FROM A SPOKEN TO A WRITTEN LANGUAGE

The Introduction and Development of Literary Urmia Aramaic
in the Nineteenth Century

H. L. MURRE-VAN DEN BERG

FROM A SPOKEN TO A WRITTEN LANGUAGE

The Introduction and Development of
Literary Urmia Aramaic
in the Nineteenth Century

PUBLICATION OF THE "DE GOEJE FUND"
No. XXVIII

NEDERLANDS INSTITUUT VOOR HET NABIJE OOSTEN
LEIDEN
1999

Nederlands Instituut
voor het Nabije Oosten
Witte Singel 25
Postbus 9515
2300 RA Leiden, Nederland

ISSN 0169-8303
ISBN 90 6258 981-2

© Copyright 1999 by "De Goeje Fund", Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

CONTENTS

FOREWORD XVII

ABBREVIATIONS XXI

MAP XXIII

1 Introduction **1**
1.1 Preliminaries 1
1.1.1 Literary Urmia Aramaic 1
1.1.2 Literary Aramaic 1
1.1.3 Neo-Aramaic 3
1.2 Aims of the present research 5
1.2.1 The study of Literary Urmia Aramaic 5
1.2.2 Language development 7
1.2.3 Choice of subjects 9
1.2.3.1 History 9
1.2.3.2 Language 10
1.3 The sources 13
1.3.1 Introduction 13
1.3.2 History 13
1.3.3 Language 15
1.4 Linguistic framework 18
1.4.1 Introduction 18
1.4.2 Functional approaches 19
1.4.3 Functional terminology 21
1.4.3.1 Introduction 21
1.4.3.2 Grammatical terms 22
1.4.3.3 Semantic terms 23
1.4.3.4 Pragmatic terms 23
1.4.3.5 Basic clause 24
1.5 Transcription 25
1.5.1 Transcription of LUA in Syriac script 25
1.5.2 Transcription of CS 29
1.5.3 Transcription of non-Aramaic languages 29
1.5.4 Representation of existing transcriptions 29
1.5.5 Spelling of names 30

2 The Assyrian Christians at the beginning of the nineteenth century **31**
2.1 Earlier history 31
2.1.1 The origins of the Persian Church 31
2.1.2 Contacts with the Roman Catholic Church 33
2.1.3 Terminology 35
2.2 The situation at the beginning of the nineteenth century 38
2.2.1 The region 38
2.2.2 Chaldeans and Nestorians 40

3 Missionary activities
3.1 The first period of the American Protestant mission (1834-1850) 43
3.1.1 Preparations 43
3.1.2 Beginnings 45
3.1.3 Expansion into the Hakkari mountains 46
3.1.4 Further expansion 50
3.2 The Roman Catholic mission (1839-1918) 53
3.2.1 Beginnings (1839-1854) 53
3.2.2 In Urmia and Khosrowa (1858-1918) 57
3.2.3 The Dominican mission in Mosul 59
3.3 The Anglican mission (1886-1915) 60
3.3.1 The forerunners 60
3.3.2 Work in Urmia and Qodshanis 62
3.4 The continuation of the American mission (1850-1918) 66
3.4.1 The separation from the Church of the East 66
3.4.2 The work of 'The Mission to Persia' 69
3.5 The Lutheran mission 71
3.6 The Russians (1851-1914) 72
3.7 Part of a World War 74
3.7.1 The years before the War (1905-1914) 74
3.7.2 The First World War (1914-1918) 78
3.7.3 After the War 81
3.8 Summary and conclusions 84

4 The creation of the literary language **87**
4.1 The linguistic situation at the beginning of the nineteenth century 87
4.1.1 Classical Syriac 87

4.1.2 Neo-Aramaic 88
4.1.3 Other languages 89
4.1.4 Multilingualism 90
4.2 The Protestant contribution 91
4.2.1 Preliminaries 91
4.2.2 Beginnings 93
4.2.3 The first period of the Protestant press 97
4.2.4 Standard Literary Urmia Aramaic 100
4.2.5 Texts from native speakers 106
4.2.6 Post-1870 publications 108
4.3 The Roman Catholic contribution 111
4.3.1 The Roman Catholic press 111
4.3.2 The works of Paul Bedjan 113
4.4 The Anglican contribution 116
4.5 Further developments 118
4.5.1 Introduction 118
4.5.2 LUA in the Soviet Union 118
4.5.3 LUA in other parts of the world 119
4.6 Summary and conclusions 121

5 Phonetics, phonology, and orthography 123
5.1 Introduction 123
5.1.1 The relationship between phonetics, phonology, and orthography 123
5.1.2 Classical Syriac as point of departure 123
5.1.3 Classical Syriac orthography 125
5.1.4 CS script adjusted to the needs of LUA 127
5.1.5 Methods and sources 129
5.2 Gemination and degemination 130
5.2.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 130
5.2.1.1 Introduction 130
5.2.1.2 Grammatically conditioned loss of gemination 132
5.2.1.3 Exceptions 132
5.2.1.4 Other exceptions 134
5.2.1.5 Secondary loss of gemination 134
5.2.2 Representations in orthography 135
5.2.2.1 Introduction 135
5.2.2.2 Grammatically conditioned loss of gemination 136
5.2.2.3 Exceptions 137

5.2.2.4 Other exceptions 138
5.2.2.5 Secondary loss of gemination 138
5.2.3 Conclusions 139
5.3 Phonemicalization of *begadkepat* consonants 140
5.3.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 140
5.3.1.1 Introduction 140
5.3.1.2 [b] and [k] 140
5.3.1.3 [g] 141
5.3.1.4 [p] 141
5.3.1.5 [d] and [t] 141
5.3.2 Representations in orthography 142
5.3.2.1 Introduction 142
5.3.2.2 [b] and [k] 142
5.3.2.3 [g] 144
5.3.2.4 [p] 144
5.3.2.5 [d] and [t] 144
5.3.3 Conclusions 145
5.4 Palatalization of [g] and [k] 145
5.4.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 145
5.4.1.1 Palatalization of original [g] and [k] 145
5.4.1.2 Newly introduced palatalized consonants, [c], [j] and [ž] 146
5.4.2 Representations in orthography 147
5.4.2.1 Palatalization of original [g] and [k] 147
5.4.2.2 Newly introduced palatalized consonants, [c], [j] and [ž] 147
5.4.3 Conclusions 148
5.5 Assimilation of voiced to voiceless, dental to bilabial, and vice versa 148
5.5.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 148
5.5.1.1 Assimilation of voiced to voiceless 148
5.5.1.2 Assimilation of dental to bilabial 149
5.5.2 Representations in orthography 149
5.5.2.1 Assimilation of voiced to voiceless 149
5.5.2.2 Assimilation of dental to bilabial 150
5.5.3 Conclusions 150
5.6 Loss of consonants 151
5.6.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 151
5.6.1.1 Introduction 151

5.6.1.2 Loss of [ʾ] 151
5.6.1.3 Loss of [ʿ] 151
5.6.1.4 Loss of [h] 152
5.6.1.5 Loss of [y] 153
5.6.1.6 Loss of [d] and [t] 154
5.6.1.7 Loss of [w] and [f] (*b̲* and *p̲*) 154
5.6.1.8 Loss of [l] 154
5.6.1.9 Loss of [r] 154
5.6.1.10 Loss of [m] 154
5.6.1.11 Loss of [n] 154
5.6.1.12 Loss of [š] 155
5.6.2 Representations in orthography 155
5.6.2.1 Introduction 155
5.6.2.2 Loss of [ʾ] 155
5.6.2.3 Loss of [ʿ] 157
5.6.2.4 Loss of [h] 158
5.6.2.5 Loss of [y] 159
5.6.2.6 Loss of [d] and [t] 160
5.6.2.7 Loss of [w] and [f] (*b̲* and *p̲*) 160
5.6.2.8 Loss of [l] 160
5.6.2.9 Loss of [r] 160
5.6.2.10 Loss of [m] 161
5.6.2.11 Loss of [n] 161
5.6.2.12 Loss of [š] 161
5.6.2.13 Other forms with *l.o.* 161
5.6.3 Conclusions 161
5.7 Lenghtening and shortening of vowels 162
5.7.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 162
5.7.1.1 Loss of phonemic value of vowel length 162
5.7.1.2 Shortening in closed syllables 162
5.7.1.3 Lengthening in open syllables 163
5.7.1.4 Influence of stress 163
5.7.2 Representations in orthography 164
5.7.2.1 Loss of phonemic value of vowel length 164
5.7.2.2 Shortening in closed syllables 164
5.7.2.3 Lengthening in open syllables 165
5.7.2.4 Influence of stress 165
5.7.3 Conclusions 166
5.8 The vowels [i] and [iʸ] 166

5.8.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 166
5.8.1.1 [i] 166
5.8.1.2 [i^{y}] 166
5.8.2 Representations in orthography 167
5.8.2.1 [i] 167
5.8.2.2 [i^{y}] 167
5.8.3 Conclusions 168
5.9 The vowels [u] and [u^{y}] 168
5.9.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 168
5.9.1.1 [u] 168
5.9.1.2 [u^{y}] 168
5.9.2 Representations in orthography 169
5.9.2.1 Introduction 169
5.9.2.2 [u] and [u^{y}] in standard orthography 170
5.9.2.3 [u] and [u^{y}] in Socin and Merx 171
5.9.3 Conclusions 172
5.10 Other changes in vowel pronunciation 173
5.10.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 173
5.10.1.1 Change of short vowels 173
5.10.1.2 *Shewa* vowels 173
5.10.2 Representations in orthography 174
5.10.2.1 Change of short vowels 174
5.10.2.2 *Shewa* vowels 174
5.10.3 Conclusions 175
5.11 Contracted and uncontracted diphthongs 175
5.11.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 175
5.11.1.1 Contracted diphthongs 175
5.11.1.2 Uncontracted diphthongs 177
5.11.2 Representations in orthography 177
5.11.2.1 Contracted diphthongs 177
5.11.2.2 Uncontracted diphthongs 179
5.11.3 Conclusions 180
5.12 Emphasis 180
5.12.1 Phonological and phonetic changes 180
5.12.2 Representations in orthography 182
5.12.3 Conclusions 183
5.13 Summary and conclusions 184
5.13.1 The phonemes of UA and their representations 184
5.13.1.1 Consonants 184

5.13.1.2 Vowels 185
5.13.2 Conclusions 185

6 Morphology and morphosyntax: a survey 189
6.1 Introduction 189
6.2 Pronouns and pronominal elements 190
6.2.1 Introduction 190
6.2.2 Independent personal pronouns (nominative) 190
6.2.3 Demonstrative pronouns: near 191
6.2.4 Demonstrative pronouns: far 191
6.2.5 Interrogative pronouns 192
6.2.6 Suffixed pronouns i: oblique case 192
6.2.7 Suffixed pronouns ii: oblique case 193
6.2.8 Suffixed pronouns iii (= copula): nominative case 193
6.2.9 Suffixed pronouns iv: nominative case 195
6.3 Substantives and adjectives 195
6.3.1 Introduction 195
6.3.2 Substantive formation 196
6.3.3 Gender 197
6.3.4 Number 197
6.3.5 State 198
6.3.6 Genitive 198
6.3.7 Adjectives 199
6.4 Adverbs, prepositions and sentence connectives 200
6.4.1 Adverbs 200
6.4.2 Prepositions 200
6.4.3 Sentence connectives 201
6.5 Verbs 201
6.5.1 Introduction 201
6.5.2 Stemforms and stempatterns 201
6.5.3 Classes of weak verbs 203
6.5.4 Imperative stem 204
6.5.5 Subjunctive stem 205
6.5.6 Preterite stem 206
6.5.7 Infinitive stem 206
6.5.8 Participle stem 207
6.5.9 Some irregular verbs 208
6.6 Verbs with object suffixes 209
6.6.1 Introduction 209

6.6.2 The five stemforms with object suffixes 209
6.6.2.1 IMP stem 209
6.6.2.2 SUB stem 210
6.6.2.3 PRET stem 210
6.6.2.4 INF and PART stem 211
6.6.3 Some remarks on the syntax of object marking 211
6.7 Tense and aspect 213
6.8 Pseudo-verbs 214
6.9 A classification of LUA predicates 215
6.10 Conclusions 217

7 Copular clauses 219
7.1 Introduction 219
7.1.1 Copular clauses 219
7.1.2 Some features of copular clauses in LUA 220
7.1.3 Arrangement of the chapter 221
7.2 Incomplete copular clauses 222
7.2.1 Introduction 222
7.2.2 Clauses with consecutive predicates 223
7.2.3 Relative clauses 225
7.2.4 Adverbial clauses 226
7.2.5 Attributively employed infinitives 228
7.2.6 Main and reported clauses 229
7.2.7 Conclusions 231
7.3 Affirmative main clauses 232
7.3.1 Introduction 232
7.3.2 Unmarked copular clauses with pronominal subjects (Pc) 232
7.3.3 Copular clauses with preverbal pronominal subjects (SpronPc) 234
7.3.4 Copular clauses with preverbal nominal subjects (SnounPc) 237
7.3.5 Introductory clauses (SPdemc) 238
7.3.6 Copular clauses with post-predicate subjects (Pc, Ta) 239
7.3.7 Clauses with independent copula (SCP) 242
7.3.8 Clauses with cleft predicates (SPcP) 244
7.3.9 Conclusions 247
7.4 Clauses with enclitic copula attached to non-predicate constituents 248
7.4.1 Introduction 248

7.4.2 Identifying clauses (SproncP) 249
7.4.3 Pseudo-cleft clauses (XcP) 252
7.4.4 Conclusions 254
7.5 Subordinate clauses 254
7.5.1 Introduction 254
7.5.2 Subordinate clauses in the texts of Merx and Socin 256
7.5.2.1 Reported clauses 256
7.5.2.2 Adverbial clauses 256
7.5.2.3 Relative clauses 257
7.5.3 Subordinate clauses in BT and ZdB 259
7.5.3.1 Reported clauses 259
7.5.3.2 Adverbial clauses 260
7.5.3.3 Relative clauses 261
7.5.4 Subordinate clauses in the texts of Bedjan 263
7.5.4.1 Reported clauses 263
7.5.4.2 Adverbial clauses 263
7.5.4.3 Relative clauses 264
7.5.5 Conclusions 265
7.6 Negative clauses 266
7.6.1 Introduction 266
7.6.2 Negative copula without predicate 266
7.6.3 Negative clauses with pronominal subject 266
7.6.4 Negative clauses with explicit subject 267
7.6.5 Clauses with post-clausal negative copula 269
7.6.6 Conclusions 269
7.7 Interrogative clauses 270
7.7.1 Introduction 270
7.7.2 Yes-no questions 271
7.7.3 Basic WH-questions 271
7.7.4 WH-questions with interrogatives attached to the predicate 272
7.7.5 WH-questions with explicit subject 272
7.7.6 WH-questions with fronted subject 273
7.7.7 Embedded interrogative clauses 274
7.7.8 Conclusions 275
7.8 Name-giving 275
7.8.1 Introduction 275
7.8.2 Main name-giving clauses 276
7.8.3 Relative name-giving clauses 276
7.8.4 Conclusions 278

7.9 Presentative copula, *duli* and *weli* 278
7.9.1 Introduction 278
7.9.2 Presentative copula with nominal predicates 278
7.9.3 Presentative copula with verbal noun predicates 279
7.9.4 Presentative copula with finite verbs 279
7.9.5 Conclusions 280
7.10 Clauses with finite copula 280
7.10.1 Introduction 280
7.10.2 Regular clauses with copular *hwāyā* 281
7.10.3 Other constituent orders 283
7.10.4 Other functions of *hwāyā* 284
7.10.5 Clauses with copular *pyāšā* 285
7.10.6 Clauses with copular *pyāšā* and post-verbal subject 286
7.10.7 Conclusions 287
7.11 Summary and conclusions 287
7.11.1 Conditions governing constituent order in copular clauses 287
7.11.2 Differences between the text types 290

8 Verbal clauses 293
8.1 Introduction 293
8.1.1 Verbal syntax 293
8.1.2 Overview 293
8.1.3 Arrangement of the chapter 295
8.2 Basic orders 296
8.2.1 Introduction 296
8.2.2 Verbal clauses without explicit subject or object 297
8.2.3 Clauses with nominal objects (VO) 298
8.2.4 Verbs complemented by prepositional phrases (VX) 300
8.2.5 The order of verbal complements 301
8.2.6 Clauses with VS order 304
8.2.7 Clauses with SV order 308
8.2.8 Clauses with explicit subject and verbal complements 312
8.2.9 The position of other constituents 314
8.2.10 Conclusions 316
8.3 Clauses with fronted verbal complements 317
8.3.1 Introduction 317
8.3.2 Fronted objects with focus function (OV) 317
8.3.3 Fronting of prepositional phrases (XV) 319
8.3.4 Fronted verbal complements with topic function 320

8.3.5 Clauses with fronted complements and explicit subjects 321
8.3.6 Conclusions 324
8.4 Other orders 324
8.4.1 Introduction 324
8.4.2 Clauses with pre-clausal constituents with explicit reference 325
8.4.3 Clauses with pre-clausal object-like constituents 326
8.4.4 Clauses with intra-clausal sentence adverbs 327
8.4.5 Clauses with clause-end subjects 328
8.4.6 Clauses with clause-end objects 331
8.4.7 Clauses with post-clausal constituents 332
8.4.8 Clauses with post-clausal constituents introduced by *ya'ni* 333
8.4.9 Conclusions 335
8.5 Negative clauses 335
8.5.1 Introduction 335
8.5.2 Negation of the verbal phrase 336
8.5.3 Negation of other constituents 337
8.5.4 Conclusions 338
8.6 Interrogative clauses 338
8.6.1 Introduction 338
8.6.2 Yes-no questions 338
8.6.3 WH-questions 339
8.6.4 Embedded questions 341
8.6.5 Conclusions 341
8.7 Imperative clauses 341
8.7.1 Introduction 341
8.7.2 Clauses with basic order 342
8.7.3 Clauses with fronted verbal complements 343
8.7.4 Conclusions 343
8.8 Summary and conclusions 343
8.8.1 Conditions governing LUA constituent order 343
8.8.2 Relations between copular and verbal constituent order types 346
8.8.3 The differences between the text types 347
9 Conclusions 349
9.1 Overview 349
9.1.1 Introduction 349
9.1.2 The initial period 349

9.1.3 Standardization 350
9.1.4 The 'classical' period 351
9.2 Influences on the development of LUA 353
9.2.1 Introduction 353
9.2.2 Socio-historical factors 353
9.2.3 Linguistic factors 355
9.3 The language 357
9.3.1 Introduction 357
9.3.2 Features of LUA mainly due to influence of other languages 357
9.3.3 Distinctive features of Literary Urmia Aramaic 359
9.4 Evaluation 361
9.4.1 Literary Urmia Aramaic 361
9.4.2 Further research 362

Texts **363**
1. On the subject of repentance (1841/1842) 365
2. The early Bible translation: Gospel of Matthew, chapter 2 (1846) 370
3. The early Bible translation: Ruth (1852) 372
4. The revised Bible translation: Gospel of Matthew, chapter 2 (1893) 378
5. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* 1849/1: Introduction 380
6. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* 1849/1: Education - Schools 380
7. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* 1849/1: About *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* 384
8. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* 1849/1: Miscellaneous news on the Pope, cholera, the Sandwich Islands, Washington, and Mr. Layard's discoveries 386
9. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* 1871/12: True fear of God 390
10. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* 1871/12: The great fire of Chicago 394
11. Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament: Gospel of Matthew, chapter 2 (1877) 398
12. The writings of Paul Bedjan: *Taš'ita Qaddišta — Histoire Sainte* (1888), chapter 53: Ruth, the Moabitess 400
13. The writings of Paul Bedjan: *Xayyi d-Qaddīšī — Vies des Saints* (1912), St. Thecla and her four martyr friends, daughters of the covenant 402
14. Remembrance of the Archbishop of Canterbury (1896) 408

Bibliography **413**

Indexes **436**

FOREWORD

It was in March 1989, almost exactly ten years ago, that Prof. Gideon Goldenberg of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem gave a course in Urmia Neo-Aramaic in Leiden. At that time I had just started my graduate work in Neo-Aramaic, under the inspiring supervision of Prof. Lukas Van Rompay, professor of Aramaic Languages and Cultures at Leiden University. He had introduced me to the work of the nineteenth-century American Presbyterian missionaries who translated the Bible into the Neo-Aramaic language of the Urmia region in northwestern Persia and had encouraged me to engage in a study of this relatively unknown Semitic language. My graduate work in Neo-Aramaic led to dissertation research, which was executed in the years 1991 to 1995, at the department of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Ugaritic Languages and Cultures of Leiden University. The project was funded for by a grant from the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). The resulting dissertation, entitled 'From a Spoken to a Written Language. The Introduction and Development of Literary Urmia Aramaic in the Nineteenth Century' was defended at Leiden University in October 1995.

In the years following the defense I pursued the subject of the thesis in two directions: into the history of the American mission in Urmia, and into the history of the printing press of the American missionaries in this town. A further grant from NWO enabled me to pay a four-month visit to Harvard University in Cambridge (MA). In its libraries, Houghton Library, Widener Library, and the Andover library of the Divinity School, many additional materials on the history of the American Board mission in Urmia were found. Most of the research of this period was laid down in separate articles, but the general outlines are included in the present work. In addition, I re-edited and translated a number of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century texts in Literary Urmia Aramaic.

Books are never written alone. I first of all want to acknowledge my indebtedness to those whom I did not have the opportunity to meet in person: to the nineteenth-century missionary-scholars who laid the foundation for the study of Neo-Aramaic, and, in our century, to Prof. H.J. Polotsky of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem, whose rich and diverse work on Neo-Aramaic was introduced to me by his pupils.

It is a pleasant duty to thank my colleagues from the Leiden Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, especially those of the former Department of Hebrew, Aramaic, and Ugaritic Languages and Cultures. Prof. J. Hoftijzer and Karel Jongeling are prominent among those who gave me a sound philological training, whereas the friendship and good advice of Ineke van der Dool, Judith Frishman, Dirk Kruisheer, Alessandro Mengozzi, and Bas ter Haar Romeny deserve to be singled out. I also thank my present colleagues in the Faculty of Theology, especially those of the Department of Church History, for their enduring interest in matters so far removed from European Church History.

Many colleagues around the world helped me in locating the materials necessary and supported me with their friendship and sharing of ideas. I thank Wolfhart Heinrichs, Robert Hoberman, Simon Hopkins, Otto Jastrow, Olga Kapeliuk, Geoffrey Khan, Fabrizio Pennacchietti, Bruno Poizat, Yona Sabar, Jasmin Sinha, Shabo Talay, Martin Tamcke, and Daniel Wolk for their help and friendship.

I am grateful as well to those members of the Assyrian community who expressed sincere interest in my research and who helped me in many different ways. Special thanks I offer to Mark and Madlen Mkrdichian, Francis Sarguis, as well as to Mar Bawai Soro and his sisters Lena and Shami with their families. Their hospitality and friendship, as well as their willingness to share with me so much of their insights into the Assyrian community have greatly enriched my understanding of nineteenth- and twentieth-century history.

Thanks also to all friends and family members: those who attracted my attention to things other than Neo-Aramaic and those who during all these ten years did not loose interest in the proceedings of my work. Special thanks to my friend Gerda van der Haar, who, together with Bas ter Haar Romeny, was of great help during the preparations for the defense of the thesis in 1995.

A few people contributed more fundamentally to this book.

Prof. Gideon Goldenberg from the very beginning in 1989 never lost track of my wanderings in Neo-Aramaic and always was ready to give good advice on whatever topic I consulted him;

Dr. Chip (J.F.) Coakley, the only person with whom I could discuss the lives and works of nineteenth-century missionaries in Urmia as if they were mutual acquaintances, contributed greatly to my research in all its stages, especially during my stays in Cambridge (MA) in 1996 and 1998.

Prof. Lukas Van Rompay, my supervisor in Leiden, was the person who aroused my interest in the Syrian Churches and who set me on the trail of the American missionaries and of Neo-Aramaic. He also willingly and minutely read over my work, from its initial stages until the very last proof-sheets.

My parents, Adam and Tjallie van den Berg-Meijer, always encouraged my curiosity, in whatever directions it ventured.

And lastly, my dear husband Jan, who endured my absences without complains, who always was willing to hear me out on my latest discoveries, and who never lost faith in the final outcome.

I offer you all my heartfelt thanks.

Heleen Murre-van den Berg
Leiden, March 1999

ABBREVIATIONS

Texts

BT	the Protestant Bible translations in their first editions, OT of 1852 and NT of 1846.
BT '93	the revised version of 1893 (Protestant press)
BT 1906	the Anglican LUA translation of the NT Epistles of 1906
Duval	Duval (1886)
HS	Paul Bedjan, *Histoire Sainte* (1888)
Kam	Kampffmeyer (1905)
Im	Paul Bedjan, *Imitatio Christi* (1885)
Teachings	*Teachings from the Word of God* (1841)
MdP	Paul Bedjan, *Manuel de Piété* (1886)
Merx	Merx (1873)
Osip	Osipoff (1913)
Socin	Socin (1882)
Syl	Paul Bedjan, *Syllabaire Chaldéen* (1886)
VdS	Paul Bedjan, *Vies des Saints* (1912)
ZdB	*Zahrīri d-Bahrā* 'Rays of Light'

Grammatical terms

C	independent copula
c	enclitic copula
c	common (masculine and feminine)
encl.	enclitic
DO	direct object
f	feminine
FUT	future marker
HAB	marker of 'habitual'
IO	indirect object
l.o.	*linea occultans*
m	masculine
O	object
o	object suffix attached to verbal form
OBJ	object marker
P	predicate
P1	special position
PAST	past marker
pl	plural
REL	relative marker, introducing a relative clause
REP	marker introducing a reported clause
S	subject
s	subject suffix attached to verbal form
Snoun	nominal subject

S_{pron}	pronominal subject
Sa	sentence adverb
Sc	sentence connective
sg	singular
SUB	marker of subjunctive
suf.	pronominal suffix
X	one or more complements (usually prepositional) to the verb

Other

A	Arabic
ABCFM	American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions
ABS	American Bible Society
ATS	American Tract Society
AzT	Azeri Turkish
BFBS	British and Foreign Bible Society
CMS	Church Missionary Society
CS	Classical Syriac
K	Kurdish
LUA	Literary Urmia Aramaic
Md	dictionary of Maclean (1901)
Mg	grammar of Maclean (1895)
MH	*Missionary Herald*
Mt	the transcription in Maclean's dictionary
NA	Neo-Aramaic
NENA	Northeastern Neo-Aramaic
P	Persian
RGS	Royal Geographical Society
SPCK	Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge
SPG	Society for the Propagation of the Gospel
Sv	Soviet script (*Novyj Alfavit*)
UA	Urmia Aramaic (the spoken dialect)

MAP

The country of the Aramaic-speaking Christians in the nineteenth century

1
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Preliminaries

1.1.1 *Literary Urmia Aramaic*

In the first half of the nineteenth century, the Northeastern Neo-Aramaic vernacular of the Assyrian Christians[1] of the Urmia-region in northwestern Iran was shaped into a written language. This new literary language was introduced by American Presbyterian missionaries arriving in Urmia in 1835. The development of this new literary language, the historical circumstances of its growth, its acceptance by the local people and its grammatical and syntactical characteristics are the subject of the present research. The First World War marks the end of the formative period of this literary language, because in the years following the war, the Assyrian Christians were dispersed to a number of countries in which the literary tradition was continued in different ways. The present study, therefore, ends with 1914. Before discussing the main objectives of this study, I will present a brief overview of the history of the literary Aramaic languages and of the position of Urmia Aramaic among the present-day dialects of Aramaic

1.1.2 *Literary Aramaic*

The first pieces of written Aramaic are attested in the ninth century BC, when Aramaic was the language of a number of small kingdoms in northern Syria. The dialects of *Old Aramaic* differ considerably according to their place of provenance. The rise and spread of the Assyrian, and later of the Persian Achaemenid Empire in the seventh and sixth century BC made one of the Aramaic dialects the lingua franca of the Middle East, both in its spoken and its written forms. This language, in its written form, is commonly called *Imperial Aramaic*. This position of Aramaic was maintained during the years of the Persian dominance in this region. Greenfield assumes that in these years a 'literary' Aramaic (i.e., used for literature) emerged, 'Standard Literary Aramaic', alongside the official Imperial Aramaic language. Standard Literary Aramaic, like Imperial Aramaic, probably has its

1. On the different names for these Christians, see 2.1.3.

origins in an Eastern Aramaic dialect, but is colored with the traits of the spoken Aramaic dialects of the region in which the texts were written.[2]

When, in the third and second centuries BC, Greek gradually took over the lingua franca position of Imperial Aramaic, the literary form of Aramaic continued to be used in various parts of the former Persian Empire. This literary tradition, which came to its close in the second century CE, is represented by the Aramaic texts from Qumran (between the second century BC and first centuries CE) and the early Targums. Around the beginning of the Christian era, a number of local dialects acquired the status of an official language, in the kingdoms of Palmyra, Hatra, Petra, and Edessa. In this period, that of *Middle Aramaic*, according to Fitzmyer's subdivision of the history of the Aramaic language, the differences between the various written dialects became more prominent.

From the third century onwards, the main religious groups of the Middle East employed various forms of Aramaic as their literary language. Jews, Christians, Samaritans, and Mandeans all employed Aramaic. Among these, the Jews and Christians each developed two separate traditions, one in the western part of the Middle East (Jewish Palestinian and Christian Palestinian Aramaic) and one in northern Syria and Mesopotamia (Babylonian Aramaic and Classical Syriac[3]). Other literary languages were employed to communicate with people outside one's own religious group. In the first centuries this was Greek, whereas from the seventh century onwards Arabic fulfilled this role. In the Parthian and later Sassanian Empire, Persian was the main literary language.

The various Aramaic literary languages of this period, taken together as *Late Aramaic*, can been seen as the successors of the earlier Standard Literary Aramaic. This standard language, however, became colored more and more by the local Aramaic dialects. The dialectal differentiation between Western and Eastern Aramaic, traces of which already can be discerned in the periods of Old and Imperial Aramaic, becomes clearly visible in the different literary languages of Late Aramaic. However, the exact lines of mutual influence between the various local dialects as well as the continuation of the earlier Standard Literary Aramaic still need further research.[4]

The literary languages of Late Aramaic were kept in use in their respective communities during the Islamic period, and up till the present day. The

2. Greenfield 1974.

3. On the standardization of CS, see Van Rompay 1994.

4. On the history of literary Aramaic, see Greenfield 1974, Greenfield 1978, Fitzmyer 1979, Boyarin 1981, and Muraoka 1983/4. The classification followed here is the one proposed by Fitzmyer.

literary languages of their neighbors, like Arabic, Persian and later also Turkish, were employed only to a limited extent. Today Jewish (Babylonian and Palestinian), Samaritan, and Mandean Aramaic are employed as liturgical languages, whereas Classical Syriac is employed not only as a liturgical, but also as a literary language within the Syrian Orthodox Church and the Church of the East.[5] Most of the communities employing these literary Aramaic languages also employed — and some still employ — Aramaic dialects for their daily communication.

1.1.3 *Neo-Aramaic*

The Aramaic dialect of Urmia, which became the basis for the literary language, is one of the Aramaic dialects that survived until the present day. These Neo-Aramaic dialects consist of four groups, all of which are still spoken in the Middle East.[6]

(i) *Western Neo-Aramaic*. This group consists of the dialects of the three villages Maʿlula, Baxʿa, and Jubbʿadin in western Syria. It is the only remnant of the dialects of Western Aramaic in the earlier periods. The Aramaic speakers living in Maʿlula are Christians, belonging to the Greek-Orthodox and Greek-Catholic Churches, whereas the inhabitants of the two other villages became Muslims two or three centuries ago.[7]

(ii) *Central Neo-Aramaic*. The main dialect of this group of Neo-Aramaic dialects is *Ṭuroyo*, spoken in the mountainous region of Ṭur ʿAbdin in southeastern Turkey, the main towns of the region being Mardin and Midyat, its eastern border being the Tigris. A large number of Ṭuroyo speakers have emigrated to Western Europe, establishing large communities in Sweden, Germany and The Netherlands. The nearly extinct dialect of the town *Mlaḥso*, northwest of Midyat, probably constitutes a remnant of a separate group of Central Neo-Aramaic dialects. The speakers of these central dialects nearly all are Syrian Orthodox Christians.[8]

(iii) *Northeastern Neo-Aramaic*. This group of dialects comprises the largest number of different dialects, and its region extends from Lake Van in Turkish Kurdistan to Sanandaj in Persian Kurdistan, and from Lake Urmia to Mosul. In the west, the river Tigris constitutes the border line between the Central and the Northeastern dialects of Neo-Aramaic. The inter-

5. Brock 1989.

6. Hoberman 1989: 3-9 and Heinrichs 1990. For a concise overview of the grammatical structure of the respective dialects, see Jastrow 1997.

7. For a collection of texts in these dialects, see Arnold 1989-1991, and for the most important grammatical studies, see Correll 1969 and 1978, and Arnold 1990.

8. On these dialects, see Jastrow 1967/1993, 1986, and 1994.

nal classification of the Northeastern dialects is difficult, and until now no satisfactory study has been published on this subject.[9] It is possible that a dialect division has to be assumed between the Jewish and the Christian dialects, because in a number of places Jewish and Christian dialects were hardly mutually intelligible. However, most of the differences between the Jewish and Christian dialects correspond to the differences between the main Christian dialects. Jewish dialects were to be found in Turkish towns like Van and Bashkale, in the towns of Iraqi Kurdistan, like Zakho, in northwestern Persia in Urmia and Salmas, and in Persian Kurdistan, in towns like Sanandaj and Kerend. Nearly all Jews of eastern Turky, Iran and Iraq have emigrated to Israel.[10]

Maclean, in 1895, proposed to divide the Christian dialects of this group into four main groups: (I) the 'Urmi group', consisting of the dialects of the Urmia plain, extending southwards to Solduz; (II) the 'Northern group', consisting of the dialects of the northern part of the mountains, i.e., Gawar and Jilu, and the region around Salmas; (III) the 'Ashiret group', consisting of the dialects of the tribes (i.e., *āširāti*) living in the Hakkari mountains, like the Tiari and Tkhuma tribes; and (IV) the 'Southern group', consisting of the dialects of the regions of Alqosh, Bohtan, and Zakho.[11] Further research is needed to see whether this classification is still valid. The dialect of Urmia, which was at the basis of the literary language, belongs to group I. The present situation of these dialects differs considerably from that in the nineteenth century, because a majority of the speakers no longer live in the same region. According to Odisho, the mixing of Christian dialects of the Hakkari mountains and the Alqosh region with the literary dialect of Urmia led to the development of an *Iraqi Koine*.[12] The same type of mixing can be assumed for the speakers of Northeastern Neo-Aramaic in various parts of the former Soviet Union and in Iran.

(iv) *Southeastern Neo-Aramaic*. The fourth, very small, group of Neo-Aramaic dialects consists of Mandaic dialects, spoken by Mandeans in Iran (Khuzistan) and in southern Iraq.[13]

The exact relationship between the modern dialects and the earlier, Late Aramaic literary languages is difficult to establish. The Western Neo-Aramaic dialects originate in Western Aramaic, and the three other groups,

9. See Hoberman 1989: 6-8.

10. For an overview of the research into Jewish Aramaic, of the history of the Jews of Kurdistan, and an extensive bibliography, see Hopkins 1993. For texts, see, a.o., Sabar 1984, 1991, 1994, Avinery 1988, Zaken 1997, and Israeli 1997.

11. Maclean 1895: xiii-xv, and Maclean 1901: ix-xi.

12. Odisho 1988.

13. Macuch 1989 and 1993.

Central, Northeastern and Southeastern, originate in Eastern Aramaic. However, none of the modern dialects can be considered to be a direct descendant of one of the literary languages; all of them originate in forms of Aramaic that were not transmitted as a literary language. In a sketch of the relationship between the Late and the Modern Aramaic dialects, Hoberman proposes to consider both the Central and the Northeastern dialects as originating in dialects somewhere between Classical Syriac[14] and Babylonian Aramaic, the Northeastern dialects being closer related to the latter and the Central dialects to the former.[15]

Thus, the Christian dialect of Urmia, which often is referred to as 'Modern Syriac', is not linguistically closer to Classical Syriac than to Babylonian Aramaic, whereas the Ṭuroyo dialect in many respects is closer to Classical Syriac than the Northeastern dialects. However, the continuous literary tradition from Classical Syriac to 'Modern Syriac' provides some justification for the use of this epithet for the written Neo-Aramaic dialect of Urmia. In the present work I will use the term *Urmia Aramaic* (UA) for the spoken dialect of the Urmia plain and *Literary Urmia Aramaic* (LUA) for the written language that was based on the Urmia dialect. The *Northeastern Neo-Aramaic* dialects are referred to as NENA dialects.

1.2 Aims of the present research

1.2.1 *The study of Literary Urmia Aramaic*

Among the wealth of Neo-Aramaic studies that have been issued from 1838 down to the present,[16] no studies have been devoted solely to Literary Urmia Aramaic as it developed in the nineteenth century.[17] In the publications from the nineteenth century, the data from the literary texts are usually not separated from data taken from the spoken language. In modern studies, the main emphasis is on the spoken language forms. The basic presumption underlying the present study is that a literary language, in this case, the literary Urmia dialect, deserves to be studied in its own right, being the result of a conscious shaping of a vernacular language to suit the needs of a literate community.

14. CS even displays certain features of Western Aramaic, cf. Boyarin 1981.
15. Hoberman 1989: 7, referring in particular to Blau 1968: 605 n. 1.
16. The first publication in the field of NA linguistics is Rödiger 1838.
17. For an overview of all linguistic studies on Neo-Aramaic of the last two centuries, see the 'Annotated Bibliography' in Krotkoff 1990. The earlier bibliography of Poizat (Poizat 1973-1979) also includes works on the history of the speakers of Neo-Aramaic.

Although nineteenth-century LUA as yet has not been described from this point of view, a number of studies pay attention to the features of this literary language. Most important in this respect are the three grammars of Urmia Aramaic that appeared in the last century. These studies were mainly based on the literary language, and as such they provide valuable information on the grammar of LUA.

The first of these is the grammar written by D.T. Stoddard in 1855. Its author was one of the Protestant missionaries in Urmia and was actively involved in the shaping of the literary language. In his grammar he intended to describe the correct forms of the literary language, being aware of the fact that the written form is not entirely identical with the spoken vernacular (cf. 4.2.4). When Nöldeke in 1868 published his grammar 'der neusyrischen Sprache', the texts of the Protestant mission press provided his main source of data. He further employed a few short texts by Chaldean priests of Khosrowa, who were native speakers of the Salmas dialect. For most of the vernacular forms he was dependent on Stoddard's work. In his introduction, Nöldeke indicates that he is aware of the differences between the spoken language and the literary language of the missionaries, as well as of the influence of Classical Syriac on the written form.[18] However, his limited range of sources did not enable him to evaluate the various types of the literary language and their relation to the spoken language. The Anglican missionary Maclean acquired a good insight into the relations between the various Northeastern Neo-Aramaic dialects, and his grammar, which appeared in 1895, paid much attention to the variant forms in the respective dialects. He employed these dialect differences to gain support for a much more historical spelling of LUA, with the object of creating a supradialectal form of the literary language (cf. 4.4).

In the twentieth century two other grammars appeared that are of importance for a better understanding of LUA. The older of the two, the grammar of Marogulov that was published in 1935, describes the literary language in use in the Soviet Union of the thirties. This language is a linear descendant of nineteenth-century LUA, and therefore this description is of considerable importance for the study of the earlier phases of the language, even more so because the writer was a trained linguist and a native speaker. In 1964, Tsereteli published a grammar of 'Standard Assyrian'.[19] Although he does not clearly state what he understands by 'Standard Assyrian', the language

18. Nöldeke 1868: xxvii-xxviii.

19. The literary language was given the name *Modern Standard Assyrian* in Tsereteli 1978, Odisho 1988 used the name *Standard Written Language* (SWL).

is described as the language originating in the language standardized by the missionaries of the last century.[20] The author does not indicate which texts he employed, and does not pay attention to differences between various texts in LUA, or between the spoken and the written language. However, in spite of these uncertainties, this grammar helps in understanding the conventions of LUA.

In modern studies in which the spoken dialects of Neo-Aramaic are the subject of description, the literary language of the last century is hardly touched upon. The articles of Polotsky constitute the most notable exception to this tendency. In his work on 'Modern Syriac', Polotsky made use of a large number of publications in LUA, from the nineteenth as well as from the twentieth centuries.[21] His findings illustrate several grammatical and orthographical problems of the literary language, whereas he also drew attention to a number of differences between texts of different provenance in LUA, in particular between the texts from the Protestant press and the publications of Paul Bedjan. In none of his articles, however, these observations on the heterogeneity of LUA have led to a theory on the development of the literary language or to an evaluation of the contributions of the various mission presses.

The literary language of Urmia, therefore, needs further description to enable us to evaluate the contribution of the mission presses as well as of the native writers of the last century. The existing descriptions of LUA hardly pay attention to the differences between the various texts that together constitute the corpus of LUA, or to the changes in the language that can be discerned in the course of the nineteenth century. A further description of the literary language is needed, paying special attention to the differences between the texts of different provenance and of different periods.

1.2.2 *Language development*

The study of a literary language, however, should not consist only of a description of the literary language itself. For an adequate understanding of the developments and variation in the language, a study of the historical context in which the literary language was introduced and further developed is indispensable. The interaction between the historical and linguistic

20. Tsereteli 1978: 18.

21. Polotsky 1961, 1979, 1984-86, 1994, and 1996. The article of 1996, being an extensive review of the Italian translation of Tsereteli's grammar (1970), was written already in 1973/1974. After Polotsky's death in 1991, O. Kapeliuk prepared the manuscript for publication.

developments becomes visible only in a study that takes both aspects into account.

This twofold description of a literary language, historical and linguistic, is a prominent feature of the contributions in the volumes edited by István Fodor and Claude Hagège, entitled *Language Reform. History and Future* (1983-1994). In the introductory article of Hagège and in the 'Scheme of the articles' by Fodor, the main issues with regard to language development are discussed.[22] I will summarize the lines set out by Fodor, and add a few points brought forward by Hagège.

Fodor proposes to discuss language reform from three viewpoints: (i) brief history of the reform; (ii) external factors; (iii) internal factors.

In the historical overview, the initiators of the reform, the main participants, the participation of linguists, the role of the media (including the press), the ideological basis, grammatical studies resulting from the reform, and the possible influence of other reforms should provide insight into the context of the reform. The second part, on 'external factors', is meant to focus on the context of the language itself. What is the relationship of the new literary language to other literary languages in use, and to the vernacular language? What are the functions of the new literary language? In the overview of Hagège, the 'action externe' mainly is a matter of 'standardisation': which dialect became the standard dialect, and why?[23] This second part, therefore, is concerned as much with the historical context as the foregoing, but concentrates on the issues that are directly relevant to the language itself. In the third part, the actual changes in a language due to the reform are to be described, i.e., the 'internal factors'. These changes may range from orthography to syntax, but Fodor and Hagège put much emphasis on the changes in the field of lexicology, i.e., the modernization of the lexicon by borrowing, loan translations, derivation, and composition.

This description of language reform as proposed by Fodor proves to be a fruitful scheme for the description of different types of language reform and language planning, as can be seen from the articles in the above mentioned volumes. Whether it concerns language planning by the government, language academies or private institutions, whether it concerns the introduction of a completely new literary language or the reform of an old literary language, the description of history and language together provides some

22. Hagège 1983 I and Fodor 1983/4 III: 452-3 (Appendix I). In Hagège's article, the main points of Fodor are further developed (in a slightly different order) and applied to different contexts.

23. Hagège 1983: 13-15.

insight into the complicated process of human interference with languages, and shows that the difficulties of initiators and users in completely different situations have much in common.

In my opinion, the description of the literary language of Urmia can benefit from this approach of language reform. The diachronic developments as well as the synchronic variation in the literary language are closely related to the historical developments in the period under discussion. A satisfactory language description, therefore, will be dependent on our knowledge of the history of the community in which the language was employed and of the history of the language itself.

Until now, studies of LUA have not paid much attention to the historical context of the introduction of the literary language, whereas most of the historical studies, albeit mentioning the achievements of the literary language, do not attempt to connect the external history of the language with the internal developments. The only study that, to a certain extent, takes both aspects into account is the history of 'Modern Syriac' literature by Rudolf Macuch (1976). His work on the history of the Urmia mission presses and the publications of native writers is complemented by a number of remarks on the orthographical conventions of LUA, referring to the conventions that are followed by different writers and presses. However, Macuch does not attempt to provide a systematic overview of these conventions, and does not pay attention to differences in other parts of grammar.[24]

Consequently, the present study aims at providing new insights into the development of the literary language of Urmia in the nineteenth century by describing the two aspects of this development: (i) the historical context of the introduction and development of LUA, and (ii) the distinctive characteristics of LUA in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

1.2.3 *Choice of subjects*

1.2.3.1 With regard to the historical context of the introduction and development of LUA, various questions will be studied (chapters 2 to 4).

Chapter 2 will be devoted to the socio-cultural position of the Assyrians just before the arrival of the Western missions, enabling us to understand the great impact of the changes brought upon by the Western missionaries. This overview includes a brief history of the Church of the East.

Chapter 3 deals with the missionary activities in this region in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The first of these missions, a Protes-

24. For an extensive review of this work, see Brock 1978.

tant mission under the responsibility of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions (ABCFM), initiated the use of the literary language and played a major role in the further development through its active use of the mission press. The Roman Catholic and Anglican missions, arriving later, followed the Protestant mission in their use of the literary language in their mission work, and so greatly stimulated the further spread of LUA. The history of the Western missions is presented within the context of the socio-cultural and political history of the region.

In chapter 4, the main subject of the historical part is presented, viz. the description of the introduction and development of the literary language. The preparations by the Protestant missionaries, the arrival of their printing press, the main publications, the contributions of the other mission presses and the contributions of native writers will be presented. The LUA texts that are employed in the second part of this study will be mentioned and briefly situated in their historical context. The history of the literary language will be preceded by a description of the language situation just before the arrival of the Western missions. Attention will be paid to the ways in which the various local dialects were used and to the status and functions of the literary languages in use at that time.[25]

1.2.3.2 The remaining chapters will be devoted to the description of a number of distinctive characteristics of LUA in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. A complete description of this language, of course, is impossible within the range of a restricted research project. A limited number of subjects have been chosen on the basis of two main questions that are of specific interest for the description of the character of the newly introduced literary language.

The first series of questions concerns the different types of texts that together constitute the corpus of nineteenth-century LUA. The fact that the use of the literary language spread from the Assyrians connected with the Protestant mission to all Assyrians, with various confessional backgrounds, is evidence for the fact that the introduction of LUA had been successful. This extension to other groups at the same time resulted in a language that was largely dependent on the character of the texts originating in these different groups. Therefore it is important to know what the specific characteristics of these different texts types are, how the differences between them

25. Note that this distinction is not the same as that between Fodor's (cf. 1.2.2) 'historic overview' and 'external factors'. Most of the issues suggested by Fodor for these two subjects are treated in my second part, on the language, whereas I add a more extensive overview of the general history, in order to provide the necessary background information.

are to be explained, and whether the different text types did influence each other.

The second series of questions is about the relationship of LUA to the vernacular language and to existing literary languages, in particular to Classical Syriac. A new literary language never stands alone, but is always related to a vernacular language on the one hand, and to one or more existing literary languages on the other. In the case of LUA, one might ask to what extent LUA reflects the vernacular dialect of Urmia, or perhaps other dialects from the same region, and in what respects the literary language differs from these dialects. In addition, one may ask to what extent Classical Syriac, and perhaps other literary languages like Persian, have influenced the shape of LUA.[26]

These two fields of interest in the description of the literary language led me to choose two main subjects which might help to provide answers to these questions.

The first subject to be dealt with concerns the relationship between orthography and phonology (chapter 5). It is clear from the outset that the orthography differs from one mission press to another and sometimes from one author to another. Orthographical features, therefore, constitute an important characteristic of a group of texts belonging to the same circle of readers and writers. The orthographical conventions are largely influenced by Classical Syriac, but to a different extent in the various presses. In all of them, the influence of the classical literary language became clearly visible in the orthographical conventions. At the same time, the influence of the spoken language can be discerned in texts in which the spelling departs further from CS orthography.

The second subject concerns constituent order syntax (chapter 7 and 8). Here too, it will be obvious that there are important differences between the various text groups. As will be seen in the two chapters devoted to syntax, the reasons for these differences vary according to the character of the text: literal translations from other languages (notably in case of the Bible translations) are different from original texts, which, in turn, might differ from each other in syntactical devices, because their language may range from an informal style close to spoken language to a formal classical style. In various types of texts, influence from CS is an important factor, whereas also influence from Persian or from the spoken languages of the region may be

26. In the above mentioned articles of Fodor and Hagège limited attention is paid to the influence which long-established literary languages may exert on the characteristics of new literary languages. Fodor (1994: 542-4) seems to be aware of this special aspect of language reform, but does not pay any further attention to it.

assumed. Constituent order syntax is treated in two chapters, the first on copular clauses, the second on verbal clauses. These two main clause types of Urmia Aramaic differ significantly from each other and therefore need separate treatment.

It should be noted that these two subjects represent two different ways of influence on the literary language. Differences in orthographical conventions often result from conscious, deliberate choices of the writers and printers, even if not all users of the written language are equally involved in this process. Differences in syntax, on the contrary, are often passed by unnoticed by many writers. Their language, therefore, might have been influenced by other languages or stylistic notions that have not consciously been chosen for. This dichotomy certainly is not absolute: sometimes orthographical changes were introduced without any explicit discussion, whereas certain syntactical innovations cannot be explained otherwise than by a very conscious introduction.

A few additional reasons for the choice of these two subjects may be given. The orthographical conventions of LUA have been given attention in a number of studies,[27] but until now no systematic overview of the various systems that were employed in the course of the nineteenth century has been presented. A systematic overview will be of great importance in order to understand the influence of CS orthography on LUA orthography. A careful description of the development of the orthography may further serve to date the large number of undated publications in the first twenty years of the Protestant press. An important reason for the investigation of constituent order patterns in the nineteenth-century texts is the fact that this subject has been neglected in nearly all descriptions of Neo-Aramaic dialects. Thus, the chapters on constituent order may serve not only as a comparative study between the various text types, but also as a general introduction to Urmia Aramaic syntax. For this reason, due attention will be paid to the linguistic framework that is needed for a modern description of constitutent order patterns (cf. further 1.4).

Language description is incomplete without an overview of the morphology and morphosyntax of a language. Because most of these subjects have been treated in the standard grammars of LUA, and the differences between the text types are not very large, I have refrained from investigating these subjects in detail. However, to facilitate the understanding of the chapters on syntax, as well as to be able to add a few remarks on certain issues of morphology that are not satisfactorily discussed in the existing grammars, a

27. In the nineteenth-century grammars, as well as in Polotsky 1961 and Macuch 1976.

chapter on the morphology and morphosyntax of LUA will be added (chapter 6). It will precede the two chapters on syntax.

Thus, two grammatical subjects are treated in detail: the relationship between orthography and phonology in LUA, and the constituent order patterns in LUA. Within the general description of these subjects, much attention will be paid to the differences between the text corpuses and to the possible influences of CS and other languages on the literary language. The knowledge of the historical circumstances of the various presses and authors, as described in the historical chapters, will contribute to a better understanding of some of these differences. I expect that such a detailed investigation of two selected issues can serve to describe the various forces that influenced the development of the literary language, and to understand how these forces determined the final character of the literary language.

In the concluding chapter (chapter 9), the development of LUA will be summarized, distinguishing three main periods on the basis of the material from the historical and linguistic chapters. The historical and linguistic factors that determined this development will then be summarized, whereas the most characteristic linguistic features of LUA will be given separate attention.

1.3 The sources

1.3.1 *Introduction*

The present study covers a wide range of subjects, and therefore a great number of different sources are employed. As for the historical chapters, a considerable part of the work is based on published sources, while only for a few subjects have unpublished sources been employed. The linguistic study of LUA for the most part is based on the printed texts of the nineteenth-century corpus itself, but much additional information has been gathered from a wide range of earlier studies on Neo-Aramaic as well as from enquiries into general linguistics.

1.3.2 *History*

The sources used for the historical chapters consist of three categories: (i) unpublished primary sources, e.g., letters of the missionaries; (ii) published primary sources, such as books written by missionaries and nineteenth-century travelers in this region and publications in nineteenth-century missionary magazines; (iii) modern publications.

The description of the historical context of the development of the literary language is secondary to the description of this development itself. Therefore, unpublished archival materials have been used only to a limited extent. Most important in this respect are the letters written by the missionaries to secretary Rufus Anderson of the missionary society (ABCFM) that was responsible for the missionaries in Urmia. These letters, part of the archives of the ABCFM, are now being kept in Houghton Library at Harvard University.[28] Parts of these letters were published in the *Missionary Herald* (MH), a magazine published by the American Board for the Christian public at home.

The published sources from the nineteenth century are of great importance for the present study. Mention must be made of the narratives written by the first missionary visitors to this region, Eli Smith and H.G.O. Dwight (1834), the Protestant missionary and translator Justin Perkins (1843, 1861), the Anglican missionary George Percy Badger (1852), and the Roman Catholic traveler and missionary Eugène Boré (1840). On the missionary Stoddard a biography was written by Joseph P. Thompson (1858), based on Stoddard's private letters, some of which are included in the book. The later period has been described less well by the missionaries themselves, but the book of the Anglican missionaries Arthur J. Maclean and W.H. Browne (1892), as well as Robert E. Speer's biography of the Protestant missionary-physician Joseph Plumb Cochran (1911) and the biography of William Ambrose Shedd by his wife Mary Lewis Shedd (1922), fill in some of the lacunae. The work by Rufus Anderson, covering all ABCFM missions in the period until 1870 (1872/1873), is based on the letters and reports of the missionaries.

In the second half of this century, a number of important studies on the history of the Assyrians and of the missions in this region have been published. The first of these is the work of Peter Kawerau (1958), describing the history of the Protestant American missions in the Middle East among the Eastern Christians in the first half of the nineteenth century, mainly based on the publications in the *Missionary Herald* and its precursor, the *Panoplist*. Whereas Kawerau's work focusses on the Protestant mission itself, John Joseph's fundamental work is concerned more with the socio-political history of the 'Nestorians' in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in general (1961). This work, making use of a number of diplomatic and

28. Permission to quote from these archives was given to me by Dr. David Y. Hirano from the United Church Board for World Ministries (Cleveland, Ohio). These letters are referred to by their Houghton call numbers, beginning 'ABC'.

missionary archives, as well as of Arabic sources, deals with many issues that had not been discussed earlier.[29]

The work of Rudolf Macuch (1976) on the history of Modern Syriac literature, mentioned above, provides a detailed overview of the literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, placed within its historical context. Of prime importance are the many extracts from Neo-Aramaic publications that are otherwise difficult to obtain. These magazine articles, often written by Assyrians, reveal many interesting details of the history of this period. The edition of the report of the consul of France in Erzerum, Count Challaye, on the situation of the Roman Catholic Christians in Persia constitutes another example of a nineteenth-century text that has become available long afterwards. This report, dating from 1854, has carefully been edited and annotated by Hornus (1970/71/72), and in this form contributes much to our understanding of the Roman Catholic view on the activities of the Protestant missionaries in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The sources of the data in the works of Gabriele Yonan are not always accurately identified, but she provides detailed information on a large number of subjects related to the Assyrians. In her first book (1978), after describing the history of the Assyrian people in short, she presents a detailed overview of the present situation of the Assyrians in the Middle East and in the Western diaspora. Her book on Assyrian journalism (1985) provides valuable information on a large number of Assyrian magazines. In her last book (1989), she publishes various documents concerning the 'Holocaust' of the Syrian Orthodox and Assyrian Christians (both in Turkey and in Persia) during the First World War. Some of these documents, including some letters from American missionaries, are published here for the first time.

Concerning the history of the other missions, a few works have to be mentioned. Vosté, in 1945, published a long article on the life and work of Paul Bedjan, the most important native writer. For the history of the Lazarist mission, the articles of Tfinkdji (1914), and especially those of Chatelet (1933-39) are of importance. Recently J.F. Coakley (1992) has written a very complete history of the Anglican mission in Persia replacing a number of earlier studies on this subject.

1.3.3 *Language*

The data for the linguistic research also belong to three different categories, coming from three different types of sources: (i) primary sources, i.e., texts

29. A second edition of this work is in preparation.

and grammars from the period that is being studied; (ii) additional sources, e.g., texts and grammars from other periods and concerning other dialects; (iii) general linguistic studies. The data of the first category are of prime importance, whereas the two other categories provide material for comparison or methods of description. The linguistic studies that have been employed in the present study will be discussed in the following section (1.4), whereas the additional sources are referred to when necessary.

The primary sources for the study of LUA in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries are the texts that were written and published in this period. These texts can be divided into subcategories in a number of different ways, especially according to provenance (which mission press or author), date of publication, or genre. To a certain extent, these criteria have all three been employed to make an a priori categorization. In the conclusion (9.1) this categorization will be further refined.

The main publications of this period are discussed in chapter 4. There attention will be paid to the output of the Protestant mission press, of the Lazarist and Anglican mission press, as well as to the texts of native speakers, like those of Paul Bedjan and those edited by Socin and Merx. From the large number of texts I have made a selection upon which the linguistic research is based. In the light of the development of the literary language, the most characteristic texts are those of the first period of the Protestant press, those of Paul Bedjan, being the first native writer to publish his own work, and the texts edited by Socin and Merx, the latter reflecting the use of LUA by a native speaker educated at the Protestant mission. A selection of the texts that were used for the linguistic research can be found in this volume (see Texts). The texts published by Merx, Socin, and Duval are not represented in this collection, as these editions can be found in most libraries.

The texts that have been employed for the present research are the following:

Texts of the Protestant press (4.2.3, 4, 6)

1. Early Protestant printings, the most important being *Teachings from the Words of God* (1841) and the tract *On Repentance* (1841/2).[30]
2. The early Bible translations (BT): the New (1846) and Old Testament (1852);[31]

30. Of the latter, the first eight pages are in this volume, see Texts no 1.

31. Selected parts were employed for the linguistic study of constituent order: Genesis 1-9, Ruth 1-4, Matthew 1-5, and Mark 14-16. For Ruth 1-4 and Mat. 2, see Texts nos 2-3.

3. Issues from the magazine *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* (ZdB), 1849/1, 1850/10 and 1871/12;[32]
4. Additional texts from the post-1870 period, the most important being the revised Bible translation of 1893 (BT '93).[33]

Texts of native speakers (4.2.5)

1. The texts edited by Adalbert Merx (1873);
2. The texts edited by Albert Socin (1882).

Texts of Paul Bedjan (4.3.2)

1. Publications by Paul Bedjan, the two most important being *Histoire Sainte* (HS) 1888, and *Vies des Saints* (VdS) 1912;[34]
2. The texts of Bedjan edited by Rubens Duval (1886).

These three groups represent texts from different periods and different origins. Most of the texts of the Protestant press date from 1840 to 1870, and the most important of these are from the period 1846-1852. They represent the first period of LUA, in which the Protestant mission press was the only producer of LUA texts. It is uncertain to what extent native speakers contributed to these texts. They certainly assisted the missionaries in translating and correcting Urmia Aramaic texts, but there are almost no indications that they also composed texts themselves.

The text editions of Merx and Socin are of prime importance for our understanding of LUA, as they are written by a native speaker who had adopted the literary language as introduced by the missionaries. His language is informal and unpolished, which makes these texts considerably different from those of the Protestant press and from Bedjan. An additional reason to take these texts into account is the fact that Socin and Merx have added phonetic transcriptions of the native speaker's pronunciation. These texts in transcription constitute the earliest witnesses of the pronunciation of UA.

The texts of Paul Bedjan, including those edited by Duval, represent the first beginnings of a truly literary tradition in the newly written language. An educated native speaker like Bedjan was needed to model LUA into a

32. In this volume: 1849/1/1A1-2B1 (Texts nos 5-6), 4B23-6B24 (Texts nos 7-8), and 71/12/90A31-91A20 (Texts no 9), 94A9-94B16 (Texts no 10).

33. Texts no 4 (Mat. 2).

34. From these two publications selected parts were employed for the study of constituent order: HS 1-11, 84-103; and VdS i-xi, 1-16, 247-253, 338-358. In this volume: HS 84-86 (Texts no 12), VdS 345-349 (Texts no 13).

flexible but very polished language. These texts were issued in the period between 1885 and 1912.

In addition to these three main corpuses, a number of other texts have been employed. Among these are publications of the Lazarist and Anglican press, the most important being the Roman Catholic NT translation of 1877,[35] and the Anglican translations of Mark (1895), and the Epistles (1906),[36] as well as editions of small portions of text with transcription in scholarly publications, like Kampffmeyer (1905) and Osipoff (1913). The latter will mainly be used in the chapter on orthography and phonology.

Moreover, the grammars of this period often provide valuable information on the literary language as well as on the vernacular. The grammars of Stoddard, Nöldeke, and Maclean, therefore, serve not only as reference works for the grammatical description, but also as a source of data on nineteenth-century UA and LUA.

1.4 Linguistic framework

1.4.1 *Introduction*

For the description of differences in the grammar of the various text types, a specific linguistic terminology will be employed. My main interest is descriptive, and my first objective was not to integrate the data into one or another linguistic model. However, linguistic terminology needed for description of the language is never free of the influence of one of the linguistic schools. In this work, it is Functional Grammar theories that have provided an adequate linguistic framework to describe the syntax of LUA.

The description of the relation between the orthographical conventions and the phonology of Urmia Aramaic is based on a phonemic analysis of its speech sounds, as far as these can be derived from the written sources. A detailed phonological description, naturally, cannot be based on such a purely written corpus. In a few instances, well-attested non-phonemic differences between speech sounds are discussed.

In the following parts, I will present a brief introduction to Functional Grammar linguistic terminology. The terminology employed in the chapter on phonology and orthography needs no further introduction.

35. Texts no 11 (Mat. 2).

36. Cf. 4.3.1 and 4.4. No part of NT was included in the collection of texts in this volume, because no translation of the Gospel of Matthew was made by the Anglicans. A few pages from the 'Remembrance of the Archbishop of Canterbury', 1896, provide a specimen of the Anglican production (Texts no 14).

1.4.2 *Functional approaches*

Many descriptivists have adopted an approach that consists of describing the various clause-order patterns that occur in a certain language and explaining these different patterns by the grammatical characteristics of the constituents. In some languages such a formal description of clause order types leaves little to be explained. In English, e.g., it usually suffices to know whether or not a phrase is employed as a subject in order to be able to predict correctly its position vis-à-vis the verbal form. In the Neo-Aramaic dialects this does not seem to be the case. Many examples can be found of clauses in which the grammatical properties of the constituents are the same, whereas the constituent order is different. Thus, these grammatical properties as such are not able to account for the different constituent orders that occur in the texts. This may lead one to conclude that these dialects have extremely free constituent order. But what is meant by 'free'? It is rather unlikely that this means that all different order patterns can occur in all different contexts. However, if this is not what is meant, then certain factors do indeed condition constituent order, factors that are different from morphological or grammatical properties of the constituents of the clause.

Already in the last century, these non-grammatical factors that influence constituent order patterns have been recognized and described as 'emotive' or 'psychological' factors. In the years following the First World War, the recognition of the importance of the 'psychological' factors was further developed.[37] In Prague, Vilém Mathesius developed the theory of the 'Functional Sentence Perspective', distinguishing between *theme* and *rheme* of a sentence.[38] The theme, being described as the starting point, the basis, or the known information of the sentence, in unmarked, non-emotive clauses, precedes the rheme, the latter representing the new information.[39] In marked, emotive clauses this order is reversed. After the Second World War, Prague linguists continued to work on the same lines. An important contribution was made by Daneš, who introduced 'a three-level approach to syntax'. He proposed to distinguish between 'the grammatical structure of sentence', 'the semantic structure of sentence', and 'the organization of utterance'. The third level, that of the organization of the utterance, is to be described in terms of the functional sentence perspective, the above mentioned theme and rheme or the later *topic* and *comment* distinction.[40] Firbas

37. One of the earliest works reckoning with these factors is Weil 1844/1887. In the twentieth century these ideas were further developed; compare Jespersen 1924.

38. Mathesius 1929 and 1939, Firbas 1974, Sgall 1993: 349.

39. For an overview of the definition of the theme in Prague linguistics, see Firbas 1964.

40. Daneš 1964.

introduced the notion of *communicative dynamism*: the 'extent to which the sentence element contributes to the development of the communication'; this being a way to describe more accurately the differences in informational status between topic and comment, as well as between the various elements within the topic or comment.[41]

In the field of syntax, therefore, two important contributions have been made by the Prague scholars: first, the introduction of a three-level approach to syntax, and second, the topic-comment distinction, being a way to describe the functions characteristic of the third level, that of the discourse functions of the clause.[42] These two elements of syntactic description have been widely accepted and constitute the main characteristics of functionalist work on syntax.[43]

The three levels nowadays are usually described as three types of functions that are expressed by the arguments of the verb: *grammatical, semantic,* and *pragmatic* functions. Grammatical, or syntactical, functions mark the way in which the arguments are linked to the verb. The two main grammatical functions are that of subject and object, whereas the various types of verbal complements introduced by a preposition can be described as another grammatical function. Semantic functions describe the way in which the constituents are related to the verb with regard to their 'agency', the kind of involvement in the action they express. Semantic terms are agent, dative, recipient, patient, and locative. Pragmatic functions describe the way in which these arguments mark the differences between, e.g., given and new or contrastive and non-contrastive information. The study of pragmatic functions is thus closely linked to the study of 'discourse pragmatics': the way in which single clauses form part of the discourse.[44]

In the linguistic theory introduced by Simon C. Dik, labelled 'Functional Grammar' (FG), these two elements of functional language description are further refined.[45] According to Dik, 'the primary function of a language is communication'.[46] This preliminary implies that the pragmatic functions, which are employed to mark the communicative value of the clause, are of

41. See Firbas 1964, and, most extensively, Firbas 1992.

42. For recent work in the tradition of Prague, including work on phonology and semantics, see Dirven & Fried 1987, Tobin 1988, and Sgall 1993.

43. For a general survey of functionalist approaches, see Bolkestein 1993. I have employed the work of Chafe 1976, Li & Thompson 1976, and of Givón 1984/1990.

44. So Comrie 1981a: 51-78.

45. For a comparison between the functional approaches of Dik and the Prague school linguists, see Gebruers 1987 and Bolkestein 1993. Dik himself hardly pays attention to the relation between his work and that of other functionalists.

46. Dik 1978/1981: 4-5.

prime importance if we are to understand the structures of the language. Semantic and grammatical functions, in his view, are subservient to pragmatic functions. In the later works of Dik, as well as in works by various other linguists employing the functional paradigm, this prime importance of pragmatic functions is illustrated by the description of a number of languages.[47] These studies show that especially for the study of constituent order patterns, the recognition of pragmatic factors can be a powerful tool. For the present description of a Neo-Aramaic dialect, two monographs devoted to the application of FG to Semitic languages are of special importance, the study of Buth (1987) on Biblical Aramaic, and that of Moutaouakil (1989) on Modern Standard Arabic.

The emphasis on the prime pragmatic functions of language also results in predictions with regard to constituent order patterns. An important claim of FG is the existence of a 'special position', P1, in perhaps all natural languages. This special position very often constitutes the initial position of the clause. All constituents, including subject and object, can be placed in P1 to perform special topic and focus functions, provided that this position is not filled by specific constituents that can only occur in this position, like interrogatives or sentence connectives. The group of obligatory P1-constituents differs from one language to another.[48] The initial proposal of Dik to assume only one special position in clause initial position is modified in various other publications,[49] and there is reason to believe that many languages have more than one special position that can be filled with constituents specially marked for topic and focus.

1.4.3 *Functional terminology*

1.4.3.1 The main objective of the syntactical part of the present work is to describe as accurately as possible the different constituent orders as they occur in the various text corpuses, as a means to characterize these different corpuses. FG provides a theoretical framework enabling us to account for most of the constituent order patterns that occur in LUA. In the two chap-

47. Cf. Dik 1981, Dik 1989, Bolkestein et al. 1985, Buth 1987, Moutaouakil 1989, Connolly 1991.

48. Dik 1978/1981: 174-183 and Dik 1989: 348, 359-363.

49. Buth 1987: 101-2, 173-4 assumes two or more preverbal special positions (P1-Pn), and one secondary 'post-core' special position (P2) for Biblical Aramaic, whereas Moutaouakil (1989: 60-1), distinguishes two preverbal special positions for Modern Standard Arabic. Dik himself (1980: 135) proposes to accept two preverbal positions for Hungarian, one for topic and one for focus functions. However, in Hungarian the grammatical functions of subject and object seem to play a minor role. A summary of these possibilities for P1 can be found in Dik 1989: 363-65.

ters on constituent order in LUA clauses, I will employ a number of terms that are characteristic for FG, but at the same time I will make use of the terminology of other functionally orientated descriptions, as employed in the work of Givón and Li & Thompson. I will now give an overview of these terms.

1.4.3.2 The grammatical terms that will be employed are those of *subject, direct object,* and *prepositional complements.* The *indirect objects* belong to the latter group.[50] These terms express the possible relations of the arguments to the core of the predication, the *verb.* The complicated relations between direct and indirect objects, as well as the possibility of 'promotion to direct-objecthood' of prepositional complements,[51] leads me to describe all these different relations to the verb together as 'grammatical' relations, even if the relations mediated by prepositions are of a different nature. Note that in this description the terms 'direct' and 'indirect' object refer to the formal, grammatical status of the arguments, not to the semantic function of these phrases.

Copular clauses usually consist of a subject phrase and a predicate phrase. The predicate usually consists of a noun phrase + enclitic copula, but the enclitic copula can be replaced by a copular finite verb preceding the noun phrase. In copular clauses with verbal noun predicates (infinitival and participal forms), direct and indirect objects can complement the predicate. The description of a copular clause as consisting of subject + predicate must be considered similar to the purely formal and grammatical description of the verb and its arguments in verbal clauses. Therefore, the attribution of the terms subject and predicate to the two main parts of a copular clause must be based as much as possible on formal grounds. Only then will it be possible to distinguish between the formal pattern of a copular clause and its pragmatic functions.[52] In my description the terms *subject* and *predicate* in copular clauses do not so much refer to pragmatic notions (like given and new information), but to the grammatical relations of these two main parts of the clause.

50. In FG, only the first two are considered true grammatical relations. The other, 'indirect', relations are described as 'satellites'. However, Dik also states that 'satellites have the same functional status as arguments' (Dik 1978/1981: 17) and that the main difference between arguments and satellites is the fact that the latter are optional, whereas the former are obligatory (Dik 1989: 72-3).

51. Cf. 6.6.3.

52. So also Buth 1987: 238-39, 245-46, and Moutaouakil 1989: 88, 99 (n. 7), who both differentiate between the grammatical functions of subject and predicate, and the pragmatic functions of topic and focus. For a further discussion, see 7.4.

1.4.3.3 In LUA semantic properties do not constitute a major factor in the governing of constituent order. This is only the case with regard to the syntax of direct and indirect objects. Thus, the semantic terms that are most frequently employed in this study are those of *patient* and *dative*.[53] The term patient refers to the argument that expresses the undergoer of the main action, who usually is passive, whereas the dative refers to the often human and active participant to the main action. Other terms that are incidentally employed are those of *agent* (the active initiator of the main action), *locative* (the place where the action takes place), and *instrumental* (the instrument with which the action is performed). More terms of this kind are necessary for an accurate description of all semantic properties of a verb, but for the description of constituent order these major terms suffice.

1.4.3.4 The last group consists of the pragmatic terms. These are the most important for the subject of constituent order, but certainly are also the most difficult to describe clearly and unambiguously. The two basic pragmatic terms are those of *topic* and *focus*. Topic is defined by Dik as 'the entity about' which the discourse is organized.[54] A topic is employed to refer to that part of the predication that is known to the addressee. This 'given' information might have been mentioned earlier in the discourse, but might also belong to the common cultural background of both the speaker and the addressee, and as such needs not to have been mentioned earlier in the discourse. The second term, that of focus, is described by Dik as 'the arguments which present information bearing upon the difference in pragmatic information between Speaker and Addressee, as estimated by the Speaker'.[55] Focus thus refers to that part of the clause that conveys new, salient or contrastive information. The two pragmatic functions, topic and focus, are essentially different from each other, which explains that no clauses occur in which one constituent performs topic and focus functions at the same time.[56] However, it is not to be excluded that more than one constituent in a clause performs topic or focus functions.[57]

However, in many languages the description of constituent order patterns needs a further refinement of the topic and focus functions. I will follow Moutaouakil in distinguishing between new and constrastive/assertive fo-

53. In FG the traditional term patient is replaced by *goal*, and the term dative by *recipient*.
54. Dik 1978/1981: 19.
55. Dik 1978/1981: 149.
56. So Moutaouakil 1989: 34, 73. Note that Dik 1989: 266, assumes a certain 'overlap' between the functions of 'topicality' and 'focality'. However, this does not seem to have consequences for his description of topic and focus functions.
57. So Moutaouakil 1989: 73.

cus.[58] This distinction between new and contrastive/assertive function in LUA seems to be useful for the topic functions as well. Within the category of new topics the difference between definite and indefinite new topics appears to be relevant.[59] However, it is difficult to say what the difference is in pragmatic terms.[60]

These two terms suffice to describe the pragmatic functions of the constituents that are part of the predication. However, in many languages, and in LUA as well, often extra-clausal constituents occur that are not part of the grammatical structure of the predication. For the functions that are executed by these constituents, FG has coined two other terms, that of *theme* and *tail*. The theme constituent provides the context of the clause, 'the universe of discourse',[61] and the tail constituent furnishes additional information to one of the constituents of the clause, as an 'afterthought'.[62]

1.4.3.5 In the description of constituent order another term is of importance, that of *basic clause*. Basic clauses, with basic constituent order, should meet with various conditions.

The first is that basic clauses should *semantically* be the most simple clause possible.[63] Because this semantic definition cannot help us in case of pairs of clauses with exactly the same constituents, but with different constituent order, a second condition should be added: basic constituent order should be neutral, or *unmarked*, with regard to pragmatic functions of the clause.[64] The problem with the latter definition is that if one starts to ana-

58. See Moutaouakil 1989: 19, who includes 'assertion' in the constrastive focus function. See further Dik 1989: 282, who divides the various kinds of focus into 'new' or 'completive' versus 'contrastive' focus. The latter category is subdivided into 'parallel' and 'counterpresuppositional' focus. Among the latter 'replacing', 'expanding', 'restricting', and 'selecting' focus are distinguished.

59. Cf. 8.2.6-7.

60. Dik 1989: 267, assumes, apart from new topic, also subtopic and resumed topic function. The notion of subtopic is adequate for some of the cases of 'definite' new topic, but not for all of them.

61. Dik 1978/1981: 19.

62. Dik 1978/1981: 19.

63. So Keenan 1976: 307: 'For any Language L,

a. a syntactic structure x is semantically more basic than a syntactic structure y if, and only if, the meaning of y depends on that of x. That is, to understand the meaning of y, it is necessary to understand the meaning of x.

b. a sentence in L is a basic sentence (in L) if, and only if, no (other) complete sentence in L is more basic than it.' See further Keenan 1976: 307-311.

64. So Dik 1978/1981: 172-3. Compare also Hopper 1986: 123-40, who works with a pragmatic definition of a 'Basic Sentence Type' (the subject is 'old or topical', the predicate is assigned 'the focus of new information'), but who also is aware of the fact that this definition is very much dependent on the analysis of the discourse.

lyse an unknown language, one does not know which clause orders are marked or unmarked. To distinguish between marked and unmarked orders, it is often assumed that the clause type that occurs most often in the language represents the unmarked order, and that the various other orders represent marked orders. Thus, the third condition might be that basic constituent order should be the *dominant* order in a range of texts of different types.

However, in functional as well as in generative approaches to language, a fourth prerequisite for basic clauses is employed: basic constituent order should not only correspond to the semantically and pragmatically most simple clauses, but this order should also provide the best starting point to explain the other, marked orders. And although in FG the basic order is not assumed to be an 'underlying' order from which all other orders are to be derived, the 'placement rules' of FG also need one or more basic patterns as a starting point.[65] In FG these basic patterns are thought to be connected with the predominantly prefield or postfield character of a language. In prefield languages the basic pattern is P1SOV, whereas in postfield languages the basic pattern is P1VSO. The different functions of the P1 position in different languages lead to a number of different actual constituent order patterns.[66]

In many languages, these four conditions together will not necessarily lead to one and the same constituent order that can be considered to be basic. This is also the case in LUA, in which the dominant clause order type does not seem to be the pragmatically unmarked order, and certainly is not a basic pattern that can be employed to understand the other orders. In the description I will first pay attention to the various types of basic orders. Which is the dominant constituent order type, which is the pragmatically unmarked type of clause, and which basic pattern is to be assumed for LUA in order to understand the various orders that occur in the language? After these questions are answered, it is possible to describe the links between the various types of basic orders.

1.5 Transcription

1.5.1 *Transcription of LUA in Syriac script*

I have chosen to use a transcription of LUA in the main study to enable other than Syriacists to read the Neo-Aramaic texts. However, the original

65. Cf. Dik 1989: 334-36.
66. Dik 1989: 346-55.

Syriac orthography conveys important information about the writers' opinion on the language, and a simplified, phonemic transcription of the nineteenth-century texts does not suffice to reflect these different attitudes towards the literary language. Therefore, I have chosen to reflect the Syriac orthography as accurately as possible, which has resulted in a transcription that is not phonemic and in which different graphemes may represent the same sound. In addition, the transcription provides some information on the pronunciation and grammatical analysis of the forms not present in Syriac orthography. It is always possible to deduct the Syriac spelling from the transcription.[67] Transcription from Syriac script is always given in italics, whereas phonemic representation is given between square brackets. In the collection of texts, in the back of this volume, I used the East-Syriac script, thus enabling a comparison between the transcription and the original orthography.

Consonants

ܐ	ʾ	ܙ	*ž*	ܣ	*s*
ܒ	*b*	ܓ	*x*	ܥ	*ʿ*
ܒ̲	*b̲*	ܕ	*ṭ*	ܦ	*p*
ܓ	*g*	ܗ	*y*	ܦ̲	*p̲*
ܓ̇	*ġ*	ܘ	*k*	ܨ	*ṣ*
ܔ	*j*	ܟ	*k̲*	ܩ	*q*
ܕ	*d*	ܟ̲	*c*	ܪ	*r*
ܗ	*h*	ܠ	*l*	ܫ	*š*
ܘ	*w*	ܡ	*m*	ܫ̲	*š̲*
ܙ	*z*	ܢ	*n*	ܬ	*t*

Vowels

◌ܰ	*a*	◌ܺ	*ī*	◌ܶ	*ê*
◌ܳ	*ā*	◌ܹ	*ē*	◌ܴ	*ô*
◌ܲ	*e*	◌ܽ	*u*	◌ܰ◌ܝ	*ay*
◌ܺ	*i*	◌ܼ	*o*	◌ܰ◌ܘ	*aw*

67. For the exact relation between the phonemes and graphemes of Urmia Aramaic, see 5.13.1.

Remarks

(1) The ܐ (') is represented only when written inside a form, at the beginning of the copula in certain orthographies (cf. 6.2.8), at the beginning of a form when ' has no vowel, and at the end of the word ܡܐܐ 'hundred', which is represented as *mā'*. Otherwise ܐ is not represented at the beginning and at the end of forms. The consonant is present in the Syriac script when a form begins with a vowel and when a form ends with *ā* or *i*.

(2) The *y* often does double duty: ܒܝܝܘܗܝ *bīyuhy*, and in this case is represented twice (*ī* + *y*).

(3) A limited number of words are always written without vowel signs, according to CS usage. In the transcription the appropriate vowels are added. The choice between the contracted or uncontracted forms of the masculine and feminine pronouns is made on the basis of grammar (cf. 6.2.2 and 6.2.4).

ـܘ	*u-*	'and'
ܡܢ	*men*	'from'
ܡܢ	*man*	'who'
ܟܠ	*kul*	'everything', 'all'
ܗܘ	*haw / hô*	'he' / 'that one', 'that'
ܗܝ	*hay / hê*	'she' / 'that one', 'that'

(4) A number of former diphthongs are written uncontracted to prevent different spellings to merge in the transcription. In nearly all forms, these are pronounced contracted (cf. 5.11). In the plural forms of the past copula, Syriac orthography suggests a contraction to [o] (*ī(h)wāw*, cf. 6.2.8). However, final *w* here is due to a false etymological spelling and is not present in the pronunciation. Thus *āw* rather than *ô* is transcribed.

ـܘ	*aw*
ـܒ	*āḇ*
ـܒ	*aḇ*
ـܦ	*āp̄*
ـܦ	*ap̄*

(5) In a limited number of words the 'half *zlama*' or *mhaggyānā* is employed to denote a *shewa* vowel that is needed to dissolve a consonant cluster (cf. 5.10.1.2 and 5.10.2.2). This sign (ܼ) is transcribed as *ı*.

(6) The plural sign, *syāmi*, ◌̈, is not transcribed. In most instances the plural form is recognisable by its ending (*i*) or by the context. If any uncertainty arises, the noun will be followed by (pl).

(7) In CS the *linea occultans* (*l.o.*), ◌̇, is employed to mark consonants no longer pronounced. This 'obscuring line' is frequently employed in LUA and is transcribed by round brackets. In CS orthography, a limited number of consonants at the end of a form are not pronounced, like *-y* and *-hy*, but not written with *l.o.* In current transcriptions of CS these consonants are also written between brackets. I have chosen not to mark these silent consonants in LUA, because such a practice would obscure the differences in the use of *l.o.* between the various text types. In the texts of Merx and Socin, the use of *l.o.* in endings of this type varies.

◌ܐܢ̇ܬ	*a(n)ty* [at]	'you' (f)
◌ܟ̇	*-āḵy* [ax]	'your' (f)
◌ܗ̇	*-uhy* [u]	'his'
◌ܗ̇	*-uh* [o]	'her'

(8) In Syriac orthography words consisting of only one consonant are written connected to the following word. In the transcription these are separated by a single hyphen (-). The copula, constituting a morphological unit with the preceding noun, is written separately in Syriac orthography, but in transcription is connected to the preceding noun with a double hyphen (=, cf. 6.2.8). The same accounts for object suffixes which sometimes are written separate from the verb they belong to. These are written also with a double hyphen.

(9) In Syriac orthography doubling of consonants can be inferred only from vowel patterns and etymology. Because doubling of consonants is part of the phonemic inventory of Urmia Aramaic (cf. 5.2 and 5.7), doubled consonants are transcribed whenever I assume them to have been present in nineteenth-century Urmia Aramaic. Thus, the writing of doubled consonants is decided on at the basis of comparative Aramaic data, as well as on the transcriptions of UA in Roman script. In Syriac orthography, most writers indicate doubling with short vowels

(*a* and *i*) in seemingly open syllables. In case of *u*, Syriac orthography does not provide enough information, because *u* is employed for [u:] as well as for [ŭ].

(10) In the transcription, personal and place names are written with initial capitals, as is common in European languages.

1.5.2 *Transcription of CS*

The transcription of the consonants is the same for CS as for LUA, but the transcription of vowels is brought in line with general usage. With regard to doubling, *begaḏkepat* consonants and *linea occultans* the general practice is followed. The full vocalization of Eastern Classical Syriac thus is not completely reflected in this orthography.

◌ַ	*a*	◌ֶ	*ē*	◌ֻ	*u*
◌ָ	*ā*	◌ֵ	*ī*	◌ֹ	*o*
◌ֶ	*e*	◌ֵ	*ē*		

1.5.3 *Transcriptions of Non-Aramaic languages*

For Azeri Turkish, Persian, Arabic and Kurdish, which in the nineteenth century all employed Arabic scripts, I follow current transcriptions of these languages, making use of the transcription of the consonants already in use for Aramaic.

1.5.4 *Representation of existing transcriptions*

A number of text editions employ a transcription of LUA.[68] I have represented these transcriptions as accurately as possible. In the transcription of Socin,[69] a few signs occur that I have represented slightly different: *j̱* > *i̱*, *a̱* > *ä*, *e̱* > *ë*, and *u̱* > *ü*. In Duval's transcription,[70] I have represented *ḫ* by *ẖ*. These transcriptions are all given in italics, except for those of Osipoff,[71] who employes the phonetic alphabet. In the alphabet that was developed in the Soviet Union (see 4.5.2), *š* is written as *ş*, and *ṭ* as *ţ*. For the transcription of the vowels in this alphabet, see 5.12.1.

68. Cf. 1.3.3.
69. Socin 1882.
70. Duval 1886.
71. Osipoff 1913.

1.5.5 *Spelling of names*

The spelling of personal and place names in the English text, in the historical chapters as well as in the translations in the grammatical chapters, is intended to represent the actual pronunciation of the Syriac names, without employing diacritical signs. Thus [ġ] is written as *gh*, [x] as *kh*, and [š] as *sh*. The *u* is employed to represent aspirated *b̲* [w], in names like Auraham and Gauriel.

2

THE ASSYRIAN CHRISTIANS AT THE BEGINNING OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

2.1 Earlier history

2.1.1 *The origins of the Persian Church*

The Church of the East, as present in the region of Urmia, Mosul, and the Hakkari mountains at the beginning of the nineteenth century, has its origin in the Christian communities that developed in the first centuries AD in the Parthian and Sassanian (from 224) empire. At what time exactly Christianity was introduced in the region east of the Euphrates is not known, but at the end of the second century clear references to Christian Churches occur. Among the communities deported from Roman territory by Shapur I (240-271) were many Christians, who greatly strengthened the young Persian Church. Other Christians came to Persia as refugees in periods of persecution by Roman emperors. Many of the deportees and refugees seem to have originated in the region of Antioch.[1]

What kind of relationship existed between the Church in the Roman and the Church in the Persian empire in the third and fourth centuries is unclear. No reliable sources indicate that the Persians have ever been dependent on the patriarchate of Antioch, whereas the Roman-Persian wars and the persecutions during the reign of Shapur II (309-379) make it unlikely that bishops could travel frequently between the two empires. During the reign of Yazdgard I (399-420) the relations with the East Roman empire improved, and contacts between the churches in the two empires became more frequent. The Synod of 410 in Seleucia-Ctesiphon was supervised by Yazdgard, and was attended by bishop Maruta from Maiperqat, who also served as an ambassador of the East Roman empire at the Sassanian court. At this Synod the Persian bishops decided on the internal organization of the Persian Church and on the acceptance of the Council of Nicaea.[2]

In the second half of the fifth century, the geographical and political separation between the Roman and Persian Churches was followed by a

1. See Brock 1982 and, most extensively, Chaumont 1988.
2. Cf. Labourt 1904 and Fiey 1970. On the persecutions that again broke out at the end of the reign of Yazdgard, see Van Rompay 1995.

dogmatic separation. After the Antiochene teachings on the Incarnation of Nestorius (d. 451) were condemned at the Council of Ephesus (431), the Persian Church became increasingly associated with the former, although it were the writings of Theodore of Mopsuestia (d. 428) rather than those of Nestorius which were at the basis of the theological teaching in the schools of the Persian empire. At the Synod of Seleucia-Ctesiphon in 484, the Persian Church made an explicit choice for the Antiochene dyophysite doctrine, which made a final separation from the East Roman Church inevitable. In the sixth and seventh centuries, this 'Nestorian' theology was further developed.[3] The school of Nisibis, whose first head was Narsai, played an important role in this period. Although every now and then persecutions broke out, which might have been caused by the ongoing efforts of the Christians to convert Mazdeans, it was possible for the Christians to live their own lives, and even to attain high office at the Sassanian courts.[4] Sources refer to the presence of bishops in Azerbaijan, the earliest being a note about bishop Hosha (Hosea) from Ganzak, situated south of lake Urmia, who attended the Synod of 486, the latest refers to Hananisho, in 605.[5]

In the first period of Islam, the expansion of the Persian Church was not hampered. The Abbasids too, from the eighth century onwards, in general were tolerant towards the Christians and permitted them to retain their own culture, although various measures were proclaimed to limit their influence outside their own community. These rules, however, did not prevent the Christians from making an important contribution to the formation of Arab culture. Their translations of scientific literature from Greek via Syriac to Arabic were widely appreciated, whereas a number of Christian physicians were employed at important posts at the Abbasid court. During this same period, East Syrian monks undertook missions to Central Asia and the Far East, which led to the spread of Christianity far beyond the Middle East.[6]

The fourteenth century witnessed the end of the heyday of the Church of the East. After the Mongol invasions of the thirteenth century, the Christians still prospered for a time. The first Mongol rulers, themselves adhering to animist religions, had several Christians among their own families and thus favored the Christians rather than the Muslims. At the end of the thirteenth century, however, the Mongols officially became Muslims and

3. For a recent discussion of the 'Nestorian' character of this theology, see Brock 1996.
4. Cf. Labourt 1904.
5. Fiey 1973: 399 and Fiey 1993: 81.
6. See Fiey 1970 and 1980, Dauvillier 1983, and Spuler 1964: 140-154. For some recent studies on the history of the Church of the East, see Coakley and Parry 1996.

the position of the Christians in their empire deteriorated. Khan Timur Leng (1360-1404), known in Europe as Tamerlane, gave the final blow by his severe persecutions against Christian communities. Many churches and monasteries were destroyed and some of the Christians that were able to escape sought refuge in the mountains of Kurdistan, where Syriac bishoprics had long been known. At what time Christians first settled in the fertile plain of Urmia, east of the mountains, is difficult to ascertain.[7] According to Fiey, an Urmian bishop is mentioned in 1111 and the church of Urmia, Mart Maryam, is referred to in 1284, whereas Christians in Salmas and Khosrowa are referred to in 1281. Whether Christians had been living on the Urmia and Salmas plains already before the Mongol period is not certain.[8]

2.1.2 *Contacts with the Roman Catholic Church.*

After a silence of nearly two centuries, the East Syrians are heard of again when in 1551 Yukhannan Sulaqa, the superior of the monastery of Rabban Hormizd near Alqosh, took himself to Rome to be consecrated and acknowledged as patriarch by the Pope. He took up residence in Amida (Diyarbakır).[9] The other patriarch, Shimun VII Bar Mama (1538-1558) fiercely opposed to the new patriarch and probably was involved in his imprisonment and subsequent death in 1555. However, Sulaqa's line was continued by Audishu (1555-1571), who also was in communion with Rome. Shimun's line was continued under the name of Eliya, starting with Eliya VI (1558-1591), residing in Rabban Hormizd near Alqosh.

In the seventies of the seventeenth century, a late successor of Sulaqa, Shimun XIII (1662-1700), severed all ties with Rome, settled in Qodshanis, and proclaimed himself 'Patriarch of the Mountain Nestorians'. Two 'Nestorian' patriarchates thus existed, one in Alqosh and one in Qodshanis. A few times both patriarchates renewed their contacts with Rome, but no union resulted from this. Not long afterwards, a new Uniat patriarchate was established in Diyarbakır. Its first patriarch was Yosip I (1681-1693).[10]

In the second half of the eighteenth century, the 'Nestorian' patriarchates of Qodshanis and Alqosh both sought a union with Rome: Shimun XV

7. Cf. especially Fiey 1975, and further Spuler 1964: 155-162, Fiey 1964: 443-472, Anschütz 1969: 124, and Nöldeke 1868: xvii-xxiv.

8. Fiey 1973: 402-407, Fiey 1993: 141-42.

9. For further references on the history of this period, see Murre-van den Berg 1998. For the patriarchal lines of this period, see Lampart 1966: 63-4 and Murre-van den Berg 1999.

10. On Yosip I, see foremostly Lampart 1966. Compare further Tisserant 1931: 228-244, 263, Habbi 1966, and Kawerau 1955: 119-121.

Mikhael Muktes did so in 1770/1771 and Eliya XI Denkha in 1772. Shimun XI's attempt did not lead to a union, and that of Eliya XI led, after his death in 1778, to a long struggle over his succession. Eliya XI had appointed his nephew Ishuyau as his successor. As Eliya XII, however, the latter returned to 'Nestorianism', whereupon his younger cousin, Yukhannan Hormuz, who had been consecrated metropolitan of Mosul by Eliya XI,[11] tried to become patriarch of the Chaldean party in his place. The Uniat patriarchate in Diyarbakır, however, still existed, and Rome was not inclined to support two Chaldean patriarchates.

When in 1780 Yosip IV (1759-1780) of Diyarbakır resigned,[12] Rome was not able to find a suitable successor, and thus Yosip IV was asked to act as *administrator patriarchalis ad interim*. Augustin Hindi (his nephew, who was consecrated bishop in 1779) assisted him, hoping to become patriarch in due time. In Mosul, Yukhannan Hormuz cherished similar expectations, which led to a series of clashes, not only between the two future patriarchs, but also between the Roman Catholic missionaries in Mosul and Baghdad and Yukhannan Hormuz. In 1812 this led to Yukhannan Hormuz' dismissal. This made it possible that from about 1817, Augustin Hindi was more and more seen as patriarch, a development which was approved of by Rome. In 1824, however, Yukhannan Hormuz was rehabilitated and after Augustin Hindi died in 1827, he again became candidate for the patriarchate. In 1834 he received the pallium and was consecrated Chaldean Patriarch of Baghdad, as successor of Yoseph IV.[13]

In 1807 Gauriel Danbo (1775-1832) established a Chaldean monastic order in the old monastery of Rabban Hormuzd, in which at that time no longer any monks were living. Yukhannan Hormuz in Mosul severely opposed this order, but the monks had accepted Augustin Hindi as Patriarch, and had several priests ordained bishop by him. The monks played an important part in the opposition against Yukhannan Hormuz.[14]

11. Kawerau 1955: 121, and Badger 1852: I 151 (from an English translation of Yokhannan Hormuz' autobiography), and Tfinkdji 1914: 462.

12. According to Kawerau 1955: 122, Yosip IV died in 1779, but according to Bello 1939: 7-8, he decided to resign in 1780, which decision was accepted in 1781, after which he died in 1796. According to Tfinkdji 1914: 459, he left for Rome in 1781 and died there in 1791. So also Fiey 1993: 41.

13. Cf. Kawerau 1955: 122-7 and Bello 1939: 8-26. The latter gives the most detailed account of this episode. According to him Yukhannan VIII was consecrated Patriarch of Baghdad in 1834 and died later in the same year. So also Tfinkdji 1914: 463. Badger 1852: I 167, states that Yukhannan Hormuz in 1840 received the pallium from Rome and died in 1841. No other sources confirm this.

14. Cf. esp. Bello 1939, but also the detailed account of Rich's visit to this monastery in 1820 (Rich 1831: II 90-99). Badger 1852: I 162-166, pays some attention to the difficulties between Yukhannan Hormuz and the monks.

After the death of Eliya XII in 1804, the East Syrian patriarchate in Alqosh probably came to an end. According to De Vries, the 'Nestorian' Mar Eliya, 'a Patriarch resident at Alqosh', with whom Justin Perkins met in 1834,[15] probably was a metropolitan rather than a patriarch.[16]

2.1.3 *Terminology*

The unions with Rome, doctrinal differences between the various Eastern Churches, and the different opinions of Westerners in contact with these churches, have led to a range of names for the various parties which is sometimes confusing. For this study, the terminology employed in nineteenth-century literature is especially important.[17]

For long the Church of the East was called the 'Nestorian Church', both in Europe and in the Middle East, because of its supposed Nestorian theology. Until the end of last century the Nestorians themselves also employed this name alongside other names, whereas in nineteenth-century travel stories they are sometimes said to reject the name 'Nestorians'. This prevented certain authors from using it.[18] According to others, they called themselves *Nusrāni*, which in Arabic is used for 'Christians' in general. *Siryāni* was added to denote their specific group, whereas in Aramaic they called themselves *Surāyi* or *Suryāyi*.[19]

Already in fifteenth-century papal documents concerning the union with Rome of a group of East Syrians at Cyprus, the name 'Chaldeans' was employed to denote those who had repudiated Nestorianism.[20] Why this name was chosen is not entirely clear, but Fiey suggests that this might have been due to the fact that in the West the Syriac/Aramaic language of these Christians was sometimes called 'Chaldaic'. Thus the name of the language, rather than an ethnic or geographical association with the ancient Chaldeans may have been behind this designation.[21] Yukhannan Sulaqa (1552-1555) was styled 'the first Patriarch of the Chaldeans'.[22] The designation 'Assy-

15. Perkins 1843: 174, 180, Grant 1841: 27-8.

16. Cf. De Vries 1960, refuting Kawerau's assumption that Mar Eliya was indeed another patriarch, opposing Yukhannan Hormuz in Bagdad (Kawerau 1955).

17. The most extensive and recent treatment of this subject is given by Heinrichs 1993. In Joseph 1961: 3-21, some attention is paid to the nineteenth-century situation. See further Fiey 1965.

18. Cf. Ainsworth 1842: II 273-4, Grant 1841: 171, and Perkins 1843: 175, 180.

19. Smith & Dwight 1834: 372, Perkins 1843: 175, and, much later, Bishop 1891: II 237.

20. Tisserant 1931: 226.

21. Fiey 1996.

22. Assemani 1719 vol. iii/2, 3, entitled his essay on them 'Chaldeorum, seu Assyriorum, qui Orientales et Nestoriani appellantur'. Cf. Nöldeke 1871: 129-30, Tfinkdji 1914: 455, Fiey 1965: 146-148, and De Mauroy 1976: 57.

rians', which often was employed parallel to 'Chaldeans' in early Roman Catholic records,[23] disappeared. The nineteenth-century Roman Catholic missionary F. Boré made great efforts to prove that the East Syrians were descendants of the people which in the Bible were called the '*Kasdim*', i.e., Chaldeans, living in Babylon and Nineveh.[24] The designation 'Nestorians', which was employed by Roman Catholic writers for those not united with Rome, clearly was meant to be pejorative.[25] Boré used the appellation 'catholiques' to denote both French and East Syrian Catholics.

W.F. Ainsworth, an English officer travelling in 'Mesopotamia and Chaldea' at the same time as Boré, employed the term 'Chaldean' as the name of a people, not of a religion. Therefore he added 'Romish' when he explicitly referred to the Uniat Christians. According to him, the title 'Nestorians' was given by seventeenth-century Roman Catholic missionaries to those that were not willing to unite with Rome, and thus had to be avoided. He noted that the East Syrians did not consider themselves to be adherents of Nestorius, whereas they accepted a probable descent from the biblical Chaldeans.[26] Another indication of a more general use of the name Chaldean is Mar Yukhannan's assertion that he preferred the designation Chaldean to Nestorian, during Perkins's visit to the Urmia area in 1834.[27] So also Sachau, who in the late nineteenth century mentions that the two parties of the '*Kildani*', the Chaldeans, of Mosul and the Mosul plain had split into two parties, 'der *Trockenen* und *Nassen*'; 'wet' referring to the Uniates, who were being watered by the money of the Roman Catholic mission and 'dry' to the Nestorians, who had to do without such help.[28] However, in most of the literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the designation 'Chaldean' is employed exclusively to denote those East Syrian Christians that were united with the Roman Catholic Church. The missionaries in the first half of the nineteenth century nearly always spoke of Nestorians and Chaldeans to differentiate between the two groups.[29]

After, in the forties of the last century, Henry Layard had rediscovered the culture of the ancient Assyrians, he brought the question of the descent

23. Fiey 1965: 146-7.
24. Boré 1840: II 159-198.
25. Cf., e.g., Boré 1840: II 280.
26. Ainsworth 1842: II 256-74. Layard 1850: I 236, for the same reason (and for some additional reasons, cf. below) wrote about 'Catholic Chaldeans' versus 'Nestorian Chaldeans'.
27. Perkins 1843: 175.
28. Sachau 1893: 349-50, 359.
29. Smith & Dwight 1832: 366, and e.g. 370; Grant 1841: 170-1; Southgate 1840: I 295, II 221; Perkins 1843: 4; Badger 1852: I xx, and 177-181.

of the Christans in this region to the attention of the general public. In his book on these discoveries, which at that time was extremely popular in Britain, he wrote: 'Those who at that time *(i.e., the time of Khan Timur)* sought the heights and valleys of Kurdistan, were the descendants of the ancient Assyrians, and the remnant of one of the earliest Christian sects.'[30] This opinion might have led to the name which in 1886 was chosen for the Anglican mission among the East Syrian Christians: *The Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians*. The name 'Assyrians' for the East Syrians in the Urmia region for a long period was employed almost exclusively by Anglicans, although many of the Anglican missionaries actually working in the field preferred the name 'East Syrian (Nestorian or Chaldean) Christians'.[31] The Protestant missionaries in Urmia did not employ the name 'Assyrians' for the East Syrians in general, but interestingly enough, the Protestant mission in Mosul, which was started in 1849, was named 'The Assyria Mission'.[32]

At the end of the nineteenth century, the use of the name Assyrian became connected to the rise of a national, ethnically-based consciousness, transcending the various confessional strands that were dividing the community.[33] In the literary language, two forms were used to refer to the 'Assyrians', *Āṯorāyi* and *(')Surāyi*.[34] The name 'Assyrian' was employed

30. Layard 1850: I 258. He equates the names 'Chaldeans' and 'Assyrians', although in the Bible these do not seem to be the same people. Anschütz 1969: 127, notes that the Nestorians in the mountains call themselves 'seit den Veröffentlichungen Layards [..] 'Bergassyrer' '. Note, however, that in 1831 Rich already employed the designation 'Assyrian Christians' (1831: II 120). Layard, therefore, only popularized this designation, he did not invent it.

31. See Maclean 1895: ix, and 1901: ix, and also Maclean & Browne 1892: 6-9, where the usage of 'Assyrian' is explicitly rejected. See further Coakley 1992: 147-8 and Fiey 1965: 149-52.

32. Anderson 1875: IV 78ff.

33. See Murre-van den Berg 1998.

34. On these names, see Fiey 1965: 156, Macuch 1987, and Heinrichs 1993: 102-8. It is likely that the name *Āṯorāyā* had been in use to denote people from the Mosul region long before the modern identification with the ancient Assyrians arose. Compare, e.g., Brock 1982: 1617, who cites a fourth-century Syriac text in which a Syrian martyr claims descent from Assyrian kings. Note further that the Arabic name for the Assyrians in northeastern Syria is *Ashuri*, whereas *Ashuriān* (the Persian form) is used in present-day Iran. The form *(')Surāyā* is an orthographical variant denoting one's adherence to the Assyrian ideal, while maintaining the form current in the spoken language, which is *Surāyā*. For a recent evaluation of the historical arguments under discussion, cf. Frye 1992/1997 and Joseph 1997. There might be some truth in the assumption of Joseph 1998 that pre-nineteenth-century use of the designations 'Assyrian' and 'Chaldean', as well as the veneration for the prophets Jonah and Nahum (the former connected to Nineveh/Mosul, the second to Alqosh), among the community itself is to be attributed mainly to influence of the Bible. However, one cannot exclude the possibility that this identification with biblical peoples and persons was encouraged by the fact that a certain historical connection was thought to exist.

widely when after the First World War this nation sought support for an independent state in Kurdistan.[35] In this nationalistic context the association with the ancient Assyrians even became popular with certain groups within the Syrian Orthodox and Maronite Church, although most of its clergy did not approve of it. The clergy of the Church of the East has decided to go along with this strong current among their flock, and since the seventies, this church has used the name 'Holy Apostolic Catholic Assyrian Church of the East'.[36]

In this study, the designations 'Nestorian' or 'East Syrian' have not been avoided altogether. The first is used mainly in contrast with 'Chaldean', the latter for the period before 1800. When possible, preference is given to 'Assyrian', even when for the nineteenth century this is somewhat anachronistic. The designation 'Chaldeans' is employed for those in union with Rome.

2.2 The situation at the beginning of the nineteenth century

2.2.1 *The region*[37]

The Assyrians lived in a mountainous region that in the nineteenth century extended over two countries: the Ottoman and the Persian empire. A large number of Assyrians inhabited the Hakkari mountains, situated mainly within the present Turkish border. The Kurds, living in the same region, in most areas were the factual rulers, because the Ottoman government was not able to extend its powers into this wild and far-away part of the country. The Assyrians in these mountains, sometimes called 'Mountain Nestorians', were living in tribal groups, *āširāti*, most of which were subjected to the Kurds. Some of the larger tribes, however, like that of Jilu or Tiari, had acquired a certain independence.[38] The Nestorian patriarch had his residence in Qodshanis, a mountain village in northern Barwari. It was prob-

35. See further 3.6.3. Cf. also titles as *The Assyrian Settlement* and *The Assyrians and their Neighbours*, Wigram 1922 and 1929.

36. Cf., e.g., Macuch 1976: 213, Fiey 1965, Heinrichs 1993: 99-100, and Coakley 1996. For a modern interpretation of the identification with the ancient Assyrians, see Odisho 1988: 318, where an introduction entitled 'An Ethnolinguistic History of the Assyrians' may be found.

37. The most extensive treatment of this subject is found in Chevalier 1985. He gives an overview of the situation in this region in the nineteenth century, relying mainly on travel stories, some of them unpublished.

38. Cf., e.g., Smith & Dwight 1835: 375, Perkins 1843: 6-10, and Ainsworth 1842: II 286. Maclean & Browne 1892: 10, distinguish between 'Ashiret', which are independent tribes, and 'Rayat', subject both to the Turkish government and local Kurdish rulers.

ably due to the isolation of this region that the Roman Catholics did not succeed in bringing these Assyrians into union with Rome. The estimated number of Nestorians in the Hakkari mountains in the nineteenth century varies. In the forties, the American missionary Perkins estimated their number at about 110,000, whereas Ainsworth, an English traveler, in the same period counted only 27,840 souls, though he admitted that this might be an underestimate. A. Smith, another American missionary, made a careful estimate after a journey through this region in 1844 and believed their number not to have exceeded 50,000 before the Kurdish attacks in the early forties.[39] The Assyrian tribes depended on their cattle and on the crops from small pieces of land, just like the Kurds.[40]

Another important area for the Assyrians was the plain south of the Hakkari mountains, extending as far as Mosul. In most of its villages, as well as in Mosul, the Chaldeans formed the majority of the East Syrians. Badger reckoned the total number of Chaldeans in this region to be about 1160 families, of which 350 were in Mosul.[41] As to the numbers of non-Uniat Assyrians, no reliable data are available. In the area close to Mosul, their numbers were low, but closer to the Hakkari mountains quite a number of Assyrian villages had not yet accepted Catholicism.

The third area in which Assyrians were living was the fertile plain extending from north to south between the Hakkari mountains and the Urmia Lake, together with the Salmas plain north and northwest of the lake. In this agricultural region many different crops were grown: corn, rice, cotton,[42] grapes, and vegetables, while allmost all kinds of fruit trees were doing well. Most of the Assyrians lived in villages in which they often formed the majority of the population. Most of them were farmers and paid their taxes, often consisting of crop sharing or a day's labor,[43] to the Persian lords of

39. Perkins 1843: 10, Ainsworth 1842: II 286-7, and Smith 1851: 61-68. It is difficult to compare the numbers given by various authors. Often the number of 'houses' or 'families' is taken as a starting point, but the number of persons reckoned to be part of such a household varies from six to ten. Perkins (1843: 10), supposes ten, Ainsworth (1842: II 286), eight and Badger (1852: I 174 and 399-400), six (not explicitly stated, but deduced from several numbers). Cf. also Chevalier 1985: 126-31 and 278-85, for an overview of the numbers given by various authors.

40. For an interesting description of the living conditions of the independent tribes in the eighties of the nineteenth century, see Maclean & Browne 1892: 11-46.

41. Badger 1852: I 82, 174-5. In Mosul there were 750 West Syrian families, 300 of them were in union with Rome.

42. According to Issawi 1991: 599, cotton probably was introduced in this region by the American missionaries around 1852. In Smith & Dwight 1834: 398 an 'instrument for cleaning cotton' is mentioned, and Perkins 1843: 7 and 429, reckons cotton among the staple crops of the Urmia region, for 'domestic use and foreign trade'. Compare also Lambton 1987a: 51.

43. Lambton 1987a.

the villages, just like their Muslim neighbors. Most of the time the two groups lived together in peace.[44]

According to Perkins, the community of Assyrians in Urmia itself was relatively small, about 600 persons in a total population of 20,000 or 30,000,[45] especially when compared with the number of Assyrians living on the Urmia plain, amounting up to 30,000 or 40,000 people. The missionary activities in the nineteenth century led to a growth of the Assyrian community in Urmia, to some 6500 in 1910.[46]

2.2.2 *Chaldeans and Nestorians*

In the early nineteenth century, part of the Assyrians were united with Rome, under the Chaldean patriarchate. During most of that century, those not united with Rome far outnumbered those that were.

The total number of non-Uniat Assyrians in Turkey and in Iran is estimated by Perkins at about 140,000. Badger, a couple of years later (during which the Kurds had attacked the Assyrians), gave a total number of 11,378 'families', or at least 70,000 persons. This number is considerably lower than the earlier estimates, and the difference seems too large to be attributed only to the Kurdish inroads. Interesting in this respect is Badger's remark that the numbers given by the Patriarch were sometimes exaggerated, and that he had reduced the latter's numbers by about one third.[47] Perhaps the total number of non-Uniat Assyrians at the beginnings of the nineteenth century hardly exceeded 100,000.[48] In the seventies of that century the American missionaries estimated the number of Nestorians at 81,000 (56,000 in the mountains, 25,000 in the Urmia plains) and that of the Chaldeans at 36,000, a total number of 117,000.[49]

In the fifties, Badger counted only 1743 Chaldean families (or some 10,458 individuals), of which the majority (1160 families) lived in the Mosul plain. The community around Khosrowa consisted of 150 families. The rest mostly lived in the region southwest of the Hakkari mountains, around Amadiya and in Jezirah. Towards the end of the nineteenth century their numbers seem to have risen to about 17,700 in the southern part and 16,700 in the Khosrowa region. In 1913 these numbers, according to Chevalier, had risen to 24,000 and 19,200, whereas Hartmann gives 10,500

44. Maclean & Browne 1892: 47-117, Joseph 1961: 68-9.
45. Perkins 1843: 9, Hartmann 1980: 74-5, Hambly 1991: 547.
46. Hartmann 1980: 74.
47. Perkins 1843: 10, Badger 1852: I 174-5, 392-99.
48. So also Chevalier 1985: 129-30.
49. Cutts (n.d.; around 1877): 175.

in 1914 for the Salmas region. Even the lowest number indicates a considerable growth, especially when compared to the early fifties.[50]

In the Mosul region Catholicism was already present for about 250 years, whereas in the Khosrowa region it was more recently introduced, probably towards the end of the eighteenth century.[51] In 1831, according to Smith and Dwight (cf. 3.1.1), there were Chaldean bishoprics in Khosrowa, Alqosh, Ain Kawa (near Baghdad), Diyarbakır, Seert, and Mardin. Badger does not mention Ain Kawa, but adds Jezirah, Kirkuk and Baghdad.[52]

In the central Hakkari mountains only Nestorian villages were found, of which Qodshanis and Julamerik (Çölemerik) were the most important, the first being the usual residence of the patriarch. The villages in the plain of Urmia also were mainly Nestorian. In the mountains the tribes of Jilu, Barwari (Barbar), and Gawar had their own bishops. Bishops were consecrated also for Bohtan, Bet Shamsdin and Gonduk. Ada, Ardishay, Armood Aghay, Gawilan/Jamalawa and Gugtapa were the bishoprics of the Urmia plain.[53]

At that time it was only in Mosul that a Western mission was active, consisting of Roman Catholics of the Dominican order. The priests came from Italy, later the mission was taken over by Dominican friars from France.[54] Earlier Roman Catholic missionary activities had also been concentrated

50. Badger 1852 I: 174-5, Chevalier 1985: 132, Hartmann 1980: 74 (based on the Annuario Pontificio of 1914).

51. On the Mosul region, see Murre-van den Berg 1998. On Khosrowa, see Hornus 1971: 291-2, n. 73 and Boré 1840 II: 256, who mention a young Chaldean from Diyarbakır who under influence of Dominican missionaries was trying to win over people to Catholicism in the Khosrowa region. Through one of his converts the bishop of Khosrowa, Ishuyau (III) Shimun (1777-1789) became Roman Catholic. In other sources only this bishop is mentioned, so Fiey 1993: 127. Compare further Wolff 1829: III 132, and Coakley 1992: 179-80. From the *Missionary Herald* 48 (1852): 69, one might infer that Roman Catholicism was introduced in Khosrowa in 1781 (70 years before 1851). Chatelet 1934: 260 mentions a number of earlier adherents to Roman Catholicism, but he does not give his sources.

52. Smith & Dwight 1834: 352 [S&D], versus Badger 1852: I 172 [Bd]: S&D *Diyarbakır* with bishop Basilius, Bd: Botros; S&D: *Seert* with Michael, Bd: id.; S&D: *Mardin* with Ignatius, Bd: id.; S&D: *Ain Kawa* with Lorentius, Bd: *Baghdad* with Elia; S&D: *Alqosh* with Yokhannan and Yosef, Bd: *Alqosh/Mosul* with Yosef (1846-1878); S&D: *Khosrowa* with Yokhannan, Bd: ex-patriarch Zeyya (cf. II.2.1.) Bd: *Jezirah* with Basilius. In Badger's list (1852: I 174) also Mosul and Amadiya are mentioned as bishoprics, but without names of bishops.

53. See for the bishoprics in the Urmia plain: *Ada* (Yosip): Smith & Dwight 1843: 387, Hornus 1971: 142-3; *Ardishay* (Gauriel): S&D 395, Ainsworth 1842: II 277, H 133-4; *Gawilan/Jamalawa* (Yukhannan) S&D 367, A 277, H 144; *Gugtapa* (Eliya): Perkins 1843: 182, H 137-8, *Armood Aghay* (Auraham) S&D 403, H 147. For the bishoprics in the mountains, see Badger 1852: I 392-399, Perkins 1843: 324, and Fiey 1964: 445-6.

54. Cf. 3.2.3.

mainly on the East Syrians near Mosul and Diyarbakır.[55] Dating to the second half of the eighteenth century, the time of the Turkish-Russian war, were the contacts with Georgian Christians.[56] These contacts intensified after the Treaty of Turkmanchay (1828) between Russia and Persia, when considerable numbers of Assyrians went to Tblisi as seasonal workers. It is possible that this acquaintance with a Christian society made the Assyrians more receptive towards the possible benefits of the American Protestants.

However, as much as these contacts with Georgia might have formed a channel through which 'Western' ideas could reach the Assyrians, it was only when the American missionaries in 1835 started to live in Urmia, that the West really was coming up to their doorsteps. Their arrival proved to be the starting point of a new period in the history of the Assyrians, not only of those in Persia, but also of those living in the Ottoman empire. Within a few years their outlook on the world would be different and their relationship with their Muslim neighbors changed.

55. See Murre-van den Berg 1998.

56. See Tsereteli 1996 for some interesting evidence of these early contacts between the Assyrians and the Georgians.

3

MISSIONARY ACTIVITIES

3.1 The first period of the American Protestant mission (1834-1850)

3.1.1 *Preparations*

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, various persons became interested in the Assyrians, a community that until then was hardly ever heard of in Europe.[1] Rufus Anderson, secretary of the *American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions* (ABCFM), an interdenominational missionary society founded in 1810 (most of its members belonging to Congregationalist or Presbyterian churches), read an account on the 'Nestorians' in Eastern Turkey by Robert Walsh, a British chaplain in Constantinople.[2] This report was reprinted in the *Missionary Herald*, the ABCFM magazine. At that time Joseph Wolff, an Episcopalian of German-Jewish extraction, was already traveling around the Ottoman empire, and had met with the Assyrians.[3] Another early traveler was W. Jowett, who in 1825 published an account of his journey on behalf of the *Church Missionary Society* (CMS), an Anglican society. In this he included a short description of the history and present situation of the 'Nestorians', although he himself had not met with anyone of this nation.[4] Anderson decided to ask Rev. Eli Smith and Rev. H.G.O. Dwight, who were to travel to Turkey to explore

1. For a survey of the early interest in the Aramaic-speaking peoples, see Hopkins 1993: 53-4.

2. Walsh had acquired his information from '(arch)bishop Shimon Pietri Shewris from Al-Jazira' (Walsh 1836: II 405-13, Kawerau 1958: 217). Bishop Shevris left for Rome in 1806, returned to Iran in 1819 by way of Constantinople, where he appeared in 1822 (cf. Bello 1839: 14 and n. 31 and Coakley 1992: 18) and died of pestilence in 1831 in Tabriz (cf. Hornus 1972: 298 n. 179, 'Pierre Chauriz from Seert', Perkins 1843: 350). While staying in Rome, he became acquainted with the British and Foreign Bible Society. He was asked to translate the Bible into Kurdish and was paid a monthly allowance in return. This translation proved to be far from adequate and was not printed. On return, he still sympathised with the Roman Catholic faith (Smith & Dwight 1834: 353). Joseph Wolff had met him in Rome in 1817-8, had learned 'Modern Chaldean' from him, and had met him again in Tabriz in 1825, when Shevris worked for the BFBS (Wolff 1829: III 115-6, 130). Both Tfinkdji (1914: 493-4) and Bello do not seem to have been fully informed about this bishop.

3. Wolff 1828-9.

4. Jowett 1825.

future mission fields for the ABCFM, also to pay attention to the 'Nestorians' and their living conditions.[5]

At the end of 1829, Smith and Dwight left for Constantinople, traveled through northern Turkey, Georgia and Armenia, and at the end of 1830 arrived in Tabriz, the capital of Azerbaijan. In the spring of 1831, they left for Urmia, but by the time they arrived at the Urmia plain, they learned that pestilence raged in the town. A visit to the mountains, to the Patriarch of the Church of the East, was also cancelled, because the Kurds had become rather threatening in that area. However, on their visit to a couple of Assyrian villages, like Khosrowa, Jamalawa, Ada, and Ardishay, they collected much useful information on the economical and religious situation of the Christians. The Chaldeans of Khosrowa, who had united with the Roman Catholic Church about fifty years earlier, were not unfriendly and, according to Smith and Dwight, their contacts with Rome were rather sparse.[6]

In their opinion the non-united Assyrians in particular might benefit from the work of future American missionaries, who should pay special attention to furnishing an educational system.[7] There were a few Christian schools before the missionaries arrived, one of them probably even in Urmia, which, rather similar to the Muslim schools, concentrated on transmitting religious knowledge and the reading of the liturgies. These schools were led by priests and bishops and were attended chiefly by future deacons and priests.[8]

The Assyrians themselves enthusiastically supported the plans for foreign help. Although Smith and Dwight did not promise any political support, the Assyrians apparently expected Christian help from the West to include taking over the government from the Muslims. When Smith and Dwight became aware of these expectations, they tried hard to explain their purely spiritual aims, but it seems that they did not fully convince the Assyrians.[9]

5. Anderson 1873: II 85.

6. Smith & Dwight 1834: 355.

7. Cf. Keddie 1991: 176-8, who notes that education in Iran was not considered a governmental task, but was left to the religious leaders. The existing schools only provided Islamic education, which was hardly suitable for Christian children.

8. Smith & Dwight 1834: 355 (Khosrowa), Perkins 1843: 185 (Mar Eliya in Gugtapa), and Malech 1910: 329 (Mar Auraham Malech in Urmia). Surprisingly, no reference is found to the school in Urmia in the reports of the first missionaries. On the school in Gugtapa, see *Nestorian Biography* 1857: 184-7, and Murre-van den Berg 1996.

9. Smith & Dwight 1834: 393-4, 406. Compare also Joseph 1961: 45-49, who draws attention to the fact that this political reasoning of the Assyrians may be explained from the possibility of a Russian occupation of Azerbaijan a few years earlier, in the period before the Treaty of Turkmanchay in 1828. The documents recently discussed by Tsereteli (1996) con-

Smith and Dwight expected Urmia to be the most suitable place for establishing a mission post, even if the number of Assyrians here was comparitively small. Apart from being the central town of the Urmia plain, from which the surrounding Assyrian villages were easy to reach, the Persian government present in this town would be able to protect the missionaries if necessary.[10]

3.1.2 *Beginnings*

The ABCFM took the positive advice of Smith and Dwight seriously and started with the preparations for a mission in Persia in 1832. In September 1833, Rev. Justin Perkins (1805-1869), who had worked as a tutor at Amherst College, and his wife Charlotte Bass (1808-1897), were sent as missionaries to Persia. Their main object should be 'to enable the Nestorian Church, through the grace of God, to exert a commanding influence in the spritual regeneration of Asia'.[11] At this early time, ABCFM mission work in general was directed at bringing new life into the Eastern Churches, not only for the sake of the Eastern Christians themselves, but also to enable them to gain Muslims for the Christian faith. A revival in the Eastern Churches could only be expected after the Bible had been made available to the people. Therefore, the major task of all the missionaries of the ABCFM was to provide the Bible in the vernacular and to establish schools where children and grown-ups could learn to read. In most places the pastor-missionary was accompanied by a physician, whose skills often provided an easy access to the people.[12]

At the end of September, Perkins and his wife had left Boston, and they arrived in Constantinople in December, where they stayed till May 1834. In August of that year, they arrived in Tabriz, from whence Perkins made a preparatory trip to Urmia. He was well received, as were his plans for establishing a mission post. Two Assyrians, bishop Yukhannan and priest Auraham, joined him to Tabriz, willing to teach him their language.[13]

cerning contacts between high Assyrian clergy (including the Patriarch) and a Georgian king, Irakli II, indicate that this antagonistic feelings towards the Muslim authorities date at least from the period of the Russian-Turkish war (1768-1774).

10. Smith & Dwight 1834: 410.

11. Perkins 1843: 31.

12. For the religious background of the ABCFM missionaries, see Kawerau 1958: 1-169. In the 'Instructions', the speech delivered by Rufus Anderson on the eve of the departure of the Perkins couple, the objectives of the ABCFM missions are summarized, cf. Perkins 1843: 28-31.

13. Perkins 1843: 187-89.

In America a physician had been found to join the Persian mission: Dr. Asahel Grant (1807-1844). Together with his wife Judith S. Campbell (1814-1839), he left for Tabriz, where they joined the Perkinses' in Octobre 1835. The two couples then left for Urmia, and entered their mission-field on the 20th of November.[14] From the moment they arrived, people came to see them, and Grant was besieged by patients. In December Perkins already wrote a letter to the American Board stressing the need for extra people and for a printing press.[15]

On the 18th of January 1836 a school was opened, which already on the second day was joined by 17 pupils. After some time, the Americans had to give these boys an allowance to enable them to attend classes without harming their parents by their not earning any money.[16] Priest Auraham and bishop Yukhannan assisted Perkins both with teaching and with preparing teaching materials. In the course of time more members of the clergy, especially deacons and priests, were engaged in teaching in the schools of the Americans.[17]

3.1.3 *Expansion into the Hakkari mountains*

From the very beginning there had been plans to establish another mission post in the mountains west of the Urmia plain. To carry out this plan, the co-operation of the Patriarch of the Church of the East, Mar Shimun XVII Auraham (in office from 1820 to 1860), at that time residing in Julamerik, was necessary. When, in 1837, A.L. Holladay and W.R. Stocking arrived from America to join the mission, for a short time it seemed possible that two of the four missionaries would make a fact-finding trip into the mountains. However, this soon proved to be too dangerous. In 1838 the American Board urged the missionaries to make haste, because they had learned that the Anglicans as well had taken interest in this mission field.[18]

Grant was very much interested in this work, and after his wife died in January 1839, he devoted as much time as he could to this area. In October 1839 he made his first visit to the Patriarch. He was received very kindly

14. Perkins 1843: 231.
15. Perkins 1843: 246, Kawerau 1958: 273.
16. Cf. Perkins 1843: 255, 375 and Anderson 1873: I 182-3. A few years later the Catholic missionaries would accuse the Americans of bribery because of this practice, compare Boré 1840: 280, 351-2, Chatelet 1934: 248, 394, and Hornus 1971: 290. In the series of articles of Chatelet, nearly all successes of the Protestant missionaries are attributed to bribery of the Assyrians, see, e.g., Chatelet 1934: 386-7, 400, 4-2, 575, and 585.
17. Perkins 1843: 250-1, Anderson 1873: I 345, Murre-van den Berg 1996: 10-11.
18. Kawerau 1958: 236, 560, see further 3.3.1.

and stayed with the patriarchal household for five weeks, attending the sick.[19] In December he returned to Urmia. This journey brought him to the conclusion that Mosul would make a good place for a mission station, from whence the mountains could be easily reached. When the Patriarch informed the Americans that he would like to see Grant again, the latter traveled back to the mountains in the spring of 1840.[20] During this second trip Grant also met with Nurullah Beg, the Kurdish Amir of the Hakkari mountains, who also received him warmly.[21] When in that same year Grant traveled to America to bring his children who had lost their mother under the care of a family member, he also visited Boston to give an account of the mission work in Persia. He was rather optimistic about the mission work that might be done in the mountain region, but he also informed the American Board about the rising tensions between Kurds and Christians in the Hakkari mountains.

In June 1840, shortly after Grant had left the Patriarch, William Ainsworth and I.A. Rassam[22] visited the latter on behalf of the Anglican Church. During this visit they promised help from the Anglican Church, by the way expressing their doubts about the work of the American missionaries. The Patriarch did not express his opinion very clearly.[23]

Grant returned from America with two new missionaries, A.K. Hinsdale and C.C. Mitchell, both accompanied by their wives, who planned to work in the mountains. Mitchell died on the way, and Hinsdale fell ill. Grant paid a third visit to the Patriarch in the summer, whereas in the autumn of 1841, Grant and Hinsdale made another short trip into the mountains. They intended to spend the winter with the Patriarch, but ongoing troubles between Kurds and Assyrians prevented them from doing so. Grant still was optimistic and believed that real warfare would not break out, although the Patriarch already had been attacked by Nurullah.[24]

The Kurdish Amir Nurullah wanted to secure his position as head of the Hakkari tribes, including the Assyrian ones, by putting himself directly under Ottoman power in Erzerum. The burning of Qodshanis in August 1841 was certainly meant as a warning to the Patriarch not to strive for independ-

19. Grant 1841: 80-86, Kawerau 1958: 238.
20. The complicated history of these years is extensively treated in Joseph 1961: 49-64.
21. Grant 1841: 88-91.
22. Christian/Isa Anthony Rassam (b. 1808) was married to Mathilda Badger, a sister of G.P. Badger. He had traveled to Britain in 1837 and became British Vice-Consul in Mosul in 1840. His younger brother, Hormuzd Rassam (1829-1910), accompanied H. Layard on his excavations. Cf. Coakley 1992: 20, Hornus 1970: 297 n. 81, and below, 4.2.2 n. 36.
23. Ainsworth 1842: II 246-253, Coakley 1992: 28-33.
24. Kawerau 1958: 240-9 and Anderson 1873: I 199-223.

ence or to seek other alliances. The following winter the conflict seemed to have eased, and Grant, in the summer of 1842, again made his way into the mountains. He obtained permission both from Nurullah and the Patriarch[25] to build a mission house in Ashita, but the house seems to have resembled a fort so much that it caused suspicion with all parties.[26]

At this time the political situation had changed. The Ottoman government had started to gradually reduce the power of the independent Kurdish chiefs. At the southeastern part of the Hakkari mountains, Pasha Mohammed of Mosul was waiting for an opportunity to subdue Nurullah. The Patriarch was caught in the middle of this conflict.

In March 1843 Rev. George Percy Badger came to the Patriarch to offer him the support of the Anglican Church.[27] Moreover, it seems that Badger not only offered educational and religious assistance, but also hinted at a possible intervention in Ottoman politics by the British ambassador in favor of the Assyrians.[28] One of the restrictions he put to his proposals was that the Patriarch would not prolong any contacts with the American missionaries. The Patriarch seemed to have accepted the proposals, but did not make any promises regarding the Americans. During this visit messengers of Nurullah came to the Patriarch to organize a meeting between the two leaders, but the Patriarch did not react, whereas in the course of the same visit he probably had hinted at his alliance to the Pasha of Mosul. Thus Nurullah's messengers received the impression that the Patriarch expected help to come from the foreigners.[29] In April, Grant visited Ashita, but the Kurds were taking such a menacing attitude that he soon returned to Mosul. In June, Nurullah, together with Badr Khan, the Amir of Botan, and with consent of the Mosul Pasha, launched an attack on the Assyrians, as a result of which the Patriarch fled to Mosul in July.[30] Many Assyrians were killed, probably as many as one third of those living in the mountains.[31]

25. Badger 1850: I 185-6, 248, suggests that the Patriarch consented only from fear of Nurullah, but the enduring contacts between the former and Grant seem to indicate otherwise. Compare also Hornus 1970: 293 n. 66. Joseph (1961: 56) suggests that Nurullah gave this permission because a mission building could be of use for him in a future war with the Pasha of Mosul.

26. Layard 1850: I 156-7.

27. See further 3.3.1.

28. Coakley 1992: 39-14.

29. Badger 1852: I 244, 47-51, Joseph 1961: 60-2.

30. Cf. Badger 1850: I 271, 77, 85, Kawerau 1958: 250-1, Hornus 1971: 25-6, and Coakley 1992: 41. The Patriarch's brother had fled to Urmia, after which troubles between him and the missionaries arose.

31. Joseph 1961: 64, Badger 1850: I 366-67.

It is clear that the presence of the Americans and Anglicans in the Hakkari mountains influenced the course of the tragic events of 1843. The interest shown by foreigners from mighty countries in the poor and helpless people in the mountains aroused the suspicion of the Kurds as well as of the Ottoman government. The Assyrians themselves found it difficult to believe that foreign support would not include political help also, even more so since such help appears to have been promised explicitly by Badger and unwillingly by Grant, building his fort-like mission house. These expectations certainly caused the Assyrians to be less careful in their relations with the Kurds. Grant, who had established good relationships both with Nurullah and with the Patriarch, perhaps could have tried to negotiate between the two (or three) parties, but it is likely that for a very long period he did not understand the extent of the feelings involved.[32] When in the summer of 1844 the missionaries came in conflict with the patriarchal family, the latter accused the Protestant missionaries of having played an important role in causing the tragedy. The missionaries tried to plead themselves free, pointing to the fact that this possible relationship between Grant's activities and the Kurdish attacks only was brought forward after the patriarchal family had started to oppose the mission, for reasons other than the war of 1843.[33]

Ainsworth, who was perhaps least involved, worried about his own part in the tragedy, whereas Badger, who was to blame most for his strong suggestion of political help, had difficulties in correctly assessing the situation. He suggested that he himself had played an important part in arousing the interest of the British consulate in Constantinople, through his brother-in-law I.A. Rassam, the British Vice-Consul in Mosul. Whether or not this really had any influence on the ceasing of the fighting is difficult to ascertain. After the massacre, Badger and Rassam helped the refugees in Mosul as much as they could. Grant, also caring for the refugees in Mosul, died shortly afterwards of typhus.[34]

32. Joseph 1961: 64-66, is rather negative about the foreign influence in this region, in which he is followed by Waterfield 1973: 106-7. Hornus 1970: 292-4, and Coakley 1992: 40-41, take a less harsh view, whereas Reed 1968: 7, 16, believes that Badger exerted a positive influence.

33. For the missionaries' defense of their policy, see Laurie 1853, the author having arrived at this mission field in 1842. Interestingly enough, among the missionary correspondence at Houghton a piece of Syriac writing has been preserved in which the unknown writer states that Grant was not to blame for what happened. This scrap, with translation, was sent to the Board in 1844, apparently sometime after it was written, ABC 16.8.1. vol. 3, nr. 206 (the Syriac letter with translation undated) and 207 (accompanying letter by James Lyman Merrick, 15 March 1844).

34. Ainsworth 1842: II 253-55, Badger 1850: I 191, 275-77.

After the massacres in 1843, relationships between Kurds and Christians in the Hakkari mountains were unstable for a long period. In 1845 and 1846 many Assyrians fell victim to new attacks from Badr Khan.[35] In 1847 the Ottoman government was able to bring the area under its power, Badr Khan was taken captive, and the Patriarch probably returned to Qodshanis, after having lived in Mosul for five years.[36]

Although after Grant's death in 1844 a new physician for the mountain post had arrived from America, the Urmia missionaries decided that it might be better not to begin a new mission post in the mountain region. The Kurds still were not to be trusted and the Patriarch also was less friendly than he had been, although American visitors had been received cordially from time to time.[37]

3.1.4 *Further expansion*

Towards the end of 1840, Edward Breath, a trained printer, arrived at the Protestant mission with a printing press. Before the year was over, printing had started with an edition of the Psalms in Classical Syriac. In 1842 the first parts of the New Testament in the vernacular were available.[38]

The schools of the mission saw a gradual increase of popularity. In 1842 the missionaries counted some 500 pupils in the twenty mission schools in the villages, headed by 48 native teachers, 22 of whom were priests. In 1839 there had been 12 schools in 12 different villages, with a total of 272 boys and 22 girls. In 1849 the number of schools had increased to 32 schools, with 590 pupils, of whom 125 were girls.[39] In Urmia itself there was a boarding school for girls, founded in 1843 by Fidelia Fiske (1816-1864),[40] as well as one for boys, which both offered some kind of higher

35. For an account of his visit in the summer of 1846 to Tiari and Tkhuma, two mountain regions, cf. Layard 1850: I 157-239. Many Tiari villages had been destroyed in 1843. In Tkhuma hardly any damage was done, but after Layard had left the area in 1846, Tkhuma was attacked by Badr Khan.

36. Badger 1852: I 368-74, Waterfield 1973: 107, and Hornus 1971: 26-8, n. 33-4. Compare also Anderson 1873: I 342: according to him Badr Khan was emprisoned in 1848, Nurullah Bey in 1849, and Suleyman Bey in 1849.

37. Kawerau 1958: 252-3 and Hornus 1971: 291. According to Coakley 1992: 52, the Patriarch had stayed in Urmia from 1847-49, which period had ended with his strongly opposing the American mission.

38. See below, 4.2.3.

39. Anderson 1873: I 345.

40. Earlier Judith Grant had set up a girls' school, but after she died in 1839 the school was not continued. For Fidelia Fiske and her school, see Perkins 1843: 17; Guest (n.d., preface 1870); Anderson 1875: IV 281-83, Waterfield 1973: 109, and Macuch 1976: 172 (quotation from ZdB 1910/61). On Fiske and female education, see further Laurie 1863, Pitman (n.d.): 140-159, and MH 60/9 (1864) 257-60 (Fiske's obituary). Recently two studies paid

education.[41] In the village schools, where primary education was offered, boys and girls attended classes together.

In these years the missionaries established good relationships with the Assyrians. Many priests and a couple of bishops were involved in the mission work, while at the same time they went on fulfilling their duties in the Assyrian Church. This was approved of by the missionaries. Innovations that were introduced by the missionaries, like education for girls and the use of the Scriptures in the vernacular language, were welcomed by most of the Assyrians in the Urmia region.[42]

A few Assyrians came under the direct influence of the Protestant faith of the missionaries. Priest Auraham and bishop Yukhannan, who had lived with the Perkins family in Tabriz,[43] teaching them the languages, stayed with them after they had moved to Urmia. They attended the house services of the American families, which on weekdays consisted of Bible reading, prayers and singing, and on Sundays of two services in which Perkins gave a sermon. At the same time they continued celebrating the Assyrian masses. When the boarding school pupils also began to attend these private services, one of the Sunday services was held in Neo-Aramaic.[44] Perkins stimulated the Assyrian clergymen present to contribute to the preaching and praying, which after some time they did.[45] On their request, he also admitted them to the Protestant celebration of the Lord's Supper.[46]

In 1838 priest Yukhannan, on behalf of several other priests, asked the missionaries to preach in Assyrian churches, as part of the regular Sunday services. Perkins had never dared to ask for such an opportunity himself, because he had feared that it would not improve the relationship with the clergy. However, when it was requested by the clergy itself, he gladly approved. In 1841 all the American missionaries who spoke Neo-Aramaic,

considerable attention to Fiske and her role in the woman missionary movement in antebellum America: Robert 1997 and Porterfield 1997.

41. Anderson 1873: I 185, 316. For more on D.T. Stoddard, who supervised this school, see Thompson 1858.

42. In Ada, e.g., people sent their daughters to school, without being asked explicitly to do so by the missionaries (Perkins 1843: 290). In 1839 Mar Eliya introduced the reading of Paul's epistles in the church of Gugtapa, in Classical Syriac as well as in the vernacular (Perkins 1843: 376).

43. Perkins 1843: 197.

44. Perkins 1843: 250, 285, 384.

45. Perkins 1843: 251-2 and 256-7, and Anderson 1873: I 179.

46. Perkins 1843: 263 (March 1836): 'Though we have much reason to fear that they are still in the bondage of sin, we dared not close the door of the Lord's table against their earnest importunity — regularly professing Christians as they are, while their outward conduct is in general unexceptionable.'

preached in the Assyrian churches in the Urmia plain, sometimes as often as three times a Sunday, in different churches. These services were usually well attended.[47]

After nearly ten years of mission work, a major crisis almost brought it to an end. In the summer of 1844, members of the patriarchal family, who probably saw their influence among the people diminish, tried to influence the course of the mission work. Assyrians working with the missionaries were banned, parents were forbidden to send their children to the mission schools and the missionaries were asked to stop publishing books in the vernacular language. The missionaries then decided to discontinue most of their activities, hoping that the Assyrian leadership would realize what the benefits of their presence actually were. In the autumn of 1844, the mission had to deal with an accusation of proselytism by the Persian government, which probably originated in an earlier conflict with Roman Catholic missionaries. These attacks from outside fuelled slumbering conflicts among the missionaries themselves concerning the general policy of the mission. These came down to whether the mission should work towards a reformation of the Assyrian Church or towards building a separate Protestant community. Finally, the two missionaries who were least inclined to hope for a reformation, Willard Jones and James Lyman Merrick, were forced to return to America. Their return, as well as the positive outcome of the inquiry into proselytism by the Persian government, led to a general improvement of the situation. In 1846, this showed in a wave of revivals among the Assyrians. These revivals, of course, encouraged the remaining missionaries in their hope for a general reformation of the Assyrian Church.[48]

The most important achievements of the creation of the literary language already should be mentioned here.[49] In 1846 the translation of the New Testament into the vernacular was finished. The edition consisted of the Neo-Aramaic translation with the Peshitta text in parallel columns. In 1852 the Old Testament translation was edited in the same way. In 1849 another major publication of the mission press started: the magazine *Zāhrīri d-Bāhrā* (ZdB), i.e. 'Rays of Light', which was published monthly, and later

47. Perkins 1843: 333, Perkins 1861: 76-7.

48. For this period, see Murre-van den Berg 1997b, Murre-van den Berg, 'The American Board and the Eastern Churches' (forthcoming) and also below, 3.2.1. Some general, rather vague, references to the conflict can be found in Anderson 1873: I 319-323. On Merrick, who was also the first American missionary to the Muslims in Persia, see Finnie 1967: 221-224 and Phillips 1969: 147-148. For much the same discussions among the missionaries of the American Board in Syria, see Badr 1992.

