

The Armenian Dialects of Jerusalem*

Bert Vaux, Harvard University

In Armenians in the Holy Land, Michael Stone, ed. Louvain: Peeters, 2002.

1. Introduction

The Armenian community in Jerusalem was first established somewhere between the third and fifth centuries, and since that time has remained relatively isolated from the rest of the Armenian-speaking world. It has furthermore been subjected to a degree of Arabic influence that is quite uncommon among Armenian linguistic communities. For these reasons, it is not surprising that a distinctive dialect of Armenian has emerged in the Armenian Quarter of Jerusalem.

Strangely, though, this dialect has never been studied by Armenologists or linguists, and is not generally known outside of the Armenian community in Israel. (Mention of the Armenian dialect of Jerusalem is notably absent in the standard works on Armenian dialectology and in the Soviet Armenian Encyclopedia, for example.) Those who do know about the distinctive speech of the Jerusalem Armenians generally consider it to be “bad Armenian” supplemented by words

* A thousand thanks to Vartan Abdo, Arpine, †Antranig Bakirjian, Chris Davis, Yeghia Dikranian, Hagop Hachikian, Garo Hagopian, Vartuhi Hokeyan, Tavit Kaplanian, Arshag Merguerian, Madeleine Habosian Derderian, Shushan Teager, Abraham Terian, Rose Varzhabedian, Aram Khachadurian, and Apkar Zakarian for all of the hours they devoted to assisting me with this project.

The transcription employed here is that of REArm; linguists should note the following oddities of this system:

- <ɮ> represents a voiced uvular fricative, IPA [ʁ].
- <x> represents a voiceless uvular fricative, IPA [χ].
- <j> represents a voiced alveopalatal affricate, IPA [dz].
- <c> represents a voiceless alveopalatal affricate, IPA [ts].
- An inverted apostrophe after a letter indicates aspiration; e.g. <k'> = IPA [k^h].

The following symbols are also employed for Arabic and Turkish forms:

symbol	description	IPA value	example
ä	low front vowel	[æ]	English <i>man</i>
ö	mid front rounded vowel	[œ]	French <i>peur</i> ‘fear’
ü	high front rounded vowel	[y]	French <i>lune</i> ‘moon’
ʌ	mid central vowel	[ʌ]	English <i>hut</i>
ā	long a	[ɑ:]	American English <i>rod</i>
ī	long i	[i:]	English <i>see</i>
ū	long u	[u:]	English <i>do</i>
q	voiceless uvular stop	[q]	
G	voiced uvular stop	[G]	
ʔ	glottal stop	[ʔ]	English <i>uh-oh</i>
ħ	voiceless pharyngeal fricative	[ħ]	
ʕ	voiced pharyngeal fricative	[ʕ]	
ğ	not pronounced in Standard Turkish, but a voiced velar or uvular fricative in some nonstandard dialects.		

and expressions drawn from the local language, Arabic. (Hebrew is a relatively recent introduction and has not had significant influence on Jerusalem Armenian.) Generalizations of this sort are not peculiar to the Jerusalem dialect; one frequently hears similar proclamations made in reference to the Armenian varieties spoken in France, Greece, the United States, and elsewhere in the Diaspora. These are nothing more than unfounded folk myths; in the case of the Jerusalem dialect, for example, careful linguistic analysis reveals that it is as robust and systematic as any other variety of Armenian, literary or otherwise.

Another popular take on the Jerusalem dialect is to view it as a source of folk wisdom and humor. One expatriate k'atak'ac'i observed that it is common for Armenians in the know to sit around the fire and make fun of how the k'atak'ac'is talk; he added that an Armenian group in New Jersey even composed and performed a skit making fun of the dialect. Others have a more negative view; one younger k'atak'ac'i observed to me, "my grandma is still alive and you should hear her k'atak'ac'i accent. Luckily I don't have it."

The sorts of reasoning outlined above may be largely responsible for the lack of scholarship on the Jerusalem dialect. If, the reasoning goes, the language spoken by the Jerusalem Armenians is merely incompletely-learned standard Armenian augmented by Arabic words when the speaker does not know the proper Armenian forms, then the language should not be considered as a dialect per se and does not merit special study. Those who support this position maintain that in order to be considered a dialect, the idiom under discussion must show ancient dialect forms, linguistic innovations that cannot be attributed to simple borrowing from the superstrate language of the area, and so on.

In fact, my investigations thus far have revealed that the Jerusalem dialect contains many such features. Before discussing these features, though, we should first specify what we mean when we refer to the Jerusalem dialect. There are at least three distinct varieties of Armenian, identified with two main subparts of the community in and around Jerusalem, the k'atak'ac'is and the k'alt'agans. The *քաղաքացիներ* (k'atak'ac'is, literally 'citizens, city dwellers') are the indigenous armenophone inhabitants of the Armenian Quarter. Until recently, isolated groups of speakers were also to be found in nearby areas of Israel, most notably Jaffa. The k'atak'ac'is live outside the monastery walls, and attend the *Սուրբ Հրեշտակապետաց* (Surp Hrešdagabedac') church. The *գաղթականներ* (k'alt'agans, literally '[im]migrants'), on the other hand, attend services at the cathedral of Saint James. They came more recently to Jerusalem from various reaches of the Ottoman empire, for the most part immediately following the Genocide of 1915-1920. In the period immediately after their arrival they were referred to by the k'atak'ac'is as *zuwar*, the Arabic word for 'visitors'. The k'alt'agans in turn are reported to have labelled the k'atak'ac'is as *p'is arab* 'dirty Arab'. The two groups each remained wary of the other for some time, and in fact did not intermarry on a significant scale until after World War II. Relations subsequently improved; k'atak'ac'is are now fond of saying:

գաղթականները գացին եկան առանց վարտիկ, եղան մարդիկ

k'axt'agannerə k'ac'in yegan aranc' vardig, yetan mart'ig¹

'the immigrants went around without underwear, [but] became men (i.e. made something of themselves)'

The three varieties of Armenian that we find among these two groups can be summarized as in (1).

(1) The three varieties of Jerusalem Armenian

- i. The traditional dialect of the k'alak'ac'is.
- ii. The language spoken by the k'alt'agans. This dialect is not an assortment of regional Armenian dialects from Turkey, but rather a unique melange of linguistic elements drawn from standard Armenian, the k'alak'ac'i dialect, Turkish, and a number of Turkish Armenian dialects. Jerusalem Armenians are quite aware of the distinction between k'alak'ac'i and k'alt'agan Armenian, and typically know (at least passively) the word for a given object in both dialects.
- iii. The variety of "standard" Armenian spoken by more educated and younger Jerusalem Armenians, which is distinct from the standard Armenian prescribed in the grammar books and displays fewer Arabic and Turkish influences than the k'alak'ac'i and k'alt'agan dialects.

