

Word Order in the Clauses of the Narrative Sections In P.P. Saydon's Bible Translation in Maltese¹

Anthony Abela

1. All about the Project

1.1 Preliminaries

1.1.1 General Aims This study project was aimed at discovering a linguistic explanation for a historical phenomenon: the failure of the Bible translation in Maltese done by Rev Prof Peter Paul Saydon, to impose itself as the Bible of the population of Malta at large even though it was hailed from the beginning as a literary masterpiece.

1.1.2 Contents of Dissertation This dissertation had three main parts or sections. In the first section we shall say all the reader needs to know about our research project in order to understand our work: we shall identify the object of our study, define the research proposal, and describe our method of work. Then comes the central section which contains the data employed as empirical basis for the generalisations to be made in the third and final section. The data will be preceded by an introduction in which help will be provided for the eventual reader of the dissertation who does not know Maltese, so that he/she will be able to go through the data without undue difficulty. The linguistic discussion proper will be given in the third section, to be followed by the conclusions.

1.2 Rev Prof Peter Paul Saydon and his Translation of the Bible

1.2.1 Narrative While we read in a private communication of the author himself that he had conceived of the project already in 1925 (Cfr Muscat 1974 in

¹This is an abridged edition of the MA Dissertation that the author has written for an MA in Linguistics from the Department of Linguistic Science of the University of Reading in England during the academic year 1996-1997. This dissertation was submitted to Dr Richard Ingham. In this issue of *Melita Theologica* we are publishing the first part of this research project; the second part will appear in the next issue of this volume.

Sant1992:327), the publication of *Ktieb il-Ġenesi* did not come until 1929. It seems that Saydon's contribution in the field of Bible translation formed part of a wider concerted effort by Saydon and two other Catholic contemporaries to translate the whole Bible in a short span of time. Saydon was allotted the first five books of the Bible globally called 'the Pentateuch' or 'the Torah' (Eissfeldt1974:155-156) as his share of the project. His partners in the project were a popular writer, Alfons Maria Galea, and a theologian, Rev Peter Paul Grima (cfr Muscat1974 in Sant1992: 327-328). Of the three, Saydon was the one who was best prepared professionally for this task of translation, since he had received post-graduate training as a biblical scholar at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome. He could therefore translate the Bible from the original languages of Hebrew and Greek while his colleagues translated from the Vulgate or from modern versions. This also explains the choice of the books he was given to translate. Saydon finished working on his share of the translation project in 1931 when he published Deuteronomy. Between 1929 and 1931 he published *Ktieb il-Ġenesi* (Genesis) (1929), *Ktieb l-Esodu* (Exodus) (1930), *Ktieb il-Levîtku* (Leviticus) (1930), *Ktieb in-Nûmri* (Numbers) (1931), and *Ktieb id-Deuteronomju* (Deuteronomy) (1931). In (Saydon1930a:v) we read that the positive reaction to the translator's first publication in 1929 encouraged him to proceed with his enterprise notwithstanding criticism from some quarters. We cannot say for sure, however, whether Saydon's project was from the beginning to complete the translation of the entire Bible. In 1931 Saydon published his 'sixth book', *Ktieb Ġożwè* (Joshua), and the publication of this book made his intentions clear. Saydon's work on what became his *opus magnum* and a literary masterpiece in Maltese dragged on for another thirty years after the publication of the translation of the Book of Genesis, and came to an end in 1959 with the issuing of *L-Apokalissi* (Revelation). In 1964 Saydon was already talking of plans for a revision of his monumental work (Saydon1964 in Sant 1992: 312).

1.2.2 Possible Influences on Saydon's translation work This dissertation is not the forum for an empirically sustained analysis of Saydon's translation work, meant to identify the possible sources of influence upon the translator. What the present writer aims to achieve is to offer the reader a number of intuitions to help him/her collocate the object of our research in its cultural and historical setting.

There seem to have been three cultural factors that exerted considerable influence on Saydon's strategies in translating the Bible: his study of the earliest translations, especially that of Mikiel Anton Vassalli, the Maltese scholar who wrote the first Grammar and Lexicon of Maltese (cfr Sant1975 in Sant1992:30-34 for the contri-

bution of Vassalli), the movement for Semitic Maltese, and the contemporary translation ethos in the first half of the twentieth century.

Saydon showed keen interest into the history of Bible translation into Maltese. Already in 1937 he wrote an essay about "the earliest Biblical translation from Hebrew into Maltese" (Saydon1937 in Sant1992:287-297). Twenty years later he composed his own "History of the Maltese Bible" (Saydon1957 in Sant1992:269-284), an account which left its mark upon the subsequent historical essays by Carmel Sant, which are collected in (Sant1992).

For any insights into possible influence these former translations might have had on Saydon who studied them closely, we have here to rely upon the critique he himself made about them. Especially influential seems to have been the translation of Mikiel Anton Vassalli. When one reads Saydon's generally positive evaluation of Vassalli's style and lexicon, and then studies Saydon's own translation, one may easily deduce that Saydon kept Vassalli as his model in these regards. Given our empirical methodology for these considerations, we prefer to quote rather too generously from Saydon's commentary on Vassalli's contribution:

"Vassalli's translation combines the two chief qualities of a good translation, namely fidelity and perspicuity of expression. The sense is always fully grasped and beautifully expressed in a clear, easy and elegant style.... This constant aim at fidelity makes the translation sometimes adhere somewhat slavishly to the Latin text, thus sacrificing the exigencies of Maltese style impairing the freshness and vigour of a genuinely Maltese construction.....This strict adherence to the Latin text did not prevent the translator from giving the translation a fluent, graceful and vigorous form of expression. The construction is generally built according to the strict rules of Semitic style. Viewed from the literary standpoint Vassalli's translation has seldom, if ever, been surpassed, and even now, after more than a hundred years, it is read with profit and delight by all lovers of Maltese literature....

"Looking more closely into the linguistic features of the translation, we notice...(that) the subject very often follows the verb....Another characteristic feature of Vassalli's translation is the exuberant richness of its vocabulary. Many old and obsolete words are constantly met with in every page, stems of words are skilfully developed into derivatives having different shades of meaning; briefly, the translation reveals everywhere the rare competence

and the high standard of scholarship of our first and best lexicographer...It has been deemed necessary to dwell at some length on these literary points inasmuch as they exhibit the characteristic traits of Vassalli's works which began to wane soon after his death until they almost entirely disappeared in modern literature" (Saydon1957 in Sant1992: 272-274).