49. See further below, 4.2.4.

bi-monthly, until 1918. This Neo-Aramaic magazine was one of the first magazines in Persia.[50]

The work of the missionaries of the ABCFM in various parts of the world greatly increased the interest in 'foreign' languages and cultures. The *American Oriental Society* was founded in 1849, publishing the *Journal of the American Oriental Society (JAOS)*. During the journal's early years, its main contributors were ABCFM missionaries, who published sketches of 'oriental' languages, drew attention to manuscripts found in their regions, and informed their readers about interesting archeological findings. Justin Perkins published two Classical Syriac texts, whereas also the first grammar of vernacular Aramaic was published in this journal, written by the Urmian missionary D.T. Stoddard (1818-1857). S.A. Rhea (d. 1865), who labored in the Hakkari mountains (Gawar) from 1851 to 1859, contributed a sketch of the local Kurdish dialect.[51] Missionaries like Perkins also were in regular correspondence with scholars back home, thereby also contributing to the further development of oriental studies.

3.2 The Roman Catholic mission (1839-1918)

3.2.1 *Beginnings (1839-1854)*

When the Protestant missionaries began their work in northwestern Persia, a Chaldean community existed in the region of Khosrowa, north of Urmia, as well as in the village of Ardishay, south of Urmia. Their existence probably was due to influence from Roman Catholic missionaries in Diyarbakır or Mosul, but apparently none of these missionaries actually worked in this region.[52] When, in the years 1838-1841, Eugène Boré, a French professor

50. Macuch 1976: 136, Avery 1991: 815-24. A Persian paper had been published from 1834-48, but the first regularly appearing (weekly) magazine started in 1851. According to Avery the publications of the mission press scarcely affected the non-Christian population. Perkins (1843: 315) heard about the Persian paper in 1837.

51. See *JAOS* 1 (1840) 2, 61-63. The following articles were published by missionaries connected to the mission in Urmia: J. Perkins, 'Notice of a Life of Alexander the Great', *JAOS* 4 (1854) 357-439 and 'The Revelation of the Blessed Apostle Paul. Translated from an Ancient Syriac Manuscript', *JAOS* 8 (1866) 183-212. D.T. Stoddard, *Grammar of the Modern Syriac Language as Spoken in Oroomiah, Persia and in Koordistan*, London 1855 and reprinted in *JAOS* 5/6 (1856) 1-180a-h. The contribution of S.A. Rhea, 'Brief Grammar and Vocabulary of the Kurdish Language of the Hakari District', was published fifteen years after his death in *JAOS* 10 (1880) 118-154. On Stoddard's scholarly work (including astronomic observations), see further Thompson 1858: 340-52, on Perkins, see Perkins (Jr.) 1887: 40-55 (a chapter contributed by prof. Isaac H. Hall).

52. See further 2.1.2 and 2.2.2.

of Armenian, began traveling in the Middle East, the situation changed. At first his main interest was in questions related to his scholarly research, but more and more he became interested in the possibilities of establishing mission work in Persia. He put much energy in preparing the ground for the Lazarist mission work in Isfahan, Tabriz and Urmia.[53]

In 1839 he obtained permission from the regent of Urmia, Malik Mansur Mirza, to establish a school in Ardishay.[54] This school became the subject of the first quarrel between the American Protestants and the French Catholics. In 1838 bishop Gauriel of Ardishay had promised some Catholics, one of them Boré, to let them start a school in his village. About a year later, he gave the American missionaries permission to begin with a school. The Catholics at that time had not yet started theirs. Upon hearing about the Protestant school, they announced to Gauriel that they very soon would start with the promised school. Gauriel then became afraid and asked Perkins and Stocking to come to him. They immediately came and helped him writing a letter asking the Catholics not to begin with their school. The latter refused, accusing the American missionaries of bribing Mar Gauriel. The Catholic school that was opened soon afterwards did not attract many pupils.[55]

In 1840 French Fathers of the order of St. Vincent de Paul, also called Lazarists, made a new start with the mission in Persia. Father Ambroise Fornier came to assist Boré in Isfahan, whereas one year later the Fathers Augustin Cluzel (1815-1882) and Joseph Darnis (1814-1858) arrived in Persia. Darnis left for Urmia to start a Catholic mission there, Cluzel went to Isfahan and Fornier to Tabriz.[56]

At the end of 1841, Boré left for Mosul; from there he went to Constantinople. In the spring of 1843 he visited Rome. Then he returned to Constantinople, was appointed French Consul in Jerusalem, but after some time entered the Lazarist order in Constantinople (1849). In 1874 he became its superior. He passed away in 1878.[57]

53. Cf. Kawerau 1958: 510-12, Boré's own memoirs (Boré 1840), Chatelet 1933: 499-510, and Goyau 1938: 178-182.

54. Kawerau 1958: 514, Boré 1840: II 362-3, Macuch 1976: 191.

55. Compare Perkins 1843: 393-6, 439-40 and ABC 16.8.1 vol. 3, nr. 175: 70-81 (Perkins, 16 July 1845) against Boré 1840: II 353, 360-62 and Challaye in Hornus 1971: 133-7. Cf. also Kawerau 1958: 514-5 and Chatelet 1933: 502-504. The accusation of bribery would become a recurrent theme in the Roman Catholic opposition to the Protestant mission.

56. Waterfield 1973: 80.

57. Kawerau 1958: 512-3, Waterfield 1973: 80-1. On the history of the Lazarist order, see Goyau 1938.

In 1842, the permission given in 1840 to Boré by the Shah to proselytize among the Eastern Christians was withdrawn, probably at the instigation of the Russian ambassador De Medem. As De Medem was known to be a Protestant, the Roman Catholics interpreted this as an anti-Catholic measure inspired by the Protestant missionaries, but it is more likely that his action was aimed at protecting the Eastern Churches in general. Especially the Roman Catholic mission work under the Armenians in Julfa, Isfahan, had aroused much suspicion.[58] As a result, Fornier had to leave the country in April 1842, whereas some time later Cluzel left Isfahan for Urmia and joined Darnis.[59]

In 1843 a Roman Catholic church was built in Urmia, dedicated to 'Mary Mother of God'. The Roman Catholic missionaries also assisted the Chaldean community of Ardishay in restoring a dilapidated Assyrian church in the village, because the Chaldeans had no church of their own. The Assyrian community thought this entirely illegal and asked for the help of the American missionaries in regaining the church. The American missionary William R. Stocking traveled to Tehran to take action. He was accompanied by three of the four Assyrian bishops of the region, including Mar Gauriel, bishop of Ardishay. This delegation succeeded in convincing Count De Medem of their case. The latter, however, decided not only to ask for the return of the Ardishay church into Assyrian hands, but also to have the Roman Catholic missionaries expelled from the country, in view of their proselytizing activities. Stocking is said to have objected to this expulsion, but the Russian ambassador was not to be stopped.[60] As a result, Darnis, the head of the mission, was imprisoned. When Cluzel arrived in Tehran to defend the Catholic mission, he was forced to leave the country. Through the help of the French diplomat M. de Sartiges, the problem was settled and the missionaries obtained permission to continue their work. As they were not allowed to work in Urmia again, they chose Khosrowa to be their main post. It is likely that the subsequent accusation of proselytism of

58. So Hornus 1971: 292-4 and Chatelet 1934: 93-96.

59. According to Hornus 1971: 295-6 n. 83, Cluzel was accompanied by two other clergymen. Perkins 1843: 459-60, describes a meeting (June 1843) with a certain Lazarist, 'M. Theophane, a French Catholic priest, who has come to Oroomiah to commence Papal operations'. This might be the same as 'frère Théophane Dequevauvilliers', mentioned by Hornus, who came to Urmia just after the troubles about the firman.

60. See further Hornus 1971: 296-301 and notes, ABC 16.8.1 vol. 3, no. 175, p. 28ff (Perkins, 16 July 1845). See also an earlier letter in MH 40/8: 261-63, 28 March 1844. The missionaries mention Stocking only, not Perkins and Stocking (so Hornus), as going to Tehran.

the American missionaries was due to French diplomatic intervention, at the instigation of the Roman Catholic missionaries.[61]

In Khosrowa a substantial community of Chaldeans existed, and already in 1838 Roman Catholic missionaries had visited this town. The Lazarists built a church and in 1846 established a seminary, which after a short time had 16 pupils. Among these first pupils was Paul Bedjan, born in 1838, who in due time was to be an important member of the Chaldean and Roman Catholic community. Another pupil of these early years that became of great importance for the Lazarist mission was Désiré Salomon.[62]

In that same year problems arose with the Chaldean Patriarch Nicolas Ishaya (or 'Zayya', Patriarch from 1840 to 1846), who spent most of his time in his native town Khosrowa. Supposedly, tensions between him and the Lazarist missionaries forced him to resign in 1846. He was succeeded by Yosip Audo (1847-1878). Nicolas Ishaya then wanted to become bishop of Khosrowa, but the see already was occupied. He also had tried to come to terms with the Protestant missionaries, but his efforts came to nothing. He died in 1863.[63] The way Challaye, in his report on the missions in Persia, spoke about these troubles makes one think that the Patriarch perhaps had quite a few followers.[64]

In 1854, in the same report, Challaye concluded that lack of money was one of the most serious problems of the Lazarist missionaries, especially when compared to the amount of money the American missionaries could spend among their followers.[65] He further noted that perhaps more schools should have been established, not only in Chaldean, but also in 'Nestorian' villages.[66]

61. See further Hornus 1971: 301-307, Chatelet 1934: 250-258, Anderson 1873: I 319-321, Waterfield 1973: 81 and above, 3.1.4. These sources are conflicting at a number of points, a solution of these issues awaiting research into the history of the Lazarist mission in its own right. For now, it seems that Hornus is wrong in correcting his own main source, the account of Count Challaye, as to the fact that the accusation of proselytism against the Lazarist as well as the Protestant missionaries was about proselytizing of Muslims, rather than of Christians of the Eastern Churches. Chatelet, Anderson and Waterfield have difficulties in distinguishing between the various stages of the troubles in the years 1842 to 1844.

62. Hornus 1971: 291 n. 73, Chatelet 1934: 266-7, and Vosté 1945: 47. On Bedjan and Salomon, see further 4.3.

63. So Hornus 1971: 309-314, Badger 1852: I 168-73, Chatelet 1934: 401 and Kawerau 1955: 127-8; compare, however, Tfinkdji 1914: 463, who gives 1855 as the year of his death. Tisserant 1931: 244-45 follows Tfinkdji. They do not provide any information as to the source of the troubles.

64. Hornus 1971: 315.

65. Hornus 1972: 289-291. See also n. 16 and 55 on the accusation of bribery.

66. Hornus 1972: 293, Chatelet 1934: 393-96.

3.2.2 *In Urmia and Khosrowa*

In the early fifties the Lazarists re-established themselves in Urmia.[67] In the first years their work in this town was limited, but in 1858, the school they had started contained about 61 pupils. The schools in the villages around Urmia at that time had about 130 pupils. At that time there were three Lazarist missionaries in Khosrowa and four in Urmia. These missionaries directed six schools in the plain of Salmas and eleven in the plain of Urmia. Before the arrival of the Lazarists, perhaps not more than one Chaldean family lived in Urmia, whereas some other Chaldean families lived in the villages of Barwari and Ardishay. In Challaye's report of 1854, however, a number of 1500 'Catholics' in the Urmian plain is given, and in 1859, 2000 people are said to have converted recently to Catholicism. These numbers suggest that due to the Lazarist mission work the Chaldean community in the Urmia plain had increased remarkably.[68]

From 1856 onwards, the Lazarist missionaries were assisted by the 'Sœurs de la Charité'. They devoted their attention to the education of girls and women and provided some medical care and lodgings for people visiting Urmia. Later on these sisters worked also in Urmia and Tehran.[69] In 1858 Darnis, the head of the mission, died. He was succeeded by Cluzel, who was to lead the mission till 1882. In 1859 the seminary of Khosrowa acquired a new building and a new group of seminarists was admitted.[70]

In the years between 1866 and 1873, the Lazarist mission went through a difficult period, resulting in a decreasing number of pupils at their schools. Famines and Kurdish unrest made these years hard on the whole population. The Lazarist mission suffered more, because, due to political problems in France, the mission received hardly any financial support.[71] From 1873 onwards, the situation improved, and the number of schools and pupils

67. According to Chatelet this was possible because in this period the ban on proselytism was removed, which earlier had driven the Roman Catholics out of Urmia, see Chatelet 1934: 392-3, 396-7, 400. Strangely enough, although Chatelet ascribes this removal of the ban to the interference of the American missionaries, I have not come across any mentioning of it in American sources.

68. Hornus 1972: 293-4 and n. 171, Chatelet 1934: 404-5. Compare, however, the numbers provided by Thompson in 1866, working for the British legation (Anderson 1875: IV, 295): 20.000 'Nestorians' in the Urmia and Salmas region and 625 'Papal Christians' in the Urmia region. He could not obtain data on the number of Chaldeans of Salmas.

69. Chatelet 1934: 424-30, Waterfield 1973: 81-2.

70. Chatelet 1934: 406-10.

71. Chatelet 1934: 569-71, 1935: 83-89 and Hajjar 1979: 197-8. The latter mentions difficulties in the relations between the Chaldean Patriarch and Rome, which also might have influenced the work of the Lazarist mission. For some photographs of Urmia and the mission in this period, see Binder 1887.

again increased. In 1874, the Persian Apostolic Delegation was separated from that in Mesopotamia, Kurdistan and Armenia. Cluzel then was appointed Apostolic Delegate.[72]

Paul Bedjan, who after his primary education in Khosrowa had gone to Rome to become a Roman Catholic priest, returned to Persia in 1861. He then worked at the Lazarist mission until 1880, both in Urmia and in Khosrowa. On his return from Europe he had brought with him a little press, which, however, seems to have been used far less than the harmonium taken from Europe on the same trip. In 1880, when Bedjan went back to Europe, he set himself the task to provide religious books for the Chaldeans of Persia, in the vernacular as well as in the Classical Syriac language.[73]

His position in the Chaldean Church seems to have been rather controversial. In Persia he had made himself popular by his preaching, as much as his books later were enthusiastically received by the Chaldeans.[74] After his return to Europe, several attempts were made to appoint him bishop of Khosrowa. At that time, however, Bedjan had fallen out of grace with the Chaldean Patriarch, Eliya XIV Abulyonan (1879-1894),[75] who had not approved of the changes Bedjan had made in his edition of the Chaldean breviary, printed in 1886. The Patriarch opposed to Bedjan's appointment as bishop and since the latter himself was no longer interested and preferred to stay in Europe, further attempts to have him consecrated remained without result. In 1920 Bedjan died in Germany, without ever having been in Persia again.[76]

Although Roman Catholic mission work in the Urmia and Salmas region had started soon after the Protestant initiative, it was only towards the end of the nineteenth century that it became more successful in the region. Why this was so, should be decided upon only after further study of the Lazarist mission, but a contemporary Chaldean writer's comparison of almost a century of Lazarist and Protestant mission work gives a few indications as to what direction to look for.[77] Babakhan, writing at the end of the last century, attributed the greater success of the Protestants foremostly to the fact

72. Chatelet 1935: 88-89, 94-95.

73. On these, see below, 4.3.2. Bedjan's biography still has to be written, but see Vosté 1945, Simono 1984, and Murre-van den Berg 1994. Simono 1984, which is a hagiographic booklet on Bedjan in LUA and Persian, also has a few photographs of Bedjan.

74. Vosté 1945: 51-2, 75-6, Babakhan 1899: 439 n. 1, Simono 1984: 10-12.

75. Cf. 2.1.2 n. 8, Vosté 1945: 73 (Abolionan). Extrapolating from the list of Eliya's in Lampart 1966: 63-4, Abulyunan should count als Eliya XIII. See also Hajjar 1979: 198-201.

76. Vosté 1945: 54-5 and 57-73.

77. Babakhan 1899. On p. 433 the main conclusions are given.

that their effort not only consisted of spiritual assistance, but also of much-needed material help. The Americans set up carefully planned aid programs, whereas the Catholics spent most of their money at specific occasions when help was asked for, and then easily depleted their funds. Even if the Catholics would have had just as much money as the Americans, so Babakhan thought, they would not have been able to do the same amount of work. According to Babakhan, the second factor that contributed to the success of the Protestant mission was the fact that they, as far as possible, paid attention to all 'Nestorians'. They traveled into the mountains, visited every village and tried to keep in touch with the Patriarch. In his opinion, the Lazarist missionaries focused on the Chaldean party, and never really sought much contact with the other Assyrians. The Protestants' third important contribution was their extensive school system. The Catholics never succeeded in setting up a system that could compete with that of the Protestants, so most Assyrians preferred to send their children to Protestant schools. In addition, these schools benefited from the American printing press, which was producing a flow of literature from 1840 onwards, whereas the Lazarist press, starting in 1876, did not produce more than perhaps a dozen books in its initial period. Only from 1885 onwards, when Bedjan's books were published in Europe, was the 'Catholic' literature able to compete with that of the Protestants. Finally Babakhan points to the fact that the Protestants had not stressed the theological differences between them and the Assyrians.

3.2.3 *The Dominican mission in Mosul*[78]

Years before the Lazarist mission in Persia started, Roman Catholic missionaries had been working in Mosul. In 1750, a Dominican mission had been established by Italian fathers. In 1856, the mission was handed over to a group of French Dominicans. Because, by that time, an important part of the Assyrians in and north of Mosul had become Roman Catholics, the French friars put much effort into the conversion of the 'Mountain Nestorians'. From Mosul various journeys were undertaken into the mountains to visit the Patriarch, trying to convince him of the advantages of becoming a Roman Catholic. At various times the Patriarch seems to have seriously considered uniting with Rome, and especially at the turn of the cen-

78. An important work on this subject is Goormachtigh (1895-6 and 1897-8). See further Hajjar 1979: 442-462 on the political relations in the years before the war, and Fiey 1993b for the Dominican press.

tury, under the superior J. G. Galland, the Catholics gained ground in the mountains. However, they never succeeded in winning over the Patriarch himself.[79]

The French succeeded in setting up a successful mission press. Most of its publications were in Arabic or Classical Syriac, but some works were in the modern language. Some of these books found their way into Persia, and were distributed among the Chaldeans. Jean-Jacques Rhetoré (1841-1921) worked with the Dominican mission in Turkey from 1874 till his death, spending several years in Van and Ashita. He frequently traveled into the Hakkari mountains. His grammar of the modern Aramaic dialect of the Mosul area was published in Mosul in 1912, whereas he was also involved in the publication of modern Aramaic poetry.[80] Grammar and orthography of the Mosul dialect are different from that of the Urmia and Salmas plains, which might explain why in the nineteenth century there does not seem to have been much intercourse between the two literary traditions. It was only after the First World War, when the geography of the Assyrian and Chaldean population had been completely changed, that the two strains came to together.

3.3 The Anglican mission (1886-1915)[81]

3.3.1 *The forerunners*

As early as 1825 the Anglicans had established their first contacts with the Assyrian Christians in the Urmia region. Joseph Wolff (1796-1862), of German-Jewish extraction, became a Roman Catholic and went to Rome to study at the *De Propaganda Fide*. On a visit to Britain, however, he was attracted to the Anglican Church and converted. He became one of the first Western travelers in the regions where the Assyrians lived. In 1824 he arrived in Mosul, after having traveled in many parts of the Ottoman empire, and in 1825 he visited Khosrowa and Urmia. He obtained a couple of Gospel manuscripts, which constituted the basis of the Syriac Gospel edition of the *British and Foreign Bible Society* (BFBS) in 1827.[82] Later he went to America where he was ordained an Episcopalian priest.[83]

79. Cf. Coakley 1992: 170-8 and 258-66.
80. For a description of Rhetoré's life and work, see Chevalier 1985: 318-26, on his literary activities see Fiey 1993b and Poizat 1990.
81. For a detailed description of the history of this mission, see Coakley 1992.
82. See Darlow and Moule 1903: II,3 1543.
83. Wolff 1827-9, Kawerau 1958: 553-336, Coakley 1992: 19-20.

The first British Euphrates expedition, which was headed by Coll. F.R. Chesney and charged to investigate alternative ways to India (1835-7), made contact with the Christians in the region of Mosul and Mardin. A second expedition was organized by the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge* (SPCK) together with the *Royal Geographical Society* (RGS); one of its objectives was to pay special attention to the Christians in this region. William Ainsworth, who directed the undertaking, was asked to seek contact with the Assyrian Patriarch, on behalf of the Anglican Church. The company left in 1838 and was able to visit the Patriarch in Julamerik in 1840.[84] Ainsworth's report led the SPCK, in co-operation with the *Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (SPG), to send George Percy Badger (1815-1888) as a missionary to this area.

At the end of the year 1842, Badger arrived in Mosul. In 1843 he made his first visit to the Patriarch, offering him the assistance of the Anglican Church, on condition that he would no longer keep in touch with the American missionaries.[85] The Patriarch did not want to choose between the two parties and did not make any promises. Badger thought that the Patriarch, for fear of Nurullah, was not able to dismiss Grant, although he had to admit that perhaps the medical skills and the money of the Americans might have been very important for the Patriarch.[86] When the war between the Kurds and the Christians broke out, the Patriarch fled to Mosul, where he stayed for a long period with Badger and his household.

In 1844 Badger was called back to Britain, and this meant the end of the first Anglican mission among the Assyrians. The main reason the SPG gave for this withdrawal was the lack of funds for maintaining the mission, since they had not intended a permanent settlement. In all likelihood, however, there were other reasons. Many Anglicans were sympathetic towards the work of the Presbyterian missions of their time, and presumably they did not approve of Badger's strong opposition to the American mission in this region. When the SPG withdrew from the project, the SPCK was not able to maintain the mission on its own. Badger himself had strongly protested against his withdrawal, helped by letters of concerned Assyrians, but he could do nothing to make the members of the Board change their minds.[87]

In the same period the Episcopalian Church, the American branch of the Anglican Church, became interested in the Middle East. In 1836 Horatio

84. Ainsworth 1842, Kawerau 1958: 556-560, Coakley 1992: 20-34.
85. Cf. 3.1.3.
86. Badger 1852: I 248-9.
87. Kawerau 1958: 560-62, Coakley 1992: 35-54.

Southgate (1812-1894), a deacon, was sent to the Middle East to look into the circumstances of Christians and Muslims and to explore the possibilities of establishing mission centres. In 1837 he reached Urmia and visited the Protestant missionaries. After visiting Tabriz, Tehran, and Baghdad, he returned by way of Mosul. He arrived at the same conclusion as the Protestant Americans had arrived at before him: missionary activities directed to Muslims would not be accepted anywhere, whereas the Christians of the East would make a much more promising mission field.[88] After having been ordained priest, he started working in Constantinople in 1840. He, like Badger, became the subject of much debate, because he openly disparaged the work of the American missionaries. In addition, he seems not to have cared much about the theological differences between the Episcopalians and the Eastern Churches. Another problem arose from the fact that his Board in America wanted Southgate to work among the Syrian-Orthodox in eastern Turkey, whereas Southgate became more and more involved with the Armenians in Constantinople itself. In this period, no other Episcopalian missionaries were sent to the eastern part of the Turkish empire.[89]

3.3.2 *Work in Urmia and Qodshanis*

After Badger had left Mosul, only informal contacts between the Anglicans and the Assyrians were maintained, although the British consuls in Erzerum and Tabriz occasionally spoke up for the Assyrians.[90] In 1868 a group of Assyrian priests, bishops, and *maliks,* tribal leaders, wrote a letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury to ask for his assistance. They complained about their poor conditions and the low level of education among their people, and stated that they did not like the tenets of the Protestant and Catholic missionaries.[91] Significantly, the Patriarch was not among those who signed the letter. This letter was followed by one from the American missionaries, who were anxious to inform the Archbishop that they themselves had never heard these complaints and that in their opinion it would be unwise to establish another mission in Persia.[92] The Anglicans did not react immedi-

88. Southgate 1840; for his visit to Urmia, see I 294-311, and to Mosul, II 208-257.
89. Kawerau 1958: 563-607.
90. Coakley 1992: 53, Joseph 1961: 95-107.
91. Chatelet 1934: 585 notes that early in 1868, the British Consul, Mr. Abbot, visited the Urmia region and promised the Assyrians Anglican/British assistance. This visit might explain why the Assyrians at that period turned to the Anglicans for help.
92. Cf. Coakley 1992: 55-68. Notable is the fact that in the same year the Patriarch, who did not sign the letter to the Archbishop, wrote a letter to the Emperor of Russia, drawing his attention to the difficult situation of the Assyrians, cf. Joseph 1961: 99-100 and Coakley 1992: 58.

ately, but in 1876 E.L. Cutts was sent to the Assyrians for a survey of the prospective mission field. At the end of 1876, Cutts returned from the journey during which he had presented himself to the Patriarch and had visited many Assyrian villages as well as the American missionaries.[93] The Patriarch had received him cordially, but had not given any specific promise concerning a future Anglican mission. The Americans were worried about the prospect of a new mission in Urmia, and urged Cutts not to proceed with it. Cutts had promised somewhat prematurely that the Anglicans would not establish any school where the Americans already had one. In fact, he does not seem to have taken the doubts of the Protestants very seriously. Cutts clearly preferred the work of the older generation of American missionaries, 'who are dead or gone' to that of the present 'younger men, who are said to pursue different measures and to have different aims'.[94] According to him much good could be done by Anglican missionaries. After Cutts had left Urmia, the Americans wrote another letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury, asking him not to proceed with his plans for a second Protestant mission in this same region. They told the Archbishop that the Assyrians first of all had political reasons for asking his help, and would have welcomed assistance from the Russians and the French as much as from the Anglicans.[95]

Despite the American protests, Cutts' report led to renewed plans for a mission among the Assyrians. It took, however, another four years until enough money was collected and a missionary was found. Rudolph Wahl, born in Austria in 1840, was chosen to go to Kurdistan, together with his wife. After some time on missionary duty, it became clear that he did not possess the diplomatic qualities which were needed in the contacts with the Turkish and Persian governments and in the relationship with the Eastern Christians. In 1884, Athelstan Riley, a representative of the Archbishop of Canterbury, was sent to Asia to investigate the situation. His report convinced the Archbishop that Wahl had better be withdrawn and replaced by other missionaries.[96]

In 1885 the Anglicans for the third time began a mission among the Assyrians. Archbishop Benson of Canterbury (Archbishop from 1883-1896), who had taken on this task from his predecessor Tait (d. 1881), founded the *Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians*

93. Cf. Cutts (n.d., around 1877), for an account of this journey.
94. Cutts (n.d.): 283.
95. Cutts (n.d.): 284-7, Coakley 1992: 68-73 and 78-9.
96. Waterfield 1973: 126, Coakley 1992: 76-97.

(ACM).[97] In 1886 A.J. Maclean and W.H. Browne, accompanied by Riley, arrived in Urmia, carrying with them a letter to the Assyrian Patriarch Shimun XVIII Ruben (1861-1903). Having visited him, Maclean and Browne returned to Urmia, whereas Riley, after having made another tour through the mountains, returned to England.[98]

The two new missionaries started with establishing new schools at several levels. Classical Syriac, Liturgy, and Preaching, along with secular subjects like Mathematics, Writing, Turkish, Persian, and English[99] formed the curriculum in their school for future clergy. This school soon had about 60 pupils, who because of space problems were divided into two groups, alternating every three months.[100] In the Anglican schools it was forbidden to wear anything other than traditional clothing, in order not to encourage 'Western' customs. Instead the children were taught to be proud of their own culture.[101]

In 1887 a third Anglican missionary arrived in Urmia, A.H. Lang. Browne was able now, in November of that year, to leave Urmia to Lang and Maclean, and to try to establish some mission work in the mountains. He spent the winter with the Patriarch, Shimun XVIII Ruben, in Qodshanis, but did not obtain official permission from the Turkish authorities to settle in the region.[102] The Turkish authorities were afraid that Western presence in the mountains would eventually diminish their power over the Assyrians. The Patriarch, however, did not want him to return to Urmia. When in that first winter the Kurds threatened to attack the Christians, Browne was able to inform Maclean, who alerted the European envoys in the Persian capital. The fact that the coming attack was made known to so many people, may have influenced the decision of the Kurds to refrain from actually launching it. This, in any case, was the opinion of the Patriarch, who from then onwards supported Browne as much as possible. In the view of the Turkish authorities, however, this confirmed the impression that these missionaries would interfere with politics in the Hakkari mountains.[103] Browne was per-

97. In the period between Tait and Benson, the orientalist R. Payne Smith, then a deacon (1851-1895) of the diocese of Canterbury, was in charge. He was much interested in the Syrian Churches, and contributed to the foundation of this mission. Cf. Reed 1968: 17. On Benson, see also this volume, Texts no 14.

98. Cf. Riley 1889 and 1891, and Coakley 1992: 98-108.

99. According to Coakley 1992: 111, Maclean wrote in Jan. 1885: 'We should not have included English in it, but that they strongly wished to learn.'

100. Reed 1968: 24-26.

101. Bishop 1892: II 231-2, Maclean & Browne 1892: 160-80, Coakley 1992: 155.

102. According to Yonan 1987: 48-9, the Turkish government had been opposed to an Anglican mission post on Turkish territory in 1886.

103. Coakley 1992: 123-7.

mitted to live in one of the rooms of the patriarchal household, until the time the Turks finally gave him permission to build a chapel and a house. The chapel was finished in 1896. After a few years, the Patriarch became less friendly and hardly used his influence to support Browne's work among the Assyrians in the mountains. The Turks never permitted him to start with a school, but he was able to teach some of the children of the patriarchal household. One of his pupils was a niece of the Patriarch, Surma Khanum; she was to play an important role in the Assyrian delegation to the League of Nations after World War I. Browne became much loved by all Assyrians in the mountains, and stayed there until his death in 1910.[104]

During the first years of the Anglican presence, the relationship with the American missionaries was somewhat awkward. The Anglican missionaries rejected an invitation to a conference on missionary affairs, at which their different aims could have been discussed. After some time, personal contacts among the English speaking residents of Urmia caused the tension between the two missions to lessen, making it possible to assist each other when necessary.[105]

The Anglican press issued Neo-Aramaic works as well as liturgical works of the Church of the East.[106] The policy of assisting the Church of the East as much as possible was sometimes in conflict with their (or their superiors') theological opinions on certain Syriac writers. Works containing heretical views, in Anglican opinion, were not printed at all, so as not to offend the Assyrians with censured liturgies. In works in which 'heretics' like Nestorius were mentioned, these names were not printed, and blank spaces were left in the text. Then the Assyrians themselves were responsible for the eventual adding of these names.[107]

In 1890, the first women came to join the mission — the Anglican missionaries living in celibacy — belonging to the order of the 'Sisters of Bethany', who concentrated on the education of girls. They found it hard to become accustomed to life in Urmia because of differences between their own way of life and that of the male missionaries. After a series of difficult years, in which they had to cope with serious illnesses of various members, in 1898 their Mother Superior decided to have them return to Britain, with-

104. Bishop 1891 II: 285-319, Reed 1968: 27-32, Coakley 1992: 125-34, 195-204, Surma d'Bait Mar Shimun 1983.

105. Coakley 1992: 112-6.

106. Cf. 4.4.

107. For the discussion among the Anglicans about the printing of 'heretical' views, see Coakley 1992: 134-144, and Arberry 1969: 528.

out sending out any new sisters. In 1903 new plans were made for sending some sisters to Urmia, but without success.[108]

3.4 The continuation of the American mission (1850-1918)

3.4.1 *The separation from the Church of the East*

In the first period of the mission of the American Protestants in Urmia, neither the Assyrians nor the Americans themselves thought of forming a separate Protestant Assyrian community. Perkins, the founder of the mission, explicitly rejected the idea of any separation, and directed all his energy to reforming the Church of the East in matters of education of the clergy, active participation of the laity, and, most of all, to stimulating a 'living faith' in all its members. In due time, however, the need for a separate body was felt more and more, mainly because tension arose between those Assyrians who agreed with the aims of the missionaries and those who were opposed to their activities. Later generations of missionaries were less reluctant to encourage the idea of a separate ecclesiastical community than Perkins and his colleagues had been; they wanted more and more 'to build up a Church untrammelled with dry remnants of a hierarchy or of superstition, organized for self-direction and self-support'.[109]

The development towards a separate Church, however, was a gradual one. In the mid-forties of the nineteenth century, the wave of revivalism that swept through the Assyrian communities caused some local churches to assume a rather Protestant character. More emphasis was placed on preaching, the reading of the liturgy was shortened, and admittance to Holy Communion became more strict. At several times during the fifties, the possibility of separation from the Church of the East was discussed, but never put through. Meanwhile, the number of Assyrians attracted to Protestantism slowly increased. To sustain their faith, these Assyrians were permitted to participate in the missionaries' private services, in addition to their regular attendance of mass in the Church of the East. A person's first admittance to Holy Communion was preceded by a public declaration of faith, usually during a special service. In these years, the missionaries still hoped for a reformation of the Church of the East as a whole.[110]

108. Bishop 1891 II: 229, Coakley 1992: 150-62, 87-91, 234-36, 243-4.

109. Speer 1911: 30.

110. Compare, a.o., MH 52 (Oct. 1856): 299, 53 (Sept. 1857): 303-4, and 57 (Dec. 1861): 358-9, Anderson 1873: II 140-143, Lyko 1964: 18, and Speer 1911: 22.

In the summer of 1862, a *Sunhados*, or 'General Council', was chosen. This body of twelve Protestant Assyrians was to take over much of the organizational work of the missionaries, with respect to both spiritual and civil matters.[111] The Sunhados also accepted a confession and other church regulations. These regulations formed the basis of the association between the Protestant communities and were to be signed by those who bore responsibility in the churches. Although these regulations and the self-governing body at its inception were intended to function within the Church of the East, in 1871 these became the basis of the Protestant Church.[112] In hindsight, 1862 was seen as the official start of the 'Evangelical Syrian Church', because at that time the 'Regulations' were accepted.[113]

The reasons for the formal separation between the Protestant Church and the Church of the East in 1871 are to be found chiefly in the fact that in the latter half of the sixties the opposition within the Church of the East to the growing influence of the Protestants grew considerably stronger. The new Patriarch, Shimun XVIII Ruben, who had assumed office in 1861, was more antagonistic towards the American missionaries and the Assyrian Protestants than his predecessor had been. James Bassett, an American missionary who started mission work in Tehran in 1872, mentions that in 1868 the Patriarch had denied the sacraments to the Protestants.[114] In 1870 the missionaries wrote that formerly loyal Assyrians, like bishop Yukhannan and priest Yukhannan, had changed parties and were now involved in the plans for Anglican presence in Persia.[115] Priest Yukhannan even went to England, not only to collect financial aid, but also to officially ask for Anglican assistance, carrying with him letters of some of the bishops. Upon his return, perhaps incited by the help promised by England, controversies between the Protestant and Old Church party grew.[116] One may assume that the growing discontentment with certain tenets within the Protestant com-

111. In later times the word *Knushya* 'synod, meeting, committee', seems to have been used both for this council, which later evolved into the general synod of the Evangelical Church in northwestern Persia, and for the presbyteries under the responsibilities of this synod; cf. Bassett 1887: 52: 'the clergy in the service of the Mission were gathered into four ecclesiastical bodies called in the Syriac, Kanoosha', and Lyko 1964: 26, dating the 'Kenuscha' to 1862.

112. MH 59 (Feb. 1863): 49, (August 1863): 236, Anderson 1873 II: 148, and Lyko 1964: 26-7. The Church manual which was adopted is entitled: *Ktāḇā d-tāwdītā u-qnuni*, 'Book of confession and rules', in which also a translation of the Westminster cathechism is included.

113. Bishop 1891: II 226-7.

114. Bassett 1887: 51-2.

115. MH 66 (June 1870): 189-191, 66 (August 1870): 254-257.

116. Anderson 1873: II 313-19 and Coakley 1992: 63-5, cf. further 3.3.2.

munities and the loss of influence among the Assyrian community as a whole led the clergy of the Church of the East to look for foreign, i.e., British help, rather than the other way round. However, it cannot be excluded that the growing political influence of the British in Persia, as well as already existing contacts with Anglican clergy in Great Britain, may have incited further opposition to the Protestant mission.

In addition, in these years the Protestant mission itself changed its policy. The rather cautious and 'conservative' policy of the older missionaries was exchanged for a more radical course. The new missionaries of the late sixties were less reluctant to accept a separation from the Church of the East than Justin Perkins (who left the mission field in 1869) and his colleagues had been.[117] When in 1870 the decision was taken to enlarge the scope of the mission to include also work among Muslims and Armenians,[118] a separate Protestant Church became almost a neccesity. One of the missionaries who was involved in the separation from the Church of the East was John H. Shedd, who worked in Urmia from 1859 to 1895.[119] Other missionaries working in Urmia in these years were Benjamin Labaree (from 1860 to 1906) and Joseph Gallup Cochran (from 1847 to 1871). Their respective sons, born and raised in Persia, would play an important role in the third period of the Urmia mission.[120]

It is difficult to estimate the amount of influence which the American Protestant mission exerted among the Assyrians of Persia. A minority only of the Assyrians became a member of the 'Evangelical Church'. In 1857, according to Bishop, the Protestant communities had 216 members (she probably refers to those Assyrians taking part in the Holy Communion with the American missionaries) and in 1887 the number had grown to 2003. Bassett mentions 720 members in 1868, 700 in 1871 and 1600 in 1884. Hornus arrives at 763 members in 1871.[121] Most Protestants lived on the Urmia plain, with an Assyrian population of about 25,000. On a total Assyrian population of about 80,000, therefore, they constituted only a small minority. However, the influence of the American mission reached beyond the Protestant communities, as many more Assyrians benefitted from the Protestant schools, literature, and medical assistance.

117. So Cutts (n.d.): 283 and Richter 1910: 303-4.

118. See 3.4.2.

119. Shedd 1922: 34.

120. Vinton Book vol. III: 117, 119-120, Anderson 1875 II: 498. On their sons, see 3.4.2 and 3.7.

121. Bishop 1891: 227, Bassett 1887: 52, 55, 333, Hornus 1970: 300 n. 88.

3.4.2 *The work of 'The Mission to Persia'*

In 1870 yet another change took place. The Presbyterians withdrew themselves from the ABCFM that supported the mission work in Urmia. Mission work in Turkey was transferred to the Congregationalists, whereas the Presbyterians took over the work in Syria and Persia. The mission in Urmia, therefore, came under the responsibility of the *Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions*. Most of the missionaries in Urmia were Presbyterians, so this decision did not cause much trouble among its missionary community. Whether the changes that did take place in these years, like the separation from the Church of the East and the enlargement of the scope of the mission, were due to differences in policy between the ABCFM and the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions, needs further research. However, the fact that these changes preceded the actual transference, makes it unlikely that there is any immediate connection.

Six months earlier *The Mission to the Nestorians* had changed its name to *The Mission to Persia*, reflecting the fact that since a few years the work no longer was confined mainly to the 'Nestorians' of northwestern Persia.[122] New projects in Persia were set up, in Tehran (1872), Tabriz (1873), Hamadan (1881), Kermanshah (1894), Resht (1902), and Meshed (1911), whereas in Urmia the work was extended also to Armenians and Muslims. In all these towns small Protestant congregations were organized. The work in Tehran, initiated by James Bassett, proved especially successful. Preceded only by James Merrick who worked among the Muslims of Tabriz, Bassett was the second American missionary working mainly among Muslims.[123]

The mission work in Urmia flourished in the later years of the nineteenth century. In the early sixties of the nineteenth century, the number of pupils at the Protestant schools had diminished greatly, which perhaps should be attributed to the controversies between the Old Church and the Evangelical Church.[124] Shortly afterwards, however, the number of pupils rose again, and at the beginning of the eighties the number was higher than it had ever been. These large numbers suggest that it is unlikely that only children of

122. Anderson 1873: II 321, Bassett 1887: 52-3, Lyko 1964: 8, and Brown 1936: 489-90.

123. Waterfield 1973: 111, 133-140, Lyko 1964: 15-39, Richter 1910: 317-29, Bassett 1887: 327-33.

124. The sixties and seventies seems to have been a difficult period for the Roman Catholic mission as well, cf. 3.2.2. Perhaps the decline also had something to do with political unrest in that period.

Protestant families joined these schools.[125] It was not only primary education that grew in these years. The two seminaries in Urmia, the Male and Female Seminary, rose their standards considerably, changing the Male Seminary into the Urmi College. These institutes provided higher education for a considerable number of students, but its Western-styled type of education also gave rise to critical observations, especially as it seemed to encourage young Assyrians to leave the country and travel to the United States or to Europe.[126]

Medical work too expanded in this second period. The physician Joseph P. Cochran (1855-1905), son of an Urmian missionary, returned to Urmia in 1878 after having completed his medical studies in the United States. In 1880 he built a hospital just outside the town of Urmia, which is said to have been the first hospital in Persia. From that time onwards, native physicians were trained in this hospital.[127] In 1890 a special women's wing was built that was headed by the physician Emma T. Miller.[128] People from all ethnic groups had themselves treated in this hospital, which contributed greatly to the Americans' popularity with the Persians and Kurds.

At the end of the seventies, new attempts were made to form an independent Kurdish state. At first Sheikh Ubaydullah directed his attention to Persia, which was rather weak in the northwest, an initiative that was stimulated by the Ottoman government. In the autumn of 1880, the Sheikh laid siege to Urmia. The physician Cochran, who had a good reputation among Christians and Kurds alike, was able to persuade him not to attack Urmia immediately. This postponement gave the Persians some time to organize their defense, but before an attack was launched, the Kurds were quarrelling among themselves and retreated. In the meantime the American missionaries had been able to shelter many refugees on their premises, both Christians from the plain and Persians.[129]

125. Cf. *ZdB* 1910/61/108 in Macuch 1976: 172-3; in an overview on occasion of the 75th anniversary of the Mission, the following numbers are given: in 1862, 'halving' (no number), then (no date), 24 schools with 530 pupils, then (no date), 50 schools with 908 pupils, and in 1882, 80 schools with 2286 pupils. In 1897 a new 'College' was built inside the city.

126. Bishop 1891 II: 222-3, Richter 1910: 306-7. For an interesting example of such a wandering Assyrian, see Coakley 1993 on Yaroo M. Neesan.

127. Richter 1910: 307-8, Speer 1911: 63 and 318-364, Macuch 1976: 174 (ZdB1910/61).

128. Speer 1911: 319; Macuch 1976: 174 (ZdB1910/61), supposes that 'Dr. Muller' was a man.

129. Speer 1911: 74-101. On the political background of this Kurdish uprising, see Joseph 1961: 107-113 and Izady 1992: 57.

3.5 The Lutheran mission

In 1881, Lutheran influence made itself felt in the Urmia region. The Assyrian priest Pera Yukhannan, born in Ardishay but living in Wazirabad, in 1875 had started his theological studies at Hermannsburg. After his return to Persia in 1880, he started to preach in his home town and to establish schools in the region. He was financially supported by the Hermannsburger Mission. In 1891, the Lutheran reform movement was officially supported by the Patriarch and his counselors, because they thought it to be a possible counter influence to the American Presbyterian and Russian-Orthodox missions. The coming of the latter mission in 1897 (cf. below, 3.6), made it particularly hard for the Lutherans to proceed with their work, as a considerable part of their community converted to Russian-Orthodoxy, thereby succeeding in securing the ownership of the church buildings. In 1900, these churches were restored to the Lutheran communities, through interference by the director of the Hermannsburger Mission, Rev. Georg Haccius. In 1905, the Lutheran party was strenghtened by a Norwegian missionary from the United States, Rev. Fossum. However, the foreign missionaries and the Assyrian-Lutheran priests did not always agree on the course they had to take in their co-operation with the other clergy of the Church of the East. In these years other Lutheran organizations, among which a Swedish-American association, a society from Berlin, and the Orient Mission from Dr. Lepsius also supported work among the Assyrian Christians.[130]

As for literary matters, none of these organizations contributed significantly to the development of the literary language. One should mention, however, Lazarus Yaure, who in the fifties of this century contributed some articles on the literary language of Urmia. He was born in 1888 as the son of priest Yaure Auraham from Gugtapa, one of Pera Yukhannan's earliest sympathizers. After having received a large part of his education in Germany, the Hermannsburger Mission send him back to Persia in 1912. After some difficult years, due to tensions between the American-Lutheran and Assyrian-Lutheran mission workers, he left Persia in the course of the First World War. He settled in Philadelphia (Pennsylvania), where he served as a minister of an Assyrian-Lutheran congregation.[131]

130. Richter 1908: 232, Richter 1910: 308, 314-15, Coakley 1992: 282-4, Yonan 1989: 202, Tamcke 1993, Tamcke 1994a, Tamcke 1994b and Tamcke 1998. For an overview of the work of the Hermannsburger Mission, see Haccius 1914: 412-422 and Haccius 1920: 369-385.

131. See Tamcke 1995: 355-85. For the problems of these second-generation Assyrian-Lutherans, see also Tamcke 1995-1996 and Tamcke 1996, on Luther Pera, the son of Pera Yukhannan and his mission work in Urmia in the years preceding the War.

3.6 The Russians (1851-1914)

During the second half of the nineteenth century, Britain and Russia had been struggling to extend their power in Persia. Traditionally Russia was strong in the northern part of the country, including Azerbaijan, and Britain in the south. The Persian government had to steer a middle course between the interests of these two political powers, and it could hardly make any decision without the consent of the consuls of both countries. For a long time already, the Christians in Azerbaijan favored stronger Russian influence in their part of the country, because they expected to be better treated under a Christian government. Their Muslim neighbors naturally opposed to the coming of the Russians, so that another cause of trouble between Christians and non-Christians was created.[132]

The first contacts between the Church of the East and the Russian Orthodox Church probably dated from the early nineteenth century, when after the Treaty of Turkmanchay considerable groups of Assyrians had settled in Russia. According to Suttner, these Assyrians were incorparated into the Russian Orthodox Church, but were permitted to celebrate the mass in Classical Syriac. In 1851 an attempt was made to establish some official contact between the Church of the East and the Russian Orthodox Church, but the details are unknown. More is known about the journey of priest Mikhael from Urmia, who, in 1861, having been disappointed by the Americans, traveled to St. Petersburg to arouse the interest of the Russian clergy in Assyrian affairs. The Orthodox Church was interested in a possible union between the two bodies, but no union was established.[133] In 1883 bishop Gauriel was sent to Tbilisi to ask for Russian help. The Russian Church promised to establish a mission post in Urmia, but it took until 1895 before the first Russian Orthodox priests entered Persia. It is likely that they hesitated to come to Azerbaijan as long as this might have been misunderstood by Assyrians, British, and Persians as a political intervention; only when Russian domination in this part of Persia was generally recognized, did they send their missionaries.[134]

132. Cf. on this subject a legendary (?) story that is told in Merx 1873: 26, about a gathering of Muslims who plan to kill all Christians in Urmia. One person present, however, reminds the others of the fact that if they would do so, the Russians would come and kill them and their king, a threat that prevented the killing.

133. The *Missionary Herald* published some letters of the Protestant missionaries which indicate that some attempts were indeed made to gather support for a union with the Orthodox Church among the Assyrians, and that these attempts created considerable unrest; *MH* 58 (August 1862): 253, 58 (Oct. 1862): 311-14.

134. Cf. Anderson 1873: II 144, Hornus 1971: 142 n. 60, Joseph 1961: 120, Coakley 1992: 219-20, and Suttner 1995: 33-36.

In this same period, tensions between the Kurds and the Christians again increased, and Kurdish raids on Assyrian villages became more and more numerous. In 1896 the above mentioned Assyrian bishop Gauriel was murdered; this led to British pressure on the Turkish government to punish the murderer. In most instances, however, both the Turkish and the Persian government were not eager to interfere in these quarrels. Many Assyrians of the mountains fled to the plains of Urmia and Salmas.[135]

In 1897 two Russian Orthodox priests visited the Urmia region and within a few months they collected about 10,000 signatures of Assyrians who wanted to join the Russian Orthodox Church. This successfull campaign in 1898 led to the establishment of a mission post in Urmia, consisting of two Russian priests and a few Assyrians. Considerable numbers of those who had been connected to the Anglican and Roman Catholic missions entered the Russian Orthodox Church, but the majority of converts formerly belonged to the Church of the East.[136]

The Anglicans considered the Russian Orthodox Church to be a sister church of the Anglican Church. In that capacity, the Orthodox Church was actually better fitted for mission work among the Assyrians as their own, as it was the church of a neighboring country. The Anglicans assisted the Russians as much as they could and intended to leave the Urmia region themselves in due time. Nobody, however, really wanted them to leave, so the final decision to leave was postponed for a couple of years.[137]

Members of the Evangelical Church as well converted to the Russian Orthodox Church. J.P. Cochran, in a letter of July 1897, described the situation in the village of Ada, in which half of the Protestants became Orthodox. He suggested that in other villages the situation was somewhat better for the Protestants, but he also admitted that the great many departures caused financial problems for the Evangelical Church.[138] In a speech he gave in 1898, the Russian missionaries were mentioned, but no indication whatsoever is given about actual consequences for the Evangelical Churches and the schools run by the missionaries.[139] In the above mentioned letter of 1897, he emphasized that the reason for these mass conversions was a political one: the Assyrians expected that a conversion to the

135. Coakley 1992: 212-15, Joseph 1961: 115-19.

136. Coakley 1992: 221-2, 30-34, Suttner 1995: 36-40, and Bolshakoff 1943: 101-2; according to the latter about 50.000 Assyrians asked to be permitted to the Russian Orthodox Church.

137. Coakley 1992: 222-34.

138. Speer 1911: 209-11.

139. Speer 1911: 20-24.

Russian Orthodox Church would hasten a Russian occupation of Azerbaijan. It can hardly be denied that this was indeed the main reason; one indication for this is the fact that the important 'Nestorian' theological issues that had caused long discussions with the other missions suddenly were passed over without notice.[140]

At the end of the century, the Russian mission went through a troublesome time. Mar Yonan, an Assyrian bishop who had been working with the mission, misbehaved, while problems among the Russian missionaries themselves prevented them from handling the matter adequately. About 1903, however, things again went better. In 1905 the Russian mission began editing a magazine, *Ormi Ārtādoksêtā*, 'Orthodox Urmia', written in Russian and Neo-Aramaic. Its last issue appeared in 1915.[141]

3.7 Part of a World War

3.7.1 *The years before the War (1905-1914)*

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the problems between the Kurds and the Assyrians for a very short period seemed to have been settled, but already in 1903 rumors spread of new disturbances between Assyrian mountain tribes and Kurdish tribes. In Urmia the Muslims became more and more opposed to the growing Russian influence, causing a growing uneasiness in their relations with the Christians living in their town. The Persian government tried to mediate between the various groups in the region, but especially in the mountain areas, where the Kurds were causing trouble, they were not really able to do so.[142]

Early in 1904 B.W. Labaree, one of the group of second-generation American missionaries, was murdered. The murderer took Labaree for Dr. Cochran, the physician, who afterwards received several warnings that someone intended to kill him. It was known which Kurdish tribe and which person was responsible for the murder, but the Persian government did not undertake any specific action. This led to diplomatic pressure by the British and American ministers in Tehran. In 1905 the murderer was taken captive and after some years died in jail. The Persian raids into Kurdish territory

140. Cf. Richter 1910: 310-14, 16, Joseph 1961: 121, and Coakley 1992: 223-4.

141. Bolshakoff 1943: 102, Coakley 1992: 240-3, Macuch 1976: 205-6, Yonan 1985: 24-25. Macuch and Yonan differ from Coakley in dating the first issue of 'Orthodox Urmia' to 1904.

142. Speer 1911: 245-248.

had also worsened the relations between the Turkish and Persian government, leading to the occupation by Turkish troops of parts of northwest Persia until 1912.[143]

In 1906 some Assyrians began a magazine in Neo-Aramaic, *Kôḵḇā*, 'The Star'. The leading figures of this magazine were connected to the Protestant mission and *Kôḵḇā* was printed on their presses, but the magazine explicitly aimed at all Assyrians, irrespective of the group to which they belonged. There is every reason to view *Kôḵḇa* as one of the first clear signs of a growing nationalism, not in the least because it was written in LUA. This language became an important element of Assyrian nationalism, because it could be used to express a common identity, transcending the confessional differences that, at least partly, originated in the nineteenth century.[144]

The national political scene in Persia changed greatly in that period. The constitutional movement was struggling for the institution of a parliament that would diminish the power of the Shah. In 1906, after a period of unrest in several parts of the country, a national parliament was elected. The weak Shah Muzaffar ad-Din (1896-1907) died and was succeeded by his son Muhammad Ali (1907-1909), who dissolved the parliament in 1908. This led to a revolt in Tabriz, after which in 1909 the parliament was restored.[145] This time a seat was reserved for a representative of the Christian minorities, but the latter did not succeed in finding the right person because of internal quarrels.[146] The start of the periodical *Kôḵḇā* fits nicely into this period, in which freedom of press and equality of all ethnic groups were much stressed. In *Kôḵḇā*, however, it was not made very clear what the Assyrians thought about these developments. In 1906 the editors wrote, after having remarked that *Kôḵḇā* intended to be a nationalistic and patriotic magazine, that they felt themselves to be Persians and would strive for the prosperity of their country and their king.[147] With such statements they probably

143. Speer 1911: 259-68, Joseph 1961: 125-127, Coakley 1992: 247-50.

144. See Macuch 1976: 206-10, where he gives an overview of the contents of *Kôḵḇā* in the years 1906-8. See further Yonan 1985: 29-31, 124 and Murre-van den Berg 1998.

145. Keddie 1991: 204-6.

146. Heinrichs 1993: 109.

147. Macuch 1976: 207 (*Kôḵḇā* 1906-7/1). One wonders if there is any connection between the name *Kôḵḇā* and the name of a Persian magazine issued in Istanbul from 1875-1895, *Aḵtar*, 'Star'. This magazine had played an important role in stimulating the Persians in their fight for a more democratic government, and contained many articles translated from English papers, cf. Avery 1991: 831-2. I have not been able to ascertain whether the symbol of the 'Assyrian star', probably taken from Assyrian reliefs and now a popular symbol of Assyrian nationalism, was known and used already in this period. Another possible connection is that with the 'star in the East' which led the wise men from the East to Jesus (Mat. 2: 2), a popular theme in Syriac exegetical tradition.

meant to take away suspicions that might have been roused by their Assyrian nationalism, rather than to express definite opinions on national politics.

National politics in Persia in this period were largely determined by foreign powers. Major financial problems had made the country greatly dependent on foreign loans, mainly from Britain and Russia. These countries tried to influence internal Persian politics by adding various conditions to their financial aid. The ongoing competition between Russia and Britain for influence in Persia was ended in 1907 by the Anglo-Russian Convention, in which the 'Partition of Persia' was laid down. Britain, while maintaining its influence in the southeastern part of Persia, lost much of its influence on the Persian government that was established in northern Tehran. This loss was accepted, because it had become rather unlikely that Persia or Russia would dare to expand towards India, Britain's most cherished territory. The northern part of the country was left to Russian influence, and from that time Russia greatly extended its influence on Persian politics, as, e.g., in the matter of the closing down of the parliament in 1908.[148]

Although the Russian occupation of Azerbaijan had improved living conditions for the Christians, it did not prevent the Assyrians from leaving their country to seek better conditions elsewhere. In the nineteenth century, many had left for Tbilisi in Georgia, which was near enough to enable them to visit their relatives from time to time.[149] Many others, however, had decided to leave for the United States, which country in many ways seemed to offer better opportunities. Already in 1906 an Assyrian community, with its own organization, existed in Chicago.[150] Their contacts with the American missionaries for the past 70 years, their America-orientated education and their knowledge of English made this possible. An additional reason for leaving their home country was that jobs suited to their rather advanced education were difficult to find in Muslim Persia.[151]

148. See Kazemzadeh 1968: and Kazemzadeh 1991: 314-49. W. Morgan Shuster, an American who worked as a financial adviser for the Persian government in 1911 and was dismissed in 1912 under Russian pressure, named his book on this period *The Strangling of Persia* (New York 1912).

149. The first wave of emigration to Georgia took place after the Treaty of Turkmanchay (between Russia and Persia) in 1828, the second at the end of the century, after the coming of the Russian mission. Cf. Yonan 1978: 166-7 and Macuch 1976: 114.

150. Malech 1910: 401. A son of Malech was one of the leading figures of this community; Malech himself had died on his way to America. The latter's book was edited by his son and published in the U.S.. Malech Sen. had become a Lutheran priest.

151. According to Bishop 1891: II 222-3, from the eighties onward many of the young men educated by the American missionaries left for the U.S.A.

In 1903 the Anglicans removed their school for young clergy from Urmia to Van, and work in Urmia gradually diminished. In 1910 they finally decided to leave Urmia and move their headquarters to Amadiya in Turkey. The printing press, which was difficult to transport over the mountains, was left in Urmia. In 1911 new buildings in Amadiya were brought into use. After Browne died in 1910, his quarters in Qodshanis were kept and used from time to time when the Anglicans visited the mountain region. In this period, just before the war, over and over again new difficulties led to discussions over the continuation of the mission, but no final decision was made. January 1915, when the Russian troops withdrew, the Anglican mission was closed, and it was never re-opened.[152]

In these years before the war, the Protestants reconsidered their relationship with the Church of the East. In 1906, the American missionary E.W. McDowell, working in the mountains, declared that he did not want to establish any Protestant congregations there, but only wanted to enlighten and spiritualize the Church of the East. This change of attitude had its consequences also for the Protestant communities in the Urmia plain. The Protestant missionaries and Browne, the Anglican missionary, agreed on a statement about the conditions under which the Protestants could return into the Church of the East. This plan, however, appeared to be too idealistic and was not accepted by the Protestant Assyrians nor by the Patriarch.[153] In 1909 another attempt was made, this time by the missionary W.A. Shedd. The two parties agreed on cooperation, but again, 'the time was not ripe for the union of the two bodies'.[154]

In these years, the American missionaries took further steps to make the 'Evangelical Church' independent from the mission. The implementation of the Andersonian three-self formula, demanding self-support, self-government, and self-propagation of mission churches, always had been rather difficult in the complicated situation in Urmia. Until the creation of the Sunhados in 1862, the Protestants were fully part of the Church of the East and were subject to the rule of the Patriarch and bishops. When they entered into communion with the missionaries, they submitted themselves to the 'government' of the American missionaries, but the authority of the Patriarch in civil and clerical matters could not be discarded with. The Sunhados, consisting of twelve Assyrian Protestants, was the first step towards self-government of the Protestant communities, but the missionaries

152. Coakley 1992: 254-364.
153. Coakley 1992: 287-8.
154. Shedd 1922: 119-121.

still had a large say in its operations, especially since most of the money and a large part of the educational work was provided by the mission. In the years preceding the war, these matters were discussed at length. As a result, the Board of the Evangelical Church took full responsibility for their churches, especially in financial matters. The two bodies, the Evangelical Church and the mission, agreed on five principles. These stated, in short, that on the one hand the mission was not to exercise any control over the Church, not even in matters of money given by the mission. On the other hand, the mission was not obliged to give money aid to the Church. Indeed, it should not do so for regular church work, but only to help the Church in its evangelistic efforts. The mission and the Church were to function as separate bodies, 'bound together by bonds of love and service'. The mission controlled its own 'auxiliary' work, educational, literary and medical, but not without consulting the Church in important matters. The mission had its own responsibility in evangelistic work, but should take care not to discourage the Church in this respect.[155] Unfortunately, Church and mission in this region did not have a chance to work with these principles for long. The war that was soon to begin ended most of the regular Church and mission work.

3.7.2 *The First World War (1914-1918)*[156]

Although Persia stayed neutral during this war, the northwestern part of the country constituted an important battle ground for the three major participants of the war in the Orient: the Turks, the Russians and the British. In the opening years of the war, the Russians and the Turks were trying to prevent each other from extending their territory in this part of the world, whereas the British in southern Persia tried to keep control over the route to India. In the course of the war, the British became increasingly concerned with the position of the Christian minorities in the Middle East, those minorities that Turkey became increasingly uncomfortable with. After the Russians had to withdraw in 1917 because of the Russian Revolution, the struggle continued between the British and the Turkish army. At the same time a group of German officers, allied to Turkey, tried to attack the British positions in southern Persia.

At the outset of the war, the situation did seem rather favorable for the Christians in the northwestern part of Persia. The Russian army, which had

155. Shedd 1922: 122-124. See further Lyko 1964: 26-28.

156. For a recent evaluation of the role of the American missionaries in Urmia during the War, see Zirinsky 1998, with additional comments in Ishaya 1998. For the influence of American missionaries on American diplomacy in this period, see Grabill 1971.

controlled Azerbaijan since 1908, was in firm control even of the Kurdish tribes in the mountains. In 1911 they occupied Urmia and other towns with their troops. In the autumn of 1914, however, the Turkish army won several victories in western Azerbaijan and Georgia, and in December they reached the Urmia plain. This led to the withdrawal of the Russian troops on January 2nd, 1915, taking the Russian missionaries with them. Many Assyrians chose to follow in their footsteps and retired to the safety of Russia. With the Russian army gone, the Turks, joined by Kurdish troops, advanced to the east and raided the villages in the plain. The Assyrians living on the plains fled to Urmia and sought refuge in the Protestant and Roman Catholic missions. Both missions took great pains to feed the thousands of refugees and had their boards campaigning for extra money in their home countries.[157] The American mission, which had enlarged its premises by attaching to it many of the houses and streets surrounding it, was able to house up to 15,000 people, creating a 'safe haven' under the American flag, a haven which was badly needed until at the end of May the Russians returned. Dr. William A. Shedd, son of the Urmian missionary John H. Shedd, was head of the mission at that time. He played an important role as an intermediary between the different parties involved.[158]

In eastern Turkey, where the English missionaries worked until war, the situation was even more difficult. Because the Armenians, and therefore also other Christians, in the eyes of the Turks were not to be trusted with regard to their loyalty towards the Ottoman Empire, the Turks had issued orders that all Christians should be removed from the border regions in eastern Turkey. This led to massive deportations and massacres of Christians in 1915 and 1916, often by Kurdish irregular troups. In the winter of 1914/15, many Assyrians living in the western part of the Hakkari mountains were murdered. Many of them fled to Qodshanis, where Patriarch Shimun XIX Benjamin (1903-1918) had assembled a small army. The women and children were sent to Tiari, in the southern part of the mountains, which was thought to be safer. When the situation became increasingly dangerous, the Patriarch, together with a group of relatives, decided to

157. The missionary organizations at home established special relief organizations; working for the Assyrians in Persia were the Persian War Relief Committee, the American Committee for Armenian and Syrian Relief (ACASR), and the Assyrian Relief Fund (part of ACASR), see Yonan 1989: 313-315.

158. Cf. Macuch 1976: 180-86 (ZdB 1914/65-1917/68) and Joseph 1961: 131-3. Yonan (1989: 109-212) published a number of documents relating to this tragic episode, of which the series of letters from an American woman missionary, living on the premises filled with refugees, is most impressive (144-182). On W.A. Shedd, see the biography by the wife of his later years, Mary Lewis Shedd (Shedd 1922).

leave the mountains and to flee to the plains, which they reached in August 1915.[159]

In May 1915 the Russian army returned to Urmia and many Assyrians were able to return to their villages. The Russian missionaries also came back to Urmia. In July the Turkish army was able to regain some ground, and many of the Assyrians fled towards Russia. After one month the Turks had to retreat and the Assyrians were again able to return.[160]

After a year of quiet, in 1916 Assyrian troops tried several times to defeat the Kurds, but without support from the Russians they were not able to gain a final victory in the mountains. The Kurds launched several counter-attacks and most of the Assyrians retreated to the Urmia plain at the beginning of the winter. In March 1917 a combined battalion of Russians and Assyrians successfully attacked the Kurds, but in the autumn of 1917 the Russian army was forced to leave Persia for good, because the Russian Revolution had broken out some months earlier. The Patriarch then created his own, completely Assyrian battalion, consisting of about 4000 men.[161]

The withdrawal of the Russians gave way to the advance of the Turkish troops, marching on to Baku,[162] whereas Kurds and Persians wanted to take their revenge for the misbehavior of the Russian soldiers towards the Muslims. Headed by missionary Shedd and helped by a group of Russian officers who had stayed behind, the Assyrians were strong enough to retain control of Urmia. An Assyrian committee was formed to govern the city. A couple of villages in the neighborhood of Urmia were captured by the Assyrians and also brought under their control. The Persian government, as far as it was still in control, worked together with the Assyrians to create some stability.[163]

In March 1918, Patriarch Shimun XIX Benjamin was ambushed by the Kurds and killed. Thereupon the Christians launched a great attack, which for a short time was successful; even part of their territories in the mountains were regained. In April 1918, however, the Turkish army joined the Kurds and marched on Urmia. The Assyrians succeeded in defending the city, but the Turks kept returning and the situation became increasingly difficult. Only would British forces be able to help them, but at that time these

159. Macuch 1976: 230-41. Macuch bases himself on probably one of the best Assyrian sources, an account written by Ya'qub bar Malek Ismael. See also Joseph 1961: 134-5 and Yonan 1989: 210-250.

160. Bolshakoff 1943: 103, Joseph 1961: 134.

161. Macuch 1976: 242-46, Joseph 1961: 135-6.

162. Compare Fromkin 1989: 352-4, on the Pan-Turkish dreams of the Turkish leaders at that time.

163. Macuch 1976: 246-9, Joseph 1961: 138-40.

troops were too far from Urmia. In July news came through that the British were coming nearer to the city. On their request the Assyrians formed a regiment that broke out of the city and forced its way towards the British. That moment the Turks launched another attack at the town, which by now was weakened. This was too much to bear for the Assyrians in the town, and they fled in great numbers. They fled to Hamadan, where the British were in power. From there they were directed to Baquba, northeast of Baghdad, where they were taken care of in a refugee camp. The American missionaries left Urmia together with the Assyrians and were able to give valuable assistance in organizing the camps. Among the British working in Iraq were some of the former Anglican missionaries.[164]

3.7.3 *After the War*

The aftermath of the war became a decisive period in the history of the Assyrian people. It was impossible to return to their pre-war homelands, because the political situation in Azerbaijan had drastically changed. Turkey had been reduced in size, Iraq had become a British protectorate, the Soviet Union had lost all interest in Persia, and Muslims and Kurds were increasingly hostile towards the Christians who had sided with the Western powers.[165]

It soon became clear that an independent Assyrian state was not to be hoped for. Internal quarrels among the Assyrians, rival claims from the Kurds, and the unwillingness of both Turkey and the British Mandate of Iraq to give up a part of their country made this impossible. In 1925 the League of Nations, basing itself on the recommendations of the Mosul Commission, assigned the province of Mosul to Iraq and the Hakkari mountains to Turkey. Thereupon the Assyrians chose to leave the mountains in which some of them had already resettled, and settled in the Mosul plain, because Turkey clearly did not want an extra group of Christians within its territory. When it became clear that Britain had decided to grant Iraq independence within a couple of years, the Assyrians once again tried to obtain guarantees from both the British and the Iraqi administrations about a form of self-government within the Muslim state. Neither government wanted to make such promises and the Assyrians feared for their future.

164. Cf. Macuch 1976: 249-60, Joseph 1961: 140-144, Anschütz 1969: 127, Coakley 1992: 340-1, and Yonan 1978: 35-6, 52.

165. For the complicated history of this post-war period, see Anschütz 1969: 128-31, Fromkin 1989: 449-54, Joseph 1961: 147-209, and Strothmann 1936: 58-77. See Coakley 1992: 336-64, on the role of the former Anglican mission in this period.

The British had enlisted many Assyrian men into their mandatory army, the 'Iraq Levies', who were employed to maintain peace in rebellious parts of Iraq. A couple of times this army had to fight against the Kurds, although the Assyrians had asked explicitly not to have to fight against their neighbors. This did no good to their relationship with the population of Iraq, of which many came to associate the Assyrians with the loathed dominion of the British.[166] When the end of British rule drew near, new plans were made to create a safe living place for the Assyrians. Emigration to Western countries had become very difficult and was possible only for those who already had friends or family living there. Mass emigration to Canada was considered, but this came to nothing.

Syria, then under French protection, was willing to accept a group of Assyrians in the Khabur region, in the far northeast, close to the frontier with Iraq. At first emigration to this area encountered some difficulties, but in the thirties and forties a community began to flourish there.[167] Other communities decided to stay in Iraq and in the early thirties it seemed for a moment that many of the old village communities might be restored. In 1933, however, after the independence of Iraq in 1932, groups of Assyrians were massacred by units of the Iraqi army. Together with new Kurdish unrest, this led to a further exodus from the old villages to the towns of Iraq and to Syria. There it was possible to build up new community life and to establish schools, at the same time participating as much as possible in the societies of Iraq and Syria.[168]

Those originating in Persia could return to their former homeland, and many of them were able to regain their houses and their land. Compared with the pre-war period, however, only a small minority returned to the villages; the majority of the Assyrians of Persia settled in the towns. After some difficult years, the Urmia community flourished again and the American missionaries returned in 1923.[169] Schools were re-opened, as was the hospital. After in 1925 Reza Khan had come to power, the Persian government became more and more suspicious of anything that went on in distant

166. Yonan 1978: 56-8.

167. Yonan 1978: 62, 72-4, Dodge 1940, and Fernandez 1998. The latter gives detailed statistics on the present-day situation of the Khabur community.

168. Odisho 1993: 191. Cf. also Yonan 1978: 52-70. The texts in Sabar 1995 give an interesting insight in the present-day situation of the Assyrian and Chaldean Christians of Kurdistan.

169. On this early post-war period, see especially Zirinsky 1998, who tells the story of the missionary Harry P. Packard who tried to return in 1919 and then witnessed the looting of the American mission grounds and as well as the murdering of 270 Assyrian refugees by local Iranians.

provinces, especially if they were as close to Soviet Russia as was Azerbaijan. The presence of Western missionaries made it difficult to keep a firm grip on the situation. In 1934, therefore, all foreigners had to leave Azerbaijan, which meant the end of a century of American missionary presence in this part of Persia. Although the Persian Christians of Azerbaijan could continue much of their business, they had to cope with certain restrictions especially concerning travel. Because of their good education many Assyrians were able to find well-paid jobs in other Persian towns. In this way a large community was founded in Tehran, which after the Second World War was large enough to have its own printing presses, schools and cultural associations.[170]

Among those returning to the Urmia region also were the Evangelical Assyrians. They rebuilt their churches, ordinated new pastors, and started new mission work, this time directed to Muslims rather than to their fellow Assyrians of the Church of the East. In 1933 the churches resulting from Protestant mission work in Iran formed a general synod of Evangelical Churches in Iran. Among these were the Protestant communities from the Urmia region. From the late twenties, efforts have been made to establish a union between the Episcopal and Evangelical Churches of Iran. This has led to various forms of cooperation, but not to a union.[171]

The Assyrian community in Tbilisi, Georgia, had grown considerably in the years of war. From Tbilisi, the Assyrians also moved to other parts of the Soviet Union. In the first years of the Communist government, much attention was paid to the culture and language of minority groups. This political line was abandoned under Stalin, and it became difficult for the Assyrians to maintain their educational system. However, they seem to have succeeded to a considerable extent in maintaining their language and culture.[172]

Although in many parts of the Middle East the Assyrians were able to build up new communities, emigration to the United States increased after the war. Large numbers of Assyrians headed for Chicago and Detroit, and even the Patriarch transferred his seat there after he had been expelled from Iraq by the British.[173] After the Second World War, new waves of emigra-

170. Yonan 1978: 83-96, Joseph 1961: 152-3, 163-5, 209-13 and 225-6. On the situation up to the Islamic Revolution, cf. De Mauroy 1978, Macuch 1987, and Hartmann 1980: 84-114. According to the latter, in 1970 17% of the 'Assyro-Chaldeans' lived in and around Urmia, 20% in the 'oil regions' and 50% in Tehran.

171. On the history of the Protestant Churches in Iran, see Lyko 1964.

172. Yonan 1978: 167, Friedrich 1960: viii, Comrie 1981b: 272-3.

173. For an overview of the situation of the Assyrians in the US, see Benjamin 1996, Coakley 1996, and Murre-van den Berg 1997a.

tion brought the Assyrians from the Middle East to European countries such as Britain, Germany, Sweden and France, while others went to South America and Australia. At the same time, Assyrians are still living in the villages and towns of Syria, Iraq and Persia, although sometimes under very difficult conditions.[174]

In such a wide-spred community it became all the more important to define a common identity. To some extent, membership of the Church of the East or the Chaldean Church provides such an identity, but it is Assyrian nationalism that functions as the most important common denominator. Perhaps 'nationalism' is not an adequate term any more. After World War II, the emphasis is less on acquiring an independent state somewhere in Mesopotamia — Bet Nahrain, as it is commonly called — than on creating a common Assyrian identity. In this process of identity-building LUA has played an important role, especially in early twentieth-century Iran. And the common language, be it in its spoken or its written form, still is a strong cohesive element in the Assyrian communities all over the world, even if it is not so much spoken of as is the possible link with the ancient Assyrians and Babylonians.

3.8 Summary and conclusions

In this chapter, the historical context of the development of the literary language has been presented. The introduction and development of LUA is determined by the history of the Western missions that came to Urmia in the last century.

The Protestant mission, the first to arrive, was intended to stimulate a revival, 'a spiritual regeneration' of the Church of the East, not only for the sake of the Assyrians themselves, but also to enable this Church to attract Muslims to the Christian faith. A very important means to reach this main object was, in the opinion of these missionaries, to have the local Christians

174. Yonan (1978: 81-220), gives an overview of the post-war situation in all countries where Syrians have settled. Hartmann (1970: 27) provides an indication of the number of Assyrians in the Middle East. According to him, in 1970 there were about 19,800 Assyrians in Iran, 42,000 in Iraq, 30,000 in Syria, and 5000 in Lebanon. Together with the 24,294 Assyrians in the Soviet Union in 1970 (Comrie 1981b, 272), this gives a number of 121.094. In Ishaya 1978, an overview of the Assyrians outside Iran is presented. Ishaya includes the Syrian-Orthodox among the Assyrians, and gives a number of 200,000 Assyrians in the United States. She estimates the total number of 'Assyrians' in the world at about 1,500,000. Both numbers seem to be rather high. On the history of the Church of the East in the twentieth century, see Coakley 1996.

read the Bible in their own language. And thus the Protestant missionaries, from the very beginning, devoted all their attention to education and printing. The Protestant mission was efficiently managed, and the missionaries were able to establish a large number of schools and to print a large number of books, without coming into conflict with the Assyrians. Medical work proved a valuable addition to the other missionary activities, creating goodwill not only with the Assyrians, but also with the Kurds, Azeris and Persians of the region.

The Protestants, during all the years of their presence in Persia, maintained good relationships with the majority of the Assyrians, even if the Patriarch and some of the clergy close to him were not always supportive of their work. Even the growth of separate Protestant congregations, in the sixties, did not really jeopardize this mutual understanding.

The position of the Roman Catholic Lazarist mission, which was established a couple of years after the start of the Protestant mission, from the beginning aroused more suspicion. The Roman Catholics were known for their attempts to bringing the Church of the East in union with Rome, and therefore were regarded with mistrust by those belonging to this Church. In the first difficult years of the mission, they were supported mainly by the Chaldean community in the Khosrowa region, but in later years, after they established a second mission house in Urmia, their influence grew, as can be deduced from the rising number of Chaldeans in this region. One additional reason for the slow start of this mission might be found in the fact that their educational system was rather poor as compared with that of the Protestant mission, whereas their press began to function long after the press of the Protestant mission. In Mosul, where the Protestant mission had never gained as much ground as in Urmia, the Roman Catholic Dominican mission seems to have been the most influential, supported as it was by an important mission press.

The Archbishop of Canterbury's mission was highly valued by the Assyrians, although they worked in Urmia for a short period only as compared with the two earlier missions. Their unambiguous choice for the Church of the East and their respect for the local traditions made them, in the eyes of the Assyrians, an attractive alternative to the Protestant as well as to the Lazarist mission, especially for those Assyrians who were afraid of losing their cultural heritage in contact with the Westerners. The difficult political situation at the end of the nineteenth century may also have stimulated the Assyrians to seek contact with the British missionaries, because the latter represented a power that was of great importance in Persia. How-

ever, although the Anglican mission within a short period had acquired a considerable number of pupils at their schools and had a good working printing press, they did not succeed in becoming so well established as the Protestant mission. This may be due partly to lack of staff and funds. Meanwhile, the Protestants benefited from a growth of the mission work, especially in the field of the medical care.

A further weakening of the Anglican position was caused by the arrival of Russian Orthodox missionaries at the end of the century. What never had happened before happened when the Russian missionaries visited the Urmia region for the first time: thousands of Assyrians indicated that they were willing to join the Russian Orthodox Church. The Anglican Church, which acknowledged the Russian Orthodox Church as a sister Church, just as they acknowledged the Church of the East, did not object to this arrival of the Russian Church, and handed over part of their work to these missionaries. These massive conversions to Russian-Orthodoxy made clear that the search for political protection constituted an important reason for the acceptance of the Western missions. Now Russia could provide this political protection, because in those years it had extended its political power far into Persia. The Christians in Urmia hoped for a Russian occupation of Azerbaijan, which perhaps would be hastened by their conversion to the Russian Orthodox Church.

These four missions, as well as the smaller missions that worked alongside them, each contributed to the great changes in the Assyrian community in Persia. Their contributions were intended for the welfare only of the Assyrian Christians, but the changes they brought about were not only for the better. The missionaries brought education, 'living faith', and Western civilization to a small, subjugated, minority of Christians in a Muslim country. They could not avoid bringing at the same time division and struggle, between the Christians themselves and between the latter and the population surrounding them, thus disrupting the traditional balance between the parties. Once this small minority had acquired self-esteem and powerful friends, it became impossible to return to the old order in which they were lowest in esteem. Clashes like the Kurdish attacks of 1843 and the disastrous course of the First World War at least partly can be understood as the result of this change in the traditional social order. It seems hardly fair to blame the nineteenth-century missionaries for not having foreseen all this. And perhaps the only way of preventing such an outcome would have been not to interfere at all with these cultures, be it with political, economical, or missionary aims.

4

THE CREATION OF THE LITERARY LANGUAGE

4.1 The linguistic situation at the beginning of the nineteenth century

4.1.1 *Classical Syriac*

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, CS was the main literary language of the Assyrians in the region of Urmia and Khosrowa. This language was employed in the liturgy of both the Chaldean Church and the Church of the East,[1] whereas the language served also as the means of communication between distant communities. However, according to the informants of Smith and Dwight, the 'common people' were not able to understand CS, and therefore could not comprehend the church services.[2]

The priests and deacons who had to recite the liturgy were able to read and understand Classical Syriac.[3] They transmitted this knowledge to their sons and nephews, in particular to those who were destined to succeed them. In some villages priests had set up schools for boys, as in Khosrowa, Gugtapa and perhaps in Urmia.[4]

The number of CS manuscripts in the towns and villages seems not to have been very high and consisted mainly of parts of the Bible and liturgical volumes. Smith and Dwight were told that there were no copies of a complete Bible in the region around Urmia.[5] There are no indications that in the Urmia region CS was employed for the writing of literary texts other than letters.[6]

1. In the Chaldean liturgy minor changes had been introduced, consisting mainly of the removal of heretical names, like Nestorius. See Vosté 1945: 57-73 on Bedjan's work on the Chaldean breviary, and further Maclean 1894: xxix and Layard 1850: I, 155.

2. Smith & Dwight 1834: 371.

3. Macuch 1976: 119, gives the number of 40 men and one woman (Helena, the sister of the Patriarch, cf. Perkins 1863: 10) that could read when the missionaries arrived.

4. See above, 3.1.1 n. 8.

5. Smith & Dwight 1834: 400, 404-5. Apart from liturgical MSS, they mention the existence of a MS that resembled a Syriac grammar, although the bishop could not tell what it was. Grant 1841: 320 mentions a thirteenth-century MS of the 'Gennerbusamé' (*Gannat Bussame*) in possession of the Patriarch. It is probable that the Patriarch had a somewhat larger library. On this ms., see also Reinink 1977.

6. See Rödiger 1840, in which CS letters of the Patriarch are published.

4.1.2 *Neo-Aramaic*

The daily language of the Assyrians around Urmia was a dialect of North-eastern Neo-Aramaic. Other dialects belonging to this group were spoken by the Chaldeans in the Salmas plain, the Hakkari mountains and the Mosul-Alqosh region, as well as by Jews in various towns in Kurdistan and Azerbaijan.

Although in the Urmia region this language certainly was not employed as a literary language on a large scale, Macuch draws attention to the fact that Smith and Dwight mention 'a beautiful copy of the Pentateuch, accompanied by an explanation which he [i.e., the bishop of Ardishay] said the common people can understand'. This 'explanation', according to Macuch, probably consisted of a parallel translation in the vernacular language.[7] No further references to this translation, or to other MSS in the vernacular, occur in the period before the Protestant mission. The existence of such translations may be connected to the usage of translating the Gospel into 'vulgar Syriac' in the services of the Church of the East, sometimes with additional explanations in the same language.[8]

Near to Urmia, in Khosrowa, the local dialect was written on a limited scale. In this village a Catholic priest had translated the *Doctrina Christiana*, a popular Roman Catholic catechism written by the Italian cardinal Robert Bellarmine, into the vernacular language. This priest probably was a native Chaldean who had received part of his training in Rome at the *De Propagande Fide*. He had also opened a school in which he taught a group of local boys to read and write.[9] A copy of his translation, together with other small pieces written by this priest, were brought to Europe by Smith and Dwight. Nöldeke employed the catechism for his grammar of Neo-Aramaic. Rödiger added a short text to his Classical Syriac reader, and edited another part of it in an article in 1839.[10]

In and around Alqosh, the local Neo-Aramaic dialect had been written since the early seventeenth century.[11] This early literature consists mainly

7. Macuch 1976: 91, Smith & Dwight 1834: 400.

8. Smith & Dwight 1834: 355, 393, 408, Grant 1841: 60, and Maclean & Browne 1892: 323.

9. Smith & Dwight 1834: 355, Macuch 1976: 106-8, and Kawerau 1958: 338 n. 39. The latter suggests two names for this anonymous priest: 'Nikolaus Jesajas Jakobi' (= the later Patriarch Nicolas Ishaya, cf. 3.2.1) or 'Don Giorgo' (Giwargis), who had both studied in Rome.

10. Nöldeke 1868: viii, Rödiger 1838: 138-9 and Rödiger 1839. How this catechism is related to a catechism printed in Rome in 1861, signed by 'Joseph Guriel', is uncertain. For the latter writer, see Macuch 1976: 399 and Oussani 1901: 90-91. In the latter article, this work of Guriel is listed among the anonymous works, whereas a number of other works of Guriel are mentioned.

11. For an introduction into this literature, see Macuch 1976: 90-106, Poizat 1990: 161-179 and 1993: 227-272, Pennacchietti 1993, Murre-van den Berg 1998, and Mengozzi forthcoming.

of religious poetry. Other genres, like popular poetry and translations of Classical Syriac literature, are represented only in ninteenth-century manuscripts, being otherwise undated, and might go back to an oral tradition. Among the first to ask attention for this literature was the German scholar Eduard Sachau, who traveled the region at the end of the last century and had copies made of most of the poems we know of today.[12]

The earliest Jewish Neo-Aramaic manuscripts likewise date from the mid-seventeenth century onwards, from Kurdistani towns like Zakho and Amadiya.[13] Among these are Bible translations (targumim), homilies, and other types of religious literature. This literature seems to have remained unnoticed by the Assyrians and the nineteenth-century missionaries, and thus has not influenced the Urmia language in any way.[14]

4.1.3 *Other languages*

In Persia as well as in Ottoman Turkey, knowledge of Neo-Aramaic naturally was not sufficient to conduct all one's affairs. Various other languages were employed in the region in which the Assyrians lived, and most of them seem to have been able to speak at least one of these other languages.

In the Urmia region, most of the Muslim population consisted of Azeris, speaking the Azeri Turkish dialect. This language differs considerably from Ottoman Turkish, and was written from the thirteenth century onwards.[15] However, this written tradition of Azeri was unknown to the missionaries, and perhaps was not represented in Urmia itself.[16] It is likely that Smith and Dwight refer to the regional Turkish when they remark that 'all knew likewise something of Turkish'.[17] Further into the mountains, as well as in the region north of Mosul, this language was not spoken.

12. Sachau 1883, 1895, and 1896.

13. See the editions of these texts by Sabar, a.o., Sabar 1984 and Sabar 1991.

14. Compare a remark by Perkins 1861: 98, in which he notes that many Jews live in Persia, of which 5000 in Urmia, and that 'they speak the languages prevalent among the people where they dwell, as Turkish, Persian &c.' No mention is made of Aramaic-speaking Jews. Remarks of Grant and Stoddard, however, indicate that the missionaries were aware of the Aramaic language of the Jews but not of their literature, compare Grant 1841: 153-63 and Stoddard 1855: 8.

15. For the Azeri language, see Doerfer 1989, and for Azeri literature, Javadi & Burrill 1989.

16. Southgate 184: II 7, mentions that the language 'has not [..] been reduced to grammar, excepting by the German missionaries lately labouring in Georgia.' The latter were from the Basel Mission, see Richter 1910: 97-103.

17. Smith & Dwight 1834: 370. In this same passage they note that some Armenian was understood by the Syrians in Jamalawa, a village close to Khosrowa.

In Urmia and Khosrowa, the larger towns of the region, Persian was an important language, being the language of the higher classes, of education and of administration.[18] A general knowledge of Persian among the Assyrians is not evidenced in the sources, but the presence of Persian loanwords suggests that the language was known to a certain extent. It is uncertain whether Assyrians in this period were able to obtain some formal education, including literacy in Persian.

The second large ethnic group in this region were the Kurds. They spoke a number of Kurdish dialects, most of them belonging to the Kurmanji group.[19] The Kurds were very numerous in the Hakkari mountains, but smaller groups lived in the Urmia plain. In Mosul itself, no Kurds lived, but north and also east of Mosul, many Kurds were found. It can be safely assumed that most of the Assyrians living in the mountains could express themselves in Kurdish.[20] The influence of Kurdish loanwords on Neo-Aramaic, therefore, is especially large in the mountain region, but in the Urmia dialect Kurdish words are by no means absent. The Kurdish dialects of the Hakkari and Urmia region at that moment had not been put into writing.

In Mosul itself, Arabic was the language of the Muslims. This local dialect of Arabic was also employed by the Christians of Mosul, many of whom no longer employed a dialect of Aramaic. Most of their liturgy was still in CS, but the Gospel readings were in Arabic.[21] In Mosul, written Arabic, being different from the local dialect, was employed by Christians too.[22] In the towns and villages north of Mosul, the influence of Arabic is visible in the Neo-Aramaic dialect, alongside the influence of the local Kurdish dialect, whereas in the Urmia dialect Arabic words can be assumed to have entered mainly via Azeri Turkish and Persian.

4.1.4 *Multilingualism*

Although there are no reliable data on the linguistic competence of the Assyrians in this region, it is probable that most of those who had Neo-Aramaic as their first language were at least bilingual in one of the other lan-

18. Cf., e.g., Southgate 1840: I 307, II 7, and a letter of Perkins dated 21 June 1840 in which he mentions that Persian is taught in the schools in Urmia, and is spoken by the upper classes in this town. He does not say whether there are Christians among these upper classes.

19. On the Kurdish dialects, see Mackenzie 1962. Note that an early grammar of a Kurdish dialect of the mountain region was written by the Protestant missionary S.A. Rhea, cf. Rhea 1880.

20. So Stoddard 1855: 3.

21. Southgate 1834: 234.

22. Southgate 1840: II 244-5.

guages of the region. In the majority of towns and villages where they lived, people with other languages were living around them, so that even the women and children had to acquire some knowledge of another language. In the Urmia region this second language was Azeri Turkish, whereas closer to the mountains this must have been Kurdish.[23]

Literate Assyrians, in addition, had a knowledge of Classical Syriac, but perhaps also of Persian (in Persia) or Arabic or Ottoman Turkish (in Mosul). As far as we know, this was true only for a limited number of Assyrians, but one may assume that the knowledge of these written languages influenced the language of illiterate people as well. The number of CS, Persian, and Arabic loanwords in NA dialects may partly be due to introduction by the educated minority.

This complicated linguistic situation is reflected in a large amount of loanwords from four non-Aramaic languages (Kurdish, Azeri Turkish, Persian and Arabic) in all Neo-Aramaic dialects. However, because languages like Kurdish and Azeri also contributed loanwords to each other, and because Arabic and Persian offical terms were employed in all these languages, there are quite a number of loanwords in NA whose direct provenance cannot easily be ascertained. There must have been a large regional vocabulary to which the major languages of this region had contributed, and from which all languages, including the Neo-Aramaic dialects, drew new forms.[24] It is likely that the Neo-Aramaic dialects in turn contributed words to Turkish and Kurdish, although there is no indication that this happened on a large scale.

4.2 **The Protestant contribution**

4.2.1 *Preliminaries*

One of the major problems in the description of the history of the Protestant press is the fact that until now no general catalogue of the publications has been made. A number of lists are availabe, the two most important being the one in Kawerau's work on the American Protestant missions in the

23. It is uncertain to what extent Neo-Aramaic was understood by the Azeris and the Kurds. The Assyrians in most instances seemed to have been at the bottom end of the social scale, and so their language was less likely to be taken over.

24. I know of no recent study discussing at some length the problems of Neo-Aramaic lexicology, except perhaps Krotkoff 1985. For etymology, Maclean's dictionary (1901) still is the best source.

Near-East by Mary Walker[25] and Macuch's overview of this press.[26] For the earlier period, a chronological list in Stoddard's grammar is of importance. He gives the titles of thirty-one 'more important publications' up to 1853.[27] In January 1861, Perkins himself sent a list of the publications of the press to Boston, consisting of 53 items. They are given 'nearly in the order in which they have been issued'.[28] Another nineteenth-century list is part of a chapter by prof. Isaac H. Hall on Perkins' scholarly work in the biography written by the latter's son. It enumerates thirty-seven items to which Perkins contributed.[29] Further information on the various books can be gleaned from incidental remarks in the missionaries' letters at their time of publishing as well as from some of the printed biographies and histories of the mission.[30]

Most important is, however, to compare these lists with the actual collections of Neo-Aramaic books that have survived. These collections suggest that all lists so far are incomplete. Kawerau's list was based on the collection of the ABCFM. In 1944, this collection came to Houghton Library (Harvard University), whereas some time later, the biblical parts of the collection were transferred to Andover-Newton Seminary. In the Andover-Harvard Library of the Divinity School (also Harvard University) a somewhat smaller collection of texts from the Protestant press is kept. This collection originates in the collection of the above mentioned Isaac Hall.[31] Two other collections are those of the Königliche Bibliothek in Berlin[32] and of the British Library in London.[33] The majority of materials in all five collections date from the period up to 1871. This might be due to the fact that the archives of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions are less extensive than those of the ABCFM, to the great losses the mission suffered during the First World War, as well as to a lessening of printing activities in these years. A closer look at the Presbyterian archives might yield some extra information in this respect.

25. Kawerau 1958: 639-42.
26. Macuch 1976: 121-138.
27. Stoddard 1855: 5-6.
28. Perkins, ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320, 5 Jan. 1861. I have numbered Perkins' list.
29. Perkins 1887: 48-50.
30. Perkins 1843, Anderson 1872/1873.
31. The items in the two libraries of Harvard University are catalogued in Harvard's online catalogue, HOLLIS. Dr. J.F. Coakley and the present author are preparing a bibliography of the Protestant-American press in Urmia.
32. Sachau 1885. It is likely that Macuch made use of this collection, but he must have had access to other collections (possibly private ones) to make his description of the Protestant press.
33. Moss 1962.

4.2.2 *Beginnings*

From the very beginning, the American Board, which was responsible for the Protestant mission to Persia, was convinced of the necessity to provide books in the vernacular language of the Assyrians. In Perkins' 'Instructions' the Board is referred to as 'an *educating society, a translating society, a society for printing and distributing books*'. Although in the rest of the 'Instructions' these objectives are no further referred to, it is clear that education, translating, and printing were among the basic and most important goals of every mission under responsibility of the ABCFM.[34] In line with the activities of Protestant missions all over the world in the nineteenth century, the most important book to be translated and distributed was the Bible.[35] It is not surprising, then, that Perkins brought with him copies of the Gospel edition that had been printed by the BFBS in 1829, together with a 'Nestorian' spelling book that he had acquired in Malta.[36] He was clearly preparing himself for the task. At the same time, these copies could give the Assyrians an example of a printed text.[37]

When Perkins in October 1834 made a preparatory trip to the Urmia region, one of his purposes was to find a teacher for Classical Syriac and for the vernacular language of the Assyrians. He returned to Tabriz with bishop Yukhannan from Gawilan and priest Auraham from Gugtapa. According to Anderson, 'the year did not close before this indefatigable missionary commenced reducing the modern Syriac to writing'. In the course of 1835 a beginning was made with the grammatical analysis of the modern language, with the help of Auraham.[38] Perkins, in turn, taught English, a language they very much wanted to learn, to Yukhannan and Auraham. When

34. Perkins 1843: 28. A good illustration of this can be found in the standard 'Annual Forms' that each year had to be completed by each mission. In these forms the number of schools and pupils, the number of printing presses, the number of books and tracts published and distributed, as well as the total number of pages had to be given in detail; cf. the forms of 1836-1843 of the Nestorian Mission (vol. II) in the ABCFM archives in Houghton Library.

35. For an overview of Bible translating in the nineteenth century, see Wootton (1980), for printed editions of the Bible, see Darlow and Moule 1903.

36. In Malta Perkins acquired copies of a 'Nestorian spelling book', through the help of C.F. Schlienz, a German missionary who worked for the press of the Anglican *Church Missionary Society* (CMS). The CS book was prepared and lithographed by the Chaldean I.A. Rassam. Rassam originated in Mosul and worked for the CMS on an Arabic Bible translation, cf. Perkins 1843: 52 and Coakley 1992: 371, n. 60.

37. However, in May 1836 (ABC 16.8.7 vol 1, no 36), he wrote to Anderson that the copies of this spelling book 'prove wholly useless', due to 'imperfection' of the type that was employed.

38. Perkins 1843: 174, 179. See further Anderson 1875: III 178, Kawerau 1958: 337, n. 37, and Macuch 1976: 120.

Perkins settled in Urmia at the end of 1835, he continued his work on the modern language, so that, when the first school opened in January 1836, they were able to employ 'school cards' with Bible texts in the vernacular and in the Classical language to teach the children to read.[39]

Perkins' comments on the actual writing of Neo-Aramaic confirm his statement in the introduction of his account of his mission work in Persia, that 'it seemed to us, at the outset, quite indispensable to the due accomplishment of our object, to make their *modern dialect* the medium of *written*, as well as of *oral*, instruction.'[40] The main reason for this was that the classical language was not understood by the majority of the people, and that it was therefore rather unlikely that this language could serve as the literary language of the common people.[41] A few lines further on he describes the 'popular' language as '*absolute sovereign*', which cannot be conquered by CS. Thus, from the very beginning, it was clear that CS could not be made to serve as the modern literary language of the Assyrians, even if the missionaries were highly convinced of the importance of this language, as well as of the need to provide instruction in it.

Although the missionaries started writing the dialect of the Urmia plain,[42] there has been some discussion about which form of language had to be employed for the Bible translation. Apparently, one of the objects of Grant's visit to the mountains in 1839 was a further description of the mountain dialects in order to be able to provide a Bible translation in a common standard language.[43] This is confirmed by the presence of a manuscript with a translation in one of the mountain dialects from Genesis 1-8.[44] The Patriarch seems to have favored such an interdialectal translation, and there is some uncertainty why the missionaries decided against it. The most likely explanation is that it would have taken much more time to provide such a translation.[45] Another reason for the interest in the mountain dialects was the fact that they were generally believed to be closer to Classical

39. Perkins 1843: 250-1.

40. Perkins 1843: 13.

41. So also Macuch 1976: 121.

42. The missionaries lived in Urmia, and in most instances had to deal with people from the Urmia plain. Yukhannan and Auraham also came from the Urmia plain. Compare also Stoddard 1855: 7: 'We generally use the language in our books which is spoken on the plain of Oroomiah, unless there are obvious reasons for variation in a particular case.'

43. Laurie 1853: 89, 262.

44. Cf. Ms. Syriac 13 in Houghton (Goshen-Gottstein 1979), by priest Ruel of Minganish in Tiari. Ms. Syriac 175, a translation of Gospels fragments with some comments by priest Auraham bar Yonan of Ashita in Tiari, of 1843, might represent another, even later, attempt at collecting samples of other dialects.

45. Kawerau 1958: 234, 239.

Syriac than the more 'corrupted' Urmia dialect. However, Stoddard remarked that if 'the dialect which is nearest to Ancient Syriac should be the standard, this will necessarily be unintelligible to a large portion of the people'.[46] Thus, he suggested that a mountain dialect, which was purer — that is, closer to CS — would be understood only by a small number of people, whereas the Urmia dialect, which had become the standard, was perhaps less pure, but intelligible to a large number of people. Among whom this dialect was 'allgemein verständlich', as described by Macuch, is difficult to say, but it seems reasonable to assume that the dialect of the plain, being closer to the centers of commerce and education was understood by Assyrians from the mountains, rather than the other way round.[47] Whether Thomas Audo's estimation as the dialect of Urmia being 'sans contredit le plus important' is to be taken as an independent witness, or as a confirmation of the important status that the Urmia dialect acquired during the nineteenth century is hard to tell.[48]

Justin Perkins, in the edition of his journals in 1843, as well as in his personal letters to Rufus Anderson, the secretary of the Prudential Committee of the ABCFM,[49] does not tell us very much about the actual process of shaping the Urmia dialect into writing. He mentions the composing of verbal paradigms in May 1835, in Tabriz, with the help of Auraham, this being the first explicit remark on the work on the vernacular language, 'which I am now beginning to learn'.[50] One may assume that this writing, from the very beginning, was based on East-Syrian script and orthography, precisely because no attention at all is paid to this subject. Although both assistants, priest Auraham and bishop Yukhannan, at that time already could read some English, they apparently did not consider it proper that their language should be written in the script of the missionaries.[51]

Macuch raises the question whether or not the missionaries' orthography had been influenced by the earlier writings in Neo-Aramaic, especially those of the Alqosh region. According to Macuch, some of the ortho-

46. Stoddard 1855: 7.

47. Compare Macuch 1976: 121.

48. Audo 1911: i.

49. According to Kawerau 1958: 125, Anderson became Assistant Secretary in 1824, and Correspondent Secretary from 1832 to 1866.

50. See Perkins 1843: 211, and his letter dated 10 May 1836 (ABC 16.8.7 vol. 1, no 36).

51. In Perkins' letter of January 1861, reviewing the work of the press, he comes back to this issue, in response to critical remarks from an anonymous American scholar. Rather than giving some rational explanation he cites bishop Yukhannan, who said on the subject: '*We* are correct, in writing from right to left; why do *you* mistake, in writing from left to right?'. Without adding further arguments Perkins then concludes: 'the absurdity of which [writing Modern Syrian with Roman letters] would soon be obvious on experiment'.

graphical conventions of the early years are closer to the phonetics of the Alqosh dialect than to that of the Urmia dialect.[52] However, most of these spelling conventions can also be explained from CS influence, whereas there is no indication at all that the missionaries at that time were acquainted with the Alqosh texts. In 1861, Perkins wrote about a text in the Alqosh dialect: 'I never discerned a vestige of any attempt of this kind till I had been many years in the field, when I fell upon a manuscript, which purported to be the rendering of a portion of the New Testament into the dialect of the Syriac spoken near Mosul, but the words, most awkwardly spelled, were so strung together, often filling whole lines continuously, that hardly anything could be made of the jargon.'[53] Even at that time, he does not seem to have been acquainted with texts other than the Gospel lectionary. Thus, when Perkins and his Assyrian co-workers had to decide on orthographical issues, they may have been influenced by the catechism of Khosrowa that was taken home by Smith and Dwight,[54] but not by any Alqosh literature. No unique spellings of the catechism, however, can be found in the early Protestant books.

The texts in the vernacular language of that early period consisted mainly of portions of the Bible. Bible verses were written down on 'school cards' that were employed to teach the children to read and write. In February 1836, according to his journal, Perkins started with the actual translating of the Bible into the vernacular, assisted by priest Auraham.[55] It is important to note that Perkins often mentioned the assistance of the native translators who were employed by the mission. Although it is likely that he himself supervised most of the translation work, Perkins' reports suggest that his assistants did much of the work.[56]

In the first years of the mission, there were hardly any signs of opposition against the work of the Protestants. Their efforts to shape the vernacu-

52. Macuch 1976: 72. Cf. further 5.11.2.1.

53. Perkins, ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320. Two late 19th-century Gospel lectionaries in the Alqosh dialect may have been copied from the manuscript Perkins refers to (Ms. Syriac 147 in Houghton and Union Theological Seminary Ms. 15 in New York, cf. Goshen Gottstein 1979). As to earlier remarks on the absence of any written 'Modern Syriac', see Perkins 1843: 13 and 246. Compare also Rödiger 1839: 81, who wrote in the introduction to the partial edition of the *Doctrina Christiana*: 'diese Sprache war nun bisher so gut wie gar nicht als Schriftsprache angewendet'.

54. Cf. 4.1.2.

55. Perkins 1843: 250-1 and 256-8, Perkins 1861: 44. Compare, however, Macuch 1976: 125, who mentions '15-2-1838' as the start of the translation.

56. On the contribution of the Assyrians to Literary Urmia Aramaic, see Murre-van den Berg 1996.

lar into writing, their schools, and the prospect of a press for Syriac books seem to have been warmly welcomed. At Perkins' first arrival in the Urmia region, in September 1834, he spoke with several people about the plans for the mission. According to the missionary, his plans for establishing a printing press were favorably received. The visit of Smith and Dwight was not forgotten, and one Assyrian bishop, Mar Yukhannan, asked him: 'How can your people make books for us when you do not understand our language?' Mar Eliya of Alqosh, presenting himself as being Patriarch of the Urmia plain,[57] also asked for a Syriac printing press.[58] Later Perkins recalled with satisfaction a question of Auraham, who, in December 1834, had inquired 'whether I did not think it would be a good thing to have the Bible translated into their vernacular language.' Perkins added: 'I had never suggested the idea to him; but now encourage it.'[59]

4.2.3 *The first period of the Protestant press*

In one of the very first letters that Perkins sent to Anderson after his arrival in Urmia, he stressed the importance of a printing press for the mission.[60] The ABCFM approved, but the first attempt, in 1837, failed. The press was stuck in Trebizond; it 'was found too unwieldy to be carried overland'.[61] Towards the end of 1840, the ABCFM succeeded in sending a printing press to Urmia. Together with the press, Edward Breath, a trained printer, came to stay with the mission. He had obtained an East Syrian type from the BFBS in London, which in due time was replaced by a growing amount of new types. Some of these were made by Breath himself, others were brought in from America.[62] This long-awaited arrival of press and printer constituted the starting point of the rapid spread of the literary Neo-Aramaic language among the Assyrians. Now books and school materials could be printed in such amounts that they became available for everybody, thereby stimulating the people to learn to read.

In the following I will present the most important works of the Protestant press. I will give special attention to those that were used in the present

57. Cf. 2.1.2.

58. Perkins 1843: 181, Perkins 1861: 31.

59. Perkins 1843: 243.

60. So the letters of Perkins and Grant of December 22, 1835 and Februari 17, 1836 (ABC 16.8.7 vol. 1, nos 1 and 2), see also Kawerau 1958: 276-7.

61. Perkins 1843, Anderson 1875: I 182, Kawerau 1958: 277.

62. On Breath and his Syriac printing, see Coakley 1995. When Breath died in 1861, he had trained Assyrian printers and book-binders, so no new printer had to come in from the U.S.

study. As most of these works are quite rare, I will note in which library collections these works are being kept.[63]

The work at the press started with an edition of the Psalms in Classical Syriac, on the basis of a Nestorian manuscript.[64] However, before the latter work was finished early in 1841, a small tract in Neo-Aramaic came from the press, entitled *Teachings from the Words of God*.[65] Probably not long afterwards, the tract *Reasons for not being a Roman Catholic* was translated into Neo-Aramaic and printed.[66]

A considerable part of the missionaries' printing consisted of tracts of this kind. Some of these were translations from tracts of the American Tract Society (which also sponsored these translations), as the one mentioned above, others may have been composed by the missionaries themselves. Titles like *Regeneration (Tract on the New Birth)*,[67] *The Greatness of Salvation*,[68] and *Christ the Only Refuge*[69] give a good impression of the kind of issues the missionaries were concerned with. Usually these tracts are undated, but due to some peculiarities in spelling and printing type they can be dated with certainty to this early period. The tract *On Repentance*, of which some pages of text and translation can be found in this volume (no 1), also belongs to this group.[70]

More parts of Scripture were printed. Among these were the first specimens of the new Bible translation into LUA. Stoddard's list of 'our more

63. I.e., in the British Library in London, the Königliche Bibliothek in Berlin, Houghton Library in Cambridge (Massachusetts), Andover-Newton in Newton (Massachusetts), or Andover-Harvard also in Cambridge (Massachusetts). Cf. also 4.2.1.

64. Houghton. Cf. Macuch 1976: 124, Stoddard 1855: 5, no 1, Perkins no 1 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

65. Andover-Harvard. Copies of the second edition of this tract (which was printed probably somewhere in the years 1841 to 1843) are in the British Library, Houghton, and again in Andover-Harvard. On the first edition, see Coakley 1995a and Stoddard 1855: 5 no 2. It is not mentioned in the list of Perkins (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, n. 320), but may be identical to the 'small Scripture tract' that was 'the first fruit of the labors of the press, and the first book ever printed in the spoken language of the Nestorians' (Perkins 1861: 75).

66. Not located, it is listed only in Perkins no 3 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320). Macuch (1976: 124) does not distinguish between the various anti-Roman Catholic tracts that appeared in the early years. One might doubt whether the tract was in fact printed at all (so Coakley, private communication).

67. Houghton. Cf. Perkins no 8 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320). This might be identical to Macuch's *On the necessity of a New Heart*, cf. Macuch 1976: 124, but apparently is not the first book.

68. Houghton, Andover Harvard, Berlin. Cf. Perkins no 6 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

69. Houghton, Andover Harvard. These tracts might be in the volume referred to in the Berlin collection as Sachau no 271: 'Erbauungsschriften'.

70. Andover Harvard, perhaps Berlin, cf. Sachau no 274. Cf. Perkins no 7 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

important publications' mentions, apart from *The Acts and the Epistles* in CS,[71] the *Joseph story* and part of the *Gospel of John*,[72] *The Gospel of Matthew*[73] and *The Four Gospels*[74] in the modern language.

Opposition to the Roman Catholic missionaries played an important role in these years, and the above mentioned tract in which reasons for not being a Roman Catholic had been given, in the summer of 1844 was followed by another tract with a like subject. In Stoddard's list the tract is called *The Faith of the Protestants*, in CS and LUA.[75] The Neo-Aramaic version was a translation from Classical Syriac, which in turn was a translation from Arabic. After printing was finished, it appeared that the Assyrians did not like the tract at all, so the missionaries decided to not further distribute it. However, harm was done already, since a copy of the tract was to play a key-role in a governmental accusation of proselytizing.[76] This opposition caused a stand-still of all mission work, including the work at the press. Breath, the printer, used the time to supply the press with new types, which enabled the press to continue in 1845 with a supply of even nicer East-Syrian letter types. This was when the first 'novel' was published in LUA, a translation of Legh Richmond's *The Dairyman's Daughter*, or *The Daughter of Wallbridge*, as the work was called in Neo-Aramaic.[77]

The data on the annual forms of the ABCFM testify to the large production of the mission press. In the first three years (1841-1843), nearly 3000 'volumes' were printed, and more than 12,000 'tracts'. Although not all of these publications immediately went out of stock, the number of items that left the mission indicate that a considerable number of people were interested in these publications.[78] The missionaries almost never tell how many

71. Andover-Newton. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 5, no 3, Perkins no 4 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

72. Houghton, Andover-Harvard. Stoddard 1855: 6, no 8, Perkins no 10 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

73. Andover-Newton, Cf. Stoddard 1855: 5, no 9, Perkins no 11 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

74. Andover-Newton. Stoddard 1855: 5, no 9, Perkins no 13 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

75. Stoddard 1855: 6 no. 11, Perkins no 12 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320). The Neo-Aramaic version is in Andover-Harvard and perhaps in Berlin (Sachau 1885: 26, no 292), a manuscript of the Classical Syriac is in Houghton (Ms Syriac 11, cf. Goshen-Gottstein 1979). A copy of the Classical Syriac version might be present in Berlin, cf. Sachau 1885: 24, no 267.

76. On the history of this tract, see Murre-van den Berg 1996: 15.

77. Houghton, Andover-Harvard. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 6, no 14, Perkins no 14 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320), Macuch 1976: 129.

78. See the Annual forms in ABC 16.8.7 vol. 2. In 1841, 1400 issues were distributed, and 3900 were in depository, in 1842, 8720 were distributed and 3446 in depository, whereas in 1843 the first line is left blank, and the second, depository, says 2450. From the total amount of 14,960 impressions, 9320 were distributed with certainty.

copies were printed of each title, but considering the above numbers and the number of titles, an average of 600 copies each seems a good guess. This number might also give an indication of the number of people that were able to read at this period of the mission. The annual forms of these years point to a considerable rise of pupils at the mission schools, from 516 in 1841 to 1065 in 1843.[79]

Since many of these early publications of the press were published anonymously and probably were translations from English, their interest for research into the development of the literary language lies mainly in the many orthographical variations that are no longer found in the later impressions.[80] Most examples of early Protestant orthography come from *Yulpāni d-men himezmāni d-Alāhā*, i.e., the above-mentioned *Teachings from the Words of God*.[81] Other examples of this early orthography can be found in the parts from the tract *On Repentance* (Texts no 1).

4.2.4 *Standard Literary Urmia Aramaic*

The late forties of last century constituted the formative period for the Protestant press. The most important publications of this period are the LUA translation and CS edition of the New Testament in 1846,[82] the LUA translation of Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* in 1848,[83] and the start of the magazine *Zahrīri d-Bahrā*, 'Rays of Light', in 1849. This monthly magazine of the mission appeared till the end of the war in 1918.[84] In 1852 the Bible translation was completed by the edition of the Old Testament, again in LUA and CS.[85] No accurate data on the number of copies of these

79. On the press in these early years, see further Perkins 1843: 446, 456, Anderson 1873 I: 196, 316, Hornus 1971: 295, and Macuch 1976: 124-5.

80. See chapter 5.

81. The booklet is further referred to as *Teachings*. Moss 1962: 120 erroneously dates this booklet to 1852.

82. Andover-Newton, Andover-Harvard, London, Berlin. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 6, no 17, Perkins no 16 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320). A manuscript version of the Gospel of Matthew of this translation is kept in the library of Union Theological Seminary, New York (Ms. 18, Goshen-Gottstein 1979). For a specimen, see Texts no 2.

83. Houghton, Andover-Harvard, London, Berlin. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 6 no. 19, Perkins no 20 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320). According to Perkins' list, it was translated by himself, with help of shamasha (deacon) Yonan, thus not by Stoddard, as Macuch claims (Macuch 1976: 131-2).

84. London (up till 1871), Macuch 1976: 136-7. According to the *Annual Report* 52 (1862) of the ABCFM, *ZdB* had about four hundred paying readers, much the same as in 1873, when according to the *Annual Report* of the Presbyterian Board of Missions, nr. 36, four to five hundred copies a time were sold. For some text specimens, see Texts nos 5-10.

85. Andover-Newton, Andover-Harvard, London, Berlin. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 6, no 29, Perkins no 33 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320). For the LUA translation of Ruth, see Texts no 3.

editions are available, but according to letters from Perkins, the edition of NT was planned to number 1200 copies, whereas that of OT was to number 1500 copies.[86] In these years, around 1850, the orthography reached the form that remained prevalent almost till the end of the century.[87]

Other publications of these years consist of hymnbooks, catechisms, school books on spelling, geography and arithmetics, and of numerous little tracts. Some popular works from the Puritan tradition were translated into Urmia Aramaic; among these were works from Richard Baxter, Phillip Doddridge, and Isaac Watts.[88] As to the later years, mention must be made of Perkins' commentaries on Genesis (1867),[89] Exodus (1869),[90] and Daniel (1869).[91] These works were mainly based on Anglo-American commentaries, but Perkins also mentions having used the 'commentary of Mar Aprem'.[92] Two earlier commentaries, on the Minor Prophets (1861)[93] and on Matthew (1865),[94] are lacking an introduction. They are not ascribed to Perkins.

The LUA translation of the Bible was reprinted several times. In the second edition of the NT translation, in 1854[95] — issued without the Peshitta text — the spelling was brought into line with the new standard that was set by the OT edition of 1852. A somewhat revised version appeared in 1860, prepared by A.H. Wright. He also added scriptural references.[96] This version probably was printed in a pocket edition in New York in 1864.[97] The second edition of OT appeared in 1858, with references, 'copied from the Standard Edition of the Am[erican] Bible Society, by deac[on] Joseph and

86. Perkins in letters of April 1846 (NT) and January 1846 (OT), so Dirksen 1995: 162-3. The latter estimate was given a long time before the actual printing, so perhaps the actual number was different.

87. See chapter 5.

88. On the 'Missionsliteratur' that was translated by the Protestant missionaries everywhere in the Orient, see Kawerau 1958: 390-97.

89. Berlin.

90. Andover-Harvard.

91. Andover-Harvard, Berlin.

92. See the prefaces to Perkins' *Nuhhārā 'al ktāḇā d-Mappqānā* (Commentary on Exodus) 1869: 1, and *Nuhhārā 'al seprā da-Brītā* (Commentary on Genesis) 1867/8 which I consulted in the edition of Macuch-Panoussi 1974: 28-30 [215-217]. Macuch-Panoussi gives 1868 as the date of edition, the Sachau catalogue of Berlin, no 279, has 1867. It does not seem likely that Perkins had access to Ephrem's commentary on Genesis and Exodus, but he may have used traditional Syrian exegetical works, parts of which were attributed to Ephrem.

93. Houghton, Berlin.

94. Houghton, Andover-Newton, Berlin.

95. Andover-Newton, London.

96. Andover-Newton. Cf. Perkins no 52 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

97. Cf. Anderson 1875 IV: 287. It is possible that this edition is identical to no. 68 in Kawerau's list, 'Pocket Testament. Oroomiah, 1864' (Kawerau 1958: 641), although the printing by the ABS certainly took place in New York, not in Urmia.

reviewed by me.'[98] The translation was not revised.[99] In 1847, according to Anderson, 'two thousand intelligent readers, the result of the schools, had been supplied with the sacred volume'.[100] The number of new editions of the Bible, as well as the new version that was to appear at the end of the century, suggest that the translation was widely accepted by the Assyrians.

Among the early works of the Protestant missionaries the *Grammar of the Modern Syriac Language* by David T. Stoddard deserves particular attention.[101] Being a grammar, it testifies to the standardization of LUA in the early fifties in an explicit way, more clearly than the Urmia printings of these years could do. In the introduction, Stoddard remarks on the matter of standardization that 'the modern language is assuming a permanent form. It should still, however, be considered as imperfect. It is difficult to give in a precise manner either its orthography, its etymology or its syntax, because the language is not to-day just what it was yesterday, nor just what it will be to-morrow. Until the publication of the Old and New Testaments, there was no standard of usage.'[102] These remarks of Stoddard suggest that, although there were still some points to be solved with regard to orthography or syntax, the editions of OT and NT served as the standard for the orthography and grammar of the literary language. This grammar provides us with the necessary background for the understanding of the spelling conventions of the impressions of these years.

Although in general Stoddard merely described the different forms that occur in the modern language, he sometimes tended to be somewhat prescriptive. He then employed the adjective 'vulgar' to describe certain pronunciations or grammatical forms that in his opinion should not be encouraged. However, other strong contractions or strange forms are given with-

98. Perkins no 47 (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320).

99. Andover-Harvard, London.

100. Anderson 1875 IV: 133-4 (quoting Perkins).

101. London 1855. The preface of this work is dated July 1853. A manuscript version is preserved in Beinecke Library, Yale University, New Haven (Connecticut), being part of a collection from the American Oriental Society. In this same period Stoddard worked on a dictionary, of which manuscript versions are also found in Beinecke Library. This work was never published, but was used by Maclean for his dictionary (Maclean 1901: xi). According to Perkins (ABC 16.8.1 vol. 7, no 320: 34), this grammar was commenced by the missionary Albert Lewis Holladay, who had left the mission in 1845 for reasons of health. This seems to be confirmed by Stoddard's mentioning of 'a very brief, though excellent sketch of the grammar' by Holladay. To this the American publisher of Stoddard's grammar added that Holladay supervised the printing in America (Stoddard 1855: 7).

102. Stoddard 1855: 7.

out comment.[103] He also frequently referred to parallel Classical Syriac forms, but seldom with a prescriptive object.[104]

Among the many productions of the press in the years between 1840 and 1871 (the period ended by Perkins' return and death, and the transfer of the mission to the Presbyterian Board, cf. 3.4.2), the Bible translation undoubtedly was most important and influential. I have referred to a remark of Stoddard, in his grammar, on the standardization of the language that took place in the years between 1846 and 1852. Perkins, in his letters, is even more explicit about the major importance of the Bible translation for the development of the literary language. In 1846, he wrote:

> We are able also to send forth our translation in a style comparatively perfect, much more so than could have been done at an earlier day. A great amount of labor, first and last, has been expended upon this work; and it now has the benefit of all the progress, in orthography and in other respects, which we have been able to effect in the outline of the modern Syriac, since we first commenced reducing it to writing, a dozen years ago. Different members of the mission have also carefully revised the copy. We may therefore, regard this translation as of permanent value; though in future editions minor verbal modifications will doubtless be found expedient.[105]

Although the actual impact on the Assyrians themselves is hard to measure, Macuch probably is right when he wrote that the Bible translation was seen 'von Eingeborenen als eine Grundlage ihrer Schriftsprache'.[106] This is the reason that the early Bible translations constitute a major source in the study of the literary language in its formative period.

The New Testament translation was issued in 1846. The title page is in CS: ܟܬܒܐ ܕܩܝܡܬܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܕܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ. ܒܠܫܢܐ ܥܬܝܩܬܐ ܘܒܦܫܝܛܬܐ. ܘܟܬܒ ܡܫܚܐ ‘The book of the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ. In the ancient language and in translation'. The edition consists of the Neo-Aramaic translation with the Peshitta text in parallel columns. Although it is not so stated explicitly, the translation was made from the Peshitta, not from the Greek. When the Greek text differs from the Peshitta, the Greek is represented in notes at the bottom of the page. This Peshitta-based translation was the result of a long discussion between the Urmia missionaries and the Prudential Committee of the ABCFM and the American Bible Society. Both committees preferred a translation based on the Greek text, whereas

103. Compare the use of 'vulgar(ly)' in Stoddard 1855: 35, 39, 41, 44 against 30.

104. In his introduction (Stoddard 1855: 8) he notes that his 'design has been to trace up the language, as now spoken, to the Ancient Syriac', this being his main reason for the CS forms, whereas he also tries to interest his American readers by providing references to Classical Hebrew.

105. ABC 16.8.1 vol 3, no 249 = MH 43 (1847): 128.

106. Macuch 1976: 125.

the missionaries were convinced of the necessity and possibility of translating from the Peshitta. The missionaries thought that a translation based on the Greek would almost certainly be rejected by the Assyrians, and perhaps even incite considerable opposition to the mission work in general. At the same time, they did not see so much fault in the Peshitta as the administrators in Boston did.[107] Interestingly enough, the variations of the Greek text were incorporated in the main text in the 1860-edition of the New Testament. Whether it were the missionaries in Urmia or the administrators in Boston who had changed their minds, is unknown so far. The Greek remained the basis for all later editions of the New Testament.

In 1852, the Old Testament was edited in the same way, in two columns. Here the title page, however, reveals which source language was employed: ܟܬܒܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܬܝܩ. ܣܘܪܝܝܐ ܘܬܪܓܘܡܐ ܡܢ ܥܒܪܝܐ. 'The Holy Scripture, of the Old Testament. Syriac and translation from Hebrew'. That Hebrew was the source language, instead of CS, is also clear from the translation itself, in which hardly any traces of the Peshitta text are to be discovered, either in the text itself, or in the notes. In the missionaries' letters not much attention is paid to this decision and the exact reasons are unclear. It is likely that the missionaries, in view of the more numerous differences between the Hebrew text and the Peshitta, now decided to follow the advice of the Prudential Committee of the ABCFM to translate from the original language.[108] There are no indications that the Assyrians objected to this change of source language, which might be due to the fact that the text of OT in general was less well-known than that of NT. Another reason for the missionaries' decision to follow the Hebrew text might be found in the fact that they still had another discussion going with the Committees of the ABCFM and the ABS on the inclusion of the Peshitta text in the edition of the Old Testament. The administrators were not too eager to subsidize the proposed edition of the OT with both the Peshitta and the LUA translation. Their main argument may have been financial, but some misgivings about the OT Peshitta were at stake too. The missionaries, however, stood for their decision of including the Peshitta. They won and the edition was thus printed.[109] Which texts constituted the basis of the Peshitta that was printed by the Urmia missionaries has been the subject of some debate. Until now, no direct evidence in the missionaries' letters on this subject has been

107. For this quarrel, see Dirksen 1995, Murre-van den Berg 1996, and my 'The American Board and the Eastern Churches: The Nestorian Mission (1844-1846)' (forthcoming). Note that Anderson, who in the forties already was the secretary of the Board, in 1875 (1875 III: 317, 333) wrote that the NT translation was made on the basis of the Greek, as was decided in the 'Prudential Committee'.

108. Cf., e.g., ABC 16.8.1 vol. 3, no 179 (Perkins, Jan. 21, 1846).

109. On this discussion, see again Dirksen 1995 and Murre-van den Berg 1996: 13-14.

found. In my opinion, the interest of Perkins and his colleagues in Classical Syriac tradition makes it rather likely that Perkins made ample use of East-Syrian manuscripts, alongside the edition of Samuel Lee. Later positive evaluations of the textcritical value of Perkins' edition seem to confirm this, but only detailed textcritical study will give the final answer.[110]

The type of translation employed in NT and OT is similar. In both texts the translation is rather literal: every word in CS or Hebrew has an exact parallel in LUA, whereas also the constituent order of the source language is closely followed. The latter characteristic has led to constructions that do not seem to be entirely grammatical in comparison with other texts.[111] On the other hand, the large number of loanwords from Kurdish, Persian and Turkish, as well as the use of Aramaic stems that differ from the parallel CS stems, indicate that the translators did not feel obliged to choose words reflecting CS as closely as possible. I assume that the translators were more aware of the danger of being not understood correctly on the level of the lexicon, than on the level of constituent order. Even more, it is not to be excluded that they were aware of the 'strangeness' of some of the constructions, but that they thought it more important to adapt LUA to the constituent order patterns in the Bible, a sacred text, than to change the order of the sentences completely. No remarks on translation techniques have been encountered in the letters or journals of the missionaries.[112]

It is difficult to assess the influence of native speakers on the final text. In the missionary correspondence of this period a number of Assyrians are mentioned who worked with Perkins on the translation. These were priest Dinkha from Tiari and priest Ishu in the period of the NT translation, and priest Yosip from Digala and deacon Yonan from Ada in the period of OT. The latter two had learned Hebrew and Greek, and are being praised by Perkins as being particularly well suited for their task. Justin Perkins was

110. Pace Dirksen 1995, who suggests that the edition of Samuel Lee (printed in 1823 by the BFBS) constituted the main source of the Peshitta edition of OT and NT. Cf., e.g., Isaac H. Hall (Perkins 1887: 53): 'The ancient Syriac [of the Urmia edition, MvdB] is not merely a reprint of the London Polyglot, or of the later edition of Prof. Lee. It is largely based on ancient manuscripts found among the Nestorians, to which also the vowelling generally conforms', and Shedd 1922: 125, 129-30, who presents the Urmia and Lee edition as two different texts, of which Urmia is the better one. Barnes (1904: xxxii-iii) notes that the text of the Psalms in the Urmia edition represents 'a genuine Nestorian text of great value', much more so than the text of Chronicles, of which not many good Nestorian mss were available to the missionaries.

111. See chapter 7 and 8 on constituent order patterns.

112. This type of translation technique, which is rather similar to that of the translations in Western languages in use in this period, can be classified among the 'philological approaches', as described in De Waard & Nida 1986: 182-3. Its main characteristic is the effort to reproduce the structures of the source language as faithfully as possible, often at the expense of the grammaticality or comprehensiveness of the receptor language.

the missionary who paid most attention to the work of the press. During the time of the preparation of OT, A.H. Wright, who had come to Urmia as a physician, became his assistant in this work.[113]

In my study of the development of the literary language, the Bible translations have played an important role. I assumed that the Bible, being the most important text in Protestantism, represented the best example of the literary style that had developed in the years after the arrival of the missionaries. The editions were carefully made, with respect to translation as well as to orthography, and probably had a large influence on later writers. However, since the Bible is a rather literal translation, some aspects of the literary language probably were not represented in it. Therefore I turned to a body of text that includes many original pieces, the magazine *Zahrīri d-Bahrā* (ZdB). For the period under discussion, many copies of this magazine have survived. The last issue is from 1871.[114] Later issues have been used by Macuch, but it is unknown where they are now.[115] I have used parts from the earliest period of the magazine (1849-1851) and from 1871.[116]

Each issue usually contained an explanation of a part of Scripture, followed by all kinds of 'interesting' stories. Most of these tell about the wonders of life elsewhere in the world, with special attention to the United States. In the first years the magazine hardly served as a newspaper. Most of the articles in ZdB are original compositions in Urmia Aramaic, and represent a much more informal language than that of the Bible translations. However, there remains a possibility that some texts are translations, either from CS or from English. Nearly all contributions appeared anonymously, but the contents of the articles in the first years suggest that the missionaries were the main contributors. One anonymous piece has been identified as written by an Assyrian woman, whereas other pieces clearly presuppose an Assyrian author.[117] Assyrians almost certainly were involved in translating and correcting texts of the missionaries before publication.

4.2.5 *Texts from native speakers*

Although in the period under discussion native speakers of UA contributed a great deal to the publications of the Protestant press, there are no refer-

113. Murre-van den Berg 1996: 8-9.
114. British Library.
115. Macuch 1976: 138ff.
116. See Texts 5-10 (ZdB 1849/1, 1871/12).
117. With help of a reference in Laurie 1863: 251-257, an early Assyrian contribution to ZdB has been identified. Laurie's book contains some compositions by pupils of Fidelia Fiske's Female Seminary in English translation. One of these pieces is identical to an LUA piece in ZdB 1850/10 (August), 75A-79B. According to Laurie, it was written by a girl called Moressa; in ZdB it appeared anonymously.

ences to books or tracts that were independently issued by these Assyrian authors. The first booklet that can be ascribed with certainty to an Assyrian writer is deacon Yonan of Ada's *Sermon in Memory of Mr. Perkins*. Yonan gave this sermon early in 1870, when the news of Perkins' death after his arrival in the USA had reached Urmia. It was probably printed soon after.[118]

Two text editions, however, that were not printed at the mission press, testify to the Assyrians' literary activities in this period. These are the texts edited by Adalbert Merx in 1873 and by Albert Socin in 1882, based on the materials they had collected in earlier years.

The texts in Socin's edition were supplied by Audishu bar Arsanis, an Assyrian from Matmaryam near Urmia,[119] who had come to Berlin at the end of the sixties. At Socin's request Audishu wrote down several stories, consisting of folklore and anecdotes, in which he employed the orthographical conventions of the Protestant missionaries. Afterwards these texts were read aloud by Audishu and transcribed by Socin and his assistant, a certain Hoffmann, in a Latin-based transcription. A number of the texts provided by Audishu are given only in transcription. All texts are accompanied by a German translation.

In Merx's textbook the focus is primarily on the written language. Merx presents several stories written down by the same Audishu, in the same period. Among these are parts of the Shahnameh, the famous Persian epic cycle. To these traditional stories Merx added several letters that had been written to the Protestant missionaries by native speakers in the fifties of the nineteenth century. In this edition too, all texts are accompanied by a German translation, and Merx quite often supplies additional notes on etymological and phonological matters. He further provides a part of the Gospel of Luke in the translation of 1846 accompanied by a Latin transcription, probably also on the basis of Audishu's pronunciation.[120] Interestingly, Merx also added a few stories written down by the missionaries. The 'notebook' from which these stories were taken, now is in the National Library in Jerusalem.[121]

The importance of these texts can hardly be overestimated. They give us an insight into the way native speakers employed the literary language with

118. Houghton and Andover-Harvard.

119. I have not found this village on nineteenth-century maps.

120. Thus, Audishu bar Arsanis is our most important witness on the pronunciation of Urmia Aramaic in the middle of the nineteenth century.

121. Cf. Merx 1873: 1* and 54-5. The notebook in Jerusalem, Ms.Or. 17, has A.H. Wright's signature in it. He worked in Urmia from 1840 till 1865.

regard to spelling, grammar and style, whereas at the same time its pronunciation has been presented in two different transcriptions. They testify to the fact that the Protestant effort to 'reduce the language to writing' had succeeded, so that Assyrians who had received their education at the mission schools, could employ this language for their own use.

4.2.6 *Post-1870 publications*

After 1870 the documentation of the mission and the mission press in Urmia becomes less complete. This may be due to the transference of the mission from the ABCFM to the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions (cf. 3.4.2). The return of Perkins to the United States in 1869 also may have caused a break in the careful documentation. However, it cannot be excluded that in these years printing itself became less important to the missionaries in Urmia. In any case, all collections have considerably less texts dated later than 1870. Most of these were prepared in the seventies and consist of a few schoolbooks, a hymnbook and some issues of the yearly Almanac. A list in Rosenbergs 'Lehrbuch', being a reprint of the 1896 catalogue of the mission press, with more than a hundred books 'for sale', indicates that many of the books printed earlier were still available. However, a considerable number of new titles is among them, almost all of them of educational or religious nature.[122]

Of great importance is Macuch's overview of the contents of the magazine ZdB in the years 48/1897 to 69/1918. Apart from interesting information on the political situation of those days, these issues testify to the growing importance of the literary language, and to the growing participation of the Assyrians themselves in the discussion concerning orthography and style.[123] He does not give any text samples.

Another milestone in the development of the literary language was reached in these years. From the early seventies, there had been a growing need for a new version of the Bible translation in LUA. It took till the eighties before a committee was formed to undertake this revision. This committee consisted of five Assyrians and one American missionary. In 1886, in the introduction to their preliminary translation of Genesis, its members stated the main reasons for this revision. Due to the growing number of readers coming from the mountains who used dialects considerably differ-

122. Rosenberg (n.d.) 151-159, Macuch 1976: 188-9. Six categories of books are distinguished: Bible, school books, church books, books on the Bible, theology, piety (mostly being translations from English devotional literature), and history.

123. Macuch 1976: 127-87.

ent from the Urmia dialect, the language was in need of lexical innovation. The committee chose to bring the language closer to Classical Syriac, by omitting Urmian words that were not commonly understood by all speakers of Aramaic. Among these were many Turkish and Persian loanwords. The revision was not confined to lexical matters. Nineteenth-century textcritical work, about which the missionaries apparently were informed, made new translations necessary, not to mention the simple correction of earlier mistakes. In the field of syntax almost no changes were made.[124]

In 1893, the complete Bible was printed by the American Bible Society in New York, in a revised version very much in line with the earlier Genesis translation.[125] The translation was based on the original Hebrew and Greek and had numerous references to parallel texts. It is clear that in many instances the Peshitta played a considerable role in the lexical innovations, although it was not used as the basis of the translation any more. Many loanwords and Aramaic forms typical for the dialect of Urmia were replaced with stems that occurred in the Peshitta. Presumably, these were understandable to all Assyrians.[126] It is interesting to note that the orthography of the Genesis translation of 1886 was still in line with the standard the Protestant press had set in the early fifties. In the edition of 1893, however, some new spellings occur. These are obviously influenced by the growing tendency to employ more etymologically-based spellings.[127]

Mention must be made also of a Gospel edition of 1873. According to Maclean, the Protestant press had issued an edition of the Gospels in the Alqosh dialect, 'some years ago', which 'has long been out of print, and is now almost unobtainable'.[128] In the British Library two copies are preserved of a Gospel edition of 1873, which Moss attributed to Stoddard.[129] However, Stoddard died in 1857. The language of this text can very well

124. See the 'introduction' to the new edition of Genesis, *Sepra d-Brita* 1886: 1-11, Darlow and Moule 1903: II 1555, and a note in the archives of the American Bible Society (Essays #16, IV-F, Near East, 1861-1900).

125. It is this edition that is reprinted down to the present day; the latest edition perhaps being the reprint of 1993, by the Bible Society in Lebanon. A sample text (Matthew 2) has been included in this volume (Texts no 4). In the library of Andover-Harvard the copy of the OT edition of 1858 has handwritten notes corresponding in many cases to the revisions of the 1893 edition. These suggest that the copy once belonged to one of those working on the revision.

126. Cf., e.g., Mat. 2:1 *pešli ylīdā* (1893) / *pešli (h)wīyā* (1846) / *etṯīled* (CS).

127. Cf., e.g., Mat. 1:18, *mu(š)cextā* (< *meškax)* instead of *mjīxtā* or *mcīxtā*. In the edition of 1901 the spelling *mcīxtā* again occurs. See further chapter five.

128. Maclean 1895: xii and Maclean 1901: xi and n. 2.

129. See Moss 1962: 357. Another copy of this text is in Berlin (Sachau 1885: 24, no 270).

represent the Alqosh dialect, and thus these copies may in fact be identical to the edition mentioned by Maclean. As far as I know, this is the only text that was printed in a Neo-Aramaic dialect other than that of Urmia by the Protestant missionaries. Whether or not this translation was based on a Gospel lectionary originating in the Alqosh area, as Macuch suggests, needs further investigation.[130]

Around the turn of the century the Assyrians began to contribute more and more to LUA literature. Their books were published on the Protestant press, but also on those of the Lazarist and Anglican missions. Of these publications, only very few have reached European or American libraries. Some others are known from later reprints. I have not taken these into account.[131] Undoubtedly, the most important writer of this period was Paul Bedjan, to whom I will pay separate attention (4.3.2). Another landmark in the development of the literary language is the start of a journal edited by the Assyrians themselves, *Kokḇā* 'The Star'. It was printed on the Protestant press, from 1906 till 1914, with the explicit purpose of uniting the Assyrians that were part of the various denominations as one people with one language. The first editor of this journal was Youkhannan Mooshie.[132] The latter in 1912 published a grammar of Urmia Aramaic, *Pāsīqtā d-leššānā Surāyā swādāyā*, 'Summary of the Vernacular Syriac Language'.[133] In this work, the etymological orthography that had developed in these years was employed. A small collection of texts written by Assyrians connected with the Protestant press can be found in the grammar of Rosenberg.[134] In general, the older standard orthography is found in these texts.

In this same period, at the turn of the century, a few texts in phonetic transcription were published. Apart from the transcriptions in Maclean's dictionary (1901), the most important is a list of proverbs published by G. Kauffmann in 1905. In 1894 and 1896, the latter collected these proverbs from Assyrians who had visited Berlin. His introduction suggests that he

130. Macuch 1976: 90-91. Two Alqosh Gospel lectionaries that had been copied in Urmia ended up in American libraries, Ms Syriac 147, in Houghton (Harvard University) and UTS 15 in Union Theological Seminary in New York (Goshen-Gottstein 1979).

131. For an overview of Assyrian writers of the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century, see Macuch 1976: 211-229.

132. Cf. Macuch 1976: 206-211, and Yonan 1985: 29-31, 124.

133. According to the introduction, Mooshie was born on 24 Aug. 1872 in Gugtapa; he was educated at the American College and pursued his studies in the U.S. from 1894 to 1901. These data differ slightly from those presented by Macuch 1976: 217-8. According to the latter, he died in 1918.

134. Rosenberg (not dated, around 1903). The texts probably date from the period around the turn of the century.

first made a phonetic transcription and afterwards asked his informant to write down the text in Syriac script. He noted that he had not changed anything in the spelling of the Syriac. His transcription gives the impression of being very accurate and marks certain features that were not consistently marked in earlier transcriptions.

4.3 **The Roman Catholic contribution**

4.3.1 *The Roman Catholic press*

The Lazarist mission was present in Urmia and Khosrowa from 1838 onwards, but in the first twenty years of the mission no printing was done. In the schools of the Lazarists, the Protestant editions of the Bible were employed.[135] In 1861, Paul Bedjan brought a 'petite presse autographique' from Europe,[136] which was replaced by a larger press brought from Belgium by Désiré Salomon in 1874. This press began to work in 1876.[137] According to Chatelet, another press, probably never used, had been sent in from Rome in 1870, and in 1889 the fourth press, better than the one of 1874, was brought to Urmia. This press, however, worked only till 1894; it was repaired two years later and was probably in use till the outbreak of the war.[138]

Until now, not much attention has been paid to the production of this press, and there are no reliable lists of its productions. In the last part of Chatelet's series of articles a considerable number of publications are listed.[139] Both Chatelet's and Macuch's lists appear to be incomplete.[140] Chatelet does not always indicate whether the language is LUA or CS. Most of these books have not reached Western libraries, but a few specimens of the Lazarist press can be found in the collections of the British Library and Andover-Harvard.

In Chatelet's list, one volume, a 'Catéchisme', is dated to 1875, which is about a year before the installation of the new press. This booklet therefore was perhaps printed on Bedjan's press. In the first years of the new press a

135. Vosté 1945: 49, 56.
136. Chatelet 1934: 414, 420, Vosté 1945: 49.
137. Babakhan 1899: 439, Chatelet 1935: 94-5, 99-101, Yonan 1985: 23.
138. Chatelet 1939: 399.
139. Chatelet 1939: 398-401. Another list occurs in the *Annales de la Congrégation de la Mission* of 1902. I have not been able to consult this list myself, but it does not seem to include books not mentioned in Chatelet's (J.F. Coakley, private communication).
140. Macuch 1976: 192-3.

couple of books were issued, edited by Salomon, like *Rituel* (1876), *Manuel de piété* (1877), and an edition of the New Testament (1877).[141] In the latter edition, the Peshitta is given with a vernacular translation in smaller type at the bottom of the page. The preface is presented in the same manner: the main text in CS with LUA translation at the bottom of the page. Explanatory notes in LUA are sometimes provided. The translation differs from the Protestant translations with regard to some smaller points of orthography, and more often in the choice of the words. At other points, however, a preference for CS forms becomes apparent, especially when loanwords from Turkish and Kurdish are replaced by new forms based on CS. With regard to syntax, this translation, like the earlier Protestant translation, tends to follow CS constituent order patterns, rather than to adapt clause structure to UA patterns.[142] Apart from these books which probably were all in the vernacular, a number of books in CS were issued in this period.[143]

In the period following the installation of the fourth press, in 1889, a considerable number of publications appeared. Apart from Salomon, who was still active in this period, books were written by Alphonse Boucays and Abel Zaya. The list in Chatelet contains about 31 titles, some of which seem to be in CS and a few in Armenian.[144] Thomas Audo, who since 1892 was Chaldean archbishop of Urmia, contributed several pieces to the Lazarist press, some of which are in use up till the present day. Among these are his dictionary of Classical Syriac[145] and his *Grammaire de Langue Chaldéenne Moderne, Dialecte d'Ourmiah*, or *Grammaṭīqī d-leššānā swādāyā*.[146]

In the last years of the mission, probably around 1903, according to Chatelet a number of works of Paul Bedjan (like the *Imitatio Christi* and *Histoire Sainte*) were re-edited in Urmia, but 'expurgées complètement de

141. British Library; for the translation of Matthew 2, see Texts no 11. In Andover-Harvard, there are copies of a *Manuel de prières*, dated to 1876, and a *Taksā d-Opiyā* 'Burial rite' (1881).

