

## The Basic Lexicon of Mlaḥsô: 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 Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo. These point to the existence of a proto-Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥsô, which was not an ancestor of any other modern Aramaic language known to us. A study of the basic lexicon of Mlaḥsô, in comparison with that of Ṭuroyo and NENA, supplies a lexical dimension to the proto-Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥsô hypothesis. A second goal of the paper is to trace down innovations and retentions of Mlaḥsô as compared with proto-Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥsô.]

**Keywords:** Modern Aramaic Dialectology, Mlaḥsô, Ṭuroyo, Basic Lexicon.

For Otto Jastrow

Mlaḥsô is an Eastern Neo-Aramaic language of Upper Mesopotamia (South Eastern Turkey), now extinct.<sup>1</sup> 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,<sup>2</sup> and a glossary. In 2002, Shabo Talay published one more text in Mlaḥsô, the story of Ahiqar (around 1900 words), narrated to him by Ibrahim Hanna, one of Jastrow’s informants and the last known speaker of Mlaḥsô (Talay 2002).<sup>3</sup>

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

---

\* We are grateful to Charles Häberl and Hezy Mutzafy 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 Mlaḥsô ... 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: Mlaḥsô, situated near the present-day town of Lice, north of Diyarbakir, and <sup>5</sup>Anša, 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 Mlaḥsô abounds in loanwords from Classical Syriac (e.g., *šar* ‘he began’ Talay 2002, 697: 18) and Ṭuroyo (*qaṭanto* ‘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 Mlaḥsô.

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

### 1. *Non-Lexical Isoglosses Relevant to the Subgrouping of Mlaḥsô*

Otto Jastrow suggests that Mlaḥsô is especially closely related to Ṭuroyo, a Neo-Aramaic language originally spoken in Tur-Abdin (South Eastern Turkey),<sup>5</sup> though he is reticent about the exact nature of this special proximity.<sup>6</sup> Mlaḥsô is important for the history of Aramaic, because Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥsô may form a genealogical subgroup of their own, i.e., there exists cumulative evidence to the effect that, in *Stammbaum* terms, Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥsô 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 Mlaḥsô, a language that was a “sister” or (more likely) an “aunt” of the NENA we know.

Salient morphological **innovations** linking Mlaḥsô 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 Mlaḥsô has a gender-neutral form *a-*, which may have resulted from a merger of gender-specific Ṭuroyo-like articles,<sup>7</sup> 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 Mlaḥsô, the Present Passive of the G-stem goes back to the Middle Aramaic Gt-stem participle (Jastrow 1996). Moreover, in both languages, the shape of the G-stem Present Passive of hollow roots points to a proto-form *\*mitR<sub>1</sub>āR<sub>3</sub>*, while Middle Eastern Aramaic knew both *\*mitR<sub>1</sub>āR<sub>3</sub>* and *\*mitR<sub>1</sub>īR<sub>3</sub>* patterns (Furman and Loesov 2016: 39f.).

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

Thus we assume that Ṭuroyo and Mlaḥsô had an exclusive common ancestor, i.e., a proto-Ṭuroyo/Mlaḥsô, 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.

#### 1.1. *Phonology*

1. In Mlaḥsô, 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.

resistant to other types of language change such as analogy.” This means, in particular, that, depending on an individual research agendum, 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 Mlaḥsô und Ṭuroyo historisch eng verwandt sind, sich im Laufe ihrer Entwicklung aber in vielen Punkten voneinander entfernt haben. Der Abstand zu den nächstverwandten ostaramäischen Dialekten ist jedoch wesentlich größer, so daß Mlaḥsô und Ṭuroyo in jeder Klassifizierung des Neuaramäischen 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.

2. Mlaḥsô keeps apart the reflexes of MA \*w (> w) and \*b (> v), which have merged in Turoyo, yielding /w/ (Jastrow 1994: 13).

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

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

Turoyo (Midān): *domax* – *dəmxī* – *domaxno* (all three forms bear penultimate stress)

Mlaḥsô *doméx* – *domxí* – *doméxno*.

Thus, in Turoyo, tense vowels<sup>8</sup> 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 Mlaḥsô, 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 Mlaḥsô vs. *ádno* in Turoyo ('ear'), cf. CS *ʔeḡnā*; *besró* in Mlaḥsô vs. *bášro* in Turoyo ('meat'), cf. CS *besrā* (Kim 2010: 234).

