1. Introduction

This paper is a preliminary approach to relativization in Syriac, which is a dialect of Aramaic, a Semitic language of the Afro-Asiatic family. This study will concentrate on the morpheme ‘d-’ as a “relative morpheme”. In the introduction I will quote other dialects of Aramaic, including oriental/Westerner and neo-Aramaic.

(1) Linguistic classification of Syriac within language families

```
Afro-asiatic
   Semitic
      Northeast  Northwest
           Aramaic  Hebrew
                  East Syriac  Western Syriac
                                      Neo-Aramaic Eastern  Neo-Aramaic Western
```
Historical approach 1

Aramaic appeared in Syria and in Mesopotamia before the 1st millennium BC. The spread of Aramaic resulted from the fact that it was an official language in the Assyrian, Babylonian and then Persian empires. Syriac is a dialect of oriental Aramaic which was first spoken in Edessa and which spread after the appearance of Christianity. With the conquest of Alexander the Great, Syriac and other Aramaic dialects began to appear in writing in reaction to the dominant Hellenism. However, Aramaic continued to be used for communication even after the introduction of the Greek language.

Historical approach 2

Around 132 years B.C.E, the kingdom of Orsena, established in Edessa, adopted Syriac as its official language. With the appearance of Christianity, Syriac supplanted the imperial Aramaic language as the standard version of Aramaic.

The Syriac people were divided into two branches: the oriental, called “Nestorians” Syriac, which were established especially in Mesopotamia and in Iran, and the western Syriac including “Jacobites”, who lived in Syria, in High Mesopotamia and in Lebanon.

Today, the Syriac language, which is used in certain oriental churches, has approximately 400,000 speakers. It is spoken mainly in the southeast of Turkey and in the north of Iraq, as well as in Syria, Lebanon, Iran, Armenia, Georgia and Azerbaijan. It is also attested in North and South America, as well as in Europe.

3. Method - Corpus

Due to the difficulty of getting manuscripts, because of the political problems which exist in the Middle East, I have chosen to work on a written corpus. This enables me to have a view of the syntactical structures of the classical Syriac language. The corpus is Peshitta – Matthew’s gospel or [kruzuto da - mti chliho] “prophet Matthew’s gospel”.

4. Traditional analysis of the morpheme ‘d-’

The morpheme ‘d-’ in Syriac plays a variety of syntactic roles. It is used in several syntactical structures; that is why its nature changes according to the context by which it is surrounded.

It is an old demonstrative like others in many Semitic languages. It is followed by a nomen rectum when a nomen regens is not a construct
(‘peripheric genitive’); it also enters a noun phrase to mark the complement of the noun; it binds two clauses as a conjunction: main clause and subordinated clause or adverbial clause; it can bind a direct or indirect short speech; it can also introduce indirect questions; and finally it can be a relative pronoun. Its original meaning is the one of a demonstrative-relative or of a demonstrative-preposition: ‘the one who/that of’ according to the traditional grammars (Duval 1881, Nöldeke 1904, Costaz 1955, etc.), and even from Homeric Greek where the relative pronouns are still properly demonstratives. In Aramaic their function may be attributed to a determinative: zî / dî (Lipinsky 2001:533).

Thus the syntactic flexibility of ‘d-’ goes from the syntax to the clauses. We are not going to study every syntactic point of the morpheme. Instead, we are going to concentrate on ‘d-’ as a ‘relative pronoun’.

There are a certain number of sentences which are sometimes considered relative and sometimes adverbial clauses according to French or other translations. In (2) the translation is ‘that’, and the traditional grammarians analyzed this morpheme as a relative pronoun.

(2) a. Matthew 8:19

\[ u \text{ qareb} \quad \text{safro} \quad \text{had} \quad \text{w emar} \]
And to come near.inac.3m.sg. scribe num and to say.acc.3m.sg.

\[ l – \text{eh Rabb-ay ite} \quad \text{botr – okh} \quad \text{l – atar} \]
prep-3m.sg. teacher-1sg. to come.inac.1sg. after-2m.sg. Prep-Loc

\[ d – \text{ozel – at} \]
REL-go.imp.-2m.sg.

