

The Basic Lexicon of Mlaḥṣô: A Comparative Study

Eugene Barsky
(Orthodox Encyclopedia, Moscow)
Maksim Kalinin
(Institute of Oriental Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow)
Sergey Loesov
(National Research University “Higher School of Economics”, Moscow)*

[The paper provides a list of morphological innovations exclusively shared by Mlaḥṣô and Ṭuroyo. These point to the existence of a proto-Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥṣô, which was not an ancestor of any other modern Aramaic language known to us. A study of the basic lexicon of Mlaḥṣô, in comparison with that of Ṭuroyo and NENA, supplies a lexical dimension to the proto-Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥṣô hypothesis. A second goal of the paper is to trace innovations and retentions of Mlaḥṣô as compared with proto-Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥṣô.]

Keywords: Modern Aramaic Dialectology, Mlaḥṣô, Ṭuroyo, Basic Lexicon

For Otto Jastrow

Mlaḥṣô is an Eastern Neo-Aramaic language of Upper Mesopotamia (South Eastern Turkey), now extinct.¹ The language was first discovered in 1968 by Otto Jastrow. Jastrow 1994 is its monograph-size description. Jastrow’s book includes phonology, morphology, a text corpus (around 7200 words) consisting of recordings of the only four informants Jastrow was able to find,² and a glossary. In 2002, Shabo Talay published one more text in Mlaḥṣô, the story of Ahiqar (around 1900 words), narrated to him by Ibrahîm Ḥanna, one of Jastrow’s informants and the last known speaker of Mlaḥṣô (Talay 2002).³

In this study, we start with an overview of grammatical features relevant to the genealogical subgrouping of Mlaḥṣô. In the main part of the paper, we offer an analysis of the basic lexicon of Mlaḥṣô.⁴ This analysis is meant to provide lexical data relevant to the history of Aramaic.

1. NON-LEXICAL ISOGLOSSES RELEVANT TO THE SUBGROUPING OF MLAḤSÔ

Otto Jastrow suggests that Mlaḥṣô is especially closely related to Ṭuroyo, a Neo-Aramaic language originally spoken in Tur-Abdin (South Eastern Turkey),⁵ though he is reticent about the exact nature of this special proximity.⁶ Mlaḥṣô is important for the history of Aramaic, because

* We are grateful to Charles Häberl and Hezy Mutzafi for numerous corrections. The work on the paper was financed by the Russian Science Foundation, project 16-18-10343.

1. According to Jastrow 2011: 697 f., “the language of Mlaḥṣô .. must be considered extinct by now. Already in 1915 this idiom apparently was spoken only in two villages which were both destroyed during the ethnocide: Mlaḥṣô, situated near the present-day town of Lice, north of Diyarbakir, and ⁵Anša, a village near Diyarbakir. The few people who escaped the massacres have all died since.”

2. See Jastrow 1994: 5-10 for the dramatic tale about the discovery of the language.

3. The story of Ahiqar in Mlaḥṣô abounds in loanwords from Classical Syriac (e.g., *šar* ‘he began’ Talay 2002, 697: 18) and Ṭuroyo (*qatānto* ‘she-cat’ (Talay 2002, 701: 77). We have excluded from this lexical study those words of Ahiqar that display phonological and morphological features alien to Mlaḥṣô.

4. The notion “basic vocabulary” is notoriously hard to define in stringent terms. Martin Haspelmath suggests that “basic vocabulary” is, in particular, “the words which are used most frequently” (2008: 50). He continues as follows: “It would not be surprising if they were resistant to borrowing, because it is well known that high-frequency items are resistant to other types of language change such as analogy.” This means, in particular, that, depending on an individual research agenda, the Swadesh-style dichotomy of “basic” vs. “cultural” lexicon (with its concomitant positive bias towards “culture-free” terms) has to be abandoned.

5. Jastrow 1994: 13–16; Jastrow 1996: 49 et passim; Jastrow 2011: 697–708.

6. Jastrow’s most explicit statement is the following one: “Als Ergebnis dieses knappen Sprachvergleichs läßt sich wohl sagen, daß Mlaḥṣô und Ṭuroyo historisch eng verwandt sind, sich im Laufe ihrer Entwicklung aber in vielen

Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥṣô may form a genealogical subgroup of their own, i.e., there exists cumulative evidence to the effect that, in *Stammbaum* terms, Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥṣô are closer relatives than either of them are to NENA. This means that one can attempt to reconstruct some features of the immediate mother tongue of Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥṣô, a language that was a “sister” or (more likely) an “aunt” of the NENA we know.

Salient morphological **innovations** linking Mlaḥṣô and Ṭuroyo and opposing both languages to NENA are as follows:

1) There exist prepositive definite articles on substantives. In both languages, these articles inflect for number. Ṭuroyo inflects the singular article for gender (*u-* masc., *i-* fem.), while Mlaḥṣô has a gender-neutral form *ə-*, which may have resulted from a merger of gender-specific Ṭuroyo-like articles,⁷ going back to Middle Aramaic anaphoric pronouns **hū* and **hī*.

2) There exists a synthetic Present Passive, unknown in the documented varieties of NENA. In both Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥṣô, the Present Passive of the G-stem goes back to the Middle Aramaic G-stem participle (Jastrow 1996). Moreover, in both languages, the shape of the G-stem Present Passive of hollow roots points to a proto-form **mitR₁āR₃*, while Middle Eastern Aramaic knew both **mitR₁āR₃* and **mitR₁īR₃* patterns (Furman and Loesov 2016: 39f.).

3) Unlike in NENA, **qattīl* is used as a base of finite verb tenses in both Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥṣô, i.e., as the intransitive Preterit in Ṭuroyo and the Perfect of both transitive and intransitive verbs in Mlaḥṣô (Jastrow 1994: 14f.).

Thus we assume that Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥṣô had an exclusive common ancestor, i.e., a proto-Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥṣô, which was not an ancestor of any other modern Aramaic language known to us. For this reason it makes sense to compare certain non-lexical features of these two languages in terms of innovations and retentions, thus providing materials for the reconstruction of their immediate mother tongue.

Phonology

1. In Mlaḥṣô, the plosive consonant */p/* inherited from Middle Aramaic has been preserved, while in most varieties of Ṭuroyo, it has merged with */f/* going back to the fricative variant of */p/* of Middle Aramaic.

2. Mlaḥṣô keeps apart the reflexes of MA **w* (> *w*) and **ḫ* (> *v*), which have merged in Ṭuroyo, yielding */w/* (Jastrow 1994: 13).

3. Ṭuroyo preserves the interdental consonants *t̪* and *d̪* inherited from MEA, while in Mlaḥṣô they shifted to *s* and *z* respectively (Jastrow 1994: 13).

4. In closed syllables, Mlaḥṣô, unlike Ṭuroyo, preserves inherited tense vowels of MEA (Kim 2008: 522; Jastrow 2011: 699). Consider the following two alternation series:

Ṭuroyo (Midān): *doməx* – *dəmxī* – *doməxno* (all three forms bear penultimate stress)

Mlaḥṣô *doméx* – *domxī* – *doméxno*.

Thus, in Ṭuroyo, tense vowels⁸ in closed syllables shift to */ə/*, while etymologically short **/e/* shifts to */a/* in closed stressed syllables, and to */ə/* in closed unstressed ones. In Mlaḥṣô, the closed syllable */e/* is preserved, whether stressed or unstressed. In particular, this works for closed syllables in nouns with the base going back to the Middle Aramaic **qetl-*: *eznó* in Mlaḥṣô vs. *áđno* in Ṭuroyo (‘ear’), cf. CS *ʔeđnā*; *besró* in Mlaḥṣô vs. *bášro* in Ṭuroyo (‘meat’), cf. CS *besrā* (Kim 2010: 234).

Punkten voneinander entfernt haben. Der Abstand zu den nächstverwandten ostaramäischen Dialekten ist jedoch wesentlich größer, so daß Mlaḥṣô und Ṭuroyo in jeder Klassifizierung des Nearamäischen eine eigene Gruppe bilden” (Jastrow 1994: 16). Within the same comparative overview, Jastrow is reluctant to admit an exclusively shared ancestor: “Zieht man <...> die Morphologie mit heran, so finden sich zahlreiche Abweichungen, die nicht einfach als ältere bzw. jüngere Entwicklungen erklärt werden können, sondern auf unterschiedliche Ausgangsformen zurückgehen müssen” (Jastrow 1994: 13).

7. Jastrow 1994: 14; Jastrow 2005.

8. I.e., in the case of Ṭuroyo, etymologically long ones.

5. For the word stress position, the rule of thumb is as follows: Ṭuroyo stresses the penultimate syllable of the word/base,⁹ while Mlaḥsŏ usually stresses the last syllable.¹⁰ Jastrow 1994: 14 believes that the ultimate stress of Mlaḥsŏ is a retention (evidently, from the Middle Aramaic period).¹¹ Yet Jastrow 1994: 26 cites a few high frequency demonstrative pronouns and adverbs with penult stress, *áno* ‘this’, *áneḵ* ‘these’, *árko* ‘here’, all of them being of transparent Aramaic origin, so their penult stress looks like a retention. Additional instances of this kind are *éyko* ‘where?’ (JM 173), *támo* ‘there’ (JM 191), *ózi* ‘this (f.)’ (< MEA **hādē*, JM 185), and see also *hátun* ‘you (pl.)’ (JM 175). We believe that the final stress of Mlaḥsŏ is an innovation, developed under the influence of Kurmanji.¹² In Mardin varieties of Kurmanji, adjectives, as well as substantives without inflectional suffixes, are stressed on their final syllable.¹³

Morphology and Syntax

The differences in formal morphology and morphosyntax of the verb between Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥsŏ are of such a nature that one cannot arrive at the Mlaḥsŏ picture starting from a Ṭuroyo-like one. For this reason, we posit that the two languages parted ways when (1) **qatala* was still their principal past tense, (2) **qattil* was a productive predicative adjective freely formed from intransitive verbs. The new, and specifically “eastern” Neo-Aramaic verb system was formed via parallel developments in the two languages.

In Mlaḥsŏ, the active transitive *l*-Preterit gave up vestiges of object agreement, still existing in Ṭuroyo and some of NENA,¹⁴ which means that Mlaḥsŏ has overcome relics of the split ergativity stage more consistently than Ṭuroyo and part of NENA.

Against the background of Ṭuroyo, a most salient feature of Mlaḥsŏ (unique in Aramaic) is the coupling of the *l*-inflection with *all* preterital bases of the language, independently of their diathetic values, – most importantly, with the passive ones (Jastrow 1994: 33f.; Jastrow 1996).

Let us now compare the D-stem shapes of the two languages, taking the D-form of *šdr* ‘to send’ as an example. The Ṭuroyo picture, Pres. *mšadər* – Pret. *mšadalle* (active) vs. Pres. *mišadər* – Pret. *mšadər* (passive) is a natural outcome of the evolution whose direction had been determined already in the Middle Aramaic period.¹⁵ The Mlaḥsŏ picture, Pres. *šadər* – Pret. *šadərle* (active) vs. Pres. *mšadər* – Pret. *mšadərle* (passive) can be explained as one step more progressive vis-à-vis Ṭuroyo. That is, we posit that Mlaḥsŏ once used to have structurally the same forms of the D-stem as today’s Ṭuroyo. We suggest that the change came about as follows. Mlaḥsŏ had developed a passive *l*-Preterit by adding the *l*-inflection to the Present Passive bases of all three stems. Later on, the language dropped the first vowel of the D-stem Present Passive **mišader*, and this led to the homonymy of active and passive Inflectum shapes (**mšader* ‘he is sending’ and ‘he is being sent’).¹⁶ To overcome this unsatisfactory merger, Mlaḥsŏ proceeded to drop the prefix *m-* of the two active tense forms in the D-stem, so the active and passive conjugations of the D-stem became non-homonymous once more.

9. See Jastrow 2002: 17 f. for details.

10. Jastrow 1994: 14, 26 f.

11. See Kim 2008: 513 for an overview of the word stress position in Neo-Aramaic languages.

12. This possibility is corroborated by other structural influences of Kurmanji on Mlaḥsŏ: postpositive *-ki* as a marker of indefiniteness (Jastrow 1994: 60, 180), which is etymologically the enclitic marker of indefinite singular nouns in Kurmanji (Thackston 2006: 10), and the Kurdish complementizer *ko/ku* used both as the complementizer and the default relative pronoun (Jastrow 1994: 180). The Aramaic *d-* has not been preserved in Mlaḥsŏ as a conjunction; it appears only in fossilized prepositional phrases.

13. This follows from our fieldwork with speakers of Kerboran Kurmanji. See also Jastrow 1977: 94, Thackston 2006: 4.

14. Khan 2007a.

15. For details, see Furman and Loesov 2016: 38 f.

16. This suggestion is corroborated by another observation: in Mlaḥsŏ, the C-stem Present Passive *mtašog* ‘it is being washed’ etymologically matches the respective Ṭuroyo form (*mītaqtəl*), once more with the syncope of the etymologically long */il/*, hence **mītašog* > *mtašog*.

In Mlaḥṣô, the imperative plural preserves the final *-n* (*ksavun* ‘write!’), lost in Ṭuroyo (*ktawu* ‘write!’). The Imperative of IIIy verbs in Mlaḥṣô, unlike in Ṭuroyo, preserved feminine singular forms: *ṣti* (ms), *ṣtay* (fs) ‘drink!’ They go back transparently to their respective Middle Aramaic forms, cf. Syriac *ṣtī* and *ṣtāy*.

Unlike in Mlaḥṣô, in sound roots of Ṭuroyo the base of the G-stem Present Passive developed /o/, by way of analogy of IIy roots: *misomi* ~ *məgroši* (Furman – Loesov 2016: 39f).

