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JAAKKO HÄMEEN-ANTTILA

An Old-Fashioned Genre – Maqāma in the 18th Century

Abstract

The eighteenth century was crucial for the development of Arabic literature. While some genres were more prone to change, the maqāma remained a conservative and elitist genre. Yet it did enjoy a kind of renaissance in the eighteenth century. The maqāmas of the eighteenth century were a varied lot, both qualitatively and content wise. Al-Ḥarīrī remained the favourite model for eighteenth-century authors. Also other great authors of the past, such as Az-Zamaḥšarī and As-Suyūṭī, were often imitated. The article surveys the production of maqāmas in the eighteenth century.
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The eighteenth century was crucial for the development of Arabic literature. While old styles and ancient genres remained alive and dominated the cultural atmosphere, new trends started slowly developing. Little by little the tradition was modified, and new themes and stylistic modifications appeared. By the end of the century, European, mainly French, influences found their way into Arabic literature with an unprecedented strength of impact. For almost a millennium, Arabic literature had remained immune to foreign influences of this magnitude and one has to go back to the early ‘Abbāsid period to find an influx of similar importance, that time from Persia.1

While some genres were more prone to change, the *maqāma* remained a conservative and elitist genre.² Yet it did enjoy a kind of renaissance in the eighteenth century. At least, we know of more *maqāma* authors from this century than from the previous ones and the success continued during the following century. According to my listing of *maqāma* authors,³ there are 29 authors who died between 1700 and 1799, whereas the previous century can only boast of twelve authors. From the nineteenth century we know about the same number of authors, 31. While the list could be expanded, the numbers are comparable and we may clearly see that the oncoming modernity was actually signalled by an increase in the number of authors working within this very conservative genre.

To be able to follow the development of the genre, we have to start by discussing the definition of the term *maqāma* and the boundaries of the genre. Basically, we have two ways of defining what a *maqāma* is at any given period of time. We may start with the definitions given by the authors and/or their biographers or anthologists and call those and only those texts *maqāmas* which are so labelled in the sources. This, however, is not a very satisfactory way to proceed, as there seems to be much confusion in the use of the term. Native literary theory never defined the genre, so that we do not have a well-defined answer from pre-Modern times to the question: “What, exactly, is a *maqāma*?”

In the beginning, *maqāmas* were understood in vague terms of imitating Al-Hamaḍānī and, since the early twelfth century, Al-Ḥarīrī, but the later we get the more amorphous the term’s use becomes and the difference between a Hamaḍānīan or Ḥarīrians *maqāma* and any piece of rhymed prose becomes blurred. Not even the use of a fictitious *isnād* is always kept in later *maqāmas*, nor is it restricted to them, and very often it remains the only common feature, besides the use of *saḏ*, between a late text labelled “*maqāma*” and the work of Al-Hamaḍānī and Al-Ḥarīrī. Incidentally, even the formal element of the *isnād* is problematic. In later *maqāmas*, the fictitious narrator often bore the name of the author himself and, especially in anthologies and biographical dictionaries, the *isnād* was sometimes dropped. Hence, e.g., Ar-Rasmī’s ([171] d. 1197/1783) *Al-Maqāma az-Zulāliyya al-Baṣṣāriyya*, as it stands in Al-Murādī’s *Silk ad-durar* (I: 74–77), starts abruptly, without the speaker having been identified in an *isnād*.

The self-definitions being often misleading and a native theoretical definition lacking, we are left with another possibility. We have to define the genre on the basis of internal criteria and take the titles of the texts as of only secondary importance. Thus, many texts labelled *maqāmas* need not be taken by us to belong to the genre and, *vice versa*, we may add texts which are not called *maqāmas* but which do fulfil the requirements of the genre as we define it. Without going into more details here, let it suffice to say that I understand three features as the cornerstones of a *maqāma*, viz. a fictitious *isnād* (or, at least, an implicitly fictitious scene of narration), a fictitious hero (often, but not always, accompanied by a fictitious narrator who may use the name of the author) and,


³ Hämeen-Anttila, *Maqama*, pp. 396–407. Numbers in square brackets after an author’s name refer to this list.
finally, the use of *saḡ*’. It should be emphasized that we cannot limit the genre to the picaresque *maqāmā*, which is the most famous but not the only, nor even the most popular, subgenre.4 Distinguishing the genre from the *munāẓara* is especially problematic from at least the fifteenth century onwards, when personified non-human characters started appearing more and more often as *maqāmā* heroes, as in the flower *maqāmās* of As-Suyūṭī ([119], d. 911/1505).5 They being among the most famous *maqāmās*, it would be somewhat awkward to rule them out from the genre, yet, in fact, it would be easier to classify the texts as *munāẓaras* rather than *maqāmās*.

The *maqāmās* of the eighteenth century were a varied lot, both qualitatively and content wise. To give an idea of the variety of *maqāmās* in the eighteenth century, we may select some authors who died between 1700 and 1799 and who wrote widely different *maqāmās*. Hence, e.g., Aš-Šibāmī ([149], d. 1115/1703) wrote *maqāmās* after the fashion of Az-Zamaḥšarī in the tradition of exhortatory *maqāmās*. Al-Fāṣī ([154], wrote in 1120/1708) composed eulogies on the prophet after the model of Al-Ḥārīrī, and Al-Marīnī ([159], d. 1145/1732) wrote panegyric *maqāmās* on his patron – in later centuries, the genre was more and more drawn into the tradition of panegyric court literature with its mercenary aims. The process was, of course, already set in motion by Al-Hamaḏānī himself, among whose *maqāmās* there are several written for Ḥalaf Ibn Aḥmad,6 but the full impact of this development was seen only centuries later, when more and more often the heroes in the end are advised to go and see the patron, or patron-to-be, of the author. Whether there was at any time a conscious imitation of the panegyric *qaṣīda*, remains a point to be studied, but the structural similarities of the two genres are unmistakable.

To come back to the variety of the 18th-century *maqāmā*, ‘Abd al-Bāqī ‘Arīf ([155], d. 1125/1713) celebrated conquests in his *maqāmās*, while Al-Wargī ([169] d. 1190/1776) personified a tavern pulled down by ‘Alī Bāšā, clearing the ground for a *madrasa*. Al-Ḥifnī ([164] d. 1178/1764) wrote *munāẓaras* between wine and flowers using the *maqāmā* structure, after the fashion of As-Suyūṭī who had made this subgenre one of the most popular ones since the 15th century. No city *maqāmās* seem to have been written by authors of the 18th century, but this seems accidental, and an early 19th-century author, Ar-Rāfī’ī ([181] d. 1230/1815), wrote a *maqāmā* entitled *Maqāmat al-mufāhara bayna Himṣ wa-Hamā*. The boundaries of the genre remained wide apart and *maqāmās* covered topics from obscene pieces to learned discussions and pious sermons. Whatever one may say of eighteenth-century authors, one cannot blame them for not putting all possible varieties into use.

Al-Ḥārīrī remained the favourite model for eighteenth-century authors. Also other great authors of the past, such as Az-Zamaḥšarī and As-Suyūṭī, were often imitated – one might add that, contrary to the interests of modern scholars, Al-Hamaḏānī was not

---

popular and his *maqāmas* were often considered somewhat simple. He had been eclipsed, once and for all, by Al-Ḥarīrī and he never regained his popularity before modern times, as one may easily see when comparing the number and provenience of the manuscripts of each. Al-Hamaḏānī’s *maqāmas* were also rarely anthologized after Al-Ḥuṣrī’s *Zahr al-ādāb*, in clear contrast to Al-Ḥarīrī’s.

The debt of eighteenth-century *maqāmas* to Al-Ḥarīrī and others may be seen both by an analysis of the texts and the explicit comments on them in contemporary sources. Writers of biographical dictionaries often explicitly state that the authors vied with, or imitated, Al-Ḥarīrī in their production.

In the eighteenth century, the genre was varied, but very much bound to tradition. Its development was primarily an internal one. The majority of *maqāmas* written during the century follow earlier models rather closely and cannot be called innovative in theme, style or technique. Their variety arises from an intensive use of the whole width of the genre, not so much from inventing new forms or making new conquests. There were, however, changes in the statistical profile of the genre: some subgenres gained in favour, others lost, but no new subgenres were developed nor were important innovations made that would have gained access to the standard repertory of the genre. Compared with earlier centuries, we may see a slight preference for the panegyric *maqāma* and a continuation of the neglect of narrative in favour of rhetoric, which may be seen in the comparative lack of picaresque *maqāmas*. Picaresque *maqāmas* were occasionally written in the eighteenth century, but it has only been modern taste that has pointed them out as the most interesting pieces of the genre and this has caused a misguided evaluation of their importance in the development of the genre. The heavy rhetoricization of the genre began with Al-Ḥarīrī and went further with each successive generation of *maqāma* authors, perhaps culminating in Ibn as-Ṣayqal ([82], d. 701/1301) whose *maqāmas* verge on the unreadable. Narrative gave place to linguistic finery.

The role of Al-Ḥarīrī in the following, nineteenth century deserves a short note. The often-repeated legend of Al-Ŷāziḡī ([193] d. 1287/1871) “finding” Al-Ḥarīrī thanks to Western incentives should be erased from histories of modern Arabic literature. He did model himself on Al-Ḥarīrī and he did study Al-Ḥarīrī’s texts intensively while correcting the proofs of the second edition of Silvestre de Sacy’s edition of the *maqāmas*, but the idea that he, or for that matter, any Arab gentleman of the eighteenth or early nineteenth century could have been ignorant of Al-Ḥarīrī is preposterous. The numerous imitations of, and competitions with, Al-Ḥarīrī throughout these centuries show that there is no point in claiming that someone could have “discovered” Al-Ḥarīrī. 7 Al-Ŷāziḡī knew Al-Ḥarīrī perfectly well before coming across Silvestre de Sacy’s edition which is why he was given the task of correcting the edition in the first place. What may be counted as Western influence in the nineteenth-century *maqāma* is that his labour with the Western edition brought Al-Ŷāziḡī into intimate contact with the *maqāmas* which he knew well,

---

and this inspired him to write his Majma' al-bahrāyn which could well have remained unwritten had Al-Yāziği not worked with an edition of Al-Ḥārīrī.

One can hardly call the eighteenth-century maqāma an innovative genre. The genre was, though, not thoroughly imitative and adverse to new developments. There are individual pieces of interest which have remained little studied, mainly, I think, because they fall in between Classical and modern literature. For Classical scholars, they are, perhaps, too late to kindle interest, and modern scholars tend to be more interested in those works that can be perceived as predecessors of modernity, which in the case of maqāmas is rarely the case. The eighteenth-century maqāma, thus, falls in between two different interests, neither of which fully covers the eighteenth-century literature.

Of the more interesting maqāmas several were written either by members of the Baghdadian As-Suwaydī family or their dependents. A curiously constructed maqāma that deserves attention is Al-‘Umarī’s ([170] d. 1193/1779) Al-Maqāma ad-Duğaliyya, which contains a long exposition of heresies inserted within a well-told maqāma frame, and ends with a panegyric reference to two of the As-Suwaydīs. The narrative parts show dramatic sensitivity and the author is in creative dialogue with tradition. This is at its clearest in the beginning, where we have the typical scene of a company of elegant youths in a garden being disturbed by an intruder. What is new is that here the intruder is the narrator and the hero is one of the elegant youths, which turns the usual setting upside down. The innovative feature is, however, in a sense also extremely conservative. It inverts one of the basic topoi of the maqāma since Al-Hamaḏānī and, for its effect, depends on the familiarity of the topos. The innovation is based on internal development within the genre and it receives its piquancy from the fact that it stands in dialogue with the tradition.

The central part of Al-‘Umarī’s maqāma, the learned discussion of heresies, is basically an overly long showpiece of the hero’s eloquence and erudition. It differs from, e.g., Al-Ḥārīrī’s respective pieces only in two points, viz. its length and also perhaps its topic, which is less concerned with linguistic mastery than earlier maqāmas tended to be. When Al-Ḥārīrī gave his attention to the fatwāwā al-‘arab, it was not so much the religious content of the fatwās that was the point than the linguistic legerdemain involved in them. It is no wonder that the technical part in Al-Hariri’s maqāma was quoted by As-Suyūṭī in his linguistic encyclopaedia, not in any of his religious works. Al-‘Umarī’s learned discussion is, moreover, written in a lively way which, rather surprisingly, is able to capture the attention of the reader through the lengthy exposition of heresies.

Another innovative maqāma written by the dependents of the As-Suwaydī family is Al-Maqāma az-zar‘iyya by Abū al-Fāṭḥ Naṣr Allāh al-Ḥusaynī ([162], presumably from the mid-eighteenth century), which, on first sight, might seem astonishingly modern in

---

In this *maqāma*, the narrator (who bears the same name as the author) listens to complaints by the neglected crop made against the new town-dwelling owner of the field. The *maqāma* sounds like a eulogy on agriculture and is most untypical of Classical literature, which always remained either urban or Bedouin in tone. It could be read as social criticism and, hence, taken as an indication of changing times and changing social conditions and attitudes. Yet I am doubtful about such a reading, however tempting it might be. The tone of the *maqāma* is far from serious and it difficult to discern any real social agenda behind the lamentations by the crop. It is not the aim of the author to draw attention to the neglected agricultural system in eighteenth-century Iraq, however much it would have deserved attention. Instead, the *maqāma* is a playful petition to a patron and the rural point of view is there, I believe, to make the listeners/readers laugh, not to awaken them to the social malaise in the countryside. In this, it is somewhat similar to Aš-Širbīnī’s ([144], d. after 1099/1687) *Hazz al-quḥāf*, which laughs at the villagers and their customs, but does this by presenting their life in a way which to a modern reader may bring social criticism to mind.12 *Al-Maṭāma az-zarʿiyya* does, however, widen the scope of *maqāmas* by introducing a rural setting. It may also be that the gradual awakening of an interest in things outside contemporary cities and past fantasies of the imagined desert does foreshadow a change in social relations and attitudes and, hence, the *maqāma*, despite its basically conservative attitude may be taken as a sign of a changing world.

The As-Suwaydī family not only patronized *maqāma* authors. Some of them also tried their own hand at the genre. The most successful of the As-Suwaydīs was Šīhāb ad-Dīn Aḥmad Ibn Abī al-Barakāt ([176] d. 1210/1795), whose romantic *maqāma* successfully describes garden scenes and romantic involvements, skilfully avoiding *muḡūn*, yet playing with erotic overtones.13 The end of the *maqāma* turns to panegyric aims: the Lady, in whom the narrator-cum-author has fallen in love, advises him to turn to ‘Uṭmān Efendi al-ʿUmarī, a *maqāma* author himself (cf. above), who will certainly be attentive to the eulogies which close the *maqāma*. A homoerotic *maqāma* of the late eighteenth century by Aḥmad al-Rasmī ([171] d. 1197/1783), ultimately inspired by Al-Hamaḏānī’s *Al-Maṭāma al-Asadiyya* and the tradition starting from there, is less successful, and descends at points into the obscene.14 In fact, it seems that homoerotic themes more often verge on the obscene than heteroerotic ones. This phenomenon is already to be seen in, e.g., the ghazals of Abū Nuwās, whose *muḍakkarāt* are often bolder than his *muʿannaṭāt*.15

Eighteenth-century *maqāmas* did, then, sometimes introduce minor innovations. But where does this innovativeness come from? Changes in the eighteenth and the early nineteenth centuries are often attributed to European influence. In the case of *maqāmas*...
it seems, though, that these changes are unlikely to be due to any European or outside influence. They grow from the tradition of the genre itself, crossbred mainly by the adjacent genre of munāzara as well as romantic tales. Hasan al-‘Aṭṭār ([188] d. 1250/1834) did, to be sure, write a *maqāma* on the coming of the French and it certainly does take up an unprecedented theme, yet it hardly evidences European literary influence.

There was nothing new in making slight changes and introducing minor innovations in the genre. Most authors had always written strictly within the framework delineated by their predecessors, most notably by Al-Ḥarīrī, but there had always been exceptions, innovative authors searching for new ways of using the structure of the *maqāma*. Islamic Spain had been the hothouse of such innovations and some steps were taken there by authors such as Ibn aš-Šahīd ([12], late 5th/11th century) or even Ibn al-Aštarkūwī ([29] d. 538/1143) towards writing a kind of precursor to the modern novel, though the authors never took the final steps. After that, in late Medieval and Early Modern times, the *maqāma* made other innovative attempts. Limited innovativeness was part and parcel of the Classical tradition, and not every innovation needed to be backed up by foreign influence, literary or social. Classical Arabic literature in later centuries was conservative but not paralysed.

The eighteenth-century *maqāma* thrived within the Classical tradition, though this, perhaps, was its undoing. Al-Yāziḡī’s attempt to revive the genre was in a way fundamentalist. His *maqāmas* are strictly Ḥarīrīan and it is no surprise that they could not revive the genre in the changing literary environment despite their own success. When Classical Arabic culture dwindled, *maqāmas* more or less dwindled with them.

After the eighteenth century, the development of the *maqāma* was twofold. Classical *maqāmas* were, and still are, written but more as an antiquarian hobby than as modern literature. Some, like Al-Ǧabārī ([211] d. before 1331/1913), made slight innovations, but still remained strictly within the framework of the Classical tradition. Al-Ǧabārī’s use of substandard language in his otherwise rather Ḥarīrīan *maqāmas* might seem a European-inspired innovation, especially as the author worked as a civil servant for the French, yet this actually follows the tradition of the vulgar *maqāma*, which originated in the late twelfth century.

At the end of the 19th century and later, the Classical *maqāma* was crossbred with modern, Western-influenced literature by men such as Ahmad Fāris al-Šidyāq (d. 1305/1887), Muḥammad al-Muwayliḥ (d. 1349/1930), Ḥāfiẓ Ibrāhīm (d. 1351/1932) and Bayram at-Tūnūsī (d. 1380/1961). Yet the *maqāma* is merely one constituent part in their respective works and not perhaps the most seminal one. In other words, these authors wrote within the tradition of modern, Western-inspired literature and merely borrowed the title and/or some technical features from the *maqāmas*. Their works do not grow out of the *maqāma* genre, but only borrow from it. One may borrow the use of

---

complicated language, or even sağ’, or a picaresque hero, but the result is only loosely connected with Classical maqāmas, even when the term maqāma is used in the title.

Maqāmas may perhaps exemplify the situation of early modern literature in general. The Classical literary tradition did live on, but it was not very vivid. In time, it gave way to new genres which were only marginally influenced by the older tradition. In modern literature, the maqāma perhaps fared less well than some other genres. What, then, were the causes of the demise of the maqāma? Such questions are never answerable and proposed answers must always remain speculative. But if I am allowed to speculate on this, I would like to point out the highly specialized style of the maqāmas, which are defined more by their technique than by their content. Once you take the linguistic legerdemain out of a maqāma the cornerstone of the genre is lost and what remains is a variety of prose texts that may make excellent reading, but hardly differ from anecdotes and other genres. Obviously, anecdotes were the origin of picaresque maqāmas, which one might call long anecdotes with certain stylistic additions. Once these stylistic features are taken away, we are back to the anecdotes and the genre of maqāma has vanished into thin air.

Finally, one should not forget that even if we may be more interested in texts that presage the nascent modern literature, the eighteenth-century was still predominantly Classical. There were few texts that were in any sense modern and the (largely un-interesting) bulk of literature, quantitatively speaking, remained Classical or post-Classical. And when it specifically comes to maqāmas, one is hard put to point to any significant departures towards modernity in this genre.
BARBARA MICHALAK-PIKULSKA

Theatre in the United Arab Emirates

Abstract

In the Emirates the first theatre productions took place in schools, for example in the al-Qassimiyya school in Aš-Šāriqa. For Emirate schools and those teaching within them were to produce the actors and dramatists of latter years. Following the gaining of independence in 1971 the Ministry of Culture lavished financial support on the numerous theatre groups that were coming into being. In the 1980s there were already 14 histrionic troupes. The organisation of the Ash-Shariqa Theatre Days (Ayyām Aš-Šāriqa al-Masraḥiyya) is viewed as a breakthrough in the history of Emirate theatre, this had its beginnings in 1984. The aim of the festival was the development of theatre all over all of the Emirates, the promoting of the performing arts, the development of knowledge about the theatre and art amongst young people. The theatrical productions that were staged from the very beginning were connected with the social current of expression which diligently accompanied the economic changes. The dramas presented a society that was comprehended the aim of life and the status of individual family members. Dramatists in presenting concrete examples from the reality that surrounded them desire to inform one of, and to instruct society. For the discovery of oil changed and divided society, one that had hitherto lived from fishing and the trade in pearls. The young generation brought up in plenty is directed towards quick profits, comfort and a consumer style of life.

Keywords: United Arab Emirates, theatre, drama, literature

Hzābīb Ğulūm al-‘Aṭṭār in the introduction to the book The Development of Theatrical Activity in the Gulf Region wrote that theatre occupied an important place within the societies of the countries of the Gulf. At present theatre in these countries has been equipped with advanced technological equipment which has enabled those connected
with it to follow the very latest achievements in the field of the performing arts. Besides the Higher Institute of Theatre Arts in Kuwait there has been opened a theatre faculty at the Sultan Qabús University in Oman as well as at two Saudi universities: the King Saud University and the Imám Muhammad Ibn Saʿūd University. Finally in 1999 the Theatre Institute was founded in Aš-Šāriqa.¹

The development of theatre in the countries of the Gulf has been connected with the development of schooling. And so the first production entitled Al-Qādī bi-amr Allāh (“A Judge from God’s Will”) took place in Al-Muḥarraq in Bahrain 1925 on the boards of the al-Hadāya al-Ḥalīfiyya school.²

Equally in the Emirates the first theatre productions took place in schools, for example in the Al-Qāsimiya school in Aš-Šāriqa. For Emirate schools and those teaching within them were to produce the actors and dramatists of latter years. Further development of theatre was to take place in sports clubs: Nādī al-ʿUmānī i Nādī aš-Šaʿb wa-al-ʿUtrīḥah in Aš-Šāriqa, Nādī Aš-Šūrta and Nādī al-Ahlī ṣ-raiyāḥi in Abu Dhabi, Nādī aš-Ṣabāb in Dubai, Nādī an-Nāṣr in Ajman, Nādī ʿUmān in Raʾs al-Khayma. Up until 1972 there were active within the United Arab Emirates twenty four clubs and in each of these there was a theatre troupe.³ They did not always present plays. These were often merely sketches or occasional words and music pieces. The actors independently prepared the stage, the decorations and the costumes. In the day of no television or Internet these clubs fulfilled an exceptionally significant social role. The inhabitants met, talked, exchanged views. It was this very transfer of theatre from the schools to the clubs that resulted in its development. For actors did not have to be recruited from amongst pupils while the texts no longer needed to be confined to didactic matters.

The play by the Egyptian Maḥmūd Ḥunaym Al-Murūʿa al-muqniʿa (“Sufficient Chivalry”)⁴ staged in 1955 is considered the beginning of the theatre movement in the United Arab Emirates. The first text to be written by an Emirate writer, by Sulṭān Ibn Muhammad al-Qāsimī is the play entitled Nihāyat Ṣahyūn (“The End of Zion”, 1958)⁵. This drama, in a similar way to the work by Ğābir Ǧarīb, entitled Al-Islām wa-at-taʿāwun (“Islam and Cooperation”) and performed in 1959, generated a wave of demonstrations against the British. Nihāyat Ṣahyūn examines the problem of the Palestinian conflict while at the same time sharply condemning the British authorities. The play heats up the lively debate as to the future of the Arab world as well as the role of western powers.

---

¹ Habib Ghuloom al-Attar, The Development of Theatrical Activity in the Gulf Region, United Arab Emirates 2009, p. 11.
⁴ This play is also found entitled Ğābir ʿAṣārāt al-Kirām (own name).
⁵ This play also had the title Wukalāʾ Ṣahyūn (“Agents of Zion”).
in the settling of the problems of the Middle East. Both plays were performed at the Folk Club (Nādī Aš-Ša’b) in Aš-Šariqa.

An exceptionally important role in the development and propagating of theatre in the Emirates has been played by the local newspapers: “Ar-Rūla”, “Kawālīs” and “Al-Masраḥ”.

Following the gaining of independence in 1971 the Ministry of Culture lavished financial support on the numerous theatre groups that were coming into being. It helped with the organising of workshops. New artists and directors came to the Emirates. Amongst whom it follows to mention: Al-Munṣīf as-Suwaysī, Ibrāhīm Ġalāl, Fu’ad Aš-Šaṭṭī, and Ṣaqr Rašūd, who died tragically in an accident.

In the 1980s there were already 14 histrionic troupes. The most important of which is the National Theatre for Youth and Art (Al-Masраḥ al-Qawmī li-aš-Šabāb wa-al-Funūn) in Dubai. The idea to found this group was taken in 1972 while a year later it was already in operation as the first artistic body in the Emirates. Young people were associated with different clubs that put on plays under the auspices of the Ministry of Sport and Youth. One of the most important plays is: *At-Tubāḥ ḥā-al-marra* (“Forgive Me this Time”) by ‘Īsā Lūtāh and directed by Ṣā’in Ğum’a in 1987. The drama concentrates on one of the most important social weaknesses that is indifference. The author points to the lack of possibility for understanding between people, while man is not the only element in the Universe. He has to understand his transitory nature. For too much attention is paid in man’ life to unimportant things and he consequently losses everything that has real worth. The most important things in life happen quickly and one has to be diligent so as not to miss them. Art appears to bring with it a message of understanding amongst people. It shows that man devotes too much time to an analysis of his own experiences and consequently becomes indifferent to the problems of others.

The play entitled *Laḥāẓāt mansiyā* (“Forgotten Moments”) by the Iraqi dramatist Ġalīl al-Qaysī and directed by Ḣābīb Ğulūm in 1989 shows the heroine, one still in love with her husband, living in the hope of the return of her beloved. The day begins with thoughts of him. She does not feel the need to analyse the psychic state that has accompanied her since he left. She is filled with happiness and joy when she receives a telegram that he is returning. When it turns out, however, that the postman has given her another letter by mistake and the husband is not going to return to her she falls into sorrow and despair. Life seems to her to be an endless band of unhappiness which results in her inability to see in life any sense.


**The National Theatre in Aš-Šariqa** (Masraḥ aš-Šariqa al-Waṭanī) was created in 1976 and became one of the most active places for theatre in the United Arab Emirates.

---

Troupe members included: ‘Alī Ḥumays, Muḥammad Yūsuf, Ṣayf al-Ḡunaym, ‘Abd Allāh al-Manā‘ī. The most important task of the group was the reactivation of cultural life in Aš-Šariqa.

One of the most interesting plays of this group is the drama Hal šākil yā Za‘farān? (“Is that What You Did to Zafaran?”) by the Ḍaṭārī ‘Abd ar-Raḥman al-Manā‘ī and directed by the Kuwaiti Fu‘ad Aš-Ṣāṭṭī in 1983. The hero of the play, Za‘farān, a peasant cultivating melons, under the influence of pressure exerted by his wife stops selling the goods in his village and goes to the town so as to cash in more favourably on his harvests. This is an opportunity for him to confront the simple life led in the countryside with the pace of life in the town. The author is on the one hand referring to the Biblical influence exerted by Eve on Adam, who persuaded him to eat from the forbidden fruit which finally resulted in their expulsion from paradise, while on the other to show people who stand before a dilemma and choice involving new life routes. They are not devoid of fears over prospective changes. Only adapting to the new conditions will enable them to occupy a higher position in the social hierarchy.

The Dubai Folk Theatre (Masraḥ Dubayy Aš-Ša‘bī) was founded in 1976 as a branch of the Dubai Association of Folk Arts and Theatre (Firqat Masraḥ Ğam‘iyyat Dubayy li-al-Funūn aš-Šabiyya). Among its eminent representatives are: Ḥisā‘īl Muḥammad, Aḥmad al-Anṣārī, Ğum‘a Mubārak, Samīra Aḥmad, Munā Hamza. The first performance was staged in 1977.

There have appeared within the literary output of the Gulf many works devoted to domestic staff and service. Their heroes are usually Asian servants. The subject matter being an echo of the sizeable influx of labour motivated by financial remuneration. The play Maṭlūb ḥaddāma ḥālan (“Home Help Required at Once”) written by Muḥammad Sayyid, and directed in 1984 by Aḥmad al-Anṣārī shows the situation and problems connected with the presence of immigrants in Emirate households. The greatest of these is the influence on the upbringing of children. Servants were on the whole of another religion, spoke different languages and represented another cultural tradition. The authors of the spectacle wanted to arouse in their audience a sense of responsibility for their children.

Human existence and the attitude of man to suffering is the subject of the play Bū Mahyūs fi warṭa (“Bu Mahyus in Trouble”) written by Ğamāl Sālim and directed in 1992 by Muhammad Sayyid. The problem matter undertaken is one of the most important within the countries of the Gulf, namely the search for medical treatment abroad. This is connected with the unwillingness on the public in general to be treated by local doctors. They are witnesses to the inadequacies of the healthcare system in their country and know no peace until they have gone abroad. Foreign doctors appear to them to be more efficient and worthy of their trust. The dramatist attempts to convince the public, i.e. ordinary citizens to regain trust in local doctors and specialists.

National Theatre in Dubai (Masraḥ Dubayy al-Aḥlī) was founded in 1981 (earlier it had functioned under the name of the Experimental Theatre (Al-Masraḥ at-Taḡrībī). The company was joined by numerous young well educated enthusiasts something that found reflection in the high level of creativity produced. These included: Ğamāl Yūsuf
Maṭar, Ḥalid Ahmad Ġawād, Ḥalid Ġum’a, ʿUmar Ġubāš, Naǧī al-Hāy. Besides the staging of theatrical works, the organising of lecturers and literary meetings there were also promoted presentations for children.

The action of the play Ġamīla (“Jamila”) written and directed by Ġamāl Maṭar in 1991 is played out on the coast, for the inhabitants of the Emirates are daily linked to the seashore and the experiences of all of them are directed to the coast. This was the main motor of local life that gave the population employment, nourishment, rest, freedom, hope and a subject for stories. In the play the grandmother is the representative of the past and tells the grandchildren stories and resurrects the local legends. While the heroine of the drama is a beautiful girl whose father has put aside a rich dowry for whoever tries for her hand. Finally this is to befall poor Maǧnūn, a boy from a social underclass, who unaware of the danger dives and in bringing pearls wins her hand. The father bound by his promise must give his daughter over to this good-for-nothing. The heroine equally does not object for her dream is to leave the family home. Once again it is shown what an important role is played in social relationships by breeding and wealth.

The Umm Al-Qaywayn National Theatre (Masraḥ Umm al-Qaywayn al-Qawmī) was founded in 1978. Its leading representatives include: Saʿīd Sālim, Ġāsim Ḥalfān, Sālim Sayfa, Sayf al-Gāwī. The theatre’s activity is presented by the play Bidūn ʿunwān (“Without Address”) written by the Egyptian Ġānīd Sālim and directed by Sayyid Sālim in 1986. Once again the authors have taken up the subject of the newly enriched society that has forgotten about its basic obligations. The protagonists are parents neglecting their children. Absorbed by the ‘dash for cash’ they have no time to bring up their charges, who fall foul of drugs and bad company.

The theatre movement in the Emirates is not limited to these five groups. We may note equally the activities of others such as: Masraḥ ‘Aḏmān aš-Šaʿbī (The Folk Theatre in Ajman) and Masraḥ an-Nāḍī al-Waṭanī li-at-Ṭaqāfa wa-al-Furgyā (The National Club of Culture and Art) in Ajman, Al-Masraḥ al-Ḥadīṯ (The Contemporary Theatre) in Ash-Shariqa, Masraḥ Raʾs al-Ḥayma al-Waṭanī (The National Theatre) in Raʾs al-Khayma, Masraḥ al-Furqayra al-Qawmī (The National Theatre in Fujayra), Masraḥ at-Ṭalʾīʿa (The Avant-Garde Theatre) in Khor Fakkan, Masraḥ Kalbāʾ aš-Šaʿbī (The Folk Theatre) in Kalba, Ġamʿiyat Dibbā li-at-Ṭaqāfa wa-al-Furgyā wa-al-Masraḥ (The Association of Culture, Art and the Theatre) in Diba.7

The activities of these many theatres prove that Emirate theatre is buoyant. Presently drawing more heavily on local Emirate texts, from the plays of Syrian dramatists such as Saʿd Allāh Wannūs and ʿAlī ʿUqla ʿUrsān or Egyptians: Saʿd ad-Din Wahba, ʿAlī Sālim and Maḥfūẓ ʿAbd ar-Raḥmān. There are also produced adaptations of western plays with minor adaptations to accommodate them to local conditions in order for them to be well received by local theatre goers.

The organisation of the Aš-Šariqa Theatre Days is viewed as a breakthrough in the history of Emirate theatre, this had its beginnings in 1984. The originator was Sheikh of

---

7 Cf. Al-Attar, The Development..., pp. 87–94.
Aš-Šariqa, Sultān Ibn Muḥammad al-Qāsimī. The aim of the festival was the development of theatre all over all of the Emirates, the promoting of the performing arts, the development of knowledge about the theatre and art amongst young people.

A subsequent step in reply to the need for development of theatre in the United Arab Emirates was the founding in the 1990s of the Theatre Association (Ǧamʿīyyat al-Masrāḥīyyīn), whose task is to combine in activities with the authorities aimed at achieving the greater financial and developmental possibilities. Besides the Association represents Emirate theatrical institutions abroad. It was also responsible for the organisation of theatre workshops, conferences, festivals, competitions and the popularisation of theatre amongst young people.

Without doubt Emirate theatre differs today noticeably from what it was in the past. It is an obvious fact that the movement has achieved a level of maturity both in the quantity and quality of the dramas written and produced. The originality of Emirate theatrical creators suggests that the period of infancy for this recently born art is already truly in the past.

The most interesting dramas of the last decade include: Ǧabr al-wält (“The Benefactor’s Grave”) by Ğamāl Maṭar of 1998. The subject under discussion is a timeless one and recalls the novel by Ṭaha Ḥusayn Šaḡarat al-bu’s (“The Tree of Unhappiness”) and the short stories by Maḥmūd Taymūr. The story takes place in a small village where rain has not fallen for a long time. The drought is blamed on the dumb heroine of the drama (in a similar way to how the son’s ugly wife is blamed for all the misfortunes the befall the family in the novel Šaḡarat al-bu’s). They happen upon the village two men who desire to enrich themselves through the sale of the water they have brought on their donkey. When the animal dies they bury it under a nearby tree. Then the inhabitants of the village approach and while greetings of welcome are exchanged it starts to rain. The situation is a great blessing and saviour of the village. The inhabitants consider the guest to be sent from heaven, while the buried animal as holy remains (there are similar occurrences in the short stories of Taymūr, e.g. ‘Āmm Mitwallī (“The Uncle Mitwallī”), Šayḫ Sayyid al-abīt (“Stupid Sheikh Sayyid”). The incomers decide to take advantage of the naivety of the people and to stay on in the village which results in many amusing situations. The drama is enhanced by local colour and folk songs. The subject is for certain to be repeated many times more as exploitation of the poor and the naive is prevalent in all times and places.8

The subject matter of the play Wa maḏā ba’d? (“And What Then”) by Ḥabīb Ġulṭūm al-‘Aṭṭār from 2002 is the freedom of the word. It depicts an unhappy and lonely journalist who loses his job as a result of articles of a political nature. This event disillusiones him and forces him to give up on his youthful ideals. He shuts himself away in a room with a computer and piles of paper. After losing his wife – with who he assumes he is conducting a conversation – he feels lonely, he experiences a period of depression and cannot perceive

8 On the basis of an interview conducted by Barbara Michalak-Pikulska with Bilāl Baddūr in Dubai 20th of January 2010.
the sense in life itself. His dead wife symbolises in the play the lost homeland, which is constantly present in the life of the hero. The room becomes his prison, in which he undergoes the loss of his individuality. He writes articles which he sells a budding journalist. Ḥabīb Ġulūm al-‘Aṭṭār’s play *Wa maḏā ba‘d?* was given an award in 2002.9

Upon reading the play reflections on the media come to the fore, the television and Internet, which play and will play a key role in the forming of ways of behaviour in Arab society as well as shaping outlooks. The author considers, in a way similar to many publicists and journalists within the Emirates, that the best way to fight the negative influences within the state is the development, modernisation and free functioning of the local media.10

In the works of the dramatists theatrical plays cease being a passive account of events illustrating traditional social life, but rather consciously undertake the question of man and his place in the contemporary world. Not only has the thematic scope of the dramatists broadened but also the differentiation of the roles of the heroes’ individual and social attitudes to the changes brought in by the current times. The quick arising of new rich districts that accompanies the economic development arouses mixed feelings in the older inhabitants. This is recounted by the play entitled *Šammā* (“Šammā”, 2003) by ‘Umar Ġūbāş. The heroine observes the destruction of the old houses and bazaars on whose place new building arise that reflect in their dimensions and splendour the newly enriched society. A women experiences sadness, pain, helplessness and loss. In a similar way to the hero of Ḥabīb Ġulūm al-‘Aṭṭār’s play she also finds solace in talking to her dead husband. She is aware of her own distinctness and is tormented by the social regulations in force. The play is clearly linked to the economic boom which resulted in an influx of capital, labour and the construction of the cities. The new social class caused damage to the traditional model of life. Despite the fact that the generation of grandfathers and fathers still tightly held on to traditional values and religion this generation of educated sons was and is open to progress and civilisation.

