ORIENTALIA SUECANA

Contents of last vols.

Contents

"May God grant a happy outcome"

Jewish religious self-expression in thirty letters from the Cairo Genizah[1]

Karin Almbladh
Uppsala

In the fifth volume of *A Mediterranean society*, S. D. Goitein portrays "the true believer" within the Genizah society. Judging from their letters, the people of the Genizah constantly bore God's name on their lips—it was His kingdom, which represented the physical, moral and political world order. Goitein also suggests that their words mirror the habits of speech common in those parts and times. Arabic was their mother tongue, which they used for oral and written discourse, while Hebrew and Aramaic were the languages of their scriptures and their prayers. In the present paper thirty letters penned by three North African Jewish merchants between 1050 and 1065, Avon b. Ṣedaqa, Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ and Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl, are analysed in order to understand the extent to which these pious phrases were part of the usage in the society they lived in as well as when they had recourse to Jewish scriptures. The letters studied here are autographs, i.e. we can read them as they penned them, without any manipulations by later copyists. Studying them we come as close as we ever can to the way the writers expressed themselves, and the letters can thus be compared to samples collected for linguistic and anthropological research.

The comparative sample is supplied by the editions of Werner Diem of medieval Arabic letters from Egypt, as these letters frequently originate in a similar social and professional milieu. They are also autograph letters in the same sense. All of them, except seven letters from a Christian milieu, come from a Muslim milieu.[2] Excluded are the introductory and concluding Arabic eulogies, as they were part and parcel of a more or less uniform epistolary style. They are only taken into account in cases when Hebrew phrases are woven into them. For Arabic words and phrases, forms of Classical Arabic (CA) have been used whenever the text allows this. One reason is that the writers use what has been called "Standard Judaeo-Arabic Spelling" (SJAS). This was modelled upon the conventions of CA and it achieved predominance among Arabic-speaking Jews by the end of the first millennium as the only acceptable orthography. As for vulgarisms, the principle adopted by Werner Diem in his editions of medieval Arabic letters has been adopted, viz. to transcribe them

---

[1] An earlier version was read at the 11th International Conference of the Society for Judaeo-Arabic Studies in St Petersburg 25–28 August, 2003.

[2] Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 5, 323–347, Diem, 1991, 1993, 1995, 1996a, 1996b, 1997. The letters from a Christian milieu are Diem, 1991, nos. 2, 34, 66, 67, 1993, nos. 14, 34 and 1996b, 14. References to rabbinical scriptures follow the references by the editors of the letters and have also been culled from *The Responsa project 8.0*.

when the text clearly indicates them.[3] These vulgarisms are, however, normally not discussed. The system of transliterating Arabic, used by Diem, has been adopted here as well. The only exception is that the *tā' marbūṭa* is rendered *-a*, not *-ah*. Whether or not to indicate the *hamza* is a special problem, as it is usually not indicated in Arabic in Hebrew script, not even in CA texts in Hebrew script. In the final analysis it has been decided to follow the principles adopted by Diem. He treats all texts in one and the same way irrespective of script. Whenever a phrase or an expression in the letters studied here is also found in his editions, the vocalisation used there has been adopted here. The main reason is that there are no indications of vowels in the letters studied here. As for the transcription of the Hebrew elements, forms of Biblical Hebrew have been used in words and phrases from the Bible, while forms as they appear in the grammar by M. H. Segal have been adopted for words and phrases from rabbinical scriptures. The system in the grammar by Gustaf Dalman has been adopted for Aramaic elements from rabbinical scriptures. It may, however, be assumed that the writers adapted these elements to the phonetic system of Arabic, their spoken language. This is at least likely according to the classic study of the pronunciation of Hebrew in medieval Spain by Irene Garbell.[4] Translating the Hebrew elements, italics have been used. In those cases where the writers use the 3rd person singular for formal address, be it in Arabic or Hebrew, this has been translated by the 2nd person singular.[5]

At times a word as found in the text may be interpreted both as Arabic and Hebrew. Words like *bin/ben*, "son", *yawm/yūm*, "day", *bi/bě*, "by, with", *li/lě*, "to", *wa/wě*, "and", *kull/kol*, "all" and *min*, "from" are understood as Hebrew when they occur in initial positions in phrases, which are identified as quotations from Hebrew (or Aramaic) scriptures or are otherwise indicated as a fixed phrase in these languages. Elsewhere they are understood as Arabic. In other cases it has been decided to understand a number of nouns expressing religious categories as Hebrew. Thus *talmīd*, "scholar" not *tilmīḏ*, "student", *ḥāvēr*, "member of the academy", not *ḥabr*, "religious scholar", and *rāv*, not *rabb*, "master" are preferred. A few other cases are discussed in their proper contexts. As for a number of place-names the choice has been made in the opposite direction. Thus, they are understood as *ṣūr*, not *ṣōr* for Tyre and *dimašq*, not *dameśeq* for Damascus.

The study takes as its starting point the printed texts as published by Moshe Gil in 1983 and in 1997, although other editions have been consulted as well. All the letters are, according to the editors, autograph letters, i.e. written by the merchants themselves. The parts of the letters are quoted as follows: r. = recto, v. = verso, rt = right, mrg = margin, a = above, b = below, u = upside down. FI I r.rtmrg, 6 is thus deciphered as Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl letter I (= Gil, 1997, no. 501) recto right margin line 6. As for the Arabic letters published by Diem, they are referred to as done by the editor.

---

[3] The development of Judaeo-Arabic orthography is discussed in Blau, 1999, 241–243, where SJAS is called "a transliteration" of CA spelling. For Diem, see the discussion in Diem, 1991, pages 5–6.
[4] Garbell, 1954 (though her study obviously refers to social groups different from those discussed here). See also the discussion of the pronunciation of Hebrew in modern Algeria in Bar-Asher, 1992, 37–62.
[5] A discussion of formal/informal address in this type of correspondence is found in Diem, 1991, page 4.

The merchants and their letters

The three merchants all hailed from Qābis (Gabes) in modern Tunisia, and they were active in the middle of the 11th century. The three of them also belonged to the circle of the great merchant-banker Nehorai b. Nissim in Fusṭāṭ, who also hailed from the Maghreb and whose activities can be traced for half a century until his death in 1095. No less than eighteen of the letters studied here are thus addressed to him.

Abū l-Farağ Āvōn b. Ṣĕdāqā al-Maġrībī al-Qābisī was active in Jerusalem, obviously as the representative of Nehorai b. Nissim. Judging from his letters, Avon b. Ṣedaqa was a learned merchant, as he mentions a number of books, which he studied as well as his contacts with scholars. In a letter from ca. 1045 he is also apostrophised as *rabbī*, the title of prominent scholars, whose legal opinions were regarded as authoritative.[6] His complicated personality is mirrored in his letters, and this has puzzled modern scholars. For instance Goitein thought he was a man truly at peace with his God, while Moshe Gil thought of him as a man whose conscience was troubling him.

The letters from Avon b. Ṣedaqa (AṢ) are: I = Gil, 1983, no. 497 (from 5 February, 1064), II = Gil, 1983, no. 499 (from 10 March, 1064), III = Gil, 1983, no. 498 (from 3 April, 1064), IV = Gil, 1983, no. 500 (from 11 November, 1064), V = Gil, 1983, no. 501 (from 28 August, 1065) = Gottheil & Worrell, 1927, no. 27 (with a facsimile of the letter), VI = Gil, 1983, no. 502 (from October, 1065), VII = Gil, 1983, no. 503 (perhaps from 1065). Letter I is addressed to Ḥayyim b. ʿAmmār, who was the representative of the Jewish merchants from Sicily in Alexandria. Letters II to VII are addressed to Nehorai b. Nissim. All of them are in Hebrew script.

Abū Ibrāhīm Ismāʿīl b. Faraḥ al-Qābisī belonged to a family of merchants who moved to Egypt in the first half of the 11th century. Well in Egypt he, as well as at least two of his brothers, settled in Alexandria, where they were engaged in the triangular trade on Egypt-Sicily-the Maghreb. The family was associated by marriage to Nehorai b. Nissim, whose sister Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ married. He was an experienced merchant but much more shadowy than Avon b. Ṣedaqa.

The letters from Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ (IF) are: I = Gil, 1997, no. 487 (from ca. 1051), II = Gil, 1997, no. 488 (from 9 September, 1056), III = Gil, 1997, no. 489 (from 11 September, 1056), IV = Gil, 1997, no. 490 (from 23 September, 1056), V = Gil, 1997, no. 491 (from 23 September, 1056), VI = Gil, 1997, no. 492 (from 25 September, 1056), VII = Gil, 1997, no. 493 (from 29 October, 1056), VIII = Gil, 1997, 494 (from 6 November, 1056), IX = Gil, 1997, no. 495 (from November, 1056), X = Gil, 1997, no. 496 (from ca. 1060), XI = Gil, 1997, no. 497 (from ca. 1060), XII = Gil, 1997, no. 498 (from ca. 1060). The addressee of I is an unknown member of the merchant-dynasty Banū Tāhirtī, letters III, V, IX are addressed to his son, Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl, letters VII and VIII are addressed to Joseph b. ʿAlī Kohen Fāsī, another merchant associated with Nehorai b. Nissim, while letters II, IV, VI, X–XII are addressed to Nehorai b. Nissim. All of them are in Hebrew script.

---

[6] The reference to Avon b. Ṣedaqa is found in Gil, 1997, vol.3, no. 509 v., 1. The use of the title *rāv* is discussed in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 2, 211–212.

His eldest son, *Abū l-Surūr Faraḥ b. Ismāʿīl al-Qābisī*, evidently traded in copper, iron, knives, nails, wax, silk, saffron and pepper. He was still active in March 1085, as he is mentioned in a letter from that date. Eleven of his letters, all in Hebrew script except for one in Arabic script, are available from 1050 to 1057.

The letters by Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl (FI) are: I = Gil, 1997, no. 499 (from October 22, 1050), II = Gil, 1997, no. 500 (from October 22, 1050) = ʿAodeh, 1998 (with a facsimile of the letter), III = Gil, 1997, no. 501 (from November, 19, 1050), IV = Gil, 1997, no. 505 (perhaps from 1053), V = Gil, 1997, no. 395 (perhaps from 1054), VI = Gil, 1997, no. 502 (perhaps from 1056), VII = Gil, 1997, no. 503 (from June 5, 1056), VIII = Gil, 1997, no. 504 (from October 8, 1056), IX = Gil, 1997, no. 506 (perhaps from 1057), X = Gil, 1997, no. 507 (perhaps from 1057), XI = Gil, 1997, no. 508 (not datable). No. V is peculiar, as this is actually two letters in one. They are written by Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl but signed as well by Joseph b. ʿAlī Kohen Fāsī. For reasons discussed elsewhere, it is likely that only the first part (= V r., 1–21) actually is from him, while he acts as the secretary of Joseph b. ʿAlī Kohen Fāsī in the second part (= V r., 22–the end). Thus only the first part of the letter V is taken into account here, as we there, beyond doubt, hear the voice of Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl. This is called V1. Letters I, III and X are to his father, II (in Arabic script) to the merchant Manasseh b. David, VIII to another wealthy merchant in Fusṭāṭ, Judah b. Moses ibn Sughmār, while IV, V1, VI, VII, IX and XI are addressed to Nehorai b. Nissim.[7]

The formal structure of the letters studied here follows, with slight modifications, the current Arabic epistolary structure of the period. This is evident from a detailed analysis of the letters of Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl. The letters from the two other writers have the same structure as his letters.[8]

1. Eulogies and prayers, blessings and oaths

2.1. Eulogising the living

Arabic is normally the language of eulogising the living.

One feature, which the merchants share with the writers in the comparative sample, is that they often introduce a eulogy with *ʾasʾalu llāha* or *ʾasʾalu mina llāhi*, "I ask God" + a subordinate clause with the eulogy. *Kataba llāhu s-salāmata* (with different verbal forms and suffixes), "may God decree the well-being of…", is a conventional eulogy, which the three of them use, as is *allāhu yaǧʿalka fī ḥayyizi s-salāmati* "may God preserve you in the state of well-being", (once more with different verbal forms and suffixes).[9] To this eulogy the three of them at times add *wa-kol yiśrāʾēl*, "and *all of Israel*" and now and then Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ add *li-kol yiśrāʾēl*, "to *all of Israel*" to conventional phrases.[10] In IF IX,

---

[7] What is known about Avon b. Ṣedaqa is found in Gil, 1992, 267–269. The dates of his letters I and II are given after Gil, 2004, 588. The comments of Goitein are found in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 5, 52. The biographical information on Ismaʿl b. Faraḥ and his family is cited from ʿAodeh, 1998, 126–128.

[8] The letters of Faraḥ b. Ismaʿl are discussed in detail in Almbladh, 2004.

[9] Diem, 1995, 43r., 10, 1996b, 27r., 9, 35r., 8–9.

[10] That *kol* should be understood as Hebrew in these cases is clear from IF I r., 7, v., 2, VII r., 13, VIII v., 8, where the writer has added horizontal strokes above the phrase, the conventional way of indicating that a word is to be understood as Hebrew.

r.mrga, 1– v., 1, Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ likewise notes *wa-maʿa hāḏā mā yaʿrifu ʾaḥadun mā kutiba lahu*, "yet nobody knows what is decreed for him". In AṢ VII r., 19, Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses a conventional phrase in *allaḏī razaqanī llāhu taʿālā*, "that which God (He is exalted!) has granted me". Also conventional in the comparative sample are *sallamahu llāhu*, "may God save him", *ʾayyadahu llāhu*, "may God help him" (FI IV r., 14), *ʾaʿazzahu llāhu* (AṢ III r., 4, AṢ IV r., 31) and *ʾaḥyāhu llāhu*, "may God let him live" (AṢ IV r., 16, FI VI r., 8).[11] In IF II r.rtmrg, 3 the writer prays *ʾasʾalu mina llāhi ʾan yuġrīnā ʿalā ḥusni ʿawāʾidihi wa-lā yuḥlīnā wa-ʾiyyāka mina s-salāmati*, "I pray God that He treats us according to His kind manners and that He does not deny us and you well-being". In AṢ I r.rtmrg, 12 Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses the first of these eulogies in *wa-mā ʾaġrāhu llāhu baynanā mina l-widādi wa-ṣ-ṣuḥbati*, "… and that which God has provided us of mutual love and friendship".[12] In IF V r.rtmrg, 1–3, Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ blesses his son in a long chain of conventional eulogies. Into this he has embedded a quotation of Ps 68:6, *allāhu ǧallat qudratuhu yakūn maʿaka liʾannahu ʾāvī* [Ps 68:6] *wa-ʾanā bihi wāṯiqun ʾannahu yuġrīka ʿalā ḥusni ʿawāʾidihi wa-yakūna maʿaka ʾaynamā tawaǧǧadta*, "may God (His might is great) be with you, for He is *the father of* [Ps 68:6] and I trust in Him that He treats you according to His kind manners and that He will be with you wherever you turn".[13] In IF VII r., 13, he blesses the addressee with *allāhu ǧallat qudratuhu yuṭliʿnā ʿalā ḥayrin wa-ʾiyyāka*, "may God (His might is great) show us and you what is good". In IF IX r., 17–18, he links another chain of eulogies for his son with a Biblical quotation, which is badly preserved, *allāhu yuṭliʿnī minka ʿalā ḥayrin wa-yaġʿalka fī ḥayyizi s-salāmati wa-yattaqabbil minnī fīka ṣalāḥa d-duʿāʾi wa-yastaǧībhu minnī laka wa-fīka kataba llāhu fīka kī*, "may God show me that which is good about you and may He preserve you in the state of well-being, receiving from me the righteous prayer for you, and may He accept it from me for you and concerning you, may God decree concerning you *for/that*". While the eulogy with *ʾaṭlaʿa* is not found in the comparative sample, the rest of them are conventional and are attested there.[14] In IF XI v., 4, he varies the conventional eulogies with *zāda* by *zādaka llāhu min kulli mazīdin ḥayrin*, "may God increase for you all that which is good".[15]

Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses routinely the eulogy *ḥarasahu llāhu* (with different suffixes according to the circumstances), "may God protect you/him", at times interchanging with *ḥafiẓahu llāhu* of the same meaning. Another conventional eulogy of the same meaning is *ḥāṭahu llāhu*. A similar meaning has AṢ VI r., 6, 9 *ṣānahum llāhu*, "may God preserve them". *Ḥarasahu llāhu* is also common in the letters of Ismaʿīl b.

[11] For the first eulogy, see Diem, 1991, 70v., 1 (with comment), 1997, 40r., 3, and for the last eulogy, see Diem, 1995, 41r., b 8. The glossaries in Diem may be consulted for the third eulogy and the dictionaries for the second eulogy.

[12] For these, see Diem, 1991, 41, 2ff, 1993, 7, 10, 1995, 41v., a, 2, 1996a, 35r., 16.

[13] For the introductory eulogy the dictionaries may be consulted, and for the second, see the comment on Diem, 1991, 16v., 5.

[14] The editor has identified the quotation as Ps. 67:5 while Goitein has understood it as a reference to Ex. 20:12 or Deut. 4:40 (Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 3, 244 (with footnote 151). For the eulogies, see Diem, 1991, 6, 5, 1995, 45r., 14, 1996b, 35r., 8–9 (in each case with comments).

[15] For eulogies with *zāda*, the glossaries in the editions by Diem may be consulted as well as Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v.

Faraḥ, while his son employs it only twice. They share all these eulogies with the comparative sample.[16] In AṢ IV r., 14, however, Avon b. Ṣedaqa eulogises Elijah ha-Kohen b. Solomon Gaon by the Aramaic naṭ[rēh] raḥ[ămānā], "may the Merciful protect him". In AṢ IV r.rtmrg, 11, the ḥāvēr Ḥayyim b. Solomon is eulogised in the same way (but in AṢ IV v., 16, ḥarasahu llāhu is found for him) and in AṢ V v., 3 "R' Isaac". This use of Aramaic may be due to the scholarly rank of the eulogised persons.

Peculiar is ṭawwala llāhu 'umraka, "may God prolong your life", in AṢ III r., 11, AṢ II r., 12, AṢ V v.rtmrg, 3. To begin with, the use of the second form instead of the fourth is of interest, but this is found in the comparative sample as well. To this is added 'umraka instead of the more common baqā'aka. In AṢ I r., 29, however, he uses the wholly conventional 'abqāka llāhu.[17] In AṢ III v., 1 [wa-ma'a man] yulhimuhu llāhu and AṢ IV v., 23 [mā] 'alhamahu llāhu "[... and with whoever/... whatever] God inspires", he uses a conventional phrase, and for this the dictionaries may be consulted. AṢ III v., 2 'aḥsana llāhu ḏikrahu and AṢ III v., 5 ḏakarahā llāhu bi-l-ḥayri have roughly the same meaning, "may God remember him/her". In AṢ II r., 6 two eulogies are combined, ḏakarahu llāhu bi-'elef šālōm wa-yaḡma'u bihi 'alā 'afḍali ḥālin, "may God remember you with a thousandfold well-being and may He let me meet you in the most happy circumstance".[18] In AṢ III v., 6, he asks for good news from the lady eulogised in the previous line, allāhu yusmi'nā 'anhā ḥayr, "may God let us hear good [news] from her". This is a conventional eulogy that Isma'īl b. Faraḥ also uses in IF V v., 9 and in IF VII r., 26 for the happy outcome of a business enterprise.[19] The writers also pray that the addressee should be protected from evil. Thus Isma'īl b. Faraḥ writes in IF V r., 11 'āfāka llāhu minhā wa-kafāka r-ra'ya s-sū'a, "may God protect you from it and free you from bad judgement". Avon b. Ṣedaqa varies the second eulogy in AṢ I r., 38 wa-kafānā wa-kafāka kulla maḥḍūrin, "... may God free us and you from every danger".[20]

In IF VI r., 2, Isma'īl b. Faraḥ congratulates the addressee, according to the editor perhaps at his wedding, adding to the congratulation a quotation of Prv 20:5, concluding it with a conventional eulogy, 'anā 'uhinnīka bi-mā 'ašra'ta fīhi yitten [Prv 20:5] [wa-'a]s'ada llāhu ba'ḍakum bi-ba'ḍin, "I congratulate you for that which you have entered upon! May God give [Prv 20:5], and may God make you happy with each other". IF VII r., 25–26, wa-ḡa'ala [llāhu] sa'ādataka laka, may have the sense "and may God turn your lucky star in your favour". This eulogy is part of a chain of eulogies, introduced by the sinister ḥaqana llāhu damaka, "may God spare your blood", a eulogy also found in IF VII r., 13.[21]

---

[16] For these eulogies, see Diem, 1991, 10, 2; 18, 13 and Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.vv.

[17] The eulogy is discussed in Diem, 1991, 57, 6. Peculiar is 'umraka, as it is not attested in the comparative sample in this eulogy. For the grammatical point, see Hopkins, 1984, § 71b.The eulogy 'abqāka llāhu is easily traced through the glossaries in the editions by Diem.

[18] For the eulogy see the discussion on Diem, 1991, 39, 5.

[19] Diem, 1995, 67, 2 (with comment).

[20] For the first eulogy, the glossaries in the editions by Diem may be consulted. The second eulogy is discussed in the comment on Diem, 1991, 32r., 3.

[21] For the interpretation of sa'ādataka as "your lucky star", see Diem, 1997, 35v., 14. For the introductory eulogy in this chain, see Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v. ḥaqana. The eulogy 'as'ada llāhu is conventional and is easily traced through the glossaries in the editions by Diem.

Appropriate here is to mention the condolences, which Avon b. Ṣedaqa offers the addressee in AṢ I r., 4–6 [ ] *laka l-bĕrākā fī man baqā laka wa-lā 'ar'aka ba'dahu ḥasāratan*[22] *wa-lā 'ansāka hādihi l-ḥasrata bārūk* [*dayyan 'emet fa-lā*] *ḥīlata yāsayyidī fī qaḍā'i llāhi'āḥ* [Ps 49:8] *wa-bi-l-ǧumlati man māta fī hādā l-waqti 'aḥsanu ḥālin mimman ya'īšu li-ṣ-ṣarōt wa-l-mĕṣūqōt wa-lladī ḥtāra lahu l-bāri ta'ālā huwa l-ḥayru lā 'ilāha siwāhu*, "[ ] for you the blessing for anyone who remains for you, may He not let you experience after him any loss and not let you forget this grief. *Blessed* [*be the truthful judge*. It is] impossible, sir, to escape the Divine judgement, *a brother* [Ps 49:8]. And, on the whole, he who died in this time is better off than he who lives through the *distress* and the *straits*" [Zeph 1:15], and whatever the Creator (He is exalted!) chooses for him is the best. There is no God but He".

In IF VII r.mrga, 2–3, a person outside the Jewish community is eulogised, [*'abīdun li-mawlānā*] *ḥallada llāhu mulkahu wa-fataḥa lahu mašāriqa l-'arḍi wa-maǧāribahā*, "[servants of our master], may God make his rule eternal, and make him victorious in East and West". The first part of the eulogy is well attested and no doubt the sequel is also conventional.[23] But to whom does it refer? As the letter was written in Egypt, the most likely candidate is the Fāṭimid caliph.

God may also be invoked to mete out requital. In AṢ I r., 35–36 is an elaborate example of this, *fa-lā samaḥa llāhu li-man lā yu'aṭiru ḍālika 'alā 'ašǧālihi 'ūlay 'emṣā rĕwāḥā lĕ-nafšī wa-yu'āqib allāhu kulla ẓālimin fī l-barri wa-l-baḥri*, "may God not forgive anyone who does not prefer this before his own worries, *perhaps I will find relief for my soul* and may God requite every evildoer by land and sea". AṢ V r., 18–19 provides another example, *mĕšallĕmē* [...] *ṭōvā llāhu ta'ālā yukāfā kulla wāḥidin bi-niyyatihi*, "*Those who requite …good* [Ps 38:20], may God (He is exalted!) requite each one with his intention", where the prayer for requital is conventional, and it is repeated in AṢ VII v., 29 *wa-kāfāhu llāhu 'alā mā 'āmalanī bihi*, "may God requite him for the way he has treated me". Likewise we meet in AṢ I r., 31–32 *fa-'aḥrama llāhu bi-smi man kataba 'ilayka 'illā mimmā sami'a fī maǧlisi r-rayyisi*, "may God curse the name of anyone who has only written to you what he has heard in the court of the rayyis". In AṢ VII v., 9, he writes *fa-lā ḥalla lahu llāhu*, "…and may God not forgive him" and later on in the same letter, AṢ VII v., 19–20, *fa-'aksāhu llāhu dar'a fi'lihi fī l-barri wa-baḥri*, "may God dress him in the crookedness of his action by land and by sea".[24] AṢ V r., 37 *qad ṭaraḥa llāhu fīhā* [= *'aṣ-ṣurra*] *l-mĕ'ērā* seems to be understood as the opposite of a blessing attested in modern usage, *aḷḷa yiṭraḥ-al-barake fi* (*mālku*), "may God bless (your property)", and thus it should be understood as "God *cursed* it [= the sealed bag of money]".[25]

---

[22] In the printed text it is written *ḥšrh*, which does not make sense, and which may be an error or a *scriptio defectiva*.

[23] The first part of the eulogy is discussed in the comments on Diem, 1996a, 33, 5, where there are further references.

[24] This understanding of the phrase is different from the editor's interpretation. For *dar'un*, see Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v.

[25] For the first expression, see Piamenta, 1983, 43, 216–217. In Gottheil & Worrell, 1927, the Hebrew word has been altered into Arabic *'al-marāra*. It is, however, clearly indicated in the letter that the word should be understood as Hebrew through the addition of two horizontal strokes above the word.

In AṢ II r.rtmrg, 4, he uses Hebrew, cursing a person who has slandered him, writing *yaknī'ō wĕ-yašmīdō*, "*may He subjugate him and wipe him out*". The use of Hebrew here no doubt adds to the force of the curse. In AṢ I r., 27–29, Avon b. Ṣedaqa bewails the misfortunes, which he experiences, writing *fa-l-waylu wa-ṯumma l-waylu li-man ḥalla fī hāḏihi 'aṣri lladī 'a'dāhu llāhu bi-l-kulliyati wa-mā baqiya man yasūsu qiṣṣatan wa-lā yudabbiru ḥāl wa-lā yalummu ša'aṯ wa-ṯabata fīnā wĕ-'ēn* [Is 57:1], "Woe and again woe anyone who lives in this age, which God has completely infected, and no one is left who neither rules an affair, nor governs a situation, nor settles disorder, and it is confirmed concerning us *nobody*", [Is 57:1]. Further on in the same letter, he laments in AṢ I r.rtmrg, 9–11 *fa-l-waylu wa-ṯumma l-waylu li-man lā yaṯiqu bihi wa-lā yuḥalliṣu qalbahu wa-niyyatahu fī ṭā'atihi*, "Woe and again woe anyone who does not trust in Him, and who does not purify his heart and intent, in obedience to Him". In AṢ V v.rtmrg, 2–3, finally, he blames the memory of a person who had wronged him with *fa-'awīlun lanā fa-mā 'aġfalanā 'an ḥāli 'anfusinā*, "Woe unto us! How unmindful of us he was as to the state of our minds!"

In some cases their Arabic eulogies have no parallels in the comparative sample. This is the case with AṢ VI r., 4 and FI II r., 3, III v., 2–3 *'arrafahu llāhu barakatahu*, "may God acquaint you with His blessing", FI III v., 3 *ǧa'alaka fīhi min as-sālimīna*, "may He make you, in this respect, safe and sound", FI VI r.rtmrg, 11–12 *allāhu yaqḍā bi-l-barakati*, "may God decide upon the blessing" and FI IX r., 10 *allāhu yašġulka fī ḫayrin*, "may God divert you with good". Ismā'īl b. Faraḥ likewise eulogises Nehorai b. Nissim a few times with words without such parallels, as in IF VIII r., 8–9 *'as'alu mina llāhi lā yuḥayyib 'anā'aka wa-yaǧ'al sa'yataka laka*, "I ask God that He may not make your toil be of no avail, and that He may make your effort profitable for you" and in IF XI r., 4 *wa-llāhu ta'ālā yuġhidnī laka 'akṯara wa-'akbara* "may God (He is exalted!) urge me on in your service even more and even more strongly", while the editor corrects IF XI v., 4 to *wa-'ašhadanī minka ḥayr*, "may He let me witness what is good from you". In AṢ I r., 37, the addressee is eulogised by *'alzamaka allāhu li-mā laka fīhi l-ḥira [...] wa-lā ǧa'alanā wa-ǧa'alaka mina l-ẓālimīna*, "may God make you cleave to that in which there is blessing for you [...] and may He not let us and you belong to the evildoers".[26] AṢ III r., 4 [ ] *allāhu bi-t-tahniyati* may be the final words of an otherwise fragmentary eulogy, "may God [ ] with the congratulation".

Hebrew eulogies are used a few times to eulogise the living. As was current among the North African Jews of the period, Avon b. Ṣedaqa eulogises one of the most prominent members of the Jewish community of Fusṭāṭ, Judah ha-Kohen b. Joseph. b. Eleazar with *yĕḥī lā-'ad*, "*may he live for ever*".[27] *Rabbēnū yĕḥī lā-'ad*, "*our master, may he live for ever*", usually also refers to him, but in AṢ IV r., 22 it refers to Elijah Gaon. The use of the eulogy *yimṣā raḥămīm*, "*may he find mercy*" is ambiguous. In AṢ I r., 15 it is used for the Gaon Daniel b. 'Azariah, who was dead when this letter was written. Faraḥ b. Isma'īl uses it in FI III r., 28 probably for his

---

[26] For *'alzamaka allāhu*, see, however, Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v.

[27] The place of Judah ha-Kohen among the North African Jewish merchants of the period is discussed in Gil, 1992, 269–271.

paternal uncle, who was still active when the letter was written. As for Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ, he uses it in I v., 6 in the oath [wa-ḥaqqi ʾabī] yim[ṣā] raḥ[ămīm], "[by my father], *may he find mercy*". It thus seems that this eulogy was used both for the living and for the dead. In this way it provides a parallel to the Arabic *raḥimahu llāhu* of the same meaning, as this was used in both contexts in this period.[28] Here is also the place to mention that in IF III r., 1, VIII r., 1 and in FI X r., 1 father and son bless the addressee with *wa-kāna laka wa-maʿaka ʿōzēr wĕ-sōmēk*, "and may He be for you and with you *a helper and a supporter*", where the Hebrew phrase may be rooted in the liturgy.[29] In AṢ II r., 4 the writer has inserted the following prayer for addressee: *wa-yizke lĕ-šānīm rabbōt wĕ-yarʾēnī lō ben zākār bĕ-qārōv*, "...and *may you live long, and may you soon let me see a son of yours*". In AṢ V r., 3–4, a similar blessing is found in a mixture of Arabic and Hebrew: *ʾašhadanā lahu bānīm zĕkārīm lĕ-ḥayyīm*, "may He let us witness for you *sons for life*".

An Arabic letter is normally concluded by the word *as-salāmu*, In two letters Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl uses *wa-šālōm* as the final greeting as does his father in IF II. In the conventional phrase *ʾaḥaṣṣa fulānan bi-ʾatammi s-salāmi* (and its variants), "to give NN the most special greetings", Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Ismāʿīl b. Faraḥ frequently (but not always) glosses *as-salāmi* with *wa-šālōm*. At times they also gloss the final *as-salāmu* with *wa-šālōm*. Avon b. Ṣedaqa concludes AṢ I by *hqbh yĕnaḥem lĕ-[ʾammō] wĕ-šālōm rāv*, "*may the Holy One (blessed be He) comfort [His people], and greatly farewell*". He concludes AṢ II by [ʾarġabu ʾilayhi li-yuhanniya rabbēnū yĕḥī lā-ʿad ʾannī bi-hāḏa l-mōʿēd al-muqbili ʾilaynā wa-yuqriʾhu] ʾalfē šĕlōmōt ūšĕlōm ʾădōnī wĕ-yaqqīrī wĕ-ʾallūfī yigdal lĕ-ʿădē ʿad wa-ḥătānekā hamyuqārīm hamkubbādīm rabbōtay šālōm rāv, "[I want you to greet *our master, may he live for ever*, from me at this *festival*, which is to come to us, and may you greet him] *my honoured lord and my master, may he be great for ever and ever, a thousandfold, and your honourable and honoured sons-in-law, my masters. Greatly farewell*". This may be compared with the conclusion of AṢ IV. The substance of the conclusion of AṢ II is more or less repeated in a mixture of Arabic and Hebrew: *ḥaṣaṣtuhu bi-ʾatammi s-salāmi wĕ-rabbēnū yĕḥī lā-ʿad ʾalfē šĕlōmōt wa-yatafaḍḍal mawlāya yuhannīhi ʾannī bi-hāḏihi l-ʾaʿyādi l-mubārakati ʾašharahu sādātī ʾafḍala s-salāmi*, "I give you my special greetings, *and our master, may he live for ever, thousands of greetings*, and please, sir, greet him from me at these blessed festivals. To your sons-in-law, my masters, the best greetings".

2.2. Praying for a happy outcome

The letters from Ismāʿīl b. Faraḥ and his son abound with wishes for the happy outcome of commercial enterprises. These prayers, as well, are normally in Arabic. The most frequent is *ʾin šāʾa llāhu*, "God willing". Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses normally only this phrase in the address, where it belonged to the formal requirements. Elsewhere

---

[28] The use of *raḥimahu llāhu* in this period is discussed in the comment on Diem, 1991, 13, 5. The corresponding vulgar form was in use among Tunisian Jews of the early 20th century, see Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 1, 116 (footnote 1).

[29] *Seder Amram Gaon* as quoted in *The Responsa project 8.0*.

he uses it but once or twice—his were other worries.[30] Expressing their worries for the outcome of an enterprise, father and son at times also write *'idā mina llāhi*, "God permitting", which also is peculiar to them. In IF VI v., 8, Ismaʿīl b. Farah expresses his worries by *'idā tafaddala llāhu bi-salāmatihi*, "if God may show grace by its happy outcome" and in FI V1 r., 2, his son uses a similar phrase of the same meaning, *'in tafaddala llāhu ğallat qudratuhu 'an*. Such phrases are conventional, and they need no comment. A eulogy, which Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Ismaʿīl b. Farah use now and then, is *'ahsana llāhu ğazā'aka*, "may God compensate you well". This eulogy they share with the comparative sample. Of the same meaning is IF I r., 8 *ğazāka llāhu hayr*, which is also found there.[31] To this latter eulogy, Ismaʿīl b. Farah adds the conventional *wa-lā 'adimtu tafaddalaka*, "may I not be deprived of your kindness".[32] IF I r., 5–6 is slightly damaged, but probably it belongs here, *allāhu taʿāl[ā] yahīr [ ] yuʿidnā kullanā hayr*, "may God (He is exalted!) make [ ] well, may He compensate all of us well".[33] Later on in the same letter, in IF I v., 23, he prays for the delivery of some goods to the market, writing *wa-llāhu yab'at lahā sūq*, "may God send it to the market", and he closes his description of his efforts in IF I v., 24 with the conventional expression *wa-llāhu ya'lamu hirsī 'a[lā]*, "God knows my effort [to]".[34] In IF XII r.rtmrg, 1–2, Ismaʿīl b. Farah describes the eastern wind, which hindered the ships, and he concludes the description with *'arğū mina llāhi 'annahu yusihha 'indahum ta'addin*, "I put my hope on God that He makes crossing [the sea] lucky for them".

A conventional way of praying for a happy outcome is *allāhu yusāhil*, "may God make it possible", which father and son use a number of times.[35] In praying for the help of God *wa-llāhu yu'īn*, "and may God be of help", is also used in FI VIII r., 23.[36] In IF II r., 7, the payment of some goods is discussed, and there the writer prays *wa-llāhu yūfīhi*, "may God pay him in full". *Waffaqa llāhu*, "may God grant success" is a conventional eulogy, which Ismaʿīl b. Farah frequently employs, at times also Avon b. Ṣedaqa. In IF XI r., 8, XII r., 16 as well as in FI V1 r., 19, it is rather a person, who is intended, *ma'a man yuwaffiqu llāhu*, "with whomever God grants". Also this is conventional in the comparative sample. In IF XI r., 8–9, Ismaʿīl b. Farah writes *mā 'u'awwilu 'alā 'ahadin 'illā 'alā tawfīqi llāhi*, "I only ask for God's support", the last part of which is a variant of the Qur'anic *wa-mā tawfīqī 'illā bi-llāhi* (Q 11:90).[37] This is immediately followed by *wa-mā yusabbibuhu sababun hayrun 'in šā'a llāhu laka wa-lanā*, "and whatever He assigns is good compensation, God willing, for you and for us".[38] In IF V v., 4–5, it is developed

---

[30] For its place in the address, see Björkman, 1928, 116.

[31] Diem, 1991, 56, 13, 1993, 14r., 8.

[32] Diem. 1995, 61, 6 (with comment).

[33] For the first eulogy, see Diem, 1991, 28, 8 (with comment), and for the second eulogy, see Diem, 1995, 45r., 19 (with comment). There the verb is in the second form, but here the fourth form must be intended.

[34] For the expression, see Diem, 1993, 26, 4–5, 1995, 21, 3–4, in each case with comments.

[35] Diem, 1995, 54r.mrg, 1.

[36] Diem, 1996b, 5v., 20.

[37] Diem, 1995, 43v., 4 (with comments). The glossaries in his editions should also be consulted for further examples.

[38] For this understanding of *sabbaba* and *sababun*, see Diem, 1995, 30r., 5 (with comment) and Dozy, (1881) 1991, s.v.

further in *waffaqaka llāhu li-r-ra'yi s-sa'īdi s-sadīdi 'ēš mā štaraytahu muqābaḍatan mubārak*, "may God grant you the happy, well-balanced view, [may] whatever you buy in exchange be blessed".[39] Invoking his trust that the addressee will advance some money, he uses a conventional phrase in IF XII v., 3–4 *wa-'anā muttakilun 'alā llāhi wa-'alayka fī wuṣūli hāḏihi d-danānīri*, "I trust upon God and upon you that these dinars will be paid". The phrase in IF XII v., 7 *wa-'anā muttakilun 'alā faḍlihi*, "I trust upon his kindness…" is obviously a variant of this.[40] In FI XI r., 10, Faraḥ b. Isma'īl discusses some money-matter, and there he tells the addressee that the matter should be settled *bi-mā qasama llāhu*, "with that which God disposes", i.e. "at any price you get". His father uses at times shortened forms of the same expression, viz. *fī l-qismi, bi-l-qismi, huwa qismu llāhi* and *lākinna hāḏihi qismu llāhi*.[41] In IF I v., 3–4, Isma'īl b. Faraḥ mentions his troubles and worries, finishing with *'as'alu mina-llāhi r-rifqa*, "I ask God for grace", which is a variant of a current eulogy.[42] Trust in God is also expressed in FI II r.rtmrg, 1–2 by the conventional *'ā'iḏun bi-llāhi*, "I am seeking protection by God".[43]

Praying for a happy outcome in the overall context of the hard times in Alexandria in 1056, Isma'īl b. Faraḥ uses *ḥalāṣun* and *ḥallaṣa* in IF V, IF VIII and IF IX. Of these, IF V v., 11 *'aḥsana llāhu ḥalāṣanā minhu*, "may God make our delivery out of it [i.e. hard times] good" calls for no special comment, and the same holds true of the same expression in IF VIII r.rtmrg, 3. More difficult is IF IX r., 10, in a discussion of business during the hard times in Alexandria in 1056. Following an analysis by Werner Diem, it is possible to interpret the passage as *ḥallaṣanā llāhu mina n-nāsi kamā ḥulliṣū minnā* and referring to payment of goods, viz. "may God grant us payment from the people just as they have got payment from us."[44] In AṢ IV v., 5–6 Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses it praying for a happy deliverance from this world *allāhu yuḥsini l-ḥalāṣa min hāḏihī d-dunyā wa-min 'ahlihā*, "may God make the delivery from this world and from its inhabitants good". In AṢ I r., 37, in a less desperate mood, he writes *wa-ḥassana 'uqbāka wa-'uqbānā*, "… and may He make good your recompense and ours". Both are used for the happy outcome of business-matters, as in IF I r., 7 *ḥassana llāhu 'uqbāka wa-ḥalāṣaka wa-ḥalāṣana*, "may God make our compensation good as well as your outcome and ours" and later on in the same letter, in IF I v., 11, *wa-ḥassana ḥalāṣa l-ǧamī'i min ba'ḍikim ba'ḍi*, "may He bring all of you a good outcome". In IF IX r., 15, Isma'īl b. Faraḥ ascribes the hard times to God, saying *hiya 'awqāt 'an ṣa''abah[ā][45] llāhu*, "these are times, which God has made difficult".

Sickness was another occasion when prayer for the outcome was appropriate. In AṢ V v., 9, Avon b. Ṣedaqa prays for the recovery of one of the notables with the

---

[39] For *'r-ra'yu* […] *s-sadīdu*, see Diem, 1993, 17r., 8–9 (with comment).

[40] The phrase is discussed in the comments to Diem, 1991, 16v., 5, 1996b, 1r., 4.

[41] For the expression, see Diem, 1995, 49r., 6 (with comment) and Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 1, 185–186. Of interest is to note the spelling used by Isma'īl b. Faraḥ, *qaṣama, qiṣm*.

[42] Diem, 1991, 1r., 7 (with comment).

[43] For this, see the dictionaries.

[44] For the discussion of the expression, see the comment on Diem, 1991, 14, 7.

[45] The writer has obviously misspelt the suffix.

conventional *allāhu taʿālā yašfīhi*, "may God (He is exalted!) heal him". Feeling that sickness has ruined his life, he prays with the words of an Arabic-Hebrew hybrid in AṢ II r., 16 *ʾasalu llāha yaǧʿali l-ʾaḥārīt lĕ-ṭōvā*, "I pray God that He make the *end for good*". This is more or less a version of the eulogy *allāhu yaǧʿali l-ʿāqiba ʾilā ḥayrin*, "may God grant a happy outcome", which Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl uses for the outcome of a business enterprise, and this is attested in the comparative sample. In AṢ V r.mrga, 10 he uses a variant of this, *allāhu yuḥsini l-ʿāqiba*. This variant is also found in IF X r., 9–10 (although the text is so fragmentary there that it is difficult to understand the precise context) and in IF XI v., 7.[46] In AṢ V r.mrga, 4–6, Avon b. Ṣedaqa for once has a word of joy, perhaps connected with news about the rise of the Nile, *surirnā bi-wafāʾi l-māʾi allāhu yabliǧ bihi l-manāfiʿa wa-yahdīnā*, "We were happy that the water has risen, may God bring you the profits, and may He guide us".[47]

There are a number of peculiar expressions in AṢ IV. In AṢ IV v., 17, Avon b. Ṣedaqa tells of the good outcome for a girl in a troubled situation, *wa-ʾaḥlafa llāhu ʿalā ṣ-ṣabiyati ḥalf ḥasan*, "and God compensated the young girl well". Further on in the letter he mentions some economic problems, which may affect the addressee. The circumstances are not clear, but he closes his account in AṢ IV v., 23 by *fa-ʾaw-waḍahu llāhu ḥayr fī ʿaqlihi*. The eulogy is conventional, but the difficulty here is the sense of *ʿaql*. The context suggests that "reason" is not likely here. Instead it points to something like "may God compensate him [= who has been wronged] well in vengeance for him [= who has incurred losses for him]".[48] In AṢ IV r., 28–29 and in V r., 37, he obviously uses one and the same expression. Thus in IV r., 28–29 he complains *fa-lā ǧamaʿa llāhu minhā šay wa-ʾakūnu ʾaqbiḍuhā bayna yadayyi l-bārī* and in V r., 37 *wa-mā ǧamaʿa llāhu minhā dīnār*. The overall context of the two of them is clear, viz. that he has been unsuccessful in some business-enterprise. They may be variants of an expression current in the comparative sample, *ǧamaʿa llāhu ʿalā fulānin mālahu*, "God enabled NN to collect his property", i.e. here "God did not enable [me] to collect anything/a dinar of it". The sequel of the first expression is more difficult to understand and not attested in the comparative sample, but it may perhaps be understood as "but I will collect it in the presence of the Creator".[49]

2.3. Blessing months and festivals

At times Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ insert blessings for months and religious festivals. Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl, on the other hand, never uses such blessings.

The two of them bless Elul. Avon b. Ṣedaqa has a long blessing for the month and the future festivals in AṢ V r., 2–3 [ʾēlūl] *ʾaʿāda llāhu ʿalayhi hāḏihi l-mōʿādīm al-muqbilata sinīna ṭāʾilatan wa-ǧaʿalahā ʿalayhi maymūnatan mubārakatan bi-*

---

[46] Diem, 1995, 41r., a, 5f, 1996b, 27r., 19–20 (with comments).

[47] For the first eulogy, see Diem, 1993, 11, 12 (with comments) and Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v.

[48] For the eulogy, see the discussion in the comment on Diem, 1995, 45r., 19 and for *ʿaql*, Dozy, (1881) 1991, s.v. and Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v. The events, which are described in the letter, are discussed in Gil, 1992, 266.

[49] Diem, 1991, 13, 7 (with comment), where *qabḍa* also is discussed. See also Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v. *ǧamaʿa*.

qubūli t-tawbati wa-l-matwabati, "[Elul] may God add to you these *festivals*, which are to come for many years, and may He make them fortunate for you and blessed in the acceptance of the repentance and the reward". In IF II r., 2, Isma'īl b. Farah writes ['ēlūl] ḥatamahu llāhu 'alayka bi-'aḥsani ḥātimatin wa-'as'adaka bi-mā yalīhi, "[Elul] may God seal it for you with the best seal, and may He make you happy with that which follows it". As for Tishri, Avon b. Ṣedaqa writes in AṢ IV r., 2 [tišrī] 'a'āda llāhu 'alayhi hāḏihi l-'a'yāda šānīm rabbōt, "[Tishri] may God add to you these festivals *for many years*". In IF IV r., 2, written two days after the Day of Atonement, Isma'īl b. Farah writes about the same month: [tišrī] wa-l-'amru li-llā[hi ṣā]ḥibihi, understood by the editor as "[Tishri], the decision [haḥlāṭā] belongs to God, its lord", referring to the significance of the previous holidays.

In IF III r., 1–2, written on the eve of New Year's Day, Isma'īl b. Farah blesses his son with the appropriate Hebrew blessing for the festival: tikkātev bě-sefer ḥayyīm bě-se[fer] par[nāsā] wě-kalkālā wě-tizke lě-šānīm rabbōt tir'e bě-neḥāmat ṣīyōn, "... may you be inscribed in the book of life and in the book of livelihood and maintenance and be granted many years, may you behold the redemption of Zion". Of particular interest is IF V r., 2–3, written 12 of Tishri, i.e. two days after the Day of Atonement: ǧa'alaka llāhu min al-fāyizīna wa-min al-maqbūlīna wa-taqabbala minka ṣalāḥa d-du'āi wa-tikkātev bě-sefer ḥayyīm wě-tizke la-ḥāzōt bě-no'am wěgw', "...may God make you belong to the blest and the beloved, and may He from you accept the righteous prayer, *and may you be inscribed in the book of life and be granted to behold the beauty etc*". Min al-fāyizīna is of Qur'anic origin (e.g. Q 9:20, 59:20). The eulogy, which follows, is conventional, and after that follows the traditional Jewish blessing for the festive season including the High Holidays and the Feast of Tabernacles, concluded by a quotation from Ps 27:4. A fragment of the same prayer may be found in IF VI r., 1, viz. 'erev sukkōt tizke lě-, "*Eve of Tabernacles may you...*".[50]

In AṢ III r., 3, Avon b. Ṣedaqa blesses Passover ['ărūvā pesaḥ] yaǧ'ulhā llāhu 'alayhi 'aymana l-'a'yādi wa-'abrakahā, "[Eve of Passover], may God make it for you the most happy and the most blessed of the festivals", a blessing, which is repeated in AṢ II r., 3 for the Feast of Weeks. Here is also the place to mention that the editor understands the phrase in AṢ III r., 4 [ ] allāhu bi-t-tahniyati as part of greetings for the ensuing holiday. The blessing for Feast of Weeks is introduced by greetings for the festival: wa-'anā muhanni'an lahu bi-hāḏā l-'īdi l-muqbili 'ilaynā šāvū'ōt ǧa'alahu llāhu 'alayhi..., "and I congratulate you at this festival, which is to come to us, *the Feast of Weeks*, may God make it [the suffix referring to al-'īdi] for you..." In AṢ IV v.rtmrg, 3, he blesses the High Holidays in Tishri with bi-hāḏihi l-'a'yādi l-mubārakati, "at these blessed festivals".

The eulogy with ḥatama is found in the comparative sample for Ramaḍān and Ṣafar as well as for an anonymous 'īd, and ǧa'alahu llāhu barakatan "may God make it a blessing" is attested for Ramaḍān.[51] The use of such blessings for Ra-

---

[50] The Arabic eulogy is discussed in the comment on Diem, 1991, 6, 5–7. The inclusion of Ps 27:4 in blessings for holidays is treated in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 5, 350–351, 394 (with footnotes).
[51] Diem, 1991, 11, 17, 1995, 19r., 2, 55v., 1, 1996a, 35r., 18, 1996b, 43v., 2, 1997, 42r., 3–4 (in each case with comments).

maḏān naturally puts their use for Elul and Tishri in focus as Elul is the month of penitence among Jews and it is customary to fast in preparation for the High Holidays in Tishri.

2.4. Praising God

The language of praising God is Arabic.

The writers use current forms of the *ḥamdala*. Thus AṢ V v., 4 *li-llāhi l-ḥamdu llaḏi 'asfa'ahu*, "praise to God who cured him", Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ in IF VII r., 8–9 *li-llāhi l-ḥamdu 'alā salāmatihi*, "praise to God for its well-being", Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl in FI IV r., 2, VIII r., 2 *al-ḥamdu li-llāhi rabbi l-'ālamīna*, "praised be God, the Lord of the worlds!", FI VI v., 5 *naḥmadu llāha wa-naškuruhu*, "we praise God and thank Him" and FI VII v., 1 *bi-ḥamdi llāhi wa-tafaḍḍulihi*, "through God's grace and His favour".[52] Eulogising God, Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses the conventional *'azza wa-ğalla* while Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ and Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl both use the inverted form, *ğalla wa-'azza*, also found in the comparative sample. The two of them also write [*al-lāhu*] *ğallat qudratuhu*, "His might is great", and Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl once writes *allāhu ğalla ṯanāyuhu*, "God, His praise is high" and once *fa-ğayyidun allāhu ta'ālā*, "for God (He is exalted!) is excellent". These are wholly conventional.

A few times Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses the *tasbīḥ*, viz. in AṢ I r., 16 *fa-subḥīḥ huwa maṣṣīl* [Ps 35:10] "and Glory to Him who *delivers* [Ps 35:10]", in AṢ I r.rtmrg, 5–6 *fa-subḥāna man ya'malu ma'ī l-mu'ğizāta wa-l-barāhīna bĕ-kol 'ēt ū-vĕ-kol šā'ā bi-faḍlihi bi-'istiḥqāqin*, "and Glory to Him who works wonders and miracles with me *at every time and every moment* in His grace with due claim", adding a passage from the final benediction in the Eighteen Benedictions, and in AṢ V r., 36 *fa-subḥāna man 'asqaṭa nağmahā*, "and Glory to Him who made its star to sink". The *tasbīḥ* is of Qur'anic origin and there it is usually followed by *llāhi*. Already in the Qur'an, however, there are examples where substitutes for *llāhi* are used or even periphrases.[53] Avon b. Ṣedaqa here uses periphrases with the addition of the relative clauses: twice appending phrases in Hebrew, once a quotation from the Psalms, once from the liturgy.

In IF III r., 6, Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ thanks God for the escape from a danger with the conventional *bi-mā tafaḍḍala llāhu bihi ğalla wa-'azza*, "… that, by which God (He is high and strong) has showed His grace". Of particular interest is AṢ II r.rtmrg, 4–5, which in substance (though not formally) is a praise of God, *wĕ-lūlē raḥămē šāmayim la-kuntu halaktu*, "*and were it not for the mercy of Heaven* I had perished". This seems to be a reminiscence from a variant reading of Saadia Gaon's second *baqqāšā*, *lūlē raḥămēkā 'āz 'āvadtī*, as translated by the Gaon himself [*lawlā raḥmatuka*] *la-kuntu halaktu*.[54] Another praise of God is the long passage in AṢ I r., 9–11, *wa-'ālimu s-sarā'īri wa-l-ḥafiyāti melek malkē ham-mĕlākīm wa-*

[52] For the *ḥamdala*, see *EI2*, s.v. (D. B. Macdonald), and for its current forms in the comparative sample see Diem, 1995, 32r., 2–3, and cf. also Diem, 1993, 12, 5 (with comment).

[53] It is discussed in *EI2*, s.v. (D. Gimaret). See also Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, col. 1291, where examples without *llāhi* are quoted.

[54] For the words of Saadia Gaon, see the edition of Davidson *et al.*, 1970, 72.

'ilayhi ta'ālā š-šakwa wa-l-istiğātatu wa-huwa qādirun 'alā ḫalāṣi l-kulli wa-yu-barhinu l-ḥaqqa 'ayna huwa fa-lladī satara ṭūla hādihi l-muddati huwa yasturu mā baqiya mina l-'umri mina l-qawmi l-ẓālimīna, "The King, King of Kings knows the secrets and the hidden things, to Him (He is exalted!) the complaint and the cry for help is addressed, and He is able to redeem everything, and He demonstrates where the truth is, and whatever He has hidden during this period He will hide from the evildoers during that which is left of life".

Death was a moment of life when the liturgy provided Avon b. Ṣedaqa with the appropriate words, viz. bārūk dayyan hā-'emet šōfēṭ bĕ-ṣedeq wĕ-'emet, "blessed be the truthful judge, who judges righteously and truthfully", in AṢ V r., 6, adding the phrase še-gāzar gĕzērā zō, "who made this decree", in AṢ IV r., 4–5, while only the introductory word remains in AṢ I r., 4.[55] The usage here may be compared to the usage in the Lutheran church in Sweden, where the memorial prayer for the dead is called tacksägelse ("thanksgiving").

2.5. Blessing the dead

Blessings for the dead are (with one exception) found only in Hebrew script parts. The most common blessings used by the three of them are "X son of Y n[ūḥō] '[eden], "may he rest in Eden", and "X son of Y n[āḥ] n[afšēh] (in AṢ I address in Arabic script) , "may he rest in peace". In AṢ I r., 15, however, Avon b. Ṣedaqa blesses the Gaon Daniel b. 'Azariah, by z[eker] ṣ[addīq] l[ivrākā] yimṣā raḥămīm, "the record of the righteous is a blessing, may he find mercy".

The use of the Hebrew (and Aramaic) blessings is thus conventional. A few times, however, Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses Arabic blessings. In AṢ IV v., 26, he uses the conventional raḥimahu llāhu, "may God have mercy upon him", for a certain Ṣāliḥ b. Marduk. The corresponding epitheton ornans al-marḥūm/al-marḥūma, "the deceased one", is used in AṢ I r., 3 (for the son of the addressee), AṢ IV r., 11 (for the sister-in-law of the Gaon) and in AṢ IV r.rtmrg, 1 (for the Gaon Daniel b. 'Azariah). It is of interest here to mention that the memorial service for the dead in the synagogue was called tarḥīm in this period. In a Jewish context, it may be coined from a Hebrew (or Aramaic) word, but it was also current among Christians. Another blessing for the dead in his letters is qaddasa llāhu rūḥahu, "may God bless his spirit". This blessing is found in AṢ I r., 3 (for the son of the addressee) and in AṢ IV r.rtmrg, 1, 7, v., 14 (for the Gaon Daniel b. 'Azariah). The editor identifies it as an Islamic blessing, perhaps having in mind qaddasa llāhu sirrahu, "may God bless his name", used for Muslim saints. Elsewhere he mentions the possibility that Daniel b. 'Azariah was murdered as he was called qādōš, "holy", in a document from 1079 (he died in 1062). It is also known that the North African Jews of the period were committed to him. The blessing here may strengthen this suggestion. This would, however, also suggest that the other person for whom this blessing is used met a violent death. Perhaps this is hinted at by the violent outburst of grief follow-

[55] See Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 5, 325, for a discussion of this blessing.

ing the blessing, including a quotation of Ps 49:8 and concluded by the quotation of the *šahāda* in I r., 6.[56] Still this is a mere conjecture.

This is also the place to mention the use of the eulogy *'alayhi/'alayhim as-salāmu*, "peace upon him/them" in AŠ I r., 21, 22. As is well known, this is the customary blessing upon the prophets in Islam. Here, however, it is explicitly used for the post-biblical rabbis, for whom *zikrōnō/ zikrōnām livrākā*, "*of blessed memory*", are current. The usage here is, however, also found in Ibn Gabirol's *Iṣlāḥ al-'aḥlāq*, "The improvement of moral qualities", from 1048, and a hundred years after our writers Moses Maimonides uses it the same way as Avon b. Ṣedaqa.[57] Ibn Gabirol and Maimonides follow the Islamic usage when they eulogise prophets, but they also use it eulogising post-biblical rabbis. This means that the sense of this blessing was widened when it was appropriated to Jewish discourse.

2.6. Epitheta ornantia

There are a number of *epitheta ornantia* in the letters from Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Isma'īl b. Faraḥ. *Al-kitāb al-karīm*, "the honourable letter", which Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses a few times, is conventional and needs no comment. The same is true of AŠ V v.rtmrg, 3 *fī 'agalli mawlāya*, "concerning my most honoured lord". An *epitheton ornans* connected with *al-quds* is found in the oath in AŠ II r., 14 *wa-l-qudsi l-ǧalīli*, and this may be understood as "the glorious (or magnificent) *al-quds*". The *epitheton ornans* is conventional for persons, but it is also used for places.[58] AŠ I r., 1 *mina l-qudsi l-ma'mūri* calls for comments. *Ma'mūr* is found in the Qur'an 52:3, *wa-l-bayti l-ma'mūri*, traditionally interpreted as "by the inhabited House" and referring to the Ka'ba. It is also an *epitheton ornans* for public buildings. Al-Qalqašandī explains *'ad-dīwānu l-ma'mūru/'ad-dawāwīnu l-ma'mūratu* by *lā tazāla ma'mūratan bi-kuttābi 'aw bi-dawāmi 'izzi ṣāḥibihā wa-baqā'i dawlatihi*, "they shall continue to be peopled by secretaries or by the continued strength of their master and by the continued existence of his rule".[59] But what does Avon b. Ṣedaqa mean by *al-quds* here? *Al-quds* was originally used for the sanctuary. In the

---

[56] For *al-marḥūm*, see Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v. *Tarḥīm* as the name for the memorial service for the dead in the synagogue is discussed in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 2, 163. There the word is derived from Hebrew, but in the footnote it is said that medieval Jews were not the first to use it. For its use among Christians, see Graf, 1954, s.v. See also Dozy, (1881) 1991, s.v. The support for Daniel b. 'Azariah from the North African Jews and the suggestions about his violent death are discussed in Gil, 1992, 728, 738. For the blessing *qaddasa llāhu sirrahu*, see Schregle, G, 1981–, s.v. The same blessing is used for Ibn Gabirol in Ibn Gabirol, (1902) 1966 (Arabic text), 2.

[57] For Ibn Gabirol, see Ibn Gabirol, (1902) 1966 (Arabic text), 13, for Maimonides, see Almbladh, 2001, 7. It was also used by Jews of Tunisia of the early 20th century for the post-biblical rabbis, for which see Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 1, 61 (footnote 2). There it is also said that the corresponding Hebrew phrase, *'ālāw/'ālēhem haš-šālōm*, was in use for Biblical personalities. The Hebrew phrase is a calque of Medieval origin.

[58] The use of *karīm* and *'aǧall* in the comparative sample is easily traced through the glossaries in the editions by Diem, where the use of *ǧalīl* is discussed. See also Blachère, 1970–1976, s.v.

[59] al-Qalqašandī, 1915, 185, *The bounteous Koran*, 697. See also Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v *'amara* (for a discussion of Q 9:18 and the phrase *'amara llāhu bi-ka manzilaka*) and s.v. *ma'mūrun*. In his translations of Isaiah and of the Psalms, Saadia Gaon renders forms of Hebrew *yāšav* in the sense "inhabit" by forms of Arabic *'amara*.

early 10th century, Karaite Jews used it for the sanctuary and *bayt al-maqdis* (or *bayt al-muqaddas*) for the city. A Muslim source mentions that the local people used *al-quds* for the city by the 11th century, while *al-ḥaram* was used for the Temple area. It is, however, likely that this usage only applied to Muslims of the city.[60] It is obvious that Avon b. Ṣedaqa refers to the city in II r., 8, IV v., 32, V v., 9, VII r., 31, v., 12, 30 by *al-quds*, and perhaps he prays for the rebuilding of the city in IV r., 3 [*wa-'ašhadanā wa-'iyyāhu*] *bunyāna qudsihi*, "[and may He make us and you witness] the building of His Jerusalem".[61] The usage of '*al-ma'mūru* as an *epitheton ornans* for the Ka'ba and for buildings, however, suggests that he is referring to the sanctuary here.

A mixed Arabic-Hebrew *epitheton ornans* is accorded an unknown religious notable in AṢ V r., 5–6 [*min wafāti*] *s-sayyidi l-fāḍili 'āṭeret rōšēnū*, "[after the demise] of the noble lord, *the crown of our heads*". The Hebrew *epitheton* is rooted in Jewish tradition, but in IV r., 6 the deceased lady is accorded with the Arabic *kānat tāǧa d-dārihā wa-faḥrahā*, "she was the crown of her house and its praise".

Mubārak, "blessed", is a frequent *epitheton ornans* in the comparative sample.[62] Peculiar is its use in commercial contexts in IF I r., 4 *wa-kāna bay' mubārak*, "*it was a blessed sale*".

2.7. Oaths

The writers use conventional oaths, while at times that by which they swear is specifically Jewish.

Avon b. Ṣedaqa at times uses conventional oaths like *wa-llāhi, bi-llāhi, fa-llāhu*, "by God" and *la-'amrī*, "by my life". In AṢ IV v., 18, AṢ VII r., 16–17, 34, he writes *wa-ḥayāti mawlāya*, "by your life, sir", which is peculiar but found as well in the comparative sample.[63] He is fond of oaths with *wa-ḥaqqi*, as the frequent *wa-ḥaqqi l-qudsi*, (AṢ V r., 10 *wa-wa-ḥaqqi hāḏā l-qudsi*) and AṢ III r., 7 *wa-ḥaqqi mā na'taqiduhu*, "by that in which I believe". In AṢ V r.mrga, 2 he uses the related *fa-bi-ḥaqqi l-'aḥăvā*, "by the *love*". Perhaps *al-'aḥăvā* here is used in the sense of *aṣ-ṣuḥba*. This was used not only for "friendship" but also as a technical term for commercial partnership, and *al-'aḥăvā* was the Hebrew equivalent in both senses.[64] *Wa-ḥaqqi* is a conventional oath, but of interest is that he here and in the oath AṢ II r., 14 *wa-l-qudsi l-ǧalīli* swears by the sanctuary. Examples of swearing by a sanctuary are lacking in the comparative sample. The oaths sworn by the sanctuary, however,

---

[60] The use of the name *al-Quds* in the period of the letters is discussed in *EI2*, s.v (S.D. Goitein).

[61] A similar phrase in another letter is discussed in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 5, 392 (with footnote). There, however, the word rendered here as Arabic *bunyān* is understood as Hebrew.

[62] Its use in the comparative sample is discussed in the comment on Diem, 1995, 55v., 1. There it appears that it was above all used for months, years and festivals.

[63] For this oath in the comparative sample, see Diem, 1995, 45r., 16 (with comment).

[64] For *wa-ḥaqqi* in the comparative sample, see Diem, 1995, 3r., 5 (with comment), and for *bi-ḥaqqi*, see Diem, 1991, 9, 15, 33r., 10. I have interpreted *na'taqiduhu* as the North African form of 1st person in the imperfect as a perusal of Avon's letters suggests this was his current use. To this may be added that the same oath appears with the "correct" verbal form, '*a'taqiduhu*, in a letter from another merchant in Gil, 1997. no. 404, v. 2. A discussion of the terms for "friendship" and "commercial partnership" is found in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 5, 277, 279.

should of course be compared with the quotation from the Qur'an referred to above.[65]

Isma'īl b. Faraḥ has a much more restricted use of oaths. Thus in IF I v., 1 he writes *bi-llāhi l-'aẓīmi*, "by the God, the Mighty", and this is attested in the comparative sample as well.[66] In IF I v., 6, he writes *wa-ḥaqqi 'abī yim[ṣā] raḥ[āmīm]*. Swearing by one's father is conventional, but the oath is judaised by the addition of the Hebrew eulogy. Elsewhere the conventional *wa-bi-llāhi and fa-llāhu* are found.

Faraḥ b. Isma'īl is even more restrictive. The only oaths in his letters are the conventional *wa-llāhi*, *bi-llāhi*, *fa-llāhu* and *allāha llāha*.

2.8. Proverbs

At times the writers spice their letters with proverbs and other current sayings. Thus Isma'īl b. Faraḥ writes in IF V r., 8–9 *wa-man laysa lahu mālun mā lahu rawḥun*, "he who lacks money lacks joy" and in VII r., 6–7 *lākinna l-mušfiqa yūla'u bi-sū ẓ-ẓanni*, "…but the tender [boy] is addicted to evil opinion".[67] In AṢ V r., 8–9, Avon b. Ṣedaqa laments *wa-našrabū hāḏihi l-'akwāsa l-murrata*, "… and we drink these bitter cups".[68] The expression *barran wa-baḥran*, "by land and by sea", is, of course, wholly conventional, but it is nevertheless of interest to note its use. AṢ I r., 35–36, *wa-yu'āqib allāhu kulla ẓālimin fī l-barri wa-l-baḥri*, and AṢ VII v., 19–20, *fa-'aksāhu llāhu dar'a fi'lihi fī l-barri wa-baḥri* have already been quoted above. To them should be added AṢ II r., 15 *wa-'ayḍan mā lī ṭāqatun miṯlu ġayrī lā fī safarin lā fī barrin wa-lā fī baḥrin*, "… and furthermore I have no possibility like somebody else to travel, neither by land nor by sea". Also Isma'īl b. Faraḥ uses it in XII r., 11–12 *wa-yaduka muṭlaqatun fī 'infāḏi hāḏihi d-dn' šā barr 'aw baḥr*, "… and you are free to send these dinars either by land or by sea".[69]

3. Expressions for religious concepts and customs

The writers now and then mention concepts and customs peculiar to Judaism, Jewish cult and Jewish scholarship, just as they mention persons holding office in the Genizah society. These mostly appear in the letters from Avon b. Ṣedaqa. This is what might be expected as he obviously was close to several Jewish notables, taking an active part in community life in Jerusalem.

3.1. Appellations for God

The writers make a profuse use of *allāhu*, the appellation for the one God. Here it is of interest to observe that in his translation of the Bible, Saadia Gaon at least sometimes renders the Tetragrammaton by *allāhu*, and obviously *allāhu* was understood in this way in a Jewish context. This is evident from the Medieval Hebrew transla-

---

[65] See, however, for the modern period Piamenta, 1979, 126, where examples of oaths by the Ka'ba (cited from Jerusalem) are quoted.
[66] Diem, 1995, 28, 7, 45r., 16 (in both cases with comments and references).
[67] Cf. Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v. *šafīq*.
[68] For this, see Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v. *ka's*.
[69] For *šā*, see the discussion in Blau, 1980, 259 (footnote 55), 344.

tion of Maimonides' introduction to his commentary on *Pereq ḥeleq*. There *allāhu* more often than not is rendered by the current substitute for the Tetragrammaton, *haš-šēm yitbārak*, "the Name, He is blessed".[70] At times the merchants use *allāhu ta'ālā*, "God, He is exalted", or only *ta'ālā*. There are a few other appellations for God, viz. in AṢ I r., 6, AṢ IV r., 29 *al-bārī*, in FI VI r., 15 *al-ḫāliqu*, and in IF I v., 3, and VI r., 3, *allāhu l-'ālimu*, "God is the one who knows", all of them current in the comparative material.

Only Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses Hebrew appellations for God. It is noteworthy that except for AṢ I r., 9, all of them appear in quotations from scriptures or in fixed phrases. There we encounter the well-known Jewish reticence about mentioning the name of God. In AṢ I r.rtmrg, 4, he refers to God by *y'y*, the common abbreviation of the Tetragrammaton, in AṢ I r.mrga, 11 and VII v., 5 by *hqbh*, "the Holy One, blessed be He", in AṢ II r.rtmrg, 5 by *šāmayim*, "Heaven", and in AṢ I r., 9 by *melek malkē ham-mělākīm*. All of them are classical Jewish appellations for God. Of interest is AṢ I r., 5. Judging from the printed text, he manipulated the *Hebrew* word for God, *'elōhīm*, in a quotation from Ps 49:8, spelling it [*l*]'*ym* instead of [*l*]'*lhym*. It is obvious that two equally conventional systems were operating for him. Writing Hebrew, he avoided the profanation of God by the conventional devices, while the "Arabic" system allowed him a profuse use of the word for "God". This may be compared with a number of letters whose linguistic character has been studied by Joshua Blau and Simon Hopkins. A number of business-letters from the 9th and 10th centuries show early examples of how the Hebrew system influenced the Arabic system as the writers manipulated *allāhu* to avoid the profanation of God. At the same time the letters are steeped in the same formal structure as the letters studied here.[71]

3.2. Concepts peculiar to Judaism

3.2.1. The Jewish community and its notables, scholarship

In AṢ IV r., 8, 13, Avon b. Ṣedaqa calls the (Jewish) community in Jerusalem *al-ğamā'a*. For "synagogue" he uses *al-kanisīya* in AṢ IV v., 21 and V r., 26, 30–31— otherwise *kanīsa* seems to have been in use in the Genizah society for "synagogue". In Andalusian-Arabic literature *kanisīya* is found for "church", just as it was in use among the mozarabs in Toledo in Christian Spain and in Norman Sicily. It is also found in modern Moroccan Arabic as *knisiya* (in the plural *knisiyat*).[72] The ritual bath for women is called *al-ḥammāmu* in AṢ V r., 30. In AṢ V r., 30, he also mentions the Jewish quarter in Jerusalem, calling it *ḥārat al-yahūdi*, and in IF II v., 6, Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ mentions that a certain person lives *fī l-ḥārati*, "in the [Jewish]

[70] For this, see Almbladh, 2002, 7f.

[71] = Blau, 1988, 198–209 (letters ii, iii, xi, xii).

[72] Dozy, (1881) 1991, s.v., Corriente, 1997 s.v. and Ferrando Frutos, 1995, 183–184 (with a discussion of the etymology, as well as its place in Moroccan Arabic), Metcalfe, 2003, 203. The same word is used for the synagogue in Ramla in another letter from the Genizah, viz. Gil. 1983, no. 507, r. 8. For *kanīsa* for "synagogue" in the Genizah society, the index in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 6 may be consulted—it is also found among Christians for "church" (for which, see Graf, 1954, s.v). For words for "synagogue" among North African Jews of the 20th century, see Brunot & Malka, 1940, 75 and Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 1, 171.

quarter [of Alexandria]". For yeshiva Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses the arabised form of Aramaic *mětīvā*, *al-matība*, and this was current among the Jews of the period. The word appears in AṢ IV r., 7, 18–19 in the construction *ra's al-matība*, "head of the academy", the official title of the Gaon, the spiritual leader of Palestinian Jewry.[73] Speaking of the Gaon, Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses the title *ar-rayyis* for Elijah Gaon, and this was the title currently in use among the Jews. In III r., 11 he also accords Joseph ha-Kohen, *'āv bēt dīn* or president of the rabbinical court and thus number two in the hierarchy, the title *ar-rayyis*. In AṢ IV r., 22, *ğawāb*, "answer" is the current word for "legal opinion", here from Elijah Gaon.

For titles of Jewish religious notables they otherwise normally use Hebrew loans, usually prefixed by the Arabic definite article, viz. AṢ IV r., *7 an-nāśī*, the official title of the exilarch, AṢ IV r.rtmrg, 11 etc. *al-ḥāvēr*, "the *member of the academy*", AṢ IV v., 1 *al-parnās*, "the *welfare office*r", AṢ IV v., 22 *ar-rāv*, "the *master*", IF IX r., 12 *ad-dayyān*, "the *(rabbinical) judge*" and FI VI r.mrga, 11 *al-ḥazzān*, "the *synagogue cantor*". *Al-kōhēn* is very frequent in the letters of father and son, and it obviously refers to the merchant Joseph b. 'Alī Kohen Fāsī, and here it may be seen as a proper name. Likewise *at-talmīd*, "the *scholar*", is part of the name of the merchant Abraham the son the Scholar, mentioned by Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Isma'īl b. Faraḥ. Here it is of interest to observe that in spoken Judeo-Arabic of the 20th century, Hebrew loan-words normally take the Arabic definite article, including its appropriate form before Hebrew loans beginning with "sun letters". Judging from the spelling in other letters from North African Jews, this was also the case in this period.[74] The two of them also give several notables of the community the title *rāv* (usually only abbreviated *r'*). Among them should be mentioned the principal addressee of the letters studied here, Nehorai b. Nissim, to whom Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Isma'īl b. Faraḥ frequently accord this title.[75] As already mentioned, the merchants held Judah ha-Kohen b. Joseph b. Eleazar in high esteem, as also Avon b. Ṣedaqa. He never mentions him by name, only referring to him by *rabbēnū yěḥī lā-'ad*, *rabbēnū*, *ar-rāv*, *ar-rāv yěḥī lā-'ad*, *'ădōnī wě-yaqqīrī wě-'allūfī yigdal lě-'ădē 'ad*, *'ădōnēnū wě-rabbēnū hā-rāv yěḥī lā-'ad*. These are all ways to refer to him, current among the Jewish merchants of the period. Of interest is to compare how Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Isma'īl b. Faraḥ refer to the post-biblical rabbis. Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses the Hebrew-Arabic compound *rabbōtēnū 'ls*, "*our rabbis*, peace upon them", in AṢ I r., 21, while Isma'īl b. Faraḥ writes in IF I v., 8 *ba'ḍu l-ṣāliḥīna*, "one of the pious [= the rabbis]". As Avon b. Ṣedaqa was a learned merchant and engaged in the study of scriptures, he mentions books, which he studied. Here he uses their Hebrew (and Aramaic) titles in AṢ IV r., 33, 35, r.rtmrg, 5. In AṢ V r.rtmrg, 13–15 he mentions that he had penned questions, *masā'ilu*, on a number of Biblical sections, and these he mentions by their Hebrew *incipits*.

---

[73] This is discussed in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 2, 5–22. The treatment of the word is discussed in Blau, 1999, 160, 165.

[74] This phenomenon is discussed in Bar-Asher, 1992, 75–76. For its spelling among North African Jews in the 11th century, see e.g. Gil, 1997, no. 512, v., 11 (the writer is a brother of Isma'īl b. Faraḥ).

[75] The scholarly position of Nehorai b. Nissim is discussed in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 2, 214, 217, 325–326, 332, 338.

The writers normally use Arabic for self-identifications in *al-yahūdī* for "Jew(ish)". In IF VIII r., 6–7, Isma'īl b. Farah, however, writes *wa-'a'limtuka bi-wuṣūli markabi muğāhidi min dāniyata wa-laysa fīhi 'ivrī*, "I inform you that the ship of Mujahid has arrived from Denia [in al-Andalus], and onboard there was no *Hebrew*". Elsewhere he uses *al-yahūdī*, so it is difficult to grasp the precise sense of '*ivrī* here. In IF V r., 15 he writes *al-ma'ărāvīm*, "the North Africans", as opposed to *siqillīn*, "men from Sicily", but perhaps specifically meaning North African Jews. Anyway this is singular, as the other two writers use the common Arabic word for North African Jews, *al-mağāriba*. As already quoted, Avon b. Ṣedaqa finally uses Arabic for "Hebrew" in *bi-l-'ibrānī* in AṢ I r., 16.

3.2.2. Festivals, religious customs, religious concepts

Hebrew loan-words are, as a rule, used for the names of Jewish festivals, religious customs and religious concepts, although there are exceptions. For the eves of the festivals, the Hebrew *'erev* (but *'ărūvā* [*pesaḥ*], "*Eve of Passover*" in AṢ III r., 3), is used when dating a letter. In AṢ IV r., 6, however, Avon b. Ṣedaqa writes *laylat simḥat tōrā*, "eve of the *Rejoicing of the Law*". This may be compared to the usage in the speech of Tunisian Jews of the 20th century where *līlət* [*əššəbbät*] is recorded for "Friday".[76] Peculiar is [*miṯla*] *sabti tiš'ā bĕ-'āv* in AṢ V r., 6–7 *wa-kāna hāḏa s-sabtu 'indī wa-'inda 'ahlī miṯla sabti tiš'ā bĕ-'āv*. Elsewhere Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Isma'īl b. Farah now and then mention *yawn as-sabt*, "Saturday, Sabbath", and this is an early Hebrew calque in Arabic. Intended here, however, may be that the news of the unexpected death mentioned just before arrived on the Sabbath before the fast on 9 Av, viz. "and this Sabbath was for me and my family like the Sabbath before *the ninth of Av*".[77] For "festival/s", Avon b. Ṣedaqa twice uses a Hebrew loan as in AṢ II v.mrga, 7 *bi-hāḏa l-mō'ēd al-muqbili*, referring to the Feast of Weeks (but in AṢ II r., 3 the Arabic *al-'īd* for the same festival) and in AṢ V r., 1 *al-mō'ădīm*, referring to the High Holidays. Elsewhere he, like the other writers, uses the Arabic word *al-'īd* irrespective of festival, just as all of them express "to celebrate a festival" with the Arabic *'ayyada*, Friday is also a day of the week which has a religious significance in Judaism. Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Isma'īl b. Farah write here *yawn al-ğum'a*. For "prayer" Avon b. Ṣedaqa uses the Arabic *ṣalāt*, as in AṢ V v., 8 *ṣalāt minḥā* to define it as the "*afternoon* prayer", in AṢ VII v, 27 *ṣalātī*, "my prayer", and in AṢ VII r., 9 *ma'ărīv* may be understood as "*evening prayer*". Here may also belong *al-bĕrākā* in AṢ I r., 4 [ ] *laka l-bĕrākā fī man baqā laka*. In the printed text there are horizontal strokes above the word, indicating that it should be understood as Hebrew. Of interest here is that Tunisian Jews of the 20th century used the Hebrew loan for benediction in the ritual (*bénédiction rituelle*), while the corresponding Arabic word was used elsewhere. This suggests a similar use here, referring to the blessing for the dead, which follows.[78]

---

[76] For this, see Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 2, 235.
[77] For a similar expression for this Sabbath, see Gil, 1983, no. 446, r. 5, where *as-sabt 'ēkā* is used for this Sabbath.
[78] Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 1, 23 (footnote 3).

Here is also the place to mention that the months are given according to the Jewish calendar in Hebrew script parts of the letters. AṢ III, IF III and IF VI are, furthermore, dated according to Jewish festivals. The spelling *'ylwl* for "*Elul*" in IF II r., 2, v., 8 is ostensibly an argument that it should be pronounced *'aylūl*, i.e. the Christian month of that name. An analysis of the (according to the printed texts) aberrant spelling reveals, however, that it is a *scriptio plena* of the vowel as in *syfr* in IF III r., 1, IF V r., 3 for *sefer*, "*book*". More difficult is to determine its pronunciation, but it is not out of place to mention that *ṣērē, segol* and *ḥāṭef segol* were realised as *i* in the speech of North African Jews of modern times.[79] The spelling here underscores nevertheless that it is Hebrew and thus to be understood as the Jewish month. For Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl, the choice of script was decisive, as he uses Arabic months in Arabic script parts. Elsewhere the use of the Arabic months is only found in reported speech, as in FI IV v., 6, where Ramaḍān is found, Shawwāl in FI VIII r., 15, and in AṢ V r., 29, where the writer mentions the renting of a lodging *ilā l-muḥarrami*, "until al-Muḥarram". Here he evidently reports a deal with the Muslim proprietor of the lodging, who naturally uses the Arabic months. Interesting is IF IV r., 13–14. Discussing the dispatch of some letters, he mentions two copies, which obviously were sent *li 10 baqīna min rabīʿi l-ʾawwali*, "on the 21st of Rabīʿ I". The context is not quite clear, but it may be understood as meaning that the sender of these copies was a Muslim. It is also worth observing that Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ in IF VII r., 11 and in IF VIII v., 3 relates a terrible storm, which occurred in September 1056. In both letters it is said to have occurred *baʿda ṣ-ṣalībi*, "after [the Christian feast of the finding of] the Cross" in September.

In AṢ IV v., 17–18, [*wa-ʾaḥlafa llāhu ʿalā ṣ-ṣabīyati ḥalf ḥasan*] *mina d-dīni wa-l-māli wa-t-tōrā*, *at-tōrā* calls for no comment. Whatever the origin of *ad-dīn*, Goitein has suggested that its Hebrew equivalent in this period was *yirʾat šāmayim*, "*fear of Heaven*". He has also suggested that in the Genizah society it expressed the virtues inside religion just as *murūwa* expressed the virtues outside religion.[80] In AṢ I r., 20, [*min*] *hāḏihi d-dāri*, "[from] this abode", is used to express this world as opposed to the world to come.[81] In AṢ IV v., 13 the writer criticises a notable in the community, saying *'an yalfiẓa bi-mā lā yaǧibu yaḏkuru fī l-kitābi min ʾāfāti l-kutubi miṯli tēḥīyat ham-metīm wa-ʾumūri l-nuǧūmi wa-ġayri ḏālika*, "…he talks about that which one should not mention in writing because of the pitfalls of letters like *the resurrection of the dead*, matters of the stars etc".

In AṢ VII r., 5, Avon b. Ṣedaqa mentions pilgrims, *fī l-ḥaǧīǧi*, "among the pilgrims". It is here of interest to observe that the Hebrew *ḥōgēg*, "*one who celebrates a festival*", was also used for "pilgrim" during the period discussed here, no doubt influenced by its Arabic cognate.[82] In AṢ VII v., 27 he writes *wa-ʿalayya qamīṣu*

---

[79] For the pronunciation of the vowels among Algerian Jews in modern times, see Bar-Asher, 1992, 53 (*sifr* and *ilul*).

[80] Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 5, 191–192, 333–334. I have followed his interpretation of the passage in vol. 3, 261. The editor understands the syntax of the passage differently, interpreting *wa-t-tōrā* as an oath, "by the *Torah*".

[81] For such a use of *dār*, see Lane, (1863–1893) 1984, s.v.

[82] Gil, 1992, 622.

quṭnin wa-'ukaṭṭiru ṣalātī, "…I was dressed in a gown of cotton, and I multiplied my prayer". The editor suggests here that by *qamīṣu quṭnin* the small fringed prayer shawl, the *ṭallīt qāṭān*, is intended, although he may have understood the word rendered here *quṭnin* as Hebrew *qāṭān*.

3.2.3. Names of places mentioned in the Bible

In the period discussed here, Palestine was part of the geo-political entity called al-Shām, comprising modern Syria, Lebanon, Israel and Palestine. Writing in Arabic, the Jews used this name for whatever part they intended. There was thus obviously no need to single out Palestine, the ancestral homeland, as a separate entity by giving it a separate name, be it in Hebrew or in Arabic. In this respect the merchants discussed here conformed to the praxis of the period, using al-Shām for the whole area including Palestine.

Avon b. Ṣedaqa lived in Jerusalem, and he had contacts in the country. With two exceptions, he uses the current Arabic names of the places in Palestine. This is also true of names of places found in the Bible. Thus he always calls Jerusalem al-Quds except in AṢ I r., 31, where it is called *bayt al-maqdis* (or *bayt al-muqaddas*). Another place known from the Bible is Ṣoʿar, called *zuġar* in AṢ VII r., 11, 14, 22, 28. The first exception to this usage of the Arabic names of the period is, in AṢ IV r., 9, [*min bābi*] *ṣīyōn*, "from the *Zion* gate" (in Jerusalem). This gate was in this period obviously identical with the Nea Gate. The other exception is found in AṢ V r., 15, VII r., 28 *qivrē āvōt*, "*the graves of the patriarchs*". This expression for Hebron was current among the Jews of the period (or perhaps rather for the compound around the Macpelah), and here he conformed to the usage of the period.[83]

3.3. *Islamic usage*

The writers also use expressions connected with Islamic usage. At times they, no doubt, were unaware of this, but in other cases they must have been acquainted with the provenance.

The eulogy *ʿalayhi/ʿalayhim as-salāmu* has already been treated. A quite common expression for Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ and Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl is '*istaḥartu llāha*, "I have entreated God to choose the best". '*Istiḥāra*, asking for Divine guidance by divination, was common in the society of the period, but at times it seems to be used almost routinely meaning more or less "I deliberated". This holds true both of the writers discussed here and those in the comparative sample.[84]

In AṢ I r., 6, Avon b. Ṣedaqa concludes his condolences to the addressee with a modified form of the *šahāda*, *lā 'ilāha siwāhu*. This is not unique in a Jewish context. The current form is found in certain manuscripts of Saadia Gaon's translation

---

[83] For the Zion gate, the map in Prawer & Ben-Shammai, 1996 may be consulted as well as the discussion of D. Bahat in this book. The name for Hebron among the Jews of the period is discussed in Gil, 1992, 206–208 and in *EJ2*, s.v. *Hebron*.

[84] For '*istiḥāra*, see *EI2*, s.v. and Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 1, 346–347, vol. 5, 331–332 as well as Diem, 1995, 37r., 2 with comment. See also Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 1, 112–118 for its presence among Tunisian Jews of the early 20th century.

of Ps 18:32. There are other examples in scholarly literature from Yemen. The Yemeni-Jewish author Nethan'el b. al-Fayyūmi in the 12th century thus discusses it in his *Bustān al-'uqūl*, "The garden of the intellects", and in the 15th century, the Yemeni Jew Ḥōṭer ben Shelōmō uses it in his commentary on the thirteen principles by Maimonides. It is also found in the Arabic translation of the Psalms, made in the 10th century by the Andalusian Christian Ḥafs al-Qūṭī. This familiarity with the *šahāda* is, of course, not surprising from what we know of the social context of the period. What is noteworthy is its use in Jewish (and Christian) contexts.[85]

Here is also the place to mention that Farah b. Isma'īl opens his Arabic script letter with the Islamic *basmala*. While it may be argued that he follows the conventions of Jews of the period by restricting its use to writing in Arabic script, there is no doubt that he was familiar with its place in Islamic discourse. He closes this letter with the *ḥasbala*, here in the form *wa-ḥasbī ṯiqatī bi-llāhi*, "sufficient for me is my trust in God". This is originally a quotation from the Qur'an 3:167 but belonged to the formal elements in Arabic epistolary style, and North African Jewish merchants also used it.[86] The *tasbīḥ* belongs also to Islam. The *ḥamdala* as used by Farah b. Isma'īl in the introduction of letters IV and VIII belongs, no doubt, to the conventional epistolary style. Its use elsewhere, as well as the forms used by the writers, suggest, however, that it had been integrated into their language.