Unlike in Ṭuroyo (Midən), the Imperative of the derived stems in Mlaḥṣô does not have the prefix *m-*. Is this *m*-less Imperative of Mlaḥṣô an innovation or a retention? From among NENA, the *m*-prefix in the respective bases is absent at least from the Qaraqosh dialect (Khan 2007: 12f.). The *m*-less Imperative of the derived stems is known in Ṭuroyo as well, where it is a minority form attested in certain village varieties, see Ritter 1990: 150 ff, 169 f. The evidence can be best explained by the following hypothesis: at a certain point all of Eastern Aramaic (save Mandaic) endeavoured to form the Imperative of derived stems anew, i.e., from the respective Present bases possessing the *m*-prefix. Later on, part of the Neo-Aramaic varieties dropped the *m*-prefix.

Mlaḥṣô, unlike Ṭuroyo, has preserved the Middle Aramaic direct object marker *l-* (Jastrow 1994: 53).

Thus, from a genealogical perspective, the balance of comparative innovations and retentions in both languages appears complex and requires further study.¹⁷

2. THE BASIC LEXICON OF MLAḤṢÔ¹⁸

As a first step, we compiled the 100-word Swadesh list for Mlaḥṣô, with etymological notes. As many positions of the list as possible were filled with the data of the extant Mlaḥṣô text corpus. As a second step, we looked for exponents of commonsense basic concepts outside the Swadesh list. We then compared the items of our list with the exponents of the same meanings in Ṭuroyo as another member of the same close genealogical group as Mlaḥṣô.¹⁹ We have provided the Ṭuroyo words, wherever they are not immediate cognates of their semantic counterparts in Mlaḥṣô, with etymologies. Finally, we have undertaken a comparison of our findings with the data of NENA, using all available descriptions of NENA that offer lexical information. In the glossary entries below, we adduce the data of NENA in so far as they are dissimilar from those of Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥṣô, in other words, if they can be used to highlight exclusively shared innovations or exclusively shared retentions of the Ṭ/M subgroup.

The organization of our entries is as follows:

CONCEPT: exponent in Mlaḥṣô (ref.) ♦ exponent in Ṭuroyo (ref.)

Etymology.

※ Commentaries.

For words of Aramaic origin, the cognates in the Middle Eastern Aramaic varieties (i.e., Syriac, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, and Classical Mandaic) are listed, with references to standard dictionaries. The words marked by the asterisk (*) are attested in the Mlaḥṣô corpus only in bound forms. The < sign shows the etymology of a Mlaḥṣô or Ṭuroyo word, the ← sign indicates productive synchronic derivation within Mlaḥṣô or Ṭuroyo. The note “cf.” in the etymological section refers to the Middle Aramaic situation and says that we have not found in MEA an exact counterpart of a given Neo-Aramaic noun but rather words with the same root yet possessing such morphological shapes that these words cannot be etymons of the Neo-Aramaic terms in question.

In case of Mlaḥṣô, unlike in Ṭuroyo, one cannot justify one’s decisions with the help of a sizable corpus and/or fieldwork with native speakers. Jastrow’s book and the story of Ahiqar are all

17. Cf. also Kim 2008 for various observations relevant to the subgrouping of Modern Aramaic.

18. Previous studies mention several lexical retentions of Mlaḥṣô vis-à-vis Ṭuroyo, see Jastrow 1994: 15 f., Goldenberg 1998: 65, Kim 2008: 522.

19. Part of these Ṭuroyo exponents has been imported from Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018, while the majority of them has been established for the first time. For this end, we used the searchable corpus of Ṭuroyo in progress (on which see Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018) and did field research among our informants.

that is left for us of Mlaḥsô.²⁰ This fact entails that, strictly speaking, we cannot always prove synchronically that a given Mlaḥsô word is basic as the exponent of a meaning in question. Yet, since the contexts of the terms in question are neutral, and many terms themselves are familiar from better documented Aramaic languages as basic enough, we may be justified in surmising the basic status for them.

2.1. The one-hundred-word Swadesh List

2.1.1. Notions and exponents

1. ALL: *kul-* (JM 180) ♦ *kul* (RW 281)

MEA: *kul, kol* ‘all’ (SL 622); *kullā* (DJBA 559); *kul* (MD 206).

4. BELLY **gayo* (JM 174) ♦ *gawo* (RW 172)

MEA: *gāwwā* ‘inner part of the body, stomach’ (SL 210); *gawwā* ‘the inside, inward parts; the belly, inner part’ (DJBA 267); *gaua* ‘inside, interior’ (MD 74).

✧ The promotion of **gawwā* onto the main exponent of BELLY is an exclusive innovation of Mlaḥsô and Turoyo against the background of the known NENA. In NENA, the exponents of BELLY are cognates of MEA words *karsā* ‘belly, stomach’ (SL 655), *karsā, krēsā* ‘stomach, rumen, womb’ (DJBA 603), *karsa* ‘belly, stomach’ (MD 201).²¹

5. BIG, LARGE: *rabo* (JM 188) ♦ *rabo* (RW 430)

MEA: *rabbā* ‘great, large’ (SL 1425); *rah* ‘great one, great thing’ (DJBA 1052); *rab* ‘master, the greatest’ (MD 417).

6. BIRD: **ṭayro* ♦ *safruno* (RW 450), *ṭayro* (RW 531)

MEA: *ṭayrā* ‘bird’ (SL 528).

MEA: *ṣeprā* ‘bird’ (SL 1298); *ṣippārā* ‘bird, fowl’ (DJBA 962); *ṣipra* ‘little bird, sparrow’ (MD 394).

8. BLACK: *komo* (Talay 2002: 710) ♦ *komo* (RW 278)

MEA: *kōmā* ‘black’ (SL 608); *ṭukkāmā* ‘black’ (SL 15); *ṭukkām* ‘black’ (DJBA 88); *ṣukma* ‘blackness’ (MD 343), *ṣkuma* ‘black’ (MD 349).

9. BLOOD: *dmo* (JM 172), *edmo* (Talay 2002: 709) ♦ *admo* (RW 27)

MEA: *dmā* ‘blood’ (SL 307); *dmā* ‘blood’ (DJBA 340); *dma* ‘blood’ (MD 111).

10. BONE: **garmo* (JM 174) ♦ *garmo* (RW 170)

MEA: *garmā* ‘bone’ (SL 261); *garmā* ‘bone’ (DJBA 302); *girma* (MD 92).

11. BREAST: *ḥazyo* (JM 177) ♦ *ṣadro* (RW 472)

ḥazyo < MEA: *ḥadyā* ‘breast’ (SL 415); *ḥadyā* ‘breast’ (DJBA 432); *hadia* ‘breast’ (MD 116).

ṣadro < Arab.: *ṣadr* ‘Brust’ (AWSG 701); *ṣadər* ‘Brust’ (VW II 24); *ṣədər* ‘Brust’ (Kinderib 80).

✧ In Turoyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

13. CLOUD : *ṣaymo* (JM 167) ♦ *ṣaymo* (RW 4) , *ṣaywo* (RW 5)

20. Note also a sober remark of Jastrow regarding the speech competence of his three Diyarbakir informants: “Alle drei Sprecher schienen als tägliche Umgangssprache das Kurdische zu benutzen, die Sprache von Mlaḥsô hatten sie seit langem – vielleicht seit Jahrzehnten – nicht mehr gebraucht. Deshalb sprachen sie unbeholfen, stockend, mit Fehlern und bisweilen unverständlich” (Jastrow 1994: 10).

21. E. g., Hertevin *karsa* (Jastrow 1998: 190), Barwar *kasa, kʿasa* (Khan 2008: 1305), C. Urmi *cisa* (Khan 2016, III: 121).

ṣaymo < MEA: *ṣaymā* ‘cloud’ (SL 1096).

ṣaywo < MEA: *ṣaybā* ‘obnubilatio, nubes humidae’ (TS 2824); *ṣēbā* ‘dark cloud, cloudiness’ (DJBA 850); *aiba* ‘cloud, fog, darkness’ (MD 14). The Syriac word is attested only in medieval Syriac lexicons and may be a borrowing from Neo-Aramaic.

15. COME: *ṣy* (JM 155) ♦ *ṣty* (RG 741)

MEA: *ṣty* ‘to come’ (SL 110); *ṣty* ‘to come’ (DJBA 176); *ata* (MD 41).

16. TO DIE: *mys* (JM 159) ♦ *myt* (RG 510)

MEA: *mwt* ‘to die’ (SL 731); *mwt* ‘to die’ (DJBA 650); *mut* ‘to die’ (MD 263).

17. DOG: *kalbo* (JM 179) ♦ *kalbo* (RW 260)

MEA: *kalbā* ‘dog’ (SL 622); *kalbā* ‘dog’ (DJBA 580); *kalba* ‘dog’ (MD 197).

18. TO DRINK: *ṣty* (JM 163) ♦ *ṣty* (RG 556)

MEA: *ṣty* ‘to drink’ (SL 1614); *ṣty* ‘to drink’ (DJBA 1184); *ṣta* ‘to drink’ (MD 476).

19. DRY

Only the verb *ngv* ‘to be dry’ (JM 159) is attested. The word for DRY in Turoyo is *našifo* (RW 359).

ngv < MEA: *ngb* ‘to dry up’ (SL 886); *ngb* ‘to be dry’ (DJBA 727).

našifo ← *nšf* (RG 164, 168) < Arab.: *nšf* ‘trocknen’ (AWSG 1275); *nšf* ‘trocknen’ (VW II 206); *nšf* ‘trocknen’ (Kinderib 142).

20. EAR: *ezno* (JM 173) ♦ *aḏno* (RW 27)

MEA: *ṣeḏnā* ‘ear’ (SL 10); *ṣuḏnā* ‘ear’ (DJBA 85); *ṣudna* ‘ear’ (MD 342).

21. EARTH: *arṣo* (JM 169) ♦ *arṣo* (RW 36)

MEA: *ṣarṣā* ‘earth, land’ (SL 104); *ṣarṣā* ‘earth, land’ (DJBA 170); *arqa* ‘earth, land’ (MD 39).

22. TO EAT: *ṣxl* (JM 156) ♦ *ṣxl* (RG 702)

MEA: *ṣkl* ‘to eat’ (SL 41), *ṣkl* ‘to eat’ (DJBA 129); *akl* ‘to eat’ (MD 16).

23. EGG: *biṣe* (pl.) (JM 171) ♦ *bəḥto* (RW 66)

MEA: *bēṣtā* ‘egg’ (SL 143); *bēṣtā*, *bētā* ‘egg’ (DJBA 204); *baia*, *biia*, *bita* ‘egg’ (MD 47, 60, 64).

24. EYE: *ṣayno* (JM 168) ♦ *ṣayno* (RW 4)

MEA: *ṣaynā* ‘eye’ (SL 1097); *ṣēnā* ‘eye, sight’ (DJBA 855); *ayna* ‘eye’ (MD 15).

27. FIRE: *nuro* (JM 185) ♦ *nuro* (RW 371)

MEA: *nūrā* ‘fire’ (SL 904); *nūrā* ‘fire’ (DJBA 738); *nura* ‘fire’ (MD 294).

29. TO FLY: *prḥ* (JM 160) ♦ *fyr* (RG 511)

prḥ < MEA: *prḥ* ‘to fly’ (SL 1235); *prḥ* ‘to fly’ (DJBA 930); *phr*, *pra* ‘to fly’ (MD 366, 377).

fyr < Arab.: *frr* ‘fliegen’ (VW II 91); *frr* ‘fliegen’ (Kinderib 104).

✱ In Turoyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

30. FOOT: **reḡlo* (JM 188) ♦ *raḡlo* (RW 431)

MEA: *reḡlā* ‘foot’ (SL 1434); *riḡlā* ‘leg, foot’ (DJBA 1073); *ligra* ‘foot, leg’ (MD 235).

✧ The exponents of FOOT in Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo display an exclusive retention against the background of the known NENA. In NENA, the exponents of FOOT are cognates of MEA *ṣaqlā* ‘shank, leg’ (Mutzafi 2014: 186).

31. FULL *mlese* (JM 183) ♦ *malyo* (RW 311)

mlese < MEA: *mlāytā*, ESyr *mlētā* ‘fullness’ (SL 771); *mlyyt?*, *mly?t?*, *ml?yt?* ‘additional amount, remainder, stuffing’ (DJBA 679).

malyo ← *mly* (RG 333) < MEA: *mly* ‘to fill up’ (SL 768); *mly* ‘to be full’ (DJBA 678); *mly* ‘to fill, be full’ (MD 272).

✧ *mlese* is a direct continuation of the MEA base **mlēt-* with a partly fossilized anticipatory pronoun. This pronoun is *-e* in three of the four extant tokens (with no agreement with a virtual source of agreement), and once *-en* agreeing with *arbsi* ‘forty’: *arbsi taṣne da=baḡle mlesen dahve* ‘forty mule-loads full of gold’ (JM 92: 139).²²

Synchronically, *malyo* is a part. pass. derived from *mly* according to a productive rule (LuF § 114 a). Since in MEA the part. pass. of *mly* has the same morphological shape as in Ṭuroyo (e.g., *malyā* in Syriac), the exponent of FULL in Mlaḥsô is an innovation.

32. TO GIVE: *yhv* (JM 165) ♦ *hyw* (RG 586)

MEA: *yhb* ‘to give’ (SL 565); *yhb* ‘to give’ (DJBA 526); *yhb* ‘to give’ (MD 189).

33. TO GO: *?zl* (JM 156) ♦ *azze/azze* (RG 752)

MEA: *?zl* ‘to go’ (SL 24); *?zl* ‘to go, travel’ (DJBA 100); *azl* ‘to go, move on’ (MD 12).

