1.xxx – total makeover

x.1xx – new chapter/section/major update

x.x1x – new subsection/minor update

x.xx1 – spelling corrections, notes and tips, etc.

Intermediate Gallifreyan Grammar

v. 1.221 [08.09.13]

Stranger-Come-Knocking

Table of Contents

Chapter One: Classes

In Gallifreyan, ambiguity is not always tolerated well. To avoid confusion, certain suffixes are attached to nouns, and occasionally adjectives. There are four classes:

1. People (–dod)
2. Objects (–fɛd)
3. Actions (–ɑzu)
4. Thoughts, Ideas, and Concepts (–ɐʔwoj)

1.1 Impossibilities. The first ambiguity is in the realm of the "possible" and the "impossible." In a single play of a sporting event, someone is likely to shout, "But that's impossible!" Well, what was impossible? Most likely the play, but it could have been the player, maybe an object on the field, maybe even the play itself.

With possibilities or impossibilities, they may also be rendered as adjectives or nouns by themselves. Observe.

1. Person (-dod)

"The Shakri are impossible."	"The Shakri are an impossibility."
The Shakri are impossible[pers].	The Shakri are an impossibility[pers].
Are the Shakri impossible[pers].	Are the Shakri an impossibility[pers].
Odad uθ Σɐkrijoz fodɑɹijəɬ[pers].	Odad uθ Σɐkrijoz uh falodɑɹijəɬ[pers].
Odad uθ Σɐkrijoz fodɑɹidodəɬ.	Odad uθ Σɐkrijoz uh falodɑɹidodəɬ.

The noun classes listed above *always* come before *all* other suffixes: plurals, placement markers, possession, *all* of them.

The same rules apply to alo/dɑɹi (possibl[ility]).

2. Objects (-fɛd)

"But the Tardis is bigger on the inside! It's impossible!"

Here, you could just say Odadi fodɑɹi since the impossibility has just been named.

"It's impossible."	"It's impossible."
"It is an impossible-thing."	It's impossible-thing.
"It is an fodɑɹifɛd."	Is it impossible.
Odadi uθ fodɑɹifɛdəɬ.	Odadi ɹʃoz fodɑɹifɛd

3. Actions (-azu)

I want to make it possible to attribute...
I want to make possible-it[action] to attribute...
I want to create a [possible-action] to attribute...
I want to create a [possibility-action] [that] will attribute...
Soɾɛlamɪm ʈazow ɪmoz uh alodɑɹijazujəɬ towa [will attribute] uh alodɑɹəɬ nor uh falodɑɹijəɬ.

4. Thoughts, Ideas, and Concepts (-ɐʔwoj)

"No, that's a silly idea, impossible."
"No, that silly idea is impossible."
"No, that silly idea is impossible-thought/idea."
"No, that silly idea is fodɑɹijɐʔwoj."
"ɛfo, odadi [idea, silly] ɛk bəro fodɑɹijɐʔwojəɬ."

You could say either say "X is im/possible-[attr]" or "X is a/n im/possibility-[attr]" Both mean the same thing. With the Tardis, one could say that being "bigger on the inside" would be more of a concept. However, the primary difference between the thing and thought/idea attributes is tangibility. You can definitely see and feel the bigger on the inside, whereas an idea or a plan cannot be seen. (Unless written down, but I digress.)

"That's a fantastic idea! Entirely possible!"

could be rendered any of the following ways...

"That's a fantastic idea! Entirely [possible-idea]!"

 OR

"That fantastic idea is entirely [possible-idea]."

 OR

"That fantastic idea is a [possibility-idea]."

 OR

"That's a fantastic idea! Entirely [possible]!"

If the im/possible thing has been named in the same or previous sentence and unambiguous, attributes are not required. However, if there is some uncertainty, the attribute is required.

"That's impossible!"
"Odadi bərowoz fodɑɹijəɫ!"
"Odadi bərowoz uh falodɑɹijəɫ!"
 (Or, if you're pressed for time) "Fodɑɹijəɫ!"

"That's possible!"
"Odadi bərowoz dɑɹijɔm."
"Odadi bərowoz uh alodɑɹijɔm."
 (Or, if you're pressed for time) "Dɑɹijəɫ!"

 And generic terms can be used, if needed. Not impossible.

1.2 EveryMan. It's a pun. Well, sort of. More of a philosophical metaphor. And it's the second adjective to take these classes. Thankfully, two of them don't need extensive explanation and can be skimmed over.