‘And a scribe came near (to him) and said to him: “Teacher, I shall follow you towards the place that you are going to.”’

b. Matthew 5:34

\[ …\text{Lo timun} \quad \text{sokh} \quad \text{lo ba – Šmayo} \quad \text{d – kursy – aw} \]
no to swear.imp.2m.pl. never no prep-sky CONJ- chair-3m.sg.

\[ d – \text{aloho} \]
Gen-god

‘…make no oath at all, either by heaven, because it is the throne of God, or...’
Basing their translations on other languages, traditional grammars analyzed the morpheme ‘d-’ as a relative in the first sentence and as a conjunction in the second. The same is done in other reference languages.

5. **Typological classification of relative clauses**

Several parameters enable a typological study of relatives in different languages. The study of relatives was particularly prevalent in the seventies and in the nineties. The most notable results of these studies are:

I- To identify the position of relative clause  
II- To identify the different strategies of relativization  
III- To determine the different degrees of accessibility to relativization

**a. Types of relatives**

The relative varies according to an essential syntactic parameter: the position of the relative clause with regards to the nominal head and to the main sentence. A relative clause can be set or removed from its noun phrase. A relative clause can be preposed or postposed with regards to its main clause (Lehmann 1984, 1986).

– Embedded relative clause (prenominal or postnominal) or untied from its nominal syntagm  
– Relative clause can be preposed or postposed to the main clause.

6. **The postnominal relative clauses in Syriac**

Syriac is concerned only with one type of relative: postnominal. Postnominal relatives are common to almost all the languages of the world, including French, Arabic, and Modern Hebrew. They are composed of a nominal head and postposed relative clause, which is dependent. In this example, the nominal heads are in bold and dependents are postposed to this name. Here we can see that the postnominal relative is placed after all the other dependents of the noun. This is normal for postnominals, according to Creissels (2006).
‘(…) Observe the lilies of fields, how they grow (which) they are not tired.’


### a. Characteristics of the Syriac structures of relative clauses

The structure of the Syriac language is made of three types of relative clauses:

A- Verbal construction of relative clauses
B- Nominal construction of relative clause
   a – Nominal construction clause
   b – Prepositional construction clause

#### i. Verbal construction

The postnominal relative clause is the most used strategy in Syriac. It can be used either with a finite verb or a non-finite verb. The following table shows the forms used in Syriac relative clauses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect/Mode verbal</th>
<th>Subject relative</th>
<th>Object relative</th>
<th>Oblique relative</th>
<th>Free relative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfect/finite</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfect/infinitive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect/finite</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperfect/infinitive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oblique REL-clause - Finite Verb

(5) Matthew 3:17

[... hon – aw ber ḫavivo d – v – eh
Dem.m.sg.-3m.sg. son.1sg. beloved REL-prep-3m.sg. to

ešṭbith ]
please.pass..pfv.1m.sg.

‘This one is my beloved Son in whom I am well pleased.’
(lit:) ‘This one is my beloved Son, that in him I am well pleased.’

Subject REL-clause – non-finite verb

(6) Matthew 4:16

[‘amo d – yoteb ba – ḫuqo…. w aylen
Peuple REL-to sit.Ipfv.nonfinite.3m.sg. prep – darkness and 3pl.
d - yotbin b – atro wa – b - ṭelol –e
REL-to sit.Ipfv.nonfinite.3m.pl. prep(in)-place and-prep-ombre-pl

d – mawto nuhro dnaḥ l – hun ]
gen(de)-death light to shine.pfv.3m.sg. prep-3m.pl.

‘The people who live in darkness will see a great light. And those who live in the dark land of death the light will shine.’

ii. Nominal construction

Unlike the previous sentence (e.g. 7a), the verb in this one is missing and also sometimes is replaced by a personal pronoun that serves as a copula (e.g. 7b), which characterizes the second type of structure perspective:
(7) a. Matthew 9:9

‘He saw a man …whose (lit: that his name) name was Matthew.’

b. Matthew 5:34

‘…make no oath at all, either by heaven, because it is the throne of God, or…’

iii. Prepositional construction

This type of structure only contains a prepositional constituent: preposition + (pro)noun: ‘with him’.

