

NEO-ARAMAIC AND ITS LINGUISTIC
CONTEXT

Edited by

Geoffrey Khan and Lidia Napiorkowska

ABBREVIATIONS

I, II, III—class, type I, II, III etc.
1,2, etc.—morphemes of Set₁, Set₂, etc.
A—agent
ABL—ablative
ABS—absolutive
ACC—accusative
ADD—additive
ADJ—adjective
ADP—adposition
AGR—agreement marker
AGT—agentive
ALLT—allative
AOR—aorist
Ar.—Arabic
ART—article
ATR—advanced tongue root feature
AUG—augment
AUX—auxiliary
C/c.—common
CLC—clitic
CL—noun class
CNST—genitival construction or construct state
COMP—complement
CONJ—conjunction
CONV—past convertor
COP—(present) copula
COP.NEG—negative copula
COP.PST—past copula
DAT—dative
DEIC—deictic

DEM—demonstrative
DET—determinator
DETRANS—detransitive
DIR—directive
DIRC—directional particle
DO—direct object
DUR—durative
EMPH—emphatic
ERG—ergative
EXIST—existential
EXP—experiencer
EZ—*ezafe* (-like suffix)
F—feminine
FUT—future marker
GER—gerund
HAB —habitual
IMP—imperative
IMPRF—imperfect
INDF—indefinite
IND—indicative prefix/particle
INETR—interrogative
INFECT—infectum
INF—infinitive
INS—instrumental
INTER—interrogative
INTR—intransitive
INTRJ—interhection
J—Jewish
Kurd.—Kurdish

L—Neo-Aramaic past person agreement marker formant	PROG—progressive (marker)
LNK—linking particle	PROH—prohibitive
LV—light verb	PRON—pronoun
MAL—malefactive	PRP—preposition
MARK—marker	PRS—present
M—Middle Persian	PST —past tense/form
M—masculine	PTC—particle
NC—numeral classifier	PTCP—participle
NEG—negator	PUNCT—punctual
NOM.ACT—nomen actionis	Q—question word/particle
NOM—nominative	QUANT—quantifier
NUC—nucleus marking	REFL—reflexive
OA—Old Aramaic	REL—relative
OBL—oblique	morpheme/subordination particle
OP—Old Persian	RES—resultative participle
OPT—optative	RTR—retracted tongue root feature
PAM—person agreement marker	SET.POSS—oblique person agreement marker
PART—partitive	SG—singular
PAS—passive	SOURCE—source
PAST—preverbal past tense particle	STAT—stative
Pers.—Persian	SUBJ—subjunctive
PL—plural	SUBOR—subordinator
PN—proper name	SUBS—substantive
POSS—possessive suffix	SUB—subject
P—patient	TV—thematic vowel
PEJ—pejorative	V.EMPH—verbal emphatic particle
PREFIX—prefix	VBD—verboid
PRES—presentative	VB—verb
PRET—preterite	VERB.NOUN—verbal noun
PRF—perfect(ive)	VOC—vocative

The form *qatāl* (appearing elsewhere as the Present Base, subjunctive, non-past etc.) has a wide range of functions, which makes it difficult to ascribe to it a single label that captures all its uses. For this reason, rather than appearing with a different gloss in each article, it is left unmarked in the volume.

STUDIES IN THE ṬUROYO VERB

YULIA FURMAN AND SERGEY LOESOV¹

For Otto Jastrow and Shabo Talay

The first part of the paper is a report on the Verb Glossary in progress. In the second part, we use the Glossary database for a study of the historical grammar of Ṭuroyo, in which we discuss the two-place experiencer verbs of Ṭuroyo that are *qatal*-shaped, i.e., morphologically intransitive.

I

The present writers' interest in Ṭuroyo was first stimulated by their work on a history of the Aramaic language. As is well-known, the key problem in the history of Aramaic is to identify the causes of the development from the Middle to the Modern form of the language in the Eastern group of dialects, i.e., “the morphological revolution,” the reshaping of the finite verb in what is now North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA) and Ṭuroyo-Mlaḥsô.

Ṭuroyo is the most grammatically conservative among the modern Eastern Aramaic varieties (if we exclude Neo-Mandaic from consideration). The Ṭuroyo verb appears to represent more closely than other dialects the form of the Aramaic verb that arose at the period of the “revolution.”

The claims of the last paragraph can be justified by the following facts:

¹ Sergey Loesov presented an earlier version of this paper at the conference “Neo-Aramaic Dialectology: Jews, Christians and Mandaean” held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, June 26–27, 2013. We are grateful to Shabo Talay who corrected some errors in the draft of the paper. Our thanks go to Ilya Arkhipov who discussed with us some details of ergative alignment in Ṭuroyo.

1) The ʿuroyo verb keeps intact two different shapes of the G-stem Preterite depending on the transitivity of the root, e.g. *nšaqle* ‘he kissed (him)’ vs. *naḥaq* ‘he went out/he left’. We are assuming that the ancestors of all Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects used to have two Preterite shapes (cf. in particular Hopkins 1989). This evidence, along with some vestiges of object agreement, is traditionally described in terms of split ergativity (and see Khan 2007 on the situation in NENA).

2) Unlike in NENA, all TENSE-ASPECT-MOOD-DIATHESIS meanings of ʿuroyo verbs are still expressed by synthetic conjugations, sometimes in combination with particles (prefixed, suffixed or infixes), which have no inflection of their own. There are no analytic verb forms as in English, Standard Literary Arabic, or NENA. In other words, there are no verbal conjugations consisting of an auxiliary inflected for person + a form of the lexical verb. In particular, against the background of NENA, ʿuroyo and Mlaḥsô are special in having synthetic passives (Jastrow 1996). These features are retentions and must have been characteristic also of the unattested ancestors of NENA.

3) All nine participles of Middle Eastern Aramaic (see the table in Brockelmann 1962: 126-129) have become bases of ʿuroyo finite inflections, cf. Jastrow 1967 with previous literature, in particular Siegel 1923.

Thus, the ʿuroyo verb is the key to the understanding of the crucial period in the history of Eastern Aramaic, i.e., the transition from the Middle to the Modern period.

At a certain point in our work, it became clear to us that a morphosyntactic description of the ʿuroyo verb in the form of a glossary would produce results important for further historical research, especially given that ʿuroyo lexicography is still rudimentary. The state of the art is as follows:

Hellmut Ritter’s ʿuroyo-Wörterbuch, a typewritten manuscript with handwritten additions and corrections, was published posthumously (Ritter 1979) and was recently digitized by Veronika Betzold, an MA student of Shabo Talay (Betzold 2012). It has everything but verbs. It constitutes a solid base for a future comprehensive dictionary of ʿuroyo, as far as nouns and uninflected words are concerned. Hellmut Ritter created the list of lemmata for this dictionary drawing principally upon his own fieldwork. Yet our reading experience shows that in the three volumes of oral texts Ritter had published there occur dozens of nouns that do not appear in the ʿuroyo-Wörterbuch.

A second book-length contribution to lexicography is Jan Beṭ-Ṣawoce’s “Xēzne d xabre Ordlista: Ṣurayt-Swedi” (Beṭ-Ṣawoce 2012). Verbs are represented in the “Xēzne d xabre” in the form of action nouns (=infinitives) of the G-stem, with only one to three glosses. Derived stems are not mentioned. The corpus upon which “Xēzne d xabre” is based is not indicated.

There are also glossaries in Otto Jastrow's *Lehrbuch* (Jastrow 2002) and Shabo Talay's *Lebendig Begraben* (a testimony of a Syriac Orthodox priest who was taken hostage by Hisbollah, Talay 2004). All verb roots and pertinent examples from these two books are now part of our Verb Glossary.

As a preliminary step towards the Verb Glossary, Loesov created a pattern of the entry. This entry organization will facilitate a future study of the Țuroyo verbal morphosyntax, which is of great importance both for the general linguist and the student of the Semitic verb.

The lemma of the entry is the verbal root. It is immediately followed by etymological information, e.g.

nḥt MEA *nḥt* SL 909f.: 'go down, descend'

[MEA is Middle Eastern Aramaic, SL is Sokoloff's Syriac Lexicon. For the abbreviations used in this study, see a list at the end of the paper.]

There follows a bold face Roman numeral (I, II or III) which stands for the respective stem. Then follow the basic (i.e., 3sg.m.) shapes of the Preterite and the Infectum, Jastrow's "Präsens." We use the label "Infectum," following the model of Latin grammar, because by itself the form does not express the present tense. It is, in fact, a conjugated base used to encode PRESENT, FUTURE, VOLITIVE, IMPERFECT and more Tense-Mood-Aspect (TAM) meanings in combination with various clitics and affixes.

