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* This paper is dedicated to Prof. Tatsuо Nishida (Department of Linguistics, Kyoto University) as a token of gratitude for his teachings on the occasion of his Kanreki (60th birthday). I owe to him what I know of dialectology I learned in his courses of Sino-Tibetan linguistics. Also I cannot express my gratefulness enough to Prof. H. J. Polotsky who has most kindly given me permission to refer to his typescript full of valuable observations.

Abbreviations and symbols used are the following: CS=Classical Syriac, H=Hertevin, MA=Modern Aramaic, PS=pronominal suffix, U=Urmii. For MCA, MEA, MM, MWA and A–D of MEA see note 11 and Table 7. Symbols for PS sets (A, B, C, C' and D), though the same as those of subgroups of MEA, should not cause confusion because of the different nature of the discussion where they are used. CS words are quoted from native dictionaries (Audo and Manna) if need be as well as from ordinary European ones. Note also that in Urmii examples α=a, and that the translation for examples may at times sound unnatural due to the attention paid to show their linguistic structure and the cited forms may differ slightly from the original because of linguistic analysis given and typographical reasons.
1. Introduction

For those who are interested in modern Semitic languages, especially in Arabic and Aramaic, Turkey is indeed a wonderland that has preserved to this day many diverse dialects of them in various parts of the territory\(^1\). We owe the knowledge of such dialects solely to the indefatigable efforts of German scholars and our great admiration and thanks are due to them for their truly scientific activities in no easy situation. Admittedly Otto Jastrow is a leading figure in this field.

1.1. Modern Aramaic of Hertevin

In October 6, 1970, he discovered a new type of Aramaic dialect, totally unknown hitherto, in a remote village called Hertevin\(^2\), the existence of which he had learned in Mardin in 1967. It is situated some kilometers west of Pervali (Province of Siirt), south of Lake Van and had 437 inhabitants in 1965, of which the third or the quarter were Chaldean Christians who spoke this Aramaic dialect\(^3\). In 1982\(^4\), however, this village was reported as almost completely deserted except two or three families (Christians?), so regrettably we have no more chance to find native speakers except by rare luck in a place where they have emigrated. Thus we are all the more grateful to O. Jastrow for his first (and evidently last) recording of this dialect from his informant called Moqși Dawod (now deceased).

1.2. Aim of this Study

In the next year 1971, he published an article to report his discovery and gave us a brief sketch of the dialect together with two short texts in the dialect. To the present writer, who studied it in some detail, this dialect was at once a great and puzzling surprise because of its linguistic structure quite different from any other dialect hitherto known, but since we did not have enough information chiefly other than verbs and some etymologies of its vocabulary remained unclear, I refrained from writing about it. But now Jastrow has provided

---

1) For Arabic dialects in Turkey, see Jastrow 1983: 72. Here we are informed of three groups of Arabic: (a) qaltu-dialects in Anatolia, (b) a type of nomadic dialect in Urfa region, and (c) a Syro-Palestinian type of sedentary dialects in the Province of Hatay near the Mediterranean, concerning the latter two of which we are still expecting detailed study from him.

2) The village has several names: Ekindüzü (official name in Turkish), Hertevinler (in older Turkish documents), Hârtwan (Kurdish, the language of the neighboring majority), 'Artun (native Aramaic). Jastrow prefers to cite the village as Hertevin and we follow him. See Jastrow (1971: 216, 1988: xviii). Poizat (1981: 414) gives us another one, Artwan which again corroborates identifying with it yet other names: Arteen/Artuvin (Chevalier 1985: 120, 123 note 1 and map II at the end of the book).


4) Jastrow 1988: xviii and note 7 there.
us with a full description of the dialect in his usual masterly way (Jastrow 1988) and has enabled us to study it fully. So this is the result of the study based on his grammatical description and his texts, of which the part published first in Jastrow 1971 has been studied thoroughly,\(^5\) in order to understand its independent place among MA languages, making clear what are in common with others as MA and different from them as a separate branch.\(^6\)

1.3. **Position of Hertevin Dialect**

It was only natural that this dialect attracted the attention of K. G. Tsere- teli, a well-known MA scholar, and he referred to it as belonging to the eastern branch with many traits common the central group.\(^7\) Jastrow himself is almost of the same opinion and describes it as "Dialekt neuostaramäischen Typs".\(^8\) But it is R. D. Hoberman, to the best of my knowledge, that has listed explicitly some linguistic features peculiar to Hertevin (H) in his study of MA pronominal elements\(^9\) and his opinion is now even clearer that H forms an independent subgroup of 'Northeastern Neo-Aramaic' (his term) comparable to Urmı, Northern, Ashirat and Southern.\(^10\)

\(^5\) Jastrow 1971: 219–22. Text I here corresponds to texts (101)–(110) in 1988: 116, and Text II to (122)–(131) in 1988: 118–20. To cite the text we follow his numbering given to every passage of the total texts and his system of phonemic notation with the replacement of glottal stop and voiced pharyngeal to ' ' and ' ' resp. It should be noted that the last part of Text I (10-11) is not correctly represented in 1988: 116. Judging from his almost same German translation (1971: 221; 1988: 117), we should add the following words after b'ahel (the second last line, end): "swat'ew w tarab mennew. (111) koyom w koyom w koyom. yane hel xales".

\(^6\) In so doing I have retained the same method and terminology I have used in my previous studies. This is, in my opinion, vital in the study of any MA language if interrelationship among dialects or historical development from Late Aramaic is to be investigated. See Takashina 1985: 55–6, 1986: 67 and 1988: 1641b–45b.


\(^9\) 1988: 559 note 7+572.

\(^10\) 1989: 4, 6. Table 2 on p. 7 gives his scheme most clearly. Beyer (1986: 54–5=orig. German 1984: 70–1) may fall into line with this, since he cites Jastrow 1971 in the footnote for 'Northeastern Neo-Aramaic' group. Incidentally Maclean seems to give us the same picture. 'The Southern Group (IV)' of his classification of MEA (1895: xiv, 1901: x) includes Bohtan district and Hertevin fits into the northern Bohtan (Bohtan, Botan; cf. Chevalier 1985: 116-24 and maps at the end). Though what dialects he meant is not clear and what few features he cites as 'Bo.' in his grammar do not always correspond to Jastrow's data, he took this area as belonging to MEA. Sachau (1895: 4) also adds to the area of Fellihy type of Mosul such northern places as Deh (=Dib, now Eruh just south of H) and Hazhe (=Khosker east of H? cf. Chevalier 120 note 1, etc.). These facts may lead us to the assumption that before the upheaval of (e)migration of MA speakers there was a general understanding among them that dialects resemble each other somehow in the region. For this see also Macuch 1976: 68–9.
Whatever the appellation\(^{11}\) may be, the point to be made clear is this: is H a subgroup of MEA or can it claim an independent position different from both MEA and MCA? The answer depends, of course, on the notion of 'sub-' or 'independent', yet we cannot but hesitate to put it into either of them. The choice left is now to recognize it as a group of its own.\(^{12}\) Hopefully the discussions that follow can demonstrate it.

2. Phonology\(^{13}\)

2.1. Aspiration, Palatalization and Velarization

The aspiration of \(p, t\) and \(k\) reminds one of a phenomenon of plain pronunciation of suprasegmental feature called 'synharmonism' in MEA subgroups A and B.\(^{14}\) But it is likewise the feature of Aradhin (D of MEA, Krotkoff 1982: 11) and MCA (Jastrow 1985a: 2-4) and may, therefore, not be a new fact. The palatalization of \(k\) and \(g\) is also found as part of plainness in MEA A-B, but on the contrary it is not attested in MCA.\(^{15}\) Rather, what is more important, initial *\(q\) in a certain number of words has changed to \(k\) and thus undergoes the aspiration.

No matter what quality *\(q\) had in the previous stage of Aramaic, aspiration of \(k\) (velar) and \(t\) seems to be coexistent with \(q\) (uvular) and \(t\) (velarized) without any ensuing result in MCA where velarization basically applies to an individual segment, while in MEA the situation is somewhat different. Aradhin

---

11) Terms used for MA (as opposed to Late Aramaic) are the following: Modern West Aramaic (MWA) for Ma'ālula group, Modern Central Aramaic (MCA) for Ţurāy group, Modern East Aramaic (MEA) for dialects from Mosul to Urmiya [Maclean's subgroups I-IV correspond to my A-D resp.], and Modern Mandaic (MM). To be sure MM is an offspring of Mandaic, one of the Eastern branch of Late Aramaic, but Mandaic, Modern or Late, is best known by its own name. So the use of 'East' for MEA will not blur the existence of MM; rather 'West, Central and East' should be understood as showing mere geographical distribution, not affinity. Cf. Hoberman 1988: 557 note 2. As to the Jewish dialects, I quite agree with Hoberman's scheme (1989: 7 table 2). See Takashina 1983: 62 and forthcoming "Jewish Modern Aramaic" in Gengogaku Dai-Jiten, Vol. I, part III). For my classification of MA and the sources I employ, please see Table 7 and the sources given there.

12) I have alluded to this fact a few times (Takashina 1985: 64, 1988: 1640b; unpublished paper read at the 27th annual meeting of the Society for Near Eastern Studies in Japan held Nov. 3, 1985 in Tokyo).

13) In the following discussion reference to the relevant pages of Jastrow 1988 is omitted for brevity's sake. His clear format of presentation will make up for it.

14) In the following, U (subgroup A) form is quoted in the 'New Alphabet' spelling for MEA and Midin form (Jastrow 1985a; if lacking in it Ritter 1967 and 1976 are used) for MCA, unless otherwise stated. For the use of New Alphabet I follow Polotsky 1961 (Takashina 1985: 60-1) and the flatting is checked by Friedrich 1960 and Orahim's dictionary. CS is cited according to the Nestorian tradition. For aspiration in U and the contribution Osipov made, see Polotsky 1961: 5+7.

15) Tsereteli 1978: 47.
(group D), where ‘velarization spreads easily to adjacent sounds and syllables (Krotkoff 1982: 11),’ we find an opposition of velar q and postpalatal k side by side with the aspiration. In U (group A), where velarization called synharmonism extends within a word boundary and does not apply on each segmental level, the fronting of q and aspiration are so complete as to form the following equation: \( *q : *k = U [k] : ([c'] : [c]) \), on the basis of \( *t : *t = U [t] : [t'] \). [c'] appears in plain words and [c] in flat while q [k] remains the same.\(^{16}\) It may be said that, with the lessening of the burden of \( t \) as velarized phoneme, q now need not be uvular only to maintain a quasi-opposition with k. In fact aspiration of MEA is one of the main features of un-velarized articulation, while in MCA it is structurally irrelevant. In view of this, though limited to the word/syllable initial position, the opposition (q : k’) of H is apparently unstable, since velarization of H is diminishing its influence because of the change of ‘ and \( q \) to ‘. Partial as the change \( q > k \) [k’] may be, the weakening structural support for q except by loanwords has induced it to move forward.\(^{17}\) This will enable us to grasp the whole picture better. Thus the underlying structural change in H is doubtless parallel to that of MEA.\(^{18}\) The double relations, however, that q has with k on the one hand and with t on the other have caused a great trouble on MA, and even U, to say nothing of H, has not succeeded yet in doing away with it.

