pratidahann abhicaṣṭam arātiṁ sa me-
nāṁ mohitu paresāṁ
nihastāṁ cakrnavaj jātavedhāh yūryam ugrā maruta īdrce
sthā-
bhi prate mrḍāta sahadhvāṁ amūmrḍāṁ vasavo nāthitebhyo
agnir ye-
śāṁ vidvān praty etu cātiṁ, amittrasenāṁ maghavāṁ
asmān. | ca
tīyatāṁ abhi tam tvāṁ īndra vṛttrehan agniṁ ca dahataṁ
prati | prasūta īndra
ś pravatā haribhyāṁ pra te vajraḥ pramanṛtyihi cātiṁ. | jahi
prati-
co nūcaḥ parāco viḍvāṁ viṣṭāṁ kṛnuhi satyaṁ esāṁ | me-
nāmohananā kṛ-
ṛva āndramittrebhyas tvāṁ agner vātasya vrājyās tāṁ vi-
ṣuco vi nācaya
indrasyenān sohin maruto gnis tv ojasā | cakṣūṁṣay agnir ā
dattāṁ puna
r etu parājitaḥ z z z
Read: agnir no vidvān praty etu ṇatṛun pratidhānam abhīcaṣṭām arātīm || sa senāṁ mohayatu paresāṁ nirāhaṁ ca kṛtvaj jātvedāḥ || z 1 z yūram ugra maruta idṛṣe sthābhi preta mṛdta sahadhvam || amirmdan vasaνo nāthitebhṛyo agnir yeṣāṁ vidvān praty etu ṇatṛun z 2 z amatrasenāṁ maghavann āśmaṁ ṇatṛiyatam abhi || täṁ tvam indra vṛtrahan agnīc ca dahtamaṁ prati || z 3 z prasita indra pravatā hāribhyāṁ pra te vajraḥ pramṛṇan yāḥ ṇatṛun || jahi pratīc mūcaḥ paraṁ viṣvam viṣṭam kṛṇhi satyaṁ esām || z 4 z senāmooho kṛṇāvā indrāmitreḥbhṛyas tvam agner vātasya dhṛājya tāṁ viṣuṇo vi nācaya || z 5 z indras senāṁ moḥayan maruto ṣṇis tu ojasā || caksuny agnir ā dattāṁ punar etu parājīta || z 6 z 1 z

The reading of our ms. in st. 2 supports Aufrecht’s reconstruction (KZ. 27. 219), yet I venture to print the above for the Paipp. In st. 6b it is entirely possible that we should read ghunantv for ṣṇis tu, in agreement with Ā.

7. [f. 50 b, l. 12]

Ā. 3. 9.

ekacatāṁ viṣkandhāni viṣṭhitas prthi
vim anu teśāṁ ca sarvesāṁ idam asti viṣkandhadūṣaṇāṁ

Read viṣṭhitā in b, and sarvesāṁ in c.

karṣabhasya viṣabhasya dyauḥ pitā prthivī mātā yathācakra devas tathāpi kṛṇu-
tā punah

The forms in pāḍa a may be real variants of these uncertain words, but it is doubtful; Ā. has karṣaphasya viṣaphasaya. In c yathābhicakra as in Ā. would improve metre and sense; in d read devās tathāpa.

acleśamāṇo dhārayan tathā tan manunā kṛtam. | kṣano-
mi vavri ca viṣkandhamo muṣkāvarho gavāṁ iva
For a we may read acleśamāṇo dhārayan. Probably we should read kṛṇomi vadhri, but kṣanomi might stand if we can take vadhri as proleptic; muṣkābarho in d.

sūtre piṣuṅkhe khugilam ya-
dā badhnantu vedhasaḥ sravasyāṁ čuṣma kābābarām va-
dhirāṁ kṛṇvantu bandhuraḥ.

Read piṣaṅge khugilam in a, badhnanti in b; čuṣmaṁ kābā-
vaṁ in c. Ā. has čravasyāṁ in c.
yenā
sravasyo carata devāyavāsramāya | çunām kapir iva dūṣa-
ṇām bandhu-
rā kābhavasya ca |

In a read sravasyaḥ caratha, although sravasyo points to-
ward the ċravasyaḥ of Ç; for b devā ivāsramāyaḥ; in c
dūṣaṇo, and in d kābhavaya.

juṣṭi tvā kāṃcchabhi joṣayitvābhavam uta
[f. 51 a] rāmavo rathāyava pathebhīs sarisyata z 2 z

Read: duṣṭyai hi tvā bhartsyāmi dūṣayisyāmi kāvavam |
uttarāvanto rathā iva çapathēbhīs sarisyatha z 0 z 2 z

The very corrupt first hemistic seems to be only a corrup-
tion of Ç, ab: uttarāvanto is suggested as a possibility, for
which Ç, has ud açavo.

8. [f. 51 a, l. 1.]
Ç. 19. 56.

yamasya lokād adhy ā
babhūyatha pramādā mantān pra yunnakṣa dhīraḥ ekājinā
sarathām yā-
si vidvān svapna mimāno asurassa yonāu

Read babhūvitha in a, martān (or martaṇ with Ç,) and
yunakṣi in b; ekākinā in c, and asursya in d.

babhās tvāgre viçvavathāvapaçyana purā rātryā janitor eke hni tatas svapnenam adhy
ā cabhūyathā bhi-
ṣajña rūpam apigūhamānaḥ

The ms. corrects to (viçvavayā)(va).

Read in a bandhas and viçvavayā avapaçyat, in b ’hni; in
c svapnāinam and babhūvitha, in d apaghā - and possibly bhīṣajyam.

vṛham grāvāsurebhīyo bhī devān upā-
vabantu mahimānam ōcchaṇ tasmāi svapnādadhuḥ ādhī-
patyam trayastrīνcā-
sa svar āniçāna

It seems to me possible to read in a vṛhan grāvāsurebhīyo
bhī devān, which is no worse than Ç; in b upāvavarta. Pāda
c might stand as it is but probably the reading of Ç, svapnāya
dadhu should be followed: for d read trayastrīνcāsāh svar
ānaçānāḥ.
nātāṁ viduṣ pitaro nota devā yeśāṁ jālyā
caranty antareśāṁ trite svapnāṁ aridīḍhāpātāṁ nara
ādityāso varuṇe-
nānusīḍtā
In c we will probably do well to adopt the reading of ī, adādhun āśtye nara; in d ānuĉīštāḥ.
vy asya kūram abhijātā duśkr̥ne svapnena sukṛtas punya
m āpuḥ svar asajāsi paramena vadvinā tapyamānasya manaso
dhi jajniṣe
Read abhajanta in a, and duśkṛto as in ī, seems almost forced on us; asvapnena would then follow in b. In c asajāsi
would be good and bandhūnā; in d dhi.
vidme ta sarvāṁ pariḥ parastād vidma svapna yo dhī-
pā hyo te yaçaśvino no yaçaśo hi pāhy āraṅ viśebhir apa yāhi
dūraṁ z 3 z
Read: vidme te sarvāṁ pariḥ parastād vidma svapna yo
dhīpa iha te | yaçaśvino no yaçaśeha pāhy āraṅ viśebhir apa
yāhi dūraṁ z 6 z 3 z.

9, [f. 51 a, l. 13.]
ambātma puṣāt ārta padvat ārjata satyayajñi-
yeyāṁ ārjāmi | hanḍūtāṁ asmāṁ viśāya hantave | vār ugram a-
rasāṁ viṣāṁ ākhyām arasāṁ viṣāṁ nirviṣāṁ |
Out of the first five words, even if they are correctly di-
vided, I can get nothing; satyayajñiyeṇāṁ ārjāmi seems a possi-
bility, and probably the colon should stand after han-
dūtāṁ, which might perhaps be emended to āhaṁ dūtāṁ. The
rest seems good. Ī. 10. 4. 3d, 4d has arasāṁ viṣāṁ vār ugram.

indram aham iyaṁ hu-
ve somāṇa ubhayāvinaṁ asmāi |
Read: indram aham iyaṁ huve somāṇa ubhayāvinaṁ | as-
māi * * z 2 z
- It seems probable that somāṇa is to be read, although
ī. 5. 25. 9 d is somāṇa ubhayāvinaṁ: but the context is very
different. It is clear that the ms. intends the repetition of
all that stands after asmāi in st. 1.

varuṇam aham iyaṁ huva | u-
gro rājanyo māmahi |
Read: varuṇam aham iyaṁ huva ugro rājanyas sasahii |
asmāi * * z 3 z
aditim aham iyam huve ċūraputraṁ kanīni-
kāṁ asmāi

Read: ċūraputraṁ in b.

vṛhaspatim aham iyam huve | yo devānāṁ purohito a-
[f. 51 b.] smāī z

Read: vṛhaspatim aham iyam huve yo devānāṁ purohitāḥ |
asmāī z 5 z

ānāc cāṇāc caṇḍām arkān asmāi viśāya hantave | vār
ugram ara-
sām viśām aheya arasām viṣaṁ nirviṣām

Read: ****ānāc caṇḍān arkān | asmāi viśāya han-
tave | vār ugram arasām viṣaṁ aheya arasām viṣaṁ nirviṣām
z 6 z

The conjecture of a lacuna of ten syllables here (the letters
ānāc c seem to be dittography) is due to the feeling that this
stanza ought to be symmetrical with the preceding four; but
the proposed emendation of the last four syllables of pāda b
does not favor this conjecture much.

navānāṁ navatīnāṁ viśasya ropeṣṭāṁ
sarvāsām agrabhām nāma vitāpayatārasām viṣaṁ z 4 z

Read: navānāṁ navatīnāṁ viśasya ropeṣṭāṁ | sarvāsām
agrabhām nāma vitāpetārasām viṣaṁ z 7 z 4 z

The first three pādas appear RV. 1. 191. 13 abc.

10. [f. 51 b. l. 3.]

mṛtyur eko

yama ekas sarvesu ċārur ud bhava | te naṁ krṇvantu bhe-
ṣajāṁ devasenaṁhya
s pari | punar no yamas pitṛbhir dadātu punar mitrāvaruṇā
vāto gniḥ a-
ghamāno aghaṇāṁśa punar dāt punar no devī nīrtrīr da-
dhātu | yā devī
ś prahiteṣuṣuṣa tapase vā mahāse vāvāṣṭaṁ somas
svām a-
smad yāvayatu vidyāṁ pitaro vā devahūtā nṛcaṇīsaṁ sahas-
rasāko
martyāḥ punarūpa ihāvatu prakhyed ugram ahārṣaṁ saha-
gus sahapāurusāḥ
yas te manyus sahasrākṣa viṣeṇa parisacyate | tena tvam
asmabhyaṁ mṛ-
da çivo naç castur a cara mä te manyu sahasrākṣa bhā- metür māmakāṁ ja-gat. ye no dvestī tām gaccha yaṁ dvismas tām jahi z oṁ yaṁ dvisma
s tāṁ jahi z 5 z anu 2 zz

Read: martyur eko yama ekas sarvesu carur ud bhava | te naç kravyantu bheṣajāṁ devasenāḥhyas pari z 1 z punar no yamaś pitṛbhir dadātu punar mitrāvarṇaṁ vato 'gniḥ | agha-
maṁ agahaçānas punar dāt punar no devi nirṛtir dadātu z 2 v ya devi prahiteṣus patās tapase vā mahāse vāvasraṣṭa | samas tvām asasad yāvayatu vidvān pitaro vā devahūti nṛcakṣasaḥ
z 3 z sahasrākṣo 'martyaḥ punar tūpa īhāватu | ṛprakhyed ugram
ahāraṁ saha-gus saha-purusah z 4 z yas te manyus sahasrākṣa
viṣeṣa parisīcyata | tena tvam asambhyam maṁça civo naç ca-
bhur a cara z 5 z mā te manyus sahasrākṣa bhāmet tan mā-
makāṁ jagat yo no dvesti tām gaccha yaṁ vayam dvismas
tām jahi z 6 z 5 z

St. 3 has appeared Paipp. l. 95. 4, but was not rightly emended: the pādas 1c. 4a, and 5d appear the Concordance. In the margin opposite st. 4 the ms. has rakṣāmantram.

11. [f. 51 b, l. 13.]
Q. 3, 26.

atha rakṣāmantram zz zz
om raḵṣa ye sthāsyāṁ prācyāṁ dići hetayo nāma devāḥ
tēśāṁ vo agni
r īsavaḥ te no mṛdāta to no vrūta tebhayo nāmas tebhyaś svāhā z raḵṣa ye sthā-
syāṁ daḵṣīṇāyāṁ dići avicyavyo nāma devās teśāṁ vo pa-
iśavaḥ

te no mṛdāta te no dhi vrūta tebhya namas tebhyaś svāhā
z raḵṣa ye sthāsyāṁ
[f. 52 a] pratīcyāṁ dići vīrājo nāma devās teśāṁ vaṣ kāma
iśavaḥ te no mṛdā-
ta te no dhi vrūta tebhayo namas tebhyaś svāhā z raḵṣa ye
sthāsyāṁ udīcyā dići
pravidhīyanto nāma devās teśāṁ vāta iśavaḥ te no mṛdāta
ta te no dhi vrūta te-

bhyo namas tebhyaś svāhā z raḵṣa ye sthāsyāṁ dhruvā-
yāṁ dići vīlimpā nā-
ma devās tešām vo nnam ṭasaḥ te no mrṭāta te no dhi vrūta tebhyo namas tehbya
s svāhā z rakṣa ya sthāsyāṁ urdhvāyāṁ diṣṭi aviyanto nāmā devās tešām
vo varṣam ṭasaḥ te no mrṭāta te no dhi vrūta tebhyo namas tehbyas svāhā z
rakṣoḥaṇāṁ vājimāṁ ā jīganmi mittraṁ pratiṣṭham upa
yāṁī carma |
čeṣāno agniś krutbhīs samiddhās sa no divās sa riṣā pātu
naktam praty agne haram iti japet sarvam. z z iti rakṣāmantram. z z

Read: rakṣā || ye sthāsyāṁ prācīyām diṣṭi hetayo nāmā devās tešām vo agnir ṭasaḥ te no mrṭāta te no dhi vrūta
tebhya namas tehbyas svāhā z 1 z rakṣa || ye sthāsyāṁ daksīṇāyām diṣṭi avisyavo nāmā devās tešām va āpa ṭasaḥ || te
no *** z 2 z rakṣa || ye sthāsyāṁ pratiṣṭāyām diṣṭi virājo nāmā devās tešām vaś kāmā ṭasaḥ || te no *** z 3 z rakṣa || ye
sthāsyāṁ udacyām diṣṭi pravidhyanto nāmā devās tešām vo vātā ṭasaḥ || te no *** z 4 z rakṣa || ye sthāsyāṁ dhruvāyām
diṣṭi vilimpā nāmā devās tešām vo 'numā ṭasaḥ || te no *** z 5 z rakṣa || ye sthāsyāṁ urdhvāyām diṣṭi avasvanto
nāmā devās tešām vo varṣam ṭasaḥ || te no mrṭāta te no dhi vrūta tebhyo namas tehbyas svāhā z 6 z 1 z

rakṣoḥaṇāṁ vājimāṁ ā jīganmi mittraṁ pratiṣṭham upa yāṁī
carma | čičāno agniś krutbhīs samiddhās sa no divā sa riṣā
pātu naktam z z praty agne hareseti japet sarvam z z iti
rakṣāmantram z z

The ms. indicates that the "rakṣā" at the beginning of each stanza is to be set off from the rest. In st. 2 and 6
avisyavo and avasvanto are adopted from Ç.

It seems clear to me (as indicated by the arrangement) that
hymn no. 1 of anuvāka 3 has only 6 stanzas; following it
RV. 10. 87 entire is to be mattered. Cf. Introduction.
Read agrír yó vṛtṛe at end of a, read ācārānī in b; ya-asvēcānāsaḥḥār in c, āgnibhyo in d.

Yes some antar yo gośv antar yo viśṭo vayasi yo mṛgesu ya āviveça dvipado yaç catuṣpadas tebhyaḥ.

Read yas in a, and in d tebhyo followed by continuation marks.

āśireṇa sarathāṁ
sambabhūva vāciṣṭhānara uta viṣṇadāvayaḥ i johāvīmi prta-
ñasu sāsa-

hyaṁ tebhyaḥ z

Read ya indreṇa in a, viṣṇadāvyoḥ in b; yaṁ and sāsahitiṁ in e, tebhyo in d as above.

yo devo viṣṇud yam a kāmam āhur yam dātāra pra-
tigṛhṇāntam āhuh yo dhira caktaṣu paribhūr ādābhyaḥ tebh-
yaḥ z

Read: yo devo viṣṇud yam a kāmam āhur yam dātāra pra-
tigṛhṇāntam āhuh | yo dhira cakraṣ paribhūr ādābhyaḥ tebhyo z 3 z

yam tvā
hotāraṁ manasābhiḥ samvidus trayodaṣa bhuvaṇā paṇca
mānavāḥ varco-
dhase yaçase sūntaṁate tebhyaḥ

Read mānavāḥ in b, sūntaṁate in c, and tebhya in d.

ukṣ*nnaya vaçānāya somaprāthā-
[f. 52 b] ya vedase vāciṣṭhānara jyesṭhebhyaḥ tebhyaḥ z

Read for a ukṣānāya vaçānāya, vedhase in b; tebhyo in d.

divam prthivīṁ antarikṣam ye
vidyutam anusāncaranti ya daksantar yo vāte antas tebhyo
agnibhyo huta

m astv etat.

Incorrect asv after prthivīṁ in a, read yo dikṣy antar in b.
vrhaspatiṁ varuṇaṁ mittra agnyāṁ hiranypāṇayāṁ savitā-
ram indrāṁ viṣvāṁ devāṁ ānāgirasāṁ havāmaha indrām
kravyādaṁ çāmaya-

ntv āgniṁ

Read mitram agniṁ hiranypāṇiṁ in ab, and probably ān-
girasā in c; havāmaha imaṁ in ed.

çānto agniṁ kravyād ato puṇaṛasenaḥ ato yo viṣ-
vadāvyās tam

kravyādyaṁ aśtāsam z z z
Read: čánto agníṣ kravyād atho puruṣaresīṇāḥ | atho yo vṛćradāvyas tam kravyādam ačīcamaṃ z. 9 z 2 z

13. [l. 52 b, l. 6.]
Q. 3. 5.

āyam agaṇ pūrṇamaṇir balī
balena pramṛṇaṇ sapatrāṇ. | ojo devānāṃ paya oṣadhirā me
yi raṣṭram jinvanpa prayacchan

The ms. corrects to pana- in a.

Read agaṇ parṇamaṇir in a, pramṛṇaṇ sapatnāṇ in b; oṣa-
dhināṇ in c, and for d mayi raṣṭram jinvatu prayacchan.
Whitney reports in d jinvatv aprayacchan; the ms. does not
have this but we might well restore it.

mayi raṣṭram parṇamaṇe mahi dhāraya
raṣṭram aho raṣtrasyābhīvarge yajā bhūyasam uttarā |

In b read mayi, in c ahaṁ, in d uttarah; yathā for yajā
seems to me good, though yujo (suggested by Whitney) must
be considered.

r vanaspatāu vājin devaṣ priyam nīdhim. tam ma indras

yam nididhi

maṇiṃ dadātu bhartave |

Read nidadhur in a; in b vajam would seem better than
vajin but I think the latter can stand. Delete the syllable
ma after sahāyusā.

somasya parṇas saha ugram āgam indrena
datto varuṇena sakhyāḥ tam ahaṁ bibharmi bahu rocāmāno
dirghāyu-
tvāya caṭacaśradāya |

Read āgam in a; perhaps sakhyāḥ can stand but I rather
think it is only a corruption of āṣṭah which Q. has.

ā mā rakṣatu parṇamaṇir mahyāriṣṭatāta-
ye yathāham uttaro sānī manusyā adhisaṃcataḥ

In a Q. has a mūrksat which is probably intended here
though the ms. reading seems possible; in b read mahyā arisṭ;
in c sānī: manusyā adhisāmcitaḥ would be a good pada if
we may take mānṣi as a noun, or we might read manusāya-
dhisāmcitaḥ.

punar mayiv i-
ndriyaṃ punar āttasā draviṇaṃ vrāhamanaṃ ca | punagnyo
dhrṣṇyāso ya-
thāsthāmalpayantām ivaha z

VOL. XXXII. Part IV.
This is Q. 7. 67. 1. Read: punar mātva indriyāṁ punar ātmā draviṇaṁ vrāhmaṇaṁ ca | punar agnayo dhiṣṇyāśo yathāsthāma kalpayantām ihāiva z 6 z

yat takṣaṇo rathakāraṁ karmārā ye maniṣināḥ sarvāṅs tvānparṇa raṇdhayopastiṁ kṛṇu medināṁ

Read: ye and rathakāraṁ in a, tān parṇa randh in c, and medinam in d. The sign up in tvān parṇa is not clear.

upastir astu vaiçya uta cūdra utārya sarvāṅs tvān parṇa raṇ-

[|f. 53 a| medināṁ z 3 z

Read: upastir astu vaiçya uta cūdra utāryaḥ | sarvāṅs tān parṇa raṇdhayopastiṁ kṛṇu medinam z 8 z 3 z

This stanza has no parallel.

14. [|f. 53 a, l. 1|]

Q. 3. 23.

yena vehe dadhṃasi | yā te garbho yonim etu pu-

mānṣam putram jānaya tvam pumān anu jāyatāṁ bhavāśi

putrāṇāṁ mātā

ātānāṁ janayāsi ca | yāni bhadrāṇi bijāny rśabhā jana-
yati | tās tvām putram vindasva sā prasūr dhenukā bhava

krṇomi te prā-

jāpatyam ā garbho yonim etu te | vindasva putram nārya

tubhyam sam asakhya-

ma tasmāi tvam bhava | yāsāṁ pitā parjanyo bhūmir mātā

babhūva tā-

s tvā putravidyuṣa deviṣ prāvantv oṣadhiḥ yas te yonim

ud īmga-

yā vṛṣabho retasā saha | sa tā sinçatu prajāṁ dirghāyuç

catāca- radām. z 4 z

Read: yena vehad babhūvitha nācayāmi tat tvat | idaṁ
tad anyatra tvad apa dūre ni dadhmasi z 1 z a te garbho

yonim etu pumān bāṇa iheṣṇāṁ | a viro 'tra jāyatāṁ putras
de daçamāsyaḥ z 2 z pumānṣam putram jānaya tvam pumān

ano jāyatām | bhavāśi putrāṇāṁ mātā jātānāṁ janayāc ca yān

z 3 yāni bhadrāṇi bijāny rśabhā janayanti ca | tās tvām pu-

tram vindasva sā prasūr dhemikā bhava z 4 z krṇomi te prā-

jāpatyam ā garbho yonim etu te | vindasva putram nāri yas

tubhyam çam asac chām u tasmāi tvām bhava z 5 z yāsām
pitā parjanyo bhūmir mātā babhāva | tās tvā putravidyāya
devī prāvanṭv oṣadhiḥ z 6 z yas te yonim ud īṅgayad vrṣabho
retasaḥ saha | sa ta a śīcata prajāṁ dirghāyuc āṭaṭaṭaḥ
z 7 z 4 z

The ms. corrects to ja(naya) in 32 and (janayā)mi in 3d.
Note that the ms. has only a few words of stt. 1 and 2, and
I have supplied the rest from Q.; other emendations follow Q.
The last stanza is new.

