

Babel und Bibel 9

*Proceedings of the 6th Biennial Meeting
of the International Association for Comparative Semitics
and Other Studies*

Edited by

L. KOGAN, N. KOSLOVA, S. LOESOV, AND S. TISHCHENKO

Editorial Secretary

I. ARKHIPOV

Published for
the Russian State University for the Humanities
by
EISENBRAUNS
Winona Lake, Indiana
2016

**Orientalia et Classica: Труды Института восточных культур и античности.
Выпуск LXIV**

Под редакцией И. С. Смирнова

Вавилон и Библия. 9

Редколлегия

Л. Е. Коган, Н. В. Козлова, С. В. Лёзов, С. В. Тищенко

Ответственный секретарь

И. С. Архипов

© Российский государственный
гуманитарный университет, 2016
© Институт восточных культур
и античности, 2016

ISBN 978-1-57506-448-2

ISSN 1938-5668

The paper used in this publication meets the minimum requirements of the American National Standard for Information Sciences—Permanence of Paper for Printed Library Materials, ANSI Z39.48-1984. ©™

Contents

Contents

i

Selected Papers Presented at the 6th Biennial Meeting of the International Association for Comparative Semitics

M. Bulakh. Was There a Color Term <i>*hmr</i> ‘to be red’ in Proto-Semitic?	3
G. del Olmo Lete. The Use of the Infinitive in Sequential Constructions in Ugaritic	19
Yu. Furman, S. Loesov. Notes on Historical Morphology of Turoyo	37
V. Golinets. Amorite Animal Names: Cognates for the Semitic Etymological Dictionary	55
O. Kapeliuk. Neo-Semitic: New Verb Forms, New Usage	87
G. Khan. Remarks on Roots and Stems in the Christian Urmi Dialect of Neo-Aramaic	105
M. Krebernik. Etymological and Historical Problems Concerning Akkadian <i>tamkāru</i> ‘merchant’	119
T. Notarius. The Second-Person Non-Negated Jussive in the Language of Ugaritic Poetry in Comparative Semitic Perspective	131
P. Stein. The Cohortative in Biblical Hebrew – Subjunctive or Energetic? A New Approach from the Sabaic Perspective	155
O. Stolbova. Ethiosemitic–Chadic Lexical Parallels	171
G. Takács. Semitic “Fat”: Some New Etymologies	183
E. Vernet. Etymologischer Ursprung der reduplizierten und geminierten Wurzeln im Proto-Semitischen	189
M. Vernet. Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Semitic Verbal Root Incompatibilities: a New Typological Approach	207

Other Studies

Ancient Near Eastern Studies

Articles

- E. Jiménez. May the Reader Not Withhold the Tablet!
On a Formula in Late Babylonian Colophons 227

Reviews

- M. Maiocchi. *Classical Sargonic Tablets Chiefly from Adab in the Cornell University Collections* (E. Markina) 243
A. Kloekhorst. *Accent in Hittite. A Study in Plene Spelling, Consonant Gradation, Clitics, and Metrics*
(A. Sideltsev, M. Molina) 259

Semitic Studies

Articles

- T. Fain, J. N. Ford, A. Lyavdansky. Aramaic Incantation
Bowls at the State Hermitage Museum, St. Petersburg 283

Short Notes

- L. Kogan, A. I. al-Da‘rhi, K. McNeer. Vitaly 319
N. Kuzin, S. Loesov. The Sun Also Rises: *ko-saləq u=yawmo* 325

Old Testament Studies

Articles

- C. von Büttner. “My God Was My Help”:
A Note on the Great Isaiah Scroll (Isa 49:5) 337

- Abbreviations of Periodicals, Reference Works, Series,
Sources, and Languages 349



EISENBRAUNS

Offprint from:

L. Kogan, N. Koslova, S. Loesov, and S Tishchenko (eds.),
*Babel und Bibel 9: Proceedings of the 6th Biennial Meetings of the
International Association for Comparative Semitics and oOther Studies*
© Copyright 2016 Eisenbrauns. All rights reserved.

Notes on Historical Morphology of Turoyo

Yulia Furman

Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

yufurman@gmail.com

Sergey Loesov

Russian State University for the Humanities, Moscow

sergeloesov@gmail.com

Turoyo is the most archaic among modern Eastern Aramaic languages (with the exception of Neo-Mandaic), hence its importance for the history of Aramaic. Numerous features of Turoyo verbal morphology are easily traceable back to Classical Syriac proto-forms in so far as formal shapes are concerned. For this reason, the cases in which certain Turoyo forms do not stand in direct continuity with the assumed Syriac proto-forms promise new results in the reconstruction of the Middle Aramaic ancestor of Turoyo.

Keywords: Verb in Eastern Aramaic, verbal system of Turoyo, history of geminated roots in Turoyo, shape of hollow verbs in NENA

0. Introduction¹

Current scholarship starts from the premise that the Middle Aramaic ancestor of Turoyo was an Eastern idiom virtually identical to Classical Syriac, i. e. the Aramaic spoken in Edessa (today's Şanlıurfa in the South-East of Turkey) around 300 AD. There are good reasons to believe that this Middle Aramaic Proto-Turoyo was close to the Edessan variety, yet we are able to produce a number of isoglosses separating our Proto-Turoyo from Syriac we know. By the same token, some of these isoglosses link Proto-Turoyo to other Middle Aramaic varieties. In what follows, we shall discuss part of the material we have managed to collect, in the hope to deal with the rest of it later.²

¹ The research has been supported by RFH grant No. 14-04-00374.