The theatrical productions that were staged from the very beginning were connected with the social current of expression which diligently accompanied the economic changes. The dramas presented a society that was comprehended the aim of life and the status of individual family members. For from men there was expected strength, riches, a high social position, while from women total subservience, a conscientious fulfilment of domestic duties as well as numerous heirs which would consolidate the image of a woman as a wife and mother. Dramatists in presenting concrete examples from the reality that surrounded them desire to inform one of, and to instruct society. For the discovery of oil changed and divided society, one that had hitherto lived from fishing and the trade in pearls. The young generation brought up in plenty is directed towards quick profits, comfort and a consumer style of life.

---

9 On the basis of an interview conducted by Barbara Michalak-Pikulska with Ḥabīb Ġulūm al-‘Aṭṭār in Shariqa on the 21st of January 2010.

We also observe in Emirate literature the problems of struggled for independence along with those of Arab unity. This can be particularly strongly felt in the plays of Sulṭān Ibn Muhammad al-Qāsimī. The drama mentioned at the beginning Nihayat Şahyūn of 1958 undertakes an analysis of the Palestinian conflict to ultimately lay blame at the foot of Western powers for the undoing of the Palestinian people. Another play by Al-Qāsimī, entitled ‘Awdat Hūlākū (Holaku’s Return) from 1998 plays out the action in the 13th century though events actually refer to the present day. Already in the Prologue does the dramatist make it clear that “In reading the history of the Arabs I discovered that what occurred before the collapse of the Abbasid Caliph is similar to that which is occurring at present within Arab countries. Therefore I wrote this play from the perspective of history in order to present our painful present”.

The event in the drama are based on historical facts and relate to the taking of the Abbasid capital by the grandson of Chingiz Khan. The author shows the background of negotiations between the Caliph Musta’ṣim and Hulagu and the crisis that subsequently arose. All the events end tragically – with the death of the caliph and the fall of Baghdad. The play exposes two heroes: the figure of the weak and naive caliph as well as of the wise military leader Ad-Duwaydār. Caliph Musta’ṣim in the face of danger escapes in the face of responsibility into pleasure and play. He is unable to behave in a dignified way in opposition to his commander who is prepared to sacrifice his life for the good of his homeland. Between them Al-Qāsimī places the figure of the traitor Ibn al-‘Alqmām, the minister who has conspired with Hulagu in order to later become the marionette ruler of Baghdad. He is reduced to the rank of a physical object completely subordinated to the invaders in a way that later his son is also to be. The minister finally becomes aware of the immensity of the evil he has instigated but it is already too late. His place is taken by his son – bearing the self same name.

The play shows how weak and defenceless man can be in the face of history. The dramatist ponders the moral evaluation of his protagonists’ deeds, wherein the threat of which arouse raw instincts, rapacity and hypocrisy. For after all history is awash with the constant letting of blood, of victories, the defeated and death. Thus man is embroiled in history. It appears that subsequent generations are on their way to death. The past, the present and the future do not differ from each other. Therefore the play ‘Awdat Hūlākū by Sulṭān Ibn Muhammad al-Qāsimī as a timeless quality to it.

In summing up it follows to state that within the course of a few dozen years Emirate writers have created a substructure for the dramatic arts in every possible meaning of the phrase. They have developed their own style and subject matter. They have shown contemporary society in the day of immense economic-social changes. They have been courageous enough to criticise backward traditions and customs, to expose naked rapacity and have analysed the behaviour of this newly enriched society regardless of the consequences that threaten them. They have become the witnesses of social, cultural and structural changes.

11 Sultan bin Mohammed Al Qasimi, Holaku’s Return, Sharjah 2004, p. 5.
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Arabic Linguistics
A Historiographic Overview

Abstract

The study of Arabic language seems to have started under the driving need to establish a correct reading and interpretation of the Qur’ān. Notwithstanding the opinions of some writers about its origins one should stress that the script and spelling of the Holy Writ derives directly from the Nabataean cursive. Aramaic Nabataean script was used to write Old Arabian since the first century A.D., also at Taymā’ and Madā’in Ṣaliḥ, in the northern part of the Arabian Peninsula. Variant readings and divergent interpretations of Qur’ānic sentences, based on ancient Arabic dialects, are not expected to disturb the Arabic grammatical tradition, which was possibly influenced to some extent by Indian theories and Aristotelian concepts. It served as foundation to modern European studies and was then expanded to Middle Arabic, written mainly by Jews and Christians, and to the numerous modern dialects. From the mid-19th century onwards, attention was given also to pre-classical North-Arabian, attested by Ṣafaitic, Ṭamūdic, Liḥyanite, and Ḥasaean inscriptions, without forgetting the North-Arabian background and the loanwords of Nabataean Aramaic, as well as the dialectal information from the 7th–8th centuries, preserved in Arabic sources.
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The study of Semitic grammar, either Arabic, Syriac or Hebrew, started under the driving need to establish a correct reading and a proper interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, the Qur’ān and the Bible, both in their formal and semantic dimensions. In the first centuries of Islam, the lack of a vowel system and of diacritical signs distinguishing
some consonants, as well as the territorial expansion of the Arabs to countries with a population speaking other idioms, required a grammatical and semantic analysis of problematic passages in the Qur’ān and in the Ḥadīṯ. Besides, the Qur’ān was basically written in the Hiḡazi idiom used in the Qurayš tribe for poetry and perhaps also for writing in general. Its language was regarded as close to a classical form of Arabic, the purity and clarity of which had to be preserved.

1. The Qur’ān and Classical Arabic

According to the Muslim tradition, Muḥammad did not collect himself the revelations of the Qur’ān, “recited” to him by Allāh or by his angel. This was done, after various attempts, about twenty years after the Prophet’s death in 632 A.D. The first comprehensive written version is attributed by the tradition to Zayd Ibn Ṭābit, who has been Muḥammad’s secretary. He was instructed in the reign of Abū Bakr (ca. 573–634 A.D.) to collect the scattered records in one volume. This manuscript passed to ‘Umar (ca. 581–644 A.D.) and, at his death, to his daughter Ḥafṣa, one of Muḥammad’s widows. When in the reign of ‘Uṯmān (ca. 574–656 A.D.) quarrels arose as to the true form of the Qur’ān, Zayd was again appointed by the caliph, together with three members of the Qurayš tribe, to prepare an authoritative version, obviously based also on oral tradition. Copies of this were sent to the main cities of the empire, and all earlier written versions or transcripts, except the text of Ḥafṣa, were ordered to be burned. The recension of ‘Uṯmān thus became the only standard text for the whole Muslim world up to the present day. Its absolute value was guaranteed by the tadwīn, a term used in the 10th-century Rasā’il Iḥwān as-Sāfa to describe the divinely inspired editing of the Qur’ān.

The final result of this tradition broadly corresponds to the opinion of Western scholars who generally accept Theodor Nöldeke’s and Friedrich Schwally’s conclusion that the written Qur’ān was not sent into general circulation among the Muslims until some time after the death of Muḥammad. In the meantime, however, the political situation of the Arab world had so profoundly altered that Günther Lüling, a German Arabist, assumed that ‘Uṯmān’s recension amounted to nothing less than a reworking of the Qur’ān.

---

1 This other Islamic holy writ was at least partly put in writing in the 8th century, probably earlier. Cf. I. Goldziher, Muhammedanische Studien II, Halle 1890 (reprints, Hildesheim 1971, 2004), pp. 1–274.


3 Th. Nöldeke’s original Geschichte des Qorāns was published at Göttingen in 1860, but its second edition is generally used nowadays: Th. Nöldeke, Geschichte des Qorāns I–III, 2nd ed., Leipzig 1909–1938 (6th reprint, Hildesheim 2008). Vol. I (1909), dealing with the origins of the Qur’ān, was revised by F. Schwally; vol. II (1919), concerning its compilation, was completely rewritten by F. Schwally; vol. III (1926), the history of the text, was reworked by G. Bergsträsser and O. Pretzl. The indices to the three volumes were prepared by A. Gottschalk-Baur and issued in 1938.
texts. His thesis and the forwarded arguments are unconvincing, while the presence of such a precept as Sura XXIV, 2, contradicting the Islamic death penalty for adultery, shows that the preservation of the original contents was the main concern of the redactors, possibly of Zayd Ibn Ṭabīb.

Lüling’s ideas are paralleled to a certain extent by the views of John Wansbrough who dates the basic codification of the Qur’an from the 9th century A.D. Few readers seem to have embraced this opinion. In fact, Chapter 101 of the Dialectica, written by St. John of Damascus (ca. 675–752) in the first half of the 8th century, refers to the Qur’an, which no doubt constituted a well-known work at that time. Its existence in the mid-8th century or at an earlier date is implied also by two Arabic papyri from Egypt, going probably back to the time of Theodore Abū Qurra (ca. 740–820), bishop of Harran, and paraphrasing some passages of the Qur’an. Moreover, titles of Suras appear already in Dialectica 101 and in the papyri in question, indicating that the Qur’an had a relatively firm shape at that time. This does not mean of course that variants and free copies or paraphrases did not exist or have disappeared completely with the introduction of the standard version. The fragments of the so-far oldest Qur’ānic text, a palimpsest discovered at Ṣan‘ā’ (Yemen) in the 70’s of the 20th century and probably dating from the first half of the 8th century A.D., show different sequences of Suras and verses, omissions and additions, as well as some different vowel letters. Such fragments do certainly not imply that the edition of a standard version is a utopian idea. As for the Arabic script, its perfect development in the early 8th century is shown for instance by the inscription engraved on the capital from Al-Muwaqqar (Jordan), shown here below. Its date, 104 A.H., i.e. 723 A.D., is inscribed on the shaft of the column.

---

However, a serious question can be raised because of the lack of diacritics and vowel signs in the early manuscripts of the Qurʾān. The shape of one character has no less than five reading possibilities (b, t, ṭ, n, y), if the diacritical dots are missing, while other have three (ḡ, h, ḭ) or two possibilities (d and ḥ, r and z, s and š and d, t and z, ‘ and ḡ). This situation results from the use of the cursive post-Nabataean script to write the Qurʾān in the mid-7th century. This Aramaic script was not distinguishing a number of phonemes existing in spoken Arabic; besides, it was lacking diacritics and vowel signs. Both were progressively introduced, following the Syriac example. The earliest attestation of diacritics in Arabic is found in an inscription from 58 A.H. and their use was slowly generalized in the 8th and 9th centuries. In the early Islamic period, two types of Arabic writing existed, known as Kufic and cursive nāshīṭ. The former was discontinued except for formal purposes, where cursive writing could not be employed. The nāshīṭ is the parent of usual and modern Arabic writing.

---

10 Cf. E. Lipiński, Émergence et diffusion des écritures alphabétiques, “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” 63/2 (2010), pp. 71–126, in particular pp. 116–117 with earlier literature. All Arabic characters are similar to the cursive Nabataean ones, and ten are similar to Nabataean only, not to Syriac. The question can thus be regarded as finally resolved.


Considering the problematic or obscure Qur’anic passages one should accept the possibility of mistakenly added diacritics. For instance, St. John the Baptist is called Yahyā in the present punctuation of the Qur’ān\textsuperscript{13}, but the consonants also allow the reading Yūḥannā, which probably corresponds to an early pronunciation of the name. In fact, when the Mandaeans introduced John the Baptist in their literary tradition to show to the Muslims that they have a Prophet recognized in the Qur’ān, they first called Yəḥannā, as shown by his mentions in the Ginza, their earliest sacred book. Later, in the so-called John-Book, they mainly use the name Yahyā\textsuperscript{14}. This punctuation was very likely chosen by Muslim scholars because Yūḥannā does not appear in Arabic onomastics, while Yahyā is a well attested name, occurring already in Ṣafaitic inscriptions\textsuperscript{15}.

Some twelve years ago, Christoph Luxenberg (a pseudonym) suggested a number of repunctuations of Qur’anic words, referring sometimes to Aramaic or Syriac\textsuperscript{16}. The most spectacular case is supposed to occur in Sura XLIV, 54 and LII, 20, where the happy afterlife of the pious dead is described also by the phrase: “We coupled them (zawwaḡnāhūm) with nymphs (ḥūrīyāt)”. Luxenberg proposes changing the diacritics in order to read rawwahāhūm, “we gave them rest”, while the ḥūrīyāt become “white”, in Aramaic ḥīwwrāt\textsuperscript{17}. However, he hardly pays attention to the y of ḥūrīyāt and to the use of the variant rayyaha or of Stem IV arāḥa in the sense “to give rest”, while rawwaha could rather mean “to revive the spirits”. There are errors in Luxenberg’s transcriptions of Syriac words, but it is pointless to discuss them because the basic idea of a Syriac

\textsuperscript{13} Sura III, 34/39; VI, 85; XIX, 7.


\textsuperscript{15} G.L. Harding, An Index and Concordance of Pre-Islamic Arabian Names and Inscriptions (Near and Middle East Series 8), Toronto 1971, p. 662: YHYY.


\textsuperscript{17} Chr. Luxenberg, Die syro-aramäische Lesart des Koran (n. 16), pp. 256–275.
background lacks any factual support. Besides, as a matter of principle, one should reckon with ancient Arabian dialects, as done by Chaim Rabin\textsuperscript{18}, and with the North-Arabian inscriptions\textsuperscript{19} before using Aramaic, whose vocabulary influenced Arabic, as shown already in the 19th century by Sigmund Fraenkel (1855–1909)\textsuperscript{20}, but mainly at a somewhat later stage. This is a basic methodological question undermining Luxenberg’s approach. The language of the Qur’ān certainly exhibited differences from the spoken dialects, but it was also supposed to contain real or assumed dialectal words\textsuperscript{21}. Moreover, one should not forget that Arabic script derives from Nabataean cursive, not from Syriac. Also the non-classical feminine ending -\textit{a} is indicated by -\textit{h} like in Nabataean, e.g. \textit{nhlh}, “estate”, \textit{s'h}, “hour”, contrary to Syriac, which always uses the \textit{ālaf}.

One should still stress here that some statements of Luxenberg and of authors defending similar ideas are historically incorrect, for instance when stating that the personal name \textit{Muhammad} does not appear before year 67 A.H., i.e. towards the end of the 7th century A.D. In reality, this name is attested already hundreds of years earlier in Sabaic and in Ṣafaitic, which was a pre-Classical Arabic dialect\textsuperscript{22}. Also the name ‘\textit{Abd-Ilah} of Muhammad’s father is well attested in Ṣāmūdic, Ṣafaitic, and South-Arabian onomastics\textsuperscript{23}. Such examples can be multiplied.

Arab commentators of the Qur’ān knew its internal problems, and their early treatises demonstrate that ambiguous and variant readings did indeed occur across the whole range of lexical and morphosyntactic issues: from simple pronunciation variants through different case endings or verbal forms, synonyms or near synonyms, to interpretations of whole phrases. A state of the art is presented in the \textit{Encyclopaedia of the Qur’ān}\textsuperscript{24}, where one should consult not only the article on Qur’ānic readings\textsuperscript{25}, but also the contributions dealing with textual criticism\textsuperscript{26}, grammar\textsuperscript{27}, and exegesis\textsuperscript{28}.

\textsuperscript{18} C. Rabin, \textit{Ancient West-Arabian. A Study of the Dialects of the Western Highlands of Arabia in the Sixth and Seventh Centuries A.D.}, London 1951.

\textsuperscript{19} Cf. here below, pp. 37–47.

\textsuperscript{20} S. Fraenkel, \textit{Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im Arabischen}, Leiden 1878 (reprint, Hildesheim 1982). Cf. also A. Mingana, \textit{Syriac Influence on the Style of the Kur’ān}, “Bulletin of the John Rylands Library” 11 (1927), pp. 77–98. Since Mingana regards ‘\textit{allāh}, \textit{kāhin}, \textit{nafs}, \textit{ṣur’ān}, etc., as words derived from Syriac, one should approach his article with a critical mind. A plural like \textit{sfrh}, “scribes”, in Sura LXXX, 15, goes certainly back to Aramaic, but it could be Syriac as well as Jewish Aramaic. In any case, one must remember that Nestorian missionaries have reached South Arabia in the 5th century A.D. at the latest.

\textsuperscript{21} Now, one must remember that it was often impossible for the Arabic script to express genuine dialect forms, just as it is inadequate today for writing the colloquial forms of speech.

\textsuperscript{22} G.L. Harding, \textit{An Index and Concordance} (n. 15), p. 531.

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., pp. 397, 400.


Among the problematic passages best known are “the seven variant readings” or qirā‘āt, described by Abū Bakr Ibn Muğāhid (d. 935 A.D.)29, but phonological, semantic, and grammatical analyses of problematic passages in the Qur’ān are more important than simple lists of variants to establish the “true” meaning of the text. Hence the endeavour of early Arab philologists to explain rare or difficult Qur’ānic words in works quoted later under the name Kitāb al-luġāt, “Book on the Dialects”, or the like. We possess one of these monographs, the Risāla (“Treatise”) ascribed to Abū ‘Ubayd Qāsim Ibn Sallām al-Harawi30. The purpose of those lexicographers was somewhat similar to that of the oldest linguistic treatise preserved in India: the Nirukta (“Etymology”) of Yāska, a Sanskrit scholar of the 5th century B.C.31 He provides brief explanations of Rigvedic words which had become obscure. As a matter of fact, Abū ‘Ubayd’s Risāla was written when the study of Arabic grammar was already established as an independent discipline, traditionally represented by the Kufan and Basran schools32.

Farrā’ (d. 822 A.D.) from Kufa (12 km north-east of An-Naḡaf, Iraq) analyzed problematic Qur’ānic passages from the phonetic, morphological, and contextual points of view in his “Meanings of the Qur’ān”33. Without presenting a complete study of syntactic structures, he examined the sense of various words in larger components, sometimes above the level of the sentence. This approach records the Indian treatises following the Mahābhāṣya (“Great Commentary”) of Patañjali (ca. 150 B.C.). Farrā’ was extremely detailed as to questions of pronunciation and morphology, while scarcely touching syntax. Instead, a considerable attention was given to the syntax in the Basran school of Arabic grammar, whose main representative is Sībawayhi (d. 793 A.D.)34, who studied at Basra under Al-Ḫalīl Ibn Ṭāhir Ibn ʿAmr (710–786 A.D.)35. Al-Ḫalīl was the leader of the Basran school and the compiler of the first Arabic dictionary, the Kitāb al-ʿAyn, “The

---

30 Abū ‘Ubayd Qāsim Ibn Sallām al-Harawi (d. 838 A.D.), Risāla fī-mā warada fī al-Qurʾānī al-Karīmi min luġāt al-qabāʿīlī, Cairo 1310 A.H.
34 Sībawayhi is the nickname of Abū Bišr ʿAmr Ibn ʿUṯman Ibn Qanbar. He was a Persian client of an Arab tribe.
Book of the Eye”36. The work was compiled with the help of Al-Layt Ibn al-Muzaffar, a Khorasani. Al-Ḥalīl paid attention also to dialectal usages, listing roots separately in accordance with the number of letters they contained: two, three, four or five. He also invented a special alphabetic order based on phonetic principles, beginning with the gutturals and ending with the labials. This suggests Sanskrit grammatical influence37, but no direct contacts are known. However, Basra was a harbour trading with India and its area was inhabited also by Mandaesans, among whom we find names such as Ḥyndw and Ḥyndwytyt’, revealing relations with Northwestern India38. Some knowledge of Sanskrit grammar could thus reach Al-Ḥalīl quite easily.

The same can be said about Sibawayhi’s Kitāb39, the first known full-scale Arabic grammar, on which all subsequent Arabic grammars were based. Like Sanskrit, which makes a perfect distinction between nouns and verbs, the Kitāb distinguishes the categories of noun and verb, but adds a third part of the speech, viz. the particle, while Sanskrit includes the indeclinable words in the category of nouns. The Kitāb applies both to nouns and to verbs the notion of ‘‘irāb, literally “Arabization” in the sense of “accidence” or inflection of words. This appellation seems to be suggested by the Greek use of ἐλληνικός to designate the correct Greek speech. Instead, Sanskrit grammarians termed inflection vihakti-, “modification”, as being a change in the bare stem-form. Greek influence on Sibawayhi is appearing also in the use of some other grammatical terms and in the choice of particular words for the paradigms of the nouns. Such influence is likely to have been carried into Arabic by the early converts from the conquered territories, many of whom belonged to educated social classes. The parts of speech and their syntactic use are dealt with in the Kitāb in great detail, with supporting quotations from the Qur’ān and from Arabic poetry. Instead, Sībawayhi shows little interest in the dialects40 and he mainly mentions such dialectal usages that were permissible in the lugā faṣīḥā, the “correct speech” as he conceived it.

Similarities in some terminology do no answer the question of the origins of the Arabic grammatical tradition41, which as early as ca. 800 A.D. had a depth and precision

41 The debate among Western scholars have been presented several times by J. Owens, The Foundations of Grammar: An Introduction to Medieval Arabic Grammatical Theory, Amsterdam 1988; id., Early Arabic Grammatical
unexplainable in terms of borrowing. Its earlier stage was scrutinized by Raphael Talmon
on the basis of twenty-seven scattered texts\textsuperscript{42}, but none stands as a work of pure grammar
and one can hardly follow him in assuming the existence of a full-fledged “Old Iraqi
School”, reformed by Al-Ḫalîl and Sîbawayhi\textsuperscript{43}.

Arabic grammar and linguistics have generally been regarded by native scholars
as a science elaborated by Arabs independently from a foreign model during the first
centuries of the Islam. Modern scholarship has concurred with this view to a large extent
and Henri Fleisch only admitted the influence exercised by a few concepts of Aristotelian
logic\textsuperscript{44}. Against this view, C.H.M. Versteegh maintained that the Greek impact on the
nascent Arabic grammar should not be traced to the Aristotelian logic, still unknown in
the 8th century among Arab grammarians\textsuperscript{45}, but that “the real influence was exercised by
Hellenistic education institutes with their long-standing tradition of grammar-teaching”\textsuperscript{46}.
The sudden appearance of a complete grammatical system with Al-Ḫalîl and Sîbawayhi
at Basra should thus be explained by direct contacts with schools of Greek rhetoric and
grammar. Instead, the influence of Aristotelian logic, presupposing the translation of
Greek philosophical texts into Arabic, did not become apparent before the 10th century,
when some grammarians of Arabic introduced Aristotelian notions, methods, and
arguments in their writing. The basic system of Arabic grammar was then elaborated since
two centuries.

Versteegh’s basic hypothesis of “growing acquaintance with Greek grammatical
practice”\textsuperscript{47} lacks any evidence and one cannot accept his sheer assumption that Arab
grammarians failed to mention any Greek grammarians because of their hostility to
foreign culture\textsuperscript{48}. Rather, the mode of transmission of Aristotelian concepts and of some
Greek grammatical elements must have been similar to that of Christian influences on
early Muslim law and theology, as exposed already by J. Schacht\textsuperscript{49}. Such influences
were carried into Islam by converts from cities in conquered territories, many of whom
belonged to the educated classes. One should refer here especially to Syriac-speaking
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\textsuperscript{42} R. Talmon, \textit{Eighth-Century Iraqi Grammar} (n. 32).
\textsuperscript{44} H. Fleisch, \textit{Traité de philologie arabe} I, Beyrouth 1961, pp. 1–50, 470–500. The idea was first expressed
\textsuperscript{45} The hypothesis of early Arabic translations of Greek logical treatises lacks so far a solid basis. It was
formulated both by F. Rundgren, \textit{Über den griechischen Einfluss auf die arabische Nationalgrammatik}, “Acta
\textsuperscript{46} C.H.M. Versteegh, \textit{Greek Elements in Arabic Linguistic Thinking} (Studies in Semitic Languages and
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., p. 18
\textsuperscript{48} Ibid., p. 120.
\textsuperscript{49} J. Schacht, \textit{New Sources for the History of Muhammadan Theology}, “Studia Islamica” 1 (1953), pp. 23–42
(see pp. 26–27).
people, either having access to Syriac translations of Aristotelian philosophical writings, like that of the *Categories*, going back to the 6th century\(^{50}\), or trying to prevent an inappropriate reading of the Holy Scripture by introducing the vocalic signs\(^{51}\). This system was in fact adopted by Arab scribes in the 8th century and further research should look for other elements of Syriac origin in early Arabic grammar without running off the rails like Luxenberg and company.

Arabic system of grammar as a whole, however, was developed without foreign influence. The latter is appearing in some lexicographic conceptions, in an apparently similar terminology, in reflexes of Aristotelian logic\(^{52}\), but basic grammatical notions seem to presuppose a native understanding of the spoken language. This is exemplified by the absence of an univocal concept of subject in mediaeval Arabic linguistic theory. This is no sign of its inferiority, as stated by Henri Fleisch, but the correct assessment of the different role of the subject in a verbal and in a nominal clause. The logical subject of the verbal clause, *al-fā'il*, “the acting one”, seems in fact to go back to the *casus agens* of an ergative grammatical system, while the subject of the nominal clause, *al-mubtada' bihi*, “the one with whom one begins”, goes apparently back to the *casus patiens*. These are remote traces of ergativity the characteristic feature of which is that the object of transitive verbs is the same case as the subject of intransitive verbs, whereas the subject of transitive verbs is in a particular case, the ergative. In Berber dialects, this difference appears also in stative and fientive sentences, e.g. *a-gyul immut*, “the donkey is dead”, and *immut u-gyul*, “the donkey died”.

The grammars of the post-Sībawayhi period were more transparent than the *Kitāb*. The centre of grammatical studies shifted in the mid-9th century to Baghdad, the seat of the caliphate, and some creative activity lasted there until the end of the 10th century, influenced undoubtedly by Aristotelian logical principles\(^{53}\). With Abū ‘Alī al-Qāfī, still known as al-Bağdādī, the Arabic grammatical tradition migrated to Cordoba\(^{54}\), in Spain, while various summaries of reference grammars were then written. Nevertheless, the Arabic grammatical tradition remained basically unchanged\(^{55}\), and it served as foundation to the modern European grammars of Classical Arabic\(^{56}\), the first one being Guillaume Postel’s (1510–1581) *Grammatica Arabica*, issued in 1538. It was followed by the grammar of
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\(^{50}\) D. King, *The Earliest Syriac Translation of Aristotle’s Categories: Text, Translation and Commentary* (Aristoteles Semitico-Latinus 21), Leiden 2010. In the same period, Τέχνη γραμματική of Dionysius Thrax was translated into Syriac by Joseph Hūzāyā.

\(^{51}\) See here above, pp. 24–25.

\(^{52}\) Cf. here above, p. 28.


Thomas Erpenius (1584–1624) reedited several times, among others by Jacob Gool in 1656.

The remarkable achievement of George Sale (ca. 1697–1736) should be mentioned here, although this was no linguistic publication. Sale was a lawyer, but his heart lay in oriental scholarship and he had a European reputation as an orientalist. Having studied Arabic for some time in England alongside Arab scholars who had come to London to assist in the Arabic version of the New Testament to be used by Syrian Christians, he became the chief corrector of this work, begun in 1720 by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. But Sale’s main accomplishment was an admirable English translation of the Qur’ān, printed in 1734. It was the first English version based on the original Arabic text and it surpassed earlier works of the kind in the quality of translation. Sale’s Qur’ān remained the best available English version of the Holy Writ until the end of the 19th century.


64 Н.Б. Юшманов, Грамматика литературного арабского языка, Leningrad 1928.


67 Б.М. Гранд, Грамматическое таблицы арабского литературного языка, Moscow 1950; id., Курс арабской грамматики в сравнительно-историческом освещении, Moscow 1963.


Grammars of Arabic are based on the old traditions of Arab grammarians. An exception is N.V. Yushmanov’s grammar, as well as the syntax of modern Arabic prose by V. Cantarino.70

Arab scholars were active also in the field of lexicography. A particular problem is created there by the *aḍḍād*. A *ḍidd* is a word or a root with supposed two opposite meanings. An instructive analysis of *aḍḍād* has been provided by David Cohen71, who distinguishes “false *aḍḍād*” from real “antithetic meanings”. The first group contains not only unnoticed textual errors and misspellings, but also apparently opposite meanings resulting from syntagms using different prepositions, like *raḡiba fīr*, “he turned to”, and *raḡiba ʿan*, “he turned away from”, providing seemingly contrary meanings: “to like” and “to dislike”. Disregard of dialectal differences, popular idioms, technical or professional language, semantic development lead also to the creation of alleged *aḍḍād*. Instead, actually opposite meanings result from metaphors and euphemisms, like *baṣīr*, “seeing”, to denote a blind man, from extrapolations, like in the case of *bayʿa*, “commercial transaction”, what can mean either “sale” or “purchase”, and mainly from extra-linguistic factors, like traditional, dogmatic or theological interpretations of passages in the Qurʾān and the Ḥadīṯ. Although these contrary meanings were interpretative in their origin (“this means that ...”), they were conceived by Arab lexicographers as *aḍḍād* and projected into the semantic sphere.

The fifteen volumes of Ibn Manẓūr’s (1232–1311 A.D.) *Lisān al-ʿArab* contain about 80,000 entries,72 but the main organizing principles within the lemmas, representing a root, were semantic with little or no attention to the morphology. In Europe, one had to wait until the early 17th century to have a proper dictionary of the Arabic language. Pedro de Alcála’s *Vocabulista* of 1505 was a Spanish-Arabic glossary in transcription only, and the Arabic lemmas of Valentin Schindler’s (d. 1604) *Lexicon pentaglotton*, published in 1612, were printed in Hebrew characters. The first dictionary of the Arabic language in Arabic characters to be printed was the *Lexicon Arabicum* of Franciscus Raphelengius (1539–1597), the son-in-law of Plantin and collaborator of the Antwerp Polyglot Bible. He became printer to Leiden University in 1586 and was appointed professor of Hebrew in 1587. His dictionary was published by his sons after his death, and was composed with the Arabic types specially cut for him in 1595 by Hondius. Thomas Erpenius added an important section of philological *Observationes in Lexicon Arabicum* (pp. I–LXVII)73.

The Arabic lexicon of Jacobus Golius (Gool, 1625–1667)74 dominated the field until Georg Wilhelm Freytag’s dictionary appeared.75 The next large-scale modern Arabic
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dictionary was the Arabic-English lexicon of Edward William Lane (1801–1876), which has hardly been superseded\(^{76}\). However, the lexicon is incomplete and only sketches remain after the beginning of letter \(kāf\). The International Congress of Orientalists adjudged the completion of the work as a matter of high priority, but only the letters \(kāf\) and \(lām\) have so far been published in order to fill the gaps in Lane’s work\(^{77}\). Among the major dictionaries of Classical Arabic used nowadays, one can mention the volumes prepared by R. Blachère, C. Pellat, M. Chouémi, and C. Denizeau\(^{78}\), and the dictionaries of H. Wehr\(^{79}\), Ch.K. Baranov\(^{80}\), J. Kozłowska and J. Danecki\(^{81}\), Jerzy Łacina\(^{82}\). There are also specialized dictionaries, as the one concerning the Aristotelian terminology of Al-\(Fārābī\) (ca. 870–950)\(^{83}\) or the Arabic translations of Galen’s medical work *De simplicium medicamentorum temperamentis ac facultatibus*, translated *ca.* 800 by Al-\(Bīṭrīq\) and *ca.*


\(^{78}\) R. Blachère, C. Pellat, M. Chouémi, and C. Denizeau, *Dictionnaire arabe-français-anglais (langues classique et moderne)*, Paris 1963 ff. The modern language is, of course, the Standard Literary Arabic.


870 by Hunayn Ibns Isḥāq. Comparison of these two versions, as well as of translations of other Gallen’s works, of Hypocrates, Dioscurides Pedanius, Philomenus of Alexandria, Aristoteles, etc., enables M. Ullmann to follow the development of Arabic scientific terminology from its beginnings to its maturity. One should also mention the Greek and Arabic lexicon in progress.

2. Middle Arabic and Arabic Dialects

Grammatical study of Classical and Standard Literary Arabic represents only one aspect of Arabic linguistics as practiced on a scholarly level since the 20th century. Modern colloquial Arabic in its multiple forms, spoken from Central Asia (Uzbekistan) and the Persian Gulf to the Atlantic Ocean, is an important field of linguistic research, promoted in the mid-20th century by J. Cantineau, Ph. Marçais, etc. The recent introduction to the geography of Arabic dialects can be helpful here, while studies of particular modern dialects are published, among others, in the series Semitica Viva. Useful information on the linguistic situation in the Maghrib is provided by Gilbert Grandguillaume.

Arabic-speaking societies are continuously confronted with problems arising from the so-called diglossia, i.e. the simultaneous existence of regional dialects of low social status and a rather different literary language of high prestige, the modern form of Classical Arabic: the Modern Standard Arabic (MSA), symbol of the Arabic cultural heritage. The latter is mastered more or less perfectly after many years of studying, while the dialect, acquired by children as a first language, generally remains the language one thinks in.

---

89 Semitica Viva, Wiesbaden 1987 ff.
The interferences are thus frequent and their importance depends mainly on social factors and situations. This Arabic bilingualism or diglossia has phonological, morphological, syntactical, and lexical aspects, as well as literary and cultural ones. The concrete problems differ from country to country. Arabic diglossia in Syria, Lebanon, and Cairo has been admirably studied and its complexity clearly presented by Werner Diem in the line of Uriel Weinreich’s theoretical study of languages in contact.

Some fifty years ago, C.A. Ferguson developed the theory that mediaeval and modern Arabic dialects have developed from a single koiné after the Islamic conquest. In the light of studies on Arab dialectology, this theory is simply unacceptable, as stressed already by Joshua Blau: “the picture would seem to be that of a great variety of Bedouin and Middle Arabic dialects existing from the very beginning of the conquests.”

One can certainly go up to the Byzantine and Roman times, pointing at the varieties of Ṣafaitic and Ṣāmūdic dialects. Also David Cohen’s hypothesis of modern dialects emerging from a number of koinés in different centres seems to be unacceptable. The dialects of the Bedouin and of the country people existed independently from the various urban vernaculars, and local koinés rather developed from regional dialects. Of course, innovations in modern Arabic dialects can result from external influences, especially in bilingual societies. This is certainly the case of the Cypriot Maronite Arabic, where the protracted linguistic influence of Greek is perceptible, especially in phonology and vocabulary. A similar situation occurs in Maltese Arabic.

The modern idioms can be morphologically quite different from the Classical language, even so the dialects spoken in the interior of the Arabian Peninsula, although they preserve some archaic features. Middle Arabic, known thanks to mediaeval sources, is closer to the colloquial forms of Arabic than is the idiom used in Muslim literature, which is a classical form. These sources are generally either Christian or Jewish. Christian Arabic texts comprise documents, translations from Greek, Syriac, etc., and original compositions like the theological treatises of Yahyā Ibn ‘Adī (893–974), the language of which is almost classical. The reference grammar to Christian Arabic, published in 1965–1967.

---

95. Ibid., p. 226.
by Joshua Blau\textsuperscript{101}, could of course not take recently discovered texts into account, like the 155 Christian Arabic manuscripts found in 1975 in St. Catherine’s Monastery at Mount Sinai, some of which date from the 9th century\textsuperscript{102}.

Judaeo-Arabic texts, either Rabbanite or Karaite, have the peculiarity of being written in Hebrew characters. A large number of such Karaite manuscripts from both Firkovitch collections are in St. Petersburg and many fragments of the kind have been found in the Cairo Genizah. The Judaeo-Arabic language has been studied by J. Blau\textsuperscript{103}. A further linguistic study, characterized by a diachronic approach and based on mediaeval and post-medieval letters from the Cairo Genizah, is provided by Esther-Myriam Wagner\textsuperscript{104}. It mainly aims at describing the features of epistolary Arabic from different periods, as distinguished from both the vernacular and literary languages. Beside Judaeo-Arabic, there is a lexicon of Andalusian Arabic, composed by Pedro de Alcalá and analyzed by F. Corriente\textsuperscript{105}, who also studied the grammar of some Andalusian Arabic compositions\textsuperscript{106} and provided a dictionary\textsuperscript{107}.

One should record here the existence of garshuni texts, written in Arabic but in Syriac script. It was used by Christians, just as Jews were writing Arabic in Hebrew script, and by no means indicates that Arabic writing system was not yet fully developed. Its beginning can be dated to the 9th century A.D., when Arabic has become the dominant language in northern Mesopotamia. Its earliest known example seems to be provided by a garshuni receipt, written exceptionally in estrangela script, in the manuscript Add. 14644 of the British Library\textsuperscript{108}. This garshuni text is undoubtedly a transcription of an original nashīt text, written without diacritics, as shown by some erroneous readings. The earliest

\textsuperscript{101} J. Blau, \textit{A Grammar of Christian Arabic based mainly on South-Palestinian Texts from the First Millennium} (CSCO 267, 276, 279), Louvain 1965–1967.


dated garshuni text would instead date from 1402\(^{109}\). It is only towards the end of the 19\(^{th}\) century that attention was attracted by B. Carra de Vaux to these linguistically and thematically interesting Arabo-Christian texts. Orthography, vocabulary, and syntax are in general conform to Classical Arabic, but vowels can be added, revealing the actual pronunciation. There are, for instance, funerary inscriptions, various manuscripts\(^{110}\), as well as fragments of a Christian commentary to the Qur’\(\text{ā}\n\)^{111}. The latter’s original goes probably back to the 9\(^{th}\) century.