5. For the word stress position, the rule of thumb is as follows: Turoyo stresses the penultimate syllable of the word/base,<sup>9</sup> while Mlaḥsô usually stresses the last syllable.<sup>10</sup> Jastrow 1994: 14 believes that the ultimate stress of Mlaḥsô is a retention (evidently, from the Middle Aramaic period).<sup>11</sup> Yet Jastrow 1994: 26 cites a few high frequency demonstrative pronouns and adverbs with penult stress, *áno* 'this', *áneḱ* '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 Mlaḥsô is an innovation, developed under the influence of Kurmanji.<sup>12</sup> In Mardin varieties of Kurmanji, adjectives, as well as substantives without inflectional suffixes, are stressed on their final syllable.<sup>13</sup>

## 1.2. Morphology and Syntax

The differences in formal morphology and morphosyntax of the verb between Turoyo and Mlaḥsô are of such a nature that one cannot arrive at the Mlaḥsô picture starting from a Turoyo-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 Mlaḥsô, the active transitive *l*-Preterit gave up vestiges of object agreement, still existing in Turoyo and some of NENA,<sup>14</sup> which means that Mlaḥsô has overcome relics of the split ergativity stage more consistently than Turoyo and part of NENA.

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

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 Mlaḥsô: 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 Mlaḥsô 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.

Against the background of Ṭuroyo, a most salient feature of Mlaḥsô (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.<sup>15</sup> The Mlaḥsô 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 Mlaḥsô 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. Mlaḥsô 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’).<sup>16</sup> To overcome this unsatisfactory merger, Mlaḥsô 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.

In Mlaḥsô, the Imperative plural preserves the final *-n* (*ksavun* ‘write!’), lost in Ṭuroyo (*kṭawu* ‘write!’). The Imperative of IIy verbs in Mlaḥsô, unlike in Ṭuroyo, preserved feminine singular forms: *šti* (ms), *štay* (fs) ‘drink!’ They go back transparently to their respective Middle Aramaic forms, cf. Syriac *štī* and *štāy*.

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

Unlike in Ṭuroyo (Midən), the Imperative of the derived stems in Mlaḥsô does not have the prefix *m-*. Is this *m*-less Imperative of Mlaḥsô 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 ff. 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.

Mlaḥsô, 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.<sup>17</sup>

## 2. The Basic Lexicon of Mlaḥsô<sup>18</sup>

As a first step, we compiled the 100-word Swadesh list for Mlaḥsô, with etymological notes. As many positions of the list as possible were filled with the data of the extant Mlaḥsô text corpus.

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

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

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

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

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 Turoyo as another member of the same close genealogical group as Mlaḥsô.<sup>19</sup> We have provided the Turoyo words, wherever they are not immediate cognates of their semantic counterparts in Mlaḥsô, 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 Turoyo and Mlaḥsô, in other words, if they can be used to highlight exclusively shared innovations or exclusively shared retentions of the T/M subgroup.

The organization of our entries is as follows:

CONCEPT: exponent in Mlaḥsô (ref.) ♦ exponent in Turoyo (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 Mlaḥsô corpus only in bound forms. The < sign shows the etymology of a Mlaḥsô or Turoyo word, the ← sign indicates productive synchronic derivation within Mlaḥsô or Turoyo. 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 Mlaḥsô, unlike in Turoyo, 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 that is left for us of Mlaḥsô.<sup>20</sup> 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).

19. Part of these Turoyo 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 Turoyo in progress (on which see Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018) and did field research among our informants.

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).

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 Țuroyo 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).<sup>21</sup>

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: \**garṃo* (JM 174) ♦ *garṃo* (RW 170)

# MEA: *garṃā* ‘bone’ (SL 261); *garṃā* ‘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); *ṣadər* ‘Brust’ (Kinderib 80).

※ In Țuroyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

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

# *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: *ṭsy* (JM 155) ♦ *ṭty* (RG 741)

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

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

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: *šty* (JM 163) ♦ *šty* (RG 556)

# MEA: *šty* ‘to drink’ (SL 1614); *šty* ‘to drink’ (DJBA 1184); *šta* ‘to drink’ (MD 476).

19. DRY

Only the verb *ngv* ‘to be dry’ (JM 159) is attested. The word for DRY in Țuroyo 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) ♦ *ađno* (RW 27)

# MEA: *ʔeđnā* ‘ear’ (SL 10); *ʔuđnā* ‘ear’ (DJBA 85); *ʕudna* ‘ear’ (MD 342).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

# MEA: *ʕaynā* ‘eye’ (SL 1097); *ʕēnā* ‘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*, *pri* ‘to fly’ (MD 366, 377).

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

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

30. FOOT: *\*reġlo* (JM 188) ♦ *raġlo* (RW 431)

# MEA: *reġlā* ‘foot’ (SL 1434); *riġlā* ‘leg, foot’ (DJBA 1073); *ligra* ‘foot, leg’ (MD 235).

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

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

# *mlese* < MEA: *mlāytā*, ESyr *mlētā* ‘fullness’ (SL 771); *mlyyt?*, *mlyʔt?*, *mlʔyt?* ‘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 *arbʕi* ‘forty’: *arbʕi ʔaʕne da=baḡle mlesen dahve* ‘forty mule-loads full of gold’ (JM 92: 139).<sup>22</sup>

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 ʤuroyo (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: *ʔzl* (JM 156) ♦ *ʔzze/azze* (RG 752)