² Cf. a similar *Fragestellung* in Hoberman 1988:557: “The modern Aramaic dialects native to northern Iraq and adjacent parts of Iran and Turkey (Northeastern Neo-Aramaic, NENA) are descended from the undocumented Aramaic that must

1. The shape of the G-stem detransitive Inflectum

The Turoyo verb displays two important retentions vis-à-vis NENA: it has two kinds of the G-stem active Preterit, depending on the transitivity value of the root, and synthetic Detransitive³ forms of all stems. In the table below, we list the inflectional bases of the Turoyo verb:

Stem	Preterit			Inflectum ⁴	
	Active		Detransitive	Active	Detransitive
I	transitive	intrans	<i>qtil</i>	<i>qotəl</i>	<i>maqətəl</i>
	<i>qtəlle</i> (<i>qtil</i> + L-infl.)	<i>qatəl</i> (+ nomin- ative infl.)			
II (= D)	<i>mqatalle</i>		<i>mqatəl</i>	<i>mqatəl</i>	<i>miqatəl</i>
III (= C)	<i>maqatalle</i>		<i>maqətəl</i> (village: <i>mtaqətəl</i>)	<i>maqətəl</i>	<i>mitaqətəl</i>

have been spoken there in ancient times. The relationship between the modern dialects and older Aramaic may be explored by applying the method of comparative reconstruction to the modern dialects, creating a hypothesis as to the nature of their ancestor. This approach is applied here to the personal pronouns and the pronominal suffixes which function in the inflection of verbs, nouns, and prepositions. The reconstructed proto-NENA pronominal system has similarities to those of Syriac and Babylonian Jewish Aramaic, but also important innovations of its own. By identifying innovations shared by two or more of the modern dialects, conclusions about their genetic classification can be drawn.” We endorse this approach, except that to posit a proto-NENA is too strong a claim, while proto-Turoyo has to have existed.

³ We use this alternative label, “Detransitive,” rather than “Passive,” to highlight the fact that the respective verb bases encode various valence-decreasing operations, not just the agent backgrounding (= passivization), see Furman–Loesov 2015:3f.

In an elegant way, all nine “official” participles of the Middle Aramaic verb became bases of the verb forms represented in the table, nothing has been lost. The tenth “participle” of the Middle Aramaic, not yet recognized as such by our grammars of Syriac, is **qattīl*, the productive resultative adjective formed from intransitive G-stem verbs. Now, the G-stem Preterit has two active bases: *qtīl* + L-infection to encode the agent (transitive verbs) as against *qatəl* + “nominative” inflection to encode the subject (intransitive verbs). The *qatəl* Preterit base is the reflex of the Middle Aramaic **qattīl*.

The second important feature of the Turoyo verb (shared only by Mlaḥsō) is the synthetic Detransitive for both the Preterit and Inflectum. In particular, the base of the G-stem detransitive Inflectum is *məqtəl*, which is a reflex of the Middle Aramaic Gt-stem participle *metqtel* (*metqtel*). Taking *nšq* ‘kiss’ as the root to be used in the morphological examples: the shortest form (3 ms) is *mənšəq*, while the forms with inflectional suffixes have /*ō*/ between R₂ and R₃: *mənšəqo*/*mənšəqi*. Now the corresponding Syriac forms are *meṭnšeq*/*meṭnašqā*/*meṭnašqān*, i. e., they go back to the pre-syncope **matnašiq* base, which looked very much like the Active Participle of the Arabic Gt-stem. It stands to reason that *mənšəqi* does not go back to *meṭnašqān* but rather to a Gt-stem shape that used to have a long */*ā*/ between the second and the third radicals. For the strong three-radical verb, it is completely excluded to have this kind of vowel “initially,” i. e., in the Middle Aramaic. To explain this */*ā*/, we have to recur to an analogy with the hollow roots.⁵ In Syriac, the Gt-stem of hollow roots had coincided (probably due to a prosodic levelling with the sound verb forms) with the Ct-stem of hollow roots, the participle being *metsīm*, with etymologically long -*tt*-: *mettVsīm*. In Turoyo, **metsīm*/*metsīmīn* would have yielded *misəm*/*misimi*, while what we actually have is *misəm*/*misomi*. This evidence makes it clear that Proto-Turoyo had the long /*ā*/ in the respective slot.

⁴ Our “Inflectum” is Otto Jastrow’s “das Präsens.” We rechristened this stem (see also Furman–Loesov 2015:3) because in Turoyo it is one of the two *conjugated verbal bases*, the other one being the Preterit in its two shapes. Inflectum gets its individual grammatical readings (Present, Future, Imperfect/Habitual, Jussive/Subjunctive, Irrealis, etc.) from the morphological and syntactic context, in particular from prefixed particles and the suffixed/infix past-time marker.

⁵ An analogical development spreading from hollow roots to sound roots is not a too far-fetched idea: cf. in particular the Hebrew *hipšīl* of sound roots, whose shape is most easily (and plausibly) explained by an analogy with that of roots II-*w/y*.

This /ā/ is indeed attested in various Aramaic idioms. The earliest reliable instance is BA: ܝܬܬܫܐܡ *yittāšām* ‘(till the appropriate edict) is published’ (Ezr 4:21), *mittāšām* ‘(timber) is being laid’ (Ezr 5:8), *yittāšāmūn* ‘(your houses) will be converted (into a dunghill)’ (Dan 2:5), but note ܝܬܬܙܝܢ *yittāzīn* ‘(all kinds of living beings) get nourishment’ (Dan 4:9), a Gt-form of the hollow root *zwn*. Targum Onkelos, admittedly written in a variety of Imperial Aramaic, has only /ā/ (Dalman 1905:317). In JBA, the Gt forms of hollow roots have both /ī/ and /ā/, cf. Bar-Asher Siegal 2013:139. The same happens in JPA (Dalman 1905:317). In this slot, /ī/ rather than /ā/ seems natural, so the origin of the /ā/ is as yet unexplained (for various suggestions, cf. GVG I §270 Gf; Bauer–Leander 1927 §46 n-p; Beyer 1984:488).

The above explanation of the Turoyo forms was suggested already by Adolf Siegel in his grammar of Prym & Socin corpus.⁶

Most importantly, Mlaḥsô shares this feature with Turoyo. In Mlaḥsô, the G-stem Passive Inflectum of II-*y* verbs is *mCoC-*, e. g., *mšodī* ‘they will be seized.’⁷ This fact, along with some other data, corroborates the impression that Turoyo and Mlaḥsô constitute a genealogical subgroup opposed to all of NENA.⁸

Excursus: the shape of the C-stem detransitive Inflectum of hollow roots

In Turoyo, the detransitive Inflectum of the C-stem hollow verbs has the shape *mitanəḥ/mitaniḥi* (Jastrow 1967:108). It is not identical to the same form of the G-stem, which, as we know, is *misəm/misomi*. This situation is different from the Syriac one (see above). The *mitanəḥ/mitaniḥi* shape must go back to **mittannīḥ*, because the simplification of an erstwhile consonantal doubling is the only source of the non-elidable /a/ in Turoyo (i. e., this is compensatory lengthening of a short /a/, in the way of Tiberian Hebrew vocalism, see also chapter 3 of this paper). Thus, to explain *mitanəḥ/mitaniḥi*, we have to admit an analogy of hollow roots with II = III roots, as it happens elsewhere in Aramaic (see Chapter 3 of this paper). This **mittannīḥ* shape has no parallels among the known Ct-stem of Middle Aramaic, although it is true that not in all of them (unlike in Syriac, CPA,

⁶ Siegel 1923:162f. Ritter 1990:129 refers back to Siegel’s explanation.