In tilata ‘three’ we find another example common to all groups of MEA in that original \( *t \) in the initial position switched to its counterpart evidently because of the non-aspiration of it caused by the existence of ‘dark’ I just after it.\(^{19}\)

### 2.2. BaGAD-KaPâT

Older fricative allophones of stops are reflected in MA in accordance with its own phonological system that has resulted from its respective linguistic history, but these allophones have achieved phonemic status in various ways, sometimes merging into another.\(^{20}\) Here I list them in the limited relevant

---

\(^{16}\) Polotsky 1961: 6-7. Note that \( t \) is nothing but a historical spelling.

\(^{17}\) Similar opposition in MCA (q : k’) is regarded as stable in that a full set of pharyngeals and laryngeals together with non-aspiration common to both q and \( t \) support the articulation of q.

\(^{18}\) Of the examples Jastrow cites as \( *q > k \) all are plain (=un-velarized) in U also but kora ‘grave’ \( < *qâbîrâ = U qora \) (flat). H gora ‘man’ \( < *qâbîrâ \) is said to be palatalized when its cognate U gora is flat. This shows that emphaticness of \( q \) and velarization are two things apart and that quite naturally a velarizing factor in U do not work well in a different phonological system.

\(^{19}\) Incidentally this was the very word by which scholars knew synharmonism through Nöldke. See Polotsky 1961: 9.

\(^{20}\) The way it is achieved differs from one another, to be sure, but in my opinion the ways of this achievement, or distribution of them should be understood in the geographical span from MWA to MM inclusive.
dialects only (Tables 1 and 7). We can observe that three out of six have the same realization with MEA (except $t$ in Mosul) and we cannot help being amazed at the fact that H resembles U in dentals across groups C-D where they preserve spirantization relatively well. I do not now see why, yet this is very conspicuous. $^*$b $>$ w is a general feature of group D including MCA.

2.3. Stress

Stress falls on the penultimate syllable, which rule applies to every MA language known thus far excepting Jewish Modern Aramaic of Azerbaijan and Mlaḫsə $^{21}$ that have ultimate stress. Indeed the stress rule for verbs in H appears complicated but it seems to depend on a very simple fact that Jastrow remarks; namely, in the case of composites made up of two stress units (i.e. words) the stress falls on the last syllable of the first unit (p. 20).

In Imperfective, $^{22}$ whose conjugation originates from the fusion of old participle + enclitic form of independent personal pronoun in Late Aramaic, the pronominal suffix (PS) for subject (A) is such an integral part of the verb that they form one stress unit, however complex it is or how many other object PS's (C') are added to it: $^{23}$ [pašq-en]-ne-lehon (p. 63; 1 or 3$^{24}$) 'I interpret them (dreams) to you (pl.).' Since the 2nd person plural PS -iton (A), however, is made up of two syllables and must have been too 'heavy' to form one stress unit, its first syllable -i always takes the stress and -ton is counted as a separate suffix: [danīh-t]-ton (p. 18; 1 or 3) 'yo[u sleep],' hazé (<<[hazy-t]-ton-ne(hen) (p. 75; 1 or 3) 'yo[u see] them.' The same applies to the Resultative in which PS used as subject marker goes back to the same origin.

As regards Perfective, its conjugation base does not generally change, which means that stress falls always on the inflectional base (ptih) with the suffix(es) left to form the second stress unit: [tɛ]-lehen (p. 20; 4) 'they [came],' [nḫeq]-

---

$^{21}$ See the note under Table 7 for sources. This dialect was discovered by Jastrow in 1968, i.e. before the discovery of H in 1970, but the information about it is still too fragmentary. It has extraordinary pron. suffix for 3rd pers. m. -aw that reminds one of H and Azerbaijan (J; B of MEA) in contrast to MCA -e, and the spirantization of *t and *d are z and z like those of Zakhó (D of MEA). Yet passive participle of Pael seems to be *mLaQQaS in common with MCA. This situation is very similar to that of H, and considering its geographical place (near the town of Lice, Diyarbakır Province far north of the MCA region) we cannot deny the possibility of pairing it with H to form a separate group, though Jastrow suggests putting it in MCA for the moment. See the discussion below and Table 7.

$^{22}$ Imperfective, Perfective, Resultative and Past Perfective correspond to Jastrow's Präsens, Präteritum, Perfekt and Plusquampräteritum resp. See discussions below and Table 5. Also for groupings of PS see Table 2 and the discussions below.

$^{23}$ I.e., even if two or more PS's are suffixed to the verbal base, it only means that they form the second stress unit.

$^{24}$ [ ] = the first stress unit; the hyphen (−) = boundary between verbal base and PS's. Numbers refer to the verbal forms given in Table 5.
wa-lehon (p. 74; 10 Past Perfective) ‘You (pl.) had [gone out].’ This corresponds to what Jastrow remarks concerning Perfective (p. 51). If ‘Inkorporiertes Objekt’ (p. 62) appears with Perfective, the rule does not change and it also becomes the fused part of the base, because, as Jastrow says (ibid.), it was historically a part of the inflectional ending for gender and number of substantives and the passive participle, used now for the Perfective base, was treated as such: [mat*n-f]-loh (p. 62) ‘you(sg. m.) [loaded them].’

But forms like hzelahlehon (p. 76; 4), in which Perfective changes its subject PS from -lan (C) to -lah (C) automatically, stress is said to fluctuate (p. 76 note 2): [hzé]-lah-lehon ‘we [saw] you’ and [hze-làh]-lehon ‘[we saw] you.’ This too, however, stands to good reason, either because its historical passive participle used in Perfective construction forces the stress to fall on it (hzé-), or because main part of -lah (-ah) is nothing but subject PS (A) for Imperfective, which, being an integral part of the verbal base, causes the stress to fall on the seemingly last syllable (hze-làh-) of the first stress unit. This rule can likewise explain the form in which the tense-indicator -wa is put unusually between subject PS (C) and object: (dohér)-räh (<-lah)-wa-le (p. 62; √dwrh) ‘we had [made disappear = killed] him.’

Thus the stress rule can be formulated as follows:

i) Verbal forms that consist of only one stress unit have it on the penultimate according to the general rule. This applies to the Imperfective and Resultative that do not have any suffix. Those with one or more suffix(es) belong to the next category. The ‘heavy’ 2nd person plural -iton (A) also belongs to the next, since -ton out of -iton is looked upon as one of the suffixes.

ii) Verbal forms that comprise two or more stress units have it on the last syllable of the inflectional base according to the general stress rule for composites, seeing that the inflectional base is no more than the first unit of the composite. This applies, in the Imperfective and Resultative, to the -iton mentioned above and forms with suffixes (-wa and/or object). But above all this is the rule for the Perfective, because its subject PS-C is counted strictly as a pure suffix.

iii) Imperative has its own rule of stress on the initial syllable.

It may be said that these rules reflect the history of the formation of the verbal system in H, when the tense indicator -wa and the subject PS for Perfective (C = object PS) used to be separate words: hāwā ‘it was’ and la-+ genitive

25) -1- of -lah comes from -1- of -lan, a peculiar trait in subject PS-C of Perfective.
26) It seems to have been employed here to avoid confusion between subject -lan and object -lan. Such ‘confusion’ might not have happened, if object in Perfective had been expressed in earlier times by means of enclitic independent pronouns (PS-A) attached to the passive participle. Cf. mat*n-nilôh cited above.
27) For the ordering of verbal base, subject PS, object PS and tense-indicator -wa, see Table 5.
pronounal suffix. After having ceased to be independent, they are still active in MA as a sign of stress unit boundary.28)

This fact deduced from the stress rule for the composite words speaks, then, for another trait H has in MA. The penultimate stress is certainly common to almost every MA language, as stated above, but the way penultimate- ness is decided is different as far as verbs are concerned. When we mark (+) for the languages with a stress rule very similar to that of H and (−) where it is not the case, we get the following chart as regards some relevant languages. Though still tentative and not exhaustive, it will suffice for the present purpose. For the verbs other than Imperatives U alone differs from the rest in that stress unit includes all the suffixes except copula and auxiliary verbs.29) Imperatives of MCA are stressed on the final syllable but others on the initial.30) In this comparison H shows a similarity to the subgroup D of MEA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MCA</th>
<th>Hertevin</th>
<th>Aradhin</th>
<th>Amadiya</th>
<th>Urmu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>verbs</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td></td>
<td>final</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>initial</td>
<td>initial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. Other Phonological Features

*$g > *i > 'i$ and $*k > h$ are peculiar to H. Seeing that $x$ is limited to loanwords only, Hēt must have been $h$ in this dialect since earlier times as in MCA, not as in MEA that has $x$ for it.31)

---

28) Hence in the notation of H text it would be better to show it, e.g. as ūḥāqēn-nelebn. A similar line of result is presented in Hoberman 1989: 116–7 though his approach is somewhat different. I knew this after I have almost finished this paper, since his book reached me too late for me to make good use of it. But I incorporated the information it gives on the Modern Jewish Aramaic of Amadiya in some parts where possible.

29) One example for the case with copula: bidmāxīlī < $*bi$-dmāxā ijlī ‘he is (in the state of) sleeping.’ Thus the case of Urmī, ‘notorious’ for its complicated verbal system, may be regarded as a reflection of such a high level of development that it has incorporated suffixes as if they were inherent parts of the verb.

30) Jastrow 1985a: 28 note 1. ‘Imperative’ here means singular forms without a suffix at least, for I am not sure of the place of stress in the Imperative with object PS in Aradhin. Generally, however, suffixes are disregarded and the stress remains on the same syllable where singular without a suffix has it.

31) Sachau writes $h$ for $*x$ and $h$ for $*g$ [=x] for etymological reasons (1895: 6). $\sqrt{xpr}$ ‘to till’ may be an additional exception, whether it is Aramaic $\sqrt{hpr}$ ‘to dig’ or comes from Arabic $\sqrt{hfr}$ ‘to dig’. In both cases H must retain $h$ and in the latter case $f$ must appear here, though some have changed even a foreign $*f$ to $p$. See Jastrow 1988: 6 note 4. A ‘fugitive’ * (p. 17) is found only once in ‘Texte’: bglāPlace (32). Since we do not learn a short $e$ becomes $*$ (gālēl) and the notation of the text is phonemic, though with slight compromise necessarily, it is to be hoped that this phenomenon (p. 41) be noted in some appropriate place in the phonology (eg. in § 1.4.4., p. 14).
3. Morphology

3.1. Personal Pronouns

For these we have now a detailed study of Hoberman 1988 and I will not dwell on the points he has made clear. What is most striking is a very simple system of independent pronouns of H. We can analyze it as below. We call this simple, because this structure consists of prefixes ('ah- for singular and 'ahn- for plural, except 'ana) plus suffixed elements similar to PS-A. Whatever

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{'ah-} & \quad + u \text{ (he)} & \text{'ahn-} & \quad + i \text{ (they)} \\
\text{i} & \quad \text{(she)} & \text{et} (\text{you sg. m./f.}) & \quad \text{iton (you pl.)} \\
\text{['ana]} & \quad (l) & \text{ah} & \quad (we)
\end{align*}
\]

the historical development and the relation it has to other MA may be, we have here almost the simplest and final result of all MA that have tried to reconstruct the system of pronouns in their own way. This fact can suggest a unique position of H, though not sufficient in itself yet, among all the members of MA. The nearest one comparable to H in this point may be Amadiya,\(^{32}\) but there ani ‘we' still retains the contrast to ana ‘I' with -i in ani being interpreted as plural ending as in PS-A. So as regards independent pronouns we can say that H has attained a stage of development one step further than other MEA dialects, although H shares indeed a general tendency of development with MEA as Hoberman points out (1988: 572), but this new stage has brought about a system so different in nature from others as almost to keep H aloof from both other MEA and MCA.