On the 2nd May 1963 Saydon delivered a lecture at the University Theatre. This lecture was then published in 1964 in the review of the Faculty of Theology, *Melita Theologica*(Saydon1964 in Sant1992: 301-322). This lecture may be considered as Saydon's *apologia* for his translation strategies against criticisms that were voiced in some quarters. He admits that in the lexicographical choices he was guided by some principles: "I have invariably avoided all foreign words for which there is a purely Maltese-Semitic equivalent"(p.312). "In the construction of sentences I have endeavoured to follow the rules of the Semitic syntax. That is why my style has a strong Semitic style so different from that of most Maltese writers, who are sometimes so deeply imbued in the style of foreign languages that they unconsciously shape their style after the fashion of their favourite language. This I have done every effort to avoid. One day I happened to be talking with a foreign Semitic scholar who had my Maltese Bible. He told me: 'I can understand your translation better than any other book in Maltese'. And that was a great compliment to me"(p.314). Does Saydon's stand on the Semitic character of the syntax to be adopted and the style to be adopted, reflect a hidden item on his agenda: his desire to emulate Mikiel Anton Vassalli's translation work? Saydon himself never acknowledges Vassalli's influence upon his work as translator, and to ascertain such influence empirically one needs perhaps to study biblical abstracts which both translators treated. But Saydon's admiration of Vassalli points in this direction.

Closely linked to the influence which Vassalli's translation seems to have exercised upon Saydon's was the latter's leaning towards the movement for Semitic Maltese. This movement was one of two cultural phenomena that emerged with the recognition in 1934 of Maltese as official language of the Maltese Islands. In a paper first published in 1958, Professor Joseph Aquilina called these movements 'schools of thought': "When at last in 1934 Maltese became an official language two schools of thought came into existence, in sharp contrast with each other; one which advocated the use of pure Maltese to the exclusion of most recent loan-words and another which, on the contrary, barred the use of a number of words of Arabic origin which the critics considered out of tune with the country's Latin culture. Between these two schools, both reactionary and therefore tending to be

extremist, the linguist had to establish his middle way very cautiously” (cf Aquilina1961.1970:1).

Again, Saydon never acknowledged any affiliation or adherence to any of the two movements. But the strategy behind his lexicographical and stylistic choices betrays his leanings towards the first of the two schools of thought. This movement advocated the use of *Malti safi* (pure Maltese) and the exclusion of words derived from Romance. This is what Saydon himself practised in his translation work. In the Preface to his translation of Genesis, Saydon wrote: “I avoided also all vocabulary of foreign derivation that entered Maltese without there being any need for it” (Saydon 1929:viii). With the publication of his translation of Exodus in 1930, Saydon felt the need to permit another explanatory note to justify his options of vocabulary. There he admits that his readers did not cherish the use of “some Maltese words, old and forgotten, which not everyone knows what their meaning is” (Saydon1930a:v). He also promised to publish a glossary of all the terms that create difficulty for understanding. This promise he kept in 1931 with the publication of *Tifsir il-Kliem fil-Kotba Ġenesi, Ezodu, Levitku, Nûmri, Dewteronomju*. In his 1964 *apologia* Saydon enlarges over his operations in this field: “In order to eschew as far as possible the use of words of foreign origin I have used words which, though registered in our vocabularies, are today obsolete, archaic, not easily comprehensible by the average reader....In my effort to use always a purely Maltese word I have not hesitated to form new words from existing roots....All such new words are formed according to strict rules of Maltese-Arabic Grammar and have their exact equivalent in Arabic...(Saydon1964 in Sant1992:312-313). Saydon's choice of vocabulary of Semitic origin[although he had to allow for some exceptions, cf Saydon1964 in Sant 1992:312]. For a critique of such linguistic options, cf Aquilina1961.1970:2-3).

Saydon's choice of vocabulary of Semitic origin and his systematic avoidance of words of romance descent (although he admitted he had to allow for a few exceptions, cf Saydon1964 in Sant1992: 312), provoked what he termed the “violent onslaught by some self-made critics who accused my translation of incomprehensibility and unsuitability for the people.” Saydon was in no mood to accept criticism from these quarters on linguistic issues. “It is rather their limited knowledge of Maltese the cause of unintelligibility of a score of words in my translation. With a small effort and an adequate knowledge of the flexibility of the language and its power of shooting new forms from existing roots one will easily arrive at understanding every single word in my translation, especially in view of the fact that many difficult words are explained in the notes”(Ibid:314). But it was

not only his adversaries who considered his lexicon a hindrance to effortless reading of his translation. In the sixties the local Roman Catholic Church approached Saydon for permission to make use of his translation in public worship. The churchman who made the contacts was Rev Prof Joseph Lupi, Saydon's colleague at the Faculty of Theology, who was responsible for reforming the Church's public worship according to the guidelines of the Second Vatican Council. In a private letter to the present writer, dated 17th March 1997, Prof Lupi said that the permission to use Saydon's translation included the authorisation to introduce a number of changes of some words, "especially those terms which the general public does not know." The writer continues that Saydon "found no difficulty at all in giving me the authorisation we asked him for, and it was I myself who changed a number of words." Later on Saydon is said to have lamented that the changes introduced by Lupi were more than he had expected. Information as to what actually happened afterwards is not available; but a number of other biblical scholars on the Island were commissioned to prepare a new translation of the texts used in the liturgy, while the Malta Bible Society decided in 1966 to embark on a fresh translation "in current Maltese" (cfr Sant 1988 in Sant 1992:161).

Saydon's translation however did not enter into limbo. After attempts, made by the Malta Bible Society in 1965 to publish this translation, failed (Sant Ibid), this "masterpiece of Maltese prose" (cfr Sant 1988 in Sant 1992:160) found a new sponsor in the Societas Doctrinae Christianae who first published a revised edition of the translation in three volumes in 1976, 1982, 1990, under the editorship of Rev Carmel Attard, and then, in order to commemorate the centenary of Saydon's birth in 1995, published the whole Bible in one volume. The editorial team that prepared the volume announced that this last edition of "Saydon's Bible" reproduces the text of the former three-volume forerunner except "for a slight revision of some words here and there" (cfr Abela 1996a).

Saydon's 1964 *apologia* reflects the translator's concern to collocate his opus within contemporary translation work in Europe and North America. "In order to give some idea of the scientific standard of my translation I should like now to submit a list of passages that are translated by me differently from current and traditional translations, and sometimes even from modern translations of the highest scientific standard" (Saydon 1964 in Sant 1992: 316). "I have endeavoured to bring my work abreast of modern biblical studies" (Ibid: 322). And the present writer, being a biblical scholar himself and having been involved in translation work (Abela 1996), may attest to the truthfulness of these statements. But Saydon's

attempts to keep up to the standards reached by contemporary translations of the Bible influenced also the ethos of his work. Most of the translations he mentioned in his 1963 lecture may be labelled as formal translations. Naturally this is not the forum for discussing the various approaches to translation that have been developed; for two relatively recent descriptions of these approaches the present writer would refer the reader to a number of good contributions (Margot 1979; Larson 1984; Jan de Waard/Eugene A. Nida 1996; Buzzetti 1993; Buzzetti 2001). But for the scope of our discussion here, it seems useful to borrow two succinct characterisations of formal translation, also called 'formal correspondence translation', both appearing in the sixties: "A translation that emphasises formal correspondence is oriented primarily towards the source message, or the message in its original form, sentence and clause structure, and consistency of word usage in terms of the source language," (Wonderly 1968: 50-51). Nida and Taber wrote of 'the old focus and the new focus' in Bible translation work. "The older focus in translating was the form of the message, and translators took particular delight in being able to reproduce stylistic specialities, e.g. rhythms, rhymes, plays on words, chiasmus, parallelism, and unusual grammatical structures" (Nida/Taber 1969:1).

