

selling the girl to slavery. As Leontius stresses, St. Stephen himself “showed mercy and compassion not only to Christians, but also to Muslims,” whom “he would feed with abundant foods of diverse kinds” (Leontius Damascenus, “De S. Stephano Sabaita thaumaturgo monacho,” in *Acta Sanctorum*, vol. VII/3 [Antwerp: Jacobus du Moulin, 1723], 572–73, 586–87, 613 [§§99–102, 133–34, 186]; J. C. Lamoreaux, *The Life of Stephen of Mar Sabas*, 2 vols. [Louvain: Peeters, 1999], 88–90, 110–11, 146 [Arabic]; 81–83, 100–101, 131 [English] [§§52.3–52.11, 64.1–64.4, 81.5]; I have cited Lamoreaux’s translations).

It would seem that the perceived difference between Syriac and Greek sources has to do not so much with Syriac-speakers’ and Greek-speakers’ “different experience of Islam” as with the relative paucity and vicissitudes of preservation of Greek texts written in the Muslim-ruled Middle East, particularly those that shed light on day-to-day life of ordinary Christians (and Muslims). If we had more Greek sources like the *Life of St. Stephen of Mār Sābā* (and if Greek, among Christians of the Middle East, had not been supplanted so relatively quickly by Arabic), the artificial dichotomy between Syriac and Greek would surely crumble.

Despite the minor shortcomings outlined above, Michael Penn deserves the highest praise for publishing an incisive and enlightening commentary on Syriac writings about Muslims and Islam in their historical development and for calling attention to such an important and virtually unstudied phenomenon as Christian-Muslim hybridity, which will surely preoccupy future researchers. The book is unquestionably a landmark contribution to the study of Syriac Christianity and Christian-Muslim relations, and a must-read for all those interested in the social history of the Middle East in this period, specialists and non-specialists alike.

ALEXANDER TREIGER  
DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY

---

*A Grammar of the Christian Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Diyana-Zariwaw.* By LIDIA NAPIORKOWSKA. *Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics*, vol. 81. Leiden: BRILL, 2015. Pp. xiv + 600. \$234, €181.

This book demonstrates that Neo-Aramaic dialectology is a mature field of investigation, covering a wide range of dialectal variation, that is firmly rooted in and makes an original contribution to Semitic and general linguistics. It is part of the Brill series “Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics,” which hosts a number of important contributions to the field, such as the four-volume *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of the Assyrian Christians of Urmi* by Geoffrey Khan (vol. 86, 2016), *Comparative Lexical Studies in Neo-Mandaic* by Hezy Mutzafi (vol. 73, 2014), *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Amədyā* by Jared Greenblatt (vol. 61, 2010), *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Challa* by Steven E. Fassberg (vol. 54, 2009), *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Sulemaniyya and Halabja* by Geoffrey Khan (vol. 44, 2004), and *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Qaraqosh* by Geoffrey Khan (vol. 36, 2002).

The descriptive format is that of the Cambridge school of Neo-Aramaic studies led by Geoffrey Khan. In comparison with other works from the same research team, however, the language description is interspersed with much more precise and instructive references to classics of general and typological linguistics, especially of the 1970s to 1980s, such as Bybee, Comrie, Givón, Ladefoged, and Lyons. Based on the author’s Ph.D dissertation, the book under review contains a detailed description of the dialect on the three main levels of linguistic analysis (phonology, morphology, and syntax), a rich corpus in phonological transcription and English translation, and an Aramaic-English and English-Aramaic glossary, in which verbs are listed separately from other parts of speech. An impressive bibliography and two indexes complete the volume. A geographical map would have probably proved more useful to the reader than the index of geographical names.

The grammar describes the dialect(s) of Christian Assyrians of the town Diyana (or Diana), located to the north of the better-known Rawandiz and today belonging to the Erbil Governorate of Iraqi Kurdistan. Distinct dialectal features of speakers whose ancestors migrated to Diyana from the more

northern villages of Zariwaw, Riččawa, and Şeru or western Harir are also taken into consideration. Therefore, the grammar contributes “data of a geoelect variety rather than a homogenous dialect” (p. 5). The villages are now deserted and Diyana is a middle-sized fast-developing Kurdish town, known by the same name of the district: Soran. Napiorkowska’s informants live in Sweden or in the UK; one speaker was recorded and consulted by Khan in Diyana. The texts are precious contributions to the oral history, hence the historical memory, of the migrated, displaced, or indeed dying-out Aramaic-speaking communities.

