Lalaith's Guide to Adûnaic Grammar

by Lalaith <andreas.moehn@wiesbaden.netsurf.de>

[Back]

Part I: The Three Adûnaics

Beyond a few preliminary scraps that are represented only by a couple of personal names in the various versions of „The Drowning of Anadûne", the evolution of Adûnaic is marked by three important steps of development. It seems noteworthy that each of them yields a different word for „earth": *kamât*, *daira*, and **aban*, respectively (which does not necessarily mean that one replaced the other). For convenience, we may use these words as sort of a "key fossil" and reference the evolutionary steps by their initials as *k-Adûnaic*, *d-Adûnaic*, and *a-Adûnaic*. (Lowdham frequently writes *Adunaic* but here we agree with the translator of the Red Book and write *Adûnaic* throughout.)

k-Adûnaic is represented in early drafts for **NC**: It is a strongly inflecting, "indo-european"-style language. (*Inflecting* means that much of the vocabulary changes its appearance according to number, gender, case, tense, or other symptoms. Latin, Russian, or German are good examples of inflecting languages).

d-Adûnaic is the kind that Arundel Lowdham described in **RA.** Other than its predecessor, it is an agglutinating language that Lowdham attributes with „a faintly semitic flavour" (**NC**), though similarities to, say, Hebrew grammar seem to be at least superficial. (*Agglutinating* means that the stem of a word may accumulate lots and lots of affixes in front, behind or even inside, and so express relationships that inflecting languages use prepositions for. Turkish and Finnish are examples of agglutinating languages. This kind has the profound disadvantage that you cannot take a dictionary and simply look up an unknown word: You first have to decide what may be the proper stem.)

a-Adûnaic is the „official version" attested in the **LR** Appendices and in **LE.** It is known only through royal names and a few other specimen such as *adûn* „west", *pharaz* „gold". We do not know anything about its grammar but can fathom that some of the known vocabulary is not constructed with the grammar of d-Adûnaic in mind.

Mr. Lowdham in particular discusses the grammar of a kind that he calls „Classical Adûnaic", seemingly that kind that was spoken in Númenor at the time of its Downfall. In this essay, we will first examine what Arundel Lowdham tells us about the grammars of k- and d-Adûnaic, apply the results to the "Lament of Atalante" that was in fragments found among the Notion Club Papers, and finally have a look on how a-Adûnaic might have changed the context that we know.

The Noun

Lowdham gives in his report many tables of nouns declined through the various cases, numbers, sexes, etc. There is nothing to add to them, and so there is no need to repeat them here, and we may just summarise the general rules and trends.

(A) The good news first: A couple of features that many European languages love to bother us with are fortunately absent from Adûnaic of any kind. For example, as Mr. Lowdham nicely put it: Adûnaic has no gender, but it has sex ("there is not strictly speaking any 'gender' in Adunaic") - by that it quite corresponds to the English language. This means that inanimate objects generally are devoid of grammatic genders and useless questions like "Why is a table female in France (*la table*) and male in Germany (*der Tisch*)?" do not need to be asked by pupils of Adûnaic. Another comforting feature of the grammatic sex is that it may determine the shape of nouns and pronouns, but not of other word forms such as adjectives - only that Lowdham tells us a little later that the system of suffixes which are used as "m[asculine] and f[eminine] signs runs through all Adunaic grammar". Well, it was him who said he understood Adûnaic.

The bad news is that other than in English, there are as many as **four** sexes. But they are not so difficult to grasp, as you will see:

1. **Masculine**. This sex denominates everyone and everything male, including eventual professions and titles: Men, Elves, Balrogs, and animals (but not plants. How would a Númenórean address Treebeard?). Masculine nouns can be identified either by their last vowel being *-u(-)*, *-û(-)*, or *-ô(-)* which developed out of archaic *-au(-)* (a sound-shift that can also be observed in the development of vulgar Latin), or by certain suffixes that are considered „male". Note that these suffixes do not apply to personal names which usually end in consonants regardless of sex.

2. **Feminine**. Analogous for girls, Elf-maidens, Ungoliant, etc. Feminine nouns prefer *-i(-)*, *-î(-),* and *-ê(-)* (from archaic *-ai(-)*) as their last vowel, but also certain other suffixes.

3. **Common**. The sex that ultra-feminists regret to miss in modern languages. It strictly incorporates both sexes and thus is used whenever you want to leave the actual sex of the person(s) in question unspecified. Númenóreans use the Common when talking about mixed couples and groups, races and species, probably also about professions of unspecified gender - though we may seriously doubt that p.e. *tamar* "smith" ever developed a Common derivative. Many Common nouns, Lowdham says, feature *-a(-)* or *-â(-)* as their last vowel. But actually, these two vowels are the notorious troublemakers in the Adûnaic language, for they can as well occur in any other sex. So, word by word, we have to explicitly memorise the sex of a noun that ends on *-a(-)*, *-â(-).*

4. **Neuter**. Everything that is neither explicitly male or female or both: objects, abstract terms, philosophical ideas - and plants, p.e. *kulub* "root". It could also be called the „inanimate" sex as was the case in Adûnaic's late descendant, Westron. Grammatically, the Neuter is also the least clearly specified sex, for any word on *-u(-), -a(-), -i(-)* or their long variants can be Neuter. The usage of this sex is more or less identical to that of the preposition „it" in the English language, but unfortunately, it is rather inappropriate to describe mythological concepts. The Númenóreans therefore enjoyed to develop divine or angelic personifications by attributing a Neuter noun with one of the other sexes. We may thus for example construct the genius loci of a land or a city: the adjective *anadûni* "western" assumes a Feminine suffix and becomes *Anadûnê*, lit.: "She, Westernesse"; the Neuter noun *agan* "death" assumes a long *â* and becomes the personification *Agân* "Death" (would that be Mandos???), *nîlu* "moon" is personified as *Nîlû* "Man in the Moon" (the one whom fishermen sometimes find in "the windy bay of Bel"). Most interestingly, the Adûnaic word for God, *Êru,* can thus be perceived as either neuter or male.

(B) In addition to sex, Adûnaic nouns are altered by **number**. And worse than in most modern European languages, there are three of them, for the ancient Edain counted „one, two, many":

1. **Singular**, one item at a time. This should not pose any problem, but alas, sometimes a word that looks like a singular is in fact not. Lowdham insists that p. e. *gimil* is not one star but defines the totality of stars, vaguely similar to the collective plural of Elvish, while „one star" actually was expressed by *gimli*. A corresponding example seems to be found in the two attested forms *azar* vs. *azra*, "sea".

2. **Dual**, a pair of them. This one is the trickster among the Adûnaic numbers. The Dual is only used if two items actually belong together (p.e. two parents) or contrast (sun and moon, yin and yang, and so on). Other than in those European languages that still feature a dual, you must not use the Adûnaic dual if you only talk about two objects that only accidentally come together. For example, one of your parents, either father or mother, is *nuphar*. Both your parents are named by using the dual *nuphrat*. But if you happen to discuss one of your parents vs. one of your friend's parents, then you have to use the singular and add the number 2 behind: *nuphar satta*. Lowdham in a struggle for perfection gives many interesting examples of the Adûnaic dual, such as *huznat* "two ears", *nuphat* "two fools" (what an Adûnaic youngster would say for *nuphrat?*), and last not least *banâthat* "[my] two wives".
   If this should cause trouble, remember that English and some other languages also retain odd relics of an ancient dual. As soon as you put on your „sunglasses", you are wearing a dual right on your nose. Slovene, one of those living language that still maintain a full-fledged dual, notoriously sees two pub doors (*vrata*) where there ought to be one. Don't ask me why.

3. **Plural**, many items. Plurals enjoy their last vowel to be *-î(-)*, quite regardless of sex. This should as well not be very problematic if you consider one caveat: Where **two** objects do not belong together, as in *nuphar satta*, you have to give the noun in Singular number and not in plural. But if you talk about **three or more** objects, your choice is the Plural number, thus we write *gimlî hazid* "seven stars" but *gimli satta* "two stars", *balîk hazad* "seven ships", and so on (Lowdham contradicts himself in whether the correct form is *hazid* or *hazad*. It seems conceivable that *hazid* was an irregular Subjective formation, but such an explanation attempt is probably too forced.)

The curious word order of *noun + numeral* results from the fact that other than in English, numbers higher than 1 are not adjectives but other nouns (Lowdham forgot to tell us what kind of word the 1 would be). The items that you are counting you do arrange in front of the numerals because you are actually constructing the equivalent of a genitive according to the Adûnaic rules of grammar. The proper translation of such constructions is "Two of ships", "Seven of nine", etc. Now, as your homework you will translate "Two out of seven ships".

(C) The Adûnaic **cases** probably require the most effort. Not only is their structure thoroughly different from those which are found among most European languages, but they are also very distinct in k- and d-Adûnaic.

1. **Normal**. The Normal case, present in both k- and d-Adûnaic, is of course the standard form of a noun, that one that you would find listed in an Adûnaic dictionary if there was any. You also find it in most places of a standard Adûnaic text. Sure, good grammarian that he is, Lowdham classifies many a situation in which a Normal is required. But why bother? Say that except for a very few cases the Normal is your choice, and leave it at that.

2. **Subjective**. The Subjective case puts an emphasis on a noun. In cases where English speakers help themselves with constructions like: "This very one", "Him it was who...", Adûnaic replaces the Normal by a Subjective noun. US-marines prefer to talk in such Subjectives: "This recruit here has the trousers full of dung." Lowdham also insists that a Subjective is the subject of a verb, but this is somewhat misleading, for the Subjective can also replace the very verb where it ought to be a form of „to be". Adûnaic behaves somewhat like Russian here. Better it was to say that the Subjective case marked the subject of a *phrase*.
   Most often, Subjectives either end on some vowel + *n* or they alter the last occuring vowel. We met already one possible case of a Subjective above in the word *hazad* „seven" that belongs with the also attested Normal *hazid*. Note that Dual nouns form a Subjective only if they are of Neuter sex.
   (Hebrew has an equivalent of the Adûnaic Subjective: That is probably one reason why Lowdham attributed to Adûnaic "a faintly semitic flavour". For the same reason you may grant it a Scandinavian flavour, however.)