⁷ Jastrow 1994:36.

⁸ In the G-stem passive of sound roots, there appears a non-elidable /e/ between R₂ and R₃: *metnehī* ‘they are going to recover’ (Jastrow 1994:64).

and Samaritan)⁹ the Gt-stem of hollow roots is identical to the Ct-stem of hollow roots. For the state of affairs in Classical Mandaic, see Nöldeke 1875:251f.; for JBA, see Bar-Asher Siegal 2013:139; for JPA, see Dalman 1905:317.

2. The fate of geminated roots in Turoyo

In our Turoyo Verbal Glossary in progress, we have spotted some seventy-four¹⁰ Turoyo verbs which are traceable to historically geminated roots.¹¹ Forty-six originally geminated roots turned into hollow ones in Turoyo, nine of which happen to have the C-stem only. This rule works for all kinds of geminated roots, be they of Aramaic origin or borrowings. Cf. *ḥoyəf/ḥəfle* ‘wash’ < MEA *ḥpp* (SL 481); *loyəf* ~ /*ləfle* ‘roll, wind’ < Ar. *lyf* (Wehr:1158f.); *maḥəs* ~ /*maḥəsle* ‘wake up; notice’ < Ar. *ḥss* IV (ibid. 252f.).¹²

Turoyo has nineteen geminated verbs in the D-stem, with both inherited roots and loans. The etyma of all these verbs are also geminated. Cf. *msaməm* ~ /*msaməmle* ‘poison’ < MEA *smm* (D-stem, SL 1020); *mkarər* ~ /*mkaralle* ‘repeat’ < Ar. *krr* II (ibid.:1092); *mšahəḥ* ~ /*mšahəḥle* ‘correct’ < Ar. *šḥḥ* II (ibid.:696). A deviant case is *mḥale* ~ /*mḥalele* ‘permit, allow’ < Ar. *ḥll* II (ibid.:284f.).¹³

Besides, there are ten quadriliteral reduplicated verbs, most of which go back to Arabic geminated roots. Cf. *mbašbəš* ~ /*mbašbəšle* ‘blaze’ < Ar. *bšš* (ibid.:91); *mğəšğəs* ~ /*mğəšğəsle* ‘touch (body, corpse)’ < Ar. *ğss* (ibid. 183).

There are also a few verbs relevant for the present inquiry which underwent more complicated phonological changes. The verb *rokəx* ~ /*rakəx* ‘be soft,’ related to the MEA *rkk* ‘be soft,’ developed its Neo-Aramaic root from the Middle Aramaic verbal adjective *rakkīk-*. In the same way, the verb *roqəq* ~ /*raqəq* ‘become soft; relent’ had been formed from the MEA

⁹ For Syriac, see Nöldeke 1966 §177 B; for CPA, see Müller-Kessler 1991:217; for Samaritan, see Tal 2013:70.

¹⁰ See the Appendix.

¹¹ I. e., II = III (or 𐤒"𐤒) roots. The label “geminated roots” may be not lucky, because “gemination” is best applied to morphological operations, such as the formation of the D-stem in classical Arabic and some other Semitic languages, yet it is convenient for us in the present context.

¹² The fact that in Turoyo the majority of historically geminated roots (whether of Aramaic or Arabic extraction) has become II-*y* roots is well-known (Siegal 1923:182f.; Ritter 1990:499; Tezel 2003:37).

¹³ See also a discussion in Tezel 2003:53f.

adjective *raqqīq-* ‘soft, thin.’¹⁴ Thus, it is the only MEA root that has retained its geminated shape in the G-stem.¹⁵

In Syriac (unlike, e. g., in BA), the active participle of geminated roots is *bāʔez/bāzzīn*, i. e. the shortest shape was newly formed on the analogy of hollow roots, while the forms with endings followed the old pattern (the BA forms, according to the consonantal text, would be *bāʔez/bāzīzīn*). Yet in JBA (Bar-Asher Siegal 2013:144)¹⁶ and Classical Mandaic (Nöldeke 1875:250) the forms of the *bāyazīn* kind are the regular ones. In JBA, one observes a similar analogical development of the passive participle. Along with the expected *bzīz*, the form *bīz* is also attested (Bar-Asher Siegal 2013:145).

This feature may be a development of what we find in Classical Syriac, it is easily explainable as paradigmatic levelling starting from the shortest form and expanding to those with inflectional suffixes.

In NENA as well, the G-stem geminated verbs of any origin (save a few exceptions) moved to the II-*y* class. This is in particular the case of Barwar,¹⁷ with the exceptions of *ḡnn* ‘sing a dirge’ and *šnn* ‘burn (food)’; both verbs, however, have alternative II-*y* shapes;¹⁸ cf. also Alqosh,¹⁹ C. Urmi,²⁰ Sardarid,²¹ Sanandaj,²² Arbel (with *xll* ‘wash’ and *ḥll* ‘profane’ as exceptions),²³ Sulemaniyya (but cf. *xll* ‘wash’),²⁴ J. Urmi,²⁵ Betanure²⁶ (with the only exception *lll* ‘become wet’).²⁷

¹⁴ In Syriac, no G-stem forms of this root are attested (SL 1489f.).

¹⁵ The synchronically geminated verb *gaxəx* ~ /*gaxəx* ‘laugh’ comes from the MEA *ghk* ‘laugh’ with **h* assimilated to the fricative /*k*/.

¹⁶ In other dialects the m. sg. form is similar to the form of the II-*w/y* roots *baʔez* ‘plunder.’ In JBA, as a result of leveling, all forms of the paradigm conjugate like the II-*w/y* with the similar variation of *ʔ/y*.

