LATIN WORDS IN CLASSICAL SYRIAC

AARON MICHAEL BUTTS

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the more than one hundred Latin words that are found in Syriac texts, not translated from Greek, written through the beginning of the eighth century. The study aims to provide an exhaustive collection of these words categorized by date in which they are first attested in Syriac. This diachronic approach makes it possible to observe changes over time in the contact between Syriac speakers and the Greco-Roman world. Attention is also paid to other languages of the Near East in which a Latin word is found, including various dialects of Aramaic as well as other languages, such as Mishnaic Hebrew, Armenian, and Coptic, in an effort to contextualize the presence of the Latin words in Syriac. Finally, the study hopes to make explicit that almost all of the Latin words in Syriac reached Syriac via Greek.

INTRODUCTION

The Syriac language contains loanwords from a variety of languages. The largest number of loanwords in Syriac comes from Greek.¹ There are in fact more than eight hundred Greek

* I would like to thank the following people who helped with this study: Sebastian Brock (University of Oxford), Dexter Brown (Yale University), Simcha Gross (Yale University), Kristian Heal (Brigham

loanwords attested in pre-eighth-century Syriac texts that were not translated from Greek.² Many more are to be found in translated texts from this period or in later Syriac literature (whether translated or not). The next largest group of loanwords in Syriac derives from the various Iranian languages.³ Some of these Iranian words were inherited in Syriac, finding their source in earlier Iranian languages, e.g., Syriac ܡܙܕܝܐ *gazṣā* ‘treasure’ (*LS2* 111; *SL* 223), which derives ultimately from Old Persian **ganṣa-* via an earlier dialect of Aramaic,⁴ whereas others were transferred from an Iranian dialect contemporaneous with Syriac, e.g., Syriac ܡܨܠܡܐ *‘messenger’* (*LS2* 81; *SL* 142) from an Iranian dialect such as

Young University), George Kiraz (Beth Mardutho: Syriac Institute), Lucas Van Rompay (Duke University), and Janet Timbie (The Catholic University of America). I am especially grateful to Geoffrey Moseley (Yale University) for helping to sort out the etymological relationship between some of the Greek and Latin words. The following abbreviations are employed throughout the study: CPA = Christian Palestinian Aramaic; JBA = Jewish Babylonian Aramaic; JPA = Jewish Palestinian Aramaic; LJLA = Late Jewish Literary Aramaic; MH = Mishnaic Hebrew; SA = Samaritan Aramaic; TgChron2 = Targum Chronicles 2 (ed. Le Déaut 1971); TgEsth1 = Targum Esther 1 (ed. Grossfeld 1983); TgEsth2 = Targum Esther 2 (ed. Grossfeld 1994); TgJob = Targum Job (ed. Stec 1994); TgJon = Targum Jonathan (ed. Sperber 2004); TgLam = Targum Lamentations (ed. Sperber 2004); TgProv = Targum Proverbs (ed. Diez Merino 1984); TgPsJon = Targum Pseudo-Jonathan (ed. Clarke 1984); TgSong = Targum Song of Songs (ed. Sperber 2004). Abbreviations for lexicographical tools are explained at the end of the study.

¹ For an analysis of contact-induced changes in Syriac due to Greek, including loanwords, see Butts 2016. For previous literature, see Schall 1960 (with a valuable Greek-Syriac index in Voigt 1998) as well as a number of indispensable studies by Brock, especially Brock 1967, 1975, 1982, 1994, 1996, 1999–2000, 2004, 2005, 2010. A bibliography on Greek loanwords in Syriac is available in Voigt 1999–2000.

² A comprehensive collection of the Greek loanwords in Syriac continues to be a *desideratum*. The present author is currently compiling a glossary of Greek loanwords in Syriac up to and including Ya‘qub of Edessa (d. 708).

³ For a detailed analysis, see Ciancaglini 2008.

⁴ See the discussion in Ciancaglini 2008: 142 with further bibliography.

Pahlavi *bayašpān* (CPD 17).⁵ Syriac also inherited a number of words ultimately from Akkadian.⁶ This is, for instance, the case with Syriac ܫܬܪܐ *štarā* ‘deed, document’ (LS2 773; SL 1549), which derives ultimately from Akkadian *šataru* (CAD Š2 221-225) via an earlier dialect of Aramaic.⁷ Akkadian also served as a bridge for Sumerian loanwords in Syriac, such as Sumerian É.GAL ‘big house’, which is found in Akkadian as *ekallu* ‘royal palace’ (CAD E 52-61) and which eventually made its way into Syriac as ܒܝܬܐܬܐ *bayklā* ‘palace, temple’ (LS2 174; SL 340-341).⁸

One etymological source of words in Syriac that has not received significant attention in the secondary literature is Latin.⁹ More than one hundred Latin words are found in Syriac texts, not translated from Greek, written through the beginning of the eighth century. The present study aims to provide an exhaustive collection of these categorized by the date in which they are first attested in Syriac.¹⁰ This diachronic approach makes it possible to observe

⁵ Again, see the discussion in Ciancaglini 2008: 126-127 with further bibliography.

⁶ A foundational resource on Akkadian loanwords in the various Aramaic dialects, including Syriac, is Kaufman 1974.

⁷ See Kaufman 1974: 101.

⁸ See the discussion in Kaufman 1974: 27 as well as Mankowski 2000: 157 (on Hebrew).

⁹ Schall (1960: 244), for instance, lists only fourteen examples in his appendix on Latin words in Syriac.

¹⁰ In the lists that follow, the earliest text attesting the word in question that is known to the present author is cited with a heading in bold giving the century of composition. Consider, for instance, the following Greek loanword: ἔθος (LSJ 480) > ܐܕܬܐ *‘custom’* (**6th cent.** Eliya, *Life of Yuhanon of Tella*, 84.26 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; LS2 184; SL 356). To the present author’s knowledge, this word is not found in Syriac until the sixth century when it occurs in the *Life of Yuhanon of Tella* by Eliya, which was edited by Brooks. Throughout this study, citations of Latin words in Syriac are systematically provided with references to LS2 and SL; the English translations in this study derive from SL, though with minor adaptations, such as *curator* for Sokoloff’s hybrid *courator* that combines Greek κουργάτωρ and Latin *curator*. The determination of the earliest occurrence of a given word was facilitated by two large ‘databases’: the Oxford-BYU Syriac Corpus and Sebastian Brock’s more than two

changes over time in the contact between Syriac speakers and the Greco-Roman world. An effort is also made in this study to list other languages of the Near East in which a Latin word is found, including various dialects of Aramaic as well as other languages, such as Mishnaic Hebrew, Armenian, and Coptic.¹¹ The broad attestation of a Latin word across a number of different languages indicates that the word in question was widespread across the Roman and then Byzantine Near East.

Before looking at the Latin loanwords in Syriac, a brief word is needed on the use of Latin in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia. Prior to the establishment of Roman control of Edessa in the late second century and again in the third century,¹² Greek was the

thousand card files listing Greek loanwords in Syriac. I would like to thank Kristian Heal (Brigham Young University), who provided me with a Beta-version of the Oxford-BYU Syriac Corpus. In addition, I am grateful to Sebastian Brock (University of Oxford), who allowed me to digitize his card files over several weeks in August of 2011.

¹¹ For comparative Aramaic data, the Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon (CAL), accessible online at <<http://cal.huc.edu/>>, is essential. For Greek and Latin loanwords in the various dialects of Jewish Aramaic as well as post-Biblical Hebrew, see *GLLTMT*, which is, however, outdated and should be used with caution. For Latin words in Classical Ethiopic, see Wenginger 2000. There is no study dedicated solely to Latin words in Armenian, though Greek loanwords in Armenian are analyzed in Hübschmann 1897: 323-389 and Brockelmann 1893. For Greek loanwords in Coptic (including those ultimately of Latin origin), the Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic (*DDGLC*) will be an indispensable resource (see <<http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~ddglc/>>). I would like to thank its director Sebastian Richter (Universität Leipzig), as well as his team, especially Dylan Burns (Universität Leipzig), for sharing a Beta-version of their lemmata list. Readers should note that the references in this study to *DDGLC* are provisional and may well change as that project progresses.

¹² The dating formulae in the Old Syriac documents provide the most important information for the last set of these dates (the most convenient edition of these texts is Drijvers and Healey 1999: 232-248; for further bibliography, see Butts Forthcoming B). P. Dura 28 shows that the Abgarid dynasty must have come to an end in 212/213 when the city became a Roman *colonia*. On the basis of P. Euphrates 19, which states

language of international communication and commerce throughout the Seleucid Empire. The Roman Empire did not significantly alter this.¹³ In general, the Roman Empire did not force the Greek-speaking provinces to adopt Latin. Rather, Greek remained the official language of empire in the eastern provinces. Latin had a more restricted use, being employed primarily in military matters as well as in certain legal contexts.¹⁴ The distribution of Greek and Latin in a Roman city in the Eastern provinces from the first centuries of the Common Era can be illustrated by the more than 150 documents discovered at Dura-Europos, an important military outpost on the Euphrates until its destruction in 256 CE. A majority of the documents from this site are written in Greek or Latin, though there are also texts in Iranian or Aramaic (including Syriac).¹⁵ The documents from the archives of the Cohors Vicesima Palmyrenorum (a Roman military troop) are primarily in Latin (P.Dura 54-150). All of the texts associated with official military business are in Latin, including reports (P.Dura 82-97) and rolls and rosters (P.Dura 98-124). The famous *Feriale Duranum*, which is a calendar of official religious observances, is also in Latin (P.Dura 54). Correspondences by military officials are primarily in Latin though some are in Greek (P.Dura 55-81). Finally, judicial business and receipts from the archives of the Cohors Vicesima Palmyrenorum are primarily in Greek though a few are in Latin (P.Dura 125-129). In contrast to the predominance of Latin in the archive of the Cohors Vicesima Palmyrenorum, a vast majority of the texts found outside of this archive are in Greek (P.Dura 1-52). Thus, all of the texts from the

that 28 Dec. 240 is the 2nd year of King Abgar, it can be established that the dynasty was restored in 239 (or late 238) under Abgar X, son of Ma'nu. Finally, it seems that Edessa must have reverted to a *colonia* by 242 on the basis of P. Euphrates 20, which gives 1 Sept. 242 as year 30 of the *colonia*. For further information, see Brock 1991; Ross 1993; 2001; Teixidor 1989.

¹³ See Rochette 2010: 289-290.

¹⁴ Latin was, for instance, used in more official and bureaucratic legal matters, such as law codes. In addition, Latin was the language of education at the law school in Berytus.

¹⁵ All of the texts are edited in Welles, Fink, and Gilliam 1959.

registry office are in Greek (P.Dura 15-44), which include individual documents, such as a gift, loans, deeds of sale, deposits, a marriage contract, and divorce contracts. The lists and accounts are also in Greek (P.Dura 47-53) as are the texts associated with civil administration (P.Dura 12-14). Two letters are also in Greek, one of which may be an official letter (P.Dura 45) and the other of which is from a soldier (P.Dura 46). The documents from Dura-Europos, thus, illustrate the degree to which Latin was restricted to the military and even then to official military matters. Greek, in contrast, was used by the military in some correspondences as well as in day-to-day legal matters. Outside of the military, Greek was the language for a vast majority of tasks. Thus, Greek would have been the language of the Roman Empire with Latin restricted more or less to official military matters in Syria and Mesopotamia.

Given the restricted use of Latin in Late Antique Syria and Mesopotamia, it is necessary to explain how more than one hundred Latin words are found in Syriac texts, not translated from Greek, written up to the beginning of the eighth century. It seems that most of the Latin words in Syriac were not transferred directly from Latin into Syriac but rather that Greek served as a bridge between Latin and Syriac.¹⁶ That is, Greek is usually the immediate source for Latin words in Syriac.¹⁷ In some cases, the phonology of the Syriac form is an indication that the word was transferred via Greek. The *n* in Syriac ܢܠܝܡ ‘palace’ (LS2 574; SL 1199), for instance, indicates that the immediate source was Greek παλάτιον (LLGE 85; LSJ 1291) and not Latin *palatium* (OLD 1284; LD 1291).¹⁸ In addition, a majority of the Latin words found in Syriac

¹⁶ So already Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; 1975: 90; 1996: 255; 1999-2000: 443; 2005: 23; Ciancaglini 2008: 7; Healey 1995: 83; Rochette 2010: 292; Schall 1960: 243-244; Wasserstein 1995: 134.

¹⁷ Immediate source refers to the language from which a lexeme was transferred to the recipient language whereas ultimate source is a reflection of a word's etymology (for this distinction, see Butts 2016: §4.7, building on Wohlgemuth 2009: 51). A similar situation is attested for other Aramaic dialects; all of the Latin words in Palmyrene Aramaic, for instance, likely arrived by way of Greek (Brock 2005: 23).

¹⁸ There are occasional cases in which the phonology points to Latin as the immediate source. The initial voiced bilabial stop of Syriac ܠܝܡ

are also attested in Greek as loanwords. It is interesting to note in this regard that many of the Latin words in Syriac are attested in the Greek documentary record from Egypt.¹⁹ In addition, almost all of these Latin words are found in Byzantine Greek.²⁰ This suggests that these Latin words were used in the Koinē Greek of the Eastern Roman Empire, and it is in this way that many of them entered Syriac.

LATIN WORDS FIRST APPEARING IN SYRIAC BEFORE THE FOURTH CENTURY

Latin words that first appear in pre-fourth century Syriac, including the Peshiṭta Old Testament,²¹ are as follows:²²

- (1) a. Latin *caldaria*, *caldarium* (LD 268) > καλδάριον (GLBRP 621) > ܠܕܝܐ ‘pot’ (Pre-4th cent. Ex 27:3, 38:3; 1 Sam 2:14; 1 Kg 7:40; 2 Kg 25:14; Jer 52:18; LS2 693; SL 1402; see also Joosten 1998: 40; rare)
- b. Latin *candela* (OLD 264; LD 276) > κανδήλη, κανδήλα

‘tower’ (LS2 92; SL 130) suggests, for instance, that the immediate source is Latin *burgus* (OLD 245; LD 255) and not Greek πύργος (LSJ 1556) (see also Schall 1960: 50-51).

¹⁹ A lexicon of the Greek documentary record from Egypt is available in LLGE.

²⁰ For a lexicon of Byzantine Greek, see GLBRP.

²¹ The Syriac Old Testament is cited according to the Leiden edition where it exists and otherwise according to the British and Foreign Bible Society’s edition (1905-1920).

²² Several of the words in (1) are first attested in the *Acts of Thomas* (ed. Wright 1871: 2.171-333). Both the date and original language of this text are disputed. It, however, seems likely that the text was composed in Syriac (see the discussion in Attridge 1990), and that the date of composition is the first half of the third century (see the discussion in Bremmer 2001: 73-77). The Syriac original was translated into Greek at an early date (the Greek text is edited in Bonnet 1903: 99-291). The content of the Syriac text that is now extant shows signs of revision, often bringing it more in line with the emerging orthodoxy. The language of the Syriac text, however, contains a number of early forms (see Wright 1871: 2.xiv-xv), which indicate that the language belongs to the earliest period of Syriac. Thus, Latin words found in this text are included in this section.

- (*LSJ* 874; *PGL* 700; *GLBRP* 626) > ܠܡܕܐ ‘lamp, torch’ (**Pre-4th cent.** *Acts of Thomas*, 232.20 [ed. Wright 1871: 2.171-333]; *LS2* 676; *SL* 1379-1380; see also Brock 1996: 255; 1999-2000: 443; *GLLTMT* 552), also in JPA ܩܢܕܝܠ (*DJPA* 496) and Mandaic *qandila* (*MD* 401), as well as Armenian Կանդիլ (*NDAE* 325; see also Hübschmann 1897: 337, 354; Brockelmann 1893: 9), Arabic *qandil*, *qindil* (*BK* 820; *AFA* 95),²³ Coptic 𐩧𐩢𐩨𐩣𐩪𐩥 (*DDGLC* 1027; see also Förster 2002: 375), Sogdian PL *qndylt* (Sims-Williams 1988: 152; via Syriac), and Classical Ethiopic *qandil* (*CDG* 434; see also Weninger 2000: 144)
- c. Latin *carrarius* (*OLD* 279) > ܠܕܝܐ ‘driver’ (**Pre-4th cent.** *Acts of Thomas*, 238.7, 9, 13; 241.16 [ed. Wright 1871: 2.171-333]; also in 2 Macc 9:4; *LS2* 689; *SL* 1417; very rare)²⁴
- d. Latin *carruca* (*OLD* 279; *LD* 295) > ڪاروۓ, ڪاروۓڇا, ڪاروۓڇون (*LSJ* 879; *GLBRP* 630; *PGL* 703) > ܠܡܕܐ ‘chariot’ (**Pre-4th cent.** Ex 14:6; Josh 11:4, 6, 9; 24:6; 1 Kg 10:25; 20:33; Is 66:20; *LS2* 696; *SL* 1403; see also Brock 1996: 255; 1999-2000: 444; Joosten 1998: 40), also in JPA ܟܪܘܝܢ (*DJPA* 503), as well as Coptic (DDGLC 3228)
- e. Latin *cassis*, accusative singular *cassida*, *cassidem* (*OLD* 282; *LD* 297) > ڪاسسۓ (*GLBRP* 632; *LLGE* 50; *PGL* 704) → accusative singular ڪاسسۓڏا > ܠܡܕܐ ‘helmet; azure of the sky’ (**Pre-4th cent.** Job 38:29; 41:12; *LS2* 679; *SL* 1307; see also *GLLTMT* 556; rare), also in MH ܩܕܝܠ (*Jastrow* 1395) and Coptic 𐩧𐩢𐩨𐩣𐩪𐩥 (*DDGLC* 2879; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 15)
- f. Latin *cella* (*OLD* 295; *LD* 309-310) > ڪٽٽلا (*GLBRP*

²³ For the vowel assimilation **a > i* / _CCi in *qindil*, see Fox 2003: 267 n. 1. Compare the development of the Proto-Semitic nominal patterns **C₁aC₂C₂iC₃* to **C₁iC₂C₂iC₃* (Fox 2003: 267-268) and **C₁aC₂C₃iC₃* to **C₁iC₂C₃iC₃* (Butts 2011: 92-95) in Arabic. A similar assimilation rule is also found in Ugaritic (Huehnergard 1987: 269-270).

²⁴ See Latin *carrum* ‘two-wheeled wagon’ (*OLD* 279; *LD* 295) > ڪارڀون (*LSJ* 880).

- 657; *LLGE* 51; *PGL* 741) [→ *κελλιον* (*GLBRP* 658; *LLGE* 52; *PGL* 741)] > ܟܠܠܝܐ ‘cell’ (**Pre-4th cent.** Num 25:8; *LS2* 668; *SL* 184, 1371-1372; see also Schall 1960: 104-105, 224; Joosten 1998: 40; Brock 1996: 254; common throughout Syriac), also in CPA *qhy*’ (*DCPA* 374; *LSP* 180), LjLA PL ܟܠܝܢ (PsJon Gen 6:14; Jastrow 1327), and JBA ܟܠܝܢܐ (*DJBA* 1013), as well as Arabic *qillyat*- (*BK* 808; *AFa* 275), Sogdian *qhyt*’ (with alternative orthographies) (Sims-Williams 1988: 152; via Syriac; see also Brock 1975: 82), and Coptic *κελλα* (*DDGLC* 1103; see also Förster 2002: 403)
- g. Latin *circus* (*OLD* 326; *LD* 343-344) > ܟܝܪܟܝܘܣ, ܟܝܪܟܝܘܣ (*LSJ* 953; *LLGE* 55; *GLBRP* 665) > ܟܝܪܟܝܘܣ ‘ring’ (**Pre-4th cent.** Ex 26:6, 11, 23, 24, 26, 27; 36:13, 18; 39:33; *LS2* 701; *SL* 1415; see also Brock 1999-2000: 444; 2005: 17; *GLLTMT* 571),²⁵ also in CPA *qwrqws* (*DCPA* 367), JPA ܟܪܟܝܘܣ (*DJPA* 507), SA ܟܪܟܝܘܣ (*DSA* 800), and LjLA ܟܪܟܝܘܣ (TgPs 69:13; Jastrow 1886-1903: 1426), as well as MH ܟܪܟܝܘܣܝܘܬ (Jastrow 1426), Armenian Կրկես (*NDAE* 364; see also Hübschmann 1897: 360), and Classical Ethiopic *kirkos* (with alternative orthographies) (Weninger 2000: 144)
- h. ܟܠܗܝܬܪܝܘܢ (*LSJ* 957) > Latin *clathri*, *clatri* (*OLD* 333; *LD* 350) > Late Latin *cracli* (attested in the *Appendix Probi*; ed. Baehrens 1922: 8 [s.v. ln. 209]) > ܟܠܗܝܬܪܝܘܢ ‘grated cover’ (**Pre-4th cent.** Ex 27:4, 5; 38:4, 30; 39:39; *LS2* 700; *SL* 1416; see also Nöldeke 1904: §84 [p. 58 n. 1]; very rare)²⁶
- i. Latin *collarium*, *collare* (*OLD* 350; *LD* 365) > ܟܠܠܐܪܝܘܢ (*GLBRP* 675; *LLGE* 56; *LSJ* 972) > ܟܠܠܐܪܝܘܢ ‘iron collar’ (**Pre-4th cent.** 1 Chr 20:3; 2 Sam 12:31; *LS2* 671; *SL*

²⁵ This word should be added to Joosten 1998: 46-47.

²⁶ This word should be added to Joosten 1998: 46-47. Sokoloff (*SL* 550), building upon Brockelmann (*LS2* 288), sees Late Latin *cracli* as the source of ܟܠܗܝܬܪܝܘܢ ‘gridiron’ via dissimilation. Alternatively, however, Joosten (1998: 39-40) has suggested that ܟܠܗܝܬܪܝܘܢ derives from Latin *craticula* (*OLD* 499; *LD* 478), though he points out the lack of a possible Greek intermediary for this derivation.

- 1330; see also *GLLTMT* 508), also in TgJon קולר (Ezek 19:9; Jastrow 1330) and JPA קולר (*DJPA* 479), as well as MH קולר (Jastrow 1329) and Coptic (*DDGLC* 4941)
- j. Latin *colonia* (*OLD* 355; *LD* 370) > κολωνία, κολωνεία (*GLBRP* 676-677; *LLGE* 56; *PGL* 766; *LSJ* 974; see also Mason 1974: 5, 6, 62, 109) > ܡܠܬܐ, ܡܠܬܐ ‘colony’ (**Pre-4th cent.** P.Dura 28.4; P.Euphrates 20.4 [ed. Drijvers and Healey 1999: 232-248]; *LS2* 669; *SL* 1329; see also Schall 1960: 40, 42; *GLLTMT* 546-547), also in Palmyrene *qlny*’ (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 406; see also Brock 2005: 18) and JBA קְלִנְיָא (*DJBA* 1021)
- k. Latin *denarius* (*OLD* 514; *LD* 545) > δηνάριον (*GLBRP* 356; *LLGE* 40; *LSJ* 388) > ܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘gold *denarius*’ (**Pre-4th cent.** P.Dura 28.ii (abbreviation), 9; P.Euphrates 19.ix, 16, 17, 18, 22 [ed. Drijvers and Healey 1999: 232-248]; P.Euphrates 7.29; 10.22 [ed. Feissel, Gascou, and Teixidor 1997]; *LS2* 160; *SL* 297; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; 1999-2000: 443; Schall 1960: 41, 98), also in Palmyrene *dnr*’, *dynr* (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 356; see also Brock 2005: 14), Judean Aramaic *dynr* (*DNWSI* 256), Hatran Aramaic *dnr* (*DNWSI* 256; Contini and Pagano 2015: 133), TgJon PL דִּנְרִין (2 Kg 5:5), JPA דִּנְרָא (*DJPA* 147), JBA דִּנְרָא (*DJBA* 334), Mandaic *dinara* (*MD* 108), CPA *dynr* (*DCPA* 86; *LSP* 45), LJLA דִּנְרָא (TgPsJon Ex 30:13; Jastrow 1886-1903: 302), as well as Arabic *dinār*- (*BK* 737; Lane 919; *AFA* 191-192; *FVQ* 133-134), Punic *dn’ry*’ (*DNWSI* 256), Armenian դիւար (*NDAE* 139; see also Hübschmann 1897: 346; Brockelmann 1893: 11), Coptic (*DDGLC* 2679), Pahlavi *dēnār* (*CPD* 26), Bactrian δ(δ)ιναρο (Sims-Williams 2013: 228), Classical Ethiopic *dinar* (*CDG* 138; see also Weninger 2000: 145), etc.
- l. Latin *legio* (*OLD* 1013-1014; *LD* 1047) > λεγιών, ληγιών, λεγεών, λεγιώνη (*LSJ* 1033; *LSJ Suppl.* 194; *GLBRP* 707; *LLGE* 65; *PGL* 794; see also Mason 1974: 5, 6, 7, 8, 65, 138, 163-165) > ܠܓܝܘܢ ‘legion’ (**Pre-4th cent.** Num 24:24; *LS2* 358; *SL* 673; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; 1999-2000: 443; Schall 1960: 97; Joosten 1998:

- 40), also in Palmyrene *lgywn* (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 376; see also Brock 2005: 18), TgJon PL לגיונין (Ez 30:9), CPA *l(y)gywn* (DCPA 199, LSP 101), JPA ליגיון (DJPA 281), LJLA לגיונא (TgJob 15:24; Jastrow 1886-1903: 692), as well as MH לגיון (Jastrow 692), Armenian լեզնոն (NDAE 255; see also Hübschmann 1897: 337, 352; Brockelmann 1893: 13), Classical Ethiopic *legenon* (with alternative orthographies) (CDG 308; see also Weninger 2000: 142), and Coptic λεγεων (DDGLC 2740; see also Lefort 1950: 158)
- m. Latin *piscina* (OLD 1383; LD 1380) > φισκίνα (PGL 1485; du Cange 1688: 2.1679), πισκίνη (GLBRP 891; PGL 1082) > ܦܝܣܩܝܢ ‘pool’ (Pre-4th cent. Neh 3:15, 16; LS2 585; SL 1215; see also GLLTMT 450), also in CPA *psqyn* (DCPA 336; LSP 160), as well as MH פיסקין (Jastrow 1168) and Coptic (DDGLC 5265)
- n. Latin *ponto*, *pontonium* (OLD 1403; LD 1397) > ܦܘܢܬܐ ‘ferry boat’ (Pre-4th cent. *Acts of Thomas*, 174.8; 185.11 [ed. Wright 1871: 2.171-333]; LS2 579; SL 1204; very rare)
- o. Latin *sextarius* (OLD 1751; LD 1688) > ξέστης (LSJ 1189-1190; GLBRP 790; LLGE 76-77) > ܦܫܬܐ ‘vase, urn; measure’ (Pre-4th cent. Ex 16:33; Judg 6:19; LS2 679; SL 1387; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; GLLTMT 535; Joosten 1998: 40), also in Palmyrene *qstwn* (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 406; see also Brock 2005: 19), JPA קסיט (DJPA 498), CPA *qyṣṭ* (DCPA 372; LSP 181; Baillet 1963: 383-384), JBA קיסטא, קיסטא (DJBA 1014), LJLA קסטא (TgPsJon Ex 30.24), as well as Armenian քստստ (NDAE 753; see also Hübschmann 1897: 389; Brockelmann 1893: 22, 35), Coptic κσεστης (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 1495; see also Lefort 1950: 186; Behlmer 1997-1998: 20; Förster 2002: 555-556), and Arabic *qisṭ*- ‘a measure; a measure for corn; a mug’ (Lane 2523; AFA 205)
- p. Latin *strata* (OLD 1826; LD 1758 [s.v. *sterno*]) > στράτα, στράτα (LSJ Suppl. 281; GLBRP 1014; LLGE 108) > ܣܬܪܐ, ܣܬܪܐ ‘street; road’ (Pre-4th

- cent.** *Acts of Thomas*, 239.7 [ed. Wright 1871: 2.171-333]; *LS2* 34; *SL* 71; see also *GLLTMT* 82-83; Schall 1960: 244), also in LJLA אִסְרָטָא (TgPsJon Num 20:19; Jastrow 911), JPA אִסְרָטָא (DJPA 52), and SA *srth* (DSA 611), as well as Arabic *ṣirāṭ*- (Lane 1678; *FVQ* 196)
- q. Latin *subsellium* (OLD 1848; LD 1781) > συμψέλλιον, συμψέλια (GLBRP 1060; LLGE 109; LSJ 1690) > ܠܡܨܐܐ, ܠܡܨܐܐ 'bench' (**Pre-4th cent.** 2 Chr 9:11; *Acts of Thomas*, 218.3 [ed. Wright 1871: 2.171-333]; *LS2* 491; *SL* 963, 1032; see also *GLLTMT* 408-409; not common), also in JPA סבסל, ספסל (DJPA 386) and JBA סבסל (DJBA 827), as well as MH ספסל (Jastrow 1015) and Coptic (DDGLC 5439; 5769)
- r. Latin *sudarium* (OLD 1859; LD 1790) > σουδάριον (GLBRP 1001; LLGE 106; LSJ 1621; see also Benveniste 1969: 213-217) > ܠܚܝܐ 'cloth; turban, tiara' (**Pre-4th cent.** Jer 13:1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11; *LS2* 461; *SL* 976; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; *GLLTMT* 373-374), also in JBA סודרא (DJBA 792), CPA *sudr*' (DCPA 282; LSP 133), JPA סודר (DJPA 370), and LJLA סודרא (TgPsJon 21.15), as well as MH סודרין (Jastrow 962) and Coptic ܣܘܕܪܝܐ (DDGLC 2584; see also Lefort 1950: 276; Behlmer 1997-1998: 25)
- s. Latin *tabellarius* (OLD 1897-1898; LD 1831) > ταβελλάριος (GLBRP 1067; LLGE 109; LSJ 1752; see also Mason 1974: 4, 6, 90-91) > ܠܚܝܐ 'keeper of records' (**Pre-4th cent.** 2 Sam 15:1; 2 Kg 11:4; Prov 24:34; 2 Chr 30:6, 10; *LS2* 266; *SL* 510-511; see also Brock 1992: 229 n. 4; 1999-2000: 444),²⁷ possibly also in LJLA סבֿלֿרֿא (TgProv 24.34)
- t. Latin *trulla* (OLD 1981; LD 1905) > τροῦλ(λ)α (GLBRP 1097; LLGE 113; LSJ 1827) > ܠܚܝܐ 'iron spoon or pan' (**Pre-4th cent.** Num 4:7; *LS2* 289; *SL* 549; see also Joosten 1998: 40; very rare)

A number of the Latin words that are attested in the earliest phase of Syriac literature continue to be common throughout the

²⁷ See also ܠܚܝܐ 'keeper of records' (5n) below.

later history of Syriac, such as ܥܠܝܬܐ ‘cell’ (1f) and ܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘gold *denarius*’ (1k). Several of the words in (1) are, however, very rare in Syriac, including ܕܪܝܬܐ ‘driver’ (1c), ܡܝܬܐ ‘grated cover’ (1h), ܦܠܝܬܐ ‘ferry boat’ (1n), and ܦܝܬܐ ‘iron spoon or pan’ (1t). Some, if not all, of these words are likely to be closer to Fremdwörter than they are to Lehnwörter.²⁸ That is, some of them may have remained foreign words in Syriac and were not integrated as loanwords.

In almost every case in (1), a possible Greek intermediary is attested between Latin and Syriac. The only exceptions to this are: ܕܪܝܬܐ ‘driver’ (1c), ܡܝܬܐ ‘grated cover’ (1h), and ܦܠܝܬܐ ‘ferry boat’ (1n). It is interesting to note that each of these is, as just mentioned, very rare in Syriac. It is possible that the Greek intermediary is simply unattested with these words or alternatively that the Latin words reached Syriac without a Greek intermediary, possibly as learned Fremdwörter. In cases in which a possible Greek intermediary is attested, the Greek is often also found in the documentary record from Egypt and/or in later Byzantine Greek (this is shown by the numerous references to *LLGE* and *GLBRP* in (1)). This suggests that these Latin words were used throughout the Koinē Greek of the Eastern Roman Empire.