3. **Genitive**. This case and the subsequent ones, present only in k-Adûnaic, are identical to those found in European languages. Like in English the Genitive answers questions that begin "Whose...?". k-Adûnaic masculine Genitives append *-ô* to the Normal form but after vowels *-vo*. Example: *bârun-adûnô*, „Lord of the West", from the Normal *adûn*.

4. **Dative**. This case, like in English, answers questions that begin "To whom...?". k-Adûnaic Masculine Datives end on *-s* or, after consonants, *-us*. Example: *dalad Ugrus*, „under [the] Shadow", from the Normal *ugru*.

5. **Instrumental**. This case does not occur in English but it is familiar to Slavs. It answers questions that begin "With what...?" k-Adûnaic Masculine Instrumentals end on *-mâ* or, after consonants, *-umâ.* Lowdham insists that this suffix once was simply a word meaning "with". Example: *sôbêthumâ*, „with assent", from a Normal **sôbêth*.

Note the absence of one familiar English case from k-Adûnaic: the **Accusative**, answering questions that begin with "Whom...?" Lowdham's fragments give no hint to how it was expressed in Adûnaic.

d-Adûnaic does not possess cases (3) to (5). It rather imitates them by applying various prepositions to the noun, either before or after, in the way languages like Finnish or Hungarian do. A Dative is now expressed by adding *-ô, -vô,* a Genitive by supplying *an-, 'n-* before the word, and also simply by placing the noun in question right before the one it is related to (see our above case of counting items: *gimli hazid.* Sometimes, English may work the same way: *kingfisher*, a word that Tolkien discussed in **L240**, was actually a king's fisher), and the Instrumental still by adding *-mâ* which is now just no longer considered a case declension. Instead, d-Adûnaic has a new and rather unusual third case:

6. **Objective**. We do not meet it so often, fortunately, for it appears only in compounds or in arrangements that serve as compound, p.e. noun + verb that has become a noun (p.e. „ship-building") or noun + participle. The Objective is most of the time recognisable by an *-u-* as the last vowel of a noun. Not any compound features an Objective, though, for its presence depends on whether both nouns are simply aligned or actually have a link in meaning to each other. Lowdham gives as an example *Minul-târik* „Pillar supporting heaven" vs. *Minal-târik* „Pillar [of clouds] in heaven". If that sounds weird to you, you will see that we can do the same in English. Consider again the kingfisher of **L240**: d-Adûnaic uses the Objective *arûn-* here if the intended meaning is "someone who is fishing for the king" but the Normal *arun-* if the meaning simply was „a king who fishes".
One caveat, though: An Objective is always Singular even if its implied meaning is a Plural. Of course, d-Adûnaic just behaves as illogical as English here. *Nimruzîr* thus is certainly a friend of many Elves and not of a particular one, and yet his name is notoriously translated "Elf-friend" rather than „Elves' Friend", *Ar-Balkumagân* is known as the "Shipwright" or "Ship-Builder" even though he fas reknown for building a *lot* of ships. If you really need a proper Plural within a compound then you only can resort to the Normal case and have to use some kind of infix such as *an-* to indicate what case you think is proper here.

(D) And then, Adûnaic distinguishes **strong** and **weak** nouns. Now this one is a real pet among grammarians: **Strong** nouns are too weak to resist internal deformation by case, number, or other grammatical features; **weak** nouns are too strong to allow for such intrusions. Any further questions? Well, for that reason grammarians lately prefer to talk about **irregular** and **regular** declensions instead. If you want an example, *Proudfeet* is a Strong or Irregular declension, *Proudfoots* is a Weak or Regular one.

Many modern languages seem slow by slow to abandon Irregular declensions because people consider them useless complications that only burden theirr memory. The vast majority of English or German nouns have by now acquired Regular declensions; new coinages always seem to be Regular. Adûnaic displays the same tendency. Regular inflexions have long become the rule in Classical Adûnaic and among the Masculine, Feminine, and Common sexes they all but completely replaced the Irregulars. Also, Neuter nouns that are either monosyllabic or have "a long vowel or diphthong in the final syllable" (**RA**) are all regular.

The proper inflexions of the Adûnaic noun depend on the last vowel of the stem, here marked in red for clarity: *huzun* "ear", *azra* "sea", *zîr* "love(r)", and so on. The **Regular** declension is quite easy to memorise.

1. **Singular declensions**. The Normal case displays the standard, unchanged form of a word. Subjectives add a suffix: Masculine *-un*, Feminine *-in*, Common *-an,* and Neuter simply *-a*. Most Objectives ending on consonants add an *-u* to Masculines, Commons, and Neuters but *-i* to Feminines (not for any argument of logic but because the *-u* was routinely mistaken for signifying Masculine sex) while Objective ending on vowels replace this one by *-u*. But if any noun that is not Neuter ends in a (long) vowel, then the Objective case is identical to the Normal case.

2. **Dual declensions**. Dual nouns add *-ât* throughout. There was once a group of words which used *-at* in the Normal case, but this had long since been dropped. Lowdham is unfortunately totally obscure with regard to existing distinctions between Normal and Subjective Duals. He does mention that Neuter nouns which display a long first vowel originally retained the last vowel in the Normal case but dropped it in Subjective. To illustrate this he gives an ancient Normal *târikat.* But how would Classical Adûnaic treat it since there is no suffix *-at* any longer? Does that mean there is a Normal Dual **târikât* and a Subjective Dual **târkât*? An as obscure statement seems to suggest that non-Neuter nouns use to shorten last long vowels in the Normal Dual: *nardû* "soldier", if this is interpreted correctly, thus produced the Normal Dual *narduwat > narduwât* and the Subjective Dual *nardûwât*. Strangely, Common nouns ending on *-â* seem to produce only a short *-a-* in the Dual. But this latter may be a typo or an error in the interpretation of the source texts.

3. **Plural declensions**. The Normal Plural usually just adds an *-î.* But non-Neuter nouns ending in vowels behave differently and thus apparently serve to Lowdham as markers to classify his grammatical arrangements. Unless this is not another error, Normal Masculines ending in *-û* seem to be undecided about whether or not they should shorten the vowel when a glide consonant is inserted, and so we meet both *narduwî* and *nardûwî* (now what is a glide consonant? Adûnaic like Croatian abhors certain kinds of diphthongs and inserts a similar, hardly spoken consonant between the two vowels, resulting in *narduwî* rather than **narduî*). On the other hand, Normal Masculines ending in *-ô* always retain the long vowel, insert no glide consonant and add a *short -i*, thus *manô* develops *manôi* and not **manôwî*. Further, Normal Feminines on *-î* do not add a Plural marker at all and thus look exactly like their Normal Singular form, and Feminines on *-ê* develop an unusual glide consonant: *izrê > izrênî* – or should this be a typo for **izrêyî*? Unfortunately, Lowdham fails to describe the behaviour of Normal Commons on *-â.* But from what he otherwise says we may deduce that they behave similar to Normal Commons on *-ô*, and so, the Normal Singular of *Adûnâi* „Númenóreans" was apparently **Adûnâ*. Are you still with me? Despite the terrifying fuzz Lowdham makes about the Subjective Plural it is in fact very easy to handle: add *-ya* to the Normal Neuters and *-m* to all the others.

So much for the easy part. Now the **Irregular** inflexions fall apart into several categories or **Classes** which other than with the Regular inflexions never merged into one**.** These Classes are distinguished by whether or not their stem ends in a vowel, and in the plural forms they behave quite distinctly. Fortunately, we may recall that among the non-Neuter sexes, Classical Adûnaic had mostly erased out all the irregularities, and so, the definitions below concern only quite few words.

1. **Class I** behaves irregularly only among Neuter nouns that have three consonants (i.e. are bisyllabic, like *kalab* „fall") and end in one of them. In the Normal, their last vowel also always is short, and so, they derive their Subjectives simply via "a-fortification" of this vowel. Where necessary, resulting diphthongs are merged: *-ai-* > *-ê-*, etc. The other sexes all inflect the Subjective regularly, that is, they add those standard suffixes that we already discussed. Short last vowels are getting lost during this process. The Objective case replaces the last vowel with *-u-;* but this irregularity has much dwindled and is in Classical Adûnaic mostly replaced by regular declensions, either maintaining or dropping the last vowel. The Dual always is regularly declined. In the Plural, Normals replace long last vowels by *-î-;* the Subjective adds the suffix *-a* to the Neuter sex and *-im* to any of the others. In fact, the Subjective behaves mostly like in Singular; only where the Normal Singular has a short last vowel there the Subjective Plural drops it rather than replacing it by *-î-.*

2. **Class II** correspondingly concerns nouns that end with a vowel; their stems may hold either two or three consonants. There are in this class no Neuter nouns that end on a long vowel. In Singular, their Subjectives use the a-fortification as they do in Class I while the other sexes again apply the regular suffixes. However, where a diphthong occurs it does in this Class not merge into one long vowel but kills off the first one: thus *raba* "dog" produces the Subjective *raban*, not **rabân*. Quoth Lowdham. One may of course also say that the non-neuter Subjectives simply add a suffix *-n* to the Normal and leave it at that. The Objective replaces the last vowel in the Singular by *-u* (an exception is the word *anâ* "human being" that has an Objective *anû-*. This is the last irregular survivor of another, vanished, subclass.) The Dual always replaces the same vowel by *-ât.* Similar to Class I, Class II Plurals replace the last vowel by *-î* (except again for *anâ* that also developed a regular Plural *anâi*), Subjectives add a suffix *-ya* to Neuters but *-m* to other sexes, so that in contrast to Class I Subjectives they retain the Normal's *-î-* at the end of the truncated stem.

Note: Lowdham presents the history of the Class II Dual in a very awkward manner, making over-extensive use of the multiple meanings of the word "later". What he wants to tell is in fact simply this: Ancient Adûnaic gained out of the Neuter Singulars *azra, gimli, nîlu* the Normal Duals *azrat, gimlat, nîlat* (one may wonder under which conditions a Númenórean saw *nîlat* - "double moons"!?!) and the corresponding Subjectives *azrât, gimlât, nîlât*. While centuries passed, the idea stuck fixed in the mind of Númenórean pupils that the final *-a/â-* belonged to the suffix and should not be declined; this was an evident confusion because the non-Neuter sexes of the same class indeed featured suffixes of such kind. So, Middle Adûnaic invented a new kind of Normal Duals: *azrat, gimliyat, nîluwat* as well as corresponding Subjectives. Later-on, when pupils became even worse, as with all other nouns this system eventually eroded away and in Classical Adûnaic left only the Normals *azrât, gimlât, nîlât.*

Well, that was the worst of it. If you need to know anything further, I refer you to Mr. Lowdham's report.