34. GOOD: *tarqo* (JM 191) ♦ M:²³ *kayiso/kayso* (*Xəzne* 124); Q:²⁴ *tawwol/towo* (RW 536), *kayiso*

tarqo < MEA: *tarqā* ‘good; honorable, noble’ (SL 556).

kayiso < Arab.: *kayyis* ‘gewitzt, fein, hübsch’ (AWSG 1132); *kwayyās*, *kwayyes* ‘gut, schön’ (VW II 156); *kwayyās* ‘schön’ (Kinderib 127).

tawwol/towo < MEA: *tābā* ‘good’ (SL 507); *tāb* ‘good’ (DJBA 492); *tāba* ‘good’ (MD 172).

✧ The exponent of GOOD in Proto-Ṭ/M was **tābā*. In a part of Ṭuroyo dialects, it was replaced by an Arabism (Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 86), while Mlaḥsô promoted a former secondary term for GOOD onto this position.

35. GREEN: *yaruqo* (Talay 2002: 712). Cf. also *yaruqso* ‘Grünzeug’, a derivation of *yaruqo* (JM 194) ♦ *yaroqo* (RW 574)

MEA: *yūrāqā* ‘green’ (SL 570); *yūrāq* ‘green, yellow’ (DJBA 531); *iuraqa* ‘yellow, green’ (MD 191).

36. HAIR: *šahfe* (JM 190) ♦ *šafro* (RW 471), *sawko* (RW 457)

šahfe < Arab.: *šāṣfa* ‘Gipfel’ (AWSG 659); *šāṣfe* ‘Hauptgaar, längeres Haupthaar’ (Kinderib 76);

šafro < MEA: *saṣrā* ‘hair’ (SL 1028); *šāṣrā* ‘hair’ (DJBA 1189); *sara* ‘hair’ (MD 315).

sawko must be related to the NENA word *kosa* ~ *kawsa* ‘hair’. The further etymology of these words is uncertain (Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 87).

✧ The exponent of HAIR in Proto-Ṭ/M was **saṣrā*. It has been preserved in a part of Ṭuroyo dialects (Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 87), while in Mlaḥsô it was replaced by an Arabism.

37. HAND: *izo* (JM 179) ♦ *ido* (RW 248)

MEA: *?īdā* ‘hand’ (SL 31); *yīdā* ‘hand, possession’ (DJBA 523); *ṣda* ‘hand’ (MD 341).

²² Jastrow transcribes *mlese dahve*, yet the speaker says clearly *mlesen dahve*.

²³ Mədyoyo, the Midyat variety of Ṭuroyo.

²⁴ Quryoyo, village varieties of Ṭuroyo.

38. HEAD: *rišo* (JM 188) ♦ *qaršo* (RW 399)
 # *rišo* < MEA: *rēšā* ‘head’ (SL 1462); *rēšā* ‘head, top part’ (DJBA 1078); *riša* ‘head, top’ (MD 434).

qaršo: see MEA: *qaršā* ‘gourd’ (SL 1414); Arab. *qarṣ* ‘Kürbis’ and *qarṣa* ‘Kürbis; Schädel, Kopf’ (AWSG 1018) (see Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 88)

✱ In Turoyo an Aramaic term is used with the semantic shift ‘gourd’ → ‘head’, also known in Arabic.

39. HEAR: *šmf* (JM 163) ♦ *šmf* (RG 87)

MEA: *šmf* ‘to hear, listen to’ (SL 1574); *šmf* ‘to hear’ (DJBA 1158); *šma* ‘to hear, listen’ (MD 469).

42. I: *ono* (JM 28) ♦ M: *uno*, Q: *ono* (RG 1)

MEA: *ʔenā* ‘I’ (SL 58); *ʔānā* ‘I’ (DJBA 143); *ana* ‘I’ (MD 24).

43. KILL: *qtl* (JM 161) ♦ *qtl* (RG 287)

MEA: *qtl* ‘to kill’ (SL 1352); *qtl* ‘to kill’ (DJBA 1006); *gʔl* ‘to kill’ (MD 87).

44. KNEE: *berko* (JM 170) ♦ *barko* (RW 56)

MEA: *burkā* ‘knee’ (SL 131); *birkā* ‘knee’ (DJBA 206); *burka* ‘knee’ (MD 57).

45. TO KNOW: *yzʕ* (JM 165) ♦ *ʔdʕ* (RG 721–727)

MEA: *ydzʕ* ‘to know’ (SL 563); *ydzʕ* ‘to know’ (DJBA 525); *yda* ‘to know’ (MD 188).

46. LEAF: *pāle* (pl.) (JM 185), *ʔarfe* (pl.) (JM 193) ♦ *ʔarfo* (RW 534)

pāle < Kurd. *pʿel* ‘leaf’ (Chyet 437).

ʔarfe, *ʔarfo* < MEA: *ʔarpā* ‘leaf’ (SL 555); *ʔāʔarpā* ‘leaf’ (DJBA 108); *aʔirpa* ‘leaf’ (MD 13).

✱ Each of the two words is attested only once in the corpus. *Pāle* refers to individual leaves,²⁵ while *ʔarfe* is ‘foliage’.²⁶ Thus it is *pāle* that has to fill this position of the Swadesh list.

49. LONG: *yarixo* (JM 194) ♦ *yarixo* (RW 574)

MEA: *ʔarrīk* ‘long’ (SL 99); *ʔārīk* ‘tall, long’ (DJBA 167); *arika* ‘long’ (MD 37).

51. MAN (male): *gavro* (JM 174) ♦ *gawro* (RW 171), *zlam* (RW 587)

MEA: *gabṛā* ‘man, person, husband’ (SL 202); *gabṛā* ‘man, husband’ (DJBA 258); *gabra* ‘man’ (MD 73).

52. MAN (person): *nošo* (JM 185) ♦ *insan* (RW 252), *nošo* (RW 369)

MEA: *nāšā* ‘man’, ‘(coll.) human beings’ (SL 65); *ʔināšā* ‘man’ (DJBA 120); *anaša*, *naša* ‘human being’ (MD 24).

Arab.: *ʔinsān* ‘Mensch’ (AWSG 48); *ʔnsān* ‘Mensch’ (VW I 19); *ʔnsān* ‘Mensch’ (Kinderib 10).

✱ In Turoyo, the Aramaic word was partly replaced by an Arabism (for the distribution on *ʔinsān* and *nošo* see Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 91-92).

53. MANY, A LOT OF: *say* ~ *sayo* (JM 189)²⁷ ♦ *ḡalabe* (RW 183)

say, *sayo* < MEA: *saggī* ‘much, many, greatly’ (SL 968); *saggī* ‘many, much’ (DJBA 787); *sagia* ‘large, much, many’ (MD 309).

ḡalabe < Arab. Cf. *ḡlb* ‘vorherrschen, dominieren’ (AWSG 922); *aḡlab/aḡlāb* ‘meistens, vor allem’ (VW II 85); *aḡlab* ‘das meiste, die meisten’ (Kinderib 102).

25. *Axo aselen šalena, axo aselen, mun omərnolox, mezro məqaro, pāle da=ilone məqaro* ‘So they came to us, so they came... how can I tell you... (They were as) numerous as dust, as leaves of the trees’ (JM 120: 88).

26. *Ṭurawo kule qayse-yo. Kule qayse-yo w-kule ʔarfe-yo* ‘All that mountain was (full of) firewood. It was (full of) firewood and foliage’ (JM 138: 14).

27. The two shapes of the adjective are used in free variation.

✧ In Ṭuroyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

54. MEAT: *besro* (JM 170) ♦ *başro* (RW 59)

MEA: *besrā* ‘flesh, meat’ (SL 167); *bisrā* ‘flesh, meat’ (DJBA 207); *bisra* ‘flesh, meat’ (MD 62).

56. MOUNTAIN: *ṭuro* (JM 193) ♦ *ṭuro* (RW 540)

MEA: *ṭūrā* ‘mountain’ (SL 521); *ṭūrā* ‘mountain’ (DJBA 498); *ṭura* ‘mountain, hill’ (MD 178).

57. MOUTH: *pemo* (JM 185) ♦ *femo* (RW 155)

MEA: *pūmā* ‘mouth’ (SL 1165); *pūmā* ‘mouth’ (DJBA 889); *puma* ‘mouth’ (MD 368).

58. NAIL: *neynuke* (pl.) (JM 184) ♦ M: *ṭarfo* (RW 534), Q: *ṭafro* (Tezel 2003: 103)

neynuke < Kurd. *neynûk* ‘fingernail, toenail’ (Chyet 412).

ṭarfo, *ṭafro* < MEA: *ṭep̄rā* ‘nail, claw, talon’ (SL 548); *ṭup̄rā* ‘fingernail, toenail’ (DJBA 498); *ṭupra* ‘claw, nail’ (MD 178).

✧ In Mlaḥsô, the Aramaic term was replaced by a Kurdism.

59. NAME: *išmo* (JM 179) ♦ *ašmo* (RW 254)

MEA: *šmā* ‘name’ (SL 1569); *šmā* ‘name’ (DJBA 1153); *šuma* ‘name, reputation’ (MD 454).

60. NECK: *qzolo* (JM 188) ♦ *qḏolo* (RW 408)

MEA: *qḏālā* ‘neck’ (SL 1317); *qḏālā* ‘neck’ (DJBA 984).

62. NIGHT: *lilyo* (JM 181) ♦ *lalyo* (RW 289)

MEA: *lelyā* ‘night’ (SL 691); *lelyā* ‘night’ (DJBA 626); *lilia* ‘night’ (MD 236).

63. NOSE: *nḥiro* (JM 184) ♦ *nḥiro* (RW 365)

MEA: *nḥīrā* ‘nasus’ TS 2340; *nḥīrā* ‘nostril’ (DJBA 741); *nhira* ‘nose’ (MD 291).

64. NOT: *lo* (JM 181f) ♦ *lo* (RW 297)

MEA: *lā* ‘no’ (SL 665); *lā* ‘no’ (DJBA 613); *la* ‘no, not’ (MD 227).

65. ONE: *ḥa* (JM 176) ♦ *ḥa* (RW 209)

MEA: *ḥad* ‘one’ (SL 413); *ḥad* ‘one’ (DJBA 430); *had* ‘one, single’ (MD 116).

66. RAIN: *meṭro* (Talay 2002: 711) ♦ *maṭro* (RW 323)

MEA: *meṭrā* ‘rain’ (SL 749); *miṭrā* ‘rain’ (DJBA 665); *miṭra* ‘rain’ (MD 266).

67. RED: *semoqo* (Talay 2002: 711) ♦ *semoqo* (RW 460)

MEA: *summāqā* ‘red’ (SL 981); *summāq* ‘red object, redness’ (DJBA 794); *s(u)maq(a)* ‘red, ruddy’ (MD 322).

68. ROAD: *yerḥo* (JM 195) ♦ *darbo* (RW 115)

yerḥo < MEA: *ṷurḥā* ‘road’ (SL 21); *ṷorḥā* ‘road, path’ (DJBA 94); *ṷuhra* ‘road, way’ (MD 343).

darbo < Arab.: *darb* ‘Pfad, Weg’ (AWSG 383); *darb* ‘Weg, Straße’ (VW I 152).

✧ In Ṭuroyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

71. SAND: *rām̄al* (Talay 2002: 711) ♦ *qum* (RW 423)

rām̄al < Arab.: *raml* ‘Sand’ (AWSG 500); *ram̄al* ‘Sandzauber’ (VW I 182).

qum < Kurd.: *qûm* ‘sand’ (Chyet 498). In Kurdish, the word is a Turkic borrowing, cf. Turk. *kûm* ‘sand’ (Redhouse 1880: 711).

72. TO SAY: *ʔmr* (JM 155) ♦ *ʔmr* (RG 687–701)

MEA: *ʔmr* ‘to say’ (SL 57); *ʔmr* ‘to say, tell’ (DJBA 140); *amr* ‘to say, speak’ (MD 23).

73. TO SEE: *ħzy* (JM 158) ♦ *ħzy* (RG 331)

MEA: *ħzy* ‘to see’ (SL 438); *ħzy* ‘to see, look at’ (DJBA 444); *ħza* ‘to see, look’ (MD 138).

75. TO SIT: *yṭv* (JM 165) ♦ *yṭw* (RG 677–680)

MEA: *yṭb* ‘to sit’ (SL 587); *yṭb* ‘to sit’ (DJBA 545); *yṭb* ‘to sit, stay’ (MD 193).

77. TO SLEEP: *dmx* (JM 156) ♦ *dmx* (RG 94)

MEA: *dmk* ‘to sleep’ (SL 310); *dmk* ‘to lie’ (DJBA 343).

78. SMALL, LITTLE: *zʕuro* (JM 195) ♦ *naʕimo* (RW 352)

zʕuro < MEA: *zʕōrā* ‘small’ (SL 390), *zʕērā* ‘small, young’ (DJBA 418).

naʕimo < Arab.: *naʕīm* ‘sanft; friedlich’ (AWSG 1292); *naʕīm* ‘klein (Sache), jung (Vieh) (VW II 210); *naʕīm* ‘klein, jung (von Alter)’ (Kinderib 143).

✧ In Ṭuroyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

79. SMOKE: *tenuno* (JM 191) ♦ *dexono* (RW 126)

tenuno < MEA: *tennānā* ‘smoke’ (SL 1656); *tnn?* ‘smoke’ (DJBA 1223); *tana* ‘vapour, smoke’ (MD 479).

dexono < Arab.: *duxxān* ‘Rauch’ (AWSG 381); *dəxxān* ‘Rauch’ (VW I 152); *dəxxān* ‘Rauch’ (Kinderib 49).

✧ In Ṭuroyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

80. TO STAND: *kly* (JM 158) ♦ *kly* (RG 347)

MEA: *kly* ‘to impede, prevent’ (SL 624); *kly* ‘to be finished’ (DJBA 582); *kla* ‘to keep enclosed, hold back’ (MD 216).

