

même qui n'existent pas en celui-ci, p. ex. *xejrath* „aumône“ = pers. mod. *xejrāt*.

Le XX-ème siècle voit se multiplier les emprunts au russe. D'abord c'étaient des mots désignant les choses d'usage quotidien, p. ex. *thalerkha* „assiette“ ≤ russe *tařetka*, *bořkha* ≤ russe *bořka* „tonneau“, *pheč* „le poêle“ ≤ russe *peč*. Ces emprunts se diversifient de plus en plus à présent; on y rencontre en effet des mots abstraits aussi, p. ex. *daverya anil* „se fier“ ≤ russe *dořeriye* „confiance“.

En ce qui concerne la phonétique des emprunts au russe, il est à noter que les occlusives sourdes russes étaient d'abord rendues à l'aide des sourdes aspirées indigènes, p. ex. *peč* „le poêle“ = *pheč*, russe *mořeta* ≥ *maneth* (rouble), *žarith anil* „fire, griller“ = russe *žariř*; maintenant, sous l'influence de la langue littéraire, on s'y sert plutôt des sourdes non aspirées (fortes), p. ex. *kořeyka* = *kapekh* (*kopek* littéraire).

Les consonnes palatalisées russes sont prononcées dures, p. ex. *pheč*, *maneth*, etc.

La source de ces emprunts est le russe parlé, leur base — la forme phonétique des mots russes. On le voit clairement d'après les voyelles (*o* inaccentué prononcé comme *a*, cf. exemples ci-haut). La place de l'accent dans les emprunts au russe en témoigne aussi; en effet, celui-là ne change guère, cf. *daverya* „confiance“ ≤ russe *dořeriye*.

En outre, des mots littéraires se frayent de plus en plus souvent le passage dans les parlers du dialecte d'Ararat, ce qui est dû à l'expansion de la langue littéraire (est-arménienne) et au développement de l'instruction publique. Partant, on peut en général dire que l'influence de l'idiome littéraire sur les parlers arméniens contemporains croît toujours; il refoule ceux-ci tout court.

ANDRZEJ ZABORSKI

TEACHING THE LANGUAGE OF THE BIBLE

Semitic studies have lost regular contact with modern linguistics a long time ago. In effect, in spite of occasional breaks made by a rather limited number of linguists, there is a considerable stagnation¹ not only in the general descriptive studies but also in the realm of comparative historical studies. The old methodology is reapplied without any serious innovations in both. The old-fashioned „philological“ approach is predominant in the majority of cases. Of course philology² is a necessary prelude for any linguistic

¹ Akkadian is exceptionally well described thanks to E. Reiner (her *Linguistic Analysis of Akkadian*, The Hague 1966, is essentially distributional but with some elements of early transformational-generative theory) and to I. Gelb (his *Sequential Reconstruction of Proto-Akkadian*, Chicago 1969, is also essentially a distributional synchronic study). Distributional „item and arrangement“ analysis is, however, already outdated in general linguistics since approximately 10—15 years. The pessimistic opinion expressed by H. Birkeland, *Semitic and Structural Linguistics*, in: *For Roman Jakobson*, The Hague 1956, pp. 44—51, is still valid. As far as BH is concerned the important studies by Z. Harris, G. Schramm, J. Cantineau and other scholars are widely ignored. Kuryłowicz' great works on comparative-historical problems of Semitic languages are simply not understood by most Semitists since the gap is too wide. Methalinguistic (e.g. terminological) differences provide the greatest obstacle preventing Semitists from learning the new general linguistic theories and methods which grow in number.

² I mean the study of texts, i.e. their deciphering, establishing and commenting upon which ends in a critical edition. J. Barr, *The Ancient Semitic Languages — the Conflict Between Philology and Linguistics*, TPS, 1968, p. 37, follows the older English usage and equates philology not only with the study of texts but also with historical and com-