3. Pre-Classical North-Arabian

Pre-Islamic North-Arabian dialects are known thanks to the early Arab philologists, who have preserved some dialectal information from the 7\(^{th}\)–8\(^{th}\) centuries A.D. As far as recorded in ancient Arabic sources, they have been examined by C. Rabin and F. Corriente\(^{112}\). Thousands of Ṣafaitic graffiti from southern Syria, Jordan, and northern Saudi Arabia, in part still unpublished, provide an older source for the Old Arabian dialects. Written in a variant of the South-Arabian alphabet, they date from the 1\(^{st}\) century B.C. through the 4\(^{th}\) century A.D. They are called Ṣafaitic because they belong to a type of inscriptions first discovered and copied in 1857 by Cyril C. Graham in the basaltic desert of Ṣafá’, southeast of Damascus\(^{113}\). The following year, in 1858, J.G. Wetzstein, the Prussian consul in Damascus, copied 379 texts in the Harra region, ten of which he published in his report\(^{114}\). On his travels in Syria, Melchior de Vogüé (1829–1916) copied 402 inscriptions, which he published in 1869–1877\(^{115}\). Attempts to decipher them were then made by O. Blau and D.H. Müller, but it is Joseph Halévy (1827–1917) who managed in


\(^{112}\) C. Rabin, Ancient West-Arabian (n. 18); F. Corriente, From Old Arabic to Classical Arabic through Pre-Islamic Koine: Some Notes on the Native Grammarians’ Sources, Attitudes, and Goals, “Journal of Semitic Studies” 21 (1976), pp. 62–96.


\(^{114}\) J.G. Wetzstein, Reisebericht über Hauran und die Trachonen nebst einem Anhange über die Sabäischen Denkmüler in Ostsyrien, Berlin 1860. Further inscriptions were published by D.H. Müller in 1876 and by H. Grimme.

\(^{115}\) Ch.E.M. de Vogüé, La Syrie centrale: Inscriptions sémitiques, Paris 1869–1877.
1882 to identify sixteen letters correctly\textsuperscript{116}. The remaining seven letters were identified in 1901 by Enno Littmann\textsuperscript{117}, and almost 1,500 new inscriptions were published in 1901–1904 by R. Dussaud, F. Macler\textsuperscript{118}, and E. Littmann himself\textsuperscript{119}. They are all included in the largest corpus of Ṣafaitic graffiti, published in 1950 by Gonzague Ryckmans (1887–1969) as \textit{Pars quinta} of the \textit{Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum}, containing 5,380 inscriptions in its first instalment, the only one published so far\textsuperscript{120}. Further inscriptions were edited by E. Littmann\textsuperscript{121}, G.L. Harding\textsuperscript{122}, F.V. Winnett\textsuperscript{123}, A. Jamme\textsuperscript{124}, W.G. Oxtoby\textsuperscript{125}, and M.C.A. Macdonald\textsuperscript{126}. About 1,500 inscriptions are included in the Ph.D. dissertation of V. Clark\textsuperscript{127}, 304 in Mahmoud M. Rousan’s\textsuperscript{128}, more than 1,000 in the publication of Mohammad I. Ababneh\textsuperscript{129}. Further graffiti from Wadi Salma were edited by S. Abbadi\textsuperscript{130},

\textsuperscript{116} J. Halévy, \textit{Essai sur les inscriptions de Šafa}, reprint from “Journal Asiaticque”, 7\textsuperscript{th} ser., 10, 17, 19 (1877–1882), Paris 1882.
\textsuperscript{120} CIS. \textit{Pars V Inscriptiones Saracenicas continens I/1 and Tabulae 1}, Paris 1950–1951.
\textsuperscript{121} E. Littmann, \textit{Ṣafaitic Inscriptions} (Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expeditions to Syria in 1904–1905 and 1909. Division IV, Section C), Leiden 1943, with 1,302 graffiti.
\textsuperscript{123} F.V. Winnett, \textit{Ṣafaitic Inscriptions from Jordan}, Toronto 1957, with 1,009 new texts.
\textsuperscript{125} W.G. Oxtoby, \textit{Some Inscriptions of the Ṣafaitic Bedouin}, New Haven 1968, with 480 texts.
\textsuperscript{128} M.M. Rousan, \textit{New Epigraphical and Archaeological Materials from Wadi Salma (Northern Jordan)}, Ph.D. King Saud University, ar-Riyad 2002, with 304 new inscriptions.
\textsuperscript{130} S. Abbadi, \textit{Nuqāš safa‘iyya ḏa‘idta min Wāḏī Salmā (al-Bādiya al-‘Urduniyya)}, ‘Ammān 2006.
and 425 inscriptions from Al-Fahda and Wāḍī al-Aḥīmr have been published by Ali Yunes Khalid al-Manaser\textsuperscript{131}, while Ṣafaitic graffiti from the Hauran were issued by H. Zeinadden\textsuperscript{132}. Other publications of Ṣafaitic inscriptions are listed in M. Rousan’s dissertation\textsuperscript{133}.

About 20,000 Ṣafaitic inscriptions are known at present, but hundreds of them are not yet published, although most have been copied. Their decipherment by E. Littmann was followed by a grammatical study joined to his publication of other Ṣafaitic inscriptions\textsuperscript{134}. Regarding the syntax, one should notice the regular use of formal syntetic parataxis instead of subordinate relative clauses, e.g. \textit{l-ḥd bn nṣr bn grm’l bn kn w-wgm ’l ’mh}\textsuperscript{135}, “By Ḥadda, son of Naṣr, son of Ġaram’īl, son of Kanna, who is grieving over his mother”; \textit{l-kddh bn s2mrt w-t’r}\textsuperscript{138}, “By Kudāda, son of Shamrit, who is keeping watch”. This construction is a particular case of the widespread use of parataxis to express logical hypotaxis\textsuperscript{139}. Ṣafaitic has been compared to Classical Arabic by W.W. Müller\textsuperscript{140} and situated by M.C.A. Macdonald in the general frame of ancient North-Arabian\textsuperscript{141}.

To a large extent, Ṣafaitic graffiti are memorial inscriptions that mention the name of the person involved and of his ancestors, often indicate his job or the circumstances of his passage at the site, and call on a deity to protect the inscription and ensure peace to him. Since the Ṣafaitic graffiti have been found on the Nabataean territory and are contemporaneous with Nabataean Aramaic inscriptions, some of them are likely to be written in Nabataean Arabic. In any case, the Nabataeans are mentioned in Ṣafaitic inscriptions, but are often regarded as enemies\textsuperscript{142}. This notwithstanding, Ṣafaitic texts do not belong to a single dialect, as shown e.g. by the use of two different articles, namely \textit{h-}, which is very common in Ṣafaitic inscriptions, and \textit{al}, which is widely used

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{133} For instance, A. Jamme, \textit{Safaitic Inscriptions from Saudi Arabia}, “Oriens Antiquus” 6 (1967), pp. 189–213.
\item \textsuperscript{134} E. Littmann, \textit{Safaitic Inscriptions} (n. 121), pp. XII–XXIV: “The Language”.
\item \textsuperscript{135} M.M. Rousan, \textit{New Epigraphical and Archaeological Materials} (n. 128), No. 11.
\item \textsuperscript{136} The translation of the preposition \textit{l} by English “by” corresponds to our conception of a text written by somebody. Instead, the preposition \textit{l} basically expresses a relation of dependence and signifies here that the writer is the “owner” of his inscription, which should not be “stolen” by defacing or changing it.
\item \textsuperscript{138} M.M. Rousan, \textit{New Epigraphical and Archaeological Materials} (n. 128), No. 55. Cf. other examples in E. Lipiński, \textit{Semitic Languages} (n. 32), § 55.8.
\item \textsuperscript{139} E. Lipiński, \textit{Semitic Languages} (n. 32), § 55.5–7.
\item \textsuperscript{142} F.V. Winnett and G.L. Harding, \textit{Inscriptions from Fifty Safaitic Cairns} (n. 122), pp. 7–8, 68, 71, 325, 406, 514, 515, 538; V.A. Clark, \textit{A Study of New Safaitic Inscriptions} (n. 127), pp. 85–96.
\end{itemize}
in Nabataean proper names but appears exceptionally in names attested by the Ṣafaitic graffiti.

In spite of their Arab origin, the Nabataeans used an Aramaic literary dialect as their written language, but their colloquial language was Arabic, what is reflected to some extent by their proper names\(^{143}\), by Arabic loanwords\(^{144}\), and by four inscriptions in Aramaic Nabataean script\(^{145}\). The bilingual inscription, found in 1979 at Oboda (‘En ‘Avdat, Israel), should probably be dated between A.D. 88/9 and 125/6. Its lines 1-3 and 5 are written in Aramaic, while lines 4-5 are obviously North-Arabian\(^{146}\). The first sentence, read by the writer fa-yaf‘al lā fidā’ wa-lā aṭara\(^{147}\), is important from the linguistic point of view because the old preterite, corresponding to Akkadian iprus, seems to be used there after the conjunction fa- as a narrative past tense\(^{148}\), like wa-yqtl in Hebrew, Moabite, Phoenician, Old Aramaic, South-Arabian, and even Arabic.

These inscriptions testify to the evolution of the Arabic language. While the case endings of the nouns are still used correctly in the bilingual from Oboda, dated ca. 100 A.D., there was no longer a fully functioning case system in the 3\(^{rd}\) and 4\(^{th}\) centuries A.D. This appears from an inscription of Ḥegrā’ (Madā‘in Śaliḥ, Saudi Arabia), dated in A.D. 267/8\(^{149}\), and from the epitaph of “Mar’ al-Qays Ibn ‘Amr, King of all the Arabs”, found at An-Namāra (Syria) and bearing a date corresponding to A.D. 328. The inscription was discovered in 1901 by René Dussaud and deciphered by Charles Clermont-Ganneau,

---


\(^{147}\) Line 4: *p-yp‘l l’ pd‘ w-l‘ r‘*, “And he acted neither for reward nor by self-interest”.

\(^{148}\) E. Lipiński, *Semitic Languages* (n. 32), § 38.11.

who recognized that it was written in Arabic. The inscription was published by R. Dussaud in 1902150, and Felix Peiser immediately noticed that Mar’ al-Qays Ibn ‘Amr was the Laḥmid king of Al-Ḥīra, known from Arab tradition151.

There is a fourth inscription, found in 1884 by Charles Huber and Julius Euting in the oasis of Taymā’ (Saudi Arabia) and housed at present in the Louvre museum152. It is written in a particular and irregular Nabataean script variety and it is engraved with embossed letters like the Taymā’ stele of the 5th century B.C. (CIS II, 113). Its various decipherments are not convincing, even impossible, especially the readings of the first word, qṣr’, ‘mr’ or ḥgr’, and of the beginning of line 3, read either ḥr/dḥ or lmnwh, although it obviously does not begin with l. The X-shape of the final aleph in line 4, misread in previous decipherments, suggests dating the inscription from the first century B.C. or A.D., while its vocabulary indicates that it is written in an Old Arabian dialect, except for the ligature br in line 2 and the stereotyped formula ‘l ḫy’ in line 4.


152 AO 26599, published in CIS II, 336, with a facsimile.
Taymā’ inscription (Louvre, AO 26599)

1) mbr’ z qrb  This building (was) offered (by)
2) Mzmw br Rgzm  Mzmw, son of Rgzm,
3) ml l-’lm Lht z  (in) full title for feasting this Goddess,  
4) ‘l hy’  for the life of
5) [ ... ]  [ ... ]

The noun mbr’, “building” (line 1), and the syntagm ’lm lht, “to hold banquet for Lāhat” (line 3), with the divine name in the accusative, are well attested in South-Arabian153. Besides, the patronymic Rgzm (line 2) occurs in Sabaic as a tribal name Rgz154, while the proper name Mzmw of the dedicator is attested in Ṣafaitic155. The demonstrative adjectivesḏā (line 1) andḏī (line 3) are simply written z, although Arabian ḍ was usually indicated in Aramaic script by d, already in an inscription from Eliachin (Israel), going back to the 5th century B.C.156 The verb qrb (line 1) is obviously used here in the fa’ala form; it is a characteristic Arabian term signifying that one presents something to God as offering157. The noun māl, “property” (line 3), is the second object of the verb qrb and must here mean “in full title”, as the result of the “offering”. The syntagm ‘l hy’ (line 4) corresponds to Nabataean Aramaic ‘l hyy, but we find the spelling with final aleph here, like in the construct state of many Palmyrene and Hatraean inscriptions158. If this is a construct state also at Taymā’, as one can assume, a further written line is

155 G.L. Harding, An Index and Concordance (n. 15), p. 543: MZM.
158 This formula was studied by K. Dijkstra, Life and Loyalty, Leiden 1995.
broken off at the bottom of the inscription. The structure of the verbal clause in lines 1-2 is typically Arabic: the direct object (mbr’ z) precedes the verb (qrb), which is followed by the subject (Mzmw). The vocabulary of the inscription apparently witnesses a dialect with North- and South-Arabian lexemes, but a larger North-Arabian corpus with a richer lexicon would be needed to formulate a judgement. The theonym Lht is still spelled in such a way in Liḥyanite.\(^{159}\)

The building dedicated by Mzmw was a dining room or triclinium with two or three couches which must have served to celebrate ritual banquets in honour of the goddess Lāhat. It was very likely built in the precinct of her sanctuary at Taymā’.\(^{159}\)

One could still refer here to the inscription from Eliachin, mentioned above\(^{160}\), since it is written in Old Arabian, except br and the final zy b-Šrn’. The second object of the verb qrb is br’, obviously corresponding to Sabaic brd, a kind of offer. Instead of assuming that the spelling br’ implies an Aramaic intermediary\(^{161}\), one could simply point at the pharyngealized character of the emphatics, which led to the notation of dād by ‘ayn because of the lack of an appropriate character. As noticed already by Ph. Marçais, the articulation of ‘ayn concerns “la même région arrière de la langue que la construction d’emphase”\(^{162}\).

\[
\text{dw qrb } \text{'zmt br nn}
\]

\[
\text{br’ lštm zy bšrn’}
\]

“What ’Azmāt, son of Nūn, brought as offering for ’Ashtarum who is in the Sharon (plain)”.

The so-called Ţamūdic graffiti form another group of North-Arabian inscriptions, deciphered by Enno Littmann\(^{163}\). They are named after Ţamūd, one of several Arabian tribes mentioned in Assyrian annals (Tamūdi) and Neo-Babylonian letters\(^{164}\). A mention of Ţamūd occurs later in a bilingual Graeco-Nabataean temple foundation text, dating


\(^{160}\) See n. 156.

\(^{161}\) This was assumed by the writer: E. Lipiński, The Cult of ’Ashtarum (n. 156), p. 318.


\(^{163}\) E. Littmann, Zur Entzifferung der thamudenden Inschriften (MVÄG IX/1), Berlin 1904; cf. id., Thamud und Safa, Leipzig 1940 (reprint, 1966); W.W. Müller, Das Frühnordarabische (n. 140), pp. 18–20.

from 166/169 A.D. and found at Rawwafah, in northern Al-Hiǧāz\textsuperscript{165}, then in a 5th-century Byzantine source referring to a cameleer corps on the north-eastern frontier of Egypt, also in North-Arabian graffiti from the Taymā’ region, in many passages of the Qur’ān, and in writings of Arab geographers\textsuperscript{166}.

Tamūdīc epigraphy is greatly indebted to travellers of the 19th century who have collected hundreds of inscriptions. Charles Montagu Doughty (1843–1926) spent two years in Arabia (1876–1878)\textsuperscript{167}, marching with the Mecca pilgrims in the ḥaǧǧ caravan as far as Madâ’in Šāliḥ, where he studied the Nabataean monuments and inscriptions, which he later published\textsuperscript{168}. Then he wandered all over the Naǧd-Ḥiǧāz borderland, visiting Taymā’, where he discovered the famous stele afterward acquired by C. Huber for the Louvre. The following year he travelled to Ḥāyil and, after many perils and arduous journeys, managed to visit Tā’if and finally reached the coast at Jedda.

Charles Huber travelled through Arabia in 1878–1882\textsuperscript{169}, and in 1883–1884 he set off again with Julius Euting (1839–1913) on an expedition to Central Arabia aiming at seeking out traces of pre-Islamic history, such as inscriptions and monuments\textsuperscript{170}. From these travels Huber brought hundreds of copies of Tamūdīc inscriptions. The three expeditions of J.A. Jaussen O.P. and R. Savignac O.P. to Madâ’in Šāliḥ, Al-‘Ulā, Taymā’, and Al-Hiǧr in 1907, 1909, and 1910 yielded 761 Tamūdīc graffiti beside the hundreds of Minaic, Nabataean, and Libyanite inscriptions\textsuperscript{171}.

These sources indicate that the Tamūdaeans were living between Mecca and Taymā’. However, the word ṭ-m-d occurring in graffiti from this area and interpreted as “Tamūd” rather means “pool” or “puddle”, and occasionally can be a “broken plural” ṭimād. The word is etymologically related to Mishnaic Hebrew ṭmd, “sour liquid”. It is already attested at Qumran in 3Q15, col. IX, 14–15, mentioning a byt tmd, “a receptacle of sour water”, and in the Mishnah\textsuperscript{172}. Besides, one cannot identify the supposed Tamūdaeans of North

\textsuperscript{165} The Greek text, mentioning a Thamoudenon ethnos, was published by H. Seyrig, Antiquités syriennes, “Syria” 34 (1957), pp. 249–261 (see pp. 259–261), while the fragmentary Nabataean text, referring to šrk tmdw, was deciphered by J.T. Milik, Inscriptions grecques et nabatéennes de Rawwafah, “Bulletin of the Institute of Archaeology” (University of London) 10 (1971), pp. 54–58 and pls. (see pp. 54–57). No convincing new data emerge from DNWSI, p. 1193, but see also K. Dijkstra, Life and Loyalty (n. 158), pp. 77–80.

\textsuperscript{166} For details of these sources, see A. Van den Branden, Histoire de Thamoud (Publications de l’Université Libanaise. Section des études historiques 6), Beyrouth 1960; 2nd ed., 1966, pp. 1–20, to be used with caution.


\textsuperscript{168} Ch.M. Doughty, Documents épiigraphiques recueillis dans le nord de l’Arabie, Paris 1884, edited by E. Renan.


\textsuperscript{170} C. Huber, Journal d’un voyage en Arabie (1883–1884), Paris 1891; J. Euting, Tagebuch einer Reise in Inner-Arabien, Leiden 1896–1914 (reprint, Hildesheim 2004); the second part of the diary was published posthumously by Enno Littmann.


\textsuperscript{172} Maaseroth V, 6; Maaser Sheni I, 3; Hullin I, 7.
Arabia with the Banū Ṭamad of Saba, mentioned by Al-Hamdānī. In other words, the name Ṭamūdīc was incorrectly applied to various types of graffiti found throughout Arabia, dating from the 6th century B.C. to the 3rd or 4th century A.D. and belonging to different dialects. Some inscriptions found in the Negeb and in the surrounding areas are described as "Ṭamūdīc" as well. Their script shows differences, revealing diverse scribal traditions and various periods. According to Winnett’s first classification one should distinguish Ṭamūdīc A-B-C-D-E, but he later reduced this fivefold grouping to three categories.

The Ṭamūdīc graffiti often contain only proper names and patronymics. The names or, at least, their elements are known from the pre-Islamic Arabian onomasticon. Considering such a small basis, the grammatical study of the inscriptions cannot lead easily to firm results. One should notice that even phonology presents difficult problems. The phonetic interpretation of some signs is controversial, as in the case of ⟨ḍ⟩, ⟨g⟩, and ⟨t⟩ in the majority of "Ṭamūdīc" E or Tabuki inscriptions. Geraldine King rightly reached the conclusion that ⟨ḍ⟩ represents the etymological /ṯ/ in these graffiti. However, where writing is not based on a solid scribal tradition, the signs represent articulated words and names, not etymological forms. One should thus admit a shift in the articulation of /ṯ/, as stated by E. Lipiński, and assume that ⟨ḍ⟩ stands possibly for a pharyngealized palato-alveolar [Ø], considering the original value /š/ of ⟨ḍ⟩ and the well-known change ⟨t⟩ > ⟨š⟩. As for ⟨g⟩ and ⟨t⟩, E.A. Knauf’s opinion is perhaps correct. He argued in several articles that the grapheme ⟨t⟩ represents etymological /g/ with a pronunciation [g].

177 F.V. Winnett and W.L. Reed, Ancient Records (n. 174), pp. 69–70.
179 E. Lipiński, Semitic Languages (n. 32), § 13.9.
while the grapheme $\{g\}$ represents etymological /g/ with a pronunciation foreign to the dialects in question and only occurring in loanwords and loan names. In “Tamūdic” D, some graffiti begin with the demonstrative $zn$, “this”, but $q$ occurs in proper names of the same inscriptions, e.g. $gmrsbr$. The problem $d:\partial:z$ is not yet solved in a satisfactory way.

An older stage of North-Arabian is represented by the Liḥyanite inscriptions from the 6th–4th centuries B.C., engraved in a variety of the South-Arabian script181. Liḥyanite is the local dialect of the oasis of Al-‘Ula, ancient Dedān, that had its own king in the 6th/5th century B.C. Nabonidus defeated a king of Dedān (šarru šá Da-da-nu)182 and a Liḥyanite epitaph mentions “Kabar’il, son of Mati’il, king of Dedān”183. The Liḥyanite inscriptions were dated by W. Caskel about 300 years later than is commonly accepted184, while evidence of Babylonian rule is provided by the date-formula of Jaussen-Savignac 349 lih: “At the time of Geshem, son of Šahr, and of ‘Abd, governor of Dedān” ($b’y m Gšm bn Šhr w-‘bd flt Ddn$). Šhr is a royal name, since it appears as Šhrw on a coin from Samaria, probably indicating a Liḥyanite king or king-governor of the 4th century B.C.185 At least seven kings of Liḥyan in the 4th–early 2nd centuries B.C. are identified by Saba Farès-Drappeau186.

Liḥyanite should not be distinguished from the idiom of the so-called “Dadanite” inscriptions, which are somewhat older187. The language is represented by a series of graffiti188 and of mainly monumental inscriptions engraved in a variety of the South-Arabian script189, in an alphabet counting 28 letters. The available epigraphic material was increased twelve years ago by the excellent publication of 189 new inscriptions by Alexander Sima190. This work is an important tool for the study of North-Arabian in the 5th–2nd centuries B.C.


183 A. Jaussen and R. Savignac, Mission archéologique en Arabie (n. 171), No. 138 lih.


189 A. Jaussen and R. Savignac, Mission archéologique en Arabie (n. 171), have collected 379 Liḥyanite inscriptions. They have been recently analyzed by S. Farès-Drappeau, Dédan et Liḥyān (n. 186).

Finally, Ḥasaean is the name given to the language of the inscriptions written in a variety of the South-Arabian script and found mainly in the great oasis of Al-Ḥasāʾ, in the east of Saudi Arabia. Ḥasaean inscriptions were first published by A. Jamme. A new edition was provided by A. Sima. As a matter of fact, North-Arabian words occur also in other texts written in South-Arabian script.

4. Bibliographic researches

Bibliographic research, required by a more detailed historical survey of Arabic linguistics, was greatly enhanced by the work of J.H. Hospers, the two bibliographies of Mohammed Hasan Bakalla, and by the specialized bibliography of Werner Diem, who quotes Persian titles and M.A. theses from Cairene universities. One could add the sociolinguistic bibliography compiled by Richard W. Schmidt and, of course, the Index Islamicus, the usefulness of which is increased by the Bio-bibliographical Supplement and by the Concise Biographical Companion. One should further record the Abstracta Islamica, as well as the Journal of Arabic Linguistics, edited from 1978 onwards by Hartmut Bobzin and Otto Jastrow. It deals with all the historical stages of the language, as well as with the regional and social variants of Arabic up to Modern Standard Arabic. A rich bibliography is offered by Wolfdietrich Fischer in his grammar of Classical Arabic and in the most important synthesis on Arabic philology that has appeared in the late 20th century thanks to him and to H. Gätje.

203 See here above, n. 68.
Late Appearance of Early Arab Cartography. 
A 19th C. Manuscript Map by Az-Zayyānī: 
Its Toponymy and Its Vision of the World

Abstract

The question of survival of the Ptolemaic cartographical tradition in the Arab World, all through the Idrisian transmission chain and down to the modern times, is the subject of this article. A handwritten map found in Arabia, which – in this author’s opinion – was authored by a Moroccan intellectual Az-Zayyānī at the break of the 18th–19th cc., is apparently the last pre-modern Arabic cartographical creation. It’s history is obscure, but the physical shape bears strong resemblance to the other two published maps by the same author (whereabouts of those two manuscript specimens, unfortunately, are unknown at present). The map is analysed in respect of its geographical contents as depicting the world, as well as of the intellectual horizons the map presented to its users at its time, and questions about its relevance are asked.

Keywords: Moroccan culture, manuscripts, Arab cartography, Idrisian tradition, Abū al-Qāsim az-Zayyānī

---

1 This is a slightly revised version of a paper read at the 25th International Cartographic Conference in Paris, in July 2011, Section E-1: History of Cartography and GIS Science. The participation in the Conference was made possible thanks to a subsidy from the Islamic Society for Cultural Formation in Poland, to whom I express my warm gratitude. I also thank Dr Philip W. Matthews for his kind assistance with the final edition of this article.
1. Early Arab Cartography

Under this heading we usually understand the classical period of the Arab cartography which began with translations of the Ancient works by Ptolemy (ca 100–168 B.C.) into Arabic (8–9th cc.), followed by the earliest Arabic cartographic productions (8–9th cc.), at present only known from verbal second-hand accounts, and with the so-called Al-Balḥī school (9th c.) and independent works by Al-Bīrūnī (11th c.). It reached its apex with the famous geographer Al-Idrīsī (12th c.) and his map of the world produced at the order of King Roger of Sicily. The tradition of Idrisian cartography barely survived until the early 17th c. and came to an end with the sudden but isolated outburst of the very characteristic portolan maps executed by Aṣ-Ṣafāqisī family in Tunisia.

However, two centuries later, quite unexpectedly, the Idrisian tradition reemerged in Morocco like the Phoenix from the ashes and made its last known appearance, marking the final stage of premodern Arabic cartography. It was an early 19th c. map of the world by a Moroccan Az-Zayyānī (1734/35–1833), which, like most of all previous cartographic productions of the Arabs, was not an independent item per se but was meant to accompany and illustrate a written text.

Thus ended the premodern Arabic cartography based on Ptolemy’s works. Five years after the death of Az-Zayyānī, an Egyptian intellectual Rifā‘a Badawī Ṭāfī at-Taḥtāwī (1801–1873) elaborated and published an Arabic translation of Conrad Malte-Brun’s Géographie universelle, under the title: Al-ǧuğrāfiyyā al-jumāmiyyā; this was accompanied by a geographical dictionary: At-Taʿrīfāt aš-šāfiyya’ li-murīd al-ǧuğrāfiyyā (Visible definitions for seekers of geography), published in Al-Qāhirah (Būlāq) in 1838. It was the beginning of a completely new era in Arabic geography and cartography.

2. Az-Zayyānī, his book and his map

On the 12th day of the month Rabī‘ al-Awwal of the Muslim (Ḥiǧrī) year 1233, corresponding to 20th or 21st of January 1818, a Moroccan statesman, traveler, poet and historian, named Abū al-Qāsim az-Zayyānī, successfully completed his main and most important work, drawing on history and geography, titled At-Turğumānāʾ al-kubrā fi ʿalbār al-maʿmūr barrūn wa-bahrūn (The great interpreter of relations from the inhabited world on land and sea). In fact, none of his works (about fifteen titles altogether) were ever completed in the proper sense of the word, because until the last of his days the author used to place additional notes on the margins of his books which thus amplified the earlier texts and always tried to bring out some new material for readers.

At the beginning of the 20th century At-Turğumānāʾ al-kubrā came to be known to exist in only two manuscripts in unspecified private Moroccan collections in the cities of Salā and Marrākuš (Salé and Marrakech), as vaguely mentioned by Évariste Lévi-Provençal in 1922. Forty five years later, in August 1967, the book was published in the Arabic
original in Morocco, without any indication as to the origin of a handwritten codex (or codices) on which the printed edition was based.

The manuscript of *At-Turğumâna al-kubrá* was accompanied by a map which was meant – in principle – to illustrate the book and give its readers a better spatial presentation of the facts mentioned in its contents. There was only that one map in the book, and at present we have no information about anything else beside the map.

That map from *At-Turğumâna al-kubrá* is the subject of the present short study. How the purpose of the map was achieved, will be discussed below.

### 3. The Map (copies A and B)

The map accompanying *At-Turğumâna al-kubrá* has until recently been only known from two technically imperfect printed photographs in black and white.

The first of them in the order of appearance and which will be called here Map A, was reproduced from the original and published by Évariste Lévi-Provençal in 1922, as the plate/figure 3 on p. 188, in his book. Lévi-Provençal named it facticiously “la carte des mers” (“map of the seas”) but gave no information as regards the source of the reproduced map and which codex (possibly one of the two mentioned above) it originally came from. The same Map A was again reprinted after the Lévi-Provençal’s book by J.B. Harley and D. Woodward (1992, p. 172) in their insightful study of Islamic cartography. The authors inform us sadly that “attempts to locate a manuscript of this work [*At-Turğumâna al-kubrá*] have proved fruitless”.

A photograph of the second copy of the map, here called Map B, was included in the Arabic printed edition of *At-turğumâna al-kubrá*, (Az-Zayyânî 1967, between pp. 30–31), without indication of the source of both the map and the text. It could have been reproduced from one of the codices mentioned by Lévi-Provençal in 1922, or from a different one. We have no information about where in the manuscript text the map was originally inserted. It is not known which of the two hitherto known maps came from which codex (Salâ or Marrâkuš, or possibly another one).

This author’s endeavours in detecting the present whereabouts of the two earlier known manuscripts of *At-Turğumâna al-kubrá* and/or their maps did not yield any result. Nor could it be ascertained if there exist any other manuscripts of that book except those two from Salâ and Marrâkuš. *Nota bene*, recently an information was received from a source which choose to remain anonymous, that the Map A could be found in a manuscript no. Ms. 2470 in the collection of Al-Ḥizâna al-Ḥasaniyya of the Royal Palace in Rabat, but that indication could not be confirmed.

Both Maps A and B are very similar but at the same time certainly distinct, like any two manuscript copies of the same work. Map A was reproduced by both Lévi-Provençal and Harley/Woodward in its entirety, while the Moroccan reproduction of the Map B covers only its right half (that is its Western part, since the map, following an old Islamic tradition in cartography, was oriented towards the South). No information is available on
the actual size of those maps, but both maps were apparently folded in two, to match the size of their respective codices.

4. A third copy of the map appears

Forty one years after the printing of the Arabic text of *At-Turğumānaṭ al-kubrá*, in 2008, another copy of apparently the same map, which will be called here Map C, appeared on the antiquarian market in Saudi Arabia. In November of that year it was acquired for the library of Ibn Khaldun Institute in Poland.

The vendors could furnish only basic information about Map C. It had remained for quite a long time as a property of a Saudi family in the city of Ğudda (Djedda, Jeddah), who recently decided to sell it. The map is a separate sheet obviously extracted from a book. The last owners of the map, and the vendors alike, had no information about the book itself nor about earlier owners of the map. It may only be hypothetically assumed that at a certain time, between ca mid 19th century and mid 20th century, the map was brought to Arabia by a Moroccan (or, more largely speaking, Mağribian) pilgrim who covered a part of his travel and living expenses during *ḥaǧg* through selling it to a local customer. Unless new evidence comes to light, the veracity of both the vendor’s story and our hypothesis cannot be tested.

Was the map taken out of one of the earlier mentioned manuscripts or still from a third one? That question cannot be answered without close examination of all the manuscripts of *At-Turğumānaṭ al-kubrá*, but their number and present locations remain unknown. In consequence it is not known, either, how many other similar maps may exist now in unsearched and uncatalogued collections.

5. Map C – physical description

Map C is a hand-written copy, drawn and painted in water-colors on what appears to be a thin, white, hand-made sheet of paper, pasted to another thin white paper (*doublure*). It has a shield water-mark which still awaits identification. The reverse side of the second sheet is clear, without any drawing or writing on it. The map was folded in two, apparently so as to match the size of the book of which it was an integral part.

The size of the map within drawn frames, is 37.8 cm (bottom) or 38.5 cm (top) by 28 cm (right) or 27.8 cm (left). The overall size of the whole sheet, with margins, is 42 cm by 31.5 cm. When folded in two, the map has the size of a modern A-4 office paper. The manuscript, from which the map originates, was therefore of significant dimensions and certainly must have been a sumptuous object.

Map C is very similar in shape and disposition to the other two maps, but contains visibly more extensive toponymic coverage. It seems that Map C was drawn separately from A and B (those two seem more to resemble each other than C). It is interesting to
note, however, that Map B has a compass rose in lower right (NW) corner, while Maps A and C do not.

Numbering of pages, executed in pencil on a painted side, is preserved in the center of upper (Southern) margins of the map, in European figures as used in the Maghrib (contrary to Middle-Eastern usage), judging by the character of writing. Page numbers 531 and 532, indicating two halves of the map, go from right to left, according to Arabic way of reckoning the pages. It may be assumed that the numbers follow the numbering of pages of the non-extant (?) manuscript of At-Turğumânâ al-kubrâ, from which Map C originates. It should be noted that the number 5 in both cases has overwritten another undecipherable number (perhaps 2?).

One can certainly ask questions about correct attribution of Map C. Is it really a map produced to illustrate the book by Az-Zayyânî? There is no definitive argument to support this hypothesis. On the other side, however, there is a strong resemblance between the three maps in outline and disposition, and also a visible lack of any other similar maps, known to exist in other books originating from the same region and times (in fact – from any area and any times). It is most unlikely that in a period when Arabic maps were almost no longer produced (except this special case) there could emerge, out of nothing, a complete, separately created, cartographic work. That allows us to believe that we really have before us a third sister – an original map from At-Turğumânâ al-kubrâ.

Another mysterious fact is the deliberate change of the numbering of pages. Who did that, when and why? Was the map initially integrated with one manuscript and then removed and put into another one?

Finding manuscripts of this book, that may possibly still exist somewhere, and comparing them with Map C, could perhaps give a final argument in favor of our interpretation or offer a new solution of the problems.

The map is unevenly preserved. Quite big spaces are in almost perfect condition and are easy to read. However, even there there are wormholes which sometimes mutilate the inscriptions. The fold in the middle is in bad condition with some small parts of the map missing: ca 1 cm² in the bottom part (Northern Europe), ca 2 cm² in the middle part (Northern Mesopotamia), and ca 4–5 cm² in the upper part (Central Arabia).

The second layer of paper was apparently used to repair the damages incurred by the original map, while the margins were on the reverse reinforced with still other bands of paper. Subsequently the map was again injured with wormholes everywhere and at the heavily used fold, and the two halves are now hardly attached to each other.

6. Contents of Map C

Judging from the imprecise topographical outlines and awkwardly spelled geographical names, the map comprises in the South (upper side), in Africa, the basin of Nil as-Südân, the Nile of the Sudan, that is Senegal and Niger rivers, represented according to the old
Arab tradition as a one single waterway, originating together with Nil Miṣr, the Nile of Egypt in an (unnamed) big lake, detaching from the Nile and flowing into the (unnamed) Atlantic Ocean. Further to the East (left) the map comprises the big part of the Indian Ocean and includes India and China with its eastern shores.

The bottom left (North-Eastern) part of the map shows the country of Yāḡūḡ (Biblical Gog and Magog), well separated from the rest of Asia by the (unnamed) mythical Alexander’s Wall. The country of Yāḡūḡ extends as a narrow strip far to the West and finally touches on the North Sea.

The North-Western (bottom right) corner of the map includes the whole of England, Ḟazzīrat Niqlāṭīrat, written over an irregular shape with the very characteristic promontory of Cornwall, and another, oblong island, located immediately to the North-East of England, named Ḟazzīrat Rṣ.lāndāt. This island, which seems displaced from some other original location, allows free interpretation. May be it is Iceland. That Iceland, however, could perhaps be rather identified as Ireland, that was more commonly known to extra-European world. Another explication could be that the name repeated a German name of Russia – Russland, overheard during author’s travels and applied to an island lying a bit out of context (distant Russia extending somewhere to the North-East of England).

Two more islands adjoin Great Britain from the left/Eastern side. The first, whose name was in greater part mutilated by bookworms, can still be identified (after Al-Idrīsī) as Ḟazzīrat Narbāḡāt or Narfāḡāt, i.e. Norway. The other one, lying more to the East and close to the country of Yāḡūḡ, does not have a name on it.