Each of the three varieties of Armenian described above is quite distinctive. Consider for example the lexical variations in (2):

¹ Vartuhi Hokeyan mentions a variant *եկան պալա վարտիկ, եղան մեր վրայ մարդիկ yegan bala vardig, yetan mer vəra mart'ig*. The use of 'without underwear' here may well have a literal value (it is possible that many of the refugees actually arrived without underwear), but may also function as a pun; compare the use of *anvardig* in some dialects in the sense of 'idle, without purpose' (cf. Gabikian 1952:68).

(2) “Standard” ²	K‘aġak‘ac‘i	K‘aġt‘agan	gloss
gurjk‘	sáder	döš	(sheep) breast
voč‘	voč‘	heč‘	no(ne)
liart‘	k‘ibdi	sev ĵiyer	liver
ənguyz	ĵoz	ĵeviz	walnut
gaġamp‘	mālfuf	lahana	cabbage
gogort‘	ħalf	boġaz	throat
hoviv	raġi	č‘oban	shepherd
xanjarur	buġje	boxč‘a ³	swaddling clothes, wrapper
azadk‘eġ	baġdunes	maġdanos, maydanoz	parsley
goġov, zamp‘yuf	sep‘et‘	sāp‘āt‘	basket

One can observe in (2) that the k‘aġak‘ac‘i forms are generally—but not always—from Arabic, and the k‘aġt‘agan forms are generally from Turkish. Crucially, however, the use of Turkish forms is not sufficient to identify a speaker as k‘aġt‘agan and the use of Arabic forms is not sufficient to identify a speaker as a k‘aġak‘ac‘i, because each dialect contains both Arabic and Turkish loans. (Kaghakac‘is for example use only the Turkish expression *şişbeş*⁴ for ‘cross-eyed’; they have not heard the Standard Armenian form *շիլ* *šil*; see section 3.2 for further discussion of the use of Turkish forms by k‘aġak‘ac‘is.)

As with any language or dialect there is also significant idiolectal (individual) variation, as can be seen in the following inventories of terms for basic lexical items (capital letters refer to specific k‘aġak‘ac‘i informants):

(3) ‘bathroom’:	<i>շիշմե</i>	šišme	(AZ)
	<i>պէտքարան</i>	bedk‘aran	(AZ)
	<i>մնշխարհա</i>	māšxaxa	(GH)
	<i>պէյթ մայի</i>	bet‘ mayi	(GH)
	<i>քնննք</i>	k‘änāf	(AM)
	<i>Համեմ</i>	ħamem	(YE)
‘key’:	<i>բալլիք</i>	p‘allink‘	(AT, AZ)
	<i>բալանի</i>	p‘alani	(GH)
	<i>մուքղան</i>	muft‘āh	(YD)
	[compare the k‘aġt‘agan form <i>p‘alhak</i>]		

² I am not actually sure of all of the forms in the Jerusalem “standard” column, because in my fieldwork I have focused on collecting k‘aġak‘ac‘i and k‘aġt‘agan forms. Some of the “standard” forms (such as gurjk and gogort) I have had to fill in myself based on Standard Western Armenian; I have not yet been able to confirm that these are the forms used by Jerusalem Armenians when speaking “standard”.

³ One informant (AZ) noted that *boxča* was also used by k‘aġak‘ac‘is in the sense of ‘package’. He hypothesized that k‘aġak‘ac‘is used the Turkish (as opposed to Arabic or Armenian) form in this case because in the old days they had to go to the Turkish bath to bathe.

⁴ Persian *šāš* ‘six’ + Turkish *beş* ‘five’.

One of the central goals of my ongoing study of the Jerusalem dialects is to identify the non-standard features of each variety that have a specific regional distribution among the traditional Armenian dialects. (The form *p'allink'* for 'key', for example, also occurs in the dialects of Hadjin, Suzawa, Istanbul, and Diyarbakir; *p'alani* is not found elsewhere, but the Eastern dialects of Erevan, New Julfa, and Agulis have very similar forms augmented by the old plural suffix *-k'* (Adjarian 1971:405).) By identifying the dialectal antecedents of the Jerusalem dialect, I hope to localize the main streams of Armenian immigration into the Holy Land, and determine which of these were most influential in the formation of the new *koine* of the Armenian immigrants.

In this paper I concentrate on the *k'alak'ac'i* dialect, the variety generally associated with the Jerusalem Armenians, and also the variety in the most immediate danger of dying. The *k'alak'ac'i* dialect is currently spoken by at most a handful of older Armenians, but the majority of Armenians who have either lived in Jerusalem or visited it are familiar with its distinctive features, which are generally identified as "sing-song" intonation, protraction of stressed vowels, and extensive borrowing and calquing from Arabic.

1.1. Sociolinguistic situation and prognosis

In order to understand the structure of the *k'alak'ac'i* dialect it is important to know the historical and sociolinguistic context in which it developed and currently exists. As is well known, Armenians have resided in Jerusalem since the third or fourth century (though our first written records are from the fifth century), when they started coming as pilgrims following their conversion to Christianity. This initial influx would have been solidified by the foundation of the Armenian patriarchate of Jerusalem in the seventh century, and augmented by merchants and artists. (For further details see Thomson 1985.) A large number of Armenians (approximately one thousand) apparently came to Jerusalem with the Crusaders in the twelfth century; presumably these Armenians came primarily from Cilicia and northern Syria.

Various Arabic-speaking countries controlled Jerusalem until 1517, when the Ottoman Turks assumed control; Jerusalem remained under Ottoman dominion until 1918. According to Simeon the Pole only twelve Armenian families were to be found in Jerusalem in 1616; it is therefore possible that whatever Armenian dialect had been formed in Jerusalem prior to that point may not have survived and thus may not be the direct ancestor of the modern dialect. Armenian immigrants in subsequent centuries would most likely have come from within the Ottoman Empire, and therefore would have been from Western rather than Eastern Armenia.

Jerusalem subsequently fell under British rule from 1918-1948, after which the city became part of the state of Israel. Since that time the Armenian community has been surrounded primarily by speakers of Hebrew, Arabic, and English. The fall of the Soviet Union in 1990 and the subsequent troubles in the Republic of Armenia have produced a flood of immigration of Eastern Armenians, bringing with them varieties of Eastern Armenian.