study of the recorded languages. It is impossible to neglect or to underestimate the necessity and the value of all great achievements of the traditional philology which must exist (however in a much more specialized realm) and even develop in the future. What we need, is, in my view, the specialization and cooperation of at least four kinds of experts — philologists, linguists, literary scholars, and historians. Traditional philology combined all these special activities and this was necessary and feasible in the past but has ceased to be so in the modern situation. Semitic philology as well as many other branches of Oriental studies has not reached the level of the so-called neophilologies yet where the split has come a long time ago. The Semitists' neglect of the developments and achievements in general linguistics³ is especially apparent in the out-dated and very unproductive methodology of language teaching and of teaching in general as it does not prepare the new adepts for the application of new methods. This is still the case to a considerable extent even with literary Arabic⁴. The isolationism produces a really vicious circle. The tradition, however generally valuable, provides negative side-effects: old methods which have been compromised and abandoned elsewhere a long time ago as well as old handbooks are repeatedly used with only minor improvements. A number of new handbooks which appear

parative linguistics. According to him, linguistics deals mainly with spoken languages and „its field of interest is much wider: it is interested less in the historical tracing of items and more in the description of systems ... and its basis is firmly set upon phonetics“. Barr's characteristic pertains to old-fashioned philology and to ... already rather old-fashioned linguistics as well. It is influenced by the conflict between early structural (i.e. Bloomfieldian) distributional or taxonomic linguistics and Neogrammarian historical-comparative school. There is no conflict among synchronic and diachronic linguistics now and we witness since a few years a revival of diachronic studies in new frames of e.g. transformational-generative grammar. There is no reason for leaving historical-comparative studies to „philology“ now.

³ In spite of the fact that such great linguists as Harris and Chomsky started their career with studies on Semitic languages, Semitists play rather a limited part in the development of linguistics.

⁴ There are some good handbooks of literary Arabic (e.g. by Adil Yacoub and E. MacCarus) and of some dialects but still old „grammar and translation“ handbooks are written or reedited.

do not introduce anything substantially new both in the description of the language and what is even worse, in the methodology. Old errors and mistakes are repeated and even accumulated. The student of most of the Semitic languages is in as bad a position as he was hundred years ago — he must devote an enormous amount of time and unnecessary effort in order to gain, after many years, only a limited knowledge of the language and even worse knowledge of its structure. After years of studying by the „grammar and translation“ method (certainly grammar predominates) which has proven long ago to be of little use and painstaking, the students gain only an atomized picture of paradigms and some syntactic rules which are obliterated from their memory very quickly as they are based only on a strenuous memorizing of rules and a rather limited acquaintance with the texts. A very big number quite naturally drop.

It is only recently that we have heard some voices calling for a reform and for a substantially new approach to the problem of teaching BH. Barr⁵ and Keller⁶ admit that BH is not a very difficult language and that the ineffectiveness of the teaching must be accounted for by the false methodology and by the inadequate description of the language. Keller as well as Vetter and Walther⁷ suggest a new approach and Keller provides a concrete outline of the BH curriculum. Vetter and Walther vote for a new linguistic approach to BH but their suggestions, though sound in many points, are rather general. Keller's attempt to introduce the method elaborated and applied in teaching modern languages should be, generally speaking, given the fullest support. His attempt to make use of the modern sophisticated and much more effective method of teaching is essentially right. One cannot agree, however, with his concrete solution of the problem

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 52.

⁶ C. A. Keller, *Probleme des hebräischen Sprachunterrichts*, VT, 20, 1970, pp. 278—286. Cf. p. 278.

⁷ D. Vetter, J. Walther, *Sprachtheorie und Sprachvermittlung — Erwägungen zur Situation des hebräischen Sprachstudiums*, ZAW, 83, no 1, 1971, pp. 73—96. A very important booklet by D. Vetter and J. Walther, *Hebräisch funktional — Beschreibung operationalen Verfahrens*, Stuttgart 1973, appeared when this article was already in the press.

though it is very probable that his way of teaching BH is incomparably better than the traditional one. One of the main drawbacks of the old approach which still reappears in some even substantially new methods, consisted in the fact that it did not make clear the actual goal of teaching — it attempted to teach the language in general and did not concentrate on a specified kind of language activity. It has been made clear by the modern methodology⁸ that there is no universal method for teaching a language so that different methods must be applied for different goals, i.e. different programs must be elaborated for teaching the spoken analytical code, the spoken synthetic code, the written analytical code and the written synthetic one, not to mention more specialized kinds of language activity. In Keller's view the „written“ approach to the teaching of BH is to be blamed for the inefficacy and therefore BH must be taught as a living language, e.g. with a strong emphasis on the pronunciation. This should be done with all the already verified apparatus, like language laboratory etc. If it really were so, the situation would be relatively easy since we should have only to apply the methods which are already relatively well developed and verified in the practice of teaching languages like English, French etc. etc. and which have been already used successfully for teaching MH. It is not as simple as that. Teaching the students to speak BH is not easier by itself than teaching any other language which is spoken by the teacher though it is clear and well proven that it is impossible to teach to speak any language successfully by the old „grammar and translation“ method. Teaching to speak BH may be rejected⁹