81. STAR: *kokvo* (JM 180), *kavəkbe* (pl.) (Talay 2002: 710) ♦ *kukwo* (RW 281)

MEA: *kawkbā* ‘star’ (SL 606); *koḳbā* ‘star’ (DJBA 558); *kukba* ‘star’ (MD 206).

82. STONE: *kifo* (JM 180) ♦ *kefo* (RW 272)

MEA: *kēpā* ‘stone’ (SL 594); *kēpā* ‘stone’ (DJBA 577).

83. SUN: *šemšo* (JM 190) ♦ *šəmšo* (RW 496)

MEA: *šemšā* ‘sun’ (SL 1576); *šimšā* ‘sun, sunlight’ (DJBA 1136); *šamša* ‘sun’ (MD 443).

86. THAT (m. sg.): *aw(o)* (JM 31) ♦ *hawo*

MEA: *haw* ‘that one’ (SL 333); *hāhū* ‘that one, a certain one’ (DJBA 368); *hahu* ‘this, that’ (MD 116).

87. THIS (m. sg.): *ano* (JM 31) ♦ *hano* (RG 13)

MEA: *hānnā* ‘this’ (SL 346).

88. TONGUE: *lešono* (JM 181) ♦ *lišono* (RW 297)

MEA: *leššānā* ‘tongue’ (SL 698); *liššānā* ‘tongue’ (DJBA 627); *lišana* ‘tongue’ (MD 237).

89. TOOTH: *ʕarše* (pl.) (JM 167) ♦ *ʕaršo* (RW 12)

MEA: *ʕaršā* ‘molar tooth’ (SL 1144).

✧ **ʕaršā*, the former term for MOLAR, becoming the main exponent of TOOTH is an exclusive innovation of Mlahsô and Turoyo as against the known NENA. In NENA, the exponents of TOOTH are cognates of another MEA term for MOLAR, *kakkā* (Mutzafi 2014: 113).

90. TREE: *hilono* (Talay 2002: 709), *ilone* (pl.) (JM 178) ♦ *dawmo* (RW 121)
hilono, *ilone* < MEA: *ʔilānā* ‘tree’ (SL 35); *ʔilānā* ‘tree’ (DJBA 116); *ʕlana* ‘tree’ (MD 351).

dawmo < Arab.: *dawme* ‘Baum’ (VW I 164); *dawme* ‘Baum’ (Kinderib 53).

✧ In Turoyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

91. TWO: *tre* (JM 192) ♦ *tre* (RW 528)

MEA: *trēn* ‘two’ (SL 1666); *trē(n)* ‘two’ (DJBA 1233); *trin* ‘two’ (MD 490).

92. WARM: *šahino* (JM 190) ♦ *šahino/šahunu* (RW 483)

šahino ← *šhn* ‘be(come) warm’ (JM 163) < MEA: *šhn* ‘to be inflamed’, Pa. ‘to warm, heat’ (SL 1544); *šhn* (DJBA 1128); *šhn* (MD 451).

šahino/šahunu ← *šhn* ‘become warm’ (RG 260 f.) < MEA (see above).

93. WATER: *may*, *mayo* (JM 182) ♦ *maye* (RW 325)

MEA: *mayyā* ‘water’ (SL 750); *mayyā* ‘water’ (DJBA 662); *mai* ‘water’ (MD 242).

94. WE: *elāna* (JM 28) ♦ *aḥna*

MEA: *ḥnan*, *ḥnhn* ‘we’ (SL 472, 60); *ānan* ‘we’ (DJBA 145); *anin*, *anfn* ‘we’ (MD 27).

✧ Diachronically, the exponent of WE in Mlahsô is the oblique form of the 1 pl. personal pronoun. This form goes back to the MEA preposition *l-* used with bound pronouns to express pronominal objects.

95. WHAT?: *mān* (JM 183), *mun* (JM 184) ♦ *mān* (RW 335)

MEA: *mān* ‘what?’ (SL 778); *mān* ‘what’ (DJBA 637).

96. WHITE: *ḥawro* (Talay 2002: 709) ♦ *ḥeworo* (RW 230)

MEA: *ḥewwārā* ‘white’ (SL 432); *ḥiwwār* ‘white’ (DJBA 450); *hiuara* ‘white’ (MD 142).

97. WHO?: *man* (JM 182), *ma* (Talay 2002: 710) ♦ *man* (RW 313)

MEA: *man* ‘who?’ (SL 778); *man* ‘who?’ (DJBA 636); *man* ‘who?’ (MD 246).

98. WOMAN: *eso* (JM 173) ♦ M: *aṭto* (RW 39), Q: *pire* (RW 382), *ḥurma* (RW 246)

eso, *aṭto* < MEA: *aṭṭā* ‘woman, wife’ (SL 66); *ittāṭā* (DJBA 128); *ʕnta* ‘woman, wife’ (MD 354).

ḥurma < Arab.: *ḥurma* ‘was unantastbar, geheiligt ist; Frau, Dame, Gattin’ (AWSG 249); *ḥərme* ‘femme (appartenant à un homme)’ in Mardin Arabic (Grigore 2007: 196).

pire < Kurd.: *pîr* ‘old woman; wife’ (Chyet 464).

✧ In Turoyo, *aṭto* is the main term for woman in the Midyat dialect, while villages use *pire* and *ḥurma*. The Mlahsô exponent of woman matches *aṭto*. Thus the Turoyo/Mlahsô group betrays an exclusively shared retention in comparison to NENA, since in all known NENA the basic word for woman is *baxta* (see Khan 2007: 11).

99. YELLOW: *šaḥuso* (Talay 2002: 711) ♦ *šaḥuṭo* (RW 481)

MEA: *šʕoṭā* ‘wax, color of wax, yellow’ (SL 1582); *šauta* ‘wax’ (MD 440).

100. YOU (thou): *hat* (m.) (JM 28) ♦ *hat* (RG 1)

MEA: *att* ‘you (sg.)’ (SL 66); *ant* ‘you (sg. m.)’ (DJBA 146); *anat* ‘thou’ (MD 24).

2.1.2. Analysis

The extant textual corpus of Mlaḥṣô allows us to fill seventy-eight positions in the one-hundred-word Swadesh list. Two words are of Kurdish extraction: No 46 LEAF (*pāle*) and No 58 NAIL (*neynuke*). Another two words are of Arabic origin, No 36 HAIR (*ṣahfe*) and No 71 SAND (*rāmāl*). The remaining seventy-four words are of Aramaic origin.

A comparison with the one-hundred-word Swadesh list for Ṭuroyo yields the following results: for fifty-nine words of the Mlaḥṣô list, Ṭuroyo has their etymological matches as its basic exponents of the same meanings. These are as follows: 1. ALL, 4. BELLY, 5. BIG, LARGE, 8. BLACK, 9. BLOOD, 10. BONE, 15. TO COME, 16. TO DIE, 17. DOG, 18. DRINK, 20. EAR, 21. EARTH, 22. EAT, 23. EGG, 24. EYE, 27. FIRE, 30. FOOT, 32. TO GIVE, 33. TO GO, 35. GREEN, 37. HAND, 39. HEAR, 42. I, 43. KILL, 44. KNEE, 45. KNOW, 49. LONG, 51. MAN (MALE), 54. MEAT, 56. MOUNTAIN, 57. MOUTH, 59. NAME, 60. NECK, 62. NIGHT, 63. NOSE, 64. NOT, 65. ONE, 66. RAIN, 67. RED, 71. SAND, 72. TO SAY, 73. TO SEE, 75. TO SIT, 77. TO SLEEP, 80. TO STAND, 81. STAR, 82. STONE, 83. SUN, 86. THAT, 87. THIS, 88. TONGUE, 89. TOOTH, 91. TWO, 93. WATER, 95. WHAT?, 96. WHITE, 98. WOMAN, 99. YELLOW, 100. YOU. In addition, No 6 BIRD (*ṭayro*) matches one of two basic exponents of BIRD in Ṭuroyo, *ṭayro*, the other one being *safruno*. Similarly, No 52 MAN (*nošo*) corresponds to one of two basic exponents of MAN (PERSON) in Ṭuroyo, the other one being *insan*. The exponent of No 13 CLOUD in Mlaḥṣô (*ṣaymo*) matches the exponent of this notion in Midyat (*ṣaymo*), as against *ṣaywo* in village dialects. Further, the Mlaḥṣô word for WOMAN corresponds to the main exponent of this meaning in the Midyat dialect of Ṭuroyo. Finally, the extant textual corpus does not allow one to establish the main exponent of No 46 LEAF in Mlaḥṣô. There are two candidates, *pāle* and *ṭarfe*, both of them attested only once. Of these, *ṭarfe* matches the exponent of LEAF in Ṭuroyo.

All the Swadesh list terms shared by Mlaḥṣô and Ṭuroyo are of MEA origin. Two of them, No 4 BELLY and No 89 TOOTH, betray exclusive semantic shifts against the NENA background. These shared semantic innovations support the morphological evidence in favour of Mlaḥṣô and Ṭuroyo forming a genealogical subgroup of their own. Further, two words, 30 FOOT and 98 WOMAN, are exclusive retentions of Mlaḥṣô and the Midyat dialect of Ṭuroyo.

In eight positions of the list, Mlaḥṣô has kept Aramaic exponents, while Ṭuroyo has filled them with Arabisms. The respective concepts are as follows: 11 BREAST, 29 TO FLY, 38 HEAD, 53 MANY, 68 ROAD, 78 SMALL, 79 SMOKE, and 90 TREE (note also the term *insan* as one of two exponents of No 52 MAN in Ṭuroyo). In two cases, Ṭuroyo keeps an Aramaic word where Mlaḥṣô has an Arabism: 50 NAIL and 71 HAIR (and note another common word for HAIR in Ṭuroyo, *sawko*, whose etymology is unclear).

Three Mlaḥṣô terms, 31 FULL, 34 GOOD, and 94 WE, betray semantic innovations as against the assumed common ancestor of Mlaḥṣô and Ṭuroyo.

2.2. Basic Lexicon outside the one-hundred-word Swadesh list

The meanings included into this list have to do with body parts, kinship terms, flora, fauna, and natural phenomena.

2.2.1. Meanings and their exponents

ANIMAL: *ḥaywane* (pl.) (JM) ♦ *ḥaywan* (RW 213)²⁸

Arab.: *ḥaywān* ‘Tier, Wesen, Lebewesen’ (AWSG 312), *ḥaywān*, *ḥīwān*, nomen unitatis *ḥaywāne* ‘Tier, Vieh, Last-, Reittier’ (VW I 132), *ḥaywān* ‘Tier’ (Kinderib 42).

ANT: *šišwonto* (f). (Talay 2002: 712) ♦ *šāšwono* (RW 498)

MEA: *šušmānā* ‘ant’ (SL 1538), *šumšmānā*, *šuššəmānā* ‘ant’ (DJBA 1121), *šušmana* ‘ant’ (MD 458).

28. The variant *ḥaywane* (RW I 214) is also attested.

BACK: **ḥašo* (JM 177, Talay 2002, 699: 42) ♦ *ḥašo* (RW 223)

MEA: *ḥaṣṣā* ‘hip, haunch’ (SL 482), *ḥaṣṣā* ‘loin, back’ (Margoliouth 154); *ḥarṣā* ‘loin’ (DJBA 484); *halṣa*, *ḥaṣa* ‘hip, back’ (MD 122).

✧ In Ṭuroyo, as well as in part of MEA, *ḥašo* is both ‘hip’²⁹ and ‘back’. The context of Talay 2002, 699: 42 makes it clear that *ḥašo* may say ‘back’ in Mlaḥsô;³⁰ whether *ḥašo* could also mean ‘hip’ is not clear.

BARLEY: *ṣfore* (JM 189) ♦ *ṣfore* (RW 448)

MEA: *ṣfārtā* ‘barley’, pl. *ṣfārē* (SL 1028), *ṣfārtā* ‘barley’, pl. *ṣfārē* (DJBA 1189), *saria* (pl. ‘barley’) (MD 315 s. v. *sara* 2).

TO BE AFRAID: *dhl* (JM 156) ♦ *zyṣ* ‘angst bekommen’ (RG 511)

dhl < MEA: *dhl* ‘to be afraid’ (SL 290); *dhl* ‘to be afraid’ (JBA 324); *dhl* ‘to be afraid’ (MD 104).

zyṣ < MEA: *zwṣ* ‘to tremble; to be afraid’³¹ (SL 324); *zwṣ* ‘to move, shake’ (DJBA 405); *zha*, *zua*, *zuh* ‘to tremble, shake with fright’ (MD 162).

✧ The basic exponent of BE AFRAID in Proto-Ṭ/M was **dhl*. In Ṭuroyo, **dhl* has been replaced by **zwṣ*. The same promotion of **zwṣ* onto the basic exponent OF BE AFRAID, with the accompanying loss of **dhl*, happened in NENA (Mutzafi 2014: 116f).

BEAR: *debo* (JM 172) ♦ *ḥarč* (RW 204)

debo < MEA: *debba* ‘bear’ (SL 268), *dubbā* ‘bear’ (DJBA 315).

ḥarč < Kurd.: *hirç* ‘bear’ (Chyet 278).

✧ The exponent of BEAR in Proto-Ṭ/M was **debba* or **dubbā* (in Mlaḥsô, both protoforms must have resulted in *debo*). In Ṭuroyo, it was replaced by a Kurdish term.

BITTER: *mariro* (JM 182) ♦ *mayiro* (RW 325)³²

MEA: *marrīrā* ‘bitter’ (SL 834); *mārīr* ‘bitter, cruel’ (DJBA 710); *mrira* ‘bitter, bad’ (MD 278).

TO BOIL, SEETHE: *rsh* (JM 162) ♦ *rth* (RG 88)

MEA: *rth* ‘to be boiling hot; to boil up’ (SL 1493); *rth* ‘to seethe, boil’ (DJBA 1096); *rht* ‘to seethe’ (MD 427).