The book brings attention to a poorly investigated and little-known area on the map of the vast North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA) territory. The author’s approach is comparative in that she refers to grammars or grammatical sketches of more than thirty NENA dialects. Sketches are drawn from the Cambridge NENA Database ([nena.ames.cam.ac.uk](http://nena.ames.cam.ac.uk)), where two pictures of the town and an audio sample of the dialect can be found. Thanks to the grammars of Neo-Aramaic dialects published so far and the British (Cambridge) and German projects (*Semitica Viva* and *Semitisches Tonarchiv*), the endangered Neo-Aramaic tongues are one of the better-described sub-groups of the Semitic languages.

Napiorkowska offers the reader a very clear and sound treatment of emphasis, distinguishing emphasis spread and synharmonism, as bound to the phonetic domains of syllables and whole words respectively, and describes the two phenomena as occurring in the language groups of the region: Arabic, Aramaic, Kurdish, and Turkish. Emphasis spread and synharmonism are intertwined processes that form a continuum, “having on the one hand of the spectrum the dialects like Txuma, with clearly segmental emphasis, and the harmonic system like the one in CU [Christian Urmi], on the other” (p. 55). The Christian dialect of Diyana takes an intermediate position, closer to Urmi synharmonism.

The author tests the distribution of emphasis with an instrumental acoustic approach involving the use of the software Praat. From a phonetic point of view, the results suggest that “emphasis in this dialect consists mainly in pharyngealization, with a number of words thoroughly velarized” (p. 50). Since the phonological system of the dialect exhibits transitory features, and various subsets of the phonological inventory (dental emphatics, pharyngeal *ʕ*, liquids, and bilabials) have various effects on the distribution of emphasis, both the diachronic and synchronic perspectives are taken so as to account for the occurrence of emphatic allophones, vowels, and consonants. On the synchronic level, rather than forming polar pairs (emphatic vs. non-emphatic sounds), phonemes can be described as possibly vs. never emphatic segments.

In the description of verb morphology, Napiorkowska singles out the main lines of structural developments, such as the similarity between inflectional endings of the copula and the nominative pronominal endings (pp. 171, 194); the tendency to preserve number over gender (p. 180); the morpho-phonological motivation rather than semantic and functional nature of derived stems (p. 185); the extension of the vowel /e/ from final /y/ to strong verbs (*xazewa* ‘they used to see’ || *patxewa* [expected *patxi-wa*] ‘they used to open’, p. 197; in the bibliography I missed R. Voigt, in *Orientalia Suecana* 43–44 [1994–1995]); and the merging of Aramaic forms derived from initial /y/, initial /ʕ/, and middle /y/ roots (p. 267).

Thanks to her comparative and diachronic approach, Napiorkowska often gives intriguing and plausible historical reconstructions of forms, whether sounds, morphemes, or borrowed lexemes. In the reflexes of historical BGDKPT consonants, I wonder if /p/ ever spirantized to [f] in many NENA dialects, where it is regularly pronounced as a stop, and it is therefore necessary to assume with Napiorkowska (p. 28) that it shifted back to plosive /p/.

Mandaic and NENA plurals with reduplication of the third radical consonant (e.g., *təlpape* ‘eyelashes’ < *təlpə*) were already described in Brockelmann’s *Grundriss* (1908–1913: 440). They represent an innovative development, attested also in other Afro-Asiatic languages, and should not be confused with the early Aramaic anomalous plural forms of the adjectives *rabrəbīn* (*rabrəbīm*, with final *m* on p. 121) ‘big’ and *daqdaqē* ‘small’ (see R. R. Ratcliffe, *The “Broken” Plural Problem in Arabic and Comparative Semitic* [Amsterdam, 1998], 160–62).