In almost all cases, the shapes of the Preterite and the Infectum are predictable, yet we believe it will be useful for the reader who is not familiar with the language to specify them in each entry.

The paragraph that follows the basic forms contains numbered lexical meanings of the stem. The glosses are currently all in German, because they are borrowed from Hellmut Ritter's *Grammatik* (Ritter 1990) and the published field corpus, where all texts are accompanied by German translations, e.g.

I:

naḥt/noḥt

1. herab-, hinab, ab-, aussteigen. 2. auf freien Platz, freies Feld hervortreten, hinausziehen, auf den Kampfplatz treten, zum Kampfe antreten, losgehen auf (I-); 3. ausspielen (Schachfigur, Spielkarte), einen Zug machen. 4. fallen (der Regen). 5. laufen, strömen, rieseln (die Erde, das Wasser, die Tränen).

There follow boxes with verbal inflections: in case of transitive verbs, these are the **Preterite** and the **Infectum** of both **Active** and **Detransitive**, the latter being our label for the traditional Passive. We use this alternative label, "Detransitive," to highlight the fact that the respective verb bases encode various valence-decreasing

operations, not just the agent backgrounding (= passivization). It appears that the agent backgrounding/passivization is not the most frequent reading of the traditional “Passive.” Indeed, the detransitive form is attested even for intransitive roots. Since it is not always possible to predict diathetic (and even lexical) meanings of the Turovo detransitive forms on the basis of the direct voice meanings, we provide the “Detransitive” box with its own glosses (see the sample entry below).

The direct voice bases are the default ones and therefore are presented first and are unmarked, while detransitive bases bear the label **Detransitive**.

Within the basic stem, the *nafəq*-shaped Preterite is flagged as **Preterite Intransitive**, while the *nšəqle*-shaped Preterite is simply “Preterite”.

We have also introduced “subordinate” boxes for **Preterite-wa** (Jastrow’s Plusquampreteritum) and **Infectum-wa** (Ritter’s Habitualis/Irrealis).

The main bulk of the dictionary is constituted by textual examples. The numbering of the examples within each box follows the running numbers of the glosses at the head of the stem entry (as shown above for *naḥat/noḥat*). Thus, because we have singled out five meanings for *naḥat/noḥat*, each of the boxes for finite forms will, ideally, include no less than five textual examples, although currently this cannot be achieved for each and every verb, given the limited volume of the corpus.

We have also provided boxes for the **Infinitive**, which is a fully productive action noun, and for the **Part act** (= Active Participle). The latter is an umbrella concept for two different morphological shapes of deverbal adjectives. One of them is formed only for the G-stem static (or change-of-state) verbs (e.g. *yatiwo* ‘sitting,’ derived from *yatu/yotu* ‘sit/ sit down’), and this is diachronically the **qattil* pattern. The other is formed only for the G-stem verbs of intransitive motion, both telic and atelic, e.g. *azolo* ‘going’ (derived from *azzé/əzzé* ‘go’) and *nafoqo* ‘coming out’ (derived from *nafəq/nofəq* ‘come out’), and this is diachronically the **qattāl* pattern. Otherwise, no “active participles” exist in the language, see Jastrow (2002: 141ff). We have included these two kinds of adjectives because, according to our preliminary observations, they play a part in the coding of the present time sense when used as nominal predicates.

There are also boxes for the **Part pass** (= Passive Participle) of all three stems. They are formed freely from transitive verbs.

As a sample, we present below the draft of a short entry, which has only two closely related lexical meanings of the G-stem and a small number of textual examples. The second of the two meanings is metaphorical and lexically bound, i.e. *darbo* ‘the way’ is an obligatory surface argument. Note that in the etymological sections of the Glossary the G-stem of the assumed etymon is treated as the default one:

ʿwǧ Ar. ʿwǧ AWSG 891: krumm, gekrümmt, gebeugt, gebogen sein; Anat. ʿwǧ VW II 76: biegen, beugen; Kinderib 99: 1. (intrans.) schief sein od. werden. 2. (trans.) biegen

I:

ʷəɣle/ʷowəɣ

1. schief, krumm machen. 2. (mit *darbo*) vom rechten Wege abweichen

Preterite	1. ʷəɣle u = <i>basmero</i> 'er schlug den Nagel krumm' 467
Infectum	2. <i>faqat ramhəl mə-d-hawina atto w-gawro, d-ote naqla d-ʷəɣo u = darbo, ġēr m-u = qaṭlo layt bayn l-ūno w-liya</i> 'Aber wenn wir morgen Mann und Frau geworden sind, wenn es vorkommt, dass sie vom geraden Wege abweicht, dann gibt es nur Töten zwischen mir und ihr' 467; 26/253

Detransitive

ʷiɣ/məʷəɣ

1. schief sein/werden. 2. (mit *darbo*) vom rechten Wege abweichen

Infectum	1. <i>ašmo d-məʷəɣ u = qamyon-ste muḥaqqaq g-qulbina-wo</i> 'Wenn der Lastwagen sich ein wenig schief gelegt hätte, wären wir bestimmt heruntergekippt' 11/145. 2. <i>zlām d-məʷəɣ m-u = darbo</i> 'ein Mann, der vom Wege abweicht' 467
Part. Pass.	ʷiɣo 'krumm, schief, zusammengedrückt' 467

The sample happens to show that, in the way characteristic of the language, under certain conditions the Detransitive may be similar to the direct voice in its lexical meaning.

The next important stage of the project was taken in 2010–2011 by Loesov's student Andrey Ontikov, who, in his MA thesis, entered alphabetically all verbal roots mentioned into Hellmut Ritter's 800-page-long *Grammatik* and arranged all verb forms attested in this book in the entry pattern described above, along with some textual examples. Ontikov also provided preliminary etymologies of the roots. In this way, a draft of the Glossary came into being. Since then, the members of the Glossary team have been entering into the Glossary database new textual material from the corpus and improving on lexical meanings and etymologies.

The text transcriptions of the published corpus are heterogeneous, consider especially the sub-phonemic and sometimes impressionistic renderings of the first text edition based on field research (Prym-Socin 1881). For the moment, there are no two publications of Țuroyo texts which follow the same rules for transcription. Yet

what we need for our lexicographic and grammatical purposes is a standardized phonological rendering, as simple/simplified as reasonable, especially because the Glossary may turn out useful for readers who are not well-versed in the language. As a result of our ongoing conversations with Otto Jastrow and Shabo Talay, we decided to use the rules of Jastrow's *Lehrbuch* for all village *Mundarten*, with two kinds of simplifications:

1) We write *dukto* rather than *dūkto* 'Stelle, Ort': since the CVCC environment does not tolerate long vowels, one is allowed to drop the breve. This simplification is valid for all short *u*-vowels in the CVCC context, most importantly for the Inflectum of the Midyat dialect: *ko-nušqi* 'they kiss,' etc.

2) We write *grīš* rather than *grīš* 'er wurde gezogen,' *sim* rather than *sīm* 'es wurde getan,' because in this morphological context the simple *i*-sign is an unambiguous indication of the vowel length, cf. *grāšno* 'ich wurde gezogen' and *sāmno* 'ich wurde getan'. This simplification is valid only for derivations from the **qtil* base.

As for the Midyat variety, we follow Otto Jastrow's description of the Midyat vocalism (a manuscript written in 2013). Jastrow formulates the most salient difference in the vocalism of the two dialects as follows: "All long vowels in open syllables which lose the stress are preserved as long in the villages. In Midyat only those long vowels which go back to a short vowel + geminated consonant remain long; if they go back to a long vowel they are shortened." The shortening may involve a change in the vowel quality; the reader will learn the details from Jastrow's study when it is published.

At this early stage of the project, the corpus of the Glossary is almost entirely limited to published field research. At the moment, the corpus is divided into two parts.

The most important part consists of the field research that forms the basis for Ritter's *Grammatik*. It includes in particular three volumes of texts recorded and published by Hellmut Ritter (for details, see References). Ritter's collection contains 117 texts, the numbering running through the three volumes. We refer to this collection by text and verse, with no additional sigla, e.g. 82/57. If the text in question is cited in Ritter's *Grammatik* as well, we mention first the page number of the *Grammatik*: 94; 82/57, the number 94 referring to Ritter 1990: 94. In the *Grammatik*, there occur important verb forms presented in sentences out of context, which had been elicited by Ritter from his informants. We refer to these sentences by the page number of the *Grammatik* only. Prym-Socin 1881 is quoted by page and line (e.g. PrS 57/19), the page number of Ritter 1990 coming first if the PrS text is mentioned there. The textual *Anhang* of Jastrow 1967 (= LuF) is cited by page and verse.