15. [f. 53 a, l. 9.]
yām tvā vāto varaya rāridra nābhā maharṣa-
bhāḥ | tasyās te viṣvadāhāyasa viṣadūṣanām ud bhare |
In a varaya is possible; for the first half of pāda b no-
thing plausible suggests itself, although I have thought of some
form of rudra or of āṛdra. Pādas cd can stand.
yās tvā va-
rāho śanad ekasminn adhi puṣkare |
In a read yām and 'khanad, and cf. Q. 4. 4. 1. It seems
clear that for pādas cd the second hemistich of st. 1 is meant
to stand here too, for the ms. sometimes fails to indicate a
refrain when it should; cf. Pāipp. 2. 19; 29; and 49.
yām tvādītir avapad bīja
vāpam adhi puṣkare |
Though not good metrically this may stand, with the refrain
to be supplied from st. 1.
yasyās kulāyam salīle antar mahaty a-
rnave | tasyās te viṣvadāhāyasa viṣadūṣanām ud bhare |
This stanza lends support to the suggestion of āṛdra in st. 1.
"ut te bhara-
d uttamāyā adhamāyās tūd bhare anu mahyā madhyame

dūṣanām agrabhām
In a bharām would seem to be the best reading; for c I
can do no more than the word division indicates.
sam agrabhām ubhāv antāu sam agrabhām divač ca
prthivyāc ca viṣadūṣanām ud bhare z 5 z anu 3 z
Read: * * * samagrabhām ubhāv antāu samagrabhām |
divač ca prthivyāc ca viṣadūṣanām ud bhare z 6 z 5 z anu 3 z
The ms. has no indication of the loss of four syllables in
pāda a, but it seems very probable; perhaps something like
mahyam bhūmyās stood there as in Q. 6. 89. 3 cd. The ms.
corrects to prthi(vi)č.
pāidvo si pṛtanāyu svāhā soma hiṁsīs soma hiṁsītō si svāhā |
The first of these two formulae we might read pāidvo 'si pṛtanāyus svāhā: soma hiṁsīs may stand (cf. RV. 9. 88. 4), and at a venture I would conjecture somāhiṁsītō 'si svāhā for the rest.

vrahmaṇaṁa hiṁsīr vrahma hiṁsītō
[f. 53 b] si svāhā |
One would expect here a parallelism to the preceding but I am unable to work it out satisfactorily; what is given does not lend support to the conjecture made above.

nābhūd ahir bhṛṇampāṁ ahir agnim arasāvadhi | viṣasya vrahmaṇāṁ āsīt tato jīvan na mokṣaṁe |
In the first hemistic I can see nothing more than the division of words indicates; in c viṣo yo might be a possible reading.

uṣṭo hi samuṣṭo hi nirvī to rasas kṛtāḥ viṣasya vrahmaṇāṁ āsīt tato jīvan na mokṣaṁe |
For pādas ab read uṣṭo 'hir samuṣṭo 'hir nirvīta rasas kṛtāḥ; for the rest see above.

punar dadāti me viśam pūrvapadyam udāhrta | māṁ da-

nyase mayā daśto na mokṣaṁe z 1 z
Read: punar dadāti me viśam pūrvapadyam udāhrtaṁ | māṁ dadačvāṁ manyase mayā daśto na mokṣaṁe z 6 z 1 z

The stanza is numbered 6 because of the three occurrences of svāhā above, which seem to indicate three separate formulae.

17. [f. 53 b, l. 5] ekačatam bheṣajāṇi
tešāṁ māṭasyo oṣadhe | samudram iva gacchasi prthivyāṁ [adhi ni-

ṣūṭhitāḥ
At the end of pāda d niṣṭhāti would agree better with ma-
tāṣy. Q. 19. 32. 3b is prthivyāṁ asi niṣṭhītaḥ (sc. darbha).

yasyāṁ vedādibheṣajāṁ đaçaçirṣo đaçaçihvah te pra-
thamā dadhe samārvānty oṣadhe yam arād vīrayad bhīṣak.
If we may take adibheṣajam to mean “the original medi-
cine” we have at the beginning two pādas which might pos-
sibly stand: Q. 4. 6. 1b is đaçaçirṣo đaçasyaḥ. For the rest, in addition to the division of words I can only suggest for
consideration samsrāvāṇy and ārad; but these throw no light on what is to me wholly obscure.

puṇaḥ ca-
ksus puṇaḥ prāṇam punar āyun nā gamat. niṣṭvākaram niśkrtyā niṣ tvā

nikṛtyākaram

Ini a read prāno, in b āyun na ā; in d niṣkrtyākaram.

muṇcāmi tvā ċapathyād ato vārupād uta | a-
tho yamasya padbhicādi viçvamād deva duṣkṛtāt.
The ms. seems to correct dvi to dbhi.

Read uta in b: and padbicād in c. This stanza appears Q. 6. 96. 2 with muṇcāntu mà in a, varunyād in b, and kil-biṣat in d.

caṁ te cī-
ṛpaṇas kapālāni ḫṛdayasya ca ye viduḥ udyaṇ śūryādityo a-
ṅgadyo tam aniçat.

Cf Q. 9. 8. 22. In pāda a read sām; for ed udyaṇ śūryādityo aṅgabhodam aniçat. This however does not reckon with Q. which in b has yo vidhuḥ, a lectio difficilior; yet I do not believe we need to read it here.

himavataś pra svavata śindhū sam āha saṅga-
mah tāpas sarvasā sāṁgatya caksus prāṇam cañhatu nah z22

Read: himavataś pra svavata śindhū sam āha saṅgamaḥ | tā āpas sarvasā saṁgatyā caksuḥ prāṇam cañhatu nah z 6

The first hemistic appears Q. 6. 24. I ab; and with pāda d may be compared Q. 10. 2. 29d.

18. [l. 53 b, l. 15.]

Q. 3. 22.

hastivarcasam prthatiṁ vṛhad disu adityā ya tanvas sambabhūva ta-
t sarve savitur mahyās etu viçve devāsā aditis sajosāh

Read prathatāṁ in a, and perhaps dikṣu though yoço as in Q. seems better; in b yat. In c we will have to read as in Q. samadur mahyam etad.

mittra-
č ca varuṇaḥ cendro rudraḥ ca tejatu devāso viçvedāhāyasas te
[l. 54 a] maṁdantu varcasā |

The ms. corrects tejatu to tejasāḥ; if we accept this, as I think we may, it obviates the difficulties with the form ceta-
tus of Q. In a read mitraḥ, in d maṁjantu.
yat te varcó jātavedo vrhad bhavaty āhutam tena mām abhya varcasāgre varcasvinām kṛdhī |
Read adya varcasāgne in cd. In Č these pādas are 4 ab and 3 de; Č has āhuteḥ and kṛnu.
yena haste varcasā sambabhūva yena rājā manuṣeṣhva antah yena devā jyotisā bhyām udāyam tena mā-
gne varcasā samā sṛjeha |
Read hasti in a, dyām udāyan in c. What we have here is in Č, st. 3 abc with a new pāda d.
yāvad varcas sūryasyāsurasya ca hasti-
nah távan me acvinā varcas kṛnutam puṣkarasrajah |
Read puṣkarasrajah in d. In Č this is st. 4 e-f, and ā dhat-
tām stands for kṛnutam.
yāvac catasra
št pradicač caksur yāvāt samačnute tāvāt samāitv indriyam mayi tad dha-
stivarcasam. z 3 z
This is the sixth stanza of the third hymn of the fourth anuvāka.

19. [f. 54 a, l. 7.]
Č. 3. 19.
saṁcitam mayidam vrahma saṁcitam vīryam mama | saṁcitam kṣattram me jiṣṇu yesām asmi purohitah
sam aham e-
śām rāṣṭrām paçyāmi sam ojo vīryam balaṁ | vrccāsi ca-
tāṁ bahu
sam acvām acvān aham | tiṃśanīyāsas pharṣor agnes
tiṃśnatarād u-
ta | indrasya vajras tiṃśaniyaṁso esām asmin purohitah |
adhas padyantām adhare bhavantv ena īndram maghavā-
nām prtinyān
kṣaṇāni vrahmanāmitrān anvāyaṁ čvān aham yesām ām ā-
yudhā saṁ cyāsy esām rāṣṭram suvīram vardhayasva ye-
śām kṣattram aja-
ram astu jiṣṇu ugram esām rāṣṭram suvīram vardhayasva
yesām kṣa-
m ajaram astu jiṣṇu ugram esām cittām bahudhā viçvaru-
Read: 

**śaṃcītaṁ ma idāṁ vṛtmaśa śaṃcītaṁ vṛtmaśaḥ mama |**

śaṃcītaṁ kṣatram me jīsmaṁ yēśāṁ asmaṁ purohitāḥ z 1 z sam aham ėśāṁ rāṣṭram cyāmi; sam ojo vṛtmaśa balam | vṛcāmi
cāṭrūṇāṁ bāhūṁ sam ėśāṁ acvāṁ aham z 2 z tiṅṣṭīyauṇāśa

paraśor agnes tiṅṣṭātārā uta | indrasya vajrā tiṅṣṭīyauṇa
yēśāṁ asmaṁ purohitāḥ z 3 z adhas padyantām adhāre bhau

vantu ye na indram magha-vānaṁ pṛṭanyān | kṣiṇāmi vṛh-

maṇāmitraṁ un nayāmi svāṁ aham z 4 z ėśāṁ aham āyudhā

sam cyāmy ėśāṁ rāṣṭram suvīrām vardhayaṇa | ėśāṁ kṣatram

ājaram astu jīnugram ėśāṁ cīttam bahudhāviye-vāpaṁ z 5 z

abhi preta jayata prasūtās sam cyāmy nara āyudhāni | tiṅṣṭe

śavaḥ baladhanvana hato-grāvṛdhā abalān ugrārahavaḥ z 6

z 4 z

In st. 3 d the ms. corrects to asmi; and in 4 d it has a

correction which seems to make ad dhvāyāma out of avā
yāma so perhaps we should read ud dhvāyāmi. In 3 b it

might be possible to read tiṅṣṭaṭarād uta as in the ms.

Whitney in his comments on Q. 3. 19. 6 and 8 implies that

they are found in Pāipp. Bk. 3 at this point, but they are

not in the birchbark; they do appear Pāipp. l. 56, and the

confusion is doubtless due to the fact that he did not have

access to a facsimile or the original (cf. Whitney's Translation

p. lxxxi ff).

20. [f. 54 b, l. 2.]

Q. 3. 12.

ihāiva dhruvāmya minomi cālāṁ kṣeme tiṣṭhā

mi ghṛttaṁ ukṣaṁanā | tāṁ tāvučāle sarvavīrās suvīrā a-

bhi saṁ carema |

Read dhruvāṁ ni in a, tiṣṭhāsi in b; tāṁ in c, and supply

aristavrā (as in Q.) in d.

ihāiva dhruvā pra tiṣṭha čāle acvāватi gomā-
ti sūnpāvatī | uryasvatī ghṛtavatī payasvaty uc chraya-
yasva mahate sāubhagāya |

- Read prati in a, uc chrayasva in d.

dharuny asi čāle grhač chandā

sūtadhānaya ā tvā vato mayi med ā kumārā dhena-vasyāya

m āsyandhamānā
Reading chandas in b we get a fairly good pāda; grhač chandas is rather better than the brhačchandās of Ç and the latter's pūtidhānyā has proved troublesome; sūtadhānyā may mean "containing produced grain". In cd read vatso me gamed a kumāra a dhenavas sayam āyandamānāḥ.

imām cālam savitā vāyur agnis tvāstā hotā ni srotu prajānaṁ ukṣaṇtūna maruto ghrtena | somo no rājā ni kṛṣṇa tanotu

Read ni minotu prajānan in b; ukṣantūdāṁ in c, kṛṣṇa in d; colon after pāda b.

sānassa patnič caraṇā syonā devibhī r nimitāsy āgne | ūnmaṁ vasanā sumanā yaṣas tvam rayim no dhi subhage suvīram

We may read in a mānasya patni caraṇā, for b devi devebhīr nimitāsy agre. In c trāṇam vasanā sumanā asas seems most probable; in d read dheli and suvīram.

ā tvā kumāras taraṇa a vatso jagatā saha | ā tvā pariṣṭitaṁ kumbha a dadhnaṁ kalaṇaṁ ca yā z 5 z anu 4 z

Read: ā tvā kumāras taraṇa a vatso jagatā saha | ā tvā pariṣṭitaṁ kumbha a dadhnaṁ kalaṇaṁ ca yāḥ z 6 z 5 z anu 4 z.

21. [f. 54 b, l. 14.]

Ç. 4. 22.

imam indra vardhaya kṣatrichtam sa imam vičārā m ekaviṣa kṛṣṇu tvam ni mitrān akṣṇu tasya sarvāṅs tā radhaya-

smāhamuttareṣu | ayam astu dhanapatiḥ dhanāṇām ayam vičārā

vičkrpatistu rājā | asmiṁn indu mayi varcāṁsi dhey a-

[f. 55 a] varcasam kṛṣṇuhi catrum asya | idaṁ bhaja grāme śveṣu gosva niś tam bhaja yo mittro sya | varṣmat kṣattrāṇām ayam astu rājendra catrū ran-
dhaya sarvam asmā | asmāi
dyāvāprthivī bhūrvāsū sam duhitāṁ ghrmaduheva dhe-

num | vayaṁ rājā pri-

ye indrasya bhūyāḥ priyo gavām oṣadhīnām utāpāṁ yu-
najmi tam uttāra-

vantam indra yena jayante | yas tvā karad ekavṛṣaṁ ja nānām uta rājan u-
ttamam mānavānāṁ | uttaras tvam adhare mantv anye ye 
ke ca rājan prācīcata-
sthe | ekavṛṣā indrasakhā jīgivān catrūyatām abhi tiṣṭhā ma-
ḥānsi | z 1 z

Read: imam indra vardhaya kṣatriyāṁ ma imam viçāṁ ekavṛṣāṁ kruṇa tvam | nir amitṛān aśbhu taśa sarvāḥ tān 
randhayāṃśa ahamuttarāroṣu z 1 z ayam astu dhanapātir dhā-
ṇānāṁ ayam viçāṁ viçpatir astu rājā | asmin indra mahi var-
cānsi dheyi avarcasaṁ kruṇaḥ catrum aṣya z 2 z emaṁ bha-
grāme 'caveṣy gosu niṣ taṁ bhāja yo 'mitro 'syā | varṣman 
kṣatrānāṁ ayam astu rājendra catrum randhayā sarvam aṣ-
māi z 3 z asmai dyāvāpṛthiv bhūrī vāmaṁ saṁdūḥāthāṁ 
gharmedugheva dhenuḥ | ayam rājā priya indrasya bhūyāt 
priyo gavām oṣadhumāṁ utāpām z 4 z yunajmi tam uttarā-
vantam indram yena jayanti na para jayante | yas tvā karad 
ekavṛṣām janānāṁ uta rājann uttamām mānavānāṁ z 5 z 
uttaras tvam adhare santv anye ye ke ca rājan prācīcata 
vas te | ekavṛṣā indrasakhā jīgivān catrūyatām abhi tiṣṭhā maḥā-
ṇāsi z 6 z 1 z

This hymn appears also in TB. 2. 4. 7. 7—8, and our text 
is in agreement with it in several places: st. 6d in C. 7. 73. 
10 d. In 1c it is entirely possible that our ms. has only a 
corrupt form of the C. reading aśbhuḥ asya; in 5a C. has 
a better reading yunajmi taḥ, but probably ours can stand; in 
5b I have supplied words from C.

22. [f. 55 a, l. 8.]

viṣāṃsyā aṅgirasi devaṁ prācīcakṣīṁ 
divas prāthivyaṁ saṁbhūtas sahasrākṣī dhi naḥ

Read aṅgirast in a, saṁbhūtā in e (= C. 6. 100. 3c); for d 
we may read sahasrākṣī vi śyādhi naḥ, which is supported by 
C. 6. 121. 1a viṣāṃ pācān vi śyādhy aṣmat.

sahasrākṣī yād grbhāti 
paṣyāmy oṣadhe sadānvāgī rakṣogñī bhaveha prācīcakṣīṁ |
A probable reading for pāda a is sahasrākṣī yad grbhāti, 
with teṇa paṣyāsy in b; read sadānvāghīnti in c.

ye hara-
nty āmuteyam payasphātīṁ ca oṣadhe | sadānvāgī rakṣo-
ghī bhaveha

prācīcakṣīṁ

In pāda a I think we may read āsuteyam with the same
meaning as āśuti, which seems to mean "brew" or "concoction"; in b write ācāsadhe, in c sudānāvāghī. The hemistichs do not hang together very well.

yātuno raṇḍhayante rukṣantāṁ ca vihurataṁ tāṁś tvā sahasrakaṁ sūkhaṁ grhaṁya kṛtavīrye

A possible (and perhaps plausible) reading for pāda a would be yatudhānāṁ raṇḍhayantī; rukṣantāṁ in b can hardly stand and I would write rūṣyantāṁ. In c read tvāṁ sahaṁ rukṣantāṁ; in d kṛtavīryāya seems possible. Pāda c = Q. 19. 35. 3c.

yathā āśū ca taturāṅglo rānṭram naktāṁ paṭīyaṁ eva sahaṁ rukṣantāṁ tvāṁ prati paṭīyaṁ āyata |

In d read āyataḥ: Q. 4. 20. 5 cd is atho sahaṁ rukṣantāṁ tvāṁ prati paṭīyaḥ kimidinaḥ (cf. our next stanza), and the two hymns have the same intent.

gobhir ācāvāṁ vasubhi

r apakritāsyā oṣadhi āśūvaṁ vācvasya ca kāsūsaṁ prati paṭīyaṅ kimidinaḥ z

2 2 2

Read: gobhir ācāvāṁ vasubhī apakritāsya oṣadhe āśūvaṁ vācvasya kāsūsaṁ prati paṭīyaṅ kimidinaḥ z 6 z 2 2

23. [f. 55 a, l. 16.]

sam cūdadvām saṁ pipadvām annaṁ vo madhumat saha vratam vas sarvam
sadhrik samānaṁ ceto stu vaḥ saṁ jānīdhvaṁ indraṁ cettā vo stv ayaṁ vo gnir ni-
haraḥ ca mayāyī yaḥ verahatyaṁ u bhīmaṁ āśīd vīce deva ut prāva-
[f. 55 b.] yantu saṁ vaṣcy āstu vṛhaspatiḥ saṁ dyāvāprthiḥ
ubhe caṁ antarikṣam uta vo maruvāṁ saṁ vaṣcy astv aditir devaputra kalpetāṁ dyāva-
prthivī kalpa-
ntāṁ āpa oṣadhi kaḷpantāṁ āgnyas sarve asmai ṭṛṣṭhāya sarvāda
sam vas sṛjāṁ hṛdayaṁ saṁsṛṣṭaṁ mano astu vaḥ saṁ-
sṛṣṭa vas tanvas sa-
tu saṁsṛṣṭaṁ pṛñāno astu vaḥ saṁ vaṣ pačūnaṁ hṛdayaṁ
sṛjāṁ saṁ
putraṁ uta ya duhitara vaḥ saṁ vo jāyāṁaṁ manasaṁ
manānśi
sam patinām uta ca kāsūsaḥ sṛjāṁ z 3 2
Read: saṁ cūndhadhvāṁ samā pibadhvam annam vo ma-
dhumat sahaḥ | vratam vas sarvam sadhryak samānām ceto
stu vah z 1 z saṁ janidhvam indrac citta vo sv̄ avayam vo
‘gnir ni haraḥ çamayati | yad vairahatyam u bhīmam āsidd-
vīce deva ut prāvayantu z 2 z cañ ca vy astu vihaspatiç cañ
dyāvāprthivī ubhe | çam antariksam uta vo maruttvān cañ
vaçīny astu aditir devaputra z 3 z kalpetam dyāvāprthivī kal-
pantam āpa oṣadhī | kalpantām agnayas sarve asmai çres-
thāya sarvadā z 4 z saṁ vas srjāmi hrdayah samsrṣtah mano
astu vah | samsṛṣṭa vah tanvas santu samsrṣtas prāṇo astu vah.
z 5 z saṁ vas paçūnāṁ hṛdayah srjāmi saṁ putrānāṁ uta
yā duhitarā vah | sañ jāyānāṁ manasā manānī samā patitānā
uta caksusā srjāmi z 6 z 3 z.

Stanzas 4 and 5 appear KS. 7, 14 and 12, and elsewhere:
re be compared in contents are such hymns as Q. 6, 66.
and 74.

24. [l. 55 b. L 8.]
Q. 3. 27.
atha rakṣāmantram.
oṁ prācī dig agnir adhipatir asito rakṣatādityā īsavaḥ te-
bhyo na-
mo dhipatibhyo namo rakṣatubhyo namo ṛṣibhyo namo vo
stu yo smān dveṣti yam
ca vayan dvīṣmas tam vo jambhe dadhmas tam u prāṇo ja-
hātu z daksi-
nā dig īndro dhipatis tīrāccarāje rakṣaṭa vasava īsavaḥ prati-
cī dig vavaruṇo dhipatis prajākū rakṣatā mittra īsavaḥ udī-
cī dik somo dhipatis svajā rakṣatā vāta īsavaḥ z dhruvā
dig vi-
ṣūr adhipatiṣ kūlmāsagrivo rakṣatā vīrudho īsavaḥ ėrdhvā
dig vr-
haspatir adhipatīṭ çattro rakṣatācānir īsavaḥ tebhyo nāmo
dhipa-
tibhyo nāma rakṣitubhyo nāma ṛṣibhyo nāmo vo stu yo
smān dvīṣti yam ca
vayan dvīṣmas tam vo jambhe dadhmas tam u prāṇa ja-
hātu z 4 z.