Oʃɾɛndod (everyone) – Pretty self-explanatory, right?

Oʃɾɛnfɛd (everything [object]) simply means everything within a given situation. Where roʃ means *absolutely* everything, the universe and all reality and so on, oʃɾɛnfɛd simply means every object in a room, in a plan, within the scope of the foreseeable future.

If you're any bit of intelligent, you can probably guess the last two.

Scenario: A team in the final quarter of a game has a chance to tie it up and force overtime. The coach comes up with a plan.

3. Actions (-aʐu)

Sentence: Everything[action] is going wrong!
Usage: The plan is totally fine, but the players are morons and are physically unable to pull it off.

4. Thoughts, Ideas, and Concepts (-ɐʔwoj)

Sentence: Everything[plan] is going wrong.
Usage: The plan is a flop. The players execute it to the letter but are unable to overcome the opposition. There is still time for another play, another plan. Again, the

players execute the plan down to the last step, but the plan is faulty and they still fail and lose the game.

Question: Can I attach these classes to other adjectives?
Answer: As of this moment, no. If some blanket rule can be established regarding these classes, we will certainly announce it. However, for right now, they are only available for "im/possible" and "every."

Chapter Two: Creative Verb Affixes

Verbal affixes can be complicated. Perfective? Imperfective? Habitual? And don't even get me started on personal versus universal. Oh, and let's not forget regular versus ever-present verbs. It's all good fun, isn't it? Even with all this to choose from, you can't always express what you want to say.

That's when you have to get creative with your affixes. You remember "Tense Vs. Aspect" in "Gallifreyan Made Easy"? This is sort of like a continuation.

2.1 "Have *verb*ed."

Your first reaction might be to just use "-al/ıl" (had *verb*ed). However, they are slightly different. Observe:

We had travelled for three days before coming upon the life-saving oasis.

We have travelled for three days and still haven't found any water.

Time for a mini-lesson: when a verb is "perfective" that means it is finished. Done. Over and out. In the first example, "-al" would be used because "had travelled" is finished in the context that they found water. But the second is not perfective. They are still travelling and still haven't found water. *But*, they are relaying everything in the past tense. So then, time for creativity.

What do we know? The travelers speak about their trek in the past tense. That is the personal timeline. But in the context of finding water, the trek is continuing, and that is present tense.

Personal: -al
Universal: -ıł

Lɑ ziʃiri uvɛnorəlalıł.
Three days we have travelled.

2.2 "Have/has been *verb*ing."

This is called the Present Perfect Continuous. She has been painting, we have been traveling. So, what do we know about this tense?

As relating to the subject, the verb is present continuous. Those nitty gritty little helpers are what make it all complicated and stuff. This means that we can approximate the affixes like so:

Personal: aɹ
Universal: ɪl

Ijowotɪmaɹɪl.
She has been painting.

2.3 "Had been *verb*ing."

This tense is barely used in English and is a little complicated in terms of wibbly-wobbly-ness. Despite the "-ing" this is almost exclusively entirely past tense. "Had been" makes in perfect, it's a closed matter. But, as noted before, the "-ing" does not mean present in this case. Our affixes might look something like this:

Personal: an
Universal: ɪl

Question: So are these established tenses? Will they be added to the Verb Affix Chart?
Answer: No and no. These are not established Gallifreyan tenses. In fact, Rhiannon is quite militarily against "have verbed." This chapter is merely a tool for you to approximate English tenses for translation and be able to move them back and forth more easily.

Question: I have a different idea for X-tense. It seems to make sense, but now I'm not sure after looking at these.
Answer: As I said before, these are not fixed tenses and affixes. These are merely for translation purposes, to give you an idea of what it might look like. If you have an idea for another way to write them, or for a new tense that needs translating, by all means, submit it to us.

Chapter Three: Strictly Gallifreyan Terms

Some words, while they can be rendered *closely* in English, cannot be adequately expressed. These are considered strictly Gallifreyan terms.

3.1 Inter- and intra-historical. The words themselves are not terribly difficult to master, though it is important to master the concepts.

Interhistorically, Romulus and Remus have always been at war.
Meaning: Historically, Romulus and Remus have always been at war [with other worlds, but not each other].

Intrahistorically, Romulus and Remus, have always been at war.
Meaning: Historically, Romulus and Remus have always been at war [with each other].

Historically, Romulus and Remus have always been at war.
Meaning: Historically, Romulus and Remus have always been at war [maybe with each other, maybe within themselves, maybe with others].

These terms also work with single entities.