The second part of the corpus consists of texts published after the completion of the *Grammatik*, which still remains (and will probably always be) the main source of verb roots for our Glossary. These are texts recorded by Otto Jastrow for his *Lehr-*

buch (Jastrow 2002 = JL, cited by lesson-paragraph-verse, e.g. JL 9.9.11), Talay 2004 (LB, cited by verse), and various texts published by Otto Jastrow, of which only Jastrow 1968 (= MM, cited by verse) has been quoted in this paper.

There are a number of literary texts written in Turoyo at our disposal. They include among other things translations and free renderings of the Bible and other classical texts (e.g. *Alice in Wonderland*), an ABC book for native speakers, and essays by Jan Beṭ-Şawoce related to current politics. For various reasons, we have not yet included them into the Glossary corpus.

II

The Glossary now includes a total of around 2000 verbal roots. According to the preliminary etymological analysis, some 600 roots are of Aramaic origin, some 700 roots are of Arabic origin, about 100 roots are of Kurdish origin, and 27 roots are of Turkish origin. There are, in addition, about 250 roots of unknown origin, for which further etymological research is needed.

Though the Glossary is still in preparation, its draft can be used as a research tool, as we shall now show.

The Glossary has 209 roots with *qatal* (or “*naḫaq*-shaped”) Preterites, 116 of them are of Aramaic origin, 81 are of Arabic origin, 12 have not yet been etymologized.

Let us now look at the two-place experiencer verbs with *qatal*-Preterites. The case study is of interest both synchronically and also for the history of Aramaic. We have found ten verbs of this type that constitute a tightly knit semantic group: *yaləf* ‘learn,’ *aḏə* ‘to know,’ *abə* ‘want,’ *taʿi* ‘forget,’ *šamə* ‘hear,’ *fahəm* ‘understand,’ *ʿayəz* ‘need,’ *qadər* ‘can, be able,’ *ṭamə* ‘desire,’ *lazəm* ‘need, require’. The first five of them are of Aramaic origin and were singled out as *qatal*-“transitives” in Jastrow 1967: 71. The last five roots were borrowed from Arabic.

In what follows, we reproduce and analyze some of the examples gathered in the Glossary. We deal with our textual examples in the following way. The transcription is normalized according to the standards described above, and the original German translations of the editions are maintained. We then add morphological glossing and English translations of the Aramaic, which results in a four-level construction. Abbreviated grammatical category labels are those of the Leipzig Glossing Rules. Additional abbreviations, of our own creation, are listed at the end of the article.

Looking at the evidence of the corpus, one notices that the way these ten verbs link to their Stimuli may vary. In particular, the data gathered below show that the Inflectum and the Preterite of the same verb within the group tend to use different methods of governing their Stimuli expressed by substantives. The distinction mir-

rors the split ergativity inherent in the G-stem of the Turoyo verb. Time and again, the *qatəl*-shaped Preterite of the ten verbs is syntactically intransitive, i.e., its Stimulus is governed by a preposition (in our sample, by *l-*, *b-* and *‘al-*), while the Inflectum of the same verb is in most cases syntactically transitive. That is to say, the *qatəl* Preterite tries to avoid taking its Stimulus in the zero-marked form, which would result in both Subject and Stimulus arguments being assigned the same absolutive case. For detailed observations, see the syntactic notes following the textual evidence for individual verbs, where counterexamples are also recorded.

yłf ‘learn’:

- (1) *yaləf u = kurrək-o qroyo, msəkle as = sahrat bi = qrayto*

‘Der Junge **lernte** lesen, und durch das Lesen empfing er Zauberkräfte’. (PrS 157/25).

<i>yaləf-Ø</i> learn.PRET.INTR-3SG.M	<i>u = kurrək-o</i> ART.SG.M = boy-SG	<i>qroyo,</i> read.INF	<i>msək-le</i> acquire.PRET-3SG.M
<i>as = sahrat</i> ART.PL = magic.PL	<i>b-i = qrayt-o</i> in-ART.SG.F = reading.SG		

‘The boy learned how to read, [and] acquired [the art of] magic through reading’.

- (2) *iləfla qroyo? omər iləfla mayito*

“‘**Hat** es (das Kamel f.) lesen **gelernt**?’—‘Ja, es **hat’s gelernt** und ist gestorben.’” (PrS 201/6)

<i>iləf-la</i> learn.PRET-3SG.F	<i>qroyo?</i> read.INF	<i>omər-Ø</i> say.INFECT-3SG.M	<i>iləf-la</i> learn.PRET-3SG.F
<i>mayit-o-Ø</i> die.PRET.INTR-F-3SG			

“‘Did it (the she-camel) learn how to read?’ He says: ‘It learned [to read] and died.’”

- (3) *bi = qritaydan kətlān rawmo rabto, eba yaləfno li = soba*

‘In unserem Dorf haben wir einen grossen Teich, in dem **habe ich** schwimmen **gelernt**’. (JL 9.9.11)

<i>b-i = qrit-aydan</i> in-ART.SG.F = village-POSSII.1PL	<i>kətlān</i> there_is-to-POSSI.1PL	<i>rawm-o</i> pond[F]-SG
---	--	-----------------------------

rab-to eb-a yaləf-Ø-no
 big-F in-POSSL.3SG.F learn.PRET.INTR-M-1SG
l-i = soba
 to-ART.SG.F = swimming

‘In our village we have a big pond where I learned to swim’.

For the Preterite of *ylf* both morphological shapes are attested, *yaləf* and *iləfle*, while Shabo Talay tells us that *iləfle* is unusual; in (3) the target of learning is introduced as an indirect object (via the preposition *l-*), unlike in (1) and (2). In our view, the prepositional government of *yaləfno li = soba* in (3) betrays the tendency of *qatal*-shaped experiencer Preterites to avoid *absolutivus duplex*. One has to bear in mind that in Turoyo the genuine direct object does not take the preposition *l-*, unlike in Classical Syriac and other MEA varieties.

ʔd̪ʕ ‘know’:

(4) *omər kāyso. aḏəʕ i = emo-yo*

“‘Schön,” sagte jener und **erkannte**, daß es die Mutter war’. (PrS 58/21)

omər-Ø kāys-Ø-o. aḏəʕ-Ø
 say.INFECT-3SG.M good-M-SG know.PRET.INTR-3SG.M
i = em-o = yo
 ART.SG.F = mother-SG = COP.PRS.3SG

‘He says, “Good!” He realized that she was the mother’.

(5) *lo = kuḏəʕət d-kəthət tayō*

‘Du **weißt nicht**, daß du Muslim bist’. (JL 19.6.15)

lo = k-uḏəʕ-ət d-kəthət tay-Ø-o
 NEG = PRS-know.INFECT-2SG.M that-COP-SUBJ.PRON.2SG.M Muslim-M-SG

‘You do not know that you are a Muslim’.

(6) *mak-kodəʕ b-lišone d-an = nune*

‘Wer **versteht** die Sprache der Fische?’ (PrS 57/19)

mak-k-odəʕ-Ø b-lišon-e-d-an = nun-e
 who-PRS-know.INFECT-3SG.M in-language[M]-EZ-of-ART.PL = fish-PL

‘Who understands the language of fish?’

(7) *edī tə = nošo la = kodəʕ abxun*

‘Niemand **erfährt** dann (etwas) von euch’. (47/17)

<i>edī</i>	<i>tə=noš-o</i>	<i>lə=k-oḍə-∅</i>
then	none = person[M]-SG	NEG = PRS-know.INFECT-3SG.M
<i>ab-xun</i>		
in-POSS.2PL		

‘Then no one will learn [anything] about you’.

(8) *hiye w-hiya aḍi-iwa ḥḍode bu=ṭuro*

‘Die beiden **hatten** sich im Gebirge **kennengelernt**’. (MM 126)

<i>hiye</i>	<i>w-hiya</i>	<i>aḍi-i-∅-wa</i>	<i>ḥḍode</i>
he	and-she	know.PRET.INTR-PL-3-CONV	each_other
<i>b-u=ṭur-o</i>			
in-ART.SG.M = mountain-SG			

‘They came to know each other in the mountains’.