⁸ It must be borne in mind, however, that the methodology of teaching dead languages and the analytical written code is less developed than the methodology of teaching to speak living languages. Cf. K. D. Diller, *Generative Grammar*, Structural Linguistics and Language Teaching, 1971; M. Kehoe (Ed.), *Applied Linguistics: a Survey for Language Teachers*, New York 1968; W. F. Mackey, *Language Teaching Analysis*, Bloomington 1967; Valdman (Ed.) *Trends in Language Teaching*, New York 1966; and „Glottodidactica“ published by the important centre in Poznań.

⁹ Keller, *op. cit.*, p. 286, also rejects the idea of OT exegesis in Hebrew.

(though not necessarily) on philological grounds since it certainly is a dead language recorded in a limited though diversified corpus. The main argument against this proposal is, however, simply that for the great majority of students who take BH, learning to speak it (or MH) will also mean an unnecessary waste of time and effort while they will gain only something which is practically useless for their tasks. Speaking Hebrew is a necessary prerequisite for an Hebraist and not for a Biblical scholar for whom it still has only a subsidiary part in view of the scholarly publications in MH, but of course only an ability to speak MH and not BH can be useful for him. If we have to train an Hebraist, then MH taught as a spoken, living language must be *un point de départ* with all the modern teaching methodology and only after a substantial progress and a specified efficiency in it is gained, one may proceed to the study of the archaic, dead stage of BH applying different teaching methodologies in the case of teaching linguists, literary scholars etc. respectively. I am dealing here, however, only with the principles of teaching BH to the so-called Semitists and Biblical scholars, and not Hebraists. The goals must be then specified as follows: teaching the analytical written code in order to gain: 1. reading abilities with a limited translating proficiency, i.e., reading with „direct“ understanding (this introduction may be sufficient e.g. for some students of theology), 2. reading and translating proficiency (this would be for e.g. specialists in OT literature, philologists, historians, etc.) There is certainly no clear-cut boundary between purely linguistic and historical and literary understanding of a text but essentially teaching for the latter purpose cannot be conducted by the way of teaching simultaneously the language, i.e. by the traditional „*explication de textes*“. The latter, i.e., exegesis in the broadest sense can be applied during the language lessons only in a very limited and subordinate way. With a different methodology it must be taught separately as it means something which is not a language.

It is a well known fact that one can read and understand texts without being able to give easily a good equivalent (dynamic or formal) of them in another language, i.e. without being able to translate in the full sense of the word. Certainly teaching to translate is a subject by itself though it is impossible to neglect

it totally (the failure of a strictly „direct“ method) at an early, introductory stage¹⁰, when translation must be used by the teacher but should be used only in a restricted and controlled measure. As Vetter and Walther point out, most of the students want above all to read BH and for this, teaching phonological system practically, i. e., teaching to perceive and to reproduce the phonemes of BH and all other phonological phenomena is only unnecessary burden. It is possible to learn a written language because, to repeat what is a commonplace in modern linguistics, though the language is not synonymous with its written record, nevertheless it remains a language even if it is only a written language¹¹. Teaching a correct pronunciation may be more difficult than teaching the graphemics — it depends not only on student's personal abilities but to a high degree on the phonology of his mother language which may interfere. Graphemics can be taught effectively following a structural analysis and a structural presentation though at the very beginning the language should be taught in a simplified¹² transcription. This is a principle which must be observed even if we teach a spoken language. How many students of BH dropped its study at the beginning because of difficulties in coping with its relatively not very complicated system of writing! Teaching to write has a methodology of its own and it is really surprising why so long the system has been usually given *en bloc* during the first few hours and then the presentation of intricate problems of phonology and grammar made the burden (the student usually did not know the system of writing well enough yet) heavier and heavier.