BREAD: *laḥmun* (JM 181) ♦ *laḥmo* (RW 288)

MEA: *laḥmā* ‘bread’ (SL 685f), *laḥmā* ‘bread’ (DJBA 622f), *lahma* ‘bread, food’ (MD 227).

✧ The exponent of BREAD in Proto-Ṭ/M was **laḥmā*. The term *laḥmun* in Mlaḥsô must go back to **laḥmuno*, a diminutive of **laḥmā* derived via the suffix *-un-*, whose counterpart *-on-* (*-un-* in the West Syriac pronunciation) is well-known in Classical Syriac (SG §131). The promotion of diminutives onto neutral words is known in Ṭuroyo, see on BROTHER below.

BRIDE: *kalo* (JM 179) ♦ *kalo* (RW 261)

Cf.: MEA: *kaltā* ‘bride, daughter-in law’ (SL 628); *kaltā* ‘bride, daughter in law’ (DJBA 584); *kalta* ‘bride, daughter-in-law’ (MD 197).

✧ Unlike MEA, Mlaḥsô has different words for BRIDE (*kalo*) and DAUGHTER-IN-LAW (*kalso* < **kaltā*). The absence of the feminine marker **-t-* in *kalo* cannot be explained as the result of a

29. This is the etymologically primary meaning of the word, see SED I 107 f.

30. *A=zṣure maḥto ṣal ḥaṣen* ‘She puts the children on their (birds’) backs’

31. In Classical Syriac, this meaning is marginal and contextually conditioned.

32. The shape *mariro* (RW 318) is rare.

regular phonetic development. The t-less terms for BRIDE occur in NENA as well.³³ In Țuroyo, both BRIDE and DAUGHTER-IN-LAW are rendered by *kalo*, while **kaltā* is lost. An intermediate state of affairs exists in spoken C. Urmi, which has *calu* for BRIDE, and both *calu* and *calta* for DAUGHTER-IN-LAW (Khan 2016, III: 116).

BRIDEGROOM: *hesno* (JM 177) ♦ *ḥatno* (RW 224)

MEA: *ḥatnā* ‘bridegroom; son-in-law’ (SL 505); *ḥatnā* ‘bridegroom; son-in-law’ (DJBA 491ab); *hatna* ‘connexion by marriage, son-in-law’ (MD 128).

BROTHER: *aḥo* (JM 168) ♦ *aḥuno* (RW 30)

MEA: *ʔaḥā* ‘brother’ (SL 25); *ʔāḥā* ‘brother’ (DJBA 102); *aha* ‘brother’ (MD 8).

✧ The exponent of BROTHER in Proto-Ț/M was **ʔaḥā*. In Țuroyo, *ʔaḥā* was replaced by a diminutive form. In this language, a similar shift is displayed e. g. by *qaṭuno* ‘cat’ (RW 406), cf. Classical Syriac *qaṭṭonā* ‘small cat’ (SL 1349) vs. *qaṭṭā* ‘cat’ (SL 1347).

CHEEK: **poso* (JM 186) ♦ *foto*, *poṭō* (RW 162, 386)

MEA: *paṭā* ‘front side; side; edge of beard’ (SL 1152f).

✧ Țuroyo uses *foto* to say both CHEEK and FACE.³⁴ In the extant Mlaḥsô corpus, there is no exponent of FACE. The etymologically related Syriac word means neither ‘face’ nor ‘cheek.’ Thus, for **paṭā*, we reconstruct a semantic shift FRONT SIDE > FACE, CHEEK. This shift is well-known in NENA (Mutzafi 2014: 112f).

CHILD (progeny): *taflo* (sg.), *zṣure* (pl.) (JM 195) ♦ *naṣimo*, pl. *naṣime* (RW 352)

taflo < MEA: *teplā* ‘children’ (SL 547), *taḥlā* ‘child’ (DJBA 513), *ṭapalia* pl. ‘households, families’ (MD 175); cf. *ṭpl* ‘child’ (DJPA 229), *ṭpl* ‘children’ (SD 322).

zṣure < MEA: *zṣōrā* ‘small’ (SL 390), *zṣērā* ‘small, young’ (DJBA 418).

naṣimo < Arab.: *naṣīm* ‘klein (Sache), jung (Vieh)’ (VW II 210); *naṣīm* ‘klein, jung (von Alter)’ (Kinderib 143).

✧ In Mlaḥsô, *taflo* is the only attested exponent of CHILD-SG (in Țuroyo, **taḥlā* has not been preserved). In Mlaḥsô, *zṣuro* is an adjective ‘small, little’ (JM 195), while *zṣure* is also a pl. substantive ‘children’. Thus in Mlaḥsô, CHILD-PL is both *tafle* and *zṣure*, while *zṣure* is more frequent. In Țuroyo, the older exponent of SMALL, **zṣōrā*, was replaced by an Arabism *naṣimo* (see above on 78. SMALL, LITTLE). Yet *zṣure* (pl. m.) still exists in this language as CHILD-PL,³⁵ while *naṣime* is more frequent exponent of this sense.

Thus the shift from SMALL to CHILD-PL for **zṣōrā* is an exclusive shared innovation of Mlaḥsô and Țuroyo against the background of those modern EA languages whose basic lexicon is known to us.³⁶

CHILD (age group): *zṣure* (pl.) (JM 195) ♦ *naṣimo*, pl. *naṣime* (RW 352)

See above on CHILD (progeny).

✧ In the extant Mlaḥsô corpus, only plural forms are attested for CHILD (age group).

CITY: *mzito* (JM 184) ♦ *walaye* (RW 546)

mzito < MEA: *mdītā* ‘city, town’ (SL 713), *mdīntā* ‘city’ (DJBA 642), *mdinta* ‘city, large town’ (MD 258).

33. E. g., Hertevin *kala* (Jastrow 1998: 190), Barwar *kalo*, *kyalo*, *čalo* (Khan 2008: 1303). An archaic shape *kalta* is displayed by Qaraqosh (Khan 2002: 735).

34. This follows from the corpus and the evidence collected from our informants.

35. In Țuroyo, there are also words for ‘boy’ *zṣuro* and ‘girl’ *zṣurto* (RW 577).

36. On the exponents of CHILD in NENA, see Mutzafi 2014: 163f.

walaye < Arab.: *wilāʔa* ‘Verwaltungsbezirk’, ‘Provinz’ (AWSG 1438), *walāye* ‘Vilaet; Provinzhauptstadt’ (VW II 246), *wlāye* ‘Stadt, Provinzhauptstadt’, *lūlāye* ‘die Provinzhauptstadt (d.h. Mardin)’ (Kinderib 154).

✧ In Ṭuroyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

CLOTHES: *ḡlele* (JM 175) ♦ *ḡule* (RW 87f)

Kurd.: *cil* ‘clothing, clothes’ (Chyet 91).

COCK: *toḡo* (Talay 2002: 712) ♦ M: *zoḡo* (RW 587), Q: *diko* (RW 129)

toḡo < MEA: *tāḡā* ‘crown’ (SL 1623), *tāḡā* ‘crown’ (1193) *taga* ‘crown’ (MD 477).

zoḡo < MEA: *zāḡā* ‘chick (of a hen)’ (SL 364), *zāḡā* ‘cock, hen’ (DJBA 399), *zaga* ‘cock’ (MD 157).

diko < Arab.: *dīk* ‘Hahn’ (AWSG 422), *dīk* ‘Hahn’ (Kinderib 54).

✧ Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo (as well as NENA) have lost the MEA term for COCK (*tarnāḡlā*, SL 1669; *tarnuḡlā*, *turnōḡālā*, *trngwlʔ*, DJBA 1235). The Mlaḥsô term for COCK displays a semantic shift CROWN > COCK’S COMB > COCK (Mutzafi 2014: 193).

COW: *turto* (JM 192) ♦ *tārto* (RW 524)

MEA: *tāwrā* ‘bull, ox’ (SL 1633); *tawrā* (CSD 608); *tōrā*, *tawrā* ‘ox’ (DJBA 1199); *taura*, *turta* ‘bull, ox’ (MD 478, 483).

DAUGHTER: *brato* (JM 171) ♦ *barṭo* (RW 58)

brato < MEA: *brattā* ‘daughter’ (DJBA 248), *brata* ‘daughter’ (MD 70).

barṭo < MEA: *bartā* ‘daughter’ (SL 192).

✧ The words *brato* and *barṭo* do not go back to the same proto-form. Positing that Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥsô possess an exclusive common ancestor, one has to assume that either *barṭo* or *brato* is a borrowing. That *barṭo* could be a borrowing into Ṭuroyo from another Aramaic variety is unlikely, because in Modern Aramaic this shape of DAUGHTER occurs only in Ṭuroyo, while *brato* has parallels throughout ENA. Thus, it is the Mlaḥsô term for DAUGHTER, *brato*, which must have been borrowed from outside the Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥsô subgroup.

DAUGHTER-IN-LAW: *kalso* (JM 179) ♦ *kalo* (RW 261)

See above on BRIDE.

DAY: *yomo* (JM 195) ♦ *yawmo* (RW 575)

MEA: *yawmā* ‘day’ (SL 568); *yōmā* ‘day, sun’ (DJBA 529); *iuma*, *iauma* ‘day’ (MD 190).

DONKEY: *ḥmoro* (JM 178) ♦ *ḥmoro* (RW 241)

MEA: *ḥmārā* ‘donkey’ (SL 467); *ḥāmārā* ‘donkey’ (DJBA 471); *hamara*, *himara*, *hmara* ‘donkey’ (MD 122).

DUST: *mezro* (JM 183) ♦ *ṣafro* (RW 3)

mezro < MEA: *medrā* ‘soil, mud, dust’ (SL 717); *midrā* ‘clay’ (DJBA 643).

ṣafro < MEA: *ṣap̄rā* ‘dust’ (SL 1124); *ṣap̄rā* ‘earth, dust’ (DJBA 875); *apra* ‘dust, ashes’ (MD 32).

✧ The MEA counterparts of *mezro* and *ṣafro* were roughly synonymous. In Ṭuroyo, **medrā* was lost. We do not know whether **ṣap̄rā* was preserved in Mlaḥsô.

EAGLE: *nəsər* (Talay 2002: 711) ♦ *nəšro* (RW 367)

nəsər < Arab.: *nasr* ‘Adler’ (AWSG 1268), see also Talay 2002: 711.

nəšro < MEA: *nešrā* ‘eagle’ (SL 954); *nišrā* ‘eagle’ (DJBA 780); *nišra* ‘eagle, falcon’ (MD 300).

✧ In Mlaḥsô, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

EMPTY: *xalo* (JM 194) ♦ *xalyo* (JL 183)

xalo – cf. Arab. *ḥlw* ‘leer sein; frei sein’, *ḥalīy* ‘leer, frei’ (AWSG 362f) and MEA *ḥlīlā* ‘hollow; empty’ (SL 455); *ḥālīl* ‘hollow’ (DJBA 463); *hll* ‘to hollow out, pierce’ (MD 148).

xalyo ← *xly* ‘frei, leer werden’ (RG 349) < Arab. *ḥlw* ‘leer sein; frei sein’ (AWSG 362).

✧ The term *xalo* in Mlaḥsô looks like a loan from Arabic, yet it displays the C₂=C₃ base, which is attested for EMPTY in MEA. Thus, the exponent of EMPTY in Mlaḥsô must be the result of a contamination of Arabic and Aramaic bases.

TO ENTER: *ʕyl* (JM 155) ♦ *ʕbr* (RG 233f, 236)

ʕyl < MEA: *ʕll* ‘to enter’ (SL 1103); *ʕll*, *ʕll* ‘to enter’ (DJBA 864); *all*, *aul*, *ʕll*, *ʕul* ‘to enter’ (MD 20).

ʕbr < MEA: *ʕbr* ‘to pass, cross over’ (SL 1064); *ʕbr* ‘to pass, cross over’ (DJBA 840); *abr*, *ʕbr* ‘to get over, cross over’ (MD 4).

✧ The verb for TO ENTER in Proto-Ṭ/M was **ʕll*. Ṭuroyo replaced it by **ʕbr*, the MEA verb for TO PASS. The verb *ʕvr* (< **ʕbr*) is attested in the extant Mlaḥsô corpus, where it preserves its primary meaning (JM 94: 142, Talay 2002, 697: 5; 698: 32).

Mlaḥsô has a second term for TO ENTER, *nfl*, whose etymologically primary meaning is ‘to fall’ (JM 159; 82: 52). This meaning of *nfl* is a loan translation from Kurd. *k’etin* ‘to fall; to enter’ (Chyet 312).

EVENING: *də=ramšo* (JM 188) ♦ *ʕaʕriye* (RW 13)

də=ramšo < MEA: *ramšā* ‘evening’ (SL 1475); *ramšā* ‘evening’ (DJBA 1089); *ramša*, *ramšia* ‘evening’ (MD 421).

ʕaʕriye < Arab.: *ʕaʕər*, *ʕaʕer*, *ʕaʕrīye*, *ʕaʕīr* ‘Nachmittag’ (VW II 63); *ʕaʕər* ‘Nachmittag’ (Kinderib 94).

✧ In the Mlaḥsô corpus, *də=ramšo* means both ‘evening’ (JM 104: 2) and ‘in the evening’ (JM 84: 61). Diachronically, this term is a prepositional phrase ‘of the evening’. This phrase contains the older exponent of EVENING, **ramšā*. In Ṭuroyo, **ramšā* was replaced by an Arabism.

TO FALL: *nfl* (JM 159) ♦ *nfl* (JM 314–318)

MEA: *npl* ‘to fall’ (SL 931); *npl*, *npy* ‘to fall, enter, occur’ (DJBA 761); *npl* ‘to fall’ (MD 303).