Several of the Latin words found in the earliest layer of Syriac literature are also found in other dialects of Aramaic. In some cases, these words may have been transferred into Aramaic at an earlier period and then inherited in Syriac. This is especially the case for words that are attested already in the earliest period of Syriac as well as in an Aramaic dialect prior to the second century CE (Middle Aramaic or earlier).²⁹ Words in (1) that fit this criterion include:³⁰ ܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘gold *denarius*’ (1k), ܠܝܝܝܐ ‘legion’ (1l), ܦܝܬܐ ‘iron collar’ (1i), and ܡܝܬܐ ‘vase, urn; measure’ (1o). It is likely that these words were transferred into Aramaic at an earlier period

²⁸ For this distinction, see, e.g., Brock 1975: 81; 1996: 261 n. 35; Butts 2016: §4.5; Ciancaglini 2008: 5, 23–25; Haspelmath 2009: 43; Joosten 1998: 42–43; Mankowski 2000: 8; Schall 1960: 9.

²⁹ For this criterion, see Butts 2016: §4.9.

³⁰ For a full listing of Greek words that were likely inherited in Syriac, see Butts 2016: Appendix 1.

and then inherited in Syriac. In addition, some of the words in (1) are not only attested in Aramaic dialects, but also in non-Aramaic languages from Late Antiquity, such as Mishnaic Hebrew, Armenian, and Coptic. Consider, for instance, Latin *denarius* (1j), which is found in various dialects of Aramaic, including Palmyrene Aramaic, Judean Aramaic, Ḥatran Aramaic, Targum Jonathan, Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Christian Palestinian Aramaic, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, Mandaic, Syriac, and Late Jewish Literary Aramaic, as well as in non-Aramaic languages, such as Coptic, Arabic, Punic, Armenian, Pahlavi, and Classical Ethiopic. This wide distribution illustrates the prominence of this word across the Roman Near East.

The words in (1) fall into a number of well-defined semantic groups. The largest semantic group is that of tools and utensils: ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘lamp, torch’ (1b), ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘iron spoon or pan’ (1t), ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘bench’ (1q), ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘pot’ (1a), ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘cell, tent’ (1f), and ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘vase, urn; measure’ (1o). The word ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘vase, urn; measure’ (1o) also falls into a category of coins, weights, and measures, along with ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘gold *denarius*’ (1k). Several words in (1) belong to a semantic group related to architecture and the house: ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘pool’ (1m), ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘ring’ (1g), and ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘grated cover’ (1h). A semantic group of clothing is found with ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘cloth; turban, tiara’ (1r) and ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘helmet; azure of the sky’ (1e). Another semantic group concerns transportation: ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘street; road’ (1p), ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘ferry boat’ (1n), ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘chariot’ (1d), and ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘driver’ (1c). Perhaps surprisingly and especially in comparison to later periods, the number of words related directly to Roman officials or personnel is small, being restricted to ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘keeper of records’ (1s). There are, however, a couple of words related to the army, including instruments of torture: ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘legion’ (1l) and ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘iron collar’ (1i). There is one term that is clearly related to Roman administration: ܠܡܥܠܐ ‘colony’ in (1j).

LATIN WORDS FIRST APPEARING IN THE SYRIAC NEW TESTAMENT

While this study is primarily concerned with Latin words that occur in Syriac texts not translated from Greek, it is necessary to look

briefly at Latin words that occur in the New Testament, since many of these also appear in later Syriac compositions. The following Latin words are first attested in Syriac in the New Testament:³¹

- (2) a. Latin *assarium* (OLD 186) > ἄσσάριον (GLBRP 264; LLGE 31; LSJ 260) > ܐܣܪܝܐ ‘*assarius*, small copper coin’ (NT Mt 10:29 [SP]; Lk 12:6 [SP]; LS2 38; SL 80; see also Brock 1967: 394; 2005: 12-13), also in Palmyrene ܐܪ (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 341; see also Brock 2005: 12-13), Ḥatra ܐ (Contini and Pagano 2015: 129); CPA ܐܪ (DCPA 24; LSP 16), and JBA ܐܪܝܐ (DJBA 123), as well as Armenian ասարիոն (Hübschmann 1897: 341; Brockelmann 1893: 34), Coptic (DDGLC 2653), and Classical Ethiopic ʾasorayon (with alternative orthographies) (CDG 44; see also Weninger 2000: 145)
- b. Latin *caesar* (OLD 254; LD 265) > καῖσαρ (GLBRP 616-617; LSJ 860; see also Mason 1974: 58) > ܥܣܪܐ ‘*Caesar*, emperor’ (NT Mt 22:17 [SCP], 21 [SCP]; Mk 12:14 [SCP], 16 [SCP], 17 [SCP]; Lk 2:1 [SCP]; 3:1 [SCP]; 20:22 [SCP]; Jn 19:12 [P], 15 [P]; Acts 11:28; 17:7; 18:2; 25:8; Phil 4:22; LS2 680; SL 1388; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; 1999-2000: 443; Schall 1960: 40, 83), also in Judean Aramaic qysr (DJA 77-78), Palmyrene qysr (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 406; see also Brock 2005: 17), Nabataean Aramaic qysr (DNW5I 1018-1019; Healey 1995: 81), JPA קיסר (DJPA 491), JBA קיסר (DJBA 1014-1015), CPA qysr (DCPA 372; LSP 179), as well as Armenian կայսր (NDAE 524; see also Hübschmann 1897: 337, 354; Brockelmann 1893: 13-14), Coptic (DDGLC 2969), Arabic qayṣar (BK 846), Sogdian qysr (Sims-Williams 1988: 145), Bactrian κησαρο (Sims-Williams 2013: 228), etc.

³¹ The Syriac Gospels are cited according to Kiraz 1996, with the siglum C referring to the Curetonianus ms., S to the Sinaiticus ms., and P to the Peshitta. Other texts of the New Testament are cited according to the British and Foreign Bible Society's edition (1905-1920). For Latin words in the Syriac New Testament, see already Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; 1999-2000: 443-444.

- c. Latin *centurio* (OLD 300; LD 316) > κεντυρίων, κεντορίων, κεντουρίων (LSJ 939; GLBRP 659; LLGE 53; PGL 744; see also Mason 1974: 5, 60, 163) > ܟܢܬܘܪܝܐ, ܟܢܬܘܪܝܐ ‘centurion’ (NT Mt 8:5 [CP], 13 [CP]; 27:54 [SP]; Mk 15:39 [SP], 44 [SP]; Lk 7:2 [SP], 6 [SP]; 23:47 [SCP]; LS2 677; SL 1382-1383; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; 1999-2000: 443; GLLTMT 529; Schall 1960: 97), also in Nabatean Aramaic *qntryn* (DNWSI 1015; Healey 1993: 209, 264; 1995: 77), Palmyrene *qtrywn* (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 405-406; see also Brock 2005: 17), and CPA *qntrywn* (DCPA 377; LSP 181), as well as MH קנטרין (Jastrow 1353), Coptic ΚΕΝΤΗΡΙΟΝ (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 1106; see also Lefort 1950: 135-136; Förster 2002: 405), and Classical Ethiopic *qanṭorābi* (CDG 436; see also Weninger 2000: 142)
- d. Latin *custodia* (OLD 478; LD 504-505) > κουστωδία, κοστωδία (LSJ 987; LSJ Suppl. 184; GLBRP 687; LLGE 63) > ܟܘܣܬܘܕܝܐ ‘guard’ (NT Mt 27:65 [S], 66 [S]; LS2 679; SL 1387; very rare; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46),³² also in CPA *qstndy* (DCPA 378; LSP 182), as well as Coptic ΚΟΥΣΤΩΔΙΑ (DDGLC 2985; see also Lefort 1950: 148)
- e. Latin *fascia* (OLD 677; LD 726) > φασκία (GLBRP 1136; LLGE 114) > ܠܚܬܡܬܐ ‘bandage used to wrap a corpse’ (NT John 11:44 [SP]; LS2 585; SL 1215), also in TgJon פסיקיא (Is 3:24; Jastrow 1196), CPA *psqy* (DCPA 336; LSP 160), and JPA פסיקיא (DJPA 432), as well as MH פסיקיא (Jastrow 1196), Coptic ΦΑΣΓΙΑ (DDGLC 2839; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 28), and perhaps Arabic *fāsqiyat*- ‘a certain way of tying a turban’ (BK 594; Lane 2453)
- f. Latin *flagellum* (OLD 708; LD 755) > Late Latin *fragellum* (attested in the *Appendix Probi*; ed. Baehrens 1922: 6 [s.v. ln. 77]) > φραγέλλιον (GLBRP 1147; LSJ 1952) >

³² Fränkel (AFA 282) connects this with Arabic *qustās*- (apparently a *hapax legomenon*).

- ܦܠܝܬܝܢܝܢ ‘whip’ (NT Mt 27:26 [SP]; Jn 2:15 [P]; *LS2* 592; *SL* 1227; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; *GLLTMT* 477-478; *DGLLT* 153-154),³³ also in CPA *pryl* (*DCPA* 339; *LSP* 161), as well as MH ܦܪܓܠ (Jastrow 1214) and Coptic (DDGLC 2632)
- g. Latin *libertinus* (OLD 1025; LD 1059) > λιβερτῖνος (*LSJ* 1047; *GLBRP* 714) → PL λιβερτῖνοι > PL ܠܒܬܝܢܝܢ ‘freedmen’ (NT Acts 6:9; *LS2* 357; *SL* 688; see also Schall 1960: 194; not common), also in Coptic ܠܝܒܝܪܬܝܢܝܢ (DDGLC 4703; see also Lefort 1950: 159)
- h. Latin *lorarius* (OLD 1043; LD 1078) > ܠܠܝܢ ‘harness or saddle maker’ (NT Acts 18:3; *LS2* 361; *SL* 679; very rare)
- i. Latin *macellum* (OLD 1057; LD 1091-1092) > μάκελλον (*GLBRP* 728; *LLGE* 70; *LSJ* 1074) > ܡܥܠܐ ‘meat-market’ (NT 1 Cor 10:25; *LS2* 400; *SL* 821; see also *GLLTMT* 349), also in JPA ܡܩܝܠܝܢ (*DJPA* 326), as well as MH ܡܩܠܝܢ (Jastrow 829), Armenian մաղէղն (NDAE 447; see also Hübschmann 1897: 363; Brockelmann 1893: 23), and Coptic ܡܐܕܝܠܠܝܢ (DDGLC 5029; see also Lefort 1950: 169)
- j. Latin *mille* (OLD 1109; LD 1144)³⁴ > μίλιον, μείλιον (*GLBRP* 760; *LSJ* 1134) > ܡܠܐ ‘one-thousand paces; mile-stone’ (NT Mt 5:41 [SCP]; Jn 11:18 [S]; *LS2* 383; *SL* 752; very common; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; 1999-2000: 443; *GLLTMT* 335; Schall 1960: 100), also in Palmyrene *m(y)l* (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 380; see also Brock 2005: 18), JBA ܡܝܠܐ (*DJBA* 667), CPA *myl* (*DCPA* 220; *LSP* 109), JPA ܡܝܠ (*DJPA* 304-305), LJLA PL ܡܝܠܝܢ (TgPsJon Ex 12:37), as well as MH ܡܝܠ (Jastrow 773), Armenian մղն (NDAE 480; see also Hübschmann 1897: 365; Brockelmann 1893: 11-12), and Coptic

³³ Fränkel (*AFA* 282) connects this with Arabic *farjawn-*, *firjawn-* ‘comb’ (*BK* 563; 2361).

³⁴ Perhaps the source is *miliun*, a back-formation from the plural *milia*.

- (DDGLC 2752)³⁵
- k. Latin *modium* (OLD 1123; LD 1155) > μόδιος (GLBRP 763; LLGE 73; LSJ 1140) > מִדְיָה 'corn measure, peck; container' (NT Matt 5:15 [C]; LS2 375; SL 721-722; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; 36, 58, 63; Schall 1960: 36, 58, 63), also in Palmyrene *md'* (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 378; see also Brock 2005: 18-19), CPA *mwdy'* (DCPA 211; LSP 107), JBA מִדְיָה (DJBA 645), JPA מודיי (DJPA 294), as well as Armenian մոդի (NDAE 482; see also Hübschmann 1897: 366) and Coptic मोδιον (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 1432; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 19; Förster 2002: 527)
 - l. Latin *praetorium* (OLD 1448; LD 1436) > πραιτώριον (LSJ 1458; LSJ Suppl. 257; GLBRP 915; LLGE 93; PGL 1126-1127; see also Mason 1974: 5, 78) > پرايتوريوم 'governor's residence' (NT Mt 27:27 [SCP]; Mk 15:16 [SCP]; Jn 18:28 [SCP], 33 [SCP]; 19:9 [SCP]; Acts 23:35; Phil 1:13; LS2 574, 596; SL 1199, 1237; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; GLLTMT 455-456), also in CPA *phytwryn* (DCPA 332; LSp 158), JPA פֿלַטוֹרִין (DJPA 435), and LJLA פלַטוֹרִין (TgLam 4.1), as well as MH פלַטוֹרִין (Jastrow 1180), Armenian պրայտորիոն (NDAE 619; see also Hübschmann 1897: 375; Brockelmann 1893: 31), and Coptic پرايتوريون (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 1812; see also Lefort 1950: 252-253; Behlmer 1997-1998: 24; Förster 2002: 668)
 - m. Latin *quaestionarius* (OLD 1535; LD 1502) > καταστροφιστάρσιος (GLBRP 694; LLGE 63)³⁶ > مصلون 'torturer' (NT Mt 27:65 [P], 66 [P]; 28:11 [P], 12 [P] [these may be corruptions of مصلون (Brock 1967: 405)]; also in Aphrahat, *Demonstrations*, 1.705.24 [ed. Parisot 1894-1907]; LS2 679; SL 1387; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; DGLLT 173-175; GLLTMT 514; Schall 1960: 96), also in MH קוֹסְטִינֵר (Jastrow 1336) and Coptic (DDGLC

³⁵ For possible Arabic reflexes, see AFA 282-283.

³⁶ Brockelmann (LS2 679), followed by Sokoloff (SL 1387), gives the Greek intermediary as καταστροφιστάρσιος, which is not, however, found in the Greek lexica.

n. Latin *speculator* (OLD 1802; LD 1739) > σπεκουλάτωρ (GLBRP 1003; LLGE 106; LSJ 1626; see also Mason 1974: 4, 85) > ⲥⲓⲫⲓⲃⲟⲥⲱⲥ, ⲥⲓⲫⲓⲃⲟⲥ ‘executioner’ (NT Mk 6:27 [SP]; LS2 36; SL 75; see also Brock 1967: 424 n. 46; DGLLT 133-135; GLLTMT 92-93, 409), see also LJLA אַספּקלשטראַ (TgEsth2 5:2; Jastrow 1886-1903: 56), JPA אַספּקלשטראַ (DJPA 68), CPA ⲉⲣⲱⲩⲧⲏⲣ (DCPA 23; LSP 15), as well as MH אַספּקלשטראַ (Jastrow 1017) and Coptic ⲥⲡⲉⲕⲟⲩⲗⲁⲩⲱⲣ (DDGLC 3056; see also Lefort 1950: 278)

o. Latin *talaria* (PL) (OLD 1901; LD 1835) > ταλάριον (LLGE 110) > PL ⲥⲓⲕⲓⲗⲏ ‘sandals’ (NT Mk. 6:9 [P]; Acts 12.8; LS2 278; SL 535), also in TgJon טלרי (1 Kg 2.5; Jastrow 1886-1903: 538), as well as Armenian տառաղիւն (NDAE 692; see also Hübschmann 1897: 383; Brockelmann 1893: 32)

p. Latin *uncinus* (OLD 2090; LD 1929) > ὄγκινος (GLBRP 793; LSJ 1196) > ⲥⲱⲙⲁⲕ ‘hook; anchor; sailors’ sounding line’ (NT Acts 27:28, 29, 40; Heb 6:19; but not common until the fifth century; LS2 9; SL 20; see also Brock 1999-2000: 444 with n. 23),³⁷ also in Coptic ⲟⲩⲣⲓⲛⲟⲥ (DDGLC 1509; Förster 2002: 561)

³⁷ Two corrections to the lexica are in order here: 1. Brockelmann (*LSJ* 9), followed by Sokoloff (*JL* 20), analyzes 𐤊𐤍𐤏𐤓 in 124.22 of the *Julian Romance* as ὠκεανός ‘ocean’; this, however, does not fit the context: 𐤌𐤕𐤔𐤁 𐤉𐤃 𐤓𐤀𐤕 𐤊𐤍𐤏𐤓 𐤎𐤒𐤏 𐤎𐤒𐤏𐤓 𐤇𐤓 𐤆𐤓 𐤈 𐤕𐤓 𐤏𐤗𐤏𐤕𐤁𐤏𐤕 𐤕𐤏 𐤋𐤏 𐤕𐤓𐤏𐤕 𐤌𐤏 𐤏𐤕𐤏𐤕𐤏 𐤕𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤏𐤕 𐤓𐤏𐤖𐤓𐤏𐤕𐤓 𐤕𐤏𐤓 ‘For, Lord, your Divinity knows that our town holds the faith that your fathers handed down to it, like **an anchor**, in the soul of its inhabitants, and it will not forget this kingdom of yours’ (*Julian Romance*, 124.22-24; ed. Hoffmann 1880). Already Gollancz (1928: 134 [correct Sokoloff’s reference from pg. 136]) interpreted the word as ‘anchor’. Note that Narsai refers to faith as an anchor (𐤊𐤍𐤏𐤓) on several occasions, e.g., 𐤕𐤓𐤏𐤕 𐤕𐤏𐤕𐤓 𐤕𐤏𐤕𐤓𐤏𐤕 𐤊𐤍𐤏𐤓 𐤊𐤍𐤏𐤓 ‘with the anchor of faith, let us moor the ships of our minds’ (ed. Mingana 1905: 1.326.24-327.1; see also Brock 1999-2000: 444 n. 23). 2. Brockelmann (*LSJ* 9), followed by Sokoloff (*JL* 20), relates 𐤊𐤍𐤏𐤓 in the *Life of Rabbula*

To these words that first appear in the New Testament, the following can be added that appear in the New Testament but are first attested in earlier Syriac (see (1)):

- (3) a. ܥܠܝܢܐ ‘gold *denarius*’ (1k) occurs in Mt 18:28 (SCP); 20:2 (SCP), 9 (SCP), 10 (SCP), 13 (SCP); 22:19 (SCP); Mk 6:37 (SP); 12:15 (SP); 14:5 (SP); Lk 7:41 (SCP); 10:35 (SCP); 20:24 (SCP); Jn 6:7 (SCP); 12:5 (SP); *passim*
- b. ܠܓܝܢܐ ‘legion’ (1l) occurs in Mt 26:53 (SP); Mk 5:9 (SP), 15 (P); Lk 8:30 (SCP)
- c. ܥܝܪܐܬܐ ‘cloth; turban, tiara’ (1r) occurs in Jn 11:44 (SP); 20:7 (SP); Acts 19:12
- d. ܥܡܠܐܬܐ, ܥܡܠܐܬܐ ‘colony’ (1j) occurs in Act 16:12
- e. ܡܥܬܐܬܐ ‘vase, urn; measure’ (1o) occurs in Mk 7:4 (SP), 8 (P); Heb 9:4

A number of the Latin words attested in the Syriac New Testament continue to be common throughout the later history of Syriac. Several are, however, very rare in Syriac, including ܥܠܝܢܐ ‘harness or saddle maker’ (2h) and ܡܥܬܐܬܐ ‘meat-market’ (2i). Both of these may well be Fremdwörter. In addition, it should be noted that ܥܠܝܢܐ ‘harness or saddle maker’ (2h) is the only word in (2) for which a possible Greek intermediary is not attested.

Three quarters of the words in (2) occur in another language from the Roman Near East, whether Aramaic or not, and a number of them are in fact attested in multiple languages. This suggests that these Latin words were Wanderwörter spread throughout various languages of the Roman Near East.

The words in (2) fall into well-defined semantic groups. The largest group is that of Roman officials or personnel: ܥܝܪܐܬܐ, ܥܡܠܐܬܐ,

(161.14; ed. Overbeck 1865: 157-248) to Greek ὄγκινος (*LSJ* 1196), which itself derives from Latin *uncinus* (*OLD* 2090; *LD* 1929). Bowersock (2000: 260), however, has shown that the Syriac is better understood as Greek ὠκεανός ‘ocean’ (*LSJ* 2031) based on the well-attested use of ὠκεανέ as an acclamation (see Peterson 1929; Robert and Robert 1958: 207 [s.v. 105], both with additional references). Doran seems to have misunderstood Bowersock when he states, “Literally, the Syriac reads ‘hooks’, ‘anchors’, but Bowersock has pointed out that the Greek behind the Syriac was a well-known acclamation” (2006: 67 n. 6).

ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘executioner’ (2n), PL ܠܬܩܠܝܬܐ ‘freedmen’ (2g), ܡܢܬܝܢܐ, ܡܢܬܝܢܐ ‘centurion’ (2c), ܡܫܬܠܡܐ ‘guard’ (2d), ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘torturer’ (2m), and ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘Caesar, emperor’ (2b). Related to this category is also ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘governor’s residence’ (2l). In addition, another word is related to torture: ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘whip’ (2f). All of these are clearly associated with Roman administration. Another semantic group is that of tools and utensils: ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘hook; anchor; sailors’ sounding line’ (2p), ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘corn measure, peck; container’ (2k), and ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘bandage used to wrap a corpse’ (2e). The word ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘corn measure, peck; container’ (2k) also falls into a semantic group of coins, weights, and measures, along with ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘*assarius*, small copper coin’ (2a) and ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘one-thousand paces; mile-stone’ (2j). Two words are related to commerce: ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘harness or saddle maker’ (2h) and ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘meat-market’ (2i). Finally, one term is related to clothing: PL ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘sandals’ (2o). In contrast to the words in (1), most of the words in (2), if not all of them, are connected with Roman culture in one way or another, whether through administration and rule or everyday items.

LATIN WORDS FIRST APPEARING IN FOURTH-CENTURY SYRIAC

A small number of Latin words first appear in Syriac in the fourth century³⁸:

- (4) a. Latin *caesarianus* (OLD 254; LD 265) > ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ (GLBRP 617; LSJ 860; see also Mason 1974: 6, 58) > ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘of the caesars’ (4th cent. Aphrahat, *Demonstrations*, 1.220.15, 17 [ed. Parisot 1894-1907]; LS2 680; SL 1388; see also Schall 1960: 83-84, 95; very rare)
- b. Latin *indulgentia* (OLD 888; LD 928) > ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ

³⁸ Several of the words in (4) are first attested in the *Book of Steps*, which has traditionally been dated to the fourth century. It should be noted, however, that in a recent paper Smith (2014) has argued that this text more likely stems from the fifth century. If this is in fact the case, then ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘palace’ (4e), ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘axe’ (4g), and ܩܥܡܠܝܬܐ ‘hymns’ (4h) should be moved to the list in (5).

- (GLBRP 601) > ܡܠܝܚܝܬܐ (corrupt) ‘amnesty’ (4th cent. Aphrahat, *Demonstrations*, 1.589.6 [ed. Parisot 1894-1907]; LS2 155; SL 295; only here)³⁹
- c. Latin *moneta* (OLD 1130; LD 1161) > μονήτα, μονήτα (GLBRP 766; LLGE 73; PGL 880; see also Mason 1974: 68) > ܡܢܝܬܐ, ܡܢܝܬܐ ‘coin; money; coin die’ (4th cent. Ephrem, *Madraše against Heresies*, 81.3; 166.24 [ed. Beck 1957]; not uncommon in Syriac; LS2 395; SL 781; see also Brock 1999-2000: 443-444; GLLTMT 326-327), also in JPA מוניט (DJPA 295)
- d. Latin *orbita* (OLD 1264; LD 1276) > ܐܘܪܝܬܐ ‘orbit (?)’ (4th cent. Ephrem, *Prose Refutations*, Discourse 2-5, 138.38; 139.2 [ed. Mitchell 1912-1921]; LS2 45; SL 20; only here)
- e. Latin *palatium* (OLD 1284; LD 1291) > παλάτιον (GLBRP 832; LLGE 85; LSJ 1291; see also Mason 1974: 74) > ܡܠܝܬܐ ‘palace’ (4th cent. *Book of Steps*, 293.16; 525.7 [ed. Kmosko 1926]; LS2 574; SL 1199; see also GLLTMT 457-458), also in JPA פֿלֶטִין (DJPA 435) and CPA ܦܠܬܝܢ (DCPA 332), as well as MH פלטין (Jastrow 1180), Armenian պալատ(ւ), պալատ(ւ) (NDAE 590; see also Hübschmann 1897: 337, 370; Brockelmann 1893: 14), Coptic (DDGLC 2556), and (possibly) Arabic *balāt*- ‘palace’ but more commonly ‘pavement’ (BK 160) and less likely *balad*- ‘country, region’ (BK 158-159; Lane 247),⁴⁰ see also Hatra PL ܦܠܬܝܢ ‘palace servants’ (Contini and Pagano 2015: 137)
- f. Latin *patronus* (OLD 1311; LD 1316-1317) > πάτρων (GLBRP 866; LLGE 88; LSJ 1349; see also Mason 1974: 5-7, 12, 152) > ܡܠܝܬܐ ‘patron’ (4th cent. *Book of Steps*, 389.11; 392.18 [ed. Kmosko 1926]; Ephrem, *Commentary on Diatessaron*, 64.21 [ed. Leloir 1990]; LS2 565; SL 1183), also in JPA פֿאַטֿרױן (DJPA 429), as well as Coptic ܡܬܪܘܢ (DDGLC 1698; see also Förster 2002: 631)
- g. Latin *securis* (OLD 1722; LD 1655-1656) > σεκούριον,

³⁹ Note, however, ܡܠܝܬܐ* ‘indulgence’ in (6w) below.

⁴⁰ For discussion of these two Arabic words, see AFA 28; FVQ 83-

- σικαούριον, τζικαούριον (*LSJ* 1589; *GLBRP* 988, 1080) > ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘axe’ (4th cent. *Book of Steps*, 773.11 [ed. Kmosko 1926]; *LS2* 496; *SL* 1007; see also *GLLTMT* 391; rare), also in JPA סיקור (*DJPA* 376) and LJLA סיקורא (TgPsJon Deut 19:5; Jastrow 1886-1903: 986), as well as Arabic *ṣāqūr*- (*BK* 1352; Lane 1706; *AFa* 84-85) and Armenian սսկուր (*NDAE* 629; see also Hübschmann 1897: 316)
- h. Latin *statio* ‘lit. standing’ (*OLD* 1814; *LD* 1751) > ܣܬܐܬܝܘܢ, ܣܬܐܬܝܘܢ (*GLBRP* 1006; *PGL* 1251; *LSJ* 1634; *LLGE* 107) > ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘hymns’ (4th cent. *Book of Steps*, 181.10; 185.7, 16, 18; 309.6; 312.17, 18; 748.27; 924.5; 932.2 [ed. Kmosko 1926]; *LS2* 32; *SL* 69; see also Schall 1960: 244; rare), calqued on ܣܬܐܬܝܘܢ (*PGL* 1251; *LSJ* 1634)

Among these words, only ܠܚܝܥܐ, ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘coin; money; coin die’ (4c) is very common, though ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘patron’ (4f) and ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘palace’ (4e) each occur a number of times throughout later Syriac literature. Both ܠܚܝܥܐ, ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘coin; money; coin die’ (4c) and ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘palace’ (4e) are also attested in other languages of the Roman Near East. The remainder of the words in (4) are very rare, and a couple of them are probably *hapax legomena*, e.g., ܠܚܝܥܐ (corrupt) ‘amnesty’ (4b) and ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘orbit’ (4d). These two words are more likely to be Fremdwörter than Lehnwörter. This may also be the case with ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘of the caesars’ (4a), ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘axe’ (4g), and ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘hymns’ (4h), which are only attested rarely in later Syriac literature. Out of all of these rare words, only ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘axe’ (4g) is attested in another language of the Roman Near East.

For most of the words in (4), a possible Greek intermediary is attested. This is not, however, the case for ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘orbit’ (4d). Again, it should be noted that this word is rare in Syriac and may well be a Fremdwort rather than a Lehnwort. This word is, thus, similar to the words discussed in (1) for which a possible Greek intermediary is not (yet) attested.

The words in (4) fall into several well-defined semantic groups. The category of Roman officials or personnel is found with ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘patron’ (4f). Related to this category are ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘palace’ (4e) and ܠܚܝܥܐ ‘of the caesars’ (4a). A tool is found in ܠܚܝܥܐ

‘axe’ (4g), and ܐܚܫܐ, ܐܚܫܐ ‘coin; money; coin die’ (4c) falls into the category of coins, weights, and measures. A religious term is found in ܐܡܠܬܐ ‘hymns’ (4h). Finally, the two rare words ܐܡܢܝܬܐ (corrupt) ‘amnesty’ (4b) and ܐܚܝܐ ‘orbit’ (4d) do not fall into as clear of semantic categories as the other Latin words in Syriac.

LATIN WORDS FIRST APPEARING IN FIFTH-CENTURY SYRIAC

The number of Latin words first appearing in fifth-century Syriac is larger than the number first appearing in the fourth century:⁴¹

- (5) a. Latin *birrus* (LD 239)⁴² > βίρρος (GLBRP 309; LSJ 316) → accusative singular βίρρον > ܠܐܝܬܐ, ܠܐܝܬܐ ‘toga, cloak, patriarch’s chlamys’ (5th cent. *Life of Rabbula*, 184.26 [ed. Overbeck 1865: 157-248]; 6th cent. Barḥadbshabba, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 1, 115.10 [ed. Nau 1932]; Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 527.2 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; LS2 69; SL 143, 187),⁴³ also in MH בִּירוֹם (Jastrow 166) and Coptic ܒܝܪܐ (DDGLC 389; see also Förster 2002: 137)
- b. Latin *cervical*, *cervicarium* (OLD 305; LD 322) > ܟܝܪܒܝܩܐܪܝܐܢ (LSJ Suppl. 175; GLBRP 661; LLGE 53-54)

⁴¹ Perhaps also φαινόλης (LSJ 1912; GLBRP 1132) > Latin *paenula* (OLD 1282; LD 1289) > φαίνουλα, παίνουλα, πένουλα, or the like > ܦܢܐ ‘clerical vestment’ (5th cent. *Life of Rabbula*, 184.27 [ed. Overbeck 1865: 157-248]; LS2 566; SL 1188; see also Schall 1960: 214), also in Armenian փիլին (NDAE 728; Hübschmann 1897: 387) and MH פִּינֹם (Jastrow 1165; Krauss 449). The Latin is originally a loanword from the Greek. There are, however, a few Greek forms in the *Edict* of Diocletian (φαίνουλα, παίνουλα, and πένουλα) that seem to have been loaned back into Greek from Latin. See the discussions in Frisk 1954-1972: 981-982; Ernout, Meillet, and André 1985: 474; Beekes 2010: 2.1545; TLL X.1.68.

⁴² It should be noted that this is a loanword in Latin, probably from Celtic (Adams 1977: 77).

⁴³ Fränkel (AFA 51) suggests a connection with Arabic *burnus*- ‘hooded cloak’ (BK 118; Lane 196) via a dissimilation from **burnus*-. For the unlikelihood of such a dissimilation, however, see Butts Forthcoming A.