(8) a. Matthew 12:4

‘He had no power either to eat it or to stand over those who (are) with him.’

b. Matthew 8:9

[... hzo gabro.... da – šm-eh mti..]

see.pfv.3m.sg. man REL-name-3m.sg. Matthew

‘He saw a man …whose (lit: that his name) name was Matthew.’

[... Lo timun sok lo ba – šmayo d –]

kursy – aw d – aloho ]

chair-3m.sg. GEN(of)-God

‘…make no oath at all, either by heaven, because it is the throne of God, or…’

Also 1sg. Adv man -1sg. REL-prep(under) power
‘For I am a man that (has) soldiers under him...’

7. Relativization and relativized noun

The process of relativization is made with regard to a noun or a nominal head. A relativized noun is indicated here by the term of domain noun according to Creissels (2006). In some languages the relative pronoun is not always present, as in English:

(9) The girl {we met last week}

In a language such as the Syriac, the presence of a particle, the morpheme ‘d-’, is compulsory for the structure of relativization.

a. Strategies of relativization

If we consider the realization of the nominal head in relative, Comrie (1981:204-211) classifies four strategies of prototypical relativization in the languages in the following points:

- non-reduction strategy
- resumptive pronoun strategy
- relative pronoun strategy
- gap strategy

(10) Strategies of relativization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-reduction strategy</th>
<th>Japanese (internal head nominal)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[Neko-ga sakana-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>cat- Antiacc fish - acc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>torootoshita]-no-o Hanako-ga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>steal.pfv-Nom-acc Hanako- Antiacc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tukamaeta to catch.pfv</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘Hanako caught a cat that was trying to steal a fish.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resumptive pronoun strategy</th>
<th>Arabic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[ al - rajulu alla-zi ta’araftu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Def-man JONC-m.sg. to meet.pfv.1sg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘alay-hi huwa min almany ]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prep-3m.sg. 3m.sg. prep(loc) Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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‘The man I met is from Germany.’  
(lit: ‘The man that I met him is from…’)

| Relative pronoun strategy | French:  
[la fille qui est allée  
Def.f. girl REL Aux.to go.pfv.3f.sg.  
à la campagne a disparu]  
prep def country to side.pfv.3m.sg. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘The girl who went to the country, side’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Gap strategy or Strategy of disappearance | Occitane:  
l’òme que parli  
def.m.sg.-man.sg. SUB parler.PRES.S1S |
|------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
|                                          | ‘The man I am talking about’  
(lit: ‘The man that I am talking’) (Creissels 2006:227)’ |

**b. Strategies of Syriac relativization**

Syriac uses two of the above strategies:
- strategy with resumptive pronoun (e.g. 11a)
- gap strategy or strategy of disappearance (e.g. 11b)

(11) Strategies of relativization in Syriac

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>non-reduction strategy</th>
<th>………………..</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| resumptive pronoun strategy | a. Matthew 15:13  
[...]kul nesbto Aydo d – lo  
Quant. plant dem.f.sg. REL-no |
|                          | nasb-oh ob d – ba – smayo  
to take.pfv.-3f.sg. father.1sg. REL-prep-sky |
|                          | tet’aqar  
to pull out.pass.pfv.3f.sg. |
|                          | ‘Every plant **which** my heavenly Father did not plan (**it**) shall be uprooted’ |
i. Resumptive pronoun strategy

Because the Syriac verb contains necessarily an indication of subject enclitic in the verb and susceptible to represent on its own the subject argument, resumptive pronouns are used in a relativization of the roles different from the subject.

So the relative clauses of the Syriac language are characterized by two different formats: their common point is the same morpheme ‘d-’. The difference between the two is that the first one includes a pronominal object marker which refers to the domain noun, while the second one does not include this marker. For the former one the pronominal object marker is the same as the one that would appear in the assertive sentence where the object is not expressed.