142. According to Chatelet 1939: 399, Désiré Salomon was the translator of the work. The language and style of the translation are close to the (later) work of Paul Bedjan (cf. Murre-van den Berg 1994: 390), which might be explained by the fact that both originated in the same Persian village and received their primary education at the Khosrowa seminary.

143. Chatelet 1939: 400.

144. Chatelet 1939: 399-401. The number of '300 Bücher' in Yonan 1985: 23 perhaps is due to a typing error. Compare Macuch 1976: 192, who refers to Sarmas' list of 30 titles, including items not printed on the press in Urmia, but in Mosul or Leipzig.

145. Cf. Audo 1911.

146. The first edition appeared in 1905, the second in 1911. Its reprint is undated, but probably took place in the early eighties in Chicago, as the introduction is dated to 1982.

tous leurs termes ou locutions turcs que le dialecte chaldéen d'Ourmiah, épuré désormais par toutes les productions des imprimeries des missionnaires, ne pouvait plus admettre'.[147] This suggests that the language of Bedjan, in which Turkish and Persian words were used freely, was felt to be no longer suited to the wishes of readers in Urmia and Khosrowa. However, no copies of these versions are known to have survived.

In 1897, the Lazarists had also begun editing a journal, *Qālā d-Šrārā*, 'The Voice of the Truth', edited by Salomon and Miraziz. This journal survived till 1915. Only very few issues of this magazine have come down to us, which have not reached Western libraries. Macuch presents an overview of the contents of the second and third year (1898-1900).[148]

In this same period, the press of the Dominican mission was active in Mosul. It started in 1860, a few years after the Italian Dominicans had transferred the mission to their French brothers.[149] Although their efforts for the greater part were directed towards the Chaldeans of the Mosul plain, and often to the Arabic speaking Chaldeans, their work was known to the Lazarist mission in Urmia and the publications of both presses are said to have been distributed amongst all Chaldeans.[150] To what extent the dialectal differences between the Aramaic of the Mosul plain and of the Urmia and Khosrowa region hindered the exchange between the two Roman Catholic presses, is not clear. Further research would be needed in order to assess the contribution of this press to the development of the literary language. In the nineteenth century this press apparently played a minor role in the development of the literary language, but since after the war northern Iraq became a centre of Assyrian cultural activities, one may expect that the standard it had set for the literary language became more important.

4.3.2 *The works of Paul Bedjan*

The major writer of the nineteenth and early twentieth century was Paul Bedjan. In 1838 he was born in Khosrowa, in a Chaldean family that had strong ties with the Lazarist missionaries in this town. Bedjan received his primary education at the seminary of the Lazarists. In 1856 he traveled to Paris to enter the Lazarist order, where he continued his education. In 1861,

147. Chatelet 1939: 400-1.

148. Babakhan 1899: 440-3, Chatelet 1938: 97, 1939: 401, Macuch 1976: 194-201, Yonan 1985: 23-4, 122.

149. For a recent description of the history of this press, see Fiey 1993b. The most important publications of this press are mentioned in this article. Other publications of this press are mentioned in Oussani 1901.

150. Macuch 1976: 194.

after his ordination, he returned to Persia. He worked as a missionary in Urmia and Khosrowa until 1880. In 1880 Bedjan returned to Europe, devoting his time to the writing and printing of books. Bedjan worked in Paris until 1885, then lived in Belgium, in Ans-les-Lièges and Seraing, until 1902, and finally moved to Köln-Nippes in Germany, where he spent the rest of his life till his death in 1920. At various times he was asked to return to Persia, and even to occupy the see of Khosrowa, but perhaps due to his somewhat controversial position within the Chaldean Church, he never consented.[151]

The first of Bedjan's books to be printed in Europe was a translation into LUA of the *Imitatio Christi* by Thomas a Kempis, issued in 1885. His second book too was in the vernacular, the *Manuel de Piété*, printed in 1886. A second edition of this work, a 'livre de prières, de méditations et des offices', was issued in 1893. In 1886 there also appeared a catechism in LUA, *Doctrina Christiana*,[152] and a spelling book, *Syllabaire Chaldéen*. In this same period he published his first editions of CS texts.[153] In 1888 his *Histoire Sainte* was published, a retelling of Bible stories from Old and New Testament.[154] In the nineties he concentrated on CS editions, among which his seven volumes with Saints' lives, *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum* (1890-1897). In 1904 the next work in LUA appeared, *Mois de Marie*, with meditations, prayers and stories concerning the Virgin Mary on the occasion of the fiftieth birthday of the feast of Mary's Immaculate Conception. After devoting his attention, amongst other things, to the CS edition of the *Homilies* of Jacob of Serug (1905-1910), his last work was again in LUA, *Vies des Saints*, which was published in 1912.[155] For this work he selected a great number of stories from his *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, and retold them in the vernacular.[156]

All his works were printed in a beautiful typesetting by W. Drugulin in Leipzig, but the majority of them were officially published in Paris, under the responsibility of the head of the Lazarist order. The printing office, W. Drugulin, published a list of his works, containing forty titles.[157] In addition

151. On the life of Bedjan, see also 3.2.2.

152. This is a translation of the same catechism by Bellarmine that had been translated in Khosrowa in the thirties, cf. 4.1.2, and n. 10.

153. Cf. Vosté 1945: 56ff, for a discussion of his CS editions.

154. See Texts no 12.

155. See Texts nos 13 and 14.

156. See the bibliography for the complete titles.

157. This list, of which a copy is in the National Library in Jerusalem, is not dated. At that time the director of Drugulin press was Maurice Chamizer.

to the thirty-two editions of CS texts are eight books in the literary language of Urmia.

For the present work on the literary language a limited number of Bedjan's texts were studied in greater detail, although all his texts were consulted from time to time. Two texts proved especially suitable for the purpose of grammatical research: *Histoire Sainte* (HS) and *Vies des Saints* (VdS). Both works are narrative texts, and therefore comparable to the texts selected from the Protestant press. They belong to different periods (1888 and 1912), and show differences in orthography. In HS, in which Bible stories are retold, Bedjan often keeps quite close to the biblical text itself. This has enabled me to compare his 'rewritten' Bible with the Bible text of the Protestant missionaries. A third work, which I employed mainly for orthographical issues, is the *Syllabaire Chaldéen* (Syl) from 1886. This is a primary reader for school children, in which the orthographical niceties of the modern literary language are illustrated, often by supplying alternative 'phonemic' spellings for words that are spelled etymologically.

These publications of Paul Bedjan should be compared with anonymous texts published by Rubens Duval in 1883. Duval, who was in charge of the Dominican mission in Mosul from 1873 to 1895, had acquired these texts during a stay in Paris from 'un Persan que je serais heureux de nommer', but whose name he was not free to give at that time. In all likelihood, this anonymous Chaldean from Salmas was no other than Bedjan himself.[158] In these texts, Bedjan employed his native dialect of Khosrowa that differs in some respects from the literary language based on the dialect of Urmia. Duval's transcription of these texts reflects Bedjan's original that was written in Syriac script.[159] This transcription provides additional information on the pronunciation of the Salmas dialect. Although I will not pay separate attention to the latter dialect, these texts constitute an important witness to the relationship between Bedjan's use of the literary Urmia language and his use of his native dialect. It should be noted, however, that the style of the texts in Duval's editions is rather literary too, and does not reflect any kind of conversational, daily language.

158. See the arguments furnished by Polotsky 1961: 5-6.

159. In the National Library of Israel in Jerusalem, a handwritten text in Syriac script is preserved corresponding to the 'Chaldean' texts in Duval's edition (Ms.Or.52). This might plausibly be Bedjan's original text. Note, however, that the handwriting differs from that in another handwritten text (Ms.Or.31) that is signed with 'PB' and thus certainly must be Bedjan's. In the latter MS. two dates occur: 1865 and 1886. On Ms.Or.52, compare also Polotsky 1962: 276 n. 2.

4.4 The Anglican contribution

The press of the Anglican mission, although it had arrived in Urmia together with Wahl in 1881 (cf. 3.3.2), was installed only at the time of Maclean's arrival in 1886 and started work for the first time in 1889. In 1915 the missionaries left the printing establishment behind when they left Urmia, and the press seems to have been employed afterwards by the Assyrians themselves.[160] The printings of this press are of less importance for the development of the literary language than the printings of the Protestant press or the editions of Bedjan, but deserve to be mentioned, because they testify to the contribution of the Anglican press to the final form of LUA orthography.

I will briefly mention a few of its more important publications in LUA, referring to the bibliographical article of Coakley for a detailed description of the output of this press.[161]

An important part of the publications of this press consists of editions of CS texts, most of them liturgical works. Several parts of the Peshitta were also edited. The majority of the books in Urmia Aramaic were intended to serve as school books. Among these are grammars of Classical Syriac, Urmia Aramaic, English, and Persian, alongside catechisms and arithmetics, usually at various levels. No complete translation of the Bible appeared, but translations exist of Luke (1894), Mark (1895), and the Acts of the Apostles (1896), intended as school texts,[162] and a translation of the NT Epistles with a commentary (1906).[163] I have employed these translations a few times in comparison with the translations of the other mission presses. The text included in this volume (Texts no 14) is a memoir written on the occasion of the death of Archbishop Benson of Canterbury in 1896. From 1883 onwards, Benson had been steadily supporting the mission among the Assyrians.[164]

Probably the most important contribution of the Anglican mission to the development of the literary language was the grammatical work of Arthur J. Maclean. His grammatical works, in LUA[165] and in English,[166] testify to his preference for a spelling based on CS to the 'unscientific' spelling of the

160. Coakley 1985: 40-1.
161. Coakley 1985.
162. Coakley 1985: 56-8, nos 19, 22, 24.
163. Coakley 1985: 71, no 46.
164. On Benson, see Coakley 1992, on the *Remembrance*, Coakley 1985: 58-59.
165. Coakley 1985: 46-7.
166. Maclean 1895 and Maclean 1901.

Protestant press.[167] In the introduction to his grammar, Maclean accounts for the spelling conventions employed in the Anglican press. He stated seven 'principles': (i) LUA is a historical language and therefore etymology 'must be considered'; (ii) CS spelling is the basis of LUA spelling, even if the pronunciation is not exactly the same; (iii) when some dialects differ from CS, and others follow CS, the spelling is based on the latter dialects; (iv) when nearly all dialects differ from CS, the spelling is according to the vernacular pronunciation; (v) words that are employed only in one dialect — most of these are loanwords — are used 'as sparingly as possible'; (vi) silent letters, marked by *linea occultans*,[168] are regularly employed, to enable different pronunciations in different dialects, and (vii) to enable etymological spellings. Maclean concludes by saying that 'the method here advocated will not give the exact colloquial language of any one dialect; but it aims rather at producing a literary style which will make communication between the various districts easier.'[169] His spelling principles are thus based on two basic assumptions: first, that the spelling of LUA should reflect the relationship with CS,[170] and second, that the spelling (as well as the lexicon) should reflect a supradialectal 'literary style', not one particular dialect. These two assumptions may reinforce each other: a CS spelling can represent a pronunciation that is found in one of the more conservative mountain dialects.

Maclean's proposals for a more historical spelling were readily accepted by many native writers, and probably strenghtened classicizing tendencies that were already present among the latter. In the works of the twentieth century, most of the historical spellings introduced in this period are still being employed.[171]

For the present research Maclean's grammatical and lexical work has been employed as a primary source for two other subjects. He was the first to provide a significant amount of regional variants of grammatical forms and lexemes, both in the dictionary and the grammar. Further, in the dictionary every word is given with a transcription in Roman alphabet. Although these transcriptions in some instances seem to have been influenced by the spelling in Syriac script, in most words they appear to provide reliable information on the pronunciation at the end of the nineteenth century.

167. Coakley 1985: 56.
168. Cf. 5.1.3.
169. Maclean 1895: xvi-xvii.
170. Note that Maclean was aware of the fact that LUA certainly was not a linear descendant of CS (Maclean 1895: x).
171. Cf. 5.13.2.

4.5 Further developments

4.5.1 *Introduction*

In the period following the First World War, the Assyrian communities were scattered over the world. In different countries the literary heritage of the nineteenth century was taken further in different ways. Although these developments do not belong to the main scope of this research, it is instructive to see the different directions the language has taken. In a number of cases, the texts that were produced in these later years prove useful to understand those of the earlier period and as such deserve to be mentioned separately.

4.5.2 *LUA in the Soviet Union*

In the course of the nineteenth century, a considerable number of Assyrians went to Armenia and Georgia. This community in the Tsarist provinces was further strengthened by the refugees who arrived in the war years. Among them, the number of well-educated people seems to have been high, and it is thus not surprising to find that in 1914 a Neo-Aramaic journal was issued in Tbilisi.[172] However, not much is known about the circumstances of these Assyrians in the first years of the Communist government.

In the twenties the Communist regime paid much attention to the culture and language of minority groups. A great effort was made to supply as many ethnic groups as possible with their own literary language. It seems that, with this initiative, the Soviet state hoped to create goodwill towards the Communist order among minority peoples, whereas a rapid spread of literacy would also facilitate the implementation of Soviet education. For a considerable number of languages, this was the first time they were written, whereas for languages with non-Roman scripts this often meant the change to a Roman alphabet.[173]

The number of speakers of Urmia Aramaic (or related dialects) at that time appears to have been large enough to include Urmia Aramaic among the languages that were to be supplied with a Roman alphabet.[174] In the period from about 1926 to 1937, a great number of books and papers were published in this phonemic *Novyj Alfavit*, consisting of translations from

172. On this magazine, *Madınxā*, see Yonan 1985: 31-2, 124.

173. Cf. Lewis 1972, Comrie 1981b, and Smeets 1994: 523-4.

174. It is uncertain how much they were at that period. Comrie 1981b: 272, refers to the census of 1970 in which 24,294 Assyrians were counted, of which 64.5% were said to have Aramaic as their native language. In 1959 the numbers were more or less the same.

Russian works as well as of original works in LUA.[175] School materials for the Aramaic-medium schools were provided, and it is likely that with the enormous rise of literacy in the Soviet Union in these years, literacy among the Assyrians rose as well.[176] I have made use of the texts in this alphabet that were re-edited in later publications[177] and also of a paper that was issued in Tbilisi in 1934.[178] It is remarkable that in this paper CS script and the new alphabet were employed side by side.

The texts in *Novyj Alfavit* are important for the study of the literary language for two reasons. In the first place, they testify to the growing use of the Urmia-based literary language, even when the speakers no longer lived in their home region. Although the language had acquired a number of specific Soviet characteristics, it is still very close to the Urmia language of the nineteenth century. In the second place, the accurate phonemic script marks certain phonetic distinctions of Urmia Aramaic that could not be represented in the Syriac script (cf. 5.12) and that often were not noted accurately in earlier transcriptions.

4.5.3 *LUA in other parts of the world*

In other parts of the world, the literary tradition of Urmia was continued in a more direct way, making use of the Syriac script. In most countries where Assyrians came to live, Aramaic could not be employed as the language of instruction in schools, but in many places the language continued and still continues to be the language of the home and of the Assyrian community, whereas in quite a number of places it also serves literary and educational purposes.

In Iran, the Protestant mission was able to resume its activities after the war, and a number of the pre-war institutions, like hospitals and Aramaic-medium schools, were continued. However, only very few publications, whether books or journals, are known to have appeared in the years between the First and Second World War. It is only in the fifties of this century that the Assyrian community in Iran again established a flourishing cultural life. In that period a great number of journals and books were published. After the Revolution in 1979 this cultural output again

175. Polotsky 1961, Friedrich 1959, and Friedrich 1960.

176. Cf. Comrie 1981b: 272-3. According to Comrie 1981b: 28, literacy increased from 28.4% in 1917 to 87.4% in 1939.

177. Polotsky 1961, Polotsky 1976, Friedrich 1959, Friedrich 1960, Friedrich & Yaure 1962, and Yaure 1957. On Yaure, cf. Tamcke 1995 and above, 3.5.

178. *Koxvə d mədinxə*, 39/242 (1934).

was brought down to a lower level, but did not stop completely.[179] In the sixties, dr. Pera Sarmas published his three-volume *Taš'ita d-seprāyutā Ātorêtā*, 'History of the Assyrian Literature' (1962-1970), which is an important source on modern LUA literature, especially with respect to Assyrian writing in Iran.

In Iraq, where many of the Assyrians who used to live in the Hakkari mountains found a place to live, the language flourished in the years after the war. A new koine dialect developed and many Assyrians became literate not only in Arabic and English, but also in Aramaic. However, in the sixties and seventies, despite the 1972-Edict of the Iraqi government on the 'Cultural Rights of the Syriac-speaking Minorities', the tolerance of the Arabic-speaking majority for the minority languages decreased, and it became more difficult to publish and teach in Aramaic. The ongoing emigration of the Aramaic-speaking population further reduced the chances for the preservation of a literary tradition in the modern language in Iraq.[180] However, the work by Rev. Samuel Dinkha, *Taš'ītā pāsīqtā d-seprāyutā Ātorêtā xadtā (swādāya) 1840-1990*, 'A Short History of the Modern Assyrian Literature (1840-1990) (2vols, 1991), lists quite a number of Iraqi Assyrian authors of the last couple of decades.

In Syria, where many Assyrians found refuge in the thirties, the literary tradition hardly survived. There seems to have been an Assyrian printing press in the thirties, but the number of books or journals that originate in the Khabur region seem to be very small. At present, the modern language, alongside Classical Syriac, is taught to a limited extent in the schools of the community. The language is spoken by the majority of these Assyrians. The political climate in Syria seems not to allow the Assyrians openly to stress their own culture.

In the U.S., where the largest Assyrian community outside the Middle East is found, from the beginning of this century Assyrian presses were established. As far as I know, no reliable lists of these presses and their production exist, apart from a list of journals to be found in Yonan's work on Assyrian journalism.[181] Many of these journals and other publications of the Assyrian presses are in English only,[182] or in English and Neo-Aramaic side

179. Cf. Yonan 1978: 84-88, 92-6, Yonan 1985: 54-61. For some texts from 20th-century Iran, see Pennacchietti-Cerulli 1971 and Macuch-Panoussi 1974.

180. Cf. Odisho 1993, Yonan 1978: 104-106, 108-9, Yonan 1985: 46, 63-68.

181. So Yonan 1985: 38-42, 83-96. Dinkha 1991 probably is the best source for the work of Assyrian authors in the U.S.

182. In English, note the growing number of electronic journals and sites on the World Wide Web by and for Assyrians.

by side.[183] It is unlikely that the literary language as it was developed in Urmia and was continued in the Soviet Union, Iraq, and Iran after the war, will be able to function as a full-fledged literary language in the Assyrian community of the US. Most of the third- and fourth-generation immigrants no longer speak the language of their parents,[184] whereas recent immigrants from Iraq and Iran, who do indeed speak Aramaic, no longer are literate in this language. Thus, the influx of these new immigrants from the Middle East may help in preserving Aramaic as one of the languages of the Assyrian community in the U.S., but it is unlikely that these new immigrants will be able to keep the literary tradition of the nineteenth and early twentieth century alive over a longer period of time. However, for the time being, there is still a significant number of Assyrians in the US that publish in Neo-Aramaic. Poetry, both religious and secular, is by far the most popular genre.

The communities in Europe, considerably smaller than those in the US, face the same difficulties in maintaining their literary language vis-à-vis the dominant languages of these countries. Even so, a considerable number of journals are issued, which are partly in Neo-Aramaic, and partly in the language of the country and in CS.[185]

4.6 Summary and conclusions

In this chapter I have presented an overview of the history of writing and printing of the literary language based on the dialect of Urmia. This process started in the forties of the last century and reached its peak in the years preceding the First World War, when in the Urmia region a considerable part of the Assyrian population had become literate in the modern language and was able to contribute to the further development of the language. In the years after the war, literacy in Aramaic further increased in Iran, Iraq, and the Soviet Union. However, in the second half of the twentieth century, LUA seems gradually to lose ground in the Middle East, due to the absence of a common educational system as well as to the predominance of other literary languages. Among the immigrant communities in Europe and the United States, attempts are made to continue the literary tradition, but here

183. See, e.g., *The Assyrian Star — Kokhba* (the journal of the Assyrian American National Federation) and the *Journal of the Assyrian Academic Society*, since volume xi (1997) *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies*.

184. Odisho 1994: 198.

185. Compare Yonan 1985: 98-112, 143-147.

even more the majority languages constitute a threat to its chances of survival.

The development of the literary language was started by American Protestant missionaries, who in the first twenty-five years of their press (1840-1865) set the standard. This was achieved by the combination of the setting up of a large number of village schools and a steady flow of publications, among which the Bible translation should be considered of prime importance. The consolidation of the literary language is reflected in the texts published by Merx and Socin, dating from the sixties and seventies.

In the second half of the century, other groups began to make use of the literary language and, in turn, influenced its course. The contribution of the Lazarist press needs further investigation, but seems not to have been very large. The works of the native Lazarist priest Paul Bedjan, who employed a very accurate and elegant style, illustrate the accomplished character of the literary language in the late nineteenth century. However, this highly literary style seems not to have had many followers in the twentieth century, whereas Bedjan's use of Turkish loanwords was no longer approved of by later generations of writers and printers.

The influence of the Anglican mission press was greatest in the field of orthography. The grammatical work of Arthur J. Maclean, one of the Anglican missionaries, greatly contributed to the standard for an etymological, Classical-Syriac-based spelling that is still in use up to the present day.

5

PHONETICS, PHONOLOGY, AND ORTHOGRAPHY

5.1 Introduction

5.1.1 *The relationship between phonetics, phonology, and orthography*

In the present chapter it is my aim to describe the orthographical conventions adopted by the various mission presses. In order to understand the differences between them, it is necessary to make use of phonetic descriptions of the Urmia dialect and its cognates. A number of nineteenth-century Urmia Aramaic texts, in which various kinds of phonetic transcriptions had been employed, are available. These texts, together with descriptions of Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects written in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, make it possible to present a clear picture of the phonetic developments that separate the Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects, and the Urmia dialect in particular, from the language of Classical Syriac texts in the Eastern tradition.

Although CS obviously cannot be considered to be the direct ancestor of UA, the relationship of the phonetic and phonological characteristics of these two languages is important for the understanding of the relationship between the orthographical conventions of these languages. The main object of this chapter is to clarify the various orthographical conventions of Literary Urmia Aramaic in light of these differences between CS and UA.

5.1.2 *Classical Syriac as point of departure*

Why has CS exerted such an influence on the orthographical conventions of LUA? It might be helpful to have a look at the basic assumptions of the people that first undertook to write this language.

Although the Protestant missionaries certainly did not easily accept all aspects of the culture of the Assyrians, they soon realized that the use of the CS script would greatly facilitate the acceptance of the new literary langage. Even when the greater part of the Assyrians could not read, CS was regarded by all as the ultimate standard of writing. It was even more so regarded by the learned clergy, who were the missionaries' first teachers and assistants. Thus, from the very beginning, they employed the Classical

Syriac script, in the East Syrian or 'Nestorian' type, even though they had been advised by some Western scholars to employ a Latin alphabet (cf. 4.2.2). And not only was the CS script most suitable to facilitate the acceptance of the new literary language, but so was CS orthography even more. The resemblance of LUA words to CS words made it easier for the Assyrians to accept the vernacular language in writing.[1]

The 'acculturational' motive of the missionaries, the adaptation to local practice, was further stimulated by a 'cultural' motive. Perkins wrote: 'we have been, from the first, fully impressed, in attempting to reduce this spoken dialect to writing, with the high importance of shaping it, so far as practicable, to the very perfect model of the ancient Syriac'.[2] Although the Protestant missionaries were fully convinced of the importance of writing the vernacular, being the language spoken by the common people, they too tended to rate CS higher, as an example of a venerated classical language. This higher status made CS the ideal model for the vernacular language, in particular with regard to its spelling. At the end of the nineteenth century, the Anglican press took the logical step of introducing a truly etymological spelling, based on a more thorough knowledge of the relation between LUA and CS.[3]

CS orthography influenced LUA orthography at two different levels. Firstly, the consonant and vowel signs, together with other orthographical devices of the East Syrian script, were employed to write LUA. This method could have resulted in a fairly phonemic spelling. Secondly, however, not only were the individual characters taken over as such, but the spelling of many words was taken over as a whole, even if the pronunciation was different. To understand the orthographical methods of the missionaries, these two levels, although influencing each other in many ways, must be kept apart.

The spelling of those words that in Eastern CS were pronounced more or less the same as in the local dialect constituted the starting point of the spelling of unknown words. Therefore the pronunciation of CS in nineteenth-century Urmia is of prime importance to understand the spelling conventions. However, these pronunciation habits are difficult to establish

1. In modern publications on language planning and alphabetization, it has been acknowledged that it is important for language planners (like Bible translators) to adopt a script and orthography that is as close as possible to the language that is held in high esteem by the people that will use the new script, because of the many extralinguistic factors that influence the acceptance of a certain script and orthography; cf. Smalley 1963, Berry 1977, and Fishman 1977.

2. Perkins 1843: 14.

3. Cf. 4.4.

in detail, because no description of this nineteenth-century pronunciation is available. Hoberman's description of the 'Modern Chaldean' pronunciation of Classical Syriac, although situated in another region and another period, provides interesting information in this respect.[4]

The conventions of CS orthography constitute the basis for comparing CS phonemic inventory to that of UA, even if exact phonological data are not available. It might even be possible to reconstruct CS pronunciation habits in nineteenth-century Urmia on the basis of the relationship between pronunciation and orthography in UA. In the following I will give an overview of the consonants and vowels represented in CS orthography, as found in late Eastern Syriac manuscripts.[5] Manuscripts of this type were available in nineteenth-century Urmia and may have constituted the starting point for the missionaries.

5.1.3 *Classical Syriac orthography*

The exact phonetic nature of the sounds in CS is difficult to establish, and therefore I will not use phonetic symbols to represent the CS sounds. I employ the transcriptions of the Eastern Syriac characters, in italics, which can be assumed to represent the phonemic inventory of an early stage of CS. The following 22 consonantal phonemes can be assumed to be present in CS:[6]

ʾ b g d h w z ḥ ṭ y k l m n s ʿ ṣ p q r š t

Among these are a number of typically Semitic consonants: the two emphatic consonants: *ṭ* and *ṣ*, the glottal and glottopharyngeal *ʾ* and *ʿ* and the *q* next to k. Vocalized texts suggest that glottal *ʾ* had disappeared in pronunciation whenever it is not found between two full vowels. The other consonants show no signs of weakening.

The twofold pronunciation of the *litterae begadkepat*, present in Biblical Hebrew and in earlier and contemporary Aramaic dialects, is found also in Classical Syriac: the *b*, *g*, *d*, *k*, and *t* are spirantized when preceded by a vowel, resulting in [w], [γ], [d̲], [x] and [t̲]. The corresponding allophone of *p* was [f], but in nineteenth-century Eastern Classical Syriac this allophone does not occur, and [p] is pronounced in all positions. The 'hard' pronunciation (*qušš̄āyā*) was marked by a dot above the consonant, the spirantized allophone (*rukkāk̲ā*) was marked by a dot below the consonant.

4. Cf. Hoberman 1997.
5. For some examples of such manuscripts, see Hatch 1946: plate CLXXIX - XXXIII.
6. See 1.5.1, for the consonants and vowels in East Syriac script.

Doubling must be supposed to have been present in various morphologically conditioned forms, as well as being the result of some types of assimilation. However, it was marked only when one of the *begadkepat* letters occurred between vowels: this would normally require the spirantized pronunciation, whereas when the 'hard' pronunciation is indicated, doubling must be supposed to be present.

The data in Hoberman's article on the relation between CS and NA pronunciation in present-day northern Iraq make clear that the pronunciation of the two layers of speech is based on the same phonemic principles, even if a small number of significant differences are present. Most consonants and vowels in CS are pronounced as those in the modern language.[7] One may assume that this was also the case for the pronunciation of CS in nineteenth-century Urmia. This implies that the actual pronunciation of CS in Urmia differed from the 'classical' pronunciation in earlier times as described above.

The seven vowels with phonemic value represented in Eastern CS orthography are:[8]

ā a ē e ī o u

In CS, the difference between *ā* and *a* and between *ē* and *e*, not only was one of length, but also of quality. Although there was a tendency of *ā*, *ē*, and *ī* to occur in open syllables, whereas *a* and *e* more often occurred in closed ones, it does not seem possible to reduce the two pairs of phonemes to two vowels which vary in length according to their position.[9]

The *o* and *u* vowels probably vary in length according to their position in the syllable, but this is not noted in orthography, and can be assumed only on historical grounds.[10]

Two diphthongs are present in CS: *aw* and *ay*. The first diphthong in Eastern Syriac manuscripts often is written as *ā*w.[11]

A *shewa* vowel, often resulting from shortened full vowels, was employed in CS to dissolve consonant clusters, but no phonemic value is attached to it, and no separate sign is in use.[12]

7. Hoberman 1996 and 1997.

8. In Western CS only five vowels are present: *ō* (< *ā*), *a*, *ī* (< *ḕ*, *ī*), e (< e, *ē*) and *u* (< *o*, *u*). Eastern CS *ē* corresponds to former *ē* and *ḕ*. These mergers of [e] sounds do not influence the UA vowel system. Cf. Blau 1969.

9. Nöldeke 1898: 9. According to Nöldeke 1898: 29, the East Syrians often write *a* for *ā* in closed syllables and *ā* for *a* in open syllables.

10. Nöldeke 1898: 5.

11. Nöldeke 1898: 35. Compare, e.g., Hatch 1946: plate CLXXXII, l. A15.

12. Muraoka 1987: 8.

However, again, it is quite likely that the actual pronunciation of these vowels in Urmia was much closer to UA than this description suggests.

Some other important characteristics of Eastern CS orthography must be mentioned:

(i) The consonant characters *y* and *w* are also employed to denote the long vowels *ī*, *o*, and *u*, the two latter cases being differentiated by dots above or beneath the letter.

(ii) The sign ʾ is employed not only to mark a glottal stop, but also to mark *ē* or *ā*, mainly in vowel endings.

(iii) A *y* at the end of a word, preceded by a consonant without a vowel sign, is never pronounced. This remnant of a historical unstressed *ī* ending is employed to mark feminine forms. In the same way *w* is employed to mark the third person plural in perfect verb forms, being the remnant of a former unstressed *ū* ending.

(iv) The *mbaṭṭlāna* or *linea occultans* (*l.o.*), the 'obscuring line', is a line placed above a consonant to prevent it from being pronounced. With the help of *l.o.* historical spellings of words could be retained, while at the same time their current pronunciation was indicated.

(v) A number of words are usually written without vowel signs. To avoid confusion between words with the same consonants, diacritical dots are placed above or under the letters. Fixed orthographies are found with the following words:
ـە *wᵉ-*, 'and'; ܡܢ *man*, 'who'; ܡܶܢ *men*, 'from'; ܟܠ *kul*, 'everything'; ܗܘ *haw*, 'he'; ܗܝ *hāy*, 'she'.

5.1.4 *CS script adjusted to the needs of LUA*

It can safely be assumed that the missionaries and their Assyrian helpers took their starting point in those words that occurred both in CS and UA. These words constituted the basis of the phonemic value attached to the CS signs in LUA, even if the pronunciation may have differed slightly. For many consonants the correspondence between the CS pronunciation and that in UA must have been easy to state, whereas for other consonants, and for most of the vowels, the phonological and phonetic value had to be reinterpreted. Thus, firstly, all CS consonants and vowels had to be reinterpreted as UA phonemes. Sometimes they were exactly the same as in CS and sometimes they differed from it.

A second problem that had to be solved was the presence of some consonants in UA that had no counterpart in CS. These had been introduced into

the language through the insertion of loanwords from the neighboring languages, whereas some of them already had spread to genuine Aramaic words. To represent these consonants, diacritical signs were added to existing consonants. Many of these signs were in use in CS orthography for the representation of Arabic or Turkish words.

By far the most difficult problem to solve was how to spell forms that were obviously related to CS forms, but had changed considerably in their pronunciation. These forms could be spelled either phonemically or historically, both ways presenting their own advantages and disadvantages. The most obvious merit of a phonemic spelling would be a consistent spelling throughout the vocabulary. However, the unfamiliar look of many well-known CS words must have prevented the missionaries from doing this. Further, one might expect that the Assyrian clergy would hardly have accepted such unorthodox spellings.

Another advantage of a historical spelling can be added: the possibility of refraining from choosing the specific form of the word in one dialect against its form in another, by employing the 'underlying' CS form, from which various dialectal forms could be derived. This argument was employed at the end of the century when the Anglicans devised their spelling conventions.[13] However, it is likely that such etymological spellings in an interdialectal literary language suffice only for a limited part of the lexicon; in many cases the various dialects use completely different words rather than different forms of the same word.

The choice to employ historical spellings as often as possible led to an abundant use of *l.o.*, marking consonants no longer pronounced in the vernacular. It also gave rise to a great many inconsistencies in the spelling, because it often was difficult to decide at what point the etymology of the word was sufficiently clear to justify a historical spelling. The different opinions about this boundary line account for most of the differences in spelling between the various texts.

The very large group of loanwords from the neighboring languages constituted the last orthographical problem the missionaries had to solve. These words presented two major difficulties: to what extent the original spelling in Arabic script of Persian and Arabic words[14] — when it was known — was to be transposed to the conventions of CS script, and to what extent the phonetics of loanwords had to be adapted to that of UA. The answer to the latter problem was complex: the degree of adaptation to UA phonetics in

13. Cf. 4.4.
14. Cf. 4.1.3.

vernacular pronunciation must have differed greatly from one word to another, and even from one speaker to another. The first mentioned problem was influenced by the problems of the latter: the more a word differed in its pronunciation from its pronunciation in the original language, the more difficult it became to retain the original spelling. The spelling of loanwords display a great variety, and thus far it has not been possible to classify words into clearly defined groups on the basis of their spelling. However, loanwords may furnish good examples of spelling conventions, although more research will be needed to give a complete description of the absorption of loanwords into this Neo-Aramaic language.[15]

5.1.5 *Methods and sources*

I have arranged the material on the basis of the phonological developments that separate UA from CS, because of the importance of these developments for the understanding of the orthographical conventions.

Each section will give first a description of a phonetic difference between CS and UA, and of the possible consequences of this difference for the phonemic inventory of UA. This description is based on the nineteenth-century transcribed texts and on phonological descriptions of nineteenth- and twentieth-century UA.

The texts that have been used for this chapter have been discussed in detail in chapter 4. Two other types of text are employed: (i) texts in phonetic transcription, like those of Merx 1873, Socin 1882, Duval 1883, Kampffmeyer 195, and Osipoff 1913; (ii) grammars and dictionaries containing information on the pronunciation of LUA in the last century, like those of Stoddard 1855, Nöldeke 1868, and Maclean 1895, as well as on the present pronunciation, like those of Tsereteli 1961, Polotsky 1961, and Odisho 1988.

The second part of each section will describe the ways in which that particular phonological phenomenon is reflected in the various groups of texts, as they were described in the introductory chapter (cf. 1.3.3 and 4.2-4). In most sections, some examples will be given from every group of LUA texts.

Often the texts can be divided into two groups on the basis of the spelling convention under discussion: those in which a phonemic spelling is employed, and those in which a historical spelling is in use. Much attention is paid to the orthographical conventions employed in the verbal system.

15. See Garbell 1965, who gives an exhaustive description of the phonological consequences of the insertion of Kurdish and Turkish loanwords into Jewish Neo-Aramaic.

5.2 Gemination and degemination

5.2.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.2.1.1 The gemination of consonants constituted an important morphological and phonological feature in earlier Aramaic. To what extent gemination was still of importance in UA, is subject of debate. All nineteenth-century authors agree that earlier gemination in many words had been lost and had been compensated for by lengthening of the preceding vowel. Most of the verbal forms derived from former *pa"el* belong to this category.

However, in a considerable number of forms in Syriac script, short vowels occur in open syllables carrying stress without being lengthened, contrary to the rules of syllabic structure.[16] In such words authors like Socin and Merx wrote doubled consonants in their transcriptions.[17] In his grammar, Stoddard clearly states that doubling is present when a short vowel occurs in a seemingly open syllable, even with consonants such as *x* and *r*, transcribing ܒܚܚܠ as *bahh-hhul* and ܓܪܪܠ as *garril*.[18] Nöldeke agreed, adding references to double writing of consonants in the early Roman Catholic writings.[19]

In 1905, Kampffmeyer noted that doubling is present, but 'es besteht die Neigung, sie ganz aufzugeben.' Only in careful pronunciation it is still heard. He adds: 'Bei dauernder Aufgabe ursprünglicher Doppelkonsonanz ist Längung eines vorhergehenden Konsonanten zu beobachten'.[20] However, in his transcribed texts many words are found with a short consonant preceding a single consonant. This, in my opinion, suggests that for many forms a kind of intermediate state must be assumed, in which gemination already had disappeared in fast pronunciation, but had not been balanced by compensatory lengthening.

One might even wonder whether this development did not take place during the nineteenth century itself, which might explain why Stoddard in 1855 was so certain about gemination in certain forms, whereas Maclean,

16. See 5.7.1.4 on the relationship between vowel length, syllabic patterns, and stress.

17. Is is unlikely that linguists such as Merx and Socin would employ doubled consonants as an orthographical device only, the way doubling is employed in English and Dutch.

18. *'P'tahha* (*a*) has generally the sound of short and close *a*. In the great majority of cases, when a consonant follows it (..) which has a vowel of its own, that consonant is doubled in pronunciation' and about *e* ('short zlama'), 'The same rule (..) applies also to *e*.', and earlier: 'Unlike the Hebrew, however, the Modern Syriac may double *x* and *r*, and does so constantly', Stoddard 1855: 12, 14, 12.

19. Nöldeke 1868: 27.

20. Kampffmeyer 1905: 5.

writing at the end of the century, asserted: 'With these exceptions[21] the East Syrians never double letters'.[22] When gemination was lost, Maclean asserts, 'the foregoing vowel is sometimes broadened by way of compensation',[23] but he does not explain why so many forms in his dictionary contain short instead of long vowels in open syllables, although derived from earlier geminated forms. In many instances these happen to correspond to forms written with a geminated consonant in other sources.

One may venture the supposition that gemination in UA was lost twice, in two different periods. The first process resulted in a group of forms in which earlier gemination was compensated for by lengthening of the preceding vowel. This group then fitted nicely into the usual syllabic patterns. The second process resulted in a group of forms that apparently had lost their gemination, without compensatory vowel lengthening being added. This latter group should perhaps be described as possessing 'virtual' or 'weak' doubling:[24] doubling not heard in actual speech, but affecting the form with regard to syllabic structure and vowel length.[25]

Marogulov, writing in the thirties of the twentieth century, lists a number of minimal pairs that show that the difference between long and short vowels is phonemic. He seems to suggest that this is true for the difference between short and long consonants as well. However, only concerning *r* he explicitly states that it is pronounced long, for other consonants this remains uncertain.[26] In any case, there certainly is a difference between words like *sama* 'part' and *samma* 'poison', whether or not the consonant is pronounced differently.[27] In the Latin alphabet of the Soviet Union, employed by Marogulov, vowel length was not noted, and thus it was necessary to note the doubling of consonants.

In my own transcription I write doubled consonants in those forms that had not lost gemination during the first process, because the distinction be-

21. A 'few cases', according to Maclean, in which the consonant is written twice in Syriac script.

22. Maclean 1901: xvii.

23. Maclean 1901: xvii.

24. Compare Joüon/Muraoka 1991: 77, on similar problems in Biblical Hebrew. Muraoka distinguishes between 'weak' and 'strong' gemination, preferring the term 'weak' rather than the traditional 'virtual'.

25. This seems to be in line with Tsereteli 1961: 235: 'In Dialekten begegnen aber auch kurze Vokale in offenen betonten Silben (...). In diesem Falle ist die Silbe infolge von Geminatenvereinfachung sekundär geöffnet. Gewöhnlich werden Vokale in ähnlichen Fällen gelängt, machmal bleiben sie aber gleichsam aus Trägheit kurz.' Cf. also 258-61, on the loss of gemination in NA. However, he does not distinguish between two different 'stages' of degemination, but assumes a gradual loss of all gemination.

26. Marogulov 1976/1935: 11-13.

27. Compare Maclean's dictionary (Md): *sāhmā // sammā*.

tween the two groups in nineteenth-century UA clearly was important, and perhaps still is in the twentieth century.

5.2.1.2 Under what conditions was gemination lost for the first time? No satisfactory phonological conditions can be found,[28] and the only way to explain the limited loss of gemination is to assume that it was lost only in grammatically conditioned environments.[29] Whenever gemination functioned as a word building element in CS, as it did in (1) *pa"el* stems, (2) adjectives of the *qaṭṭil* pattern, and (3) in other noun formations with morphological doubling, it was lost. A number of exceptions to these rules will be discussed below. Some verbs derived from Arabic intensive stems (II) conform to the group of *pa"el* stems that have lost their gemination, whereas other stems have retained gemination, perhaps due to a later date of introduction (cf. 5.2.1.3).

Few examples of independent nouns with a morphological doubled middle consonant are found in UA, and it is difficult to ascertain whether they really belong to this class. Many of them have lost the first (unstressed) vowel before the formerly doubled consonant. This loss, however, can only be explained if degemination had taken place beforehand.

(1)	*qābil* (< *mqabbel*) (Socin 21.1)[30]	Mt *(m)qābil*, Sv *qəbuli*[31]
	tānēta (< *mtannāytā*) (Socin 45.18)	Mt *(m)tânî*, Sv *tənuji*,
	zābín (< *mzabben*) (Kam 4)	Mt *(m)zâbin*, Sv *zəbuni*,
	bāqūrēlę (< *mbaqqer*) (Kam 107)	Mt *(m)bâqir*
	jāreb (< A *jariba* II) (Md)	Mt *(m)jârib*
(2)	*šāpírta* (< *šappīrā*) (Socin 17.7)	Mt *shapîrâ*[32]
	bāsíma (< *bassīmā*) (Socin 15.18)	Mt *basîmâ*, Sv *bəsijmə*,
	yāríḥa (< *yarrīḵā*) (Socin 25.14, 45.22)	Mt *yarîkhâ* or *ya-*
	mak'īḥa (< *makkīḵā*) (Kam 35/104)	Mt *makîkhâ*, Sv *məkijxə*
(3)	*lišána* / *līšánó* (< *leššānā*) (Socin 47.9/22)	Mt *lishânâ*
	dána (< *'eddānā*) (Socin 7.17)[33]	Mt *dânâ*

5.2.1.3 Doubling was retained in *pa"el* forms when the root itself was a 'geminate root', containing a doubled consonant ($C_1C_2C_2$) (1). Some pho-

28. Nöldeke 1868: 27, is uncertain about the conditions for degemination: 'in vielen Fällen nach *â*', referring explicitly to *pa"el* forms.

29. Cf. Anttila 1989:[2] 77-84, where he presents several examples of grammatical conditioning of sound changes in Finno-Ugric languages.

30. If not indicated otherwise, the forms following '<' are the reconstructed earlier Aramaic forms, often on the basis of CS forms.

31. Mt = the transcription in the dictionary of Maclean (1901), Sv = Soviet orthography.

32. Cf. 5.2.2.2.

33. See also Nöldeke 1868: 28, citing, a.o., *xwārā (< xewwārā)* and *'dānā (<'eddānā)*.

nological features seem to have prevented degemination as well, like a middle [d], and perhaps middle [t]. It is possible that the verb rappuwi (< *mrappē*) has maintained its gemination because of the [p], but other verbs and adjectives with doubled [p] were subject to degemination. In several stems with [ʿ] as a third consonant, gemination also was maintained (2).

Furthermore, morphological gemination was retained in a number of stems introduced from Arabic. A couple of verbs in form and meaning are Aramaic stems, but have retained their gemination, perhaps because of sound correspondence with an Arabic stem.[34] Most of these verbs in Arabic can be employed in the intensive stem, resembling the *paʿʿel* pattern (3). According to Maclean, many of these verbs have *ā* instead of *a* (IIa instead of IIb, cf. 6.5.2) in some other NENA dialects.[35]

The fourth category of verbs in which gemination has been retained (4), consists of stems derived from former weak (med. *w*/*y*) *afʿel* stems, like *maqqem*.[36] However, some of these verbs have lost their gemination, or occur both with and without gemination (4a).

(1)	*tummúmliḥ* (< *tmm*) (Socin 25.6)	Mt *(m)tamim*
	ḥálḗla, 'Beim langsamen sprechen: *ḥallílla*' (Kam 1)	Mt *(m)khalil*
(2)	*qaddíša* (< *qaddīš-*) (Socin 17.7), *qaddíšili* (Merx 60.3)	Mt *qudisha*
	rappíla (< *mrappē*) (Socin 47.15)	Mt *mrâpé*, but U: (Sc) *mrape*, f. *mrapâ*[37]
	ṭąbbíḷun (< *tbʿ*) (Socin 3.15)	Mt U *(m)ṭăbî* / K *mṭâbé*
(3)	*gawweb, jammeʿ, ʿajjez* (Mg §87)	Mt *(m)jă-wib, (m)jămî, (m)'ujiz*
	zawweg (< CS *zwg* / A *zwj* II) (Mg §87)	Mt U *(m)ză-wig* / K *mzâ-wig* 'to join', 'to marry' (= CS)
	ṣarrep (< CS *ṣrp* / A *ṣrf* II) (Nöld §100b)	Mt U *(m)ṣărip* / K, Al *mṣârip* 'to spend', 'to refine'
(4)	*madder* (< *afʿel dwr*) (Merx 58.17)	Mt *madir*
	maġġibíṭun (Socin 35.11)	Mt *makhib*, Sv *məxxubi*
	mättáḥlī (Socin 23.19)	Mt *matiw*, Sv *məttuvi*
	maqqem (Md)	Mt U *maqim* / Ti *mâqim*
(4a)	*māġíbla* (Socin 35.6)	

34. Nöldeke 1868: 209-10, and Maclean 1895: 283-4, list a number of these verbs, but do not explain their exceptional behavior.

35. Maclean 1895: 283-4.

36. The history of this form is unclear. In CS and Babylonian Aramaic the parallel form is *mqīm* (act. part). The present UA form is similar to the act. part. af. of gem. roots: *matteḵ* (< *tkk*). In Biblical Aramaic it is once *mārīm* (Dan 5:19), elsewhere *mhāqēm* or *mqīm*. In UA *mārem* constitutes one of the exceptions to this category; compare, however, Socin 29.16 *murrúmlun* // Socin 29.18 *múrumlē*.

37. Cf. Maclean 1895: 133; he remarks on this verb that it is conjugated according to IIa instead of IIb (6.5.2), thus, it is conjugated as if *p* was not doubled any more, and a had become long.

5.2.1.4 Nouns derived from geminate roots ($C_1C_2C_2 > C_1vC_2C_2v$) do not regularly fall into one of the two groups. Some of them have lost their gemination (1), some of them have retained it (2).[38] However, some of them had already lost their gemination in CS or behaved irregularly in other ways.

(1)	*râba* (< *rabbā*) (Socin 25.14), *râbe* (Kam 24)	Mt *râbâ*,[39] Sv *raba*
	bâba (cf. CS *abā*, JA *abbā*) (Socin 27.4)	Mt *bâbâ*, Sv *bəbə*
	ālâha (< *alāhā*) (Socin 123.19), *aláha* (Merx 59.18), *ālāhē, ālāhā, âla* (Kam 89, 100, 42)[40]	Mt *alâhâ*
(2)	*mínni* (< *menn-* + suf) (Socin 25.10)	Mt *min-î*
	šímmūlī (< *šemm-* + cop) (Socin 25.16), *šímu* (Kam 57)	Mt *shimâ*, Sv *şimmə*
	yímmiḥ (< *emm-* + suf) (Socin 25.19)	Mt *yimâ*, Sv *jimmə*
	ḥáijuḥ (< *xayy-* + suf) (Kam 82)	Mt *kha-yâ*, Sv *xəjji*
	'alláha (Merx 57.12), *alāhā, ālâhā* (Kam 10/32, 42)	

5.2.1.5 After this first process of degemination, many words remained with doubled consonants. Additionally, in the course of time new forms arose with doubled consonants, resulting either from assimilation or occurring in loanwords. Gemination now became a feature of the syllabic structure of the language, rather than of its morphological patterns (as it had been in earlier Aramaic), and thus even was attached to loans not possessing doubling in the source language. Then, perhaps in the second half of the nineteenth century, all gemination slowly began to disappear from UA, without compensatory lengthening of the preceding vowel. This second type of gemination was retained in most of the other NA dialects, which, like UA, had lost most of their morphological gemination.[41]

Secondary gemination, which perhaps had become 'virtual' or 'weak' at the end of the nineteenth century, is found in the following classes of forms: (1) new forms in the verbal system in which assimilation had taken

38. Tsereteli 1961: 260, lists some former geminate roots in which loss of gemination is compensated for by insertion of *-y-*, like *mayra* (< *mrr*) and *qayra* (< *qrr*).

39. Maclean distinguishes *rabbâ* from *râbâ*, the first denoting the independent noun 'elder', the second the adjective and adverb 'much, very'. Compare, however, Maclean 1895: 186 (§87), in which he asserts that both forms in UA are pronounced with *ā* in the first syllable.

40. *Alāhā* already in Biblical Aramaic and CS seems to have lost its gemination. The lengthening of [a] in these UA texts confirms this hypothesis, although, even in the transcriptions, instances are also found of short [a], even with doubled [l].

41. Odisho 1988: 26.

place, of [rl] > [rr], and [nl] > [ll],[42] and also of [tl] > [tt];[43] (2) words in which assimilation of voiced to voiceless consonants had taken place (cf. 2.5.1); (3) words in which the syllabic pattern had changed because of consonant losses, especially [ʿ], (4) forms in which short vowels were maintained by gemination of the last radical, especially in the SUB and PART forms of verbs of the IIb class,[44] and (5) loanwords that were adapted to the syllabic structure of UA.

(1)	*zíllih* (< *ʾᵃzīl leh*) (Socin 25.4)	
	mírrun (< *ʾᵃmir leh*) (Socin 25.5), *mĭrrun* or *mĭrun* (Kam 94) Sv*mirrun*	
	hámminnaḥ (< *mhaymen-l-*) (Socin 27.3)	
	ḥállę́la ('Beim langsamen sprechen: *ḥallílla*') (Kam 1)	
	ḥilę́ or *ḥillę́* (< *ʾᵃḵil lih*) (Kam 9)	
(2)	*qattę́l*$^{(d)}$*ju* (< *qā d-tilgu*) (Kam 62)	
(3)	*tárra* (< *tarʿā*) (Socin 25.4)	Mt *tarʿā*
	márre (*marʿē*) (Socin 13.18)	Mt *marʿâ* or *marî*
	kíssō (< *kers-*) (Socin 47.11)	Mt *kîsâ*
	játtę́ (< *yādeʿ*, but cf. Sc *ydʿʾ*) (Kam 24)	Mt (U) *yăṭî*
	máddin (< *maddē'-*) (Socin 25.17)	Mt *madî*
	qadda (< A *qaḍā'*, Sc *qadʿā*) (Kam 99)	Mt *qŭdâ*
(4)	*janjírriḥ* (< *janjir* + *ī*) (Socin 5.14)	
	maddírriḥ (< *madder* + *ī*) (Socin 13.13)	
(5)	*míllat* (< T *millet*) (Socin 3.1)	Mt *milat*
	hámmāša (< *ham šāʿā*[45]) (Socin 25.11)	
	hắmāšā, *hắmāšā* (Kam 12, 33)	Mt *hamâshâ*, Sv *həmməšə*

5.2.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.2.2.1 In Syriac script doubling of consonants can be marked only by the length of the preceding vowel. If we assume that the second process of degemination took place after the standardization of the written language, it is to be expected that doubled consonants are always preceded by a short vowel, whereas consonants that are not doubled, or have lost their doubling, are preceded by a long vowel. In the Protestant texts of all periods, this opposition is marked consistently, thus [CvCv:] = [CvCCv:], whereas [Cv:Cv:] = [Cv:Cv:]. Stoddard refers to this standard several times, as already mentioned above.[46] This opposition can be noted only when the pre-

42. So also Nöldeke 1868: 53.
43. Perhaps this assimilation took place only in the Salmas dialect.
44. As described by Kapeliuk 1992: 60-63. See also 6.5.5 and 6.5.8.
45. Cf. Merx 1, n. 3.
46. See 5.2.1.1.

ceding vowel is [a] or [i], because for [u] the difference between long and short realizations cannot be marked, and [o] and [e] occur only as long vowels. The opposition between [i] and [i:], *e* and *i* in Syriac script, is not marked consistently in the Syriac texts of Merx and Socin. It looks as if the Assyrian scribes preferred *i* for both long and short [i]. These texts thus provide reliable data on gemination only in case of *a* // *ā*.

5.2.2.2 By and large the representation of the forms that according to the nineteenth-century transcribed texts had lost their geminated middle consonant, is the same in the printings of the various mission presses.

In all text groups, the former *pa"el* forms that had lost their gemination are written with *ā* [a:] in the first syllable of the SUB form (1).[47] The verb *rappowī* (< *rp'*) in all texts constitutes an exception to this rule, as it does in the transcribed texts. Some Arabic loans are found with geminated middle consonants, whereas other verbal loans have lost their original gemination.

The adjectives of the *qaṭṭil* pattern constitute the second group of forms that had lost their gemination (2). These are nearly always written with *ā* as first vowel. An important exception to this rule is *qaddīš*, which never is written with *ā*, but always with *a*. As suggested above, it is likely that [d] was less apt to loose its gemination than other consonants. This is confirmed by the occurrence of *zaddīq* in Bedjan's text. In the texts of Socin and Merx the orthography of *šāpīrā* is variable, but *ā* is more frequent. Perhaps [p] too was more likely to retain its gemination.

In the last publication of Bedjan (1912), as well as in Maclean's dictionary (1901) and the Anglican Bible translation (1895), many instances are found in which the adjectives are written with *a* instead of *ā*. Even in the revision of the Protestant translation of 1893, incidentally instances of *a* occur. Maclean employed this etymological spelling because of the pronunciation with *a* in some dialects and with *i* in others. Only UA has *ā*.[48]

Not many examples are found of independent nouns that had lost their doubled middle consonant (3). A number of examples are found of nouns that have retained their original gemination. Some of them perhaps are recent loans from CS, and therefore had not been susceptible to degemination.

(1) *ṣālimon* (< *mṣallē*) (*Teachings* 1.5)
bāsomi (< *mbassem*) (Mat. 4:23)

47. This [a:] is shortened when in a closed syllable, and some texts represent this shortening in writing. See 5.7.1.2 and 5.7.2.2.

48. Maclean 1895: 244, 284.

ki šāwetten (< *mšawwē*) (Merx 29.4)
tānuwi (< *mtannē*) (Merx 12.16)
msāpi (< *msāppē*) ('95: Mark 14:10), *sāpyānā* (NAg) (HS 8.12)
mpāreq (< *mparreq*) (Mg §35)
jāreb (< A *jarrib*) (Mat. 4:3)

(2) *mākīḵ-* (< *makkīḵ-*) // *makkīḵutā* (*Teachings* 2.15, Mat 5:5, Merx 28.17, HS 3.23, MdM 210.14 // VdS 248.22)
bāsīm- // *bassīm-* (Merx 6.11, HS 5.14, MdM 210.18 // VdS ii.10)
šāpīr- // *šappīr-* (Merx 4.15, Syl 56.1, MdM 74.5 // Merx 1:10, VdS 248.11)
yārīḵ- (Merx 4.4, Syl 52.1)
šarrīruta (Mark 14:70 '93)

(3) *xadutā* (< *xaddē*)[49] (Mat. 2:10) Mt *khadûtâ*
bāṣorā (< *baṣṣorā*?) (Mat. 5:19) Mt *baṣûrâ*
dayyānā (< *dayyānā*) (Mat. 5:25) but Mt *déyânâ*
yammīna (< *yammīnā*) (Mat. 5:29) but Mt *yâmînâ*
lišānā[50] (< *leššānā*) // *leššānā* (Merx 12.18 // Syl 12.3) Mg (§88g) *giḇāyā*, Mt *gîwâ-yâ*
ʿidānā (< *ʿeddānā*) // *ʿdānā* (Socin 16.17) Mt *dânâ*

5.2.2.3 The four types of forms that have retained their gemination — (1) former *paʿʿel* forms of geminate roots, (2) forms with geminated [d], (3) Arabic loans and irregular Aramaic stems, and (4) weak *afʿel* stems — are found with short *a* in the first syllable. In the texts written by native speakers in Syriac script, as represented by Merx and Socin, a few former *afʿel* forms from II-*w*/*y* roots seem to have lost their gemination (4a).

(1) *tammem-* (< *mtammem*) (Mat. 3:15, Md)
mxallel (Mg §36)

(2) *qaddīš-* (< *qaddīš*) (*Teachings* 1.6, Merx 34.1, HS 3.13, MdM 3.12)
zaddīq- (< *zaddīqā*) (HS 8.11, MdM 3.6)
rappi=lāh (< *rappē*), *rappī* (IMP) (Mat. 1:9, Im 3:15)

(3) *jammuʿwi* (< A *jammeʿ*) (Mat. 3:12), *(m)jammeʿ* (Mg §87)
jammi (= *cāmih*) (Mat. 3:12)
(m)jawweb / *(m)ʿajjez* (Mg §87)

(4) *maxxi* (Mat. 1:21, Md)[51]
maqqumi- (< *maqqem*) (Mat. 3:9), *maqqem-* (HS 2.8, Md), cf. also *meqqemmī* (Ms.Or 52 = Duval 10.2 *ki miqímmiḥ*)
madder (Mat 1: 21, 3:9, 5:39, Merx 12.2, Md)

49. Stoddard 1855: 13, marks this word as being an exception to the rule, being 'derived from the ancient language': *a* is written, while *ā* is pronounced. Two other words mentioned as exceptions are *atunā* and *malaʾḵā*. Thus no gemination should be supposed in these forms.
50. See 5.2.2.1 on *e* // *i* in Merx's texts.
51. Note the neat opposition between *maxxi* 'to revive' and *māxi* 'to slay'.

(4a) *māxibā* (< *maxxeb*) // *maxxeb* (Merx 1.5 // Md)
mākosi (< *makkes*) (Merx 32.9, Md[52])

5.2.2.4 Nouns with a geminated root consonant may either keep the gemination (1) or lose it (2). The same words fall into the same category in nearly every text written in Syriac script, which proves that the two categories are not an invention of a single speaker or writer.

(1) *rābā* (< *rabbā*) (Mat. 2:10, Merx 30.3, Socin 2.5)
yāmā (< *yammā*, cf. M: *yâmâ*) (Mat. 4:18, Syl 31.24), *yāmmāti*[53] (Teachings 6:10)
Alāhā // *Ālāhā* (*Teachings* 6:7, Mat. 1:23, Merx 9.1 // Merx 20.4), *bāban* (*Teachings* 1.6)
(2) *yemm-* (< *yemmā*) // *yimā* or *yimmā*[54] (Teachings 5.14, Mat. 2:13, Syl 31.23 // Merx 14.5)
ʿamman (< *ʿamm*-sf) (Mat. 1:23),
lebbā (< *lebb-*) // *lib-* (Mat. 5:4, Syl 5.7, Im 1.10 // Im 1.14)[55]

5.2.2.5 The most frequent types of assimilation in the verbal system, [rl] > [rr] and [nl] > [nn] (1), were represented by the American missionaries with doubled *r* and *n*, indicated by a preceding short vowel. This usage was followed in most printed texts. In the texts written by Assyrian scribes, often *i* is found preceding doubled *r* or *n*, but this may be due to their apparent reluctance to employ *e* (cf. 5.2.2.1). Conversely, Bedjan in his early books seems to prefer *e* in this position, even if doubling is not present.[56] Bedjan also has some examples of [tt] resulting from [tl], which perhaps are due to his native dialect.

I have not come across any texts in which the second type of doubling mentioned above, resulting from assimilation of voiced to voiceless consonants (2), was represented in Syriac orthography.

In words where, according to the transcribed texts, gemination arose because of loss of [ʿ] or [γ] (3), the missionaries in most instances chose not to represent this phenomenon. The preceding vowel was short in CS (i.e., in the Urmia edition of the Bible), and was written short in LUA. Some exam-

52. Md: 'sometimes *makkes*', transcribed as *mākis*.
53. Note that this form has double m in Sc: ܝܡܡܬܝ. Md has pl. *yāmāti*. The double *m* probably has to be explained by the CS plural form, rather than denoting a true doubled consonant.
54. See 5.2.2.1 on *e* // *i* in Merx's texts.
55. Cf. Odisho 1988: 26: Koine *lıbba* against Urmi *lıbā*
56. Mainly in III-y: *hwelih* (< *hw'* + *lih*) (HS 89.10), *mxelon* (< *mx'* + *lhon*) (HS 89.13).

ples are found in which [ʿ] or [γ] have disappeared from the spelling, probably because of insufficient etymological knowledge.

The type of secondary gemination described by Kapeliuk (cf. 5.2.1.5) is reflected in the orthography by retaining the short vowel in the last syllable before the ending. This suggests that most writers were aware of this pattern.

In some forms loanwords may be assumed to possess doubled middle consonants (5). It remains uncertain whether the short consonant in the first syllable is the reflex of a short vowel in the source language, or whether it indeed points to a geminated consonant following. In some loanwords original gemination had been lost in LUA orthography.

(1) *(')merron* (< *'mīr l(h)on*) (Mat. 2:5), *(')merri* (*Teachings* 1.4, HS 81.16)
npellon (*npīl l(h)on*) (Mat. 2:11), *npellā* (HS 88.16)
(')zellon (< *'zīl lēh*) (Mat. 2:12)
ʿḇerron (< *ʿbīr l(h)on*) // *(')biron* (Merx 35.4, ZdB71/12/91B20 // Merx 3.10)
lābšennun (< SUB 1sg *-en-* + o-suf 3pl *-lun*) // *šalxinun* (id.) (Merx 4.8 // 4.9)
maʿḇerrettan (< SUB 2msg *-et-* + o-suf 1sg *-lan*) (Syl 40.10)
(3) *narrā* (< *narġā*) (Mat. 3:10)
arʿā // *ʿarrā* (incidental) (*Teachings* 5.2 // Merx 2.8)
(4) *massemmī* (ZdB49/1/1A11)
(5) *zimat* (< AzT *ḍmt*) // *zemmat* (Im 3.22 // Md)
hammāšā (< *ham šāʿā*) (Merx 1.3)
hammām (< A *hammām*) (Merx 55.4)

5.2.3 *Conclusions*

The long pronunciation of consonants in earlier Aramaic that was present in a number of morphological categories like the verbal *paʿʿel* form and some nominal formations has lost its morphological relevance in Urmia Aramaic. The loss of morphological gemination has enabled gemination to become a feature of the phonemic structure of the language. Loss of consonants, as well as various assimilation processes have caused new long consonants to arise. In nineteenth-century UA (as opposed to all or most other NENA dialects) geminated consonants were shortened once again, this time without corresponding lengthening of the preceding vowels. The phonemic difference between open and closed syllables thereby became dependent on the length of this vowel, long and short respectively.

In the texts in Syriac script, long consonants are usually indicated by the short vowels preceding the consonant. The consonant itself is not marked for length.

5.3 Phonemicalization of begadkepat consonants

5.3.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.3.1.1 The CS *begadkepat* consonants, [b], [g], [d], [k], [p],[57] and [t], were characterized by their spirantized allophones when preceded by a vowel. In UA all these consonants have lost this feature, but the reflex of this earlier feature is not the same for all of them.[58]

5.3.1.2 The consonants [b] and [k] have split into two phonemes: [b] > [b] / [v], [k] > [k] / [x]. The conditions under which [b] > [v] and [k] > [x] are very much the same as those that caused spirantization in earlier Aramaic. However, the spirantized consonants no longer can be regarded as allophones, because they do not again become 'hard' when the consonant, in another form of the word, is preceded by a consonant. In a verbal paradigm it seems to be decisive whether the middle consonant was spirantized or not in the active participle (*qaṭel*). If the consonant was 'hard' in the active participle, it is hard in all other forms of the stem pattern, whereas it is spirantized in all forms if it was spirantized in the former active participle. This explains why all former *pa"el* forms still have [b] or [k], although no longer geminated, whereas derivations of the first stem have [v] or [x]. The prefixing of the sentence connective *u-*, or of prepositions like *b-* and *l-*, which caused spirantization in CS, now no longer influences the pronunciation of [b] and [k].

This split into two phonemes did not cause new phonemes to be added to the inventory, because of their merging with already existing [w] and [ḥ]. These two sounds, probably at the same time, changed to [v][59] and [x].

[b]	*qā́bil* (< *mqabbel*) (Socin 15.20)	Mt *(m)qâbil*, Sv *qəbuli*
	ṣēbūṭḗ (< *ṣaybūt*-suf) (Socin 15.3)	Mt *sébûtâ*
[v]	*wídlun* (< *ʾḇid*-suf, cf. *ʿaḇed*) (Socin 13.6)	Mt *ʿâ-wid*, Sv *əvid*
	āver (< *ʿaḇer*) (Kam 41)	Mt *ʿâ-wir*, Sv *avır*
[k]	*ūkúl-* (< *w-ḵul*) (Socin 15.11)	Mt *kül*, Sv *kul*
	māk'iḥā (< *makkīḵā*) (Kam 35)	Mt *makîkhâ*

57. In all likelihood [p] lost its spirantized prounciation early in Eastern CS (cf. 5.1.2.2).

58. Nöldeke 1868: 29, clearly indicates this loss of spirantized allophones before trying to give rules for hard or soft pronunciation (30-38). Maclean 1895: 278-80 and 298-310, gives detailed rules for the irregular pronunciation of these consonants in the modern dialects, but does not seem to realize their different phonemic status in comparison to CS.

59. The exact phonetic nature of this sound in UA is not clear. Stoddard 1855: 10, 'nearly the sound of English *w*, sometimes inclinging to *v*'. Odisho 1988: 26 and Hetzron 1969: 113, both assume the sound in UA to be nearer to [v], whereas in other dialects it was probably closer to [w]. Compare also Odisho 1990: 29-33, on this sound in Iraqi Koine.

[x]	*dḥirri* (< *dḵar-*) (Merx 60.20)	Mt *tâkhir*
	ǎḥlaḥ (Syriac script: *aḵl-aḵ* < *aḵel* + *-ax*) (Kam 28)	Mt *âkhil*

5.3.1.3 With [g] the situation is somewhat different. This sound also split into two phonemes: [g] and [γ], but the second phoneme was not very stable, and in many instances developed further into [ʿ], [ʾ] or zero.[60] In some words it was retained, and the phoneme [γ] merged with Arabic غ (ġ), or Persian غ (ġ) or ق (q̇, also pronounced as ġ), which had entered the language in loanwords. It began to function also as the voiced allophone of [x] (cf. 5.5.1).

ø	*pą́lliḥ* (< *mpāleg*) (Socin 19.22)	Mt *(m)pălî*
[γ]	*šγíša* (< *šġīšā*) (Merx 58.7)	Mt *shâghish*,
	pą́ġra (< *paġrā*) (Socin 21.17)	Sv *paxra*

5.3.1.4 The former allophone p̄ ([f]) has hardly survived in UA. In most words former [f] has become [p],[61] whereas in a few loans it has retained its [f] sound. In most loans Arabic [f] became [p]. When preceded by [a], it formed the diphthong [aw] and was further contracted to [o] (cf. 5.11.1.1). When preceded by [u], it was lost completely (cf. 5.6.1.7)

[p]	*mpíllun* (< *npīlā*) (Socin 13:15)	Mt *nâpil*, Sv *npələ*
	septā (Md)	Mt siptâ
	pekkir (< A *fikr*) (Md)	Mt *pikîr / pikir*
[f]	*siffáreš* (Socin 25.19)	Mt *sipârîsh* [sic]
[w]	*nošā* (< *nāpšā*) (Md)	Mt *nôshâ*
	ruišé (< *rupštā*)[62] (Socin 9.7)	Mt *rûshâ*, Sv *ru(j)ṣa*

5.3.1.5 The spirantized allophones of [d] and [t] in the Urmia dialect in many words have merged with the plosive variant, whereas *t* in some other dialects has developed into a glide (Salmas),[63] or into [s]/[z] or [l] (Jewish dialects) in intervocalic positions.[64] Spirantized [d] and [t] in a number of

60. Cf. Tsereteli 1990: 35-42.

61. Tsereteli 1962: 223-4, assumes a new allophone of [p], an 'Abruptiv' [pʰ]. This sound is attested only in texts transcribed by Russian writers. Odisho 1988: 44, shows that the aspirated consonants pʰ, tʰ, cʰ and jʰ, now are phonemic in Iraqi Koine. According to Odisho, these sounds are present in Urmia Aramaic, but there is no indication that they have a phonemic status. Cf. further Mackenzie 1981: 479 on 'aspirated' (pʿ, tʿ, cʿ, kʿ) and 'unaspirated' plosives in Kurmandji Kurdish of the north east, probably under 'Caucasian' influence. It seems likely that an areal feature is present here; so also Tosco 1992: 261.

62. Cf. also 5.9.

63. Cf. Maclean 1895: 339.

64. For an overview of the Jewish dialects in this matter, see Kapeliuk 1997.

words have been lost completely (cf. 2.6.1.6), whereas Stoddard already noted the 'vulgar' pronunciation of the plural ending *āti* as *aē*.[65]

[d] *khâdir* (< CS *xāḏer*) (Mt)
mad^{i}nkhâ (< CS *maḏn^{e}xā*) (Mt)
[t] *kanuta* (*kānuṯā*) (Merx 58.1) Mt *-utâ*
[w] *malkőuvät* (< *malkuta d-*) (Duval 24.3)

5.3.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.3.2.1 In CS the two allophones of the litterae *begadkepat* were often not marked, because of their being conditioned by clear phonological rules. The Protestant missionaries, and in their footsteps most of the other writers and printers, must have realized that spirantization no longer could be easily deduced from the syllabic pattern, and decided to consistently note both spirantization and the absence of spirantization. In Syriac script the dots above and under the *litterae begadkepat* merge with those of the vowel signs and might cause confusion, but because of their consistent marking, it is always clear what is meant: ◌ܒ = *bā*, ◌ܒ = *b̲ā*, ◌ܒ = *b̲e*, and ◌ܒ = *be*. In the Protestant texts I have hardly come across ambiguous spellings.[66] In the texts of Bedjan and in the texts written by Assyrian scribes, somewhat more unmarked *begadkepat* consonants occur, leaving it to the reader to decide on their pronunciation.

5.3.2.2 The missionaries' consistent marking of the variants suggests that they were aware of the two realizations of [b] and [k]. Stoddard noted in his grammar that the sound of spirantized *b* 'can hardly be distinguished from *w*', whereas *x* 'cannot be distinguished in pronunciation from *k̲*.'[67] In most instances the missionaries decided to retain CS spelling, but in a few words and suffixes a 'simplified' spelling was chosen. The most remarkable instance is the verbal stem *ʾbr*, which is written with the root consonants *ʾwr* when meaning 'to enter', and with *ʾb̲r*, when meaning 'to pass by/away'. One wonders whether the first spelling had not been caused by a lack of understanding in the beginning, and later was reinterpreted, being a suitable way of differentiating between the two semantic aspects. Other descriptions do not suggest any difference in pronunciation between these two meanings.

65. Stoddard 1855: 116.

66. The only exceptions perhaps are the very early publications, befor the standardization process was completed. Nöldeke's remark (1868: 30) about the lack of dots in the Protestant publications may refer to these impressions.

67. Stoddard 1855: 10

In the majority of texts most words are written with the original *b̲* and *k̲*, rather than with *w* and *x*, although in the less carefully written texts of Socin and Merx incidentally the 'wrong' consonants are employed. Bedjan, in his *Syllabaire*, an elementary reader, employes *b̲* and *k̲* according to etymology, but he notes that their pronunciation is identical with *w* and *x*. In his other writings he adheres carefully to etymology. In some texts, he spells the INF of *mhqy*, written *hāqowi* in the Protestant texts, with *b̲*. This might be an example of hypercorrection due to the different pronunciation of this verb in his native dialect (*hāquyi*).

Important to note is the spelling of the first person plural suffix [-ax], employed in the verbal system and forming part of the first person plural copula. In the Protestant texts, as well as in Bedjan's earlier texts, this suffix is spelled *-ak̲*, with long *ā* and spirantized *k̲*, although in CS the suffix is spelled with *x*. Stoddard does not comment on this spelling. In the revised version of 1893 the suffix is written as *-ax*, whereas in the Anglican Bible translation (1895), it appears as *-āxn*. Final *-n* probably was added in light of its presence in many of the other dialects.[68] From 1904 onwards Bedjan too employed *-ax*.

b *lublāli* (< *lābel*) (Mat. 1:25)

b̲ *ki xašb̲ā* (< *xāšeb̲*) (Merx 1.9)

w *ma'wer* (< *ma'b̲er*) (*Teachings* 2.2, Merx 29.2, 3)
'aywā (*'aybā* > *'ayb̲ā*) (Merx 8.14)

b̲/w *'ab̲rī* (*'āb̲er*) // *ôrī-* (*'āb̲erīn* > *āwrī-*) (Mat. 5:18 // 20, Merx 34.16)
hāqub̲- (< *mhāquwi*) // *hāquy-* (MdP 154.7 // VdS iii.12)
hewwi // *heb̲b̲ī* // *hib̲ī* (< K *hîvî*) (MdP 3.14 // MdP ed. '93 // Md)
šbārā (= *šb̲ārā* < CS *šwārā*) // *šwārā* (Merx 16.12 // 18.13)

k *b-kul* (*Teachings* 3.10), *d-b-kul* (Mark 14.6 '95)

k̲ *ki ak̲lī* (< *āk̲el*) (Socin 4.13), *(')k̲ālā [xālā]* (Syl 10.8-9)[69]
kôk̲b̲ā (Mat. 2:9)
īd-uk̲ [īdux] (*īdā* + suf 2msg) (Syl 20.4-6)
lābl-āk̲=lun (SUB 1pl + o-suf 3pl) (Merx 23.3)
d-āzā(l)k̲ hādrāk̲ (d + SUB 1pl + SUB 1pl) (Mark 14:12)

x/k̲ *d-āzā(l)xn mhādrāxn* (Mark 14:12 '95) / *d-āzā(l)x hādrāx* ('93)
šākuri=(')wāk̲, šākori=(')wāk̲ (INF + cop 1pl) (MdP '86 2.13, '93 2.14)
xāz-āk̲ (SUB 1pl *-āk̲*) (HS 3.11),
qarax=lhon (SUB 1pl + o-suf 3pl) (MdM 199.10)
yād'ax (SUB 1pl *-ax*) (VdS i.6)

68. Maclean 1895: 82 (§31): *pārqāx* / *pārqāxn* (UA) / *pārqāxnī* (Tkh. / *pārqīx* (Ti. Al. Sh. Ash) / *pārqīxn* (Ti. Sh.) / *pārqux* (Al) / *pārqīxā* (Q).

69. In his Syllabaire (1894), Bedjan often provides a phonetic spelling in Syriac script alongside the conventional, historic, spelling. His phonetic spelling is given between square brackets.

5.3.2.3. The [g] is written without any sign when pronounced 'hard', but when spirantized [g] has survived in Aramaic words, it is written with the sign of spirantization ($\underline{g} = \dot{g}$). When the sound had further developed into ʿ, *y*, or *w*, the latter consonants sometimes are written, probably because the etymology was unknown. The *g* is also employed to represent Arabic and Persian *ġ* and *q̇* in loanwords.

g	*ki garšī* (< *gāreš*) (Merx 17.8)
	gnāḇā (Syl 11.15)
ġ	*paġr-ī* (Mark 14:22, Im. 2.18)
	besġādā (b + INF *sgd*) (MdP 2.8), *sġādtā* (ZdB 71/12/92A32)
	šġušyā (VdS 250.8, Mark 14:2 '95), *šġīš-* (ZdB 71/12/91B24)
	yāġīyutā (< A *yāġeh*) (ZdB 71/12/ 92A3)
	ôtāġ (< P, T *otāq̇*) (Mark 14:9 '95)
ʿ	*š(ʿ)īšā* // *šʿīšā* (Ruth 1:19 '52 // '58)

5.3.2.4 The [p], nearly always pronounced 'hard', is marked by a half circle underneath when spirantized (ֿפ). When preceded by a vowel, [f] became [w] and formed a diphthong with the vowel (cf. 5.11). In Arabic words, [f] in most instances becomes [p]. If pronounced as [f], the sign of spirantization was added in most instances.

p	*kiʿpā* (Mark 14:28)
	yālip (Syl 45.5)
	pāliṭ (Syl 48.1)
	pīkir (< A *fikr*) (Merx 1.15)
	pêriz (< AzT *fīrīs/pīrīs*) (Merx 2.1)
p/f	*sipārīš* (Socin 24.19)[70]
p̲	*ṭupsā [tuwsā]* (Syl 26.2-4)
	naṗsā [nošā] (Syl 26. 2-4)

5.3.2.5 The two *begadkepat* consonants [d] and [t] that have no spirantized counterpart in UA are written without the dot marking spirantization in the standard orthography. In the earliest publications usage is wavering. Only in the publications of the Anglican press do forms occur in which *t̲* is regularly distinguished from *t* (with dot above), because in dialects other than UA these spirantized consonants were retained.

See 5.6.1.6 and 5.6.2.6 for some forms in which spirantized [d] and [t] were lost.

70. Compare 5.3.1.4, where the transcription of this form is given.

d *ābād* (< P *ābād*) (HS 1.7)
t *Rāmtā* (< *Rāmṭā*) (Mat. 2:18)
sġādtā (ZdB 71/12/92A32)
t/ṯ *māṣīton // d-īṯ // ytīḇi* (BT '95: Mark 14: 7 // 8 // 18)

5.3.3 *Conclusions*

The alternation of the *begadkpat* consonants and their spirantized allophones has disappeared in Urmia Aramaic. Some of these spirantized allophones have merged with other consonants, and thus acquired a phonemic status, whereas other spirantized allophones have disappeared completely.

In case of merging with other consonants, the distinctive spelling of the spirantized consonants has been retained in the standard spelling. In case of loss of spirantized consonants, the consonant is still written, marked with *l.o.* to indicate non-pronunciation, or left out.

5.4 Palatalization of [g] and [k]

5.4.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.4.1.1 Palatalization was, and still is, an important feature of the Urmia dialect. Especially the [k] and the [g] are liable to palatalization.[71] Only when followed by [o] do they retain their original pronunciation, in all other instances [k] becomes [k^{y}] and [g] becomes [g^{y}]. Perhaps this feature was borrowed from surrounding languages like the Azeri Turkish dialect, spoken in the plains west and north of Lake Urmi, but not in the Hakkari mountains or in the Mosul region.[72] In Duval's texts from the Salmas region, no traces of this feature occur. The changes of [u] > [u^{y}] and [i] > [i^{y}], which are connected with palatalization, will be dealt with separately in 5.8 and 5.9.

Although this process is abundantly illustrated in the transcribed texts, Maclean does not note these palatalized allophones in his transcription. On the contrary, he notes that in Ṭiari (in the southwestern part of the Hakkari mountains) often *j* is heard where Urmia has *g*, e.g., *jānā* (T) instead of

71. Nöldeke 1868: 40-41 comments on this 'Mouillierung' of *k* and *g*, and on its occurrence in Turkish languages. On the basis of the texts available to him, he was not able to grasp its widespread occurrence. Odisho 1988: 25, mentions the 'strong palatalization tendency' in UA, and so also Tsereteli 1961: 244-5.

72. On palatalized allophones of [k] and [g] in Azeri, see Foy 1903: 175, 188, 191-2,

gānā (U).[73] These allophones thus became identical with the prepalatal consonants introduced from Arabic, Turkish, and Persian. This suggests that in the mountain region the process had taken one extra step, but the scarcity of texts from these regions makes it impossible to draw any firm conclusion. In Kampffmeyer's transcription and in some examples of Nöldeke this further step is also suggested, but these texts in all likelihood do not come from the mountain region.[74] Note that these palatalized allophones are not represented in the Soviet orthography.

[k^{y}]	*málk[y]ā* (Socin 9.12)	Mt *malkâ*
	meǩtíβiy (< *makteḇ-*) (Merx 57.1)	Mt *maktiw*
	ǩul (Merx 57.5)	Mt *kül*, Sv *kul*
	kyáttit (< *ki yad'et*) (Socin 13.9)	
	mek'(tχ)ḥek'ánuḥ (< *magxekān-*) (Kam 52)	Mt *magkhik*
	k'ĭk^{y}ā (< *kikā*) (Kam 55)	Mt *kîkâ*, Sv *kikə*
[g^{y}]	*g[y]úrta* (Socin 9.11)	Mt *gûrâ*, Sv *gurta*
	palg[y]ę́ (Socin 11.16-7)	Mt *pelgâ*, Sv *pəlgi*
	yu, g[y]u (Socin 7.20, 9.3), *^{d}jo* (*gāw*) (Kam 19)	Mt *gô, gû* (K, Sal, rarely U), *Sv go* or *gəv*
	ḡerwusila ḡániy (Merx 60.19)	
	^{d}jurbā^{d}jur (< *gurbāgur?*) (Kam 2, 19, 19, 52, 55)	Mt *(m)gerwis*
	^{d}jűmla (*gumlā*) (Kam 2)	Mt *gümlâ*

see further Mt *gâna*, Ti. Ash *yânâ*, Al. Ash (sometimes) *gyânâ*, Sv *gən-*

5.4.1.2 In UA three other palatalized consonants had been introduced into the language together with loanwords from Arabic, Turkish, Persian, and Kurdish. These consonants, [c], [j], and [ž], were new in Aramaic, but came to be employed in Aramaic words too.[75] The phoneme [c] merged with sounds resulting from assimilated consonant clusters such as *tš*, *šq* and *šk* in Aramaic words,[76] [j] resulted from palatalized [g],[77] and [ž] from voiced [š].

[c]	*b-qamcíyyī* (< T *kamçı*) (Socin 9.2)	Mt *qŭmchî*
	cim (< T *cum*) (Socin 7.3)	Mt *chim*
	ḥácā (< *xad* + T *ce* or CS *kmā*?) (Socin 7.5)	Mt *khăchâ*
	mächę́(i)lī (< *meškax*) (Socin 29.22)	Mt *mācex / e*
	pečĺltelạ (< *paškel?*) (Kam 7)	Mt *pâchil*
	ıcca (< CS *teš'ā*) (Marogulov 35)	Mt *'ichâ*

73. Maclean 1895: 311.
74. Nöldeke 1868: 41.
75. Tsereteli 1961: 225.
76. For more examples, see Maclean 1895: 325-27.
77. Nöldeke 1868: 65, assumes [j] to result also from assimilation of [r] in the UA verb *rajrej* from stem *rxš*.

[j] *jąldī* (Socin 7.3) Mt *jeldî*
ājástā (Socin 7.21-2) Mt *m'âjiz*
cqillun (< *šqil-lun*) (Socin 23.3)
[ž] *ži*

5.4.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.4.2.1 In the printed texts there are no indications at all of the palatalized allophones of [k] and [g]. This may be due to the nearly complete changing of the pronunciation of these two vowels, which made it possible to retain the same sign. Stoddard remarks on the pronunciation of *k*: 'has often the sound of *k* in *kind*, as pronounced by Walker, a *y* being quickly inserted after *k*.' He does not comment on the pronuciation of *g*.[78] This confirms that he has noted the palatalized *k*, but did not think it necessary to mark this in Syriac script.

Even in the Syriac texts written by the Assyrian scribes, no traces have been found of palatalization.

k *malkā* (Mat. 2:19)
karbā (Mat. 3:7)
kāteb (*Teachings* 3.3)
kiwpi // *kupi* (both transcribed as *k[y]ūpī*) (Socin 10.8 // 9)
g *gumli* (Mat. 3:4)
gān- (Mat. 3:9, Im 3.5)
gurutā (*Teachings* 3.3)

5.4.2.2 For [j], [c] and [ž] separate consonant signs were in use, i.e., a small waved line which is added to *g*, *k* and *z*, to mark *j*, *c* and *ž*. Of these, *c* became to be employed in original Aramaic words. Bedjan adds this waved line to *š* [š], probably indicating the same sound as otherwise written as *ž*.

In the texts that predate the OT edition of 1852, no separate sign was in use for the unvoiced [c], and *j* was emplyed both for [j] and [c], also in Aramaic words.[79] This *j* for *c* occasionally appears in Merx's texts, especially in parts which contain many other deviations from standard spelling.

c/j *mjīxtā* (< *meškax*), *mujex-* // *mācox-*, *macx-* (Mat. 1:18, Merx 46.8 // ZdB71/12/91B25, Merx 6.15)

78. Stoddard 1855: 11.

79. Stoddard 1855: 10 on *j*: 'Until the last two or three years, we used it also to express *ch'* (= *c*). The preface is dated July 1853. In the last issues of ZdB from 1850, *c* does not yet occur.

axji // axci (*Teachings* 2.13, Mat. 5:47, Merx 54.13 // Syl 20.10)
ʿejjā (< *teš'ā*) // *ʿeccā* (*Teachings* 7.8 // Stod. 131)
hej (< P,T *hic*) // *hec* (*Teachings* 7.14, ZdB 50/10/76A33 // Stod. 137)
xajjā // xaccā // xa(d)cā (Mark 14:35 // Merx 10.3, MdP 154.11 // Mark 14:35 '95)

j *jammuʿwi* (< *mjammeʿ*), *jam-* (Mat. 3:12, Merx 15.5)
juwab (< *A juwāb?*) (Merx 6.7)
jargā (< T *jark*) (Merx 15.11)

š *ṣdāyā // ždāyā* (Syl 27.14 // Md)
ṣāri // žāri (Syl 27.15 // Md)

ž *ži* (Ruth 2:9)

5.4.3 *Conclusions*

The palatalized consonants that originate in CS *k* and *g* are not usually represented in LUA script, whereas those that originate in loans from neighboring languages are represented by separate consonant signs. In the oldest Protestant texts (until about 1850), [j] and [c] were represented by the same grapheme *j*, which later was employed only for [j].

5.5. Assimilation of voiced to voiceless, dental to bilabial, and vice versa

5.5.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.5.1.1 The loss of spirantized allophones seems to have prepared the way for the development of voiceless allophones of voiced consonants and vice versa.[80] Two rules govern the occurrence of these allophones. The first rule predicts the regressive assimilation of both voiced to voiceless and voiceless to voiced (1). Thus [dt] > [tt] and [td] > [dd].[81] Incidentally, progressive assimilation occurs (2).

The second rule states that a voiced consonant becomes unvoiced at the end of a word (3). This rule, although clear enough, presents some difficulties, because the word boundary is not always as clear as one would like. Especially in genitive constructions, when two words are connected with the genitive marker *d-*, this *d-* is connected either to the foregoing word, and then becomes voiceless, or is felt to belong to the second word, and then its realization depends on the latter's first consonant.[82]

80. See 5.13.1.1 for the pairs of voiced // voiceess consonants.
81. So Tsereteli 1961: 241-3, and Marogulov 1976: 7-8.
82. Tsereteli 1961: 241-3, does not comment on this problem in his description of various assimilation processes.

(1) *ᵝpḥëlat 'Ilíya* (< *u-b-xaylā d-*) (Merx 58.16)
lma'psü:mı (< *l-mabsumi*) (Osip 79.12)
sqī́ra (< *zqīrā*) (Socin 11.10) Mt *zqr*, cf. *zqûrâ*
jā́ṭṭḛ, jā́ṭin (*yād^{e}'ā* > *yad'ā* > *yaṭṭa*) (Kam 24, 1)
pū́lul (< *b-'ulul*) (Kam 10)
mepḥjā́nuḥ (< *mabḵyān-*) (Kam 51)
hátḥa (< *hādā* + *aḵ?*) (Socin 13.15) Mt *hâtkhâ*
bigdā́lo (< *b-qdāl-*) (Socin 21.7)
biġzḗta (< *b-xzaytā*) (Socin 15.6)
aġdī́ju (< *aḵ dīy-*) (Kam 26)
hī́ğ dānā ("ğ fast *ds*') (< *hic dānā*) (Kam 60)
ub drānā́nī (< *up dra'nāni*) (Socin 19.12)
(2) *sipfā́tu* (< *sepwātā* (pl) + suf 3msg) (Kam 19) Mt (xxiii) *sipwatî*
(3) *gā́raḳ* (< *gārag*) (Socin 17.21) Mt *gârag*
āvit (< *'āḇed*) (Kam 42)
yāwáltad daṛdī // praqtat dunyi (Socin 9.4, 7.22)
pā́tā dḛmī́ya // yāwáltat ḥáša (Socin 15.2-3, 9.4)
térrad bābu (< *tar'ā d-bāb-*) (Kam 46)
qā́dda dālā́hā ("rash': *qaddat ĕlāhā*) (Kam 99)

5.5.1.2 Another type of regressive assimilation that is often marked in the transcribed texts is that of the dental [n] to bilabial [p]: [np] > [mp], a type of assimilation that is common in many languages, and notably also in Persian.

mpíllun p'urḥa (< *npālā b-urxā*) (Socin 13.15-6)

5.5.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.5.2.1 The missionaries did not represent voiced or voiceless allophones in their orthography. Stoddard does not mention this feature in his grammar, and it is likely that he did not notice it. Maclean noted the alternation of voiced and voiceless consonants, but did not formulate the conditions under which allophones were employed.[83] Bedjan too, was well aware of the process, as appears from the forms in the *Syllabaire*, in which voicing and devoicing were represented by a phonological spelling in Syriac script. No mission press, however, decided to write these allophones, obviously because this would have led to many unfamiliar orthographies, whereas the regularity of the process did not make it necessary to represent them. Inci-

83. Maclean 1895: 309-10 (*b*/*p*), 314-15 (*d*/*t*/*ṭ*), 321-22 (*z*/*s*/*ṣ*), 334 (*ġ*/*x*). Nöldeke 1868: 45, already noted this phenomenon for *d*/*t*/*ṭ*, again without making it general.

dentally, in some words and text types, the devoiced counterpart is written instead of the voiced consonant.

The word *hatḵā*, derived from *hādā* + ḵā[84], is written with *t* in all earlier texts, but in the second half of the century the orthography changes to *d*. Perhaps someone suggested a plausible etymology based on *hādā*.[85]

In loanwords the spelling of these consonants presents some difficulties. In some cases the Arabic orthography was taken over, but in other instances the spelling was brought into line with pronunciation habits in UA. In my opinion, no fixed rule was ever employed in this respect. However, the many differences between the presses with regard to the spelling of loanwords can often be explained by the uncertainty of the spelling of voiced and unvoiced consonants.

d/t *hatḵā / atḵā* (*Teachings* 1.4, Mat. 1:17, Socin 12.15 / MdP '86)
hadḵā (Merx 10.9 (incidentally) (MdP '93)
mut // mud (Merx 6.10 // Md)
xadtā [xattā] (Syl 14.7-11)
hājad (probably hypercorection) // *hajjat* (< T, K *hajjat*) (Merx 46.6 // Md)
g/k *gsāyā [ksāyā]* (Syl 13.15-16)
z/s *Xazqī'ēl [Xesqī'ēl]* (Syl 17.11-16)
xeṣdā [xezdā] (Syl 26.8)
hargīs // hargez (< P, T *hergiz*) (Syl 48.5, Im 9.4, MdM 73.19 // VdS 246.19)
ġ/x *ujāx // ujāġ* (< T, K *ujāq*) (Mat. 1:17 / VdS 246.10, Md)

5.5.2.2 In the printed texts, very few traces can be found of the assimilation of [n] > [m] when followed by labials. Stoddard was well aware of the process, but he did not think it necessary to represent this assimilation in script.[86] Bedjan, although he himself always employs the etymological spelling, in his *Syllabaire* noted the existence of this assimilation.

tambal (Stod. 11)
pambel (Nöld. 52)
npālā [mpālā] (Syl 24.9-12)

5.5.3 *Conclusions*

All voiced consonants have unvoiced allophones, and all unvoiced consonants have voiced allophones. The allophones occur under influence of re-

84. The second element is uncertain, cf. Maclean 1895: 160.

85. The spelling of the stem *tḵr* (< *dḵr*) (contrary to the present rules of UA) in all mission presses is probably due to the fact that assimilation had already taken place in CS *etp'el*, cf. Maclean 1895: 314.

86. Stoddard 1855: 11, gives one example in which *m* is written for *n*, as does Nöldeke 1868: 52.

gressive assimilation. Unvoiced allophones of voiced consonants appear also when they occur at the end of a syllable. Further, regressive assimilation of [n] > [m] takes place under influence of labials.

These various allophones are not usually represented in the standard orthography, although a few fixed spellings with the allophones do occur in the Protestant press and in Bedjan's writings.

5.6 Loss of consonants

5.6.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.6.1.1 Several CS consonants have disappeared in UA, some of them in all positions, others only in certain positions. Four consonants underwent very similar developments: [ʾ], [ʿ], [h], and [y]. The loss of spirantized [d] and [t] has been mentioned under 5.3.1.4, but needs some extra attention here, especially with regard to orthography. Some other consonants have been lost through complete assimilation in certain positions, of which the oral sonants [r] and [l] are most important. Apart from these a few consonants have been lost only in a restricted number of forms.

5.6.1.2 The disappearence of [ʾ] (glottal stop), whenever not in intervocalic positions, which took place already in CS, is also present in LUA (1).

However, in LUA, [ʾ] tends to be deleted in intervocalic positions as well. In this position it is regularly replaced by a glide, [y] (2). In a few forms, [ʾ] instead of earlier [y] turns up in intervocalic positions (3), reminding one of the forms in Biblical Aramaic.[87] When [ʾ] disappeared at the end of a syllable, compensatory vowel lengthening took place (4).

(1)	*nâsa*, naʃa (< *(ʾ)nāšā*) (Socin 5.4, Osip. 79.4)	Mt *nâshâ*, Sv *nəʂə*
	ḫēna (< *(ʾ)xarinā*) (Kam 14)	Mt *khénâ*, Sv *xinə*
	ḫul (< *ʾᵘḵol*) (Kam 32)	Sv *xala* (INF)
(2)	*pâjiš* / *pā'iš* (< *pā'ēš*) (Kam 35)	Mt *pâ-ish*, Sv *pajiʂ*
	mājit (< *mā'ēt*) (Kam 44)	Mt *mâ-it*, Sv *məjit*
(3)	*sūrâ'i* (Syriac *Suryāyi*) (Socin 17.14)	Mt *sûrâ-yâ*, Sv *surəjə*
	armnâ'i (Syriac *Ārimnāyi*) (Socin 19.21)	Mt *ârimnâ-yâ*
(4)	*d-máḫā* (< *men 'ayḵ*) (Socin 15.15)	Mt *mâkhâ*
	mâkhil (< *ma'ḵel*) (Md)	

5.6.1.3 [ʿ] (glottopharyngeal fricative) in intervocalic position has developed into [ʾ] and further into [y] (or [w] when preceded by [u]), whereas

87. See, e.g., *ktiḇ/qrē* in Ezra 5:12 כַּסְדָּיֵא // כשדאה 'Chaldean'.

double [ʿ] has become *-ww-* or *-w-* (1).[88] In all other positions it has disappeared as a consonant (2). However, etymological [ʿ] is closely related to 'back' pronunciation, and has left its traces on the articulation of the word (cf. 5.12.1).

Loss of [ʿ] at the end of a syllable, before a consonant, usually is compensated for by lengthening of the preceding vowel (3), less often by gemination of the following consonant (4). Loss of [ʿ] at the beginning of a syllable is compensated for by doubling of the preceding consonant. If the latter is a voiced consonant, it is devoiced (5).[89] However, incidentally examples are found in which the preceding vowel is lengthened.[90]

When [ʿ] is the reflex of former [γ] (cf. 5.3.1.3), the developments are the same (6).

(1)	*bawwuri / baʿwuri / bāwuri* (< CS *mbaʿʿer*) (Md)	Mt *mbâ-wir*
	ṭawwuwi / ṭāwuwi (< CS *mṭaʿʿe*) (Md)	Mt (m)ṭâ-wî[91]
(2)	*dā̆na* (< *ʾeddānā*) (Socin 7.17)	Mt *dânâ*, Sv *dana*
	ājásta (< *ʾajaztā*) (Socin 7.21)	Mt *ʾâjiz* (SUB)
	ṣū̆ri (< *zʿorē*, cf. 6ii) (Socin 9.9)	Mt *sûrâ*, Sv *surə*
(3)	*yā̆nī* (< *yaʿni*) (Socin 9.11)	Mt *yânâ*, Sv *janı*
	ṭānānā (vulgar: *ṭēnānā*) (< *ṭaʿnānā*) (Kam 38), *ṭō̆nī* (Socin 9.1)	Mt *ṭânâ*
(4)	*bayyīlun* (< *baʿyī=l(h)on*) (Socin 15.9)	Mt *bâ-yî* (SUB), Sv *baja*
(5)	*ă̆rra* (< *ʾarʿā*) // *ârâ* (Kam 39, Socin 3.3 // Nöld 61)	Mt *arʿâ*, Sv *arra*
	jă̆ṭṭĕ (< *yadʿin*) (Kam 24)	Sv *yaṭṭi*
	árpā (< *arbʿā*) (Socin 33.15)	Mt *arbâ*, Sv *arpa*
(6)	*šrāyā* (*šrāḡā* > *šrāġā* > *šrāʿā*) (Kam 72)	Mt shrâyâ, Sv *ṣraja*
	pālūwwū (< INF of *(m)pāleg*) (Socin 17.7)	Mt *(m)pălî*

5.6.1.4 The consonant [h] was lost whenever directly preceded or followed by another consonant (1). When in CS a *shewa* vowel may be supposed to separate [h] from another consonant, this *shewa* vowel has not prevented the loss of [h]. The consonant was also lost at the end of a form, notably in the endings of the third person singular masculine (*-leh*) and feminine (*-lah*) (2). When lost at the end of a syllable, the preceding vowel was lengthened. When lost at the beginning of a syllable, the preceding consonant probably became geminated.[92]

Between two full vowels [h] was sometimes retained, but could also be replaced by [w] or [y]. Nöldeke quotes one form in which [h] has become

88. Nöldeke 1868: 62.
89. Tsereteli 1961: 227.
90. Nöldeke 1868: 61, states the same rule and cites *ârâ* (< *arʿā*) as an exception.
91. See also Nöldeke 1868: 251.
92. Nöldeke 1868: 57-8.

[x]. (3). In fast speech [h] is lost completely between two identical vowels. At the beginning of a word, when followed by a full vowel, it is usually retained, but incidentally it seems to have been lost in this position (4).

(1)	*wili* (< *hᵉwe lih*) (PRET)	
	lun / *lon* < *lᵉhon*	
	sāra (< CS *sāhrā*) (Socin 27.20)	Mt *sârâ*
	bārā (< CS *bahrā*) (Md)	Mt *bâh'râ* or *bârâ*
	zallez (< CS *zalhez*) (Nöld. 58)	Mt *(m)zaliz*
(2)	*widlē* (< *ʾb̲īd lih* = PRET + s-suf) (Socin 7.14)	
(3)	*ālâha* (Socin 123.19)	
	hāwi (SUB)	Sv *həvi*
	qayyi (< *qāhi*) (Nöld. 59)	
	rāxeṭ (< *rāheṭ*) (Nöld. 59)	
(4)	*âhâō* (*āhā hāw* > *āhā ô*) (Kam 27)	
	aṭ̲ka (normally *haṭ̲kā*)	
	âdyā (< *âḥā ᵈjāhā* < *āhā gāhā*) (Kam 44)	

5.6.1.5 The consonant [y] was lost when, at the beginning of a form, it is directly followed by a consonant. When [y] was part of a diphthong, it merged with the preceding vowel (cf. 5.11.1). When [y] constituted the first consonant of a syllable, it was retained. Between two full vowels it was retained, except when the preceding vowel was [u]. Then [y] became [w].[93]

deli (< *yde'li*)	Sv *dili*
jâṭṭē (< *yāde'*) (Kam 24)	Sv *yaʈʈi*
qârûwâ (< *qāroyā*) (Mt)	Sv *qaruvva*

5.6.1.6 Spirantized [d] and [t] have disappeared in various positions. The exact phonetic conditions are unclear, but perhaps the number of [a] vowels in the examples might be significant. The development does not seem to be regular. Stoddard mentions the disappearance of [t] (originally *t̲*) in plural endings in vulgar pronunciation.[94]

bar (< *bāṭ̲ar*) (Socin 5.10)	Sv *bar*
qâmēta (< *qaḏ̲maytā*) (Socin 5.12)	Sv *qəmtə*
ḫ̲ā (< *xaḏ̲* / *xḏ̲ā*) (Socin 5.2)	Sv *xə*
tlą (< *tlāṭ̲ā*) (Socin 25.2)	Sv *ʈla*
soosawaē (< *susāwāṭ̲ī*) (Stod. 116)	

93. Nöldeke 1868: 54-56.
94. Stoddard 1855: 116. Cf. also Nöldeke 1868: 43-44, 109-110.

5.6.1.7 Two other spirantized consonants, *b̲* [w] and *p̲* [f] (as well as original *w*), are no longer sounded when preceded by an [u] vowel and followed by a consonant.

ruiš-ḛ̂ (< *rupštā*) (Socin 9.7) Sv *ru(j)ṣa*
darqul (< *darqub̲l*) (Mg 310)

5.6.1.8 The [l] in UA also is very susceptible to assimilation: *rl* > [rr], *tl* > [tt] and *nl* > [nn] (cf. also 5.2.2.5).

mirrun (< *ʷmir-lhon*) (Socin 7.4)

5.6.1.9 The loss of [r], although not entirely regular, occurs rather frequently when [r] occurs in a consonant cluster. A few instances of assimilation to [s] occur.[95]

ḫ̂šlḛ̆ (< *rxeš* + *lih*) (Kam 56) Mt *khishlî*, Sv *xiṣli*
mât (< *marty*) (Mt)
khénâ (< *(')xrēna*) (Mt) Sv *xinə*
khétâ (< *xrētā*) (Mt) Sv *xitə*
kîsâ (< *kersā*) (Mt)

5.6.1.10 The consonant [m] was lost in the dialects of Urmia and Salmas in all forms derived from former *pa"el* (*mqaṭṭel* > *qāṭel*). In some other words, [m] in initial position without vowel was also lost.[96] In a number of words [m] was lost at the end of the last syllable. At the beginning of a second conjugation form, [m] was retained in the mountain dialects.[97]

qābil (< *mqabbel*) (Socin 21.1)
qômâ (< *mqawmā*) (Mt)
qû (< *qum*) (Mt)
idyû (< *hādā* + *yumā*) (Mt)

5.6.1.11 The consonant [n] was lost when part of the plural ending *īn*. In the texts a few examples occur of assimilation of the preposition *men* to initial [r] of the next form. The assimilation of [n] to following [t] of earlier Aramaic is present in UA as well, but I did not encounter new forms in which [n] assimilated.

janjirrih (< *janjer* + pl *-īn*) (Socin 5.14)
mirrank (< *min rang*) (Socin 21.5)

95. For more examples, see Maclean 1895: 334-5.
96. Compare, however, *mdīta*, that has not lost its initial [m].
97. Maclean 1895: 331.

mirríḥqā (< *min rexqā*) (Socin 5.10)
mdi̯ta (< *mdī(n)tā*) (Socin 5.21)

5.6.1.12 The loss of [š] at the end of certain words must be considered incidental.

mídrē (< *men-d-rēš*)[98] (Socin 35.19) Mt *midrî*

5.6.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.6.2.1 One of the most complicated issues of LUA orthography is the representation of consonants that are present in CS forms but are absent in their UA cognates. Three options were available to the missionaries: (1) not writing the consonant, (2) marking the consonant with *l.o.*, and (3) writing the consonant without *l.o.*, after having noted its 'silent' pronunciation in grammatical descriptions.

One is tempted to believe that the first option, not writing the consonant, was chosen only when the etymology of the word was unclear. However, it is hard to believe that in all these instances no etymology was found, so other reasons may be assumed. Important in this respect is the curious remark of Stoddard on the spelling of *qām* (< *qḏām*) versus *bā(t)r* (< *bāṯar*), marking the difference in use of *l.o.*, referring to 'good reasons', without, however, telling what these good reasons are.[99] Why is in the first case *d* omitted, whereas in the second form *t* is written with *l.o.*? The most likely explanation is that Stoddard was aware of the fact that in many dialects the *ṯ* of *bāṯar* was still present, whereas the *ḏ* of *qḏām* probably did not survive in any of the NENA dialects.

Root consonants, especially in verbal forms, were retained as much as possible, and thus often written with *l.o.* when not pronounced. If an assimilated consonant was part of a suffix, rather than the root, it was more easily omitted. This explains why the assimilated consonants in the sequences *nl* > *nn*, *tl* > *tt* and *rl* > *rr* (cf. 5.2.2.5) are never written.

5.6.2.2 The former consonant ' (*alef*) is nearly always written, and hardly ever marked by *l.o.* It marks words beginning with a vowel, as well as all words endings in *ā* or *i*. Even if the vowel is preceded by a one-consonantal preposition, like *b-* or *d-*, ' still is written, although no hiatus seems to have been pronounced. In my transcription this ' is never written because of its

98. Cf. Tsereteli 1961: 257, Maclean 1895: 335.

99. Stoddard 1855: 13: 'One who had not fully considered the subject, might often think we were arbitrary, where good reasons for a variation may be assigned'.

purely orthographical function. One special case has to be mentioned in this respect: the copula (*īlā* 3fsg, etc.) was written in the Protestant texts without an ', probably because of its close connection to the foregoing word. Bedjan chose to write the copula with ' (1).[100]

When an etymological ' occurs at the end of a syllable, it is written without *l.o.*, although no longer pronounced (2).

Although ' is written as the third consonant in the SUB form of the verb, it is not considered to be a root consonant, but only a sign of a vocalic ending. This ' is not written (3) when the SUB stem, or any other stem of the verbal system, is followed by a closely connected suffix.

When ' is the first root consonant of a verb,[101] it is not pronounced in the PRET and INF stem forms (4). Then ' is written with *l.o.*, to make the root morpheme recognizable. Some irregular imperatives constitute an exception to this rule. In Bedjan's writings, *l.o.* is often not written in this position, since the absence of a vowel sufficiently indicates the non-pronunciation of '. In some texts ' is left out.

In second-*w/y* verbs in UA, which in CS have ' in the masculine singular active particple, this weak middle consonant is pronounced as [y].[102] In the older texts, this [y] was written with *y*, but in later texts the ' was introduced. In the two forms with ' between two full vowels in Socin's transcription (5.6.1.2), the text in Syriac script has *y* (5).

(1) *īli, (y)li // d-ʾīli, (')li // (')ylih, (')wax* (Mat. 3:3, 2:2 // Im 2.22, Im 1.6 // VdS ii. 25, ii.18)

(2) *ki'nā* (Mat. 1:18)
mala'ka (Mat. 1:21)
la'kā (Merx 3.16)
mā' [mā] (Syl 10.11)

(3) *qrili* (Mat. 2:15)
timon (< *ʾti'mon*) (Mat. 2:8), *zi'mon* (Mat. 2:8, Merx 3.6)

(4) *w-(')merri* (Mat. 1:21)
(')tilon (Mat. 2:1), *(')telāh* (VdS 1.8)
zi (< *zālā*) Mat. 2:20)
(')ḵālā [xālā] (Syl 10.8)
(')xi(r)nā [xennā][103] (Syl 27.7)

(5) *pāyeš // pā'eš* (*Teachings* 1.6, Mat. 1:22 // Merx 31.4, Syl 52.7)
Surāyi (Socin 16.14), *Arimnāyi* (Socin 18.21)

100. This ' is represented in my transcription. See further 6.2.8.

101. These verbal stems can better be described as beginning with a vowel, see 6.5.3, 'first *v*'. They correspond to first-' verbs in CS.

102. It is impossible to say whether this form in UA was ever pronounced with ', or whether it always had been *y*.

103. Note the unexpected gemination!

5.6.2.3 Whereas ' in a limited number of instances is left out entirely, this is not the case with ʿ. Because of its influence on the pronunciation of the form (cf. 5.12), it was treated as a normal root consonant, although verbs with this consonant closely resemble those with ' or *y* in that position.

The rules for writing ʿ with *l.o.* vary considerably between the texts, but some general tendencies can be stated. When ʿ closes the syllable, it is hardly ever written with *l.o.* (1). Neither is *l.o.* added when ʿ is the first consonant of a form (2). When ʿ immediately precedes a consonant, it does not need *l.o.* either (3).

The ʿ is often found with *l.o.* at the beginning of non-final syllable (4), preceded by a consonant or former *shewa*. This might have been done to prevent pronouncing a hiatus, which otherwise might seem the only way to explain the presence of ʿ. However, these forms with *l.o.* occur side by side with forms without it.

When [ʿ] occurred in intervocalic positions, it became [y] or [w]. This regularly took place in the INF stem, when ʿ is the third root consonant. The Protestant missionaries accounted for this development by adding *y* to ʿ. Because of the regular non-pronunciation of ʿ at the end of a syllable, this yielded the correct pronunciation.[104]

(1) *arbaʿsar* (Mat. 1:17)
šmeʿli, šmiʿlih (Mat. 2:3, Merx 12.12)
mrīʿtā (VdS 250.13)
šuʿli (normally *šuli*) (VdS 248.13)
(2) *ʿābed* (Mat. 1:19)
(3) *ʿreqli* (Mat. 2:14)
ʿmīdā (Mat. 3:14)
ʿdānā (Ruth 2:14, Merx 32.8, Syl 6.17)
ʿḇādā (Syl 25.10-14)
(4) *arb(ʿ)ī // arbʿā* (Mat. 4:2 // HS 2.9)
yād(ʿ)ī // yādʿā (ZdB 49/11B10 // VdS 248.12)
mad(ʿ)ī (ZdB 49/11B11)
š(ʿ)īšā (< *sġīšā*) (Mat. 2:3)
šāmʿī (ZdB 49/2A3)
saḇʿī (Mat. 5:6)
arʿā (*Teachings* 2:9)
z(ʿ)ur- // zʿurtā (Merx 17.10 // Merx 30.6)
tunyāti (< *tʿuntā*) (Mat. 3:8)
(5) *jammuʿwi* (INF, SUB *mjammeʿ*) (Mat. 3:12)
līdāʿy- (*l-yᵉdāʿā* > *līdāyā*) // *bīdā(ʿ)yā* (Ruth 2.10 // Merx 2.14)

104. Nöldeke (1868: 59, n. 1) thought this spelling 'ein grosser Fehler'. Compare also his discussion with Merx (Nöldeke 1873: 1965-67).

šme'yā (PART < *šmī'ā*) // *(y)dī'ā* (Merx 31.4 // Syl 18.10)
šmā'ytā [šmetā] // *(y)dā('ytā* (Nac) (Im 1.14 // HS 4.5)

5.6.2.4 The consonant *h* is written both with and without *l.o.*, in a way that is comparable with the conventions for '. However, the rather restricted occurrence of *h* in UA makes it difficult to find examples of different forms, and the majority of forms with *h* are derived from the verbal root *hw'*.

The consonant *h* is employed to mark vocalic endings (both verbal and nominal) with a specific grammatical function (3msg and 3fsg). In this position *h* is not pronounced, and a spelling with ' would yield the same, correct, pronunciation. In one part of the verbal derivation (the subject suffixes of the PRET stem) this has led to two different spellings: the Protestant missionaries, probably because of initial lack of insight into the etymology of the form, spelled the [li] and [la] endings with '.[105] Although they must have come across the right etymology later, they preferred to retain this spelling, even in the revised version of BT 1893.[106]

Bedjan in nearly all his books adherred to this spelling, but in his last book (VdS 1912), he changed to a spelling with *-lih* and *-lah*, with a dot on the *h* in the feminine suffix, which was in use in CS to distinguish between masculine and feminine suffixes. Probably the Anglican missionaries were the first to employ this etymological spelling of these suffixes when attached to the PRET stem. The same difference in spelling is found in the third person singular copulae. In the texts written by Assyrian scribes a number of times the third person masculine singular copula is spelled (*-yli*) when the corresponding suffix (*-lih*) was needed.[107]

Thus no *l.o.* is employed when *h* is etymologically written at the end of a syllable, either with the suffixes (1), or in nouns or verbs with (former) *h* as middle consonant. A few instances are found where *h* is written with *l.o.* in this position (2).

In accordance with the convention for ', *h* is still written, either with or without *l.o.*, when originally with *shewa* and being the first consonant of a

105. This spelling enabled them to distinguish artificially between a 3msg PRET form with and without object suffix, which was not marked grammatically: *kteḇlih* (+ o-suf 3msg ø) // *kteḇli*. See also 6.6.2.3.

106. In Stoddard's grammar the explanation of this PRET form is not correct (**qām lih*; 'he rose to himself'), but his explanation as well suggests a spelling *-lih* instead of *-li*. Stoddard adds: 'Our mode, however, of spelling the preterite, more correctly represents the present pronunciation.' (Stoddard 1855: 108).

107. That this element of LUA orthography is a real problem for Aramaic-speaking writers, is confirmed by the grammar by Nimrod Simono, as translated by Poizat (1973-1979a: 192)

word (3). This occurs only with verbs of the first conjugation beginning with *h*, and the most important verb in this class is *hwaya*. In the copula and in the past marker [wa:], *h* is written nearly always with *l.o.*

When [h] was lost between former *shewa* and a full vowel (4), it is either written with *l.o.* or left out entirely. The most important example of this feature is the plural suffix of the third person: [lun] (< *l^{e}hon*). When this suffix serves as the subject suffix of the PRET stem, it is most often written without *h*, but when serving as object suffix with the SUB stem, it is written with *h*. In the Anglican press both functions are written with *h*. In most instances Bedjan adopted the spelling of the Protestant press. When following a consonant and preceding a vowel, *h* was written without *l.o.*, probably because a vowel had to be attached to it.[108]

The loss of [h] between two full vowels was not represented in the texts.

(1) *-lih / -lāh* (pron. ◌ᵊf) (Mat. 1:19, id. in all other texts)
ʾḇedlā, šqelli, ʾḇidlā, =(y)li (cop 3msg) (Mark 14:8, ZdB71/12/94A15, id. Syl 41.12, Merx 2.8, Mark 14:14)
grešlāh, (y)teḇlih, =ʾīlāh (cop 3fsg) (VdS 19.15, 19, 20.5)
ʾbīd=lāh, ʾti=lih, =ylih (cop 3msg) (Mark 14:8, 17, 14 '95)

(2) *kāhni* (Mat. 2:4)
bahrā (Mat. 4:16)
yahḇet (SUB) // *b-yā(h)ḇā* (INF) (*Teachings* 7.9 // Mark 14:6)
ṣa(h)yī (SUB < *ṣ(h)āyā*) (Mat. 5:6)
sāmā (< A *sahm*) (ZdB49/1/4B26)

(3) *(h)wêt-ih* (Nac) (Mat. 1:18)
(h)wīlā (PRET) // *u-hwellā* (Mat. 1:18 // HS 2.8)
(h)wā (past marker) (Mat. 1:18, Mark 14:3 '95, VdS 21.21, etc.)
y(h)wā // *(ʾ)y(h)wā* (past cop after vowel) (Mark 14:1 '95 // VdS 22.17)
ʾī(h)wā (past cop after consonant) (VdS 22.14)

(4) *-l(h)on (o-sf)* // *xzilon, brellon* // *plīṭ=l(h)on* (PRET 3pl) (Mat. 2:4, Syl 40.8 // Mat 2:11, HS 2.15 // Mark 14:26 '95)
malhi [malli:] (Nöld 57)

5.6.2.5 The consonant *y* is written with *l.o.* when lost at the beginning of a word (1). It is employed also to mark feminine forms in orthography that are identical with the masculine forms in pronunciation, by adding a *y* without vowel after the last consonant of the verbal or pronominal forms (2). This usage is based on CS rules (cf. 5.1.2.4).

(1) *(y)deʿlī* // *deʿli* (< *ydeʿ* + sf) (ZdB71/12/91B20 // Merx 55.5)
(2) *a(n)ty* (f) // *a(n)t* (m) (Stoddard)

108. So Nöldeke 1868: 58.

-uḵ (m), *-āky* (f) // *-uḵ*, *aḵy* (Stoddard 25, Mg 18, §11)
ʾḇody (f) // *ʾḇod* (m) (IMP)

5.6.2.6 The loss of spirantized [d] and [t] in the later texts is indicated by adding *l.o.* to these consonants. However, in the early Protestant works the word [qam] always is spelled without former [d], whereas in the later Protestant publications, a distinction is made (although not consistently) between [qam] and [qameta], of which the former is written without *d* and the latter with (*d*). The word [xa] (< *xad*) in most of the nineteenth-century Protestant publications is written without [d], whereas in the Anglican impressions it is written with (*d*). This was taken over by the Protestants in the Bible edition of 1893.

qām- (< *qᵉḏām*) // *qā(d)m* (Mat. 5:12, Ruth 4:4, ZdB71/12/91B25 // VdS 249.8)
qāmêtā // *qa(d)mêtā* (< *qaḏmāytā*) (*Teachings* 2.7, Merx 8.1 // Ruth 3:10, Merx 39.10)
qa(d)māyā, *qa(d)mêtā* (HS 1.14, Mark14:8 '95, id. in BT '93)
xā // *xa(d)* (ZdB71/12/91B20 etc. // Mark 14:10 '95, id. in BT '93)
bā(t)r (< *bāṯar*) (in all printings, only incidentally is *l.o.* or *t* left out)
ṭlā // *tlā(t)* (< *tlāṯā*) (Mark 14:30 // Mark 14:30 '95 and BT '93)
yālā (< *yaldā*) (Merx 13.19)

5.6.2.7 In most instances the loss of spirantized [p] and [b] after [u] is not marked, and the consonant is written without *l.o.* However, some examples can be found in which either *l.o.* is written or the consonant is left out entirely.

rupštā (< *rapšā*) [rušta] (Mat. 3:12)
ʾruḇtā [ru:ta] // *ruʾḇtā* (HS 3.6 // Merx 38.6)
xuyyā (< *xuḇyā*) // *xuḇyā* (Mat. 4:16 // BT '93)

5.6.2.8 The assimilations of [rl] > [rr], [tl] > [tt], and [nl] > [nn], are always represented in orthography by *r*, *t* and *n*, in most texts preceded by a short vowel (cf. 5.2.2.5).

ʾḇerron (PRET 3pl) (ZdB71/12/91B33)
bāqirri(h) (SUB 3msg + o-suf 3msg) (Merx 12.10)
lābšennun (SUB 1msg + o-suf 3pl) (Merx 4.9)

5.6.2.9 When [r] was lost, this consonant may be written with or without *l.o.*

mart [māt] (Syl 27.10)
ba(r)t qālā [bat qālā] (Syl 17.11-12)
ke(r)sāḵy (< *ke(r)sā* + suf. 3fsg) (Syl 40.15)

5.6.2.10 The *m* of the second conjugation was not written in the Protestant press nor in Bedjan's books. In the Anglican press it was written always, either with or without *l.o.*, because of its occurrence in other dialects.[109] In other positions, lost *m* usually was written with *l.o.* in all presses.

(m)qābel (< *mqabbel*) // *(m)qabel* (Md)
qu(m) (Mat. 2:13)

5.6.2.11 The lost *n* of plural endings was never written. When *n* was lost through assimilation at the following consonant, its orthography varies.

māṣī (< *māṣēn*) (ZdB49/1/1B11)
xamšī (< *xamšīn*) (HS 10.15)
gibā (< *ganbā*) (Mat. 4:25)
min rexqā (Socin 4.21)

5.6.2.12 The word *medri* was written phonologically by the Protestants and by Bedjan, whereas the Anglicans introduced the etymological spelling with *n* and *š* with *l.o.*

medri // *me(n)dri(š)* and *medri(š)* (Mark 14:25, HS 10.21, BT '93 // Md)

5.6.2.13 In forms that in CS orthography are written with *l.o.*, this spelling was retained, even if the consonants with *l.o.* had long ceased to be pronounced.

(')nāšā, mdī(n)tā, (')xi(r)nā (cf. Socin 5.4, 21: *nášā, mdíta*; Kam 14: *ḥéna*)
(')xi(r)tā, (')xi(r)nā [xennā] (Mat. 2:12, Syl 27.9)

5.6.3 *Conclusions*

A number of Aramaic consonants have disappeared in UA, some of them without leaving any trace, others disappearing only under certain conditions, and others leaving traces like gemination of remaining consonants or lengthening of the preceding vowel. In case of ', ʿ, and *h*, the original consonant is usually maintained in LUA orthography, often without, and sometimes with, *l.o.* Most other lost consonants are written with *l.o.*

109. Maclean 1895: 91.

5.7 Lengthening and shortening of vowels

5.7.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.7.1.1 In CS the difference between *ā* and *ē* on the one hand and *a* and *e* on the other is governed not only by the syllabic structure of the word, but also by the history of the word itself. In fact, it is generally believed that the difference between the two pairs of vowels is not one of length only, but also one of vowel color.[110] In UA a development has taken place in which the difference in length between these two pairs of vowels has become dependent on their position in either an open or a closed syllable. Hereby length lost its phonemic value in UA.[111] Phonetic descriptions indicate that these developments not only accounted for [a] and [i] (CS *ē* and *e*), but also for [u], although with this vowel length is not always noted. Another feature that becomes clear from the transcribed texts is the position of CS *ī* (cf. 5.8.1). In closed syllables this vowel is shortened to [i], and can no longer be distinguished from shortened *ē* (> [i]).[112]

[a]	*tą̆ma* (Socin 25.2)	Mt *tâmâ*, Sv *tama*
	bar hādá (Socin 25.5)	Mt *bâr hâdâ*, Sv *bar hədə*
	hámmāša, hắmăšā, hắmāšą̄, `ham:aʃa (Socin 25.16, Kam 12, 33, Osip 79.10)	Mt *hamâshâ*, Sv *həmməʂə*
	pāta (Kam 1)	Mt *pâtâ*
	hắram (< T, A, P *harām*) (Kam 8)	Mt *hârâm*
[i]	*dĭ̄wan* (Socin 25.3)	Mt dîwân,
	zĭ̄llih (Socin 25.3)	
	tĭ̄lih (Socin 25.8)	
	ḫĭ̄zya (< *xezyā*) (Kam 4)	
	yārĭ̄ḫtĕ̄la (< *yārīxtā-*) (Kam 5)	
[u]	*yūma*, `yü:ma (Socin 25.4, Osip 80.1)	Mt *yômâ / yûmâ*, Sv *jumə*
	muštŭ̄luḫ (Socin 25.10)	
	dsūpĭlun (Merx 57.3)	
	ᵈjŭ̄mla (Kam 19)	Mt *gümlâ*
	`cül:e (Osip 79.11)	Mt *kül, külî*, Sv *kulli*

5.7.1.2 In accordance with the above mentioned rules, long vowels in open syllables and short vowels in closed syllables have been retained. However, in CS long vowels occasionally occurred in closed syllabes, often because

110. Compare Boyarin 1978: 141-160, where he describes the change of the functions of *ā* and *a* in Babylonian Aramaic, in which, however, other conditions are at stake than in UA.
111. So also Hetzron 1969: 113.
112. Nöldeke 1868: 3-6.

of earlier loss of *shewa*. These long vowels were shortened in UA (*qāt^{e}lā* > *qātlā* > [qatla]). When consonants were lost, new syllabic structures appeared and new closed syllables could arise (cf. 5.6.1).

ą́lma (< *ālmā*) (Socin 25.2)	Mt *âlmâ*, Sv *alma*
bar (< *bātar*) (Socin 25.5)	Mt *bâr*, Sv *bar*
qą́rya (< *qāryā* SUB) (Socin 25.16)	

5.7.1.3 Short vowels in open syllables were lengthened. New open syllables arose when earlier gemination was lost (cf. 5.2.1.2), or when certain consonants were lost (cf. 5.6.1).

rą́ba (< *rabbā*) (Socin 27.4)	Mt *râbâ*, Sv *raba*
sāra (< *sāhrā*) (Socin 27.20)	Mt *sârâ*

5.7.1.4 This pattern of short vowels in closed syllables and long vowels in open syllables is somewhat blurred by the influence of stress. Long vowels in open syllables following the main stress are shortened, whereas incidentally long vowels preceding the main stress are shortened (1).[113] In some words, Socin indicated a long unstressed vowel in the last syllable. Perhaps these forms have to be explained through his knowledge of classical orthography. It should be noted that the long vowels [i^{y}], [u^{y}], [o], and [e] have no short allophones.

Long vowels in closed stressed syllables occur occasionally. Most of these long vowels are found in loanwords, a fact that is easily explained by Persian and Arabic vocalic patterns in which long vowels in closed syllables are rather common (2).[114] These forms probably were not yet fully integrated into the syllabic patterns of UA.

The long vowels occasionally written in Aramaic words may be explained by the fact that stress and length were closely connected; thus a long vowel in a closed syllable might indicate main stress. Conversely, Merx, who only occasionally marked vowel length, might have thought it sufficient to note stress (3).

(1) *ána*, *ánā* (Socin 25.2, 4), *āna* (Merx 57.4)
plāša (< *plāšā*) (Socin 3.7)
tą́ma (< *tāmā*) (Socin 5.9)
qtólle (< *qṭel* + *lih*) (Socin 7.15)

113. So Marogulov 1935/1976: 14-5, §20. See also Odisho 1988: 52-55, for the same phenomenon in Iraqi Koine.

114. Cf. Marogulov 1935/1976: 12-3, §17.

(2) *qìr* (Kam 30)
(3) *āt* (Kam 71)
ágā (Socin 256)
tāhắr (usually: *tắhar*) (Socin 27.2)
dsūpílun (Merx 57.3)
byumánet (Merx 57.9)

5.7.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.7.2.1 As in many other parts of orthography, historical and phonemical spellings occur side by side. The main rule of LUA orthography — choosing an historical spelling whenever etymology is known, and a phonemical spelling in all other instances — seems to have been applied here also. Only in the earliest Protestant texts are forms with a phonemical spelling found whose etymology must have been known to the missionaries. Most of these forms were brought back into the CS patterns in the course of the century. The Anglican missionaries in particular were very eager to revert to CS orthography as often as possible.

5.7.2.2 In the earliest Protestant texts, many examples can be found in which shortened *ā* was written as *a* and shortened *ē* and *ī* both as *e*. However, in most of the texts, the later Protestant texts, as well as in those of Bedjan and of the Anglicans, the orthography of CS is followed and shortening of vowels is not noted (1).

Two verbal stem forms, the third person femine singular SUB and the PRET stem, contained such shortened vowels. Shortened *ā* in the SUB stem is attested, although not regularly, in the early Protestant texts and in later texts written by less careful scribes (2). Shortened *ī* in the PRET stem is found in all Protestant texts.[115] Remarkably, when the syllable becomes open because of insertion of an object suffix, *ī* is employed by the Protestants (3b). This might have something to do with the reflex of CS *ī* in open syllables (cf. 5.8). At the end of the century, the Anglicans decided to reintroduce the *ī* in all forms of the PRET. Bedjan spells the PRET stem with *e*, even if the syllable is open which is the case for third-y verbs (3).

The PART stem, based on the same form as the PRET, is always written with *ĭ*, whereas here also the [i] is in a closed syllable. This seems to be due to analogy: if the masculine form has *ī*, the feminine should also have it (4). Analogy may also account for the reintroduction of *ā* in the third person

115. In the texts of Socin and Merx, there seems to be a tendency to employ *i* both for *i* and *e*, which makes these texts somewhat different from the others.

feminine singular SUB, which was made to correspond to the masculine form with *ā* (1).

(1) *ʿalmā // ʿālmā* (Merx 10.12 // *Teachings* 3.4)
ba(t)r // bā(t)r (Socin 4.9 // Mark 14:1)
sāprī (Mark 14:1)
Māryā (HS 1.7)
(2) *sagdet* (< *sāgᵃdā-*), *ki xašḇā* (< *xāšᵃḇā*) // *bāṭnā* (< *mbāṭᵃnā*)
(*Teachings* 5.4, Merx 1.9 // Mat.1:23)
(3) *ʿḇedlā* (< *ʿḇīd lāh*), *šqelli*, *ʿḇidlā // ʿbīd=lāh*
(Mark 14:8, ZdB71/12/94A15, Merx 2.8 // Mark 14:8 '95)
qreli, (ʾ)merri, grešlāh (HS 1.15, HS 2.1, VdS 19.15)
(3b) *nšeqlā* (< *nšīq-lāh*) (Ruth 1:14)
nšīqêlā (< *nšīq-ê-lāh*) (Ruth 1:9)
bsemlā=li (< *bsīm-la lih*) (Mat. 1:19)
(4) *mjīxtā* (PART fsg) (Mat. 1:18)
snīqā (PART msg) (Mat. 3:14)
mākīḵtā, yārīḵtā (adj) (*Teachings* 2.15, Merx 4.4)

5.7.2.3 Vowel lengthening is usually noted when it is the result of degemination (cf. 5.2.2). When lengthening is due to consonant loss, it is not noted when the lost consonant is still written, whether with or without *l.o.* The vowel is written as long when the lost consonant is not represented in orthography (cf. 5.6.2).[116]

qāšā (Merx 13.19)
rābā (Merx 30.3)
bahrā (HS 1.114)
yālā (< *yaldā*) (Merx 13.19)

5.7.2.4 In loanwords it must have been rather difficult to decide which consonant to write, and whether to adjust its length to UA syllabic patterns or to represent its pronunciation in the source language. No clear rules can be stated.

ujāxi (< T, K *ʾūjāq*) (Mat. 1:17)
mbādāl (< A, T *mbadal*) (Mat. 2:22)
xārābī (< A, T, K *xarābeh*) (Mat. 3:1)
sābāb (< A *sabab*, K *sebeb*) // *sābab*, (Mat. 3:3, HS 3.3 // *Teachings* 2.4)
ābad // ābād (< A *ʾabad*) (*Teachings* 2.5, HS 1.7)
šāpāqat (< T, P *šapaqat*) (*Teachings* 5.9)
rigtoḵ (< P *rīgā*) (*Teachings* 6.7)

116. So Stoddard 1855: 13: 'P'tahha is lengthened, when followed by ', *h* or ʿ'. Likewise Maclean 1895: 283.

5.7.3 *Conclusions*

The length of vowels is not phonemic in UA. Vowel length is adjusted to the type of syllable in which the vowel occurs: short vowels occur in closed syllables, long vowels in open syllables. In unstressed open end-syllables, long vowels are usually shortened. In loanwords, long vowels in closed syllables have survived in a number of words, especially in stressed syllables.

In LUA orthography, vowel length is usually noted.

5.8 The vowels [i] and [iy]

5.8.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.8.1.1 CS *ē* and *e* have merged into one [i]-vowel in UA.[117] This vowel is pronounced short or long, depending on syllabic structure. In closed syllables, CS *ī* also merged into this phoneme. The pronunciation of the phoneme [i] varies from [ə] to [i] under influence of loss of stress or of velarization (cf. 5.7.1.4 and 5.12.1).

náši (< *'nāšē*) (Socin 3.1)	Mt *nâshî*, Sv *nəşi*
min, mɪn (< *men*) (Socin 3.8, Osip 80.16)	Mt *min*, Sv *min*
widlun (< *'b̲īd lhon*) (Socin 3.7)	
šĭ́tā (< *šentā*) (Socin 3.9)	Mt *shîtâ*, Sv *şitə*
píšli ḥízya (< *pīš leh xĭzyā*) (Merx 58.6)	Mt *pishlî* -, Sv - *xizjə*
'ázil (*āzel*) (Merx 58.16)	Mt *âzil*, Sv *əzil*
rīše (< *rēšā*) (Kam 24)	Mt *rîshâ*, Sv *rişə*
ʃa'pɪrt'e (< *šāpīrtā*) (Osip 79.4)	

5.8.1.2 In open syllables, CS *ī* became a palatalized [iʸ], tending towards [iḥ]. Accoring to Polotsky and Odisho, this development took place at the end of a word, as well as when *ī* occured in open syllables inside a word, in words like CS *šappīra*.[118] At the end of a word this vowel can indeed be clearly distinguished from [i] in open syllables, but in open syllables inside a word it is difficult to find clear attestations of [iʸ]. Socin and Merx do not seem to have noticed [iʸ] in this position, but Kampffmeyer gives a couple of examples, as does Osipoff. In the Soviet orthography [iʸ] is marked by *ij*

117. Tsereteli 1961: 235, classifies this merger of [e] with [i] and that of [o] with [u] under the heading 'Verengung langer Vokale'.

118. Polotsky 1961: 15-6 and Odisho 1988: 25. Tsereteli 1961: 225, 236 also describes the palatalization, but does not recognize its regularity.

(as opposed to *i*). In Maclean's transcription this sound is marked by *î* (in italics, as opposed to î for [i]), but only when at the end of a word.

ódiḣ (< *ʿāḇdīn* SUB 3pl), *hāviχ* (< *hāwīn*) (Socin 3.4, Kam 27)	Cf. Sv *hamzimmij*
ána ḥíšliḣ (< *rxes-* PRET 1s) (Socin 25.5-6)	Sv *-lij*
hallıĭ (< *hal lī*) (Osip 80.4)	
mī́ʲta (PART mss), *qī́jdīnę* (< *qīdi=(y)nā*) (PART mpl + cop 3pl) (Kam 2, 3)	Sv *ṣqijlə* (// *ṣqiltə*)
bāsíma (adj) (Socin 25.14)	Sv *bəsijma / bəsimtə*
ʃaʿpıĭra (Osip 80.17)	
dīʲlę (< *d-īli* cop) (Kam 2)	Sv *ijlə*
ıĭva (< *īwā*) (Osip 80.7)	Sv *ijvə*
īʲda (< *īda*) (Kam 1)	Mt *îdâ*, Sv *ijdə*
īʲlānā (Kam 38)	Mt *îlânâ*
ıĭna (Osip 79.5, 10)	but Mt *înâ*, Sv *inə*

5.8.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.8.2.1 The development from short and long [e] vowel in CS to short and long [i] vowel in UA is not reflected in orthography. The [i] vowels are written with the signs for the [e] vowels, and it is quite probable that Assyrians when reading CS, did not pronounce [e] but [i] vowels. Differences in writing between CS and UA with respect to these vowels occur only for reaons of syllabic structure as explained above. Stoddard describes short *e* (= [i]) as '*i* in *pin*' and *i* (= [i:]) as 'between *e* in *elate* and *a* in *hate*'.[119]

5.8.2.2 The opposition between [i] in open syllables and the palatalized [iʸ] vowel is sometimes indicated in the printed texts. The Protestants chose to write *ī*, instead of *i*, in open syllables at the end of a word, when [iʸ] was pronounced. The difference in pronunciation between the first person [-iʸ] and third person masculine singular suffix [-i] thus was adequately represented. This practice might have been partly due to CS orthography, but it was also introduced into new formations of UA, like the *ī* in *īnā*, 'but'.[120] In most of the phonetic texts this sound is written with a sign for [i:], and then should have been spelled with *i*. However, in the text of Osipoff, this sentence connective is found with [iʸ] (1).

In the feminine PART stem a historical *ī* is written, whereas it is quite unlikely that [iʸ] was pronounced. This must be due to the fact that in the

119. Stoddard 1855: 12.

120. According to Md, this is a loanword from Kurdish, *īnā*.

masculine and plural PART forms [i^{y}] was pronounced. The *ī* in *īt* ('there is'), spelled with *ī* in all texts, had been shortened to [i], and the spelling must be regarded as purely historical (2).

(1) *qārī, pārxī* (SUB 3pl) (Mat. 1:23, HS 2.15)
museqlī (suf 1sg) (// *museqli* 3msg) (*Teachings* 6.8)
mendī (Mat. 1:22, VdS 2.8)
aynī (Mat. 2:7)
īman (Mat. 2:7)
ānī ('they') (versus *anni* 'these') (Mat. 2:7, 8, 20)
axjī (*Teachings* 2.13)
prīšêli (PRET 3msg + o-suf 3pl) // *prešli* (PRET 3msg) (HS 2.3)
nīxā (PART ms) (*Teachings* 5.11)
īdā (Syl 51.1)
īnā (Mat. 1:19)

(2) *ṭlībtā, qṭīltā* (PART fsg) (Mat. 1:18, Syl 39.2)
īt (Mark 14:3)

5.8.3 *Conclusions*

In Urmia Aramaic two phonemically different long [i] vowels are present in open syllables: [i:] and [i^{y}]. In closed yllables the two phonemes merge into the short vowel [i]. The two long phonemes are not consistently marked in LUA orthography, although in general *ī* reflects [i^{y}], and *i* reflects [i:], due to the corresponding sounds in CS.

5.9 The vowels [u] and [u^{y}]

5.9.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.9.1.1 The Eastern CS vocalized texts distinguish between an [o] and [u] vowel, both of which can be either short or long. In UA [o] has become [u], both short and long, the latter being conditioned by syllabic structure. A new [o] vowel has developed out of contraction of various diphthongs (cf. 5.11).