To sum up, the map shows – in its own way – all of Asia and Europe and about half of the African continent. The presented part of Africa (with adjoining seas) occupies ca 20% of the space on the map, Europe occupies another 20%, and the remaining 60% remains as the share of Asia.

Shapes of all geographical features are very general, disproportionate and disfigured.

The scale of the map cannot be established for the whole of it since the proportions differ from one place to another.

The Asiatic part of the map, on which space is rendered in a symbolical rather than real way, and which does not offer fixed places for calculation, roughly corresponds to scale 1:24,000,000 when measured from North to South and 1:34,000,000 in the West-East direction.

In Europe and Africa it is quite different but not more precise. The scales vary from 1:15,000,000 (calculated after the distance İstanbul–Hamburg) and 1:13,000,000 (Ceuta–Alexandria), through 1:9,200,000 (İstanbul–Tīnbuktū) and 1:9,100,000 (Rome–Ǧudda‘), to 1:8,500,000 (Ceuta–Hamburg) and 1:6,300,000 (İstanbul–Rome).

The map has the shapes of continents and islands drawn with countour lines in black. Mountain chains are marked with black wavy or meandering lines. Inland waters, that is rivers and lakes, are marked in red.

The nomeclature and short explicative texts on Map C (similarly to A and B) are in a typical cursive Mağribī script.
Names of inhabited places are written also in black but there are no special marks to indicate the location of those entities. Occasionally found black dots rarely coincide with localities, and the closer examination reveals their true nature as small worm-holes.

The seas, including the Caspian Sea, are all painted with an uneven layer of brownish green paint, reminding us of the colour of spinach. This paint occasionally overlays and covers some islands and inscriptions that were put on the map earlier. It seems that the paint was applied later, by the author or may be even a subsequent user, as if to make the map more decorated and nicer.

In analogy to Maps A and B, and following more than a millennium of the cartographical tradition of Ptolemy, transmitted by Al-Idrīsī, Map C is divided with black lines vertically (latitudinally) into seven climates (iqlīm), starting with the Southerthernmost one at the top of the map and ending with the Northernmost at the bottom of the drawing. Each climate is subsequently divided into ten horizontally (longitudinally) arranged sections (ḡūzʾ). This conventional grid system tries to arrange the global space orderly and reveals superficial similarity to the existing modern topographical grid networks. The technical bases of the two systems are incompatible and the grids should not be mistaken through taking one for the other or vice versa. As can be seen from Al-Idrīsī’s or Az-Zayyānī’s maps, they are now hardly comparable.

It should be remarked that most of the lines, that were originally drawn in black, have faded and now represent various shades of grey.

Contour lines depicting continents and islands extend in several places far beyond the frames of the map into the margins, together with inscriptions on them. That phenomenon can also be observed, although to a lesser degree, on Maps A and B. Oceans of Map C are painted also when they overlap the margins.

7. Toponymy

This section on toponymy will not include the review of all place names overwritten on the map, leaving their detailed study for another occasion. Some remarks are however due in order to better understand the nature of the map.

Geographical names on the map may be approximately reckoned and split by continents as follows:

Europe – 107 names (most of them in the Iberian peninsula),
Africa – 179 names,
Asia – 272 names (most of them in the Middle East).

It makes roughly 558 lexical units appearing on the map, with the reservation that after a careful study some of them may in reality appear to constitute jointly just one name and others may possibly have to undergo a division. Nevertheless, the quantities and proportions would not change considerably.
A brief review of the names on the map reveals that they belong to several categories:
1. Names of populated places;
2. Oronymic features, like: a) seas, gulfs and lakes, b) islands, c) mountains, d) rivers;
3. Regionyms referring to: a) physical areas, b) historical and political areas, c) tribal areas.

The toponymic coverage of the map is uneven, both as regards the relations between the continents and various categories of names. It is not in proportion to actual density of human settlements. Some seemingly important orographic elements, shown on the map in drawing, are devoid of names.

I would like to highlight just some particular features.

Many toponyms are equivocal and many of them are repeated.

They may either mean a tribe itself or a tribal territory, like the name At-Turk – the Turks. Al-ḥarāb – the ruins, which are dispersed (alongside with the name At-Turk) over large territories of North-Eastern Asia, may refer either to concrete abandoned human dwellings of whatever kind or, alternately, to a naturally devastated, unfertile and inhospitable land.

Among others we find the tribal name Qibğaq, without any generic term (it could be, for example, bilād, or dār, or arḍ, or some other one), but certainly referring to a territory. Another structure of a regionym, more developed, is exemplified by Mağālāt al-Guzz – transhumance expanses of the Oguz tribe. located not too far away from Qibğaq. The interchangable and repeated names like Al-Mafāza‘ and Al-Qafr, both of them meaning desert, may either refer to particular area bearing such a name or have a quite general character. Interesting to observe that some of them actually appear inside a neatly delimited area.

Names of populated places appear to be as if selected at random and sometimes it is difficult to ascertain when they mean a concrete place and when a territory. Some of them are repeated in areas where they never belonged – like Al-Banādiq, Venice, appearing all along the Eastern shore of the Apennine Peninsula. Place names along the Nil as-Sūdān are systematically repeated on both shores of the river.

Most of geographical names, in all continents, seem to repeat (although in a more limited selection) the names known from Al-Idrīṣī’s works, that is reflecting the reality from before 800 years, at least verbally – because their localisation on the map leaves a lot to desire. Some names shown in Al-Maġrib repeat expressions earlier encountered in the geographical descriptions by Ibn Ḥaldūn (1332–1406), like Mağālāt al-Barbar or Mağālāt Hayyib wa-Ruwāḥ‘.

The highest density of populated places is shown all around the Mediterranean Sea: the Maġribian shores, Egypt, the Levant and Asia Minor, then Spain. In those areas, and in comparison with Maps A and B, Map C offers a true richness of toponyms.

There are, however, also signs of newer times, the names of entities that became known to our author through more up-to-date evidence. The name Ar-Rūsiyā (Russia,
Al-Idrīsī’s Rūsiyyāt) appears alternately with Al-Mūsk (Moscow, or the state of Muscovy), the name which could not be known to classical Arab geographers (see also above about the possible German name of Russia). Opposite Great Britain, on the European continent, we find Ġn.b.rq (Hamburg), a very important economic center during the lifetime of Az-Zayyānī.

Interweaving old, obsolete names with newer ones introduces a lot of confusion into the geographical knowledge of the readers that could be gathered from the map. The names match but a little with geographical descriptions contained in At-Turğumānāt al-kubrá, which further complicates the processus of communication between the author and the reader.

8. Textual descriptions


Hardly detectable inscriptions, because of an overlaying paint, can be traced on the Adriatic Sea, Black Sea and the Caspian Sea. For comparison, Maps A and B reveal several more inscriptions, including some numerical data, in the maritime areas.

The full list of names and descriptions from the map should be carefully compiled and studied in comparative light, specially as regards its relationship with the book itself and its two other sister maps, A and B, as well as other premodern Arabic sources, particularly Al-Idrīsī’s work, on which this map seems to be directly dependent. The more insightful research will allow to identify all features named on the map and to establish correct spelling of the names, as well as assessing the informative value of the textual descriptions.

The first glimpse on the map and the book allows us to find, however, that the contents of this Idrīsīan map has in general little connection with the contents of the book, conceived according to a different scheme and outline, and the book is definitely less dependent on the descriptive geographical work by Al-Idrīsī than the map.

9. Relevance of the map and the vision of the world

Az-Zayyānī’s map, the epigon of classical Arab cartography, appeared when the Arab geographical science was in a precarious situation. How could it happen?

Self isolation of the Moroccan Empire that some later observers called the “Japan of the West” created a split and separation from the modern trends in life and science that were coming to the Mediterranean. The Ottoman Empire under a pressing need to keep control of its waters as well as waters that – not yet? – belonged to the Empire, developed its own school of portolan cartography. This drew on Turkish intelligence sources and extensively used foreign maps, acquired for that purpose from (mainly) Italian producers
and other European cartographers. The technological transfer took place there on a large scale and lead to the development of Turkey’s own cartographers who could satisfy the requirements of military and civil administration.

The exchange of technology and information between Al-Maġrib and the Ottomans was meagre, if any. Ottoman maps (for instance, those produced by Piri Reis, ca 1465–1554) used place names of the Magribian sea shores in all sorts of European spellings, retransliterated into the Arabic script of the Ottoman Turkish. Confusion was complete as no information flow between two culturally related countries could really be observed in that sphere.

At the same time Moroccans remained isolated from the outside world by the will of the ʿAlawī sultans, in fear of the competing Ottoman power and of the progress of European influence in the country and of possible aggression from that side (as we see from further history, those fears were quite justified). Thus they missed a chance of the development of intellectual exchange and technological transfer.

Az-Zayyānī, as other Moroccans of his times, had only the Arabic classical tradition at his disposal and used it the best he could, building a dead-end of that ancient and medieval tradition in modern times. Though his map may seem all too simplistic for our taste, it was nevertheless an important source of information for the readers in his closed-in society and offered them a wider vision of the world from which they were separated. There lay the relevance of the map for the contemporary users.

Continuation of the classical tradition in Arabic geography did not end completely with the appearance of first translations of modern scientific works from French. The Arabs did not only feel attached to their old poetry but also to their old scientific traditions which could last and last in parallel to the new developments. In Egypt, which looked to be so much culturally advanced in comparison with Morocco, Muhammad Amīn al-Ḥāniği wrote a geographical dictionary which was a direct supplement to the famous dictionary Muʿğam al-buldān by Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī (13th c.) and had it printed in 1907.

Az-Zayyānī should be praised for what he did in the given circumstances and not blamed for what the others did not. His map will remain a rare and intellectually significant document from those difficult times and conditions.
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Abstract

The stream of historical revisionism within the Orientalist scholarship has offered in recent years a number of intriguing theories attempting to undermine some of the conventional concepts of the Arab-Muslim early history and religious tradition. Regardless of their actual scholarly value, they do shed light on various methodological problems concerning the critical research on early the Islamic historiography, raise sensitive and stimulating questions, and encourage to think possibly of revising certain axioms of knowledge about that epoch. This paper endeavours to present briefly an alternative image of the arrival of Islam on the Iberian Peninsula, as emerging from research by the revisionist school of West-European scholars called Inârah. Their controversial theory involving, among others, historical and dogmatic aspects of the development of Islam in Andalusia, disputes the generally accepted version of historical events beginning with the 8th century C.E. which is largely based on the traditional sources of Arabic historiography.

Keywords: Historical revisionism, Arab-Muslim conquest of Spain, early Islam, Islamic historiography

This article outlines briefly an alternative image of early Islamic history on the Iberian Peninsula, as emerging from research by the revisionist school of West-European Semitists called Inârah (active mostly in Germany and France for nearly 10 years). The controversial theory involving, among others, historical and theological aspects of the development of Islam in Andalusia, disputes the generally accepted version of historical
events beginning with the 8th century C.E. which is largely based on the traditional sources of Arabic historiography.

The precursors of the Inârah Institute gained publicity in year 2000 after the publication of the known pioneer philological work of Christoph Luxenberg entitled. Die syro-aramäische Lesart des Koran – Ein Beitrag zur Entschlüsselung der Koransprache (the book was released in English in 2004 as The Syro-Aramaic Reading of the Koran – A Contribution to the Decoding of the Language of the Koran by Verlag Hans Schiler). It soon became the reference point for most of scientific research undertaken by scholars of the Oriental studies affiliated with the Inârah movement. Luxenberg, its member, calls for the revision of our current knowledge on the oldest Islamic history by means of subjecting its primary sources to the requirements of scientific criticism. The main methodological assumptions of Christoph Luxenberg rely on the analysis of the Qur’anic text against the cultural and historical background of its probable origins – the Middle East of the 7th and 8th century, saturated with the Syro-Aramaic tradition. The Inârah school embraced scholars (mostly German, French and American) specializing in different fields, such as Semitistics (including Arabic and Syriac studies), Iranian and Turkish studies, archeology, history of the pre-Islamic ages and early centuries of Islam, Christian and Muslim theology, history of art (relics of Arab material culture, including numismatics), Islamic studies, literature and other branches of human science.

The scientific activities of the Inârah movement are strongly revisionist and are criticized by most of the Orientalist milieux as lacking scientific objectivity and charged with prejudice against the Muslim tradition. On the other hand, the critical scientific theses put forward by members of the Inârah group gained support of some prominent intellectuals of the Western Oriental scholarship, including the Egyptian liberal Muslim theologian-in-exile Nasr Hamid Abu Zayd and the world-renowned German paleographer of the Arabic language Gerd-Rüdiger Puin. The publicity surrounding Inârah has contributed to the popularity of their scientific theories which are widely discussed within the Western Orientalist milieux, undoubtedly pushing forward the development of this field of human sciences. Every year, dozens of published scientific papers refer directly or indirectly to the effects of Inârah’s work.

The main assumption made by the revisionist school is that our contemporary knowledge on the origins of Islam has almost solely been acquired from the sources of the Islamic tradition, written accounts of which date back to the 8th–9th century AD or later, i.e. 150–200 years after the events in question. Historical credibility of these sources has never been sufficiently confirmed by scientific research, least of all archaeology.

According to Inârah’s theory, the formation of Islam as a separate religion was a long-term process covering about two centuries. The forerunner of the Muslim community became in the 7th century a specific community of Syro-Arab Christians who

---

1 The hypothesis of a wide expanse of time accompanying various processes leading to the (development or) evolution of the dogmatic message of Islam (i.e. the Qur’anic script, exegesis, but also jurisprudence etc.) is an often returning motif within the critical scholarship on Islam. See also, inter alia: John Wansbrough, Quranic Studies. Sources and Methods of Scriptural Interpretation, Oxford University Press 1977, p. 47, 90, 92, 140 etc.
were gradually detaching themselves dogmatically from the Byzantine church since the
time of the First Council of Nicaea in 325 C.E. (which recognized the doctrine of the
Holy Trinity). In the 7th century, their faith was already marked by a distinct form of anti-
trinitarianism, in some way akin to the beliefs of the Arians. Hence, the Syrian literature of
the 7th and 8th centuries (including theological treatises and historical chronicles) considers
this denominational group to be an Arab-Christian heresy. Its followers began to assume
power over the region of Great Syria after the Emperor Heraclius (610–641 C.E.) had
renounced his administrative authority over the eastern provinces of Byzantium in the
twenties of the 7th century. Since then, the Syriac Arabs regarded themselves politically
as the rightful heirs of the Byzantine dominions in the Middle East. Religiously, they
believed in the new anointment of the Arabs – sons of Ismail as the inheritors of Abraham’s
spiritual legacy and the heirs of the divine law given to Moses. By the end of the 7th
century, the Arab Umayyad Empire under the leadership of ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Marwân
usurped the spiritual and material patrimony over the former provinces of the Byzantine
Empire in the Arab East, as well as the lands in North Africa and Spain.

In the revisionist theory, this theological movement was gradually drifting away from
the teachings of Constantinople and Rome and transforming itself slowly into Islam as
an independent non-Christian religion, a process which only materialized at the turn of
the 8th and 9th century.

Also, the very terminology of the Islamic religion is – according to the Inârah school
– historically late and derives from the Syriac Christian tradition. The word “islâm”
was initially to mean theologically the compliance of faith dogmas with the message
of Al-Kitâb – the Holy Book. The term “muslim” depicted believers of this specifically
conceived form of pre-Nicaean theology, and the Arabic passive participle “muḥammad”
(Arabic: praised, glorified) was to be the theological Arab epithet referring to the person
of the Messiah Son of God and describing one of His virtues, and was not to refer to
the name of the Muslim prophet Muhammad.

In this sense, Muḥammad is not a historical figure, but one of theological concepts
of the said group of Arab-Syriac Christians. This concept becomes for the new Arab

---

Wansbrough supports J. Schacht’s point that the canonization of the Qur’an could not have preceeded the process
of working out of the Islamic jurisprudence first. John Wansbrough, op. cit., p. 44.

2 Within this theory, the Qur’an, and precisely its oldest surahs, was originally thought as the eschatological
epopee of the spiritual struggle of these people.

3 According to revisionist views, during the reign of ‘Abd al-Malik the Arab state subsumed Tripolitania
and the former Roman province of Africa. This fact is historically confirmed by numismatic finds from these
areas – coins marked with the religious symbol ‘Abd al-Malik’s sovereignty (called yegar sahaduta – the Old
Testamental “stone of witness”), corresponding to similar coins of the same ruler minted in the Arab East. The
newly subjugated territories were governed by ‘Abd al-Malik’s brother – ‘Abd al-‘Aziz Ibn Marwân. Then the
sons of ‘Abd al-Malik continued further conquest of Africa in the western direction, and Spain.

4 Volker Popp, Biblische Strukturen in der islamischen Geschichtsdarstellung, in: Markus Groß, Karl-Heinz

Rekonstruktion anhand zeitgenössischer Quellen, Berlin 2007, pp. 13–222.
church (breaking free religiously from the hegemony of the Patriarch of Constantinople and administratively from the rule of the Byzantine Emperor) the main motto and guiding maxim of “new Arab Christianity”. It was only after the Abbasid dynasty had been established that a historic dimension was added to the concept of “muḥammad”, within the frame of a reverse projection into Islam’s history, done by Abbasids to make their dominion legitimate. It was also that time when the Arabic biography of Muḥammad was created.

According to the revisionist school, this religious philosophy, and not Islam as defined today, arrived in 711 at the gates of the Visigothic Spain (and earlier to Egypt and the entire North Africa.) This belief was characterized by doctrinal resemblance to various Christian-like religious factions of the Iberian Peninsula at that time, from the still strong Arianism to gnosticism. The new anti-trinitarian theology, which was brought by the newcomers from the East, could therefore find fertile Arian ground on the Iberian Peninsula which in turn might have greatly facilitated its conquest.

Researchers from the Inārah group believe that the Berber-Arab army encountered remnants of the Arian community still before their military arrival in Spain, that is in North Africa. An anti-Catholic and anti-Franconian coalition was formed there and found its natural ally on the other side of the Strait of Gibraltar in parts of the population inhabiting southern Spain. This may mean that the legendary victory of the Arabs over the Visigothic king Roderick in 711 might have been the result of the said alliance between the Visigothic Arian aristocracy on one side and – on the other one – the Arian Berbers together with a few Syrian Arabs professing the belief in one God whose anti-trinitarian faith put them close to Spanish Arians. This hypothesis implies that the conquest of Spain might not have been an ordinary military campaign with the “Muslim finger of God” in the background, but it rather had an opportunistic ground – the Berber-Arab army could have been “invited” to Spain to help in the removal of the Visigothic king loyal to Rome.

In revisionists’ opinions, such a theory correlates with historical descriptions of the religious situation in Spain of the 8th and 9th centuries. Preserved synodical documents and writings of church officials do not refer in any way (at least till the middle of the

---


7 Looking at the further course of historical events from this perspective, the victory of Charles Martel over the Arabs at Poitiers in 732 cannot be regarded as “driving back Muslims from the walls of Christian Europe”. The military invasion of the Spanish anti-Catholic coalition was a retaliation for continuous pro-Catholic interferences of the Franks into Spanish affairs.

8 The more that cases of coup d’etat of a religious nature with Arian participation were not anything new in Spain by that time. The mere fact of the conversion of the Visigothic king of Spain Reccared I (586–601) to Catholicism in 587 was of an opportunistic political nature: his intention was to avoid the fate of the Ostrogothic Arians and a blow from the part of the Catholic Franks of the Narbonese Gaul. A year later, in 588 some significant noble Arian clans lead by Witteric revolted against the king demanding the rehabilitation of the Arian faith. Witteric instigated another revolt in 603 gaining reign over the Visigothic state till 609. In turn, he was murdered by a group of Catholic aristocrats.
9th century) to the supposed appearance of a new non-Christian religion in Spain. The original source-texts (including theological writings devoted to dogmatics, correspondence, polemics, etc.) neither mention the terms “Islam” nor “Muslims”. Still in the 7th century, numerous Spanish clergymen were pointing in their letters to some gradually increasing threats to the orthodoxy of the Catholic faith – mainly posed by the Arians and other locally-rooted religious currents. For this reason, by the end of the 7th century Toledo saw seven synods of bishops9 held in short time intervals during which many of the spreading heresies, including gnostic currents associated with the earlier priscillianism and movements related to nestorianism, were condemned. In the 8th century the conflicts within Christianity took on more momentum, still no one seemed yet to know about the advent of a new teaching – the Islam10. The Church hierarchy was mainly occupied with its continuous struggle against internal Christian heresies. The metropolite of Toledo – Elipandus (717–808) took an attempt to unite factions of the church by announcing the doctrine of adoptionism, which, however, led in effect to sealing the already existing divisions11. At the same time, increasing numbers of the Christian Spanish population were adhering to an Arab faith brought from the East by the Umayyads. It was characterized by strong anti-trinitarianism, however the literature still did not call it Islam, but a Christian sect. A member of the Inārah institute prof. Johannes Thomas writes that in the 9th century the Christians of Córdoba were already in a substantial part followers of those various religious anti-trinitarian factions which still back in the 7th century were the reason for convening a series of synods. The Andalusian theologian and poet Álvaro of Córdoba (c. 800–861) complains in a letter to his friend written around the year 840 that the heresy of which he had been writing earlier, was tearing apart the church, and leading the whole community to destruction12. Its followers were, inter alia, denying the unity of the Holy Trinity and rejecting the belief in the divinity of Christ. The religious beliefs of the Cordoban Christians in reference to Jesus and the Holy Trinity coincide with the faith dogmas condemned by the First Council of Nicaea, which were in turn preserved by the

9 During these synods bishops defended the teachings of the First Council of Nicaea (325 C.E.), the First Council of Constantinople (381), both councils of Ephesus (431 and 439), and especially the Council of Chalcedon (451). The Toledan synods were convened in the years 675 (11th synod), 681 (12th), 683 (13th), 684 (14th), 688 (15th), 693 (16th) and in 694 (17th). José Vives (ed.), Concilios visigóticos y hispano-romanos, Barcelona–Madrid 1963, p. 171.

10 According to this theory, also the analysis of numismatic findings does not indicate that Spain was a Muslim country (in today’s understanding of this word) by the 8th and beginning of the 9th century. More on this: Popp Volker, Die frühe Islamgeschichte nach inschriftlichen und numismatischen Zeugnissen, in: Karl-Heinz Ohlig, Gerd-R. Puin (ed.), Die dunklen Anfänge. Neue Forschungen zur Entstehung und frühen Geschichte des Islam, 3.Aufl.2007, Berlin pp. 16–123.

11 The adoptionism of Elipandus, akin to the views of Paul of Samosata and Photinus of Sirmium, was condemned by the pope and Charlemagne as a form of nestorianism. Northern Spain took energetically the side of the pope, whereas southern Spain, including Hispania Baetica (approximately today’s province of Andalusia) limited itself just to refuting adoptionism as a thesis.

tradition of the Syro-Arab church in the East. The fact that they were still referring at that time to the Gospel of Matthew (and not the Qur’an) also presupposes that they might have still been more heirs to the pre-Nicaean Christian dogmatics rather than Muslims.13

Given the foregoing considerations, the revisionist school opposes the division of the events that took place before 711 and after this date into the Christian era and Muslim era, which is common in Spanish historiography. Many of today’s scientific works illustrate the Berber-Arab conquest of Andalusia as a sharp turn in the course of history and an ideological reference point for the entire subsequent history of the Arab Umayyad caliphate in Spain. The history preceding the arrival of the Arabs is being “lumped” together under the catchword of “the Christian kingdom of the Visigoths”, and all events after 711 are being stereotypically classified under the heading “Arab-Muslim governance”, just as if they were two homogeneous opposing historical epochs. Contesting this view, Johannes Thomas also argues that Islam today is not the same religion as professed in the 8th century by Arabs, Ibadi Berbers conquering the Iberian peninsula or inhabitants of Andalusia by that time.14 According to the German Romanist, the myth of a “fine division of two historical epochs” is sustained by the uncrirical gaining of knowledge of that time from hardly reliable Arab historical chronicles, written down not earlier than a few hundred years after the portrayed events.15 According to researchers

13 Till the time of condemning the so-called Cassian heresy in 839, it seems that for the Cordoban church the problem of the person of Muhammad was not existent (later he was present in clergy writings and depicted as the “harbinger of the Antichrist”). A synod convened at that time dealt with the case of the Cassian sect and with the passivity of the catholic faith of those Christians who did not stand against the Syro-Arab christology. The bishops shared their concerns with the Umayyad caliph ‘Abd ar-Rahmān II, who convened the synod.

14 The more that the conquest of Spain was mainly executed by the Berber army. The chronicle of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam from the 9th/10th century describes the North African Berber tribes interchangeably with two closer unspecified terms: ‘ṣufrī (Sufris) and iḥāḍ (Ibadis). As for some tribes (e.g. Barani, Butr) it is being mentioned that they remained Christian. In most cases however, the chronicle does not mention the religious affiliation of the Berber tribes. Thus it may be concluded that the troops invading Spain in the early 8th century did not consist of Sunni Muslims, but of Sufris and Ibadis (Similarly moreover, when the chronicle of Ibn ‘Abd al-Hakam talks about the commander Mūsà Ibn Nuṣayr, it mentions only a few Arab personalities assisting him, however most of the persons surrounding him were Berber leaders and their freedmen (mawālt). Thus, there couldn’t have been any major religious conflicts between them and the conquered Spanish Christians). In turn, according to Muslim tradition, Ibadi missionaries arrived in Africa from Basra not earlier than in 757 and supposedly managed to Islamize immediately the Berber tribes. However, this seems highly unlikely only because of the reason that Berbers spoke Berber dialects and Latin, and not Arabic. Anyway, it is possible that Ibadis were more concerned with acquiring Christian Berbers for an alliance against the Umayyads than perhaps islamizing them. Johannes Thomas, op. cit., p. 119.

15 As Johannes Thomas points out, the thesis of tabula rasa creates scientific paradoxes in such fields as archeology, history of arts and architecture. For example, archaeologists working in Spain sometimes classify buildings and ornamentation similar architecturally to Umayyad palaces in the Arab East as a direct influence of Islamic culture, although till recently these monuments were regarded unquestionably as examples of Visigothic architecture. Moreover, the Spanish historian Luis Caballero Zoreda argues that Spanish architectural objects deriving by all their features from the late Roman, Byzantine or Visigothic periods are being tendentiously reclassified into the Muslim period. Thus, for example, a floormosaic dating till now on the basis of archaeological evidence to the 4th or 5th century, must be regarded as a monument of the 9th century, although it is explicit with taking the oldest archaeological layer for the youngest one. And further, after classifying the church as a building from
from *Inārah*, the transformation of Christian and gnostic Spain into Muslim Andalusia was a much smoother and long-lasting process than and it is being presented today by modern researchers. The Spanish historian Ignacio Olagüe (1903–1974) indicates that it is only since the 9th century that sectarian unrest began growing, the pressure against orthodox Christians was building up, Islam was formed as a religion separate from Christianity and started to be considered by the followers of Christ as the embodiment of the apocalyptic beast from the Book of Daniel16. It is impossible to understand the historical events in Spain of the early 8th century by adopting the view of the “fine clean division of two epochs”, without paying attention to the cultural and religious background of the Mediterranean region and of the Orient in the late antiquity.

The revisionist school questions the generally accepted historical outline of the beginnings of Islam on the Iberian Peninsula showing that we owe it largely to the Muslim tradition written down on demand of the late Abbasid dynasty. It is a version of history oriented theologically and politically to sanctioning the religious and political power of the Abbasid rulers. It may be concluded from the research done by the German theologian Volker Popp that it is exactly in this political agenda of the first Abbasid caliphs where the real motives standing behind this homogenous traditional Muslim concept of describing the early history of Islam should be looked for. At the request of the Abbasids, a specific version of history friendly to the Abbasids rulers was created and projected back into the past, with the overall objective of purposeful legitimizing their political and religious authority. It is a certain kind of mythologization of history, in order to derive one’s own lineage from the Prophet of Islam from Arabia17. At the same time, the Christian traditions of the Syriac Arabs did not correspond to the image of the history promoted by the Abbasid dynasty. Hence their marginalization or complete omission in traditional works of Muslim historiographers.

In the opinion of the renown English medievalist Roger Collins, it must be remembered that Arab sources portraying the conquest of Spain are not contemporary with the described events, but much later, sometimes even several hundred years. Thus, it is hard assigning them historical value, but only the literary one. These sources are also unreliable historiographically because they do not meet the requirements of scientific criticism: they often provide contradictory information, do not respect the chronology of events, include numerous literary topoi as well as later interpolations and contaminations, in a much greater degree than contemporary Latin chronicles. All this makes it necessary to treat early Arabic sources with a large dose of skepticism and credit them with confidence only if the information contained therein is confirmed by other sources of the given period18.

---

The oldest Arabic document of Andalusia dating back to the year 94 A.H. (713 C.E.) is the text of the treaty concluded by the son of the Arab commander Mūsà Ibn Nuṣayr – ‘Abd al-‘Aziz – with the Gothic magnate Theodemir. However this document which is referred to by almost every contemporary source of the Spanish history after 711, makes part of a manuscript dating from the turn of the 12th and 13th century, therefore it cannot be regarded as a historical source 19. What is more, it contains numerous interpolations of subsequent later copyists which makes it impossible to verify the historical authenticity of the treaty.

In turn, the chronicle considered to be the oldest Arab annal reporting on the ongoings of the North African and Spanish conquest is the Egyptian chronicle attributed to Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam (803–871) entitled Futūḥ Ifrīqiya wa-al-Andalus. However, problematic from the standpoint of historical criticism is the fact that the chronicle contains some information about events from the mid-10th century (such as the conquest of Narbonne by the Franks in 941/2) 20. The author himself had never been to Spain, and wrote his work in Egypt drawing knowledge from travelers whose accounts find no confirmation in history. The Western Oriental scholarship has treated Ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥakam’s chronicle as an unreliable source since the known Dutch Arabist Piet Reinhart Dozy revealed its inaccuracies, the author’s tendency to confabulating and fabricating facts. Dozy likened the information provided by the chronicle to “tales from One Thousand and One Nights” 21.

Late is also the chronicle attributed to the first Andalusian historiographer known by his name – ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Ḥabīb (790–854) which is preserved only in fragmentary quotations by later authors. However, since the last events portrayed in it involve the years 888–912, and it also contains allusions to the reconquest of Toledo (1085), hence it is being suggested that the work might have been originally written down by the successors of ‘Abd al-Malik Ibn Ḥabīb. Similar doubts arise over the chronicle of the Cordoban historiographer Ar-Rāzī (889–955). The text has been preserved through its later translations (including into Portuguese ca. by the year 1400, and into Castilian in the 15th century) and later compilations.

Hence, the oldest preserved Arabic-language Andalusian contribution to the history of Spain after 711 is generally considered the collection of traditional stories entitled Aḥbār Mağmū‘a 22 dating to – by various estimates – between 10th and 11th/12th century 23.

---

19 The manuscript saw wider light of the day for the first time in the publication of Miguel Casiri by the 18th century.
22 Aḥbār Machmu. Crónica anónima del siglo XI, dada a luz por primera vez. Traducida y anotada por Emilio Lafuente y Alcántara, Madrid 1867.
23 Aḥbār Mağmū‘a as a source written from the perspective of the late Muslim tradition does not reflect historiographically the actual socio-religious considerations of Spain at the brink of the 8th century, particularly
Its oldest manuscript (from the 14th century) is stored in the National Library in Paris. All other Arab sources to early medieval history of Andalusia (including the work of Ibn al-Qūṭiyya *Taʿrīḫ ʾiṭtāḥ al-Andalus* preserved in manuscripts from the 14th and 15th centuries, and the anonymous chronicle *Fath al-Andalus* from the 12th century) are even more subsequent. Because of numerous contradictions between various Arab chronicles and the large time-span separating them from the events described, some historians conclude that the reconstruction of the history of Arab Andalusia demands assigning the priority to more reliable Latin chronicles24. Another argument against the Arab accounts is the fact that they were written from the perspective of the victors. As pointed out by Roger Collins, “to a large degree the problem is one of contradictions and confusion in the [Arab] sources, resulting not least from the character of much of the Arab historiography of the western conquests. Thus the Arab historians writings in Egypt, North Africa, and Spain from the later ninth century onward often worked backward from contemporary conditions and practices and tried to find an explanation for their existence in terms of what had happened in the past. In practice this could often mean inventing a past what was able to make sense of the present. (...) Added to this must be the natural if regrettable tendency to give particular region, tribe, people, or settlement a longer and more distinguished Islamic past than it might actually have enjoyed. (...) [the] actual conquest by the Arabs would be a far longer and slower process than the sources imply, and in which Islam would be established much less rapidly and with less homogeneity than the piety of thirteenth-century and later Muslim historians writing in North Africa in North Africa would find able to credit”25.

There exist two Latin chronicles from Spain of the period in question: the chronicle of the year 741 (*Continuatio Byzantia Arabica a. DCCXLI*)26 and of the year 754 (the so-called *Continuatio hispanica a. DCCLIV*)27. Especially the latter one is considered the oldest source of Muslim historiography of Spain and the benchmark of credibility for the facts reported by Arab chronicles and subsequent Latin historiographic descriptions by passing over in silence on the influence of the Jodeo-Christian culture. For example, when the text refers to Tariq Ibn Ziyad’s army consisting mainly of Berbers and free mercenaries, it uses the vague term “Muslims” even though Berbers were still not Islamized nor Arabized by then. However, a dozen pages later when describing the Berber rebellion against Arabs, the chronicle uses the term “Muslims” only in reference to Arabs. The author or compiler of *Aḥbār Mağmū’a* must have probably known that Berbers had revolted against the official Islam of the caliph. He wrote the chronicle from the perspective of the Arab rulers who did not acknowledge usurpers of power nor any different views on their religion.

---

27 Eduardo Lopez Pereira (red.), *Crónica mozárabe de 754. Edición crítica y traducción por E.L.P.*, Zaragoza 1980. It is believed that the work was actually written around 790, and its author was a Cordoban or Toledan cleric.
or their compilations. The contents of these two chronicles correlates with the historical continuum of the Byzantine influence in Spain. Both works correspond in terms of the text, sources and chronology to the Byzantine chronicle of world events by Theophanes the Confessor (c. 760–c. 817) and with *Chronologia brevis* by the Patriarch of Constantinople Nikephoros I (750–828). All these reports show a great deal of knowledge about events in the Byzantine Empire, the expansion of the Arabs and the situation in Spain, which simultaneously demonstrates that there must have been an intense flow of information between Spain and the Orient. It is worth noting that both chronicles of 741 and 754 write about the conquests of the Saracene Arab prophet Muhammad, but do not mention by name the appearance of a new religion, the *Qur’an*, ‘Alī nor the term of *ḥiǧra* (but e.g. *year of the Arabs*). In turn, the Mozarabic chronicle of 754 describes, among other things, the Kharijites as a sect of Christian heretics. Unfortunately, a serious shortcoming of these Latin chronicles remains the fact that they are also preserved only in later copies. And so, the chronicle of 754 is known from wide fragments of its copy dating to the 9th century.

Unfortunately, the current outline of the 8th-century Spanish historiography is primarily based on the late Arab chronicles, supplemented by information derived from the Latin chronicle of 754 (or its later compilations), but only within the scope not contradicting with the Arab report. Moreover, as pointed out by Johannes Thomas, the measure of reliability of Arab historiographic texts is often the degree of their compliance with one another. As a result, when encountering contradictory facts historians usually tend to believe one or another Arab chronicle without reaching out to independent sources. Besides, those historians who have their eyes fixed on the traditional Muslim historiography are particularly fond of these works which contain a greater variety of detailed descriptions. Thus, while citing the said Latin chronicle of 754 and Arab sources, many modern historians quote willingly e.g. the author of Spain’s history Rodrigo Jiménez de Rada (1170–1247) whose work *Historia Arabum* comes only from the 13th century. In other words, all information contained in the Arab sources is being taken for historical facts except for some obvious legends, unfortunately regardless of the time span separating the sources from the events described. And so the renowned modern Spanish historian Pedro Chalmeta portrays in his *Invasión y islamización. La sumisión de Hispania y la formación de al-Andalus* the successful landing of Ṭāriq Ibn Ziyād on the Spanish coast

---


29 For example, it is often stated as a historical fact (taken from Arab annals) that during the conquest of Spain in the early 8th century, the entire Christian population, if not killed, fled from the cities to the mountains. Such a retreat into the Asturian Pyrenees or to Galicia of all the residents of Cordoba, Granada, Seville and Merida seems historically very improbable.

30 Published by Mapfre in Madrid in 1994.
citing without reservation a detailed story by Al-Haza’īnī although it is known only from a compilation of his work by Al-Maqṣarī, so – from the early 17th century31.