In order not to confuse the terms, we will be using the term relativizer (which was used by Creissels) instead of relative pronoun. The example in (12a) presents the sentence in its assertive state. (12b) presents the pronominal indications attached to the verb, the object being absent. Example (12c) reveals the presence of the same pronominal indications in spite of the presence of an embedded proposition.

(12) Matthew 7:9
a. [ bro nešal gabro laḥmo ]
   son ask.lpfv.3m.sg. man bread
   ‘The son will ask for some bread to the man.’

b. [ br - eh nešel – iw laḥmo ]
   son-3m.sg. ask.lpfv.3m.sg.-3m.sg. bread
   ‘His son will ask him for some bread.’
In the following example, the personal pronoun in the sentence (13b) replaces the noun complement of the sentence (13a): [d-atto] ‘of the woman’:

(13) Matthew 9:20
a. [dmo  d – atto rode – wo ]
   blood  gen-woman  flow.Lpfv-be.Pfv.3m.sg.
   ‘The blood of the woman was flowing’

b. [ dm – oh  rode – wo ]
   blood-3f.sg. flow.Lpfv.- to be.Pfv.3m.sg.
   ‘her blood flowed (was flowing)’

c. [ … atto d – rode – wo  dm – oh  Snin
   woman  REL – flow.Lpfv-to be.Pfv.3m.sg. blood-3f.sg. year.Pl
   tartaʾesre…]
   twelve
   ‘… A woman who had been suffering from severe bleeding for twelve years (lit: whose blood was flowing)…’

ii. Gap strategy or strategy of disappearance

Is the relativizer ‘d-’ a genuine relative pronoun? The syntactical elements of a Syriac independent sentence do not follow a strict order in their structures, which is rather flexible; we can have a verb at the beginning of the sentence (e.g. 14a) and we can have a verb in a position after the subject (e.g. 14b):

(14) Assertive clauses
a. Matthew 2:4
   [ u  kaneš  kul – hun  rab – ay  kohn – e u … ]
   and to call.pfv.3m.sg Quant.-3m.pl. big-et.c. Priest – pl. and
   ‘He called together all the chief priests and…’
b. Matthew 1:2

[abrohom awled l-ishedq …] Ibrahim to beget.Pfv.3m.sg. prep-Isaïc
‘Abraham begat Isaac.’

The clause which enters the canonical position of a subordinate relative clause has normally the peculiarity of having at least a constituent. In the process of relativization in primary strategy, a syntactic gap occurs in the canonical position of the name. The clause constituent of the relative clauses of the first and second example corresponds to (15-16a), and we are going to represent the syntactic gap, which appears in an embedded relative, by a horizontal line in (15-16b):

(15) Main vs. subject relative clause
a. Main clause:
[forahət da-šməyo lo zor’ìn u lo ḥošdin ]
Birds gen-sky no sow.Ipfv.3m.pl. and no harvest.Ipfv.m.pl.
‘The birds of the sky neither sow and nor harvest.’

b. Subject relative clause:
Matthew 6:26
[ forahət da-šməyo d – lo —— zor’ìn … ]
sky gen-sky REL - no sow.Ipfv.3m.pl.
‘The birds of the sky (which) do not sow…’

(16) Main vs. object embedded clause
a. Main clause:
[šeqlat atto temrat la-ḫmiro ]
take.Pfv.3f.sg. woman hide.Pfv.3f.sg. prep-yeast
‘The woman took (and) buried a yeast.’

b. Object embedded clause:
Matthew 13:33
[ la-ḫmiro haw d – šeqlat —— atto]
Prep-yeast dem REL- take.Pfv.3f.sg. woman
‘the yeast, the one that the woman took.’