Interhistorically, Romulus has always been at war.
Meaning: Historically, Romulus has always been at war [with other worlds].

Intrahistorically, Romulus has always been at war.
Meaning: Historically, Romulus has always been at war [within itself, ie. civil war].

Historically, Romulus has always been at war.
Meaning: Historically, Romulus has always been at war [with others, within itself, etc.].

Chapter Four: Want

In most languages, "want" is simply a verb followed by either a noun or infinitive verb. "I want cookies." "I want to go." Nothing wrong with that; it's simple, easy to remember. But when has Gallifrey ever been concerned with simplicity? The good news is that their complexity allows for the expression of incredible ideas by changing only a few words.

Thus begins the explanation of "want". Want itself is an Ever-present verb, thus it takes only Ever-present affixes.

If you want an object (like cookies), the object (or cookies) merely take a direct object ending. This does not change.

If you want to do something, this is where it gets complicated because instead of it just being "I + want + to verb" the verb actually becomes a participle. Thus, the future participle indicates something you want to do. The present participle is something you would rather be doing. The past participle is something you would like to see done.

How does this work with a Regular verb that can take personal and universal affixes? Well, just like this.

4.1 Past Tense of Sorɛl.

Past want + past participle:
I used to want [this to happen] instead of what actually happened
ɛdoθ aʃsorɛl aʃəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
I wanted to go to the mountains (instead of getting lost in a jungle).

Past want + present participle:
I used to want [to be doing this]
ɛdoθ aʃsorɛl adəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
I used to want to be going to the mountains (but what I'm doing now is much better).

Past want + future participle:
I used to want [to do this]
ɛdoθ aʃsorɛl azəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
I used to want to go to the mountains (back when I had time and energy).

4.2 Present Tense of Sorɛl.

Present want + past participle:
I want [this to be done]
Ɛdoθ adsorɛl aʃəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
*I want to have gone to the mountains (instead of going scuba diving).**

Present want + present participle:
I want [to be doing this right now]
Ɛdoθ adsorɛl adəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
I want to go to the mountains! (Why aren't we there yet?)

Present want + future participle:
I want [to do this]
Ɛdoθ adsorɛl azəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
I want to go to the mountains (it's on my bucket list).

4.3 Future Tense of Sorɛl.

Future want + past participle:
I will want [this to be finished]
Ɛdoθ azsorɛl aʃəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
I will want to go to the mountains (and then leave).

Future want + present participle:
I will want [to be doing this]
Ɛdoθ azsorɛl adəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
I will want to be going to the mountains (by 9am, and if you're not ready, too bad).

Future want + future participle:
I will want [to do that]
Ɛdoθ azsorɛl azəm ımoz uθ ɹəlçɛ ʒun.
I will want to go to the mountains (at that time, but not now).

*So what's the difference between past + past versus present + past?

Past + Past is wanting to do Thing A, instead doing Thing B, ending up in Situation C, and now wanting to do Thing D.
Thing A: I want to go to the mountains.
Thing B: We ended up going on a safari.
Situation C: Now we're lost.
Thing D: I just want to go home.

Meanwhile, Present + Past is wanting to do Thing A, instead doing Thing B, ending up in Situation C, but still wanting to do Thing A.

Thing A: I want to go to the mountains.

Thing B: Instead, we went scuba diving.

Situation C: The water was shark-infested and our vacation is ruined.

Thing A: I wanted to go to the mountains (but no, we had to go scuba diving).

4.5 Word Order and Double EV. You may have noticed that sorεl takes both a participle and an EV affix. You will also note that doθ came first and had the pronoun affix. So is sorεl a verb or an adjective? What's the word order here and how does it make sense?

Well, the first thing to remember is that we are not translating word-for-word. We're translating meaning. So, point one:

"Sorεl" in this context is a non-entity. It is a feeling, it is not tangible, it is unique to the individual, it is ever-present. For this reason, it takes an ever-present affix to indicate when the person felt it, and then the participle to indicate the mindset of the want as relating to outside events. So what does that make sorεl? EV affix notwithstanding, it is an adjective.

This leads us to the next point of "doθ" coming first. By now you should know pretty well that basic word order is verb-subject-object. However, adverbs come before verbs and adjectives come after nouns. So, what's up? What is with this funky word order? The best explanation is that it's just how it is. That is how the language developed. Sometimes, there is no logical explanation. This is just one of those things you have to memorize, like irregular verb declension.

And finally, why does "doθ" take the pronoun affix? Because it's the verb.