Read: atha rakṣāmantram || oṁ z z prācī dig agnir adhi-
patir asito rakṣatādityā īsavaḥ | tebhyo nāmo ‘dhipatibhyo
namo rakṣitrdbhya namo iṣubhya namo vo 'stu | yo 'smān dveṣṭi yaṁ ca vayaṁ dvīṣmas tāṁ vo jambhe dadhmas tam u prāṇo jahāṭu z 1 z dakṣinā dig indro 'dhipatis tiṣṭeṣirājṛ rakṣitā vasava iṣavah | tebhya • • • z 2 z prattei dig varuṇo 'dhipatiṣ prakāṣa rakṣitā mitra iṣavah | tebhya • • • z 3 z uṇet dik somo 'dhipatis svajō rakṣitā vata iṣavah | tebhya • • • z 4 z dhruvaḥ dig viṣṇu adhipatiṣ kalmāṣagṛivo rakṣitā viruddha iṣavah | tebhya • • • z 5 z uṛdhvā dig vṛhaspatir adhipatiṣ evitro rakṣitācanīr iṣavah | tebhya namo 'dhipatibhya namo rakṣitrdbhya namo iṣubhya namo vo 'stu | yo 'smān dveṣṭi yaṁ ca vayaṁ dvīṣmas tāṁ vo jambhe dadhmas tam u prāṇo ja- hāṭu z 6 z 4 z.
indra esa manusyeśv antar gharma
s tapatac carati samciçanaḥ supradasassa udare na sariṣad
yau naçni-
hād anauhu vijīnan.

Read tapaț in b; in c we should probably read suprajās
sa, in d yo naçnyād. An alternative form of c would be
suprajāsa sant sa udare na sarsad.

yena devās tuvārurhatar hitvā cañīram amṛta-
sya dhāma tena geśma sukṛtasya lokam gharmasya vra-
tena yaçasā tapasyā

In pāda a we will have to read as in Q. devās svar a ruru-
hur. If we may have tapasyavāḥ at the end of d we get a
fair reading but it looks like an accidental inversion of the
better reading of Q, tapasā yaçasyavāḥ.

dvā
daçaīta rārvartīaḥu praṇāpater vartyā rātrī dvādaça tad
vāpi vraham-

yo veda tad vānuḍhau balāṅ

If it is desirable to reduce the first hemistich to anuṣṭubh
rhythm (and it seems so to me) we may read dvādaçaīta
vratyā ahu praṇāpater vratyā rātril; but less violent emenda-
tion is necessary if we read dvādaçaīta rātrir vratyā ahuṣ
praṇāpater vratyā rātrir dvādaça. In d read tad vā anauhu
balam.

duhe vānaḍvāna sayam due prātar duhe
divā doḥa ye sya sayantā tān vidmāṇupadaysaṭaḥ

Read in a vā anādvān; in c sya sam yanti.

ye devānaḍhuo

dohān asvapnāṇupadaysaṇa praṇām ca lokāṁ cāpnoti tatha
saptarṣayo

viduḥ

Read for ab yo vedānaḍhuo dohān saptāṇupadaysaṭaḥ; any
suggestion of svapna seems out of place here.

madhyam etad anauhu yata isā vaḥitaḥ etāvad asya pracīna
yavān pratyaṇ samāhitaḥ

For pāda b read yatraśa vaḥa āhitaḥ; in c prācīmam, in
d yavaṇ.

padbhis sedhim amakramamn irām jaṅghābhi
r uksida cramaṇānaḍvāṇa kilālam kinaçasya upagacchata

Read padbhī sedhim samakramamn irām jaṅghābhīr utkhi-
dan | cramaṇānaḍvāṇa kilālam kinaçaç copa gacchataḥ z 11 z
çois manusyeqv anaqvan ity ucyate çapha somya párśain sarvā yāc cāsya

[f. 56 b.] kuṣṭhinah

This seems to be an incomplete bit of commentary belonging to st. 3; if the above word division is correct we might read the whole thus: — indra eṣa manusyeqv anaqvan ity ucyate | çaphas somyāh pārśain sarvā yāc cāsya kuṣṭhikāh. This might have been a scholium standing once in the bottom margin; the letter i standing at the end of the next to the last line of f. 56 a would then have been the initial of indro balenāśya.

indro balenāśya parameṣṭhi vratenaīna gāus tena vāiçvadevāḥ yo smān dveṭi yaṁ ca vaya dviśas tasya prāṇān aṣa vahes tasya prāṇā

n vi varhaḥ z 5 z a 5 z

Read: indro balenāśya parameṣṭhi vratena yena gāus tena vāiçvadevāḥ | yo smān dveṭi yaṁ ca vaya dviśas tasya prāṇān apa vahes tasya prāṇān vi barhaḥ z 12 z 5 z ann 5 z

26. [f. 56 b, l. 3]

Q. 7. 60.

grhān esi manasā modamānojam bibhrad vasumatis sumetāghoreṇa caksuṣā mitriyena grhānām paçyañ paya ut tarāmi | ime grhā mayobhuva u-rjasvantas payasvantaḥ pūṁa vamasya tiṣṭhantas te no jānantu jānataḥ

sūnṛtāvantas subhagā iravanto hasāmuda akṣudhyāśtry-dhyāśtry-syāmo grhā māssad vibhītantah | eṣām adhy etu pravan eṣa so-

manasso bahuḥ | grhān upa hvayāmaya yan te no jānaṅtv āyataḥ

upahūtā iha gāva upahūtā ajāvayaḥ a-tho nyasya kilāla upahūto gṛhesu nah upahūtā bhūrdhni nā sakhyās svādusāmmara arīṣās sarvāpūrṣa grhā nas sa-

ntu sarvadah z 1 z

Read: grhān emi manasā modamāna ārjana bibhrad vas sumatis sumedhāḥ | aghoreṇa caksuṣā mitriyena grhānām paç-

yañ paya ut tarāmi z 1 1 ime grhā mayobhuva urjasvantaḥ
The Kashmirtan Atharva Veda.

27. [f. 56 b, l. 13.]

hantāyam astva pratighāty asā sam vām indra prtanāvṛśṭih prajāpatir adadād ojo smāi vrhad dhavi r haviśā vardhanena | prajāpater haviśā vardhane hantāyam indram akṛṇor agādyam tasmāi viṣo devakṛṭā nimantas sahyantin sahi-

[f. 57 a] havyo babhūva | prajāpate abhi no neśi vasv orvo gavyūtis abhimātiśāhah vardhaya nn indram vrhata renāya devami devena haviśā vardhanena z yathā vićvāś pr- tanāt samjāyā yathā čatrūn sahasā mānasā mahī yathāsah samrāṇ susa-

mṛđa devātte indro aprativadhan kṛnotu ayaṁ viro prati hantu čatṛn vācve
devā uṣas adas karāya nāsya prajām ririśam nota vīrān imam indra | ja-

hi čatrūn prati randhayasvāgniš te gopā adhipāvasiśṭhah čarma te rājā

varunō ni yacchā devā tvendro aprativadhram kṛnotu z 2 z

Read: hantāyam astu pratighāty asat sam vām indraṁ prtanāvṛśṇih | prajāpatir ā dadhūd ojo smāī vrhad dhahir haviśā vardhanena z 1 z prajāpate haviśā vardhanena hantāram indram akṛṇor agadhyam | tasmāi viṣo devakṛṭā namanta sa hantā sa vihavyo babhūva z 2 z prajāpate abhi no neśi vasāvṛnī gavyūtim abhimātiśāhah | vardhayeinn indram vrhate rāpāya devam daivena haviśā vardhanena z 3 z yathā vićvāś prtanās samjāyā yathā čatrūn sahasā manasā | mahī yathāsah
suprañ susamrāj devas tvendra apratīvadham kṛṇotu z 4 z
ayam viro prati hantu catrūn viçye deva osam adhas karayan j
nāsya prajāṁ rirīṣan nāta virāṅ imān indrāḥ z 5 z jahi catrūn prati randhayasvāṅśis te gopā adhipā vasīṣṭhāḥ | čarna te rājā varūno ni yacchād devas tvendra apratīvadham kṛṇotu z 6 z 2 z
A goodly number of objections might be brought against the emendations offered, but I think the intent of the hymn cannot be mistaken. In st. 1a apratīgha is suggested but it brings difficulties with it; in 1c ādādhād might stand, or even ādādād as in the ms. In VS. 8. 46 and other Yajas texts there is a stanza similar to our no. 2; most of these texts have āvadhyam in pāḍa b for our āgadhyam, they have sam anamanta pūrvir in c where I write devakṛtā namanta and for d they have ayam ugro vihavyo yathāsat; my emendation of pāḍa d is pure conjecture. About st. 5b I am very doubtful, but the reading given seems possible.

28. [f. 57 a, l. 7.]

sam sprṣethāṁ
tanubhyāṁ sam mukhābhyaṁ sam ātmāṁ saṁ vāṁ vrāhmaṇaṁspatis somas saṁ sparṣa-
yābhū vāṁ.
In d I read sparṣayatu, or possibly sparṣayātu. Cf. C. 6. 74. 1.
abhy āsya nāham vācā dadhāṁ; nāhasokṣase pame dāhinaṁ kā-
me labhāi kṛṣṇam ivākhare
For the first hemistic I can get nothing satisfactory; I incline to think that some accusative should stand in place of nāham. For c perhaps we might read upa me dāhinaṁ kāme, the upa to be taken with labhāi.
yāḥ premāś preṇyāṁ āśid dattāḥ somena babhrū-
ṇāṁ | tasmād adhi ārutaṁ mano mayy āsya manāhitaṁ
In a read premā, or perhaps premā, in b babhrūpa; in c śrutāṁ, in d manā āhitam. Cf. C. 6. 89. 1 ab and 1. 1. 2d.
yāṁ pusāṁsaṁ kāmyete ya-
śminn ā bhagam icchate | hṛcchokam asmīn lā dadhmo yathā ċisyāti tvām a-
nu | yathāsya hṛdayaṁ ċisyād
For a yāṁ pumāṁsaṁ kāmyate seems good. In c read
hrēchokam, in d cusyāti and in-e cusyāt. It seems proper to
der the verse at this point though the ms. has no sign.

apičchāṁ neva caṁ guṇi ca | kṣur ākācāṁ
bhīma māṃpaṇyam abhinorujāṁ priyaṁkaram uttamam
madhughena tad ābhrāṁ

For the first few words I am unable to make a suggestion,
and therefore cannot feel sure that they belong with this
verse. For the rest I think we may read: caksur ākācāṁ
bhīma māṃpaṇyam abhirorudam | priyaṁkaranam uttamam
madhughena tad ābhrāṁ. Cf. Ç. 7. 38. 1b and our next
hymn st. 2.

tvam hā-

si varcasyo atho hāsyā sumaṅgalaḥ atho sarvāsāṁ víru-
dhāṁ priya-

ṅkaraṇam ucyase

Read: tvam hāsi varcasyo atho hāsi sumaṅgalaḥ | atho sar-
vāsāṁ vírudhāṁ priyaṅkaraṇam ucyase z 6 z 3 z

The ms. gives no indication of the end of this hymn and
I have made this arrangement principally because the norm
of this book is six stanzas: it seems not impossible that the
last two stanzas should go with the next hymn, but the
connection does not seem close enough to force us to such an
arrangement.

29. [f. 57 a, l. 16.]
Ç. 7. 38 (in part).

pratīci somam asy oṣadhe pratīcy anu sūryāṁ prat-
īci ví-

çvān devāṁs tathā tvācchāvadāmasi | imāṁ khanāsy oṣa-
dhāṁ vitāntriṁ a-

nutaṁtunāṁ āyataḥ patiraṁdhanī parāyato nivartanaṁ |
amuṣyāḥam parāya-
ta āyato mano agrabhāṁ agrabhāṁ hastīṁ mano atho

[f. 57 b.] manāhitām mayi cittāṁ mayi vrataś mamed apa

dapi | aham vadāṁ maha tvam sabhāyāṁ ha tvam vada

mameda | ċastiṁ kevalo

nābhyāsāṁ kīrtayaś cina yadi vāṣya dirocanāṁ yadi vā

nadyas tirah

yam tvā mahṛm oṣadhīr vadhveva nyānayah z 4 z

Read: pratīci somam asy oṣadhe pratīcy anu sūryāṁ | pra-
tci viçyān devās tathā tvācchāvadāmasi z. 1 z imām khanāmy oṣadhim vitantrim anutanuntunām | ayataḥ pratirandhamiḥ parāyato nivartanām z. 2 z amuṣyāham parāyata āyato mano agrabhām | agrabhām hastim mano atbo hydayunā manab z. 3 z mayi te mana āhitam mayi cittam mayi vratam | mamed aha krataś aso mama cittam a śidāsi z. 4 z aham vadiṇi māha tvam sabhāyam aha tvam vada | mamed asas tvam kevalo nāyāsām kṛtayāc cana z. 5 z yadi vāśi tirojanām yadi vā nadyas tirah | iyam tvā mahyam oṣadhir buddhveva nyānayat z. 6 z 4 z

Pāda b of st. 2 I have not tried to emend thinking it might be taken to mean “having various magic powers and widely effective”, or something of that sort; the māṃpaṇyam abhirorudam of Q. is no better. Our stt. 3 and 4 are not in Q. but st. 4 has appeared in Paipp. 2. 77. 1; the form here is what was suggested there. St. 5 has also appeared in Paipp. 2. 79. 5 with anākena me nyānayat for pāda d.

30. [f. 57 b, l. 4]
Q. 19. 57.

yathā kalām itekā mam rājāno gusmrnāny aguḥ sam cuṣṭhāgus sam kalāgus sam asmāsu suṣvaptrīm nir diçate duṣvaptrīm suvāma z devānām patnīnām garbha ya-masya karaṇa | yo bhadrā svapna sva muma yaq papas tam dviṣate pra hiṃma tyaṣṭāmā nāmāi kṛṣṇaçakuner mukham nirṛter mukham tam tvā svapna ta-thā vidma | svapnos svaptvā açīvā kāyam açīvā nīnā-haṁ | mā-smākam devapiyum priyāruru vapsa | yad asmāsu duṣvapnī yad go-su yaq ca no gr no grhe | sāsmākam devapiyuḥ priyārurum niṣka-m iva prati muñçaṭām navāratnān apamāyām asmākam tan-vas pari duṣvapnyo sarvam durbhūtam dviṣater nir dviṣāmasi z divṣater nir dvi-

[...]
For the first part of this we may read as follows: yathā kalām ity ekā z 1 z saṁ rājano 'gus saṁ raṁy agus saṁ kus̄thā agus saṁ kalā aguḥ | saṁ asmāsa duṣvapnyām nir dviṣate duṣvapnyām suvāma z 2 z devānāṁ patniṁāṁ gurba yamasya karana yo bhadrās svapna | sa mama yaṣ pāpaṭ saṁ dviṣate pra hiṁmah z 3 z.

The quotation of st. 1 by pratika only indicates the previous appearance of the stanza in this text, viz. Bk. 2. 37. 3, thus: yathā kalām yathā čophaṁ yathārpaṁ saṁ nayanti | eva duṣvapnyām sarvam aprīye saṁ nayāmasi. In the first part of st. 3 it would seem that the vocatives might stand.

In st. 4 our text is as hopeless as that of Č.: in tyaśtāma it may be that we have only a corruption of what stands in the Č., pada-mss. mātrāṇa (note that the last syllable of the preceding line is ma), or it might be that tṛṣṭāma as intended; this latter is a palaeographic possibility and occurs as the name of a river RV. 10. 75. 6. For the second part of the stanza I have nothing worth suggesting. In the third part sūmakaṁ may be intended, and we may read piyāruḥ; for vipasa we might then read with Whitney-Roth vapa.

For the last two stanzas we may read: yad asmāsa duṣvapnyāṁ yad goṣu ya ca no gṛhe | sūmakaṁ devaptum piyāruṁ niśkam īva prati muñcatāṁ z 5 z navāratnīn tāpamāyaṁ asmākaṁ tāvvas pari | duṣvapnyāṁ sarvaṁ durbhūtaṁ dviṣate nir dviṣāmāsi z 6 z 5 z anu 6 z z.

While not wholly satisfactory this is rather better than the version of Č., in which the last stanza is not metrical: I believe it is so here.

31. [f. 57 b, l. 14.]
Cf. MS. 2. 4. 7.

devā marutas pṛṣṇimātaro apo dattoditam bhīñta | divas prthivyā uror antari-kṣat tas-

smāi kṣattrāyā neta vrahmaṇābhyaḥ prajābhya ābhya oṣadhībhyaḥ svāhā
devā agnī indra sūrya apaḥ devāḥ cojo mittrāvarunā yamaṁ
tapaḥ devāṣ pitaro māvyāṣ kravyāpaḥ devāpsuṣado pāṁ
napāt tāṁnū-
[f. 58 a.] napāṁ narāçaṇsāpo dattodītim bhīnta deva vr̥has-pate apo dehy adītim bhīnti | deva prajāpate apaḥ deva parameṣṭhin āpo dehy adītim bhīnti | devas pr- thivyā uror antarikṣāt tasmāi kṣattrāya nena prahmaṇā-bhyās prajābhya ābhya oṣadhībhya svāhā z 1 z

Read: devā marutas preṇimātaro apo dattodādhim bhīnta | divas prthivyā uror antarikṣāt tasmāi kṣatrāya na ita | vrahmaṇābhyaḥ prajābhya ādbhya oṣadhībhyaḥ svāhā z 1 z devā agna indra suryāpo •• | divas •• z 2 z devaç cojoc mitraj-varuṇar̥yamam apo •• | divas •• z 3 z devaç pitāro vaśava-yās kravyādo po •• | divas •• z 4 z devā apusado pāni napāt tamarpanān narāçaṇsāpo dattodādhim bhīnta | divas •• z 5 z deva vr̥has-pate apo dehy uddhādm bhindhi | divas •• na ihi | vrahmaṇābhyaḥ •• z 6 z deva prajāpate apo dehy uddhādm bhindhi | divas •• z 7 z deva parameṣṭhin āpo dehy uddhādm bhindhi | divas prthivyā uror antarikṣāt tasmāi kṣa-trāya na ihi | vrahmaṇābhyaḥ prajābhya ādbhya oṣadhībhyaḥ svāhā z 8 z 1 z

In the stanza corresponding to our st. 3 MS. has devaç cārmaṇya, which suggests for our text the possibility of devaç cārma no; I have thought also of deva açvināu, but neither of these is compelling.

32. [f. 58 a., l. 4.]

Q. 2. 34.

prajāpater jāyamānaṃ prajā jātāc ca yā i-māḥ tā asmāi prativedayā cikitvān anu manyataṃ eṣām içe paçu-patih paçunām catuśpadām uta vā ye dvipadah niśkrītas te yajñī- yā yanti lokāṃ rāyas poṣā yajamanām majantām pramaṇ-canto bhuvanasya
gopa gātum devā yajamāṇāya dhatāh upākṛtam čiçumānaṃ yaj a-
sthār priyaṃ devānām apy eti pāthaḥ ye badhyamanām anu idhīyānāmi-
ksanta manasā caksūṣā ca | agniṣ tān agre pra mumukta
devāḥ prajāpatiḥ pra-
jabhis samvidanam yesam praho na badhnanti baddham
gavam pacunami uta
paurusanam | indras tam ya aranyas pacavo vicvarupap
uta ye
kurupah vayus tvan agre pra mumukta devas prajapatis
prajabhis sam-
vidanam prajananta prati
grehantu devas pramam ange-
rbhayam gaccha prati tisthah carirais svargam yahi
pathibhihip ciwebhii

z 2 2

Read: prajapatem jayamana pra jata ca ya imah | ta
asmari prativedaya cikitvau anu manyatam z 1 z yesam ic
paupati pacum a catuspadam uta va ye dvipadah | niskritas
te yajnyam yantu lokathi raya paso yajamanam sacantam
z 2 z pramunicanto bhuvanasya gopa gatun deva yajamanaya
dhatam | upakrtau caamanam yad asthat priyam devanam
apy etu pathah z 3 z ye badhyamanam anu didhyana anvika-
santa manasa caiksuca ca | agniris tan agre pra mumoktu devah
prajapatish prajabhish samvidanahe z 4 z yesam rpmo na bad-
lnanti baddham gavam pacum a uta paurusanam | indras tan
* * * * * z 5 z ya aranyas pacavo vicvarupap virupap uta ya ekarupah |
vayus tan agre pra mumoktu devas prajapatish prajab-
this samvidanah z 6 z prajananta prati grhantu devas
pramam anegbhayas pary |acarantam | dyam gaccha prati tisthah
carirais svargam yahi pathibhihip ciwebhii z 7 z 2 z

These stanzas appear also TS. 3. 1-4. 1 and KS. 30. 8
our first stanza is not in C, and our fifth is new. Our pada
2b is a mixture of the version of C. catuspadam uta yo dvi-
padam, and that of KS. catuspada uta ye dvipadah; it might
be better to read catuspada in our version. I think the simplest
emendation in its st. 5a would be prana. In 6b I have
inserted virupa which all the texts have.