Certainly, there is a nominal term of the independent clause which does not appear in the subordinate clause, but the question is: does the relativizer ‘d-’ refer to this nominal term?
A relative pronoun is called this because it represents in an anaphoric way the contents of a nominal constituent with which it is usually put in correlation. It varies according to the nature of the relativized noun. It is essential for the pronoun to have a case marker which facilitates the identification of the relativized noun.

A relative is characterized by the considerable difference which exists between the relative sentences and the independent sentences concerning the linear order of their structures. A relative pronoun can also have the function of subordination.

The Syriac relative clauses (subject / object / oblique) are subordinate clauses whose clause constituents correspond to the sentences (a) in each example that will follow:

(17)  Matthew 1:16

Matthew 1:16

\[ \text{Matthew 1:16} \]
\[ '\text{Mary REL-prep-3f.sg. Pfv-to give birth.3m.sg. Jesus} \]
\[ '\text{d \text{- metqre mši}́ho} \]
\[ '\text{REL-Pfv.call.3m.sg. Messiah} \]

\‘\ldots the husband of Marie, \textbf{from whom} (lit: \textbf{that of her}) Jesus was born, who (lit: \textbf{that}) is called Messiah.\’

We can see in the independent clauses that no term is missing; in other words they have the same units as those present in relative clauses.

**Main clause:**

\[ \text{men marya eth-iled-ø yešu } \]
\[ \text{Prep Mary Pfv-to give birth-3m.sg. Messiah} \]

\‘\ldots Of Marie Messiah was born.\’

\[ \text{yešu metqre mši}́ho \]
\[ \text{Jesus Pfv.call.3m.sg. Messiah} \]

\‘Jesus is called Messiah.\’

Here it is the same; the terms of the relative will be in the independent sentence which follows:
Matthew 8:19

[ ... l – atar d – ozel – at ]
Prep-loc REL-go.lpfv.-2m.sg.
‘Teacher, I shall follow you in the place that you go.’

Main clause:
[ ozel – at l – atro z’uro]
go.lpfv.-2m.sg. prep-endroit/pays
‘You go for the small country.’

Matthew 3:17

[...Hon – aw ber ḥavivo d – v – eh]
dem.m.sg.-3m.sg. son.1sg. beloved REL-prep-3m.sg.
eṣṭvith ]
Pass.to grant.Pfv.1m.sg.
‘this one is my beloved Son that in him I granted.’

Main clause:
[ eṣṭvith b – ber ḥabibo]
Pfv.grant.Pfv.1sg. prep-son.1sg. beloved
‘I granted in my beloved son.’

8. Hierarchy of accessibility:

Languages do not have identical syntactic roles in the relativization, and they do not have the same degrees of relativization as far as nominal clauses are concerned. Keenan-Comrie (1977) established a universal hierarchy of accessibility to relativization, schematized in the following drawing:

SU > DO > IO > OBL > GEN > OCOMP

It means that the nominal clause occupying the function of subject (SU) is more easily relativized than the direct object (DO), this one is more easily relativized than the indirect object (IO), this one is more easily relativized than another complement governed by the verb (OBL), this one is more easily relativized than the complement to the name (GEN), and finally the noun complement
relativizes more easily than the complement of the comparative degree (OCOMP).

In Syriac, the primary strategy which applies to the subject is the one which uses an unique relativizer, here the morpheme ‘d-’; but this primary strategy is optional when the relativized noun is the object of the verb.

The other strategy with a resumptive pronoun applies to all the cases where we relativize something different from the subject of the main verb of the relative, that is to say in all other roles which are situated lower in the ladder of the Hierarchy of Accessibility.

Subject relative clauses:

This is an example of a relativized noun having the function of SUBJECT, where we use the primary strategy with the unique relativizer ‘d-’:

(18) Matthew 4:16

\[
\text{People REL-sit.Ipfv.3m.sg. prep- darkness-pl. and 3pl.}
\]

\[
\text{d – yotbin … ]}
\]

\[
\text{REL-sit.Ipfv.3m.pl.}
\]

‘The people who were sitting in the darkness(…); and those who were sitting in the land (…)’

Object relative clauses:

This is an example of a relativized noun having the function of OBJECT, where two strategies can be used: the first one is the one using resumptive pronouns and the second one uses the primary strategy with the unique relativizer ‘d-’; they are used roughly equally.