What is being said here of the formal correspondence translation perfectly fits Saydon's translation strategies. In the Preface to Genesis Saydon wrote that he had done his best "to give a completely Maltese garb to the thought of the inspired writer, without weakening the strength of the (biblical) word whether Hebrew or Greek" (Saydon 1929:viii). "Saydon chose the formal style for his translations because firstly during those times it was thought that the Word of God had to be formal....Secondly Saydon was under pressure to write in this style owing to the cultural norms of sixty years ago which dictated this style so as to help develop the Maltese language" (Sant 1982 in Sant 1992:148). Close scrutiny of the translator's operations will easily show that Saydon did his best to formally reproduce his source text into the receptacle language (Cf Abela 1996a).

The relevance of this line of thought becomes clear when one comes to know the word order of the typical Hebrew sentence: "Biblical Hebrew is a verb-first language. When an explicit subject is present, the expected and most frequent order of constituents in narrative verbal clauses is V-S-O. When the subject is implicit in the verbal form, the order is V-O" (Bandstra 1992:115). And this is the prevalent word order we encounter in Saydon's monumental work. This word order belonged to the 'Semitic style' as perceived by Saydon and as he had probably seen it realised in Vassalli's translation. But the need to reproduce his source text as perfectly as

possible according to the ethos of the 'translation ministry', seems to have been among the influential factors that determined the syntax of Saydon's translation.

1.3 *The Reasearch Proposal*

1.3.1 *Mixed Reception* Notwithstanding Saydon's enthusiastic avowal in his 1963 lecture that by then "the Maltese Bible has been read and studied by hundreds and thousands of our countrymen who have in it the nourishment for their spiritual life and literary equipment"(Saydon1964 in Sant1992:301), this could hardly be said to have happened through his own version of the Bible. Although no figures are available as to how many copies of each volume were printed and actually sold or distributed, we may assume that these figures must have been rather low. This we may deduce from a letter of the translator himself to the weekly paper *Lehen is-Sewwa* of June 27, 1953. There he lamented that "The books translated by me enjoy very small circulation" (Cf Formosa1995:25). His translation met with overall apathy from the general public for whom Saydon did his work. And the people who bothered to buy and read his Bible were deeply divided. Rev Prof Carmel Sant who was first Saydon's own pupil and then successor at the Biblical Department of the University of Malta, characterised these opposing views in this way: "Saydon's translations had a controversial reception due to various internal and external factors, some of them completely alien to the Bible itself. At the same time the language question was at its height. There were two extremes: those who were in favour of a Semitized Maltese -*Malti Safi*- on the one hand and the others who preferred an Italianized Maltese. The former acclaimed the translation as a masterpiece of Maltese prose, the latter as an incomprehensible piece of writing away from the spoken language and above the head of the man in the street. No one, however, challenged the solid scientific value of the translation as far as Biblical interpretation was concerned"(Sant1988 in Sant 1992:160). In the hot political climate of Malta in the sixties some ideologues even speculated that the widespread neglect of Saydon's translation was the outcome of behind-the-scenes manoeuvring by the Catholic Church who was hesitant in front of the prospect that the man in the street could have the Bible in his hand. In Sant's opinion, however, expressed in a critical though serene appreciation of his teacher's contribution to the tradition of Bible translation in Maltese, such speculations were mere speculations. The issue of why Saydon's Bible failed to become the Bible of the man in the street has linguistic roots: "... the language used by Saydon in his translation was strange to those with a low literary education or who were accustomed to using a language whose direct or indirect influence was European languages. It was this linguistic aspect that was

controversial in Saydon's translations. There were no other principles, like that of giving the Bible to the people, that created controversy" (Sant1982 in Sant1992:148).

If the explanation for the explicit or implicit opposition to Saydon's translation was linguistic in character, to which aspect of this literary masterpiece do we owe this phenomenon of refusal? Why is Saydon's translation of the Bible constantly experienced by the man in the street as difficult to understand without undue exertion? Most critics pointed their finger towards the researched vocabulary employed by the translator. And when attempts were made to adapt this translation for use by a less learned audience, the solution adopted was to substitute a number of the more rare lexemes by others enjoying wider circulation in contemporary spoken Maltese. Understandably, this proved to be superficial and merely cosmetic, and served little to make the translation reader-, or listener-friendly. On the other hand, the short stories of Dun Xandru Cortis, another Maltese priest who lived a generation before Saydon, are easier to read and understand, even though the writer employed a number of words and phrases which are not so commonly used by the general public (Cf Mifsud1991). Vocabulary, therefore, though a contributor towards rendering Saydon's Bible hard to manage by the unsophisticated Maltese speaker, is not the main factor to be mentioned in this regard. The translator was correct in rebutting the accusation of incomprehensibility and unsuitability of his work for the common people because of the unintelligibility "of a score of words in my translation" (Saydon 1964 in Sant1992: 314). The present writer opines that the difficulty of Saydon's Bible for effortless comprehension lies with its syntax, especially with the word order in the normal narrative sentence.

1.3.2 Formulating the research proposal

In this essay we shall enquire whether Saydon has not used the wrong word order in his sentences. This research proposal actually involves two directions of enquiry: a) whether Saydon has not employed the Verb-Subject-Object word order instead of the Subject-Verb-Object one which we intuitively regard as the normal word order in current written Maltese; b) whether current written Maltese does not use the S-V-O instead of the V-S-O word order.

1.4 Method of Research

1.4.1 On the track of tradition

In order to establish whether Saydon has employed the correct word order in the

sentences of his translation, the present writer could have taken the track of 'tradition' or 'authority', that is, he could have consulted the works of Maltese grammarians and linguistic scholars, and see whether they could shed any light as to which order of constituents in the sentence should be considered the correct one in written Maltese, and hence understand whether the order of the constituents in Saydon's Bible was following the established norms. Unfortunately, the writer of this essay would have found indications of a solution, but hardly a definitive answer as to whether Saydon after all used the wrong word order.

Sutcliffe (1936:210) considered the V-S-O order as the normal sequence in the sentence even though he admitted that this order often changes 'for reasons of euphony or emphasis'. Cremona (1938.1962:233 art 578), the most prominent grammarian of Maltese in the first half of the twentieth century, states that, as a rule, the subject with its qualifications comes first in a proposition, then come the verb and the predicate with their qualifications, and finally, the rest of the sentence, that serves as complement to the proposition as a whole. On p.235 art 585 Cremona adds that "The Subject is put also after the verb in the manner of Semitic languages." Cassola (1969:42 art 1): "The normal order of words in sentences is: Subject, Predicate, Object....For reasons of euphony this order is often altered." Chetcuti, who is currently considered as the principal grammarian of Maltese, wrote in his *Tghallem il-Malti f'20 lezzjoni* (1982.1986:103): "The natural order in which to put the constituents in a sentence should be: subject, components qualifying the subject, verb, object that may be direct or indirect or both at the same time, and other complements. This is the direct construction of the sentence, but this construction is not absolutely necessary. As a matter of fact the order of the words may easily be altered by the speaker or writer. Changes in the order very often give particular nuances to discourse."