¹⁷ Khan 2008:205ff.

¹⁸ Khan 2008:217f.

¹⁹ Coghill 2003:193.

²⁰ Hetzron 1969:123f.

²¹ Younansardaroud 2001:104–108.

²² Khan 2009:104.

²³ Khan 1999:97.

²⁴ Khan 2004:111f.

²⁵ Khan 2008a:91.

²⁶ Mutzafi 2008:73.

²⁷ Mutzafi 2008:77.

In the descriptions of Hertevin,²⁸ Jilu,²⁹ Bohtan,³⁰ and Amədyā³¹ a list of hollow verbs is not provided, while they do not mention the II = III class either. One may guess that the etymologically geminated roots in these idioms had the same fate as in the above NENA.

3. *Verba mediae y*: the shape of their C-stem

In Turoyo, the C-stem of verbs II-*y* has the following basic forms: *maqəm/maqimi* (Inflectum), *maqəmle/maqimile* (Preterit). These shapes do not go back to the corresponding Syriac participles *mqīm* (Active)/*mqām* (Passive), because, on purely phonological terms, the Middle Aramaic participial shape *mqīm* could have survived in Turoyo, cf. the D-stem base *mḥaləq* of Turoyo: the initial cluster is tolerable in verb forms, the *mḥaləq* shape has not changed since Middle Aramaic times.

As we shall see, the forms structurally comparable to Turoyo ones exist (or used to exist) in the rest of Eastern Aramaic known to us, with the only exception of Classical Syriac. In other words, in so far as the morphonology of C-stem verbs II-*y* goes, most of Eastern Aramaic has lived through the stage represented by today's Turoyo.

The Syriac shapes *mqīm/mqām* are older than the Turoyo-like formations. How then did this development come about?

The change had been triggered by an analogy with geminated roots. As is well-known, in Old and Middle Aramaic, prefixing forms of geminated roots lengthen the first root consonant rather than the second one, e. g., *maddəqā* (C-stem fem. sg. part. of *dqq* 'break in pieces') in Biblical Aramaic,³² *mabbez/mabzīn* (C-stem part. of *bzz* 'plunder') in Syriac.³³

Let us first, as our point of departure, look at the Turoyo picture more carefully, and then proceed to the rest of Eastern Aramaic.

In Turoyo, the only source of the "morphological" */ā/ in open syllables is the pre-modern *-aCCV sound sequence: in proto-Turoyo *-aCCV shifted to -āCV due to the shortening of all Middle Aramaic long conso-

²⁸ Jastrow 1988:38.

²⁹ Fox 1997:27.

³⁰ Fox 2009:42f.

³¹ Greenblatt 2011:127–130.

³² Bauer-Leander 1927 §48i.

³³ Nöldeke 1966 §178.

nants and the compensatory lengthening of /a/,³⁴ e. g., *nafiqi* ‘they went out’ < **naph̄īqīn*.³⁵

The analogy with geminated roots is not sufficient to explain the shapes *maq̄m/maq̄mi*, because the vowel following the first root radical does not drop out or shift to /a/, as it happens to historically short vowels, cf. *noš̄aq* < **nāš̄iq* ‘he kisses’ vs. *nōš̄qo* < **nāš̄qā* ‘she kisses’ and *nofaqno* < **nāf̄īqnā* ‘I go out’ vs. *naf̄eqno* < **naph̄īqnā* ‘I went out.’ This means that in *maq̄mno/maq̄mi* the second vowel goes back to the long */ī/. Thus, as has been already noticed by Hellmut Ritter, the C-stem of Turoyo II-*y* verbs has a complex origin: the first syllable of the shape *maq̄m/maq̄mi* was formed analogically to the C-stem of erstwhile geminated roots (**mabbez*), the second one goes back to the C-stem of hollow roots (Ritter 1990:535).

Siegel (1923:185f.) proposed that the C-stem of II-*y* verbs could have developed on an analogy with the C-stem of sound roots (**mq̄m* > *maq̄m* ~ *maq̄tal*). A similar explanation was suggested by G. Khan for Jewish dialects of Arbel³⁶ and Sulemaniyya.³⁷

Ritter’s hypothesis is to be preferred, since it squares well with some pieces of historical evidence cited below.

Even in Biblical Hebrew, a conservative NWS language, some II-*w/y* roots form N- and C-stem verbs by doubling the first radical (i. e., probably on an analogy with the “aramaizing” shape of II = III *yissōb*) and preserving the long root vowel. Cf. the C-stem of √*swt*: *yassīl* along with *yāsīl* ‘he incites’; the N-stem of √*mw*: *nimmōl* ‘he was circumcised.’³⁸ Yet this feature does not appear in the vocalization of BA.

Now the verbs II-*y* in the C-stem of certain Middle Aramaic varieties are inflected analogically to the C-stem of II = III roots.

Outside Eastern Aramaic, consider JPA: Dalman (1905:316) says that in part of its corpus the C-stem forms of hollow roots ‘sind nach Analogie der Verba geminata gebildet,’ e. g., *ʔaf̄f̄īqū* ‘they pressed’ (√*f̄wq*), *ʔaš̄š̄l* ‘he listened’ (√*š̄swt*). According to Odeberg 1939 II 26ff., prefixed forms of II-*y* in Aramaic portions of Bereshit Rabba have both pristine shapes and

³⁴ I. e., the lengthening was caused by the shortening of long (or “geminated”) consonants.

³⁵ Ritter 1990:85.

³⁶ Khan 1999:106.

³⁷ Khan 2004:117.

³⁸ GKC §72ec.

younger ones (with gemination of the first radical) even in the G-stem (*yiqqūm* and *miqqūm*).

In Classical Mandaic, the etymological II-*y* and II = III roots had merged.³⁹ The inflectional prefix consonants of etymological II-*y* verbs are followed by the **Ń**-vowel sign, e. g., *nʔrym* ‘he will lift’ and *mʔqym* ‘he raises up.’ Another piece of evidence for the merger is that the stem vowel of etymologically hollow roots drops out in open syllables, e. g., *mʔqmylyn* ‘they raise them’ (as against the Syriac *mqymyn/mqīmīn*). However, mixed (i. e., Turoyo-like) forms also show up, e. g., *mʔrymʔ* ‘she raises.’