Matthew 15:13

\[
\text{Every plant inter.f.sg. REL-no take.Pfv.-3f.sg.}
\]

‘Every plant which my heavenly Father did not plant (it) shall be uprooted’
Oblique relative clauses:

This is an example of a relativized noun having the oblique function. In such examples with oblique functions, the resumptive pronoun strategy is used:

(19) Matthew 18:7

\[\text{Gabro} \quad \text{d} - \text{b-id} - \text{eh} \quad \text{nitun} \quad \text{makšul} - \text{e}\]

man REL-prep-hands-3m.sg. to come.1pfv.3m.pl. scandal-pl.

‘(…) woe to that man through whom (lit: that by his hands) the scandal comes!’

In the oblique functions and in others at lower positions in the Hierarchy, the strategy with resumptive pronouns is mostly used. But it does not prevent the presence of the primary strategy. In the following examples we find the inconstant of time is not resumed (taken back) by a resumptive pronoun in the relative (20). Also it is the same case about the second example (21) where the object is referred by any pronoun.

(20) Matthew 24:38

\[\text{ʾdamo} \quad \text{l-yawmo} \quad \text{d} - \text{ʾal} \quad \text{nuḥ} \quad \text{l} - \text{kewelo}\]

until prep-day REL-enter.Pfv.3m.sg. Noah Prep-Arc

‘(…) Until the day (lit: that) when Noah entered the Ark.’

(21) Matthew 13:33

\[\text{la-ḥmiro} \quad \text{haw} \quad \text{d} - \text{šeqlat} \quad \text{atto}\]

Prep-yeast dem REL-take.Pfv.3f.sg. woman

‘the yeast, the one that the woman took.’

The relativizer ‘d-‘ does not change according to the gender or according to the relativized role. The translatives which “mark the subordinate clause (...) are invariable words, the relative pronoun is a variable word” (Tesnière 1966:560). What would be difficult to analyze is its relativized role because this role is more or less necessarily assumed in Syriac by a resumptive pronoun. The relativizor ‘d-‘ serves as a morpheme of subordination exactly like the subordinating conjunctions ‘d-‘. The relativizor ‘d-‘ = complementizer ‘d-‘.
Subordinate clauses

(20) Matthew 4:12

[ kad šma’ den yešu’ d - yuḥanόn
when to hear.acc.pers3m.s. adv Jesus COMP-John

Ešṭlem … ]
Pass.to deliver.Pfv.3m.sg.

‘Having learnt that John had been delivered, he (it) withdrew in Galilee.’

(21) Matthew 5:20

[ omar – no l – kun ger d -…] say.lpfv.-1c.sg. prep-2m.pl. adv COMP-…

‘Because I say it to you that if your justice does not surpass…’

9. Results

The relativizer ‘d-’ never changes form. It is clearly remarkable that there is a total lack of correlation between the relativizer and relativized role. It is never combined to elements of the relative clause. The relativized role is concretized with no morphological material (by the only relativizer ‘d-’) but it would be assumed by resumptive pronouns. We thus have the following results:

- Gap in the relative clause
- Invariability of the form of ‘d-’
- Total lack of correlation between the relativizer and relativized role
- Lack of combination to elements of the relative clause
- Any morphological material can assume this role

10. Conclusion

The invariability of the Syriac element indicates the authenticity of this “relative pronoun” which traditional grammars speak about.

According to the grammars, the relative pronoun should have a variable syntactic morphology. It follows the syntactic role which implies the domain noun. It has not been attested for the Syriac language, where we find that ‘d-’ is a mere complementizer which only marks a subordinated link between a main
clause and a subordinate. As a conclusion, the Syriac relative clause does not have a clearly anaphorical relative pronoun. According to Lipinsky (2001), “Semitic languages do not have real relative pronouns.” The Syriac relative clauses are simple appointed subordinate clauses.
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