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

34. GOOD: *tarqo* (JM 191) ♦ M:<sup>23</sup> *kayiso/kayso* (*Xəzne* 124); Q:<sup>24</sup> *ʔawwo/ʔowo* (RW 536), *kayiso*

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

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

# *ʔawwo/ʔowo* < MEA: *ʔābā* ‘good’ (SL 507); *ʔāb* ‘good’ (DJBA 492); *ʔaba* ‘good’ (MD 172).

✱ The exponent of GOOD in Proto-ʤ/M was *\*ʔābā*. In a part of ʤuroyo 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.: *šafʕa* ‘Gipfel’ (AWSG 659); *šahfe* ‘Haupthaar, längeres Haupthaar’ (Kinderib 76);

# *šafro* < MEA: *šafṛā* ‘hair’ (SL 1028); *šafṛā* ‘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-ʤ/M was *\*šafṛā*. It has been preserved in a part of ʤuroyo dialects (Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 87), while in Mlaḥsô it was replaced by an Arabism.

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

23. Mədyoyo, the Midyat variety of ʤuroyo.

24. Quryoyo, village varieties of ʤuroyo.



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

# MEA: *ṣṣḏā* ‘hand’ (SL 31); *yḏā* ‘hand, possession’ (DJBA 523); *ṣḏa* ‘hand’ (MD 341).

38. HEAD: *rišo* (JM 188) ♦ *qarṣo* (RW 399)

# *rišo* < MEA: *rēšā* ‘head’ (SL 1462); *rēšā* ‘head, top part’ (DJBA 1078); *riša* ‘head, top’ (MD 434).

# *qarṣo*: see MEA: *qarṣā* ‘gourd’ (SL1414); Arab. *qarṣ* ‘Kürbis’ and *qarṣa* ‘Kürbis; Schädel, Kopf’ (AWSG 1018) (see Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 88).

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

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

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

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

# MEA: *ṣenā* ‘I’ (SL 58); *ṣānā* ‘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); *gtl* ‘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: *yṣṣ* (JM 165) ♦ *ṣḏṣ* (RG 721–727)

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

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

# *pāle* < Kurd. *p’el* ‘leaf’ (Chyet 437).

# *ṭarfe*, *ṭarfo* < MEA: *ṭarpā* ‘leaf’ (SL 555); *ṣāṭarpā* ‘leaf’ (DJBA 108); *aṭirpa* ‘leaf’ (MD 13).

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

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

# MEA: *ṣarrīk* ‘long’ (SL 99); *ṣārīk* ‘tall, long’ (DJBA 167); *arika* ‘long’ (MD 37).

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

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

25. *Axo aselen ṣalena, axo aselen, mun omārnolox, mezro māqaro, pāle da=ilone māqaro* ‘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 ṭarfe-yo* ‘All that mountain was (full of) firewood. It was (full of) firewood and foliage’ (JM 138: 14).

52. MAN (person): *nošo* (JM 185) ♦ *insan* (RW 252), *nošo* (RW 369)  
 # MEA: *nāšā* ‘man’, ‘(coll.) human beings’ (SL 65); *ṣināšā* ‘man’ (DJBA 120); *anaša*, *naša* ‘human being’ (MD 24).  
 # Arab.: *ṣinsān* ‘Mensch’ (AWSG 48); *ansān* ‘Mensch’ (VW I 19); *ansān* ‘Mensch’ (Kinderib 10).  
 ✕ In Turoyo, the Aramaic term was partly replaced by an Arabism (for the distribution of *ṣinsān* and *nošo* see Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018: 91-92).
53. MANY, A LOT OF: *say* ~ *sayo* (JM 189)<sup>27</sup> ♦ *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/aḡlab* ‘meistens, vor allem’ (VW II 85); *aḡlab* ‘das meiste, die meisten’ (Kinderib 102).  
 ✕ In Turoyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.
54. MEAT: *besro* (JM 170) ♦ *bašro* (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: *ṭēprā* ‘nail, claw, talon’ (SL 548); *ṭuprā* ‘fingernail, toenail’ (DJBA 498); *ṭupra* ‘claw, nail’ (MD 178).  
 ✕ In Mlaḥsô, the Aramaic term was replaced by a Kurdism.
59. NAME: *išmo* (JM 179) ♦ *əšmo* (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* ‘nusus’ TS 2340; *nḥīrā* ‘nostril’ (DJBA 741); *nhira* ‘nose’ (MD 291).