ṭhut (< *txot*) (Socin 3.3)	Mt *tkhût*
šmiṭlun (< *šmīṭ lhon*, PRET 3pl) (Socin 3.8)	
yûma (< *yom*) (Socin 25.4)	Mt *yûmâ*, Sv *jumə*
brúna (< *bronā*) (Merx 61.8)	Mt *brûnâ*,
qālúltẹla / qālúlẹna (< *qālōlā* + cop) (Kam 22)	Mt *qâlûlâ, qəlulə*

5.9.1.2 The palatalization of CS *ī*, as discussed in the preceding section, has a clear counterpart in that of CS *u*. This vowel in open syllables has become

[uʸ], and must be distinguished from [u] that originates from CS *o*. In the Salmas dialect this [u] in open syllables became [uġ]. In closed syllables CS *o* and *u* have merged into [u]. The ending *-uta* does not seem to be affected by this development, perhaps because of its pronunciation [ua].[121] Although the special pronunciation of UA [uʸ] is mentioned in the early grammars, and is incidentally marked in the Soviet orthography, prior to Polotsky nobody seems to have understood the phonemic distinction between the two sounds and their distribution (1).[122]

The [u] vowel resulting from [u] + [w] (*b̲*) or [f] (*p̲*), was also pronounced as [uʸ], and perhaps *ktụíta* from CS *ktīb̲tā* may be explained as a development from [i] + [w] > [u] > [uʸ]. The palatalization of [u] in *puqdānā* and *dukta* probably is initiated by the co-occurence of a palatal[123] and a dental plosive (2).[124]

(1)	*yāquírē* (< *yāqurā*) (Socin 9.1)	Mt *yâqûrá*, Sv *jaqura*
	zụízi (< *zuzi*) (Socin 13.10)	Mt *zûz-â*, Sv *zuzı*
	šk'ú̯re (< *škūri*, Kam: '*ū̯* oder *ū̃ʲ*') (Kam 73)	Mt *shkûrî*
	qú̯jra (< T *qūrā*) (Kam 88) // *qóuġra* (Duval 22.9)	Mt *qûrâ*
	nóuġna (Duval 12.6)	Mt *nûnâ*, Sv *nunə*
(2)	*ruišḛ̄*, ruĭʃɑ:nə (< *rup̲ša*) (Socin 9.7, Osip 80.6)	Mt *rûshâ*, Sv *ru(j)ṣa*
	ktụíta (< *ktīb̲tā*) (Socin 19.8)	Mt Sv *ktivtə / ktujtə*
	puidánu (< *puqdān-*) (Merx 57.13)	Mt U: *pûd- or pûʲdânâ*
	duíkta (< *duktā*) (Socin 13.9)	Mt *düktâ*, Sv *dukə*

5.9.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.9.2.1 The reflection of CS [o] and [u] in LUA is rather complex. Stoddard, in his list of vowel signs, distinguishes between *u* and *o*, saying that *o* sounds as '*o* in *note*' and *u* as '*oo* in *poor*', whereas on the next page he comments on *o*: 'This is long *o*, but is often undistinguishable in pronunciation from *u*, which has the sound of *oo* in *poor*, but at times inclines also to the sound of long *o*.' This explanation is followed by a curious remark that 'when *ā* precedes, *o* should follow; when *a* precedes, *u* should follow.'[125] It is likely that Stoddard wanted to make the difference between the two vowels — which apparently was difficult to hear — more under-

121. Cf. 5.6.1.6.

122. See Polotsky 1961: 11-16, Nöldeke 1868: 14, and Maclean 1895: 292.

123. In the Soviet orthography the verb *pəqudi* is supposed to be fronted, which makes [q] even more alike to [k]. For the palatalizing tendency of [k], see 2.4.

124. It is interesting to note that in Chatelet 1934: 250, the place name *Gugtapa* is spelled as *Gueitapē*, reflecting a similar development.

125. Stoddard 1855: 12, 14.

standable by limiting their employment to certain positions. However, as was described in the preceding paragraphs, this difference is not attested to at all in the transcribed texts. Stoddard's rule, therefore, is an orthographic rather than a phonetic principle. As Nöldeke already suggested, this rule may have been based on the CS patterns *yālōdā* versus *yallūdā*. Of the second pattern, however, very few examples occur in UA.[126]

5.9.2.2 Thus the phonetic conditions describing the correspondence between CS *o* and UA [u], as well as between CS *u* and UA [u^{y}], hardly provide a clue to understanding the spelling conventions in the Protestant publications. Stoddard's rule about the connection between *ā* — *o* and *a* — *u*, provides understanding for a limited number of forms (1). This rule offers a neat explanation for the choice of the vowel in the INF stem forms in which *o*/*u* alternates between stems with and without gemination: *mālopi* // *maqqumi*. This rule was applied also to nouns in which the reflex of CS *o* or *u* was preceded by a long or short [a]-vowel, even when these words were new in the Aramaic vocabulary.

When the [o] or [u] vowel was not preceded by an [a] vowel, CS orthography was decisive, and *o* remained *o* while *u* remained *u* (2). This convention, although not exactly representing the phonetic situation, leaves the border line between the two phonemes intact. The spelling of many forms can be explained from this rule. Some important regular forms in this category are the IMP stem, derived from CS *qtol*, and the suffixes of the second and third person plural: *īton* < *-ton* and *lon* < *lhon*.

In loanwords and new forms, when not subject to the *ā* — *o* rule, the actual pronunciation was decisive for its spelling (3). This might explain for the *-uḵ* suffix (2msg, CS *-āḵ*) and for the PRET stem of the second stem pattern (IIa and IIb): *puleṭ-* and *mucex-*. When loanwords contained an [o], this sound is represented either by *o*, or, as was usually done by the Protestants, by the diphthong *ô* (< *âw*).[127]

Bedjan changed the orthography of the forms with [o], [u], and [u^{y}] in the course of time. In his *Syllabaire*, he employs a rather phonetic spelling, in which *u* represents [u], and sometimes [u^{y}], and *o* denotes the contracted diphthong [aw] (cf. 5.11.2). He incidentally employs *ux* or *uy* for [u^{y}]; the first spelling obviously being suggested by the Salmas pronunciation of this phoneme. In the books written until 1893 the spelling of these phonemes

126. Nöldeke 1868: 11.

127. Although these rules are not based consistently either on etymology or on phonology, the distribution of *o* and *u* is not arbitrary, as Polotsky 1961: 11 suggests.

fluctuates somewhat, but tends to be phonetical. From 1893 onwards, he follows the spelling conventions of the Protestants, although incidentally more phonetic spellings occur. The Roman Catholic Bible translation (1877) follows the Protestant spelling. The Anglicans clearly had not been able to suggest a more etymological spelling and therefore they also adhered to the Protestant spelling conventions.[128]

(1) *dāḵowi* (< *dakkē*), *bāqori, mpāroqi, šāqori* (Mat 3:12, Mat 2:2 '77, Mg 90, MdP 2.14 '93)
jammuʿwi (< *mjammeʿ*), *maxruzi, mxazdug-* (Mat 3:12, Mat. 3.1 '77, Mark 14:6 '95)
bāṣortā, qārowā, yāqori (Mat 2.6, id. in BT '93, Mark 14:30 '95, VdS vi.3)

(2) *ṭurā* (Mat. 5:14, Mark 14:26 '95)
nurā (Mat. 3:11)
puqdānā (*Teachings* 4.11)
txot (Mat. 5:15)
yomāni (< *yāwm-*)[129] (Mark 14:4), *yomā* (once: *yumāni*) (*Teachings* 6.2 (6.3), VdS 22.12)
bnonê (VdS 246.12)
ṣlotā (*Teachings* 2.6)
zʿorā, zʿortā (Mat. 2:13, VdS 247.10)
šḇoq (IMP) (Mat. 5:24, Mark 14.6 '95, MdP 4.14 '93, VdS 242.22)
šmeʿlon (Mat. 2:9)
ʾāḇdenôḵon (SUB) (Mat. 4:19)
hāwēton (SUB) (Mat. 4:19)
ṣālimon (IMP pl) (*Teachings* 1.5)

(3) *mudī* (*Teachings* 6.2, Mark 14:23 '95) // *qāmodī* (Mark 14:4, id '95)
cāton (Mat 1:9 '77)
šāqlī=luḵ (SUB) (Mat. 4:6)
aqluḵ (Mat. 4:6)
bureḵli (Mark 14:22)

5.9.2.3 In the texts of Socin and Merx, the actual pronunciation of the reflexes of [o] and [u] was more or less represented in Syriac script, by em-

128. Cf. Maclean 1901: xix, in which he notes the correspondence between *u* / *û*^{i} (U) / *ügh* (S). It is difficult to say whether he has noticed that this correspondence was based on the CS difference *o* // *u*. Cf. Polotsky 1961: 12.

129. It is difficult to reconstruct the exact history of the pronunciation of this word. In CS the construct form is *yom-*, while the emphatic form is *yāwmā* (Eastern CS). CS [aw] > UA [o], but in the transcribed texts [yuma] is the regular form. This might be a further (irregular) development after contraction had taken place: [yawma] > [yoma] > [yuma]. Thus, the orthography *yomā* in the Protestant press is pseudo-historical, because in CS orthography this form never existed.

ploying *u* for former [o] (1), and *uy* for former [u] (2). Thus many examples are found of *uy* where the standard texts have mostly *u*, confirming Polotsky's thesis on the occurrence of this palatalized vowel. However, not in all words where this *uy* could occur, it does occur. This might be due to the fact that these writers, probably unconsciously, mixed the standard spelling with a spelling more closely reflecting the actual pronunciation. Incidentally these forms with *uy* occur in the standard texts as well. As noted in the preceding paragraph, Bedjan in his first period also employed a more phonetical spelling, in which apart from *u*, also *ux* and *uy* are found for [u^{y}]. In the earliest Protestant texts *u* is employed both for [u] and [u^{y}], although etymological *o* occurs incidentally as well.

(1) *brun-ih* (< *bronā*)[130] (Merx 16.17, Mat. 1:1, Syl 40.3)
yumā (Merx 1.4, Syl 40.8, HS 2.5, MdP 2.15 '86)
ṣlutā (Merx 13.20)
ʾḇudon, (ʾ)mur, šḇuq (IMP) (Mat. 3:8, 4:3, Syl 40.8)
lqāduš-ih, xāduri, pāqudi, šākuri (INF) (Mat. 5:13, Merx 10.7, Syl 43.7, MdP 2.13 '86)
pelxānuḵ, brunuḵ (suf 2msg) // *brunoḵ* (*Teachings* 6.4, MdP 1.9 '86 // *Teachings* 6.6)
qāmudi (Merx 13.9, HS 7.18)

(2) *nuyrā* (Merx 5 nt. 12)
zuyzi (Merx 10.9)
Suyrāyā (Merx 12.8)
suysāwāti // susi (Merx 7.14 // Syl 32.24)
guydāni, guydā (Merx 10.16, Syl 30.6)
b-uxdāli (Syl 18.4, HS 5.20)

5.9.3 *Conclusions*

The two long [i] vowels have a parallel in the presence of two phonemically different [u] vowels: [u:] and [u^{y}]. As was the case with the two [i] vowels, these two [u] vowels merge in closed syllables to one short [u] vowel. In LUA orthography, the distribution of [u:] and [u^{y}] is not marked, because etymological and phonological spellings were employed side by side. In the standard spelling, etymological considerations are most important, and therefore original [u] that became [u^{y}] in general is spelled as *u*, whereas *o* reflects CS [o] that became UA [u]. In substandard spelling, UA [u] is usually spelled as *u* and [u^{y}] as *uy*.

130. This might be an example where perhaps the exact etymology was not known to the missionaries.

5.10 Other changes in vowel pronunciation

5.10.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

5.10.1.1 In the transcribed texts many instances are found in which the vowels differ from those in earlier Aramaic, or even from those in the Syriac orthography of LUA. Most of these vowel changes are due to emphasis or fronting, and these changes are not reflected in the orthography of LUA (see 5.12). Other vowels, however, seem to have changed phonemically. In all examples these vowels are short and often unstressed, and perhaps one must assume that in this postition the three short vowels [a], [i], and [u] could easily interchange. These alternations took place in a limited number of words, and might be conditioned by certain consonants, e.g., fronting when preceded or followed by labials (1).

In the Salmas dialect most [a]'s in closed syllables, especially before the main stress, have changed into [i] (2).[131] Some of these [i]'s occur in open syllables of forms that formerly were closed by a geminated consonant. For some words this suggests that the change to [i] took place prior to the loss of gemination, but in others the [i] vowel in Duval's text perhaps must be interpreted as a kind of *shewa* vowel, resulting from the disappearance of [a:] before a degeminated consonant.

(1) *ʾīmen* (< *īman*) (Kam 40)
mekʾ(tχ)ḫekʾắnuḫ (< *magxekkān-*) (Kam 52)
(2) *minšíqla* (< *manšeq-*) // *yamínnouḫ* (Duval 2.1 // 1)
bisímta (< *bassimtā*) (Duval 2.17)
ríba (< *rabbā*) // *áṯḫā* (Duval 2.17 // 17)

5.10.1.2 In UA two types of *shewa* vowels exist. A consonant cluster at the beginning of a syllable was pronounced with a very short [ə] vowel, which in most texts is not transcribed at all, or else is indicated by a [ʾ] sign, to mark the short hiatus between the two consonants. When *d-*, *b-* and *l-* are prefixed to a form without a cluster, this ultra-short *shewa* vowel is needed (1). When the first syllable has a cluster, a longer *shewa*, perhaps identical with short [i], is inserted after the proclitic (2). Only with the INF (usually beginning with a cluster) are single consonants preceded by [i].

A cluster of two consonants at the end of a non-final syllable (thus followed by a third consonant) was dissolved by adding the longer *shewa* vowel between the two consonants of the cluster, which led to a new syl-

131. Cf. Tsereteli 1961: 232, Maclean 1895: 286-9, and Audo 1905: iii.

labic division of the form (*malkᵉtā* > [ma:ləkta:]) (3). This syllable could become stressed and probably this vowel does not differ from short [i].

A *shewa* vowel probably also resulted from shortening of the *-ā* ending of *a* noun when followed by the genitive marker *d-* and a second noun (4).[132]

(1) *d'míllat* (Socin 3.1)
mdíta (Socin 3.1)
(2) *diḥmārĕlĕ* (< *d-xmārā* + cop) (Kam 16)
dęplítlun (< *d* + PRET) (Socin 7.1)
biplát- (< *b* + INF) (Kam 18)
bidája (< *b* + INF) (Kam 51)
(3) *dmadénḥa* (< *d-madnxā*) (Duval 12.9)
mâliktâ (< *malktā*) (Mt)
(4) *libet babawáti* (Merx 58.17)

5.10.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.10.2.1 Not many examples of the interchange between short [i], [a], and [u] occurred in the transcribed texts, and it is rather difficult to find many of them in the texts printed by the mission presses. Some words differ between the various presses, and especially in loanwords the short vowels may differ. Some of the differences between Bedjan and the other presses may be due to his native dialect and others to influence of Classical Syriac, but the number of examples is too small to allow any definite conclusions.

xešbunā // *xušbunā* (< *xušbunā*) (Md // VdS i.7)
gumlā // *gamlā* (< *gamlā*) (Mg §89b)
jeldi // *jaldi* (Md // Im. 2.22)
'ešq // *'asq* (Md // Im. 3.15)
umīd // *umud* (Md // Im 3.22)
dunyi // *denyi* (VdS 248.11 // MdP 41.10, HS 1.6)
udyu // *edyo* (MdP '86 2.17 // '93)

5.10.2.2 The two *shewa* vowels are neatly distinguished in LUA orthography. When the ultra-short *shewa* vowel may be expected, no vowel is indicated. When a longer neutral vowel was inserted into a cluster, two vowel signs are employed. In the first place short [i] (*e*) is employed. However, when this vowel is employed before an INF without a cluster, it is written as long [i] (*i* or *ī*), because the syllable is open.

132. Cf. Nöldeke 1868: 148, Krotkoff 1982: 51-2, and Murre-van den Berg 1994: 386-8.

A third way to denote this vowel is a short line under the consonant (transcribed as *ı*), which is described by Maclean as 'half Zlama', thus 'half' *i*.[133] This sign is almost never employed by the Protestant missionaries, according to Stoddard this type of short *shewa* does not need a separate sign.[134] Maclean employs this sign in many forms where, according to him, *e* had no historical basis. Note that Bedjan, in his later books (from 1893 onwards), added this sign also to the word *kul* when followed by a suffix. In the earlier orthography *kul* was written without vowel signs. The sound of shortened [u] thus must have been very close to this [ə].

Perhaps the employment of an *-ih* suffix in the genitive construction (*baytih d-malkā*), was caused by the change of the ending [a] to [ə] when followed by the genitive marker -d in an unstressed closed syllable. Thus UA [beta d-malka] was pronounced as [betə-t malka], and was reinterpretated according to CS grammar as *bêtih d-malkā*.

e *lešḇāqā* (*l* + INF) (Ruth 1:16)
i *li'ḵālā* (*l* + INF) (Ruth 2.10)
ī *līda'yā* (*l* + INF) (Ruth 3:4)
ı *madınxā* (VdS 247.18)
kullih // *kıllih*, *kıllāh* (*kul* + suf) (MdP '86 2.12 // '93, VdS 248.21)
-ih *tājih d-rišan* (Syl. 51.10)
lebbā d-aḇḇāhi (Luc. 1:17, cf. Merx 58 in 5.10.1.2, ex. 4)

5.10.3 *Conclusions*

In closed syllables, short vowels may differ from the vowels in earlier Aramaic. In the Salmas dialect, Bedjan's native tongue, [a] in closed unstressed syllables regularly becomes [i]. A *shewa* vowel, which probably is identical with short [i], is regularly inserted between the first and second consonant of a cluster of three consonants. This latter vowel is indicated either by a *half zlāmā*, or by one of the consonants *i* or *e*.

5.11 Contracted and uncontracted diphthongs

5.11.1 *Phonological and phonetical changes*

5.11.1.1 All former diphthongs in Aramaic have been contracted in UA. The few words in which the diphthongs [ay] and [aw] occur are loanwords

133. Maclean 1895: 8.
134. Stoddard 1855: 15.

that were introduced into the language after the contraction had taken place. The contraction took place regardless whether the [a] vowel was long or short, and whether the [w] consonant originated in CS *w* or in CS *ḇ* or *p*. In some words, the presence of emphasis may have prevented contraction to [e] (cf. 5.12), but usually this is not the case. The contraction to [e] is found also when the copula, beginning with [y], is attached to a noun ending in [a]. The resulting vowel is always long.[135] In a few instances this [e] changes to [i], and the [o] irregularly develops into [u].

Another contraction that took place in UA is [ew] > [u]. According to Stoddard the resulting sound was somewhere between English *ew* and *oo*.

Various pronominal suffixes originate in former diphthongs: the third person masculine [u] and feminine [o] possessive suffixes,[136] as well as the third person plural possessive suffix [e].[137] The independent pronouns have split into a contracted and an uncontracted form (see 5.11.1.2).

[e]	*mḥétā (mxāytā)* (Socin 7.18)	
	blélī (b-layli) (Socin 7.21)	Mt *léli*, Sv *leli*
	léwa (< lā=īhwā) (Socin 9.18)	Sv *levə*
	ātīqēli (< ʾattīqā=yli) (Socin 9.13)	
	ṭúrīwa (< ṭurā=īhwā) (Socin 9.19)	
	qámeyta (< mqadmāytā) (Merx 57.3)	Sv *qəmetə*
	dḛ́ra (< dāyrā) (Kam 1)	
	jārḭ́ḥṭḛ́lā (< yārīḵtā=ylā) (Kam 5)	Sv *bimərili* (i for e)
	lắḥaivin (< laḳā=ywin) (Kam 51)	
	bīdḛ́ (< b + īdā + suf 3pl) (Socin 3.11)	
[o]	*dṓqiḥ (< dāḇqī)* (Socin 11.5)	
	ṭóris (< Taḇriz) (Socin 19.20)	
	lóma (< A lāwm-?) (Merx 57.13)	Mt *lômâ*
	hoyálux (< hāwyā-) (Merx 58.11)	Sv *hoyə*
	zṓᵈje (< zāwgā) (Kam 18)	
	lᵉqṓra (< l-qaḇrā) (Kam 83)	
	ṭḷṓḥḛ́ (< ṭlapxī) (Kam 86)	
	šímm-o (noun + suf 3fsg) (Socin 19.10)	

135. An interesting exception to this rule is *kāḇḵḇā* > *kōḵḇā* [koxva]. That this is an unusual form is confirmed by the fact that it is also found as *keḵḇā* (5.11.2.1, ex. 1) in which the vowel is shortened again.

136. Hoberman 1988: 563-4, 570-1 reconstructs PNENA (Proto Northeastern Neo-Aramaic) **-ew* (m) (< **-ayhu*) and **aw* (f), assuming that the *-w* ending of the f-suf was due to an analogical formation based on masculine **-eh* (with sg nouns) + **-ew* (with pl nouns) > *-ew* (with sg and pl) // feminine **-ah* (with sg nouns) // **?* (with plural nouns) > *-aw* (with sg and pl).

137. Hoberman 1988: 565, reconstructs underlying **-ayhi* from PNENA **ayhın*.

[u] *dyûshâ* (< *deḇšā*) (Mt)
tûtâ (< *teḇtā*) (Mt)
tûnâ (< *teḇnā*) (Mt)
qûrâgh (Mt) (< azT *qurāġ*, in Syriac script: *qewraġ*)
qōšín-ū (noun + suf 3msg) (Socin 3.7)

5.11.1.2 In three types of forms uncontracted diphthongs occur: (1) in loanwords, (2) in the third person singular pronouns, and (3) in a few Aramaic words in which [ay] did not contract to [e].

In the case of loanwords, this is probably due to their introduction after contraction took place. As for the pronouns, the two uncontracted diphthongs are in opposition with the demonstrative pronouns [o] and [e], 'that one' or 'that' (both masculine and feminine). Hoberman reconstructs **ahu* and **ahi* as underlying PNENA forms, becoming [aw] and [ay] or [o] and [e].[138] According to Nöldeke, contraction of diphthongs in Aramaic words might have been prevented in words with emphasis.[139]

(1) *ṣaú* (< azT *ṣaw*) (Socin 47.5)
pāida (< A *fā'ida*) (Kam 42)
(2) *wu'áu* 'and he' (Merx 59.4)
up ai 'also she' (Merx 60.4)
ō ʕde ḥína 'that other festival' (Socin 23.20)
ʕ́ duka 'that place' (Socin 23.12)
(3) *taíra* (Socin 25.16) Mt *ṭérâ*
éyna / *ayna* (< *'aynā*) (Merx 57.15 /) Mt *'ainâ* (U) / *'énâ* (other NA dialects), Sv *ajna*

5.11.2 *Representations in orthography*

5.11.2.1 The historical spelling of the diphthongs could be retained, because the vowel change was nearly complete. Thus, CS *āw*/*aw* is employed to signify UA [o] (transcribed by me as *ô*/*aw*), and CS *āy*/*ay* signifies [e] (transcribed by me as *ê*/*ay*) (1). This historical spelling maintains the difference between CS *o* and *e* (pronounced [u] and [i] in UA) and UA [o] and [e], written as *ô* and *ê*. The contracted diphthongs with *-ḇ* and *-p̄* are written with the original consonants too, whereas Stoddard noted that these were pronounced the same as the sound with *-w*.[140] This spelling convention was also employed for loanwords; those containing an [o] vowel were written with *ô*, those containing an [e] with *ê*.

138. Hoberman 1988: 561 and 1990: 83-86.
139. Nöldeke 1868: 13. Cf. also Tsereteli 1961: 234.
140. Stoddard 1855: 17-8.

It is uncertain whether the contraction in the sequence of INF + copula was noticed by the American missionaries, since Stoddard made no mention of it in his grammar.[141] The fact that they wrote the copula with initial *y-*, and not with initial ʾ (as did Bedjan), might indicate that they were aware of the fact that the original two morphemes now are pronounced as one. However, the fact that they wrote *y-* with *l.o.*, suggests that they were not aware of the fact that the rules for diphthongization might account for this sequence of [a] and [y] as well (2).

In his earlier books (cf. 5.9.2.2), Bedjan employed a slightly different orthography. The grapheme *o* represents [o] resulting from [āw] and [aw], and *u* represents etymological *o*. In his later books (from 1893 onwards) he employs *ô*, and *u* // *o* like the other presses (3).

The orthography of the suffixes constitutes another example of the mixing of orthographical and phonological considerations (4). The third person plural suffix [é] was written as *āy* (*ê*) by the Protestant missionaries. This practice was followed by most other printing presses. The Anglicans decided to adopt a more etymological spelling based on the forms that occurred in neighboring dialects: *-ayhy*.[142]

The history of the third person singular suffixes was not understood by the American and Anglican missionaries. At frst, the American missionaries differentiated between the suffixes attached to singular and plural words, according to CS grammar. They wrote *-ih* and *-ah* with singular, and *-uhy* and *-uh* with plural words. The first two forms might both have been influenced by the usage in CS, and by the fact that in UA an [-i] and [-a] suffix is still present, but not with nouns.[143] This practice was abandoned by 1852,[144] and in the later Protestant publications, as well as in the Syriac texts of Socin and Merx, *-uhy* (or *-u(h)y*) and *-uh* have become regular. In the Roman Catholic Bible translation, I encountered the first example of *-oh* instead of *-uh* for the third person feminine. This usage was followed by Bedjan up to his last book in 1912. The Anglicans again wrote *-uh* for the feminine, in line with the Protestant press, probably because *-oh* was very difficult to explain etymologically. With singular nouns, however, the

141. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 35; he only mentions a more far-reaching contraction: *beprāqā=(y)wen* > *'prakin'*.

142. Maclean 1895: 18 gives *-ayhiy* for K, J, Al, and Tal, both from the Ashiret (mountain) dialects and from the southern dialect.

143. Macuch 1976: 72, suggests that the Protestant missionaries were acquainted with earlier NA texts in the dialect of the Mosul region (Felliḥi), in which *-ih* and *-āh* were the usual suffixes with nouns. However, I found no indication of such influence; see 4.2.2.

144. Stoddard 1855: 26, 'We now substitute for these, in all nouns, *-uhy* and *-uh*, in accordance with Oroomiah usage.'

Anglicans re-introduced the use of *-ih* and *-ah*, because these suffixes were used in the mountain dialects. This was taken over by the editors of the 1893-revision of the Bible.

In a limited number of words, most of which seem to be loans from CS, *ē* represents [e]. This is due to CS orthography. Moreover, *ē* was never employed on a large scale to represent this contracted diphthong (5),[145]

(1) *qāmētā* (*Teachings* 2.7)
l-baytā (Mat. 2:11)
ʿaynuḵ (Mat. 5:29)
zaḇnā (*Teachings* 3.10, Mat. 2:7)
xôšibā // xošebbā (*Teachings* 6.2 // Syl 42.12)
āḇdet (*Teachings* 6.3)
Yôsep (Mat. 1:18)
gaḇrāh (Mat. 1:19)
kāwḵḇih (Mat. 2:2) // *keḵḇā* (Mat. 2:2 '77)
kokā (< azT *kawkeh*) // *kôkā* (Syl 44.9 // Md)
qayratkiš (< P, T *ġayrat*) (*Teachings* 6.6)
(2) *aykā=(y)li* (Mat. 2:2)
(3) *morešā // môrišā* (Syl 45.3 // Md)
qolā // qôlā (MdP '86 4.1 // '93 4.9, Md)
-ôḵun // -oḵun (suf 2pl) (Mat 5:11, Mg // Mat 5:11 '77, HS 5.13, VdS vii.3)
teḇna [tunā], diḇšā [dušā] (Syl 12. 6-9)
(4) *kul-ê* (suf 3pl) (Mat. 1:17)
baḵt-uhy, qôšunu(h)y (< noun + suf 3msg) (Ruth 1:1, Socin 2.8)
bnun-uh, šimuh, bazruh (< noun + suf 3fsg) (Ruth 1:3, Socin 18.10, ZdB71/11/94A17)
dīyoh (*d-* + suf 3fsg) (Mat. 2:3 '77)
(5) *wēnā* (Merx 7.7)

5.11.2.2 No separate sign was created to note uncontracted diphthongs, and these are written with the same sign as the contracted diphthongs (1).

In the Protestant texts, the difference between the demonstrative and the personal pronouns is not reflected in orthography; both are written as ܐܘ and ܗܘ.[146] In the texts in Syriac script of Socin, the point above the *h* in *haw/hô* has turned into a *l.o.*, which probably is to be explained by the fact

145. Note that this *ē* was employed in earlier texts to represent [i] as well, in forms like *qāṭlēton // qāṭlīton*. Bedjan, in his *Syllabaire* (1884: 19.11), suggests that *ē* can be employed for [e], but he used *ē* only in names, taking over the CS spelling.

146. In my transcription I distinguish between the two forms: *hay/hê* and *haw/hô*, see 6.2.2 and 6.2.4.

that the *h* was not pronounced. The feminine *hay/hê* is found with diacritical dot as well as with *linea occultans*.

Bedjan differentiates between two masculine forms, ܗܘ // ܗܳܘ (*ho // hāw*), but not between the two femine pronouns, ܗܝ (*hê* as well as *hây*). The first form is employed for the attributive demonstrative, and the second for the personal pronoun. It is not clear which form he employs for the independent demonstrative. In HS, he distinguishes between three masculine and two femine forms, ܗܘ / ܗ̣ܘ / ܗ̈ܘ (*ho / hâw / hô*), ܗ̈ܝ / ܗ̣ܝ (*hê / hāy*).[147] I assume that the forms with the diacritical dots denote the uncontracted personal pronouns, whereas the third masculine form, without dot, denotes the independent demonstrative, with contracted diphthong. However, because the personal pronouns in many contexts have an assertive function, it is difficult to be sure about this distinction.

(1) *ṣāw* (Socin 46.5)
pyḏ' / paydā / pāydā (Kam 42, Md)
(2) *(h)aw ʾidā (')xi(r)nā*[148] (Socin 22.18-9)
hay dukā / b-(h)ê ṣāhat / (h)ay (')mirrā (Socin 22.11, 26.12 and 28.20)
ho yumā / hô d-but (Syl 41.17, Syl 41.11)
ho nohrā / u-up hô .. / hâw bet .. (HS 5:17, 5:15, 6.16)
hê (')dānā / hāy qam .. (HS 6.13, 6.10)

5.11.3 *Conclusions*

The former diphthongs [ay] and [aw] are contracted to the long vowels [e] and [o] in Urmia Aramaic. The diphthongs [ay] and [aw] occur occasionally in loanwords and in a few Aramaic words with emphatic pronunciation. In the Protestant press, the contracted diphthongs are written in the same way as their uncontracted counterparts in CS, *āy/ay* and *āw/aw* whereas Bedjan, in some of his works, writes [o] as *o*.

5.12 Emphasis

5.12.1 *Phonological and phonetic changes*

A very typical feature of UA is its division of all lexemes into two classes that are pronounced differently: one class is pronounced fronted or palatal, the other backwards, or velarized.[149] In recent studies, this phenomenon is

147. Note that the 'dot' in the first forms is the dot to denote *rwāxā*, whereas the dot in the second forms is a (slightly larger) diacritical dot. See also 6.2.2 and 6.2.4.

148. In Syriac script: *(')xirnā*.

149. Tsereteli assumes a third category to exist, consisting of words with 'mittleres Timbre', cf. Tsereteli 1961: 252-55 and Tsereteli 1982: 344.

usually described as emphasis, the fronted lexemes being the unmarked forms, and the emphasized forms the marked form.[150]

It is difficult to trace the exact origin of this feature which, with different characteristics, occurs in many of the Northeastern Neo-Aramaic dialects.[151] It is quite possible that Turkish vowel harmony patterns influenced these Aramaic dialects, but the phenomenon is clearly linked with the emphatic or velarized consonants that since long are part of Aramaic consonant inventory.[152] According to Garbell, Kurdish influence on the Jewish NA dialect of Iran may also account for part of this feature.[153]

Although the exact phonetic conditions that gave rise to this feature are difficult to ascertain, it is clear that the velarized consonants of earlier Aramaic constitute an important factor. Aramaic words with 'emphatic' [ṭ], [ṣ] and [ˁ][154] are nearly always pronounced with emphasis, whereas words with [k] and [g], and often even words with [q],[155] are palatalized. However, because the opposition between emphasized and non-emphasized consonants has spread to whole morphemes, and other consonants, which originally existed only in a non-velarized forms, were also affected, one must describe [ṭ], [ṣ], and [ˁ], together with perhaps [l̩],[156] [r̩], [z̩], [d̩], [c̩], and [j̩] as the emphasized allophones of [t], [s], [ʿ], [l], [r], [z], [d], [c], [j].[157] Emphasis then has to be marked as a suprasegmental phoneme.[158] Hoberman, employing the terminology of 'autosegmental analysis', as developed by Van der Hulst and Smith,[159] has further refined the description of emphasis and the distribution of this feature in the various NA dialects, at the same time comparing this phenomenon with comparable features of neighboring languages.[160]

150. See Marogulov 1935/1976: 8-9, Friedrich 1959: 56 (although mistakenly restricting the phenomenon to 'Vokalharmonie', Polotsky 1961: 8-10, and Hetzron 1969: 113. For a more modern description of emphasis in NA, see Odisho 1988: 49, and Hoberman 1985 and 1989. When necessary, I will mark emphasized lexemes with ˁ[..].

151. In none of the other NA dialects the domain of velarization is extended to the complete form, as it is in UA; cf. Garbell 1964, Krotkoff 1982: 7-8, and Hoberman 1989.

152. Hoberman 1985.

153. Garbell 1964.

154. The presence of [ˁ] among the 'velarizing' consonants is discussed in Hoberman 1989: 91-3.

155. In Arabic loans in the Azeri Turkish dialect, words with [q] also very often have a fronted pronunciation.

156. Nöldeke 1882: 671, recognized [ɬ] in the word *ṭlā*.

157. With other consonants velarization is very difficult to hear.

158. Solomon & Headly 1973: 143, Tsereteli 1982.

159. Van der Hulst & Smith 1982a and Van der Hulst & Smith 1982b.

160. Hoberman 1989.

The transcribed texts represent this feature of UA to a considerable extent, even if the editors did not really understand its scope and function. In these texts, emphasis is nearly always represented, often by noting 'darker' shades of vowels and sometimes by noting emphatic consonants (1). Fronting is less clearly observable (2). Maclean incidentally notes fronting, whereas only in the Soviet orthography is every word attributed to one of the two categories. In this orthography two pairs of vowels are employed, which indicate emphasis or palatalization for all phonemes in the word: *a* and *ı* (back) versus *ə* and *i* (front).[161]

(1)	*qtólle* (< *qṭilī*) (Socin 7.15)	
	ą́moṣ (< *āmeṣ*) (Socin 11.9)	Sv *msaja*
	póltiḥ (< *palṭī*) (Socin 13.1)	Sv *paluṭı*
	ḫilę̄ (< *(')ḳelī*) ('*i* stark hinten artikuliert') (Kam 9)	Sv *xılı* (PRET)
	dārę̄la (< *dari=lah*) (Kam 47)	Sv *djara*
	tlą (< *tlātā*) (Socin 23.15)	Sv *tla*
(2)	*kűllī* (< *kulē*) (Socin 7.17)	Sv *kullə*
	líblaḥ (< *lablaḳ*) (Socin 17.4)	Sv *ləbuli*
	k'elba (*kalbā*) (Kam 11)	Sv *kəlbə*
	kámajęlę (< *qa(d)māyā=yli*) (Kam 27)	Sv *qəməjə*

5.12.2 *Representations in orthography*

There are no indications that the missionaries have tried to represent emphasis. According to Stoddard the different 'colors' of the same vowel are due to certain consonants in the word. He assumed that it is possible to predict the pronunciation on the basis of the consonants, and therefore he provides a rather lengthy description of the influence of certain consonants on vowel pronunciation.[162] Nöldeke too paid attention to this feature, especially in his treatment of the quality of the vowels.[163] Neither Nöldeke nor Stoddard seems to have realized that a velarized consonant did not only affect the vowels in their pronunciation, but also the other consonants in the word. Bedjan's lists in his *Syllabaire*, in which spellings with and without emphatic consonants are compared, suggest that he was perhaps aware of the second feature too (1).[164]

Although in general the consonantal pattern of a word was not easily changed (if etymology was known), the influence of emphasis can be traced

161. In original Russian editions in *Novyj Alfavit*, back vowel [i] usually is written as ь, wheres in some scholarly texts also ї is used for this sound.

162. Stoddard 1855: 16-7.

163. Nöldeke 1868: 6.

164. Bedjan 1886: 11, 14, 15, 25, 28.

in several texts (2). Most important in this respect is a wrong position of ʿ, betraying that it was lost as a separate consonant, while its influence was still felt. In forms that had acquired emphatic pronunciation but historically had ʾ in it, ʿ is found to replace ʾ.[165] Merx, in this textbook, rightly remarked on these 'wrong' spellings that the use of ʿ in these cases denoted a certain 'Klangfarbe'.[166] The alternation of *s* // *ṣ* and *t* // *ṭ* is due to the influence of emphasis as well.[167] Athough most of the irregularities in this respect are found in loanwords, some Aramaic words are also affected. The regular spelling of *ṭlā* with *ṭ* instead of *t* should be explained by the wish to denote the emphasis in LUA orthography.[168]

In loanwords the early spelling conventions often reflect emphasis or the absence of it (3). Words with Arabic *ṣ* sometimes have lost their emphatic sound in UA, and thus, in the early printings of Bedjan and in the Protestant printings, are often written with *s*. The Anglicans adhered to etymology and wrote *ṣ*, according to the Arabic orthography. The same accounts for the difference between *t* and *ṭ* in loanwords. Other loanwords had (or acquired) emphasis, and were written with emphatic consonants, like ⁺[Stoddard], the name of the missionary-grammatician Stoddard.

(1)	*āḵil [ʿāḵil]* (Syl 11.3-4)	Sv *axıl*
	ʿḇādā [(ʾ)wādā], wādā (Syl 25.10, Nöld 60/Cat.)	Sv *vədə*
	bahrā [baʿrā] (Syl 15. 6-8)	
	sḇeʿli [ṣḇeʿli] (Syl 25. 6-7)	
	trīṣā [ṭrīṣā] (Syl 28. 12-14)	
(2)	*ītā (< īṭā)* (Merx 7.15)	Sv *ijtə*
	arʿā [ʿarʿā], ʿarā, ʿarʿā (Syl 11.3-4, Merx 2.8, 8.6)	Sv *arra*
	ṭlā / tlą (< CS *tlāṭā*) (Merx 24.2, HS 2.5 / Merx 25.2)	Sv *tla*
(3)	*sāʿat // ṣāhat* (< A, P *sāʿat*) (ZdB 71/11/91A8, VdS viii.3 // Merx 15.16)	Sv *saat*
	ṣpāyī (< K *spéhi / sbâhî*) (Mt 3:10)	Sv *spaj*
	masrap (< A, T *maṣrap*) (Mt. 5:13)	Sv *məsrəp*
	Ṣṭddrd (< Eng. *Stoddard*) (Merx 39.2)	

5.12.3 *Conclusions*

In Urmia Aramaic the presence or absence of emphasis constitutes a suprasegmental phoneme. Incidentally the presence of this phoneme is

165. This was noted by Nöldeke 1868: 63, but without understanding its full significance.

166. Merx 1873: 57.

167. On the varieties of spelling of *s* // *ṣ* and *t* // *ṭ*, compare Nöldeke 1868: 45-7 and Maclean 1895: 321-2, 335-8.

168. Note that 'thirty', *tlāyī*, and 'third', *tlītāyā* (Sv *tlijtəjə*) do not have emphasis, probably because of the palatalized *ī*-ending. In general plurals have the same pronunciation as the singular.

noted in LUA orthography. Because the presence of emphasis is closely connected to the presence of the earlier Aramaic emphatic consonants and ʿ, the maintaining of the traditional CS spelling usually provides enough information on the presence or absence of emphasis. However, not all instances of emphasis can be understood on the basis of CS spelling.

5.13 Summary and conclusions

5.13.1 *The phonemes of UA and their representtions*

5.13.1.1 In the following table the phonemes of nineteenth-century UA are listed. Although the exact phonetic realizations may be uncertain, their number and mutual relations have become clear from the transcribed texts. Consonant length has phonemic value in UA. The voiced consonants have unvoiced allophones, and vice-versa.

		phonemes	graphemes
plosives:	voiced bilabial	b	*b*
	unvoiced ,,	p	*p*
	voiced dental	d	*d*
	unvoiced ,,	t	*t* / *ṭ*
	voiced postpalatal	g	*g*
	unvoiced ,,	k	*k*
	velar	q	*q*
affricates:	voiced prepalatal	j	*j*
	unvoiced ,,	c	*c*
fricatives:	voiced labiodental	v	*w* / *b̲*
	unvoiced ,,	f[169]	*p̲*
	voiced alveolar	z	*z*
	unvoiced ,,	s	*s* / *ṣ*
	voiced prepalatal	š	*š*
	unvoiced ,,	ž	*ž* / *s̲*
	voiced velar	γ	*g* / *ʿ*
	unvoiced ,,	x	*x* / *k̲*
	glottal	h	*h*
nasal sonants:	bilabial	m	*m*
	dental	n	*n*
oral sonants:	bilabial smooth	[w][170]	*w* / *b̲*
	dental ,,	l	*l*

169. Only in loanwords.
170. Probably only as an allophone of [v].

alveolar	r	*r*
prepalatal	y	*y* / ’
suprasegmental phoneme:	emphasis ⁺[]	’, *ṣ*, *ṭ*

5.13.1.2 The vowel inventory of UA consists of seven vowels. These seven vowels all occur in open syllables, whereas five of them have a shortened allophone occurring in closed syllables and in open unstressed syllables. The long vowels [o] and [e] occur only in stressed open syllables. Clusters of three consonants are dissolved by insertion of a short [i], whereas sometimes a non-phonetic *shewa* vowel is employed in clusters of two consonants.

vowels	graphemes
iʸ — ĭ	*ī*
i: — ĭ	*i* / *ī* — *e* / *i*
e	*ê* / *ay* / *iy*
a: — ă	*ā* / *a* —
	a / *ā*
o	*ô* / *aw* / *o*
	/ *āḇ* / *aḇ*
u: — ŭ	*u* / *o* — *u* / *o*
uʸ — ŭ	*u* / *uy*

suprasegmental phoneme	⁺[]-

5.13.2 *Conclusions*

Perhaps the most salient feature of LUA spelling conventions in the nineteenth century is the ongoing search for the ‘true spelling’;[171] the spelling that is correct in view of the history of the language. Nearly all spelling conventions can be understood by the rule that whenever the etymology was known, an etymological spelling was preferred, and that only in cases of complicated or unknown etymologies, phonological spellings were introduced. However, spelling conventions differed considerably between the various mission presses. This can be explained in the first place by the ongoing understanding of the history of the Neo-Aramaic dialects, which lead to new etymological spellings, and in the second place by the tendency to retain certain standard spellings, even if they turned out to be ‘wrong’.

The early Protestant texts differ in many points of orthography from later ones. They display more phonological spellings, as, e.g., the notation of

171. Stoddard 1855: 14.

vowel length and the spelling of [o] and [u]. A few traces of (wrong) etymology occur, e.g., in the spelling of the personal suffixes (*-ih* for *-u*). It seems that in this period the missionaries had not yet made up their minds with regard to the relevance of etymology. Stoddard remarks in his grammar: 'Until the publication of the Old and New Testaments, there was no standard of usage.'[172] In the NT edition of 1846 a tendency towards more etymology becomes visible, illustrated by the spelling of the third person feminine singular SUB forms with *ā* instead of *a* (*qāṭlā* for *qaṭlā*). A 'new' etymology for the personal suffixes was found, which yielded the spellings *-uhy* (3msg) and *-uh* (3fsg), based on CS *-aw(h)y* and *-ēyh*.

In the years just before the edition of OT (1852), a number of other spelling innovations were introduced. Some of these yielded a more phonemic spelling, e.g., the introduction of a separate sign for [c]. Most changes, however, reflect a tendency towards a more etymological spelling, like the spelling *pā'eš* with ' for [payiš]. The edition of OT can be viewed as the first text in standard LUA, containing the orthography which, by and large, came to be the standard for the next fifty years.

In his grammar, Stoddard never explicitly states rules for the employment of etymological spellings. In a note on orthographical problems, he remarks, after having stressed the importance of 'the original spelling' of many words: 'It is often a matter of much doubt how far we are permitted to go in defacing the escutcheon of words, and obliterating all traces of their ancestry.'[173] This might suggest that at certain points the Americans deliberately chose to employ phonological spellings, but the only example given by Stoddard is the spelling of *qām* (< *qḏām*) (cf. 5.6.2.1).[174] In the next paragraph he mentions the difficulties in ascertaining the correct spelling of loanwords, stating that in cases where 'much of their original form and sound' have been retained, the missionaries preferred 'to refer to the language whence they came'.[175] He ends his elaboration on the problems of orthography by pointing to the various dialects: 'As familiarity is acquired with the language spoken, in all the dialects, reasons are often found for changing orthography which was supposed to be definitely settled.'[176] As a whole, his explanation confirms the hypothesis that from the very beginning etymology played a role in establishing spelling conventions.

172. Stoddard 1855: 7.
173. Stoddard 1855: 13.
174. Stoddard 1855: 13.
175. Stoddard 1855: 14.
176. Stoddard 1855: 14.

In later Protestant texts many minor deviations from this standard can be traced, which must sometimes be viewed as deliberate improvements, and sometimes as simple mistakes. Especially in the field of loanwords, spelling conventions changed from time to time. Most of the deliberate changes are towards a more etymological spelling. Many of these for the first time appeared in the revised Bible translation of 1893. These deviations from their earlier spelling conventions may be due to Anglican influence, but perhaps are to be attributed also to growing influence of Assyrians themselves on the development of the literary language in the late nineteenth century.

In earlier texts written by Assyrian scribes, the Protestant orthography is generally followed. The many deviations can nearly always be explained by a tendency to spell according to their own pronunciation habits. Besides, considering the period in which these texts were written (about 1860 to 1870), it is also possible that the authors had learned to spell in the period before 1850, and had retained some of the conventions of that early period.

The Roman Catholic Bible translation of 1877 also rather closely adheres to the post-1850 spelling conventions of the Protestants. The only important innovation is the spelling of the third person feminine singular suffix [-o] as *-oh*, as opposed to *-uh* of the Protestants. This feature is also found in Bedjan's early books.

In the early books of Bedjan somewhat more spellings are different from those of the Protestants. Only in these books is there a very moderate attempt to create a more phonemic spelling. Especially the spelling of [o], [u] and [u^{y}] is different from all other presses. However, Bedjan clearly did not want to loosen the link with CS, and most of the etymological spellings already in use were retained. Some peculiar spellings in these early books were caused by his native dialect that differed somewhat from that of UA, but in general he followed UA phonology.

In the second edition of the *Manuel de Piété*, which appeared in 1893, Bedjan brought the spelling more into line with the Protestant publications, although at some points he chose an even more etymological form than was usual in these Protestant works. Perhaps the influence of the Anglican missionaries was already felt. In his last work, *Vies des Saints* (1912), the influence of the Anglican mission press was still stronger, although he never took over all of the etymological spellings of this mission.

The Anglican missionaries, among whom Maclean must have been the most important, deliberately chose to write the language as much as possible according to CS orthography.[177] In the preface of his dictionary

177. Cf. 4.4.

Maclean gives the main reason for this practice: 'Where books are printed for the use of as large a circle of readers as possible, and where the readers speak dialects differing from one another in a greater or lesser degree, it is impossible to make the books widely intelligible if an exact phonetic system, based on one dialect only, be rigidly adhered to.'[178] Maclean's interest in linguistic matters and apparent knowledge of many NA dialects gave rise to new etymologies, which in turn were applied to the orthographical standard of the Anglican press. The growing use of silent letters, usually indicated by *l.o.*, was one of its main characteristics. It is this type of orthography that can still be recognized in present-day Neo-Aramaic publications.

The attraction of the consistent etymological orthography of the Anglicans to Assyrian writers becomes apparent from the lengthy discussions on orthography on the pages of ZdB. These discussions were initiated by the proposed LUA dictionary of Rabi Baba d-Kosi.[179] Although the contributors did not of course agree on all single spelling proposals, it is clear that there is a general tendency towards a more etymological spelling. The tendency towards a more 'classical' language is reinforced by the rejection of loanwords from neighboring languages, in favor of the introduction of 'real' Syriac words, these words being in fact loans from CS.[180] The high status of CS, which had influenced the missionaries from the beginning, thus continued to influence the creation of the Literary Neo-Aramaic language even fifty years after its origin.

178. Maclean 1901: xiii.

179. According to Macuch 1976: 216, this dictionary was never published.

180. See the discussions described by Macuch 1976: 74-88, where extracts from ZdB 1897 are reproduced.

6

MORPHOLOGY AND MORPHOSYNTAX: A SURVEY

6.1 Introduction

In this chapter a general survey of the morphology and morphosyntax of LUA is offered. This survey provides the basic material for understanding the discussions of the other chapters, especially those on constituent order. As stated in the introduction, I have chosen to direct my attention mainly to the fields of orthography and constituent order, two subjects in which many differences between the text types are present and which hardly have been described thus far. In the field of morphology and morphosyntax, on the other hand, the differences between the text corpora are smaller and much more has been published. Therefore, I have chosen to limit myself to a general survey of these parts of the grammar of LUA rather than discussing every single point.

This limited treatment of LUA morphology and morphosyntax may serve three functions. The first function is to provide a survey of those points of grammar that are not discussed in the chapters on orthography and constituent order, summarizing the material of the various reference grammars (mainly Stoddard, Nöldeke, and Maclean) and adding the variant forms as occurring in the different text corpora. Secondly, whenever possible, references are made to recent studies on various points of NA grammar, so that an overview of the state of research in the field of Northeastern Neo-Aramaic linguistics will be presented. In this general survey, thirdly, it is possible to pay attention to a few, mainly morphosyntactical, points on which the various text corpora of the nineteenth century display some interesting differences, and which, therefore, are relevant for the rest of the study. The most important subject in this respect is the description of the various kinds of object marking (6.6).

As a survey, this chapter does not seek to be exhaustive in any point of grammar. Its main purpose is to present the regular forms of pronouns, nouns, and verbs, and their derivational and conjugational patterns. The functions of these different forms are described briefly, and, when necessary, remarks on morphosyntax will be added.

Orthographic differences are represented either in different columns or in notes.[1] In this chapter I have chosen not to represent the orthographical vari-

1. Most of these differences are discussed in chapter 5. Here they are presented in their grammatical context.

ations as found in the texts of Merx and Socin. Their orthography is close to that of the Protestant press, and the differences between the Protestant press and the texts of Merx and Socin are mainly due to private variations or even mistakes of the informants.

6.2 Pronouns and pronominal elements

6.2.1 *Introduction*

The pronouns can be divided into two main types: independent and dependent pronouns. The first of these, the independent pronouns, consist of morphemes that constitute a separate constituent in a clause. The dependent pronouns serve in the flexion of nouns, verbs, and prepositions. Independent pronouns consist only of nominative forms, whereas dependent pronouns perform all kinds of grammatical functions and have two different forms, a nominative form (that is morphologically related to the independent nominative form) and an oblique form. However, because of the passive origin of one of the verbal stems, the oblique form can also function as a nominative suffix.[2]

6.2.2 *Independent personal pronouns (nominative)*[3]

Nominative personal pronouns are employed to represent the grammatical subject or extra-clausal constituents like an addressee preceding imperative or jussive clauses. It is also employed to represent a fronted pronominal object.[4]

		Protestant press[5]	Bedjan's books[6]	Anglican press[7]
sg	1m	*ānā*	*ānā*	*ānā*
	2m	*a(n)t*	*a(n)t*	*a(n)t*

2. Cf. 6.5.2 n. 41.

3. On the history of the Neo-Aramaic pronoun and pronominal suffixes, see Hoberman 1988 and 1990.

4. For a few examples, see Polotsky 1994: 98 and Polotsky 1996: 33. In the example in the latter article, the absolute pronoun is at the end of the clause. Polotsky assumes these pronouns to be 'absolute' and in 'extrapolation', although some of these pronouns are preceded by a subject pronoun. I would suggest that these pronouns are to be considered part of the clause itself, cf. 8.3.2-4. See also Maclean 1895: 17, who mentions the 'objective' use of these pronouns (only third person) after certain prepositions.

5. Forms marked by an asterisk occur only in texts from the American press before 1850.

6. In his later books (1893, 1904, 1912) Bedjan employed slightly different spellings (cf. 5.13.2). In VdS (1912) the differences with his earlier books are even greater. Forms marked by an asterisk are found only in VdS.

7. The forms in this column include those of Maclean's grammar (1895) and dictionary (1901).

	2f	*a(n)ty*	*a(n)ty*	*a(n)ty*
	3m	*haw*[8]	*hāw*[9]	*haw*
	3f	*hay*[10]	*hāy*[11]	*hay*
pl	1c	*axnan*	*axnan*	*axnan*
	2c	*axton*	*axton*	*axton*
	3c	*ānī*	*ān*[12]	*ānī*

6.2.3 *Demonstrative pronouns: near*

The first series of demonstrative pronouns are employed independently or attributively with a noun. In the latter case, they precede the noun. If independently, they are employed like the independent personal pronouns, i.e., as subject, fronted object, and in extra-clausal position.

sg	c	*āhā*
pl	c	*anni*

6.2.4 *Demonstrative pronouns: far*

The singular forms of the second series of demonstrative pronouns originate in contracted forms of the third person singular pronouns, [haw] > [ho] and [hay] > [he]. These demonstrative pronouns are employed independently, but may also be used attributively, preceding a noun.

In the Protestant texts, the difference between the third person singular personal and demonstrative pronouns is not reflected in orthography, whereas Bedjan in HS distinguishes not only between the personal and demonstrative forms, but also between the independent and attributive demonstrative forms, although these two are pronounced the same.

		Protestant press	Bedjan's books	Anglican press
sg	m	*hô*[13]	*hô* / *ho*[14]	*hô*
	f	*hê*[15]	*hê* / *hê*[16]	*hê*
pl	c	*ānī*	*ān*	*ānī*

8. In Syriac script: ܗܘ; so also in Anglican press.
9. In Syriac script: HS ܗܘ, VdS ܗܘ̀.
10. In Syriac script: ܗܝ; so also in Anglican press.
11. In Syriac script HS ܗܝ, VdS ܗܝ̀.
12. According to Maclean 1895: 16, this is a typical Salmas form, reflecting Bedjan's native dialect.
13. In Syriac script: ܗܘ; so also in Anglican press.
14. In Syriac script: HS: ܗܘ̀ (independently) / ܗܘ (attributively), whereas in VdS the same orthography for the independent and attributive function is employed: ܗܘ.
15. In Syriac script: ܗܝ; so also in Anglican press.
16. In Syriac script HS ܗܝ̀ / ܗܝ, VdS ܗܝ̀.

6.2.5 *Interrogative pronouns*

'who?'	*man* / *mānī*
'which?'	*aynī* [eni^{y}]
'what?'	*mudī* (attributively: *mud*)

6.2.6 *Suffixed pronouns i: oblique case*[17] *— attached to nouns and prepositions*

These suffixes are attached to nouns and prepositions to denote the genitive, as in *yemm-ī*, 'my mother'; *dīy-an*, 'of ours'. When attached to the noun *gānā* 'soul', the combination of noun and pronoun functions as a reflexive pronoun, as in *gān-ī* 'myself', *gān-uk̲* 'yourself'. The pronominal suffixes are unstressed, except for the third person plural suffix [-é].

The third person singular suffixes have an alternative form (related to the earlier pronominal suffixes attached to singular nouns), which is employed differently in the various periods and in the various text groups. In all texts these suffixes are employed proleptically with *kull-* 'all', 'whole': *kull-ih baytā* 'all of it house' > 'the whole family'. Under influence of CS, these suffixes are also employed instead of the regular suffixes in some of the Protestant texts,[18] or, only with the third person masculine singular suffix, instead of the *ā*-ending of nouns in the genitive construction (6.3.6), in the Protestant Bible translations and in Bedjan's texts.[19]

		Protestant press	Bedjan's books	Anglican press
sg	1c	*-ī* [-i^{y}]	*-ī*	*-ī*
	2m	*-uk̲ (ok̲*)* [-ux]	*-uk̲*	*-ok̲*
	2f	*-āk̲y* [-ax]	*-āk̲y*	*-ak̲y*
	3m	*-uhy* [-u] / *-ih* [-i]	*-uhy* / *-ih*	*-uhy* / *-ih*
	3f	*-uh* [-o] / *-āh* [-a]	*-oh*[20] / *-āh*	*-uh* / *-āh*

17. For a twofold distinction among the pronominal elements into nominative and oblique pronouns, see Polotsky 1979: 208, and, for a threefold division (objective, nominative and genitive), Polotsky 1994: 95. This type of description allows one to distinguish between the form (nominative or oblique) and function (e.g, subject or object reference) of these pronominal elements. I have modified Polotsky's description by adding the enclitic copula to this category of 'pronominal elements', because the copula fits in neatly if two properties of the pronominal elements are taken into account: *nominative // oblique*, and *attached to nominal forms // attached to verbal forms*.

18. Mainly in the texts until 1850, to mark the difference between suffixes with singular and suffixes with plural nouns. These 'classical' suffixes become more numerous again at the end of the century, in Protestant as well as Anglican publications. However, in UA no such difference between singular and plural suffixes exists, cf. 6.3.6.

19. Cf. Murre-van den Berg 1994: 386-8.

20. The earliest occurrence of this spelling is in the Roman Catholic Bible translation of 1877. Perhaps it had been employed in earlier publications from this press, from 1875.

pl	1c	*-an* [-an] / *-āni*[21] [-ani]	*-an* / *-āni*	*-an* / *-āni*
	2c	*-ôḵon* [-oxun]	*-oḵun*	*-ôḵon*
	3c	*-ê* [-é]	*-ê*	*-ayhy*

6.2.7 *Suffixed pronouns ii: oblique case — attached to verbs and pseudo-verbs*

The second series of oblique pronominal elements originating in the preposition *l-* plus the suffixes of the preceding series,[22] is employed with verbs (*kteḇ-lā*, 'she wrote', *kāteḇ-lā*, 'he wrote to her') and pseudo-verbs (*īt-lī*, 'there is to me' > 'I have'). The grammatical function of these suffixes depends on the type of verb: they express the subject with the PRET stem and pseudo-verbs, and the object with the SUB stem (see 6.5 and 6.8). The first form of each column is employed with PRET and pseudo-verbs, the second with SUB. If the suffixes of this group are attached to forms ending in *-n* or *-r*, the *l-* is assimilated to the preceding *-n* or *-r*, which then becomes doubled.

		Protestant press	Bedjan's books	Anglican press
sg	1c	*-lī* [-liʸ]	*-lī*	*-lī*
	2m	*-luḵ* [-lux]	*-luḵ*	*-luḵ*
	2f	*-lāḵy* [-lax]	*-lāḵy*	*-laḵy*
	3m	*-li* / *lih* [-li]	*-li* (*-lih**) / *-lih*	*-lih*
	3f	*-lā* / *lāh* [-la]	*-lā* (*-lāh**) / *-lāh*	*-lāh*
pl	1c	*-lan* [-lan]	*-lan*	*-lan*
	2c	*-lôḵon* [-loxun]	*-loḵun*	*-lôḵon*
	3c	*-lon* (*-lun**) / *l(h)on* [-lun]	*-lon* / *-l(h)on*	*-l(h)on*

6.2.8 *Suffixed pronouns iii (= copula): nominative case — attached to nouns*

Although the exact derivation of the copula is uncertain (cf. 7.1.2), the endings of the forms are clearly related to the independent nominative pronouns (6.2.2) on the one hand, and to the nominative suffixes (6.2.9) on the other. In nineteenth-century Urmia Aramaic the copula is nearly always enclitically attached to a nominal predicate, and does not function as an independent verbal form. This is the main reason for not treating the copula as a part of the paradigm of the verb *hwāyā* 'to be', although the two are clearly connected by semantic function and historic origin.

In one clause type, the copula precedes the predicate and takes an independent form (cf. 7.3.7). This independent form is identical with the full form of the enclitic copula as found after a consonant. In the independent form the

21. Employed to refer to 'we' but excluding the person spoken to, see Polotsky 1961: 19-20.

22. Note that the pronominal element of 3pl is different in i and ii: [-é] // [-lun].

copula is stressed on the first syllable, whereas it is unstressed when enclitically employed.

When the copula follows a nominal predicate, it represents the subject of the clause. When the predicate ends in a consonant, the following forms occur:

		Protestant press	Bedjan's books	Anglican press
sg	1m	*=īwen*[23]	*='īwen*	*=īwen*
	1f	*=īwān*	*='īwān*	*=īwān*
	2m	*=īwet*	*='īwet*	*=īwet*
	2f	*=īwaty*	*='īwaty*	*=īwaty*
	3m	*=īli*	*='īli (-h*)*	*=īlih*
	3f	*=īlā*	*='īlā (-h*)*	*=īlāh*
pl	1c	*=īwāḵ / -āx*[24]	*='īwāḵ (-x*)*	*=īwāx / īwāxn*
	2c	*=īton*	*='īton*	*=īton*
	3c	*=īnā*	*='īnā*	*=īnā*

When the predicate ends in [a], this [a] coalesces with the intial [iʸ] of the copula to [e]. This is marked by *l.o.* on initial *y-* in the texts of the Protestants, and by *l.o.* on initial *'-* of the copula in Bedjan's texts. If the predicate ends in another vowel, the same orthography is employed. Where the noun ends in [i] or [e], the connecting vowel can be expected to be [i] or [e], whereas in case of [o] or [u] endings, it is uncertain whether the initial [i] of the copula exerts any influence on the pronunciation of the [o] or [u] ending.

sg	1m	*-ā=(y)wen* [-e-wen]	*-ā=('ywen*	*-ā=ywen*
	3f	*-ā=(y)lā* [-e-la]	*-ā=('lā(h*)*	*-ā=ylāh*

The past marker [wa] can be added to the copula to mark the simple past tense. It should be noted that in all texts the plural past form is orthographically marked by the CS third person plural ending *-w*, although in LUA there is no difference in pronunciation between the singular and plural forms.

sg	1m	*=īwen=(h)wā*	*='īwen=(h)wā*	*=īwen=(h)wā*[25]
	1f	*=īwān=(h)wā*	*='īwān=(h)wā*	*=īwān=(h)wā*
	2m	*=īwet=(h)wā*	*='īwet=(h)wā*	*=īwet=(h)wā*
	2f	*=īwaty=(h)wā*	*='īwaty=(h)wā*	*=īwaty=(h)wā*
	3m	*=ī(h)wā*	*='ī(h)wā*	*=ī(h)wā*
	3f	*=ī(h)wā*	*='ī(h)wā*	*=ī(h)wā*

23. Friedrich (1959: 61) suggests that there is an opposition between the independent form [iʸwen] and the dependent form [-iwen] when following a consonant. I assume that the phonemic form is [iʸwen], whereas in fast speech, thus often in connected forms, the [iʸ] is pronounced as [i].

24. Revised version of Bible translation, 1893.

25. In these compound forms also the orthography *=y(h)wā* (CS ܐܘܳܝ) occurs for the past marker [wa].

pl	1c	*=īwāḵ=(h)wāw*	*='īwāḵ=(h)wāw*	*=īwāx=(h)wāw*
	2c	*=īton=(h)wāw*	*='īton=(h)wāw*	*=īton=(h)wāw*
	3c	*=ī(h)wāw*	*='ī(h)wāw*	*=ī(h)wāw*

When the noun ends in a vowel, the orthography of the past third person forms is slightly different. The Protestant orthography suggests that no [i] or [y] is present, as opposed to the actual pronunciation.

sg	3c	*-ā=(h)wā* [-e-wa]	*-ā=(')ywā*	*-ā=y(h)wā*

When a copular clause is negated, a negative copula is formed by prefixing *lā* to the copula, resulting in *lā=(y)wen*, pronounced as [lewin]. This negative copula is employed independently, preceding the predicate (7.6).

6.2.9 *Suffixed pronouns iv: nominative case — attached to verbs*

The second series of suffixes of the nominative case function as the subject suffixes of the SUB stem (*kāṯḇ-ān*, 'I write') and as the object suffixes of the PRET stem (*kteḇ-ê-lan* 'we wrote them(patient)'). The third person plural suffix has two different forms; the first when functioning as subject, the second when functioning as object.

		Protestant press	Bedjan's books	Anglican press
sg	1m	*-en* [-in]	*-en*	*-en*
	1f	*-ān* [-an]	*-ān*	*-ān*
	2m	*-et* [-it]	*-et*	*-et*
	2f	*-aty* [-at]	*-aty*	*-aty*
	3m	*-Ø*	*-Ø*	*-Ø*
	3f	*-ā* [-a]	*-ā*	*-ā*
pl	1c	*-āḵ (aḵ*)* [-ax] / *-āx*	*-āḵ (āx*)*	*-āxn*
	2c	*-īton / (-ītun)* [-itun][26]	*-īton*	*-īton*
	3c	*-ī / -ê* [-i] / [-é][27]	*-ī / -ê*	*-ī / -ay(hy)*

6.3 Substantives and adjectives

6.3.1 *Introduction*

In LUA, substantives and adjectives are not marked for state or case. The three different forms of substantives and adjectives in earlier Aramaic ('absolute', 'emphatic' and 'construct' state, differentiating between indefinite, defi-

26. According to Polotsky 1996: 15, the second plural suffix also has an alternative form with [e] when functioning as object: '*šqijl-etun-lij* "I took you (pl)" '. I did not come across any examples of this construction in Syriac script.

27. Like the 3pl suffix of the first series, this suffix always carries main stress.

nite, and dependent usages of the word) have disappeared in LUA. In CS the various forms still exist, but have lost much of their distinctive value. Nearly all Aramaic substantives have survived only in their 'emphatic' form, ending in *-ā* or *-tā*. Loanwords were taken over in their original form, often ending with a consonant, resembling the 'absolute' rather than the 'emphatic' forms.

In many Aramaic words, the difference between substantives and adjectives is not morphologically marked, although both groups, substantives as well as adjectives, have a number of derivational suffixes that are unique for that group. Functionally, substantives and adjectives are different from each other, and can be employed only in one of the two functions.

Substantives as well as adjectives usually have main stress on the penultimate, but in a number of loanwords the ultimate has maintained its stressed caracter.

6.3.2 *Substantive formation*

Although most of the nominal derivational suffixes of earlier Aramaic do not seem to be productive anymore, a few of them still are. Additional derivational suffixes were brought into LUA by loanwords from surrounding languages, which, however, in most instances did not spread to Aramaic words. Agent and action nouns are regularly derived from verbal roots.

Productive suffixes in LUA:

-(n)āyā	'inhabitant of' (also adjectival)
-utā	abstract noun (also very easily attached to loanwords)
-onā [-una]	diminutive

The most important Turkish and Persian suffixes are:

-cī (T)	agent
-kār (P)	agent
-dār (P)	possessor

Two kinds of verbal nouns can be derived from each of the three verbal patterns (cf. 6.5.2): an *agent* noun with the endings *-ānā* (m) and *-āntā* [-anta] (f) related to the SUB stem, and an *action* noun with the ending *-tā* (f) related to the INF stem.[28]

28. A third type of verbal noun, i.e., *qāṭolā* [qatula] (expressing the agent), survives in a number of forms: *yālopā, zābonā, 'āḇorā* (m) and *'aḇurtā* (f). It is uncertain whether it still is productive in LUA.

		agent	action
I	regular	*pārq-ān-ā*	*prāqtā*
	III-*y*	*xāzy-ān-ā*	*xzêtā*
IIa	regular	*zābn-ān-ā*[29]	*zābāntā*
	III-*y*	*sāpy-ān-ā / -tā*	*sāpêtā*
IIb	regular	*madḇeqān-ā*	*madḇaqtā*
	III-*y*	*maxzīyānā / tā*	*maxzêtā*

6.3.3 *Gender*

In LUA there are two grammatical genders: masculine and feminine. In verbal nouns the endings consistently reflect this grammatical gender, as they do in a considerable number of other Aramaic substantives. However, in many other substantives, whether of Aramaic or of foreign origin, the morphology of the noun does not necessarily reflect the gender, even if the endings are identical with those of the verbal nouns. Although grammatical gender, thus, is not adequately marked, it influences the form of certain adjectives (6.3.7), and it governs, in case the noun phrase functions as subject or definite object, the gender of the subject and object suffixes attached to the verbal stem. The regular endings for masculine and feminine substantives are:

sg m	*-ā*
sg f	*-tā*
pl m	*-(C)-i*
pl f	*-(C)-āti*

6.3.4 *Number*

Various plural endings are present in LUA, but all of them have the *-i* ending (reflecting CS *-ē*) in common. This *-i* ending was analogously transferred to endings originally ending on *-ā*. Thus the six principal endings are: (1) *-i*, (2) *-āti*, (3) *-wāti*, (4) *-yāti*, (5) *-āni*, and (6) *-āC*$^{2/3}$*i*.[30] These six endings are attached to nouns with different endings. A large number of words, both with consonantal and *-ā* endings, have the plural *-i*. The distribution of the other plural suffixes is hardly predictable, even when many forms may be understandable on the basis of related forms in CS. Many words have more than one plural form, sometimes conveying different meanings.[31]

29. In the Anglican press, the CS *m*-prefix is written in IIa and IIb forms (*mzābnān-ā /-tā*), because this consonant was pronounced in certain mountain dialects.

30. I.e., doubling of the last consonant: *berkā — birkāki, peqqā — peqqāqi*.

31. Maclean's dictionary (1901) lists the plural form of every substantive. In Stoddard 1855: 113-17, Nöldeke 1868: 132-46, and Maclean 1895: 39-54, the various plural forms are systematically treated. For an overview of the various plural formations in Aradhin Aramaic, see Krotkoff 1982: 41-44.

6.3.5 *State*

As mentioned in 6.3.1, the state distinctions of earlier Aramaic between 'emphatic', 'construct' and 'absolute' state have disappeared in LUA. Although the distinction between definite and indefinite is no longer expressed in noun morphology, it has not lost its function in the grammar of the language.

How is state marked? Definite noun phrases are marked by the presence of demonstrative pronouns, pronominal suffixes and personal names, and by the absence of the indefinite marker *xā* 'a', 'one'. Definite objects need a coreferential pronominal element in the verbal form (cf. 6.6). In some clauses, these coreferential pronouns serve as a marker of the definiteness of the object, but in most cases the object noun is marked as usual for definiteness by suffixes or demonstrative pronouns.

Indefinite noun phrases are marked by the presence of *xā* and by the absence of markers for definiteness. Since definite nominal phrases can also be unmarked, this implies that for some noun phrases their state has to be derived from the context only. However, most unmarked noun phrases are indefinite.

6.3.6 *Genitive*

Two different structures are employed to denote possession. In the unmarked form, oblique pronominal suffixes (series i, 6.2.6) are attached to the independent noun, replacing the vowel endings. The difference between suffixes with masculine singular and plural nouns, which is present in CS and other Aramaic languages, is not present in LUA or other Neo-Aramaic dialects.

sg	*-C-ā*	*-C-suf*	*yemm-ā* > *yemm-ī* 'my mother'
	-C	*-C-suf*	*mulk* > *mulk-ī* 'my estate'
pl	*-C-i*	*-C-suf*	*sāhd-i* > *sāhd-ī* 'my witnesses'

When a certain emphasis is needed or when the noun is indefinite, the preposition *dīy-* (related to the particle *d-*) is employed with the same series of pronominal suffixes (i).

bronā dīy-uhy 'the/a son of him' > 'his son'

The particle *d-* is also employed if the genitive relationship between two nouns has to be expressed.[32]

bronā d-malkā[33] 'the/a son of the king'

32. On this use of d-, see in particular Pennacchietti 1996.

33. In some texts of Bedjan and the Protestant missionaries (BT) written as *bronih d-malkā*, see 6.2.6.

In certain fixed expressions the old synthetic genitive has left its traces. In a couple of them the 'construct' element seems to be productive, and can be employed with other nouns.

brā(t) īdā [bra iʸda] 'daughter of the hand' > 'glove'
brā(t) qālā [bra qala] 'daughter of voice' > 'echo', 'report'
bnay Urmī 'sons of Urmia' > 'inhabitant(s) of Urmia'
māri ṭimā 'possesser of worth' > 'worthy' (cf. 6.3.7)

6.3.7 *Adjectives*

Several specific adjective formations occur in LUA. Suffixes can be attached to substantives to form adjectives (1), and participles can be employed as adjectives (only first stem pattern, cf. 6.5.2) (2). The old adjectival pattern *šappīrā* occurs rather often, but has nearly always lost its gemination (cf. 5.2.2.2-3). A substantive preceded by *māri*, 'possessing', 'endowed with', also functions as an adjective.[34]

(1)	*-C-ā*	*-C-ānā*
	-C-ā	*-C-āyā*
	-C	*-C-ānā*
(2)	*s-p-q*	*spīqā* (empty, vain)
	d-ḵ-y	*deḵyā* (clean, pure)
(3)	*b-s-m*	*bāsīmā* (pleasant)
	š-p-r	*šāpīrā* (beautiful)
	q-d-š	*qaddīšā* (holy)
(4)		*māri mīyā* (watery) *(= mīyānā)*
		māri dāweltā (wealthy)

If the adjective belongs to one of the regular buildings (1-3), it agrees with the substantive in number and gender.

sg	m	*-ā / -yā*[35]	*(')nāšā šāpīrā*
	f	*-tā / -ītā*	*baḵtā qaddīštā*
pl	c	*-i / -yi*	*baḵtāti šāpīri*

A few irregular adjectives have survived from Classical Syriac, whereas a few loanwords brought their 'own' declension with them, like, e.g.:

sg m / f / pl	*(')xi(r)nā / (')xi(r)tā / (')xi(r)ni* (other)
sg m / f / pl	*kurā* (< P, T, K) / *kuri* / *kuri* (blind)

34. Perhaps a fifth regular pattern consists of the doubling of nouns, as described by Maclean 1895: 62, e.g., *rangi rangi* 'colours colours' > 'multicoloured'.
35. In case of of III-y verbs.

A great many adjectives are indeclinable for number and gender, whether they are of Aramaic origin or borrowed from other languages; e.g., *qurbā* 'near', *tāzā* 'new', and *sôġul* 'dear'. This also holds true for numerals, although for *xā* 'one' sometimes *xdā* (f) is written. The latter form may be due to the fact that in some dialects the difference between masculine and femine numeral forms still exists.

Adjectives regularly follow the substantive, but a small group precedes it. Among these are numerals when employed adjectivally as well as attributive demonstratives (6.2.3-4). The most important (indeclinable) adjectives preceding the noun are:

ṣpāyī (good)
rābā (much)

There are no special forms for comparative or superlative degrees in LUA. Comparison is expressed by the phrase *buš* [adjective] *men* 'more [adjective] then'.

hô ktāḇā buš ṣpāyī men d-āhā ktāḇā 'this book is better than that book'

6.4 Adverbs, prepositions, and sentence connectives

6.4.1 *Adverbs*

No specific adverb formation occurs in this type of Aramaic. Many adverbs are loanwords, others are compound forms, consisting of prepositions and nouns (both from Aramaic and non-Aramaic words), and others are common Aramaic adverbs. The same applies to interrogative adverbs.[36]

6.4.2 *Prepositions*

Many of the old Aramaic prepositions have been retained, but a series of new ones have been added. The Aramaic prepositions consisting of one consonant, *l-, b-, d-* (to, in, of), are written together with the substantive, without an additional vowel. The other prepositions, of Aramaic or non-Aramaic origin, are written separately.

Prepositions not found in earlier Aramaic often consist of a compound form of several elements. These are usually connected to the following substantive by the particle *d-*.[37] This *d-* is employed with all prepositions when preceding

36. For lists of adverbs, see the nineteenth-century grammars, Stoddard 1855: 134-40, Nöldeke 1868: 158-69, and Maclean 1895: 156-69.

37. For a list of examples, see Maclean 1895: 176-78. Compare Goldenberg 1995: 30, for a discussion of the parallel structure in CS Peshitta.

a demonstrative pronoun. Most of the single prepositions take pronominal suffixes of the first series (i), whereas the compound prepositions do not take suffixes.

l-baytā 'towards home'
men baytā 'from home'
l-d-hê baḵtā 'towards that woman'
but xāter d- 'because of'

6.4.3 *Sentence connectives*

LUA employs co-ordinating and subordinating connectives. The most important of these are:

co-ordinating	*u-* (and)
	īnā (but)
	yan (or)
subordinating	*d-* (introduction of reported[38] and subordinate clauses)
	qat (introduction of reported clauses)
	en (if)
	sābāb (because) (with or without *d-*)
	cunki (because) (with or without *d-*)
	qā d- / qat (in order that)

6.5 Verbs

6.5.1 *Introduction*

Although the verbal system has undergone great changes as compared with older forms of Aramaic, the basic Semitic verbal system has remained intact. The two main characteristics of this verbal system are the employment of more than one form of a verbal root to express distinct but related semantic functions (stem patterns), and of different 'stem forms' for each stem pattern, constituting the derivational bases.

6.5.2 *Stem forms and stem patterns*

All verb forms are based on roots consisting of three or four consonants. From one root, five principal forms, 'stems', can be derived by adding different vowel patterns, each having its own pattern of conjugation for number, gender and person and having its specific type of object suffixes.

38. Only in the Protestant texts.

The five basic stem forms are: the imperative stem (IMP), the subjunctive stem (SUB), the preterite stem (PRET), the infinitive stem (INF), and the participle stem (PART).[39] The forms are given here with their inflectional suffixes in the order in which they are attached to the stems.[40]

IMP	*proq*	sg/pl	object ii
SUB	*pāreq*	subject iv	object ii
PRET[41]	*preq-*	object iv	subject ii
INF	*prāqā=*	object i	copula iii
PART	*prīqā=*	object i	copula iii

The stem patterns in LUA are the remnants of the older Aramaic active stem patterns *pʿal*, *paʿʿel* and *afʿel*. However, instead of a three-part opposition, now a two-part opposition is at work. Stem pattern I, the 'simple' pattern, originating in *pʿal*, is contrasted with pattern II, which originates in a merger of *paʿʿel* and *afʿel*. Stem pattern II is divided into two groups, one for triradicals, the other for quadriradicals, including some verbs with a doubled middle consonant. It should be noted that this division in IIa and IIb is not identical with former *paʿʿel* versus former *afʿel*, because three-radical *afʿel*-stems (from II-y verbs) belong to IIa, whereas IIb consists of all types of four-radical stems, among these former *afʿel*, but also *paʿʿel* stems with a doubled middle consonant, or original four-radical stems that have lost the prefix *m-*.

Quite a number of triradical roots are conjugated in both stem patterns (I and IIa), whereas other triradical roots have a counterpart in the quadriradical pattern (IIb) through an *m*-prefix. However, the relationship between roots in conjugation I and those in IIa and IIb cannot be adequately described synchronically, and there does not seem to be a regular, productive relationship between these two classes any more. Verbal loans from Arabic may be conjugated in both patterns, with a preference for second pattern. Loans from other languages usually are incorporated into the verbal system as cognate objects, conjugated by the verb *ʿḇādā*.

39. The earlier Aramaic forms from which these stems are derived are: IMP < imperative, SUB < active participle, absolute state, PRET < passive participle, absolute state, INF < noun of action / infinitive, PART < passive participle, emphatic state.

40. For the four series of pronominal suffixes, including the copula, see 6.2.6-9.

41. Note that the PRET stem in origin is a passive formation: *kteḇ-lī* might be interpreted as 'it is written by me'. If 'more things' were written, the form would be *kteḇ-ê-lī*, 'they are written by me'. This passive formation, however, is employed to denote a regular preterite and in synchronic description this form should rather be described as active, by reinterpreting the object and subject suffixes, thus 'I wrote [it]' and 'I wrote them'. The preterite formation in Neo-Aramaic has been the subject of much debate; cf., a.o., Kutscher 1969, Hopkins 1989, Goldenberg 1992, Kapeliuk 1996, and Polotsky 1996: 12-18.

I	*prāqā*[42]	(simple, often intransitive)
IIa	*zāboni*[43]	(often transitive / causative)
IIb	*madḇuqi / xadduti*	(often transitive / causative)

6.5.3 *Classes of weak verbs*

Three classes of weak verbs are present in LUA. Verbs of these classes have slightly different vowel patterns and consonantal structures in some of the basic stem forms and stem patterns.

The first group consists of the verbs beginning with a vowel or with *y* in the SUB stem (I-*v*/*y*). The verbs with initial vowel originate in roots with original *ʾ* and *ʿ*, and are often written with these consonants in the Syriac script. However, the latter have disappeared as phonemes (cf. 5.6.1.2-3). Most of the verbs with I-*y* were I-*y* in earlier Aramaic, whereas some come from I-*ʾ* roots, like *ʾsr*. In many roots with I-*y*, metathesis of the first and second radical takes place in the INF stem.[44]

The second group of verbs consists of verbs with second consonant *y*. They originate in a merger of stems with with II-*y*, II-*w*,[45] II-*ʿ*, and II-*ʾ*.[46] The orthography of these verbs is somewhat confused, but very often the corresponding CS consonant is still written, sometimes with phonemic *y* added to it. In the SUB stem often middle *ʾ* is written, even if the stem is originally II-*y* or II-*w*.[47]

The third group of weak verbs consists of verbs with a vocalic ending in the 3ms PRET and SUB stems. These verbs originate in roots with third *y* and third *ʿ* in earlier Aramaic.[48] To understand the various forms of these stems, it is necessary to describe these verbs as III-*y*, even if some of them originate in III-*ʿ*. In the latter case, Syriac orthography writes the original root consonant *ʿ* in all forms, but adds *y* when necessary for the pronunciation.

first *v*/*y*	*āḵel* / *(ʾ)ḵālā* [xala] 'to eat', *yādeʿ* / *(y)dāʿyā* [daya] 'to know' *yālep* / *lyāpā* 'to learn'

42. Because in LUA the SUB of the first stem pattern is not different from that of the second (IIa), I prefer to employ the INF stem as quotation form.

43. Note that the second vowel in both stem patterns, IIa and IIb, is [u]: [zabuni] and [madwuqi]. The *o*/*u* alternation is due to an orthographic convention of the Protestant press, cf. 5.9.2.12.

44. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 62-3.

45. A few LUA verbs have middle-*w*, and these are conjugated according to the regular patterns.

46. I did not find a LUA correspondence to a CS II-*ʾ* verb.

47. Compare the paragraphs on *y*, *ʾ*, and *ʿ* in 5.6.

48. Probably stems with III-*ʾ* also merged into this category, but I did not come across any examples.

second *y* *qā'em* [qayem] / *qyāmā* 'to stand',
third *y* I *xāzi* / *xzāyā*, 'to see'
IIa *sāpi* / *sāpowi* [sapuwi] 'to deliver'
IIb *maxzi* / *maxzuwi* [maxzuwi] 'to show'

In the following, a complete paradigm will be given of the first stem pattern of each stem form with a regular root. Of the other stem patterns the basic stem form will be given. The I-*v*/*y* and II-*y* verbs are irregular in the first stem pattern only, because their counterparts in IIa or IIb have lost their distinctive *y* in this pattern (cf. *mā(')ḵoli*, *maddu'wi*, *maqqumi* and *mālopi*). The verbs III-*y* have deviant forms in both stem patterns. If a type of weak root is not mentioned, it conforms to the regular pattern.

6.5.4 *Imperative stem*

The imperative stem has only two forms, a singular and a plural form. The distinction between the masculine and feminine singular forms is orthographical only. The basic pattern is CCuC, although the Syriac orthography suggests an [o] vowel. In the III-*y* pattern, the [u] is not present, and an *-ī* ending reflects the stem consonant *y*.

Stem pattern I

	regular	I-*v*
sg m	*proq*[49]	*(')ḵol* / *('')ḇod* / *(y)lop*
sg f	*proq-y*[50]	*(')ḵol-y* / *('')ḇod-y* / *(y)lop-y*
pl c	*proq-on*[51]	*(')ḵol-on* / *('')ḇod-on* / *(')lop-on*
	II-*y*	III-*y*
sg m	*qu(m)* / *puš*	*xz-ī*
sg f	*qum-y*	*xz-ī*
pl c	*qum-on*	*xz-imon*[52]

Stem pattern IIa

	regular	III-*y*
all forms	*zāben-*	*sāp-i-*
alternative pl	*zābne-mon*	*sāpi-mon*

49. In the Protestant texts from before 1850 and in Socin and Merx, usually *pruq-*.

50. This *-y* is an orthographical convention taken over from CS to distinguish m from f. In the spoken language there is no difference between the two forms.

51. In the early Protestant press, in Merx and Socin, and in the Anglican press: *-u(n)* ending in all stem patterns.

52. In Anglican press: *xzi'mun*. Compare also Nöldeke 1868: 226, who notes this strange plural ending *-mun*, which incidentally also occurs with strong verbs. This ending probably arose under influence of the plural ending of imperative *q-y-m: qu(m)* (sg) and *qumun* (pl).

Stem pattern IIb

	regular	III-*y*
all forms	*madḇeq-*	*maxzī-*
	xaddet-	

6.5.5 *Subjunctive stem*

The basic form of the SUB stem is CaCiC, in both stem patterns. This stem is conjugated for the subject by the nominative suffixes of series iv. In the II-*y* verbs, [a] + [y] contracts to [e], except when [y] is in intervocalic position. In verbs with vocalic ending, original [y] has survived as the third radical in the feminine forms (1fsg, 2fsg, and 3fsg), but assimilated with the second vowel [i] in the other forms. In stem pattern IIb, the last radical is doubled when followed by a vowel (cf. 5.2.1.5).

Stem pattern I

		regular	II-*y*	III-*y*
sg	1m	*pārq-en*[53]	*qêm-en*	*xāz-en*
	1f	*pārq-ān*	*qêm-ān*	*xāzy-ān*
	2m	*pārq-et*	*qêm-et*	*xāz-et*[54]
	2f	*pārq-at(y)*	*qêm-at(y)*	*xāzy-at(y)*
	3m	*pāreq*[55]	*qā'em*[56]	*xāz-i*[57]
	3f	*pārq-ā*	*qêmā*	*xāzy-ā*
pl	1c	*pārq-āḵ*[58]	*qêm-āḵ*	*xāz-āḵ*
	2c	*pārq-īton*	*qêm-īton*	*xāz-iton*[59]
	3c	*pārq-ī*	*qêm-ī*	*xāz-i*

Stem pattern IIa

		regular	III-*y*
sg	m	*zāben / zābn-*	*dāḵ-*
	f	*zābn-*	*dāḵy-*
pl	c	*zābn-ī*	*dāḵī*

Stem pattern IIb

		regular	III-*y*
sg	m	*madḇeq / madḇeqq-*	*maxz-*
	f	*madḇq-ā / madḇeqq-*	*maxzy-*
pl	c	*madḇq-ī / madḇeqq-*	*maxzi*

53. In the earliest Protestant issues (before 1846), the *-ā-* in closed syllables is written as *a-*, thus *parqen*, conforming to the pronunciation [parqin].

54. In Bedjan's works from 1893 onwards: *xāzēt*.

55. In the older works of Bedjan (until 1893) *pāriq*.

56. In the Protestant publications until 1846 the usual spelling was *qāyem*. In later ones this orthography sporadically occurs, cf. 5.6.1.2/3 and 5.6.2.2/3.

57. In Bedjan's works from 1893 onwards: *xāze*.

58. In later Bedjan and BT '93 *-ax*, in the Anglican press *-axn*.

59. In later Bedjan (post 1893): *xāzēton*.

6.5.6 *Preterite stem*

The PRET stem is conjugated for the subject by the oblique pronominal suffixes from series ii. Note that assimilation of the *l-* of the suffix with *n* or *r* of the stem takes place. Third person object suffixes (see 6.6) are infixed and thus precede the subject suffixes.

The basic pattern of the first stem pattern is CCiC, while for the second pattern one finds CuCiC or CuCCiC.[60]

Stem pattern I

sg	1c	*preq-lī*[61]
	2m	*preq-luḵ*
	2f	*preq-lāḵ(y)*
	3m	*preq-li*
	3f	*preq-lā*
pl	1c	*preq-lan*
	2c	*preq-lôxun*
	3c	*preq-lon*

I-*y*	*(')ḵel- / (y)lep-*
II-*y*	*qem-*
III-*y*	*xzi-*[62] */ xezy-* (with 3fs and 3pl suffixes)

Stem pattern IIa

regular	*zuben-*
III-*y*	*supi-*

Stem pattern IIb

regular	*mudḇeq-*
	xuddet-
III-*y*	*muxzi-*

6.5.7 *Infinitive stem*

The INF stem is preceded by the preposition *b-* when employed with the copula, or *l-* when employed infinitivally.[63] An [i] vowel is added to avoid a consonant cluster. This [i] becomes [i:] when the initial syllable is open be-

60. It is noteworthy that the basic patterns of the second stem are not derived from the passive participles of the *pa"el* (*mpa"al*) and *af'el* (*maf'al*), but from the participles of the old Aramaic passive stem patterns *pu"al* (*mpu"el*) and *huf'al* (*muf'al*).

61. In the Anglican press the suffix is written separately from the PRET stem, whereas in the other presses the suffix is connected to the stem. For the variations between the presses in the suffixes, see series ii (6.2.7). In the Anglican press, the PRET stem is written the same way as the PART stem: *prīq-*.

62. In post-1893 Bedjan: *xze-*, in Anglican press: *xze'*.

63. Polotsky (1996: 18-21) distinguishes between prepositional and 'gerundial' use of *b-*, the latter being the form with the copula.

cause of I-*v*. This is reflected in the Syriac orthography by alternating between *e* and *i* or *ī*. The basic stem pattern is CCaCa.

In the second stem pattern (CaCuCi or CaCCuCi), the prefix *b-* presumably assimilated with original initial *m* and has left no traces. Under influence of the vowel [u], verbs with III-*y* have a *w* as third consonant, instead of the *y* in the first pattern.

Without preposition the infinitive stem can be employed as an independent noun.

Stem pattern I

regular	*prāqā*	*beprāqā=*	*leprāqā*
I-*v*	*ʾk̲ālā*	*biʾk̲ālā=*	*liʾk̲ālā*
	(y)dāʿyā / (y)daʿyā	*bīdāʿyā=*	*līdāʿyā*
II-y	*qyāmā*	*beqyāmā=*	*leqyāmā*
III-y	*xzāyā*	*bexzāyā=*	*lexzāyā*

Stem pattern IIa

regular	*pāroqi*	*pāroqi=*	*lpāroqi*
III-*y*	*sāpowi*[64]	*sāpowi=*	*lsāpowi*

Stem pattern IIb

regular	*madb̲uqi*	*madb̲uqi=*	*lmadb̲uqi*
	xaduti	*xaduti=*	*lxaduti*
III-y	*maxzuwi*	*maxzuwi=*	*lmaxzuwi*

6.5.8 *Participle Stem*

The PART stem is built on the pattern CCiCa in the first, and on CuCiCa or CuCCiCa in the second stem pattern. The participle stem has three different endings, [-a] for masculine, [-ta] for feminine and [-i] for plural, like the regular adjectives (cf. 6.3.7). The feminine ending causes the shortening of [i] in the preceding closed syllable. Although this basic pattern is the same as that of the PRET stem, the Syriac orthography of the two stems is not the same, not in the Protestant press nor in Bedjan's writings. In the second stem pattern, both in IIa and IIb, the last radical is doubled when a vowel precedes and follows.

Stem pattern I

		regular
sg	m	*prīq-ā*
	f	*prīq-tā*
pl	c	*prīq-i*

64. In later texts (BT '93, Anglican press) also *sāpoyi*. The pronunciation in Urmia certainly was [-uwi], but the *y* was probably written on historical grounds.

	I-*y*	II-*y*	III-*y*
sg m	*(')ḵīl-ā / (y)līp-ā*	*qīm-ā*	*xezy-ā*
f	*(')ḵīl-tā / (y)līp-tā*	*qīm-tā*	*xzī-tā*
pl c	*(')ḵīl-i / (y)līp-i*	*qīm-i*	*xezy-i*

Stem pattern IIa

	regular	III-*y*
sg m	*zubn-ā*	*supy-ā*
sg f	*zuben-tā*	*supī-tā*
pl c	*zubenn-i*	*sup-i*

Stem pattern IIb

	regular	III-*y*
sg m	*mudḇeqq-ā*	*muxzī-yā*
f	*mudḇeq-tā*	*muxzī-tā*
pl c	*mudḇeqq-ī*	*muxz-i*

6.5.9 *Some Irregular Verbs*

A small number of frequently used irregular verbs are given with their five basic stem forms, in phonemic transcription and Syriac orthography.[65]

'to be'[66]		
IMP	[wi] / [wimun]	*(h)wī / (h)wīmon*
SUB	[haw-] / [hoy-] / [haw-]	*hāw-* (m/c) / *hôy-* (f) / *hāwi* (sg3m)
PRET	[wi]	*(h)wi-*
INF	[-i-waya]	*-(h)wāyā*
PART	[wi-ya]	*(h)wī-yā*
'to go'		
IMP	[zi] / [xuš-][67]	*zi (zi') / xuš-*
SUB	[azil] / [azzin]	*āzel / āz(l)en*
PRET	[zi] / [xiš-]	*(')zi- (zi') / xeš-*
INF	[-i-zala] / [-i-rixša]	*ī-zālā / -e-rexšā*
PART	[zila] / [xiš-a]	*(')zilā / xīš-ā*
'to come'		
IMP	[ta] / [timun]	*tā / timon*
SUB	[at-] / [aty-] / [ati]	*āt- / āty- / āti*
PRET	[ti-]	*(')ti-*
INF	[-i-taya]	*-i'-tāyā*
PART	[ti-ya]	*(')tī-yā*

65. See Maclean 1895: 119-133, for an exhaustive list of irregular verbs.

66. The verb *hwāyā* is employed in three different ways: as a main verb, meaning 'to be born'; as a copular verb, 'to be' and 'to become', supplying the tense and aspect references missing in the conjugation of the copula (6.2.8); and, with the suffixes of series ii, supplying the missing tenses and aspects of the conjugation of *īt* (6.8).

67. The stem *rxš* has taken over some of the parts of the conjugation of *'zl*. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 61. Different dialects use different combinations of the two parallel stems, cf. Maclean 1901.

'to give'

IMP	[hal] / [hallun]	*ha(ḇ)l / ha(ḇ)lon*
SUB	[yawil] / [yawin]	*yā(h)ḇel / yā(h)ḇen*
PRET	[yiwil] [yuwil-]	*ye(h)ḇel- / yu(h)ḇel-*
INF	[i-yawa]	*ī-yā(h)ḇā*
PART	[yuwa] / [yiwilta]	*yu(h)ḇā / ye(h)ḇeltā*

6.6 Verbs with object suffixes

6.6.1 *Introduction*

All stems can take object suffixes, although for some of them their employment is rather limited. The pronominal object suffixes are taken from the same series of pronominal elements as some of the subject suffixes (6.2.6-9). The function of a pronominal element (subject or object suffix) is dependent on the stem form. As summarized in 6.5.1, all verbal stems except the PRET stem have object suffixes from the oblique series; the IMP and SUB stem from series ii, and the INF and PART stem from series i. These stems have subject suffixes from the nominative series iii and iv. The PRET stem, on the other hand, employs oblique suffixes to refer to the agent of the verb (ii), and nominative suffixes to refer to the patient (iv). This is due to the passive origin of the PRET stem, in which the patient originally referred to the grammatical subject of the form, and the agent was constructed as a prepositional complement to the verb (*l-* + suffix). In the modern language, the agent has become the grammatical subject, and the patient the grammatical object.[68]

Object suffixes may refer to pronominal patient or dative objects, as well as, coreferentially, to direct nominal objects (object marking). Different text corpora employ different strategies of object marking.

6.6.2 *The five stem forms with object suffixes*

6.6.2.1 IMP stem

The imperative stem takes object suffixes from series ii. The initial *l* of the suffix assimilates with preceding *n* or *r*. In the latter case, the suffix is written as one word with the preceding verbal form, whereas with other final consonants the object suffix is written separately.

	o-suf		
sg	3msg	*dḇoq=lih*	take it / him
pl	3msg	*dḇoqon-nih*	take(pl) it / him

68. For further literature, see n. 41.

6.6.2.2 SUB stem

The subjunctive stem also takes its object suffixes from series ii. These suffixes follow the subject ending of the fourth series (iv). The initial *l* of the suffix assimilates with preceding *n* or *r*. Like the object suffixes with IMP stems, these suffixes are written separately when not assimilated.

s-suf	o-suf		
1msg	3msg	*dāḇq-en-ni*	I take it
2msg	3msg	*dāḇq-et-lih*[69]	you take it
3msg	3msg	*dāḇeq-Ø=lih*	he takes it
3fsg	3msg	*dāḇq-ā=lih*	she takes it
3pl	3msg	*dāḇq-ī=lih*	they take it

6.6.2.3 PRET stem

The preterite stem takes object suffixes from the fourth series (iv), which precede the subject suffixes (ii). These suffixes thus occur in the same order as with the SUB stem.

Most of the object suffixes with the PRET stem are of the third person feminine and plural. In all grammars the first and second person suffixes are given, but in the texts from the nineteenth century they are rare, in the Protestant texts as well as in Bedjan's or the Anglican ones.[70] A third person masculine singular object cannot be marked, because its suffix is zero (*dḇeq-Ø-lī*). Thus there is no opposition between the PRET with a third person masculine singular object suffix and the PRET stem without an object suffix. In the Protestant press this ambiguity is resolved by employing an alternative spelling for the *subject* suffix in third person masculine singular PRET forms in which such an object suffix is needed.

o-suf	s-suf		
1msg	3msg	*dḇīq-enn-i*[71]	he took me
2msg	3msg	*dḇīq-ett-i*	he took you
3msg	3msg	*dḇeq-ø-li* / *dḇeq-ø-lih*	he took [him]
3fsg	3msg	*dḇeq-ā-li*	he took it/her
3pl	3msg	*dḇeq-ê-li*	he took them

69. In Bedjan *l-* is found assimilated to *-t*, thus *dāḇqettih*.

70. Compare Stoddard 1855: 106; according to him only 3msg (Ø) and 2pl do not occur. Nöldeke does not treat the object suffixes of the PRET stem with the object suffixes of the other stem forms, but he does mention, apart from the third person suffixes, the use of the 1sg ('ziemlich häufig') and 1pl ('sehr selten') suffix in the Protestant texts (Nöldeke 1868: 222). Maclean (1895: 136-7) again has all possible forms, but he adds that these forms are not common in the colloquial language of Urmia. Compare, however, also Goldenberg (1992: 125-6 and n. 47), where he notes that the first and second person object suffixes occur regularly in Soviet Urmia Aramaic. Polotsky (1961: 21 n. 1) suggests that in Bedjan's dialect of Salmas the forms with first and second person suffixes were unknown.

71. Rare, but cf. ZdB 50/10/77A20: *burḵanni* / blessed.me(f).he / 'he blessed me'.

The shortcomings of the use of object suffixes on the PRET stem are supplemented by employing an alternative periphrastic preterite verbal phrase.[72] This periphrastic preterite consists of the SUB stem with a proclitic element *qam*.[73] The SUB stem can take all suffixes and the periphrastic preterite, therefore, is regularly employed to express third person masculine singular suffixes. However, the use of the periphrastic preterite is not limited to cases of obvious deficiency in the PRET forms, but is regularly found with all persons and numbers. This suggests that the use of the PRET stem with suffixes was considered difficult, even by native speakers.[74] The periphrastic preterite is sometimes even employed when no suffix is present, especially in the texts of Merx and Socin.[75]

s-suf	o-suf		
3msg	3msg	*qam dāḇeq=lih*	he took him
3msg	2pl	*qam dāḇeq=lôḵun*	he took you

6.6.2.4 INF stem and PART stem

The infinitive and participle stems are nominal forms and therefore the first series of suffixes (i) is employed, in the same way as these suffixes are attached to other nouns. The suffix replaces the *ā* or *i* ending of the noun (cf. 6.3.6). The copula (iii) follows the object suffix.

o-suf	copula		
1sg	3msg	*be-dḇāq-ī=(y)li*	he is taking me
3msg	3msg	*be-dḇāq-u(hy)=(y)li*	he is taking it/him
3pl	3msg	*be-dḇāq-ê=(y)li*	he is taking them
o-suf	copula		
1sg	3msg	*dḇīq-ī=(y)li*	he has taken me
3fsg	3fsg	*dḇīqt-uh=(y)lā*	she has taken it/him

6.6.3 *Some remarks on the syntax of object marking*

The category of 'objects' consists of two different constituent types: 'direct' and 'indirect' objects. The relationship of indirect objects to the verb is mediated by the preposition *qā* / *qat-*, whereas direct objects complement the verb without a preposition. Usually the direct object relation is employed to refer to patients, whereas the indirect construction is employed for datives.

72. For an overview of the different ways in which in Neo-Aramaic dialects the difficulties with the PRET stem with object suffixes are solved, see Pennacchietti 1994.

73. Cf. Pennacchietti 1997 for possible etymologies of this particle.

74. So Marogulov 1935/1976: 60, who notes the complexity of the PRET-stem with object suffixes. Stoddard 1855: 41, considers the use of the periphrastic preterite to be a matter of 'euphony', if the usual form 'does not readily take suffixes'.

75. So also Polotsky 1961: 21, n. 1.

Transitive verbs may govern a direct and an indirect object at the same time.[76]

If a direct object is definite (cf. 6.3.5), a coreferential suffix is attached to the verb, comparable to the way the subject is referred to in the verbal form. These suffixes are subject to the rules for pronominal object suffix attachment as summarized in the preceding paragraph. Definite indirect objects usually have no coreferential pronoun.

This is summarized in the following scheme:

	nominal + definite	nominal + indefinite	pronominal
patient	Vo O	V O	Vo
dative	V qa O	V qa O	V qat-o
pat. + dat.	Vo O qa O	V O qa O	Vo qat-o

This neat system is complicated by two other characteristics of object marking in LUA:

1. If the patient object of transitive verbs is indefinite (and thus not marked by an object suffix), a pronominal dative object may be represented by an object suffix attached to the verb, instead of to the preposition, thus, Vodat Opat.[77] In case of intransitive verbs, the dative object never becomes an object suffix connected the the verb.[78]
2. Animate patient objects, which usually are represented as direct objects, are sometimes constructed as datives, being introduced by *qā*.[79] Occasionally, probably because of the mixing of the two alternative constructions, definite indirect objects of this type are accompanied by a coreferential object suffix attached to the verbal form.[80]

In the Bible translations of the Protestants, this pattern of object marking is blurred by a strong influence of Classical Syriac grammar and the way this

76. Cf. Polotsky 1996: 31-39 on what he calls the 'intra-conjugational' (direct) and 'extraconjugational' (indirect) constructions. He explains the various conflicting constructions from a mixture of two fundamentally different types of verbal complementation, rather than from an interplay of direct and indirect constructions, as I prefer to see it.

77. For a large number of examples with the verb *īḇāyā* (*yhḇ*) 'to give', see Polotsky 1979: 21314 and Polotsky 1996: 37-39. See further Givón 1984a: 151-182 and 1984b: 172-79, for some remarks on the cross-linguistic description of the promotion of indirect dative objects to direct-objecthood.

78. Note, however, that some verbs which usually are treated as being intransitive, occasionally may become transitive: *āmrennuḵ* / I-say-you(sg) / I will say to you (Mat. 2:13, '93).

79. This happens in verbs like *mxāyā* 'to slay', *dḇāqā* 'to grasp', *bāruḵi* 'to bless', and *lyāṭā* 'to curse', and also in a number of verbs referring to answering: *tānuyi* 'to answer', *madduwi* 'to let know', *bā(ʾ)yā* 'to wish'. Verbs of the first group have this alternation between direct and indirect only with nominal objects (pronominal objects always appear as direct object suffixes), whereas those of the second group occur also with pronominal indirect objects (*qat*-suffix).

80. Cf. Merx 4.11: *qat qāṭil=(h)wā=lih qā hāywan* / REP he.kills=PAST=it IO animal / 'that he killed that animal'.

grammar is handled in the Peshitta text.[81] The most important feature taken over from CS is the use of the preposition *l-* as definite object marker, both for patient and dative objects, whereas an object suffix marking a definite object is rare. The dative marker *qā* is also rare. Human patient objects are regularly employed as datives, in the indirect construction with *l-*. With pronominal object suffixes, the preposition *l-* takes the form *el-*.

In ZdB, the regular patterns for object marking occur, although *l-* is often employed as dative marker instead of *qā*.

It is difficult to give exact rules for object marking in the Bible translations, because the final outcome results from the merger of CS and LUA patterns. However, the following scheme covers most of the instances:

	nominal + definite	nominal + indefinite	pronominal
patient	V l-O	V O	Vo
dative	V l-O	V l-O	V el-o

6.7 Tense and aspect

The five verbal stems, together with a limited number of particles, constitute the elements of the Neo-Aramaic verbal system. The combination of particle and verbal form is usually treated as one constituent which cannot be separated by other constituents. The semantic functions of tense and aspect of the various combinations can be summarized as follows:[82]

IMP	imperative
lā + IMP	prohibitive
SUB	subjunctive, jussive or subordinate
lā + SUB	prohibitive[83]
lā + SUB + *wa*	past subjunctive, jussive or subordinate
ki + SUB	present habitual, narrative
ki + SUB + *wa*	past habitual, past narrative
bet + SUB	future
bet + SUB + *wa*	future in the past

81. In some parts of OT (among which those parts of Genesis employed for the present research), the Peshitta is considerably influenced by the Hebrew original with regard to syntax and object marking devices.

82. Cf. Kapeliuk 1996 for a discussion of the many similarities between the Neo-Aramaic and the Persian verbal system.

83. According to Maclean 1895: 147, the difference between the two prohibitive forms (*lā* + IMP and *lā* + SUB) is that with the IMP stem 'a single action' is prohibited, whereas with SUB a 'continued action' is indicated. It is possible that an impersonal form employed in the Protestant texts, *lā (h)wi d-*, has to be explained as a contracted form of a negated SUB stem: *lā hāwi d-*, thus, 'let it not be that'.

li + SUB	negation of *ki* and *bet* + SUB[84]
qām + SUB	preterite (alternative for PRET with suffixes)
PRET	preterite
lā + PRET	negation of preterite
be- + INF + cop	present continuous
be- + INF + cop + *wa*	past continuous
li + cop + INF	negation of present continuous
le- + INF	infinitive, complement of finite verb
(')tāyā + *le-* + INF	passive[85]
PART + cop	perfect or passive[86]
PART + cop + *wa*	pluperfect
li + cop + PART	negation of perfect
pyāšā + PART	passive[87]

6.8 Pseudo-verbs

The existential particle *īt* [it] 'there is' functions to introduce indefinite topics into a story.[88] Its negated counterpart is *layt*[89] or *līt*[90] [lit], and a past tense is formed by adding the past marker *=(h)wā* [wa]. The particle is always complemented by an indefinite noun phrase referring to a new topic of the discourse, and is optionally complemented by one or more prepositional phrases. In the clause, the noun phrase and the prepositional phrase both are part of the new focus of the clause.

īt (īten)[91] *xā (')nāšā b-gantā*	there is a man in the garden
layt / līt / līten[92]	there is not
īt=(h)wa	there was

The particle [it] can be conjugated with the suffixes of series ii. Literally the phrase then means 'there is to Y(pron) X', X being the subject of the phrase.

84. Compare Stoddard 1855: 41, who mentions *lā bet* SUB as an 'emphatic' alternative for *li* SUB.

85. This form does not occur often in the texts, but is mentioned by Stoddard 1855: 101 and Marogulov 1976: 62 (§80). On the various passive forms, see also Nöldeke 1868: 287-90.

86. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 101-2.

87. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 97, who notes on this passive construction that it is common in the mountain dialects, but not in the spoken language of Urmia. The missionaries used it, however, in their printed texts.

88. Cf. also Polotsky 1996: 39.

89. Spelling in Protestant and Anglican press, based on CS spelling of this form.

90. Spelling in Bedjan's texts.

91. In Bedjan's texts often an alternative form with *-en* ending occurs.

92. This form occurs only in Bedjan's texts. There is no difference with *līt* or *layt*.

This combination of particle and suffix serves as the verb 'to have': 'Y has X'. When the possessor is nominal, the phrase becomes: Y *it-lih* X, literally: 'Y there.is-to.him X', thus 'Y has X'.

This phrase can be negated by employing [lit] + suffix, whereas for the past the past marker [wa] is added, preceding the suffix. When other 'tenses' or 'aspects' are needed, the pattern is complemented by forms of *hwāyā* 'to be' with the same suffixes, to be understood on the basis of the original dival function of this suffix series.[93]

īt=lī	there is to me > I have
bāḵtā īt=lāh laxmā	the woman there is to her bread > the woman has bread
īt=(h)wā-lan	there was to us > we had
layt=(h)wa=l(h)on	there was not to them > they had not
hāwi=lī / hôyā=lī[94]	I should have..
hwilā=lī / qam hāwi=lī[95]	I obtained ..

A limited number of transitive verbs, like *bsāmā* 'to please' and *tāyā* 'to go', may employ the original dative suffix of series ii in the same manner as *hwāyā*, in the SUB stem as well as in the PRET stem.[96]

bāsmā=lī	I am pleased..
bsim-lā=lī	I was pleased..

The suffixes of the second series also are employed with the noun *ṭuḇ-* 'blessed'. The personal suffixes of the first series are attached to the noun. All examples in the texts are of the third person plural.[97]

ṭuḇê=l(h)on[98] their.blessedness=to.them > blessed are they

6.9 A classification of LUA predicates

A number of different predicate types occur in LUA. These different types have their specific characteristics with regard to the kinds of arguments the

93. Cf. Polotsky 1979: 209-212 and Polotsky 1996: 39-42.

94. Polotsky 1979: 210, noted that the f and m forms of the verb are invariable in Bedjan (usually m) and in the Protestant BT (usually f). In Merx I came across a few examples of variation in the SUB stem; cf. Merx 34.16 // Merx 34.17: *d-balkā ṣāhāb hāwi=lih lebba* (REP-perhaps mister SUB.it(m).is=to.him heart(m) / 'that the Mister may perhaps want to..') // *d-xā gāhā (')xi(r)tā hôya=lan har la'ḵā xā tpāqtā d-xadutā* (REP-a time other it(f).is=to.us just here a meeting(f) of-joy / 'that another time we may have here a joyful meeting'). For a further discussion, see Polotsky 1996: 40-42.

95. The first form is regularly found in the Protestant press, whereas the second is common in Bedjan's texts.

96. See Polotsky 1979: 209-212, for a discussion of these verbs with dival suffixes.

97. For some other forms, like *ṭḇay-lih, ṭḇay-lā-lih*, and, with a noun, *ṭuḇā=l-(nāṣā)*, see Maclean 1895: 63.

98. In BT '93, this form is rendered as *ṭuḇā l-ānī* (Mat. 5:6).

predicate may take, with regard to the types of subject and object suffixes that are atttached to it, and with regard to constituent order patterns.

The main distinction with regard to constituent order patterns is that between copular predicates with a nominal morphology on the one hand, and verbal predicates with a verbal morphology on the other. However, some of the nominal predicates exercise verbal functions. The two groups are further distinguished by their suffixes: predicates with nominal morphology have object suffixes that are identical with the genitive suffixes of nouns (i), whereas predicates with verbal morphology employ other kinds of object suffixes (ii, iv).

All predicates may have prepositional complements. Predicates with verbal functions (i.e., including those with INF and PART stems) can have object complements and further verbal complements, like a second finite verb, usually of the same stem form,[99] or an infinite verbal form. These latter types of verbal complements are not part of the verbal phrase, and may be separated from the first finite verb by a postverbal subject or an object.

The pseudo-verbs do not form a homogeneous category. The particle [it] without suffixes is close to nominal morphology and function, whereas the particles with suffixes of the second series conform to verbal morphology in their conjugational patterns. The clauses with [it] + suffix can be reinterpreted as consisting of subject + 'verb' + object, resembling the reinterpretation of the preterite structure. Therefore one might classify these pseudo-verbs among the predicates with verbal morphology and verbal function.

1. noun phrase + enclit. copula	nominal morphology and function no object arguments
2. indep. cop. / cop. verb[100] + noun phrase	nominal morphology and function no object arguments
3. INF/PART + enclit. copula	nominal morphology, verbal function object arguments
4. indep. cop. / cop. verb + INF/PART	nominal morphology, verbal function object arguments[101]
5. finite verb (IMP, SUB, PRET)	verbal morphology and function object arguments
6. pseudo-verbs	verbal morphology and function

99. Cf. Marogulov 1976: 70, §88, on 'Verbes conjoints'. Stoddard 1855: 166, and Nöldeke 1868: 367, treat these phase verbs as if the relative marker *d-* is missing; *bā'yi d-yālep* > *bā'yi yālep*. Both constructions do indeed occur.

100. Independent copula and copular verbs like *hwāyā* 'to be' and *pyāšā* 'to remain'.

101. In passive clauses, with the copula *pyāšā*, no direct object arguments are possible.

6.10 Conclusions

In the present chapter, the morphology and morphosyntax of LUA have been surveyed. In most parts of the grammar, the differences between the text types consist mainly of orthographical variations. The most important differences were encountered with regard to the morphology and morphosyntax of object marking. These differences can partly be accounted for by influence of Classical Syriac. In addition dialectal differences between the Urmia dialect and that of the northern region around Salmas may also have played a role.

At the same time, this survey of LUA makes clear that, although the language has been fairly well described in the existing grammars and grammatical studies, many aspects of the grammar, especially those concerned with the relation between form and function still remain unclear.

Among the points that await a further description, the relation between form and function in the verbal system is most important. The semantic functions of the stem forms in the verbal system have not been fully described. Neither are the conditions that govern the distribution of these stem forms over a stretch of discourse. Further, the different object marking devices as employed in nineteenth-century LUA urgently need more detailed description.

7

COPULAR CLAUSES

7.1 Introduction

7.1.1 *Copular clauses*

This chapter will be devoted to the various clause types that can be distinguished within the category of 'copular' clauses, i.e., in all types of clauses in which two nominal phrases are connected by a copula. These clauses are of the type 'the house is old', a clause type that is often represented in other Semitic languages by pure nominal clauses, in which no copula is needed. As stated in the introduction, I will concentrate on the study of constituent order.

When referring to the 'copula' in LUA, the simple present and past forms of the copula are usually under discussion. These forms have their own, specific, conjugation and cannot be linked directly to a verbal conjugation. Clauses in which this basic copula is employed constitute the major subject of this chapter. However, it must be borne in mind that the verb *hwāyā* in its various forms may perform copular functions as well, which are complementary to the simple present and past forms of the copula.[1] The verb *pyāšā* 'to remain', can also be employed as a copula. A finite form of *pyāšā* is complemented by a PART stem to form a passive verbal phrase. These independent copulae, also called auxiliary verbs, differ from the enclitic copula with regard to their position in the clause.

One might argue that in LUA also true nominal clauses exist: clauses in which subject and predicate are in juxtaposition without copula. However, in my opinion clauses of this type can better be described as incomplete copular clauses, because they hardly ever occur as independent main clauses, and can be employed only if a copula or finite verb form is employed in a main clause preceding or following it. These clauses are treated in 7.2.[2]

1. The copula was already described as part of the 'tenses' of *hwāyā* in the early grammars, so Stoddard 1855: 28-34, and Maclean 1895: 76. Perhaps Nöldeke (1868: 345) also has something similar in mind when he says: 'Die regelmässigen Formen von ܗܘܐ *sein*, *werden* stehn durchgehend vor dem Haupttheil des Predicats'. This point of view is explicitly formulated by Krotkoff 1982: 36-7, Hoberman 1988: 31-4, and Polotsky 1996: 39-40, 4245.

2. So also Polotsky 1996: 27.

In this chapter, I will present an overview of the various constituent order patterns that occur in copular clauses. As stated in the introduction (1.4.1-3), these different patterns can be accounted for by the pragmatic functions that are performed by copular clauses. In addition, the various patterns, as used in the different text types, may serve to distinguish the different layers in the shaping and development of the language. On the basis of the comparison of the clause order patterns in the various text types, first, the grammaticality of the order has to be ascertained, second, the conditions for its employment are to be formulated, and third, the differences between the various texts are to be explained.

7.1.2 *Some features of copular clauses in LUA*

Before presenting the various clause types with copula, it is necessary to examine a number of morphological and syntactical features of the LUA copula.

As mentioned above, the simple present and past forms of the copula are not part of a regular verbal paradigm. The exact history of the form is uncertain. Initial *ī*, in all likelihood, is a remnant of the existential particle *īt* ('there is'), whereas *-w-* in the first and second person singular can be explained only as a remnant of the verb *hwāyā*. The endings of the first and second person must originate in enclitic personal pronouns, whereas the endings of the third person singular forms clearly go back to *l-* + pronominal suffix.[3] Thus, the history of the copula links this form not only to the verb *hwāyā*, but also to nominal elements, like the particle *īt* and *l-* + pronominal suffix.[4]

A common feature of finite verbs and the copula is the fact that pronominal subjects need not to be expressed outside these forms. A predicate with a copula, in the same way as a single verb, constitutes a complete sentence.

Two types of copulae have to be distinguished. The first, unmarked, type consists of the enclitic copula. This copula follows the constituent it belongs to (Xc). The second type consists of the independent copulae, among which are the independent form of the enclitic copula, the negative copula, and the copular verbs *hwāyā* and *pyāšā*. These copulae are not attached enclitically to the constituent they belong to, but precede this constituent as an independent form (CX). Usually it is the predicate of the clause that is followed or preceded by a copula (Pc or CP).

3. Cf. Nöldeke 1868: 201-6, and Fox 1990: 74; the latter repeats Nöldeke's reasoning.
4. See 6.2.8 for the forms of the copula in the various text types.

The last feature to be mentioned with regard to LUA copular clauses, is that the predicate may consist of a participle or an infinitive stem.[5] Semantically, the resulting compound form is part of the verbal system, because the participle and infinitive stems thus employed express tense and aspect in a way that cannot be taken over by finite verb forms. Grammatically and morphologically, however, the verbal nouns are part of the nominal system.[6] The constituent order patterns of clauses of this type are the same as that of copular clauses with other types of nominal predicates, such as independent noun phrases or prepositional and adjectival phrases. Morphologically these verbal nouns certainly are nominal, as can be seen from the fact that the pronominal suffixes that are employed with verbal nouns to refer to the direct object are identical with the suffixes that are employed with independent nouns to denote possession, whereas they are different from the suffixes employed with finite verbs to refer to the direct object.[7]

This feature, the nominal conjugation performing also verbal functions, is one of the reasons why this clause type is of great importance for LUA syntax. Nöldeke, naming the simple present and past forms of the copula 'Verbum substantivum', already recognized its prime importance for the Neo-Aramaic conjugation: 'Ehe wir nun aber zur Flexion der verschiednen Verbalklassen übergehn, müssen wir die für alle gleich wichtige Formation des Verbum substantivum betrachten, welches wesentlich dazu dient, der ns. [i.e., neusyrischen] Conjugation ihr characteristisches Gepräge zu verleihn.'[8]

7.1.3 *Arrangement of the chapter*

In this chapter the various types of copular clauses will be discussed. I begin with the 'incomplete copular clauses' (7.2). In this section various clause types are described in which the copula is absent. In my opinion the syntax of these clauses is closely related to the syntax of copular clauses.

In the following section I will present the clause types that occur in main affirmative copular clauses (7.3). Starting from two basic clause types, I will present a number of types deviating from the general pattern, expressing various types of marking. This section is followed by a discussion of the clause types in which the copula is attached to a non-predicate constitu-

5. Cf. Polotsky 1996: 20-21.
6. For a classification of the various nominal and verbal predicates in LUA, see 6.9.
7. So also Polotsky 1994: 92-3; see further 6.2.6 for these suffixes.
8. Nöldeke 1868: 200.

ent. Among these are identifying and pseudo-cleft clauses, clause types that, as in many other languages, constitute a very interesting part of copular clauses in general (7.4).

The following three sections are devoted to copular clauses with deviating syntax because of their being subordinate (7.5), negative (7.6), or interrogative (7.7). In these groups not only do some of the marked clause types discussed in the section on main affirmative clauses occur, but also clause types that are characteristic of these categories.

Copular clauses that are concerned with name-giving deserve separate attention, because their syntax does not wholly conform to regular constituent orders (7.8).

In LUA two presentative copulae occur, although they do not occur very often in the corpora under discussion. A few examples will be given (7.9).

The last section describes the ways in which copular *hwāyā* and *pyāšā* are employed (7.10). Clauses with these independent copulae closely resemble other copular clauses.

As stated in the introduction, the texts edited by Merx and Socin, as well as those written by Bedjan, will play an important role when it comes to deciding on the grammaticality of the various copular clause types in LUA. The copular clause types that occur in the texts from the Protestant press will be compared with those in Merx, Socin, and Bedjan.

A major point of interest is the influence of the source languages on the LUA Bible translations. It is likely that the syntax of Hebrew, Greek, and Classical Syriac influenced the syntax of LUA. In this chapter several illustrations of this phenomenon will be given.

7.2 Incomplete copular clauses

7.2.1 *Introduction*

The clauses under discussion in this section are clauses that at first sight seem to be true nominal clauses: clauses without a copula and consisting of a subject and a predicate. However, there are several indications that clauses of this type are not to be described as independent nominal clauses. The first fact to be accounted for is that clauses of this type are very rare in independent main clauses, at least, in texts written by native speakers. Second, apart from those clauses in which a subject and a predicate are present, 'clauses' also occur that consist only of a predicate. In the latter type, it is clear that not only the copula is wanting, but also the subject. The latter has

to be inferred from the preceding clause, which is why this latter type should not be considered a complete clause. Both clause types under discussion can be adequately described as clauses in which the copula could have been present, but is wanting.

There seem to be important differences in the way incomplete copular clauses are treated in the various corpora. In all texts the copula is often found wanting in clauses with consecutive predicates when its function can be inferred from a copula employed earlier in the sentence. In addition, in BT and ZdB the copula is regularly absent in relative and circumstantial adverbial clauses. These texts from the Protestant mission also furnish the majority of examples of independent and reported clauses without copula.

Separate attention will be paid to those infinitives that are placed in apposition to a noun. These may be interpreted as incomplete copular clauses, consisting only of the predicate, but it seems more likely that the infinitive is employed attributively.

7.2.2 *Clauses with consecutive predicates*

In clauses with consecutive noun phrases predicated to the same subject, the copula often is employed only with the first predicate.[9] These consecutive predicates in most instances are introduced by *u-* ('and'), but sometimes *up* ('also') is employed. These consecutive predicates need not be of the same type.

In the texts of Merx and Socin, only a small number of clauses without copula occur. Most of them belong to the present category (1, 2).

In BT a number of clauses with consecutive predicates without copula occur. In the first example a copula is added in the first clause (when compared with the Peshitta and the Hebrew text), but not in the second (3). In the example from NT (4), a copula is employed after the first predicate and not after the second, whereas in CS both forms are active participles without further marking. In the next example (5), it would have been possible to delete the copula after the second predicate. The fact that it is there is may be due to the Peshitta, which has enclitic *hw'* after the first and second participle of the sequence, and not after the third and fourth. In the BT revision of 1893, the copula was left out after the second infinitive. This should be explained on the basis of the verbal forms employed in the Greek text, in which the first finite verbal form is followed by three participles, rather than by assuming a closer adherence to LUA grammar. However, both translations, whether they are closer to the Peshitta or to the Greek text, tes-

9. Nöldeke 1868: 337.

tify to the fact that it is possible to delete a second or third copula in sequences like this. The absence or presence of the copula, thus, may point to Hebrew, Greek, or CS influence, especially if the copula is present after a second or third consecutive predicate. It is likely that especially CS influenced the NT translation, but within the rules of LUA grammar.

In ZdB (6) as well as in Bedjan's texts (7, 8), not many clauses of this type are found, but the examples confirm that deletion of the copula is grammatical in consecutive predicates.

(1) *qā rābā šenni (h)wīyi=(y)wāḵ lkes ʿudāli [..], u-ʿḇīdi rābā ṣôhbāti bāsīmi mʿudāli* / for many years were=we.were to each.other, and did much talks sweet together / 'for many years we regularly met each other, and did a lot of nice talking together' (Merx 35.2-4)

(2) *up māri 6 quci=(ī)nā up māri gulpānāni {gülpānâne}*[10] / also owner of 6 thumbs=they.were, also owner.of wings / 'they had six thumbs, and wings' (Socin 6.2)

(3) *āhā ādīyā garmā men garmī=(y)lā, u-besrā men besrī* / this now bone from my.bone=she.is, and-flesh from my.flesh / 'This one now is bone from my bones and flesh from my flesh' (Gen 2.23)

(4) *u-kad (y)tīḇi=(h)wāw u-biʾḵālā, (ʾ)merri Īšoʿ* / and-while seated=they.were and-eating, he.said Jesus / 'And while they were seated and were eating, Jesus said..' (Mark 14:18)

(5) *u-bexdārā=(h)wā Īšoʿ b-kullih Glīlā, u-mālopi=(h)wā b-jāmāʿtê,*[11] *u-makruzi mašxadtā d-malkuta, u-bāsomi kul dard u-marʿā b-ṭāyeppā* / and-walking.around=he.was Jesus in.all.of.it Galilee, and-teaching=he.was in-their.synagogues, and-preaching the.message of.kingdom, and-healing every pain and.sickness among.the.people / 'And Jesus was going around in Galilee, and he was teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the message of the kingdom and healing every affliction and sickness among the people' (Mat. 4:23)

(6) *darwāzi d-mdī(n)tā qaddīštā har ptīxi=(h)wāw u-hāzer l-qābulī* / gates of-city holy already opened=they.were and-ready to.receive me / 'The gates of the holy city already were opened and were ready to take me in' (51/10/76B51)

(7) *lḇīšā=(ʾ)ywā cargaymā,*[12] *u-mutḇā taskellô b-rīšuhy* / dressed=he.was in coat of mail, and-placed(m) helmet(f) on-his.head / 'He wore a coat of mail, and had put a helmet on his head.' (HS 95.9)

10. Between the {}-braces Socin's phonetic transcription of the author's re-reading of the text is given.

11. Md gives 'crowd', 'multitude' for *jāmāʿtā;* the meaning 'synagogue' is inferred from the Greek and Syriac text.

12. According to Md, *gayemcārā* (in the parallel passage in I Sam 17:5), comes from *gaymā* ('coat') and *cārā* ('remedy'). The form in HS has these two elements reversed.

(8) *saypuḳ xayyan=ʾilih u-purqānan* / your.sword our.life=it.is andour.deliverance / 'Your sword is our life and our deliverance' (VdS 348.13)

7.2.3 *Relative clauses*

Relative clauses, nearly always introduced by *d-*, are generally employed with a copula (cf. 7.5.1). Because no examples were found of deletion of the copula in relative clauses with *d-* in the texts of Merx and Socin, and only a few in Bedjan's texts, it is likely that this type of clause was rather uncommon, although perhaps not entirely ungrammatical. The examples suggest that this clause type is possible only when the predicate consists of a prepositional phrase.

A second type of relative clause are those without relative marker.[13] The subordination is expressed by a pronominal suffix referring to the antecedent. This clause type is often employed when a name is given.[14] However, in my corpus I did not encounter clauses of this type other than with *šemm-* suf. 'whose name is..' (see 7.8). An example from Nöldeke's grammar, taken from a text issued by the Protestants, is added to illustrate this clause type (7).

In the Bible translations a considerable number of relative clauses without copula occur. The subject is the same as in the main clause, and the predicate may consist of a verbal noun or a prepositional phrase. Many of the examples in BT have their origin in CS and the frequency of clauses of this type is much higher in BT than in texts of native speakers. In CS the enclitic personal pronoun is not always present in relative clauses, and in all three examples (1, 2, 3), CS does not employ such an enclitic pronoun.

In ZdB few examples occur and the one example quoted (4) is obviously related to the clauses in 7.2.5, with an attributive infinitive without copula. However, here the infinitive is introduced by *d-*, whereas the 'attributive infinitives' are not introduced by this particle.

In Bedjan's text few relative clauses without copula occur, but the two examples represent the two types: with relative marker *d-* (5) and without it (6).

It is worth noticing that in exx. 1, 3, and 5 the 'predicates' in these relative clauses consist of prepositional phrases. One might argue that in this case, these relative clauses without copula should rather be described as at-

13. Cf. Nöldeke 1868: 358-362. Polotsky (1996: 23-26) cites many examples, making the small number of examples from the Protestant press seem like the exception, rather than the rule.

14. For the same type of clause in CS, see Goldenberg 1983: 132-3.

tributive prepositional phrases introduced by *d-*. What exactly the pragmatic difference is between attributive prepositional phrases and relative clauses is difficult to say (cf. e.g., exx. 12, 13, 14 in 7.5.3.3 and ex. 13 in 7.5.4.3).

(1) *u-pešlon muksi kullê ṭurāni rāmi d-txot kullāh šmayyā* / and-they.became covered all.of.them mountains high REL-under all.of.her heaven / 'and all the high mountains under the heavens became covered' (Gen. 7.19) (id. in CS)

(2) *li māṣyā d-ṭāsyā mdī(n)tā d-ʾal ṭurā bnītā* / not.HAB he.is.possible REP.he.hides city REL-on mountain built / 'One cannot hide a city that is built on a mountain' (Mat. 5:14)

(3) *dāʾḵī d-bābôḵon d-b-šmayyā kāmīl=īli* / like that-your.father REL-in-heaven perfect=he.is / 'like your Father in heaven (or: who is in heaven) is perfect' (Mat. 5:48) (cf. MdP 4.4: *bāban d-īwet b-šmayyā*)

(4) *d-šmeʿli xā qālā mākīḵā u-xubbānā d-byā(h)ḇā šlāmā l-enyatī* / REP-I.heard a voice sweet and-lovely REL-giving peace to-my.conscience / '.. I heard a sweet and lovely voice giving me peace of mind' (50/10/75B28)

(5) *u-semli Šāʾol bar Qīš d-men ojāġ d-Benjāmēn* / and-he.appointed Saul son.of Kish, REL-from family of-Benjamin / 'And he appointed Saul, the son of Kish, who was from the family of Benjamin' (HS 90.8, id. VdS 338.10)

(6) *īt xā (ʾ)nāšā gô Rāmtā šemmuhy Halqānā;* there.is a man in Rama, his.name Elkana / 'There is a man in Rama whose name is Elkana' (HS 86.10, id. HS 95.9)

(7) *īt=lan xā bābā lebbuhy mraxmānā* / there.is=to.us a father his.heart compassionate / 'We have a father whose heart is compassionate' (Nöl. 359, who cites Baxter 1854: 395, cf. n. 19)

7.2.4 *Adverbial clauses*

Adverbial clauses of circumstance regularly occur without a copula in BT and ZdB. In the texts of Merx and Socin very few examples are found of this type of clause, whereas the few adverbial clauses in Bedjan's texts introduced by *kad* always have the copula. In other adverbial clauses the copula is never deleted. These data make it unlikely that this type of clause was really grammatical. These doubts are fuelled by a remark of Stoddard himself, who asserts that *kad* is not employed in Urmia Aramaic to introduce a participle, 'although we occasionally employ it thus in our books.'[15] This remark suggests that the Protestant missionaries employed *kad* when they found it necessary for a correct translation, even while they knew that

15. Stoddard 1855: 170. This was already noted by Polotsky 1994: 97. See also Polotsky 1996: 26.

it was not customary in the dialect of Urmia. Although Stoddard does not mention the employment of the copula in *kad*-clauses, it is not far-fetched to assume that, in texts which represent literal translations from CS the absence of the copula may also be due to the influence of CS.

These adverbial clauses without copula share a number of characteristics. Although most of them are introduced by *kad* ('while'), they also may be introduced by *hālā* ('already', 'while'), *ayḵ d-* ('according to') or *heš* ('while yet'). The predicate in most cases consists of an infinitive, sometimes of a participle and only incidentally of a prepositional phrase. In NT many of these clauses are the translation of Greek participles, which in the Peshitta were translated by active and passive participles, mostly introduced by *d-* or *kad*. In OT no examples of *kad*-clauses without copula occur. This should be explained by the fact that in Hebrew no direct counterpart of this type of adverbial clauses exists. This suggests that these clauses in the NT translation arose under the influence of the Peshitta. It is remarkable, therefore, that they appear also in ZdB. It is possible that the missionaries were influenced by the English present participle introduced by 'while', although such English participles more often seem to have been represented by attributive infinitives (cf. 7.2.5).

In the first example from Merx's edition (1), it is clear that the participle is predicated to the noun preceding *kad*. In the second example (2), the plural form of the participle indicates that 'the twelve' are the subject of the adverbial clause, whereas 'he' (i.e., Jesus) is the subject of the main clause. No copula is present, although the subject changes. If the predicate in an adverbial clause consists of an infinitive and the subject changes, it is necessary to add a copula, even if it is not present in CS.[16] In the two clauses taken from ZdB (3, 4), the subject of the main clause is the same as that of the adverbial clause, and no copula is needed. Note that in ex. 4 a prepositional phrase occurs in an adverbial clause without copula.

(1) *albattā cāton=(y)la hatḵā taʿlamtā kad lā xezyi* / certainly difficult=it.is such an.ordeal when not seen / 'certainly such an ordeal is difficult when it is not foreseen' (Merx 31.3-4)

(2) *īnā b-xartā pešlā xezyā l-xaddeʿsar kad (y)tīḇi* / but in-end he.became seen to-eleven while seated(pl) / 'However, at last he was seen by the eleven while they were seated' (Mark 16:14)

(3) *hô (')nāšā kad bezdāʿyā buqerri, d-rābā merʿyā=(y)wen?* / this man while fearing he.asked, REP-very ill=I.am? / 'this man, being afraid, asked: "am I very ill?" ' (49/1/4B10)

16. Cf. Mark 16:12.

(4) *kad b-gibā (')xi(r)nā, gāšuqi=(y)wen ʿal ʿāmrāni d-mdīnāti u-mātwāti d-Pransā* / while in-place other, looking=I.was at inhabitants of-towns and-villages of.France / 'When I was somewhere else, I was looking at the inhabitants of the towns and villages of France' (71/12/91B34)

7.2.5 *Attributively employed infinitives*

The infinitive form without prefix (*b-* or *l-*) is regularly employed as a substantive, whereas the infinitive preceded by *l-* is always employed as the continuation of a finite verb or of a predicate + copula. The form with *b-*, which is regularly employed with the copula to express the continuous tense (present or past), may also be employed without copula in apposition to a noun phrase.[17] Nöldeke gives a great many examples of this construction, whereas many examples occur also in BT and in ZdB. However, I wonder whether this construction is really indigenous to Urmia Aramaic. I found no examples in the texts of Merx and Socin, nor in Bedjan's texts. The fact that Stoddard gives an example of a specific way of employing the infinitive adverbially, complicates the pattern even more. This type of adverbial infinitive occurs a few times in the texts of Socin.[18]

In the example from Genesis (1), the infinitive in LUA is parallel to a relative clause introduced by *d-* in CS, whereas the Hebrew clause has no relative marker.

One wonders whether perhaps influence of the English present participle may be at work here, because in the texts from NT no clear examples are found, whereas a limited number of them occur in ZdB (2, 3), in texts that in all likelihood were composed by English speakers. In the second example the infinitive may even be analysed as an adjective, just as in English the same -ing form can be employed both as present participle and as adjective. In the other texts no examples are found of this clause type. All Nöldeke's examples seem to come from LUA translations of English books[19] or from ZdB.

The participle stem is regularly employed as an adjective. However, in ex. 4, it has kept its verbal functions and has two verbal complements.

17. Nöldeke 1868: 329-331.

18. Stoddard gives examples of this participial use of the infinitive (note that his 'infinitive' is our participle and vice versa!) which he calls 'adverbially'; i.e. '*berxāṭā berxāṭā xuš, running, running, go*, i.e. as fast as you can;' in Stoddard 1855: 170. Cf. id. in Socin 99.3.

19. Richard Baxter, *The Saint's Everlasting Rest*, London 1650 / Urmia 1854, and John Bunyan, *The Pilgrim's Progress*, London 1678 / Urmia 1848. Both LUA translations probably were based on 19th-century American editions of these works by the American Tract Society.

(1) *u-šmeʿlon qālā d-Maryā Alāhā bexdārā b-gantā* / and-they.heard voice of-Lord God walking in-garden / 'and they heard the Lord God walking in the garden' (Gen. 3.8)

(2) *(ʾ)merri hô (ʾ)nāšā bemyātā* / he.said this man dying / 'said this dying man' (49/1/4B16)

(3) *īt ādīyā tmānyā makrezzāni yan iwāngālesṭi d-ʿidāti Iwāngilāyi beplāxā gô R(h)omi* / there.is now eight preachers or evangelists of-churches Evangelical working in Rome / 'Today there are eight preachers or evangelists of the Evangelical churches working in Rome' (71/12/96A34)

(4) *īt ṣpāyī madrāsi gô Lamsestān huderri men malkutā qā kullê* / there.are good schools in Germany instituted by government for all.of.them / 'There are good schools in Germany, instituted by the government for everybody' (50/10/79B10)

7.2.6 *Main and reported clauses*

Although the number of main and reported clauses without copula is not very high, it is likely that independent clauses without a copula are not entirely ungrammatical. Clauses of this type occur not only in BT and ZdB, but also in Socin and Merx. Apart from a few clauses that obviously are literal translations from Hebrew or CS, the common characteristic of such clauses seems to be their use in exclamations, reflections of direct speech and vivid descriptions. This was already noted by Nöldeke, who introduced clauses like this by saying: 'Einzeln stehn nun aber auch sonst Sätze ohne Copula, namentlich bei grösserer Lebhaftigkeit der Rede'.[20] In Bedjan's texts clauses of this type are not attested.

The first three examples from Socin (1-3) can be interpreted as vivid descriptions of something happening at that moment. Note also the employment of *īnā*, 'but', to introduce such clauses. In ex. 4 it is uncertain whether this really is such an instance of vivid description of something happening before one's eyes. In this phrase the copula was added when the writer reread the phrase.

The first three examples taken from BT (5, 6, 7) do not belong to the type of clauses described above. It is likely that they were influenced by the Hebrew and CS phrasing of the clause, where no pronoun or form of *hwʾ* is present. Only in the first clause of ex. 5 has CS an independent form of *hwʾ*, following the subject. This is represented in LUA by the past copula following the predicate. The next clause (7) perhaps can really do without the

20. Nöldeke 1868: 338. So also Polotsky 1996: 29-31, who describes these clauses as 'tableau-phrases'. Tsereteli 1978: 85, mentions the existence of nominal clauses without copula, and the few examples he provides all are exclamatory clauses.

copula, although in other texts *šemmā*-clauses without copula occur as relative clauses only. The last example from BT (8) fits neatly into the description given above. In this clause the infinitive without copula in LUA represents an active participle in Hebrew and a finite verb in CS. Although in the LUA translation of OT, the Hebrew (without copular pronoun) usually seems to have influenced the LUA translation more than the Peshitta has, in this case the copula could indeed be left out.

A lengthy example from ZdB (9) illustrates the use of infinitives without copula, in a vivid description of a fire that had destroyed the larger part of Chicago (cf. Texts no 10). A copula is employed in the first line, whereas in the rest of the paragraph new subjects are introduced without copula. In ZdB also a couple of clauses were found in which *b-* + infinitive is used in an impersonal exhortation, with *lā*, 'not' (10). No examples of this type were encountered in other text types.

(1) *īnā xā (')nāšā beṣlāyā men rišā d-ṭurā lā'iltix* / but a man coming.down from top of-mountain to.this-under / 'look, a man coming down from the top of the mountain' (Merx 12.6)[21]

(2) *mṭilon ʿal d-āhā hāywan u-xzilun īnā rābā gurā* / they.reached on that animal and-they.saw but very great / 'they came to that animal, saw it, and look, it was very great' (Merx 3.11)

(3) *hê dlā lišānā dlā mendī* / she without language, without something / 'she was speachless and could do nothing' (Socin 46.9)

(4) *pitwu(h) xamšā carāgi=(ī)li up jullu(h) rābā zardi men rang {up jůllō rą̊ba zą̊rdīna mirrą̊nk}* / her.width five caragi's=it.was also her.clothes very yellow from color / 'her width was five caragi's, and her clothes have a bright yellow color' (Socin 20.4)

(5) *u-arʿā xrāḇā u-spīqtā=(h)wā, u-xuyā ʿal pātā d-ʿumqā, u-ruxā d-Alāhā raprupi ʿal pātā d-mīyā* / and-earth ruin and empty=it.was, and-darkness on the surface of-deep, and-spirit of-God hovering on surface of-the.water / 'And the earth was corrupted and empty, and darkness was on the surface of the deep, and the spirit of God was hovering above the surface of the water' (Gen. 1:2)

(6) *u-xzili Alāhā l-bahrā d-ṣpāyī* / and-he.saw God OBJ-light REP-good / 'and God saw that the light was good' (Gen. 1:4)

(7) *u-šemmā d-nahrā d-trê, Gīxon*; and-name of-river of-second Gihon; 'and the name of the second river is Gihon' (Gen. 2:13)

(8) *u-hā, xezmā beʿḇārā* / and-look, redeemer passing / 'and look, the redeemer was just passing' (Ruth 4:1)

21. Cf. id. Merx 5:14: *d-xzila(h) men rixqā bi'tāyā xā jwanqā rābā šāpīrā* / REL-she.saw from far coming a young.man very beautiful / '.. when she saw a very beautiful young man coming from afar,..'