FATHER: *ovo* (JM 185) ♦ *babo* (RW 45)

ovo < MEA: *ʔabā* ‘father’ (SL 1), *ʔabbā* ‘father’ (DJBA 72), *ab*, *aba* ‘father’ (MD 1).

babo – the immediate etymology is unknown. Similar basic words for FATHER exist, in particular, in Kurdish and Turkish (Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 83) and NENA (Mutzafi 2014: 58).

FATHER-IN-LAW: *ḥemyono* (JM 177) ♦ *ḥemyono* (RW 235)

Cf. MEA: *ḥemyānā* ‘father-in-law’ (SL 464).

FINGER: *ʕebʕo* (JM 190) ♦ *ʕawʕo* (RW 476)

MEA: *ʕebʕā* ‘finger, toe’ (SL 1272); *ʔaʕbʕā* ‘finger’ (DJBA 159); *ʕʕba* ‘finger’ (MD 355).

FLY (insect): *dedve* (pl.) (JM 172) ♦ *dədwono* (RW 128)

MEA: *dedbā* ‘fly’ (DJBA 328), *didbia* (pl.) ‘fly’ (MD 106f), cf. *dabbābā*, *debbābā* ‘fly’ (SL 268).

✧ The shape of FLY in Ṭuroyo betrays a derivational innovation as against Proto-Ṭ/M.

FOOD: *moklo* (JM 184) ♦ *muklo* (RW 348)

Arab.: *maʔkal* ‘Essen, Nahrung’ (AWSG 34).

FOX: *taflo* (JM 191) ♦ *taflo* (RW 506)

MEA: *taflā* ‘fox’ (SL 1657); *taṣālā* ‘fox’ (DJBA 1223); *tala* ‘fox’ (MD 478).

TO GET UP, STAND UP: *qym* (JM 162) ♦ *qym* (RG 560)

MEA: *qwm* ‘to rise, stand’ (SL 1330); *qwm*, *qw* ‘stand up, stand’ (DJBA 992); *qum* ‘to stand, rise’ (MD 407).

TO GO DOWN: *nḥt* (JM 160) ♦ *nḥt* (RG 640–641)

MEA: *nḥt* ‘to go down, descend’ (SL 909); *nḥt* ‘to descend, go down’ (DJBA 742); *nḥt* ‘to go down, descend’ (MD 292).

TO GO OUT: *nfq* (JM 159) ♦ *nfq* (RG 631)

MEA: *npq* ‘to go out’ (SL 933); *npq* ‘to go out’ (DJBA 763); *npq* ‘to go out’ (MD 304).

GOAT: *ṣezo* (JM 168) ♦ *ṣezo* (RW 17)

MEA: *ṣezza* ‘goat’ (SL 1089), *ṣizzā* ‘goat’ (DJBA 852), *ṣnza* ‘goat, nanny-goat’ (MD 353)

GOOSE: *wazze* (JM 193) ♦ *qaze* (RW 408)

wazze < Arab.: *ṣiwazz* ‘Gans, Gänse’ (AWSG 53);

qaze < Kurd.: *qaz* ‘goose’ (Chyet 474).

✧ In the Ṭuroyo corpus, there appears a few times *wazo* ‘goose’ (RW 552), which must be a retention from MEA (*wazzā*, SL 357; *ṣāwazzā*, DJBA 86; *auaza* MD 9). Both in Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo, **wazzā* as the main exponent of GOOSE was replaced by loanwords.

GUEST: *urḥo* (JM 193) ♦ *ḍayfo* (RW 141)

urḥo < MEA: *ṣārḥā* ‘guest’ (SL 48), *ṣarḥā* ‘traveller, guest’ (DJBA 166).

ḍayfo < Arab.: *ḍayf* ‘Gast’ (AWSG 759f); *ḍayf* ‘Gast’ (VW II 37).

✧ In Ṭuroyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

TO HANG: *tly* (JM 164) ♦ *ḥlq* II (RG 154, 164, 168)

tly < MEA: *tly* ‘to hang up, suspend’ (SL 1648); *tly* ‘to hang, suspend’ (DJBA 1208); *tla* ‘to lift, hang’ (MD 487).

ḥlq < Arab: *ḥlq* II ‘hängen, aufhängen’ (Wehr 866); *ḥlq* II ‘aufhängen’ (VW II 69–70); *ḥlq* II ‘aufhängen’ (Kinderib 96–97).

✧ In Ṭuroyo, **tly* as an exponent of HANG has been replaced by an Arabic term, while **tly* has acquired derived meanings ‘take away; to hide’ (RG 441, 443f).

HEN: *talḡunto* (JM 191) ♦ *gdayto* (RW 173)

talḡunto < MEA: *tarnāḡultā* ‘hen’ (SL 1669), *tarnāḡultā* ‘hen’ (DJBA 1235), *tarnaula* ‘hen’ (MD 482).

gdayto: cf. late MEA *ṣakḍāytā* ‘hen’ (SL 40 s.v. *ṣakḍāyā*).

✧ The exponent of HEN in Mlaḥsô is a retention which is exclusive against the Eastern Neo-Aramaic background. The exponent of HEN in Ṭuroyo, as well as in NENA, is related to the term *ṣakḍāyta* (with uncertain etymology) which spread in the upper Mesopotamia in the late Middle Aramaic period (Mutzafi 2014: 192f).

HORSE: *susyo* (JM 189) ♦ *susyo* (RW 470)

MEA: *susyā* ‘horse’ (SL 986); *susyā* (DJBA 794); *susia* ‘horse’ MD (322).

HOUSE: *beyto* (JM 170) ♦ *bayto* (RW 48)

MEA: *baytā* ‘house’ (SL 144), *bētā* (DJBA 208), *baita* ‘house’ (MD 47).

ILL: *kiryō* (JM 180) ♦ *kayiwō* (RW 270)

kiryō: cf. MEA: *kry* ‘to be short; to grieve, be sad; (impersonal) to suffer, grieve, be in distress’ (SL 650); *kry* ‘(impersonal) to grieve, worry’ (DJBA 601); *kra* ‘(impersonal) to grieve, pain, harass, be sad, distressed; to trouble, make turbid’ (MD 222).

kayīwo ← *kyw* ‘weh tun, schmerzen; krank werden, krank sein’ (RG 583f) < MEA: *kʔb* ‘to inflict pain, to suffer pain’ (SL 592).

✧ The exponent of ILL in Mlaḥsô is a *qitl*-derivation from **kry*, with a semantic shift.³⁷ We do not know if the verb *kry* existed in Mlaḥsô,³⁸ yet it still exists in Ṭuroyo, where it preserves the MEA repertoire of meanings.³⁹

The exponent of ILL in Ṭuroyo is derived from the verb *kyw* according to a productive rule (LuF § 171 a). There are no traces of **kʔb* in Mlaḥsô.

TO LAUGH: *ghk* (JM 157) ♦ *ghx*⁴⁰ (RG 86, 98)
MEA: *ghk* ‘to laugh’ (SL 227); *ghk* ‘to laugh’ (MD 81).

TO LEARN: *ylf* (Talay 2002: 712) ♦ *ylf* (RG 656, 658)
MEA: *ylp* ‘to learn’ (SL 575), *ylp* ‘to learn’ (DJBA 536), *ylp*, *ʔlp* ‘to learn’ (MD 192, 21).

LENTIL: *ʔloḥe* (JM 193) ♦ *ʔlawḥe* (RW 539)
MEA: *ʔlāpḥā* ‘lentil’ (SL 534); *ʔlāpḥā* ‘lentil’ (DJBA 506).

TO LIE (to tell something untrue): *dgl* II (JM 156) ♦ *dgl* II (RG 313)
MEA: *dgl* II ‘to lie, deceive’ (SL 273).

LIGHT: *nuhro* (JM 185) ♦ *bahro* (RW 46)
nuhro < MEA: *nuhrā* ‘light’ (SL 896); *nəhōrā* ‘light, eyesight’ (DJBA 732); *nhura* ‘light’ (MD 291);

bahro: see Arab.: *bahara* ‘strahlen, leuchten’, *bahr* ‘Blendung’ (AWSG 118).

✧ The exponent of LIGHT in Proto-Ṭ/M was **nuhrā*. In Ṭuroyo, the Arabism *bahro* became the main exponent of LIGHT, yet the term *nuhro* is also attested in the corpus with the same meaning.

LIP: *septo* (JM 189) ♦ *sapto* (RW 454)
MEA: *seṗtā* ‘lip’ (SL 1036); *ṣṗtā* ‘lip’ (DJBA 1188); *sipta* ‘lip’ (MD 329).

TO LOVE: *rḥm* (JM 162) ♦ *rḥm* (RG 68)
MEA: *rḥm* ‘to have pity upon; to love’ (SL 1455–1456); *rḥm* ‘to love, have compassion’ (DJBA 1068); *rḥm* ‘to love, pity’ (MD 426).

TO MAKE: *sym* (JM 162) ♦ *sym* (RG 500)
MEA: *sym* ‘to place, set up’ (SL 1002); *sum*, *sim* ‘to put, place’ (MD 321).

✧ The promotion of **sym* into the basic exponent of TO MAKE is the exclusive innovation of Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo against the background of NENA whose basic lexicon is known to us. NENA, like MEA varieties, keep **ʕbd* for this concept. In Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo, **ʕbd* has narrowed its meaning to TO WORK.

37. The connection with Classical Syriac *krīhā* ‘ill’ (see JM 180) is unlikely, because MEA intervocalic [h] remained unchanged in Mlaḥsô, cf. *noher* ‘es wird hell’ (JM 159) and Classical Syriac *nhr* ‘to shine’ (SL 894).

38. For ‘to fall ill’, Mlaḥsô informants used *kiryō nofel* (JM 76, IH 28; JM 106, Š 23), which is a calque of Kurdish compound verb *nexweş ketin* ‘to fall ill’.

39. ‘Kurz, kürzer werden’, and (impersonal) ‘leidtun, sich betrüben, ärgern’ (RG 430).

40. In the corpus, the variant *ghk* is also attested.

TO MARRY: *gvr* (JM 157) ♦ *gwr* (RG 451)

cf. MEA: *gabrā* ‘man; husband’ (SL 202); *gabrā*, *gubrā* ‘man, husband’ (DJBA 258); *gabra* ‘man’ (MD 73)

✧ The exponent of TO MARRY in Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo is a denominative verb derived from **gabrā*. In comparison with our MEA sources, this is an innovation shared by some of NENA (Mutzafi 2014: 145).

TO MELT (intransitive): *pšr* (JM 161) ♦ *fšr* (RG 234)

MEA: *pšr* ‘to digest, liquefy, melt’ (SL 1263); *pšr* ‘melt’ (DJBA 945); *pšr* ‘to melt, dissolve’ (MD 383).

MILK: *ḥalyo* (JM 177) ♦ *ḥalwo* (RW 217)

ḥalyo < MEA: *ḥalyā* ‘sweet’ (SL 455); cf. Ṭuroyo *ḥalyo* ‘süss’ (RW 217).

ḥalwo < MEA: *ḥalbā* ‘milk’ (SL 452), *ḥalbā* ‘milk’ (DJBA 461), *halba* ‘milk’ (MD 121).

✧ The exponent of MILK in Proto-Ṭ/M was **ḥalbā*. According to O. Jastrow (JM 177), the term for MILK in Mlaḥsô is due to a shortening of the original **ḥalwo ḥalyo* ‘sweet (i.e. fresh) milk’, as against soured milk.

MONTH: *yarḥo* (JM 194) ♦ *yarḥo* (RW 574)

MEA: *yarḥā* ‘month’ (SL 584); *yarḥā* ‘new moon; month’ (DJBA 542); *iahra*, *iuhra* ‘month’ (MD 185).

MORNING: *ṣafro* (JM 190) ♦ *ṣafro* (RW 473)

MEA: *ṣap̄rā* ‘morning’ (SL 1299); *ṣap̄rā* ‘morning’ (DJBA 971); *ṣipra* ‘dawn, early morning’ (MD 394).

MOTHER: *emo* (JM 173) ♦ *emo* (RW 145)

MEA: *ʔemmā* ‘mother’ (SL 52b); *ʔimmā* ‘mother’ (DJBA 116b); *ʕma* ‘mother’ (MD 352a).

MULE: *baḡlo* (JM 170) ♦ *baḡlo* (RW 46)

Arab.: *baḡl* ‘Maultier’ (AWSG 102); cf. MEA: *baḡlā* ‘mule’ (SL 117), in late texts only.

✧ The Arabic term for MULE was borrowed into Proto-Ṭ/M and (probably via Aramaic vernaculars) in written late Classical Syriac.

NEAR (adjective): *qarivo* (JM 187) ♦ *qariwo* (JL 176)

MEA: *qarrībā* ‘near’ (SL 1407); *qarrīb* ‘close, relative’ (DJBA 1042); *qarib* (MD 402).

OLD (MAN): *sobo* (JM 189) ♦ *sowo/sawwo* (RW 468, 457)

MEA: *sābā* ‘old man’ (SL 959); *sābā* ‘old person’ (DJBA 782); *saba* ‘old man’ (MD 308).

OLD (THING): **ṣatiqo* (JM 167) ♦ *ṣatiqo* (RW 14)

MEA: *ṣattīqā* (SL 1147), *ṣattīq* ‘old’ (DJBA 885), *atiqa*, *hatiqa* ‘old, ancient’ (MD 43, 138).

TO OPEN: *psh* (JM 160) ♦ *ftḥ* (RG 177)

MEA: *ptḥ* ‘to open’ (SL 1265); *ptḥ* ‘to open’ (DJBA 946); *pth*, *pht*, *pta* ‘to open, break open’ (MD 366, 383-384).

OX: *tawro* (JM 191) ♦ *tawro* (RW 518)

See in COW.

TO PAIN: *kyv* (JM 158) ♦ *kyw* (RG 582f)

MEA: *kʔb* ‘to inflict pain, to suffer pain’ (SL 592); *kʔb* ‘to be in pain or distress’ (DJBA 549); *kib*, *kab*, *kub* ‘to pain, hurt, ache’ (MD 211).