---

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

64. NOT: *lo* (JM 181f) ♦ *lo* (RW 297)  
# MEA: *lā* ‘no’ (SL 665); *lā* ‘no’ (DJBA 613); *la* ‘no, not’ (MD 227).
65. ONE: *ha* (JM 176) ♦ *ha* (RW 209)  
# MEA: *ḥaḍ* ‘one’ (SL 413); *ḥaḍ* ‘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: *ṣurḥā* ‘road’ (SL 21); *ṣorḥā* ‘road, path’ (DJBA 94); *ṣuhra* ‘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: *rāmāl* (Talay 2002: 711) ♦ *qum* (RW 423)  
# *rāmāl* < Arab.: *raml* ‘Sand’ (AWSG 500); *ramāl* ‘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: *ṣmr* (JM 155) ♦ *ṣmr* (RG 687–701)  
# MEA: *ṣmr* ‘to say’ (SL 57); *ṣmr* ‘to say, tell’ (DJBA 140); *amr* ‘to say, speak’ (MD 23).
73. TO SEE: *ḥzy* (JM 158) ♦ *ḥzy* (RG 331)  
# MEA: *ḥzy* ‘to see’ (SL 438); *ḥzy* ‘to see, look at’ (DJBA 444); *hza* ‘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: *ṣṣuro* (JM 195) ♦ *naṣīmo* (RW 352)  
# *ṣṣuro* < MEA: *ṣṣōrā* ‘small’ (SL 390), *ṣṣērā* ‘small, young’ (DJBA 418).  
# *naṣīmo* < Arab.: *naṣīm* ‘sanft; friedlich’ (AWSG 1292); *naṣīm* ‘klein (Sache), jung (Vieh)’ (VW II 210); *naṣīm* ‘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); *dāxxān* ‘Rauch’ (VW I 152); *dāxxān* ‘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: *šarše* (pl.) (JM 167) ♦ *šaršo* (RW 12)  
# MEA: *šaršā* ‘molar tooth’ (SL 1144).  
✂ \**šaršā*, the former term for MOLAR, becoming the main exponent of TOOTH is an exclusive innovation of Mlaḥsô and Țuroyo 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: *ṯilānā* ‘tree’ (SL 35); *ṯilānā* ‘tree’ (DJBA 116); *ṯlana* ‘tree’ (MD 351).  
# *dawmo* < Arab.: *dawme* ‘Baum’ (VW I 164); *dawme* ‘Baum’ (Kinderib 53).  
✂ In Țuroyo, 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: *šaḥino* (JM 190) ♦ *šaḥino/šaḥuno* (RW 483)  
# *šaḥino* ← *šḥn* ‘be(come) warm’ (JM 163) < MEA: *šḥn* ‘to be inflamed’, Pa. ‘to warm, heat’ (SL 1544); *šḥn* (DJBA 1128); *šḥn* (MD 451).  
# *šaḥino/šaḥuno* ← *šḥn* ‘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: *eləna* (JM 28) ♦ *aḥna*  
# MEA: *ḥnan*, *ṯnḥnn* ‘we’ (SL 472, 60); *ānan* ‘we’ (DJBA 145); *anin*, *anḥn* ‘we’ (MD 27).

✂ Diachronically, the exponent of WE in Mlaḥsô 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? : *mən* (JM 183), *mun* (JM 184) ♦ *mən* (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: *atto* (RW 39), Q: *pire* (RW 382), *ḥurma* (RW 246)

# *eso*, *atto* < MEA: *attā* ‘woman, wife’ (SL 66); *ittāṭā* (DJBA 128); *ḥnta* ‘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, *atto* is the main term for woman in the Midyat dialect, while villages use *pire* and *ḥurma*. The Mlaḥsô exponent of woman matches *atto*. Thus the Turoyo/Mlaḥsô 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) ♦ *šaḥuto* (RW 481)

# MEA: *šḥoṭā* ‘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 Mlaḥsô 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 (*šahfe*) and No 71 SAND (*rāmāl*). The remaining seventy-four words are of Aramaic origin.

A comparison with the one-hundred-word Swadesh list for Turoyo yields the following results: for fifty-nine words of the Mlaḥsô list, Turoyo has their etymological matches as its basic exponents of the same meanings. These are as follows: 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 Turoyo, *ṭayro*, the other one being *safruno*. Similarly, No 52 MAN (*nošo*) corresponds to one of two basic exponents of MAN (PERSON) in Turoyo, the other one being *insan*.

The exponent of No 13 CLOUD in Mlaḥsô (*ṣaymo*) matches the exponent of this notion in Midyat (*ṣaymo*), as against *ṣaywo* in village dialects. Further, the Mlaḥsô word for WOMAN corresponds to the main exponent of this meaning in the Midyat dialect of Țuroyo. Finally, the extant textual corpus does not allow one to establish the main exponent of No 46 LEAF in Mlaḥsô. There are two candidates, *păle* and *tarfe*, both of them attested only once. Of these, *tarfe* matches the exponent of LEAF in Țuroyo.

All the Swadesh list terms shared by Mlaḥsô and Țuroyo 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 Mlaḥsô and Țuroyo forming a genealogical subgroup of their own. Further, two words, 30 FOOT and 98 WOMAN, are exclusive retentions of Mlaḥsô and the Midyat dialect of Țuroyo.