In the G-stem of modern Mandaic, the etymological II-*y* and II = III verbs coalesced into one shape: *qāyem* < **qym* ‘stand up’ vs. *hāyef* ‘wash’ < **hpp*. The C-stem verbs of this class double the first radical in the forms without suffixes (*aqqem* ‘he raised up’ and (*m*)*aqqem* ‘he raises up’).⁴⁰

C-stem shapes of hollow verbs that are comparable with the Turoyo one are known in various NENA. Like in Turoyo, they possess the prefix vowel /a/ and the non-elidable */ī/ of the second syllable. Consider the following Inflectum shapes: Barwar *mazid/mazida* ‘add, increase’ (along with *mazyəd*),⁴¹ Alqosh *mafet/mafeta* ‘pass time,’⁴² Hertevin *maheš/mahiša* ‘gather,’⁴³ Sanandaj *māšiš/māšiša* ‘rock,’⁴⁴ Arbel *mazid/mazida* ‘add, increase,’⁴⁵ Sulemaniyya *māzid/mazida* ‘add, increase.’⁴⁶

In Jilu, all hollow roots in the C-stem, whatever their diachronic source, conjugate according to the pattern *meddər*, i. e., with gemination of the first radical.⁴⁷ The examples are *meddər* ‘return (tr.)’ < **dʕr*,⁴⁸ *mekkep* ‘bow (tr.)’ < **kpp* and *meddən* ‘lend’ < **dyn*. The only exception is **rym*. Thus, Jilu has

³⁹ Nöldeke 1875:247–254.

⁴⁰ According to Häberl 2006:264, this gemination has a phonological, not a historical background. The gemination gets undone when the stress moves away from the initial syllable. Cf. *máqqem* ~ *māqémna* (Macuch 1965:328).

⁴¹ Khan 2008:236ff.

⁴² Coghill 2003:157.

⁴³ Jastrow 1988:43.

⁴⁴ Khan 2009:122f.

⁴⁵ Khan 1999:106.

⁴⁶ Khan 2004:117.

⁴⁷ Fox 1997:71f.

⁴⁸ *daʕər/doʕər* (of unknown origin, probably < MEA *hḏr* ‘return’) is the basic exponent of ‘return’ in Turoyo. This *dʕr* is, according to the common opinion, the etymon of *dyr* ‘return’ in various NENA.

merəm ‘lift up.’ At least for one verb the shape with the strong /y/ is attested: *mebyən* ‘seem, look,’ cf. Sardarid and C. Urmi below.

In Sardarid, hollow verbs go back to etymological II-y, II = III and II = ʔ/ʕ roots. Their C-stem has two varieties.

The first variety doubles the first radical (*mamməš* ‘cause to suck’ < *mšš; *massim bala* ‘take care (of smb.)’ < *sym).⁴⁹ This doubling may be also explained by the synchronic rule according to which all V̇C syllables double their consonant and so get closed, cf. Younansardaroud 2001:8ff.

The second variety conjugates on the pattern of the sound root with a strong /y/ as the second radical (*mahyil* ‘cause to sew’ < *hyt).⁵⁰ Most verbs of the latter group (i. e., with the strong /y/) are of relatively recent vintage, because those of them that are of Aramaic provenance do not usually have the C-stem in Middle Aramaic (e. g., *hyt*), some of the roots are etymological II = III, mediae aleph or primae yod in MEA. Other members of the subgroup are borrowings.

As for the C-stem of the former group, these verbs were inherited from Middle Aramaic and merged into one class in pre-Modern times.

The first group comprises the following verbs: *maṭṭir* ‘return (tr.)’ (< *dṭr); *maččis* ‘cover’ (< *kšy², SL 639; DJBA 591; MD 220); *maččip* ‘turn (the volume) down’ (< *kpp², SL 643f., no C-stem; DJBA 596f.; MD 208); *mammis* ‘cause to suck’ (< *mšš, SL 818; DJBA 701; MD 277); *massim bala* ‘take care of smb.’ (< *sym, SL 1001ff., no C-stem; MD 321f.); *mayyiq* ‘make narrow’ (< *ṣyq, SL 1084f.; DJBA 848; MD 10); *maqṣt* ‘cause to touch’ (< *qtṭ, SL 1423; MD 417); *maqṣm* ‘awaken’ (< *qym, SL 1330–1333; DJBA 992–999; MD 407f.).

The second group is as follows: *mazyid* ‘increase (intr.)’ (< Ar. *zyd*, Wehr:539); *mazyir* ‘cause to swell’ (< ?); *maxyil* ‘cause to sew’ (< *hyt, SL 422f.; DJBA 436; MD 135); *maxyip* ‘bathe (tr.)’ (< *hṭp, SL 481; DJBA 477f.; MD 136); *masyiw* ‘make old’ (< *sṭb, SL 958; DJBA 782); *maryix* ‘stretch’ (< *ṛx, SL 100; DJBA 168; MD 37); *masyil* ‘obey’ (< *ytl, SL 1282; DJBA 957f.; MD 392); *manyix* ‘rest’ (< *nyḥ, SL 897; DJBA 735f.; MD 293); *madyin* ‘lend’ (< Ar. *dyn*, Wehr:422f.); *malyiz* ‘hurry’ (< Kurd. *lezandin*, Chyet 2003:351); *maryiz* ‘put in order’ (< Kurd. *rēz kirin* ‘to arrange in a

⁴⁹ Younansardaroud 2001:107f. The verb *marim* ‘raise, lift’ belongs to neither of these groups, like in C. Urmi and Jilu.

⁵⁰ The same happens in Barwar: both patterns of C-stem II-y verbs, *mazid* and *mazyəd*, are attested in competition for the same roots (Khan 2008:236f.).

row or line,' Chyet 2003:515); *maryis* 'irrigate' (< **rss*, SL 1477; DJBA 1089).

The same two varieties exist in C. Urmi. Cf. a few examples of C-stem verbs with doubling of the first radical: *mamməx* 'sniff' < **mħħ*, *maqəm* 'raise up' < **qym* vs. *marəm*, *marma* 'lift' < **rym*.⁵¹ The following verbs exhibit the pattern of the sound root: *mabyən* 'seem' < **byn*, *madyəl* 'assist at birth' < **yld*, *malyəz* 'hurry' (< Kurd. *lezandin* 'hurry'),⁵² *manyəx* 'get rest, find relief' < **nyh*.⁵³ At least a part of them can be explained in the same way as for Sardarid.