In the opinion of the revisionists from Inārah, when taking into account the requirements of historical criticism, the character of Ṣāʿīd Ibn Ziyād must be rejected as not being confirmed by any independent historical evidence, such as inscriptions, coins, etc. The geographical name of the Gibraltar peninsula cannot be taken as a proof for the existence of the Berber commander. It much more brings to mind the common tendency of Arab literature to explain proper names of localities by proper names of important personalities. Numerous examples for this were put forward by the German scholar of Islamic studies Albrecht Noth (1937–1999) arguing that localities were receiving names after fictional characters who supposedly visited them32. What is more, Ṣāʿīd is in Arabic language an anthroponomical name meaning *someone following a path*. Another example of explaining names of localities by personal names is the story of the expedition of Tarīf to the Spanish coast in 710, from which shall be derived the name of the Spanish port of Tarifa. With high probability however, this town has already had this name before that period33. It is possible that also many other proper names of Spanish localities, that are commonly explained as deriving from Arabic, may actually come from Latin, Greek or Punic names34.

According to Fred Donner and Albrecht Noth, doubts about the early Arab annals arise not only because of the proper names of people or localities35. Disputable is primarily the very informational value of these works. The authors’ manner is either to ignore the chronology of events in whole, or to attach little importance to it. Datings according to the hijra calendar, as well as many other textual elements, are later interpolations. Finally, the reports themselves are filled with a multitude of literary topos. An example of such a topos is the central planning for the conquest of non-Muslim countries by the caliphate’s administration36, as well as the conquest of Cordoba with the help of a shepherd who was to show the invading army a gap in the city walls. A similar

31 Similarly, Chalmeta describes as historical facts, inter alia, the following: the nowhere confirmed historiographically first expedition of Tarīf Ibn Malik to Tarifa, running by Tarīf an independent trade activity, naming the city by his name, the lack of resistance of the Visigoths and only one decisive battle at the river Rio Barbate or Rio Guadalate, as well as stories of shepherds showing invaders the way to Cordoba by a breach in the city walls. Even the finding of the richly decorated king Solomon’s table doesn’t seem for the historian Pedro Chalmeta completely unreliable. The only information he regards as unreliable is the story of the closed chamber in the royal castle and the prophetic prediction about the upcoming invasion of the Arabs. Ibidem, pp. 118–157.
34 For example, in the theory of Johannes Thomas, the name of Gibraltar may be derived from juxtaposing the Aramaic (Punic?) *gibr.* (great, high) with the its Latin synonym *altus*. Such types of joins are not unusual (for example, the Persian *kamarband* (belt) is the juxtaposition of two synonyms meaning belt: the Aramaic *kamar* and the Middle Persian *band*). Johannes Thomas, *Araboislamische…*, op. cit., p. 160.
topos may be encountered in the literary descriptions of seizing the cities of Damascus, Caesarea (Palestine), Alexandria, the stronghold of Babilon-Fustat in Egypt or Tustar in the Persian Khuzestan.

As demonstrated by prof. Thomas from the University of Paderborn, there exist no Arabic inscriptions from Spain dating to the 8th century, and only six of them come from the 9th century – the inscription on the foundation act of a mosque in Seville by ‘Abd ar-Rahmān II (792–852), two inscriptions on the foundation of the fortress in Merida by the same ruler, the inscription on the restoration of a mosque in Cordoba also by ‘Abd ar-Rahmān II, the inscription on the tombstone of a Cordoban female magnate released by Al-Hakam, and the inscription on the anonymous grave in Torre del Campo in the province of Jaen. At the same time, religious formulas appear thereby only in the inscriptions at the fort in Merida and the Mezquita in Cordoba, of which only one dating to the end of the 9th century contains the expression Muḥammad-un Rasūl-u Allāh, which is not anything unusual for this period of Islamic history. As Solange Ory writes, “in the šahāda formulas the reference to the Prophet is not systematic. This reference is also absent in the text engraved on the right side of the entrance gate to the Umayyad mosque in Busra. As well as it is not present in most of funeral texts”.

Thus, if Andalusian inscriptions lack the Muḥammad motto, so they correspond to the traditions of the east-Umayyad inscriptions from the period of ‘Abd al-Malik’s reign. It follows from that also that the confession of faith in the prophet was not yet by then an integral part of the Arab faith.

Regardless of the correctness (or incorrectness) of the theses put forward by the members of the Inârah Institute, and in spite of their clearly revisionist overtones, they definitely possess one fundamental value. Namely, they revive the critical discussion on various aspects of the historiography of early Arab Spain, including its essential methodological assumptions to which the science has not yet presented fully satisfactory explanations.

As Roger Collins writes, we should after all remember that till now, “the western expansion of Islam has been relatively little studied and understood, and that current interpretations depend heavily upon late and ideologically slanted sources that present an image of the processes of the conquest of North Africa that may have been justified by conditions and perspectives of the thirteenth century and later, but which have little to do with the realities of the second half of the seventh century and early eight.

---

37 More on this see: Evariste Lévi-Provençal, Inscriptions arabes d’Espagne avec 44 planches en phototypié, Leiden 1931, as quoted by Johannes Thomas, Frühe..., op. cit., p. 178.
Apostasy as a Tool to Suppress Dissent – Indonesian Perspective

Abstract

Accusation of apostasy in the Muslim majority countries has the potential of becoming a dangerous tool against the dissenting voices. When it is used by those with religious authority and appears in a form of a fatwā it is likely to be interpreted as a concession for persecution. In the legal processes following the incidents of religiously motivated violence it seems rare for the perpetrators to be punished. Instead the victims of religious violence are accused of inciting hatred. This article discusses two respective cases of apostasy fatāwā in Indonesia: the death fatwā on the leaders of the Liberal Islam Network, and a fatwā which rendered apostate the members of the Indonesian Ahmadiyya religious movement.
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Accusation of apostasy can be used by anyone – religious leaders, preachers, politicians, or ordinary citizens to target their opponents. The accusation often comes in a form of a fatwā. Fatwā is a non-binding resolution, an opinion of a religious scholar or a group of scholars, ‘ulamā’, which does not progress into a law. Yet, not surprisingly, to the followers of some ‘ulamā’, the human-made state law does not count when confronted with the laws of God. This text is devoted to Indonesia and two examples of such apostasy fatāwā are discussed respectively: the death fatwā on the Liberal Islam Network (Jaringan Islam Liberal) and a fatwā on Ahmadiyya religious movement, both of which have directly inspired violence against the two groups mentioned.

The rise of the violent radical-conservative Islamic advocacy in Indonesia is a new phenomenon which emerged soon after the collapse of general Suharto regime in the late 1990s. Amidst the economic crisis and uncertain political conditions, the radical groups
took on a political momentum\(^1\). M. Syafi’\’e Anwar describes these groups as harbouring a strong disrespect for pluralism and considering this idea to be an offence against Islam as the only truth\(^2\). Different ideas or different interpretations are rendered “untruth” and are ascribed to “deviated people”, “infidels” or “apostates”. This is perhaps not striking as such mindset is present among members of all radical groups, regardless the religious ideology they subscribe to. What strikes however is that they do not take their notions from the vacuum but base them on the ideas which are aired by some of the otherwise respected Islamic scholars.

The ‘ulamā’ are trusted by the communities for their knowledge and interpretation of religion. But sometimes it happens that their knowledge is insufficient to fulfil the roles which society provides them with. This becomes particularly visible when some of them come up with bold statements on who ‘truly’ believes in God and whose beliefs deny or deviate from the ‘truth’. If such statements are given in a form of a fatwā, despite the lack of legal provisions to implement it, their influence is likely to trigger ordinary people “to take justice in their own hands”. When the ‘ulamā’ declare somebody apostate, heretic, deviationist, non-believer or blasphemer, emotions of the crowd are very high and can be easily manipulated. This often leads to intimidation, violence and even to destruction of life. Those who take part in mobs against persons condemned by the ‘ulamā’ justify their actions as following the fatwā. The ‘ulamā’ on the other hand claim no responsibility as the fatāwā they issue are legally non-binding.

**Death fatwā and Liberal Islam Network**

Death threats against intellectuals are not common in Indonesia, it was therefore shocking when in November 2002 one of the founders of the Liberal Islam Network (JIL, Jaringan Islam Liberal), Ulil Abshar Abdalla, was condemned to death by a group of conservative religious activists.

The incident was anticipated by a book of Hartono Ahmad Jaiz, Bahaya Islam Liberal (The Danger of Liberal Islam) which was published almost a year earlier. The book is somewhat chaotic and author’s message is not too clear, but it carries a huge amount of hatred against several Indonesian thinkers, Ulil Abshar Abdalla included. It may be assumed that Hartono was then not the only person whose negative attitude towards the Liberal Islam Network was growing exponentially. The motto\(^3\) of the book is a hadith,

---


\(^2\) Ibidem, p. 365.

\(^3\) “Pada akhir zaman akan muncul sekelompok orang yang berusia muda dan jelek budi pekertinya. Mereka berkata-kata dengan menggunakan firman Allah, padahal mereka telah keluar dari Islam seperti melesatnya anak panah dari busurnya. Iman mereka tidak melewati tenggorokannya. Di mana pun kalian menjumpai mereka, maka bunuhlah mereka. Karena sesungguhnya orang yang membunuh mereka akan mendapatkan pahala di Hari Kiamat.” (Ahmad
narrated by ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, from the compilation of Imām Al-Buḥārī (d. 870). The ḥadīth orders to kill a group of young people, who would come when the end of the world is close and who would already be unbelievers, but would be using the words of the Qur‘ān:

“In the last days of this world there will appear some young foolish people who will use (in their claim) the best speech of all people (the Qur‘ān) and they will abandon Islam as an arrow going through the game. Their belief will not go beyond their throats (they will have practically no belief), so wherever you meet them, kill them, for he who kills them shall get a reward on the Day of Resurrection”\(^4\).

Although Hartono does not say it explicitly, the allusion to the members of the Liberal Islam Network (JIL, Jaringan Islam Liberal) is rather clear\(^5\). Most of them were young, learned, well-versed in the Qur‘ān, and by those who disagreed with them often labelled as non-believers.

JIL is a loose organisation established by a group of Muslim intellectuals associated with the Paramadina Foundation, IAIN Jakarta (Institut Agama Islam Negeri, State Institute of Islamic Religion) and the Utan Kayu Community (Komunitas Utan Kayu or Teater Utan Kayu). Quoting one of its founders, Luthfi Assyaukanie, it was created “to accommodate liberal Islamic trends that have been flourishing in the country for the last two decades”\(^6\). The movement was inspired by the one generation older Indonesian thinkers such as Nurcholish Madjid, Abdurrahman Wahid, Harun Nasution, Ahmad Syafi’i Maarif, Moeslim Abdurrahman and M. Dawam Rahardjo.

From the series of discussions, workshops, radio programmes and lectures facilitated by the Utan Kayu Community, books, magazine and newspaper publications which received wider media coverage thanks to the founder of Utan Kayu, Goenawan Mohamad, the movement expanded at home and abroad attracting intellectuals, journalists, researchers and activists from various universities, think-tanks and NGOs\(^7\).

The challenge from the radical and conservative Islamic groups started to reach JIL particularly in the end of 2002 after the publication of an article by Ulil Abshar Abdalla in the Kompas daily. The article was titled “Menyegarkan Kembali Pemikiran Islam” (‘Reviving the Muslim Thought’). To the significant appreciation of some, and to the rage of other, Ulil stated several matters quite daringly. One of them, which later caused a more violent reaction from the conservative groups, was his view that what exists is human law, not God’s law. This ultimately meant that šarī‘a was a product of human history\(^8\):


\(^5\) Names mentioned in the book consist mostly of the JIL members or persons sympathising with them.

\(^6\) Luthfi Assyaukanie, Islam and the secular state in Indonesia, ISEAS Publications, Singapore 2009, p. 201.


“Religion is an advantage for the humankind. And since humankind is a continuously growing organism, both quantitatively and qualitatively, religion must grow up as well, accordingly with the needs of humans. What exists is the human law, not the law of God, for it is human that becomes the stakeholder of all deliberations concerning religion”9.

For some circles it was not acceptable... Yet it in the first place it was clearly misunderstood. An example of such misunderstanding is the book of Hartono Ahmad Jaiz. In fact, it was published in January 2002, almost a year before Ulil Abshar Abdalla’s article was printed. However, in 2001 JIL was already active, there is no doubt that Hartono, a former journalist, had access to the ideas of the JIL members, especially as they were freely distributed.

In the last paragraphs of his book, Hartono states that the liberal Islam offers views that are not in line with science, facts of life and history; that it does not use the arguments provided in the Qur’ān, sunna (the aḥādīth), and the consensus of religious scholars (iǧmā’); and that it is “far from the truth”10. He farther creates a non-direct link bringing him back to the ḥadīth-motto of the book which might be read as an implicit encouragement for violence. According to Hartono the members of JIL reject šarī’ā, “the law of the Prophet”. In order to answer what should be done with such individuals, Hartono comes up with a “lesson” in which he reminds an incident with ‘Umar Ibn al-Ḥaṭṭāb, the companion of the Prophet Muhammad and later the second Muslim caliph. ‘Umar killed a man who came to him and requested his judgement, after the judgement given by Muhammad did not satisfy him. A verse from the Qur’ān11 was provided in order to justify the killing. Hartono quoted it and came to the conclusion that people who do not want to be judged accordingly with the law of the Prophet are non-believers, and it would be lawful to kill them12.

Hartono’s interpretation of the Qur’ān and other sources is undoubtedly a dangerous overstatement. Yet even more dangerous were the reactions which burst immediately after Ulil’s article was published in “Kompas” on 18 November 2002. On 30 November 2002 a group of clerics affiliated with the Forum Ulama Umat Indonesia (FUUI, the Forum of Indonesian Religious Scholars) gathered at Al-Fajar mosque in Bandung, and issued a fatwā which contained a demand that the authorities dissolve JIL which “systematically and massively insults the God, the Prophet, the Muslim community and the ‘ulamā’”. The article written by Ulil was given as an example of blasphemy. The FUUI farther stated that “according to the Islamic law, persons who insult and falsify the truth of religion can be punished with death”. The chairman of FUUI, Athian Ali Muhammad, announced that

10 Hartono Ahmad Jaiz, Bahaya Islam Liberal..., p. 86.
12 Hartono Ahmad Jaiz, Bahaya Islam Liberal..., pp. 86–92.
the fatwā was not only for Ulil, but aimed to “dissolve the motive behind Liberal Islam Network which he leads”\(^\text{13}\). Almost immediately the FUUI received huge criticism for their fatwā – a very odd and disturbing act on the Indonesian intellectual scene which is otherwise open for discussion and free from threatening the lives of dissidents.

Asrori S. Karni, a senior journalist from the Gatra weekly, who wrote a critical and often quoted record of the matter, accounted that eventually the FUUI announced they did not issue a death fatwā, but only demanded a legal process. Indeed, the term fatwa mati (‘death fatwā’) was not mentioned, however Athian Ali Muhammad in his statement explained that FUUI attitude towards JIL was the same as towards pastor Suradi\(^\text{14}\). In February 2001 FUUI issued a fatwā against him which was explicitly a ‘death fatwā’\(^\text{15}\). Nevertheless, in order to prove that the case was different, even though it was previously declared to be the same, Athian Ali Muhammad reported Ulil Abshar Abdalla to the police. Although the police did not follow with the case, the incident did not end there. Until now death threats and various acts of violence are being committed against the leaders of JIL. In March 2011 a bomb hidden in a book titled They Must Be Killed Because of Their Sins Against Islam and Muslims\(^\text{16}\) was addressed to Ulil. The JIL staff being suspicious of the package have alarmed the police. The bomb explosion has left one policeman heavily wounded.

**Aḥmadiyya**

In the recent years the Indonesian branch of Aḥmadiyya, a Muslim minority group, has been a target of religion-based violence, which it is often justified by the assailants with reference to several decrees issued by the state institutions that administrate the religious affairs. The most influential among them is Majelis Ulama Indonesia (Indonesian Council of Religious Scholars) which openly declares Aḥmadiyya heretical and its followers to be apostates from Islam.

Aḥmadiyya is a religious movement that emerged in the small town of Qadīān in Punjab, India, in 1889. It was founded by Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad (1835–1908). There are two branches of the movement, the Jamāʿati Aḥmadiyya (Aḥmadiyya Muslim Community) also known as Aḥmadiyya Qadīān and Aḥmadiyya Anjuman Ishāʿī Islām (Aḥmadiyya Movement for the Propagation of Islam), known as Aḥmadiyya Lahore. When Mīrzā Ghulām Aḥmad passed away the community continued to exist under the leadership of Mawlawī Nur ad-Dīn. When he died some of the movement’s executive members seceded and formed a religious society in Lahore. Aḥmadiyya Lahore has been particularly active in translating to numerous European and Asian languages the Qurʾān, the commentaries


\(^{14}\) Pastor Suradi is an Indonesian missionary accused of blasphemy by the FUUI.


\(^{16}\) Mereka Harus Dibunuh Karena Dosa-Dosa Mereka Terhadap Islam dan Kaum Muslim.
of it (tafsīr), the traditions of Muḥammad, and various other works on Islam. The famous leader of the movement was Muḥammad ‘Alī (1874–1951), a prolific author and famous Pakistani intellectual17.

The majority of the group remained in Qadīān, and nowadays the membership of Ahmadiyya Qadyān greatly outnumbers the Lahore movement. It should be noted that most often the references being made to Ahmadiyya in general pertain to Ahmadiyya Qadyān. The issue which attracts most of the attention towards the movement is the understanding of the finiteness of prophethood. This also very often serves as an excuse for persecution of Ahmadiyya members by the followers of other Muslim groups.

The different understanding of the finiteness of prophethood is explained by Abdul Moqsith Ghazali, a renowned Muslim intellectual and lecturer at Paramadina University in Jakarta. Prophet Muḥammad was the ‘seal of the Prophets’ (ḥātam an-nabīyyīn) who received the final revelation (the Qur’ān) for all mankind and for all time. Ahmadiyya affirms this. However, in their interpretation Prophet Muḥammad is the spiritual ‘seal’ of all prophets, in the sense that he had reached the peak of spirituality which had not and will not be achieved by anyone else. Yet Muhammad is not seen as the physical ‘seal’. This means that there may come new prophets after him, but their spiritual qualities will always be weaker than that of Muḥammad. One of these lower-rank prophets was the founder of Ahmadiyya himself, Mirzā Ghulām Ahmād. Such interpretation clearly differs from the tafsīr, the Qur’ānic exegesis, of the Sunni scholars for whom Prophet Muḥammad is the final prophet, the ‘seal’ to all kinds of prophethood. Nobody after him would ever receive a revelation. Therefore, it is not quite surprising that many of the Sunni ‘ulamā’ would declare Ahmadiyya as deviant or heretical, and its followers as apostates18. The issue of prophethood is also one of the dividing points in the Ahmadiyya movement itself. The Lahore community accepts Mirzā Ghulām Ahmād as mujaddid (reformer, renewer, renovator of Islam) not as prophet. According to the Islamic tradition in every century God would send a man to explain the matters of religion. Many of the prominent Muslim scholars throughout the ages would be referred to with this title.

In Indonesia both branches of the Ahmadiyya movement are present. Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia, the Indonesian branch of Ahmadiyya Qadīān was established in December 1925. It was registered in March 1953 by the Ministry of Justice19 (JA.5/23/13, 13 March 1953)20. Gerakan Ahmadiyah Indonesia (Indonesian Ahmadiyya Movement, GAI), the Indonesian branch of Ahmadiyya Lahore, was established in December 1928. In April 1930 it was registered as a legal body by the colonial government of the Dutch

---

19 Kementerian Kehakiman, presently Ministry of Justice and Human Rights, Kementerian Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia.
East Indies. After Indonesia became independent, GAI was registered by the Ministry of Religious Affairs in December 1963 (18/II, 27 December 1963)\textsuperscript{21}.

It is difficult to estimate the number of Ahmadiyya followers worldwide. The organisation’s statistics are not helpful here, sometimes it claims 80 million membership, sometimes even 200 million which does not seem realistic. In Indonesia, according to the Ministry of Religious Affairs the number of Ahmadiyya followers would be between 50,000 to 80,000. According to Jemaat Ahmadiyah itself it would be half a million. The bases of Jemaat Ahmadiyya are Sukabumi, Kuningan and Garut districts in West Java, and the North Sumatran city of Medan. The Ahmadiyya Lahore (Gerakan Ahmadiyah Indonesia) is based in Yogyakarta with a small contingent in Jakarta\textsuperscript{22}. The acts of violence towards the members of Ahmadiyya are most often reported in West Java.

When in January 2007 the Indonesian National Human Rights Commission (Komisi Nasional Hak Asasi Manusia, KOMNAS HAM) released its report on the attacks against Ahmadiyya, it appeared that the Muslim hostility was in high extent evoked by the legal opinions, \textit{fatwā}, issued by some Indonesian ‘\textit{ulama}’. Luthfi Assyaukanie notes that even though \textit{fatwā} is a religious opinion produced by ‘\textit{ulama}’ and it is commonly claimed that “\textit{fatwā} is not binding”, thus, having no legal enforcement, it is a mistake to assume that \textit{fatwā} has no social and political implications. The example he gives is that of Ayatollah Khomeini’s \textit{fatwā} in early 1989 demanding Salman Rushdie’s execution for his book \textit{Satanic Verses}. The publication of \textit{fatwā} led to international violence with attacks on the bookstores, publishers and persons who were associated with translating the book. Luthfi Assyaukanie observes that while no Muslim is obliged to follow it “after all, \textit{fatwā} is not an ordinary statement from a layperson but a ruling by learned and respected scholars with religious authority”\textsuperscript{23}.

In Indonesia the main institution to issue \textit{fatwā} is Majelis Ulama Indonesia (Indonesian Council of Religious Scholars, MUI). It was established in 1975 with the endorsement of former president, general Suharto, as an advisory board to the government. MUI comprises Islamic scholars (‘\textit{ulama}’) from various Muslim organisations, with Nahdlatul Ulama and Muhammadiyah members being in majority.

The first \textit{fatwā} which MUI issued against Ahmadiyya was a result of the organisation’s second national conference on 26 May–1 June 1980 in Jakarta. Ahmadiyya Qadīān was then rendered as a group not belonging to Islam, deviate and leading others astray (\textit{di luar Islam, sesat dan menyesatkan})\textsuperscript{24}.

Another anti-Ahmadiyya document was produced during the MUI national working meeting on 4–7 March 1984. There MUI issued a recommendation to the government

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{21} Nanang R.I. Iskandar, \textit{Fatwa MUI & Gerakan Ahmadiyah Indonesia}, Darul Kutubil Islamiyah, Jakarta 2005, p. 62.
  \item \textsuperscript{24} Majelis Ulama Indonesia, \textit{Himpunan Fatwa MUI. Sejak 1975}, Penerbit Erlangga, Jakarta 2011, pp. 40–42.
\end{itemize}
concerning the Ahmadiyya community (this time it was Ahmadiyya in general, no reference was made to Qadi̇rān or Lahore). According to the document, the organisation was causing social unrest (their doctrines contrasting the Islamic doctrines); disintegration (especially in devotional matters); and a threat to the social stability and the national security. To solve this problem MUI recommended that all ‘ulamā’ and preachers throughout Indonesia should be highlighting and explaining the heretical nature of the doctrines of this non-Islamic group. It was suggested that the members of Ahmadiyya should return to the Islamic teachings, and that all members of the Muslim community should be alert to avoid being influenced by the heretical doctrines.25

The 1980 fatwā remained without legal sanction and the Indonesian government did not make an attempt to enforce it. Earlier in 1980, before the fatwā was issued, the authorities came with a charter allowing the Ahmadiyya members to build their mosques and to teach their doctrines to the group members.26 While general Suharto was in power the matters of protecting or enforcing the Islamic orthodoxy were proficiently obscured in the service to the government. Any possible violent reactions in the society that could be potentially triggered by the fatwā, in the 1980s would be easily suppressed by the security apparatus.

Luthfi Assyaukanie mentions a thought-provoking tendency in the change of relations between the MUI and the state since the fall of Suharto regime: there has always been a reciprocal interest between religion and politics, between the ‘ulamā’ and the rulers. The ‘ulamā’ would request the caliphs to enact and enforce their fatāwā, while the caliphs would ask the ‘ulamā’ to issue specific fatāwā to justify their policies. Such collaboration took place under the rule of general Suharto, yet with the downfall of his regime the position of MUI changed. According to Assyaukanie, something counter to the Suharto era is now taking place. The MUI is officially a state-controlled, governmental advisory institution, yet in the recent years it has apparently been acting as if its role was not advising but controlling the state. With the government (Assyaukanie directly refers to the cabinet of the president Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono) reluctant to review the role of MUI, it is more independent to appoint its leadership. Since the MUI comprises several Muslim organisations, the leaders are chosen by these organisations. If the radical ‘ulamā’ are well established within the organisations, they may be chosen to lead the MUI, bypassing the checks and balances, as the governmental voice is not interfering at all.27

The fatwā which since the last few years has been triggering violence against the followers of Ahmadiyya was inspired by the ultra-conservative ‘ulamā’ among the MUI members.

On 26–29 July 2005, during its seventh national conference, the MUI maintained its position on Ahmadiyya (not specified if Qadīrān or Lahore) and demanded that the

27 Luthfi Assyaukanie, Fatwa and Violence....
government banned it. The 1980 fatwā was reaffirmed together with the explanation that a Muslim who had joined Ahmadiyya would automatically become apostate. The persons who had joined the Ahmadiyya were called to return immediately to the true Islam (in line with the Qur’ān and the traditions of the Prophet). MUI requested the government to ban the dissemination of Ahmadiyya doctrines, to dissolve the organisation and to close all its offices in Indonesia28.

Two months after the fatwā was issued the Ahmadiyya community was violently attacked by thugs in Bogor and Cianjur. Both the MUI and the Minister of Religious Affairs, M. Maftuh Basyuni denied the allegations that violence was in any way spurred by the fatwā. However, most of the assailters acknowledged that their action was driven by the MUI declaration that Ahmadiyya is a deviant group29.

The majority of the persons who commit violence following the MUI fatwā remain exempt from punishment. Such was the situation after the 2005 attacks on the members of Ahmadiyya:

“[…] It is rare for someone who has committed an act of violence following a fatwa to be sanctioned through due process. What does happen is the contrary: members of groups that have been attacked were caught and sent to the police for interrogation. The charge is that they have ‘annoyed’ people with new beliefs. Instead of becoming a good agent, the government has taken sides and supported fatwas that clearly stimulate hatred and intolerance”30.

This article written by Luthfi Assyaukanie in 2007 anticipated a series of grievous abuses against Ahmadiyya a few years later. In 2010 there were at least 13 reported cases of violence where members of the organisation were abused, their property damaged or looted, their schools, mosques and places of prayer burnt and destroyed. Yet the events that outraged the Indonesian and the international public opinion began in early 2011. On 6 February in Cikeusik, Banten province in West Java, a mob attacked Ahmadiyya meeting and bludgeoned to death 3 of its members, severely injuring other six. Soon a video showing the sickening attack and desecration of the victims’ bodies was posted on the Internet. Dozens of police officers present at the scene were standing and watching the crowd of two thousand people slaughtering the Ahmadi. No attempt to intervene was made at all. The district police announced that the Ahmadiyya sect members who came from Jakarta triggered the fight. The local police chief said that two cars bringing in around 20 Ahmadiyya members from Jakarta had refused to leave the village and provoked the locals31.

Particularly appalling was the reaction of state and judiciary authorities. Persons proven guilty of murdering 3 members of Ahmadiyya were sentenced to 5 months in prison. The light sentencing of the assailants spurred discussions on the quality of the Indonesian justice, yet it was the further court case which left the international public

28 Khoiruddin Nasution, *Fatwa Majelis Ulama Indonesia…*
30 Luthfi Assyaukanie, *Fatwa and Violence…*
opinion utterly shocked. The victim whose household was attacked by the mob, and who tried to defend his family and property, was sentenced to six months in prison for not obeying the police orders to leave his own house and for attacking the aggressors who broke into it32.

In the aftermath of the Cikeusik tragedy several local governments passed new regulations which restricted or banned the activities of... Aḥmadiyya. The Governor of East Java issued the ban on 28 February, while the Governor of West Java on 3 March. A parliamentary commission met to discuss the matter. Eventually, the chairman of the commission stated that “in the light of the SKB there is no problem. This is a matter for the Minister of Home Affairs to revoke it [the ban] in case there is a violation [of SKB]”33.

The SKB stands for surat keputusan bersama, ‘joint decree’ which was issued on 9 June 2008 by the Minister of Religious Affairs (M. Maftuh Basyuni), Minister of Home Affairs (Mardiyanto) and Attorney General (Hendarman Supandji). The decree limited Aḥmadiyya, by banning its activities, yet did not ban the organisation itself. It is vague, however, what is understood by “activities”. The second point of the decree states that as long as Aḥmadiyya members (Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia) claim they are Muslims, they are to stop the activities which deviate from the Islamic doctrine, that is, spreading the views that there was a prophet after Muḥammad34. Numerous local human rights NGOs raised concerns that SKB violated the Constitution and that it was not publicly binding. The document was widely perceived as a product of political bargaining by which the government addressed the demands to dissolve Aḥmadiyya. The SKB left much disappointment among the intellectual elites and the members of Aḥmadiyya, yet it also disappointed their hardest opponents. Some controversial figures from the Indonesian public, such as Abu Bakar Ba’asyir, the head of Majelis Mujahidin Indonesia (Mujahidin Council of Indonesia) demanded that the government disperse the Aḥmadiyya or declare it non-Muslim. He said that the matter with Aḥmadiyya is not of religious freedom but the freedom to destroy Islam. Rizieq Syihab, the leader of the notorious Front Pembela Islam (Front of Islam Defenders) appealed to the Muslims to urge the government to disband Aḥmadiyya35.

Even though perceived by the hard-liners as not sufficient, the decree, as much as the fatāwā of Majelis Ulama Indonesia (Indonesian Council of Religious Scholars) became a form of justification for them to launch violent attacks against Aḥmadiyya followers.

---
34 “Memberi peringatan dan memerintahkan kepada penganut, anggota, dan/atau anggota pengurus Jemaat Ahmadiyah Indonesia (JAI), sepanjang mengaku beragama Islam, untuk menghentikan penyebaran penafsiran dan kegiatan yang menyimpang dari pokok-pokok ajaran Agama Islam yaitu penyebaran faham yang mengakui adanya nabi dengan segala ajarnannya setelah Nabi Muhammad SAW” (Surat Keputusan Bersama Menteri Agama, Jaksa Agung dan Menteri Dalam Negeri, 9 Jun 2008).
On 14 February 2008, in Banjar, West Java, Sobri Lubis, secretary general of Front Pembela Islam, urged for killing the Aḥmadiyya members. During the public gathering he shouted that their blood can be shed, and that the fight against them is a matter of self-defence. The prospective killers were ensured that he personally, the FPI, the ‘ulamā’, and other Muslims will take joint responsibility for the killings:

“We call the Muslim community to fight with the Aḥmadiyya. Kill Aḥmadiyya, wherever they are, brothers. God is great! Kill, kill, kill! No problem to kill in self-defence [when they] destroy my faith. […] It is lawful to shed Aḥmadiyya blood. Later they will say we violate the human rights, to hell with human rights, bullshit human rights! […] Fight with Aḥmadiyya, kill Aḥmadiyya, knock out Aḥmadiyya from Indonesia. God is great! No worries later, we will take the responsibility. I personally, also the FPI, other Muslim groups, and the religious scholars will take the responsibility. If there is somebody who kills Aḥmadiyya, say we told you to. Say Sobri Lubis told you to, Habib Rizieq Syihab told you to, no problem. We are ready to take the responsibility in the hereafter for killing the Aḥmadiyya anywhere they are. God is great!”

The occurrence of the words describing Aḥmadiyya as heretical or explicitly apostate in the fatwā of the MUI cannot account for abuse and murder. Neither does the decree issued by the three ministers. However, they do incite hatred and are used to justify violence. It is therefore most difficult to understand why these documents are being upheld while it has been proven that there is a relationship between declaring somebody murtadd or heretic, and the extrajudicial decisions to take that person’s life.

In the first case discussed it was the intellectuals who became the target of violence. Whenever there emerges a goal to trigger violence against those who look differently at the religious tradition, it must raise a plain human opposition, regardless one agrees or not. It is ironic that the state does not intervene. And it is tragically ironic that those who undertake a discussion through the books are attacked with bombs hidden inside them.

36 Bernhard Platzdasch, op. cit., p. 27.
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Agaw Lexicon and Its Cushitic and Afro-Asiatic Background¹

Abstract

The long awaited Comparative Dictionary of the Agaw Languages published most recently by David Appleyard (2006) presents a precious etymological treatment not only for specialists of Agaw and Cushitic, but also from the standpoint of our current research on comparative Afro-Asiatic lexicon. The present paper is to examine Appleyard’s material and suggestions from these aspects for possible addenda and corrigenda.
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Introduction

The Agaw (or Central Cushitic) languages and peoples, on which the earliest reference dates back to the first centuries AD², are scattered today in four main blocs: (1) Bilin in the area of the town Kärän in Eritrea, (2) in Ethiopia: Ḥamọț ~ Ḥomọț people (sg. Ḥamra ~ Ḥomra) in the area of northern Wag, (3) Kemant of Kärkär and ḋalga (north of Lake Tana), the Falasha or Betä Isra’el, (4) Awi (sg. Awiya) of Agäwm ḋer in Gojjam and the Kunfäl of the lowlands to the west of Lake Tana. Hamtanga and Awngi in Ethiopia and Bilin in Eritrea have regional language status.

¹ The ideas of this paper were originally presented at the 5th International Conference on Cushitic and Omotic Languages (Paris, 16–18 April 2008), but the text is not going to be published in its proceedings (which are still just forthcoming in early 2012).

² The name of the people is attested in the Greek Adulis inscription (Monumentum Adultitanum, 2nd half of 3rd cent. AD, lost, copied by Cosmas Indicopleustes in the early 6th cent.) as 'Αθαγαους < *ad-agäw, which is also mentioned in the Geez inscription of ዓEzana (4th cent. AD) as Atagäw.
Appleyard distinguishes basically four principal languages (with dials. or vars.):

(1) Bilin (dialects: Tā’akʷə or Tārkekʷə or Senhit), with 90–120 thousand speakers in Senhit province of Eritrea focusing on the towns Kärän and Halhal, both Christians and Muslims.

(2) Hamtanga, identical with Reinisch’s Hamir (Hamta of Conti Rossini 1904 is to be regarded its dialect), spoken by the Ḥaməṭ ~ Ḥeməṭ people in the northern part of the Wag region (in the former Wällo province) with a highly uncertain number of speakers.

(2-3) Kailinya (Kaylənnə or the language of the Kayla formerly applied to the Betä Isra’el, recorded by Jacques Faïtlovitch somewhen in 1904–5 and 1908–9) with a position between the Hamtanga and Kemant clusters.

(3) Kemant (dialects: Qwara vs. Falasha of Flad 18664), now with about 1,650 speakers (all bilingual Amharic speakers), although the 1998 Ethiopian census counted 172,327 people identifying themselves as ethnic Kemant (no longer speaking it).

(4) Awngi (dials.: Damot, Agawmidir), i.e., the language of the Awi(ya), in Agäwmødär and eastern Mätäkkäl districts of the once Gojjam province, with about 100 thousand speakers (Wedekind in 1995) = 279,326 (1998 census). A closely related language is Kunfäl with no more than 2 thousand speakers in the lowlands west of Lake Tana.

These major Agaw languages are as a rule accounted for by Appleyard when discussing the individual Agaw etymologies. The critical analysis offered below will take Appleyard’s 2006 PAgaw reconstructions as a starting point of the discussion (without repeating the individual forms of the Agaw daughter languages) – unless either (1) the Agaw root is only known in isolated forms and no P(N)Agaw reconstruction can be attained or (2) the proto-form proposed by Appleyard is problematic.

**Comments on the Agaw roots**

- **Agaw *säg** “(upper) back” [Apl. 2006, 27], akin to LECu.: Oromo sag-ō “back of the head” and Dasenech sug-u “back” < PCu. *sVg- “back” [GT], cannot be related to Bed. sinkwa ~ sankwa ~ sunka ~ sinka “shoulder” as mentioned by Appleyard, since it represents (via *-mk- > -nk-) a fully distinct AA root, namely *č-k-m ~ *č-m-k “shoulder” [GT], cf. EDE III 594-5 s.v. Eg. mst.


---

3 5 thousand to at least 80 thousand, but possibly more than 100 thousand (Berhanu Hailu et al. in 1995, cited by Appleyard) = 93,889 monolinguals with a total of 143,369 mother tongue speakers (the 1998 Ethiopian census).

4 Spoken just by a few elderly in Israel, formerly northwest of Lake Tana + Dembiya in the 19th cent., northern shore of Lake Tana.
Bucklige” (MK, Wb I 43, 11) = “hump-back” (FD 11) = “Buckliger” (GHWb 31) |||


• Hamir čaqa “bad” [Apl.]: Appleyard (2006, 27) was disposed to see in it a devoicing and palatalization from a hypothetic Agaw *dəkk[k]- and to identify it with Awngi dəkkí “bad”, but Hamir č- (vs. -q-) < Agaw *d- (vs. *-k-, resp.) would be very strange. Instead, cp. perhaps SCu. *či:kʷ- [*či- reg. < AA *č-/č-] “bad” [Ehr.]: Iraqw & Alagwa čakʷ “bad, sorry, ugly, nasty, evil”, hence Iraqw čakʷ-e “badness”, čakʷ-es-a “crime”, čaku-s-mo “evil-doer”, Burunge čakʷ-i “1. bad, etc., 2. rotten” | Qwadza čakʷ-a “bad”, Asa dak-a “1. bad, etc., 2. rotten” (SCu.: Ehret 1980, 214-215, #8) < AA *č-k “bad, abnormal” [GT].