(9) *zôdā men palgā d-anni 300 000 d-(ʾ)nāši d-hê mdī(n)tā, berxāṭā=(y)nā l-āhā gibā u-l-hô gibā gô ʿālolāni, xakmā beṭʿānā bā(t)r kelpattê tlīqi, xakmā lāboli xā xāzīnê kmā d-māṣyi gô xpāqê, u-txot xājê, u-lā bīdaʿyā aykā ā(l)zī, xakmā beṭʿānā bā(t)r ārābāni u-kāleski d-maʿreqqī kilpattê, susāwāti u-qenyāni pulṭi men pagānê beqyādā, u-berxāṭā l-āhā gibā u-l-hô gibā* / more than half of-those 300,000 of.people(pl) of-that.city, running **they.are** to-this side and-to-that side in-streets, some looking for their. families lost, some taking their.possessions as they.are.able in their.bosoms and-under their.armpits, and-not knowing where (SUB).they.go, some looking for carriages and-coaches to-saving their.families, horses and.cattle(pl) escaped from their stables burning, and-running to-this side and-to-that side / 'More than half of the 300,000 people of this city are running to and fro in the streets, some looking for their lost families, some taking as much possessions as they could in their bosoms and under their arms, not knowing where to go, some looking for carriages and coaches to let their families escape, and horses and cattle that escaped from their burning stables, are running to and fro.' (71/12/94A45-B4)

(10) *lā beqlābā, lā l-yammīnā, u-lā l-semmālā* / not turning around, not to-right, and-not to-left / 'Don't turn around, not to the right, and not to the left' (71/12/91A13)

7.2.7 *Conclusions*

The survey of nominal clauses without copula leads to the conclusion that clauses of this type do not constitute a separate group of true nominal clauses, but that these clauses have to be considered as incomplete copular clauses. The copula can be absent under specific circumstances. These are: (i) after the second or third predicate in a series of consecutive predicates; (ii) in relative clauses consisting of a prepositional predicate; (iii) in relative clauses without *d-* in which a pronominal suffix marks the relation between main and relative clause; (iv) in clauses with vivid descriptions.

All other nominal clauses without copula seem to be ungrammatical and due to influence of other languages. The absence of the copula in BT in short relative clauses, in consecutive clauses with different subjects, or in short reported clauses in all likelihood is due to Hebrew or CS influence. The presence of attributively employed infinitives and participles in ZdB, as well as in texts from the Protestant missionaries that were translated from English, perhaps may be attributed to influence of English grammar.

7.3 Affirmative main clauses

7.3.1 *Introduction*

In affirmative main clauses two basic constituent order types occur, depending on whether the subject consists of a noun phrase or of a personal pronoun. In the latter case, the nucleus of predicate and copula (Pc) is sufficient in itself, the subject being represented by the copula. When the subject consists of a noun phrase, the dominant order in all text types is SPc.[22] These two order types are basic, not only because of their being the most common order, but also because of the fact that these two types are pragmatically unmarked. In an unmarked copular clause, the predicate represents the new, salient information, i.e., the focus, and the subject represents the given, presupposed information of the clause, i.e., the topic.

All deviations from these two types can be considered to indicate a certain marking. In this section a number of variations on the basic orders are discussed. In all these variations the basic pragmatic functions of subject and predicate, topic and focus, remain the same. In 7.4, those clauses are presented in which the pragmatic functions no longer run parallel to the grammatical and semantic functions of the two parts of a copular clause.

7.3.2 *Unmarked copular clauses with pronominal subject (Pc)*

The basic clause type with a pronominal subject does not occur very frequently in main clauses, because main clauses often are employed to introduce new topics expressed by nominal subjects. However, in all text types examples are found in which the predicate, consisting of a nominal phrase (1, 4, 5), an adjectival phrase (2), or a prepositional phrase (3), together with the copula constitutes a complete sentence. The predicate may also consist of a verbal noun, but in the majority of these clauses the predicate has a complement (see exx. 6-11).

(1) *klās qāmêtā=(y)wān* / class first=I.am(f) / 'I am in the first class' (Merx 31.16)

(2) *rābā rixqā men mdī(n)tā ʿal ṭurāni=(ī)nā {t(o)ṷ́rēna}* / very far from city in mountains=they.are / 'They are very far from the city, in the mountains' (Socin 62.8)

(3) *men xezman=īlī* / from our.kinsmen=he.is / 'he is one of our kinsmen' (Ruth 2:20)

22. So also Stoddard 1855: 152, Nöldeke 1868: 344, l. 1-6, and Maclean 1895: 192, §74.5.

(4) *u-sāʿat d-madrāsi d-xôšibā=(y)lā* / and-hour of-schools of-Sunday=it.is / 'It is the time of the Sunday schools' (71/12/92A36)[23]

(5) *meskini=(h)wāw* / poor=they.were / 'They were poor' (HS 85.13)

The predicate in this type of clause may be complemented by a prepositional phrase, or, if the predicate consists of a verbal noun, also by an object phrase. The usual place of the copula is after the main phrase of the predicate. Prepositional phrases usually follow this nucleus (6, 8), but may also precede the nucleus for reasons of assertive or contrastive focus, like in ex. 7. Sentence connectives and sentence adverbs occupy the first position of the clause (7).

In the example from BT (9), the copula follows the participle, and this nucleus is being followed by a prepositional phrase. In ex. 10 from ZdB, this same structure is employed with a predicate consisting of a noun phrase.

The two examples taken from Bedjan's texts illustrate the same clause type. In the first clause (11), the complement consists of a direct object followed by prepositional phrase expressing the indirect object, whereas in the second (12) it consists of a prepositional phrase.

(6) *ʿal xā ṭurā=(h)wā {ṭūrēwa} qurbā ʿal mdī(n)tā d-Šušāwan* / on a mountain=it.was close to city of-Shushawan / 'It was on a mountain close to the city of Shushawan' (Socin 8.19)

(7) *mejjid b-rābā pāšamtā gurtā šāruwi=(y)wān* / certainly, in-much sadness great dwelling=I.am(f) / 'Really, I am very distressed' (Merx 29.18)

(8) *u-rābā (ʾ)ḵīli=(ī)nā {ḥ̤illīna} minnê* / and-much eaten=they.were from-them / 'and they had eaten very much from them' (Socin 64.2)

(9) *u-(y)tīḇā=(h)wā ʿam xelmatkāri* / and-seated=he.was with servants / 'And he sat down with the servants' (Mark 14: 54)

(10) *yomā d-nyāxtā=(y)li qātê* / day of.rest=it.is for.them / 'It is the resting day for them' (71/12/92A5)

(11) *pīši=(h)wāw targaltā*[24] *qā kullih ʿālmā* / became=they.were stumbling.block for all.of.him world / 'They [i.e., the sons of Eli, cf. I Sam. 2:12] became a stumbling block for all the world' (HS 86.22)

(12) *ḫamšā ištēna bil kóulli* / five six=they.are in.of total.of.it / 'they are five to six all' (Duval 29.9)

This same type of clause is very characteristic of clauses that introduce reported clauses. The predicate in clauses of this type may consist of a participle or infinitive, and also of adjectives like 'truly', 'proper', 'important'

23. Cf. Polotsky 1996: 20 n. 22 on 'subjektlose' verbs.

24. Probably related to CS *rgl;* the *shaph'el* formation of this stem means 'to impede, ensnare, to drag'.

etc. With the latter type of predicate the subject is impersonal, and referred to by the feminine form of the copula. The predicate may be complemented by an adverbial phrase. In all texts examples are found of this type of introduction of reported clauses (13-17).[25]

(13) *u-mijjid=(ī)lā d- {wmíǧedílā}* / and-true=it.is REP- / 'And it is true that..' (Socin 22.11)

(14) *ṣpāyī=(h)wā qā d-hô (')nāšā, en..* / good=it.was for for.that man if.. / 'It would be better for that man, if..' (Mark 14:21)

(15) *wājeb=īlā d-kullê (')nāši qārī u-šāmʿī himezmāni d-ktāḇi qaddīši* / proper=it.is REP-all.of.them people SUB.they.read and-SUB.they.hear words of-Scriptures holy / 'All people ought to read and hear the words of the holy Scriptures' (49/1/2A2)

(16) *cātīn='īlā qā barnāšā qat..* / difficult=it.is for man REP / 'It is difficult for man to..' (Im 15.18)

(17) *máhlem íla min dā ădat qat..* / clear=it.is from this usage REP.. / 'It is clear from this usage that..' (Duval 9.18)

7.3.3 *Copular clauses with preverbal pronominal subject (SpronPc)*

A pronominal subject can perform marked topic functions when a personal pronoun is added to the nucleus of predicate and copula. Thus, an independent personal pronoun can be employed to mark the change of a (pronominal) topic in discourse, or to mark the fact that the topic is in contrast or comparison with another topic.[26] Such assertive and contrastive pronominal topics precede the predicate.

In the first example from Socin (1), the personal pronoun is probably employed because 'we' are introduced for the first time, when a question on the identity of these people is being answered. The pronoun has the same function in the second clause (2), which is the first occurrence of the 'I' in a letter. When the same clause, somewhat extended, is repeated a few lines further (Merx 34.14), the copula suffices to represent the subject. In ex. 3 the speaker emphasizes that he himself saw it happen, whereas in ex. 4 and 5 the pronoun marks contrast between two clauses.

25. These indeclinable adjectives can also be employed without copula, preceding a finite SUB stem. In the same way two finite verb stems can be employed together without consecutive or subordinate marker, thus *lāzem massem bālā* 'he ought to pay attention' and *āmeṣ massem bālā* 'he is able to pay attention'. In Bedjan, the adjectives *lāzem* and *garag* without copula or relative marker are also employed with other verb forms.

26. This was already noted by Maclean 1895: 76, §29.6: 'As the terminations of *īwen* etc. contain the personal pronouns, it is unnecessary, except for emphasis or distinction, to repeat these'. Compare Goldenberg 1983: 103, who states for CS that with a pronominal subject 'Pattern B [SPs, MvdB] will enable marked fronting of the subject and Pattern C [PsS, MvdB] will not occur'. For the same pattern in Hebrew, see Muraoka 1975: 31.

In BT the employment of an independent personal pronoun appears to be very much determined by its occurrence in the Hebrew or CS text. In Hebrew the conditions governing the use of a personal pronoun in clauses of this type seems to be somewhat different from those in LUA. In most instances BT follows the Hebrew text in such way that the independent pronoun is literally translated, also when it is not present in the Peshitta text. This is illustrated by ex. 6. One wonders whether the explicit pronoun does not change the meaning of the clause from 'because he is *flesh*' (not spirit) to 'because *he* is flesh' (rather than somebody else). The example from NT illustrates the contrastive function of the pronoun (7), but here the independent pronoun is also present in CS. A similar example is found in Mat. 3:11.

The first clause from ZdB is the first line of a letter in which the 'I' speaks (8), in the second example the subject is only referred to in a prepositional phrase preceding the predicate (9), and thus is taken up with an independent pronoun. However, in most of the clauses in ZdB with an independent pronoun, one may wonder whether its presence is according to its function in the texts of Socin and Merx. No examples have been found of clear contrastive usage.

In Bedjan's texts the use of independent pronouns is restricted to clauses in which the subject expresses various kinds of assertive topics, either contrastive or comparative. In the first example contrast is most important (10), and in the second comparison (11). The third example belongs to a paragraph in which the strength of a leopard is described. This clause affirms that the king himself is like that leopard, and that he does not have to fear for his subjects (12).

(1) *axnan xaccā (ʾ)nāši xāduri=(y)waḵ {ḥādūrewaḥ}* / we some people walking.around=we.are / 'we are some people walking around' (Socin 6.4)

(2) *ānā pšīmā=(y)wen rābā* / I saddenend=I.am much] / 'I am very sad' (Merx 34.8)

(3) *cim rābā xātirjam ānā b-ʿaynī xizyā=(ī)wen {ḥízyēwin} qat..* / very much certain I in-my.eyes saw=I.was REP... / 'Certainly I myself saw that..' (Socin 36.10)

(4) *haw meṭyā=(y)li l-xartā d-sāpārtuhy, u-taklā d-up axnan māṭāḵ lkesluhy.* / he arrived=he.was at-end of-his.journey, and would REP-also we SUB.we.arrive to.him / '*He* has arrived at the end of his journey, and hopefully *we* will arrive with him' (Merx 34.2)

(5) *u-ʾmerri up ānā bnay Tawriz=īwen* / and-he.said also I inhabitant.of Tabriz=I.am / 'and he said: 'I am also coming from Tabriz' ' (Merx 55.6)

(6) *bxlāṭê haw besrā=(y)li* / because he flesh=he.is / 'because he is flesh' (Gen. 6:3) (in Hebrew: pron. + noun, in CS: noun + encl.pron.)

(7) *u-up a(n)t ʿam Īšoʿ Nāṣrāyā=(y)wet=(h)wā* / and-also yóu with Jesus Nazarene=you.were / 'You also were with Jesus the Nazarene' (Mark 14:67)

(8) *ānā šemʿyā=(y)wen d-* / I heard=I.was REP.. / 'I have heard that..' (49/1/3A29)

(9) *b-xabrā (')xārāyā bā's d-Pāpā, haw hālā b-Gi'tā=(y)li* / in-news latest concerning of-Pope, he still in-Gaeta=he.is / 'According to the latest news about the Pope, he is still in Gaeta' (49/5/A22)

(10) *a(n)t bi'tāyā=(')ywet ʿallī b-asbābi, u-ānā bi'tāyā=(')ywen ʿalluḵ b-šemmih d-Maryā Alāhā* / yóu coming=you-are on.me with-weapons, and-Í coming=I.am on-you in-his.name of-Lord God / 'You come to me with weapons, but I come to you in the name of the Lord God' (HS 97.5)

(11) *a(n)t zaddīqā=ywet mennī* / you righteous=you.are than.me / 'You are more righteous than I' (HS 101.21)

(12) *ó malka lá zdiḥ, át pálänk ívit* / oh king, not fear, you leopard=you.are / 'Oh king, do not be afraid, you are a leopard' (Duval 23.11)

Demonstrative pronouns preceding the predicate also perform topic functions. However, in case of demonstrative pronouns, this clause type cannot be considered to be marked vis-à-vis an unmarked constituent order type in which the demonstrative is in another position. Pragmatically, this clause with demonstrative pronoun is identical with the basic copular clause with explicit subject (cf. 7.3.4).

Semantically, however, this clause type is indeed marked vis-à-vis the same clauses with personal pronouns,[27] or vis-à-vis clauses without explicit pronoun. Demonstrative pronouns in this position usually resume an earlier mentioned topic, often in order to conclude a chain of sentences. It may mark also the introduction of a new topic, which is explained in the clauses following the one with the demonstrative pronoun.[28]

A clause like *āhā mejjed=īlā* (13) marks a turning point of the description and introduces an important clause, whereas *mejjed=īla* without explicit pronominal subject can be employed without any specific marking (cf. 7.3.2, ex. 14, being part of a chain of descriptive clauses). The next clause, ex. 14, introduces a description of a certain custom, and ex. 15 is the introductory clause of a few lines in which the speaker gives his opinion on the situation after four years of work among the mountain tribes. The demonstrative pronoun refers to the year of writing.

27. Somewhat problematic is the fact that in various text types the demonstratives for 'farther away' are written in the same way as the personal pronouns, so that the difference can only be concluded from the context (cf. 6.2.2 and 6.2.4).

28. Sometimes these resumptive or proleptic functions may be connected to span boundaries, but this is not always the case. See Khan 1988, who discusses a number of structures that are employed in Semitic languages to mark span boundaries.

In BT demonstratives in this position are rare. In the example from Mark the demonstrative is present also in CS (16). In Gen. 2:23 (ex. 3 in 7.2.2) the demonstrative is present both in Hebrew and in CS. In both examples the pronominal subject is clearly stressed. In ZdB this clause type occurs too; the clause in ex. 17 is at the end of a series of clauses in which various states of life (like wealth and fame) were mentioned, which, according to the author of the article, are worth nothing when it comes to dying.

In Bedjan's texts a few examples of this type are found, but I did not find any in Duval's texts. In ex. 18 the first few lines on Mar Barbashemin are quoted. In these lines the structure under discussion is employed twice. The first *āhā* takes up the immediately preceding noun, the name Barbashemin. The second *āhā* again refers to this name, but now referring to the person behind it, not to the name itself.

(13) *āhā mejjed=(y)lā d-* / this true=it.is REP- 'It really is true that..' (Merx 53.4)

(14) *āhā xā ʿādat=(ī)lā {ʔádad ʔíla} gô atrā dīyan īman d-* / this a custom=it.is in the.land of.ours] when.. / 'It is a custom in our land that when..' (Socin 54.2, cf. Socin 84.4 without *xā*, at the end of a discourse span)

(15) *āhā ši(n)tā d-4=(y)li dīwen gô* / this year of-four=it.is REP-I.am among / 'This is the fourth year that I am among..' (Merx 29.8)

(16) *d-up āhā mennê=(y)li* / REP-also this from.them=he.is / 'This one also belongs to them' (Mark 14:69)

(17) *anni šuli zʿori=(y)nā* / these small things=they.are / 'These are unimportant things' (49/1/3/A3)

(18) *bā(t)r Šāhdôst qātoliqā, qemli Barbaʿšmīn. āhā xā šemmā Kaldāyā=(')ylih, ayḵ tanaytā d-Bar ʿEḇrāyā, u-ki pāʿeš pušqā d-arbʿā šemmāni. up āhā men Bēt Garmay=(')y(h)wā, bron d-xātā d-ṭuḇānā Šemʿon bar Ṣabbāʿi sāhdā.* / after Shadost katholikos, he.arose Barbashemin. this a name Chaldean=it.is, as mentioning of-Bar Hebraeus, and-HAB it.becomes translated by-four names. also this.one from Bet Garmay=he.was, son of-sister of-blessed Shemon bar Sabbaʿi martyr. / 'The katholikos Shadost was succeeded by Barbashemin. This is an Aramaic name, according to Barhebraeus, and it means "four names". This man was also from Bet Garmay, being a son of a sister of the blessed Shemon bar Sabbaʿi, the martyr.' (VdS 339.15-18)

7.3.4 *Copular clauses with preverbal nominal subject (SnounPc)*

If a nominal subject precedes the nucleus of predicate and copula, the clause type is unmarked. This type of clause is employed when a new topic is introduced, when the topic performs assertive or contrastive functions, as

well as when a topic that had been mentioned earlier is repeated without specific marking.[29] It is the dominant order in all text corpora.

(1) *up malkā Mammat rābā ʿattīqā=(ī)li {ātīqēli} men dôri rābā* / also king Mammat very old=he.is from ages many / 'King Mammat is also very old' (Socin 8.12)

(2) *Alāhā raxmānā=(ī)li {raḥmānēli}* / God merciful=he.is / 'God is merciful' (Socin 42.16)

(3) *āhā (ʾ)nāšā hônānā=(ī)wā {hônānīwā}* / this man wise=he.is / 'This man was wise' (Socin 60.17)

(4) *sohbātuhy*[30] *ruxānāyi rābā bāsīmi=(h)wāw qātan* / his.talks spiritual very sweet=they.were for.us / 'His spiritual talks were very sweet to us' (Merx 30.20)

(5) *u-Nox bar eštā mā' šenni=(h)wā* / and-Noah son.of six hundred years=he.was / 'And Noah was six hundred years old' (Gen. 7:6)

(6) *u-hamzamtuḵ bedmāyā=(y)lā* / and-your.speech resembling=it.is / 'and your speech is similar' (Mark 14.7) (CS: act. part. 3msg)

(7) *rābā mennê meskini=(y)na u-kpīni* / many of.them poor=they.are and-hungry / 'Many of them are poor and hungry' (49/1/6A29)

(8) *šulā d-Maryā biʾzālā=(y)li lāqāmuhy gô d-hô atrā* / the.work of-Lord going=it.is to.its.forward in that country / 'The work of the Lord is progressing in that country' (71/12/96B1)

(9) *dḇāqtā d-nātā buš ṣpay=ylā men deḇxi* / turning of-ear better=it.is than offerings / 'obedience is better than offering' (HS 93.5)

(10) *bdouḵāni ḥíni pála bouš árzan île* / in.places other laborer more cheap=he.is / 'In other places a laborer is cheaper' (Duval 16.4)

(11) *kóut āǧa ḥa hákim-waláyat île* / all.of Agha a ruler-vilayet=he.is / 'Every Agha is the ruler of a vilayet' (Duval 21.15)

7.3.5 *Introductory clauses (SP$_{demc}$)*

A special type of SPc clauses are those clauses in which the predicate consists of a demonstrative pronoun. The majority of clauses with a demonstrative followed by the enclitic copula belong to the identifying clauses (cf. 7.4.2). In the clauses under discussion here, the predicate, consisting of a demonstrative, is followed by a number of noun phrases or clauses that contain an enumeration or a description.[31] The demonstrative pronoun re-

29. Thus, at this point there seems to be a fundamental difference between copular clauses and clauses with finite verbs. In the latter VS order constitutes an alternative to SV order, see 8.2.6-7.

30. In Syriac script: *sôhabtuhy*.

31. Introductory clauses may also be constructed with an independent copula, cf. ex. 3 in 7.3.7. Perhaps this latter type is somewhat more assertive than the type under discussion in the present section.

fers to this enumeration or description. These latter parts are attributively attached to the preceding copular clause, and can be interpreted as post-clausal tail constituents, providing additional, in this case salient, information.

In the examples from Socin and Merx, the nucleus *āhā=(y)li* is followed by an explanation (1, 3), and an enumeration (2).

The example from ZdB (4) introduces a long description of the great fire in Chicago (cf. Texts no 10).

In Bedjan's texts, edited by Duval, several clauses occur of this type. Ex. 5 introduces the description of the 'condition' mentioned in the predicate, ex. 6 opens a paragraph in which farming utensils are listed, and ex. 7, although at the end of a paragraph, introduces a description of four possible remedies for the problems of agriculture in Persia.

(1) *šimmā d-āhā yumā āhā=(ī)li r(ʿ)uytā d-mīti* / the.name of-this day this=it.is Friday of-the.dead / 'The name of this day is this: Friday-of-the-dead.' (Socin 82.13)

(2) *(ʾ)nāši d-[..], d[...], anni=(y)nā, mallā 10, sêyīdi 3,..* / people that [...], these=they.are: 10 Mollahs, 3 Seyids,.. / 'The people that [.....], are these: ten Mollahs, three Seyids,..' (Merx 54.4)

(3) *cārā āhā=(y)li d-ṣālāḵ ṣlutā* / remedy this=it.is REP-SUB.we.pray prayer / 'The remedy is this, that we pray..' (Merx 37.2)

(4) *xabri (ʾ)xārāyi d-īt=lan but d-hô nurā gurā d-māqadtā d-Šekāgo, anni=(y)nā* / news(pl) other(pl) that-there.is=to.us about that fire great of-burning of-Chicago, these=they.are / 'The latest news we have about the large fire in Chicago is as follows:..' (71/12/94A30)

(5) *ḗ šart góurta ouqammáya min kóulle ắhēla:* / that condition important and.first of all.of.them this.it.is: / '.., the first and most important condition is this:..' (Duval 9.16)

(6) *haǵátid varzigarṓuva ắnnina: ptắna...* / utensils.of farming these.they.are: plough... / 'The utensils needed for farming are these: a plough,..' (Duval 15.9)

(7) *čáro ắhēla* / her-remedy this=it(f)-is / 'Her remedy is this. (i).. '(Duval 17.13)

7.3.6 *Copular clauses with post-clausal constituents (Pc, Ta)*

If the subject consists of a noun or noun phrase, it may also be placed after the nucleus of predicate and copula. This clause type is far less frequent than the one with the subject in pre-predicate position (7.3.4). The difference in frequency suggests that the former is a marked type, and this is confirmed by the fact that post-predicate subjects occur in specific, marked

contexts. In the majority of the examples, a subject in this position is employed to mark the end of a topic span,[32] in a concluding or resumptive clause.

The 'subject' in these clauses always consists of a given topic, which is repeated at the end of a topic span. Therefore it is likely that these 'subjects' can better be described as post-clausal constituents, performing *tail* functions, i.e., adding additional or resumptive information to the preceding clause.[33]

The two types of main affirmative clauses in which the subject regularly occurs in post-predicate position, i.e., clauses introduced by *kmā* and marked name-giving clauses, do not belong to this category. In these clauses, the postpredicate subjects do not perform resumptive functions and cannot be considered to be extra-clausal. These clauses are discussed in 7.7.5 and 7.8.2.

In the texts of Merx and Socin, the first two examples illustrate regular usage (1, 2): both clauses are the concluding clauses of a story told by the narrator. In many cases the post-clausal constituent of the clause, thus, is identical with the topic of the passage, and had been mentioned earlier.[34] However, this is not always necessary. If a description of something is given, the last clause of that description may take this structure, even if the subject is not the same as that of earlier clauses. In ex. 3 the narrator is recalling all the sad things that befell him, and this is the last clause referring to the past tense. In the next clause he begins to describe his present situation. Ex. 4 is the last clause of a description of a journey, before the narrator turns to describe a special event that happened on that journey. The second clause of ex. 5 concludes a short description of the arms of some kind of demon.

In the LUA translation of OT all instances of post-predicate position of the subject are parallel to the constituent order in Hebrew, which basically has a VSO order.[35] In many instances the constituent order in the Hebrew text is reflected in the Peshitta. In NT, LUA follows the constituent order in

32. See Khan 1988: xxxiii-xxxvi for this terminology.

33. In the chapter on verbal syntax, post-clausal constituents are discussed in more detail, cf. 8.4.5-8.

34. Compare Goldenberg 1983: 104, who suggests that the parallel construction in CS can be employed only when the subject is known to the reader/hearer.

35. Stoddard 1855: 149-50, gives an example of a clause in which a pronominal subject follows the nucleus of predicate and copula. This clause is introduced by the explanation: 'An inversion of the ordinary construction may, however, be employed for emphasis'. The 'emphasis', according to Stoddard, is on the predicate, not on the subject. Nöldeke 1868: 348, cites the same clause, not adding further examples.

the Peshitta, in which the subject may occur also after the subject. In many instances the Peshitta reflects the order in Greek. No examples were found in which the LUA translation employs post-predicate subjects independently from the Greek or the Peshitta text. In ex. 6 the order in Hebrew and in Peshitta was taken over in LUA.[36] In the example from NT (7), both CS and Greek have the same constituent order. The clause is the introduction of a part on Jesus' work in Galilee and the post-predicate position of the subject is rather out of place. In these PcS clauses in the Bible translations, it is difficult to speak of an extra-clausal constituent, because the subjects often are new topics, and the clause does not perform a resumptive function.

In ZdB the number of clauses of this type is much smaller, which confirms the assumption that their occurrence in BT is mainly due to the source languages. An example of the conclusive, resumptive usage is given in ex. 8.

It is interesting to note that in Bedjan's text no clear example of the resumptive usage has been found so far.[37] The position of the subject in ex. 9 probably is due to influence from the Bible text.[38]

(1) *u-cim mijid=(ī)lā {míjet ɬla} āhā mitlā* / and-very certainly=it.is this story / 'And this story is very certain' (Socin 24.15)

(2) *rābā maxyānā d-zārab=(ī)li āhā haywān bīšā* / much someone.who.afflicts damage=he.is this animal bad / 'And this animal is a very damaging one' (Merx 1.13)

(3) *xīšā=(h)wā men īdī šuʿlī* / gone=it.was from my.hand my.work / 'my work left from my hands' (Merx 46.10)

(4) *pyāšā=(h)wāw {pīšīwa}*[39] *trê yumāni d-māṭinwā l-baytā* / remaining= they.were two days OBJ-SUB.I.reach-PAST to-home / 'Two days of traveling remained for me to reach home' (Socin 24.9)

(5) *up īt=lun qārābīni rābā yārīḵi u-rābā yāquyri ayḵ tmānī batmāni=(ī)li {batmānêli} yuqrê* / also there.is.to.them carbines very long and-very heavy

36. Cf. also the passive clause Gen. 2:23: *sābāb d-men (')nāšā pīštā=(y)lā šqīltā āhā* 'because from the man she was taken'. The demonstrative pronoun in Hebrew (not in Peshitta) is rendered in LUA, suggesting focus on the subject pronoun, rather than on the predicate.

37. Note that also in verbal clauses Bedjan seems to refrain as much as possible from the use of post-clausal constituents, cf. 8.4.5-8, whereas in the texts of Merx and Socin these clause types are much more frequent.

38. See 1Sam 14:45. It is difficult to tell which text was employed by Bedjan for his HS. Most likely he had the Peshitta available, but what about the LUA translation and the Hebrew text? In the LUA edition of 1893 exactly the same phrasing occurs.

39. The phonetic transcription seems to reflect a participle (*pīšā* (ms), *pīši*, (pl)) rather than a contracted form of the infinitive.

about eighty batmans=it.is their.weight / 'They possess also very long and heavy carbines whose weight is about eighty batman' (Socin 54.15)

(6) *qurbā=(y)li ellan hô (ʾ)nāšā* / relative=he.is to.us that man / 'That man is a relative of ours' (Ruth 2:20)

(7) *u-bexdārā=(h)wā Īšoʿ b-kullih Glīlā* / and-walking.around=he.was Jesus in-all.of.it Galilee / 'And Jesus went about all Galilee' (Mat. 4:23)

(8) *hatkā biʾmārā=(y)li malkā ʿāqeldār* / thus speaking=he.is king wise / 'Thus said the wise king' (49/1/8B26)

(9) *xayyā=yli Māryā* / alive=he.is the.Lord / 'The Lord is alive' (HS 92.3)[40]

7.3.7 *Clauses with independent copula (SCP)*

In the texts a number of clauses are found for which the analysis as suggested above presents some difficulties. The common characteristic of these clauses is the fact that the copula *precedes* the predicate. This means that the copula is placed between the subject and the predicate.[41] There are several indications that the copula in clauses of this type has an unusual form, with initial *ī*, whether the preceding noun ends in a consonant or not. The first indication is the phonetic transcription of these clauses in the texts of Socin. A second argument is found in the descriptions of Friedrich and Tsereteli. They differentiate between two types of copula: the usual enclitic form and the alternative form that Friedrich calls 'betont' and Tsereteli 'emphasised'.[42] I call this alternative form the 'independent' copula, basing myself on the morphological difference between the regular and the variant form.[43] The spelling of the independent copula in Merx and Socin suggests that in the early period, this *i*-vowel was not indicated in standard orthography. However, I did not come across any examples of this form in the earlier Protestant impressions, so I do not know what the standard orthography was supposed to be. The two examples from ZdB, however, suggest that in later Protestant orthography independent copula was indeed marked by a full vowel *ī*-.

40. Compare also HS 5.10, with the same constitutent order in Gen. 3:3 in Hebrew, CS, and BT '93.

41. This was noted by Stoddard 1855: 152; he interprets this order (SCP) as conveying 'a kind of emphasis'. He adds: 'the change of the usual construction, as in other cases, giving more force to the words.' Nöldeke 1868: 344 does not add further examples, classifying Stoddard's with clauses of the type ScP (7.4.2).

42. Friedrich 1959: 61 and Tsereteli 1978: 89, 1970: 79. Unfortunately, they do not pay attention to the syntax of the two types of clauses.

43. It is possible that Maclean 1895: 76, §29.5, refers to this independent copula, which is employed 'In poetry, or for emphasis'. However, his only example is with a pronoun, of which I did not find any examples.

The clauses with SCP constituent order have a pragmatic function that is different from clauses with SPc order. Clauses in which the independent copula is employed have an emphatic, assertive stress on the complete clause, and perhaps one may say that the focus function is extended over the complete clause, instead of being assigned to one constituent, thus *assertive sentence focus*.[44]

In the two examples from Socin, the clause with independent copula (1, 2) introduces a new paragraph of description, of which both elements are new information. This initial clause is followed by a second clause with usual constituent order (1a, 2a), in which the subject is no longer part of the focal information of the clause, but performs topic function as usual. It is rather difficult to render this difference in the English translation. The example from Merx is the clause introducing the very point of the story and thus also seems to reflect this general assertive function (3).

The two examples of ZdB come from a text that is included in this volume (Texts no 9). In both cases, the independent form of the copula is indicated by initial *ī-*, rather than *(y)-* following a vowel (4, 5). In these examples both the general assertive function and the new focus both for subject and predicate can apply. Another example was found in the text from the Anglican press (Texts no 14), again with initial *ī-* after a vowel (6).

In the texts of Bedjan, no examples of this order have been found.

It is important to note that in the twentieth-century texts, especially in those from the Soviet Union, this independent copula seems to have become rather common in copular clauses with nominal subjects.[45] In fact, in certain texts, like, e.g., in the magazine *Koxva d-Madınxā*, the independent copula is employed in nearly all clauses in which a nominal S occurs. It is likely that the marked character of this clause type in the nineteenth-century texts has disappeared to a great extent in the Soviet texts of the twenties and thirties of the twentieth century.

(1) *qômu(h) (ī)li {qṓmō íli} trê drā'yi* / her.height it.is two draya's / 'Her height is two draya' (Socin 20.3)

(1a) *pitwu(h) xamšā carāgi=(ī)li {cārā́(i)gīlī}* / her.width five carag's=it.is / 'her width is five charag's' (Socin 20.4)

44. Cf. Moutaouakil 1989: 25-30, on 'sentence Focus', which can be either 'New' or 'Contrastive'. Assertive sentence focus is also found in verbal clauses, see 8.2.7.

45. Cf., e.g., *Koxva d-Madınxā* 1934/39: 242, Friedrich 1958, and Polotsky 1967. In Mooshie 1912, the independent copula seems to be used more in line with earlier usage, in slightly asserted contexts; cf. Mooshie 1912: 37: (1) *Bristol xdā mdī(n)tā gurtā=ylā* (2) *Lewerpol buš gurtā=ylāh men Bristol* (3) *Landān īlāh hê mdī(n)tā buš gurtā men kullê.* / '(1) Bristol is a large town, (2) Liverpool is larger than Bristol, (3) London is the biggest town of all'.

(2) *rixqāyutā d-āhā ṭurā d-MarBišoʿ (ī)li {d'márbíšū ílī} ṭlā yumāni* / distance of-this mountain of MarBisho it.is three days / 'The distance to this mountain of MarBisho is three days' (Socin 22.14)

(2a) *u-up rixqāyutā d-MarSargīs 3 ṣāhāti=(ī)lā {sāhátteila} men Urmi* / and-also distance from MarSargis three hours=it-is from Urmi / 'and even MarSargis is three hours away from Urmi' (Socin 22.14)

(3) *qat ma(ʿ)nāyā d-āhā himizmān īli āhā d-* / REP meaning of-this word it.is this REP-.. / 'that the meaning of this word is this:..' (Merx 13.11)[46]

(4) *hāw b-šeḳ=ī(h)wā, en Īoḇ b-kāmīlutuhy, sābābuh ī(h)wā xā īqārā rišāyā l-Alāhā.* / he in-doubt=he.was, if Job in-perfection.his, reason.her it.was a reverence chief to-God / 'He doubted whether the reason for Job's perfection was his basic reverence for God' (71/12/90A34)

(5) *bāqartuhy gurtā īlā, mudī (y)lā duz?* / question.his main it.is what=it.is right / 'his main question is: what is right?' (71/12/90B9)

(6) *nīyatih rišêtā ī(h)wā l-maqqummi la'ḳā xdā dastā d-qaššīši Suryāyi ylīpi..* / aim.his chief it.was to-raise.up here a goup of-priests Syrian educated.. / 'His chief aim was to raise up here a group of educated Syrian priests..' (*Memoir of the Archbishop of Canterbury* 1896: 6.20)

7.3.8 *Clauses with cleft predicates (SPcP)*

The copula has a special function in another type of clause too. In these clauses, however, there is less evidence that the independent form is employed.

These clauses have in common that the copula is employed after a phrase introduced by an indefinite article, *xā* 'a', or *xaccā* 'some'. The copula is followed by another phrase, thus X1 C X2. At first sight one might be inclined to interpret these clauses as SCP, even more so because in one or two clauses there is an indication that the independent copula is employed (exx. 1, 2).

However, this SCP interpretation, although grammatically possible, is quite unlikely in the context of the clauses. The main problem is the fact that the indefinite phrase then would become the subject of the clause, whereas these 'subjects' seem to refer to something or someone that has been mentioned before. This interpretation is even more unlikely, because in quite some clauses another phrase precedes the X1 C X2 sequence, a phrase that is much more like a subject (2, 3, 6, 7).

The interpretation that accounts best for the different features of this type of clause is PaCPb or SPaCPb. Thus, both phrases around the copula are part

46. A similar clause is found in Mooshie 1912: 3. Here the orthography is unambiguous: *nīyat d-āhā ktāḇā īlāh d-b-urxih..* 'The purpose of this book is that in this way…'

of the predicate. This clause type therefore is probably the marked form of the unmarked clause type *SP(a+b)-c, in which the predicate is not 'cleft' by the copula.[47] I suppose that cleaving of the predicate is possible only when the predicate consists of an indefinite noun plus an adjectival complement.[48] This construction is employed to give important information on a previously mentioned topic of the discourse, and thus the adjectival rather than the nominal part of the predicate is assigned assertive or contrastive focus.

Clauses of this type then would constitute the only exception to the rule that genitival and adjectival complements in LUA are not separated from the main part of the predicate by a copula. It is possible that these clauses correspond to certain types of cleft clauses in English.

Although the grammatical and pragmatic conditions for the use of this construction are clear, it remains difficult to be sure about the type of copula employed. There is only one clause (1), in which the transcription reflects the independent form. In all other clauses of this type, only Syriac script is available, which, especially in the early years, does not differentiate between these two types of copula. In ex. 2, the Syriac script suggests an independent form, because initial *ī* is not marked with *l.o.*, as it is in other clauses. However, the transcription in ex. 2a seems to indicate an enclitic copula rather than an independent one. Another argument for enclitic copula is given by the fact that the two examples from ZdB come from the same issue in which two clear instances of independent copula were found (cf. 7.3.8., exx. 4, 5), and thus the use of *l.o.* in these clauses must be taken seriously. The fact that in CS the enclitic copula is always employed in predicates like this, furnishes an additional argument for the enclitic form.[49] The main argument for independent copula, apart from exx. 1 and 2, is the fact that the copula can be employed to assign focus to non-predicate constituents of the clause (cf. 7.4). Independent copulae precede the constituent they assign focus to, either the predicate or another constituent (cf. 7.6.4 about the negative copula). In the clauses under discussion,

47. Note that, in Goldenberg's description of P-s P clauses in CS, clauses occur which seem to be of the same type, e.g., *bar (')nāšā=(')nā xāšošā* 'I am a passible man' (Goldenberg 1983: 101). However, in CS the enclitic pronoun always follows the main part of the predicate.

48. Compare Maclean 1895: 192, who notes that 'if the predicate is long', the copula can appear after the first main noun. His only example, however, is a clause with an indefinite noun phrase (with *xā*) followed by a complement.

49. One cannot exclude the possibility that in clauses of this type native speakers themselves wavered in their use of enclitic and independent copula, as might also be the case in clauses with the copula attached to non-predicative constituents, cf. 7.4.2, n. 53.

the copula seems to assign focus to the adjectival part that follows the copula, rather than to the nominal part of the predicate, as independent copulae usually do.

The first example from Socin (1), without explicit subject, suggests that the copula is independent (*ā* + *ī*), as does ex. 2 from Merx, whereas in ex. 2a, the transciption indicates an enclitic copula. In ex. 2b the alternative unmarked clause is given. The first example from ZdB has an explicit subject (3), in the second, the second part of the predicate contains an adjectival participle (4).

This clause type also occurs regularly in Bedjan's texts. In ex. 5 no nominal subject is present, whereas in exx. 6 and 7 a nominal subject functions as the topic of the clause. In Bedjan's texts, there is no indication of an independent copula. However, because no clauses with ScP order were found, I do not know whether Bedjan would indicate independent copula or not.

(1) *xā ṭayrā=(ī)li {ṭā́(i)ra Íli} balqā* / a bird it.is speckled / 'This bird is speckled' or 'It is a bird that is speckled' (Socin 24.11)

(2) *axnan xaccā (')nāši īwaḵ xāduri* / we some people we.are walking.around / 'We are some people walking around' or 'We are some people that are walking around' (Merx 10.7)

(2a) *qat áḥnan ḥáca nā́šēwaḥ ḥā́dūrī* (Socin 93.13)

(2b) *axnan xaccā (')nāši xaduri=(y)waḵ* / 'We are some people walking around' (Socin 6.4)

(3) *mdī(n)tā d-Šekāgo xā duktā=(h)wā buš manšur men kullê d-gô dunya qā..* / city of Chicago a place=it.was more famous than all.of.them in world for.. / 'The city of Chicago is a place that is most famous in the world for..' (71/12/94A21)

(4) *xā duktā (h)wā mlītā men anbāri d-xiṭi qā zāboni* / a place it.was filled with storerooms of-grains for selling / 'It was a place filled with storerooms full of grain to be sold' (71/12/94A34)

(5) *xā (')nāšā ywā rābā māri dāweltā* / a man he.was very wealthy / 'He was a very wealthy man' or 'He was a man who was very wealthy' (HS 85.16)

(6) *Šā'ol xā (')nāšā (')ywā prīšā u-kšīṭā* / Saul a man he.was distinguished and-holy / 'Saul was a special and holy man' or 'Saul was a man who was special and holy' (HS 90.12)

(7) *ho pardaysā ar'ānāyā xā baxcā (')ywā cim šāpīrā* / that paradise earthly a garden it.was very beautiful / 'That earthly paradise was a very beautiful garden' or 'That earthly paradise was a garden that was very beautiful' (HS 4.3)

In ZdB two incidences occur of a copular clause that might belong either to this category or to that decribed in the previous paragraph. In the preceding

paragraphs of the article, the ideal God-fearing man is characterized (cf. Texts no 9). This characterization is followed by 'Such a man was Joseph' and later by 'Such a man was Daniel' (90B25). Thus, the topical information of these two clauses is the phrase 'such a man', and the names, 'Joseph' and 'Daniel', represent new focus. This would make an interpretation of SCP rather likely, if not in the very same article in ZdB the copulae of two SCP clauses had been written with initial *ī-*, indicating the independent copula. In these clauses, *ī-* is absent. The initial constitutent *xā hatḳa (')nāšā* reminds one of the clauses in the present paragraph, and lead to an interpretation of PcP. Problematic, however, is the fact that the personal name than has to be interpreted adjectivally.

(8) *xā hatḳā (')nāšā (h)wā Yoseph* / a such man he.was Joseph / 'Such a man was Joseph' (71/12/90B20), *xā hatḳā (')nāšā (h)wā Dānī'il* (71/12/90B25)

7.3.9 *Conclusions*

Main copular clauses occur in two unmarked basic types: (i) Pc and (ii) SPc. As opposed to SV order in verbal clauses, SP order in copular clauses does not indicate any special pragmatic marking. All types of topics occur as subjects in pre-predicate position.

If a pronominal subject requires marking for reasons of contrastive or comparitive focus, an independent personal pronoun precedes the nucleus.

A demonstrative pronoun in pre-predicate position performs anaphoric or cataphoric functions that are due to the function of demonstratives themselves, not to the position of the pronominal subject.

The end of a topic span can be marked by postponing the subject to a position following the nucleus of predicate and copula. In all likelihood, this constituent should be considered to be an extra-clausal phrase, functioning as a tail constituent.

An independent copula, preceding the predicate instead of following it, is employed to assign new or assertive focus to the complete clause.

The copula, in its dependent or independent form, is also employed in clauses with a cleft predicate, in this case to assign assertive focus to the adjectival part of the predicate.

The influence of the source languages has changed the usual constituent order patterns in BT, especially with regard to SPc // PcS order and the presence of explicit personal pronouns.

7.4 Clauses with enclitic copula attached to non-predicate constituents

7.4.1 *Introduction*

In some clause types, the copula is attached to constituents that are not easily interpreted as grammatical predicates (cf. 1.4.3.2). Two different types can be distinguished: (i) identifying clauses and (ii) pseudo-cleft clauses.

In the second type, there is no uncertainty about the fact that it is not the predicate that is followed by the copula, because the grammatical structure of the clause is clear. In the first type, however, it is possible to label the constituent that is followed by the copula 'predicate' and the remaining constituent 'subject'. Then, however, the terms 'predicate' and 'subject' are used as pragmatic terms, referring to the pragmatic function of the constituent, whereas I employ these terms as much as possible as grammatical terms. The constituent that corresponds in number, gender, and person with the copula is the subject, whereas the remaining constituent is the predicate. In clauses with third person pronoun and copula, the correspondence between pronoun and copula is not decisive, because the remaining nominal phrase can also be considered to be of the third person. I assume that, parallel to clauses with second and first person pronominal subjects and copula, in clauses with a third person pronoun, the independent pronoun is the subject, and the remaining phrase the predicate.[50]

The common feature of the two types of clauses under discussion is the fact that the copula is attached to the constituent that is assigned focus function. In basic copular clauses, it is the predicate that is assigned focus function. It is possible, however, to assign focus to other parts of the copular clause by attaching the enclitic copula to the focused constituent. Such clauses, in which the construction indicates to which part focus is assigned, are named by Dik *focus constructions*.[51] This construction is particularly fit to assign focus to the subject phrase, which, because of its inherently topical nature, needs extra marking when it performs focus functions. Another example of focus construction can be found in the constituent order of WH-questions, in which the focused part, including the interrogative, precedes the rest of the clause, regardless of the grammatical functions of the constituents (7.7.4-6).

50. For a similar approach to the grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic features of copular clauses in Biblical Aramaic consisting of a pronoun, a second 'copular' pronoun and a noun phrase, see Buth 1987: 244-252.

51. Dik 1980: 210-229 and Dik 1989: 278. Compare also Goldenberg 1990: 338-41, who describes the same phenomenon of 'Focalization/Rhematization' in CS, employing, however, a different terminology.

7.4.2 *Identifying clauses (SpronсP)*

The distinguishing feature of this type of clauses in LUA is the fact that the nucleus is formed by a personal or demonstrative pronoun followed by the copula.[52] The copula is employed in the same person, number and gender as the pronoun. Usually this nucleus is followed or preceded by a complement that furnishes the relevant information on the pronoun in the nucleus. The copula follows the pronoun enclitically.[53] The agreement between pronoun and copula constitutes the main reason for labelling the pronoun subject and the noun phrase predicate.[54]

It is illustrative to compare these identifying clauses (SpronсP) with clauses having the same semantic features, but which have the copula in the usual position (SpronPc). The small number of non-identifying clauses with predicates that are comparable to those of identifiying clauses illustrate the difference. In identifying clauses, focus is assigned to the pronoun (subject), whereas in non-identifying clauses focus is assigned to the noun phrase (predicate) and contrastive topic function to the subject.[55] This is reflected in translation by a definite predicate in case of identifying clases and by an indefinite predicate in non-identifying clauses. The clause *āhā ʿādat=(ī)lā* (this custom=it.is) should be translated as 'It is a custom which..', whereas *āhā=(y)lī sābāb d-qamudī* (this=it.is reason why) or *cārā āhā=(y)li* (remedy this=it.is), should be translated as 'This is the reason

52. Note that in Classical Hebrew, Biblical Aramaic, and CS, the nucleus of identifying clauses is formed by two pronouns. In CS the second pronoun is enclitically attached to the first, in the same way as it is, in other clauses, to the predicate. See Joüon & Muraoka 1991: 561-77, Muraoka 1987: 60-62 + n. 121-3, Goldenberg 1983: 100, 104-106, Goldenberg 1990, and Buth 1987: 244-49. The problems of deciding what is predicate // subject and focus // topic are much the same in these related languages.

53. A few examples suggest that it is also possible to employ an independent copula following a personal or demonstrative pronoun. Perhaps Socin's *ʾāʾili* (< *āhā (y)lī*) must be considered of this structure, whereas Maclean gives the form *'ānā īwin'*, 'in poetry, or for emphasis' (Maclean 1895: 76). Whether these clauses are to be considered as identifying clauses or as descriptive clauses belonging to the category SCP (7.3.7) is hard to tell from the small number of examples.

54. As did Nöldeke, see Nöldeke 1868: 344, where he gives a number of clauses in which the copula follows the subject. Several of these are identifying clauses. Hoberman too analyses clauses of this type as ScP, see Hoberman 1989: 176.

55. It is interesting to note that, in the LUA translation of 1846, Mat. 3:14 is translated as *ānā=(y)wen snīqā d-mennuk pêsen ʿmīdā, u-a(n)t lkeslī (ʾ)tiluḵ?*, whereas in the edition of 1893 this sentence is translated as *ānā snīqā=ywen d-mennuḵ pêšen muʿmeddā, u-a(n)t lkeslī ʾtiluḵ?* The second translation is closer to the Peshitta, in which the enclitic pronoun follows the passive participle, whereas the first translation seems to make more sense in the context, in which John the Baptist stresses the fact that 'it is *me*' who needs to be baptized by Jesus, rather than the other way round. Bedjan renders this clause as *ānā=(ʾ)wen snīqā qat mennuḵ pêšen ʿmīdā* (VdS 13.16).

why', and 'The remedy is that... '. Maclean remarks concerning the latter type of clauses that the copula does not follow the predicate 'with demonstrative pronouns [i.e., demonstrative subjects], especially when the predicate is definite'.[56]

In identifying clauses, the predicate follows the nucleus of subject and copula. Contrastive or assertive focus function is assigned to the subject, whereas the predicate reflects the new focus or perhaps even the topic of the clause.

In the texts of Merx and Socin, the most common type of identifying clauses is that with demonstrative pronouns. When a demonstrative pronoun is employed with an enclitic copula, the clause often functions as a resumptive clause in which the focused demonstrative pronoun performs anaphoric functions. This is the case in the two examples from Merx (1, 2). Sometimes the demonstrative pronoun is employed cataphorically, the explanation following the introduction (3). In this example the grammatical subject is preceded by a theme constituent (cf. 1.4.3.4).

When the subject is a pronoun of the first or second person the clause is a true identifying clause, which often serves as an answer to questions. A clear example is the question in ex. 4. The clause in ex. 5 perhaps is a pragmatically wrong translation.[57] The answer to the question of Boaz 'who are you?', probably had to be *Rʿot=īwān*, with *Rʿot* being the focus of the clause.[58] In the clause in ex. 5, *ānā* receives focus function, and thus becomes the answer to the unasked question 'Is it you, Ruth?'.[59] Another example from OT illustrates the structure with a demonstrative pronoun, without an exact parallel in CS or Hebrew (6). This clause functions as the introduction of a new part of the creation narrative.

In ZdB both types are present, although not very often. In ex. 7 a personal pronoun is employed, whereas in ex. 8 a demonstrative pronoun occurs in a concluding clause at the end of an article on the true faith. In ex. 9 the clause with a demonstrative pronoun is the introductory line of an article on subjects for prayer.

In Bedjan's texts again the two types are present, with a personal pronoun (10, 11) and with a demonstrative (12), the latter being part of a question.

56. Maclean 1895: 192, §74.5.

57. Note the Peshitta parallels: *enā=(')nā Rʿot.*. (Ruth 3:9) and *a(n)t=(h)u Mšīxā.*. (Mark 14:61).

58. It seems to me that this is the most likely interpretation of the Hebrew text, so also Muraoka 1985: 19, n. 48.

59. Compare also the identifying questions in ex. 2, 4, and 6 in 7.7.2.

(1) *āhā=(y)li xā qāšā myuqrā u-dôlatmand* / this-he-is a priest important and-wealthy / 'This is an important and wealthy priest' (Merx 43.14)

(2) *u-āhā=(h)wā šulī d-trê šenni* / and-this=it.was my.business of-two years / 'And this was my occupation in the past two years' (Merx 50.2)

(3) *Mišilmāni āhā=(y)li {ʔāhēli} šulê* / Muslims, this=it.is their.business / 'As to the Muslims, this is their business' (Socin 70.3)

(4) *a(n)t=īwet Mšīxā brunih d-brīḵā?* / you=you.are Messiah his.son of-Blessed? / 'You are the Messiah, the son of the Blessed One?' (Mark 14:61)

(5) *ānā=(y)wān Rʿot qārāwāšuḵ* / I=I-am Ruth your.servant / 'I am Ruth your servant' or 'It is me, Ruth your servant' (Ruth 3:9)[60]

(6) *anni=(y)nā ujāxi d-šmayyā u-arʿā* / these=they.are generations of-heaven and-earth / 'These are the generations of the heaven and the earth' (Gen. 2:4)

(7) *haw=īli qābālā d-xaṭṭīyātī* / he=he.is the.bearer of-my.sins / 'He is the bearer of my sins' (50/1077A51)

(8) *āhā=(y)li hô mazhab d-ki myāqer l-Alāhā* / this=it.is that religion REP-HAB it.honors OBJ-God / 'This is the religion that honors God' (71/12/91A18)

(9) *anni=(y)nā hajjāti qā ṣlotā* / these=they.are the.subjects for prayer / 'These are the subjects for prayer' (71/12/89A3)

(10) *haw=yli bābih d-Išay* / he=he.is his.father of-Isai / 'He is the father of Isai' (HS 86.2)

(11) *a(n)t=ʾīwet beryan u-purqan bī d-ho demmā* / you=you.are our.creator and-our.savior in that blood / 'You are our creator and our savior through that blood..' (MdP 2.9)

(12) *āhā=ylih ho qurbānā d-[..]?* / this=it.is that offering [..]? / 'Is this that offering..?' (VdS 348.11)

A few times the nucleus of the identifying clause, consisting of Sc, occurs without a predicate noun phrase. Although this might lead one to describe this nucleus as Pc, because that is a complete clause, whereas Sc is not, the contexts in which these clauses occur indicate that they are identifying clauses as well. Therefore it is better perhaps to interpret these clauses as incomplete identifying clauses. This type of clause occurs either as an answer to a question, or as additional information.[61] The occurrence of this type of clause in the texts of Bedjan, as well as in Maclean's grammar,

60. In a Zakho Jewish Aramaic translation of this text, Ruth's answer is translated as *ʾāna Rut* ('I Ruth') Goldenberg & Zaken 1990: 155. This is a literal rendering of the Hebrew.

61. The corresponding translation in English is not always easy; Maclean 1895: 79 (§29.1), gives *ānā=wen* as being equal to English 'It is I', but perhaps 'I am' would also have been correct.

makes it likely that this clause type is grammatical, although it does not occur in Socin and Merx.[62] However, in these texts no alternative expressions are found.

In the parts from NT two examples are found (13, 14). Both clauses might very well be interpreted as a loan translation from CS, because in Peshitta the same construction (*enā=(ʾ)nā* and *huyu*) occurs. In the Greek text, these clauses seem to be elliptical as well. In ex. 14, the preceding noun phrase probably has to be interpreted as a pre-clausal theme constituent. The third example comes from ZdB (15). A fourth example, with a demonstrative pronoun, comes from Bedjan (16).

(13) *u-Īšoʿ (ʾ)merri ellih, ānā=(y)wen* / and-Jesus he.said to.him, I=I.am / 'And Jesus answered him: "I am" ' (Mark 14:62)

(14) *hô d-našqennih, haw=īli* / that REL-SUB.I.kiss.him, he=he.is / 'The one that I will kiss, he is it' (Mark 14:44)

(15) *hi, haw=īli* / yes, he=he.is / 'Yes, it is him' (50/10/76A10)

(16) *(ʾ)merri Māryā qā Šmuʾēl, qu(m) sum=lih, āhā=(y)li* / he.said the.Lord to Samuel, rise, appoint=him, this=he.is / 'The Lord said to Samuel: "go, appoint him, this is him".' (HS 94.9)

7.4.3 *Pseudo-cleft clauses (XcP)*

The common characteristic of the clauses in this part is the fact that the copula is attached enclitically to a noun phrase that certainly is not the predicate. In all examples, there is a verbal noun present in the clause, and this phrase must be interpreted as the grammatical predicate. In these clauses, contrary to regular clauses with verbal nouns, the copula does not follow the predicate. In most of the clauses, the copula is attached to the subject, but not necessarily so; the copula seems to be able to follow any constituent of the clause. Pragmatically, the constituents followed by the copula share an important characteristic: they express contrastive or assertive focus. The rest of the clause may perform either topic or new focus function. The constituent with the copula usually occupies the first position in the clause. Independent copulae, like the negative copula, can also mark assertive or contrastive focus in clauses of this type, but these copulae precede the constituent, rather than follow it.

When these pragmatic functions are expressed in the corresponding English clause, the result is a cleft clause. However, although these clauses in LUA display features that are common to cleft clause constructions in

62. Compare Hoberman 1989: 176, giving an example from Jewish Amadiya of Pc (Sc in my interpretation): *hatxa='ila*, ex. 36e, and PcS (= ScP): *'ayye=le darmana dide*, ex. 36g.

many languages — notably the assignment of focus function to non-predicative constituents — the characteristic properties that lead to the term 'cleft' clause are absent in LUA. There is no indication that we have to assume a basic clause that is split into two clauses of which the second is subordinate to the first. In LUA there is no relative marker and there is only one copula, not two. The grammatical construction is completely identical with that of the identifying clauses discussed above, just as the pragmatic functions assigned to the constituents are identical. These two types of focus construction differ only in their semantic functions. Therefore I employ the term *pseudo-cleft* clauses.[63]

In Merx and Socin's texts, I came across only one example of a pseudo-cleft clause (1). In this clause the copula is attached to a prepositional phrase. In the reread text, the copula is again in its unmarked position, following the verbal noun.

In Bedjan's texts quite a number of examples of these pseudo-cleft clauses occur. In the majority of these the copula is attached to the subject (2-4), whereas it is also possible to attach the copula to a fronted indirect object (5), or to a fronted direct object (6). In the first clause in ex. 5, a negative copula precedes an indirect object. The parallelism of these two clauses indicates that this pre-focus position of an independent copula is equivalent to post-focus position of enclitic copula. In all these clauses the fronted constituents followed by the copula express contrastive or assertive focus.

In exx. 3 and 4, the focused constituent is not in initial position, but is preceded by another phrase. These phrases are considered to be pre-clausal constituents, functioning as themes (cf. 8.4.3).

(1) *u-b-āhā tāhar=(ī)nā turṣi {bḥā tāhar túrsīna}* / and-in-this way=they.are prepared / 'and it is in this way they are prepared' (Socin 10.12)[64]

(2) *qat Māryā=(')ywā beqrāyuhy yālā* / REP *Lord* he.was [calling.him the.boy] / 'that it was the Lord calling the boy' (HS 87.14, id. 87.8)

(3) *u-anni qāli d-ʿunyāti d-sāhdi, zi, [..], Māry Mārutā=(')ylih mulxemmê* / and-these melodies of-anthems of-martyrs, look, [..], Mar Maruta he.is [composed.them] / 'And about the melodies of these martyr's anthems, look [..], it is Mar Maruta who composed them.' (VdS iii, 15-17)

(4) *kullih mendī Alāhā=(')li beryuhy* / all.of.it thing God=he.is created.it / 'All this, it is God who has created it' (HS 3.3)

63. Compare Goldenberg 1977, who uses the term 'imperfectly transformed cleft sentences' for clauses of the same type in CS, Hebrew, and Babylonian Aramaic in which the relative marker is not present.

64. See Goldenberg 1990: 343-4, for a discussion of the ways to translate cleft clauses in CS into English.

(5) *lā=(')ynā qātuḵ masluḇi, ellā qātī=(')ynā rappuḇi* / not=they.are you rejecting, but me=they.are casting away / 'It is not you they are rejecting, but it is me they cast away' (HS 90.4)

(6) *atḵā=(')yli bi'mārā Māryā* / this it.is saying Lord / 'This is what the Lord says:..' (HS 92.14)

7.4.4 *Conclusions*

In the clauses discussed in this section, the copula is attached enclitically not to the grammatical predicate, but to another part of the clause. The position of the copula marks various types of focus, assigned to a part of the clause that usually does not perform focus function. In the majority of clauses of this type this is the subject. Thus, the term 'focus construction', coined by Dik, is appropriate to describe these types of clauses.

Two different types of focus constructions have been described, identifying clauses and pseudo-cleft clauses.

In identifying clauses, the order of constituents is ScP. The subject consists of a personal or demonstrative pronoun and the predicate of an independent noun phrase. In these clauses, in which the identity of someone or something is conveyed, the focus is on the subject, rather than on the predicate. In answers to questions or in other types of direct speech, the predicate can be absent, and 'clauses' may consist only of the nucleus of Sc.

The second type of focus construction consists of clauses that correspond to English cleft clauses. In these clauses, the copula can be attached to the subject, to prepositional phrases, and perhaps to the direct object, in order to assign assertive or contrastive focus to these constituents. There is no indication that these clauses are actually cleft and consist of two clauses, because no relative marker is present and only one copula is found. Independent copulae, like the negative copula, can also serve as focus marker, but in that case precede the fronted constituent. In Bedjan's texts, a relatively large number of clauses of this second type of focus construction occur.

7.5 Subordinate clauses

7.5.1 *Introduction*

The survey of main copular clauses has revealed an important characteristic of the enclitic copula: it tends to be attached to the constituent that is assigned focus function. In basic copular clauses, the predicate performs new focus function and is followed by the copula, but in identifying and pseudo-

cleft clauses, the copula follows a non-predicate constituent. In subordinate clauses, the enclitic copula is often found to occupy the initial position of the clause, being attached to the particle *d-* (dcP or dcSP).[65] The employment of the relative marker *d-*,[66] as well as the rules that govern the fronting of the copula, differ widely between the various corpora.

In all texts from the nineteenth century, *d-* is employed to introduce relative clauses, both defining and non-defining,[67] adverbial clauses if the sentence connective consists of a composition with *d-*,[68] and object (or reported) clauses, which also may be introduced by *qat* (which should probably be derived from *qa* + *d-*).[69] To introduce interrogative reported clauses, forms such as *mudī* ('what') and *d-aykā* ('from where') are employed (cf. 7.7).

If we now turn to the position of the copula in subordinate clauses in general, it is important to note that fronting of the copula occurs in all types of subordinate clauses, whereas at the same time, in the same texts, a large number of subordinate clauses follow the constituent order of main clauses, in which the copula follows the predicate. In adverbial clauses introduced by sentence connectives without *d-*, the copula is never fronted. This leads to the conclusion that copula fronting is closely linked to the presence of the relative marker.

As mentioned above, the distribution of subordinate clauses with and without fronted copula is remarkably different in the various text types. This makes it preferable to discuss these clauses according to the texts in which they are found, rather than according to their function and constituent order. The subordinate clauses in the three main text types (Merx/Socin, BT/ZdB and Bedjan/Duval), will be discussed separately, and in each paragraph the specific distribution of these clauses over clause types with and without fronted copula will be described. Examples will be given of subor-

65. Cf. Nöldeke 1868: 347-8 and Maclean 1895: 192; both mention the possibility of the fronted position of the copula in relative clauses introduced by *d-*, without explaining the specific circumstances. See also Hoberman 1989: 179-180, according to whom the copula is always attached to *d-* in Jewish Amadiya.

66. On the close relation between the genitive and relative functions of *d-* in Aramaic, and especially in NA, see Goldenberg 1993: 296-298.

67. The distinction between defining and non-defining relative clauses does not seem to be of any importance for the grammar of LUA, so in the following I will not differentiate between the two types.

68. Apart from these, a few sentence connectives without *d-* are in use in LUA, like *en* ('if'). Others sometimes loose the relative marker, like *sābāb (d-)* ('because').

69. Stoddard 1855: 157, mentions that 'it [i.e. *d-*] may denote the objective case of the relative'. He does not mention *qat*. Maclean 1895: 188, remarks that *qat* in the Salmas dialect is employed as 'that'.

dinate clauses with main constituent order, but they will not be described extensively. These clause types have been described in other sections of this chapter.

7.5.2 *Subordinate clauses in the texts of Merx and Socin*

7.5.2.1 In each of these text editions only one example was found of a reported clause with a fronted copula, whereas all other reported clauses follow main constituent orders. In both examples the clause introduced by *d-* is dependent on a form of the stem *yd*ʿ: *dāyā* / *madduwi* 'to know' / 'to let know'.

(1) *Hyumām deʿli l-Sādi d-īhwa bnay Širāz* / Hyumam he.knew OBJ-Saadi REP-he.was son.of Shiraz / 'Hyumam came to know that Saadi was from Shiraz' (Merx 55.5)

(2) *up āhā šiklā īt=lih*[70] *madʿêtā qat d=(ī)li {qat ʾīlī} xā men draʿnu(h) prīmā* / also this portrait(m) there.is=to.him knowledge REP REP-it.is one of her.arms cut.off / 'About this figure, it is known that one of her arms is cut off' (Socin 20.2)

In the rest of the examples, clauses are given in which one of the constituent orders of main clauses is represented, and the copula is not fronted. Most reported clauses are introduced by *qat* (2, 3, 6), once spelled as *kad* (5), but *d-* is not uncommon (1, 4). Note that in ex. 4 the copula is present only in the text written in Syriac script, not in the phonetic transcription based on re-reading by the author.

(3) *axnan ki xašḇaḳ qat rābā qaddištā=(ī)lā {qadíštīla}* / we HAB we.think REP very holy=she.is / 'We believe that she is very holy' (Socin 20.7)

(4) *yāʿni āhā tāhar d-qrêtā d-āhā batšom=(ī)lā {dáhā baṭšum}* / that.is this kind of-calling REP-this ruin=it.is / 'that is, such a kind of calling [i.e., of a bird] meaning that this house will become a ruin' (Socin 26.1)

(5) *sābāb d-xšeḇlī kad hatḳā kêpuk ṣpāyī=(y)li d-* / because I.thought that thus your.health good=it.is REP- / 'because I thought that your health is so good that..' (Merx 39.12)

(6) *qat ānā=(ī)wan xdā baḳtā sāḇṭā* / because I=I.am a woman old / 'because I am just an old woman' (Merx 2.12)

7.5.2.2 The majority of adverbial clauses introduced by sentence connectives with *d-* follow the order of main clauses, but a limited number of examples occur in which the copula is fronted. In Merx's texts a few exam-

70. In Syriac script: *īt=(y)li*.

ples occur with fronted copula in adverbial clauses, whereas in Socin's texts the number is slightly higher. The example from Merx is somewhat elliptical (7). In the clauses from Socin nothing irregular is found (8, 9).

(7) *qāmêtā mi(ʿ)ryā ki hāwi dmīḵā gô julli yāʿni qam gānā ki hāwi sābab d-īli rābā mi(ʿ)ryā* / first sick HAB he.is laid.down on bedclothes that.is before soul HAB he.is because he.is very sick / 'At first the sick person is laid down on his bed, when he is still alive, because he is very ill' (Merx 27.3) (cf. also Merx 25.7 with *sābāb d-*).

(8) *[..] hê ʿidānā d-baʿyī d-yaṯḇī ʿal ʿarʿā ki ṭāliz rišê gô ʿarʿā sābab d-īli rābā pārumā ayḵ naštar* / [..] that time REL-they.want to-they.sit.down on earth HAB it.stabs their.points in earth, because it.is very sharp like lancet / '[...] every time when they want to sit down on the earth, its point [i.e., of a nail] stabs into the earth, because it is as sharp as a lancet' (Socin 54.21)

(9) *u-b-āhā tāhār ki maplax-lah kul yumā ayḵ kmā d-īlā xmāṭā bīyoh* / and-in-this manner HAB he.make.work-her every day as long.as she.is needle in.her / 'And in this way one could keep her in bondage every day as long as the needle is in her' (Socin 58.17)

The majority of adverbial clauses, however, do not deviate from constituent order in main clauses. As in main clauses, the subject may consist either of a noun (12) or a pronoun (10, 11, 13). The copula is employed to mark the focused part of the adverbial clause.

(10) *u-kul mendī d-tāni qātê ki ʿāḇdī sābāb d-irwānā=(ī)li ki xāšḇī* / and-all thing REL-he.tells to.them SUB they.do because of-charity=it.is SUB they-think / 'And everything he tells them, they do, because they believe it counts as charity' (Merx 25.12)

(11) *ayḵ kmā d-bimxāyā=(h)wā qāto(h) hê har barburi=(h)wā men zarb d-mxêtā* / while striking=he.was to.her she even roaring=she.was from strength of-slaying / 'While he was striking her [i.e., a captured bear], she kept roaring from the fierce blows' (Socin 64.11)

(12) *īnā tlexlan āhā pekkīr xā sābāb d-xarjilg rābā=(y)lā d=trê sābāb..* / but we.overthrew this thought one because expenses many=they.are, second because.. / 'but we put aside this thought, first, because the expenses are very high, second, because..' (Merx 41.12)

(13) *bā(t)r hādā tunilon sābab d-axton (')nāši dunyi xadtā=(ī)tun {ḥātītun}* / after that they.answered: because.of you(pl) people world new=you.are / 'Thereupon they answered: "Because you are people from the new world".' (Socin 6.8)

7.5.2.3 In both text editions the majority of relative clauses have a fronted copula, although in Merx's texts a considerable number of relative clauses

follow the order of main clauses. In Socin's text relative clauses with fronted copula by far outnumber those with other constituent orders. There is no apparent link to the type of predicate (e.g., participle and infinitive versus noun, adjective or adverbial phrase); all types of predicates occur with fronted copula (14-20).[71] Very few examples occur of relative clauses with an explicit subject and fronted copula (21), but this is due to the character of relative clauses, in which explicit nominal subjects are rare.

(16) *d-bāyrāg d-[..] muremtā=(h)wā ʿal (')gāri d-meššenrāyi u-d-āxonwātuḵ d-(y)nā gô mdī(n)tā d-Urmī* / REP-flag of-[..] raised=it.was on roofs of-missionaries and-of-your.brothers REL-they.are in city of.Urmia / '.. that the flag of-[...] was raised at the roofs of the missionaries and of your brothers in the city of Urmia' (Merx 40.2)

(17) *Sādi d-ī(h)wā bnay Širāz, u-Hyumām bnay Tawrīz, terwayhon (')nāši manšur=ī(h)wā* / Saadi REL-he.was inhabitant.of Shiraz, and-Hyumam inhabitant.of Tabriz, the.two.of.them men distinguished=they.were / 'Saadi, who was from Shiraz, and Hyumam from Tabriz, both were well-known men' (Merx 55.2)

(18) *ki zaḇnī=lih*[72] *gô šuqā gô bāzar d-īli rābā ṭīmā* / HAB they.sell=it in market in bazar REL-it.is very expensive / 'They sell it [i.e., honey] in the market, in the bazar, where it is very expensive' (Socin 62.12)

(19) *kul mendī d-īnā hamzumi ʿammoh hay layt=(ī)lā hāyy l-gānoh* / all thing RELthey.are speaking with.her she not.there.is=to.her apprehension to-her.self / 'Everything they are saying to her, she does not understand it herself' (Socin 46.9)

(20) *qā ptāxtā d-sanduqā d-kālo d-īlā muʾyītu(h)y ʿammu(h)* / for opening of-box of-bride REL-she.is taken.it with.her / '.. for the opening of the box of the bride that she brought with her' (Merx 21.14)

(21) *yāʿni xā prizlā d-īlā rišê rābā bīz u-xāruypā* / that.is an iron REL-it.is their.point very pointed and-sharp / 'that is, a nail whose tip is very pointed and sharp' (Socin 54.20)

In Merx's texts quite a number of relative clauses adhere to the constituent order of main clauses (22, 23), whereas in Socin's texts only a few examples of this order are found (24). These examples all have past copula. Again very few examples of relative clauses with explicit subject occur (25). It seems that clauses with a predicate consisting of a participle or in-

71. One example is found in which *qat*, usually introducing reported clauses, introduces a relative clause: *xā yumā ʿḇīdi=(h)wāw āhā Rājābālīxan xā māṣālāhat rābā gurtā qat=īwā rābā hônāntā* / one day done=he.was this Rajabali-Khan a counsel very great REL=it.was very wise / 'One day this Rajabali-Khan gave an important counsel that was very wise' (Merx 26.3)

72. In Syriac script: *ki zaḇnī=(y)li*.

finitive are somewhat more likely to retain the constituent order of main clauses, but a few examples of relative clauses with other predicates and main consituent order do occur (22).

(22) *īt=lī xā karmā rābā gurā, dlā mari=īli* / there.is=to.me a vineyard very large, without owner=it.is / 'I have a large vineyard, which has no master' (Merx 2.13)

(23) *īnā īmān d-taḵrān l-d-ānī zaḇni d-ʿḇīri=īnā, rābā ki pāšmān* / but when SUB.I.think OBJ-those times REL-passed=they.are, very HAB I.am.sorry / 'However, when I think about those times that are gone, I am very sorry..' (Merx 30.8)

(24) *ki hāqyā=(h)wā qā (')nāši but tāhār d-xzītā=(h)wā tāmā* / HAB she.tells=PAST to people about kind REL-seen=she.was there / 'she used to tell people about the kinds of things she saw there' (Socin 38.9)

(25) *gô d-hê dastā d-Muši (')nāšā d-Alāhā gāwuhy=(y)li* / in that company REL-Moses man of.God in.it=he.is / 'In that company among which is Moses, the man of God.'[73] (Merx 33.16)

Although I have not found any unambiguous condition governing the use of fronted versus regular copula position, it is perhaps possible to state a certain tendency. It seems to me that the copula in relative and adverbial clauses is employed to mark the amount of pragmatic dependence on the main clause. If the copula is attached to *d-*, the relative or adverbial clause is part of the pragmatic pattern of the main clause, whereas in subordinate clauses in which the copula follows the predicate (or another part of the clause), the subordinate clause has its own pragmatic pattern, marked by the position of the copula.

7.5.3 *Subordinate clauses in BT and ZdB*

7.5.3.1 In BT and ZdB, the distribution of the fronted copula over the various types of subordinate clauses differs from the distribution emerging from the texts of Merx and Socin. In BT, the employment of fronted copula is influenced to a great extent by the source languages, whereas in ZdB the missionaries perhaps created their own rules for the use of fronted copula, especially in relative clauses.

In the texts from OT and NT, no examples are found of reported clauses with a fronted copula; these all follow the consituent order of main clauses. In the first example, both CS and Hebrew do not have a past tense of *hw'/*

73. This division of subject and predicate seems more likely to me than that of Merx: 'in der Moses der Mann Gottes ist'.

hy' in that position, but a personal pronoun (1). Reported clauses in ZdB also follow the constituent order of main clauses (2). This is in accordance with the picture emerging from Merx and Socin.

(1) *u-xzilon bnuni d-Alāhā l-bnāti d-barnāšā, d-šāpīri=(h)wāw* / and-they.saw sons of-god OBJ-daughters of.men, REP-beautiful=they.were / 'And the sons of God saw that the daughters of men were beautiful' (Gen. 6:2)

(2) *u-qāryāni ki=yād'ī, d-men mdī(n)tā d-Nuyārk hal Lewwarpul, qurbā 3800 mīli=(y)lā* / and-readers HAB.they.know, REP-from city of-New.York to Liverpool, nearly 3800 miles=it.is / 'And the readers will know that the distance from the city of New York to Liverpool is nearly 3800 miles' (71/12/94A4)

7.5.3.2 In the NT parts only one example is found of an adverbial clause with a fronted copula (3), whereas in the OT parts no examples occur. Both in Hebrew and in CS no parallel pattern exists, which might account for the lack of examples.

In ZdB adverbial clauses with a fronted copula occur regularly, but still the majority of adverbial clauses follow the order of main clauses. The predicates of clauses with fronted copula mainly consist of prepositional phrases (4, 5).

(3) *u-brunih d-(')nāšā bi'zālā=(y)li, dā'ḵī d-īli ktīḇā ʿalluhy* / and-his.son of-man going=he.is like it.is written about.him / 'And the Son of man is going away according to what is written about him' (Mark 14:21)

(4) *b-Ammirekkā, li=(y)lā uxcā mamyettānā ayḵ d-ī(h)wā b-Assīyā* / in-America, not=it.is such slaughtering as it.was in-Asia / 'In America the deathrate [caused by pestilence] is not as high as it was in Asia' (49/1/5B1)

(5) *xešlon u-xzyêlon anni wayrāni, īman d-ī(h)wāw gô Môṣel* / they.went and-they.saw.them these ruins, when they.were in Mosul / 'They went to see these ruins when they were in Mosul' (49/1/6B22)

In BT, in general, adverbial clauses adhere to the constituent order of main clauses (6-9). The subject, if expressed outside the copula, is often found to follow the predicate (8, 9). In ex. 8 this is a very clear example of Hebrew and CS influence (both in the Hebrew Bible and in the Peshitta the same constituent order is found), whereas the second example is a telling example of a clause in which the copula follows the fronted predicate, which performs assertive focus function (9). This specific pattern occurs in Bedjan's texts as well (cf. 7.5.4.2 ex. 12).

In ZdB, the majority of subordinate clauses follow the constituent order of main clauses (10, 11). If an explicit subject is present, a fronted copula

never occurs. Nearly all these subject phrases follow the sentence connective (11); the position after the predicate is very rare.

(6) *bnātī, zi'mon, sābāb d-sīḇtā=(y)wān men d-hôyān l-gaḇrā* / my.daughters, go, because grown.old=I.am from REP-SUB.I.am OBJ-man / 'Go away, my daughters, because I am too old to belong to a man' (Ruth 1:12)

(7) *mujxêli dmīḵi, sābāb d-ʿaynê yuqrenni=(h)wāw* / he.found.them asleep, because their.eyes became.heavy=they.were / 'He found them asleep, becauses their eyes had become heavy' (Mark 14:40) (SPc)

(8) *u-hwilā, d-kad b-xaqlā=(h)wāw ānī, qemli Qā'ēn ʿal Hāḇēl āxunuhy* / and-it.happened, REP-while in-field=they.were they, he.rose Cain against Abel his.brother/ 'And while they were in the field, Cain attacked his brother Abel' (Gen 4:8)

(9) *sābāb d-dīyê=(y)lā malkutā d-šmayyā* / because theirs=it.is kingdom of-heaven / 'because theirs is the kingdom of heaven' (Mat. 5:10)

(10) *ādīyā gāmīyi d-dešmenni, kad rexqā=(y)nā men berzā, ki pêšī purpessi men bārut* / now ships of-enemies, while far=they.are from coast, HAB they.become destroyed by gunpowder / 'Nowadays the ships of enemies, while they are still far away from the coast, are being destroyed by gunpowder' (49/1/8A24)

(11) *sābāb d-Alāhā b-šmayyā=(y)li, u-a(n)t ʿal arʿā* / because God in-heaven=he.is, and-you on earth / 'because God is in heaven, and you are on earth (71/12/91B4)

7.5.3.3 The situation with regard to the relative clauses deviates most from the patterns as described for the texts of Merx and Socin. Within the Protestant texts, BT and ZdB differ considerably, and even in OT en NT the patterns are not the same.

Fronted copulae occur quite often in OT, although the total number of relative clauses is not very high. The absence of a copula in Hebrew prevented Hebrew syntax from exerting too much influence on the position of the copula in LUA. In ex. 12, no pronoun or form of *hw'* is employed in the parallel Hebrew and CS texts.

In NT also not very many relative clauses occur, and there does not seem to be a consistent practice in translating them. In a number of cases no copula is present (cf. 7.2.3), and when it occurs, it is found both in fronted and in regular position. There is no indication that the position of the copula is influenced by the presence of an enclitic pronoun or an enclitic form of *hw'* in CS. When CS has a participle without such an enclitic form, both fronted and post-predicate position of the copula occur. In ex. 13 a PART stem with fronted copula is the translation of a CS passive participle without enclitic form, whereas ex. 14 is the translation of a clause with the enclitic form of *hw'* following the predicate.

In ZdB there is a strong tendency to employ the fronted copula only if the predicate consists of a prepositional or noun phrase (15). In ex. 16 a relative clause with the fronted copula is employed to introduce an explanation.

(12) *u-tpeqli tpāquh b-sāmā d-xaqlā d-Bāʿāz, d-ī(h)wā men ujāx d-Ilīmalk* / and-it.happened her.happening in-field of-Boaz, REL-he.was from family of-Elimelech / 'And she happened to be on the field of Boaz, who belonged to Elimelech's family.' (Ruth 2:3)

(13) *d-ānā bet sātrennih āhā hayklā d-īli ʿḇīdā b-īdāti* / REP-I FUT I.pull. down.it this temple REL-it.is built with-hands / 'that I will pull down this temple that is built with hands' (Mark 14:58)

(14) *u-hay (ʾ)zellā mušxedlā l-ānī d-ī(h)wāw ʿammih*[74] / and-she she.went she.told OBJ-those REL-they.were with.him / 'And she went to tell it to those that were with him' (Mark 16:10)

(15) *(ʾ)nāši d-ī(h)wāw māri d-melyoni tumāni qudmi, edyu muskenni* / people REL=they-were owners of-millions Tomans yesterday, today impoverished / 'People that yesterday possessed millions of Tomans, today have become poor' (71/12/94B4)

(16) *d-gô Cīn īt xā tāhār d-xāmêtā d-ʿanḇi d-pêšī tāzā qā rābā zaḇnā, d-īlā āhā* / REP-in China there.is a kind of-preservation of.grapes REL-they.stay fresh for many time, REP-it.is this / '... that in China there is a kind of preservation of grapes with which they stay fresh for a long time, which is this:..' (71/12/93B34)[75]

As stated above, in OT the tendency is to employ fronted copula in relative clauses, especially when they consist of prepositional phrases. However, in ex. 17 an example is given of a clause with post-predicate copula, although there is no reason at all for this in the Hebrew or CS text. Note that in ex. 14, in a nearly identical clause, the copula is indeed fronted. The only difference is the presence of a complement to the predicate.

In NT verbal nouns in relative clauses occur both with fronted and with post-predicate copula. In ex. 18 the copula is attached to the verbal noun.

In relative clauses in ZdB there is a strong tendency to follow main consituent order if the predicate consists of a verbal noun (19, 20). In ex. 20 an explicit subject is present.

(17) *u-pešli šḇīqā axcī Nox, u-ānī d-ʿammuhy=(h)wāw b-qiḇutā* / and-he.became left only Noah, and-those REL-with.him=they.were in-ark /

74. Cf. BT '93: *u-hay (ʾ)zellā mušxedlā l-ānī d-(h)wīyi=(h)wāw ʿammih.*

75. So also Mark 15:34: *Iyl, Iyl lmānā šḇaqtānī, d-īlā, Alāhā...* / ' *"El, El, lmana shvaqtani"*, which is: "God,..." '.

'and only Noah was left, and those that were with him in the ark' (Gen. 7:23)

(18) *ṭāyeppā d-betyāḇā=(y)li b-xuyā, bahrā gurā xzili* / people REL-sitting=it.is in darkness, light great it.saw / 'The people sitting in darkness saw a great light' (Mat. 4:16)

(19) *gāmīyi gô nahrā d-npīlā=(y)li b-gāwā d-mdī(n)tā, kullê beqyādā* / ships in river REL-laid.down=she.is in-middle of-town, all.of.them burning / 'The ships on the river running through the town were all burning' (71/12/94A35)

(20) *d-saxberren l-xā madrāsā d-xôšibā d-haw muqqemmā=(h)wā tāmā* / REP-SUB.I.visit OBJ-a school of-Sunday REL-he founded=he.was there / 'that I would visit a Sunday school that he had founded there.' (71/12/92A41)

7.5.4 *Subordinate clauses in the texts of Bedjan*

7.5.4.1 In Bedjan's texts no examples were found of reported clauses with fronted copula; they all follow the various orders that are also found in main clauses (1, 2, 3).

(1) *bexzāya=ywen qat qarrāṣā=ywet u-axmāq* / seeing=I.am REP quarrelsome.man=you.are and-fool / 'I see that you are a quarrelsome man and a fool' (VdS 341.2)

(2) *xā sāpār (')xi(r)tā Yonātān šme'li qat Dāwīd ṭušyā=(')ywā gô xā mēšā* / one journey other Jonathan he.heard REP David hidden=he.was in a forest / 'Another time Jonathan heard that David was hiding in a forest' (HS 100.3)

(3) *ĩna bgānḗ oupsaparḗ átḥa bi qāidēna qat bouš ṣpáila hič min bāsḗ la himzímmaḥ* / but in.themselves and.in.their.voyages such disorders=they.are that much good=it.is nothing from concerning.them not SUB.we.speak / 'However, on them [i.e., ships on Lake Urmia] and on their voyages there is so much disorder, that we had better not speak about them' (Duval 29.11)

7.5.4.2 It is therefore all the more remarkable that in Bedjan's texts, including those edited by Duval, nearly all adverbial clauses introduced by sentence connectives with *d-* have a fronted copula (4-7, 9). The tendency of fronting the copula after sentence connectives with *d-* also holds true after *kad* (6), with verbal nouns (4, 8), and in cases where an explicit subject is present (7). In ex. 8 the copula is fronted even when *d-* is not present, but in ex. 9 the same sentence connective with *d-* is employed, which is its regular form.

(4) *īnā axcon d-ʾīwāw bedyārā men daʿwī, men kullê dukāni ʿālmā pleṭli l-pišwāzê* / but when they.were returning from war, from all.of.them places crowd it.went.out to-welcome.procession / 'When they returned from the war, crowds went out to welcome them in all places' (HS 98.11)

(5) *ḵmät íla mar trḗ gānáiḥ* / as.long.as she.is owner.of two souls / 'as long as she is pregnant' (Duval 10.15)

(6) *ītā kad=ī(h)wāw Abonā u-Kresṭyāni d-ʿammuhy (y)tīḇī kes dmāḵtuhy,..* / then while=they.were Bishop and-Christians REL-with.him seated next to his.sleeping / 'Then, while the Bishop and the Christians that were with him, were seated next to the sleeping man,..' (VdS 338.20)

(7) *īnā kmā d-ʾīlā gānā d-hô ṣaġ..* / but as.long.as she.is soul of.that.one healthy.. / 'but as long as that man is alive,..' (HS 99.15)

(8) *hec li pāxmī d-ayḵ=(ʾ)īnā mudyi u-qrīḇi* / not.at.all not.HAB they.understand how=they.are made.known and-approached / 'They do not understand at all how they are taught and are coming near' (MdP 156.24)

(9) *íllā daġ díva öutra bdáura dbabou-ádam* / but as it.was country in.period of.father-Adam / 'but as it was in the time of our father Adam,..' (Duval 24.7)

When adverbial clauses are introduced by sentence connectives without *d-*, they follow the constituent order of main clauses, like in exx. 10 and 11. In ex. 12 the copula is not fronted, but placed between predicate and subject. Here the focus function of the genitive construction *di* + suffix obviously was more important than the use of fronted copula (cf. 7.5.3.2 ex. 9).

It is difficult to say whether this rather neat distribution of fronted copula in adverbial clauses corresponds to the living language, or whether it is part of Bedjan's literary language. The fact that in the texts of Merx and Socin such a distribution is not present, might indicate that Bedjan somewhat stylized the literary language.

(10) *en raxmi d-Alāhā gurā=ynā* / if mercies of-God great=they-are / 'If the mercies of God are great' (HS 89.16)

(11) *cóunki bouš qourbēla* / because much near-she.is / 'Because she [i.e., Russia] is very near' (Duval 36.15)

(12) *sābāb d-dīyuḵ=(ʾ)ylā malkutā, u-xaylā..* / because of.you=it.is kingdom, and-power.. / 'Because Yours is the kingdom, and the power..' (MdP 4.8)

7.5.4.3 In line with the foregoing, nearly all relative clauses have a fronted copula (13, 14), also when an explicit subject is present (15, 16).

(13) *[-] am qārāwāšuhy d-īwāw gô xaqlā* / with his.maidens REL=they.were in field / 'with his maidens that were in the field' (HS 85.19)

(14) *čounki mouqábil deḥatḥa davílta díla biplâṭa mínno móud zouġza kiáver gávo?* / because instead.of this wealth REL-it.is [leaving from.her] what

money HAB.it.enters in.her? / 'Because instead of this wealth that is leaving her [i.e., Persia], what money is coming in?' (Duval 37.1)

(15) *kad qurbennā Xawwā l-d-ho īlānā d-īwā ṭ'untuhy qādāġā, xuwi (')merri qātoh* / while she.approached Eve to-this tree REL-it.was his.fruit forbidden, serpent he.said OBJ.her / 'When Eve approached the tree whose fruit was forbidden, the serpent said to her..' (HS 5.5)

(16) *ē nérḥ díla malkóuva qaṭíto ríbā ṣpáila* / this tariff REL.it.is kingdom imposed.it very good.it.is / 'This tariff that the kingdom imposed, is very good' (Duval 21.6)

The few relative clauses in which the copula is not fronted are difficult in various ways. It is probable that the unusual constituent order is caused by the need for contrastive assertion or comparison. Ex. 17 is part of an extended question about what kind of revenge would be appropriate for the evils that were committed by Judas, betraying Jesus, and the priest Paula, betraying his fellow Christians (cf. Texts no 13).

(17) *yā'rab, hāy d-hô buš quytā=(')ylā, yan hāy d-āhā buš ma(r)yrtā=(')ylā?* / Oh.Lord, she REL.he more firm=she.is, or she REL-this more bitter=she.is? / 'Oh Lord, something [i.e., a kind of revenge] that is stronger than that one [i.e., Judas], or that is more bitter than this one [i.e., Paula]?' (VdS 347.24)

7.5.5 *Conclusions*

Fronting of the copula, i.e., moving the copula to the first position after the sentence connective, occurs in all kinds of subordinated clauses. However, there are important differences between the various text types.

In the texts of Merx and Socin, fronted copula occurs incidentally in reported clauses, a few times in adverbial clauses introduced by sentence connectives with *d-*, and frequently in relative clauses, especially if the predicate consists of a prepositional phrase.

In BT, fronted copula occurs in adverbial and relative clauses, although few examples of either kind are found. In NT there may be some influence from the CS enclitic pronoun or enclitic forms of *hw'*, but the presence and position of these forms is not decisive for the use of copula in LUA.

In ZdB, there seems to be a tendency for predicates consisting of prepositional or noun phrases in adverbial and relative clauses to have a fronted copula, whereas predicates consisting of verbal nouns in most clauses have a post-predicate copula.

In Merx and Socin, as well as in BT and ZdB, a fronted copula is hardly ever employed when, in adverbial or relative clauses, an explicit subject is present.

In Bedjan's texts the general pattern is that whenever *d-* is present, introducing adverbial as well as relative clauses, the copula is attached to it. Bedjan does not distinguish between predicates with verbal nouns and other types of predicates.

7.6 Negative clauses

7.6.1 *Introduction*

In negative copular clauses, the copula is attached to the negative marker *lā*.[76] In verbal clauses this marker precedes the main verb, and in copular clauses the fusion of *lā* + copula usually precedes the predicate. One can term this compound form a 'negative copula' (Cn). The two elements are connected in the same way the copula is attached to *d-* or the predicate (*-ā* + *y* > *ē*).[77] In subordinate clauses the negative copula can be attached to *d-* (dCnP), but it is more often employed independently.

In general, the negative copula immediately precedes the part of the clause that performs focus functions. Usually this is the predicate, but object and subject phrases too, may be assigned focus functions.

A few clauses are found in which the negative copula follows the predicate (PCn or SPCn). All of them come from Duval's texts.

7.6.2 *Negative copula without predicate*

Under certain conditions it seems possible to employ the negative copula without a predicate. The impersonal subject (3fsg) in the example from ZdB refers to the preceding question why leaves are green and not red or something else.

(1) *li=(y)lā sābāb d-rang mīlā buš bāsīmā=(y)li l-ʿaynan?* / not=it.is because color green more pleasant it=is to-our.eyes? / 'It is not so because the color green is more pleasant to our eyes?' (50/10/80B27)

7.6.3 *Negative clauses with pronominal subject (CnP)*

If a negative clause consists of a predicate and a copula, the negative copula occupies the first position in the clause, closely followed by the predicate

76. Nöldeke 1868: 347, 350, Maclean 1895: 192, §74.5

77. The Protestant orthography gives a false impression of the pronunciation of the negative copula, because *li=(y)li* suggests the pronunciation of [lili], whereas the actual pronunciation is [leli]. This could have been written as *lā=(y)li*, parallel to the way the copula is attached to a predicate with *-ā* ending, the *y* indicating the contracted diphthong.

(1, 5). Sentence connectives (2, 4), sentence adverbs (3, 7), and objects (8) may precede this nucleus. This pattern is found in all types of texts, in those of Socin and Merx, in BT, in ZdB, and in the texts of Bedjan.

Note the different positions of the object. In ex. 6, the object follows the main part of the predicate, and in this way is part of the negated focus of the clause. In ex. 9, the indirect object directly follows the negative copula and precedes the predicate, indicating that this is a focus construction in which the indirect object receives main focus (cf. 7.4.3 ex. 5). In ex. 10 it is the verbal part of the predicate that performs focus functions, whereas the fronted object plus the following prepositional phrase, preceding the negative copula, functions as topic.

(1) *li=(ī)nā bīdāʿyā qat..* / not=they.are knowing that.. / 'They don't know that..' (Merx 10.11)

(2) *īnā li=(y)wān bīdaʿyā* / but not=I.am knowing / 'but I don't know…' (Merx 30.4)

(3) *d-b-anni yarxi li=(h)wā ayḵ spārtā d-xā dāryā (ʾ)nāši* / REP-in-those months not=it.was like sojourn of-a group men / 'that in those months no holdup took place for travellers' (Merx 52.11)

(4) *u-xzilā qat li=(ī)li {léli} xāyā* / and-she.saw REP not=he.is alive / 'And she saw that he was no longer alive' (Socin 68.9)

(5) *li=(y)li laʾḵā* / not=he.is here / 'He is not here' (Mark 16:6)

(6) *li=(y)wet madduri juwāb?* / not=you.are giving answer? / 'You are not giving an answer?' (Mark 14:60)

(7) *b-Amirekkā, li=(y)lā uxcā mamyettānā ayḵ d-ī(h)wā b-Assīyā* / in-America, not=it.is such slaughtering as it.was in Asia / 'In America the deathrate [caused by pestilence] is not as high as it was in Asia' (49/1/5B1)

(8) *īna xā hādā ktāḇā, ādīyā b-āhā dôrā, uxcā qulāb li=(y)nā mattuḇi ʿalluhy* / but a this writing, now in-this period, such value not=they.are putting on.it / 'but nowadays people do not attach much value to such a writing.' (71/12/95A49)

(9) *lā=(y)nā qātuḵ masluḇi* / not=they.are OBJ.you rejecting / 'It is not you that they are rejecting,..' (HS 90.4)

(10) *qat oup óupra al mîti léli bidâ drâ* / REP also dust on dead(pl) not=he.is knowing throwing / '[a priest..] that even does not know how to throw dust on the dead' (Duval 13.5)

7.6.4 *Negative clauses with explicit subject*

In the majority of clauses of this type, the negative copula follows the subject and precedes the predicate. Sentence adverbs and sentence connectives generally precede the subject (1, 3). Note that adverbs precede the negative

copula, following the subject (2, 4). This pattern is found in Socin's and Merx's texts (13), as well as in BT, ZdB (4-7), Bedjan's texts (8, 9), and in those edited by Duval (10). In two examples (5, 9) the explicit subject is a personal pronoun, preceding the copula. The subordinate clauses in this section are of types that do not employ fronted copula, like reported clauses (1, 2) and adverbial clauses without *d-* (3).

(1) *kmā ki xāden īmān d-šamʿen d-kêpuḵ li=(y)lā ayḵ qā(d)mêtā* / how HAB I.rejoice when I.hear REP-your.health not=it.is as first / 'I am very glad to hear that your health is not [i.e., not as bad] as before' (Merx 39.9)

(2) *hajjat d-pāšamtā=(y)lā d-ṭunyāti d-āhā barzaʿā hālā li=īnā mabyuni* / a reason of-grieve=it.is REP-fruits of-that seed yet not-they.are appearing / 'It is a reason for grieve that the fruits of that seed [i.e., of the Gospel] are not yet appearing' (Merx 53.14)

(3) *in xā bābā li=(ī)li byahḇu(h) {léli bīyáwō} brātu(h)y qā xā yālā* / if a father not=he.is giving.her his.daughter to a young.man,.. / 'If a father does not give his daughter to a young man,..' (Socin 34.20)

(4) *u-kul cālu d-deštā hālā li=(h)wā b-arʿā* / and-all bush of-field yet not=it.was on-earth / 'And no bush of the field was yet on the earth' (Gen. 2:5)

(5) *īnā ānā b-kullih zaḇnā li=(y)wen lkeslôḵon* / but I in-all.his time not=I.am with.you / 'but *I* will not always be with you' (Mark 14:7)

(6) *kullê dôstī u-aḇḇāhī li=(h)wāw bespārā d-šāmʿī qālī (')xi(r)nā* / all.of.them my.friends and my.parents not=they.were waiting REP-SUB.they.hear my.voice again / 'All my friends and my parents were not expecting to hear my voice again' (50/10/76A47)

(7) *albattā āhā li=(y)lā bāsīmtā qā d-ānī d-men mazhab ʿattīqā d-Rusnāyutā* / of.course this not=it.is pleasant for those of-from religion ancient of-Russianness / 'Of course this is not pleasant for those from the ancient Russian religion' (71/12/96A31)

(8) *hê ʿdānā Yonātān lā=ywā tāmā* / that time Jonathan not=he.was there / 'At that time Jonathan was not there' (HS 91.19)

(9) *ānā lā=ywen deryā qāli bīyuḵ* / I not=I.was given my.voice to.you / 'I didn't call you' (HS 87.9)

(10) *dīwan lêla mousṓummi bâla* / government not.it.is paying attention / 'The government is not paying attention' (Duval 34.14)

Ex. 11 from Bedjan illustrates that an explicit subject consisting of a personal pronoun can be explicitly negated by a preceding negative copula, by employing the focus construction for pseudo-cleft clauses (cf. 7.4.3).

In ex. 12, the first part is a normal negative clause (CnP), but in the second clause, with nominal subject, the negative copula has split into the ne-

gation marker *lā* and the copula, which is attached to the predicate. Probably this is possible only in clauses that follow clauses with regular negation.

(11) *li(')ton axtun šudrī laḵḵā, ellā Alāhā* / not.you.are sent here, but God / 'Not you have sent me here, but God' (VdS 1.4)

(12) *li=(')ywen ṣehyā l-qeṭlā, u-lā ʿaynī l-môtā=(')ylā* / not=I.am thirsting formurder, and-not my.eye on-death=she.is / 'I am not longing to be murdered, nor is my eye upon death' (VdS 341.5-6)

In the second example from Duval (13), both subject and object are placed before the negative copula. However, here the fronted object (contrary to ex. 10 in 7.6.2) as well as the predicate are negated, whereas the object at the same time receives focus function (cf. 7.4.2). This is done by adding the particle *cu* ('any' or 'no') to the object.

(13) *ou dǐwan čou čāra allé lĕla vítta* / and government any remedy on.it not.she.is doing / 'and the government is not trying to remedy it at all' (Duval 38.2)

7.6.5 *Clauses with post-clausal position of negative copula*

In Duval's texts a number of clauses occur in which the negative copula follows the predicate, although these predicates perform focus function like those in the preceding paragraphs. These clauses with post-predicate negative copulae may reflect a dialectal peculiarity of the region of Salmas. However, as suggested by Hoberman for the Jewish Aramaic of Amadiya,[78] it is also possible that this order is employed only under specific circumstances, which do not occur in the other texts. Although this order clearly is a marked one, it is difficult to establish the exact conditions.

(1) *móumkin lĕla hárgis qat...* / possible not.it.is at-all REP.. / 'It is not possible at all' (Duval 25.5)

(2) *čounki méndih dganĕ lĕla* / because something of.himself not.it.is / 'because it is not something of himself' (Duval 19.15)

(3) *mouḥábbene-dǐyouḥ lĕla?* / pity of.you not.it.is? 'Pity of you, isn't it?' (Duval 4.3)

(4) *o̤špatto čătin lĕla* / her.proof difficult not.it.is / 'Her proof is not difficult to give' (Duval 35.4)

7.6.6 *Conclusions*

In negative clauses, it is the negated part of the clause that performs focus functions. The negative copula, being an independent copula, precedes the focused part of the clause. In unmarked negative clauses, the predicate and

78. See Hoberman 1989: 174, who comments on ex. 34a (a question with right dislocated negative copula): 'marked order, according to the informant, conveying astonishment'.

its complements are assigned focus function and thus are preceded by the negative copula. Adverbs, although part of the focused predicate, precede the negative copula. The subject, being the topic in unmarked clauses, precedes the negative copula.

The negative copula, like the enclitic copula, can be employed to assign contrastive or assertive focus to constituents other than the predicate. When the negative copula precedes the subject, the subject is assigned focus functions, rather than topic functions. When the negative copula precedes a fronted object or verbal complement, these perform constrastive or assertive focus. Another way to assign assertive focus to an object is to add a negation marker to the noun phrase.

When a fronted object, without negation marker, precedes the sequence of negative copula and predicate, it is probably a topic.

In Duval's texts examples occur of clauses in which the negative copula follows the predicate. The conditions for this different order are uncertain.

7.7 Interrogative clauses

7.7.1 *Introduction*

As in most languages, interrogative copular clauses can be divided into two main groups: yes-no questions, without interrogative pronouns, and WH-questions, with interrogative pronouns. In written texts, the interrogative character of clauses of the first group is indicated by the context, by the extra-clausal element *qāmu* ('why'), which does not participate in the rest of the clause, and sometimes by a question mark. There is no indication that constituent order plays a major role in LUA in distinguishing these yes-no questions from affirmative clauses.[79]

In WH-questions the interrogative may serve as predicate to which the copula is enclitically attached. Further, interrogatives can be employed with every constituent of the clause, i.e., with the subject and the various parts of the predicate, like prepositional phrases, verbal nouns, and objects. The copula follows the focused part of the clause, which in WH-questions consists of the constituent with the interrogative. This constituent occupies the initial position of the clause, reversing the topic-focus order of basic clauses. This order is characteristic for focus constructions (cf. 7.4.1), and WH-questions clearly belong to this category.

In embedded questions introduced by interrogatives, no sentence connectives are needed.

79. Nöldeke 1868: 352, Maclean 1895: 194, §74.9.

7.7.2 *Yes-no questions*

No deviations from the constituent order of main affirmative copular clauses are encountered with yes-no questions. To mark questions, the Protestant missionaries and Bedjan employ a question mark. Another, apparently optional, devise to mark a question is to add the word *qāmu*, 'why', at the beginning of the clause. This particle does not influence the clause structure (3, 4, 7).

Note the three identifying questions among this type of interrogative clauses (2, 4, 6). These clauses confirm that the pronoun is the focused part of the clause (cf. 7.4.2).

In the texts of Merx and Socin no examples of copular yes-no questions are found.

(1) *li=(y)wet madduri juwāb?* / not=you.give answer? / 'You do not answer?' (Mark 15:4)
(2) *a(n)t=īwet malkā d-Īhudāyi?* / you=you.are king of-Jews? / 'You are the king of the Jews?' (Mark 15:2)
(3) *qāmu, nāṭārtā d-āxonī=(y)wen?* / why, keeper of-my.brother=I.am? / 'Am I my brothers keeper?' (Gen. 4:9)
(4) *qāmu, ānā=(y)wen?* / why, I=I.am? / 'Is it me?' (Mark 14:19)
(5) *dīwān d-Ālī duz=īlā yan lā?* / judgement of-Ali right=it.is or not? / 'Is Ali's judgement right or not?' (71/12/93B26)
(6) *āhā=(y)li baġcuḵ?* / this=it.is your.garden? / 'This is your garden?' (71/12/93A40)
(7) *qāmu ānā kalbā=ywen* / why; I dog=I.am? / 'Am I a dog?' (HS 97.2)[80]
(8) *āhā qālā dīyuḵ=(')yli, brunī Dāwīd?* / this voice of.you=it.is, my.son David? / 'Is this your voice, my son David?' (HS 103.4)
(9) *mouḥábbene-dǐyouḥ lĕla?* / pity-of-you, not-it-is? / 'Pity of you, isn't it?' (Duval 4.3)

7.7.3 *Basic WH-questions*

In a limited number of clauses, the nucleus of interrogative and copula (sometimes complemented by an adverbial phrase) constitutes a complete clause. Note that in the first example from Socin (1), the copula is absent in the text in Syriac script, but present in the phonetic transcription. Adverbial and pronominal interrogatives are employed.

(1) *u-(')mirron qātê axton d-aykā {dǐkyetun}* / and-they.said to.them, you (pl), from-where={you-are}? / 'And they said to us: "You, from where are you?" ' (Socin 6.4)

80. In BT of '93 this clause from 1Sam 17:43 was translated as *hā, kālbā=ywen ānā?*, which is rather close to the Hebrew.

(2) *aykā=(ī)wit=(h)wā {ʔikitw-} anni xā uxcā yumāni* / where=you.were these a some days / 'Where have you been these days?' (Socin 88.10)
(3) *aykā=(y)wet?* / where=you.are? / 'Where are you?' (Gen 3:9)
(4) *mānī=(y)waty?* / who=you(f).are? / 'Who are you?' (Ruth 3:9)
(5) *man='īlih āhā (')nāšā u-mudī=(')īlih, d-īlih..?* / who=he.is this man and-what=he.is, REP-he.is / 'Who is this man, and what is he, that he..?' (VdS 340.11)

7.7.4 *WH-questions with interrogatives attached to the predicate*

Adverbial and adjectival interrogatives, employed to question either the verbal part of the predicate or the noun phrase, usually occupy the initial position of the clause. Phrases that precede the interrogative are considered to be extra-clausal (1).

The copula in WH-questions follows the constituent that is the focus of the question. In many questions this is the predicate (1-3), or a complement to the predicate (6, 7). It is also possible that the copula is attached to the interrogative itself (4, 5). In these clauses the focus is on the interrogative, whereas the predicate is part of the topic. These conditions for the position of the copula indicate that WH-questions employ focus construction to mark the focus of the question.

There seem to be no important differences between the text corpora.

(1) *la'ḳā mudi bi'ḇādā=(ī)ton {bīwǎdītún}* / here what doing=you(pl).are? / 'What are you doing here?' (Socin 6.5)
(2) *mut xabrā=(y)lā malkā* / what word=it.is king / 'What message is there, O king?' (Merx 6:10)
(3) *mudī bexšāḇā=(y)ton?* / what thinking=you(pl).are? / 'What are you thinking?' (Mark 14:64)
(4) *l-(')aykā=(y)lā bi'zālā?* / to-where=she.is going? / 'Where is she going?' (50/10/76B20)
(5) *qāmudī=(')ywet rupyā ba(t)r regguḳ?* / why=you.are throwed after your.servant? / 'Why have you been persecuting your servant?' (HS 103.6)
(6) *mud xerbāyutā=(')wen 'ḇīdā?* / what evil=I.am done? / 'What evil have I done?' (HS 103.6)
(7) *mẹn moudívet biqvála?* / from what-you-are complaining? / 'About what are you complaining?' (Duval 4.2)

7.7.5 *WH-questions with explicit subject*

If an explicit subject occurs in an interrogative clause, it usually follows the nucleus of interrogative + copula. This structure occurs both with predicates that consist only of the interrogative (1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10), and with predi-

cates that consist of an interrogative attached to part of the predicate (3, 4). As in other focus constructions, the focused constituent occupies the initial position in the clause, followed by the constituents with topic functions.

The adverb *kmā* 'how' can introduce both a question (4) and an exclamatory clause (5, 9). The constituent order in both types is the same.

There are no significant differences between the various text types.

(1) *aykā=(y)li bêtā d-Rustam* / where=it.is house of-Rustam / 'Where is Rustam's house?' (Merx 2.6)

(2) *aykā=(y)lā Hāḇēl āxonuḵ?* / where=he.is Abel your.brother? / 'Where is your brother Abel?' (Gen. 4:9)

(3) *m-ādīyā qāmudī lāzem=(y)nā qātan sāhdi?* / from-now why necessary=they.are for.us witnesses? / 'Now then, why do we need anymore witnesses?' (Mark 14:63)[81]

(4) *kmā rexqā=(y)li šemšā men arʿā?* / how far=it.is sun from earth? / 'How far is the sun from the earth?' (49/1/7A7)

(5) *kmā šāpīrtā=(y)lā mīlānutā d-īlāni* / how beautiful=it-is greenness of-trees / 'How beautiful is the greenness of the trees' (50/10/80B20)

(6) *d-mānī=(y)wān=(h)wā ānā, yan mudī=(h)wā xšāxtī* / REP-who=I.am=PAST I, or what=it.was my.value / 'Who was I and what was my value?' (50/10/78A34)

(7) *mudī=yli āhā Pleštāyā* / what=he.is this Philistine? / 'What is this Philistine?' (HS 96.4)

(8) *ēkā=yna ān qa(d)māyi d-* / where=they are these first.ones REP- / 'Where are those first ones that..' (VdS 342.3)

(9) *kmā zālīm=ywaty baxxīlutā* / how cruel=it.was envy / 'How cruel was the envy' (HS 100.12)

(10) *daḥ īla kḗpouḥ?* / how it.is your.health? / 'How is your health?' (Duval 3:21)

7.7.6 *WH-questions with fronted subject*

When an explicit subject occurs in the initial position of the clause, this constituent can be adequately described as being pre-clausal. The pre-clausal constituent, either nominal (1, 4) or pronominal (2, 3), serves as a theme constituent. In ex. 2 the theme serves as a vocative.

(1) *kḗpuḵ dâḵī=(ī)lā?* / your.health how=it.is? / 'About your health, how is it?' (Merx 9.13)

(2) *a(n)t mudī biʿḇādā=(ī)wet laʾḵā* / you what doing=you.are here / 'You, what are you doing here?' (Socin 46.4)

81. The adverb may be considered to be extra-clausal. The use of this adverb in this clause, in an unusual sense ('from now on' > 'now then') probably is due to CS influence (*mānā mekkēl*, 'how thus').

(2) *aykā=(ī)wit=(h)wā {ʔikitw-} anni xā uxcā yumāni* / where=you.were these a some days / 'Where have you been these days?' (Socin 88.10)
(3) *aykā=(y)wet?* / where=you.are? / 'Where are you?' (Gen 3:9)
(4) *mānī=(y)waty?* / who=you(f).are? / 'Who are you?' (Ruth 3:9)
(5) *man=ʾīlih āhā (ʾ)nāšā u-mudī=(ʾ)īlih, d-īlih..?* / who=he.is this man and-what=he.is, REP-he.is / 'Who is this man, and what is he, that he..?' (VdS 340.11)

7.7.4 *WH-questions with interrogatives attached to the predicate*

Adverbial and adjectival interrogatives, employed to question either the verbal part of the predicate or the noun phrase, usually occupy the initial position of the clause. Phrases that precede the interrogative are considered to be extra-clausal (1).

The copula in WH-questions follows the constituent that is the focus of the question. In many questions this is the predicate (1-3), or a complement to the predicate (6, 7). It is also possible that the copula is attached to the interrogative itself (4, 5). In these clauses the focus is on the interrogative, whereas the predicate is part of the topic. These conditions for the position of the copula indicate that WH-questions employ focus construction to mark the focus of the question.

There seem to be no important differences between the text corpora.

(1) *laʾķā mudi biʿḇādā=(ī)ton {bīwādītún}* / here what doing=you(pl).are? / 'What are you doing here?' (Socin 6.5)
(2) *mut xabrā=(y)lā malkā* / what word=it.is king / 'What message is there, O king?' (Merx 6:10)
(3) *mudī bexšāḇā=(y)ton?* / what thinking=you(pl).are? / 'What are you thinking?' (Mark 14:64)
(4) *l-(ʾ)aykā=(y)lā biʾzālā?* / to-where=she.is going? / 'Where is she going?' (50/10/76B20)
(5) *qāmudī=(ʾ)ywet rupyā ba(t)r regguķ?* / why=you.are throwed after your.servant? / 'Why have you been persecuting your servant?' (HS 103.6)
(6) *mud xerbāyutā=(ʾ)wen ʿḇīdā?* / what evil=I.am done? / 'What evil have I done?' (HS 103.6)
(7) *mẹn moudívet biqvâla?* / from what-you-are complaining? / 'About what are you complaining?' (Duval 4.2)

7.7.5 *WH-questions with explicit subject*

If an explicit subject occurs in an interrogative clause, it usually follows the nucleus of interrogative + copula. This structure occurs both with predicates that consist only of the interrogative (1, 2, 6, 7, 8, 10), and with predi-

cates that consist of an interrogative attached to part of the predicate (3, 4). As in other focus constructions, the focused constituent occupies the initial position in the clause, followed by the constituents with topic functions.

The adverb *kmā* 'how' can introduce both a question (4) and an exclamatory clause (5, 9). The constituent order in both types is the same.

There are no significant differences between the various text types.

(1) *aykā=(y)li bêtā d-Rustam* / where=it.is house of-Rustam / 'Where is Rustam's house?' (Merx 2.6)

(2) *aykā=(y)lā Hāḇēl āxonuḵ?* / where=he.is Abel your.brother? / 'Where is your brother Abel?' (Gen. 4:9)

(3) *m-ādīyā qāmudī lāzem=(y)nā qātan sāhdi?* / from-now why necessary=they.are for.us witnesses? / 'Now then, why do we need anymore witnesses?' (Mark 14:63)[81]

(4) *kmā rexqā=(y)li šemšā men arʿā?* / how far=it.is sun from earth? / 'How far is the sun from the earth?' (49/1/7A7)

(5) *kmā šāpīrtā=(y)lā mīlānutā d-īlāni* / how beautiful=it-is greenness of-trees / 'How beautiful is the greenness of the trees' (50/10/80B20)

(6) *d-mānī=(y)wān=(h)wā ānā, yan mudī=(h)wā xšāxtī* / REP-who=I.am=PAST I, or what=it.was my.value / 'Who was I and what was my value?' (50/10/78A34)

(7) *mudī=yli āhā Pleštāyā* / what=he.is this Philistine? / 'What is this Philistine?' (HS 96.4)

(8) *ēkā=yna ān qa(d)māyi d-* / where=they are these first.ones REP- / 'Where are those first ones that..' (VdS 342.3)

(9) *kmā zālīm=ywaty baxxīlutā* / how cruel=it.was envy / 'How cruel was the envy' (HS 100.12)

(10) *daḥ īla kḗpouḥ?* / how it.is your.health? / 'How is your health?' (Duval 3:21)

7.7.6 *WH-questions with fronted subject*

When an explicit subject occurs in the initial position of the clause, this constituent can be adequately described as being pre-clausal. The pre-clausal constituent, either nominal (1, 4) or pronominal (2, 3), serves as a theme constituent. In ex. 2 the theme serves as a vocative.

(1) *kḗpuḵ dâḵī=(ī)lā?* / your.health how=it.is? / 'About your health, how is it?' (Merx 9.13)

(2) *a(n)t mudī biʿḇādā=(ī)wet laʾḵā* / you what doing=you.are here / 'You, what are you doing here?' (Socin 46.4)

81. The adverb may be considered to be extra-clausal. The use of this adverb in this clause, in an unusual sense ('from now on' > 'now then') probably is due to CS influence (*mānā mekkēl*, 'how thus').

(3) *āhā men mudī=(y)lā?* / this from what it.is? / 'Why is this?' (50/10/80B34)

(4) *kĕpi díyouḥ daġ īla?* / health of.you how it.is? / 'About your health, how is it?' (Duval 6.4)

In ex. 5 from ZdB, the subject is fronted, but follows the interrogative. In this case the subject is not extra-clausal. This is the only example of such an order with copular clauses and it is, therefore, uncertain whether it is grammatical.[82]

(5) *qāmudī gellā u-tarpi d-īlāni mīli=(y)nā, qāmudī li=(y)nā kumi yan smuqi?* / why grass and.leaves of-trees green=they.are, why not=they.are black or red? / 'Why are grass and the leaves of trees green, why are they not black or red?' (50/10/80B25)

7.7.7 *Embedded interrogative clauses*

When WH-questions occur as embedded questions, no sentence connectives are needed. Constituent order in these subordinate clauses is the same as in main interrogative clauses.

(1) *qat xāzāḳ aykā=(ī)lā brātā yāʿni Jansulṭan* / REP we.see where=she.is daughter, that is Jansultan / 'that we will see where the daughter, that is, Jansultan, is.' (Merx 6.12)

(2) *en baʾyaty yadʾaty ānā mānī=(y)wān* / if you.want you.know I who=I.am / 'If you want to know who I am..' (Merx 31.14)

(3) *bet tāninôḳun but d-anni trê (ʾ)nāši mānī=(h)wāw {mắnīwa}* / FUT I.tell.you(pl) about these two people, who=they.were / 'I will tell you who these two people were' (Socin 70.4)

(4) *bit madʿinôḳon but [..] mudī āhā=(ī)li {ắʾili} paġri qāši* / FUT I.tell.you(pl) about […] what this=it.is funeral feast / 'I will tell you about [..], what this funeral feast is.' (Socin 80.4)

(5) *hā bābônā raʿyā ki yadʿit kmā urxā lazīm=(ī)lā {lắzim īlắ} qat azlaḳ* / O father shepherd, you.know how way necessary=it.is REP we.go / 'O father shepherd, do you know how far we have to go yet?' (Socin 12.19)

(6) *albatta (ʾ)nāši bet xāšḇī u-bāqrī, mudī=(y)li nīyat d-āhā ktāḇā?* / certainly people FUT they.think and-they.ask, what=it.is purpose of-this journal / 'Certainly people will ask themselves what the purpose of this journal is' (49/1/4B2)

(7) *balkā āmrīton dāʾḳī=(y)nā ktīḇi, kad d-li=(y)nā lkes ʿuydāli?* / perhaps you.say how=they.are written, when not=they.were with each.other? /

82. Note that also with verbal clauses one example of this order has been found, again in ZdB (8.6.3 ex. 2).

'Perhaps you will ask yourself how they have written when they were not together?' (50/10/82B12)

(8) *u-xzī kêpê d'ayḵ=ʾīlā?* / and.IMP.see their.health how=it.is? / '.., and see how their health is?' (HS 95.21)

7.7.8 *Conclusions*

Yes-no questions are not marked by their syntax. Marking of yes-no questions by the particle *qāmu* seems to be optional. In various texts question marks are employed.

WH-questions adhere to the syntax of focus constructions, in which the focused part of the clause, which need not to be the predicate, occupies the initial position and is followed by the enclitic copula. This focused part is followed by the topic constituent. The interrogative is part of the focused constituent.

Pre-clausal constituents, preceding the focused part, perform theme functions. Vocative function can be considered a special type of theme.

In embedded questions with interrogatives, no sentence connectives are needed. Constituent order in embedded questions is the same as in main interrogative clauses.

7.8 Name-giving

7.8.1 *Introduction*

Clauses in which the name of somebody is given display some features that are different from other clauses.

In the first place, clauses of this type can do without a copula more easily than other copular clauses. Name-giving clauses without copula mainly occur in relative clauses (7.2.3), but in BT a few examples of main clauses without copula occur (7.2.6). The latter probably are less grammatical.

In the second place, the function of the marked main order (PcS) seems to be different from PcS order in other copular clauses (7.3.5). There is no indication that these name-giving clauses are resumptive.

In the third place, name-giving clauses in which a copula is present have different orders in main and relative clauses. In main clauses the copula is attached to the predicate, i.e., the personal name. In relative clauses, the copula can be attached to the relative marker, but it can also follow the phrase 'his/her name', rather than the personal name. In the latter case, the relative marker is often lacking.

7.8.2 *Main name-giving clauses*

Main name-giving clauses do not differ from other main copular clauses. The basic clause type is SPc. The personal name constitutes the predicate, and performs new focus function, supplying salient information. The phrase 'his/her name', *šemm-* + suffix, constitutes the topic.

(1) *šemmuhy d-rigā Šāhbāz=yli* / his.name of-servant Shabaz=it.is / 'The name of the servant is Shabaz' (Merx 46.2)

(2) *u-šemmā d-(')nāšā, Ilīmalk=ī(h)wā* / and.name of-man Elimelech=it.was / 'And the name of the man was Elimelech' (Ruth 1:2)[83]

(3) *īt=(h)wā xā kāhnā, šemmuhy Zkaryā, u-šemmā d-baṭuhy Ilīšbaʿ=(')y(h)wā* / there=was a priest, his.name Zechariah, and-name of-his.wife Elizabeth=it.was / 'There was a priest, whose name was Zechariah, and the name of his wife was Elizabeth' (VdS 8.5)

The reverse order also occurs (PcS) and does not perform the same resumptive function which this constituent order performs in other copular clauses. In fact, pragmatically these clauses resemble focus constructions quite closely, the assertive or constrative focus preceding the topic. The difference between SPc and PcS, therefore, is the type of focus that is performed by the predicate. In the first order it is new focus, whereas in the latter assertive or contrastive focus is intended. In ex. 4, Zechariah, the father of the new-born John (the future Baptist), insists that his son should indeed be called John, contrary to the expectations of his family. In the line preceding ex. 5, Bejan, who is to become the main topic of the story, was introduced without his name. In this clause his name is given.

(4) *u-(')merri, Yoxannan=(')īlih šemmuhy* / and-he.said, Yokhannan=it.is his.name / 'and he said: "John will be his name".' (VdS 10.10)[84]

(5) *yaʿni Bêjān=(ī)li semmuhy* / that.is Bejan=it.is his.name / 'That is, Bejan is his name' (Merx 3.3)

7.8.3 *Relative name-giving clauses*

Four different types of relative clauses occur: two without relative marker *d-*, and two with relative marker. In the first category the copula is either absent or attached to *šemm-* + suffix. In the second category the copula is either attached to *d-*, or to *šemm-* + suffix.

Examples of the first type have been given in 7.2.3 ex. 6 and above, in 7.8.2 ex. 3. The connection to the preceding noun is established by the pro-

83. In BT '93 the copula, which is not present in Hebrew or CS, is left out.
84. Id. in BT '93, Luc 1:63.

nominal suffix attached to *šemmā*. Both examples come from Bedjan's texts.

The examples of the second type, in which the copula is attached to *šemm-* + suffix, and no relative marker is present, all come from Socin and Merx. Again one must assume that the relation of the subordinate clause to the main clause is marked by the pronominal suffix. In ex. 2 the particle *yāʿni*, usually introducing an additional phrase, is employed to introduce a subordinate clause.

I suppose that the copula is fronted to stress the subordinate relation, which is comparable to the function of fronting of the copula to the relative marker (cf. 7.5.2.3).

(1) *maʿdduwi qat mdī(n)tā ʿattiqtā=(y)lā šimmuh=(ī)li {šīmmō-li} Qintā* / telling REP city ancient her.name=it.is Qinta / '[a sign] telling that it is an ancient city, whose name is Qinta' (Socin 4.21, cf. id. Socin 110.9)

(2) *īt=(h)wā xā xan yaʿni šimmu(h)y=īwā Rājabbāʾlī-xan* / there.was a khan, his.name=it.was Rajabbali-Khan / 'there was a khan whose name was Rajabbali-Khan.' (Merx 26.1)

(3) *āhā ṭairā šimmu(h)y=(ī)li {šímmūlī} Quptā,..* / this bird, his.name=it.is Qupta,.. / 'This bird, whose name is Qupta,...' (Socin 24.16)

In Socin's text a number of examples occur of the third type, in which the relative clause is introduced by *d-*, to which the enclitic copula is attached. I assume that their is no pragmatic difference between this type of subordination and that of the first three examples.

(4) *anni šiʾdi d-īli {díli} šimmê Xāmurnāyi* / those demons REL-it.is their.name Khamornayi(pl) / 'Those demons whose name is Khamornayi,..' (Socin 4.15)

(5) *īt xā tāhar šīʾdi d-īli šimmê {it šimmḗ} Šīxāsāni* / there.is a kind of.demons, REL-it.is their.name Shikhasani / 'There is a kind of demons whose name is Shikhasani' (Socin 54.9)

In Merx's texts a fourth type of relative name-giving clause occurs, which can perhaps be explained as a contamination of the two above constructions: with the relative marker *d-* and with the copula attached to *šemmuhy*. In BT also an example of this type occurs (7), which differs significantly from Bedjan's rendering (cf. 7.8.3 ex. 3).

(6) *d-šemmuhy=yli Nātnīʾiyl* / REP-his.name=it.is Nathaniel / 'whose name is Nathaniel' (Merx 39.20)

(7) *xā kāhnā d-šemmuhy=(h)wā Zkaryā* / a priest REL-his.name=it.was Zechariah / 'a priest whose name was Zechariah (Luc. 1:5, ed. '93 / 1901)

Although there are not very many examples of relative clauses of this type, the limited number of examples suggests that there is a neat distribution of the different types. In Bedjan's texts, only examples without relative marker and without copula occur, whereas in Socin and Merx the subordination is marked either by *d-* or by the copula attached to *šemm-* + suffix.

7.8.4 *Conclusions*

Name-giving clauses differ from other copular clauses with regard to their functional patterns and to the marking of subordination. The special functional pattern of PcS clauses is common to all text types, whereas for the marking of subordination there is a difference between the texts of Bedjan and those of Merx and Socin. In BT and ZdB not very many examples occur of this construction.

7.9 Presentative copula

7.9.1 *Introduction*

Two special forms of the copula occur. Both seem to originate in a particle + enclitic copula, the first being *du-* + copula, the second *we-* + copula.[85] This combination constitutes a minimal copular clause: *dulā* here.she.is > 'here she is', which might be extended by a noun phrase: 'here is X'.[86] This compound copula came to serve also as an independent copula that is employed together with PART and INF stems. It can also be employed in clauses with finite verbs, serving grammatically as an extra finite verb, through which the aspectual value of the main verb is changed. No examples of these copulae seem to occur in the texts edited by the Protestants. In Merx and Socin not very many examples occur, and therefore the majority of the examples come from Bedjan. One wonders whether these forms were more often employed in his native dialect, or whether he had reasons of style to employ these.

7.9.2 *Presentative copula with nominal predicates*

In Bedjan's texts a number of clauses occur in which the presentative copula is complemented by a nominal phrase. Like other types of the independent copula, this form precedes the focused constituent it belongs to.

85. It is uncertain where these particles derive from. Perhaps *we-* may be connected to a form of *hwāyā*, 'to be', most likely to the passive participle, *(h)wī*.

86. Maclean 1895: 78, §29.16, 17.

(1) *u-(ʾ)merri, duli šeppulā d-jebbuḵ b-īdī* / and-he.said, there.he.is skirt of-your.robe in.my.hand / 'And he said: "Look, the skirt of your robe is in my hand' (HS 101.15)

(2) *u-du=(ʾ)ylih*[87] *qālā men šmayyā d-ī(h)wā biʾmārā* / and-there.it.was voice from heaven, REL-it was saying / 'and then there was a voice from heaven, saying:..' (VdS 13.22)

7.9.3 *Presentative copula with verbal nouns*

In these examples the copula is employed with verbal nouns. The first example displays the unmarked order of subject, copula, and predicate, whereas in ex. 2 a pre-clausal object precedes the copula.

In the first example from Bedjan (3), no explicit subject is present, and the copula is in clause-initial position. The same accounts for ex. 4, but here the copula precedes an explicit subject. This clause may possibly be understood as a focus construction, in which the copula precedes the focused constituent.

(1) *qat (ʾ)nāši dunā bitāyā* / REP people here.they.are coming / 'that here people are coming' (Socin 56.8)

(2) *u-(ʾ)merrā qātê qat Bêjān dunā diryu(h)y gô qunyā* / and-she.said to.them REP Bejan here.they.are throwed.him into well / 'and she said to them that here they had thrown Bejan into a well' (Merx 10.7)

(3) *du=(ʾ)ywen bexzāyā xā semmaltā d-xeqrā* / here.I.am seeing a ladder of.honor 'Here I see a ladder of honor..' (VdS 339.5)

(4) *duli Alāhuḵ supyuhy dešmennuḵ l-īduḵ* / there.he.is God delivered.him your.enemy into-your.hand / 'God here has delivered your enemy into your hands' (HS 102.16, id. 101.8)

7.9.4 *Presentative copula with finite verbs*

The presentative copula can also be employed together with the PRET stem, a finite verb. This construction resembles the verbal construction of two finite verbs, phase verbs, of the same stem form, in which the first modifies the semantic value of the second.[88] The presentative copulae in this function emphasize the momentary, often surprising, character of the action. Until now, only examples from Socin and Merx were found. Note that all three examples concern verbs of motion.

(1) *ba(t)r hādā gušiqlan xā yumā dulā (ʾ)tīlā xā (ʾ)têtā rābā mazdi(ʿ)yantā* / after that we.saw one day here.she.is she.came a coming very frightening / 'Thereafter, we saw her entering one day in a frightful way' (Socin 38.15)

87. Note the different spelling of this copula in HS and VdS.

88. Cf, e.g., *āmeṣ kāteḇ* 'he is able to write'.

(2) *dulā (')tīlā {dűlä-tílā} nīxā nīxā* / here.she.is she.came slowly slowly / 'There she came, very slowly' (Socin 46.16)

(3) *wēnā (')zillon rikābi* / they.are they.went horesemen / 'There they came, the horsemen' (Merx 7.7)

Bedjan also uses this copula with finite verbs, but in a different way. In ex. 4, the function of the copula is comparable to that in 7.9.3 ex. 4 (focus construction), whereas in ex. 5 it seems to be independent of the rest of the clause.

(4) *duli Māryā qam mašix=lux taġberrānā ʿal jammāʿatuhy* / here.he.is Lord, PAST anointes=you counselor over his.people / 'The Lord here has anointed you as counselor to his people' (HS 90.8)

(5) *cunkī d-du=(')ylāh kad npelih qālā d-šlāmāḵy gô nātyātī, b-xedyutā gurtā pṣexlih yālā gô ke(r)sī* / because here.it.was while it.fell voice of.greeting in my ears, in-joy great he.rejoiced child in my.womb / 'because the moment your greeting reached my ears, the child rejoiced greatly in my womb' (VdS 10.2)

7.9.5 *Conclusions*

The presentative copulae are independent copulae that are employed with nominal predicates, both independent noun phrases and verbal nouns. They can be employed also as finite verbs in phase with other finite verbs.

7.10 Clauses with finite copula

7.10.1 *Introduction*

Apart from the various types of copula that have been discussed in the preceding sections, two finite verbs can also function as copula. The first is *hwāyā* 'to be', and the second is *pyāšā*, 'to remain'.[89] The finite stems of the first verb are employed as complementary forms of the enclitic copula, to express tense and aspect functions that cannot be marked with the two enclitic forms, which can only mark the simple present and past tense. With the stem forms of *hwāyā*, the other tenses and aspects can be expressed, the imperative, subjunctive, continuous, and perfect. The verb *pyāšā*, in all its stem forms, is employed with the PART stem of another verb to make passive constructions.

89. Note that Rhétoré 1912: 91, starts his discussion of the various forms of the copula with the remark: 'Les Verbes Auxiliares sont au nombre de deux: ܗܘܳܐ, être - ܥܬܺܝ, devenir.'

In clauses with copular *hwāyā*, constituent order patterns are comparable to those in clauses with enclitic copula, the basic pattern still being SP. However, the different pragmatic markings resulting from the distinction between the independent and the enclitic copula cannot be transferred to these finite copulae. The number of different orders therefore is smaller than in clauses with non-finite copula.

In clauses with forms of *hwāyā*, however, one must reckon with the possibility that this verb, apart from its being used as a copula, may also be used as a full verb. In certain contexts the distinction between copula and full verb is easy to make, but if a verbal complement is present, this is sometimes difficult. Furthermore, *hwāyā* + *l-* is employed as a complementary form of the particle of existence *it* + *l-*. This function of *hwāyā* should also be distinguished from copular *hwāyā*. In 7.10.4 I will give a few examples of *hwāyā* in non-copular functions.

In clauses with *pyāšā*, constituent order is somewhat different from that in copular clauses, because the semantic relations between subject and predicate in passive clauses are different.

I will first give an overview of the employment of copular *hwāyā* in unmarked and marked clauses. This part is followed by a few examples of *hwāyā* in other functions. Thereafter I will discuss the use of copular *pyāšā* and the constituent order patterns in passive clauses.

7.10.2 *Regular clauses with copular hwāyā*

The unmarked constituent order is SCP with explicit subject, and CP without such a subject. In this respect these clauses follow the orders of regular copular clauses, because post-copular subjects (cf. postverbal subject in 8.2.6) do not occur. All stem forms of *hwāyā* occur in copular clauses, and these stems are employed with the same semantic function as are finite verbs in verbal clauses.[90] There are no important differences between the text corpora in this respect, although INF and PART stems of copular *hwāyā* are not represented in all texts.

The most common order seems to be CP, which is employed with nearly all stem forms and in all different text types.

In the first two examples the IMP stem is employed (1, 2), in the next three (3-6) the PRET stem. This stem usually denotes 'became', but incidentally also 'was' (6). In ex. 7 *ki* + SUB stem, denoting the habitual, is employed, in ex. 8 the same stem with the future particle, and in ex. 9 this

90. Cf. 6.7.

stem occurs in its jussive function. In this latter clause a fronted object performs focus function. In the last example, a PART stem + past copula is employed, probably denoting a pluperfect (10).

(1) *(h)wī xātirjām d-lebbī rābā ki yāqed ʿammāḵ* / be certain REP-my.heart very HAB burns with.you / 'Be sure that my heart mourns with you' (Merx 32.1)

(2) *u-(h)wī dāyem b-ṣlotā* / and-be continually in-prayer / 'Be always in prayer' (49/1/4A16)

(3) *u-kad (h)wilā ṣāhat d-eštā, (h)wili xuyā ʿal kullāh arʿā* / and-when it.became hour of-six, it.became darkness over all.of.her earth / 'And at the sixth hour darkness fell on all the earth' (Mark 15:33) (id. CS, perfect)

(4) *b-anni šenni (h)wilon kresṭyāni* / in-those years they.became Christians / 'In those years they became Christians' (49/1/5B23)

(5) *derrih u-hwelih kresṭyānā* / he.repented and-he.became Christian / 'He repented and became a Christian' (VdS 358.5)

(6) *Māryā hweli ʿam Šāʾol* / Lord he.was with Saul / 'The Lord was with Saul' (HS 92.12)

(7) *men xā gibā ki hāwī bimxāyā āhā zurnā* / from one side HAB they.are beating this drum / 'On one side they use to beat the drum' (Merx 27.15)

(8) *qat bet hôyā=(h)wā yemmā d-malkā mšīxā* / REP FUT she.is.PAST mother ofking Messiah / 'that she would become the mother of king Messiah' (VdS 9.15)

(9) *uprí ṯḥut[t] áqluḥ ốyan* / dust under your.feet SUB.I.am / 'Let me be dust under you feet' (Socin 101.22)

(10) *d-pešlī buqrā men d-ānī d-(h)wīyi=(y)wāḵ=(h)wāw bālād b-ʿuydāli gô baytā dmallā* / REP-I.became asked from those REL-been=we.were known to-each.other in house of.Mollah / '.. that I was asked by those which I had met with in the house of the Mollah,..' (Merx 50.9)

The order SCP occurs regularly, and clauses occur with all five stems. In ex. 11 the PRET stem is represented and in ex. 12 the SUB stem (habitual). In the next three examples (13-15), the SUB stem is employed in its subjunctive function. Note that in three examples (12, 13, 15), the subject consists of an explicit personal pronoun marking an assertive topic. In ex. 16, the copula is of the INF stem. No other examples of such a copular clause are found, making its grammaticallity somewhat uncertain. However, the INF stem gives a distinct meaning to this copular clause, which probably cannot be expressed by another verbal phrase. In the last two examples (17, 18), a PART stem is employed as a copula in an adverbial clause.

(11) *u-up kullê julli d-Bêjan (h)welon dimāni* / and-also all.of.them clothes of-Bedjan they.became bloody / 'And also all Bedjan's clothes became covered with blood' (Merx 3.19)

(12) *īnā ānī ki hāwī=(h)wāw begxākā bīyuhy* / but they HAB they.were laughing at.him / 'but they used to laugh at him' (HS 9.17)

(13) *a(n)t hāwit bāsīmā* / you SUB.you.are pleasant / 'May you be prosperous' (Merx 28.12) (in context: 'farewell')

(14) *ṣlāwātī u-xabrī li hāwī yārīḳi [..] but d-āhā himezmānuḳ hāwī xaccā* / my.prayers and-my.words not SUBthey.are long [...] because of-this your.words SUB.they.are short / 'Let my prayers and my words not be long [..], therefore, let your words be short (71/12/91B4-6)

(15) *āhā hôyā ṭupsā qā yāli* / this SUB.it.is example for children / 'This ought to be an example for children..' (HS 12.4)

(16) *demman behwāyā=(y)li šextānā, kad bi'wārā=(y)li b-gāwā d-paġran* / our.blood becoming=it.is filthy, while passing=it.is in-inside of-our.body / 'Our blood is becoming filthy when it is passing through our body' (50/10/80B5) (cf. also 50/10/80A29-30)

(17) *up en rābā mennê har b-kullih d-āhā setwā (h)wīyi=(y)na dāršāni* / also if many of.them even in-all.of.it of-that winter been=they.are opponents / 'even although many of them had been opponents all that winter' (Merx 51.18-52.1)

(18) *īnā cunki d-bnay Laywonīyā, u-Estunīyā u-Korland, hammāšā (h)wīyā=(y)nā ra'yatti maṣyettāni* / but because inhabitants.of Litonia and-Estonia and-Courland, always been=they.are subjects obedient / 'However, because the inhabitants of Litonia and Estonia and Courland always have been obedient subjects,..' (71/12/96A20)

7.10.3 *Other constituent orders*

In a limited number of clauses, copular *hwāyā* follows the predicate. In all clauses in which the explicit subject precedes the predicate, the copula is of the PRET stem, denoting 'to become'. It is not clear what the pragmatic or perhaps grammatical conditions are for the occurrence of this order. Most of the examples come from Bedjan's texts.