It is possible and necessary to learn a great deal of the basic structure of any language in transcription and, what is the main goal here, to teach to read simple transcribed texts. The graphemic system must be taught only in an auxiliary way and successively

¹⁰ I agree with Keller, *op. cit.*, p. 285.

¹¹ Cf. Keller's opinion, *op. cit.*, p. 279, which is apparently opposite. Cf. also H. J. Uldall, *Speech and Writing*, „Acta Linguistica“, 5, 1945—1949, pp. 86—93, who expresses a rather too radical opinion of glossematics on the substance (i. e. graphic or sound representation of signs) and C. E. Bazell, *The Grapheme*, „Litera“, 3, 1956, pp. 43—46.

¹² In this point I am in agreement with Keller.

presenting the oppositions¹³ etc. according to a specified program but it must take only a restricted span of time. The pronunciation should be conventional and to some extent adapted (i. e. facilitated) taking the phonological system of students' mother language into consideration. The intonation, though also conventional, should not be, however, dispensed with. The full knowledge of the graphemic system may be attained successively when a substantial deal is already known about the language¹⁴. But what does it mean „about the structure“ of a language? Latent in this this expression there is a serious danger. The old „grammar and translation“ method was ineffective because, among others, it taught „about the language“ and it did not teach „the language“, i. e., it required the student only to memorize the traditional „rules of grammar“ and this certainly is not equal to active dealing with the language, i. e. to language competence. Learning about language, i. e., learning the structural patterns of the language may be a good goal for a linguist who need not know the language as *energeia*. It is evident that, e. g. linguists dealing in their various comparative studies with a big number of languages do not know them and they are not strictly obliged to know them, they only know their structure, i. e., they know *about* these languages. Teaching the structure of a language is, however, a different goal too and once again it must be said that it requires a different methodology. Certainly a student who wants only to read BH (i. e. mainly theologian, historian, archaeologist etc.) must know also about the structure of BH but as Vetter and Walther rightly point out, his main goal is to deal with texts, to be able to understand them and therefore the main accent must be put on the text and not on grammar. In the traditional handbooks we have an old-fashioned exposition of phonology (in practice rather *Buchstabenlehre* and not even graphemics properly speaking), morphology, and syntax and the language itself is limited and degraded only to the role of examples, i. e., of

¹³ G. M. Schramm's valuable study *The Graphemes of Tiberian Hebrew*, Berkeley—Los Angeles 1964, may be useful for preparing the program and exercises.

¹⁴ Unvocalized texts should be introduced only when a good knowledge of the language is attained.

an illustration of grammatical rules given in an aprioric way. The sentences of passages given in the so-called exercises are also limited in number and only illustrative. Frequently these examples work rather as puzzles or riddles which offer extralinguistic additional obstacles providing an extra barrage.

The failure of this traditional teaching of grammar which made it an abhorred subject is due mainly to the fact that the language has been only an addition to grammar, disappearing behind the rules, the exceptions etc. The nonstructuralist description of any grammar only intensified this feeling of immense, unmotivated complexity and chaos which is often provided by the old handbooks. This feeling strikes (and frequently knocks down) the beginner. Grammar must be learnt from the texts beginning with clauses, sentences, and short texts and not vice versa, grammatical rules being the abstractions of pattern of the language represented in the texts. Grammarians discover them when analysing the texts and this „natural“ way of producing a grammatical description must be reproduced¹⁵ (in a simplified and specially programmed way) with the students. The students have to construct a grammar of their own on the basis of the samples of sentences and texts presented by the teacher and to be found in the handbook. Of course the teacher must be well acquainted with general linguistics¹⁶ and especially with the methodology of language de-

¹⁵ The distributional „item and arrangement“ method which made very important contributions to the development of linguistics is already outdated as a general approach but its grammar discovery techniques are still useful — cf. such classical handbooks like E. Nida, *Morphology: The Descriptive Analysis of Words*, Ann Arbor 1949, and H. A. Gleason, *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics*, New York 1965. Transformational-generative grammar in principle rejects the problem of grammar discovery procedures as irrelevant but this may be accepted only with some conditions. Tagmemic school is still interested in these problems and develops some useful methods: cf. B. Elson, V. B. Pickett, *An Introduction to Morphology and Syntax*, Santa Ana 1962; R. E. Longacre, *Grammar Discovery Procedures*, The Hague 1964; W. A. Cook, *Introduction to Tagmemic Analysis*, New York 1969.