4. Quotations from scriptures and other Hebrew elements

It has been discussed above how the writers use Hebrew eulogies as well as Hebrew elements to express concepts peculiar to Judaism. Here is the place to discuss other Hebrew elements.

4.1. Quotations from Biblical and rabbinical scriptures

Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Isma'īl b. Farah quote at times Biblical and rabbinical scriptures. No such quotations are made by Farah b. Isma'īl.

A few times the quotations are introduced in a learned way by *qīla*, "it is said", or the like. Avon b. Ṣedaqa makes very elaborate introductions to some of his quotations. Thus in AṢ I r., 19–21 *'ar'anī llāhu fī badanihi ṣ-ṣāra'at wa-n-něgā'ōt wa-lā 'aḥraǧahu min hāḏihi d-dāri ḥattā yarā fī nafsihi ṣ-ṣāra'at wa-'anā wāṯiqun 'an-nahu yakūnu hāḏā 'in šā'a llāhu li'anna rabbōtēnū 'ls qālū*, "may God let me see on his body the *leprosy* and the *plague-spots*, and may He not let him leave this abode until he sees upon himself the *leprosy*, and I am confident that so it be (God willing!) for *our rabbis* (peace upon them!) said", after which he quotes b Shab. 97a. In AṢ I r., 22 here writes *wa-qāla r' yōsē ' 'ls*, "...and r' Yose (peace upon him!) said", followed by a quotation from b Shab 118b. An allusion to a Biblical

---

[85] Saadia Gaon, 1966, 80 (with footnotes), Ibn al-Fayyūmī, 1908, 5, 7, 29 (English translation), 3–4, 17–18 (Arabic text), Ḥōṭer ben Shelōmō, 1974, 64–65 (English translation), 219 (Arabic text). For Ḥafs al-Qūṭī, see Urvoy, 1994. For its presence among Tunisian Jews of the early 20th century, see Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 1, 132.

[86] For the suggestion that North African Jews used the formula, see Goitein, 1973, 235.

situation may be made here. The rabbinical statement, which he quotes to confirm his introductory curse refers to the Biblical story of Miriam, sister of Moses (Nu 12: 10–15). The Hebrew words in the curse may then be an allusion to this story as well. It has been cited above how he concludes a long lamentation with a quotation of Is 57:1 introduced by *wa-ṯabata fīnā* in AṢ I r., 28. In AṢ I r.rtmrg, 3–4 he writes *wa-lākinnī qaraytu fī waqti hāḏā*, "…but I read in that moment", quoting 2 S 24:14 and in AṢ IV r., 15 *qulnā naḥnu ḥoq wĕ-lō*, "we said *a decree not*", quoting Ps 148:6. Very intricate is AṢ V r., 10–13: *wa-wa-ḥaqqi hāḏā l-qudsi laqad mirār kaṯīratan natamannā l-mawta wa-naštahīhi wa-ṣirtu mimman qīla fīhi hamḥakkīm* [Job 3:21] *mimmā 'uqāsīhi min humūmi hāḏihi d-dunyā wa-kaṯrati faǧ'ātihā wa-'aẓīmi maṣā'ibihā wa-muqāsāti 'ahlihā llāḏī nqaṭ'at minhumi l-'imāna wa-ṯabata fīhim 'āvĕdā* [Is 7:28]. "by this *al-quds*, many times I wish for death and long for it. I have become one of those, concerning whom it is said, '*who long for* [Job 3:21], because of that which I endure because of the cares of this world, the multitude of its sorrows, the might of its calamities, and the hardships from its people, from whom faith has been cut off, and it is confirmed concerning them, '*Perished* [Is 7:28]". The Arabic words, which precede the quotation, are here more or less a free rendering of what follows. As for Isma'īl b. Faraḥ, he writes in IF I v., 7–8, discussing some business matters: *wa-lā 'aqūlu yihyū* [Is 48:19] *'iḏ qāla ba'ḍu l-ṣāliḥīna īlān* [b Ta'n. 5b], "I do not say: *May your offspring* [Is. 48:19], for one of the pious say: *O tree, with what shall I bless Thee … May your offspring* [b Ta'n. 5b]".

More often, however, they integrate the quotations by other means. Avon b. Ṣedaqa's quotation of Ps 49:8 in AṢ I r., 5 has been cited above, as has the quotation of Ps 35:10 in the praise of God in AṢ I r., 16. In I r.rtmrg, 11–14 he writes *wa-qad kāna yaǧibu 'alayka…' an tĕdīnēnī*, "…and it is incumbent upon you … that *you judge me*", referring to Abot 1:6. In AṢ III r., 16, the quotation is connected with what follows: *wĕ-had-dāvar …wā-'ātā lā yaḥruǧhu mawlāya li-'ishāq*, "…*and the matter… and you*, do not, sir, divulge it to Isaac", quoting 1 S 20:23. In AṢ IV r., 20–21, a Biblical quotation is introduced as a confirmation of a number of calamities which had befallen some travellers: *'alā mā ḏakara min ǧamī'i l-'umūri… wa-faqri 'aṣḥābinā bā-'ăwōnōt yiddall kĕvōd*, "concerning that which you have mentioned about all the things … and the destitution of our people, *alas the glory is humbled*", quoting Is 17:4.[87] In AṢ IV v., 19, he writes *'iḏā sami'tu 'amr 'u'ādiluhu 'alayhi, wa-huwa 'ăšer* [Ps 58:6], "…when I heard a matter, upon which I hesitated, but you *who* [Ps 58:6]". Confident that the addressee understands what he means without giving him details, he continues in AṢ IV v., 20–21 by *'ašǵaltu qalbahu ḥarasahu llāhu ǵayra 'annahu mēvīn dāvār mittōk dāvār* [b Sanh. 93b] *wĕ-ḥākīmā bĕ-ramzā wĕ-ya'ăšē kĕ-ḥåkmātō*, "…I have troubled you (may God protect you!), although you *understand one thing from another* [b Sanh. 93b], *wise by a mere hint and acting according to your own wisdom*". The quotation of Ps 38:20 in AṢ V r., 18 has been cited above, and in AṢ VI v., 2 all that is left is a quotation of Hab 1:2. In what is reported speech the following is found in AṢ VII v., 5–6: *fa-qāla lahu*

---

[87] The translation of *bā-'ăwōnōt* here is discussed below.

wa-da'ā lahu hqbh yĕmallē' hesrōnĕkā, "…and he said to him, praying: *'May the Holy One, blessed be He, replace your deficiency'* ", quoting b Ber. 16b.

Turning to Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ, a quotation of b Meṣ. 83a in I r., 11 *dīnā dĕ-malkūt dīnā lā ḥīlata*, "*the law of* [the] *kingdom is law*, there is no escape", is embedded in the text, and the same holds true of his quotation of Abot 2:4 *baṭṭel rĕṣōnĕkā … rĕṣōnĕkā*, "*make naught your will …your will*", in I v., 5. The quotations of Prv 20:5 in VI r., 2 and of Ps 27:4 in V r., 2–3 have already been referred to above. There are traces of another quotation as well in VI r., 3, but that is all. The quotation of Ps 68: 6 in V r.rtmrg, 1–2 has been mentioned above. In IX r., 15, finally, he writes, also to his son, *'unḏur li-nafsika 'ēze hū ḥākām hārō'ē han-nōlād*, "*beware of who is wise he who sees the event*", quoting Abot 4:1 and 2:13. The very mixture of two phrases may suggest that he is quoting more or less from memory.

They may, however, just quote a fragment, confident that the reader knows the context. Avon b. Ṣedaqa's allusion to Zeph 1:15 in I r., 5–6 has been cited above. Later on in the same letter, in I r.rtmrg, 2–3, he writes *katabtu hāḏā l-kitāba bĕ-mar nefeš*, "*I have written this letter embittered*", which may be a reminiscence of Ez 27: 31 and in I r.rtmrg, 6 *bĕ-kol 'ēt ū-bĕ-kol šā'ā*, "*at every time and every moment*" referred to above. Zeph 1:15 is alluded to once more in AṢ IV r., 12 *wa-kānat ṣārōt ū-mĕṣūqōt*, "…and there were *distress and straits*". In VII r., 3–4, he writes *fa-qāsaytu wa-ḥaqqi l-qudsi mina l-mĕrōrot ma'ahum*, "… and I endured—by *al-quds*!— *troubles* together with them". The Hebrew loan may here be an allusion to the rabbinical interpretation of Dt 32:32.[88] In IF V v., 11, Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ describes the troubled situation in Alexandria in September 1056, writing *al-ḥubzu wa-širā'uhu bi-rībatin 'aḏīmatin ba-ḥărāvōt ū-vā-rĕmāḥōt ḏāhiratan*, "… and the bread and its commerce with it goes on with great anxiety, *with knives and lancets* openly", perhaps alluding to I R 18:28.

4.2. Other Hebrew elements

A number of times Avon b. Ṣedaqa and Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ use Hebrew loans and phrases, which can neither be identified as quotations, nor as belonging to the religious sphere. Although strictly speaking beyond the scope of the present investigation, they are included for the sake of completeness. For practical reason the two writers are treated separately. The only word of this kind occurring in the letters of Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl is included in the discussion of his father.

4.2.1. Avon b. Ṣedaqa

At times it is likely that the characters *'lf* should be understood as Hebrew and not as Arabic. In I, he relates that he has been accused of having stolen some money. In I r., 15–16 he thus writes […*yaqūluhā ṣ-ṣaġīru wa-l-kabīru*] **bi-l-'ibrānī** *hākāḏā 'lf zāhūv*. Here it is explicitly said that the words are said in Hebrew, and so it should be rendered, "[…Young and old say] this in **Hebrew**: *'A thousand gold coins'* " II r., 6, it is possible that *'lf* in *'lf šālōm* should be understood as Hebrew, at least if we

---

[88] Understanding *al-mĕrōrōt* as "troubles", see Ben-Yehuda, 1960 and Jastrow, 1975 s.vv.

are to judge from the conclusion of the same letter where he writes *'alfē šĕlōmōt*, "*thousands of greetings*". In I r.mrga, 11, he closes the letter with *hqbh yĕnaḥem lĕ-['ammō]*, "*may the Holy One (Blessed be He) comfort [His people]*", which may be a fixed formula. In III r., 6 he writes *min ḥiṭābi pĕlōnī*, "from what *NN* says" and in VII, v., 18, *li'annanī lĕ-'ōlām lā kallamtuhu wa-lā ḥāḍartuhu*, "... for I have *never* spoken to him, nor visited him". Twice he uses the phrase *bā-'ăwōnōt*, "*because of the iniquities*, viz. in III r., 7 *li'anna wa-ḥaqqi mā na'taqiduhu bā-'ăwōnōt mā taqa'u l-'aynu l-yawma 'alā 'aḥadin*, as well as introducing the quotation of Is 17:4 in IV r., 21. This phrase was used in the speech of North African Jews in modern times in the sense "alas". This justifies an understanding of *bā-'ăwōnōt* in this sense here as well, viz. "... for, by that in which I believe, *alas* it does not today appear good to anyone".[89] In II r.rtmrg, 4, he calls an adversary *al-bĕliya'al*, "the *rascal*". Blessing Tishri in IV r., 2, he writes ['a'āda llāhu 'alayhi hāḍihi l-'a'yāda] *šānīm rabbōt*, "... [may God add to you these festivals] *for many years*", but in the same blessing in V r., 2–3, Arabic *sinīna ṭā'ilatan* of the same meaning is found. In IV r., 3–4 he writes: *wa-mā 'aqwā 'aṣifu 'ăḥat mē-'elef min ṣārōt ğarat 'alaynā fi hāḍa l-'īdi wĕ-'ăḥar kol zōt tuwaffiyat sittāt zawğatu r' nātān*, "I cannot describe *even one of a thousand troubles*, which have happened to us during this festival, *and after all this* Sittāt, the wife of *R' Nathan*, passed away". Later on he writes in IV r., 12 *fa-'aṭaynā šoḥad*, "...and we gave *bribes*". In IV v., 12 *fa-ḥaṣala l-'āna bā-rabbīm mašhūr*, "...and now it took place *publicly*, in public", he glosses the Hebrew word with an Arabic word of the same meaning. In V r., 5, he writes *mina l-gēzērā l-kabīrati wa-l-faǧ'ati l-'aẓīmati*, once more glossing the Hebrew loan with an Arabic expression, a phenomenon recorded in the speech of North African Jews of the 20th century.[90] It is also noteworthy that *gēzērā* was used in the sense "*catastrophe*" by North African Jews in the 20th century, and hence it is justified to render the phrase here by "...because of the mighty *catastrophe* and the strong calamity".[91] V r., 37 *qad ṭaraḥa llāhu fīhā l-mē'ērā* has been quoted above. In V r., 28 we have *fa-lamma 'aǧibnā 'ilā s-sittati ṭalaba yaǧību 'ălīlōt min wuǧūhin 'āḥirin*, "... and when we had agreed to the six, he sought to bring *troubles* from other directions".[92] In V r.rtmrg, 7, he mentions two volumes *allatī fīhā 'uṣūlu d-diqdūq*. As the Hebrew word was used in the sense "grammar" since the 10th century, unqualified *ad-diqdūq* obviously has the sense "Hebrew grammar" for him, viz. "... where are found the principles of the [Hebrew] *grammar*".[93] For V r.mrga, 2 *fa-bi-ḥaqqi l-'ahāvā*, it has already been suggested that it is used in the sense of *'aṣ-ṣuḥba*. In V r., 38, he mentions some commodities, with which he has been doing business, *fī sabsatāna wa-ṣamaǧin lawzin wa-ǧāsūlin wa-qallālōt*, "... in plums and gum-arabic, almonds and soap and *jugs*".[94] There are also a few isolated words, which are not al-

[89] For this understanding *bā-'ăwōnōt*, see Bar-Asher, 1992, 92, Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 1, 157. See also Ben-Yehuda, 1960, s.v. *'āwōn*, where it is translated "leider, malheureusment, unfortunately".
[90] For this, see Tedghi, 1995, 61–62.
[91] For this, see Bar-Asher, 1992, 102, Cohen, 1964–1975, vol. 1, 163.
[92] Following the translation in Gottheil & Worrell, 1927, 121.
[93] For the word, see Ben-Yehuda, 1960, s.v.
[94] For *sabsatāna* [so vocalised?], see Dozy, (1881) 1991, s.v., and for *qallālōt*, see Ben-Yehuda, 1960, s.v. *qallāl*, following the interpretation in Gottheil & Worrell. Gil has understood the word as *qĕlālōt*, "curses".

together easy to understand. Thus in V r., 15 *wa-štarā qamḥ bi-šiqāqin kānat ma'ahu wa-'ānīyūt*, "...and he bought wheat for pieces [of cloth], which were with him and ?" The Hebrew word means "*poverty*", but it is difficult to understand in the present context. The editor suggests, however, that it may be understood as an exclamation, "poor devil", or the like. In VII r., 12–13 the context is difficult: a person has come from Tyre with a number of commodities, including *wa-ḥušūb wa-rūḥōt*, "... wood and ?". The words mean "and *spirits*", but the context is strange.

4.2.2. Isma'īl b. Faraḥ

Father and son were trading in cloth, and so they mention [*aš-*]*šēš*. Gil argues convincingly that with this word they (and other Jewish merchants of the period) intended fine linen cloth. The 11th century Andalusian-Jewish philologist Ibn Janāḥ thus explains the Hebrew word by *kattān*, "linen" in his dictionary.[95]

In I, Isma'īl b. Faraḥ inserts a few Hebrew phrases, viz. I v., 2 [*lā ma'aka wa-lā ma'a l-ġayri*] *wĕ-kol še-kēn bal 'urīdu 'a'la'mu 'ēš yabqā 'alayya*, "...[not with you nor with anybody else.] *Surely* I want on the contrary to know what more I owe... ". Here it may be argued that *wĕ-kol še-kēn* and *bal* more or less are synonyms. More difficult is I v., 9–10 as there is a lacuna before the Hebrew phrase [ ] *bĕ-kēn al-yawma min bni ḥallūfī*, "[ ] *Thus* today from Ibn Khallūf... ". Writing of upheavals in the Maghreb in II, he refers to the local ruler in II r., 14 by *al-melek*, but this word may also be understood as Arabic *al-malik*. In III r., 5, he says about some people *wa-'aktaruhum min 'ereṣ mĕqullālā*, "...and most of them are from *a cursed land*", according to the editor referring to Sicily. In autumn 1056, he wrote two letters where he described the difficult situation. Thus he writes in VII r., 28 *al-mayim ḥāser wa-l-ma'kūlu kulluhu mabyū'un al-ḥittīm 3 bi-zāhūv*, "the *water has sunk*, and all the food is sold, the *wheat* 3 [waybas] for *a gold coin*". The same situation is described in VIII r.rtmrg, 2 ... *ḥittīm 3 bi-dīnārin*, "... *wheat* 3 [waybas] for one dinar". The use of Hebrew for "wheat" describing hard times seems to be conventional as it occurs in other letters of the period.[96]

4.3. Calques

There are but a few Hebrew calques in the letters. It has already been pointed out that *yawn as-sabt* is an early calque. *Al-matība* in *ra's al-matībati* has also been discussed. Of interest is a possible Hebraism in FI III r., 4, r.rtmrg, 14–15 ...[*bni*] *raġuli l-mā'idati*, "the man of the table". This may be an otherwise unknown word for "money-changer" coined after Hebrew *šulḥānī*, "money-changer". Of interest is *'aḥrama*, in AṢ I r., 31–32 *fa-'aḥrama llāhu*. In Christian texts, it is found in the first, second and fourth forms in the meaning "anathémiser, excommunier", and this may be compared to Syriac *aḥrem*. In Jewish texts, it is used for "excommunicate",

---

[95] Ibn Janāḥ, 1875, s.v., Gil, 1992, 239–241.
[96] The use of Hebrew for "wheat" in times of drought is discussed in Goitein, 1967–1993, vol. 5, 71 (with footnotes). It is, however, also used in a letter from the 12th century (?), see Blau, 1988, 207 (line 24), where no such circumstances seem to be described. The water, which "has sunk", is here interpreted as referring to a low Nile.

i.e. influenced by the Hebrew *heḥĕrīm*, "to pronounce the *ḥerem*, [i.e. the rabbinical ban]". Here it is obviously used in the sense "to curse", i.e. in a sense, which is close to its use in Christian texts.[97] *Al-kanisīya* belongs, finally, also here.

5. Jewish religious self-expression as reflected in the letters of Avon b. Ṣedaqa, Ismaʿīl b. Faraḥ and Faraḥ b. Ismaʿīl

To express their piety, the merchants drew upon two sources. The main source was the stock of pious expressions which they shared with the society reflected in the comparative sample. Their precise origin is beyond the scope of the investigation. It is, however, tempting to connect them with the repertoire of non-ritual personal invocations for help, protection and support, the *duʿāʾ*, which evolved during the first centuries of Islam. These formulae are largely inspired by religion, with the name of Allah explicitly or implicitly included in them. Later on these formulae were collected in traditional manuals. Studies of everyday Arabic speech of today suggest that these formulae eventually were integrated into the spoken language, and several of the phrases discussed here are part of spoken Arabic of today.[98] The other source was Jewish scriptures and the liturgy, providing the appropriate words at life-cycle events like marriage, death and wishing the addressee a male offspring as well as at the great holidays. They also provided the appropriate words for the writers to underscore their words and their emotions, just as they obviously enabled Avon b. Ṣedaqa to demonstrate his learning. Of special interest is the quotation from Saadia Gaon's second *baqqāšā*, as this highlights the role of translations into Arabic of Jewish scriptures and liturgical compositions. The use of Hebrew loan words for concepts peculiar to Judaism is what might be expected among Jews. Here it is rather the use of Arabic that is remarkable. Remarkable are also expressions that are shared with Christian Arabic. As Hebrew may be regarded as the religious marker of Judaism, the addition of stereotyped Hebrew phrases like *wa-kol yiśrāʾēl, li-kol yiśrāʾēl* and *šālōm* to conventional Arabic phrases may be interpreted as a judaisation of these phrases. This is also achieved by the way the writers seamlessly add phrases from the scriptures and the liturgy to Arabic blessings. Peculiar are the cases where the merchants use Hebrew words and phrases, which can neither be identified as quotations, nor as belonging to the religious sphere. In a few cases these were part of the commercial language of the Jewish merchants. There are also cases where a quotation from the Bible is found in reported speech, as is another Hebrew phrase. Peculiar are, finally, also the cases where the writers use words and phrases that have been recorded in the speech of the North African Jews of the 20th century. This raises questions about the roots of the Hebrew component in the spoken varieties of the Arabic of the Jews.

---

[97] For the meaning of the word in Christian texts, see Dozy, (1881) 1991, Graf, 1954, Corriente, 1997 and Wehr, 1985, s.v., and for a discussion of the word in Jewish texts, see Blau, 1999, 161, 162. For Syriac, see Payne Smith, (1903) 1979 s.v.

[98] Piamenta, 1979, 1–2. See also *EI2*, s.v. *duʿāʾ*. The place of the phrases in Arabic speech of today may be traced in the indexes of Piamenta, 1979 and of Piamenta, 1983.

References

Alcalay, R., 1995. *The complete Hebrew-English dictionary*. Tel Aviv.

Almbladh, K., 2001. "Islamic terms in the Introduction to the commentary on *Pereq ḥeleq* by Moses Maimonides", in *Orientalia Suecana*, vol. l, 5–12.

—, 2004. "The letters of the Jewish merchant Abū l-Surur Faraḥ b. Ismāʿīl al-Qābisī in the context of medieval Arabic business correspondence", in *Orientalia Suecana*, vol. liii, 15–35.

ʿAodeh, Ṣ., 1998. "Eleventh century Arabic letters from the Cairo Geniza: The letter of Faraḥ Ibn Ismāʿīl, a mercantile representative, to Abu Sahl Minashi Ibn Dāūd Al-Ṣayrafī", in *Teʿuda*, vol. 14, xv–xvi, 125–138.

Bar-Asher, M., 1992. *La composante hebraïque du Judeo-Arabe algerien*. Jerusalem.

Ben-Yehuda, E., 1960. *A complete dictionary of ancient and modern Hebrew*. New York-London.

Björkman, W., 1928. *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Staatskanzlei in islamischen Ägypten*. Hamburg.

Blachère, R., 1970–1976. *Dictionnaire Arabe-Français-Anglais*, vol. 3. Paris.

Blau, J., 1980. *A grammar of medieval Judaeo-Arabic* (2nd ed.). Jerusalem.

—, 1988. *Studies in Middle Arabic and its Judaeo-Arabic variety*. Jerusalem.

—, 1999. *The emergence and linguistic background of Judaeo-Arabic* (3rd ed.). Jerusalem.

Brunot, L. & Malka, E., 1940. *Glossaire judéo-arabe de Fés*. Rabat.

Cohen, D., 1964–1975. *Le parler arabe de juifs de Tunis*, vol. 1–2 (quoted by volume and page). Paris-the Hague.

Coranus arabice (ed. Flügel). Leipzig 1881.

Corriente, F., 1997. *A dictionary of Andalusi Arabic*. Leiden-New York-Köln.

Dalman, G., 1905. *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch*. Leipzig.

Diem, W., 1991 (ed. and trans.). *Arabische Briefe auf Papyrus und Papier aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung*. Wiesbaden.

—, 1993 (ed. and trans.). *Arabische Briefe aus dem 7.–10. Jahrhundert*. Wien.

—, 1995 (ed. and trans.). *Arabische Geschäftsbriefe des 10. bis 14. Jahrhunderts aus der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien*. Wiesbaden.

—, 1996a (ed. and trans.). *Arabische amtliche Briefe des 10. bis 16. Jahrhunderts aus der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien*. Wiesbaden.

—, 1996b (ed. and trans.). *Arabische Privatbriefe des 9. bis 15. Jahrhunderts aus der Österreichischen Nationalbibliothek in Wien*. Wiesbaden.

—, 1997 (ed. and trans.). *Arabische Briefe des 7. bis 13. Jahrhunderts aus den Staatlichen Museen Berlin*. Wiesbaden.

Dozy, R., (1881) 1991. *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*, vol. 1–2. Reprint Beirut.

EI2 = *Encyclopaedia of Islam* (2nd ed.). 1961–. Leiden.

EJ2 = *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (2nd ed.). 1971. Jerusalem.

Ferrando Frutos, I., 1995. *El dialecto andalusí de la marca media*. Zaragoza.

Garbell, I., 1954. "The pronunciation of Hebrew in medieval Spain", in *Homenaje a Millás-Vallicrosa*, vol. 1. Madrid.

Gil, M., 1983 (ed. and trans.). *Palestine during the first Muslim period (634–1099)*, vol. 2–3. Tel Aviv.

—, 1992. *A History of Palestine, 634–1099*. Cambridge.

—, 1997 (ed. and trans.). *In the kingdom of Ishmael*, vol. 2–4. Tel Aviv.

—, 2004. *Jews in Islamic countries in the Middle Ages*. Leiden-Boston.

Goitein, S. D., 1967–1993. *A Mediterranean society*, vol. 1–6. Berkeley (quoted by volume and page).

—, 1973 (trans.). *Letters of Medieval Jewish traders*. Princeton.

Gottheil, R. & Worrell, W. H., 1927. *Fragments from the Cairo Genizah in the Freer collection*. New York.

Graf, G., 1954. *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini*. 2nd edition. Louvain.

Ḥōṭer ben Shelōmō, 1974. *The commentary of R. Ḥōṭer ben Shelōmō to the thirteen principles of Maimonides* (ed. and trans. D. R. Blumenthal). Leiden.

Hopkins, S., 1984. *Studies in the grammar of early Arabic*. Oxford.

Ibn al-Fayyūmī, 1908. *The Bustan al-ukul* (ed. and trans. D. Levine). New York.

Ibn Gabirol, (1902) 1966. *The improvement of the moral qualities* (ed. and trans. S. Wise). New York.

Ibn Janāḥ, 1875. *The book of Hebrew roots* (ed. A. Neubauer). Oxford.

Jastrow, M., 1975. *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic literature*. New York.

Kassis, H. & Kobbervig, K. I., 1987. *Las concordancias del Corán*. Madrid.

Lane, E.W. (1863–1893) 1984. *An Arabic–English Lexicon*, vol. 1–2. Reprint Cambridge.

Mandelkern, S., 1978. *Veteris Testamentii Concordantiae* ...cum M. Goshen-Gottsteinii et F. Margolinii additamentis (11th ed.) Tel Aviv.

Metcalfe, A., 2003. *Muslims and Christians in Norman Sicily*. London-New York.

Payne Smith, J. (ed.) (1903) 1979. *A compendious Syriac dictionary*. Oxford.

Piamenta, M., 1979. *Islam in everyday Arabic speech*. Leiden.

—, 1983. *The Muslim conception of God and human welfare*. Leiden.

Prawer, J. & Ben-Shammai, H., 1996. *The history of Jerusalem*. Jerusalem-New York.

al-Qalqašandī, 1915. *Ṣubḥ 'al-'a'šā*, vol. 6. Cairo.

Saadia Gaon, 1896. *Version arabe d'Isaïe* (ed. J. Derenbourg and H. Derenbourg). Paris.

—, 1966. *Tĕhillīm 'im targūm ū-fērūš Sa'adiah Gā'ōn* (ed. Y. Qāfiḥ). Jerusalem.

—, 1970. *Siddur R. Saadja Gaon* (ed. I. Davidson et al.). Jerusalem.

Sefer tōrā nĕvī'īm ū-kĕtūvīm (ed. Snaith). London 1958.

Segal, M., (1927) 1958. *A Grammar of Mishnaic Hebrew*. Oxford.

Schregle, G., 1981– (ed.). *Arabisch–deutsches Wörterbuch*. Stuttgart.

The bounteous Koran ... authorized by al-Azhar 1984. London.

The Responsa project 8.0 (Bar-Ilan University 1972–2000).

Tedghi, J., 1995. "Les interférences de l'hébreu dans les langues judéo-arabes d'Orient et d'Occident musulmans", in *Les interférences de l'hébreu dans les langues juives*. Paris.

Urvoy, M.-Th., 1994. "Influence islamique sur le vocabulaire d'un psautier arabe d'al-Andalus", in *Al-Qanṭarah*, vol. 15, 509–517.

Wehr, H., 1985. *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. 5th ed. Wiesbaden.

Wright, W., 1981. *A grammar of the Arabic language*. 3rd ed. Cambridge.

Tilim Chan, ein iran-türkischer *aşıq*

Christiane Bulut
Uppsala

1. Hintergrund: Folkloreforschung, Terminologie

Die Türken Irans verfügen über eine sehr lebendige, meist mündlich tradierte Volksliteratur; diese ist jedoch nur in den seltensten Fällen ausreichend dokumentiert und beschrieben. Das liegt unter anderem daran, dass die iranische Folkloreforschung bislang noch am Anfang steht. Im 19. Jahrhundert waren iranische Intellektuelle vor allem an den Errungenschaften der westlichen Zivilisation interessiert. Die eigene Kultur galt in jener Zeit als rückständig und einer eingehenden Betrachtung unwürdig. Erst vor etwa achtzig Jahren, in den Zwanzigerjahren des 20. Jahrhunderts, entdeckten Schriftsteller wie Ğamâlzâde, ʿAlî Akbar Dehxodâ und Şâdeq Hedâyat den Reiz der Volkssprache und brachten sie in ihre Werke ein. Dies führte zu einer intensiveren Beschäftigung mit den Quellen, mit volkstümlichen Erzählungen, Märchen, Sprichwörtern etc.

1938 hatte die Persische Akademie ihre Absicht bekundet, das Sammeln von regionalen Wörtern und Redensarten, Sprichwörtern, Erzählungen und Liedern zu fördern. Kleinere Aufsätze zu verschiedenen relevanten Themen erschienen in der Zeitschrift *Payâm-e now*, die später von Bozorg ʿAlawî herausgegeben wurde. 1945 veröffentlichte Şâdeq Hedâyat einen Artikel, in dem er Richtlinien für das Sammeln und die Dokumentation iranischer Volksliteratur aufstellte. Hedâyat gilt als der erste Iraner, der sich wissenschaftlich mit Folklorestudien auseinandersetzte. Es sollten jedoch 25 Jahre vergehen, bis seine theoretischen Überlegungen (1970) ein erstes Mal in einer Feldstudie umgesetzt wurden.

1958 wurde im Ministerium für Kunst und Kultur eine Abteilung für Volkskultur eingerichtet, die nach einigen Umstrukturierungen in den 70er Jahren als *Markaz-e mardom šenâsî-e Îrân* für eine Vielzahl von Projekten und Veröffentlichungen verantwortlich war. Nach der Islamischen Revolution kamen die Aktivitäten der Folkloreforscher weitgehend zum Erliegen, bis 1985 die Organisation für Kulturelles Erbe (*Sâzmân-e mirâs-e farhangî*) gegründet wurde, die dem Ministerium für Hochschulerziehung und Kultur untersteht. Sie gibt die Zeitschrift *mirâs-e farhangî* heraus. Richtungweisende Aktivitäten auf dem Gebiet persischer Folklore haben vor allem das Volksmärchen zum Gegenstand. Unter den Sammlungen von Märchen in persischer Sprache sind vor allem die *Afsânehâ-ye Âzarbayğân* des Schriftstellers Şamad Behrangî und Ulrich Marzolphs Untersuchungen zu Typen persischer Volksmärchen zu erwähnen[1].

---

[1] Eine ausführliche Darstellung der Entwicklungen innerhalb der iranischen Folkloreforschung gibt Marzolph (2001); zur volkstümlichen Dichtung siehe Kreyenbroek (2001).

Heute untersteht die iranische Folkloreforschung der 1985 gegründeten 'Organisation für Kulturelles Erbe' (*Sâzmân-e mirâs̱-e farhangî*). Deren Aktivitäten konzentrierten sich vor allem auf die sog. orale Literatur der iranisch-sprachigen Völker. Untersuchungen zu den Minderheiten-Kulturen Irans dagegen sind bislang nicht systematisch in Angriff genommen worden[2].

Schon die Iran-spezifische Definition des Begriffes *aşıq*, der uns im Zusammenhang mit Tilim Chan beschäftigen wird, schafft gewisse Probleme. In Dehxodâs *Luġatnâme*, der umfangreichen iranischen Nationalenzyklopädie, kommt das Wort lediglich in seiner arabischen Grundbedeutung ('Liebender') vor, Verweise auf die Beziehung zur volkstümlichen Dichtung fehlen völlig.

Ganz anders stellt sich bekanntlich die Situation im Nachbarland Türkei dar, wo man bereits seit den Anfangsjahren der Türkischen Republik die Folklore als Mittel türkischer Identitätsbildung entdeckt hat. Entsprechend pfleglich ist man mit diesem nationalen Erbe umgegangen, hat gesammelt, beschrieben und klassifiziert. Schon in den Dreißigerjahren des vergangenen Jahrhunderts veröffentlichte Köprülü (1930–1940) seine dreibändige Anthologie türkischer *aşıq*-Dichtung.

Somit ist man, was die volkstümlicher Literatur der Türken Irans angeht, vor allem auf die Terminologie und die Definition von Typen angewiesen, die zur Beschreibung der eng verwandten Spezies in der Türkei, bzw. insbesondere in Anatolien, entwickelt wurde. Mit der Volksliteratur der Türken Irans haben sich türkische Forscher eher selten auseinandergesetzt; sie wird meist nur als ein Anhängsel der aserbaidschanischen Literatur behandelt, siehe z.B. Karaağaç & Açıkgöz (1998).

Eine intensive Beschäftigung mit der eigenen türkischen Folklore findet selbstverständlich auch im Nachbarland Aserbaidschan statt. Aserbaidschanische Forscher, wie z.B. Ġazanfer Paşayev, nehmen sich zudem türkischer Volksliteratur in den brachliegenden Gebieten Südaserbaidschans und des sogenannten türkmenischen Gürtels im Irak an. Die Grundintention ist dabei, sog. südliche Ausläufer der zentralen aserbaidschanischen Kultur dingfest zu machen.

2.1 Zur Person des Dichters

Ich möchte im folgenden am Beispiel des Dichters Tilim Chan einen Aspekt der *aşıq*-Tradition in Iran vorstellen. Auf die Verse Tilim Chans stieß ich eher zufällig bei Feldstudien zur Sprache und Kultur der Türken von Bayadistan.

Bayâdîstân oder 'das Land der Bayat', liegt relativ abgelegen in einem Gebirgstal, das sich entlang des Flüßchens Mazdaqân von der Provinz Saveh im Osten bis in die Provinz Hamadan im Westen erstreckt. Seine Bewohner gehören den Stämmen der Bayat und der Chaladsch an, wobei, in charakteristischer Siedlungsweise, die Dörfer der Bayat am Flusslauf liegen, während die Chaladsch an den Berghängen siedeln.

Bei beiden Gruppen sind die Verse des Tilim Chan sehr populär. Er ist die zentrale Gestalt in der volkstümlichen Literatur dieser Region, und gleichzeitig der einzige Dichter, der aus der Anonymität der Volksdichter heraustritt und namentlich

---

[2] Eine Ausnahme von dieser Regel stellen lokale Aktivitäten von Heimatforschern dar, wie z.B. die umfangreichen Dokumentationen der Folklore der Qaschqâ'î von Manûtscher Kejânî aus Schiraz.

erwähnt wird. Obwohl Tilim Chan auch den Frauen Bayadistans bekannt ist, werden seine Gedichte ausschließlich von männlichen Interpreten rezitiert oder gesungen (was wahrscheinlich als Hinweis darauf zu werten ist, dass man es mit ernstzunehmender Literatur zu tun hat).

Der Vortrag kann, muss aber nicht, von Instrumenten (wie z.B. Def oder Saz) begleitet sein. Die Texte werden mündlich tradiert, d.h. meist auswendig gelernt. Einige wenige Interpreten verfügen auch über eigene handschriftliche Aufzeichnungen als Gedächtnisstütze, wobei das Türkische nach den Regeln der persischen Orthographietradition notiert wird.

Verschiedentlich war auch zu hören, man habe gehört, ein Divan der Gedichte Tilim Chans sei zusammengestellt und in jüngster Zeit in Qom gedruckt worden. Intensive Recherchen in dieser Richtung förderten zwar einige interessante Exemplare sog. grauer türkischer Literatur der größeren Region zu Tage, ergaben aber keine Hinweise auf das Buch Tilim Chans.

Über das Leben des *aşıq* ist wenig bekannt. Es ist überliefert, dass er in Marâghe am Meyme-Çayı geboren wurde, und dass sein wirklicher Name Maḥmûd gewesen sei[3]. Nach einem tragischen Ereignis in seiner Familie habe er sich von der Welt zurückgezogen und zu dichten begonnen. Er habe die Abgeschiedenheit der Berge gesucht und sei, wann immer es ihm gefiel, in die Dörfer gekommen, um seine Lieder vorzutragen. Zu seiner Biographie existieren die unterschiedlichsten Angaben; so soll er vor ein-, zwei- oder sogar dreihundert Jahren gelebt haben. Auch die älteren Interpreten seiner Werke haben ihn nicht persönlich gekannt; sie geben an, seine Verse von der Vätergeneration gelernt zu haben.

Das Bild, das die Bevölkerung von diesem in der Region so populären Dichter und Sänger hat, ist eher unscharf; doch es enthält deutliche Hinweise auf die Person eines *aşıq* dieses Namens, der vor ca. einhundertfünfzig Jahren in Bayadistan, im Dorf Marâghe gelebt hat. Seine Familie hat die *aşıq*-Tradition über sechs oder sieben Generationen bis zum heutigen Tage fortgeführt. Gegenwärtig ist ʿAlî Tilimî, hauptberuflich Inhaber eines Baumarktes in Noubaran, Verwalter dieses Erbes[4]. Wieweit sich die im Volk verbreitete Dichtung Tilim Chans von dem in seiner Familie überlieferten Material unterscheidet, bedarf, ebenso wie die historische Gestalt des Dichters, einer gesonderten Untersuchung. Eine interessante Aufgabe wäre selbstverständlich die Erstellung einer kritischen Edition der Gedichte des Tilim Chan.

Im Mittelpunkt meiner Untersuchung steht vorläufig nur die volkstümliche Gestalt des *aşıq* Tilim Chan. Ein Informant aus dem Dorf Saman fasst wie folgt zusammen, was man in Bayadistan über den Dichter sagt:

> „Tilim Chan war ein *ḥaqq aşıġı*, keiner dieser normalen Sänger, er war erfüllt von wirklicher Gottesliebe. Die Leute liebten es, wenn er seine Gedichte rezitierte oder sang, sie sagten, dass seine Worte gut gewählt und treffend seien. (…) Deshalb gehören die Texte Tilim Chans noch immer zum Repertoire der wandernden Sänger. Er konnte die Leute erreichen,

---

[3] Mîrzâ Maḥmûd Xân ist auch der Name eines Enkels oder Urenkels des Tilim Chan, siehe Anmerkung Nr. 4 zum Stammbaum Tilim Chans.

[4] Sein Stammbaum (*selsele*) ist wie folgt: ʿAlî Tilimî, Sohn des Aḥmad Xân, Sohn des Mîrzâ Ḥoseyn Xân, Sohn des Mîrzâ Maḥmûd Xân, Sohn des Mîrzâ Murâd Xân, Sohn oder Enkel des Tilim Xân.

sie aufheitern und zum Lachen bringen, oder ihnen eine Lehre erteilen; er hatte die Gabe, in Worte zu fassen, was die Menschen bewegt. Oft erschien er auf Hochzeiten und ähnlichen Festen, um seine Lieder zu singen. Heute bestellt man zu solchen Gelegenheiten Musiker, aber früher kamen die Barden und sangen, und die Leute hörten ihnen zu.''

Die Charakterisierung des iran-türkischen *aşıq* stimmt also weitgehend mit der anatolisch-türkischen *aşıq*-Tradition überein. Auch hier ist der *aşıq* ein fahrender Sänger, der seine – oft spontanen – Kompositionen rezitiert oder auf der Laute begleitet. Literaturwissenschaftler wie Fuat Köprülü sehen in der Kunst der volkstümlichen Dichter und Sänger die Fortsetzung der alten oghusischen *ozan*-Tradition (Özkırımlı 1987: 135).

Darüber gilt Tilim Chan als *ḥaqq aşıǧı*, 'einer, der Gott (wahrhaftig) liebt'. Nach einer auch in Anatolien verbreiteten Vorstellung wird der Dichter durch ein besonderes Berufungserlebnis zum *bâdeli* oder *ḥaqq aşıǧı*[5]. Aus dieser Initiation bezieht der *ḥaqq aşıǧı* seine poetische Kraft (Boratav 1969: 20)[6]. Entsprechend hoch sind die Erwartungen, die an seine charakterlichen Qualitäten gestellt werden, an seine absolute Hingabe an Gott, seine Fähigkeit zu Aufrichtigkeit und Weltentsagung.

Nach der gängigen türkeitürkischen Interpretation (Özkırımlı 1987: 135) entstammt der Begriff des *ḥaqq aşıǧı* der stark vom Sufismus beeinflussten Volksliteratur zwischen dem 13. und 15. Jahrhundert. Er bezeichnet somit einmal sufische Dichter wie Yunus Emre und Qayǧusuz Abdal, zum anderen auch zahlreiche wandernde Derwische, die in der Zeit der anatolischen Fürstentümer ihre Hymnen oder *îlahi* zur Begleitung der Laute vortrugen. Ab dem 16. Jahrhundert entwickelt sich dann im eher städtischen Bereich eine regelrechte *aşıq edebiyatı*, die von den Dichtern der Derwischorden (*Tekke şairleri*) getragen wird (Boratav 1969: 22).

Eine Sonderstellung nimmt die anatolisch-alevitische *aşıq*-Dichtung ein. Sie ist von den Einflüssen wechselnder Literaturströmungen relativ unberührt geblieben, was auf ihre enge Einbindung in den Kult der meist dörflichen Qızılbaş-Gemeinden zurückzuführen ist (Boratav 1969: 31). Auch die Wurzeln der *aşıq*-Dichtung der Bayat sind wahrscheinlich im Milieu der vor-safawidischen schiitischen Qızılbaş-Stämme zu suchen.

Weder die lückenhaften Angaben zur Biographie Tilim Chans, noch die Inhalte seiner Texte erlauben vorläufig eine genaue Datierung der Gedichte. Nicht einmal die Zuschreibung der in der gesamten Region verbreiteten silbenzählenden Dichtung zu Tilim Chan ist gesichert; sie beruht auf etwas wolkigen Überlieferungen, die oft durch den *maḥlaṣ*, die Nennung des Dichternamens im letzten Vers oder in der letzten Strophe gestützt wird. Es ist somit fraglich, ob es sich tatsächlich um das Werk eines einzigen Dichters, oder, wie etwa im Fall des Karacaoğlan, eine Unterschiebung volkstümlicher Poesie unterschiedlicher anonymer Dichter handelt.

---

[5] Der Adept träumt, dass er aus der Hand seines Scheichs oder Pir ein Gefäß mit dem *aşq bâdesi* erhält und das Bild der idealen Geliebten sehen kann.

[6] Oder sollte die gängige Bezeichnung *aşıq* lediglich eine verkürzte Version von *ḥaqq aşıǧı* sein?

2.2 Die Gedichte

2.2.1 Sinnsprüche und Vierzeiler (*mani*, *ḫoyrat* oder *bayatı*)

Eindeutig zeigt sich jedoch, dass der Dichter Tilim Chan im Zusammenhang mit der bereits erwähnten anatolischen *aşıq*-Tradition zu sehen ist. Neben den charakteristischen Eigenschaften, die man dem Sänger selbst zuschreibt, weisen auch Form und Inhalte der Texte deutliche Parallelen zur volkstümlichen *aşıq*-Literatur auf, wie sie bis in jüngste Zeit in Anatolien und im Irak verbreitet war. Dies soll im Folgenden anhand einiger Beispiele demonstriert werden.

So soll der *aşıq* mit einfachen Worten komplizierte Zusammenhänge aufdecken und seine Hörer zum Nachdenken anregen, wie in dem folgenden Aphorismus:

Beispiel (1)
tilım, bʊ gʏnlerı jaxtʃə sejlemæ
daxə bʏ gʏnıje nɛ jaman gɛrɛkʰ?

Tilim, sprich nicht gut von diesen Zeiten!
Welches Übel vermisst Du noch an Deiner Zeit?

Ein weiteres Merkmal des *aşıq* ist seine Fähigkeit, unerwartet eintretende Ereignisse spontan in Dichtung umzusetzen. Das folgende Gedicht wäre nicht verständlich ohne die Erklärungen, die der Interpret zum Kontext gibt, in dem es entstand: Eines Tages ergeht sich Tilim Chan in einem Gebirgstal, um die Schönheiten der Natur zu genießen. Da zieht ein Gewitter auf; der plötzlich einsetzende Regenguss durchnässt den Dichter bis auf die Haut, während die Fluten des anschwellenden Gebirgsbaches ihn fast davon schwemmen. Großherrlich befiehlt er daraufhin der Gewitterwolke, sich hinweg zu heben. So dichtet er:

Beispiel (2)

gøjdɛ saralam boloʊtʰ,	(a)	Wolke, die sich über den Himmel breitet
gøjdɛ ɣarælam boloʊtʰ,	(a)	Wolke, die den Himmel verdunkelt
ræŋŋə saralam boloʊtʰ	(a)	und sich gelb färbt
menıŋkɛ mɛnɛ verdıj,	(b)	Du hast mir mein Teil gegeben;
innɛ ʔarælam boloʊtʰ!	(a)	jetzt magst Du weiterziehen!

Formal repräsentiert dieses Gedicht Tilim Chans den in Anatolien, Aserbaidschan und Irak wahlweise als *mani*, *ḫoyrat* oder *bayatı* bekannten Typ silbenzählender Metrik. Es handelt dabei meist um einen Vierzeiler (bzw. in unserem Beispiel Nr. (2) ausnahmsweise um einen Fünfzeiler) mit dem Reimschema (a-a-b-a), wobei jede Zeile im Idealfall aus sieben Silben besteht[7]. Die vom Grundreim abweichende Zeile führt meist einen neuen Gedanken ein, der dem Inhalt eine neue, überraschende Wendung geben soll.

Ein weiteres charakteristisches Merkmal ist das Einbringen eines Wortspiels, *cinas* oder Paronomasie genannt. Es basiert auf gleichklingenden Wörtern unterschiedlicher Bedeutung, in unserem Fall *sarılan* 'sich ausbreitend' und *saralan* 'gelb werdend'. Nach Ansicht einiger Folkloreforscher sind Vierzeiler, die ein der-

---

[7] Zur Diskussion über den Ursprung des Vierzeilers in der türkischen und persischen Literatur siehe Doerfer (1994).

artiges Wortspiel enthalten, als *ḫoyrat*, solche ohne *cinas* als *mani* zu bezeichnen (Paşayev 1998: 103–105).

Auch in dem folgenden Sechszeiler ist der inhaltliche Umbruch formal durch einen Wechsel des Reims zwischen Zeile 4 und 5 gekennzeichnet. Während das Reimschema keiner festen Form zu folgen scheint, beträgt die Zahl der Silben durchgängig elf. Der Inhalt spricht, denke ich, für sich und bedarf keiner Erläuterung.

Beispiel (3)

barı‿'llaha:, bo‿dor sɛndɛn dılɛgem:	(a)		Ewiger Gott, dies erbitt' ich von Dir:
bır atadan a tmǝʃ oɣlan tørıjæj!	(b)		Dass Du einem Vater sechzig Nachkommen schenken mögest!
ombɛʃımez ækın tıke:n elijæ:k,	(c)		Fünfzehn von uns mögen Ackerbau treiben,
ombɛʃımez ʃaha qollǝɣ elijekʰ,	(c)		weitere fünfzehn in den Dienst des Schah treten.
oˀttʰʊzomoˀz qarnǝm ɣstdɛ dolanaq[8],	(d)		Und zu dreißig wollen wir uns um mein leibliches Wohl kümmern
atalixdan sultan‿olaq bırǝmez!	(e)		So dass einer aus unserer Sippschaft Sultan sei!

2.2.2 *Qoşma*

Neben kurzen Gedichten und Sinnsprüchen hat Tilim Chan vor allem die klassische Form der *aşıq*-Dichtung, die sog. *qoşma* verwendet. Diese besteht meist aus 3, 5 oder 6 Strophen zu je vier Zeilen, wobei jede Zeile im Normalfall 11 Silben umfasst. Häufig trägt die letzte Zeile der Strophe den sog. Hauptreim (x), während die ersten drei Zeilen untereinander reimen. Es ergibt sich somit das Schema (a-a-a-x, b-b-b-x, c-c-c-x usw.). Die Reime der ersten Strophe weichen oft von diesem Grundmuster ab: Alternativ können in der ersten Strophe z.B. die ersten und dritten Zeilen reimen, während die zweiten und vierten Zeilen bereits den Hauptreim vertreten, so dass in der ersten Strophe das Reimschema (a-x-a-x) lautet. In der letzten Strophe (*tapşırma*) nennt der Dichter für gewöhnlich seinen Namen (Özkırımlı 1987: 766–767). Die Qoşma wird meist gesungen, wobei der *aşıq* seinen Gesang auf einer Laute begleiten kann. Zu den behandelten Themen gehören Naturbeschreibungen, Liebeslieder, und Verweise auf die Vergänglichkeit irdischen Glanzes.

Wie in der alevitisch-anatolischen Dichtung nehmen auch hier *İlâhî*, Hymnen auf die Zwölf Imame, und insbesondere Lobpreisungen des Ersten Imams Ali, eine zentrale Stellung ein. Beispiel Nr. (4) ist die dritte Strophe einer vierstrophigen *İlâhi* mit eher didaktischen Charakter, die von den Wundertaten des Imam Ali berichtet. (Qoşma, Reimschema a-x-a-x, b-b-b-x, etc., 11 Silben pro Zeile.)

In einer nur aus drei Strophen bestehenden *qoşma*, siehe Beispiel (5), geht der Dichter freier mit der Form um: Während die Zeilen der ersten Strophe nur acht Silben umfassen, wird in der zweiten und dritten Strophe wieder das übliche Maß von elf Silben pro Zeile erreicht. Ein durchgehender Hauptreim existiert nicht. Ungewöhnlich ist, dass der Dichter in der ersten *und* zweiten Strophe seinen *maḫlaṣ*

---

[8] In Anspielung auf Redewendungen wie *qarınqulu* 'Vielfraß' oder *qarınpa* 'wer alles Essbare in sich hineinstopft'.

nennt. Die letzte Zeile der zweiten Strophe erinnert ferner an den Refrain der Hymne in Beispiel (4).

Inhaltlich spiegelt dieses Gedicht Vorstellungen des schiitischen Volksglaubens wider. Der in der ersten Zeile erwähnte Maǧnûn gilt im Islam allgemein als der Prototyp des von der Liebe entrückten Dichters. Im schiitischen Volksglauben erfährt er eine weitere Aufwertung, da er als Schüler des sechsten Imam Ǧa'far aş-Şâdeq angesehen wird[9]. Typisch ist auch der hier zum Ausdruck gebrachte Glaube an die Wunderkraft der Vierzehn Unschuldigen. Gleichzeitig enthält diese *qoşma* zahlreiche Verweise auf die Person des *aşıq*, der sich hier als kämpferischer Zwölfer-Schiit präsentiert.

Ein weiteres Standard-Thema der *aşıq*-Dichtung stellt die Verehrung der idealen Geliebten dar. Bei Beispiel (6) handelt es sich um die ersten drei Strophen einer insgesamt achtstrophigen *qoşma*. In diesem lyrischen Lied bedient sich Tilim Chan klassischer Vorbilder. Eingangs wird das besonders in Ostanatolien und Aserbaidschan beliebte romantische Epos *Kerem ile Aslı*[10] zitiert, die Geliebte mit einer Rose verglichen. Später folgen Verweise auf andere berühmte Paare, wie Yûsuf und Zulaycha, Laylâ und Maǧnûn, Schîrîn und Ferhâd[11]. Der Einsatz derartiger Stereotypen ist in der gesamten *aşıq*-Dichtung, wie auch in der höheren Literatur verbreitet. Seine Kunstfertigkeit demonstriert der Dichter hier weniger durch eine Schaffung neuer Themen und Figuren, als durch die Ausgestaltung bekannter Motive.

Gedichte, die einen direkten Bezug zur Landschaft der engeren Region haben, dürften wesentlich zum Ruhm Tilim Chans beigetragen haben. Diesen Themenbereich behandelt eine fünfstrophige *qoşma* über den Meyme Çayı, die in deutlicher Weise die Gefühle des Dichters für seine Heimatregion und seine Fähigkeit zu genauen Beobachtungen der Natur zum Ausdruck bringt; siehe Beispiel (7).

Nun wäre das Repertoire eines *aşıq* nicht komplett ohne ein weiteres Motiv: Im Rückblick auf sein Leben zieht der Dichter Bilanz, er erkennt die Vergeblichkeit menschlichen Bemühens. Die straff konzipierte *qoşma* >*Ömrün puç eddem*< (Beispiel (8)) gehört zu den schönsten Gedichten Tilim Chans.

Inhaltlich finden sich zahlreiche Parallelen zu Liedern anatolischer Sänger; es werden z.T. dieselben Bilder verwendet. So gilt z.B. auch im ostanatolischen Volks-

---

[9] Der wohl bekannteste romantische Roman, Laylâ und Maǧnûn, soll ursprünglich in Arabien entstanden sein, wo der historische Maǧnûn, Qays al-'Âmirî, im ersten Jahrhundert der Hidschra lebte. Über die Jahrhunderte wurde das Laylâ und Maǧnûn-Motiv immer wieder von Autoren aus verschiedenen Regionen der Islamischen Welt aufgegriffen. Bekannte Dichter wie Niżâmî, 'Alî Şîr Nevâ'î und Fużûlî schufen Adaptionen an die klassische Divan-Literatur; daneben finden sich auch frühe volkstümliche Versionen in türkischen Sprachen. Typisch iranisch-schiitisch ist die Vorstellung, dass Maǧnûn ein Schüler des sechsten Ǧa'far aş-Şâdeq gewesen sei.

[10] *Kerem ile Aslı* zählt zu den bekanntesten Vertretern des türkischen romantischen Epos und entstand aus volkstümlichen Traditionen, die das Leben des 'Âşiq Karam (14. Jahrhundert) beschreiben. Verschiedene Versionen des romatischen Epos sind vor allem in Ostanatolien, Irak und Aserbaidschan verbreitet.

[11] Eine Aufzählung bekannter romatische Romane. Einige Motive in *Farhâd va Şîrîn* haben ihre Wurzeln in der epischen Tradition Irans und wurden schon in Ferdousîs Dichtung aufgenommen; auch Vertreter der klassischen Divan-Literatur, wie z.B. Niżâmî, griffen diese Motive auf. Noch älteren Ursprungs ist die Geschichte von *Yûsuf va Zuleyḫa*; sie ist bereits in der Thora und im Koran vertreten und beschäftigt somit auch die frühen Traditionarier, wie z.B. aţ-Ţabarî. Daneben existieren bekannte türkische Bearbeitungen wie die von 'Alî, Şeyyâd Ḥamza etc.

glauben Xıdır als Schutzpatron der wandernden Sänger, der Bär dagegen symboli-
siert den ungehobelten, unsensiblen Menschen. Charakteristisch ist auch die nega-
tive Bilanz, die der Dichter für sein Leben zieht. *Ömrüm boşa geçti* 'ich habe mein
Leben vertan' lautet auch das Standardresümee in der anatolischen Dichtung.

2.3 Sprache

Die Sprache der Tilim Chan zugeschriebenen Verse weist einige Besonderheiten
auf, die als archaische Züge, Hinweise auf die Entstehung der Dichtung in einem
anderen Dialektgebiet oder Einflüsse einer schriftsprachlichen Tradition interpre-
tiert werden können. Diese betreffen verschiedene Bereiche der Sprache, d.h. Lexi-
kon, Morphologie und Morphosyntax.

So kommt in Beispiel (1) das Wort *seylemek* für 'sagen' vor, das in der Umgangs-
sprache heute nicht mehr verwendet wird. Gleiches gilt für das Hilfsverb *et-* 'ma-
chen, tun' in Beispiel (8), das heute vollkommen zugunsten von *elä-* aufgegeben ist.
Evliya Çelebis Dialektproben aus Hamadan zeigen allerdings, dass *etmek* im 17.
Jahrhundert noch in der Region verbreitet gewesen sein muss[12].

> Lexikon: Bsp. (1) *söylemek* 'sagen':   tılım, bʊ gʏnlɛrɪ jɑxtʃə sejlɛmæ
>   Bsp. (8) Hilfsverb *et-* 'machen, tun':   ømrʏm pʊtʃ ɛdde:m

Auch in der Morphologie und Morphosyntax treten Elemente auf, die in der Gegen-
wartssprache nicht vorkommen. So lautet die Kopula der 2. Person Singular heute
{+Ay}; in Beispiel (4) dagegen ist sie durchgängig mit {+sAn} wiedergegeben.

> Bsp. (4) Kopula {+sAn}: ('sɛn sɑxıs_se:n, 'sɛn ʔaɣa_sæ:n)

In Beispiel (6) wird das komplexe Gerundium auf {-DIġçA} verwendet; nach Cafe-
roğlu und Doerfer (1959: 303) ist dieses Konverb in der sog. aserbaidschanischen
Schriftsprache vertreten, während es schon in den älteren Dialekten fehlt.

> Bsp. (6) mırzalærej ja:zdəˣdʒæ:g, ej, sœzʏm, ej, var mæne:m
> ə, mʊllalarıj ja:zdəˣtʃa:ġ sœzʏm, e:j, var mæne:m

Das Vorhandensein derartiger, von der heute in der Region gesprochenen Sprache
deutlich unterschiedener Archaismen weist darauf hin, dass die Verse Tilim Chans
über lange Zeit unter Bewahrung sprachlicher Details überliefert wurden.

3. SCHLUSS

Inhaltlich und formal stehen die Gedichte Tilim Chans eindeutig in der Tradition
der anatolisch-schiitischen *aşıq*-Dichtung. So stehen sie gleichzeitig für die Bewah-
rung eines typisch türkischen Elements in der sonst stark von iranisch-türkischen
Kontakten geprägten Kultur eines sog. Konvergenzgebietes.

Die Inhalte der Gedichte sagen wenig über die Person des Dichters aus; es han-
delt sich um Stereotypen, die in der gesamtem Region verbreitet sind.

---

[12] So in einer Sprachprobe aus *Hamadan* (Bağdat Köşkü 305, 310b5/6): *men dilèdigim êdermen* 'Ich tue
was ich will/wünsche', siehe Bulut 2002.

Das Auftreten ungewöhnlicher oder archaischer Elemente in der Sprache kann als Hinweis darauf verstanden werden, dass diese Texte – trotz der bislang nur mündlichen Form der Überlieferung – relativ unverändert von Generation zu Generation weitergegeben wurden. Ein Rückschluss auf das Alter und den Urheber der Gedichte ist trotzdem nicht möglich, solange nicht bekannt ist, aus welcher Quelle z.B. die altertümlichen Formen in der Sprache stammen, ob sie schriftsprachlichen Vorlagen entnommen oder von ihnen inspiriert wurden.

Obwohl volkstümlich, ist die sogenannte orale Literatur sehr wohl eine Kunstform. Sie bedient sich nicht der gesprochenen Gegenwartssprache. Ihre Inhalte reflektieren einmal Themen, die in enger Beziehung zur jeweiligen Region stehen; zum anderen treten Motive auf, die der klassischen islamischen Kunstdichtung entstammen.

References

Bulut, Christiane, 2002. Türkische Dialekte der Übergangsgebiete nach Evliya Çelebi. In: Nurettin Demir & Fikret Turan (Hrsg.): *Scholary Depth and Accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson*. Ankara: Grafiker Yayıncılık, 83–100.

Boratav, Pertev Naili, 1969. 100 Soruda Halk Edebiyatı. İstanbul.

Caferoğlu, Ahmet & Doerfer, Gerhard, 1959. Das Aserbeidschanische. In: *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta I*: Wiesbaden: Steiner, 280–307.

Doerfer, Gerhard, 1994. Gedanken zur Entstehung des *rubâ'î*. In: Lars Johanson & Bo Utas (Hrsg.): *Arabic prosody and its applications in Muslim poetry*, Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell 1994, S. 45–59.

Karaağaç, Günay & Açıkgöz, Halil, 1998. *Azerbaycan Bayatıları*. Ankara: Türk Dil Kurumu.

Köprülü, Fuat, 1930–1940. *Türk Saz Şairleri Antolojisi*. Üç cilt. İstanbul: Kanaat Kitabevi.

Kreyenbroek, Philip G., 2001. Folk Poetry in Iranian languages. In: Yarshater, Ehsan. *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. X, 66–71.

Marzolph, Ulrich, 2001. Folklore Studies of Iran. I. Of Persia. In: Yarshater, Ehsan. *Encyclopaedia Iranica*. Vol. X, 71–75.

Özkırımlı, Atilla, 1987. *Türk Edebiyat Ansiklopedisi*. 2. Aufl. 5 Bde. İstanbul: Cem Yayınevi.

Paşayev, Gazenfer, 1998. *Irak Türkmen Folkloru*. İstanbul: Kerkük Vakfı.

Appendix: Texte Nr. 4, 5, 6, 7 und 8

Beispiel Nr. (4): *İlâhi*

Dritte Strophe einer vierstrophigen *İlâhi* mit eher didaktischen Charakter, die von den Wundertaten des Imam Ali berichtet. *Qoşma*, Reimschema (a-x-a-x, b-b-b-x, c-c-c-x etc.), 11 Silben pro Zeile.

ahaj, tɛræ-bar gøtørɛːn ɣɔro ʔaɣaʃdaːn	(c)	Der Du frische Früchte von einem trocknen Baum pflücken kannst,
hæx jolənda gɛtʃen dʒanənnan baʃdan	(c)	und für den, der auf dem Wege Gottes Herz und Verstand zurückließ,
xajaːte mɔːzdəne, sɛn verdej dˤaʃdan	(c)	den Lebenslohn aus einem Stein hervorbringst.
ʹsen saxıs_sɛ̂ːn on eʔkkʰʹ_imaːm ıtʃindɛː	(x)	Du bist das Bindeglied unter den Zwölf Imamen,
ʹsen ʔaɣa_sæːn on eʔkkʰʹ_imaːm ıtʃindɛː	(x)	Du bist Herr unter den Zwölf Imamen.

Beispiel Nr. (5)

Dreistrophige *qoşma* in relativ freier Form: erste Strophe mit acht Silben, zweite und dritte Strophe mit elf Silben pro Zeile. Kein durchgehender Hauptreim; *maḥlaṣ* in der ersten *und* zweiten Strophe; Reimschema (a-a-a-b, c-d-d-e, f-f-f-g).

1.

mæʒnɔŋ kımın, mɛn dæːlı͜ jem	(a)	Entrückt bin ich wie Maǧnûn.
dındırsaˀez, ɛj, tʃɔx dɔːlə͜ jam lː2	(a)	Hört Ihr mir zu, so bin ich erfüllt (von dem, was ich sagen will),
tilım xan͜ am, ɛːjı, mæraɣælı͜ jæːm	(a)	so (wahr) ich Tilim Chan bin, aus Maraghe:
vɛrmæjax vɛrænaː, hɛj, daɣlajaːr	(b)	Wir werden diese Berge nie den Angreifenden überlassen.

2.

ahaːj, belɛ kʰælbı͜ jeːm, gedmænɛm, ajaj, dærdɛ:	(c)	Wie einer aus dem Stamm der Kalb werde ich nicht weichen,
ˈʃæfamə alɔræm, aːx, ˀærbı-joːˀo: ˀ æʃæːrdaːjan	(d)	solange die Vierzehn mein Leid nicht gestillt haben.
ətilım͜ æm, xɔːfom jɔːx rozı-jejej mæːʃæːrdan	(d)	So (wahr) ich Tilim bin, der das Jüngste Gericht nicht fürchtet,
sızej kımın, ɛːj, oneˀkkʰ'͜ ımaːm ıtʃındæ:	(e)	wie Ihr, die Ihr zu den Zwölf Imamen gehört,
sızej kımın, ɛːj, aɣalarin, aj, ıtʃindeja	(e)	wie Ihr, die Ihr zu den Herren gehört.

3.

hæsæn dʒaːn, ɣojmaməʃam dyʃman gırɛ baːɣıja	(f)	Mein Hassan, ich habe nicht zugelassen, dass der Feind in Deinen Garten dringt,
æl ʉzada, jaj, bʊ daɣina, jej, baːɣɔna, ja	(f)	dass er seine Hand ausstreckt nach Deinen Bergen und Tälern.
sinem benzɛr, ɛj, saman daɣɔnı͜ jej, qarəna	(f)	Meine Brust ist breit, wie der Leib des Saman-Berges,
mɛmɛlɛrım, ɛːj, jel-abadıj, jej, narɛ͜ dəːj	(g)	meine Brust ist ein Feuer, das der Wind anfacht,
eh, narɛ͜ dɔr, ə, mɛmɛlɛrım, ɛːj, jel-abadın ɛːj, narɛ͜ dəːj	(g)	ein Feuer ist in meiner Brust, das der Wind anfacht

Beispiel (6) Liebeslied

Hier nur die ersten drei Strophen einer insgesamt achtstrophigen *qoşma*; Reimschema (a-a-a-x, b-b-b-x, c-c-c-x etc.); Wiederholung der leicht abgewandelten letzten Zeile jeder Strophe.

1.

əhaːj, kʰeræn deːrɛː, jej: jarəm tɔtar, ɛːj, yzʉnɛ	(a)	So spricht Kerem: Wem meine Geliebte ihr Gesicht zuwendet,
sijaː syrmɛ, jaj, mæsd͜ ejlı, waj, gɵezɵnɵ	(a)	den machen ihre schwarz geschminkten Augen trunken.
ˀadə ˀæslı͜ je, jejej, qara mælıkın, ɛːj, qeze͜ nɛ:	(a)	Ihr Name ist Aslı, Tochter des Qara Melik.
ə dʒanim ɣədʒaja, senə ˀæslını, jej, gɵrmæːde	(x)	Ach, mein Herz welkt dahin, wenn es Dich nicht sieht,
he, gɵezɵm ɣədʒaj, senej gɵrmæde, jej	(x)	mein Auge wird trüb, wenn es Dich nicht sieht.

2.

ɐha:j, bɛlɛ gejmɛ:g‿ɤtʃɤn, ɛ:j, køjnaʔgı   (b) Zum Kleid hat sie ein Hemd aus Dornen
var, ɛ:j, xarɐ var,

ɛmmæg‿ıtʃɤn, ɛ:j, læblɛrınıj, ej, bɑ:lɐ   (b) und zur Labung den Honig ihrer Lippen.
var

əha:j, bɛlɛ saro:dʒa baj jɒʃmaɣı, jaj, vɛ   (b) Ihr Schleier ist bedeckt von Gold, und ihr
gymˠʃ, ɛ:j, nalə var   Schuh von Silber.

dʒa:nɐm ɣɵdʒaʔe:j, sænə, ʔæslını, je:j,   (x) Ach, mein Herz welkt dahin, wenn es Dich
gørmæde:j   nicht sieht,

hej, gœzɐm ɣɵdʒaʔe:j, sænə, ʔæslıne: (x) mein Auge wird trüb, wenn es Dich nicht sieht.
gørmæde:j

3.

əha:j, bele ɑ:dɒm mahmo:j‿ ja:‿døde,   (c) So mein Name Maḥmûd ist, Geliebte,
jej hej, ja:rə, ɣɵj, jaj, døkɛræm

qalbemə, to:jɒtab‿dɵrə dæ:rd‿enan   (c) lass mich mein Herz Dir geben, voll von Leid.
vɛræ:m

əha:j, bele dærjalar mo:rækkab, və   (c) Wären die Meere Tinte, und die Wälder
dʒæŋgɛllɛr ɣælam   Schreibrohre,

mırzalærej ja:zdɵˠdʒæ:g, ej, sœzɣm, ej,   (x) ich hätte mehr Worte niederzuschreiben als
var mæne:m   alle Fürsten,

ə, mɒllalarıj ja:zdɵˠtʃa:ǧ sœzɣm, e:j,   (x) ich hätte mehr Worte niederzuschreiben als
var mæne:m   alle Mollahs.

Beispiel (7) Meyme Çayı

Erste, zweite und letzte Strophe einer fünfstrophigen *qoşma* über den Meyme Çayı; vierzei-
lige Strophen mit acht Silben pro Zeile. Reimschema: In der ersten Strophe nur ein durchge-
hender Reim (a-a-a-a), dann in der zweiten, dritten und vierten Strophe (b-b-b-x, c-c-c-x,
d-d-d-x); fünfte Strophe (e-x-f-x). Beim Vortrag werden jeweils die zweiten und vierten
Zeilen der Strophe wiederholt.

(1)

tʃɔx sɛ:slæmɛ, mejmɛ: tʃajı, ẽja   (a) Erheb' Deine Stimme nicht, Meyme Çayı,
baʃej‿də mæræɣe: sɛnej:, l:2   (a) dessen Quelle in Maraghe ist.
bajramnan ɑ:ʔtmɒʃ gehe:dɛndej   (a) Nur sechzig Tage nach dem Neujahrsfest
ʔæl jandirar dˠaʃɒj sɛnej l:2   (a) verbrennt man sich die Hand an den Steinen
                                                  (Deines Bettes).

(2)

hanə sɛnıj, e:j, qarda?aʃlarəj   (b) Wo sind Deine Brüder?
qɒn aɣlar ɣaræ dˠaʔaʃlarəj l:2   (b) Deine schwarzen Steine weinen Blut,
utʃa:rdə tʰo:ba qo:ʔo:ʃlarəj   (b) und deine Paradiesvögel sind weitergeflogen.
gedɛ:rdə araja, vaj, dˠaɣlar l:2   (x) Sie haben sich einem anderen Ort gesucht, ach,
                                                  ihr Berge.

(5)

køhnɛ ʔœmrɣm, ej, tʰæzzæ:, ej,   (e) Neues Leben habe ich gefühlt,
helende:
ˈjɵlɵm dø:ʃde sɛnæ: dˠaɣlar l:2   (x) wann immer ich in die Berge zog.
hĩ, gedæ:r gıjemax jɵlɵ ɣsdɛ‿jem   (f) Und wieder bin ich unterwegs.
øʲzej tɒtma, bølɛ jana, jej, dˠaɣlar l:2 (x) Wendet Euch nicht von mir ab, ihr Berge.

Beispiel (8)

Vierstrophige *qoşma*, mit Zeilen à 11 Silben; Reimschema (a-x-b-x, a-a-a-x, c-c-c-x, d-d-d-x). Beim Vortrag werden jeweils die letzten Zeilen der zweiten, dritten und vierten Strophe wiederholt.

(1)

dʒan dʒæfɒjæ verde:m, ømrym pʊtʃ (a) Qualen habe ich mein Herz ausgesetzt, mein
eḍde:m   Leben verschwendet,

gedmedım bır jɒxtʃi dʒɒnənɛ, hejıf (x) und ach, nie das Gute gesucht.

dʒɒnimɐ ɣojdoʊm bi-væfalar jolina: (b) Für mich selbst habe ich den Weg der Treulo-
                                         sen gewählt;

tʃeʲkdıjım dʒæfaja bʊ dʒɒna hejıf   (x) schade um dieses Leben, die Qualen, die ich er-
                                         duldet habe.

(2)

otʊrmʊʃḍym, mɛn de øzym bılmæde:m (a) Ich saß da, und ohne dass es mir bewusst war,
jãndʊ qɒra ba:rɐm, k'‿øzym   (a) verbrannten meine wertlosen Güter, und ich
bılmæde:m   verstand es nicht.

nɒʃə særraf ɐdoʊm, søzym bılmæde:m (a) Ich war ein unerfahrener Geldwechsler, der
                                         nicht zu verhandeln weiß;

goʊhærɛmı satḍoʊm, nɒ-dɒna, hejıf ǀ:2 (x) und ach, aus Unwissenheit habe ich mein Wert-
                                            vollstes verkauft.

(3)

aɣlıjan‿aɣlasoʊn, ɣylɛn ɣylmɛsın   (c) Wer weint soll damit fortfahren, wer lacht, das
                                        Lachen lassen;

beʃı dırılmeẓsɛ, bıry ølmæsen   (c) und solange die Fünf nicht zum Leben erwa-
                                        chen, soll der Eine nicht sterben.

bır særraph kʲeʲ goʊhær qædrim   (c) Wenn ein Händler das Wertvollste nicht er-
bılmæse:n   kennt,

goʊharen mæzænæ o dʒana hejf ǀ:2   (x) ach, so grämt er sich um den Wert des Juwels.

(4)

xidır axtarɐrdoʊm, xersɛ tʊʃ oldoʊm (d) Während ich nach Xıdır suchte, bin ich nur auf
                                         grobe Menschen gestoßen;

gøzel axtarɐrdoʊm, pisɛ tʊʃ oldoʊm ǀ:2 (d) und während ich das Schöne suchte, fand ich
                                            nur Häßlichkeit.

tilim dıjer: bır nɒ-kæsɛ tʊʃ oldoʊm (d) Tilim sagt: Ich habe nur Unzulänglichkeit ge-
                                         sehen;

ge:ʃty ruzıgaroʊm, dovranɛ hejıf ǀ:2 (x) mein Leben verging, schade um diese Zeit.

A forthcoming English translation of H.S. Nyberg's *Hebreisk grammatik*

Mats Eskhult
Uppsala

The Hebrew grammar by the Swedish Orientalist H.S. Nyberg, published in 1952, aimed at introducing advanced students to an in-depth understanding of Biblical Hebrew syntax. As it was published in Swedish, however, the ideas it contains were scarcely disseminated outside the Nordic countries.

In his preface, Nyberg points out that in the section on *word formation*, he not only lists the various formations but also thoroughly discusses their semantics in the once living language. He hopes that his effort in this regard will be properly noticed. As for the portion on *syntax*, his main guide, he says, is the comparatively outdated treatise in Gesenius–Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*.[1] He laments the scarcity of relevant modern studies and adds that he in many respects was forced to work on his own. It goes without saying that a syntax based on the personal observations of such a skilled scholar as Nyberg arouses one's benign curiosity; and in fact, there is so much in it that bears the token of his profound and original thinking that no one will be disappointed when studying it.

This short presentation of some distinguishing qualities of Nyberg's discussion of Biblical Hebrew syntax starts with the circumstantial phrases and clauses, and then turns to the distinction between nominal and verbal clauses. His discussion of the verbal system is treated briefly; and, finally, some recent treatises on Biblical Hebrew syntax will be touched upon from a text-linguistic point of view.

In his discussion of adverbial modifiers Nyberg follows the outline in Brockelmann's *Grundriss*, first and foremost in the sections dedicated to qualifications describing place, time, inner object, circumstance, limitation, manner etc.[2] Accordingly, he says that a personal object may be further qualified by a (usually indefinite) noun, whose function is to specify what part of the object is affected by the action. This is traditionally called the accusative of specification—Arabic *tamyīz^{un}*—e.g., הוּא יְשׁוּפְךָ רֹאשׁ וְאַתָּה תְּשׁוּפֶנּוּ עָקֵב "he shall bruise you on (in respect to) the head, and you will snap at (in respect to) his heel", Gen. 3,15 (§ 89*h*).

Between the discussion dedicated to the paronomastic inner object, e.g., וַיָּצָם דָּוִד צוֹם "David fasted a fast", 2 Sam. 12,16, and the adverbial qualifier of time, place, manner (§ 89*i,j* and *n*), Nyberg turns to the more or less accidental circumstance whereby the object in a specific situation is further qualified by an indeter-

[1] W. Gesenius – E. Kautzsch, *Hebräische Grammatik*, 28. Aufl., Leipzig 1909.
[2] C. Brockelmann, *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, I–II Berlin 1908–13: "Akkusativische und präpositionelle Näherbestimmungen" and "Andere adverbielle Näherbestimmungen", part II, pp. 266–337 and pp. 338–359, respectively.

minate participle or an adjective (§ 89*m*). This adjunct—Arabic *fiḍla^tun*—he calls *specification of circumstance*, a term which in today's terminology would rather correspond to "circumstantial phrase", for instance:

וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶת־קוֹל יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים מִתְהַלֵּךְ בַּגָּן "and they heard the sound of Yahweh God walking in the garden", Gen. 3,8. If the subject is modified, the circumstantial phrase corresponds to a predicative, e.g., אָנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ עֲרִירִי "I will depart childless", Gen. 15,2.

What is to be observed here, is that Nyberg, by his use of the term "circumstantial", points to the connection between phrases and clauses that are characterized by a description of state, whether this is syndetically introduced, as in: "let us build ourselves a city and a tower, וְרֹאשׁוֹ בַשָּׁמַיִם whose top is in heaven", Gen 11,4, or asyndetically, as in: "and pitched his tent, בֵּית־אֵל מִיָּם וְהָעַי מִקֶּדֶם with Bethel on the west and Ai on the east", Gen. 12,8 (§ 85*f*). This observation is also found in Gesenius-Kautzsch, §§ 155 and 154, where it is stated that clauses introduced by *waw*, as well as asyndetic clauses—especially negated verbal clauses—are frequently circumstantial. Nyberg is, however, a bit more specific in this matter and dedicates separate sub-paragraphs to the circumstantial phrase and the circumstantial clause, and emphasizes the concepts of state and description—Arabic *ḥāl^un*—thus showing influence from the Arabic grammatical tradition as conveniently described in W. Wright's Arabic grammar.[3] He also possibly consulted the discussion in Joüon's *Grammaire de l' hébreu biblique*, where the arrangement of the material strongly resembles that in Arabic. Joüon, § 159*a*, says: "the circumstantial clause plays a role analogous to the predicate accusative".[4] Of interest is also A.B. Davidson's *Hebrew Syntax*, which states that the circumstantial clause differs from the accusative of condition only in being a proposition of its own, subordinate to the principal clause in meaning but co-ordinate in construction (see § 137). In Gibson's reworked edition of Davidson's grammar, however, this discussion is omitted with reference to the fact that the adverbial use of nouns and prepositional phrases should not be treated under the heading of the accusative.[5]

Apparently from the observation that there is an analogy between the predicative accusative of state and specification, on the one hand, and the circumstantial clause, on the other, Nyberg chose to follow the Mediaeval Arab grammarians' description of the two main kinds of clauses. According to this description, a clause is nominal if it lacks a finite verb, or even has a finite verb but begins with the subject. Its predicate—whether verbal or not—does not signify any action, but rather states something concerning the subject. A verbal clause, in contrast, begins with the predicate verb and is characterized by action.[6] Consequently, in the description of

---

[3] W.Wright, *A Grammar of the Arabic Language Translated from the German of Caspari*, 3rd ed. revd. by W. Robertson Smith and M.J. de Goeje, Cambridge 1896–98. On this point, see also the discussion of *p^esūq hammaṣṣāḇ* in Ch. Rabin, *Taḥbīr l^ešōn hammiqrā'*, pp. 95–96 (I am obliged to professor Frank Polak, Tel Aviv, for having drawn my attention to this booklet).

[4] P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l' hébreu biblique* Rome 1923, translated to English and revised by T. Muraoka, Roma 1993.

[5] Davidson, A.B., *Hebrew Syntax*, Edinburgh 1896, thoroughly revised by J.C.L. Gibson, Edinburgh 1994.

[6] The term nominal clause must not be mixed up with the noun-like character of non-adverbial subordinate clauses.

clauses Nyberg states that Biblical Hebrew distinguishes between these two types of clauses, a distinction that is fundamental for its way of forming a description and accounting for a narrative.

In consequence, Nyberg (§ 85*g*) maintains that in narration the finite verb as a rule occupies the prior position, and the clause thus formed is verbal. If, however, the free subject is placed before the finite verb, the clause is nominal. More precisely, the clause thus formed is a *compound* nominal clause. The fronted 'principal subject' may coincide with the subject of the predicate clause, or, the predicate clause may have its own subject, in which case the 'principal subject' is referred to by a *resumptive* pronoun.[7] Certainly, the object or adverbial qualifiers may also precede the finite verb—if these are stressed—but this arrangement does not turn the clause into a nominal clause (§ 86*m*). Thus, אָנֹכִי בַּדֶּרֶךְ נָחַנִי יְהוָה, "As for me, Yahweh has guided me in the way", Gen. 24,27 is a compound nominal clause, whereas in contrast וְאֶת־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי לְאַבְרָהָם וּלְיִצְחָק לְךָ אֶתְּנֶנָּה "the land which I gave to Abraham and Isaac I will give to you", Gen. 35,12,[8] is a verbal clause, although with the object in prior position.

The functional difference between the two kinds of clauses is that the verbal clause presents a link in the course of events. The nominal clause, on the other hand, if functionally related to a verbal clause, is circumstantial in character: "the nominal clause marks circumstances that occur alongside the main action; it describes situations and so on", he says (§ 85*a*). By its capacity of being circumstantial, the nominal clause is consequently employed to express time, reason, concession, contrast and synchronism in relation to the verbal clause. On the textual level, it is frequently used to begin episodes. At the same time, Nyberg also stresses that the nominal clause often forms independent presentative utterances. In these cases it is not circumstantial, e.g., הִנָּךְ הָרָה "behold, you are with child", Gen 16,11.

The theoretical basis for the Arab grammarians' analysis of the compound nominal clause has been widely discussed.[9] Already Brockelmann noticed that there is a predilection for the word order S V O at the very beginning of separate narratives. In view of the functional criteria of this word order, D. Michel expressly sided with Nyberg. In the more current discussion, Muraoka arrives at the result that such an inversion mostly involves emphasis, but the circumstantial character of the clause in

---

[7] The latter variant is in some treatises called dislocation or extraposition, and regarded as essentially different from the former, see, e.g., Chr. van der Merwe, J.A. Naudé & J.H. Kroeze, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, Sheffield 1999, p. 339.

[8] On this very point Nyberg differs from the analysis presented by A. Niccacci in a number of books and articles, notably "Basic facts and the theory of the Biblical Hebrew verb system in prose", in E. van Wolde (ed.), *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible*, Leiden 1997, pp. 167–202. True, Niccacci's point of departure is that the verbal clause indicates the principal line of communication, while the nominal clause indicates a secondary, subsidiary line; but the distinction between the two types of clauses is primarily formal: the verbal clause begins with a verb, and the nominal clause does not. This, *inter alia*, entails that a chiastically fronted object automatically turns an otherwise verbal clause into a nominal clause. Compare also the analysis by R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik*, Berlin 1966–72, § 92 b, where it is stated that in a compound nominal clause the grammatical object may function as topic/subject.

[9] Though rejecting this analysis, Gesenius-Kautzsch, §§ 140 and 142, admits that from a functional point of view the idea is very reasonable. See further, for instance, the survey in G. Khan, *Studies in Semitic Syntax*, Oxford 1998, pp. xxixf.

question may condition it. F. Andersen argues that the main function is to express information tangential to the main thrust of discourse.[10]

As Nyberg made no distinction between narration and direct speech, however, he concludes that clauses, whose predicate verb expresses a present perfect or a simple future, are static in character and thus construed as compound nominal clauses, e.g., אִישׁ מִמֶּנּוּ אֶת־קִבְרוֹ לֹא־יִכְלֶה מִמְּךָ הָאֶחָד בָּא־לָגוּר "this one has come to sojourn", Gen. 19,9; and "none of us will refuse you his grave", Gen. 23,6. Now, these "tenses" basically belong to direct speech. Since dialogue normally refers to what is present in a situation and has little need of background information, it seems that 'contrast' and 'focus' rather than 'grounding' are the factors that govern inverted word order in dialogue.[11]

Accordingly, Nyberg's position appears very fruitful and fully justified from a functional point of view as far as the analysis of extended narrative texts is concerned, but it seems less appropriate when it comes to direct speech. Nevertheless, what is to be observed is that his highlighted concept *circumstance* actually integrates the analysis of tangential information on the phrasal and clausal as well as the textual level. In spite of certain similarities with Schneider's and Niccacci's approach, based on Weinrich's dichotomy of narrative and discourse linked to grounding and tense perspective,[12] Nyberg's syntax shows a text-linguistically oriented approach that is based on action versus state and description.

Nyberg apparently gives preference to a temporal comprehension of the verbal system. Still, he adds that the Hebrew perfect and imperfect do not locate an action in time absolutely, but rather signify the *relation* between an action, quality or state, and a certain situation or person. The temporal location pointed out, then depends on the situation that is narrated, or the speaker's mental attitude towards his utterance (§ 85c,f).

The perfect of an action verb is said to feature an action that falls outside the immediate speech situation; it does not depend on the state and feelings of the speaker and is consequently *independent* in character and thus constative. The imperfect, on the other hand, looks upon an action, or a state, in relation to something else or in relation to the position of the speaker. The action is, as it were, regarded from the inside, from a certain point of view, and consequently, it is *dependent*, being descriptive in character, as it illustrates and illuminates the situation at hand. As such it also voices an expectation for something to happen—the latter characteristic explains the common modal as well as future sense of the form (§ 86b–d, f, t, u). It would actually seem that Nyberg here adopts the subjective, socio-psychological aspectual

---

[10] Brockelmann, *Grundriss*, II, p. 436; D. Michel, *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen*, Bonn 1960, pp. 179ff., T. Muraoka, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*, Jerusalem–Leiden 1985, pp. 45ff., F. Andersen, *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, Hague–Paris 1974, pp. 77–91.

[11] It would also seem that the very spatial relationship between the participants of a dialogue—'I' and 'you'—tends to put these in focus and hence makes them occupy the first position in the sentence. Also, in conversation, text type shifts rapidly from, for instance, instruction to eulogy and then to a short inserted narrative, and so on; and what forms background in one text type does not necessarily form background in another.