In eight positions of the list, Mlaḥsô has kept Aramaic exponents, while Țuroyo 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 Țuroyo). In two cases, Țuroyo keeps an Aramaic word where Mlaḥsô has an Arabism: 50 NAIL and 71 HAIR (and note another common word for HAIR in Țuroyo, *sawko*, whose etymology is unclear).

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

## 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: *ḥayvane* (pl.) (JM) ♦ *ḥaywan* (RW 213)<sup>28</sup>

# 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) ♦ *šəšwono* (RW 498)

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

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

# MEA: *ḥaššā* ‘hip, haunch’ (SL 482), *ḥaššā* ‘loin, back’ (Margoliouth 154); *ḥaršā* ‘loin’ (DJBA 484); *halša*, *haša* ‘hip, back’ (MD 122).

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

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

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

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

BARLEY: *şfore* (JM 189) ♦ *sfore* (RW 448)

# MEA: *sṣārītā* ‘barley’, pl. *sṣārē* (SL 1028), *ṣṣārtā* ‘barley’, pl. *ṣṣārē* (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’<sup>31</sup> (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) ♦ *hərč* (RW 204)

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

# *hərč* < 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)<sup>32</sup>

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

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

# MEA: *rṭh* ‘to be boiling hot; to boil up’ (SL 1493); *rṭh* ‘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: *kalṭā* ‘bride, daughter-in law’ (SL 628); *kalṭā* ‘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* < *\*kalṭā*). The absence of the feminine marker *\*-t-* in *kalo* cannot be explained as the result of a regular phonetic development. The *t*-less terms for BRIDE occur in NENA as well.<sup>33</sup> In Ṭuroyo, both BRIDE and DAUGHTER-IN-LAW are rendered by *kalo*, while *\*kalṭā* is lost. An intermediate state of

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

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

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

affairs exists in spoken C. Urmi, which has *calu* for BRIDE, and both *calu* and *caltā* for DAUGHTER-IN-LAW (Khan 2016, III: 116).

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

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

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

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

✂ The exponent of BROTHER in Proto-Ṭ/M was *\*ḥaḥā*. In Ṭuroyo, *ḥaḥā* 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*, *poṭo* (RW 162, 386)

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

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

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

# *ṭaflo* < MEA: *ṭepālā* ‘children’ (SL 547), *ṭapālā* ‘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, *ṭaflo* is the only attested exponent of CHILD-SG (in Ṭuroyo, *\*ṭapālā* 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 *ṭafle* and *zṣure*, while *zṣure* is more frequent. In Ṭuroyo, 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,<sup>35</sup> 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 Ṭuroyo against the background of those modern EA languages whose basic lexicon is known to us.<sup>36</sup>

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: *mḏittā* ‘city, town’ (SL 713), *mḏintā* ‘city’ (DJBA 642), *mdinta* ‘city, large town’ (MD 258).

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

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

COW: *turto* (JM 192) ♦ *tərto* (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: *barṭā* ‘daughter’ (SL 192).

✂ The words *brato* and *barṭo* do not go back to the same proto-form. Positing that Țuroyo 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 Țuroyo from another Aramaic variety is unlikely, because in Modern Aramaic this shape of DAUGHTER occurs only in Țuroyo, while *brato* has parallels throughout ENA. Thus, it is the Mlaḥsô term for DAUGHTER, *brato*, which must have been borrowed from outside the Țuroyo/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: *ṣāṣrā* ‘dust’ (SL 1124); *ṣāṣrā* ‘earth, dust’ (DJBA 875); *apra* ‘dust, ashes’ (MD 32).

✂ The MEA counterparts of *mezro* and *ʕafro* were roughly synonymous. In ʤuroyo, \**medrā* was lost. We do not know whether \**ʕap̄rā* 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 C<sub>2</sub>=C<sub>3</sub> 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*, *ʔll* ‘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-ʤ/M was \**ʕll*. ʤuroyo 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) ♦ *ʕašriye* (RW 13)

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

# *ʕašriye* < Arab.: *ʕašər*, *ʕašer*, *ʕašrīye*, *ʕašīr* ‘Nachmittag’ (VW II 63); *ʕašər* ‘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 ʤuroyo, \**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) ♦ *ḥamyono* (RW 235)

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

FINGER: *ṣebfo* (JM 190) ♦ *ṣawfo* (RW 476)

# MEA: *ṣebfā* ‘finger, toe’ (SL 1272); *ṣaṣbfā* ‘finger’ (DJBA 159); *ṣṣba* ‘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 Turoyo betrays a derivational innovation as against Proto-T/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 Turoyo corpus, there appears a few times *wazo* ‘goose’ (RW 552), which must be a retention from MEA (*wazzā*, SL 357; *ṣawazzā*, DJBA 86; *auaza* MD 9). Both in Mlaḥsô and Turoyo, \**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 Turoyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

TO HANG: *tly* (JM 164) ♦ *ʕlq* 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).