Given these historical influences, we expect that the Jerusalem dialect might contain elements of:

- **Western Armenian dialects** (from the Crusader-era immigration from Cilicia and Syria, and Ottoman-era immigration from Western Armenia)
- **Arabic** (from the period of Arab dominion up to 1517 as well as the subsequent centuries, in which Arabic remained the dominant language in Jerusalem)

- **Turkish** (from the period of Ottoman rule, 1517-1918)
- **English** (from the period of British rule, 1918-1948)
- **Hebrew** (from the period of Israeli rule, 1948-present)
- **Eastern Armenian** (from the influx of ex-Soviet refugees, 1990-present)

With the exception of English, Hebrew, and Eastern Armenian, these are exactly the elements we find, as I detail below. English and Hebrew have exerted little or no influence on the Jerusalem dialect because of their recent appearance on the scene and relatively small number of speakers in the area (though it should be mentioned that many contemporary k'alak'ac'is are quite fluent in English.). An 1839 article on Jerusalem in the Smyrna Armenian journal *Štemaran* mentions that very few Jews were to be found in Jerusalem, for example, and one must bear in mind that Hebrew only began to be spoken in large numbers after 1948, though technically it had been revived decades earlier. The k'alak'ac'i dialect is also devoid of Eastern Armenian influence, which is not surprising given that most k'alak'ac'is had never even heard Eastern Armenian until the 1990s.

Turning to the status of the dialect today, Jerusalem presently contains approximately 1000 local Armenians (i.e. k'alak'ac'is) and 3000 other Armenians (Azarya 1984:177). The numerical superiority of non-k'alak'ac'is has played a major role in the decline of the k'alak'ac'i dialect, as have the T'ark'manč'ac', Mxit'arean, Araradean, and Vaspuraganean schools, which since the middle of the nineteenth century (beginning with the creation of the T'ark'manč'ac' school in 1867) have been central forces in promoting Standard Western Armenian at the expense of the local dialect. The dialect moreover was severely disrupted by the events of 1918, 1948, and 1967. Ongoing emigration to the West, spurred in large part by the loss of Armenian homes and property in Israel in 1948 and 1967, combined with large-scale immigration from the Armenian Republic, have decimated the dialect.

At this point the k'alak'ac'i dialect is in immediate danger of disappearing; to the best of my knowledge only one completely fluent native speaker remains, and the fact that she lives in New York virtually guarantees that the dialect will not be passed on to future generations. Approximately 10-15 elder members of the Jerusalem community feel somewhat comfortable speaking the dialect; five individuals or so can speak it quite well but stress that it is not their native dialect; and many more in Jerusalem and elsewhere know a few words, phrases, and jokes, and are able to imitate the intonational pattern of the dialect. Given the present situation, the dialect will have no fluent or even semi-fluent speakers left in 10-20 years. In fact, the entire community itself is in immediate danger of disappearing—the wealthy move into other parts of Jerusalem, and the closed environment in the Armenian Quarter spurs many to move to Beirut or the West.

For this reason it is imperative to document the language and culture of the Jerusalem Armenians as soon as possible. It is particularly essential that extensive audio recordings be made, as these provide the only means of preserving the distinctive intonation patterns of the dialect.

2. Linguistic features of the K'alak'ac'i dialect

With these preliminaries in hand, let us now turn to more detailed examination of the linguistic features of the dialect. As stated above, the features most often noticed by individuals familiar with the dialect are the large-scale Arabic influence on the vocabulary and the unique intonational structure, the latter of which is itself claimed by some to be a result of Arabic

influence. Perhaps the most commonly cited illustration of the dialect is the question ‘would you like to eat yoghurt (with) sliced cucumber, (srpazan)?’, which I have heard in the following forms:

- (4) a. ջարդեմ խիար կուտես մածոն č‘art‘em xiar gudes majun [AM]
 b. ջարդեմ քեզի խիար կուտես č‘art‘em k‘ezi xiar gudes [VH]
 c. ջարդեմ քեզի կուտես խիար č‘art‘em k‘ezi gudes xiar [A]
 d. խիար սրբազան ջարդեմ կուտես xiyar sərp‘azan č‘art‘em gudes [CD]

The variants in (4) demonstrate that this seemingly simple question does not have a consistent form; the key for those describing the dialect seems to be that the word order be different than in Standard Western Armenian (where *kezi* needs to precede *xiar* unless it the addressee who is being cut), that the non-standard form *xiar* ‘cucumber’ be used instead of its Standard equivalent *varung*, and that the characteristic k‘aʔak‘ac‘i intonation be employed. All of these differences are felt to be hallmarks of Arabic influence, but this generalization is problematic. Of the word orders in (4), only (4a) would be standard in Arabic; compare the Arabic equivalent in (5).

- (5) *färämt ?äl xiar äkält älä läbän*

As for the vocabulary, it is not entirely clear that *xiar* is borrowed directly from Arabic, as it is also employed in Turkish dialects and most of the nonstandard Armenian dialects.

Finally, it is not clear that the characteristic k‘aʔak‘ac‘i intonational pattern is borrowed from Arabic. I return to this issue in section 3.1.2.

2.1. Pronunciation

Though the dialectological merits of the above example remain somewhat unclear, there are many other features of k‘aʔak‘ac‘i pronunciation that can be linked to other varieties of Armenian. In the realm of vowels, we find that many k‘aʔak‘ac‘is metathesize the *իւ* diphthong (originally pronounced [iw]) to [uy] in preconsonantal position, as in *ձիւն* ‘snow’ > *ցույն c‘uyn* ‘snow, ice’; *միւս* ‘other’ > *մուս muys*. (Speakers of Standard Western Armenian generally pronounce this diphthong as either [yu] or [ü] before a consonant.) The metathesis to [uy] is also found to a limited extent in other dialects (e.g. Istanbul), but I do not know of any dialect that systematically employs this treatment of *իւ*.

The k‘aʔak‘ac‘i treatment of diphthongization with proclitics also finds parallels in other nonstandard forms of modern Armenian. Whereas word-initial *o-* diphthongizes to *vo-* (cf. *որ vor* ‘which, that’), it remains unchanged following the imperfective proclitic *g-*: *կ’որոշեմ* ‘I decide’ → *gorošem*, not **gə vorošem*, which we find in Standard Western Armenian. The absence of diphthongization in this situation is common in spoken and dialectal Armenian, but as with the behavior of *իւ* it is difficult to identify specific regional antecedents for it.