In his important monograph *The Structure of Maltese* (1957.1973:341), Prof Aquilina lists 'the rules of syntactic combinations governing the structure of a sentence'; they are: S+V+O (where O remains unidentified); S+V+lil+O (where O is identified and is governed by the preposition 'lil'); V+S [This combination "occurs i) in emphatic or high-flown literary language; or ii) in subordinate clauses in which, however, the usual order S+V, though less common and less idiomatic, is also heard"]. Other combinations follow; these are interesting in themselves but as they fall beyond the scope of the present work, we shall not proceed with their description as given by Aquilina. A few pages later, Prof Aquilina discusses word order in another context, "A Comparative Note on Maltese Semitic and Romance

Syntax" (pp.343-351). On p.343 he offers a list of the simplified phrasal combinations of the syntax of Semitic Maltese, and starts with the use of the Nominative. He says that in a verbal sentence we have the Subject in the Nominative case to be followed by the Predicate(also in the Nominative if the sentence is nominal). If the Predicate is a verb, the order may be V+N "in literary language(solemn style as in the Biblical translations of Saydon)," and cites the translator's version of Genesis 1,9 as an example.

In his study of Maltese grammar , entitled *Ilsienna* (1988), Prof Albert Borg dedicates the whole of chapter five to an analysis of the order of constituents in the sentence. He writes that in his own dialect of Maltese [In his discussion of the linguistic aspects he examines in this book, Borg always refers to his own variety of Maltese; he never generalizes to the use of the language as a whole even though he admits to the existence of Standard Maltese, the language "which we may regard as the native variety of a number of (Maltese) rather concentrated in a number of towns; we find it being spoken also throughout our Islands, since it is learned by the rest of the population as the second variation of their Maltese language"(p.10). On this issue of the Standard Maltese one should consult Aquilina/Isserlin1981, Camilleri1995, and Brincat2000] he could distinguish at least five acceptable varieties of constituents' order: S-V-O; S-O-V; V-O-S; O-V-S; O-S-V whether in their positive or negative version. The only sequence which is "mhux accettabbli fid-djalett tieghi" (not acceptable in my dialect) is the V-S-O, and he exemplifies this in the sentence "*Laqat it-tifel il-kelba*" (The boy hit the bitch) (p.117); this sentence however may be repaired if to the verb is affixed the 3rd fem. sing. pronominal suffix indicating the accusative: "*Laqatha t-tifel il-kelba*" (Hit **her** the boy the bitch) (p.138-139).

From the above survey one would not be able to decide conclusively whether the difficulty in Saydon's Bible translation lies in this aspect of syntax which is the word order in its sentences. And this for two reasons. Most of the grammarians and linguists cited are native speakers of Maltese. Although they offer samples of all the versions of word order they intuitively describe, it is with difficulty that they can escape the accusation of artificiality. You still need to come in touch with the 'real thing' which is naturally built expressions of the language, even if in our case this has to be written expressions. Moreover, Prof Borg states that the V-S-O sequence(though not the version V+ acc.pron.suff -S-O) is absolutely unacceptable *in his own dialect*. Borg was born and lives in the north-central area of the island of Malta while Saydon was born and lived in south of the island. Can't we say that what is unacceptable in Borg's

area in this second half of the twentieth century could have well been acceptable in Saydon's region some fifty years before? These considerations led the present writer to seek a different line of research, a different approach.

1.4.2 *The line of research adopted here*

The line of research adopted for this essay is based on the reasoning that if one wants to establish empirically whether Saydon built the sentences of his translation with the correct, that is acceptable, word order, one has to compare and contrast a substantial number of these sentences with an equivalent number of sentences taken from contemporary literary and not so literary writings. If from this exercise there results that the word order in Saydon's translation more or less coincides with that of the sentences in these modern expressions of the written language, then the word order of the constituents in the sentences of Saydon's Bible is completely alien to the phenomenon we are studying, that is, the difficulty of the modern average Maltese speaker to read this Bible, a difficulty that goes beyond the hermeneutical issues attached to the contents of the Bible itself. If on the other hand, there is substantial difference concerning the variables S-V-O, V-S-O sequences between Saydon's Bible and these modern written realisations of Maltese, one may reasonably attribute this phenomenon to this difference.

1.4.3 *Procedure*

The line of research adopted in this essay required a solution to a series of methodological issues. One such issue concerned sampling of data. According to Hatch and Lazaraton(1991:41-42), in data collection there are factors which influence the internal validity of a study as there are other factors which bear upon its external validity. "...If a study does not have internal validity, then it cannot have external validity. We cannot generalise from the data." Internal validity touches upon the concern that the data collected answer the research questions from the descriptive standpoint for which the data was collected at all. External validity depends upon whether the data is representative enough of the reality upon which we hope to be able to generalise. "We need to overcome the threats to external validity so that we can generalise, can make inferential claims...We cannot generalise anything from the results unless we have appropriate subject selection...One way to attempt to obtain a representative sample is via random selection. In random selection every candidate...has an equal and independent chance of being chosen...." Hatch and Lazaraton's text was used rather generously because it describes the

procedure more or less employed in this work, as well as the difficulties that sample selection involved for the present project.

How could the present writer randomly select a sizeable extension of the text of Saydon's Bible to analyse the word order in its sentences and then compare the same factor in an equivalent extension of text from contemporary literature? How to quantify this 'sizeable extension'? And as regards the 'Saydon data' the researcher had to decide from which edition to glean this material; was he to select this data from the first edition which as we have seen appeared in pamphlet form over a period of thirty years(1929-1959)? Could he use the second edition which was published in three large volumes in 1977, 1982, 1990? Or could he employ the one-volume edition prepared for wide readership and printed in 1995? The choice of the literature from which to cull the clauses to compare Saydon's data with that taken from contemporary representative written texts other language for the variable of word order, involved another important methodological decision: which written expressions of the Maltese language could be said to be representative of how this language appears in its written form in modern times?

1.4.4 Concrete Solutions to Practical Questions

1.4.4.1 Edition of Saydon's Bible

The present writer opted for the first edition of Saydon's translation. The two subsequent editions of *Bibbja Saydon*, that in the three elegant volumes of 1977, 1982, 1990, and the 1995 one-volume edition, carry changes(Cf the Forward to the 1977 volume) to the original text and this makes it difficult to know exactly what belongs to the author and what to the editors. So the decision was taken to employ the text of the first edition (1929-1959).