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

✕ In Turoyo, *\*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: *talğunto* (JM 191) ♦ *gdayto* (RW 173)

# *talğunto* < MEA: *tarnāğultā* ‘hen’ (SL 1669), *tarnāğultā* ‘hen’ (DJBA 1235), *tarnaula* ‘hen’ (MD 482).

# *gdayto*: cf. late MEA *ʔakdāytā* ‘hen’ (SL 40 s.v. *ʔakdāyā*).

✕ The exponent of HEN in Mlaḥsô is a retention which is exclusive against the Eastern Neo-Aramaic background. The exponent of HEN in Turoyo, as well as in NENA, is related to the term *ʔakdāyta* (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) ♦ *kayiwo* (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).

# *kayiwo* ← *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.<sup>37</sup> We do not know if the verb *kry* existed in Mlaḥsô,<sup>38</sup> yet it still exists in Turoyo, where it preserves the MEA repertoire of meanings.<sup>39</sup>

The exponent of ILL in Turoyo 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*<sup>40</sup> (RG 86, 98)

# MEA: *ghk* ‘to laugh’ (SL 227); *ghk* ‘to laugh’ (MD 81).

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 LEARN: *ylf* (Talay 2002: 712) ♦ *ylf* (RG 656, 658)

MEA: *ylp* ‘to learn’ (SL 575), *ylp* ‘to learn’ (DJBA 536), *ylp*, *Ɂlp* ‘to learn’ (MD 192, 21).

LENTIL: *ɥloḥe* (JM 193) ♦ *ɥlawḥe* (RW 539)

# MEA: *ɥlapḥā* ‘lentil’ (SL 534); *ɥlāpḥā* ‘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: *sepsō* (JM 189) ♦ *sapto* (RW 454)

# MEA: *sepṭā* ‘lip’ (SL 1036); *ṣipṭā* ‘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); *rhm* ‘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.

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

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

✕ The exponent of TO MARRY in Mlaḥsô and Ṭuroyo is a denominative verb derived from \**gaḥrā*. 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 \**ḥalḥā*. According to O. Jastrow (JM 177), the term for MILK in Mlaḥsô is due to a shortening of the original \**ḥalvo 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, iihra* ‘month’ (MD 185).

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

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

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

# MEA: *ṣemmā* ‘mother’ (SL 52b); *ṣimmā* ‘mother’ (DJBA 116b); *ṣma* ‘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: *qarriḥā* ‘near’ (SL 1407); *qarriḥ* ‘close, relative’ (DJBA 1042); *qarib* (MD 402).

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

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

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

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

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

# MEA: *pth* ‘to open’ (SL 1265); *pth* ‘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: *kḏb* ‘to inflict pain, to suffer pain’ (SL 592); *kḏb* ‘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); *dūḡ* ‘place’ (DJBA 317b); *dukta* ‘place’ (MD 104b).

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

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

# MEA: *ṭṣīnā* ‘carrying; pregnant’<sup>41</sup> (SL 542).

✕ PREGNANT in Proto-T/M is \**ṭṣīntā*. The basic exponents of PREGNANT in MEA corpora are *baṭnā*, *baṭntā* (SL 139), *bṭīnā*, *bāṭntā* (DJBA 198), *baṭna* (MD 47). For *ṭṣīn-*, the meaning ‘pregnant’ is marginally attested only in late Classical Syriac corpora. Therefore the use of \**ṭṣīntā* 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: *dṣr* (JM 156) ♦ *dṣr* (RG 59, 249)

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

✕ The root shape *dṣr*, attested also in NENA, must have emerged as a result of metathesis and voicing in \**ḥdr* ‘to return’.<sup>42</sup>

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

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

TO SEND: *ṣdr* II (JM 163) ♦ *ṣyṣ* II (RG 3), *ṣdr* II (RG 243)

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

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

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

SHEEP (an individual animal): \**ṣerbo* (JM 168)<sup>43</sup> ♦ *ṣwono* (RW 25)

# *ṣerbo* < MEA: *ṣerbā* ‘lamb, sheep’ (SL 1134); *ṣirbā* ‘lamb’ (DJBA 162).

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

✕ A cognate of *ṣerbo* exists in Ṭuroyo (*ṣarbo* / *ṣerbo* / *ṣərbo*), where it refers to a male sheep. The Mlaḥsô term *ṣerbo* ‘an individual sheep’ has the same meaning as the corresponding MEA word and must be a retention from Proto-T/M.

The shape of the Ṭuroyo term *ṣwono* does not stand in continuity with \**ṣānā*. Shapes comparable to *ṣwono* exist in Nerwa (*ṣṭwanta* ‘ewe’, pl. *ṣṭwāne*, Sabar 2002: 93), Hertevin (*ṣwana* ‘Schaf’, Jastrow 1988: 182), Qaraqosh (*ṣuwana*, *wana* ‘female sheep’, Khan 2002: 532),<sup>44</sup> and Aradin (*wana* ‘ewe’, Krotkoff 1982: 153).<sup>45</sup> All of them say ‘individual sheep’, unlike the collective

41. For *ṭṣīn-*, 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. *ṣerbe* is attested.

44. Pace Khan 2002: 183, the derivation of *ṣuwana* from \**ṣerbā* is unlikely, since in Ṭuroyo *ṣwono* coexists with *ṣarbo*.