Pronominal suffixes (Table 2)\(^{33}\) do not in general pose us a problem hard to explain but one (synchronically, I mean; see below), and show a close affinity with MEA. Those which are employed to form Imperfective and Resultative conjugations (PS-A), attached to the active and passive participles of Late Aramaic respectively, were enclitic independent personal pronouns (2nd and 1st persons) or gender/number suffixes of substantives because participles were treated as such (3rd person). Hence it is no wonder that the suffixed elements of independent pronouns mentioned above resemble PS-A. Also it is no less easy to see that PS-C', peculiar to H, is very much alike to independent pronouns when we take into account how it came into being.\(^{34}\) The reason why the 3rd person remained the same (C = C') is accounted for by the simple fact

---

\(^{32}\) Hoberman 1988: 561, but in his 1989: 196 he states that 'ahu and 'ahi are rarely used.

\(^{33}\) My groupings of PS (A, B and C) correspond to Hoberman's (1988) Verbal, Nominal and L-Set suffixes respectively, but in Hoberman (1989: 195-6) 'Verbal' is replaced by A-set and 'Nominal' by B-set, while 'L-Set' is explained as formed from set B preceded by -ι-.

\(^{34}\) See discussions below and notes 25 and 26.
that their origin is different as mentioned above and that if otherwise the 3rd person series would be l-∅, l-a, l-i which should no doubt invoke another problem.

PS-B is really bewildering in the 3rd person singular: namely -ew 'his' and -o 'her', as is, incidentally, the case with the corresponding forms -u and -o in U that have long been left to us as a puzzle until recently. The long history apart, it is Polotsky who has resumed this problem of U and put it on the proper line.35) Confirming the right approach of Duval (1896: 134), he compares the corresponding forms of Jewish Modern Aramaic of Erbil (-e:w, -a:w) and explains U forms as 'the regular contractions'.36) The role -w played in producing these 3rd person singular of the relevant dialects is now clear almost beyond doubt, but scholars differ in explaining the nature and origin of this -w.

Polotsky leaves it simply as 'obscure.' Hoberman, who bases his theory on Kaufman's suggestion as well as on the extensive MEA examples available now, proposes the process of change in his diachronical study of MEA pronouns thus: *ayhū > *ehu > *e-u > -ew (> -u)37) 'his'. According to him *ehu triggered the analogical creation of feminine *ahu, which in turn resulted in -aw (> -o) 'her'. Jastrow, on the other hand, explains it by the replacement of -h in -eh and -ah (CS) with -w but speaks nothing about the origin of -w.38) As is well-known, Aramaic has had *hū 'his' attached to the suffix 'his' recurrently as often as the existing form has been felt too weak to bear the burden in its turn. In view of this and the gradual intrusion of suffixes for plural nouns (-ay-) in Late Aramaic (Babylonian Aramaic and Classical Mandaic, but not CS), Hoberman's theory seems to be preferable.

Be that as it may, the real problem that bewilders us is the existence of -ew in H in the place far away from the easternmost subgroups of MEA (A and B) that have -ew and -u, with its feminine counterpart in H having completed the change (*-aw > -o) at that.39) Subgroups C and D lying between the two do not have it. This much is sufficient to give rise to questions: is this a mere coincidence of independent development with a parallel result, or has H had some relation with the easternmost groups in the past, or did speakers of H emigrated from some part of the region of A-B at the time, say, when *ayhū

36) Polotsky, ibid. Also Takashina 1985: 72, 1988: 1648b-4a and the Table on page 1642 which is now given in this paper as Table 7.
37) Hoberman 1988: 563-4, 570-1. He writes (p. 570) the last stage of this development as (> -o; sic). Is this to be understood as (> *-o) that afterwards changed to -u in U, since I am afraid there is no -o for 'his' in MEA (see his Table 4, p. 563)?
39) See Table 7 and Takashina 1988: map on p. 1640.
came into being? Or is this to be interpreted as an example of an old linguistic change often preserved in fringe areas? These questions should, in my opinion, hold us from regarding this seemingly similar phenomenon as having one and the same origin. Rather, the likelihood is that the first question be in the affirmative in view of the fact that Mlaḥšō, situated also in the northwestern part of MA area, seems to share the phenomenon. It has -āv 'his' < *-aw.\(^{40}\) Though this form poses another problem why -ā for 'his,' we must confine ourselves, for the moment when we are not informed of 'her,' to the fact that -w common also to Mlaḥšō may perhaps suggest an independent origin in the region. We must recall here that it undoubtedly resembles MCA group owing to the feature *ā > ā.

PS-C, which is nothing less than B preceded by a preposition la- ‘to’ of Late Aramaic, presents no problem. As is the case with other MEA, H has a separate series for the 3rd person singular in it, reflecting the forms in Late Aramaic faithfully. This is in strong contrast to MCA, where the 3rd person singular elements, i.e. PS-C minus l-., are the same as those of PS-B; -e, -a (B) and -e, -a (C). Moreover, MCA has developed a secondary PS for nouns and the use of B directly with them is rather limited\(^{41}\).

The number-ending of Imperatives (PS-D), too, singles out H since its plural ending -en (variant -on) has no equivalent in others. Apart from MM and MWA,\(^{42}\) dialects of MEA and MCA may be divided into three groups by the criterion whether -n element of *-ān is preserved or not. To -un group belong A, B\(^{43}\) and D (Aradhin and Zakho). -u group comprises C (Tkhuuna), Mangesh (D) and MCA. Mosul seems to be inbetween. This distribution of the Imperative suffix shows a little different isogloss, but we cannot but admit that -en of H is quite different.

3.2. Independent Possessive Pronoun

This consists of a base did- plus PS-B. We are concerned with two points here. This series of pronoun ('mine, etc.') can usually function also as a substitute for PS-B ('my, etc.') in any MA, but to the varying degree in accordance with its semantic burden it bears as against PS-B. Generally speaking, MEA uses it almost as a free variant of the latter and thus helps to rid of neutralization of number in cases like naš-a dij-u 'his man' vs. naš-i dij-u 'his men,"


\(^{42}\) They both differ from others in preserving the gender distinction in plural though their forms are the result of linguistic history mutually independent: *-ān(m)/-en(f) in MM and *-un(m)/-ān(f) in MWA. See Table 7.

\(^{43}\) In these -mun is a variant under conditions specified differently in each dialect. I wonder what are the 'Jewish dialects of Southern Kurdistan' in which 'all verbs take -mum'. Cf. Polotsky 1981: 29.
but nasi-u 'his man/men' in U.

Polotsky is keen enough to observe a difference of the two usages in Jewish Modern Aramaic of Zakho.\footnote{Polotsky typescript: sections 5.31 and 5.32. Cf. Avinery 1988: 13.} He distinguishes 'Strong Cmidut' (noun + PS-B) for nouns that mean parts of body and terms of kinship from 'Weak Cmidut' (noun + did-) for others. This distinction reminds one of a very similar phenomenon in Midin and Mzizaḥ (MCA) between PS-B and a secondary one\footnote{See the reference given in note 41.} and leads one to doubt if this applies to other dialects also, since most of the Arabic modern dialects have the same tendency as well.\footnote{Harning 1980, especially p. 161. This is a point of alienability known in many languages but I refrain from referring to them now. As far as MA is concerned, however, I know no other reference than to MCA and Zakho. Is there no such phenomenon in other dialects?} MCA uses did- only as independent possessive pronoun and so is the case with MWA and MM where corresponding PS-B is very productive. But in H we are not informed of it by Jastrow who knows this phenomenon in MCA and Arabic dialects as well. He writes about a complementary use of these two on a different principle.

As to the form of the base for this pronoun, we can observe here again that did- of H finds its cognate on the both sides of the border of MCA and MEA. Jewish dialects of Zakho, Gzira and Amadiya (D of MEA) have did- in common with MCA,\footnote{MWA tid-<*did- and MM ald-<*ldid- 'to that of' (?). Cf. al-did-i 'his.'} while Christian dialects of MEA (U, Tkhuma, Aradhin and Mosul) seem to have dij- for it. Apparently the problem involves several factors, but the point is that H is put in this respect within the former group, whether the situation in H is a genuine historical development or a secondary one formed through some analogy.

\section*{3.3. Demonstratives}

In this point we observe a definite similarity of H to MEA as against MCA that is rather a faithful daughter of Jacobite CS. 'That' in MEA has either 'aw or 'o < *hâ-hû for masculine, 'ay or 'e < *hâ-hî for feminine with 'an for plural. It is no wonder that these forms are sometimes used in place of the 3rd person pronouns, because they are semantically very similar and have undergone again a similar phonological process.\footnote{Whether 'ahu 'he' of H (and its cognates in other MEA) comes from *hâ-hû or 'a-hu ('a- having been prefixed on the analogy of other persons), it does not matter here. The core in the both is *hû 'he'. Cf. Hoberman 1988: 569. This, together with its use like a definite article (Jastrow 1988: 92), reminds us of the fact that MCA has a system of definite articles ('u- m., 'i- f. 'aC- pl.) that derives from the use of the 3rd person pronouns described in Nöldeke 1904: 180. As to the shift of demonstratives to the definite article in MEA see the case of Aradhin in Krookoff 1982: 20-2.} We have parallels of it in other MEA.\footnote{U and Mangesh for example. In Mangesh they have merged into one and there is no distinction between them. Cf. Sara 1974: 68.
but nṣu ’his man/men’ in U.

For ‘this’ that has lost gender distinction in some or has rebuilt a feminine form anew, some dialects are characterized by the existence of -d: Mosul (D), Mar Bishu and Shamzdin (C) and Jewish Nerwa texts of pre-Modern nature.\(^{50}\) Whether it is from feminine *hāde or not, the rest of MEA have lost, or have not inherited, it. Surprisingly enough ’ad- of H, used only attributively, falls into this group. The formation of secondary sets of demonstratives is a matter for each dialect.

3.4. Copula

Generally speaking, group D of MEA (including Nerwa) has a very systematic set of copula (i)le ‘he is’ in that -l- appears also in the third person plural (i)lu ‘they are’ and that -w- replaces -l- in all other persons: wax, ḥiłun ‘we/you (pl.) are.’\(^{51}\) U deviates from this group in both: īnaa ‘they are’ and ītuun ‘you (pl.) are.’ Seen with these points in mind, H deviates from group D more than U does. ’They are’ has no -l- as in U, but more than that, the 2nd and 1st persons have no -w-. -l- in the 3rd person singular is no doubt a common feature shared with MEA, but the lack of -w- points to the opposite direction, MCA. Though the phonetic appearance of H and MCA shows a great gap between them, the lack of -w- proves that these two formed the copula without recourse to /hw- ‘to be’ of Late Aramaic.\(^{52}\) When we take it into account that MCA has no -l- in the 3rd person, H has no place to go, being left with no choice but to bid farewell to neighbors on both sides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3rd pers. m.</th>
<th>3rd pers. f.</th>
<th>2nd pers. m.</th>
<th>2nd pers. f.</th>
<th>1st pers. m./f.</th>
<th>singular</th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-ile</td>
<td>-ila</td>
<td>-ihat</td>
<td>-ihet</td>
<td>-ina</td>
<td>-iñe</td>
<td>-ehñah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5. Excursus: Deictic Copula \(\text{we-}\)

In MEA there are two sets of deictic copulas:\(^{53}\) \(\text{we-}\) (there he is) and \(\text{du/ho-}\)

---


51) Examples of copula here are from Zakho (J).

