

L'usage de cette orthographe est limité — à part l'URSS — à la Roumanie et à la Bulgarie, où elle est employée aussi pour les textes ouest-arm. Ceux-ci, une fois publiés en URSS, sont aussi écrits à l'orientale. L'arm. occid. partout ailleurs, et l'arm. orient. d'Iran et de l'Inde, sont écrits en orthographe classique, presque inchangée depuis le V-ème s.

L'arménien littéraire contemporain est donc divisé de façon double: une ligne de division porte sur la structure grammaticale, où l'on distingue la variante orientale et la variante occidentale — l'autre ligne de division affecte la forme écrite de l'arménien. D'où il découle qu'on peut distinguer les variantes qui emploient l'orthographe orientale (phonétique) et occidentale (classique), ce qui aboutit à donner les quatre types suivants:

1. langue arm. orient., écriture phonétique (URSS)
2. langue arm. orient., orth. classique (Iran, Inde)
3. langue arm. occid., écriture phonétique (Roumanie, Bulgarie)
4. langue arm. occid., orth. classique (autres pays).

TADEUSZ POBOŹNIAK

THE ORIGIN OF COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES IN HINDI

The category of degree is characteristic of the adjective. It expresses different intenseness of a possessed quality. To denote this intenseness one must confront an object having a given quality with another object of the same quality, i.e. to compare it. The comparison may be made either with one element or with a group of denoted objects. If the comparison shows no difference in the intensity of quality, then we call it a positive degree, whereas, if a difference occurs, then the term 'comparative' is used. There are languages which distinguish only these two possibilities and thus they have two classes of degree i.e. they possess two kinds of formal exponents of this category. However, there are also languages in which the second class is divided in dependence on whether the comparison is made between two elements or among a denoted group of elements. If in the system of a language there are for each of these possibilities special exponents, we have three classes in the category of degree which traditionally are termed, as in Latin grammar, positive, comparative and superlative.

The category of degree is connected with comparison which is, however, not always expressed; sometimes it is only implied or it was performed in the past. When we denote the intensity of a feature without making a comparison, then an absolute phrase arises which is called elative. The most primitive way of expressing an elative is the repeating of the adjective. It also may be expressed by adding to the adjective auxiliary words, such as 'very', 'much' and the like. In three-class languages also the form of superlative may be used for this purpose.

Sanskrit, as to the category of degree, belongs to the three-class group of languages — whereas Hindi to the two-class group. The change of the type took place for many ages and any chronological division is here conventional only. Both the types coexisted for hundred of years, although it is not always attested in preserved texts. It is assumed that the change of the type arose as a result of adopting the Aryan language by large non-Aryan groups of people, notably the Dravidian ones. Those peoples transferred some features of their own language into the new system.

Sanskrit, the Old Indian language, inherited from the Proto-Indo-European two pairs of suffixes which served to express comparative and superlative degrees. These are the suffixes *-(i)yas*, *-iṣṭha*, added to the root of a word and *-tara*, *-tama*, joined with the stem. The first pair was no more productive already in Sanskrit, whereas the second one could still form new words. Neither of the kinds of suffixes shows any semantic difference.

The superlative suffix *-tama* is also used to form ordinal numbers, especially the higher ones, e.g. *vimśatitama* 'the twentieth'. It is caused by the fact that in the Proto-Indo-European language the suffix **-tamo* denoted an object distinguished by some feature in the set. This demand is fulfilled both by ordinal numbers and superlative. Hence e.g. in German we can still see the identity of suffixes of ordinal numbers and superlatives (der zwanzigste, der schönste). The suffix **-tero*, on the other hand, denoted the opposition of two objects and thus Skr. *katara* 'which of the two?', Gothic *hvathar*, Latin *alter* 'the other'.

In the Middle Indian period the Old Indian morphological system has been preserved in spite of the changes which have taken place in the phonology. Thus the Sanskrit exponents of degree have survived, but the suffixes *-(i)ya*, *(ijja)* and *iṭṭha* are used only for a limited number of adjectives, whereas new adjectives take only the suffixes *-tara* and *-tama*. These suffixes in their Middle Indian form were not distinctive enough, as *-tara* and *-tama* have been changed in various dialects into *-yara*, *-dara*, *-ara* and *-yama*, *-dama*, *-ama*. Still a certain change of the system

appears already in this period, e.g. (Pali) *etesu kataram nu kho mahantam* 'which of these two is bigger?' (literally: 'is big'), which is already the New Indian type.

The New Indian texts show a complete decay of Sanskrit type of comparison. According to the influence of Sanskrit, smaller or greater number of Sanskrit words (*tatsama*) occur in the particular New Indian languages and in the particular authors. Also Sanskrit forms of comparative and superlative occur with them. They are most numerous in Bengali language. Persian forms with the suffixes *-tar*, *-tarin* and even the Arabic ones are used by Muhammadan writers in Hindustani. These suffixes, however, are not added to genuine Indian adjectives, but only to those borrowed from Persian and Arabic languages.