(9) *u‘do hani tarte=əšne aṭina l-Ştambəl w-aḍi-ina lu=profesor Ritter, w-u‘do kom‘awnūnale əšmo bu=lišono ṭuroyo*

‘Jetzt vor zwei Jahren sind wir nach Istanbul gekommen und **haben** Professor Ritter **kennengelernt**, und jetzt helfen wir ihm ein wenig bei der Ṭuroyosprache’. (94/1)

<i>u‘do</i>	<i>hani</i>	<i>tarte=əšn-e</i>	<i>aṭi-na</i>	<i>l-Ştambəl</i>
now	these	two.F=year[F]-PL	go.PRET.INTR-1PL	to-Istanbul
<i>w-aḍi-i-na</i>		<i>l-u=profesor</i>	<i>Ritter</i>	<i>w-u‘do</i>
and-know.PRET.INTR-PL-1PL		to-ART.SG=professor	Ritter	and-now
<i>ko-m‘awn-i-na-le</i>		<i>əšmo</i>	<i>b-u=lišon-o</i>	
PRS-help.INFECTII-PL-1PL-3SG.M,P		little	with-ART.SG.M=language-SG	
<i>ṭuroy-o</i>				
Ṭuroyo-SG				

‘Now it is two years that we have come to Istanbul and met professor Ritter.
And now we help him a little bit with the Ṭuroyo language’.

As expected for a verb of propositional attitude, *‘ḍ’* often takes sentential complements, cf. (4) and (5). The argument encoding the content of knowledge may be introduced by the preposition *b-* in the Inflectum, example (6) and probably (7), and cf. Ritter 1990: 721: ‘Auch mit *b-* “verstehen, Bescheid wissen, sich verstehen auf.”’

This fluctuation in the coding of the Stimulus between zero and a preposition is typical of experiencer verbs in general, quite independent of the syntactic alignment problems, cf. an instance of prepositional government of *yd* in Biblical Hebrew:

(10) *ʾiš lō yēdaʿ bad-dəḇārīm hā-ʾēlle*

‘Let no one know (about) these words’. (Jer 38: 24)

Note the *l*-government of a *qatəl*-Preterite in (9): *aḍiʿina lu = profesor Ritter* ‘we came to know professor Ritter’.

ʔb ‘want’:

(11) *u = zlām-ano l = abəʿ gowər ʿal a = tre = naʿimani d-kətnə gabe*

‘Der Mann wollte zu den beiden Kindern, die bei ihm waren, nicht wieder eine Frau nehmen’. (75/3)

<i>u = zlām-ano</i>	<i>l = abəʿ-Ø</i>	
ART.SG.M = man-this.M	NEG-want.PRET.INTR-3SG.M	
<i>gowər-Ø</i>	<i>ʿal</i>	<i>a = tre = naʿim-ani</i>
marry.INFECT-3SG.M	because	ART.PL = two = child-these
<i>d-kətnə</i>	<i>gab-e</i>	
REL-COP-SUBJ.PRON.3PL	with-POSSI.3SG.M	

‘This man did not want to (re)marry because of these two children who were at his side (lit. ‘with him’)

(12) *ono mi = naqla d-ḥzélilux, l = abəʿno mqatanno aʿmux*

‘Ich habe schon, als ich dich sah, nicht mit dir kämpfen wollen’. (78/115)

<i>ono</i>	<i>m-i = naqla</i>	<i>d-ḥzél-li-lux</i>	
I	from-ART.SG.F = time	when-see.PRET-1SG-2SG.M.P	
<i>l = abəʿ-Ø-no</i>	<i>mqatan-Ø-no</i>	<i>aʿm-ux</i>	
NEG = want.PRET.INTR-M-1SG	fight.INFECTII-M-1SG	with-POSSI.2SG.M	

‘As soon as I saw you, I did not want to fight with you’.

(13) *bu = gabano pano abəʿ d-ʿorəq mu = ḡāwāb*

‘Er suchte der Antwort aus dem Wege zu gehen’. (MM 27)

<i>b-u = gab-ano</i>	<i>p-ano</i>	<i>abəʿ-Ø</i>
in-ART.SG.M-side-this.M	in-this.M	want.PRET.INTR-3SG.M

d-ʕorəq-Ø *m-u=ğāwāb*
 that-escape.INFECT-3SG.M from-ART.SG.M = answer

‘By all means (lit. on this side and that [side]), he tried (lit. wanted) to escape answering’.

(14-15) *kobaʕno* *d-mšadrətli.* *lo=kobaʕno* *d-ono-ze* *fašno*
bi=duktō *d-aḏ=ḏarbē*

‘Ich will, daß Sie mich wegschicken. Auch ich will nicht da bleiben, wo es immer Schläge gibt (wörtl.: am Ort der Schläge)’. (JL 19.6.19)

k-obaʕ-Ø-no *d-mšadr-ət-li*
 PRS-want.INFECT-M-1SG that-send.INFECTII-2SG.M-1SG.P

lo=k-obaʕ-Ø-no *d-ono-ze* *faš-Ø-no*
 NEG = PRS-want.INFECT-M-1SG that-I-also stay.INFECT-M-1SG

b-i=duktō *d-aḏ=ḏarb-e*
 in-ART.SG.F = place-SG of-ART.PL = blow-PL

‘I want you to send me away [since] I do not want to stay at the place of blows anymore’.

(16) *kubʕi ḥalwo d-aryo*

‘Sie wollen Löwenmilch.’ (75/276)

k-ubʕ-i-Ø *ḥalw-o* *d-ary-o*
 PRS-want.INFECT-PL-3 milk[M]-SG of-lion[M]-SG

‘They want lion’s milk’.

(17) *ṭr-otē l-arke uʕdo kobaʕne*

‘Er soll hierher kommen, ich brauche ihn jetzt’. (MM 140)

ṭr-otē-Ø *l-arke* *uʕdo*
 OPT-come.INFECT-3SG.M to-here now

k obaʕ-Ø-n-e
 PRS-want.INFECT-M-1SG-3SG.M.P

‘Let him come here, I need him now’.

(18) *abiʕi lu=qatlayde, maṣəʕwole*

‘Sie wollten ihn töten, machten ihm Angst’. (21/39)

abi'-i-Ø *l-u = qaṭl-ayde*
 want.PRET.INTR-PL-3 to-ART.SG.M = killing-POSSII.3SG.M

mazə'-i-Ø-wo-le
 frighten.INFECTIII-PL-3-CONV-3SG.M.P

‘They wanted to kill him, [and therefore] frightened him’.

A sentential complement encoding the object of volition may be expressed by either an asyndetic jussive whose subject is coreferential with that of the main clause (11-12), or by a *d*-jussive whose subject does not have to coincide with that of the main clause (14-16). The object of volition is encoded by a substantive and an object pronoun in (16-17), while in (18) it is encoded by an substantival indirect object introduced by *l*-. In the latter instance, the predicate is once more a morphologically intransitive Preterite: *abi'i lu = qaṭlayde*.

ʔy ‘forget’:

(19) *hate ʔa'inowayla d-ománnanxuyo meqəm*

‘Ich habe vorher vergessen, euch das zu erzählen’. (57/210)

hate ʔa'i-Ø-no-way-la
 this.F forget.PRET.INTR-M-1SG-CONV-3SG.F.P
d-omán-Ø-na-nxu-yo *meqəm*
 that-say.INFECT-M-1SG-2PL.DAT-3SG.P before

‘I forgot to tell you this earlier’.

(20) *ũno-stene mi=šrolo ḥşuli ruḥi d-kətno bu=qayto. bāle ʔa'ino d-kətno b-Ştambul*

‘Ich fühlte mich wirklich im Sommer. Aber ich vergaß, daß ich in Istanbul bin’. (8/10)

<i>ũno-ste</i>	<i>nem-i=šrol-o</i>	<i>ḥşu-li</i>	<i>ruḥ-i</i>
I-also	from-ART.SG.F = truth-SG	think.PRET-1SG	REFL-POSSI.1SG
<i>d-kətno</i>	<i>b-u=qayt-o</i>	<i>bāle</i>	
that-COP-SUBJ.PRON.1SG	in-ART.SG.M = summer-SG	but	
<i>ʔa'i-Ø-no</i>	<i>d-kətno</i>	<i>b-Ştambul</i>	
forget.PRET.INTR-M-1SG	that-COP-SUBJ.PRON.1SG	in-Istanbul	

‘As for me, I did think that I found myself in summer. But I forgot that I was in Istanbul’.

(21) *ma hēš lo=taʿət u=mhoyaydi?*

‘Hast du denn noch immer nicht vergessen, mich zu verprügeln?’ (62/343)

ma hēš lo=taʿ-Ø-ət
Q still NEG = forget.PRET.INTR-M-2SG.M

u=mhoy-aydi
ART.SG.M = whip.INF-POSSII.1SG

‘You still have not forgotten to whip me?’