33. [I. 58 a. i. 16.]
C. 2. 6.
mamah tvagna rthavo vardhayantu samvatsara shayo yah
nu
sakhyah sam dyumnena didhibi rocanena vicva ahabhhih
pradica ca-
tasravah sam cedhyavasvgne prati bodhayenam uc ca tisthah
mahate saubhagah-
ya | mā te riṣamṇaṁ upasattā te agne vrahmaṇāṅs te yaçasas
sanu pā-
[f. 58 b.] nye tvām agne vṛntute vrahmaṇā ime āghīa gre
prabhṛṇo nedihi sapattringre abhimābhicad u bhavaḥ sve kṣa didḥhy aprayucchan.
īhāivāgne
adhi dhārayā rayīṃ mā tvā dabhāṅ pūrvacittā nīkārīṇaḥ
ksattram
m agne sūyamam astu tubhyam uta sattra vاردḥatām te
nīskṛtaḥ kṣettraṇā-
gne mbenā sam rabhasva mittraḥāṅe mittradheyam vaca-
sva | sajātāṇāṁ madhyā-
meṣṭheha ma syā rājñām āgne vihavyo didhiha | ati naho
iti nir-
tīr any atātīr ati dviṣāḥ viṣvā bhya paredīca dhaḥ anādhṛṣīyo jātaveda anīṣṭhato
virā-
d āgne kṣatrībhīr didhiha vī mīvā pramāṇaḥ manusye-
bhyaç cīvebhīr a-
bhya pari pāhi no gayyāḥ z 3 z

Read: samās tvāγa rtavo vardhayantu samvatsara ṛṣayo ya nu sakhyā | saṁ dyumnena didhiḥ rocannena viṣvā a bhāhi
pradiçaḥ catasraḥ z 1 z saṁ cedhyasvāgne prati bodhayainam
uc ca tiṣṭha malate sūbhagaya m mā te riṣamṇa upasattāro
agne vrahmaṇaṁ te yações satru mānye z 2 z tvām agne
vṛntute vrahmaṇaṁ ime āghīa gre prabhur nu na edhi
| sapatnaḥagne abhimāṭjid u bhava sve kṣaye didhiḥ aprayucccha z
3 z ihaivāgne adhi dhārayā rayīṃ mā tvā dabhāṅ pūrvacittā
nīkārīṇaḥ kṣatram sūyamam astu tubhyam uta sattā vard-
hatām te nīskṛtaḥ z 4 z kṣatrīṇaṅge avena sam rabhasva
mitraḥāṅge mitradheyam vacaṣa | sajātāṇāṁ madhyāmeṣṭhā ilā
sa syā rājñām āgne vihavyo didhiha z 5 z ati tnuho tni nir-
tir aty arāṭtīr ati dviṣāḥ viṣvā bhya paredīca dhaḥ z 6 z anādhṛṣīyo jātaveda
anisṭhato virād āgne kṣatrībhur didhiha | viṣvā anvāh prama-
ṇaḥ manusyebhyaç cīvebhīr adya pari pāhi no gayyāḥ
z 7 z 3 z

In st. 1b it is entirely possible that the reading ya nu
sakhyā is only a corruption of yāṃ satya which all the others
have. The reading of st. 2c given in our ms. seems to involve
a mixture of the Č, form and the form given by the Yajus texts. In st. 4d upasattā as in the other texts would probably be better. St. 5c has appeared in this book no. 1. 4c. In st. 7d the ms. makes the correction to adya. Our st. 4 is Q. 7.82. 3 and our st. 7 is Q. 7.84. 1.

34. [f. 58 b, l. 10.]
Q. 3. 20.

ayam te yonir rtviyo yatoto jato arocathah tam jananm agna a rohathā no vardhayā rayim

Read rohathā in ed, and rayim before the period and numeral.

pra

dattarām havāmahe agnim ugram ūtaye | çuciryo vṛtrahanttamāṁ

The first pāda of these appears TS. 1.7.13.4a, but refers to Indra. In the margin opposite these pādas is the following: somam rājānam açervacana (to be corrected açirvacana). It seems then that there is here a grouping of four pratikas, and that they do not form a stanza of this hymn.

In the third pāda vṛtrahantamāṁ seems to be intended.

agnie cchā vadeha naṁ | pratyāṇ nas sumanā bhava pra no yaccha viçāṁ pate dhanadāsī nas tvam.

In a read cchā, place colon after bhava; in d read dhanadāsī, and tvam before the period.

pra no yacchatv aryamā pra bhaga-

pra pūṣā proba sūṛtaṁ rayim devī dadhātu naḥ

In a read pra; drawing on Č, we may read for b pra bhagaṣ pra vṛhaspatiḥ. In c read sūṛta.

aryamaṇam vṛhas-

spatim indraṁ dānayā codaya vātaṁ viṣṇum sarasvatim savitarām ca

vājīnam

In pāda b read dānayā.

somam rājānam averse gniṁ gīrbdhir havāmahe ādityaṁ viṣṇum sūryāṁ vṛahmanāṁ ca vṛhaspatim

Read 'gniṁ' in b; in d vṛhaspatim before the period. The stanza is no. 5.

suhaveha havāmahe | ya-

thā nas sarvam ij janas saṣīgasatyāṁ sumanā hasāt. |
The omission of pāda a is probably accidental; in Q. it is indravāyu uhhāv iha. In c read sarva; the form sarvam may be due in some way to TS. 4. 5. 1. 2, where sarvam īj jagat stands. For d read saṅgatyāṁ suṣmanā asat.

[fl. 59 a] tvāṁ no agna agnihir vrahmāṇāṁ ca vardhaya tvāṁ no devatātaye rayim dānāya codaya |

In pāda a read agne; it seems very probable that vrahmāṇam in b is only a corruption of vrahma yajñam as in Q. vājasvedāṁ prasāve sambabhūva ya ima ca viṛvā bhuvañāny antaḥ utātiṣṭchantam dāmayatu prajānāṁ rayim dhehi sarvavīraṁ

ni yacchatam. |

While it seems possible to read pāda a as it stands here, ending with ya, I am inclined to think that ya represents only a transitional sound of pronunciation and that the correct reading is sam babhūvemā ca — in Q. too I think we might amend to sam babhūvemā on the basis of dittography. For our pāda c read utāditsantaṁ dāpayatu prajānāṁ; yacchatam in d.

durān me pānca pradiço durāṁ urvī yathābalam. prāpeyam sarvā mākūṭir manasā hrdayena ca |

In a read duḥrāṁ, in b duḥrāṁ urvīr: in c ma ākūṭīr, gosaniṁ vācae-

m udeyam varcasa māhhy arunyyamhi | āyu rundhāṁ sar-
vato vā tvāṣṭa pu-

ṣāya ċriyatāṁ z 4 z

Read: gosaniṁ vācam udeyam varcasa māhhy ārunyyamhi | a rundhāṁ sarvato āyu tvāṣṭa posāya dhriyatāṁ z 10 z 4 z

It is possible that the end of pāda b has gotten confused with the beginning of pāda c, and that we ought to read as in Q. māhhyudiḥi. The form suggested for d appears Q. 6, 141. 1b.

35. [fl. 59 a, l. 7]
Q. 19. 15.

yata indra bhayāmahe tato no abhayam kṛdhi | maghavaṁ sakti tava tvam na tudbhir vi dviṣo vi mṛdho jahi | i-

ndram vayam anorādham havāmahe anūrādhyāssad dvi-
padāc catuspadā |
mā na sonārausīr usa gur viśūcīr indra druho vi nācaya i-
ndras trātoto vṛttarahā parampā no varenyāḥ ca rakṣatā
caramatas sva
madhya sva paṭcāt sva purastān no stu z rumum no
lokam anu neṣī vidvā-
n svarva jyotir abhayam svasti ugrā ta i sthavirasya
bāhū upa kṣe-
ma čaraṇā vr̥hantā abhayam naṣ karaty antarikṣam a-
bhayam dyāvāpt-
thīvī ubhe abhayam paṭcād abhayam purastād uttarā-
dhād abhayam no
stu abhayam mitrād abhayam amitrābhī jñātād abhayam
puro yah abha-
yam naktam abhayam divā nas sarvācā mitram bhavan-
tu z 5 z

In l. 10 the ms. corrects usa to apa.

Read: yata indra bhayamahe tato no abhayam kṛdhe 
maghavaḥ cāgilhi tava tvām na ātīhikīr vi dīśo vi mṛdho
jahi z 1 z indram vayam anūrddham havāmahe anu rādhya-
ma dvipāda catuṣpādā mā naḥ senā ararusīr upa gur viśū-
cīr indra druho vi nācaya z 2 z indras trātota vṛttahā paras-
pā no varenyāḥ sa rakṣitā caramatas sa madhyatas sa paṭcāt
sa purastān no stū z 3 z rumū no lokam anu neṣī vidvān
svarvaj jyotir abhayam svasti ugrā ta indra sthavirasya bāhū
upa kṣeyema čaraṇā vr̥hantā z 4 z abhayam naṣ karaty an-
tarikṣam abhayam dyāvāpṛthīvī ubhe abhayam paṭcād abha-
yam purastād uttarād adharād abhayam no stū z 5 z abha-
yam mitrād abhayam amitrād abhayam jñātād abhayam puro
yah abhayam naktam abhayam divā nas sarvācā mitram bhavan-
tu z 6 z 5 z anu 7 z.

36. [f. 59 a, l. 18.]

Contains RV. 1. 102. 4, 6, 9, 10.

me prehi māpa kṛmaḥ caṭṭāṇām vedākhīda 
indras sapattraha bhimaḥ samjayas te samānrdhak. tvāṁ
[f. 59 b.] jayāsi na parājayāsā abhyecv āso maghavan ma-
hatsa ca ugram

cit tām avase sam sicimahe sa tvāṁ na indra havanesu 

mṛdā goji-
The reading given for st. 1c seems probable; but we must also consider samājaya te samān ṛdbhak. The general sense of st. 2 ab is fairly clear, but the exact reading I cannot get: RV. has tvaṁ jigētha na dhana rāudhithārbbhē ṛjā **. In st. 3a the reading seems possible, but in view of RV. form gojītā bāhū amitakratuh simāḥ we might conclude that the Pāipp. form was ** simo 'mitakratur yāḥ. In st. 4d indro vihace might be considered a possibility. St. 5 is given as it stands both in RV. and Q. 7. 50. 4. Our stt. 1 and 4 have no parallels.

The ms. corrects to āyāmi in st. 2 and asmākām in st. 5.
37. [f. 59 b, l. 10.]

smara smaro si
devāīr datto si smara | amuṣya manāssara yathāham kā-
maye tathā čo-
çocayāmya ṭrādayan kāma gacchāṅga jvaro dahatu čocatu-
tutanā | saṅka-
lpāstyasmarantādhībhir yamāivāsyasidhmo hanam anyā-
narānandāḥ

pramuthyato manumaho nāivo naśākarta arṇavaḥ āvečinīś
pradrupo ro-
payiśṇur etās tvābhya prāhino vrahmanā | ṭrutantunī ṭtvīdā
grāmā-

bhāṣinī svapna yacchatu dudhnā manomuha | āvečinīś
pradrupo ro-
po payiśṇur erās tvādyā prāhino vrahmanā | indrāgni
mitrāvaruṇa cebhyotayata | dyāvāprthivī mā-
[f. 60 a] turičā | ačvinā devas savitā bhagaḥ ca mana-
stūdhnayantu naram āśā trtṛyas trīṇ-
cas tvā bhūḍhnaṃtut dvāgniṣ cid yam upa te bhăradvājaḥ
cam uta yas trīṇcatāṅc chinne

vanordhvam dhanā pra plavasva z etās patyanty ābhīyo
vārsikāriva vidyutah tāsam
tigraho bhava sāyam goṣṭho gavām iva niĉīra nipāti-
tābhīyo veçaṇā-
mi te | tās tvāsam uttanitīr bodhayantīr upā sabhāṁ. etās
tvādyā prahino-
mi vrahmanā striṣ prā purogavāṃ tās tvā trīṇam iva čoka-
yām ato tvā ro-

dayā bahuh z 2 z

In f. 59 b l. 15 the ms. corrects bhya to dya: also dyo to
dhyo f. 60 a l. 3.

Out of all this I have been able to emend only some few
portions; the sphere of the charm is evident but the parti-
cular intent is not.

For the first stanza we might read the following: smara
smaro 'si devāir datto 'si smara | amuṣya manas smara yathā-
ham kāmaye tathā čocayāṣya ṭrādayam. Next we seem to
have four pādas of fair cadence, thus: kāma gacchāṅga jvaro
dahatu čocatu manah | saṅkalpā asya smaranāṭádhībhir tyama-
vāṣya dadhmāu. In the last pāda we might possibly read yān
svāsyā. The next pada would seem to be hanam anyanaranānandāḥ meaning perhaps "may I smite those women who take pleasure with other women's husbands"; and next we seem to have pramuhya manomuho. After this I can get nothing helpful until the sixth line below where the reading might be chinne vana ārdhavām dhanā pra plavasva.

We seem to get next the following stanza: etās patyanty ādhyo varṣikrī īva vidyutatāh tāsām pratigrado bhava sāyam gośtho gavām īva. There follows a stanza whose first two padae parallel Q. 1: 131. 1 ab, and our pada a seems to be the same with that of Q.; the hemistic might read thus: ni čciśato ni pāttata ādhyo veçayāmi te. A bold rewriting would give a second hemistic for this stanza thus: tās tvaśan uttarāvatīr bodhayantī upā sabhām. It looks however as if the stanza ends at the colon after vrahmanā: perhaps this last clause which appears three times in the hymn might be read etās trād ādhyāḥ prahinomi vrahmanā. Out of striṣ prā purogavām ī get nothing; but for the rest it seems fairly safe to read tās tva śrūnam īva čoçayān attho tva rodāyān bālaṃ.

It will of course be evident that these emendations are offered with no great assurance. The amount of material would make about nine stanzas; the hymn is no. 2 in the annvāka.

38. [f. 60 a, l. 7.]
Verses found in Q. 4. 14; 9. 5; and Kauç. 68. 26.

ajo hy agner ajaniśta çokāt so paçcej jani-
tāram agre tena devā devatām āgrāyan tena rohān aro-
ham upa medhiyān-
āh z kramadhvam agnibhin nāka meksān hastesu bibhrata
divas prḥam svar gatvā
mičra devebhīr ādhyām | agne prehi prathamo deva etām
cakṣur devānām uta ma-
rtayānām | iyakṣamānā bhṛgubhis sajośasas svar yantu ya-
jamānā
a svasti z svar yanto nāpekṣantantā dyām rohantu rā-
dhasaḥ agni viçvatodhāram sa-
vidvānās vitenire | agnim yunajmi čavasā ghṛtena divyām
samudrām payasam
ruhantāṁ | tena geśma sukṛtasya lokāṁ sa ruhāṇā adhi nākam uttamaṁ | imāu
tē pakṣā ajarāṁ patatṛtipā yābhyāṁ rakṣāṁsy apahaṁsy odanāṁ tābhyaṁ patyaśmi
sukṛtasya lokāṁ yatṛarṣyaṁ prathamajāṁ purāṇāḥ yadi tiṣṭho sivas prāṣṭhe
vyomaṁ adya odanaṁ anvāyaṁ satyaadharma no vrahmanā rādhasā saha |
prāṣṭhāt prāṭhivyām antarikṣam ārham antarikṣā divam ārham divo nākasya prāṣṭhā
t svar jyotīr agāṁ aham. | ajo sy aja svargo si tayā lokam anāgirasa pra-
[f. 61 u.] jānan. | tam lokam anu pra jneṣma yena vā sahas-
[ṛyaṁ vahāsi yena yā sarvaved-
dsāsām, temāṁ yajāṁ no vaha svar deveṣu gantave | aja ta pacata pacva coda-
nā | ajaṁ paṃcāudanām packva devalokāṁ samāṇačūḥ |

Read: ajo hy agner ajanīṣṭa ċokāt so pācyaj janitäram agre | tena deva devatāṁ agra ayan tena rohān arohan upa medhiyāṁsaḥ z 1 z kramadhvam agnibhir nākau mekṣān has-
teṣu bibhrataḥ | divas prāṣṭhān svar gatva migra debebhir ādh-
vam z 2 z agne prehi pratham devayataṁ caksur devanāṁ uta martāyāṁ | iyākṣamaṇā bhūrgubhis sajosasas svar yantu yajāmanāṁ svāsti z 3 z svar yanto nāpeksanta a dyām ro-
hantu rādhasāḥ | yajñāṁ ye viṣvatodhāram survīdāṇo viṭemore z 4 z agnim yunajmi cavasa ghrtena divyāṁ samudrama paya-
sām ruhantām | tena geśma sukṛtasya lokāṁ svo ruhāṇā adhi nākam uttamaṁ z 5 z imāu te pakṣā ajarāṁ patatṛtipā yāb-
hyāṁ rakṣāṁsy apahaṁsy odanāḥ | tābhyaṁ pathyāsma sukṛtasya
lokāṁ yatṛarṣyaṁ prathamajāṁ purāṇāḥ z 6 z yad atiṣṭho
divas prāṣṭhe vyomāṁ adhy odana ṅ anvāyaṁ satyaadharma no vrahmanā rādhasā saha z 7 z prāṣṭhāt prāṭhivyā aham antarik-
ṣam ārhuṁ antarikṣād divam ārhuṁ | divo nākasya prāṣṭhāt svar jyotīr agāṁ aham z 8 z ajo sy aja svargo sī tiyā lok-
am anāgirasa prajānam | tam lokām anu jneṣma z 9 z yena vā sahasraṁ vahāsi yena vā sarvavedasām | tenemāṁ yajāṁ
no vaha svar deveṣu gantave z 10 z ajām ca pacata paṅca caudanān | ajāṁ paṃcāudanān paktvā devalokāṁ samāṇačūḥ z 11 z 3 z.

Stanzas 6 and 7 are in Kāṇḍa. 63, the last three in Č. 9. 5.
In st. 4c I have adopted the reading of Č. I think there
is reason to doubt whether the last part of st. 11 is really part of the hymn.

In st. 7 b the ms. corrects to adhyā.

39. [I. 60 b, l. 3.] yā te prajā
vihātā parābhū dhruvenaçvītāpam bharāmi | agnis te tām ādyamah
punar dād vāïçvānaraḥ

Read parābhūd in pāda a; in b dhruvena is pretty clearly the first word, and sam bharāmi may be the verb, but I can get nothing more out of the pāda. For pādas cd we might read agnis te tām ādyamah punar dād vāïçvānaraḥ; pāda e lacks one syllable.

paramasmābhya mnastam patiç ċivo gni dvitiyaṁ mi praajasā
jaradāṣṭi satasva | mūcāināṁ grāhyāṁ niṛṛtir yad abandhāgne praajasā praajasākāmāya dchehi |

Possible readings here seem to be 'mnas tām and 'gnir in a, dvitiyaṁ me and jaradāṣṭin in b: śāduśa is the only thing I can suggest for satasva. For cd we may read mūcāināṁ grāhyā niṛṛtir yad abadhnād agne - .

tvām agne vṛṣabham vāciṣṭeyam ānyajāt putrakāmāsu paryati | tām ā roha sumanasyamānas praajasāteṣ praṣaṣ nanā resiṇinām |

At the end of a we might read vācata iyam; ānyajāh, if it may mean "ready to give birth again", might stand in b, with pary eti. It would seem that praajasāte ought to stand in d, but resiṇinām I cannot solve; enām may be at the end of the pāda.

tubhyāṁ nārī putrakāmā yam agne ċuddham pūtam ghṛtam ā juhoti | tā
m ani tām ani ṣkandha vilayavsa netodhā ugraḥ praajasā sam srjīnāṁ

In a we may read yad agne; in b I would read tām adhi ṣkanda, for d retodhā ugraḥ praajasā sam srjīnām. Cf. C. 5. 25. 8.

parvatād divo yene gāṭrād-gāṭrāt samāçrutam, neto devas-ya devasama- rāu parṇam iyādhān
This appears in C. 5, 25.1. In a read youer, in b samāṣṭam seems possible; C. has samābhṛtam. For c read reto devasya devās, and for d sarāṇa parṇam īva dhān seems possible; C. has ce po garbhasya retodhāḥ sarāṇa parṇam īva dadhat.

indrasya jātasya prapapāta nābhīs tām ekodenāṣ pra-ti jagrāhaš kāmi | tvayā vayaṃ vrahmaṇaśa somapāś supayā s sutayāna sūyate z 4 z

The first letter of the last line is not certain. I can do no more with this than the division of words indicates. The stanza is no. 6 and the hymn no. 4.

This is clearly a charm for successful conception, and it seems to be intended to help obtain a child in place of one lost.

40. [f. 60 b, l. 14.]

tyajanān tyajanām jātaṁ tyajanāṁ jāyate cara | na eṣati na ṭoṣati yas tvā bi-bhārī tejana pāutram asi tejanaṁ pāutram te prabhaṇjanam pāutro stu so kā-mo yena mūrčham ayāmahe z yā doṣaḥ čaro stv odane-bhyaṃ kṛṇavadbhyām tāva do-sa tvam tejanas tyajanām maruto dadham. tyajanām me viĉve devās tyajanāṁ pita-ro dadham. tenāham anyeṣaṁ striyo tyāksam purā ma-dhyadinād uta | purā sā-[f. 61 a,] yityādi tyāksam tejane ya mahād vilam | asthād dyāumṛ asthāt prthivy asthād viĉvam i-dam jagat. asthād dvihvṛdevās tiṣṭhaḥ kāmo ayam tava z 5 z a 8

zz zz ity ātharvaṇikapāipalādaçākhāyām triśyas kāṇḍa
s samāptāḥ zz zz

Read: tyajanāt tyajanām jātaṁ tyajanān jāyate cara | nāi-ṣati na ṭoṣati yas tvā bibhārī tejana z 1 z pavitrān Asi tejana pavitrān te prabhaṇjanam | pavitro stu sa kāmo yena mūrčham ayāmahe z 2 z yāvān doṣaḥ čaro stv odane-bhyaṃ kṛṇavadbhyām | tāvan doṣaḥ tvaṁ tejana tyajanān maruto daḏhan z 3 z tyajanān me viĉve devās tyajanαn pitaro daḏhan | tenāham anyeṣaṁ striyo z 4 z z tyaḥ vyān purā maḍhyāmāṇād uta | purā tṣāiypo tyaḥsma tejane yan mahād bilam z 5 z asthād dyāur asthāt prthivy asthād viĉ-
vam idām jagat | asthād vihvarita eva tiṣṭhāt kāmo ayām
tava 2 6 2 5 2 anu 8 2

**Ity ātharvanikapāippalādaçākhāyāṁ tṛtyaś kāndas saṁāptaḥ 22**

In st. 1b ċaraḥ seems entirely possible though not necessary. The reading given for 3ab seems possible, but the word odanebhyaś creates doubts; I should think that something likedhanubhyaś karnavadbhyaḥ would fit the context better. The ms. gives no hint of the lacuna I have indicated in stt. 4 and 5 but I am fairly sure that my arrangement is correct. In st. 5c çāyītvād u would be good if we may take çāyītvā to mean “bed-time”. St. 6ab appears Q, 6, 45. 1ab and 6. 77. 1ab; the conjecture for pāda c fits in so neatly that I have ventured to write it as a sure correction. But after all is said this hymn is left in an uncertain state.

**POSTSCRIPT.**

In each of the following stanzas the first line of transliteration does not correspond exactly with the ms. in spacing: in hymns 8, 5; 12. 8; 18. 3; 18. 5; 22. 4; 25. 12; 34. 8. In each case the line of transliteration should be indented a little to indicate that the first word of the line is not at the left margin of the ms.

This postscript seems the best way to correct these errors, which will probably cause no serious confusion.
The Vedic hapax suśīśvī-s. — By EDWIN W. FAY,
The University of Texas.