52) It is certain that H and MCA has created their respective copula after, or simultaneously with, reforming the new set of independent pronouns, by suffixing them enclitically to the predicate.

53) I follow Polotsky 1967: 111 in calling this set of copula ‘deictic.’ Hoberman 1989: 33 + 173 + 198 also uses this term. Deictic copulas stand before its predicate in the affirmative sentences in strong contrast to the ordinary copula, which is a distinguishing trait of them from the latter.
(here he is). Since they seem to have been somewhat neglected until recently, it may not be out of place to refer to them here. Though not exhaustive, they are attested as follows.54)

a) those that have both: U, Ṭiari, Alqoš.

b) those that have we-: Amadiya, Zakho, Mosul55)

c) those that have du/ho-: Tkhuma, Aradhin

As seen in Table 3, we- is generally attested only for the third person. But strangely enough Amadiya has a full set for all the persons and the examples Hoberman cites56) show that they are employed quite often like the proper copula itself. This frequent use of it, supported by the phonetic similarity of one of the two bases (we-) to we-le (Perfective of copula), may explain its spread over the whole persons. I cite here a few examples of this copula.

1) Duli beta d karpic smuqa, ve-li beta xina mari
here-it-is house of brick red, there-it-is house another owner-of
"Here is a house of red brick, there is another house of two stories."
tre tabq-i (U)57)
two story-PLURAL.

2) baxt-e g-xazyagör-a wē-le mkifa (Zakho)58)
wife-his PRESENT-she-sees husband-her there-he-is pleased.
"His wife sees her husband, behold, he is pleased!"

3) wē-la mcůrkan-ta gyān-a l-xa ānṇi (Zakho)59)
there-she-is have crouched-FEMININE self-her to-one hidden corner.
"Now, look! She has crouched herself in one corner."

4) wē-lux mōpiq-∅ xmār-ux (Mosul/Alqoš)60)
there-you-are take-out-Imperative/Singular ass-your.
"Here it's you! Take out your ass!"

54) Stoddard 1856: 139, Maclean 1895: 78 and 1901: 62a+74a+81a, Nöldeke 1868: 162. Maclean does not mention we- set for Qudshani and Ashitha and since his listings do not always cover all the extant forms, I omit them in this list. Here they are classified according to their forms without regard to their syntactic functions. They can be even used in combination with Infinitives or passive participles to form Durative or Resultative resp. But in general they are never used in relative and subjunctive clauses owing to its intrinsic nature as deictic (i.e., the part of the sentence with a deictic copula always forms an independent clause cut off from the rest) and have no negative forms. In these the proper copula is used instead. See the examples below.

55) Sachau does not mention any of them, though Maclean gives both forms for Alqoš near Mosul. Mosul, however, has at least one example of we-. See the example below.

56) See the reference in note 53 above.

57) Polotsky 1967: II/1-72. This is a good example of contrast between we- and du/ho-.

58) Avinery 1978: 94.


60) Lidzbarski 1894: I-262 line 15+12-208+417. This is a Fellibi text but written by a man from Alqoš. See do.: I-xx.
No matter what the etymology of this *we-* may be, these examples seem to point to its interjectional nature uttered to the listener. In Nerwa texts, well-known for its antiquity, they are employed to translate original Hebrew *hinne* ‘lo!’ and interestingly enough, Sabar notes that they are ‘impersonal’ and ‘not inflected.’ Anyway we find no cognate for this in H.

3.6. Deictic Copula du/ho-

This set has a full inflection as seen in Table 4, and what is more, it is said to have been integrated into the complicated copula system in the languages described by the scholars (Tkhum, Aradhin). Inflectional endings at variance with one another show that this set has evolved secondarily in each dialect on the basis of a germinal phenomenon they had in common at the pre-Modern stage as reflected in the third person singular *l* + PS·B (= PS·C). As to the third person plural the genuine copula ending (*na, -ne, -ni*) has superseded *l* in some dialects (U, Tkhum63 and Qudishan, H respectively), or in others the generalization of *l* took place (Aradhin, Ṭiari, Ashitha).

At any rate, we can posit the etymology of both *du/ho-* because of their phonological and syntactic similarity as follows:

*ēx-hū l-ēh ‘now it is to him’ > *daw-leh > *dō-le > du-li ‘here it is’64
*hā-hū l-ēh ‘behold, it is to him’ > *haw-leh > hō-le/li ‘here it is’

According to the second and first person endings we can put them into the following groups.

(I) those which have borrowed the proper copula endings:

61) In spite of some phonological difficulty, I conjecture, as one of mere possibilities, that *we-* comes from *hawi* Imperative singular of *hwy* ‘to be’: *hawi-l-ēh* > we-le ‘let it (topic) be to him (that he is . . .).’ in the sense ‘just imagine, he is now . . . !’. This may perhaps be compared with the use of imperatives in narrating past events in certain Arabic dialects of Negev, Syrian desert and North Arabia. dagāt šēras-ih, uḏyāb-ha ‘she touched his head, (imagine that he) strike her.’ The imperative form invites the listener to imagine the scene vividly. See H. Blanc: “The Arab Dialect of the Negev Bedouins” in The Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, Proceedings 4 (1970): 112-150, esp. p. 139-40. I owe this reference to my colleague and teacher, Prof. N. Fukuhara.

62) Sabar 1976: 53 note 145. Still, then, the inflectional element of this copula remains obscure. l-e/a/u ‘to him/her/them’ may have had a psychological referent depending on the context, though without proof yet.

63) Maclean 1985: 78. Jacob 1973: 132+135 states explicitly that this set has forms only for the 3rd person and for the plural he lists ḥō-le.

64) For ēx ‘now!’ see Maclean 1895: 190 and 1901: 59a. See also Nödeke 1968: 162. It is likewise well-known as a demonstrative in Late Aramaic; for Babylonian Aramaic ēx ‘this (E)’ see J. N. Epstein's grammar (1960: 28, Jerusalem) and for Mandaic see Nödeke's grammar (1875: 89, Halle) and its probable use as masculine see Jewish and Mandaean Incantation Texts by W. S. McCullough (1967: 27, Toronto, University of Toronto Press).
U (A), Tkhuma (C) and Aradhin (D). 65

(II) those in which the generalization of *- has been completed (PS-C):
   Tiarı (C), Alqoš (D).

(III) the one which has enclitic independent pronouns (PS-A):
   Qudshanis (B).

(IV) the one which is fluctuating between copula and PS-C:
   Ashitha (C).

In view of this, whereto does H 66 belong? It has PS-C in singular that is a
mixture of PS-A and PS-C (-i) and in plural a queer analogy to -n- (the third
person plural -ni) has taken place, though in the first person plural it is still
in the process. Indeed the existence of this deictic copula can be a good proof
for the proximity of H to MEA, yet the difference is too great to put it into
MEA. A few examples will suffice to show the nature of this deictic copula.

5) axaj-ux puqid-li qə-t-iq qà Dunj-u Ø- labl-in xa k tow, inà
   master-your ordered-he to-me to Dunja-his that-bring-I one letter, but
   “Your master ordered me to bring a letter to his Dunja, but
   un=k du-veïq muniya, eka Dunja dij-u ki xajjo.
   I here-I am have-forgotten, where Dunja of-his present live-feminine
   alas I have forgotten where his Dunja lives.
   La du-λo laxxà (U) 67
   Look! here-she-is here.
   Look, here she is! Here I!”

6) xzi-li av, d alma du-li (bi)bərbüzi (U) 68
   saw-he he, that people here-it-is (in the state of) dispersing.
   He saw himself, behold, people are now dispersing.

7) mete-Ø-le l-kam-èd tar’a, qenyana ho-le go goma (H) 69
   brought-it-he to-front-of door, cattle here-it-is in stable.
   “He brought it (one load of hay) to the front of the door, now the cattle

---

65 Krotkoff 1982: 37 calls this set of Aradhin an ‘emphatic’ copula. In this dialect, it is
said, the ‘emphatic’ copula can also have the tense-indicator *-əə infused to it. But I wonder
what a ‘past’ deictic copula is like. He says ‘There are no contextual examples for the
emphatic [past; Takashina] copula (do.: 38).’ Also it is very important to make a clear
distinction between the Subjunctive of √hwy ‘to be’ (my Imperfective with Ø-prefix)
and this deictic copula. Compare the following: haw-wa and haw-ut ‘that I(∫)/you(m.)
be’ vs. ho-wan and ho-wit ‘here I(∫) am/you(m.) are.’ The phonetic similarity should

66 Jastrow calls this set of deictic copula ‘Aktuelle Kopula (1988: 27); ‘die Präsentativpartikel
hole (do.: 54)’ and ‘die aktualisierende Partikel (do.: 57+58).’

67 Friedrich 1960: 40+41 note 77. For la du-λo see Marogulov 1976: 76 where he gives an
example of la ‘tiens!’ in almost the same wording: La du-λo! ‘Tiens, le voilà!’ Friedrich’s
interpretation is not correct.

68 Friedrich do.: 36.

is in the stable.”

8) dan-ew wed-le ḥeḡgom l-kekwan-i, nešw-ı ho-ni kāmut-êd
time-of made-they attack to-partridge-my, snare-my here-they-are opposite
“When they (wild partridges) made attack on my partridges, my snares being
kekwan-i mēp-lêheñ l-nešw-e (H)\(^{70}\)
partridge-my fell-they to-snare-plural.
now just in front of my partridges, they (wild ones) fell into the snares.”

3.7. Interrogatives and Adverbs

Regarding the interrogatives two things must be mentioned. First, H has
‘ema for ‘which’ where others derive it from *āynā somehow or other: enij in
U, ‘ayna in MCA and ēna in MW.\(^{71}\) This *āynā is a common characteristic
in subgroup D of MEA.\(^{72}\) Here we observe that *ay ‘which’ has been strength-
ened by *mā ‘what’ in its too short a form and in its interrogative meaning
as well. In addition to this, H has a pair of ‘what’ as pronoun and adjective,
mahi and mu respectively. This reminds us of the same distinction in U, quite
in the distance, between muḏij and muḏ.\(^{73}\) Examples:\(^{74}\)

\(^{70}\) Jastrow 1988: 118 passage 127. For ḥeḡgom see Kurdoev’s Kurdish (Kurmanji) dictionary
(1960: 351a, Moscow) which gives ĥucûm [hudʒum] Cf. MCA hučûm (Ritter 1979: 215),
Anatolian Arabic haʃûm (Vocke-Waldner 1982: 438), U huçûm [huçûm], Kurdish (Sulay-

\(^{71}\) Jastrow should have listed ‘ema on page 35. It is used in the texts five times at the
least: passages 178, 233 (three times) and 640. MM has a different derivation: hem <

\(^{72}\) ‘ēma (Zakho), āynā (Mosul), ‘ema (Mangesî) and ēma (Aradhin). Even Nerwa is no
exception. Perhaps the phonetic similarity of this new *āynā to the old *āynā added
to its spread.