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

term \**ʕānā*. Thus, ʤuroyo and the above NENA dialects have a common feature: \**ʕwānā* referring to single sheep. There are no traces of \**ʕwānā* in Mlaḥsō.

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.: *kātāf* ‘Arm, Schulter’ (VW II 144; Kinderib 121).

✕ In the ʤuroyo corpus, the shape *katpo* (RW 269) corresponding to *kespo* in Mlaḥsō and *katpā* in CS and JBA is attested as well. The more frequent shape *katfo* must be an Arabism.

SISTER: *ḥoso* (JM 178) ♦ *ḥoto* (RW 242)

# MEA: *ḥātā* ‘sister’ (SL 503); *ʔāḥātā* ‘sister’ (DJBA 106); *ahata* ‘sister’ (MD 8).

SKY: *šmayo* (JM 190) ♦ *šmayo* (RW 499)

# MEA: *šmayyā* ‘sky, heaven’ (SL 1572); *šmayyā* ‘sky, heaven’ (DJBA 1157); *šumia*, *ʕšumia* ‘heavens’ (MD 455).

SNAKE: *ḥevyo* (JM 178) ♦ *ḥayye* (RW 214), *kurfo* (RW 284)

# *ḥevyo* < MEA: *ḥewyā* ‘snake, serpent’ (SL 424), *ḥiwyā* ‘snake’ (DJBA 450), *hiuia* ‘serpent, snake’ (MD 142).

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

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

✕ The exponent of SNAKE in Proto-ʤ/M was \**ḥewyā*. In ʤuroyo, it was replaced either by an Arabic (in Midyat and Kfarze) or by a peripheral Aramaic (in the rest of the villages) term.<sup>46</sup> The cognate of *ḥevyo* exists in ʤuroyo (*ḥawyo*), 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: *ḥesno* (JM 177) ♦ *ḥatno* (RW 224)

# See above on BRIDEGROOM.

TO SOW: *zrʕ* (JM 166) ♦ *bzr* (JL 159)

# *zrʕ* < MEA: *zrʕ* ‘to plant, sow’ (SL 399); *zrʕ* ‘to sow, contain semen’ (DJBA 421); *ZRA* ‘to sow, scatter’ (MD 170).

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

✕ In ʤuroyo, the Aramaic term was replaced by an Arabism.

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



SPRING: *rvišo* (JM 189) ♦ *rabəf* (RW 430)

# *rvišo* < MEA: *rbīšā* ‘autumn rain’ (SL 1428). Cf. *rbyšh* ‘first rain’ (DJPA 514); *rbīšā* ‘rainfall (in the autumn)’ (Jastrow 1442).

# *rabəf* < Arab.: *rabīf* ‘Frühling, Lenz’ (AWSG 447), *rabīf*, *rabīh*, *r<sup>2</sup>bīh* ‘Frühling’ (VW 173), *rabīf* ‘Frühling’ (Kinderib 56).

✧ The exponents of SPRING in both Turoyo and Mlaḥsô are unique against the background of those NENA whose basic lexicon is known to us.<sup>47</sup> In Mlaḥsô, *rvišo* ‘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: *ylf* III (Talay 2002: 712) ♦ *ylf* III (RG 660ff)

# See TO LEARN on the MEA cognates of *ylf*.

✧ The causative stem derivation of *ylf* ‘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) ♦ *ṣammo* (RW 9)

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

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

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

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

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

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-nisanā*, *nisanā*, Khan 2016, III: 105;) or Kurdisms (Qaraqosh *bahar*, Khan 2002: 227).

✂ 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).<sup>48</sup>

WATERMELON: *zabaše* (pl.) (JM 195) ♦ *žābaš* (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: *heṭo* (Talay 2002: 709, JM 178) ♦ *heṭo* (RW 230)

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

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

# MEA: *saṭwā* ‘winter’ (SL 1051); *sṭwā* ‘winter’ (DJBA 809); *situa* ‘winter’ (MD 330).

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

# MEA: *dēḥā* ‘wolf’ (SL 268); *dēḥā* ‘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: *šgl* (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).

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

✂ In Proto-T/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 Mlaḥsô and the Midyat dialect of Turoyo. In village dialects of Turoyo, \**ʕbd* in the meaning TO WORK was replaced by the Arabism *šgl*.

TO WRITE: *ksv* (JM 158) ♦ *ktw*

# MEA: *ktb* ‘to write’ (SL 660); *ktb*, *ktu* ‘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 Mlaḥsô 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,

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

MULE, and WORK. The exponent of WATERMELON may be of either Arabic or Kurdish origin. The remaining eighty-seven words are of Aramaic provenance.