In RV. 1. 65, which is addressed to Agni, we find the following pādas:

2 c vārdhantam āpah pantā suśīśvīm
āmṛāsya yonā gārbhe sūjātam,

of which the first means in Latin something like
augent cum lymphae laude (? ) suśīśvīm

But what does suśīśvīm mean? Oldenberg (Sacr. Books of the East, 46, 54) renders by 'the fine child' and Griffith's rendering is 'the growing babe'. I suggest that suśīśvīs is rather the result of spirant shifting, in which popular etymology played a rôle, for suṣī-śvīs. Native authorities define suṣī- for which suṣī- is a frequent variant (cf. also suṣi-rū-s (1) 'cavum'; (2) 'reed, bamboo'); by (1) śroṣa- 'ariditas'; and actual usage attests (2) 'cavum'. For (1) cf. śūṣκā- 'aridus', noting RV. 1. 68. 2 b:

śūṣkād yād deva jivō jāniṣṭhāh
arido ċ ligno ā cum dive vivus natus es.

With these facts before us the interpretation of suṣī-śvīs as 'in arido ċ ligno turges' is self-suggesting, and the interpretation gains point for 1. 65. 2 c by the juxtaposition of the 'waters' with the 'dry'. The production of fire by the drill and the use of dry twigs as kindling need but to be noted, and I have elsewhere interpreted Skr. śroṣa-dī-s 'plant' as generalized from an original 'Brenn-Pflanze' (TAPA, 41, 25).

If, however — and this I did in KZ, 37, 154 — to the satisfaction of as sane a mythologist as the late V. Henry — we can trace the Prometheus myth in the Brāhmaṇas, we must ask ourselves whether the 2d meaning of 'cavum' is not rather to be recognized in suṣī-śvīs. Then the epithet will refer to the hollow reed of the Prometheus fire-myth. Even so, the reed is probably but an allotropic designation for the socket slab
wherein fire was begotten. The idea of ‘hollow’ in sūṣi-śvis lends point to the two references in 1. 65. 2d to the womb wherein Agni was born.

For the posterius, -śvis, only a word need be said: it is a weakest grade root noun used as a compounding final. The root is Skr. śvā(y): Av. spā(y) - ‘turgere’. In the Agni-epithet Matari-śvan- which, as I am explaining in KZ. 45, 134 meant ‘in materia turgens’ (= ‘materiae puer’), we have a cognate posterius -śvan- from the same root. As for the development of mātari-: Lat. māteria from mātār- ‘mother’, credat Judaeus Apella. But if I am right in deriving māteria from *(f)mater- ‘cutter’ (of timber), it is possible that *(f)mater- ‘mother’ also comes from *(f)mater- ‘cutter’. Testimony to the activity of woman in wood-cutting in the savage and semi-savage races could doubtless be found in abundance (see, e.g., Mason, Woman's Share in Primitive Culture, pp. 32, 153), but the function of woman as a ‘cutter’ is better displayed, we may think, in the following: “The husband has slain the deer .... and there his share of the operation ends. The woman .... removes the skin .... and then divides the carcass for immediate consumption or to be dried. In these (sic) she is a butcher, and the whole earth are (sic) her shambles. This meat she then proceeds to apportion according to the rules of her tribe and her clan” (ibid. p. 27). In Germany, if my limited observation goes for anything, woman is still the carver. — In the final shaping of *(f)mater- the inevitable fusion therewith of the babbling child’s mamma is not to be lost to sight.

Postcript.

For the explanation of Skr. bauḍhis as ‘brenn-pilhanze’ cf. φυλόγαννον (φυλόγαν ‘roasts’), which became a regular designation, in the botanical classification of Theophrastus, for the class of shrubs.

In sūṣi-śvis the posterius should perhaps be written -śvis, with reduplication, cf. saṁ-śīvāri (in K. Z. l. s. c.).
Sanskrit dhēṇa — Avestan daenā — Lithuanian dainē.

By Dr. Samuel Grant Oliphant, Professor in Grove City College, Grove City, Penna.

The two objects of this paper are, first, to determine the meaning of the Sanskrit dhēṇa and then to establish the equation that gives its title.

The word dhēṇa is found fifteen times in the RV. In the later Vedic and Brahmanic literature we find seven of these passages repeated a total of seventeen times. The word is found also in two compounds in the RV. One of these occurs twice only and in the same sūkta. The other occurs once in RV and twice in the later literature. Two other instances, not in the RV, are found later, one occurring in six different works and the other in three. Elsewhere it is found — so far as the writer has discovered — only in Nāgānātukā I, 11, in the Unadigyanasatra (268) of Hemachandra and in Sāyana.

The PWB. defines dhēṇa in the sg. as "milchende Kuh" and in the pl. as "Milchrank", in all passages of the RV, except three. For I, 101, 10 and V, 30, 9, it says, "viel, Stute" and for I, 2, 3, "viel, vom Gespann Vayus zu verstehen ist". Grassmann's Wörterbuch has the definitions "Milchkuh, Stute,

1 Thus RV. I, 101, 10 — Naig. 6, 17; RV. III, 34, 3d — AV. XXI, 11, 3d; Vāj. S, 29, 29; RV. IV, 58, 6 — Vāj. S, 19, 38; 17, 94; KS., 40, 7; Tārt. S, 4, 2, 9, 9; MS., 2, 7, 17; Tārt. År. 1, 10, 40; CB., 7, 3, 2, 11; Āp. Č., 17, 18, 16; RV. V, 62, 2 — MS., 4, 14, 19; TR. 2, 8, 6, 6; RV. VII, 94, 4 — SV., 2, 150; RV., X, 43, 6 — AV., XX, 17, 6; RV., X, 101, 3 — AV., XX, 25, 2; 33, 2.
2 Dhēṇa brāhapatī in MS., 1, 9, 2; KS., 9, 10; GR., 2, 2, 9; Tārt. År., 3, 9, 1; Vāt. S., 15, 3; Āp. Č., 11, 3, 14.
3 Dhenākkhī kalpamāṇāḥ in MS., 4, 13, 4; KS., 16, 21; and Tārt. Br., 3, 6, 5, 1.
4 The reference in PWB. to the Anekārthasangraha (2, 271) of this author seems to be an error, as the edition of Zacharias (2, 297) defines dhēṇa and dhēṇi but has no mention of dhēṇa.
Milchtrank" and in ten instances agrees with PWB. in their distribution, but not in the other five. Commentators and translators differ widely in their interpretations. Sāyana gives six different definitions of the word. Grassmann in his RV. disagrees with himself in his WB. in five instances, withdraws "Stute" and enters "Lippen", "Weiber" and "Gewässer". Griffith's translation agrees in general with Sāyana, but adds one definition and withdraws another. Ludwig consistently renders in all instances by "Stimme", "Lieder" or "Schall", but considers this difficult in V. 62, 2 and desiderates "Ströme". Geldner in Ved. Stud. II, 35 ff. has made a special study of the word and, as the result, propounds the definitions: 1. Schwester, viell. auch Geliebte, Frau. 2. Weibliches Tier, Kuh. 3. a. Zunge, b. Stimme, Rede, Lob. In all but three instances he practically agrees with Sāyana. Oldenberg in his Veda-forschung 93 ff., has a special excursus on the word and concludes that in all but two instances its meaning is "Milchströme", either literally or figuratively, and in those two instances it still refers to potable fluids.

The table opposite shows at a glance the various renderings proposed in each instance.

In view of this diversity of interpretation which attaches several incongruous meanings to what would seem a single word, it has seemed advisable to study the word anew to establish its fundamental signification and to trace its semantic development.

In Nāigahanṭuka (L. c.) we find āhenā listed as one of the fifty-seven synonyms of vāk. This is the one meaning most frequently given by Sāyana and best supported by native tradition as will appear in the sequel. It lends itself to our equation. So we start with it in the consideration of the several passages.

Among these we find the greatest degree of unanimity in X, 104, 10—

\begin{verbatim}
virēnyah krātur indrah sāgastir
utāpi āhenā paruhiśām ita
\end{verbatim}

(HERÓIC strength and goodly praise is Indra. Yea, also āhenā praises him, invoked of many).

It seems clear as Ludwig observes "dass es nicht Kuh oder Milch bedeuten kann". So Grassmann's sober second thought leads him here to substitute "Lippen" in his RV. for the "Milch-
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kuh" of his Wörterbuch and Bergaigne (La Rel. Ved. II, 278, n. 1) says: "La vache qui ' invoque' Indra ne peut être que la prière.*

The worshipper's voice uplifted in the adoration of song or prayer would seem a better subject for the verb *itg* than the lexicographers' "cow" or Oldenberg's "oblation of milk". Moreover, this assumption is greatly strengthened by an examination of the ninety-five passages in the RV. that contain this verb. In sixty-three of these it may not be indubitably clear whether the praise, honor, worship, etc., expressed by the verb were manifested by thought and its expression in song, prayer, etc., or by the oblation, offering, etc. As a matter of fact, of course, both were integral parts of the sacrifice. In the great majority of these instances it would seem to the writer that the dominant idea in the verb is that of song or prayer. This may, however, be due to the more or less unconscious bias of one defending a thesis. So let us examine only the thirty-one instances — exclusive of our passage — in which there is an absolutely clear expression. In seven passages the subjects are decisive; viz., I, 142, 4, *matir*; VII, 24, 5, *arkā*; 45, 4, *girah*; 91, 2, *sūṣutīr*; 93, 4, *girbhir vi-
prah*; 94, 5, *vīprāsa*, with *tā girbhir* in 6; VIII, 60, 16, *saptā hōtāras*. In no passage in the RV. is *havis* or any word meaning "oblation, offering", etc., used as the subject of this verb. In three passages, — VIII, 43, 22, 24: 44, 6 — the immediate juxtaposition of the verb *jru* shows that song or prayer is meant and in X, 66, 14, the same is clearly shown by *vācam*. In thirteen passages the expressed instruments of the action are *sūktēbhir vacobhir* (I, 36, 1), *girā* (II, 6, 6; III, 27, 2; VIII, 19, 21: 31, 14), *girbhir* (III, 52, 5), *nāmasū* (V, 12, 6; X, 85, 22), *nāmobhir* (V, 1, 7: 60, 1), *nāmasū girbhir* X, 85, 21), *stōmāir* (VII, 76, 6) and *gāthābhis* VIII, 71, 14).

In five passages the expressed means are *havisā giritēna* (I, 84, 18), *havirbhīr* (III, 1, 15), *svucā* (V, 14, 3) and *hai-
yēbhir* (VII, 8, 1; VIII, 74, 6). In the remaining two the expressed means are *nāmobhir havisā* (V, 28, 1) and *yañēbhir girbhir* (VI, 2, 2). Excluding these last two passages as neutral because of their participation in both classes, we have a total of twenty-four passages that clearly associate thought, song, or prayer, with the verb and only five that so associate oblation, etc. If then *dhēna* could be either song or ob-
lation, the mathematical probabilities are about five to one in favor of song.

In the third stanza of this same hymn we have —

\[ \text{indra dhēṇabhīr ihā mādayasa} \\
\text{dhēbhīr viśvabhīḥ qācyā grnānāḥ} \]

(Rejoice thou here, O Indra, in our songs,
Hymned mightily in all our thoughts).

We should on a priori grounds expect the word to have the same meaning here as in 10 below and we fail to find any reason for thinking otherwise. It is certainly as reasonable to interpret dhēṇabhīr as the worshippers’ voices uplifted in song as to substitute the “Milehrank” of G.R.V. and the lexicographers. This harmonizes nicely with the general context of the hymn, which is replete with the idea of song and praise. Cf. gīro 1\(^a\), ukthavāhāḥ 2\(^a\), dhībhīr...grnānāḥ 3\(^a\), grnāntah 4\(^a\), stōtāra 5\(^a\), brāhmāni 6\(^a\), swyktim 7\(^b\), gīro 7\(^c\), huvena 11\(^a\), grnvantam 11\(^c\). There are references, expressed or implied, to the oblation of soma in 1\(^ed\), 2\(^ke\), 3\(^b\), 6\(^b\) and 7\(^b\), but more than half of these are in the first two stanzas and they do not dominate the entire hymn as do the former.

As Oldenberg (p. 98 f.) feels that the verb mad supports the idea of “drink”, we may add that this verb is predicated of Indra, relative to stōmbhīr, in I, 9, 3 and, relative to gīrbhīr, in I, 51, 1; of the devās, relative to stōme, in III, 54, 2; of the worshippers of Indra, relative to gīrbhīr, in III, 53, 10 and V, 36, 2. Hence the verb is appropriate enough with dhēṇabhīr as songs in the passage before us.

That Indra rejoices in the songs of his worshippers is shown by many passages in the R.V.; e.g., I, 5, 7, 10; 9, 3, 9; 10, 3, 5, 9, 12; 16, 7; 30, 4, 10, 14; 51, 1; 54, 7; etc. In fact, every suktā in his honor proves it and we have his own word for it in I, 165, 4. So he naturally takes note of such songs and looks with favor upon them. Thus in X, 43, 6—

\[ \text{viśam-viśam maghāvā pāry açayata} \\
\text{jāntinām dhēṇā avacākaśad uṣṇa} \]

(Maghavan came to all the tribes in turn,
And of the songs of men the Bull took note).

and in VIII, 32, 22—
Oldenberg (p. 98) finds little difficulty in these passages. Their evidence is clear enough. “Wären die dhënāh Preislieder, so wäre das ‘Herabblicken’ zwar nicht unerwähnt, aber viel näher läge es doch, ein ‘Hören’ erwähnt zu finden. Wo im Veda werden die dhënāh ‘gehört’?” In reply to this question I trust it will appear that dhënāh are heard in every passage in which the word occurs in the RV. In controversy of his statement that “Herabblicken” is quite unthinkable in reference to songs of praise we would state that brāhmanyuṣṣīm is the object of abhicaksāthe in VII, 70, 5; that stōmān is the object of upadarcathā in VIII, 26, 4; that stōmā is the subject of the medial passive prayudṛṣṣata in VIII, 5, 3; that śrīkam is an epithet of stōmām in I, 27, 10 and paricakṣaṇī of vacāṇi in VI, 52, 14. It is then a case of the Rṣis against Oldenberg as to whether it is so “unthinkable” that songs of praise could be seen or “looked at”. Our next passage is VII, 94, 4:

\[
\text{indre agnā nāmo bhūt, suṣrīkātm ērayamahe dhiyā dhënā avasyāvah.}
\]

(To Indra, Agni too, we raise Our homage high and excellent hymn, Our songs with prayers, their favor seeking).

Dhēnāh as “songs” continues the nāmo of a and suṣrīkātm of b and forms part of the dominant thought of the entire hymn. This is expressed also in mānmanā pūrvyāstūṭiḥ of
Sanskrit dhēnā — Avestan daēnā, &c.

1. "ṛṇatām jaritūr hāvam of 2, vānataṁ āryāh of 2, pip-yataṁ dhiyāh of 2, ātata viprāsa of 5, gārhīr... havēmahe of 6, ukthē lhīr 11, gīrā 11 and āngūsāir of 11. Only in 6 and 10 is there any reference to the oblation. Even Oldenberg (p. 98) is forced to admit that song is implied in dhēnā here, not directly, he adds, but only as the libation is joined with it or in so far as it represents the libation. But in the light of the context it would seem a strange perversion to say that "song" rather than "libation" is the implicit thought.

In I, 141, 1—

yād im īpa kvārate sādhatē matir
ṛtasya dhēnā anayanta sasrūtaḥ]
(Where'er he bends thereto, well speeds the hymn;
The songs of Rta bring him as they flow).

Oldenberg (p. 97) argues that sasrūtaḥ plainly shows that "etwas Fließendes gemeint ist? This word, however, is found elsewhere in the R.V. just twice, once as attributive to āpās (IV, 28, 1) and once as attributive to gīras (IX, 34, 6). The latter proves that songs may flow as well as "streams of milk" and that the passage is no more a bulwark of defence for his position than his "unthinkable" cases above.

In I, 67, 7 b; V, 12, 2 b; VII, 43, 4 b; VIII, 6, 8 c; IX, 33, 2 b; 63, 4 a, 14 b, 21 b, we have mention of the āhārās of Rta; in I, 70, 3 a and III, 55, 13, of the pāyas; in I, 73, 6 a of the dhēnācas; in I, 84, 16 a, of the gās; in IX, 77, 1 a and X, 43, 9 b, of her udiṅghā. On the other hand, we have in I, 68, 5 b; 71, 3 a; IV, 23, 8 b; IX, 76, 4 b, 97, 34 b; 111, 2 a, mention of the dhīti of Rta; in III, 31, 1 b; IV, 2, 16 c; IX, 102, 1 b, 8 c, of the didhitā; in IV, 23, 8 c of the gōka of Rta. So the mention of the prayers, holy songs, etc., of Rta is almost as frequent as that of her oblations of milk. Thus Vedic usage presents no difficulty to the interpretation of dhēnā as songs in this passage.

The dhēnā flow also in IV, 58, 6—

samyāk śraucanti sarito nā dhēnā
antār hyā mānasa puyāmānāḥ
etē ārantaṁ urmāyo, gīrtāsya
mṛgā āva kṣipanār īsamānāḥ [1]

1 gīro ārantaṁ sarūtaḥ (The streaming songs flow on).

Cf. "Bathing in streams of liquid melody". Crashaw.
(Our songs, like streams, flow on together,
Cleansing themselves ’twixt heart and mind.
These waves of ghee flow on apace
E’en as wild beasts that flee before the bowman).

Oldenberg (p. 97) deems this passage “besonders wichtig”
for his theory. His reasons are (1) the dhénáh sarvani;
(2) “the entire hymn praises the streams of ghyta; (3) dháráh is found
“four times” in the hymn. We have already shown that songs
may “flow”. They are here expressly compared with “streams”.
In VIII, 1 4, 6 dhátáyah “flow” and are compared with a
copious gushing spring. They flow also in VIII, 50, 4. A
gir is described as “flowing” in I, 13181, 7, and if Aufricht’s
reading in IX, 108, 7 is correct, a stóma may be “pressed” and
“poured out”. These passages, with the one previously
cited, amply demonstrate the fluidity of songs in the RV, and
dispose of his first defence. To pass to his third point, we
observe that ghytáya dháráh is found five times, one more
than Oldenberg claimed, in the hymn. It is in 5 7, 7 8, 9 9, and
10 4, always in the third or fourth páda. In 6 4, in
exact formal correspondence with these, we find úrmáyo ghr-
táya. The streams of ghytá are mentioned in every re. of
the súkta from 5 to 10 inclusive, but in 6 úrmáyo, not dhéná,
represents the dháráh of the others. To return to his second
point, it is true that the hymn is in praise of the ghytá, of

1 udriva rajastru avatá ná sítcaté
dhárantidá dhátáyah
(As a copious spring, O thou of the thunderbolt, gushes forth, our
songs of adoration flow to thee, O Indra).

2 anékhásam vra hávaránam útaye
mádhrá bhurante dhátáyah
(To the peerless one that calls you for aid,
Songs of adoration, sweet as honey, are flowing).

3 ézarjí cám sthávára vedháma gir
bhúké ápéná tredhá bhuranti
(Your strong laud, ye pious, was sent forth,
flowing threefold, in mighty flood, ye Aquinas).

4 d sotá pāri sítcatá
ácapá ná stóman aptúram vajñáram
(Pray, pour forth as a steed, the song of praise, strong and pierc-
ing the air).

We may add also that in VIII, 18, 5, songs even dance like waters,
--- kriyanty aya súñitá ápo na.
the strange, mystic and symbolically zoomorphic gṛṭā, as well as of the streams of gṛṭā. It is one of the most mooted of all the hymns of the R.V. by the native commentators. It has several peculiar formal correspondences, arranged with almost mathematical precision. One of these has just been noted. We now have another. In 2abc we read —

vayāṁ nāma prā bravāmā gṛṭāya
asmin yajñā dhūrayāmā nāmābhiḥ
ūpa brāhmaṇa ārvavac chasyāmāṇam
(Let us tell forth the name of gṛṭā;
let us at the sacrifice uphold it with our homage;
let the Brahman hear it sung).

This is immediately followed by the description of the gṛṭā in bizarre animal form. In 6abh, the mathematical center and the summit of the hymn, we have our passage, the next reference to the song of 2. In 10abh, at the same distance from the medial summit, in the only other reference to song, the gods are asked to reward the singers,

abhya ārṣata suṣṭutiṁ gāvyaṁ ājīṁ.
asnāsu bhadrā drāvināṁ ṭhatta | (Send to our hymn of praise a herd of cattle;
bestow upon us goodly possessions).

Gṛṭā is dominant. Stanza 1 is a prelude but in c it has reference to the nāma gūhyam of gṛṭā. In 2abc the singers are going to tell it forth in song. In 2ā and 3 they describe the mystic gṛṭā. In 5c, 6c, 7c, 8c, 9d, 10d, the hymn masses effectively its mention of the streams of gṛṭā. In 10abh the singers ask their reward, 10ad and 11 are a postlude, but still emphasize the gṛṭā. In 6abh the song announced in 2 is described as in full flow and in 10 it is practically over. We believe then the dhēnā of 6c is the song promised in 2 and the suṣṭuti for which the reward is asked in 10.

Oldenberg, for the benefit of his argument, has wisely refrained from any attempt at the exegesis of 6b, which seems so admirably to sustain our interpretation. The commentator on Vāj. S. 17, 94, glosses dhēnā by rācaḥ and places it among the vānmāsas with reference to Naigh. (L. c.). He adds — kīdṛcyo dhēnāḥ antar ṛṣaḥ manasā puyāmānāḥ ca rūrāntara-vya-vasthitena hṛdad pavaṇasthāniyena manasā ca puyāmānāḥ ca baddosēbhayo vineyamānāḥ, i.e., they cleanse themselves, separate themselves, from the defects of speech in the mind which has a
pure place and in the heart which is situated in the interior of the body. Here we seem to have the native way of expressing the noble thought that the worshippers are striving in their adoration to clothe the thoughts prompted by the heart and conceived by the mind, both pure, in a noble form, pure from the defects of ordinary speech. However that may be, it is quite certain that the collocation of *hrdā* and *mānasā* points to thought, song, etc., rather than to libations of melted ghee. In fact, we have a close parallel in I, 61, 2 —

indrāya hrdā mānasā maṇiṣī pratīṇyā pāṭyo dhiyo marjayaṁanta||
(For Indra, ancient lord, they cleanse their songs,
In heart and mind and spirit). It is appropriate that the songs should be purified and cleansed in heart and mind, for it is here that they are fashioned also, as shown by I, 171, 2—

esa va stómo maruto nāmaseśan hrdā taśo mānasā dhiya devāh||
(To you, ye gods of storm, this land, in homage rich, and fashioned in heart and mind, is brought).