\(^{73}\) And possibly Tkhuma also. See Jacobi 1973: 222. U muḏ is doubtless a shortened form
of muḏij < *mā-hû-d ‘what is it that…’; muḏij xzi-lux (Marogulov 1976: 39) ‘what
is it that you saw’ what did you see?’; muḏula it-lux (Friedrich 1960: 40) ‘what of
business do you have?’ But as my translation shows it must have been reinterpreted
as muḏ ‘what of’ and this helped to fix using the latter only before nouns as inter-
rogative adjective. For H, however, it is possible to posit *mā-hû ‘what is’ for mu seeing
that mahî/me ‘what (pronoun)’ comes no doubt from *mā-hî of which hî is the 3rd
person feminine pronoun used as copula in CS? To put it otherwise, *hû ‘he’ as copula
for adjectival ‘what’ and *hî ‘she’ as copula for pronominal ‘what’ would appear too
arbitrary.

\(^{74}\) A very interesting example of mahî is quoted here.

mâhî-leva Ø-ōd-et (passage 654)
what (pronoun)-COPULA (he) SUBJUNCTIVE-do-you (m. sg.)
“What on earth do you do?”

The existence of copula -ile and the fact that copula follows its predicate clearly demon-
strate that ‘odet is the subject as a noun clause with a zero nominalizer at its head. So
this sentence may be paraphrased as "It is what that you should do." in the sense 'what
is it that you are doing?' It is to be recalled that the Subjunctive form of the verb,
which generally means wonder or doubt also in the main clause, is used in the non-
factual (irreal) subordinate clause. This is reminiscent of Arabic mā-dâ: mā-dâ taktubû?
‘what is it that you write?’
9) 'ema dukt-ot\i  Œ-mar'-a (passage 178)
   which place (f.)-you (m.) SUBJUNCTIVE-afflict-she
   "Which part of you gives pain?"
10) mu helma hze-lox (passage 478)\(^7\)
   what dream saw-you (m.)
   "What dream did you see?"

Secondly, what interests us is the existence of d- in dima ‘when.’ d- in
dah/dehi ‘how’ has a good parallel in MEA.\(^7\)\(^6\) Nöldke (1868: 161) referred
this to the relative particle da in Late Aramaic and indeed the use of this particle
in adverbial expressions is attested well in CS.\(^7\)\(^7\) So this etymology can
be regarded as established. But in H it is prefixed to *emmät (CS) as well:
d-imä ‘when’. In as many materials available to me as possible from MWA to
MM, this is the only instance of the kind. Being isolated in this respect,
it corroborates conversely the widespread use of d- in such expressions in
previous times.

Adverbs that attracted my attention are böltama ‘thither’ and bebha ‘here.’
The former may be analyzed into b- ‘o + l-tama ‘at that (m.) to there.’ Although

\(^7\) See the variation of syntactic roles that mu plays in the following.
   i) yasoq laž-žan,       mu  beaž-č-et (passage 530)
      shame to-you (pl.)  what      ignoble-COPULA (you, pl.)
      “Shame on you! How ignoble you are!”
   ii) mu  pek-ek (<d)  kep'-et  'et-lan (passage 631)
        what  fruit-RELATIVE  want-you (m.)  have-we
        “We have whatever fruit you want.”

\(^7\) For example, U daxiṣ < *daxē < *d-’a(y)k-'ay ‘of like which.’ We know dax is used
   also in U phrase bαs dax? ‘then how?’ (Maclean 1985: 190, 1901: 59a) and yet Maclean
   informs us of its another meaning ‘like’ without any specification (1901: 59a), which
   puzzles us greatly. However what turns out after careful scrutiny into available ma-
   terials is, so to speak, a very interesting complementary distribution of ‘like’ and ‘how’
   for one and the same word dax. Such dialects as have māto ‘how’ in place of dax- have
   dax or max (or both) for ‘like’: Zakhö (mātō; ku-dax or mux), Aradhin (mātū; dax or
   max), Gîra (mātō; mux) and Azerbaijan (mātō; mago). Those with dax- as ‘how’ never
   have it as ‘like’ albeit their ‘like’ is varied: U (daxiṣ; ax, rarely max). Tkhuma (dāxi/
   dāx; ‘ax or max), Nerwa (dix; ‘x), Mangesh (dix; ‘x) and Mosul (dax/dāxi: mux Lidzbarski
   1896: I/214+II/511). The only exception seems to be Tiari (ax; dix Lidzbarski
   I/82+II/439 and mātū Lidzbarski I/156+II/508). In this result we may guess
   as follows. At the last stage of Late Aramaic of the region, d-ax as ‘like’ had been
   well established and only after that a new ‘how’ came into being. Some chose a simple
   method to make use of this new preposition: *dax- ‘ay > *daxē, while others had recourse to
   quite a different etymology (mātō), whatever it may have been (Nöldke 1868: 162).
   If then, dax as ‘how’ must be a secondary evolution after the establishment of *daxē
   as ‘how.’ max is also secondary and the newcomer mātō exercised its influence on the
   old *ax. The intricate picture of today is the outcome of mutual contact and their
   emigration due to the hardships they had to suffer in modern times.

\(^7\) Nöldke 1904: 167+290.
it is not clear why *l-tama is not enough as in Tkhuma, *b-'o is doubtless a separate word in view of the stress rule described above. H has a series of words for 'here': bahha 'here,' lahha 'to here,' and mahha 'from here' but *ahha is never used alone unlike 'axxa in Aradhin, Mosul, Zakho and Nerwa. This is very similar in nature to laxxa in U as laxxa in Mangesh (laxxā in Mosul is a variant to 'axxā), where l- is an integrated part of the word. In addition H has another word bebha apparently from *b-kā 'at here.' *kā 'here' is the element found in CS hákā and harkā that MCA has inherited as hārke. It is also preserved in H as *men-ha: mehha (passage 341) and memha 'from here.' Then what is be- prefixed to it? One conjecture is to interpret this as parallel to bōltama. *bha came to be felt too 'light' and b- 'in, at' was added again to strengthen the phonetic form: *b-bha>*b̪̄b̪a, when the analogy to, and the contrast to, bōltama worked and helped interpreting *o as e 'that(f.)' as against o 'that(m.)' in bōltama. Note that o/e is the basic demonstrative element and it means 'that' only in contrast to the secondary 'this' built anew from it ('o-hā/ *e-hā) and this fact brings it near the definite article in its function with nouns. So bebha would mean 'in the here.'

3.8. Excursus: Prepositions with d-

CS had a unique syntactic construction of relative d- after prepositions: 'amm-eh dā-haw rušā 'with it of that wickedness' > with that wickedness.'78) As is well-known this construction came into being on the analogy of the two nouns in the genitive relation: bār-eh dālāhā 'son-his of God > the Son of God.' This is, in part at least, because many prepositions had a nominal origin or nature. In MA the old system of states in nouns disappeared and the role of d- increased greatly and in many of them it is the sole means available to express such relations of nouns except MWA and MM where a new system of states has been brought into being. Most of MEA and MCA languages have inherited this tendency from the similar situation of Late Aramaic comparable to that of CS. Thus we find now a profuse use of d- after prepositions in MEA and MCA. But they never use d- when PS is suffixed to prepositions, because this would have resulted in a phonetic reduplication only.79) CS did not do it, either. Modern dialects, however, differ from each other in its retention of the proleptic PS suffixed to the preposition or noun. Some has left a trace of it80) under some conditions: MCA bayt-e d-ū-babo 'house-his of-the-father > father's house.'

What concerns us here is those dialects that have left this trace. Sachau

---

78) Examples cited here are from Nöldeke 1904. CS rule referred to in the following concerning this is described on page 175-6.
79) But see the exception of Aradhin below.
reports us that in Mosul some prepositions have allomorphs before nouns (1895: 17+32–33): ilgēbē d-/il-gēb ‘by, near,’ imm-i d-/am ‘with,’ thōt-i d-/thut ‘under.’ In MCA this trace is discernible in the prepositions whose nominal origin is evident (Jastrow 1985a: 255–261): b-filig-e d- ‘in the midst of,’ b-gāw-e d- ‘inside,’ riš-e d- ‘toward’ and some others. Zakho has also left some clues: ‘imm-t d- ‘with,’ and min-qām-i d- ‘from before.’

Qurious is the way it appears in Aradhin, for it is in the case of pronouns, not nouns, that d- appears with proleptic PS attached to the preposition, and for all persons at that (Krotkoff 1982: 47–8+20). Krotkoff says that this happens ‘in actual use’ of the prepositions with suffixes. Nouns can also be used thus for the third person. Seeing that this does not apply to the nouns, they are not as genuine traces as in MCA and Mosul. Aradhin’s case may be looked upon as secondary development to enforce the pronominal function of little morphemes on the analogy of diy- with the nouns (see examples 13 below). This analogy, however, is to the same direction that took place in CS.

As against Aradhin, Jewish Modern Aramaic of Azerbaijan reveals a more straightforward reflection of its linguistic history. Garbell’s excellent analysis teaches us that forms with this d- are free variants of those without it. Here all prepositions but three (out of 89 in her list) ‘may take the suffix -it- id in relation to nouns . . . ‘in the archaic style and in deliberate speech.’ This calls to mind a hapless fate of U that is now a standard literary language for most of the MEA speakers owing to the fact that its Nestorian (call it Assyrian or Chaldean) orthography has developed basically from what the American missionaries invented. Stoddard says min amma (‘from people’) ‘quickly pronounced will be minit umma (his italic)’ and explains this, saying ‘The Ancient Syriac idiom has been retained in the spoken language, though not introduced into our books.’ Maclean, too, records minít, ʿālit, and qāmit as ‘sometimes pronounced’ for orthographical min, al and qam respectively. Indeed so is the case as seen in the short text of Doctrina christiana published by Rödiger. Whether the language of the text belongs to subgroup B or A, this text reveals a ‘quick’ pronunciation with qam-t for qam ‘before.’ Whatever reasons they had, the quasi-historical orthography missionaries adopted for printing overshadowed, as is noted by themselves, the real pronunciation of this phenomenon, too. This is why we cannot detect what vague trace U may have in

81) See Sabar 1983. This preposition is attested in Nerwa too: m-qām-i d- (Sabar 1976: 63+147).
82) Garbell 1965: 60–2, especially 61.
84) Rödiger 1939: 85–6. This text is written by a Chaldean priest in Khosrova (east of Dilman/Shahpur) by the year 1827. One example will suffice: bīnum-i ʿałha ‘his-son of-God,’ for others are cited in Nöldeke ibid.
the printed materials.\footnote{The same historical principle influenced even on the ‘New Alphabet’ in some points. See Polotsky’s detailed study on it in his work of 1961 throughout.} Now here are some examples from dialects referred to above.

11) ilgêb-ê d-bêta (Mosul) ‘near it of the house’
12) b-âw-e d-â-ú-turo (MCA) ‘into it of the mountain’
13) gâw-e diy-e (Aradhin) ‘in it’
   cf. bâb-e diy-e (Aradhin) ‘his father of his’
14) m tôšle ‘âdâm â baxt-e min-qa’m-î d’îstâz ‘ôlam ‘ilâha (Zakho)\footnote{Sabar 1983: 5; this is a Biblical translation of Genesis 3:8.}

   hid-he Adam and wife-his from-before of Lord world God
   “He hid, Aram and his wife, from before God, Lord of Universe.”
15) minn-i d-olka (Azerbaijan) ‘from it of the city’

   (m-olka is its variant; not italic because they are plain.)