• NAgaw *fāγ- “to bake (bread)” [Apl.] was combined by Appleyard (2006, 28) with LECu.: Afar fah- “to boil, ferment”. A further cognate appears in Eg. wfh “verbrennen” (LP, Wb I 306, 6), which, besides, V. Orel (1995, 103, #45; HSED #819) compared with the Ch. word for “fire” (dubious, cf. EDE II 424-5). Cf. also LECu.: Somali fōh-a “gum for burning” [Bell 1969, 167]?


• NAgaw *wän-/*wán- “to be” [Apl.] can hardly have anything to do with the reflexes of Cu. *w-y-n “to be big” [GT] as suggested by Ehret (1987, 135; 1995, 467), whom D. Appleyard (2006, 29) quoted with right hesitation (“With regard to the Agaw root being cognate, the semantics seem problematical”). The Agaw root has – beside Eg. wnn (for the Agaw-Eg. equation cf. also Blz. 1992, 141) – no further AA cognates according to my

---

etymological catalogue. Appleyard’s alternative comparison with Awngi wena “pregnant animal” is semantically weak.6

• Awngi əš- “to spend the day, be” [Apl. 2006, 29]: identical with LECu.: Saho & Afar as- “den Tag zu bringen mit etwas” [Rn. 1890, 48] = “passer la journée” [Chn.], which Cohen (1947, #276) compared with the reflexes of AA *s-[?] “day” [GT], cf. Eg. s.w “Monatstag” (MK, Wb IV 58, 2) > Cpt. (SALBF) COY- “Tag, Monatstag” (KHW 174) vs. s.w “Zeit” (MK, Wb IV 47-58) Ill (???) Brb. *a ss “day” [Djk.] (GT: unless < *a sf) Ill LECu.: Oromo sia “time” [Mrk. 1987, 415], Boni sa- “time” [Sasse 1979, 52 with further ECu. comparanda] Ill NOm.: Janjero aši “now” [Grb.] Ill WCh.: Sura ši “Tag (24 Stunden)” [Jng. 1963, 83] (isolated in AS, cf. GT 2004, 345) Ill CCh.: PKotoko *cV “day” [Prh.]: Ngala & Logone see “day” [Grb.], Buduma či ~ če “Tag” [Lks. 1939, 94]. See also Chn. 1947, #276 (Eg.-Brb.-LECu.); Grb. 1963, 55, #22(Cu.-Brb.-Janjero); Djk. 1965, 42 (Brb.-CCh.); Prh. 1972, 58, #32.1 (Kotoko-Brb.-PCu.).

• Bilin šakwäm “beard” [Apl.] = šekum ~ var. čeḥum “Kinn und -bart” [Rn.] = šakwäm “chin” [KH/Apl.]: affiliated – along with Hamta čeḥem [Rn.] = čeḥam [Apl.] – by Reinisch (1887, 170) and Appleyard (2006, 29) with ES: Geez šəḥm “beard”, Tigre šəḥam ~ čeḥam “beard, jaw, chin”, Tna. čeḥmi “beard”. Reinisch regarded Bilin šekum as a Nebenform. Although the reflexes of the AA glottalized affricates *č- and *č- in Chadic have been so far little investigated, it seems that a prenasalized variety yields AS *č- (cf. Stl. 1996, 41-42, 47-49), and thus the Ethiopian root might be alternatively affiliated with WCh.: AS *čaγam ~ *čaγaγam > *čaγam (?) “1. chin, 2. beard (?)” [GT 2004, 432] Ill ECh.: Mokilko zūkimó ~ zūkimó “1. Kinn, 2. Bart (menton, barbe)” vs. sūkimó “mâchoire” [Jng. 1990, 202, 178], whose former comparison with Sem. *di/aκαν- “beard” [SED] (HSED #2650; Stl. 1996, 49; SED I 59-60, #63) is dubious because of the anomalous C3.

• Bilin šaḥar “beauty”, šaḥar-d “to beautify”, šaḥar-t “to be beautiful”, šaḥar-əḫ “beautiful” [Apl. 2006, 30] = šaɣar ~ (häufiger) šeɣar “schön sein”, šeɣár “Schönheit” [Rn. 1887, 318]: no cognates were suggested by either authors. Cp. Sqt. šker “être beau”7 [Lsl. 1938, 416] = farɛɛam di škerɛɛ “the nice girl” [kind p.c. by M.-C. Simeone-Senelle, Paris, April 2008]. With regard to the very frequent OK interchange of Eg. ẖ- ~ š-, one is tempted to identify this root with Eg. ẖkr (OK var. ẖkr) “geschmückt sein” (PT, Wb III 401).

7 Identified by Leslau with Ar. šk V: tašakkala “être beau (d’une belle forme)” (leaving the irregular C3s unexplained).
“bed” (Bade: Schuh 1975, 112). The Agaw-Bade-Eg. etymology was first suggested in EDE I 52, 234. These AA cognates are leading to AA *r-k “bed” [GT], as verb “to lean on” (or sim.) [GT], cf. HECu. *irk-ad- (med.) “to lean upon”, *irk-is- (caus.) “to support” [Hds. 1989, 414]. Note that Agaw *-g- is irregular, which does not agree with Eg. *-k, HECu. *-k-, and Bade -k-. Note that Osing (2001, 574) erroneously explained OK “bed” from 3ṯ [< *lkj] “to nurse” (PT, CT, FD 6; DCT 10) = 3ṯj (IIIae inf.) “1. aufziehen (Kind), hegen, 2. (fig.) sich kümmern um (Stadt)” (OK 2x, ĀWb I 21), which, besides, represents a root with *l- (not *r-)⁸. Note that Satzinger (1999, 381) most recently suggested for OK 3ṯj an unconvincing external (AA) etymology⁹.


- **Agaw *ŋar-** “brain” [GT]: Kemant ṅār-a ~ nār-ā “cerveau” [CR 1912, 238-9] = nara “brain” [Apl.], Qwara nāl-ā “Gehirn” [Flad apud Rn. 1885, 105], Hamta nil-ā “cervello” [CR 1905, 224] | Awngi (and Damot) ṅār-ī “tête” [CR 1912, 238] = ṅārī “head” [Apl. 2006] vs. Awngi nalī “brain” [Htz. 1978, 136; Apl. 1994 MS, 14], perhaps Kunfel ṅkhūri “head” [Apl.]: Appleyard (2006, 36) reconstructs PAgaw ṅat-a “head” (with irregular Kemant and Awngi reflexes) as a match of Bed. mat “crown of the head” and ECu. *math- “head”, whereby he regarded the Hamta and Awngi reflexes with -l- as either loans from or influences by ES: Geez nāl “brain, skull” [Lsl. 1987, 398], Tigre nāl “cervello” [CR 1905, 224] = Amh. & Tigre nāl “cerveau” [CR 1912, 238] = Tigré & Tna. & Amh. nala “brain, skull” [Lsl.1]. On the other hand, Appleyard even surmised a reverse way of borrowing from Agaw into ES, whose -l- words “may have influenced in turn some of the Agaw originals”, which is little convincing, since then how to explain the -l- in ES? Although I am unable to give a definite answer either, I find a further groups of parallels of high interest that are also to be accounted for. First, the Agaw root (hardly

---

⁸ Cf. Ar. laki’a “2. se livrer entièrement à qqch.”, lky: laka “1. se livrer avec assiduité à qqch., ou être adonné à qqch. (av. b- de la chose), 2. s’attacher à qqnn. et le suivre partout (av. b- de la pers.)” [BK II 1020, 1022] = lakiya “an j-m hängen, zu j-m halten” [WKAS II 1267]. Cf. perhaps also Ar. lakka “jmdn. (mit Fleisch, Muskeln) beschlagen, ausstatten, reichlich versehen” [WKAS II 1240] with special regard to the special sense of OK 3ṯj “hegen, säugen” (PT 371: synonym of snq “to suckle”, ĀWb I 21) = “to nourish” (Ember 1930, #22.8).

⁹ He equated Eg. 3ṯt with AA *dVk (sic!) “Stufe, Sitz” [SISAJa II #129], which is for me unacceptable for phonological reasons.

• **NAgaw *kär/-*käil-** “to break” [Ap. 2006, 37]: Appleyard’s equation with ECu. *ka/e/ur- “to cut” is both phonologically (NAgaw *k- ≠ ECu. *k-) and semantically unconvincing. More appropriate seems to compare the Agaw root with Eg. ḥṛṭr “zerstören” (late NK, Wb III 330, 7) with the correspondence of Eg. ḥ- ~ “African” AA *k- pointing to an original voicevelar postvelar (*q).


---


11 Attested a.o. in WCh.: Bole-Tangale *numV “to close” [GT] > Tangale númē “to lock, close against s.o., block up, bar” [Jng. 1991, 125], Pero núm(m)ò “to shut”, númmò “to close” [Frj. 1985, 44], Dera númè “to shut, close” [Kidda 1991 MS, 13].
• Agaw *kat- “to cross” [Apl.]: Appleyard’s (2006, 49) traditional segmentation of *-t- in it as a pass.-refl. extension (added to a stem **ka-) and its equation with ECu. *ka¢-“to get up, rise” seems very unlikely (cf. rather SCu. *ka¢- and Eg. ḫaj “to rise”). In this case, *-t- was perhaps part of the root, cf. Eg. ḫt (Präposition) “1. durch ein Land hin; 2. durch die Glieder” (OK, Wb III 343).

• Agaw *wāγ /-γ- “to cry, shout” [GT]: Appleyard (2006, 50) compared this stem only with ECu. *wa¢- “to shout, call, invite” [Sasse 1979, 42], but cp. also Ar. wa¢wa¢a “se rappeler qqch.” [BK II 1570] || ES: Geez wawwa¢a “to clamar, raise a shout, shout loudly, cry aloud, howl, roar, wail” [Lsl. 1987, 623] || Eg. w¢3 [if < *w¢?] “to curse” (MK, FD 57) || PCu. *wā¢- “to yell” [Ehret] > SCu. *wā¢- “to curse, revile” [Ehret 1980, 313] || Ch. *wa “to call” [Nwm. 1977, 23]. For the AA etymology see also Mlt. 1984, 157 (Cu.-Sem.-Eg.); Ehret 1987, #585 (Bed.-ECu.-SCu.).

• Agaw *käb-/*kab- “to cut” [Apl.]: Appleyard’s (2006, 51) correctly equated it with SCu. *ḥab- “to split firewood” [Ehret 1980, 304], which points to PCu. ḫ- and an AA voiceless postvelar. This is corroborated also by Eg. ḫb “1. (late NK) hinrichten (als Strafe), 2. (GR) (die Feinde, die Bösen) vernichten, töten, 3. (GR) (Schenkel) abschneiden” (Wb III 252), ḫb.t “Gemetzel (im Kampf)” (XVIII., Wb III 252, 15) vs. ḫbb “Gemetzel” (GR, Wb III 253, 17).

• Agaw *təng*war/*dənk*Vr “deaf” [Apl.]: as rightly pointed out by Appleyard (2006, 53), this is related (presumably as the source of borrowing of it) to ES *̩dn̩ʔr (which has, acc. to Apl., “no secure Semitic etymology”), in which, eventually, the 4th root consonant may have been an extension, cf. Geez danqawa and Harari dönqa “to be deaf, stupid”, which rules out any etymological connection to Agaw *dəγ*war- “donkey” suggested by Appleyard. This is confirmed also by Eg. *dlg: (MK) dng ~ d3g ~ dg, (late NK) dnrg “eine schlechte Eigenschaft des Ohrs” (Wb V 470) = “to be deaf” (DLE IV 136) = “*taub” (GHWb 982).

• Agaw *kat- “to die” [Apl.]: aside from the NOm.: Kefoid cognates quoted by Dolgopol’skij (1973, 245) and Appleyard (2006, 54), cp. also SBrb.: Ahaggar kety-et “1. s’en aller (le sujet étant une personne ou un animal qui partent pour franchir une longue distance), 2. fig.: s’en aller (de la vie), mourir” [Fcd. 1951-2, 935] = kety-ət “to die” [Mlt.] (Brb.-NOm.: Mlt. 1991, 247; 1991, 255, #17.3) || CCh.
(?) Hitkala kəḍ- “zu Ende gehen” [Lks. 1964, 107]. Any connection to AA *k-t “old” [GT]?  

**NAgaw *gwäz-** “to till the earth, plough” and **SAgaw *gəz-** “to dig” [Apl.]: aside from the HECu. and Om. cognates (with voiced *g- and voiceless *-s-) listed or mentioned by Appleyard (2006, 54), we have a firm external parallels with -z < AA *-ʒ, namely Sem.: presumably Ar. *ḥz “to sting, pierce” [Zbr.]: Ar. ḥazza ~ nḥazza ~ waḥazza (lit. for Ar. *ḥz: Zbr. 1971, 71, #113; Eilers 1978, 128; Blv. 1993, 34, #22) || Eg. ḫz ~ ḫ3z (GW for ḫz) “Kanal, Brunnen” (XVIII., Wb III 332, 4) = “creek, runnel” (FD 185) = “Sumpfloch, Rinnsal, Bach”, ḫz n mw “Brunnen (am Grab)” (GHWb 619) || NBrb.: Qabyle ə-γz “creuser” || SBrb. *√γ-z “creuser” [GT]: Ahaggar ə-γəh, Taneslen ə-γəs, Tawlemmet ə-γəš ~ ə-γəz ~ ə-ḫəz, Ayr ə-γəz, Ghat ə-γ(γ)əz (Brb.: Prs. 1969, 84, #565) < AA *γ-ʒ “to dig” [GT]. These correspondences also confirm that Agaw (and Cu.) *g- may derive (also) from AA *γ-.  


**NAgaw *bäl-a** “(wooden) door” [Apl.]: Appleyard (2006, 56) correctly surmises that “it is perhaps debatable whether PNA *bäl-a ... is itself from EthSem. bärr”. All the more, since the NAgaw stem has parallels with *-l, cf. LECu.: Oromo balbul-a, balbal-a, balball-a, bälbäl-a “gate, door” [Sasse] = balbal-a “door” [Gragg 1982, 34], Konso palpal-a [p- < *b-] “door” [LS], Gidole palpal [p- < *b-] “door” [Sasse] (LECu.: Sasse 1982, 33) || WCh.: Buli bìla “doorway” [Stl.?] || ECh.: Lele bulo “window, entrance” [Skn. 1996, 32].  


---

be akin to Eg. *b3n\(^{13}\) [reg. < *brn, perhaps met. < *nbr], attested as j.b3n “schlafen” (PT, Wb I 62, 19) = “être endormi” (CT VI 103b-c, AL 78.1237) = “entschlummern, eingeschlafen sein” (GHWB 41) || WCh.: Sbauchi *yVmbVr ~ *yVmbVI “to sleep” [GT]: Geji yémbili [Gowers] = yambıl, yambal [Smz.], Polchi ndìa ýíimbr [Smz.], Zodi naambar [Smz.], Jimi yemburdo [Gowers], Soor (Zangwal) nda imbùr [Smz.], Sho (Ju) nda imbr- [Smz.], Booluu nda ýèmbal [Smz.] (SBch.: Smz. 1978, 37, #71; JI 1994 II, 298). From AA *(n)-b-r ~ *b-r-n (?) “to sleep” [GT]? One wonders if the ultimate AA root was just biconsonantal (*b-r), cf. CCh.: Masa bùùrà “se coucher” [Ctc. 1978, 71] = bùr “1. (tr.) coucher, poser, 2. (intr.) se coucher, dormir” [Ctc. 1983, 40], Lame bùr “se coucher” [Scn. 1982, 279].

• **Agaw *3aq-/*3aq-** “to drink” [Apl.]: its relationship to ECu. *ṭug- “to drink” proposed by Appleard (2006, 57) seems very unlikely. Instead, it might be perhaps combined with Ar. (Maghrebi) ḍf'aq “manger, dévorer” [Beaussier/DRS 338] || SCu. *ʒ1ak/ḥ- [GT] (theoretically possible and regular), Qwadza caʔ-am- “to drink” [Ehr. 1980 MS, 11]. Perhaps from AA *ʒ-(*)-k [“to drink (?)” [GT]? Any connection to SBrb.: perhaps Ayr i-ẓ qaɣ “être trempé (par la pluie, dans l’eau de lavage, dans un bain de teinture etc.)”, Ayr & ETawlemmet a-ẓ qaɣ “être inondé (terrain plat)” [PAM 1998, 370]?

• **Agaw *²anq-** “ear” [Apl.]: Appleyard’s (2006, 59) reluctance to accept its old equation with Eg. ṣḥwj “die zwei Ohren (als Körperteil des Menschen)” (MK, Wb I 204-5)\(^{14}\) as “probably not related” – is baseless. Further possible cognates, by the way, appear in CCh.: Bura ngga “hören”, ngga-ta “hören, fühlen, empfinden” [Hfm. in RK 1973, 93], Chibak ngà-tì “hören” [Hfm. 1955, 135], Margi-Wamdiu nga-ri “to hear” [Krf.], WMargi nga-ðì “to hear”, nga-ðì “1. to hear, 2. feel” [Krf. 1: Higi nga-ðì “entendre” [Krf.] (CCh.: Krf. quoted by Jng.-Br. 1990, 77) || ECh.: Mokilko ʔannigá “(se) taire” [Jng. 1990, 58] < AA *n-Q “to listen, hear” [GT].

• **Agaw *qw-** “to eat” [Apl.] (Agaw: Apl. 1984, 53). Appleyard (2006, 59) is probably wrong in assuming that it is cognate with ECu. *-km-/*-kám- “to chew” [Sasse 1982, 121-2] and that the loss of *-m may be due to that Agaw *qw- “derives from the same asyllabic stem variant” as seen in ECu. *-km-. Instead, cp. ECu.: Yaaku -qau- “to bite” [Heine 1975, 121] || SCu. *keh- “to bite” [Ehr.]: W Rift *keh- [GT] || Qwadza kà-l Dahalo kàh- (SCu.: Ehr. 1980, 252, #27) || WCh.: Sbauchi ki-yi “to bite” [Skn.]: Warji kàyi- [Skn.] = kì! [Jng.] = kìya\(^{u}\) [IL], Mburku kàyi- [Skn.], Pa’a kì [Jng., IL] = kì [MSkn. 1979], Siri kì [Skn.] = kìwá [IL] = kì (so, k-!) [Skn./JI], Miya kìy- [Skn.], Kariya kàkì [Skn.] (NBch.: Skn. 1977, 13; JI 1994 II 24). From AA *k-h “to bite” [GT]. The NBauchi-Bilin etymology was first suggested by Mukarovsky (1987, 95).

• **NAgaw *kwàan-** “(to become) evening, spend the night” vs. “evening” [Apl.]: Bilin kwàan- (v.), kwàanð (n.) [Apl.] = kun- “to spend the evening” [KH], Hamta kwàan- (v.), kwàana/kwàanð (n.) [Apl.], Kemant kwàna (n.) [Apl.], Qwara kùŋá ~ kùnìŋá (Apl.:

\(^{13}\) Meeks (AL 78.0256) considers j.b3n a pseudo-participle of *b3n with prothetic j-. Similarly, Hannig supposes a *Grundform* *b3n*.

\(^{14}\) For this Agaw-Eg. etymology see Zhl. 1932-33, 166.
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[kʷənəŋa] (n.) vs. kwəm- (v.) “to spend the evening” [Rn.] | Awngi kəm- (v.) [Apl.] vs. kemaná “evening” [CR]. Appleyard (2006, 62) is presumably right in distinguishing this common Agaw stem from Kemant kənəŋa [Apl.], Hamta kelú “evening” [Apl.], Qwara kʷənəŋa [Apl.] (extended with -ŋa suffix) < *kʷəŋ-/*kʷəŋ- [GT], for which cf. Agaw *qir-/*qar- “night” [Apl. 1991, 21] l SCu.: Iraqw ḫwera “night, esp. the earlier part of it” [Ehret 1980, 270 with false etymology] || Eg. ḫwera [reg. < *ḥr- sg.] “Abend” (PT, Wb III 225). As for NAgaw *kʷə-, Appleyard pondered reconstructing the PAgaw root with *m- (as in Qwara and Awngi) and comparing it with Eg. km “black”. But *kʷəm- might be just as well be due to an assimilation < *kʷən-, for which cp. rather Eg. knm.t “die Finsternis” (BD, NK, Wb V 132, 10; GHWb 885) vs. knh.w “Finsternis, Verfinsterung” (BD, GR, Wb V 133; GHWb 885) < biconsonantal *kn- “dark” (?).


- NAgaw *ʔansay- “to fill” [Apl.]: its kinship with ECu. *-mg- “to fill” [Sasse 1979, 25] imagined by Appleyard (2006, 67) (speculating that both tr. *ʔansay- and intr. *ʔantay- were extended by *s-/*-t-, resp., via metathesis) is very far-fetched. Any connection to
WRift *hac “to be full” [KM 2004, 134] = PRift *hač- “to be full” (cf. Asa haš- id., Qwadza hacumo “much”) [Ehret 1980, 81, #2], whose a doubly irreg. cognate appears in Ar. ḡašā’a “remplir, bourrer, farcir de qqch.”, ḡaṣi’a “être rempli” (de qqch.)” [BK I 435]? Note that Rift *h- ≠ Sem. *ḥ-, neither Rift *c corresponds to Sem. *š.

**Agaw *daŋ**- “to finish” [Apl.]: aside from ECu. *da/i/um- “to come to an end” suggested by Appleyard (2006, 67), cp. also Sem. ṭmm15 and Sem. ṭtm “to stop up”16 [GT] ṭm “verschließen” (PT, Wb V 308, 5-9) = “to close” (FD 298)17. The Eg.-Sem. parallel has been first pointed out by Vergote (1945, 144, #21.b.11) and Cohen (1947, #33).

**Agaw *läḥ**- “fire” [Apl.]: this can not be compared with ECu. *la†- “hot, day” and Eg. ṭ “sun” as Appleyard (2006, 68) maintains. Instead, cp. Eg. ṭl.t [reg. < *ḍl.t] “Flamme, Feuer” (BD-GR, Wb I 17, 6).


---


16 Reflected by: Hbr. ṭm “to qal "1. to stop up (one’s ears), 2. (archit. term of window) closed, barred, framed (?)” [KB 37], Syr. ṭm “to be deaf” [KB] ṭm “to cover”, IV “fermer (une porte)” [BK I 39] = “to stop up, close” [Zbr.] = “serrer, fermer”: ṭm “être resserré (to be constricted)”, ṭm “rétrécir (l’orifice d’un puits)” [Blachère 147] (Sem.: Zbr. 1971, #267).

17 The derivation from Eg. ṭm “vollständig sein” (Wb) proposed by Leslau (1949, 314, #33; 1962, 45, #3) and Oising (2001, 579), is just a pseudo-etymology rightly refuted already by Ward (1962, 400-2, #4).
• **NAgaw ləkw** “foot, leg” [Apl. 2006, 71]: cognate with Eg. *ṯ* < *lk* “foot (or sim.)” can be reconstructed from the foot hieroglyph occurring in the MEg. title (glossed in Wörterbuch as wēr.t.w) “Vorsteher, Aufseher” (MK, Wb I 288, 9-14), which is to be read correctly as ʿṯ.w (cf. Posener, Revue d’Égyptologie 15, 1963, 127-128; Berlev, Palestinskij Sbornik 17, 1969, 6-20; GHwb 17; Satzinger, kind p.c. on 9 Febr. 1996).


• **Bilin wāγab ~ māγab** “1. to play, 2. game” [Apl.]: no cognates were given by Appleyard (2006, 73, 110). Eventually, however strange it may prima vista seem, one might compare perhaps Sem. *lḥb > Syr. ṭḥ etpael “seine Lust an etwas haben” [GB] l Ar. laḥaba I “scherzen, spielen” [GB] = “2. jouer, badiner, folâtrer, 3. jouer à un jeu de hasard, 4. jouer” [BK II 999] (Sem.: GB 388) and Eg. ḥfb “(ein Spiel) spielen” (OK, Wb III 42, 6), of which already Greenberg (1950, 180) wrote: “I don’t think we can keep (it) apart from Sem. *lḥb*”. The mystery of how and why the first radicals (w-, l-, ḥ-) changed in the reflexes of AA *C 1-γ- “to play” [GT] remains, of course, to be resolved.

“adolescent” (DELC 150) = “recruit, cadet, conscript” (Jones 2000, 483, #1807), cf. also nfr “verjüngt sein” (CT IV 292b, Graefe 1971, 168, fn. 1 & 244). See also Hommel 1899, 349; 1904, 110, fn. 1 (Eg.-Akk.); DELC 150 (Eg.-Akk.); Castellino 1984, 16 (Eg.-Akk.-Agaw); Bmh. 1986, 248 (Eg.-Akk.).


- Agaw *fāt- “to go” [Apl.] can have nothing to do with Eg. ptpt “to tread, trample” as Appleyard (2006, 75) suggests. By the way, in the Agaw stem, the suffix *-t- has probably to be singled out, cp. Eg. pj “sich begeben” (LP, Wb I 502, 3) ||| Ch. *p-y “to go (or sim.)” [GT]: WCh.: PRon *fay “to walk (Jng. 1968), go (Jng. 1970)” [GT]: Sha fay, Kulere fa (Ron: Jng. 1968, 8, #65; 1970, 284, 351) | Dera pú- “s’en aller” [Brt.-Jng.] (WCh.: Stl. 1987, 248) || CCh.: (?) Lamang (Hitkala) piy- “treten” [Lks. 1964, 108] | Masa pā “se promener” [Ctc. 1978, 73] = pāy [Ctc. 1983, 125] < AA *p-y “to go” (or sim.) [GT].


- **NAgaw ***nan* “hand, arm” [Apl. 2006, 79]: naturally, it has nothing in common either with WCh. *niwan- or Eg. Ųn “fingernail” as suggested in HSED #401. Instead, it is cognate with WCh.: Gwandara náni “hand” [Mts. 1972, 86], cf. Hausa hánnúú [Lsl.: prefix ha- of body parts] “hand” [Abr. 1962, 371]. See also Lsl. 1962, 67 (Agaw-Hausa); Mlt. in Sts. et al. 1995 MS, 15 (Agaw-Gwandara). Any connection to SOm. *ãn- “hand, arm” [GT]: Ari (?)*ãn-í, Hamer *ãn-(i), Dime *ãn- (SOm.: Bnd. 1994, 151, #37) via partial redupl.?

- **NAgaw ***bántäl/r- “hare, rabbit” > i.a. Bilin mändäl “hare, rabbit” [Apl. 2006, 79]: the 4th radical (*-är/l-) was presumably not part of the original root, cf. Ch. *b[i]nd-ab (presumably from an older **bint-) “hare” [GT]: WCh.: Guruntum beédu (“probably < *bindab) [Jaggar] \( \mid \) CCh. *bi/and-ab [*-nd- < **-nt-?] \( \rightarrow \) *mi/and-ab “hare” [GT]: Dghwede vindá [Frick], Matakam wándâv [Schubert], Mofu hwândâv [Brt.], Gisiga-Dogba mandaf [Lks.] \( \mid \) Musgoy móndvâ [Mch.], Daba mandâvin (“rabbit”) [Lnh.] \( \mid \) Gidár mándáva [Mch.]. (CCh.: JI 1994 II 181), where the nasal may be secondary, cf. Ch. *bit- “hare” [GT] > WCh.: Diri ávìčá [Skn.] \( \mid \) Ngizim vindâ (“rabbit”) [Schuh] \( \mid \) CCh.: Bura pti [Krf.], Margi pitu [Krf.], Glavda víída [Rapp] \( \mid \) Masa vét-ná (m) [Jng.], Zime-Batna fíti [Snc.] \( \mid \) ECh.: Kera àvètè [Ebert] (Ch.: JI 1994 II 180-1).


- **Bilin **laû “erben, Erbe sein” [Rn. 1887, 260] = law “to inherit” [Ehret 1987, 75, #315] = lâw “to inherit” [Apl. 2006, 87]: Appleyard gives no cognates. Apparently cognate with Eg. jw [reg. from *lw] “to inherit” (OK, FD 12; Wb I 50, 8-10), whose further AA cognates can equally not be found as yet.

- **Bilin **baskʷi ~ bâskʷ “kidney” [Apl. 2006, 89]: Appleyard gives no cognates. However, it is perhaps to compared with Eg. bsk “1. Eingeweide allgemein (oft neben Herz), 2. auch für das Herz selbst” (MK, Wb I 477, 10-11) = bsk.w (pl.) “entrails” (PT 292, FD 85) = “1. viscères, 2. aussi: cervelle (?)” (CT V 180g, AL 78.1370) = “Eingeweide, dual. Eingeweide, Innereien” (GHwb 262). The AA parallels suggest a biconsonantal origin (*bs-k), where *-k (suffix of body parts?) originally did not belong to the root,
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• Agaw *ʔaʔʁ- “to know” [Apl. 1989 MS, 6; 1991, 23] = *ʔärq- [Apl. 2006, 89-90] ||| LEcu. *ʔarg- “to see” [Sasse 1982, 26] (NB: LEcu. *-g- strange) originate from the AA basic sense “to see” (cf. IE *weid-). Add also Bed. erh- “sehen, schauen, erblicken” [Rn. 1895, 29] = erh, irh, reh, rh “to see” [Rpr. 1928, 153], Ammar’ar reh- ~ rh- “to see” [Dlg.], Bisharin rēh- ~ rh- “to see” [Almkvist] (Bed.: Dlg. 1973, 170) ||| Eg. rēh “to know” (OK, FD 151; Wb II 442-5) as suggested by many authors: Hommel 1894, 357; Rn. 1895, 29; Zhl. 1932-33, 169; Vcl. 1934, 46, 77; 1938, 134; Chn. 1947, #415; Dlg. 1973, 170-1; OS 1992, 176.

• Agaw *b- “to lack, not to have” [Apl. 2006, 90]: cp. also SBrb.: Ahaggar a-ba “ne pas y avoir de, ne plus y avoir de” [Fcd. 1951-2, 13], ETawlemmet-Ayr i-ba “1. ne pas y avoir de, 2. y avoir disparition/pert de, 3. y avoir mort de”, hence i-ba, pl. i-ba-t-ăn “1. perte, 2. mort, 3. manque” [PAM 1998, 2], Taneslent i-bba ~ i-ba “not to have, to lose” [HCV I 6] ||| NOm.: POMeto *ba[-] “not to have, not to be” [GT]: NWOmeto: Wolayta ba-wa “non esserci” [CrLf. 1929, 28] = bay- “to get lost” [Hbr.-Lmb.], Basketo bā “non esserci, non avere” [CrLf.] = bā- “not to be there” [Hbr.-Lmb.], Gamo be-t- “to disappear” [Hyw. 1994 MS, 2] = bā-wa [Lmb.: copula -wa] “there is not” [Hbr.-Lmb.], Dawro (Kullo) bay- “to be lost” [LS] ||| SEOMeto: Zala bawa “non esserci” [CrLf. 1929, 43], Zayse baʔa “non esserci” [CrLf.] = bay- “to get lost, migrate” [Hbr.-Lmb.], Koyra (Baditu) bay-s caus. “finire” [CrLf.] etc. Chara baʔa “not to be there” [Hbr.-Lmb.] ||| WCh.: Hausa baa “there is / are / was / were not” [Abr. 1962, 47] = baā- “not to exist” (with verbal suffixes), e.g. baā-ni dài mai “I exist not with oil” = “I do not have oil” [Hodge 1987, 156] ||| Dera bōi “to spoil (intr.), get lost” [Nwm. 1974, 121] ||| Bade bee “nicht vorhanden” [Lks. 1974-5, 100] ||| CCh.: Lamang (Hitkala) bū “nicht vorhanden” [Lks. 1964, 106] ||| (?) Musgu pai ~ poi [p- irreg.] “nicht (vorhanden)” [Lks. 1941, 72] ||| ECh.: Kera bīʔí “verderben, zerstören (porrir, détruire)” [Ebert 1976, 33].


• NAgaw *mēl муж “to guard, look after” [GT] = *mē]- [CR 1912, 228]: cf. hence, e.g., Qwara mēl- “spähen, beobachten, herumschauen” [Rn. 1885, 98] (NAgaw: Apl. 1994, 248): the comparison with LEcu.: Saho-Afar -uble “to see” suggested by Conti Rossini (l.c.) was correctly rejected already by Appleyard (2006, 95). Instead, cp. Ar. ʔmēl V:
ta'amala “1. regarder avec attention, contempler qch., 2. réfléchir à qch., 3. penser, être en méditation” [BK I 56] = “examiner” [DRS 22] ||| Eg. m33 “sehen” (OK, Wb II 7-10) = “to look, see” (FD 100) ||| HECu.: Sidamo malamama “to enquire, examine” [Gsp. 1983, 221], Hadiya mal- “1. to examine, investigate, 2. doubt” [Hds. 1989, 52, 59], Gedeo (Darasa) mall- “to examine, investigate” [Hds.] ||| NOm.: Kaffa mall-et- “osservare” [Crl. 1951, 471]. Here may eventually belong the special Cu. (Agaw-Oromo) isogloss *m-l- (ext. *-l-) “to look” [GT] 18.

• NAgaw *ąankan- “to love, like” [Apl.]: Appleyard correctly singles out in it an old refl.-pass. prefix *ą-and compares LECu.: Afar kiḥin- “to love, be loving, happy” and Beja -khan “to love”. The same AA root (i.e., *k-ḥ-n with met.) may be present in Eg. ḡkn “1. (einen Gott) preisen, (das Herz, die Glieder) erfreuen mit (m), 2. jubeln, sich freuen über” (PT, Wb III 178) > ḡkn.w “Lobpreis” (MK, Wb III 179). 19

• NAgaw *ąncwā- “mouse, rat” [Apl.]: the cognates like Saho-Afar -andaw-a and Oromo hantilt- (listed by Appleyard 2006, 102) – add SOm.: Ari (?) jūntīn “rat, mouse” [Bnd. 1994, 156] – indicate an interchange of initial *č- ~ *h-, which makes a connection with Eg. hnt3 ~ hntj “ein Tier mit Stacheln (dessen Haar offizinell verwendet wird)” (Med., Wb III 121, 15 & 122, 7) = “Igel, Stachelschwein” (GHWb 543) probable. For Eg.-Cu. see also Orel 1993, 41; 1995, 100, #5. Not clear whether WCh.: Bole-Tangale *gwand- “giant rat” [Schuh 1984, 209] can also be related (whether we can project a process *gwand- < **ḥantaw- has to be subject to further research).

• NAgaw *māk- “mouth” [Ehret 1987, #438; Apl. 1989 MS, 16] = *mākāy-[a] “mouth” [Apl. 2006, 102]: this stem has been clearly extended with *-k- (found in some other AA anatomical terms). The Agaw stem represents an old AA root and is akin to Akk. maʔtu “tongue or a part of the tongue” [CAD m1, 414, 435] ||| Brb. *imi “1. bouche, 2. entrée, ouverture” [Bst. 1890, 37; 1890, 312; Bst. 1929, 33-34] = *imi, pl. *im-awn “bouche” [Durand 1993, 243] = *a-mwi (sic) “mouth” [Blz.] = *mV- (sic) [HSED]


- ECu. *ḥandur/-*ḥundur- “navel” [Sasse 1979, 24] cannot be related to any of the synonymous Agaw terms (Bilin ?atāb rather ~ Bed. tēfa “nável”, Kemant gwórba < ES, cf. Geez ḥənbərt) as Appleyard (2006, 104) speculates. A comparison with Eg. ḡnt3 [reg. < *ḥntr] “ein Teil der Brust am Brustbein” (Med., Wb III 122, 8) = “Brustbein, sternum” (GHWb 543) is perhaps also to be ruled out. The ECu. evidence (Saho & Afar ḡundub are only derivable from *ḥVnd-ub-) and NOm.: Kefoid (Gonga) *yund-o “nável” [GT]: Kafa and Mocha yund-o, Wombera yund-?jund-a (NOm.: Flm. 1987, 159; ECu.-NOm.: Blz. 1989 MS Om., 23, #79) indicate that the C4 was an extension.