[12] H. Weinrich, *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt;* W. Schneider, *Grammatik des biblischen hebräisch* (1974), reworked edition *Grammatik des biblischen hebräisch: Ein Lehrbuch*, München 2001; A. Niccacci, *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose*, Sheffield 1990.

view of J. Pedersen, who in his grammar stresses the independent character of the completed action represented by the perfect and the dependent, supplementary, preparatory and continual character of the incomplete action represented by the imperfect.[13]

Of importance for this short presentation is the way Nyberg analyses the use of verbal forms in circumstantial clauses. In § 86*t* he says that the *yiqtol* form very often expresses contingency, which entails that it is used for actions that are dependent on the speaker, the subject or the situation at hand. Consequently, it commonly furnishes the circumstance, under which another action takes place, or took place, irrespective of whether it stands in a compound nominal clause or in a verbal clause. In the latter case the *yiqtol* form constitutes a *verbal* circumstantial clause. An example of *yiqtol* in a compound nominal clause is: "she will be a mother of nations מַלְכֵי עַמִּים מִמֶּנָּה יִהְיוּ inasmuch as kings shall come from her", Gen. 17,16 (cf. § 85*i*), while *yiqtol* in a verbal circumstantial clause is found in: "and both of them, the man and his wife, were naked וְלֹא יִתְבֹּשָׁשׁוּ without being ashamed", Gen. 2,25.[14] Though not explicitly pointed out by Nyberg, the use of *yiqtol* to form asyndetic attributive clauses, § 94*l*, contributes to illuminating the descriptive character of this verbal form.[15] In this usage *yiqtol* more often than not occurs in negated clauses; in positive clauses a nominal participial clause is more common (§ 86*dd*). Compare, for instance: עוֹד זֶה מְדַבֵּר "while this one was yet speaking", Job 1,16, in contrast to יִשְׁכָּבוּ טֶרֶם "before they had gone to sleep", Gen. 19,4 The participle, accordingly, encroaches of the sphere allotted to the *yiqtol*. In its capacity of acting as a predicate in a nominal clause it is frequently employed instead of *yiqtol*. The difference between the two of them is often a matter of style, Nybergs says (§ 86*v,dd*). By this, he actually describes the participle as an integrate part of the verbal system.[16]

It is worth considering that in the Arab grammatical tradition the perfect and imperfect forms are also described according to whether they are descriptive of state or not. Consequently, Wright, *Grammar*, §§ 3*b*, 8*cd* and 183*a–d*, points out that an Arabic perfect introduced by *qad* or *waqad* describes a state, *ḥāl^un*, and the same is true for the Arabic imperfect when it is used asyndetically and corresponds to a past future, e.g., "he came to a spring of water *yašrabu* to drink" or refers to a past circumstance, e.g., "Zeid came *yaḍḥaqu* laughing". Consequently, in the section on copulative sentences introduced by *wa* Wright states that sentences descriptive of

---

[13] J. Pedersen, *Hebreisk Grammatik*, København 1926, §§ 29*a*, 119*a*, (however, Nyberg makes no use of Pedersen's observation that the designation "consecutive" is adequate only for the *perf cons.*, while the *impf cons.* should be described as "strongly connecting" in force). In fact, Michel, *Tempora und Satzstellung*, puts forward the same idea, when stating that the perfect features "selbstgewichtige Fakten", whereas the imperfect denotes an action "die nicht selbstgewichtig ist, die in Beziehung zu etwas anderem steht", pp. 95 and 128. If Nyberg knew about Brockelmann's epoch-making article "Die 'Tempora' des Semitischen" in *Zeitschr. f. Phonetik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, 5, 1951, he hardly had any time to utilize the ideas presented in it.

[14] See, for instance, G. Bergsträsser, *Hebräische Grammatik*, I–II, Leipzig 1918–29, § 7*b*, where the connection between circumstantial clauses and w^e – subj – *yiqtol* clauses is duly pointed out.

[15] See Davidson, *Syntax*, § 44, Rem.3 (Gibson's revised edition, § 63, Rem. 2).

[16] In historical narrative an asyndetic *qatal*, owing to the want of participles expressing past time, may be employed to specify an action: "They had just gone out of the city לֹא הִרְחִיקוּ not being far off", Gen. 44,4. See Davidson, *Syntax*, § 41, Rem. 3.

state may be nominal or verbal, and in the latter case they may employ the imperfect indicative or jussive or the perfect. Now someone may ask whether Arabic is relevant to the description of Biblical Hebrew? In answer, it may be pointed out that in the use circumstantial phrases and clauses Arabic is, one dare say, as useful for analysing Hebrew as Ugaritic is.

F. Rundgren followed up his studies in Semitic aspectology by the article "Aspectology in the light of text linguistics" (*Orientalia Suecana* 36–37, 1987–1988, pp. 57–76). A survey of some modern treatises on Biblical Hebrew syntax shows that Waltke and O'Connor[17] surprisingly enough do not include any text-linguistically oriented discussion at all. Gibson, in his revised edition of Davidson's *Syntax*, leaves out references to Arabic grammar and thus unfortunately cuts off a link to a fruitful description of Semitic syntax. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*, retains these references and the connection between circumstantial phrases and clauses as observed by Joüon. The descriptive function of verbal clauses is, however, not expressly noticed, and accordingly the term "circumstance" does not have the same cross-referring function as in Nyberg. Van der Merwe et alii, *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, §§ 46 and 47, do not discuss the function of fronting and dislocation in terms of some "circumstance" that is introduced in the running narration; instead they list various semantic-pragmatic functions of fronting as a sort of focus. The fronted element is regarded as being introduced, activated or reactivated, at the same time as a fronted *subject* may signal anteriority to, or simultaneity with the main line of narration. Also, it is maintained that dislocation, i.e., the pendens construction, may be used to (re)activate an identifiable referent.

In conclusion, one may say that Nyberg's way of integrating the functional role of elements expressing state and description into the running narration gives his syntax a text-linguistically oriented approach. This approach he applies to earlier Old Testament prose. Decades ago Nyberg described the text-linguistic function of various kinds of clauses in Biblical Hebrew. Only recently has this approach begun to be employed, but it has not as yet been properly noticed and integrated in the standard international grammars. As a matter of fact, Chaim Rabin in his article on Hebrew in *Current Trends in Linguistics*[18] says: "Among the many grammars for academic teaching published in the period since 1918, the Swedish one by H.S. Nyberg stands out. It describes just one type of Biblical Hebrew, the prose language of the period down to 587 B.C., and in this way is a first step towards the important future task of writing descriptions of Biblical Hebrew in its different periods on a synchronic level, the present type of grammar being rather a cross-section than a synchronic analysis".

In view of this last appreciative assessment, it is the more regrettable that Nyberg's grammar after fifty years has not yet been translated into English. In order to remedy this deficiency, I am now preparing an English version of the portions dedicated to word formation and syntax.

---

[17] B.K Waltke – M. O'Connor, *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake 1990.
[18] "Hebrew" in *Current Trends in Linguistics*, ed. T.A. Seboek, The Hague 1970, vol. 6, pp. 309f.

References

Andersen, F., *The Sentence in Biblical Hebrew*, Hague–Paris 1974.

Bergsträsser, G., *Hebräische Grammatik*, I–II, Leipzig 1918–29.

Brockelmann, C., *Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen*, I–II Berlin 1908–13.

Brockelmann, C., "Die 'Tempora' des Semitischen" in *Zeitschr. f. Phonetik und allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft*, 5, 1951.

Davidson, A.B., *Hebrew Syntax*, Edinburgh 1896, thoroughly revised by J.C.L. Gibson, Edinburgh 1994.

Gesenius, W. – Kautzsch, E., *Hebräische Grammatik*, 28. Aufl., Leipzig 1909.

Joüon, P., *Grammaire de l'hébreu biblique* Rome 1923, translated to English and revised by T. Muraoka, Roma 1993.

Khan, G., *Studies in Semitic Syntax*, Oxford 1998.

Meyer, R., *Hebräische Grammatik*, Berlin 1966–72.

Michel, D., *Tempora und Satzstellung in den Psalmen*, Bonn 1960.

Muraoka, T., *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*, Jerusalem–Leiden 1985.

Niccacci, A., *The Syntax of the Verb in Classical Hebrew Prose* (JSOT suppl. ser. 86) Sheffield 1990.

Niccacci, A., "Basic facts and the theory of the Biblical Hebrew verb system in prose", in E. van Wolde (ed.), *Narrative Syntax and the Hebrew Bible*, Leiden 1997, pp. 167–202.

Pedersen, J., *Hebreisk Grammatik*, København 1926.

Rabin, Ch., "Hebrew" in *Current Trends in Linguistics*, vol 6, ed. T.A. Seboek, The Hague 1970.

Rabin, Ch., *Taḥbīr lᵉšōn hammiqrā'* (ed. Šmu'el Školnikov) Academon, Jerusalem 1965.

Rundgren, F., "Aspectology in the light of text linguistics" (*Orientalia Suecana* 36–37, 1987–1988, pp. 57–76).

Schneider, W., *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch* (1974), reworked edition *Grammatik des biblischen Hebräisch: Ein Lehrbuch*, München 2001.

van der Merwe, Chr., Naudé, J.A., & Kroeze, J.H., *A Biblical Hebrew Reference Grammar*, Sheffield 1999.

Weinrich, H., *Tempus. Besprochene und erzählte Welt*, 3rd ed., Stittgart 1977.

Wright, W., *A Grammar of the Arabic Language Translated from the German of Caspari*, 3rd ed. revd. by W. Robertson Smith and M.J. de Goeje, Cambridge 1896–98.

Waltke, B.K.–O'Connor, M., *An Introduction to Biblical Hebrew Syntax*, Winona Lake 1990.

Structural ambiguity in Bashkir relative clauses

Michael Hess
Berlin

The present paper investigates various instances of structural ambiguity in Bashkir, a Turkic language written and spoken in the Ural region of Russia. The focus is on Bashkir relative clause constructions. These are investigated using hitherto unpublished authentic material.[1] Based on these examples the argument is put forward that the example of Bashkir proves structural ambiguity to be a language-inherent phenomenon. It is therefore not dependent on variable models of linguistic categorization.

The material

The text samples are taken from prose works of modern written Bashkir. Bashkir (self-designation *Baškort tele*) is a Turkic language spoken by approximately 1,5 million people living predominantly in the autonomous Republic of Bashkortostan (bšk. *Baškortostan Respublikahï*, in Russian *Respublika Baškortostana*) in the Ural region of the Russian Federation. From the prose works selected, phrases with inverted word order have usually been excluded. The reason for this, as well as for disregarding poetical texts completely, is that certain of the points which are being made in this paper are directly related to word order. It would be impossible to dis-

---

[1] The transcription used for Bashkir is that of Benzing (1959: 423), apart from some slight modifications in the appearance of a few letters, which will be easily discernible. All examples are given in transcribed form (not in the original Cyrillic script). In addition, there is an interlinear gloss with linguistic explanations of text portions of immediate importance, an English translation of the quoted text and references to the source from which the example has been taken in each case. In the transcription and in the gloss, grammatical units (marked by capital letters) are separated by hyphens. As a rule, one morpheme in the transcription corresponds to exactly one grammatical unit in the gloss. However, if two or more grammatical units are attributed to a single morpheme they are placed below this morpheme without a hyphen separating them. Accordingly, if two or more morphemes taken together constitute a single grammatical unit, they are not separated by hyphens either. The translation into English is not meant to reproduce the grammatical structure of the original (which can be guessed at more easily from the gloss) but to convey the overall meaning of the text portion given. Those parts of the text samples which are of particular interest and are discussed in the accompanying text are underlined. They are not given in italics in order to avoid misunderstandings which might arise due to the use of italics for sample text. As a consequence of their morphophonological variations, Bashkir suffixes have a number of forms. For instance, the possessive suffix of the 3rd person appears as *-ho, -hö, -hï, -he, -o, -ö, -ï* or *-e* depending on the preceding phonemes. In order to simplify the presentation, all Bashkir suffixes throughout this article are represented by only one abbreviated symbol each. Within the abbreviations for the suffixes, capital letters indicate variables, while small letters stand for invariables. Superior numbers following variables indicate the number of variables. Brackets indicate optional elements. Thus, all eight variants of the above mentioned 3rd person possessive suffix are amalgamated into *-(h)I⁴*.

cuss them in passages where word order follows altogether extraordinary rules (for pragmatic reasons) or is possibly subject to poetic intention. Whenever single words are quoted that can be looked up in the dictionary (Uraḳsin 1996), no reference will be marked.

Theoretical background

The topic of this article is not merely relevant within the framework of a single linguistic theory. This means, on one hand, that elements from various modern linguistic theories will be included in the investigation. On the other hand, opinions or problems which are of relevance only to particular linguistic schools will not receive special attention. The definitions and the terminological framework used in this article have been compiled from the works of several authors, including (Dik 1996), (Givón 1984), (Johanson 1998), (Lehmann 1984), (Lehmann 1995), and (Matthews 1993).

In order to avoid misunderstandings, it is appropriate to delimitate the usage of a few linguistic *termini technici*, the definitions of which can vary greatly among different schools of modern linguistics.[2] The term "sentence" refers in this article to an independent unit of expression which as a rule ends with a full stop (or other "stop signs", such as exclamation marks or question marks), as opposed to the clause, which need not form the final part of an independent unit of expression[3] (but can, as will be shown in the treatment of the material below). The core element of both sentences and clauses is, following a long-standing tradition, termed "predicate", no matter if it is a noun or a verb. The word "subject", on the other hand, is used as a purely syntactical term and refers to a grammatical unit in the nominative case which represents the first actant of a clause or sentence, for instance, *telegramma* "telegram" in *telegramma kilde*[4] "a telegram has arrived" or *ul* "he" in the sentence *Ḳajða huŋ ul?*[5] "So where is he after all?". "First actant",[6] in turn, designates the most important semantic complement of a predicate. The first actant need not have a syntactical representation in the surface structure; it is a merely hypothetical entity. In the second example above, the predicate *kilde* has a first actant, which is represented in the surface structure by the noun *telegramma* and which corresponds to the referent "telegram". Note that in Bashkir there are predications that do not have a first actant, such as *töṣmörläp bula* in (1). As a consequence of its lacking a first actant, *töṣmörläp bula* cannot take a subject either.

(1)	*Läkin*	*ošo*	*ujðїrma*	*vaḳїġa-lar,*	*möġžizä-le*	*obraz-dar*
	but	this	fictive	event-PL	miracle-ADJ	personage-PL

	aša	*їsїnbarlїḳ-ta*	*bul-ġan*	*ḳajhї ber*	*küreneš-tär-ðe*
	through	reality-LOC	to exist-K^4A^2n	some	phenomenon-PL-ACC

---

[2] A list of symbols and abbreviations is found at the end of the article.
[3] Matthews 1993: 96f.
[4] KM 99, l. 21.
[5] KM 99, l. 22.
[6] The term "first actant" and its definition are taken from Johanson 1998: 52f. Cf. Bazin 1990.

xäl-äxüäl-där-ðe	*tösmör-lä-p*	*bul-a*
state-condition-PL-ACC	to imagine-NV-GER	to be possible-PRES-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$

"But through these fictive events and miraculous figures it is possible to imagine phenomena and conditions that were really existing."

(BB 22, l. 13–15)

Other *termini technici* will be explained as they are introduced in later chapters.

A simple definition of relative clauses

For the limited purposes of this article it is sufficient to choose a simplfied definition of "relative clause". This definition contains two criteria. The first is that relative clauses must have predicate structure. Since it is beyond the scope of this paper to engage in a fundamental discussion of predicate[7] structure, we positively assume that, one way or another, Bashkir predicative constructions can be distinguished unequivocally from non-predicative structures. The term "predicate" in this paper thus has roughly the same semantic scope as in everyday discourse or in so-called "traditional"[8] linguistic terminology. Thus, apart from being the constituent element of predications and sentences (see above), the "predicate" is that which is stated, or "predicated", about something else in a minimal unit of utterance.[9] Although the notions of predicate and predicate structure are based to a certain degree on not formalizable, "fuzzy" semantics, they nevertheless serve us well in establishing the nature of clauses, and especially relative clauses. It is true that the term "clause" is derived from non-Turkic, predominantly Indo-European, linguistics. But although Turkic constructions often have a quite distinct syntactical structure when compared to English, French or Italian "clauses", the term "clause" can also be applied to Turkic phrases that are more or less the semantic and translation equivalents of the non-Turkic clauses. An important formal trait of Turkic "clauses" that distinguishes them from English etc. clauses is, for instance, that the predicate of such a Turkic "clause" is not necessarily a finite verb form.[10] (Finite verb forms, on the other hand, normally mark the end of a sentence by their morphological structure alone, for example the Bashkir $-D^4I^4$ preterite.[11]) The predicate of a clause can also be a non-finite form, such as a gerund or—particularly importantly for the present topic—a participle. The second essential criterion for our relative clauses is that they be constructions that give additional information about the referent of a noun (it is added to the information known from the context or even the lexeme itself that stands for the referent). (As a *terminus technicus* for "to give information about the referent of a noun" we shall henceforth use "to qualify"). Again there are two terms

---

[7] The category "predicate" (and thus, sentence) is controversial in both Turkological and general linguistics. A small selection of approaches to the notion of predicate, which are of relevance to this paper is: Belousov 1989: 8f., 408f.; Drosdowski 1984: 558; Engel 1991: 180; Juldašev 1981: 453f.; Jung 1988: 28; Kočergina 1991: 148, 159; Lyons 1984: 175; Matthews 1993: 91–95; Nigmatov 1984: 4; Širalijev/Sevortjan 1971: 202 and Zakiev 1983: 31, 35.

[8] About the notion of traditional grammar/linguistics see Bußmann 1990: 798f.

[9] Bußmann 1990: 597, s.v. "Prädikation(1)."

[10] Cf. the similar use of the term "clause" for Turkic by Johanson 1998: 63f; see also Johanson 1971: 17.

[11] See Johanson 1971: 16 for the Turkish correspondence.

that we have to dwell on briefly, namely "noun" and "referent". There is widespread agreement among Turkologists about the definition of the category "noun"; nouns can in most cases be identified by their formal structure (see for instance (Johanson 1998): 38). It is essential to point out that "noun" is used here as a purely syntactical term referring to the surface structure.[12] The semantic counterpart of each Bashkir noun on the representational level is called "referent" throughout this article. We understand "referent" here as a purely hypothetical entity, which stands for the person, thing, concept etc. that is denoted by a certain noun. Thus, we can speak of a "referent" even if there is no syntactical representation of it in the surface structure. The term "referent" must not be confused with "first actant". "First actant" is a notion that refers to the structure of predicates. But "referent" is a term which can be used of any linguistic unity having a referent, including predicates, nouns, adjectives, adverbs and so forth. The distinction between a noun and its referent is vital to the analysis of relative clauses. For according to our definition, relative clauses are supposed to qualify not "nouns" but "referents of nouns". This entails that there be relative clauses without a noun appearing as head to the clause on the surface structure level. An example for such a relative clause is (2). Such relative clauses are called "free relatives".[13] On the other hand, if there is not only no noun, but also no referent to be qualified, we can no longer speak of relative clauses, even if the surface structure of such a construction might resemble the structure of free relative clauses. (3) is an example for such a construction, which must not be regarded as a (free) relative clause. For we cannot identify any semantic entity which would be qualified by *torġanïn* and *ineüen*. *Torġanïn* and *ineüen* in (3) are not relative, but declarative clauses.

(2) *"Išbirðe"*   *ti-gäne*   *anau*   *möjöš-tä*   *jat-ḳan*   *keše*   *bul-ïp*
    Išbirðe   call-PART-POSS₃.   that   corner-LOC   lie-PART   person   be-GER

sïḳ-tï
come out-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

"It turned out that the one whom he had called *Išbirðe* was the person lying in the corner."

(KM 360, l. 19f.)

(3) *Sektor*   *mödir-e-neŋ*   *tüŋla-p*   *tor-ġan-ï-n,*   *unïŋ*
    section   director-POSS₃.-GEN   listen-GER   stand-PART-POSS₃.-ACC   heGEN

jan-ï-na   *jänä*   *ber*   *jat keše*   *in-eü-e-n*   *šäjlä-p,*
side-POSS₃.-DAT   again   one   stranger   enter-INF-POSS₃.-ACC   notice-GER

ġäðäti   *tauïš*   *menän*   *öndäš-te:*
usual   voice   INSTR   say-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

"When he noticed that the section manager was standing there and listening and that another stranger had entered his room, he said with his usual voice: …"

(BD 68, l. 2f.)

---

[12] In contrast to definitions of "noun" that contain both formal and semantic or functional elements, as proposed by Juldašev 1981: 100 for Bashkir.

[13] Following, among others, Avgustinova 1996: 10, Lehmann 1984: 45, Matthews 1997: 316.

Only constructions for which both of the above conditions obtain will be regarded as relative clauses.[14]

A brief survey of some important Bashkir relative clause types

The following brief chapter is not intended to give an extensive survey of the manifold types of Bashkir relative clauses, which instead will be attempted in a forthcoming publication. But in order to instructively demonstrate how Bashkir relative clauses are related to the phenomenon of structural ambiguity, a few general typological distinctions are essential. The aim of the present chapter is to briefly highlight the three fundamental types to which all Bashkir relative clause types (conforming to the definition in the preceding chapter) can eventually be attributed. Also, a few very important subtypes will be indicated, though not systematically or exhaustively.

The three main types of Bashkir relative clauses appear to be a) non-verbal relative clauses, b) participial relative clauses and c) correlative clauses. The terms "non-verbal" and "participial" refer to the word class to which the predicate of the relative clause belongs in each case. As for correlative clauses, they have a special syntactic structure, which in theory is independent from the word class status of the relative clause's predicate (though in practice, the predicate of correlative predications is as good as always a finite verb, i.e. a verbal form). But correlative clauses constitute a class of Bashkir relative clauses that can easily be distinguished from the other two main types. And therefore, this class of relative predication deserves to be treated in its own right. Examples of the three main types are given below.

Non-verbal relative clauses

This type of relative clause comprises all relative clauses which are not correlative constructions (see below) and at the same time have a non-verbal predicate (*taniš tügel* in (4)).

(4) *Tän-em-ä   jän, keüät ör-öüse   iŋ   ber-ense-lär-ðän bul-ïp*
     body-POSS₁.-SG-DAT life power blow-PART SUP one-ORD-PL-ABL   to be-GER

jarðam ḳul-ï-n   huð-ïusï   taniš tügel haldat   kit-ep
help   hand-POSS₃.-ACC   stretch out-PART known NEG   soldier go away-GER

bar-ðï
go-PRET-Ø₍₃₎

"That <u>unknown</u> soldier, who had blown life and strength into my body and who, as one of the first, had stretched out a helping hand, went away."

(TX 31, l. 23f.)

---

[14] This definition is a modification of the one given by Lehmann 1984: 47.

Participial relative clauses

As the name implies, here the predicate of the qualifying construction is a participle. This group is quantitatively by far the most important class of Bashkir relative clauses and also the one with the greatest number of subgroups. (5) is an example of one of the most frequent types of participial relative clauses, namely the one where the referent of the head is identical with the first actant referent of the relative clause predicate. Note, however, that these two referents are by no means identical in all participial relative clauses: in (6), the first actant referent of the relative clause predicate *baškarasak* (which has the participle form *-(j)A²sA²K⁴*) is not identical with the referent of the head noun *ēštär*. It is not "the tasks" (referent of *ēštär*) that "will manage" (*baškarasak*), but a syntactically not encoded referent, most likely identical with the second person referent included in *ölöšöŋdö* "your share (accusative)". Because of its not being syntactically encoded and thus possibly being unidentifiable and its imputability to the second person singular referent, one can reasonably translate it into English with "you", which fits both of these meanings.

(5) *Niŋä*   *ojat*   *bul-hïn,*   *ķara-r*   *keše*   *bul-ma-ġas,*
     why   shame   to be-IMP₃   to take care-AORPART   person   to be there-NEG-GER

     ber   *ðä*   *ojat*   *bul-maś.*
     one   EMPH   shame   to be-AORNEG₃.SG

"Why shall it be a shame? Since there is nobody who would take care, it will not be a shame either."

                                                (ĠMF 220, l. 31)

(6) *Mömkin*   *tiklem*   *här*   *kön-dän*   *teješle*   *ölöš-öŋ-dö*
     possible   as...as   every   day-ABL   necessary   share-POSS₂.SG-ACC

     al-ïp   *ķal-ïrġa,*   *unï*   *kiläsäk-tä*   *baškar-asaţ*   *ēš-tär*
     to take-GER AUX-INF   itACC   future-LOC   to fulfill-FUTPART   task-PL

     ösön   *tupla-rġa*   *käräk.*
     for   to collect-INF   necessary

"You should grab your share of every day as long as you can, and collect it for tasks that you will accomplish in the future."

                                                (ĠR 35, 13–15)

Correlative clauses[15]

In this type of relative constructions, there are typically two "correlative" (from Latin, = "referring to each other") pronouns. More complex types may contain more than two correlative pronouns, but these rare cases must be disregarded in this cursory introduction. However, it is quite common for one of the two standard correlative pronouns to be missing. The correlative character of the construction is nevertheless preserved because the *referent* of the absent pronoun is understood. (This

---

[15] For correlative constructions in general see Trask 1993: 65.

follows the same principle that allows relative clauses without a head noun and has been developed in the preceding chapter). The missing element is always the one which would have occurred in the syntactically higher predication (which is *jöð täŋkelek tügel* in (7)). An example for this type of defective correlative construction is (7). A regular example for a correlative construction with two syntactically expressed correlative pronouns is (8).

(7) *Ni*   *genä*   *hora-ha*   *la*   *jöð*   *täŋkä-lek*   *tügel,*   *ti*
    what   MOD   ask-COND-∅$_{(3.)}$ also   hundred   ruble-NN   NEG   sayPRES$_3$.

"Whatever he asked for, (it) was not worth a hundred rubles, it is said." (or:) "Anything he asked for was not worth one hundred rubles."

<div align="right">(AA 61, l. 27)</div>

(8) *Hunar-ða*   *kem-deŋ*   *ḳoš-o*   *nimä*   *tib-ä,*   *šunï*   *miŋä*
    hunting-LOC   who-GEN   bird-POSS$_3$ what   to hit-PRES-∅$_{(3.)}$ thisACC   IDAT

    al-ïp   *kil-er-hegeð!*
    to taken   to come-AOR-$_2$.PL

"You will bring to me what the birds of each (of you) has hit in hunting!"

<div align="right">(SÖÄ 178, l. 20f.)</div>

Correlative clauses have some special semantic features. For instance, they are semantically marked because they always have an indefinite, but mostly specific, head referent. However, such semantic qualities of correlative clauses are not vital to our subject. More important is the fact that the pronominal element in the qualifying part of the correlative construction is formally identical to an interrogative pronoun; *ni* in (7) also means "what?", as does *nimä* in (8).

A number of other types of Bashkir relative clauses can be established besides the three basic types mentioned. These subdivisions include, for instance, the one according to the representation of the first actant (which from a formal point of view can be put in the nominative or genitive case or encoded by a possessive suffix), the possibility of syntactic coincidence between the predicate and the head of the relative clause (which is realized in "free relative clauses", cf. above) and semantic criteria such as the restrictiveness/non-restrictiveness opposition. But these are not of immediate importance for the central point of this paper, to which we shall return now.

The notion of structural ambiguitiy

In general linguistics the term structural ambiguity[16] is used of phrases which have "two or more different (structural) interpretations" ((Lessau 1994): 35). An important characteristic of structurally ambiguous constructions is that their different in-

---

[16] There is a number of synonyms for "structural ambiguitiy" in linguistic literature, such as "amphiboly" Lessau 1994: 36, "constructional homonymy", "grammatical ambiguity" (Lessau 1994: 35) and "polysyntacticity" (Lessau 1994: 35, cf. Bußmann 1990: 75).

terpretations obey certain rules, are predictable and can be described in a systematic way. This distinguishes structural ambiguity from other types of ambiguity or vagueness, where the different semantic interpretations of a given word or construction are not systematically predictable.[17] Let us take for example the Bashkir word *sabïu*. (Uraḳsin 1996): 523 lists in five separate entries five different basic meanings that a *sabïu* can have. These are (1) "to gallop" (russ. *skakat' na loščadi'*), (2) "to mow" (russ. *kosit'*), (3) "to cut, injure" (russ. *razrubat'*), (4) "to hit, slap" (russ. *udarjat'*) and (5) "lap of a skirt" (russ. *pola, fadla*). Although it might be argued that entries (3), (4) and (5) form one single lemma, there would still be three different meanings for *sabïu*, none of which can be predicted from one of the others. Therefore, the various meanings of *sabïu* constitute an example of homonymy, but not of stuctural ambiguity. On the other hand, we see structural ambiguity in the following two examples:

(9) *Minä*   *unïŋ*   *ösön*   *üð-em-de*   *bötön-läj*   *juḳ*   *it-ergä*
     IDAT   sheGEN   because of   self-POSS₁.SG-ACC   all-ADV   gone   to make-INF

   jïjïn-ïu-ïm-dan   *saḳ*   *tor-op*   *ḳal-ġan-ïm*   *da*
   to be ready-INF-POSS₁.SG-ABL   hardly   to stand-GER   AUX-PART-POSS₁.SG   also

   jet-kän.   *Ul kön*   *inde*   *art-ta.*
   to reach-PRET-∅₍₃.₎   that day-∅   now   back part-LOC

"And (finally,) I had reached (the day) when I was hardly able to stand on my feet because I was ready to sacrifice myself completely for her. That day is now a matter of the past."

(ĠR 138, l. 29–31)

(10) *Huŋǧï*   *un*   *kön*   *ės-e-ndä*   *min*   *un*   *üð-e-mde*   *jïl*
      last   ten   day-∅   inside-POSS₃.-LOC   I   ten   self-POSS₁.SG-ACC   year-∅

   jäšä-gän   *keüek*   *toj-ðo-m.*   *Ös*   *kön*   *aša-rġa*   *la*
   to live-PART   like   to feel-PRET-₁.SG   three   day-∅   to eat-INF   also

   bul-ma-nï.
   to be there-NEG-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

"In the last ten days I felt as though I had lived ten years. And for three days there was nothing to eat, too."

(ĠR 125, l. 17f.)

In these examples, we find nouns that denote a unit of time: *kön* three times and *jïl* once. Grammatically, they all appear in the same form, the so called absolutive or nominative case, which is characterized by the zero morpheme (or in other words: it has no morpheme). Although all instances of *kön* and *jïl* in (9) and (10) have the

---

[17] See Lessau 1994: 32–35, s.v. ambiguity and vagueness; 469f., s.v. indeterminacy; 904f., s.v. vagueness; cf. also Bußmann 1990: 75.

same grammatical form, their functions and meanings are different. *Kön* in (9) is the subject of a sentence. The first *kön* in (10) is the first element of a postpositional phrase, *un kön ésendä*. And finally, the second *kön* in (10) as well as *jïl* are temporal adverbs. The different functional status of these morphemes entails a different meaning, which is reflected in the translations. The important point about *jïl* and the *kön*s is that all their distinct functions and meanings can be predicted systematically even if they do not actually occur in a clause or sentence. For it is a general rule of Bashkir grammar that endingless nouns denoting time units can either be temporal adverbs, subjects or elements of nominal compounds. Therefore, the multiple functions of *kön* and *jïl* in the examples can be described as a case of structural ambiguity. Note, however, that the structural ambiguity of *kön* and *jïl* as a rule only obtains when they are considered out of context. If they appear in a real utterance, the correct meaning usually is evident, as in (9) and (10). We will see that the Bashkir examples discussed in the following chapter are somewhat stricter than (9) and (10), for they show structural ambiguity *in spite of* their surrounding context. We can therefore use a special term for this special kind of structural ambiguity: independent structural ambiguity. The relative structural ambiguity of (9) and (10) can be termed contextual structural ambiguity.

Let us now sum up the two necessary conditions for structural ambiguity. Firstly, a given language unit must be attributable to two (or more) linguistic categories at the same time. Secondly, the given language unit must not be an irregular or otherwise unpredictable form (such as a *hapax legomenon* or an archaic, dialectal, idiolectal, idiomatic or lexicalized form[18]).

The interface of structural ambiguity and Bashkir relative clauses

Let us now take a more detailed look at some instances of category mixing in Bashkir. To my knowledge, the question of structural ambiguity has never explicitly been raised for any Turkic language. Certain Turkologists have claimed that, for instance, Turkish finite verbal forms are essentially nouns (see the reflections of this theory in (Johanson 1971): 17). However, this concept, which seems to have obliterated nowadays, has nothing to do with structural ambiguity. For its representatives claim that the "nominal" interpretation of Turkic verbs[19] is an alternative to their common interpretation as verbs, but they do not come up with a theory which would ascribe two (or more) structural interpretations to a single grammatical unit (as, for instance, finite verb forms).

All the examples that are given below are, as a requirement of the subject of the present paper, somehow related to the category of relative clauses, and all of them happen to show independent structural ambiguity.

---

[18] These seem to be the essential "borderline" phenomena which do not admit an interpretation as structural ambiguity, but see Lessau 1994: 81 for some more items.

[19] Incidentally, the paradoxical side of such a view is criticized by Johanson 1971: 17.

Relative clause~adverbial clause

In Bashkir, there are two semantic types of constructions in which the categories of participial relative clause and participial adverbial clause coincide. The first of these types contains a head element which conveys the meaning of comparison, while the head element of the second has a temporal meaning. Among the elements with comparative meaning that can be subject to category mixing are the suffixes $-(n)D^4A^2j$ and $-(n)sA^2$, particles such as *hïmak* or *keüek* and noun derivatives such as *köjö*, *šikelle* or *töslö* (which are derived from the nouns *köj* "melody, manner, way", *šikel* "form, manner" and *tös* "colour, way, manner" with a degree of meaning shift, respectively). All of these morphemes can be translated into English by "as, like", although some of them may have an additional semantic shade, which might in relevant cases be traced back to the semantic properties of the basic nouns. However, such additional nuances do not have to be dealt with in depth in the present paper, since they do not affect the principle of structural ambiguity. In the second group of morphemes, those which allow category mixing and have a temporal meaning, we find a host of lexemes belonging to the word class noun and having the meaning "time" (or, again, a partially synonymous notion, such as "period", "point of time" etc.). The two most important morphemes to mention from this group are *mäl* ("point of time, time") and *vakït* ("time"). Other morphemes in this group include *ara* "time, interval of time", *miðgel* "time, point of time" and *zaman* "time".

Since lack of space prevents us from giving examples of all the morphemes listed above, it will have to suffice to provide one example each of the three classes of words into which those morphemes fall, i.e., suffix, particle and noun. This means that not all possible combinations of semantic status and word class status can be illustrated. As an example of suffixes, I have chosen $-(n)D^4A^2j$. For particles there will be examples of *keüek*. While both of the foregoing morphemes have comparative meaning, the usage of nouns in this type of category mixing will be illustrated with the temporal morpheme *mäl*. Each of the constructions that will be given below have in common that they can just as well be interpreted as relative clauses as analysed as adverbial clauses.

The comparative morpheme $-(n)D^4A^2j$

The first morpheme to be investigated is $-(n)D^4A^2j$. Remember that according to our relative clause definition, a head noun need not necessarily be present on the surface structure. It is sufficient that there be only a *referent*, a semantic entity, which is qualified by the relative clause. The term "referent" denotes, as stated above, a purely hypothetical entity. The following examples with $-(n)D^4A^2j$ allow in each case an interpretation both as a relative and as an adverbial clause. The relative clause interpretation will be indicated by the letter R, the adverbial reading by A. Since the possibility of a twofold interpretation is persistent in all of the examples given below for the participle-plus--$(n)D^4A^2j$ constructions, it can be stated that this duality is independent of the context and an indication of the independent structural ambiguity of the constructions themselves. The relative clause participle in evidence in the examples below is the very widespread $-K^4A^2n$ morpheme.

(11) *Teleüðäk*   *direktor-ï*   *üð-e-n*   _*upķin-ġa*_   _*os-op*_   _*töš-öp*_
     television   director-POSS₃.   self-POSS₃.-ACC   abyss-DAT   to fly-GER   to fall-GER
     center

    *bar-ġan-daj*   *toj-ðo,*   *ämmä*   *ķaltïra-n-ïp*   *kit-kän*
    AUX-K^4A^2n-$(n)D^4A^2j$ to feel-PRET-∅₍₃.₎   but   to shake-REF-GER   AUX-K^4A^2n

    ķul-dar-ï-n   *öṣtäl*   *aṣt-ï-na*   *jäšär-ðe.*
    Hand-PL-POSS₃.-ACC   table   bottom-POSS₃.-DAT   to hide-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

"The director of the television station felt (R) like one who was rushing towards the bottom of an abyss (A) as if he was rushing towards the bottom of an abyss. But he was able to hide his shaking hands underneath the table."

                                                (BD 71, l. 22–25)

(12) *Xatta*   *ķarši-ġa*   *osra-ġan*   *keše-lär-ðeŋ*   *küð-ðär-e-ndä,*
     even   opposite-DAT   to be met-K^4A^2n person-PL-GEN   eye-PL-POSS₃.-LOC

    jöð-ðär-e-ndä   *lä*   *jïlmaj-ïu*   *balķï-j,*   *nindäjðer*   *hil*
    face-PL-POSS₃.-LOC   also   to smile-INF   to shine-PRES-∅₍₃.₎   a certain   calm

    tantana   *ular-ðï*   *ės-tän*   _*jaķtïr-t-kan-daj*_   *toj-ol-a.*
    dignity   they-ACC   inside-ABL   to shine-CAUS-K^4A^2n-$(n)D^4A^2j$ to feel-PASS-PRES-∅₍₃.₎

"And what is more, in the eyes and faces of the people that you were meeting even a smile was shining, and a certain calm dignity was felt (R) like something which was lighting them from inside (A) as if it lighted them from inside."

                                                (BD 15, l. 34–36)

(13) *Major,*   *jaķin*   *tuġan-ï*   *menän*   _*ajïr-ïl-ïš-ķandaj,*_
     major   close   relative-POSS₃.   with   to separate-PASS-REC-$K^4\dot{z}^2n$-$(n)D^4A^2j$

    ixlas   *xušlaš-tï,*   *ķul-ï-n*   *huð-ðï*
    heartily   to say goodbye-PRET-∅₍₃.₎   arm-POSS₃.-ACC   to stretch out-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

"The major heartily said goodbye to him, (R) like somebody who was leaving a close relative, (A) as if he was leaving a close relative, and stretched out his hand: ..."

                                                (BD 82, l. 4–6)

The following two examples, (14) and (15), are not instances of structural ambiguity. They demonstrate how -$(n)D^4A^2j$ is attached to nouns. The reason why they are presented here is the following: the relative clause interpretation of the -$(n)D^4A^2j$ forms in examples (11), (12) and (13) presupposes that the elements to which -$(n)D^4A^2j$ is attached are nouns, too. Therefore, the existence of noun plus -$(n)D^4A^2j$ constructions such as (14) and (15) is a necessary prerequisite for the possibility of interpreting (11), (12) and (13) as relative clauses.

(14) - *Säǧit Xarisovič, bïndaj   xäl-deŋ   beð-ðä   bul-ġan-ï*
      Säǧit Xariovič this(n)D^4A^2j event-GEN we-LOC to happen-K^4A^2n-POSS₃

    juḳ,   *- ti-ne*   *ul.*
    not existant   to say-PRET-∅₍₃.₎   he

" '*Säǧit Xarisovič*, such a thing has never before happened by us', he said."

(BD 71, l. 36f.)

The noun from which *bïndaj* is derived by the attachment of the suffix -(n)D^4A^2j is the personal pronoun *bïl* "this one (here), this one (near to the speaker)". The disappearance of the final -*l* of *bïl* in the process is a morphologically irregular phenomenon in Bashkir, but it is not limited to -(n)D^4A^2j. Compare the dative case *bï-ġa* and the genitive case *bï-nïŋ* of that same pronoun. The consonant deletion does not affect the word class status and meaning of the pronoun.

(15) *Bïna   Xïjalïj   Xälil   ḳarama-hï-nïŋ   ür-gä   tarbaj-ġan*
    DEIC   *Xïjalïj Xäli l* elm-POSS₃.-GEN top-DAT to spread-K^4A^2n

    botaḳ   os-o-nan   haǧïð-ðaj   ḳara   käzä   bäräs-e
    twig   end-POSS₃.-ABL tar (n)D^4A^2j black   goat   young-POSS₃

    mikäkäjlä-p   ïrǧ-ïp   töš-tö.
    to bleat-GER to jump-G ER to fall-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

"And at this moment, a young goat, as black as tar, jumped down, bleating, from the twig ends of *Xïjalïj Xälil*'s elm, which were climbing upwards."

(SJ 71, l. 7f.)

Digression: unequivocally dependent clauses

Before we continue to give examples of structural ambiguity between relative and adverbial clauses using *keüek* and *mäl*, it is useful that a general point about Bashkir dependent clauses be made. For it is important for the reader to know that category mixing of the type illustrated in the preceding section is a characteristic neither of Bashkir relative clauses nor of Bashkir adverbial clauses in general. For there are plenty of examples for relative clauses which must not be analysed as adverbial clauses, and, on the other hand, many types of adverbial clauses which must not, or at least not normally, be interpreted as relative clauses. The present paragraph aims at providing a few examples of this, before we resume the thread of our previous argumentation with the examples of *keüek*.

Morphologically unequivocally dependent clauses

One of the means by which we can safely recognize a certain construction as being a relative clause, or not, is morphology. For there are certain morphemes which are only interpretable in either way. For instance, the suffixes -(n)$D^4A^2\acute{G}^2I^2$ and -$D^4I^4K^2I^4$ *exclusively* serve to form relative clauses (according to our definition). Thus, *üðebeððeke* in (16) could literally be translated into English by "those who belong to us" or "those who are of us", and it is a kind of relative clause derived

from *üðebeð* "we ourselves". *Üðebeð* is a noun according to our general conception of Bashkir grammar. The morpheme *-D⁴I⁴Ḳ²I⁴*, which is part of it (and appears, due to morphophonological reasons, in the form *-ðeke*), serves to transform *üðebeð* into a unit that qualifies nouns and at the same time has a possessive meaning.

(16) *Motahar   Ġilmanovič,   bar,   dežur   mašina-nï,*
      Motahar   Ġilmanovič   to go-∅(IMP$_{(2.)}$)   on duty   car-ACC

    üð-ebeð-ðeke-lär-ðe   *lä*   *montaž-sï-lar*   *art-ï-nan*
    self-POSS₂PL-(n)D⁴A²Ġ²I²-PL-ACC   also   montage-NAG-PL   back-POSS₃-ABL

    jebär.
    to send-∅(IMP$_{(2.)}$)

"*Motahar Ġilmanovič*, go and send the car on duty, as well as <u>our folks</u>, after the fitters!"

                                     (BD 74, l. 28–30)

Just as *-D⁴I⁴Ḳ²I⁴*, the morphem *-(n)D⁴A²Ġ²I²* may not form adverbial clauses, but only relative clauses like the one in (17):

(17) *Isïn   jäj   kil-ep   jet-kän-de   bel-der-ep-me*
      real   summer   to come-GER   to reach-Ḳ⁴A²n-ACC   to know-CAUS-GER-?

    ikän,   zäŋgär   kük-täge   *ḳojaš   ta   artïḳ   jomart-la-n-ïp*
    MOD   blue   skies-(n)D⁴A²Ġ²I²   sun   also   from now on   generous-NV-PASS-
                                                    GER

    kit-te -   *ḳajnar   nur-ðar-ï-n*   *ber öðlökhöð   jer*
    to go-PRET-∅$_{(3.)}$ warm   light-PL-POSS₃-ACC   incessantlyADV   earth

    öṣt-ö-nä   *jau-ðïr-ðï.*
    surface-POSS₃-DAT   to rain-CAUS-PRET-∅$_{(3.)}$

"Was it perhaps in order to promulgate that the real summer had arrived that the sun <u>in the blue skies</u> (lit., <u>which was in the blue skies</u>) was now becoming more generous and pouring its warm rays of light incessantly down on the earth?"

                                       (BD 75, l. 7–10)

While *-(n)D⁴A²Ġ²I²* and *-D⁴I⁴Ḳ²I⁴* exclusively form relative, but never adverbial clauses, there are, on the contrary, also morphemes which may under no circumstances be understood as relative clauses, but which must be interpreted as adverbial clauses. There is quite a number of these morphemes, but it will suffice to have a look at two of them. We will take as examples constructions with *-Ḳ⁴A²s* and *-(I⁴)bI⁴rA²Ḳ²*. *-Ḳ⁴A²s* constructions can often be translated into English by temporal clauses which are introduced by "after, as soon as". This morpheme only forms adverbial clauses. *-(I⁴)bI⁴rA²Ḳ²*, on the other hand, which is a complex gerund made up of the gerundial suffix *-(I⁴)P²* and the comparative morpheme, *-(I⁴)rA²Ḳ*, approximately equals an adverbial clause expressing a restricted modification. Typically, *-(I⁴)bI⁴rA²Ḳ²* clauses contain the semantic element of comparison (as one would expect from the second component of the morpheme). See examples (18) and (19).

(18) *Ḳormantaev öndäšmäne,   ul ujlana ine. Bajramov jan-ï-na*
                                                     Bajramov   side-POSS₃-DAT

    kil-ep   jet-käs,   oδaḳ ḳina tege-nä²⁰ ara-p
    to come-GER   to arrive-*Ḳ⁴A²s* long ADV   that-DAT   to look at-GER

    tor-δo
    AUX-PRET-∅₍₃₎

"*Ḳormantaev* did not say a word. He was thinking. After *Bajramov* had come to his side, he kept looking at him for a long time."

(BD 71, l.21f.)

(19) *Šunan   uŋajhiδ-la-n-ïb-ïraḳ   baṣ-ïp   tor-gan*
     thisABL   bewildered-NV-REF-(*I⁴*)*P²*-COMP   to step-GER   to stand-*Ḳ⁴A²n*

    jäš-tär-gä   ḳara-p   öṣt-ä-ne: Heδ-δeŋ   šäχsi
    young-PL-DAT   to look at-GER top-NV-PRET-∅₍₃₎   you-GEN   personal

    jomoš-oġoδ   bar   šikelle.
    job-POSS₂PL   extant MOD

"And then he added with a glance at the young people, who were standing there, becoming still a little bit more bewildered: 'It looks as if you have got a personal job...'"

(BD 75, l. 2–4)

It is perfectly clear already from the morphological appearance of the marked constructions in (18) and (19) that they cannot be understood as relative clauses.

Other unequivocally dependent clauses

The constructions illustrated in examples (16), (17), (18) and (19) can, due to their morphological structure, unequivocally be assigned to a single grammatical category (either relative clause or adverbial clause). However, many Bashkir morphemes can *not* be unequivocally attributed to a single grammatical category solely judging by their morphological appearance. Perhaps the most important of these morphemes is -*Ḳ⁴A²n*, which we pick out as our next example. The next in importance among these morphemes (which, again, cannot be presented here in full) are the future tense morpheme -(*j*)*A²sA²Ḳ⁴* and the aorist morpheme. The morpheme -*Ḳ⁴A²n*, a special use of which is presented in this paragraph, serves, among other things,[21] to form both relative and adverbial clauses. That is, it is not possible to determine only by the morphological shape of this morpheme whether we are dealing with a relative or an adverbial construction. Some constructions with -*Ḳ⁴A²n* (and other morphemes) are subject to structural ambiguity in the same way as we have witnessed while discussing the above -*Ḳ⁴A²ndA²j* examples. Other -*Ḳ⁴A²n* phrases are, however, for reasons other than morphology, unequivocally attributable to a single grammatical category. The unequivocal status of these constructions can be en-

---

[20] The original text has *tegeŋä*, which might be due to a misprint.

[21] In the next section, the usage of -*Ḳ⁴A²n* as a sentence-concluding morpheme will be shown.

coded through additional syntactical or lexical information contained in them. Also, in some cases the particular grammatical status of a given $-\underline{K}^4A^2n$ construction is established by its habitual usage in the Bashkir language. We will now briefly demonstrate two of these unequivocal morpheme types. The morpheme $-\underline{K}^4A^2ndA^2$ (which, in a diachronic perspective, can be divided up into its constituent elements, the $-\underline{K}^4A^2n$ participle and the locative suffix $-D^4A^2$) as good as always forms temporal adverbial clauses. The English counterparts of these clauses can be introduced with "when, while, as" etc. In the material investigated, not a single example is found where a (theoretically imaginable) interpretation of a $-\underline{K}^4A^2ndA^2$ construction as some sort of relative clause in the locative case would be appropriate. Accordingly, *jahaǵanda* in the following example must not be regarded as a relative clause, but can only be understood as a temporal adverbial clause. But this is not due to the morphological marking, but the special lexicalized meaning of $-\underline{K}^4A^2ndA^2$.

(20) *Xäjer,   letučka-la   <u>ul sïǵïš   jaha-ǵanda</u>   heð   juḵ   ine-geð.*
     no   briefing-LOC   he appearance   to do-$\underline{K}^4A^2ndA^2$ you   absent   to bePRET-$_2$PL

"No, <u>when he made his appearance</u> in the briefing, you were absent."

(BD 71, l. 39f.)

Another morpheme which, notwithstanding its morphological similarity to relative clauses, never actually forms relative clauses in the body of the analysed material is $-\underline{K}^4A^2n\dot{G}^2A^2$. This suffix is, from a purely morphological point of view, made up of the morpheme $-\underline{K}^4A^2n$ and the dative case suffix $-\underline{K}^4A^2$. As a single unit, $-\underline{K}^4A^2n\dot{G}^2A^2$ conveys either causal meaning, as can be seen in (21), or is to be understood as a declarative clause with an additional dative suffix, as is the case in (22).

(21) *Ular,   jarlï   bul-ǵan-ǵa   kürä,   tübän   feker-le   bul-ïrǵa*
     they   poor   to be-$\underline{K}^4A^2n$-DAT   because   low   thoughts-NN   to be-INF

     ällä   ḵasan-dan   öjrän-ep   kil-gängä,   bïnï
     INDEF   when-ABL   to become accustomed-GER   AUX-$\underline{K}^4A^2n\dot{G}^2A^2$ this-ACC

     ber ðä   auïr-hïn-ma-j   ǵina   ḵabul   it-kän   töṣ-lö
     EMPH   hard-NV-NEG-GER   MOD   acceptance   to do-$\underline{K}^4A^2n$ colour-ADJ

     bul-dï-lar.
     to become-PRET-$\varnothing_{(3.)}$-PL)

"Because they were poor, and <u>because they had</u> for some time <u>got used</u> to nourishing mean thoughts, they in no way saw it as a hardship, but had somehow come to accept it."

(ĠMJ 229, l. 32–34)

(22) *Ber-ense-nän,   äðäbi   tapšïrïu   <u>töšöp al-ǵanǵa</u>   riza-hïð-lïḵ*
     one-ORD-ABL   literary   broadcast   to be cancelled-$\underline{K}^4A^2n\dot{G}^2A^2$ consenting-NEG-NN

     bel-der-ðe.
     to know-CAUS-PRET-$\varnothing_{(3.)}$

"Firstly, he communicated his dissent <u>about the cancelling</u> of the literary programme (literally, <u>about the fact that the literary programme had been cancelled</u>)."

(BD 71, l. 40f.)

Constructions with -$Ḵ^4A^2nĠ^2A^2$ might theoretically be assumed to generally form also relative clauses in the dative case, which would be equivalent to the Turkish *di-yen-e* in *ne mutlu Türküm diyene*[22] "how lucky it is for him who says 'I am a Turk!'". On the other hand, the literary Bashkir of the investigated texts shows in such cases a clear tendency to employ a semantically empty head noun, such as *äδäm*, *insan* or (most frequently) *keše*, all meaning "man" or "human being",[23] instead of free relative clauses in the dative case and with human reference. This can be illustrated by the following example, where the semantically empty head noun used is *insan* "human being". There is no -$Ḵ^4A^2nĠ^2A^2$ construction, even though its human reference would be unequivocally understandable in the context, since the word *hiŋä* "to you", which has the same referent as *insanġa*, raises the human reference of *šöġöllängän insanġa* beyond any doubt.

(23) <u>Hiŋä,</u>   baškort   tarix-ï   menän   tägäjen   <u>šöġöl-lä-n-gän</u>
      youDAT   Bashkir   history-POSS₃   with   intensely   occupation-NV-REF-$Ḵ^4A^2n$

      <u>insan-ġa,</u>   Amerika   as-ma-ġan-mïn-dïr,   älbittä
      human being-DAT   America   to discover-$Ḵ^4A^2n$-NEG-₁SG-MOD   certainly

"<u>For you, a man who has</u> intensely <u>occupied himself</u> with Bashkir history, I have not discovered America, of course…"

(SJ 60, l. 47f.)

After we have seen examples for -$Ḵ^4A^2n$ constructions that cannot—in any case as far as the data allow us to know—be understood as relative clauses, but must be interpreteted as some kind of adverbial clause, let us now finally, before returning to the examples of category mixing with relative clauses, illustrate constructions where the opposite holds. These are -$Ḵ^4A^2n$ constructions which cannot be explained as adverbial clauses, but clearly are relative clauses. The reason why the underlined phrases in the following two text samples cannot be taken as adverbial clauses, is the semantic class to which their head noun belongs. Thus, because of the semantic class into which the head noun *jortoġoδ* "your house" in (24) falls it is excluded that the construction *(hala) torġan jortoġoδ* be regarded otherwise than as a relative clause. The same is true for the head elements *taṣmalardïŋ* and *kopijalarï* in (25), which are clearly not semantically empty and therefore cannot be considered only as markers of a grammatical category. Therefore, in example (24), none of the two relative clauses *urlanġan* and *montažlanmaġan* can be understood as any kind of adverbial clause.

(24) <u>Hal-a</u>   <u>tor-ġan</u>   <u>jort-oġoδ-δoŋ</u>   majδan-ï   turahïnda
      to build-GER   AUX-$Ḵ^4A^2n$ house-POSS₂PL-GEN   area-POSS₃   about

---

[22] A famous motto by Atatürk, see e.g. Steuerwald 1972: 660.
[23] Sometimes even words with more specific semantics, such as *jeget* "young man, youth, boy, lad" are employed in this way.

feker-lä-š-ep   *al-ahï*   *ine*   *lä,*   *jara-r*
thought-NV-REC-GER   to take-PART   was   and   to be all right-AOR-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$

inde.
already

"One should give a thought to the area of <u>the house that you are building</u>, this would already do it."

<div align="right">(BD 72, l. 38f.)</div>

(25) <u>*Urla-n-ġan*</u>   <u>*taṣma-lar-ðïŋ*</u>   <u>*montaž-la-n-ma-ġan*</u>
     to steal-PASS-K^4A^2n tape-PL-GEN   montage-NV-PASS-NEG-K^4a^2n

<u>*kopija-lar-ï*</u>   *bar.*
copy-PL-POSS₃   extant

"There are copies of the <u>stolen</u> tapes <u>that have not been mounted</u>."

<div align="right">(BD 74, l. 21f.)</div>

The fact that category mixing may depend on the semantic status of the head word, as we have seen in the last examples, becomes evident whenever the head element is a morpheme that has neither comparative nor temporal meaning. Such constructions can be grammatically interpreted in only one way, that is, either as a relative or as an adverbial clause. For instance, if we take the particle *ösön*, which conveys a meaning of purpose, as a head element, the whole phrase must not be interpreted as a relative clause. Or rather, there are no examples of such a possibility in the texts under scrutiny. As a rule, constructions with *ösön* as their second element must be understood as equivalent to English adverbial clauses. Take (26) as an example:

(26) *Ösönsöhö—Börkötlölä berðän-ber jerän säsle, hipkelle malaj Ajðar. Uniŋ*
     «Ḳïr käzähe» tigän ḳušamatï la bar.

Šäp   <u>*jüger-gän*</u>   *ösön*   *šulaj*   *ti-p*   *jörö-t-ä-lär.*
fast   to run-K^4A^2n because   thus   to say-GER   to go-CAUS-PRES-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$-PL

"The third of them is the one and only red-haired and freckly boy in *Börkötlö, Ajðar*. He also has a nickname, 'wild goat'. They call him this, <u>because he can run fast</u>."

<div align="right">(KM 161, l. 25–28)</div>

It has been demonstrated in the preceding digression that Bashkir relative clauses cannot in their totality be seen as functionally equivalent to Bashkir adverbial clauses, and vice versa, for morphological, syntactical and lexical reasons. Now we will return to our original subject, that is, to those cases where such a mutual functional equivalence *does* obtain. In illustrating the pertinent examples, the use of the letters R and A will be the same as above. Practically unacceptable interpretations will in each case again be marked by an asterisk. The constructions thus marked by the asterisk might theoretically be regarded as being acceptable in some appropriate (especially constructed, fictive) context. But they are never attested in the material investigated for this article. However, the mere distant possibility that they might be is the reason for the restricting formulation "hardly".

The comparative postposition *keüek*

Postpositions like *keüek* differ from suffixes because they are written separately and do not change according to the rules of Bashkir vowel harmony. But they resemble suffixes in that they do not occur independently. Despite the peculiarities that distinguish it from suffixes, *keüek* appears in constructions with structural ambiguity in a similar way to the ones with *-(n)D⁴A²j*. That is, as a rule, constructions consisting of a participle[24] and the morpheme *keüek* can be interpreted either as relative or adverbial clauses.

(27) *Ä*   *ḳïðïḳaj,*   *buš*   *urïn-ġa*   *ara-ġan*
    but   girlHYP   empty   space-DAT   to look-*Ḳ⁴A²n*

    keüek,   *unïŋ*   *aša*   *stena-ġa*   *töbä-l-ep,*
    like   itGEN   across   Wall-DAT   to direct-PASS-GER

    zäŋgär   *küð-ðär-e-n*   *tïnïs*   *ḳïna*   *ujna-t-tï:*
    blue   eye-PL-POSS₃-ACC   calm   MOD   to play-CAUS-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

(R) "But the girl was <u>like somebody who looked into empty space.</u> (A) It was, <u>as if the girl looked into empty space,</u> she directed herself through it to the wall, and she let her blue eyes play slowly."

                                            (BD 102, l. 27–29)

(28) *Hin*   *köt-mä-gän-heŋ-der*   *ðä*   *unï.*   *Min*
    you   expect-NEG-PRET-₂SG-MOD   even   itACC   I

    üð-em-de   *hineŋ*   *al-da*   *ällä*   *nindäj*
    self-POSS₂SG-ACC   youGEN   front-LOC   INDEF   some

    ġäjep   *ėšlä-gän*   *keüek*   *xis*   *it-ep*   *kit-te-m*
    mistake   to make-*Ḳ⁴A²n*   like   to   feel-GER   AUX-PRET-₁SG

"Probably you did not even notice it, but in front of you I felt (R) <u>like somebody who had committed</u> some sort of mistake (A) <u>as if I had committed</u> some sort of mistake…"

                                         (ĠR 37, l.42–38, l.2)

Again, as with *-(n)D⁴A²j*, the postposition *keüek* also occurs as an element of noun constructions which are not relative clauses. In such constructions it has the same syntactical function as if following free relative clauses. See the next example:

(29) *Unïŋ*   *haġïn-ïp,*   *äsä*   *keüek*   *kil-eü-e*
    sheGEN   to yearn-GER   mother   like   to come-INF-POSS₃.

    mine   *bik*   *tulḳïn-la-n-dïr-ðï.*
    me   very   wave-NV-REF-CAUS-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

"That she had come yearningly, <u>like a mother,</u> moved me deeply."

                                           (ĠR 44, l. 14f.)

---

[24] Instead of speaking about "participles", one should more correctly say "participles capable of forming relative clauses" or use a special term for these participles which would indicate their ability to be part of relative clauses. But it is possible to save space by just speaking about "participles", even if "participles that can be used in relative clauses" is to be understood.

A noun with temporal meaning: *mäl*

Finally, structural ambiguity between relative and adverbial clauses occurs also if the head element is a noun. In general, what distinguishes nouns from suffixes like *-(n)D⁴A²j* and postpositions like *keüek* is that they may appear independently, with their specific semantic contents. The fact that the head element is a noun also has consequences for the syntactical analysis. For if the whole construction is to be seen as a relative clause, consisting of a preceding qualifying part and the adjoining noun, this relative clause must not then be a free relative clause (as in the examples with *-(n)D⁴A²j* and *keüek* above), but a "normal" relative clause. We will now take a look at an example with *mäl*. The deeper reason why this example can be understood both as a relative and an adverbial clause seems to be that the abstract semantic content of *mäl* comes close to the semantic status of a purely grammatical morpheme.

(30) *Ošo*   *höjläš-eü*   <u>*bar-ġan*</u>   *mäl-dä*   *processija*   *kil-de.*
       this   to speak-INF   to be in process-K^4A^2n time-LOC   procession   to arrive-PRET-$\varnothing_{(3.)}$

"(R) <u>At the time when</u> this conversation <u>was taking place</u>, (A) <u>While</u> this conversation <u>was taking place</u>, the procession arrived."

(BD 130, l. 21f.)

As before, the usage of *mäl* when not bound up in a participle construction is given in the following example for comparison.

(31) <u>*Šul*</u>   *ilahi*   *mäl-de*   *Säfärġäli*   *töš-tär-e-ndä*   *kür-ep*
       this   divine   moment-ACC   *Säfärġäli*   dream-PL-POSS₃-LOC   to see-GER

jöðä-ne,   *xatta*   *jön*   *kofta-nïŋ*   *fäķät*   *unïŋ*
to become exhausted-PRET-$_{(3.)}$ even   wool   cardigan-GEN   only   heGEN

pinžäk   *töjmä-he-nä*   *èleg-eü-e-n*   *üð-e-nä*
jacket   button-POSS₃-DAT   to be caught-INF-POSS₃-ACC   self-POSS₃-DAT

jura-p   *ta*   *böt-tö,*   <u>*ošo*</u>   *mäl-dän*   <u>*bašlap*</u>   *ular*
to read-GER   EMPH   to end-PRET-$\varnothing_{(3.)}$ this   moment-ABL   from   they

ara-hï-nda   *ġišïķ*   *ut-ï*   *ķabïn-ïp*   *kit-äsäk.*
space-POSS₃-LOC   love   fire-POSS₃   to starf-GER   AUX-FUR-$\varnothing_{(3.)}$

"In his dreams *Säfärġäli* had seen and explained <u>this divine moment</u> until he almost grew tired of it, and he had even privately developed a complete exegesis about the wool cardigan getting caught in the button of his jacket (and no other!). <u>From this moment onwards</u>, the fire of love would burn between them…"

(BD 105, l. 46–106, l. 4)

Relative clause~sentence

Another instance of structural ambiguity of relative clauses and another grammatical category in Bashkir, are certain constructions with the participle -K^4A^2n in finite position. By finite position is meant the position at the end of a sentence, which in normal declarative discourse is where a (morphologically) finite predicate, e.g. a verb in the -D^4I^4 preterite, stands.[25] As will be seen in the examples given below, such a finite predicate can normally only be followed by certain modal particles. (The extant "abnormal" cases of word order have been placed outside the scope of investigation already in the initial chapter.) However, Bashkir -K^4A^2n and other participles placed in this position oscillate between being relative clauses and finite verbs, as will be demonstrated below. A somewhat similar ambiguity of participles in the finite position, which can be interpreted both as (finite) verbs and as adjectives, has also been observed in the English language.[26]

A number of Bashkir morphemes sometimes function as participles and sometimes as finite verb forms. These morphemes include the three morphemes most frequently occurring as predicates of relative clauses, -K^4A^2n, -$(j)A^2sA^2K^4$, and the aorist. In certain cases, notably when such a form has a third person referent, the participle and the finite verb form are indistinguishable from a purely morphological point of view. However, in most cases this ambiguity is eliminated by the context. Thus *ašamaṣ* in (32) may morphologically be identical with a free relative clause, meaning, roughly, "something or somebody which or who eats". But the context hardly provides the indefinite referent (translatable as "somebody" or "something") integral to this interpretation. Instead of seeing a free relative clause, it is far more natural to analyse *ašamaṣ* as just a finite form of the aorist.

(32) *Törmä-lä   totkon-dar-ðï   äðäm-gä   hana-ġan   keše   juḳ.*
 prison-LOC   prisoner-PL-ACC   human being-DAT   to regard as-K^4A^2n person   absent

  Nisek   käräk   šulaj   mïṣḳïl   it-ä-lär,   auïð-ðar-ï-nan
  how   needed   so   humiliated   to make-PRES-$\emptyset_{(3,)}$-PL   mouth-PL-POSS₃-ABL

  sïḳ-ḳan-dï   ėt   aša-maṣ.
  to come out-K^4A^2n-ACC   dog   to eat-AOR-NEG)

"In prison, nobody thinks of the prisoners as human beings. They humiliate them any way they can, and not even a dog would eat the things that come out of their mouths (R: ... and not even a dog is something that would eat the things that come out of their mouths)."

(ĠM 24, l. 38–40)

Equally, in the following example, one cannot easily suppose that *sïġïr ða...kiter töṣlö* is a free relative clause plus postposition. For there is no other referent for *sïġïr ða...kiter töṣlö* than the action of "coming out and...going" itself, which is not enough to form a qualifying construction which alone could be taken for a relative clause according to the definition.

[25] This conception of "finite position" is borrowed from Johanson 1971: 25.
[26] See, for instance, Hodge 1993: 14, footnote 3.

(33) | *Xäðer* | *kemder* | *öj* | *art-ï-nan* | *kil-ep* | *sïġ-ïr* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| now | somebody | house | back-POSS$_3$-ABL | to come-GER | to come out-AOR-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$ |

ða	*beð-ðeŋ*	*ajak̦-k̦ul-dar-ðï*	*bäjlä-p,*	*kino-la-ġï*	*iše*
and	we-GEN	foot-hand-PL-ACC	to bind-GER	cinema-LOC-ADJ	just as

tuk̦ma-p,	*at*	*k̦ojroġ-o-na*	*taġ-ïp,*	*kire*	*al-ïp*
to beat up-GER	horse	tail-POSS$_3$-DAT	to attach-GER	back	to take-GER

kit-er	*töṣ-lö.*
to go-AOR	colour-ADJ

"It was as if somebody would immediately come out from behind the house, bind our hands and feet together, beat us up just like in the cinema, tie us to the tail of a horse and then take us back."

(ĠM 8, l. 46–9, l. 3)

On the other hand, there are many instances where the context cannot help us to decide whether we are dealing with a (free) relative clause or a finite predicate. This is especially the case when the predicative form is followed by one of a series of modal particles that themselves show contextually ambiguous structure in that they can govern both nouns (and free relative clauses) and finite verbs. Most of these particles have a comparative meaning. Some of them have already been touched upon earlier in this chapter, as for instance *-(n)D⁴A²j*, *hïmak̦*, *keüek*, *šikelle* and *töṣlö*. A further morpheme that appears in this function is the combination of the aorist plus the derivational suffix *-lI⁴K̦⁴*, which conveys the notion of possibility (see example (38) below). The parallelism between the ambiguous usage of these morphemes in non-finite (as dealt with earlier in this chapter) and finite (as dealt with in the present chapter above) position is evident. It can be considered as one and the same principle, working in different positions. Let us first see various usages of *töṣlö* in the final position.

(34) | *Bar-ïbïð* | *ða* | *tauïš-tïn-hïð,* | *ni-ðän-der* | *k̦urk̦-a-bïð,* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| all-POSS$_1$PL | EMPH | voice-sound-ADJNEG | what-ABL-MOD | to be afraid-PRES-$_1$PL |

här	*ber-ebeð*	*ður*	*gonah*	*ėšlä-gän*	*töṣ-lö.*
every	one-POSS$_1$PL	great	sin	to perpetrate-$K̦⁴A²n$	colour-ADJ

"All of us were completely silent, we were afraid of something, and (R) every one of us was like somebody who had perpetrated a great sin (A) it was as if every one of us had perpetrated a great sin."

(ĠM 7, l. 32f.)

The next two examples illustrate that *töṣlö* in itself is indeed grammatically ambiguous in such a way that it can be a postposition or an adverb, according to the context. In (35), it is an adverb, since the form *tora*, which precedes it, can in no way be regarded as a noun. *Tora* is clearly a finite, and finite only, form; it is unmistakably not a relative clause.

(35) *Unan Xäkimjän küð ald-ï-na   kil-ep   bas̱-a,   ul*
     Then Xäkimjän eye front-POSS₃-DAT to come-GER to step-PRES-∅₍₃₎ he

haman da   beð-ðe   FZO-ġa   oðat-a   At-ï-n
still   EMPH   we-ACC   FZO-DAT to bring-PRES-∅₍₃₎   horse-POSS₃-ACC

jetäklä-p   tau   bit-e-ndä   ḳul-ï-n   bolġa-p
to lead-GER   hill   slope-POSS₃-DAT   hand-POSS₃-ACC   to wave-GER

tor-a   tös̱-lö.
to stand-PRES-∅₍₃₎   colour-ADJ

"Then *Xäkimjän* appeared before my inner eye—he was still bringing us to the FZO… It was <u>as if he was</u> <u>standing</u> on the slope of the hill, holding his horse and waving his hand."

On the other hand, the use of *tös̱lö* as a postposition (i.e. following nouns) is very widespread. An example is (36).

(36) *Ber jaḳ-ta - taš-lï tekä tau,   ike-nse jaḳ-ta - up ïn tös̱lö tekä*
     one side-LOC stone- steep mountain two-ORD side-LOC abyss like steep
                    ADJ

ḳaja, jar   as̱t-ï-nda,   alïs̱-ta,   šarla-p   jïlġa aġ-a.
rock   bank bottom-POSS₃-LOC   distance-LOC   to rush-GER   river to flow-PRES-
                                                                        ∅₍₃₎

"One one side there was the steep mountain, on the other side there were rocks <u>as steep as an abyss</u>, and below the banks, in the distance, the river was rushing."

(ĠM 8, l. 12f.)

But in (37), the *-Ḳ⁴A²ndA²j* form *ös̱tägändäj* in (36) again can be understood both as a free relative clause with comparison suffix and as a kind of finite predicate (preterite form *-Ḳ⁴A²n*).

(37) *Küŋel-där kütär-el-ep   kit-te.   Big-eräk   tä jaḳšï küŋel-le*
     heart-PL   to raise-PASS-GER AUX-PRET-∅₍₃₎   very-COMP and good heart-ADJ

apaj -   unïŋ   hüð-ðär-e   beð-gä   kös-xäl   ös̱tä-gän-däj.
elder sister she-GEN word-PL-POSS₃   we-DAT   strength-force to add-Ḳ⁴A²n-like

"Our hearts became encouraged. (R) Especially the words of the kind old woman resembled <u>such as were</u> <u>giving us strength</u>. (A) <u>It was as if</u> especially the words of the kind old woman <u>were giving us strength</u>."

(ĠM 12, l. 11–13)

(38) is an example of aorist plus *-lI⁴Ḳ⁴*.

(38) *Ėš   tä   auïr,   ölgör-öp   bul-ïr-lïk   tügel.*
     work   also   hard   to cope with-GER AUX-AOR-lI⁴Ḳ⁴   NEGPRED

"The work is hard, too, (R) <u>it is nothing (=not anything) that you can cope with</u> (A) <u>you cannot cope with</u> <u>it.</u>"

(ĠM 5, l. 7)

Note that in Bashkir the syntactic construction consisting of a -P^2 gerund (*ölgöröp* in (38)) and the verb *bul-* has by itself the meaning "to be able to", as in *barïp bula* "one can go".[27] Thus here the function of the aorist plus -ll^4K^4 might be different from expressing possibility only and similar to the comparative meaning of the other morphemes discussed in the present chapter.

Examples like (34), (37) and (38) show that without an appropriate context there is no firm distinction between (free) relative clauses and finite predicates in the predicative position. Therefore, one can speak of structural ambiguity in these cases, too.

Relative clause~declarative clause

In mid-sentence position there is no formal distinction between declarative clauses and relative clauses in Bashkir, provided that both have participial predicates. In some cases, the only means by which these two categories can be differentiated is the context, as example (39) shows.

(39) *Niġmätulla   aġaj,   baδ-ġa   töš-mä-hen   ösön,   katï-katï:*
      Niġmätulla   elder brother cellar-DAT to fall-NEG-IMP₃ in order to rough-rough

      kiskir-a   bašla-nï: «Kil-mä,   ti-men,
      to shout-GER to begin-PRET-∅₍₃₎ to come-NEG-∅(IMP₂SG)   to say-PRES-₁SG

      ker-mä!»   ti-p,   katï-katï   kiskir-ha   la,   bala
      to enter-NEG- to say-GER rough-rough to shout-COND-∅₍₃₎ even if child
      ∅(IMP₂SG)

      üδ-e-nä   kiskir-ġan-dï   bel-mä-j,
      self-POSS₃-DAT   to shout-PART-ACC   to know-NEG-PRES-∅₍₃₎[28]

      bäxet-heδ-leg-e-nä   karšï, tura   išek   as-ïp   ker-eü
      luck-NEGADJ-NN-POSS₃-DAT   to   direct door   to open-GER to enter-INF

      menän, tura   baδ-ġa   jöδ   tübän töš-öp   tä   kit-ä.
      mit   direct cellar-DAT face down   to fall-GER EMPH   to go-PRES-∅₍₃₎

"In order to prevent it from falling into the cellar, *Niġmätulla* started screaming at the top of his voice: 'Don't come, I tell you, don't come in!' But no matter how vociferously he shouted, the boy did not know that he was shouting at him, and thus, unfortunately, he opened the door right away, came in and in the same moment went directly falling down head first into the cellar."

(ĠMF 216, l. 38–42)

Theoretically and out of context, *kiskirġandï* could also mean "the one who was screaming". But in the context of (39), this would be an unacceptable reading. For "the one who was screaming" is the father of the child at whom he is shouting, and it would hardly be understandable why the child would not recognize his father's

---

[27] Uraksin 1996: 109, s.v. *bulïu*, 13.
[28] This form is a homonym to the gerund in -A^2/jhI^2.

voice. That *-Ḵ⁴A²n* forms in the accusative case sometimes are indeed relative clauses is demonstrated by example (40).

(40) | *Heð* | *ḵuš- an-dï* | *ǧïna* | *ėšlä-rgä* | *käräk-me* | *inde?* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| you | to order-*Ḵ⁴A²n*-ACC | only | to perform-INF | necessary? | now |

Nu	*ḵust-ïm,*	*ḵuš-ḵan-dï*	*ǧïna*	*ėšlä-mä*
well	younger brother	to order-*Ḵ⁴A²n*-ACC	only	to perform-NEG-∅(IMP(₂SG))

"Is it necessary to do only <u>what you have ordered (me to do)</u>?"—"Well, do not just do <u>what you have been ordered (to do)</u>."

(BD 133, l. 21f.)

(40) also sheds light on the following example, (41), and on example (39). In (41) a construction formally identical with the ones in (39) and (40) must again not be understood as a declarative clause as is the case in (39) but as a relative clause. That *xökümät birgände* in (41) is to be interpreted as a relative clause follows from the semantics of *alïp ḵajtïp tapšïr-* "to return", which syntactically governs *birgände*. A declarative clause would not easily be possible for this verb, which is not a verb of communication. The declarative interpretation of *xökümät birgände* could not have been rejected without this additional knowledge, taking into account only the morphological appearance of (*xökümät*) *birgände* itself. Therefore we can conclude that certain forms with *-Ḵ⁴A²n* and an accusative have contextual structural ambiguity.

(41) | *Min* | *bit* | *xökümät* | *bir-gän-de* | *genä* | *al-ïp* | *tapšïr-ïusï.* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| I | EMPH | government | give-PART-ACC | only | take-GER | hand over-PART |

"As a matter of fact, I am just the one who is giving back <u>what the government has given</u> (to me)."

(BZ 294, l. 23f.)

Whereas in examples (39) and (41) the *-Ḵ⁴A²n* participle does not bear possessive morphology—which would have to be marked by the possessive suffix *-(h)I⁴-*, the same kind of structural ambiguity as in (39), (40) and (41) is observable also in examples where there *is* possessive morphology. The following are examples of the use of the *-Ḵ⁴A²n* participle plus possessive morpheme as both declarative (42) and relative clauses (43). Note that the form of the accusative suffix, which was *-D⁴I⁴* in (38) and (40), changes to *-n* after the possessive suffix of the third person (in examples (42) and (43)). This is a regular feature of Bashkir morphology and is not limited to participles or relative clauses.

(42) | *Ä* | *bögön* | *ul* | *üð-e-neŋ* | *tuġaj* | *ės-e-nän* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| but | today | she | self-POSS₃-GEN | brushes | inside-POSS₃-ABL |

uð-ġan-ï-n		*da*	*toj-ma-nï.*
to pass-*Ḵ⁴A²n*-POSS₃-ACC		even	feel-NEG-PRET-∅₍₃₎

"But on that day, she did not even notice <u>that she passed through the shrubbery</u>."

(BZ 290, l. 39f.)

(43) *Šulaj ða kešelärðe aŋlamaşhïŋ. Börkötlölär üð ixtïjarðarï menän ḳajðaġïlïr alïš ḳalalarġa, küð kürmäš, ḳolaḳ išetmäš ildärgä barïp jöröp ḳajtalar.*

Kür-gän-där-e-n	*märäkä*	*it-ep*	*höjlä-j-ðär.*
to see-*Ḳ⁴A²n*-PL-POSS₃-ACC	funny	make-GER	to tell-PRES-∅₍₃₎-PL

"But nevertheless you are not able to understand these people. The inhabitants of *Börkötlö* take, of their own free will, trips to far-away cities in unknown locations and to countries that no one has ever heard of. And then they tell in a funny way <u>what they have seen</u>."

(KM 159, l. 8-11)

Relative clause~interrogative clause

As has been illustrated in the chapter about relative clause types, the qualifying clause of correlative constructions contains an interrogative pronoun which can also appear in non-subordinate question constructions. All interrogative pronouns that occur in correlative clauses can also introduce an interrogative sentence. Among the most important of these pronouns are *ḳajhï* "which (specific, of a specific group)", *kem* "who; who?", *ni* or *nimä* "what; that; what?", *nindäj* "which, what kind of (un-specific); which, what kind of?". Besides these pronouns, there are in Bashkir other interrogative pronouns, which do not refer to nouns and thus do not occur in the standard type of correlative clause given above. Among these we can mention *ḳajða* "where; where? (direction and location)", *ḳajðan* "where ... from; where ... from?", *ḳasan* "when; when?", *nisek* "how; how?" and others. These pronouns can be part of interrogative sentences and subordinate question clauses. It can be generalized that all Bashkir interrogative pronouns are subject to independent structural ambiguity since they may all occur in both sentence and subordinate clause questions. To illustrate this point, here are some Bashkir question constructions. They are arranged in pairs, the first element of which shows direct questions in the form of complete sentences, while the second element contains subordinate constructions with the same interrogative pronoun. The examples are chosen so as to include both relative and other subordinate clauses. (44) is a correlative predication. (45) is a direct question sentence, introduced by the interrogative pronoun *ni*, which is formally identical to *ni* in (44).

(44)	*Här kem*	*jul-ġa*	*jara-r-lï*	*ni*	*tab-a,*	*šunï*
	everybody	journey-DAT	to be useful-AOR-MOD	what	to find-PRES-∅₍₃₎	thisACC

jïj-ïp	*bar-a.*
to collect-GER	to go-PRES-∅₍₃₎

"Everybody took with him <u>whatever</u> he found to be useful for the journey."

(ĠM 6, l. 39f.)

(45) *Bïna, uḵip jatḵanda, ike iṣerekte küräm. Hïu tulïp jatḵan soḵor ėrgähendä*
    sajḵalïšip torðolar ða alǵa atlanïlar. Nïḵlap ḵaraham, Ġabdulla aǵaj
    (Äxmätšin) menän Dahi! Ġäðättäge küreneš. Aǵaj «Tal'jan garmun» menän
    ber rättän, jaḵšïraḵ p'esalar tïuðïrïp ölgörgän bulïr ine lä bit…

Ä	*Dahi-ǵa*	*ni*	*ḵal-ǵan?!*
but	*Dahi*-DAT	what	to remain-PRET-∅$_{(3.)}$

"Just then, while I was occupied by my reading, I saw two drunkards. They staggered about beside a
water-filled ditch for a few seconds and then moved forward. Taking a closer look, I saw it was *Ġabdulla*
(*Äxmätšin*) and *Dahi*! The usual sight! As for the former, he had been able to create some tolerable plays,
like 'Tal'jan Accordion". But who was left for *Dahi*?"

(ĠR 28, l. 40–29, l. 2)

(46) is a non-relative subordinate construction, (47) a cognate sentence.

(46)	*Nisek*	*jaḵ-ha-ŋ*		*da*	*jara-r*		*šunda.*
	how	to heat-COND-$_2$SG		INDEF	to suit-AOR-∅$_{(3.)}$		MOD

"No matter how you heat it (sc. the sauna, tr. n.), it will be just fine."

(AA 99, l. 27)

(47)	*Nisek*	*beš-er-ergä*		*huŋ*	*unï?*
	how	to cook-CAUS-INF		MOD	itACC

"But how (am I) to cook it?"

(AA 99, l. 17)

As (45) and (47) are sentences and not subordinate clauses they cannot be interpret-
ed as relative clauses. The same holds true for analogous sentences introduced by an
interrogative pronoun and expressing direct questions. Thus, as possible candidates
for structural ambiguity only the subordinate clauses in examples (44) and (46) re-
main. From our definition of relative clauses we can expect that even in the subordi-
nate examples there will be no structural ambiguity concerning the grammatical cat-
egories "relative clause" and "other subordinate clause types", and this because of
the semantic nature of the above interrogative pronouns. That is, if the interrogative
pronoun employed in the subordinate part is an adverb, such as *nisek* in (44) (or else
ḵajða, *ḵajðan* etc.), and if its correlate in the syntactically higher phrase is either ab-
sent (as in (46)) or is also an adverb, it has to be assumed, according to our defini-
tion, that such phrases are not relative clauses. For we cannot speak of a relative
clause, wherever no *noun referent* or *noun* is qualified by a relative clause construc-
tion. Conversely, where there is a nominal interrogative pronoun (such as *ni* in (44))
in a clause that qualifies a noun (the pronoun *šunï*), we can speak of a relative
clause, since both criteria of the definition are fulfilled. However, in Bashkir there
are cases where an *adverbial* pronominal element in a subordinate predication cor-
responds to a *nominal* element in the higher predication, like (48).

(48) *Gölsibär* *nisek*, *ḳajðan*   *uram-ġa*   *siġ-ïp*   *ölgör-gän-der*,
      Gölsibär   how   where from street-DAT to go out-GER to manage-*Ḵ⁴A²n*-MOD

      unïhïn   *Väliulla* *aŋġar-ma-j*   *ḳal-dï.*
      thatPOSS₃POSS₃ACC   Väliulla   to notice-NEG-GER AUX-PRET-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$

"How or from where *Gölsibär* had possibly come out on the street, *Väliulla* had not noticed (that)."

(BD 11, l. 18f.)

The pronominal form *unïhïn* is a noun and on the level of case grammar has a partitive meaning, indicating "that (out of several)". Semantically, it refers to several possible events that *Väliulla* might have noticed. The phrase *Gölsibär nisek, ḳajðan uramġa siġïp ölgörgänder* expresses which of these possibilities is actually being referred to. Therefore, *Gölsibär nisek, ḳajðan uramġa siġïp ölgörgänder* can be understood as a restrictive relative clause belonging to *unïhïn*. On the other hand, one can argue that *Gölsibär nisek, ḳajðan uramġa siġïp ölgörgänder* does not semantically offer a restriction of the plurality of the possible referents for *unïhïn*, but that the two phrases have in fact the same referent. According to this interpretation, they denote the same fact or referent; they are coreferential. (49) is an example, where the coreferential interpretation is even more plausible.

(49) *Ällä* *ḳïðï-ḳaj* *jïlmaj-ġan-daj*   *it-te-me,*   *binïhïn*
      or   girl-HYP   to smile-*Ḵ⁴A²n*-like to do-PRET-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$-? thisPOSS₃POSS₃ACC

      asïḳ   *ḳïna* *xäterlä-mä-j*   *Väliulla,* *ämmä* *Gölsibär-ðeŋ*   *bäläkäj*
      clear   MOD   to remember-NEG-   Väliulla   but   Gölsibär-GEN   little
                     PRES-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$

      genä *ḳajnar* *us-ï-n*   *üð-e-neke-nä*   *al-ïp*
      only   warm   open Hand-POSS₃-ACC   self-POSS₃-*D⁴I⁴Ḵ²I⁴*-DAT   take-GER

      xuš-la-š-ḳanda *tän-e*   *bujlap* *nindäjðer* *bildä-heð*   *räxät-lek*
      farewell!-NV-   body-POSS₃   along   a certain   mark-NEGADJ   pleasant-NN
      REC-GER

      tara-l-ġan-dï   *onot-a*   *al-ma-j.*
      to spread-PASS-*Ḵ⁴A²n*-ACC   to forget-GER   to be able to-NEG-PRES-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$

"Or had the nice girl only pretended that she had been smiling? This, *Väliulla* could not remember clearly. But he was still unable to forget that when he had taken *Gölsibär*'s little warm open hand into his own at their farewell, an undefinable pleasure had spread over his whole body."

(BD 15, l. 3–7) (Erz.)

Again, *binïhï* is a noun, and the preceding clause can be interpreted as qualifying it in a restrictive sense. But, on the other hand, it can also be argued that *ällä ḳïðïḳaj jïlmajġandaj itteme* and *binïhïn* have just a single referent. In this case, its interpre-

tation as relative clause is impossible. Therefore, the type of construction illustrated in (48) and (49) seems to be another case of structural ambiguity.

On the fringes of structural ambiguity: relative clause~lexicalized form

Finally, we will touch on a kind of structural ambiguity that is perhaps the most complex of the ones discussed in this article so far, for it concerns the borderline between grammatical units and lexicalized forms, a distinction which is controversial in current linguistic debate.[29] When in the present section the terms "lexicalization" or "lexicalized forms" are employed, they are used with a restricted meaning. They will refer to lexical units which are the result of word formation processes. Of course, theoretically, lexicalization also comprises forms which are not the result of word formation. For instance, Bashkir has *bahuvrīhi* compounds such as *bušboġaδ* "blabber, driveller", which is derived from *buš* "empty" and *boġaδ* "throat". This is clearly a lexicalized form, since its meaning is not identical with the sum of the meanings of its components, as is usual with *bahuvrīhi* compounds. Neither does it have any overt morphological marker. But such morphemeless lexicalizations can be disregarded in the present chapter, insofar as the relative clauses with which lexicalized forms are confronted in the present chapter all show verbal morphology.[30] In the examples of structural ambiguity discussed in the previous sections ambiguity obtains between grammatical categories only, which conforms well to the definition of "structural ambiguity" introduced at the outset. Now if we take into account (derived) lexicalized forms, we leave the sector of grammatical categories and enter the field of word-formation, where we have to deal with unpredictable semantical relations, in other words, with vagueness.[31] According to our definition, we can only speak about "structural ambiguity" if it is possible to systematize the relation between the ambiguous categories. The question has to be put, whether this can really be true in comparing grammatical to lexical structures. In my mind, it can indeed be true, provided we do not compare grammatical structure to a certain lexical class only, but to lexicalization as a whole, to all the lexical derivates taken together as a single class. In this understanding, "lexicalization" is a macro-term comprising all the (at least partially unpredictable) ramifications of the lexicon, without differentiating between the various types of lexicalization. Thus, what the remainder of this chapter will try to do is to compare grammatical structures not to individual

---

[29] See, for instance, the remarks of Daneš 1997: 18 and Lewandowski 1990: 729f. Cf. ibid. 1254f., s.v."Wortbildung", on the subject.

[30] However, from a philosophical point of view, adjectives (which consist of a single word) might indeed be compared to or even taken for nominal relative clauses in Bashkir, because in this language adjectives have predicative force without further morphemes being attached. Following this, in a phrase like *saf haua* "pure air" (ĠM 9, l. 45), the adjective *saf* would then be seen as a relative clause: "that was pure", resulting in "the air that was pure" for *saf haua*. This kind of structural ambiguity has been left out of consideration in this paper, since it seems debatable. It will be discussed in a more detailed survey of Bashkir relative clauses to appear in German.