(1) *ānī rāzī (h)wilon [...], u-haw rāzī lā (h)wili* / they willing they.became [...], and-he willing not he.became / 'They agreed [..], but he did not agree' (71/12/93B9-13)

(2) *u-ānī zi yumā l-xabruhy buš xerbā hwelon* / and they also day to-his.brother more wickedness they.became / 'And they, from day to day they became worse' (HS 87.5)

(3) *ādīyā yāqīn hwelā qātī, qat* / now certain it.became for.me REP / 'Now it has become certain for me that..' (HS 102.1)[91]

(4) *qiḇutā bi'zālā hwelā u-bi'tāyā lpāt mīyā* / ark going it.became and coming on.surface.of water / 'The ark began to move and to float on the surface of the water' (HS 10.4)

91. So also HS 89.23 and 103.14.

In a few clauses, copular *hwāyā* precedes the subject. The three examples are of different types. In ex. 5 (CSP), the fronted copula perhaps is due to the subjunctive function, whereas ex. 6 (PCS) probably is of the same type as clauses with a predicate introduced by *kmā* (cf. 7.7.5), in which the subject regularly follows the nucleus of predicate and copula. In ex. 7 the fronted form of *hwāyā* may be due to analogy with fronted copula in relative clauses, although in other relative clauses the finite copula is not fronted. Note also that in this clause the meaning of the PRET form does not seem to be any different from that of the past copula.

(5) *hôyā aqluḵy brīḵtā* / be your.feet blessed / 'Let your feet be blessed' (Merx 14.15)[92]

(6) *uxcā yārīxtā ki hôyā šintê* / so long HAB it.is their.sleep / 'So long is their sleep' (Merx 4.3)

(7) *b-kullê d-ho zaḇnā d-hweli Šmu'il nḇīyā* / in-all.of.them of-that period REL-Samuel he.was prophet / 'all that time Samuel was prophet' (HS 89.14)

7.10.4 *Other functions of hwāyā*

Two other functions of *hwāyā* are of importance. The first is its use as a full verb, meaning 'to be present', 'to exist', or 'to be born'.[93] The second is its employment as a complementary form of *īt* + *l-* 'to have'. Like the copula, the latter sequence can be employed only in the present and simple past (with *-wa*), and the sequence *hwāyā* + *l-* is employed to supply the other tenses and aspects.

In clauses with the full verb *hwāyā*, constituent orders are conditioned by the pragmatic patterns of verbal clauses. A number of marked orders occur, which illustrate the distinction between these clauses and clauses with copular *hwāyā*. Quite a number of XV orders occur, in which the complement is fronted for reasons of focus (1, 2). In other clauses (3, 4), also having fronted complements, the subject follows the verb (XVS), an order that performs very specific pragmatic functions in copular clauses (cf. 7.3.5), but that is not uncommon in verbal clauses (cf. 8.2.6). In ex. 5, in a relative clause, the order is XSV.

(1) *u-tāmā (h)wī hal d-amrennuḵ* / and-there be until I.tell.you / 'and stay there until I tell you' (Mat 2:13)[94]

92. So also in Socin 183 n. 57 and Duval 2.20.

93. One wonders whether perhaps *hwāyā* in the first two functions is partly complementary to *īt* 'there is'. The difference is that *hwāyā* is mainly employed with definite subjects, whereas *īt* can only be employed with indefinite 'subjects'. So also Polotsky 1996: 42-44.

94. A similar clause occurs with *pyāšā* in VdS 5.18: *u-pā'eš=(h)wā tāmā, hal..* 'and he stayed there until..'

(2) *ṣpay bet hāwēt* / good FUT you.are / 'You will feel better' (HS 94.18)

(3) *bʾḏī rastḗ ki hṓa yālíḥtā d-ḥígga* / in.my.hand right HAB she.is handkerchief of-dancing / 'In my right hand there is usually a handkerchief for dancing' (Socin 104.1)[95]

(4) *d-mennoh bet hāwi=(h)wā pāroqā d-ʿalmā* / REP-from.her FUT he.born=PAST savior of=world / 'that from her, the savior of the world would be born' (VdS 2.20)

(5) *u-mṭelon lkes d-ho šqīpā, d-(t)xotuhy qaddīšā hāwi=(h)wā* / and-they.reached to that rock, REL-under saint he.was=PAST / 'And they reached the rock under which that saint was staying' (VdS 355.17)

A few examples will be given of *hwāyā* + *l-*. In exx. 6 and 7, the preterite tense is employed to denote 'to receive', 'to get'. In the Protestant press, this is expressed by the PRET stem + *l-*, whereas in Bedjan's texts, this is represented by *qam* + SUB + *l-*.[96] In ex. 8, this construction is employed with a SUB stem.

(6) *ānā b-gānī (h)welā=lī persat l-saxburi l-xā daryā mdīnāti guri d-Amirekkā* / I in-my.self there.became=to.me opportunity to visit one part cities big ofAmerica / 'I myself recieved the opportunity to visit a good many big cities of America' (71/12/92A10)

(7) *u-ho brunā qa(d)māyā d-qam hāwi=lāh* / and-that son first REL-PAST he.became=to.her / 'And the first son she received,..' (HS 85.25)[97]

(8) *d-xā gāhā (ʾ)xi(r)tā hôyā=lan har laʾḵā xā tpāqtā d-xadutā* / REP-one time other SUB.it.is=to.us just here a meeting of-joy / 'that another time we would have a joyous meeting here' (Merx 34.17)

7.10.5 *Clauses with copular pyāšā*

Passive verbal phrases consist of a finite stem of *pyāšā*, complemented by the PART stem of the verb that is needed.[98] The unmarked order in clauses with such verbal phrases is ScP (2-5). The grammatical subject is usually a semantic patient. In many clauses, especially in those without ex-

95. Cf. also Socin 103.21: *bʾḏiḥ g[y]ārāk hṓya ḥā yāliḥtā* 'In my hand ought to be a handkerchief'.

96. For a further discussion of these constructions, see Polotsky 1979: 209-10 and 6.8.

97. Cf. in HS 86.10 a parallel clause with *īt* + *l-*: *u-Xannā baḵtuhy līt=(h)wā=lāh yāli* 'and Hannah, her sister, did not have children'.

98. It should be noted that the verb *pyāšā* can also be employed independently, meaning 'to remain', 'to stay'. This is the case in a curious clause in Merx 11.18: *lā pīšā pīšā=(ī)wet*. This is translated by Merx as 'Du bist nicht verlassen worden?', and thus interpreted as *lā pīšā=(ī)wet pīšā*. I am not sure whether this actually reflects the meaning, perhaps some idiomatic expression is at stake. A regular clause with full verb *pyāšā* is: *kad har btultā bet pêšā=(h)wā* 'while she would remain a virgin' (VdS 2.23).

plicit subject, a fronted complement precedes the predicate (1, 4). These fronted complements perform assertive focus function. Ex. 6, from Bedjan, suggests that *pyāšā* can also be employed as a copula with a nominal predicate.

(1) *b-āhā zarb xaylāntā pišlon mixyi* / with-this blow fierce they.became slain / 'With this fierce blow they were defeated' (Socin 6.17)

(2) *d-āpen šladdā qayrā, pêšā=(h)wā ṭumertā gô ʿaprā* / REP-although corpse cold it.became=PAST buried in earth / 'although the cold corpse is buried in the earth' (Merx 33.13)

(3) *ānī d- [..], bit pêšī deryi gô dusāxānā men ṭlā hal eštā yarxi* / those REL-[..], FUT they.become thrown in prison from three to six months / 'Those who [...], will be thrown in prison for three to six months.' (71/12/95B25-27)

(4) *u-xakmā (')xi(r)ni b-dôrā d-gānuhy pīši=(')y(h)wāw qṭīli* / and-some others in-period of.him.self they.became.PAST killed / 'And some others were killed in his own days' (VdS iii.12)

(5) *ríba ouríba ġaiḥ dīwáni ki péšiḥ qiṭye dla sádi ou óṣpat* / many and.many times judgements HAB they.become decided without witnesses and proof / 'Many and many times judgements were given without witnesses or proof' (Duval 49.4)

(6) *hāw har hādā pešlih makīḵā* / he certainly such he.remained humble / 'he just remained humble' (VdS ix.7)

7.10.6 *Clauses with copular pyāšā and post-verbal subject*

In a limited number of clauses, the subject follows the passive predicate. There are no indications that post-verbal subjects serve to mark narrative, given topics, like in verbal clauses (cf. 8.2.6). In the three examples, the post-verbal subject refers to a new assertive topic. In ex. 3, the subject can even be considered to be extra-clausal.

(1) *īnā men nāgistān pā'eš šem'yā haṭḵā brāqāla māyra* / but from immediately it.became heard such sound bitter / 'but when suddenly such a bitter sound is heard' (Merx 31.4)

(2) *u-aygā up b-rīšā dīyī pešli muṭḇā xā benpār māri ṭīmā* / and-then also on head of.me it.became put a crown possessor.of value / 'And then a very expensive crown was put on my head' (50/10/77B17)

(3) *u-pešlih xezyā qā Zkaryā mala'ḵā d-Māryā, d-ʾī(h)wā kelyā men yammīnā d-madbxā d-besmā* / and-he.became seen to Zechariah angel of-Lord, REL-he.was stood from right of-altar of-incense / 'And to Zechariah appeared the angel of the Lord, who was standing at the right side of the altar of incense' (VdS 8.11)

7.10.7 *Conclusions*

Clauses in which the two finite verbs *hwāyā* and *pyāšā* are used as a copula are more close to copular clauses than to verbal clauses with regard to their constituent order patterns. The basic pattern is SP, as in clauses with the enclitic copula, and the only difference is the position of the copula, preceding the predicate rather than following it.

In clauses with *hwāyā*, PS does not occur, whereas in passive clauses this order is found a few times. The conditions for PS in these clauses are clearly different from those for VS in verbal clauses.

The copula *hwāyā* in the PRET stem in a number of clauses follows the predicate, rather than preceding it. Which conditions govern this alternative order is as yet uncertain.

7.11 Summary and conclusions

7.11.1 *Conditions governing constituent order in copular clauses*

The three kinds of functions that are being distinguished in linguistic description, grammatical, pragmatic, and semantic functions, all influence consituent order patterns in copular clauses.

The grammatical functions of subject and predicate provide the basic pattern: SP. This coincides with the basic pragmatic pattern: topic precedes focus. All variations in copular constituent order are due to pragmatic and semantic functions of the clause, not to its grammatical properties.

This becomes very clear from the position of the copula: its position is conditioned purely by pragmatic and semantic factors, not by grammatical factors. The pragmatic factor is the fact that the copula always accompanies the constituent that carries the main focus of the clause. Pragmatic and semantic properties of the clause decide whether an independent copula will be employed — like a negative copula or a finite form of *hwāyā* — or an enclitic copula. The first will always precede the constituent it belongs to, the latter will follow this constituent.

The most important variation on basic copular constituent order is the focus construction. This type of clause is employed in a number of marked clause types, i.e., identifying clauses, pseudo-cleft clauses, and WH-questions. In the focus construction the special initial position of the clause, the P1 position (cf. 1.4.2) is filled.

In the following template the various possible constituent orders are summarized.

theme | Sc P1[c] Sa S P[c] X | tail

The placement rules for the various constituents can be summarized as follows:

Predicate

1. The predicate is always placed in the predicate position P, performing new focus function.
2. If the predicate consists of more than one prepositional phrase, or of a verbal noun followed by an object or a prepositional phrase, these additional complements are placed in X
3. If the predicate consists of an indefinite noun phrase introduced by *xā* 'a', followed by an adjectival complement, the adjectival complement can appear in X.

Subject

1. The subject is placed in S in all possible topic functions, i.e., new topic, assertive and contrastive topic, and resumed topic.
2. If the subject is assigned focus function, providing the salient information of the clause, it is placed in P1 position, whether the subject is a personal or demonstrative pronoun, or a noun phrase.

Complements

1. When complements to the predicate, prepositional phrases or objects, are assigned new focus function, they are placed in position X.
2. When these complements are assigned assertive or constrastive focus function, they are placed in P1.

Interrogatives

1. Interrrogatives or phrases with interrogatives always occupy P1 position.

Sentence connectives and sentence adverbs

1. Sentence connectives and sentence adverbs occupy the initial position (Sc and Sa) of the clause if the P1 position is empty.
2. If the P1 position is filled, only sentence connectives may precede P1, sentence adverbs follow P1, in position Sa.
3. If a sentence adverb is assigned focus function, it occupies position P1.

4. The relative marker *d-* as well as adverbial sentence connectives may, but need not, occupy position P1. The exact conditions are unclear.[99]

The copula

1. If position P1 is occupied, the copula is attached to the constituent in P1, regardless of the type of constituent.
2. If position P1 is empty, the copula is attached to the predicate in P (thus, the copula always follows the constituent that is assigned the main focus of the copular clause).
3. Enclitic (dependent) copulae follow the constituent they belong to, either in P1 or in the predicate position P.
4. Independent copulae precede the constituent they belong to, again, either in P1 or in the predicate position P.

Constituents without grammatical function

1. Constituents that are referred to inside the clause by a suffix attached to a noun are assigned theme functions when in pre-clausal position. If the theme-position is filled, usually no sentence connective is present, but if it is present, it may precede the theme.
2. If the P1 position is filled, the theme position can be filled with an extra-clausal constituent that is congruent with the subject-suffix of the verbal phase.
3. Additional information on subject, object, and prepositional phrases can be placed in post-clausal position, in juxtaposition or introduced by *ya'ni*. If a known topic is resumed at the end of the clause, the clause often has a resumptive function at the end of a topic span.

Additional remarks

1. The clause is complete when either the P1 position or the predicate position is filled by a constituent and complemented by a copula.
2. It is possible to omit the copula in clauses with consecutive predicates, in relative clauses consisting of prepositional phrases, in relative clauses in which a pronominal suffix links the subordinate clause with the main clause, and in clauses with a subject and a predicate in vivid description.

99. Perhaps it is possible to see subordination as a special type of focus construction, in which the enclitic copula attached to *d-* marks the subordination itself as the main focus of the clause.

7.11.2 *Differences between the text types*

In all text types, the basic copular clause, Pc and SPc, constitute the dominant unmarked order. The absence of the copula in the source languages of BT led to some incomplete subordinate clauses in this translation, but in the majority of copular clauses in BT, the copula is present and in the correct position. In the OT translation, PcS order is sometimes due to the source language.

The alternative independent form of the copula in SCP order occurs in the texts of Merx and Socin and in ZdB, whereas no examples were found in Bedjan's texts. On the other hand, the second clause type in which probably an independent copula is employed, clauses with cleft predicates, are rather common in Bedjan's work, whereas they occur also in Socin and Merx. In BT these clauses are absent, and in ZdB a few clauses occur that can possibly be interpreted as employing an independent copula.

In all text types focus constructions occur. Identifying clauses occur in all texts, whereas the defective type is not attested in Socin and Merx. The second type of focus construction, in pseudo-cleft clauses, is frequently employed by Bedjan, whereas in Socin's texts only one example was found. The third type of focus construction, in WH-questions, occurs in all texts corpora.

The differences between constituent order in subordinate and main clauses consist mainly of the possibility of fronting of the copula. In the various text corpora, this possibility is employed to a different degree. In Bedjan, fronting of the copula takes place in all subordinate (i.e., adverbial and relative) clauses that are introduced by *d-*. In the texts of Merx and Socin, fronting of the copula is rare in adverbial clauses, and more frequent in relative clauses, especially when the predicate consists of a prepositional phrase. In BT, fronted copula is rare. The absence of fronted copula may be due to the influence of the source languages, in which nothing like a fronted copula is present, but its presence in a few other clauses cannot be explained from influence of the source languages. In ZdB adverbial and relative clauses usually have the fronted copula if the predicate consists of a prepositional phrase, whereas, with verbal nouns, the copula tends to follow the predicate. The tendency in the texts of Merx and Socin seems to have become a rule in ZdB.

The two types of presentative copula, *duli* and *weli*, are present both in the texts of Merx and Socin and in those written by Bedjan. In the texts from the Protestant press these copulae are absent.

With respect to clauses with other independent copulae, like the negative copula and the finite forms of *hwāyā* and *pyāšā*, constituent order patterns are much the same in the three text corpora.

Two concluding remarks can be made.

The first is that the LUA translation of copular clauses in BT makes clear that the position of the enclitic copula is an important feature of these clauses. Although in a number of minor clause types, like relative clauses, the position of the copula is influenced by the source languages, this is hardly the case in main affirmative, identifying, interrogative, and name-giving clauses. The position of the enclitic personal pronoun in CS, or the additional personal pronoun in Hebrew was not slavishly followed in BT, and the patterns of focus marking by the enclitic copula as found in the texts of Merx, Socin, and Bedjan are unmistakably present in BT. Thus, this pragmatic conditioning of constituent order was felt to be an inherent part of the grammar of the language, something that could not be changed for reasons of concordant translation.[100]

The second is that Bedjan's language in some respects differs from that of the other texts. The most important difference is the fact that pseudo-cleft clauses, which are extremely rare in the other corpora, are quite common in Bedjan's texts. Is this use of the focus construction due to CS influence, in which the enclitic third person masculine pronoun can be employed in much the same way? This focus construction is very much part of the pragmatic marking of copular clauses, so it is unlikely that Bedjan introduced this construction from CS. Perhaps Bedjan took a construction already present in the Urmia dialect and employed it more frequently, in a way comparable to its use in CS. This construction fits in well with the literary style that characterizes Bedjan's writings.

100. It is interesting to note that according to Goldenberg 1995 the use of the pronomen copula in CS Peshitta displays this same indepence vis-à-vis the Hebrew text. Focus constructions ('rhematization') in particular have survived the overall literal translation of Hebrew idiom.

8

VERBAL CLAUSES

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 *Verbal syntax*

In this chapter I give an overview of the various constituent orders in verbal clauses.[1] In LUA quite a number of different orders occur, and the first question is which one of these different constituent order types can be considered the basic order. In the introduction of the section 'Basic orders' I will discuss this problem (8.2.1). After having decided which is the basic order, I will describe the various orders that deviate from it.

The description of the constituent order patterns may serve to answer two questions: (i) what are the pragmatic functions that are performed by these different order types; and (ii) are there any differences between the text groups with respect to constituent order in verbal clauses? As in the preceding chapter, I will discuss the data from the text corpora in each section, and discuss differences in frequency or pragmatic functions.

In this chapter, the main focus is on verbal clauses, i.e., clauses with a finite verbal form, built on the SUB, PRET, and IMP stem. Clauses containing verbal forms consisting of a PART or INF stem with a copula are not taken into account, because they follow the constituent order types of copular clauses. The morphology and semantic functions of the verbal stems have been discussed in chapter 6.

8.1.2 *Overview*

What has been written on clause order types and their functions in Neo-Aramaic is rather limited. This is even the case for a number of modern descriptions of spoken Neo-Aramaic dialects. However, many grammars do make a few remarks on constituent order which are worth considering.

In the oldest grammar, that of Stoddard, constituent order in verbal clauses is not referred to at all, in contrast to the, albeit limited, attention that is paid to the order in copular clauses.[2]

1. For the differentation between verbal and copular clauses, see 6.9 and 7.1.2.
2. Stoddard 1855: 152.

The important grammar of Nöldeke has a separate chapter on syntax, in which a number of paragraphs are devoted to constituent order. Nöldeke's interest too is mainly in copular clauses, but he does not ignore verbal clauses. Nöldeke states that, because of the nominal origin of all NA verb forms, 'der eigentliche Platz des Subjects die Spitze des Satzes ist'. Later on he describes VS clauses as resulting from 'eine Inversion'.[3] The terms 'eigentliche Platz' and 'Inversion' indicate that Nöldeke seems to consider SV as being the basic order of subject and verb. He does not comment on the various positions of object phrases.[4] His opinions on constituent order are based on the missionaries' translations of English works and on articles in ZdB, whereas the texts of Rödiger and the Catechism seem not to have provided much material in this respect. Despite his assertion of SV as the basic order, he also gives quite a number of examples of VS order (cf. 8.3.2).

Maclean, who based himself on the written as well as on the spoken language, writes on the order of the main constituents: 'In the position of words in the sentence N.S. [i.e., New Syriac] very closely resembles English.' After having described SVO order, he adds: 'But variations are commoner than in English'.[5] He does not pay separate attention to VS orders, which is somewhat surprising in view of his usually accurate and complete descriptions in other fields of grammar.[6]

Marogulov, a native-speaking grammarian of LUA, who described the literary Urmia dialect in 1935,[7] does not pay any attention to constituent order.[8] This may be due to the fact that the grammar was intended for native speakers, who will not have had much trouble with this subject. In another grammar from the Soviet Union on Urmia Aramaic, by the Georgian-speaking Tsereteli, SV order is described as being most common, whereas VS order, in his opinion, is limited to certain verbs. No attention is paid to the position of object noun phrases.[9]

The most extensive treatment of constituent order in Neo-Aramaic until now is to be found in Hoberman's study of 1989. In his appendix on 'Sen-

3. Nöldeke 1868: 344, 347.

4. Compare Nöldeke 1868: 315-16, where he remarks on object marking morphology, but not on constituent order.

5. Maclean 1895: 192.

6. See Maclean 1895: 193; under '(6) *Emphasis*' he mentions one VS clause that is *not* emphatic in his opinion ('*mxī zigā*'), and a number of copular clauses with PcS structure, in which the subject is last for 'emphasis'.

7. He describes the language of the Urmia-speaking population of the former Soviet Union.

8. Marogulov 1935/1976.

9. Tsereteli 1978: 89.

tence Order' he describes the various clause orders occurring in the Jewish dialects of Amadiya and Zakho.[10] He assumes SVO to be the basic order in these dialects. In Krotkoff's description of Aradhin Aramaic, also a few comments on constituent order occur. Interesting are his remarks on 'topicalization', which he describes as the 'advancement of the principal referent'. He states that SV and VO are the dominant orders, whereas VS and OV occur regularly.[11]

Recently, Kapeliuk published a short, but detailed, study on constituent order in clauses with imperatives, based on the Urmia Aramaic text of Marogulov's grammar.[12] She too presumes a basic SVO order.

8.1.3 *Arrangement of the chapter*

The description of clause order types and their pragmatic functions is divided into the following sections. In the first section (8.2), the basic constituent orders in LUA are described. The basic order of verb and object is VO, but with regard to the basic order of subject and verb, a decision is more difficult. SV as well as VS order have certain characteristics of the basic order. In 8.2 all these orders will be discussed.

In section 8.3 the most important marked form of verbal clauses will be discussed, i.e., when a verbal complement, be it an object or a prepositional phrase, precedes the verbal form. The various positions of the subject phrase in case of fronted complements will be given due attention.

The majority of clauses follow the orders discussed in 8.2 and 8.3, but a small number of clauses display several variations on these orders. These are presented in 8.4. In most of these clause types, extra-clausal constituents are present.

In this chapter on verbal clauses, I will not treat constituent order in subordinate clauses separately. Whereas in copular clauses interesting differences between constituent order in main and subordinate clauses were found, no such difference seems to exist for verbal clauses. Some constituent order types occur less often in subordinate clauses than in main clauses, but this is due to the specific pragmatic functions of subordinate clauses as compared with main clauses. In principle, all clause types, except for those with certain types of extra-clausal constituents, occur in all types of subordinate clauses, and there is no constituent order type that is uniquely employed in subordinate clauses. For this reason, I will present the various

10. Hoberman 1989: 157-180.
11. Krotkoff 1982: 52-55.
12. Kapeliuk 1992: 64-67.

types of subordinate clauses among the main clauses of the same constituent order type.

The remaining sections are devoted to negative clauses (8.5), interrogative clauses (8.6), and imperative clauses (8.7). These clause types all display certain variations on the constituent order types presented in the first part of the chapter.

In the concluding section (8.8), I will discuss the relations between the various order types, as well as the relations with the order types in copular clauses. The differences between the use of clause order types in the different corpora will be summarized and commented on.

In this chapter, the examples from BT have been employed with care. Whereas in copular clauses constituent order in BT sometimes displays its own characteristics, constituent order in verbal clauses is largely influenced by constituent order in the source languages. I have not come across any verbal clause in which BT constituent order is significantly different from that in Hebrew or Syriac. All examples from BT in this chapter are thus to be seen as illustrations of the fact that a specific order type does indeed occur in BT, even if such an order is not due to a deliberate choice of the translator. Examples from BT cannot serve as additional arguments for the grammaticality of a certain order or illustrate a specific function of a given order.

8.2 Basic orders

8.2.1 *Introduction*

One of the characteristics of all Neo-Aramaic dialects is their large amount of possible constituent orders. In LUA too all possible permutations of verb, subject, and object occur. If the various adverbial and prepositional phrases are also taken into account, the number of possible orders increases even further. However, it soon becomes clear that the distribution of these numerous orders is in no way haphazard or disorganized. To find some regularity in these orders, it is necessary to make a distinction between basic orders and orders deviating from this basic order, in the same way as was done with the clauses with a copula (cf. 7.3).

It proved somewhat difficult to select one type of verbal clause as being basic not only grammatically, but also semantically and pragmatically. Ideally, basic clause order is unmarked with respect to the function of all its constituents. For the pragmatic functions, this would mean that the predi-

cate, consisting of verb and object, provides the new information (focus), whereas the subject represents old and known information (topic).[13]

With regard to the position of the object and the other complements of the verb, it is indisputable that the order VO is unmarked. However, with regard to the position of the subject, no clear opposition between marked and unmarked positions can be stated. In this section I will discuss VS as well as SV order, because both have certain characteristics of the unmarked order. I will start with the presentation of clauses consisting only of a verbal form, proceed with clauses with objects and prepositional complements (VO, VX) and verbs with more than one complement (VOX, VOO), and then turn to clauses with explicit subjects (VS, SV) and to orders in which a nominal subject as well as an object or complement are present.

I will conclude with a few remarks on the basic position of sentence connectives, sentence adverbs, adverbs, and prepositional phrases that do not function as verbal complements.

8.2.2 *Verbal clauses without explicit subject or object*

The clause type in LUA that certainly deserves the predicate 'basic' is the one in which a verbal form on its own constitutes a complete clause. If the subject is pronominal, the verbal form in itself sufficiently indicates the subject by means of subject suffixes. These suffixes follow the stem of the verb (Vs). Pronominal object suffixes too are attached to the verbal form itself.[14] A single verbal form, therefore, may refer to a pronominal subject and pronominal object. The kind of suffixes employed for subject and object reference as well as their order differ according to the verbal stem. With the SUB stem, the subject suffix precedes the object suffix (Vso), whereas with the PRET stem, the object suffix precedes the subject suffix (Vos).[15] This difference in morphology does not influence the constituent order patterns.

The verbal forms with pronominal subject and object references can be employed if subject or object are sufficiently clear from the preceding clauses. Thus, a subject always consists of a given topic (1, 2, 3, 4), and an object (4, 5, 6), being part of the focus of the clause, refers to an earlier mentioned participant. However, very few clauses consist only of a verbal

13. Cf. Hopper 1968: 124, and further 1.4.3.5.

14. Note that in some texts in CS script object suffixes on the IMP and SUB stem are written separately. However, they do belong to the verbal stem form.

15. See further 6.6.2. In the rest of this chapter I will not note the subject suffixes, because they are present in every verbal form. The object suffixes are optional, and therefore represented.

phrase. In most instances the verbal phrase is preceded by a sentence connective, a sentence adverb or a prepositional phrase (1, 2, 3, 5, 6). In subordinate clauses, in which the participants are usually known, examples of this type occur regularly (3, 5, 6). No significant differences between the text corpora have been found.

(1) *u-(')zil-lon hal…* / and-they.went until… / 'And they went until…' (Socin 14.2)
(2) *ou bit pirpíll-iḥ qat ātē ou..* / and FUT they.beg REP they.go and.. / 'and they will beg to go and..' (Duval 74.5)
(3) *in yād'-it, up ā(n)t…* / if SUB.you.know, also you / 'If you would know, you also.. ' (Merx 11.6)[16]
(4) *bit māx-aḳ-luḳ d-mayt-it* / FUT we.strike.you in.order.that-you.die / 'We will strike you so that you will die' (Merx 7.20)
(5) *qat rābā xdirr-ī, lā mucx-ā-lī* / REP much I.went.around, not I.found.her / 'that I made a long journey, but I did not find her' (Merx 6.7)
(6) *en qam qāṭil=lī, axnan hāwāḳ ra'yattoḳon* / if PAST he.kills=me, we SUB.we.are your(pl).subjects / 'If he kills me, we will be your subjects' (HS 95.14)[17]

8.2.3 *Clauses with nominal objects (VO)*

In the majority of clauses with nominal objects, the order of object and verb is VO. OV order occurs regularly too, but must be considered to be a marked order (cf. 8.3). In clauses with VO order, the object refers to new, salient information, and thus represents new focus. New focus is the unmarked function of verbal phrase plus object and complements. The analogy between the Vo order of a verb with a pronominal object (8.2.2), and VO order in verbs with nominal objects, provides a further indication of basic VO order.[18]

I will first give a number of examples of clauses with direct objects. An important characteristic of direct objects is the fact that their state of definiteness is marked by the presence or absence of a pronominal object suffix attached to the verb. If the DO is definite, a coreferential object suffix is present, if the DO is indefinite, no object suffix is present. Nominal DO's usually refer to patients, although incidentally a locative or an instrumental is found.[19]

16. Cf. id. Socin 2.5.
17. Note the following, contrastive clause: *u-en ānā qam qāṭlennih, axton hwêmon ra'yâtênī* / 'and if I kill him, you will be our subjects' (HS 95.14)
18. So Givón 1976, but compare the discussion of this hypothesis in Comrie 1980: 210.
19. On the morphology and morphosyntax of objects, see 6.6.2-3.

This is illustrated by examples taken from all text corpora, both main and subordinate clauses. In the example from Socin (1), an indefinite patient object follows the verb, whereas in exx. 2 and 3, a definite patient is accompanied by a pronominal suffix. In ex. 4, from BT, a definite direct object is erroneously treated as indefinite, which is confirmed by Bedjan's rendering of the same clause, given in ex. 6, in which an object suffix is attached to the verbal form. Ex. 5, from ZdB, shows that the Protestant press did indeed know how to use the coreferential suffixes. In the last two examples from Bedjan's texts (7, 8), an indefinite patient object follows the verb.

(1) *men bā(t)r nšāqā ki maṯbī nurā* / after kissing HAB they.put fire / 'After the kissing, they kindle the fire' (Socin 18.1)

(2) *nāgistan grīš-ā-li gurzīnuhy* / suddenly he.took.it his.club / 'Suddenly he took his club' (Merx 3.18)

(3) *ba(t)r hādā malkā puqidli qat prumun=lih*[20] *qdālā d-Jānsulṭān* / after that king he.ordered REP cut.off=it throat of-Jansultan / 'Thereafter the king ordered that they should cut off Jansultan's throat' (Merx 9.20)

(4) *u-šqelli xdā men qāborguhy* / and-he.took one of his.ribs / 'And he took one of his ribs' (Gen. 2:21)

(5) *ptīx-ê-lan panjāran palgā d-sāʿat bā(t)r sāʿat d-tmānyā* / we.opened.them our.windows half of-hour after hour of-eight / 'We opened our windows at half past eight' (71/12/92A19)

(6) *šqīl-ā-li xā elʿuhy* / and.he.took.it one his.rib / 'And He took one of his ribs..' (HS 4.15)

(7) *qā mabsummuhy lebbā d-ān d-qārī bīyê* / to please.him heart of-those REL-they.read in.them / 'to please the hearts of those who read them' (VdS i.17)

(8) *ou moúvver sádi mouhtábar yan nāmouhtábar* / and SUB.he.brings witnesses reliable or non-reliable / 'and he brings reliable or unreliable witnesses..' (Duval 44.21)

A number of verbs in LUA may govern a cognate object. This cognate object is part of the verbal phrase, and usually follows the verb.[21] The verb *ʿbādā* 'to make', 'to do' is employed in a large number of compound verbal phrases,[22] whereas a number of other verbs have fixed lexical complements.

20. In Syriac script: *(y)li*.

21. For this use of the term cognate, see Givón 1984: 105. He classifies this type of object, complementing a 'semantically empty' verb, with proper cognate objects that complement verbs with the same or a closely related stem. For preverbal cognate objects, see 8.3.2.

22. Probably the compound verbal forms in Persian, often also with 'to do' (*kār*), have stimulated the use of this periphrastic verbs.

Such a verbal phrase, consisting of verbal form plus noun, may govern a direct object and other verbal complements. Usually compound verbal phrases are complemented by a direct object or a prepositional phrase.

In the following examples, a direct object complements the compound verb form. In all clauses the nominal direct object follows the cognate object. Object suffixes are always attached to the verbal form itself, and therefore precede the cognate object (11-13).

(9) *u-ki ʿāḇdī hāzīr ṣuprā qā (')ḵāltā d-laxmā* / and-HAB they.make ready table for eating of-bread / 'and they prepare a table to eat bread (Merx 14.11)[23]

(10) *u-qrili šemmuhy Šēt* / and-he.called his.name Seth / 'And he called him Seth' (Gen. 4:25)

(11) *u-qam āḇed=l(h)on xāterjām*ʿ / and-PAST he.does=them assurance / 'and he assured them,..' (71/12/96A28)

(12) *īmañ d-ʿḇīd-ê-lī murāxas raʿyatti* / when I.do.them permission subjects / 'When I let the subjects go..' (71/12/95A18)

(13) *mumxīy-ê-lih baṣmā b-Surīt u-b-Lātennī* / he.stroke.them print in-Syriac and-in-Latin / 'He has printed them in Syriac and in Latin' (VdS iv.4)

8.2.4 *Verbs complemented by prepositional phrases*

Verbal forms can be complemented by different kinds of prepositional phrases. In unmarked clauses, when the verbal complement conveys the most salient information of the clause, these complements follow the verbal form.

An important subgroup of the prepositional phrases are the indirect objects.[24] Indirect objects, being usually employed for datives, are introduced by the preposition *qā* that has lost its meaning 'in the direction of' and functions as an indirect object marker. In BT and sometimes in ZdB, the preposition *l-* is employed in like manner.[25] Definite indirect objects have no coreferential pronoun at the verbal form.

In exx. 1, 2, 4, and 6, instances of the use of the indirect object marker *qā*, taken from all text corpora, are given. In the example from BT (3), the indirect object marker *l-* is employed. In exx. 5 and 6, a pronominal indirect object is represented, with a suffix attached to the preposition, not to the verb. Note further that it is possible, and not unusual, to construct an ani-

23. One wonders whether *hāzīr* 'ready' is a noun. However, Maclean in his dictionary gives it also as a noun, although he does not provide an adequate translation. Merx, in n. 6, adds 'gegenwärtig, fertig'.

24. For my use of the grammatical terms direct object, indirect object, and prepositional phrase on the one hand, and the semantic terms patient and dative on the other, see 1.4.3.2.

25. Under influence of CS, see further 6.6.3.

mate patient object as an indirect object with *qā* (2), whereas this type of object, when pronominal, is referred to with a direct object suffix on the verbal form.[26]

(1) *ki hāqyā=(h)wā qā (')nāši but..* / HAB she.told to people about / 'She used to tell people about..' (Socin 38.8)
(2) *u-mxili qa d-āhā hāywan xdā gāhā* / and-he.struck to this animal one time / 'And he struck this animal once' (Merx 3.13)
(3) *u-(')merri l-baḳtā* / and-he.said to-woman / 'and he said to the woman' (Gen. 3:1)
(4) *u-(')merron qā xākīm d-atrā..* / and-they.told to ruler of-land / 'and they told to the ruler of the land..' (49/1/4A7)
(5) *(')morron ellê* / tell to.them / 'Tell them..' (50/10/82A45)
(6) *u-puqedli qātuhy* / and-he.ordered to.him / 'and he ordered him' (HS 4.8)

Also other types of prepositional phrases follow the verbal form in basic, unmarked clauses. These verbal complements may refer to the semantic roles of dative (10, 11), locative (7, 8), manner (9), etc., depending on the kind of preposition that is employed. This type of clause occurs in all text corpora, in main as well as in subordinate clauses (8).

(7) *mixyāli ʿal hāywan* / he.struck.it upon animal / 'He threw it [i.e., his club] to the animal' (Merx 18)
(8) *qat kul (')nāšā d-āti men tarʿā gô bêtā yāʿni lgāwāyī yan kul baḳtā yan brātā qāmêtā gārag yāhḇī zuzi qā d-āhā (')nāšā d-* / REP every.man REL-he.goes from door in house that.is inside, or every women or girl, first necessary SUB.they.give coins to this man REL-[...] / 'that every man that comes from the door into the house, i.e., inside it, as well as every woman or girl, they should first give money to this man that.. ' (Merx 20.17).
(9) *up rābā māri zuzi (')tilun b-xā zyārat rābā qābol u-qaddīštā u-xadtā* / also very possessing wealth they.returned on-a pilgrimage important and-holy and-new / 'Very wealthy they returned from an important and holy pilgrimage of a new kind' (Socin 14.19)
(10) *u-buqerri mennih* / and.he.asked from.him / 'And he asked him' (Mark 15:44)
(11) *u-supelon bī Bar'uni u-bī T'omīsā* / 'and-they.handed.over to Baruni and-to Tomisa / 'And they handed it over to Baruni and to Tomisa' (VdS 253.6)

8.2.5 *The order of verbal complements*

In basic clauses, direct objects usually precede indirect objects, and indirect objects precede other prepositional phrases. Since patients usually are constructed as direct objects, this order reflects a hierarchy common to many

26. So in 8.2.2 ex. 4.

languages. In this hierarchy, patient precedes dative, requires less marking (in many languages patients are constructed as DO's), and more often constitutes a secondary topic than do datives.[27] Additional reasons for this order perhaps can be found in the 'language independent' tendency to give short constituents a place in the beginning of the clause, and longer constituents a position towards the end of the clause. Indirect dative objects, because of their preposition, usually are longer than direct patient objects, and thus would preferably appear at the end of the clause.[28] The principle of 'verb-object bonding' predicts the same hierarchy among direct and indirect objects.[29]

In LUA, however, this pattern is complicated by the fact that a pronominal dative object can be constructed as a direct object suffix attached to the verb rather than suffixed to a preposition (*qā-*).[30] This is possible when no patient object is present (then the order stated above remains intact) or when the patient object is indefinite and does not need a coreferential pronoun. Thus, in case of a pronominal dative suffix plus a patient object, the order of patient and dative is reversed.[31] In grammatical terms, the order is verb — pronominal direct object — nominal direct object — indirect object (V-o DO IO). Whether the pronominal object refers to a dative or a patient is irrelevant as to constituent order.

In the first example, from Socin, an indefinite patient object precedes a definite, nominal benefactive introduced by *qā* (1). In the first example from Merx, an indefinite instrumental is followed by a human patient pronominal object (2). The first object is constructed as direct object, whereas the human patient is constructed as indirect object. In ex. 3 the pronominal dative is represented as direct object suffix attached to the verb, thus reversing the usual patient — dative order, but following the basic grammatical order of V-o DO.

In BT the indirect object often precedes the direct object. In many clauses of this kind, the indirect object is a dative or a human patient. As said before, constituent order in OT and NT is so thoroughly influenced by

27. Cf. Givón 1984a: 139, 183. Note that this order contrasts with the agency scale in which the dative precedes the patient: AGENT DAT PAT.

28. See Dik 1981: 190-212, where the 'LIPOC' (language independent preferred order of constituents) hypothesis is described in extenso. See also Dik 1989: 351, for another formulation of this tendency.

29. As proposed by Tomlin 1986: 4, 73-101, taking up earlier ideas of Venneman 1974. Although this principle predicts the closer link between the object of a transitive verb and the verb than between the subject and the same verb, this principle also seems to imply that the direct object is more closely connected to the verb than the indirect object.

30. Cf. 6.6.3.

31. On 'dative shifting' or 'promotion to DO' in various languages, see Givón 1984a: 151-182 and 1984b: 172-179.

Hebrew and CS that these findings do not add much to our understanding of LUA constituent order. A few clauses follow the basic order, in which the direct object precedes the indirect object. In ex. 4 a definite direct object precedes a definite indirect object.[32] In ZdB, the usual order is DO < IO, as is illustrated by ex. 5.

In Bedjan's texts too, direct objects predominantly precede indirect objects and other verbal complements. The same is true for the texts in Duval's edition. In the first example a definite direct patient object precedes an indefinite indirect dative object (6), in the second a pronominal patient object suffix precedes the definite indirect dative (7), and in the last two examples, a subordinate (8) and a main clause (9), a dative direct object suffix precedes an indefinite patient. In exx. 7 and 9, the object phrases are followed by prepositional verbal complements.

(1) *qāmêtā ki qablax xā ʿarbā yāʿni diḇxā qā ʿumrā d-Mardānīl* / first HAB we.bring a sheep i.e. offering for monastery of-MarDanil / 'First we use to bring a sheep, i.e, an offering, for the monastery of MarDanil (Socin 16.1)

(2) *u-mxili xā gurzīn qātê* / and-he.struck a club to.them / 'and he struck them with a club' (Merx 8.7)

(3) *qam yā(h)ḇil-lāh xā yālixtā mlītā laxmā* / PAST he.gives.her a napkin filled bread / 'He gave her a napkin filled with bread' (Merx 11.7)

(4) *lā maddeʿyaty gānāḵy l-(ʾ)nāšā* / not you.let.know yourself to-man / 'Do not show yourself to the man' (Ruth 3:3)

(5) *u-šḇīq-ê-li ṭlā qā d-hô (ʾ)xi(r)nā* / and-he.gave.them three [i.e., coins] to-that other / 'and he gave three to that other one' (71/12/93B12).

(6) *bet yāhḇenn-ih besruḵ qā ṭayri d-šmayyā u-qā jānāwāri d-barrīyā* / FUT I.give.it your.flesh to birds of-heavens and-to beasts of.field / 'I will give your flesh to the birds of the air and to the beasts of the field' (HS 97.3)[33]

(7) *u-qam zāḇnett-an qā Alāhā b-demmā d-gānuḵ men kul ujāġ u-leššānā u-jamāʿat u-mellat* / and-PAST you.buy.us for God in-blood of-yourself from every family and-language and-community and-people / 'You have bought us for God with your own blood out of every family and language and community and people' (VdS viii.9)

(8) *u-ṭleblon mennuhy qat yāhḇil=(h)wā=l(h)on xā malkā* / and-they.asked from.him REP SUB.he.gives=PAST=them a king / 'And they asked him to give them a king' (HS 90.1)

(9) *[..] ki yāvîl-i ḥa pítva maġ tinnáiou ou maġ líbbou* / [..] HAB he.gives.him a judgement according.to his.story and according to his.heart / '[..], he [i.e., the judge] judges him according to his story and his wish' (Duval 45.3)

32. Note that in this clause the definite patient is not marked by an object suffix attached to the verb, and that the dative is marked by *l-* instead of *qā*. In BT '93, the wording is the same.

33. Cf. BT '93, 1Sam. 17:44: *u-yā(h)ḇen besruḵ l-pāraxtā d-šmayyā u-l-xaywtā d-deštā.*

A limited number of verbs can govern two direct objects (ex. 10).[34] Ex. 11 seems to be a special case, in which the second object ('kings and priests') may also be interpreted as a complement to the pronominal object ('us') rather than to the verb.

(10) *mulbiš-ê-li Ādam u-baḳtuhy xakmā sudrāti d-gellā* / he.clothed.them Adam and-his.wife some veils of leaves / 'He clothed Adam and his wife with some leaves' (HS 6.24)

(11) *u-qam ʿāḇdett-an qā Alāhā malki u-kāhni* / and-PAST you.make.us for-God kings and-priests / 'You have made us for God kings and priests' (VdS viii.10)[35]

8.2.6 *Clauses with VS order*

In the introduction of this chapter, it was said that it is difficult to establish the basic order of subject and verb. VS and SV both have certain characteristics of a basic constituent order type, and therefore I will discuss both types in this section on basic orders. First I will pay attention to clauses with VS order. I give an overview of the various functions of this order and its distribution in the various texts. Whether indeed VS or SV is more basic, will be discussed in the conclusion of this section (8.2.10).

The subject in clauses with VS order usually refers to a *given topic*. VS order often occurs in chains of clauses, in parts of the discourse in which an ongoing story is told.[36] The foremost pragmatic function, therefore, is to mark the progress of the action, without attracting particular attention to the topic, a function that is especially important in narrative texts.[37] VS order is particularly frequent with verbs like 'to say', 'to answer' and the like.[38] This might be due to their semantic function, being usually employed to describe the continuation of the narrative. In these clauses with VS order,

34. An often cited example from the grammars is the verb *mlāyā* 'to fill': 'to fill X with Y', Maclean 1895: 153.

35. See the preceding clause in ex. 7.

36. On this subject, see Hoberman 1989: 162-5. He distinguishes two types of VS order, 'S-V inversion' and 'Subject Postposing'. About the latter (cf. 'tail position' in 8.4) he states that 'subjects which are old information' may occur at the end of the clause. For 'S-V inversion' he did not discover 'any special discourse-structural function'.

37. Nöldeke's description of VS orders (1868: 347) may point to the same direction, as he mentions 'Inversion' in clauses which he characterises as 'Einschiebsel', i.e., short inserted clauses. However, his justification of VS order in these cases does not seem to be correct: 'Hier wird durch die Umkehr der gewöhnlichen Ordnung deutlicher gemacht, dass ein selbständiger Satz anhebe'. The fact that the English original of the LUA version of *The Pilgrim's Progress* by John Bunyan, from which Nöldeke took most of his examples, uses VS construction quite regularly too, presents a further complication.

38. This was already noted by Tsereteli 1978: 89.

the subject is unmarked, whereas the verbal form is assigned new focus function. It is not surprising to see that in non-narrative texts, VS order is less frequent than in narrative texts.[39]

Another function of VS order is to introduce *new topics*. New topics that are introduced in this way usually are subtopics of the discourse. New topics in VS order are always indefinite (cf. 8.2.7). This type of clause is not very common in LUA.[40]

It has been suggested that the presence of a sentence adverb or a fronted complement favors VS order.[41] However, in LUA, both VS and SV order occur in clauses beginning with sentence adverbs, so the presence of an adverb does not automatically lead to postverbal subjects. Another question is whether fronted complements, objects or prepositional phrases, trigger a postverbal position of the subject. In the majority of clauses with fronted complements, no explicit subject is present. If an explicit subject is present, it may occur in all three possible positions (SXV, XSV and XVS, cf. 8.3) and no correlation between fronting and postverbal subjects can be assumed. In all text types, subordinate clauses regularly display VS order, but SV order occurs as well.

More important with regard to the distribution of VS and SV clauses is the difference in the VS/SV ratio in different texts. These differences may be partly due to the genre (narrative // essayistic), but perhaps also have to be attributed to other factors. I will discuss the examples from the various text corpora.

In Merx the largest number of clauses with VS order occur. The majority of these fit in neatly to the pattern described above. A few exceptions will be discussed below. In Socin the number of VS clauses is much lower, but these again consist for the greater part of clauses with given topics without any specific marking. In the first clause (1), 'Zal' is a given topic, just as 'those people of Rustam' in the relative clause in ex. 2, 'Lazar' in ex. 3 and 'the eucharist' in the adverbial clause in ex. 4.

In OT, the number of VS clauses outnumbers that of SV clauses, but this is entirely due to constituent order in Hebrew (5). In NT the number of VS orders is considerably lower than in OT. In ZdB the number of VS clauses

39. Non-narrative texts are hardly represented in my corpus. I have looked for additional evidence in Bedjan's *Imitatio Christi* (1886) and *Mois de Marie* (1904), which are devotional and essayistic, rather than narrative.

40. See Dik 1989: 269-70, who mentions the introduction of new topics as a typical function for clauses with VS order alongside SV order. In LUA, however, the introduction of a new topic is not the most common function of VS order.

41. So by Hoberman 1989: 164, and Krotkoff 1982: 52, although they note that there is no hard and fast rule.

is low, and many of them consist of clauses with verbs like 'to say' and 'to answer' (6). However, also other verbs occur with VS order (7), again mostly in narrative contexts.

In Bedjan's texts, VS order is much more common in HS than in VdS. Both texts are purely narrative, HS relating the Bible stories, VdS retelling the lives of the saints. In HS the pragmatic function of VS order is about the same as in Merx and Socin, the subject represent a given topic (8, 9). In VdS most of these functions are performed by clauses with SV order.

In the last three clauses (10-12), examples of VS order for new, indefinite, topics are given from Socin and Bedjan. In ex. 12 a new topic appears in a subordinate clause.

(1) *nīxā nīxā (')zilli Zāl cim qurbā lkes hāywan* / slow slow he.went Zal very close towards animal / 'Slowly Zal went very close to the animal' (Merx 3.13)

(2) *u-hê (ʿ)dānā d-ṭallī ānī ṭāyipā d-Rustam* / and-that time REL-they.sleep those people of Rustam.. / 'And the period that those people of Rustam used to sleep..' (Merx 4.2)

(3) *up ki ʿāḇed āhā qaššīšā Lāʿzar* / also HAB he.does this priest Lazar / 'So also did this priest Lazar' (Socin 36.15)

(4) *u-bā(t)r priqli qurbānā qāšā ki qāri l-ʿalmā* / and after eucharist it.finished[42] priest HAB he.calls to-people / 'And once the eucharist is over, the priest calls the people' (Socin 20.21)

(5) *u-(')merri Alāhā* / and-he.said God / 'And God said:..' (Gen 1:9)[43]

(6) *lā, (')merri hô hākīm* / no, he.said this physician / ' "No", this physician said' (49/1/4B14)

(7) *u-mubyenna pātuhy šôqānta ayḵ demʿāntā* / and-it.appeared his.face shining like crying / 'And his face shone with tears' (50/10/77B31)

(8) *murmālā baḵtā* / she.answered woman / 'The woman answered' (HS 5.7)

(9) *npelli ho Alāhā d-duġlā qā(d)m qiḇutā* / he.fell this god of-lying before ark / 'This deceitful god fell down before the ark' (HS 89:4)

(10) *ba(t)r xakmā yumāni (')tilun (')nāši d-āhā mdī(n)tā qat..* / after some days they.came people from-that town REP / 'After some days people from that town came to..' (Socin 14.7)

(11) *u-beʿḇādā=(')yli qôlā, qat bet ātī xā pāruqā* / and-doing.he.is promise, REP FUT he.comes a savior / 'And he promises that a savior will come' (HS 6.1)

(12) *bas axcon d-ātī ʿidāwāti mārānāyi yan d-Mārty Maryam, yan ʿaryi d-qaddīši, šāqlax=lhon ān ktāḇi basīmi* / therefore whenever SUB.they.come

42. According to Md, the first stem of *prq* is intransitive (*prāqā*), whereas the second stem is transitive (*pāroqi*).

43. So also in Bedjan, cf., a.o., HS 2.7.

feasts of.the.Lord or of-Saint Mary, or festivals of-saints, SUB.we.take these books beautiful / 'Therefore, whenever come the Lord's Feasts, or feasts or Our Lady, or Saints' days, we should take these beautiful books..' (VdS ii.8)

The presence of an object suffix at the verbal form does not seem to influence the choice between VS or SV. A few examples with VoS order from different text types will suffice (13-15). Note that in exx. 13 and 14 the actual topic appears for the first time. In ex. 13 this is probably due to the fact that in the preceding paragraph the evil influence of demons etc. had been talked about, so the topic is 'inferrable', whereas in ex. 14 a new topic is introduced.

(13) *u-ba(t)r hādā li maxyā-luḳ ʿaynā bīštā* / and-after that not.SUB it.strikes-you eye evil / 'And thereafter the evil eye will not strike you' (Socin 36.18)

(14) *nāgestan dḇīq-enn-ā xā šentā bāsīmtā* / suddenly it.took.me a sleep sweet / 'Suddenly I was overcome by a sweet sleep' (50/10/75A9)

(15) *u-bī rābā muštāqutā ki qārī=lhon kullê (')nāši* / and-in very longing HAB they.read=them all.of.them people / 'and with much eagerness everybody reads them' (VdS ix.3)

In clauses with two phase verbs,[44] VSV order is more common than SVV, although the latter is not impossible. However, no examples were found in which VSV was employed for contrastive or assertive topics, and thus it is not certain whether the pragmatic function of the subject or the double verb causes the postverbal position of the subject. This type of clause is often found in Bedjan's texts (17), but occurs also in other presses (16).

(16) *men šarʿat, gārag kul yālā yālep leqrāyā* / by law, it.ought every child SUB.it.learns to.read / 'By law, every child ought to learn to read' (50/10/79B9)

(17) *u-qemli Šmu'ēl (')zelli lkes İli* / and-he.rose Samuel he.went towards Eli / 'And Samuel rose and went to Eli' (HS 87.7)

A few clauses occur, even in Merx's and Socin's texts, in which VS clauses are employed for other pragmatic functions. In ex. 18, the context makes clear that the subject performs assertive topic function, which is usually presented in SV order. This is the only example of assertive topic in postverbal position. This might be due to the presence of *up*, 'also'.

44. Or its equivalent with *gārag* or *lāzem*, frozen forms which go together with a finite verb form.

(18) *u-bā(t)r hādā ki ṣāli up xitnā men (')gāri gô bêtā* / and-after that HAB descend also bridegroom from roof into house / 'And afterwards also the bridegroom descends from the roof into the house' (Merx 19.7)

8.2.7 *Clauses with SV order*

In all text types, except for OT under influence of Hebrew, the majority of clauses with nominal subjects follow SV order. In Socin's texts, as well as in ZdB, Bedjan's VdS and Duval's texts, the number of VS is considerably lower than the number of SV clauses. Only in Merx and in Bedjan's HS, the number of VS clauses is nearly as high as the number of SV clauses.

The subject in SV clauses may perform various pragmatic functions, four of which are marked vis-à-vis the subject in VS clauses.

The main function of a subject in preverbal position is to mark the presence of a *contrastive topic*. If two subject-topics in two consecutive clauses are in contrast with each other, they appear in preverbal position. Closely related to this function is that of *assertive topic*, used when no explicit contrast is present, but the identity of the topic should be stressed. The latter function is often additionally marked by the particle *up* 'also'. Subjects that are assigned contrastive or assertive topic function hardly ever occur in postverbal position.

In a number of cases, SV order is employed in clauses with given topics, which as such are not contrastive or assertive. However, the complete clause can be described as being assigned assertive focus, thus *assertive sentence focus*. Clauses of this type often occur at a turning point in the discourse. This might coincide with a (typographically marked) paragraph boundary, but not necessarily so. SV order also is very common when the subject consists of a noun preceded by a demonstrative. Such a subject by definition is a given topic, but the use of a demonstrative indicates that this topic needs more attention than other given topics. This might also account for clauses in which the word *kull-* 'all of', either attributive or independent, is part of the subject. In clauses of these two types (paragraph boundary and subjects with demonstrative or *kull-*), SV order adds to the emphatic, assertive character of the complete clause, not only to part of it, as is the case with contrastive and assertive topics.[45]

A fourth function possibly performed by a preverbal subject is the introduction of a *new topic*. New topics are usually introduced by other means,

45. This 'assertive sentence focus' seems to be of the same character as described in 7.3.7 for copular clauses with independent copula.

either by employing an *īt*-clause[46] or by employing an indefinite noun phrase in postverbal position (see 8.2.6 exx. 10-14). However, definite new topics, often consisting of personal names, can be introduced in preverbal position. This usage might be related to the function of assertive topic. In a number of clauses with SV order, the new topic, although it appears in the discourse for the first time, probably can be assumed to have been known to the listeners.

In the examples, these four functions of SV clauses are illustrated. It is important to note, however, that there are some differences between the various text types. In Merx's texts nearly all examples can be neatly described as belonging to one of these categories. In Socin's texts the number of SV clauses is considerably larger than that of VS clauses, but still the majority of them fit into the patterns described above. In BT, as mentioned before, the constituent order of the source languages is followed. In ZdB the number of VS clauses is very small, and SV orders are employed not only for the distinctive functions described above, but also for the other pragmatic functions as described in the previous paragraph (8.2.6). It is possible that the English-speaking authors of these texts were not fully aware of the distinct pragmatic functions of SV orders.

In Bedjan's texts, there is a considerable difference between the two texts I have been studying closely. In *Histoire Sainte* (1888), the function of SV versus VS clauses is comparable to that in Merx and Socin, whereas in *Vies des Saints* (1912), the relative number of SV clauses is much higher, and this order is employed for nearly all types of clauses, even if a significant number of VS clauses occur. In the texts of Bedjan edited by Duval, VS orders are rather uncommon.[47]

In the first three clauses the subject expresses a contrastive topic (1-3). The following examples illustrate the third category of pragmatic functions: 'assertive sentence focus' (4-6). All three clauses mark the beginning of a new part of the discourse. In the following five examples (7-11), a new definite topic is introduced. The last three examples illustrate the use of SV in subordinate clauses. In ex. 12 a new definite topic is given, whereas in exx. 13 and 14 the subject might be in preverbal position to underline the importance of the temporal adverbial clause.

(1) *u-Zāl rābā zid(ʿ)li men d-āhā hāywan inā Bêjān hic lā zed(ʿ)li* / and-Zal very he-feared from that animal but Bedjan not.at.all not he.feared / 'And

46. Cf. *īt=(h)wā xdā baḵtā sāḇtā* 'There was an old woman…' (Merx 1.2).

47. Clauses with VS order also seem to be uncommon in the other publications of Bedjan, like the *Imitatio*, *MdP* and *MdM*. These texts contain mainly devotional and 'essayistic' texts.

Zal was very much afraid of that animal, but Bedjan was not afraid at all' (Merx 3.11)

(2) *palgā ayḵ..., hô palgā (')xi(r)nā ki dāmi ʿal ṭayrā* / half like..., that half other HAB it.resembles to bird / 'One half is like.., the other half resembles a bird' (Socin 10.16)

(3) *u-bā(t)r hādā up brunā d-xātā d-Rustam (')merri up ānā bet āze(l)n* / and-after that also son of-sister of-Rustam he.said also I FUT I.go / 'And thereafter also the son of Rustam's sister said: "I too will go" ' (Merx 3.2)

(4) *ba(t)r xakmā šinni anni (')nāši dirron l-ba(t)rê yaʿni l-baytê b-tāhar (')xi(r)nā..* / after some years these men they.turned to.after.them that.is to-their.houses in-way other / 'After some years these men returned to their houses by another way..' (Socin 14.13)

(5) *anni meskini (')tilon lkes Urmī* / these poor they.went to Urmia / 'These poor people went to Urmia' (49/1/4A6)

(6) *l-hô yumā d-šaḇʿā, Šmu'ēl xaccā ʿurqelli* / on-that day of-seven, Samuel somewhat he.was.delayed / 'On the seventh day, Samuel was somewhat delayed' (HS 91.3)

(7) *u-Zāl (')merri ānā bet āze(l)n* / and-Zal he.said I FUT I.go / 'And Zal answered: "I will go" ' (Merx 3.1)

(8) *ba(t)r hādā (')nāši dīyan ki māxīlun b-ṣaydā* / after that people of-us HAB they.strike.them in-hunt / 'Thereafter our people use to hunt them' (Socin 10.20)

(9) *īna Īhudā Skaryoṭā, xā men treʿsar, (')zelli lkes gurāni d-kāhni* / but Judas Iscariot, one of twelve, he.went to chiefs of-priests / 'Then Judas Iscariot, one of the twelve, went to the chief priests..' (Mark 14:10) (Judas is mentioned for the first time in this chapter)

(10) *Ilīmalk d-Bētlxem šqelli baḵtuhy Naʿmī, u-trê bnunuhy* / Elimelech of Bethlehem he.took his.wife Naomi, and-two his.sons / Elimelech of Bethlehem took his wife Naomi and his two sons,..' (HS 84.22)[48]

(11) *koulli azáni ou aḥyáni ki öǧézziḥ minniḥ* / all goers and comers HAB they.annoy from.me / 'All who come and go are annoyed with me' (Duval 53.14)

(12) *ayḵ kmā d-aqlātān d-az(l)ī bit azlaḵ l-hê dunyi xritā* / as much.as our.feet [REL][49].they.go FUT we.go to.that world new / 'As long as our feet carry us, we go to that other world' (Socin 12.7)

(13) *u-bā(t)r d-kullê ʿalmā jmiʿli ki matḇī ṣuprā [..]* / and-after all.of.them people they.gathered HAB they.set table / 'And after everybody has come in, they set the table' (Merx 21.10)

(14) *hê (')dānā d-anni qārā'xābāri mṭelon l-mdī(n)tā, treṣlā xā šīwān d-li ātyā ltānuḇi* / that time REL-these bad.news they.reach to-city, it.makes a great.

48. In BT (Ruth 1:1) the closest parallel clause has VS order.

49. It is difficult to translate this *d-*. I assume that it does not introduce a relative clause, but that it is a 'doubling' of the *d-* that belongs to the sentence connective.

mourning(f) REL-not it.comes to-tell / 'That time, when this bad news reached the city, there was great mourning, impossible to relate' (HS 88.22)

An explicit personal pronoun that is added to the subject reference of the verbal form usually marks a contrastive (17) or assertive topic (15).[50] In case of first and second person, the pronoun can be employed also to mark a new topic, or the change of a pronominal topic (16). This is identical with the use of explicit pronominal subjects in copular clauses.[51] Marked pronominal subjects always occur in preverbal position.

(15) *up axnan ki xašḇaḳ qat..* / also we HAB we.think REP / 'We too think that..' (Socin 10.22)

(16) *ānā juwweblī* / I I.answered / 'I answered' (50/10/33)

(17) *īnā ānī lā (ʿ)ḇedlon mʾayḳ dīyuhy,* / but they not they.did like him / 'but they did not do what he did,..' (HS 11.20) (Sem and Japhet versus Cham in Gen. 9:22-23)[52]

A more widespread use of SV orders is present in the later narrative works of Paul Bedjan (VdS), in his earlier essayistic texts (MdP, Im, and the texts edited by Duval), as well as in the texts of the Protestant press, especially in ZdB. A survey of the post-war texts from the twentieth century indicates that SV order then has become the regular order, except in cases of verbs like *ʾmr* 'to say' and the like.[53]

Although this use of SV order can be partly explained by the fact that SV order has taken over the pragmatic functions of VS order, notably that of referring to a given topic, this cannot account for all examples. When one looks for clauses with given topics in SV order — in texts in which SV order is employed in the majority of clauses with an explicit subject — it becomes clear that in fact very few clauses of this type occur in these texts, either with SV or with VS order. I assume that the preponderance of VS orders in early narrative texts may be due to a stylistic device of repeating known topics. In essayistic texts, as well as in later narrative texts, an explicit subject is nearly always employed to refer to a new topic, whereas given topics are sufficiently marked by the pronominal reference of the verbal form. Only in case of contrastive or assertive topics may the subject refer to a given topic.

50. Cf. also ex. 3 and 7 above.
51. Cf. 7.3.3.
52. Cf. also ex. 7.
53. These texts are outside the scope of the present study, and their grammar needs further investigation.

Thus, the gradual disappearance of VS order may be due to a change in narrative techniques, rather than to a loss of markedness of the preverbal position. This change of narrative technique stimulated the disappearance of the opposition between VS and SV in favor of SV order, whereby SV did indeed lose much of its marked character.[54] One might further assume that English and French, two languages that might have influenced native speakers of Urmia Aramaic[55] and that both have a predominant SV order, hastened the use of SV in LUA.[56]

8.2.8 *Clauses with explicit subject and verbal complements*

In the foregoing, already a number of examples of VS and SV orders with objects and other verbal complements have been given. These indicate that, in principle, both orders of verb and subject can be complemented by objects or prepositional phrases. However, when comparing the amount of VS and SV clauses with verbal complements, it appears that VS order often has prepositional complements, but few objects, whereas the majority of clauses with direct object and explicit subject has SV order. Thus, although VS order can be employed in clauses with a direct object or prepositional phrases, these clauses more often employ SV order.

In Merx's and Socin's texts, a number of examples of VSO/X order occur. In ex. 1, the indirect object follows the subject, whereas in the next example (2), an indefinite direct object, followed by an indirect object, follows the subject. The subject consists of a given topic.

As one would expect, in OT a considerable number of VSO orders occur, whereas in NT the number is very small (3). In ZdB one example has been found of VSO (4).

In Duval's texts no examples of this order are found. In Bedjan's texts a number of VSO clauses occur, the majority of which come from HS (5).

54. This might be explained by the presumption of Dik 1978/1981: 178-182 and Dik 1980: 127177, about the tendency of VS languages becoming SV languages through an intermediate state of preponderance of S in P_1 for reasons of pragmatic marking. Gradually the markedness of the SV order may then disappear, and SV becomes the unmarked order.

55. English was taught by the American Protestants and the Anglicans and French was taught by the Lazarists. The latter language may have influenced Bedjan when living in Europe.

56. It is interesting to note that Hopper, in an article on the gradual disappearence of VS order in Malay in the nineteenth century (Hopper 1974), assumes that this change might be partly attributed to a situation of westernization, language contact, and growing importance of written language, factors that ask for a more explicit, predicative style, rather than a narrative style. The first style he connects with SV, and the second with VS order. These factors might have played a role in nineteenth-century Urmia too.

VSO clauses occur both with and without sentence adverbs in initial position.

(1) *u-ba(t)r hādā (')mirri Rustam qā pāhluwānu(h)y* / and-after that he.said Rustam to his.heroes / 'And thereafter Rustam said to his heroes' (Merx 2.15)

(2) *u-bā(t)r hādā qam yā(h)ḇil āhā āgā zuyzi qā d-āhā Suyrāyā miskinā rābā zuyzi* / and-after that PAST he.gives this Agha money to that Syrian poor much money / 'And thereafter this Agha gave money to that poor Syrian, very much money.' (Merx 13.13)

(3) *brāšīt brili Alāhā l-šmayyā u-l-arʿā* / in.the.beginning he.created God heavens and-earth / 'In the beginning God created heavens and earth' (Gen. 1:1)

(4) *šāqel malpānā palgā men ʿidtā, u-palgā men aḇḇāhi d-yāli* / SUB.he.takes teacher half of church, and-half of parents of-children / 'A teacher should take half [of his wages] from the church and half from the parents of the children (49/1/2B19)[57]

(5) *šqelli Šmuʾēl mešxā qaddīšā* / he.took Samuel oil holy / 'Samuel took the holy oil' (HS 94.11)

The majority of clauses with a subject and verbal complements follow SVO or SVX order. A few examples will suffice (6, 10, 12-14). In subordinate clauses VSO order is very rare. The examples (7, 8, 9, 11, 15) illustrate the use of SVO or SVX order in subordinate clauses. Most examples come from Bedjan's texts.

(6) *u-haw Bêjān (')mirri qātuhy* / and-this Bejan he.said to.him / 'And this Bejan said to him' (Merx 7.8).

(7) *uxcā ki māxi=(h)wāw=lun hal d-gildê šālix=(h)wā mʿallê* / so HAB they.strike.PAST.them until their.skin SUB.it.strips.PAST from.them / 'So they struck them, until their skins were stripped off from them' (Socin 8.5)

(8) *ki tanyā=(h)wā qat ānā xzilī MarSargīs u-Alāhā u-(y)tiḇlan mʿuydāli l-xā ṣuprā* / HAB she.tells=PAST REP I I.saw MarSargis and-God and.we.sat together at-one table / 'She used to say: 'I saw Mar Sargis and God, and we sat together at one table' (Merx 44.10)

(9) *qat kullê pāhluwānuhy jāmʿī ātī lkesluhy* / REP all.of.them officers they.gather they.come to.him / 'that all his officers should come to him' (Merx 2:17)[58]

57. It is possible that this phrase is part of a piece that is translated from CS, but it is difficult to decide where the quotation from CS ends (cf. Texts no 6).

58. Cf. also Socin 10.22.

(10) *āhā marʿā hatḵā xdīrêli kullê gibāni d-brītā* / this disease thus it.went.around.them all.of.them parts of-world / 'This disease thus went around all parts of the world' (49/1/5A32)[59]

(11) *hatkā up wājeb=īlā d-qāryāni parmī maṭlab d-ktāḇi* / this also necessary=it.is REP-readers SUB.they.understand content of-Scriptures / 'So also it is necessary that readers understand the contents of the Scriptures' (49/1/1B7)

(12) *Pleštāyi lublālon qiḇutā d-Māryā* / Philistines they.took.it ark of-Lord / 'The Philistines took the ark of the Lord' (HS 89.3)

(13) *hē ʿdānā T'omīsā šuderrāh juwāb qā Bar'uni, qat* / that time Thomisa she.sent reply to Baruni, REP / 'At that time Thomisa sent a message to Baruni, that..' (VdS 252.20)

(14) *dīwan muṭṭrīṣā ourḥāiḥ* / government SUB.she.constructs roads / 'The government should construct roads' (Duval 38.20)

(15) *xayyi d-sāhdi Kaldāyi u-Parsāyi, d[....], aġlābā ktīḇê=(')ywax b-taṗsīr up'en b-keryutā, qat kullih ʿālmā yādeʿ=lhon anni bābāwātan, u-xeqrā d-mellattan*[60] / lives of-martyrs Chaldean and-Persian, [...], precisely written.them=we.did with-explanation even.in-short, REP all.of.it world SUB. it.knows=them these our.fathers, and-honor of.our.nation / 'As for the lives of the Chaldean and Persian martyrs, we wrote them down accurately with a commentary and in brief, so that everybody might know these Fathers of ours as well as the glory of our nation' (VdS ii.14)

8.2.9 *The position of other constituents*

The position of two other types of constituents in LUA clauses needs a few additional remarks: the position of sentence adverbs and sentence connectives. As can be inferred from many of the above examples, both constituents prefer a clause-initial position, in which a sentence adverb should follow a sentence connective. This clause-initial position does not influence the order pattern of the other constituents; and so a sentence connective or a sentence adverb can be followed by all types of clauses, SV and VS as well as VO and OV. Therefore it seems justified to leave sentence connectives and sentence adverbs outside the general scheme of clause orders. A sentence connective or sentence adverb can always be added to a clause, whatever its constituent order may be.

Some adverbs can be used either as a sentence adverb, modifying the complete clause, or as an adverb modifying the verbal form. In the latter case, the adverb is part of the verbal phrase and cannot be separated form the verb. It is not always possible to distinguish between these two func-

59. Note that the direct object is a locative, instead of a dative or patient.

60. In Syriac script: *d-mellātan*.

tions. Further, prepositional phrases in initial position may also be used as sentence adverbs, modifying the complete clause. These clause-initial prepositional phrases must be distinguished from fronted verbal complements (8.3.3). Usually this is clear from their different functions. Prepositional phrases at the end of the clause nearly always serve as verbal complements.

In ex. 1, a prepositional phrase serves as a sentence adverb and is followed by SVX order. In ex. 2, *two* sentence adverbs precede the rest of the clause, but this is rather uncommon. In ex. 3, a sentence adverb is followed by a verbal phrase with three adverbs, followed by the subject. In ex. 4, from ZdB, one wonders whether *medri* 'again' refers to the complete clause, or to the verb only, while the status of the adverbial phrase at the end of the clause is also unclear. In view of the context,[61] it is most likely that 'again' has to be taken as a sentence adverb, whereas 'three times a day' is part of the verbal phrase. In ex. 5, a sentence adverb precedes a SVX clause. In ex. 6, a prepositional phrase serves as a sentence adverb, whereas in ex. 7 the prepositional phrase must considered to serve as an adverb.

(1) *b-ṣāhat d-trīʿsar u-d-ištā kullê anni muṣāxbi ki ātī gô d-āhā bêtā* / at-hour of-twelve and-of-ten all-of these groomsmen HAB they.go in this-house / 'At twelve and at ten, all these groomsmen use to go into the house' (Merx 15.6)

(2) *hammāšā b-layli ki xadrī tāmā* / always at-night HAB they.walk.around there / Always they walk around there at night (Socin 2.3)[62]

(3) *u-qêdamtā môrīšā jim rābā jaldī ki āti qāšā* / and-tomorrow morning very much fast HAB he.comes priest / 'And the following morning the priest comes very quickly' (Merx 20.7)

(4) *medri breḵli ʿal birkāḵuhy ṭlā gāhi b-yomā* / again he.kneeled on his.knees three times in-day / 'Again he knelt down on his knees three times a day' (71/12/91A2)

(5) *albāʾal āhā qubā d-šmayyā ptexlā mʾayḵ xā cādir* / immediately this arch of-heavens opened like a tent / 'Immediately this arch of the heavens opened up like a tent' (HS 2.2)

(6) *men d-ho gibā (')xi(r)nā xā men d-anni (')nāši ki tāni* / from that side other one of these people HAB he.says / 'From the other side, one of the people says:..' (Merx 19.14)

(7) *axnan zi, d-īt […], bī sayberrānutā rāxṭax l-āhā daʿwī* / we also, REL-it.is [..], in endurance we.run to-this fight / 'We also, that […], with endurance we run to this fight [run the race]' (VdS x.21)[63]

61. Cf. Dan. 6 and Texts no 9.
62. Cf. id. Socin 10.19.
63. Quotation from Hebr. 12.1, in Bedjan's own translation.

8.2.10 *Conclusions*

In the preceding section, the basic orders of LUA verbal clauses have been described.

The basic clause type in LUA consists only of a verbal form. This verbal form always refers to a pronominal subject (Vs), and optionally refers to a pronominal object (Vso). Every verbal form is a complete clause, with a subject suffix referring to a given topic, and the verbal form reflecting new focus, the salient information of the clause.

If the verbal form is complemented by a direct object or by prepositional phrases, including the indirect object, these complements in basic clause order follow the verbal form. In this case, the verb and its complements supply the new information of the clause (VO/VX).

In the discussion on VS and SV order, I have shown that VS order has the characteristics of the basic order, being employed in clauses in which the verb provides the salient information and the subject represents a given topic or an indefinite new topic. SV order is employed in clauses in which the subject represents a contrastive or assertive topic function, a definite new topic, or in which assertive focus is assigned to the complete clause. These are marked functions vis-à-vis the function of given topic and indefinite new topic. As I will show in the last section of this chapter, VS order also provides the best starting point to explain the existing order types in LUA. These two elements, the predominantly unmarked character of the subject in VS clauses against the predominantly marked character of the subject in SV order, as well as the better starting point for an understanding of the other orders, lead me to assume that VS is the basic order.

However, the fact that SV is the dominant order in all texts except for OT, as well as the fact that SV orders become more frequent in younger texts, indicates that probably in the twentieth century SV is becoming the basic unmarked order for verb and subject.

It is likely that the Protestant missionaries did not quite understand the pragmatic function of the opposition between SV and VS. In BT, VS order types are much more frequent than is usual in LUA, whereas in ZdB less examples occur than is usual. The fact that Stoddard in 1855 did not pay any attention to constituent order in verbal clauses confirms this assumption. However, in ZdB not many narrative parts occur, and VS order does not seem to be so common in descriptions and essays. The regular use of VS in *The Pilgrim's Progress* might be due as much to constituent order in the English original as to a conscious attempt at creating a narrative style. The difference in VS/SV ratio between Bedjan's HS and VdS probably has

to be attributed to changes in LUA syntax that took place between 1888 and 1912; it perhaps can also be attributed to influence of his French or German speaking environment.[64]

8.3 Clauses with fronted verbal complements

8.3.1 *Introduction*

All complements to the verb that follow the verbal form in the basic clause type may occur also in preverbal position. These constituents include direct and indirect objects, as well as all kinds of prepositional phrases.

In this section, the various clause order types resulting from fronting will be described. The pragmatic functions of these constituents in preverbal position are discussed, and it will be shown that fronted objects and fronted prepositional phrases do not always perform the same pragmatic function.

8.3.2 *Fronted objects with focus function (OV)*

In all types of texts fronted objects occur, although their relative number varies considerably. In the majority of clauses the function of a fronted object is contrastive or assertive focus.[65] Thus, clauses with such a fronted object are marked vis-à-vis clauses with postverbal objects, which represent new focus (cf. 8.2.3-5).

However, it is not in all clauses that the fronted object can be said to represent contrastive or assertive focus. Cognate objects may appear in preverbal position, especially in Bedjan's texts. These objects usually are part of the focused part of the clause, but certainly do not need to be contrastive with an earlier object. Two different, but probably convergent, phenomena may account for fronting of cognate objects. First, fronting may be due to influence of Persian morphology and constituent order. Persian has a basic SOV order, together with a large number of composite verbs in which the 'object' always precedes the verbal form.[66] Second, these cognate objects in LUA tend to consist of single short words that may be subject to the rule of fronting of shorter and postponing of longer constituents.[67]

64. Cf. 4.3.2.

65. Note that in a passive clause the same procedure of fronting of the consituent carrying contrastive focus (= grammatical subject) is found: *men kul xā mennê 'esrā tumāni, balkā zôdā, pešlon šqīli* / 'From every one of them ten tomans, perhaps more, were taken' (49/1/4A8). Note further that the topic in this clause is represented by a prepositional phrase.

66. Cf. Lazard 1957: §192 and §263.

67. Cf. 8.2.5.

In all text types, the number of OV clauses with sentence adverbs preceding the object is very low.

In the first two examples from Merx and Socin (1, 2), the fronted direct object carries assertive focus. In the two clauses from ZdB, both fronted objects carry assertive focus (3, 4).[68]

In the texts of Bedjan, in his printed texts as well as in Duval's edition, the number of clauses with OV order is considerably higher than in the other text types. This might be due to Bedjan's style of writing, in which the focused parts are carefully indicated, but Bedjan also might have been more susceptible to influence from Persian than the informants of Socin and Merx.[69] In ex. 5, three objects are contrasted in three consecutive clauses. The last object is a cognate object. In the example from Duval (6), the fronted object precedes two phase verbs.

(1) *qat up xā men zarbāzuḵ lā šḇiqli kullê qam qāṭillon* / REP also one of your.soldiers not he.left all.of.them PAST he.killed.them / 'that again he has left not one of your soldiers, all of them he has killed' (Merx 9.4)

(2) *yaʿni kiktā d-ʿumrā ki qāraḵ šimmu(h)y* / that.is tooth of-church HAB we.call his.name / 'i.e., we call it "church bite" ' (Socin 22.6)

(3) *u-šemmāni d-yāli [..] kāteḇ* / and-names of-children [..] SUB.he.writes / 'And he should write down the names of the children [..]' (49/1/2B12)

(4) *xā tāpāwut lā ʿḇedlā bīyuhy parmān* / a difference not it.made to.him decision / 'This decision did not make any difference to him' (71/12/90B35)

(5) *lā har ṭupsā tāḇi yāhḇī=l(h)on, u-yulpānih d-Māryā mālpī=l(h)on, ellā hammāšā qārāwul gāršī ʿallê* / not just example good SUB.they.give=them, and-teaching of-Lord SUB.they.teach=them, but always guard SUB.they.mount over.them / 'They should not only give them a good example, and teach them the teachings of the Lord, but they should also always mount guard over them' (HS 88.8-10)

(6) *ḥā milta le ámṣiḥ misqiḥ* / a verb not.HAB they.are.able they.raise / 'They cannot even conjugate a single verb' (Duval 41.20)

Fronted objects can also be employed in subordinate clauses. In exx. 7 and 9, the fronted objects perform assertive focus function. In exx. 8 and 10, cognate objects are fronted, and in both cases it is more difficult to assume contrastive or assertive focus. Note that in ex. 10, with two phase verbs, a prepositional phrase precedes the sequence of a cognate object and a verb.

68. In ZdB also a number of clauses occur in which *hic* 'nothing' functions as object. However, *hic* does not usually follow the verb, and the 'fronted' position can hardly be considered a marked one.

69. In fact, these two influences might come together: the high prestige of Persian has possibly led to the a kind of literal prestige for OV order in LUA.

(7) *haw xšiḇli qat darmānā qam yahḇā=lih*[70] / he he.thought REP poison PAST she.gives=him / 'He thought that she gave him poison..' (Merx 11.12)

(8) *mānī d-īdā dāri ʿallê bit darbinnī cim jaldi īdātuhy* / the.one REL-hand he.throws to.them FUT they.wound very fast his.hand / 'Whoever stretches his hand to them, they will immediately wound his hand' (Socin 10.11)

(9) *āhā empirātor zālem šuderrih Lusīmāḵos ʿam Silēnos, qat Kresṭyānutā baṭlī=(h)wāw=lāh gô madınxā* / this.emperor cruel he.sent Lusimachos with Silenos, REP Christianity SUB.they.abolish=it in East / 'This cruel emperor sent Lusimachos with Silenos to abolish Christianity in the East' (VdS 248.17)

(10) *malkṓuva zōnāla moulkḗ qat ámṣiḥ gou touġrắni bínna yásriḥ* / government SUB.she.buys.it their.property REP they.are.able in.mountains building they.erect / 'The government should buy them properties so that they can settle in the mountains' (Duval 73.18)

8.3.3 *Fronting of prepositional phrases*

When prepositional verbal complements appear in preverbal position, these perform contrastive or assertive focus in the same way as fronted objects do. Indirect objects too, can be fronted in the same way as direct objects and prepositional phrases. Sentence connectives and sentence adverbs may precede the fronted complement.

In the first example from Merx (1), a sentence adverb precedes the fronted complement. In ZdB a few examples occur of fronted complements (2, 3). The fronted prepositional phrase in ex. 3 perhaps can also be interpreted as a sentence adverb (cf. ex. 6 in 8.2.9).

In HS, VdS, and Duval's edition, the clauses with fronted prepositional phrases constitute only a small part of the clauses with fronted constituents. Most of them have a subject. The two examples without subject come from Duval's texts. The fronted prepositional phrases represent contrastive focus (4-5). In ex. 5, a fronted cognate object does not prevent fronting of the indirect object.

(1) *kul yum b-āhā tāhār ki ʿāḇdā=(h)wā* / every day in-this manner HAB she.does=PAST / 'Every day she does this the same way' (Merx 10.4)

(2) *u-qa tagberrānyātī (')merri* / and.to my.guides he.said / 'And to my guides he said:..' (50/10/76A51)

(3) *u-l-hô gibā xzilī dukāni d-mennê..* / and to-that side I.saw places REP-from.them / 'And on the other side I saw places from which..' (71/12/A46)

(4) *bgānḗ ki pṛzē oubgānḗ káḥliḥ* / in.their.souls HAB they.fast and-in.their.souls HAB they.eat / 'They fast for themselves and they eat for themselves' (Duval 47.18)

70. In Syriac script: *(ī)li.*

(5) *gäh qa dấ tarap haq kiávih, ougäh qa dấ tarap ḫĩ/na* / time to that party justice HAB.they.give, and time to that party other / 'One moment they do justice to that party, and the other moment to the other party' (Duval 45.11)

8.3.4 *Fronted verbal complements with topic function*

However, not all fronted verbal complements perform focus function. In quite a number of clauses, these complements serve as topic of the clause rather than as focus. In the majority of the clauses this topicalization concerns direct objects, alongside a few instances of indirect objects. Other prepositional phrases are less likely to be assigned topic functions. Topicalization of the object is known from other languages too.[71] Thus, when the object phrase is fronted to preverbal position, this position indicates either a more marked type of focus (cf. 8.3.2) or it indicates a change of the usual focus function to a topic function.

A difficulty in describing these types of clauses is the fact that a topical object can also be described as an extra-clausal constituent, that is to say, as a theme constituent. There does not seem to be a grammatical difference between the two theoretically distinct clause types.[72] It is also difficult to clearly define the pragmatic difference between a topic and a theme. Only in case of two constituents that can be topic/theme is it possible to distinguish between them on grammatical and pragmatic grounds. This is the case when a subject is preceded by an object-like constituent that also exerts topic functions (so ex. 2 in 8.4.3).

In all examples, the fronted objects represent given topics. Therefore definite noun phrases are employed, and this is indicated by a pronominal suffix (2, 3), a demonstrative pronoun (4, 6, 8), or by personal names referring to known participants of the story (5, 7).

In the first example from Merx, the object noun phrase is not marked for definiteness, but 'the bridegroom' certainly is known to the listeners. The context — no other persons are brought up to the roof — indicates that this object cannot to be interpreted as conveying assertive focus, although this is grammatically possible. In the reported clause in ex. 2, the topic 'their children' is followed by the assertive focus of the clause, the fronted prepositional phrase 'in the fear of the Lord'. In ex. 3, two direct objects are present, one of which is fronted and constitutes the topic of the clause. An-

71. Cf. Givón 1984a: 170, and Comrie 1981: 207.

72. The existence of fronted topical pronominal direct objects in the nominal form (like in ex. 8) might indicate that these 'objects' can be considered as being pre-clausal. See further 6.2.2 n. 4.

other case of two fronted verbal complements is given in ex. 4, from BT. Here again the direct object constitutes the topic of the clause, and the indirect object represents assertive focus. This order is found also in CS.

In ex. 5, from Bedjan, 'Pibronya' is the main topic of the story, and is repeated here to remind the readers of the topical function of this phrase. In ex. 6, the noun phrase resumes a couple of preceding lines, whereas in ex. 7, the indirect object 'to David', represents a contrastive topic, although the other element of the pair had not been made explicit. The fronted direct object in this clause performs contrastive focus functions. The last example from Bedjan's texts provides an example of a fronted pronominal object in the nominative case (8). The preceding paragraph had informed the readers that 'these' refers to 'the armor of king Saul that David could not wear'.

(1) *u-up xitnā musqu(h)y=(y)nā ʿal gāri* / and-also bridegroom brought.up. him=they.are on roof / 'And the bridegroom, they have brought him up to the roof' (Merx 18.14)

(2) *yālpī bābā u-yemmā, qat yālê gô zduʿtih d-Alāhā garwessī=l(h)on* / SUB.they.learn father and.mother REP their.children in his.fear of-God SUB.they.raise=them / 'Let the fathers and mothers learn that they should raise their children in the fear of God' (HS 88.6)

(3) *up āhā gildê ki dārī=(h)wāw=lih xaccā bubiggi b-qurnītê* / also this their.skin HAB they.throw=PAST=him a.few tassels on-their.corners / 'This skin of theirs, they put a few tassels on its corners..' (Socin 8.6)

(4) *anni kullê elluḵ bet yā(h)ḇen* / these all.of.them to.you SUB.I.give / 'All these I will give you' (Mat. 4.9)

(5) *qaddištā Pibronyā mutḇālon gô sanduqā gô ʿumrā d-dayrā* / holy Pibronya they.put.her in coffin in church of-monastery / 'They laid the holy Pibronya in a coffin in the church of the monastery' (VdS 253.10)

(6) *u-hē sġādtā d-ī(h)wā wājeb qā bāroyê, lā (y)hīḇāloḵon qātê* / and-this worship REL-it.was appropriate to their.creator, not you(pl).gave.it to.them / 'And this worship which was appropriate to their creator, you did not give them' (VdS vii.3)

(7) *qat qā Dāwīd xā tāqā xeqrā zodā yehḇellon* / REP to David a part honor more they.give / '.. that to David more honor they gave' (HS 98.13)[73]

(8) *ānī šḇīqêli* / these he.took.them.off / 'These he took off' (HS 96.22)

8.3.5 *Clauses with fronted complements and explicit subjects*

In the majority of clauses with fronted verbal complements, no explicit subject is present. If an explicit subject is present, both SXV and XVS order occur. Although fronted prepositional phrases and objects both occur with

73. Id. Duval 45.11.

either order — VS and SV — both types of fronted complements in general occur with one of the two types.

In clauses with a fronted direct object, and even more if the object is a cognate object, the subject tends to precede the object and verb. The fronted object is further employed to represent contrastive or assertive focus, the subject performing topic functions. I assume that the constituent representing the topical information preferably precedes the constituent representing focal information, also when both of them precede the verbal phrase. In the texts of Merx and Socin very few examples occur with explicit subject, but in the texts of Bedjan this tendency is clear. I have not come across clauses in which both the subject and the preverbal object perfom topic functions.

In the examples from Socin and Merx (1, 2, 3), the object precedes the verb, without apparent contrastive or assertive focus. The subject precedes the object, and in ex. 1, a prepositional complement follows the verb. In exx. 1 and 3, this concerns a cognate object. As many of these cognate objects are loans from Turkish or Persian, one might consider that the OV order is influenced by these languages too. The two other examples come from Bedjan. In the two clauses in ex. 4, the fronted objects perform contrastive focus function, even though they are cognate objects, whereas the subjects perhaps perform contrastive topic function. In both clauses in ex. 5, assertive focus is expressed by the fronted object, which in the main clause is preceded by the subject.

(1) *cucānā muštulux lublo(h)=(h)wā minnī* / magpie first.tidings brought.it= it.was from.me / 'The magpie brought the first news about me' (Socin 24.9)

(2) *in ānā xā brātā ki bāʿyin* / if I a girl HAB I.want / 'If I want a certain girl,..' (Socin 30.20)

(3) *qat kullê yas dāḇqī* / REP all.of.them mourning SUB.they.take / 'that they all should mourn' (Merx 4.14)

(4) *Qāʿin warzegarutā ki ʿābed=(h)wā, u-Hāḇēl ʿarbī ki xāmi=(h)wā* / Cain agriculture SUB he.does=PAST, and Abel sheep SUB he.keeps=PAST / 'Cain used to be a farmer, whereas Abel used to keep sheep' (HS 7.11)[74]

(5) *malkā asbābi d-gānuhy hīḇêli qā Dāwīd, qat bīyê pāleṭ=(h)wā l-daʿwī* / king weapons of-him.self he.gave.them to David, REP with.them SUB.he.goes.out.PAST to-fight / 'The king gave his weapons to David, in order that he would fight with them' (HS 96.19)

74. Note the contrast between the topics (Cain // Abel) and between the focuses of the two compound verbal forms (farming // sheep-keeping). Cf. Duval 70.12 // 70.14, for a similar contrast between subjects and objects.

The following example illustrates that a preverbal subject might also be employed with a fronted prepositional phrase, although this is rather unusual.

(6) *u-anni dārwīši men zdu(')tê šʿilun ʿal guydānāni d-baytā* / and these dervishes from their.fear they.plaster on walls of.house / 'and out of fear, these dervishes pressed themselves to the walls of the palace' (Merx 10.17)

In most clauses with fronted prepositional phrases, the subject follows the verb. Whether this position is triggered by the prepositional phrase is difficult to say, because in most clauses the subject represents either a given topic (8, 9, 11) or an indefinite new topic (10), i.e., functions that are typical for postverbal subjects. In ex. 1 the subject seems to be a definite new topic, which usually occurs in preverbal position. However, it is quite possible that the subject is inferrable from a previously mentioned topic.

Note that in a number of clauses the fronted prepositional phrase consists of a place or time phrase with an attributive demonstrative pronoun. These phrases nearly always occur with postverbal subjects. It is possible to interpret these prepositional phrases as regular sentence adverbs, but the consistent VS order, as well as the assertive focus of the phrase, suggests that these adverbial phrases can better be seen as fronted verbal complements than as sentence adverbs with a basic clause initial position (cf. 8.2.9).

Ex. 12 from Duval's texts seems to be of a different character. The new focus of the clause is more likely on the postverbal subject phrase than on the preverbal cognate object or the clause-initial prepositional phrase. The latter has to be regarded as a sentence adverb.

(7) *b-hô gibā (')xi(r)nā ki yāṯḇā bāḳtā d-āhā qārīḇā lkes kālo* / in-that side other HAB she.sits wife of-that godfather next.to bride / 'On the other side is the wife of the godfather seated, next to the bride' (Merx 20.15).

(8) *ʿam Alāhā xderri Nox* / with God he.walked.around Noah / 'And Noah walked with God' (Gen. 6:9)[75]

(9) *b-hô qaytā d-(')tilan men lkeslôḵon, mreʿlan ṭluntan* / in-that summer REL-we.went from from.you, we.fell.sick three.of.us / In that summer when we left you, all three of us fell sick' (50/10/82A7)

(10) *men īlānā (')teli môtā, u-men īlānā d-ṣlīḇā qaddīšā (')telon xayyi u-purqānā* / from tree it.came dead, and-from tree of.cross holy they.came life(pl) and-salvation / 'From the tree came death, and from the tree of the holy cross came life and salvation' (HS 5.22)

75. Note that BT here follows Hebrew order, but that in CS constituent order is different: *w-špar Nox l-Alāhā*.

(11) *b-hô zāḫnā nexli Šmu'ēl* / in-that time he.died Samuel / 'At that time Samuel died' (HS 102.5)

(12) *gou íran qoullouġ ki yavélla ő dína árz vídi min ídou* / in Iran fee HAB he.gives.it that.one REL.it.is lawsuit it.comes against his.hand[76] / 'In Iran the one who is prosecuted has usually to pay the fee, ' (Duval 51.19)

8.3.6 *Conclusions*

Fronting of verbal complements may mark two different pragmatic functions: (i) contrastive or assertive focus of the verbal complement, to be distinguished from verbal complements in postverbal position with new focus; (ii) topic function of direct and indirect object, a function that is usually performed by the subject phrase.

In the first function, the fronted complement directly precedes the verbal form, in the second, the object phrase may precede other object phrases.

In Merx and Socin, clauses with fronted object and explicit subject are rare, whereas in Bedjan's texts this type of clause occurs regularly, mostly with SOV order. Clauses with fronted prepositional phrases tend to follow VS order in Bedjan's texts as well as in Merx and Socin. In ZdB not so many clauses with fronted verbal complements occur as in the other texts, but when present, the same pragmatic marking is indicated.

A considerable number of fronted objects in Bedjan's texts consist of cognate objects that do not seem to perform contrastive or assertive focus functions. Persian influence might account for this phenomenon, because in Persian many composite verbs occur, consisting of an object followed by a verbal form. These have SOV order as their basic order type.

8.4 Other orders

8.4.1 *Introduction*

The orders described above, the basic orders and the variations resulting from the fronting of verbal complements can be further varied by adding extra- and intra-clausal constituents. These constituents precede or follow the clause, or are inserted inside the clause without becoming part of the clause itself. Pre-clausal constituents usually are assigned theme or addressee functions, intra- and post-clausal constituents are assigned tail function. The relationship between the extra-clausal constituents and the constituents inside the clause can be expressed in several ways.

76. Maclean: *'ābed 'arz men īdā d-* 'to prosecute' or 'to appeal against'

First, the constituent is referred to inside the clause by a coreferential suffix that is attached to one of the noun phrases inside the clause. Second, the extra-clausal constituent is resumed inside the clause by a resumptive nominal phrase. Third, intra- and post-clausal constituents are introduced by *ya'ni* 'that is'. In these three cases, the extra-clausal constituent cannot be interpreted other than as being outside the clause itself, because the phrase is not grammatically related to the verbal form.

However, because in LUA the verb always carries suffixes that refer to the subject and in some cases to definite direct objects, all subject and definite object phrases that occur at the 'edges' of a clause can theoretically be interpreted as extra-clausal constituents. In this section a few clause types are discussed in which the subject- or object-like phrase can be considered to be extra-clausal, but perhaps need not be.[77]

8.4.2 *Clauses with pre-clausal constituents and explicit reference*

In this type of clause, the pre-clausal constituent is referred to inside the clause by a pronominal suffix attached to one of the noun phrases. This may be the subject as well as to the object phrase, whereas one example is found in which a pronominal suffix is attached to a preposition. The pre-clausal constituent represents the theme of the clause, 'the universe of discourse'.[78]

In Merx and Socin only a few examples of this phenomenon have been found, whereas Bedjan seems to have been rather fond of the construction. In the first three examples, the coreferential suffix is attached to the subject, and the subject phrase consists of a more specific 'part' of the pre-clausal constituent (13). In the following example (4), the pre-clausal constituent is connected to the object by a coreferential suffix.

In ex. 5, no coreferential suffix is present, but the object in the clause states the connection between the pre-clausal phrase and the rest of the clause. In this case, a sentence adverb precedes the theme constituent, which is rather unusual.[79] In the last example the pre-clausal consituent is referred to by a suffix attached to a preposition. This preposition is not em-

77. An important feature of extra-clausal constituents in other languages is their being separated from the rest of the clause by an intonation break. However, the written corpus does not allow many inferences with regard to intonation. Occasionally commas are employed to denote intonation breaks, but their employment does not seem to be very indicative of extra-clausal constituents, particularly not in the texts of Merx and Socin.

78. Dik 1978/1981: 19.

79. Perhaps the adverb *bā(t)r hādā*, which is employed frequently, serves more as a sentence connective than as a sentence adverb.

ployed with the pre-clausal phrase, which yields a further argument for its position outside the clause itself (6).

Note that in the first five examples, the extra-clausal phrase is connected to the constituent inside the clause that performs topic functions, be subject or object. This indicates that a theme function has to be distinguished from a topic function.[80]

(1) *u-anni urxāti (')xi(r)ni kul minnê xa mānat ki yaḥḇī* / and-these guests other all.of.them a rouble HAB they.give / 'And all the other guests usually give a rouble' (Merx 17.2)

(2) *Sāṭānā, ʿaynuhy lā ṭʿennon bī Ādām u-bī Xāwā d-īwāw..* / Satan, his.eyes not they.bore on Adam and.on.Eve REL.they.were / 'Satan did not take his eyes away from Adam and Eve, that were..' (HS 5.2)

(3) *Šmuʾēl axcon d-seḇli, yāluhy lā jwejlon mʾayḵ dīyuhy bī zduʿtā d-Maryā Alāhā* / Samuel when REL-he.aged, his.sons not they.moved like him in fear of-Lord God / 'Samuel's sons, when he became old, did not fear the Lord God as he did' (HS 89.21)

(4) *ho bronê buḵrā šemmuhy muteḇlon Qāʾin* / this their.son oldest his.name they.give Cain / Their oldest son they called Cain' (HS 7.10)[81]

(5) *bā(t)r hādā anni ktuyāti (')xi(r)ni xā haḇlā(h) qā yālā* / after that these writings other one she.gives to boy / 'As for these writings, she later gives one of them to the young man' (Socin 34.4)

(6) *kou ắĝa deḫắviṭ gou šoula drayáttou, yän ắvid dĭwan allế, yän öĝézlē ḫa ṣpáih tắmbā ắvid bĭyou hákim dŏutra* / every agha REL-mixes in affair of his.subjects, or he.does lawsuit to.them, or he.troubles.him, a good punishment SUB.he.does to.him ruler of.country / 'As to an agha that interferes in the affairs of his subjects, or sues them, or troubles them, the ruler of the country ought to give him severe punishment' (Duval 52.4-7)

8.4.3 *Clauses with pre-clausal object-like constituents*

In a few clauses a fronted object is separated from the verb by the subject. Because usually subjects precede fronted objects, I assume that these objects are pre-clausal rather than fronted, and that they perform theme rather than topic functions (cf. 8.3.4). In the first example (1), the object-like phrase resumes the theme of the preceding lines.[82] The object phrase in the

80. For clauses in which the clause initial constituent can theoretically be interpreted either as as theme or as topic, see 8.3.4.

81. Compare HS 93.22, in a subordinate clause: *cunki gô bnunuhy, xā mennê prīšuhy=(')wen malkā qā gānī* / because among his.sons, one of.them chosen=I.am king for myself / 'because one of his sons I have chosen to become king'.

82. Note that no pronominal reference is present in the clause. Because the phrase is definite this is a problem for either interpretation, whether the constituent is pre-clausal or

second example (2), is followed by a known topic, the subject, which makes a second preverbal topic unlikely. Note further that the first phrase, although definite, has not been mentioned before. It is likely that the 'book of the blessing' is so well known to the listeners that the preceding description of a marriage presupposes this book. Both clauses, therefore, can be explained as consisting of a pre-clausal theme phrase, followed by the clause itself.

(1) *kullê anni mindīyāni d-xīyuṭā d-jullā hê ʾḇīdtā=(y)lā yāʿni āhā kālo* / all these things of-needlework of clothes she made=she.is that.is this bride / 'All these clothes and linen she, the bride, has made herself' (Merx 22.5)

(2) *up āhā ktāḇā d-bāraḵtā qāšā ki zābinni qā xā (ʾ)nāšā qat* / also this book of-blessing priest HAB he.sells.it to a man REP / 'This book of the marriage liturgy the priest sells to someone,..' (Merx 20.16)

8.4.4 *Clauses with intra-clausal sentence adverbs*

In a limited number of clauses the order of subject and sentence adverb is reversed. The description of these clauses presents some difficulties. Either the subject is in pre-clausal position and performs theme instead of topic functions, or the sentence adverb is placed inside the clause. In none of the examples found thus far, is the subject a clear thematic phrase, so I tend to think that a preclausal position of the subject is less likely in this clause type.

What might be the function of the inserted sentence adverb? The examples found thus far suggest that with this order the complete clause is more assertive. Most of the examples occur at the beginning of a new paragraph (1, 3, 5, 6), whereas the clauses in exx. 2 and 4 are not directly connected with other clauses and stand by themselves. The long inserted 'sentence adverb' in ex. 2 is the only example of an inserted sentence adverb with a relative clause dependent on it. In ex. 3, the sentence adverb consists of a prepositional phrase. In ex. 6 a fronted object follows the inserted sentence adverb.

(1) *trê (ʾ)nāši dīyan xā yumā ʾḇidlun pikīr lkes gānê* / two people of-us one day they.did thought to themselves / 'These two of our people one day thought to themselves..' (Socin 12.6)[83]

fronted. However, one might assume that lack of pronominal reference is less of a problem for extra-clausal constituents than for fronted definite objects. Another possibility is that the pronominal reference was not adequately represented in Syriac script: *hê ʾḇīdtā=(y)lā* [he widt-e-la] can also be interpreted as *hê ʾḇīdtê=(y)lā*, i.e., she made.**them**=she.is.

83. So also: *xā xān xā yumā bizālā=(h)wā* / 'A certain khan one day went..' (Merx 12.5).

(2) *āhā Jansulṭan brātā d-malkā hê (ʿ)dānā d-xzilā(h) men rixqā biʾtāyā xā jwanqā rābā šāpīrā har gô xzaytu(h) uxcā bʿilā(h) [šlili blebbu(h) u-men ʿašqu(h) men ʿisrā dukāni qtiʾlā(h) tiktu(h)]* / this Jansultan daughter of-king that time REL-she.saw from afar coming a young man very beautiful just in her.looking so she.wanted [..] / 'This Jansultan, the daughter of the king, when she saw this very beautiful young man coming, she wished very much [that he..]' (Merx 5.13-15)

(3) *up aḇāhāti d-Surāyi b-dôri qādīmi buš ki massemmī bālā l-madrāsā qā yāli* / also fathers of-Syrians in-ages ancient very HAB they.put mind to-schools for children / 'The Syrian fathers also, in the ancient times, paid much attention to schools for children' (49/1/2A11)[84]

(4) *u-ruxih d-Māryā men d-ho yumā šrelā ʿalluhy* / and-spirit of-Lord from that day it.dwelled on.him / 'And from that day, the spirit of the Lord came to rest on him' (HS 94.11)

(5) *qidāmtā qemli Šāʾol npelli l-urxā, u-up Dāwīd zi bā(t)r hādā qemli pleṭli* / early.morning he.rose Saul he.fell on.road, and-also David also after this he.rose he.left / 'Early in the morning Saul rose and took to the road, and David also immediately rose to leave (HS 101.14)

(6) *Šmuʾēl hā men d-ho yumā, (ʾ)xi(r)nā hic pātih d-Šāʾol lā xezyāli* / Samuel see from that day, again not.at.all his.face of.Saul not he.saw.it / 'From that day on, Samuel did not see the face of Saul any more' (HS 93.19)

One example has been found in which a sentence adverb was inserted after the clause-initial verb, preceding the postverbal subject. The context of this clause suggests that it marks a turn of the discourse, even if no new paragraph appears in the written text.

(7) *u-ki ātyā kul yumā xā baḵtā miskinta ki lablā=(h)wā laxmā qā gānuh* / and-HAB she.comes every day a woman poor she takes-PAST bread to herself / 'And every day there came a poor woman getting bread for herself' (Merx 11.2)

8.4.5 *Clauses with clause-end subjects*

In all texts, clauses occur in which the subject appears at the end of the clause, following one or more verbal complements. Whether or not such a constituent has to be considered extra-clausal, depends on semantic and pragmatic conditions, because there is no formal difference between the two types of clauses.

Pragmatically, a post-clausal constituent can be expected to provide additional information that is not necessary to understand the preceding

84. Cf. idem 49/1/2B17.

clause. A grammatical subject, on the contrary, belonging to the clause itself, provides necessary topical information. Clauses with clause-end subjects can be expected to resemble clauses with VS order, in which the subject refers to a new indefinite topic or to a given topic. If indeed such clauses resemble VS clauses, the most likely explanation of such an order is that the verbal complement is felt to be part of the verbal phrase itself, being a cognate object or another kind of lexically related complement. Thus, the semantic characteristics of the verbal complement may indicate whether or not the subject-like phrase is likely to be extra-clausal.

I will first present a number of clauses with post-clausal constituents. They follow verbal complements that are not lexically connected to the verb, and they provide additional information that is not essential to the understanding of the clauses. Either the subjects are known already to the listeners/readers, or the exact nature of the subject is not directly relevant.

In the first example (1), the post-clausal constituent gives additional information on a given topic, whereas in the other clauses (2-5) the prime function of the postponed subject seems to be resumptive.[85] In ex. 4, both functions are combined. Note that all types of verbal complements may precede the subject: indefinite (1) and definite (3) patients, prepositional phrases (1, 2, 5), and infinitival complements (4). In ex. 5 an adjectival complement precedes the prepositional complement.

It is interesting to note that this type of post-clausal constituents occurs a few times in Bedjan's texts, whereas the two other types of post-clausal constituents (cf. 8.4.7-8) seem to be absent from his works.

(1) *li rappī īdā men šḇārā u-lirqādā bī zurna dāwulā trê dāsti up bnāti up bāḵtāti [..]* / not they.throw hand from dance and to-leap on pipe drum two bands also daughter also women [..] / 'They didn't refrain from dancing and leaping on the music of two bands of pipes and drums, girls, women,...' (Merx 20.4)

(2) *u-ki yātbī ʿal xā ṣupā kālo u-xitnā* / and-HAB they.sit on a rug bride and bridegroom / 'And they sit on a rug, the bride and the bridegroom' (Merx 20.13)

(3) *u-ki jamiʿlāh kulla āhā ṣābaxtā āhā (ʾ)nāšā* / and-HAB he.gathers.it all.of.it wedding.gift.of.money this man / 'And so this man gathers all the wedding gifts [consisting of money]' (Merx 19.17)

(4) *u-bā(t)r hādā ki qêmī lišwārā u-lirqādā anni bnāti up kālunyāti up bāḵtāti* / and-after that HAB they.stand to-dance and-to-leap these daughters also brides also women / Thereafter they rise to dance and leap, these girls, and women young and old' (Merx 22.8)

85. See also Merx 6.13, 9.17, and 3.7.

(5) *pešlon māʿt b-āhā sāhdtā qaddīštā Lusīmāḵos u-Prīmos* / they.became surprised at-that saint holy Lusimachos and Primos / They were much surprised by this holy saint, Lusimachos and Primos' (VdS 253.6)

In the remaining clauses with clause-end subjects, it is more likely that these are true grammatical subjects in clauses with a basic VS order. The majority of these clauses are employed to introduce a new topic (1-3, 5). In ex. 4 the subject resumes an earlier topic of the discourse, whereas in ex. 6, the subject is partly resuming and partly new. Both are regular functions of VS clauses. Note that in ex. 5 the postponed subject is followed by an additional prepositional phrase, which makes it unlikely that the subject is outside the clause. The fact that all examples come from narrative texts, and that no examples occur in Duval's edition, provides a further indication that these clauses are to be compared with VS clauses, which are also frequent in narrative clauses and uncommon in essayistic texts.

However, among these examples there are only two verbal complements that can safely be interpreted as lexically connected to the verb, i.e., exx. 4 and 7. The remaining examples suggest that two other characteristics of verbal phrases may facilitate postponement of the subject. In exx. 1-6, the verbal phrase consists of a verb of motion plus a preposition of direction. Perhaps this type of prepositional complements are felt to be more closely connected to the verb than other combinations of verb + prepositional phrase.

Secondly, in exx. 1, 2, 3, 6, and 9, the prepositional phrase is considerably shorter than the subject phrase, and in many of these the preposition introduces a pronominal suffix rather than a noun phrase.[86] In BT a few examples are found of this order, but in all of them the order of Hebrew and CS is the same.[87] The type of inversion in ex. 8 — definite object and given subject — is found only in this example; its pragmatic function is not clear.

(1) *bā(t)r xaccā (ʿ)dānā mṭīlun ʿalluhy xakmā (ʾ)nāši* / after short time they.arrived to.him some people / 'After a short time some people came to him' (Merx 13.8)

(2) *u-ki palṭī qāmuhy (ʾ)nāši u-bnāti d-mātā* / and-HAB they.go.out before.him people and daughters of-village / 'and men and young women of the village go out towards him' (Merx 18.5)

(3) *b-hê (ʿ)dānā d-mṭilun l-tāmā cim rābā zdiʿlun sābab d-pliṭlon men liʾltix ʿarbā gānāti māri ʿarbʿā ʿayni* / in-that time REL-they.arrived at-there very much they.feared because they.went.out from.below four souls possesser.of

86. So also ZdB 50/10/76B17, 50/10/76A23, and 71/12/90B35.
87. Gen. 8:11, Ruth 2:14, Mat. 3:5, 4:10, and Mark 14:23.

four eyes / 'When they arrived there, they became very much afraid, because from below four beings with four eyes came up' (Socin 4.2-6.1)[88]

(4) *xā yumā bi'zālā=(h)wā muydāli Mar Sargīs u-Šāxāni* / one day going=they.are together, Mar Sargis and Shakhani / 'One day they went out together, Mar Sargis and Shakhani' (Socin 42.12)

(5) *b-ši(n)tā d-1848 d-Mšīxā, yā'ni, še(n)tā d-'ḇerrā, (')tilon l-atrā d-Yunayted Stayts 239.270 nuxrāyi, men atrāwāti d-Yorep* / in-year of-1848 of-Messiah, that is, year REL-it.passed, they.came to-country of-United States 229.270 strangers, from countries of Europe / 'In the year 1848 AD, i.e., last year, 229.270 strangers came to the country of the U.S. from the European countries' (49/1/6A26)

(6) *u-bā(t)r d-preqli men tāruṣoh qiḇutā, 'ḇerri gāwoh Nox b-gānuhy, u-baḵtuhy, u-ṭlā bnunuhy, Šēm, u-Xām, u-Yapt, u-ṭlā kālātuhy* / and-after that-he.finished from constructing ark, he.entered in.it Noah himself, and-his.wife, and-three his.sons, Shem, and-Ham, and-Japheth, and-three their.brides / 'And after he had finished building the ark, Noah himself, and his wife, and his three sons, Shem, Ham and Japheth, and their three brides.' (HS 9.18)

(7) *dreli qālā Maryā Alāhā bī Ādam* / he.threw voice Lord God at Adam / 'The Lord God called Adam' (HS 6.5)

(8) *grīšāli jedduhy Šā'ol qat māxi=(h)waw=lih* / he.took.it his.spear Saul REP he.slays.him / 'Saul took his spear in order to kill him' (HS 99.19)

(9) *u-(')merrih qātuhy mala'ḵā* / and-he.said to.him angel / 'And the angel said to him' (VdS 8.13)[89]

8.4.6 *Clauses with clause-end objects*

In a limited number of clauses a direct object follows prepositional complements. In the second example the object is indefinite, whereas in the other three it is definite. In case of definite objects, with a coreferential pronoun, these constituents might be considered to be extra-clausal. As in clauses with extra-clausal subjects, the function of an extra-clausal object-like constituent should be additional to the preceding phrase and should not provide essential information. Only in ex. 1 is this pragmatic condition met and can the clause-end phrase be understood as a post-clausal tail constituent. The direct object constitutes the topic of the discourse, and the prepositional phrase the new focus of the clause.

In the three other clauses, the direct object is part of the new focus of the clause, providing new salient information. In these clauses, therefore, the object cannot be understood as being extra-clausal. It is more likely that the

88. The postponed subject here is in a subordinate clause. There is no indication that there are any significant differences between constituent order patterns in main and subordinate verbal clauses, cf. 8.1.3.

89. Cf. VdS 8.23: *u-(')merrih Zkaryā qā mala'ḵā.*

various verbal complements are ordered according to the salient information they provide. The constituent with the most salient information comes last. In ex. 3 the order is exceptional in several ways. This is due to the order in the Hebrew and CS original,[90] although Bedjan has adapted this order at one point: the prepositional phrase is put closer to the verb. Perhaps the presence of the object suffix on the verb made this re-ordering unnecessary for the direct object phrase.

(1) *bit xayṭitlun ʿal rʿuyšuḵ rastā anni ktuyāti* / FUT you.sew on shoulder right these writings / 'You should sew these writings on your right shoulder' (Socin 36.17)

(2) *bābā d-yālā ki dāri b-rīšuh xā canqā zuyzi* / father of-boy[91] HAB he.throws onher.head [i.e., of the bride] a handful coins / 'The father of the young man throws a handful of coins on her head' (Merx 17.9)

(3) *curcerrāli men ʿalluḵ Māryā Alāhā malkutih d-Īsrāyil udyu yumā* / he.tore.it from of-you Lord God his.kingdom of Israel this.very day / 'The Lord God tore the kingdom of Israel away from you today' (HS 93.11)

(4) *b-rābā zahmāti u-b-masrāpi guri mexyêlan baṣmā b-leššānā ʿattiqā šaḇʿā dubāqi* / in-very troubles and-in-expenses much we.stroke.them print in-language old seven volumes / 'With much trouble and great expense, we printed seven volumes in the old language' (VdS i.18)

8.4.7 *Clauses with post-clausal constituents*

In these clauses, a noun phrase is added to the clause. This extra-clausal phrase supplies additional information on one of the constituents of the preceding core clause. This may concern the subject, as in exx. 1 and 2, or the object, as in ex. 3. The rather complicated clause in ex. 4 is added because of the tail constituent 'these groomsmen'. In all these clauses the tail constituent cannot be interpreted as part of the core clause itself, because an explicit subject or object is already present in the clause.

Neither in Bedjan's texts, nor in ZdB, have examples of this structure been found. I assume that employment of this type of extra-clausal constituents is characteristic of a more informal kind of speech, which was avoided by Bedjan and the missionaries.

(1) *u-ʿḇirron ṭuluntê mʿuydāli Bêjān Jānsulṭān up gurā d-malkā* / and-they.went the.three.of.them together, Bejan, Jansultan also officer of-king / 'And the three of them went together, Bejan, Jansultan and the officer of the king' (Merx 9.16)

90. 1Sam. 15:28, Hebr: VSOXSa = CS = BT'93.

91. Merx translates 'der Vater des Mädchens'. Maclean gives only 'boy' or 'child' for *yālā*. It is clear from other texts that *yālā* can also denote a young man, and thus refer to a bridegroom, as in this clause, but it is highly unlikely that it refers to a young woman or a bride.

(2) *up ānā zi ki baʿyinna(h) Xannā Sôgol* / also I also HAB I.want.her Khanna Sogul / 'And I, Khanna Sogul, want her as well..' (Socin 30.22)

(3) *u-bā(t)r hādā qam yā(h)ḇil āhā āgā zuyzi qā d-āhā Suyrāyā miskinā rābā zuyzi* / and-after that PAST he.gives this Agha money to that Syrian poor much money / 'And thereafter this Agha gave money to that poor Syrian, very much money.' (Merx 13.13)

(4) *bā(t)r hādā ānī (')xi(r)ni anni tri(')sar talmīdi kul xā ki āti jargu(h)y qat qā'im l-aqluhy d-lāqiṭ ʿal d-anni škuyri d-āhā bêtā d-xluylā hal d-kullê parqī anni muṣāxbi* / after that these others these twelve disciples every one HAB he.comes his.row REP he.rises to.his.feet to.he.gathers onto these roofs of-this house of-marriage until all.of.them they.finished these. groomsmen / 'Thereafter these others, these twelve disciples, every one of them, when the turn comes for his row, rises to his feet to gather from the table [?] in the house of the marriage until every one, every groomsmen, has finished' (Merx 15:15)

8.4.8 *Clauses with post-clausal constituents introduced by yaʿni*

The most common way to add additional information to a clause, is to insert phrases introduced by the Arabic loan *yaʿni* 'that is'. In Merx and Socin's texts these phrases are very common, whereas in Bedjan's texts, as well as in ZdB, they are rare. All constituents of the clause can be expanded in this manner, and the phrases introduced by *yaʿni* may follow every constituent. However, *yaʿni* phrases most often occur at the end of the clause. Very often there is a semantic connection only between the phrase introduced by *yaʿni* and the phrase it comments on.

In the first five examples the subject phrase is expanded in different ways. In the first example a pronominal subject is 'explained' at the end of the clause (1), whereas in the second example (2), the postverbal subject is followed by a prepositional phrase, and this is followed by the *yaʿni* phrase. In ex. 3 the postponed subject is further elaborated upon in the *yaʿni* phrase. In ex. 4, the extrapolated clause refers to a suffix on the subject phrase, whereas in ex. 5 the phrase introduced by *yaʿni* explains a subject that has not even been mentioned.

If the object phrase is expanded, the *yaʿni* phrase usually follows this constituent, like in ex. 6, but may also be somewhat further away if the object is fronted (7).

Phrases introduced by *yaʿni* can also be employed to expand prepositional phrases (8) and sentence adverbs (9).

In the last three examples (10-13), the phrases introduced by *yaʿni* are of a somewhat different type: they consist of independent additional constituents, rather than of additions to constituents inside the clause. Probably

these clauses, of which there are very few, represent the spoken language far more than the stylized literary language.

(1) *u-bā(t)r hādā ki pālṭī gô tarʿā d-dartā qā šḇārā xluylā yaʿni anni muṣāxbi* / and-after that SUB they.go.out in door of.court for dancing wedding that.is these groomsmen / 'And thereafter they, these groomsmen, enter the courtyard for the wedding dance' (Merx 16.11-14)

(2) *ba(t)r hādā ki ātī ṭayri men rixqā yāʿni ʿurlā d-rāwulā* / after that HAB they.come birds from afar that.is vulture of-deep.valley / 'Thereafter come the birds from afar, i.e., the vultures from the mountain valleys' (Socin 5.8)

(3) *ʿḇidlun plāšā xā muddat anni trê malki yāʿni xā Surqus malkā d-Qintā […], up xā malkā zi Mammatša(ʿ)h* / they.made war a time these two kings that.is a Surqus king of Qinta [that…], also a king yes Mammatsha / 'These two kings made war for a certain period, king Surqus of Qinta […], with king Mammatsha.' (Socin 8.13)

(4) *uxcā yārīḳtā ki hôyā šintê yaʿni āni (ʾ)nāši d-Rustam* / such long HAB it.is their.sleep that.is these people of-Rustam / 'So long is their sleep, i.e., that of Rustam's people' (Merx 4.3)

(5) *up min Taḇrīz yāʿni Ārimnāyi ki ātī* / also from Tabriz that.is Armenians HAB they.come / 'Also from Tabriz they, i.e., the Armenians, come' (Socin 18.21)

(6) *u-šqillon l-pummê xā zapiskā yāʿni up xā pyālā d-xamrā* / and.they.took to-their.mouths a zapiska that.is a cup of wine / 'And they brought to their mouths a 'zapiska', i.e., a cup of wine' (Socin 44.1)[92]

(7) *up xamrā štilan yāʿni šampāniskā* /also wine they.drank that.is champagne / 'They also drank wine, i.e., champagne' (Socin 44.12)

(8) *mijed bit qaymān bit āza(l)n lkesluhy yāʿni lkes Rustam* / truly FUT I(f).rise towards.him that.is towards Rustam / 'I certainly will go to him, to Rustam' (Merx 2:2)[93]

(9) *b-ši(n)tā d-1848 d-Mšīxā, yāʿni si(n)tā d-ʿḇerra, (ʾ)tilon l-atrā d-Yunayted Stayts 239.270 nuxrāyi men atrāwāti d-Yorep* / in-year of-1848 AD, that is year REL.it.passed, they.went to.country of.United States 239.270 strangers from countries of-Europe / 'In the year 1848 AD, i.e., last year, 239.270 strangers came to the U.S. from the European countries' (49/1/6A26)[94]

(10) *u-ki gāršī hallā kullê (ʾ)nāšī yāʿni qālā rābā rāmā* / and-HAB they.pull 'halla', that.is sound very.high / 'And all people shout 'halla', a very loud cry' (Merx 18.20)

(11) *u-ānī zarbāzi d-Šāmīršak ki rappī nīšanqā yāʿni ʿal d-anni dišminni* / and-these soldiers of-Shamirshak HAB they.throw sign that.is on-these ene-

92. So also in Merx 21.12, Socin 16.1, 36.11
93. So also in Merx 2.5, Socin 8.20, 12.1, 14.13, 28.16.
94. Id. Merx 4.19

mies / 'And these soldiers of Shamirshak are always aiming at these enemies' (Socin 2.12)

(13) *īman d-[...] ānī ki dāḇqī b-īdê cim quyā yā'ni qalxānê u-up saypê*[95] / when [..] they HAB take in-their.hand very strong that.is their.shields and-also their.swords / 'When [..], they take in their hands their shields and also their swords' (Socin 2.11)

8.4.9 *Conclusions*

Extra-clausal constituents, performing theme and tail functions, play a relatively important role in LUA clause structure. In a considerable number of clauses, extra-clausal constituents are clearly distinguished from fronted and postponed clause-internal constituents. In clauses with clause-end subjects, this difference is not always clear.

Apart from the difference in function between pre-, intra- and post-clausal constituents, another characteristic of clause-external constituents has come to light. The use of pre-clausal constituents, especially when referred to inside the clause by a pronominal suffix in the subject or object noun phrase, seems to belong to a higher, more literary, level of speech. These types of clauses occur notably more often in Bedjan's writings. On the other hand, the use of post-clausal constituents seems to be restricted to informal, more or less spontaneous speech and writing and occurs far more often in the texts edited by Merx and Socin than in the other texts.

8.5 Negative clauses

8.5.1 *Introduction*

Negative clauses are composed by adding the negative marker *lā* to the verbal form. The particles *bet* and *ki* are replaced by the negative marker, which then becomes *li*, whereas the past marker *qam* is the only particle that regularly occurs between the negative marker and the verbal form.[96] One should note, however, that there is a strong tendency to employ *li* with all forms of the SUB stem, thus including its jussive and subordinate uses.[97]

95. In Syriac script: *saypay*.

96. Cf. 6.7, Nöldeke 1868: 349-51, Maclean 1895: 88-9, and Marogulov 1976: 47-8 (§57). Compare also Stoddard 1855: 44, who mentions *lā bet* as being the 'emphatic' alternative for *li*.

97. So already Stoddard 1855: 44, 'Vulgar usage sometimes employs *li* instead of *lā* with the subjunctive', and Nöldeke 1868: 303, who notes a parallel employment of *ki* in conditional and subordinate clauses.

If subject or object phrases are negated, certain adjectives precede the noun phrase. However, these adjectives should be complemented by the negative marker preceding the main verbal forms.

8.5.2 *Negation of the verbal phrase*

The negative marker precedes the main verb, and thus is preceded by sentence connectives, sentence adverbs, explicit preverbal subjects, and fronted verbal complements. Although other constituents can be negated as well (cf. the following paragraph 8.5.3), the examples show that the conditions for negation of other elements are different from those at work in English.

In the first two examples, the negative marker opens the clause, followed by the main verb with its pre- and suffixes (1, 2). In all the other examples, the negative marker is preceded by an explicit subject (3, 5, 6, 8), by a prepositional phrase (7), or fronted object (9), and by sentence adverbs (4, 6). Note that in a few clauses, the English translation needs a negation with other parts of the clauses, rather than with the verb (3, 4).

In all text types, clauses with a negation have the negative marker in the position directly preceding the verbal form.[98] Whether or not this particle has to be seen as a clitic is difficult to say. In Duval's texts, *lā* or *li* usually has no main accent, whereas in Socin it is regularly given with main stress. The verbal form is usually stressed as well, but sometimes follows without main stress.[99]

(1) *li māṣet d-āze(l)t* / not you.are.able to.you.go / 'You cannot go' (Merx 3.4)
(2) *lā qam mācixlāh* / not PAST he.finds.her / 'He did not find her' (Merx 6.6)
(3) *midri xišli xabrā qā malkā qat up xā men zarbāzuḳ lā šḇiqli* / again it.came message to king REP also one of your.soldiers not he.left / 'Again the message reached the king that not one of his soldiers was left' (Merx 9.4)
(4) *hammāšā li baṣrī zuzi minnu(h)y* / always not they.want money(pl) from. him / 'There is never money wanting from him' (Socin 28.9)
(5) *axton u-kullāh dunyi li māṣiton d-makliton=li* / you(pl) and all.of.it world not you(pl).are.able to-you.withholding=me / 'You, or the whole world, will not be able to withhold me' (50/10/76B27)
(6) *hi halbattā Māryā Alāhā li ṭāleb men kulluntan qat...* / yes, certainly Lord God not he.asks from us.all REP / 'Of course the Lord God does not ask from all of us that..' (VdS ix.23)

98. Compare Gen. 3:4, in which the negative marker precedes the object: *lā memyātā bet mētīton* / no dead FUT you.die / 'You certainly will not die..'. This order is due to constituent order in Hebrew and CS.

99. Compare Socin 29.9: *hámmāšā lé́ báṣriḥ zű́izi mínnū* with Socin 35.2: *ána lí́ yaṭṭin.*

(7) *qat men bā(t)r mennī li ʾāḇdetton zāʿyā yālī* / REP from after from.me not you.do.them youngster my.children / '.. that after me, you will not harm[100] my children (HS 102.2)

(8) *ḫin yóuqra dęmalyat le nápil al miskíni* / then weight of.taxes not it.falls on poor / 'Then the weight of the taxes will not fall on the poor' (Duval 34.12)

(9) *ḫā milta le ámṣiḥ misqiḥ* / a verb not they.are.able they.raise / 'Not one verb they can conjugate' (Duval 41.20)

8.5.3 *Negation of other constituents*

The adverbs *cou* 'any', 'no', 'nothing', or *hic*, 'no', 'never', 'not at all', are employed adjectivally to negate noun phrases. If a verbal forms follows, this should be negated as well. The last form, *hic*, can also be employed to strengthen the negation of the verbal form.[101]

In the first example (1), from Merx, an indefinite object is negated by *hij*, whereas in the example from Socin, *hij* strengthens the negation of the verb (2). This is also the case in the example from ZdB (3). In the examples from HS (4, 5) a subject phrase is negated by *cu*, just as in ex. 6, from Duval. In the second example from Duval (7), the subject noun phrases are negated by *lā*.[102] Again, the verbal form as well is preceded by *lā*.

(1) *hij kār lā ʾḇidli qātuhy* / not.at.all work not it.did to.him / 'It did not work at all with him' (Merx 3.14)

(2) *īnā ādīyā hij li xašḇā=(h)wā qā ximyānu(h) u-qā xmātu(h)* / but now not.at.all not she.considers=PAST to.her.father.in.law and-to her.mother.in.law / 'but now she did not consider her parents-in-law at all' (Socin 38.20)

(3) *hij la ʾâḇdet sabr hal qêdamtā* / not.at.all not you.do patience till morning / 'let not wait till the morning,..' (50/10/82B17)

(4) *qat (ʾ)xi(r)n cu darmānā kar li ʾāḇed bīyê* / in.order.that other no poison work not.HAB it.does to.them / '[..], so that no other poison would work in them' (HS 88.13)

(5) *lāzem (ʾ)nāšā lā yāmi, u-lā qābil cu nedrā, u-lā ʾāḇed cu qôlā, d-lā taxmuni, u-d-lā bāquri bi yādʿāni d-šarʿat* / it.is.necessary men not he.swears, and-not he.takes any oath, and-not he.does any promise, REL-

100. It is uncertain what *ʾḇādā zāʿyā* should mean. Md gives for *zāʿyā* 'the young of an animal or bird'. From the context it seems that something like 'harass', 'harm' is intended. Perhaps the noun is related to the verbal stem *zyāyā* (*zyʿ*), Md: 'to move' (Alqosh), 'to fear' (Ṭur ʿAbdin).

101. Cf. Stoddard 1855: 171, Nöldeke 1868: 350-1, and Maclean 1895: 161.

102. The negative marker *lā* may be employed to negate substantive nouns and adverbs as such, so Maclean 1895: 241. Perhaps these negative noun phrases may be interpreted in the same way.

not considering and.REL.not.asking from those.who.know of.law / 'One should not swear, nor take any oath, nor make any promise, without thinking about it, or without inquiring of people who know the law' (HS 92.8)

(6) *oup in čou gęnā́ la pálta kislou* / also when no sin not it.goes.out to.him / 'also when no crime at all is brought against him' (Duval 49.2)

(7) *in [..], ḫina la šḗḫ ou la aširátti lamṣiḥ douz gíšqiḥ..* / if [..], then no Sheikh and no tribes not.they.are.able right they.look.at.. / 'If [..], then no Sheikh and no tribes can really look at..' (Duval 74.18)

8.5.4 *Conclusions*

Negative clauses do not differ in their overall syntactic structure from affirmative clauses, except for the negative marker *lā* or *li* preceding the verbal form. This particle can hardly be considered a separate word, and may be better considered to be one of the clitics that are closely connected to the verbal form, comparable to the way *lā* can be attached to nouns to form its negative counterpart.

8.6 Interrogative clauses

8.6.1 *Introduction*

As was the case with copular clauses, two main types of interrogative verbal clauses are to be distinguished, i.e., clauses to which the answer should be 'yes' or 'no', thus, clauses without an interrogative pronoun or adverb, and interrogative clauses with these interrogatives, called WH-questions. The latter category is somewhat better represented in the texts than the former. These WH-questions may also occur as embedded questions.

8.6.2 *Yes-no questions*

In all texts yes-no questions are rather rare. In Merx and Socin no examples occur at all. In ZdB and BT a number of examples of yes-no questions occur, just as in Bedjan's texts. The examples in ZdB (1, 2) and BT (3) do not differ from those in Bedjan (4-6); in all questions of this type the same clause orders occur that were described for main, affirmative clauses. Thus clause order is not employed to mark interrogative clauses.[103] The interrogative character of clauses in written texts is marked by context, question marks, and in case of ex. 2, by the extra-clausal question marker *qāmu*.

103. Cf. Nöldeke 1868: 352.

Note that both pre- and postverbal subjects occur in yes-no questions. The position of these subjects seems to be dependent on other factors than the interrogative character of the clause.

(1) *haw d-layt=lih (y)diʿtā, ki māṣi d-mālep (y)diʿtā qā (')xi(r)nā?* / that.one REL-not.is.is=to.him knowledge, HAB he.is.able to.teach knowledge to others / 'He that does not have knowledge, is he able to teach knowledge to others?' (49/1/1A20)

(2) *qāmu, xurāyī ki zādeʿ Īyob men Alāhā?* / why, in vain HAB. he.fears Job from God / 'Is it in vain that Job fears God?' (71/12/90A32)

(3) *īnā Pīlāṭos juwebli u-(')merri, baʿyīton d-šāren qātôḳon malkā d-Y(h)udāyi*? / but Pilate he.answered and-he.said, you.want REP-I.release to.you king of-Jews? / 'But Pilate answered and said: "Do you want me to release for you the king of the Jews?" ' (Mark 15.9)

(4) *xā tāqā deḇšā ṭʿemlī, but d-hāw lāzem mêten?* / a bit honey I.tasted, about that it.is.necessary I.die? / 'I tasted a bit of honey, and therefore should I die?' (HS 92.1)

(5) *dʾayḵ, Yonātān, d-īli purquhy Īsrāyēl, bet māʾet?* / really,[104] Jonathan, REL-he.is savior Israel, FUT he.dies? / 'Does Jonathan, who is Israel's savior, really have to die?' (HS 92.2)

(6) *nexlā qaddīštā Pibronyā b-še(n)tā d-Maṙan 305?* / she.died saint Pibronya in-year of-Lord 305? / 'Did St. Pibronya die in 305 AD?' (VdS 253.20)

8.6.3 *WH-questions*

Not very many interrogative clauses occur in the predominantly narrative texts of Socin, Merx and Bedjan. In ZdB and in Bedjans' texts edited by Duval, which are somewhat more essayistic, interrogative clauses occur more often.

The pragmatic characteristic of interrogative clauses of this type is that the constituent with the interrogative constitutes the main focused part of the clause, whereas the rest of the clause is of topical nature. The interrogative character of the clause is further stressed by the fact that in unmarked interrogative clauses, the focused part of the clause precedes the topical part, whereas in affirmative clauses the order is topic < focus. This is characteristic of focus constructions, as they have been discussed in in 7.4 and 7.7. The difference between focus constructions in verbal and copular clauses is the fact that in verbal clauses the focused part of the clause is marked only by its clause initial position, not by an accompanying copula.

104. Cf. Md: *dāʾḵ* 'an expostulation asserting a fact which is denied'.

The fact that a sentence adverb and a preverbal subject may follow the interrogative indicates that there is a special clause initial position for the interrogative, rather than that the interrogative occupies the preverbal focus position for verbal complements. However, not very many interrogative clauses occur in which sentence adverbs or subjects precede the verb.

In ex. 1, a verb follows the interrogative, whereas in ex. 2 a subject precedes the verb. In exx. 3 and 4, an adverbial interrogative is employed. In most questions the interrogative represents (7, 9) or is part of (5, 6) one of the constituents of the clause, being the subject (5, 6) or the direct object (7, 8, 9).

(1) *qāmo zadʿaḳ* / why SUB.we.fear / 'Why should we be afraid?' (Socin 6.8)
(2) *qāmudi zigā ki āḇed qālā rāmā* / why bell HAB it.does sound loud / 'Why does a bell have such a loud sound?' (50/10/79A50)
(3) *dʾāḳī (h)wili* / how he.was / 'How did he?' (Merx 4.11)
(4) *aykā bit āz(l)ītun* / where FUT you.go / 'Where are you going?' (Merx 10.6)
(5) *ênī minnôḳun ki māṣi d-āzil men d-āhā sāḇtā qat..* / which of.you(pl) HAB he.is.able to.go from that old.woman in.order.to / 'Which of you can go with that old woman to..' (Merx 2.19)
(6) *kmā kôḳḇi ṭāʿayyā ki āz(l)ī ʿam aṛʿā* / how.many stars wandering HAB they.go with earth, [..]? / 'How many planets go together with the earth, [..]?' (49/1/7A31)[105]
(7) *īnā mudī qušiqli gô karmā* / but what he.saw in vineyard / 'but what did he see in the vineyard?' (Merx 4.13)
(8) *mut cārā bit ʿāḇdīton qā d-āhā (ʾ)nāšā* / what remedy FUT you.do for that man? / 'What measures you will take against that man?' (Merx 9.7)
(9) *mud (ʾ)merri qātuḳ Māryā?* / what he.said to.you Lord / 'What did the Lord say to you?' (HS 88.1)

In WH-questions, pre-clausal constituents may occur. The theme constituent precedes the interogative pronoun or adverb, and may be referred to inside the clause by a subject suffix (10, 11) or an object suffix (12). In ex. 13, a prepositional phrase is extra-clausal and is not explicitly referred to in the main clause.

(10) *up āhā sāḇtā, mudī ʿḇidlā?* / also this old.woman, what she.did / 'This old woman, what did she do?' (Merx 1.13)

105. Note the parallel order pattern in a clause with *kmā* that is not interrogative, but exclamatory: *ḳma sanatkâri mârit šimma bit qēmîva gou ôutra!* / how.many artisans possessor.of fame FUT they.stand.PAST in country / 'How many artisans would have appeared in the country' (Duval 39.21). So also with extra-clausal theme constituent: *hóuḳma dmalka ḳmā bit zát* / power of-king how FUT it.gains / 'The power of the king, how would it gain' (Duval 52.6).

(11) *bit mad'in qātôḵon but d-āhā quptā mudī ki 'āḇdā* / FUT I.inform you(pl) about that owl, what HAB she.does / 'I will tell you about this owl, what it does' (Socin 24.17)

(12) *rîšouḥ móud mumrínni?* / your.head what SUB.I.hurt.it? / 'Why should I give you a headache?' (Duval 36.2)

(13) *bas lšōpḗ mínih míttaḥ?* / therefore in.their.footprints who we.place / 'but who are we going to put in their place?' (Duval 72.19)

8.6.4 *Embedded questions*

A few examples of embedded questions occur in the texts. With most of the interrogative pronouns and adverbs no sentence connective is needed. In the first example (1), the adverbial *d'āḵī* 'how' is employed in this way, and in the second (2), the adverbial *mud* 'what'. Note that in the first example the explicit subject follows the verb.

(1) *āzi(l)n xāzin d'āḵī (h)wili Bêjān* / SUB.I.go SUB.I.see how he.was Bejan / 'I will go and see how Bedjan has been doing' (Merx 4.6)

(2) *u-bet tānennuḵ mud lāzim 'āḇdet* / and-FUT I.tell.you what it.is necessary you.do / 'And I will tell you what you should do' (HS 91.1)

8.6.5 *Conclusions*

In interrogative clauses, as in all clause types in LUA, constituent order patterns are dependent on the pragmatic functions of the constituents. Thus, in yes-no questions as well as in WH-questions, the devices of fronting and postponing, as well as the use of extra-clausal constituents can be employed as in main affirmative clauses. However, in WH-questions the usual order of topic and focus is reversed. The focused part of the clause, which is the part with the interrogative, precedes the topical part of the clause. Pre-clausal theme constituents can be employed to provide topical information preceding the question.

8.7 Imperative clauses

8.7.1 *Introduction*

In LUA, imperative clauses consist of a verbal form based on the IMP stem. Clauses of this type have no subject phrase, but the verb can be expanded by all kinds of verbal complements. Contrary to the tendency in most Semitic languages, imperative stems can be negated by the negative marker *lā*.

8.7.2 *Clauses with basic order*

The basic constituent order type in imperative clauses is that in which the verbal phrase is the initial constituent of the clause. The majority of imperative clauses in my corpus follows this pattern. The imperative form is incidentally preceded by a sentence adverb or by the 'addressee', parts which should be considered to be extra-clausal. Addressee constituents may also follow the clause. The verbal form may be followed by definite and indefinite direct objects, as well as by prepositional complements. No differences between the various text types are found; however, the number of imperative clauses in Socin's and Bedjan's texts is rather low.

In the first two examples from Merx, an addressee constituent precedes (1) or follows the verbal phrase and its complements (2). In ex. 3, an indefinite object follows the verb. In the first example from ZdB (4), a definite object follows the verb,[106] whereas in ex. 5 an indirect object and an indefinite direct object follow the verb.

In the first example from Bedjan a negative imperative is followed by a prepositional phrase (6). In ex. 7, the verbal phrase consists of an imperative followed by a subjunctive. This is a rather common way of expressing exhortations. In the last example (8), a definite direct object extended by a relative clause follows the verb.

(1) *(')nāšā miskinā qu(m)=luḵ l-hô gibā* / man poor rise=you to-that side / 'Poor man, come up to this side' (Merx 7.18).

