

- 25 Ibidem, p. 135.
- 26 Ibidem, p. 466.
- 27 A. Czapkiewicz, Arabic Idioms, Zeszyty Naukowe UJ, N^o 75, Kraków 1983.
- 28 Providing that the word kaššār^{un} is a substantivied adjective - cf. H. Wehr, op. cit., p. 829.
- 29 Z. Gołąb, A. Heinz, K. Polański, op. cit., p. 653.
- 30 A detailed study of the problem may be found in doctoral thesis of the author - cf. E. Górska, The Rules Governing Word Order for Nominal Multiattributive Groups in Modern Written Arabic, 1987 (in the Polish language); typescript in Jagiellonian Library, Kraków.
- 31 E. g. H. Wehr, op. cit., p. 1009.
- 32 V. Cantarino, Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose, Indiana University Press, Bloomington/London 1975, vol. 2, p. 71.
- 33 Ibidem.
- 34 Ibidem.
- 35 C. Brockelmann (A. Socins), Arabische Grammatik, Verlag von Reuther Reichard, Berlin 1913, p. 126.
- 36 Ibidem.
- 37 Ibidem, p. 127.

John A. C. GREPPIN

A NOTE ON ARMENIAN ZUĦNA¹

In a recent article in the Festschrift for Adam Heinz, Andrzej Piśowicz (1986, 115) discusses Arm. zuĦna, a term he glosses as 'fife', and which stands for a type of pipe upon which folk music can be performed. The word is recorded in Armenian apparently only in modern times. ZuĦna is not listed in the compendious Nor baĦgirk' haykazean lezui (Venice 1836-1837), nor is it mentioned in Adjarian's marvellously thorough Root Dictionary (four volumes, Yerevan 1926-1935). Nor is it known in the medieval Armenian vocabulary as reflected in the BaĦgirk' hayoc' (Istanbul 1698, in manuscript; printed in Yerevan 1975), the most complete lexicon compiled during that period. It is only in recent years² that the word has been recorded, and it can now be found in any of the modern Armenian lexicons, that of Malhaseants (1944), of Aghayan (1976), or of the Academy of Sciences (1969). There it is glossed principally as 'a type of oriental flute', by which meaning it is also known in Persian, Georgian and Turkish, with the spelling zuĦna.

The most commonly used classical and middle Armenian term for 'fife' was sring, a loan from Gk. σῦριγξ³. It appears in the Bible ten times and is a common term throughout later Armenian literature. It is unclear to me why the actual literary references to Arm. zuĦna are so late, for the instrument called by that name is itself commonly known, and considered ancient.

Pisowicz, in the article being mentioned here, discusses numerous phonetic features of Persian loan words in Armenian; among them

is Arm. zuřna, the word that is the focus of this brief paper. Pisowicz observes that it reflects a medieval pronunciation of Persian, before early Persian zurnā had become modern Persian zorna. Pisowicz also offered a parallel development, whereby Armenian cinār 'plane-tree' reflects early Persian cinār, not modern Persian čenār.

Pisowicz has made a workmanlike and rather interesting observation, but its relevance to Arm. zuřna is not as absolute as it might appear, because this word for 'fife' is also known in some of the ancient languages of Anatolia, some that arguably made lexical contributions to Armenian⁴. Accordingly Arm. zuřna might not at all be a loan from Persian, but come from an earlier source. This word for 'fife' is found in Hieroglyphic Luwian as šurna⁵, a hapax noted in Meriggis' dictionary (1962); it is also known in vestigial form in cuneiform Luwian, where it is recorded as SI-na-, with the Sumerogram SI the equivalent of 'horn', and the final -na- assuming the form of word-final šurna. The word in this shape is not known in Hittite, where 'fife' appears as karawar⁶, itself often written with the same Sumerogram as SI-ar, but with a word-final -ar that reflects Hittite karawar, rather than Luwian šurna. The word is not known as a loan in either Hurrian or Urartian, nor in Semitic⁷.

So it would appear that Arm. zuřna could come from a source earlier than Persian, and thus not necessarily reflect absolutely an early-Persian vocalism. The question then is what language carried HL šurna into historical times. Was it Armenian, which passed the word to Persian, or Persian, which passed the word to Armenian?

Notes

¹ It was Aram Kossian of the Oriental Institute in Yerevan who discussed this word with me in the autumn of 1985.

² The earliest citation known to me is from the curious lexicon of uncommon Armenian words, edited by E. Riggs and published in Smyrna, 1847. He notes that the word is Turkish!

³ The Greek term is passed on to Indic as Skt. suruṅgā. A d-jarīan (Root Dictionary) notes the closeness of Per. čiringa 'the tinkling of bells', but it is a doubtful comparison.