In the Jewish dialects mentioned below, there are two Inflectum bases for II-*y* verbs in the C-stem: some verbs have a long second vowel, while others have a short (i. e., elidable) one. Cf. the data from J. Urmi: *mazəd/mazida* vs. *mazəd/mazda*,⁵⁴ Amədyə *mazəd/māzida* vs. *maləp/malpa*.⁵⁵ Both types of bases for II-*y* verbs in the C-stem are also attested in Beta-nure. The first one, *māləp/malpa*, is restricted to the verbs *mys* 'nurse' < **m,ss*, *rym* 'lift' < **rym*, *qyd* 'burn (tr.)' < **yqd* and *lyp* 'teach' < **ylp*, which are conjugated on the pattern of I-*y*/*?* class in the C-stem. The second one has the basic forms *māqəm/māqima*.⁵⁶

This evidence is explainable on the hypothesis that some verbs shifted to II-*y* class more recently than others. These relative newcomers keep their old Inflectum with a short (elidable) second vowel: *maləp/malpa* 'teach' (*lyp* < **ylp*). As for the pristine hollow verbs and those which entered the club long ago, they maintain the characteristic long vowel of the second syllable.

Summing up: in NENA there exist two shapes of the C-stem II-*y* verbs with the weak /*y*/: *maCVC* and *maCCVC*,⁵⁷ depending on an individual variety of NENA. Of these two, only *maCVC* is attested in Turoyo. The phonological rules of Sardarid do not allow us to decide whether the *maCCVC* shape is the manifestation of a synchronic phonological process or it is a piece of evidence for the merging of II-*y* and II = III. In Sardarid,

⁵¹ Hetzron 1969:125f.

⁵² Chyet 2003:351.

⁵³ Hetzron 1969:126.

⁵⁴ Khan 2008a:108.

⁵⁵ Greenblatt 2011:207–215.

⁵⁶ Mutzafi 2008:73f.

⁵⁷ We cannot ascertain the etymological quantity of the second vowel, because it always stands in a closed syllable due to gemination of the last radical before a suffix beginning with a vowel.

the D-stem gemination was lost (e. g., *pālīt* ‘free’), while nominal roots have retained their original doubling (e. g., *pumma* ‘mouth’).⁵⁸ Therefore the *maCCVC* shape may be an innovative feature, i. e., a secondary development. Cf. the picture in Barwar, where the retention of doubling in nouns is lexical, i. e., unpredictable (*labbā* ‘heart,’ *qaddiša* ‘saint’ vs. *basima* ‘pleasant’), while doubling in verb forms is always due to synchronic phonological rules (*māl̥bpa* ~ *māl̥ppa* ‘she teaches,’ *qal̥bne* ‘I (m.) kill him’).⁵⁹

The same is true of Jilu. The grammatical gemination in the D-stem was lost (cf. the D-infinitives *zobone* ‘to sell,’ *šodore* ‘to send’), while doubling exists in certain nouns of Aramaic stock (*əzza* ‘she-goat’), loanwords (*ğulla* ‘clothing,’ *mudda* ‘a period of time’), as well as in some verbs which must have been recently borrowed or formed (*rozsole* ‘to shame’ < Kurd. *rezilt* ‘shame’;⁶⁰ a counterexample is *xollole* ‘to wash’ < MEA *ħll*).

C. Urmi also exhibits this feature. The grammatical gemination of the D-stem was lost in verbs of Aramaic origin (*qabāl* ‘receive,’ *bašəl* ‘cook’) or old loans (*ğarəb* < Ar. D-stem *ğrb* ‘try’⁶¹). At the same time, a number of roots which must have been borrowed or derived more recently double their second radical in the D-stem (*qavvəm* < Kurd. *qewimîn* ‘happen,’⁶² *ğavvəb* < Ar. D-stem *ğwb* ‘answer,’⁶³ but cf. *xalləl* ‘wash’). According to Geoffrey Khan, consonantal doubling in nouns is of the same nature as in Barwar, i. e., lexical.⁶⁴

Thus the shape *maCCVC* is secondary in Sardarid, Jilu and C. Urmi. In Sardarid, the doubling of R₁ is due to synchronic phonological rules and must represent a further development of the *maCVC* shape. In Jilu and C. Urmi, the doubling of R₁ is due to various difficult-to-describe features, in particular to the erstwhile phonological context.

To sum up: we believe that both Turoyo and various NENA idioms developed *maCVC* and *maCCVC* each of them on its own, on an analogy with geminated roots. The prosodic analogy with the old II = III forms

⁵⁸ The observable synchronic gemination in verb forms is secondary.

⁵⁹ Khan 2008:98–103.

⁶⁰ Kurdoev 1960:638.

⁶¹ Wehr 1985:173.

⁶² Chyet 2003:486.

⁶³ Wehr 1985:213.

⁶⁴ Khan 2016: I 195f.

rather than with the sound root (*pace* Siegel and Khan) is born out by similar shifts in Middle Aramaic, as traced above.

The other shapes of II-*y* NENA verbs, *mazəd/mazda* and *mazyəd*, cannot be the result of an analogy with geminated roots. They are explained as follows.

Verbs of the deviating form *mazəd/mazda* have never belonged to the II-*y* type in the C-stem. Having moved to II-*y* class in the G-stem, they possess other kinds of roots in derived stems.

Thus, as suggested above, the shape *mazyəd* of Barwar, Sardarid and C. Urmi is innovative. In Sardarid, C. Urmi, and probably in Jilu *mazyəd* serves as a shape for adaptation and derivation of new II-*y* verbs and is restricted to a few roots. Barwar looks more advanced, because it uses *mazid/mazida* and *mazyəd* for most II-*y* verbs interchangeably.