1.4.4.1.1 Which Section of the Bible

A second decision concerned which part of Saydon's translation was to be chosen for the taking the data from. Unfortunately, no study has been conducted to date to check whether Saydon was constant in the application of his translation strategies throughout the whole project. We have to assume that he was and that every book of his Bible is an adequate representative of his entire translation work. On the level of intuition we say that Saydon was best in his translation of Hebrew source texts since he was a Semitic scholar, and that the earlier texts were the better ones. For these reasons the data for this enquiry was taken from Saydon's translation of Genesis (1929), Exodus(1930a), Leviticus(1930b), Numbers(1931a),

Deuteronomy(1931b), and Joshua(1931c). As the datation of the translations implies, these publications were the outcome of the same literary activity of the translator, and one may be justified in assuming that the literary level and value of the translation is standard throughout the first six books of Saydon's opus.

1.4.4.2 *The Data from Contemporary Maltese*

The samples of modern written Maltese were culled from sources that may be said to belong to two narrative genres, globally speaking, novels and newspapers. This option was made in view of the fact that the Saydon Data was taken from what today is known as the 'primary history' that covers from Genesis through to 2 Kings(Abela 1997). This historiographical complex actually contains clusters of literary genres (Cf Coats1983), including genealogies and lists (Cf Westermann1984), and legal material (Clark1974). But the spirit and mood of the narrative style prevails over all and shapes the material. So it was natural that the source material from which data would be gleaned in order to control whether the word order in Saydon's Bible translation was that of contemporary written Maltese, had to belong to the narrative genre, widely understood. Novels and newspapers fall within this type of literature. Of course one has to allow that the general category of 'novel' calls for further refinement of definition, for there are probably various types of novel to which our sources belong. But variations in genre does not necessarily involve variations in language structure. The same holds for the newspapers chosen for this exercise. They represent three social blocks, not precisely definable; but the social realities they speak for do not seem to have any relevance for the line of inquiry we are conducting here: their language is Standard Maltese.

What mattered most as the search for relative material was under way, was the period these novels and newspapers appeared. With the exception of one novel, *Is-Salib tal-Fidda* of Wistin Born, which appeared for the first time in 1939 (In this essay we shall be using the 1991 edition), the novels belonged to the last quarter of the twentieth century. The other novels are Frans Sammut's *Samuraj* (1975.1991), Alfred Sant's *Silġ fuq Kemmuna* (1982), Anton Grasso's *It-Tqala* (1994), and Kilin's *It-Tapit Imsaħħar* (1995). For the purpose of our research other novels could probably have been chosen. But these served this purpose admirably well. The newspapers were issued during the long weekend of May, 9-11th, 1997. *L-Orizzont* (10th May) and *It-Torċa*(11th May) represent the interests and the points of view of the Malta Labour Party and the General Workers Union; *In-Nazzjon* (10th May) and *Il-Mument*(11thMay) express the ideas and the ideals of the other

social force, the Nationalist Party, while *Il-Ġens* (9th May) is published by an agency of the Roman Catholic Church, the main religious institution to which the majority of Maltese belong to, and promotes the views of the Church. *L-Orizzont* and *In-Nazzjon* are daily papers while the other three are weekly. These papers have been chosen mainly because they all seem to enjoy wide circulation; unfortunately, though, we cannot cite figures as there exists no official documentation concerning the circulation flow of these national papers; the statement about their circulation has to be based on intuition: these newspapers are among the most widely read papers in Maltese.

1.4.4.3 Selection of Samples

1.4.4.3.1 The Saydon Data

The selection of this data had to answer to the possible accusation of manipulation of the material being studied by the present researcher. That is, how could he ensure that the clauses sampled out for study of their internal structure, were chosen 'randomly'? To support the hypothesis that Saydon employed mainly the V-S-O word order, one could be tempted to single out the agreed number of clauses carrying this word sequence. But that would not constitute 'random sampling' of the material. The present writer had to devise a system of selection which would as much as possible function automatically, and which would allow the narrowest margin of intervention from his part while the data was being selected and collected.

This system is based upon the standard division of the Hebrew Text in verses; this division is to be found in every translation of the Bible, together with the other division in chapters. Our system took into account only the first division. The text being studied was then portioned into three hundred units of twenty verses each. One should remember that a Bible verse is usually made up of more than one clause; very often a verse is made up of a bunch of sentences and clauses. This twenty verses extension of the text was deliberately narrowed down by singling out the last ten verses as possible candidates to have their clauses selected for the exercise. Given the length limitations of the study, the present writer could not indulge in an analysis of an infinite number of clauses; he had to limit their number to only one thousand. But the choice of these one thousand samples involved going through a much larger number of sentences and clauses. Out of the ten verses from which the material was supposed to be selected, only the third, the sixth, the ninth, and the tenth would be automatically considered. And the tenth verse in each unit would be chosen only every third unit.

These are the three hundred units into which the text of the first six books of Saydon's translation was apportioned. In the following list, first comes the unit number in bold print, then the sigla of the book's name in Maltese; after the sigla there follows the reference, with the number prior to the comma referring to the chapter, and those numbers posterior to the comma referring to the verses. A dash in between two numbers refers to an extension of text between two verses; thus Gen 1,1-20 means the Book of Genesis in its Maltese translation by Saydon, chapter one, verses from one to twenty. The unit often goes across chapter division, but the dash carries the same function of delimiting an extension of the text. The sigla of the name of the biblical book from which the units are taken is given only with the first unit, and is then taken for given in the subsequent units from the same book. The following are the three hundred textual units from which the Saydon Data was gleaned:

1. Ġ 1,1-20; **2.** 1,21-2,9; **3.** 2,10-3,5; **4.** 3,6-4,2; **5.** 4,3-22; **6.** 4,23-5,16; **7.** 5,17-6,5; **8.** 6,6-7,4; **9.** 7,5-8,1; **10.** 8,2-22; **11.** 9,11-20; **12.** 9,21-29+11,1-11 (Genesis 10 had to be skipped as it consists of mere lists of names); **13.** 11,12-32; **14.** 12,1-20; **15.** 13,1-14,2; **16.** 14,3-23; **17.** 14,24-15,18; **18.** 16,1-17,4; **19.** 17,5-25; **20.** 17,26-18,18; **21.** 18,19-19,6; **22.** 19,7-27; **23.** 19,28-20,9; **24.** 20,10-21,11; **25.** 21,12-34; **26.** 22,1-20; **27.** 22,23-23,18; **28.** 23,19-24,18; **29.** 24,19-39; **30.** 24,40-60; **31.** 24,61-25,13; **32.** 25,14-34; **33.** 26,1-20; **34.** 26,21-27,5; **35.** 27,6-26; **36.** 27,27-28,1; **37.** 28,2-22; **38.** 29, 1-20; **39.** 29,21-30,5; **40.** 30,6-26; **41.** 30,27-31,4; **42.** 31,5-25; **43.** 31,26-46; **44.** 31,47-32,12; **45.** 32,13-33; **46.** 33,1-20; **47.** 34,1-20; **48.** 34,21-35,9; **49.** 35,10-29 (We had to widen this textual unit as vv.23-26a turned out to be a list); **50.** 36,1-20; **51.** 36,21-42; **52.** 37,1-20; **53.** 37,21-38,6; **54.** 38,7-27; **55.** 38,28-39,18; **56.** 39,19-40,15; **57.** 40,16-41,12; **58.** 41,13-33; **59.** 41,34-54; **60.** 41,55-42,17; **61.** 42,18-38; **62.** 43,1-20; **63.** 43,21-44,6; **64.** 44,7-27; **65.** 44,28-45,12; **66.** 45,13-46,7 (From v.8 up to v.25 were not taken into consideration because they are for the most part lists of names); **67.** 46,26-47,11; **68.** 47,12-31; **69.** 48,1-22 (Most of Genesis 49 has been left out because the text is poetry); **70.** 50,1-26.