⁴ Hittite loans in Armenian have long been suggested, and first dealt with accurately in Soviet Armenian publications by Ghapantsian (1956), and then in the West by Schultheiss (1961). The theory faces some difficulties, the principal one being the rather small number of Armenian-Hittite (and -Luwian) parallels; some would dismiss the hypothesis, arguing that the examples are few, and only coincidental. On firmer ground is the hypothesis of Urartian (or Hurrian) loans, which was first suggested by M sérian (1904) at the thirteenth Congress of Orientalists in Hamburg, 1902.

⁵ The etymology of this word is clear, though it is unsure if it should be sounded as šurna or šurna. It is derived from IE *korn-, Lat. cornu, etc., as well as being close to the Semitic root for 'horn', q-r-n. I. J. Gelb was the first to comment on it (1942, 19ff), noting also the closeness of HL šuwana to Gk. κῶνυ. Here see Greppin 1978.

⁶ Both the Luwian and the Hittite words are ultimately similar, and from the same source, IE *k-r-n/w: compare Hitt. karawar and Gk. κέρας, κέρα(F)-ός 'horn'.

⁷ There is at least one incident of a Hurrian word that can be found not only in Armenian (Greppin 1982), but in various Iranian languages as well, and that is Arm. maxr 'type of conifer tree', Hurr. māhri, Kurdish mārx etc.

Bibliography

- ACADEMY OF SCIENCES. 1969-1980. Žamanakakic' hayoc' lezvi bac' atrakan bafaran. Four volumes. Yerevan. Press of the Armenian Academy of Sciences.
- AGHAYAN Edward (Ağayan, E. B.). 1976. Ardi hayereni bac' atrakan bafaran. Two volumes. Yerevan. Hayastan.
- GELB Ignace J. 1942. Hittite Hieroglyphs III. Chicago. University of Chicago Press.
- GHAPANTSYAN G. A. (Капанцян, Г. А.) 1956. Общие элементы между Хеттским и Армянским языками. Историко-лингвистические работы. Yerevan. Press of the Armenian Academy of Sciences, pp. 329-408.
- GREPPIN John A. C. 1978. Luwian Elements in Armenian, Древний восток 3, pp. 115-126.
- 1982. Two Points on Hurrian-Armenian Lexical Relationships [in:] Societies and Languages of the Ancient Near East: Studies in Honour of I. M. Diakonoff. Aris & Phillips. Warminster.
- MALKHASEANTS St. (Malxaseanc', St.). 1944-1945. Hayeren bac' atrakan bafaran. Four volumes. Yerevan. Press of the Armenian Academy of Sciences.
- MERIGGI Piero. 1962. Hieroglyphisch-Hethitisches Glossar. Otto Harrassowitz. Wiesbaden.

MSÉRIANTZ Lévon. 1904. Les éléments ourartiques dans la langue arménienne [in:] Verhandlungen des XIII. Internationalen Orientalisten-Kongresses. Hamburg September 1902; Leiden. E. J. Brill, pp. 128-129.

PISOWICZ Andrzej. 1986. On Some Phonetic Problems of Loan-Words from New Persian in Armenian Dialects [in:] Collectanea Linguistica: In Honorem Adami Heinz. Wrocław. Wydawnictwo Polskiej Akademii Nauk, pp. 113-119.

RIGGS E. 1847. A Vocabulary of words used in Modern Armenian but not found in the Ancient Armenian Lexicons. Smyrna. W. Griffith.

SCHULTHEISS Tassilo. 1961. Hethitisch und Armenisch. Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung 77.219-234.

Andrzej PISOWICZ

LES TRAITS DISTINCTIFS DES CONSONNES OCCLUSIVES ET AFFRIQUÉES
DE L'ARMÉNIEN CLASSIQUE⁺

Le problème du consonantisme arménien suscite l'intérêt depuis un siècle et provoque de vives discussions et des controverses plus fondamentales que dans d'autres domaines. La fin de ces discussions et la solution de toutes les difficultés semblent s'éloigner de plus en plus dans l'avenir. Surtout les problèmes de diachronie sont tels qu'ils donnent très peu d'espoir de trouver une explication satisfaisant tous les linguistes.

Les discussions autour du consonantisme arménien, particulièrement vives dans les années 1960, ont repris récemment vigueur suite à la popularité croissante dont jouit, ces dernières années, la théorie glottale qui se réfère, dans une large mesure, aux données de la langue arménienne. Lors de la conférence de l'Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes qui s'est tenue à Bruxelles en 1986, je me suis prononcé, en tant qu'arménologue, contre les principales thèses de la dite théorie.

Cette fois-ci, tout en soutenant mon attitude critique envers la théorie glottale, je voudrais présenter quelques conclusions que j'ai tirées de l'étude de la fréquence de phonèmes dans les textes arméniens classiques. Il ne s'agit, bien entendu, que des consonnes occlusives et des affriquées.

Tout d'abord, je vais commencer par le rappel et le développement des objections que j'ai formulées à plusieurs reprises contre

⁺ Le texte qui suit a été présenté le 15 octobre 1988 à la quatrième conférence de l'Association Internationale des Études Arméniennes tenue à Fribourg/Suisse.