[31] See the remarks in Žolobov 1991: 45 on the lack of "standardization, regularity and predictability" (russ. "*standartnosti, reguljarnosti i predskazuenosti*") in word formation. On vagueness in general, compare the discussion in the chapter on structural ambiguity.

lexicalized structures but to *the fact of being lexicalized*. Although we have to keep in mind that grammatical units and lexicalized ones are not always strictly separable,[32] a distinction between these two categories is often made in both non-Turkic general linguistic literature[33] and special investigations into Turkic linguistics.[34] One criterion, though neither the only nor a sufficient one, by which grammatical and lexicalized forms can be distinguished from each other is syntax. If we understand "Inbeziehungsetzen" (putting into relation) as a central function of syntax,[35] it is very clear that relative clauses are, at least to a certain degree, syntactical phenomena; they always put the referent in relation to something else. Moreover, they do so in a quite systematic way. Lexical units, on the other hand, are marked by a high degree of irregularity.

In the following final section of this chapter we will have a look at one Bashkir phenomenon, where the borderline between lexicalization and grammaticalization[36] is blurred to such a degree that structural ambiguity seems to become a possible explanation for this state. It has been pointed out earlier in this chapter that there is only a small number of verbal morphemes with which most Bashkir relative clauses are formed, most importantly $-(j)A^2sA^2K^4$, $-K^4A^2n$ and the aorist. However, a host of other deverbal morphemes can be compared to these three morphemes under the aspect of their limited productivity as relative clause predicate markers. Of these, we will take a look at the suffix $-K^4I^4s$.[37] We will restrict ourselves to instances that may be regarded as structurally ambivalent in the way just described. However, we will not consider lexicalizations of $-K^4I^4s$ which from their semantic appearance cannot unambiguously be interpreted as relative clauses. These are *nomina instrumenti* such as *al"jap-ķis* "apron" (from *al* "front" and *jaB²-* "to cover"), *as-ķis* "key" (from *as-* "to open") or *ultïr-ġïs* "chair" (from *ultïr-* "to sit (down)"). In our context "limited productivity" means that the ability of morphemes like $-K^4I^4s$ to form relative clauses does not seem to be restricted lexically (i.e. they do not occur only with certain verbs), semantically, syntactically or otherwise. One cannot give a rule that would delimit the contexts in which these morphemes form relative clauses. On the other hand, there are two restrictions which make them strongly resemble lexicalized forms and therefore relevant for the question of structural ambiguity. Firstly, although their occurrence is not qualitatively predictable, they are rarer as predicative morphemes of relative clauses than at least the most frequently occurring main-

---

[32] Daneš 1997: 19. Compare also the account of various approaches in traditional Russian linguistics given by Žolobov 1991.

[33] For Russian, see Žolobov 1991: 40–45.

[34] In general, see Bußmann 1990: 244f., s.v. "Flexion" and 852f., s.v. "Wortbildung". For "word formation" as a grammatical category separate from other morphological categories in a Turkic language (Azerbaijanian) see Schönig 1998: 250f. As to Bashkir, consider, for instance, that in Juldašev 1981 there are separate chapters on the word formation (*slovoobrazovanie* in Russian) of verbs, adverbs, nouns and adjectives.

[35] Daneš 1997: 19.

[36] Here, the notions of lexicalization and grammaticalization are only schematically opposed to each other. In a more detailed investigation of these terms, they seem to be more likely to form a continuum, see Traugott/Heine 1991a: 2.

[37] Other deverbal morphemes belonging to this class are $-A^2/jhI^2$, $-K^4I^4rI^4$ and $-mI^4š$.

stream morphemes $-(j)A^2sA^2\underline{K}^4$, $-\underline{K}^4A^2n$ and aorist. In a randomly selected text sample (SJ, p. 54, l. 20–p. 70, l. 5) the following occurrences of relative clause predicates have been counted. $-(J)A^2sA^2\underline{K}^4$ occurs 11 times, $-\underline{K}^4A^2n$ 107 times, aorist 8 times (including aorist plus modal affix $-ll^4\underline{K}^4$), but $-\underline{K}^4I^4s$ only 4 times. Even if we take into consideration that these statistics may contain a certain percentage of uncertain cases, it seems beyond doubt that $-\underline{K}^4I^4s$ belongs to the quantitatively marginal relative clause morphemes. Secondly, some of the derivatives of morphemes of the $-\underline{K}^4I^4s$ class are quoted in the dictionaries with their separate entries, thereby becoming in a non-theoretical *de facto* way "lexicalized". The entries include *hoklan-ġïs* and *hoklandïr-ġïs* "charming, fascinating" (from *hoklan-* "to be fascinated, charmed", *hoklandïr-* "causative of *hoklan-*: to fascinate, attract"), *jalkït-kïs* "painfully boring" (from *jalkït-* "to annoy with boredom"), *jandïr-ġïs* "incendiary, fiery (speech) (from *jandïr-* "to set on fire"), *kïðïktïr-ġïs* "interesting" (from *kïðïktïr-* "to arouse interest"), *köldör-gös* "funny, ridiculous, causing to laugh" (cf. *köldör-* "to make laugh"), *mauïktïr-ġïs* "interesting, fascinating" (compare *mauïktïr-* "to draw attention, to be interesting") and *tilert-kes* "maddening" (from *tilert-* "to drive mad"). Some examples of the use of these forms are given in (50) and (51). Note the structural similarity to relative clauses like *karar keše* in (5).

(50) | *Bäläkäj* | *genä* | *tel-där-e* | | *baš-ka* | *hïj-mas-lï* | | *nämä-lär* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| small | only | tongue-PL-POSS$_3$ | | head-DAT | to hold-AORNEG-$ll^4\underline{K}^4$ | | thing-PL |

höjlä-j.		*Hüð-där*	*tasma*	*keüek*	*oðon,*	*jalkït- ïs.*
to say-PRES-$\emptyset_{(3.)}$		word-PL	ribbon	like	long	to bore-$\underline{K}^4I^4s$

"Their little tongues are saying things that your head cannot hold. The words are long like ribbons, <u>nauseating</u>."

$\hspace{8cm}$ (ĠR 30, l. 10–12)

(51) | *Üð-eŋ-de* | | *üs-ter-eü,* | | *tel-eŋ-de* | | *bajït-ïu* | *häm* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| self-POSS$_2$SG-ACC | | to grow-CAUS-INF | | language-POSS$_2$SG-ACC | | to enrich-INF | and |

üð-eŋ-dä		*šiġir*	*kul' tura-hï*		*tärbiä-lä-ü*		*ösön*	*täržemä*
self-POSS$_2$SG-LOC		poem	culture-POSS$_3$		education-NV-INF		in order to	translation

iŋ	*käräkle,*	*iŋ*	*fajðalï,*	*iŋ*	*kïðï tïr-ġïs*	*häm*	*mauïktïr-ġïs*	*éš!*
SUP	necessary	SUP	useful	SUP	to be interesting-$\underline{K}^4I^4s$	and	to fascinate-$\underline{K}^4I^4s$	work

"In order to develop yourself, to enrich your vocabulary and to foster in yourself the culture of the poem, translation is the most necessary, the most useful, the most <u>interesting</u> and the most <u>fascinating</u> work."

$\hspace{8cm}$ (ĠR 27, l. 3–6) (Tageb.)

The forms that according to the dictionaries are lexicalized also include phrases consisting of more than one element (and resemble relative clauses, for that matter):

iṣ kit-kes "incredibly, terribly, extremely, very" (from *iṣ* "reason; consciousness"
and *kit-* "to go away"; thus literally, "driving you out of your mind/such, that your
mind is lost due to it"), *jän öð-göð* "terrible, unbearable, heartrending" (from *jän*
"soul, life" and *öð-* "to tear to pieces", literally, "of such a nature, that it may tear
your soul apart"), *ḳolaḳ jar-ġïs* "deafening" (literally, "splitting one's ears", from
ḳolaḳ "ear" and *jar-* "to split"), *ḳot os-ḳos* "terrible" (literally, "of such a nature, that
the charisma (=*ḳot*) flies away (=*os-*)"). A typical use of these forms is illustrated in
example (52). Since there *iṣ kitkes* and *ḳot osḳos* are adverbs (or, more precisely,
ad-adjectives) with no identifiable referent in the context a relative clause interpre-
tation is most likely to be excluded. This can be taken as a further indication of the
lexicalized status of such expressions as *ḳot osḳos*. At the very least, these analytical
forms do not always behave like the simple -*K⁴I⁴s* examples.

(52) Kïð-ðar-ðïŋ   ber-e-he   *iṣ*   *kit-kes*   hïlïu,   ike-nse-he,
     girl-PL-GEN   one-POSS₃.-POSS₃.   mind   to go-*K⁴I⁴s*   beautiful   two-ORD-POSS₃.

     ḳutïrlï ärmände hïmaḳ,   *ḳot*   *os-ḳos*   jamaḳ,   ti.
     scabby   toad   like   charisma   to fly away-*K⁴I⁴s*   ugly   sayPRES-Ø₍₃.₎

"One of the girls was <u>mind-bogglingly</u> beautiful, the other was <u>unbelievably</u> ugly, like a scabby toad, thus
it is said."

                                                                                    (AA 64, l. 8–10)

On the other hand, even the analytical constructions may structurally be analysable
as relative clauses, as can be seen in (53). *Ḳolak tondorġos* stands in attributive, not
adverbial position.

(53) Hïbïðġï   tïŋla-j-tïŋla-j   *ða,*   *bïl*   *ḳolaḳ*
     shepherd's flute   to listen-PRES-Ø₍₃.₎-to listen-PRES-Ø₍₃.₎   and   this   ear

     tondor-ġos   tauïš-tar-ġa   tüð-ä   al-ma-jïnsa,   jïjïn-a
     to deafen-*K⁴I⁴s*   sound-PL-DAT   to endure-GER   to be able to-NEG-GER   to get ready-
                                                                                        GER

     bašla-j.
     to begin-PRES-Ø₍₃.₎

"'Shepherd's Flute' listened attentively for a while, but then, not being able to endure these *deafening*
sounds any longer, he started to get ready."

                                                                                    (NN 15, l. 26f.)

It is understood from the above examples, however, that many of the -*K⁴I⁴s* forms
can also be analysed as relative clauses, without causing a perceptible change of
meaning. This seems to be an argument in favour of their being structurally ambigu-
ous. Words with a (shade of) meaning unpredictable from their components, such as
jandïrġïs, are in the minority. In the case of *hoḳlanġïs*, a certain degree of lexicaliza-
tion might be seen in the absence of a causative morpheme (in contrast to

hoḳlandïrġïs) at the same time as the meaning of *hoḳlanġïs does* seem to contain a causative element. However, this fact must not be overestimated, since marking of the *genus verbi* is not imperative in Bashkir neither in lexicalized forms, nor in relative clauses. See for instance *tigäne* in (2), *baškarasaḳ* in (6), *hala torġan* in (24) and the second *ḳuškandï* in (40), where there is no *genus verbi* marking in the individual relative clauses, although in the biased eyes of an Indo-European linguist or native speaker this might have been expected. But *genus verbi* morphology *can* also appear in Bashkir relative clauses, as *urlanġan* shows in (25). While all the above examples leave the impression that -*K⁴I⁴s* is not a grammatical morpheme, but occurs only in lexicalized forms, there are several instances in the material under investigation where it occurs in words that are not listed in the dictionaries (such as *baškar-ġïs* in (54), *sum-ġïs* in (55), *tondor-ġos* in (53) and *tulḳïnlandïr-ġïs* in (56)) and which are, in the case of (57), also very probably not lexicalized forms. Together with the general structural resemblance with most -*K⁴I⁴s* forms (with the exception of those occurring as adverbs), this seems to justify the diagnosis of structural ambiguity in at least these cases, although further examples would be needed to corroborate this impression and ascertain how far the ability of -*K⁴I⁴s* to form non-lexicalized forms reaches.

(54)

Šulaj	*it-ep,*	*baš-tan*	*uḳ*	*baš*	*küter-eüse-lär*
so	to do-GER	beginning-ABL	EMPH	head	to raise-NAG-PL

saf-ï-na	*iŋ*	*jakšï*	*jaugir-ðär-e-n*	*jebär-gän*	*baškort*
battle row-POSS₃.-DAT	SUP	gut	warrior-PL-POSS₃.-ACC	to send-K^4A^2n	Bashkir

xalḳ-ï	*Pugačev*	*ġäskär-e-n*	*tergeð-ep,*	*jau-ðïŋ*	*iŋ*
people-POSS₃.	Pugačev	army-POSS₃.-ACC	to invigorate-GER	campaign-GEN	SUP

töp	*baškar-ġïs*	*kös-ö-nä*	*äjlän-gän.*
base	to execute-K^4I^4s	force-POSS₃.-DAT	to become-PRET-∅₍₃.₎

"In this manner, the Bashkir people, who had from the very start sent their best warriors to join the ranks of the rebels, had invigorated *Pugačev*'s army and had become the most fundamental *executive* force of the campaign."

(B 115, l. 31–34)

(55)

Ürðäk-tär	*aptïra-p*	*hïu*	*töb-ö-nä*	*sum-a-lar.*
duck-PL	to be astonished-GER	water	bottom-POSS₃.-DAT	to dive-PRES-₃PL

Sum-ġïs	*ürðäk*	*bul-ġan-dar-ðïr*	*inde.*
to dive-K^4I^4s	duck	to be-PRET-∅₍₃.₎-PL-MOD	just

"The ducks were astonished and dived to the bottom of the water. They were diving ducks, as it were."

(BB 36, l. 6f.)

(56) | *Nazïm* | *Xikmät* | *-üð* | *xalḳ-ï-nïŋ* | | *ïŋ* | *dörös* | *tauïš-ï!* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nazım | Hikmet | own | people-POSS₃-GEN | | SUP | upright | voice-POSS₃ |

Bötä-he-nän		*dä*	*big-eräk*	*«Tïuïu»*	*šiġïr-ï*
everything-POSS₃-ABL		EMPH	more-COMP	birth	poem-POSS₃

oḳša-j		*miŋä.*	<u>*Tulḳinlandïr-ġïs,*</u>	*jïlï,*	*köslö!*
to please-PRES-∅₍₃₎		me	to create waves-*K⁴I⁴s*	warm	strong

"Nazım Hikmet is the most upright voice of his country! More than anything else his poem 'birth' pleases me. It is <u>stirring</u> (literally, <u>stirring up waves</u>, tr. n.), warm, strong!"

(ĠR 29, l. 39–41) (Tageb.)

(57) | *"Ḳan-ġa -* | *ḳan"!* | *ti-p* | *ažar* | *hal-ïp,* | *ura-t-ïp* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| blood-DAT | blood | to say-GER | menace | to spread-GER | to surround-CAUS-GER |

al-a-lar	*bïlar-ðï,*	*äsir-lär-ðe*	*tere*	*kileš*	*jer-gä*
to take-PRES-∅(3.)-PL	thisPL-ACC	prisoner-PL-ACC	alive	manner	ground-DAT

küm-ep,	*maŋlaj-ðar-ï-na*	*taš*	*bär-ep*	*ülter-ä-lär,*
to bury-GER	forehead-PL-POSS₃-DAT	stone	to hit-GER	to kill-PRES-∅₍₃₎-PL

Jäjäüle	*Mäxmüt-te*	*genä*	*ḳal-dïr-a-lar:*	*ïḳ-ḳan*
Jäjäüle	Mäxmüt-ACC	only	to remain-CAUS-PRES-∅₍₃₎-PL	to vanish-*K⁴A²n*

mal-dar-ï-n		*ḳajt-ar-t-maḳ-ḳa*	<u>*jul*</u>	<u>*kürhät-kes*</u>	*tere*
cattle-PL-POSS₃-ACC		to return-CAUS-CAUS-INF-DAT	way	to show-*K⁴I⁴s*	living

amanat	*it-ep.*
monument	to -make-GER

"Shouting out menacingly: 'blood for blood!' they encircled them. They buried the prisoners alive in the ground and then killed them by smashing their foreheads with stones. They spared only *Jäjäüle Mäxmüt*: as a living statue <u>which was to show the way</u> one made the vanished cattle come back again."

(SJ 22, l. 29–32)

The complex expression *jul kürhätkes* is clearly an *ad hoc* form motivated spontaneously by the context and not available as a prefabricated unit of the lexicon at the time this passage was written.

What has been demonstrated with *-K⁴I⁴s*, can be repeated analogously for all

other Bashkir morphemes occurring in constructions formally interpretable as relative clauses. This includes even the most productive morphemes of verbal relative clauses, such as $-(j)A^2sA^2K^4$, $-K^4A^2n$ and the aorist. While no principle of formal, semantic or functional differences can be established between relative clauses and certain deverbal forms in $-K^4I^4s$ (and also in $-A^2/jhI^2$, $-K^4I^4rI^4$, $-mI^4\check{s}^4$ and others[38]), the proportion of clearly lexicalized forms is much lower in the case of "mainstream" relative morphemes (as $-(j)A^2sA^2K^4$, $-K^4A^2n$ and the aorist). Compared to the hundreds of relative clauses containing one of the afore-mentioned morphemes in their predicates, there are comparatively few lexicalizations formed with them. Strikingly, the most productive morpheme of all, $-K^4A^2n$, appears only in a limited number of lexical derivates, for instance, *jet-kän* "grown-up" (from *jet-* "to reach, to attain, to arrive"), *ḳap-ḳan* "trap" (from *ḳaB²-* "to catch") or *uŋ-ġan* "successful" (from *uŋ-* "to be successful"). Lexicalized forms derived from the $-(j)A^2sA^2K^4$ participle, which quantitatively speaking plays a less important role in relative clauses, are seen relatively more frequently (cf. the statistical data given above.). These lexicalizations include *al-asaḳ*, *bir-äsäk*, *köt-äsäk* (all meaning "debt", from *al-* "to take", *bir-* "to give" and *köt-* "to expect", respectively), *kil-äsäk* "the future" (from *kil-* "to come"). And finally, for $-K^4I^4s$, which only in comparatively rare cases forms non-lexicalized forms, we have an overwhelming dominance of lexicalized forms, as has been seen above, too. Thus, in the forms discussed, lexicalization and grammaticalization seem *not* to be strictly separate categories, but potential properties of these morphemes, which are employed to a varying degree.

The stability of structural ambiguity in Bashkir across linguistic definitions

By approaching its subject through defining one of its central concepts, namely, "relative clauses", this paper follows a technique which has been a persistent element in Western (and other) linguistic tradition(s) since antique times. To avoid misinterpretations, it is in general very helpful to use only one, (more or less) coherent, terminological system at a time. But it is evident that there can be more than one definition of and terminological approach to many, if not all, subjects.[39] There is, for instance, a number of distinct definitions of "computer", "language", "mind", and so on. That is to say, in most cases definitions are a matter of debate and consensus. It is not the main purpose of this paper to discuss the preferability of certain linguistic delimitations over others. The relative clause definition which has been established at the beginning of this paper may or may not be better than any of the other definitions of relative clauses which have so far been formulated. But the specific contents and quality of any definition which might possibly be used do not bear on the central line of argument proposed in this paper. For even if, for instance, we would change the definition given or replace it altogether, the theoretical prob-

---

[38] Space limitations prevent their being discussed in this paper. They will be investigated in the above mentioned forthcoming work in German.

[39] See again the survey of terminology about morphology in Žolobov 1991.

lem of structural ambiguity would, at its core, still remain the same. Only the names of the linguistic categories affected by structural ambiguity would be different. Thus, merely by changing or refining the wording of the relative clause definition the problem of category mixing cannot be solved. Or in other words: this problem is not one of methodology or pure theory. To illustrate this important point, we can confront the relative clause definition used with two others that have been applied to the Bashkir language by Soviet linguists. Both of these definitions are more narrow than ours. One of these definitions states that only constructions with a finite verb form as predicate qualify as (clauses, and thus indirectly as) relative clauses.[40] According to this definition, not all constructions with participial predicates can be regarded as relative clauses (in contrast to what is presupposed in this paper). But even if we ignore all constructions with a participial predicate, there are still examples of structural ambiguity between relative clauses and other grammatical units among the remaining constructions. Accordingly, if we replaced our relative clause definition with the other delimitation quoted, a similar result obtains as regards structural ambiguity. To give another example to the same effect, another definition (put forward, for instance, by (Kiekbajev 1976): 363 and (Säjetbattalov 1961): 62–70) excludes constructions with a genitively encoded first actant from the category of relative clauses. But there are examples (for instance, (42) and (43)) that show that even this does not affect the fact of structural ambiguity. These two definitions are the only ones to have been actually proposed for Bashkir relative clauses which significantly deviate from the one chosen for this paper. But it seems very likely that there does not exist any other definition of Bashkir relative clauses which would be able to preclude structural ambiguity. Thus, structural ambiguity in Bashkir should to my mind for now be regarded as a fact of that language, and not a purely descriptive problem.

Conclusions

Categories seem to offer a serious challenge to modern descriptive linguistics. If one follows the tradition of dividing up the object of analysis into mutually exclusive sectors, the complex and interdependent structure of such phenomena as Bashkir relative clauses and similar or cognate grammatical structures (as well as other grammatical entities of Bashkir and other languages) may not become sufficiently evident. For, as has been shown in this article, there is no clear-cut borderline between many of the categorizations with which one has traditionally attempted to describe Bashkir and which to a large extent have been formulated by analogy to other (and mostly non-Turkic) languages. A number of Bashkir patterns of speech seem in principle to belong to a number >1 ($\in$N) of (theoretically postulated) grammatical units *at the same time*, instead of being members of mutually exclusive units which might (due to some circumstances such as context or homonymy) only *seem* to coincide. The difference between a more traditional approach which tries to arrive at mutually exclusive categories and a new one which takes category mixing

[40] See for example Zakiev 1984: 31.

into account can be illustrated as follows. Let *a*, *b*, *c* and *d* be linguistic (surface) expressions and *A*, *B*, *C*, *D* be grammatical categories (in the traditional sense). If we let the linguistic expression *a* belong to the categories *A* and *B*, *b* to *B* and *C*, *c* to *C* and *D* and *d* to *D* and *A*, then the linguistic expressions *a* and *c* will, on the surface of things, have none of the categories under observation in common. But in reality we know, that there is a certain, albeit indirect, link between them; they are members of the same chain. This link becomes apparent, for instance, in the linguistic expression *b*, which shares one category each with both *a* and *c*. Graphically, the linguistic units *a*, *b*, *c* etc. could be represented as rings. In the Bashkir language, most (or even all) of these rings are connected to at least one other. That is, even when there is no direct linkage between all rings (=linguistic surface units), they all are members of a single complex ring structure (=the whole of the linguistic expression, with the distinction between *langue* and *parole* or competence and performance being of no consequence in this case). If, on the other hand, the rings (respectively, linguistic surface units) or even only some of them were to be represented without connection to the others, we could be led to the misleading impression that linguistic units in general could be described independently of all or most others. Structural ambiguity phenomena such as the ones described in this paper should therefore be taken into account when new descriptive linguistic models are developed for Bashkir (and other languages). Categories are obviously an indispensable element of linguistic descriptions for which there is no alternative in sight. The conclusion drawn from the empirical fact of structural ambiguity should not therefore consist in resolving to abolish the descriptive tool of categorization. But the idea should be included in descriptive linguistic systems that it might not always be possible for mutually exclusive categories to provide a complete representation of the facts of language.

Symbols and abbreviations

?	1) introduces a questionable form or reading
	2) (in the linguistic glossing:) representation of the Bashkir question marker -ml^d
* (asterisk)	introduces clearly unacceptable or hypothetical forms
∅	zero morpheme
∅(X)	zero morpheme representing (the grammatical category) X
1., 2., 3.	indicate first, second or third grammatical person, respectively
ABL	ablative (case)
ACC	accusative (case)
ADJ	adjective (suffix)
ADV	morpheme marking adverbs
AOR	aorist (morpheme)
AUX	auxiliary (verb)
CAUS	causative
COMP	comparative (morpheme)
COND	conditional (mode)
DAT	dative (case)
DEIC	deictic (morpheme)
EMPH	emphatic morpheme
GEN	genitive (case)
GER	gerund
HYP	hypocoristical (morpheme)

IMP($_{2, 3.}$)	imperative (of the second/third grammatical person)
INDEF	morpheme expressing indefiniteness
INF	infinitive
INST	instrumental (morpheme)
IT	iterative
l.	line
LOC	locative (case)
MOD	modal (morpheme)
NAG	(suffix for) *nomina agentis*
NEG	negation
NN	word-forming morpheme deriving nouns from other nouns
NV	word-forming morpheme deriving verbs from nouns
ORD	ordinal number (suffix)
PART	participle
PASS	passive voice (suffix)
PERS	personal endings (on verbs and other predicates, as opposed to the possessive endings)
PL	plural (suffix)
POSS($_{1, 2, 3.}$)	(first, second, third person) possessive suffix
PRES	present tense
PRET	preterite (tense)
REC	reciprocal suffix (-(I^4)š-)
REF	reflexive
Russ.	Russian
SG	singular
SUP	superlative
tr. n.	translator's note
VN	word-forming morpheme deriving nouns from verbs
VV	word-forming morpheme deriving verbs from other verbs
VV(IT)	word-forming morpheme deriving verbs form verbs, with iterative meaning

References

Primary sources

The references to the primary sources which have been quoted are given in the alphabetical order of their abbreviations.

AA   Aslaev, T. X./ Atnaġolova, S. V. (eds.): *Äkiättär. 3–4 siniftarða klastan tiš uķiu ösön*. Ufa 1996. Kitap.

B   Beješ, Äkräm: *Baškort xalķïnïŋ tarixï häm azatlïķ köräše*. Ufa 1993. Kitap.

BB   Bikbulatov, Nail et al.: *Baškort xalïķ iźadï*. Vol. 2. *Riüäjättär, legendalar*. Ufa 1997. Kitap.

BD   Büläkov, Dinis: *Tuđđïrïlġan tamuķ*. Ufa 1996. Kitap.

BR   Bikbaev, Rauil: *Šaġir hüđe-šaġir namïşï*. Ufa 1997. Kitap.

BZ   Biiševa, Zäjnäb: *Äşärðär*. Vol. 2. Ufa 1996. Kitap.

ĠM   Ġälimov, Marat: *Xököm*. (Various authors:) *Büre küđđäre*. Ufa 1993. 5–36. Kitap.

ĠMF   Ġafuri, Mäžit: *Fäķirlek menän ütkän tereklek*. Xösäjenov, Ġ. B. (ed.): *Äðäbiät. Xrestomatija. Urta mäktäbteŋ 9 klasï ösön*. Ufa 1986. 213–220. Kitap.

ĠMJ   Ġafuri, Mäžit: *Jarlïlar jäki öjðäš ķatïn*. Xösäjenov, Ġ. B. (ed.): *Äðäbiät. Xrestomatija. Urta mäktäbteŋ 9 klasï ösön*. Ufa 1986. 221–244. Kitap.

ĠR   Ġaripov, Rämi: *Äşärðär (ös tomda)*. Vol. 2. Ufa 1998. Kitap.

KM   Kärim, Mostaj: *Äşärðär. Biš tomda*. Vol 3. Ufa 1997. Kitap.

ĶM   *Ķuđïjkürpäs menän Majanhïlïu*. Transl. B. Bikbaj and H. İðelbaj. Xösäjenov, Ġ. B. (ed.): *Äðäbiät. Xrestomatija. Urta mäktäbteŋ 9 klasï ösön*. Ufa 1986. 98–131. Kitap.

NN   Nosov, N. N.: *Belmäsjän mažaralarï*. Transl. from Russian by A. Ġirfanov. Ufa 1979. Baškortostan kitap näšriäte.

SJ   Soltanov, Jïhat: *Jerem, kešelärem*. Ufa 1996. Kitap.

SÖÄ   Söläjmänov, Äxmät (ed.): *Baškort xalïķ iźadï*. Vol 3. Ufa 1998. Kitap.

SS   Sälimgäräev, Salavat: *Ķähärgä äjtelgän amin*. In: *Šoŋkar* 2 (1995): 110–119.
TX   Tapaķov, Xäjðär: *Êt küðendäge ķojaš*. *Šoŋkar* 1 (1998): 18–47.
XÄx   Xarisov, Äxnäf: *Ütkän gümer–ķalǧan xäter*. Ufa 1997. Kitap.
XFB   Xisamitdinova, F. G./ Šaripova, Z. Ja./Xažin, V. I.: *Baškirskij jazyk dlja načinajuščix*. Ufa 1991. Baškirskoe knižnoe izdatel'stvo.

Other references

Agišev, I. M. et al. (eds.): *Baškort teleneŋ hüðlege*. 2 vols. Moscow: Russkij Jazyk 1993.

Avgustinova, Tania: *Relative Clause Constructions in Bulgarian HPSG*. (= CLAUS Computational Linguistics at the University of the Saarland, report 71). No place 1996.

Bazin, Louis: "L'actance en turc". In: Feuillet, Jack (ed.): *Actance et Valence dans les Langues de l'Europe*. Berlin, New York : Mouton de Gruyter 1990, 925–938.

Belousov, V. N. et al.: *Kratkaja russkaja grammatika*. Moscow: Russkij jazyk 1989.

Benzing, Johannes: "Das Baschkirische". In: *Philologiae Turcicae Fundamenta*. Vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner 1959, 421–434.

Berta, Árpád: "Tatar and Bashkir". In: Johanson, Lars/Csató, Éva-Ágnes (eds.): *The Turkic Languages*. London, New York: Routledge 1998. 283–300.

Bußmann, Hadumod: *Lexikon der Sprachwissenschaft*. Stuttgart: Kröner 1990[2].

Daneš, František: "Zur Theorie und Praxis der Wortbildung". In: Šimečková, Alena/Vachková, Marie (eds.): *Wortbildung. Theorie und Anwendung*. (KAROLINUM Vydavatelství Univerzity Karlovy.) Prague 1997, 18–23.

Dik, Simon C.: "Funktionale Grammatik—eine Übersicht". In: Hoffmann, Ludger (ed.): *Sprachwissenschaft. Ein Reader*. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1996, 564–590.

Drosdowski, Günter (ed.): *DUDEN Grammatik der deutschen Gegenwartssprache*. Mannheim, Wien, Zürich: Bibliographisches Institut 1984.

Engel, Ulrich: *Deutsche Grammatik*. Heidelberg: Groos 1991.

Givón, Talmy: *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam, Philadephia: John Benjamins Publishing Company 1984.

Hodge, Stephen: *An introduction to Classical Tibetan*. Warminster: Aris & Phillips 1993.

Jelitte, Herbert/Nikolaev, Gennadij A. (eds.): *Die Beziehung der Wortbildung zu bestimmten Sprachebenen und sprachwissenschaftlichen Richtungen*. Frankfurt am Main etc: Peter Lang 1991.

Johanson, Lars: *Aspekt im Türkischen*. Uppsala: Berlingska Boktryckeriet 1971.

Johanson, Lars: "The Structure of Turkic". In: Johanson, Lars/Csató, Éva-Ágnes (eds.): *The Turkic Languages*. London, New York: Routledge 1998, 30–66.

Juldašev, A. A. (= Juldašev 1958a): *Analitičeskie formy glagola v tjurkskix jazykax*. Moscow: Nauka 1958.

Juldašev, A. A.: *Grammatika sovremennogo baškirskogo literaturnogo jazyka*. Moscow: Nauka 1981.

Juldašev, A. A. (= Juldašev 1958b): *Sistema slovoobrazovanija i sprjaženije glagola v baškirskom jazyke*. (Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR.) Moscow 1958.

Jung, Walter: *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache*. Ed. Günter Starke. Leipzig 1988.

Kiekbaev, Džamil' Giniatovič et al.: *Baškirskij jazyk dlja pedučilišč*. Ufa 1976.

Kočergina, V. A.: *Vvedenie v jazykoznanie*. (Izdatel'stvo Moskovskogo Universiteta.) Moscow 1991[2].

Lehmann, Christian: *Der Relativsatz*. Tübingen: Narr 1984.

Lehman, Christian: "Relativsätze". In: Jacobs, Joachim et al. (eds.): *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*. 2nd half volume. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1995, 1199–1216.

Lessau, Donald A.: *A Dictionary of Grammaticalization*. 3 vols. Bochum: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer 1994.

Lewandowski, Theodor: *Linguistisches Wörterbuch*. 3 vols. Heidelberg, Wiesbaden: Quelle & Meyer 1990[5].

Lyons, John: *Einführung in die moderne Linguistik*. München: C. H. Beck 1984[6].

Matthews, Peter: "Central Concepts of Syntax". In: Jacobs, Joachim et al. (eds.): *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung*. First half-volume. Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter 1993, 89–117.

Matthews, Peter H.: *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Linguistics*. Oxford, New York: Oxford University Press 1997.

Nigmatov, X. G. et al.: "Struktura predloženija i aktual'nye voprosy sintaksisa tjurkskix jazykov (tezisy formal'no-funkcional'nogo isledovanija)". (*Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 5, 1984), 3–9.

Säjetbattalov, Ġ. Ġ. *Bašķort teleneŋ ušma höjläm sintaksise*. Ufa 1961.

Schönig, Claus: "Azerbaijanian". In: Johanson, Lars/Csató, Éva-Ágnes (eds.): *The Turkic Languages*. London, New York: Routledge 1998, 248–260.

Širaliev, M. Š./Sevortjan, É. V.: *Grammatika azerbajdžanskogo jazyka*. Baku: Izdatel'stvo Élm 1971.

Steuerwald, Karl: *Türkisch-deutsches Wörterbuch*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1972.

Trask, R. L.: *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London, New York: Routledge 1993.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs/Heine, Bernd (eds.): *Approaches to grammaticalization. Vol. 2. Focus on types of grammatical markers*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company 1991.

Traugott, Elizabeth Closs/Heine, Bernd (=(Traugott/Heine 1991a)): "Introduction". In: Traugott, Elizabeth Closs/Heine, Bernd (eds.): *Approaches to grammaticalization. Vol. 2. Focus on types of grammatical markers*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company 1991, 1–14.

Uraķsin, Z. G. (ed.): *Bašķortsa-russa hüðlek*. Moscow: Digora and Russkij Jazyk 1996.

Zakiev, M. Z.: "Aktual'nye problemy složnyx predloženij v tjurkskix jazykax". (*Sovetskaja Tjurkologija* 3, 1983), 29–38.

Žolobov, O. F.: "Slovoobrazovanie i morfologija". In: Jelitte, Herbert/Nikolaev, Gennadij A. (eds.): *Die Beziehung der Wortbildung zu bestimmten Sprachebenen und sprachwissenschaftlichen Richtungen*. Frankfurt am Main etc: Peter Lang 1991, 31–55.

Lexical cohesion patterns in Arabic and English expository texts

Adil al-Kufaishi
Copenhagen

The objective of this paper is to identify the lexical cohesion patterns that character-
ize two parallel Arabic and English expository texts, to specify the types of cohesive
ties utilized, to determine their frequency of occurrence in each text and to indicate
the language-specific rhetorical tendencies of Arabic and English exposition.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are postulated. They are then tested and evaluated.

- Arabic expository texts are dominated by a higher ratio of recurrence (lexical
  repetition) than English expository texts,

- English expository texts utilize complex repetition (lexical variation) more ex-
  tensively than Arabic expository texts

- Parallel repetition-replacement / synonymy patterns characterize Arabic texts
  more conspicuously than English texts.

Introduction

Halliday and Hasan's resources of textual cohesion

The foundations of text linguistics were laid down by Halliday and Hasan's "*Cohe-
sion in English*" in 1976. This was later reinforced by Beaugrande and Dressler's
"*Introduction to Text Linguistics*" in 1981 and then further consolidated by the pub-
lications of text linguists like Philips (1985), Hoey (1983, 1991), Johnstone (1991,
1994) and Winter (1986) among others.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the configuration of cohesion consti-
tutes and defines a text. It incorporates the semantic, lexico-grammatical and struc-
tural resources of reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction and lexical cohesion.
Halliday and Hasan view cohesion as a semantic relation based on the central notion
of presupposition—one element presupposes another which is located somewhere
in the text (anaphora or cataphora) or in the context of situation (exophora) and
which is essential for text interpretation. Presupposition is realized at three levels:
the semantic level (as in the case of reference) which has the semantic property of
definiteness and specificity, the lexico-grammatical level (as in the case of substitu-
tion and ellipsis) and the grammatical level as in the case of conjunctions. The three
types of reference (ibid 31–87), personal, demonstrative and comparative involve

presupposition—reference is made to specific information items in the text whose retrieval from elsewhere is crucial for interpretation. Personal reference subsumes personal and possessive pronouns. Demonstratives "this" and "that" make reference to extended text. Particular comparison is also referential in the sense that reference is made to a certain standard by which one thing is said to be superior, inferior or equal. The definite article has the semantic property of definiteness and specificity of reference.

Both ellipsis and substitution (ibid 88–225) presuppose the existence of certain textual elements. Nominal ellipsis presupposes the head noun, verbal ellipsis may presuppose either the lexical verb or the operator, and clausal ellipsis presupposes the entire preceding clause. Nominal substitutes such as "one" and "thing" presuppose a countable noun and function as heads of the nominal group; the lexical item "same" presupposes the entire nominal group. The verbal substitute "do" presupposes the lexical verb and functions as the head of the verbal group. Substitutes "so" and "not" presuppose an entire clause. The conjunctions, which are classified into additives, adversatives, causal and temporal, also involve presupposition since they make reference to what precedes and less frequently to what follows and establish linkage (as in the case of the cohesive temporal ties "previously", "afterwards" and "meanwhile").

Lexical cohesion, which is the fifth resource of textual cohesion in Halliday and Hasan's model, is defined as the cohesion achieved by the selection of vocabulary (ibid 274). It is classified into two major subcategories: reiteration and collocation, both of which involve presupposition. Reiteration covers repetition—the lexical recurrence of an item—and the use of synonymy or near synonymy, a super-ordinate or a general term. Collocation, lexical cohesion achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur within and across the sentence boundaries (ibid 284), is a more open category which includes lexical items that are interpreted in relation to the existence of other lexical items because of: a) their belonging to an ordered series, b) their relevance to the topic or c) their oppositeness.

Hoey's lexical cohesion patterns

Hoey (1991) envisages lexical cohesion as the central component of text linguistics. It subsumes Halliday and Hasan's four categories of textual cohesion: reference, substitution, ellipsis and the two subclasses of lexical cohesion with the exception of conjunctions which are structural elements that encode the semantic relations of addition, adversity, causality and temporality. The edifice of cohesion according to Hoey (1991, 26) is the product of lexical relations. The abundance of lexical items in the text and their frequent recurrence within the lexical network has led him to assign a dominant role to lexical cohesion. Lexical cohesion is realized through different types of recurrence:

a) simple lexical repetition which involves repeating the same lexical item "with no greater alternation than is entirely explicable in terms of a closed grammatical paradigm" (ibid 53),

b) complex lexical repetition, which involves forms that either share the same lexical morphemes (as in "read" and "reading") or belong to two different parts of speech (as in "support" which is a noun as well as a verb),

c) simple paraphrase which involves the use of a lexical item that "may substitute for another in context without loss or gain in specificity and with no discernable change in meaning" (ibid 62),

d) complex paraphrase which is not explicitly defined; it occurs when "two lexical items are definable such that one of the items includes the other, although they share no lexical morpheme"—an example would be forms such as "sickness" and "doctor" (ibid: 64). Under this category belong lexical items that are restricted in their application to three situations. The first is related to antonymy, which covers both antonymy that shares the same morpheme as in "connected" and "disconnected", and that has different morphemes such as "hot" and "cold". The second situation occurs when the item under scrutiny is a complex repetition of another item as in "writer", "writings" and "author"; the complex paraphrase link could be established between "writings" and "author" (ibid 64–65). The third grows directly out of the first two situations as in the relationship between "instruction" and "teacher" in the absence of the related item "teaching" in a text that has both the lexical items "instruction" and "teacher" (ibid 66–67). According to Hoey, true paraphrase is the one that is interchangeable in the same contextual environment,

e) a superordinate-hyponymy relation as in the relation between "biologist" and "scientist",

f) co-reference: items that are interpreted as having the same referent even though they are not lexically related such as "Augustus" and "the Emperor" and

g) personal and demonstrative pronouns, the former initiating pronominal reference. Hoey (ibid: 71–72) observes that there is a problem with using the term reference in this context since a pronoun "does not refer to an earlier item but co-refers with the earlier item to something real or imaginary outside the context". Among the personal pronouns, only "he", "she", "it" and "they" are treated as items entering into significant repetition sets together with the demonstrative pronouns.

Halliday and Hasan conceive cohesion as a semantic relation whose effect is realized by semantic continuity whereas Hoey conceives it as a lexical relation the effect of which is materialized by lexical continuity. Hoey claims a central role for lexis in building text cohesion and in organizing the text. It is worth noting that lexical cohesion is the dominant type of textual cohesion not only in Hoey's model but also in Halliday and Hasan's since it accounts for more than 40% of the textual ties analysed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). One can observe convergence rather than divergence in Halliday's and Hoey's conceptions of cohesion. Both assign a dominant role to lexical cohesion and both conceive cohesion as a dependency rela-

tion; one item depends on another for interpretation. In both models, the preceding environment provides the amount of data required for the interpretation of the item involved. Textual cohesion is thus the result of the integration of the presupposing and the presupposed elements.

The research tools—The model of lexical cohesion
Arabic and English lexical cohesion patterns
Cohesion could be defined as a lexico-semantic relation encoded by lexical and lexico-grammatical forms. It is a lexical relation since it involves lexical items that enter into a network of intricate relationships with others and form a lexical set. It is semantic since it involves the presupposition and dependency relations. Lexical cohesion is realized by the presence of lexical chains that establish multi-connections among the lexical items and thus create textuality. The model of textual cohesion which is adopted in the present analysis follows. Textual cohesion patterns are realized through:

1   the recurrence of lexical items which involves:
   a   simple repetition: the reiteration of the same lexical item
   b   complex repetition: root repetition, lexical variation
   c   pattern repetition: morphological repetition
   d   repetition by a general term

2   hyponymy relation
   a   superordinate-hyponymy relation
   b   hyponymy-hyponymy relation

3   synonymity or near synonymity relation

4   semantic contrast which could either be:
   a   complementary: one lexical item completes the meaning of the other
   b   antonymic: two lexical items that are opposite in meaning (old/new)

5   meronomy: the relation of the part to the whole which could either be:
   a   concrete (as in toe/foot)
   b   abstract (as in building/people)

6   collocation: a sequence of lexical items that indicates continuity of sense. The lexical items are either:
   a   relevant to a specific topic or
   b   belong to an ordered series

7   co-reference: two occurrences that have the same referent

8   pronominal reference: the replacement of a noun with a pronoun

9   parallelism: using parallel structures such as two or more than two noun phrases, verb phrases, adverbial phrases, noun clauses, adjectival clauses, adverbial clauses, sentences, etc.

10   paraphrasing: repeating the same content in different forms

These patterns are originally based on Halliday and Hasan (1976), Johnstone (1991) and Hoey's (1991) models of cohesion analysis. For the purpose of the present analysis, lexical repetition is defined as either the recurrence of the same lexical item or the recurrence of an inflected form of the same item. Complex lexical repetition is defined as either the use of two lexical items that share the same lexical morphemes but that are not formally identical (as in "care" and "careful") or the use of two lexical items that are formally identical but have different grammatical function (as in "support" which could either be a noun or a verb) (following Hoey 1991: 55), i.e. lexical variation is limited to the use of a derived form or a form that belongs to two grammatical categories. Both inter- and intrasentential instances of lexical cohesion will be noted and counted as instances of lexical cohesion. This position is consistent with that expressed by text linguists such as Baker 1992; Al-Batal 1985; Al-Jabr 1987, Williams 1982 and Al-Khafaji 2005 among others who maintain that lexical cohesion should not be confined to sentence boundaries. Lexical items are identified as synonymous or near synonymous on the basis of their contextual meaning (after Hoey 1991). Only open class lexical items will be considered in the present analysis. Having defined the necessary terms and established the resources of textual cohesion, we now proceed with the analytical process which involves analysing the parallel two Arabic and English texts, identifying the lexical cohesion patterns in each text, specifying the types of cohesion devices together with their frequency of recurrence in each text and then contrasting the parallel texts to highlight the pattern(s) that is (are) more productive than the others.

Statistical data analysis

The selected Arabic and English texts are parallel in that they are "matched in terms of genre and text type" (Aijmer and Altenberg, 1996 p. 13). Both are expository texts of almost equal length. The sentences in both texts are numbered to facilitate reference. The Arabic text is an excerpt from an article entitled "al-'arab wa taḥadii al-ma'rifah": "The Arabs and the Challenge of Knowledge" written by Burhan Gilyon, a Syrian writer. The writer makes reference to a UN report that attributes the gap in knowledge between the industrialized world and the Arab world to different factors, the most important of which, according to the writer, being the nature of the political regimes in the Arab countries. The text consists of seven orthographic paragraphs. The first, which is made up of three sentences, states the problem facing the Arab world today: that political regimes constitute the main obstacle to accessing knowledge. The second paragraph, which is also made up of three sentences, is more specific in that it relates the problem to the absence of democracy, a fact that has led the ruling clique to accord priority to the security issue at the expense of other aspects that are more essential for development. The third paragraph, which consists of two sentences, elaborates on the lack of investment in the science and education sectors. The primary objective of the regimes is to maintain power; thus they squander the nations' wealth on bribing their collaborators. The fourth, which consists of two sentences, accounts for the lack of investment in scientific research. That is due to the absence of the political will to initiate

change and encourage investment. The fifth paragraph, which is made up of three sentences, draws a comparison between the allocations of funds to education and scientific research in the industrialized world and in the Arab world. Scientific research in the Arab world receives 0.002% of the local product whereas it receives 2% in the industrialized world. The sixth paragraph, which is made up of three sentences, emphasizes the fact that the educational institutions and scientific centres suffer neglect, disregard and passivity because they are dominated by the political strategies. The seventh paragraph, which consists of one sentence, reiterates the rationale behind the neglect of the educational institutions: their subjection to the political strategies, the struggle for power, the relegation of the standards of efficiency and aptitude to the standards of allegiance to the ruling clique, and the restriction of the researchers' political liberties that results in the elimination of motivation and creativity (see Appendix *IIb*).

The English text is an excerpt from a UN study entitled "UNEP Study Sounds Alarm about the Disappearance of the Mesopotamian Marshlands" issued by UNEP in 2001. The report exposes the real threats the Arab communities encounter in the marshlands. The text comprises ten orthographic paragraphs. The first, which is made up of three sentences, highlights the catastrophic impact the draining of the marshes is having on the ecosystem and biodiversity as revealed by recent satellite imagery. The second paragraph, which is made up of three sentences, describes the difficulties involved in monitoring the events taking place in Iraq in recent years, a justification for not being able to report in due time. The third paragraph, which consists of two sentences, reiterates the gravity of the situation and its devastating impact on wildlife and the human communities living there. The fourth paragraph, which consists of two sentences, specifies the location of the marshlands and the reasons behind the desiccation of the marshlands: the upstream dams and the drainage schemes. The fifth paragraph, which is made up of three sentences, elaborates further on the construction of more than thirty large dams on the two rivers, the Tigris and the Euphrates, and their effect on the marshlands. The sixth paragraph, which is made up of two sentences, discusses the drainage schemes implemented in Southern Iraq in the early 1990s and their impact on the draining of the marshlands. The seventh paragraph, which consists of two sentences, reiterates what the satellite images have revealed: the extent of the damage inflicted on the marshlands. The eighth paragraph, which consists of two sentences, illustrates what now remains of the marshlands, a small northern fringe of what used to be one of the gigantic marshes impounded by new dams. The ninth paragraph, which consists of three sentences, describes the suffering of the marshland inhabitants, the majority of whom now live in neighbouring Iran in refugee camps. The tenth paragraph, which is made up of four sentences, reiterates the devastating impact the disappearance of marshes has had on the teeming wildlife, the waterfowl species, the fish and mammals and the coastal fisheries (see Appendix *IIa*).

A comprehensive table for each of the two analysed texts is worked out. All the lexical items are entered and sorted on the basis of the types of cohesive relations that bind them with other lexical items. Each of tables *Ia* and *Ib* is basically made up of three columns. In the first appears the serial number of the sentences analyzed, in

the second, the number of cohesive ties is specified, and in the third, the lexical items are listed together with the presupposed lexical items with which they enter into a cohesive relationship. Opposite each lexical item, the type of cohesive tie is specified (see Appendix *I*).

The following table represents a numerical summary of the raw results analysed in Appendices *Ia* and *Ib*. The first column specifies the type of cohesive ties and the subsequent columns display the number and the ratio of their occurrence in each of the parallel texts.

Type of cohesive tie	No. of occurrences in the Arabic text	Percentage of occurrences	No. of occurrences in the English text	Percentage of occurrences
Lexical Repetition	90	35.57	74	36.66
Lexical Variation (Root Repetition)	38	15.01	19	9.40
Synonymy	15	5.92	24	11.88
Near Synonymy	20	7.90	33	16.33
Co-reference	10	3.95	21	10.39
Pronominal Reference	26	10.27	8	3.96
Parallelism	15	5.92	9	4.45
Pattern Repetition	10	3.95	0	0
Specific Reference	11	4.34	1	0.49
Collocation	10	3.95	3	1.48
Contrast	5	1.97	6	2.97
Superordination	2	0.79	3	1.48
Meronomy	1	0.39	1	0.49
Total	253		202	

Results and discussion

The research findings have shown that:

1 – the ratio of lexical repetition in English expository texts is as high as that of Arabic expository texts (36.66% to 35.57%), thus the claim that Arabic texts favour lexical recurrence—simple repetition—and utilize it more intensively than complex repetition does not hold credence at least as far as the expository text under analysis is concerned. This claim is made by several researchers including Hatim and Mason (1997 p. 32) who observe that Arabic texts opt for lexical recurrence—simple repetition—and tend to utilize it more frequently than complex repetition-variation, Baker (1992 p. 236) who notes that Arabic utilizes repetition of form and substance as a major rhetorical device the function of which is to convince by assertion, and that such a "style of argumentative prose is seen by non-Arabs as too verbose" and Stotsky, who argues that there is in English an increase in the use of complex lexical repetition (variation) rather than simple lexical repetition (recurrence) and that this increase could be interpreted as an indicator of growth (in Hoey, 1991 p.:243). The claim may be true of argumentative texts that have as their primary objective persuasion and/or changing the viewpoints of others; it may be true of literary texts

which abound with rhetorical devices, including lexical repetition, or it may charac-
terize the writings of graduate and undergraduate students who have not mastered
the skills of writing academic papers, but it is not true of present day Arabic exposi-
tion as the analysis has revealed. Dudley-Evans and Swales (1980 p. 97) note that
academic writings of Arab students are incoherent and not properly organized, and
that Arabic texts are characterized by loosely connected anecdotal facts, many of
which are merely repetitions of earlier points. Thus, hypothesis No. 1 cannot be
validated.

2 – Arabic ratio of lexical variation (complex repetition / root repetition) to English
is 15.01% to 9.40%; thus the assumption that English utilizes complex repetition
more extensively than Arabic (hypothesis No.2) is not substantiated either, at least
as far as expository texts are concerned.

3 – Pattern repetition, which constitutes 3.95% of the total Arabic lexical ties, is
unique to Arabic. Arabic is characterized by an elaborate, highly productive and
easily accessible system of morphological patterns and roots that is exploited to cre-
ate root and pattern repetition. The roots, which are ordered sets of usually three
consonants, are instantiated in various forms in accordance with certain nominal
and verbal morphological patterns that make them pronounceable by adding a) a
pre-consonantal, intra-consonantal or post-consonantal vowel, b) more consonants
or c) by geminating one or more consonant. Pattern repetition partially accounts for
the abundant use of Arabic lexical cohesion. The patterns and roots are at the heart
of the Arabic language system, and they work in harmony with the parallel dis-
course patterns to create parallelism at the phonological, morphological, syntactic
and textual levels, and to render the text rhythmic, appealing and moving (John-
stone, 1991: 56).

4 – Arabic lexical cohesion patterns are characterized by another type of repetition
that involves the recurrence of lexical couplets or lexico-semantic doubling. They
could either be lexically equivalent, synonymous or nearly synonymous as in:

al-mufaji'ah waġayri al-mutawaqa'a   *fā'idah wa mardūd*
sudden and unexpected   *benefit and revenue*

or morphologically parallel—belonging to the same pattern—as in:

mubāš īrayn wa saīr'ayn   *'ilmīyah 'w θaqāf īyah*
direct and rapid   *scientific and educational*

Eleven instances of lexical couplets are identified in the text under analysis. They
are subsumed under synonymy and pattern repetition resources (see appendix *Ia*).

5 – the occurrence of synonymy and near synonymy in English texts is higher than
that in Arabic texts (11.88% and 16.33% to 5.92% and 7.90%) respectively.

6 – the ratio of co-reference: the use of two items that have the same referent in
Arabic texts compared to that of English texts is 3.95% to 10.39%. English has a
tendency to create textual cohesion and variety via the use of synonymy and near
synonymy, co-reference and reference by a general term.

7 – pronominal reference is more dominant in Arabic exposition than in English exposition (10.27% to 3.96%). This is due to the fact that Arabic is highly inflected and most of these pronouns are inflected forms attached to the nouns. They render the text more cohesive.

8 – parallel constructions are more recurrent in the Arabic text under analysis than in the English text (5.92% to 4.45%). Thus, hypothesis No.3 which claims that these patterns are more recurrent in Arabic than in English is substantiated. Parallelism is a discoursal structural device that binds together textual information and displays text organization. Arabic parallel constructions operate as a textual organization device that utilizes parallel clauses linked by conjunctives. Parallel constructions are repetitive patterns characterized by certain modifications: addition and/or the use of synonymous lexical items. Four pairs of these patterns are identified in the Arabic sample text, whereas only one is identified in the English text.

These patterns are presented in the following diagram; the repeated, parallel or synonymous items in the interactive links are placed in boxes.

S7	S9	
wa ġaliban mā	wa min al-ṭabī'ī 'an	
takūn	takūn	lexical repetition
al-ḍaḥīyah al-ra'isīyah litaqlīs al-'infāq al-ḥukūmī fī al-māyadīn al-'ukhrā li ṣaliḥ tanmiyat wasā'il al-'amn	qaṭā'āt al-θaqāfah wa al-ma'rifah wa al-baḥθ al-'ilmī	parallelism (two NPs)
hiyah	hiyah	lexical repetition
mayādīn al-našāṭāt		
al-latī	al-latī	lexical repetition
lā ta'tī fā'idah wa mardūd mubāširayn wa sarī'ayn	tata' araḍ qabla ġayriha 'ila al-'ihmāl sawa'an	parallelism (two VPs)
	min ḥayθ al-'ihtimām al-siyasī aw	
	min ḥayθ takhṣiṣ al-'istiθmarāt al-mādīyah	lexical repetition
'iδ	wa	

S11	S12	
lā	lā	lexical repetition
yatajāwaz naṣīb al-baḥθ al-'ilmī fī al-bilād al-'arabīyah	tukhaṣaṣ al-qaṭā'ā t al-'intajīyah wa al-khadamīyah	near synonymy
siwa	siwa	lexical repetition
0.002% min al-nātij al-ma ḥalī	3% faqat min hiδihi al-maṣādir	parallelism (two pre. Phrases)
muqābil mā yazīd 'an	baynamā tazīd	synonymy
2% bilnisbah limu'ḍam al-duwal al-s ina'īyah	haδihi fī al-duwal al-mutaqadimah 'ala 50%	synonymy

A concluding remark

Each language has its own reservoir of lexical cohesion resources and textual patterns. Arabic relies heavily on its linguistic and stylistic edifice of cohesion—root repetition, pattern repetition and parallelism—to create lexical and textual cohesion, whereas English favors co-reference, reference by a general term, synonymy and near synonymy as cohesive resources that introduce variety and create textuality. Lexical recurrence is a universal phenomenon common to both English and Arabic expository texts; thus the claim that Arabic utilizes lexical repetition more abundantly than English, and that English has a tendency to use variation—complex repetition—more extensively than Arabic can not be validated at least as far as exposition is concerned. However further study is required to support these and other conclusions. The study has not investigated the density of Arabic and English lexical chains—the number of multiple lexical links an element has with other elements across the text and the distance that separates the presupposing from the presupposed elements within a lexical set. It has not investigated the manipulation of these patterns in translation either. These themes are the subject matter of a coming research paper. The study has highlighted certain tendencies in the rhetorical and lexical patterns of Arabic and English expository texts that are pertinent to textlinguistics and to the translation processes of text analysis, conversion and restructuring.

References

Al-Batal, M. M. 1985. *The Cohesive Role of Connectives in a Modern Expository Arabic Text*. University of Michigan (Unpublished Ph. D. Thesis).

Al-Jabr, A. M. 1987. *Cohesion in Text Differentiation: A Study of English and Arabic*. University of Aston in Birmingham (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis).

Aijmer, K. and B. Altenberg. 1996. "Introduction". In *Languages in Contrast: Papers from a Symposium on Text-Based Cross-Linguistic Studies* (Lund Studies in English 99), ed. by K. Aijmer, B. Altenburg and M. Johansson. Lund: Lund University Press, pp. 11–16.

Al-Khafaji, R. 2005. "Variation and Recurrence in the Lexical Chains of Arabic and English Texts". In *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, Vol. 40, pp. 5–25. Poznan..

Baker, M. 1992. *In Other Words*. London and New York: Routledge.

Burhan Ghalyuun, 2003. "Al-Arab and the Challenge of Knowledge" ("al-ʿarab wa taḥadii al-maʿrifah") http:www.aljazeera.net/point_views/2003/11/11-22-1. htm.

De Beaugrande, R. & Dressler, W. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.

De Beaugrande, R. 1980. *Text, Discourse and Process: Toward a Multidisciplinary Science of Texts*. London: Longman.

Dudley Evans, T. and Swales, J. (1980) "Study Modes and Students from the Middle East", *ELT Documents* 109. London: British Council.

Fareh, S. I. 1988. *Paragraph Structure in Arabic and English Expository Discourse*. University of Kansas (Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis).

Hatam, B. and Mason, I. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London: Longman.

Hatim, B. and Mason, I.. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.

Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Hoey, M. 1991. *Patterns of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hoey, M. 1983. *On the Surface of Discourse*. London: George Allen & Unwin

Hoey, M. 1989. "Another Perspective on Coherence and Cohesive Harmony". In *Trends in Linguistic Series–Functional and Systemic Linguistics,* ed. by E. Ventola. Berlin: Moton De Gruyter, pp. 385–414.

Johnstone, B. 1991. *Repetition in Arabic Discourse.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Johnstone, B. 1994. *Repetition in Discourse: Interdisciplinary Perspectives,* ed. by B. Johnstone.. New Jersey: Alex Publishing Corporation.

Philips, M. 1985. *Aspects of Text Structure: an Investigation of the Lexical Organization of Text.* Amsterdam: North-Holland.

UNEP, 2001. "UNEP Study Sounds Alarm about the Disappearance of the Mesopotamian Marshlands" (the English Text). Geneva.

Winter, E.O. 1986. "Clause Relations as Information Structure: Two Basic Text Structures in English". In *Talking About Text: Studies Presented to David Brazil on his Retirement*, ed. by M. Coulthard. (Discourse Analysis Monographs No. 13). Birmingham: English Language Research, University of Birmingham.

Williams, M. P. 1982. *A Contrastive Analysis of Text Cohesion and Development in Arabic and English.* University of Leeds (Unpublished M.A. Thesis).

Appendix Ia: **The Lexical Chart for the Arabic Text**

Serial No.	No. of Links	Cohesive links	Cohesive ties	Type
S1	5	"hi" in ihtimāmihi and "hi "in sa'yihi refer to al-taqrīr	S1	pronominal reference
		al-laði	S1	pronominal reference
		al-manṭ iqah al-'arabiyah / al-bilād al-'arabiyah	S1	synonymy
		al-tanmīyah / al-tanmīyah	S1	lexical repetition
S2	11	al-taqrīr / al-taqrīr	S1	lexical repetition
		al-awḍ' al-ma'rifiah / mas'alat al-ma'rifah	S1	synonymy
		"hi" *in* taḥlīlihi *refers to* al-taqrīr S2; al-latī	S2	pronominal reference
		'awāmil / 'asbāb	S1	near synonymy
		"hā" *in* 'ahamuha *refers to* al'awaamil	S1	pronominal reference
		'awāmil 'adīdah / ṭ abī'at al-niḍaam	S1	superordinate-hyponymy
		nuqṭat al-ḍa'f / ṭabī'at al-nuḍum	S2	co-reference
		al-'arabīyah / al-'arabīyah	S1	lexical repetition
		al-mujtama'āt al-'arabīyah / al-bilād al-'arabīyah	S1	meronomy
		al-ma'rif īyah / al-ma'rifah	S1	variation
S3	12	haðihi S3 haðihi	S3	specific reference
		al-nuḍum / al-nuḍum	S2	lexical repetition
		al-bunyat / al-nuḍum	S3	near synonymy
		al-iqtisādīyah wa al-ijtima'īyah wa al-θaqāfīyah	S3	pattern repetition
		al-mujtamā't / al-mujtamā't	S2	lexical repetition
		"hā" *in* 'inaha *refers to* alnuḍum	S3	pronominal reference
		"hā" *in* fahmiha *refers to* al-bunyāt	S3	pronominal reference
		al-nuḍum / al-madkhal al-waḥīd	S3	co-reference
		"hā" *in* mu'ālajatiha *refers* to al-bunyāt	S3	pronominal reference
		fahm / fahm S1 lexical repetition	S3	pronominal reference
		al-'ijtima'īyah / al-mujtama'āt	S2	variation / root repetition
S4	12	yušīru / 'ašāra	S2	variation / root repetition
		al-taqrīr / al-taqrīr	S1	lexical repetition
		yušakkil / tušakkil	S2	lexical repetition

		'adam al-istiqrār wa 'iḥtidām al-i ṣrā' wa al-tanāfus 'ala al-manāṣib	S2	parallelism
		al-tanāfus 'ala al-manāṣib... ġīyab al-dīmuqrāṭīyah	S4	co-referemce
		al-sulṭa / alnuḍum al-sīyāsīyah	S2	collocation
		ġīyab al-dīmuqrāiṭīyah / 'ā'iq 'asāsī	S4	co-referemce
		al-ma'rifah / al-ma'rifah	S1	lexical repetition
		nimuu al-ma'rifah wa tawaṭuniha wa tarasukhiha	S4	parallelism
		al-turbah al-'arabīyah / al-bilād al-'arabīyah	S1	synonymy
		al-laðī	S4	pronominal reference
		ya'īš / ḥayāt	S3	collocation
S5	17	hāða	S5	specific reference
		al-ra'isīyah / al-ra'isīyah	S2	lexical repetition
		al-waḍ' / al-awḍ'	S2	lexical repetition
		al-siyāsī / al-siyāsīyah	S2	lexical repetition
		mustaqir / istiqrar	S4	variation
		ḥākim / maḥkūm	S5	variation
		al-taqalubāt / 'adam al-'istiqrār	S4	synomym
		al-inšiqāqāt wa al-taqalubāt wa al-taḥawulāt	S5	pattern repetition
		al-taqalu bāt wa al-taḥawulāt	S5	near synonymy
		al-taqalubāt / al-inqilābāt	S5	variation
		al-mufāji'ah wa ġayri al-mutawaqa'a	S5	lexical couplets / pattern repetition
		al-'amn / al-hākim wa al-m hkuum / al-nukhab al-hākima	S5	collocation
		al-ra'īs / al-ra'isīyah	S5	lexical repetition
		al-natā'ij al-ra' īsīyah / taḥwīl mas'alat al-'amn	S5	co-referemce
		al-nukhab al-hākima / al-sulṭa	S4	near synonymy
		al-a hakima / al-ḥākim	S5	variation
		al-nukhab / al-nukhab	S4	lexical repetition
S6	8	al-sulṭāt / al-nukhab al-ḥakima	S4 S5	synonymy
		Θābit / Θābita	S4	lexical repetition
		al-niḍām / nuḍum	S3 S2	lexical repetition
		'asās / 'asāsīyan	S4	variation
		šakal / yušakil	S2	variation
		al-sulṭāt / al-sulṭah	S4	lexical repetition
		mas'alat al-'amn / 'mn al-niḍām	S5	synonymy
		hīyah	S6 S3	specific reference
S7	9	al-ra'īsyah / al-ra'isīyah	S2	lexical repetition
		ḥukūmii / ḥākima / maḥkūm	S5	variation
		tanmīyah / tanmīyah	S1	lexical repetition
		al-'amn / al-'amn	S5	lexical repetition
		mayādīn / mayādīn	S7	lexical repetition
		f ā'idah wa mardūd	S7	lexical couplets / near synonymy
		mubāhīrayan wa sarī'ayn	S7	lexical couplets / pattern repetition
		al-ḍaḥīyah al-ra'isīyah / mayādīn al-na šāṭ at	S7	co-referemce
		takūn / kāna	S2	variation
S8	12	rašwat al-zaba'in / mayādīn al-našaṭ āt 'alati	S7	co-referemce
		falašak / bišakil ḥatmī	S6	near synonymy
		al-zaba'in wa al-muqarabīn	S8	lexical couplets / near synonymy

		manḍūr / naḍarī	S2	variation
		al-waḍ' al-siyasī / al-waḍ' al-siyasī	S5	lexical repetition
		?ala mabda' al-tanāzu'....la 'ala mabda'....	S8	parallelism
		al-tanāzu' 'ala al-baqā'/tanmīyat al-manāfi' al-mutabadalah	S8	contrast
		mabda' / mabda'	S8	lexical repetition
		tanmīyah / tanmīyah	S1	lexical repetition
		istiθmāraat / istiθmārāt	S6	lexical repetition
		'ilmīyah 'w θaqafīyah	S8	lexical couplet / pattern repetition
		Θaqāfīyah / θaqāfīyah	S3	lexical repetition
S9	11	Min al-ṭabī'ī / falašak	S8	near synonymy
		Θaqāfa / θaqāfīyah	S7	variation
		al-ma'rifa / al-ma'rifa	S1	lexical repetition
		al-θaqāfa wa al-ma'rifa wa al-baħθ wa al-'ilm ī	S9	collocation
		qaṭā'āt / qaṭā'āt	S9 S6	lexical repetition
		al-ihmāl / al-ihtimām	S9	contrast
		al-sīyasī / al-sīyasī	S2 S8	lexical repetition
		al-istiθmārāt / al-istiθmārāt	S8 S6	lexical repetition
		sawa'an min ħaiθ / aw min ħaiθ	S9	parallelism
		hīya	S9	specific reference
		al-latī	S9	pronominal reference
S10	15	al-iqtisadīyah / al-iqtisadīyah	S3	lexical repetition
		'awāmil / ''māl	S5	variation
		"hā" in nafsaha refers to al-'awāmil	S10	pronominal reference
		'awāmil / 'awāmil	S2	lexical repetition
		al-istiθmār / al-istiθmārāt	S8	lexical repetition
		al-ba ħθ / al-baħθ	S9	lexical repetition
		al-sīyāsāt / al-sīyasī	S2 S8	variation
		ta'līmīyah / 'ilmīyah	S8 S9	variation
		ḍa'ālat / 'iftiqār	S4	near synonymy
		al-istiθmārāt / al-istiθmārtāt	S8 S6	lexical repetition
		Θaqāfīyah / θaqāfīyah	S8 S3	lexical repetition
		Θaqāfīyah / θaqāfah	S9	variation
		hāða	S9	specific reference
		ḍa'fun wa takhabutun waḍa'ālatun	S10	parallelism
		ḍa'fun / ḍa'fun	S2	lexical repetition
S11	15	al-waḍ' / al-waḍ'	S8 S5 S2	lexical repetition
		idrāk / fahm	S1	near synonymy
		ħisah / takhṣīṣ	S9	collocation
		mukhaṣaṣāt / takhṣīṣ	S9	variation
		al-baħθ al-'ilmī / al-baħθ al-'ilmī	S9	lexical repetition
		al-bilād al-'arabīyah / al-bilād al-'arabīyah	S1	lexical repetition
		'aalam / 'ilm ī	S11	variation
		nāmīyah / tanmīyah	S8 S1	variation
		"hā" in nafsaha refers to al-buldān al-nāmīyah	S11	pronominal reference
		al-buldān / al-bilād	S11 S1	lexical repetition
		al-buldān al-nāmiiyah / al-bilād al-'arabīyah	S1	superordinate
		nātij / natā'ij	S11	variation
		natā'ij / natā'ij	S5	lexical repetition
		al-buldān al-namīyah / al-'ālam al-ṣina'ī	S11	contrast
		hāða	S11	specific reference
S12	9	naṣiib / ħiṣa	S10	synonymy

		al-baḥθ al-ʾilmī / al-baḥθ al-ʾilmī	S9	lexical repetition
		al-ʾilmī aw al-tiqanī	S12	lexical couplets / collocation
		al-bilād al-ʿarabīyah / al-bilād al-ʿarabīyah	S1 S11	lexical repetition
		al-nātij al-maḥalī / al-nātij al-maḥal ī	S11	lexical repetition
		muqābil / muqāranah	S11	near synonymy
		al-duwal al-ṣinaʿīyah / al-ʿālam al-ṣinaʿī	S11	synonymy
		al-nisbah / al-nisbah	S12	lexical repetition
		yatajawaz / yazīd	S12	near synonymy
S13	14	al-ʾinfāq / al-ʾinfāq	S7	lexical repetition
		al-ba ḥθ / al-ba ḥθ	S12 S11 S9	lexical repetition
		al-ba ḥθ wa al-taṭwīr	S13	lexical couplets / collocation
		al-bildān al-ʿarabīyah / al-bilād al-ʿarabīyah	S12 S11 S1	lexical repetition
		maṣādir / ṣadara	S1	variation
		ḥukumīyah / ḥukumī	S7 S5 S3 S2	lexical repetition
		tukhaṣiṣ / mukhaṣaṣāt / takhṣīṣ	S9 S11	variation
		qaṭā ʿāt / qaṭāʿāt	S9 S6	lexical repetition
		al-ʾintājīyah / al-natij	S11	variation
		al-ʾintājīyah wa al-khadamīyah	S13	lexical couplets / pattern repetition
		al-maṣādir / maṣādir	S13 S1	lexical repetition
		tazīd / yazīd	S12 1	exical repetition
		haðihi	S13	specific reference
		al-duwal al-mutaqadima / al-duwal al-ṣinaʿiiyah	S12 S11	synonymy
S14	17	al-waḍʿ al-siyaasī / al-waḍʿ al-siyāsī	S8 S5	lexical repetition
		al-ikrāh wa rafḍi al-i ḥtikām	S14	parallelism
		al-i ḥtikaam / ḥakim	S5	variation
		mujtamaʿīyah / ijtimaʿīyah repetition	S3	lexical
		rafḍi al-i ḥtikām / ġiyab al-dīmuqrāṭīyah	S4	co-referemce
		θaqāfīyah / θaqāfīyah	S8 S3	lexical repetition
		fikr / idrāk / fahm	S11 S1	near synonymy
		mustaqilah / mustaqilah	S3	lexical repetition
		mujtamaʿīyah wa θaqāfīyah wa fikrīyah	S24	pattern repetition
		lā yatawaqaf / wa lakinahu yatajāwaz	S14	parallelism
		taqlīṣ / taqlīṣ	S7	exical repetition
		al-baḥθ al-ʾilmī wa al-tiqanī / al-baḥθ al-ʾilmī wa al-tiqanī	S12	lexical repetetion
		al-ʿālam al-ʿarabī / al-bilād al-ʿarabīyah	S12 S11 S1	synonymy
		yatajāwaz / yatajāwaz	S12	lexical repetition
		al-ʾilmīyah / al-ʾilmī	S11	lexical repetition
		"hā" in nafsiha *refers to* al-idārah	S14	pronominal reference
		al-ʾilmīyah wa al-tarbawīyah	S14	lexical couplets / pattern repetition
S15	27	mimā la šaka fihī / falašaka	S8	ynonymy
		al-ḍaʿf / ḍaʿf	S10 S20	lexical repetition
		taʿlīm / taʿlimīyah	S10	variation
		al-baḥθ al-ʾilm ī / al-baḥθ al-ʾilm	S9 11 12 14	lexical repetition

		al-ʿarabī / al-ʿarabī	S1 11 12 14	lexical repetition
		yuqalil / yuzīd	S12	contrast
		yumayiz…wa yuqalil	S15	parallelism
		ʿawaʾid / manāfiʿ / mardūd	S8 S7	near synonymy
		"hā" in ʿawaʾiduha refers to al-muʾassasāt	S15	pronominal reference
		"hā" in ḥirmaniha refers to al-muʾassasāt	S15	pronominal reference
		al-ḍaʿf al-shadiid … huwa sayṭarat	S15	co-referemce
		al-sīyasīyah / al-sīyasī	S14	lexical repetition
		al-muʾassasāt / al-muʾassasāt	S15	lexical repetition
		ḥirmān / ʾinʿidām / ʾiftiqār	S10 S4	near synonymy
		al-ṣaliha al-kafuʾah wa al-munasibah	S15	pattern repetition
		al-istiqlāliah / mustaqilah	S14	variation
		ʿilmun wa ba-ḥθun wa maʿrifatun	S15	collocation
		tajdīd wa ʾibdāʿ	S15	lexical couplets / pattern repetition
		maʿrifī / maʿrifah	S15	variation
		sayṭara / wa ḥirmān	S15	parallelism
		ḥirmāniha min / min jihah wa min al-istiqlāliah min jihah θaniyah	S15	parallelism
		liʾayi rajuli ʾilm … wa liʾayi tajdīd	S15	parallelism
		huwa	S15	pronominal reference
		hāðihi	S15	specific reference
		al-latī in S15 and al-laðī in	S15	pronominal reference
S16	20	tataḥawal / taḥwīl	S5	variation
		al-muʾassasāt al-maʿrif īyah / muʾassasāt al-taʿlīm wa al-baḥθ al-ʿilmī	S15	synonymy
		ʾajhizat / ʾadawāt	S16	lexical couplets / near synonymy
		ʾiḍafīyah / ʾiḍafah	S13	variation
		taʿzī z / takrī s	S16	near synonymy
		sayṭarat / sayṭarat	S15	lexical repetition
		al-nukhab al-ḥākima / al-nukhab al-ḥiākima	S5	lexical repetition
		taʿzīz wa tawsīʿ	S16	parallelism
		qāʾidah / mabdʾa	S8	near synonymy
		"hā" in qāʾidatuha refers to al-nukhab	S16	pronominal reference
		"hā" in ʾilayha refers to al-qāʾidah	S16	pronominal reference
		al-ʾijtimaʿiiyah / al-ʾijtimaʿiiyah	S3	lexical repetition
		yabqā / al-baqāʾ	S8	variation
		al-bilād al-ʿarabīyah / al-bilād al-ʿarabīyah	S12 S11 S1	lexical repetition
		taʿlīman aw baḥθan aw tajdīdan	S16	pattern repetition
		taqanīyah / taqanī	S14 S12	lexical repetition
		al-maʿrifah / al-maʿrifah	S15	lexical repetition
		al-latī	S16	pronominal reference
		qāʾidah / ʾasās	S6	synonymy
		maydān / mayadīn	S7	lexical repetition
S17	40	yušakkil / tušakkil	S4	lexical repetition
		muʾassas ā t al-baḥθ al-ʿilmii / muʾassas ā t al-baḥθ al-ʿilmii	S15	lexical repetition
		al-sitrātijīyāt al-siyasīyah / al-sitrātijīyāt al-siyasīyah	S15	lexical repetition
		al-ṣirāʾ / al-ṣirāʾ	S4	lexical repetition
		al-sulṭlah / al-sulṭah	S4	lexical repetition

		al-walāʾ wa al-zabanīyah	S17	near synonymy
		ʾidārat / ʾidārat	S14	lexical repetition
		al-muʾassasāt / al-muʾassasāt	S17 S15	lexical repetition
		maqāyīs / maqāyīs	S17	lexical repetition
		al-kafāʾah / al-kafuʾah	S15	variation
		ʾikhḍāʾ / wa taqdīm / wa taqyīd	S17	parallelism
		al-maʿrifah / al-maʿrifah	S16 S15	lexical repetition
		al-fikrīyah / fikrīyah	S14	lexical repetition
		al-siyāsīyah / al-siyāsīyah	S15 S14	lexical repetition
		ʾikhḍāʾ / sayṭarat	S16	collocation
		al-rʾayī al-ʿām / jam ī al-sukān	S16	collocation
		yaqūd / yaqūd	S6	lexical repetition
		taqyīd al-ḥurīyāt al-fikrīyah / takbīl al-ʿuqūl al-ḥayah	S17	synonymy
		ʾikhmād lijaðwat al-maʿrifah / qatl ḥawāfiz al-ʾibdāʾ	S17	parallelism
		yušakkil / yušakkil	S4	lexical repetition
		ʿāmil / ʾawāmil	S10	variation
		al-manḍūma al-ʾilmīyah al-tiqanīyah/-muʾassasāt al-baḥθ al-ʾilmī	S16	synonymy
		baḥiθīn / baḥθ	S 9 11 12 14 15 17	variation
		takhaluf al-manḍūma / wa ḍaʿfihā / wa ʾjizihā	S17	parallelism
		al-ʾidārī wa al-maʿrifī	S17	lexical couplets, pattern repetition
		ḍaʿfihā wa ʾajzihā	S17	lexical couplets, pattern repetition
		al-ʾintāj wa al-ʾibdāʾ	S17	lexical couplets, pattern repetition
		al-zabāʾinīyah / al-zabāʾin	S7	variation
		haðihi	S17	specific reference
		al-kafāʾah wa al-maʿrifah	S17	collocation
		ḥayah / ḥayāt	S2	variation
		ʿaql / fikr	S17	near synonymy
		ḍaʿf / ḍaʿf	S2	lexical repetition
		maʿrifī / maʿrifī	S15	lexical repetition
		al-ʾibdāʾ / al-ʾibdāʾ	S17	lexical repetition
		ʾidārī / ʾidārah	S14	variation
		raʾisīyan / al-raʾisīyah	S8 S2	lexical repetition
		tafsīr / yufasir	S10	variation
		"hā" in ḍaʿfiha & "hā" in ʔajziha refer to al-manḍūma	S17	pronominal reference

Appendix Ib: **The Lexical chart for the English Text**

Serial No.	No. of links	Cohesive links	Cohesive ties	Type
S1	2	marshlands / the largest wetland	S1	co-reference
		marshlands / fresh water ecosystem	S1	hyponymy-superordinate
S2	5	report / UNEP study	S1	repetition by a general term
		report / wake-up call	S2	repetition by a general term
		environment / ecosystem	S1	near synonymy

		2001 / the turn of the 20th century	S1	synonymy
		wetland / wetlands	S1	lexical repetition
S3	13	It / report	S7	pronominal reference
		wetlands / wetlands	S1 S2	lexical repetition
		wetlands / habitat	S3	co-reference
		on Earth / in the world	S3	synonymy
		looming crisis / mounting threats	S2	near synonymy
		freshwater / freshwater	S1	lexical repetition
		important / outstanding	S1	near synonymy
		valuable / important	S3	near synonymy
		globe / world	S1	synonymy
		mounting / accelerating	S2	synonymy
		freshwater / fresh	S1	variation
		highlights / shows	S1	near synonymy
		crisis / threat	S1	near synonymy
S4	6	reports / report	S2	lexical repetition
		warning / threat	S3	near synonymy
		Mesopotamia marshlands / Mesopotamia marshlands	S1	lexical repetition
		imminent decline / looming crisis	S1	near synonymy
		such a fate / decline	S4	co-referential
		decline / environmental change	S2	co-referential
S5	6	in the past decade / in past years	S4	near synonymy
		past / past	S4	lexical repetition
		has limited access to and hindered …	S5	parallelism
		marshlands / marshlands	S1	lexical repetition
		Iraq / marshlands of the Tigris-Euphrates delta	S1	meronomy
		event / action	S5	near synonymy
S6	7	ecological / ecosystem	S1	variation
		disaster / crisis	S3	near synonymy
		rapidity / pace	S2	synonymy
		large / largest	S1	lexical repetition
		unreported / report	S2	variation
		major ecological disaster / mounting threat	S3	co-reference
		extent and rapidity	S6	parallelism
S7	11	satellite / satellite	S1	lexical repetition
		evidence / imagery	S1	co-reference
		UNEP study / UNEP study	S1	lexical repetition
		scale / extent	S6	synonymy
		speed / rapidity	S6	synonymy
		back / evidence / document	S7	collocation
		wetlands / wetlands	S1 S2 S3	lexical repetition
		disappear / vanish	S1	synonymy
		which	S7	pronominal reference
		the scale and speed	S7	parallelism
		pessimistic scenario / ecological disaster	S1	co-reference
S8	9	It / report	S1 S7	pronominal reference
		disappear / disappear	S7	lexical repetition
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 S5	lexical repetition
		with devastating impact / with important implications	S3	parallelism
		human / human	S2	lexical repetition
		communities / lived / habitat	S3	collocation

		live / life	S8	variation
		there / the marshlands	S1	co-referemce
		on wildlife and communities	S7	parallelism
S9	10	Tigris Euphrates / Tigris Euphrates	S1	lexical repetition
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 S5 S8	lexical repetition
		locate / situate	S5	synonymy
		river / rivers	S9	lexical repetition
		Iraq / Iraq	S5	lexical repetition
		partially / part	S9	variation
		Tigris Euphrates river system / Tigris Euphrates delta	S1	meronomy
		Iraq / Middle East	S1	hyponymy-superordinate
		extend / extent	S6	variation
		Iran / Middle East	S1	hyponymy-superordinate
S10	11	report / report	S1S2 S7	lexical repetition
		the vast wetland resources / marshlands	S1	co-reference
		main / major	S6	near synonymy
		scheme / system	S9	synonymy
		attributable to / due to	S2	synonymy
		upstream dams and drainage schemes	S10	parallelism
		shows / shows	S1	lexical repetition
		desiccation / drying	S6	synonymy
		vast / large tracts of	S6	synonymy
		wetland / wetland	S1 S3 S7	lexical repetition
		covering between / the largest wetland	S1	co-reference
S 11	4	Tigris Euphrates / Tigris Euphrates	S1 S9	lexical repetition
		dammed / dam	S10	variation
		rivers / rivers	S9	lexical repetition
		world / world	S1	lexical repetition
S12	9	past / past	S4 S5	lexical repetition
		rivers / rivers	S9 S11	lexical repetition
		volume / storage capacity	S12	near synonymy
		dams / dams	S10	lexical repetition
		years / years	S4	lexical repetition
		whose	S12	pronominal reference
		large / large	S6	lexical repetition
		great / large	S1	near synonymy
S 13	10	dams / dams	S10 S11	lexical repetition
		turning / turn	S2	variation
		substantial / important	S3	synonymy
		downstream / upstream	S10	contrast
		ecosystem / ecosystem	S1	lexical repetition
		reduced and eliminated	S 13	parallelism
		water / freshwater	S1	variation
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 S4 S5 S8 S9	lexical repetition
		floodwater / water	S13	variation
		that	S13	pronominal reference
S14	7	immediate / immediate	S4	lexical repetition
		cause / causes	S10	lexical repetition
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 4 5 8 9 13	lexical repetition
		dewatering / water	S13	variation

		massive / vast	S10	synonymy
		drainage works / drainage schemes	S19	synonymy
		Southern Iraq / Southern Iraq	S1 S10	lexical repetition
		In the early 1990 / in the past decade	S5	synonymy
S15	16	engineering works / drainage works	S14	synonymy
		chronic salination / M's main environmental problem	S14	co-reference
		Mesopotamia marshlands / Mesopotamia marshlands	S1	lexical repetition
		intra-fluvial region / Mesopotamia's delta	S1	co-reference
		chronic / historical	S14	near synonymy
		environmental / environmental	S2	lexical repetition
		expand / reduce	S13	contrast
		scheme / schemes	S10	lexical repetition
		drain / drainage	S14	variation
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 4 5 8 9 13 14	lexical repetition
		historically / historical	S1	variation
		they / works	S13	pronominal reference
		deal with / reduce / eliminate	S13	near synonymy
		main / main	S10	lexical repetition
		expand / extend	S10	near synonymy
		although / despite	S4	near synonymy
S16	14	satellite images / satellite imagery	S1	synonymy
		hard evidence / hard evidence	S7	lexical repetition
		extensive / extent	S6	variation
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 4 5 8 9 13 14 15	lexical repetition
		vast / vast	S10	lexical repetition
		covered / covering	S10	lexical repetition
		salt / salination	S14	variation
		provide / highlight / show	S1	near synonymy
		extensive / massive	S14	near synonymy
		dried-up / drying	S6	variation
		stretches / large tracts	S6	synonymy
		recent / new	S1	near synonymy
		dried-up and regressed	S16	parallelism
		that	S16	pronominal reference
S17	6	satellite imagery / satellite imagery	S16, S1	lexical repetition
		shows / shows	S1	lexical repetition
		limited / vast	S10	contrast
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 S4 S5 S8 S9 S13 S14 S15 S16	lexical repetition
		limited / limited	S5	lexical repetition
		area / region	S15	near synonymy
S18	10	northern / southern	S10	contrast
		marsh / marshland	S1	variation
		straddle / stretch	S16	synonymy
		Iraq / Iraq	S10	lexical repetition
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 4 5 8 9 13 14 15 16 17	lexical repetition

		small / large	S1	contrast
		fringe / part	S9	near synonymy
		Iran / Iran	S18	lexical repetition
		Al-Hawazi marsh / Hawr Al-Azim	S18	co-reference
		a small fringe / all that remains	S18	co-reference
S19	11	this last vestige / all that remains	S18	co-reference
		dwindle / expand	S13	contrast
		water / water	S13	lexical repetition
		dams / dams	S10	lexical repetition
		impounded … and diverted	S19	parallelism
		rapidly / rapidity	S1	variation
		new / new	S1	lexical repetition
		purposes / purposes	S17	lexical repetition
		for irrigation purposes / for agricultural purposes	S17	near synonymy
		dwindle / reduce	S13	near synonymy
		impound / hinder	S5	near synonymy
S20	14	Marsh Arab Society / unique human communities	S8	co-reference
		Marsh Arab Society / a distinct indigenous people	S20	co-reference
		inhabit / habitats	S3	variation
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 4 5 8 9 13 14 15 16 17 18	lexical repetition
		millennia / millennia	S8	lexical repetition
		confer / highlight	S3	near synonymy
		human / human	S8	lexical repetition
		environmental / environmental	S3 S2 S15	lexical repetition
		disaster / disaster	S5	lexical repetition
		vivid / distinct	S20	synonymy
		collapse / disappear	S23	near synonymy
		society / human community	S8	near synonymy
		that	S10	pronominal reference
		this	S20	specific reference
S21	6	Marsh Arabs / Marsh Arabs	S20	lexical repetition
		living / live	S8	lexical repetition
		Iran / Iran	S18	lexical repetition
		the rest / that remains	S18	near synonymy
		Iraq / Iraq	S18	lexical repetition
		estimated / nearly	S1	near synonymy
S22	5	heir to ancient Sumerians and Babylonians / Marsh Arab Society	S2	co-reference
		coming to an abrupt end / eliminated	S13	near synonymy
		ancient / old	S21	synonymy
		year / years	S4 S12	lexical repetition
		serious jeopardy / mounting threat	S3	near synonymy
S23		impact / impacts	S8	lexical repetition
		marshlands / marshlands	S1 4 5 8 9 13 14 16 17 18 20	lexical repetition
		desiccation / desiccation	S10	lexical repetition
		wildlife / wildlife	S8	lexical repetition

		devastating / devastating	S8	lexical repetition
		significant / important	S3	synonymy
		global / global	S3	lexical repetition
		implications / implications	S3	lexical repetition
		southern / southern	S9	lexical repetition
		biodiversity / teeming wildlife	S8	co-reference

Appendix IIa: **The English Text**

UNEP Study Sounds Alarm About the Disappearance of the Mesopotamian Marshlands
(18 May 2001)

(1) Drawing on historical and fresh satellite imagery, a new UNEP study shows that the Mesopotamian marshlands of the Tigris-Euphrates delta—the largest wetland in the Middle East and one of the most outstanding freshwater ecosystems in the world—has nearly vanished. (2) The report, due to be released in Summer 2001, is another wake-up call on the accelerating pace of human-driven environmental change at the turn of the twentieth century. (3) Specifically, it highlights the mounting threats facing wetlands, one of the most valuable habitats on Earth, with important implications on the looming global freshwater crisis.