PARTRIDGE: *qaqwone* (pl.) (JM 186) ♦ *qaqwono* (RW 399)

MEA: *qaqbānā, qaqwānā* ‘partridge’ (SL 1399).

PLACE: *gusto* (JM 175) ♦ *dukto* (RW 137f)

MEA: *dūktā* ‘place’ (SL 281a); *dūk* ‘place’ (DJBA 317b); *dukta* ‘place’ (MD 104b).

✱ The shape of PLACE in Mlaḥsô is a result of the metathesis (JM 175).

PREGNANT: *ḥinto* (JM 192) ♦ *ḥanto* (e.g., 6: 59, 64; 26: 24, 29)

MEA: *ḥīnā* ‘carrying; pregnant’⁴¹ (SL 542).

✱ PREGNANT in Proto-Ṭ/M is **ḥīntā*. The basic exponents of PREGNANT in MEA corpora are *baṭnā, baṭntā* (SL 139), *bīnā, bāntā* (DJBA 198), *baṭna* (MD 47). For *ḥīn-*, the meaning ‘pregnant’ is marginally attested only in late Classical Syriac corpora. Therefore the use of **ḥīntā* for PREGNANT is a Ṭuroyo-Mlaḥsô innovation against the MEA background. A cognate term is attested in Barwar as a secondary exponent of PREGNANT (Khan 2008: 1425).

TO RETURN: *dḥr* (JM 156) ♦ *dḥr* (RG 59, 249)

MEA: cf. *ḥdr* ‘to surround, wander around’; *hḍr, ḥdr* ‘to return’ (DJBA 363); *hḍr* ‘to turn, return’ (MD 131).

✱ The root shape *dḥr*, attested also in NENA, must have emerged as a result of metathesis and voicing in **ḥdr* ‘to return’.⁴²

TO RUN: *rḥt* (JM 162) ♦ *rḥt* (RG 87, 99)

MEA: *rḥt* ‘to run’ (SL 1440); *rḥt* ‘to run’ (DJBA 1060); *rḥt* ‘to run’ (MD 426).

TO SEND: *šdr* II (JM 163) ♦ *šyḥ* II (RG 3), *šdr* II (RG 243)

šdr < MEA: *šdr* II ‘to send’ (SL 1514); *šdr* II ‘to send’ (DJBA 1112); *šdr* II ‘to send’ (MD 450)

šyḥ < Arab: *šyḥ* II ‘aussenden, schicken’ (Wehr 689); *šyḥ* ‘schicken, senden’ (VW II 18); *šyḥ* II ‘schicken’ (Kinderib 79)

✱ In the corpus, there is no meaningful distribution, while most informants use *šyḥ* for sending both people and things. Thus, *šyḥ* is gaining terrain in Ṭuroyo, while at older stages of the language *šdr* must have been the basic exponent of SEND.

SHEEP (an individual animal): **ḥerbo* (JM 168)⁴³ ♦ *ḥwono* (RW 25)

ḥerbo < MEA: *ḥerbā* ‘lamb, sheep’ (SL 1134); *ḥirbā* ‘lamb’ (DJBA 162).

ḥwono – cf. MEA: *ḥānā* ‘flock; sheep (coll.)’ (SL 1114); *ḥānā* ‘small cattle’ (DJBA 871); *ana* ‘sheep, herd, flock’ (MD 24).

✱ A cognate of *ḥerbo* exists in Ṭuroyo (*ḥarbo* / *ḥerbo* / *ḥarbo*), where it refers to a male sheep. The Mlaḥsô term *ḥerbo* ‘an individual sheep’ has the same meaning as the corresponding MEA word and must be a retention from Proto-Ṭ/M.

The shape of the Ṭuroyo term *ḥwono* does not stand in continuity with **ḥānā*. Shapes comparable to *ḥwono* exist in Nerwa (*ḥwanta* ‘ewe’, pl. *ḥwāne*, Sabar 2002: 93), Hertevin (*ḥwana* ‘Schaf’, Jastrow 1988: 182), Qaraqosh (*ḥuwana, wana* ‘female sheep’, Khan 2002: 532),⁴⁴ and Aradin (*wana* ‘ewe’, Krotkoff 1982: 153).⁴⁵ All of them say ‘individual sheep’, unlike the collective term **ḥānā*. Thus, Ṭuroyo and the above NENA dialects have a common feature: **ḥwānā* referring to single sheep. There are no traces of **ḥwānā* in Mlaḥsô.

41. For *ḥīn-*, the meaning ‘pregnant’ is marginally attested only in late Classical Syriac corpora, probably under the influence of vernacular Aramaic.

42. This explanation was suggested by Yulia Furman (personal communication).

43. In the corpus, only pl. *ḥerbe* is attested.

44. Pace Khan 2002: 183, the derivation of *ḥuwana* from **ḥerbā* is unlikely, since in Ṭuroyo *ḥwono* coexists with *ḥarbo*.

45. See also the data gathered in SED II 284, No 219.

SHORT: *keryo* (JM 179) ♦ *karyo* (RW 267)
MEA: *karyā* ‘short’ (SL 651).

SHOULDER: *kespo* (JM 179) ♦ *katfo* (RW 269)
MEA: *katpā* ‘shoulder’ (SL 663); *katpā* ‘shoulder’ (DJBA 610); *kadpa* ‘shoulder’ (MD 195).

Arab. *katāf* ‘Arm, Schulter’ (VW II 144; Kinderib 121).

✧ In the Turoyo corpus, the shape *katpo* (RW 269) corresponding to *kespo* in Mlahsô and *katpā* in CS and JBA is attested as well. The more frequent shape *katfo* may be an Arabism.

SISTER: *hosō* (JM 178) ♦ *hoto* (RW 242)
MEA: *hātā* ‘sister’ (SL 503); *hātā* ‘sister’ (DJBA 106); *ahata* ‘sister’ (MD 8).

must

SKY: *šmayo* (JM 190) ♦ *šmayo* (RW 499)
MEA: *šmayyā* ‘sky, heaven’ (SL 1572); *šmayyā* ‘sky, heaven’ (DJBA 1157); *šumia*, *šsumia* ‘heavens’ (MD 455).

SNAKE: *hevyo* (JM 178) ♦ *hayye* (RW 214), *kurfo* (RW 284)
hevyo < MEA: *hewyā* ‘snake, serpent’ (SL 424), *hiwyā* ‘snake’ (DJBA 450), *hiuia* ‘serpent, snake’ (MD 142).

hayye < Arab.: *hayya* ‘Schlange, Viper’ (AWSG 312); *hayye* ‘Schlange’ (VW I 132; Kinderib 42).

kurfo < MEA: *kurpā* ‘female serpent’ (SL 615); the extant textual sources for this word are from the 8th century on, its further etymology is unknown (Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 98).

✧ The exponent of SNAKE in Proto-T/M was **hewyā*. In Turoyo, it was replaced either by an Arabic (in Midyat and Kfarze) or by a peripheral Aramaic (in the rest of the villages) term.⁴⁶ The cognate of *hevyo* exists in Turoyo (*hawyo*), yet it is rare and its meaning has narrowed down (a male snake, see RW 226).

SNOW: *talgo* (JM 191) ♦ *talgo* (RW 510)
MEA: *talgā* ‘snow’ (SL 1647); *talgā* ‘snow’ (DJBA 1208); *talga* ‘snow’ (MD 478).

SON-IN-LAW: *hesno* (JM 177) ♦ *haṭno* (RW 224)
See above on BRIDEGROOM.

TO SOW: *zrʿ* (JM 166) ♦ *bzr* (JL 159)
zrʿ < MEA: *zrʿ* ‘to plant, sow’ (SL 399); *zrʿ* ‘to sow, contain semen’ (DJBA 421); *ZRA* ‘to sow, scatter’ (MD 170).

bzr < Arab.: *bazara* ‘sähen’ (AWSG 86); *bazar* ‘säen’ (VW I 97); *bazar* ‘säen’ (Kinderib 15). See also Tezel 2003: 204f.

✧ In Turoyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

SPRING: *rvišo* (JM 189) ♦ *rabəš* (RW 430)
rvišo < MEA: *rbīšā* ‘autumn rain’ (SL 1428). Cf. *rbyšh* ‘first rain’ (DJPA 514); *rbīšā* ‘rainfall (in the autumn)’ (Jastrow 1442).

rabəš < Arab.: *rabīš* ‘Frühling, Lenz’ (AWSG 447), *rabīš*, *rabīh*, *rʿbīh* ‘Frühling’ (VW 173), *rabīš* ‘Frühling’ (Kinderib 56).

46. On the dialectal distribution of these words, see Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 98.

✧ The exponents of SPRING in both Turoyo and Mlaḥsô are unique against the background of those NENA whose basic lexicon is known to us.⁴⁷ In Mlaḥsô, *rviſo* ‘spring’ must have evolved from a meaning ‘early rain’, probably under the influence of the Arabic *rabīf*.

STORK: *laglag* (JM 181) ♦ *laggo* (RW 287)

Kurd.: *legleg* ‘stork’ (Chyet 347).

TO TEACH: *yſf* III (Talay 2002: 712) ♦ *yſf* III (RG 660ff)

See TO LEARN on the MEA cognates of *yſf*.

✧ The causative stem derivation of *yſf* ‘to learn’ as the exponent of TO TEACH (also known in NENA) is an innovation against the MEA background. In MEA, the meaning TO TEACH is expressed by the D-stem of the cognate root *ʔlp* (SL 575, DJBA 136, MD 21), while the causative stem of *ylp* is not attested.

TO THROW: *dry* (JM 156) ♦ *hlq* II (RG 159, 168)

dry < MEA: *dry* ‘to scatter, disperse’ (SL 322); *dry* ‘to winnow, scatter’ (DJBA 351); *dra* II ‘to scatter, sprinkle’ (MD 113).

hlq II < Arab: *hlq* II ‘werfen’ (VW 123); *hlq* II ‘werfen’ (Kinderib 39).

✧ In Turoyo, **dry* as the exponent of THROW has been replaced by an Arabic term, while **dry* has acquired the meaning ‘to cast down’ (RG 335). The very use of **dry* for THROW is an innovation against the attested MEA languages where the main exponent of THROW is *rmy* (SL 1441, DJBA 1085, MD 435).

UNCLE (maternal): *holo* (JM 178) ♦ *holo* (RW 242)

MEA: *ḥālā* ‘uncle’ (SL 451).

UNCLE (paternal): *dozo* (JM 173) ♦ *šammo* (RW 9)

dozo < MEA: *dādā* ‘paternal uncle’ (SL 275).

šammo < Arab.: *šamm* ‘Vatersbruder, Onkel väterlicherseits, Oheim’ (AWSG 875); *šamm* ‘Onkel väterlicherseits’ (VW II 73).

✧ In Turoyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

VILLAGE: *qriſo* (JM 187) ♦ *qriſo* (RW 419)

MEA: *qriṭā* ‘village, town; field; property, possession’ (SL 1410a); *qirtā*, *qartā* ‘town, village, countryside’ (DJBA 1043).

✧ This word for VILLAGE is an exclusive retention of T/M. In NENA, for this meaning are used cognates of MEA *mātā* ‘region, homeland’ (SL 858), *mātā* ‘town, place’ (DJBA 718), *mata* ‘town, city, village’ (MD 256).⁴⁸

WATERMELON: *zabaše* (pl.) (JM 195) ♦ *žabaš* (RW 256)

Kurd.: *zebeş* ‘watermelon’ (Chyet 684), *şebeş* ‘Wassermelone’ (Omar 593) or Arab.: *ğabaš* (nomen unitatis *ğabašē*), *ğabše*, *žabaše* ‘Wassermelonen’ (VW I 83); *zabaš* ‘Wassermelonen’ (nomen unitatis *zabaše*) (Kinderib 62).

WHEAT: *heſo* (Talay 2002: 709, JM 178) ♦ *heſo* (RW 230)

MEA: *heṭṭā* ‘wheat’ (SL 444); *hiṭṭā* ‘wheat’ (DJBA 453); *hiṭta* ‘wheat’ (MD 140).

WINTER: *sesvo* (JM 189) ♦ *saṭwo* (RW 457)

47. For SPRING, NENA use either cognates of the MEA term for the month Nisan (Hertevin *bnisane*, Jastrow 1988: 195; Barwar *be-nisane*, Khan 2008: 1245; C. Urmi *bī-nisanə*, *nisanə*, Khan 2016, III: 105;) or Kurdisms (Qaraqosh *bahar*, Khan 2002: 227).

48. E. g., Qaraqosh *maṭa* (Khan 2002: 737), J. Zakho *masa* (Sabar 2002: 210), J. Betanure *maṭa* (Mutzaḥ 2008: 362), C. Urmi *mata* (Khan 2016, III: 214).

MEA: *satwā* ‘winter’ (SL 1051); *sītawā* ‘winter’ (DJBA 809); *situa* ‘winter’ (MD 330).

WOLF: *divo* (JM 172) ♦ *dewo* (RW 126)

MEA: *dēḥbā* ‘wolf’ (SL 268); *dēbā* ‘wolf’ (DJBA 326); *diba* ‘wolf’ (MD 106).

WORK: *šuglo* (JM 191) ♦ *šuglo* (RW 502)

Arab.: *šugl* ‘Beschäftigung, Arbeit’ (AWSG 661); *šəḡal*, *šəḡel* ‘Arbeit, Beschäftigung’ (VW 342); *šəḡal* ‘Arbeit’ (Kinderib 76).

TO WORK: *ʕbz* (JM 155) ♦ M: *ʕwd*, Q: *šḡl* (RW 448, 451, 453, 456f)

ʕbz, *ʕwd* < MEA: *ʕbd* ‘to work; to make, do’ (SL 1054); *ʕbd*, *ʔbd*, *ʔby* ‘to do, make’ (DJBA 836); *abd*, *ʕbd*, *awd*, *ʕwd* ‘to do, perform’ (MD 2).