- > ܡܠܚܡܐ ‘pillow, cushion’ (5th cent. *Life of Rabbula*, 185.2 [ed. Overbeck 1865: 157-248]; 6th cent. Eliya, *Life of Yuḥanon of Tella*, 48.6 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; *LS2* 667; *SL* 1367-1368; see also *GLLTMT* 176; rare), also in *JBA* ܓܠܘܦܩܪܐ (*DJBA* 285) and *LJLA* ܩܠܘܦܩܪܝܐ (TgPsJon Deut 24:13; Jastrow 1886-1903: 247), as well as *MH* ܩܠܘܦܩܪܝܢ (Jastrow 247)
- c. Latin *comitatus* (OLD 360; LD 374) > ܕܝܝܡܝܬܐ (*LSJ Suppl.* 181; *GLBRP* 677; *LLGE* 58) > ܡܫܬܠܡܐ ‘retinue, suite’ (5th cent. Rabbula of Edessa, *Works*, 219.18 [ed. Overbeck 1865: 210-248, 362-381]; *LS2* 672; *SL* 1363; not common; see also Brock 1996: 255), also in *JPA* ܩܘܡܝܬܐ (*DJPA* 482, 844), as well as Coptic ܕܕܓܠܬܐ (*DDGLC* 1172; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 17; Förster 2002: 432)
- d. Latin *dux* (OLD 582; LD 621) > ܕܘܟܝܬܐ (*GLBRP* 395; *LLGE* 41-42; *LSJ* 447; see also Mason 1974: 3, 6, 11, 39) > ܕܘܟܝܬܐ ‘leader’ (5th cent. *Martyrdom of Shmona, Gurya, and Habbib*, 5.16 [ܕܘܟܝܬܐ; ed. Burkitt 1913: 3*-43*]; 6th cent. Eliya, *Life of Yuḥanon of Tella*, 39.23 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 175.20 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 153; *SL* 281),⁴⁴ also in *JPA* ܕܘܟܝܬܐ (*DJPA* 140-141), *JBA* ܕܘܟܝܬܐ (*DJBA* 317-318), and *LJLA* ܕܘܟܝܬܐ (TgEsth1 5.11; Jastrow 1886-1903: 285), as well as Armenian դուխ (NDAE 149; see also Hübschmann 1897: 346; Brockelmann 1893: 36) and Coptic ܕܘܟܝܬܐ (with alternative orthographies) (*DDGLC* 578; see also Förster 2002: 210)
- e. Latin *exceptor* (OLD 634; LD 676) > Greek ἐξέκπτωρ, ἐξέκπτωρ (*GLBRP* 484; *LLGE* 44; *LSJ Suppl.* 121) > ܐܡܢܘܝܬܐ, ܐܡܢܘܝܬܐ ‘amanuensis, scribe’ (5th cent. *Martyrdom of Shmona, Gurya, and Habbib*, 14.20; 41.20 [ed. Burkitt 1913: 3*-43*]; *Acts of Sharbel*, 61.23 [ed. Cureton 1864: *41-*63]; *LS2* 19; *SL* 45; see also Schall 1960: 244; not common), also in *JPA* ܐܡܢܘܝܬܐ (*DJPA* 52-53), as well as Armenian սկսիչ (*NDAE* 643; see also

⁴⁴ See also ܕܘܟܝܬܐ ‘military command’ (6q) below.

- Hübschmann 1897: 379; Brockelmann 1893: 37)
- f. Latin *fabulator* (OLD 665; LD 713) > ܠܚܡܠܝܢ *‘storyteller’* (5th cent. *Acts of Sharbel*, 52.18 [ed. Cureton 1864: *41-63]; LS2 569; SL 1193; only here)
 - g. Latin *falsus* (OLD 673-674; LD 722) > ܦܐܠܣܘܢ (GLBRP 1134; PGL 1470) > ܦܠܣܡ *‘false’* (5th cent. Rabbula of Edessa, *Works*, 220.11 [ed. Overbeck 1865: 157-248]; LS2 575; SL 1202; very rare; see also Brock 1996: 255)
 - h. Latin *famulus* (OLD 676; LD 725) > ܦܐܡܘܠܘܣ (GLBRP 1134) > ܡܚܠܝܢ *‘servant’* (5th cent. Ishaq of Antioch, *Mēmṛē*, 1.286.3 [ed. Bickell 1873-1877]; LS2 577; SL 1204; only here), also in LJLA פִּימְלִיָּא (TgSong 1:15; Jastrow 1185)
 - i. Latin *forma* (OLD 722-723; LD 768) > ܦܕܪܡܐ, ܦܕܪܡܬ (GLBRP 1149; LLGE 115; LSJ *Suppl.* 308) > ܦܕܪܡܐ *‘imperial edict’* (5th cent. Ishaq of Antioch, *Mēmṛē*, 1.440.1 [ed. Bedjan 1903]; LS2 598; SL 1170; rare), also in Coptic (DDGLC 5997)
 - j. Latin *galearius* (LD 800) > ܓܐܠ(ܠ)ܝܪܝܘܣ (LSJ 337; LLGE 38) > ܓܠܝܝܪ *‘galearius, military servant’* (5th cent. Ishaq of Antioch, *Mēmṛē*, 1.234.8 [ed. Bedjan 1903]; *Julian Romance*, 132.6; 158.21 [ed. Hoffmann 1880]; LS2 118; SL 237-238; see also GLLTMT 168; not common), also in JPA גולייך (*DJPA* 123) and LJLA גולייך (TgEsth2 6.12; Jastrow 221-222)
 - k. Latin *mansio* (OLD 1074; LD 1109) > ܡܢܨܝܘܢ *‘journey of ten parasangs’* (5th cent. Balai, *Mēmṛē on Joseph*, 210.8 [ed. Bedjan 1891]; Narsai, *Mēmṛē*, 1.183.7 [ed. Mingana 1905]; Yohānnan Ihidaya, *Letters*, 1.148 [ed. Strothmann 1972]; Ya‘qub of Serugh, *Mēmṛē*, 1.99.10; 1.504.9; 2.341.14; 4.140.21; 5.16.11 [ed. Bedjan 1905-1910]; LS2 396; SL 790; see also Brock 1967: 424; 1996: 255; 1999-2000: 444 with n. 25)
 - l. Latin *orarium* (LD 1274) > ܐܘܪܐܪܝܘܢ (GLBRP 1186; LLGE 117; PGL 1557) > ܐܘܪܐܪ *‘type of garment, stole’* (5th cent. Narsai, *Mēmṛē*, 1.350.19 [ed. Mingana 1905]; LS2 45; SL 23; see also Benveniste 1969; Brock 1999-2000: 444; Schall 1960: 244), also in Sogdian *wrr’* (Sims-

- Williams 1988: 148; via Syriac; see also Brock 1975: 82; 1999-2000: 444 n. 24), Armenian *նրար, արար* (NDAE 530; see also Hübschmann 1897: 369; Petit, Van Rompay, and Weitenberg 2011: 162-163 n. 519), and Coptic (DDGLC 5342)
- m. Latin *sacer*, PL *sacra* (OLD 1674; LD 1610-1611) > *σάκρα* (GLBRP 977; PGL 1221; LSJ 1581; see also LLGE 100) > ܣܐܪܐ ‘imperial letter, imperial archives’ (5th cent. *History of Shemʿon bar Šabbaʿe*, 791.2; 811.14, 24; 814.1, 2, 3, 5; 815.17; 818.8, 11 [ed. Kmosko 1907]; LS2 495-496; SL 1041; see also Brock 1975: 104-106),⁴⁵ also in Armenian PL *սահերք* (NDAE 629; see also Hübschmann 1897: 376; Brockelmann 1893: 26) and Coptic (DDGLC 6193)
- n. Latin *tabularius* (OLD 1899; LD 1832) > *ταβουλάριος* (GLBRP 1067; LLGE 110; PGL 1370) > ܬܒܘܠܐܪܝܘܣ ‘keeper of records’ (5th cent. *Teaching of Addai*, 1.13; 2.8, 16, 25; 3.11; 4.10, 21; 5.5; 31.19; 53.3 [ed. Howard 1981]; LS2 267; SL 509; very rare outside of this text)⁴⁶
- o. Latin *uncia* (OLD 2090; LD 1929) > *οὐγκία* (GLBRP 823; LSJ 1268; LLGE 79)⁴⁷ > ܐܘܢܥܝܐ ‘ounce’ (5th cent. *Life of Rabbula*, 182.10 [ed. Overbeck 1865: 157-248]; 6th cent. *Eliya, Life of Yuhanon of Tella*, 46.23 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; LS2 30; SL 18), also in JPA ܐܘܢܥܝܐ (*DJPA* 40), CPA *mqyʿs* (DCPA 106; Baillet 1963: 384), and JBA ܐܘܢܥܝܐ (*DJBA* 93), as well as Armenian *ունկի* (NDAE 576; see also Hübschmann 1897: 369; Brockelmann 1893: 25), Arabic *ʿuqyyat-* (BK 69; AFA 201), and Coptic (DDGLC 1591)
- p. Latin *velum* (OLD 2024; LD 1965-1966) > *βῆλον*,

⁴⁵ This word was not included in the first printing of *SL* but was added in the second printing.

⁴⁶ See also ܬܒܘܠܐܪܝܘܣ ‘keeper of records’ (1s) above.

⁴⁷ It should be noted that the ultimate etymological relationship between the various Greek and Latin forms is not entirely clear. Nevertheless, it is likely that Greek *οὐγκία* in Late Antiquity is a loanword from Latin *uncia*. In general, see still Rosen 1964.

- οὐῆλον (*GLBRP* 307; *PGL* 295; *LSJ Suppl.* 68) > ܐܠܐ, ܐܠܐ ‘veil, curtain’ (5th cent. Narsai, *Memre*, 2.133.1 [ed. Mingana 1905]; *Acts of Sharbel*, 59.13 [ed. Cureton 1864: *41-*63]; 6th cent. Ya‘qub of Serugh, *Memre*, 1.23.8; 1.48.4; 1.106.11; 4.13.6 [ed. Bedjan 1905-1910]; *LS2* 185; *SL* 358; see also Brock 1999-2000: 444; *GLLTMT* 235-236), also in JPA ܐܠܐ (*DJPA* 169), JBA ܐܠܐ (*DJBA* 220), and LJLA ܐܠܐ (TgPsJon Ex 27:9), as well as MH ܐܠܐ (Jastrow 373) and Coptic (*DDGLC* 4757)
- q. Latin *veredarius* (*OLD* 2035; *LD* 1973) > βερεδάριος, βερηδάριος, οὐβερεδάριος (*GLBRP* 306; *LLGE* 34, 79) > ܠܝܬܐ, ܠܝܬܐ ‘letter carrier’ (5th cent. *History of Shem‘on bar Šabba‘e*, 806.4 [ed. Kmosko 1907]; *LS2* 75; *SL* 141; see also *GLLTMT* 155-15), also in JPA ܠܝܬܐ (*DJPA* 104), as well as MH ܠܝܬܐ (Jastrow 171), Coptic (*DDGLC* 4751), and Arabic *barid-* (*BK* 108; Lane 185; see also Ullmann 1997)
- r. Latin *veteranus* (*LD* 1982) > οὐετ(ε)ρανός, βετρανός (*GLBRP* 823; *LSJ* 1269; *LSJ Suppl.* 233) > PL ܠܝܬܐ ‘magnates’ (5th cent. *Letter from Cosmas to Simeon the Stylite*, 4.646.9 [ed. Bedjan 1890-1897: 4.644-648]; *LS2* 8; *SL* 14; see also *GLLTMT* 30-31; only here), also in Palmyrene *wtṛn* (Hillers and Cussini 1996: 361; *DNWSI* 297; see also Brock 2005: 19-20), Targum Jonathan *ʾittarun* (Is 9:13), Ḥatran *wtṛn* (Contini and Pagano 2015: 129)

A few of these words are relatively common in later Syriac, such as ܠܝܬܐ ‘leader’ (5d) and ܠܝܬܐ ‘journey of ten parasangs’ (5k). Most of these words are, however, never too common. Some of them are in fact very rare, such as ܠܝܬܐ ‘false’ (5g) and ܠܝܬܐ ‘keeper of records’ (5n). In fact, several of the words in (5) seem to be *hapax legomena* in Syriac: ܠܝܬܐ ‘storyteller’ (5f), ܠܝܬܐ ‘servant’ (5h), and PL ܠܝܬܐ ‘magnates’ (5r). Thus, in comparison with the words in (1) and especially (2), relatively more of the words in (5) are likely to be closer to Fremdwörter than they are to Lehnwörter.

A number of the words in (5) are found in another dialect of Aramaic or another language from the Roman Near East. This

includes: ܬܘܓܐ, ܬܘܓܐ ‘toga, cloak, patriarch’s chlamys’ (5a), ܡܠܚܡܐ ‘pillow, cushion’ (5b), ܡܫܬܠܦܐ ‘retinue, suite’ (5c), ܡܚܪܐ ‘leader’ (5d), ܐܡܢܘܢܝܐ, ܡܢܐܡܢܝܐ ‘amanuensis, scribe’ (5e), ܕܠܓܠܝܐ ‘galearius, military servant’ (5j), ܚܚܝܐ ‘imperial letter, imperial archives’ (5m), ܐܘܢܥܐ ‘ounce’ (5o), ܪܠܐ, ܪܠܐ ‘veil, curtain’ (5p), ܕܠܬܐ, ܕܠܬܐ ‘letter carrier’ (5q), and PL ܡܢܬܐ ‘magnates’ (5r). The Latin words lying behind these Syriac words thus seem to have been spread across the Roman Near East. Compared with the words in (1) and especially (2), fewer of the words in (5) are attested in another dialect of Aramaic or another language from the Roman Near East. This indicates that Syriac is one of the languages of the Near East that was most affected by its Greco-Roman context.

The only words in (5) for which a likely Greek intermediary is not attested are ܕܠܬܐ ‘storyteller’ (5f) and ܡܚܪܐ ‘journey of ten parasangs’ (5k). As already noted, ܕܠܬܐ ‘storyteller’ (5f) appears to be a *hapax legomenon* in Syriac, and thus it may well be a Fremdwort. In contrast, ܡܚܪܐ ‘journey of ten parasangs’ (5k) is fairly common in Syriac, but no Greek intermediary seems to be attested.⁴⁸

Several of the semantic groups attested with the words in (1), (2), and (4) are also found with the words in (5). The largest semantic group is Roman officials or personnel: ܡܚܪܐ ‘leader’ (5d), ܐܡܢܘܢܝܐ, ܡܢܐܡܢܝܐ ‘amanuensis, scribe’ (5e), ܕܠܓܠܝܐ ‘galearius, military servant’ (5j), ܕܠܬܐ ‘keeper of records’ (5n), ܕܠܬܐ, ܕܠܬܐ ‘letter carrier’ (5q), and PL ܡܢܬܐ ‘magnates’ (5r). In addition, there are several terms related to this semantic group: ܡܫܬܠܦܐ ‘retinue, suite’ (5c), ܚܚܝܐ ‘imperial edict’ (5i), and ܚܚܝܐ ‘imperial letter, imperial archives’ (5m). All of these are clearly related to Roman administration. There are also two terms that fall into a semantic group of coins, weights, and measures: ܡܚܪܐ ‘journey of ten parasangs’ (5k) and ܐܘܢܥܐ ‘ounce’ (5o), as well as two terms related to clothing: ܬܘܓܐ, ܬܘܓܐ ‘toga, cloak, patriarch’s chlamys’ (5a) and ܕܠܬܐ ‘type of garment, stole’ (5l). A couple of words belong to a semantic group of household items:

⁴⁸ Brock (1967: 424; 1996: 255) already noted that no Greek intermediary is attested for this word.

ܡܠܚܡܐ ‘pillow, cushion’ (5b) and ܡܠܚܐ, ܡܠܚܐ ‘veil, curtain’ (5p). Interestingly, three of the very rare words do not fall into well-attested semantic groups: ܡܠܚܡܐ ‘storyteller’ (5f), ܡܠܚܐ ‘servant’ (5h), and ܡܠܚܐ ‘false’ (5g). This is probably another indication that these are closer to Fremdwörter than Lehnwörter.

LATIN WORDS FIRST APPEARING IN SIXTH-CENTURY SYRIAC

The sixth century saw a large increase in the number of new Latin words in Syriac:

- (6) a. Latin *annona* (OLD 135-136; LD 125-126) > ἄννωνα, ἄννωνη (LSJ 145; LSJ Suppl. 35; GLBRP 172; LLGE 28-29; see also Mason 1974: 5, 6, 22) → accusative plural ἄννωνας > ܡܠܚܡܐ ‘yearly produce’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 339.9 [ed. Brooks 1935]; LS2 29; SL 60; see also GLLTMT 66; rare), also in CPA PL ܡܡܢܝܢ (DCPA 20; LSP 13) and JPA ܡܡܢܝܢ (DJPA 65), as well as Armenian Խննի (Hübschmann 1897: 340) and Coptic ܐܢܢܘܢܐ (DDGLC 164; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 5; Förster 2002: 60)
- b. Latin *balnearius* (OLD 224; LD 220) > ܡܠܚܐ ‘bath attendant’ (6th cent. Barḥadbshabba, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 1, 92.12 [ed. Nau 1932]; LS2 78; SL 162; rare)⁴⁹
- c. Latin *campus* (OLD 263; LD 275) > κάμπος (GLBRP 625; LLGE 49; PGL 700) → accusative singular κάμπον > ܡܠܚܐ ‘plain’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 300.30 [ed. Brooks 1935]; LS2 673; SL 1379; see also GLLTMT 510; rare), also in JPA ܡܡܢܝܢ (DJPA 496)
- d. Latin *cancellarius* (LD 276) > καγκελλάριος (LSJ 848; LSJ Suppl. 162; GLBRP 610; LLGE 48; PGL 681; see also Mason 1974: 4, 58) > ܡܠܚܐ ‘notary’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 543.2; 545.6 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; LS2 679; SL 1386; only

⁴⁹ A possible Greek intermediary does not seem to be attested, but note βαλανεύτρια ‘bath-woman’ (GLBRP 172).

e. Latin *cancellus* (OLD 264; LD 276) > κάγκελ(λ)ος (LSJ 848; LSJ Suppl. 162; GLBRP 610; LLGE 48) > ܡܢܚܠ ‘trellis, grating’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 266.23 [ed. Brooks 1935]; LS2 679; SL 1386; see also DGLLT 192; GLLTMT 533-534; rare), also in JPA קנקל (DJPA 498) and LJLA קנקל (TgPsJon Ex 27:4), as well as MH קנקל (Jastrow 1394), Armenian Կանկեղ (Hübschmann 1897: 354), and Coptic (DDGLC 973; see also 4891 and 6049)

f. Latin *capsa* (OLD 273; LD 288) > κάψα (LSJ 873 [s.v. κάμψα]; GLBRP 656) > ܡܚܫܬܐ ‘basket’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 415.4 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; LS2 685; SL 1395; rare), also in LJLA קופסא ‘box’ (TgPsJon Deut 31:26; Jastrow 1886-1903: 1339), Mandaic *kbašiata* ‘cages, dovecotes’ (MD 202), and JBA קפצא ‘bird cage’ (DJBA 1033), as well as MH קפצא (Jastrow 1403), Coptic καψα (DDGLC 1093; see also Förster 2002: 400), and Arabic *qafaṣ-* ‘bird cage’ (BK 789; Lane 2551; AFA 118-119)

g. Latin *castrum*, PL *castra* (OLD 282; LD 299) > κάστρον (GLBRP 632; LLGE 50-51; PGL 704-705; see also Mason 1974: 5, 59, 138) > ܡܚܫܬܐ, ܡܚܫܬܐ ‘fortified place’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 327.20 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 35.4, 6; 326.11 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; Eliya, *Life of Yuhanon of Tella*, 66.19 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; LS2 680; SL 1387; see also GLLTMT 557), also in CPA *qštrwn* (DCPA 379; LSP 182), JPA קסטרה (DJPA 498), and LJLA קסטרוותהון ‘their fortresses’ (TgPsJon Gen 25.16), as well as MH קסטרה (Jastrow 1396) and Coptic καστρον (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 1047; see also Förster 2002: 383)

h. Latin *castrensis* (OLD 283; LD 298) > καστρήσιος, καστρένσιος (GLBRP 632; LLGE 50; LSJ Suppl. 168; see also Mason 1974: 4, 59) > ܡܚܫܬܐ, ܡܚܫܬܐ ‘palace

- steward' (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 546.2; 547.10, 13; 552.7 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LSJ* 680; *SL* 1388; only here)
- i. Latin *centenarium* (OLD 298; LD 1969: 315) > κεντηνάριον (*LSJ* 939; *GLBRP* 659; *PGL* 744) > ܟܢܬܝܢܐܪܝܘܢ, ܟܢܬܝܢܐܪܝܘܢ, ܟܢܬܝܢܐܪܝܘܢ 'hundredweight' (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 43.7 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 212.11; 430.10, 13; 432.3; 548.12; 550.7 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LSJ* 676; *SL* 1382; see also *GLLTMT* 532-533), also in JPA קינטיר, קינטיר (DJPA 491) and JBA קינטיר (DJBA 1014), as well as Armenian կենդիւնար (NDAE 342; Hübschmann 1897: 356), Coptic ΚΕΝΤΗΝΑΡΙΟΝ (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 1105; see also Förster 2002: 404), and Arabic *qintār*- (Lane 2559; AFA 203)
- j. Latin *chartularius* (LD 326)⁵⁰ > χαρτουλ(λ)άριος (*LSJ* 1980) > ܟܬܘܠܐܪܝܘܢ 'archivist' (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 48.28 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 543.2; 545.9 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LSJ* 344; *SL* 650), also in Armenian քարտուղար (NDAE 748; see also Hübschmann 1897: 388) and Coptic (DDGLC 2358)
- k. Latin *comes* (OLD 359; LD 373-374) > κόμης, κόμης (*GLBRP* 677; *LLGE* 57-58; *PGL* 766-767; *LSJ* 975; see also Mason 1974: 3, 6, 11, 62) > ܟܘܡܐ, ܟܘܡܐ, ܟܘܡܐ 'governor' (6th cent. Eliya, *Life of Yuḥanon of Tella*, 66.14; 68.13; 69.6, 8; 87.22; 90.21; 93.5 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 67.6 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 459.2 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LSJ* 673; *SL* 1334; see also Nöldeke 1873: 500-501 n. 5; *GLLTMT* 509), also in Judean Aramaic *qwm*s (DNWSI 1004), JPA קומיס (DJPA 482), and JBA קומא (DJBA 999), as well as MH קומיס (Jastrow 1333),

⁵⁰ It should be noted that the stem of this Latin word is a Greek loanword, i.e., χαρτης (*LSJ* 1980) > Latin *charta*, *carta* (OLD 309; LD 325).

Armenian **կնսէ** (*NDAE* 354; see also Hübschmann 1897: 359; Brockelmann 1893: 14), Coptic **ⲕⲟⲙⲏⲥ** (with alternative orthographies) (*DDGLC* 1171; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 17; Förster 2002: 431-432), and Arabic *qūmas-* (*BK* 812)⁵¹

- l. Latin *cubicularius* (*OLD* 463; *LD* 486) > **ⲕⲟⲩⲃⲓⲕⲟⲩⲗⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ** (*GLBRP* 685; *PGL* 779; *LSJ Suppl.* 184) > **ܟܝܡܠܐܬܐ, ܟܝܡܠܐܬܐ** ‘chamberlain’ (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 67.13, 27 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 25.3; 431.1, 7; 432.4; 433.10; 436.4; 437.2, 3; 439.2; 535.6; 546.2; 552.6 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 644; *SL* 1309; see also Brock 1996: 255), also in Coptic (*DDGLC* 4954)
- m. Latin *curator* (*OLD* 474; *LD* 501) > **ⲕⲟⲩⲣⲁⲩⲱⲣ** (*GLBRP* 686; *LLGE* 62; *PGL* 773; *LSJ* 986; see also Mason 1974: 5, 6, 63) > **ܝܠܝܐܬܐ** ‘curator, an official responsible for financial matters’ (6th cent. Eliya, *Life of Yuḥanon of Tella*, 59.20 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 69.12 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 695; *SL* 1344), also in Armenian **կըրատոր** (Hübschmann 1897: 360) and Coptic **ⲕⲟⲩⲣⲁⲩⲱⲣ** (*DDGLC* 1196; see also Förster 2002: 438)
- n. Latin *diarium* (*OLD* 536; *LD* 569) > **ⲗⲓⲁⲣⲓⲟⲥ** (*GLBRP*

⁵¹ Latin *comes* also occurs in Syriac spelled with a final *š*, i.e., **ܟܡܝܫܐ**, in texts that are post-Islamic (see, e.g., Nöldeke 1873: 496.9). The emphatic *š* could be explained as the result of assimilation of the feature [+emphatic] (for similar assimilations, see Butts 2016: §5.2.6). Alternatively, **ܟܡܝܫܐ** with emphatic *š* could be a loanword from Arabic *qummuš-* (so Nöldeke 1873: 500-501 n. 5). Regardless, these examples that have a secular meaning of governor should probably be distinguished from others that occur in a monastic sense (for citations of several examples with a monastic sense, see Van Rompay 2015: 558-559). The examples with a monastic sense, which are usually spelled with the emphatic *š* and only rarely with non-emphatic *š*, almost certainly derive from (Christian) Arabic *qummuš-*, which is traditionally connected with Greek **ἡγούμενος** and not Latin *comes* (see Graf 1954: 93).

- 369; *LLGE* 40; *LSJ* 409) > PL 𐤒𐤓𐤁 ‘stipend, pay’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 11.24 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 152; *SL* 300; not common)
- o. Latin *domesticus* (OLD 570; LD 607-608) > δομεστικός, δομέστικός (*GLBRP* 392; *LLGE* 41; *PGL* 380; *LSJ Suppl.* 97) > 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁, 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁 ‘domesticus, a Byzantine imperial guard soldier’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 9:19 [𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁] [ed. Brooks 1935]; Pseudo-Zacharias, *Ecclesiastical History*, 2.60.4 [𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁], 6 [𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁] [ed. Brooks 1919-1924]; *LS2* 158; *SL* 283), also in Coptic ΔΟΜΕΣΤΙΚΟΣ (with alternative orthographies) (*DDGLC* 4817; see also Förster 2002: 208)
- p. Latin *donativum* (OLD 572; LD 610) > 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁 ‘largess, gift’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 137.4 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 160; *SL* 284; very rare)
- q. Latin *ducatus* (OLD 576; LD 615) > δουκάτον, δουκάτον (*GLBRP* 394; *PGL* 384) > 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁 ‘military command’ (6th cent. Eliya, *Life of Yuhanon of Tella*, 87.2 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; *LS2* 163; *SL* 287; only here)⁵²
- r. Latin *excubitor* (OLD 637; LD 680) > ἐξκουβίτωρ (*LSJ Suppl.* 121; *GLBRP* 484; *LLGE* 44-45) > PL 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁 (sic; without *syāmē*), 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁 (sic; with two *syāmē*), 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁 ‘Excubitors, Byzantine palace guards’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 15.28; 30.10; 168.10 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 28.13 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 493; *SL* 78, 1037; see also Schall 1960: 244; only with this author), also in Coptic (*DDGLC* 5404)
- s. Latin *exercitus* (OLD 641) > ἐξέρκετον (*GLBRP* 482; *LLGE* 44; *PGL* 495; *LSJ Suppl.* 121) > 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁

⁵² See also 𐤒𐤌𐤁𐤌𐤓𐤁 ‘leader’ (5d) above.

- ‘army’ (**6th cent.** Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 279.13 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS* 19; *SL* 45; rare), also in Coptic (*DDGLC* 6219)
- t. Latin *follis* (*OLD* 719-720; *LD* 765) > φόλλις (*LSJ* 1949; *GLBRP* 1149; *LLGE* 115) > ܦܠܠܝܬܐ ‘follis, obole’ (**6th cent.** Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 526.8, 9, 10 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS* 2 575; *SL* 1202; see also *GLLTMT* 426), also in *JBA* ܐܕܪܝܬܐ (*DJBA* 889), as well as Armenian փող (*NDAE* 731; Hübschmann 1897: 387), Coptic φολλις (with alternative orthographies) (*DDGLC* 2318; see also Förster 2002: 853-854), Arabic *fals*-, *fil*s- ‘small copper coin’ (*BK* 630; Lane 2440; *AF*A 192), and Classical Ethiopic *ḥalus* (*CDG* 160; see also Weninger 2000: 145)
- u. Latin *fossa* ‘camp, army’ (*OLD* 728; *LD* 774) > φόσσα (*GLBRP* 1150) > ܦܫܫܐ, ܦܫܫܐ ‘army’ (**6th cent.** Ya‘qub of Serugh, *Mēmre*, 5.202.14; 5.229.15; 5.297.2 [ed. Bedjan 1905-1910]; *LS* 2 580; *SL* 1208; see also *GLLTMT* 432), also in *MH* ܐܕܝܬܐ ‘ditch’ (Jastrow 1144), Armenian փնու ‘ditch, pit’ (*NDAE* 733; see also Hübschmann 1897: 337, 387; Brockelmann 1893: 13), and Coptic ܦܫܫܐ (*DDGLC* 5540; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 28)
- v. Latin (*vir*) *illustris* (*OLD* 830) > ἰλλούστριος (*GLBRP* 597; *PGL* 673; *LSJ Suppl.* 158) → nominative plural ἰλλούστριοι > ܐܝܠܠܘܫܬܪܝܐ ‘bearers of title *vir illustris*’ (**6th cent.** Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 165.15 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS* 2 22; *SL* 50; only here), also in Coptic ܐܠܠܘܪܝܐ (with alternative orthographies) (*DDGLC* 951; see also Förster 2002: 346)
- w. Latin *indulgentia* (*OLD* 888; *LD* 938) > ἰνδουλεντία (*GLBRP* 601; *PGL* 674) > ܐܝܢܕܘܠܝܢܬܝܐ* ‘indulgence’ (**6th cent.** Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 165.3 [ms. ܐܝܢܕܘܠܝܢܬܝܐ] [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS* 2

- 28; *SL* 59; only here)⁵³
- x. Latin *lectica* (*OLD* 1012; *LD* 1045) > λεκτίκιον (*GLBRP* 709; *LLGE* 66; *LSJ* 1037) > ܠܥܬܝܟܝܢ ‘small litter’ (6th cent. *Life of Aba I*, 270.9; 271.13 [ed. Bedjan 1895: 206-287]; Qiyore of Edessa, *Six Explanations of the Liturgical Feasts*, 111.19 [ed. Macomber 1974]; *LS2* 370; *SL* 697; see also Brock 1975: 106-108; *GLLTMT* 319), also in MH ܠܥܬܝܟܝܢ (Jastrow 718), Armenian լիտիք (*NDAE* 260; see also Hübschmann 1897: 353), and Coptic (*DDGLC* 4992)
 - y. Latin *lecticarius* (*OLD* 1012; *LD* 1045-1046) > λεκτικάριος (*GLBRP* 709; *LLGE* 66; *LSJ Suppl.* 194) > ܠܥܬܝܟܝܢ ‘priest who carries funeral biers’ (6th cent. Eliya, *Life of Yuhanon of Tella*, 88.24 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; *LS2* 370; *SL* 697; see also Schall 1960: 196)
 - z. Latin *legatum* (*OLD* 1013; *LD* 1047) > ληγάτον, ληγᾶτον, λήγατον (*GLBRP* 712; *LLGE* 66; *PGL* 799; *LSJ Suppl.* 196; see also Mason 1974: 65-66) > ܠܥܬܝܟܝܢ ‘bequest’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 258.8 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 358; *SL* 688; see also *DGLLT* 104-105), also in MH ܠܥܬܝܟܝܢ (Jastrow 692) and Armenian լիդատս (Hübschmann 1897: 352)
 - aa. Latin *libellus* (*OLD* 1022-1023; *LD* 1056) > λίβελλος (*GLBRP* 714; *LLGE* 66-67; *LSJ* 1047; see also Mason 1974: 6, 66) → accusative singular λίβελλον > ܠܥܬܝܟܝܢ ‘deposition, written accusation; letters of resignation of office’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 41.29 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 356; *SL* 687-688; see also Schall 1960: 193-194), also in Coptic (*DDGLC* 5002)
 - bb. Latin *magister* (*OLD* 1062; *LD* 1097) > μάγιστρος (*GLBRP* 726; *LLGE* 69; *PGL* 819; *LSJ Suppl.* 201; see also Mason 1974: 67) > ܡܥܝܬܝܟܝܢ ‘magister’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 315.30 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*,

⁵³ Note, however, ܠܥܬܝܟܝܢ (corrupt) ‘amnesty’ in (4b) above.