The Verb

Lowdham's explanation of Adûnaic grammar never advanced beyond the noun and a few glimpses of other word forms. All information that we have on the verb are a few notes that CT summarised like that (some paragraphs inserted to increase clarity):

"There were three classes of verbs:
I Biconsonantal, as *kan* 'hold';
II Triconsonantal, as *kalab* 'fall down';
III Derivatives, as *azgarâ-* 'wage war', *ugrudâ-* 'overshadow'.

There were four tenses:
(1) aorist ('corresponding to English "present", but used more often than that as historic present or past in narrative');
(2) continuative (present);
(3) continuative (past);
(4) the past tense ('often used as pluperfect when aorist is used = past, or as future perfect when aorist = future').

The future, subjunctive, and optative were represented by auxiliaries; and the passive was rendered by the impersonal verb forms 'with subject in accusative'."

Ahem.

This sounds like approaching nightmare. But only so because grammarians enjoy to describe languages in such a way that they all look like Latin. For what the above statement tells us indeed is that the Adûnaic verb is a very simple thing and lacks many of the intricacies that ridiculously complicated languages like French or Macedonian bother us with.

The three **Classes** are not difficult to grasp at all. Classes I and II use a base directly as the stem of a verb. The bases are those things that Lowdham somewhat inconsistently writes VERSALLY: They never were actual words but are an agreement among grammarians to arrange words of common origin in their dictionaries. For example, "verb", "verbally", and "verbose" all have a common base VERB. Now, Class I features bases that display two consonants (and one or more vowels) while Class II has three of them. Both classes were presumably quite small in comparison to Class III, for therein, everything is found that distorts a base rather than using it unchanged. Lowdham gives a good example: *azgarâ-* "wage war" is evidently derived from the base ZAGAR (or Z'GAR) "sword". We may expect that this class features various subdivisions, strong and weak verbs, irregularities etc., but of those we do not learn anything.

(We may then also assume that there are **regular** and **irregular** verbs like there are regular and irregular nouns. But about these we have no informations at all.)

The **Tenses** may look funny to the eye of a European, but they are not that difficult, either.

1. The Adûnaic **past tense** will of course not mean any problem. Like in English, it is used to tell of something that happened in the past, wherever in time the narrator's viewpoint is. In comparison, note the behaviour of the word "come" in the following example: If your viewpoint is in the present, the past tense is in the past: "I tell you that he has come." If you told about it already in the past, the past tense is even further in the past: "I told you that he had come." (English grammarians call that a pluperfect, for they never learned to pronounce the correct expression *plusquamperfect* - Latin: "more than

perfect"). And if you are going to tell that in the future, then the past tense is located in a future somewhat closer to your present: "I will tell you when he will have come." Quite convenient that one tense can do all these things.

2. Now the **aorist** is a feature that occurs in languages like Ancient Greek, Turkish or Quenya, though each time it means something different. That's probably why the grammarians gave it that name, for it means "unlimited" and its content of definition is thus actually nil. In Adûnaic it may serve as the present tense („I come") but other than in English is also the preferred tense of written stories and histories („historic present or past"). Well, of course Mr. Lowdham could simply have informed us that Dúnedain authors prefer to tell their tales in present tense, couldn't he? But of course, he would not be a good grammarian if he did. English, BTW, can do this as well. "Me goes straight back into the pub and hits him right-away on the nose". That's the straight use of an aorist.

3. **Continuative present** (which is not called "continuative aorist"!) and **past** are virtually the same two things again. But they have a tiny difference. This time, they refer to on-going or repeating actions, that is, in those cases where English uses these dreadful things on *-ing* that we foreign pupils despise so much ("I learn" - "I am learning" - never?). English grammarians call that the *progressive*, their Russian colleagues dub it *the imperfective aspect*, describing continuous or repetitive actions in contrast to the *perfective* or one-time action. But we better leave that all alone...

I suppose most inexperienced students of Adûnaic will latest have swooned when they read that "the future, subjunctive, and optative were represented by auxiliaries". But no reason for that. As ominous as it may sound, it is simply a sophisticated demonstration of the talented grammarian's magic skill to bring forth things that in the discussed language are not there at all. What Mr. Lowdham actually tells us here is that Adûnaic does not have anything of these. For while many languages torment us with different inflections for all or some of these gadgets and demand from us to learn all of them by heart, there is no need to do that in Adûnaic: like in many civilised languages, in such cases we leave the poor verbs all alone and only add some indicators. That could perhaps be a second verb which tells us "read future tense here". And that second verb, most often a form of „to be" or „to have" or „to will", is the **auxiliary**! If you compare: Ancient Greek has all the features Lowdham mentions and more, and that is why "it is all Greek to me" became proverbial among the humanistically educated. French and Italian have a future and a subjunctive but the Italian subjunctive also conveniently covers the optative. German has no future but two subjunctives (here called conjunctives) which are rapidly declining. English has none, and so does Adûnaic.

Let us take a standard phrase: "The king falls", and apply those features to it one after another. Obviously, we have two ways to tell something that will happen in the **future**. Either we use an aorist: "The king falls tomorrow", and rely that we will be understood AND survive the uproar among conservative grammarians. Or we add the little word "will" (and cut a tiny suffix): "The king will fall." - The little word "will" serves as our auxiliary: our grain of salt that we add to the phrase so that we may express the whole tense without having to bother about declensions, conjugations, and other frightening troubles.

Now subjunctives and optatives are together known as **moods.** This does not mean happy or angry but is an ancient misspelling of "modes" that, like the "pluperfect", English grammarians will never learn to set straight again. Our standard phrase "The king falls" they call the **indicative** mood, for it indicates what is really true (or what you think it is). The **subjunctive** mood is convenient if you are not convinced that it is true what you are saying (evidently, Anglo-Saxons use subjunctives VERY sparingly): "The king might fall". The **optative** mood expresses a wish, a desire, or a hope. "Long live the king" is one classic optative, another is: "The king shall fall". Now you may regret the lack of one mood that seems familiar from your nativ language: the **imperative**. How do you give orders in Númenor? Simply by wishing someone to do it, and so, your obvious choice is the optative (though, if your name is Ar-Pharazôn, it does not make much of a difference). Adûnaic behaves like ancient Hebrew here; the optative is thus the mood the Ten Commandments are written in, and you have to admit that "Thou shalt not kill" sounds more impressive than "Don't kill!", doesn't it?

And finally there is the **Passive**. This belongs, together with the **Active,** to the **Voice** or **Genus**. The passive you use if you tell something that you do not want to be held responsible for. So, "The king fell" is an active, "The king was felled" is a typical passive.

With regard to Adûnaic it is said above that the Passive is constructed by using "the impersonal verb forms". This leads us to an important alternative approach to Adûnaic sexes. For we may now distinguish two verbal genders:

1. **Personal**. A verb connected to a Normal noun *must* be personal, that is, some prefix signifying sex and number has to precede it. Lowdham's example is *Bar ukallaba* „The Lord fell" where *u-* is the marker of the Masculine Singular person.

2. **Impersonal**. A verb connected to a Subjective noun *may* be impersonal, i. e. either with or without the above prefix. Using a personal verb is thus not really wrong here but it increases the emphasis so much that if you overdo it you will sound like a fanatic prophet. Thus, *Barun kallaba* is more emphatical than *Bar ukallaba* but *Barun ukallaba* is even more.

(And if you now ask "Where is the Objective?", remember that it appears only in compounds and cannot go with a verb.)

So according to the above statement, the Adûnaic Passive is generally made from verbs that do not have pronouns in front. English uses in this case a **participle** ("felled"), but this may not be so in Adûnaic.

But there is one unsolvable problem left to us. What does the statement mean that the passive is accompanied by its "subject in accusative"? As we have learned above, the one case that Adûnaic never developed is the Accusative! Does that mean perhaps that the description of the Adûnaic verb belongs to yet another phase of development besides k- and d-Adûnaic that we know nothing else about? Hello, Mr. Lowdham?!?

The Adjective

We cannot tell much about Adûnaic adjective. In general, words like "old, far, crazy", etc. seem to behave the same way they do in English: Unlike verbs, they are not sensitive to sexes. Adjectives are all considered to be of common sex, but they react sensibly on numbers and in contact to nouns provide us with Singular, Plural, and probably also Dual prefixes. They seem as well to respect Normal, Subjective, and Objective cases: There is clearly an Objective involved in *izindu-beth* "prophet" (*izindi* "straight,

true"), while *burôda* may be a Subjective of a Normal adj. **burôdi* (this example was kindly suggested to me by Aleš Bičan).

Like in any language, there exists a predefined set of adjectives. But further ones can be formed out of nouns or verbs (i.e. participles) or even other adjectives. Thus, *adûn* "west" may first turn into a genitive *an-adûn* "of the west" and finally *anadûni* "western". This new adjective may become once again a noun: *Anadûnê* "Westernesse", and from that of course may follow **an-Anadûnê* „of Westernesse", and so on ad nauseam.

The Companions

Companions are little words that accompany a noun or replace it. They are commonly known as **pronouns** and as **articles**. We do not have a list of Adûnaic pronouns, but there are a couple of statements which allow some conclusions.

(A) As in any other language, we have to distinguish first **person** ("I"), second ("you"), and third ("he, she, it"). Probably there were also made distinctions between familiar and formal addressing, for Westron had such, but their nature is unknown to us. Fith regard to sex, Adûnaic behaves very much like p.e. Latin, for it "distinguishes gender (or rather sex) in the pronouns of the third person" but not in the others. That means that if you talk about yourself or address somebody, you do not have to question your or your opposite's sex. In the third person, however, the vowels found in the companions serve to distinguish the sexes: "*u* and *i* are the bases of pronominal stems for 'he' and 'she'", which, as early Adûnaic featured neither *e* nor *o*, leaves *a* to be used both for Common and Neuter pronouns. There also is a "variation between pronominal *u-* and *hu-*", arising from different stems. But we do not have any information about where either of them has to be applied.

(B) The companions also distinguish our usual **numbers,** Singular, Dual, and Plural. Different from English, they produce sex-specific plurals, so if you talk about some men, you will use a different "they" than if your objects are some women.

(C) There is no information on whether companions are sensitive to Case.