We can infer that for at least some k‘aʔak‘ac‘is original *e* became *i*, judging by the forms *hrištagabed* (Standard *հրեշտակապետ hrešdagabed* ‘archangel’) and *iric‘gin* (Standard *երեցկին yerec‘gin* ‘priest’s wife’) mentioned by Rose 1993. Raising of *e* to *i* in *հրեշտակ* ‘angel’ is fairly common in the Armenian dialects, appearing in Tiflis, Alashkert, Mush, Agn, Istanbul, Rodosto, Sivas, Hamshen, Karabagh, Nor Naxichevan, and Zeytun (Adjarian 1977:135). The *iric‘gin* form is also quite common; compare Axaltsxa and Erzerum *իրիցկին iric‘kin*, Zeytun, Agn, Aslanbek,

Xarper, Istanbul, Rodosto, Sivas, and Ankara *irisgin*, Suczawa *iric 'g'in* (Adjarian 1973:53; it is also common in spoken Western Armenian).

Vowel harmony can be observed in the speech of some k'atak'ac'is: in the Armenian Quarter I have heard forms such as *պոստող budut* 'fruit' (Standard *պոստող bəduť*) and *դոդոսմ tutum* 'pumpkin' (Standard *դոդոսմ t'ət'um*). In all such cases an original schwa (ը) assimilates the quality of the vowel in the following syllable. This process is actually fairly common in spoken Turkish Armenian, such as one hears in Istanbul; for this reason, I suspect that it is also employed by the k'alt'agans (though I have been unable to confirm this).

Two other vocalic changes can be identified that are restricted to particular morphological environments. The third person singular copula *է* 'is' becomes *a*, as in Erevan and numerous other Armenian dialects; this particular change does not apply to any other instances of original *է*. It should be noted that the *a* form is also employed by younger speakers; it is not clear whether this represents an isolated survival of the traditional k'atak'ac'i dialect, or rather an independent importation into contemporary Jerusalem Standard Armenian from a different dialectal source. Another irregular vocalic change that is quite widespread in other forms of Armenian (e.g. Beirut Armenian) is the (optional) deletion of the final *i* of the future proclitic *bidi*, which k'atak'ac'is typically pronounce as [bid], as in *bid das* 'you will give' (cf. Standard Western *պիտի տաս bidi das*).

Perhaps the most striking aspect of the k'atak'ac'i vowel system is the extreme lengthening of the vowel that bears the sentential stress, as in:

- (6) *այսոր մեզի պիտի գասասաս*
aysor mezi bidi k'aaaaas
 'will you come to visit us today?'

This example was related to me by Madeleine Habosian; she also provided an anecdote involving a set of k'atak'ac'is living outside the Vank (as St. James monastery is called by locals). A priest from the Vank goes to their house to visit. Because the day is extremely hot, the k'atak'ac'i hostess says to the priest:

- (7) *հայր սուսուսուրբ բերեմ քեզի անկէ որ կընէ ֆըշ-ֆըշ*
hayr suuuurp' p'erem k'ezi ange vor gəne fəš-fəš?
 'Holy father, can I bring you some of that [drink] that goes *fizz fizz* [i.e. a soda]?'

Note in examples (6) and (7) that it is only the vowel bearing sentential stress that lengthens; the stressed vowels of other words in the sentence are not noticeably longer than in other varieties of Armenian.

Turning to the consonantal system, we find that k'atak'ac'is frequently deaffricate the original Armenian affricates when not preceded by a vowel, as in *sex* for *ցեխ* *c'ex* 'mud' and *zagic'in* for *ծակեցին* *jagec'in* 'they punched holes'. This is characteristic of Armenian pronounced with a Turkish accent, and of the Armenian dialect of Ayntab (for further discussion see Vaux 2000).

The Jerusalem dialect also differs from Standard Armenian in its word for 'grape', which is *խավող xavot* for some speakers and *խավոխ xavox* for others (cf. Standard *խաղող xatot*). The replacement of original *t* by *v* in this word is found in almost all of the modern dialects, and hence is not a useful diagnostic for the regional origins of the Jerusalem dialect.

The pronunciation of the stops and affricates identifies the Jerusalem dialect as a member of the same Western group as Standard Western Armenian and Malatia (Gharibyan’s group 5; cf. Pisowicz 1976).

(8)	Classical	SWA	Jerusalem	gloss
a.	gas	k‘as	k‘as	come-2sg.
b.	tas	das	das	give-2sg.
c.	t‘as	t‘as	t‘as	cup

2.2. Vocabulary

The lexicon of the Jerusalem dialect confirms the Western grouping, being replete with Western forms such as *հաւկիթ havgit* ‘egg’ (cf. Eastern *ճու ju*) and *մէկ meg* ‘one’ (cf. Eastern *մի mi*). The morphology is similarly Western, employing familiar features unknown in the Eastern realm such as the irrealis clitic *նէ ne* (commonly thought to be borrowed from Turkish, but actually of Middle Armenian origin; see section 3.1.3 for an example) and the progressive clitic *կոր gor* (as in *ինչու կը խօսիս կոր հետս inč‘u gə xosis gor hedəs* ‘why are you speaking with me?’).

Another morphological construction that has parallels in nonstandard Western dialects is the imperative of monosyllabic verbs, which k‘atak‘ac‘is prefix with *u*: *ու գասս u k‘as* ‘come (here)!’ (SWA *հոս եկոր hos egur*), *ու տասս u das* ‘give!’ (SWA *տոր dur*). I do not know of any other dialect that employs *u-* in this situation, but the Tigranakert dialects employ *i-* with monosyllabic infinitives (Haneyan 1978:104), and the older Istanbul dialect employs *i-* with the negative imperfective of monosyllabic verbs (Kazanjian 1924:214).

One also finds features that are widespread in spoken modern Armenian, but are not employed in the standard language; I have provided some examples in (9).

(9)	K‘atak‘ac‘i	Standard	gloss
	vodk‘əs gə c‘avi	sərunk‘əs gə c‘avi	my leg hurts ⁵
	žam	yegelec‘i	church [VA]
	šuk‘	əsdver, šuk‘	shadow
	xosal	xosil	speak
	desnal	desnel	see
	yerev(n)al ⁶	yerevil	appear
	onk‘	honk‘	eyebrow (some speakers use both forms)

Other lexical features of the k‘atak‘ac‘i dialect appear to be relatively widespread in dialects, but we do not know their precise distribution. Such is the case with *բəzdəlig* ‘small’, corresponding to Standard *պզտիկ bəzdig* ‘small’; Adjarian (1979:77) mentions that this form occurs in other dialects of modern Armenian but does not specify which ones. (I know it to be used by some Istanbul Armenians.) I have summarized several other forms of this type in (10).

⁵ Note here that *vodk* does *not* just refer to the foot. This more general use of the ‘foot’ word to refer to the entire leg is found in many languages across the world, including Russian and Modern Greek.

⁶ As in *վաղը ես քեզի կ’երեւնամ vatə yes k‘ezi gerevnam* ‘I’ll see/visit you tomorrow’.