(22) *a=bnotayde maʿən lu=gworo. lə=mšayele hiye aʿlayye xud taʿalle*

‘Die Töchter kamen ins Heiratsalter. Er fragte aber nicht nach ihnen, **als ob er sie vergessen hätte**’. (77/18)

a=bn-ot-ayde maʿ-ən
ART.PL = daughter-PL-POSSII.3SG.M reach.PRET.INTR-3PL

l-u=gworo lə=mšaye-le hiye
to-ART.SG.M = marry.INF NEG-ask.PRETII-3SG.M he

aʿ-l-ayye xud taʿ-Ø-lle
about-POSSI.3PL as forget.PRET.INTR-3SG.M-3PL.P

‘His daughters reached marriage age. [However], he did not inquire about them as if he had forgotten them’.

What is forgotten may be introduced by a *d*-clause, whether a verbal one with a jussive (19) or a copular one with *kit* (20). It may be encoded by an infinitive (21) or a bound pronoun as well (22). Note that in (18) *abiʿi lu=qatlayde* lit. ‘they wanted to his killing’ the government is different from (21) *lo=taʿət u=mhoyaydi* lit. ‘you did not forget my whipping’. The reason for this is unclear.

šmʿ ‘hear’:

(23) *šaməʿ u=šulʿono səmle hawxa l-Abu-Zed*

‘Hierauf **hörte** der Sultan, daß Abu-Zed solches getan habe’. (PrS 15/11)

šaməʿ-Ø u=šulʿon-o səm-le
hear.PRET.INTR-3SG.M ART.SG.M = sultan-SG do.PRET-3SG.M

hawxa l-Abu-Zed
so A-Abu-Zed

‘The sultan heard that Abu-Zed had done so’.

(24) *bāle aḥna šami'ina d-komaḥarmət niše, gawre, flān*

‘Doch, **wir haben gehört**, daß du Frauen und Männer und so weiter verdammt’. (LB 103)

<i>bale</i>	<i>aḥna</i>	<i>šami'-i-na</i>	<i>d-ko-maḥarm-ət</i>
but	we	hear.PRET.INTR-PL-1PL	that-PRS-curse.INFECTIII-2SG.M
<i>niš-e</i>	<i>gawr-e</i>	<i>flān</i>	
woman-PL	man-PL	somebody	

‘But we have heard that you are in the habit of cursing women, men, and so on’.

(25) *hano u=abro du=šēx, hēš, lu=ḥzéwayle lo=šamə'wa xabro me-fema lo=ṭowo*

‘Der Sohn des Scheichs **hatte** bis dahin noch **nie** ein ungutes Wort aus ihrem Munde erlebt und **gehört**’. (94; 82/57)

<i>hano</i>	<i>u=abr-o</i>	<i>d-u=šēx</i>	<i>hēš</i>
this.M	ART.SG.M=SON-SG	of-ART.SG.M=sheikh	yet
<i>lu=ḥzé-way-le</i>	<i>lo=šamə'-Ø-wa</i>		
NEG=see.PRET-CONV-3SG.M	NEG=hear.PRET.INTR-3SG.M-CONV		
<i>xabr-o</i>	<i>me-fem-a</i>	<i>lo=ṭow-Ø-o</i>	
word[M]-SG	from-mouth[SG.M]-POSSL.3SG.F	NEG=good-M-SG	

‘The sheikh’s son had not yet seen this; he had hardly heard a bad word from her lips’.

(26) *u=xabrano man šmə'le ba'='ašayir w-baq=qabayl?*

‘Wer hat je von dergleichen bei den Stämmen gehört?’ (29/92)

<i>u=xabr-ano</i>	<i>man</i>	<i>šmə'-le</i>
ART.SG.M=word-this.M	who	hear.PRET-3SG.M
<i>b-a'='ašayir</i>	<i>w-b-aq=qabayl</i>	
among-ART.PL=tribe.PL	and-among-ART.PL=clan.PL	

‘Who among tribes and clans heard of this custom (lit. word)?’

The Stimulus participant is encoded either by a sentential complement (asyn-detic or introduced by *d*-, 23-24) or as a noun in the absolutive case (25), the cause probably being the form *ḥzéwayle*, an ergative “Plusquampraeteritum”.

Note that we have found one example of the *l*-Preterite for this root (26), *šmāle* is definitely an innovation vis-à-vis *šamā*, it is a NENA-like development.

fhm ‘understand’:

(27) *i = šari‘atxu šafro lə = fahimīna mede mena*

‘Heute Morgen haben wir von eurem Rechtshandel nichts begriffen’. (26/57)

<i>i = šari‘atxu</i>	<i>šafro</i>	
ART.SG.F = case-POSSII.2PL	morning[M]-SG	
<i>lə = fahim-i-na</i>	<i>mede</i>	<i>men-a</i>
NEG = understand.PRET.INTR-PL-1PL	something[SG.M]	of-POSSI.3SG.F

‘This morning, we have not understood anything about your case’.

(28) *i = atto du = tağər hzela u = maktub du = gawrayda, qrela fahimole*

‘Die Frau des Kaufmanns sah den Brief ihres Mannes, las ihn und verstand ihn’.
(23/47)

<i>i = att-o</i>	<i>d-u = tağər</i>	<i>hze-la</i>
ART.SG.F = woman-SG	of-ART.SG.M = merchant[M]	see.PRET-3SG.F
<i>u = maktub</i>	<i>d-u = gawr-ayda</i>	
ART.SG.M = letter[M]	of-ART.SG.M = husband-POSSII.3SG.F	
<i>qre-la</i>	<i>fahim-o-le</i>	
read.PRET-3SG.F	understand.PRET.INTR-3SG.F-3SG.M,P	

‘The merchant’s wife saw the letter of her husband, read and understood it’.

(29) *faham m‘ašarle i = kačkayo kmo waxt, faham ‘al i = ləğatte*

‘Er verstand, [was sie sagten]; er war ja eine Zeitlang mit jenem Mädchen zusammengewesen und hatte die Sprache [der Tauben] zu verstehen gelernt’. (57/178)

<i>faham-Ø</i>	<i>m‘ašar-le</i>
understand.PRET.INTR-3SG.M	live_together.PRETII-3SG.M
<i>i = kačk-ayo</i>	<i>kmo waxt faham-Ø</i>
ART.SG.F = girl-this.F	some time[M] understand.PRET.INTR-3SG.M
<i>‘al</i>	<i>i = ləğ-atte</i>
about	ART.SG.F = language-POSSII.3PL

‘He understood. He spent with this girl some time, so he had come to under-

stand their language’.

(30) *fhəmle* *lu = šēx ki hani b-lebo šafyo atən a‘me*

‘Der Scheich merkte, daß diese Leute in aufrichtiger Gesinnung mit ihm gekommen waren’. (29/195)

<i>fhəm-le</i>	<i>l-u = šēx</i>	<i>ki</i>	<i>hani</i>
understand.PRET-3SG.M	A-ART.SG.M = sheikh	that	these
<i>b-leb-o</i>	<i>šafy-Ø-o</i>	<i>at-ən</i>	<i>a‘m-e</i>
with-heart[M]-SG	pure-M-SG	come.PRET.INTR-3PL	with-POSSI.3SG.M

‘The Sheikh understood that these came with him without bad intentions’.

(31) *u = muxtar fhəmle i = masale omər «tayyab u‘do l-mən atutu l-gabi?»*

‘Der Schultheiß verstand, was gespielt wurde, und sprach: “Schön! Und warum seid ihr jetzt zu mir gekommen?”’ (54/59)

<i>u = muxtar</i>	<i>fhəm-le</i>	<i>i = masala</i>
ART.SG.M = head	understand.PRET-3SG.M	ART.SG.F = matter
<i>omər-Ø</i>	<i>tayyab</i>	<i>u‘do</i>
say.INFECT-3SG.M	good	now
<i>l-mən</i>	<i>at-utu</i>	<i>l-gab-i</i>
to-what	to-side[M]-POSSI.1SG	come.PRET.INTR-2PL

‘The mayor understood the problem. He said, “Fine. Now then, why have you come to me?”’

(32) *u = hakəm ġwamēr b-‘aqəlyo fhəmle*

‘Der Fürst war ein Edelmann und klug; er verstand’. (102/44)

<i>u = hakəm</i>	<i>ġwamēr</i>	<i>b-‘aqəlyo</i>
ART.SG.M = governor	noble[M]	with-reason[M]-COP.PRS.3SG
<i>fhəm-le</i>		
understand.PRET-3SG.M		

‘The ruler, being noble in mind, understood’.