71. E 1,1-20; **72.** 1,21-2,18; **73.** 2,19-3,14; **74.** 3,15-4,13; **75.** 4,14-5,3; **76.** 5,4-23; **77.** 6,1-20; **78.** 6,21-7,10; **79.** 7,11-8,3; **80.** 8,4-24; **81.** 8,25-9,16; **82.** 9,17-10,2; **83.** 10,3-23; **84.** 10,24-11,10; **85.** 12,1-20; **86.** 12,21-41; **87.** 12,42-13,11; **88.** 13,12-14,11; **89.** 14,12-22; **90.** 14,23-31 + 15,19-16,2 (Exodus 15,1-18 have been skipped since the text consists of poetry where the structure of the sentence follows particular rules); **91.** 16,1-20; **92.** 16,21-17,4; **93.** 17,5-18,9; **94.** 18,10-19,3; **95.** 19,4-25; **96.** 20,18-21-12; **97.** 21,13-33; **98.** 21,34-22,16; **99.** 22,17-23,6; **100.** 23,7-27; **101.**

23.27-24,14; **102.** 24,15-25,16; **103.** 25,17-37; **104.** 25,38-26,17; **105.** 26,18-37; **106.** 27,1-20; **107.** 27,21-28,19; **108.** 28,20-40; **109.** 28,41-29,17; **110.** 29,18-38; **111.** 29,39-30,13; **112.** 30, 14-34; **113.** 30,35-31,16; **114.** 31,17-32,18; **115.** 32,19-33,4; **116.** 33,5-34,2; **117.** 34,3-23; **118.** 34,24-35,8; **119.** 35,9-29; **120.** 35,30-36,11; **121.** 36,12-32; **122.** 36,33-37,14; **123.** 37,15-38,5; **124.** 38,6-36; **125.** 38,37-39,15; **126.** 39,16-36; **127.** 39,37-40,13; **128.** 40,14-38.

129. L 1,1-2,3; **130.** 2,4-3,8; **131.** 3,9-4,11; **132.** 4,12-32; **133.** 4,33-5,16; **134.** 5,17-6,10; **135.** 6,11-7,8; **136.** 7,9-29; **137.** 7,30-8,11; **138.** 8,12-32; **139.** 8,33-9,16; **140.** 9,17-10,12; **141.** 10,13-11,12; **142.** 11,13-33; **143.** 11,34-12,6; **144.** 12,7-13,18; **145.** 13,19-39; **146.** 13,40-59; **147.** 14,1-20; **148.** 14,21-41; **149.** 14,42-15,5; **150.** 15,6-26; **151.** 15,27-16,13; **152.** 16,14-34; **153.** 17,1-18,4; **154.** 18,5-25; **155.** 18,26-19,15; **156.** 19,16-37; **157.** 20,1-20; **158.** 20,21-21,13; **159.** 21,14-22,9; **160.** 22,10-30; **161.** 22,31-23,17; **162.** 23,18-38; **163.** 23,39-24,14; **164.** 24,15-25,11; **165.** 25,12-32; **166.** 25,33-55; **167.** 26,1-20; **168.** 26,21-40; **169.** 26,41-27,14; **170.** 27,15-34.

171. N 1,1-30 (This unit is rather larger in size than the other units; this to permit choice of data as the greater part of the unit consists of lists); **172.** 1,31-50; **173.** 1,51-2,16; **174.** 2,17-3,4; **175.** 3,5-25; **176.** 3,26-45; **177.** 3,46-4,14; **178.** 4,15-34; **179.** 4,35-5,6; **180.** 5,6-26; **181.** 5,27-6,15; **182.** 6,16-7,12; **183.** 7,13-32; **184.** 7,33-53; **185.** 7,54-83 (The repetitive style of the contents of the text and the pro-drop phenomenon in Maltese, made it difficult for the unit to provide the necessary number of data required unless it was lengthened by a number of verses as here); **186.** 7,84-8,14; **187.** 8,15-9,8; **188.** 9,9-10,5; **189.** 10,6-25; **190.** 10,26-11,10; **191.** 11,11-30; **192.** 11,31-12,16; **193.** 13,1-20; **194.** 13,21-14,8; **195.** 14,9-29; **196.** 14,30,-15,5; **197.** 15,6-26; **198.** 15,27-16,5; **199.** 16,6-26; **200.** 16,27-17,11; **201.** 17,12-18,2; **202.** 18,3-22; **203.** 18,23-19,10; **204.** 19,11-20,9; **205.** 20,10-21,1; **206.** 21,2-22; **207.** 21,23-22,7; **208.** 22,8-28; **209.** 22,29-23,7; **210.** 23,8-30; **211.** 24,1-25,6; **212.** 25,7-26,9; **213.** 26,9-27,11; **214.** 27,12-28,9; **215.** 28,10-31; **216.** 29,1-20; **217.** 29,21-30,3; **218.** 30,4-31,7; **219.** 31,8-28; **220.** 31,29-32,6; **221.** 32,7-27; **222.** 32,28-33,6; **223.** 33,7,56 (The contents in this text are formulaic in character, repetitive, and marked by the presence of the pro-drop phenomenon); **224.** 34,1-29 (The text includes a list of names); **225.** 35,1-20; **226.** 35,21-34; **227.** 36,1-13 (This unit is shorter to make it coincide with the biblical division of the text).

228. D 1,1-20; **229.** 1,21-40; **230.** 1,41-2,14; **231.** 2,15-35; **232.** 2,36-3,18; **233.** 3,19-4,8; **234.** 4,9-28; **235.** 4,29-49; **236.** 5,1-20; **237.** 5,21-6,7; **238.** 6,8-24; **239.** 7,1-20; **240.** 7,21-8,15; **241.** 8,16-9,15; **242.** 9,16-10,7; **243.** 10,8-11,6; **244.** 11,7-

27; **245.** 11,28-12,15; **246.** 12,16-13,1; **247.** 13,2-14,2; **248.** 14,3-23; **249.** 14,24-15,14; **250.** 15,15-16,12; **251.** 16,13-17,11; **252.** 17,12-18,12; **253.** 18,13-19,11; **254.** 19,12-20,11; **255.** 20,12-21,12; **256.** 21,13-22,9; **257.** 22,10-23,1; **258.** 23,2-22; **259.** 23,23-24,16; **260.** 24,17-25,4; **261.** 25,5-26,5; **262.** 26,6-27,7; **263.** 27,8-28,2; **264.** 28,3-23; **265.** 28,24-43; **266.** 28,44-63; **267.** 28, 64-29,15; **268.** 29,16-30,4; **269.** 30,5-31,5; **270.** 31,6-26; **271.** 31,27-32,16; **272.** 32,17-36; **273.** 32,37-52; **274.** 33,1-20; **275.** 33,21-34,12.