(10) K‘aḷak‘ac‘i	Standard	gloss
<i>urdeḷ</i>	<i>ur</i>	where
<i>danis</i>	<i>danik‘</i>	roof
<i>gəzmərt‘el</i>	<i>gəsmət‘el</i>	pinch (v)
<i>gəzmərdel</i>		
<i>ḷəmḷugel</i>		
<i>ḷəmḷəgel⁷</i>		
<i>həramayec‘ek‘</i>	<i>hərammec‘ek‘</i>	said when inviting someone to enter
<i>ink‘ə gəlla</i>	<i>andesagen yeter e,</i> <i>anonc‘me yeter e</i>	said when someone goes crazy (literally ‘he becomes himself’)
<i>badərdəvaj vosp</i>	<i>k‘ašaj vosh</i>	string beans
<i>sem</i>	<i>šem(k‘)</i>	threshold
<i>burtul</i>	<i>bultur</i>	boiled, dried, and cracked wheat
<i>fəš-fəš</i>	<i>fəššal, fəšfəšal</i> (spoken Std.)	fizz(ing); the sound made by a steam locomotive

2.3. Sayings

The Jerusalem community appears to possess its fair share of distinctive sayings. The following was shared with me by two elderly k‘aḷak‘ac‘i women:

- (11) *այս տարի անձրեւները էկեր են շատ
շատ հորերը լեցվեր են լէթըմմօ
կարեւորութիւնը [i.e. կառավարութիւնը] ըսեր է ջուրերը տապկէք ու խմէք*
- ays dari anc‘revnerə eger en šad
šad horerə lec‘ver en let‘əmmo
garevorut‘yunə [i.e. gařavarutyunə] əser e ḷurerə dabk‘ek‘ u xəmek‘*

This year many rains came
They filled many holes to the brim
The government said “fry the waters and drink [them]!”

Note the use of the Arabic expression *let‘əmmo* ‘to the brim’, and the Freudian slip of *garevorut‘yunə* ‘the important-ness’ in place of *gařavarut‘yunə* ‘the government’.

I have not yet had the opportunity to work on the topic of sayings in detail and therefore unfortunately cannot offer any further examples here.

3. Foreign influences on the k‘aḷak‘ac‘i dialect

Like all other varieties of Armenian, the k‘aḷak‘ac‘i dialect has been profoundly influenced by the languages with which it has been in contact, most notably Arabic and Turkish. As one k‘aḷak‘ac‘i observed to me, *ուզես չ’ուզես, ինքիլթրէյթ կ’ընեն* *uzes č‘uzes, infilt‘reyt‘ gənen* ‘like it or not, they infiltrate [our Armenian]’. The k‘aḷak‘ac‘i dialect differs from other varieties of Armenian in the extreme degree of influence exerted by Arabic, however.

⁷ Compare k‘alt‘agan *ճիմճիկել* *ḷimḷigel*.

3.1. Arabic

The unusually large Arabic influence on the kʼalakʼacʼi dialect might initially seem odd, given that the kʼalakʼacʼis traditionally spoke Arabic with an Armenian accent (Rose 1993), and that Turkish rather than Arabic was traditionally the prestige language among the Jerusalem Armenians (Apkar Zakarian, personal communication). Turkish prestige notwithstanding, though, Mr. Zakarian adds that at the end of nineteenth century the Armenians of Jerusalem often spoke Arabic at home; one suspects that they used Arabic on the street as well.

Why would the kʼalakʼacʼis import Arabic elements into their Armenian, though? As a general rule, polylingual speakers are well aware of the distinctions between the different languages they control: given a word, the average Armenian bilingual in Armenian and Turkish (educated or not) can state correctly whether the word is Armenian or Turkish, for example. The layman's favorite explanation for this conundrum is that polylinguals import words from one of their languages when they do not know or in the heat of the moment are unable to recall the proper word or construction in the language in which they are speaking at the time.

This explanation accounts for some cases of Arabic importation into Jerusalem Armenian, such as the use of ճազար *ǰazar* for 'carrot' (many Armenians do not know the Standard form, ստեպղին *sdebtin*), մալֆուֆ *mälʃuf* for 'cabbage' (vs. Standard կաղամբ *gatamp*)⁸, ճոզ *ǰoz* for 'walnut' (vs. Standard ընկոյզ *ənguyz*), and պնտոթ *bəndoq* for 'hazelnut' (vs. Standard կաղին *gatin*). Careful reflection reveals, though, that this is not a complete explanation of the importation of Arabic influence into Armenian. A speaker may well know both the Arabic and Armenian forms but select the Arabic because it may be more appropriate in the situation at hand; if the Armenian equivalent has learned connotations, for example, a teenage boy speaking informally with his friends may well choose the Arabic equivalent to avoid appearing bookish or nerdy or excessively formal. Individuals speaking in Armenian may also choose to employ an Arabic form if they suspect that their interlocutors will not be familiar with the Armenian equivalent, or if there is no exact Armenian equivalent for the concept being invoked, as with հաս *hab* 'pill' and մալթի *maltʼi* 'type of bedsheet cloth'. The Arabic form may be more efficient than the Armenian equivalent in a given situation; it is easy to imagine conversational situations, for example, in which the shorter Arabic form *kärkänd* 'lobster' will be preferable to its Armenian counterpart ծովային խեցգետին *jovayin xecʼkʼedin*. (The same holds for those Armenians who know the literary form *tʼetahad* 'pill'.) If one is speaking poetically or fancifully, the Arabic form may enable a rhyme or alliteration that is not possible with its Armenian synonym. There are many other factors of this sort that play a role in the selection of an Arabic word or construction over an Armenian one, but this enumeration should suffice to demonstrate that the popular memory-failure explanation is inadequate.

Another interesting aspect of the Arabic component in the kʼalakʼacʼi dialect is that it is based on the Jerusalem Palestinian dialect, not on Standard Arabic, as shown in (12). This makes perfect sense when we consider that the kʼalakʼacʼis would have learned their Arabic at home and on the streets, rather than in school.

⁸ The kʼaltʼagans use the Turkish form (originally from Greek) *լահանա lahana*.

(12)	K‘aġak‘ac‘i	Std. Arabic	gloss
	<i>ʔawaʕi</i>	<i>θiyäb</i>	clothing
	<i>dän</i>	<i>ʔuðun</i>	ear
	<i>ʃoz</i>	<i>zäwż</i>	double
	<i>beda</i>	<i>bed, bīḍ</i>	egg
	<i>häje</i>	<i>kīs, zəkībä, šäntä</i>	shopping bag
	<i>ġeme</i>	<i>säħabä</i>	cloud

(It should be noted that most k‘aġak‘ac‘is know Armenian equivalents to the forms in (12); they are equally comfortable with using both the native and the imported Arabic forms in their spoken Armenian.)