(2) *rābā ṣpāyī, zi'mun m'uydāli, a(n)t, u-Zāl* / very good, go(pl) together, you, and-Zal / 'O.K., go together, you and Zal' (Merx 3.6)

(3) *ādīyā drimun (')nāši l-urxāti d-* / now throw(pl) people to-roads in.order.that- / 'Now, send people on the roads to..' (Merx 6.14)

(4) *u-hammāšā tḵor anni himezmāni d-šlīxi* / and.always remember these words of.apostles / 'And always remember these words of the apostles' (49/1/3B22)

(5) *kul kmā gāhi ktoḇ qā xā mennê xā ktāḇā* / all as times write to one of.them a letter / 'Once every time, write a letter to one of them' (71/12/93A12)

(6) *lā nḵop mennī* / not be.shy from.me / 'Do not be shy with me' (HS 88.2)

(7) *(')merron, têmon bānāḵ xā mdī(n)tā,..* / they.said, come(pl) we.build a city.. / 'They said: "Come, let us built a city.." ' (HS 12.10)

(8) *tḵoron ān pahluwāni d-men qā(d)m mennāḵy* / remember.them these athletes REL-from before from-you / 'Remember these martyrs that preceded you' (VdS 249.17)

106. Note that the object suffix at the verbal stem, marking definite objects, is missing.

8.7.3 *Clauses with fronted verbal complements*

A few imperative clauses occur in which verbal complements precede the imperative verbal phrase. In the first example, from Merx, an indefinite object phrase precedes the verbal phrase, because of assertive focus. In the second example, the first phrase can be considered to be a pre-clausal theme constituent, that is referred to inside the clause by the fronted, topical, demonstrative *hādā*. Although not very many examples of fronted or extrapolated verbal complements with imperatives occur in the texts, it is likely that that these devices are due to the same pragmatic factors that are at work in affirmative clauses.[107]

(1) *xā pyālā xamrā haḇlun šāti* / a cup wine give.them SUB.he.drinks / 'Let them give him a cup of wine to drink' (Merx 19.15)

(2) *kul d'ayḵ d-bāsmā=luḵ, hādā ʿḇod bīyuhy* / all like REL-it.pleases.you, this do to.him / 'Everything you want, do that to him' (HS 101.9)

8.7.4 *Conclusions*

Constituent order in clauses with imperatives, as in all other clause types in LUA, is governed by the pragmatic functions of the clause and its constituents.

8.8 Summary and conclusions

8.8.1 *The conditions governing LUA constituent order*

In this chapter I have shown how the pragmatic functions of a clause constitute the major factor for the ordering of the constituents. Four pragmatic functions are being distinguished: topic, focus, theme, and tail.

The basic order of verb and object is VO, but it has proved difficult to establish the basic order of subject and verb. The dominant order is SV, but in a number of respects this order is marked vis-à-vis VS. At the same time, there seems to be a tendency towards an unmarked SV order. To understand the various pragmatically marked orders, a VS order constitutes a better starting point than an SV order. Therefore, I propose to accept VS as basic order of subject and verb. The fact that LUA has a basic postfield

107. Note that these findings differ somewhat from those of Kapeliuk (1992: 64-67), who studied clauses with imperatives in Marogulov's grammar. In that corpus, she distinguished a number of formal criteria that govern the position of direct and indirect object phrases vis-à-vis the imperative. However, I think that most of these formal criteria can be reformulated as resulting from the pragmatic functions of the phrases involved.

character — dependents follow their heads — supports this view, because most postfield languages have a basic VSO order.[108]

The various possible orders according to their pragmatic functions can be summarized in the following template:[109]

theme | Sc Sa P1 P2 V S O X | tail

The placement rules for the various constituents can be summarized as follows:

Verbal phrase

1. The verbal phrase[110] always occupies position V
2. If, and only if, V is occupied by a verb, is the clause complete

Object

1. If the (direct) object provides new, salient information, it occupies position O.
2. If the object is assigned contrastive or assertive focus functions, it occupies P2.
3. Cognate objects may occur in P2 without being assigned contrastive or assertive focus functions.
4. If the object is assigned topic functions, it occupies P1.
5. A definite object may be put in pre-clausal position, preceding a subject in P1, to perform theme function.
6. A definite object may be put in post-clausal position, following other verbal complements, to perform tail function.

Prepositional complements

1. If prepositional complements, including indirect objects, provide new, salient information, they occupy position X. Position X can be filled with more than one prepositional complement.
2. If a prepositional complement is assigned contrastive or assertive focus functions, it occupies P2.
3. If a prepositional complement is assigned topic functions, it occupies P1.

108. So Dik 1989: 346-55.

109. In this order two 'special positions' are presumed for LUA (cf. 1.4.2), one for topic and one for focus functions. In clause order types like SOV and OOV both positions are filled, and therefore they cannot be reduced to one position.

110. Cf. 6.9.

4. In the sequence VOX, prepositional phrases and direct objects may change places when the object provides more salient information than the prepositional phrase.
5. Some types of verbal complements, especially with verbs of motion, may occur as part of the verbal phrase rather than as a separate phrase.

Subject

1. If a subject is assigned given topic function, it usually occupies position S.
2. If a subject is assigned new topic (indefinite) function, it usually occupies position S.
3. In case of verbal complements that are closely connected to the verbal form (cf. above, prepositional complements no 5), the subject follows the verbal complement.
4. If a prepositional phrase is in P2, the subject usually is in S.
5. If a subject is assigned contrastive or assertive topic function, it occupies position P1.
6. If a subject performs new topic function with definite nouns, it occupies position P1.
7. If assertive sentence focus is assigned to the clause, the subject occupies position P1.
8. If the verbal clause has a fronted cognate object, or if an object is present in P2, the subject usually is in P1.
9. Subjects with the functions described in nr. 1-3, may occupy position P1, especially in non-narrative and late-nineteenth- and twentieth-century texts.
10. Definite subjects can be placed in post-clausal position to perform tail function, providing additional information.

Sentence connectives and sentence adverbs

1. Sentence connectives and sentence adverbs occupy the first two positions (Sc/Sa) of the clause, regardless of which other positions are filled. Usually not more than one sentence connective and one sentence adverb occur in a clause. When the theme position is filled, usually no sentence connective is present, but if it is present, it may also precede the theme constituent.
2. Sentence adverbs may occur in the second position of the clause, usually following the subject in P1, to stress the assertive character of the clause. In this position, the sentence adverb is not part of the clause itself.

Constituents without grammatical function

1. Constituents that are referred to inside the clause by a suffix attached to a noun perform theme functions when in pre-clausal position.
2. Additional information on subject, object, and prepositional phrases can be placed in post-clausal position, in juxtaposition or introduced by *ya'ni*.

In WH-questions the template is slightly different.

theme | Sc P1 Sa P2 V S O X | tail

The constituent with the interrogative always occupies P1 position, which in this template is the focus position. The usual clause pattern, without the preverbal focus position, follows the constituent in P1, in which the P2 postition now represents the topic position. However, I have found only very few examples of a subject in P2. The pre-clausal position is often filled by a theme constituent.

8.8.2 *Differences between copular and verbal constituent order types*

The difference in morphology between copular and verbal clauses is reflected in a number of differences in the constituent order types. At the same time, there are clear parallels between the constituent order patterns. Two important points have to be mentioned.

The first is about the position of the subject. In verbal clauses the subject can occupy two different positions: pre- and postverbal. The use of these positions is governed by pragmatic factors, i.e., differences in the type of topic function. In copular clauses, all types of topic functions are performed by pre-predicate subjects. However, in both clause types, the pre-predicate subject position is employed for contrastive and assertive topics. Both clause types have a further possibility to place subjects in post-clausal position to perform tail function in resumptive clauses.

Another issue that is of importance for the comparison between copular and verbal clause patterns is the function of the special pre-predicate position. In copular clauses, it is the P1 position that is employed in the focus construction. In clauses with focus construction, this position is filled by constituents that usually are not assigned focus functions, like subjects or sentence adverbs, or by constituents that usually are assigned new focus function, like prepositional phrases. The latter constituents in P1 position are assigned contrastive or assertive focus. The P1 position is employed

also to mark focus on the constituent with the interrogative in WH-questions.

In verbal clauses, P1 position is employed for special topic functions, whereas verbal complements can be placed in P2 position to perform assertive and contrastive focus. Thus, P2 position in verbal clauses has much the same functions as P1 position in copular clauses, except for the fact that subject and sentence adverbs cannot be marked for focus in this position. The fact that verbal clauses employ a different construction for WH-questions indicates that the two positions are not entirely the same. In verbal WH-questions, the constituent with the interrogative precedes all other constituents, even subjects and sentence adverbs, like the constituent in P1 position in copular clauses. Thus, the function of P1 position in verbal WH questions is parallel to P1 position in copular clauses, whereas in non-interrogative verbal clauses P2 position is parallel to P1 position in copular clauses.

8.8.3 *The differences between the text types*

With regard to constituent order patterns in verbal clauses a number of differences between the three text groups appeared.

With regard to the position of the subject, the number of VS clauses in Merx's texts is higher than in other texts. In Bedjan's texts the number of VS clauses is lower than in Merx and Socin, although there is a difference between narrative (higher VS) and non-narrative texts (lower VS).

The pragmatic conditions for fronting of object phrases in Bedjan's texts are slightly different from that in the other texts. Cognate objects occur more often in preverbal position than in the texts of Merx and Socin, also when no contrastive or assertive focus has to be represented. This might be due to Persian influence in which objects always precede the verb.

Extra-clausal constituents occur in different shapes in the different text types. In the texts of Bedjan, pre-clausal constituents are rather common and are always employed with coreferential pronouns in the core clause, whereas in the texts of Merx and Socin, pre-clausal constituents occur less frequently and the connection between the extra-clausal constituent and the rest of the clause is not always clearly stated. On the other hand, post-clausal constituents occur very seldom in Bedjan's texts, whereas they are quite common in Merx and Socin, very often being introduced by *yaʿni*. In ZdB both types of extra-clausal constituents are uncommon.

In general, the pragmatic conditions governing fronting of verbal complements and subjects do not seem to vary significantly between the various

text types. Only in BT, because of its adherence to constituent order in the source languages, do deviating constituent order patterns occur. The latter patterns testify to the fact that pragmatically conditioned constituent orders can be more easily violated than grammatically conditioned patterns. The clauses in BT are usually grammatically correct, even if pragmatically they may be somewhat awkward.

9

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

9.1 Overview

9.1.1 *Introduction*

When taking the data of the historical and the linguistic chapters together, a three-phase development of LUA can be distinguished. The first phase is characterized by the introduction of the literary language by the American Protestant missionaries; the second by a standardization of the literary language and its general acceptance in wider circles than just those connected to the Protestant mission, notably among the people connected to the Lazarist mission; and the third by a further standardization of the written language, mainly under influence of the Anglican mission. Although in all three phases the Western missions played an important role, the acceptance and active participation of the Assyrians were vital for the success of each phase of the development. Some characteristics of each period will be listed.

9.1.2 *The initial period*

In the first period, which opened with the start of the American Protestant mission in November 1835, the spoken language of Urmia was shaped into writing. This written language was employed in the newly established schools, in which children and grown-ups for the first time learned to write and read their own language. In this period, Perkins, the head of the mission, started translating the Bible into the modern dialect, in collaboration with some of the native clergy. Parts of this translation were written on 'school cards', which were employed in teaching.

At the end of 1840, a printing press arrived and in 1841 the first printed Urmia Aramaic texts were issued. The orthography of these early texts differs from that in later texts, in that it was more phonetic and less influenced by Classical Syriac grammar than later texts. It is difficult to say whether this was a deliberate choice of the missionaries and their assistants or whether it was mainly due to lack of comparative knowledge. Whatever the reason for this rather phonetic spelling may have been, I think that these

early spelling conventions indicate that one should not accuse the Protestant missionaries of deliberately introducing a 'historical' spelling. The early spelling was rather phonetic, both in its consonant and vowel inventory, and employed very few silent letters. One must assume that the missionaries intended to devise a spelling that was easy to understand and easy to learn.

It did not take long before the first changes in the orthography appeared. Some of these spelling innovations were needed to better represent the actual speech sounds, whereas some other innovations can be interpreted as changes towards a more historical spelling. A number of these spelling innovations were introduced in the NT edition of 1846, a landmark in the history of LUA.

The growing number of the schools, the increasing participation of the local clergy in the work of the Protestant mission, and the general acceptance of the Bible translation in the vernacular language indicate that the work of the Protestant mission was accepted and appreciated.

9.1.3 *Standardization*

In the years between the NT edition of 1846 and the OT edition of 1852, the orthography of LUA was further standardized. Except for some variations in the writing of loanwords, the orthographical conventions as employed in the edition of 1852 were maintained in the Protestant press almost till the end of the nineteenth century. The grammar of the missionary Stoddard, written about 1853, testifies to this standardization of the written language. The greater part of the productions of the Protestant press, therefore, used this standard.

The letters to the missionaries in the edition of Merx make clear that in the sixties the literary language was firmly established as a means of communication. These letters were written by people who had received their education at the Protestant schools. The main part of the texts edited by Merx and Socin consists of the stories written down by Audishu bar Arsanis, at the end of the sixties in Berlin. These texts, containing traditional stories and descriptions of special events like marriage, baptism, and funeral, are written in a narrative style, which gives the impression of being rather close to the spoken language, with many repetitions, anacoluthons and inserted explanations. This style is different from that which is employed in the missionary magazine ZdB, in which the sentences are carefully formulated. Other differences between ZdB and the texts of Merx and Socin may be due to the fact that missionaries, most of whom were non-native speakers themselves, contributed to the magazine.

In its first years, the mission work of the Lazarists, which started in 1839, made use of the publications of the Protestant press. The small press that was brought in from Europe by Bedjan in 1861, although little used, indicates that in these years the Lazarists became convinced that they had to produce their own literature, in order to compete successfully with the Protestant mission. The oldest example from the Lazarist press that has been studied by me, the NT Peshitta edition with translation in the vernacular of 1877, shows that this press, in its use of the vernacular, in general followed the orthographical conventions as employed in the Protestant press. The Lazarists introduced a few innovations, thereby correcting some odd spellings of the Protestant press.

Although it is uncertain whether Bedjan was purposely sent to Europe to provide books for the Chaldean Christians, his activities in the field of the literary language proved to be of great importance for the work of the Lazarist mission. This educated native speaker not only edited a large number of Classical Syriac texts, but also contributed to the growth of LUA by writing a number of books in the new literary language. His first book in LUA appeared in 1885. He continued the orthographical tradition as set by the Lazarist press, being close to the Protestant conventions. It is the refined literary style of his books that set them apart from all other texts in LUA produced until then. His texts benefited from a combination of inside knowledge of the vernacular language and solid training in languages with a long literary tradition, like Classical Syriac, Persian, and Latin.

9.1.4 *The 'classical' period*

The main characteristic of the third period in the pre-war development of LUA is the growing use of historical spellings, based on Classical Syriac grammar and orthography. In all likelihood, the first initiative to devise a more etymological spelling came from the Anglican missionaries. Arthur Maclean, who worked in Urmia from 1886 to 1891, was an advocate of a historical spelling for two reasons: first, 'the vernacular must be treated as a historical language' and not 'as one invented in the present generation', a fact that in his opinion is obscured by a purely phonetic spelling, and second, differences in pronunciation between the various dialects in the region are better served by a historical spelling, because these classical forms are more easily recognized than forms based on the particular pronunciation of Urmia. The latter argument, by the way, also provided a reason for making only restricted use of words that were understood only in one part of the Aramaic-speaking area. This applies mainly to loanwords.

This historical spelling was employed in the books of the Anglican mission press, which began printing in 1889. It is uncertain at what time these etymological spellings were employed for the first time by writers publishing with the other mission presses, but it is revealing that already in the Bible edition of 1893 a few of these etymological spellings occur. A very important feature of the etymological spelling, the third person singular masculine and feminine endings of the PRET and copula with *h* rather than ', is not yet found in BT of 1893, and neither is it employed by Bedjan in his *Mois de Marie* of 1904. It appears, however, in his *Vies des Saints* of 1912. I do not have enough material of the Protestant press of these years to decide when these endings were first employed, but they are found in the grammar of Mooshie of 1912.

The abstracts from ZdB, as presented by Macuch, show that towards the end of the nineteenth century the discussion on orthography was not confined to the missionaries of the Anglican and Protestant missions. Native writers contributed to the discussion in ZdB with long articles. Most of these Assyrian writers favored a more etymological spelling, so it is not surprising to find that, in the course of the twentieth century, most aspects of the spelling conventions as used by the Anglican press became part of the standard spelling.

The revised version of the Bible translation of 1846/1852, which in 1893 was issued by the American Bible Society in New York, in another way can be seen as representative of the developments in this period. Although the influence of the orthographical conventions that came in vogue at the end of the century is visible, the edition in this respect still is much closer to the earlier Protestant conventions than to the 'Anglican' innovations. It is in the field of lexicography that this translation is markedly different from the earlier version. In the 1893 edition, which is based on the Hebrew and Greek text, a deliberate effort was made to free the vocabulary of typically 'Urmi' forms, including loanwords from Turkish and Persian. Instead, lexical items closer to Classical Syriac were preferred, often in view of the Peshitta text. We do not know for certain who worked on this revision, but it is likely that at least some of the members of the committee that worked on the preliminary edition of Genesis of 1886, also contributed to the edition of 1893.

Altough one may have doubts whether or not the translation and its revision can be considered to be a 'good' translation in the linguistic sense, it clearly served its purpose in the nineteenth century. As such it was kept in high esteem by the Assyrians. The 1893 edition has been reprinted time and again. Although recently new translations of parts of the Bible have become

available, the 1893 edition still is the only complete Bible in Neo-Aramaic which is being used by those Assyrians who read the modern language, in the Church of the East as well as in Protestant denominations.

The First World War ended the formative period of Literary Urmia Aramaic, but at that time the language was already firmly rooted in the Assyrian community. After the war, the literary tradition was continued in various ways in the different countries in which Assyrian communities were established. In all of these, the literary language of Urmia constituted the basis for further developments, even when a large part of the community did not originate in the Urmia region. In nearly all these communities, except for the one in the former Soviet Union, the orthographical conventions of the pre-war period were maintained. In the Soviet Union a new orthography was created, based entirely on phonemic principles. However, due to changing political circumstances, this new literary tradition was not able to survive.

9.2 Factors determining the development of LUA

9.2.1 *Introduction*

An important question that has to be answered in this concluding chapter is why the introduction of a new literary language by Western missions proved to be so successful. Or, to put it differently: which factors determined the development of LUA, positively or negatively? How did LUA acquire the form it had at the outbreak of the war? The chapters on the general history, on the history of the missions and the history of writing and printing, and the chapters on the language itself, all provide elements for answering this question.

9.2.2 *Socio-historical factors*

The situation of the Christians in Persia, in the early nineteenth century, was that of a small minority that was accepted by the majority as long as it did not attract too much attention. Most of the people were farmers and were not educated. The clergy was literate in Classical Syriac, but most of them only to a limited extent. In all likelihood, literacy in Persian or Arabic was hardly ever acquired by any of them. It is, therefore, understandable that the Assyrians were eager to make contact with Western travelers and missionaries, who represented a world in which Christians were a majority rather than a minority, and a world that in many respects seemed to be wealthier and more important than theirs.

This positive attitude towards the West might explain why the American Protestant missionaries from the very beginning were heartily welcomed and assisted by the local people, including the clergy. The Assyrian Christians approved of the idea of establishing schools and a printing press. It is unclear to what extent they themselves had been fostering the idea of using the vernacular, rather than Classical Syriac, for literary and educational purposes. There are no indications that the earlier texts in the vernacular of the Mosul and Alqosh region were known in Urmia. However, the ongoing support after the introduction of the new literary language shows the Assyrians' approval of and even their enthusiasm for the use of a literary language that could be easily learned.

An additional reason for this positive attitude of the Assyrians may have been their hopes of political protection against the arbitrary rules of the Muslim majority. The Protestant missionaries were aware of these lingering expectations and tried not to encourage them. However, the presence of the missionaries as such already led to a better protection of the native Christians. Crimes committed against Christians, which before the arrival of the missionaries were often disregarded by the local Persian rulers, now were brought to their attention by the Protestant missionaries, whose requests could not so easily be ignored.

Thus, the introduction of the new literary language was closely connected with the introduction of modernization and westernization among the Assyrians. In their thirst for modernization, they were eager to learn to read and write; in English as well as in their native language.

Apart from a general receptiveness of the Assyrians for Western innovations, I assume that also the respectful attitude of the American Protestants towards the Assyrian culture played an important role in their acceptance of the literary language. The Protestant missionaries were careful not to introduce any changes that would not be approved of by the Assyrians. They waited till they were asked to establish schools in the villages, they waited till they were asked to preach in the Assyrian churches, and they did not encourage the people to break with their own traditions. Although the Protestant missionaries were convinced of the superiority of their own Western culture and Western type of Christianity, they understood that the only way to transmit their cultural values to the Assyrian Christians was to respect their culture in the first place.

I further assume that the fact that two, later three, and at the end of the century five, missions were competing for influence in the Urmia region stimulated rather than hindered the further spread of the literary language.

The initial success of the literary language among the Assyrians connected with the Protestant mission forced the Lazarists to publish their own Roman Catholic books in LUA. Consequently the Anglicans, when establishing their press, could not refrain from publishing in the vernacular language. The more books were printed in the literary language, the more people of different groups came in contact with the language, and the more widespread the use of the literary language became.

After the First World War, the development of the literary language was hampered by the spread of the Assyrian Christians to a large number of different places. In some of these diaspora communities the literary tradition was continued, as it was in the communities in the Middle East, but nowhere were the circumstances so favorable for a common literary development as they had been in nineteenth-century Urmia.

The missionaries' introduction of the literary language based on the Urmia Aramaic dialect also gave rise to the scholarly study of the Neo-Aramaic dialects. Some of the missionaries themselves contributed to the study of Neo-Aramaic, such as the Protestant missionary Stoddard, the Anglican missionary Maclean, and the Roman Catholic missionary Rhétoré (in Mosul), whereas most Western scholars interested in Neo-Aramaic, like Rödiger, Nöldeke, Socin, and Merx, were largely dependent on the material sent to them by the missionaries. The other way round, in the earliest periods of the development of the literary language, when the Protestant missionaries standardized the orthography, the influence of scholarly opinions on this language seems not to have been very large. In the third period, the growing knowledge of the relation between earlier Aramaic languages, like CS, and the modern vernaculars greatly stimulated the use of etymological spellings, its major advocate being the Anglican missionary and grammarian Maclean.

9.2.3 *Linguistic factors*

The linguistic situation in nineteenth-century Urmia also may have contributed to the introduction and acceptance of the new literary language. What were the main characteristics of the linguistic situation, and how can they be related to the introduction and development of LUA?

The most important factor is the role of Classical Syriac. This 'Kultursprache' of the Assyrians was, and still is, the language of the liturgy, of the Peshitta, and of the literary tradition of the Assyrian people. In addition, it was the language of communication between the various communities. However, in nineteenth-century Urmia, only a limited number of

people were able to read this language, and an even smaller number, all of them clergy, could express themselves in this language. Thus, although CS still had a very high status among the Assyrians, its function was rather limited. The liturgy was not commonly understood, the reading of the Gospel had to be orally translated into the vernacular language, and most of the people did not write anyhow, and certainly not CS.

Thus, the new literary language did not have to compete with CS, despite the latter's high status. None of the functions of LUA were performed by CS any more, at least, not for the majority of the people. The newly written language created its own functions, viz. education and correspondence, which CS did not cover. At the same time, CS continued to play the role it had played in the period before the introduction of LUA within the liturgy, clerical correspondence and parts of religious training. CS still had a very high status among the Assyrians, literate and illiterate alike, being a visible expression of their culture, different from that of the Muslims, different also from that of Western Christianity. These factors made CS, although it was used only by a small part of the Assyrian people, the perfect model for the new literary language. Therefore the acceptance of the new literary language by the Assyrians was greatly facilitated by its CS-based orthography.

The introduction of the written language on the basis of the dialect of the Urmia region strengthened the position of this dialect among the other Neo-Aramaic dialects. It is unclear whether or not the town dialect of Urmia already had a regional status prior to the introduction of LUA, but it certainly acquired such a status after its introduction.

One wonders whether the choice of this particular dialect influenced the acceptance of LUA by speakers of other dialects. There are no indications that people explicitly rejected this dialect, but it is possible that the acceptance in the Hakkari mountains was hindered by it. The mountain dialects are less close to the Urmia dialect than the other dialects of the plains of Urmia and Salmas. However, I believe that more factors influenced the slow acceptance of LUA in the mountains. The Assyrians living in the mountains clearly were less eager to accept modernizations; they were closer to the traditional centre of their culture, the see of the Patriarch, and were at a greater distance from the missionary activities. These factors, taken together, may explain why the alphabetization process in the mountains went at a slower pace. At the same time, the political developments at the end of the century, which caused many Assyrians from the mountains to move to the Urmia and Salmas plains, may have constituted an important factor in the development of a more interdialectal language in this period.

It is difficult to say to what extent the neighboring languages, like Azeri Turkish, Kurdish, and Persian, influenced the introduction and acceptance of LUA. Although the local Azeri dialect was written at that time, most of the Muslim neighbors of the Assyrians were illiterate like themselves. Thus, becoming literate in one's vernacular language was a way of distinguishing oneself from one's neighbors, not of coming closer to them. Persian at that time was a language with a long literary tradition, but it may be assumed that only in the town of Urmia were a considerable number of people literate in this language. In the first half of the nineteenth century, printing was still at a very low stage in Persia, the printing press of the Protestants being the first press in the region. Again, literacy and education for the Assyrians became a means of distinguishing themselves from their neighbors, rather than becoming closer to them.

9.3 The language

9.3.1 *Introduction*

In the present study a number of characteristic features of LUA have been investigated and discussed. The features that are characteristic for the literary language of the nineteenth century can be divided into two categories: features that reflect the influence of other languages on the creation and development of the literary language, and features that belong inherently to the Urmia dialect, and that have been employed in various ways to fit the needs of the new language.

9.3.2 *Features of LUA due to the influence of other languages*

A number of characteristics of LUA are due to the influence of other languages. The most important of these are to be found in the fields of orthography, lexicon, and style, whereas in the texts of the Protestant press an important feature in the field of morphology and morphosyntax must be mentioned.

The orthography is based completely on CS orthography, on two levels: the script and the phonetic value of the graphemes are taken over, and the forms of LUA, if possible, are spelled in the same way as their CS parallels. As stated above, in the third phase of the development of LUA the use of etymological spellings increased, with the intention of creating a supradialectal literary language based on CS. The spelling at the end of the period of research (1914) seems to be as close to CS as possible.

However, it was not only CS that influenced the orthography of LUA. In the first two phases of the development, loanwords from Azeri Turkish, Kurdish and Persian, in general, were spelled phonetically, according to the value of the CS signs. In the third phase, due to the same etymological tendency, the orthography of loanwords was brought into line with the spelling in Arabic script, usually conforming to Persian orthography.

A similar development can be discerned in the development of the lexicon. In the first two phases, loanwords from the neighboring languages were employed freely, due to the fact that they belonged to the daily vocabulary of the common people, and so to the inherent features of Urmia Aramaic. However, in the third phase, at the end of the century, a tendency towards purism becomes visible. New forms preferably were based on genuine Aramaic stems, whereas loanwords from Arabic, Azeri Turkish, Persian, and Kurdish, were replaced by loans from CS. This was worked on deliberately by the Anglican press, especially in the Bible translations. In the Protestant press the use of such loanwords was considered less problematic. The large amount of Persian loanwords in Bedjan's writings, while Persian was hardly spoken in this region, perhaps can also be accounted for by a deliberate attempt to 'upgrade' the vocabulary with loans from the prestige language of this region, although one may assume that a number of these Persian loanwords were used in the Azeri dialect of the region as well.

The two cultural languages, Classical Syriac and Persian, probably had their impact also on the style of the writings in the nineteenth century. Some specific characteristics of Bedjan's texts can only be explained by assuming direct influence from Persian or CS syntax. In the other texts, hardly any indications of such influence were encountered. This confirms the idea that Bedjan deliberately tried to create a literary style, not only with regard to grammar and lexicon, but also by a refined use of syntactical constructions.

In BT and ZdB, CS has influenced an aspect even of morphology. In these texts, a construction for object marking is used that is not employed in the other texts, and that in all likelihood has to be ascribed to influence of CS. In BT, this construction is employed to literally reproduce the CS constructions. In ZdB the same object marking preposition as in BT is employed, *l-*, but usually according to the grammatical rules for object marking with *qā* in the other texts. Thus, the usual type of object marking has been abandoned in these cases, in order to adhere to constructions commonly used in CS.

9.3.3 *Distinctive features of Literary Urmia Aramaic*

The distinctive features of the literary language, which play a different role in the various text corpora, belong mainly to the field of constituent order syntax. I assume that in the field of morphology such distinctive features can be found as well, but this will need further investigation.

The most important characteristic of LUA syntax is the fact that the constituent order patterns are almost entirely pragmatically conditioned. The order of the main constituents of a clause can be decided on only when the discourse function of every constituent is known. In earlier studies the specific pragmatic markings of constituent order in NA, and especially in LUA, have not been sufficiently described. The present study, using the Functional Grammar theories of Dik, has shown that the apparently 'free' constituent order of LUA consists of a complicated pattern of various order patterns that can express a number of clearly defined pragmatic functions, making use of the two main functions of topic and focus. It has further been shown that the difference between copular and verbal clauses not only consists of a difference of semantic categories or of grammatical relations, but also in the different ways in which the pragmatic functions govern constituent order.

The description and categorization of the constituent order patterns that occur in different texts also proved to be a tool for a further classification of the texts. Differences in the frequency of certain constituent orders often appear to coincide with differences in the genre of the text, the author, or the printing press. Differences in 'style' very often can be reformulated as differences in the use of certain constituent order patterns.

This becomes obvious when the constituent order patterns of the Protestant press and those of the other texts are compared. In the Protestant press, a large number of orders occur that do not fit into the discourse patterns of the context. This is particularly true of the Bible translation, in which in the overwhelming majority of clauses the constituent order of the source languages, CS, Hebrew, or Greek, is followed, also if this order in LUA conveys a pragmatic function different from the one conveyed in the source language. At the same time, however, the position of the copula is usually determined by LUA grammar, rather than by the clause order in the source languages.

The clauses in BT are nearly always grammatically correct, because, due to the many types of constituent order, very few possible orders are inherently ungrammatical. However, in many of them, the pragmatic functions of the clause order in the source language are not adequately conveyed in

LUA. In the OT translation based on the Hebrew, the largest number of orders deviating from LUA patterns occur.

Constituent order patterns in ZdB are influenced far less by CS or Hebrew, and are close to those in the texts of Merx and Socin. However, some of the marked patterns, like OV and VS order, occur notably less often in ZdB than more basic orders like VO and SV. This may indicate that the mastery of the language of these authors was not sufficient to apply all possible types of variation in constituent order, even if they usually employed the pragmatically correct orders. One must conclude, on the basis of the texts as well as on the basis of the lack of attention to these subjects in the grammars, that the missionaries were not fully aware of the pragmatic functions of constituent order.

The very consistent translation of BT according to the constituent order patterns in the source languages can also be interpreted in a slightly different way. The fact that missionaries and native speakers alike did not object to such a literal LUA translation from the source languages indicates that pragmatic conditions for constituent order could be set aside for the text to serve a 'higher' function: to underline the similarity between a revered source text and its translation.

The study of constituent order patterns brought to light a number of significant differences between the texts of Paul Bedjan and the other texts of the nineteenth century. I will briefly summarize the two most interesting features.

In all texts extra-clausal constituents occur, in pre-clausal as well as in post-clausal position. In the texts of Socin and Merx, pre-clausal constituents are not very frequent, and usually consist of phrases that agree with the subject or object suffix included in the verbal form. In Bedjan's texts, however, pre-clausal constituents are significantly more frequent, and very often consist of phrases that are referred to in the core clause by a genitive suffix in the subject or object phrase. This type of clause, which is grammatically more complicated, does occur in the texts of Socin and Merx and of the Protestant press, but it is rare. On the other hand, the use of post-clausal constituents, especially those introduced by *ya'ni*, is very frequent in the texts of Merx and Socin, but very rare in those of Bedjan. Another type of clause which occurs more often in the texts of Bedjan than in the other texts, are pseudo-cleft clauses. In this copular clause type, a fronted constituent that is not the predicate of the clause is followed by the copula.

These features of Bedjan's language are not unique for his texts, but his extensive use of them suggests that they belong to a higher, more stylized

level of the language. Whether these stylistic devices were 'invented' by Bedjan for the literary language, or whether they perhaps already existed in formal speech before the introduction of the literary language, cannot be decided on the basis of the present material.

9.4 Evaluation

9.4.1 *Literary Urmia Aramaic*

The study of the nineteenth- and early twentieth-century texts in the written language that developed in Urmia makes clear that one can indeed speak of 'Literary Urmia Aramaic', a written language that is based on the local dialect of Urmia, but differing from the latter dialect in its distinct literary character. This literary language displayed its supradialectal character by becoming the basis for the further literary developments among the Assyrians in the period after the First World War, in all countries in which they settled.

Part of the success of the literary language can be attributed to the fact that already in the nineteenth century people from the various groups within the Assyrian community took an active part in the creation and shaping of this language, Protestants, 'Old Church' people, and Chaldeans. The literary language belonged to all Assyrians, not just to part of them.

These people of diverse origins which employed the language also contributed to the development of its literary potential. I have paid considerable attention to the works of Paul Bedjan, because in this early period he is the one who seems to have made the most important achievement. However, the comparison of the different texts corpora also has made clear that Bedjan's work is firmly rooted in the pioneering work of the Protestant missionaries and their Assyrian assistants.

Perhaps Odisho is right in pointing to some negative aspects of the development of the literary language. According to him the use of this language 'further isolated them [i.e., the Assyrians] from their old language and cultural and intellectual heritage', whereas the development of a lingua franca based on the Urmia dialect was reached 'at the expense of the other dialects'.[1] It cannot be denied that the introduction of the literary language, being part of a larger process of modernization, changed the traditional outlook of the Assyrian community. As in all modern societies, the role of the Church and its traditional literature decreased and local customs and local

1. Odisho 1988: 20.

dialects began to disappear, while, instead of these traditional values, new values arose: education and progress, a Western orientation, and a national, more than a religious, identity. Whether the new values are worth the loss, or the partial loss, of the older ones, is now subject for debate. The Assyrians in the nineteenth century had few doubts about this choice; they appear to have been as eager to accept modernization as were the missionaries to share it with them.

9.4.2 *Further research*

The present study of the literary language of the nineteenth century deals only with a number of selected subjects and is somewhat limited by the relatively small corpus of texts on which it is based. Further study of LUA will certainly bring other aspects of its introduction and development to light.

In the field of the linguistic description of LUA, I presume that a further investigation of the semantic and pragmatic functions of the verbal forms in the various text corpora will yield more information on the relations between those corpora and at the same time provide a better insight into the complicated verbal system.

Another issue that is of importance for the description of LUA is the development of the lexicon. The lexicon of a language can be enlarged by employing derivation, compound forms, loan translations, and loanwords. At the same time, the language may often be purified by trying to omit certain forms, many of them loanwords. In LUA, the replacement of loans from the neighboring languages, Azeri, Kurdish, and Persian, by loans or calques based on Classical Syriac was subject for discussion, whereas in the Protestant press a number of English loans are employed for scientific terms. Much research will be needed to present a clear picture of these developments.

In this study I have confined myself to the most important texts of the nineteenth century, those of the Protestant press in its standardized period, the texts of Merx and Socin, and those of Paul Bedjan. Our view of the literary language of the nineteenth century would benefit from a more comprehensive study of the texts of the smaller presses, like the Lazarist and the Anglican presses, as well as of the Protestant publications in the less well-known periods, especially after 1870. Such a study may reveal several kinds of lateral developments that may greatly enrich our overall picture of LUA in the nineteenth century.

TEXTS

Introduction

This appendix consists of a number of early printed texts in Literary Urmia Aramaic. These constitute a representative portion of the texts used in the present study (see 1.3.3 and chapter 4). This collection does not include texts published by Merx and Socin, most of which are readily accessible to scholars.

As far as possible, the texts reproduced here are as they appear in the original editions. Since these texts were in general remarkably well-edited, very few emendations were required. The following points should be kept in mind:

1. Variations in spelling, mainly in Text no 1, have been retained. A few obvious mistakes have been corrected and are referred to in a note.
2. In the original texts, diacritical points are not always distinguished from vowel points. Where I assume that a diacritical point is intended, ◌̇ is used, rather than ◌̈ . However, underneath the consonant (due to the limitations of the computer) ◌̣ for both. This will not as a rule lead to confusion.
3. As far as possible, *syāmi* is on the same consonant as in the original text, but due to typographical constraints, this is not always possible.
4. The page numbers of the original editions are given in square brackets.

1. *On the subject of repentance (1841/1842)*[1]

ܡܫܡܪܢܘܬܐ ܕܒܟ ܒܝ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬܒܥܐ.

ܒܥܕ ܡܥܒܪ ܙܒܢ ܕܒܬܘܒܬܐ: ܙܕ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܟܘܡܓ ܕܐ ܠܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܟܕ ܐܗ ܡܬܒܥ ܒܝ ܒܟܝܢ ܐܢܐ. ܟܐܡ: ܠܐ: ܟ.

ܡܬܒܥ ܟܘܡܓ ܕܐ ܠܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܠܐ. ܡܢ ܙܒܢ ܕܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܟܕ ܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܒܟܝܢ. ܟ

1. *On the subject of repentance (1841/1842)*

Words on the subject of repentance

Jesus Christ said: 'I say to you that all of you too, unless you repent, will perish likewise'. Luke 13:3.

Repentance is a matter of great importance. It is the first thing God asks from us sinners. Whatever else we do, we will not be able to please God before we repent. No alms and no prayer and no fasting and no other works will be acceptable if we love sin and our hearts are hard. Many people put their trust [2] in these things, those who do not know at all what a broken heart is. They reject the broken heart and the humble spirit which God asks for, and they first reach after these works with which those who are in the flesh cannot please God. Romans 8:8.

God says: 'return[3] to me with all your heart, with fasting and weeping and mourning, and rend your hearts and not your clothes. Joel 2:13. However, people turn from repentance with all their[4] heart, and grasp only the sign of repentance, which is fasting, and take a shadow instead of substance, and rend their garments and not their hearts.

[3] In this way, many people deceive their souls with their repentance. They value a kind of repentance that is not repentance. It is necessary, therefore, that we distinguish between repentance which is genuine and that which is not genuine.

First I will mention to you a number of things that are not repentance, and thereafter I will speak on genuine repentance, and on the appropriateness of that repentance for everybody.

First, tormenting of the body is not repentance.

3. The text has a passive vorm: 'become returned', which might be a literal rendering of Peshitta *'tpnw*, which should be translated by 'return' or even 'convert'.

4. NA: 'his'.

ﻣﺎﺭﺍﺗﻲ ﻭﺍﺭﺍﺗﻲ ﻛﺎﻳﻮ ﺑﻪ

Many people bend their necks like a shepherd's crook, and rend their garments and torment their bodies, hoping that these things will atone for their sins. And there are [4] unbelievers who raise their arm until it withers and they are not able to bring it down.

And there are [people] who crawl on their knees to the house of their idols. And there are [people] who do not sleep for a long time. And there are [people] who throw themselves on sharp knives, hoping that these things will be an offering acceptable to their gods. These [things] are not repentance.

Second, self-hate as such is not repentance.

In this manner, Judas repented and then went off to hang himself. His repentance was not genuine. He did not have a dislike of his sins, and no love for God, and no trust in His mercies. He did have a knowledge of his sin, and self-hate, and fear of punishment, which hastened him to destruction. [5] Like the repentance of Judas, all lost souls in hell will repent with weeping and mourning and gnashing of teeth forever.

Three, fear of punishment is not repentance.

Many people fear punishment who do not fear God. You have seen people who, when they were beaten, promised repentance,[5] and enjoyed the mark of the sticks. And their fear went away and they returned again to their former evil-doings, as a dog to its vomit. In this way they repented and sinned, and sinned and repented.

Four, there are other people who when they are about to die, call a priest to pray for them, or to give [6] something to the poor, hoping that they will not go to hell.

Five, there are other people who fear the wrath of God like bad people who fear the king; they fear his authority and great power, but do not hate their evil-doings — these things are not repentance.[6]

In such repentance, which results from fear of punishment only, there is no trust in the mercies of God and no belief in the greatness of his grace. Although the gospel of Christ is filled with good will and peace towards human beings, and He has opened the door of hope,

5. NA: 2x *tôba*.

6. Note that in this type of impersonal clauses, UA can more easily switch from pl to sg than English.

ואתה תצוה את בני ישראל ויקחו אליך שמן זית זך כתית למאור להעלות נר תמיד: [9] באהל מועד מחוץ לפרכת אשר על העדות יערך אתו אהרן ובניו מערב עד בקר לפני יהוה חקת עולם לדרתם מאת בני ישראל: ואתה הקרב אל אהרן אחיך ואת בניו אתו מתוך בני ישראל לכהן לי אהרן נדב ואביהוא בני אלעזר ואיתמר: ועשית בגדי קדש לאהרן אחיך לכבוד ולתפארת: ודברת אל כל חכמי לב אשר מלאתיו רוח חכמה ועשו את בגדי אהרן לקדשו לכהנו לי: [10] ואלה הבגדים אשר יעשו חשן ואפד ומעיל וכתנת תשבץ מצנפת ואבנט ועשו בגדי קדש לאהרן אחיך ולבניו לכהן לי: ואתה קח את הזהב ואת התכלת ואת הארגמן ואת תולעת השני ואת השש: ועשו את האפד זהב תכלת וארגמן תולעת שני ושש משזר מעשה חשב: שתי כתפת חברת תהיה אל שני קצותיו וחברה: ותבנת אפדתו אשר עליו כמעשהו ממנו זהב תכלת וארגמן תולעת שני ושש משזר: ולקחת את שתי אבני שהם ופתחת עליהם שמות בני ישראל: ששה משמותם על האבן האחת וששת שמות הנותרם על האבן השנית כתולדתם: מעשה חרש פתוחי חותם תפתח את שתי האבנים על שמות בני ישראל משבצות זהב תעשה אתם: ושמת את שתי האבנים על כתפות האפד אבני זכרון לבני ישראל ונשא אהרן את שמותם לפני יהוה על שתי כתפיו לזכרון: ועשית משבצות זהב: ושתי שרשרת זהב טהור מגבלת תעשה אתם מעשה עבת ונתת את השרשרת העבתים על המשבצות: [11] ועשית חשן משפט מעשה חשב כמעשה אפד תעשנו זהב תכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני ושש משזר תעשה אתו: רבוע יהיה כפול ורת שבר ארכו וזרת שבר רחבו: ומלאת בו מלאת אבן שדה אדם פטדה וברקת האחד הטור הראשון: והטור השני נפך ספיר וישפה: והטור השלישי לשם שבו ואחלמה: והטור הרביעי תרשיש שהם ויספה מוסבות משבצתם תהיינה בפתחתם: והאבנים תהיינה על שמת בני ישראל שנים עשר על שמתם פתוחי חותם איש על שמו תהיינה לשנים עשר שבט: ועשית על החשן שרשרת גבלת מעשה עבת זהב טהור: ועשית על החשן שתי טבעת זהב ונתת את שתי הטבעת על שני קצות החשן: ונתת את שתי עבתי הזהב על שתי הטבעת אל קצות החשן: [12] ואת שתי קצות שתי העבתים תתן על שתי המשבצות ונתת על כתפות האפד אל מול פניו: ועשית שתי טבעת זהב וישמת על שני קצות החשן על שפתו אשר אל עבר האפד בית: ועשית שתי טבעת זהב ונתתה על שתי כתפות האפד מלמטה מלפני מפנו אצל מחברתו מעל חשב האפד: וירכסו את החשן מטבעתיו אל טבעת האפד בפתיל תכלת להיות על חשב האפד ולא יזח החשן מעל האפד: ונשא אהרן את שמות בני ישראל בחשן המשפט על לבו בבאו אל הקדש לזכרון לפני יהוה תמיד: ונתת אל חשן המשפט את האורים ואת התמים והיו על לב אהרן בבאו לפני יהוה ונשא אהרן את משפט בני ישראל על לבו לפני יהוה תמיד: ועשית מעיל האפד כליל תכלת: ופי ראשו בתוכו שפה יהיה לפיו סביב מעשה ארג כפי תחרא יהיה לו לא יקרע: ועשית על שוליו רמני תכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני על שוליו סביב ופעמני זהב בתוכם סביב: פעמן זהב ורמון פעמן זהב ורמון על שולי המעיל סביב: והיה על אהרן לשרת ונשמע קולו בבאו אל הקדש לפני יהוה ובצאתו ולא ימות: ועשית ציץ נזר קדש וכתבת עליו מפתוחי חותם קדש ליהוה: ושמת אתו על פתיל תכלת והיה על המצנפת אל מול פני המצנפת יהיה: והיה על מצח אהרן ונשא אהרן את עון הקדשים אשר יקדישו בני ישראל לכל מתנת קדשיהם והיה תמיד על מצחו לרצון להם לפני יהוה: [13] ועשית כתנת שש תשבץ מצנפת שש תעשה ואבנט מעשה רקם תעשה: ולבני אהרן תעשה כתנת ועשית להם אבנטים ומגבעות תעשה להם לכבוד ולתפארת: והלבשת אתם את אהרן אחיך ואת בניו אתו וקדשת אתם ומשחת אתם ומלאת את ידם וקדשת אתם וכהנו לי: ואתה דבר אל בני ישראל לאמר שמור תשמרו את שבתתי כי אות הוא ביני וביניכם לדרתיכם לדעת כי אני יהוה מקדשכם: ושמרתם את השבת כי קדש הוא לכם מחלליה מות יומת כי כל העשה בה מלאכה ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מקרב עמיה: ששת ימים יעשה מלאכה וביום השביעי שבת שבתון קדש ליהוה כל העשה מלאכה ביום השבת מות יומת: ושמרו בני ישראל את השבת לעשות את השבת לדרתם ברית עולם: בינתי ובין בני ישראל אות הוא לעלם כי ששת ימים עשה יהוה את השמים ואת הארץ וביום השביעי שבת וינפש: [14] ויתן אל משה ככלתו לדבר אתו בהר סיני את שני לחת העדת לחת אבן כתבים באצבע אלהים: וירא העם כי בשש משה לרדת מן ההר ויקהל העם על אהרן ויאמרו אליו קום עשה לנו אלהים אשר ילכו לפנינו כי זה משה האיש אשר העלנו מארץ מצרים לא ידענו מה היה לו: ויאמר אלהם אהרן פרקו נזמי הזהב אשר באזני נשיכם בניכם ובנתיכם והביאו אלי: ויתפרקו כל העם את נזמי הזהב אשר באזניהם ויביאו אל אהרן: ויקח מידם ויצר אתו בחרט ויעשהו עגל מסכה ויאמרו אלה ישראל אשר העלוך מארץ מצרים: וירא אהרן ויבן מזבח לפניו ויקרא אהרן ויאמר חג ליהוה מחר: וישכמו ממחרת ויעלו עלת ויגשו שלמים וישב העם לאכל ושתו ויקמו לצחק: וידבר יהוה אל משה לך רד כי שחת עמך אשר העלית מארץ מצרים: סרו מהר מן הדרך אשר צויתם עשו להם עגל מסכה וישתחוו לו ויזבחו לו ויאמרו אלה ישראל אשר העלוך מארץ מצרים: ויאמר יהוה אל משה ראיתי את העם הזה והנה עם קשה ערף הוא: ועתה הנח לי ויחר אפי בהם ואכלם ואעשה אתך לגוי גדול: [15] ויחל משה את פני יהוה אלהיו ויאמר למה יהוה יחרה אפך בעמך אשר הוצאת מארץ מצרים בכח גדול וביד חזקה: למה יאמרו מצרים לאמר ברעה הוציאם להרג אתם בהרים ולכלתם מעל פני האדמה שוב מחרון אפך והנחם על הרעה לעמך: זכר לאברהם ליצחק ולישראל עבדיך אשר נשבעת להם בך ותדבר אלהם ארבה את זרעכם ככוכבי השמים וכל הארץ הזאת אשר אמרתי אתן לזרעכם ונחלו לעלם: וינחם יהוה על הרעה אשר דבר לעשות לעמו: וישב משה וירד מן ההר ושני לחת העדת בידו לחת כתבים משני עבריהם מזה ומזה הם כתבים: והלחת מעשה אלהים המה והמכתב מכתב אלהים הוא חרות על הלחת: [16] ושמע יהושע את קול העם ברעו ויאמר אל משה קול מלחמה במחנה: ויאמר לא קול ענות גבורה ולא קול ענות חלושה קול ענות אנכי שמע: ויהי כאשר קרב אל המחנה וירא את העגל ומחלת ויחר אף משה וישלך מידו את הלחת וישבר אתם תחת ההר: ויקח את העגל אשר עשו וישרף באש וטחן עד אשר דק ויזר על פני המים וישק את בני ישראל: ויאמר משה אל אהרן מה עשה לך העם הזה כי הבאת עליו חטאה גדלה: ויאמר אהרן אל יחר אף אדני אתה ידעת את העם כי ברע הוא: ויאמרו לי עשה לנו אלהים אשר ילכו לפנינו כי זה משה האיש אשר העלנו מארץ מצרים לא ידענו מה היה לו: ואמר להם למי זהב התפרקו ויתנו לי ואשלכהו באש ויצא העגל הזה: וירא משה את העם כי פרע הוא כי פרעה אהרן לשמצה בקמיהם: ויעמד משה בשער המחנה ויאמר מי ליהוה אלי ויאספו אליו כל בני לוי: ויאמר להם כה אמר יהוה אלהי ישראל שימו איש חרבו על ירכו עברו ושובו משער אל שער במחנה והרגו איש את אחיו ואיש את רעהו ואיש את קרבו: ויעשו בני לוי כדבר משה ויפל מן העם ביום ההוא כשלשת אלפי אישׁ: [17] ויאמר משה מלאו ידכם היום ליהוה כי איש בבנו ובאחיו ולתת עליכם היום ברכה: ויהי ממחרת ויאמר משה אל העם אתם חטאתם חטאה גדלה ועתה אעלה אל יהוה אולי אכפרה בעד חטאתכם: וישב משה אל יהוה ויאמר אנא חטא העם הזה חטאה גדלה ויעשו להם אלהי זהב: ועתה אם תשא חטאתם ואם אין מחני נא מספרך אשר כתבת: ויאמר יהוה אל משה מי אשר חטא לי אמחנו מספרי: ועתה לך נחה את העם אל אשר דברתי לך הנה מלאך ילך לפניך וביום פקדי ופקדתי עליהם חטאתם: ויגף יהוה את העם על אשר עשו את העגל אשר עשה אהרן: [18] וידבר יהוה אל משה פסל לך שני לחת אבנים כראשנים ועלה אלי ההרה והיה לי שם על ראש ההר: ואיש לא יעלה עמך וגם איש אל יראה בכל ההר גם הצאן והבקר אל ירעו אל מול ההר ההוא: ויפסל שני לחת אבנים כראשנים וישכם משה בבקר ויעל אל הר סיני כאשר צוה יהוה אתו ויקח בידו שני לחת אבנים: וירד יהוה בענן ויתיצב עמו שם ויקרא בשם יהוה: ויעבר יהוה על פניו ויקרא יהוה יהוה אל רחום וחנון ארך אפים ורב חסד ואמת: נצר חסד לאלפים נשא עון ופשע וחטאה ונקה לא ינקה פקד עון אבות על בנים ועל בני בנים על שלשים ועל רבעים: ויחפז משה ויקד ארצה וישתחו: ויאמר אם נא מצאתי חן בעיניך אדני ילך נא אדני בקרבנו כי עם קשה ערף הוא וסלחת לעוננו ולחטאתנו ונחלתנו: ויאמר הנה אנכי כרת ברית נגד כל עמך אעשה נפלאת אשר לא נבראו בכל הארץ ובכל הגוים וראה כל העם אשר אתה בקרבו את מעשה יהוה כי נורא הוא אשר אני עשה עמך: שמר לך את אשר אנכי מצוך היום הנני גרש מפניך את האמרי והכנעני והפרזי והחוי והיבוסי: השמר לך פן תכרת ברית ליושב הארץ אשר אתה בא עליה פן יהיה למוקש בקרבך: כי את מזבחתם תתצון ואת מצבתם תשברון ואת אשרתו תכרתון: כי לא תשתחוה לאל אחר כי יהוה קנא שמו אל קנא הוא: פן תכרת ברית ליושב הארץ וזנו אחרי אלהיהם וזבחו לאלהיהם וקרא לך ואכלת מזבחו: ולקחת מבנתיו לבניך ובנתיו זנות אחרי אלהיהם והזנו את בניך אחרי אלהיהם: אלהי מסכה לא תעשה לך: את חג המצות תשמר שבעת ימים תאכל מצות אשר צויתך למועד חדש האביב כי בחדש האביב יצאת ממצרים: כל פטר רחם לי וכל מקנך תזכר פטר שור ושה: ופטר חמור תפדה בשה וכל בכור בניך תפדה ולא יראו פני ריקם: ששת ימים תעבד וביום השביעי תשבת בחריש ובקציר תשבת: וחג שבעת תעשה לך בכורי קציר חטים וחג האסיף תקופת השנה: שלש פעמים בשנה יראה כל זכורך את פני האדון יהוה אלהי ישראל: כי אורישׁ גוים מפניך והרחבתי את גבלך ולא יחמד איש את ארצך בעלתך לראות את פני יהוה אלהיך שלש פעמים בשנה: לא תשחט על חמץ דם זבחי ולא ילין לבקר זבח חג הפסח: ראשית בכורי אדמתך תביא בית יהוה אלהיך לא תבשל גדי בחלב אמו: [19] ויאמר יהוה אל משה כתב לך את הדברים האלה כי על פי הדברים האלה כרתי אתך ברית ואת ישראל: ויהי שם עם יהוה ארבעים יום וארבעים לילה לחם לא אכל ומים לא שתה ויכתב על הלחת את דברי הברית עשרת הדברים: ויהי ברדת משה מהר סיני ושני לחת העדת ביד משה ברדתו מן ההר ומשה לא ידע כי קרן עור פניו בדברו אתו: וירא אהרן וכל בני ישראל את משה והנה קרן עור פניו וייראו מגשת אליו: ויקרא אליהם משה ויפנו אליו אהרן וכל הנשאים בעדה וידבר משה אליהם: ואחרי כן נגשו כל בני ישראל ויצו אתם את כל אשר דבר יהוה אתו בהר סיני: ויכל משה מדבר אתם ויתן על פניו מסוה: ובבא משה לפני יהוה לדבר אתו יסיר את המסוה עד צאתו ויצא ודבר אל בני ישראל את אשר יצוה: וראו בני ישראל את פני משה כי קרן עור פני משה והשיב משה את המסוה על פניו עד בואו לדבר אתו: [20] ויקהל משה את כל עדת בני ישראל ויאמר אלהם אלה הדברים אשר צוה יהוה לעשות אתם: ששת ימים תעשה מלאכה וביום השביעי יהיה לכם קדש שבת שבתון ליהוה כל העשה בו מלאכה יומת: לא תבערו אש בכל משבתיכם ביום השבת: ויאמר משה אל כל עדת בני ישראל לאמר זה הדבר אשר צוה יהוה לאמר: קחו מאתכם תרומה ליהוה כל נדיב לבו יביאה את תרומת יהוה זהב וכסף ונחשת: ותכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני ושש ועזים: ועורת אילם מאדמים ועורת תחשים ועצי שטים: שמן למאור בשמים לשמן המשחה ולקטרת הסמים: אבני שהם ואבני מלואים לאפד ולחשן: וכל חכם לב בכם יבאו ויעשו את כל אשר צוה יהוה: את המשכן את אהלו ואת מכסהו את קרסיו ואת קרשיו את בריחו את עמדיו ואת אדניו: את הארון ואת הבדים ואת הכפרת ואת פרכת הסך: את השלחן ואת בדיו ואת כל כליו ואת לחם הפנים: ואת מנורת המאור ואת כליה ואת נרתיה ואת שמן המאור: ואת מזבח הקטרת ואת בדיו ואת שמן המשחה ואת קטרת הסמים ואת מסך פתח לפתח המשכן: את מזבח העלה ואת מכבר הנחשת אשר לו את בדיו ואת כל כליו את הכיור ואת כנו: את קלעי החצר את עמדיו ואת אדניו ואת מסך שער החצר: את יתדת המשכן ואת יתדת החצר ואת מיתרתם: את בגדי השרד לשרת בקדש את בגדי הקדש לאהרן הכהן ואת בגדי בניו לכהן: ויצאו כל עדת בני ישראל מלפני משה: ויבאו כל איש אשר נשאו לבו וכל אשר נדבו רוחו אתו הביאו את תרומת יהוה למלאכת אהל מועד ולכל עבדתו ולבגדי הקדש: והאנשים על הנשים באו כל נדיב לב הביאו חח ונזם וטבעת וכומז כל כלי זהב וכל איש אשר הניף תנופת זהב ליהוה: וכל אשר נמצא אתו תכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני ושש ועזים ועורת אילם מאדמים ועורת תחשים הביאו: כל מרים תרומת כסף ונחשת הביאו את תרומת יהוה וכל אשר נמצא אתו עצי שטים לכל מלאכת העבדה: וכל אשה חכמת לב בידיה טוו ויביאו מטוה את התכלת ואת הארגמן את תולעת השני ואת השש: וכל הנשים אשר נשא לבן בחכמה אתן טוו את העזים: והנשאים הביאו את אבני השהם ואת אבני המלואים לאפד ולחשן: ואת הבשם ואת השמן למאור ולשמן המשחה ולקטרת הסמים: כל איש ואשה אשר נדב לבם להביא למלאכה אשר צוה יהוה לעשות ביד משה הביאו בני ישראל נדבה ליהוה: [21] ויאמר משה אל בני ישראל ראו קרא יהוה בשם בצלאל בן אורי בן חור למטה יהודה: וימלא אתו רוח אלהים בחכמה בתבונה ובדעת ובכל מלאכה: ולחשב מחשבת לעשות בזהב ובכסף ובנחשת: ובחרשת אבן למלאת ובחרשת עץ לעשות בכל מלאכת מחשבת: ולהורת נתן בלבו הוא ואהליאב בן אחיסמך למטה דן: מלא אתם חכמת לב לעשות את כל מלאכת חרש וחשב ורקם בתכלת ובארגמן בתולעת השני ובשש וארג עשי כל מלאכה וחשבי מחשבת: ועשה בצלאל ואהליאב וכל איש חכם לב אשר נתן יהוה חכמה ותבונה בהמה לדעת לעשות את כל מלאכת עבדת הקדש לכל אשר צוה יהוה: [22] ויקרא משה אל בצלאל ואל אהליאב ואל כל איש חכם לב אשר נתן יהוה חכמה בלבו כל אשר נשאו לבו אל הקרב אל המלאכה לעשתה: ויקחו את כל התרומה אשר הביאו בני ישראל למלאכת עבדת הקדש לעשות אתה והם הביאו אליו עוד נדבה בבקר בבקר: ויבאו כל החכמים העשים את כל מלאכת הקדש איש איש ממלאכתו אשר הם עשים: ויאמרו אל משה לאמר מרבים העם להביא מדי העבדה למלאכה אשר צוה יהוה לעשות אתה: ויצו משה ויעבירו קול במחנה לאמר איש ואשה אל יעשו עוד מלאכה לתרומת הקדש ויכלא העם מהביא: והמלאכה היתה דים לכל המלאכה לעשות אתה והותר: ויעש כל חכם לב בעשי המלאכה את המשכן עשר יריעת שש משזר ותכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני כרבים מעשה חשב עשה אתם: אורך היריעה האחת שמנה ועשרים באמה ורחב היריעה האחת ארבע באמות מדה אחת ליריעות: ויחבר את חמש היריעות אחת אל אחת וחמש היריעות חבר אחת אל אחת: ויעש לולאת תכלת על שפת היריעה האחת מקצה בחברת כן עשה בשפת היריעה השנית בחברת השנית: חמשים לולאת עשה ביריעה האחת ועשה חמשים לולאת בקצה היריעה אשר בחברת השנית מקבלת הלולאת אחת אל אחת: ויעש חמשים קרסי זהב ויחבר את היריעת אחת אל אחת בקרסים ויהי המשכן אחד: ויעש יריעת עזים לאהל על המשכן עשתי עשרה יריעת עשה אתם: אורך היריעה האחת שלשים באמה ורחב היריעה האחת ארבע באמות מדה אחת לעשתי עשרה יריעת: ויחבר את חמש היריעת לבד ואת שש היריעת לבד ואת היריעה הששית כפל אל מול פני האהל: ויעש חמשים לולאת על שפת היריעה הקצה החברת ומחמשים לולאת על שפת היריעה החברת השנית: ויעש קרסי נחשת חמשים לחבר את האהל והיה אחד: ויעש מכסה לאהל עורת אילם מאדמים ומכסה עורת תחשים מלמעלה: ויעש את הקרשים למשכן עצי שטים עמדים: עשר אמות ארך הקרש ואמה וחצי האמה רחב הקרש האחד: שתי ידת לקרש האחד משלבת אחת אל אחת כן עשה לכל קרשי המשכן: ויעש את הקרשים למשכן עשרים קרש לפאת נגבה תימנה: ואת ארבעים אדני כסף עשה תחת עשרים הקרש שני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד לשתי ידתיו ושני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד לשתי ידתיו: ולצלע השנית למשכן לפאת צפון עשרים קרש: וארבעים אדניהם כסף שני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד ושני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד: ולירכתי המשכן ימה עשה ששה קרשים: ושני קרשים עשה למקצעת המשכן בירכתים: והיו תאמם מלמטה ויחדו יהיו תמים על ראשו אל הטבעת האחת כן עשה לשניהם למקצעת שני יהיו: והיו שמנה קרשים ושש עשרה אדניהם כסף שנים אדנים תחת הקרש האחד: ויעש בריחם עצי שטים חמשה לקרשי צלע המשכן האחת: וחמשה בריחם לקרשי צלע המשכן השנית וחמשה בריחם לקרשי צלע המשכן לירכתים ימה: ויעש את הבריח התיכן בתוך הקרשים מבריח אל בריח: [23] ואת הקרשים צפה זהב ואת טבעתיהם עשה זהב בתים לבריחם וצפה את הבריחם זהב: ויקם את המשכן כמשפטו אשר הראה יהוה אתו: ויעש את הפרכת תכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני ושש משזר מעשה חשב עשה אתה: ואת ארבעה עמדיה שטים ויצף אתם זהב וויהיהם זהב וילט להם ארבעה אדני כסף: ויעש מסך לפתח האהל שש משזר ותכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני מעשה רקם: וחמשה עמדיהם ווייהם וצפה ראשיהם וחשקיהם זהב וחמשה אדניהם נחשת: ויעש את ארון עצי שטים אמתים ארכו ואמתים וחצי רחבו ואמתים וחצי קומתו: ויצף אתו זהב טהור מבית ומחוץ וצפה עליו זר זהב סביב: ויצק לו ארבע טבעת זהב על ארבע פעמתיו ושתי טבעת על צלעו האחת ושתי טבעת על צלעו השנית: ויעש בדי עצי שטים ויצף אתם זהב: ויבא את הבדים בטבעת על צלעת הארון לשאת את הארון בהם: ויעש כפרת זהב טהור אמתים וחצי ארכה ואמה וחצי רחבה: ויעש שני כרבים זהב מקשה עשה אתם מן שני קצות הכפרת: כרוב אחד מקצה מזה וכרוב אחד מקצה מזה מן הכפרת עשה את הכרבים על שני קצותיו: ויהי הכרבים פרשי כנפים למעלה סככים בכנפיהם על הכפרת ופניהם איש אל אחיו אל הכפרת היו פני הכרבים: ויעש את השלחן עצי שטים אמתים ארכו ואמה רחבו ואמה וחצי קומתו: ויצף אתו זהב טהור ויעש לו זר זהב סביב: ויעש לו מסגרת טפח סביב ויעש זר זהב למסגרתו סביב: ויצק לו ארבע טבעת זהב ויתן את הטבעת על ארבע הפאת אשר לארבע רגליו: לעמת המסגרת היו הטבעת בתים לבדים לשאת את השלחן: ויעש את הבדים עצי שטים ויצף אתם זהב ויסב בהם את השלחן: ויעש את כליו אשר עליו ואת קשותיו ואת מנקיותיו ואת מכסיותיו אשר יסך בהם זהב טהור: ויעש על השלחן את לחם הפנים לפני תמיד: ויעש את המנורה זהב טהור מקשה עשה את המנורה ירכה וקנה גביעיה כפתריה ופרחיה ממנה היו: ושש קנים יצאים מצדיה שלשה קני מנורה מצדה האחד ושלשה קני מנורה מצדה השני: שלשה גביעים משקדים בקנה האחד כפתר ופרח ושלשה גביעים משקדים בקנה האחד כפתר ופרח כן לששת הקנים היוצאים מן המנורה: ובמנורה ארבעה גביעים משקדים כפתריה ופרחיה: וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה לששת הקנים היוצאים ממנה למעשהם: כפתריהם וקניהם ממנה היו כלה מקשה אחת זהב טהור: ויעש את נרתיה שבעה ומלקחיה ומחתתיה זהב טהור: ככר זהב עשה אתה ואת כל כליה: ויעש את מזבח הקטרת עצי שטים אמתים ארכו ואמתים רחבו רבוע יהיה ואמתים וחצי קומתו ומן ממנו קרנתיו: ויצף אתו זהב טהור את גגו ואת קירתיו סביב ואת קרנתיו ויעש לו זר זהב סביב: ושתי טבעת זהב עשה לו מתחת לזרו על שתי צלעתיו על שתי צדיו תעשה ולבתים לבדים לשאת אתו בהם: ויעש את הבדים עצי שטים ויצף אתם זהב: ויתן את המזבח על שפת הקדש לפני הפרכת אשר על ארון העדת לפני הכפרת אשר על העדת אשר אדבר אליך שמה: [24] ויקטר עליו אהרן קטרת סמים בבקר בבקר בהיטיבו את הנרת יקטרנה: ובהעלת אהרן את הנרת בין הערבים יקטרנה קטרת תמיד לפני יהוה לדרתיכם: לא תעלו עליו קטרת זרה ועלה ומנחה ונסך לא תסכו עליו: וכפר אהרן על קרנתיו אחת בשנה מדם חטאת הכפרים אחת בשנה יכפר עליו לדרתיכם קדש קדשים הוא ליהוה: ויעש את כיור נחשת וכנו נחשת לרחצה ונתן אתו בין אהל מועד ובין המזבח ונתת שמה מים: ורחצו אהרן ובניו ממנו את ידיהם ואת רגליהם: בבאם אל אהל מועד ירחצו מים ולא ימתו או בגשתם אל המזבח לשרת להקטיר אשה ליהוה: רחוץ ידים ורגלים ולא ימתו והיתה להם חקת עולם לו ולזרעו לדרתם: ויעש את שמן המשחה קדש ואת קטרת הסמים רקח מעשה רקח שמן משחת קדש יהיה: ויעש את שמן המשחה קדש ואת קטרת הסמים רקח מעשה רקח שמן משחת קדש יהיה: ומשחת בו את אהל מועד ואת ארון העדת: ואת השלחן ואת כל כליו ואת המנורה ואת כליה ואת מזבח הקטרת: ואת מזבח העלה ואת כל כליו ואת הכיור ואת כנו: וקדשת אתם והיו קדש קדשים כל הנגע בהם יקדש: ואת אהרן ואת בניו תמשח ואת בניו תקדש לכהן לי: ואל בני ישראל תדבר לאמר שמן משחת קדש יהיה זה לי לדרתיכם: על בשר אדם לא יסך ובמתכנתו לא תעשו כמהו קדש הוא קדש יהיה לכם: איש אשר ירקח כמהו ואשר יתן ממנו על זר והכרת מעמיו: ויאמר יהוה אל משה קח לך סמים נטף ושחלת וחלבנה סמים ולבנה זכה בד בבד תהיה: ועשית אתה קטרת רקח מעשה רקח ממלח טהור קדש: ושחקת ממנה הדק ונתתה ממנה לפני העדת באהל מועד אשר אועד לך שמה קדש קדשים תהיה לכם: והקטרת אשר תעשה במתכנתה לא תעשו לכם קדש תהיה לך ליהוה: איש אשר יעשה כמו כן להריח בו והכרת מעמיו: [25] ויאמר יהוה אל משה ראה קראתי בשם בצלאל בן אורי בן חור למטה יהודה: וימלא אתו רוח אלהים בחכמה בתבונה ובדעת ובכל מלאכה: ולחשב מחשבת לעשות בזהב ובכסף ובנחשת: ובחרשת אבן למלאת ובחרשת עץ לעשות בכל מלאכת מחשבת: ולהורת נתן בלבו הוא ואהליאב בן אחיסמך למטה דן: מלא אתם חכמת לב לעשות את כל מלאכת חרש וחשב ורקם בתכלת ובארגמן בתולעת השני ובשש וארג עשי כל מלאכה וחשבי מחשבת: ועשה בצלאל ואהליאב וכל איש חכם לב אשר נתן יהוה חכמה ותבונה בהמה לדעת לעשות את כל מלאכת עבדת הקדש לכל אשר צוה יהוה: [26] ויקרא משה אל בצלאל ואל אהליאב ואל כל איש חכם לב אשר נתן יהוה חכמה בלבו כל אשר נשאו לבו אל הקרב אל המלאכה לעשתה: ויקחו את כל התרומה אשר הביאו בני ישראל למלאכת עבדת הקדש לעשות אתה והם הביאו אליו עוד נדבה בבקר בבקר: ויבאו כל החכמים העשים את כל מלאכת הקדש איש איש ממלאכתו אשר הם עשים: ויאמרו אל משה לאמר מרבים העם להביא מדי העבדה למלאכה אשר צוה יהוה לעשות אתה: ויצו משה ויעבירו קול במחנה לאמר איש ואשה אל יעשו עוד מלאכה לתרומת הקדש ויכלא העם מהביא: והמלאכה היתה דים לכל המלאכה לעשות אתה והותר: ויעש כל חכם לב בעשי המלאכה את המשכן עשר יריעת שש משזר ותכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני כרבים מעשה חשב עשה אתם: אורך היריעה האחת שמנה ועשרים באמה ורחב היריעה האחת ארבע באמות מדה אחת ליריעות: ויחבר את חמש היריעות אחת אל אחת וחמש היריעות חבר אחת אל אחת: ויעש לולאת תכלת על שפת היריעה האחת מקצה בחברת כן עשה בשפת היריעה השנית בחברת השנית: חמשים לולאת עשה ביריעה האחת ועשה חמשים לולאת בקצה היריעה אשר בחברת השנית מקבלת הלולאת אחת אל אחת: ויעש חמשים קרסי זהב ויחבר את היריעת אחת אל אחת בקרסים ויהי המשכן אחד: ויעש יריעת עזים לאהל על המשכן עשתי עשרה יריעת עשה אתם: אורך היריעה האחת שלשים באמה ורחב היריעה האחת ארבע באמות מדה אחת לעשתי עשרה יריעת: ויחבר את חמש היריעת לבד ואת שש היריעת לבד ואת היריעה הששית כפל אל מול פני האהל: ויעש חמשים לולאת על שפת היריעה הקצה החברת ומחמשים לולאת על שפת היריעה החברת השנית: ויעש קרסי נחשת חמשים לחבר את האהל והיה אחד: ויעש מכסה לאהל עורת אילם מאדמים ומכסה עורת תחשים מלמעלה: ויעש את הקרשים למשכן עצי שטים עמדים: עשר אמות ארך הקרש ואמה וחצי האמה רחב הקרש האחד: שתי ידת לקרש האחד משלבת אחת אל אחת כן עשה לכל קרשי המשכן: ויעש את הקרשים למשכן עשרים קרש לפאת נגבה תימנה: ואת ארבעים אדני כסף עשה תחת עשרים הקרש שני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד לשתי ידתיו ושני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד לשתי ידתיו: ולצלע השנית למשכן לפאת צפון עשרים קרש: וארבעים אדניהם כסף שני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד ושני אדנים תחת הקרש האחד: ולירכתי המשכן ימה עשה ששה קרשים: ושני קרשים עשה למקצעת המשכן בירכתים: והיו תאמם מלמטה ויחדו יהיו תמים על ראשו אל הטבעת האחת כן עשה לשניהם למקצעת שני יהיו: והיו שמנה קרשים ושש עשרה אדניהם כסף שנים אדנים תחת הקרש האחד: ויעש בריחם עצי שטים חמשה לקרשי צלע המשכן האחת: וחמשה בריחם לקרשי צלע המשכן השנית וחמשה בריחם לקרשי צלע המשכן לירכתים ימה: ויעש את הבריח התיכן בתוך הקרשים מבריח אל בריח: [27] ואת הקרשים צפה זהב ואת טבעתיהם עשה זהב בתים לבריחם וצפה את הבריחם זהב: ויקם את המשכן כמשפטו אשר הראה יהוה אתו: ויעש את הפרכת תכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני ושש משזר מעשה חשב עשה אתה: ואת ארבעה עמדיה שטים ויצף אתם זהב וויהיהם זהב וילט להם ארבעה אדני כסף: ויעש מסך לפתח האהל שש משזר ותכלת וארגמן ותולעת שני מעשה רקם: וחמשה עמדיהם ווייהם וצפה ראשיהם וחשקיהם זהב וחמשה אדניהם נחשת: ויעש את ארון עצי שטים אמתים ארכו ואמתים וחצי רחבו ואמתים וחצי קומתו: ויצף אתו זהב טהור מבית ומחוץ וצפה עליו זר זהב סביב: ויצק לו ארבע טבעת זהב על ארבע פעמתיו ושתי טבעת על צלעו האחת ושתי טבעת על צלעו השנית: ויעש בדי עצי שטים ויצף אתם זהב: ויבא את הבדים בטבעת על צלעת הארון לשאת את הארון בהם: ויעש כפרת זהב טהור אמתים וחצי ארכה ואמה וחצי רחבה: ויעש שני כרבים זהב מקשה עשה אתם מן שני קצות הכפרת: כרוב אחד מקצה מזה וכרוב אחד מקצה מזה מן הכפרת עשה את הכרבים על שני קצותיו: ויהי הכרבים פרשי כנפים למעלה סככים בכנפיהם על הכפרת ופניהם איש אל אחיו אל הכפרת היו פני הכרבים: ויעש את השלחן עצי שטים אמתים ארכו ואמה רחבו ואמה וחצי קומתו: ויצף אתו זהב טהור ויעש לו זר זהב סביב: ויעש לו מסגרת טפח סביב ויעש זר זהב למסגרתו סביב: ויצק לו ארבע טבעת זהב ויתן את הטבעת על ארבע הפאת אשר לארבע רגליו: לעמת המסגרת היו הטבעת בתים לבדים לשאת את השלחן: ויעש את הבדים עצי שטים ויצף אתם זהב ויסב בהם את השלחן: ויעש את כליו אשר עליו ואת קשותיו ואת מנקיותיו ואת מכסיותיו אשר יסך בהם זהב טהור: ויעש על השלחן את לחם הפנים לפני תמיד: ויעש את המנורה זהב טהור מקשה עשה את המנורה ירכה וקנה גביעיה כפתריה ופרחיה ממנה היו: ושש קנים יצאים מצדיה שלשה קני מנורה מצדה האחד ושלשה קני מנורה מצדה השני: שלשה גביעים משקדים בקנה האחד כפתר ופרח ושלשה גביעים משקדים בקנה האחד כפתר ופרח כן לששת הקנים היוצאים מן המנורה: ובמנורה ארבעה גביעים משקדים כפתריה ופרחיה: וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה וכפתר תחת שני הקנים ממנה לששת הקנים היוצאים ממנה למעשהם: כפתריהם וקניהם ממנה היו כלה מקשה אחת זהב טהור: ויעש את נרתיה שבעה ומלקחיה ומחתתיה זהב טהור: ככר זהב עשה אתה ואת כל כליה: ויעש את מזבח הקטרת עצי שטים אמתים ארכו ואמתים רחבו רבוע יהיה ואמתים וחצי קומתו ומן ממנו קרנתיו: ויצף אתו זהב טהור את גגו ואת קירתיו סביב ואת קרנתיו ויעש לו זר זהב סביב: ושתי טבעת זהב עשה לו מתחת לזרו על שתי צלעתיו על שתי צדיו תעשה ולבתים לבדים לשאת אתו בהם: ויעש את הבדים עצי שטים ויצף אתם זהב: ויתן את המזבח על שפת הקדש לפני הפרכת אשר על ארון העדת לפני הכפרת אשר על העדת אשר אדבר אליך שמה: [28] ויקטר עליו אהרן קטרת סמים בבקר בבקר בהיטיבו את הנרת יקטרנה: ובהעלת אהרן את הנרת בין הערבים יקטרנה קטרת תמיד לפני יהוה לדרתיכם: לא תעלו עליו קטרת זרה ועלה ומנחה ונסך לא תסכו עליו: וכפר אהרן על קרנתיו אחת בשנה מדם חטאת הכפרים אחת בשנה יכפר עליו לדרתיכם קדש קדשים הוא ליהוה: ויעש את כיור נחשת וכנו נחשת לרחצה ונתן אתו בין אהל מועד ובין המזבח ונתת שמה מים: ורחצו אהרן ובניו ממנו את ידיהם ואת רגליהם: בבאם אל אהל מועד ירחצו מים ולא ימתו או בגשתם אל המזבח לשרת להקטיר אשה ליהוה: רחוץ ידים ורגלים ולא ימתו והיתה להם חקת עולם לו ולזרעו לדרתם: ויעש את שמן המשחה קדש ואת קטרת הסמים רקח מעשה רקח שמן משחת קדש יהיה: ויעש את שמן המשחה קדש ואת קטרת הסמים רקח מעשה רקח שמן משחת קדש יהיה: ומשחת בו את אהל מועד ואת ארון העדת: ואת השלחן ואת כל כליו ואת המנורה ואת כליה ואת מזבח הקטרת: ואת מזבח העלה ואת כל כליו ואת הכיור ואת כנו: וקדשת אתם והיו קדש קדשים כל הנגע בהם יקדש: ואת אהרן ואת בניו תמשח ואת בניו ת

and although forgiveness of sin and free redemption are given to everyone who is tired and has a heavy load [7] of sin, and although the blood of Christ is able to cleanse us from all sin however great it may be, that person does not go to Christ for redemption. On the contrary, he constructs a kind of repentance and righteousness from his own works, and he will continue to trust that God, because of his prayers and his alms or other things, will revive him; in this way he reviles the blood and righteousness of Christ and tries to buy a portion of the kingdom of heaven by his own righteousness.

Six, furthermore, when someone abandons some of his sins for a certain time — this is not repentance. If someone who swears, or lies, or steals, or drinks, or does other wicked things, abandons these for a certain time, but does them again [8] another time — this is not repentance, and God will not accept it.[8] Herod repented in that way, because he feared John, whom he knew to be a righteous and holy man, and he protected him and often listened to him and did [things].[9] Mark 6:20. Nevertheless, he did not do what was appropriate: he did not abandon his sins. He did not listen to John, to what he said to him, that he was not permitted to take his brother's wife, and he did not give up his brother's wife.

In this way, many people resemble Herod. When they are being rebuked, they fear and do certain things, but they do not repent and abandon these sins which are as [9] dear to them as their right eye or their right hand. None of these things are repentance.

8. The clause is UA seems to be defective: either a relative marker *d-* has to be inserted before *yamyānā*, or the sentence connective *w-* befor *šaḇiq*. The translation is based on the first possibility.

9. This quotation gives the impression of being literally translated from the Peshitta, the verb *ʿḇādā*, 'to do', without object being as strange in UA as in English.

2. *The early Bible translation: the Gospel of Matthew, chapter 2 (1846)*[10]

ܡܬܝ ܒܪ ܐܘܢ ܒܥܕ ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܐܬܝܠܕ ܒܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܝܡܝ ܗܪܘܕܣ ܡܠܟܐ:
ܗܐ ܡܓܘܣܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܝܢܚܐ ܐܬܘ ܠܝܪܘܫܠܡ: 2. ܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܕܝܠܕ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܗܘܕ
ܐܝܟ ܚܙܝܢ ܟܘܟܒܗ ܒܡܕܢܚܐ ܘܐܬܝܢ ܠܡܣܓܕ ܠܗ: 3. ܗܪܘܕܣ ܡܠܟܐ ܫܡܥ ܗܠܝܢ ܘܬܪܥܫ
ܐܬܪ ܟܠ ܝܪܘܫܠܡ ܥܡܗ: 4. ܘܟܢܫ ܟܠ ܪܒܪܒܢܐ ܘܣܦܪܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܫܐܠ ܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܟ ܢܗܘܐ
ܝܠܕܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ ܢܬܝܠܕ: 5. ܐܡܪܘ ܠܗ ܒܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܝܡܝ ܢܒܝܐ ܟܬܝܒ: 6. ܘܐܢܬ
ܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܐܪܥܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܠܐ ܙܥܘܪܬ ܐܢܬ ܒܝܢ ܪܒܪܒܢܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܡܢܟ ܢܦܩ ܡܪܝܐ
ܕܢܪܥܐ ܠܥܡܝ ܐܝܣܪܝܠ: 7. ܗܝܕܝܢ ܗܪܘܕܣ ܩܪܐ ܠܚܟܝܡܐ ܒܣܬܪ ܘܫܐܠ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܙܒܢ
ܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܐܬܪܐܝ ܠܗ: 8. ܘܫܕܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܠܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܘܐܡܪ ܐܙܠܘ ܫܐܠܘ ܒܫܘܪ
ܛܠܝܐ ܘܟܕ ܬܫܟܚܘܢ ܐܬܝܒܘ ܠܝ ܕܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܐܣܓܕ ܠܗ: 9. ܗܠܝܢ ܫܡܥܘ ܡܠܟܐ
ܘܐܙܠܘ ܘܗܐ ܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܚܙܝܬ ܒܡܕܢܚܐ ܩܕܡ ܠܗܘܢ ܥܕ ܕܐܬܐ ܘܩܐܡ ܥܠ ܐܬܪ ܗܘܐ
ܛܠܝܐ ܕܟܘܟܒܐ ܗܘ: 10. ܘܟܕ ܚܕܝܘ ܚܕܝ ܣܓܝܐܝܬ ܡܢ: 11. ܘܥܠܘ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܝܡܪ
ܘܚܙܘ ܠܛܠܝܐ ܥܡ ܡܪܝܡ ܐܡܗ ܕܝܠܕܐ ܘܢܦܠܘ ܘܣܓܕܘ ܠܗ ܘܦܬܚܘ ܓܢܙܝܗܘܢ
ܘܩܪܒܘ ܠܗ ܗܕܝܐ ܕܕܗܒ ܘܠܒܢܬܐ ܘܡܘܪ: 12. ܘܐܬܓܠܝ ܠܗܘܢ ܒܚܠܡܐ ܕܠܐ ܢܗܦܟܘܢ
ܠܘܬ ܗܪܘܕܣ ܐܬܦܪܫܘ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܐܚܪܢܐ: 13. ܘܟܕ ܐܙܠܘ ܗܐ ܡܠܐܟ ܡܪܝܐ ܐܬܓܠܝ
ܠܝܘܣܦ ܒܚܠܡܐ ܘܐܡܪ ܩܘܡ ܣܒ ܠܛܠܝܐ ܘܐܡܗ ܘܙܠ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܕܝܣܪܝܠ ܡܛܘ ܓܒܪ
ܕܒܥܘ ܢܦܫܐ ܕܛܠܝܐ ܡܝܬܘ: 14. ܘܩܡ ܝܘܣܦ ܘܐܙܠ ܠܐܪܥܐ ܕܝܣܪܝܠ ܗܘ ܘܐܡܗ

10. The notes marked with an * are those of the original. These refer to the Greek text where it differs from the Peshitta. Since the NA translations follow the Hebrew and Greek texts quite literally, current English versions will suffice as translation. For the LUA Bible translations, see 4.2.4.

ᏂᎯᏱᏉ ᏓᏁᏎ ᏰᏂᏍᏐ ᎤᏓᏅᏛᏍᏗ ᎠᏎᏉᏱ: ᎤᏓᏍᏗᏱᏉ ᏓᎵᏅᏘᏂᏍ: 15. ᏱᏗᏱᏉᏱ ᏎᏁᏎ ᏰᏁᏉ
ᏓᎾᏁᏍᏗᏱᏉᏍ ᏱᏰᏍᏂᏍᏎ: ᏧᏂᏍᏎ ᏱᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏍᏂᏱᏉᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏃᏁᏉᏱ ᏂᏍ ᏎᏁᏎ ᏕᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏃᏁᏉᏱ:
ᏧᏂᏍ ᏅᏂᏃᏂᏍ ᏍᏎᏁ ᏓᎵᏍᏎᏂᏍ.

16. ᏂᏍᏁᏎ ᏰᏂᏍᏐᏍ: ᏎᏂ ᏱᏰᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏰᏱᏗᏍᏎ ᏂᏍ ᎤᏁᏱᏰᏎᏉᏱ: ᎾᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏍᏎᏁ
ᎤᏛᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᎤᏰᏂᏅᏉᏱ ᎾᏍᏎ ᏍᏎᏁᏎ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᎤᏓᏅᏘᏂᏍᏗᏱᏉᏍ ᏱᏍᏎᏁᏰᏂᏍ: ᏧᏂᏍ ᏎᏂ ᎾᏍᏎ ᏱᏂᏍᏎ
ᎤᏁᏓᏅᏍᏗ: ᏂᏍᏁᏎ ᏰᏂᏍᏐᏍ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏂᏍ ᎤᏁᏱᏰᏎᏉᏱ. 17. ᏂᏍᏁᏎ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᎤᏰᏂᏍᏎ ᏧᏂᏍᏎ
ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏰᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᎾᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ: 18. ᏎᏁᏎ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏂᏍᏎᏁᏎ ᎾᏍᏎᏉᏱ: ᏧᏂᏍᏎ
ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏰᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᎾᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ: 19. ᏂᏍᏁᏎ ᏰᏂᏍᏐᏍ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏰᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ
ᏱᏰᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏰᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏰᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏰᏱ ᏧᏂᏍᏎᏉᏱ ᏱᏰᏱ

3. *The early Bible translation: Ruth (1852)*

סחד בֹּנְסמ

מבלמס׃ 2.

1. מִסְוֹלֵל כמסְקֵל בְּקֵנְל בְּקֵנְל: מִסְוֹלֵל כֹּבְלֵל בֹּנְכֵל: מְלְוֹלֵל לְלֵל בְּסִוֹלֵל כמסְקֵל בְּקֵנְל: 2. בְּסִלֵּלֵל בְּסִוֹסְקֵל: לְלֵסְקֵל בֹּנְכֵל כמסְקֵל: וסִ מִקְבֵּסְוֹסִם סְלֵּל כֹּמְקֵוֹסִם. מִלֵּסְקֵל כֹּנְכֵל: לְלֵסְקֵל בֹּנְכֵל כמסְקֵל: וֹלֵל מִקְבֵּסְוֹסִם: מְלֵסְקֵל בְּקֵנְ

ⵉⵙⵙⵓⵔⵏ ⵜⵉⵏⵜ ⵜⵉⵎⵓⵔⵜ ⵏ ⵜⵎⵓⵔⵜ ⵏⵏⵙ ⵙ ⵜⵎⵓⵔⵜ ⵏⵏⵙ

ואמר אליהם אל תקראו לי נעמי קראו לי מרא כי המר שדי לי מאד׃ 9. מלאתי הלכתי ריקם השיבני יהוה למה תקראנה לי נעמי ויהוה ענה בי ושדי הרע אתי׃ 10. ותשאנה קולן ותבכינה עוד ותשק ערפה לחמותה ורות דבקה בה׃ 11. ותאמר הנה שבה יבמתך אל עמה ואל אלהיה שובי אחרי יבמתך׃ 12. ותאמר נעמי שבנה בנתי למה תלכנה עמי העוד לי בנים במעי והיו לכם לאנשים׃ 13. השבר תשברנה בנתי כי מרה לי מאד מידכם כי יד יהוה יצאה בי׃ 14. ותשאנה קולן ותבכינה עוד ותשק ערפה לחמותה ורות דבקה בה׃ 15. ותאמר הנה שבה יבמתך אל עמה ואל אלהיה שובי אחרי יבמתך׃ 16. ותאמר רות אל תפגעי בי לעזבך לשוב מאחריך כי אל אשר תלכי אלך ובאשר תלוני אלין עמך עמי ואלהיך אלהי׃ 17. באשר תמותי אמות ושם אקבר כה יעשה יהוה לי וכה יוסיף כי המות יפריד בינו ובינך׃ 18. ותרא כי מתאמצת היא ללכת אתה ותחדל לדבר אליה׃ 19. ותלכנה שתיהן עד כי באתן בית לחם ויהי כבואן בית לחם ותהם כל העיר עליהן ותאמרנה הזאת נעמי׃ 20. ותאמר אליהן אל תקראנה לי נעמי קראן לי מרא כי המר שדי לי מאד׃ 21. אני מלאה הלכתי וריקם השיבני יהוה למה תקראנה לי נעמי ויהוה ענה בי ושדי הרע אתי׃ 22. ותשב נעמי ורות המואביה כלתה עמה השבה משדי מואב והמה באו בית לחם בתחלת קציר שערים׃

מלכים׃ לא.

1. ויהי בימי שפט השפטים: ויהי: גם פתח הוא נהג: ויהי עשה ימי שפט השפטים; וכו׳: וכה היתה 2. ויהי לו איש אחד ממשפחת בית לחם יהודה׃ ויקרבו לפני השפטים; וכו׳: וכה היתה איש גבור חיל מאד מלחמה: ושמו אלימלך ושם אשתו נעמי ושם שני בניו מחלון וכליון אפרתים מבית לחם יהודה ויבאו שדי מואב ויהיו שם׃ 3. ומת אלימלך איש נעמי: ומת אלימלך: וימת אלימלך: גם אלימלך נפטר נעמי: ואיש נעמי: וישאר היא ושני בניה׃ 4. ויקחו להם נשים מנשי מואב שם האחת ערפה ושם השנית רות ויהיו שם כעשר שנים׃ 5. וימותו גם שניהם מחלון וכליון ותשאר האשה משני ילדיה ומאישה׃ 6. ותקם היא וכלותיה וישובו משדי מואב כי שמעה בשדי מואב כי פקד יהוה את עמו לתת להם לחם׃ 7. ותצא היא ושתי כלותיה מן המקום אשר היתה שם ותלכנה בדרך לשוב אל ארץ יהודה׃ 8. ותאמר נעמי לשתי כלותיה: תלכנה ושבנה איש לבית אמה: יעש יהוה עמכם חסד כאשר עשיתם עם המתים ועמדי׃ 9. יתן יהוה לכן ומצאנה מנוחה איש בבית אישה: ותשק להן ותשאנה את קולן ותבכינה׃ 10. ותאמרנה לה כי אתך נשוב לעמך ולארצך׃ 11. ותאמר נעמי: שובנה בנותי למה תלכנה עמי: הלעוד בני במעי והיו לכם לאנשים׃ 12. שובנה בנותי לכנה: הלכנה כי זקנתי מהיות לאיש: כי אמרתי יש לי תקוה גם הייתי הלילה לאיש וגם ילדתי בנים׃ 13. הלהן תשברנה עד אשר יגדלו: הלהן תעגנה מהיות לאנשים: לא בנותי כי מר לי מאד מכם: כי יצאה בי יד יהוה׃ 14. ותשנה קולן ותבכינה עוד ותשק ערפה לחמותה: ורות דבקה בה׃ 15. ותאמר: הנה שבה יבמתך אל עמה ואל אלהיה: שובי אחרי יבמתך׃

14. ותשנה קולן ותבכינה עוד ותשק ערפה לחמותה: ורות דבקה בה׃ 15. ותאמר: הנה שבה יבמתך אל עמה ואל אלהיה: שובי אחרי יבמתך׃

12. In the original edition with two *sydmi*.

13. Unusual spelling: *wā-* instead of *w-*.

ومومبحرلا بلاوة: ولاوزلا لمحبلاة. 16 ولاوزلا لجم مشاوة: ولاوزتا: شبر
لمؤمن: لاتموا ومومبحرلاة للاوة حل هلجب بحرلجرلا للاوة اةو لزلجا. 17
ولاوزتا: زبا زبرلا (حبولا) جهرلاتا بهجرلا للا: هلجا جزاوزتا للا: لا لمؤمن
مهبامرلا لجم مشاوبم. 18 ولاوزتا: لمؤمبح لاتموا: ابل جبجبلاه زتبب جرا
لبلل برولا: هلجا جرلا ابو هلجم اةو لزلجا: برتوه هج جاوهج برولا زبرو
مشاو.

مهلالاو: ج.

1 .ولجرلا هبرلا لمبجلاوا: ولابجرلا هشا: ماوا: بهشا جرلجزتا: اةو
جرووهبولا لجرلا: ولاوزتا: ملاوة لمؤمبح لزبجا: ابو ولجا جرشح. مللجلا
ولابجرلا. 2 برجلا بلهشا لزلجا هج مللجرلا جولجرلاا: ولاوزتا: لمؤمبحرلا
لزبجا: ولابجرلا. 3 ولاوزتا لمبهشا: هشا جبرلاا جرلاوا لزلجاوا لجلاوبلا:
ابوبرا لمزلا بلاهج: جبجا هج بلجلا جولاوزتا. 4 ولجلا لزاوبج: جرا لجلا لللاوهم:
لزهشتا: ابرو لاح لهلجتلا ولاح مللجرلجرلا جهلجبو. لا لجبجرا: لجبا: ولا لر
لجبجرا: هجرلجب لبا: ولجرلا: هشا جهلجا لجلا جاوهم لجشوبر: ولجلا لمؤمهم.
ولاوزتا: زلجا جرا لجبجا. 5 ولاوزتا لجلا: لجاوشا جاوجرا جرلاوا بلاوا جرلا:
هج لجلاوا هولجبمزلا يا: لجبجرا جولجرلا: اوجرلجرا: لهشاووبر بهشا جولجرلا بلجا
هلجبلجرلاوبم. 6 ولاوزتا بهشا: لجا هشا لجبجا لجلاوا: لجا اةوبر جهشلجبجا
هلجبلجرلاوبم. لجبجا لمؤمها زلجا لجبجاوا: هشجا ججرا هشا لجلجاوبر. 7 ولجلا اةوبر
لجلشلجا جاوهشجرا جرلا لجبجلاا ولجا جلجبا هلجبلجلاا: لهشاووبر حل برولجا: برولجلا
لجلشلجا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا لجبجرا: لجلشاووبر حل برولجا: برولجلا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا
بهشا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 9 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
ولججرا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
جاوبم لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: هج زلجا جاوجرا. ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 8 ولاوزتا
لجلشلجا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا لجبجرا: لجلشاووبر حل برولجا: برولجلا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا
بهشا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 9 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
ولججرا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
جاوبم لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: هج زلجا جاوجرا. ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا
لجلشلجا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا لجبجرا: لجلشاووبر حل برولجا: برولجلا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا
بهشا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 9 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
ولججرا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
جاوبم لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: هج زلجا جاوجرا. ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا
لجلشلجا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا لجبجرا: لجلشاووبر حل برولجا: برولجلا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا
بهشا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 9 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
ولججرا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
جاوبم لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: هج زلجا جاوجرا. ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا
لجلشلجا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا لجبجرا: لجلشاووبر حل برولجا: برولجلا لجلاوبلا: ولجلا
بهشا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 9 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
ولججرا لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا لجلا لمجلجاوبر
جاوبم لجلجا: ولجا لمؤمها: هج زلجا جاوجرا. ولجاوشلجلا يولجاوبم. 10 ولاوزتا

ᓂᐦᑖᐧᐃᓂᒪᓂᐦ: ᐋᐦᑖᐧᐃᓂᒪᓂᐦ ᑭᓂᐦᑖᐧᐃᓂᒪᓂᐦ ᐅᓂᐦᑖᐧᐃᓂᒪᓂᐦ ᓂᐦᑖᐧᐃᓂᒪᓂᐦ ᐅ

4. *The revised Bible translation: the Gospel of Matthew, chapter 2 (1893)*[14]

ⲙⲁⲑⲑⲁⲓⲟⲥ ⲕⲁⲡ. ⲃ.

1. ⲁⲙⲉⲛ ⲉⲓⲥⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲁⲅⲟⲓ ⲁⲡⲟ ⲓⲉⲣⲟⲥⲟⲗⲩⲙⲱⲛ ⲁⲫⲓⲭⲟⲛⲧⲟ ⲓⲉⲣⲟⲥⲟⲗⲩⲙⲁ ⲙⲁⲑⲏⲧⲁⲓ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩ: 2. ⲗⲉⲅⲟⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲡⲟⲩ ⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛ ⲟ ⲧⲉⲭⲑⲉⲓⲥ ⲃⲁⲥⲓⲗⲉⲩⲥ ⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁⲓⲱⲛ; ⲁⲥⲧⲉⲣⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲧⲟⲩⲥⲁⲙⲉⲛ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲛ ⲧⲏ ⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲏⲗⲑⲟⲙⲉⲛ ⲙⲁⲅⲟⲓ ⲁⲡⲟ ⲓⲉⲣⲟⲥⲟⲗⲩⲙⲱⲛ ⲉⲓⲥ ⲧⲟⲛ ⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁⲓⲁⲛ. 3. ⲁⲕⲟⲩⲥⲁⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲏⲣⲱⲇⲏⲥ ⲟ ⲃⲁⲥⲓⲗⲉⲩⲥ ⲉⲧⲁⲣⲁⲭⲑⲏ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲡⲁⲥⲁ ⲓⲉⲣⲟⲥⲟⲗⲩⲙⲁ ⲙⲉⲧ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩ: 4. ⲕⲁⲓ ⲥⲩⲛⲁⲅⲁⲅⲱⲛ ⲡⲁⲛⲧⲁⲥ ⲧⲟⲩⲥ ⲁⲣⲭⲓⲉⲣⲉⲓⲥ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲅⲣⲁⲙⲙⲁⲧⲉⲓⲥ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲗⲁⲟⲩ ⲉⲡⲩⲑⲁⲛⲉⲧⲟ ⲡⲟⲩ ⲟ ⲭⲣⲓⲥⲧⲟⲥ ⲅⲉⲛⲛⲁⲥⲑⲁⲓ; 5. ⲟⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲓⲡⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲧⲱ ⲉⲛ ⲃⲏⲑⲗⲉⲉⲙ ⲧⲏⲥ ⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁⲓⲁⲥ; ⲟⲩⲧⲱⲥ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲥⲧⲓⲛ ⲅⲉⲅⲣⲁⲡⲧⲁⲓ ⲇⲓⲁ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲡⲣⲟⲫⲏⲧⲟⲩ: 6. ⲕⲁⲓ ⲥⲩ ⲃⲏⲑⲗⲉⲉⲙ ⲏ ⲅⲏ ⲓⲟⲩⲇⲁ ⲟⲩⲇⲉⲙⲓⲁ ⲉⲗⲁⲭⲓⲥⲧⲏ ⲉⲓ ⲙⲏⲇⲉⲙⲓⲁ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲉⲝ ⲥⲟⲩ ⲉⲝⲉⲗⲉⲩⲥⲉⲧⲁⲓ ⲏⲅⲟⲩⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲓⲧⲧⲁⲛ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲗⲁⲟⲩ ⲙⲟⲩ ⲧⲟⲛ ⲓⲥⲣⲁⲏⲗ. 7. ⲧⲟⲧⲉ ⲏⲣⲱⲇⲏⲥ ⲗⲁⲑⲣⲁⲓⲱⲥ ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲕⲁⲗⲉⲥⲁⲙⲉⲛⲟⲥ ⲧⲟⲩⲥ ⲙⲁⲅⲟⲩⲥ ⲏⲕⲣⲓⲃⲱⲥⲉⲛ ⲁⲡ ⲁⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲧⲟⲛ ⲭⲣⲟⲛⲟⲛ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲫⲁⲓⲛⲟⲙⲉⲛⲟⲩ ⲁⲥⲧⲉⲣⲟⲩ ⲏⲅⲁⲅⲉⲛ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩⲥ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲡⲉⲙⲯⲁⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩⲥ ⲉⲓⲡⲉⲛ ⲙⲉⲧⲁⲃⲁⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲅⲉⲛⲛⲏⲥⲁⲧⲉ ⲁⲕⲣⲓⲃⲱⲥ ⲡⲉⲣⲓ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲡⲁⲓⲇⲓⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲉⲝⲉⲧⲁⲥⲁⲧⲉ ⲁⲕⲣⲓⲃⲱⲥ ⲉⲡⲓⲍⲏⲧⲏⲥⲁⲧⲉ ⲇⲉ ⲙⲉ ⲓⲛⲁ ⲕⲁⲅⲱ ⲉⲗⲑⲱⲛ ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲕⲩⲛⲏⲥⲱ ⲁⲩⲧⲱ. 9. ⲟⲓ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲕⲟⲩⲥⲁⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲃⲁⲥⲓⲗⲉⲱⲥ ⲉⲡⲟⲣⲉⲩⲑⲏⲥⲁⲛ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲓⲇⲟⲩ ⲁⲥⲧⲏⲣ ⲟⲛ ⲉⲓⲇⲟⲛ ⲉⲛ ⲧⲏ ⲁⲛⲁⲧⲟⲗⲏ ⲡⲣⲟⲏⲅⲉⲛ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩⲥ ⲉⲱⲥ ⲉⲗⲑⲱⲛ ⲉⲥⲧⲁⲑⲏ ⲉⲡⲁⲛⲱ ⲟⲩ ⲏⲛ ⲧⲟ ⲡⲁⲓⲇⲓⲟⲛ. 10. ⲓⲇⲟⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲇⲉ ⲧⲟⲛ ⲁⲥⲧⲉⲣⲁ ⲉⲭⲁⲣⲏⲥⲁⲛ ⲭⲁⲣⲁⲛ ⲙⲉⲅⲁⲗⲏⲛ ⲥⲫⲟⲇⲣⲁ. 11. ⲕⲁⲓ ⲉⲗⲑⲟⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲉⲓⲥ ⲧⲏⲛ ⲟⲓⲕⲓⲁⲛ ⲉⲩⲣⲟⲛ ⲧⲟ ⲡⲁⲓⲇⲓⲟⲛ ⲙⲉⲧⲁ ⲙⲁⲣⲓⲁⲥ ⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲏⲧⲣⲟⲥ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲡⲉⲥⲟⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲉⲕⲩⲛⲏⲥⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲧⲱ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲁⲛⲟⲓⲝⲁⲛⲧⲉⲥ ⲧⲁⲥ ⲑⲏⲥⲁⲩⲣⲟⲩⲥ ⲁⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲡⲣⲟⲥⲏⲛⲉⲅⲕⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲧⲱ ⲇⲱⲣⲁ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲭⲣⲩⲥⲟⲛ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲗⲓⲃⲁⲛⲟⲛ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲙⲩⲣⲣⲁⲛ. 12. ⲕⲁⲓ ⲭⲣⲏⲙⲁⲧⲓⲥⲑⲉⲓⲥ ⲕⲁⲧ ⲟⲛⲁⲣ (ⲙⲏ ⲁⲛⲁⲃⲏⲛⲁⲓ ⲡⲣⲟⲥ ⲏⲣⲱⲇⲏⲛ) ⲇⲓ ⲁⲗⲗⲏⲥ ⲟⲇⲟⲩ ⲁⲛⲉⲭⲱⲣⲏⲥⲁⲛ ⲉⲓⲥ ⲧⲏⲛ ⲭⲱⲣⲁⲛ ⲁⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲕⲁⲧ ⲁⲗⲗⲟ ⲇⲓⲁ ⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲅⲓⲁⲥ ⲅⲣⲁⲫⲏⲥ ⲉⲡⲟⲣⲉⲩⲟⲛⲧⲟ ⲉⲱⲥ ⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲉⲅⲁⲗⲏⲥ ⲡⲟⲗⲉⲱⲥ.

13. ⲁⲛⲁⲭⲱⲣⲏⲥⲁⲛⲧⲱⲛ ⲇⲉ ⲁⲩⲧⲱⲛ ⲓⲇⲟⲩ ⲁⲅⲅⲉⲗⲟⲥ ⲕⲩⲣⲓⲟⲩ ⲫⲁⲓⲛⲉⲧⲁⲓ ⲕⲁⲧ ⲟⲛⲁⲣ ⲧⲱ ⲓⲱⲥⲏⲫ ⲗⲉⲅⲱⲛ ⲉⲅⲉⲣⲑⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲁⲣⲁⲗⲁⲃⲉ ⲧⲟ ⲡⲁⲓⲇⲓⲟⲛ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲧⲏⲛ ⲙⲏⲧⲉⲣⲁ ⲁⲩⲧⲟⲩ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲫⲩⲅⲉ ⲉⲓⲥ ⲁⲓⲅⲩⲡⲧⲟⲛ ⲕⲁⲓ ⲓⲥⲑⲓ ⲉⲝⲉⲛⲁⲩ ⲱⲥ ⲁⲛ ⲉⲓⲡⲱ ⲥⲟⲓ ⲙⲉⲗⲗⲉⲓ ⲅⲁⲣ ⲏⲣⲱⲇⲏⲥ ⲍⲏⲧⲉⲓⲛ ⲧⲟ ⲡⲁⲓⲇⲓⲟⲛ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲁⲡⲟⲗⲉⲥⲁⲓ ⲁⲩⲧⲟ. 14. ⲟ ⲇⲉ ⲉⲅⲉⲣⲑⲉⲓⲥ ⲡⲁⲣⲉⲗⲁⲃⲉⲛ

14. To permit a comparison, the revised version of Mat. 2 is given. More vowel points seem to be missing here than in the earlier printings, especially with *o* and *u*. Obvious mistakes like these have been automatically corrected. See also 4.2.6.

ⲕⲛⲁⲩ ⲙⲡⲉⲓⲱⲧ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲕⲣⲁⲛ. 15. ⲁⲩⲱ ⲡⲉⲕⲣⲁⲛ ⲉⲧⲥⲟⲩⲱⲛⲓ ⲉⲃⲟⲗ ⲛⲁⲩ ⲛⲁⲓ ⲛⲉ ⲙⲡⲉⲕⲣⲁⲛ:

5. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1849/1:*[15] *Introduction*

ܙܗܪܝܪܝ ܕܒܗܪܐ ܫܢܬ ܐܠܦ ܘܬܡܢܝܢ ܘܬܫܥ.

ܙܗܪܝܪܝ ܒܪ ܙܗܪܐ ܩܕܡ ܐ. 1849. ܥܡܕ ܐ.

[1a1] ܙܗܪܝܪܝ ܒܪ ܙܗܪܐ:

ܙܗܪ ܫ ܙܗ ܚܕܬ ܟܬ: ܩ ܒ ܟܬ ܕܡܫܟ ܙܟܫ: ܙܡܙܗܪܐ: ܙܡܙܟܪ: ܙܡܫܟ ܙܗ ܒ ܟ ܩ ܙ ܙ ܙ

5. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1849/1: Introduction*

RAYS OF LIGHT
Urmia, November 1849, number 1

[1A1] WHAT ONE SHOULD KNOW

This is a periodical dealing with piety, education, science, and miscellaneous news, which is published in the town of Urmia, at the beginning of every month, edited by American gentlemen.

6. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1849/1: Education — Schools*

[1A7] EDUCATION
SCHOOLS

Among all nations, schools are very useful. All nations amongst which they are established want them and give attention to them. Where schools are abandoned, learning is usually at a low level, evil increases, children grow up ignorant and disobedient, and all of the nation's business diminishes. Moreover, in lack of learning, the Church of Christ, which He bought by his blood, is lazy. Because if the priests are not educated, how will they be able to teach others? He who is blind, is he able to show the way to others?

He who has no knowledge, how will he be able to teach others? Someone who only knows the letters of books, even if he recites the literature beautifully,[16] but does not understand its contents, [1B] resembles one who is eating the shells of walnuts only, rather than the kernel within. As long as he eats shells, he will grow thin.[17] And all those whom he causes to eat shells, will die. For food, if it is prepared,

16. According to Maclean (1901), the noun *sāprāyutā* refers to the 'office of a scribe', but in combination with the verb *qrāyā* ('to read, recite, study'), I prefer to see *sāprāyutā* as synonymous with *seprāyutā*, '(Classical Syriac) literature'.

17. The last line is not a separate clause in the LUA text, but makes more sense this way.

ܒܫܡܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܒܐ ܘܒܪܐ ܘܪܘܚܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܚܕ ܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܐܠܗܘܬܐ ܗܘ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܠܥܠܡ ܥܠܡܝܢ ܐܡܝܢ ܘܐܡܝܢ ܀

ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܫܠܡܐ ܠܟܘܢ ܐܢܐ ܫܠܡܐ ܡܫܒܩ ܠܟܘܢ ܫܠܡܝ ܐܢܐ ܢܬܠ ܠܟܘܢ ܘܐܬܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܥܠܡܐ ܕܐܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܫܠܡܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܐܢܐ ܢܬܠ ܠܟܘܢ ܠܐ ܐܝܟ ܗܘ ܥܠܡܐ ܕܐܬܐ ܐܠܐ ܫܠܡܐ ܕܝܠܝ ܐܢܐ ܢܬܠ ܠܟܘܢ ܀

ܠܐ ܬܬܪܥܠ ܠܒܟܘܢ ܘܠܐ ܬܬܕܚܠ ܀ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܘܢ ܫܡܥܬ ܕܐܡܪܬ ܠܟܘܢ ܐܙܠ ܐܢܐ ܘܐܬܐ ܠܘܬܟܘܢ ܐܢ ܐܝܬ ܠܟܘܢ ܪܚܡܐ ܠܝ ܕܐܙܠ ܐܢܐ ܠܐܒܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܝ ܐܒܐ ܪܒ ܠܝ ܗܘ ܡܢ ܐܢܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܘܢ ܕܗܫܐ ܐܡܪܬ ܠܟܘܢ ܕܬܗܝܢ ܐܡܝܢ ܀

ܘܗܫܐ ܐܡܪ ܠܟܘܢ ܩܕܡ ܕܗܘܐ ܕܐܡܪ ܠܟܘܢ ܕܬܗܝܢ ܐܡܝܢ ܀ ܠܐ ܐܡܠܠ ܥܡ ܟܘܢ ܣܓܝ ܡܠܐ ܐܠܐ ܐܬܐ ܗܘ ܪܫܝܥܐ ܕܥܠܡܐ ܗܕܐ ܘܠܝ ܠܝ ܠܡܕܡ ܒܗ ܐܝܬ ܠܝ ܡܕܡ ܒܝ ܀ ܐܠܐ ܕܬܕܥ ܠܥܠܡ ܕܐܢܐ ܪܚܡ ܠܐܒܐ ܘܐܝܟ ܕܦܩܕܢܝ ܐܒܐ ܗܟܢܐ ܐܥܒܕ ܀

ܩܘܡܘ ܢܦܠܝܢ ܡܢ ܗܪ ܙܝܬܐ ܗܢܐ ܘܐܙܠ ܠܗ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܀

ܘܐܬܐ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܀

ܘܐܬܐ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܀

ܘܐܬܐ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܀

ܘܐܬܐ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܀

ܘܐܬܐ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܗܝ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܘܐܬܒ ܠܟ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܘܟ ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗ ܡܪܝ ܀

18. Probably a printing error for *šulê*, 'their affairs'.

ought not to stay in the mouth, but rather to go down into the stomach and be digested. So too, readers should understand the contents of the books, like that faithful eunuch of Candace, the queen of the Cushites. And then they will know what is the will of God, and they will be able to teach others.

A human being is endowed with reason and intelligence, in which he differs from the animals, but this reason and intelligence grow like a body and need exercise by means of schools, books, and instruction.

Every village needs a good school, just as a dark room needs a lamp. By nature, the human mind is dark and filled with ignorance and sin, but the lamp of the word of God expels the darkness and enlightens the mind. As David says, 'your word is a lamp to my feet, and a light for my paths'.[19] Therefore, if David [2A] saw that the words of God were of so much advantage to him, everyone ought to read and obey the words of the Holy Scriptures, in order to learn the will of God and the way of salvation through Jesus Christ.

In other countries, parents set up schools, buy books, build buildings, pay wages to teachers, spend much money, and send their children [to school] in order that they may become wise and conduct all their affairs in this world well, as they should.

In ancient times, the Syrian fathers also paid more attention to schools than they do now. They had schools for boys who were to take orders, as well as for others. One was situated in the town of Edessa, that is Urhay, which was founded by Mar Ephrem. And the majority of its students were from Persia. This school was open both to the sons of the Christians as well as to those of the pagans. However, this school was destroyed by the emperor Zeno, in the year A.D. 489. And after one year, another school was opened in that city, which became very famous. And during that period, another school was founded in Seleucia. In the year A.D. 385, another school was founded in the city of Darcayna. In the year A.D. 832,

19. Psalm 119:105.

ܟ ܐܒ ܐܒ ܕ ܐ ܐ ܐ

there were two schools in Baghdad and two others nearby. There were schools set up by the Syrians in Tarhana, Mahoza, Ajabina, and Atur, as well as in Maragha in Azerbaijan. There were also schools in Elam, [2B] Persia, and Khorasan, and in Arabestan. There was a school in Nusaybin, in which boys studied for three years. Much attention was given to the study of the Old and New Testament, but they also studied grammar, rhetoric, poetics, arithmetic, gematriya, music, astronomy, and medicine.

One Doctor of the Syrians wrote as follows: 'First of all, every chief priest should appoint a teacher where there is none.[21] And he must write down the names of the children who deserve education, and summon their parents to send them to school, even if it requires some effort. And if there are among them orphans or children without clothes, their allowances ought to be paid by the church. And if the church is poor, every Sunday the head of the church should collect money from the faithful for their expenses. The teacher should receive half [of his wages] from the church and half from the parents of the children.'[22]

7. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1849/1: about Zahrīri d-Bahrā*

[4B23] ZAHRĪRI D-BAHRA

Urmia, October 1st, 1849

[4B25] Since this is the first newspaper produced in this part of the country, no doubt people will ask themselves: 'What is the purpose of this paper?' The short explanation we provide here may serve to answer part of this question, but for it to become truly clear, our readers should find enlightenment in the pages of *Rays of Light* as this paper appears month after month.

[5A] In all countries of Europe and America there are many newspapers. The purpose of the writers of some of these is simply this: to fulfill the desire many people have,

21. The expression *d-layt* 'where there is none' is CS.

22. It is uncertain where the quotation ends.

ܚܒܬܬܐ ܕܒܗ ܟܘܪܣܝ ܒܝ ܕܘܟܬܐ ܕܦܪܒܐ: ܟܥܒܕܐ ܫ ܡܥܒܪ ܫܓܐ.
ܗܝܐ ܕܒܟܝܦܬܐ ܙܝܪܬܐ ܐܡܪ ܟܠ: ܕܒܟܒ ܟܘܒܬܐ ܒܟܐ ܕܩܘܝܐ ܐܦ ܒܝ ܫܒܚ:
ܡܝܟܫܬܐ ܕܝܢܟܐܟܬܐ. ܒܟܝܦܬܐ ܙܝܪܬܐ ܐܒ ܟܘܪ ܫ ܗܝܐ ܚܒ ܚܒܐ ܡܟܐ
ܟܬܐ: ܕܒܟ: ܕܒܟܒܒ ܡܕܒܐ ܒܐ ܕܟܐ ܕܒܟܒ ܒܟ ܡܬܐ: ܒܝ ܕܝܟܐ ܫ
ܟܒܫܬܐ ܣܒܟܬ: ܐܟܘܒܐ ܒܟܐ ܫ ܐܒ ܟܘܪ ܒܝ ܟܐ: ܐܒ ܟ ܐܒ ܟ ܐܒ ܟ ܐ ܟ ܐ ܟ ܐ

like ancient Athens, to hear something new. The purpose of other writers is this: to inform salesmen about the wares of producers and traders, and about the products of artisans. Other writers have a higher and more useful purpose, that is, to increase the knowledge of men, bringing to them writing that helps to sharpen their thoughts and cleanse their hearts. This, we declare, is our purpose too. And we hope that with God's help we will accomplish it.

We hope that those who receive these issues will keep them carefully, for they are printed in such a way that at the end of the year they may be easily bound together into one volume. And we intend to fill these with writing that is worth keeping.

8. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1849/1: Miscellaneous news on the Pope, cholera, the Sandwich Islands, Washington, and Mr. Layard's discoveries*

[5A21] MISCELLANEOUS NEWS

As to the latest news about the Pope — he is still in Gaeta, which is a village of the kingdom of Naples. A few months ago, he fled to this place for fear of his subjects. A French army took the city of Rome, and they forced the inhabitants to let the Pope return as their ruler.

Cholera, that frightful illness that arrived here about two or three years ago, is now in some European countries as well as in America. On this journey, this illness traversed all parts of the world as it did [5B] twenty years ago. In America, the death rate is not as high as it was in Asia, because the people of that region are not as susceptible as those here in Asia, and they also keep themselves cleaner. Nevertheless, the President, that is the chief ruler of the United States, advised that on the third day of August, the people of the country should fast and pray that perhaps God would turn this frightful illness out of the country. In many, many places this day was diligently observed and in the fear of God. God hears the prayers of those beseechers. He sends his plagues to the earth for people to learn righteousness. As soon as people turn to him and repent,

كجهكهجكا مهكهجهكا: بهكا جهكا هكا جهكا مهكهجهكا: بهكا هكا جهكا مهكهج

there is hope that He will lift his hand from punishing them because of their sins.

Last year the church of Mr. Coan, a missionary from the Sandwich Islands,[23] contributed forty tomans for preaching among the Armenians in the Ottoman Empire. Thirty years ago, the people of the Sandwich Islands were blind pagans. Since then they have become Christians. They are still very poor materially, but many of them are very eager to labor and go to great trouble for the sake of Jesus Christ. In name, the Armenians became Christians 1400 years ago — the first shall be last and the last first.

People are building an obelisk in the capital of the United States for the commemoration of Washington; its height is 142 *draya*,[24] it is four-cornered, and its surface is covered with white marble.

[...]

[6B1] Last year Mr. Layard, an Englishman who is engaged in unearthing the remains of the ruins of Nineveh, went back to his country and wrote a beautiful book about his findings, and now he has returned to Mosul to again take up this work. His findings there are quite marvelous, like those big palaces, all of them built with white marble slabs, each slab about two *draya* long and one and a half *draya* wide. And these slabs are all carved most beautifully, with pictures of people, animals, birds, woods, hunting parties, soldiers and besieged cities. Also, the surfaces of many of them are covered with beautiful writing, in ancient symbols that resemble the blade of a spear, which today's people do not understand. All this remained under the earth for some three to four thousand years, on the banks of the river Tigris, but now they are again very beautiful and clean as new. Mr. Perkins, Mr. Stocking, Mar Yukhannan and Shamasha Iskhaq went to see these ruins when they were in Mosul last spring, and they were very much astonished by these wonders.[25]

23. Rev. Titus Coan, missionary on the Sandwich Islands from 1834 to 1870.
24. One *draya* is just short of a meter.
25. For another report of this visit, see Perkins 1851: 112-119.

9. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1871/12: true fear of God*

ܡܫܡܫܢܐ ܕܡܪܝ ܒܗܪܐ ܫܢܬ 1871، ܝܪܚܐ ܕܐܝܪ، ܝܘܡ 12

[31290] ܗܕܐ ܡܐܡܪܐ ܕܡܪܝ ܒܗܪܐ

ܒܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܚܝܠ ܠܡܕܚܠ ܒܡܠܟܘܬܐ ܕܐܠܗܐ: ܐܦ ܒܗܠ ܕܐܢ ܐܝܬ ܒܗ ܡܕܥ ܕܐܠܗܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܚܝܠ ܒܪ ܐܢܫ ܕܢܬܪ ܒܗ ܡܢ ܕܐܢ

9. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1871/12: true fear of God*

RAYS OF LIGHT, Urmia, December 1871, no 12

[90A31] TRUE FEAR OF GOD

When Satan asked, 'does Job fear God for nothing?', he was expressing his doubts about whether something like the fear of God exists. He questioned whether the reason for Job's perfection was his fundamental reverence for God. He believed that following a change in his situation, he would be no better than other people, and would also revile Him openly.[27] He did not believe in a loyal fear of God [90B1], a fear of God that would keep him strong and firm[28] in the midst of any situation, no matter how difficult.

However, there is such a fear of God, even though it is, alas, very rare. Goodness and perfection safeguard their owner. He is not led astray by each breath of new doctrine. He is not turned from the way by each enticing temptation. He is not ruled by passions and thoughts, and he does not look for worldly profit. His main concern is: what is right, what should I do?

Therefore, he is someone whom you can trust, someone you can count on in any situation. You always know where to find him. Whatever others do, whatever temptation leads them astray — but he stands firm as if he was planted on a rock, and does not move. He works as if before the eyes of God, examining everything; he lives as if seeing Him who cannot be seen. And the love and fear of God keep him firm.

Such a man was Joseph: still a young man, far from home, amongst strangers, in very trying circumstances — but he took a firm stand, saying:

27. This expression is not entirely clear: *(m)ṣā'er-lih l-pātuhy* / he.reviles.him to.his. face?.

28. Cf. Maclean: *muxkem*.

ﻣﻦ ﺍﻟﺴﻤﺎﺀ ﻭﺍﻟﺮﺿﻮﺍﻥ ﻭﺍﻟﺠﻨﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﻨﺎﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﺼﺮﺍﻁ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﻴﺰﺍﻥ ﻭﺍﻟﺤﺴﺎﺏ ﻭﺍﻟﻜﺘﺎﺏ ﻭﺍﻟﻨﺒﻴﻴﻦ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﺮﺳﻠﻴﻦ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﻼﺋﻜﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﺮﻭﺡ ﻭﺍﻟﻘﻴﺎﻣﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﺒﻌﺚ ﻭﺍﻟﻨﺸﻮﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﻘﻀﺎﺀ ﻭﺍﻟﻘﺪﺭ ﺧﻴﺮﻩ ﻭﺷﺮﻩ ﻭﺍﻟﺒﻌﺚ ﺑﻌﺪ ﺍﻟﻤﻮﺕ ﻭﺍﻟﺤﺴﺎﺏ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﻴﺰﺍﻥ ﻭﺍﻟﺼﺮﺍﻁ ﻭﺍﻟﺠﻨﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﻨﺎﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﺨﻠﻮﺩ ﻓﻲ ﺍﻟﺠﻨﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﺨﻠﻮﺩ ﻓﻲ ﺍﻟﻨﺎﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﺮﺅﻳﺔ ﻟﻠﻪ ﺗﻌﺎﻟﻰ ﻓﻲ ﺍﻟﺠﻨﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﻨﻈﺮ ﺇﻟﻰ ﻭﺟﻬﻪ ﺍﻟﻜﺮﻳﻢ ﻭﺍﻟﻜﻼﻡ ﻭﺍﻟﺴﻤﺎﻉ ﻭﺍﻟﻘﺮﺏ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﺠﺎﻭﺭﺓ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﺤﺒﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﺮﺿﺎ ﻭﺍﻟﺘﺠﻠﻲ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﻌﺮﻓﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﺘﺴﻠﻴﻢ ﻭﺍﻟﺘﺤﻴﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﺴﻼﻡ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﺰﻳﺪ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﻨﺎﺯﻝ ﻭﺍﻟﻘﺼﻮﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﺨﻴﺎﻡ ﻭﺍﻟﺤﻮﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﻮﻟﺪﺍﻥ ﻭﺍﻟﺨﻤﺮ ﻭﺍﻟﻠﺒﻦ ﻭﺍﻟﻌﺴﻞ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﺎﺀ ﻭﺍﻟﻔﻮﺍﻛﻪ ﻭﺍﻟﻄﻴﺮ ﻭﺍﻟﻠﺤﻢ ﻭﺍﻟﺨﻴﻞ ﻭﺍﻟﺒﻐﺎﻝ ﻭﺍﻟﺤﻤﻴﺮ ﻭﺍﻟﺸﺠﺮ ﻭﺍﻟﺜﻤﺮ ﻭﺍﻟﻨﻌﻴﻢ ﻭﺍﻟﺴﺮﻭﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﺤﺒﺮﺓ ﻭﺍﻟﺒﻬﺠﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﻘﻴﻞ ﻭﺍﻟﺸﺮﺍﺏ ﻭﺍﻟﻄﻬﻮﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﻜﺄﺱ ﻭﺍﻟﺒﺮﺩ ﻭﺍﻟﺮﻳﺤﺎﻥ ﻭﺍﻟﻔﺎﻛﻬﺔ ﻭﺍﻟﺨﻀﺮﺓ ﻭﺍﻟﺰﻫﺮ ﻭﺍﻟﻨﻬﺮ ﻭﺍﻟﻌﻴﻦ ﻭﺍﻟﺴﻠﺴﺒﻴﻞ ﻭﺍﻟﻜﺎﻓﻮﺭ ﻭﺍﻟﺰﻧﺠﺒﻴﻞ ﻭﺍﻟﺘﺴﻨﻴﻢ ﻭﺍﻟﺴﻠﺴﺒﻴﻞ ﻭﺍﻟﻤﺰﺍﺝ

how could I do something so very evil and sin against God?

Such a man was Daniel. He was so conscientious and perfect in everything that although his enemies were pursueing him, they were not able to find one thing against him except in the law of his God. And when, with their grudging tricks, they advised the king to issue that cruel edict, we read that when Daniel learned that this writing was sealed, he went to his house, his windows open to the direction of Jerusalem, and knelt down three times a day, and prayed and gave thanks to God as he had done before. The edict did not make any difference to him. The path of duty was evident, and it was his intention to let everything he had return to Him.[29] He could have shut his windows and prayed in private, and his enemies would not have known, but it was a matter [91A] of true fear of God, and he was not afraid of what might happen to him, and so he knelt down three times a day and prayed and gave thanks to God, as he had done before.

And a man like Paul, from the moment he was so suddenly stopped on the road to Damascus, and trembling and wondering was urged to ask: 'my Lord, what do you want me to do?', until the moment in which he gave his life in a martyr's death, he did not doubt the way of the faith in the Jesus whom he first had persecuted. There is no harm in whatever dangers overcome him in this way; he surges forward, not turning aside, neither to the right nor to the left, knowing that for him, living is Christ and dying is gain.

True fear of God knows no pride,[30] it does not take council with flesh and blood, and does not look upon temptations and difficulties. This is the religion that honors God and exalts Christ, and that will bring victory to the world.

29. Unclear.

30. The meaning of *taġya* is not clear. The form might be connected to an Arabic derivation of the root *t-y-h* > *tayyāh*, meaning 'straying, wandering, haughty'.

10. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1871/12: the great fire of Chicago*

[9294] سحدّة هج ذسمد

بهسمع هممهه. حيعضدنه ىَهْ هج بهنيمع هنُهمهه: دحجذب فضنه شه بهدّة يْهْنه هوكِه كه شه هدبئة دجيخبه: هدبئة دفههه يْهْخ: هدفكِكِه دهدبئة ىَميحكِه. هؤهدّة هج 60.000.000 همضدّة ذيكة: ههْخه ىَنعِّة هُكِكِ هَوكفه. شه نكد حميكِه شه فعهْخ ىَويِه كدكِكِه يسكغبه هُويْهه: همه هسِكد وُهضه بُكد فعهْخ همهويسكد جوذهه. (شه هُهْخ جوْة دجه كُكِه هج يْذنه: همه كوس بُسِ خذفه: جه كِ ىَكِه سجبغه كه فعهْخ.) همه جوْة كيسكِه همؤذخعهه حيْهكِه: همُهشه سُكنه هسِكِه: همضكفكد حهذيوكِه لكفِة. هدبئة دجيخبه شه دهحة هَه دهه جمه ضعهذ هج حكد دكه دهمه فه وْجنة دجيكِه: ىهك جمه ضعهذ بُه وْجنة دضفِة فه ضكبسة دنيكِة. يُووْة جه هَ دنُه ضفِة همضِة ىَميحكفه. همُكد جمه سيذخه: ضتغهِ يُهوْة: دميند جه ضدسب همه كَهَ بُه ضفِة: هوكفه دهْة همىَميحكفه. يحمنه شه وْذْ دْذخه هيكهفِة همضِة: همينِكد يُكفِ.

ضحوّة ىَشْتِة دنبه ك جمه دهه هْة يُهْة دضضهْه دجيخبه:[31] بُه ىَنه. شه خهْبه جدهْة ىَكِ: جدمهمهيح بكد كضجدهحه يْهْمهْه دلهْه مبهْة. حْذخه ميهْجهْه كوِة يحذهْه همه همجعهْة هج ضبة كضبة: همه ىُكهفكد كفكهكد. كمه همه همجه ضدبئة كه دهمه هْتِة ضْشهِ همضِة. هْ عمكد دضْشه: ذْخه ضتِكِ نبه همه يُووْة دضضِة هُوذ هْ دهْة. شه دهحة همه هكبة هج بُعْتِة دضيكِ هْ وْخفِه: هيكهفِة دهُكفِة: حكد ىَميحكفه. كمتِه كه بُهْة دعكبكد ىَكِ حكهْه دهدبئة: حكد جمنْة. وُهْة هج 10 حهمْتِة مبجه ىَنه: همحكد جْةهضهْ ضعهذ. وْذحشِة: هُميْهذهشِة: همْهذهه: همضهشِة: همحكد هْيكِة همخنِة دهُجبِة: همُسِ 50.000 خهِة: همحكد ضْتوبكِه حوِة دْذْفِة دبهْة همْذْفنه ىَميحكفه. همُسِ 100.000 ىَنعِّة مبجه ىَنه دكد جبة. شه خهْبه جدهْة ىَكِ: ىُكهفكِة هيكِه ىَنه هج يْهْه ىَنعِّة همحكهضه: جسْذة كْهْة هُ همهه همضه

31. Earlier spelled as *Šekkāgu*.

10. *Zahrīri d-Bahrā 1871/12: the great fire of Chicago*

[94A9] NEWS FROM AFAR

UNITED STATES. We hear from the United States that in October a frightful fire was ignited in the city of Chicago,[32] the city of Mr. Basset, and that half of the city burned down. Goods worth more than 60,000,000 tomans and many people were lost. A child had taken a lantern and had gone to the stable to milk the cow. The latter kicked over the lantern which spilled its oil (a kind of oil which comes from the earth and which catches fire like gunpowder when it is not enclosed in the lantern). And the oil caught fire and spread quickly. And a strong wind was blowing, which easily spread the flames. The city of Chicago was a place that was most famous in the world for the trade in corn as well as lumber.[33] Endless piles of wood and planks burned; even worse, large forests from which this wood was taken took fire and burned, causing damage running into many millions of tomans as well as hundreds of lives.

The latest news we have about that big fire that burned down Chicago is the following. One paper says: 'It is impossible to convey the frightfulness of this fire. Very quickly the flames were spreading and jumping from house to house and from street to street. There is no city in the world which is so full of wood and planks. Many, many woodpiles used in the factories were ready for the fire. It was a place filled with storerooms with tens of thousands of tons[34] of corn to be sold — all burned. The ships on the river passing through the city — all were on fire. More than ten churches and all the famous hotels burned down. Mints, the telegraph offices, theaters, and printing offices as well as all the tradesmen's storehouses and shops, about 50,000 houses, and all the large railway stations and their trains burned down. And about 100,000 people became homeless.' Another paper says: 'The streets are filled with hundreds of people with their families, wandering to and fro,

32. One wonders what *xā* is doing here; literally it says: 'a city of Chicago'. This might refer to a part of the city of Chicago, rather than to the whole town.

33. Lit.: 'wood for carpentry'.

34. Lit.: 'millions of *ṭa'ni*'; one *ṭa'nā* being equivalent to 320 lb or 145.28 kg.

لكنا: كد ديبندا ابنا كمبر. ونتا زكؤ كيبر زيا مومتر ديبرتوبن ٱكا
فنلوبم لر زكر. ترفتا زكر فرتنكا دموتا ومجنفيه هي كفتا بلا مدوم: لر
ٱهنا دمبر يُهنكا هي دنهنا سلهكا. نهنا هي فكلكا دنيا 300,000 دزنكؤ دهن
مديمكا: ديتيكا زيا لزهنا لكنا ولهنا لكنا كه نلاوتؤ: ابحفنا ديكانزا
[94ت] كمنا جكلفين ولديمًا: ابحفنا كمولى نهيتا حفنا دفيزا كه سكفين:
ولهنفا نيكس: ولا دينبندا ابنا زاكب: ابحفنا ديكانزا كمنا زنفؤ ولجمؤ
دفنكيم جكلفنا: مؤفظؤ ولمنؤ فولكا هي فكؤن ديمنؤ: ولجنكا لزهنا
لكنا ولهنا لكنا. زنفؤ دبهنا فؤز دفجنوفا ولفؤز مدوجنا: يُمنا ولمجيز:
ولوي جمنا لا فيكنا دنيفين. ديرفؤز زكر: لر زمين لفزجولوبا زيا ستؤبا يُوفز:
ابفا زكر لرفؤز: دهن ولمنؤ لمولهنا دجكفا: ابنا دنيم ٱهنا هكبفا دنيؤز
دفجلوفز مولؤز فيمزيؤز فزنؤز دمولجميلا: ؤكؤ ٱهوبا زكز: ولجنا فؤز هي
هكلا دكلولتؤبن ولمنيؤز زكز لريفؤلا. فيم زهز ولفز يُهنا بزجوبا زكر
لكنلا: زنؤبر بنيز ديكؤ، كمولبز زكز بلا بنوز دفيز دينز فنجوؤز بلا
ولجنؤ: فيم فيجؤلا: دلا ٱهوبر دفولا هكؤز لمولؤز كه دهن هفز دمجنؤ
دفبكز زكر دلا ولجز.

زنفؤ تمفؤز دمولفيم ولجنلا فجولجبا زكز ولوفلا 5,000,000 مولؤز:
ولولجؤز زكز فؤلا: لولا دبّن ريكيزم ولكفهكا، ولجؤز زكز لا ؤنكا.

not knowing where to stay. And many people have been burned, the number of which is not known yet.' And further: 'The rain of fire and sulphur from heaven on Sodom was not as frightful as this scene. More than half of the 300,000 inhabitants of this city are running to and fro in the streets, some looking [94B] for their lost families, some carrying as many possessions as possible under their arms or clutching them to their chests, not knowing where to go, some looking for carriages and coaches to allow their families to escape, and horses and cattle which had escaped from their burning stables running to and fro, people who yesterday owned millions of tomans, today became poor, and nothing remained in their hands.' And further: 'It is impossible to describe these terrible scenes; it suffices to say that this large city of Chicago, in which there were properties whose profits ran into hundreds of millions of tomans, has been ruined and that one-third of its inhabitants now depend on charity. As this terrible day draws to an end, thousands of anxious eyes are looking at the clouds of smoke rolling over the city, hoping that the wind will not drive the fire to that part of the city that is not on fire yet.'

Friendly people in the United States have collected nearly 5,000,000 tomans and sent it to them, whereas also people from England and Germany have sent a contribution.

11. *Roman Catholic translation of the New Testament: the Gospel of Matthew, chapter 2 (1877)*[35]

ܟܬܒܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ ܕܥܬܝܩ ܘܚܕܬ: ܒ.

1. ܒܡ ܝܫܘ ܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܒܝܗܘܕܐ ܒܝܘܡܬܐ ܗܘ ܡܠܟܐ[36] ܗܪܘܕܣ ܒܬܪ ܗܐ ܐܬܐ ܡܓܘܣܐ ܡܢ ܡܕܝܢܚ ܐܝܠܢ ܠܝܪܘܫܠܡ. 2. ܘܐܡܪܝܢ ܠܗ ܐܝܟܐ ܐܝܬ ܠܟ ܕܢܗܘܐ ܡܠܟܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܝܐ[37] ܕܝܠܕ ܐܬܝܢ ܕܚܙܝܢ ܟܘܟܒܗ ܒܡܕܝܢܚ ܘܐܬܝܢ ܠܡܣܓܕ ܠܗ. 3. ܟܕ ܫܡܥ ܗܪܘܕܣ ܐܬܪܥܫ ܘܟܠ ܝܪܘܫܠܡ ܥܡܗ. 4. ܘܟܢܫ ܟܠ ܪܒܪܒܢܐ ܘܣܦܪܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܫܐܠ ܠܗܘܢ ܐܝܟܐ ܢܗܘܐ ܝܠܕܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ. 5. ܐܡܪܘ ܠܗ ܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܟܗ ܟܬܝܒ ܒܢܒܝܐ. 6. ܘܐܢܬ ܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ ܒܐܪܥܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܠܐ ܙܥܘܪܐ ܐܢܬ ܒܝܢ ܪܒܪܒܢܐ ܕܝܗܘܕܐ ܡܢܟ ܢܦܩ ܡܪܝܐ ܕܢܪܥܐ ܐܬ ܥܡܝ ܝܣܪܝܠ. 7. ܒܗܝܕ ܩܪܐ ܗܪܘܕܣ ܠܚܫܐ ܠܘܬ ܓܒܪܐ ܡܓܘܣܐ ܐܬ ܙܒܢܐ ܕܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܐܬܚܙܝ ܠܗܘܢ. 8. ܘܫܕܪ ܐܬ ܠܒܝܬ ܠܚܡ[38] ܘܐܡܪ ܠܗܘܢ ܙܠܘ ܫܐܠܘ ܒܫܘܪ ܛܠܝܐ ܘܟܕ ܬܫܟܚܘܢ ܐܬܝܘ ܠܝ ܕܐܦ ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܐܣܓܕ ܠܗ[39]. 9. ܗܠܝܢ ܕܫܡܥܘ ܠܡܠܟܐ ܐܙܠܘ ܘܗܐ ܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܚܙܘ ܒܡܕܝܢܚ ܩܕܡܝܗܘܢ ܥܕ ܕܐܬܐ ܘܩܡ ܥܠ ܐܬܪ ܛܠܝܐ[40]. 10. ܟܕ ܚܙܘ ܟܘܟܒܐ ܗܘ ܫܡܚܘ ܫܓܝܐ ܒܣܓܝ. 11. ܘܥܠܘ ܠܒܝܬ ܐܒܐ ܘܚܙܘ ܠܝܠܕ ܥܡ ܡܪܝܡ ܐܡܗ ܘܢܦܠܘ ܠܩܕܡܘܗܝ ܘܦܬܚܘ ܓܢܙܝܗܘܢ ܘܩܪܒܘ ܠܗ ܗܕܝܐ ܠܘܬ ܙܗܒ ܘܠܒܘܬܐ ܘܡܘܪ. 12. ܘܥܠ

35. Cf. 4.3.1.

36. In this text, there are a number of irregular spellings. Here the text has *dayhudā* (= CS spelling) instead of *dīhuda*.

37. Text: *dyhudāyi*.

38. Text: *b-in*.

39. The regular spelling would be *be-ʾḵaltā*, rather than *be-ʾlḵātā*. It is not unlikely, however, that this form corresponds more closely to the pronunciation than the regular form.

40. Note the two different spellings for 1sm: *-in* and *-en*. It is uncertain which one is the regular spelling in this translation.