The Dravidian languages which were spoken in Hindustan before the arrival of the Aryans are not known. The oldest Tamil texts date from the last centuries B. C. The existing state of languages in India is the resultant of interdependences of both language families. Therefore it is not only the Indo-Aryan languages that changed their type having absorbed the Dravidian substratum, but also vice versa the Dravidian peoples having adopted the Brahmanic culture from the Aryans were considerably influenced by Aryan languages, notably the Sanskrit.

The lack of comparative texts does not allow us to follow the evolution of the interferences or to state a chronological division into periods. Within the category of degree both the Dravidian languages and the New Indo-Aryan ones now generally show the identical type, namely two classes in the degree of comparison, the exponents of the comparative not being a suffix which is added to the adjective, but a syntactical construction in which the adjective remains unchanged, while the compared object is placed in the ablative or locative case.

The construction of comparative looks as follows:

'A differs from B in the feature x'.

The form of superlative is the same, but instead of B we place the name of a group, and where a more exact denotation of this group is lacking, we use the pronoun 'all' instead (i.e. all the elements of this group).

Thus in Hindi we have the constructions:

Śyām Rām se lambā hai
'Śyam is taller than Ram'.
Śyām sab se lambā hai
'Śyam is the tallest'.

A similar scheme can also be found in other Indo-Aryan languages, the differences being in the form of exponents of cases only. Instead of ablative the locative is used which means 'within this group'.

In larkom meṁ Śyām lambā hai.

'Among these boys Śyam is the tallest'.

These schemes have been used in Dravidian languages from the oldest times. We infer therefore that the change in construction which has taken place in Indo-Aryan languages, arose under the influence of the Dravidian languages.

Other means of denoting or emphasizing comparison in Hindi i.e. by repeating the adjective e.g. *barā barā* 'very big', or by using the auxiliary words e.g. *adhik*, *aur* 'more', *atyant* 'exceedingly', *ati* 'very', could appear independently being at first but a stylistic feature and they became in the course of time a grammatical rule.

Analogical forms can also be found in other Indo-Aryan languages. Besides, certain words of Persian and Arabian origin, such as *banisbat* 'in comparison', *ziyāda* 'more', *kam* 'less', are used in Hindi for comparison.

The construction with the phrase *kī apekṣā* 'in comparison with' which apparently is pure Sanskrit has an exact equivalent in Tamil and is probably a sanskritization of a Dravidian construction only.

Jarmanī kī apekṣā aṅgrezī saral hai

'English is easier than German'.

On the other hand, the attempts to implant into Tamil the Sanskrit suffixes *-tara* and *-tama*, found in sanskritized texts, have given no permanent result.

ROMAN PYTEL

ZUR EXEGESE VON Ps. 135,17

Der Text des Verses Ps 135,17 lautet im TM:

'p'yn yš rwh bpyhm

Vor allem es ist die ungewöhnliche Nebeneinanderstellung zweier Wörter die unsere Aufmerksamkeit auf sich zieht: *'yn* und *yš*.

Das erstgenannte fungiert als adverbelle Negation der Existenz und wird im Hebräischen auf zweierlei Art gebraucht: a) es negiert das Sein oder Vorhandensein einer Sache oder Person (in diesem Falle hat das Wort eine ähnliche Bedeutung wie der französische Ausdruck *il n'y a pas*), b) es bildet eine Opposition des Hilfswortes „sein“ — der logische Kopula des gewöhnlichen Nominalsatzes: man vergleiche Dt. 4,12 *qwl dbrym 'tm šm'ym wtmwnh 'nkm r'ym* = 'den Ton seiner Worte hört ihr aber eine Gestalt gewahrtet ihr nicht'. Das Wort fungiert also als Negation des Nominalsatzes. Der Unterschied zwischen den Negationen: *'yn* und *l'* besteht darin, dass *l'* ein einzelnes Wort verneint, besonders bei pronominalem Subjekt. *L'* ist die gewöhnliche Negation des Affirmativsatzes¹.

Die kontrahierte Form *'en* wird gebraucht: a) wenn das Wort vor dem Subjekt steht, z. B. Nüm, 21,5: *'yn lhm w'yn myym* — Nichtexistenz von Brot und Nichtexistenz von Wasser = 'kein Brot und kein Wasser ist da', b) wenn das Wort nach dem Subjekt steht aber mit dem folgenden Worte durch Verbindungsakzente

¹ Vgl. P. Joüon, *Grammaire de l'hebreu biblique*. Rome 1923, § 160 b G. Beer, R. Meyer, *Hebräische Grammatik*². Berlin 1955, vol. II, S. 95.