(4) Despite intermittent reports in past years warning against the imminent decline of the Mesopotamian marshlands, there has been little immediate action to avoid such a fate. (5) Iraq's difficult situation in the past decade has limited access to and hindered monitoring of events in the marshlands. (6) As a result, this major ecological disaster, broadly comparable in extent and rapidity to the drying of the Aral Sea and the deforestation of large tracts of Amazonian, has gone virtually unreported.

(7) Backed with hard satellite evidence, the UNEP study graphically documents the stunning scale and speed at which the wetlands have disappeared, confirming the most pessimistic scenarios. (8) It concludes that over 85% of the marshlands had disappeared by May 2000, with devastating impacts on wildlife and unique human communities that have lived there for millennia.

(9) Comprising an integral part of the Tigris-Euphrates river system, the marshlands are located at the confluence of the two rivers in southern Iraq, and partially extend into Iran. (10) The report shows that the desiccation of these vast wetland resources, originally covering between 15,000–20,000 square kilometres, is attributable to two main causes: upstream dams and drainage schemes.

(11) The Tigris and the Euphrates are amongst the most intensively dammed rivers in the world. (12) In the past 40 years, the two rivers have been fragmented by the construction of more than 30 large dams, whose storage capacity is several times greater than the volume of both rivers. (13) By turning off the tap, dams have substantially reduced the water available for downstream ecosystems and eliminated the floodwaters that nourished the marshlands.

(14) The immediate cause of marshland dewatering, however, has been the massive drainage works implemented in southern Iraq in the early 1990s, following the second Gulf War. (15) Although some of these engineering works were meant to deal with chronic salinisation in the inter-fluvial region, historically Mesopotamia's main environmental problem, they were expanded into a full-fledged scheme to drain the marshlands.

(16) Recent satellite images provide hard evidence that the once extensive marshlands have dried–up and regressed into desert, with vast stretches covered by crusts of salt. (17) Furthermore, satellite imagery shows only a limited area of the marshlands having been reclaimed for agricultural purposes.

(18) A small northern fringe of the Al-Hawizeh marsh, straddling the Iran-Iraq border (known as Hawr Al-Azim in Iran), is all that remains of the marshlands. (19) Yet even this last vestige is rapidly dwindling as its water supply is impounded by new dams and diverted for irrigation purposes.

(20) The collapse of Marsh Arab society, a distinct indigenous people that has inhabited the marshlands for millennia, confers a vivid human dimension to this environmental disaster. (21) Around one-fifth of the estimated half-million Marsh Arabs are now living in refugee camps in Iran, while the rest are internally displaced within Iraq. (22) A 5,000-year-old culture, heir to the ancient Sumerians and Babylonians, is in serious jeopardy of coming to an abrupt end.

(23) The impact of marshland desiccation on its teeming wildlife has been equally devastating, with significant implications to global biodiversity from Siberia to southern Africa. (24) A key site for migratory bird species, the marshlands' disappearance has placed an estimated 40 species of waterfowl at risk and caused serious reductions in their numbers. (25) Mammals and fish that existed only in the marshlands are now considered extinct. (26) Coastal fisheries in the northern Persian Gulf, dependent on the marshlands for nursery and spawning grounds, have also experienced a sharp decline.

Appendix IIb: **The Arabic Tex**t

جعل تقرير التنمية الإنسانية الثاني للمنطقة العربية الذي صدر الشهر الماضي عن الأمم المتحدة من مسألة المعرفة محور
اهتمامه في سعيه لفهم أسباب تعثر التنمية في البلاد العربية(1). وقد أشار التقرير في معرض تحليله للأوضاع المعرفية إلى
عوامل عديدة ربما كان أهمها طبيعة النظم السياسية التي تشكل اليوم في نظري نقطة الضعف الرئيسية في حياة المجتمعات
العربية على جميع الأصعدة(2). ورغم أن هذه النظم ليست مستقلة تماما عن البنيات الاقتصادية والاجتماعية والثقافية السائدة في
هذه المجتمعات فإنها هي المدخل الوحيد لفهمها ومفتاح معالجتها جميعا(3).

وكما يشير التقرير بحق، يشكل عدم الاستقرار واحتدام الصراع والتنافس على المناصب النابع من الافتقار لقاعدة ثابتة ومقبولة
للتداول السلمي للسلطة بين النخب المتنازعة ـأي غياب الديمقراطية ـعائقا أساسيا أمام نمو المعرفة وتوطنها النهائي وترسخها
في التربة العربية(4). فمن النتائج الرئيسية لهذا الوضع السياسي غير المستقر ـوالذي يعيش فيه الحاكم والمحكوم في هوس
الانشقاقات والتقلبات والتحولات بل والانقلابات المفاجئة وغير المتوقعةـتحويل مسألة الأمن إلى البند الرئيسي وأحيانا الوحيد
في جدول أعمال النخب الحاكمة(5). وهذا ما يقود بشكل حتمي إلى اضطرار السلطات القائمة على غير أساس شرعي وثابت
إلى تكريس القسم الأكبر من الاستثمارات في قطاعات ضمان أمن النظام(6).

وغالبا ما تكون الضحية الرئيسية لتقليص الإنفاق الحكومي في الميادين الأخرى لصالح تنمية وسائل الأمن هي ميادين النشاطات
التي لا تعطي فائدة ومردودا مباشرين وسريعين(7). فلا شك أن رشوة الزبائن والمقربين تبدو ذات نجاعة أكبر في منظور هذا
الوضع السياسي القائم على مبدأ التنازع على البقاء لا على مبدأ تنمية المنافع المتبادلة لجميع السكان من أي استثمارات علمية أو
ثقافية(8).

ومن الطبيعي أن تكون قطاعات الثقافة والمعرفة والبحث العلمي هي القطاعات التي تتعرض قبل غيرها إلى الإهمال سواء من
حيث الاهتمام السياسي أو من حيث تخصيص الاستثمارات المادية(9). وهذا ما يفسر، أكثر من العوامل الاقتصادية نفسها،
ضعف الاستثمار في البحث وتخبط السياسات التعليمية وضآلة الاستثمارات الثقافية وأحيانا انعدامها(10).

ويكفي لإدراك نتائج هذا الوضع مقارنة حصة المخصصات للبحث العلمي في البلاد العربية مع مثيلاتها في العالم الصناعي، بل
حتى في البلدان النامية نفسها من الناتج المحلي(11). إذ لا يتجاوز نصيب البحث العلمي والتقني في البلاد العربية سوى 0.002
% من الناتج المحلي مقابل ما يزيد عن 2% بالنسبة لمعظم الدول الصناعية (تتراوح النسبة بين 2.5 و5%)(12). وبالإضافة
إلى ذلك يأتي 89% من الإنفاق على البحث والتطوير في البلدان العربية من مصادر حكومية، ولا تخصص القطاعات الإنتاجية
والخدمية سوى 3% فقط من هذه المصادر بينما تزيد هذه النسبة في الدول المتقدمة على 50%(13). (التقرير الثاني للأمم
المتحدة عن التنمية الإنسانية في المنطقة العربية 2002).

لكن أثر الوضع السياسي القائم على الإكراه ورفض الاحتكام للإرادة الشعبية والخائف بالتالي من أي مبادرة مجتمعية أو ثقافية
أو فكرية مستقلة، لا يتوقف عند تقليص ميزانية البحث العلمي والتقني في العالم التعليمي ولكنه يتجاوز ذلك إلى الإدارة العلمية
والتربوية نفسها(14). فمما لا شك فيه أن الضعف الشديد الذي يميز مؤسسات التعليم والبحث العلمي العربي القائمة ويقلل
عوائدها هو سيطرة الإستراتيجيات السياسية على هذه المؤسسات وحرمانها من الأطر الصالحة الكفؤة والمناسبة من جهة، ومن
الاستقلالية التي لا غنى عنها لأي رجل علم وبحث ومعرفة ولأي تجديد وإبداع معرفي من جهة ثانية(15). فمن دون ذلك
تتحول المؤسسات المعرفية إلى أجهزة وأدوات إضافية لتعزيز سيطرة النخب الحاكمة وتوسيع قاعدتها الاجتماعية التي تستند
إليها ولا يبقى لها ـكما هو الحال في العديد من البلاد العربية ـأي علاقة بميدان المعرفة سواء أكان تعليما أو بحثا أو تجديدا تقنيا(
16).

ومن هنا يشكل إخضاع مؤسسات البحث العلمي للإستراتيجيات السياسية وللصراع على السلطة وتقديم مقاييس الولاء والزبائنية
في إدارة هذه المؤسسات على مقاييس الكفاءة والمعرفة، وتقييد الحريات الفكرية والسياسية للباحثين، وفي وسط الرأي العام معا،
وما يقود إليه من تكبيل للعقول الحية وإخماد لجذوة المعرفة وقتل لحوافز الإبداع، يشكل كل ذلك عاملا رئيسيا في تفسير تخلف
المنظومة العلمية التقنية والمعرفي وعجزها عن الإنتاج والإبداع(17).

The Turkish language reform:
A catastrophic success

Geoffrey Lewis
Oxford

When first I opened a grammar of Chaghatay Turkish and learned that the Chaghatay for 'it will be' was *bolğay*, whereas the corresponding word in the Turkish of Turkey was *ola*, how feeble *ola* seemed in comparison with the vigorous *bolğay*! Central Asia, I thought, was the place to be. Gunnar Jarring's books opened the door to the fascinating world through which that many-talented man had journeyed. But while I was avidly reading them and dreaming of going where he had gone, I never dreamed that I would share with Gunnar Jarring the distinction of being elected to Corresponding Membership of the Turkish Language Society in the early 1950s, much less that one day I might have the honour of being invited to give the Jarring Lecture. I am fully aware of the magnitude of the contribution made to Turkic studies by Swedish scholars, not least the members of the Swedish Research Institute in Istanbul, and I am proud to dedicate this lecture to one of the greatest scholars of them all.

I am an ivory-tower scholar, not a field researcher. In spite of the fascination of Eastern Turkestan, my *kismet* has been that for most of my career my chief interest has been the language of Turkey. I did occasionally teach Chaghatay, in one year to a class including a student who wanted to read the *Baburname* in the original because it was written by Babur, the first Moghul emperor, who was one of his ancestors.

My subject this evening is the Turkish language reform. I gave my book about it the subtitle *A Catastrophic Success*. Though the reform has not been so drastic in its effect on the spoken language, it has made everything written before the early 1930s, and much that has been written since, increasingly obscure to each new generation. It has undeniably been a success, in that the reformers succeeded in their purpose of ethnic cleansing: getting rid of the non-Turkish elements in their language, so that it has changed as much in the last century as in the preceding seven hundred. I hope to show you why I call that success catastrophic.

The Ottoman Empire came to an end in 1922, but its administrative and literary language, Ottoman Turkish, the only language that ever came close to English in the vastness of its vocabulary, did not become a dead language until the middle of the twentieth century. At heart it was Turkish; that is to say, its accidence and syn-

tax were Turkish, yet Hagopian felt obliged to devote 40% of his *Ottoman-Turkish Conversation-Grammar*, published in 1907, to the grammar of Arabic and Persian. The reason was that the Ottomans had borrowed several features of those two languages. They borrowed Persian and Arabic plurals. From Arabic they borrowed the disease of language known as grammatical gender. Further, Turkish adjectives precede their nouns, but Arabic and Persian adjectives follow them. Persian interposes an *i* between noun and qualifier, and both conventions were adopted. The Ottoman name for the Sublime Porte, the central offices of the Sultan's government, was therefore *Bābıālī*, two Arabic words meaning 'gate' and 'high', joined by a Persian *i*.

The Turks were a pastoral people in what is now Outer Mongolia. In the eighth century, defeated by their Mongol neighbours in the competition for pasturage, they left their home and began to migrate towards the south and west. By the beginning of the eleventh century most of them who had reached the Middle East became Muslim, and the literate among them adopted the Arabo-Persian alphabet. Their own language was rich in words necessary for nomadic life, but it was deficient in terms for philosophical, theological, and artistic concepts. For these they resorted to Arabic and Persian.

But they did not stop there; they did not just borrow words for new concepts. Even so basic a word as *ōd* 'fire' fell out of use; it survived in poetry until the early twentieth century but had hardly been used in prose for four hundred years, its place having been taken by the Persian *ateş*. The Turkish *sin* or *sinle*, meaning 'tomb', found in popular poetry from the thirteenth to the twentieth century and still widely used in Anatolia, was supplanted in prose long ago by the Arabic *mezar*. The *Ğami' al-Faris*, a seventeenth-century dictionary, says that some people applied *sinle* only to the grave of a *kāfir*, a non-Muslim; a Muslim would be buried in a *mezar*.

In classical Turkish poetry you find lines where the only indication that they were written by a Turk is the appearance of a *-dir* 'is' or an *idi* 'was'. The same is true of classical prose. This mixture of Turkish, Arabic, and Persian was not understood by the great majority of the subjects of the Ottoman dynasty, not only the Arabs and Greeks and many other peoples, but also the Turks.

With the rise of journalism in the second half of the nineteenth century, writers, editors, and publishers realised that if they were to win readers for the new magazines and newspapers they had to simplify the written language by abandoning Arabic and Persian grammatical constructions. People who had been accustomed to calling the natural sciences *ulūm-i tabiiye* began to see that there was no harm in using the Turkish plural *ilimler* instead of the Arabic plural *ulūm*, dropping the Persian *i* and the Arabic feminine ending of the adjective, and putting the adjective first: *tabiī ilimler*. The words were still Arabic, because they were the only words in the working vocabularies of most of those who produced and read newspapers and magazines.

The poet Mehmet Ākif wrote this in 1910: "The crime reports in the newspapers are couched in language so abstruse that ordinary people listen to them as if they were religious formulae. It is ridiculous to write 'Depredators who nocturnally effected an opportunist entry into Mehmet Bey's domicile purloined costly tapis eight in number,' when what you mean is 'Burglars broke into Mehmet Bey's house by

night and stole eight valuable rugs'. Concepts for ordinary people to understand
should be expressed in the language used by ordinary people. But years were to pass
before that happened."

Although Mehmet Ākif was not alone in his opinion, it took the boundless energy
of Kemal Atatürk, as well as his authority as President of the Republic, to initiate
the ethnic cleansing of the language. In 1928 he brought about the change of the al-
phabet from Arabo-Persian to Latin. Two years later, he wrote a short preface to a
book on the history and potential of the language, in which he included these fateful
words: "The Turkish nation, which knows how to protect its territory and its sub-
lime independence, must also liberate its language from the yoke of foreign lan-
guages." That sentence has been quoted in every book ever written about the lan-
guage reform. Unfortunately, little attention was paid to his previous sentence:
"Turkish is one of the richest of languages; it needs only to be used with discrimina-
tion." He thought it would be possible to find or to construct Turkish equivalents of
all Arabic and Persian words, and he practised what he preached. He dictated a list
of topics, which he wanted historians to address. One of them was *Beşeriyet menşe
ve mebdei* 'The source and origin of human kind', all four words being of Arabic
origin. When the typescript was brought to him he amended this to *İnsanların
nereden ve nasıl geldikleri* 'Where humans came from and how they came', three of
the five words and all the grammar being Turkish. The other two words, *insan* 'hu-
man' and *ve* 'and', had long been naturalized and have survived the language re-
form.

To understand the course of the reform, you must know that language was the
first of Atatürk's two hobbies; the other being history. His passion for etymology,
however, was more enthusiastic than scientific. Among his offerings was his ingen-
ious derivation of *asker* 'soldier' (actually via Arabic from the Latin *exercitus*) from
the Turkish *asık* 'profit' and *er* 'man', i.e. a man who is an asset to his country. At-
tributed to him, probably unfairly, were Turkish etymologies for two American
place-names, Niagara being explained as from *Ne yaygara*! 'What tumult!' and
Amazon as from *Ama uzun*! 'But it's long!' It was unfortunate that although he
liked nothing better than a good argument, none of his intimates ever said "Very
amusing as an after-dinner game, Pasha, but we mustn't take it too seriously, must
we?" On the contrary, they played the same game. This being long before the age of
political correctness, the President of the Language Society, which Atatürk founded
in 1932, declared the origin of the Western word academy to be the Turkish *ak
adam*: *ak* 'white' and *adam* 'man' (an Arabic word). An anonymous article in the
Society's journal explained 'the old word *okan*' as the name of a deity, meaning
'majestic, glorious'. There was, however, no such word as *okan*; the word the writer
must have had in mind was *ugan* and its meaning was neither 'majestic' nor 'glori-
ous' but 'almighty'. But worse, he went on to say that *okan* was the etymon of
Okyanus 'ocean', which was a borrowing from Greek via Arabic.

The Society prescribed three methods for producing the words required to make
Turkish independent of foreign vocabulary: to explore the resources of the spoken
language, to collect words found in old texts, and, if necessary, to create new words
from existing roots and suffixes.

In October 1932 the word-collecting began. Every provincial Governor presided over a collection committee, with the duty of organizing the collecting of words in use among the people. Within a year, over 35,000 such words were recorded. Meanwhile, scholars had been combing through dictionaries of Turkic languages and more than 150 old texts in search of words that had fallen out of use or had never been in use in Turkey; these totalled close on 90,000. In 1934 the results of both activities were published in a book called *Tarama Dergisi* 'Combing Compendium'. Although the compilers had conscientiously put question-marks against some words of which they were not certain, enthusiasts did not feel inhibited about using any word found in it, and for a while the result was chaos. If you wanted to express 'pen' without using the ordinary word *kalem*, an Arabic borrowing, you looked up *kalem* and made your choice from among *yağuş* or *yazgaç* or *cizgiç*, or *kavr* or *kamış* or *yuvuş*. For *akıl* 'intelligence' there were 26 equivalents, from *an* to *zerey*. For *hediye* 'gift' you could pick your favourite from a list of 77 words. The one that was eventually chosen was *armağan*, not in fact Turkish but an old borrowing from Persian.

Journalists wrote their articles in Ottoman, then passed them on to an *ikameci*, a substitutor. The substitutor opened his copy of *Tarama Dergisi* and substituted for the Ottoman words whatever equivalents he chose from that book. At the same time, in the office of another newspaper another substitutor might be choosing different equivalents for the same Ottoman words.

At this point Atatürk decided that the reform had entered a dead end and that the sensible course was to retain in the language all the foreign words that were in general use and for which no Turkish synonym could be found, so long as they could be provided with a Turkish etymology. Encouraged by this, everyone had a go.

Those who instead of inventing etymologies for all the doomed Arabic and Persian words honestly tried to find pure Turkish replacements for them, made some terrible mistakes. For example, there was no Turkish equivalent of the Arabic *maarif* 'education'. The reformers produced *eğitim*, which they said was a noun derived from an ancient verb *eğitimek* 'to educate'. Well, there never was a verb *eğitimek* and, if you will pardon the paradox, it did not mean 'to educate'; it was a misreading of an ancient verb *igidimek* 'to feed (people or animals)', but that did not prevent *eğitim* from becoming the modern Turkish word for 'education'. For *millet* 'nation' the researchers had found eight possibilities, among them *uluş* and *ulus*, and they chose the wrong one, *ulus*. *Uluş* was a genuine Turkish word, though it meant not 'nation' but 'country'. The Mongols borrowed it, gave it the Mongolian pronunciation *ulus* and also gave it a new meaning, 'empire' or 'people'. By the fourteenth century the Turks had borrowed it back in its Mongolian form *ulus*, which they used until the seventeenth century and use again today. The reformers could not find a Turkish suffix to replace the Arabic adjective-suffix *-ī* as in *millī* 'national', so they borrowed the French suffix *-el* or *-al* as in culturel and principal, and they replaced *millī* 'national' by *ulusal*. Having chosen for 'national' a word half Mongolian and half French, the reformers could at least claim that they were not chauvinists.

Yet the name of the National Library of Turkey is still *Millī Kütüphane*, which is

part Arabic and part Persian. I once asked the Director of the Library how it had escaped being called *Ulusal Kitaplık*. With a happy smile she explained that the name *Millī Kütüphane* was written into the law establishing the library; the reformers had not noticed it and, *inşallah, deo volente*, nobody ever would.

Many of the neologisms were correctly constructed from Turkish roots and suffixes, for example *altyapı* 'under-building', which has replaced the French *enfrastrüktür*, and *kazı* 'excavation' and *çağrışım* 'association of ideas', which have replaced the Arabic *hafriyat* and *tedai* respectively. Far too many neologisms, however, were not correctly constructed.

You may say that this is no reason to call the reform a catastrophe. After all, every language is a set of conventions, and most people everywhere neither know nor care about the origins of the words they use; they are not interested in whether a word has always been part of their language or was recently created by a Language Society or an Academy. But I am thinking of the educated Turks who know the exact word they want but hesitate to use it because it is too old-fashioned and has not been replaced with a neologism. Or it has been replaced by one of the many neologisms that were arbitrarily invented. So they use a French or English word instead. A Turk, however, does not have to be a professional scholar to find at least some of the inventions excruciating and cannot bear to hear them, much less to say them.

An example: the reformers made *neden*, the ablative of *ne* 'what?', into a noun meaning 'cause', replacing the Arabic *sebep*. This new noun is unique in having an ablative case which no Turk with any feeling for the language will use. The old expression for 'because of this' was *bu sebepten*, literally 'from this cause'. Few Turks can bring themselves to say *bu nedenden*, literally 'from this from-what'. Nor do they like the alternative *bu neden nedeniyle*, 'by this from-what's from-what', so they continue to use the Ottoman *bu sebepten*.

The assumption behind the change of vocabulary was that the meaning of neologisms constructed from Turkish roots and suffixes, unlike Ottoman words would be readily intelligible to everybody; while a Turk might not know the Arabic *mefhum* 'concept', he could at once understand *kavram*, manufactured from *kavramak* 'to grasp'. Well, he might, unless he was from one of the many regions of Anatolia where it means 'handful'. And when the suffix was itself a neologism he would be even worse off, especially if it coincided in form with a familiar word. Among Atatürk's coinages for the language of geometry, of which 1 shall be saying a little more, were replacements for the Arabic names of the plain figures—triangle, pentagon and so on. He added to the appropriate numeral a newly invented suffix *-gen*. The more committed reformers will tell you its origin was Turkish, but in fact it was the suffix *-gon* of pentagon and hexagon, altered to *-gen* because as a rule the vowel *o* does not occur in final syllables. Anyway, the word for 'triangle' became *üçgen*. In theory, anyone could understand that it had something to do with 'three', and would soon realise from the context that it meant 'triangle'. But the reformers should have known that *gen* was part of the vocabulary of every farmer in Anatolia, to whom *üçgen* could mean only 'three fallow fields'. Consider the neologism *özek*, the official replacement for the Arabic *merkez* 'centre'. A villager from the neighbourhood of Isparta would have no difficulty with it, because it was there that the

word-collectors had found it. To most other Anatolians, however, it would mean only the pole of an ox-cart. A town-dweller, knowing *öz* 'own' and *ek* 'patch, addition', could never guess its new meaning.

Those are typical of the mistakes that the reformers made. Another was that they impoverished the language by eliminating a great many Arabic and Persian words for which there were no Turkish equivalents, nor did they take the trouble to construct them from Turkish roots and suffixes. The enormous resources of Ottoman Turkish were at their disposal. They did not have to perpetuate the whole exuberant vocabulary; they were free to pick and choose, but they deliberately elected to throw away their heritage.

Ottoman had individual words that expressed the concepts of declaring, asserting, remarking, hinting, and more of similar meaning. To express all these senses, modern Turks have to make do with *anlatmak* 'to tell', *söylemek* 'to say', and *bildirmek* 'to inform', with adverbs to supply the nuances. So, for 'to hint', if they wish to avoid or don't know the old word *ima*, they have to say *üstü kapalı söylemek* 'to say covertly' or *dolaylı anlatmak* 'to tell indirectly'.

I have mentioned another of the refomers' sins, that when they could not find or construct a real Turkish equivalent for a foreign word that they wanted to expel from the language, they invented one. There was an incident at the Sixth Language Congress, in 1949, which does not appear in the published proceedings. Someone asked what principles had governed the formation of new technical terms. An embarrassed silence was eventually broken by the chairman of the Linguistics and Etymology Commission, who said: "My friends! We had no principle or anything resembling a principle. We've been making them up as we went along!"

That was no more than the truth. As the pure Turkish replacement for the Arabic *hayal* 'image' they produced *imge*, its alleged origin being the Old Turkic *im* 'password', with the addition of the suffix seen in *çekirge* 'grasshopper' and *süpürge* 'broom'. The connection between 'password' and 'image' may seem tenuous, but one only has to spell out *imge* and the French or English *image* to see the true etymology.

The old word for 'civilization' was *medeniyet*. It was of Arabic derivation, though it was a nineteenth-century Turk who did the deriving, and the Arabs borrowed it from the Turks. The replacement found for it was *uygarlık*, an arbitrary coinage based on the name of the Uyghur, the people who established an advanced civilization in Eastern Turkestan in the tenth to twelfth centuries. So it has far less claim to being pure Turkish than *medeniyet*, which still holds its ground.

I once conducted a small experiment about those two words. On the northern approaches to Izmir one sees notices reading *Yayaya Saygı Uygarlıktır* "Respect for the Pedestrian is Civilization." I asked two affable taxi-drivers the meaning of *uygarlık*, and after briefly conferring they agreed that *uygar* meant the same as modern or *çağdaş* 'contemporary'. It emerged that they did not associate *uygarlık* with *medeniyet*, which they both knew, though I did not try their patience by asking them to define it. I am sure that Gunnar Jarring would have had the courage to pursue the enquiry to its very end. But my small experiment lends support to the view of a Turkish friend whom I told about it: that nuances of meaning are emerging be-

tween old words and their replacements; he himself did not feel *uygarlık* and *medeniyet* to be synonymous. If he was talking about a particular civilization or the history of civilization, he would use *medeniyet*. *Uygarlık*, on the other hand, conveyed to him something more dynamic: civilized and vigorous and progressive.

There are two questions we should ask about the reform. The first is, has it liberated the language from the yoke of foreign languages? The answer is yes; most of the vocabulary of younger writers is that of the new Turkish. The second question is, has it eliminated the gap between the language of the intellectuals and the language of the people? The answer is no. It is natural that there should be a gap between the language of intellectuals and the language of the people, because intellectuals need more words than non-intellectuals. No one ever expected intellectuals to stop talking about literary criticism or bacteriology or whatever their particular interest might be. The hope was that they would give up the use of Ottoman words for everyday concepts; they would not, so to speak, say 'domicile' when they meant 'house', or "I shall exercise cogitation on this topic" rather than "I'll think about it". And they don't; the language of the intellectuals is no longer full of Ottoman words, but it is full of so-called 'pure Turkish' neologisms, very few of which have entered the language of the people, the majority of whom are not great readers. The language of the people, though not full of Ottoman words, retains many that the intellectuals have abandoned. The reform has hardly changed the speech-habits of non-intellectuals; the language spoken today by the farmer, the shopkeeper, and the small craftsman is not very different from that spoken by their grandparents.

For a change, let me say a word about one aspect of the reform that I see as totally admirable: the technical terms of the sciences. Until 1937, Turkish schoolchildren were still being taught geometry with the Ottoman technical terms. 'Right angle' was *zaviye-i kaime*, two Arabic words joined by the Persian *i*. It is now *dik açı*, a straight translation of the Arabic. The change began in the winter of 1936/7, when Atatürk wrote a little book on the elements of geometry, which was published anonymously. In it he employed most of the geometrical terms now in regular use, many of his own invention.

We all remember the formula we learned at school: "The area of a triangle is equal to the length of the base multiplied by half the height." In pre-reform Turkish it was *Bir müsellesin mesaha-i sathiyesi, kaidesinin irtifaına hâsl-ı zarbinin nısfıa müsavidir*. Now it is *Bir üçgenin yüzölçümü, tabanının yüksekliğine çarpımının yarısına eşittir*. Really two languages; all they have in common is the indefinite article *bir* at the beginning and the suffix *-dir* at the end. But only a fanatical conservative would persist in calling interior opposite angles by the 16 syllables of *zaviyetan-ı mətekabiletan-ı dahiletan* rather than the five syllables of *içten açılar*. New technical terms have been devised for the other branches of science, although not all their practitioners use them. Certainly medical doctors seem to prefer English or French.

To revert to non-technical words, the sad truth is that very many of them were created by people with no qualifications for the job, a category that included not a few of the Society's experts. But the individual who produced the largest number of new words did not claim to be an expert on language. He was Nurullah Ataç, a

popular writer on literature who cheerfully admitted "my ignorance is endless and at my age it cannot be eradicated." Whenever he introduced a neologism into one of his articles, he added in parentheses the word it was intended to replace, but without trying to explain or to justify his invention. His contributions to the new Turkish number many hundreds, most of them now in regular use, such as *yanıt* 'answer', *örneğin* 'for example' and *sorun* 'problem'.

Some devotees of the reform will look you in the eye and swear that such obvious adaptations of Western words as *okul* for 'school', *genel* for 'general', and *terim* for 'technical term' are of purely Turkish origin. They make the same claim for *süre* 'duration', a Frankenstein's monster whose father was the Turkish *sürmek* 'to continue' and whose mother was *durée*, the French for 'duration'.

Let me sum up my four reasons for calling the reform catastrophic. (1) The reformers did not close the language gap between intellectuals and non-intellectuals; what they did was to create a new gap. (2) They impoverished the language by failing to produce Turkish replacements for all the Arabic and Persian words they consigned to oblivion. This loss affects every Turk who now, in speaking or writing, looks for the word that expresses his feelings but does not find it, because it is as dead as Etruscan and has not been replaced. (3) Many of the replacements that were produced are far from being pure Turkish. (4) Most Turks below the age of 50 are cut off from the writings of the 1920s and 1930s, one of the greatest periods of their modern literature. The "Translations into Modern Turkish" that you will see in bookshops are no substitute for the real thing.

Here is an extract from a reader's letter to the newspaper *Cumhuriyet* in 1995: "I was looking for one of Yakup Kadri's books. It was nowhere to be found. I asked the publisher who had reprinted many of his books why he hadn't reprinted that one. He replied, 'We haven't been able to find anyone to put it into Turkish.' Apparently a book printed in the 1930s, which I read as a schoolboy, today has to be put into Turkish! Did Yakup Kadri write it in Chinese, I wonder? Further, no one can be found to understand that Turkish and turn it into the new garbage!" The writer of that letter was not alone; all but one of the many Turkish friends who supplied me with material for my book said that if I criticized the reform too unkindly they would not mind a bit. Most of them were no older than the one friend who did not say that.

In general, conservative-minded people were against the reform, while progressives were for it. A man named Tekin Erer wrote this in 1973: "There is a simple method of distinguishing the leftists in our country. To ascertain how far to the left a person is, look at the words he uses in writing and speech. If the fake words he employs are too numerous for you to be able to understand, you may unhesitatingly call him a communist."

He was wrong; extremists at both ends of the political spectrum were bitterly opposed to the reform. The communists saw it as a bourgeois movement aimed at widening the gulf between the official and literary language and the language of the people. The poet and playwright Nazım Hikmet (1902–63), the most distinguished of all Turkish communists, did not use 'pure Turkish' but followed Atatürk in making full use of the language as it stood. Extremists of the right regarded the Lan-

guage Society as a subversive organization whose mission was to decrease mutual understanding between the Turks of Turkey and the Turks of the then Soviet Union, whom they hoped some day to liberate.

Atatürk's devotion to the reform which he had initiated suffered a shock on 3 October 1934. He had already gone a long way in the use of the new language; he took it to the limit in the speech he made that day at a banquet in honour of the Crown Prince and Princess of Sweden. He had composed the speech in the language he had spoken all his life, and every Arabic or Persian word was then replaced with a neologism, presumably by a 'substitutor'. It is recorded that he delivered the speech "like a schoolboy who has just begun to read." One can see why this embarrassing experience made him think that the reform had gone too far.

He had another shock two years later, at the Language Society's Third Congress, which was dominated by the Sun-Language Theory, for which he was responsible. Uriel Heyd, in his 1954 book on the language reform, calls it "this amazing theory". So does Bernt Brendemoen, writing in 1990, who in addition calls it 'infamous'. It was inspired by a Dr Kvergic of Vienna, who sent Atatürk an unpublished paper entitled "La Psychologie de quelques éléments des langues torques", which did not mention the sun; the sun was part of Atatürk's contribution. Kvergic asserted, among other things, that Turkish was the first language in the world. Atatürk's theory taught that language began when primitive man looked up at the sun and said 'Aa!', in Turkish spelling *ağ*, which became "the first-degree radical of the Turkish language." Its meanings were numerous, ranging from 'sun' and 'God' to 'water' and 'time'. Dr Kvergic was invited to the Congress and he applied the Sun-Language Theory to produce the following etymology of *unutmak* 'to forget':

> Its earliest form was *uğ+un+ut+um+ak*, *Uğ*, 'discriminating spirit', is the mother-root. The *n* of *un* shows that the significance of the mother-root emerges into exterior space. The *t* of *ut* is always a dynamic factor; its role here is to shift the discriminating spirit into exterior space. The *m* of *um* is the element which embodies the concept of *uğ-un-ut*, while *ak* completes the meaning of the word. After phonetic coalescence, the word takes its final morphological shape, *unutmak*, which expresses the transference of the discriminating spirit out of the head into the exterior field surrounding the head.

Every word of that was pure invention. One wonders how a man who talked such rubbish in public ever obtained a doctorate.

İbrahim Dilmen, the Secretary-General of the Society, used the theory to prove that the Western word *electric* was derived from the Uyghur *yaltrık* 'gleam, shining'. One is reminded of Müller's dictum "The change of a consonant is a mere trifle, for in etymology vowels are worth but little, and consonants almost nothing." In case you do not believe that Müller could have said that, I should explain that this was not the great nineteenth-century Oxford philologist Max Müller but his cousin George.

There were a number of foreign guests at the Congress, besides Dr Kvergic. Atatürk's faith in his theory was shaken by the reactions of all of them except Dr Kvergic. Some of them politely said the theory was interesting. Others wanted more time to think about it. Four of them did not mention it at all. Atatürk was a man of high intelligence and he knew what they thought of his Sun-Language Theory.

His interest in technical terms continued after the Congress. Already by the end

of 1936, however, he had lost interest in creating neologisms for everyday words, and had reverted to his mother-tongue.

After Atatürk's death, in November 1938, Dilmen cancelled the course of lectures on the Sun-Language Theory which he had been giving at Ankara University. When his students asked him why, he replied "After the sun has died, does his theory survive?"

The Language Society felt secure in the knowledge that it was not a State institution but a private body founded by Atatürk, so that it could never be abolished. Nor was it; when the conservatives thought the time was ripe it was simply nationalized. A law passed on 11 August 1983 reconstituted it as part of a new Atatürk Cultural, Linguistic, and Historical Institute dependent on the Prime Minister's office. Since then the new Society has ceased to propose replacements for Ottoman words.

The importation of French words began in the nineteenth century and continues. The Higher Education Council has recently prepared draft regulations for higher education based on the internet. They contain two words not to be found in any Turkish dictionary: *akreditasyon* and *akredite*. The most grotesque example of French borrowing I have so far met is the notice outside the places where you can have the exhaust emission of your vehicle tested. It reads *Ezgoz emisyonu ölçüm istasyonu* 'exhaust emission measuring station'. Only the third word is Turkish.

As long ago as 1974, Özcan Başkan, one of the first generation of Turkish linguists, combined *Türkçe* 'Turkish' and *İngilizce* 'English' to make a Turkish counterpart of the French franglais: *Türkilizce*. Since the 1960s, French has been largely replaced by English as the source of Western words. The Turkish for 'balloon' is *balon*, plural *balonlar*, but a company organizing flights over Göreme, in the ancient Cappadocia, calls itself 'Kapadokya Balloons'. The switch from French borrowings to English borrowings is the subject of a shrewd Turkish witticism: "I'm really getting tired of Turks who talk English instead of Turkish. Most people now say *opereyşin* instead of *operasyon*, and *spekületyşin* instead of *spekülasyon*."

The new Language Society regularly suggests Turkish replacements for such Western words, though nobody seems to take much notice of its suggestions. In these proposed replacements 'pure Turkish' is far from predominating; some of them are what I think of as proper Turkish and what the old Language Society would have called Ottoman. In the pages of any newspaper or magazine, Ottomanisms may now be seen which twenty years ago one would have thought obsolete. One example: in a newspaper report on a terrorist raid last April, the terrorists were called *teröristler*. The headline, however, was *Otelde Dehşet* 'Terror at Hotel', *dehşet*, of Arabic origin, being the Ottoman for 'terror'. On 15 October 2001, the newspaper *Akşam* reported that the Turkish Army had moved to *kısmî teyakkuz* 'partial alert', both words being Arabic.

Pleasant though it may be for lovers of the old language to see and hear some of it coming back into use, they must not deceive themselves into assuming that the language reform is over and done with. Hardly any neologisms are being created nowadays (why bother to create them if you know French or English?), but the effects of fifty years of indoctrination are not so easily eradicated. Let me finish with a word about two neologisms.

The established replacements for the Arabic *istiklāl* 'independence' and *hürriyet* 'freedom' are *bağımsızlık* and *özgürlük*. The *-ım* of *bağımsızlı* is a deverbal suffix, but as *bağ* is not a verb-root, the root has to be the noun 'bond, impediment'. The best one can say for *bağımsızlık* is that its meaning is not so unguessable as that of its partner *özgürlük*. *Öz* means 'pure', and *gürlük* means 'abundance', so *özgürlük* can only mean 'pure abundance'; it cannot mean 'freedom'. But it does. The objection most critics have raised to these two words, however, is not the obvious one that the first violates the rules of the language, while the second makes no sense, but that they have no emotional content. Untold thousands of Turks, they say, fought and died for *hürriyet* and *istiklāl*; how many would be ready to fight and die for *özgürlük* and *bağımsızlık*? The answer to this rhetorical question is that you do not miss what you have never known. To those Turks who have grown up since the 1950s, *Hürriyet* is the name of a daily newspaper and square in Beyazıt, while *İstiklāl* is the name of a street in Beyoğlu. To them, *özgürlük* and *bağımsızlık* mean what *hürriyet* and *istiklāl* meant to their grandparents and what 'freedom' and 'independence' mean to English-speakers, and yes, they are ready to fight and die for them if necessary. The language they have spoken all their lives is their language.

Ah well. Ottoman was a splendid language while it lasted. *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*.

Symbolism and surrealism in literature from Bahrain

Gail Ramsay
Uppsala

Historical Background

An independent Gulf state since 1971, Bahrain took the form of a constitutional monarchy under the reign of King Hamad bin Isa Al Khalifa in 2002. This island kingdom, with its approximately 700,000 inhabitants, of whom some 70 percent are citizens and the rest expatriate workers and experts, has a distinct modern literature and cultural identity of its own alongside the other Gulf states. One important reason for this is that Bahrain has provided elementary schooling for boys since 1919 and for girls since 1928.[1] Another reason is that Bahrain was the first Gulf state to enter the era of the oil-economy. The country has been exploiting its oil reserves since 1932 and is also the first Gulf state having to cope with a "post-oil economy".[2] As is the case with Gulf works of literature generally, the past and the present interweave; as a result of the rapid pace of change, old customs continue on in new social arrangements of life and people may have difficulties coping with the new circumstances which have arisen with the income from the oil and the changes wrought with the oil-economy.[3]

As in the Arab world in general, the press has played a pivotal role in the appear-

---

[1] In Bahrain the first primary school for boys, *al-Hidāya al-khalīfiyya*, was founded in 1919. In 1927 two more schools were established, and in 1928 the first school for girls in the Gulf appeared in Bahrain. Consult Ibrāhīm ʿAbd Allāh Ghalūm, *al-Qiṣṣa al-qaṣīra fī al-Khalīj al-ʿArabī, al-Kuwayt wa-al-Baḥrayn* ("The Short Story in the Arabian Gulf: Kuwait and Bahrain: A Foundational Critical Study"), Beirut: al-Muʾassasa al-ʿarabiyya li-ad-dirāsāt wa-an-nashr, al-markaz ar-raʾīsī, 2000, (Second impression), p. 73.

[2] Bahrain's limited oil-reserves are still being exploited but "can only be sustained for a maximum of 25 years", according to Anthony H. Cordesman, *Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, and the UAE: Challenges of Security*, Boulder and Oxford: Westview Press, 1997, p. 59.

[3] On the subject of the impact of social changes and education introduced with the oil-economy on the Gulf region's literature consult Gail Ramsay, "Styles of Expression in Women's Literature in the Gulf", in Éva Á. Csató, Carina Jahani, Anju Saxena, Christiane Schaefer (eds.), *Orientalia Suecana* LI–LII (2002–2003), Uppsala: Uppsala University, p. 371 and Ramsay, "Confining the Guest Labourers to the Realm of the Subaltern in Modern Literature from the Gulf", in *Orientalia Suecana* LIII (2004) Uppsala: Uppsala University, pp. 133–42, esp. pp. 133–4. Exploratory drilling for oil was started in Bahrain in 1930 by Standard Oil company of California. Since 1932 the country has been exploiting its limited oil resources, and oil was found in commercial quantities in July 1940, the royalties of which provided the sheikh of the Al Khalifa family with a regular income. See Fred H. Lawson, *Bahrain: The Modernization of Autocracy*, Boulder, San Francisco, London: Westview Press, 1989, pp. 38–9, 94 and Cordesman, who makes reference to the fact that Bahrain "is still an oil exporter, but its reserves are now limited and its production has been reduced to token levels by Gulf standards. Bahrain now has proven recoverable oil reserves of only 350 million barrels." In other words, the inhabitants of Bahrain are being confronted with a reality in which it is becoming increasingly necessary to cope without oil. Consult Cordesman, *Bahrain, Oman, Qatar, and the UAE: Challenges of Security*, Westview Press, 1997, p. 59.

ance and consolidation of modern fictional writing in the Gulf states.[4] In his study
al-Qiṣṣa al-qaṣīra fī al-Khalīj al-ʿArabī: al-Kuwayt wa-l-Baḥrayn ("The Short Story
in the Arabian Gulf, Kuwait and Bahrain"), Ibrāhīm ʿAbd Allāh Ghulūm informs us
that, unfortunately, much of the earliest Bahraini fictional works have been lost and
are unknown today, precisely because they were originally published in local news-
papers and magazines. These early newspapers were never properly filed and stored
due to a lack of interest in researching their contents (Ghulūm, 2000, p. 22).

Ghulūm's detailed thematic descriptions of the literary phases through which
Bahrain's modern literature has passed, as well as its impact on and response to the
surrounding social reality, have provided us with a systematisation of the earliest
modern literature of his country which began to take shape in the 1940s. Ghulūm
suggests that Maḥmūd Yūsuf's short story, *Ḥāʾira* ("A Confused Woman"), pub-
lished in the magazine *al-Baḥrayn*, 13 November, 1941, is the first short story writ-
ten by a Bahraini (Ghulūm, 2000, p. 798).

As in other parts of the Arab world, early works of prose fiction in Bahrain were
marked by the features of romantic writing and historical romance, the peak of ro-
manticism in Egypt and Syria usually being placed between the two World Wars,
and political commitment—*iltizām*—coming into vogue after the Second World
War. In Bahrain, it was during the period of consolidation in the 1940s that roman-
tic short stories appeared in the same vein of as the work of Maḥmūd Yūsuf men-
tioned above. These were coloured by melodrama, emotions and exhortations for
high morals and virtue. Romanticism, being a tool with which to combat rigid tradi-
tions during this time, kept on gaining ground in the 1950s and was still in sway
well into the 1970s (Ghulūm, 2000, pp. 30, 532, 541).[5]

In the midst of the difficult circumstances in the Gulf region such as the collapse
of the pearling industry and subsequent depression of the 1930s, the aftermath of the
Second World War and the struggle for independence from the colonial power,
these early romantic Bahraini writers placed their heroes in situations of confronta-
tion with patriarchal norms, epitomised in the will of the family head. These heroes
were also held in place by the dictates of traditional society as exemplified by
Aḥmad Salmān Kamāl, whose short stories appeared in literary and cultural journals
and the press between 1950–58 (Ghulūm, 2000, pp. 226, 778–79).[6]

By the end of the 1950s the pioneer generation of writers in Bahrain—*jīl ar-
ruwād*—had brought forth the earliest pieces of modern fictional writing, and this

---

[4] Ghulūm treats the link between the printing-press, the media and short-story and novelistic writing in
Kuwait and Bahrain at length in chapter three, entitled "Dawr aṣ-ṣiḥāfa al-maḥalliyya" ("The Role of the
Local Press") in his study *al-Qiṣṣa al-qaṣīra fī al-Khalīj al-ʿArabī: al-Kuwayt wa-al-Baḥrayn: dirāsa
naqdiyya taʾṣīliyya*, Beirut: al-Muʾassasa al-ʿarabiyya li-ad-dirāsāt wa-an-nashr, 2000 (Second impres-
sion), pp. 95–128.

[5] Ghulūm has treated the romantic trend in the literature of Kuwait and Bahrain at length in his study *al-
Qiṣṣa al-qaṣīra fī al-Khalīj al-ʿArabī: al-Kuwayt wa-al-Baḥrayn*, in chapter five, entitled "ar-Rūmānsiyya
wa-ṣuwar-hā ash-shadīda al-khayba fī al-qiṣṣa al-qaṣīra" ("Romanticism and its Sharp Expressions of Dis-
appointment in the Short Story") (pp. 211–319). "All that which surrounds the protagonist in the romantic
story consists of emotions and excellent values and the reasons behind these feelings are that he suffers
from a deep emptiness and gap", observes Ghulūm (Ghulūm, 2000, p. 226).

[6] Ghulūm, 2000, p. 226.

stage, *marḥalat ar-riyāda*—came to a close (Ghulūm, 2000, p. 29). It had included a variety of attempts at literary creativity and fictional and semi-fictional texts such as descriptive and illustrative texts, contemplations and didactic essaistic writings (Ghulūm, 2000, p. 29).

During the 1960s, when a second generation of writers deeply influenced by the romantic trend began to write, the pace of economic change and signs of social unrest in the form of recurrent labour disputes and general strikes, made visible imprints in the literature as it turned towards realism and social criticism in the 1970s (Ghulūm, pp. 461, 509).

As I have demonstrated in my article entitled "Styles of Expression in Women's Literature in the Gulf", Bahraini authors today have a literary base which includes a variety of styles from which to operate (Ramsay, 2002–3, pp. 382–88).[7] In that article I analysed modernist styles in Bahraini and Emirati women's short stories and novels which due to their poetic techniques demand that the reader interprets fragmentary and metaphorical information about the plot and the characters in order to make sense of the text.

I also demonstrated that we can speak of a modernistic literary style in the Gulf which I named magic Gulf realism.[8] Folk-tale imagery, popular beliefs in magic powers and superstitions, set in the context of realistic settings, make up the backbone of such Gulf magic realist literary texts (ar-Rashīd Abū Shuʿayr, 1998, pp. 42–96, esp. 43–45).[9] Rather than commenting realistically on the context, social and global realities shape the textual expression resulting in a fusion between folktales, myth and realism in the framework of a modern short story (Ramsay, 2002–2003, p. 388).[10]

[7] Two Bahraini woman authors exemplifying this style are Fawziyya Rashīd in her novel *Taḥawwulāt al-fāris al-gharīb fī al-bilād al-ʿāriba* ("The Metamorphoses of a Strange Knight in Arabising Lands"), 1990, and Munīra al-Fāḍil in her novel *Li-aṣ-ṣawt, li-hashāshat aṣ-ṣadā* ("To the Voice, to the Cheerfulness of the Echo"), 2000. Consult Ramsay, (2002–2003), pp. 371–390, esp. pp. 382–88.

[8] Ramsay, "Globalisation and Cross-Cultural Writing in the United Arab Emirates and Oman" in *Literature and Literary History in Global Contexts*, Stefan Helgeson (ed.), Vol. 3:II, Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter, forthcoming (2006).

[9] Consult William Rowe, "Magical Realism" in *Encyclopedia of Latin American Literature*, Verity Smith (ed.) 1997, p. 506.

[10] Examples of exponents of magic Gulf realism are Salmā Maṭar Sayf and ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Aḥmad from the UAE and Muḥammad al-Yaḥiyāʾī from the Sultanate of Oman (Ramsay, 2001). In "Global Heroes and Local Characters in Short Stories from the United Arab Emirates and the Sultanate of Oman", *Proceedings of 5th EMTAR (European Meeting of Teachers of Arabic Literature) Colloquium*, Bonn, 6–9 June, 2001, Stefan Wild, Paul Starkey, Boutros Hallaq (eds.), (forthcoming), I have analysed ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd Aḥmad's short story "Nasama hawāʾ ṭāʾisha", Salmā Maṭar Sayf's short story "ath-Thuʿbān" and Muḥammad al-Yaḥiyāʾī's short story "Ṣabāḥ", from his collection *Yawma nafaḍat Khazīna al-Ghubār ʿan Manāmati-hā* ("The Day Khazīna Shook the Dust Off Her Nightgown") (1998), from Arjun Appadurai's perspective of "locality as lived experience in a globalized … world" involving, among other things, the impact of globalisation on local imaginative resources. The protagonists in "ath-Thuʿbān", "Nasamat hawāʾ ṭāʾisha" and "Ṣabāḥ" are global inasmuch as that they exist in the global environment of the big city and are subjected to its rules. At the same time, they are "localized" in the textual domain which is replete with Arabic folktale imagery, magic powers and myth. Themes, motifs and images from the more than thousand year-old Arabic literary heritage are put to work, and such elements inject momentum into the plot and give the status of reality to magic. Consult Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis: Public Worlds, Vol. 1, Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1998 (Fourth impression), esp. p. 52. Also see the section "Magic, Myth and Modernity", in Ramsay, 2006, forthcoming.

Starting from the point to which Ghulūm brings us in the historical phases of modern Bahraini literature, I shall here present works by three Bahraini authors. My aim is to demonstrate that Bahrain's literary scene includes additional Gulf modernist literary styles than those which I have mentioned above. These styles will be referred to as symbolist and surrealist in this article.

It should also be made clear that modernistic Arabic literature designates numerous literary styles all of which have in common that they cannot strictly be referred to as romanticism or realism. Arabic modernistic literature does not necessarily signify the same as what we mean when we speak about Western literary modernism although there may, of course, be similarities. In brief, our vantage point on Arabic literary modernism has been posited by Stefan G. Meyer[11] who explains that

> the experimental Arabic novel of the 1960s represented a strain of modernism that emerged in a very different world from the canonical Western modernism of the turn of the century, sixty years before. It was a world that had been profoundly changed by, among other things, modernism itself. This gives an indication of the extent to which the experimental Arabic novel represents a unique form of modernism, distinct from its Western counterpart (Meyer, 2001, p. 8).

Symbolism

Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik

Ghulūm has exemplified social criticism in realistic short stories with works by Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik and ʿAbd Allāh Khalīfa and experimentalism in stories by Khalaf Aḥmad Khalaf and Amīn Ṣāliḥ (Ghulūm, p. 574). Makkī Muḥammad Sirḥān has also devoted attention to the realistic features of works by ʿAbd al-Malik observing that:

> Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik's short stories interact with utmost sensitivity with realism, according to it great importance in the structure… (Sirḥān, 2001, p. 21).[12]

قصص محمد عبد الملك تتعامل مع الواقعية بحساسية مفرطة وتعطيها الأهمية الكبرى في البناء... (مكي محمد سرحان، ٢٠٠١، ص. ١٢).

For ʿAbd al-Malik, as for other writers in the 1970s, the realistic short story served well as a crucible for popular standpoints on questions of social concern as well as agency for the lower social classes. The striking gap between the poorer classes that had not been able to take advantage of the processes of industrialisation and modernisation, and the ruling elite and wealthy merchants, became the focus of attention for this writer. This has been observed by Sirḥān who explains that,

---

[11] Stefan G. Meyer, *The Experimental Arabic Novel: Postcolonial Literary Modernism in the Levant*, New York: State University of New York Press, 2001.
[12] Makkī Muḥammad Sirḥān, *Udabāʾ khalījīyūn mutmayyizīyūn: Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik* ("Prominent Gulf Writers: Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik"), Beirut: al-Muʾassasa al-ʿArabiyya li-ad-dirāsāt wa-an-nashr, 2001, pp. 21–8.

Scenes of the poverty in which he ['Abd al-Malik] had lived and which he was surrounded by in the various communities of people were manifold in the world of his short stories (Sirḥān, 2001, p. 14).

الفقر الذي عاش في داخله، وأحاطه في هيئات الناس من حوله،

كثرت في عالمه القصصي مشاهده (مكي محمد سرحان،

٢٠٠١، ص. ١٤).

In this article I will attend to another dimension of 'Abd al-Malik's stories than that of strict realism. Albeit through a realistic lens, he has also chosen to employ symbols to illustrate and address some of the problems facing Arab societies today. In fact, 'Abd al-Malik has informed me that to him "[S]ymbols can be seen everywhere in everything, in a tree, a street, in the sky and symbols give writing depth".[13] To 'Abd al-Malik it is the question of a technique for treating problems facing Arab societies today: "Depression has come over the Arab intellectuals. They are going from darkness to darkness," is his pessimistic view of the situation. "People haven't understood modernity. Education is the key", he concluded in a conversation with me on 23 October, 2001.[14]

"al-Ḥidād" ("Time of Mourning")[15]

In the opening story of 'Abd al-Malik's short-story collection Ra's al-'Arūsa ("The Doll's Head"), (1987),[16] entitled "al-Ḥidād" ("Time of Mourning"), people have gathered to mourn a deceased friend. Before his burial, the dead corpse exhibits several signs of life. He winks his eyes, sits up and even stands on his feet. People cannot bear to think that their friend runs the risk of being buried alive and therefore refuse to bury him. One doctor after another is called upon to examine the corpse and issue a death certificate. Each physician comes to the same conclusion, namely that the man is dead. The people, however, cannot relinquish the idea that the man may yet be alive and therefore will not bury him. His coffin and resting-place become a sanctuary for pilgrimages.[17]

> They brought groups of people. They circled around the stretched-out corpse and regarded the fact that it remained intact and was neither interred nor spoiled as a symbol of their own remaining intact and not being interred or spoiling. They brought a large rock to the place, erected a building and placed a guard there. They slaughtered sheep and offered sacrifices,

---

[13] All personal comments in this article by Muḥammad 'Abd al-Malik were made during an interview in Manama, Ramada Hotel, 23 Oct., 2001.

[14] Manama, Ramada Hotel, 23 Oct., 2001.

[15] Muḥammad 'Abd al-Malik, "al-Ḥidād" ("Time of Mourning") in Ra's al-'Arūsa ("The Doll's Head"), Bahrain: Maṭbaʿat al-fajr li-aṭ-ṭibāʿa wa-an-nashr, 1987, pp. 3–9.

[16] Muḥammad 'Abd al-Malik, Ra's al-'Arūsa ("The Doll's Head"), Bahrain: Maṭbaʿat al-fajr li-aṭ-ṭibāʿa wa-an-nashr, 1987.

[17] At the Nordic-Arab Research Conference on Arabic Literature and Linguistics, the Swedish Institute in Alexandria, 13–15 April, 2005, Dr. Alanoud Alsharekh suggested that against the background of Bahrain's large number of Shi'ites, this short story may have been inspired by the Shi'ite tradition of mourning departed or martyred members of the community at a Ḥusayniyya, often situated at or near the municipal cemetery.

ate, drank, wept and sang hymns as they waited for the deceased to rise one day ('Abd al-Malik, 1987, p. 9)!

وكانوا يحضرون زرافات. ويدورون حول الجثة المسجية.

ويرون بقاءها كما هي دون دفن أو تلف رمزا لبقائهم دون دفن أو تلف.

وفي هذا المكان أحضروا صخرة كبيرة وأسسوا مبنى ووضعوا حرسا،

وذبحوا الخراف والقرابين، وأكلوا وشربوا وبكوا وأنشدوا الأناشيد في

انتظار أن ينهض الميت يوما ما (محمد عبد الملك، ١٩٨٧، ص. ٩) !

The symbolism in this story is linked to the idea that people cannot accept that the man is dead. In the same way the Arabs sanctify the concept of the glorious Arab nation of yore, maintains 'Abd al-Malik. The people in the story who believe that their dead friend will be revived symbolise those Arabs who have fallen into the trap of looking backwards instead of towards the future. They look to the glories of a great Arab past which they believe can be revived, is the author's conclusion.

"Ra's al-'Arūsa" ("The Doll's Head")[18]

In another story, "Ra's al-'Arūsa" ("The Doll's Head"), included in the short-story collection with the same title, a little girl, Widād, living in a ramshackle neighbourhood in the poor quarters of the city, is hugging a large baby doll without a head. In place of the head is a gash and its stomach is torn open.

> A doll without a head—or a human being without a head—as it appears to me, cut off in a battle which we have not seen ('Abd al-Malik, 1987, p. 45).

عروسة بلا رأس ـ إنسان ـ أو يهيأ لي ـ بلا رأس، مقطوع في معركة لم نرها

(محمد عبد الملك، ١٩٨٧، ص. ٤٥).

This little girl is cheerfully hugging her wounded doll while munching on a *Kit-Kat* chocolate bar that she has picked up from the ground. Flies are buzzing around her, settling on her and her doll.

> The little girl cries for help as she shoves away the flies coming towards her face, to the bar of *Kit-Kat*, to her nose ... ('Abd al-Malik, 1987, p. 46).

تصرخ الفتاة الصغيرة وتطرد الذباب القادم إلى وجهها إلى قطعة «الكت

كات» إلى أنفها... (محمد عبد الملك، ١٩٨٧، ص. ٤٦).

This story breathes of cynicism and delusion. The little girl naturally believes that she possesses something worthwhile and wonderful, while all she is actually hold-

---

[18] Muḥammad 'Abd al-Malik, "Ra's al-'Arūsa" ("The Doll's Head") in *Ra's al-'Arūsa*, Bahrain: Maṭba'at al-fajr li-aṭ-ṭibā'a wa-an-nashr, 1987, pp. 43–50.

ing on to is a mutilated doll. ʿAbd al-Malik has explained some of the symbolism in "Raʾs al-ʿArūsa" as a matter of delusion.

At the root of this delusion lie the thwarted efforts and plans of the generation of Jamāl/Gamāl ʿAbd an-Nāṣir (Nasser). This generation was "looking to build the world, people were looking to a better future. In the 1960s there was hope for the Arab nation, but after Nasser came depressions and even after the colonialists left things got worse", the writer maintains.

The girl symbolises the Arabs who have believed in the illusory propaganda of Arab nationalist leaders with their promises of a shining future. When she grows up she will realise that she owns nothing more than a ragged doll without a head and that her future is evaporating into poverty and subjection. This symbolises the feeling of despondency which struck the Arab nations after the promises of Nasser and other nationalists had failed to deliver and people were faced with a reality that gave them a feeling of dejection and subjugation in the face of Israel and the West. In fact, this disillusionment reaches its ultimate peak at the point in the story where the girl and the doll change places; the lifeless, decapitated doll holds the little girl in her arms.

> The doll which I saw was big... her shoulders stretched out along the horizon... and her legs became full... The large doll embraced the little girl who embraced the large doll. Then I saw the girl's head... cut off (ʿAbd al-Malik, 1987, p. 48)!

والعروسة التي رأيتها كبيرة... وكتفها يطول في الأفق... وسيقانها تمتلئ...
العروسة الكبيرة ضمت الطفلة الصغيرة التي ضمت العروسة الكبيرة
فرأيت رأس الطفلة... مقطوعا (محمد عبد الملك، ١٩٨٧، ص. ٤٨)!

In addition to ʿAbd al-Malik's own remarks regarding the symbolism in his story we may note a detail specifically connected with the Gulf region in the present post-colonial era. In spite of the vast and rapid social changes, and the economic and technological advances that thanks to the oil revenues characterise the region, some people have become despondent. This is especially true for the author's own society where the 1960s and 1970s saw the consolidation of a social reality in which the deep-seated contradictory interests between the diverse subordinate classes and an influential minority became a source of unrest.[19] The promises of bright prospects have not materialised for everyone. For example, metropolitan ways of life where women may be treated as little more than "dolls", do not necessarily entail greater

---

[19] According to Fred H. Lawson, three forces dominate in Bahraini society: "a dominant class consisting of the central branch of the Al Khalifah and the more prominent members of the commercial oligarchy; a class of retainers made up of the Arab tribes allied to the Al Khalifah, the staff of the country's central administration, and the smaller traders and shopkeepers in the larger cities and towns; and a subordinate class composed of urban and rural workers, artisans and craftspeople, fisherfolk, and subsistence farmers. Conflicts of interest among these three classes have determined not only the broad pattern of coalition formation among the country's most powerful social forces but also the incidence and impact of political revolt on the islands." Lawson, *Bahrain: The Modernization of Autocracy*, Boulder, San Francisco and London, 1989, p. 5.

respect for women than did the traditional lifestyle, all of which is symbolically il-
lustrated in "Ra's al-ʿArūsa".

> And in the cities which are behind the poor quarters in which the dolls are standing, where
> the dolls sleep and out of which the dolls proceed with their heads on their shoulders… after
> they have… wilted, grown sick and got dirty, they are discarded with the rubbish after their
> heads have been cut off and their stomachs ripped open (ʿAbd al-Malik, 1987, p. 49).

وفي المدن التي خلف الحارات الفقيرة التي تقف فيها الدمى، وتنام فيها
الدمى، وتخرج منها الدمى ورأسها فوق كتفها ... بعد أن...
تذبل وتمرض وتتسخ.. ترمى مع القاذورات بعد أن تقطع
رأسها ويمزق بطنها... (محمد عبد الملك، ١٩٨٧، ص. ٤٩).

In other words, the question remains to be answered whether modernised, western-
style consumer society and global big-city ways serve the interests of all members
of society including the poor and the women.[20]

Surrealism

Farīd Ramaḍān

al-Barzakh: najma fī safar ("Between This Life and the Next: A Travelling Star")[21]

Farīd Ramaḍān, born on the island of al-Muḥarraq in 1961, is one of Bahrain's cre-
ative young writers. His experimental novel *al-Barzakh: najma fī safar* ("Between
This Life and the Next: A Travelling Star"), (2000), has been inspired by the au-
thor's personal experiences of losing his brother at a young age and his own disease
from which he has suffered since childhood.[22]

The setting of the novel is the village of Busītīn in an unspecified historical epoch
albeit certainly after the Second World War in the era of the oil-economy. The late
1940s saw a general economic upswing and were a time when wealthy merchant
houses created a commercial boom through their entrepreneurship and trade with in-
ternational corporations. European and American luxuries and necessities became
available for the rich and middle-classes. Despite the increase in wealthy merchant
houses in the 1950s, the local economy continued to be composed of smaller stores
and workshops, and the small industrial enterprises were largely run by foreign na-
tionals. Facets of such a reality impinge on the narrative of this novel and its charac-
ters.

---

[20] As I have explained elsewhere, urbanisation, modernisation and globalisation in the Gulf region may
impose less freedom as well as destitution for some of its members, especially if these processes are not
accompanied by adjustments of the traditional social practices. See Ramsay, "Badriyya al-Wahaybī,
Bushrā Khalfān, Ṭāhira al-Lawātiyya: Thalāth kātibāt min ʿUmān" ("Three Woman Authors from Oman")
in *Nizwā* (24), Muscat: Oman Establishment for Press, News, Publication and Advertising, 2000, pp. 248–
52 and Ramsay, (2002–2003), pp. 376–78.
[21] Farīd Ramaḍān, *al-Barzakh: najma fī safar* ("Between This Life and the Next: A Travelling Star", Bei-
rut: al-Muʾassasa al-ʿarabiyya li-ad-dirāsāt wa-an-nashr, 2000.
[22] This information has been conveyed to me in an e-mail from Farīd Ramaḍān dated 27 Feb., 2002.

The heroine of the novel, Sārra, is a girl approaching womanhood, whose grand-father had immigrated from Oman and father, ʿĪsā al-Khāl, is a grave-digger in Busītīn. The family gains its sustenance from grave-digging and traditional cleansing and dressing of corpses. Besides the obvious questions of livelihood, income, disease, life and death, more subtle matters of roots, belonging, exile and nationality make up the backbone of *al-Barzakh*.[23]

What I aim to illustrate here is that in *al-Barzakh* Farīd Ramaḍān taps into an experimental, modernist style which is closely affiliated to what we usually regard as surrealism. Although there are obvious affinities between magical realism and sur-realism, the metaphors for the extreme paradoxes of the rapid changes in Gulf so-cieties, which I have shown to be part of a magical Gulf realist style, are not salient elements in *al-Barzakh*.[24]

Surrealist texts, on the other hand, often attempt to convey psychological elements such as hidden thoughts, secret desires and fears in vivid images, and especially in dreams. Questions of sex as well as existential concerns about death and the hereafter are topics which lend themselves to surrealist expression through surprising narrative sequences unconstrained by the logic of the laws of nature or our waking lives. Two themes related to these topics are central in *al-Barzakh*: First, the puzzle of sexuality, in this case from a young girl's perspective, and second, an attempt at solving an artistic problem of dealing with death and what may take place in a coming existence, such as in *al-Barzakh*. In fact, the author has expressly told me that his idea was to let this story evolve from a situation in which a teenage girl "thinks of the changes in her body", at the same time as she senses "that she will die young".[25]

As for the question of the exact locality of *al-Barzakh*, an exhaustive discussion of the interpretation of this Persian and Arabic word essentially meaning obstacle, hindrance or separation, would be impractical here.[26] A few points however, about how we may interpret the meaning of this expression in the context of Farīd Ramaḍān's novel *al-Barzakh*, will be useful.

In this novel "al-Barzakh" indicates a place to which we are removed after death. For the heroine, *al-Barzakh* represents a domain which provides her with the possi-bility of expressing thoughts and experiences which she usually must suppress in her ordinary life; they become manageable and are expressed with her words in the narrative. However, passing on to *al-Barzakh* through death does not solely imply that her secret thoughts and deeds become utterable, but that they indeed will be re-vealed in one way or another. That the heroine is fully aware that the locus of *al-Barzakh* implies both of these factors, namely the heroine's liberty to express her

[23] Farīd Ramaḍān has taken a personal interest in the histories of immigrants from other nations to Bahrain. He has conducted interviews with immigrants from Oman and Iraq in his research about the roots of foreigners who have been drawn to Bahrain for social, economic and political and other reasons. All of this has been explained to me in an e-mail dated 27 Feb., 2002.

[24] Ramsay, (2002–2003), pp. 379–82 and 2006, forthcoming.

[25] As quoted from an e-mail to me from Farīd Ramaḍān, dated 27 Feb., 2002.

[26] Consult the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* for references and further information on the various meanings of the entry *al-Barzakh*.

concealed thoughts and secrets and that such an exposure also is bound to take place, becomes clear from her statement:

> To die means divulging your secrets, to tell others in your sudden exit that which you have been ashamed of saying (Ramaḍān, 2000, p. 90).

<div dir="rtl">

أن تموت يعني أن تفشي أسرارك، أن تقول للآخرين في ذهابك الطارئ

ما كنت تخجل من قوله (فريد رمضان، ٢٠٠٠، ص. ٩٠).

</div>

It is also in this place that the laws of nature cease to rule. Like Alice in Lewis Carroll's novel *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, arguably the first great surrealist novel in English, Sārra encounters animals endowed with the gift of speech. In contrast to Alice and her sojourns in Wonderland though, for Sārra there is no return from *al-Barzakh*. That her arrival in *al-Barzakh* represents an impediment preventing her from completing her life in this natural world is made clear by a fox who presents himself to her at the beginning of the novel.

To Sārra's friend Ṣāfīya, whose father beats her when she is a child and whose husband carries on with this behaviour after they are married, *al-Barzakh* implies deliverance from a hellish existence on earth. Ṣāfīya has fallen in love with a friend, Salmān, and has given him a photo. This act may by no means be exposed since it would constitute improper behaviour on her part, something which calls for severe punishment, maybe even for death. However, after Ṣāfīya has taken her life by pouring kerosene over herself, taking one of her husband's matches while he is smoking a cigarette and igniting herself, this photo left behind reveals her forbidden feelings and acts which heretofore have been concealed. While Sārra is provided with freedom of expression and movement in *al-Barzakh*, Ṣāfīya's fate after she has passed through the door to *al-Barzakh* remains unknown. What is clearly stated however is that to her any exit from her wretched life, even in the gruesome way illustrated in the novel, is to be likened to a passage through "the door which leads to a light dazzling with the names [of God] (Ramaḍān, 2000, p. 88)".[27]

<div dir="rtl">

"هذا الباب المؤدي إلى نور باهر بالأسماء (فريد رمضان، ٢٠٠٠،

ص. ٨٨)".

</div>

The artistic problem of dealing with death and the hereafter in a literary work is brought to light in the complicated structure of the narrative. The reader finds himself wafted between scenes in which it is unclear whether the setting is a dream, a place in which the surreal becomes reality or the real world. Consider the opening lines of the novel as narrated by the heroine:

> I am standing near my body. It appears shining, beautiful, stretched out in solitude. I have definitely died… In this wide space I can set my childhood free. It had passed by without

---

[27] Numerous traditions link the concept of *al-Barzakh* to a place dazzling with bright light; "From Mohammed's grave", explains Ragnar Eklund, "a pillar of light ascends to the *ḳubba* of *barzaḥ*" and further, "*Barzaḥ* is now filled with the light that comes from the faith of the believers…". See Ragnar Eklund, *Life Between Death and Resurrection According to Islam*, (doct. diss.), Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksells Boktryckeri AB, 1941, p. 153.

me really joining it. I could leave my stretched-out body and reach what I had been deprived of since the arrival of that deceptive blood... (Ramaḍān, 2000, pp. 7–8).

أقف قرب جسدي، يبدو ناصعا وجميلا، ممددا في وحدته. لا بد وأن
أكون قد مت... في هذا المكان المتسع يمكن لي أن أطلق أسر طفولتي
التي مضت دون أن أترادف معها بصدق، وأهبط عن جسدي الممدد
لأصل ما منع عني منذ ذلك الدم المراوغ (فريد رمضان، ٢٠٠٠، ص. ٧-٨).

As the heroine contemplates the scene, watching her body stretched out on the ground beside the freshly dug grave, a fox approaches her. It is at this point that he informs her that she must return to life because she has many tasks remaining to be carried out there. He speaks to her indicating that it is within her power to return to life should she choose to, for he orders her to "rise," for "there remains much that has not yet been accomplished (Ramaḍān, 2000, p. 9)."

انهضي فهناك العديد من الأمور التي لم تنجز حتى الآن (فريد
رمضان، ٢٠٠٠، ص. ٩).

After this experience, an owl alights on her chest and begins ripping asunder her dress. At this she senses pain and opens her eyes.

At first glance the reader may be led to believe that the heroine is brought back to life from a near-death state inasmuch as she has been ordered by the fox to return and because we are told that she senses pain.[28] However, in the following sequence she is addressed by the fox again. At this point the reader must conclude that it is not a question of existence in the real world which answers to the laws of nature, but rather an existence in which animals can speak.

That it is not a question of natural existence in the ordinary world is also illustrated in the heroine's and her friend's ability to fly, an ability the spirit of a body that has been properly cleansed by the undertaker is understood to become equipped with.

...we rose together upwards. The sky received us as two spiritual beings in the air, the earth vanished from our sight as we flew at a low altitude... I tilted my white-feathered wings with the stirring of the north wind... (Ramaḍān, 2000, pp. 41).

"وكنا معا نرتفع، وكانت السماء تستقبلنا مثل روحيين في هواء، تتراءى لنا
الأرض، ونحن نحلق على مستوى منخفض... أميل بجناحي ذي الريش
الأبيض مع حركة الريح الشمالية... (فريد رمضان، ٢٠٠٠، ص. ٤١)."

---

[28] Surrealism seems to have a predilection for illustrating situations and experiences which would be unthinkably painful in natural life, but which in the world of surrealism are wholly unproblematic. Just think of Leonora Carrington's *The Hearing Trumpet*, (1976), in which the narrator finds herself standing by a boiling pot stirring a soup made of her own flesh and merrily throwing in a few peppercorns and a pinch of salt to enhance the taste!

This scene reflects several traditions affiliated with the concept of *al-Barzakh*. One such tradition says that this "is a space in which the spirits *(rūḥ)* dwell during the time they are not linked to the body, *i.e.* before and after this life on earth", and another says that the spirits of Muslim children dwell in Paradise "in the form of birds".[29]

Recurrent scenes of Sārra contemplating her body and the physical changes taking place as she matures into womanhood serve to underline the theme of adolescent puzzlement with sexual maturity. Sārra is soon going to turn thirteen, and the two subjects at the top of her mind are the physical transformations taking place during adolescence and questions concerning death. These subjects are woven into her narration of her daily down-to-earth activities in her capacity as the daughter of a grave-digger. An example of this is when she relates how she sets out to help her father dig a grave. Having toiled in the heat and dirt, her activities and thoughts are brought to light as she washes herself, exhausted and covered with sand and dust.

> When I undressed my small body was decorated with specks of yellow dust ... I let out my hair, let it down over my shoulders ... turned on the faucet. The water was warm. I positioned my body under its flow letting it fall lightly and softly so that its play would excite me... (Ramaḍān, 2000, p. 17).

حين نزعت ثوبي، كان جسدي الصغير مطرزا بحبات التراب
الصفراء ... فللت شعري، تركته ينزل فوق كتفي... فتحت
الحنفية، كان الماء دافئا، أسكنت جسدي تحت هديره، ينزل علي
خفيفا وهانئا، يحقق لي دعابة مثيرة... (فريد رمضان،
٢٠٠٠، ص. ١٧)

In this situation she ponders the physical changes taking place at this point in her life.

> Next month I will be thirteen. Suddenly I have felt these changes as they have swept over my body. It was as if I had been sleeping and then had woken up, then discovered a body intolerant of itself, a body pulled out from a soft childhood... (Ramaḍān, 2000, p. 17).

في الشهر القادم سأبلغ الثالثة عشرة. فجأة أحسست بهذه التغيرات،
وهي تجتاح جسدي، وكأنني كنت في نوم ثم يقظة، ثم اكتشاف
لجسد غير متسامح مع نفسه، جسد مسحوب من طفولة ناعمة ...
(فريد رمضان، ٢٠٠٠، ص. ١٧).

Clearly questions of womanhood and sexuality are at the top of her mind. These concerns are thematically intertwined with thoughts about death; even as she enjoys

---

[29] Eklund, pp. 153, 141.

the water and ponders the secrets of her developing body the other topic central to the novel is broached, namely questions of death and the hereafter. "Are the water and the tremor of death related to each other…", she asks herself and continues: "The water flows over me as I trace the growth of my breasts… (Ramaḍān, 2000, p. 18)."

هل للماء علاقة برعشة الموت… يرافقني الماء وأنا أتابع نهدي
في نموهما (فريد رمضان، ٢٠٠٠، ص. ١٨).

Combining Symbolism with the Surreal

ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAqīl
Kaff Maryam ("The Palm of Maryam's Hand")

Another influential personality in the literary arena in Bahrain is ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAqīl, director of the National Museum in Bahrain and author of short stories and short novelistic works. According to himself, his personal technique includes drawing inspiration from religious thought and mysticism by making allusions to the Koran, the Bible and the sayings of Christ, and employing expressions of Sufi tradition as well as elements from folktales and popular myth.[30]

A number of these features come to view in his two novelistic works Kaff Maryam ("The Palm of Maryam's Hand") (1997) and Ayyām Yūsuf al-akhīra ("Yusuf's Last Days") (1999).[31] Like his compatriot, Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Malik, ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAqīl is careful to point out that symbols are central devices in his literary expression. In other words, his works expose the reader to symbols inspired by mysticism, myth and religious thought which lend themselves to various interpretations.

Here we will devote our attention to Kaff Maryam which in its whole and parts is symbolic according to ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAqīl.[32] In the following I will take up a number of symbols all of which have been pointed out and explained to me by the author. In addition, I aim to demonstrate that this work also reflects features closely affiliated with what we usually regard as surrealism.

Like Farīd Ramaḍān's novel, al-Barzakh, which we have discussed above, Kaff Maryam, the story of a boy who has lost his twin sister, seems to be preoccupied with questions of death and the hereafter. The reader makes the acquaintance of the protagonist in the opening lines of the story as he is trying to push open a great city-gate. As he enters this city, which is unfamiliar to him, he is met with a festive atmosphere—ajwāʾ iḥtifāliyya; well-dressed people with happy faces are laughing

---

[30] This comment made by ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAqīl originates from an interview with him on 22 Oct., 2001, at his office in the National Museum of Bahrain.

[31] ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAqīl, Kaff Maryam ("The Palm of Maryam's Hand"), Bahrain: al-Kalima li-an-nashr wa-at-tawzīʿ, 1997. Ayyām Yūsuf al-akhira ("Yūsuf's Last Days"), Amman: al-Muʾassasa al-ʿArabiyya li-ad-dirāsāt wa-an-nashr, Dār al-fāris li-an-nashr, 1999.

[32] In this discussion on Kaff Maryam all quotations by the author were made during an interview at his office in the National Museum of Bahrain, 22 Oct., 2001.

and dancing gaily in the streets. He proceeds through the city feeling like a stranger, yet impressed by its beauty. He passes through another gate. All of a sudden he finds himself in dreary surroundings filled with seemingly endless rows of snow-covered hills and icebergs. Here the scenery is dominated by white snow and a grey sky while a bitterly cold wind sweeps over him causing him pain. Next he sees three women draped in their black gowns—'abāʾas—while a man digs a hole in the snow nearby. Later he learns that these three women are his grandmother, mother and twin sister Maryam. This group appears sad in contrast to those he has seen earlier who were rejoicing. As he draws closer the man senses his presence and it is revealed that this is the protagonist's father.

> I drew closer to the man. He felt my presence and turned to me choking on his tears. This man was my father. But he was sad, his spirits were crushed. He was carrying a glass bottle in his hand which produced a strong light. My father held up the bottle and inside I saw a lifeless foetus which resembled myself. He said to me with a choked voice filled with pain: "We lost you before you came to know this life" ('Abd al-Qādir 'Aqīl, 1997, p. 10).

<div dir="rtl">

أقترب من الرجل. يشعر بدنوي منه فيلتفت إلي والعبرات تخنقه.
فيكون هذا الرجل أبي. لكنه كان حزينا، مسحوق النفس، يحمل
بيده زجاجة يشع منها نور قوي. يرفع أبي الزجاجة، فأرى
بداخله جنينا ميتا يشبهني. يقول لي بصوت مخنوق متوجع:
"فقدناك قبل أن تعرف الدنيا" (عبد القادرعقيل، ١٩٩٧، ص. ١٠).

</div>

From these lines it is apparent that we are left in the dark as to whether the protagonist is a person living and acting in the sphere of natural, human life or whether we should consider him as speaking from an existence in an afterlife.

In the following scenes the reader is familiarised with the daily life of the protagonist and understands that the story is set in the time of the Six-Day War of 5–10 June, 1967, between Israel and its Arab neighbours. The protagonist experiences a hot summer day in June, the illness and recuperation of his grandmother, his worry for his twin sister Maryam who is blind, and he is aware of the questions in the air about whether there will be an outbreak of war between Israel and Egypt. Throughout the protagonist suffers fainting spells during which he is transferred to the bleak, snow-covered place where he always finds the glass vial buried in the snow containing a foetus.

Twice in the story a rider on a horse presents himself in a dream to the protagonist and his grandmother respectively. This rider represents the Angel of Death and the purpose of his appearance is "to make the reader believe the unbelievable", as expressed by the author. More precisely, what the reader is made to believe throughout most of the story is that Maryam, the protagonist's sister, is alive; she communicates and plays with her twin brother until the last pages of the book. At this point his father becomes irritated with his insistence on asking about the whereabouts of his sister as if she were in the vicinity playing somewhere. He reproaches

his son and reminds him that she is no longer alive. "Are you crazy?", he says. "Your sister is dead. She does not exist in this world. This is something that you must understand ('Abd al-Qādir 'Aqīl, 1997, p. 80)."

أمجنون أنت؟ أختك ميتة: وهي غير موجودة في هذه الدنيا،

يجب أن تفهم هذا (عبد القادرعقيل، ١٩٩٧، ص. ٨٠).

As in the case of Muḥammad 'Abd al-Malik's short story "Ra's al-'Arūsa", the symbolism underlying the thematic feature of the protagonist living a life based on self-deception concerns the Arab delusion ultimately expressed in their defeat in the June war in 1967. In the same way "the Arabs were believing a lie", states 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aqīl. The protagonist deceives himself, making believe that his twin sister is alive. Likewise,

> the brethren of the Arab nation believed in the lie told to them by Jamāl/Gamāl 'Abd al-Nāṣir. This was an illusion based on the delusive propaganda of Nasser and the Arab nationalists of the day which said that Arab military power was strong and healthy, when in reality it was not.[33]

The consequence of this deception was that the Arabs were defeated by the Israelis during the course of one week, concludes 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aqīl.

In *Kaff Maryam* the lie is finally and conclusively uncovered on the symbolical date of 6 June, 1967, by which time it had become clear that Israel had destroyed most of the Egyptian air force on the ground. On this same day, when Nasser's "lies about being able to defeat Israel within one hour" were found to be empty, it is revealed to the reader that Maryam actually has been dead all along. This parallel between the shattering Arab awakening to a grim reality and the protagonist being made to unequivocally accept the death of his sister, is the principal feature of the symbolism in *Kaff Maryam*.

In the final scene we meet the protagonist digging a deep hole in the snow, his own grave as it were, in which he buries himself holding the embryo in the glass vial to his chest. The snow is a symbol of purity, and the act of immersing himself in the bitterly cold snow represents the protagonist's search for purity in a world permeated with lies and delusions, according to 'Abd al-Qādir 'Aqīl. We are unable to discern whether the final scene takes place in the protagonist's natural waking life, in a state of unconsciousness or in an after-life existence. In fact, this is unclear to the protagonist himself. Consider the closing lines of the story:

> I am digging deeply into the snow, so there will be a hole the size of my body. I descend into the hole carrying the embryo... I lay down in the hole and bury the glass bottle on my chest asking myself: "Am I dead or alive? Is Maryam dead or alive? Are we dead or alive? What is death? And what is life?"
> The snow is slowly covering me.
>   The snow covers me.
>   The snow.
>   ('Abd al-Qādir 'Aqīl, 1997, p. 83)

[33] Interview at the National Museum of Bahrain, 22 Oct., 2001.

أحفر عميقا في الثلج، حتى تصير الحفرة بحجم جسدي، أنزل في الحفرة ومعي
الجنين... أستلقي في الحفرة، أدفن الزجاجة في صدري وأسأل نفسي:
هل أنا ميت أم حي؟ هل مريم ميتة أم حية؟ هل نحن أموات أم أحياء.
ما هو الموت، وما هي الحياة؟
الثلج يغطيني شيئا فشيئا.
الثلج يغطيني.
الثلج.

(عبد القادرعقيل، ١٩٩٧، ص. ٨٢–٨٣)

Conclusion

Even though Bahrain is one of the smallest Gulf nations with regard to population
and geographical area, the country possesses a variety of expressions in its modern
literature. Romantic writing dominated during the 1940s and 1950s and a movement
towards realism took place in the 1960s and 1970s. From this time onward Bah-
rain's literary scene offers a variety of modes of expression such as symbolist strat-
egies serving the purpose of delivering criticism of local and Arab national circum-
stances, and surrealistic styles providing techniques with which to treat human exis-
tential concerns.

ʿAbd al-Malik writes apparently realistic short stories which nonetheless lend
themselves to symbolical interpretations. This symbolism may serve to present crit-
icism in a disguised form on matters about which it may be difficult to be straight-
forward. In "al-Ḥidād" the symbolism springs from the rhetorical figure of synec-
doche in that the villagers stand for Arab groups who embrace certain ideas. The
villagers refuse to budge from the grave-site clinging to the conviction that the de-
ceased man is actually alive, or at least to the hope of his revival. They will not ac-
cept that he is irrevocably dead. The situation which evolves metaphorically in the
story stands for an ideology which stipulates that society should be cast along the
lines of bygone days rather than accepting that societies may change and take shape
in various forms of modernity. In other words, this story carries a critical comment
on rigid traditionalism.

By substituting the poor girl in "Raʾs al-ʿArūsa" who is clinging to a ragged, mu-
tilated doll for certain groups in Bahraini society, or the Arab nation, who have lost
hope in those in power, ʿAbd al-Malik is able to criticise the political leadership.
The girl/Bahraini society/Arab nation symbol springs from metonymy and synec-
doche through contiguity and association. The little girl stands for the poor and de-
luded individuals of low-class Bahraini society or such groups in the Arab nation.
These individuals and groups are left out of entrepreneurial prosperity, have meagre

hopes of reaching positions which may lead to a respectable future and have not been able to take advantage of the welfare system where such systems exist.

With respect to "the poor quarters in which the dolls are standing", the dolls seem to say something about abused women in metropolitan settings. This dolls/women symbolism is based on metaphor and raises the question of whether the lifestyle and social arrangements wrought in the process of urbanisation and modernisation in the Gulf and the subsequent western-style globalisation are only positive, especially with respect to low-class women. Substituting "dolls" for "women" the story pushes this question to its ultimate point. The poignancy of this symbol becomes extremely sharp in the lines telling of how after the "dolls" have "wilted, grown sick and got dirty, they are discarded with the rubbish after their heads have been cut off".