¹⁶ It would be useful to publish for Semitists an introduction like O. Thomas' *Transformational Grammar and the Teacher of English*, New York 1965 (already not up-to-date but still very useful).

scription, i.e. with grammar discovery procedures, but only a very limited and basic knowledge of linguistics is required from the student. By comparing and substituting the items the student easily discovers and identifies the morphemes and he should be almost at the very beginning introduced to a syntactic analysis both deep and surface. Substituting items in sentences and transforming sentences he learns not only how the words are constructed (the old grammar and methodology concentrated mainly on the word and not on the most important unit which is sentence) but learns sentences and if sentences given in the lesson constitute specially programmed discourses, he learns a great deal the language and not just grammar (traditionally mainly morphology).

I wish to emphasise very strongly that aprioric statements about the structure cannot be, however, absolutely eliminated. Discovering many structures may take too much time and it is more economical to give some of them, especially the rare ones, apriorically. Exceptions, however, should be introduced only when basic structures are already mastered.

Summarizing these very general, basic principles of teaching BH, I wish to say that a language lesson must contain sentences and samples of texts for discovering the structure (with translations) with a limited number of hints and additional aprioric statements about the more intricate problems, but the bulk of the lesson should be devoted to the exercises proper (i.e. not tests!) for substitution, transformation etc. After an introductory period specially adapted (natural) texts with programmed and carefully controlled structure and vocabulary should be added with well arranged glossaries (in the right order) and all necessary (i.e. strictly selective) notes and comments. Teaching the graphemic system, i.e., reading the original script is, as I have said, a special task and it needs a separate part of the lesson coordinated with the main one. It must be once again emphasised that the order of lessons must follow not the order of the grammatical description but must be strictly subordinated to the didactic purposes, it must constitute a step-by-step program.

For such a program we need also a far better description of BH

than we have so far¹⁷. But I repeat that a programmed handbook cannot be synonymous with a grammar and texts for explication, i.e., traditional chrestomathy. As far as the latter is concerned, it is deplorable that we have no really good chrestomathies for most of the Semitic languages. A chrestomathy or a reader for a lower course must contain adapted texts and very carefully chosen easy unabridged texts with good glossaries and programmed notes. The vocabulary should be selective and based on statistical computations of different styles and genres. The texts must be extensively annotated in order to enable the student to concentrate on the text and not on what lies behind or on grammar and vocabulary by itself. We lack such properly annotated texts (partially for fear of cribs) especially for BH since the text of OT is usually used, i.e., the texts which appear in some respects easy to the teacher (frequently they really are) and then the texts which are not necessarily easy but which are important for extralinguistic reasons. Of course the student must learn to use at first a special students' dictionary and then the „normal“ one¹⁸ but he cannot by any means be condemned to a despairing search in the dictionary for almost every word to break through the text. There are many much better methods of testing student's work and progress than making him translate and memorize words, forms and grammatical rules.

The old „grammar and translation“ method not only did not teach the language effectively — neither did it teach translation which was even prohibited. Translation treated only as a way for testing the student's knowledge of forms, words etc. was responsible (apart from tradition) for the worst traits of the so-called „philological“ translation and was one of the factors which prohibited the development of translation on a great scale. In order to translate, it is not enough just to know two languages and certainly it is not enough to have the traditional knowledge of forms and words which have been often considered as the main

¹⁷ Cf. however G. M. Schramm's *Hebrew Reference Grammar* (forthcoming) and M. Azar's important *Analyse Morphologique du Text Hébreu de la Bible*, 2 vols., Nancy 1970.

¹⁸ We need also a new type of dictionary based on really modern semantic theory.

object of a „philological“ translation which was also considered rather as a test for a philologist than as a really dynamic equivalent for a reader who does not know the original. We owe to Biblical studies the most outstanding contributions to the development of translation methodology thanks to E. Nida's great work¹⁹ and it is only regrettable that because of the ignorance of modern linguistics many Biblical scholars are still unable to appreciate and to learn the methods developed by him. Teaching translation requires a considerable knowledge of the language and a special methodology too. What I meant by saying that even at the first stage a limited proficiency in translating must be taken into account, is that the student at this stage should be able to understand the deep structure (this is, roughly speaking, the sense of „direct understanding“) of the original and to give simple paraphrases²⁰ of the original deep structure into the deep and surface structure of his own language and the problem of the equivalence of surface structures of the original and of the translation (if valid at all!) should be dispensed with. „Verbal“ translations must be strictly excluded²¹. Only when teaching translation (i.e. during an advanced translating course) on the lines drawn by Nida the dynamic and eventually formal equivalence should be aimed at.