276. Ġo 1,1-2,2; **277.** 2,3-24; **278.** 3,1-4,3; **279.** 4,4-24; **280.** 5,1-6,5; **281.** 6,6-25; **282.** 6,26-7,18; **283.** 7,19-8,12; **284.** 8,13-32; **285.** 8,33-9,17; **286.** 9,18-10,10; **287.** 10,11-31; **288.** 10,32-11,8; **289.** 11,9-12,3; **290.** 12,4-24(A text which includes a names list); **291.** 13,1-20; **292.** 13,21-14,8; **293.** 14,9-15,14; **294.** 15,15-45(The unit is wider as it includes a list of names); **295.** 15,46-16,4; **296.** 16,5-17,14; **297.** 17,15-18,16; **298.** 18,17-19,10; **299.** 19,11-31; **300.** 19,31-20,2.

Working with these units of text for gathering the needed data was not an easy task and did not always proceed smoothly. The annotations added to the references of some units given above, by themselves explain how certain units had to be enlarged from the beginning as the prospects of finding the required number of data seemed bleak from the start (Cf units no. 171 and 185). This is because the unit includes long lists of names or formulaic language which would not yield complete sentences that could be chosen for the exercise. Far more frequent was the other difficulty created by the language itself. If the present enquiry means to examine the relative positions of the subject and the verb in the sentences in both Saydon's Bible translation and in the expressions of written contemporary Maltese, the researcher had to discard from consideration those sentences in the sources from which the data were culled, in which the subject is dropped for some reason or another. Now this 'pro-drop parameter' [Cfr Rizzi1982,1986; Jaeggli and Safir1989; Haegeman 1994: 19-25 for a discussion of this linguistic phenomenon] concerns both Biblical Hebrew and Maltese. For the former the reader would be referred to an authority already mentioned in this discussion:Bandstra1992:115-116. For the latter a short and non-exhaustive treatment is offered in Borg1988:114-148. In Maltese we can say:

1. *Ġanna marret il-Belt*
(Jane has gone to the City [Understood here as the Capital, Valletta])
2. *Marret il-Belt*
(She has gone to the City)

3. *Eva kielel il-frotta*
(Eve has eaten the fruit)
4. *Kielel il-frotta*
(She has eaten the fruit)

In the examples 1 and 3, the subject of the sentence is explicit; in the other two sentences, 2 and 4, the morphology of the verb makes it clear that a third person singular, feminine is the subject of the verb which remains to be recovered from the wider context of the sentences. The relevance of this short discussion becomes clear when we go through Saydon's Bible translation. Often, as in its Hebrew *Vorlage*, the sentences in Saydon's version of the Bible translation drop the subject; this is then retrieved from the previous sentence or sentences. This phenomenon made the collection of clauses with explicit subjects more complicated for the present writer who had then to devise a system of selection in order to replace the first clauses in the third, sixth, ninth, or tenth verse in each unit when the pro-drop phenomenon was in action. In these cases the data would be sought first from the other clauses in the same verse if it would contain more than one clause; when this possibility would be negated, the clauses would be sought from the second, fifth and eighth, or from the first, fourth, and seventh clauses. Sometimes the last ten verses would not yield the required number of data and so other verses from the unit would be taken into consideration. Fortunately enough, the search for data never had to go beyond the delimitation of the above units of text. But of course, these difficulties have the tendency to weaken somehow the automaticity of the system that has been constructed to arrive for the choice of the data with the narrowest margin of personal choice by the researcher.

1.4.4.3.2 Contemporary Maltese Data

The data coming from expressions of modern written Maltese created lesser difficulties to be extracted. The researcher planned to retrieve the first ten clauses that were adequate for the purposes of the present enquiry on the following pages of each of the five novels: 3, 9, 15, 21, 26, 32, 38, 44, 50, 56. The only difficulty met with here was that one or two novels did not have p. 3; in these cases data was gathered from p. 62. The 500 data samples gleaned from newspapers were the first ten clauses of the first ten paragraphs in the first ten pages of each newspaper. The only slight mishap was caused by those papers which had any of the first ten pages taken over by adverts. In cases like this the ensuing page would be added. Most of the material from which these data were retrieved consisted of reports of events.

2 THE DATA

2.1 Narrative

The following data consists of two thousand short clauses, half taken from the first six books of Saydon's translation of the Bible, half from the novels and newspapers mentioned in the previous paragraphs. These clauses were numbered from 1 to 2000, put into a table where they could be examined for the variable that touches upon what interests this dissertation, identified as to the source from which they have been culled, and surveyed for their typology, structure, and as to whether Saydon was following the model of his *Vorlage* in structuring his sentences.

2.2 Keys for Reading the Data Table

2.2.1 Maltese Orthography

A quick glance at the first page of the ensuing data (to be reproduced in the next issue of *Melita theologica*) will tell that the present writer has opted not to transliterate but to reproduce the data in Maltese orthography. The reasons for this option were two: first, most of the Maltese orthographic symbols correspond in a one-to-one fashion to the international phonetic (IPA) symbols even though phonetic variations would be captured within the same orthographic sign by a trained phoneticist. For a detailed discussion of this issue reference is being made to (Aquilina 1959.1973:22-141 wherein the author discusses the phonology of Semitic and non-Semitic Maltese) and (Aquilina 1961.1970:117-165 where some historical phonetic changes are examined). The non-Maltese reader would need to know only of a handful of idiosyncrasies of the Maltese alphabet to be able to read the text of the data. "The Maltese alphabet numbers twenty two consonants, two semi-vowels and five long or short vowels, though phonetically Maltese has actually twenty seven consonants, five of the additional six being contextual, and one independent but represented by the ambiguous symbol z (cp *zona*, [dzo:na], 'zone' and *ziju*, [tziyyu] 'uncle'). As for the vowels, we can say that Maltese has five long or short vowels only by a broad phonetic description, for had we to adopt instead a narrower and, therefore, more exact transcription the number of vocalic symbols required would be greater but also too unwieldy and specialised for our purpose.