The search for literary techniques with which to express secrets of the subconscious and concerns that are difficult to discuss openly is often central to surrealism. Allowing for a parallel between the situation of *al-Barzakh* in Farīd Ramaḍān's novel of the same title and the human state of dreaming, a condition which in surrealist expression is a favourite method of revealing otherwise inexpressible or repressed elements, our interpretation of this novel as surrealistic makes sense. In *al-Barzakh* metaphors become real and the fantastic effaces the world of reality and common sense. As Sārra narrates her firsthand experiences from an after-life existence in *al-Barzakh* she also tells the story of her family, their lives as grave-diggers and undertakers. We are whisked between realistic scenes depicting the daily chores of the members of her family, their friends and neighbours and surrealistic events such as humans flying like birds and conversations between humans and animals. This technique assists in familiarising the reader with intimate aspects of the heroine's physical transformation into female maturity as well as her whereabouts after death and her doings in the hereafter.

In summary, Sārra's abode in *al-Barzakh* not only gives her the liberty to express what must be suppressed in real life, and what most of the time centres on questions of maturing into womanhood, but her secret thoughts are revealed be it her wish or not.

ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAqīl's novelistic work *Kaff Maryam* from 1997 brings together symbolism and surrealism. The main symbol in this work emerges as a metaphor. The protagonist's sister is long since dead but he deceives himself while acting and speaking as if she were alive and must one day wake up to face the grim reality that his sister no longer exists as a living person. This symbolises the fact that the Arabs during a certain period in history were kept in the dark, forced to live with illusions about their capacity to conquer their enemy, which ended in bitter disappointment. This interpretation of the symbolism contained in *Kaff Maryam* was given by the author himself.

The surrealistic features of this work are readily perceptible to the reader. The centrality of questions of life, death and the hereafter and the various artistic techniques which are employed in dealing with them such as dreams and states of unconsciousness, all are characteristic of a surrealist expression. Furthermore, it is questionable whether the protagonist has experienced any of the events which take place in the story at all. Remember, the father tells the protagonist that "We lost you before you came to know this life" (ʿAbd al-Qādir ʿAqīl, 1997, p. 10). In other

words, the borderline between the real natural world with all the events which may take place in daily human lives and an unspecified place outside of the realm of human conscious reality has been blurred in *Kaff Maryam*.

The Ḥusaynī Sermon (*al-khuṭba al-ḥusayniyya*) in Shīʿīte literature: Development, structure, venue, preachers' titles

Khalid Sindawi
Tel-Aviv University

Introduction

The death of Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī,[1] his family and supporters in the battle of Karbalāʾ[2] (680 CE) on the Day of ʿĀshūrāʾ,[3] has had a tremendous effect on Shīʿites[4] and is reflected in rites of mourning that have been performed from the time of the event itself down to our day and age.[5]

The rites themselves, whose performance has always been encouraged by Shīʿite imams, take the form of mass gatherings in which the participants mourn Ḥusayn and cry over his fate, listen to elegies and recount the tragic events of his death. With time the ceremony developed into a social and religious custom that has become an annual tradition.

One of the most important elements of the ceremony is the Ḥusaynī Sermon (*al-khuṭba al-ḥusayniyya*), which is devoted to the events surrounding Ḥusayn's martyrdom.

In this paper we shall describe in some detail the way the sermon is reflected in contemporary Shīʿite literature.*

The current state of research

To our knowledge very few studies have directly addressed Ḥusaynī Sermons as they are performed today in Arabic among Twelver Shīʿites, in the way that the present paper does. However, numerous scholars in both the Orient and Occident have done research on various aspects related to the Ḥusaynī Sermon; scholarly interest has focused in particular on the following issues:

[1] For details see L. Veccia Vaglieri, "al-Ḥusayn b. Abī Ṭālib", *EI²* (1986), Vol. 3, pp. 240–243.
[2] For details see E. Honigman, "Karbalā", *EI²* (1997), Vol. 4, pp. 637–639.
[3] For details see Ph. Marcais, "ʿĀshūrā", *EI²* (1986), Vol. 1, p. 705.
[4] Shīʿa and Shīʿite refer throughout this article to Imamī (Twelver) Shīʿism
[5] The fact that Shīʿite writers compose works on this subject to this very day, more than 1,300 years after the event, constitutes a unique phenomenon in Arab literature. Shīʿite imams encourage such writing and promise great spiritual rewards to those who engage in it. For more details see Khalid Sindawi, *The Maqātil in Shīʿite Literature*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 2000), pp. 35–36 [in Hebrew].

1. Annual *condolence ceremonies* held on the Day of ʿĀshūrāʾ throughout the Shīʿite world.

This issue is dealt with, for example, in Mahmud Ayoub's comprehensive study *Redemptive Suffering in Islam* (Mouton, 1978); articles by various authors collected in *Taʿziyeh: Ritual and Drama in Iran* (edited by Peter Chelkowski) also deal with condolence ceremonies in various Shīʿite communities.

Another notable study is Ibrahim al-Ḥaydarī's comprehensive *The Tragedy of Karbalāʾ*; al-Ḥaydarī discusses the ceremonies performed on ʿĀshūrāʾ and their implications for Shīʿite social and political life. He argues that these ceremonies have become ways of expressing dissent and opposition to established authority.

2. *Biographies of Ḥusaynī preachers.* One noteworthy example of a work devoted to this topic is Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Kirbāssī's *Muʿjam khuṭabāʾ al-minbar al-ḥusaynī* ("Dictionary of Ḥusaynī Preachers"), which forms part of a series entitled *Al-Mawsūʿa al-Ḥusayniyya* ("The Ḥusaynī Encyclopedia").

3. *The Friday noon sermon in Iran* and its political significance for the Islamic revolution in that country. One work in which this subject is dealt with in considerable depth is Haggay Ram, *Myth and Mobilization in Revolutionary Iran: the Use of the Friday Congregational Sermon*, Washington: The American University Press, 1994.

4. *The Merits of Āshūrāʾ Day* and its connections to the Jewish Day of Atonement (Yom Kippur). This aspect has attracted growing scholarly attention in recent years. Here we shall mention two studies of this kind: Jamāl al-Dīn ʿAbd Allāh, *Ṣiyām yawm ʿāshūrāʾ* ("The Fast of ʿĀshūrāʾ Day") (Beirut, 1998); Hawting, "The Tawwæbûn Atonement and Ashura", *JSAI* (17) 1994, pp. 166–181.

5. *The status of Karbalāʾ as a holy site.* Among studies addressing this topic we may mention George Kanazi's *Karbalāʾ fī al-adab al-shīʿī* ("Karbalāʾ in Shīʿite Literature"). Another work is Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn Āl Kāshif al-Ghaṭāʾ, *ʾAl-Arḍ wal-turāb al-ḥusaynī* ("The Earth and Ḥusaynī Soil") (Qumm, 1995).

6. *Modern-day "maqātil" (stories about Ḥusayn's murder).* The writers of these stories emphasize Ḥusayn's sublime revolutionary principles, which may be implemented anywhere and at any time. Examples of such writings are the following: Madī Shams al-Dīn, *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn, ẓurūfuhā al-ijtimāʿiyya wa-āthāruhā al-insāniyya* ("Ḥusayn's Revolution: Its Social Context and Its Human Consequences"); al-Sayyid Muḥammad al-Ṣadr, *Aḍwāʾ ʿalā thawrat al-Ḥusayn* ("Shedding Light on Ḥusayn's Revolution") (Beirut, 1996).

7. *Elegies for Ḥusayn*, such as Lynda Clarke, "Some Examples of Elegy on the Imam Husayn", *Al-Serat* (XII) 1986.

A number of studies have dealt the issue of the killing of Ḥusayn from a historical perspective. One of these is H. Jafri's *The Origins and Early Development of Shīʿa Islam* (London,1979) In Chapter Seven of his book Jafri discusses the events leading up to Ḥusayn's death. The author argues that Ḥusayn had decided before the battle that he would sacrifice himself in order to arouse anti-Umayyad sentiments

among Muslims after his death, *contra* western scholarship which refused to perceive Ḥusayn's internal conflict on the eve of his demise. Jafri notes at the end of the chapter that one of his main sources of information on "the tragedy of Ḥusayn" was Abū Mikhnaf's *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*.

On the occasion of the 1400th anniversary of Ḥusayn's birth in 1984 an international conference was held in London, where scholars were invited to speak on the subject of *maqtal al-Ḥusayn*. The texts of the fifteen lectures delivered at the conference, dealing with various aspects of Ḥusayn's death, were later published in a special issue of the journal *Al-Ṣirā* and in a book entitled *Al-Imām al-Ḥusayn* (London, 1986).

All of the above leads to the conclusion that although numerous studies exist which touch on many aspects of the Ḥusaynī Sermon in modern times, none has so far appeared which takes it as its main theme, to be investigated in depth, as the present paper does.

The specific issues we shall address in our study are the following:

1. Unique features of modern-day Ḥusaynī Sermons.
2. The stages of development of the Ḥusaynī Sermon and the changes it has undergone.
3. The structure of the Ḥusaynī Sermon.
4. The topics discussed in a modern Ḥusaynī Sermon.
5. The occasions on which, and the places where, Ḥusaynī Sermons are held.

The sources used for the present study

Our research was based on an investigation of 161 Ḥusaynī Sermons delivered by modern Shīʿite Ḥusaynī preachers. Most of these sermons were disseminated via the internet and/or on the Al-Manār television network on various dates, as follows:

– Nine sermons by the preacher ʿAlī al-Mīlānī at www.aqaed.com/alnadwat/index.html

– Two sermons by ʿAbd al-Zahrāʾ al-Kaʿbī, five sermons by ʿAbd al-Riḍā Maʿāsh, twelve sermons by ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd al-Muhājir, five sermons by Ḍiyāʾ al-Zubaydī, and ten sermons by Nāṣir al-Ḥāʾirī, all at www.angelfire.com/ns/alwilaya/

– One hundred sermons by Aḥmad al-Wāʾilī and ten sermons by Muḥammad Bāqir al-Fālī at www.wadyalgary.com/mejales-waeli.htm

– Eight sermons delivered by Ḥasan Naṣrallāh via the Al-Manār television network during the first ten days of the month of *muḥarram*, the month in which Ḥusayn was killed.

What is the Ḥusaynī Sermon?

The Ḥusaynī Sermon is, first of all, a sermon, a talk on a religious topic by a Shīʿite preacher, at the end of which some mention is made of the death of Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī,

members of his family and his followers on the Day of ʿĀshūrāʾ and/or the fate of his family and descendants after that day. The commemoration of these events is accompanied by the reading of a selection of elegiac verse, whether in classical or colloquial Arabic. The sermon opens with an introduction read in a distinct way, or with a poem, which then leads to a description of one or another of the calamities that befell Ḥusayn or one of the people who was with him. The sermon thus begins and ends on this emotional note, between which the preacher interposes the sermon's main topic. The name Ḥusaynī Sermon thus derives from the fact that in every such sermon mention is made of the fate of the unfortunate Ḥusayn.

But Ḥusayn is not always the only figure of the times mentioned in the sermon, which may also bring up incidents in the lives of the Prophet Muḥammad[6] (d. 632 CE), of Ḥusayn's father ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib[7] (d. 661 CE) or of another Shīʿite imām. However, whatever other topics are dealt with during the sermon, toward the end it will always be connected with the tragedy at Karbalāʾ. More details will be presented below, in the section on the structure of the sermon.

Stages in the development of the Ḥusaynī Sermon

The following views exist on the sermon's stages of development.

A. *Shaykh Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn*[8]

According to Shams al-Dīn the first and primary source for the Ḥusayn Sermon is a group of writings of the type known as "books of the fatal battle" (*kutub al-maqtal*),[9] with elegiac poetry as a second source. He distinguished three stages in the development of the sermon: *The first stage* began with the death of Ḥusayn in 680 and ended with the fall of Baghdad in 1258 CE at the hands of Hulago,[10] or perhaps somewhat earlier. *The second stage* lasted from the fall of Baghdad through

---

[6] For details see T. Ehlert, "Muḥammad", *EI*² (1993), Vol. 7, pp. 360–387.

[7] For details see L. Veccia Vaglieri, "ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib", *EI*² (1986), Vol. 1, pp. 381–386.

[8] Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn b. ʿAbd al-Karīm al-Ḥārithī al-Hamdhānī al-ʿĀmilī was a prominent Shīʿite jurist and writer. Born in Najaf in 1931, he emigrated to Lebanon in 1969 and there was appointed to the post of Deputy Chairman of the Shīʿite Supreme Islamic Council. Later, in 1993, he became Chairman of the Council. He died in 2001.

For more details on him see Fayṣal Khālid al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī* (Beirut: Dār wa-maktabat al-hilāl, 1ˢᵗ printing, 2004), p. 148, fn. 1; www.14masom.com/aalem-balad/10/10/htm.

[9] Among Shīʿites such compositions, describing the circumstances of Ḥusayn's death in the battle of Karbalāʾ, are considered a genre of their own. The first such "books of the fatal battle" were composed already in the first century AH. The earliest known book entitled *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn* is ascribed to Iṣbaʿ b. Nubāta, who died in the year 719 CE; this was followed by another, of the same title, written by Jābir b. Yazīd al-Jaʿfī (d. 745 CE). Unfortunately both these books are lost. The first of the long series of compositions in this genre to have reached us is *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn* ascribed to Abū Mikhnaf (d. 773 CE), who was followed by many other writers over the centuries. All the early compositions were entitled *Maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, but with time other titles began to be used, among them: *Madʿan al-bukāʾ, Nafas al-mahmūm, Muthīr al-aḥzān, Al-Mufīd fī dhikrā al-sibṭ al-shahīd*, and more. For more details on this genre see Sindawi, *The Maqātil*, pp. 33–57; S. Günther, "Maqātil Literature in Medieval Islam", *JAL* 25 (1994), pp. 166–181.

[10] For details see J. Burton-Page, "Hūlāgū", *EI*² (1990), Vol. 3, pp. 569–570.

the "period of decline" (*'uṣūr al-inḥiṭāṭ*) until the beginning of the "period of revival" (*'aṣr al-nahḍa*).[11] *The third stage* began with the "period of revival" and has lasted down to our day.

B. *Dākhil al-Sayyid al-Khuḍarī*[12]

Al-Khuḍarī, too, speaks of three stages in the development of the Ḥusaynī Sermon. The first stage consists of the sermons given by Ḥusayn's captured wives, sisters and aunts when they were led as prisoners to Damascus. In the second stage elegiac poems were composed and read in the presence of the imāms of the Shī'ite faithful. Finally, the third stage is that of the full-fledged, contemporary Ḥusaynī Sermon.[13]

However, Fayṣal al-Kāẓimī argues against Al-Khuḍarī's division. He dismisses the latter's first stage, since whatever sermons may have been produced then were spontaneous, and still under the direct influence of the tragic events at Karbalā'.[14]

Al-Kāẓimī's objection seems to be valid, since an examination of Ḥusaynī Sermons, past and present, shows that far from being improvised, they show all the signs of careful preparation and planning. Al-Khuḍarī's classification suffers from two further drawbacks as well. It is superficial, ignoring, for example, periods of stagnation in Shī'ite literature, and none of the periods are given any chronological boundaries.

C. *Shaykh Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Kirbāssī*[15]

Al-Kirbāssī perceives seven stages in the development of the Ḥusaynī Sermon, as follows:[16]

---

[11] There is considerable disagreement among scholars as to precisely when the "period of revival" began. N. Tomiche, for example, in her commendable entry "Nahḍa" in the *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, takes the end of the "revival" to be the immediate aftermath of WWI, when the West succeeded in getting control of most of the Arab world, for which see N. Tomiche, "Nahḍa", *EI²* (1993), Vol. 7, pp. 900–903. However, Salāma Mūsā in his book *Mā hiya al-nahḍa*, published in 1934, claims that we are still "living to a large extent in the Middle Ages even today, for religious doctrine is allowed to influence science, and the old controls the new". For more detail see Salāma Mūsā, *Mā hiya al-nahḍa* (Beirut: Maktabat al-ma'ārif, 1962), p.114.

[12] Born in the city of Al-Khaḍr (Southern Iraq) in 1952, he moved to Al-Najaf in 1967 in order to pursue his religious studies. Today he is one of the best known preachers of the Ḥusaynī Sermon. He has also written a number of books. For more details see Muḥammad Ṣādiq al-Kirbāssī, *Mu'jam khuṭabā' al-minbar al-Ḥusaynī* (London: Hussaini Centre for Research, 1999), p. 184.

[13] For more details on his views see Dākhil Sayyid Ḥasan, *Mu'jam al-khuṭabā'* (Beirut: Al-Mu'assasa al-'ālamiyya lil-thaqāfa wal-i'lām, 1991), Vol. 7, pp. 41–46.

[14] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 157.

[15] Muḥammad Ṣādiq b. Muḥammad al-Kirbāssī was born in Karbalā' in 1947 and studied at the local university. He was politically and socially very active, and a prolific writer. Eventually he left for Iran, later moving to Beirut, and finally in 1986 to London, where he still lives. He is the author of fifty-seven works on Islamic jurisprudence and other aspects of Arab culture, the best-known being the encyclopedia *Dā'irat al-ma'ārif al-Ḥusayniyya*, a work consisting of over five-hundred volumes. For more details on the author see issue 11–12 (1999) of the journal *Al-Murshid* (published in Damascus), pp. 127–133. For further details on his encyclopedia see Kh. Sindawi, "Al-Mawsū'a al-Ḥusayniyya", *Al-Risāla* 11–12 (2002–2003), pp. 225–245; 'Alā' al-Zaydī, *Ma'ālim dā'irat al-ma'ārif al-Ḥusayniyya* (Beirut: Dār al-mujtabā, 1ˢᵗ printing, 2000).

[16] For details on the stages see Al-Kirbāssī, *Mu'jam khuṭabā' al-minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 37ff.

The first stage: From the death of Ḥusayn in 680 CE to the end of the 12ᵗʰ imām's[17] "minor occultation"[18] between 874 and 941 CE.

The second stage: from 940 CE until the beginning of the thirteenth century CE. This was a time when Shīʿite dynasties ruled various parts of the Muslim world: the Buwayhids[19] (933–1066) in Baghdad; the Ḥamdānids[20] (905–1004) in Aleppo and the Fāṭimids[21] (969–1171) in Cairo.

The third stage: from the beginning of the thirteenth until the end of the fifteenth century. During this period the Shīʿite states were no more, and the Ḥusaynī Sermon disappeared in a number of regions, and in others its occurrence became severely limited.

The fourth stage: this stage lasted from the beginning, or shortly before the beginning, of the sixteenth century, until sometime in the nineteenth century. During this stage Shīʿite preachers wrote books of Ḥusaynī Sermons which were read from the pulpits.[22] As a result elements of religious exhortation and instruction came to predominate.

The fifth stage: from the mid-nineteenth century until the mid-twentieth century. During this stage a number of extremely gifted preachers appeared, who were able to prevent the decline of the sermon in the face of the increasing influence of the modern media.

The sixth stage: the second half of the twentieth century. During this stage Western colonialist rule over Muslim lands waned and ended, and the Muslim world faced new challenges, which in turn affected the style and content of Ḥusaynī Sermons.

The seventh stage: the stage of the future development of the Ḥusaynī Sermon.

The problem with Al-Kirbāssī's division is that on the one hand he proposes a relatively large number of stages without, however, providing sufficient evidence for their need and, on the other, his first stage conflates the initial, spontaneous sermons with later, more carefully constructed versions. To his credit, he was the first to have taken into consideration the influence which the Shīʿite states of the Middle Ages had on the development of the Ḥusaynī Sermon.

A comparison of the three views outlined above reveals that all agree with respect to two developmental stages: the first, from immediately after the battle of Karbalāʾ until the end of the line of twelve imāms, all of whom encouraged the celebration of ʿĀshūrāʾ and the preaching of sermons in commemoration of Ḥusayn and his tragic

---

[17] For details on the 18ᵗʰ imam see J.G.J. Ter Haar, "Muḥammad al-Ḳāʾim", *EI²* (1993), Vol. 7, p. 443; A. Abdulaziz and A. Sachedina, *Islamic Messianism* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1981), pp. 39–77.

[18] For details on the minor occultation see D.B. Macdonald – [M.G.S. Hodgson], "Ghayba", ", *EI²* (1991), Vol.2, p. 1026.

[19] For details see C. Lollin Davies, "Buwayhids or Būyids", ", *EI²* (19863), Vol. 1, pp. 1350–7.

[20] For details see M. Canard, "Ḥamdānids", ", *EI²* (1971), Vol. 3, pp. 126–131.

[21] For details see M. Canard, "Fāṭimids", ", *EI²* (1985), Vol. 3, pp. 850–862.

[22] For detail on the pulpits see G.S.P. Frenville, "Minbar", *EI²*, Vol. 7, (1993), pp. 78–80.

death; and the most recent (Shams al-Dīn's and Al-Khuḍarī's third stage and Al-Kirbāssī's sixth), from the beginning of the modern period until today.

In contradistinction to the views reviewed above, our own research has led us to the conclusion that the development of the Ḥusaynī Sermon over the centuries is best described as having gone through four stages, as follows:

The first stage

This stage begins just after the battle of Karbalāʾ (680 CE) and ends at approximately 940 CE, with the establishment of the Shīʿite states, in particular that of the Buwayhids in Baghdad. During this stage the Shīʿite imāms worked to establish the Ḥusaynī Sermon as a permanent feature of Shīʿite worship, as part of the organized observance of mourning ceremonies for Ḥusayn. The imāms encouraged the attendance at these ceremonies, in which the faithful cried over Ḥusayn's fate and heard elegiac poems,[23] in addition to the sermon itself, and pronounced them to be pious deeds. As a result Ḥusayn's tomb in Karbalāʾ developed into a significant site of pilgrimage, in which the Ḥusaynī Sermon played an important role.

One of the most favorable periods for the Ḥusaynī Sermon at this stage was during the imamate of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq[24] (d. 765). This was the time when the Umayyad[25] dynasty fell and was replaced by the Abbasids.[26] It proved to be an opportune moment in history, in which the Ḥusaynī Sermon flourished, as shown by the great number of traditions in which Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq urges Shīʿites to visit Ḥusayn's shrine and perform the Ḥusaynī Sermon.

A second period of flowering during this same stage occurred in the days of Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq's grandson ʿAlī al-Riḍā[27] (d. 818). The Ḥusaynī Sermon received an invigorating boost when the latter became crown prince of the Abbasid caliph Al-Maʾmūn[28] (813–833) and gave many Shīʿite preachers and poets an opportunity to declaim in his presence.

---

[23] Shīʿite poets have been writing elegies over the death of Ḥusayn from the time of his death down to our own day and age. The number of extant elegies is huge. Many of these poems have been published in collections such as Fakhr al-Dīn al-Ṭurayḥī's *Al-Muntakhab fī jamʿ al-marāthī wal-khuṭab* and Muḥsin al-Amīn al-ʿĀmilī's *Al-Durr al-naḍīd fī marāthī al-sabṭ al-shahīd*. The latter contains over six thousand lines of poetry. In fact, some poets have written entire collections devoted to mourning Ḥusayn, and others simply did not write any other kind of poetry. For example, the eighteenth century poet al-Balādī wrote a thousand-line elegy for Ḥusayn. Such poems usually possess the following pattern: at first the poet describes his own sadness and tears over Ḥusayn's death; this is followed by a description of the events at Karbalāʾ, and an enumeration of Ḥusayn's virtues and exploits as well as his blood-ties to the Prophet; the poem ends with a description of his untimely and unjust death when in a state of thirst, and an assurance that he will be able to quench his thirst in Paradise.

A good source for such elegies is Jawād Shubbar's *Adab al-ṭaff aw shuʿarāʾ al-Ḥusayn min al-qarn al-awwal al-hijrī Ḥattā al-qarn al-rābiʿ ʿashar* (Beirut: Manshūrāt al-aʿlamī, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1969). For further information see L. Clark, "Elegy (Marthiya) on Husayn: Arabic and Persian", *Al-Serat* 7 (1986), pp. 13–18; G.W. Leither, "The Elegy of Hassan and Hussain", *Imperial and Asiatic Quarterly Review*, 2ⁿᵈ (1981), pp. 206–208; Muḥammad Kāmil Sulaymān, *Al-Īdiyūlūjiā al-shīʿiyya fī rithāʾ al-Ḥusayn* (Beirut: Dār al-kitāb al-lubnānī, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1981).

[24] For details see M.G.S. Hodgson, "Djaʿfar al-Ṣādiq", *EI²* (1965), Vol. 2, pp. 374–375.

[25] For details see G. Nonneman, "Umayyads", *EI²* (2000), Vol. 10, pp. 840–854.

[26] For details see B. Lewis, "ʿAbbāsids", *EI²* (1960), Vol. 1, pp. 15–23.

[27] For details see B. Lewis, "ʿAlī al-Riḍā", *EI²* (1960), Vol. 1, pp. 399–400.

[28] For details see M. Rekaya, "Al-Maʾmūn b. Hārūn Al-Rashīd", *EI²* (1991), Vol. 4, pp. 331–339.

It was during the first part of this stage that the term *munshid*[29] (literally: reciter) was first used in connection with the Ḥusaynī Sermon. The first person who received this epithet was probably Abū ʿUmāra al-Munshid (d. in the second century AH). A number of prominent poets fulfilled the function of *murshid*, but were not given the epithet, among them Abū Hārūn al-Makfūf[30] (d. 765) and Jaʿfar b. ʿAffān al-Ṭāʾī[31] (d. 767).

Furthermore, in a tradition about the imām Al-Ṣādiq it is related that the imām inquired of a man from Kūfa about what he had heard concerning the situation at Ḥusayn's shrine. The man said to him: "I was told that in the middle of the month of Shaʿbān people come [to the shrine] from Kūfa and from elsewhere. The women bewail, readers read, storytellers tell the story, mourners mourn, and reciters utter elegies".[32] From this tradition we learn that at the shrine there were storytellers who told the pilgrims the story of what had happened to Ḥusayn.

According to Shams al-Dīn this tradition reflects the latest formal development in the performance of the Ḥusaynī Sermon, since it testifies to the existence at the shrine of both men and women who relate Ḥusayn's story as well as others who specialized in the recital of elegies in his memory.[33]

The most difficult times during this stage occurred in the imamate of ʿAlī al-Hādī[34] (d. 868), for the ruling caliph, Al-Mutawakkil[35] (847–861) pursued a policy of harsh violence against both the shrine and Shīʿites in general.

The fortunes of the Ḥusaynī Sermon thus waxed and waned in accordance with the political vicissitudes of the times. All Shīʿite imāms did their best to promote and spread the use of the sermon, but its fortunes clearly depended on external political circumstances.

---

[29] Born in Al-Madīna, he was an eminent personality of the second century AH who wrote a well-known elegy on Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī. For more details on him see Al-Kirbāssī, *Muʿjam khuṭabāʾ al-minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 318.

[30] His official name was Mūsā b. ʿUmayr al-Kūfī, a companion of the imams Muḥammad al-Bāqir (d. 732) and Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq. He is reported to have recited the elegies of the poet Al-Sayyid Al-Ḥimyarī (d. between 789 and 795) in the presence of the imām Al-Ṣādiq. For more details on him see Al-Kirbāssī, *Muʿjam khuṭabāʾ al-minbar al-ḥusaynī*, p. 42; Abū Jaʿfar Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī, *Rijāl al-Shaykh al-Ṭūsī* (Teheran: Muʾassasat al-nashr al-islāmī, 1st printing, 1994), p. 150 no. 1670–4; Abū Jaʿfar Aḥmad b. ʿAbd Allāh al-Barqī, *Kitāb al-rijāl* (Teheran: Teheran University Press, 1963), pp. 14, 44; Taqī al-Dīn al-Ḥasan b. ʿAlī Ibn Dāwud, *Kitāb al-rijāl* (Teheran: Teheran University Press, 1963), pp. 551, 570 no. 34; Muḥammad b. ʿUmar b. ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Kashshī, *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, edited and annotated by Ḥasan al-Muṣṭafawī (Mashhad: Mashhad University Press, 1929), p. 222 no. 398; Al-Ḥasan Ibn Yūsuf b. ʿAlī b. al-Muṭṭahar, known as Al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī, *Rijāl al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī* (Qumm: Dār al-dhakhāʾir, 1990), p. 267 no. 13).

[31] A prominent Shīʿite poet (d. c. 150/767), known for his compositions on members of the Prophet's family. For more details see Al-Kirbāssī, *Muʿjam khuṭabāʾ al-minbar al-ḥusaynī*, p. 42; Al-Kashshī, *Rijāl al-Kashshī*, p. 289 no. 508; Al-Ḥillī, *Rijāl al-ʿAllāma al-Ḥillī*, p. 32 no. 8; Ibn Dāwūd, *Kitāb al-rijāl*, p. 87 no. 310.

[32] Jaʿfar Muḥammad Ibn Qulawayh, *Kāmil al-ziyārāt* (Al-Najaf: Dār al-murtaḍawiyya lil-nashr, 1977), pp. 325–326 no. 1.

[33] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-ḥusaynī*, pp. 166–167; Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn, *Wāqiʿat Karbalāʾ fī al-wujdān al-shaʿbī* (Beirut: Al-Muʾassasa al-dawliyya lil-dirāsāt wal-nashr, 3rd printing, 2000), p. 258.

[34] For details see D.M. Donaldson, *The Shīʿite Religion* (London: Luzac, 1933), pp. 209–216.

[35] For details see J.R. Blackburn, "Al-Mutawakkil ʿalā ʾllāh", *EI²* (1993), Vol. 7, pp. 777–778.

The second stage

This stage begins with the "minor occultation" of the twelfth imām Muḥammad al-Mahdī in the city of Sāmarrā[36] in 874 CE. A number of significant events contributed to the considerable evolution of the Ḥusaynī Sermon during this stage. Three Shīʿite states emerged in the Muslim world, including that of the Būwayhids in Baghdad (from 945 CE) and the Fāṭimids in Cairo (from 972 CE). The rulers of these states naturally lended their support to the performance of the sermon, in stark contrast to the preceding period, when both Umayyad and Abbasid rulers did their best to suppress Shīʿite rites in general. Shīʿites thus viewed the new circumstances as the fulfillment of hopes which they had entertained for a long time, but until now in vain.

Just as the emergence of the Shīʿite states brought about a flourishing of the Ḥusaynī Sermon, so did the disappearance of these states bring about a reversal in its fortunes. While the preachers of Baghdad continue preaching the Ḥusaynī Sermon even after Būwayhid rule came to an end in the year 447 AH, it would appear that such was not the case in Cairo after the Fāṭimid dynasty in Egypt came to an end in 1171 CE. Rather, its quick disappearance from the historical record indicates that the new Ayyūbid[37] rulers of the land apparently suppressed the sermon harshly.

As for the Ḥamdānids, their rule in Aleppo did not last very long (944–1003). The fate of the Ḥusaynī Sermon there seems to have been similar to that in Cairo, since the sermon is today unknown in Shīʿite villages in the vicinity of Aleppo, just as it is unattested in Cairo today.[38]

The third stage (1171–1882)

During this stage the geographical extent of the Ḥusaynī Sermon regressed to the state it was in before the Būwayhids took over Baghdad, a state in which it remained for many centuries. It survived in Iraq, probably thanks to the fact that the tombs of six of the twelve imāms of Twelver Shīʿism[39] are located in that country, in particular the shrine of Ḥusayn. This was certainly one of the factors which favored the survival of the Ḥusaynī Sermon in Iraq. The fact that the major centers of Shīʿite learning were also located in Iraq (in Baghdad, Najaf, Ḥilla and Karbalāʾ) was probably a contributing factor as well.

In a way the Ḥusaynī Sermon thus reverted to the state it was in before the rise of the Shīʿite states. However, it never lost the elements which were added to it during its period of growth and expansion under Shīʿite rule.

---

[36] For details see A. Norhedge, "Sāmarrāʾ", *EI²* (1995), Vol. 8, p. 1041.

[37] For details see Cl. Cahen, "Ayyūbids", *EI²* (1986), Vol. 1, pp. 796–807.

[38] For more details see Ibrāhīm Naṣr Allāh, *Ḥalab wal-tashayyuʿ* (Muʾassasat al-wafāʾ, 1980.

[39] The six imāms buried in Iraq are: (1) ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib (the first imām) in Najaf, 165 km southwest of Baghdad; (2) Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī (the third imām) in Karbalāʾ, 100 km southwest of Baghdad; (3) Mūsā b. Jaʿfar al-Kāẓim (the seventh imām) in Al-Kāẓimiyya, just north of Baghdad; (4) Muḥammad b. ʿAlī al-Jawwād (the ninth imām) in Al-Kāẓimiyya; (5) ʿAlī b. Muḥammad al-Hādī (the tenth imām); (7) Al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī al-ʿAskarī (the eleventh imām) in Sāmarrāʾ, 120 km north of Baghdad. In addition, there are scores of tombs of imāms' sons who escaped to Kūfa because of ʿAbbāsid persecution. For more on this topic see Muḥammad Ḥarz Allāh, *Marāqid al-maʿārif* (Qumm: Manshūrāt Saʿīd b. Jubayr al-Kāẓimī, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1992); ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn al-Aṣfahānī, *Maqātil al-ṭālibiyyīn* (Beirut: Dār iḥyāʾ al-turāth, no date).

During the long centuries of the third stage the sermon turned into a commemorative rite of the day of ʿĀshūrāʾ, one that enabled Shīʿites to give vent to their pain. The main aim of the sermon's preachers during this stage was to arouse their public to tears.

A perusal of the books composed during this period provides clear evidence as to the perceived purpose of the Ḥusaynī Sermon of the times. For example, this is what it says in the introduction to ʿAlī b. Musā b. Jaʿfar b. Ṭāwūs'[40] (d.664 CE) *Al-Lahūf fī qatlā al-ṭufūf*:[41]

> If only Fāṭima and her father had eyes to see her sons and daughters, dispossessed, wounded, plundered and slaughtered, and the daughters of prophecy with hearts ripped open, grieving over the loss of their beloved ones, their hair flying, coming out of their quarters, striking their cheeks in their misfortune, mourning and wailing, with no protector or guardian. Oh people of sight, discernment and understanding, tell yourselves the story of these children's deaths and cry to God over one and all, help them with love and tears and grieve over their loss of support. For the souls of these kinfolk, wards of the people's ruler, fruit of the Prophet's heart, darlings of the virgin "shining one" [=Fāṭima], and whoever drank with his noble mouth their teeth, and preferred their mother and father over his own.[42]

In the introduction to his book Ibn Ṭāwūs speaks of the duty to cry over the tragedy of Ḥusayn without, however, calling for learning any lesson from what happened to him. The book was recited in commemoration of Ḥusayn at funerals, and shows how the events at Karbalāʾ were perceived in the period in question.

The dominant style at this time was rhymed prose (*sajʿ*).[43]

The following excerpt is taken from *Al-Muntakhab fī jamʿ al-marāthī wal-khuṭab*[44] by Fakhr al-Dīn al-Ṭurayḥī (d. 1674 CE), a book which is still quoted to this day as part of Ḥusaynī Sermons in the Gulf region:

> Oh, Brothers! How can we hide the sighs of sadness? How shall we bear the flames of grief? I wonder if you know what the masters of time made to happen in those places and regions. I swear by the ancient house that a believer, had he thought of the trials and tribulations which befell them, his spirit would surely have left his body! How could it be otherwise, when they, who are the light of God on His earth and in His heaven, God's bosom

---

[40] For details about him see E. Kohlberg, "Ebn Ṭāwūs", *Encyclopaedia Iranica* (California: Mazda, 1998), pp. 55–57; Idem, *A Medieval Muslim Scholar at Work: Ibn Ṭāwūs and His Library* (Leiden, New York, Köln: E.J. Brill, 1992), pp. 3–17; Muḥammad Ḥasan Āl Yāsīn, "Al-Sayyid Āl Ṭāwūs: ḥayātuhu, muʾallafātuhu, khazānat kutubihi", *Majallat al-majmaʿ al-ʿilmī al-ʿirāqī* 12 (1965), pp. 84–85.

[41] The book tells the story of Ḥusayn's martyrdom, and of his life before the tragic events at Karbalāʾ. A number of different versions of the book's title exist: *Al-Malhūf ʿalā qatlā al-ṭufūf*, *Al-Lahūf ʿalā qatlā al-ṭufūf*, *Al-Malhūf ʿalā qatl al-ṭufūf*, *Al-Malhūf ʿalā ahl al-ṭufūf* and *Al-Masālik fī maqtal al-Ḥusayn*, the latter due to the fact that the book is divided into three "masālik" or chapters. The most commonly used title is *Al-Malhūf ʿalā qatlā al-ṭufūf*. See ʿAlī b. Jaʿfar b. Ṭāwūs' (d.664 CE) *Al-Malhūf fī qatlā al-ṭufūf*, edited by Fāris Tabrīziyān "Al-Ḥassūn" (Teheran: Dār al-uswa, 1st printing, 1993), p. 67.

[42] Ibn Ṭāwūs, *Al-Malhūf ʿalā qatlā al-ṭufūf*, pp. 84–85.

[43] For more details on rhymed prose in Arabic literature see A. Ben Abdesselem, "Sadjʿ", *EI²* (1995), Vol. 8, pp. 732–738.

[44] Fakhr al-Dīn al-Ṭurayḥī, *Al-Muntakhab fī jamʿ al-marāthī wal-khuṭab*, better known as *Al-Fakhrī* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-aʿlamī lil-maṭbūʿāt, 1992).

friends and their sons, were driven away, their limbs torn from them, then thrown down on the sand and given the cup of death, on the soil of Al-Óaff.[45]

Here an atmosphere of grief predominates, expressed stylistically in rhymed prose and well-ordered expressions.

Later in the same stage another development occurred, which contributed greatly to consolidate the status of the Ḥusyanī Sermon, especially in Iraq. The most obvious aspect of this development was the appearance of the Ṣafawid[46] state (1502–1722) which extended its control over Iraq as well, including the holy cities of Shīʿism. Thus the Ṣafawid Shāh Ismāʿīl (d. 1523) entered Baghdad in the year 1508, and on the very next day went to Karbalāʾ, performed the rites of pilgrimage there and spent the night secluded in Ḥusayn's tomb.[47]

This event proved to have created a political, military and economic situation that was very favorable to the development and dissemination of the Ḥusaynī Sermon,[48] especially after the Shāh instituted ceremonies to commemorate Ḥusayn's death.[49]

The era of Ṣafawid rule over Iraq was doubtlessly the decisive factor in the continuous survival of the Ḥusaynī Sermon in that country. Had Cairo also undergone a second period of Shīʿite rule after the Fāṭimids the Ḥusaynī Sermon would probably have survived there as well.

The Ṣafawids exploited the Ḥusaynī Sermon as an efficient popular and emotional instrument for the propagation of the Shīʿite creed, which they had adopted and disseminated in Iran.

Interestingly enough, all three views as to the stages of the Ḥusaynī Sermon's development which we reviewed above make no mention at all of this development, which was to prove so significant, in particular for Iraq.

This stage came to an end with the end of the first period of Western colonialism in the Islamic world, when the preachers of the Ḥusaynī Sermon were moved to develop new strategies in order to cope with the new situation. This brings us to the fourth and last stage in the sermon's development.

The fourth stage

The stage starts at the beginning of the twentieth century and is still with us to this day. During this stage the Ḥusaynī Sermon underwent a distinct qualitative development, reflected in a clear broadening of its horizons. Before this stage the sermon did not usually contain anything beyond a retelling of the events at Karbalāʾ, a recital of elegiac poems, some declarations in favor of the renunciation of worldly pleasures, and perhaps also a discussion of some specific historical topic.

But now during the forth stage preachers began introducing a variety of meta-

---

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 177.

[46] For details see R. Darly-Doran, "Ṣafawids", *EI²* (1995), Vol. 3, pp. 765–793.

[47] See Muḥammad Jawwād Mughniyya, *Duwal al-shīʿa fī al-taʾrīkh* (Najaf: Maṭbaʿat al-ādāb, 1965), p. 122.

[48] See Ṣāliḥ Ibrāhīm al-Shahristānī, *Taʾrīkh al-niyāḥa* (Beirut: Dār al-zahrāʾ, 1998), Vol. 2, p. 32.

[49] See ʿAlī al-Wardī, *Lamaḥāt ijtimāʿiyya fī taʾrīkh al-ʿirāq al-Ḥadīth* (Qumm: Manshūrāt al-sharīf al-Raḍī, 1st printing, 1993), Vol. 1, p. 59.

physical, ethical and literary topics into their sermons. These include Marxism, Capitalism, rebuttal of attacks on Islam, women's rights in Islam, slavery, the family, the relationship between religion and science, and the significance of Islam as a political or an economic system.

The more a Ḥusaynī preacher demonstrated a grasp of cultural, educational and intellectual topics, the more he was in demand by those in charge of organizing the commemoration ceremonies for Ḥusayn.[50]

During this stage the sermon also developed technically, in the sense that preachers began to insert into their sermons literary and historical quotations, scientific facts and statistics in support of whatever argument they may be developing.

During the sermon the preacher will use every opportunity to link his subject matter to the events at Karbalāʾ. In all cases the sermon ends on that topic. In what follows we provide a detailed description of the structure of contemporary Ḥusaynī sermons.

The structure of the Ḥusaynī Sermon

Preachers of present-day sermons will always be careful to include in them the following six major parts.

A. Opening remarks

In general a Ḥusaynī Sermon will begin with sentences uttered in a special tone, whose style is reminiscent of the way the Qurʾān is recited. Every preacher has his own opening, which always includes a praise of God and a prayer for the Prophet and his family. Ḥusayn will always be mentioned in a special prayer, occasionally together with the names of others who were killed with him.[51] The opening remarks always end with the same fixed phrase used by all Ḥusaynī preachers, "Would that we had been with them (or: with you), then we should have achieved a great success".[52] Recital of this phrase signals to the congregants that the introductory phase of the sermon is over and the second part is about to begin.

The following is an example of the opening remarks of the sermon:

> Praise be to God Lord of the worlds. May God pray for our master Muḥammad and his virtuous family. May God pray for you, my Master, father of ʿAbd Allāh.[53] May God pray for you, oh son of the Prophet of God,[54] God's vast mercy and the gate to the nation's

---

[50] See the section on "Preachers of the Ḥusaynī Sermon" below.

[51] According to Shīʿite tradition there are seventy-two so-called "Friends of Ḥusayn" (aṣḥāb al-Ḥusayn) who were killed with him at Karbalāʾ, including members of his own family. The only survivor among them was Ḥusayn's infant son ʿAlī. For more details on the "Friends of Ḥusayn" see, for example, ʿAlī Muḥammad ʿAlī Dukhayyil, Aṣḥāb al-Ḥusayn (Beirut: Dār al-ṭayyār al-jadīd, 2ⁿᵈ printing, 1985); Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn, Anṣār al-Ḥusayn (Beirut: Al-Muʾassasa al-dawliyya lil-dirāsāt wal-nashr, 3ʳᵈ printing, 1996).

[52] Based on the Qurʾānic verse 73:4. Shīʿites consider recital of this verse a certain sign of faith. For more details see Muḥammad b. Masʿūd al-ʿAyyāshī, Kitāb al-tafsīr, edited and with a commentary by Hāshim al-Rasūlī al-Maḥallātī (Teheran: Al-Maṭbaʿa al-ʿilmiyya, 1960), 1:257 no. 191; ʿAlī b. Ibrāhīm al-Qummī, Tafsīr al-Qummī (Qumm: Muʾassasat dār al-kitāb, 1983), 1:30.

[53] Agnomen of Ḥusayn, after his elder son ʿAbd Allāh.

salvation. May God pray for you and for the martyrs in your presence. Would that we had been with you, my masters, then we should have attained a mighty good fortune.

Opening remarks of this kind are a recent development. Documented Ḥusaynī Sermons dating from previous stages begin directly with an elegiac poem.

B. The poem

The second part of a Ḥusaynī Sermon consists of an elegy, chosen by the preacher to fit in with the particular occasion on which the sermon is given.

The preacher is expected to know the elegies by heart and to be able to recite them fluently. The recital of the poem always begins in a soft voice, which gradually builds up to end in a loud and rousing tone.

Frequently the preacher ends the poem with a few lines of a popular Iraqi or Bahreini folk elegy in order to arouse the listeners' emotions. These lines are recited in a unique style of their own, interpreted in an individual way by each preacher according to the melodic characteristics of his voice.

The two major compilations of officially used elegies, both ancient and modern, are Muḥsin al-Amīn al-ʿĀmilī's *Al-Durr al-naḍīd fī marāthī al-Sibṭ al-shahīd*[55] and Shaykh Ḥusayn ʿAlī al-Balādī al-Baḥrānī's *Riyāḍ al-madḥ wal-rithāʾ lil-sāda al-nujabāʾ*.[56]

In addition, there are numerous existing compilations of elegies in the colloquial Arabic of Iraq, Bahrein, eastern Saudi Arabia and the Arabic-speaking region in Iran, and new ones appear on the market regularly.

Elegiac poems are not a necessary part of a Ḥusaynī Sermon, and in fact are regularly missing from the sermons given during the month of Ramaḍān.[57] The importance attached to elegies differs from one place to another and from one preacher to another. For example, the most well-known contemporary Ḥusaynī preacher, Shaykh Aḥmad al-Wāʾilī,[58] often refrains from reciting any poem at all. When he does decide to use a poem because the circumstances demand it, as on the night of ʿĀshūrāʾ, he limits himself to a few lines read in a gentle voice. Elegies are considered to be an obligatory part of the sermon during the first ten days of the month of Muḥarram in the Persian Gulf region and in Lebanon.[59]

---

[54] One of Ḥusayn's epithets, alluding to his kinship with the Prophet, his grandfather.

[55] Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Al-Durr al-naḍīd fī marāthī al-sibṭ al-shahīd* (Qumm: Manshūrāt al-sharīf al-raḍī, 2000).

[56] Ḥusayn ʿAlī al-Balādī al-BaḤrānī, *Riyāḍ al-Madḥ wal-rithāʾ lil-sāda al-nujabāʾ* (Qumm: Al-Maktaba al-Ḥaydariyya, 1996).

[57] For details on Ramaḍān see M. Plessner, "Ramaḍān", *EI²* (1995), Vol. 8, pp. 417–418.

[58] His full name is Shaykh Aḥmad b. Ḥasūn b. Saʿīd al-Laythī al-Wāʾilī al-Najafī, born in Najaf in 1927. A prominent Ḥusaynī preacher, he died in 2003 and was buried in Najaf. For more on him see Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 191–197; Al-Kirbāssī, *Muʿjam khuṭabāʾ al-minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 361; Ḥaydar al-Marjānī, *Khuṭabāʾ al-minbar al-Ḥusaynī* (Al-Najaf: Maṭbaʿat al-qaḍāʾ, 1st printing, 1977), Vol. 1, p. 116; ʿAlī al-Khāqānī, *Shuʿarāʾ al-gharī* (Al-Najaf: Al-Maṭbaʿa al-Ḥaydariyya, 1954), Vol. 1, p. 294; Muḥammad Hādī al-Amīnī, *Maʿa rijāl al-fikr wal-adab fī al-najaf* (No publisher, 1992), Vol. 3, p. 1316.

[59] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 210.

C. The lecture

The lecture part of the Ḥusaynī Sermon usually begins with a Qurʾānic verse, a traditional story quoting the Prophet, an excerpt from the book *Nahj al-balāgha*[60] or a line or two of poetry. The preacher then begins to explain the text and to draw whatever conclusions may be drawn from it from a number of aspects, leading his listeners from one idea to another, each bolstered by quotations from literary or historical works intended to catch the audience's ears and to alleviate the boredom of listening to a lecture. The character of the lecture itself differs from one preacher to another. Some have a preference for modern scientific theories and connect them to Islam, others tend to provide moral guidance and still others tend to speak about historical events, and so on.

D. The transition (takhalluṣ)[61]

In this, the fourth part of the sermon, the preacher moves from the topic of the lecture to the events at Karbalāʾ, with the express purpose of arousing the audience's tears over Ḥusayn's fate. Preachers take care to make the change from the lecture to the "transition" as smooth as possible, so that the listeners are moved gradually from the atmosphere of the former to the tragic events of the battle.

Shīʿites greatly value a preacher's ability to provide a smooth transition from the lecture to descriptions of the events at Karbalāʾ. For example, a preacher may lecture on the topic of infants and their education in Islam, and then go on to link the end of the lecture with ʿAlī's infant son[62] who was shot with an arrow and killed on the day of ʿĀshūrāʾ as he was lying in his father's lap. Next the preacher will describe how Ḥusayn came bearing his child and asking for some water for the infant. The audience is thus taken from the general topic of the lecture, namely children and children's rights in Islam, and led to think about the events of ʿĀshūrāʾ and the killing of one of Ḥusayn's children.

This part of the sermon is also a recent development. The first preacher to have used the *takhalluṣ* in its present form was Shaykh Kāẓim Sabtī[63] (d. 1921). In time and with increasing skill and practice certain preachers came to be known for the

---

[60] Ascribed to ʿAlī b. Abī Ṭālib, compiled by Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī (d. 1009 CE). The book is a collection of ʿAlī's speeches, essays, letters and sayings. For more detail see M. Djebli, "Nahdj Al-Balāgha", *EI²* (1993), Vol. 7, pp. 903–904.

[61] On the term *takhalluṣ* in Arabic literature see G.J.H. Van Gelder, "Takhalluṣ", *EI²* (2000), Vol. 10, p. 123; Ziyād Ṣāliḥ al-Zuʿbī, "Muṣṭalaḥ al-takhalluṣ fī al-naqd al-ʿarabī al-qadīm", *Dirāsāt islāmiyya*, Islamabad, 29 (1994), p. 81–133; R. Jacobi, *Studien zur Poetik der altarabischen Qaside* (Wiesbaden, 1971), pp. 49–65.

[62] His name was ʿAlī b. al-Ḥusayn b. ʿAlī, nicknamed "Al-Aṣghar" ("The Smaller One") to distinguish him from his elder brother. He was killed in the battle of Karbalāʾ although still an infant, the youngest person to have died with Ḥusayn. Only six months old, he was killed by Ḥirmala b. Kāhila or Kāhil al-Asadī. For more details see Muḥaddithī, *Mawsūʿat ʿĀshūrāʾ*, p. 328; Raḍī al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Mūsā b. Jaʿfar b. Ṭāwūs, *Iqbāl al-aʿmāl* (Teheran: Dār al-kutub al-islāmiyya, 2nd printing, 1947), p. 574; idem, *Al-Lahūf ʿalā qatlā al-ṭufūf* (Teheran: Dār al-ʿālam (Jahān) lil-nashr, 1929), pp. 117, 123; Najm al-Dīn Jaʿfar b. Muḥammad b. Namā al-Ḥillī, *Muthīr al-aḥzān wa-munīr subul al-ashjān* (Qumm: Madrasat al-imām al-mahdī, 3rd printing, 1985), p. 73.

[63] His full name is Kāẓim Ḥasan b. ʿAlī b. Sabtī al-Najafī al-Sahlānī al-Ḥimyarī. He was born in Najaf 1848 and became a prominent Ḥusaynī preacher. For more detail see Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 181–184.

quality of their "transitions", which Shī'ites appreciate for their artistic merit and emotional intensity. Among revolutionary Shī'ite groups the *takhalluṣ* is especially used in order to effect a transition to the desert of Karbalā' and the battle there, which then serves them as a source of inspiration and a starting point for disseminating the idea of martyrdom. When such a Shī'ite dies his relatives and companions meet and turn to speaking about Karbalā', Ḥusayn and other Shī'ite martyrs.[64]

In popular circles in Iraq and the Persian Gulf the word *karīz*, meaning transition, is used instead of *takhalluṣ*. Some Ḥusaynī preachers explain the origins of the word folk-etymologically as deriving from classical Arabic *qarīḍ* (= poetry) which, losing its emphatic qualities in the popular pronunciation became *karīz*. The preachers claim that the classical word is appropriate in this context because the *takhalluṣ* is generally followed by some lines of classical Arabic elegiac poetry or *qarīḍ*.[65]

E. The disaster

As mentioned at the beginning of this paper, originally the Ḥusaynī Sermon consisted simply of a commemorative retelling of the tragic events surrounding the battle of Karbalā' and the death of Ḥusayn and his family and companions, together with a recital of appropriate elegies in order to move the audience to tears and grief.

This element of the sermon still remains, but in contemporary versions it has been moved to the sermon's end, where the preacher is duty-bound to mention the painful happenings at Karbalā', embellishing his descriptions with appropriate lines of verse in classical and colloquial Arabic, recited in a special manner aimed at arousing the listeners' pity.

A very large number of elegiac poems have been accumulated and recorded over the years. These describe in minute detail many of the events of that fateful day, including what happened to Ḥusayn himself, to his family and companions, as well as to his wives after the battle, thus helping the preachers choose the event or events they will discuss in any particular sermon. In fact, there exist one or more elegies[66] for every event from Ḥusayn's journey to Mecca[67] from Al-Madīna[68] until the events of Karbalā' itself, and the return of his wives to Al-Madīna.

In this part of the sermon the preacher has a chance to demonstrate his rhetorical abilities, and to describe the events at Karbalā' in a way that arouses his listeners' compassion. The greater a preacher's skills at agitating his audience and moving it to tears, the more popular he will be and the greater will be the demand for his services.

F. The invocation

This is the last part of a Ḥusaynī Sermon, in which the preacher asks for God's mercy on the wise men of the Shī'ites and those present at the sermon, with an occa-

---

[64] For further detail see Muḥaddithī, *Mawsū'at 'Āshūrā'*, p. 90.
[65] A prominent preacher who held this opinion was 'Abd al-Zahrā' al-Ka'bī al-Ḥusaynī (d. 1994), author of *Maṣādir nahj al-balāgha wa-asānīduhu*.
[66] See fn. 22 above.
[67] For details on Mecca see D.A. King, "Mekka", *EI²* (1991), Vol. 6, pp. 144–187.
[68] For details on Al-Madīna see R.B. Winder, "Al-Madīna", *EI²* (1986), Vol. 6, pp. 994–1007.

sional special prayer for those who make financial contributions, ending in a recital of the opening chapter of the Qurʾān (*Al-Fātiḥa*) dedicated to the deceased and to all believing Muslims. The precise text of this part of the sermon differs from one preacher to another.

The topics with which the contemporary Ḥusaynī Sermon deals

Today's sermon is no longer limited to an emotional retelling of the events at Karbalāʾ. In fact, the death of Ḥusayn has become no more than a headline, while the sermon's contents now encompass a broad range of topics.[69] One of the reasons for this may be the fact that there are so many competing Ḥusaynī preachers today, each of whom wants to demonstrate his special skills and abilities.

Among the topics that are dealt with in the sermons are the following.

A. *Information about Islam*, its history, literature, exegesis of the Qurʾān, the Prophet's biography and that of the first Muslims, and the biographies of the twelve Shīʿite imāms. This proliferation of topics has brought about a great increase in the frequency and extent of the Ḥusaynī Sermon and a corresponding increase in the number of preachers. Shīʿites are particularly fond of hearing such sermons during the months of Muḥarram and Ramaḍān.

In fact, some Shīʿites during the month of Ramaḍān move from one sermon to another, listening to the words of preacher after preacher. This is possible due to the fact that during Ramaḍān the sermons are preached continuously from after the dawn prayer until late at night, in every mosque, as well as in *ḥusayniyya* shrines,[70] open squares and private homes.[71]

The proliferation of the Ḥusaynī Sermon together with the ever-increasing diversity and better education of the preachers have resulted in raising the educational level of the Shīʿite man-in-the-street.

B. *The sermon's educational and ethical function*: the Ḥusaynī Sermon undoubtedly plays an important role in educating Shīʿites and increasing their adherence to Shīʿite doctrine. Many Shīʿites have become more observant in their religion thanks to hearing these sermons from preachers who are experts at convincing members of their congregations to uphold the tenets of their faith, using such stories as Ḥusayn himself did not missing a single prayer even on the day of ʿĀshūrāʾ itself despite the upcoming battle. In such a manner the Ḥusaynī Sermon has become an instrument for instruction on the dos and don'ts of the Shīʿite faith.[72]

C. *The sermon's social role*: The occasion of listening to a Ḥusaynī Sermon brings together Shīʿites of diverse classes, who converse, cooperate and get to know each other. In addition, as part of the sermon the preachers call on Shīʿites to help the

---

[69] See Aḥmad al-Wāʾilī, *Tajāribī maʿa al-minbar* (Beirut: Dār al-zahrāʾ, 1st printing, 1988), p. 43; al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 317.

[70] For details about these shrines see the section on "*Ḥusayniyya* shrines" below.

[71] In the autobiography of a prominent citizen of Najaf he claims to have attended more than twenty sessions during a single ʿĀshūrāʾ day. For details see al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 318.

[72] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 320–321.

poor and needy and to give alms for the sake of Ḥusayn.[73] Many are the poor who are given assistance on these occasions, and many the mosques that have been built thanks to the sermons. It is a common practice today for the managers of charities to urge Ḥusaynī preachers to call on their audiences to contribute to these charities, either immediately on ascending the podium or as part of the lecture.

Some Ḥusaynī Sermons are intended for particular groups, such as members of a certain profession, the residents of a certain quarter, or members of certain tribes, with the aim of enhancing the faith and increasing godliness among the people.[74]

D. The political role

It is the Shīʿite view that Ḥusayn died fighting against Umayyad injustice and tyranny. As a result political parties in some Shīʿite countries have exploited the great popular empathy toward Ḥusayn and the admiration of his struggle against oppression in order to disseminate their ideologies and draw young people into their ranks, using the argument that they are fighting evil just as did the movement led by Ḥusayn.[75]

Some political parties have also exploited the Ḥusaynī Sermon for purposes of propaganda and a call for *jihad*, arguing that Ḥusayn's actions had a political and *jihad* dimension, for he refused to pledge his allegiance to the caliph Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya[76] (d. 683) and left Al-Madīna for Mecca, then continued on to Iraq, fought and was killed in a struggle against iniquity.

Occasionally we find that a Ḥusaynī preacher criticizes the current political situation. For example, in Iran such preachers played a crucial role in revolutionizing the masses and turning them against the Shah's regime. It is therefore not surprising that the imām Khomeini would state repeatedly that "whatever we have we owe to ʿĀshūrāʾ".[77]

In Iraq Ḥusaynī preachers played a prominent role in the struggle against British colonialism, which in that country began in 1914. The Shīʿite religious authorities in Najaf immediately gave a ruling requiring all believers to fight the British in a holy war and to support the Ottoman state, whereupon preachers of Ḥusaynī Sermons quickly disseminated this ruling among Shīʿites and called on them to join the *jihad*, using the story of Ḥusayn as the basis for their call.[78]

When the Communists ruled Iraq Ḥusaynī preachers were very influential in turn-

---

[73] See Muḥsin al-Amīn, *Iqnāʿ al-lāʾim ilā iqāmat al-maʾātim* (Qumm: Muʾassasat al-maʿārif al-islāmiyya, 1ˢᵗ printing), p. 318.

[74] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 322.

[75] One such political movement is the Iraqi *Daʿwa* party, founded in 1957 by Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr, whose platform makes explicit mention of its support for religious ceremonies, especially those connected with the events at Karbalāʾ. For details see Shumrān al-ʿIjlī, *Al-Khārita al-siyāsiyya lil-muʿārada al-ʿirāqiyya* (London: Dār al-Ḥikma, 2002), p. 176; The Islamic Daʿwa Party, *Thaqāfat al-daʿwa al-islāmiyya* (1ˢᵗ printing, 1984), Chapter on Organization, Vol. 1, p. 282.

[76] For details on this caliph see G.R. Hawting, "Yazīd (I) B. Muʿāwiya", *EI²* (2002), Vol. II, pp. 309–311.

[77] See, for example, Muḥammad Ḥusayn Faḍl Allāh, *Min waḥy ʿĀshūrāʾ* (Beirut: Dār al-malāk, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1996), p. 72; Rūḥ Allāh al-Mūsawī al-Khomeini, *Nahḍat ʿĀshūrāʾ* (Beirut: Dār al-wasīla, 1996), p. 115; Haggai Ram, "The Model of Karbalāʾ: Founding Myth and Mass Mobilization in Iran's Islamic Revolution", *Zemanim* 62 (1998), pp. 50–58 [Hebrew].

[78] See, for example, *Hākadhā raʾaytuhum* (Beirut: Muʾassasat al-maʿārif, 1ˢᵗ printing, 2002), p. 17.

ing Shīʿites against that ideology, in particular after the religious rulings of Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm,[79] in which he declared that Communism constituted an atheistic heresy.[80]

In Lebanon the Ḥusaynī Sermon played an important part in the struggle against the Israeli military presence in the south of the country. Preachers utilized the mass meetings at which they preached and the deep sense of empathy with the story of Ḥusayn's murder to incite Shīʿites to resist and wage *jihad*. Preachers would compare the position Ḥusayn found himself in and that of contemporary Shīʿism. This is what Ḥasan Naṣr Allāh, the present leader of Hezbollah, says on the subject: "We do not mention Abū Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn and Karbalāʾ only when a martyr of the Resistance falls, but also when we assault forts and sow our flags on the highest peaks".[81]

The Ḥusaynī Sermon of the year 2003 was exploited in Lebanon quite explicitly for the purpose of expressing support for the intifada in the West Bank and Gaza, and at the 10th of Muḥarram processions were used for the same purpose.[82]

In short, the Ḥusaynī Sermon has today been transformed into a rallying point of revolutionary sentiment among Shīʿites.

Occasions on which the Ḥusaynī Sermon is preached

Today the sermon may be preached on almost any day of the year, as part of various religious and social activities. The establishment of Ḥusaynī shrines (*ḥusayniyya*) certainly played a key role in the dissemination and growing popularity of these sermons. In fact, there are currently Shīʿite areas where they are a daily occurrence throughout the year. This is the case in the Ḥusaynī shrines in Kuwait, Bahrein, the eastern part of Saudi Arabia and Oman.

A contributing factor to the sermon's increasing popularity is the fact that Ḥusaynī preachers have become involved in the general concerns of the Shīʿite populace. The success of the Islamic Revolution in Iran[83] (1978–79) was especially significant in this respect. Another factor which should not be overlooked is the general trend toward greater piety and godliness, and attending a Ḥusaynī Sermon is considered in Shīʿism to be a very meritorious act.

The occasions on which Ḥusaynī Sermons are given can be divided into two main categories.

---

[79] Born in Najaf in 1934 into a devout Shīʿite family. For details on him see www.alhakeem.com/arabic/alhakeem/sira/02.htm.

[80] See ʿĀdil Raʾūf, *Muḥammad Bāqir al-Ṣadr bayna diktātūriyyatayni* (Damascus: Al-Markaz al-ʿirāqī lil-iʿlām wal-dirāsāt, 2001), document no. 23, p. 466.

[81] Ḥasan Naṣr Allāh, *Ḥadīth ʿĀshūrāʾ* (Beirut: Dār al-ṣafwa, 1st printing, 2000), p. 257.

[82] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 330.

[83] For more on the Islamic Revolution in Iran see N.R. Keddie, *Root of Revolution* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981), Chapters 2–3; R.W. Cottam, "The Iranian Revolution", in J.R.I. Cole and N.R. Deddie (eds.), *Shīʿism and Social Protest* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986); S.A. Arjomand, "Iran's Islamic Revolution in Comparative Perspective", *World Politics* (April, 1986); N.R. Keddie and E. Hooglund (eds.), *The Iranian Revolution and the Islamic Republic* (Washington DC: Middle East Institute in cooperation with the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars, 1982).

Gatherings[84] *on public occasions*

A. *Gatherings* (majālis) *of the month of Muḥarram:*[85] this is the high season for Ḥusaynī Sermons, in particular the first ten days of the month, called "the days of ʿĀshūrāʾ".

B. *Gatherings of the month of Ṣafar:*[86] Sermons continue on, into and through this month as well, because this is the month in which the "procession of captives"[87] (*rakb al-sabāyā*) journeyed from Karbalāʾ to Kūfa[88] and thence to Damascus, after Ḥusayn's death. On the twentieth of the month, in the year 61 AH, Ḥusayn's head was returned to Karbalāʾ and buried in the grave where his body lay.[89]

C. *Gatherings of the month of Ramaḍān:*[90] the gatherings of this month are the second best-attended, after those of the month of Muḥarram. Ḥusaynī Sermons of this month are usually devoted to Qurʾānic, educational and historical concepts, and are in general attended by the more pious, unlike the sermons of Muḥarram, which are frequented by all Shīʿites, whatever the depth of their religious feelings.[91]

D. *Gatherings on the anniversaries of the deaths of the Prophet, Fāṭima*[92] *and the twelve imams:* the Ḥusaynī Sermons on these occasions open with a poem dedicated to the specific personage to whom the sermon is dedicated. After the recital of the poem the preacher goes on to speak of that person's death or torments, finally moving on to describe the events surrounding Ḥusayn's death at Karbalāʾ.[93]

---

[84] The word *majālis* in this context refers to gatherings for listening to spiritual exhortations, elegies and Ḥusaynī Sermons. They may also include acts of mourning and dramatic performances that recapitulate scenes of the Battle of Karbalāʾ. For more details see Jawād Muḥaddithī, *Mawsūʿat ʿĀshūrāʾ*, trans. by Khalīl Zāmil al-ʿIṣāmī (Beirut: Dār al-rasūl al-akram and Dār al-maḥajja al-bayḍāʾ, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1997), p. 402.

[85] For more on the month of Muḥarram see M. Plessner, "Muḥarram", *EI²* (1993), Vol. 7, p. 462.

[86] For more on the month of Ṣafar see A.J. Wensinck, "Ṣafar", *EI²* (1995), Vol. 8, pp. 764–765.

[87] The captives in question were Ḥusayn's sisters, wives and other female relatives who were captured, taken from Karbalāʾ to Damascus and presented to the caliph Yazīd b. Muʿāwiya (d. 683 CE). For more details see Khalid Sindawi, *The Maqātil in Shīʿite Literature*, unpublished Ph.D. thesis (Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University, 2000), pp. 215–218 [Hebrew].

[88] For details on the city see H. Djait, "Al-Kūfa", *EI²* (1986), Vol. 5, p. 345.

[89] Ḥusayn's head was returned to be buried with his body forty days after his death, on the twentieth day of the month of Ṣafar. This day is commemorated by Shīʿites under the name of "pilgrimage of the fortieth day" or "pilgrimage of the return of the head". The pilgrimage constitutes one of the five distinguishing features (*alāma*) which characterize the Shīʿite believer. For more details on the ceremonies of this pilgrimage and the way they are performed see, for example, ʿAbbās al-Qummī, *Mafātīḥ al-jinān* (Beirut: Dār al-mujtabā, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1995), pp. 503–510; M. Ayoub, "ʾarbaʿīn", *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, Vol. 2, p. 276.

For more details on the five distinguishing features of the Shīʿite believer see, for example, Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭūsī, *Tahdhīb al-aḥkām* (Teheran: Dār al-kutub al-islāmiyya, 4ᵗʰ printing, 1945), Vol. 6, p. 52 no. 37; Raḍī al-Dīn ʿAlī b. Ṭāwūs, *Iqbāl al-aʿmāl* (Teheran: Dār al-kutub al-islāmiyya, 2ⁿᵈ printing, 1947), p. 589; Al-Ḥurr al-ʿĀmilī Muḥammad b. al-Ḥasan, *Wasāʾl al-shīʿa* (Qumm: Muʾassasat āl al-bayt li-iḥyāʾ al-turāth, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1988), Vol. 5, p. 81 no. 49.

[90] See M. Plessner, "Ramaḍān", *EI²* (1995), Vol. 8, pp. 417–418.

[91] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 230.

[92] For details on Fāṭima see L. Veccia Vaglieri, "Fāṭima", *EI²* (1991), Vol. 2, pp. 841–850.

[93] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 231.

Gatherings on private occasions

Such gatherings are held on an occasion associated with a certain person or the group holding the sermon. Possible occasions are the following:

A. Habitual weekly gatherings: these are attended by specific, usually socially prominent, Shī'ites, and are often held after the evening prayer, although some are also held in the morning or afternoon. Every such gathering is held on a certain day of the week, attended by a circumscribed and more-or-less constant group of people, for whom it serves as a social occasion as well as providing an opportunity to discuss religious matters, especially if attended by religious masters.[94] Thus, for example, each of the chief religious authorities in Najaf,[95] Qumm[96] and other Shī'ite cities will have his own weekly gathering.

B. Gatherings in commemoration of the deceased: it has become a common Shī'ite custom to end the period of mourning for the dead with a recital of Qur'ānic verses, followed by a Ḥusaynī Sermon. In this sermon the preacher first speaks of the dead and of the world beyond, then goes on to mention the tragic fate of Ḥusayn or another member of the Prophet's family, with whom the fate of the deceased can be connected.[97]

C. Gatherings on other occasions: Ḥusaynī Sermons can also be heard on various other occasions, among them moving into new house, returning from a pilgrimage to Mecca, fulfillment of a religious obligation, or any other joyful event. In recent years it has become common for Ḥusaynī preachers to accompany groups of pilgrims to Mecca. The sermons of this type usually cater mainly to devout Shī'ites and are organized by the person who is celebrating the occasion in question.[98]

Venues of the Ḥusaynī Sermon

Ḥusaynī Sermons may be given at variety of different places, as follows.

A. Mosques

As we say above in our historical survey of the Ḥusaynī Sermon's development, mosques were used as the sermon venue at least since Fāṭimid times, when certain mosques in Cairo were used for this purpose on the day of 'Āshūrā', such as the Cairo Mosque, the Mosque of 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ, the Great Mosque of al-Azhar, and others.[99]

---

[94] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 232–233.
[95] For details on the city of Najaf see E. Honigmann – [C.E. Bosworth], "Al-Nadjaf", *EI²* (1993), Vol. 7, pp. 859–861.
[96] For details on the city see J. Calmard, "Ḳumm", *EI²* (1986), Vol. 5, pp. 369–372.
[97] For details see Ḥasan Amīn al-Bu'aynī, *Al-'Ādāt wal-taqālīd fī lubnān* (Beirut: Bīsān lil-nashr wal-tawzī' wal-i'lām, 2001), p. 122.
[98] For details see Al-Kirbāssī, *Mu'jam khuṭabā' al-minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 170–172.
[99] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 247.

B. The tombs of Shīʿite imāms

The tombs of the imāms are holy shrines, and are among the most frequently used venues for Ḥusaynī Sermons. Ḥusayn's tomb in Karbalāʾ was naturally one of the first places where elegies were recited and the tragic tale of his death told, since the times of the *tawwābūn*,[100] through both the Umayyad and ʿAbbāsid periods, and down to our own day and age.

Similarly, the shrines of other imāms are also used as venues for the sermons. These include tombs in Najaf and Kāẓimiyya[101] in Iraq, the city of Mashhad[102] in Iran, to the tomb of Zaynab,[103] ʿAlī's daughter, in Damascus,[104] and scores of other tombs in Iraq and Iran ascribed to the imāms' offspring.

C. Ḥusaynī shrines (ḥusayniyya)

These are structures erected for the express purpose of holding Ḥusaynī Sermons and the annual mourning ceremonies in honor of Ḥusayn.[105] The Ḥusaynī shrines inside the holy Shīʿite cities usually also serve as free-of-charge hostels for pilgrims.[106] The shrine is commonly named after the community which erected it: "The Aṣfahanī *ḥusayniyya*", "The Teheran *ḥusayniyya*", and so forth. *Ḥusayniyyas* of this kind may be found in Najaf, Karbalāʾ, Mashhad and other cities. They are not considered mosques, and are thus exempt from the various restrictions[107] which apply to the latter, especially with regard to entry by non-Muslims.[108]

In some areas of Lebanon the shrines are known by the name of "Ḥusaynī club" (*al-nādī al-ḥusaynī*), as for example the shrine in Tyre[109] in southern Lebanon, and elsewhere. In contrast, in the Persian Gulf area, in Bahrein, eastern Saudi Arabia, Qatar, the UAE and Oman, the shrines are called "funereal assemblies" (*maʾtam*). In Bahrein alone there exist today some 3500 such "Ḥusaynī funereal assemblies",[110] reflecting the fact that in that country Ḥusaynī Sermons take place with great fre-

---

[100] Literally "the penitent", this was a group of Kūfan Shīʿites who felt contrition for not having fought side-by-side with Ḥusayn and decided to do penitence and take revenge for his death. Their rebellion, under the leadership of Sulaymān b. Ṣurad al-Khuzāʿī (d. 684 CE) culminated in the battle of ʿAyn al-Warda. For more details on the movement see, for example, G.R. Hawting, "The Tawwābūn: Atonement and ʿĀshūrāʾ", *JSAI* 17 (1994), pp. 166–181.

[101] For details on the city see M. Streck – A.A. Dixon, "Kāẓimayn", *EI²* (1990), Vol. 4, pp. 854–856.

[102] For details see M. Steck, "Mashhad", *EI²* (1991), Vol. 6, pp. 713–716.

[103] For details see Khayr al-Dīn al-Ziriklī, *Al-Aʿlām* (Beirut: Dār al-ʿilm lil-malāyīn, 7th printing, 1986), Vol. 3, pp. 66–67.

[104] For details on Damascus see N. Elisséeff, "Dimashḳ", *EI²* (1991), Vol. 2, pp. 277–291.

[105] For details see Muḥammad Mahdī Shams al-Dīn, *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn fī al-wujdān al-shaʿbī* (Beirut: Al-Dār al-islāmiyya, 1st printing, 1980), p. 219; Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 219.

[106] Jawād Muḥaddithī is of the opinion that the preference shown by Shīʿites for Ḥusaynī shrines, particularly during the early centuries of Islam, was due to the fact that mosques were controlled by the authorities, who were more often than not hostile to Shīʿism and curbed the free practice of their religion. For details see Muḥaddithī, *Mawsūʿat ʿĀshūrāʾ*, p. 143.

[107] For more details on rules governing comportment in mosques see Ibrāhīm Ṣāliḥ al-Khuḍayrī, *Aḥkām al-masjid fī al-sharīʿa al-islāmiyya* (Riyadh: Dār al-faḍīla lil-nashr, 2001).

[108] Muḥaddithī, op.cit., pp. 142–143.

[109] For details on the city of Tyre see M. Lavergne, "Ṣūr", *EI²* (1997), Vol. 9, pp. 883–885.

[110] See Maḥrūs Karīm, *Al-Nūr Magazine* 50 (London, 1995), p. 42.

quency and on numerous occasions. In India and Pakistan they are called "Imām Centers" (*imām bāra*).

*Ḥusayniyya*s do not possess a uniform style or shape. In Iraq, Kuwait and the Persian Gulf area they are usually great mosque-like halls, whereas in Lebanon they tend to be constructed in the shape of meeting halls, with rows of chairs and a podium at one end. Some shrines are used exclusively by women. A *ḥusayniyya* may be constructed as a separate building, or as an annex to a mosque.

Among Shīʿites the Ḥusaynī shrine is second only to the mosque in importance.

The oldest extant shrine is the "Imām Dālān *ḥusayniyya*" in the city of Dacca in Bangladesh, which dates from 1642 CE.[111]

Ḥusaynī shrines may be classified into two distinct types:

1) Shrines constructed in cities and towns where Shīʿites live. This type is common in all Shīʿite countries and areas around the world.

2) Shrines in the holy cities of Shiʿism. These usually also serve as hostels for pilgrims from the towns which had them constructed. The most important holy place is, of course, Karbalāʾ, in which a number of such hostel-cum-shrines have been constructed.[112]

With time the shrines have taken on an increasing religious, social, political and cultural importance. Since the beginning of the twentieth century they have turned into social and cultural clubs where people come to exchange views and engage in social and recreational activities, in particular during religious holidays.[113]

D. Private homes

Some Ḥusaynī Sermons are held in the preacher's private home, or in the home of the person who has an occasion for holding the sermon. Private homes were among the earliest venues of the Ḥusaynī Sermon.[114]

E. Streets and public squares

Due to the growing popularity of Ḥusaynī Sermons, especially during the first ten days of the month of Muḥarram, the sermon is often given out in the street or in a public square. Occasionally traffic is halted on certain streets during the time of the sermon. This happens most frequently in Bahrein and eastern Saudi Arabia. In Lebanon it can happen as well, especially in the southern parts of Beirut as well as in some towns and villages in the Buqāʿ and in the south of the country.

F. Leased halls

Venues are leased for the purpose of holding Ḥusaynī Sermons in various locations around the world, especially in cities where there is no mosque or Islamic center.

---

[111] Ibrāhīm al-Ḥaydarī, *Trāgīdyā Karbalāʾ* (Beirut: Dār al-sāqī, 1st printing, 1999), p. 162.
[112] Salmān Hādī Ṭuʿma, *Karbalāʾ fī al-dhākira* (Baghdad: Maṭbaʿat al-ʿānī, 1988), p. 180.
[113] See Al-Ḥaydarī, *Trāgīdyā Karbalāʾ*, p. 69.
[114] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 255.

G. Large tents (surādiq)

In some Shīʿite areas tents are used as venues for the Ḥusaynī Sermon. In the tribal areas of Iraq Shīʿite tribes set up tents for the mourning ceremonies and sermons of the days of ʿĀshūrāʾ. In recent years tents have come into use in Lebanon as well, in Beirut and elsewhere, in particular for the ʿĀshūrāʾ ceremonies organized by the Hezbollah and Amal movements, which attract great crowds that no mosque or ḥusayniyya can contain. As a result the term "ʿĀshūrāʾ tent" is now in common use among Shīʿites in Lebanon.[115]

H. Public transportation

On railroad trains traveling from southern Iraq to Karbalāʾ and on buses making the trip to Karbalāʾ from Baghdad and elsewhere passengers are reminded of the trage-dy of Karbalāʾ and can listen to recitals and elegies, in particular on the occasions of regular pilgrimage,[116] such as ʿĀshūrāʾ, the middle of the month of Shaʿbān,[117] etc. The Ḥusaynī Sermon on public transportation is usually short, with no lectures, and sometimes consists merely of the recital of an elegy. On one occasion at least, so it has been reported, a Ḥusaynī preacher on a flight from Damascus to Teheran asked the crew's permission to recite elegiac slogans in honor of Ḥusayn over the air-craft's public-address system and his wish was granted.[118] The phenomenon of recit-ing the sermon on means of public transport would appear to be limited to Iraq and Iran.[119]

I. Markets

As mentioned previously, Ḥusaynī Sermons used to be given in some of the markets of Baghdad, run by associations of various crafts. Thus, for example, there were gatherings for the purpose of hearing Ḥusaynī Sermons in the merchants' bazaar, others in the taylors' market, and so on.

J. Religious schools (madrasa)

In the religious schools of Shīʿite holy cities such as Najaf, Qumm and Mashhad, the students organize gatherings to mourn over Ḥusayn, with sermons preached by one of their own or by a student from another school.[120]

---

[115] Al-Kāẓimī, Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī, p. 257.

[116] The full list of regular annual occasions is as follows: the pilgrimage of ʾĀshūrāʾ, the end of the forty days of mourning (the twentieth of the month of Ṣafar), the middle of the month of Rajab, the middle of the month of Shaʿbān, the "night of fate" (laylat al-qadr), ʿīd al-fiṭr, the night of ʿarafa and the Feast of Sacrifice (ʿīd al-aḍḥā). For more details on these pilgrimages see ʿAbbās al-Qummī, Mafātīḥ al-jinān (Bei-rut: Dār al-mujtabā, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1995), pp. 474–504.

[117] For details concerning this month see A.J. Wensinck, "Shaʿbān", EI² (1997), Vol. 9, p. 154.

[118] Perhaps this shows the influence of flights taking pilgrims to Mecca, on which they constantly repeat the phrase "I am at your service, oh God, I am at your service" (labbayka Allāhumma labbayka) through-out the flight. For details see H. Lazarus-Yaffeh, "The Ḥajj – the duty of pilgrimage", in More Conversa-tions about Islam (Tel-Aviv: Ministry of Defense, 3ʳᵈ edition, 1992), p. 12 [Hebrew].

[119] For more details see Fahmī Huwaydī, Īrān min al-dākhil (Cairo: Markaz al-ahrām lil-targama wal-nashr, 2ⁿᵈ printing, 1987), p. 222.

[120] Al-Kāẓimī, Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī, pp. 258–259.

Who initiates and organizes the performance of a Ḥusaynī Sermon?

Those who issue the call to attend a Ḥusaynī Sermon can be various people and organizations. For example, in the case of private Ḥusaynī Sermons, of the kind mentioned above, the person sponsoring the occasion will issue the call to the sermon. Among those who can be expected to issue invitations to a Ḥusaynī Sermon are the following.

A. Imāms of mosques, heads or the board of directors of ḥusayniyyas

For a Ḥusaynī gathering these religious leaders will make the choice of an appropriate preacher and make all other necessary preparations, such as lighting, furniture and refreshments, in accordance with local custom.

B. Families of Shīʿite clerics

Such families will organize gatherings in honor of their sons. These are attended by people of all classes, but in particular elders of the community, religious scholars and students at religious schools. They are usually held in the holy cities of Shīʿism, where most Shīʿite religious schools and academies are located.[121]

C. Shīʿite notables

Local and regional Shīʿite notables and prominent leaders also organize Ḥusaynī Sermons, especially during the first ten days of the month of Muḥarram. The costs of holding the gatherings are defrayed by these men personally, not by the extended family or a committee, and they also choose the preacher.[122]

D. Shīʿite neighborhoods

In the Shīʿite areas of Iraq, as well as elsewhere in regions with a considerable Shīʿite population, Ḥusaynī Sermons are frequently organized by an entire neighborhood, usually in a low-income area. The local people will issue the call for a gathering, choose the preacher and make the necessary arrangements. The venue will usually be a public space or a major crossroads in the neighborhood. Mats are spread on the ground, with some people bringing their own, loudspeakers are placed on the rooftops and the podium is placed so that it overlooks the audience.

---

[121] Such gatherings are especially typical of the city of Najaf, where the gatherings of the imām Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm were particularly renowned. These gatherings, held throughout the imām's lifetime, were attended by clerics and leading social, intellectual and political personalities. For details see Ibrāhīm ʿAdnān al- Sarrāj, *Al-Imām al-sayyid Muḥsin al-Ḥakīm* (Beirut: Dār al-zahrāʾ, 1ˢᵗ printing, 1993), p. 16.
There are also gatherings organized by laymen, such as those initiated by Muḥammad Mahdī Baḥr al-ʿUlūm (d. 1797 CE), who began holding them in his home. They are still being held today, organized by his descendants, and are considered among the most important and well-attended Ḥusaynī gatherings during the first ten days of the month of Muḥarram, when they constitute the last of the morning gatherings, ending near noon. For details see al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 238.
[122] For details see ʿAlī al-Wardī, *Dirāsa fī ṭabīʿat al-mujtamaʿ al-ʿirāqī* (Qumm: Manshūrāt al-sharīf al-Raḍī, 1993), p. 237.

E. Professional groups

Various labor unions, craft guilds and other professional organizations (for example cloth merchants, corn merchants, tailors, weavers, and so on) organize Ḥusaynī gatherings, especially in Iraq but also in other Shīʿite areas.[123] Markets and bazaars have thus become venues of Ḥusaynī Sermons.

F. Tribes and clans

Every Shīʿite tribe and clan in Iraq holds Ḥusaynī Sermons, usually inside large hair tents. The chief of the tribe or clan supervises the organization of the gathering and chooses the preacher shortly before the beginning of the month of Muḥarram. The preacher is usually a guest in the home of the chief. All members of the tribe participate in providing refreshments to the public attending the sermon.[124]

G. People from a city who are residing in other cities

In Iraq in particular many people move from the city in which they were born and raised, mostly to Baghdad but to other towns as well, where they often cooperate in organizing Ḥusaynī Sermons. Thus, for example, people from the city of Samāwa who live in Baghdad hold Ḥusaynī Sermons,[125] as do originators of Baghdad living in Karbalāʾ.[126]

H. Shīʿite émigré communities in non-Muslim countries

Shīʿite communities in the West also attach great importance to holding Ḥusaynī Sermons, in particular during the first ten days of the month of Muḥarram. The sermons are usually organized by the director of the local Islamic center and other community leaders, who choose the preacher, and make arrangements for his entry visa, lodgings and expenses.

I. Political organizations

There are currently a number of political organizations active among Shīʿites who utilize Ḥusaynī Sermons to attract adherents. The involvement of a political grouping in the organization of a sermon may be overt or kept a secret, depending on the social and political circumstances in the country in question.[127] In Lebanon, for example, the two major Shīʿite political movements, Amal and Hezbollah, quite openly organize Ḥusaynī Sermons in all areas of the country with a significant Shīʿite presence, including in Beirut, southern Lebanon and the Buqāʿ Valley. At these gatherings signs with party slogans abound, and the occasion is exploited to make the movement's stand on current issues known.[128]

---

[123] For details see Aḥmad al-Wāʾilī, *Tajāribī maʿa al-minbar* (Beirut: Dār al-zahrāʾ, 1st printing, 1998), p. 48.

[124] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 241.

[125] A city on the edge of the desert on the banks of the Euphrates about 220 km south of Baghdad.

[126] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 241.

[127] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 242–243.

[128] For details see Al-Buʿaynī, *Al-ʿĀdāt wal-taqālīd fī lubnān*, p. 131.

Each of the two political movements issues a call to attend its gatherings and chooses its own preachers, but occasionally they also agree to hold gatherings in common. In other countries the situation is similar.

J. Sermons for youths and children

Ḥusaynī Sermons arranged for children are known by the name of "youth (or children's) gatherings (or processions)" (majālis/mawākib al-shabāb/al-aṭfāl). These are usually organized for the children of a number of neighborhoods. The expenses are covered by contributions, and preachers often agree to do their work *pro bono*. Children's gatherings are frequently named after youths or children who were killed at Karbalāʾ, such as ʿAlī al-Akbar[129] son of Ḥusayn, Al-Qāsim[130] son of Ḥasan, or ʿAbd Allāh al-Aṣghar.[131]

The Ḥusaynī preacher: titles and skills

A Ḥusaynī preacher can be defined as a religious orator who possesses the combined abilities to lecture and preach, to recite elegiac poetry in a certain manner, and to make his audience become emotionally involved in the story of Ḥusayn and his tragic death. He thus must have the skills of any orator or preacher, supplemented by an aptitude for speaking of the battle of Karbalāʾ in a way that arouses feelings of sadness in his audience.[132]

Titles of the Ḥusaynī preacher

Ḥusaynī preachers are called by many different titles, some specific to certain Shīʿite regions and others in more general use. The titles are as follows:

A. *Preacher of the Ḥusaynī podium* (khaṭīb al-minbar al-ḥusaynī): This is the preacher's official name. Although this name is usually shortened to the first word in the expression (see the second title, below) both in popular and in religious usage, the full title appears in all scholarly writings and books about the Ḥusaynī Sermon.