(D) Most often, the companions are getting affixed to other words, notably verbs (thus producing the Personal verb forms) and nouns. In pronouns of personal verbs, we again have to distinguish two **classes**:

1. **subject pronouns.** The subject tells us who or what does what the verb says. In a phrase like "She loves him", "she" is the subject pronoun.

2. **object pronouns**. In the above phrase, "him" is the object, that is to whom or what happens what the verb says.

NC seems to preserve one example of a verb with both subject and object pronoun *kitabdahê*, *„you touch me", from a verbal stem **tabad* „touch".

(E) We also meet fossilised pronouns in the Subjective case that 'was originally made with pronominal affixes'. These affixes seem to correspond somewhat to the **demonstrative pronouns** of Latin or the emphatical pronoun of Swedish, thus *zigûr*, "a wizard" produces *zigûrun* "*the* Wizard; Sauron". The full set that probably as well exists or once existed as independent pronouns, is:

1. **Neuter**: in Singular and Dual there either occurs an "a-fortification of the last vowel of the stem" or *-a* is attached, Plural *-iya*

2. **Masculine**: Singular *-un*, Plural *-im*

3. **Feminine**: Singular *-in*, Plural *-im*

4. **Common**: Singular *-(a)n*, Plural *-im*

(F) Pronouns may also serve to specify time, number, space, and so on, and grammarians enjoy to invent little filers into which they may sort any kind of companion according to their liking. Thus for example "here" is a **local pronoun,** "all" is - obviously - an **indefinite pronoun,** though Anglo-Saxon grammarians seem to prefer ranking it as an adjective, and "now", "once" etc. German grammarians classify as **temporal pronouns** but many English ones as adverbs (see below).

Articles are a baffling feature of Adûnaic. What does a language that has Subjectives and gender-suffixes require articles for? One obvious usage seems to be when you want to set an emphasis on the *object* of a phrase. In such a case, the Subjective case is not allowed, and the gender-suffix alone may not seem sufficient. And so, the difference between *Akallabêth* „She who has fallen" (*kalab* „to fall", **akallaba* „something that has fallen"?) and *hi-Akallabêth* may perhaps be that the latter should rather read "It was She who has fallen". But as Lowdham tells us nothing about this peculiar issue, my attempt above remains the merest speculation.

The Particles

The German dictionary "Duden", vol. 6, gives a lovely definition of a particle: Take a text and scratch any noun, any verb, any adjective, and all the companions. Everything that is still left on the page is a particle.

The grammarians distinguish three main categories of particles: prepositions, adverbs, and conjunctions. However, if you did what I suggested to a d-Adûnaic text, you also wiped out all the **prepositions,** for these are words like *up, down, before, of, at*, etc, and they do not here exist as individual words: "Adunaic prepositions are in fact usually 'postpositions' following their noun" which is set in the Normal case, with the preposition suffixed to it. Lowdham's statement seems to imply a few exceptions to the rule, but we find such in k-Adûnaic only.

Adverbs define the circumstances of an event, such as "The king fell violently". In English, if you meet a word on *-ly*, it is an adverb, though not all adverbs finish like that. In Adûnaic, this is much less clear.

Conjunctions are little words like *and, or, but* etc. that serve to make VERY BIG phrases out of many very small ones. Plato,

Cicero, and Umberto Eco use them to create single phrases that extend across several pages. Biblical Hebrew that did not know about dots and commas used a conjunction *and/then* to separate one phrase from another, and that in the translation produces the endless repetitive sound of the KJV. In Adûnaic, we do not meet conjunctions often for there only are very tiny phrases preserved.

Word order

(A) Adûnaic phrases generally display the same sequence as English phrases: Subject-Predicate-Object,*Predicate* being a nifty way to say "verb". Well, English grammarians usually say "verb" in the first place, but others don't agree, especially those who do not reckon participles as verbs – forget it... Sometimes, the word order may be altered so that the Object locates before the Subject. That happens when the two closely relate, as in the case of Adûnaic's simulated genitive or the English *kingfisher* in which the fisher is the Subject and the king the Object. But as a rule, the Object is*never* found immediately before the Predicate. Adûnaic, though, accumulates its pronouns - "agglutinates", as the grammarians say - into a single word: "sheloveshim".

If there is any uncertainty about the identity of the Subject in your phrase, remember that you may set it in Subjective case to make it obvious, while if you want to set the stress on the object you tie it up with an article.

(B) Adjectives "normally precede nouns", says Lowdham, so an expression like "the old man" you may just literally translate. But sometimes it happens to be found behind the noun and this then should mean "the man is old", though there seem to be examples where this is not so obvious, for participles, where they are met, always seem to *follow* their noun without implying a similar *is*-relationship.

(C) Auxiliaries defining the mood seem most commonly to be found directly in front of the Predicate. This is again similar to the English way of using them. Thus, in the example "The king has fallen", the auxiliary "has" precedes the Predicate "fallen".

(D) Conjunctions apparently do not affect the word order as they do not in English (unlike, for example, in German).

All said above is only true for standard indicative phrases. We have no information on how you ask a question in Adûnaic, for example.

Part II: The Lament

The Lament of Atalante exists in three distinct versions L1, L2, L3. Each of them is more or less completely given i**NC**. L1 and L2 are manuscripts while L3 exists in both a manuscript and a typescript version that will be referred to as L3m and L3t. They are closely related to each other but not identical, and CT felt unable to decide which of them was later. However, L3m seems somewhat closer to L2 than L3t, also, the latter displays a somewhat more complex grammatical structure. It might thus be safe to conclude that L3t was the final version of the Lament.

In the following, each version is given in full and then its grammar will be analysed. The versions are officially divided into "fragments" I and II; to ease reference, I will number the individual phrases as well. For example, I/3 refers to the third phrase of fragment I.

Differing from the way they are written in**NC**, I give personal names and titles with capital initials and add in red the glosses that Lowdham omitted. The macrons indicating long vowels in **NC** are, in accordance with the spelling system of**WS,** replaced by circumflexes, for not all browsers support the display of macrons.

Version L1

L1 is clearly using k-Adûnaic. The initial form was much amended, both by ink and pencil**NC** gives the emendations in ink (bracketed here) but, very regrettably, not those in pencil.

I

1: *Kadô Zigûrun zabathân hunekkû [> unekkû] ...*
And so / the Wizard (Sauron) / humbled / he-came

Phrase I/1 resolves into the following components:

- *kadô*: a conjunction. It may in fact be the genitive of a stem *kad-*, meaning roughly "and from that". Unfortunately we have no clue to what the proper Adûmaic word for "and" might be.

- *Zigûrun*: The subject noun, a Sub. Masc. Sing. formation of the Normal *zigûr.*

- *zabathân*: This seems to be the participle of a hypothetical stem **zabath-.* It is remarkable that despite of what Lowdham says about the usage of articles (and, as may be implied, participles), this participle *follows* the noun.

- *(h)unekkû*: the personal verb belonging to *Zigûrun. hu-/u-* is clearly a male pronoun while the suffix *-û* may indicate the Singular number. The verb is based on a hypothetical stem **nek-* (a derivative of NAKH, if this existed in d-Adûnaic?) and translated by a past tense. This contains the only known application of the pronoun *hu-*, and it was for unknown reasons replaced by *u-*.

The phrase is very emphatical with a Subjective noun*and* a personal verb. Its proper translation was apparently "And so it was him, the Wizard, who humbled came". Or, as the translation of an Old English version of the same passage suggests: "... who

was humbled and came". If this latter is true, then *zabathân* may be a verb **zabatha-* with a suffix *-an* „is, was".

<div align="center">

2: *Eruhîn udûbanim dalad Ugrus ...*
The-Children-of-God / fell / under / Horror? Shadow?

</div>

- *Eruhîn*: Subject noun, the Norm. Pl. of **Eruhin.* It seems from the subsequent pronoun *u-* that the noun is Masculine, not Common, while the number is clearly expressed by the suffix *-im.*

- *udûbanim*: a personal verb, the Masc. Pl. of a stem **dûb-* with the male pronoun *u-* and a plural marker *-im.* This verb as well is translated by a past tense, though it may seem possible that the infix *-an-* is related to the suffix *-an* „is" in II/2, II/4, II/5, so that *udûbanim* would rather represent „are fallen".

- *dalad:* a preposition. It may in fact be composed of a stem **dal-* "down" and the suffix *-ad, -ada* "to, towards" that we also meet post-positioned in I/5 *Akhâs-*ada, II/1 *azûl*ada (the inconsistent strokes are a matter of transcription and not native to Adûnaic). Maybe *dalad* would mean "downwards" rather than "under"?

- *Ugrus*: Object noun, the Dat. Sing. of a Norm. Neuter *ugru*. The preposition *dalad* evidently requires a Dative in the object that, like in English, it precedes.

Noteworthy in this phrase is the unusual isolated position of the preposition, much as if Adûnaic shaped its sentences like English.

<div align="center">

3: *Arpharazôn azgaranâdu Avalôi-men [> Avalôi-si] ...*
Ar-Pharazôn / was waging war? / Powers on

</div>

- *Arpharazôn*: Subject noun in Norm. Masc. Sing. - an alternate spelling of *Ar-Pharazôn*.

- *azgaranadu*: a verb that, following a Normal noun, should be personal, evidently a Masc. Sing. of *azgara-.* The trouble is that it lacks the personal indicator, for the initial *a-* belongs to the stem. Also it is hard to explain why the suffix indicating number is *-u* rather than *-û* as in I/1. Does the preceding Normal shorten the final vowel?

- *Avalôi-men/-si:* The proper object noun, a Comm. Pl. of **Avalô*. The change in the suffix seems not to imply an alteration of the grammar but a correction of the Instrumental into a Dative required by the verb, for *-men* is clearly the Com. equivalent of the Masc. Pl. Instr. *-main* (attested by Lowdham) while *-si* corresponds to Masc. Pl. Dat. *-sim*.

<div align="center">

4: *Bârun-Adûnô rakkhatû kamât sôbêthumâ Eruvô ...*
The Lord of West / broke asunder / earth / assent-with / of God

</div>

- *Bârun-Adûnô*: A compound comprising of a Subjective noun (from the Normal *bâr*) and the Gen. Neut. Sing. of *adûn.*

- *rakkhatû:* an impersonal verb (as may follow a Subjective), the past tense Sing. of **rakhat-.* The suffix indicating number is the same as in I/1.