- 28.13 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 374; *SL* 708), also in Armenian 𐎱𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎹𐎶𐎵 (NDAE 446; see also Hübschmann 1897: 362; Brockelmann 1893: 23) and Coptic 𐩲𐩠𐩢𐩪𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿 (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 5026; see also Förster 2002: 490)
- cc. Latin *magistriānus* (LD 1098) > μαγιστριανός (GLBRP 726; LLGE 69; PGL 819) > ܡܐܓܝܣܬܪܝܢܐ ‘magistriānus’ (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 207.3 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 375; *SL* 708), also in Coptic (DDGLC 5766)
- dd. Latin *mandatum* (OLD 1071; LD 1106) > μανδᾶτον (GLBRP 731; LLGE 70; PGL 825) > ܡܢܕܐܬܐ ‘command’ (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 162.30 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 395; *SL* 780)
- ee. Latin *mantele*, *mantile* (OLD 1075; LD 1110) > μαντήλιον, μαντίλιον, μανδήλη (*LSJ* 1078; GLBRP 732) > ܡܢܬܐ ‘towel, handkerchief, shroud’ (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 540.6 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 395; *SL* 780), also in Arabic *mandil*-, *mindil*- (BK 1228; AFA 84),⁵⁴ Coptic 𐩲𐩠𐩢𐩪𐩣𐩤𐩥𐩦𐩧𐩨𐩩𐩪𐩫𐩬𐩭𐩮𐩯𐩰𐩱𐩲𐩳𐩴𐩵𐩶𐩷𐩸𐩹𐩺𐩻𐩼𐩽𐩾𐩿 (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 5793; see also Förster 2002: 499), and Classical Ethiopic *mandil* (CDG 348-349; see also Weninger 2000: 143),
- ff. Latin *metatum* (LD 1140 [s.v. *meto*]) > μήτατον, μητᾶτον (GLBRP 758; LLGE 72) > ܡܬܐ ‘house, dwelling’ (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 329.3 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 382; *SL* 752; only here)
- gg. Latin *notarius* (OLD 1192; LD 1217) > νοτᾶριος (GLBRP 786; LLGE 74-75; PGL 922-923; see also Mason 1974: 69-70) > ܢܘܬܐ, ܢܘܬܐ ‘notarius, a Byzantine official’ (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 94.5 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 187.2; 188.6, 10; 213.7 [ed.

⁵⁴ For the vowel assimilation *a > i / _CCi in *mindil*, see fn. 23 above.

- Brooks 1923-1925]; Eliya, *Life of Yuhanon of Tella*, 85.15; 87.24 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; *LS2* 427; *SL* 898, 911), also in Armenian **իօսուար** (*NDAE* 540; see also Hübschmann 1897: 368) and Coptic **ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲣⲏⲥ** (with alternative orthographies) (*DDGLC* 1486)
- hh. Latin *optio* (*OLD* 1260; *LD* 1273) > **ὀπτίων** (*GLBRP* 814; *LLGE* 78; *LSJ* 1242; see also Mason 1974: 5, 71) > **ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲣ** ‘army paymaster who distributes rations to soldiers’ (**6th cent.** Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 133.1 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 40; *SL* 84; only here), also in Coptic **ⲟⲩⲩⲓⲱⲛ** (*DDGLC* 1565; see also Förster 2002: 585)
- ii. Latin *ostiarus* (*OLD* 1276; *LD* 1284) > **ὀστιάριος** (*GLBRP* 820; *LLGE* 79) > **ⲛⲟⲩⲁⲣ** ‘porter’ (**6th cent.** Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 464.10, 11 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 30.10 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 33; *SL* 69; see also Schall 1960: 244; only here)
- jj. Latin *paganus* (*OLD* 1282; *LD* 1290) > **παγάνος** (*GLBRP* 829; *LLGE* 83; *PGL* 1990; *LSJ* 1284) > **ⲛⲁⲕⲁ**, **ⲛⲁⲕⲁ** ‘commoner, peasant’ (**6th cent.** Philoxenos, *Discourses*, 1.192.14 [ed. Budge 1894]; Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 133.3 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 556; *SL* 1154; see also *GLLTMT* 421), also in JPA **ⲛⲁ** (*DJPA* 424), as well as MH **ⲛⲁ** (Jastrow 1134) and Coptic **ⲛⲁⲕⲁⲛⲟⲥ** (*DDGLC* 1606; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 21; Förster 2002: 599)
- kk. Latin *papilio* (*LD* 1299) > **παπιλιών, παπιλεών** (*GLBRP* 839) > **ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲗⲁ** ‘pavilion’ (**6th cent.** Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 298.30 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 586; *SL* 1217; see also *GLLTMT* 474-475; rare), also in MH **ⲛⲁⲩⲁⲗⲁ** (Jastrow 1204) and Coptic (*DDGLC* 5218; 6117)
- ll. Latin *paraganda* (*LD* 1301)⁵⁵ > **παραγάδιον**

⁵⁵ The Latin word is ultimately from Old Iranian **paraganda-* (Ciancaglini 2008: 236-237 with additional references).

- (GLBRP 840; LLGE 86) > ܦܪܓܘܕܐ ‘bordered garment’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 69.4 [ed. Brooks 1935]; LS2 592; SL 1226; see also GLLTMT 477; Ciancaglini 2008: 236-237; basically only here), also in JPA ܦܪܓܘܕ (DJPA 443), Mandaic *br guda* (MD 69; see also AFA 51), and LjLA ܦܪܓܘܕܐ (TgPsJon Ex 26:31; Jastrow 1886-1903: 1214), as well as MH ܦܪܓܘܕ (Jastrow 1214) and Coptic (DDGLC 5221)⁵⁶
- mm. Latin *patricius* (OLD 1310; LD 1315) > πατρικιος (PGL 1052; GLBRP 865) > ܦܬܪܝܩܝܐ ‘patrician’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 42.10 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 157.12; 189.7; 191.10 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; LS2 565-566; SL 1184), also in CPA ܦܬܪܝܩܝܡܝܐ (DCPA 327), as well as Armenian պատրիկ (NDAE 605; see also Hübschmann 1897: 371; Brockelmann 1893: 14), Coptic πατρικιος (DDGLC 1696; see also Förster 2002: 630), Classical Ethiopic *baṭriq* (with alternative orthographies) (CDG 114; see also Weninger 2000: 142), and Arabic *baṭriq* (BK 136; Lane 217-218)
- nn. Latin *porta* (OLD 1407; LD 1400-1401) > πόρτα (GLBRP 911; LLGE 91) > ܦܘܪܬܐ ‘gate’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 566.9 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; LS2 595; SL 1170; rare), also in Coptic (DDGLC 5305)
- oo. Latin *posca*, *pusca* (OLD 1409; LD 1969: 1402) > φοῦσκα (LSJ 1952; GLBRP 1151)⁵⁷ > ܦܘܨܟܐ ‘vinegar and water mixed’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 530.7 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; Eliya, *Life of Yuhanon of Tella*, 46.25 [ed. Brooks 1907: 29-95]; LS2 585; SL 1167), also in Coptic φοῦσκα

⁵⁶ For a potential Arabic reflex, see AFA 45-46.

⁵⁷ Brooks (1925: 530 n. 3) notes the Latin *posca* but was unable to identify a potential Greek intermediary. Brockelmann (LS2 584), followed by Sokoloff (SL 1167), gives the Greek intermediary as πόσκα, which is not, however, found in the Greek lexica.

- (DDGLC 2324; see also Förster 2002: 857)
- pp. Latin *praepositus* (LD 1426) > **πραιπόσιτος** (GLBRP 914; PGL 1126) > **𐌱𐌹𐌱𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸** ‘*praepositus*, chamberlain in the court of the Byzantine empire’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 67.28 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 546.8; 548.2 [ms. **𐌱𐌹𐌱𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸**; ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; LS2 604; SL 1248-1249), also in Coptic **πρεποσιτος** (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 1811 as well as 5303; see also Förster 2002: 668), compare also the abstract Armenian **պրոպոսիտոսութիւն** ‘rank of *praepositus*’ (Hübschmann 1897: 375)
- qq. Latin *praetor* (OLD 1448; LD 1436) > **πραίτωρ** (GLBRP 915; LLGE 92; PGL 1126; see also Mason 1974: 3, 6, 7, 78) > **𐌹𐌱𐌹𐌸** ‘*praetor*’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 161.30 [ed. Brooks 1935]; LS2 596; SL 1237; only here)
- rr. Latin (*comes rerum*) *privatarum* (OLD 1461; LD 1447) > (**κῶμης τῶν**) **πριβᾶτων** (GLBRP 917; PGL 1131; see also Mason 1974: 79) > **𐌹𐌱𐌸𐌹𐌸** ‘private treasury of emperor’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 72.27 [ed. Brooks 1935]; LS2 591; SL 1238; basically only here), see also JPA **פריבט** ‘private bath’ (DJPA 446)
- ss. Latin *protector* (OLD 1503; LD 1477-1478) > **προτέκτωρ, πρωτήκτωρ** (GLBRP 957; LLGE 96; PGL 118; see also Mason 1974: 4, 11, 82) > **𐌱𐌹𐌱𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸𐌹𐌸** ‘*protector*, a military officer at the Byzantine court’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 467.2 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; LS2 596; SL 1231; see also Schall 1960: 218; not common); see also Coptic (DDGLC 6294)
- tt. Latin *quaestor* (OLD 1534-1535; LD 1502-1503) > **κυαίστωρ, κυαισίτωρ** (GLBRP 694; LLGE 63; PGL

- 784; see also Mason 1974: 3, 6, 63) > ܝܩܥܥܣܬܐ *‘quaestor, Byzantine head of judiciary’* (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 24.29⁵⁸ [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 655; *SL* 1322; see also *DGLLT* 184; not common), also in MH ܝܩܥܥܝܩ (Jastrow 1327) and Coptic (*DDGLC* 5790)
- uu. Latin *sacculus* (*LD* 1610) > σάκελλα (*GLBRP* 976; *LLGE* 100) → σακκέλιον (*PGL* 1221) > ܣܥܩܠܐ *‘public treasury’* (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 136.24 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 494; *SL* 1040; only here), compare also Coptic (*DDGLC* 1924)
- vv. Latin *scala* (*OLD* 1698; *LD* 1638) > σκάλη, σκάλα, σκα̣λα (*GLBRP* 991; *LLGE* 104; *LSJ* 1603) > ܣܥܠܐ *‘ladder’* (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 29.4 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 494; *SL* 1039; very rare), also in Coptic ܣܟܐܠܐ (*DDGLC* 1975; see also Förster 2002: 733)
- ww. Latin *scrinium* (*OLD* 1710-1711; *LD* 1648) > σκρίνιον (*GLBRP* 998; *LLGE* 105; *PGL* 1242) > ܣܪܝܢܝܐ *‘box, chest of documents’* (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 162.1 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 37; *SL* 79; only here)
- xx. Latin *sella* (*OLD* 1728; *LD* 1663) > σέλλα (*GLBRP* 983; *LSJ* 1590) → σελλίον (*GLBRP* 983; *LSJ* 1590) > PL ܣܥܠܐ, ܣܥܠܐ *‘small chair; latrine, toilet’* (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 74.11 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 392.5 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 71, 476; *SL* 149; 1001; see also *GLLTMT* 383), also in JPA ܣܥܠܐ (*DJPA* 374-375), as well as Armenian ܣܥܠܐ (*NDAE* 636; see also Hübschmann 1897: 378); compare also Coptic (*DDGLC* 1946)
- yy. Latin *stabularius* (*OLD* 1812-1813; *LD* 1749) > ܣܬܒܘܠܐܪܝܐ *‘stable-master’* (6th cent. Yuhanon of

⁵⁸ Brockelmann (*LS2* 679), along with Sokoloff (*SL* 1322), also list 114.22, but the edition does not contain the word.

Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 519.10, 13; 520.3, 13 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 32; *SL* 67-68; not common)

- zz. Latin *stabulum* (OLD 1813; LD 1749-1750) > **στάβλον** (GLBRP 1005; LLGE 107; LSJ 1631) > **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴** ‘stable’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 519.2, 5 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 32; *SL* 67; see also Schall 1960: 244), also in LJLA **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴𐎠** (TgChron2 32.28), as well as MH **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴𐎠**, **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴𐎠** (Jastrow 89), Arabic *ʾistabl*, *ʾiṣṭabl*- (BK 32; Lane 64; AFA 123-124), and Coptic **𐩪𐩢𐩠𐩬𐩣𐩪** (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 2022, 5910; see also Förster 2002: 746)
- aaa. Latin *tractatus* (OLD 1955; LD 1882-1883) > **τρακτάτον** (GLBRP 1087; PGL 1398) > **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴𐎠**, **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴𐎠** ‘negotiation’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 73.2; 319.8 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *LS2* 292; *SL* 557)
- bbb. Latin *tremis* (LD 1895) > **τριμήσιον** (GLBRP 1092; LLGE 113; LSJ 1820) > **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴𐎠** ‘tremissus (coin)’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 525.11; 526.2, 3, 9 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; *LS2* 289; *SL* 552; see also GLLTMT 273; not common), also in JPA **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴𐎠** (DJPA 231), as well as Armenian **տրմիսիւ** (NDAE 710; see also Hübschmann 1897: 385) and Coptic **𐩪𐩢𐩠𐩬𐩣𐩪** (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 2217; see also Förster 2002: 819-822)
- ccc. Latin *tribunus* (OLD 1972; LD 1897) > **τριβοῦνος** (GLBRP 1090; LLGE 112; PGL 1407; see also Mason 1974: 6, 7, 94) > **𐎲𐎠𐎼𐎡𐎴𐎠** ‘tribune, military commander’ (6th cent. Yuhanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 309.22 [ed. Brooks 1935]; *Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 459.1; 668.9 [ed. Brooks 1923-1925]; but already in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*, 184.17 [ed. Wright and McLean 1898]; *LS2* 287; *SL* 552), also in Armenian **տրիբուն** (NDAE 710; see also Hübschmann 1897: 385;

Brockelmann 1893: 37), Coptic $\tau\epsilon\rho\beta\omicron\gamma\eta\omicron\varsigma$ (with alternative orthographies) (DDGLC 2215; see also Behlmer 1997-1998: 27; Förster 2002: 819), and Classical Ethiopic *ṭrebunās* (with alternative orthographies) (CDG 597; see also Weninger 2000: 142)

- ddd. Latin *velarium* (OLD 2022; LD 1964) > $\beta\eta\lambda\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (GLBRP 307) > ܠܒܪܦ ‘curtains’ (6th cent. Ya‘qub of Serugh, *Mēmṛē*, 1.28.3 [ed. Bedjan 1905-1910]; LS2 185; SL 357; only here), also in Armenian վեղար ‘hood, cowl’ (NDAE 674; see also Hübschmann 1897: 337, 383; Brockelmann 1893: 37)
- eee. Latin *vestiarium* (OLD 2048; LD 1981) > $\beta\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$ (GLBRP 306) > ܠܒܪܦܝܐ ‘wardrobe’ (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 269.6 [ed. Brooks 1935]; LS2 80; SL 163; only here), also in Coptic $\beta\iota\varsigma\tau\iota\alpha\rho\iota\upsilon$ (DDGLC 379; see also Förster 2002: 133)
- fff. Latin *vestiarius* (OLD 2048; LD 1981) > $\beta\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ (GLBRP 306; LLGE 34; see also Mason 1974: 12) > ܠܒܪܦܝܐ ‘person in charge of wardrobe’ (6th cent. Yuḥanon of Ephesus, *Ecclesiastical History*, Part 3, 94.17 [ed. Brooks 1935]; LS2 80; SL 163; only here)

The sixth century attests the largest increase in the number of new Latin words in Syriac. This increase is, however, largely due to a few authors and texts, especially Yuḥanon of Ephesus (d. 581), who is known to have resided for a number of years in Constantinople, which was Greek speaking, but whose imperial court was officially Latinate.⁵⁹ In fact, the following words in (6) are only found in the works of Yuḥanon of Ephesus or texts derived from them: ܠܒܪܦܝܐ ‘notary’ (6d), ܡܠܝܚܝܐ ‘palace steward’ (6h), PL ܡܥܬܐܠܦܝܐܝܐ (with alternative orthographies) ‘Excubitors, Byzantine palace guards’ (6r), ܠܒܪܦܝܐ ‘bearers of title *vir illustris*’ (6v), ܠܒܪܦܝܐ * ‘indulgence’ (6w), ܠܒܪܦܝܐ ‘house, dwelling’ (6ff), ܠܒܪܦܝܐ ‘army paymaster who distributes

⁵⁹ For Yuḥanon of Ephesus, see Harvey 1990.

rations to soldiers' (6hh), ܩܪܝܢܐ 'porter' (6ii), ܦܪܕܐܢܐ 'bordered garment' (6ll), ܦܪܐܬܐܪ 'praetor' (6qq), ܦܪܕܐܢܐ 'private treasury of emperor' (6rr), ܦܪܕܐܢܐ 'public treasury' (6uu), ܩܒܝܬܐ 'box, chest of documents' (6ww), ܩܒܝܬܐ 'wardrobe' (6eee), and ܩܒܝܬܐ 'person in charge of wardrobe' (6fff). A number of additional Latin words are found primarily, though not exclusively, in Yuḥanon of Ephesus. The Latin loanwords in Yuḥanon's writings may be due to the particular sociolect of Syriac that was in use in Constantinople by Yuḥanon and his audience, which was more influenced by the imperial language of Latin as well as by Byzantine Greek.⁶⁰

Several of the words in (6) are not uncommon in Syriac, such as ܩܒܝܬܐ, ܩܒܝܬܐ 'fortified place' (6g), ܩܒܝܬܐ (with alternative orthographies) 'governor' (6k), ܩܒܝܬܐ 'curator, an official responsible for financial matters' (6m), and ܩܒܝܬܐ 'tribune, military commander' (6ccc). The vast majority are, however, rare. Many of these rare words may be closer to the Fremdwort side of the Fremdwort-Lehnwort continuum. This is especially the case for words limited to the sociolect of Syriac used in Constantinople by Yuḥanon of Ephesus and others.

The words in (6) continue the trend, seen with the previous list in (5), that the Latin source words are not as widely attested in other languages of the Roman Near East. In fact, in well over half of the words in (6), the Latin word is attested in Syriac but not in any other dialect of Aramaic as well as not in another language of the Roman Near East, such as Mishnaic Hebrew, Armenian, or Coptic. This is indicative of the fact that Syriac underwent a more intense period of contact with the Greco-Roman world at this period than many of the other languages of the Near East did.

In a vast majority of cases, a possible Greek intermediary is attested for the Latin words in (6). A Greek intermediary is not, however, attested for the following words: ܩܒܝܬܐ 'bath attendant' (6b), ܩܒܝܬܐ 'largess, gift' (6p), and ܩܒܝܬܐ 'stable-master' (6yy). None of these words is very common.

⁶⁰ The *Ecclesiastical History* of Pseudo-Zacharias (6th cent.) is similar in this regard (ed. Brooks 1919-1924).

The semantic groups attested in (6) are similar to those found in the earlier periods, though they are much more connected to Byzantine culture. By far the largest semantic group revolves around Byzantine officials and personnel: **ܚܒܐ** 'bath attendant' (6b), **ܚܡܠܐ** 'notary' (6d), **ܡܫܬܠܡܐ** 'palace steward' (6h), **ܚܝܬܐ** 'archivist' (6j), **ܡܡܪܐ** (with alternative orthographies) 'governor' (6k), **ܚܡܠܥܐ**, **ܚܡܠܥܐ** 'chamberlain' (6l), **ܚܝܬܐ** 'curator, an official responsible for financial matters' (6m), **ܡܡܪܥܐ**, **ܡܡܪܥܐ** 'domesticus, a Byzantine imperial guard soldier' (6o), PL **ܡܡܪܥܐܡܐ** (with alternative orthographies) 'Excubitors, Byzantine palace guards' (6r), **ܚܡܠܐ** 'bearers of title *vir illustis*' (6v), **ܚܡܠܐ** 'priest who carries funeral biers' (6y), **ܡܡܪܥܐ** 'magister' (6bb), **ܡܡܪܥܐ** 'magistrianus' (6cc), **ܚܝܬܐ**, **ܚܝܬܐ** 'notarius, a Byzantine official' (6gg), **ܚܡܠܐ** 'army paymaster who distributes rations to soldiers' (6hh), **ܚܡܠܐ** 'porter' (6ii), **ܚܡܐ**, **ܚܡܐ** 'commoner, peasant' (6jj), **ܡܡܪܥܐ** 'praepositus, chamberlain in the court of the Byzantine empire' (6pp), **ܚܝܬܐ** 'praetor' (6qq), **ܚܡܠܐ** 'protector, a military officer at the Byzantine court' (6ss), **ܡܡܪܥܐ** 'quaestor, Byzantine head of judiciary' (6tt), **ܚܡܠܐ** 'stable-master' (6yy), **ܚܡܐ** 'tribune, military commander' (6ccc), and **ܚܡܠܐ** 'person in charge of wardrobe' (6fff). In addition to these personnel terms, there are several other words that are directly related to Byzantine administration: **ܚܡܠܐ** 'largess, gift' (6p), **ܚܡܠܐܡܐ*** 'indulgence' (6w), **ܚܡܐ** 'bequest' (6z), **ܚܡܐ** 'deposition, written accusation; letters of resignation of office' (6aa), and **ܚܡܐ**, **ܚܡܐ** 'negotiation' (6aaa). Several words fall into a semantic group associated with the military: **ܚܡܐ** 'military command' (6q), **ܚܡܐܡܐ** 'army' (6s), **ܚܡܐ**, **ܚܡܐ** 'army' (6u), and **ܚܡܐ** 'command' (6dd). As in the earlier periods, there is a semantic group of tools and utensils: **ܚܡܐ** 'ladder' (6vv), **ܚܡܐ** 'basket' (6f), and **ܚܡܐܡܐ** 'box, chest of documents' (6ww), as well as one of coins, weights, and measures: **ܚܡܐܢܐ** (with alternative orthographies) 'hundredweight' (6i), **ܚܡܐܢܐ** 'tremissus (coin)' (6bbb), and **ܚܡܐ** 'follis, obole' (6t). There are also several items related to commerce more broadly: **ܚܡܐ** 'yearly produce' (6a) and **ܚܡܐ** 'stipend, pay' (6n). Two words also relate to the treasury: **ܚܡܐ** 'private treasury of emperor' (6rr) and

ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘public treasury’ (6uu). A semantic group concerning architecture and the house is more common than the earlier periods: ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘trellis, grating’ (6e), ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘house, dwelling’ (6ff), ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘pavilion’ (6kk), ܡܥܝܬܐ ‘gate’ (6nn), ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘stable’ (6zz), ܡܥܝܬܐ ‘small chair; latrine, toilet’ (6xx), ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘fortified place’ (6g), and ܡܥܝܬܐ ‘curtains’ (6ddd). As in the previous periods, there are also several terms related to clothing: ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘towel, handkerchief, shroud’ (6ee), ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘bordered garment’ (6ll), and ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘wardrobe’ (6eee), as well as one term related to transportation: ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘small litter’ (6x). Finally, there is one item related to the physical world: ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘plain’ (6c), and one item related to food and drink: ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘vinegar and water mixed’ (6oo).

LATIN WORDS FIRST APPEARING IN SEVENTH-CENTURY SYRIAC

A much smaller number of Latin words first appear in seventh-century Syriac:

- (7) a. Latin *calendae*, *kalendae* (OLD 989; LD 1022) > ܡܥܡܝܢ (LSJ 866; GLBRP 621) > ܡܥܡܝܢ ‘the first day of the month, esp. of January’ (7th cent. Ya‘qub of Edessa, *Canons*, 29.11 [ed. Kayser 1886]; LS2 669; SL 1307; see also GLLTMT 546), also in JBA ܡܥܝܬܐ (DJBA 1021) and CPA *qlnd* (DCPA 375; LSP 180), as well as Armenian PL ܡܥܝܬܐ (NDAE 320; see also Hübschmann 1897: 354; Brockelmann 1893: 22) and Classical Ethiopic *qalendes* (with alternative orthographies) (CDG 429; see also Weninger 2000: 144)
- b. Latin *pagus* (OLD 1283; LD 1290) > ܡܥܝܬܐ (GLBRP 829; LLGE 84) > ܡܥܝܬܐ ‘village’ (7th cent. Isho‘yahb III of Adiabene, *Letters*, 164.18 [ed. Duval 1904-1905]; LS2 556; SL 1154; rare)
- c. Latin *tabula* (OLD 1898-1899; LD 1832) > ܡܥܝܬܐ (GLBRP 1067; LLGE 109; LSJ 1752) > ܡܥܝܬܐ ‘plank, table, altar; gaming board’ (7th cent. Ya‘qub of Edessa, *Letter 18*, 60.13; 62.2 [ed. Rignell 1979], but already in Eusebius of Caesarea, *Ecclesiastical History*,

297.17 ['gaming board'] [ed. Wright and McLean 1898]; *LS* 266; *SL* 510; see also *GLLMT* 254-255), also in JPA טבלה (*DJPA* 220), as well as MH טבלא (Jastrow 518), Armenian տապլեղ 'table game' (*NDAE* 691; see also Hübschmann 1897: 383; Brockelmann 1893: 27), and Coptic ΤΑΒΛΑ (*DDGLC* 2143; see also Förster 2002: 791)

The seventh century sees a sharp decline in the introduction of new Latin words in Syriac via Greek. The contrast is especially stark compared with the sixth century, which represents the peak of the introduction of Latin words in Syriac. This probably reflects a decline in the contact between Greek and Syriac between the sixth and seventh centuries. There is a possible Greek intermediary attested for all three of the words introduced in this period. The semantic groups attested differ somewhat from the earlier periods. One term is related to the previously seen semantic group related to the house, e.g., ܐܠܬܐ 'plank, table, altar; gaming board' (7c), but another word falls into the category of social political relations, e.g., ܕܡܪܝܢ 'village' (7b), and yet another is related to the calendar, e.g., ܡܪܬܝܢ 'the first day of the month, esp. of January' (7a).

CONCLUSION

More than one hundred Latin words are found in Syriac texts, not translated from Greek, written up to the beginning of the eighth century. This fact has been obscured in the standard Syriac lexica. In his *Lexicon Syriacum*, Brockelmann does not provide a Latin etymology for more than a dozen of these.⁶¹ This is striking given

⁶¹ These are as follows: ܐܘܢܝܐ 'ounce' (5o), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'executioner' (2n), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'box, chest of documents' (6ww), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'army paymaster who distributes rations to soldiers' (6hh), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'letter carrier' (5q), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'toga, cloak, patriarch's chlamys' (5a), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'stipend, pay' (6n), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'keeper of records' (5n), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'iron spoon or pan' (1t), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'magistranus' (6cc), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'public treasury' (6uu), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'imperial letter, imperial archives' (5m), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'bordered garment' (6ll), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'whip' (2f), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'pillow, cushion' (5b), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'pot' (1a), ܐܝܬܐܝܬܐ 'grated cover' (1h).

that Brockelmann wrote his *Lexicon* in Latin. Sokoloff's English translation of Brockelmann's *Lexicon Syriacum* is even worse in this regard, with more than twenty-five additional words lacking an indication of their Latin origin.⁶² Even a specialized work such as Schall's *Studien über griechische Fremdwörter im Syrischen* neglects to mention the Latin origin of several words in Syriac.⁶³ This study has aimed to help rectify this situation by collecting all of the Latin words that occur in Syriac texts not translated from Greek up to and including Ya'qub of Edessa (d. 708).

The Latin words in Syriac fall into a number of well-defined semantic groups. The following lists organize the Latin words by semantic groups.

With the exception of the last word, Sokoloff also fails to provide a Latin etymology for these words in his *SL*.

⁶² These are as follows: ܠܚܬܐܝܬܐ 'hook; anchor; sailors' sounding line' (2p), ܠܥܡܬܐܝܬܐ 'army' (6s), ܠܥܠܝܬܐ 'bearers of title of "illustrious ones"' (6v), ܠܥܥܪܐ 'assarius, small copper coin' (2a), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'tribune, military commander' (6ccc), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'negotiation' (6aaa), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'archivist' (6j), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'bequest' (6z), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'legion' (1l), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'deposition, written accusation; letters of resignation of office' (6aa), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'small litter' (6x), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'house, dwelling' (6ff), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'one-thousand paces; mile-stone' (2j), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'command' (6dd), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'cloth; turban, tiara' (1r), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'small chair; latrine, toilet' (6xx), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'vinegar and water mixed' (6oo), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'palace' (4e), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'army' (6u), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'pool' (1m), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'pavilion' (6kk), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'chamberlain' (6l), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'curator, an official responsible for financial matters' (6m), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'cell' (1f), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'centurion' (2c), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'helmet; azure of the sky' (1e), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'guard' (2d), and ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'of the caesars' (4a).

⁶³ Though mentioned in the main text of his monograph, a Latin form is never mentioned for the following words, and they are also not included in his list of Latin words on p. 243-244: ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'gold *denarius*' (1k), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'deposition, written accusation; letters of resignation of office' (6aa), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'corn measure, peck; container' (2k), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'one-thousand paces; mile-stone' (2j), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'cell' (1f), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'colony' in (1j), ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'centurion' (2c), and ܠܥܬܐܝܬܐ 'Caesar, emperor' (2b).