B. *Preacher* (al-khaṭīb): This is the title most commonly used by Shīʿites. This word is in general use in Arabic with the meaning of "preacher", and has no connection at all with Ḥusayn when uttered in a non-Shīʿite context. However, when a Shīʿite says "he is a *khaṭīb*" or "the *khaṭīb* has arrived" it can only refer to a Ḥusaynī preacher. It is the usual title used at the major Ḥusaynī gatherings in the cities of Iraq and the Persian Gulf, as well as those of Shīʿite émigrés from these regions.[133]

C. *Reciter* (qāriʾ or qārī): This is the title used by the common people, who frequently utter it in the colloquial form, in which the glottal stop is dropped. The title is

---

[129] Al-Ziriklī, *Al-Aʿlām*, Vol. 7, p. 277; Muḥaddithī, *Mawsūʿat ʿĀshūrāʾ*, pp. 328–329..
[130] Muḥaddithī, *Mawsūʿat ʿĀshūrāʾ*, p. 355.
[131] Muḥaddithī, *Mawsūʿat ʿĀshūrāʾ*, p. 306.
[132] Al-Kirbāssī, *Muʿjam khuṭabāʾ al-minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 151; al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 260–261.
[133] Muḥaddithī, *Mawsūʿat ʿĀshūrāʾ*, pp. 156–160.

most frequently heard at popular gatherings in Iraq, the Gulf States and in the Arabic-speaking areas of southern Iran.[134]

D. *Podium speaker* (minbarī): The word *minbar* means podium, and the term *minbarī* when used by Shīʿites can only refer to the preacher of Ḥusaynī Sermons. The term is frequently used by Shīʿite clerics and religious scholars, for the purpose of differentiating between their own self-perceived higher position and the status of a Ḥusaynī preacher.

E. *Reciter of the biography of Ḥusayn* (qāriʾ [*or* muqriʾ] al-sīra al-ḥusayniyya)

F. *Reciter of mourning* (qāriʾ al-ʿazāʾ)

G. *Reciter of the mourning gathering* (qāriʾ majlis ʿazāʾ)

H. *Consoler* (al-muʿazzī)
The titles listed above are all in use in Lebanon and in some of the Shīʿite areas of Syria, especially in the vicinity of Homs[135] and Aleppo.[136] They are not in use either in Iraq or in the Gulf States.

I. *Reciter of consolation* (qāriʾ taʿziya)

J. *Rawzah khūn or al-rawḍa khūn al-qāriʾ*: This term, of Persian origin, is composed of two words meaning "reciter of the garden",[137] in which the Arabic word *rawḍa* appears as *rawza*. The term is used primarily in Iran[138] but has also, through the influence of Iranian pilgrims, come to be used by Shīʿite clerics in Iraq, and more generally in the rural areas of Iraq and the Persian Gulf, where it is also pronounced *rayzakhūn* by the more uneducated. It has also come to be used with a derogatory connotation, referring to someone who ascends to the Ḥusaynī pulpit without having the requisite skills for preaching. In Lebanon this title is not in use, except perhaps by some clerics who may have picked it up during their studies in Najaf or Qumm.

Today the term is used mainly to refer to a preacher who devotes the sermon to speaking of the merits and history of the Prophet and his Shīʿite descendants, whereas preachers who emphasize more general intellectual, cultural and social issues are known by the title of "Preacher" (khaṭīb).[139]

K. *Sermonizer* (al-wāʿiẓ)

L. *Instructor* (al-murshid)

M. *Narrator* (al-dhākir)

N. *Reporter* (al-muballigh)

---

[134] Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 262.
[135] For details on the city see J. Mandaville, "Ḥimṣ", *EI²* (1986), Vol. 3, pp. 203–204.
[136] For details on the city see J. Sauvaget, "Ḥalab", *EI²* (1971), Vol. 3, pp. 85–90.
[137] See S. Haim, *Persian English Dictionary* (New York: Hippocrene Books, 3rd ed., 2003), p. 317.
[138] See Shams al-Dīn, *Thawrat al-Ḥusayn fī al-wujdān al-shaʿbī*, p. 293.
[139] See Bāqir al-Maqdisī, *Fann al-khaṭāba min al-muqaddima* (Qumm: Maʿhad al-rasūl al-aʿẓam lil-khaṭāba, no date), p. 9.

*O. Eulogist (*al-maddāḥ*)*

All of the afore-mentioned titles are used today to refer to Ḥusaynī preachers with varying frequency in different Shīʿite regions.

The proliferation of titles for Ḥusaynī preachers reflects the great popularity of Ḥusaynī Sermons throughout the Shīʿite world and the resulting increase in the number of its practitioners, who today constitute a full-fledged prestigious social-religious class.[140]

Conclusion

The Ḥusaynī Sermon came into being shortly after Ḥusayn's tragic death and went through four historical stages before coming to have the form and distribution it has today. In its present form it consists of an introduction with a style and tone of its own, an elegy to Ḥusayn, a lecture on an issue of current interest, and a recital of the events of the battle of Karbalāʾ. This structure has become the norm among Ḥūsaynī preachers. In recent times the lecture has tended more and more to deal with educational, social and political issues of current interest. It is thus not surprising that Shīʿite political parties use the sermon for the purpose of advancing their causes.

Although Ḥusaynī Sermons are held regularly on the Shīʿite holidays, they may also be given on any other day of the year. Nor do they have a fixed venue, being held in mosques, in Ḥusaynī shrines, at imāms' tombs, in homes, on the street and in public spaces, and even on means of public transport. Ḥusaynī Sermons may be initiated and organized by a variety of individuals and groups. As a result of the sermon's importance in the lives of Shīʿites, the preacher is referred to by many different titles.

[140] Al-Kirbāssī, *Muʿjam khuṭabāʾ al-minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, p. 151; Al-Kāẓimī, *Al-Minbar al-Ḥusaynī*, pp. 265–266.

Ajem-Türkisch: Annäherung an eine historische Sprachform zwischen Osmanisch, Persisch und Osttürkisch

Heidi Stein
Mainz

An der Universität Mainz (Deutschland) ist seit 1997 ein turkologisches Forschungsprojekt angesiedelt, das sich mit den süd- und westoghusisch-türkischen Sprachvarietäten Irans und der angrenzenden türkisch-iranischen Kontaktgebiete Südostanatoliens, des Irak und Transkaukasiens beschäftigt[1]. Langfristiges Ziel des Projekts ist eine Darstellung der verschiedenen Varietäten in kontaktlinguistischer Hinsicht, d.h. es sollen die jeweiligen Beziehungen der türkischen Varietäten untereinander und zu den umgebenden iranischen Sprachen sowie ihr Verhältnis zu den Prestigesprachen Türkeitürkisch/Osmanisch und Persisch untersucht werden.

Nachdem im Projekt bisher die modernen Varietäten im Mittelpunkt des Interesses gestanden haben, liegt der Untersuchungsschwerpunkt zurzeit auf dem historischen Werdegang türkischer Varietäten in Iran auf der Basis schriftlicher Quellen ab dem 15. Jahrhundert. Dieser Beitrag will versuchen, die aktuelle Forschungsproblematik des Projekts im Überblick darzustellen und mit einigen Beispielen zu veranschaulichen[2].

Auch für die historische Situation der türkischen Sprachvarietäten des Areals ist immer ein intensiver Sprachkontakt charakteristisch gewesen – und so wie heute der Einfluss des Persischen und des Türkeitürkischen in bestimmten Gruppen der irantürkischen Varietäten eine unterschiedlich bestimmende Rolle spielt, sind auch für das ältere Irantürkisch die früheren Schriftsprachen der Region zu beachten:

1. das Neupersische in Iran mit seiner bedeutenden Ausstrahlung als Sprache der Literatur auch in den von Türken gegründeten Staatswesen der vorderasiatischen Region,

2. im Westen das Osmanisch-Türkische mit seiner Anfangsphase des Altanatolisch-Türkischen im 13.–15. Jh. Innerhalb der südwestlichen oder oghusischen Gruppe der Türksprachen, zu der fast alle irantürkischen Varietäten gehören, hat das Osmanische mit seiner Anfangsphase Altanatolisch-Türkisch die längste bekannte Geschichte als Schriftsprache.

---

[1] Das Projekt „Türkische Sprachvarietäten türkisch-iranischer Kontaktgebiete in Westasien" unter der Leitung von Hendrik Boeschoten ist Bestandteil des von der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft geförderten Sonderforschungsbereichs 295 „Kulturelle und sprachliche Kontakte. Prozesse des Wandels in historischen Spannungsfeldern Nordostafrikas/Westasiens". Das Projekt wurde von Lars Johanson 1997 initiiert und bis 2002 geleitet; gegenwärtig nimmt er auch an der Projektarbeit teil. Mitarbeiterinnen im Projekt sind Sevgi Ağcagül, Christiane Bulut, Dilek Elçin, Heidi Stein; bis 2004 war Filiz Kıral beteiligt.

[2] Er beruht auf einem Vortrag, der im Juli 2004 im Plenum des Sonderforschungsbereichs 295 in Mainz gehalten wurde.

3. Für die früheren Jahrhunderte kommen dazu die Einflüsse von osttürkischen Literatursprachen, die nicht zur oghusischen Gruppe gehören: Choresmtürkisch (13.–14. Jh.) und vor allem Tschaghataisch seit dem 15. Jh. Diese osttürkischen Einflüsse sind von Bedeutung für die frühen Phasen des Osmanischen und Irantürkischen; später sind sie vor allem in den östlicheren Teilen des oghusischen Sprachgebiets spürbar. Die ostoghusische Sprache Turkmenisch etablierte sich überhaupt unter dem starken Einfluss des Tschaghataischen; letzteres liegt aber außerhalb des eigentlichen Untersuchungsgebiets.

Die Abfolge der Projektphasen erweist sich für die jetzige Forschungsproblematik als recht günstig, denn mit den schon gewonnenen Erkenntnissen zur modernen Sprachkontaktsituation kann man an die historischen Sprachdaten mit konkreten Fragestellungen herangehen. Und auf der anderen Seite kann eine systematische Aufarbeitung der erreichbaren historischen Sprachbelege Erklärungen liefern für bestimmte Merkmale der heutigen Varietäten. Denn hier sind prinzipiell immer die gleichen Fragen zu stellen:

- Ergeben sich die heute festgestellten Merkmale aus der innertürkischen Sprachentwicklung, d.h. beleuchten sie das Verhältnis genetisch verwandter Sprachen,
- oder sind es areale Merkmale strukturell unterschiedlicher Sprachen des Gebiets
- oder schließlich Merkmale eines direkten Sprachkontakts strukturell unterschiedlicher Sprachen?

In letzterem Fall erhebt sich die Frage, ob es sich dabei um rezente Erscheinungen oder um einen alten Sprachkontakt handelt, und dazu sind historische Belege notwendig.

Dazu sei zu Anfang schon ein Beispiel zur Veranschaulichung der Problematik genannt, das aus einem Aufsatz von Christiane Bulut (im Druck) stammt, in dem sie ihre aus rezenten Varietäten gesammelten Daten auch mit historischen Belegen verglichen hat: Wenn eine sprachliche Kontakterscheinung im Türkischen wie die Übernahme des gesamten Systems iranischer Relativsatzkonstruktionen in der kleinen türkischen Enklave Sonqor in Iran (westlich von Hamadan) festgestellt wird, dann fragt man sich, ob dies eine Erscheinung ist, die auf der heutigen extremen Kontaktsituation beruht, oder ob es die Bewahrung eines viel älteren Kontakts aufgrund ebendieser Isolation ist. Dass es nur die monolingualen älteren Frauen sind, bei denen sich dieser Sprachgebrauch findet, lässt vermuten, dass es sich um einen Archaismus handelt. Und tatsächlich kann man ein ebensolches elaboriertes System von Relativsatzkonstruktionen nach iranischem Modell in frühen altanatolisch-türkischen Texten wie den Versen von Sultan Veled aus dem 13. Jh. wiederfinden. Damit allerdings ist die Erklärung nicht unbedingt beendet, denn die Frage, ob beides eventuell auf einen gemeinsamen, noch älteren Hintergrund zurückgeht und damit auf einen noch älteren iranisch-türkischen Sprachkontakt, führt zu den vielen offenen Fragen der Herausbildung der oghusischen Sprachen und ihrer Beziehungen untereinander.

Für die Geschichte der Kontaktbeziehungen irantürkischer Varietäten ist der

Kontakt mit dem nicht verwandten Persischen nur eine, wenn auch sehr wichtige Seite – die zweite sind die Wechselbeziehungen zwischen den türkischen Sprachen und Dialekten der Region, und dabei insbesondere die Frage nach der Herausbildung der größten irantürkischen Varietät – des Aserbaidschanischen.

Das (Nord-)Aserbaidschanische fungiert heute in der Republik Aserbaidschan als Schriftsprache, das nicht standardisierte Südaserbaidschanische in NW-Iran (bis Teheran und Hamadan) als überregionale gesprochene Varietät. Unter diesen überdachenden Varietäten erstrecken sich verschiedene Gruppen von Dialekten, von denen die iranaserbaidschanischen bisher kaum erforscht sind.

Im Gebiet des Iranaserbaidschanischen beginnt eine Zone so genannter Übergangsdialekte, die zum Südoghusischen tendieren, das auch unter der Sammelbezeichnung Afscharisch geführt wird. Dazu gehören die Sprachen der nomadischen Kaschkay (Qašqā'ī) und Aynallu, aber auch afscharische Dialekte in Afghanistan, nahe Kabul.

Im Westen beginnt in Ost- und Südostanatolien die Einflusszone des Türkeitürkischen mit Dialekten, die z.T. schon auf dem Gebiet der Türkei als aserbaidschanische Varietäten gelten können.

Die so genannten türkmenischen Dialekte im Nordirak bilden einen Übergang zum aserbaidschanischen und ostanatolischen Dialektgebiet und stehen ebenfalls unter stärkerem Einfluss des Türkeitürkischen.

Beschreibungen der Struktur von aserbaidschanischen, südoghusischen und ostanatolischen Varietäten und ihrer Funktionen im iranisch-türkischen Kontaktareal gehören zum Kern des genannten Forschungsprojekts.

Da die irantürkischen Varietäten noch nicht allzu lange Gegenstand der Forschung sind, ist ihre Klassifizierung innerhalb der oghusischen Sprachgruppe noch nicht vollständig geklärt. Eine der letzten Einteilungen von Doerfer (1990: 18–19), dem Altmeister der irantürkischen Forschung, unterscheidet zwei große Bereiche: Östliches Oghusisch (Turkmenisch, Chorasantürkisch) und Westliches Oghusisch, wobei sich letzteres in die etwa gleichwertigen Untergruppen Westoghusisch (= Türkeitürkisch), Zentraloghusisch (= Aserbaidschanisch) und Südoghusisch (Afscharisch, Kaschkay, Aynallu) aufteilt. Johanson (1997b: 132; 1998: 82) möchte dagegen an der gemeinsamen Bezeichnung Westoghusisch für Türkeitürkisch und Aserbaidschanisch festhalten und sieht das Südoghusische eher als eigene Gruppe neben dem Ost- und dem Westoghusischen, also etwas entfernter vom Westoghusischen und schon als Bindeglied zum Ostoghusischen.

Das Ajem-Türkische – Quellen und Merkmale
Geschichtliche Entwicklung der Kontaktsituation
Die Diskussion zur Klassifizierung der oghusischen Sprachen führt zu der Frage, ab wann und in welchem Ausmaß wir in den östlichen, d.h. den irantürkischen Gebieten des Westoghusischen, mit der Absonderung einer eigenen Sprache rechnen müssen, die sich später als Aserbaidschanisch etablierte. Dies hängt eng zusammen mit dem Problem der sprachhistorischen Einordnung des Altanatolisch-Türkischen zwischen dem 13. und 15. Jh., wozu die Diskussion noch im Gange ist. Im allgemei-

nen gilt die Annahme, dass sich als Schriftsprache seit dem 13. Jh. das Altanato-
lisch-Türkische aus einer oghusischen Untergruppe, die zuerst auch noch das
Chorasantürkische umfasste, separiert hat, und diese Untergruppe muss im wesent-
lichen der Sprache der türkischen Seldschuken, die im 11. und 12. Jh. Iran und zum
Teil Anatolien beherrschten, entsprochen haben. Zum Ende der altanatolisch-
türkischen Phase – seit dem 15. Jh. – begann sich ein östliches Westoghusisch, das
spätere Aserbaidschanisch, zu entwickeln.

Mit den Seldschuken, die aus Zentralasien kamen und den Islam angenommen
hatten, begann im 11. Jh. der massive Zustrom türkischer Nomaden aus Zentral-
asien nach Iran und damit auch die türkische Besiedlung Aserbaidschans, das mit
seinen geographischen Gegebenheiten den Bedürfnissen der Nomaden entgegen-
kam: Hier gab es Bergweiden für den Sommer und Tiefebenen für den Winter. Tür-
ken fügten sich aber nicht nur als Nomaden, sondern auch in den unter seldschuki-
scher Herrschaft gedeihenden städtischen Zentren in das iranische Umfeld ein, und
sie gebrauchten dabei ihre eigene Sprache neben dem Persischen, das bei den Seld-
schuken trotz ihrer türkischen Herkunft die offizielle und vom Hofe geförderte
Sprache blieb. In seldschukischer Zeit (1040–1195) begann auch die militärische
Karriere der Türken in Iran, die im stehenden Heer als Militärsklaven eingesetzt
wurden – eine Tendenz, die sich weiter verstärkte und in der türkischen Militärelite
des iranischen Safawidenstaates einige Jahrhunderte später kulminierte.

Zu einer weiteren Türkisierung West- und Nordirans kam es dann vor allem im
Gefolge der Mongoleninvasion (1219–1224), da die Mongolen mehrheitlich
türkische Söldner in ihrem Heer beschäftigten. Das aserbaidschanische Täbris
wurde zu einem politischen Zentrum im mongolischen Nachfolgereich der Ilchane
in Iran (1256–1335), das auch Anatolien und Irak umfasste, so dass Türken erneut
in einem Staatswesen zusammengefasst waren, dessen Zentrum Iran war und in
dem das Persische die dominierende Rolle spielte.

In Anatolien dagegen führte im 13. Jh. die Niederlage der Seldschuken und ihres
persisch geprägten Hofes dazu, dass hier eine türkische Schriftlichkeit entstehen
konnte. Die literarischen Werke dieser frühen Zeit waren heterogen und häufig von
Merkmalen östlicher Türksprachen durchsetzt. Um diese gemischte Sprache zu er-
klären, wird seit langem eine Diskussion geführt (vgl. dazu als neuere Zusammen-
fassung der Problematik Boeschoten 2005). Der einprägsame Terminus dafür,
„*olga-bolga*-Sprache", wurde von türkischen Forschern nach Varianten der Futur-
form des Kopulaverbs *(b)ol-* gebildet: Auf westoghusisch lautet diese Form *ola* und
auf osttürkisch *bolγa(y)*. In den genannten Werken treten neben diesen beiden For-
men noch die Mischformen *olγa* und *bola* auf.

Weil die Träger der anatolischen Schriftsprache überwiegend Einwanderer aus
Zentralasien waren, wäre es nicht überraschend, wenn zumindest die erste Stufe der
späteren westoghusischen Schriftsprache Einflüsse aus den vorangegangenen ost-
türkischen Schriftsprachen aufwiese, das sind:

- das Karachanidische (entstanden im 11./12. Jh. Jahrhundert in Ostturkestan)
- das im 13. und 14. Jh. allgemein benutzte Choresmtürkische
- das Mamluk-Türkische (Ägypten, 14.–16. Jh.) In dieser Sprache ist eine be-

grenzte Anzahl von Schriften verfasst worden, die zwar literarisch durchaus als Einheit dastehen, aber sprachlich kein einheitliches Bild ergeben. Ausgehend vom osttürkischen Choresmtürkischen mit kiptschakischen Zügen, entwickelt sich diese Sprache immer mehr in Richtung Osmanisch, das auch auf der Krim benutzt wurde.

Ab dem 16. Jahrhundert werden zwei große türkische Schriftsprachen im islamisierten Bereich benutzt: das Osmanische, das ein recht homogenes Ganzes von westoghusischen gesprochenen Varietäten überdachte, und das Tschaghataische im Rest der türkisch-islamischen Welt, vor allem in Zentralasien und in den Steppenregionen, das von Sprechern recht verschiedener Varietäten benutzt wurde, die nicht einmal alle derselben Türksprachengruppe zugeordnet werden können. Das Tschaghataische ist als Fortsetzung des Karachanidischen in ungebrochener Tradition anzusehen.

Als erste These wurde davon ausgegangen, dass das Osttürkische ganz am Anfang eine Rolle bei der Entstehung des Altanatolisch-Türkischen gespielt habe, wonach die osttürkischen Merkmale recht schnell wieder verschwunden seien. Diese These ist aber nicht haltbar, da die ihr zugrunde liegende Chronologie nicht stimmt. Erstens finden sich von Anfang an auch schon Werke, die in mehr oder weniger reinem Westoghusisch verfasst wurden. Zweitens finden sich gemischtsprachige Werke mindestens bis ins 15. Jh. Doerfer (zusammenfassend 1990: 20–27) hat eine andere Hypothese aufgestellt: Die Sprache dieser Werke widerspiegele die Muttersprache von Einwanderern aus Chorasan, da das Chorasantürkische, dessen ursprüngliche Träger den weiteren Westvorstoß der Oghusen nicht mitgemacht haben, osttürkische Merkmale in der gesprochenen Sprache aufgenommen habe.

Obgleich nicht auszuschließen ist, dass der von Doerfer beschriebene Mechanismus eine Rolle gespielt hat, reicht seine These für eine Erklärung nicht aus. Erstens sind die verschiedenen osttürkischen Merkmale nicht gleichmäßig über die in Frage kommenden Werke verteilt. Zweitens finden sich einige Merkmale, die ganz typisch sind für die Schrifttradition des Choresmtürkischen. So können Autoren am Werk gewesen sein, welche, unabhängig von ihrer eigenen Mundart, ihr Handwerk primär im choresmtürkischen Umfeld gelernt hatten. Eine These über schriftsprachliche Entwicklungen, die sich ausschließlich bezieht auf die mögliche dialektale Basis dieser oder jener schriftsprachlichen Varietät, ist ohnehin mit Vorsicht zu genießen. Vor allem aber sind endgültige Lösungen des Problems ohnehin nicht möglich, solange die relevanten Texte (beispielsweise ʿAlīs *Qiṣṣa-i Yūsuf* von 1233) nicht vollständig ediert und ausgewertet sind.

Für die historische Situation des Irantürkischen ist die *olga-bolga*-Diskussion insofern relevant, dass osttürkische Merkmale sich hier länger erhalten haben als im Osmanischen. Im Osmanischen verschwanden sie fast ganz, im östlichen Bereich des Westoghusischen erhielten sich aber noch lange osttürkische Schreibtraditionen und sprachliche Merkmale in Morphologie und Lexik. Der Iran gehörte also weder ganz zum Geltungsbereich des Osmanischen noch zu dem des Tschaghataischen.

Für das irantürkische Gebiet wurden noch einmal Eroberungen von Osten her von Bedeutung, nämlich diejenigen Timurs zwischen 1370 und 1405. Von Zentralasien

aus vereinigte Timur für kurze Zeit Iran, Aserbaidschan, Irak und Ostanatolien unter seiner Herrschaft. Unter seinen Nachfolgern, den Timuriden, zerfiel zwar Timurs Großreich, aber in Iran sorgten die Timuriden das ganze 15. Jh. über (1405–1506) für eine bedeutende kulturelle Blüte, die sich auch auf Sprache und Literatur auswirkte. Das Tschaghataische, die klassische türkische Sprache Zentralasiens, entwickelte sich dadurch in engstem Zusammenhang mit dem klassischen Persischen und strahlte auch nach Westen hin aus.

Während die Timuriden mehr in Transoxanien und im östlichen Iran residierten, etablierten sich in Westiran, Irak und Ostanatolien im 15. Jh. türkische Stammeskonföderationen und schufen die Reiche der Karakoyunlu (1380–1469 in Nord- und Zentraliran) und später der Akkoyunlu (1396–1508 in Ostanatolien und Iran), deren Herrschaftszentrum im aserbaidschanischen Täbris lag (1467–1501) und die schließlich in der 2. Hälfte des 15. Jh. ein Großreich in Vorderasien beherrschten, das neben dem Kerngebiet mit Aserbaidschan, Ostanatolien und Irak auch den gesamten West- und Südiran umfasste. An deren Fürstenhöfen wurde zwar auch das Persische als Literatursprache gepflegt, aber daneben entwickelte sich jetzt eine reiche Literatur in türkischer Sprache, die besondere Bedeutung dadurch bekam, dass einige der Herrscher selbst als Dichter hervortraten. Die Entwicklung des Türkischen wurde auch dadurch gefördert, dass die türkischen Herrscher nicht nur die Herrschaft über fremde Bevölkerung ausübten, sondern dass in ihrem Gefolge eine weitere große türkische Einwanderung von Nomaden geschah, diesmal aber nicht aus dem Osten, aus Zentralasien, sondern von Westen her, aus Anatolien.

So ist das 15. Jh. also schon die Zeit einer eigenen türkischen Sprachentwicklung in Westiran, Irak und Ostanatolien, die sich absetzt von der gleichzeitigen Entwicklung im Westen und der Mitte Anatoliens, wo die Osmanen den Durchbruch schaffen und 1453 Konstantinopel erobern. Eine wichtige Komponente der Sprachentwicklung im Westiran dieser Zeit muss aber auch die durch die Timuriden verfestigte Verbindung nach Ostiran und Zentralasien, d.h. zum Tschaghataischen, gewesen sein.

Eine letzte große türkische Rückwanderung von Westen her geschah durch die Anhänger der Safawidendynastie, die zu Beginn des 16. Jh. die Macht in Iran übernahm. Die Safawiden hatten ihr Zentrum in Aserbaidschan, sie nannten sich nach ihrem Ahnherrn Safīeddīn, der etwa um 1300 in Nordwestiran einen Derwischorden begründet hatte, der sich zunehmend militärisch organisierte und der schiitischen Glaubensrichtung verschrieb. Besonderen Zulauf fand er unter türkischen Nomaden Anatoliens, die sich der osmanischen Zentralmacht verweigerten und der Safawīya als Glaubenskrieger zuströmten. Ende des 14. Jh. waren die Safawiden eine militärisch organisierte Gemeinschaft von Kriegern, die nach ihrer charakteristischen Kopfbedeckung als *Kızılbaş* bekannt waren.

Mit dem Safawidenreich (1501–1722) entstand ein festes staatliches Gebilde in Iran, das sich vom türkischen Aserbaidschan aus entwickelt hatte und das die Region endgültig vom osmanischen Reich abtrennte, und zwar nicht nur in politischer, sondern auch in religiöser Hinsicht durch Annahme der Schia als Staatsreligion. Das 16. Jh. ist von Auseinandersetzungen mit den Osmanen vor allem um die westlichen Grenzregionen gekennzeichnet, 1585 bis 1606 wird Aserbaidschan zeitweise

osmanisch. Anfang des 17. Jh. wurden dann die Grenzen im Westen so festgelegt, wie sie etwa den heutigen entsprechen, d.h. Irak wird abgetrennt. Seine größte Ausdehnung erlangt das Safawidenreich unter der Herrschaft von Schah Abbas 1588–1629.

Dass diese äußere Entwicklung auch das in Aserbaidschan gesprochene Türkisch so beeinflusste, dass es sich nun weiter getrennt vom Osmanischen entwickelte, ist leicht verständlich. Gefördert wurde seine Entwicklung natürlich dadurch, dass es die Sprache der regierenden Schicht war, weil sich die Safawiden weiterhin auf die türkische Militäraristokratie stützten. Die *Kızılbaş*-Stammesführer erhielten militärische Ämter und auch solche wie die Posten der Provinzgouverneure. Das Türkische wurde zu einer offiziellen Sprache neben dem Persischen und entwickelte sich zu einer überregionalen Sprachform mit gutem Prestige. Es diente in den politischen und kulturellen Zentren des Safawidenstaates Täbris, Kaswin und Isfahan (seit 1598) – also nicht nur in Aserbaidschan im engeren Sinne – als Verkehrssprache, die vorwiegend am Hofe und beim Militär, aber auch im Alltag gesprochen und geschrieben wurde. Im 17. Jh. wurde die Vormachtstellung der türkischen Stammesführer allmählich zurückgedrängt, aber noch zu Ende des 17. Jh. wurde von dem deutschen Persienreisenden Engelbert Kämpfer berichtet, dass „die am Perserhof gebräuchliche Sprache ... das Türkische" sei (Kaempfer 1940 [1712]:134). Dennoch gefährdete es nicht die Dominanz des Persischen, das sowohl im Alltag wie auch durch dauernde Verwendung als Kanzleisprache und hohe Literatursprache weiter die prestigereichere Sprache blieb.

Obwohl also das Türkische im Safawidenstaat die Sprache einer Elite, die Sprache der Machthaber war, gelang es ihm nicht, einen dominanten Status zu erreichen. Persisch blieb die Sprache, die dem Türkischen seinen Stempel aufdrückte, und nicht umgekehrt. Auch kulturell war die iranische Gesellschaft in diesen Jahrhunderten zweigeteilt, zumindest wie sie sich selbst sah: auf der einen Seite die unterworfenen, aber zivilisierten Perser als Städter und Bauern, auf der anderen die herrschenden Türken, trotz ihrer militärischen, ökonomischen und organisatorischen Verdienste als eher ungebildete Leute nomadischen Ursprungs betrachtet.

So ist die sprachliche Kontaktsituation der Türken in Iran vollkommen anders gewesen als die der Türken in Anatolien. Im osmanischen Anatolien gab es eine typische Eroberungssituation mit türkischer Bevölkerungsmehrheit, die Sprache der Unterworfenen lebte höchstens als Substrat weiter, und die Prestigesprachen Persisch und Arabisch spielten ihre klar definierte Rolle in Literatur und Religion. Das Türkische wurde von der Mehrheit gesprochen, und das führte zur Entwicklung einer eigenen türkischen Literatur.

Dagegen konnte sich die türkische herrschende Schicht im Safawidenreich nur auf eine türkische Bevölkerungsminderheit stützen, und die Persisch sprechende Mehrheit sicherte die Dominanz des Persischen in allen Bereichen. Die Sprache der Herrschenden gewann zwar an Prestige hinzu, und in den massiv türkisch besiedelten Gebieten Aserbaidschans konnte sie sich zur Literatursprache weiterentwickeln, sie ist aber dabei immer von starkem iranischen Sub- und Adstrat geprägt gewesen.

Für die neuere Zeit schließlich ist die Teilung des aserbaidschanischen Sprachgebiets in Nord- und Südaserbaidschanisch zu beachten. 1828 wurde Aserbaidschan

zwischen Russland und Iran aufgeteilt, und danach entwickelten sich die beiden Teile auch sprachlich in bestimmter Weise auseinander. Im Norden, in der heutigen Republik Aserbaidschan, wurde die Sprache standardisiert und zur Schriftsprache entwickelt, lexikalisch ist sie vom Russischen beeinflusst. Das iranische Süd-aserbaidschanisch von Täbris ist dagegen nur vereinzelt verschriftlicht, es fungiert als gesprochene überregionale Varietät und zeigt besonders starken persischen Einfluss auf allen Ebenen der Sprache. Ob eine derartige sprachliche Teilung vielleicht auch schon früher angelegt war und sich in schriftlichen Texten belegen lässt, bleibt zu untersuchen.

Quellen

Um ältere Sprachzeugnisse der Region fassbar zu machen, benutzen wir den Hilfs-terminus Ajem-Türkisch, was einfach "älteres Irantürkisch" meint, ohne sich auf eine bestimmte Sprachbezeichnung festzulegen. Denn da wir noch nicht genau wissen, wann und für welchen Geltungsbereich es eine überregionale irantürkische Schriftsprache gab, muss man mit eingrenzenden Bezeichnungen wie z.B. Mittel-aserbaidschanisch noch vorsichtig umgehen. Es ist vor allem die eben genannte türkische Sprachform der Safawidenzeit, von der man annehmen kann, dass sie als eine Art Koine verschiedene türkische Varietäten Irans vereinigt hat und dass sie auch über das aserbaidschanische Gebiet hinaus bis nach Südiran gereicht haben muss.

Die Bezeichnung Ajem-Türkisch beruht auf einer Fremdbezeichnung dieser Koine, *le Turc Agemi*, *lingua turcica agemica,* die der französische Missionar Raphael du Mans in der zweiten Hälfte des 17. Jh. überliefert hat (Johanson 1985: 145; 1997a: 87, 89). Mit *Acemī* ‚Persisch' war das „persische Türkisch" in Abgrenzung zum Osmanisch-Türkischen gemeint, so wie im Osmanischen der Eigenname *Acem* den Perser, aber auch insbesondere den nichtpersischen Einwohner Irans, eben den aserbaidschanischen Türken bezeichnete[3]. Ein „Perso-Türkisch" wäre demnach in umgangssprachlichem Türkisch (statt des genannten französischen bzw. lateinischen Ausdrucks) das *Acem Türkī* gewesen[4]. Die Eigenbezeichnung war meist nur *Türkī* ‚Türkisch', das aber für eine Verwendung als Terminus zu vage ist.

Grundlage der Untersuchungen zum Ajem-Türkischen sind Texte, die zwischen dem 14. und 17./18. Jh. in der Region entstanden sind. Geeignet sind dafür erstens literarische Texte, die auf Grund ihres Genres einen nicht zu hohen Sprachstandard repräsentieren (siehe dazu unten), und zweitens eine Gruppe von Quellen, die Sprachaufzeichnungen im engeren Sinne darstellen und wahrscheinlich direkter die gesprochene Sprache widerspiegeln. Das sind Materialien zum Spracherwerb für Nichttürken – Glossare, Sprachführer u.ä. – zumeist von Nichttürken verfasst und in anderen Schriftsystemen als dem arabischen notiert. Missionare verfertigten in den christlichen Klöstern Irans auch türkische Übersetzungen christlicher Texte wie z.B. der Evangelien, ebenfalls in nichtarabischer Schrift. Diese so genannten Transkrip-

---

[3] Vgl. Redhouse Sözlüğü: ‚non-Persian native of Iran, esp., a Shiite Turk from Azerbaijan'.
[4] Entsprechende umgangssprachliche osmanisch-türkische Wortzusammensetzungen sind in den Dictionarien von H. Megiser (1612) belegt: *Ajem memleket, Ajem vilaget* ‚Persarum regnum'.

tionstexte sind für phonologische Untersuchungen besonders aufschlussreich, da sie
die türkischen Vokale besser bezeichnen als die arabische Schrift. Lars Johanson
(1979) hat solche Texte in Lateinschrift für eine grundlegende Studie zur Morpho-
phonologie des Westoghusischen ausgewertet[5].

Eine ganz spezifische Quelle sind die historischen Dialektproben des osmani-
schen Reisenden Evliya Çelebi, die er in seinem Reisebuch aus dem 17. Jh. auch aus
Ostanatolien, Irak und Westiran gegeben hat. Christiane Bulut (2002a, 2002b) hat
diese Proben mit den heutigen lokalen Varietäten verglichen und in Morphologie
und Lexik eine Reihe Übereinstimmungen festgestellt.

Die literarischen Texte

Eher zu vernachlässigen ist für sprachhistorische Zwecke das Genre der lyrischen
oder Divandichtung, weil deren formale Mittel, die literarischen Stereotype, für sol-
che Untersuchungen nicht allzu günstig sind. Anders sieht es mit der erzählenden
Dichtung aus, wie etwa den romantischen Epen über Yūsuf und Züleyxā, Leyla und
Mecnūn, Varqa und Gülşāh – Themen, die im gesamten Orient verbreitet waren und
immer wieder neu gefasst wurden, zum Teil in einfacher Erzählsprache. Zum ande-
ren kommen Dichtungen didaktischen und religiösen Inhalts in Frage, die neben ei-
nem Rahmentext zum großen Teil aus Erzählungen von Heiligen, aus Fabeln und
Anekdoten bestehen. In solchen Texten kann man einen sprachlichen Standard fin-
den, der literarisch nicht zu sehr genormt ist, sondern der auch gesprochene Sprache
widerspiegelt. Am interessantesten schließlich sind die – leider nicht allzu häufigen
– Werke reiner Prosaliteratur aus dem 15. und 16. Jh., die zumeist Übersetzungen
aus dem Persischen sind.

Die Übersetzungen aus dem Persischen betrafen nicht nur die Prosa, sondern
auch die erzählende Dichtung. Ihr Höhepunkt lag im 15./16. Jh., den Zeiten der
türkischen Dynastien in Iran, die den literarischen Gebrauch des Türkischen för-
derten. Übersetzer hatten also in dieser Zeit leicht Gelegenheit, solche Werke dem
Herrscher oder einem höheren Beamten zu widmen, oder diese gaben die Überset-
zung selbst in Auftrag. Es gab aber auch eine Motivation, die aus der konkreten
Sprachsituation entstand: So begründet z.B. der Übersetzer Nişātī in der Mitte des
16. Jh. sein Vorhaben damit, dass die türkischen Sufis kein Persisch verstehen.
Diese Bemerkungen zeigen, dass der Bilingualismus der damaligen türkischen Be-
völkerung in Iran noch eingeschränkt war; es ist aber auch möglich, dass sich diese
Äußerungen nur auf das Verständnis der persischen Schriftsprache beziehen.

Für die sprachliche Untersuchung bringt eine Übersetzungsliteratur natürlich Pro-
bleme. Sie sind aber nicht immer so groß, wie man meinen könnte, weil es sich bei
den literarischen Übersetzungen oft um freie Übersetzung und teilweise eigen-
schöpferische Arbeiten handelt, wobei manchmal die Grenzen zwischen Überset-
zung und selbständigem Werk verschwimmen. Die Übersetzer verstanden sich nicht
als reine Sprachtransporteure, sondern selbst als Dichter – sie ließen nach Gutdün-

---

[5] Lars Johanson bereitet die Edition dieser Texte vor und intensiviert zur Zeit ihre Auswertung im Rahmen
des Mainzer Forschungsprojekts, in dem auch Evangelienübersetzungen in georgischer Schrift bearbeitet
werden, die auf dieselbe Vorlage wie die lateinschriftlichen zurückgehen, aber unterschiedliche Sprach-
varietäten widerspiegeln.

ken Abschnitte weg und fügten eigene ein oder verknappten eine Erzählung, aber öfter schmückten sie sie aus, um den Sinn besser verdeutlichen zu können. Und deshalb folgen diese Übersetzungen nicht nur sklavisch ihrer Vorlage, sondern geben noch genügend Aufschluss über die Sprache des Übersetzers.

Ein großer Nachteil der Übersetzungsliteratur ist der, dass man so gut wie keine Kenntnisse aus anderen Quellen, wie etwa den *tezkire*, zur Person der Übersetzer hat, außer dem, was sie am Anfang oder Ende des Textes selbst mitteilen. Die für sprachliche Untersuchungen wichtige Information zur Herkunft des Autors, um seine Sprache besser lokalisieren zu können, ist meist nur aus einer eventuellen Nisbe zu erkennen. Der Ort der Abfassung der Übersetzung ist nur in seltenen Fällen angegeben. Manchmal kann man ihn indirekt erschließen, z.B. anhand der Widmung an den Herrscher.

Im Falle der Übersetzungswerke von Nişātī liegen die Texte idealerweise als Autographen vor. Aber insgesamt sind für die Beurteilung der Sprache des Textes auch die Kopisten wichtig. Im Unterschied zu rein philologischen bzw. literaturwissenschaftlichen Absichten, nämlich den Urtext zu rekonstruieren, sind für sprachliche Untersuchungen auch die Abschriften eines Textes von Interesse. Denn falls sie sich zeitlich und örtlich einigermaßen definieren lassen, dann lassen die Veränderungen, die der Schreiber an Orthographie und Text vorgenommen hat, Rückschlüsse auf entsprechende sprachliche Veränderungen zu.

Zu den frühesten Werken der ajemtürkischen Übersetzungsliteratur gehört die erzählende Dichtung *Esrārnāme*, geschrieben im Jahre 1479/ 884 H. von einem kaum bekannten Aḥmedī Tabrīzī, der es dem Akkoyunlu-Herrscher Xalīl (1478) in der damaligen Hauptstadt Täbris zueignete[6]. Man kann also davon ausgehen, dass seine Sprache das in Täbris gesprochene Türkisch war.

Es ist – oberflächlich betrachtet – die Übersetzung des gleichnamigen Werkes von Farīduddīn 'Aṭṭār und enthält ähnlich wie die Vorlage anekdotenhafte Erzählungen, deren Helden bekannte Sufi-Meister oder anonyme Derwische in Gestalt eines *deli* oder *divane* sind, die die sufischen Lehren illustrieren sollen. Die türkische Version repräsentiert aber einen sehr freien Typ von Übersetzung, denn von ihren insgesamt 40 *hikayāt* stammen nur 3 aus dem persischen *Asrārnāme*, die übrigen sind zwei anderen, ähnlichen *mesnevi* von 'Aṭṭār entnommen, dem *Mūsibetnāme* und dem *Ilāhīnāme* – insbesondere dem ersteren –, oder stammen möglicherweise auch von Aḥmedī selbst. Aḥmedī sagt, dass er wie ein „Ährenleser aus der Scheuer von 'Aṭṭār" (*xūşeçīn-i xirmen-i 'Aṭṭār olub* [Äsrarnamä 1964 [= Hs. B-1236]: 54a; s. auch Esrâr-nâme 1996: V. 1833]) gewesen ist und diese – also kein bestimmtes Werk – aus dem Persischen ins Türkische übersetzt hat. Die einzelnen Geschichten sind gegenüber dem Original fast alle doppelt so lang, so dass hier also durchaus ein ziemlich eigenständiger Text vorliegt, der nicht nur am persischen Original klebt und demzufolge Aufschluss über die Sprache des Übersetzers geben kann.

Das Werk ist in einer Reihe von Handschriften verbreitet, und es gibt auch eine

---

[6] Er ist auch Verfasser eines zweiten Werkes, *Yūsuf ve Züleyxā*, das ebenso wie das *Esrārnāme* dem nur kurzzeitig herrschenden Xalīl (Şūfī Xalīl) gewidmet, aber auch in der Zeit seines Nachfolgers Ya'qūb (1478–1490) geschrieben ist (vgl. dazu und zu den wenigen Details zum Autor, die aus seinen Werken zu erschließen sind, Esrâr-nâme 1996: VII–XIV).

türkische Edition von 1996, die sich auf fünf – meist nicht datierte – Handschriften stützt. Für die Arbeit im Projekt werden aber vor allem zwei Handschriften aus dem Handschrifteninstitut der Aserbaidschanischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Baku benutzt, die direkt im irantürkischen Umfeld entstanden sein müssen (eine davon liegt als Faksimile-Edition vor: Gährämanov 1964). Beide Handschriften zeichnen sich durch typisch irantürkische Orthographie aus, die mit häufiger Pleneschreibung der Vokale und der Schreibung *nūn kef* für *ŋ* der osttürkischen ähnlich ist. Die „aserbaidschanischen" Sprachmerkmale des Textes, die auch die Herausgeberin der türkischen Edition erwähnt, obwohl sie die Sprache des Textes generell als Altanatolisch-Türkisch definiert (Esrâr-nâme 1996: LXV, LXVII), treten in den beiden Bakuer Handschriften stärker hervor. Die beiden Kopien sind undatiert und werden auf Anfang des 18. Jh. geschätzt.

Etwa aus der gleichen Zeit – 1494/95 –, aber aus einem Gebiet viel weiter südlich von Aserbaidschan stammt der Prosatext *Tārīx-i Xatā'ī*, die türkische Übersetzung des – nicht erhaltenen – Berichts über eine persische Gesandtschaft nach China von Ġiyāṣuddīn Naqqāš. Das persische Original wurde in der Stadt Ardestan (nördlich von Isfahan) für den türkischen Gouverneur dieser Stadt übersetzt, der kein Persisch verstand. Der Text ist als einer der frühesten Prosatexte in einfacher Sprache sprachhistorisch sehr wichtig, und er wurde von Ildikó Bellér-Hann (1995) zusammen mit einer sehr guten sprachlichen Analyse publiziert.

Noch etwas weiter fort von dem aserbaidschanischen Gebiet im engeren Sinne führen die Werke des schon erwähnten Nişātī (Muḥammed Ibn Ḥüseyn/ Muḥammed al-Kātib), der ein Sūfī aus Schiras und offensichtlich ein professioneller Übersetzer war. Er lebte während der Regierung von Šāh Ṭahmāsb I. (1524–1576) und fertigte um die Mitte des 16. Jh. zwei größere türkische Prosaübersetzungen an:

Şühedānāme (1539/ 945 h.) über die schiitischen Märtyrer von Kerbela, übersetzt nach dem persischen *Raużat aš-Šuhadā* von Ḥusain Wā'iẓ Kāšifī

und die

Teẕkere-i Şeyx Ṣafī (1542/43/ 948 h.), die Biographie des Begründers der Safawidendynastie, übersetzt aus *Ṣafvatu'ṣ-ṣafā* von (Darwīš Tawakkul) Ibn Bazzāz Ardabīlī.

In der Vorrede zur Biographie von Şeyx Ṣafī (ähnlich in der des *Şühedānāme*) teilt Nişātī mit, dass das persische Werk *Taẕkirat-al Awliyā* (*Ṣafvatu'ṣ-ṣafā*) auf Persisch geschrieben ist, aber „dass die türkischen Novizen und Sufis das Persische nicht verstehen und deshalb seines Nutzens beraubt sind. Aber wenn es ins Türkische gebracht würde, werden alle türkischen Müriden, ja sogar alle Leute von Türkistan, daran teilhaben können" (*Haẕret şeyxüŋ teẕkeresi ... ol haẕretüŋ sohbetinde yazılmış idi, fārsī dili ilen dür, ve türk ṭālibler ile sūfiler pārsī dili aŋlamazlar, ma'lūm itmedüginden fāydasından maḥrūm qalurlar; eger türkiye dönse qamu türk mürīdler, belki bitün Türkistān adamları, andan behremand olurlar* – 4b). Diese Feststellungen weisen darauf hin, dass eine Zweisprachigkeit der Türken in dieser Zeit noch nicht voll ausgeprägt war, zumindest unter den der Safawiya zugeström-

ten *Kızılbaş*, die mit diesen Werken angesprochen werden sollten, um als schiitische Propagandisten zu wirken.

Gegenüber dem *Esrārnāme* gehören die Übersetzungen von Nişātī nicht zu dem sehr freien Typ, sie halten sich enger an die persische Vorlage. Sie spiegeln keine kompliziert literarische, sondern eine relativ einfache türkische Sprache wider. Deutlich wird das z.B. bei einem Vergleich des *Şühedānāme* mit dem *Ḥadiqat as-süʿedāʾ* von Fużūlī, das auf der gleichen Vorlage beruht, aber einen literarisch und sprachlich höheren Standard repräsentiert (vgl. Nağısoylu 2003: 137–140). Die beiden Texte Nişātīs sind sehr umfangreich (338 bzw. 527 Bll.) und noch nicht publiziert; einige Textbeispiele sind zu finden in Nağısoylu 2003.

Sprachmerkmale

Ziel der Untersuchungen ist unter anderem festzustellen, inwieweit es eine frühere irantürkische Koine (Ajem-Türkisch, „lingua turcica agemica", Mittelaserbaidscha-nisch) mit gemeinsamen Merkmalen gegeben hat, und inwieweit diese Sprache mit den heute dort existierenden Sprachvarietäten in Verbindung gebracht werden kann. Dazu soll aus den verschiedenen Quellen ein Merkmalkatalog erarbeitet werden.

Im folgenden sollen zwei sprachliche Merkmale besprochen werden, die im Kontext verschiedener Kontakteinflüsse zu sehen sind: das betrifft zum einen den persischen Einfluss, zum zweiten die Beziehungen zum Osttürkischen, und in beiden Fällen ist der Stand der Sprache gegenüber dem gleichzeitigen und älteren Osmanischen bzw. Altanatolisch-Türkischen zu betrachten, dem unmittelbaren und am engsten verwandten Rivalen des Ajem-Türkischen.

Einfluss des Persischen

In den Übersetzungen des Nişātī führt die enge Anlehnung an die persische Vorlage zu vielen Ähnlichkeiten, insbesondere auf den Gebieten der Syntax und der Lexik. Was die Syntax betrifft, gibt es zwar auch typisch türkische Konstruktionen mit infiniten Verbformen, die einen persischen Satz mit finiter Verbform ersetzen, insgesamt aber wird deutlich, dass sich der Übersetzer recht eng an die persische Satzkonstruktion hält. Sehr auffällig ist das bei Relativsätzen:

(1)

Badān	*amr-ī*	*ki*	*farmūda-and*	*hālā*		*maşġūl*	*ast*
PRÄP-DEM	Befehl:SPEZ	KONJ	befehl:PERF3PL	noch		beschäftigt	KOP:3SG

Ol	*nesteye*	*ki*	*aŋa*	*buyurmış idiler*	*meşġūl*	*oldı*
DEM	Sache:DAT	KONJ	er:DAT	befehl:PLUSQU3PL	beschäftigt	sei:PRÄT3SG

‚Er war noch mit dem, was sie (ihm) befohlen hatten, beschäftigt.'

(Nağısoylu 2003: 159; Şüh 155b)

(2)

Qāsim	ba	ḥaima-ī	ki	mādar-aš	bā	ʿarūs	dar ān ğā
Qāsem	PRÄP	Zelt:SPEZ	KONJ	Mutter:POSS3SG	PRÄP	Braut	dort

Qasım	bir	çadıra	ki	anası	ilen	gelini	anda
Qasım	INDEF	Zelt:DAT	KONJ	Mutter:POSS3SG	PPOS	Braut: POSS3SG	dort

būdand	rawān šud
KOP:	komm:
PRÄT3PL	PRÄT3SG

idiler	geldi
KOP:	komm:
PRÄT3PL	PRÄT3SG

‚Qasım kam zu dem/einem Zelt, in dem seine Mutter und seine Braut waren.‘

(Nağısoylu 2003: 159, Şüh 273a)

(3)

Birādar-i buzurgtar	ki	nām-aš	Muḥammad	būd	az
älterer Bruder	KONJ	Name:POSS3SG	EN	KOP-PRÄT3SG	PRÄP

Büyük qardaşı	ki	adı	Muhammed	idi	
älterer Bruder POSS3SG	KONJ	Name:POSS3SG	EN	KOP-PRÄT3SG	

ḥ ʷāb	bīdār šud	wa	ba	birādar-i kamtar
Schlaf	erwach:	und	PRÄP	jüngerer Bruder
	PRÄT3SG			

uyxudan	uyandı	ve		kiçi qardaşına
Schlaf:ABL	erwach:	und		jüngerer Bruder:
	PRÄT3SG			POSS3SG-DAT

ki	nām-aš	Ibrahīm	bud	guft
KONJ	Name:	EN	KOP-PRÄT3SG	sag:PRÄT3SG
	POSS3SG			

kim	adı	Ibrahim	idi	dedi
KONJ	Name:	EN	Kop-Prät3Sg	sag:PRÄT3SG
	POSS3SG			

‚Sein älterer Bruder, dessen Name Mohammad war, erwachte aus dem Schlaf und sagte zu seinem jüngeren Bruder, dessen Name Ibrahim war...‘

(Nağısoylu 2003: 159; Şüh 191b)

Die Gegenüberstellung zeigt deutlich die Übereinstimmung der türkischen Konstruktion mit dem persischen (bzw. indoeuropäischen) Muster eines dem Bezugswort nachgestellten Relativsatzes mit dem Relativpronomen *ki*. Die genuin türkische Methode dagegen wäre ein dem Bezugswort vorangestellter Relativsatz

mit einer infiniten Verbform als Attribut zum Bezugswort, d.h. dem -*DIQ*-Partizip in Bsp. 1 (*buyurmuş oldukları işle meşgul oldı*) und 2 (*Qasım, içinde anasıyle gelinin bulundukları* [*bir*] *çadıra geldi*) oder dem *-(y)An*-Partizip bei einem mit „dessen/deren" eingeleiteten Relativsatz in Bsp. 3 (*adı Muhammed olan büyük kardeşi …*).

Die Konstruktion nach persischem Muster wird sowohl für restriktive (Bsp. 1) wie appositive (Bsp. 3) Relativsätze verwendet. Dabei wird die Bestimmtheit des Bezugsnomens im Türkischen durch Verwendung eines vorausweisenden Demonstrativpronomens verdeutlicht (s. Bsp. 1: *ol nesteye ki*), während das Demonstrativpronomen im Persischen neben dem *yā-ye išārat* nur eine zusätzliche Möglichkeit darstellt, die Bestimmtheit zur Einleitung des Relativsatzes zu markieren (*badān amr-ī ki …*). Allerdings ergeben sich im Persischen auch zweideutige Fälle durch die mögliche Verwendung des -*ī* als *yā-ye waḥdat*, das ursprünglich Unbestimmtheit markiert, in Verbindung mit dem Relativsatz aber auch Spezifizierung ausdrücken kann. In Bsp. 2 interpretiert der Übersetzer das persische *ba ḫaima-ī ki … dar ān ğā*, das wohl eigentlich ein bestimmtes Bezugsnomen mit restriktivem Relativsatz meint (‚zu dem Zelt, in dem …') in unbestimmt-spezifischem Sinne durch Verwendung des türkischen *bir çadıra* ‚zu einem gewissen Zelt'. Die Unterscheidung, ob es sich um einen restriktiven oder appositiven Relativsatz handelt, bleibt auch in der türkischen *ki*-Version offen.

Bei der Ähnlichkeit solcher Sätze mit ihrem Original könnte man an einen individuellen Einfluss der persischen Vorlage denken. Sie ist aber wohlbekannt als Kontakterscheinung der Türksprachen, die mit dem Persischen in enge Berührung kamen. Die systematische Ersetzung türkischer Nebensätze mit infiniten Verbformen zugunsten des persischen Modells mit einleitenden Konjunktoren ist schon ein Charakteristikum des Altanatolisch-Türkischen bzw. Altosmanischen und sicher zum Teil auch auf die Übersetzungstätigkeit zurückzuführen. Besonders das persische System der Relativsatzkonstruktionen war voll ausgeprägt, zumindest in frühen altanatolisch-türkischen Texten (vgl. dazu Bulut im Druck, die vor allem Beispiele aus Texten des 13. Jh. herangezogen hat). Aber schon in einem altosmanischen Werk vom Ende des 14. Jh. sind dann türkische Partizipialkonstruktionen in Relativsätzen schon durchaus geläufig (so hat das *Marzubānnāme* schon 38 Beispiele für attributives -*DIQ*, vom Typ *dedügi söz*, s. Kleinmichel 1970: 118–119). Und im Mittelosmanischen seit dem 16. Jh. lassen die persischen Strukturen erheblich nach – wie Christiane Bulut für Evliya Çelebi feststellte, werden sie fast ausschließlich für appositive Relativsätze (Bulut 1997: 107–108) verwendet.

Erhalten und weiter ausgeprägt hat sich das persische System dann im gesamten Irantürkischen. Im *Tārīx-i Xaṭā'ī*, dem Prosatext aus Zentraliran vom Ende des 15. Jh., dominieren eindeutig die Konstruktionen nach persischem Muster:

ol orduya ki padışah qonmuş idi yetdiler
‚they reached the camp where the emperor was staying';

für türkisch geprägte Relativsätze mit –*DIQ* finden sich im gesamten Text nur 3 Beispiele:

anlarïng oturduğï yerlärdä
‚the place where they had sat'

pādišāh mindügi atïng cälüvinä yapmïšlar
‚they held the reins of the horse which the emperor had mounted‘

gätürdükläri atlar …
‚the horses which they had brought‘

(Bellér-Hann 1995: 106)

Von den heutigen türkischen Varietäten Irans und seiner Nachbargebiete hat die nordaserbaidschanische Standardsprache die Relativsätze mit *ki* zugunsten der türkischen Partizipien schon etwas zurückgedrängt und eher in die gesprochene Sprache verwiesen. Auch im Iraktürkischen hat osmanischer bzw. türkeitürkischer Einfluss dazu geführt, dass hier auch im Bereich der Relativsätze türkische infinite Verbformen regelmäßig verwendet werden. (Bulut 1999: 23). Im Südaserbaidschanischen aber und anderen irantürkischen Varietäten sind die iranischen Muster praktisch alleinherrschend, wobei für restriktive Relativsätze die dem obigen Bsp. (1) entsprechende Struktur mit vorausweisendem Demonstrativpronomen dominiert:

O qizi ki istiller alallar oγlannarïna
‚Das Mädchen, das sie wünschen, nehmen sie für ihren Sohn.‘ (Bayadistan; nach Bulut im Druck)

O kiši ki dünän bizä geldi Almanda därs oxur
‚Der Mann, der gestern zu uns kam, studiert in Deutschland.‘ (Kıral 2001: 107)

Im Täbrisaserbaidschanischen sind türkische Relativsatztypen nur eine Randerscheinung und auf restriktive Relativsätze mit dem Partizip *-(y)An* in meist substantivierter Verwendung oder attributiv mit indefinit-spezifischem Bezugsnomen beschränkt:

sän istäyän ǧïz čox četin tapïlar
‚Das [besser: ‚ein‘ – H.S.] Mädchen, das du [heiraten] möchtest, ist schwer zu finden.‘

(Kıral 2001: 98)

So zeigen die Beispiele des *Şühedānāme* zwar eine dem persischen Original sehr ähnliche Übersetzung, das muss aber im geschilderten Zusammenhang nicht heißen, dass es der irantürkischen Sprache jener Zeit nicht entspricht. Gegenüber dem Osmanischen der gleichen Zeit, das sich persischem Einfluss in diesem Bereich schon weitgehend entzogen hat, spiegelt er sich im Irantürkischen als offenbar ganz kontinuierlich weitergeführte Tradition.

Osttürkischer Einfluss

Ein anderes Merkmal beleuchtet die Stellung des Ajem-Türkischen zwischen östlichen Türksprachen und dem Osmanischen. Es wurde schon in einer zeitgenössischen Quelle erwähnt, nämlich in der türkischen Grammatik von Pietro Della Valle, die er 1620 in Isfahan (in italienischer Sprache) verfasst hatte. Es handelt sich dabei zwar um eine Grammatik des Osmanisch-Türkischen, der Verfasser geht aber in ihr auch darauf ein, dass in Iran ein östliches *Türkī* gesprochen und geschrieben werde, nämlich die Sprache der *Kızılbaş*, die sich in mancherlei Hinsicht vom Osmani-

schen unterscheide. Diese türkische Sprache sei „in allen Gebieten, die zu Persien gehören, so allgemein gebräuchlich wie das Persische, sowohl bei der türkischen Bevölkerung wie bei den *Kızılbaş*" (vgl. Stein 2005: 230) – also in den unteren und oberen Gesellschaftsschichten.

Ein Merkmal dieses östlichen *Türkī*, das Della Valle ausdrücklich als Abweichung vom gleichzeitigen osmanischen Sprachgebrauch anführt, ist eine Perfektform auf *-(y)UB*, verbunden mit den Kopulasuffixen der ersten bis dritten Person. Er bezeichnet sie – genauso wie die Form auf *-mIş* – als „näheres Perfekt" *(Perfetto più vìcino)* und gibt die Beispiele: s*evübüm* ‚ich habe geliebt‘, s*evübsen*, *sevüb* oder *sevübdür*.

Das zugrundeliegende Morphem hat in den Türksprachen die hauptsächliche Funktion eines Konverbs, einer Gerundialform zur Satzverknüpfung:

gel-ip oturdu ‚kommend setzte sie sich‘ → ‚sie kam und setzte sich‘

Ausgehend davon kann es zusammen mit einem Verb, das als Hilfsverb fungiert, eine sogenannte postverbiale Verbindung (deskriptives Verb) bilden, die zum Ausdruck von Aktionsarten dient. Im heutigen Standardtürkischen ist eine solche Verbindung z.B. im Sinne eines Durativs vorhanden:

yazıp durur ‚sie schreibt dauernd‘

Der Anwendungsbereich dieser Konstruktionen ist aber begrenzt und auch eher der gesprochenen Sprache zuzurechnen.

Diese Konstruktionen spielen eine größere Rolle in vielen anderen Türksprachen, wo sie weiter lexikalisiert oder grammatikalisiert werden können. Im Falle der Verbindung *-(I)B tur-* kann die Grammatikalisierung zur Bildung einer finiten Perfektform mit zumeist indirektiven Funktionen führen (s. dazu Johanson 1990: 143–145; 2000: 72–73), die eine Handlung vom erreichten Ergebnis her betrachtet oder als Zweitbericht wiedergibt:

yazıp turur ‚sie steht geschrieben habend‘ → ‚sie hat (offensichtlich) geschrieben‘

Daraus leiten sich selbständige Morpheme ab, in denen sich das Verb *tur-* zu *-(I)BDIr* oder *-(I)BDI* verkürzt hat, sich als *-(I)BDI* auf die 3. Person beschränkt oder mit *-(I)B* ganz verschwindet, z.B turkmenisch *yazıpdırın, yazıpdırsıŋ, yazıpdır*, uigurisch *kiriptimen, kiriptisen, kiripti* („momentanes Präteritum") oder usbekisch *yåzibman, yåzibsan, yåzipti*.

Für die oghusischen Sprachen insgesamt ist dagegen das Morphem *-mIş* charakteristisch als Vertreter der indirektiven Kategorie. Im westlichen Westoghusischen – also im Türkeitürkischen – herrscht *-mIş* heute allein und hat stabile indirektive Funktionen. Im Turkmenischen, im äußersten Osten des oghusischen Gebiets, spielt es dagegen als Verbform nur noch eine untergeordnete Rolle, und die fast alleinige Verwendung von *-(I)ptIr* zeigt, wie stark die östlichen Türksprachen das Turkmenische beeinflusst haben.

Im heutigen Irantürkischen ist deutlich eine Mittelstellung zwischen Ost und West darin zu erkennen, dass hier *-mIş* und die Formen mit *-(y)Ib* oder *-(y)Ibdl* (jetzt im Gegensatz zum Osttürkischen mit Bindekonsonant *y*) nebeneinander exi-

stieren und z.T. ein regelrechtes gemeinsames Paradigma mit einer gemeinsamen Funktion als Perfekt bilden. Allen Varietäten gemeinsam ist der Gebrauch von *-(y)Ib* oder *-(y)IbdI* oder *-(y)IbdIr* in der 3. Person; in der 1. Person wird im allgemeinen *-mIş* verwendet, und in der 2. Person ist der Gebrauch unterschiedlich:

(Nord-)Aserbaidschanisch: *-(y)Ib[dIr]*
1.Sg.:   *içmişäm*
2.Sg.:   *içmişsän* oder *içibsän*
3.Sg.:   *içmişdir oder içibdir*
‚sie hat (offensichtlich?) getrunken‘

(Rahmati & Buğday 1998: 53)

Der Gebrauch des *-(y)Ib* wird als typisch für die gesprochene Sprache angegeben (Budagova 1982: 81)

Das Täbrisaserbaidschanische gebraucht *-(y)Ib[di]* für das Perfekt in der 3. Person, während in den 1. und 2. Personen *-mIş* verwendet wird. Es handelt sich um ein einfaches Perfekt; indirektive Funktionen sind nicht vorhanden (Kıral 2001: 67–69):

(Süd-)Aserbaidschanisch (Täbris): nur in der 3.Sg. als *-(y)Ib[di]*
1.Sg.:   *içmişäm*
2.Sg.:   *içmişsän*
3.Sg.:   *içib* oder *içibdi*   ‚sie hat getrunken‘

Die gleiche Situation ist in den irantürkischen Übergangsdialekten (z.B. Bayadistan) zu beobachten; nur das isolierte Sonqori weist eigenartigerweise ein vollständiges *-mIş*-Paradigma auf (Bulut 1999: 22).

Im Iraktürkischen dagegen ist der Gebrauch von *-mIş-* auf die 1. Person beschränkt; in den 2. und 3. Personen wird *-(y)Ip* verwendet, und ein Ort hat *-(y)Ip* in allen Personen (Bulut 1999: 22). Der Gebrauch der verkürzten Form *-(y)Ip* im Iraktürkischen wird auch dadurch nicht gestört, dass das Morphem daneben in seiner gerundialen Funktion verbreitet ist, während dies im Irantürkischen nicht der Fall ist.

Im Südoghusischen (Aynallu, Kaschkay) ist das *-IB*-Perfekt heute am meisten ausgeprägt, denn es ist in allen Personen die gebräuchlichste Perfektform (regellos neben *-DI* und *-mIş*) (Kowalski 1937: 62–63):

Aynallu:
1.Sg.   *išidebän* ‚ich habe gehört‘
2.Sg.   *išidebäŋ* ‚du hast gehört‘
3.Sg.   *bişirip* ‚hat gebacken‘, *säslänip-de* ‚hat geschrieen‘
1.Pl.   *ičebäk* ‚wir haben getrunken‘
3.Sg.   *ileblär* ‚sie haben getan‘

Kaschkay:
1.Sg.   *vürübåm* ‚ich schlug‘
3.Sg.   *vürüp* ‚er schlug‘, *såluptur* ‚er warf‘ (Kowalski 1937: 63)

Was die Funktion des Morphems betrifft, so haben sämtliche irantürkische Varietäten (außer vielleicht dem Nordaserbaidschanischen) eine prinzipielle Gemeinsamkeit: sie benutzen dieses gemischte Paradigma von *-mIş* und *-(y)Ip* nicht mehr als

Indirektive, sondern aus beiden ist ein einfaches Perfekt geworden, dessen indirektive Bedeutung nicht mehr oder nur noch vage vorhanden ist und sich meist auf die resultative Nuance beschränkt. Es ist ein Perfekt mit gewissem Präsensbezug: die vergangene Handlung ist noch von Belang für die Gegenwart. Dieser Verlust der indirektiven Funktionen im Irantürkischen ist sehr wahrscheinlich auf den Einfluss des Persischen zurückzuführen, das nur über *eine* Perfektform – zudem mit formaler Ähnlichkeit (Partizip + Kopula) – mit höchstens vagen indirektiven Bedeutungen verfügt (pers. *āmade ast* ‚sie ist gekommen‘).

Man könnte heute diese Perfektform als ein gemeinsames Merkmal für irantürkische Varietäten betrachten, die sie in Beziehung zu den ostoghusischen und den östlichen Türksprachen setzt. Ein Blick in die Vergangenheit zeigt aber, dass sie früher – im Gegensatz zu heute – auch im westlichen Bereich des oghusischen Sprachgebiets verbreitet war.

Im Tschaghataischen (und ähnlich auch im Choresmtürkischen) funktionierte das volle Paradigma in allen Personen in der längeren Form mit *tur-* (auch *turur*), und für die 1. und 2. Person auch verkürzt. Die indirektive Bedeutung ist verringert, da auch andere Indirektivformen zur Verfügung stehen. Im wesentlichen wird ein resultatives Perfekt mit Bezug zur Gegenwart ausgedrückt:

Tschaghataisch: *-(I)p tur-*
1.Sg. *köräp tur män* oder *köräp män*
2.Sg. *köräp tur sän* oder *köräp sän*
3.Sg. *köräp tur*

(Bodrogligeti 2001: 241, 243)

Ähnlich wie die älteren osttürkischen Schriftsprachen kannte auch das Altanatolisch-Türkische diese Form als ein im allgemeinen resultatives Perfekt mit Präsensbezug. In Übersetzungen aus dem Persischen wird sie neben *-mIşdUr* für das persische Perfekt verwendet, z.B.:

aduŋa čoq medḥ edüb ṭururın (für pers. *gofte-am*) (*Ǧavāmiʿ al-ḥikāyāt wa lawāmiʿ ar-riwāyāt*, 15. Jh.)
‚ich habe deinen Namen oft gelobt‘ (Römer 1981: 102)

Es erscheint meist in der Form *-(y)UB* mit Bindekonsonant *-y-* und rundem Vokal in zwei Varianten:
1) mit erhaltenem Verb *-dur*[7]:

biz ḥāżır olup dururuz (ʿĀşıqpaşazāde 15. Jh.)
‚wir sind bereit‘ (Kissling 1936: 55; vgl. auch Adamović 1979: 204)

gördi ol ağaç üzerinde bir ılan sarmaşub durur (Marzubānnāme 14. Jh.)
‚er sah: oben auf jenem Baum hat sich eine Schlange herumgewunden‘ (Kleinmichel 1970: 381)

2) Sehr geläufig im 14. und 15. Jh. ist die verkürzte Form *-(y)UbdUr* in der 3. Person:

---

[7] Adamović (1979: 203–204) möchte diese Form nicht als Perfekt, sondern als reinen Durativ verstehen.

çün qız gördiki afsūn aṣar edübdür (Qırq Vezir 15. Jh.)
‚als das Mädchen sah, dass die List Eindruck mache‘ [besser: ‚machte, gemacht hat‘ – H.S.]
(Duda 1930: 102)

ḥikmet ehlinden gelübdür ki (Marzubānnāme 14. Jh.)
‚von den Männern der Weisheit ist auf uns gekommen, dass …‘ (Kleinmichel 1970: 382)

Weniger häufig erscheinen Belege für die 1. und 2. Person der verkürzten Form
-(y)UB-:

daxi dün gelübsin sen bu ava (Süheyl-ü Nevbahār 14. Jh.)
‚erst gestern bist du zu dieser Jagd gekommen‘ (s. Adamović 1979: 202)

olubvan, qılupsın (Feraḥnāme 15. Jh. – Nemeth 1919: 153)

yana yana kül olubam ‚ich bin zu Asche verbrannt‘ (Yunus Emre 13./14. Jh. – s. Adamović
1979: 203)

In einigen Texten kommen in der 3. Person neben *-(y)UbdUr* auch Belege für
-(y)UbdI vor:

basubdı ‚er hat gedrückt‘ (ʿĀşıqpaşazāde, vor 15. Jh.)
turaq ediptiler ‚sie haben haltgemacht‘ (Ahmet Harāmī 14. Jh. – nach Onay 1946: 7)
qalupdı ‚ist geblieben‘, *varupdı* ‚ist gegangen‘ (Feraḥnāme 15. Jh. – Nemeth 1919: 153)

Sie werden von den Bearbeitern als gebundene *id*-Formen (< *basub idi*) interpretiert
(aber nicht als Vorvergangenheit übersetzt). Es ist aber auch möglich, dass man
schon hier mit Belegen für das im Irantürkischen verbreitete *-IbdI*-Perfekt der 3.
Person zu tun hat, dessen *-dI* die verkürzte Kopula *-dIr* darstellt.

In der weiteren Entwicklung des Osmanischen verschwand die Perfektform auf
-(y)Ub völlig, und nur die postverbiale Verbindung mit durativer Bedeutung ist im
heutigen Türkisch partiell erhalten. Diese Entwicklung ging im Osmanischen kon-
form mit der Stärkung der Rolle des Morphems *-(y)Ub* als Konverb, das seit dem
16. Jh. als türkisches Mittel zur Satzverknüpfung mit infiniten Verbformen ausge-
baut wurde (*gelib oturdu*) und die iranische Methode der Verbindung mit Konjunk-
tion (*geldi ve oturdu*) allmählich verdrängte. Im östlichen Bereich dagegen, wie das
oben angeführte Zitat von Della Valle belegt und wie es die weitere Entwicklung
des Ajem-Türkischen oder Aserbaidschanischen zeigt, hat sich das ursprünglich
nichtoghusische *-(I)p*-Perfekt neben dem oghusischen *-mIş*-Perfekt verbreitet, wo-
bei es meist als *-(y)UB* mit Bindekonsonant und Labialvokal erscheint.

In Texten des 15. Jh. ähnelt die Situation noch dem Altanatolisch-Türkischen; die
Form tritt vorwiegend in der 3. Person mit *-dUr*, selten mit *-durur*, auf:

Esrārnāme (1479): *-(y)UBDUr* (nach 2 Hss. des Handschrifteninstituts Baku):
çoq belāya uğradıpdur o beni (Äsrarnamä 1964 [= Hs. B-1236]: 2a)
çoq belāya uğradupdur ol meni (Hs. B-5266: 45a)
‚viel Unglück hat er mich erleiden lassen‘

Ḥaqq aydur kim ölmeyüpdür vardur ol (Äsrarnamä 1964 [= Hs. B-1236]: 16a)
Allāh aydur ölmeyüpdür vardur ol (Hs. B-5266: 60a)
‚Gott sprach: jener ist nicht gestorben, er ist da‘

urubdurur ‚er hat geschlagen‘ (Xälilov 1988: 153)

Ähnlich hat *Tārīx-i Xatā'ī* (1494/95) aus Zentraliran ausschließlich Belege für die 3. Person in der verkürzten Form *-(y)UBDUr*. Zur Funktion bemerkt Bellér-Hann (1995: 101): „It is used to express a completed action, the current effects of which to the present are being emphasized. It may also refer to the continuity of the action. … These functions, however, are hard to separate in the examples":

xäbär yetdi ki muhammed beg yūnus xānïŋ elini čapubdur
‚news came that Muhammad Beg had raided Yūnus Khān's country‘

vä däxi yemišlär ki xatāda olur vä bu mämläkätdä yoxdur vä kimsä ešitmäyübdür
‚and fruit which grow in China but which cannot be found in this country and nobody has ever heard of them‘ (Bellér-Hann 1995: 101)

Irantürkische Texte des 16. Jh. wie das *Şühedānāme* (1539) weisen dann einen recht großen Geltungsbereich des *-(y)UB*-Perfekts auf, die Formen erscheinen hier in allen Personen:

1.Sg. *men seni İmam Ḥüseynüŋ savaşına gönderübem* (219a)
‚ich habe dich in Imam Hüseyns Kampf geschickt‘
buraya yetübem ‚ich habe diesen Ort erreicht‘ (212a)

2.Sg. *anı ne ad qoyubsan* ‚wie hast du ihn genannt?‘ (140b)

3.Sg. *dediler ki çox müddetdür ki ol sayru düşübdür*
‚sie sagten, dass es eine lange Zeit her ist, dass er erkrankt ist‘ (175b)

1.Pl. *gelübüz* ‚wir sind gekommen‘ (224a)

Ebenso finden sich diese Formen in Texten eines höheren literarischen Standards, nämlich der lyrischen und erzählenden Dichtung Fużūlīs, der sein Leben in Bagdad in der ersten Hälfte des 16. Jh. verbrachte:

1.Sg. *olubem ġarqa…* ‚ich bin ein Ertrinkender‘

2.Sg. *Mecnūndan olup mısen haberdār?* ‚Hast du Nachricht von Mecnun?‘

3.Sg. *ādet olupdur cefā sana* ‚Grausamkeit ist dir zur Gewohnheit geworden‘
qan ile ṭolubdurur ‚wurde (ist) mit Blut gefüllt‘ (nach Korkmaz & Olcay 1956: 26–27)

In den bisher genannten Texten wird die Form immer neben dem vollen Paradigma von *-mIş* praktisch synonym gebraucht. Es ist beim gegenwärtigen Stand noch nicht möglich, die etwaige Verteilung indirektiver Funktionen für beide genau festzustellen. Die Beispiele für *-(y)UB* weisen aber darauf hin, dass es sich dabei in den irantürkischen Texten im wesentlichen um eine resultative Perfektfunktion mit präsentischem Bezug handelt. Dazu passt auch die Definition „näheres Perfekt" in der Grammatik von Pietro Della Valle zu Anfang des 17. Jh.s, der den Gebrauch der Form in allen Personen angibt:

1.Sg. *ben seuubum* ‚jo amai‘
2.Sg. *sen seuubsen* ‚tu amasci‘
3.Sg. *seuùb* oder *seuubdur* (Della Valle, fol. 76a – Stein 2005: 236–237)

Dagegen wird in der Grammatik des Paters Raphael du Mans über die „lingua turcica agemica" (1684) der Gebrauch für die erste Person verneint (Johanson 1997a: 95), der sich damit schon dem heutigen Aserbaidschanischen nähert:

2.Sg. *gelupsen* ‚uenisti'
3.Sg. *geluptur* ‚uenit'

Für das 17. Jh. sind auch die von Evliya Çelebi überlieferten türkischen Dialektproben aus Ostanatolien und Iran aufschlussreich, die *-(y)UB* ebenfalls nur für die zweite und dritte Person ausweisen, wie z.B.:

1.Sg. *tanımamışam* (Täbris)
2.Sg. *sındırmışsan* und *neyleyibsen* (beide Ostanatolien)
3.Sg. *olupdur* (Täbris) und *çıxıpdır* (Ostanatolien)
(vgl. dazu im einzelnen Bulut 2002a: 96–98, und 2002b: 60)

Die beigegebenen osmanischen Übersetzungen (insbesondere mit *-DI*-Präteritum für die 1.Sg.) bezeugen schon den Verlust der indirektivischen Funktionen des gemischten Perfektparadigmas im Irantürkischen, womit sich erweist, dass dieses zum Ende des 17. Jh. wohl schon im wesentlichen dem heutigen Stand entsprach.

Der historische Rückblick zeigt auch für dieses für das Irantürkische typische Merkmal der Morphosyntax, dass es sich hier nicht etwa um jüngere Einflüsse aus ostoghusischen oder osttürkischen Sprachen handelt, sondern dass es eingebettet ist in eine längere Entwicklung der innertürkischen Sprachgeschichte, in der der osttürkische Einfluss bzw. die sprachliche Abgrenzung davon noch weiter reichende Bedeutung hatte als heute. Für das Ajem-Türkische ist das Ausmaß auch dieser Einflüsse für die Zeit zwischen dem 15. und 17. Jh. noch genauer zu bestimmen.

Literatur

Adamović, Milan 1985. *Konjugationsgeschichte der türkischen Sprache*. Leiden: Brill.

Äsrarnamä 1964. *Äsrarnamä (älyazmasïnïn fotofaksimile, sözlük vä izahatï)*. Qährämanov, Cahangir (ed.) Bakï: Azärbaycan SSR Elmlär Akad. Näšriyyatï.

Bellér-Hann, Ildikó: *A History of Cathay. A Translation and Linguistic Analysis of a Fifteenth-Century Turkic Manuscript*. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University 1995.

Bodrogligeti, András J. E. 2001. *A Grammar of Chagatay*. (Languages of the world/Materials 155) München: Lincom Europa.

Boeschoten, Hendrik 2005. Some Notes on „Mixed" Written Western Oghuz Turkic. In: Csató, Éva Ágnes & Isaksson, Bo & Jahani, Carina (eds.) *Linguistic convergence and areal diffusion. Case studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. London & New York: RoutledgeCurzon, 215–226.

Budagova, Zarifa 1982. *Azerbajdžanskij jazyk (kratkij očerk)*. Baku: Elm.

Bulut, Christiane 1997. *Evliya Çelebis Reise von Bitlis nach Van. Ein Auszug aus dem Seyahatname*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Bulut, Christiane 1999. Klassifikatorische Merkmale des Iraktürkischen. In: *Orientalia Suecana* 48, 5–27.

Bulut, Christiane 2002a. Türkische Dialekte der Übergangsgebiete nach Evliya Çelebi. In: Demir, Nurettin & Turan, Fikret (eds.) *Scholarly depth and accuracy. A Festschrift to Lars Johanson*. Ankara: Grafiker, 83–100.

Bulut, Christiane 2002b. Evliya Çelebi as a linguist and dialectologist: 17th century East Anatolian and Azeri Turkic dialects. In: Tezcan, Nuran & Atlansoy, Kadir (eds.) *Evliya Çelebi ve Seyahatname*. Gazimağusa: Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi Yayınları, 49–64.

Bulut, Christiane (im Druck). Syntactical traces of Turkic-Iranian contiguity. In: Johanson, Lars & Bulut, Christiane (eds.) *Turkic-Iranian contact areas. Historical and linguistic aspects*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Della Valle [1620]. *Grammatica della lingua turca di Pietro della Valle il pellegrino, divisa in sette libri*, Vatican Library (Catalogo MAI, Nr. 40).

Doerfer, Gerhard 1990. Die Stellung des Osmanischen im Kreise des Oghusischen und seine Vorgeschichte. In: Hazai, György (ed.) *Handbuch der türkischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Teil I. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó, 13–34.

Duda, Herbert W. 1930. *Die Sprache der* Qyrq Vezir-*Erzählungen. I. Teil: Formenlehre*. Leipzig: Eduard Pfeiffer.

Esrâr-nâme 1996. *Tebrîzli Ahmedî: Esrâr-nâme. İnceleme – Metin*. Ayan, Gönül (ed.) Ankara: Atatürk Kültür Merkezi 1996.

Johanson, Lars 1979. Die westoghusische Labialharmonie. In: *Orientalia Suecana* 27–28. 63–107.

Johanson, Lars 1985. Die mittelaserbaidschanischen Transkriptionstexte der Universitätsbibliothek Uppsala, in: *Beşinci Milletler Arası Türkoloji Kongresi. Tebliğler. Türk dili I,*. Istanbul, 143–147.

Johanson, Lars 1990. Zur Postterminalität türkischer syndetischer Gerundien. In: *Uralaltaische Jahrbücher* N.F. 9, 137–151.

Johanson, Lars 1997a. A Grammar of the "Lingua Turcica Agemica". In: Kellner-Heinkele, Barbara & Zieme, Peter. (eds.) *Studia Ottomanica. Festgabe für György Hazai zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 87–101.

Johanson, Lars 1997b. Rez. zu Gerhard Doerfer & Wolfram Hesche: Südoghusische Materialien aus Afghanistan und Iran. Wiesbaden 1989. In: *Central Asiatic Journal* 41, 130–132.

Johanson, Lars 1998. The History of Turkic. In: Johanson, Lars & Csató, Éva Á. (eds.) *The Turkic Languages*. London and New York: Routledge, 81–125.

Johanson, Lars 2000. Turkic indirectives. In: Johanson, Lars & Utas, Bo (eds.). *Evidentials. Turkic, Iranian and neighbouring languages*. Berlin & New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 61–87.

Kaempfer, Engelbert 1940 [1712]. *Am Hofe des persischen Grosskönigs (1684–85). Das erste Buch der Amoenitates exoticae*. Eingeleitet und in deutscher Bearbeitung herausgegeben von Walther Hinz. Leipzig: K.F. Koehler Verlag.

Kıral, Filiz 2001. *Das gesprochene Aserbaidschanisch von Iran. Eine Studie zu den syntaktischen Einflüssen des Persischen*. (Turcologica 43.) Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Kissling, Hans Joachim 1936. *Die Sprache des ʿĀšıkpašazāde. Eine Studie zur osmanisch-türkischen Sprachgeschichte*. Breslau: Akademische Buchdruckerei F. Straub, München.

Kleinmichel, Sigrid 1970: *Untersuchungen zu phonologischen, morphophonologischen und morphologischen Problemen im Marzubān-nāme*. Phil. Diss. Humboldt Universität Berlin.

Korkmaz, Zeynep & Olcay, Selāhattin 1956. *Fuzulî'nin dili hakkında notlar*. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Basımevi.

Kowalski, Tadeusz 1937. *Sir Aurel Stein's Sprachaufzeichnungen im Äinallu-Dialekt aus Südpersien*. Kraków.

Megiser, Hieronymus 1612. *Institutionum lingvae tvrcicae, libri qvatvor*. (Leipzig).

Nağısoylu, Möhsün 2003. *XVI äsr Azärbaycan tärcümä abidesi "Şühädanamä". (Paleoqrafiya, orfoqrafiya vä tärcümä mäsäläläri)*. Bakı.

Römer, Claudia 1981. Der Einfluss der Übersetzungen aus dem Persischen auf die Entwicklung des Osmanischen im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. In: Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 73, 89–114.

Stein, Heidi 2005. Traces of *Türki-yi Acemi* in Pietro della Valle's Turkish Grammar (1620). In: Csató, Éva Ágnes & Isaksson, Bo & Jahani, Carina (eds.) *Linguistic convergence and areal diffusion. Case studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*. London & New York: Routledge, 227–240.

Xälilov, Šamäddin 1988. *"Äsrarnamä" nin dili*. Bakı: Elm.

Book Reviews

Haptačahaptāitiš. Festschrift for Fridrik Thordarson. Ed. by Dag Haug and Eirik Welo. (Instituttet for sammanlignende kulturforskning, Serie B: Skrifter CXCI) Oslo: Novus forlag 2005.

This Festschrift contains an interesting mixture of articles on Indo-European topics (linguistic and literary): Indo-Iranian, Armenian, Greek and Latin. Several of them concern Caucasian problems, others treat of Turkic and other languages. Many of the articles are of great typological interest and some belong to syntax. They are well in conformance with the varied interests of the scholar to whom they are addressed.

The contributions of E. Dahl on thematic roots in Vedic, E. Ravnæs on sound change in Armenian, D. Haug on tense and aspect in Latin and T. Skomedal on the Greek aorist passive reflect the excellent tradition of Norwegian Indo-European scholarship as does P.O. Skjærvø's interesting contribution: "Poetic and Cosmic Weaving in Ancient Iran". Haug's article is of special importance for typology as are most of the articles regarding Caucasian, Turkic and other non-Indo-European languages. Much of the important discussion concerning structural traits of morphology and syntax in those languages and the comparative and diachronic dimensions of this research together with methodological questions presented in the contributions are of great import also for Indo-European linguistics. This is a very attractive trait of this valuable volume. Our review will be mainly concerned with the clearly demonstrated importance of methodology in the study of diachronic and synchronic typology.

Haug's discussion concerning a 'hole' in the Latin tense-aspect system makes use of Rothstein's analysis of aktionsart and C. Smith's understanding of grammatical aspect. Latin allows the combination of atelic predicates and perfective aspect and also of telic aktionsart and perfective aspect. The main question is why the imperfect of compound verbs with weakened prepostional meaning is so extremely rare. Pre-classical Latin does not allow imperfects formed from compounds of weak prepositional (telicized) meaning (mainly those with *con-*). Other telic verbs can form imperfects. *confodieba-* does not occur but *effodieba-* does. The prefix *con-* is entirely grammaticalised, i.e. has lost its lexical force and serves only as a marker of telicity. *ex-* gives information about the state at which the activity is aimed and this is relevant even in the imperfective aspect, whereas *con-* as a purely grammatical marker of telicity is not relevant in the imperfective aspect. It only serves to mark the verb as telic and gives no information about the telos. When the specific state is mentioned, as in the case of *ex-*, this information is relevant even when it is not focused by the imperfective aspect.

In his treatment of the emergence of Udi case morphology Wolfgang Schulze makes use of grammaticalisation theory and of internal and external reconstruction. He refers to Gildea 1999 for the discussion of the interface between Comparative Linguistics and Grammaticalisation theory. The case system of Udi is motivated both by synchronic features and by underlying diachronic layers. There were dramatic shifts from Proto-Lezgian. The author emphasises that backward reconstruction (in this case mainly internal reconstruction) should precede forward reconstruction. This will provide the starting point for establishing the grammaticalisation paths. There were both suffixing and agglutination. The plural marker precedes the case-marker. Stem augmentation expresses control (agentivity). Stem augments were used if the

referential form lacked strong inherent properties of control. These features are related to agenthood, high animacy and communicative relevance. When referring to light agents they developed into stem augments. High animacy helped to balance the "control" deficit, agentive or agent-like. The augments could be reduced to classifying stem augments. The ergative in some Lezgian languages is a reanalyzed version of the stem augments. In some Lezgian languages Semantic stem markers served as a Control marker for definite singular referents. They contained a deictic element -ó- as in muč'ur-o- 'the holy one' which marked a qualifying element for referentiality.