3.9. Prepositions in H

Prepositions of this type abound in H, or rather it is almost the rule with 10 out of 25 prepositions Jastrow gives\footnote{Garbell 1965: 61.}: ‘em-(for PS)’/emn-e d- ‘with,’ kâmut-/kâm-e d- ‘opposite’ and men-/menn-e d- ‘from.’ This is because this dialect has little been exposed to the missionary activities\footnote{Jastrow 1988: 102-5.} and their natural pronunciation has been recorded, as it is spoken, by the most competent linguist. I cite just one example for now.

16) mettu-lan lel-e r(<d>-reš-ew (passage 106)
   put-we onto-his of-head-his
   “We put onto its top.”

Maclean states in passing that demonstratives should have d- prefixed to it when it is governed by a preposition excepting l- ‘to,’ b- ‘in, at, by’ and tā ‘for’ (the last one in Alqoš, subgroup D; 1895: 181) and the same is put more explicitly by Marogulov (1976: 41): min d-e dana ‘from that(f.) time.’ This is amply attested in many dialects, and just two more will be sufficient here: ta d-â göra (Zakho, Avinery 1978: 94) ‘to this(m.) man’ and gal/gal-id d-ajne naše (plain: Azerbaijan, Garbell 1965: 62) ‘with these people.’ Maclean, however, gives some prepositions exceptional to this rule. Since this rule is so thoroughly going that we are now concerned with these exceptional ones. In the dialects where this rule is explicitly said to work, they are given as follows:

Tkhuma (Jacobi 1973: 220): b-, l-, m- ‘from’

\footnote{But see Jastrow do.: xxii-lii.}
Aradhin (Krotkoff 1982: 49): prepositions at least except gu, min, riš, and tla 'for'

Azerbaijan (Garbell 1965: 62): all but be 'without'

Though the list varies in each dialect and the situation of Aradhin is not clear enough, those given in common are l- and b-. Incidentally they coincide with the two which Nöldeke denies the use of d- even with ordinary nouns after a preposition that can take it otherwise. Examples of this abound in his texts. But the question arises what the unprefix prepositions are that govern demonstratives without d-. It is by no means short of the point to ask with the foregoing discussion in view. The result of my cursory reading of the text, though not thorough enough, brought out l-, b- and m- (men). When we consider that demonstrative adjectives in MCA come after nouns and that there is no such rule even for the articles of similar derivation, this is indeed a feature that ties H to MEA group so firmly. We list here some of the instances of this restriction rule in H.

(I) demonstrative pronouns (numbers refer to the text passage)
   a) l- ‘to’:  l-ohá (497) ‘to this(m.)’
                 l-aya (533) ‘to that(f.)’
                 l-ani (393) ‘to those’
   b) b- ‘in, at, by’: I have none.
   c) m- ‘from’: m-anñih (488) ‘from these’
                 m-aya (350) ‘from that(f.)’
                 m-ani (573, twice) ‘from those’

(II) demonstrative adjectives
   a) l-:
                 l-åd ŋal-å (162, twice) ‘to this(m.) condition’
                 l-åd 'id-e t (<d)-tar'a (533) ‘to this(f.) side of the door’
                 l-ån tlata tar'åne-å (670) ‘to these three doors’
                 l-o guå (654) ‘to that(m.) wall’
                 l-e dår (400, 401) ‘to that(f.) condition’
   b) b-:
                 b-åd (<ad) šapruta-å (368) ‘in this(f.) beauty’
                 b-då (<can) laẖme Dyārbakri-å (382) ‘from these Diyarbakır bread’
                 b-o gedda (215, 216) ‘to that(m.) rope’

90) Nöldeke 1904: 175.
3.10. Nouns

Generally speaking, MEA and MCA have simplified the gender and number endings and the gender in plural is neutralized as old masculine plural endings supplanted the feminine ones in those parts of speech that stand in grammatical concord to nouns. So the basic system of these forms is: U (MEA) -a (m.), -i (f.), -i (pl.) and MCA -a (m.), -i (f.), -e (pl.). H is no exception in this point so long as genuine Aramaic words are concerned.

What concerns us here then is the genitive construction. As referred to already regarding the preposition above (section 3.8), MEA has retained the use of d- with a proleptic pronoun attached to the first member of the construction. The nature of this proleptic pronoun, however, became forgotten in the course of time and we can now find a fossilized form (-i- or -e-) of *-eh 'his' in Late Aramaic. Examples quoted in that section show it.

With regard to nouns almost the same picture appears when we look for it in MEA dialects. The data of Mangesh given to us at least seem to lack in it: k'tawa d-babi (Sara 1974: 105) 'the book of my father.' Aradhin has left a trace of it in a slight, but quite generalized, way. Krotkoff says the final -a of the first member of the construction 'is reduced: a → a': zawr-n d-bahar 'time of spring' (1982: 51). Somewhat complicated as it is, Zakho shares the preservation of it: hakom-i t kullu hewane (Aviny 1978: 94) 'king of all the animals' and so does Nerwa texts. As to Azerbaijan we find it described very explicitly, namely, this is the ordinary means for the construction: bræti t-
\textit{sultana} (Garbell 1965: 54–5; italic for ‘flat’) ‘the daughter of the king’.\footnote{Incidentally she does not mention the style of speech, while for the case of prepositions she limited the phenomenon in ‘the archaic style and in deliberate speech.’ See note 82.}

For U we must be content with what I mentioned and referred to in the section of prepositions for the time being.\footnote{But see Takashina forthcoming for details.}

Then what comes out of H? Jastrow’s detailed analysis (1988: 25–6) teaches us that nouns of Aramaic origin ending in -a (singular and plural) and -e (plural) form -ed with the genitive particle d-, while in other types of nouns, which are nothing short of loanwords, d- stands alone. -d of -ed undergoes as a rule the assimilation to the initial consonant of the second member of the construction, totally or partially, whereas d that stands alone does not seem to be exposed to such a change and the vowel ending of the first member retains its quality. In my view this almost means that these d’s are two things apart. Standing alone, the latter d is merely a preposition on its own, whereas the former -ed is nothing but an ending of a newborn construct state, the form which a genuine Aramaic word never fail to take when it stands in relation to the following noun. Just two examples: \textit{suṣ-et poha} ‘the horse of the wind’ (passage 671) but compare \textit{ha dokt-ed tarpa} ‘one place of the leaf’ (passage 103).

Though the extent of the generalization of this has not been made sufficiently clear in each dialect, the case of Azerbaijan may also be deemed to be a new construct.\footnote{Azerbaijan has another form of ‘construct’ for feminines: \textit{pqort-it/pqor} še‘r ‘the lion’s neck’ from \textit{pqorta} ‘neck.’ Garbell do.: 55.} The necessity of admitting a new ‘construct’ state defined as above inevitably leads us to set up a new system of states as in MWA and MM.\footnote{See Takashina 1986: 97–8 for MWA and do.: 82–4 for MM. A system of new states may seem superfluous without a determinate/emphatic state, but the determinate state in eastern Late Aramaic was only nominal and yet we admit the system itself. Moreover Arabic \textit{kitāb-u} ‘the book of’ as against \textit{kitāb-u-n} ‘a book’ is construct if defined as above. In short what is more important is its syntactic function rather than its phonetic form.} With the related phenomenon being much limited in occurrence in MCA,\footnote{See note 80.} it must be said that the evolution of the nouns in H shows a kind of innate affinity with some of MEA dialects.

### 3.11. Verbs (1): Tense/Aspect System\footnote{For the verbal system, especially that of MEA, see Polotsky 1961: 20–3 among others, and Tsereteli 1968 and 1972. For the historical evolution of the verbal system of all MA languages, including MWA and MM as well, we have now a very detailed study of D. Cohen (1984: 458–577) which has left little to be added.} (100)

In the verbal system we depend heavily on Jastrow’s detailed analysis for the use of each verbal form and it is to be admitted that what follows is little short of a brief reinterpretation of his description in my framework. First of all, I call the set of various inflectional forms common to all (derived) stems,
named ‘conjugation’ by some, the tense/aspect system: \(^{101}\) ‘tense’ because the tense-indicator \(-wa\) plays an unnegligible role throughout the system but Imperatives, and ‘aspect’ because verbal forms seemingly dependent on time prove suddenly to be relative to it the moment \(-wa\) is introduced and its relativity is subject to the context, i.e., the way the speaker recognizes it. Thus the whole system is understood as referring to the time of the speech without \(-wa\), while its appearance is a good token of the shift of the time-axis into the past, not of necessity into the actual past but likewise into the past as the speaker understands it. This enables the use of Subjunctive + \(-wa\) (form 9 in Table 5) and \(bed\) + Imperfective + \(-wa\) (8) as conditional that is aloof from actuality in nature. The use of \(-wa\) separates MEA and MCA from MWA and MM that do not have it. Instead they preserve quite well the older aspect system, in spite of the introduction of new inflectional bases, in that time reference of MWA is totally dependent upon the context with the old prefixed ‘imperfect’ forms functioning still as Subjunctive and that MM has little changed the system of Classical Mandaic retaining the old suffixed ‘perfect’ forms.

The term Imperfective/Perfective \(^{102}\) is an arbitrary one but I use it just to show the difference of the inflectional base: it never purports an individual form. Forms and their function must be set apart. For Imperfective three time-markers are to be distinguished, each corresponding to its function: \(\Theta\), for the actual present (H has no progressive proper), \(bed\) for the future, \(\Theta\), for Subjunctive. Strange as it may appear to posit two zero morphemes, this assures us of clarifying implicit nature common to all MCA and MEA dialects. Namely, all of them have basically a set of three time-markers as follows. \(^{103}\)

1. **present:** 
   - \(ki\) (U)/k (Amadiya, Mosul, Mangesh)/g (Zakho, Nerwa, Azerbijan)/i (Aradhin, Tkhuma)/ko (MCA)

2. **future:** 
   - \(bit\) (U)/bid (Mosul)/bid (Nerwa)/bad (Tkhuma)/bed (Aradhin)/
     - b (Amadiya, Mangesh, Zakho)/gbe (Azerbijan)/gtd (MCA) \(^{104}\)

3. **subjunctive or jussive:** \(\Theta\) \(^{105}\)

As to \(qam\) (U)/qam (Amadiya, Aradhin, Zakho)/kim (Mangesh)/kim (Mosul), it is best understood as a syntactic variant for the Perfective whose use is restricted to the expressions of past + pronominal object (PS-C), for Perfective is forced to express its pronominal object by means of PS-A which complicates

\(^{101}\) The following argument is based on my previous studies and what is discussed there is not necessarily repeated here. See note 6.

\(^{102}\) See note 22 for the correspondence of my terms to Jastrow’s.

\(^{103}\) Allomorphs are ignored for the simplicity’s sake.

\(^{104}\) In Aradhin \(b\) is used as ‘Sequential’ and is a secondary development as a consequence of the exclusive use of \(bed\) as future. See Krotkoff 1982: 32.