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

Among the sixty-eight etymologically identical terms of our second Turoyo-Mlaḥsô 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, Mlaḥsô keeps Aramaic words where Turoyo 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 Mlaḥsô displays a semantic shift, which could be caused by the Arabic influence. Further, the exponent of EVENING (*də=ramšo*) in Mlaḥsô, 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 Turoyo has Arabic exponents alongside Aramaic ones. SNAKE, which is expressed in Turoyo both by an Arabism (*ḥayye*) and an Aramaic term of obscure origin (*kurfo* as opposite to *\*ḥewyā* in Mlaḥsô and MEA) also belongs into this group.

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

In two cases, Mlaḥsô and Turoyo display different loanwords for the same notion. For GOOSE, Mlaḥsô possesses an Arabism (*wazze*), while Turoyo 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 Turoyo 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 Turoyo 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 Turoyo that keeps the terms going back to Proto-T/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 Turoyo 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 Turoyo has counterparts in NENA. For COCK, the city dialect of Turoyo 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 Turoyo also display traces of an exclusively shared innovation. Both languages know *\*ʕōrā* for this concept, although Turoyo uses an Arabism as the main exponent of CHILD.

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

### 4. Bibliography

- |                             |  |
|-----------------------------|--|
| Barsky, Furman, Loesov 2018 | Barsky, Eugene, Furman Yulia, and Loesov Sergey. 2018. "Two-Hundred-Word Swadesh List for a Modern Aramaic variety (ʿuroyo)", <i>Aula Orientalis</i> 36/1 (2018), 75–110.  |
| Furman and Loesov 2016      | Furman, Yulia, and Loesov, Sergey. 2016. "Notes on Historical Morphology of ʿuroyo", In: <i>Babel und Bibel 9: Selected Papers Presented at the 6th Biennial Meeting of the International association for Comparative Semitics</i> . Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.   |
| Goldenberg 1998             | Goldenberg, Gideon. 1998. "Otto Jastrow, Der Neuaramäische Dialekt von Mlaḥsô: A Review Article". <i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i> XLIII/1 Spring 1998, 63–70.  |
| Grigore 2007                | Grigore, George. 2007. <i>L'arabe parlé à Mardin — monographie d'un parler arabe «périphérique»</i> . București: Editura Universității din București.  |
| Haspelmath 2008             | Haspelmath, Martin. 2008. "Loanword typology: Steps toward a systematic cross-linguistic study of lexical borrowability". In: <i>Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes</i> , 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". <i>Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik</i> . 1977(3), 84–106.  |
| Jastrow 1985                | Jastrow, Otto. 1985. "Mlaḥsô: An Unknown Neo-Aramaic Language of Turkey". <i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i> 30/2 (1985), 265–270.  |
| Jastrow 1988                | Jastrow, Otto. 1988. <i>Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Hertevin (Provinz Siirt)</i> . Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.   |
| Jastrow 1994                | Jastrow, Otto. 1994. <i>Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Mlaḥsô</i> . Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.   |
| Jastrow 1996                | Jastrow, Otto. 1996. "Passive Formation in ʿuroyo and Mlaḥsô". In: <i>Israel</i>   |

*Aula Orientalis* 36/2 (2018) 209-239 (ISSN: 0212-5730)

- 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 Semito-hamitica. Festschrift für Rainer Voigt anlässlich seines 60. Geburtstages am 17. Januar 2004*, 137–150.
- Jastrow 2011 Jastrow, Otto. “Ṭuroyo 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 Ṭuroyo Sound Changes”. In: *Proceedings of the 13<sup>th</sup> 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 Dihok)*. Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz 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/Kurmancî)*. 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 Ahiqar 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: Harrassowitz Verlag, 695-712.
- Thackston 2006 Thackston, Wheeler M. 2006. *Kurmanji Kurdish: A Reference Grammar with Selected Readings*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University.

##### 5. Abbreviations for Reference Tools

- AWSG Wehr, Hans. 1985. *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart, Arabisch — Deutsch*, 5. Auflage. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz 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: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- JM Jastrow, Otto. 2004. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Mlaḥsō*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Kinderib Jastrow, Otto. 2005. *Glossar zu Kinderib (Anatolisches Arabisch)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- LuF Jastrow, Otto. 1993. *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Mīdin im Ṭūr 'Abdīn*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- MD Drower E. S. and Macuch R. 1962. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- RG Ritter, Hellmut. 1990. *Ṭūrōyo: Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Ṭūr ḲAbdīn. C: Grammatik*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- RW Ritter, Hellmut. 1979. *Ṭūrōyo: Die Volkssprache der syrischen Christen des Ṭūr ḲAbdīn. 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 [mäd̥yoyo]*. Stockholm: Beṭ-Froso & Beṭ-Prasa Nsibin.