Arabic influence on the k‘aġak‘ac‘i dialect takes many forms, including individual lexical items, code switching of entire phrases, pronunciation, word order, and calques. In the sections that follow I provide some examples of each type.

3.1.1. Phrases

The use of entire Arabic phrases within Armenian conversations, and of Arabic words with Arabic inflections inside Armenian phrases (different from the use of Arabic stems with Armenian inflections, which is treated in section 3.1.3), is quite common in the k‘aġak‘ac‘i dialect. Some examples are provided in (13).

(13) Arabic and hybrid Arabic-Armenian expressions employed in the k‘aġak‘ac‘i dialect

- a. *րուՀննն հոննը եւ ինծի ըսաւ ապու եա՞ուպ քեզի շատ կը սիրեմ...*
ruhnä honäk ‘yev inji əsav abu yaʔub k‘ezi šad gə sirem...
‘we went there and he said to me “father of Jacob I like you very much”...’
- b. *արթնցաւ, սկսաւ երթթնուապ*
art ‘ənc ‘av, əsgəsav yət ‘t ‘äwab
‘he woke and began to yawn’
- c. *ուրլնն Հայուան*
wäläd ħaywan
‘son of a beast!’
- d. *խօս ննքնն*
xod näfäs
‘be patient!’ (literally ‘take a breath’)
- e. *խրրրպ պեթակ*
xərəb bet ‘ag
‘may your house be destroyed!’ (a curse)
- f. *խրրրպ տինակ*
xərəb dīnag
‘may your religion vanish!’ (apparently this is only said to Arabs)

- g. *Չարասնի ճիմճեց ինձի*
ʔarasni ĵimʒec' inji
 '(s)he/it bit me and pinched me' (*ʔarasni* and *ĵimʒec'* both mean 'bite, pinch', so this phrase may be better translated as '(s)he/it really/repeatedly bit/pinched me')
- h. *տահարի պուժահանի*
dahəri bužahani
 'my back hurts'

3.1.2. Pronunciation

When Armenians who have heard the k'alak'ac'i dialect are asked to describe it, the first thing they mention is normally its "sing-song intonation", which many then go on to attribute to Arabic influence. The implication here is that Arabic has a lilting melodic intonational structure, whereas regular Armenian does not, and that the k'alak'ac'is have imported the intonational system from their Arabic into their Armenian.

This "sing-song" label is unfortunately too nebulous to be useful. When one examines the cases in which this term is invoked by individuals describing a form of speech different from their own, it turns out that it means nothing more than "different from my own intonation system", and does not describe any particular sort of intonation contour. One hears this label applied by laypeople to basically any language or dialect; I have heard "sing-song" used to describe the Van and Istanbul dialects of Armenian, for example, as well as many other languages I have worked on. The fact of the matter is that *all* languages have intonational systems; it is not the case that some languages have melodic structures and others do not. Humans typically do not notice the intonational idiosyncrasies of their own speech, though; what they notice is differences from their own system. This produces a scenario in which individuals believe they (and others who have the same intonational system) speak "normally" (i.e. without a special melody), whereas speakers of languages and dialects with different intonational systems speak with a distinctive melody.

What we can infer from this discussion is that the k'alak'ac'i dialect has a different intonational system than Standard Western Armenian; it is *not*, however, more or less melodic than SWA or any other language. At present I am not equipped to formalize the differences between the SWA and k'alak'ac'i intonational systems; significant phonetic and phonological work on both dialects will be required before we can begin to extract generalizations.

Even without such information we are able to evaluate the claim that the k'alak'ac'i intonational system is borrowed from Arabic. The way to test this claim is to play recordings of the dialect for Arabic speakers and ask them whether the intonational patterns they hear are similar to what they would use in their own speech. I have carried out this experiment with several Arabic speakers, who universally replied that the intonation of the recordings was totally unlike that of Arabic. (These were speakers were not from Jerusalem, however.) We can conclude from this fact, together with the discussion above, that the k'alak'ac'i dialect has an intonation system different from that of Standard Western Armenian, but this intonational system is not borrowed from Arabic.

Another way in which the k'alak'ac'i system of pronunciation may have been affected by Arabic is in the domain of vowel quality. My impression of the k'alak'ac'i vowels *e* and *o* is that they are quite tense, resembling in this regard Arabic more so than Standard Armenian. I have not yet been able to confirm this impression with instrumental measurements of k'alak'ac'i,

SWA, and Palestinian Arabic vowels, though, so at this point the generalization will have to remain tentative.

3.1.3. Vocabulary

The number of Arabic loanwords in the kʼaʼlakʼacʼi dialect is quite large. A representative sampling of Arabic loans commonly used in the kʼaʼlakʼacʼi dialect is provided in (14).

(14)	Kʼaʼlakʼacʼi	SWA	gloss
	<i>šorba</i>	<i>abur</i>	<i>soup</i>
	<i>ʃoz</i>	<i>ənguyz</i>	walnut ⁹
	<i>mišmiš</i>	<i>jiran</i>	apricot ¹⁰
	<i>xiar</i>	<i>varung</i>	cucumber ¹¹
	<i>fasulya</i>	<i>lupʼia</i>	bean
	<i>šamandar</i>	<i>ʃagəntʼet</i>	red beet
	<i>šäbraʼa</i>	—	mixed nuts and seeds
	<i>bəndoq</i>	<i>gaʼin</i>	hazelnut ¹²
	<i>fəsdoq, bisdäkʼ</i>	<i>bisdag</i>	pistachio, peanut
	<i>näʼnä, nana, mananax</i>	<i>ananux</i>	mint
	<i>Gayfe, qahve, ʼahve</i>	<i>surʃ</i>	coffee
	<i>maʼbara</i>	<i>kʼerezman</i>	cemetery
	<i>sabaḥ</i>	<i>aṛdu</i>	morning
	<i>šbin, šibin</i>	<i>gənkʼahayr</i>	godfather
	<i>húshos</i>	<i>mičʼad</i>	bug, gnat
	<i>ʼurʼaʼa</i>	<i>gərya</i>	turtle ¹³
	<i>dikʼ hābeš</i>	<i>həntʼgahav</i>	turkey
	<i>yaxti¹⁴</i>	<i>kʼuyrəs</i>	my sister, my dear
	<i>sekʼen</i>	<i>moxir</i>	ashes
	<i>dayr</i>	<i>gəʼnag</i>	back (anatomical)
	<i>yaʼuntʼ</i>	<i>xajnel</i>	bite
	<i>sader</i>	<i>gurjkʼ</i>	breast, chest ¹⁵
	<i>udfar</i>	<i>yetung</i>	nail, claw
	<i>bärd</i>	<i>baʼt</i>	cold (temperature)
	<i>mərašex</i>	<i>harpʼux</i>	cold (illness)
	<i>mai intʼälaʃe</i>	<i>saiʼ, saʼraj čʼur</i>	ice

⁹ The kʼaʼlakʼacʼi is also use *ʃoz* to mean ‘husband’; the same is true in Palestinian Arabic, which contains a synonymous form *ʃoz* meaning ‘double’, and by extension ‘husband’.