Nowhere in the *RV.* does the phrase *hrdā mānasā* (VI, 28, 5; VII, 98, 2; X, 177, 1) or *hrdē mānasē* (I, 73, 10; IV, 37, 2) suggest even the possibility of Oldenberg’s theory.

But in Tāit. S. IV, 2, 9, 6, we have

sām it sravanti sarito nā dhēnāḥ
antā hrdā mānasā pūyāmaṇāḥ||
hṛtāya dhārā abhi caśaṁci
hiraṇyāya vetasā mādhyā āsām||

This is a composite of pedus a and b of our stanza and of c and d of the preceding, in this order. This same contamination is found also in Vāj. S. 13, 38; KS., 40, 7; MS., 2, 7, 17; ṇB., 7, 5, 2, 11 and Āp. C., 17, 18, 1. The commentator on Tāit. S. glosses dhēnāḥ by pānayeṣāḥ duskimadhetvayaṁah (portions of curd and mead, fit for drinking). The commentator on Vāj. S., who on two other occasions, of which one is this same passage, gives vṛcass as the gloss of dhēṇā, here gives instead annāṁi ... ḫvayamāṇāṁi ḫavāṇi (food ... libations that make invocation), and the ṇB. gives annam, for

---

1 Clearly do I behold the streams of ghee,
The golden reeds in the midst of them.
2 Vid. n. 1. on first page.
“the food is indeed purified by the heart and mind within him that is righteous”.

Here only in the ancillary Vedic do we find a note out of tune with our interpretation. The Vāj. S. seems to have some glimpse of the connection between dhēnā and voice as it has ṛvayamānāni and, as we have said, on each of the later occasions in which the word is used, has vācas. If it is once wholly or partly against us, it is twice quite positively for us. We can easily believe that in this “contaminated” version the unusual or rare word dhēnā has been misunderstood, possibly through contaminatio with the masculine dhenas, or dhena or the frequent dhenuvas or possibly because used with such verbs as mad, atī, pīn, āvīkṣa, etc. and the fact that songs as well as food and drink actually “strengthen” Indra and the devas.

In I, 55, 4—

sū tā vāne namasyābhir vacasyate
cāru jānesu prabuvidā indriyam 
vṛṣā ṛvandur bhavati haryatō vṛṣā
kṣēma ca dhēnām maghāvā yad invati ||

(He, truly, in the wood is called by worshippers;
When his fair Indrahood he shows among men,
The Bull is lovely; one to be desired is he, the Bull,
Whene’er with peace the Maghavan promotes our song).

Śāyana glosses dhēnām invati, 1st by śrutilakṣanām vācam prerayate, and 2nd by yajamānāh kṛtāṁ stutim vyāpnoti. Either of these makes excellent sense. The former is supported by such a passage as I, 10, 4—

ēhi stōmaḥ abhi svara
abhi grahyā ē ruva |
(Come thou, land our song of praise,
praise it, acclaim it).

also, VIII, 13, 27—

ihā tyā saḥhamādyā
yajāṁah sāmāpitaye |
hārī indre pratādvau abhi svara ||

1 Hemachandra. Undigamattra 298 glosses dhēnā by aṣvadraḥ and his Auskritāhamsaṅgraha, 2, 297 (Zach.) gives the same and adds dhena ... sahijām. Medinikēśa n. 12 has both dhena and dhena (n.) as nadi.
2 Sends forth his commanding voice.
3 Promotes the land made by the worshippers.
(Having yoked those feast-sharing, wealth-increasing, dun steeds, for drinking the soma come hither singing).

The second is supported by such parallels as VIII, 13. 32—
vṛṣa yajñō yāṁ invasi vṛṣa āvah
(Strong the worship that thou dost promote, strong the invocation).

and X, 188, 3—
tābhir no yajnāṁ invatu
(With these may he promote our worship).

and I, 18, 7—
śā dhēnāṁ yōgam invati
(He promotes the work of our psalms).

The latter is the better supported by such parallels as we have found, but our interpretation of dhēnāṁ is safe with either.

The passages I, 10, 4; VIII, 13, 27, cited above and many others give us the friendly, peaceful songs of Indra. The war-songs of his pealing thunder as it reverberates among the mountains, are called dhēnā in VII, 21, 3—
tvām indra srāvitaṁ apās kah pāriṣṭhitā dhinā ċūra pūrvah |
tvād vāvakre rathyohu nā dhēnā rējante viṣvā kaytriṁāṁ bhīśa |
(O Indra, thou didst cause the waters flow, The many waters, hero, that by Ahi were encompassed. Thy war songs rolled from thee as if on chariots borne: And all created things did quake with fear).

Of all translators and commentators, Ludwig alone is right with his "<i>cihre</i> tōnenden lieder". The nearest we can get to the nādyas of Sāvana and his followers would be to interpret dhēnā as referring to the roar of the liberated waters. Such a parallel, however, as I, 80, 14, is against it. There are

\[\text{abhigata te udrive} \\
\text{yāt atō jāgar ca rejate} \\
\text{tvātē cē tāva manīika} \\
\text{indra vairīgāte bhīrā} \\
\text{(At thy deep roar, O hurler of stones, Whate'er is fixed and what is moved doth tremble: E'en Tvaśtar at thy mighty wrath, O Indra, was all aquake with fear).} \]
necessities of references to Indra's roar, but they need not be cited here. As Oldenberg (p. 97), however, finds support in rathyō nā, we shall quote two passages which show that this comparison supports also our interpretation of dhēnā. These V, 61, 17—

etāṃ me stōmam ūrmye
dārbhyāya pārā vaha |
gīro devī rathir iva |
(O Ūrmyā, bear thou far away
For me this song of praise,
O goddess, songs as if on chariots borne).

and VIII, 95, 1—

ā tvā gīro rathir iva
āsthuḥ sutēṣu girvanah
(To thee, O lover of song, our lauds
Arise, as if on chariots borne,
Whene'er we press the soma).

One more reference to Indra's dhēnā is found in I, 101, 10—
mādayasva hāribhir yē ta indra
vi svasva cīpre vi sjasva dhēne
ā tvā suśipra hārayo vahantu
ucān hāvyāṁ prāti no jūsasva |
(Rejoice in these dun steeds of thine, O Indra;
Ope thou thy jaws; let loose thy voices twain.
Let thy dun steeds thee bring, O fair-cheeked god,
And graciously take thy joy in our oblations).

Sāyana interprets the dual dhēne as pānasāhanabhute jih-vopajihvike (tongue and epiglottis becoming effective for drinking). He would have been more consistent had he said "effective for speech". Oldenberg (p. 94) ridicules Geldner's "Zunge" as not accounting for the dual, but when he comes to the interpretation of the passage (p. 99) he finds the dual difficult and dismisses it with the question, — "Sind die dhēne also vielleicht Soma und Wasser?".

We note that sṛj is not rare in reference to songs, etc. Thus we have áṣṭgram . . . girah (I, 9, 4), áśarṣjatam . . . dhiyo (I, 151, 6), áśarṣī . . . gīr (I, 181, 7), úpastutim . . . áṣṭky (VIII, 27, 11), sāryāṅ iva sṛjatam sustūtir úpa (VIII, 35, 20); stotār medhā áṣṭkṣata (VIII, 52, 9); ghōvā áṣṭkṣata (VIII, 63, 7), etc.
We have seen, in the foregoing, ample citations showing that Indra had two distinct dhēnā, that of gracious commendation of his worshipper's praises and that terrifying, thundering battle shout. This gives one interpretation of our dual. An examination of the hymn suggests also another. In pada d of each pū from 1 to 7 inclusive, in 8* and 9*, Indra is invoked to come with his Marut band. Now the Maruts are great singers as shown by I, 19, 4; 24, 8; 37, 10, 13; 85, 2; 87, 3, 5; 165, 1; 166, 7, 11; V, 30, 6; etc., etc. Hence, as Ludwig has suggested, the dhēne here are probably that of Indra himself and that of the Maruts. This would seem supported by 11*—

marutotprasva vṛjanaasya gopā

in which the worshippers speak of themselves as the "guardians of the camp that is Marut-praised". Hence we may consider the two dhēnā as the gracious, approving song of Indra and the Marut's song of praise.

We have the dual again in V, 30, 9—

striyo hi dāsā dāyudhāni cañkṛ
kim nā kāranā abala asya śenāḥ
antōry hy ākhyad ubhe asya dhēne
āthōpa pradhī postyāye dāsyum indraḥ

(The Dāsa made his women his weapons.
What do his feeble armies do to me?
Indra distinguished both his voices
And then went forth to fight the Dāsa).

Oldenberg thinks the dhēne are the liquids that play so great a part in the Namuccci myth. This fits his general interpretation of dhēnā. Ludwig and Griffith think that Indra distinguished between the voice of Namuccci and that of his women and knew from the latter that he had to contend with no army of demon warriors. This fits our general interpretation of the word and is parallel in usage with the word in the latter interpretation of the passage immediately preceding (i.e., I, 101, 10). An interpretation parallel to the former of the preceding would be to consider the dhēne as the war songs or yells of Namuccci and his words cheering on his women. Either makes good sense and harmonizes with our interpretation of the word. As we had some preference for the latter interpretation in the preceding we have the same
for the corresponding interpretation here, the dhēnā of Namucci and that of his women.

We have a reference to the song of Vāyu in I, 2, 3—

\[
\begin{align*}
vāyo tāva prarācriti \\
dhēnā jyātī dācīse \\
urūci sōmapītaye |
\end{align*}
\]

(Vāyu, thy penetrating voice goes unto the worshipper, wide spreading unto the soma drink).

In I Vāyu is summoned to hearken unto the ṛṣī’s invocation (hāvam); in 2 the singers call him with their hymns of praise (ukthēdhīr). Here in 3, according to Śāyana, his approving voice is heard in reply, “O worshipper. I will drink the soma given by thee”. This harmonizes well with the context and we have already cited or quoted several passages that establish such commending voices of the gods. Vāyu is summoned and his dhēnā comes. This then must be an essential characteristic that may be used as a metonym of the god. This could be no libation, but in the list of “wives” of the deities given in Tūkt. Ār. 3, 9, 1, vāk is the wife of Vāyu and hence such a peculiar adjunct as would best represent him here.

In III, 1, 9, the reference is to the celestial Agni, —

\[
\begin{align*}
pitūc cād ādhar janūśā viveda \\
vāy āasya dhārā asṛjād vi dhēnāḥ |
\end{align*}
\]

(From birth he knew his father’s bosom, Sent forth his streams, his voices uttered.)

Śāyana explains ādhar as the firmament, dhārā as streams of rain, and dhēnāḥ as the voices of thunder (mādhyamikā vācās). This seems more probable than other interpretations, though this is one of Oldenberg’s star passages to prove that dhēnā means “streams of milk”. He lays special emphasis upon ādhar and dhārā and the striking comparison of IV, 22, 6,—

\[
prā dhenāvah sīrate viṣṇa ādhanāḥ
\]
as showing the synonymity of dhārā and dhēnā in this passage. Here, however, dhārā replaces dhenāvas there and it is clearly distinguished from dhēnā.

We would quote as parallels in our favor such passages as VIII, 6, 8, in which dhūtāyāh and dhārayā are associated; IX, 10, 4 in which gīrā and dhārayā are associated; IX, 44, 2,
in which mati, dhiyō and dhārayā are associated; IX, 63, 21, in which dhūhir and dhārayā are associated; etc. Such passages show how natural the connection of dhēnā as "songs" with dhāra would be in the passage before us.

As for the ādhar end of the argument, we may quote V, 44, 13—

viçvasām ādhaḥ sa dhiyām udāncanah
(The adder and bucket of all holy psalms).

The ādhar of the firmament is not a rare figure. Cf. e.g. VII, 101, 1; IX, 107, 5; X, 100, 11; etc.

Our next passage is III, 34, 3—

indro vrtraṃ anvoc chārdhanitih
prā māyinām aminād vārpanitih |
āhan vyānsam uciñhay vānesu
āvīr dhēnā akṛṇod rāmyānam |
(The leader of his host, Indra encompassed Vṛtra; Assuming shapes of those in magic skilled, he minished him. Intensely burning in the woods, he slew Vyānsu And made the voices of the nights apparent).

That āvīr akṛṇod may be predicated of song is proved by IX, 3, 5—

āvīr kṛṇoti vagvānām
(He makes his voice heard).

and IX, 96, 2—

dvā devānām yāhyāni nāma
āvīr kṛṇoti bharṣā pravāce |
(As god, he makes heard the secret names of the gods, to be told forth on the sacred grass).

That the "nights" have a voice is sufficiently shown by II, 2, 2, abhi tvā nāktir uṣāso vavaçīre
(The Nights and Dawns hellow to thee), and by VIII, 96, 1—

asmā uṣāsa ātiranta yānam
indrāya nāktam ārmyāḥ suvācaḥ |
(For him the dawns lengthened their courses;
By night, the nights became sweet-voiced for Indra).

This latter passage is a good commentary on the text before us as it, too, is from a sūkta that deals with the conflict of Indra and the demons. Otherwise we may think of the dhēnā here as the shouts of the demonic foes, or the thunderings of Indra in the darksome night of battle, or we may endorse the commentator on Vāj. S. 33, 26, who thinks the
dhēnā here are the stutiśūpā vācaḥ of yajajūkās, or those who worship frequently, even singing their adoration in the seasons of the nights.

Oldenberg (p. 95 f.) considers our next passage so strongly corroborative of his interpretation of dhēnā that he has made it the foundation upon which he has reared much of his superstructure. This is V, 62, 2—

\[\text{tāt śū vām mitrāvarūṇa mahītvām}
\text{īrūtā tāsthiśūr āhāhir āduhir}
\text{viśvāh pinvatāh svāsaraśya dhēnā}
\text{ānu vām āhāh pavaṛ ā tavarta} \]

O Mitra, Varuṇa, this is your greatness;
(Each day they have milked the kine that stand here.
You have caused to swell all songs of the svāsara;
Your single tire hath rolled along hither).

At first sight pinvatāh and svāsaraśya may seem to favor the synonymity of dhēnā with dhēnū but we find the verb pinv is used also with dhīyāḥ, the synonym of dhēnāḥ according to the interpretation we have given throughout. Thus we have in IX, 94, 2—

\[\text{dhīyāḥ pinvānāḥ svāsare nā gava.}\]

Also in I, 151, 6—

\[\text{ānu tmānā srjātām pinvataṁ dhīyo}\]

and VII, 32, 3—

\[\text{pinvataṁ apitāh pinvataṁ dhīyāḥ}\]

we have the act predicated of Mitra Varuṇa as in our passage. The Aēvins are the subject in X, 39, 2—

\[\text{codāyataṁ sunyāḥ pinvataṁ dhīya.}\]

Hence the argument from the verb fails, as it will support either interpretation. These dhīyāḥ in IX, 94, 2, even "bellow forth" (abhī nāvāgra) "a greeting to soma". This shows how completely the same words may be predicated of both "cows" and "songs".

It is here that Ludwig while still consistently rendering dhēnā by "Stimmen" thinks the association with svāsara difficult and desiderates "Strôme". Only in this passage does Geldner render dhēnā by "Kühle" and that because of svāsara. These have taken the word in the sense of "cow-pen, stall", etc. But Geldner (op. cit. III, 113 f.) has more recently argued that this word signifies a time of day, identical with the
saṅgāva or morning milking-time, which according to Tāt. Br. I, 5, 3, 1, belongs to Mitra. We believe this is correct for it brings unity instead of diversity. The older translators required three meanings for the word, as in GWB. This, however, gives one meaning that makes very good sense in each of the thirteen passages in which the word occurs in the RV. In only five of these are kine in any way mentioned in connection with the svāsara. In three of these five and in six others the gods are associated with the svāsara. In four passages, exclusive of the one under discussion, there are references to songs, etc., to the gods. Thus in II, 2, 2, Night and Morning bellow greeting to Agni; in VIII, 88, 1, Indra is addressed with gīrhhir; in VIII, 99, 1, Indra is invoked to hear the stōnavāhasom; the dhiyah pīvandh of IX, 94, 2 are cited above. In III, 60, 6, the svāsaranī bring to Indra the vṛata deśavaṁ maṁsa; ca. We see as analogous to these a reference in our passage to the adoration of the worshippers at the early morning sacrifice. Mitra and Varuna make the cows swell with milk in the next stanza. The same idea is not needed here. Whether, however, dhēnā in this mooted passage are, as we believe, the songs of adoration at the morning sacrifice, or the bawling of the cows at the pen for their calves, or, as Griffith thinks, “the voices of the thunder and the roar of the rushing rain from the vast aerial stall that holds the milch-kine of the firmament, the word is in general accord with the interpretation we have given it throughout.

Three other passages in the RV. contain dhēnā as the deuteretheme of a compound. These are not at all inconsistent with our meaning of the simple word. Thus in VII, 24, 2

vīrṣṭadhenā bharate suvyādir,

iyāṁ indrāṁ jāhuvati maniśā ||
(This hymn of out-poured song is brought,
Invoking Indra with its prayer).

We find this word also in KS, 35, 9–

vīrṣṭadhenah salīlo ghṛtaçuṭah
(Streams of song outpoured, distilling ghee).

and again in Āp. G. S. 14, 28, 4* with sarītā for salīlo. That ghṛtaçuṭa is applied to songs also, is shown by VIII, 51, 10–
turunyāvo mādhumantam ghṛtaçuṭam
vīpūro asrām āturuh
The other compound, viqvādhena, is found only in IV, 19, 2—

āhau āhīṃ pariṣayānām ārṇah
prā varitanir arado viqvāḏhenāḥ

(Thou slewest Ahi who beleaguered the waters,
And thou didst open their courses all aroar in song).

And 6

tvām mahīṃ avāṁī viqvāḏhenāṁ
turvītaye vavyaya ksarāṇīṃ

(For Vāyya and Turviti thou didst stay
The mighty stream, on flowing, aroar with song).

We take it that the rivers were roaring forth their songs of joy
and praise at their liberation. This idea suits the entire con-
text quite admirably. It has been shown that waters sing
and dance in the RV.

In the ancillary Vedic literature we find in Tūt. Ār.,
3, 9, 1—

senendrasya | dhenā bhāspateḥ | patnyā
puṣṇah | vāg vāyoh | dikṣā somasya | prthivy-
agnēḥ | vasūnāṁ gāyatri | rudrānāṁ triṣṭuk |
ādityānāṁ jagati | viṣṇor anāṣṭuk || || ||

We have already listed the other five works in which this
is given in whole or part. Some of these, as the GB, 2, 2, 9
give senendrasya patnī, etc., and thus, by supplying the miss-
ing word, make it clear that we have here a list of the
"wives" of the several deities. An examination of this " Cata-
logue of Wives" reveals how truly each is the necessary
complement of her lord and his practically constant companion.
Indra, warrior god, and his army; Vāyu, the god of wind, and
his voice, etc.

This passage in itself may be said to clinch the whole
question, for our interpretation of dhenā makes it a vastly
better complement or wife of Brhaspati than the "libation
of milk". The word is actually the equivalent of the byhas in
byhaspati, as Professor Bloomfield once remarked.

In Tūt. Br. 3, 6, 5, 1; MS. 4, 13, 4 and KS. 16, 21, we
have dhenībhiḥ kalpamānah, "aided by songs", or "furnished
with songs".
Naigh. 6, 17, quotes RV. I, 101, 10 and adds — dhenā dadhāteh, — "dhenā is derived from the verb dadhāt". As he has already defined dhenā by listing it as a synonym of vāk, it would appear that he uses dadhāti here in its sense of "fix in thought, as a prayer, etc."

Lastly Hemachandra’s Unadīganasutra 268 has the gloss — dhenā saravati mūtā ca | dhenah samudraḥ

Of this the only consistent interpretation is that saravati is the goddess of eloquence, the daughter of Vāk (?).

We consider dhenā a gunated form from the root dhi, “think”, and a synonym of dhi and dhī, with which words we have found it associated. As these words may pass in meaning from pure thought to its expression by the voice in prayer and psalm, so dhenā regularly in the Veda is the outward form in which the inward thought is expressed by the voice. In the case of human beings, it is a song of joyous praise or holy invocation to the gods. In the case of gods, it is their gracious words, commending the worshipper and expressing their appreciation of the strength imparted to them by the songs, or their war-cries and battle-shouts as they engage in combat with their foes. The streams, too, sing their joy at their release and roar in praise of the great deity that effected it.

Dhenā is the exact phonetic equivalent to the Avestan daēnā and the Lithuanian dainā. The daēnā of the Avesta is (1) religion, especially the Ahurian religion, also (2) a theological-philosophical concept of the totality of the psychic and religious properties of man. It is the spiritual ego, the immortal part of man, the mental ūgyos. Cf. Bartholomae, W.B. s. v.

The Lithuanian dainā is a folk song, but these folk songs contain the best and highest expressions of the native heart and mind. They are frequently the media of expressing their religious sentiments and their philosophical reflections. Their whole philosophy of life is enshrined in these songs which

---

1 Unless dhenā is masc. dual; then saravati is the river and the reference has no connection with our subject. Cf. n. p. 403.
2 Cf. Sk. tejās, Av. tača, Lith. staiąs.
   - meza, = mača, = mačas,
   - reza, = rača, = račius,
   - vedas, = vača, = vačius,
   - kolas, = zača, = zaudė, etc.
constitute their poetic literature. Here is expressed their thought about the great anonymous Dēvas, the moon-god and the sun maiden, the morning and the evening star, Perkūnas, the god of thunder, etc., beliefs which transport us back to the primal days of our race. Like the Sanskrit dhēnā, the Lithuanian daēnā is a voiced lōgos, but unlike the former it frequently descends from the divine heights and becomes of the earth, earthy. Thus dhēnā, daēnā and daēnā are all thought, but thought in its higher and spiritual reaches. Both phonetics and semantics proclaim them own sisters in the old Indo-European family circle.

By way of summary we may say that in every passage in which dhēnā occurs in the RV. it may consistently be interpreted as voice, song, etc. In several instances the context decidedly favors this against Oldenberg's rendering. Every adjective that modifies it and every verb of which it is subject or object is used in other RV. passages in reference to words that indubitably signify songs, prayers, etc., but not all are so used with havis or its synonyms. It is so completely identified with Vāyu that it is metonymic of him. Our interpretation is supported by Naighantuka, Sāyana and Vāj. S. It has the irrefragable support of the "Catalogue of Wives". Only in the commentators on a "contaminated" version of one Vedic passage, plus five passages in Sāyana, does it fail in support of the ancillary Vedic literature. It is not difficult to posit reasons for this. It furnishes the Sanskrit member, otherwise missing, of an equation with the Avestan and the Lithuanian. Passages which Oldenberg finds difficult become easy. Every argument he uses against it, is amply refuted by the passages quoted from the RV. The cumulative effect is overwhelming for dhēnā as a synonym of dhī, vācas, gīr, stoma, arka, etc.
Vedic, Sanskrit, and Prakrit. By Walter Petersen,
Bethany College, Lindsborg, Kansas.