\(^{105}\) Sara gives as ‘conjunctive’ marker \(d/t\) for Mangesh (1974: 74): \(tqat\) ‘that he kill’ but this \(d/t\) is nothing but a nominalizer (old relative particle \(d\) used for noun clause) and therefore the hidden marker is \(\Theta\). This is also the case with Nerwa with a nominalizer as \(d\) (Sabor 1976: xi). Compare the Modern Hebrew usage of \(\xi +\) ‘imperfect.’
the understanding of syntactic relations. In fact Sabar reports that Nerwa does not possess this particle because Perfective with PS-A as object is so complete as to dispense with qam (1976: xxxviii-xxxxix). Some like U can on the contrary enjoy the luxury of choice of inflectional bases in the expression of pronominal object. As a matter of course its actual usage differs among the dialects. So, being extrinsic in nature, this is a periphrasis which a speaker is forced to use for the benefit of easier understanding.

This tripartite system we cannot find in H as against all the others, that is to say, MCA and MEA forming one group in this case. True, we are informed that k- is found in kep' e 'he wants' (p. 39) but this is a unique petrified instance in the verb √*b'y, and used only in the Imperfective (!) at that. It may be out of place to ask here whether this implies that k- gradually fell into oblivion somehow or other after its widespread use in the past, or whether H went off the way others took to the end. We cannot answer it as yet.106) ked (presumably made up of k- and √yd 'to know') prefixed to Imperfective base to indicate ability is proven to be of a different kind because of its treatment in the negative that differs from other time-markers.107) Hence it stands to reason that we posit here two Ø morphemes, which then enables us to recognize the three kinds of syntactic use of the Imperfective base. Because its usage is the same, the lack of k- makes the position of H all the more conspicuous for it.

Now we turn to the ‘Resultative.’ Jastrow is definitely right in assuming that this is ‘nicht völlig in das Verbalsystem integriert’ (p. 59), since this is limited to the basic stem (trilliteral or quadriliteral) alone and the derived stems have no such use without a special inflectional base (see Table 6). The one used for ‘Resultative’ in the basic stem is the same ptih- used in Perfective but nonetheless the difference is clearly discernible. In the former the base undergoes a morphophonemic change in its use of PS-A for subject whose initial consonant is either a vowel or Ø (or a consonant when -Cek is suffixed, see p. 53), while in the latter such a change does not occur because of its initial consonant of PS-C used as subject, thus: pteh-C/Ø for Perfective as against pteh-C/Ø and ptih-V for ‘Resultative.’ On the basis of Jastrow’s description we set up a distinction in its usage as follows:

(I) Resultative used to show the result of a change in the state that is recognized as ensuing whether the change has taken place previous to, or

---

106) But what is very suggestive is the tendency of fluctuation of g and bid in Nerwa. Sabar observes one of the two sometimes takes the place where the other is expected (1976: 59 note 209). This may mean that at the time when the text was composed the function of time reference in them had not been fixed so firmly as today.

107) Forms with Ø or bed (1-3, 7-9; see Table 5), when negated, lose them and the negative particle le or la precedes the base directly, when ked does not disappear forming the sequence le-ked-BASE: le ken (<ked) napek (107) ‘he cannot go out’. Likewise it can be used with Perfective. See Jastrow 1988: 55.
simultaneous with, the time-axis. This is the usage by its nature for intransitive verbs, a) stative verbs or b) verbs of motion, and c) for transitive verbs though much limited in the text.\(^{108}\)

(II) Passive d) for transitive verbs, but since this syntactic use depends heavily on the nature of old passive participle *CaCiC (now ptiḥ-) without any auxiliary verb or copula, this Passive is inevitably statal and describes the state as in the Resultative above.

Complicated as it may seem, the situation is very clear with a complementary function allotted to verbs according to their nature but their historical background is quite another thing. As Kutscher has demonstrated it beyond all doubt leaving nothing to be desired,\(^{109}\) MA looked for the inflectional bases of the respective new verbal system to four kinds of morphemes extant in Aramaic: (1) CaCiC 1- and (2) CCCiC (Ca- or Ca-) for transitive verbs, (3) CaCCiC and its free variant (4) CaCiC for intransitive verbs. All these were used 'actively' and what was worse the passive participle was also (5) CaCiC. Aside from (3) CaCCiC, which is employed as Perfective of stative and neutral verbs in MCA and as Resultative of stative verbs in MWA,\(^{110}\) all the rest have been employed in MEA. In U, for example, (2) and (4) have merged into one to form Resultative but it treated this as nominal, adding -a to its end: ptiţxα. Thus it is used actively with a copula in the Resultative but at the same time it is used passively in the passive construction with auxiliary verbs √pjş 'to remain' and √/tj 'to come.'\(^{111}\) Now we shall see the correspondence of the four forms in H, U and MCA.\(^{112}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>U</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>MCA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vt. (1)</td>
<td>ptiţ-C (Perf.)</td>
<td>ptiḥ-C (Perf.)</td>
<td>ftiḥ-C (Perf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dāmix-A (Perf.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vt. (2)</td>
<td>ptiţx-α ijlį (Resul.)</td>
<td>ptiḥ-A (Resul./Pres.; 1c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi. (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>dmiḥ-A (Resul./Pres.; 1a, b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vt. (5)</td>
<td>ptiţx-α √pjş (Pas.)</td>
<td>ptiḥ-A (Pas./Pres.; 1d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

vt./vi.=transitive/intransitive verbs; A/C=types of PS for subject markers; I, II, a, b, c, d=types of 'Resultative' as defined above; Perf., Resul., Pas., Pres.=Perfective, Resultative, Passive, Present.

---

\(^{108}\) From now on the term 'Resultative' is used in this narrow sense.

\(^{109}\) Kutscher 1969. Now that this study has, strangely enough, been unduly neglected so far in MA studies, Kutscher must speak again. The following synthesis is dealt with elaborately by Cohen 1984.


\(^{111}\) This twofold nature of ptiţxα should not be overlooked: ptiţx[ɛ:]li 'he has opened (the door is open now)' and 'it is open.' See Tsereteli 1968: 251-2 and Cohen 1984: 551-2.

\(^{112}\) Cohen's table on page 568 lists such correspondence of all the verbal forms in major MA languages.
The difference between H and MCA is so apparent that we need no explanation but the effort on the part of H seems to show the parallel tendency to MEA in the formation of Resultative by means of CCiC. Certainly U cannot stand for all the MEA dialects and yet we use U here as the one possessed of the final result of reformation in the verbal system. The definite difference from U is summarized into two points: (1) H employed this form as it was in Late Aramaic, i.e., in the absolute state (-Ø for masculine and -a for feminine) of old passive participle (like MCA), while U made use of it with the form slightly changed, i.e., in the determinate state (-a for masculine and -ta for feminine); (2) subject reference is left in H to PS-A with -wa as tense-indicator, whereas U leaves these two functions to the copula or auxiliary verb. Hence in the latter the base ptija2 has been rid of any other function than to show its object\(^\text{113}\) and this enabled an elaborate tense/aspect system in it. But in H the base ptih must bear the load of expressions of subject, object and tense attached to it altogether. For object H has PS-C alone\(^\text{114}\) and the phonetic form of the base is very similar to that of Perfective on top of all these. In view of these facts it is only too natural that Resultative and Passive could not develop fully in this dialect.\(^\text{115}\) This is why we have a very limited number of Resultative in the transitive verbs with object (see examples 33–34 below).

Notwithstanding, we can find several examples of nominal use of the base as CCiC-a (examples 42–45) and all of them are preceded by a deictic copula ho-le ‘here it is’. This is in no way incidental but on the contrary it is to be regarded as inevitable requirement, seeing that it is now in the category of nouns and the nouns need a copula in order to be a predicate. No wonder we know such constructions are in use in other dialects as conditioned variant of ordinary construction with a proper copula.\(^\text{116}\) In spite of the small number of examples, it is only a step from here for the proper copula to come into use in its place. Seen in this line of argument, the verbal system of H is in the nebulous, by no means chaotic, stage of its development. Now the examples are due here.\(^\text{117}\)

For (1) a):
\begin{itemize}
  \item [17)] 'en gder(-rek) kekwana (147) ‘when the partridge has become tired’
  \item [18)] 'en 'alaha la kreb-wa menn-oh, la ñger-wa menn-oh (359) ‘if God has not
\end{itemize}

\(^{113}\) PS-B is suffixed to ptiixa, for ptiixa is nominal in nature owing to the determinate state common with nouns in Late Aramaic.

\(^{114}\) For 'Inkorporiertes Objekt' (Jastrow 1988: 62-3) see below.

\(^{115}\) But in Mangesh we find a parallel construction ptih + PS-A used as Passive. See Sara 1974: 72.

\(^{116}\) U, Zakho and Amadiya as far as I know.

\(^{117}\) For brevity's sake glosses are dispensed with. Examples listed here in the alphabetical order of the root of the verb include Jastrow's and mine together and these are all I have at present. The Resultative/Passive forms and deictic copulas are left unitalicized.
become angry with you, if he has not become wrathful at you’

King of Egypt’

20) huy-a (አአይ) kim-a (አአይ) mālēl-a go ḥdade (342) ‘it [her body(1.2)] has
become, has become black, has become blue in each-other [mixedly]’

21) dehan mit-i (አአይ) m-kopna (522) ‘now they have died [been dead] from
hunger’

22) dad-ed Yosep mih-a-wa (አአይ) (438) ‘Yosep’s mother had rested [been dead]’

23) zeda m-garme (…) la piš-i (አአይ) le’l-o, qesm besa la peš le’lo-o (481)
‘more than bones have not remained on her, a bit of flesh has not re-
mained on her’

23a) ḥakma qenyana peš-wa (171) ‘some cattle had remained’

23b) ‘ohā p(< d)-peš Benyamen-ile (539) ‘this that has remained is Benyamen’

23c) ‘e dana nter-ri(< li) ’ana pandeq-an ‘iz-an l-tamoha, w ’ahi piš-a bebha
(345) ‘this time [then] I saw, I(f.) have been thrown [and] gone to there,
and she has remained here’

24) ho-le gallak gella req-b-e (አአይ) (187) ‘look, much grass has become green
in it(m.)’


For (I) b):

26) Yosep ’izu (አአይ), dehan qem(-mek) (553) ‘Yosep has gone, [and yet] now
he has stood [returned here]’ See also 29a.

26a) Kāwo pandq-a-wa mēḥha l-tamoha ’iz-a-wa (341) ‘Kawof(f.) had been thrown
from here to there, she was gone’

26b) baḥt-ett(<-ed) ‘Oriyel xolam-ew, ’iz-a-wa, ḫep-a-wa (561) ‘the wife of Oriyel,
his servant, had gone [and] she was bathing’

26c) ‘iz-ah (431), See 30.

26d) madamki har ’iz-en (595) ‘because anyway I(m.) have gone [been there]’

26e) ‘iz-an (345). See 23c.