As for the Preterit of the C-stem II-*y* verbs, it was formed on the basis of Infectum. This Preterit keeps all phonological features of the Infectum bases discussed above, as is clear from the following examples: Turoyo *maqəmle/maqimole*; Barwar *muzidle/muzidale* and *muzyədle/muzyədale*; Betanure *moqəmle/moqimale* and *moləple/mulpale*; Jilu *moddərre*. Thus NENA II-*y* verbs follow the vocalic pattern of the C-stem sound verbs. The Preterit base of J. Urmi, Sanandaj and Sulemaniyya is an exception, because in it the prefix vowel has dropped out from the open syllable: J. Urmi *mzədle/mzidale* and *mzədle/məzdale*; Sanandaj *mššle*; Sulemaniyya *mzīdle/mzīdale*. Cf. a few examples of the vowel syncope in Preterit from the respective varieties: Sulemaniyya *mībrīq* ‘he shone’ vs. *mbīrqa* ‘she shone,’⁶⁵ Sanandaj *tāše* ‘he hides’ vs. *tšele* ‘he hid’⁶⁶, J. Urmi *maxəl* ‘he feeds’ vs. *mxəlle* ‘he fed.’⁶⁷

Appendix: Etymologically geminated roots in Turoyo⁶⁸

ʔnn II	<i>manən/mananle</i> ‘moan, groan’
ʔss II	<i>m[ʔ]asəs/m[ʔ]asale</i> ‘found, set up’
ʕyǧ I	<i>ʕoyǧ/ʕayǧ</i> ‘spread (fire)’ (intr.)
ʕyz III	<i>maʕəz/maʕəzle</i> ‘honour’
ʕzz II	<i>mʕazəz/mʕazəzle</i> ‘honour’

⁶⁵ Khan 2004:91.

⁶⁶ Khan 2009:107f.

⁶⁷ Khan 2008a:105f.

⁶⁸ The data are from our Verb Glossary of Turoyo (in progress), on which see Furman–Loesov 2015. The etymological information is adduced in the respective entries of the Glossary.

<i>lbl</i>	<i>mbalbəl/mbalbele</i> ‘part ways, become separated’ (only one detransitive token in the Glossary)
<i>brbz</i>	<i>mbarbəz/mbarbazle</i> ‘scatter, spread’ (trans.)
<i>bsbs</i>	<i>mbaşbəş/mbaşbaşle</i> ‘sparkle (the eyes), to stare’
<i>bšbš</i>	<i>mbašbəš/mbaşbaşle</i> ‘brighten (face)’
<i>byq I</i>	<i>boyəq/bayəq</i> ‘rot’
<i>byt I</i>	<i>boyət/bətle</i> ‘explode’ (intr.)
<i>byx III</i>	<i>mabəx/mabəxle</i> ‘emit (smell)’
<i>byz I</i>	<i>boyəz/bəzle</i> ‘spill, scatter (liquids)’
<i>dll II</i>	<i>mdaləl/mdalele</i> ‘spoil’
<i>dyl III</i>	<i>madəl/madile</i> ‘show’
<i>dyq I</i>	<i>doyəq/dəqle</i> ‘knock’
<i>dym I</i>	<i>doyəm/dəmle</i> ‘rebuke, reproach’
<i>dyr III</i>	<i>madər/madəlle</i> ‘damage, harm’
<i>jkjk</i>	<i>mjakjak/mjakjakle</i> ‘take apart/to pieces’
<i>jrjr/prpr</i>	<i>mjarjər/mjarjəlle</i> ‘[onomatopoeitic] flutter (with wings), make inarticulate noises’
<i>fyk I</i>	<i>føyək/fəkke</i> ‘release [technically] (make to pieces), [dis]solve’
<i>fyr I</i>	<i>føyər/fayər</i> ‘fly’
<i>gyš I</i>	<i>goyəš/gəšle</i> ‘touch’
<i>ğmm¹ II</i>	<i>mığaməm/mğaməm</i> (detrans.) ‘become covered by clouds’
<i>ğmm² II</i>	<i>mğaməm/mğaməmlə</i> ‘sadden, grieve’
<i>ğyt I</i>	<i>ğoyət/ğətle</i> ‘sink’ (trans. and intr.)
<i>ğdd II</i>	<i>mğadəd/mğadadle</i> ‘renew’
<i>ğsğs</i>	<i>mğasğəs/mğasğəsle</i> ‘touch (a body, a corpse)’
<i>ğss II</i>	<i>mğasəs/mğasəsle</i> ‘spy’
<i>hdd II</i>	<i>mhədəd/mhadadle</i> ‘threaten; confirm’
<i>hlhl</i>	<i>mhalhəl/mhalhele</i> ‘wail’
<i>hrhz</i>	<i>mharhəz/mharhazle</i> ‘shake’
<i>hyd I</i>	<i>hoyəd/hayəd</i> ‘go to ruin’
<i>hyz I</i>	<i>hoyəz/həzle</i> ‘shake’
<i>hğğ II</i>	<i>mhağğəğ/mhağğəğle</i> ‘quarrel’
<i>hly II</i>	<i>mhalə/mhalele</i> ‘allow’
<i>hmm II</i>	<i>mhaməm/mhaməmlə</i> ‘bathe’
<i>hqqq II</i>	<i>mhaqəq/mhaqəqle</i> ‘examine, investigate’
<i>hyf I</i>	<i>hoyəf/həfle</i> ‘wash’
<i>hyk I</i>	<i>hoyək/həkke</i> ‘scratch’
<i>hym I</i>	<i>hoyəm/hayəm</i> ‘be hot’
<i>hyn III</i>	<i>mahən/mahəlle</i> ‘pity’
<i>hys III</i>	<i>mahəs/mahəsle</i> ‘wake up; awaken’
<i>hyš III</i>	<i>mahəš/mahəšle</i> ‘tear off’
<i>krr II</i>	<i>mkarər/mkaralle</i> ‘repeat’
<i>kyb I</i>	<i>koyəb/kəble</i> ‘bend down’
<i>kyf I</i>	<i>koyəf/kəfle</i> ‘bend down’
<i>lyf I</i>	<i>loyəf/ləfle</i> ‘roll’
<i>lym I</i>	<i>loyəm/layəm</i> ‘gather’
<i>myd I</i>	<i>moyəd/mədle</i> ‘grasp, seize’