- *kamât*: object noun in Norm. Neut. Sing.. The similarity of *kamât* with Egyptian *kemet* "Egypt", lit. "Black earth", is maybe not accidental

- *sôbêthumâ*: an attribute, the Instr. Neutr. Sing. of **sôbêth* with a suffix corresponding to the Instr. Masc. Sing. *-ma* that was specified by Lowdham.

- *Eruvô*: the attribute of the attribute, a Gen. Masc. Sing. of *Eru*. The Genitive involves the glide consonant *-v-*.

<div align="center">

5: *azrê nai phurusam [> phurrusim] Akhâs-ada. Anadûni akallabi.*
seas / might flow / Chasm-into / Westernesse / fell in ruin.

</div>

- *azrê*: Subject noun, an unrecorded Norm. Pl. Neuter of *azra*.

- *nai phurusam > nai phurrusim:* Clearly a verb and an auxiliary, translated together as „might flow", thus *nai* = might, probably a form of „to be" and related to *-nam* etc., see II/3. Note that *phurrusim* displays the same pl. suffix as *udûbanim* in I/2 but *phurusam* does not.

- *Akhâs-ada*: an object noun, Norm. sing. Neut., *akhâs* suffixed by a pronoun *-ada* that perhaps we may also find in I/2 *dalad* (**dal-ad*?). A more literal translation seems to be „chasmward", see II/1.

- *Anadûni*: Subject noun, Normal. Sing. Neut.

- *akallabi*: The proper predicate, a Sing. modification of the stem *kalab-*, translated by past tense. The translation „fell in ruin" seems to indicate a heavy emphasis on the verb in contrast to a standard form that simply means „fell" (*kallaba* in d-

Adûnaic).

II

1: *Adûnâim azûlada ...*
The-Adunai (Men of W.) / eastward

- *Adûnâim*: Subject noun, Subj. Pl. of a Common **Adûnâ*.

- *azûlada*: A noun **azûl* „east" with the familiar suffix *-ada*, here producing an adverb. Note that other than *adûn*, *azûl* is not a borrowing from Elvish.

The proper predicate („escaped"? „fled"?) should apparently have followed *azûlada* but is missing from this fragment.

2: *agannûlô burudan nênum ...*
death-shade / heavy-is / on-us

- *agannûlô*: The Subj. Sing. Neut. of **agannûlu*, a compound of *agan* „death" and *nûlu* „shadow", both also attested as individual words.

- *burudan*: This seems to be an adjective **burudi* or **buruda* with an auxiliary suffix indicating a form of „to be".

- *nênum*: This is the compound of a personal and a locative pronoun – but which is which? We should expect the locative to be suffixed as in the case of *-ada*, so we may expect a separation into **nê-num* or perhaps **nên-um.* (Note that some scribblings on the pronouns of Westron indicate a form of „we" as *cen*, cf. **TT17**.) But then, how much weight may be put to the fact that this word is translated „on-us" rather than „us-on"? Apparently not much, for *îdôn* is translated in II/4 as „now is" but in II/5 as „is now".

II/2 provides an interesting order of words, for it seems to conflict with Lowdham's claim that adjectives normally precede the noun. Yet Adûnaic behaves just like English here: There is a difference in sound between „Heavy death-shade is on us" and „Death-shade is heavy on us". However, we would expect the Subj. *agânnûlô* to contain the copula, hence „Death-shade-is". That this is not so seems to indicate a variation between k- and d-Adûnaic.

3: *adûn batân akhaini ezendi îdô kathî batânî rôkhî-nam ...*
West / road / lay / straight / lo! now / all / ways / bent-are

- *adûn*: „West" is here used in an adverbial sense - so should we not expect *adûni*?

- *batân*: The subject noun in Normal Sing. Neut., hence „a road".

- *akhaini*: The predicate in past tense and Sing. Neut.

- *ezendi*: An adjectival attribute, apparently following the verb in the suffix.

- *îdô*: a temporal pronoun, though a rather strong one („lo!"). The emphasis may perhaps be expressed by a Subjective case: shall we assume that a simple „now" was **îdu*?

- *kathî*: a Plural form of the indefinite pronoun *katha;* its number is determined by the subsequent subject noun.

- *batânî*: The subject, *batân*, in Normal Pl. Neut.

- *rôkhî-nam*: This predicate follows the pattern given by *burudan* in II/2: There is a verbal stem *rôkh-*, this time attributed with a plural suffix, and a postposition *-nam* that evidently contains a plural suffix *-am* and the usual suffix *-n* that indicates a form of the auxiliary „to be". Apparently, we have to assume that the proper singular was **rôkhan* „bent-is".

As in II/2, the standard word-order adjective-noun is reversed and some auxiliaries are added in order to place the stress on the adjective. English behaves just the same way.

4: *êphalek îdôn Akallabêth...*
far away / lo! now is / She-that-is-fallen

- *êphalek*: The little word demonstrates the use of an adverb in k-Adûnaic.

- *îdôn*: The pronoun, familiar from II/3, is here attributed with the auxiliary „to be" and accordingly translated „lo! now *is*" - which seems surprising. Should we not rather expect the auxiliary to be attached to *êphalek*?

- *Akallabêth*: This construction of a subject noun is a verb that was attributed with the female suffix *-êth* and thereby turned

into a noun. With the stem *akallab-* compare *akallabi* in I/5. It seems surprising that here the stem is translated as „is fallen" but there as „fell in ruin".

Remark that we meet here a case in which the predicate („is")*precedes* the subject noun, something which according to Lowdham should never happen.

<h2 style="text-align:center">5: êphal êphalek îdôn Athanâtê</h2>
<p style="text-align:center">far / far away / is now / Athanâtê (the Land of Gift)</p>

- *êphal êphalek*: The first word is clearly the basic form of the pronoun „far", with the suffix *-ek* being rather an intensifier than a word meaning „away". With the form *êphal*, compare Westron *soval* "common" in **PM**.

- *Athanâtê*: The subject noun seems to contain *thani* „land", so that „of gift" is somehow represented by *-âtê*. But why is this then not a proper genitive *-âtô*? As undefinable is the meaning of the initial *a-*.

Interpretation

Listing the nouns (affixes here in red), we are able to add several further forms to the table of masculine declensions that Lowdham provided for k-Adûnaic:

Normal:

- neuter plural: *batânî, azrê (< azra)*

- common plural: *Eruhîn (< *Eruhin)*

Subjective:

- neuter singular: *agannûlô (< *agânnûlu)*

- common plural: *Adûnâim (< *adûnâ)*

Genitive:

- Genitive neuter singular: *adûnô (< adûn)*

Dative:

- neuter singular: *Ugrus (< ugru)*

- common plural: *Avalôi-si (< *Avalô)*

Instrumental:

- neuter singular: *sôbêthumâ (< *sôbêth)*

- common plural: *Avalôi-men*.

With regard to the recorded verbs, we may admit the following observations:

- Subjective nouns lengthen the final vowel of the predicate, thus *Zigûrun (h)unekkû, Bârun-Adûno rakkhatû* vs. the Normals *Anadûni akallabi, Arpharazôn azgaranâdu.*

- The verb follows the noun in number: Plural *azrê phurusam/phurrusim*, *batâni rôkhî-nam*, *Eruhîn udûbanim* vs. Singular *batân akhaini, Zigûrun (h)unekkû* etc. There is no recorded example of a verb in Dual. Unclear is the distinction between Plural endings *-am* and *-im*: They do not seem to mark sex for then the change with regard to *azrê* would not make sense. Can they indicate a tense?

- There is no clear indication that Personal verbs are indeed, as Lowdham claims, obligatory for Normal nouns. In *Arpharazôn azgaranâdu*, the *a-* certainly belongs to the stem *azgara-* and is no pronoun. Is in d-Adûnaic the Personal form maybe expressed by the *final* vowel? It would seem that all Masculine nouns feature verbs on *-u/-û: Zigûrun (h)unekkû, Bârun-Adûno rakkhatû, Arpharazôn azgaranâdu*. There are also two examples of what may be Neuters: *Anadûni akallabi*, *batân akhaini*. But what then shall we make of *hunekkû* and its explicit translation „he-came", met nowhere else in these text fragments? Can a pronoun *in addition* to the sex inflection be attached to a k-Adûnaic verb?

- The occurring verbs and participles fall in several categories: (a) Doubled second consonant: *(h)unekkû*, ra*kkh*atû (from **rakh-khat-*), *akallabi, phurrusim*. (b) Single second consonant: *phurusam, udûbanim, akhaini*. (c) Single second consonants + copula „to be": *rôkhî-nam, azgaranâdu, burudan*, maybe also *zabathân*. It has been suggested that these distinctions may represent the four tenses Lowdham described. Do the English translations offer a clue? Here we meet (a) expressions translated by past tense: *(h)unekkû, rakkhatû, akallabi, udûbanim, akhaini*, (b) expressions translated by subjunctive: *nai phurrusam, nai phurusim*, (c) expressions translated by past tense with copula: *azgaranâdu*, (d) expressions translated by present tense with copula: *rôkhî-nam*. According to what Lowdham says about „narrative past", we should expect most of these verbs to be aorists. This would make sense for the doubled ones: *rakkhatû* „he breaks or broke"? The singled ones all seem to be continuatives, either present or past: *udûbanim, akhaini, burudan, rôkhî-nam* describe lasting conditions, not actions. Somewhat questionable is *azgaranâdu*, but even „was warring" may be interpreted as a permanent condition that

does not only concern the expedition against Valinor.

- All the suspected continuatives seem to be marked by possible forms of „to be": *udûba**nim**, akhai**ni**, burud**an**, rôkhî-**nam**,* perhaps also *azgara**nâdu**.* This usage is not restricted to verbs but may be found among other word categories as well, marking them as Subjectives (*îdôn*) or perhaps participles (*zabathân, burudan* – a noteworthy exception is *Akallabêth* „She-who-*is*-fallen"!). The only verb that does not fit into either this category or the doubled-consonantal aorists is *phurusim*, which however is preceded by the copula *nai*. Is it legitimate to assume that the change from *phurrusam* to *phurusim* marks a transition from aorist to k-Adûnaic past tense?