سوبُدَ ظُدُه دےیُدَه: دُدَه ذُـدُب لدِجه وجُنوُجه:[41] ودـدوجُنُـد زُمِـجُدَه زُولدَ۲ لذِهجُد. 13. خِـد بـدَه زُولدَ۲: ڤِـدِـد ميـدَه ڤِـدُجُـدَه دُهجُدَه دےیُدَه هُـد نـهوَـق وزُهڤِدَه ظُـهوَصه: ڤِـدِـد گـدِـد لـدُجُدَه ولـدِـهوَصه: ولـدُجُـد لـهـيڤِـدُب: ولهُدَه لـهوب وُبُـل دُهُـدِـهوُم. ظُـجُد دِهوُبَ بـدِـد وجُنوُجه لـهُـدِـهُ بـُـد لـدُجُدَه بُـب دُهُـد لـهِ. 14. نـهوَـق بـدَه ڤِـهـدِـد ميـدِـد لـدُجُدَه ولـدِـهوَصه دـدِـد ولـدُجُـد لـهـيڤِـدُب. 15. وهوڤِـد هُـهُد وُبُـل هُـهوُم دِجُنوُجه:[42] خِـد گـدِـد وڤِوَيُـهُد ڤِـدِـد ڤِـدِـد زُمِـجُدَه ڤِـد هُـدُد لـدِـدُب دِزڤِدَه: دڤِـد ڤِـدِـدُب مُـدُد لـدُجُدِـب.

16. بُـدِـد وجُنوُجه خِـد سوِـد دِڤِـدِـد ڤِـهـهـيجُدَه ڤِـد ڤِـدِـدُهجُدَه: ڤِـدِـد ڤِـدُد ميـدَه ولـدِـدُهوُم: بُـب وجُدَه دِيوُمسِـدِـد ڤِـد ڤِـدِـدُهجُدَه. بُـدِـد ڤِـدِـد ڤِـهـهـيجُدَه ڤِـدِـد دِڤِـدِـد زُهڤِدَه دِزڤِدَه بجُدَه دِزڤِدَه. 18. ظُدُه ڤِـدِـد ميـدَه لـهـ ڤِـهـهـ: ڤِـدِـدَ ولـدُجُدَه ڤِـدَه: ڤِـهـد دـهـدَه ولـد بـد دـهـدَه ولـد ولـد ڤِـدِـدَه لـدِـدُهجُد لـدِـدَه: ڤِـهـدِـد دـهـد وجُنوُجه.

19. خِـد ڤِـهـدِـد بـهـدَه وجُنوُجه ڤِـدِـدَه: ڤِـدِـد ميـدَه ڤِـدِـدَه دِڤِـدَه دـهـدَه ظُـد ڤِـهـهـيجُدَه ڤِـد. 20. ولـدِـهوَصه: ڤِـهـد ڤِـدِـد لـدُجُدَه ولـدِـهوَصه ولـد لـدِـدَه دـهـدَه: ظُـدِـد دِهـڤِـدِـد[43] بـدِـد دِڤِـدِـدَه وجُنوُجه لـدِـهوَ دِدَه. 21. ولـهوَـق ڤِـهـدِـد ولـدِـهوَصه: ولـدُجُـد لـدِـدَه ولـدِـهوَصه: ولـدُجُـد لـدِـدَه دـهـدَه. 22. خِـد بـهـدَه ڤِـهـدِـد دِدَه دِـدِـدَه وجُنوُجه لـدِـهوَ ڤِـدِـدَه دـهـدَه ڤِـد لـدِـدَه دِوجُنوُجه ڤِـدِـدَه. وجُـدِـد دِدَه وجُنوُجه لـدِـدَه: ولـدِـدَه سوِـدَه ڤِـهوَصه دـهـدَه دِدَه وجُنوُجه. 23. ولـدُجُد ڤِـدِـد لـهـ ڤِـدِـدَه دـهـد ڤِـدِـد ظُـدِـدَه لـدِـدُه: بـهـ دِڤِـدِـد ولـهوَـق ڤِـدِـد دِڤِـدِـد زُهڤِدَه دـهـدَه: دِدَه ڤِـدِـدَه دـهـ ڤِـدِـد ڤِـدِـدَه.

(1) دِجُدَه ظُد ڤِـدِـدَه دِڤِـدِـدَه دِڤِـدُ۲: ڤِـهـدَه بُـدُهوَصه: ولـهوَـدَ دِڤِـدِـهوَصه. ڤِـهـدَ زُهڤِ ولـهوَـدَ دِدَه ڤِـهِـدَ دِدِـدَه ڤِـدِـدَ لـهـ

.ڤِـدِـدَه

41. Text: *Hirōdis*.
42. Text: *Hirodes* (= CS spelling).
43. Usually *meiton*.

12. *The writings of Paul Bedjan: Taʾrīḫā Qaddīšā — Histoire Sainte* (1888), *chapter 53: Ruth, the Moabitess*

[21.84] ܠܐ. ܕܢܕܐ ܡܘܙܝܢܝܐ: ܐܘܦܛ ܕܟܬܝܪ.

ܕܡܐ ܒܘܥܙ ܒܝܬ̈ܐ: ܡܝܐܠ ܒܥܐ ܠܐ ܒܥܐ ܒܡܘܒ. ܐܠܝܡܠܟ ܒܝܪܫܠܡ ܡܝܐ ܟܝ ܒܝܬ ܚܡܘܗ ܐܝܬ ܠܗ ܓܒܪ ܓܒܘܪ ܚܝܠ. ܒܥܘܐ ܠܗ ܒܥܠ ܒܝܬ ܐܒܝ ܐܝܫ̈ܬܗ ܘܫܡ ܐܚܕ ܡܢ ܒܢܝ ܡܘܒ. ܐܢܐ ܐܙܠ ܒܫܕܐ ܘܐܫܟܚ ܐܢܐ

12. *The writings of Paul Bedjan: Taš'ītā Qaddištā — Histoire Sainte (1888)*[44] *chapter 53: Ruth, the Moabitess*

[84.21] 53. Ruth the Moabitess, an example for daughters-in-law

In the days of the judges, a famine broke out in the land of Judah. Elimelech of Bethlehem took his wife Naomi and his two sons, and went to the land of Moab. He himself fell ill and died, and his sons [85] married there. After some years, they too died, and their mother and her two daughters-in-law were left as widows.

Naomi decided to return and go to Bethlehem, to her relatives and her people. Her daughters-in-law, too, set out on the road to go with her.

Naomi turned and said to them: 'My daughters, return and settle in your land. May God show kindness towards you, as you have done towards me and my two sons.' They both cried loudly. Then Orpah kissed her mother-in-law and turned to go back to the house of her father. Ruth, however, did not turn her heart from her mother-in-law, but went with her to Bethlehem.

They arrived in the season of the barley harvest. They were poor, so Ruth went gleaning to bring something to provide for her mother-in-law.

One day she went to glean in the field of Boaz, who belonged to the family of her father-in-law. He was a very wealthy man. He himself happened to come by the laborers, and he saw her there. He had heard people talking about her. He gave her permission to glean among the sheaves, and he told her to eat bread with his maidservants, who were in the field. He said to her: 'They told me everything you did for your mother-in-law, after the death of your husband. May the God of Israel, under whose wings you came, reward you.'

After some time, Boaz saw that she was a strong woman, and he himself married her. And Naomi, her mother-in-law, took the first son Ruth gave birth to [86], and made him her own son, and she called him Obed. He is the father of Jesse and the grandfather of King David.

Ruth, by her reverence for, and service to, her mother-in-law, became the mother of kings, even Christ descended from her family. All daughters-in-law should look upon her,

44. See 4.3.2.

ܒܢ ܐܒ ܕܝ ܐܒ ܕܝ ܐܒ ܕܝ

and honor and do good to their mother-in-law and father-in-law, even if they are poor. Certainly, the blessings of the Lord God will be upon them and on their children.

13. *The writings of Paul Bedjan: Xayyi d-Qaddīši — Vies des Saints (1912). St. Thecla and her four martyr friends, daughters of the covenant*[45]

[345.11] Saint Thecla and her four martyr friends, daughters of the covenant

In the same period,[46] they sent a letter to Narsai Tamshabor to tell him that in the village of Cashaz there was an evil man, called Paula, who was in name a priest. And they said to the chief of the Magi that this man was very rich and owned many things. And the chief immediately ordered his house to be surrounded — they seized the man himself, pillaged his possessions, and took all the money he had. On account of [346] of Paula, they took with him the daughters of the covenant of that village, Thecla, Maryam, Martha, Maryam, and Emmi. They were taken together, their arms bound, to the village of Khazza.

First, they brought Paula before Tamshabor, and he said to him: 'If you were to obey the King, i.e., worship the sun and eat blood, I would return to you all the possessions which have been taken away from you.' Then this apostate and son of hell Paula, who was burning with such longing for his possessions and his money that he would gladly burn for all eternity to get them back, obeyed the chief of the Magi in everything he was ordered to do.. When Tamshabor saw that he could not find a pretext to have him killed and his possessions confiscated, he made up a very hateful plan, reckoning that Paula would be ashamed and would never agree to it, and so his possessions would pass out of his hands. He decided to order him to kill these five daughters of the convenant with his own hands.

Tamshabor was pleased with this hateful plan, and immediately ordered that they should bring the daughters of the convenant into his court. And he rose in anger and said to them: 'Obey the King, worship the sun and marry, and you will escape torture and the murder that has been decided over you.

45. For the Classical Syriac original of this story, see Bedjan's *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*, vol. 2 *(Martyres chaldæi et persæ)*, Paris 1891: 308-313. The CS text is followed closely, but it is not a literal translation.

46. According to Bedjan, the preceding story took place in the year AD 347.

פּרעה בּראָם בּעתּיר גּלע: «איך בּין אַ פֿרעמדער אין דער וועלט, [347] אַל אַ
פֿרעמדער אין דער וועלט בּין איך. זאָל מען מיר נישט פֿאַרבּאָרגן האַלטן
פֿון דיר דיין בּאַפֿעל, וואָס דו האָסט מיר אויפֿגעטראָגן, אַז איך זאָל
בּויען אַ הויז פֿאַר דיין נאָמען אין דער וויסטיניש.» אין דעם בּאַמערקט
מען, אַז דער פֿאַראָרט פֿון דער וויסטיניש איז נישט אַ ווייניקער
וויכטיק ווי דער פֿאַראָרט פֿון דער אַרון. דער אַרון איז אַ סימבאָל פֿון
דער תּורה, וואָס איז אַ סימבאָל פֿון גאָט, ווי עס איז באַוויזן אין
דער מדרש, וואָס זאָגט: «ווי גאָט איז אַ גאַנץ, אַזוי איז אויך זיין
תּורה אַ גאַנץ.» אַזוי ווי גאָט איז אַ גאַנץ, אַזוי איז אויך זיין תּורה
אַ גאַנץ; אַזוי ווי גאָט איז אַ גייסט, אַזוי איז אויך זיין תּורה אַ
גייסט; אַזוי ווי גאָט איז אַ וועזן, אַזוי איז אויך זיין תּורה אַ וועזן.
אַזוי ווי גאָט איז אַ וועזן, וואָס איז אויבן אויף דער הימל, אויף דער
ערד, אין דער ים, אין דער וויסטיניש, אַזוי איז אויך זיין תּורה אַ
וועזן, וואָס איז אויבן אויף דער הימל, אויף דער ערד, אין דער ים,
אין דער וויסטיניש. דערפֿאַר איז דער מדרש [348] אין זאָגן אַז דער
אַרון איז אַ סימבאָל פֿון גאָט, ווי עס איז באַוויזן אין דער נאָמען
פֿון דער וויסטיניש אַרון; ווייל אַזוי ווי גאָט איז אַ גאַנץ, אַזוי איז
אויך דער אַרון אַ גאַנץ; אַזוי ווי גאָט איז אַ גייסט, אַזוי איז אויך
דער אַרון אַ גייסט; אַזוי ווי גאָט איז אַ וועזן, אַזוי איז אויך דער
אַרון אַ וועזן, וואָס איז אויבן אויף דער הימל, אויף דער ערד, אין
דער ים, אין דער וויסטיניש.

דאָס פֿאָלק ישׂראל: דאָס פֿאָלק ישׂראל איז אַזוי ווי דער אַרון
פֿון בּונד, וואָס איז אַ סימבאָל פֿון גאָט. אַזוי ווי דער אַרון איז
געווען אַ גאַנץ, אַזוי איז אויך דאָס פֿאָלק ישׂראל אַ גאַנץ; אַזוי ווי
דער אַרון איז געווען אַ גייסט, אַזוי איז אויך דאָס פֿאָלק ישׂראל אַ
גייסט; אַזוי ווי דער אַרון איז געווען אַ וועזן, אַזוי איז אויך דאָס
פֿאָלק ישׂראל אַ וועזן, וואָס איז אויבן אויף דער הימל, אויף דער
ערד, אין דער ים, אין דער וויסטיניש.

But if you do not listen, I will do that which has been ordered by me, and nobody will be able to deliver you from my hands.' These saints answered him with a loud voice and said: 'We do not fear your words and you cannot entice us, but that which is ordered by you, will soon be fulfilled [347]. Far be it from us that we should turn away from God our Creator, and should do what you are teaching us to do!' Then Tamshabor gave an order, and each of these women was beaten with hundred lashes, while they professed their faith with a loud voice, saying: 'God should not be interchanged with the sun; we cannot be like you, who have left the Creator to worship a creature!'

Immediately Tamshabor decided on their death penalty. Then he turned to the apostate Paula and said to him: 'If you kill these daughters of the covenant with your own hands, all your possessions that were taken from you will be returned to you.' The chief of the Magi did not believe that Paula would indeed be willing to bear this shame for ever! However, what had happened to Judas, happened to him. That which was whispered into the ears of the Iscariot, filled his heart, too. Gold won him over and silver enticed him, and his avarice destroyed him as it did the traitor, in such a way that in the end his fate became like the fate of Judas. Like him, his lot became the rope with which he was strangled. Perhaps also, like him, his belly burst and all his intestines appeared. Oh Lord, did that thief bequeath his inheritance to this one? That one killed Jesus, this one killed Christ with whom these virgins were clothed, because those who are baptized in Christ are clothed with Christ. Oh Lord, which court will do justice, and what revenge will there be for these two? Oh Lord, something that is stronger than that one, or more bitter than this one? [348] Something that is more frightful than this one, and more steadfast than that one? Justice will appear and will give him his due without limits, because they sinned without limits or boundaries.

By means of this avarice then, consisting in lust for his possessions for fear of losing them, this apostate judge enticed him and gave him hope. He made himself a face of iron and a forehead of tutenag, and he took a sword and ventured towards those virgins. Thereupon they raised their voice as one and said to him: 'Oh miserable pastor, do you stay with your sheep,

ﻣﺎﺭﺍﻳﺎ ﺍﻟﻌﺬﺭﺍﺀ ﺍﻟﺘﻲ ﻭﻟﺪﺕ ﺍﻟﻤﺴﻴﺢ ﻳﺴﻮﻉ ﻣﻦ ﺍﻟﺮﻭﺡ ﺍﻟﻘﺪﺱ ﻭﻟﻢ ﺗﻌﺮﻑ ﺭﺟﻼ ﻗﻂ؟ ﻓﺎﺟﺎﺑﻬﺎ ﺍﻟﻤﻼﻙ ﻭﻗﺎﻝ ﻟﻬﺎ ﻻ ﺗﺨﺎﻓﻲ ﻳﺎ ﻣﺮﻳﻢ ﻷﻧﻚ ﻗﺪ ﻭﺟﺪﺕ ﻧﻌﻤﺔ ﻟﺪﻯ ﺍﷲ ﻭﻫﺎ ﺍﻧﺖ ﺗﺤﺒﻠﻴﻦ ﻭﺗﻠﺪﻳﻦ ﺍﺑﻨﺎ ﻭﺗﺪﻋﻴﻦ ﺍﺳﻤﻪ ﻳﺴﻮﻉ ﻫﺬﺍ ﻳﻜﻮﻥ ﻋﻈﻴﻤﺎ ﻭﺍﺑﻦ ﺍﻟﻌﻠﻲ ﻳﺪﻋﻰ ﻭﻳﻌﻄﻴﻪ ﺍﻟﺮﺏ ﺍﻻﻟﻪ ﻛﺮﺳﻲ ﺩﺍﻭﺩ ﺍﺑﻴﻪ ﻭﻳﻤﻠﻚ ﻋﻠﻰ ﺑﻴﺖ ﻳﻌﻘﻮﺏ ﺍﻟﻰ ﺍﻻﺑﺪ ﻭﻻ ﻳﻜﻮﻥ ﻟﻤﻠﻜﻪ ﻧﻬﺎﻳﺔ. ﻓﻘﺎﻟﺖ ﻣﺮﻳﻢ ﻟﻠﻤﻼﻙ ﻛﻴﻒ ﻳﻜﻮﻥ ﻫﺬﺍ ﻭﺍﻧﺎ ﻻ ﺍﻋﺮﻑ ﺭﺟﻼ ﻗﻂ؟ ﻓﺎﺟﺎﺏ ﺍﻟﻤﻼﻙ ﻭﻗﺎﻝ ﻟﻬﺎ ﺍﻟﺮﻭﺡ ﺍﻟﻘﺪﺱ ﻳﺤﻞ ﻋﻠﻴﻚ ﻭﻗﻮﺓ ﺍﻟﻌﻠﻲ ﺗﻈﻠﻠﻚ ﻓﻠﺬﻟﻚ ﺍﻳﻀﺎ ﺍﻟﻘﺪﻭﺱ ﺍﻟﻤﻮﻟﻮﺩ ﻣﻨﻚ ﻳﺪﻋﻰ ﺍﺑﻦ ﷲ. ﻭﻫﺎ ﺍﻟﻴﺰﺍﺑﺖ ﻧﺴﻴﺒﺘﻚ ﻫﻲ ﺍﻳﻀﺎ ﻗﺪ ﺣﺒﻠﺖ ﺑﺎﺑﻦ ﻓﻲ ﺷﻴﺨﻮﺧﺘﻬﺎ ﻭﻫﺬﺍ ﺷﻬﺮ ﺳﺘﺔ ﻟﻬﺎ ﺍﻟﺘﻲ ﻛﺎﻧﺖ ﺗﺪﻋﻰ ﻋﺎﻗﺮ. ﻷﻧﻪ ﻟﻴﺲ ﻛﻠﻤﺔ ﻣﻦ ﻋﻨﺪ ﷲ ﺗﺨﻠﻮ ﻣﻦ ﺍﻟﻘﻮﺓ.

ﻓﻠﻤﺎ ﺳﻤﻌﺖ ﻣﺮﻳﻢ ﻛﻼﻡ ﺍﻟﻤﻼﻙ ﻗﺎﻟﺖ ﻫﻮﺫﺍ ﻋﺒﺪﺓ ﺍﻟﺮﺏ ﻟﻴﻜﻦ ﻟﻲ ﻛﻘﻮﻟﻚ ﻭﺍﻧﺼﺮﻓﺖ ﻋﻨﻬﺎ ﺍﻟﻤﻼﻙ. [349] ﻭﻗﺎﻣﺖ ﻣﺮﻳﻢ ﻭﻣﻀﺖ ﺍﻟﻰ ﺍﻟﺠﺒﻞ ﻭﺩﺧﻠﺖ ﻣﻐﺎﺭﺓ ﻭﺻﻠﺖ ﻓﻴﻬﺎ ﻭﺻﻠﻮﺍﺗﻬﺎ ﻭﺗﻀﺮﻋﺎﺗﻬﺎ ﺍﻟﻰ ﷲ ﺍﻟﻰ ﺍﻥ ﺍﻧﺘﻬﺖ ﺍﻳﺎﻣﻬﺎ ﺍﻟﺘﺴﻌﺔ ﺍﻟﺘﻲ ﻛﺎﻧﺖ ﺗﺪﻋﻰ ﻋﺎﻗﺮ.

6 ﺍﺳﺒﻮﻉ ﺍﻟﺴﻨﺔ: ﺍﻟﻔﺼﻞ ﺍﻟﺴﺎﺑﻊ. 347.

ﻭﻫﺬﺍ ﻣﺜﻠﻪ. ﻭﺍﻧﻪ ﻣﻜﺘﻮﺏ ﻓﻲ ﺍﻟﻨﺎﻣﻮﺱ ﺍﻟﻤﺒﺎﺭﻙ ﻛﻞ ﻣﻦ ﻳﻮﻟﺪ ﻭﻟﺪﺍ ﺫﻛﺮﺍ ﻳﺪﻋﻰ ﺍﺳﻤﻪ ﻳﺴﻮﻉ: «ﻭﻗﺎﻝ ﺍﻟﻤﻼﻙ ﻟﻴﻮﺳﻒ ... ﻭﺗﻠﺪ ﺍﺑﻨﺎ ﻭﺗﺪﻋﻮ ﺍﺳﻤﻪ ﻳﺴﻮﻉ ﻷﻧﻪ ﻫﻮ ﻳﺨﻠﺺ ﺷﻌﺒﻪ ﻣﻦ ﺧﻄﺎﻳﺎﻫﻢ» ... ﻭﻗﺎﻝ ﺍﻳﻀﺎ ﺍﻟﻤﺒﺸﺮ ﺍﻟﻘﺪﻳﺲ ﺍﻟﻰ ﺍﻟﻌﺬﺭﺍﺀ ﺍﻟﺘﻲ ﺍﺳﻤﻬﺎ ﻣﺮﻳﻢ: «ﻫﻮﺫﺍ ﺳﻴﻜﻮﻥ ﻋﻈﻴﻤﺎ ﻭﺍﺑﻦ ﺍﻟﻌﻠﻲ ﻳﺪﻋﻰ» ... ﻭﻗﺎﻝ ﺍﻳﻀﺎ ﻣﺘﻰ ﻭﻟﺪﺕ ﻳﺴﻮﻉ ﻓﻲ ﺑﻴﺖ ﻟﺤﻢ ﺍﻟﺘﻲ ﻓﻲ ﺍﻟﻴﻬﻮﺩﻳﺔ ﻓﻲ ﺍﻳﺎﻡ ﻫﻴﺮﻭﺩﺱ ﺍﻟﻤﻠﻚ ﺟﺎﺀ ﻣﺠﻮﺱ ﻣﻦ ﺍﻟﻤﺸﺮﻕ ﺍﻟﻰ ﺍﻭﺭﺷﻠﻴﻢ ﻗﺎﺋﻠﻴﻦ: ﺍﻳﻦ ﻫﻮ ﺍﻟﻤﻮﻟﻮﺩ ﻣﻠﻚ ﺍﻟﻴﻬﻮﺩ!

(1) ﺑﺎﻟﻜﻞ. (2) ﻛﻤﺎ ﻫﻮ.

and leave the lambs of your flock? Oh avarice, you became a wolf; will you tear the ewes of your separation to pieces? Is this the offering we took from your hands? Is this the life-giving blood you are letting us drink? And now, look, your sword is our life and our salvation. We are going to Jesus, our wealth and our treasure forever, but you — that which you so wanted, will not come into your hands. Before you, we will arrive at the judgement-seat; our petition, which through your hands is with us, God will immediately listen to, and your terrible verdict He will execute. And the possessions that you have when you kill us, you will not enjoy them, because you do not deserve them'.

And that satanic son of destruction came, raised his arm and slew these five daughters of the covenant. And he cut off their heads, like an executioner who had quickly learned the trade from Qain the murderer.

These saints heroically accepted their murder, and these modest ones went as an example. They became an agreeable fragrance before the Lord, [349] and He himself paid them a reward for their virtues and honor for that suffering which they endured out of love for Him!

They took the crown of the martyrs on the sixth of June, in the year A.D. 347.

Now we will end the story of Paula, son of destruction, in order that we gain wisdom. Had not this fool read that which is written in the Gospel? The land of a certain rich man produced a good crop... and he said to himself: 'my soul, eat and drink and be merry'. ... It was said to him: 'fool, this very night they will take your soul from you; the things you made ready, who will have them?'. And what happened to this rich man also happened to Paula. Just when this murderer expected his possessions to be returned to him, in that night he died. The judge was afraid that he would complain about him before the king and that his possessions would be taken away, and he sent men to him in the prison, who put a rope around his neck and strangled him. And they hid his murder, and it was not revealed... How this death resembles the death of Judas!!!

14. *Remembrance of the Archbishop of Canterbury (1896)*

[14.ס] כד שיבר בקשר סטבמסבשך כסר כשבמר מסמר רבכמר בשכ
בבמכשבקשסשס מכנס כשבמר בשבשכר בסבר כשבמר כשבמר בשבשכר
בשכ. ביר בשבשר ראשכר כד מסר שבר רבמר כד כשבקשר בבשבקשר כש
כשבס שבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשבשר כש שבשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר (שבך בשבשר): מסבשבשר כד בשבשר כשבשסשבשר בכ
בשבשר מסבשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר
מסבשר כד שבשר כ שבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר כד שבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר [ס] שבשבשר בשבשר. מסס בשבשר מסר בשבשר בשבשר
שבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר כד שבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר
בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר בשבשר: מסבשבשר בשבשר

14. *Remembrance of the Archbishop of Canterbury (1896)*[47]

Remembrance of the Archbishop of Canterbury

[5.14] One can scarcely fathom how much the late Archbishop cared for the Church of the East under the protection of Mar Shimun. Although he was very busy sending letters to all parts of the world and leading the Church of England, and had his duties in the council of aristocratic and important men of the Kingdom (the House of Lords), he found opportunity to consider all the letters we sent to him about the Syrians. And he always sent us good counsel, and sometimes he wrote us thoughful letters himself [6]. And he gave us advice on our schools in the city and in the villages, and on matters pertaining to the printing office. And he well understood the difficulties of the Syrians in trade and so forth, but he was strongly opposed to begging in other countries. He wanted the Syrian nation here to be strengthened in every possible way, so that it need not be dispersed to strange countries. Again and again he wrote letters to Mar Shimun, and each time he wanted to hear news from Mr. Browne. He was very sorry and much astonished about the murder of Mar Gauriel, and people do not know how much he understood of all that the Christians suffered through persecutions and of the distress of the Syrians in the mountains. Every day, he thought about them and prayed for them, and in England people were amazed that he could find time to preach about the Syrians. And one of his secretaries tells us that there was no other subject on which he spent so much time, with such love and joy, as on this Mission. He looked forward to that time when the Church of the East would no longer need help from the West, and when all its priests would be educated and would be spiritual and diligent leaders of their flock. His chief aim was to raise up here a group of educated and pious Syrian priests, who would be an example of Christian character and of self-denial. He was therefore very grieved when he heard of [7] students who were not conscientious

47. Archbishop Benson played an important role in founding the Anglican mission (cf. 3.3.2). This tract was first printed in 1896, the year Benson died, and was included in a larger volume in 1899, from which this fragment was taken. Cf. Coakley 1985: 58-59 and 64. On the Anglican press, see further 4.4, on the other events referred to in this piece, see 3.3 and 3.6.

ᓇᔅᑲᐧ ᓇᐦᐁᐦᐃᐦᑳᐦᑲᓂ ᐅᐦᑫᐧ ᑭᐧ ᓇᐦᐋᐧ ᑌᐧ. ᓇᐦᐁᑭᐧ ᐦᐁᐦ ᑌᐧᐦᐋᐧ ᐦᐋᐧᑎᑭᐧ ᑳᑭ ᐦᐋᐧᑎᑭᐧ

and were thinking of themselves and not of the church.[48] He was not willing to believe that a nation of martyrs would not be able emulate their forefathers, who were ready to die rather than to sell their faith.

The story of the relationship between the Church of England and the Church of the East is quickly told. In the year 1842, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London sent to Mar Shimun a learned priest whose name was Rev. Badger. However, in the end, due to circumstances, he was called back to England. In the year 1868, a petition was sent to the Archbishop by three bishops,[49] asking for help. In 1876, therefore, Dr. Cutts came here, and in the year 1881 Mr. Wahl was sent. Since he was not successful in his work, the Archbishop, soon after he heard about this, sent Mr. Riley here, in the year 1885. And in the next year, this mission started its work under the leadership of Canon Maclean and Mr. Browne. In the letter that Mar Shimun the Patriarch sent the Archbishop in that year, he prayed that God would give the Archbishop a long life in this world and a crown of honor in the world to come, which is being kept for those who work in the spritiual vineyard.

In the ten years that have passed since that time, the blessed one from Canterbury [8] has increased rather than lessened his efforts, even if from time to time he was sorry that he was not able to help more with the education of students and their spiritual assistance, and that his schools were not accepted, no matter how much they were needed for the preparation of priests, and for the difficulties which were placed in our way, which would have been no wonder, if they had been placed in the way of those who were drawing people away from the Old Church. But nothing made him diminish his love or his efforts. And in his last letters to us, he wrote that he thought that he should accept the opinion of Mar Shimun in everything. And he sent his blessing to us.

48. Cf. Coakley 1985: 59.
49. I.e., Assyrian bishops.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ARCHIVAL MATERIAL

The Archives of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts. I made use of the volumes ABC 16.8.1 vol. 3, ABC 16.8.7 vols. 1-2 and 5-7, and ABC 2.1.1 vols 7-9.

Vinton Book vol. III, Near East: 'Mission to the Nestorians', 113-125, 'Mission to the Mohammedans of Persia', 126, being lists of missionaries compiled by John A. Vinton, Alfred O. Treat, and A.M. Chapin, and kept in the Day Mission Library, Divinity School Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut.

TEXT EDITIONS

Bible editions

(Book of the New Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the old language and also in translation), Urmia 1846 (Protestant press).

(The holy Scripture, i.e., of the Old Testament. Syriac and translation from Hebrew), Urmia 1852 (Protestant press).

(The holy Scripture, i.e., of the Old Testament, with comments in the margins of the pages, translation from Hebrew), Urmia 1858 (Protestant press).

(The holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ. Translation from the version that is called Textus Receptus), Urmia 1873 (translation into the Alqosh dialect) (Protestant press).

Novum Testamentum, Urmia 1877 (Lazarist press).

Book of Genesis (with introduction), Urmia 1886.

(The book of the Old and New Testament, with comments. Translated from the ancient languages), New York 1893 (various reprints, a.o., New York 1951, Lebanon 1993).

(The holy Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Preaching of St. Mark) Urmia 1895 (the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission press).

ܕܫܠܝܚܐ ܕܒܪܟܝܐ ܥܡ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܒܠܫܢܐ ܚܕܬܐ ܘܡܫܟܚܬ ܡܢ ܐܒܗܬܐ ܩܕܝܫܐ. ܡܢܗ ܚܕ ܦܘܫܩܐ ܕܦܘܠܘܣ. ܬܠܬ ܠܘܬ ܩܘܪܢܬܝܐ. ܬܪܬܝܢ ܠܘܬ ܩܘܪܢܬܝܐ. ܓܠܛܝܐ. ܪܘܡܝܐ. ܐܘܪܡܝܐ (Epistles of the blessed apostles, with a commentary in the new language and additions from the Fathers. Part one, the Epistles of St. Paul: 1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans), Urmia 1906 (the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission press).

Magazines

ܙܝܐ ܕܢܘܗܪܐ (Rays of Light) Urmia 1849/1, 1850/10, 1871/12 (Protestant press).

ܡܕܢܚܐ (The East) 1914/4, 6, 7, Tbilisi.

Koxvə d mədinxə / ܟܘܟܒܐ ܕܡܕܢܚܐ (The Star of the East) 39/242 (1934), Tbilisi.

Other text editions[1]

Arnold, Werner, *Das Neuwestaramäische. I. Texte aus Bax'a* (Semitica Viva 4/1), Wiesbaden 1989; *II. Texte aus Ǧubb'adīn* (Semitica Viva 4/2), Wiesbaden 1990; *III. Volkskundliche Texte aus Ma'lula* (Semitica Viva 4/3), Wiesbaden 1991, *IV. Orale Literature aus Ma'lula* (Semitica Viva 4/4), Wiesbaden 1991.

Avinery, Iddo, הניב הארמי של יהודי זאכו, טקסטים תרגום עברי מבוא ומילון (*The Aramaic Dialect of the Jews of Zākho*), Jerusalem תשם"ט (1988).

Bedjan, Paul,[2] *Imitatio Christi,* nunc primum ex Latino in Chaldaicum, idiomatis Urmiae Persidis, translata, ܚܘܒܐ ܕܡܫܝܚܐ. ܕܐܬܝܠܝ ܡܢ ܟܬܒܐ ܠܐܝܓܢ ܚܘܒܐ ܕܒܪܫܐ ܕܟܬܒ ܕܐܘܪܡܝܐ, Paris/Leipzig 1885.

Bedjan, Paul, *Manuel de Piété,* ou livre de prières, de méditations et des offices (en langue chaldéenne), ܚܘܒܐ ܕܨܠܘܬܐ. ܐܝܟ ܚܘܒܐ ܕܟܠܗ ܒܫܘܪܝܐ, Paris/Leipzig 1886.

Bedjan, Paul, *Syllabaire Chaldéen*, Idiome d'Ourmiah, ܚܘܒܐ ܕܣܘܪܝܐ. ܐܘ ܐܝܓܢ ܕܦܫܝܛܐ ܕܒܠܫܢܐ ܕܐܘܪܡܝܐ, Paris/Leipzig 1886.

Bedjan, Paul, *Histoire Sainte*, ܬܫܒܚܬܐ ܕܡܪܢ ܝܫܘܥ ܡܫܝܚܐ, Paris 1888.

Bedjan, Paul, *Manuel de Piété,* ou livre de prières, de méditations et des offices (Seconde édition, revue, corrigée, considérablement augmentée, particulièrement par cinq instructions sur la Vraie Eglise), en Néo-Araméen, Paris/Leipzig 1893.

Bedjan, Paul, *Mois de Marie*, ܫܢܐ ܕܩܕܝܫܐ ܒܝ ܡܪܝܡ ܕܒܬܘܠܬܐ, Paris/Leipzig 1904.

Bedjan, Paul, *Vies des Saints*, ܣܛ ܕܡܚܝܐ, Paris/Leipzig 1912.

Cerulli, Enrico, *Testi Neo-Aramaici dell' Iran Settentrionale,* con glossario di Fabrizio A. Pennacchietti, Naples 1971 (Istituto Orientale di Napoli, Ricerche VIII).

Duval, Rubens, *Les dialectes néo-araméens de Salamas. Textes sur l'état actuel de la Perse et contes populaires. Publiés avec une traduction française,* Paris 1883.

Friedrich, Johannes, 'Neusyrisches in Lateinschrift aus der Sowjetunion', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 109 (1959), 50-81.

1. The numerous books of the mission presses (apart from the most important Bible translations, see above) are not included in this list.

2. Until Mois de Marie (1904), Paul Bedjan published his books anonymously. However, there is no doubt as to his autorship of the earlier books.

Friedrich, Johannes, 'Zwei russische Novellen in neusyrischer Übersetzung und Lateinschrift', *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 33,4 (1960).

Friedrich, Johannes, & Lazarus Yaure, 'Onkel Šälu und Qämbär. Eine neusyrische Verserzählung von D. Iljan. Text, Übersetzung und Erläuterungen', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 112, Neue Folge 37 (1962), 6-49.

Goldenberg, Gideon & Mordekhay Zaken, 'The Book of Ruth in Neo-Aramaic', W. Heinrichs, *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, Alanta 1990, 151-57.

Israeli, Yaffa, 'תרגום ספר בראשית לארמית חדשא בלהגם של יהודי סַקִּיז' ('A Translation of the Book of Genesis in Neo-Aramaic in the Dialect of the Jewish Community of Saqqiz: Three Chapters As Examples') in Moshe Bar-Asher (ed.), ספר היובל לגדעון גולדנברג, מסורות, מחקרים במסורות הלשון ובלשונות היהודים, כרך ט־י־יא / *Gideon Goldenberg Festschrift, Massorot*, Studies in Language Traditions and Jewish Languages, 9-10-11, Jerusalem 1997, 455-65.

Kampffmeyer, G., 'Neusyrische Sprichwörter im Dialekt von Urmia', *Mittheilungen des Semi[illegible]ars für Orientalische Sprachen, Westasiatische Studien (2te Abt.)* VIII (1905), 1-24.

Lee, Samuel (ed.), *Vetus Testamentum Syriacè*, Eos tantum libros sistens qui in canone hebraico habentur, ordine vero, quoad fieri potuit, apud syros usitato dispositos, London 1823.

Lidzbarsky, Mark, *Die neu-aramäischen Handschriften der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin in Auswahl herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert*, Weimar 1896 (I, II).

Macuch, Rudolf, & Estiphan Panoussi, *Neusyrische Chrestomathie*, Wiesbaden 1974.

Merx, Adalbert, *Neusyrisches Lesebuch. Texte im Dialecte von Urmia, gesammelt, übersetzt und erklärt*, Breslau 1873.

Osipoff, Sergius, ' Sürja'it' (Syriaque)', *Le maître phonétique* 1913, 79-80.

Panoussi, Estiphan, cf. Macuch 1974.

Pennacchietti, Fabrizio A., cf. Cerulli 1971.

Pennacchietti, Fabrizio A., *Il ladrone e il cherubino. Dramma liturgico cristiano orientale in siriaco e neoaramaico*, Turin 1993.

Polotsky, Hans Jakob, 'Eastern Neo-Aramaic: Urmi and Zakho' in Franz Rosenthal, *An Aramaic Handbook*, Wiesbaden 1967, part II/1 69-77, and II/2 97-111.

Rödiger, Emil, *Chrestomathia syriaca*, Halle/Saale 1838.

Rödiger, Emil, 'Über die aramäische Vulgärsprache der heutigen syrischen Christen', *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 2 (1838), 77-93, 314-316.

Rödiger, Emil, 'Syrische Briefe', *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 3 (1840), 218-225.

Sabar, Yona, *Homilies in the Neo-Aramaic of the Kurdistani Jews on the Parashot Wayḥi, Beshallaḥ and Yitro. Edition, Hebrew Translation, and Introduction*, Jerusalem 1984.

Sabar, Yona, *Targum de-Targum: an old Neo-Aramaic Version of the Targum on Song of Songs. Introduction, eclectic text, English translation, comparitive notes, and glossary*, Wiesbaden 1991.

Sabar, Yona, *The Book of Deuteronomy in Neo-Aramaic, in the Dialect of the Jewish Community of Zakho*, including selected texts in other Neo-Aramaic dialects and a glossary, ספר דברים בארמית חדשה בניבם של יהודי זאכו ונוספו עליו טקסטים אחרים של ארמית חדשה ומילון ['*Ēdā w-lāšon*, Publications of the Hebrew University Language Traditions Project XVIII], Jerusalem 1994.

Sabar, Yona, 'The Christian Neo-Aramaic Dialects of Zakho and Dihok: Two Text Samples', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 115/1 (1995), 33-51.

Sabar, Yona, 'Christian Neo-Aramaic Love Songs in a Jewish Manuscript', Shlomo Izre'el and Shlomo Raz (eds.), *Studies in Modern Semitic Languages* (*Israel Oriental Studies* 16) Leiden / New York / Köln 1996, 85-91.

Socin, Albert, *Die neu-aramäischen Dialekte von Urmia bis Mosul. Texte und Übersetzung*, Tübingen 1882.

Yaure, Lazarus, 'A Poem in the Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Urmia', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 16 (1957), 73-87.

Yaure, Lazarus, cf. Friedrich 1962.

Zaken, Mordekhay, cf. Goldenberg 1990.

Zaken, Moti, 'גורלם של ממציאים" סיפור עם בארמית חדשה של יהודי זאכו' ('"Inventors' Fate" — A Folk-Tale in the Neo-Aramaic of Zakho'), Moshe Bar-Asher (ed.), ספר היובל לגדעון גולדנברג, מסורות, מחקרים במסורות הלשון ובלשונות היהודים, כרך ט־י־יא / *Gideon Goldenberg Festschrift, Massorot*, Studies in Language Traditions and Jewish Languages, 9-10-11, Jerusalem 1997, 383-395.

STUDIES

Ainsworth, W. F., *Travel and Researches in Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Chaldea, and Armenia*, vol I & II, London 1842.

Anderson, Rufus, *History of the Missions of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions to the Oriental Churches*, Boston 1873 (I), 1872 (II), second ed., Boston 1875 (III and IV). [The page numbers are the same in both editions].

Anschütz, Helga, 'Die Gegenwartslage der 'Apostolischen Kirche des Ostens' und ihre Beziehungen zur 'assyrischen' Nationalbewegung', *Ostkirchliche Studien* 18 (1969), 122-145.

Anttila, Raimo, *Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, Amsterdam / Philadelphia 1989[2].

Arberry, A.J., (ed.), *Religion in the Middle East. Three Religions in Concord and Conflict*, Cambridge 1969.

Arnold, Werner, *Das Neuwestaramäische* (Band IV/V, *Grammatik*), Wiesbaden 1990.

Assemani, J.S., *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Rome 1719.

Audo, Thomas (Mar Touma), ܓܪܡܛܝܩܐ ܕܠܫܢܐ ܟܠܕܝܐ ܚܕܬܐ *Grammaire de Langue Chaldéenne Moderne. Dialecte d-Ourmiah*, Urmia 1905, second ed. 1911, reprint Chicago n.d. *(Vernacular Assyrian Grammar).*

Avery, Peter, *Modern Iran*, New York 1970.

Avery, Peter, 'Printing, the Press and Literature in Modern Iran', *Cambridge History of Iran VII*, Cambridge 1991.

Babakhan, J., 'Protestantisme et catholicisme chez le peuple nestorien. Une revue néo-syriaque à Ourmiah (Perse)', *Revue de l'Orient Chrétien* 4 (1899), 428-43.

Badger, George Percy, *The Nestorians and their Rituals: with the Narrative of a Mission to Mesopotamia and Coordistan in 1842-1844, and of a Late Visit to those countries in 1850 etc*, vol. I & II, London 1852.

Badr, Habib, 'Mission to "Nominal Christians": The Policy and Practice of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions and its Missionaries concerning Eastern Churches which led to the Organization of a Protestant Church in Beirut (1819-1848)', Ph.D. Princeton Theological Seminary 1992.

Barnes, William Emery, *The Peshitta Psalter, According to the West Syrian Text*, Edited with an apparatus criticus, Cambridge 1904.

Bassett, James, *Persia, the Land of the Imams. A Narrative of Travel and Residence, 1871-1885*, London 1887.

Bello, P. Stéphane, *La congrégation de S. Hormisdas et l'église chaldéenne dans la première moitié du XIXe siècle*, Rome 1939.

Benyamin, Yoab, 'Assyrians in Middle America. A Historical and Demographic Study of the Chicago Assyrian Community', *Journal of The Assyrian Academic Society* 10/2 (1996), 18-45.

Berry, Jack, 'The Making of Alphabets', Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Readings in the Sociology of Language*, The Hague 1968, 737-53.

Berry, Jack, ' "The Making of Alphabets" Revisited', Joshua A. Fishman (ed.), *Advances in the Creation of Writing Systems*, The Hague 1977, 3-16.

Binder, Henry, *Au Kurdistan en Mésopotamie et en Perse*, Paris 1887.

Bishop, Mrs. Isabella L., *Journeys in Persia and Kurdistan, including a Summer in the Upper Karun Region and a Visit to the Nestorian Rayahs*, vol. I & II, London 1891.

Blau, J., Review of Helmut Ritter, *Ṭuroyo* (1967) and Otto Jastrow, *Laut- und Formenlehre* (1967), *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 31 (1968), 605-10.

Blau, J., 'The Origins of Open and Closed *e* in Proto-Syriac', *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 32 (1969), 1-9.

Bolkestein, A.M., C. de Groot, J.L. Mackenzie (eds.), *Syntax and Pragmatics in Functional Grammar* (Functional Grammar series 1), Dordrecht 1985.

Bolkestein, A. Machtelt, 'General Ideas of Functionalism in Syntax', Joachim Jacobs et al. (eds.), *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (Hugo Steger & Herbert Ernst Wiegand (eds.), *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* 9.1) Berlin / New York 1993, 339-349.

Bolshakoff, Serge, *The Foreign Missions of the Russian Orthodox Church*, London 1943.

Boré, Eugène, *Correspondance et mémoires d'un voyageur en Orient*, 2 vols, Paris 1840.

Bosworth, E. & C. Hillenbrand, *Qajar Iran: Political, Social and Cultural Change, 1800-1925. Studies Presented to Prof. L.P. Elwell-Sutton*, Edinburgh 1983.

Boyarin, Daniel, 'On the History of the Babylonian Jewish Aramaic Reading Traditions: the reflexes of *a and *ā', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 37 (1978), 141-160.

Boyarin, Daniel, 'An Inquiry into the Formation of the Middle Aramaic Dialects', Y. Arbeitman and A. Bomhard (eds.), *Bono Homini Donum*, II (History of Linguistic Science 16), Amsterdam 1981.

Brock, Sebastian, Review of R. Macuch, *Geschichte der spät- und neusyrischen Literatur*, Berlin 1976, *Journal of Semitic Studies* 23 (1978), 129-138.

Brock, Sebastian, 'Christians in the Sasanian Empire: a Case of Divided Loyalties', S. Mews (ed), *Religion and National Identity (Studies in Church History 18)*, Oxford 1982, 1-19.

Brock, Sebastian, 'Some Observations on the Use of Classical Syriac in the Late Twentieth Century', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34 (1989), 363-375.

Brock, Sebastian, 'The 'Nestorian' Church: A Lamentable Misnomer', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 78/3 (1996), 23-35.

Brown, Arthur Judson, *One Hundred Years, A History of the Foreign Missionary Work of the Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., With some Accounts of Countries, Peoples and the Policies and Problems of Modern Missions*, New York 1936.

Buth, R.J., *Word Order in Aramaic from the Perspectives of Functional Grammar and Discourse Analysis*, PhD. 1987, Los Angeles.

Cereteli, Konstantin G., see Tsereteli.

Chafe, Wallace L., 'Givenness, Contrastiveness, Definiteness, Subject, Topics, and Point of View', Charles N. Li (ed), *Subject and Topic*, New York 1976, 25-56.

Chatelet, Aristide, 'La Mission Lazariste en Perse', *Revue d'histoire des missions* 10 (1933), 491-510; 11 (1934), 82-108, 242-69, 384-432, 567-95; 12 (1935), 77-107, 250-7, 427-44; 13 (1936), 397-426, 573-86; 14 (1937), 91-107, 246-57, 389-94, 514-20; 15 (1938), 92-8, 428-32; 16 (1939), 6288, 256-72, 390-401.

Chaumont, M.-L., *La christianisation de l'empire iranien. Des origines aux grandes persécutions du IVe siècle* (Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium 499, Subsidia 80), Louvain 1988.

Chevalier, Michel, *Les montagnards chrétiens du Hakkâri et du Kurdistan septentrional*, Paris 1985.

Coakley, J.F., 'The Archbishop of Canterbury's Assyrian Mission Press: A Bibliography', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 30 (1985), 35-73.

Coakley, J.F., *The Church of the East and the Church of England. A History of the Archbishop of Canterbury's Assyrian Mission*, Oxford 1992.

Coakley, J.F., 'Yaroo M Neesan, "A Missionary to his own People" ', *A Festschrift for Dr. Sebastian P. Brock, Aram Periodical* 5 (1993), 87-100.

Coakley, J.F., 'The First Modern Assyrian Printed Book', *Journal of The Assyrian Academic Society* 9/2 (1995), 30-31 [1995a].

Coakley, J.F., 'Edward Breath and the Typography of Syriac', *Harvard Library Bulletin* 6/4 (1995), 41-64 [1995b].

Coakley, J.F., 'The Church of the East since 1914', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 78/3 (1996), 179-98.

Coakley, J.F., and K. Parry (guest eds.), 'The Church of the East: Life and Thought', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester*, 78/3 (1996).

Cohen, David, *La phrase nominale et l'évolution du système verbal en sémitique. Études de syntaxe historique*, Paris 1984.

Comrie, Bernard, *Language Universals and Linguistic Typology. Syntax and Morphology*, Oxford 1981 [1981a].

Comrie, Bernard (ed.), *The Languages of the Soviet Union*, Cambridge (1981) [1981b].

Connolly, John H., *Constituent Order in Functional Grammar: Synchronic and Diachronic Perspectives* (Functional Grammar Series 14), Dordrecht 1991.

Correll, Christoph, 'Materialen zur Kenntnis des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Baḥ'a' [Dissertation], München 1969.

Correll, Christoph, *Untersuchungen zur Syntax der neuwestaramäischen Dialekte des Antilibanon* (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 44,4) Wiesbaden 1978.

Curzon, George N., *Persia and the Persian Question*, vol. I & II, London 1892.

Cutts, E.L., *Christians under the Crescent in Asia*, London, n.d. (around 1877).

Daneš, František, 'A Three-Level Approach to Syntax', *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1 (1964), 225-240.

Darlow, T.H. and H.F. Moule, *Historical Catalogue of the Printed Editions of Holy Scripture in the Library of The British and Foreign Bible Society*, London 1903 [reprint New York 1963].

Dauvillier, Jean, *Histoire et institutions des églises orientales au Moyen Age*, London 1983.

De Mauroy, Hubert, 'Chrétiens en Iran', (1) 'Les confessions et les communautés géographiques assyro-chaldéennes aujourd'hui en Iran', (2) 'La communauté assyro-chaldéenne dans la population iranienne', (3) 'Les communautés assyro-chaldéennes de la diaspora', (4) 'Pourquoi assyro-chaldéens? Les différentes appellations et leurs variations historiques', *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 24 (1974), 139-162 (1); 296-313 (2); 25 (1975), 174-19 (3); 26 (1976), 66-85 (4).

De Mauroy, Hubert, *Les Assyro-Chaldéens dans l'Iran d'aujourd'hui*, Paris 1978.

De Vries, Wilhelm, 'Elias XIV., letzter nestorianischer Patriarch von Alqoš?', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 26 (1960), 141-148.

De Waard, Jan, & Eugene A. Nida, *From One Language to Another. Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*, Nashville / Camden / New York 1986.

Dik, Simon C., *Functional Grammar*, Dordrecht 1981[3] (1978).

Dik, Simon C., *Studies in Functional Grammar*, London 1980.

Dik, Simon C., *The Theory of Functional Grammar. Part I: The Structure of the Clause* (Functional Grammar series 9), Dordrecht 1989.

Dinkha, Rev. Samuel, **1990-1840 (ܗܘܕܝܐ ܫܒܚܐ ܕܟܬܒܢܝܬܐ ܕܚܕܬܢܝܬܐ ܐܬܘܪܝܬܐ ܕܡܕܝܢܚܐ)** *(A Short History of the Modern Assyrian Literature. Who is Who in the Modern Assyrian Literature (1840-1990))*, 2 vols, Milpitas (California) 1991.

Dirksen, Piet, 'The Urmia Edition of the Peshitta: the Story behind the Text', Alexander Rofé (ed.), *Textus, Studies of the Hebrew University Bible Project* 18, Jerusalem 1995, 157-167.

Dirven, René & Vilém Fried, (eds.), *Functionalism in Linguistics* (*Linguistic & Literary Studies in Eastern Europe* 20) Amsterdam / Philadelphia 1987.

Dodge, Bayard, 'The Settlement of the Assyrians on the Khabbur', *Journal of the Royal Central Asian Society* 27 (1940), 301-320.

Doerfer, G, 'Azeri (Āḏarī) Turkish', Ehsan Yarshater (ed.) *Encyclopaedia Iranica* III, 1989, 245-48.

Edwards, John, *Multilingualism*, London/New York 1994.

Eura, Kinj, see Shoko Okazi.

Fernandez, Alberto M., 'Dawn at Tell Tamir: The Assyrian Christian Survival on the Khabur River', *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* 12/1 (1998), 34-46.

Fiey, Jean Maurice, 'Proto-histoire chrétienne du Hakkari turc', *L'Orient Syrien* 9 (1964), 443-472.

Fiey, Jean Maurice, 'Assyriens ou Araméens', *L'Orient Syrien* 10 (1965), 141-160.

Fiey, Jean Maurice, *Jalons pour une histoire de l'Église en Iraq* (CSCO 310/Subs. 36) Louvain 1970.

Fiey, Jean Maurice, 'Āḏarbāyğān Chrétien', *Le Muséon* 86 (1973) 397-435, reprinted in *Communautés syriaques en Iran et Irak des origines à 1552*, London 1979.

Fiey, Jean Maurice, *Chrétiens syriaques sous les Mongols (Il-Khanat de Perse, XIIIe-XIVe s.)* (CSCO 362 / Subsidia 44), Louvain 1975.

Fiey, Jean Maurice, *Chrétiens syriaques sous les Abbassides surtout à Bagdad (749-1258)* (CSCO 420 / Subsidia 59), Louvain 1980.

Fiey, Jean Maurice, *Pour un Oriens Christianus Novus. Répertoire des diocèses syriaques orientaux et occidentaux* (Beiruter Texte und Studien, Band 49), Beirut 1993 [1993a].

Fiey, Jean Maurice, 'L'Imprimerie des Dominicains de Mossoul 1860-1914', *A Festschrift for Dr. Sebastian P. Brock, Aram Periodical* 5 (1993), 163-174 [1993b].

Fiey, Jean Maurice, 'Comment l'Occident en vint à parler de 'Chaldéens'?', *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library of Manchester* 78/3 (1996), 163-170.

Finnie, *Pioneers East. The Early American Experience in the Middle East*, Cambridge (MA) 1967.

Firbas, Jan, 'On Defining the Theme in Functional Sentence Analysis', *Travaux linguistiques de Prague* 1 (1964), 267-280.

Firbas, Jan, *Functional Sentence Perspective in Written and Spoken Communication*, Cambridge 1992.

Firbas, Jan, 'Some Aspects of the Czechoslovak Approach to Problems of Functional Sentence Perspective', F. Daneš (ed.), *Papers on Functional Sentence Perspective* (*Janua Linguarum*, Series Minor 147) The Hague / Paris 1974, 11-37.

Fishman, Joshua A., 'Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems', Joshua A. Fishman (ed.) *Advances in the Creation and Revision of Writing Systems*, The Hague 1977, xi-xxviii.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., 'The Phases of the Aramaic Language', *A Wandering Aramean. Collected Aramaic Essays*, Missoula 1979, 57-84.

Fodor, István, 'Language Reforms of the Past and in the Developing Countries' (with Appendix 1: 'Scheme of the articles for each language reform'), István Fodor & Claude Hagège, *Language Reform, History and Future* III, Hamburg 1983/4, 441-454.

Fodor, István, 'Language Reforms and Associated Issues', István Fodor & Claude Hagège, *Language Reform, History and Future* VI, Hamburg 1994, 541-563.

Fox, Samuel Ethan, 'Cliticization in Neo-Aramaic', W. Heinrichs (ed), *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, Atlanta 1990, 69-78.

Foy, Karl, 'Azerbajğanische Studien mit einer Charakteristik des Südtürkischen', *Mittheilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen, Westasiatische Studien (2te Abt.)* VI (1903), 126-193 and 'Azerbajğanische Studien mit einer Charakteristik des Südtürkischen II', VII (1904), 197-265. Part three of this article unfortunately was not published because of Foy's death in 1907 (see *MdSfOS* X (1907).

Fromkin, David, *A Peace to end all Peace. Creating the Modern Middle East. 1914-1922*, London 1989.

Frye, Richard N., 'Assyria and Syria: Synonyms', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 51 (1992), 281-285 [reprint with 'A Postscript to my article' in *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* (formerly *Journal of The Assyrian Academic Society*), 11/2 (1997), 30-36].

Garbell, Irene, ' "Flat" Words and Syllables in Jewish East New Aramaic of Persian Azerbaijan and the Contiguous districts (A Problem of Multilingualism)', H. Rosén (ed.), *Studies in Egyptology and Linguistics*, in honour of H.J. Polotsky, Jerusalem 1964, 86-103.

Garbell, Irene, *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Persian Azerbaijan*, London etc. 1965 [1965a].

Garbell, Irene, 'The Impact of Kurdish and Turkish on the Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Persian Azerbaijan and the adjoining Regions', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 85 (1965), 159-177 [1965b].

Gebruers, 'S.C. Dik's Functional Grammar: A Pilgrimage to Prague?', Dirven, René & Fried, Vilém (eds.), *Functionalism in Linguistics* (*Linguistic & Literary Studies in Eastern Europe* 20) Amsterdam / Philadelphia 1987, 101-134.

Givón, Talmy, 'Topic, Pronoun, and Grammatical Agreement', Charles N. Li (ed), *Subject and Topic*, New York 1976, 149-188.

Givón, Talmy, *Syntax. A Functional-typological Introduction*, vol. I, Amsterdam / Philadelphia 1984 [1984a].

Givón, Talmy, 'Direct Object and Dative Shifting: Semantic and pragmatic Case', Frans Plank (ed.), *Objects*, Konstanz 1984, 151-182 [1984b].

Givón, Talmy, *Syntax. A Functional-typological Introduction*, vol. II, Amsterdam / Philadelphia 1990.

Goldenberg, Gideon, 'Imperfectly-Transformed Cleft Sentences', *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies*, Jerusalem 1977, 127-133.

Goldenberg, Gideon, 'On Syriac Sentence Structure', *Arameans, Aramaic and the Aramaic Literary Tradition*, M. Sokoloff (ed.), Ramat Gan 1983, 97-140.

Goldenberg, Gideon, 'On some Niceties of Syriac Syntax', René Lavenant (ed.), *V Symposium Syriacum 1988* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 236), Rome 1990, 335-344.

Goldenberg, Gideon, 'Aramaic Perfects', *Israel Oriental Studies* 12 (1992), 113-137.

Goldenberg, Gideon, Review of Otto Jastrow's *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Hertevin (Provinz Siirt)* (1988), *Journal of Semitic Studies* 38,2 (1993), 295-308.

Goldenberg, Gideon, 'Bible Translations and Syriac Idiom', P.B. Dirksen & A. van der Kooij (eds.), *The Peshitta as a Translation. Papers Read at the II Peshitta Symposium Held at Leiden 19-21 August 1993*, Leiden / New York / Köln 1995, 25-39.

Goormachtigh, B.-M., 'Histoire de la Mission Dominicaine en Mésopotamie et au Kurdistan', *Analecta Sacri Ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum* 2 (1895-6), 271-83, 405-19; 3 (1897-8), 79-88, 141-58, 197-214, 533-45.

Goshen-Gottstein, M.H., *Syriac Manuscripts in the Harvard College Library: A Catalogue* (Harvard Semitic Studies 23), Misssoula (Montana) 1979.

Gottheil, R.J.H., 'The Judæo-Aramean Dialect of Salamās', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 15 (1893), 297-310.

Goyau, G., *La Congrégation de la Mission des Lazaristes*, Paris 1938.

Grabill, Joseph L., *Protestant Diplomacy and the Near East: Missionary Influence on American Policy*, 1810-1927, Minneapolis 1971.

Grant, A., *The Nestorians or the Lost Tribes*, London 1841 (reprint Amsterdam 1973).

Greenberg, Joseph H. 'Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements', Joseph H. Greenberg (ed.) *Universals of Language*, Cambridge Massachusetts 1963, 58-90.

Greenfield, Jonas C., 'Standard Literary Aramaic', A. Caquot and D. Cohen (eds), *Actes du premier Congres international de linguistique sémitique et chamito-sémitique, Paris 16-19 juillet 1969* (Janua linguarum, Series practica 159), The Hague 1974, 280-289.

Greenfield, Jonas C., 'The Dialects of Early Aramaic', *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 37 (1978), 93-99.

Guest, W., *Fidelia Fiske. The Story of a Consecrated Life*, London, n.d. (preface 1870).

Haccius, Georg, Hannoversche Missionsgeschichte 3/1, Hermannsburg 1914, 412422; 3/2, Hermannsburg 1920, 369-385.

Hage, W., 'Nestorianische Kirche', *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 24, Berlin / New York 1994, 264-76.

Hagège, Claude, 'Voies et destins de l'action humaine sur les langues', István Fodor & Claude Hagège, *Language Reform, History and Future* I, Hamburg 1983, 11-68.

Hajjar, J., *Le Vatican – La France et le catholicisme oriental (1878-1914). Diplomatie et histoire de l'église*, Paris 1979.

Hambly, G.R.G. 'The Traditional Iranian City in the Qājār Period', *Cambridge History of Iran* VII, 1991, 542-89.

Hartmann, K.-P., *Untersuchungen zur Sozialgeographie christlicher Minderheiten im Vorderen Orient* (Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des vorderen Orients, Reihe B, Nr. 43), Wiesbaden 1980.

Heazell, F.N., *The Woes of a Distressed Nation. Being an Account of the Assyrian People, – from 1914 to 1934 –*, London 1934.

Heazell, F.N., & Mrs. Margoliouth, *Kurds & Christians*, London 1913.

Heinrichs, Wolfhart, (ed), *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, Atlanta 1990.

Heinrichs, Wolfhart, 'The Modern Assyrians – Name and Nation', R. Contini (ed.), *Semitica. Serta philologica Constantino Tsereteli dicata*, Turin 1993, 99-114.

Hetzron, Robert, 'The Morphology of the Verb in Modern Syriac (Christian Colloquial of Urmi), *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 89 (1969), 112-127.

Hoberman, Robert D., 'The Phonology of Pharyngeals and Pharyngealization in Pre-Modern Aramaic', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105 (1985), 221-231.

Hoberman, Robert D., 'The History of the Modern Aramaic Pronouns and Pronominal Suffixes', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 108 (1988), 557-575.

Hoberman, Robert D., *The Syntax and Semantics of Verb Morphology in Modern Aramaic. A Jewish Dialect of Iraqi Kurdistan*, New Haven 1989 [1989a].

Hoberman, Robert D., 'Parameters of Emphasis: Autosegmental Analysis of Pharyngealization in Four Languages', *Journal of Afroasiatic Languages* 2:1 (1989), 73-98 [1989b].

Hoberman, Robert D., 'Agglutination and Composition in Neo-Aramaic Verb Inflection', Paul Wexler, Alexander Borg, Sasson Somekh (eds.), *Studia Linguistica et Orientalia Memoriae Haim Blanc Dedicata*, Wiesbaden 1989, 145-55 [1989c].

Hoberman, Robert D., 'Reconstructing Pre-Modern Aramaic Morphology: The Independent Pronouns', W. Heinrichs (ed.), *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, Atlanta 1990, 79-88.

Hoberman, Robert D., 'Formal Properties of the Conjugations in Modern Aramaic', Geert Booij and Jaap van Marle (eds.), *Yearbook of Morphology 1991*, 49-6.

Hoberman, Robert D., 'Modern Aramaic', William Bright & Peter Daniels (eds), *The World's Writing Systems*, New York 1996, 504-510.

Hoberman, Robert D., 'The Modern Chaldean Pronunciation of Classical Syriac', Asma Afsaruddin & A.H. Matthias Zahniser (eds), *Humanism, Culture, and Language in the Near East: Studies in Honor of Georg Krotkoff*, Winona Lake (IN) 1997.

Hopkins, Simon, 'Neo-Aramaic Dialects and the Formation of the Preterite', *Journal of Semitic Languages* 34 (1989), 413-432.

Hopkins, Simon, 'יהודי כורדיסתאן בארץ־ישראל ולשונם' ('The Kurdistan Jews in Israel and their Language'), 56 פעמים, פרקי עיון במורשת ישראל במזרח (*Pe'amim, Studies in Oriental Jewry* 56) קיץ תשנ"ג (Summer 1993), 50-74.

Hopkins, Simon, 'על הצירוף שמה לגברא "שמו של האיש" בארמית' ('On the Construction *šmēh l-ḡaḇrā* "the Name of the Man" in Aramaic') in Moshe Bar-Asher (ed.), ספר היובל לגדעון גולדנברג, מסורות, מחקרים במסורות, הלשון ובלשונות היהודים, כרך ט־י־יא / *Gideon Goldenberg Festschrift, Massorot*, Studies in Language Traditions and Jewish Languages, 9-10-11, Jerusalem 1997, 349-361.

Hopper, Paul J., 'Discourse Functions and Word Order Shift: A Typological Study of the VS/SV Alternation', W.P. Lehmann (ed.), *Language Typology 1985. Papers from the Linguistic Typology Symposium, Moscow, 9-13 December 1985*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia 1986.

Hornus, Jean-Michel, Introduction to R.S. Reed, *La Mission de l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry auprès des Assyriens* (Cahiers d'études chrétiennes orientales, nr. VI), n.p. 1968, 3-13.

Hornus, Jean-Michel, 'Notes et Documents. Un rapport du consul de France à Erzéroum sur la situation des chrétiens en Perse au milieu du XIXe siècle. Texte du Comte de Challaye publié avec introduction et notes', *Proche-Orient Chrétien* 20 (1970), 272-301, 21 (1971), 3-29, 127-151, 289-315, and 22 (1972), 288-304.

Hornus, Jean-Michel, *Cent cinquante ans de présence evangélique (1908-1958)*, (Cahier d'études chrétiennes orientales XIII) Paris 1979.

Hulst, Harry van der & Norval Smith, 'Introduction', Harry van der Hulst & Norval Smith (eds.), *The Structure of Phonological Representations (Part I)*, Dordrecht 1982, 2-45 [1982a].

Hulst, Harry van der & Norval Smith, 'Prosodic Domains and Opaque Segments in Autosegmental Theory', Harry van der Hulst & Norval Smith (eds.), *The Structure of Phonological Representations (Part II)*, Dordrecht 1982, 311-336 [1982b].

Ishaya, A., 'Assyrian Settlements outside of Iran', Ehsan Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica* II (1987), 824-25.

Ishaya, Arian, 'A Commentary on Professor Zirinsky's Article "American Presbyterian Missionaries at Urmia during the Great War" ', *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* 12/1 (1998), 28-33.

Issawi, C., 'European Economic Penetration. 1872-1921', *Cambridge History of Iran* VII (1991), 590-607.

Izady, Mehrdad R., *The Kurds: A Concise Handbook*, Washington 1992.

Jastrow, Otto, *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Mīdin im Ṭūr ʿAbdīn*, Wiesbaden 1993 (4., unveränderte Auflage, 1. Aufl. 1967).

Jastrow, Otto, *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Hertevin (Provinz Siirt)*, Wiesbaden 1988.

Jastrow, Otto, *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Mlaḥsô*, Wiesbaden 1994.

Jastrow, Otto, 'The Neo-Aramaic Languages', Robert Hetzron (ed.), *The Semitic Languages*, London 1997, 334-377.

Javadi, H., & K. Burrill, 'Azeri Literature in Iran', Ehsan Yarshater (ed.), *Encyclopaedia Iranica* III (1989), 251-55.

Jespersen, Otto, *The Philosophy of Grammar*, London 1924.

Joseph, John, *The Nestorians and their Muslim Neighbors. A Study of Western Influence on their Relations*, Princeton (New Jersey) 1961.

Joseph, John, *Muslim-Christian Relations and Inter-Christian Rivalries in the Middle East. The Case of the Jacobites in an Age of Transition*, Albany (NY) 1983.

Joseph, John, 'Assyria and Syria: Synonyms?', *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* (formerly *Journal of The Assyrian Academic Society*), 11/2 (1997), 36-43.

Joseph, John, 'The Bible and the Assyrians. It Kept their Memory Alive', *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* 12/1 (1998), 70-76.

Jowett, W.A., *Christian Researches in Syria and the Holy Land, in 1823 and 1824 in Furtherance of the Object of the Church Missionary Society*, London 1825, Boston 1826.

Joüon, Paul S.J. & T. Muraoka, *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. Translated and Revised by T. Muraoka (Subsidia Biblica 14/I and 14/II), Rome 1991, 1993[2].

Kampffmeyer, G., 'Neusyrische Sprichwörter im Dialekt von Urmia', *Mittheilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen, Westasiatische Studien (2te Abt.)* VIII (1905), 1-24.

Kapeliuk, Olga, see Marogulov.

Kapeliuk, Olga, 'Miscellanea Neo-Syriaca', *Jerusalem Studies in Arabic and Islam* 15 (1992), 60-73.

Kapeliuk, Olga, 'Is Modern Hebrew the only "Indo-Europanized" Semitic Language? And what about Neo-Aramaic?', Shlomo Izre'el and Shlomo Raz (eds.), *Studies in Modern Semitic Languages* (*Israel Oriental Studies* 16) Leiden / New York / Köln 1996, 59-70.

Kapeliuk, Olga, 'ת ו־ד רפות בארמית חדשה' ('Spirantization of *t* and *d* in Neo-Aramaic') in Moshe Bar-Asher (ed.) ספר היובל לגדעון גולדנברג, מסורות מחקרים במסורות הלשון ובלשונות היהודים, כרך ט־י־יא (*Gideon Goldenberg Festschrift*, *Massorot*, Studies in Language Traditions and Jewish Languages, 9-10-11), Jerusalem 1997, 527-544.

Kawerau, Peter, 'Die nestorianischen Patriarchate in der neueren Zeit', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* lxvii (1955), 119-131.

Kawerau, Peter, *Amerika und die orientalischen Kirchen. Ursprung und Anfang der amerikanischen Mission unter den Nationalkirchen Westasiens*, Berlin 1958.

Kazemzadeh, Firuz, *Russia and Britain in Persia, 1864-1914. A Study in Imperialism*, New Haven / London 1968.

Kazemzadeh, Firuz, 'Iranian Relations with Russia and the Soviet Union, to 1921' *Cambridge History of Iran* VII (1991), 314-49.

Keddie, Nikki, 'Iran under the Later Qājārs, 1848-1922, *Cambridge History of Iran* VII (1991), 174-212.

Keenan, Edward L., 'Towards a Universal Definition of "Subject" ', Charles N. Li (ed), *Subject and Topic*, New York 1976, 305-333.

Khan, Geoffrey, *Studies in Semitic Syntax*, Oxford 1988 (London Oriental Series 38).

Krotkoff, Georg, *A Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Kurdistan, Texts, Grammar, and Vocabulary*, New Haven, Connecticut 1982.

Krotkoff, Georg, 'Studies in Neo-Aramaic Lexicology', Ann Kort & Scott Morschauser (eds.), *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, Winona Lake 1985, 123-134.

Krotkoff, Georg, 'An Annotated Bibliography of Neo-Aramaic', W. Heinrichs (ed.), *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, Atlanta 1990, 3-26.

Kutscher, E.Y., 'Two 'Passive' constructions in Aramaic in the Light of Persian', *Proceedings of the International Conference on Semitic Studies (1965)*, Jerusalem 1969, 132-151.

Labourt, J., *Le christianisme dans l'empire perse sous la dynastie sassanide*, Paris 1904.

Lambton, A.K.S., 'Land Tenure and Land Revenue Administration in the Nineteenth Century', *Qajar Persia, Eleven Studies*, London 1987, 33-86 (reprinted in *Cambridge History of Iran* VII (1991), 459-505) [1987a].

Lambton, A.K.S., 'Social Change in Persia in the Nineteenth Century', *Qajar Persia, Eleven Studies*, London 1987, 194-222 (earlier published in *Asian and African Studies* 15 (1981), 123-48) [1987b].

Lampart, Albert, *Ein Martyrer der Union met Rom, Joseph I. 1681-1696, Patriarch der Chaldäer*, Einsiedeln 1966.

Laurie, Thomas, *Dr. Grant and the Mountain Nestorians*, Boston 1853.

Laurie, Thomas *Historical Sketch of the Mission to the Nestorians and of the Assyria Mission*, New York 1862 (the first part is by Justin Perkins).

Laurie, Thomas, *Woman and her Saviour in Persia*, Boston 1863.

Layard, Henry, *Nineveh and its Remains. With an Account of a Visit to the Chaldean Christians of Kurdistan, and the Yezidis, or Devil-worshippers; and an Enquiry into the Manners and Arts of the Ancient Assyrians*, vol I & II, London 1850 (5th ed.).

Lazard, Gilbert, *Grammaire du persan contemporain*, Paris 1957.

Lewis, E.G., *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union*, The Hague 1972.

Li, Charles N. (ed), *Subject and Topic*, New York 1976.

Li, Charles N. & Sandra A. Thompson, 'Subject and Topic: A New Typology of Language', Charles N. Li (ed), *Subject and Topic*, New York 1976, 457-490.

Lyko, D., *Gründung, Wachstum und Leben der evangelischen christlichen Kirchen in Iran*, Leiden / Köln 1964.

Maclean, Arthur J. and W.H. Browne, *The Catholicos of the East and his People (being the Impressions of Five Years' Work in the 'Archbishop of Canterbury's Assyrian Mission', etc.)*, London 1892.

Maclean, Arthur J., *East Syrian Daily Offices. Translated from the Syriac with Introduction, Notes, and Indices and an Appendix Containing the Lectionary and Glossary*, London 1894.

Maclean, Arthur J., *Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac, as Spoken by the Eastern Syrians of Kurdistan, North-West Persia and the Plain of Mosul, with Notices of the Vernacular of the Jews of Azerbijan and of Zakhu near Mosul, with an Introduction and a Collection of Proverbs*, Cambridge 1895 (reprint Amsterdam 1971).

Maclean, Arthur J., *Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac, as Spoken by the Eastern Syrians of Kurdistan, North-West Persia and the Plain of Mosul, with Illustrations from the Dialects of the Jews of Zakhu and Azerbaijan, and of the Western Syrians of Tur'Abdin and Ma'lula, and an Introduction*, Oxford 1901 (reprint Amsterdam 1972).

Macuch, Rudolf, *Geschichte der spät- und neusyrischen Literatur*, Berlin 1976.

Macuch, Rudolf, 'Literature of the Assyrians', Ehsan Yarshater (ed.) *Encyclopaedia Iranica* II (1987), 822-24.

Macuch, Rudolf, 'The Assyrian Community in Iran', Ehsan Yarshater (ed.) *Encyclopaedia Iranica* II (1987), 817-22.

Macuch, Rudolf, *Neumandäische Chrestomathie mit grammatischer Skizze, kommentierter Übersetzung und Glossar*, unter mitwirkung von Klaus Boekels (Porta Linguarum Orientalum, Neue Serie XVIII), Wiesbaden 1989.

Macuch, Rudolf, 'Ein neumandäischer Brief aus dem Frühjahr 1990 und die Lage der iranischen Mandäern nach der islamischen Revolution', in R. Contini, *Semitica. Serta philologica Constantino Tsereteli dicata*, Turin 1993, 165-173.

Malech, Dawid, *History of the Syrian Nation and the Old Evangelical-Apostolic Church of the East. From Remote Antiquity to the Present Time*, Minneapolis 1910.

Marogulov, Q.I., *Grammaire néo-syriaque pour écoles d'adultes (dialecte d'Urmia), Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques (GLECS)* suppl. 5, 1976. Original edition: *Grammatiqi qə mədrəsi d gurı*, Moscow 1935. Translated by Olga Kapeliuk.

Mathesius, Vilém, 'Zur Satzperspektive im modernen Englisch', *Archiv für das Studium der neueren Sprachen und Literaturen* 155 (1929), 202-10.

Mathesius, Vilém, 'O tak zvaném aktuálním členění větném', *Slovo a slovesnosti* 5 (1939), 171-174, translated as 'On information-bearing structure of the sentence', S. Kuno (ed.), *Harvard Studies in Syntax and Semantics* 1975, 467-80.

Mengozzi, A., 'The Neo-Aramaic Manuscripts of the British Library: Notes on the study of the *durekyatha* as a Neo-Syriac genre', forthcoming in *Le Muséon*.

Mooshie, Youkhanan, ܩܨܒܬܐ ܕܟܬܒ ܗܘܕܝܬܐ (*Modern Assyrian Grammar)* Urmi 1912, reprints Tabriz 1928 and Chicago 1982.

Moss, Cyril, *Catalogue of Syriac Printed books and Related Literature in the British Museum*, London 1962.

Moutaouakil, Ahmed, *Pragmatic Functions in a Functional Grammar of Arabic* (Functional Grammar Series 8), Dordrecht 1989.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, 'On the Nominal Clause in the Old Syriac Gospels', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 20 (1975), 28-37.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, 'On the Syriac Particle *it*', *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 34 (1977), 21-22.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, 'The Tell-Fekherye Bilingual Inscription and Early Aramaic', *Abr-Nahrain* 22 (1983/4), 79-117.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, *Emphatic Words and Structures in Biblical Hebrew*, Jerusalem / Leiden 1985.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, *Classical Syriac for Hebraists*, Wiesbaden 1987.

Muraoka, Takamitsu, see Paul Joüon.

Murre-van den Berg, H.L., 'Paul Bedjan (1838-1920) and his Neo-Syriac Writings', René Lavenant, S.J. (ed), *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 247), Rome 1994, 381-392.

Murre-van den Berg, H.L., 'The Missionaries' Assistants. The Role of Assyrians in the Development of Written Urmia Aramaic', *Journal of The Assyrian Academic Society* 10/2 (1996), 3-17.

Murre-van den Berg, H.L., 'De Assyriërs in de Verenigde Staten', *Het Christelijk Oosten* 49/1-2 (1997), 148-152 [1997a].

Murre-van den Berg, H.L., 'Geldelijk of geestelijk gewin. Assyrische bisschoppen op de loonlijst van een Amerikaanse zendingspost', *Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* (Dutch Review of Church History) 77/2 (1997) 241-257 [1997b].

Murre-van den Berg, H.L., 'A Syrian Awakening. Alqosh and Urmia as Centres of Neo-Syriac Writing', René Lavenant, S.J. (ed), *Symposium Syriacum VII*. (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 256), Rome 1998, 499-515.

Murre-van den Berg, H.L., 'The Patriarchs of the Church of the East from the Fifteenth to Eighteenth Centuries', to appear in *Hugoye: Journal of Syriac Studies* 2,2 (1999), http://www.acad.cua.edu/syrcom/Hugoye/index.html.

Murre-van den Berg, H.L., 'The American Board and the Eastern Churches: The Nestorian Mission (1844-1846)', to appear in *Orientalia Christiana Periodica*.

Nestorian Biography: Being Sketches of Pious Nestorians Who Have Died at Oroomiah, Persia, by missionaries of the A.B.C.F.M., Boston 1857 (reprint: Chicago 1993).

Nida, Eugene A., see De Waard 1986.

Nöldeke, Theodor, *Grammatik der Neusyrischen Sprache, am Urmia-See und in Kurdistan*, Leipzig 1868 (reprint Hildesheim 1974).

Nöldeke, Theodor, 'Die Namen der aramäischen Nation und Sprache', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 25 (1871), 113-31.

Nöldeke, Theodor, Review of 'A. Merx, *Neusyrisches Lesebuch. Texte im Dialecte von Urmia*', *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1873 (II), 1961-75.

Nöldeke, Theodor, Review of 'A. Socin, *Die neu-aramäischen Dialekte von Urmia bis Mosul*', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 36 (1882), 669-682.

Nöldeke, Theodor, Review of 'R. Duval, Les dialectes néo-araméens de Salamas', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 37 (1883), 598-609.

Nöldeke, Theodor, *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*, Leipzig 1898 (2nd ed.), reprint Darmstadt 1977.

Odisho, Edward Y., *The Sound System of Modern Assyrian (Neo-Aramaic)*, Wiesbaden 1988.

Odisho, Edward Y., 'Phonetic and Phonological Description of the Labio-Palatal and Labio-Velar Approximants in Neo-Aramaic', W. Heinrichs (ed.), *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, Atlanta 1990, 29-33.

Odisho, Edward Y., 'Bilingualism and Multilingualism among Assyrians. A Case of Language Erosion and Demise', R. Contini, *Semitica. Serta philologica Constantino Tsereteli dicata*, Turin 1993, 189-200.

Okazi, Shoko, and Kinj Eura, *Bibliography on Qajar Persia*, Osaka 1985.

Oussani, Gabriel, 'The Modern Chaldeans and Nestorians, and the Study of Syriac among them', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 22 (1901), 79-96.

Parry, K., cf. Coakley 1996.

Pennacchietti, Fabrizio A., 'Gli allomorfi della flessione preteritale del dialetto neoaramaico orientale di Hertevin (Turchia) in prospettiva storica', Alan S. Kaye (ed.), *Semitic Studies. In honor of Wolf Leslau on the occasion of his eighty-fifth birthday, November 14, 1991*, Wiesbaden 1991, Vol. II 1197-1201.

Pennacchietti, Fabrizio A., *Il ladrone e il cherubino. Dramma liturgico cristiano orientale in siriaco e neoaramaico*, Turin 1993.

Pennacchietti, Fabrizio A., 'Il preterito neoaramaico con pronome oggetto', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 144/2 (1994), 259-283.

Pennacchietti, Fabrizio A., 'Il pronome determinativo *d* e la complementazione dall'aggettivo nel Neoaramaico di Urmia', Shlomo Izre'el and Shlomo Raz (eds.), *Studies in Modern Semitic Languages* (*Israel Oriental Studies* 16) Leiden / New York / Köln 1996, 71-84.

Pennacchietti, Fabrizio A., 'על האטימולוגיה של המילית qam/kim בארמית חדשה' ('On the Etymology of the Neo-Aramaic Particle *qam/kim*-'), Moshe BarAsher (ed.), ספר היובל לגדעון גולדנברג, מסורות מחקרים במסורות הלשון ובלשונות היהודים, כרך ט־י־יא (*Gideon Goldenberg Festschrift*, *Massorot*, Studies in Language Traditions and Jewish Languages, 9-10-11), Jerusalem 1997, 475-482.

Perkins, Justin, *A Residence of Eight Years in Persia among the Nestorian Christians with Notices of the Muhammedans*, Andover 1843.

Perkins, Justin, 'Journal of a Tour from Oroomiah to Mosul through the Koordish Mountains and a Visit to the Ruins of Nineveh', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 2 (1851) 69-123.

Perkins, Justin, *The Persian Flower. A Memoir of Judith Grant Perkins of Oroomiah, Persia*, Boston 1853.

Perkins, Justin, 'Notice of a Life of Alexander the Great', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 4 (1854), 357-439.

Perkins, Justin, *Missionary Life in Persia: being glimpses of a quarter of a century of labors among the Nestorian Christians*, Boston 1861.

Perkins, Justin, *Historical Sketch of the Mission to the Nestorians and of the Assyria Mission* (the latter part by Thomas Laurie), New York 1862.

Perkins, Justin, 'The Revelation of the Blessed Apostle Paul. Translated from an Ancient Syriac Manuscript', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 8 (1866), 183-212.

Perkins, Rev. Henry Martyn, *Life of Rev. Justin Perkins, D.D.* (Missionary Annals), Chicago 1887.

Phillips, Clifton Jackson, *Protestant America and the Pagan World. The First Half Century of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, 1810-1860* (Harvard East Asian Monographs 32), Cambridge MA 1969.

Pitman, Emma Raymond, *Heroines of the Mission Field. Biographical Sketches of Female Missionaries who have laboured in various Lands among the Heathen*, London/Paris/New York, n.d.

Poizat, Bruno, 'Un traité sur le verbe néo-araméen: présentation et traduction (partielle) d'un ouvrage en soureth (suret) de Nimrod Simono, *Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques* (1973-1979), 169-192 [1973-1979a].

Poizat, Bruno, 'Une bibliographie commentée pour le néo-araméen', *Comptes rendus du Groupe Linguistique d'Études Chamito-Sémitiques* 18-22 (1973-1979), 347-414 [1973-1979b].

Poizat, Bruno, 'La complainte sur la peste de Pioz', W. Heinrichs (ed.), *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, Atlanta (Georgia) 1990, 161-79 and 203-7.

Poizat, Bruno, 'La peste de Pioz. Suite et fin', R. Contini, *Semitica. Serta philologica Constantino Tsereteli dicata*, Turin 1993, 227-72.

Polotsky, H.J., 'Studies in Modern Syriac', *Journal of Semitic Studies* 6 (1961), 1-32.

Polotsky, H.J., Review of Johannes Friedrich, 'Zwei russische Novellen in neusyrischer Übersetzung und Lateinschrift', *Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 33,4 1960, in *Orientalia* 3 (1962), 273-83.

Polotsky, H.J., 'Verbs with Two Objects in Modern Syriac (Urmi)', *Israel Oriental Studies IX*, 1979, 204-227.

Polotsky, H.J., 'Neusyrische Konjugation', *Orientalia Suecana* 33-35 (1984-1986) 323-332 [An English translation of this article was published by Robert Hoberman in *Journal of Semitic Studies* 36 (1991)].

Polotsky, H.J., 'Incorporation in Modern Syriac', G. Goldenberg and Sh. Raz (eds.), *Semitic and Cushitic Studies*, Wiesbaden 1994, 90-102.

Polotsky, H.J., 'Notes on a Neo-Syriac Grammar', edited by Olga Kapeliuk, Shlomo Izre'el and Shlomo Raz (eds.), *Studies in Modern Semitic Languages* (*Israel Oriental Studies* 16) Leiden / New York / Köln 1996, 11-48.

Porterfield, Amanda, *Mary Lyon and the Mount Holyoke Missionaries*, New York / Oxford 1997.

Reed, R.S., *La Mission de l'Archevêque de Cantorbéry auprès des Assyriens* (Cahiers d'Études Chrétiennes orientales, nr. VI), n.p. 1968 (with an introduction by J.-M. Hornus).

Reinink, G.J., 'Die Textüberlieferung der Gannat Bussame', *Le Muséon* 90 (1977), 103-175.

Rhea, S.A., 'Brief Grammar and Vocabulary of the Kurdish Language of the Hakari District', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 10 (1880), 118-154.

Rhetoré, P.J., *Grammaire de la langue Soureth ou chaldéen vulgaire selon le dialecte de la plaine de Mossoul et des pays adjacents*, Mossoul 1912.

Rich, C.J., *Narrative of a Residence in Koordistan, and on the Site of Ancient Nineve; with a Journal of a Voyage down the Tigris to Bagdad and an Account of a Visit to Shiraz and Persepolis*, vol. I & II, London 1831.

Richter, Julius, *Mission und Evangelisation im Orient*, Gütersloh 1908.

Richter, Julius, *A History of Protestant Missions in the Near East*, New York 1910 (reprint 1970). (Revised version of Richter 1908)

Riley, Athelstan, *Progress and Prospects of the Archbishop's Mission to the Assyrian Christians; being the Report of a Visit to the Mission in the Autumn of 1888, Two Years after its Foundation*, London 1889.

Riley, Athelstan, *The Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians, I: Narrative of a Visit to the Assyrian Christians in 1884*; II: *Report on the Foundation of the Archbishop's Mission to the Assyrian Church in 1886* (perhaps a reprint of a non-dated edition which appeared somewhere in 1887), London 1891.

Robert, Dana L., *American Women in Mission: A Social History of Their Thought and Practice*, Macon (Georgia) 1997.

Rosenberg, I, *Lehrbuch der neusyrischen Schrift- und Umgangssprache*, Wien, Pest, Leipzig, not dated, about 1903.

Rücker, A., Obituary notice on P. Paul Bedjan C.M., *Oriens Christianus* (1923), 146-151.

Sachau, Eduard, *Reise in Syrien und Mesopotamien*, Leipzig 1883.

Sachau, Eduard, *Kurzes Verzeichniss der Sachau'schen Sammlung syrischer Handschriften. Nebst Übersicht des alten Bestandes, Königliche Bibliothek Berlin*, Berlin 1885.

Sachau, Eduard, 'Skizze des Fellichi-Dialekts von Mosul', *Philosophische und historische Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1895.

Sachau, Eduard, 'Über die Poesie in der Volkssprache der Nestorianer', *Sitzungsberichte der Königlich-Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin* 1896, 179-215.

Sachau, Eduard, 'Neu-Nestorianisch oder Fellîḥî, Nr. 117-137', *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der Königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin. Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften*, Band 23, Berlin 1899, 415-448.

Sarmas, Pera, ܦܥܕܒܐ ܕܣܘܪܝܝܐ ܠܐܣܛܪܐ (*History of the Assyrian Literature*), 3 vols, Tehran 1962-1970.

Segert, S., review of Tsereteli (1958), *Archiv Orientální* 29 (1961) 96-105.

Sgall, Petr, 'The Czech Tradition', Joachim Jacobs et al. (eds.), *Syntax. Ein internationales Handbuch zeitgenössischer Forschung* (Hugo Steger & Herbert Ernst Wiegand (eds.), *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft* 9.1) Berlin / New York 1993, 349-368.

Shedd, Mary Lewis, *The Measure of a Man. The Life of William Ambrose Shedd, Missionary to Persia*, New York 1922.

Shuster, W. Morgan, *The Strangling of Persia*, New York 1912.

Simono, Nimrud, ܫܡܥܘܢ ܢܡܪܘܕ (Paul Bedjan, 1838-1920), Tehran 1984 (Neo-Aramaic and Persian).

Smeets, Rieks, 'The Development of Literary Languages in the Soviet Union: the Case of Circassian', István Fodor & Claude Hagège (eds.), *Language Reform, History and Future* VI, Hamburg 1994, 513-40.

Smith, A., 'Contribution to the Geography of Central Koordistan', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 2 (1851), 61-68.

Smith, Eli, and H.G.O. Dwight, *Missionary Researches in Armenia: Including a Journey through Asia Minor, and into Georgia and Persia, with a Visit to the Nestorian and Chaldean Christians of Oormiah and Salmas*, London 1834.

Solomon, Z.S., & R.K. Headly, 'The Phonology of Modern Spoken Syriac', *Anthropological Linguistics* 15 (1973), 136-147.

Southgate, Rev. Horatio, *Narrative of a Tour through Armenia, Kurdistan, Persia and Mesopatamia with Observations on the Condition of Mohammedanism and Christianity in those Countries*, vol. I & II, London 1840.

Speer, Robert E., *'The Hakim Sahib'. The Foreign Doctor. A Biography of Joseph Plumb Cochran, MD. of Persia*, London 1911.

Spuler, B., *Die morgenländischen Kirchen* (Handbuch der Orientalistik, I Abt. VIII Band 2 Abschnitte), Leiden / Köln 1964.

Stoddard, D.T., 'Aus einem Briefe des Miss. David T. Stoddard an Prof. Dr. Bernstein', *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 8 (1845), 847-849

Stoddard, D.T., *Narrative of the Late Revival among the Nestorians*. Read at Oroomiah, Persia at the Anniversary of the Mission (Sept. 1846), Boston 1847.

Stoddard, D.T., 'From a Letter from Rev. D.T. Stoddard, of Orûmiah', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 5 (1855/56), 259, 426.

Stoddard, D.T., *Grammar of the Modern Syriac Language as Spoken in Oroomiah, Persia and in Koordistan*, London 1855 (reprinted in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 5/6, 1-180a-h, 1856).

Strothmann, R., 'Heutiges Orientchristentum und Schicksal der Assyrer', *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte* 3. Folge VI, Band 55, heft 1/2 (1936), 17-82.

Surma d'Bait Mar Shimun, *Assyrian Church Customs and the Murder of Mar Shimun*, Edited, with a Glossary by W.A. Wigram, D.D., n.d., reprint New York 1983.

Suttner, Ernst Chr., 'Die Union der sogenannten Nestorianer aus der Gegend von Urmia (Persien) mit der Russischen Orthodoxen Kirche', *Ostkirchliche Studien* 44 (1995), 33-40.

Sykes, Sir Percy, *A History of Persia*, vol II, London 1930.

Tamcke, Martin, 'Die Konfessionsfrage bei den lutherischen Nestorianern', *A Festschrift for Dr. Sebastian P. Brock, Aram Periodical* 5 (1993), 521-536.

Tamcke, Martin, 'Pera Johannes', R. Lavenant, S.J. (ed), *VI Symposium Syriacum 1992* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta 247), Rome 1994, 362-369 [1994a].

Tamcke, Martin, 'Die Kontroverse um die Gültigkeit der lutherischen Ordination anstelle der Priesterweihe in der Kirche des Ostens (Nestorianer)', Michael Kohlbacher, Markus Lesinski (eds.), *Horizonte der Christenheit. Festschrift für Friedrich Heyer zu seinem 85. Geburtstag*, Erlangen 1994 (Oikonomia 34), 268-271 [1994b].

Tamcke, Martin, ' "Eingeborener Helfer" oder Missionar? Wege und Nöte des Lazarus Jaure im Dienste der Mission', Martin Tamcke, Wolfgang Schwaigert, Egbert Schlarb (eds.), *Syrisches Christentum weltweit. Studien zur syrischen Kirchengeschichte. Festschrift Prof. Hage* (Studien zur Orientalischen Kirchengeschichte 1), Münster 1995, 355-385.

Tamcke, Martin, 'Luther Pera's Contribution to the Restoration of the Church of the East in Urmia', *The Harp* 8-9 (1995-1996), 251-261.

Tamcke, Martin, 'Urmia und Hermannsburg. Luther Pera im Dienst der Hermannsburger Mission in Urmia 1910-1915', *Oriens Christianus* 80 (1996), 43-65.

Tamcke, Martin, 'Wie Kascha Ablachat zu einem Pferd kam. Eine Episode aus dem Jahr 1911 zur Mentalität ostsyrisch-deutschen Kulturkontaktes', Bärbel Köhler (ed.), *Religion und Wahrheit. Religionsgeschichtliche Studien. Festschrift für Gernot Wießner zum 65. Geburtstag*, Wiesbaden 1998, 401-410.

Tfinkdji, J., 'L'église chaldéenne catholique. Autrefois et aujourd'hui', *Annuaire Pontifical catholique 1914*, 449-525 (also Paris 1913).

Thompson, Joseph P., *Memoir of Rev. David Tappan Stoddard, Missionary to the Nestorians*, New York 1858.

Tisserant, Eugène, 'Nestorienne, L'Église', *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* XI,1 (1931), 157-323.

Tobin, Yishai (ed.), *The Prague School and its Legacy* (*Linguistic & Literary Studies in Eastern Europe* 27) Amsterdam / Philadelphia 1988.

Tomlin, Russell S., *Basic Word Order. Functional Principles*, London 1986.

Tosco, Mauro, Review of Edward Y. Odisho, *The Sound System of Modern Assyrian (Neo-Aramaic)* (Semitica Viva 2), Wiesbaden 1988, *Journal of Afroasiatic Languages* 3:3 (1992-3), 260-64.

Tsereteli (also spelled Cereteli), Konstantin G., *Sovremennyy assiriyskiy yazyk* [The Modern Assyrian Language], Moscow 1964.

Tsereteli, Konstantin G., 'Abriss der vergleichenden Phonetik der modernen assyrischen Dialekte', F. Altheim, *Geschichte der Hunnen III (Kampf der Religionen)*, Berlin 1961, 218-266.

Tsereteli, Konstantin G., *Grammatica di Assiro Moderno*, Naples 1970 (translation of Tsereteli 1964 — erroneously referred to as 1965).

Tsereteli, Konstantin G., *The Modern Assyrian Language*, Moscow 1978 (translation of Tsereteli 1964)

Tsereteli, Konstantin G., 'On one Suprasegmental Phoneme in Modern Semitic', *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 102 (1982), 343-346.

Tsereteli, Konstantin G., 'The Velar Spirant ġ in Modern East Aramaic Dialects', W. Heinrichs (ed), *Studies in Neo-Aramaic*, Atlanta 1990, 35-42.

Tsereteli, Konstantin G., 'Die Assyrer in der Korrespondenz des Königs Iraqli II. von Georgien', *Oriens Christianus* 80 (1996), 167-176.

Van Rompay, Lucas 'Some Preliminary Remarks on the Origins of Classical Syriac as a Standard Language: The Syriac Version of Eusebius of Caesarea's Ecclesiastical History', G. Goldenberg and Sh. Raz (eds.), *Semitic and Cushitic Studies*, Wiesbaden 1994, 70-89.

Van Rompay, Lucas, 'Impetiuous Martyrs? The Situation of the Persian Christians in the Last Years of Yazdgard I (419-420)', M. Lamberigts and P. Van Deun (eds.), *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective. Memorial Louis Reekmans* (Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium CXVII) Leuven 1995, 363-375.

Vosté, J.M., 'Paul Bedjan, le lazariste persan. Notes bio-bibliographiques', *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 11 (1945), 45-102.

Walsh, R., *A Residence at Constantinople during a Period Including the Commencement, Progress, and Termination of the Greek and Turkish Revolutions*, vol. I & II, London 1836.

Waterfield, George, *Layard of Nineveh*, London 1963.

Waterfield, R.E., *Christians in Persia*, London 1973.

Weil, Henri, *De l'ordre des mots dans les langues anciennes comparées aux langues modernes*, Paris 1844. English translation: *The Order of Words in the Ancient Languages compared with that of the Modern Languages*, Boston 1887.

Weitenberg, J.J.S, 'Reform Movements in Armenian', István Fodor & Claude Hagège (eds.), *Language Reform, History and Future* V, Hamburg 1990, 393-408.

Wigram, W.A., *The Assyrian Settlement*, London 1922.

Wigram, W.A., *The Assyrians and their Neighbours*, London 1929.

Wolff, Joseph, *Missionary Journal and Memoir of the Rev. Joseph Wolff*, vol. I-III, London 1827-9.

Wootton, Richard William Frederick, 'V. Bibelübersetzungen in außereuropäische Sprachen', *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 6 (1980), 299-311.

Wright, Denis, *The English Amongst the Persians. During the Qajar Period 1787-1921*, London 1977.

Yacoub, Joseph, *The Assyrian Question*, Chicago 1986.

Yonan, Gabriele, *Assyrer heute. Kultur, Sprache, Nationalbewegung der aramäisch sprechenden Christen im Nahen Osten. Verfolgung und Exil*, Hamburg / Wien 1978.

Yonan, Gabriele, *Journalismus bei den Assyrer. Ein Überblick von seinen Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*, Berlin 1985.

Yonan, Gabriele, *Ein vergessener Holocaust*, Göttingen / Wien 1989.

Younansardaroud, 'Synharmonism in the Särdä:rïd Dialect', *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* 12/1 (1998), 77-82.

Zirinsky, Michael, 'American Presbyterian Missionaries at Urmia during the Great War', *Journal of Assyrian Academic Studies* 12/1 (1998), 6-27.

INDEXES

Index of Personal Names

Ainsworth W.F. 36, 39, 47, 49, 61
Ambroise Fornier 54-5
Anderson, Rufus 14, 43, 95, 97, 102, 104
Audishu (IV Yukhannan) 33
Audishu bar Arsanis 107, 350
Augustin Cluzel 54-5, 57-8
Augustin Hindi (Yosep V) 34
Auraham bar Yonan of Ashita, priest 94
Auraham of Gugtapa, priest 45, 46, 51, 93-8

Baba d-Kosi 188
Babakhan, J. 58-9
Badger, George Percy 14, 39, 40, 48, 49, 61-2, 410-11
Badr Khan, Amir of Botan 48, 50
Barhebraeus 237
Bassett, James 67, 69, 394-5
Baxter, Richard 101, 228 n. 19
Bedjan, Paul 7, 15, 16, 17, 56, 58, 59, 110, *111-115*, 122, 351-2, 358, 360-3, 400-7, *passim* in 123-348
Bellarmine, Robert 88
Benson, Archb. of Canterbury 63, 116, 408-11
Boré, Eugène 14, 36, 53-5
Boucays, Alphonse 112
Breath, Edward 50, 97, 99
Browne, W.H. 14, 64-5, 77, 408-11
Bunyan, John 100, 228 n. 19, 304 n. 37

Challaye, Count, consul of France 15, 56-7
Chesney, F.R. (Coll.) 61
Coan, Titus 388-9
Cochran, Joseph Gallup 68
Cochran, Joseph Plumb 14, 68, 70, 73, 74
Cutts, E.L. 63

Darnis, Joseph 54-5, 57
De Medem (Russian ambassador) 55
De Sartiges, M. 55
Dinkha of Tiari, priest 105
Dinkha, Samuel 120
Doddrigde, Phillip 101
Don Giorgio (Giwargis) 88 n. 9
Drugulin, W 114
Duval, Rubens 16-7, 115
Dwight, H.G.O. 14, 41, 43-5, 88-9, 96-7

Eliya of Alqosh, bishop 97
Eliya VI (bar Giwargis) 33
Eliya XI Denkha 34
Eliya XII (Ishuyau) 34-5
Eliya XIV Abulyonan 58
Ephrem/Aprem 101, 382-3

Fiske, Fidelia 50, 106 n. 117
Fossum 71

Galland, J.G. 60
Gauriel Danbo 34
Gauriel, bishop of Ardishay 54-5, 72-3 (the same person or his successor)
Grant, Asahel 46-50, 61, 94
Grant, Judith S. Campbell 46, 50 n. 40
Guriel, Joseph 88 n. 9

Haccius, Georg 71
Hall, Isaac H. 92
Hananisho, bishop 32
Helena 87 n. 3
Hinsdale, A.K. 47
Holladay, A.L. 46, 102 n. 101
Hosha (Hosea), bishop of Ganzak 32

Ishu, priest 105
Iskhaq, deacon (shamasha) 388-9

Jacob of Serug 114
Jones, Willard 52
Jowett, W. 43

Labaree, B.W. 68, 74
Labaree, Benjamin 68
Lang, A.H. 64

Layard, Henry 36, 37 n. 30, 47 n. 22, 50 n. 35, 388-9
Lazarus Yaure 71
Lee, Samuel 105
Lepsius 71
Luther Pera 71 n. 131

Maclean, Arthur J. 6, 14, 18, 64, 116-7, 122, 187-8, 351, 355, 410-11
Malik Mansur Mirza 54
Marogulov 6, 131
Maruta of Maiperqat, bishop 31
McDowell, E.W. 77
Merrick, James Lyman 52, 69
Merx, Adelbert 16-7, 350, 355, 360, 362-3, *passim* in 123-348
Mikhael Muktes 34
Mikhael, priest 72
Miller, Emma T. 70
Miraziz 113
Mitchell, C.C. 47
Mohammed, Pasha of Mosul 48
Moressa 106 n. 117
Muhammed Ali, Shah 75
Muzaffar ad-Din, Shah 75

Narsai 32
Nestorius 32, 65, 87 n. 1
Nicolas Ishaya 56, 88 n. 9
Nöldeke, Th. 6, 18, 88, 355
Nurullah Beg 47, 48, 50 n. 36, 61

Pera Yukhannan 71
Perkins, Charlotte Bass 45-6
Perkins, Henry M. jr 92
Perkins, Justin 14, 35-6, 39, 40, 45-6, 51, 53, 66, 68, 92-7, 101, 103, 105, 108, 349, 388-9; *Sermon in Memory of Mr. Perkins*, 107
Polotsky 6, 7 n. 21
Pope 236, 386-7

Rassam, Hormuzd 47 n. 22
Rassam, Isa (Christian) Anthony 47, 49, 93 n. 36
Rassam, Mathilda Badger 47 n. 22
Reza Khan 83
Rhea, S.A. 53, 90 n. 19
Rhetoré, Jean-Jacques 60, 355
Richmond, Legh 99
Riley, Athelstan 63-4, 410-11
Rödiger 5 n. 16, 88, 355
Ruel of Minganish, priest 94

Sachau, Eduard 36, 89
Salomon, Désiré 56, 111-3
Sarmas, Pera 120
Schlienz, C.F. 93 n. 36
Shapur II 31
Shedd, John H. 68, 79
Shedd, Mary Lewis 14
Shedd, William Ambrose 14, 68, 77, 79-80
Shimun VII bar Mama 33
Shimun XI 34
Shimun XIII (Dinkha) 33
Shimun XV 33
Shimun XVII Auraham 44, 46-50, 61, 87 n. 5, 94, 410-11
Shimun XVIII Ruben 59, 62-5, 67, 408-11
Shimun XIX Benjamin 79-80
Shimun XX Paulus 77, 83
Smith A. 39
Smith, Eli 14, 41, 43-5, 88-9, 96-7
Socin, Albert 16-7, 350, 355, 360, 362-3, *passim* in 123-348
Southgate, Horatio 61-2
Speer, Robert E. 14
Stalin 83
Stocking, W.R. 46, 55, 388-9
Stoddard, D.T. 6, 14, 18, 53, 95, 98, 102, 350, 355
Surma Khanum 65

Tait, A.C., Archb. of Canterbury 62-3
Theodore of Mopsuestia 32
Theqla, St. 402-7
Thomas a Kempis 114
Thomas Audo 95, 112
Thompson Joseph P. 14
Timur Leng (Tamerlane, Khan Timur) 33, 37

Ubaydullah, Sheikh 70

Wahl, Rudolph 63, 116, 410-11
Walsh, Robert 43

Watts, Isaac 101
Wolff, Joseph 43, 60
Wright, A.H. 101, 105

Yaure Auraham 71
Yazdgard I 31
Yonan of Ada, deacon 100 n. 83, 105, 107
Yonan, bishop 74
Yosip I 33
Yosip IV (Lazare Hindi) 34
Yosip of Digala, deacon 101, 105
Yosip VI Audo 56
Yukhannan Hormuz 34 and n. 11, 13, 14
Yukhannan Mooshie 110, 352
Yukhannan Sulaqa 33, 35
Yukhannan, bishop of Gawilan 36, 45-6, 51, 67, 93-5, 97, 388-9
Yukhannan, priest 51, 67

Zaya, Abel 112
Zeno 382-3

Index of Grammatical Subjects

a – o rule 169-71
addressee 23, 190, 324, 342
adjective 195-200
adverb *200*, 297, 314-5; interrogative 200, 270-5, 288, 338-41; sentence 233, 267, 270, 288, 297-8, 305, 313-5, 318-9, 323, 325, 327-8, 336, 340, 342, 345-7
af'el stem 133, 137, 202
agent 23, 209
aspect 213-4
assimilation 134, 138-9, *148-151*, 151, 154-5, 160, 193, 206-7, 209-10; voiced to voiceless and vice versa 135, 138, 148; progressive 148; regressive 148-51
autosegmental analysis 181

begadkepat consonants 29, 125-6, *140-45*,
benefactive 302

case: oblique 192-3; nominative 192-5, 321; genitive 192, 198
clause types: adverbial 223, *226-8*, 255-7, 260-1, 263-6, 268, 282, 290; basic *24-25*, 221, 232, 247, 295, *296-317*; copular 12, 22, *219-291*, 293, 296, 339; exclamatory *229-31*, 273; identifying 222, 238, *248-52*, 254, 271, 287, 290-1; interrogative 222, 255, *270-75*, 291, 296, *338-41* (*see also* question); imperative 190, 296, *341-43*; introductory *238-9*, 250; jussive 190; name-giving (*šemm*-suf) 225, 230, *275-8*, 291; negative 222, *266-70*, 266, 268, 274-5, 296, *335-8*; passive 280-7, 317 n. 65; pseudo-cleft 222, 248, *252-4*, 268, 287, 290-1, 360; relative *225-6*, 255, 257-9, 261-2, 264-6, 276-8, 284, 289, 290, 342; reported 223, *229-31*, 233, 255-6, 260, 263, 265, 268; resumptive 240-1, 250, 275-6, 289, 329, 346; subordinate 222, 252, *254-66*, 277, 289-90, 295-6, 299, 306, 309, 318, 331 n. 88; verbal 12, 22, 274, 284, 287, *293-348*
comment 19-20
communicative dynamism 20
compensatory vowel lengthening 130-1, 139, 152, 161
complements to a nominal predicate 22, 216, 288; adjectival 245-6; adverbial 234; genitival 245; object 233; prepositional 233
complements to a verbal predicate 22, 216, 288, 293-348 *passim;* fronted 284-6, 295, 305, *317-324*, 336, 343; prepositional 297-8
consonant cluster 126, *173-5*, 185, 206
consonant loss 135, *151-161*, 165; intervocalic 151, 153, 157
constituent order (syntax) 11-2, 19, 102, 112, 189, 219-348 *passim*, 358-9
continuous: past 214; present 214, 280
copula 28, *219-291*; dependent (enclitic) 193, 220, 242, 249, 255, 277, 281, 289; finite *280-87*; fronted 255-66, 268, 277, 284, 290; history 220; independent 193-4, 219-20, 222, 238 n. 31, 242-7, 252, 254, 266, 269, 278-80, 281, 289; negative 195, 220, 252, 254, *266-70*; past 27, 194-5, 258; presentative (*du-*, *we-*) 222, *278-80*, 290
copular clause *219-291 passim*, 346-7; incomplete 219, 221, *222-231*, 275, 290;

affirmative 221, *232-247*, *et passim;* unmarked *232-4*

d-, genitive marker 148, 174-5, 198
d-, relative marker 225, 252, 254, 255-6, 259, 263, 265-6, 275-8, 289-90
dative 23, 209, 211-3, 215, 300-303, 314 n. 59
definite/definiteness 195-6, 198, 244-5, 249, 288, 298-9; *see also* object *and* topic
degemination 132, 134, 165
derivational suffixes, 196-7
diphthong 126, 153, 168, 170, *175-180*, 266 n. 77

emphasis (back pronunciation/velarization) 152, 166, 173, *180-84*
extra-clausal constituents 24, 190-1, 295, *324-35*, 340, 342, 360;
extra-clausal interrogative *qāmu* 270-1, 275, 338

focalization 248 n. 51
focus 23, 232, 248-54, 257, 266, 269, 272-3, 278, 282, 284, 287-9, 297, 339-41, 343, 346, 359; assertive/contrastive/comparitive 23-4, 233, 247, 250, 252-4, 267, 270, 276, 286, 288, 317-19, 320-4, 344-7; new 23-4, 214, 243, 250, 252, 254, 276, 288, 298, 305, 324, 331, 346; assertive sentence 243, 245-7, 308-9, 316, 327, 345
focus construction *248-54*, 267-8, 270, 272-3, 275, 279-80, 287, 290-1, 339, 346
Functional Grammar (FG) *18-25*, 359
future 21; past 213

geminate root 132, 134, 138
gemination (long consonants) 28-9, 126, *130-139*, 152, 156, 161, 184, 198; virtual/weak 131, 134; morphological 134, 139; secondary 134, 139
gender 197, 199-201, 248
genitive construction 148, 175, 192, 198-9
genre: narrative/essaysistic 304-6, 311-12, 330, 339, 347, 350; 309 n. 47, 330, 339, 347; formal/informal 17-8, 334-5, 359-61
grammatical terms: 22, 248; functions 20, 232, 248, 287, 296; relations 22, 359
graphemes 26, 184-5

habitual: present 213, 281-2; past 213
hwāyā (to be, become) 158-9, 193, 208, 216, 219-20, 222, 278 n. 85, *280-87*, 291
hypercorrection 143

imperative 213, 280; stem form (IMP) 156, 202, *204-5*, 209-10, 281, 293, 295, 297 n. 14, 341-3; negative 341-2
īnā 229
infinitive 214; stem form (INF) 156-7, 173-4, 178, 196, 202-3, *206-7*, 209, 211, 216, 219-291 *passim*, 293; attributively employed 223, 225, *228-9*
instrumental 23, 298
intensive stem (Arabic II) 132
intonation 325 n. 77
intra-clausal constituents 324, *327-8*, 335
īt (existential particle) 168, 214, 216, 220, 309
īt-l- (to have) 215, 281, 284

jussive 213, 335; past 213; *see also* clause types

kad, adverbial marker 226-7, 256, 263
kull- 192, 308

l-, indirect object marker 300, 358
lā/li, negative marker 213-4, 335-8
lexicology, 8; lexicon, 128, 357, 362
linea occultans (*l.o.*), 28, 29, 117, 127-8, 145, 154-61, 178-80, 188, 194, 245
literary language *passim*
loanwords 8, 90-1, 105, 109, 112, 122, 128-9, 135, 139, 141, 144, 163, 165-7, 170, 173, 175, 177, 183, 184 n. 169, 187, 196, 199-200, 202, 350-2, 358, 362
locative 23, 298, 301, 314 n. 59

mhagyānā (half *zlāmā*) 28, 130, 175
morphology 12, *189-217*, 357-8; verbal *201-13*, 216; nominal *195-200*, 216, 221
morphosyntax 12, *189-217*, 357

narrative: present 213; past 213

nominal clause, true 219, 222, 231; *see also* copular clause
noun 191-3, 207; agent 196; action 196
number 197, 199-201, 248

object marking *211-3*, 217, 298-9, 358
object: cognate 202, 299-300, 317-9, 322-4, 345, 347; definite/indefinite 197-8, 298-300 *et passim*; direct 22, 211-3, 221, 233, 253, 298-300 *et passim*; fronted 190-1, 253, 267, 269-70, 282, 305, *317-324*, 326, 336, 347; indirect 22, 211-3, 233, 253, 267, 300-304 *et passim*; pronominal suffix 190, 195, 198, 197, 201, 206, 209-213, 216, 221, 289, 297-9 *et passim*; position vis-à-vis verb 297, 317-24; position vis-à-vis other verbal complements 297, 301-4
orthography 11-3, *25-30*, 60, 95, 100, 102, 108-10, 112, 115-7, *123-188*, 189, 191, 194-5, 217, 244 n. 46, 266 n. 77, 297 n. 14, 349-53, 355, 357-8; Classical Syriac 95, *123-188*, 351, 356-7; Persian 358

p'al stem 202
pa''el stem 130, 132, 136-7, 139, 140, 154, 202
palatalization: of [g] and [k] *145-148*; of [i] *166-168*; of [u] *168-172*
paragraph boundary 308-9, 327-8
participle: stem form (PART) 164, 167-8, 202, *207-8*, 209, 211, 216, 219-291 *passim*, 293; attributively employed 228-9; active CS 140, 202 n. 39, 223; passive CS 167-8, 202 n. 39, 261
passive 202, 214; *see also* clause types
past marker *wā* 194, 214
patient 23, 195, 209, 211-3, 285, 298-9, 301-3, 314 n. 59, 329
perfect 214, 280
person 190-5, 248
phonemic inventory of CS 125; of NA 184-85
phonemic split *140-145*
phonetics *123-188*
phonology 11, 13, *123-188*
placement rules 288, 344
pluperfect 214, 282
plural endings 161, 197
points, diacritical 27-8, 125, 127, 142, 147-8, 179-80, 190-1, 363; vowel 26-7, 126-7, 190-1, 363, 364 n. 2, 378 n. 14
postfield language 25, 343
pragmatic: functions 20, 21, 22, 220, 232, 248, 252, 287, 296 *et passim*; terms *23-24*, 248
predicate *215-6*; nominal 193-4, 221, 219-291 (incl. references to prepositional, adjectival, participial and infinitival predicates); consecutive *223-5*, 231, 289; cleft *244-7*, 290
prefield language 25
preposition 192-3, *200-1*, 206-7; compound 200-1
preterite 214; stem form (PRET), 156, 158-9, 164, 193, 194, 202-3, *206*, 207, 209-11, 215, 279, 281-5, 287, 293, 297
preterite, periphrastic with *qam* 211, 285
prohibitive 213
pronouns *190-5*; coreferential 212, 325, 331; demonstrative 177, 179-80, *191*, 236-9, 249-50, 252, 254, 308, 343; dependent (pronominal suffixes) 158-9, 176, 178, 186-7, *192-5*, 198, 205-6, 209-16, 220-1, 276-8; independent 176, 179-80, *190-1*, 193, 234-6, 247-50, 254, 311; interrogative 192, 248, 270-5, 288, 338-41; reflexive 192; with *kull-* 192; *see also* subject *and* object
pyāšā (to remain) 214, 216, 219-20, 222, *280-87*, 291

qā, indirect object marker 300-2
qam, past marker 211, 214, 335
qat, reported marker 256
qaṭṭil form 132, 136, 166-7, 199
question mark 271
questions: yes-no 270-*1*, 275, *338-9*, 341; WH *270-5*, 287, 290, 338, *339-41*, 347; embedded 270, 274-5, 338, *341*
quodriradical roots 202
quššāyā (hard pronunciation) 125, *140-45*

rhematization 248 n. 51
rheme 19
root consonant 155-7

rukkāḵā (spirantized pronunciation) 125, *140-45*, 153, 160

semantic 142, 193, 221, 249, 359; properties *23*; functions 20, 201, 213-4, 217, 232, 281, 287, 296, 304
Semitic consonants 125
sentence connectives 201, 233, 255-6, 261, 263-5, 267 , 270, 274-5, 288-9, 297-8, 314-5, 319, 336, 341, 345
shewa vowel 126, 152, 157-9, 163, *173-5*, 185
Speaker 23
special position (P1, P2, etc.) 21, 25, 287-9, 312 n. 54, 340, 344-7
state (emphatic, construct, absolute) 195-6, 198-9
stem form *201-02*, 203-11
stem pattern *201-02*, 203-08
stress 163, 166, 185, 194, 196, 336
subject 22, 214, 219-348; pronominal (suffixes) 190, 191, 195, 197, 206, 209-10, 216, 297-8 *et passim*; impersonal 266, 367 n. 6; position vis-à-vis verb (VS/SV) 294-5, 297, 304-14, 316-7, 329-30, 343-7, 360
subjunctive 213, 280, 282, 284; past 213; stem form (SUB) 159, 164-5, 186, 193, 194, 196, 202-3, *205*, 209-11, 215, 281-2, 285, 293, 297, 335, 342
subordinate 213, 277, 335; past 213; *see also* clause types
substantive *195-200*, 228; *see also* noun
supra(inter)dialectal language 6, 128, 356-7, 361
suprasegmental phoneme 181
syāmi 28, 363, 375
syllabic structure/patterns 130-1, 134, 142, 162-3, 165-6, 166, 168

tableau-phrases 229 n. 20, 289; *see also* clause types, exclamatory
tail (post-clausal constituents) 24, *239-42*, 286, 289, 324, 328-9, 331-5, 343-7, 360
tense 213-4
theme (pre-clausal constituents) 19, 24, 250, 252-3, 272-5, 279, 289, 320, *324-8*, 335, 340-1, 343-7, 360
topic (given) 19-20, 23, 232, 236, 238, 243, 250, 252, 267, 275-6, 287-9, 297, 304-6, 308, 311-2, 316, *320-4*, 326-7, 329, 331, 339, 341, 343-7, 359; assertive/contrastive/comparitive 234-4, 237, 282, 286, 288, 307-9, 311, 316, 321-2; new 214, 232, 236, 270, 272-3, 305-9, 311; new definite 24, 309, 316, 323, 345; new indefinite 24, 305-6, 316, 323, 329, 345; secondary 302
topic span 240, 247, 289
topicalization 320
transcription *25-30*.
triradical root 202

verb 193, 195; finite 219-20, 228, 278-87, *293-348*; intransitive 212; motion 330, 345; phase 279, 307, 318; pseudo 193, *214-5*, 216; transitive 212, 215
verbal forms: first conjugation 164-5, 170-2, 202-3; second conjugation 133, 154, 161, 170-2, 202-3; weak 203-9; first *v/y* *203*; second *w/y* 133, 137, 156, *203*; third *y* 164, *203*; irregular *208-9*
verbal phrase, compound 299-300; passive 214, 219, 280
verbal system 129, *201-213*
vowel length 126, 131, 135-6, *162-166*
vowel quality/color 126, 162, 182
vowel signs *see* points, vowel

ya'ni 277, 289, 325, *333-5*, 346-7, 360

Index of Other Subjects

Abbasids 32
ABCFM 10, 43, 44-7, 53, 69, 93, 95, 97, 99, 104, 108; archives 14, 92
Acta Martyrum et Sacntorum 114
Ada XXIII, 41, 44, 73
Ain Kawa 41
Almanac 108
Alqosh XXIII, 4, 33, 35, 41, 88, 95-6, 354; dialect 178 n. 142-3; Gospels 109-10,

Amadiya XXIII, 40, 77, 89; Jewish NA 252 n. 62, 255 n. 65, 269, 295
American Bible Society 101, 103-4, 109, 352
American Oriental Society, 53
American Tract Society 98, 228 n. 19
Amherst College 45
Anglo-Russian convention 76
Ans-les-Lièges 114
Arabic language 2-3, 29, 32, 35, 60, 90-1, 113, 120, 128, 133, 136-7, 141, 144, 146, 163, 183, 202, 333, 353, 358, 393 n. 30
Aradin XXIII; dialect 197 n. 31, 295
Aramaic 237, 255 n. 66, *et passim*; Standard Literary 1-3; Old 1, Imperial 1; Middle 2; Biblical 134, 151, 248 n. 50, 249 n.52; Jewish Palestinian 2-3; Christian Palestinian 2; Babylonian 2-3, 5, 133, 253 n. 63; Chaldaic/Chaldean 35, 237; Late 2, 5; Western 2, 4-5; Eastern 2, 5; *see also* Neo-Aramaic
Ardishay XXIII, 41, 44, 53-5, 57, 71
Armenia/Armenian 44, 54, 58, 89, 112, 118
Armenians 55, 62, 68-9, 79, 334, 388-9
Armood Aghay XXIII, 41
āširāti 4, 38, *see also* Nestorians, Mountain *and* Hakkari mountains
Ashita XXIII, 48, 60
Ashuriān 37
Assyrian nationalism 75-6, 84, 362
Assyrian-Lutheran congregation 71
Assyrians, ancient 36-7,
Āṭorāyi 37
Atur 384-5
Australia 84
Azerbaijan 44, 72, 76, 79, 81-3, 88, 384-5

Baghdad 34, 41, 62, 384-5
Baku 80
Baquba 81
Barwari XXIII, 38, 41, 57
Bashkale XXIII, 4
Belgium 111
Berlin 107, 110, 350
Bet Nahrain 84
Bet Shamsdin 41
Bible translation, Anglican 18, *116*, 136, 143
Bible translation, Jewish 89
Bible translation, Protestant 45, 93-4, 96-9, 102, 358-9; NT **1846** 16, 50, 52, *100-6*, 107, 350, 370-1, *et passim* in 123-348; NT **1854** 101; NT **1860** 104; NT of 1864 101; **OT** 1852 16, 52, *100-6*, 350, 372-7, *et passim* in 123-348; OT **1858** 101; Genesis **1886** 108-9, 352; Alqosh Gospels **1873** 109; **1893** 17, *109*, 115, 122, 136, 143, 158, 160, 187, 194, 207, 212, 223, 241 n. 38, 249 n. 55, 271, 303 n. 32-3, 332 n. 90, 352-3, 378-9
Bible translation, Roman Catholic NT **1877** 18, *112*, 171, 178, 187, 192, 351, 398-9
Bohtan 4, 41
Boston 47, 92, 104
British and Foreign Bible Society 60, 93, 97
British Mandate 81-2

Canada 82
catechism 88, 101, 111, 116
Central Asia 32
Chaldean breviary 58; Church 87, 114; monastery 34; Patriarch 33-5, 56; priests 87-8; villages 40-2
Chaldeans 35-6, 38, 40-2, *53-60*, 85, 93, 113, 151 n. 87, 314, 351, 361;
Chicago 76, 83, 230, 239, 246, 394-7
cholera 386-7
Christ the Only Refuge 98
Church Missionary Society 43
Church of England (Anglican) 48, 60-1, 67-8, 73, 86, 408-11
Church of the East (Assyrian) 3, 31, 35, 38, 52, 65-9, 71-3, 77, 85, 87, 361, 408-11; *see also* Persian Church *and* Nestorian Church
Commentary on Daniel 101
Commentary on Exodus 101
Commentary on Genesis 101
Commentary on Matthew 101
Commentary on the Minor Prophets 101
Congregationalist Church 43, 69
Constantinople (Istanbul) 43-5, 49, 54, 62
constitutional movement 75
cotton 39

Cyprus 35

Dairyman's Daughter (The Daughter of Wallbridge) 99
Detroit 83
diaspora *see* emigration
Diyarbakir (Amida) 33-4, 41-2, 53
Doctrina Christiana 88, 96 n. 53, 114

Edessa 2, 382-3
emigration/diaspora (Assyrian) 70-1, 76, 82-4, 355
English language 64-5, 93, 95, 100, 106, 116, 120, 227-8, 231, 252-4, 294, 304 n. 37, 309, 312, 316, 336, 354, 362, 369 n. 9, 370 n. 10
Ephesus, Council (431) 32
Episcopalian Church 61, 83
Erzerum 47, 62
Europe 70, 88, 111, 114, 121, 331, 334, 384-7
Evangelical (Assyrian) Church, *see* Protestant

Faith of the Protestants 99
Far East 32
folklore 107
France/French 41, 55-7, 59-60, 63, 82, 84, 113, 228, 312, 317, 386-7

Gannat Bussame 87 n. 5
Gawar 4, 53
Gawilan XXIII, 41, 93
Georgia/Georgian 42, 44, 45 n. 9, 76, 79, 83, 89 n. 16, 118
Germany/German 58, 71, 78, 84, 89, 89 n. 16, 114, 225, 317, 396-7
Gonduk 41
Gospel lectionary NA 96, 110
Great Britain (England)/British 60-2, 67-8, 72, 76, 78-82, 84, 396-7, 408-11
Greatness of Salvation 98
Greek language 2, 32, 103-5, 109, 222-4, 227, 241, 252, 352, 359, 370 n. 10
Gugtapa XXIII, 41, 71, 87, 93, 169 n. 124

Hakkari Mountains XXIII, 4, 31, 38, 39, 40, 41, 46-50, 64, 79, 81, 88, 90, 145, 356; NA dialects 4, 94-5, 108-9, 154, 197, 356
Hamadan 69, 81
harmonium 58
Hatra 2
Hebrew language 104-5, 109, 125, 131 n. 24, 222-4, 227-31, 234 n. 26, 235, 237, 240-1, 242 n. 40, 249 n.52, 250, 253 n. 63, 259-62, 271 n. 80, 276 n. 83, 291, 296, 303, 305, 308, 323 n. 75, 330, 332, 336 n. 98, 352, 359-60, 370 n. 10
Hermannsburg 71
Histoire Sainte 17, 112, 114-5, 309, 400-2
historical/etymological spelling 6, 109, 117, 124, 163, 172, 178, 182-3, 185-88, 350-2, 355, 357-8
Holy Communion (Lord's Supper) 51, 66, 68
hospital 70, 82, 119
hymnbooks 101, 108

Imitatio Christi 112, 114, 309 n. 47, 305 n. 39, 311
India 61, 76
Iranian Revolution 119
Iraq 81-2, 84, 113, 120-1, 126
Iraq Levies 82
Iraqli II 45 n. 9
Isfahan 54
Italy/Italian 59, 88, 113

Jamalawa XXIII, 41, 44, 89
Jews 88
Jezirah (Gazarta) 40-1
Jilu 4, 38, 41
Journal of the American Oriental Society 53
Julamerik XXIII, 41, 46, 61
Julfa (Isfahan) 55

Kasdim 36
Kermanshah 69
Khabur region 82, 120
Khosrowa XXIII, 6, 33, 40-1, 44, 53, 55-8, 60, 85, 87-90, 96, 111, 113-5
Kildāni 36
Kirkuk 41
Kokḇā 'The Star' 75, 110
Köln-Nippes 114

Koxvə d-Mədinxə 119 n. 178, 243
Kurdistan 58, 63, 88, 167
Kurds/Kurdish 29, 38, 39, 40, 47-50, 53, 61, 64, 70, 73-4, 79-82, 84, 86, 90-1, 105, 112, 146, 181, 357-8, 362
Kurmanji 90, 141 n. 61

language reform 8
Lazarist Order 54, 113; *see also* mission/missionaries, Lazarist
League of Nations 81
liturgy 44, 65-6, 87, 90, 356

Madınxā 118 n. 172
Malay 312 n. 56
Malta 93
Mandeans 2; Classical Mandaic, 3; Modern Mandaic 4
Manuel de piété: Salomon 1877 112; Bedjan 1886 114, 187, 309 n. 47, 311
Mardin 41
Maronite Church 38
Matmaryam 107
medical missions/physicians 45-6, 50, 57, 68, 70, 74, 78, 82, 84, 86, 119
Meshed 69
Mesopotamia 58, 84
Mission to Persia 69-70
Missionary Herald 14, 43, 72 n. 133
missions/missionaries: American Presbyterian 1, 10, 16, 14, 37, 42, *43-53*, 55-6, 58-9, 61-3, 65, *66-70*, 71, 77-9, 82-4, 88, 115, 119, 122, 312, 316, 349-50, 352, 354-5, 380-1; Anglican (the Archbishop of Canterbury's Mission to the Assyrian Christians) 10, 14-5, 37, *60-66*, 77, 79, 81, 85, 116, 312, 349, 351-2, 355, 408-11; Dominican (Roman Catholic) 34, 36, 41, *59-60*, 85, 115; German 89; Hermannsburger Mission 71; Lazarist (Roman Catholic) 10, 14-5, *53-9*, 52, 79, 85, 99, 113, 349, 351, 355; Lutheran 71; Russian-Orthodox 71, *72-4*, 80-1, 86
Mois de Marie 114, 305 n. 39, 309 n. 47, 352
Mongols 32
Mosul XXIII, 3, 31, 34, 36-7, 39, 41-2, 47-9, 53-4, 59-62, 81, 88-90, 96, 113, 115, 260, 354, 388-9; dialect 145
multilingualism 90-91
Muslim/Muslims 3, 32, 42, 44-5, 45 n. 9, 62, 68-9, 72, 74, 76, 80-1, 84, 86, 89-90, 354, 356-7

Neo-Aramaic: Central 3, 5; Iraqi Koine 120, 140 n. 59, 141 n. 61, 163 n. 113; Jewish 4, 89, 141, 181; Northeastern (NENA) 3, 5, 6, 88, 155, 181; Proto Northeastern 176 n. 136, 137, 177; Southeastern 4; 'Standard Assyrian' 6; Ṭuroyo 3, 5; Urmia *passim*; Western 3, 5; *see also* Alqosh, Amadiya, Aradin, Hakkari Mountains, Mosul, Salmas, Tiari, *and* Zakho
Nestorian Church 35; Mountain Nestorians 33, 38, 59, 236; patriarchate 33, 35, 38; theology 35, 74; villages 40-2; *see also* Church of the East
Nestorianism 34-5
Nestorians 36, 38-43, 59
Nicaea, Council 31
Nisibis 32
Norway/Norwegian 71
Nusaybin (Nisibis) 384-5
Nusrāni 35

Order of St. Vincent de Paul *see* Lazarist Order
Orient Mission 71
Ormi Artadokseta (Orthodox Urmia) 74
Ottoman Empire/Turkey XXIII, 15, 38, 42-4, 60, 78-81, 89; Ottoman government 48-50, 63-5, 73, 388-9

Palmyra 2
Paris 113
Persian Apostolic Delegation 58
Persian Church 31-2; government 45, 52, 63, 72-4, 80, 82-3, 354; language 2-3, 11, 29, 64, 90-1, 105, 109, 113, 116, 128, 141, 144, 146, 163, 299 n. 22, 317-8, 322, 324, 347, 351-3, 357-8, 362
Persians 70, 85
Petra 2

Philadelphia (Pennsylvania) 71
Pilgrim's Progress, The 100, 228 n. 19, 304 n. 37, 316
poetry, Neo-Aramaic 60, 89, 121
preaching 51-2, 58, 64, 354
Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions 69, 92, 103, 108
Presbyterian Church 43, 69
printing press: American Presbyterian 10, 16, 17, 46, 50, 59, 75, 85, *91-111*, 117, 122, 349-52, 354, 357-60, 362; Anglican 16, 18, 65, 77, 110, *116-7*, 122, 188, 352, 358, 362, 408-9; Assyrian 83, 119-121; Dominican Roman-Catholic 60, 85, 113; Lazarist Roman-Catholic 16, 18, 58-9, 85, 110, *111-5*, 122, 351, 362; Persian 357
Propaganda Fide 60, 88
proselytism/proselytizing 52, 55, 99
Protestant/Evangelical (Assyrian) Church 66-9, 73, 77, 83, 85, 353, 361

Qālā d-Šrārā 113
Qodshanis XXIII, 33, 38, 41, 47, 50, 64, 77, 79
Qumran 2

Rabban Hormizd (monastery) 33-4
Reasons for not being a Roman Catholic 98
reformation 52, 66
Regeneration 98
regional vocabulary 91
Repentance, Words on the subject of 16, 98, 100, 365-9
Resht 69
revival/revivalism 45, 52, 66
Rituel 112
Roman Catholic Church 31, 35-6, 38, 40, 59, 60, 88; *see also* uniatism
Roman Empire 31
Rome 33, 54, 60, 88, 111, 229, 386-7
Royal Geographic Society 61
Russia/Russian 42, 63, *72-74*, 76-7, 78-81
Russian Orthodox Church 71, *72-74*, 86
Russian Revolution 78
Russian-Turkish (Turkish-Russian) War 42, 45 n. 9

Saint's Everlasting Rest, The 228
Salmas 4, 6, 33, 41, 115; Plain XXIII, 39, 73, 88; dialect 141, 145, 154, 170, 173-5, 210, 217, 255 n. 69, 269, 356
Samaritans 2; Aramaic 3
Sandwich Islands 388-9
schools: Assyrian/Syrian 44, 83, 119-120, 380-5; boys' 50, 70, 87; girls' 50, 65, 70, 113; mission 44, 46, 50-2, 57, 59, 64-5, 68-9, 73, 78, 82, 84, 86, 94, 97, 100, 349-50, 354, 408-11; Muslim 44
script: East Syrian (Nestorian) script 26-7, 95, 97, 99, 124-129; *Novyj Alfavit* (Soviet) 118-9, 131, 146, 166-7, 169, 182; Roman / Latin 28, 95, 117-8, 124; Arabic 128, 150, 183, 358; *see also* orthography (grammatical index)
Seert 41
Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Synod of 410 31
Seleucia-Ctesiphon, Synod of 484 32
Seraing 114
Shahname 107
Siryāni, Suryāyi, Surāyi 35
Sisters of Bethany 65-6
Soeurs de la Charité 57
South America 84
Soviet Union (Russia) 29, 83, 118, 121, 243, 294 n. 7, 353
SPCK 61
spelling book 93, 101, 114-5
SPG 61
St. Petersburg 72
sunhādos 'General Council' 67, 77-8
(')Surāyi 37
Sweden 84
Syria 82, 84, 120
Syriac, Classical 2-3, 5-6, 11, 32, 50, 53, 58, 60, *87*, 89-91, 93-6, 99, 103-6, 109, 111-2, 114-7, 120-2, 133-4, 152, 174, 176, 192, 196-9, 217, 222-5, 227-31, 234 n. 26, 235, 237, 240-1, 242 n. 40, 248 n. 51, 249 n.52, 250, 252, 253 n. 63, 259-62, 273 n. 81, 276 n. 83, 291, 296, 300, 303, 313 n. 57, 321, 323 n. 75, 330, 332, 336, 349, 351-60, 362, 385 n. 21, 398 n. 36, 403 n. 45; Bible (Peshitta) 52, 60, 100,

103-5, 109, 112, 213, 351-2, 355, 365, 369 n. 9, 370 n. 10; literature 381 n. 16; manuscripts 53, 60, 87, 125; 'Modern Syriac' 5, 7, 15; pronunciation 125-6, 167; Psalms 50, 98; *see also* script, orthography (grammatical index), *and* liturgy
Syrian Orthodox 3, 15, 38, 62

Tabriz 44-6, 51, 54, 62, 69, 93, 95, 235, 258, 334
Targum 2
Tbilisi 42, 72, 76, 83, 118-9
Teachings from the Words of God 16, 98, 100
Tehran 55, 57, 62, 69, 74, 76, 83
three-self formula 77
Tiari 4, 38, 79; dialect 145
Tigris XXIII, 3, 388-9
Tkhuma 4
transcription *25-30*, 107, 110-1, 115, 117
translation techniques 105
Trebizond 97
Ṭur ʿAbdīn 3, 337 n. 100; *see also* Neo-Aramaic, Ṭuroyo
Turkish language 3, 64, 78-81, 89, 91, 105, 109, 112-3, 122, 128, 146, 352; Azeri Turkish 29, 85, 89-91, 145, 181, 322, 357-8, 362
Turkmanchay, Treaty of 42, 44 n.9, 72

uniatism 33-6, 40-2, 44, 53-60, 85; *see also* Chaldean Church
United States of America 70-1, 76, 83, 97, 106-8, 120-1, 285, 331, 334, 384-7, 394-7
Urmi college 70

Van XXIII, 4, 60, 77
Vies des Saints 17, 114-5, 187, 309, 352, 402-7

Washington (DC) 388-9
Wazirabad 71
World War: First 1, 15, 38, 60, 65, 71, *74-84* 86, 92, 100, 113, 118-9, 121, 353, 355, 361; Second 83-4, 119

Zahrīri d-Bahrā 'Rays of Light' 17, 52, 100, 106, 108, 188, 350, 352, 358, 360, 380-97
Zakho XXIII, 4, 89; Jewish NA 251 n.60, 295

Index of Bible verses

Genesis
1:1 313
1:2 230
1:4 230
1:9 306
2:4 251
2:5 268
2:13 230
2:21 299
2:23 224, 237, 241
3:1 301
3:3 242
3:4 336 n. 98
3:8 229
3:9 272
4:8 261
4:9 271, 273
4:25 300
6:2 260
6:3 235
6:9 323
7:6 238
7:19 226
7:23 263
8:11 330 n. 87
9:22-23 311

Ruth
1:1 179, 310 n. 48
1:2 276
1:3 179
1:9 165
1:12 261
1:14 165
1:16 175
1:19 144
2:3 262
2:9 148
2:10 157, 175
2:14 157, 330 n. 87

2:20 232, 242
3:3 303
3:4 175
3:9 250-1, 272
3:10 160
4:1 230
4:4 160
See also Texts 3, 372-7

1 Samuel
15:28 332 n. 90
14:45 241
17:5 224
17:43 271
17:44 303 n. 33

Psalms
199:105 383 n. 19

Joel
2:13 365

Matthew
1:1 172
1:7 150
1:9 137, 171
1:17 150, 157, 165, 179
1:18 147, 156, 159, 165, 168, 179
1:19 157, 159, 165, 168, 179
1:21 137, 156
1:22 156, 168
1:23 138, 165, 168
1:25 143
2:1 156
2:2 156, 171, 179
2:3 157, 161, 179
2:4 159
2:5 139
2:6 171
2:7 168, 179
2:8 156, 168
2:9 143, 171
2:10 137, 138
2:11 139, 159, 179
2:12 139, 161
2:13 138, 171, 284
2:14 157
2:15 156
2:18 145
2:19 147
2:20 156, 168
2:22 165
3:1 165, 171
3:3 156, 165
3:4 147
3:5 330 n. 87
3:7 147
3:8 157, 172
3:9 137, 147
3:10 139, 183
3:11 171
3:12 137, 148, 157, 160, 171
3:14 157, 165, 249 n. 55
3:15 137
4:2 157
4:3 137, 172
4:6 171
4:10 330 n. 87
4:16 159
4:18 138
4:19 171
4:23 136, 171, 224, 242
4:25 161
5:4 138
5:5 137
5:6 157, 159
5:10 261
5:11 179
5:12 160
5:13 172, 183
5:14 171, 226
5:15 171
5:18 143
5:19 137
5:20 143
5:24 171
5:25 137
5:29 137, 179
5:39 137
5:48 226
For chapter 2, see also Texts 2, 370-1, Texts 4, 378-9, and Texts 11, 398-9

Mark
6:20 369
14:1 159, 165

14:3 159, 168
14:4 171
14:6 143, 171
14:7 145, 238, 268
14:8 159, 160, 165
14:9 144
14:10 137, 160, 310
14:12 143
14:14 159
14:16 159, 160, 263
14:17 159
14:18 224
14:19 271
14:21 234, 260
14:22 144, 171
14:23 330 n. 87
14:25 161
14:26 159, 171
14:30 160, 171
14:35 148
14:40 261
14:44 252
14:54 233
14:58 262
14:60 267
14:61 251
14:62 252
14:63 273
14:64 272
14:67 236
14:69 237
14:70 137
15:2 271
15:4 271
15:9 339
15:33 282
15:34 262
16:6 267
16:10 262
16:12 227
16:14 227

Luke
1:5 277
1:17 175
1:63 276
13:3 365

Romans
8:8 365

Hebrews
12:1 315 n. 63