Officials or Personnel (especially Roman or Byzantine)

PL ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘magnates’ (5r)
ܐܡܢܘܢܝܐ, ܐܡܢܘܢܝܐ
‘amanuensis, scribe’ (5e)

PL ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘bearers of title
vir illustris’ (6v)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘stable-master’
(6yy)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘porter’ (6ii)

ܠܡܢܐܢ, ܠܡܢܐܢ
‘executioner’ (2n)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘army paymaster
who distributes rations
to soldiers’ (6hh)

ܠܡܢܐܢ, ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘letter
carrier’ (5q)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘bath attendant’ (6b)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘person in charge of
wardrobe’ (6fff)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘*galearius*, military
servant’ (5j)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘leader’ (5d)

ܠܡܢܐܢ, ܠܡܢܐܢ
‘*domesticus*, a Byzantine
imperial guard soldier’
(6o)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘keeper of records’
(5n)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘keeper of records’
(1s)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘tribune, military
commander’ (6ccc)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘archivist’ (6j)

PL ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘freedmen’ (2g)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘priest who carries
funeral biers’ (6y)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘*magister*’ (6bb)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘*magistriannus*’
(6cc)

ܠܡܢܐܢ, ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘*notarius*, a
Byzantine official’ (6gg)

PL ܠܡܢܐܢ (with
alternative

orthographies)

‘Excubitors, Byzantine
palace guards’ (6r)

ܠܡܢܐܢ, ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘commoner,
peasant’ (6jj)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘patron’ (4f)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘praetor’ (6qq)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘*protector*, a
military officer at the
Byzantine court’ (6ss)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘*praepositus*,
chamberlain in the court
of the Byzantine empire’
(6pp)

ܠܡܢܐܢ, ܠܡܢܐܢ
‘chamberlain’ (6l)

ܠܡܢܐܢ (with alternative
orthographies)
‘governor’ (6k)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘*curator*, an official
responsible for financial
matters’ (6m)

ܠܡܢܐܢ, ܠܡܢܐܢ
‘centurion’ (2c)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘notary’ (6d)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘guard’ (2d)

ܠܡܢܐܢ ‘torturer’ (2m)

ἱερέμης ‘*quaestor*, Byzantine
head of judiciary’ (6tt)

παλατιάρχης ‘palace steward’
(6h)

καίσαρ ‘Caesar, emperor’ (2b)

Roman or Byzantine Administration

ἀφ᾽ ἡμετέρας* ‘indulgence’
(6w)

ἐξυμνήματα ‘largess, gift’ (6p)

ἐπιπραγματεύω, ἐπιπραγματεύω
‘negotiation’ (6aaa)

ἐπιθήκη ‘bequest’ (6z)

ἀποτίθημι ‘deposition, written
accusation; letters of
resignation of office’
(6aa)

ἐπιστολή ‘imperial letter,
imperial archives’ (5m)

ἐδικτοῦ ‘imperial edict’ (5i)

παλάτιον ‘palace’ (4e)

ἐπιστολή ‘governor’s
residence’ (2l)

κλήματα, κλήματα ‘colony’ (1j)

ἐπιστολή ‘retinue, suite’
(5c)

καίσαρες ‘of the caesars’ (4a)

Military (including torture)

ἐκστρατεύω ‘army’ (6s)

ἐκστρατεία ‘military command’
(6q)

λεγιών ‘legion’ (1l)

ἐκστρατεία ‘command’ (6dd)

ἐκστρατεία, ἐκστρατεία ‘army’ (6u)

ῥαβδί ‘whip’ (2f)

ἐκστρατεία ‘iron collar’ (1i)

Tools and Utensils

ῥάβδος ‘hook; anchor;
sailors’ sounding line’
(2p)

ἐκστρατεία ‘box, chest of
documents’ (6ww)

ἐκστρατεία ‘iron spoon or pan’
(1t)

ἐκστρατεία ‘corn measure, peck;
container’ (2k)

ἐκστρατεία ‘axe’ (4g)

ἐκστρατεία, ἐκστρατεία ‘bench’
(1q)

ἐκστρατεία ‘ladder’ (6vv)

ἐκστρατεία ‘bandage used to
wrap a corpse’ (2e)

ἐκστρατεία ‘cell, tent’ (1f)

ἐκστρατεία ‘lamp, torch’ (1b)

ἐκστρατεία ‘vase, urn; measure’
(1o)

ἐκστρατεία ‘basket’ (6f)

ἐκστρατεία ‘pot’ (1a)

Architecture and the House

ܐܫܬܠܬܐ ‘stable’ (6zz)
 ܐܬܠܐ ‘curtains’ (6ddd)
 ܬܐ, ܬܬܐ ‘veil, curtain’ (5p)
 ܐܬܠܬܐ ‘plank, table, altar;
 gaming board’ (7c)
 ܬܠܬܐ ‘house, dwelling’
 (6ff)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ, ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘small chair;
 latrine, toilet’ (6xx)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘gate’ (6nn)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘palace’ (4e)

ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘pool’ (1m)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘pavilion’ (6kk)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘governor’s
 residence’ (2l)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘ring’ (1g)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘pillow, cushion’
 (5b)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘trellis, grating’ (6e)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ, ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘fortified
 place’ (6g)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘grated cover’ (1h)

Clothing

ܐܬܠܐ ‘type of garment,
 stole’ (5l)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘wardrobe’ (6eee)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ, ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘toga, cloak,
 patriarch’s chlamys’ (5a)
 PL ܐܬܠܐ ‘sandals’ (2o)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘towel, handkerchief,
 shroud’ (6ee)

ܐܬܠܐ ‘cloth; turban, tiara’
 (1r)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘bordered garment’
 (6ll)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘helmet; azure of the
 sky’ (1e)

Transportation

ܬܬܠܬܐ, ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘street;
 road’ (1p)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ, ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘small litter’
 (6x)

ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘ferry boat’ (1n)
 ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘chariot’ (1d)
 ܐܬܠܐ ‘driver’ (1c)

Coins, Weights, and Measures

ܬܬܠܬܐ ‘ounce’ (5o)

ܐܬܠܐ ‘*assarius*, small copper
 coin’ (2a)

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘gold *denarius*’ (1k)
 ܐܕܢܝܨܐ ‘tremissus (coin)’
 (6bbb)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘corn measure, peck;
 container’ (2k)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ, ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘coin;
 money; coin die’ (4c)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘one-thousand paces;
 mile-stone’ (2j)

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘journey of ten
 parasangs’ (5k)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘follis, obole’ (6t)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ (with alternative
 orthographies)
 ‘hundredweight’ (6i)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘vase, urn; measure’
 (1o)

Commerce

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘yearly produce’ (6a)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘stipend, pay’ (6n)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘harness or saddle
 maker’ (2h)

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘meat-market’ (2i)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘public treasury’ (6uu)
 ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘private treasury of
 emperor’ (6rr)

Religious

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘hymns’ (4h)

Food and Drink

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘vinegar and water
 mixed’ (6oo)

Physical World

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘plain’ (6c)

Socio-Political Relations

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘village’ (7b)

Calendar

ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘the first day of the month, esp. of January’ (7a)

There are a handful of words that do not fall into clear semantic groups, all of which are very rare in Syriac.⁶⁴

A vast majority of the Latin words in Syriac were not transferred directly from Latin into Syriac but rather find their

⁶⁴ These include: ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘orbit’ (4d), ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘storyteller’ (5f), ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘false’ (5g), and ܐܕܢܐܪܝܐ ‘servant’ (5h).

The diachronic approach employed in this study has made it possible to observe changes over time in the contact between Syriac speakers and their Greco-Roman context. A number of Latin words are already found in the earliest period of Syriac (pre-fourth century) as well as in the Syriac New Testament. Several of these words were transferred into Aramaic at an earlier period and then inherited in Syriac. Others reached Syriac (via Greek) due to the Roman presence in Syria and Mesopotamia already in the early centuries of the Common Era. The fact that many of the Latin

⁶⁶ These include: **ḥiiaḥ** ‘type of garment, stole’ (5l), **ʾamānuḥ**, **ʾamānuḥ** ‘amanuensis, scribe’ (5e), **ḥimn** ‘hymns’ (4h), **ḥiḥ** ‘porter’ (6ii), **ḥiḥ**, **ḥiḥ** ‘street; road’ (1p), **ḥiḥ** ‘wardrobe’ (6eee), **ḥiḥ** ‘person in charge of wardrobe’ (6fff), **ḥiḥ** ‘military command’ (6q), **ḥiḥ** ‘curtains’ (5ddd), PL **ḥiḥ** ‘sandals’ (2o), **ḥiḥ**, **ḥiḥ** ‘coin; money; coin die’ (4c), PL **ḥiḥ** (with alternative orthographies) ‘Excubitors, Byzantine palace guards’ (6r), **ḥiḥ** ‘axe’ (4g), **ḥiḥ** ‘village’ (7b), **ḥiḥ**, **ḥiḥ** ‘commoner, peasant’ (6ji), **ḥiḥ** ‘gate’ (6nn), **ḥiḥ** ‘imperial edict’ (5i), **ḥiḥ** ‘patron’ (4f), and **ḥiḥ** ‘servant’ (5h).

words in the Syriac of this period are also attested in other languages of the Near East, whether Aramaic or not, indicates that they were widespread throughout the Roman Near East. Many of the Latin words that are found in the earliest period of Syriac (pre-fourth-century) as well as in the Syriac New Testament were likely a deeply ingrained part of the Syriac language by the time of fourth-century authors, such as Aphrahat (fl. 337-345) and Ephrem (d. 373).⁶⁷ The fourth century saw only a small addition in the number of Latin words in Syriac. A number of these words are rare throughout the history of Syriac, and a couple of them seem to be *hapax legomena*. The presence of rare words, and especially *hapax legomena*, suggests that Syriac speakers continued to be in contact with the Greco-Roman world in the fourth century. At the same time, however, the paucity of new Latin words in this period indicates a relatively low degree of contact. Contact between Syriac and the Greco-Roman world seems to have increased in the fifth century, when the number of new Latin words in Syriac rises. The appearance of a number of Latin words that are closer to Fremdwörter than they are to Lehnwörter corroborates such an increase in contact. It is also the fifth century that sees more Latin words in Syriac that are not found in other dialects of Aramaic or in other languages of the Roman Near East, pointing to an increase in contact between Syriac and the Greco-Roman world relative to that of other languages and cultures. The sixth century represents the zenith of new Latin words in Syriac pointing to a climax in contact between Syriac culture and the Greco-Roman world. The sixth century continues two trends from the fifth century: the appearance of a large number of Fremdwörter as well as the rise in the number of Latin words in Syriac that are not found in other languages of the Near East. Both of these trends point to a high degree of contact between Syriac and the Greco-Roman world in the sixth century. This is perhaps best illustrated by Yuḥanon of Ephesus and his particular sociolect of Syriac, which contains numerous Latin words. The seventh century sees a sharp decline in the number of new Latin words in Syriac. This is at least partly due to the absence of a figure such as Yuḥanon of Ephesus in this

⁶⁷ For further arguments along this line, see Butts 2016: §10.3-10.4.

period. It may, however, also be due to a decrease in contact compared to the sixth century. When analyzed diachronically, the Latin words in Syriac can serve as a thermometer – to borrow a metaphor of Brock – to gauge the changing degrees of contact between Syriac and the Greco-Roman world in Late Antiquity.⁶⁸

⁶⁸ Brock 1999-2000.

Latin Index

- annona* (6a)
assarium (2a)
balnearius (6b)
birrus (5a)
caesar (2b)
caesarianus (4a)
caldaria, caldarium
 (1a)
calendae (7a)
campus (6c)
cancellarius (6d)
cancellus (6e)
candela (1b)
capsa (6f)
carrarius (1c)
carruca (1d)
carrum (fn. 24)
cassis (1e)
castrensis (6h)
castrum (6g)
cella (1f)
centenarium (6i)
centurio (2c)
cervical, cervicarium
 (5b)
chartularius (6j)
circus (1g)
clathri, clatri (1h)
collarium, collare
 (1i)
colonia (1j)
comes (6k)
comitatus (5c)
cracli (1h)
craticula (fn. 26)
cubicularius (6l)
curator (6m)
custodia (2d)
denarius (1k)
diarium (6n)
domesticus (6o)
donativum (6p)
ducatus (6q)
dux (5d)
exceptor (5e)
excubitor (6r)
exercitus (6s)
fabulator (5f)
falsus (5g)
famulus (5h)
fascia (2e)
flagellum (2f)
follis (6t)
forma (5i)
fossa (6u)
galearius (5j)
illustris (6v)
indulgentia (4b),
 (6w)
lectica (6x)
lecticarius (6y)
legatum (6z)
legio (1l)
libellus (6aa)
libertinus (2g)
lorarius (2h)
macellum (2i)
magister (6bb)
magistrinus (6cc)
mandatum (6dd)
mansio (5k)
mantele (6ee)
metatum (6ff)
mille (2j)
modium (2k)
moneta (4c)
notarius (6gg)
optio (6hh)
orarium (5l)
orbita (4d)
ostiarius (6ii)
paenula (fn. 41)
paganus (6jj)
pagus (7b)
palatium (4e)
papilio (6kk)
paragauda (6ll)
patricius (6mm)
patronus (4f)
piscina (1m)
ponto, pontonium
 (1n)
porta (6nn)
posca, pusca (6oo)
praepositus (6pp)
praetor (6qq)
praetorium (2l)
privatarum (6rr)
protector (6ss)
quaestionarius
 (2m)
quaestor (6tt)
sacellus (6uu)
sacer (5m)
scala (6vv)
scrinium (6ww)
securis (4g)
sella (6xx)
sextarius (1o)
speculator (2n)
stabularius (6yy)

stabulum (6zz)
statio (4h)
strata (1p)
subsellium (1q)
sudarium (1r)
tabellarius (1s)
tabula (7c)

tabularius (5n)
talaria (2o)
tractatus (6aaa)
tremis (6bbb)
tribunus (6ccc)
trulla (1t)
uncia (5o)

uncinus (2p)
velarium (6ddd)
velum (5p)
veredarius (5q)
vestiarium (6eee)
vestiarius (6fff)
veteranus (5r)

Greek Index

- ἀννώνα, ἀννώνη (6a)
 ἄσσάριον (2a)
 βερεδάριος (5q)
 βεστιάριον (6eee)
 βεστιάριος (6fff)
 βηλάριος (6ddd)
 βῆλον (5p)
 βίρρος (5a)
 γαλ(λ)ιάριος (5j)
 δηνάριον (1k)
 διάριον (6n)
 δομεστικός (6o)
 δουκᾶτον (6q)
 δούξ (5d)
 ἐξέρκετον (6s)
 ἐξέκπτωρ (5e)
 ἐξκουβίτωρ (6r)
 ἰλλούστριος (6v)
 ἰνδουλγεντία (4b), (6w)
 κάγκελ(λ)ος (6e)
 καγκελλάριος (6d)
 καῖσαρ (2b)
 καισαριανός (4a)
 καλάνδαι (7a)
 καλδάριον (1a)
 κάμπος (6c)
 κανδήλη, κανδηλα (1b)
 καρούχα, καροῦχον (1d)
 κάρρον (fn. 24)
 κασσίς (1e)
 καστρήσιος (6h)
 κάστρον (6g)
 κάψα (6f)
 κέλλα, κελλίον (1f)
 κεντηνάριον (6i)
 κεντυρίων (2c)
 κερβικάριον (5b)
 κίρκος, κίρκας (1g)
 κληθρον (1h)
 κολλάριον (1i)
 κολωνία (1j)
 κόμης, κόμες (6k)
 κοιμιτᾶτος (5c)
 κοστωδία (2d)
 κουβικουλ(λ)άριος (6l)
 κουράτωρ (6m)
 κουστωδία (2d)
 κυαισιωνάριος (2m)
 κυαίστωρ, κυαισίτωρ (6tt)
 λεγιών (1l)
 λεκτικάριος (6y)
 λεκτίκιον (6x)
 ληγάτον (6z)
 ληγιών (1l)
 λίβελλος (6aa)
 λιβερετίνος (2g)
 μαγιστριανός (6cc)
 μάγιστρος (6bb)
 μάκελλον (2i)
 μανδᾶτον (6dd)
 μαντήλιον, μανδήλη (6ee)
 μείλιον (2j)
 μήτατον (6ff)
 μίλιον (2j)
 μόδιος (2k)
 μονήτα (4c)
 νοτάριος (6gg)
 ξέστης (1o)
 ὄγκινος (2p)
 ὀπτίων (6hh)
 ὀστιάριος (6ii)
 οὐγκία (5o)
 οὐερεδάριος (5q)
 οὐετ(ε)ρανός (5r)

οὐῆλον (5p)	συμφέλλιον, συμφέλια (1q)
παγάνος (6jj)	ταβελλάριος (1s)
pāγος (7b)	τάβλα, τάβλη (7c)
παίνουλα, πένουλα (fn. 41)	ταβουλάριος (5n)
παλάτιον (4e)	ταλάριον (2o)
παπιλιών(6kk)	τζικούριον (4g)
παραγαύδιον (6ll)	τρακτάτον (6aaa)
πατρίκιος (6mm)	τριβοῦνος (6ccc)
πάτρων (4f)	τριμήσιον (6bbb)
πόρτα (6nn)	τροῦλ(λ)α (1t)
πραιπόσιτος (6pp)	φαινόλης, φαίνουλα (fn. 41)
πραίτωρ (6qq)	φάλσον (5g)
πραιτώριον (2l)	φάμουλος (5h)
πριβᾶτων (6rr)	φασκία (2e)
προτέκτωρ (6ss)	φισκίνα (1m)
σάκελλα, σακκέλλιον (6uu)	φόλλις (6t)
σάκρα (5m)	φόρμα, φόρμη (5i)
σεκούριον, σικούριον (4g)	φόσσα (6u)
σέλλα, σελλίον (6xx)	φοῦσκα (6oo)
σκάλη, σκάλα (6vv)	φραγέλλιον (2f)
σκρίνιον (6ww)	χαρτουλ(λ)άριος (6j)
σουδάριον (1r)	ώραριον (5l)
σπεκουλάτωρ (2n)	
στάβλον (6zz)	
στατίων (4h)	
στράτα (1p)	

Syriac Index

- ܠܬܝܢܐ (5r)
 ܠܡܢܐ (5o)
 ܠܡܢܐ (2p)
 ܠܦܝܢܐ (4d)
 ܠܝܝܐ (5l)
 ܝܠܦܡܡܢܐ (5e)
 ܡܠܦܝܡܝܢܐ (6s)
 ܡܠܦܝܢܐ (6v)
 ܡܠܦܝܠܡܝܢܐ* (6w)
 ܡܢܐ (6a)
 ܡܢܐ (6zz)
 ܢܠܦܢܐ (6yy)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (4h)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6ii)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (1p)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (2n)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (6ww)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (2a)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6hh)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (fn. 18)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (5q)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6eee)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ, ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (5a)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6b)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6fff)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (5j)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (5d)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ, ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (6o)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (6p)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6q)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (4b)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (1k)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6n)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6ddd)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ, ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (5p)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (5n)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (7c)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (1s)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (2o)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (1t)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (fn. 26)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6ccc)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6bbb)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ, ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6aaa)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6j)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6z)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (1l)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (2h)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6aa)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (2g)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6y)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ, ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6x)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (6bb)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (6cc)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (2k)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (4c)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6ff)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (2j)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6dd)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6ee)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (5k)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (2i)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6gg)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (1q)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (1r)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ, ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6xx)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (2n)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐ (4g)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (1q)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐܢܐܢܐ (6r)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6vv)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (6uu)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (5m)
 ܢܡܠܦܢܐ (7b)

ܦܚܝܝܬܐ, ܦܚܝܝܬܐ (6jj)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6t)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6oo)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6nn)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (5i)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (4f)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6mm)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (fn. 41)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (5f)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (4e)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (5g)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (5h)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1n)

ܦܚܝܬܐ, ܦܚܝܬܐ (6u)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1m)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (2e)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6kk)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6ll)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (2f)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6qq)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (2l)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6ss)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6rr)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6pp)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (7a)

ܦܚܝܬܐ, ܦܚܝܬܐ (6l)

ܦܚܝܬܐ, ܦܚܝܬܐ (1j)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1i)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6k)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (fn. 51)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6m)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1g)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (5c)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (5b)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1f)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6c)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1b)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6i)

ܦܚܝܬܐ, ܦܚܝܬܐ (2c)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6e)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6d)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1e)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1o)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (2d)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (2m)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6tt)

ܦܚܝܬܐ, ܦܚܝܬܐ (6g)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6h)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (2b)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (4a)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (6f)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1a)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1d)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1h)

ܦܚܝܬܐ (1c)

ABBREVIATIONS OF LEXICOGRAPHICAL RESOURCES

<i>AFa</i>	Fränkel, S. 1886. <i>Die aramäischen Fremdwörter im arabischen</i> . Leiden.
<i>BK</i>	Biberstein-Kazimirski, A. de. 1860. <i>Dictionnaire arabe-français</i> . Paris.
<i>CAD</i>	Gelb, I. J. et al. 1956-2011. <i>The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago</i> . Chicago.
<i>CAL</i>	Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon, accessible online at < http://cal.huc.edu/ >.
<i>CDG</i>	Leslau, W. 1987. <i>Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic)</i> . Wiesbaden.
<i>CPD</i>	MacKenzie, D. N. 1971. <i>A Concise Pahlavi Dictionary</i> . London.
<i>DCPA</i>	Sokoloff, M. 2014. <i>A Dictionary of Christian Palestinian Aramaic</i> (OLA 234). Louvain.
<i>DDGLC</i>	<i>Database and Dictionary of Greek Loanwords in Coptic</i> (< http://www.uni-leipzig.de/~ddglc/ >), cited by lemma number.
<i>DGLLT</i>	Sperber, D. 1984. <i>A Dictionary of Greek and Latin Legal Terms in Rabbinic Literature</i> . Jerusalem.
<i>DJA</i>	Sokoloff, M. 2003. <i>A Dictionary of Judean Aramaic</i> . Ramat-Gan.
<i>DJBA</i>	Sokoloff, M. 2002. <i>A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods</i> . Ramat-Gan.
<i>DJPA</i>	Sokoloff, M. 2002. <i>A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period</i> (2nd ed.). Ramat-Gan.
<i>DNWSI</i>	Hoftijzer, J. and K. Jongeling. 1995. <i>Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions</i> . Leiden.
<i>DSA</i>	Tal, A. 2000. <i>A Dictionary of Samaritan Aramaic</i> . Leiden.
<i>FVQ</i>	Jeffery, A. 1938. <i>The Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'an</i> . Baroda.

- GLBRP Sophocles, E. A. 1900. *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*. New York.
- GLLTMT Krauss, S. 1899. *Griechische und lateinische Lehnwörter im Talmud, Midrasch und Targum*, Vol. 2. Berlin.
- Jastrow Jastrow, M. 1886-1903. *Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature*. New York.
- Lane Lane, E. W. 1863-1893. *An Arabic-English Lexicon*. London.
- LD Lewis, C. T. and C. Short. 1969. *A Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.
- LLGE Daris, Sergio. 1991. *Il lessico Latino nel Greco d'Egitto* (2nd ed.). Barcelona.
- LS2 Brockelmann, C. 1928. *Lexicon Syriacum* (2nd ed.). Halis Saxonum.
- LSJ Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott (revised by H. Stuart Jones and R. McKenzie). 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford.
- LSJ Suppl. Liddell, H. G. and R. Scott (revised by H. Stuart Jones and R. McKenzie; edited by P. G. W. Glare). 1996. *Greek-English Lexicon. Revised supplement*. Oxford.
- LSP Schulthess, F. 1903. *Lexicon Syropalaestinum*. Berolini.
- MD Drower, E. S. and R. Macuch. 1963. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford.
- NDAE Bedrossian, M. 1875-1879. *New Dictionary. Armenian-English*. Venice.
- OLD Glare, P. G. W. 1982. *Oxford Latin Dictionary*. Oxford.
- PGL Lampe, G. W. H. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford.

- SL Sokoloff, M. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon. A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake – Piscataway.
- TLL *Thesaurus linguae Latinae*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J. N. 1977. *The vulgar Latin of the letters of Claudius Terentianus* (P. Mich. VIII, 467-72). Manchester.
- Attridge, H. W. 1990. "The Original Language of the Acts of Thomas," in H. W. Attridge, J. J. Collins, T. H. Tobin (eds.), *Of Scribes and Scrolls. Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday*. Lanham. 241-250.
- Baehrens, W. A. 1922. *Sprachlicher Kommentar zur Vulgärlateinischen Appendix Probi*. Halle.
- Baillet, M. 1963. "Un livret magique en christo-palestinien à l'Université de Louvain," *Le Muséon* 76: 375-401.
- Beck, E. 1957. *Des heiligen Ephraem des Syrers Hymnen contra Haereses* (CSCO 169-170). Louvain.
- Bedjan, P. 1890-1897. *Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum*. Paris – Leipzig.
- _____. 1891. *Histoire complète de Joseph par Saint Ephrem* (2nd ed.). Paris – Leipzig.
- _____. 1895. *Histoire de Mar-Jabalaba, de trois autres patriarches, d'un prêtre et de deux laïques, nestoriens*. Paris.
- _____. 1903. *Homiliae S. Isaaci, Syri Antiocheni*, vol. 1. Leipzig.
- _____. 1905-1910. *Homiliae Selectae Mar-Jacobi Sarugensis* (5 vols.). Paris – Leipzig.
- Beekes, R. 2010. *Etymological dictionary of Greek*. Brill.
- Behlmer, H. 1997-1998. "Index der Lehnwörter und Namen in Amélineau, *Œuvres de Schenoudi*," *Enchoria* 24: 1-33.
- Benveniste, E. 1969. "Diffusion d'un terme de culture: Latin *orarium*," in *Studia classica et orientalia Antonino Pagliaro oblata*. Rome. 1.213-218.

- Bickell, G. 1873-1877. *Sancti Isaaci Antiochi doctoris Syrorum opera omnia, syriace, arabiceque primus edidit, latine vertit*. Giessen.
- Bonnet, M. 1903. *Acta Philippi et Acta Thomae accedunt Acta Barnabae*. Leipzig.
- Bowersock, G. 2000. "The Syriac Life of Rabbula and Syrian Hellenism," in T. Hägg and P. Rousseau (eds.), *Greek Biography and Panegyric in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley. 255-271.
- Bremmer, J. N. 2001. "The *Acts of Thomas*: Place, Date and Women," in his *The Apocryphal Acts of Thomas*. Louvain. 74-90.
- Brock, S. P. 1967. "Greek Words in the Syriac Gospels (*vet and pe*)," *Le Muséon* 80 (1967): 389-426.
- _____. 1975. "Some Aspects of Greek Words in Syriac," in A. Dietrich (ed.), *Synkretismus im syrisch-persischen Kulturgebiet*. Göttingen. 80-108. (= Brock 1984: IV)
- _____. 1982. "From Antagonism to Assimilation: Syriac Attitudes to Greek Learning," in N. G. Garsoïan, T. F. Mathews, and R. W. Thomson (eds.), *East of Byzantium: Syria and Armenia in the Formative Period*. Washington, D.C. 17-34. (= Brock 1984: V)
- _____. 1984. *Syriac Perspectives on Late Antiquity*. London.
- _____. 1991. "Some New Syriac Documents from the Third Century AD," *ARAM* 3: 259-267.
- _____. 1992. *The Luminous Eye. The Spiritual World Vision of Saint Ephrem* (2nd ed.). Kalamazoo.
- _____. 1994. "Greek and Syriac in Late Antique Syriac," in A. K. Bowman and G. Woolf (eds.), *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World*. Cambridge. 149-160. (= Brock 1999: I)
- _____. 1996. "Greek Words in Syriac: Some General Features," *Scripta classica Israelica* 15: 251-262. (= Brock 1999: XV)
- _____. 1999. *From Ephrem to Romanos. Interactions between Syriac and Greek in Late Antiquity*. Aldershot.
- _____. 1999-2000. "Greek Words in Ephrem and Narsai: A Comparative Sampling," *ARAM* 11-12: 439-449.
- _____. 2004. "Secondary Formations from Greek Loanwords in Syriac," in H. Juusola, J. Laulainen, and H. Palva (eds.), *Verbum*

- et calamus. Semitic and Related Studies in Honour of the Sixtieth Birthday of Professor Tapani Harviainen*. Helsinki. 31-39.
- _____. 2005. "Greek and Latin Words in Palmyrene Inscriptions: A Comparison with Syriac," in E. Cussini (ed.), *A Journey to Palmyra: Collected Essays to Remember Delbert R. Hillers*. Leiden. 11-25.
- _____. 2010. "A Criterion for Dating Undated Syriac Texts: The Evidence from Adjectival Forms in *-aya*," *Parole de l'Orient* 35: 111-124.
- Brockelmann, C. 1893. "Die griechischen Fremdwörter im Armenischen," *ZDMG* 47: 1-42.
- Brooks, E. W. 1907. *Vitae virorum apud Monophysitas celeberrimorum* (CSCO 7-8). Louvain.
- _____. 1919-1924. *Historia ecclesiastica Zachariae Rhetori vulgo adscripta*, 1-2 (CSCO 83-84, 87-88). Louvain.
- _____. 1923-1925. *John of Ephesus. Lives of the Eastern Saints*, 1-3 (PO 17.1; 18.4; 19.2). Paris.
- _____. 1935. *Iohannis Ephesini. Historiae Ecclesiasticae. Pars Tertia* (CSCO 105). Louvain.
- Budge, E. A. W. 1894. *The Discourses of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbôgh, A.D. 485 – 519*. London.
- Burkitt, F. C. 1913. *Euphemia and the Goth, with the Acts of Martyrdom of the Confessors of Edessa*. London.
- Butts, A. M. 2011. "Reduplicated Nominal Patterns in Semitic," *JAOs* 131: 83-108.
- _____. 2015. *Semitic Languages in Contact* (Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 82). Leiden.
- _____. 2016. *Language Change in the Wake of Empire: Syriac in its Greco-Roman Context* (Linguistic Studies in Ancient West Semitic 11). Winona Lake.
- _____. Forthcoming A. "The Etymology of Aramaic (and Hebrew) $\sqrt{prns}$ 'to distribute, supply'," *JAOs*.
- _____. Forthcoming B. "Old Syriac," in Paul J.J. van Geest and Bert Jan Lietaert Peerbolte (eds.), *Brill Encyclopedia of Early Christianity*. Leiden.

- Cange, Charles du Fresne du. 1688. *Glossarium ad scriptores mediæ et infimæ Graecitatis*. Paris.
- Ciancaglini, C. A. 2008. *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac*. Wiesbaden.
- Clarke, E. G. 1984. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch*. Hoboken, N.J.
- Contini, R. and P. Pagano. 2015. "Notes on foreign words in Hatran Aramaic," in Butts 2015: 126-157.
- Cureton, W. 1864. *Ancient Syriac Documents*. London.
- Le Déaut, R. 1971. *Targum des Chroniques (Cod. Vat. Urb. Ebr. 1)*. Rome.
- Diez Merino, L. 1984. *Targum de Proverbios*. Madrid.
- Doran, R. 2006. *Stewards of the Poor. The Man of God, Rabbula, and Hiba in Fifth-Century Edessa (CSS 208)*. Kalamazoo.
- Drijvers, H. J. W. and J. F. Healey. 1999. *The Old Syriac Inscriptions of Edessa and Osroene*. Leiden.
- Duval, R. 1904-1905. *Iṣṣyabb Patriarchae III. Liber Epistularum (CSCO 11-12)*. Louvain.
- Ernout, A., A. Meillet, and J. André. 1985. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine: Histoire des mots* (4th ed., with additions and new corrections). Paris.
- Feissel, D., J. Gascou, and J. Teixidor. 1997. "Documents d'archives romains inédits du moyen Euphrate (III^e s. après J.-C.). II. Les actes de vente-achat (P. Euphr. 6 à 10)," *Journal des Savants*: 3-57.
- Förster, H. 2002. *Wörterbuch der griechischen Wörter in den koptischen dokumentarischen Texten*. Berlin.
- Fox, J. 2003. *Semitic Noun Patterns*. Winona Lake.
- Frisk, H. 1954-1972. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Heidelberg.
- Gollancz, H. 1928. *Julian the Apostate*. London.
- Graf, G. 1954. *Verzeichnis arabischer kirchlicher Termini (CSCO 147; 2nd ed.)*. Louvain.
- Grossfeld, B. 1983. *The First targum to Esther*. New York.
- _____. 1994. *The Targum Sheni to the Book of Esther*. New York.

- Harvey, S. A. 1990. *Asceticism and Society in Crisis. John of Ephesus and the Lives of the Eastern Saints* (The Transformation of Classical Heritage 18). Berkeley.
- Haspelmath, M. 2009. "Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues," in M. Haspelmath and U. Tadmor (eds.), *Loanwords in the World's Languages. A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin. 35-54.
- Healey, J. F. 1993. *The Nabataean tomb inscriptions of Mada'in Salih* (JSS Supplement 1). Oxford.
- . 1995. "Lexical Loans in Early Syriac: A Comparison with Nabataean Aramaic," *Studi epigrafici e linguistici* 12: 75-84.
- Hillers, D. R. and E. Cussini. 1996. *Palmyrene Aramaic Texts*. Baltimore and London.
- Hoffmann, G. 1880. *Iulianos der Abtruennige. Syrische Erzählungen*. Leiden.
- Howard, G. 1981. *The Teaching of Addai*. Chico.
- Hübschmann, H. 1897. *Armenische Grammatik*, Part. 1. *Armenische Etymologie*. Leipzig.
- Huehnergard, J. 1987. *Ugaritic Vocabulary in Syllabic Transcription*. Atlanta.
- Joosten, J. 1998. "Greek and Latin Words in the Peshitta Pentateuch First Soundings," in R. Lavenant, S.J. (ed.), *Symposium Syriacum VII. 1996* (OCA 256). Rome. 37-47.
- Kaufman, S. A. 1974. *Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. Chicago.
- Kayser, C. 1886. *Die Canones Jacob's von Edessa*. Leipzig.
- Kiraz, G. A. 1996. *Comparative edition of the Syriac Gospels*. Leiden.
- Kmosko, M. 1907. *S. Simeon bar Sabba'e* (PS 2.3). Paris.
- . 1926. *Liber Graduum* (PS 3). Paris.
- Lefort, L.-Th. 1950. *Concordance du Nouveau Testament Sabidique*, Vol. 1. *Les mots d'origine grecque* (CSCO 124). Louvain.
- Leloir, L. 1990. *Saint Éphrem. Commentaire de l'Évangile concordant. Texte syriaque (Manuscrit Chester Beatty 709), folios additionnels* (CBM 8). Louvain.
- Macomber, W. F. 1974. *Six explanations of the liturgical feasts by Cyrus of Edessa* (CSCO 355-336). Louvain.