As in most NENA dialects, the possibility of incorporating a pronominal object within the ergative paradigm of the preterit is confined in Diyana to the 3rd person: *šudərre* ‘he sent him’, *šudrale* ‘he sent her’, *šudrele* ‘he sent them’. According to the author, this would be a conservative feature of Diyana in comparison with other dialects in which incorporated forms are mandatory (e.g., Jewish Challa) or

available (Christian Urmi) for pronominal objects of all persons (p. 210). On the contrary, the geographical and historical distributions of NENA preterit forms with pronominal objects demonstrate that the intraconjugational object representation of all persons (*priqexle* ‘he saved us’) is an archaic feature and that the competing/complementary paradigm with prefixed *qam-* / *kem-* and extraconjugational prepositional objects, introduced by *l-* and used especially for 1st and 2nd person pronouns (*kempareqlan* ‘he saved us’), is a relatively late development (see F. A. Pennacchietti, in *ZDMG* 144 [1994], listed in Napiorkowska’s bibliography, and my article in *ARAM* 24 [2012]: 25–40). Both the creation of the *qam*-paradigm and the limitation of intraconjugational indexing of the object to 3rd person pronouns can be interpreted as structural developments linked to the “loss of ergativity”: the *qam*- forms paradigmatically restore nominative-accusative alignment, while the occurrence of a split ergative feature, such as the intraconjugational object indexing by means of subject pronominal endings, is limited to the person that occupies a lower position in the animacy hierarchy.

The book is well written and reads easily, notwithstanding the technical nature of the contents. Layout and graphics are clear. I was able to detect only a few slip-ups: Payne (2005) instead of Payne (1997) (p. 6), “maker of the pl.” for “marker of the pl.” (p. 101), and Fassber for Fassberg (p. 199 n. 2). In the verb paradigms I am not sure whether *ptixen* should be *ptixten* as fem. sg. resultative participle + 1st person ending of the copula (p. 193) and *šudertit* should, in fact, be *šuderti* ‘you (sg.f.) have sent me’ (p. 211).

ALESSANDRO MENGOSI  
UNIVERSITY OF TURIN

---

*The Technique of Islamic Bookbinding: Methods, Materials and Regional Varieties.* By KARIN SCHEPER. *Islamic Manuscripts and Books*, vol 8. Leiden: BRILL, 2015. Pp. xii + 428, illus. \$181, €140.

In this heavily illustrated volume, conservator Karin Scheper has offered a refined picture of the extant material evidence for the bookbinding techniques practiced in the Islamicate cultural areas during the manuscript age. While the wealth of technical detail presented is obviously of great benefit to conservators and bookbinding practitioners, it is also quite valuable for philologists, historians, codicologists, and, indeed, anyone relying on Islamic manuscripts as carriers of source content—textual, visual, or material.

Previous scholarship on Islamic bookbinding has addressed the descriptions of materials and techniques provided in each of the few known historical treatises and technical manuals in Arabic and Persian (Bosch 1961; Gacek 1990, 1991, and 1997; Porter 1992), elaborated classification schemes based on cover elements such as a flap or stamped or tooled ornaments (Weisweiler 1962; Déroche 1985), highlighted evidence for particular structural features and techniques as observed on a small scale (Baydar 2002; Rose 2010; Benson 2015), or relied on written and physical evidence to explore the codicological potential of structural features such as repairs (Kropf 2013).

By contrast, Scheper’s substantial study is the first to attempt to resolve from a large manuscript corpus an expanded typology of classification based on structural binding features and their associated construction techniques and materials. This approach is novel in that it looks beyond the decorative elements that have drawn so much of the attention in the material study of Islamic bookbinding until now, and focuses instead on approaches to construction, covering, and board attachment via such elements as sewing, linings, endbands, and joints. Scheper has assessed these features for more than one thousand volumes from the Oriental collections of the Leiden University Library. As her volume’s title suggests, her approach anticipates variety across time and space and attempts to resolve distinctive characteristics that may be associated with particular historical moments and particular locations.

The volume comprises six chapters and four appendices. In her introduction and opening chapter Scheper includes a much appreciated discussion of the research value of studying binding structures in the context of the material study of books and their manufacture. She briefly discusses the