- **Agaw** *tankwər- “to put, place” [Apl. 2006, 112] has nothing to do with the semantically unlikely ECu. *gūr- “to collect” (via prefixed *mV-gur- > Agaw *tankwər-) as Appleyard (l.c.) insists. Instead, one is tempted to assume that *tankwə was not part of the original root (*kʷər-), but an additional element (an old refl. prefix?), cp. Sem. *krr “to lay” [GT]: Akk. karar “setzen, stellen, legen” [AHW 447] || Tigré kárãra “to lie” [Lsl. 1964, 117] (Akk.-Tigr.: Lsl. l.c.) || Som.: Hamer (Galila) kari “place” [Bnd. 1994, 156] || Ch. *karə “to carry” [Nwm. 1977, 24, #24] = *k-r- “to load” [NM 1966, 237].
• **Agaw *sär-/*sar-** “red” [Apl.]: no cognates listed by Appleyard (2006, 114). May be akin to WCh.: Daffo-Butura šaar “rot weden, sein”, šarán “rot” [Jng. 1970, 221]. This isogloss may have preserved the original biconsonantal root attested in Sem. *šrk “to be red” [GB 794; Lsl. 1987, 534] and perhaps eventually Eg. dšr “rot (sein)” (PT, Wb V 488-490) with a prefix d- (cf. Thausing 1941)? For Eg.-Sem. see Alb. 1918, 234-5; Ember 1930, §19.a.9 (with a different and unacceptable explanation of Sem. *-k ~ Eg. d-, though).


• **NAgaw *qval-/*qal-** “to see” [Apl. 1991, 19; 2006, 118]: Dolgopol’skij (1973, 81) compared it with LECu.: Somali qollāli- “to look around (смотреть вокруг, оглядываться)”. Cp. further Eg. q3q3 [reg. < *qlql] “blicken (zum Himmel)” (late NK, Wb V 14, 4; GHWb 850) = “to look (up), ‘tower’” (DLE IV 4) Ell Brb. *V-kkVl “regarder” [GT] (Brb.: Bst. 1887, 401-2) Ell WCh.: Hausa kwálkwáléé “to investigate” [Abr. 1962, 580], cf. also Hausa káláflàáčéé [*-t-] “to examine minutely” [Abr. 1962, 459] = “to examine thoroughly, be expert in” [Hodge 1968, 22]. See also OS 1992, 176 (Agaw-Som.-Eg.-ECh.).


---
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Abstract

The present article deals with life and work of the Social Anthropologist, Sibirist and Americanist Lydia T. Black (1925–2007), whose works cover fields of research reaching from ethnological studies on the material and spiritual cultures of the natives of North East Asia, the Aleuts and Alaska to the history of Russian Alaska. The paper includes a chronological listing of the publications of this outstanding scholar as well as a biographical sketch.
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Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) in einer Einrichtung für sogenannte „displaced children“ anstellte.


Lydia T. Black war – wie eingangs erwähnt – eine Grenzgängerin: sie wirkte auf ganz unterschiedlichen Feldern und sehr verschiedenen wissenschaftlichen Disziplinen: diese reichten von der Ethnologie über die Geschichtswissenschaften bis hin zur
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Optimizing the Process of Basic Modern Chinese Teaching and Proficiency Tests for Adults in Sinological Glottodidactics in the Polish Language Environment

Abstract

The sinological studies in Poland and the Chinese language teaching have a long tradition. Due to the growing interest in China, the increasing need for the Chinese language competences has to be outlined. The teachers’ attention to teaching process is expected to be consistent with the level-specific curriculum, both for the teaching and testing language proficiency. Thus, following the experience of commonly taught languages in Europe, the European standards derived from Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment (2001) have become the base for the framework of teaching and assessing Chinese language competences on the basic level A1 and A2.

Keywords: CEFR, teaching Chinese, level-specific curriculum, planning the teaching process

The sinological studies and the teaching of Chinese carried out at the University of Warsaw have a long tradition that goes back to the 1930s and has contributed to the broad perspective of the European and worldwide studies of the Chinese philosophy, classics, tradition, literature, culture, language and society. Having neared the end of the 20th century, the hitherto practice in glottodidactics – frequently referred to as the teaching of rare languages – had to face the challenge of the expansion of teaching Chinese beyond the experienced academic centres. As a consequence, the Chinese linguistics in Poland has turned towards applied linguistics.
CEFR as a language teaching standard in Europe

Following three decades of expert works in the field, the Council of Europe released the final version of the official document titled *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment* (abbreviated further as CEFR). The book is intended for people involved in organizing and programming language teaching process in the broad sense of the term as well as for language learners undergoing the process. Going far beyond the matters concerning the teaching and learning process, the publication starts a discussion about providing instructions with regard to less-commonly taught languages in Europe (ESOKJ1 2003:5,7-8, Komorowska 2003:74–75, Martyniuk 2007:63). The publication neither determines nor restricts the teaching activities; rather than that, it offers a mode of categorization to be used for describing the teaching process from both teacher’s and learner’s perspectives.

The CEFR refers to and comes out of the plurilingualism and pluriculturalism of the communities in Europe, where language education means not only a second language instruction but, first of all, the development of communicative competence in the pluricultural context. Thanks to numerous experts and their long-term practice, the languages that are commonly taught in Europe have been taught in line with appropriately prepared courses and proficiency tests carried out within properly distinguished language levels, while courses in less-commonly taught languages have been offered without clear-cut criteria regarding the levels and scope of teaching programs.

CEFR – a new context for teaching Chinese

The growing interest in Modern Chinese in Europe is a consequence of the economic development we have recently been witnessing in China. Parallel to the call for standardized language instructions in Europe, the demand to certify language competence according to the levels being taught increases as well. The CEFR points to a substantial value of the objectives and the obvious socio-cultural dimension of language education. Communicative language competences consisting of the linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic components, namely knowledge, skills and know-how, sensitivity to social conventions, mastery of discourse, cohesion and coherence, as well as of language activities and strategies to interact through reception and production are described systematically and from a holistic perspective (CEFR 2001:13–14). Therefore the CEFR is regarded as a proper tool to optimise the process of Modern Chinese teaching and proficiency tests. The CEFR offers the A (basic) to C (proficiency) levels objectives and assumptions to be described in a way adequate for the corresponding curricula and to be applied

---

gradually and effectively within any programmed language course in the range of the given level. Yet the CEFR offers a subdivision of the level if it is justified in the scheme of the curriculum. The scope of the given level should never refer to the particular educational context (CEFR 2001:33–36). Regarded as a document “of crucial importance for language education throughout the European Union … [it] sets new standards in developing foreign language teaching curricula” (Szczepaniak-Kozak 2005:290). In addition to descriptors, the CEFR uses action-oriented approach to outline the priority goals in language (Martyniuk 2007:64). Since the communication is an act performed by a person embedded in a certain context of everyday life in a community, the CEFR treats each of such acts as a descriptor rooted in the situation, purpose, task and theme. The individual, social and cultural conditions make learner persist constantly in language competence development (CEFR 2001:9, 45). The CEFR does not promote any teaching method, thus being able to meet the requirements of any mode of language teaching. It is highly appreciable that the CEFR “has adopted the principle of the non-evaluative attitude to language teaching. It means that any teaching method, any in-class technique and any final choice as to the purpose or content of teaching is considered on equal basis” (Komorowska 2003:77).

Along with the experience in teaching and research in language acquisition and cognition, the CEFR seems to be a starting point to render the levels distinguishable and explicit both for the practice of teaching and for the proficiency certifying within the wide range of language teaching policies. The teacher’s intuitional attempts to adapt and revise a language course can be useful and sufficient in its local dimension. To make language testing and certifying reliable, the course levels and testing curricula have to comply with the European standardisation. Therefore the qualitative and quantitative method applied to scale proficiency levels of language competence can invest them with reliability in the certain research context, especially with regard to teaching, measurement and research group. Quantitative analysis, however, is a theoretical and steady process and only under that condition can it contribute to reliability estimation (CEFR 2001:21–22). “Its [CEFR] proper role is to encourage all those involved as partners in a language learning / teaching process to state as explicitly and transparently as possible their own theoretical basis and their practical procedures. In order to fulfil this role it sets out parameters, categories, criteria and scales” (CEFR 2001:18); it offers the perspective of language teaching theory and practice, as well as of language acquisition, that is oriented towards new solutions, without preference of any particular ones over others.

Planning the teaching process

In the new millennium, planning the teaching process in Poland – an inherent part of the European educational market – cannot be pursued independently of the Council of Europe’s concept of a plurilingual and pluricultural community that is capable of
effective communication and exchange of achievements and values. Thus for the use in teaching Chinese, basing on the CEFR’s original division into three broad levels (A – Basic User, B – Independent User, C – Proficient User), six levels divided further into two sublevels are proposed, using letters and numbers to denominate level codes (see CEFR 2001:23–24, Martyniuk 2007:65) as shown below:

Breakthrough – Elementary A1.1  
Breakthrough – Basic A1.2  
Waystage – Extended A2.1  
Waystage – Target A2.2  
Threshold – Pre-Threshold B1.1  
Threshold – Threshold Proper B1.2  
Vantage – Prefatory B2.1  
Vantage – Relative B2.2  
Effective Operational Proficiency – Intermediate C1.1  
Effective Operational Proficiency – Advanced C1.2  
Mastery – Professional C2.1  
Mastery – Expert Professional C2.2

Each level consists of less and more advanced stages of language competence which are numbered 1 or 2 (with extensions). If needed, further distinctions to scale the levels of the courses are possible. Such division occurs to be of importance in the light of a relatively slow increase in language competence within a language course when compared to the teaching of European languages. Only an intensive multi-hour course can cover the syllabus for the main level, like A1, A2, B1 etc. It must be emphasized that learning Chinese is time-consuming and every step has to be completed carefully in a course, otherwise a learner will quit already at an early stage, unable to build up communicative competence determined by linguistic competences. Yet since the level-specific curriculum is not in any way linked to the teaching materials or methods, its code never indicates the level to be completed within a course but the level within which that given course is covered. Language proficiency consists of the skills of using that language in the communication tasks. There is no absolute value of competences that would stretch across the full scope of proficiency for the particular level and fulfil with accuracy the criteria that permit advancement to the next level in a sequence. Yet the distance between the proficiency levels marked A, B and C does not imply equal time and effort involved in achieving the goal (CEFR 2001:31–33). Any higher and more advanced level always has a wider scope and is founded upon the already worked out skills, as pictured below:
If a course covers part of the objectives of the curriculum defined for the given level, it should define in a code the scope for the level of intermediate stages. An action-oriented approach offered in the CEFR to teach the use of language as the communication tasks in the community uses various criteria for descriptors, and therefore a thematic and lexical range along with the linguistic competences have been applied in the basic level curriculum for Chinese language teaching.

**Basic level curriculum**

Most native speakers of Polish start classes in Chinese without any socio-cultural background as regards the Chinese context. Therefore understanding the culture and some basic linguistic guidelines provides them with an idea of the communicative context in Chinese. Linguistic knowledge in itself is not the aim here; it is a source of a conscious approach to see the language and its written code, the characters, as a systemic structure in phonology and phonetics, syntax, semantics and orthography, all of them being essential in developing integrated communication skills. One must first acquire language components and the four skills to be able to use them if they are to be integrated in an act of communication.

The objectives and assumptions for the basic level curriculum have been determined by the language activities to be provided for within the scope relevant for the level as well as the linguistic competences and the strategies conditioning reception and production, required for the A1 and A2 levels. The said activities are delineated in the curriculum by the anticipated verbal communication skills in the socio-cultural context of the specified area, along with the necessary lexical and grammatical competences in that respect. Using CEFR (2001) as an instrument that facilitates incorporating the sinological glottodidactics into the European standards of learning, teaching and assessing language competences, a curriculum for the basic level has been proposed here. The four skills, namely listening, speaking, reading and writing, along with the starting skills and the fragmentary linguistic and socio-cultural skills, have to be cultivated at every level. However, attention must be paid to keep them well-proportioned and sequenced properly at every stage of the
teaching / learning process. A teaching program, if drawn out of the curriculum rooted in the CEFR’s task approach, guarantees sequential stages and effective support in the proficiency competence development.

The teaching programs and materials can differ in highlighting skills and abilities. What matters most is their inner coherence and consistency with the curriculum, which is not a guide for the teaching process but a kind of well programmed approach and syllabus of the formal tools needed for the expected communication range. Therefore teaching methods are not included in the curriculum.

Objectives and assumptions

The main goal in Chinese language teaching at the basic level is to provide learner with the communicative competence corresponding to the scope of the Waystage – Target level (A2.2). However, that stage requires an approach which can provide true beginners with learning techniques and strategies and give them a chance to develop language proficiency in all four skills in the future. Due to the difficulties in pronouncing Chinese tones as well as in writing and reading Chinese characters while taking the first steps in the learning process, the starting skills, which strongly determine the fluent and correct use of the spoken and written language, have been distinguished. The very basic language competence cannot emerge without advanced phonation skills that would correspond with the articulator phonetics. As regards the reading and writing skills and the acquisition of lexemes, awareness of the radicals and the kinetic memory of the strokes in a word notation contribute to the passive recognition of the semantics of ideograms and to the active inscription of a word as well as to imaging while processing the word in one’s mind. The basic level curriculum refers to simple everyday contacts, routines, places, issues that fit within the category of pragmatic functions which form a natural basis for word-formation categories. They are part of the set of entries defined for the program in quantitative terms estimated by the number of lexical and grammatical morphemes. They include the vocabulary for true beginners, starting from naming persons and things in learners’ direct environment to everyday affairs a foreigner can face in a Chinese-speaking community. Thus for the A1 level there are approximately 450 morphemes, and for the A2 level there are some 1,000 morphemes in the simplified and traditional writing systems (i.e. 600 and 1,300 characters in the two systems, respectively). Grammar issues introduce word, phrase and sentence constructing issues that are necessary for elementary and basic communication in the cases of simple contacts with native users of Chinese as provided for in the CEFR indicators. Parallel to gradual advancement in the basic linguistic behavior, it is also necessary to make learners familiar with social and cultural realities so that their knowledge of the culture and the society facilitated, motivated and

---

2 A true beginner starts learning, while a false beginner is already familiar with some words or structures but his / her experience with a new language is insufficient to let him / her communicate.
enhanced the usage of the learned structures and expressions in communicative contexts. The optimum time of completing the program for each of the two discussed levels, i.e. A1 and A2, has been estimated on the basis of the hitherto practice as about 240 hours of practical classes in Modern Chinese.

Proposed curriculum for teaching basic Modern Chinese – set of entries
(Zajdler 2010)

Phonetics and orthography

Phonetic transcription – the pinyin, tone marking
Relation between a sound and a letter in the pinyin transcription; register of tones
Exercising phonological hearing and the articulation of sounds
Matters related to writing Chinese characters, traditional vs. simplified characters
Radicals
Dictionary exercises

Thematic and lexical entries for A1

Polite phrases
Basic information about oneself and others
Names of everyday items, clothes, rooms at home
Family, children, education, profession
Countries, languages, popular Chinese last names
Ownership, belonging
Condition and features of people and objects in the closest environment
Directions and relations in space
Daily routines, moving around, shopping
Important public buildings (such as the office, the school, the university, the library, the railway station, the shop etc.)
Numbers, amount, money
Time, calendar
Basic information about accommodation, basic personal information in a form / an ID
Means of transportation
Attitude to the contents of an utterance (modality) within the basic scope of the following: want, be able to, can, have
Basic groceries, selected dishes
Basic interaction (questions, answers and negations expressed in phrases and in sentences)

3 Basically for the A1 level
Scope of grammar entries for A1

Personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, demonstrative pronouns
A copular sentence
SVO sequence in the sentence
Question words: 誰, 什麼, 誰的, 哪個, 怎麼, 哪兒, 什麼時候, 幾, 多少,
Question words position in the sentence
Negation 不 and 沒
Question particles 嗎 and 呢
Verb-NEG-Verb questions
Most often used adverbs
Adjectives as a predicate and as a modifier; attributive and structural particle 的
Default object and content object, the VO verbs
Numbers
Most popular classifiers
Adjectives 多 and 少; quantifier phrases
Interrogative pronouns concerning date and time, word order in interrogative sentences
Position of the adverbial of time in a sentence
Prepositional vs. post-verbal locative phrases
Time and location prepositions
Question Word referring to the location; word order
Intensifiers to adjectives as a predicate and as a modifier
Focussing construction 是... 的
Most frequent modal verbs
Imperative particle 吧
Directional verbs

Thematic and lexical entries for A2

Extending the limited vocabulary from the thematic range for A1: an individual / family
and friends / one’s close environment and places / activities / daily routines / everyday
items
Expressing intensity of a feature and skill level
Assessing intensity and skill level
Comparing, similarities and differences in features and abilities
Expressing consent, will, possibility; naming skills, abilities (or lack of any of these)
Requests and orders
Naming current activity and activity planned for the future
Parallelism, sequence and conditionality of activities
Expressing the perfective aspect and the resultativity of simple daily routines
Expressing the duration of an activity
Education, employment, dealing with basic formalities in an office
General physical and mental state, basic communication with a physician
Entertainment, leisure, hobbies, basic information about traveling
Natural phenomena, seasons, weather
Favorite places, colors, elements of culture and tradition
Expressing percentage, fractions, numbers up to a million (the specificity of the numeric system in the range up to 10,000)

**Scope of grammar entries for A2**

Ordinal numbers
Negative particle in the imperative 別
Most frequent modal verbs (follow-up)
Degree complement (得+ intensifiers and manner adverbials)
Manner phrase with 地
Constructions that link concurrent, sequenced, conditional activities
Constructions that express comparing features and abilities
Prepositional construction that expresses distance and direction
The perfective particle 了 and the experiential particle 過
Pivotal sentences
Cause-and-effect construction
Directional and resultative verbs (follow-up)
Potential verbs
Modal particles
Durative aspect
Topicalization, SOV order, 把 construction
被 construction
Classifiers (follow-up)
Verbal classifiers
Compound sentences and basic copulative, disjunctive and adversative conjunctions
Adverbs and particles used in the phrase and sentence structures listed above
Reduplication

The sociolinguistic and cultural aspect for the basic level covers basic polite phrases, skillful establishment of contacts and participation in simple informal conversations in line with the conversation formats suitable for the Eastern culture. Moreover, the symbols (e.g. the dragon), colors (e.g. red), rituals (such as expressing respect), values (social order etc.) linked directly with the culture of the East as well as the richness of tradition and thought represented by the Chinese characters constitute a background for learning the language and implementing communication.

Provided that the CEFR promotes the plurilingual and intercultural communication approach to the language education, the attempt to standardize Chinese language teaching in Poland according to its principles seems reasonable. The very first step on the way to
achieve that goal has been to draft the curriculum for the basic level with the basis of
the language functions and items on the said level, with a broad space to create teaching
programs for the courses dedicated to diverse addressees and proceeded in various ways.
In a long-ranging perspective, the basic level can serve as a stable point of reference
for the certification tests which are assumed as a means to evaluate examined people’s
fluency in a language rather than their achievements within the language courses taken.

The unification of teaching content and assessment criteria is proposed under the
common theme of language tasks and positive description of the acquired skills (the
‘Can Do’ descriptors). The issue of assessment, an integral component of the educational
activities, has been undertaken in this study from the perspective of the certification
tests in language competences on the basic level. Based on the levels provided for in
the framework, it is possible to carry out exams and certify overall language proficiency
regardless of the mode of education, the learning time, the nature of the detailed teaching
program, and the methods and materials used in the teaching process. The framework
offers a unified scope of language competences that can be arrived at with the use of
a variety of methods. Bearing in mind the requirement to chart the direction for developing
external exams carried out to certify language proficiency, the author hereby points to
objective testing and analytical assessment criteria as the optimum methods of external
assessment of language competences.

Starting with the basic level A1 and A2, this article is meant to encourage a discussion
and an analysis of the process of language teaching and the assessment of proficiency
in Chinese.
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The two volumes under review belong to the series of annuals published by the ARAM Society for Syro-Mesopotamian Studies, based at the Oriental Institute of Oxford University. As a rule, the issues of the periodical contain the papers read at international conferences organized by the Society. They deal with the past of the Aramaic world and with its offshoots, inclusive of Syriac, Mandaic, Palestinian Christianity, etc. The two fascicles of vol. 1 (1989) appeared as a journal, but vol. 2 already provides the papers read at a conference on Nabataeans, held at Oxford in 1989, and vol. 3 contains the proceedings of a conference dealing with the Syriac-Arabic cultural interchange during the Abbasid era in Iraq, held likewise at Oxford in 1991. Vol. 4 contains the papers of the conference on Decapolis, held at Oxford in 1992, while vol. 5 was dedicated in 1993 to Sebastian P. Brock, a world-wide known specialist of Syriac, passed away a few years ago. Vol. 6 deals with cultural interchange during the Umayyad period in Bilād aš-Šam, i.e. in Syria-Palestine, while Palmyra is the subject of vol. 7, and the Near-Eastern trade routes constitute the central topic of vol. 8. Vols. 9 and 10, issued in 1999, concern the history and archaeology of the Mamluk and early Ottoman periods in Bilād aš-Šam. Vols. 11-12 deal with Antioch, Edessa, the Arabian Peninsula, also with the Mandaean, which provide the special topic for vols. 16 and 22, presented here below. The history and archaeology of Beirut, as well as water problems in the pre-modern Near East, are the subject of vols. 13-14, while Palestinian Christianity since 500 A.D. is dealt with in vols. 15, 18, 19, concerning also pilgrimages and shrines. Related topics on Prophet Elijah, St. George, etc., are treated in vol. 20. Surprisingly, at first sight, alcohol is the topic of vol. 17. Instead, important contributions to modern Syriac literature are presented in vol. 21, issued in 2009.

Vol. 16, dealing with the Mandaean and the Manichaean, contains the proceedings of conferences held in 2002 at Oxford University, while vol. 22 on the Mandaean includes the papers of the Sydney conference in 2007 and of the Oxford conference in 2009. The majority of Mandaean immigrants to Australia live in or around the Liverpool quarter of
western Sydney and use an area at the Nepean River, west of Sydney, for their religious rites. This site at Penrith was specially allocated to them by the local council to undertake Mandaean ceremonies that incorporate their “baptism” in the river, a fundamental rite of Mandaean religious practice. These circumstances explain the organization of a scholarly conference on Mandaeanism at Sydney.

The Mandaeans are a Gnostic sect of southern Iraq and south-western Iran, attested from the early first millennium A.D. on. The publication of their holy writs, the recent discovery of vernacular Mandaic still spoken by some emigrants, their present-day religious practices, and the fact that the language of their writings hardly differs from Jewish Babylonian Aramaic aroused great interest in recent linguistic, religio-historical, and ethnographic studies. Two new series of scholarly text editions and studies have been created by publishers to collect apposite works: Mandäistische Forschungen, edited by Rainer Voigt and published by Harrassowitz at Wiesbaden, and Corpus Codicum Mandaearum, edited by Rifaat Ebied and Erica Hunter, and published by Brepols at Turnhout. Besides, ARAM Society already plans conferences on Mandaeanism at Stockholm University in July 2013 and at Berlin University in July 2017.

The First paper of vol. 16 by Kurt Rudolph stresses The Relevance of Mandaean Literature for the Study of Near Eastern Religions (pp. 1–12), describing the particular place of the Mandaeans in the Near Eastern history of the first and second millennia A.D. until their flight from their old Iraqi and Iranian settlements in the aftermath of the Gulf Wars of the 1980’s and the early 1990’s. One of their holy writs, the John-Book, is presented by Jorunn Jacobsen Buckley, A Re-investigation of the Book of John (pp. 13–23), in which John the Baptist plays an important role. The Author discusses it by comparing the little-known Danish doctoral dissertation by Viggo Schou-Pedersen, Bidrag til en analyse af de mandaeiske skrifter (Aarhus 1940) with Edmondo Lupieri’s book, The Mandaeans: the Last Gnostics (Grand Rapids-Cambridge 2002). The next paper by Edmondo Lupieri himself deals with Friar Ignatius of Jesus (Carlo Leonelli) and The First “Scholarly” Book on Mandaeanism (1652) (pp. 25–46). This Carmelite missionary, working at Basra, regarded the Mandaeans as “Christians of Saint John” and wrote a book dealing with their origin, rituals, and errors. Christa Müller-Kessler, well-known for having edited Syro-Palestinian texts, as well as Jewish Aramaic and Mandaic magical inscriptions, deals with The Mandaeans and the Question of Their Origin (pp. 47–60), arguing that Mandaeian creed and practices originated among the Aramaic population of Babylonia. Roberta Borghero then describes Some Phonetic Features of a Mandaean Manucript from the 17th Century (pp. 61–83) housed in the Library of Leiden University. This is a handwritten glossary in Mandaic, Arabic, Latin, Turkish, and Persian, probably composed by an Italian Carmelite, called Matteo di San Giuseppe, who was one of the first missionaries in the Mandaean community of Basra. The paper of Bogdan Burtea, Šarh Ḫ-Paruanaiia. A Mandaean Ritual Commentary (pp. 85–93), presents a Mandaean ritual text belonging to the Drower Collection (DC 24) in the Bodleian Library. It was the subject of his Ph.D. dissertation and was published by him in 2005: Das mandäische Fest der Schalttage (Wiesbaden 2005). His transcription system is unfortunately problematic, especially in
the case of pharyngeals, and it makes it difficult for the reader to trace the original spelling back.

The next article by Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst deals with *The Parthian mwqr’nyg b’š’ḥ* (pp. 95–107), a Turfan fragment (M4a I V 3-16) containing a Manichaean hymn in Parthian and believed to be based on an Aramaic original. The Author refers to a somewhat similar passage in the Ginza, the main Mandaean holy writ, and assumes that both depend on Aramaic texts of the 3rd or 4th century A.D. Şinasi Gündüz then points at *Mandaean Parallels in Yezidi Beliefs and Folklore* (pp. 109–126), which is not surprising if the Mandaeans were native from Adiabene, as recorded in the 8th century A.D. by Theodore bar Koni, Nestorian bishop of Kashkar, near al-Waṣit (Iraq).


Vol. 22 deals only with Mandaeism, also in its present form, as practiced in Australia by expatriated Mandaeans. Beside the text editions at the end of the volume, only one article by Matthew Morgenstern considers linguistic questions: *Jewish Babylonian Aramaic and Mandaic: Some Points of Contact* (pp. 1–14). Phonological features dealt with are the loss of the pharyngeals and the widespread appearance of anaptyctic vowels. The second topic concerns the enclitisation of the prepositions *b*- and *l-* with the consequent assimilation of the final *waw* or *nun* of verbal forms, for instance *amarīlt*, “I said to him”. The third subject dealt with is the conjugation of the irregular verb *y-h-b*. Jorunn J. Buckley then presents *New Perspectives on the Sage Dinanukt in Right Ginza 6*
(pp. 15–29), a wise scribe – half-book, half-human. In the next paper, Mark J. Lofts considers *Mandaeism – the Sole Extant Tradition of a Sethian Gnosticism* (pp. 31–59), a subject also dealt with in this volume by J.J. Buckley (pp. 495–507). Garry W. Trompf and Brikha H.S. Nasoraia are Reflecting on the “Rivers Scroll” (pp. 61–86), published in 1982 by Kurt Rudolph, while Iain Gardner is Searching for Traces of the ‘Utria in the Coptic Manichaica (pp. 87–96) and argues that there are unmistakeable traces of these divine beings in Coptic Manichaean texts. The ritual of the Mandaean sacramental meal is then described by Edward F. Crangle and Brikha H.S. Nasoraia: *Soul Food: The Mandaeans Laufani* (pp. 97–132). This article is illustrated by photographs taken by Crangle at the Laufa ceremony. Book 18 of Right Ginza is then examined by Dan D.Y. Shapira, *On Kings and on the Last Days in Seventh Century Iraq: A Mandaeans Text and Its Parallels* (pp. 133–170). Jennifer Hart deals further with the parallelism between John the Baptist in Mandaeans writings and Mohammed: *Yahia as Mandaeans Rasul? Some Thoughts on Islam’s Influence on the Development of Mandaeans Literature* (pp. 171–181). Further studies on Mandaeans-Islamic relations are provided below by A.Sh. Gasimova, I.I. Nadirov, J. Hart, and E. Cottrell.

Mandaeans manuscripts contain drawings of specific trees or plants; one of them is examined with illustrations by Sandi Van Rompaey, *The Tree Šatrin and Its Place in Mandaeans Art* (pp. 183–207). Possible means to preserve Mandaeans cultural heritage are then presented by Charles G. Häberl, *The Cultural Survival of the Mandaeans* (pp. 209–226). The Mandaeans *Book of the Zodiac* is compared by Daphna Arbel with Babylonian divinatory traditions and with the Hebrew III Enoch: “Acquainted with the Mystery of Heavens and Earth”: Sfar Malwašia, *Mesopotamian Divinatory Traditions, and 3 Enoch* (pp. 227–242). One turns back to the relations between Mandaeism and early Islam with the paper of Aida Shahlar Gasimova, dealing with Sabians in three Qur’anic passages and in the very confusing, mediaeval Arabic sources: *The Sabi’ans as One of the Religious Groups in Pre-Islamic Arabia and Their Definition through the Qur’an and Medieval Arabic Sources* (pp. 243–261). A second article of Sandi Van Rompaey deals with The Symbolism of the Drabśa in the Mandaeans Illustrated Manuscripts: The Drabśa of Radiance (pp. 263–310). The drabśa, “banner” or the like, was taken by 17th-century missionaries for a cross. Covered with a white sheet, as shown by the illustrations of pp. 299–310, it symbolizes radiating light. References to Mohammed in Mandaeans holy writs are identified by Ilnur I. Nadirov, who regards Bišlom, Bizbaṭ, and Nirig as Mohammed’s cryptonyms: *Encoded Names of Muhammad in Mandaeans Religious Books* (pp. 311–319). One does not understand why byšlwvm in the John-Book 45,2 should be translated “without peace”, with a Persian prefix be-, “outside”, instead of meaning “in peace”: “Lucky is the person who in the imperfect age lives in peace”.

Although the Cologne Mani Codex identifies the “baptists” of Mani’s youth with Elchasaites, Iain Gardner looks for a Mandaeans perspective in *Mani’s Book of Mysteries. Prolegomena to a New Look at Mani, the “Baptists” and the Mandaeans* (pp. 321–334). John Flannery then presents *The Augustinians and the Mandaeans in the 17th C. Mesopotamia* (pp. 335–348), while Brikha H.S. Nasoraia and Edward F. Crangle describe
the Mandaeian contemplative and healing practices: *The Asuta Wish: Adam Kasia and the Dynamics of Healing in Mandaeian Contemplative Practices* (pp. 349–390), with illustrations. *Mandean Macrohistory* is dealt with by Brihka H.S. Nasoraia and Garry W. Trompf (pp. 391–425) on a large background of biblical and Iranian conceptions, mixing myth and history. The impact of Islam on Mandaeism is examined further by Jennifer Hart, *Making a Case for a Connection between Islam and Mandaean Literature* (pp. 427–440), while David Hamidović looks for possible links with the Dead Sea scrolls: *About the Links between the Dead Sea Scrolls and Mandaean Liturgy* (pp. 441–451). The Author contends that his study confirms the Jewish background of Mandaeism, although Mandaean liturgy as such cannot be attributed to the Essenes. Such considerations stop half-way up to the conclusion that Jewish Babylonian practices of the Parthian and Sassanid periods have influenced Mandaean rites and customs to a certain degree. A re-edition of DC 20 with its variant DC 43 E is then proposed by Christa Müller-Kessler, *A Mandaic Incantation against an Anonymous Dew Causing Fright (Drower Collection 20 and Its Variant 43 E)* (pp. 453–476). The whole text is provided in transliteration with an English translation and philological notes. Despite its spelling, the first word šʾptʾ of the title is interpreted as Akkadian šiptu. This is obviously šaptu, “lips, organ of speech”, used in the sense of “speech act”, like Hebrew šāpāḥ and Sabaic šʾft, which can mean “order, injunction”. The title šʾptʾḏ-dʾḥwlwlyʾ can thus be translated “Injunction for Frights”. Transliteration and translation can be compared with the first edition of DC 20 by B. Burtea in *AOAT* 317 (Münster 2005, pp. 71–96). This contribution is followed by Christa Müller-Kessler’s edition of a Mandaic lead roll: *A Mandaic Lead Roll in the Collections of the Kesley Museum, Michigan: Fighting Evil Entities of Death* (pp. 477–493). The transliteration and translation of two incantations are followed by philological comments. A third incantation on a lead roll in the Vorderasiatische Museum of Berlin is added as appendix. The printed photographs of the Kesley Museum lead roll, obverse and reverse, are unfortunately unreadable and no facsimile is provided, only a table of characters.


The volume closes with ARAM news announcing forthcoming conferences and publications. Its content is undoubtedly very rich. It mainly concerns religious history,
although valuable philological studies are presented as well. The reviewer followed the order of the articles, as published in vol. 22, but he wonders whether a grouping of contributions by main themes or study fields would not be advisable in the future, for instance by presenting all the articles dealing with Mandaean-Islamic relations in one section, text editions and linguistic studies in another one, etc. This is just a suggestion to the chief-editor of ARAM, dr. Shafiq Abouzayd, who should be congratulated for the whole work he is accomplishing.

Edward Lipiński


After the scholarly report of the excavations conducted by Y. Garfinkel and S. Ganor in 2007 and 2008 at Khirbet Qeiyafa (cf. “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” 64/2 [2011], pp. 131–133), the Israeli archaeologists of the Hebrew University published a work aiming at a larger audience and taking the results of the excavations in 2009–2011 into account. The Hebrew inscription on an ostracon, dating from the early 10th century B.C., was the most important discovery of the earlier seasons and its presentation by H. Misgav and A. Yardeni is summarized in the present volume with photographs, a copy, and a synoptic table of characters (pp. 123–132, pls. 51–52). Instead, no reference is made to decipherments and comments by other scholars, especially by É. Puech, largely followed by the reviewer (references in “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” 64/2 [2011], pp. 131–132). Among the discoveries of the last seasons one should point in particular at the miniature sanctuaries in stone (ca. 10 x 12 cm.; 12 x 20 cm.; 20 x 35 cm.), discovered in houses (pp. 133–163, pls. 58–65). They most likely contained a figurine. The head of a figurine has in fact been found, and the Authors wonder whether this was a “Voodoo” or a household god (pp. 163–164). In a biblical context, one should rather refer to the teraphim, which are termed ’ĕlohīm, “gods”, in the Books Genesis 31:30,32 and Judges 18:24, and may designate ancestor figurines. The discovered miniature sanctuaries and the figurine head would then constitute an outstanding archaeological documentation on these teraphim.

The Authors connect the Iron Age findings of Khirbet Qeiyafa with the earlier period of David’s reign in Jerusalem (pp. 174–193), but this opinion is based on the symbolic length of forty years attributed in the Hebrew Bible to each of the reigns of David and of Solomon. Instead, more reliable data place the reigns of both kings in Jerusalem ca. 960–928/7 B.C. with 928/7 being Year 1 of Rehoboam, son of Solomon (I Kings 14:25; cf. “Rocznik Orientalistyczny” 64/2 [2011], pp. 126–127). Since Rehoboam became king at the age of 16 according to the Septuagint (III Kings 12:24a) and was most likely
the eldest Solomon’s son, born two or three years after the latter’s accession to the throne at the age of twelve, as stated in III Kings 2:12 and in the *Seder Omr Rabba* 14, one may date the birth of Solomon *ca.* 959/8 B.C., about two years after the conquest of Jerusalem by David, if we rely on the historical background hidden behind the account of II Samuel 11:2-12:23 (cf. E. Lipiński, *Itineraria Phoenicia*, Leuven 2004, pp. 499–500). David’s reign in Jerusalem started then *ca.* 961/0 B.C. after a longue career of arms in the service of King Saul and of the Philistines, and a shorter reign at Hebron. The unique Iron Age stratum at Khirbet Qeiyafa is certainly somewhat older and must go back to the time of King Saul, as indicated also by the inscription on ostracon, at least if we follow the decipherment and the quite convincing interpretation of É. Puech.

The material culture of Khirbet Qeiyafa should then be regarded as belonging to the North-Israelite tribe of Benjamin, a member of which was precisely King Saul. His power centre was Gibeon of Benjamin, usually identified with Tell al-Fül, some 30 km. north-east of Khirbet Qeiyafa. Since the first king of Israel was a Benjaminites, the tribe of Benjamin must have been an important one at that time, with a larger territory than the one attributed to the Benjaminites in later written sources. Moreover, the association of Khirbet Qeiyafa with an intermediate Iron I-II North-Israelite territorial formation is acceptable also from an archaeological view point, as shown by a recent study of I. Finkelstein and A. Fantalkin, *Khirbet Qeiyafa: An Unsensational Archaeological and Historical Interpretation*, “Tel Aviv” 39 (2012), pp. 38–63, in particular pp. 52–55.

Leaving this important historical and archaeological question aside, one should stress the high quality of the presentation of the site of Khirbet Qeiyafa and of the material discovered there in the volume under review. The lavish illustrations provided by the 65 splendid colour plates and the maps, plans, drawings of objects, synoptic tables of data constitute an important source of information also for scholars not used to read books in ‘*ivrî*.