<i>myr</i> I	<i>moyər / mayər</i> ‘be bitter’
<i>mys</i> I	<i>moyəs / məšle</i> ‘suck’
<i>nyl</i> I	<i>noyəl / nayəl</i> ‘jump’
<i>qrr</i> II	<i>mqarər / mqaralle</i> ‘decide’
<i>qyr₁</i> I	<i>qoyər / qayər</i> ‘be cold’
<i>qyr₂</i> III	<i>maqər / maqəlle</i> ‘decide’
<i>qyš</i> I	<i>qoyəs / qəšle</i> ‘cut’
<i>qyš</i> I	<i>qoyəš / qəšle</i> ‘collect’
<i>qyl</i> I	<i>qoyəl / qayəl</i> ‘stick, cling’
<i>raq</i> I	<i>roqəq / raqəq</i> ‘be thin’
<i>ryf</i> I	<i>royəf, rayəf</i> ‘flutter’
<i>ryg</i> I	<i>royəg</i> ‘desire’ – no Preterit in the Glossary
<i>ryq</i> I	<i>royəq / rəqle</i> ‘spit’
<i>rys</i> I	<i>royəs / rəsle</i> ‘sprinkle’
<i>ryš</i> I	<i>royəš / rəšle</i> ‘sprinkle’
<i>smm</i> II	<i>msaməm / msamamle</i> ‘poison’
<i>shh</i> II	<i>mšahəh / mšahahle</i> ‘correct’
<i>štk</i> II	<i>mšakək / mšakakle</i> ‘doubt’
<i>šqšq</i>	<i>mšaqšəq / mšaqšaqle</i> ‘split, tear to pieces’
<i>šyš</i> I	<i>šoyəš / šəšle</i> ‘putty’
<i>šyr</i> III	<i>mašər / mašəlle</i> ‘think, believe’
<i>tym</i> I	<i>toyəm / tayəm</i> ‘end’
<i>xyf</i> I	<i>xoyəf / xayəf</i> ‘be light’
<i>xyr</i> I	<i>xoyər / xayər</i> ‘flow’

References

- Bar-Asher Siegal 2013 Bar-Asher Siegal, E. A. *Introduction to the Grammar of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*. Münster.
- Bauer–Leander 1927 Bauer, H.; Leander, P. *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*. Halle.
- Beyer 1984 Beyer, K. *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer samt den Inschriften aus Palästina, dem Testament Levis aus der Kairoer Genisa, der Fastenrolle und den alten talmudischen Zitaten*. Göttingen.
- Chyet 2003 Chyet, M. L. *Kurdish-English Dictionary*. New Haven–London.
- Coghill 2003 Coghill, E. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Alqosh*. PhD. Diss. Faculty of Oriental Studies. University of Cambridge.
- Dalman 1905 Dalman, G. *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch nach den Idiomen des Palästinischen Talmud, des Onkelostargum und Prophetentargum und der jerusalemischen Targume*. Leipzig.
- Fox 1997 Fox, S. E. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Īḏū*. Wiesbaden.
- Fox 2009 Fox, S. E. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Bohtan*. Piscataway.

- Furman–Loesov 2015 Furman, Y.; Loesov, S. Studies in the Ṭuroyo Verb. Khan, G.; Napiorkowska, L. (eds.). *Neo-Aramaic and its Linguistic Context*. Piscataway. Pp. 1–28.
- Greenblatt 2011 Greenblatt, J. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Amḡdya*. Leiden–Boston.
- Häberl 2006 Häberl, C. G. *The Neo-Mandaic Dialect of Khorramshahr. I. Introduction, Grammar, and Conclusion*. PhD. Diss. Harvard University. Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Hetzron 1969 Hetzron, R. The Morphology of the Verb in Modern Syriac (Christian Colloquial of Urmi). *JAOs* 89:112–127.
- Hoberman 1988 Hoberman, R. D. The History of the Modern Aramaic Pronouns and Pronominal Suffixes. *JAOs* 108:557–575.
- Jastrow 1967 Jastrow, O. *Laut- und Formenlehre des Neuaramäischen Dialekts von Midin im Tur Ḥabdin*. Bamberg.
- Jastrow 1988 Jastrow, O. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Hertevin (Provinz Siirt)*. Wiesbaden.
- Jastrow 1994 Jastrow, O. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Mlaḥsô*. Wiesbaden.
- Khan 1999 Khan, G. *A Grammar of Neo-Aramaic. The Dialect of the Jews of Arbel*. Leiden–Boston–Köln.
- Khan 2004 Khan, G. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Sulemaniyya and Halabja*. Leiden–Boston.
- Khan 2008 Khan, G. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Barwar*. Leiden–Boston.
- Khan 2008a Khan, G. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Urmi*. Piscataway.
- Khan 2009 Khan, G. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Sanandaj*. Piscataway.
- Khan 2016 Khan, G. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of the Assyrian Christians of Urmi*. Vols. 1–4. Leiden–Boston.
- Kurdoev 1960 Курдюев, К. К. *Курдско-русский словарь*. Москва.
- Levias 1900 Levias, C. *A Grammar of the Aramaic Idiom Contained in the Babylonian Talmud*. Cincinnati.
- Macuch 1965 Macuch, R. *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic*. Berlin.
- Müller-Kessler 1991 Müller-Kessler, C. *Grammatik des Christlich-Palästinisch-Aramäischen*. Hildesheim–Zürich–New York.
- Mutzafi 2008 Mutzafi, H. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Betanure (Province of Dihok)*. Wiesbaden.
- Nöldeke 1875 Nöldeke, T. *Mandäische Grammatik*. Halle.
- Nöldeke 1966 Nöldeke, T. *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik* (Reprint). Darmstadt.
- Odeberg 1939 Odeberg, H. *The Aramaic Portions of Bereshit Rabba with Grammar of Galilean Aramaic*. I–II. Lund–Leipzig.
- Ritter 1990 Ritter, H. *Ṭūrōyo. Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Ṭur Ḥabdin*. C. *Grammatik*. Stuttgart.

-
- Siegel 1923 Siegel, A. *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts des Tūr Abdīn*. Hannover.
- Tal 2013 Tal, A. *Samaritan Aramaic*. Münster.
- Tezel 2003 Tezel, A. *Comparative Etymological Studies in the Western Neo-Syriac (Tūrōyo) Lexicon: with Special Reference to Homonyms, Related Words and Borrowings with Cultural Signification*. Uppsala.
- Younansardaroud 2001 Younansardaroud, H. *Der neuostaramäische Dialekt von Särä:riid*. Wiesbaden.