For the Preterite of *fhm*, both morphological shapes are attested, *fahəm* and *fhəmle*. In the corpus, we have found five tokens of *fahəm* and thirteen tokens of *fhəmle*. In (29) the object of understanding is introduced via the preposition ‘*al*’, unlike in (27 [*mede*]), where it is introduced by Ø.

Speculatively, *fhəmle* looks younger than *fahəm*, and see above on *šamə’/šmə’le*.

‘yz ‘need’:

(33) ‘*ayizat mo = lir-at*

‘Du brauch[te]st 100 Pfund’. (513)

<i>‘ayiz-at</i>	<i>mo = lir-at</i>
need.PRET.INTR-2SG.F	hundred = pound-PL

‘You needed one hundred pounds’.

(34) *lo = ‘ayǝznole qərš*

‘Ich brauchte keinen Groschen von ihm’. (513)

<i>lo = ‘ayǝz-Ø-no-le</i>	<i>qərš</i>
NEG = need.PRET.INTR-M-1SG-SOURCE.3SG.M	penny[SG.M]

‘I did not need a penny from him’.

Both sentences are taken from the same informant from the village ‘Iwardo, and we have found no more examples in the published corpus. It seems the G-stem verbs *b’y* and *ʔb’* can express similar notions, as well as *lzm* (see below). Be this as it may, (33) and (34) are counterexamples to our suggestion above that the *qatal*-shaped Preterite of the nine verbs is syntactically intransitive, i.e., its Stimulus is governed by a preposition.

qdr ‘can, be able’:

(35) *bi = ɣarayto qadərina d-m‘adlinala* [*i = gōro*]

‘Finally we managed to fix it [= the roof]’. (1/19)

<i>bi = ɣaray-t-o</i>	<i>qadər-i-na</i>
in-ART.SG.F-last-F-SG	can.PRET.INTR-PL-1PL
<i>d-m‘adl-i-na-la</i>	[<i>i = gōro</i>]
that-repaid.INFECTII-PL-1PL-3SG.F.P	[ART.SG.F = roof-SG]

‘Finally we managed to repair it [= the roof]’.

(36) *u = admo knūfahē w-kmawqarre, w-lo = fayəš kquḍri ruḥti xayifo*

‘Das Blut schwellt sie (die Wanzen) auf und macht sie schwer, und sie können dann nicht mehr so schnell laufen’. (1/26)

<i>u = adm-o</i>	<i>k-nūfah-Ø-ḥe</i>
ART.SG.M = blood-SG	PRS-make_swell.INFECT-3SG.M-3PL.P

This Arabic loan is the basic verb for the concept ‘can, be able’ in the language. An alternative is the non-verbal, etymologically existential predication *kibe* ‘he can,’ *kibi* ‘I can,’ etc., and *laybe* ‘he cannot,’ *laybi* ‘I cannot,’ etc., see Jastrow (2002: 107). As is natural, the subject of the sentential complement is coreferential with that of the main clause. The sentential complement is introduced either by *d-* or *asyndetically*.

tm ‘crave’:

(39) *w-u‘do*, ‘*al d-ṭami‘at ebi*, *d-məlli ono ʔoto elux*, *madām hawxa-yo*, *laybux howatlan mede*

‘Und jetzt, wo du mich begehrt, wo ich dir doch gesagt habe, ich würde für dich Schwester sein, und da es nun so ist, kannst du uns gar nichts mehr sein’. (52/176)

<i>w-u‘do</i>	‘ <i>al d-ṭami‘at</i>		<i>eb-i</i>
and-now	because-of-crave.PRET.INTR-2SG.M		in-POSSI.1SG
<i>d-məl-li</i>	<i>ono</i>	<i>ʔot-o</i>	<i>el-ux</i>
that-say.PRET-1SG	I	sister.F-SG	to-POSSI.2SG.M
<i>madam</i>	<i>hawxa-yo</i>	<i>layb-ux</i>	
since	so-COP.PRS.3SG	PROH-POSSI.2SG.M	
<i>how-at-lan</i>	<i>mede</i>		
be.INFECT-2SG.M-to.1PL	something[SG.M]		

‘Now then, because you have craved for me, while I said “I am going to be your sister,”—since this is so, you are not allowed to be anything whatsoever for us’.

According to a personal communication from Jan Beṭ-Şawoce, one can also say ‘*w-u‘do*, ‘*al d-ṭami‘at-li*,’ i.e., interpreting the Stimulus syntactically as Direct Object. Shabo Talay doubts if this is a good usage.

We have found so far no examples of the Infectum in the corpus.

lzm ‘require’:

(40) *hūlele u = mede d-lazəmle*, *i = xarḡiyayde*

‘Er gab ihm das Reisegeld und das, was er sonst brauchte’. (97/48)

<i>hu-le-le</i>	<i>u = mede</i>
give.PRET-3SG.M-to.3SG.M	ART.SG.M = something
<i>d-lazəm-Ø-le</i> ,	
REL-be_needed.PRET.INTR-3SG.M-to.3SG.M	
<i>i = xarḡiy-ayde</i>	
ART.SG.F = travel_money-POSSI.3SG.M	

‘[His father] gave him whatever **was necessary for him**, (including) the travel money’.

According to Ritter (1990: 206), the Preterite *lazəm* is used only “unpersönlich,” as in (40), while the Inflectum *lozəm* appears both as an impersonal predicate (*ko-lozəm d-* = ‘it is necessary that,’ and cf. Jastrow 2002:169) and as a finite verb inflected for person, e.g. *ayna yawmo d-luzmat-li* ‘if you need me one day’ (60/173), note the Direct Object in this finite verb phrase. To complicate matters, *lazəm* is also used as a **present-tense** impersonal modal predicate ‘it is necessary that,’ i.e., it is synonymous to the impersonal *ko-lozəm*. Ritter (1990: 207) terms this usage of *lazəm* “arabisches Part < izip >.” Consider the following examples:

(41) *kolozəm d-maḥṭanno*

‘Ich muß frühstücken’. (9/25)

<i>ko-lozəm-Ø</i>	<i>d-maḥṭan-Ø-no</i>
PRS-be_needed.INFECT-3SG.M	that-breakfast.INFECTIII-M-1SG

‘It is necessary that I have breakfast’.

(42a) *lazəm ḥa minan d-foyaš harke*

‘Einer von uns muß hier bleiben’. (60/114)

<i>lazəm-Ø</i>	<i>ḥa</i>	<i>min-an</i>
be_needed.PRET.INTR-3SG.M	one[M]	from-POSSI.1PL
<i>d-foyaš-Ø</i>	<i>harke</i>	
that-stay.INFECT-3SG.M	here	

‘It is necessary that one of us stay here’.

(42b) *lo lazəm ḥa marḥəm aʿle*

‘Man darf kein Mitleid mit ihm haben’. (69/574)

<i>lo = lazəm-Ø</i>	<i>ḥa</i>	<i>marḥəm-Ø</i>
NEG = be_needed.PRET.INTR-3SG.M	one[M]	pity.INFECTIII-3SG.M
<i>aʿl-e</i>		
on-POSSI.3SG.M		

‘It is not necessary that anybody have pity on him’.

The root *lzm* is of Arabic origin, as so many other roots of the language which nonetheless display, unlike *lzm*, trivial morphosyntactic behaviour. It is likely that, as Ritter hints, *lazəm* in some of its usages corresponds to the impersonal participial *lazəm* of Anatolian Arabic (for the evidence, see Kinderib 131; VW II 172). The personal Inflectum is clearly transitive, as in *ayna yawmo d-luzmat-li* ‘if you need me one day,’ and in this usage the verb is Inflectum *tantum*. The picture looks a little

bizarre. One may surmise that the derivatives of *lzm* had been borrowed from spoken Arabic more than once, with different outcomes.

We shall now summarize our review of the evidence. The five verbs of Aramaic origin above are the basic exponents of the respective concepts. As for the five Arabic loans (*faham* ‘understand,’ *ʿayaz* ‘need,’ *qadar* ‘can, be able,’ *ṭamāʿ* ‘crave,’ and *lazam* ‘need, require’), only *qadar* is the basic exponent of a verbal notion in Ṭuroyo. Though *faham* appears several dozens of times in the texts, the basic exponent of ‘understand’ is most probably the Aramaic root ʿḏ ‘know’. *Lazam* is not quite rare, but its severe paradigmatic restrictions make it the weakest member of the list. Nevertheless, its “modal” (propositional attitude) lexical meaning fits well into the group.