- Mankowski, P. V. 2000. *Akkadian loanwords in Biblical Hebrew* (HSS 47). Winona Lake.
- Mason, H. J. 1974. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions*. Toronto.
- Mingana, A. 1905. *Narsai doctoris Syri homiliae et carmina*, 1-2. Mosul.
- Mitchell, C. W. 1912-1921. *S. Ephraim's Prose Refutations of Mani, Marcion, and Bardaisan*, 1-2. Oxford.
- Nau, F. 1932. *La première partie de l'histoire de Barhadbesabba 'Arbaïa* (PO 23.2). Paris.
- Nöldeke, Th. 1873. "Zwei syrische Lieder auf die Einnahme Jerusalems durch Saladin," *ZDMG* 27: 489-510.
- . 1904. *Compendious Syriac Grammar. Translated from the second and improved German edition by James A. Crichton*. Leipzig.
- Overbeck, J. J. 1865. *S. Ephraemi Syri Rabulae episcopi Edesseni Balaei aliorumque Opera selecta*. Oxford.
- Parisot, I. 1894-1907. *Aphraatis Sapientis Persae Demonstrationes* (PS 1.1-2). Paris.
- Peterson, E. 1929. "Die Bedeutung der ὠκεανέ-Akklation," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 78: 221-223.
- Petit, F., L. Van Rompay, J. J. S. Weitenberg. 2011. *Eusèbe d'Émèse. Commentaire de la Genèse* (Traditio exegetica Graeca 15). Louvain.
- Rignell, K.-E. 1979. *A Letter from Jacob of Edessa to John the Stylite of Litarab Concerning Ecclesiastical Canons*. Lund.
- Robert, J. and L. Robert. 1958. "Bulletin épigraphique," *Revue des études grecques* 71: 169-363.
- Rochette, B. 2010. "Greek and Latin Bilingualism," in E. J. Bakker (ed.), *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*. Malden, MA. 281-293.
- Rosen, K. M. D. 1964. "Latin *uncial*," *Language* 40: 21-22.
- Ross, S. K. 1993. "The last king of Edessa: New evidence from the Middle Euphrates," *ZPE* 97: 187-206.
- . 2001. *Roman Edessa. Politics and Culture on the Eastern Fringes of the Roman Empire, 114-242 C.E.* London.
- Schall, A. 1960. *Studien über griechische Fremdwörter im Syrischen*. Darmstadt.

- Sims-Williams, N. 1988. "Syro-Sogdica III: Syriac Elements in Sogdian," in *A Green Leaf: Papers in Honour of Professor Jes P. Asmussen*. Brill. 145-156.
- . 2013. "Ancient Afghanistan and its invaders: Linguistic evidence from the Bactrian documents and inscriptions," in N. Sims-Williams (eds.), *Indo-Iranian Languages and Peoples* (Proceedings of the British Academy 116). Oxford. 225-242.
- Sperber, A. 2004. *The Bible in Aramaic* (3rd ed.). Leiden.
- Stec, D. M. 1994. *The text of the Targum of Job*. Leiden.
- Strothmann, W. 1972. *Johannes von Apamea*. (PTS 11). Berlin.
- Teixidor, J. 1989. "Les derniers rois d'Édesse d'après deux nouveaux documents syriaques," *ZPE* 76: 219-222.
- Ullmann, M. 1997. *Zur Geschichte des Wortes barid „Post“* (Beiträge zur Lexikographie des klassischen Arabisch 13). Munich.
- Van Rompay, L. 2015. "Le Couvent des Syriens en Égypte aux 15^e et 16^e siècles: L'apport des colophons syriaques de la Bibliothèque Nationale de France," *Parole de l'Orient* 41: 549-72.
- Voigt, R. 1998. "Griechischer Wortindex zu Anton Schalls 'Studien über griechische Fremdwörter im Syrischen'," in R. Lavenant (ed.), *Symposium Syriacum VII (Uppsala 1996)* (OCA 256). Rome. 539-543.
- . 1999-2000. "Griechische Fremdwörter im Syrischen: Eine Bibliographie," *Graeco-Arabica* 7/8: 555-570.
- Wasserstein, A. 1995. "Non-Hellenized Jews in the Semi-Hellenized East," *Scripta Classica Israelica* 14: 111-137.
- Welles, C. B., R. O. Fink, and J. F. Gilliam. 1959. *The Excavations at Dura-Europus. Final Report V, Part 1. The Parchments and Papyri*. New Haven.
- Weninger, S. 2000. "Lateinische Fremdwörter im Äthiopischen," *BN* 102: 141-145.
- Wohlgemuth, J. 2009. *A Typology of Verbal Borrowings*. Berlin.
- Wright, W. 1871. *Apocryphal Acts of the Apostles*. London.
- Wright, W. and N. McLean. 1898. *The Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius Pamphili, 265-339, Bishop of Caesarea*. London.

CORPSE EXPOSURE IN THE ACTS OF THE PERSIAN MARTYRS AND ITS LITERARY MODELS

HÉCTOR RICARDO FRANCISCO

IMHICIHU-CONICET/ UNIVERSIDAD DE BUENOS AIRES

ABSTRACT

This paper explores the literary models of the corpse exposure motif in East-Syriac Hagiography.

INTRODUCTION

A well-known passage of the History of Lazar P‘arpec‘i described how the Šābānšāh Yazdgard II commanded that his servants leave the corpses of the executed Christians unburied in deserted places because:

They (i.e. the Christians) say about the bones of those who die for their God, that if anyone has in his house even a small fragment of them no harm or evil machination touches him or his house or his dear ones. Furthermore, he said, they claim that in judicial proceedings [the relics] give success, wisdom, bravery, and security. They attempt by personal efforts and money, even at

the cost of their lives, to obtain at least a tooth or nail of such persons and to take to their homes.¹

This quotation may be taken as an evidence of the well-known Zoroastrian taboo about dead matter. But, after a second reading of its arguments, it is surprising to learn that it does not express the concern of a pious Zoroastrian king about the purity of the earth; instead, it actually reveals a strategy directed to avoid the establishment of a cult around the bodies of the executed Christians. The reasons given to do so are a good example of how the cult of the martyrs was perceived not by the Zoroastrian authorities, but by the author himself. Like all Late Antique Christians, he conceived relics as a source of spiritual as well as material benefits. Additionally, the fruitless attempt of the persecutors to prevent the remains of the Christian heroes from becoming the focus of worship confirmed their victory over death. Undoubtedly, the disposal of the bodies of the Christian martyrs occupied the center of the scene, but it is noteworthy that the speech entailed a different set of preoccupations other than the purity of creation. In fact, it turned the control over them into a central issue, not only because of the fear of reprisal on the part of the Magi but also because of the place occupied by relics within the Church's life. Thus, from the author's point of view, the anecdote highlights the importance of the relics in Christians' lives and, by extension, their impact on the definition of power relations inside the Church.

In the following pages I will analyze the origin and function of the stories concerning corpse exposure in the East-Syrian Martyr Acts. In particular, I will concentrate on the literary nature of these stories, arguing that East Syrian hagiographers organized the stories about the exposure and ransom of martyrs' corpses on the basis of a literary *topos*. The result was twofold. Beyond any doubt, these stories built a specific image of a religious "other" (i.e. the Magi) through which communal boundaries could be defined. However, they were primarily designed to legitimize the pretensions of the episcopacy to exercise control over Christian sanctuaries.

Corpse exposure –along with close kin marriage– has been regarded as one of the key features of the religious practices in pre-

¹ R. Thomson, *The history of Lazar P'arpec'i* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991), 135.

Islamic Iran. In fact, both contemporary literary sources and modern specialists have defined it as a mark of “Zoroastrian” identity. Although the allusions to corpse exposure in East-Syrian hagiography were frequently noted, their study is relatively recent, and chiefly focused on its theological aspects. Actually, in his study of the Acts of the Persian Martyrs under Shapur II, Gernot Wiessner had already mentioned them in a non-exhaustive catalog.² But the first systematic approach is Peter Bruns’s study of the stories related to corpse exposure in East-Syrian hagiography. By analyzing its contents and structure, Bruns concluded that these narratives alluded to an actual debate between Christian and Zoroastrian theologians.³ Thus, by appropriating images and concepts of Zoroastrian theology, Christian writers could claim the superiority of their faith over that of their religious opponents. Geoffrey Herman reached similar conclusions in his comparative study on the exhumation of corpses in the Talmud Bavli and Christian literature.⁴ Herman has demonstrated that exhumation has been a troublesome factor for Jewish and Christians living in the Sasanian Empire at least from the mid-fourth century onwards. The chronological parallels have pointed “to a synchronized common plight for both of these non-Zoroastrian communities” caused by a “Zoroastrian activism” which “legitimated the meddling in the practices of all non-Zoroastrians where these offended Zoroastrian sensibilities.”⁵

The valuable works by Bruns and Herman consider those narratives as directed towards the “outsiders” of the Christian community. This does not mean that Christian writers were arguing directly against the Magi. On the contrary, like most of the Late

² G. Wiessner, *Zur Märtyrerüberlieferung aus der Christenverfolgung Schapurs II*, Untersuchungen zur Syrischen Literaturgeschichte I, Abh. Gött, Philol.-hist.Kl., Dritte Folge 67 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967), 219-221.

³ P. Bruns, “Reliquien und Reliquienverehrung in den syro-persischen Märtyrerakten,” *Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 101 (2006), 194-213.

⁴ G. Herman, “Bury My Coffin Deep! Zoroastrian Exhumation in Jewish and Christian Sources,” in *Tiferet Leyisrael: Jubilee Volume in Honor of Israel Francus*, ed. J. Roth, M. Schmeltzer, Y. Francus (New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 2010), 31-59.

⁵ Herman, “Bury My Coffin Deep,” 52.

Antique Christian polemics, the targeted audience was their own co-religionists. For both studies, the underlying purpose of the narratives was to warn them about any possible compromise with the Magi while establishing the theological limits between both “religions.” Moreover, the above-mentioned anecdotes may be considered testimonies of the existence of an actual debate on two antagonistic theological conceptions about Death and Afterlife. In general terms, I agree with their conclusions but tend to feel that they simplify a much more complex scenario. Christian writers described some exemplary Zoroastrianism in order to transmit their own teachings. Their ultimate intention was not to generate an accurate description but to strengthen (or even create) a communal identity built on the concepts and practices which defined the *how-to-be Christian*. Thus, the images of this Zoroastrian “other” were based on a well-established literary tradition about the Iranian culture. Paradoxically, this tradition was not only developed through the contact with “actual” Zoroastrians, but was also built on references extracted from Classical ethnographers and reproduced by Jewish and Christian literature. In other words, this literary tradition was a sort of prism through which actual experience was seen. As we shall see, it seems apparent that the events related to corpse exposure in the *Acts of the Persian Martyrs* were inspired by western models, chiefly by the *History of the Martyrs of Palestine* by Eusebius of Caesarea.

CORPSE EXPOSURE IN IRANIAN MILIEU

It is well known that the Iranian custom of corpse exposure to the action of animals (birds and dogs) and natural elements caught the attention of foreign observers, namely ancient ethnographers and modern travelers. Literary evidence suggests that this practice was very old.⁶ Yet, in spite of their abundance, the early testimonies present a considerable number of interpretative problems. First, from Herodotus to Agathias, Classical and Christian sources offered a substantial amount of information about it.⁷ But these

⁶ M. Boyce, *A History of Zoroastrianism*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 1975), 325-330.

⁷ For a detailed record of the testimonies in Classical and Christian Literatures see: A. De Jong, *Traditions of the Magi. Zoroastrianism in Greek and*

“external” sources are too contradictory and biased to be taken unreservedly. Thus, it would not be an exaggeration to affirm that they do not provide much more than an insight into the prejudices and literary clichés designed to create the image of the Barbarian.⁸ Second, “internal” (i.e. Avestan and Pahlavi) sources do not provide a unanimous description. Avestan purity prescriptions designed to prevent the elements (Earth, Fire, and Water) from being polluted by corpses were complemented by Medieval Pahlavi literature which regulated a complicated funerary ceremony.⁹ Although the *Vendidad* gives several details about the rituals prescribed for the disposal of the dead and the theological principles behind them, the information provided in it is “slightly contradictory” and suggests the coexistence of various practices besides exposure.¹⁰ On the other hand, most Pahlavi theological texts -although unambiguous in their descriptions- date from a relatively late period, and their value as source for Late Antiquity is problematic, to say the least.

Furthermore, archaeological evidence offers little information on the uniformity of the funerary practices in Late Antique Iran. Recent surveys have demonstrated that corpse exposure coexisted with a great variety of funerary practices, including inhumation.¹¹ In

Latin literature, (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 436 and A. Cameron, “Agathias on the Sassanians,” *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23-24 (1969), 67-183.

⁸ De Jong, *Traditions of the Magi*, 433-437.

⁹ Most of the ritualistic prescriptions on the treatment of corpses in Avestan literature are contained in the *Vendidad*, see A. Panaino, *Vendidad: la legge di abiura dei demoni dell'Avesta zoroastriano*, (Milano: Mimesis, 1990). B. T. Anklesaria, *Zand-Akāsib, Iranian or Greater Bundabīšn. Transliteration and Translation in English*, (Mumbai: Rahnumae Mazdayasnān Sabha, 1956), 25; J. Tavadia, *Šāyast-nē-šāyast. A Pahlavi Text on Religious Customs*, (Hamburg: Friederichsen, De Gruyter, 1930), 30-73. For detailed descriptions of these rituals see: J.J. Modi, *The funeral ceremonies of the Parsees: their origin and explanation*, (Mumbai: Fort Print Press, 1905) and D. Menant, “Les rites Funéraires des Zoroastriens de l’Inde,” in *Conférences faites au Musée Guimet*, (Paris: Leroux, 1910), 141-198. For a modern analysis, see: M. Boyce, “Corpse, Disposal of, in Zoroastrianism,” in *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, 2011, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/corpse-disposal-of-in-zoroastrianism>.

¹⁰ Ibid.

¹¹ L. Trüpfelman, “Sasanian Graves and Burial Customs,” in *Arabie orientale. Mésopotamie et Iran méridional de l’âge du fer au début de la période*

addition, there is evidence that funerary practices presented multiple local variations which may have transcended religious boundaries.¹²

Besides the extent and uniformity of corpse exposure as a funerary practice, there is another issue involving the correlation between corpse exposure and the Zoroastrian “theology of Death”. The development of a Zoroastrian theology regarding the origin and nature of Death antedates the Sasanian period. However, it seems that this theology fully dealt with funerary practices only in relatively later times.¹³ As I have already mentioned, Pahlavi literature of the Early Islamic period complemented prescriptions about proper disposal of the dead in the *Vendidad*. However, as Satnam Mendoza Forrest has showed, for Zoroastrian orthodoxy the potential of contamination of a corpse was not that straightforward, and depended on the piety of the deceased while

islamique, ed. R. Bourchalat (Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1984), 317-329; R. Bourchalat, “Pratiques funéraires à l’époque sasanide dans le Sud de l’Iran,” in *Histoire et cultes de l’Asie Centrale préislamique: sources écrites et documents archéologiques : actes du Colloque international du CNRS*, (Paris, 22-28 novembre 1988), ed. P. Bernard, F. Grenet, (Paris: CNRS, 1991), 71-78; D. Huff, “Archaeological evidence of zoroastrian funerary practices,” in *Zoroastrian Rituals in Context*, ed., M. Stausberg, (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 593-630.

¹² On the debate about Christian Acculturation on Iranian funerary practices see: M.-J. Steve, et al., *L’Île de Kharg. Une page de l’Histoire du Golfe Persique et du Monachisme Oriental* (Herman Gasché, Neuchâtel, 2003), 69-77; S. Hauser, “Christliche Archäologie im Sasanidenreich: Grundlagen der Interpretation und Bestandsaufnahme der Evidenz,” in *Inkulturation des Christentums im Sasanidenreich*, ed. A. Mustafa, J. Tubach, & G. Sophia Vashalomidze, (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2007): 93-136; S. J. Simpson & T. S. Molleson, “Old Bones Overturned: New Evidence for Funerary Practices from the Sasanian Empire,” in *Regarding the Dead: Human Remains in the British Museum*, ed. A. Fletcher, D. Antoine, and J.D. Hill, (London: British Museum press, 2014), 77-90.

¹³ M. Hutter, “The Impurity of the Corpse (nasā) and the Future Body (tan ī pasēn): Death and Afterlife in Zoroastrianism,” in *Human Body in Death and Resurrection*, ed., T. Nicklas, F. V. Reiterer, J. Verheyden, H. Braun (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009), 13-26. For a general view about the development of Zoroastrian theology, see: S. Shaked, *Dualism in transformation: varieties of religion in Sasanian Iran*, (London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1994).

alive.¹⁴ For example, both for the *Vendidad* and the Pahlavi literature the corpses of the unbelievers were a minor source of pollution.¹⁵ According to Mendoza Forrest, “the more advanced the departed soul was, the more rage the demon of dead matter feels when entering the body”.¹⁶ As a consequence, the bodies of Christian Holy Men may have been considered a less harmful source of pollution than those of the pious Zoroastrians. This distinction may explain the absence of a cult around the pious Zoroastrians’ bodies but, at the same time, proves that Christian worship would offer no serious threat to their purity taboos.

East-Syrian, Armenian and Talmudic sources are purportedly first-hand witnesses. As I have already pointed out, Geoffrey Herman has demonstrated that exhumation of corpses was an actual issue for both Jews and Christians in the Sasanian Empire. However, we must also consider that the purpose of their narratives was mostly pedagogical. Moreover, their various inconsistencies and contradictions show that they cannot be taken at face value. Two frequent features of these narratives demonstrate that Christian hagiographers had little concern for the empirical accuracy of their descriptions of the Zoroastrian taboos concerning dead matter. First, all the stories point to the fact that inhumation as a practice was apparently out of the question, and the problem arises only in those cases in which Christian worship threatens the religious *status quo*. Second, the intervention of Sasanian authorities frequently seems to come directly into conflict with the practices sanctioned by Pahlavi literature.¹⁷

¹⁴ S.K. Mendoza Forrest, *Witches, Whores, and Sorcerers: The Concept of Evil in Early Iran* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011), 54-55.

¹⁵ *Vendidad*, 5.36. Quoted by Mendoza Forrest, *Witches, Whores, and Sorcerers*, 54; A. Barthelemy, *Gujastak Abalish. Relation d’une conférence théologique présidée par Le Calife Mámoun*. Bibliothèque de L’École des Hautes Études 69 (Paris, Vieweg, 1887).

¹⁶ Mendoza Forrest, *Witches, Whores, and Sorcerers*, 55.

¹⁷ For example, the bodies of the bishop and martyr Baršēbyā and his companions were thrown to be devoured by beasts and birds, but their heads were hanged on the doors of the temple of the goddess Anahīd at Estakhr, *AMS* II, 283. The *Martyrdom of Šūltan Mahdūkht*—though set in a completely legendary context—makes several references to Sasanian culture. Despite this, the story states that the body of the saint was cremated, *AMS* II, 38. According to the *Life of Mār Abā*, the Magi

Two examples could shed some light on this point. The first one is the short dialog between the East-Syrian Catholicos Mār Baboī and the *Šāhānšāh* Djamasp contained in a late source, the *Chronicle of Seert*, dating from the tenth or eleventh centuries.¹⁸ Bruns makes an extensive analysis of the theological and, especially, medical concepts in the dialog, concluding that the words of the Catholicos reflected an accurate understanding of Zoroastrian theology. However, the dialog gives us only a hint about the Galenic influence on East-Syrian anthropology, while leaving little room for an insight into the Zoroastrian viewpoint on the topic.

On the contrary, the testimony of Elišē's *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*¹⁹ can help us to reach some interesting conclusions. On the one hand, Elišē refers to Yazdgard's invective against the Christians for polluting the earth by interring the dead.²⁰ But, on the other hand, these purity taboos are set aside in another episode devoted to the execution and exposure of a *Magus* converted to Christianity. In this case, the king's concern was less related to the conservation of the purity of Earth than to the effects of the cult of the relics on religious status quo.²¹ For the king, just like in later Pahlavi literature, the focus of the debate was on the status of the corpse rather than on the burial itself, and his main concern was to avoid the spread of the cult around the martyr's relic.

Both examples demonstrate that the references to corpse exposure in Christian literature must be read with caution. Without any doubt, there were occasional clashes between Christians and the Magi about the cult of relics. Indeed, the Christian insistence

unsuccessfully tried to take the corpse of the celebrated Catholicos—a convert from Zoroastrianism—and threw it to the dogs. Finally, they accepted the superiority of Christian leadership and participated in the procession that translated his body, see P. Bedjan, *Histoire de Mar Jabalaba, de trois autres Patriarches, d'un prêtre et de deux laïques nestoriens*, (Paris: Harrassowitz, 1895), 271-272.

¹⁸ A. Scher, *Histoire nestorienne inédite: (chronique de Séert). Seconde partie. (I)*, PO 7.2, (Paris: Firmin & Didot, 1911), 37-38. This same anecdote is reproduced with interesting variants by the two versions of the *Kitab Al Majdal*.

¹⁹ R. Thomson, *Elišē. History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, (Cambridge: Harvard University press, 1982).

²⁰ *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, 90.

²¹ *History of Vardan and the Armenian War*, 207.

on the contact with dead matter as a means to reach God necessarily affected Zoroastrians' sensibility. But there is no conclusive evidence about a systematic and long-term policy against the deposition of saints' relics in churches.²² On the contrary, Christian *Martyria* were allowed into the cities and kings were eager to finance their construction.²³ In general, they did not expect religious homogeneity and they were tolerant of Christian practices, except in those cases (as in the case of Elišē's story) when the religious hegemony of the Magi was challenged.

To sum up, regardless of their undeniable factual value, I consider that these anecdotes might also be approached from a literary stance. From this point of view, they may be interpreted as literary devices which differentiate the theological concepts and funerary practices of Christians from those of "others", i.e. the Magi, the Jewish and the Manicheans. At the same time, they allowed the development of the cult around the relics, which became an incontestable mark of Christian identity. Yet they also constituted internal bonds through the assignment of hierarchical roles to the living in their exchange with the dead. Consequently, the stories about the ransom of the saint's bones from the exposure to the elements and animals, and their subsequent deposition in a *Martyrium* entitled the clerical elite to hold control over them.

THE EXPOSURE OF THE MARTYRS' CORPSES IN EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE

As mentioned above, modern studies have addressed the narratives related to the exposure of martyrs' corpses as a product of the interaction between Christians and their Zoroastrian adversaries. However, the motif of the unburied corpse was frequent in classical, Jewish and Christian literature and undoubtedly inspired East-Syrian hagiographers. In this section I will analyze some

²² The only (possible) exception to this observation is the Martyrdom of Pērōz, *AMS* IV, 254, which states that the infamous Mobad Miḥaršābhōr commanded the exhumation of all the dead who had been buried during the reign of Yazdgard I.

²³ Cf. *AMS* IV, 180, *Life of Mār ʾĪhūdemmēh*, 31; *Chronicle of Seert* 2.2, 146-147. Cf. J. B. Chabot, *Synodicon Orientale*. (Paris: Klincksieck, 1902), 107 (text), 364 (translation).

potential literary antecedents and the possible ways in which they could have reached East-Syrian literature.

References to corpse exposure abound in the Bible, though none of them is related to the Iranian culture. The first occurrence is a particular one in the Book of Jeremiah known as “the burial of the ass” (קְבוּרַת הַמֹּר), which was the punishment reserved for perjurers and blasphemers.²⁴ The second form is directly related to the formula “food for all the birds of the air and the beasts of the earth.” This formula can be found more or less *verbatim* thirteen times throughout the Bible and, although this repetition hinders the identification of any order of precedence, we can find two distinct sets. Both are closely interrelated, but their significance is clearly different.

The largest group (made up of ten occurrences) is part of the Deuteronomistic tradition, and makes reference to the desecration of corpses as the punishment reserved to those who disobeyed God’s commandments.²⁵ Almost all of these references are related to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 597 BC.²⁶ The only exception is Deut. 28: 26 in which the prophecy is replaced by the more abstract, but equally threatening, overtone of Moses’ speech about the calamities which would fall on Israel due to their disobedience.

²⁴ Jer. 22:19. Cf. *Sanh.* 82a; and especially in the Synods of the Church of the East where the “burial of the ass” is reserved for those found guilty of incestuous marriages and polygamy, see: *Synodicon Orientale*, 84-85 (text), 338 (translation).

²⁵ Jer. 7:33, 15:3, 16:4, 19:7, 22:19, 41:20; Ezek. 29:5; Isa. 18:6; 1 Sam. 17:44-46. This punitive dimension may be related to the horror shared by most ancient civilizations for the unburied corpses, and evidences the close relation between moral behavior and proper burial, although there is no mention of any link between them and individuals’ destiny in the afterlife. In Ancient Mesopotamia, denying a proper burial was a punishment for extremely awful crimes, such as impiety and treason. D. J. Wiseman, “The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon,” *Iraq* 20.1 (1958), 61-62. Classical Greek literature identified the practice of leaving corpses unburied with Barbarians. J. P. Vernant, “La Belle Mort et le Cadavre outragé,” in *La mort, les morts dans les Sociétés Anciennes*, ed. G. Gnoli, J. P. Vernant, (Paris: Editions de la maison des Sciences de l’homme, 1982), 45-77.

²⁶ The only exception is 1 Sam. 17:44-46 which is related to the combat between David and Goliath.

The second group is represented by Psalm 79: 2-3 and associated passages in the Maccabees' tradition.²⁷ All of them make reference to the defilement of Jerusalem but shift the punitive dimension of the first group to a martyrological context, adding corpse exposure to the sufferings of the Jews under an impious monarch. Yet, the exact relationship between Psalm 79 and its counterparts in the tradition of the Maccabees is problematic. The former is a lament for the destruction of Jerusalem. Verses 2 and 3 plead for the victims of the slaughter:

The dead bodies of thy servants have they given
to be food unto the birds of the heavens, the flesh
of thy saints unto the beasts of the earth. Their
blood have they shed like water round about
Jerusalem; and there was none to bury them.²⁸

Although most modern scholars relate Psalm 79 to the destruction of Jerusalem by the Babylonians in 587 BC,²⁹ this psalm is often identified by late antique exegetes as a prophecy of the defilement of the Temple by Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 167 BC.³⁰ This identification is based on the textual similarities between Ps. 79:2 and 1 Macc. 7:16-17, in which the massacre of sixty *Hasidim* (Ἀσιδαῖοι) by the pro-Syrian High Priest Alcimus is described:

Whereupon they believed him: howbeit he took of
them threescore men, and slew them in one day,
according to the words which he (Alcimus?)
wrote, The flesh of thy saints have they cast out,

²⁷ 1 Macc. 7:16-17, 2 Macc. 9:15, 3 Macc. 6:34.

²⁸ Ps. 79:2.

²⁹ M. Goulder, *The Psalms of Asaph and the Pentateuch* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 132-133.

³⁰ J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees. A new translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday & Co., 1976), 332-336; Theodoret, *Interpretatio in Psalmos*, PG LXXX, 1503-1510; R. Hill, ed., *Theodore of Mopsuestia. Commentary on Psalms 1-81* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006), 1086. M. J. Pierre, *Aphraate le Sage persan. Les Exposés I: Exposés I-X*, SC 349 (Paris: Cerf, 1988), 345-346.

and their blood have they shed round about
Jerusalem, and there was none to bury them.³¹

The passage of 1 Macc. 7:16-17 resumes the martyrological overtones of Ps. 79:2-3. Both are purported as a lament for the calamities which befell on the pious Jews. Notwithstanding the similarities of the vocabulary in both sets of references, their consequences are different. While the Deuteronomistic tradition emphasizes the punitive character of the exposure, Psalm 79 and the Maccabean tradition are more concerned with the motif of the fate of the innocents killed by the impious tyrant.

The martyrological exegesis of 1 Macc. 7:16-17 was translated into Latin and Greek martyr stories.³² Although the earliest testimonies are not directly connected to martyrological context,³³ the second- and third-century's martyr stories made the relation more explicit. In his *Ecclesiastical History*, Eusebius quoted a letter concerning the execution of the martyrs of Lyon.³⁴ This document dates from the second century AD and although it is impossible to determine the exact measure to which the original text was reproduced by the bishop of Caesarea, it is undeniable that the Books of Maccabees inspired the author of the letter in his portrayal of the Christian heroes.³⁵ This inspiration is evidenced in

³¹ 1 Macc. 7:16-17.

³² H. Delehaye, *Les légendes hagiographiques*, (Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1906), 32-33.

³³ In the *Acts of Pilate* the image of the unburied corpse is present in the form of a threat directed to Joseph of Arimathea for having buried the body of the Savior. See J. K. Elliot, *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993), 178.

³⁴ HE V, 1 55-56. The translations of the *Ecclesiastical History* are taken from K. Lake, *Eusebius: Ecclesiastical History*, Loeb Classical Library, (London: W. Heinemann, 1926).

³⁵ For a general view of the relationship of hagiography and biblical text see: M. Van Uythfange, "Modèles bibliques dans l'hagiographie," in *Le Moyen Âge et la Bible*. P. Riché, & G. Lobrichon, Dirs. (Paris, Beauchesne, 1984), 449-487; V. Saxter, *Bible et Hagiographie. Textes et thèmes bibliques dans les Actes des martyrs authentiques des premiers siècles* (Bern: Peter Lang, 1986), 37; O. Delouis, "Topos et typos, ou les dessous vétérotestamentaires de la rhétorique hagiographique à Byzance aux viii^e et ix^e siècles," *Hypothèses*, 1 (2002), 235-248.

Macc. 7:16-17. Both the governor and the people were depicted as wild (ἄγρια) and beastlike (καθάπερ θηρίου) for leaving the corpses to the dogs.⁴² The remains of the martyrs were subsequently burnt and their ashes thrown to the Rhône river. The story ends with a lament in the first person:

We could not bury the bodies in the earth (μὴ δύνασθαι τὰ σώματα κρύψαι τῇ γῇ.), for night did not avail us for this, nor did money persuade nor entreaty shame, but in every way they watched, as though they would make, some great gain, that the bodies should not obtain burial.⁴³

In both passages, the author associated bestiality with the irrational (even demoniac) nature of persecutors. In contrast, the Christians of Lyon—in all likeness with the Maccabean heroes—are endowed with martyr's virtues such as endurance and impassibility. But, unlike the subsequent references in Martyr stories, there is no posthumous victory for the Saints. On the contrary, the impious and animal nature of the pagans prevented the Christians from rescuing the corpses.

There are two other testimonies in Eusebius's works which may give us a clearer viewpoint about the transmission of the motif of corpses' exposure. Both belong to *The History of the Martyrs of Palestine*.⁴⁴ Due to its structure and contents, the Syriac translation provided successive East-Syrian martyr stories with the most obvious narrative model. The first testimony belongs to the chapter devoted to the confession of Antoninus and his companions. In this story, the bishop of Caesarea uses biblical imagery to describe

⁴² Ibid.

⁴³ *HE* V.1.61-62.