For the Lezgian agent-like "control" suffix which becomes a classifying stem marker or stem augment and the semantic stem markers (control markers) for singular referents it will be rewarding to compare the Hittite suffix -ant-, which was earlier seen as ergative but was explained along similar lines in Josephson (2004) as indefinite specific, singulative and agentive. It is known that the Hittite neuter singular cannot serve as a subject. The specifying and agentive suffix -ant- allows an original neuter to serve as a nominative by the addition of the appropriate case morpheme.

E. Hovdhaugen's contribution which treats of triple case marking in Mochica is relevant in this context: Among several peculiarities of that language he mentions that an oblique case is the stem for other case suffixes. Strings of case suffixes are in need of explanation as are cases built on stems different from the nominative or absolutive. Tamil with its separate oblique stems is cited as a rare parallel (together with Tabarian where cases are formed by attaching an ending to the ergative form). It should be observed here that the Tocharian language where case suffixes have been added to the oblique form also shows an interesting parallel from an IE language. Cf. G. Carling (2000) for a recent study of the system of local cases in Tocharian. Heteroclitic -(e)n- of IE may also be relevant .

K.H. Schmidt: "On the History of the Kartvelian Vocabulary" is of theoretical importance. Svan is a marginal language and there was an early separation. Svan generally shows preservation of archaisms. General Kartvelian etymologies have two classes of distribution. Class A is shared by Svan and another language and allows reconstruction. Class B has etymologies that are shared by Georgian and Zan but not by Svan. In this case there is either a proto-Kartvelian etymology with the Svan equivalent having been lost or else a Georgian-Zan innovation. Class B is thus relevant for the historical development of the Kartvelian vocabulary. Class A is important for the reconstruction of proto-Kartvelian. The same distinction was established for Latin by Ernout/Meillet. Class B is the object of the investigation which provides many new insights into the historical development of Kartvelian vocabulary.

The book contains more Caucasological contributions by W. Boeder on person marking in Nij Udi, B. Christophe on postterminality and evidentiality, A.C. Harris on Udi person marking, G. Hewitt on the comparative syntax of Kartvelian languages and K. Vamling on sentences with double subordinators in Megrelian. R. Bielmeier treats of West and East Iranian loans in Kartvelian. Space does not allow a detailed treatment of all of them in this review though they are of great importance. According to Boeder different meanings of Georgian -tvis are derived from causal meaning. The meaning is also that of 'concerning, on'. An original body part noun develops the metaphorical meaning of 'because of' and then, by grammaticalisation, that of purpose and beneficiary and thus becomes a grammatical marker for underlying indirect objects. According to Christophe there is a tendency to form new high-focal postterminals which diachronically may lose their focality and become defocalized postterminals. New postterminal forms are then formed again by the process of Cyclic grammaticalisation. Low focality allows the development of evidential meaning. In connection with his treatment of subordinate clauses, Hewitt discusses protasis formation in Old Georgian where an irrealis element -mtsa differentiates vague condition. There is a typological comparison with the use of Greek ἄν as combined with εἰ. For the way of expressing a vivid future condition there is an interesting comparison with Greek. Vamling's study of double subordinators is corpus based. The frequency of the initial subordinator namda as well as that of the final enclitic ni (which is not an affix) show a lot of variation between different types of texts.

L. Johanson's contribution "Participles in Caucasus Turkic" treats of the Turkic intraterminal participle in -EGEn which is explained as including *er-* "to be" and as having been grammaticalized like other verb forms, such as certain present tense forms. -EGEn is preserved in the Northern Caucasus region and is a productive participle of intraterminal meaning. Adjectives in -EGEn express intensivity and habituality and are probably formed from a vowel-final converb suffix with *er-* "to be" followed by the -GEn that is found in the present-past participle. Cf. Eng. *is doing*. There are traces of *er-* being used as a copula verb in Western Oghuz Turkic in present tense forms with an *-y*-element. Examples such as *ber-i-yir-men* are cited from the Kipchak of Codex Cumanicus. The auxiliary was later replaced by other verbs. If the Turkmen present tenses and intraterminal participle are formed with the converb suffix *-e(r)-* they are comparable to high focal intraterminals that are found in Western South Caucasian languages. At the end of the article a possibility of areal linguistic nature is suggested: The intraterminal and postterminal of Kipchak Turkic which is formed with *-EGEn and *-GEn would correspond to the South Slavic imperfect and aorist participles.

B. Brendemoen who writes about sentence subordination in the Black Sea dialects is also interested in contact linguistics. He asks whether the subordination pattern of those dialects could be an example of copying from Greek and reaches the conclusion that the distribution of paratactic and hypotactic constructions in the Trabzon dialect is similar to that of other East Anatolian dialects, where certain Persian elements are traceable, whereas copying from Greek as for example in some types of adverbial clauses, is only sporadic.

The linguistic content also comprises an article by H.O. Wiull on verbal inflection and sentence construction in Somali which includes a discussion on sentence particles and the difference between new and known information in narrative sentences. As for the Indo-European content B. Schartau discusses the Modern Greek gerund. There are Iranian contributions by F. Fritz and J. Gippert (Onomastica Nartica) and R. Schmitt (Minima Onomastica Alanica) and by F. Thiesen on two fundamental words in the poetry of Hafez. V. Roggen writes about the early modern reception of Herodotus and the meaning of being Scythian. There are several interesting articles within the field of Greek and Latin realia: K.Momrak: "Homer, Democracy and the Ancient Near East" discusses structural parallels as regards political organisation and the division of power in Greece and the Near East. E. Kraggerud treats of Horace Epod. 1. 5–6. J.L. Mey discusses Horace and colors. There is also a contribution by M.M. Tatár on ethnic continuity by the Volga.

References

Carling, Gerd, 2000, *Die Funktionen der lokalen Kasus im Tocharischen*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
Josephson, Folke, 2004, "Semantics and Typology of Hittite *-ant*". In *Indo-European Word Formation*, eds. James Clackson and Birgit Anette Olsen. Copenhagen Studies in Indo-European 2. Copenhagen; Museum Tusculanum Press. Pp. 91–118.

Folke Josephson
Gothenburg

Cantera, Alberto, *Studien zur Pahlavi-Übersetzung des Avesta* (Iranica Bd 7, ed. by Maria Macuch). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag 2004. Pp. x, 379.

This study presents the Pahlavi (Phl) versions of the Avesta from every possible point of view from reconstruction of the history of the texts and the extant manuscripts to technical details of the translation technique to the longer excurses accompanying laws and rules of the *Wīdēwdād* and more. The main thesis of the author is that the Phl versions deserve a study in their own right

1) as being the earliest and most important extant Phl works and

2) as the last representative of an Indo-Iranian tradition of philological commentary on orally tradited texts. This study asks all questions anew by reviewing all the usual sources and by exploiting material which has come to light in recent years. It is so rich in material that only a small part of it can be commented upon within the scope of this review.

The book is divided into five chapters each with numerous subsections. In Chapter I the author presents the title of the collective Phl translations or versions of the Avesta, namely the *zand* of the expression *abastāg ud zand*. Here, as in every other aspect of the study of these ancient texts, the author is faced with material which is old as to content but has been recast over and over again during the centuries to meet different circumstances. He finds that when the word *zand* is used in Phl to refer backward in time it designates all possible exegetical material but that by the 6th to the 8th centuries it had been narrowed down to mean the Phl translations of the Avestan. He then gives a short explanation of how the extant Phl versions relate to the extant Avesta. He adopts Kellens' theory that the Sasanian Avesta divided into 21 *nasks* as described in Book VIII of the *Denkard*, and which exists only in Phl, constitutes the Greater Avesta while the extant Avesta goes back to a much smaller collection of Avestan texts assembled at an early stage of Sasanian rule to serve as the liturgy. He then shows that the extant Phl versions are basically those of the Greater Avesta described in Dk VIII with certain changes introduced when they were adapted to the liturgical Avesta.

Chapter II (pp. 35–105) treats of the previous research on the Phl versions. This detailed account goes back to the rise of Avestan research with Anquetil-Duperron in the 18th century up to the present day. It is well-written and interesting but is perhaps unproportionally long in the present context. It does effectively show that until some decades ago interest in the Phl versions was entirely linked to prevailing ideas of their potential value as an aid in the interpretation of the Avesta.

Chapter III (pp. 106–163) concerns the traditing of the Avesta over the centuries with discussion of its commitment to writing. The author examines and evaluates the passage at the beginning of Book IV of the *Denkard* and finds it full of unsubstantiated fantasies. He then turns to a complete review of the outside sources, such as the questionable testimony of Pliny the Younger on the two thousand verses by Zoroaster as well as more dependable testimony from the East, i. e. Sogdian and Aśoka's dual language inscription in Prakrit and Aramaic. Returning finally to *Denkard* IV he notes that the existence of an Avesta with 21 nasks with an authoritative Phl version is clearly named for the first time in connection with the activities of Khosrow I (531–579). He concludes that the closest one can come to a date for the invention of the Avestan alphabet is somewhere between the 5th and 7th centuries thereby opting for a middle position between the proponents of a dating in the 4th century and the new later dating proposed by Kellens. He does not exclude the possibility that parts of the Avesta can have been written down in other forms for more occasional use but considers that it was basically orally tradited.

In chapter IV (pp. 164–239) he turns to the dating of the Phl translation of the Avesta which he studies from three different viewpoints. First, as there is extremely little external evidence for an absolute dating of the Phl versions, the author is obliged to proceed by means of internal comparison and it is here that he fully shows his knowledge of the texts; through careful comparison and attention to details he is able to refine our knowledge of how the different translations relate to each other. The inner relative chronology he reaches is basically that of three groups of texts representing three different periods with the *Wīdēwdād*, *Hērbedestān* and *Nērangestān* assigned to the 6th century prior to the fall of the Sasanids. He assigns the *Yasna* to the 8th or 9th century because the glosses can be traced to this period while the language of the translation itself is older. The *Xwardag Abestāg* is later and quite heterogeneous with old texts mixed with much later works. He also quotes evidence showing that the Phl versions were in existence much earlier with both a written and an oral tradition.

His second comparison is between the language of the Phl versions and that of the original Book Phl texts. The results show that the Phl versions share the same grammatical traits as the inscriptions and the Manichean texts and he correctly identifies them as the oldest extant

Zoroastrian texts. They have a more complete set of verb endings in the subjunctive mood and the differentiated nominal endings retain a difference in function. This is one of the most valuable contributions of this study as it demonstrates that linguistic differences between the Manichean material from Central Asia and the Late Book Phl texts are largely chronological.

After comparing the Phl versions of the Avesta internally with one another and then comparing the same texts with original Book Phl he takes a further step and discusses how and when the Phl versions were merged with the liturgical Avesta in the manuscripts. Here he returns to the discussion of the history of the MSS and of the nature of the Greater Avesta as compared with the now extant liturgical Avesta broached in chap. I. He argues that the extant Phl versions are originally those which belonged to the Greater Avesta but which were adapted to the extant Avesta. He discusses changes, mistakes, deletions and additions of shorter passages which illustrate how the Phl texts were adjusted to the slightly different liturgical Avesta. He places this process at a relatively late date, i. e. the 12th century for the *Wīdēwdād*. The author is however uncertain about the merging of the Phl version of the *Yasna* with the Avesta (p, 236: "…um das 12Jh. oder vielleicht früher …" as against p. 344: "… etwa zwischen dem 8. und 9. Jhr …" and it is probable that the last word has not been said on this question.

Chapter V (pp. 240–341) is devoted to the translation technique in the Phl versions of the Avesta and is practically a monograph in itself. The author points out similarities between the Phl versions and the *Targums* or translations of the Old Testament into Aramaic which show that the two cultures were in close symbiosis with each other. However, he also notes a big difference in function between the Aramaic and Phl translations. The first were meant to be recited in the synagogue while there is no evidence that the Phl versions were ever recited during a ritual. This brings the author to his second thesis, namely that the Phl versions have been developed according to the same principles and for the same purpose as the exegetic material of the Indian tradition of Ṛgvedic studies.

This section is followed by a comprehensive review of how the Avestan grammatical categories have been understood and rendered in Phl. It is based on a wider range of texts than earlier studies and is therefore more complete. This is followed by a study of the rendering of Avestan words in Phl and the special vocabulary of the Phl translations. Here the author explores such questions as the consistency of the translation and the rendering of polysemy, the etymological translations, the formation of a Zoroastrian lexicon as well as loanwords and loan translations.

Finally there is a discussion of native Iranian philology and the Phl versions. Here Cantera compares the Avesta and the Ṛgveda and concludes that the written Avesta which has come down to us is somewhat similar to the *Padapāṭha* texts which implies a grammatical and philological tradition similar to that found in India. He states that the Iranian traditions are not copies of the Indian but rather that they both go back to a common form of oral memorization which involved exegesis and philological research. One technique adduced by the author as typical for the translation of the Avestan into Phl is the division of word roots from suffixes by a point in the MSS. An example of this is the Avestan adjective suffix -*uuant* which is always separated from the root by a point and which corresponds to the Phl adjective ending -*ōmand*.

The last item to be considered is the *Frahang ī ōīm* which has been dated to the 9th century and which the author sees as a late testimony of the knowledge of Avestan grammar in the Sasanian era. Here I would like to make a short comment on the discussion concerning whether the Phl redactor is referring to dative or locative case in the phrase … *awišīh ī kū ān paywandēd* '… den Begriff des Wofür/Woran, woran man etwas anbindet'. It should be noted that the verb *paywastan* 'join, connect' is also the technical term used in speaking of the transmission or handing down of tradited material. For example we find the refrain from Book VII of the *Denkard … abastāg … ō amā nē paywast hē* '… the Avesta … would not have come down to us' (Denkard Madan p. 637:6–7) or *pēšēnīg-dēn-*āgāhān … ō amā ēn sraw paywast* 'men with knowledge of religion in former times have transmitted these words … to us' (Dādestān ī dēnīg 38:13, transl. by Jaafari-Dehāgī). In these examples the accompanying *ō* indicates dative case. If, however, one examines the usage of *ō* in the 9th century texts (e. g. *Wizīdagīhā ī Zādspram*

and *Phl Rivāyat)* one can observe that when it is used alone without *be* it frequently expresses location, i. e. 'at, on' (Josephson, "The Construction *be ō* in Middle Persian" in *Giš HUR gul-za-at-ta-ra, a Festschrift for Folke Josephson*, Göteborg 2006). In choosing the verb *paywastan* to illustrate the function of *ō* the Phl redactor may be expressing this complicated situation.

In conclusion, the author has proved that he has an excellent grasp of a very difficult subject. He has demonstrated that the Phl translations have existed since the beginning of the Sasanian period, if not earlier, and have been tradited in both written and oral form. He has proven that the language of the oldest of our now extant translations goes back to the late Sasanian period. He has shown that they testify to an ancient tradition of philological and grammatical study with extensive knowledge of the morphology of the Avesta. All in all with the publication of this study the state of the art in Phl translation studies has been brought to a higher level.

Judith Josephson
Gothenburg

Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, *Dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Subsidia: Dictionary of Manichaean Texts III: Texts from Central Asia and China 1). Turnhout: Brepols 2004. Pp. xxix, 428.

The work under discussion has been written as part of the project *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts.* This project, which was first directed by Samuel Lieu at Macquarie University, Australia, and subsequently based at the Ancient India and Iran Trust in Cambridge / UK and directed by Nicholas Sims-Williams, aims to further the understanding of the Manichaean texts and facilitate the study of these "by providing a linguistic key to the complete corpus of Manichaean material" (http://www.soas.ac.uk/departments/departmentinfo.cfm?navid=324). So far, the project has resulted in a dictionary of Manichaean texts and citations in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin (Lieu et al. 1999). A Dictionary for the Manichaean Sogdian texts will follow soon.

The book under review is a dictionary for the published Manichaean literature in the Western Iranian languages of the Middle Iranian period (WMIr.), i.e. the Middle Persian (MP) and Parthian (Pa) literature. It consists of an introduction explaining the approach and aim of the work and the structure of the entries (pp. vii–xii), a list of abbreviations (pp. xiii–xvii), a bibliography (pp. xviii–xxix), the main section (pp. 1–388) and an English-WMIr. index (pp. 389–427).

The main section contains all words found in published WMIr. Manichaean texts. The lemmata (in Roman transliteration of the Manichaean script) are accompanied by transcription, English translation, notes as to whether the word is MP or Parthian or both, references to literature with discussions of the word and a list of the pertinent word forms with references to their attestations. As will be evident from the comments below, this book does not only lay an entirely new foundation for the study of WMIr. Manichaean texts. The data presented also open new opportunities for investigation in the whole field of Middle Persian and Parthian, and mark a major step forward in the study of Manichaean literature on the one hand and Iranian studies on the other. I take the opportunity to add a few marginal notes on some minor points; these are in no way meant to create the impression of intending to reduce the value of Durkin-Meisterernst's impressive achievement.

Until the publication of the present book, the glossary by Mary Boyce was the first and only dictionary of Manichaean Middle Persian (MPM) and Parthian. This work (Boyce 1977), modestly entitled *Word-List,* is mainly intended to serve the immediate needs of students and teachers, and was written as a companion to the texts assembled in the *Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* by the same author (Boyce 1975). In order to keep the glossary

concise, Boyce omits many rare and unclear words and refrains from adding notes, references etc. Until now, those who wanted more information had to find their own way through the rather technical Iranological literature, digging MP and Pa word forms and discussion of these from text editions and a long list of specialised articles.

While the dictionary evidently owes a lot to Boyce 1977 (cf. also the author's note on p. xi), it is much broader in scope. A comparison of the two works immediately reveals the enormous increase in readily available information and the equally impressive progress made in the lexicography and philology of WM Iranian and to a certain degree also in the fields of morphology and syntax.

First, the dictionary lists **all** words occurring in hitherto published WMIr. Manichaean texts insofar as they are reasonably readable, including rare words and words the reading and/or meaning of which is somewhat unclear. This comprehensiveness is not only immensely useful for anyone studying WMIr. texts, it also amounts to a significant increase in the knowledge of the WMIr. lexicon. This might seem less important for Middle Persian since besides MPM, there is the vast Middle Persian Zoroastrian (MPZ) literature which constitutes an important source for MP words, and further items can be inferred from Old and New Persian. (Note, however, that the dictionaries available for MPZ, Nyberg 1974 and MacKenzie 1986, are again very concise.) No corresponding sources exist for Parthian, so the present dictionary advances the lexicography of Parthian by a remarkable degree. Every time one opens the dictionary, one will find some Pa words the existence and form of which have so far been unknown to most since they are not found in Boyce 1977, e.g. (to cite but a small handful of examples picked at random) *hwg* "pig", *jxm, jhm* "wound", *mwjd* "wages", *pcg* "cook (noun)", *pwrt* "bridge", *wl* "salty". Another convenience for the reader is that the dictionary includes names, titles etc. from languages other than MP and Parthian (chiefly of Turkic, Indic and Sogdian origin) which are found in the WMIr. texts.

The many cross-references will likewise be much appreciated; they save a considerable amount of trouble and time as they point the user, confronted with a particular spelling variant, to the main entry. They are admirably complete; so far, I have not come across a single instance of a missing note, where one might have wanted a cross-reference.

Conversely, the author does not note words which are only preserved partially and ghost-words. For instance, one will not find an entry Pa *'y'g* "place" quoted by Bailey 1979: 19b; it had been assumed to be present in the fragment M 104 R 12, but the word here is the usual Pa word *wy'g* (Andreas/Henning 1934: 882). Similarly, *tyšt* noted in Boyce 1954: 126 is not found under *t*, as this reading is supplanted by *ryšt* (for which cf. p. 304).

The English-WMIr. index, which is the first glossary into WMIr. apart from the English-MPZ list in MacKenzie 1986: 101–141, considerably contributes to making the lexical material accessible and will certainly be much used by readers.

Second, while Boyce 1977 usually gives only the stems, the dictionary lists all word forms attested for every lemma, and for every word form all passages in which it is found in published texts (quoting the number and line of the fragments). This will be a welcome help for all users dealing with a specific text, since there are a number of word forms which are written identically, and the dictionary helps to identify the word form occurring at a specific location according to Durkin-Meistererernst's analysis and the text editions he quotes. The data also permit morphological analyses (for instance, based on observations as to what kinds of forms are actually attested from which sorts of verbs) or syntactical investigations (e.g. starting from the lists of occurrences of conjunctions).

Durkin-Meistererernst has also made every effort to note which words and word forms are MP and which are Parthian; in the many instances of a word having the same form in MP and in Parthian, he consistently and conscientiously notes which word form in which attestation is MP and which is Parthian. This allows the reader to assess the relative frequency of MP and Pa word forms, which may lead to interesting conclusions. Although one should be cautious about using these numbers for statistical purposes, since many words are attested in a very small number of cases, these data are very relevant.

Thirdly, many entries include references to literature relevant for the WMIr. word, or short comments by Durkin-Meistererrnst himself. Together with the references to the text editions quoted for the individual word forms, they constitute another treasure trove of information which was not previously available in collected form and provides a key to relevant treatments of the WMIr. lemmata. Checking the references, which admittedly requires a well-stocked library, will open up windows on discussions of various kinds, ranging from questions concerning the identification of the form and/or meaning of a given word to its grammatical features and history. For instance, there is a note in the entry *'spyxt* "bright" (p. 88) referring to Sundermann 1979: 99, which teaches the reader about the function of the word as a title and as a translation of a Syriac epitheton for Jesus ("the splendour") and points the reader to a discussion of the meaning, morphology and etymology of the word by Henning 1947: 46–47.

The entry MP *wnyr-* "to be arranged; prosper" (p. 344) presents a short survey of previous treatments of the word (e.g. the interpretation of the word as *winīr-* "zum Heil über jem. kommen" by Andreas/Henning 1934: 193 n. 4 and its revision by Henning 1954: 175 n. 1 as "to remain permanently, stay"); this allows readers to check for themselves the complexities involved here and to evaluate whether they would prefer the interpretation by Weber 1970: 73–76 (reading *winnīr-*) or the transcriptions *win(n)er-* (thus also Boyce 1977: 92) and *win(n)ēr-* suggested by Durkin-Meistererrnst, obviously not following the assumption by Henning 1934: 206 and Weber that the verb derives from a preform with suffix *-ya-*.

Needless to say, the present book is by no means intended as an etymological dictionary of Middle Persian and Parthian, neither are the references meant to be systematic. However, the material offered does present a wealth of information relevant for etymological studies. Considering the fact that there is no etymological dictionary of Parthian and that the published etymological dictionaries of Persian are either seriously outdated (Horn 1893 for New Persian, Nyberg 1974 for MP, based on studies undertaken in the first half of the century) or incomplete (Ḥasandūst 2004 so far only treating *a-t* of the Arabic alphabet), the value of this collection cannot be underestimated.

Semitic loanwords are usually identified as such (e.g. *k'lbyd* "shape", p. 201) while for Indic loanwords, the discussion in Sims-Williams 1983 is quoted (cf. e.g. *s'rt* "caravan", p. 306).

As mentioned above, the entries are accompanied by a transcription converting the transliteration of the Manichaean script into what may have been the pronunciation of the WMIr. words. The system of transcription is the same as in Boyce 1977, i.e. *b, d, and g* in postvocalic position are transcribed /b/, /d/, /g/, respectively, where they derive from Old Ir. *p, t, k* and /β/, /δ/, /γ/ when they go back to OIr. *b, d, g*, though the difference is not marked in the Manichaean script for reasons of the inventory of graphemes used. Although it is not clear how long this difference was preserved, it is surely better to note it in order not to lose potentially relevant information. Durkin-Meistererrnst likewise follows Boyce in transcribing those cases of MPM and Pa *y* and *w* as /e/ and /o/, respectively (as suggested by MacKenzie 1967: 23–25), which go back to Old Ir. *a*, e.g. MPM *byn-* /benn-/ "bind", the suffix MPM, Pa *-yst'n* /-estān/ "-place", *frwx* /farrox/ "fortunate", *-wm* /-om/ (suffix of the ordinal numbers).

The transcription of the individual words is also largely based on the works of Boyce, in many cases deriving from published and unpublished opinions of Walter B. Henning. It will be appreciated that in a number of cases, and obviously for all words not transcribed by Boyce, Henning or Ghilain 1939, Durkin-Meistererrnst presents his own reading or suggests alternative possibilities, e.g. Pa *pwrt* "bridge" (p. 287) transcribed "/purt/, / purd/?" and *ywg* "yoke" /yōg/ (in both cases, no transcription was offered previously). MP *my'n* "among, in the middle of" is transcribed /mayyān/, /mayān/ (p. 235, vs. Boyce 1977: 59 /mayān/), the first rendering fitting the etymology particularly well since a stage *mayyān* seems to be indeed implied in the derivation of NP *miyān* from OIr. **madyāna-* (Av. *maiδiiāna-*, OInd. *mádʰya-* "middle"). Ad *myr-* "die", the alternative of reading Pa /mir-/ is noted (p. 236, so far read /mīr-/ for both MP and Pa), *-i-* appearing quite possible for Parthian with regard to the short vowels in neigh-

bouring languages (Sogd. *myr-*, Balochi *mir-*). Similarly, the reading /kōš-/ which is offered besides /kuš-/ (this variant being the one hitherto generally assumed) for MP *kwš-* "kill" (p. 215) opens the interesting possibility that this verb and /kōš-/ "struggle" might be (or at least derive from) one word, i.e. /kōš-/, past stem /kušt/ "struggle, fight, kill" (note that there is no past stem of MPM /kōš-/ "struggle"); this paradigm would then have split into (MPZ, NP) /kōš-, kōšīd/ "struggle" and /kuš-, kušt/ "kill". For Pa *xwj* "pleasant, good" (p. 368), there is an alternative /xuž/ in addition to /xōž/ also noted in Boyce 1977: 100; the former would seem to match the etymology suggested by Sims-Williams 2000: 232–233 (PIE *suĝʰ-su-*) better than the latter. On the other hand, the alternative /guxn/ given for Pa *gwxn* "blood" (p. 168) seems somewhat less likely than the transcription /goxan/ assumed otherwise (which is also noted) if the etymology suggested by Schwartz 1982 is correct.

In passing, Durkin-Meisterernst corrects errors in previous works, e.g. Pa *fr'x* /frāx/ "broad, wide spacious" (p. 154) which is transcribed /farrāx/ in Boyce 1977: 39, surely induced by the very common word Pa, MP *frwx* /farrox/ "fortunate"; Pa *šwryn* "salty" (p. 320) which Boyce 1977: 85 transcribes /šūrēn/ while NP and other Ir. languages show that it is /šōrēn/; the existence of Pa /kwš-/ "strive, struggle" noted by Ghilain 1939 and Boyce 1977 seems rather questionable (p. 215).

Unlike Boyce 1977, Ghilain 1939 and MacKenzie 1986, the dictionary does not give a transcription of the past stems of MP and Pa verbs. In many instances, this can indeed be inferred from the present stem, but in a certain percentage of instances this is not the case. Owing to the ambiguities of the Manichaean script, a word like *ryxt* "poured" could theoretically be read /rixt/, /rīxt/, /rēxt/ or /raixt/; morphological considerations limit the choice to /rixt/ and /rēxt/. The question of which alternative is to be assumed for MP and Parthian is relevant because it would be interesting to know whether MP and Parthian preserved an alternation of present stem /ē/ vs. past stem /i/ as known from Old Iranian, or whether this alternation had been regularised. For MP, the evidence of MPZ *ryxt*, which in the Pahlavi script implies a long vowel, and of New Persian *rēxt* strongly suggests the reading MPM *rēxt*, but the Pa verb need not have been identical to the MP one. As Balochi has (inter alia) *rixt*, and since it does not seem likely that such a past stem might have arisen analogically, it is possible that Parthian may have had the form presumably found in the closely related dialect of (unattested) Middle Balochi. So it is a pity that Durkin-Meisterernst does not offer his opinion on whether he would rather follow Boyce 1977: 80 who assumes /rēxt/ for both MP and Parthian, or Ghilain 1939: 94 who reads Pa /rixt/.

As noted above, the dictionary is based on the published WMIr. texts (the chief part of which consists of the books published in the series *Berliner Turfantexte* plus a number of important articles by various authors, chiefly those by Henning). This statement requires modification in that the dictionary reflects Durkin-Meisterernst's reading of these texts, which at a number of points differs from previous editions. The differences are usually explained by a note in the entry, so the basic study of a particular text will not meet with difficulties.

Moreover, Durkin-Meisterernst has published his reading of the texts on the internet (*MIRTEXT*) for everyone's reference. This web page, although not structured in the form of a data base, but in plain text, will prove extremely useful for other purposes as well, e.g. for questions like determining with which preverbs a given verb stem occurs. In this respect, it can be used to update the data in Ghilain 1939 and the reverse index in Boyce 1977. In addition, thanks to a digitalisation project of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, the photos of most relevant fragments can now be viewed at the pages of the *Digitales Turfanarchiv* so that everyone can compare the manuscripts themselves.

The strategy of basing the dictionary on published texts has the obvious advantage of enabling the user to check every aspect of the data and of the analysis applied to them by Durkin-Meisterernst and/or the text editions, which are consistently quoted in the dictionary and range up to the most recent edition (Reck 2004). One disadvantage (admitted by the author on p. vii) is that this approach might lead to incorrect conclusions where a given word (form) is only noted for MP or Parthian language although it may exist in the other one as well, or is indeed

even found in the unpublished material. Another consequence is that the previous literature is not entirely superseded in those points where it discusses material that is still unpublished. For instance, the author occasionally notes that he has not seen in any fragment a certain verb form quoted in Ghilain 1939 as "inédit", e.g. (p. 215) *kwš'd* quoted by Ghilain 1939: 66. Conversely, those verb forms in Ghilain 1939 that are still unpublished and whose existence Durkin-Meisterernst does not seem to doubt are not quoted. No present stem is given, e.g., for the Pa past stem *ˀsyst* "broken" (attested with preverb /ab ˀ/, p. 14, and /fra ˀ/, p. 156, without preverb in the derivative *systg*, p. 312) while Ghilain 1939: 83 has *ˀsynd*-, fitting nicely with OInd. *cʰinád-* / *cʰind-* on the one hand and Sogdian *'wsynd-*, Balochi *sind-* on the other.

As is the tradition in the study of WMIr. Manich. texts, MPM and Pa words are not presented separately, but the dictionary lists the WMIr. words alphabetically according to the transliteration. Any other arrangement would, indeed, be inconvenient since the MP and Pa Manichaean texts have been transmitted together, MP and Parthian often being found in one and the same text, e.g. fragments in Parthian with intermediate titles in MP (e.g. Reck 2004: 139–140), or entirely mixed texts (e.g. Reck 2004: 142, 146–148), hence a reader would need to attribute a given sentence or verse to one of the languages before consulting the dictionary. Moreover, in a sizeable percentage of cases, corresponding words have an identical form in MP and Parthian. On the other hand, the strategy of presenting MP and Parthian together in one list tends to mask differences which do or might exist between the two languages: in most cases where a word occurs in both languages spelt in the same way, it has been assumed that the meaning and the phonological (or phonetic) form is identical as well. As the transcription is in many cases inferred from Old Iranian, on the one hand, and from New Persian on the other, and since MP is much better known than Parthian, meanings and transcriptions have often reflected the New Persian form. While this is certainly reasonable for MP, it is not necessarily always adequate for Parthian (cf. the example of *ryxt* above).

One cannot help but admire the author's handling of the huge amount of material presented in the dictionary. With this mass of data and its inherent complexity, it is evident that it is simply impossible to maintain complete consistency and that minor incongruencies are bound to remain. The following notes are thus only meant to highlight the level of discussion that the lexicography of WMIr. has reached with the publishing of the book under review.

Pa *ˀwdjn* "rigour, harshness" is transcribed /udažan/ (p. 66) while *djn* "hot, spicy" is read / dažn/ (p. 138). Both words (not noted in Boyce 1977) are connected with Armenian *dažan* by Benveniste 1936: 206 (referred to by Durkin-Meisterernst for both entries, but not noted in his bibliography), which would speak for a transcription /dažan/ also for *djn*. It is not clear to me why the author would not follow Ghilain 1939: 51 in interpreting the *'w°* in *'wdjn* as the prefix /ō ˀ/. Even if no pertinent verb is attested in Parthian, it might quite well have existed, taking into account that a verbal base *daž-* is known from other Ir. languages (e.g. Avestan, Balochi and Zazaki), and the assumption of /ō ˀ/ would in my view seem preferable to an otherwise unknown element /u ˀ/.

For *'bwg* "co-wife" (p. 15), the transcription /aβōγ/ is presented. This is obviously taken from Henning 1940: 18 quoted in the entry (Henning interprets the word as MP while the dictionary has it as Parthian). However, in this article (as in some others) Henning transcribes the MIr. product of the OIr. voiceless stops *p, t, k* as /β/, /δ/, /γ/. Since the dictionary follows a different policy (see above), one might expect a transcription /abōg/ (cf. Balochi *hapōg*).

pyd "father" is divided into two lemmata for Pa (p. 288) and MPM (p. 289), separated by the entry *pyd* 2 (Pa) "meat, flesh". If this is meant to hint at the somewhat differing use of the inflectional form *pydr* (for which cf. Sims-Williams 1981), one would expect a parallel treatment of the other family terms (*m'd* "mother" etc.), but these are not presented as two lemmata.

The transcription *xwarispēg* for MP *xwrspyg* "sun-bright" (p. 369) is at variance with MP *ˀspyg* "radiance" being rendered as /ispīg/ (p. 87); Henning 1934: 178 has *ispēg* and *xwarispēg* while other sources have (*xwar*)*ispīg* (e.g. Boyce 1977: 22, 101).

It is probably inevitable that the necessarily concise form of the notes is liable to render them occasionally somewhat cryptic for users who are not deeply enough acquainted with the mat-

ter. For instance, the note ad *w'.xš* "ghost" (p. 336) "*wāxš* is MP" (quoting Sundermann 1981: 27 n. 6) might leave users wondering how to interpret the Pa occurrences of the word.

It is likewise obvious that with regard to the number of potentially relevant Iranological books and articles, the references offered are necessarily a selection of what might have been quoted, and everyone will surely have their own ideas which items could be added. Among these are e.g. Sims-Williams 2000 and Schwartz 1982 quoted above for *xwj* and *gwxn*, respectively. For MP *'w'hm'n* and Pa *'w'nm'n* "so-and-so", Sims-Williams 1990 might have been mentioned. Gershevitch 1979: 141 treats the etymology of MPM *'hnwn-c* "now", which he reads *ahnūn-č* (vs. *aha-nūn-z* elsewhere, p. 34). A reference to Gershevitch 1998: 120–131 would seem appropriate for MPM *wynyg* "nose" (p. 356) even if one does not choose to subscribe to the conclusions; Gershevitch not only challenges the etymology hitherto assumed (OP *waina-*, MP *wēn-*, NP *bīn-* "see"), but also the transcription /*wēnīg*/ noted in all dictionaries, suggesting a derivation from **wi°* + √*anⁱ* "breathe" and a transcription /*wīnīg*/ instead.

As to the bibliography, one might have facilitated access to the articles by MacKenzie and Sundermann by referring to the reprints in the volumes of their selected papers (1999 and 2001, respectively); the articles, some of which are otherwise hard to find, are not arranged chronologically in these collections. It is a bit unfortunate that the price (125 €) and the rather heavy paper on which the dictionary is printed render the book somewhat less handy to use.

Durkin-Meisterernst's book is a major achievement both with regard to the amount of material collected as well as the wealth and complexity of information it offers. Readers will surely appreciate the devotion which has gone into the collection of this amount of data. The dictionary makes the reading of a WMIr. text an entirely pleasant undertaking, the user being enlightened at every step by the hints contained in the notes and references pointing to a wealth of interesting related details. With the collection of data it presents, the book under review marks a great progress in WMIr and Ir. studies as a whole about which all those who are interested in Middle Persian, Parthian, Manichaeism, Iranian or Central Asian studies will undoubtedly be excited. In combination with the texts in *MIRTEXT* and the photos of the *Digitales Turfanarchiv*, the dictionary provides excellent new opportunities for research and teaching. It will surely inspire new works on the WMIr. texts and the MP and Pa lexicon.

The book will certainly find a permanent place on the desk of all those working with MP and Pa material. It will likewise prove to be an indispensable tool for all those involved in the study of Manichaeism and a major contribution to the advancement of Manichaean studies.

Agnes Korn
Frankfurt am Main

References

Andreas, Friedrich C. and Walter B. Henning 1934: Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch-Turkestan III". In: *Sitzungsberichte der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, pp. 846–912 (= Walter B. Henning: *Selected Papers* I (*Acta Iranica* 14), pp. 275–339)

Bailey, Harold W. 1979: *Dictionary of Khotan Saka*. Cambridge etc.

Benveniste, Émile 1936: "Notes parthes et sogdiennes" (= "Notes III"). In: *Journal Asiatique* 228, pp. 193–235 (= *Études sogdiennes*. Wiesbaden 1979, pp. 120–162)

Boyce, Mary 1954: *The Manichaean Hymn-Cycles in Parthian* (*London Oriental Series* 3). London etc.

— 1975: *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (*Acta Iranica* 9). Leiden etc.

— 1977: *A Word-List of Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian* (*Acta Iranica* 9a). Leiden etc.

Digitales Turfanarchiv: http://www.bbaw.de/forschung/turfanforschung/dta/

Gershevitch, Ilya 1979: "The Alloglottography of Old Persian". In: *Transactions of the Philological Society*, pp. 114–190

— 1998: "Balochi Audition and the Kurdish Rhinocrasis". In: Gherardo Gnoli, Vitalij M. Gusalov and Adriano V. Rossi (eds.): *Studia Iranica et Alanica. Festschrift for Prof. Vasilij Ivanovič Abaev on the Occasion of His 95th Birthday* (*Serie Orientale Roma* LXXXII). Rome, pp. 105–139

Ghilain, Antoine 1939: *Essai sur la langue parthe, son système verbal d'après les textes manichéens du Turkestan oriental* (*Bibliothèque du Muséon* 9). Louvain (réimpr. 1966)

Ḥasandūst, Mohammad 2004: *Farhang-e rīše-šenāsī-ye zabān-e fārsī* I: *a-t*. Tehran 1383 h.š.

Henning, Walter B. 1934: "Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfanfragmente". In: *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 9, pp. 158–253 (= *Selected Papers* I (*Acta Iranica* 14), pp. 65–160)

— 1940: *Sogdica*. London (= *Selected Papers* II (*Acta Iranica* 15), pp. 1–68)

— 1947: "Two Manichæan Magical Texts, with an Excursus on the Parthian ending -*ēndēh*". In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, pp. 39–66 (= *Selected Papers* II, pp. 273–300)

— 1954: "The ancient language of Azerbaijan". In: *Transactions of the Philological Society*, pp. 157–177 (= *Selected Papers* II, pp. 457–477)

Horn, Paul 1893: *Grundriß der neupersischen Etymologie*. Straßburg (repr. Hildesheim etc. 1988)

Lieu, Samuel, Sarah Clackson and Erica Hunter 1999: *Dictionary of Manichaean Texts* I: *Texts from the Roman Empire. Texts in Syriac, Greek, Coptic and Latin* (*Corpus Fontium Manichaeorum Subsidia* 2). Turnhout

MacKenzie, D. Neil 1967: "Notes on the Transcription of Pahlavi". In: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30, pp. 17–29 (= 1999/I: 35–47)

— 1986: *A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary*. London etc. (2nd ed.)

— 1999: *Iranica Diversa* (*Serie Orientale Roma* LXXXIV). Rome, 2 vol.

MIRTEXT: http://www.bbaw.de/bbaw/Forschung/Forschungsprojekte/turfanforschung/de/MIRTEXT

Nyberg, Henrik S. 1974: *A Manual of Pahlavi II: Glossary*. Wiesbaden

Reck, Christiane 2004: *Gesegnet sei dieser Tag. Manichäische Festtagshymnen – Edition der mittelpersischen und parthischen Sonntags-, Montags- und Bemahymnen* (*Berliner Turfantexte* 22). Turnhout

Schwartz, Martin 1982: "'Blood' in Sogdian and Old Iranian". In: *Monumentum Georg Morgenstierne* II (*Acta Iranica* 22), pp. 189–196

Sims-Williams, Nicholas 1981: "Notes on Manichaean Middle Persian Morphology". In: *Studia Iranica* 10, pp. 165–176

— 1983: "Indian elements in Parthian and Sogdian". In: Klaus Röhrborn, Wolfgang Veenker (eds.): *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien. Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981* (*Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica* 16). Wiesbaden, pp. 132–141

— 1990: "Persian *bahmān* 'so-and-so': An Ancient Survival?" In: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, pp. 10–12

— 2000: *Bactrian Documents from Northern Afghanistan I: Legal and Economic Documents*. Oxford

Sundermann, Werner 1979: "Namen von Göttern, Dämonen und Menschen in iranischen Versionen des manichäischen Mythos". In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 6, pp. 95–133 (= 2001/I: 121–163)

— 1981: *Mitteliranische manichäische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts, mit einem Appendix von Nicholas Sims-Williams* (*Berliner Turfantexte* 11). Berlin

— 2001: *Manichaica Iranica. Ausgewählte Schriften* (*Serie Orientale Roma* LXXXIX). Rome, 2 vol.

Weber, Dieter 1970: *Die Stellung der sog. Inchoativa im Mitteliranischen*. Göttingen (PhD thesis)

Tomas Hägg and Bo Utas, *The Virgin and Her Lover: Fragments of an Ancient Greek Novel and a Persian Epic Poem* (Brill Studies in Middle Eastern Literatures, 30). Leiden & Boston: Brill, 2003. Pp. xii+278.

This book, authored jointly by a classicist (Hägg) and a Persianist (Utas), studies the remnants of a Greek romance and its transmission into medieval Persian. The texts in question are the first- or second-century Greek prose novel *Mētiokhos kai Parthenopē* (*M&P*), of which only scattered fragments exist, and the 11th century Persian verse romance *Vāmiq u 'Adhrā* (*V&A*) by the Ghaznavid court poet 'Unṣurī (d. after 1031), of which some 380 verses, plus additional testimonia, survive. The authors state that their primary objects are to provide critical editions (with translation and commentary) of the fragmentary remains of both works, to present "supplementary material directly pertaining" to both, to consider by what channels the story eventually arrived at the Ghaznavid court in eastern Iran (present Afghanistan) in the early 11th

century, and to reconstruct the plots of both works and compare their similarities and differences (see pp. 2–3).

The book is divided into six chapters. Chapter I ("Introduction") outlines the goals of the study, briefly discusses the recovery of fragments of *Mētiokhos kai Parthenopē* (of whose origins—when, where, and by whom it was written—no evidence exists; cf. p. 188); the "reappearance" of *Vāmiq u 'Adhrā* (the fragmentary text of which, discovered and edited by M. Shafi, was published posthumously in 1967); the "conjunction" of the texts; and summaries of the scholarly discourse on both. Chapter 2 ("The Greek Sources") presents the surviving fragments of *M&P*, preserved (so far as is known to date) on five papyrus pieces and one ostracon, along with evidence from later literary and artistic testimonia, including two floor mosaics from Roman Syria. References are made to theatrical performances of the story; much attention is paid to its "historicity"; a final section deals with the (Greek?)/Coptic/Arabic "Martyrdom of St. Parthenope", which appears to have affinities with *M&P*.

Chapter 3 ("The Persian Sources") constitutes the major part of the book (some 111 pages). It discusses the fragments of *V&A* edited by Shafi, presents the Persian text (emending Shafi's edition in some places) and an English translation, and adds a section on verses found in other sources which are believed to belong to the poem. Chapter 4 ("Transformations of the Text") speculates on the ways by which the story of *M&P* reached Iran, and discusses other and later imitations of 'Unsurī poem. Chapter 5 attempts to reconstruct the plots of both works and to compare them. Chapter 6 ("Problems and Challenges") again summarises the authors' goals and suggests further lines of inquiry. The book includes a bibliography, indexes of references, a general index, and several illustrations, including color plates and facsimiles of texts.

I am not qualified to comment on Hägg's treatment of the Greek fragments and related materials, except to say that they appear to be presented meticulously, and the relevant scholarly literature is referred to extensively, all in a style typical of classical scholarship. I will focus here on the Persian text, its translation, the question of how the story might have been transmitted from Greek to Persian, and related issues. First, however, I would like to address the book's overall structure and organization. As a collaborative effort some unevenness must, of course, be expected. But the book reads more like a series of essays which refer to one another but do not completely cohere. There is much repetition, and some curious gaps, as questions raised—at least in this reader's mind—early in the book are only answered (if at all) much later. The authors' overall intent is philological rather than literary, and this colors their discussions of the texts. The Greek and Persian textual fragments are presented long before the chapter which attempts to reconstruct the plots of both works, thus leaving the reader somewhat in the dark; similarly, the *dramatis personae* need introduction at an earlier point. In short, more attention might have been given to tying up the book's various threads.

That the two works are connected is clear, as can be seen from common plot elements (e.g. the chance meeting of the lovers outside the Temple of Hera in Samos, a symposium on the nature of Eros) and from the presence of Greek names in *V&A*. Since both works are fragmentary, an entire "reconstruction" of their plots is impossible; but we may assume, as do the authors, that they contain elements typical of the romance genre, a term I prefer to both "novel" and "epic": the lovers must undergo various trials and tribulations, including wandering in foreign lands, and suffer a variety of adventures before finally achieving union—if, in fact, they do; not all romances have a happy ending. But it is unfortunate that the differences between the two romances, as well as the apparent "suppression" of *V&A* (see further below) are seen as resulting from the story's transferal from a Greek to a Muslim literary milieu. It is stated in the Introduction that "The Greek themes [unspecified] that once must have been current in the Near East did not fare well in Muslim literatures ... on the whole, it is rare to find indisputable traces of Greek motifs in these literatures." Reasons for this are said to include the fact that "Greek names were easily distorted ... and that certain plots [again, unspecified], especially love stories, were alien to the Islamic ethos that soon became dominant also in literary enterprises" (p. 10).

The argument concerning nomenclature—the difficulties in transcribing Greek proper and place names into Arabic and, later, into Persian—is a valid one. But how does one identify a

"Greek" motif or plot, or isolate these from "non-Greek" elements, after centuries of diffusion, selection, and adaptation? Moreover, neither Arabic nor Persian literature lack for "love stories", including some which might well be considered contrary to the "Islamic ethos": for example, the star-crossed lovers of Arabic 'Udhrī poetry (attributed to poets from the Arab tribe of 'Udhra, a name which resonates strongly with that of 'Adhrā), or the adulterous lovers of the Persian romance *Vīs u Rāmīn*, composed only a few decades after *V&A*. Whether these did or did not contain "Greek motifs" cannot be considered here; and, admittedly, *V&A* is a special case, due to its obvious textual relationship to *M&P*.

Utas' presentation of "The Persian Sources" (Chapter 3) comprises an edition and translation of the fragments published by Shafi, discovered in the stuffing of the binding of an unrelated manuscript, and citations of testimonia found in other sources. Unfortunately, the manuscript used by Shafi could not be examined at first hand, but only through Shafi's photographic reproductions. The discussion of the poem's meter (*mutaqārib*) and its form (*mathnawī*, i.e. rhyming couplets) is somewhat problematic: the meter (spelled both meter and metre on the same page, 79) was indeed used for "historical epics"; but the statement that "in the 11ᵗʰ century AD it was *still* used occasionally also for romantic poems" (my emphasis; the author cites the examples of 'Ayyūqīs *Varqa u Gulshāh* and 'Unṣurīs *Khing-but u Surkh-but*) begs the question of whether there is evidence for earlier usage in "romantic poems". Here, consultation of G. Lazard, *Les premiers poètes persans*, vol. 1. Paris 1964, might have been profitable. The *mutaqārib* meter was used for other types of poetry, including panegyrics and love poems (*ghazal*), for many centuries; the *mathnawī* form was used not only for "Persian epic poems"— such as, notably, the *Shāhnāma* ("Book of Kings") by Firdawsī, an older contemporary of 'Unṣurī—but for narrative poems in general: epic, historical, homiletic, didactic, romantic, mystical, and so on. Referring to the frequency of unmetrical passages in the text, the conclusion is reached that the manuscript was copied "by a non-professional hand," and that the fragment was "a private copy rather than the work of a professional scribe, probably made by somebody who fancied the poem and wanted to have a copy of it for himself". Lacking the poem's beginning and end, which might have provided some indications of for whom, by whom, where and when the copy was made, this seems a reasonable assumption; but it, too, is somewhat problematic, as will be seen later.

The Persian text and English translation follow. The verses are ordered and lacunae in the text are indicated. The text itself (which seems to reproduce a typed copy, although I cannot be sure) contains a number of typographical errors, unless these represent scribal errors; we are not told. For example: v. 35, for *diyāz* (meaningless) read *niyāz*; v. 55, for *āgāy* read *āgahī*, v. 63, read *halāk* for *talāk*; v. 144, read *farzāna-ī* for *farzāna* (orthographically correct but lacking the *hamza*-sign, which would indicate the singular); v. 159, for *rāy* read *rūy*. Metrical irregularities do indeed abound; some attempts at emendation appear in the notes.

The translation is sometimes confusing and not always felicitous; it is often vague, awkward, or questionable, and the English is not always accurate. I will give a few examples, chosen more or less at random; but before doing so I should say that, despite some lapses, and understanding the difficulties faced by the translator, the effort is both highly commendable and extremely useful. In v. 46, for "she gave him every seed of trouble in the fist," read, "she gave him fistfuls of trouble" (this is conjectural); v. 63, for "she is evil-thinking regarding my dark ashes", read "she is a dark ill-wisher towards the earth of my body" (which, alas, is equally awkward). V. 69, for "move on to" (*gashtan*) read "approach"; v. 119, for "wreathed" read "writhed"; a possible reading for the lacuna in the second hemistich might be *ba-pīchīd 'Adhrā zi gham u zi dard*, a fairly formulaic construction. In v. 134, for "very honoured" read "most honoured" (*pur-māya-tar*); v. 158 (in the symposium on the nature of Eros, which is clearly based on that in *M&P*), for "a wise man has likened love with a young man" read "to a young man". In v. 185, for "big occasion" (*kār-i buzurg*), which is clumsy, read "grand occasion"; v. 272, for "emerged" (in love), read "immersed": v. 291, for "As for 'Adhrā, all her days were spent …" read "He ['Adhrā's teacher, the subject of the preceding verses] devoted all his time [to her]." In v. 313, for "Near herself she saw" (*ba-nazdīk-i khud dīd*) read "she thought". Obviously, the fragmentary nature of the text creates difficulties in translation, and when the text is corrupt, the translations must often be conjectural.

Comments upon the text follow, which note lacunae and make some suggestions as to "what happened next". One point of interest, which is not commented upon until later (see p. 202), is the description of the young ʿAdhrā as precocious, growing more rapidly than normal, excelling in all intellectual, artistic, sporting and military fields, to the extent that her father entrusts her with his army (cf. vv. 25–39). In terms of the "Islamic ethos", this may seem unusual, but it is by no means unprecedented in other Persian texts; contemporary examples occur both in Firdawsī's *Shāhnāma* and in *Varqa u Gulshāh*. Interestingly, little is said about the abilities of Vāmiq, the "ardent lover" (p. 136).

The comments on the text are primarily philological rather than literary; here, I will note only the speculation as to why ʿAdhrā's father gave her this name (which means "virgin"); perhaps, as the text states, "because he did not see the like of her in skill" (v. 36). It is suggested that "The underlying idea is probably the essential quality of this girl as 'impregnable'" (p. 135); but, given the relationship with *M&P*, ʿAdhrā" simply translates "Parthenope", as is noted later in the book. The comments further address the manuscript, which contains a number of blank spaces; either single blank lines probably intended for headings which were never filled in, or larger spaces intended for illustrations (pp. 136–138). This is not an unlikely assumption; but if the manuscript was indeed a "private copy", as argued earlier, the likelihood of illustrations, especially of any quality, decreases. The first such illustration, intended for the blank space between vv. 85 and 86, might have been meant to show "the magic moment when the eyes of the young couple meet at the temple of Hera," an encounter summarized by the verse, "From one glance all upheaval will arise, the sharp fire of love will enter the mind" (v. 90). Says the author: "This is obviously a first dramatic peak in the story, which must have been followed by similar concentrated moments at regular intervals. Unfortunately, these seem to be irretrievably lost" (p. 137). A second space "indicates that the copyist had planned an illustration at this point, probably showing Vāmiq in front of king Fuluqrāṭ [Polykrates, at whose court he had been warmly received], possibly also showing an anxious ʿAdhrā in the background (biting her finger in amazement)" (p. 138). If this were true, we would perhaps have had a stylistic antecedent to the 13th-century manuscript of *Varqa u Gulshāh*, which has, more or less, the same type of spacing; but since the text is fragmentary, and the manuscript was quite possibly never completed, this falls within the realm of conjecture. Another question which arises—but is not addressed—is whether the pages found by Shafi might not have been a rough draft of a manuscript intended to be recopied and illustrated later. The fact that it was used as "scrap paper" in the binding of another manuscript might indicate as much.

This section also presents a prose version of the story of the lovers from the *Dārābnāma*, compiled (perhaps) in the 12th century and "ascribed to an otherwise unknown Abū Ṭāhir Tarsūsī" (or Tartūsī) (see pp. 144–148). It might be more accurate to state, "the enigmatic Abū Ṭāhir Ṭarsūsī", for the writer (or storyteller) of this name is hardly unknown. There are at least ten *dāstāns* (stories or narratives) attributed to him; and while his identity and his dates are subjects of an ongoing critical debate, his putative association with the court of Maḥmūd of Ghazna, if true, would make him a contemporary of ʿUnṣurī. (On Ṭarsūsī see, most recently, Marina Gaillard, trans., *Alexandre le Grand en Iran: Le Dârâb Nâmeh d'Abu Tâher Tarsusi*, Paris, 2005, pp. 79–85; Julia Rubanovich, review of Abū Ṭāhir Ṭarsūsī, *Dārāb-nāma*, ed. & trans. N. B. Kondyreva, in *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 27 (2002) 602–609.) The peculiarities of this text (for example, the description of Vāmiq as a youth (*barnā, kādak*) with no facial hair, *khaṭṭ*) are not discussed.

There follows a list of testimonia (some 151 verses), often, though not always attributed to ʿUnṣurī, found in other sources. With respect to their presentation, it would have been useful if the specific *shāhid*, the evidentiary word or phrase, had been clearly indicated. In the case of transcriptions into Persian of Greek names, it is obvious; at other times it is not. Moreover, the glosses and references to these testimonia assume specialist knowledge on the part of the reader. Some verses, although in the *mutaqārib* meter, do not unequivocally belong to *V&A;* others provide (somewhat shaky) evidence for further reconstruction of the poem. Some of the translations are awkward and/or questionable. For example, in #38, in light of Rādūyānī's explanation of the rhetorical figure employed, for *sākhtand*, "they prepared (for war)" would be

preferable to "they built". #41, translated as "When the eloquent expresses the opinion of the learned, /he brings the word to the tongue of the beasts" is awkward; what seems meant is "he puts words in the mouths [i.e. on the tongues] of beasts"; this, like #32, evokes the animal fable, and might be part of a versified *Kalīla wa-Dimna*. In #47 "worthless" seems more fitting than "mean" (for *kasandar*). In #117, "made" would be preferable to "built", in the context of making a musical instrument. In general, and giving due acknowledgement to the authors' statement that their aim is to provide "literal" rather than "literary" translations, more fluency could have been managed without detriment to the wording of the text.

In this reviewer's opinion, the next two chapters (4, "Transformations of the Text", and 5, "Reconstructions of the Plot") should have appeared in reverse order, thus leading naturally to the concluding chapter. I will therefore deal with them in reverse order, before moving to the conclusion. There is much unnecessary repetition in these chapters, including the search for identifiable "Greek elements" and further speculation as to why 'Adhrā's father gave her that name (see p. 218), as well as on other matters already touched upon earlier in the book. The "reconstructions" involve much speculation and uncertainty; that of *M&P* is largely based on *V&A*. The discussion is highly detailed, involving line-by-line comparisons between the Greek and Persian texts, and adducing other examples of common plot elements and motifs. (A chart of this line-by-line reconstruction might have been useful, but perhaps too cumbersome.) It is impossible do to justice to this complex analysis here; suffice to say that a major point of interest is the apparent intermingling of "Greek" and "Persian" elements in both texts, a point to which I shall return.

Chapter Four ("Transformations of the Text") speculates on how the Greek story might have reached medieval Persia, in an effort to "try to see what happened to the text between these two points, that is, trace the transformations it may have undergone in the thousand years that separate them" (p. 188). It begins by tracing the reception of *M&P* in the classical period and late antiquity, and commenting—yet again—on significant differences between the Greek and Persian versions of the story. To take just one example: the Greek text seems to provide no motivation for the symposiarch (the Greek philosopher Anaximenes/Persian *Nakhmīnus) "to choose Eros as the topic of discussion," whereas in the Persian version the philosopher, observing that the couple have fallen in love, tests them by proposing this topic. "It does not seem probable that the Persian poet has himself invented this ingenious part of the plot," which might have been "placed earlier in the Greek text … But, even so, the Persian adaptor would have improved on his model in dramatic timing" (pp. 189–190). In view of the chronological gap between the two texts, and our ignorance as to possible intermediaries (see below), we might reasonably think that, during that thousand-year gap, other versions of the story appeared upon which 'Unṣurī might have drawn. The testimonia discussed earlier—theatrical performances of the story in Asia Minor; the 3rd-century mosaics in Roman Syria—show that by that time the lovers had become famous characters, and that the story was moving eastwards. But the attested cases of reception "all represent blind alleys in relation to the transformation process that produced *V&A* in the end; for that work obviously builds on the complete novel, not on any of its adaptations. There must have been an unbroken manuscript tradition somewhere, long enough to permit the transition to another language and another literary culture" (p. 193). Various speculations on possible channels of transmission follow.

Two of these are singled out for special attention: one, "a possible Middle Persian, i.e. Sasanian, version, and the other … an Arabic intermediary" (p. 194). The existence of a Middle Persian text is based on an account by the notoriously unreliable 15th-century Persian writer Dawlatshāh Samarqandī, which "is obviously a piece of nationalistic lore. The names Vāmiq and 'Adhrā are pure Arabic and could not have appeared in a Sasanian work" (p. 195). This does not exclude the possibility of a Middle Persian intermediary, but the existence of such is certainly doubtful.

The *Fihrist* of Ibn al-Nadīm, written ca. 988, lists among the works by Sahl ibn Hārūn al-Dastmaysānī (d. 830), the director of the caliph al-Ma'mūn's library, "a Kitāb Wāmiq wa-'Adhrā" (p. 195). This reference, written almost 150 years after Sahl ibn Hārūn's death, might nevertheless be supported by a statement in Biberstein-Kazimirski's *Dictionnaire arabe–*

français (Paris, 1860) to the effect that "Vāmiq is a proper name and the lover of 'Adhrā but [is also] 'le sujet des romans arabes' ('the subject of Arabic romances'), of which, unfortunately, no examples were provided" (see p. 200). That the story or, at least, the famous pair of lovers was known in the Arabic-speaking world as early as the late 8th–early 9th century is further attested by a reference to Wāmiq by the poet al-'Abbās ibn al-Aḥnaf (d. 803?), who belonged to the generation prior to that of Sahl ibn Hārūn, in one of his love poems.

A further, and most intriguing, reference to the story is found in the polymath al-Bīrūnī's (d. c. 1050) *Kitāb al-Ṣaydāna*, a treatise on pharmacology dedicated to Sultan Mas'ūd I of Ghazna (r. 1030–1041). Al-Bīrūnī states that he himself translated the tale (*qiṣṣa*) of Vāmiq and 'Adhrā, along with two other romantic stories (also versified by 'Unṣurī), those of Qasīm al-surūr and 'Ayn al-ḥayāt (*Shādbahr u 'Ayn al-Ḥayāt*) and of "the two idols of Bāmiyān (*Khing-but u Sorkh but*)" as well as some "spicy anecdotes" (p. 195). Unfortunately, al-Bīrūnī does not state from, or into, what languages he translated these stories, when, or for whom, although it is generally assumed that he translated them from Persian verse into Arabic prose (see p. 19). Al-Bīrūnī arrived—under duress—at the court of Maḥmūd of Ghazna in 1017, where he might well have made the acquaintance of 'Unṣurī. He wrote chiefly in Arabic, and is known for his apparent contempt of the Persian language, which, he stated, "is only suitable for stories about old kings and nightly tales (*samar*)" (p. 195, and see 196). The nature and purpose of these "translations" remain a mystery; but, given both contiguity and contemporaneity with 'Unṣurī, it is tempting to infer a connection. After exploring further possible connections between 'Unṣurī's other two romances and Ṭarsūsī's *Dārāb-nāma* (see pp. 196–199), the authors conclude: "Of whatever origin, Vāmiq and 'Adhrā were known all over the Near East as the names of two exemplary lovers from at least the 10th century AD, in oral tradition possibly earlier" (pp. 199–200).

After further (repetitive) speculation on the Arabic names of the lovers, which "may be easily taken as generic," and on the probability that neither al-Bīrūnī nor Sahl ibn Hārūn (let alone 'Unṣurī) "were able to translate from Greek" (p. 200; al-Bīrūnī is said to have had a "superficial knowledge of Syriac, Greek, and Sanskrit"; see the entry in the *Encyclopedia of Arabic Literature*, ed. J. S. Meisami and P. Starkey, London, 1998; and Sahl ibn Hārūn's position virtually presupposes a knowledge of Syriac at least), we are told—again—that the prevalence of Greek names in *V&A* "makes it more or less necessary to assume a written intermediary (Arabic or Persian but not Pahlavi or Syriac)" (p. 201). A Syriac version cannot be ruled out; but oral transmission, as noted earlier, would certainly have distorted the names beyond recognition.

This largely philological discussion is followed by speculations on the influence of the "Islamic ethos" on *V&A*, to which I will return. A related issue is that of the so-called "suppression" of *V&A*. It is stated that (according to the 13th-century writer 'Awfī) *V&A*, together with 'Unṣurī's two other romances, belonged "to the so-called *Khizānah-yi Yamīn ud-daulah*, 'Treasury of Yamīn ud-daulah,' composed by 'Unṣurī in honour of his patron ... Maḥmūd of Ghazna. Apparently, none of the components of this 'treasury' fared well in the world ... Possibly, [this 'Treasury'] was suppressed after the defeat of the Ghaznavid dynasty by the Ghurids in the middle of the 12th century [this was Shafi's suggestion], but the un-Islamic nature of its plot and the inconvenient Greek shape of the names of many of its characters and places were presumably the main reasons for the disappearance of 'Unṣurī's *V&A*" (p. 203). I have not seen 'Awfī's text; but it seems possible that his reference to the "Treasury" may mean rather the famed library of Maḥmūd of Ghazna (*khizāna* is a standard term for "library"). Many of the contents of the Ghaznavid libraries were destroyed in the Ghurid sacks of Ghazna in the mid-12th century; more works undoubtedly perished during the later Oghuz occupation of the city for some 12 to 15 years (see C. E. Bosworth, *The Later Ghaznavids: Splendour and Decay*, New York, 1977, pp. 117, 124–128). Thus it is quite possible that it was not the "non-Islamic content" of *V&A* which led to its disappearance, but the fortunes, or misfortunes, of war. In this connection we might ask: how many of the works mentioned in Ibn al-Nadīm's *Fihrist*, or in the much later Ḥājjī Khalīfa's *Kashf al-ẓunūn*, are known to us now only by their titles?

Imitations of *V&A*, bearing the same title and dating nearly from 'Unṣurī's own time, have not

survived (see p. 204). The first known Turkish version, by Lāmi'ī (d. 1532), cites the authority of 'Unṣurī, but differs substantially from that poet's work (see pp. 204–206; I shall return to Lāmi'ī below). Other versions of the story, in Turkish and in Persian (and one in Kashmiri and Persian), range ever farther from 'Unṣurī's "core text"; the overwhelming motivation for such works seems to be their incorporation of the names of this famous pair of lovers, as a kind of authoritative title, with, of course, the further—stated or implied—authority of the Persian poet.

The final chapter 6 ("Problems and Challenges") restates the book's main object: to publish the relevant fragments and translations so that they may "serve as the basis for future studies of the two texts and their literary and historical contexts" (p. 251). Desiderata include inspection of the Persian manuscript used by Shafi (which is unlikely to be achieved), and "to reach further than the present editors in identifying the Greek names transmitted in Arabic/Persian form" (p. 251). "A special problem that would probably reward further scrutiny is the relationship between the novel and the epic poem [terms which need refining] as revealed in the plot where the fragments overlap" (p. 252); another task "would be the systematic search in Greek and Byzantine novels (and related literature) for parallels to the motifs discernible in *V&A*, in order both to complete the reconstruction and to find out more about the possible influence of *M&P* on later Greek fiction," as well as research on the occurrence of "Greek components in the … rich tradition of Persian epic poetry and a systematic analysis of such elements in a comparative frame-work [which] would certainly yield new insights into the cultural and literary history of Iran." Other tasks include investigating the possibility of an Arabic intermediary, and following versions of the stories in various languages (pp. 252–253).

The book as a whole is based on solid scholarship; but it has shortcomings, some of which have been touched upon above, others of which will be discussed here. We will leave aside such technical problems as mistranslations, typographical errors, and so on, and deal with the book's conceptual approach, which is dominated by the philological method. There is little effort at placing either of the works studied in their specific historical and literary contexts, although such an effort is more evident in the discussion of *M&P*; literary issues are, in general, avoided, and we learn little about the style or the literary worth of either work. Admittedly, the fragmentary nature of the texts provides little material to work with; but one might have expected to gain more literary insights than is the case.

Two major issues—for this reviewer at least—arise from the authors' handling of the textual materials. The first, which has been hinted at above, relates to the rather facile generalizations concerning the influence of an "Islamic ethos" on *V&A* and on the work's survival. The following statement (which I apologize for quoting at length) perhaps best expresses this problem. After the observation that it is impossible to know how closely 'Unṣurī followed *M&P*, or whatever model he might have had, we read:

> If more had been preserved of Parthenope/'Adhrā's intervention in the sympotic debate on Eros, the differences [between the Greek and Persian versions] would perhaps have emerged more clearly. One could have expected various attempts at islamising the story, especially perhaps the rather un-islamic figure of 'Adhrā, but neither in the extant fragment nor in the testimonial verses is there any obvious transformation of that sort. The heroine remains a remarkably independent and dominating character in the Persian poem. She seems to have the leading role. She is foretold to become a king. She takes the initiative in the relation to Vāmiq by addressing him, an unknown young man, first. She takes part in the symposium on equal footing with the men and wins the discussion on the shapes of Love by being given the last word. It is true that she is described as a perfect woman, but endowed with all the virtues of a man: brought up like a prince (son), more learned than men, a master in many arts and a hero at war … No wonder that this version of the story was suppressed at an early stage! … [The] versions that survived feature a much more restrained type of heroine (p. 202).

The assumption that works produced in an "Islamic" environment must necessarily be "islamicised", in the most narrow sense and perhaps in accord with modern perceptions of "Islam", does not hold up against the evidence. Medieval Islamic presentations of women are perhaps most notable for their variety. Epic poems and romances constitute a special case, although they are not alone in this, due to their frequent presentations of strong and positive women. The

Shāhnāma abounds in examples, as do the 12th-century verse romances of Niẓāmī Ganjavīh (in particular his *Khusraw u Shīrīn*), as well as many medieval prose romances (for instance, that of *Samak-i 'Ayyār*).

This leads us to a second issue, by way of the Turkish poet Lāmi'ī, whose use of "the repeated motif of love by picture—or hearsay," which is not present in 'Unṣurī's poem, is described as "A typical Muslim solution of the problem of how to have two future lovers get acquainted without breaking the rules of propriety" (p 206). While Lāmi'ī may have taken this motif from Niẓāmī's *Khusraw u Shīrīn*, in which falling in love by both verbal description and by picture feature prominently and/or also from many intervening romances in both prose and verse, the motif appears to be, not "Islamic", but "Greek". To take only one example: around the beginning of the 3rd century CE, the historian Athenaeus, from the Egyptian city of Naucratis, quoted a story from a History of Alexander composed by Chares of Mytilene in the 4th century BCE. Chares tells of the lovers Zariadres and Odatis, who fell in love through dream visions of each other. Athenaeus "tells the story as historically true, to illustrate the fact that there is something even more strange than falling in love by means of a portrait ... He concludes by saying that the story is greatly cherished by 'the Asian barbarians' " (Dick Davis, *Panthea's Children: Hellenistic Novels and Medieval Persian Romances*, New York, 2002, pp. 61–62).

The story of Zariadres and Odatis, he a Median prince, she a Scythian princess, receives a brief comment in the book under review: "[It] certainly points to the early existence of romantic epics among the Iranians, while the idea of an early Greek borrowing remains highly speculative" (p. 12). This leads to my final point, and to an issue that receives virtually no attention in this book, but which is presented by Davis: namely, "that connections exist between Greek Hellenistic romances and a small group of 11th century Persian romances [including *V&A*] ... that parts of the Hellenistic romances themselves derive from Persian prototypes," and that there existed "an intermittent mutual borrowing and mingling of Greek and Persian literary cultures" from around the Achaemenid period onwards (Davis, p. 1). Obviously I cannot discuss Davis's arguments in detail here; but the evidence he presents is telling. One major point, which, I think, would not be argued against by the authors of *The Virgin and Her Lover*, is that the "plots of the Greek novels of late antiquity tend generally to unfold within the territorial and temporal confines of the Achaemenid empire," i.e., "in the lands bordering on the eastern Mediterranean" (p. 2); we might note that Samos, the setting for the lovers' encounter in both *M&P* and *V&A*, fell under Achaemenid control following the death of Polykrates/Fuluqrāṭ, the father of Parthenope/'Adhrā, and that the heroines' "wanderings in Persia" appear to form a major part of both works. The fascination of Greek writers with things Persian, perhaps reflecting the "exoticism" of romance, perhaps also reflecting real or remembered realities, is certainly on record. The literary issues are of course far more complex, and encompass settings, personages, plot-structure, themes and motifs. What seems evident is that there was never a clear dividing line between "Greek" and "Persian", least of all in geographical terms, since territories changed hands, and since the effects of the long Greek presence in Persia extended well into the Islamic period. Elements of each culture, however, were absorbed into, and enriched by, the other, producing what was, in fact, a hybrid culture. It is disappointing to see that the implications of this, for both texts, are not explored in the book under review, which confines itself primarily to documentable textual evidence, and disregards consideration of the vibrant milieux which produced those texts, as well as of the likelihood that oral transmission may have contributed to the formation of both. In other words, the broader contextual milieu—and not merely the surviving textual fragments and various testimonia—deserves serious examination. There would have been an opportunity here for a truly creative discourse; but, alas, that opportunity has been ignored.

Julie Scott Meisami
Point Richmond, California

Essays on the Origins of Kurdish Nationalism. Ed. by Abbas Vali (Kurdish Studies Series 4). Costa Mesa, Cal.: Mazda Publishers, 2003. Pp. 234.

The Kurdish question, after having been regarded for many decades as an internal issue for those countries that govern the Kurds, has, since the early 1990s, received more attention not only in the Middle East but also in the Western media. However, the coverage of the Kurds' situation by the Western media has been far from systematic and thorough with regard to the various aspects of the question. Although the Kurds are the fourth largest ethnic group in the Middle East, and despite the fact that the 20th century witnessed several major Kurdish revolts in Iran, Iraq, and Turkey, the Kurds have failed to establish a national state. What are the peculiarities of the Kurdish nationalism? What are the backgrounds of the different Kurdish uprisings which have been highlighted now and again in the Western media? Why are there so many conflicting reports about the Kurds? What is the real nature of the Kurds' situation? One could add a series of similar questions to this list. In fact, the number of academic studies on the Kurds amounts to only a handful, and the curious reader still awaits a persuasive explanation of the factors underlying what has been labelled the Kurdish question. *Essays on the Origins of Kurdish Nationalism* can be regarded as one of the few serious studies that can fulfil the expectations of those who are looking for an academic analysis of the very nature of the Kurdish issue. This book provides informed argumentation and debate that can surely remedy the existing "intellectual lacuna in the area of Kurdish studies" (p. 3).

The book, which consists of six articles, is, as its title shows, mainly devoted to theoretical and conceptual analyses of Kurdish nationalism. Vali, the editor of the book, has, in his introduction, presented a precise account of the current situation of Kurdish studies in the Western academy. Further, he has professionally provided an excellent presentation of the articles of the book. The editor, in his introduction, discussing nationalism and the question of origins, asserts that arguments about the origins of an ideology, especially nationalism, are more than a plain scholastic exercise in historiography and ascertainment of the exact date of the birth of a certain ideology. The issue of origins is, in fact, "the point of the emergence of the ideology as well as the genesis of its subject as a historical and political actor". In other words the origin of an ideology "is the mirror image of the identity of its subject" (p. 1). Vali, arguing the order of causality in nationalist discourse, divides the conceptions of the origin of nationalism into three approaches: the primordialists, who believe in the antiquity of the nation, the constructivists, who consider nationalism as the *prima causa* of the nation, and the ethnicists, who are, according to Vali, positioned somewhere in between the primordialists and constructivists.

The first essay of the volume, "Some Remarks on Kurdish Historiographical Discourse in Turkey (1919–1980)", is written by Hamit Bozarslan. In the first part of this article he analyses the role of nationalist historiography in general, maintaining that "it is a discourse of political actors on the past, the present and the future" (p. 14). In the second part of the article Bozarslan analyses Kurdish historical discourse in Turkey, arguing that "it is closely linked to the material and intellectual conditions of the Kurdish movement" (p. 16). Discussing the Kurdish historiographical discourse in Turkey from its early stages in the 1910s until the end of the 1970s, Bozarslan concludes that it has not been able to change the "broad sociological outline of the Kurdish question" (p.38). However, Bozarslan argues, this has resulted in the creation of a "state of mind" among the Kurds who have, by possessing this mindset, been able to "retain a sense of themselves as belonging to the same group".

Bozarslan is also the author of the fifth essay of the volume. In this essay, "Kurdish Nationalism in Turkey: From Tacit Contract to Rebellion (1919–1925)", he takes up the situation of Kurdish nationalism during the last decade of the Ottoman Empire and the early years after the triumph of the Kemalists in establishing the Turkish Republic. Arguing the paradoxical character of the development of Kurdish nationalism in this period, he maintains that the changes in the character of the Turkish state and political power, in other words the collapse of the Ottomans and the establishment of the Turkish Republic during the early years of the 1920s, caused a radical shift in the formation and character of Kurdish nationalism in Turkey.

Martin van Bruinessen, the author of the second essay of the volume, discusses the role of an epic work written by a legendary Kurdish poet, Ahmedi Khani, in the late 17th century. Khani's *Mam u Zin* was considered a nationalist manifesto by almost all Kurdish nationalists during the entire 20th century. The nationalistic reading of this work has been used as an argument to place the onset of Kurdish nationalism at an earlier point in history. However, for van Bruinessen, who tries to show the shortcomings of such a reading, this is not an appropriate reading of a text which was produced during a time when the necessary conditions for the emergence of nationalism as a modern ideology did not exist. Van Bruinessen argues that the prevailing socio-economic structures at the time of Khani were far from proper conditions for the spread of nationalist discourses. Among van Bruinessen's key points in this article one finds his reference to the decisive role of the printing industry in the development of national language and identity as it has been suggested by Benedict Anderson. Due to the absence of such a phenomenon in Khani's time in Kurdistan van Bruinessen rejects the existence of the ideology of nationalism in Kurdistan before the late Ottoman period, i.e. the early decades of the 20th century. Nevertheless, van Bruinessen explicitly maintains Khani's importance for the later Kurdish nationalists who "have been able to discover their own ideas in Ahmedi Khani's work". Hence for him Khani "may be properly called the father of Kurdish nationalism", while he himself "was not really a nationalist" (p. 56).

The editor's own contribution to the volume appears as the third article, in which he analyses the constructions of nation and national identity in Kurdish historical writings. Vali, by deconstructing the works of some known Kurdish writers such as Amin Zaki, Amir Hassanpour and Jemal Nebez, aims to prove his argument concerning the modern genesis of Kurdish identity and nationalism. Vali's main argument in this article is that Kurdish national identity is "unmistakably modern" (p. 104). For him the emergence of various Persian, Turkish and Arab identities in early decades of the 20th century provided the basis for the genesis of Kurdish identity as a relationship between self and other. In other words it is the concept of differences resulting in the formation of new identities. Vali argues that the constructed uniform nation-states in the multi-ethnic countries of Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Syria have resulted in the constant denial of Kurdish identity and the destruction of civil society in these countries. This has in turn given a different character to Kurdish nationalism, which is distinct from classical nationalism in Europe where modernity, democratic citizenship and civil society signified the emergence of nationalism.

Amir Hassanpour, analysing pre-20th century Kurdish historical and literary discourses, discusses the making of Kurdish identity in the fourth article of the volume. By analysing these literary and historical texts he aims to show that Kurdish nationalism dates back to historians and literary men such as Bidlisi, Khani and Koyi. Hassanpour criticises "non-dialectical" critics of metaphysical historiography. According to him "while for metaphysical historians the past determines the present" postmodernist genealogists, who have also, according to Hassanpour, a metaphysical approach to the history, reject the existence of historical events and their "material effectivity in the present" (p. 162). As the editor has mentioned in his introduction to the volume, during the past ten years there has been an intellectual debate, mostly in Kurdish, between Vali and Hassanpour concerning Kurdish nationalism. That is why one finds references to Vali's writings in Hassanpour's article. The ongoing debates between Vali and Hassanpour have contributed to the development of studies on Kurdish nationalism and identity. Thus seeing some dimensions of these debates, even in this volume, makes the reading of the book more interesting.

The sixth essay of the volume, written by Nelida Fuccaro, focuses on Kurdish nationalism in Mandatory Syria (1921–1946). Fuccaro, focusing her analysis on one of the major Kurdish organisations, Khoybun, in 1927, tries to explain the role of various intrinsic and extrinsic factors in the formation, development, and finally the suppression of the Kurdish national movement in Syria in the age of colonial rule.

The articles of the book have comprehensive bibliographies consisting mostly of primary sources related to the discussed topics. Despite some inconsistent transliteration of some

proper names, the editor and the authors have successfully managed the problem of transliteration and transcription in a book which frequently refers to sources written in different modified Arabic alphabets and even in romanized Kurdish and Turkish. The comprehensive name and subject index of the book provides the reader with an excellent tool to find the needed topics in the book easily. There is no doubt that *Essays on the Origins of Kurdish Nationalism*, by bringing together five prominent scholars with different gender, national, linguistic and theoretical backgrounds, albeit all with high academic positions in the Western universities, will be placed on the bookshelves of those who have been waiting for an original study of Kurdish nationalism. As Robert Olson, the Mazda Publishers' Kurdish Studies Series editor, has suggested, these pioneering essays, through their original theoretical constructs, contribute not only to the advancement of Kurdish studies but also to the study of nationalism generally.

Hashem Ahmadzadeh
Uppsala

Jastrow, Otto, *Arabische Texte aus Kinderib* (Semitica viva 30). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2003. Pp. xii, 493.

This book by Otto Jastrow makes available dialectal material that was recorded from a Mḥallami speaker in Beirut during January and February 1969. The volume represents about half of the recorded material and includes German translations. Another volume with the rest of the material is in preparation, as well as a glossary. The Mḥallami vernacular is an Arabic dialect of the so-called *qəltu* type spoken in south-eastern Turkey, north-west of Midyat. It belongs to the Mardin group of *qəltu* dialects. The dialect was first investigated by Hans-Jürgen Sasse (1971)[1] in a dissertation which contained both grammar and texts, and it was later treated by Jastrow in several articles. It was also taken into account in Jastrow's comparative grammar of the *qəltu* dialects, *Die mesopotamisch-arabischen* qəltu-*Dialekte* (1978, texts 1981).

   The present volume focuses on one of the Mḥallami dialects, that of the village Kəndērīb (Turkish name Söğütlü) about 14 km west of Midyat in the vilayet of Mardin. The book greatly enlarges the amount of available dialect text in Mḥallami, and in addition provides an updated grammatical survey. The texts are folk-tales and other narratives as well as descriptions of the material culture, like house construction and festivals. Jastrow has included the already-published texts from Kəndērīb (Jastrow 1974 and 1981)[2] with some corrections in order to collect all the available texts from the same village. As it now stands, the volume can greatly enhance the further grammatical analysis of the dialect as well as serving anthropological purposes. The methodological weakness that all the text originate from one and the same informant is compensated by the particular talents of this speaker: his intelligence, excellent memory and high level of competence in the dialect. We might wish for linguistic material from both sexes and from several generations, etc., which certainly would have extended our knowledge of the dialect. But the circumstances for such research were not favorable at the time of Jastrow's field research in the area, and are still not so today. We have to confine ourselves to available sources, which in the case of Kəndērīb are conspicuously extensive, thanks to the efforts of

---

[1] *Linguistische Analyse des arabischen Dialekts der* Mḥallamīye *in der Provinz Mardin (Südostttürkei)*.
[2] "Der Schatz in der Zisterne. Arabische Texte in der Mḥallami-Mundart von Kəndērīb (Vilayet Mardin, Südostttürkei)," in *Islamwissenschaftliche Abhandlungen, Fritz Meier zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by R. Gramlich, 129–151, Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1974; *Die mesopotamisch-arabischen qəltu-Dialekte*, vol. 2 *Volkskundliche Texte in elf Dialekten* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 46:1, Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1981).

Jastrow, and will be even more so in the future when the remaining volumes are published.

The Mardin group is now the best known of the Anatolian *qəltu* dialects. Only the Kōsa sub-group, and the plain south of Mardin ("Ebene"), lack special studies, but, according to Jastrow, who recorded more than 20 hours of Kōsa speech during 1967–69, Kōsa differs little from Mḥallami, one of the isoglosses being the word for "he came". In Kōsa this is *ğē* with imāla, in Mḥallami *ğā*. As for the dialects of the plain we may get a hint from the study of the border dialects of ʿĀmūda, Dərbēsiyye and Rās əl-ʿAyn by Isaksson and Lahdo.[3] The Christian speakers in those towns exhibit a language close to that of Mardin with the exception of some concessions to Central Syrian speech habits.

The basic verbal morphology is practically the same as in Mardin. What is characteristic of Mḥallami speech is a complete assimilation of nonradical /t/ to a succeeding consonant (*təkkūn* < *tə-tkūn*) and a great variety of preverbal particles (verbal modifiers), which enable the speaker to express subtle aspectual, temporal and modal nuances. We even encounter compounds of verbal modifiers. A combination of the actual present particle *kū-* (< *ykūn*) and the future particle *tə-* gives rise to the complex *kū-tə-* which with the prefix conjugation (*YQTL*) expresses imminent future (an action close at hand). The complex *ka-tə-YQTL* expresses unreal actions in the past (what would have happened).

Besides being linguistic documents, the texts provide extremely valuable information about daily life in Kəndērīb. The main headings sort the texts into the subcategories of village life: "Das Haus", "Mensch und Brauchtum", "Das Dorf und seine Umgebung", "Haustiere", "Jagd und Wildtiere", "Getreide, Brot und Gebäck", "Typische Gerichte", "Kupfergefässe", "Eimer", "Siebe", "Körbe", "Säcke", "Berufe", "Schatzgeschichten", "Märchen". Concerning the technical terminology and loan words, the reader often feels the need for the promised glossary. A glossary would have explained to the reader the word *əddawmāt* (page 146 line 7) with a feminine plural suffix from Aramaic *dawmo*, or the construction *ysōqūn əzzabašš* as a calque from the Turkish *suruyorlar*. As expected, the transcriptions are of high quality. In an extensive text material it is inevitable, though, that some renderings are open to discussion. In such cases it is now possible for the reader to check all the original tape recordings at the website of SemArch, *Semitisches Spracharchiv des Lehrstuhls Semitistik an der Universität Heidelberg* (http://www.semarch.uni-hd.de). This is a commendable procedure that should become standard in all future dialectal text publications. With the help of this facility the reader can check to what extent the transcriber tends towards a phonemic rendering, disregarding some finer nuances in the speech habits. For example, on page 26 line 3 (same in 62 line 1) it is possible to catch *əpšān* "in order to" from the recording, while the transcription ignores the anticipatory assimilation and supplies the rendering *əbšān*; on the same page line 2, *əlḥəddād, ysawīlu* "the smith makes for him" hides a pronunciation with an epenthetic vowel /ə/ in accordance with § 0.3.4 ("Sprossvokal") in the grammatical survey, and it could have been transcribed *əlḥəddād əysawīlu*. This is not a fault, just a matter of suitability, since an exact phonetic transcription would make reading the texts unwieldy. The reviewers have found only one mistake in the transcription: *ʿaqrabīye* on page 62 line 3 should be rendered *ʿaqrab* (a small pickaxe).

Bo Isaksson and *Ablahad Lahdo*
Uppsala

---

[3] Isaksson, Bo and Ablahad Lahdo, "Three border towns between Turkey and Syria: ʿĀmūda, Dərbēsiyye and Rās əl-ʿAyn," in *"Sprich doch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch, wir verstehen es!" 60 Beiträge zur Semitistik. Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by W. Arnold and H. Bobzin. 311–335 (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2002).

List of Contributors

Hashem Ahmadzadeh, Dept. of Arabic and Oriental Studies, The Queen's Drive, Exeter, Devon, UK EX4 4QJ, England

Karin Almbladh, Fjärdhundragatan 54, SE 753 37 Uppsala, Sweden

Christiane Bulut, Seminar für Orientkunde, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Postfach, DE 55099 Mainz, Germany

Mats Eskhult, Dept. of Linguistics and Philology, Box 635, SE 751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

Michael R. Hess, Rathausstrasse 13/1207, DE 10178 Berlin, Germany

Bo Isaksson, Dept. of Linguistics and Philology, Box 635, SE 751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

Folke Josephson, Mäster Benkts gata 8, SE 411 65 Gothenburg, Sweden

Judy Josephson, Mäster Benkts gata 8, SE 411 65 Gothenburg, Sweden

Agnes Korn, Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft, Universität Frankfurt, DE 60054 Frankfurt am Main, Germany

Adil al-Kufaishi, Centre for Translation Studies, Copenhagen University, Njalsgade 130, DK 2300 Copenhagen, Denmark

Ablahad Lahdo, Dept. of Linguistics and Philology, Box 635, SE 751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

Geoffrey L. Lewis, St Antony's College, Oxford OX2 6JF, England

Gail Ramsay, Dept. of Linguistics and Philology, Box 635, SE 751 26 Uppsala, Sweden

Julie Scott Meisami, 542 School Street, Belmont MA, 02478 USA

Khalid Sindawi, Dept. of Arabic Language and Literature, Ramat-Aviv, Haim Levanon Str., IL 69978, Israel

Heidi Stein, Seminar für Orientkunde, Johannes Gutenberg-Universität Mainz, Postfach, DE 55099 Mainz, Germany

Vol LIII (2004)

Contents