¹⁰ For further discussion of manifestations of this form in Armenian see Greppin 1986:67.

¹¹ See Greppin 1986 for further discussion.

¹² Some kʼaʼlakʼacʼi use the Turkish form, *ʃūmɾɪʃu fəndəx*.

¹³ Some kʼaʼlakʼacʼi do not know the Standard form *gərya*.

¹⁴ From Arabic *yā ʼuxtī* ‘o my sister’. One informant (AM) states that this expression can be used with addressees of either gender; another (HM) states that it can be used only when addressing women.

¹⁵ One kʼaʼlakʼacʼi reported that the kʼaʼltʼagans use the Turkish form *döş* for ‘(sheep) breast’.

<i>samak</i> ‘	<i>c’ug</i>	fish
<i>k’oyes</i>	<i>lav</i>	good
<i>ahdar</i>	<i>gananč</i> ‘	green
<i>ša^ser</i>	<i>maz, vars</i>	hair
<i>ʔaren</i>	<i>godoš</i>	horn
<i>ruk’be</i>	<i>jung</i>	knee
<i>tənuq</i>	<i>viz</i>	neck
<i>t’aze</i>	<i>t’arm</i>	fresh
<i>xars, xäs</i>	<i>hazar</i>	lettuce

Some loans are more subtle, employing transfer of the concept rather than the word itself; cases of this sort are called *calques*. A typical example is the k’alak’ac’i use of *թուղթ t’uxt*‘ to refer to the grape or beet leaves employed to wrap dolma, as in *խավղիսի թուղթ փաթթեցին xavoxi t’uxt p’at’t’ec’in* ‘they wrapped the grape leaves’. In Standard Armenian *թուղթ* means ‘sheet of paper’; the word employed for dolma leaves is *տերեւ derev*. The k’alak’ac’i extension of the use of *t’uxt*‘ to ‘leaf’ is calqued on the Arabic *wara*‘, which means both ‘sheet of paper’ and ‘leaf’.

Another example is *c’uyn*, which as mentioned earlier corresponds to Standard Armenian *c’yun* ‘snow’, but in the k’alak’ac’i dialect means both ‘snow’ and ‘ice’, as in *բերէք ձոյնը p’erek c’uynə* ‘bring the ice [for a glass of oli]’. This is calqued on Arabic *tälj*, which is used for both ‘ice’ and ‘snow’. The expression *քաշուած սույ k’ašvaj vosh* (equivalent to Standard Armenian *պատրտուած/պատրած սույ badərdəvaj/badraj vosp*) is also based on its Arabic equivalent.

Calquing is not restricted to nouns; in fact one of the most often-noticed features of the k’alak’ac’i dialect involves the use of postpositions based on their Arabic equivalents. Armenians familiar with the k’alak’ac’i dialect are fond of citing examples such as the woman who sees the local priest visiting her neighbor and calls out *մեր վրան ալ չէ՞ս դար mer vəran al č’es k’ar* ‘won’t you also come visit us?’. (A variant expression *մեր վրայով/վրայէն անցիր mer vərayov/vərayen anc’ir* ‘stop by and visit us!’ is also common.) The point of interest here is that *վրայ vəra* basically means ‘on’ in Standard Armenian, but in this context is used in the sense of French *chez*, approximately ‘to/in the home of’. The k’alak’ac’i usage is again a calque on the Arabic; compare expressions such as *ʔumru ʔannä* ‘walk over [to] us’, where the preposition roughly equivalent to ‘on’ is used in the same sense as *vəra* above.

The k’alak’ac’is do not miss the opportunity to play on the possibilities allowed by this double entendre. One example is the popular joke in (15):

- (15) *Մամաս հիւանդ էր երէկ; տորթոր եկաւ եւ վրայ մնաց մինչեւ առաւոտ:*
Mamas hivant’ er yereg; dok t’or yegav yev vəra mənac’ minč’ev aravod.
 ‘My mother was sick yesterday; a doctor came and stayed with [her] (literally ‘on [her]’) until the morning’

Again this construction is similar to the Arabic turn of phrase, as in *dallata sal ʔimmeh* ‘he stayed with [literally ‘on’, here in the sense of ‘in the house of’] his mother’.

A play on a calque with similar bawdy possibilities takes place in the time immediately following the withdrawal of the British, when times were hard and the residents of the Armenian Quarter had to wait in line for flour, sugar, and so on. The man in charge of writing down the

names of the people in line is a priest. A k'atak'ac'i woman walks up to the priest and complains:

Ասիկա ի՞նչ է տէր հայր: Ամենուն խոթեցիր եւ զիս չխոթեցիր:
Asiga inc' e, der hayr? Amenun xot'ec'ir yev zis č'axot'ec'ir.
'What is this, Father? You pushed everyone through the line except me!'

The priest responds:

Տիկին, եթէ կարգի կենաս ամեն քեզի ալ կը խոթեմ ժամանակդ գայ նէ:
Digin, yet'e gark'i genas amen k'ezial gə xot'em žamanagət' k'a ne:
'Ma'am, if you stay in line I will push you through everything when your time comes.'

This anecdote plays on the k'atak'ac'i calque of *xot'el* (literally 'pierce') on its Arabic equivalent, as in *leš mä habbartni*, which can mean both 'why didn't you push me through it?' and 'why didn't you push it through me?' The ambiguity here is exploited to produce a sexual double entendre: the priest may be pushing the woman through everything, or everything through the woman.

3.1.4. Morphology

As a general rule Arabic words are borrowed in a bare form, and suffixed with Armenian endings if necessary, as in *däma'ec'in* in (16) below, which contains the Arabic root *däma'* followed by the Armenian third-person plural aorist ending of the *e*-conjugation, *-ec'in*.

- (16) աչքերս տնամեցին
ač'k'erəs däma'ec'in
'my eyes were filled with tears'

The same process can be observed in (17), where the third-person singular aorist ending of the *e*-conjugation, *-ec'*, is suffixed to the Arabic root *tuz* 'pierce', equivalent to Armenian *jagec'*.