How do we explain the emergence of these two-place *naḏaq*-shaped Preterites in the language? This must be a semantically conditioned innovation. We propose that, for example, *šmʿ* ‘hear,’ the verb that had been inherited by proto-Ṭuroyo from its Middle Eastern Aramaic ancestor, used to have the *l*-Preterite **šmʿle*, only to forfeit it in favour of *šamʿ*. This is not only because of the famous *šmʿ ly* ‘I have heard’ (TADAE A6.10:3) and *šmʿ ln* ‘we had heard’ (TADAE A3.3:13) forms, which are probably due to an Eastern Aramaic adstrate in the Imperial Aramaic corpus, and not just because this periphrasis with *šmʿ* is known in JBA (Bar-Asher Siegal 2011) and Syriac (see *šmʿ ln* cited in Nöldeke 1966: 210, and additional examples of the same collocation *šmʿ lan* in the Peshitta for Act 15: 24 and 19: 2, both corresponding to the active transitive aorist ἠκούσαμεν ‘we heard’ of the Greek original). The innovative nature of *šamʿ* follows also from the absence of the **šammiʿ* adjective from the corpus of Classical Syriac. According to Barsky and Loesov (in preparation), in Syriac, predicative deverbal *qattil*-adjectives were formed only for intransitive verbs, in particular for verbs of intransitive motion (see a sample of examples in Loesov 2013: 101ff.), and the same is true of other Middle Eastern Aramaic varieties. Thus the predicative *qattil*, an innovative pattern of deverbal adjectives, had been becoming increasingly popular since the early days of Aramaic until the advent of Modern Aramaic. At a certain point of Eastern Aramaic evolution, the predicative **qattil* (inflected via suffixes that had developed from cliticized subject pronouns) became the default past-time tense for intransitive G-stem verbs, most probably having passed the stages of RESULTATIVE and PERFECT (i.e., while the old Preterite **qatal* was still alive). In proto-Ṭuroyo, semantic attraction of this new intransitive Preterite was so strong that a number of two-place experiencer verbs changed their Preterite shape from *nšʿql* to *naḏaq*. Moreover, Ṭuroyo used the *naḏaq* pattern for adaptation of Arabic borrowings with appropriate meanings.

Note that in Maṭlula, a modern Western Aramaic dialect, the verbs *yḏʿ* ‘know,’ *šmʿ* ‘hear,’ *hmy* ‘see,’ along with some other experiential transitive roots, have **qattil*-

rather than **qtil*-shaped RESULTATIVE, and this evidence corresponds to the situation in Țuroyo: in Maḏlula, transitive G-stem verbs normally have **qtil*-RESULTATIVE, while intransitive ones have **qattil*.²

In proto-Țuroyo, there may have been an additional reason for the above *nšaqle* > *nafəq* shift. “In einigen Fällen (LuF 76)”, *nafəq*-shaped verbs are able to form detransitive shapes. Otto Jastrow (ibid.) mentions those of ʔḏ ‘know’ and ʔlf ‘learn’. Yet the verbal concepts such as ‘learn,’ ‘know,’ ‘want,’ ‘forget,’ ‘hear,’ ‘need,’ ‘be able,’ ‘desire’ probably have little need for passivization. Be this as it may, the only detransitive forms of these verbs we have found in the corpus are as follows:

- (43) *a=kṭowe d-gkuṭwutu bu=lišono ȥuroyo, l-kulayna xaṭəra d-lə=kmaṭ‘oyo hul*
lu=mawto gdowən

‘Die Bücher, die Ihr in der Turöyosprache schreiben werdet, werden für uns alle ein Andenken sein, das bis zum Tode nicht vergessen wird’. (11/331)

<i>a=kṭow-e</i>	<i>d-g-kutw-utu</i>	<i>b-u=lišon-o</i>
ART.PL=book-PL	REL-FUT-write.INFECT-2P	in-ART.SG.M=language-SG
<i>ȥuroyo-Ø</i>	<i>l-kul-ayna</i>	<i>xaṭəra</i>
Țuroyo-SG	for-all-POSSI.1PL	matter.SG.F
<i>d-lə=k-maṭ‘oy-o</i>		
REL-NEG=PRE-be_forgotten.DETRANS.INFECT-3SG.F		
<i>hul-l-u=mawt-o</i>	<i>gd-ow-ən</i>	
till-to-ART.SG.M=death-SG	FUT-be.INFECT-3PL	

‘The books that you will write in the Țuroyo language will become for all of us a matter that will not be forgotten till death’.

- (44) *u=qasəm d-lawḡul d-owe kayiwo w-šəqat, lə=kmašmə‘ aw kyugro i=aḏno*

‘Wenn der innere Teil krank und gelähmt wird, hört man nicht, oder das Ohr wird schwer(hörig)’. (3/44)

<i>u=qasəm</i>	<i>d-lawḡul</i>	<i>d-owe-Ø</i>
ART.SG.M=part	of-inside	if-be.INFECT-3SG.M

² See Loesov (2012: 429, with reference to standard works on Maḏlula), where this remarkable isogloss was dealt with in relation to the Sapirian “common drift” in the evolution of Aramaic.

kayiw-Ø-o *w-šāqat-Ø*
sore-M-SG and-corrupted-SG.M

lə=k-məšmə-Ø *aw*
NEG = PRS-be_heard.DETRANS.INFECT-3SG.M or

k-yuqr-o *i=aḏn-o*
PRS-become_hard.INFECT-3SG.F ART.SG.F = ear-SG

‘If the inner part [of the ear] becomes sore and corrupted, one cannot hear, or develops poor hearing’.

(45) *kmīdā* ‘*b-əšme du = Qanda d-Daywān*

‘Er war bekannt unter Namen Der Qanda von Deiwan’. (45/3)

k-mīdā-Ø
PRS-be_known.DETRANS.INFECT-3SG.M
b-əšm-e-d-u = Qanda *d-Daywān*
in-name[SG.M]-EZ-of-ART.SG.M = Qanda of-Daywān

‘He is known by the name Qanda from Daywān’.

(46) *kmīdō* ‘*d-kətyo walaye* ‘*atəqto mu = sābab d-hēš kfoyaš biya aṭarat w-baniyat rabe*

‘Man erkennt, daß es eine alte Stadt ist, weil es darin noch Ruinen und grosse Gebäude gibt’. (11/157)

k-mīdō-o *d-kət-yo* *walaye*
PRS-be_known.DETRANS.INFECT-3SG.F that-COP-COP.PRS.3SG town.SG.F
‘atəq-t-o *m-u = sābab* *d-hēš* *k-foyaš-Ø*
old-F-SG from-ART.SG.M = reason that-still PRS-stay.INFECT-3SG.M
bi-ya *aṭar-at* *w-baniy-at* *rab-e*
in-POSSI.3SG.F ruin-PL and-building-PL big-PL

‘The town is known to be old because there still remain in it ruins and big buildings’.

(47) *ya u = malkaydi kul mede hani am = medonani lo = koba* ‘*e d-ḥa ḡālabe mfakər appe. komīdō* ‘*i l-ruḥayye komibayni*

‘Mein König, über alle diese Dinge braucht man nicht viel nachzudenken. Sie werden durch sich selber erkannt und klar’. (81/111)

<i>ya</i> voc	<i>u = malk-aydi</i> ART.SG.M = king-POSSII.1SG	<i>kul</i> all	<i>mede</i> thing [SG.M]
<i>hani</i> these	<i>am = med-on-ani</i> ART.PL = thing-PL-these	<i>lo = k-oba^c-Ø-^ce</i> NEG = PRES-want.INFECT-3SG.M-3PL	
<i>d-ħa</i> that-one [M]	<i>ğálabe</i> much	<i>mfakər-Ø</i> think.INFECTII-3SG.M	<i>ap-pe</i> about-POSSI.3PL
<i>ko-mido^c-i-Ø</i> PRS-be_known.DETRANS.INFECT-PL-3		<i>l-ruh-ayye</i> for-REFL-POSSI.3PL	
<i>ko-mibayn-i-Ø</i> PRS-be_understood.DETRANSII.INFECT-PL-3			

‘Oh, my king! One does not have to think a lot about these things. They get known and understood by themselves’.