⁴⁴ This text survives in two versions. A shorter version is preserved in Greek and is included as an appendix of the *Ecclesiastical History*, see E. Schwartz, *Eusebius Werke. Erster Teil, Zweiter Band, Die Kirchengeschichte, GCS*, (Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908), 908-950; The longer version survives in a few Greek fragments published by H. Delehaye, "Eusebii Caesariensis De martyribus Palestinae Longioris Libelli Fragmenta," (*Analecta Bollandiana* 16 [1897]), 113-39; and an almost complete Syriac translation published by W. Cureton, *History of the Martyrs of Palestine by Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea. Discovered in a very Ancient Syriac Manuscript*. (London: Williams & Norgate, 1861).

the judge's brutality against the Christians. The magistrate "was carried away even beyond the laws of nature (ܠܚܝܬܐ ܕܠܗܐ) so that he wreaked his vengeance and hatred even upon the lifeless corpses (ܥܡܬܐ ܕܠܐ ܚܝܐ) of the Christians, and forbade their burial." Eusebius follows:

[...] orders were issued that their dead bodies (ܥܡܬܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܐ) should be devoured by beasts (ܕܡܬܝܬܐ), and be carefully guarded (ܕܡܬܝܬܐ) night and day till they should be devoured by birds (ܕܡܬܝܬܐ). Guards (ܕܡܬܝܬܐ) were therefore appointed to watch over this barbarous order from a distance, and to keep guard to prevent the bodies of the confessors from being carried away by us by stealth. So the beasts of the field (ܕܡܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܐ), and the dogs (ܕܡܬܝܬܐ), and the fowls of the sky (ܕܡܬܝܬܐ ܕܡܬܝܬܐ), were here and there tearing to pieces the flesh of men, so that men's bones and entrails were found even in the middle of the city; and all men were clad in sorrow on account of these things, because never before had such atrocities been done.⁴⁵

Following the same argument of the letter of Lyon, Eusebius used the parallel between the judge and the beasts to highlight the irrational nature of the sentence. Moreover, the vocabulary of the parallel resembles that in the Maccabean story and the reference to "guards" appointed to prevent the stealing of the corpse may be an indirect reference to the resurrection of the Lord.⁴⁶ This same idea is expanded with new elements in the confession of Pamphilus and

⁴⁵ *History of the Martyrs of Palestine*, 33-34; the Greek text in Schwartz, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, 929.

⁴⁶ J. Corke-Webster, "Author and Authority. Literary Representations of Moral Authority in Eusebius of Caesarea's *The Martyrs of Palestine*," in *Christian Martyrdom in Late Antiquity 300-450 AD: history and discourse, tradition and religious identity*, ed. P. Gemeinhardt & J. Leemans (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012), 51.

his companions.⁴⁷ In this story, Eusebius applied a similar set of images to define the barbarous attitude of the persecutors who exposed the corpses of the martyrs to become “food for the beasts” (ܠܫܬܐܠܝܡ ܠܚܝܬܐܠܝܡ).⁴⁸ But in this case, the Christian heroes had a posthumous victory when, according to the Syriac translator, “not even the wild beasts (ܠܝܬ ܕܝܠܐ)” dared to harm the bodies⁴⁹. Then, the believers ransomed their remains and carried them to a church where commemorations (ܠܝܬܐܠܝܡ) were celebrated in their honor. The inclusion of a miracle which allowed the ransom and deposition of the relics matched the triumphal overtones of Eusebian narrative. But most importantly, it showed all the ingredients that are present in later narratives.

Greek and Latin hagiographical texts from the fourth and fifth centuries were influenced by Eusebian material. The case of the *Martyrdom of Sergius and Bacchus* is of great interest due to its popularity among the Christians of the Sasanian Empire.⁵⁰ The cult of these two Roman soldiers spread over Mesopotamia and western Iran, and their story was soon translated into Syriac and Armenian.⁵¹ The earliest Greek version states that the judge in charge of the execution of the martyrs “became irritated because he was defeated” and did not allow the burial of the body of Saint Bacchus. Then, he ordered that his remains “be thrown out and exposed as food (βอรὰ) to the dogs, beasts, and birds (κυσὶν καὶ θηρίοις καὶ ὀρνέοις) outside the camp⁵².” The Syriac version is more explicit in quoting directly from the *Pešittā*: “but thrown to the dogs

⁴⁷ *History of the Martyrs of Palestine*, 38-48. Cf. Schwartz, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, 945, Delehay, “Eusebii Caesariensis De martyribus Palestinae,” 139.

⁴⁸ *History of the Martyrs of Palestine*, 48. The Greek version is significantly different: εἰς βορὰν τοῖς σαρκοβόροις [θηρίοις].

⁴⁹ Ibid. The Greek text of the Long version reads: οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς προσεῖμι οὐ θῆρ, οὐκ ὄρνεον, οὐ κύων, Cf. Delehay, “Eusebii Caesariensis De martyribus Palestinae,” 139. The shorter version reads: οὐ θηρίον, οὐ πτηνόν, οὐ κύων προσπέλαζεν, Cf. Schwartz, *Die Kirchengeschichte*, 945.

⁵⁰ BHG 1624-1625. BHO 1052-1055. E. Key Fowden, *The Barbarian Plain. Saint Sergius between Rome and Iran* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999).

⁵¹ Fowden, *The Barbarian Plain*, 101-173.

⁵² I. Van Den Gheyn, “Passio antiquior SS. Sergii et Bacchi Graece nunc primum edita,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 14 (1895), 389.

(ܝܬܝܕ ܕܝܥܢܝܕ ܕܗܠܝܬܝܕ), and that would be food for the beasts of the desert and the birds of the sky (ܕܝܥܢܝܕ ܕܗܠܝܬܝܕ ܕܗܠܝܬܝܕ ܕܗܠܝܬܝܕ).⁵³

In both versions, the scene ends when the birds guarded the body of Bacchus “as rational human beings” (ὡς τινων λογικῶν ἀνθρώπων/ܕܝܥܢܝܕ ܕܗܠܝܬܝܕ ܕܗܠܝܬܝܕ) until the next day, when the monks dwelling in the caves adjacent to the *Castrum* ransomed his corpse and buried it with honors. A comparable story is related by the Latin *Passion of Saint Vincent of Zaragoza*.⁵⁴ According to the *Passio Brevior* and the testimony of Prudentius,⁵⁵ the body of the Spanish deacon was thrown on the field to be devoured by dogs and beasts (*canes aut bestiae*); however his corpse was kept safe by the intervention of a raven (*Corvus*).⁵⁶

To sum up, the motif of the exposure of saints’ corpses was originated in the exegesis of the Hellenistic Judaism and then propagated to early Christian martyrological literature. Central to this motif was the theme of the wicked nature of the persecutors who denied the saints proper burial. Then, the fourth- and fifth-century Christian martyr stories added the element of the saint’s posthumous triumph thanks to divine intervention. As Wiessner has already stated, Eusebius’s *History of the Martyrs of Palestine* contributed some specific vocabulary to the East-Syrian narratives of the ‘Great Persecution’.⁵⁷ But the development of this motif in East-Syriac and Armenian literature was not the mere reproduction of a hagiographical cliché. It is undeniable that inhumation in general and the cult of the saints in particular could eventually be an issue for the Christians living in the Sasanian Empire. However, western hagiographical tradition was the prism through which

⁵³ AMS III, 305.

⁵⁴ BHL 8627-8648; BHG 1866-1867. The story of the martyrdom of this Spanish deacon is attested by three different recessions published in “Acta S. Vincentii martyris, archidiaconi Caesaraugustani, qui passus est Valentiae in Hispania, et relatio translationis ejusdem,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 1 (1882), 259-278. Cf. the sermons of Augustine: PL 38, cols. 1252-1267.

⁵⁵ V. H. G. Thompson *Prudentius*, 2 vols (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1953), 190-195.

⁵⁶ *Acta S. Vincentii martyris*, 262.

⁵⁷ Wiessner, *Zur Märtyrer-überlieferung*, 266-270.

actual events developed specific meanings which were relevant to the definition of Christian identity.

SAINTS' CORPSES AND ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY IN SASANIAN EMPIRE

The Cult of the Saints, its sociological, political and cultural consequences have captured the attention of the majority of the historians devoted to Late Antiquity for the last forty years. A great number of studies have pointed out the control exercised over the saints' tomb as a source of power in the construction of episcopal authority.⁵⁸ This control was materialized by three elements: the configuration of a sacred space in which the relics were deposited, the periodical performance of the liturgy according the Church's calendar, and the composition of narratives related to both. From the fourth century onwards, the periodical celebrations or "commemorations" of the feasts of the saints and martyrs sanctified time and space. On the one hand, those liturgical commemorations defined "sacred places", i.e. sanctuaries, where they were performed.⁵⁹ The presence of renowned sanctuaries in a city or a district projected sanctity to their surroundings. On the other hand, these celebrations often included the Memorial of the saints, a practice which served as a temporal bridge between their heroic deeds and the believers. As a consequence, the past became central to Church's life, instituting historical (i.e. biographical) narrative as one of its key components. The fourth element (relics) involved a much more conflictive process. Unlike Jewish and pagan taboos on dead matter, Christianity subverted⁶⁰ the relation between the living and the dead, thus establishing a "Tactile

⁵⁸ This may not be the time to list the vast bibliography on the Cult of the Saints in Late Antiquity. For a quick reference see P. Brown, "The rise and function of the Holy man in Late antiquity," *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971), 80-101; Idem, *The cult of the saints. Its rise and function in Latin Christianity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981).

⁵⁹ S. MacCormack, *Loca sancta: the organization of sacred topography in late antiquity*, (Urbana, University of Illinois Press, 1990); R. Markus, "How on Earth Could Places Become Holy? Origins of the Christian Idea of Holy Places," *JECs* 2.3 (1998), 257-271.

⁶⁰ A. Vauchez, "Introduction," *Micrologus. Natura, scienze e società medievali*, VII, Il Cadavere (1999), 1-10.

Revolution”⁶¹ in which death was not a source of pollution but a means to reach God. Hence, both realms were integrated by having the tomb of these “very special dead”⁶² within the city walls.

As a consequence of the presence saints’ relics, Christian sanctuaries became places where spiritual authority was manifested. But this authority also flowed through space, thanks to their circulation in the form of a “blessing” (Gr. εὐλογία, Syr. ܠܚܝܬܐ) which was perceived as endowed by the saint’s power.⁶³ Although blessings may be defined as “disinterested gifts”, their circulation established hierarchical bonds not only between individuals, but also between communities. Following Patrick Geary, we could define relics as “Sacred Commodities”: “goods destined to circulation and exchange” which establish hierarchical relations between the donor and the receiver.⁶⁴ The relics may have circulated as a reminder of the power of the saint, but especially as an expression of the special relation between him and a specific community.⁶⁵ Accordingly, the circulation of the saints’ relics could have strengthened or challenged the hierarchical relations between them. For example, J. M. Fiey has showed that the translation of the bodies of the saints in Late Antique Iraq was part of an agonistic exchange between communities.⁶⁶ This competition was intended to legitimize the authority of the *relic-holder* over his neighbors.

⁶¹ A. Samellas, *Death in the eastern Mediterranean (50-600 A.D.): the Christianization of the East : an interpretation*, Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 12 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 148-162.

⁶² Brown, *The cult of the saints*, 69.

⁶³ See: D. Caner, “Towards a Miraculous Economy Christian Gifts and Material ‘Blessings’ in Late Antiquity,” *J ECS* 14 (2006), 329-377; *idem*, “Alms, Blessings, Offerings,” in *The Gift in Antiquity*, ed M. L. Satlow (Oxford, John Wiley & Sons, 2013).

⁶⁴ P. Geary, “Sacred commodities: the circulation of medieval relics,” in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. A. Appadurai (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 169.

⁶⁵ On the translation of Saints’ relics see: H. Delehaye, *Les origines du culte des martyrs* (Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1912), 63-119; C. Mango, “Constantine’s Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics,” *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 83.1 (1990), 51-62.

⁶⁶ J. M. Fiey, “La vie mouvementée des reliques dans l’orient,” *Parole de l’Orient* 13 (1986), 183-196.

In the West, the Cult of the Saints reinforced and amplified a previously existing episcopal structure. But until the first decades of the fifth century, the Church of the East had a scarcely organized episcopal organization. From the first decades of the reign of Yazdgard I onwards, there was a process which led to a much more formal ecclesiastical structure. While this episcopal structure was being formalized, a Christian cult of the saints was developed. This cult expanded around the martyrs of the ‘Great Persecution’ under Šapūr II and it spread to a number of local martyrs and ascetics. The stories told around their deeds –what we could call the East-Syrian hagiographical tradition- were the means of expression of a Christian culture in which martyrdom was paramount. One of the main components of this culture was the assertion of a radical opposition between the Christian heroes and their religious rivals.⁶⁷ But this insistence on polemic and conflict does not conceal the multiple instances of adjustment of Christians to the Persian Culture.⁶⁸ Moreover, in posing the opposition of two antagonistic patterns of behavior, martyr stories were not intended to build a “realistic” model of Christian behavior but an ideal of Christian

⁶⁷ A. Becker, “Martyrdom, Religious Difference and ‘Fear’ as a Category of Piety in the Sassanian Empire. The Case of the Martyrdom of Gregory and the Martyrdom of Yazdpanch,” *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 2 (2009), 300-336.

⁶⁸ An extensive bibliography puts accommodation and negotiation at the center of the Church-State relations in Sasanian Empire: R. Payne, *Christianity and Iranian Society in Late Antiquity, ca. 500 – 700 CE*. (Princeton: PhD. Thesis, 2010); J. T. Walker, *The Legend of Mar Qardagh. Narrative and Christian Heroism in Late Antique Iraq* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006); S. McDonough, “A Question of Faith? Persecution and Political centralization in the Sasanian Empire of Tazdgard II (438-457 CE.),” in *Violence, Victims, and Vindication in Late Antiquity*, ed. H. Drake (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006), 69-82; *idem*, “Bishops or Bureaucrats?: Christian Clergy and the State in the Middle Sasanian Period,” *Current Research in Sasanian Archaeology, Art and History*, D. Kennet & P. Luft, eds., (Oxford, Archaeopress, 2008): 87-92; P. Gignoux, “Sur quelques relations entre Chrétiens et mazdéens d’après des sources syriaques,” *Studia Iranica*, 28 (1999), 83-94; L. Van Rompay, “Impetuous Martyrs? The Situation of the Persian Christians in the Last Years of Yazdgard I (419-421),” in *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective. Memorial Louis Reekmans*, ed., M. Lamberigts and P. Van Deun (Leuven: Peeters, 1995), 363-375.

heroism. This heroism was the starting point for the transmission of authority from the martyrs to the clergy in charge of their cult. This last observation leads us to the other characteristic of Christian culture: its local character, and its temporal continuity through the succession of martyrs and bishops.⁶⁹ The sanctuaries housed the saints' charisma, which was transmitted to the clergy attached to them by the re-enactment of their martyrdom by means of asceticism and liturgy.⁷⁰ They were actually the source of a Christian identity which stemmed from the development of a culture centered on Martyrdom.

At this point, it becomes apparent that the events related to corpse exposure in the *Acts of the Persian Martyrs* could be addressed within this much broader view. This scope includes not only the theological polemic but also the literary tradition underlying them and, chiefly, their function in the plot of each narrative. As a general hypothesis I would like to suggest that the events of corpse exposure were a form of *Inventio reliquiarum*. The *Inventio reliquiarum* is a well known feature of Late Antique hagiography related to the need to legitimize Christian sanctuaries as places of worship. The most notable of these findings is the *Inventio* of the relics of the Holy Cross by Saint Helena, the mother of Emperor Constantine.⁷¹ As a literary device, the *Inventio reliquiarum* was a means to fill the gap between the "historical" time of a saint and the emergence of his or her cult. Most of the stories about the exposure of the martyrs' body in East-Syriac literature are closely related to the *Inventio* of the relics in which a miracle reveals the place where the saint's remains are located.

⁶⁹ M. Debié, "Writing History as 'Histoires': the biographical dimension of East Syriac historiography," in *Writing True Stories: Historians and Hagiographers in the Late Antique and Medieval Near East* A. Papaconstantinou, M. Debié, H. Kennedy (eds.) (Paris: Brepols, 2010), 43-75.

⁷⁰ Cf. the link between the martyrs of Bēth Sēlōkh and the monks, *AMS* II, 531-535.

⁷¹ J. W. Drijvers, *Helena Augusta*. (Leuven: Brill, 1992).

CORPSE EXPOSURE IN EAST-SYRIAN MARTYR STORIES

Approximately sixty percent of the seventy three⁷² hagiographical pieces related to the Sasanian Empire contain some reference to corpse exposure, but their extension and characteristics are not homogeneous. Ironically, explicit references to exposure to the elements, dogs and birds are relatively sparse and ambiguous.⁷³ In some cases the references are undoubtedly bonded to biblical typology.⁷⁴ Most of them do not mention animals and are brief and plain, almost of formulaic nature. They only state that the corpses were left unburied and taken by the believers “secretly” or “by night” because they feared the Magi.⁷⁵ While some events include miracles or portents which allowed the ransom of the body,⁷⁶

⁷² This number is taken from the exhaustive catalogue made by S. Brock, *The History of Mar Ma'in with a Guide to the Persian Martyr Acts*, Persian Martyr Acts in Syriac: Text and Translation 1, (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2008), 78-84, plus a few additions of our own.

⁷³ See the martyrdoms of the captives of Bēth Zabaī, *AMS* II, 323; Jacob and Azad, *AMS* IV, 140; Baršēbyā, *AMS* II, 283, Miles of Susa, *AMS* II, 275, the Greek martyrdoms of IA, H. Delehayé, *Les Versions grecques des Actes des Martyrs Persans. Textes grecs et traductions*, PO 2.4 (Paris: Firmin-Didot, 1907), 460-461 and Širīn, P. Devos, “Sainte Sirin, martyre sous- Khosran ler Anosarvan,” *Analecta Bollandiana* 64 (1946), 131; the *Life of Mar Aba*, Bedjan, *Histoire de Mar Jabalaba*, 598, and the *Life of Aḥūdemmeḥ*, F. Nau, *Histoires d'Aboudeemeh et de Marouta, métropolitains Jacobites de Tagrit et de l'Orient (VIe et VIIe siècles), suivies du Traité d'Aboudeemeh sur l'homme*, PO 3.1 (Paris: Firmin & Didot, 1909), 46-51. Some references are unclear, see: the martyrdom of Ādhūrhōrmīzd and his daughter Ānahīd, *AMS* II, 596-600.

⁷⁴ As is the case of the introduction to the history of Simeon Bar Šābbā'e, Cf. A. Scher, & J. Perier, *Histoire nestorienne inédite: (Chronique de Séert). Première partie*. (I), PO 4.3, (Paris: Firmin & Didot, 1908), 299. M. Kmosko, *Simeon Bar Sabba'e*, PS 1.2, (Paris: Firmin & Didot, 1907), 718. Cf. K. Smith, *The Martyrdom and History of Blessed Simeon bar Sabba'e*, Persian Martyr Acts in Syriac: Text and Translation 3 (Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2014).

⁷⁵ Cf. the martyrdoms of Šābōr and Isaac, *AMS* II, 56; the 120 martyrs, *AMS* II, 295; Badmā, *AMS* II, 351; Dadō, *AMS* II, 221; Pinhas, *AMS* IV, 218; Narsai, *AMS* IV, 180; Tataq, *AMS* IV, 184; Aqebhšēmā, *AMS* II, 390-391.

⁷⁶ See the martyrdoms of Pōsī, *AMS* II, 232; Jacob and Azad, *AMS* IV, 140. Cf. Bruns, “Reliquien und Reliquienverehrung,” 201-209.

others showed how the crafty believers managed to recover it.⁷⁷ Details may vary, but their structure and contents are almost identical. First, there is often an explicit or implicit allusion to biblical literature. The Maccabean martyrs or Jesus' resurrection⁷⁸ are among the most common. Second, nearly all of the cases stressed the presence of Christian witnesses, who were also agents of the ransom of the corpse. Third, and foremost, the clergy mediated between the relics and the people depositing them in the sacred space of a sanctuary.

Only a few cases offered a more elaborated account of the events. All of them included the exposure of corpses in the context of the competition for the control over the saint's remains. The first examples come from the set of stories named by Wiessner as the *B-Zyklus*: the long version of the martyrdom of Simeon bar Šābbā'e⁷⁹ and the stories of Pōsī⁸⁰ and his daughter Marthā.⁸¹ All of them include narratives related to the final destination of the relics, especially their location in the local sanctuaries. In the final section of the *History of Simeon*, devoted to the execution and burial of the bishop and his companions, no mention was made to the exposure of the corpses to the animals.⁸² Instead, there was a reference to

⁷⁷ See the martyrdom of Gūbarlāhā, *AMS* II, 160; Z'ebīnā and his companions, *AMS* II, 49 and Sabas-Pirgušnasp, *AMS* IV, 249.

⁷⁸ In particular, the references to the episode given by the guards of Jesus's tomb in Mat. 27:64-28:13.

⁷⁹ *BHO* 1119.

⁸⁰ *BHO* 993.

⁸¹ *BHO* 698. These stories narrate the persecution in Karkhā d'Ēdān during the reign of Shapur II (circa 340 AD) but were written (probably by the same author) in the first decades of the fifth century, Cf. Wiessner, *Zur Märtyrer-Überlieferung*, 102-103. Although some of these texts may have experienced several transformations until they reached their definitive form, see G. Wiessner, "Zum Problem der zeitlichen und örtlichen Festlegung der erhaltenen syro-persischen Märtyrerakten. Das Pusai-Martyrium," in *Paul de Lagarde und die syrische Kirchengeschichte*. Ed. *Göttinger Arbeitskreis für syrische Kirchengeschichte*, (Göttingen: Lagarde-Haus, 1968), 231-351.

⁸² This anecdote, absent in the shorter version of the martyrdom, was reproduced and expanded with supernatural elements by the *Haddad Chronicle*, B. Haddad, *Mukhtaṣar al-akhbār al-bi'iyā*, (Baghdad: Al-Diwan, 2000), ١٩٢, and the *Chronicle of Seert* 1.1, 303, 'Amr Ibn Mattā: H.

how the bodies were “taken away on that very night” (ܕܗܝܠܟܢܐ ܗܝܠܟܢܐ ܕܗܝܠܟܢܐ) by some “Roman captives who lived in Karkhā d-Lēdān,” and were buried in honors (ܕܠܗܝܠܟܢܐ ܕܠܗܝܠܟܢܐ ܕܠܗܝܠܟܢܐ)”⁸³ in an unidentified place. Immediately, the desire for a portion of their bodies spread among the Christians, both local and foreign, who asked for “blessings” (ܕܠܗܝܠܟܢܐ) of the saints, “and they were given to them by the bishops who were at Karkhā at that time.”⁸⁴

The most striking feature of this anecdote is that the author transformed the exposure of the saint’s body into the starting point of its fragmentation and subsequent circulation among believers. The sequence implies that the narrative was the response to an actual competition for the control over the remains. By leaving the corpses unburied, the persecutors lost control over them, allowing their ransom by Roman captives. Unlike the place of execution, their burial site was not identified and the narrator never explained how the bishops took control of the “blessings”, which were later distributed. At this point it is worth questioning the reliability of the scene. The shorter and earlier version (i.e. the *Martyrdom*) does not mention the fate of the corpses and might seem that this final section of the *History* was a later addition. Thus the inclusion of the corpses’ ransom may reflect an interest in promoting a cult centered on the relics. Other minor inconsistencies in the narrative like the reference to Christian soldiers asking for relics⁸⁵ and the

Gismondi, *Maris, Amri et Slibae: De Patriarchis nestorianorum commentaria ex codicibus vaticanis*, vol. 2 (Roma: De Luigi, 1899), ١٨ (text), 11 (Latin translation). Surprisingly, ‘Amr wrongly states that the Magi intended to “cremate” (ܠܗܝܠܟܢܐ) the bodies. This same connection between Zoroastrianism and cremation is suggested by ‘Amr in the story of the dialogue between Catholicos Babaī and the King Zamasp, Cf. *Idem*, pp. ٣١ (Text), 21 (Latin Translation). Others directly omitted or simplified the reference. For example, Michael the Syrian did not mention it, and Marī Ibn Sulaymān just stated that the Bishop of Al-Ahwaz (Khuzestan) buried their remains.

⁸³ *History of Simeon Bar Šabba’e*, 98. The Syriac text and English translation are taken from K. Smith’s *The Martyrdom and History of Blessed Simeon Bar Šabba’e*, 210-211.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*

⁸⁵ As Kyle Smith noted (p. 210 n. 97), this statement contradicts the previous accusation against the Christians for not serving in the king’s army.

presence of bishops in Karkhā after the execution of Simeon might lead to the conclusion that the whole scene was an invention meant to fill the gap between “historical” events and the author’s time.

A different pattern applies to the martyrdoms of Pōsī and Marthā. Both stories conclude with the deposition of their relics in the house of a local Christian family. In the case of Pōsī, the Mobad in charge of the execution sought to prevent Christians from burying the corpse of the saint and taking “relics (مَنتَن) and blessings (بَرَکَت)” by appointing guards (نَظَرِی) to watch the corpse; however, a miraculous hail frightened the guards away and allowed the believers to take the body and carry it into the city.⁸⁶ The story goes on to state that a portent pointed to the house of a captive woman and *Barth q̄yāmā* as the final resting place for the saint. The pious woman and her brother, after discovering the identity of the corpse “embalmed the corpse of the glorious Pōsī, and buried it with honors, so that it will be a treasure of blessings for the citizens.”⁸⁷

Pōsī’s execution was followed by that of his daughter Marthā, who chose death over a forced marriage. Her burial was undertaken by the same family who had buried her father: “The brother of that blessed (woman) who had buried her father gave money and took her corpse. And he also embalmed her and deposited her with her father.”⁸⁸ The burial of Pōsī and Marthā’s bodies in the house of the *Barth q̄yāmā* indicates that martyrs’ shrines could frequently be a family business.⁸⁹ However, the narrator also avoids any criticism stating that the woman commemorated them every year in her habitation (مَکُونَت) “in the presence of the priests of the Church”.⁹⁰ The commemoration continued even after the woman’s death, when the shrine passed on to her brother’s son and, after his death to his two sons. At this point the narrator states that the family control over the sanctuary

⁸⁶ AMS II, 230.

⁸⁷ AMS II, 232.

⁸⁸ AMS II, 240.

⁸⁹ R. Payne, “The emergence of martyrs’ shrines in late antique Iran: conflict, consensus, and communal Institutions,” in P. Sarris, et al., *An Age of Saints? Power, Conflict and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity* (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 89-113.

⁹⁰ *Ibid.* مَکُونَتِ تَجَتِ خُونَتِ.

ended when both brothers had a dispute over the control of the relics. The quarrel was settled by the bishop Šaūmaī who “persuaded the two of them and he took them (the bones) from them and gave them to the people of the Church of Karkhā as a good reminder and a valuable treasure from the Church of the Messiah.”⁹¹ This Šaūmaī was Bishop of Karkhā dēLēdān during the first decades of the fifth century and was an active promoter of the cult of the martyrs in his diocese.⁹² His intervention allowed the translation of the control over the sanctuary from the lay elite to the local bishop. Thus, the exposure of the Martyrs’ corpses was part of a larger narrative that revealed the concern of a still precarious episcopal authority over the development of “lay” sanctuaries, i.e. the deposition of the Martyrs’ bones in private houses.⁹³

In other words, the stories of the secret burial of Simeon and the recovery of Pōsī and Marthā’s bones were less concerned with any Zoroastrian opposition than with the tensions produced by the competition for the control of martyrs’ relics. It might be alleged that in the first decades of the fifth century, the bishops of Karkhā dēLēdān tried to legitimize their monopoly over the relics of the fourth-century martyrs of the great persecution. These relics were scattered among a variety of sanctuaries devoted to their memory. The stories of Pōsī and Marthā reveal that some centers of worship remained outside the control of the episcopal authority. Thus, the narratives concerning the exposure and ransom of their bodies may be interpreted as literary devices to put them under clerical control.

The story of *Simeon* is the earliest example of corpse exposure in East-Syrian martyrs’ literature. Successive stories developed this motif at full length. Two late sixth- or seventh-century hagiographical texts from opposite fields are good examples of the diffusion of this motif. Although the details are mostly creations of a later date, these stories may reflect some historical kernel. The first one belonged to the *Life of Mār Abā*, which described the

⁹¹ AMS II, 240-241.

⁹² J. M. Fiey, “L’élam, la première des métropoles ecclésiastiques syriennes orientales,” *Parole de l’Orient* 1.1 (1970), 127.

⁹³ Cf. Payne, “The emergence of martyrs’ shrines,” 98-102. A.Vööbus, *The Canons ascribed to Marūtā of Maipherqat and related sources*, CSCO 439-440, *Scriptores Syri* 191-192, (Leuven, Peeters, 1982), 105 (Text), 88 (transl.).

funerals of the great sixth-century Catholicos (who died circa 552 AD) as a competition between Christians and the Magi for the control of his corpse:

Then the Magi from everywhere stirred up because he would not be translated until the King commanded it. And then they deposited him on a bier (ܐܝܬܝܬܝܐ gr. *λεκτίκιον*) and transported him with great difficulty because of the multitude of believers because many people cast shrouds (ܡܫܬܪܝܐ gr. *σουδάριον*) and vestments on him, and took them up again as relics (ܡܬܬܢܝܐ) and blessings (ܒܝܪܟܬܐ), until they arrived to the great church (ܕܡܕܢܬܐ i.e. the cathedral) of Kōkhē. And the Magi commanded that he be thrown to the dogs. And many companies of believers rose (saying) “If someone approaches the body of the saint, we will make havoc.” And numerous crowds approached and torn the wagon to pieces (ܕܡܬܬܠܬܡ) ⁹⁴ and took it as blessing. And nothing remained except for the chest (ܬܝܒܬܐ gr. *Γλωσσόκομον*) which contained the body of the saint. ⁹⁵

The story continues stating that the body of Ābā was honored for seven days in the cathedral of Kōkhē. During that time “all the crowd of believers from everywhere took the clothes (ܡܫܬܪܝܐ) and garments (ܐܬܝܬܝܐ) which covered his body to their homes as blessings (ܒܝܪܟܬܐ).” ⁹⁶ The conflict ended with a sort of negotiation, when the king commanded the Zoroastrian authorities to visit the body in order to confirm the saint’s death. Only after this ceremonial display of royal authority was the body of the saint posed on another bier (ܐܝܬܝܬܝܐ) and transported to the monastery of the city of Seleucia (ܕܫܠܥܝܐ) with great honor. As previously

⁹⁴ The word ܕܡܬܬܠܬܡ is related to the Parthian *bayasapak*. See C. Ciancaglini, *Iranian loanwords in Syriac*. (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2008), 127.

⁹⁵ *Life of Mār Ābā*, 270-271.

⁹⁶ *Life of Mār Ābā*, 272. Cf. Delehayé, *Les Origines*, 63-64.

mentioned, even the judges and the Magi participated in the procession.

The primal function of the whole narrative on the conflict over the corpse of Mār Ābā is to stress the leadership of the Catholicos over both Christian believers and their pagan opponents. For the Magi, their unsuccessful effort to give him a pious Zoroastrian burial (i.e. throwing his remains to the dogs) was not only a reminder of Ābā's Zoroastrian origin but also the tacit recognition that his prestige outreached religious boundaries. But they gave way to Christian pressure and followed the funeral procession to the saint's final resting place, maybe at a prudential distance from the wagon.⁹⁷ This attitude reveals that the concern over the due treatment of the corpse occupied a secondary place. On the contrary, it seems evident –if we assume that the events are historical– that even if Ābā had been Zoroastrian, a proper burial was object to negotiation.