- (17) ժանկոտած¹⁶ քամ մը ոտքը դուզեց
žangodaj k'am mə vodk'ə tuzec'
'a rusty nail pierced [his/her] foot'

Verbs can also be derived from Arabic bases by taking an Arabic stem and adding one of two Armenian auxiliary verbs: *allal* to form certain types of intransitive verbs, and *anel* in all other cases. An example of this type that I heard used while in the Armenian Quarter was *սուշուխ ընել bušux anel* 'to urinate'.

Nouns behave in similar fashion to the process described in (16) and (17), as in *ճարն ա յարն a* '(s)he's my neighbor', where the Arabic loan *jar* 'neighbor' takes the Armenian definite article *-n*, or the saying *սոսնեներու պէս մի' խօսիր bumeneru bes mi xosir* 'don't say such a bad thing or bad things will happen' (literally 'don't speak like owls'), where the Arabic noun *bume*

¹⁶ Compare Standard Western *ժանգոտած žank'odaj*; as we find in many Armenian dialects, the k'atak'ac'i form has not undergone the devoicing of original /g/ after a nasal consonant.

(19)	Kʼalakʼacʼi	Turkish	SWA	gloss
	<i>pʼəčʼakʼ</i>	<i>bəçak</i>	<i>tʼanag</i>	knife
	<i>baĵakʼ</i>	<i>baĵak</i>	<i>yerankʼ</i>	thigh
	<i>tʼenĵere</i>	<i>tenĵere</i>	<i>dabag</i>	(sauce)pan
	<i>siseř yaxni</i>	<i>yahni</i> ¹⁷	—	chickpea stew
	<i>sepʼetʼ</i> ¹⁸	<i>sepet</i>	<i>gořov, zampʼyut</i>	basket
	<i>čʼiř(ig) ənel</i>	<i>čiř etmek</i>	<i>mizel</i>	to pee (used for small boys)
	<i>iřte</i>	<i>iřte</i>	<i>aysbes (?)</i>	now, thus
	<i>sabahtʼan</i>	<i>sabahtan</i> ¹⁹	<i>ařdəvan, ařavodyan</i>	in the morning
	<i>dondurma</i>	<i>dondurma</i>	<i>bařbatag</i>	ice cream
	<i>bebekʼ</i> ²⁰	<i>bebek</i>	<i>manuĵ</i>	baby
	<i>pʼatʼatʼes</i>	<i>patates</i>	<i>kʼednaxəncʼor</i>	potato
	<i>yani</i>	<i>yani</i>	<i>ays inkʼən</i>	that is, i.e.

The extensive interaction between Turkish and Arabic often makes it difficult to identify the particular source language of a kʼalakʼacʼi form. In some cases it is clear—*pʼatʼatʼes*, for example, where we know the Arabic form is *batata*—but in some cases matters are more obscure. *Yani*, for example, resembles the Turkish form *yani* more than the Arabic *yaʼni*, but it is conceivable that the kʼalakʼacʼis might have borrowed the form directly from Arabic and then deleted the glottal stop ʔ, which is not part of their native phonemic inventory. *Məzə* ‘appetizer’ is also likely to have come from (dialectal) Turkish rather than directly from Arabic, judging from the use of *-ə-* rather than the *-a-* we would expect in an Arabic loan. Forms like *zibil* ‘trash; nothing’ and *sini* ‘round metal tray’ present greater difficulties, however, because these forms appear in both Arabic and Turkish. Some kʼalakʼacʼis also use the Arabic form *izbəʼle* for ‘trash’, suggesting the possibility that *zibil* may instead be from Turkish, but this is not entirely clear.

A further subset of the putative Turkish loanwords descends originally from Persian, such as *ĵiger/ĵiär* ‘liver’ (one kʼalakʼacʼi mentioned that it was common for grandmothers to refer to children as *ĵiärəs*, equivalent to ‘my dear’), *šař/šeřbeř* ‘squinty, cross-eyed; backgammon’, and *pis* ‘filthy’. In light of the history of the Jerusalem Armenians sketched at the beginning of this chapter, though, it is more likely that the kʼalakʼacʼis imported these forms through Turkish rather than directly from Persian.

4. Conclusions

It should be clear from the discussion in this chapter that the Jerusalem dialect is still alive, in the sense that Jerusalem Armenians still speak in a distinct fashion, the most noticeable component of which results from extensive Arabic influence, but other parts of which come from Turkish, dialectal Armenian, or autochthonous innovation. It is essential to bear in mind, though, that the traditional kʼalakʼacʼi dialect is in immediate danger of disappearing; it is my sincere hope that

¹⁷ Meat stew with onions.

¹⁸ The kʼaltʼagans use the Turkish dialectal form *səpʼətʼ*.

¹⁹ The Turkish form is borrowed from Arabic, but we know that the kʼalakʼacʼi form is borrowed from Turkish rather than Arabic because of its use of the Turkish ablative suffix *-tan*.

²⁰ As in the sentence *սէսկէքըն փաթթեցին բօքէլիյէյովլ bebekʼə pʼatʼtʼecʼin kʼofeliyeyov* ‘they wrapped the baby in swaddling clothes’.

qualified scholars will take it upon themselves to work seriously with the elder k‘alak‘ac‘is before it is too late.

References

- Աճառեան, Հրաչյա* [Adjarian, Hrachya], *Հայերէն արմատական բառարան* [Armenian etymological dictionary], 4 volumes (Erevan: Erevan State University Press, 1971-79).
- Azarya, Victor, *The Armenian Quarter of Jerusalem : urban life behind monastery walls* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
- Գաբրիէան, Կարապետ* [Kabigian, Garabed], *Բառգիրք Սեբաստաճայոց Գաւառաբեզուի* [Dictionary of the Regional Dialect of the Sebastia Armenians] (Jerusalem: St. James Press, . 1952).
- Greppin, John, “Arabic pharmaceutical terms in Middle Armenian,” *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 7:65-71 (1986).
- Հանեյան, Անահիտ* [Haneyan, Anahit], *Տիգրանակերտի բարբառը* [The dialect of Tigranakert] (Erevan: Erevan State University Press, 1978).
- Գազանճեան, Յովհաննէս* [Kazanjian, Hovhannes], *Նոր Քերականութիւն Արդի Հայերէն Լեզուի* [New Grammar of the Modern Armenian Language] (Istanbul: Gratun S. Yakobean, 1924).
- Rose, John, *Armenians of Jerusalem: Memories of Life in Palestine* (London: Radcliffe Press, 1993).
- Thomson, Robert, “Armenia and Jerusalem,” *Papers of the Ninth International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford, 1983*, Elizabeth Livingstone, ed. (Kalamazoo, MI: Cistercian Publications, 1985).
- Vaux, Bert, “Notes on the Armenian dialect of Ayntab,” *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 20:55-82 (2000).