(48) *u = zlamano d-maqimatla čadəre li = bartaydux mi = walaye w-larwal, gəzzela li = čadəre. gəzzela li = čadəre, u = yawmawo gəmmidə^c*

‘Wenn du außerhalb der Stadt für deine Tochter ein Zelt aufschlagen lässt, so wird der Mann zu dem Zelte kommen. An dem Tag **wird er erkannt worden**’. (101/16)

<i>u = zlam-ano</i> ART.SG.M = man-this.M	<i>d-maqim-at-la</i> when-set_up.INFECTIII-2SG.M-to.3SG.F	
<i>čadəre</i> tent.SG.F	<i>l-i = bart-aydux</i> to-ART.SG.F = daughter-POSSII.2SG.M	<i>m-i = walaye</i> from-ART.SG.F = town
<i>w-larwal</i> and-outside	<i>g-əzz-e-la</i> FUT-go.INFECT-3SG.M,-to.3SG.F	<i>l-i = čadəre</i> to-ART.SG.F = tent
<i>u = yawm-awo</i> to-ART.SG.M = day-that.M	<i>gəm-midə^c-Ø</i> FUT-be_known.DETRANS.INFECT-3SG.M	

‘When you set up a tent for your daughter outside the town, the man will come to the tent and be recognized on that day’.

According to Ritter (1990: 727), there exists the detransitive Preterite *idi^c* ‘er wurde gewusst, bekannt,’ the form (and the whole Preterite detransitive paradigm) having been elicited by Ritter from an informant (cf. also LuF 76). We have not found it in the corpus. Ritter (1990: 727) has even the detransitive Imperative paradigm *midī^c/midī^cu* [no translation], which was also elicited. Shabo Talay tells us that *idi^c* in the sense ‘es wurde bekannt’ does exist, while “nowadays many people use *mtawdə^c* instead” (i.e., the village form of the III-stem Preterite detransitive).

Thus we have found in the corpus detransitive forms of three of the ten verbs: *ṭʿy* ‘forget,’ *šmāʿ* ‘hear,’ *ʾdʿ* ‘know’. The form *k-milaf* ‘es wird gelernt’ is represented only by elicited examples (Ritter 1990: 659). All six available tokens are Infectum forms. The form *d-lā=k-māṭʿoyo* (43) has a genuine passive reading (‘a matter that will not be forgotten’ by the speaker). The form *lā=k-māšmāʿ* of (44) is impersonal (‘one cannot hear’). The four tokens of *miḍāʿ* are different with regard to diathesis. The construction *k-miḍāʿ b-āšme* ‘he was known (under a certain name)’ (45) is non-passive and probably idiomatic, cf. German ‘wie heissen Sie?’, *ammi-le* ‘they say to him’ = ‘they call him/his name is’ in Turoyo (JL 5.10.6), ‘he is known as’ = ‘his name is’ in English, etc. The verb *k-miḍoʿo* (46) agrees in the feminine gender with the *walaye* ‘city’ of the subordinate clause and therefore has to have a passive meaning: the city **can be recognized** as old **by an observer** because of its visible peculiarities. In (47), *ko-miḍoʿi l-ruḥ-ayye* ‘they get known by themselves’ must be non-passive due to the use of the reflexive pronoun in the construction. In the co-text of (48), *gām-miḍāʿ* means ‘he will be recognized (by those who will spot him),’ it is a clear-cut PASSIVE.

Thus some of these verbs do have detransitive forms with passive readings, and this fact may constitute another piece of evidence that their Preterite had once had the *nšaqle* rather than the *naḥq* shape. The assumed (pragmatically conditioned) paucity of their detransitive tokens may have been an additional reason for the shift.

Before closing this paper on two-place verbs with *naḥq*-shaped Preterites, we have to mention some roots that keep their *l*-Preterite though they belong to the semantic group of perception/propositional attitude. These are in particular *bʿy* (*bʿele*) ‘want, need,’ which must be etymologically related to *ʾbʿ* ‘want’ discussed above, and *ṛḥm* (*ṛḥmle*) ‘love’. Why the verbs *ʾbʿ* and *bʿy* have got different Preterite shapes is unclear.

REFERENCES

Abbreviations and sources

- Anat. = Anatolian Arabic
- AWSG = Wehr 1985
- JL = Jastrow 2002
- Kinderib = Jastrow 2005
- LB = Tayal 2004
- LuF = Jastrow 1967
- MM = Jastrow 1968
- PrS = Prym-Socin 1881
- Ritter Texte Bd.1 = Ritter 1967

Ritter Texte Bd.2 = Ritter 1969
 Ritter Texte Bd.3 = Ritter 1971
 SL = Sokoloff 2009
 TADE = Porten-Yardeni 1986-1999
 VWII = Vocke-Waldener 1982

Bibliography

- Beṭ-Şawoce, Jan. 2012. *Xêzne d xabre Ordlista: Şurayt-Swedi [mêdyoyo]*. Stockholm: Författares Bokmaskin.
- Bar-Asher Siegal, Elizur A. 2011. "On the Passiveness of One Pattern in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic—a Linguistic and Philological Discussion." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 56: 111–143.
- Barsky, Evgeny, and Loesov, Sergey. in preparation. "Predicative Adjectives of Syriac in the Neo-Aramaic Retrospective."
- Bezold, Veronika. 2012. *Überarbeitung und Digitalisierung des Turoyo-Wörterbuchs von Hellmut Ritter*. Master's Dissertation. Philosophische Fakultät II, Friedrich-Alexander University. Nürnberg - Erlangen.
- Brockelmann, Carl. 1962. *Syrische Grammatik, mit Paradigmen, Literatur, Chrestomathie und Glossar*. Leipzig: Enzyklopädie.
- Hopkins, Simon. 1989. "Neo-Aramaic Dialects and the Formation of the Preterite." *Journal of Semitic Studies* 34 (2): 413–432.
- Jastrow, Otto. 1994. "Erlebnisse eines Lastwagenfahrers. Ein neuer Turoyo-Text im Dialekt von Midan." In *Festschrift Ewald Wagner zum 65. Geburtstag, Band 1 Semitische Studien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Südsemitistik*, edited by Wolfhart Heinrichs and Gregor Schoeler, 221–233. Beirut: Steiner (in Kommission).
- . 1993. *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Midin im Tūr 'Abdin*. Semitica Viva 9. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 1968. "Ein Märchen im neuaramäischen Dialekt von Midin (Tūr 'Abdin)." *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 118: 29–61.
- . 1996. "Passive Formation in Turoyo and Mlaḥsô." *Israel Oriental Studies* 16: 49–57.
- . 2002. *Lehrbuch der Turoyo-Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2005. *Glossar zu Kinderib (Anatolisches Arabisch)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2007. "Ergativity in the North Eastern Neo-Aramaic Dialects." In *Studies in Semitic and General Linguistics in Honor of Gideon Goldenberg*, edited by Eran Cohen and Tali Bar, 147–157. Münster: Ugarit.
- Loesov, Sergey. 2012. "A New Attempt at Reconstructing Proto-Aramaic (Part I)." *Babel und Bibel* 6: 421–456.

- , 2013, “A New Attempt at Reconstructing Proto-Aramaic (Part II).” In *Proceedings of the 14th Italian Meeting of Afroasiatic Linguistics*, edited by Alessandro Mengozzi and Mauro Tosco, 91–106.
- Nöldeke, Theodor. 1966. *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*. (Reprint). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Porten, Bezalel, and Yardeni, Ada. 1986–1999. *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt*, 4 vols. Jerusalem.
- Prym, Eugene, and Socin, Albert. 1881. *Der neu-aramäische Dialekt des Ṭūr ‘Abdîn. Erster Teil. Die Texte*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht’s.
- Ritter, Helmut. 1969. *Ṭūrōyo. Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Ṭūr ʿAbdîn. Texte Band II*. Beirut: Steiner (in Kommission).
- , 1979. *Ṭūrōyo. Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Ṭūr ʿAbdîn. Wörterbuch*. Beirut: Steiner (in Kommission).
- , 1990. *Ṭūrōyo. Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Ṭūr ʿAbdîn. Grammatik: Pronomen, „sein, vorhanden sein“, Zahlwort, Verbum*. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Siegel, Adolf. 1923. *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts des Ṭūr Abdîn*. Hannover: Heinz Lafaire.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann’s Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns-Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press.
- Talay, Shabo. 2004. *Lebendig begraben. Die Entführung des syrisch-orthodoxen Priesters Melki Tok von Midan in der Südosttürkei. Einführung, Aramäischer Text (Turoyo), Übersetzung und Glossar*. Studien zur Orientalischen Kirchengeschichte. Münster: Lit.
- Vocke, Sybille, and Waldner, Wolfram. 1982. *Der Wortschatz des Anatolischen Arabisch*. MA Dissertation. Philosophische Fakultät II (Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaften), Friedrich-Alexander Universität. Nürnberg-Erlangen.
- Wehr, Hans. 1985. *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart: Arabisch-Deutsch* (5th ed.). Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.