It will be the object of this paper to point out some difficulties in the ordinary view of the relation of the Vedic and Classical Sanskrit to the popular or Prakrit dialects, and, if possible, to suggest another theory which will avoid these difficulties. And in making this attempt, instead of starting with a discussion of "What is Sanskrit?", a procedure which seems to have led to no definite result, I shall begin with the consideration of the question as to what is "Mittelindisch" or Prakrit, hoping that if a satisfactory solution of this question is reached, the problem of the origin of Sanskrit will be materially simplified.

The normal view of the relation of Prakrit and Pali to the Vedic and Sanskrit is that suggested by the word "Mittelindisch" itself, namely that Prakrit is the direct linear descendant of "Altindisch" or the language of the oldest stage of the transmission.

And since this oldest stage is found in two distinct forms, namely the Vedic and Classical Sanskrit, the inference is that Prakrit is derived either from the Vedic language or the Classical, or at least from popular languages to which the Vedic or Classical Sanskrit was related like all literary lan-

1 Cf. e. g. the widely divergent opinions of the British scholars in the JRAS. 1904. 457—457 on the article of Rupen "In what degree was Skt. a spoken language", ib. p. 435 ff.
2 For want of a better term Prakrit below is often used to include the earlier or Pali stage of "Mittelindisch" as well as the later stage to which it is ordinarily applied.
3 See the language tree of Thumb, Handbuch des Skt. 19.
4 See notes 2 and 3 p. 415.
guages to the nearest popular dialects from which they are taken. The latter alternative, however, we may dismiss once for all. The number of phonetic as well as morphological peculiarities which are common to the Vedic and Prakrit but unknown to Sanskrit, prove definitely that Prakrit is much nearer to the Vedic than to the Classical Sanskrit, and that direct origin from the latter is no longer to be thought of. There remains the supposition that Prakrit is derived either from Vedic dialects or from contemporary dialects which are close to the Vedic in character.

To this latter view, however, there are grave and unanswerable chronological difficulties on every hand. In the first place, it is a well-known fact that the Vedic hymns already contain a number of Prakritisms, forms which distinctly belong to the "middle-Indian" period and do not represent the normal status of the Vedic sounds, but are exceptional cases and consequently borrowings from a different dialect. Thus Wackernagel, loc. cit., quotes as examples words with a cerebral, e. g. kāṭa "Tiefe"; kartā "Grube"; words with n (<n), e. g. māṇi "Perle"; words with ś (<ṣ, rs, ls), e. g. AV. kāṣṭi "kratzen"; Lith. kašztį; prāuga = "prāyuga, tītau = "tītau, etc. To quote Wackernagel himself: "Daneben (se. der priesterlichen Sprache) aber war (wenigstens in bestimmten Volkschichten) schon zu der Zeit, da die uns erhaltenen Hymnen entstanden, eine Sprache gebräuchlich, die über jene priesterliche Sprache weit hinaus entwickelt war, und die Haupteigenheiten der ältesten Phase des Mittelindisch, der sogenannten Palistufe, an sich trug". The conclusion therefore can not be avoided that during the period of composition of the Vedic hymns two distinct groups of Indian dialects were developed and separated by an uncrossable gulf.

3 Cf. Bracke, ZDMG. 40. 678 f.; Thumb, loc. cit.
4 Cf. Wackernagel, AI. Gram. 1. XVII.
5 Squarely opposed to this, but certainly not justifiable, is the statement of F. W. Thomas, JRAS. 1904. 461, that during the centuries preceding the Christian era Sanskrit and the vernaculars (Prakrit) were so
on the one hand the priestly language of the Veda, on the other hand the popular dialects, which later became "Pali" and "Prakrit". From this fact it follows again that Prakrit can not be a direct lineal descendant of the Vedic of the hymns or of a contemporary dialect which was close to the Vedic in its character.

If, then, Prakrit is nevertheless derived from the Vedic, it must have been at a time considerably antedating the hymns themselves. And here the question immediately arises whether time enough had elapsed since the separation of the Indian and Persian dialects so that such large differences as exist between Vedic and the earliest "Pali" could have been developed in addition to the equally large ones between the Avestan and Vedic. As Bradko, ZDMG. 40. 672, remarks, it is a question of how long a period we allow to have elapsed between the period of Indo-Iranian unity and the Veda. If we place the latter long after the former, there is nothing impossible about assuming that the popular dialects had been developed in Vedic times and that the Vedic poets borrowed certain words from these vernaculars. Now Bradko himself believes that the time could have been amply sufficient. He declares that the oldest stages of the Indian and Iranian languages are no closer to each other than Italian and French, and yet these two languages are fifteen centuries apart. He seems to believe that in the time thus gained it is possible for the old Aryan language to have developed successively first into "Altindisch" and then into the earliest stages of "Pali". But this argument really contains a circulus vitiosus. In the first place, to those who maintain that the Vedic period can not have been too long after the period of Indo-Iranian unity because of the close resemblance of the earliest Indian and Iranian he interposes the objection that Italian and French are no farther apart and yet it took fifteen hundred years to

close to each other as to preclude comparison with Latin even in countries where Romance languages were spoken, unless indeed he means only the most developed stages of the Romance languages.

1 When Rapson, JRAS. 1904. 445, therefore maintains that Prakrit can not be traced even to Yasaka (about 600 B. C.), he would be undoubtedly wrong if he had not meant by Prakrit merely the language in the exact form in which it was later known by that name.

2 ZDMG. 40. 669.
develop the difference, that consequently it might take just as long to develop the difference between Indian and Iranian. In the second place, into these fifteen hundred years thus gained is to be put also the development of Pali from "Alt-indisch", presumably on the ground that fifteen hundred years would be amply sufficient for even such large dialectical differences to arise! First a large period of time is claimed as being probably needed to develop comparatively small differences, then this large period is in turn used as proof that comparatively large differences may have developed in the same. But we could as well counterargue that six hundred years are needed to develop the Classical Sanskrit from the Vedic, and the difference is very slight, how much more would we then expect for the large difference between either Classical Sanskrit or Vedic and even the earliest stages of Pali? Adding to this the fifteen hundred years assumed by Bradke for the development of Vedic from primitive Aryan, how many milleniums after the period of Indo-Iranian unity would the Veda be placed? And the earlier we place the latter the worse the difficulty would become for the Classical Sanskrit. If we accept Jacobi's date for the Rigveda we should have to assume at least five milleniums to account for the comparatively slight difference between the Avestan and the Classical Sanskrit. When, however, we omit precarious arguments of this kind, and seek other criteria, we find that it is really very hard to believe that the Rigveda was enough later than the period of Indo-Iranian unity to account for the large change from primitive Aryan to Pali; for the fact that the Rigveda is yet full of reminiscences of the conquest of the Panjäb, and that the larger part of the later Aryan India had not yet been settled, would make it exceedingly improbable that the Indian Aryans had been in the Panjäb a very long time before the hymns were composed. We would hardly expect a conquering people suddenly to stop for centuries in their process of expansion, and then to resume it later. Nor would it be credible that a very long period had elapsed between the time of Indo-Iranian unity and the conquest of the Panjäb. As long as the Indian Aryans dwelt together

1 So Grierson, JRAS. 1904. 477, though for a different purpose.
with the Iranians toward the northwest of the Panjäh, they were virtually one people, and only after they separated in order that one part might invade India did large differences of language develop. The difficulty then becomes greater and greater: it is impossible for me to conceive how Prakrit could have had time to develop from "Altindisch" in the usual way at a time when the Veda evidently shows that must have existed.

But let us assume for argument's sake that there nevertheless was ample time, in what relation then would we conceive the language of the Rigveda to stand to these vernaculars? The first alternative that might occur to us is that Vedic, like the later Classical Sanskrit, was already a petrified language, kept alive only by the priests and literary men. But to this idea there are several grave objections. In the first place the character of the Vedic language and literature is such that scarcely any one has seriously doubted that it was close to the living language of the time of the poets. There may have been dialect mixture and archaisms and poetic peculiarities of diction, and the actual spoken language differed from that of the hymns as the Greek vernaculars of the Homeric age differed from the language of the Homeric poets, or as the popular languages to which any literary dialects owe their origin differ from the latter, but no more. Moreover, if Vedic was a dead language when the hymns were composed, how can we assume that this old language escaped complete obliteration in so long a time? A dead language is perpetuated only in its literature, and when it dies before a literature is produced, as it would have to in this case, it will be forgotten before it has a chance to perpetuate itself. It is

1 How close this period probably is to the Vedic can be seen from the retention of intervocalic s instead of the change to h, one of the most characteristic changes of the Persian group, in a word identical with the Vedic Nāsatya found in the recently discovered inscription of Boghazköy. The retention of the s in the Iranian word thus points virtually to the period of Indo-Iranian unity, and that about 1800 B.C. On the other hand few would put the Rigveda much later than 1200 B.C. Cf. Keith, JRAS. 1909. 1100 ff. Like Keith, I assume that E. Meyer, not Jacob, has drawn the correct chronological conclusions from the inscription.

2 Cf. Whitney, Skt. Gram. XV; Wackernagel, op. cit. XVII; Macdonell, op. cit. 20; Grierson, JRAS. 1904. 471.
thus evident that at least the beginning of the literary Vedic period must have antedated the petrification of the language. But there is another and still more conclusive reason why the Vedic of the hymns could not have been a dead language. There is no one who could affirm that the art of writing was known at such an early date.¹ Now let us try to picture to ourselves how this older language (supposing it to have been established as a fashionable language so early) could have been transmitted orally. It might be possible for traditions as to new and old forms and phonetic doubles to be transmitted from one generation to another by means of oral instructions; for such changes are recognized by every one most easily, since the new and old forms continue to exist side by side, at least temporarily. But when we come to sound changes that do not result in phonetic doubles, particularly the spontaneous unconditioned sound changes, the question is altogether different. These are so gradual that no one notices the fact that he is pronouncing a certain sound differently than formerly or differently than the older members of the linguistic community. It follows that a consciousness of change never appears,² and that the old pronunciation thus will no longer be a norm with which to compare the new, since the whole community will keep so close together that no one notices a difference, and when the end of the development has finally been reached the old original pronunciation, no matter how different from the new one,³ will be forgotten with no possibility of recovery. In case of a written language directions for the pronunciation of certain letters might reveal the change to later generations, but in a language which is spoken only, there is no possibility of establishing a previous sound change of this kind except by comparative philology. Thus the change of I. E. o to Germanic a has been so universal⁴ that not a single trace of the old pronunciation could possibly have existed to the speak-

¹ Cf. Macdonell, op. cit. 15 f., who quotes Buehler for the date 800 B. C. for the introduction of writing.
² Cf. Delbrück, Einleitung § 154 f.
³ Every new nuance created in this way in fact displaces the older one. Cf. Sievers, Phonetik § 728.
⁴ Universality in fact is a characteristic of all gradual changes. Cf. Sievers, op. cit. § 731.
ers of the language after it had taken place, and since it was a gradual change, even those that lived while it took place were unconscious of it. In the same way Skt. ā became Prakrit ā spontaneously\(^1\) and under all circumstances (except before dental stops), and there was no way for the speaker of the latter sound to find out that he was pronouncing a different sound than his ancestors. But not only in case of spontaneous sound changes, but everywhere where no phonetic doubles result the old pronunciation is lost beyond recovery just as soon as the new is established. So it is with the dropping of the y in prāuga < prāyuga, or with the change of rś, rṣṣ, etc. The development of all of these new pronunciations should have completely obliterated the old, if really, as is claimed, Vedic and Prakrit were successive steps in the development of the same language. The existence of Prakrit forms with the above mentioned peculiarities in the Rigveda proves conclusively therefore from this point of view also that the two can not have been chronologically successive stages of one and the same language.

It follows that Vedic and Prakrit are sister dialects instead of being related as mother to daughter. In some way or other they must have been differentiated from their common ancestor, so that both could continue to exist side by side. It is obvious, however, that this differentiation can not have been local, i.e. Vedic and Prakrit can not have been contemporaneous dialects which arose in different localities; for it is incredible that all people in one section of the country should be so conservative in their pronunciation that they continued to speak a language very close to the primitive Aryan, while in other places, near by, and not separated by any linguistic barrier whatsoever, they were so prone to innovations that it would appear as though the language they spoke was immeasurably a more recent or modern stage than that of the former. We should in vain look for analogies to this. Evidently the cause of the differentiation must be sought in different social strata of the same communities, one a strongly conservative

---

\(^1\) In the light of the following these changes were not gradual, but due to the substitution of one sound for the other. Here we argue from the standpoint of those who maintain that Prakrit is a direct descendant of Vedic. If that be true, these changes must be gradual.
element, another offering no opposition to the tendency to innovation. At first sight this postulate, however, would seem to lead to the view held by Wackernagel and quoted above, namely that Vedic was merely a priestly language, jealously guarded by the priestly aristocracy in its pristine purity, while the natural development of the language resulted in the popular dialects. To this view, however, the objection will also hold that this presupposes a consciousness of difference, while on the other hand this very theory would presuppose that those characteristics of Prakrit which were already developed in Vedic times were largely due to spontaneous sound changes, of which the priests no less than the common people must have been unconscious even while they were in the process of becoming. Whatever theory accounts for the difference between Vedic and Prakrit must show how the differentiation could take place through causes not controlled by the human will.

This as well as all the other above-mentioned difficulties will disappear if we assume that Vedic and Prakrit were caste-languages from the beginning, and that the differences originated with the differences between the castes. And since the origin of the castes was intimately connected with the difference between Aryan and non-Aryan, we may say that Vedic was the language of the higher or Aryan castes, while Prakrit was the language of the lower or non-Aryan castes. As the old Aryans invaded the Indian peninsula and conquered certain aboriginal tribes, they would impose their language upon those whom they enslaved and which consequently formed a part of their society. But since these black aborigines had organs of speech as well as linguistic habits that differed widely from those of the Aryan invaders, they were unable to learn the language in the same form as the one in which it was spoken by their conquerors, and it was modified to suit their own characteristics in much the same way as the

---

1 Cf. foot-note p. 420.
2 Cf. Baden-Powell, JRAS. 1889. 328, who states that the middle and lower castes were either not Aryan at all or badly mixed, while the higher castes were predominantly Aryan.
4 Cf. Oldenberg, ZDMG. 51. 275: "Schon das ligved. Altertum hat die dunkelfarbigen Aboriginen nicht allein als Feinde, sondern auch als der arischen Gemeinschaft attachierte Untertanen gekannt".
American negro has modified the English language through his own physiological and mental peculiarities. And just as many peculiarities of the negro dialect are common to the whole large area of the South or his original American home, since the peculiarities which cause these aberrations are common to the whole race, just so a number of phonetic changes in Prakrit were common to all of the widely scattered areas where these popular dialects were spoken, since here also common racial peculiarities would cause common effects. And since these peculiarities primarily affect the phonological aspect of a language, it is intelligible that the Prakrit peculiarities in the Veda are exclusively phonological. Moreover, since these sound-changes from primitive Aryan to the earliest Prakrit were not due to gradual change of pronunciation, but to the substitution of one sound for another, if this theory is correct, we need not expect larger periods of time to account for such a thoroughgoing change of phonetic aspect, and it is therefore not surprising that Prakrit and Vedic should have been virtually coexistent not only from the beginning of the transmission, but ever since the Aryans first invaded India and began enslaving the aborigines.

The conclusion that the phonetic character of the Prakrit dialects is due to imposing the Aryan language upon an inferior race is further strengthened by the character of the sound changes. Franke, Pali und Sanskrit 141 ff., calls attention to the fact that many peculiarities common to all "Pali" are similar to the mistakes of children. The same assimilation or simplification of consonant groups, the same substitution of familiar for unfamiliar sounds is common to both. Franke compares e.g. from the German: täşchen for zwischen, woore for Worte, san for Arm, golle for Golde, bume for Blume, daitipf for Bleistift. This want of discrimination between different sounds, usually characteristic of childhood, is just what we would expect of a race inferior in intelligence learning a language so largely different from its own. In

---

1 Cf. Wackernagel, op. cit. XVII: "Keine sichere Spuren mittelindischer Formenbildung sind (ac. im Veda) erhalten".

2 It is of importance that those Skt. sounds for which others are substituted in Prakrit are largely those which to a great extent are characteristic of Sanskrit, and so probably would not be known to the non-Aryans. Thus, r, ñ, l, ñi, ñu, and ñ are all lacking in Prakrit.
fact the latter factor alone might cause similar changes even in case of a people of high intelligence, as can be seen particularly, by a study of borrowed proper names. Thus in all of the following Greek borrowings from the Egyptian certain unfamiliar sounds or combinations of sounds have been replaced by sequences which were familiar to the Greek: Pa-Uat't became Βοτανή, Chufu became Σαφές, Σαφυς or even Χνυς, MeΝKa-URA became Μικαράος, Bokenrenf became Βόκεραφ (Βόκεραφ), SCHaBaK became Σαβάκου, UaHΑBRA became Ἀπρίη, AAHMeS became Ἄμαρας.

If the above explanation of the origin of Prakrit is once accepted the problem as to the origin of the Classical Sanskrit becomes much simplified. There is no longer any necessity for assuming that a certain locality was so much more conservative than other neighboring ones that it was enabled to retain a language with such old characteristics, while all other communities were many centuries ahead in the development of their speech. Classical Sanskrit was rather the direct lineal descendant not of the Vedic in its literary form, but of the spoken dialects of the Vedic age, which differed from it only very slightly and may with propriety, as they are below, be designated as "Vedic". It was natural after the difference between Vedic and Prakrit had once been developed, that the old Aryan aristocracy of priests and soldiers should be proud of their language, which formed one of the principal distinctions between themselves and the despised conquered Dasas, that they should therefore guard it most jealously from all change. Since, however, the Aryan speakers of the Vedic dialects continually had practical relations with the enslaved speakers of the Prakrits, it became necessary that they should have an acquaintance with Prakrit also, and sometimes, perhaps, they would even condescend to use it themselves, e. g. to make a command clearer. In this way there was a bridge

---

1 Cf. Franke, BB. 17. 73, Pali u. Skt. 88; Rason, JRAS. 1904. 450 ff.
2 So Franke, BB. 17. 82; Rason, loc. cit. According to our view the Vedic had only one direct descendant and did not split up into two streams, as is claimed by Weber, Ind. Stud. 2: 110 ff.; Grierson, JRAS. 1904. 472.
3 The absence in Skt. of the Vedic change of intervocalic 以上的 shows that the former is not directly descended from the dialect of the hymns. Cf. Thurne, Hdb. d. Skt. 91.
by which the Prakrit could gradually encroach on the Vedic or Sanskrit. Those Aryans who were less fortunate and did not succeed in becoming a part of the aristocracy gradually lost their racial pride and came to use the Prakrit language exclusively. In the same way the Aryan women, whose more menial duties brought them into more continual and closer contact with the lower classes, gradually let the Prakrit take the place of their pure Aryan mother tongue. In the beginning, however, it was not thus. All the Aryans, women as well as men, spoke the pure Aryan language when the enslaved Dāsas first tried to learn the language of their conquerors.

As the circle of the speakers of the original Vedic languages became more and more narrow, they more and more took upon themselves the character of polite languages, with the result that the conservatism of the speakers also increased, and Vedic gradually became Classical Sanskrit. In this way is explained both the continuity of development between Vedic and Sanskrit in literature, which is the unanswerable objection against those who maintain that Sanskrit was a late artificial product and never was a spoken language, and at the same time the growing stability of the same, with the proscription of all new formations. As in all polite languages, the speakers, who prided themselves on the correctness of their speech, sought for norms which should insure them correct principles of speaking, and this on the one hand led to the stationary nature of the Sanskrit, since all new formations are, of course, to begin with mistakes, on the other hand it led to the study of the grammar, which ended in the canonization of the whole grammatical system by Pāṇini, after which the language became permanently crystallized and no longer showed even a semblance of growth.

The above view, then, agrees on the one hand with those who maintain that Sanskrit was in origin not only a living language like any other polite language, but even a vernac-

---

1 Cf. Ludwig, Rigveda 3. 44 f.
2 Cf. Franke, BB. 17. 86; Rapson, JRAS. 1904. 441.
3 Cf. Wackernagel, op. cit. XXIII.
4 Cf. Franke, BB. 17. 80.
5 That Sanskrit was a spoken language, but not really a living language is maintained by Grierson, JRAS. 1904. 472. Similarly M. Senart, quoted p. 471 of the above. Dr. Grierson's statement (p. 478) that Skt.
ular, though only of certain strata of society, but by these it was not learned as an additional language to their own Prakrit vernacular, but it was rather an inheritance from ages long past, while originally, if these persons also spoke Prakrit, it was the latter that was learned as a second language. On the other hand, in course of time the growing ascendancy of the Prakrits with all except the haute-volée may have caused this condition to have been reversed, and at any rate Sanskrit became more and more stereotyped until it may properly be said to have become a dead language. This was, however, an exceedingly gradual development, mainly due to natural causes, though perhaps hastened by Pāṇini’s canonization, and it would be impossible to fix upon a single point in time and to say its life ended here even if we were in possession of all the facts of the history of the language. Its development from the Vedic moreover was also a natural development, by an ultra-conservative society, it is true, but yet a development from which even sound change was not altogether excluded, as Wackernagel, loc. cit., maintains; for on the one hand he himself mentions the change of iy to y and of uv to v, on the other hand he has failed to point out the probability of certain sound changes which do not appear in the spelling, so the change of I. E. ai (doubtless still so pronounced in the early Vedic period) to ē, similarly of au to 0, āi with long ā could never have been a living language because it had to borrow or imitate Prakrit words for objects of every-day life, is not well taken. In the ordinary life of the Sanskrit-speaking aristocrats there was no call for words designating every-day objects, and when they were needed Sanskrit naturally borrowed from the Prakrit or language of the common people, in the same way as every living language uses borrowed words for ideas hitherto unfamiliar. As well might we argue that the Germanic languages are dead: because many words designating objects which are now familiar are Latin borrowings.