The following are the consonantal symbols of standard Maltese spelling:- b, '(tf) d, f, g, (g), [the same sound of 'j' in 'judge'], h, ['in Maltese stands also for Arabic /x/ (Aquilina 1959.1973:3)], k, l, m, n, g, [On this consonant cf

Aquilina 1959. 1973:15], q [Sounded as the Arabic hamza], r, s, t, v, x (f), z (ts or ds) and \z). The five vowels are a, a: ; e, e: ; i, i: ; o, o: ; u, u: [As the reader will soon notice, Saydon sought to distinguish the value of the vowels; a long /a/ will feature as 'â', a long /u/ will appear as 'û', etc. . These distinctions are no longer maintained orthographically in modern written Maltese. Only final stressed vowels are annotated as can be seen from the Contemporary Maltese Data] and the two semi-vowels generally resulting from the combination of *i* and *u* with a preceding or following vowel, are *j* (*y*) and *w*" (Aquilina 1961.1970:125-126). One should note that annotations within the square brackets belong to the present writer.

The second reason for which the present writer had to decide to produce the data in orthography rather than in transliteration, was that a number of International Phonetic Alphabet symbols were not available, as the reader might have sensed while going through the above quotation from Aquilina. With what has been provided in this sub-paragraph the reader will be able to pronounce and read most if not all of the words in the data.

2.2.2 Siglas Employed

The following are the main siglas employed with the Table of Data:

| | |
|--------|---|
| - ** | Nominal, verbless clauses |
| - Ag | Anton Grasso's <i>It-Tqala</i> (1994). Novel |
| - As | Alfred Sant's <i>Silġ fuq Kemmuna</i> (1982). Novel |
| - Cond | Conditional Clause |
| - D | Dewteronomju (Saydon's translation of Deuteronomy) |
| - Decl | Declarative Clause |
| - Dep | Dependent Clause |
| - E | Eżodu (Saydon's translation of Exodus) |
| - Fs | Frans Sammut's <i>Samuraj</i> (1975.1991). Novel |
| - Excl | Exclamatory Clause |
| - Ġ | Ġenesi (Saydon's translation of Genesis) |
| - Ġe | <i>Il-Ġens</i> . Newspaper |
| - Ġo | Ġożwè (Saydon's translation of Joshua) |
| - Inte | Interrogative Clause |
| - Ki | Kilin's <i>It-Tapit Imsaħħar</i> (1995). Novel |
| - L | Levítku (Saydon's translation of Leviticus) |
| - Lo | <i>L-Orizzont</i> . Newspaper |
| - Modl | Model, referring to |

| | | |
|-----------------|-------|---|
| - Mu | | <i>Il-Mument</i> . Newspaper |
| - N | | Nûmri (Saydon's translation of Numbers) |
| - Na | | <i>In-Nazzjon</i> . Newspaper |
| - p/ pp. | | page/pages |
| - Perf | | Performative Clause |
| - Struc | | Structure, referring to the constituents position in the clause |
| - To | | <i>It- Torca</i> . Newspaper |
| - Wb | | Wistin Born's <i>Is-Salib tal-Fidda</i> (1939.1991). Novel |

2.2.3 Highlighting the INFL carrier in the Clause

One element in each data unit is put in italics for clear identification by the reader who does not know Maltese. It's the INFL carrier. This practice involves a few assumptions first made by the Chomskian tradition of generative grammar that is widely known as the 'Government and Binding Theory' (Chomsky 1981), or as it has been more recently christened by its founder, the 'Principles and Parameters Theory' (Chomsky 1992). One assumption would read that the sentence is in fact a projection of the INFL (Inflection)node; another assumption would take the auxiliary, whether overt or implied, as the carrier of this node; another still, "that at a more level of representation the inflectional element tense cannot be part of the VP(Verbal Phrase), but must be generated separately from it"(Haegeman1994:109). In all sentences, whether an auxiliary is used or not, the morpheme carrying the tense element is dominated by a separate terminal node technically called INFL. The "INFL is a node which is taken to contain all the verbal inflection, i.e. including person and number properties" (Ibid:110). The latter is generally known as Agreement, (AGR). The INFL dominates, therefore, the feature of tense as well as the agreement features of the Verb. As we cannot venture further into this theoretical apparatus, we refer the reader to the discussion in Haegeman quoted above on pp.108-116 and the whole of chapter 11 where a bibliography is also provided. In Maltese both tense and agreement may be grammaticalized within the morphology of the Verb itself. Thus we say:

- 1) Ġanni *jaħdem* siegħa kuljum (Present Tense, 3rd person sing.masc.)
John works one hour every day
- 2) Ġanna *taħdem* siegħa kuljum (Present Tense, 3rd person sing. fem.)
Jane works one hour every day
- 3) Ġanni *ħadem* għal erba' sigħat (Past Tense, 3rd person sing.masc.)
John worked for four hours

- 4) Ġanna *hadmet* ghal erba' s'ghat (Past Tense, 3rd person sing.fem.)
Jane worked for four hours

Once again the present writer has no possibility in this work to delve deeper into these issues. The reader is referred to the studies of Professor Albert Borg in 1981 and 1984, especially the latter on pp.123-146. Auxiliaries are also used in Maltese, the more so in its contemporary varieties. The auxiliary *ikun/ kien* ('is' or 'will be'/'was') and plural realizations *ikunu/ kienu* are often met also in the Data. Naturally, they also appear as lexical verbs (On the use of this and other auxiliaries cf Borg1984:59-96;254-318).

2.2.4 Three Other Columns in the Table

2.2.4.1 Typology of Clauses

In the column entitled **Type** the present writer enters an intuitive description of the clauses chosen for this exercise. Thus, the reader will know from the Table whether the clause has been read by the researcher as 'declarative' or as 'dependent' clause. This latter category depends upon the syntax rather than on the semantics of the clause; the same holds for 'Conditional,' 'Interrogative,' 'Exclamatory,' and 'Performative' clauses. For a discussion of such types of clauses the reader is referred to (Shopen1985) and to (Comrie1989). We shall examine in the third part whether the typology of the clause is relevant to the issue of the order of the constituents in the clause in our two sets of data

2.2.4.2 Word Order in the Clauses

In the fifth column of the Table we shall enter the information of whether the verb in the clause precedes the subject or vice versa. This constitutes the focus of the study but it also defines its limits. We want to establish whether the V-S-O or the S-V-O sequence predominates in either the Saydon Data or in that culled from the writings of Contemporary Maltese. Given this interest in his research, the present writer may not bother always to reproduce the clauses in their entirety; adjuncts are often left out because of space problems within the column. But the subjects and the INFL carriers are always included. Whether the order is V-S-O or S-V-O is coded in the number used. Number **1** stands for V-S-O sequence, while **2** stands for S-V-O sequence.

2.2.4.3 Saydon's Model

The sixth column entitled 'Modl' for 'Model' means to verify whether Saydon tends to reproduce the syntax of his Hebrew *Vorlage* in his translation. Here the codes are **1** which means that Saydon does reproduce the grammatical form of his source text, and **0** which encodes departures by Saydon from his original in Hebrew. This investigation of Saydon's imitation in his translation of his Hebrew text, touches above all upon the question of the order of the constituents in the clause. Indirect light will thus be shed upon the main issue under investigation.

2.3 The Data

In the following pages the reader will find the data that has been gathered for this research project. First come the Saydon Data, then the Contemporary Maltese Data.

To be continued.