šḡl < Arab: *šaḡala* ‘beschäftigen’ (AWSG 660); *šaḡal* ‘arbeiten’ (VW II 341); *šaḡḡal* (II) ‘betreiben’; *štaḡal* (VIII) ‘arbeiten’ (Kinderib 76).

✕ In Proto-Ṭ/M, **ʕbd* was replaced by **sym* as the main exponent of TO MAKE and narrowed its meaning to TO WORK. As for **ʕbd*, it was preserved in a derived meaning TO WORK in Mlaḥṣô and the Midyad dialect of Ṭuroyo. In village dialects of Ṭuroyo, **ʕbd* in the meaning TO WORK was replaced by the Arabism *šḡl*.

TO WRITE: *kṣv* (JM 158) ♦ *ktw*

MEA: *ktb* ‘to write’ (SL 660); *ktb*, *kty* ‘to write’ (DJBA 607); *kdb*, *ktb* ‘to write’ (MD 204).

YEAR: *šato* (JM 190) ♦ *šato* (RW 491)

MEA: *šattā* ‘year’ (SL 1581); *šattā* ‘year’ (DJBA 1183); *šita*, *šidta* MD (464, 460).

2.2.2 Analysis

In the extant Mlaḥṣô corpus, aside from the assumed exponents of the Swadesh list terms, we have chosen for analysis ninety-seven words that, as we believe, express various everyday meanings. Among these meanings, two are expressed by words of Kurdish origin: CLOTHES and STORK. Further, seven words are of Arabic extraction: ANIMAL, EAGLE, EMPTY, FOOD, GOOSE, MULE, and WORK. The exponent of WATERMELON may be of either Arabic or Kurdish origin. The remaining eighty-eight words are of Aramaic provenance.

A comparison with the basic exponents of the same meanings in Ṭuroyo gives the following results. Sixty-eight Mlaḥṣô words have exact etymological counterparts in Ṭuroyo. In addition, TO WORK, *ʕbd*, matches one of two basic exponents of TO WORK in Ṭuroyo, *ʕwd*, the other one being *šḡl*. Similarly, in Ṭuroyo there are two frequent words for TO SEND, *šyʕ* II and *šdr* II, the second one matching the exponent of TO SEND in Mlaḥṣô.

Among the sixty-eight etymologically identical terms of our second Ṭuroyo-Mlaḥṣô list, five words are of Arabic origin (ANIMAL, FOOD, MULE, QUICK, TO WORK) and two are Kurdisms (CLOTHES, STORK). The exponent of WATERMELON adheres to this group. The remaining sixty etymological matches are of Aramaic origin. In eleven instances, Mlaḥṣô keeps Aramaic words where Ṭuroyo has Arabisms. The meanings in question are as follows: CITY, CHILD (progeny), CHILD (age group), EVENING, GUEST, HANG, LIGHT, TO SOW, SPRING, TO THROW, UNCLE (paternal). SPRING is a special case, since the exponent of this concept in Mlaḥṣô displays a semantic shift, which could be caused by the Arabic influence. Further, the exponent of EVENING (*də=ramšo*) in Mlaḥṣô, while preserving Middle Aramaic word for EVENING, **ramšā*, is lexicalization of a prepositional phrase. Note also the concepts TO WORK and TO SEND, for which Ṭuroyo has Arabic exponents alongside Aramaic ones. SNAKE, which is expressed in Ṭuroyo both by an Arabism (*ḥayye*) and an Aramaic term of obscure origin (*kurfo* as opposite to **ḥewyā* in Mlaḥṣô and MEA) also belongs into this group.

For EAGLE, vice versa, Ṭuroyo keeps an Aramaic word where Mlaḥṣô has an Arabism. For BEAR, Mlaḥṣô preserves an Aramaic term (*debo*) where Ṭuroyo has a Kurdism (*ḥarč*). For FATHER, Ṭuroyo (as well as NENA) displays an innovative term of unknown origin, while Mlaḥṣô keeps the original Aramaic exponent.

In two cases, Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo display different loanwords for the same notion. For GOOSE, Mlaḥsô possesses an Arabism (*wazze*), while Ṭuroyo has a Kurdish term (*qaz*).

For five notions, both languages have cognate terms, which, nevertheless, do not go back directly to the same proto-forms. These are BROTHER, BREAD, DAUGHTER-IN-LAW, EMPTY, and FLY.

For nine concepts, Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo have different Aramaic exponents. These concepts are TO BE AFRAID, COCK (in the dialect of Midyat), DAUGHTER, DUST, TO ENTER, HEN, ILL, MILK, and SHEEP. For TO BE AFRAID, TO ENTER, HEN, and SHEEP Mlaḥsô keeps original terms, while the Ṭuroyo exponents display either new meanings of older words (*zyʕ* ‘to be afraid’ < **zyʕ* ‘to tremble’, *ʕbr* ‘to enter’ < **ʕbr* ‘to pass’) or new shapes that must have emerged in Late MEA period (*gdayto* ‘hen’, *ʕwono* ‘sheep, ewe’). On the contrary, for DAUGHTER and MILK, it is Ṭuroyo that keeps the terms going back to Proto-Ṭ/M. The exponents of DUST in both languages are inherited from MEA. The exponents of ILL are derivations from two different roots inherited from MEA. Finally, the exponents of COCK in Mlaḥsô and the Ṭuroyo dialect of Midyat are innovative against the MEA background and go back to MEA terms with other meanings. In three cases (HEN, TO ENTER, and SHEEP), an innovative term in Ṭuroyo has counterparts in NENA. For COCK, the city dialect of Ṭuroyo displays the same semantic shift as Neo-Mandaic.

The exponents of TO MAKE in both languages are results of an exclusively shared innovation against the NENA background. Further, the terms for CHILD-PL (both ‘progeny’ and ‘age group’) in Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo also display traces of an exclusively shared innovation. Both languages know **zʕōrā* for this concept, although Ṭuroyo uses an Arabism as the main exponent of CHILD.

CONCLUSIONS

Our analysis of the basic lexicon outside the Swadesh list yields the same results as that of the one-hundred word list. In both parts of the basic lexicon, we have found exclusively shared innovations (BELLY, TOOTH, TO MAKE, and see also CHILD) and exclusively shared retentions (FOOT, WOMAN, VILLAGE) of Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥsô as compared with all known languages of the NENA group. This lexical evidence corroborates the thesis that these languages form a genealogical subgroup of their own.

In both groups, Ṭuroyo has Arabisms for those meanings that Mlaḥsô renders with inherited Aramaic words (19 positions from the the two lists, i.e., 11%). This fact indicates that Ṭuroyo has experienced a deeper contact with Arabic than Mlaḥsô.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2108 Barsky, Eugene, Furman Yulia, Loesov Sergey. 2018. “Two-Hundred-Word Swadesh List for a Modern Aramaic variety (Ṭuroyo)”, *Aula Orientalis* 36/1 (2018), 75-110.
- Furman and Loesov 2016 Furman, Yulia, Loesov, Sergey. 2016. “Notes on Historical Morphology of Ṭuroyo”, In: *Babel und Bibel 9: Selected Papers Presented at the 6th Biennial Meeting of the International association for Comparative Semitics*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Goldenberg 1998 Goldenberg, Gideon. 1998. “Otto Jastrow, Der Neuaramäische Dialekt von Mlaḥsô: A Review Article”. *Journal of Semitic Studies* XLIII/1 Spring 1998, 63-70.
- Grigore 2007 Grigore, George. 2007. *L’arabe parlé à Mardin — monographie d’un parler arabe « périphérique »*. București: Editura Universității din București.
- Haspelmath 2008 Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. “Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability”. In: *Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes*, ed. Thomas Stolz, Dik Bakker,

- Rosa Salas Palomo. Berlin, New York, 2008, 43–62.*
- Jastrow 1977 Jastrow, Otto. 1977. “Zur Phonologie des Kurdischen in der Türkei”. In *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. 1977(3)*, 84-106.
- Jastrow 1985 Jastrow, Otto. 1985. “Mlaḥsô: An Unknown Neo-Aramaic Language of Turkey”. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 30/2 (1985), 265–270.
- Jastrow 1988 Jastrow, Otto. 1988. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Hertevin (Provinz Siirt)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Jastrow 1994 Jastrow, Otto. 1994. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Mlaḥsô*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Jastrow 1996 Jastrow, Otto. 1996. “Passive Formation in Turoyo and Mlaḥsô”. In: *Israel Oriental Studies XVI: Studies in Modern Semitic Languages*, Leiden: Brill, 49–57.
- Jastrow 2005a Jastrow, Otto. 2005a: “Der bestimmte Artikel im Aramäischen — ein Blick auf 3000 Jahre Sprachgeschichte”. In: *B. Burtea, J. Tropper und H. Younansardaroud (Hg.): Studia Semitica et Semitohamitica. Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages am 17. Januar 2004*, 137-150.
- Jastrow 2011 Jastrow, Otto. “Turoyo and Mlaḥsô”. In: *The Semitic Languages: An International Handbook*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, 697-707.
- Khan 2002 Khan, Geoffrey. 2002. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Qaraqosh*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Khan 2007 Khan, Geoffrey. 2007. “The North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic Dialects”. *Journal of Semitic Studies* LII/1 Spring 2007, 1-20.
- Khan 2007a Khan, Geoffrey. 2007a. “Ergativity in the North Eastern neo-aramaic dialects”. In: *Studies in Semitic and General Linguistics in Honor of Gideon Goldenberg, Münster: Ugarit Verlag*, 147-157.
- Khan 2008 Khan, Geoffrey. 2008. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Barwar*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Khan 2016 Khan, Geoffrey. 2016. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of the Assyrian Christians of Urmi*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Kim 2008 Kim, Ronald. 2008. “«Stammbaum» or Continuum? The Subgrouping of Modern Aramaic Dialects Reconsidered”. *Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 128, No. 3 (Jul. - Sep., 2008)*, 505-531.
- Kim 2010 Kim, Ronald. 2010. “Towards a Historical Phonology of Modern Aramaic: The Relative Chronology of Turoyo Sound Changes”. In: *Proceedings of the 13th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics. Padova: S.A.R.G.O.N. Editrice e Libreria*, 229-238.
- Krotkoff 1982 Krotkoff, Georg. 1982. *A Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Kurdistan*. New Haven, Connecticut.
- Mutzafi 2008 Mutzafi, Hezy. 2008. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Betanure (province of Dihq)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Mutzafi 2014 Mutzafi, Hezy. 2014. *Comparative Lexical Studies in Neo-Mandaic*. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Omar 2016 Omar, Feryad Fazil. 2016. *Kurdisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch (Nordkurdisch /Kurmançî)*. Berlin: Institut für Kurdische Studien
- Redhouse 1880 Redhouse, 1880. J. W. *Redhouse's Turkish Dictionary*. London: Wyman and Sons.
- Sabar 2002 Sabar, Yona. 2002. *A Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dictionary: Dialects of Amidya*,

- Dihok, Nerwa and Zakho, northwestern Iraq*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Talay 2002 Talay, Shabo. 2002. "Die Geschichte und die Sprüche des Aḥiqar im neuaramäischen Dialekt von Mlaḥsō". In: „*Sprich doch mit deinen Knechten aramäisch, wir verstehen es!*“ 60 Beiträge zur Semitistik Festschrift für Otto Jastrow zum 60. Geburtstag / Hrsg. von W. Arnold und H. Bobzin, Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag, 695-712.
- Thackston 2006 Thackston, Wheeler M. 2006. *Kurmanji Kurdish: A Reference Grammar with Selected Readings*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.

ABBREVIATIONS FOR REFERENCE TOOLS

- AWSG Wehr, Hans. 1985. *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart, Arabisch — Deutsch*, 5. Auflage. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Chyet Chyet, Michael L. 2003 *Kurdish-English Dictionary*". New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- CSD Payne Smith, Jane. 1957. *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- DJBA Sokoloff, Michael. 2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*. Jerusalem: The John Hopkins University Press.
- DJPA Sokoloff, Michael. 1992. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press.
- JL Jastrow, Otto. 2002. *Lehrbuch der Turoyo-Sprache*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- JM Jastrow, Otto. 2004. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Mlaḥsō*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- Kinderib Jastrow, Otto. 2005. *Glossar zu Kinderib (Anatolisches Arabisch)*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- LuF Jastrow, Otto. 1993. *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Midin im Tūr 'Abdīn*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz Verlag.
- MD Drower E. S. and Macuch R. 1962. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- RG Ritter, Hellmut. 1990. *Tūrōyo: Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Tūr 'Abdīn. C: Grammatik*". Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- RW Ritter, Hellmut. 1979. *Tūrōyo: Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Tūr 'Abdīn. B: Wörterbuch*. Beirut, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- SED I Kogan, Leonid and Militarev, Aleksandr. 2000. *Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Anatomy of man and animals*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- SED II Kogan, Leonid and Militarev, Aleksandr. 2005. *Semitic Etymological Dictionary: Animal names*". Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- SG Nöldeke, Theodor. 2001. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.

- SL Sokoloff, Michael. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Winona Lake & Piscataway 2009
- TS Payne Smith, Robert. 1879. *Thesaurus Syriacus*. Oxonii: e typographeo Clarendoniano.
- VW *Der Wortschatz des Anatolischen Arabisch*. Teil 1. vorgelegt von Sibylle Vocke aus Nürnberg. Teil 2. vorgelegt von Wolfram Waldner aus Kronach. 1981.
- Xəzne Beṭ-Şawoce, Jan. 2012. *Xəzne d xabre Ordlista Şurayt-Swedi [mēdyoyo]*. Stockholm: Beṭ-Froso & Beṭ-Prasa Nsibin.