¹⁹ Cf. his *Toward a Science of Translating*, Leiden 1964; *The Theory and Practice of Translation*, Leiden 1969; *Science of Translation*, „Language“ 45, 1969, 483—488, and „Voprosy Yazikoznaniya“, 1970, no 4, pp. 3—14.

²⁰ Not in traditional terms. Paraphrase viewed as a parallel sentence with the same deep structure and different surface structure actually has the same meaning so that it is an acceptable translation though different paraphrases (there may be a very big number of them) may have different stylistic value. Since „I know“ = „I can tell“, understanding texts must be combined with translating if there is no speaking efficiency in the original language, i.e. when no „internal“ translation (paraphrases in BH) can be provided.

²¹ In this point I disagree with Vetter and Walther, *op. cit.*, p. 94, n. 46, who want to use translation for explaining BH structure even violating the structure of target language. I do not see the reason for providing non-grammatical or stylistically poor pseudo-equivalents for what is grammatical and normal or artistic in BH. The structure of BH should be discussed and commented upon in terms of a linguistic analysis. Cf. however D. Bolinger, *Transmutation: Structural Translation*, „Acta Linguistica Hafniensia“, 9, no 2, 1966, pp. 130—144.

Necessarily my remarks are very general and roughly sketched. Much work is needed for programming new handbooks and programmed readers and dictionaries for which the existing traditional philological research has provided the necessary and generally speaking solid basis. Much must be learnt from modern linguistics and even more from the modern language teaching methodology based on it. We must, however, remember, that teaching of the written analytic code of a dead language has a peculiar character of its own and a special methodology must be developed. In a sense this method should be traditional — we may call it with all necessary restrictions „reading (i.e. understanding) and translating“ method emphasising the fact that these are not the ways but the principal goals we try to attain.

STANISŁAW STACHOWSKI

STUDIEN ÜBER DIE NEUPERSISCHEN LEHNWÖRTER IM OSMANISCH-TURKISCHEN. I

Die viele Jahrhunderte dauernden geographischen, historischen und kulturellen Berührungen der Perser mit den osmanischen Türken hinterließen eine sehr große Spur in der osmanisch-türkischen Sprache. Der neupersische Einfluß auf das Osmanisch-Türkische zeigte sich am stärksten im Wortschatz, im kleineren Grad in der Morphologie und Syntax. Trotz der großen Rolle, die der neupersische Einfluß in der Geschichte der osmanisch-türkischen Sprache gespielt hat, ist der bisherige Stand der Forschungen auf diesem Gebiet vielmehr gering. Eigentlich kann man hier kaum drei Abhandlungen erwähnen, die unmittelbar dieses Thema betreffen. Es sind die folgenden:

1. M. Bittner, *Der Einfluss des Arabischen und Persischen auf das Türkische*, „Sitzungsberichte der philosophisch-historischen Classe der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften“, Bd. 142, Abh. III, SS. 1—116, Wien 1900. — In seiner Abhandlung stellte Bittner den arabischen und persischen Einfluß auf das Osmanisch-Türkische im Bereich des Wortschatzes, der Grammatik, Wortbildung, Aussprache und Schrift dar. Der Abhandlung geht eine ziemlich umfangreiche Einleitung voran, in der der Verfasser die historischen arabisch-persischen und persisch-türkischen Berührungen bespricht.

2. L. Bouvat, *Les emprunts arabes et persans en turc osmanli*, „Keleti Szemle — Revue Orientale“, Bd. IV, SS. 316—334, Budapest 1903. — In seinem Aufsatz beschäftigt sich der Verfasser mit der Phonetik der arabischen und persischen Lehnwörter im Osmanisch-Türkischen. Der Aufsatz zerfällt in zwei Teile: im ersten