- In opposition to what is said above, it also seems conceivable that the prefix *a-* marks a proper past tense, the completion of a process, thus *a-khaini* „lay" but not doing so any more, contrasting with the continuative present *rôkhî-nam*; *a-kallabi*, „fell in ruin" and maybe contrasting a simple aorist **kallabi* „fall/fell", *a-kallabêth* „she who-is-fallen", a definitely finished action. But in that case, the change *phurrusam > phurusim* seems uninterpretable.

Version L2

In L2, we find the huge revolution that turned k- into d-Adûnaic fully in place. L2 has no English glosses and looks like a draft to test how d-Adûnaic grammar would affect the Lament. In **SD** it was not published in full but only the differences to L3 were listed. From this list the following text can be reconstructed, later changes bracketed [], glosses added in red. The numbering of fragments and phrases corresponds to that in L1.

I

1: *Kadô Zigûrun zabathân unakkha [> yadda > unakkha]...*
And so / the Wizard / humbled / he came [> went > he came]

I/1 features the only change in the shape of the predicate: With the declared absence of short *-e-* from d-Adûnaic, a verb *unekku* was no longer possible and so it became *unakkha*, temporarily replaced by *yadda* that we meet again in II/3 with the translation „went".

2: *Êruhînim dubbudam [>dubdam] Ugru-dalad ...*
The Children of Êru / fell / Shadow-under

Eruhîn for similar reasons becomes *Êruhînim* and at the same time assumes a Subjective case *Êru-* may in fact represent an internal Objective, for the Obj. of a Normal *Êru-* is again *Êru-*). Hence it may be followed by an impersonal Plural *dub(bu)dam*, the successor of *udûbanim* with a slightly changed base. The old Dative is of course lost, and thus the preposition becomes, in accordance with Lowdham's statements, a postposition: *Ugru-dalad*.

3: *Ar-Pharazôn[un] azagrâra/azaggara Avalôiyada ...*
Ar-Pharazôn / was waging war / Valar-against

The change to Subjective seems to represent the very decision that only this case may tolerate an impersonal noun, otherwise *azagrâra/azaggara* would have had to be personalised by a pronoun. We may wonder how it would have looked like: certainly **uazaggara* would have looked rather uncouth to a Númenórean?

4: *Bârun an-Adûn urahhata [> urahta] dâira sâibêth-mâ Êruvô ...*
The Lord / of West (= Manwe) / broke / Earth / assenth-with / Êru-from

The subject noun corrsponds to Lowdham's description concerning d-Adûnaic's idea of a genitive. *Bârun an-Adûn* represents the unabbreviated form with *Bârun* in the Subjective case. This time, it is followed by a personal verb, *urah(ha)ta*, instead of the seemingly impersonal *rakkhatû* of ^L1. The poet put a really strong emphasis here! A change in vocabulary hits the word *kamât* that now becomes *dâira* and thus provides us with the formal distinction between k- and d-Adûnaic. Quite remarkably, the old Instrumental *sôbêthumâ* hardly changes and turns simply into *sâibêth-mâ*, lacking the glide vowel – one could of course say that this *still* was an Instrumental case, and whether Lowdham accepted it or not seems merely a matter of convenience.

5: *azrîya du-phursâ Akhâsada. ... Anadûnê zîrân hikallaba [> hikalba]...*
The seas / might gush / Chasm-into ... Westernesse / the beloved / she fell

Again, the subject noun *azra* turns into a Subjective case. Most interesting is the combination with the subjunctive *du-phursâ*, evidently from the same base as L1 *nai phurrusim*, but differently made. This is clearly an impersonal verb – and it raises the question whether or not subjunctives can at all be created using personal verbs. There also appears a new participle *zîrân* „beloved", made the same way as *zabathân* from stem + suffix *-ân*. The *akallabi* of L1 is now personalised as *hikal(la)ba*, a Feminine formation determined by the Feminine interpretation of *Anadûnê*.

6: *dulgu bawîb ... balîk hazad Nimruzîr azûlada ...*
black / winds ... ships-of / seven-of / Elendil / eastward

This is a sgnificant expansion of II/1 in Version L1. The corresponding Old English version and its translation by Mr. Rashbold shows that between its two fragments, only the verbs „arose and drove away" are missing, so they are in fact parts of one single phrase. The section *dulgu bawîb* illustrates Lowdham's claim that adjectives normally precede the noun and are not affected by sex. The second part shows an arrangement of genitives: in *balîk hazad*, the Normal Pl. *balîk* is apposed in genitival position to the Normal number *hazad*, thus „seven of ships", while the whole complex is again genitival to *Nimruzîr* (Elendil). Genitival affixes are in this construction unnecessary. *Nimruzîr* illustrates the usage of the Objective case, for *Nimru-* is the Objective (singular!) of *Nimir* „an Elf".The direction *azûlada* reappears unchanged from L1.

II

1: *Adûnâim azûlada ...* (struck out)

2: *agannâlô buruda nênu ...*
The death-shade (is) / heavy / us-on

agannûlô of L1 becomes the Subj. *agannâlô*, and we may correspondingly assume that the also attested basic noun *nûlu* (**NC** p. 306) becomes d-Adûnaic **nâlu*. The adj. now is no longer suffixed by an auxiliary of „to be", instead, the copula is, confirming Lowdham, expressed by the very use of the Subjective case in the noun; fittingly, the adj. here *follows* the noun. The double pronoun has lost the final *-m*, why? Does it in L1 express a modification analogous to the now absent *-n* of *burudan*?

3: *adûn batân êluk izindi yadda: îdô katha batîna lôkhî ...*
west / (a) road / once? / straight / went: / now / all / roads-are / crooked

This fragment was much changed from L1. *êluk* is a new word of doubtful meaning, perhaps an expansion of a stem **êl-*, analogous to *êphal-ak* in II/4 and II/5. The old *ezendi* is forced into *izindi* by the absence of short *-e-* from d-Adûnaic. The impersonal new verb *yadda* (going with the Subjective *batân*) replaces *akhaini*: We saw it already popping up in I/1 and vanishing again. The particle *katha* now goes without numerical suffix while *batânî* of L1 assumes the Subj. case, again signifying an inclusion of the copula „to be" that also is lost from the final adjective/participle (now *lôkhî* instead of *rôkhî-nam*).

4: *êphalak îdôn Yôzâyan...*
far away / now-is / the Land of Gift

Again, the absence of short *-e-* from d-Adûnaic requires the change of L1's *êphalek*. The particle *îdôn* is retained but now apparently identifies the Subjective case of *îdô*. The two names of Númenor exchange their places, with „Land of Gift" assuming a new, and final, translation *Yôzâyan,* a compound including *zâyan* „land". A better translation was in fact „Gift-Land", for the two components are not in genitival apposition. *Yô-* could in fact be an Objective, but nothing is certain.

5: *êphal êphalak îdôn Akallabêth*
far / far away / now-is / She who fell

Aside of the changes already noted in II/4, there is nothing else to add.

Interpretation:

Despite the upheaval of the grammar, the changes in vocabulary hardly transgress matters of orthography: new words are *kamât > dâira, Athanâtê > Yôzâyan, akhaini > yadda (*this being in fact two words of different meaning), *zîrân, êluk,* the female pronoun *hi-* (in *hikallaba*) and the phrase I/6, replacing II/1. The standard word order *subject-predicate-object* is retained, but I/4 accumulates a sequence of objects that follows the same order as it might do in an English phrase.

The adjective *ezendi > izindi* now precedes the verb, so that instead of "[a road] lay straight" II/3 reads more emphatically "straight went". English tolerates the same shifts. Most interestingly, it now seems to be established as a general rule that other than adjectives, participles directly follow the related noun, for *zîrân* finds itself in the same position to its subject as *zabathân* (though attached to a Normal noun, not a Subjective). Prepositions are in d-Adûnaic now generally suffixed: *Ugru-dalad*.

The nouns reflect the three cases of d-Adûnaic.

Normal:

- Neuter singular: *Ugru-dalad*, *dâira, sâibêth-mâ, bawîb, hazad, balîk, adûn, batân, îdô, katha, batîna, Yôzâyan*

- Masculine singular: *Ar-Pharazôn, Êruvô, Nimruzîr*

- Feminine singular: *Anadûnê hikallaba, Akallabêth*

- Common plural: *Avalôiyada*

Subjective:

- Neuter singular: *agannâlô (< *agânnâlu), îdôn (< îdô),*
  plural: *azrîya (< azra;* though it is hard to tell why this would be preferrable in I/5a against the normal *azrî*)

- Masculine singular: *Zigûrun ... unakkha (< zigûr), Bârun an-Adûn urahhata (< bâr)*

- Common plural: *Êruhînim, Adûnâim (< adûnai)*

Objective:

- Objective common: *Êruhînim* (*?*)*, Nimruzîr*

Adjectives ignore sex but apparently respect numbers and case. The normal form of a standard adjective seems to feature *i* as last vowel. II/3 has *izindi* "straight", and **RA** adds *anadûni* "western" (but *adûn* "west" in II/3!)*.* If the adjective is connected to a Subjective noun, it seems to acquire *-a: buruda.* The Normal plural indicator is *-î*, II/3 *lôkhî*, and this is perhaps accompanied by a Subjective plural **lôkhiya*. One unusual formation is *dulgu:* Perhaps it indicates a different class of adjectives, or it may even be an Objective of **dulgi* so that the compound should properly be interpreted as "winds of blackness".

The verbs represent two internal stages of development. In a first phase, all active verbs feature a doubled second consonant and, in their singular form, the last vowel *-a: unakkha, dubbuda(m), azaggara, urahhata, hikallaba, yadda*. In a second phase, half of them assume a shortened structure, lacking the second vowel: *dubdam, urahta, hikalba*. Can we propose that the alterations reflects a change of tense? It would make sense to assume that the doubled forms represent the „narrative or historic past", that is the aorist. But what about the shortened forms? The trouble is that they never seem to change the tense of the translation: In fact, Lowdham in **RA** provides us both with *usaphda* „he understood" and *ukallaba* „he fell". Now it could be argued that *ukallaba* indicates a one-time-action and thus an aorist, while *usaphda* describes a lasting condition for which one of the two continuative tenses might be appropriate. But certainly, *hikalba* is not a suitable continuative! Can the shortened forms be past tenses, thus *dubdam* „they had fallen", *urahta* „he had broken", *hikalba* „she had fallen", and finally *usaphda*, „he had understood"? Probably not, either. The most likely interpretation seems to be this: The doubled verbs actually represent the past tense, originally used throughout the Lament, and it was at this very point that the decision was made to use the present tense/aorist as „narrative or historic past", thus changing several verbs into their short aorist forms.