But the story poses another –and less obvious– issue. The *Life* affirms that Ābā died in a place next to the church of Bēth Narqōs at Ctesiphon,⁹⁸ but his body was moved to the “great church” of Kōkhē⁹⁹ and then to his final resting place in the “monastery of Seleucia” (ܡܢܝܨܬܪܐ ܕܫܠܥܝܐ).¹⁰⁰ This journey is marked by the believers' desire to strip both “blessings” from the litter and other elements which had been in contact with his body. At first sight, this attitude may be interpreted as the recognition of the privileged relation between the bishop and God. Indeed, this was a usual, though controversial, custom among Christians both in the east and the west. An echo of this controversy in the Church of the East may be found in the Canon XIV of the Synod of Mār Yešōʿab (585) which condemned the incorrect use of amulets made from the bones of the saints.¹⁰¹ Although this canon dates from a later time, it expressed the same concern over the misuse of relics by lay and

⁹⁷ The use of the expression ܡܢܝܨܬܪܐ ܕܫܠܥܝܐ seems to point in this direction.

⁹⁸ *Life of Mār Abā*, 270. On this church see J M Fiey, “Topographie Chrétienne de Mahozé,” *L'Orient Syrien* 12.4 (1967), 413.

⁹⁹ Cf. Fiey, “Topographie,” 403.

¹⁰⁰ This information contradicts the testimonies of Marī Ibn Sūleyman and ʿAmr who state that Ābā was buried at Hirtā, cf. Gismondi, *Maris, Amri et Slibae*, 45.

¹⁰¹ *Synodicon Orientale*, 150 (text), 411 (translation).

monks alike. In the same way, the author of the *Life of Mār Ābā* stresses that, despite the challenge of the Magi and lay believers, the body of the saint remained unharmed and under Church's control until its final deposition in the monastery.

To sum up, the story of Ābā's burial primarily supported the claims of the episcopal elite to monopolize the control over the Holy Man's relics. Far from being a mere description of the events, the text was organized on the basis of two distinct, but interrelated, conflicts. The first one involved the opposition between Christians and the Magi on the origin of the saint's authority. Hence, the Zoroastrian funerary custom, although pious from the Magi's perspective, was presented as an act of desecration. However, we must remember that there is no hint to indicate any concern over the earth's purity. On the contrary, the author stressed that Zoroastrian authorities were eager to negotiate, thus validating Christian worship. The second conflict may be interpreted in a very different light. The Christian crowd occupied a central place not only in the defense of the body of the saint but also in the tearing of the garments off the corpse. The resulting "blessings" scattered among the Christian households symbolized the dissemination of the saint's protection over the city.

The second example is taken from the Miaphysite literature. In the early sixth century, Miaphysite missionaries from the Roman Empire started crossing the border into the western provinces of the Persian Empire.¹⁰² However, it was only during the first decades of the seventh century, that the Miaphysite Church became a significant opponent to the Dyophysite hegemony on the Persian Church. By the seventh century, the Church of the East was structured through a well-established net of urban bishoprics hierarchically organized around the Catholicos of Māhozē. In addition, the "Nestorians" could claim continuity from the Apostles themselves through a succession of bishop-martyrs like Simeon bar Šabbā'e or Mār Ābā. Unlike their opponents, the Miaphysite Church, organized in scattered communities, could not claim such an ancient and well-established history. On the contrary,

¹⁰² For a history of the Persian Miaphysitism, see W.H.C. Frend, *The Rise of the Monophysite Movement*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1972), 282-285, 321.

it was a barely organized net of isolated communities around the monastery of Mār Matay near Mosul, and the city of Tagrīt.¹⁰³

Besides the West-Syrian historians of the Eastern Roman Empire, the early history of the Persian Miaphysism is contained in two hagiographical stories concerning the two first *Maphrian*: Mār Āḥūdemmeḥ and his successor Mār Marūthā. Both stories, written in the first decades of the seventh century, were composed to endow the recently organized Miaphysite Church with a prestigious past. In particular, the *Life of Mār Āḥūdemmeḥ* was conceived to fill a chronological gap between the seventh-century metropolis and its semi-legendary founder.¹⁰⁴

The *Life of Mār Āḥūdemmeḥ* was most likely written a few years before the Islamic invasion, and describes the semi legendary history of this bishop, missionary and confessor who died in prison circa 575 AD. His *Vita* is divided into two parts. The first part is dedicated to his mission among the pagan Arabs who dwelled in the frontier district of Bēth ‘Arabayē. The second part records his imprisonment and execution after being found guilty of the conversion of one of the sons of King Cosroes II.

Space and movement are central to Āḥūdemmeḥ’s story to the extent that his missionary travels prefigure the geography of the seventh-century Miaphysism. The saint is not only a preacher and performer of miracles but also an itinerant bishop, following the Arab tribes around the steppe. This mobile nature of the pastoral function of the saint may be considered the consequence of the control exercised by “Nestorian” bishops over the main cities. Although Āḥūdemmeḥ is credited as bishop of the country of the

¹⁰³ Some traditions located the See of the Miaphysite *Maphrian* (i.e. Catholicos, or Metropolitan bishop) of the East in Mosul, while others in Tagrīt. J. M. Fiey, “Tagrīt. Esquisse d’histoire Chrétienne,” *L’Orient Syrien*, 8.3-4 (1963), 301-309. Michael the Syrian states that the first Metropolitan of the Sasanian Empire was certain Garmaī, ordained by the Catholicos of Armenia in the Monastery of Mār Mattay. J. B. Chabot, *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, vol. II, (París: E. Leroux, 1901), p. 417 (transl), *idem*, vol IV (1910), p. 413 (text).

¹⁰⁴ The only contemporary testimony to Āḥūdemmeḥ is provided by the Miaphysite historian John of Ephesus, who did not directly relate him to the See of Tagrīt. E.W. Brooks, *Iohannes Epheseni. Historiae ecclesiasticae pars tertia*. CSCO, 105/106, *Scriptores Syri* 54/55, (Leuven, Peeters, 1935-36), 316-317 (text), 240 (transl.).

Arabs (طالار و حجاز) and Metropolitan, his mission is not restricted to a particular location, i.e. an episcopal see. On the contrary, his authority extended over isolated communities around the shrines of *Mār Sargis*, adjacent to the monastery of Ainqenoïe,¹⁰⁵ and the monastery of Gaʿatany near the castle of Āqrūntā some distance from the city of Tagrīt.¹⁰⁶ This mobility of the episcopal function is also apparent in the episode devoted to his capture.¹⁰⁷ The saint was arrested and sent to Māhōzē to be interrogated by the king. The road to the royal city was presented as a pilgrimage to the place where the saint would testify the true faith.

This sense of perpetual movement which pervaded the *Life of Mār Aḥūdemmeḥ* is the key to understand the section devoted to the ransom of his relics. According to the final section of his *Vita*, the saint died after two years in prison. The believers tried to recover his body for a proper burial but the attempt to bribe the guards was unsuccessful.¹⁰⁸ Instead, the guards carried the body outside the walls of the prison, cut his head off and took it along with the royal seal attached to the necklace. Then, they departed after leaving the body to the wild animals. At this point, the author makes a brief *excursus* by comparing the beheading of the martyr with that of John the Baptist by Herod. Finally he concludes:

And they (the guards) threw his corpse with the rest of the men who had died in that prison, *and they went out to throw it in front of the dogs* (حلك) that were also accustomed to devour the flesh of the men. And *some believers stayed at some distance* and watched so that the flesh of the saint would not be eaten *by birds and dogs* (حلك و حلك و حلك). And they saw a miracle and they were astonished. Those dogs approached the corpse of the saint, but none of them touched it. Not even the birds that hovered settled on him because of the dogs. Oh prodigy! That the wild dogs became his guards! Oh the hardness of heart of the tyrant

¹⁰⁵ *Life of Mār Aḥūdemmeḥ*, 29.

¹⁰⁶ *Life of Mār Aḥūdemmeḥ*, 32.

¹⁰⁷ *Life of Mār Aḥūdemmeḥ*, 35-40.

¹⁰⁸ *Life of Mār Aḥūdemmeḥ*, 47.

king who did not obey the commandments of
God, like the dogs!¹⁰⁹

Although, at first sight the scene seems to depict the Iranian custom of corpse exposure, the sequence of events seems to be inspired by Eusebius's *Martyrs of Palestine* in which –as we have already seen– animals' behavior is equated to the persecutors'. Yet, in this case, the comparison brings on an opposition. Unlike Cosroes, whose orders were contrary even to human law and the fear of God, the irrational dogs acknowledged the holy nature of the martyr and kept the corpse unharmed. Undoubtedly, this feature does not necessarily override the historicity of the anecdote, but its actual meaning derives from the combination of a known figure in martyrological literature and a well established tradition which associates corpse exposure to the Iranian milieu.

Furthermore, another element of the narrative points to a broader meaning than the simple description of the Iranian custom. This is the case of the believers who witnessed the exposure. Their testimony not only assures his sanctity, but also serves as recognition of the link between the saint and the royal city. Thus, the miracle is a sign of divine protection over the bodies of those who keep his commandments and the starting point of the long journey of the saint's relics. This journey has a symbolic value, since the path gives a specific meaning to both the authority of the shepherd and to his flock. As a consequence, it could be asserted that the narrative projects the contemporary claims of different communities over the body into the past.

And when the sun set and the dominion of
twilight of the dawn of that Saturday began, those
believers stole the body of the saint, and took it to
Māḥōzē and they deposited it in the church that
was there, which is called of the rebībē.¹¹⁰

Although there is no other information about the church of the rebībē, it is worth noting that the deposition of the saint's body in it connects the Miaphysite church to the royal cities. This first stop on the saint's journey may be considered as a hint of the existence of a developed cult around the martyr in the local

¹⁰⁹ Ibid.

¹¹⁰ *Life of Mār Aḥūdemmeḥ*, 48.

community, although this assertion is merely speculative. In any case, the main focus of the narrative is the translation of the relics further north, to the region adjacent to the city of Tagrīt. An hour after the deposition of the saint in the church of the capital, the deacon who was his disciple took the body and translated it to the monastery of Bēth Āsā near a village named Āqrūtā, and then made his way to Tagrīt. In its new location the relics of the saint became the focus of a struggle for their control. The story goes on to state the disciple's desire to become abbot (ܐܒܬܐ) of the monastery located inside the city. The way to achieve his goal was to negotiate with the citizens (ܚܒܝܠܐ), who accepted to make him abbot in exchange for the translation of Āhūdēmmēh's relics into the city.¹¹¹ Then, the disciple and some of the city noblemen (ܐܢܬܐ) went to Bēth Āsā in order to require their delivery from the monks. They spent two days in the monastery "pressing" (ܠܚܥܩ) the abbot until he agreed to give them the corpse. After achieving their goal, they crossed the river back to Tagrīt.

If the translation of the relics from the Royal city to the north was apparently due to human craftiness, the chain of events is henceforth explicitly ruled by divine intervention. On its way from Bēth Āsā to Tagrīt, the raft passed the village of Āqrūtā. At that moment, a wind from the south disturbed the river preventing the raft from going forward. This prodigy was understood by the deacon and the believers as a sign of divine will. At the end of the story, the bones of Āhūdēmmēh were deposited (ܐܬܬܚܒܐ) in the village, except for "a little portion of him" (ܚܕܐ ܡܢ ܚܕܐ)¹¹² which was given to the citizens of Tagrīt.

As in the case of Simeon, it can be assumed that the episode of the ransom of Āhūdēmmēh's bones and their subsequent translation was intended to fill a temporal gap, projecting the seventh century's geography of his cult into the past. Nevertheless, it also filled a spatial gap, because the final result was the location of the relics inside the city. By stressing their miraculous path, the author justified the power relations inside the diocese, or rather the different negotiations which ended with the partition of the Martyr's relics. Then, although most of the body was laid in a

¹¹¹ Ibid.

¹¹² *Life of Mār Āhūdēmmēh*, 50.

nearby village, the mere presence of a single part of it enabled the city to claim him as its first bishop.

CONCLUSION

As in most of the historiography of Late Antiquity, the main purpose of hagiography was to provide models of behavior to its audience. Thus, “facts” were incorporated to the plot to serve its primary pedagogical aims. The references to corpse exposure in East-Syriac hagiography reflected the same principle: they were pedagogical tools. However, their ultimate meaning was far from univocal. Furthermore, there was no consistency in the meanings of these references as a whole insofar each of them seemed to be the answer to specific situations. Certainly, the cult around the relics of the Christian martyrs was a controversial matter for Christians in the Sasanian Empire, but the reasons were far more complex than the mere opposition of their Zoroastrian adversaries. Although it seems undeniable that the proximity with dead matter was perceived by the Magi as a threat to the purity of creation, Christian funeral practices (i.e. inhumation) were not a central issue as long as Zoroastrian purity laws were not conceived as a universal rule, but as a constitutive part of the *ethos* of a specific ethnoreligious group.

On the other hand, theological differences between Zoroastrians and Christians about the origin and nature of death did not necessarily impact on funeral practices. Ironically, the Medieval Pahlavi literature stressed that the most serious threat of pollution came immediately after death, and that the bleached bones of the dead exposed to the sun were a minor source of pollution. Moreover, as we have already seen, the threat increased if the dead had led an extraordinary pious life.¹¹³ These statements derived from a materialistic conception of death as a demonic power created by Ahrimen to defeat the good creation of Ahura Mazda.¹¹⁴ For their part, East-Syrian and Armenian theologians may have known these arguments and insisted on the divine origin and pedagogical dimension of death. Attached to human nature by God for the sake of instruction (rather than merely for

¹¹³ Hutter, *The Impurity of the Corpse*, 18. Mendoza Forrest, *Witches, Whores, and Sorcerers*, 54-55.

¹¹⁴ *Yasna* 30:3-4.

punishment),¹¹⁵ death was perceived as a legitimate means to reach Him.

The cult devoted to the relics, as a logical result of the Christian theology of death, was of great importance to define a distinctive Christian identity. Notwithstanding this obvious function, this cult has to be performed properly, in consecrated places and overseen by the right authority. Such was the concern of East-Syrian writers as Narsai¹¹⁶ or Isaiah,¹¹⁷ who were less concerned with the hypothetical objections of the Zoroastrian authorities than the establishment of a legitimate way for the living to interact with the dead. In other words, it was the consequences of the Cult of the Saints that was at stake, rather than the polemic with external adversaries about funeral practices.

In this paper I have proposed to analyze the function of the topic of corpse exposure in East-Syrian hagiography as a result of the tensions generated inside the Church. To the extent that they fixed Christian sanctity in space, *Martyria* were not only places where Christian memory was materialized, but also the means by which God's power manifested. The stories about the exposure and ransom of saints' relics, as a form of *Inventio*, were intended to endow the clergy attached to the *Martyria* with a portion of this

¹¹⁵ Leaving aside the problem of the original immortality of Man. P. Gignoux, *Homélies de Narsai sur la Création*, in *PO* 34.3-4 (Paris: Brepols, 1968), 130; M. J. Blanchard & R. Darling Young, *Ezṛīkē of Kolb. On God*, (Leuven: Peeters, 1998), 72-76. Cf. P. J. De Menasce, *Une apologétique mazdéenne du IX^e siècle. Škand-Gumānik Vicār, La solution décisive des doutes*, (Fribourg: Librairie de l'Université, 1945).

¹¹⁶ See the homily "On Martyrs" attributed to Narsai, A. Mingana, *Narsai doctoris Syri Homiliae et carmina*. vol. 2, (Mosul: Typis Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1905), 46-55. P. Krüger, "Traduction et Commentaire de L'Homelie de Narsai sur les Martyrs. Contribution à l'étude des Martyrs dans le nestorianisme primitif," *Parole de L'Orient* 3.1 (1958), 299-316.

¹¹⁷ A. Scher, "Traité d'Isai le docteur et de Hnana d'Adiabène sur les Martyrs, le Vendredi d'or et les Rogations," in *PO* 7.1 (Paris: Firmin & Didot, 1911), 15-52. In particular, his doctrine of the inactivity of the soul after death (derived from Narsai's anthropology), see P. Krüger, *Traduction et Commentaire de L'Homelie de Narsai sur les Martyrs*, 302-303. M. Dal Santo, "The Saints' Inactivity post mortem: Soul Sleep and the Cult of Saints East of the Euphrates," in *Debating the Saints' Cult in the Age of Gregory the Great* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 237-320.

divine power, filling a more or less prolonged chronological gap between them. The stories of the ransom of the bodies of Simeon bar Šābbā'e, Ābā and Āhūdemmēh are good examples of this process. All of them projected into the past the tensions caused by the particular conditions in which they were written. But, in spite of the different circumstances, all of them reflected a common cultural heritage in which the rules that governed the relationship between the living and the dead were central to define the power relations inside the Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anklesaria, B. T. *Zand-Ākāsib, Iranian or Greater Bundabišn. Transliteration and Translation in English*. Mumbai: Rahnumae Mazdayasnan Sabha, 1956.
- Barthelemy, A. *Gujastak Abalish. Relation d'une conférence théologique présidée par Le Calife Mámoun*. Bibliothèque de L'École des Hautes Études, 69, Paris, Vieweg, 1887.
- Becker, A. "Martyrdom, Religious Difference and 'Fear' as a Category of Piety in the Sassanian Empire. The Case of the Martyrdom of Gregory and the Martyrdom of Yazdpaneh," *Journal of Late Antiquity*, 2 (2009): 300-336.
- Bedjan, P. *Histoire de Mar Jabalaba, de trois autres Patriarches, d'un prêtre et de deux laïques nestoriens*. Paris: Harrassowitz, 1895.
- Blanchard, M. J. & R. Darling Young, *Ezriq of Kolb. On God*. Leuven: Peeters, 1998.
- Bourchalat, R. "Pratiques funéraires à l'époque sasanide dans le Sud de l'Iran," in *Histoire et cultes de l'Asie Centrale préislamique: sources écrites et documents archéologiques : actes du Colloque international du CNRS, (Paris, 22-28 novembre 1988)*. ed. P. Bernard, F. Grenet, Paris: CNRS, 1991, 71-78.
- Boyce, M. *A History of Zoroastrianism*. Vol. 1. Leiden: Brill, 1975.
- Boyce, M. "Corpse, Disposal of, in zoroastrianism", in *Encyclopædia Iranica*, online edition, 2011, available at <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/corpse-disposal-of-in-zoroastrianism>.

- Brock, S. *The History of Mar Ma'in with a Guide to the Persian Martyr Acts*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2008.
- Brooks, E.W. *Iohannes Epheseni. Historiae ecclesiasticae pars tertia*. CSCO, 105/106, *Scriptores Syri* 54/55, Leuven, Peeters, 1935-36.
- Brown, P. "The rise and function of the Holy man in Late antiquity." *Journal of Roman Studies* 61 (1971): 80-101.
- Brown, P. *The cult of the saints. Its rise and function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Bruns, P. "Reliquien und Reliquienverehrung in den syropersischen Martyrerakten." *Römische Quartalschrift für Christliche Altertumskunde und Kirchengeschichte* 101 (2006): 194-213.
- Cameron, A. "Agathias on the Sassanians." *Dumbarton Oaks Papers* 23-24 (1969): 67-183.
- Caner, D. "Towards a Miraculous Economy Christian Gifts and Material 'Blessings' in Late Antiquity." *J ECS* 14 (2006): 329-377.
- Caner, D. "Alms, Blessings, Offerings." In *The Gift in Antiquity*, ed M. L. Satlow. Oxford: Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Chabot, J. B. *Chronique de Michel le Syrien*, 4 vol. Paris: E. Leroux, 1899-1910.
- Chabot, J. B. *Synodicon Orientale*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1902.
- Ciancaglini, C. *Iranian Loanwords in Syriac*. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2008.
- Corke-Webster, J. "Author and Authority. Literary Representations of Moral Authority in Eusebius of Caesarea's The Martyrs of Palestine." In *Christian Martyrdom in Late Antiquity 300-450 AD: history and discourse, tradition and religious identity.*, ed. P. Gemeinhardt & J. Leemans, Berlin: De Gruyter, 2012, 51-78.
- Cureton, W. *History of the Martyrs of Palestine by Eusebius Bishop of Caesarea. Discovered in a very Ancient Syriac Manuscript*. London: Williams & Norgate, 1861.
- Dal Santo, M. "The Saints' Inactivity post mortem: Soul Sleep and the Cult of Saints East of the Euphrates," in *Debating the Saints'*

- Cult in the Age of Gregory the Great*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012, 237-320.
- De Jong, A., *Traditions of the Magi. Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin literature*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- De Menasce, J. *Une apologétique mazdéenne du IX^e siècle. Škand-Gumānik Vicar, La solution décisive des doutes*. Fribourg: Librairie de l'Université, 1945.
- Debié, M. "Writing History as 'Histoires': the biographical dimension of East Syriac historiography." In *Writing 'True Stories' Historians and Hagiographers in the Late Antique and Medieval Near East*, ed. A. Papaconstantinou, M. Debié, H. Kennedy. Paris: Brepols, 2010, 43-75.
- Delehaye, H. "Eusebii Caesariensis De martyribus Palestinae Longioris Libelli Fragmenta." *Analecta Bollandiana* 16 (1897): 113-139.
- Delehaye, H. *Les légendes hagiographiques*. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1906.
- Delehaye, H. *Les origines du culte des martyrs*. Bruxelles: Société des Bollandistes, 1912.
- Delouis, O. "Topos et typos, ou les dessous vétérotestamentaires de la rhétorique hagiographique à Byzance aux viii^e et ix^e siècles." *Hypothèses* 1 (2002): 235-248.
- Devos, P. "Sainte Sirin, martyre sous- Khosran 1^{er} Anosarvan." *Analecta Bollandiana* 64 (1946): 87-131.
- Drijvers, J. W. *Helena Augusta*. Leuven: Brill, 1992.
- Duval, Y. *Auprès des saints corps et âme: l'inhumation "ad sanctos" dans la chrétienté d'Orient et d'Occident du III^e au VII^e siècle*. Paris: Études augustinienes, 1988.
- Elliot, J. K. *The Apocryphal New Testament: A Collection of Apocryphal Christian Literature in an English Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- Fiey, J. M. "Tagrît. Esquisse d'histoire Chrétienne." *L'Orient Syrien*, 8.3-4 (1963): 288-341.

- Fiey, J. M. "Topographie Chrétienne de Mahozé." *L'Orient Syrien*, 12.4 (1967): 397-420.
- Fiey, J.M. "L'élam, la première des métropoles ecclésiastiques syriennes orientales." *Parole de l'Orient* 1:1 (1970): 123-153.
- Fiey, J. M. "La vie mouvementée des reliques dans l'orient." *Parole de l'Orient* 13 (1986): 183-196.
- Freund, W.H.C. *The Rise of the Monophysite movement*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1972.
- Geary, P. "Sacred commodities: the circulation of medieval relics." In *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, ed. A. Appadurai. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988, 169-191.
- Gignoux, P. *Homélies de Narsai sur la Création*. PO 34.3-4, Paris: Brepols, 1968.
- Gignoux, P. "Sur quelques relations entre Chrétiens et mazdéens d'après des sources syriaques." *Studia Iranica*, 28 (1999): 83-94.
- Gismondi, H. *Maris, Amri et Slibae: De Patriarchis nestorianorum commentaria ex codicibus vaticanis*. 4 vols. Roma: De Luigi, 1899.
- Goldestein, J. *I Maccabees. A new translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1976.
- Goulder, M. *The Psalms of Asaph and the Pentateuch*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996.
- Haddad, B. *Mukhtaṣar al-akhbār al-bi'iyā*, Baghdad: Al-Diwan, 2000.
- Hauser, S. "Christliche Archäologie im Sasanidenreich: Grundlagen der Interpretation und Bestandsaufnahme der Evidenz," in *Inkulturation des Christentums im Sasanidenreich*, ed. A. Mustafa, J. Tubach, & G. Sophia Vashalomidze, Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2007, 93-136.
- Herman, G. "Bury My Coffin Deep! Zoroastrian Exhumation in Jewish and Christian Sources." In *Tiferet Leyisrael: Jubilee Volume in Honor of Israel Francus*, ed. J. Roth, M. Schmeltzer, Y. Francus. New York: The Jewish Theological Seminary of America, 2010, 31-59.

- Hill, R. *Theodore of Mopsuestia. Commentary on Psalms 1-81*. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2006.
- Huff, D. "Archaeological evidence of zoroastrian funerary practices." In *Zoroastrian rituals in context*, ed. M. Stausberg. Leiden: Brill, 2004, 593-630.
- Hutter, M. "The Impurity of the Corpse (nasā) and the Future Body (tan ī pasēn): Death and Afterlife in Zoroastrianism." In *Human Body in Death and Resurrection*, ed. T. Nicklas, F. V. Reiterer, J. Verheyden, H. Braun. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2009, 13-26.
- Key Fowden, E. *The Barbarian Plain. Saint Sergius between Rome and Iran*, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.
- Krüger, P. "Traduction et Commentaire de L'Homelie de Narsai sur les Martyrs. Contribution à l'étude des Martyrs dans le nestorianisme primitif." *Parole de L'Orient* 3.1 (1958): 299-316.
- MacCormack, S. *Loca sancta: the organization of sacred topography in late antiquity*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1990.
- Mango, C. "Constantine's Mausoleum and the Translation of Relics." *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 83.1 (1990): 51-62.
- Markus, R. "How on Earth Could Places Become Holy? Origins of the Christian Idea of Holy Places." *JECs* 2.3 (1998): 257-271.
- McDonough, S. "A Question of Faith? Persecution and Political centralization in the Sasanian Empire of Tazdgar II (438-457 CE.)." In *Violence, Victims, and Vindication in Late Antiquity*. ed. H. Drake. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2006, 69-82.
- McDonough, S. "Bishops or Bureaucrats?: Christian Clergy and the State in the Middle Sasanian Period." *Current Research in Sasanian Archaeology, Art and History*, ed. D. Kennet & Luft, P. Oxford: Archaeopress, 2008, 87-92.
- Menant, D. "Les rites Funéraires des Zoroastriens de l'Inde." *Conférences faites au Musée Guimet*, Paris: Leroux, 1910, 141-98.
- Mendoza Forrest, S.K. *Witches, Whores, and Sorcerers: The Concept of Evil in Early Iran*, Austin: University of Texas Press, 2011.

- Mingana, A. *Narsai doctoris Syri Homiliae et carmina*. 2 vols. Mosul: Typis Fratrum Praedicatorum, 1905.
- Modi, J.J. *The funeral ceremonies of the Parsees: their origin and explanation*. Mumbai: Fort Print Press, 1905.
- Nau, F. *Histoires d'Aboudemmeh et de Marouta, métropolitains Jacobites de Tagrit et de l'Orient (VI^e et VII^e siècles), suivies du Traité d'Aboudemmeh sur l'homme*. PO 3.1. Paris: Firmin & Didot, 1909.
- Panaino, A. *Vendidad: la legge di abiura dei demoni dell'Avesta zoroastriano*. Milano: Mimesis, 1990.
- Payne, R. *Christianity and Iranian Society in Late Antiquity, ca. 500 – 700 CE*. Princeton: PhD. Thesis, 2010.
- Payne, R. "The emergence of martyrs' shrines in late antique Iran: conflict, consensus, and communal Institutions." In P. Sarris, et al. *An Age of Saints? Power, Conflict and Dissent in Early Medieval Christianity*. Leiden: Brill, 2011, 89-113.
- Pierre, M. J. *Aphraate le Sage persan. Les Exposés I: Exposés IX*. SC 349. Paris, Cerf, 1988.
- Rajak, T. "The Maccabean Mother between Pagans, Jews, and Christians." In C. Harrison, C. Humfress, I. Sandwell, eds. *Being Christian in Late Antiquity: A Festschrift for Gillian Clark*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2014, 50-53.
- Samellas, A. *Death in the eastern Mediterranean (50-600 A.D.): the Christianization of the East : an interpretation*. Studien und Texte zu Antike und Christentum 12. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- Saxter, V. *Bible et Hagiographie. Textes et thèmes bibliques dans les Actes des martyrs authentiques des premiers siècles*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1986.
- Shaked, S. *Dualism in transformation: varieties of religion in Sasanian Iran*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, 1994.
- Schwartz, E. *Eusebius Werke. Zweiter Band, Die Kirchengeschichte, GCS*. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1908.
- Scher, A. "Traité d'Isaï le docteur et de Hnana d'Adiabéne sur les Martyrs, le Vendredi d'or et les Rogations." In PO 7.1. Paris: Firmin & Didot, 1911, 15-52.

- Scher, A., et al. *Histoire nestorienne inédite (Chronique de Séert)*. PO 4.3, 5.2, 7.2, 13.4. Paris: Firmin & Didot, 1908-1919.
- Simpson S. J. & T. S. Molleson. "Old Bones Overturned: New Evidence for Funerary Practices from the Sasanian Empire," in *Regarding the Dead: Human Remains in the British Museum*, ed. A. Fletcher, D. Antoine, and J.D. Hill, London: British Museum press, 2014, pp. 77-90.
- Smith, K. *The Martyrdom and History of Blessed Simeon bar Sabba'e*. Persian Martyr Acts in Syriac: Text and Translation 3. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2014.
- Steve, M.-J., et al. *L'Île de Khārg. Une page de l'Histoire du Golfe Persique et du Monachisme Oriental*, Herman Gasché, Neuchâtel, 2003.
- Tavadia, J. *Šāyast-nē-šāyast. A Pahlavi Text on Religious Customs*. Hamburg: Friederichsen. De Gruyter, 1930.
- Thomson, R. *Elišē. History of Vardan and the Armenian War*. Cambridge: Harvard University press, 1982.
- Thomson, R. *The history of Łazar P'arpec'i*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Trüpelman, L. "Sasanian Graves and Burial Customs." In *Arabie orientale. Mésopotamie et Iran méridional de l'âge du fer au début de la période islamique*, ed. R. Bourchalat. Paris: Éditions Recherche sur les civilisations, 1984, 317-329.
- Van Den Gheyn, I. "Passio antiquior SS. Sergii et Bacchi Graece nunc primum edita." *Analecta Bollandiana* 14 (1895): 373-395.
- Van Rompay, L. "Impetuous Martyrs? The Situation of the Persian Christians in the Last Years of Yazdgard I (419-421)." In *Martyrium in Multidisciplinary Perspective. Memorial Louis Reekmans*, ed. M. Lamberigts and P. Van Deun. Leuven: Peeters, 1995, 363-75.
- Van Uythfanghe, M. "Modèles bibliques dans l'hagiographie." In *Le Moyen Age et la Bible*. Dir. P. Riché, & G. Lobrichon. Paris, Beauchesne, 1984, 449-487.
- Vauchez, A. "Introduction." *Micrologus. Natura, scienze e società medievali*, VII, *Il Cadavere* (1999): 1-10.

- Vernant, J. P. "La Belle Mort et le Cadavre outragé." in *La mort, les morts dans les Sociétés Anciennes*, ed. G. Gnoli, J. P. Vernant. Paris: Editions de la maison des Sciences de l'homme, 1982, 45-77.
- Vööbus, A. *The Canons ascribed to Marūtā of Maipherqat and related sources*. CSCO 439-440, Scriptores Syri 191-192. Leuven, Peeters, 1982.
- Walker, J. T. *The Legend of Mar Qardagh. Narrative and Christian Heroism in Late Antique Iraq*. Berkeley, University of California Press, 2006.
- Wiessner, G. *Zur Märtyrerüberlieferung aus der Christenverfolgung Schapurs II*, Untersuchungen zur Syrischen Literaturgeschichte I, AbhGött, Philol.-hist.Kl., Dritte Folge, 67. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1967.
- Wiessner, G. "Zum Problem der zeitlichen und örtlichen Festlegung der erhaltenen syro-persischen Märtyrerakten. Das Pusai-Martyrium", in *Paul de Lagarde und die syrische Kirchengeschichte*. Ed. Göttinger Arbeitskreis für syrische Kirchengeschichte, Göttingen: Lagarde-Haus 1968, 231-351.
- Wiseman, D. J. "The Vassal-Treaties of Esarhaddon." *Iraq* 20.1 (1958): 61-62.