Edward Lipiński

---


The book of Mrs. Vernet i Pons is based on her doctoral dissertation directed by Prof. Gregorio del Olmo Lete and presented at Barcelona University. It is an etymological study of the verbs having *h* as third radical in Masoretic Hebrew. As well known, the third consonant of this group of verbs can etymologically correspond to *w* or to *y*, and several verbs in question are semantically related to verbs *secundae geminatae*, i.e. with the second radical consonant duplicated. The largest and most important chapter
of the book (chapt. 6) examines the verbs in question one by one, in alphabetical order (pp. 131–298). The genuine tertiae hē verbs, like gḥh, “to be high”, and tmḥ, “to be amazed”, are not examined in this chapter, but they are presented in the next one, on pp. 299–300. The English version of Gesenius’ dictionary and the third edition of Köhler’s and Baumgartner’s lexicon served as basis for this accurate analysis, which is conducted on the synchronic level of the Masoretic text, thus not in a diachronic perspective.

The two dictionaries used by the Author are based indiscriminately on texts dating from a very long period of almost one thousand years. These texts were written originally in at least three different dialects: the Judaean or Jerusalemite, the Israelite, and the Transjordanian dialect or language of the Book of Job. Besides, Aramaic influenced the Hebrew language at least from the mid-first millennium B.C. on. All this has a bearing on research. For instance, the verb mḥḥ in Numb. 34, 11 means “to strike” (p. 219) and offers a variant spelling of mḥ’, borrowed from Aramaic. In its turn, Aramaic mḥ’ is a phonetic variant of mḥṣ (Hebrew mḥṣ), resulting from the change /ṣ/ > /ḡ/ (mḥq) of the velarized emphatic consonant and from the subsequent dissimilation of the fricative pharyngeal ḋ and velar ḡ. The dictionaries based on Masoretic Hebrew do not reflect the whole development and variety of the dialects involved. Their first aim is to present the language of the Hebrew Bible as read and understood ca. 1000 A.D. in the Karaite school of Ben-Asher at Tiberias.

Mrs. Vernet i Pons is aware of the apparently similar work published in 1970 by Meir Fraenkel, Zur Theorie der Lamed-He Stämme. Gleichzeitig ein Beitrag zur semitischen-indogermanischen Sprachwissenschaft (Jerusalem 1970). She considers it to be unacceptable from the scientific point of view and states at the outset that she will not discuss Fraenkel’s etymological reconstructions (p. 21). Rejecting his quasi-Nostratic method, she first presents the Afro-Asiatic or Hamito-Semitic language family, following Igor Diakonoff’s synthesis, as published in 1988 in Afrasian Languages (pp. 23–33). The hypothesis of the original homeland of the Semitic language family in North Africa is indeed the most rational one, but it cannot be clearly proposed without explaining the emigration of entire populations. Now, the Sahara was becoming increasingly dry in the Late Neolithic period, ca. 3,800–3,000 B.C., and this must have been the reason why Semites migrated then to other areas. Additional data are provided by the extension of the cattle breeding, which started ca. 8,000 B.C. in the Western Desert of Egypt, spread in the following centuries, and reached Ethiopia ca. 3,000-2,500. These facts should have been briefly mentioned on pp. 24–25 to explain the North-African hypothesis of the Semitic origins.

Another question concerns the emphatic consonants, regarded by the Author as originally glottalized. (pp. 27–28). The alleged Proto-Semitic glottalization of the emphatic consonants seems to be based on the present-day situation in the spoken languages. Pharyngealization and velarization are indeed rare, but this results from the cross-linguistical tendency to ease articulation. In this case, we have a concrete example in the pronunciation of glottalized k’ in Bilin, a Cushitic language spoken in Eritrea, around Keren. This k’ seems to be a comparatively recent realization of older.
uvular q, attested in the earliest recorded Bilin material from the 18th century and still occurring in present-day neighbouring Awngi. The correspondence between an Egyptian emphatic and Semitic *'ayin indicates that glottalization is a secondary phenomenon. In fact, Egyptian nḏm, “pleasant”, pšḏ, “nine”, šḏm, “to listen”, are rightly identified by O. Rössler with Semitic naʾim “pleasant”, tš̂ “nine”, and šm’ with metathesis, “to listen”. In fact, d corresponds also to a Semitic emphatic consonant, i.e. a velarized one, not yet glottalized. The /’/ of n’m, tš̂, and šm’ signifies that the Proto-Semitic velarization of the fricative consonant has supplanted the basic character of the original phoneme. Glottalization parallels the absence of fricative pharyngeals in a large part of the Ethiopian languages, but J. Crass assumes at present that this is an areal feature and that fricative pharyngeals can be reconstructed for both Ethio-Semitic and Cushitic (Proceedings of the XIVth International Congress of Ethiopian Studies, Addis Ababa 2002, Vol. III, pp. 1679–1691).

The second chapter deals with the structure of the Semitic root, bi-consonantal or three-consonantal, with a particular attention to its vocalic component (pp. 35–47). This is undoubtedly an important element, because no living language uses roots without vowels. The traditional approach to Hebrew and to other Semitic languages unfortunately projects the consonantal script into the linguistic realm. The third chapter discusses the question of the incompatibility of certain phonemes in constituting a viable root (pp. 49–60). A historical and morphological description of verbal and nominal roots is the topic of the next chapter (pp. 61–90), which prepares the central theme of the work. Verbal apophony is discussed in a separate chapter (pp. 91–130), where Mrs. Vernet i Pons presents and discusses the various possibilities regarding qualitative change and length. An aspect of these questions, usually neglected in Semitic studies, is the stress accent, which is phonemic in Hebrew and in other Semitic languages. This problem is not examined.

The discussion of the role of vowels in the Ugaritic verbal system (pp. 108–113) assumes with most Ugaritologists that there was only one prefix conjugation in the indicative of each stem. Instead, the verbal roots with initial ’aleph show that there were two forms, like in Akkadian: a perfective or preterite *yiqqtul and an imperfective or present *yiqqattal, as considered already in 1932 by Hans Bauer and convincingly argued in 1938 by Albrecht Goetze (JAOS 58 [1938], pp. 266–309), who postulated the existence of two prefixed verbal forms: yiqqtul (perfective) and yiqqattal (imperfective). Their existence can be recognized only in verbs with the first radical consonant ’aleph, because i is used also when there is no following vowel, like in yiqqtul forms, while ʾ indicates a yiqqattal. We thus find širh ṭīḵl ʾṣrm, “the birds have not eaten its flesh” (KTU 1,6, II, 35–36), but yḏkal kṯ ṣḥss, “Kushar-wa-Hasis will eat” (KTU 1,4, V, 41, a phrase announcing the next episode). In the first case, we have the feminine plural *ta’kulā of the perfective and in the second case, the singular *ya’akkal of the imperfective (> [yakkal]). Examples with the verb ’ḥd are given in the reviewer’s Semitic Languages §38.6 and in “Studia Judaica” 11 (2008), p. 303. The imperfective form is attested also in syllabic cuneiform script as i-le-qa-aš-šu-nu-ti (PRU III, p. 5, RS 15.14, lines 16 and 25), “he will take them”. The normal Middle Babylonian form would have been
ilaqqa-šunāti, while this spelling reflects Ugaritic *yileqqah with a vowel change before the geminated emphatic q. One could also refer to fairly contemporaneous imperfectives from Emar which are influenced by the local idiom, e.g. e-e-zi-ib-ka /'e'ezibkal, “I shall dismiss you” (Emar VI, 262, 21), instead of usual Middle Babylonian ezziāk. However, we cannot be sure that the lengthening pattern was in Ugaritic /C:/, thus yiqaṭtal. One could surmise that it was /:C/ like in Modern South Arabian, thus yiqaṭtal, but the vowel e of i-le qa-aš-šu-nu-ti does not favour this hypothesis. The Ugaritic prefix conjugation thus seems to parallel the Akkadian iprus and iparras forms. In the reviewer’s opinion, the whole discussion of the subject in Ugaritic should thus be based on contemporary Akkadian and distinguish three verbal classes with a radical vowel a, i or u, like in Akkadian and in Classical Arabic.

Chapter 7 (pp. 299–336) offers an evaluation of the results of the etymological study of the verbs tertiae infirmae in chapter 6. Mrs. Vernet i Pons distinguishes verbs with a Proto-Semitic or with an Afro-Asiatic pedigree. This distinction, based on the analyses of chapt. 6, is made for the verbal roots as well as for the denominative verbs. The reviewer would be hesitant in several cases of verbs with a supposed Afro-Asiatic background, often assumed on the basis of Chr. Ehret’s publications or of Orel’s and Stolbova’s Hamito-Semitic Etymological Dictionary (Leiden 1995). It is a risky procedure, as seen in the case of nhh, “to lament” (pp. 226–227). First, “to rest” and “to confess” are completely different notions. Then, if the radical consonants are nhw, the final w must result from a spirantized b. This is shown by Akkadian nubbû, “to lament, to mourn”, and by Libyco-Berber nby, “to lament”, attested in several inscriptions from the Roman period or earlier (Mémorial Werner Vycichl. Articles de linguistique berbère, Paris 2002, pp. 294–295). Both nubbû and nby lack the h, that appears in Egyptian nhp(ī), “to lament”, also in Coptic, but with an unvoiced p instead of b. The entire root seems to be nhb/py and requires a further explanation. Considering the phonotactic principle /:C/ = /C:/ and the geminated b of nubbû, the h can result from a long ā like in Abrām > Abraham. The original root would then be na:by or nab:y. The different labials b/p create no problem, since the distinction of voiced and unvoiced consonants was apparently non-phonemic in Proto-Afro-Asiatic.

The conclusion summarizing the results of the research (pp. 337–351) is followed by a table with transliterations of the Afro-Asiatic, Semitic, and Hebrew consonants, presented both in the usual transcription of the Semitists and in the phonetic alphabet, with some explanations (pp. 353–354). A large bibliography is collected on pp. 355–400. The bibliographical information is sometimes incomplete, lacking e.g. the title of the series. The usual abbreviation of the title of some journals is explained incorrectly, for instance Orientalische Literaturzeitung instead of Orientalistische Literaturzeitung. An unusual practice consists sometimes in indicating in the bibliography only the pages related to the Author’s subject instead of giving the full reference.

In the reviewer’s opinion, the Author should be praised for her understanding and presenting of Semitic grammatical questions. A number of scholars interested in the subject would have probably preferred to read this book in a congress language, best in
English. However, the presentation is very clear, all the forms discussed are given either in good transcription or in Hebrew characters, and the work can thus be very useful also for readers not acquainted with Catalan.

Edward Lipiński


The grammar under review, written by Takamitsu Muraoka, emeritus professor of Leiden University, appeared almost twenty years after the publication of *Studies in Qumran Aramaic* in the same series of Melbourne University (Abr-Nahrain. Supplement 3, Leuven 1992). The present work is conceived as a reference grammar, divided in four parts: phonology, morphology, morphosyntax, and syntax. The detailed table of contents (pp. VII–XI), the preface and the introduction (pp. XXIII–XXIX) are followed by a list of abbreviations and a bibliography (pp. XXXI–XLV).

Part I deals then with phonology (pp. 3–34), Part II with morphology of pronouns (pp. 37–51), nouns and adjectives (pp. 51–81), prepositions (pp. 81–84), numerals (pp. 84–90), adverbs (pp. 91–93), conjunctions and other particles (pp. 93–96), verbs (pp. 97–144). Part III considers morphosyntax examining the use of pronouns (pp. 147–155), of nouns and adjectives (pp. 156–163), and of verbs (pp. 164–181). Part IV deals with the syntax of expanded nominal phrases (pp. 185–206), expanded verbal phrases (pp. 207–227), and other syntactic issues (pp. 228–263). There is a list of technical terms (pp. 267–269), an index of passages quoted (pp. 271–275), of modern authors (pp. 277–280), of subjects (pp. 281–282), and of words discussed (pp. 283–285). All the quotations are printed in Hebrew characters, with masoretic vocalization when biblical texts are referred to. Eventually, a transcription of other texts is added with vocalization to indicate the form and the pronunciation in a concrete way.

The main problem raised by this grammar is the mixing of various forms of speech and the apparent unawareness of a situation comparable to the Arabic diglossia. Although Qumran Aramaic is no particular Middle Aramaic idiom, Muraoka’s grammar applies this appellation to the Aramaic language used in manuscripts found in the Desert of Judah, viz. in the caves around Khirbet Qumran, in Wadi Murabba’at, in Nahal Ḥever, allegedly in Wadi Seiyal, at Ketef Jericho and Masada. Only the Aramaic papyri from Wadi Dalieh, dating from the 4th century B.C., and the Nabataean documents from Nahal Ḥever are not included. Instead some vocalizations proposed by the Author correspond to Late Aramaic pronunciation.

One of the dialects concerned is Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, spoken at the time of the written documents and characterized, among other things, by the object marker ȳt,
which is later ubiquitous in the Palestinian Targum fragments of the Pentateuch from the Cairo Genizah. It occurs very often in the documents from Nahal Hever, but is extremely rare in literary texts, despite their exposure to the vernacular language of scribes and copyists. It is found only twice in the Targum to Job (11Q10), col. 35:9 and 38:9, once in Dan. 3:12, in Proto-Esther (4Q550, 5+5a:7), in Tobit (4Q196, 2:13), and sporadically in a few other texts, but never in Genesis Apocryphon or the Visions of Amram. In literary works, the direct object is generally not preceded by a syntactic indicator, but l- is occasionally employed before nouns. This syntagm is exceptional with pronominal suffixes (11Q10, col. 4:5). In fact, pronominal suffixes are regularly attached to the verb in the Targum to Job, in the Tobit fragments, in Genesis Apocryphon. This construction is found also in the stereotyped formula ktbh or ktbyh, “he wrote it”, in the legal documents from Wadi Murabba‘at and Nahal Hever (Mur 42:8,9; 46:11; 48:7; P. Yadin 10:73; etc.), occurring next to the name of a witness. However, it clearly belongs there to the formulaic language of legal acts and does not reveal anything about the daily speech of the writer. It is obvious that we do not deal with a single corpus of Qumran Aramaic, but with texts in Standard Literary Aramaic on the one hand, and with Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, on the other. The latter has influenced the language of legal documents. The scribes of the Nabataean deeds from Nahal Hever, dating from the late 1st and early 2nd centuries A.D. better resisted the impact of spoken Aramaic and they never use the object marker yt. Instead, the legal formulations of the Nabataean tomb inscriptions at Mada‘in Salih, which are somewhat older, contain several examples of yt, showing that its use was not limited to Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, to Palmyrene, and to Syro-Palestinian. It was Western Middle Aramaic. The Nabataean use of yt shows in any case that the parallel and nearly contemporaneous appearance of yt in letters and deeds from Nahal Hever should not be explained by a constant exposure to Hebrew, but by the Aramaic dialect spoken in Palestine and different to some extent from the Standard Literary Aramaic used for literary purposes. A linguistic study of the Aramaic manuscripts found in the Desert of Judah should thus deal separately with texts redacted in a literary language, occasionally influenced by the vernacular idiom of scribes and copyists, and with letters and documents written Western Middle Aramaic, among which legal documents may preserve features of Official or Imperial Aramaic.

The disjunctive possessive pronoun dyl-, used in Aramaic deeds of the Persian period (zyl-), in the Samaria papyri as well, occurs also in several legal documents of the Judaean Desert, but it is attested only three times in Qumran literary texts: twice in Genesis Apocryphon (1Q20, col. 20:10 and 21:6), dating from the 1st or 2nd century B.C., and once in Enoch’s Epistle (4Q542, 1 i 8). This zyl-/dyl- is a feature characterizing various types of conveyance: gifts, sales, transfers. Instead, it is not typically West-Aramaic. Mixing Jewish Palestinian Aramaic with some legal phraseology and Standard Literary Aramaic is an unfortunate procedure.

Still another example is provided by the pronouns. The deeds of the Judaean Desert regularly use the demonstrative pronoun dnh/dn’, which is the standard form znh/zn’ in documents from the Persian period, also in the Samaria papyri. The influence of
spoken Jewish Palestinian Aramaic is shown nevertheless by the seven examples of the demonstrative *dnn* in deeds from Nahal Hever and Wadi Seiyal. Their meaning and function are the same as those of *dnh/dn*’. This new demonstrative *dnn* never appears in literary texts from Qumran, an evident prove that we deal with two different dialects: Official Aramaic, coloured by the spoken Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the scribes, and the Standard Literary Aramaic of the 3rd–1st centuries B.C. Later, as in Targum Onqelos, the impact of the vernacular *dnn* appears also in literary texts, for instance in Gen. 25:32; 32:5; Numb. 11:20. The determinative used as a rule in Standard Literary Aramaic texts from the Qumran caves is *dn*, often *dyn* later, in the Targums.

This being said, one must stress that the grammar of Qumran Aramaic, written by T. Muraoka, contains a wealth of material and provides an impressive amount of linguistic research. The structure of the grammar and the analyses are exemplary. It is undoubtedly a major research tool. Its user will nevertheless have the double task of reinterpreting Author’s comments on differences perceived in the texts and of distinguishing the Standard Literary Aramaic, a written language, from Western Middle Aramaic, based on an actually spoken language. This distinction should apply also to spelling and phonology, to morphosyntax and syntax. It can generally rely on the provenance of the texts. Letters and deeds from Wadi Murabbaʿāt, Nahal Ḥever, and Wadi Seiyal are usually written in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic or are strongly influenced by it, while preserving some older legal terminology. Seventeen texts erroneously classified as 4Q342-4Q348, 4Q351-4Q354, and 4Q356-4Q361 belong to this group, but none is listed in the index of passages quoted in the grammar. Most fragments and scrolls from Qumran caves proper and the Aramaic Levi Document from the Cairo Genizah are instead redacted in Standard Literary Aramaic.

Beside the dialectal differences, there is the important distinction of spoken and written language, as well as the wide chronological gap between the texts in question. Most letters and deeds date from the first part of the 2nd century A.D., while the literary compositions from the Qumran caves go back to the 3rd–1st centuries B.C. There is a gap of at least 150–200 years between the two groups. Some Qumran manuscripts date from the first part of the 1st century A.D., but the works written in Standard Literary Aramaic are undoubtedly older. This explains the differences one can observe between the Standard Literary Aramaic of the Qumran texts and the Targums Onqelos and Jonathan, first written down *ca.* 100 A.D. For instance, the preposition *l-* appears only occasionally as object marker in the Standard Literary Aramaic of the Qumran texts, but its insertion is a general rule in the Targums, first committed to writing about two hundred years after the literary compositions attested at Qumran. A diachronic approach is always needed, but somewhat lacking in the grammar.

In phonology, one should also take Greek and Latin transcriptions into account, what is not done in the grammar under review. For instance, forms like μαρανάτας have a bearing on the interpretation of the internal *aleph* of *mrʾn*’ in P. Yadin 8,9, and Σαμβαθαιος with variants and many similar cases echoes a real degemination, even if it is not registered in Aramaic texts. The basic distinction of static and kinetic consonants is missing in the grammar. Now, the latter group, incorporating the plosives,
cannot be held continuously without changing quality and this explains the dissimilations and degeminations like Σαμβαθαιος etc. Besides, U. Schattner-Rieser (L’araméen des manuscrits de la Mer Morte I. Grammaire, Prahins 2004, pp. 48–49) has collected eleven Greek transcriptions showing that pretonic short vowels were still maintained in the 1st–2nd centuries A.D. The objection of T. Muraoka, contending that Greek phonotactics does not allow a word-initial ζβ and similar clusters (p. 31 and n. 213, p. 69, n. 290), is specious, for a prosthetic vowel could appear in such cases or an etymologically voiced consonant could change into a voiceless one, giving a form similar to σβέννῦμι, “to put out, to extinguish”. Since this never happens, while transcriptions like Βρικ- or Βριχ- for /Bărik-/ never appear, Schattner-Rieser’s argument is perfectly valid. In any case, it is obvious that the vocalization of Biblical Aramaic reflects a later stage of Aramaic phonology. Some vocalizations proposed by the Author should therefore be corrected in order to bring them in agreement with the Greek transcriptions.

Very interesting for phonology are the spellings hwrrṭ for Urartu (1Q20, col. 10:12; 12:8; 17:9; cf. 1QIsa 37:38) and ḥdq’ (1Q20, col. 17:8; pace Muraoka) for Idiglat (Tigris) in Genesis Apocryphon, for they were apparently aimed at indicating an actual pronunciation of the toponyms. Such facts are not examined in the grammar, although they show that aleph, hē, and heth were not carrying the same phonetic value when the text was written.

A reference grammar of Standard Literary Aramaic, dealing with texts from the Hellenistic and early Roman periods, is a desideratum, but studies referring to particular sources, like those by S.E. Fassberg, R. Kuty, and A. Tal, or dealing with special questions are so far a prerequisite. The same can be said about Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Roman and Byzantine periods. The grammar under review can provisionally fill in these scholarly blanks and will certainly be used with great profit by specialists.

Edward Lipiński


The book under review is a slightly revised version of Renaud J. Kuty’s doctoral dissertation defended in January 2008 at Leiden University. To understand its purpose and its importance one should first situate it in the general frame of targumic studies and show the place of Targum Jonathan to the Prophets in the quite large field of targumic literature in the first millennium A.D1.

---

1 A large bibliography can be found in C. Tassin, Targum, in Dictionnaire de la Bible. Supplément XIII, Paris 2005, pp. 1*–343*. 
Aramaic was the language of the majority of Jews before the end of the Persian period (539–333 B.C.) and the need of translating the Hebrew Bible into Aramaic was increasing steadily as the time was going by. First oral explanation was given for some parts of the Bible, following rules written partially down in the Mishnah, *Megillah IV*, 4-10, but going back at least to the end of the first century A.D., since Eliezer ben Hyrkanus is mentioned in this context. Beside the public oral explanation in the synagogue, still practiced by Yemenite Jews in the 20th century, translations were made and committed to writing for private reading and study, the oldest example of which is Targum Job from Qumran2, the original of which may go back to the 3rd century B.C.

The synagogue played a role here, at least from the first century B.C. on, as shown by the Greek inscription found in 1913 by Raymond Weill in the excavation of the Ophel3. The inscription records the building of a synagogal compound in the first century, certainly before A.D. 70:

“Theodotos, son of Vettenos, priest and archisynagogos, son of archisynagogos, and grandson of archisynagogos, built this synagogue for reading the Law and teaching the commandments, also the hospice, chambers and water installations for the service of visiting guests from abroad. This synagogue was founded by his ancestors and the elders and Simonides”.

The “teaching of the commandments” following the “reading of the Torah” seems to imply a liturgical practice of commented translations of the Bible into Greek or Aramaic. In fact, the Targums disclose a wish to understand the Bible rather than the bare need of a translation. No further trace is left of Theodotos’ synagogue, but one should also mention the synagogue of Gamla4, erected between 23 B.C. and 41 A.D., and the provisional synagogues at Herodium and at Masada, employed as such during the First Revolt.

The Aramaic translation of the Pentateuch and of the Prophets was in all likelihood committed to writing as early as the first century or the early second century A.D. It is known as Targum Onqelos to the Pentateuch and Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. These translations soon reached Babylonia, probably in the aftermath of the Second Revolt (132–135 A.D.). Babylonian Jews were speaking a different, East-Aramaic dialect, and these early Aramaic translations of the Bible became there the official Targum of the Babylonian schools. This saved them from destruction, but local copyists sometimes

---

2 11Q10 ; 4Q99-101 and 157 ; 2Q15.
adapted their language to the East-Aramaic dialect of Babylonia, “to make it conform with the vernacular of the Babylonian Jews”⁵, and later provided the text with supralinear Babylonian vocalization. About the 4th–5th centuries A.D., other Aramaic versions of the Pentateuch were committed to writing in Palestine, resulting in a Samaritan Targum and in a Jewish Palestinian Targum, represented by the so-called Pseudo-Jonathan Targum or Targum Yerushalmi I, the Fragmentary Targum or Targum Yerushalmi II with several variants, and the Targum *Neofiti 1*, which preserves a complete version of the Palestinian Targum. Targums to the Writings or Hagiographa, including the Books of Chronicles, were written down somewhat later. In contrast to the Pentateuch, represented in Aramaic by several Palestinian Targum traditions, no complete Palestinian Targum to the Prophets has survived. Variant traditions and the marginal glosses of *Codex Reuchlinianus 3* in the Badische Landesbibliothek (Karlsruhe), written in 1105/6, may refer to partial translations or to heterogeneous corrections and additions to Targum Jonathan.

The date and origin of Targum Onqelos and of Targum Jonathan were somewhat uncertain for a long period, because of their Babylonian vocalization and of their mixture of Eastern and Western Aramaic linguistic traits. The first requirement was a reliable text, not corrupted by later copyists. This was provided in the years 1959–1962 by the edition of Ms. Or. 2363 for Targum Onqelos, of Ms. Or. 2210 for the Former Prophets, and of Ms. Or. 2211 for the Latter Prophets, all from the British Library (formerly in the British Museum). The editor, Alexander Sperber (1897–1970), added a double critical apparatus, quoting vocalic and consonantal variants⁶. His edition is based on Yemenite manuscripts with supralinear post-Babylonian vocalization, a scribal tradition fostered in the Yemen⁷. A. Sperber chose manuscripts representative of the transition from the genuine Babylonian to the Yemenite vocalization, which is its younger offspring, or at least texts representative of the Yemenite vocalization in its older form (for the Prophets). In fact, Targum texts with genuine Babylonian vocalization are mainly preserved in fragmentary form and come mostly from the Cairo Genizah. In Sperber’s opinion, they could not provide a basis for a critical edition of the entire Targum Onqelos and the entire Targum Jonathan to the Prophets. Criticisms have been made of Sperber’s edition because of this neglect of genuinely Babylonian manuscripts, of the small number of Tiberian textual witnesses used, and of typographic errors.

However, although the Yemenite manuscripts should be distinguished from the Babylonian ones because of their system of vocalization, these manuscripts show a virtually identical consonantal text. Besides, even if the Babylonian punctuation is the earlier one, it does not belong to the original text of the Targum that did not have vowel

---


signs initially. As for the manuscripts with Tiberian vocalization, it is widely known that they contain many additions not shared by the Babylonian-Yemenite texts and rightly regarded as later expansions of the original translation. Moreover, their punctuation varies considerably and is not very reliable. Now, most typographic errors in Sperber’s edition appear in the vocalization and in the Apparatus, while the occasional consonantal errors are easily recognizable. Therefore, Sperber’s “Bible in Aramaic” is rightly regarded as “the standard text edition”, although another one is available nowadays thanks to E. Martínez Borobio’s publication of genuine Babylonian texts of the Former Prophets and to Joseph Ribera Florit’s edition of the Latter Prophets. One should notice however that the lack of Babylonian texts obliged Martínez Borobio to reproduce the available fragments side by side and to use other manuscripts to fill the gaps (Eb 66, Eb 76, Ms. Or. 1471).

A. Sperber started collecting material for this work in his native town of Chernovtsy (Ukraine) as early as 1923. He begun preparing the publication in 1925 at the request of the Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums in Berlin, and in 1926–1927 he published some preliminary results of his examination of Targum Jonathan to the Former Prophets, followed in 1934–1935 by an introductory chapter dealing with the variant readings of Targum Onqelos. The final results of his research appeared in 1959–1973.

The language of the Targum of the Former Prophets was submitted to a detailed analysis by Abraham Tal, who based his research on A. Sperber’s edition. His grammatical treatment is focussed on phonological, orthographical, morphological, and lexical matters. The latter investigation area provides important data for the dating of the Targum, which contains a number of Mishnaic Hebrew loanwords belonging to the common daily vocabulary. This shows that it was written at the time when Mishnaic

---


14 A. Tal, *L’Sôn ha-Targûm li-Nôbbî’îm ri’sônîm ú-ma’madah bi-k’lal nîbê ha’-ar-amât / The Language of the Targum of the Former Prophets and Its Position within the Aramaic Dialects*, Tel Aviv 1975.
Hebrew was still a living language\textsuperscript{15}, thus before the Second Jewish Revolt (132–135 A.D.). This is confirmed by the rarity of Greek and Latin loanwords (45 in total), only nine of whom do not occur in Mishnaic Hebrew\textsuperscript{16}. Their appearance reflects an early phase of Hellenistic influence in Palestine.

Abraham Tal did not examine the syntax of the Targum, although this is a quite stable linguistic area which is not influenced by the particular vocabulary and phraseology of a writer or a scribal school. The reason was probably the idea that the syntax follows the one of the Hebrew Vorlage. This might be correct to a certain degree, but a detailed analysis of syntactic aspects would undoubtedly reveal significant differences. These aspects are investigated at present by R.J. Kuty in I Samuel and II Samuel with special attention to five key topics of the syntax: the use of the states of the noun, i.e. formal determination or its lack, the morphosyntax of the numerals, the distribution of the various genitive constructions, the verbal system, and the word order. Kuty’s study includes a comparative discussion of these syntactic features in the dialect of the Targum Jonathan and in other Aramaic writings, and attempts to show how the syntax of this Targum can shed light on the classification of its language in the large Aramaic language family, thus contributing to our knowledge of its origin and early history.

In this excellent piece of work Renaud J. Kuty thus made an important contribution to the “vexing question” of the origin of the Targum to the Prophets. As expected, the research is based essentially on the consonantal text. The Author begins by reviewing the present state of research in the introduction to his syntactical studies (p. 1–18). Without further comments, he uses Sperber’s edition of the Targum to the Former Prophets, based on the Yemenite Ms.Or. 2210 of the British Library, dated 1469 A.D. Comparisons are made with the Vorlage of the Hebrew Masoretic text.

The use of the determination or status emphaticus is the topic of the first chapter (pp. 19–54). R.J. Kuty notes that the classical distinction of the absolute and emphatic state is observed in the plural (pp. 25–27). In the singular, formally feminine nouns display a clear preference for the status emphaticus ending in -ā (pp. 29–30), while formally masculine nouns are often used in the emphatic state despite their indetermination because of certain morphological, morphosyntactic or lexical factors that neutralize the classical distinction between the absolute and emphatic state (pp. 30–50). Globally one notices therefore a combination of East and West Aramaic features.

The second chapter deals with numerals (pp. 55–69), which do not present characteristics leading to a classification in a particular group of Aramaic dialects. The next chapter examines the genitival constructions (pp. 71–124). The proleptic d-relation makes up only 1.5% of all genitival phrases encountered in Targum Jonathan to Samuel (pp. 73, 100–101, 104), while the frequent use of the construct state and of the bare d-relation does not leave a direct clue for linguistic classification. However, the working

\textsuperscript{15} A. Tal, Lešôn ha-Targûm li-Neḇi’îm, pp. 174–175.

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p. 180.
of the two constructions in Targum Jonathan to Samuel and in Genesis Apocryphon from Qumran is strikingly similar (pp. 121–123).

This research is very detailed and accurate. The Author notices, for instance, that the construct state is hardly used with some nouns favouring the d-relation (p. 87), thus $m'ln$, “entrance” (e.g. $m'ln$ $d-gzr$, “the entrance of Gezer”), $msqn$, “ascent”, $mlk$, “king”, and $nhl$, “wadi”. He lists all the occurrences of the construction in question. The examples with $mlk$ are quite numerous with the single exception of $mlk$ $m'kh$ in II Sam. 10:6 (p. 87, n. 47), but this is precisely a particular case, since Maacah can be a personal name that could be used in apposition (cf. the Septuagint). The Targumist apparently leaves the question open, since he writes neither $mlk'$ $m'kh$ nor $mlk'$ $dm'kh$. One should notice that the following words ' $lp$ $gbr$ rise a similar problem, since one would expect ' $lp$ $gbr'$ in line with the general Targumist’s usage in matter of determination (cf. p. 63, n. 31). Some thirty years ago, the reviewer had suggested to read ' $allâf$, “leader of men”, but this passage of II Sam. 10:6 has a slightly different wording in the Qumran version of the Book of Samuel17 and Targum Jonathan seems to have been adapted to the Masoretic text without following the initial Targumist’s usages. Similar cases might occur in I Sam. 14:26 and II Sam. 25:35, where Targum Jonathan respectively reads $bryz$ $dbš$ and $qšt$ $nhš'$ instead of the expected $bryz$ $ddbš$ and $qšt$ $dnš'$ (p. 96, n. 74). Now, the Septuagint seems to translate another Vorlage in I Sam. 14:26 and the Greek translation of Hebrew $nhwšh$ in II Sam. 25:35 is missing in the Lagardian edition of the Septuagint, what is not surprising since this word overloads the verse. A further research of this kind could be helpful for the study of Targum Jonathan and for the textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible.

Chapter IV deals with conjugations (pp. 125–194) and stresses the increasing importance of the participle $qâtel$, used with or without $hwh$. The conjugation of Targum Jonathan to Samuel is heavily influenced by its Hebrew Vorlage, but its use of $qâtal$ expressing anteriority, $yiqtol$ referring to the future or indicating modality, and $qâtel$ signifying simultaneity comes close to the situation observed in Qumran Aramaic18. The word order in the verbal clause constitutes the topic of Chapter V (pp. 195–241). The regular sequence in Targum Jonathan to Samuel turns out to be verb-subject-object, but this pattern is of limited value for a linguistic classification of its Aramaic, since the Targum follows the word order of the Hebrew Vorlage in a great many cases. However, this order is prevalent also in Qumran Aramaic and in Nabataean, while at least the sequence verb-subject is the most frequent order in Palmyrene.

The discussion of the conjugations is based mainly on the graphic appearance of the forms without considering the semantic role of the stress-accent, which can be induced

---


18 The appellation “Qumran Aramaic” qualifies texts found at Qumran and dating therefore from the Second Temple period. It does not imply that they were composed at Qumran.
sometimes from later vocalized traditions, like *wayyiqtol* < *wa-yiqtol* (accomplished), distinct from (*w*)*yiqtol* < (*wa-*)*yiqtol* (unaccomplished). The “accomplished” *yiqtol* occurs in early Hebrew poetry also without *wa*, like in Ugaritian poems, and it is present in II Sam. 22, what R.J. Kuty regards as “peculiar” (p. 144, n. 72). The Targumist understood these forms correctly and translated them with *qet*al.

The general conclusions of R.J. Kuty’s work (pp. 243–251) locate the Aramaic of Targum Jonathan to Samuel among basically Middle Aramaic dialects with one distinctly Eastern feature of Late Aramaic, namely a subsystem of determination. This can be explained by the final redaction of the Targum in Babylonia, around the 4th century A.D., while the basic linguistic features point towards the Middle Aramaic period, more specifically the Qumran Aramaic. The sole notable difference is the disappearance of a formal distinction between jussive and imperfect (with a final *n*), like in Palmyrene and in Nabataean. This may suggest a slightly later date for the basic Aramaic of Targum Jonathan, possibly the period between the First (A.D. 66–73) and the Second Jewish Revolt (A.D. 132–135). The Yabnean period and context would appear as the most suitable setting in life for the redaction of Targum Jonathan, as well as of Targum Onqelos. The reviewer believes that the initial written form of Targum Jonathan was anterior to the fixing of a standardized and authoritative Hebrew text of the Prophets.

According to R.J. Kuty, the language of both Targums cannot be an Aramaic κοινή or Standard speech, contrary to the opinion of A. Tal and J.C. Greenfield19: it is a literary West-Aramaic dialect, continuing the literary tradition of the earlier period, but influenced in all likelihood by a Judaean vernacular. Both Targums were subsequently transferred to Babylonia, probably in the aftermath of Bar Kokhba’s revolt, and were revised there around the 4th century A.D. They enjoyed such a prestige in Babylonian schools that their language, slightly adapted to local dialects and vocalized accordingly, even inspired the inscriptions of magic bowls, datable to the 5th–7th centuries A.D.20

Targum Jonathan is quoted quite frequently by Rav Joseph bar Ḥiyya (270–333 A.D.), head of the Pumbedita Academy21. Thus, as early as the beginning of the 4th century A.D., Targum Jonathan was recognized in Babylonia as being of ancient authority. Hai ben Sherira (939–1038), gaon of Pumbedita, seems to have regarded Rav Joseph as its author, since he cites passages from the Targum in his commentary to *Tohorot*, adding: “Rav Joseph has translated”22. This opinion may simply result from Joseph’s frequent quotations

21 Babylonian Talmud, *Moed Katan* 28b; *Sanhedrin* 94b; *Megillah* 3a.
of the Targum, but A. Geiger already assumed that Rav Joseph bar Ḥiyya gave its final form to Targum Jonathan\textsuperscript{23}.

R.J. Kuty’s book makes a significant contribution to the question of the origin and transmission of the Targum to the Prophets. Further studies of the kind\textsuperscript{24}, especially dedicated to the Latter Prophets, would certainly be welcome, although the numerous additions and paraphrases, written in a mixed dialect, make the research more difficult. Those interested in Aramaic linguistics, but also in the Biblical exegesis of the first and second centuries A.D., will find Kuty’s study of particular value. It is provided with an ample bibliography (pp. 255–275) and a carefully prepared index of passages in Targum Jonathan to Samuel (pp. 277–285). The Author provided us with a work which is in all respects an outstanding contribution to the study of the Targums and to Aramaic linguistics.

\textit{Edward Lipiński}


\textsuperscript{24} Targum Jonathan to Judges has already been analyzed in great detail by Willem F. Smelik, \textit{The Targum of Judges} (Oudtestamentische Studiën 36), Leiden 1995. On may still record the old editions of Franz Praetorius, \textit{Targum zu Josua in jemenischer Überlieferung}, Berlin 1899, and \textit{Targum zum Buch der Richter in jemenischer Überlieferung}, Berlin 1900.
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