There are also several special cases to be noted: *azaggara* has as a secondary form suggested *azagrara* which is a rather spectacular declension of the stem *azgarâ-*. Given the translation in L1, this could indeed represent a proper continuative – but as we will see, it was discarded in L3! And then we have *du-phursâ* which is another shortened form, but one with a fortified final *-a* that is probably determined by the usage of the auxiliary *du-* which seems to mark the (or one) d-Adûnaic subjunctive. Most remarkably, this subjunctive has no Plural ending, though the relevant noun is „seas". We meet similar forms in Lowdham's short description of the Adûnaic tenses: *azgarâ-, ugrudâ-*. Very likely, *phursâ-* is as well a bare, undeclined stem of a Class III verb. There are other examples of compounds formed with bare stems: *bêth* in *izindu-bêth*, *saibêth; zîr* in *Nimruzîr,* etc. This could as well explain now the participles: *zabathân, zîrân*.

The verb-noun *Akallabêth* is hard to explain in terms of d-Adûnaic. It suggests the combination of a past tense *akallaba* "it fell" with the female attribute *-ith* that Lowdham described in **RA** (*mith* "girl"). But what then is the meaning of the initial *a-*? It cannot identify a Neuter; neither is it a part of the stem as in *azaggara*. How would a Númenórean distinguish a proper Neuter from whatever this *a-* may mean?

Versions L3m and L3t

Both versions feature (deliberately incomplete) English glosses that substantially vary against each other. The differences in their Adûnaic are minor, though. Since as mentioned above, L3m seems to be earlier, it is given here with the changes to L3t bracketed.

I

1: *Kadô Zigûrun zabathân unakkha...*
And so / Sauron / humbled / he-came

No changes from L2.

2: *Êruhînim dubdam ugru-dalad ...*
The-Children-of-Êru / fell / ?shadow beneath [> ?shadow under]

I/2 copies down the final version given in L2. There is some uncertainty about whether *dalad* means „beneath" or „under" - probably both.

3: *Ar-Pharazônun azaggara Avalôiyada ...*
Ar-Pharazôn / was warring / against Powers

azaggara is now accepted as the final version. The translation into progressive tense „was warring" seems not to be supported by the form of the original verb, though.

4: *Bârim an-Adûn yurahtam dâira sâibêth-mâ Êruvô ...*
Lords / of-West / they rent [> broke] / Earth / with assent [> assent-with] / from Êru [> ?-from]

Bârun an-Adûn of L2 is now set into Subjective Plural, and the Personal verb *urahta* follows in sex and number, providing us with Adûnaic's Masculine Plural pronoun: *yu-*.

5: *azrîya du-phursâ akhâsada. ... Anadûnê zîrân hikalba [> hikallaba]...*
that seas [> seas] / should gush [> so-as-to-gush] / into Chasm [> into chasm]. ... Anadune [> Númenor] / the beloved [> beloved] / she fell [> she-fell down]

The only trouble against L2 here is a lasting hesitation between *hikalba* and *hikallaba*. Why this would be so problematic is hard to tell. Is a clue maybe hidden in the translations: *hikalba* „she fell", *hikallaba* „she fell down"? Unfortunately, Lowdham repeatedly translates *ukallaba* as „he fell", so there probably cannot be put much weight onto the proper translation. Rather noteworthy is the translation of *azrîya du-phursâ*: either „that seas should gush" or „seas so-as-to-gush". The translation seems to pay special heed to the Subjective *azrîya* which here, in the second part of a phrase, seems to imply a „so that". Rashbold's translation of OE suggests that hardly anything is missing between I/4 and this fragment: maybe nothing more than a mere conjunction.

6: *Bawîba dulgî... balîk hazad anNimruzîr [> an-Nimruzîr] azûlada ...*
winds (were) [> winds] / black ...ships / seven / of Elendil / eastwards [> eastward]

I/6 has some baffling changes against L2. The Normal *bawîb* is changed into a Subjectiv *bawîba* with the curious effect that the adjective *dulgu* removes behind the noun and assumes a Plural ending *-î*. According to Lowdham's rules, this should be interpreted as „the winds were black", and that is indeed the translation of L3m. Yet Rashbold translates from OE „black winds". But there is probably no contradiction here. Lowdham only says that adjectives *normally* precede nouns: one exception could be whenever the adjective (or a participle) meets a Subjective. With the simple association *balîk hazad Nimruzîr* becoming *balîk hazad an(-)Nimruzîr,* the slightly awkward sequence of genitives belonging to other genitives is finally resolved, giving us both ways of formation at once.

II

1: (cancelled)

2: *Agannâlô burôda nênud ... zâira nênud ...*
death-shadow / very heavy [> heavy] / on us ... longing [> longing (is)] / on us

L2's *buruda* is fortified into *burôda*: Is this a change of the base or an indication that adjectives also may assume Subjective cases? L3m's translation „*very* heavy" indeed seems to suggest the latter. (Aleš Bičan pointed out to me that an a-infixion used as intensifier is a feature that d-Adûnaic may have adopted in prehistorical times from Elvish. Quenya allows for similar possibilities.) Instead of *nênu* we now meet *nênud*, twice repeated in a slight expansion of the fragment that now includes a Subjective noun *zâira* (CT is not entirely clear about whether or not this expansion was already present in L2) It seems possible that this indicates a rectification of the vocabulary, **-ud* thus drawing close to *-ada* „on, towards, into".

3: *adûn izindi batân tâidô ayadda: îdô katha [> kâtha] batîna lôkhî.*
west / straight (right?) [> straight] / road / then (once?) [> once] / it went [> went] / now / all / ways (are) [> roads] / bent [> crooked]

izindi changes position and alters the meaning of II/3 from „a road went straight" to „straight a road went". The somewhat uncouth *êluk* is replaced by *tâidô* that evidently is closely related to *îdô;* but that does not necessarily mean *tâidô* had the same meaning as *êluk*. The verb *yadda* turns into a Personal Neuter *ayadda* „it went", adding even more emphasis to the phrase. Finally, *katha* assumes an accent, but this probably bears not much significance: *katha/kathu-* is the form Lowdham uses in **RA**.

4: *Êphalak îdô [>îdôn] Yôzâyan.*
far-away / now [> now (is)] / Gift-land

Rather noteworthy is the hesitation between Normal *îdô* and Subjective *îdôn* while all previous versions of this phrase had *îdôn*. Since that is repeated in II/5, it was evidently not a mere slip.

5: *Êphal-êphalak [> êphal êphalak] îdô [> îdôn] hiAkallabêth [> hi-Akallabêth].*
far far-away / now [> now (is)] / She-that-hath-fallen

The fleeting stroke may or may not indicate a REALLY HEAVY emphasis by prefixing the same adverb again and again. And then, we meet an article *hi-*, identical to the Feminine pronoun of *hikallaba*. Well, if *Akallabêth* already was already a trouble in d-Adûnaic, *hi-Akallabêth* is a nightmare. What does a noun that has a Feminine suffix need as well a Feminine article for??? Well, there is a possible explanation. Someone wanted to place another intensifier here. But unfortunately, *Akallabêth* is the Object noun of *îdô(n)*, so the Subjective **Akallabêthin* is ruled out: It may, as you perhaps recall, only be used for Subject nouns. The insertion of an article may just mean the required solution to this problem.

The smaller samples

Belonging with L3t, there are three little d-Adûnaic phrases found in **NC**. Before we interpret the grammar of L3, it will be useful also to consider these:

NC1: *Bâ kitabdahê!*
Don't touch me!

This one is really remarkable: It is translated by an imperative, but remember that Adûnaic does not have such a mood at all. Evidently, NC1 is our only example of an optative and should more literally be translated by "You shall not touch me." It can be reduced to a verbal stem *tabda-*, a Singular subject pronoun *ki-* "you" and apparently an object pronoun *-hê* "I" or „me". According to **TT17**, Westron constructs personal verbs the same way: *meputeke* „one blows me" (!!! And then people think Elf-friends were puritanical...) from a stem *put-* to which Westron suffixes an *-e* like Adûnaic suffixes *-a*. Connected to it is an auxiliary *bâ* that probably indicates a negation in Optative mood: "shall not". Latin also had such things, really desirable for a language that is meant to suit rhetors and manipulators.

The structure of the phrase, alas, is very ambiguous. Compare with our other sample of how to use an auxiliary *du-phursâ.* While both verbs feature shortened forms, one has a lengthened final *-â*, the other simply a short *-a*. It may be the object pronoun that makes the difference here. But why is *bâ* unlike *du-* not connected to the verb by a stroke? A mere slip of the transscriber or an actual difference in grammar? And can the order of the pronouns simply be reversed without further alterations? In short: would **hêtabdaki* indeed mean „I touch you"?

NC2: *Narîka 'nBâri 'nAdûn yanâkhim.*
The Eagles of the Lords of the West are at hand.

In contrast to II/6, we meet here the opposite way to endlessly chain genitives *Narîka 'nBâri 'nAdûn* or, as it could also have been written, **Narîka an-Bâri an-Adûn.* In contrast to I/4 we meet here the Normal Plural *Bâri*, properly attached to a Subjective Plural *narîka* that evidently derives from a Normal Singular **narak* „eagle". And there also is an unforeseen verb: *yanâkhim.* Its base is evidently NAKH that also gave I/1 *unakkha,* yet it seems that *nâkh-* is distinct from *nakh-* which would simply mean „to come", not „to be at hand". The prefix *ya-* clearly is the Common equivalent of masculine *yu-* „they" in I/4 *yurahtam* – may we conclude from the distribution of articles that the feminine form was **yi-*? But there is one stupefying feature, and that is the Plural suffix *-im* whereas the Lament provides only *-am*. Does this signify a different word-class or a different tense? It seems conceivable by the somewhat free translation that *yanâkhim* is a Continuative Present rather than an Aorist, for the verb seems to describe a condition, not a moment in a process. It may be allowed to conclude that analogous to *yurahtam* there also was a verb **yanakham* „they come/came", and that the fortified vowel *-â-* indicates a different derivation from the same base with a subtly different meaning.

NC3: *Urîd yakalubim!*
The mountains lean over!