1 Cf. Grierson, p. 480 of the above.
3 The fact that the Pratiṣṭākhya classify e and o as diphthongs, even though their rules for pronunciation imply simple sounds, together with their treatment in euphonic changes, implies that they were true diphthongs in the Vedic period. The Pratiṣṭākhya must have received a tradition in this respect, and this tradition certainly could not have antedated the Veda, since grammatical studies originated in the very desire to interpret the Veda. Cf. Whitney, Skt. Gram. § 38 a; Macdonell, op. cit. 38 f.
to ai, with short a, similarly âu to au, and finally the thoroughgoing change of accentuation from the Vedic accent to that of the Classical Sanskrit, which is pointed out by Wackernagel himself, op. cit. 296 f. All of these changes are certainly phonetic changes and point to a living spoken language.

If Sanskrit was the only direct lineal descendant of the Vedic and in turn of the original language of the first Aryan settlers of India, it was not necessarily a local dialect, but we should a priori expect that wherever there was an Aryan people in the ascendant we would find the Sanskrit language or some language differing from it only by minor dialectic variations spoken by the kings and priests with their racial pride in their Aryan blood; it is to be expected that Sanskrit was spoken as a caste language throughout the whole Aryan territory of India. When therefore it is maintained e.g. by Macdonell that "there is no doubt that in the second century B.C. Sanskrit was actually spoken in the whole country called by Sanskrit writers Áryávarta, or 'Land of the Aryans', which lies between the Himalaya and the Vindhyā range", the statement is in exact accord with our theory.

These statements, however, must not be construed to mean that Sanskrit in the very form in which it occurs in literature was the vernacular of the men of the upper castes in all of the vast territory of Áryávarta. Largely, of course, the same conservatism that kept the language so nearly stationary during such a long period also prevented the development of dialectic peculiarities, but yet there must have been some of them. The actual literary Sanskrit is no doubt related to these different spoken Sanskrit dialects just as any other literary language is related to the popular dialects. One or the other of them, by means of literary, religious, or political ascendancy, became the norm to which the speakers of related dialects everywhere were expected to conform, with the result that it displaced all others, which was all the easier because the dialects displaced were themselves fashionable languages, and not, as e.g. in German, popular dia-

---

1 When e was still ai, ai must have been âi with long a, otherwise the two would have been indistinguishable and treated alike. Cf. Whitney, op. cit. § 286 b.

2 Cf. Rason, p. 451 of the above mentioned article.
lects, the speakers of which largely had no sympathy with this process of normalization. Moreover, we must bear in mind that the languages displaced could have differed from the language now known as Classical Sanskrit in but a minimal degree, and that it was not the displacing of the real popular dialects of Prakrit by the polite language, which was so different as to nearly exclude mutual intelligibility. While therefore the arguments of Franke¹ and Rapson² to establish a narrower region as the original home of Sanskrit may be perfectly valid, it must always be borne in mind that they concern only that particular form of the language which appears in literature, but that other closely related almost identical dialects existed in almost all Aryavarta from the beginning. It may have happened occasionally, of course, that the pure Aryan speech in a certain locality died out altogether because of the operating of the same forces which caused the poorer Aryans and the women to give it up, but on the whole the racial pride of the aristocracy was too strong a factor to let us assume that it died out everywhere except in a narrowly circumscribed locality, from where it then had to start out to reconquer all the territory lost before.

It cannot be my object here to discuss anew the question as to the interpretation of the fact that Pali appears in inscriptions before Sanskrit, or what is the explanation of this “break in the continuity” of development. My only concern is to show that the results of Franke’s book “Pali und Sanskrit” do not necessarily conflict with the above theory. According to op. cit. 49 the results of Franke’s examination of inscriptions show “daß auch spätestens im 3. Jahrhundert v. Chr. und noch geraume Zeit danach auf der vorderindischen Halbinsel unterhalb des Himalaya und auf Ceylon als allgemeine Landessprache der arischen Bevölkerung kein irgendwie geartetes Sanskrit in irgend einer Provinz vorhanden war, sondern erst allmählich aufgekommen ist.” The emphasis should be on the “allgemeine”; i.e. Sanskrit, as shown above, was indeed never a universal vernacular, but a caste language from the beginning, which explains the fact that the

¹ Pali u. Skt. 88.
² JRAS. 1904. 451 f.
inscriptions, which were meant to be understood by as many people as possible, were originally in Pali. It was but natural, consequently, that the speech of the aristocracy, not understood by enough people to be used in public inscriptions, and also often not the vehicle of literary works, since they, even when they finally appeared, were written in the imported Classical Sanskrit, should have completely disappeared to our view from most localities. Finally, when the renewed ascendency of Brahmanism caused a greater number of persons to understand if not to speak the Brahman language, the Classical Sanskrit, originating in a certain locality and displacing the polite languages of other localities, made its way not only into the inscriptions of Aryavarta, but to every part of India where Brahman culture was disseminated.
Remarks on the Carthaginian Deity. — By W. Max Müller, Professor in the R. E. Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

For long years, Semitists do not seem to have occupied themselves in any way with the strange name of the principal divinity of the Carthaginians, the “Tanit,” as scholars used to call her in the period of Gesenius, or Tanit, as it has, somewhat more recently, become the fashion to vocalize her name. I find a trace of skepticism concerning that name only in O. Meitzer’s Geschichte der Karthager, where occasionally she is spoken of as “the goddess whom we have become used to calling Tanit.” The consonants תַּנִית, of course, are sufficiently well attested by numerous inscriptions, but if we ask for the reasons of the vocalisation, we have to go down to the infancy of Semitic epigraphics to discover attempts at proving that strange pronunciation, attempts which do not stand the test of any critical examination. The most exhaustive discussion will be found in Gesenius, Monuments linguae Phoenicicae, p. 116 to 117. I enumerate his arguments (repeated Movers, Phoenizier I, 625).

1. Strabo XI, 13, p. 532, speaks of the Persian and Armenian goddess Ἀσάκες (genet. Ἀσάκεσσα). For this form variant readings give Ταύρακες, hence Eustathius, ad Iliad. 14, 295, repeats: Ταύρακες δαμος, and Clemens Alex., Protrept. p. 43, Sylb., speaks of Artaxerxes who first introduced the image of Aphrodite Tanae (τὰς Ἀφροδίτης Ταναῖος); in the latter place, however, the reading seems to be disputed, as in

---

1 This paper, after having been read before the American Oriental Society at the meeting in New Haven, in 1906, was mislaid by its author, and not found again by him until the present year. Ed.

2 Evidently, because the diphthong was felt to be too strongly un-Hebrew. — Tanit is written by Clermont-Ganneau, Lührbarski, and others up to 1906 (and 1912).
Eustathius, *ad Dion. Perieg.* 846 ("the Armenian goddess Tanaitis or Anaïtis"). It is nowadays no longer necessary to weigh the authority of the codices in every single case for deciding between Anaïtis and Tanaitis, Tanais, for which form Gesenius himself decided. We know now sufficiently well that the Persian chief goddess was called *Anaïhtā.* Consequently, those forms with a prefixed *t* have no authority and are evidently due to comparative speculations of Greek scholars who wanted what Movers, II, 101 etc., called "the Taurian Artemis," i.e. some connection with the remote river Tanais. The notice about Artaxerxes Mmon returns then with the correct reading: 'Anaitis, Anaïtis, in Berossus (C. Müller, II, 503), Plutarch, *Artax.* 27, Pausanias III, 16, 6; Pliny 33, 24; Dio Cass. 36, 31, 31, etc. Consequently, no goddess Tanais existed.

2. (Gesen. p. 117). Akerblad is said to have compared the Carthaginian *Tët* with the Egyptian (!) goddess *Neit* (*Ndj*) "praesisto articulo ta." Modern scholars know, of course, that the Egyptian feminine article 1- (not to) cannot be connected with proper names; such a connection as the good pioneer Akerblad ventured is quite impossible, not to speak of the various other improbabilities of his bold comparison which already Movers rejected (although he strangely kept the conclusions in the form of that vocalisation!).

3. Finally Gesenius desperately referred to proper name like Tennes, Mutten-Mythonius; to city names with prefixed *t* (see below) like Tynis-Tunis, Tingis etc.; even to Libyan names like Masinha, Masinissa, etc. None of these "arguments" deserves now any discussion. Tennes, however, still seemed to be meant in Chantepie de la Saussaye, *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte,* I, 235 (Fr. Jeremias): "the divinity TNT, after a Greek personal name to be pronounced Thent". If Jeremias really meant the Sidonian king Tennes, adduced by Gesenius, we ought to demand some plausible etymology for that royal name, for the king cannot have borne the name of the goddess herself. Above all, as long as the worship of TNT is strictly limited to Carthage and its nearest dependencies and cannot

---

1 Cp. Movers I, 626. I confess not to have verified every quotation.
be traced epigraphically to Phoenicia. I consider it inad-
missible to use an argument from any Phoenician name.

Consequently, the old attempts at vocalizing those 3 conso-
nants fail completely. I regret that, after having destroyed
the old theories, I cannot offer any substitute for them; there
is hardly any basis for the pronunciation of that enigmatic
name (cp. below on Anna). I believe, however, that I can
offer at least one small advancement towards its explanation.
That "local divinity of the Carthaginians" (δαλμ ου Καρχε-
δων) as Polybius calls her, cannot well have had a Semitic
name; it is a difficult task to fit her name into Semitic ety-
mologies. Its formation, on the other hand, clearly betrays a
Libyan formation. Prefixed t (which becomes in the dialects,
th or t, even ts) + suffixed t or th are the usual characteristics
of Libyan (I avoid the senseless name "Berber, Berberic")
 feminines. Cp. e. g. Kabyltic thandint, from Arabic medine
 "city". This formation agrees too remarkably with the divine
 name TNT to be accidental. Consequently, we have to con-
sider this name as a feminine formation from a root with n
and one or two weak consonants, among which the n may take
the first, second or third place, may be doubled or not. At
present, it would be merely a frivolous play to enumerate,
from the modern Libyan dictionaries, the numerous roots with
a which a fanciful mind could use for a more or less impro-
bable etymology of T-N-T. I only lay stress on the result
that, evidently, the name of that local divinity dates from
earlier time than the Phoenician immigration and has been
kept untouched by the Carthaginians; as we should indeed
expect with the spiritus loci.

1 In do not consider the title "TNT of Lebanon", Lidzbarski, Ephe
meris I, 19, as a proof of origin in Phoenicia; Lidzbarski, p. 21, assumed with
probability that this Lebanon was some locality near Carthage. More
important is the first Athenian bilingual mentioning a "Sidonian, Abd-
TNT", in Greek Artemidoros. This would, indeed, point to a Sidonian
cult. But why are the inscriptions of Sidon herself absolutely silent
about our divinity? Hence I must assume that the name of that Sidonian
betrays a relation to Carthage; such wandering merchants and sailors
may have claimed various nationalities, even if "Sidonian" does not, in
an archaising way, mean "Carthaginian".

2 Those not acquainted with Libyan may consult Hanoteau, Essai de
grammaire Kabyle, p. 17; his Grammaire Tamacheh, p. 17, Stumm, Han
dbuch des Schülischen von Tazerwalt, p. 18, etc.
This simple result becomes very complicated only if we compare the name with that of Anna, the sister of Dido. Doubtless Anna is the principal divinity of Carthage herself, as may be seen even from Vergil where Anna plays such a supernumerary part at the side of Dido as we are wont to see with two identical personages, differentiated from synonymous names. Roman writers complete the proof by reporting of that superfluous sister Anna the same things as of Dido, above all seduction by Aeneas, and suicide. 1 Now it would be very easy to connect Anna and TNT by vocalizing the latter name Tannat, Tannath, and treating it as the Libyanized form of Semitic Anna (a Semitic adaptation by stripping a Libyan word of its double feminine mark would lack all analogies and would be very improbable). That explanation has, however, serious difficulties, if we accept the often repeated comparison of Anna with the Hebrew name Hanna. Ancient Libyan, indeed, had no h, and should be expected to drop the initial of Hanna (or to change it to h); but I have great doubts if a foreign proper name could be Libyanized by the feminine characteristics. The analogies are very much against this. It would be more plausible to assume that Anna was a Semitic adaptation of an original Libyan *Tannath, i. e. Anna, originally without initial h. It is true, the alleged name of a Punic goddess Hanna cannot be proved with certainty epigraphically, 2 and we need not trouble ourselves much with that suppositional form. Still, I confess not at all to be satisfied with the above explanation: Anna (whatever its initial may be) as a Semitization of a supposed *Tannath. I consider this theory not very plausible and would prefer leaving the explanation of the relation of the two names in doubt. A relation seems to exist, but it cannot be determined and explained with sufficient certainty, I fear.

It remains to say a word on the regular titles of our god-

---

1 Ovid. Fasti III, 623; Varro in Servius, Aen. IV, 682; cp. Movers I, 612 who, however, does not notice the identity clearly.
2 *HAN seems masculine, the well known Hanna. Prof. Torrey directs my attention to a seal which he considers Punic, mentioning an *HANHAN; I feel strong doubts whether this proves to be a female divinity. [The seal was published in this Journal, XXVIII (1897), 354. Its genuineness has been questioned by Liddzbarski, Ephemeris III, 69, but on insufficient grounds. Ed.]
dess "the mistress TNT (with?) the face of Ba'al", as she is called on so many funerary inscriptions. The last two words (⚝⚔⚝⚔⚝⚔) have, so far, remained obscure. I have proposed an explanation, Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft, 1904, IX, 168, derived from the symbol of the divinity reproduced on the Carthaginian funerary stelae. It appears in a great many fanciful variations, but all these seem finally to go back to the symbol of the bulcranon, with the solar disk between the crescent shaped horns which evidently symbolize the moon. Hence that combination of symbols of the "dea coelestis", which has a wide use in the art of all countries touching the Mediterranean, representing the heaven as a cow, bearing sun and moon upon her head. This agrees well with the designation "face of the heavenly god." The syncretism of two different conceptions of heaven, as a female or (later?) as a male divinity, presents no difficulty.

The writer has been occupied for some time in preparing for publication the magical bowl-texts from Nippur in the Museum of the University of Pennsylvania. Six of the texts of the collection are in a peculiar Syriac script, related to the Estrangelo, and in the Syriac dialect, but of a form much contaminated by dialectic influences of Mandaic character. The texts have the same contents as the bowls already numerous published in the “Rabbinic” and Mandaic dialects.

As a sample of this fresh species of script I present here a bowl-text which has been kindly placed in my hands by Mr. Wm. T. Ellis, of Swarthmore, Pa. In the winter of 1910—11 Mr. Ellis travelled through Mesopotamia and was interested as a Pennsylvanian in visiting the mounds of Nippur. He was greatly impressed by the remains of the excavations made at this site by the University of Pennsylvania expeditions, and has been urging since his return home that American scholarship should resume the operations begun on so stupendous a scale. Among the curios he acquired at Nippur from the Arabs were three inscribed bowls, doubtless private spoils from the strata uncovered by the excavators. One of these is illegible, one is in the square script and “Rabbinic” dialect, and the third, in the peculiar Syriac script and dialect referred to, is the one I now publish.

The bowl is of earthenware, the usual material and size, and of 6 1/2 in. diameter by 2 1/2 in. in depth. The text is written spirally on the inside from within out; the last six lines alone are legible, the action of water collected in the bottom of the bowl having washed out the first lines, probably four in number. The characters are frequently very faint, but the readings can
Plate I.
usually be made out by the aid of the vocabulary and formulas occurring in similar texts.

Text (Plate 1).

[Page from the original text]

Translation.

[A charm for Genibah against the evil spirits that they may not touch him] nor his house, wife, children and property, from now and forever and ever. Amen. Ya, Ya, [Ya], Ya, Ya, Ya, Ya!, seven [times?]. Avaunt, avaunt to the [southern?] bolt [pole?] of the heights of the house (?) whose flames are the lightnings, lightning of fire, and the [northern?] bolt of the shades of darkness, and their chariots the chariots of the lattába. Exorcism upon you, Sun and Moon, condemnation upon you, Astánâ and Úr ... ãthâ. And I make fast their bonds, links of brass and lead and iron, and they are sealed in the name of Šambîzâ, the lord Bagdânâ. Be there sealing and warding for Genibâ bar Dôdäi and for his house, wife, children, and cattle, and flee and depart all demons, devils, amulet-charms, idol-spirits (= gods), goddesses and liliths from Geniba bar Dodai, and from his house, wife, sons and cattle, that they transgress not nor do harm against this Geniba bar [Dodai].

Commentary.

I speak of the script below. The orthoëpy (e. g. אֵלָאָם, יְלַלְלֶכָּה), forms (e. g. הב, "his sons", Mandaic), and vocabulary are such as appear in the similar bowl-texts. The client's

1 Error for שְֻלָלָה?
name is known in the Palmyrene, cf. the biblical תְּנָכָה. 1 Ki 11:20.
I have found elsewhere, and it appears in the Syriac,
—hebrew  with  in other texts of mine, and is cited
by the native Syriac lexicographers under the form נַרְבָּא (see
Payne Smith, Thea., ad voc.). The  is reminiscent of the
parallel Hebrew word הַרְבָּע. It may mean plumbum nigrum
or album (probably with different vocalizations), either metal
having atropia value — here probably the former.

The syllables toward the beginning, מ, etc., מ, etc., are
found in the other texts, used as deterrents to the devils. מ
appears, from the spacing and faint traces of the letters, to
have been written seven times, and so I explain the following
משת. מ = מ, from מ, = "avumi". What follows is obscure,
Syriac נַרְבָּה — an obstruction, water-dam, לְנַרְבָּה, a bolt, and
the term may be understood from the Babylonian myth of
Tiamat’s hide fastened up as the firmament with a bolt,1 or
else of the function of the sky as the dam-breast to the celest-
ial waters. The following word may possibly be read נַרְבָּה (a feminine
form, but why so with נַרְבָּה?), and the reference
be to the southern bolt, or pole, of the sky, the source of the
lightnings, the second use of נַרְבָּה meaning then the north pole,
the abode of darkness. The demons are commanded to flee
to the ends of the earth. “The heights of the house” is ob-
scure (for מַנָּרְבָּה — astrological כַּהַנָּרְבָּה, see Newbold, JBL,
XXX, 204).2 The נַרְבָּה appear in other texts from Nippur;
I can explain it only as a metathesis of לְנַבָּה (in Paed form),
which is used of the “undoing” operations of demons (e. g.
נַרְבָּה פָּסָל לְלַכָּהפָּל). The deity, whose seal is referred to, “the lord Bagdána”,
appears in one of my other texts. The plural is also found,
— gods. The first syllable is the Iranian bhāy, “god”, but
the remainder of the word I cannot identify. Here another
personal name is also added, Šamhizā; Prof. G. F. Moore
suggests to me the doubtless correct identification with the
fallen angel Semyaza in Book of Enoch. I have found a

1 See King, Seven Tablets of Creation, tablet iv, l. 129, “he fastened
a bolt”.
2 Dr. von Oebele suggests to me that in the astrological scheme for
drawing horoscopes the peak of the “tenth house”, which is at the
zenith, is the abode of fire.
Plate 2.
Col. 1, the Estranghelio alphabet; col. 2, the Syriac script on the bowls, with variants; col. 3, the Turkish Manichaean script.
number of connections between the bowl-texts and Ethiopian angelology. The phrase may simply mean "S, the Lord God". In its opposition to the sun and moon, regarded as baneful, the text is in line with the Mandaic theology (cf. Ładzbarski's Mandaic Amulet published in the de Vogüé Florilegium), otherwise it is pagan and shows no direct Jewish influence, the formula "forever and ever, Amen", being a magical commonplace. סְאָטָנָא = סָאָטָן, "Satan" in perverted form; cf. Ethiopian Mastema.

The chief point of interest in this and the similar Syriac texts is the script. In my work on the Nippur texts I have made a detailed study of this script and need only note here summarily the peculiar features. A superior point is used to distinguish ג from ג, and also in my other texts to distinguish the feminine suffix in ג. The plural points are used in all plurals, the feminines of nouns, verbal forms (also pronouns), being almost always written above the final letter. The characters of form worthy of remark are:

ג, with head turned to the right for distinction from ג, which assumed an identical shape with original ג and ג.

ג, with a prolonged tail to the left, the original head sometimes disappearing.

ג, with an elaborate flourish from the head to the left.

Final ג, a horizontal, pitchfork-like character, with various modifications, the stroke often very long.

Most of the characters have close relations with forms of the Palmyrene alphabet, and the script may be described as an elder sister of the Estrangelo, with close affinity in its peculiarities to the Palmyrene. The antecedent relations of our script were thus fixed, and it appeared as a peculiar provincial alphabet, found only on the bowls without leaving further mark in literary history.

But my attention chanced to fall upon the Manichaean fragments in a Turkish dialect found in Eastern Turkestan, a series of which have been published in the Sitzungsberichte of the Berlin Academy, between 1904 and 1910.¹ The ac-

¹ For the alphabet, see F. W. K. Müller in the volume for 1904, p. 348. The script was evidently of Syriac origin, with the addition of some Arabic characters. For the Arabic tradition of the Manichaean alphabet, see G. Flügel, Mani, seine Lehre und seine Schriften, 167.
companying table, Plate 2, presents the two alphabets comparatively. Some variant forms are given in the Syriac column. The similarity or rather indentity of the alphabets is evident, and is most striking in the coincidence of the Turkish with the characters of the peculiar form in our Syriac alphabet, e.g. 7 (n.b. turning of head to the right), 8, finial 1. The Turkish differs in keeping 7 turned to the left, as its point served to distinguish it from 1. I have not found 8 in my Syriac texts and in this lack the alphabet agrees with the Manichaean.

Our provincial Syriac script has thus an interesting history forward. It is the alphabet which was used by the Manichaeeans and taken by them as the basis of the alphabet they devised for the Turkish dialect of their converts in China. And presumably it was the script of Mani himself, for he was a citizen of Babylon and our texts come from neighboring Nippur. Mani died A.D. 276; the bowls from Nippur are to be dated at the latest (on archaeological grounds, as I show elsewhere) about the beginning of the seventh century, with leesoom backwards of a century or two. The Turkish texts belong, I suppose, somewhere toward the end of the first millennium. We are thus presented with a well established provincial script which endured for several centuries and which, as a sectarian alphabet, was finally adopted for the representation of an alien tongue. Our only survivals of this peculiar alphabet, which has played its part in religious history, are rude magical texts from Babylonia and a Turkish script from distant regions. This is one more instance of the literary peculiarism of the oriental sects; Jew, Samaritan, Manichaean, the Syriac Christian churches, each party developed its own peculiar literary vehicle, starting from the native dialect or script, and in the end asserting it as its own. And so the provincial script in which Mani had learnt his letters became the peculiar alphabet of his church.

It may be added that the bowls themselves contain no traces of Manichaeism.

1 Probably now to be corrected to 278; see TLZ, 1912, 446.