Here we encounter a verb of the same kind as in NC2 *yakalubim*, clearly related to the base KALAB that also gives *hikalba, hikallaba* and finally *Akallabêth*. But a stem *kalub-* could probably not produce a tense *kalba*: Here we have to conclude on a different verb-class with different flections. Like *yanâkhim*, *yakalubim* may tentatively be interpreted as a Continuative Present: The mountains (**urud > urîd*, cf. Sindarin *orod* from which *urud* would be a typical Adûnaic loan according to **RA**) are in the state of tumbling or at the verge of falling, but the process is not accomplished yet, thus not justifying a simple aorist.

Some more specimen found in **RA** discuss the proper use of the Subjective but do not need to be discussed here in detail:

RA1a: *Ar-Pharazônun Bâr* "King Pharazôn [is] Lord"

<p align="center">RA1b: <i>Ar-Pharazôn kathuphazgânun</i> "King Pharazôn the Conqueror"</p>

Iincluding <i>katha</i> „all", here as a noun – would a more literal translation be „*taker of everything"?

<p align="center">RA1c: <i>Ar-Pharazônun kathuphazgân</i> "King Pharazôn [is/was] a conqueror"</p>

<p align="center">RA2a: <i>Bâr ukallaba</i> "the Lord fell"</p>

<p align="center">RA2b: <i>Bârun (u)kallaba</i> "it was the Lord who fell"</p>

But cf. <i>Zigûrun unakkha</i> "Sauron came" in I/1, more properly "it was Sauron who came".

Interpretation

The known **personal pronouns** now add up to:

Person	Masculine	Feminine	Common	Neuter
„I"	-hê? (object)	-	-	-
„You"	ki-	-	-	-
„He/she/it"	u-/hu-	hi-	*a-?	a-
„We (us)"	-	-	nê(n)-	-
„You"	-	-	-	-
„They"	yu-	*yi-?	*ya-?	ya-

Summing up the known verbs in impersonal Singular results in the following:

- Class I: *nakkha, yadda, bêth-, zîr-,* also, from **RA** the stem *kan-* "hold", from **NC** *nâkhi* "be at hand", *rûkh* "shout" (base *RUKH), *-bêl* "love".

- Class II: *dubda/dubbuda, rahta/rahhata, phursâ, kalba/kallaba*, also, from **RA** *saphda* "understood", from **NC** *tabda* "touch".

- Class III: *zabathân, azagrâra/azaggara*, also from **RA** *azgârâ-* "to wage war" (base *ZAGAR "sword"), *ugrudâ-* "to overshadow" (base *GUR, cf. *ugru*), from **NC** *abrazân* "steadfast" (probably base *BAR, cf. *bâr, abâr*; a stem *abrazâ- seems possible), *kalubi* "lean over" (base KALAB).

Conclusions:

- Only impersonal verbs of Class III display initial vowels: *azgârâ-, ugrudâ-, abrazân.*

- If there meet two consonants in the stem, no consonant is doubled (hence *rahhata*, not *rahhta*).

- All active verbs met in the Lament end on *-a.* But *-â-* is found in the subjunctive and in the participles. Two i-forms, *kalubi* and *nâkhi*, are met in **NC**.

- The short forms of a verb are usually translated by past tense: *dubda, rahta, kalba, saphda.* There is one exception that is translated by present tense: *tabda*.

- The doubled forms are also translated by past tense: *nakkha, yadda, kallaba*, but one is translated by a progressive: *azaggara*.

- Long forms are translated by what could be continuatives: *nâkhi, kalubi*.

We would naturally expect that the most common form of the verb also represents the most common tense, the aorist used as „historic or narrative past". This seems to be the simple short form with either one consonant (Class I) or two consonants joining (Class II and III). With regard to the doubled forms it seems decisive that *tâidô ayadda* means „once went", so *ayadda* would describe a past, no longer current condition and thus be set in the actual Adûnaic past tense „used as pluperfect". This interpretation also seems legitimate for *unakkha, (u)kallaba, hikallaba*, seeing the author hesitating between aorist *hikalba* and the proper pluperfect. And yet there is again a problem: the troublesome *azaggara* that of all represented verbs should be the one to represent a past continuative! Now the two verbs *yanâkhim* and *yakalubim* are clearly present tenses, but they both represent somewhat expanded derivatives of the base: It would seem unlikely that *kalub-* was identical to the short form *kalba-* in a different tense. Alas, we have too little material to decide whether the *-i-* in the *-im* suffix, contrasting with *-a-* in *yurahtam*, signifies the use of a continuative tense (but if this was the case, what then about *azaggara*?) or simply a different formation of the verbal stem.

The known verb forms, reduced to impersonal singular types, thus can be listed like that:

Formation	Class I	Class II	Class III
stems	bêth-, zîr-, kan-, rûkh-, bêl-	phursâ-	azgarâ-, ugrudâ-; *zabathâ-, *abrazâ-?
(1) aorist	*nakha?, *nâkha?	dubda, rahta, kalba, *kaluba?, saphda, tabda,	azagrâra?
(2) cont. present	nâkhi	*dubdi etc.?	kalubi
(3) cont. past	?	?	azaggara
(4) past	nakkha, yadda	dubbuda, rahhata, kallaba	?
participles	zîrân	*phursân, *dubdân etc.?	zabathân, abrazân

And then there was a-Adûnaic

At the end of **RA**, Christopher Tolkien expressed his belief that his father „abandoned the further development of Adunaic and never returned to it". This may be true as far as written accounts of phonology and grammar are concerned; and yet it is evident that Adûnaic *was* further developed, introducing profound changes in grammar, vocabulary, and even phonology. This step brought d-Adûnaic to a-Adûnaic, and it can be dated with some certainty to the moment when the Line of Elros expanded from 12 or 13 to more than 20 kings. For the isolated page that CT describes in **HA** § 24,25 gives Adûnaic royal names that can still be explained by d-Adûnaic: *Ar-Balkumagân* (Tar-Ciryatan, „King Shipwright") that displays the Objective case of *balak*, *Arpharazôn*. But this is no longer true for the Adûnaic names assumed by the later kings of Númenor.

Possibly a main cause for the profound change was the idea that one of the Númenórean kings would assume the throne-name „Lord of the West" in blasphemous imitation of Manwë. For the name that we meet in the Line of Elros is neither k-Adûnaic *Bârun-adûnô* nor d-Adûnaic *Bâr an-adûn* but a new compound: *Ar-Adûnakhôr*. It may seem that **Ar-Bâr an-adûn* looked too clumsy for a royal name, yet the idea of a „Lord of the West" seemed too appealing to be given up. How then is the new Adûnaic compound to be explained? Is it *Adûna-khôr* or *Adûn-akhôr*? The former looks interesting for it suggests a word **khôr* that is very similar to Elvish *heru.* But how then was the unusual *Adûna-* to be explained that clearly is not an Objective nor a typical Genitive, and would *heru* really be imported by the Númenóreans as *khôr* since Lowdham suggests that this should result in **hiru*?

Another one of the royal names may serve to even further narrow down the date of the change: *Ar-Abattârik* aka. Tar-Ardamin, the „lost king" whose name was unintentionally dropped from **KR** and never restored. Both names are intended to mean „Pillar of Earth" and seem to be a purposeful pun on the „Pillar of Heaven", the central mountain of Númenor. For *Abattârik* clearly imitates d-Adûnaic *Minul-târik*, given by Lowdham as the native name of said mountain, composed of the Objective of *minal* „heaven" and of *târik* „pillar" (but how? For since *Minul-târik* contains an Objective, so should *Abattârik*. Yet there is none. We only perceive a Normal **aban* „Earth" vs. d-Adûnaic *daira*, that is assimilated by the following -t- into *abat-*, and this would according to **RA** suggest that Tar-Ardamin's name meant simply „Pillar *on* Earth", not supporting it, actually having an effect on it, as in the case of *Minul-târik.* Had a-Adûnaic given up the Objective altogether since we do not meet it in *any* compound in this final variation of the Númenórean tongue?). Correspondingly, Ardamin mimics Menelmin that once was the Quenya name of the same mountain. This must mean that the names of the Númenórean kings were already fixated *before* Menelmin assumed its final name Meneltarma, for Ardamin's name did not accordingly mutate into *Ardatarma. Unfortunately, this poses a problem in the chronology for *Menelmin* occurs only in an older version of the Akallabêth: In the earliest draft of what would become the final Akallabêth it is already *Menelmindon* followed by *Meneltarma*, but this already in a time when there were still only 13 kings conceived of and d-Adûnaic was still fully valid. Was Ar-Abattârik's name perhaps already conceived of long before it appeared in any written text?

A third royal name seems to suggest that this may indeed be the case: *Ar-Gimilzôr* that in d-Adûnaic was a translation of Elros but in a-Adûnaic refers to Tar-Telemnar and seems to translate his name, „Silver flame". Yet Lowdham informs us that d-Adûnaic *gimil* means „star" and thus closely corresponds to *Elros* that was then translated „Star-foam". Has *gimil* assumed a different meaning in a-Adûnaic? Not always, for another name recorded in the Akallabêth is *Gimilzagar* that d-Adûnaic would simply translate as „star-sword" and thus make it correspond exactly to the Elvish name *Elemmacil*. Unless Gimilzôr is not intended at all to translate Telemnar, this may well be a case of an Adûnaic homonym: *gimil* „silver", maybe in origin a distorted loan of Khuzdul *khibil*.

Further changes in the vocabulary include the usage of *azar/azra* as "star" rather than „sea" and the change of the patronymic suffix *-(ô)hîn* (< *Azrabêlôhîn* = *Eärendilion*, „Son of Eärendil") into *-thôr* (*Ar-Sakalthôr* = *Tar-Falassion*). Also, it is unlikely that a-Adûnaic retained the name *Êru* which was by the Notes for Revision dated 1951 transferred to Elvish (see **SD** and subsequent volumes). It might have become directly adopted by the Hadorians, as were the names of most of the Valar, but if the import rules of d-Adûnaic still applied, Elvish *Éru* would have emerged as **Îru*.

And as a final note it may be observed that **RA** was definitely *not* Tolkien's final word on Adûnaic. Aside of the discussion of the abandoned root ROTH in **PR**, the Silmarillion Index states that Adûnaic *adûn* was directly borrowed from Sindarin *adún*. Since **RA** and related texts contain nothing at all to this extent, this statement proves that there must be somewhere some unpublished further material on the Adûnaic language.

List of Abbreviations