27) ho-le ’ite (አአይ) talga (143; also 142+152) ‘look, snow has come’

27a) l-ē’t-’an me ’ite-b-e (405; also 432) ‘I(f.) do not know what has come to
him’

27b) ha zalama ’ite laḥḥa (447) ‘a man has come here’

27c) haz-ah ke dāh ’ečča(< *ety-a) b-reš-ew (461) ‘we see how it(f.) has come
to his head [him]’

27d) nṯer-ren(<-len)-b-e ho-le ’ečča waxt xapor-ew (190) ‘I looked at it, behold,
the time(f.) of its tillage has come’


118) Since kim-a and mālēl-a do not have -ta ending, they are Resultative and therefore
the informant seems to have changed the choice of words for color. Otherwise *huy-a kim-ta
would have produced a very interesting example.
ho-le npel dewa bat-rew (168-170) ‘look, the wolf has fallen after[on] him’
Zâkerya rab-ewa b’-amr did-ew, su-wa, ’izu-wa l . . ., npel-wa m-hârakât (597) ‘Zakerya was great in his age, he had become old, he had gone to . . ., he had fallen from activities [become inactive]’
‘aya la ’et-wa-b-a mendi. le Qômo, hâma lâgheda npil-a-wa (341) ‘that(f.) had not anything in her. But Qomo(f.) just instantly had fallen [to the ground]’
m-hâh(-hek) (√mhy) l-tura, w ’iz-âh ptil-âh (431) ‘we have gone [been; lit. struck] to the mountain and have gone [and] roamed’
ha-homa qem(-mek) (√qym) gella (480) ‘so high [lit. much] has stood the grass’ See also 26.
gaw-eb(<-ed) brita la qim-i-wa (352) ‘in the world they have not stood [he has no equal]’
tiw-en-wa (√ytw) kam-et(<-ed) tar’a (166) ‘I had been sitting before the door’
For (I) c):
’amma ’emm-et(<-ed) hatha mhe-wa berqa. b-qudart-et(<-ed) ’alaha, mhewa berqa l-bahtonta (340)119 ‘but with thus [suddenly] a lightning had struck, by the might of God, the lightning had struck the woman’
’aya-sse qbil-en-la (636) ‘this(f.) too I have accepted it(f.)’120
For (II) d):
’attore l-et-an la l-kalwe hél (√’hl), la l-parhe hél, w la l-naše šte’ (405) ‘then I(f.) do not know [whether] he has not been eaten by dogs, he has not been eaten by birds and he has not been thrown away by men’
’en m-kam-ew člik-a qamest-ew (462 twice) ‘if his shirt has been torn from before him [the fore part of his shirt]’
mehy-a bal-o l-saq (509) / Mèsser (511)/baḥha (510) ‘she [-camel] has been turned to the east/Egypt [here]’121
l-et’ah l-dewe hél(-lek), l-naše qtel(-lek), l-debbabe hél(-lek) (432) ‘we do not know [if] he has been eaten by wolves, he has been killed by men, he has been eaten by bears’

119 Structurally this resembles Passive (see examples below) but bahtonta ‘woman’ cannot be a subject of this sentence. Note the inverted order of the sentence (V-S-O) to describe vividly the result of this shocking accident. Perhaps this may be why the ‘definite direct object agreement’ (Hoberman 1989: 102) is not found here (-la, as in the next example) albeit this woman is introduced before. mhe-le bârq-e (337 twice) ‘lightnings struck’ testifies that the lightning berqa is the subject and ’alaha cannot be the implied subject.

120 If this were Perfective, it would be *qbel-len-la.

121 The preceding passage requires here Passive. This bewildering phrase √mhy ‘to strike’ + bala ‘mind, heed’ has several meanings and needs a careful analysis. On the basis of my study (Takashina forthcoming), the example 37 here should be taken as Passive that corresponds to the Active sentence in the passage 508, not as (Active) Resultative.
39) *dārawa se’(’ek)* (233) ‘the passage has been closed’
40) se’t’ (405). See 35 above.
41) *l-‘alaha hiw-a* (ṣ/ｙḥw) *lal-ew* (499) ‘by God it(f.) has been given to him’

For CCGiC-a used nominally with *ho-le*: [a’] stative verbs
42) *ho-le dmiḥ-a* (2) ‘look, it(m.) is sleeping [lying]’
[b’] verbs of motion
43) *dim-en(<-ed) natren* ho-le *npi’l-a l-‘ar’a* (176) ‘when I see, look, he is fallen(m.) [lying] to the ground’
43a) *dim-en(<-ed) nter-ran(<-lan)* ho-la *npe’l-ta l-bōltama* (339) ‘when we see, look, she is fallen(f.) [lying] to there’
44) *Satana ho-le tiw-a* (359) ‘look, Satan(m.) is sitting’
[d’] Passive
45) *qamest-ew ho-le m-batr-ew člik-a* (463) ‘his shirt(f.), look, he(sic) is torn (m.) from behind him’

With regard to the negation of verbs, two forms of ‘not’ are known in MEA: *la* and *le*. Some dialects use *la* only while others have both of them, and *H* belongs to the latter group. Although Tkhum has as one of the latter group, it share a certain feature with the subgroup D of MEA in that the negative particle *le* is simply prefixed to the verbal forms that already have a time-marker prefixed to it: *le-bad-gārās* (Imperfective Future) ‘he will not pull.’ As is well-known, however, U displays a very subtle differentiation of the two negative particles. *le* is the exclusive particle to negate verbs except Perfective forms, which use *la*, and the time-markers of Imperfective are dropped when negated: *ki(Ø)/bit-patix* ‘he opens(open/will open)’ as against *le* *patix* in which time reference is neutralized. In *H* we learn that the negative particle *le* is used for the forms with prefixes *Ø*, and *bed* and drops them with the same result of neutralization. When we recall that the prefixes of *H* *Ø*, *bed* and *Ø₂* correspond to *ki*, *bit* and *Ø* respectively, the similarity strikes and puzzles us so greatly. No matter what the etymology of *le* may be, they both (*U* and *H*) have these two in the phonetically identical forms and

---

122) Compare 43 with 29+29a, and 43a with 29b.
123) Compare this with 36. Since *gamesa* is doubtless feminine, we are faced with a difficulty. The story runs along the hero’s actions, so the heed of the informant is concentrated on the hero, not his torn shirt, though of course it is an important factor. Thus *člik-a* agrees with *qamest-ew* as verbal predicate in the ‘feminine absolute state’ while the deictic copula *ho-le* (m.) refers to the hero. Without regard to such circumstances, however, we can take it as it is, as shown above. At any rate this is a dubious example.
124) Verbal forms coupled with a copula or an auxiliary verb are negated by means of the negation of the latter. MCA uses *lo* < *lā* for verbs throughout.
126) The prefix *qam* is negated by the ordinary *lo* and this is another evidence to show that it is quite different from the nature of the other time-markers. See MacLean 1985: 88.
are used syntactically in the same manner with only one exception in the Sub-
jective of \( H \) that use \( la \). In both of them \( la/la \) is used for the Perfective.
Are these phenomena but a coincidence at all? In this line of argument, it
must be added that in \( H \) \( la \) is used for Resultative (examples 18, 23 and
31a).\(^{126a}\)

To end this section, it would not be out of place to refer to the ‘definite
direct object agreement’\(^{127}\) rule, i.e., a definite object must have its correspond-
ing pronominal object attached to the verbal base. Though the examples are
not sufficient, the rule seems to hold good for Perfective.

46) \( h\-\-\text{len-ne(<-le) kekwan-i swa't-ehen} \) (122) ‘I gave them = my partridges
their fill’

For the reference of the definite object by means of -a (f.) and -i (pl.) at-
tached to the base, though limited to the third person only, Jastrow’s piercing
observation does not miss its syntactical significance. Despite its less developed
state in \( H \) as compared with other MEA dialects that make full use of it, its
usage corresponds to those in Amadiya and Aradhin.\(^{128}\)


Table 6, which is based on the description of Jastrow, apart from Verbal
Nouns, shows a general picture of the derived stems. Quadrilateral verbs are
quite naturally formed according to the pattern of the stem III due to the
same number of the consonants. Four peculiarities of \( H \) should be stressed
here, which will shed decisive light on the position of \( H \) among MA languages.

First of all, the imperative of stem III \( m\-\-\text{h}\-\-\text{sum-} \) has -\( u \) in its base and this
is the sole case where the analogy to the vowel of the Imperative of stem I
took place.\(^{129}\) Generally MEA has \( m\-\text{aptix} \) corresponding to the old active
participle, used now as Imperfective base, and MCA uses \( m\-\text{an\-saf}(s.)/m\-\text{an\-sef-}
\( u \).\(^{130}\) In other words Imperative is nothing but a bare Subjunctive without

---

\(^{126a}\) \( la \) used in the example 35 (three times) does not seem to be a negation of Passive. They
may best be understood as negating the noun clause and mean ‘not that . . . > whether
or not . . . ’. Compare this with the very similar example 38 where there is no \( la \).

\(^{127}\) Hoferman’s term (1988: 102) for Amadiya. Krotkoff 1982: 28–9 uses ‘the object con-
jugation’ for Aradhin. This rule was first stated by Nöldeke 1868: 276–7. Cf. Maclean


\(^{129}\) But see Garbell 1965: 71–2 for a limited occurrence of this analogy.

\(^{130}\) This is due to the strong stress on the last syllable and as the plural form suggests the
underlying form is *\( m\-\text{an\-saf} \), old active participle. Its Imperfective base also shows it:
\( m\-\text{an\-saf} \), which is in Jastrow’s analysis transcribed as \( m\-\text{an\-saf} \). So the employment of
Imperfective base for the Imperative applies to MCA too. This misleading form is to
be strictly distinguished from the similar \( m\-\text{an\-saf-\( le \)} \) (Perfective) and \( m\-\text{an\-saf-to} \) (feminine
passive participle), for they are derived from the original passive participle. See Jastrow
a subject marker in the case of stems II and III.\textsuperscript{131)}

In the second place, special mention must be made of the fact that the stem II has almost dropped off its m- prefix. As is well-known, MEA utilized paricles of Late Aramaic, active or passive, for restructuring its verbal system. As far as derived stems are concerned, the former furnished a base for Imperfective and Imperative as stated above. The latter was brought into use for the remaining bases, as Perfective under the influence of Persian\textsuperscript{132)} and as Resultative, quite naturally, due to its innate nature of stativeness. Thus in the derived stem II\textsuperscript{133)} of MEA all the verbal bases had prefix m- that it has inherited as the prefix of the old participles. Not all of the MEA members, however, have retained it. Table 7 shows the distribution of the retention of this m-. Roughly speaking, we could interpret this distribution in the geographical terms, namely, m- is better retained in the south-west group of MEA (D) and as we go farther from it to the east and north (A/B) it gets lost to the exclusion of MWA and MM that have a history utterly secluded from the area of MEA. Yet now we find ourselves totally at a loss how to understand its loss in H and Mlahsō in the region to the north-west of subgroup D. Out of nineteen verbs of stem II Jastrow counts only three that retain it in H and what instance we know of the same stem in Mlahsō\textsuperscript{\textcopyright}{\textcopyright only zābēn-li (<mazabban-li ‘I sold’) lacks it.\textsuperscript{134)} In Mosul the dropping of m- seems still sporadical and in Tkhuma it is totally optional,\textsuperscript{135)} while on the other hand in H sixteen verbs never have it at all and the rest three retain it throughout. So we have hit upon an astonishing proximity of H to subgroups A and B rather than to Mosul and Tkhuma in this respect. Seeing that the dropping of m- in the Infinitive/Verbal Noun of stem II exhibits quite the same distribution (Table 7), we may think of this phenomenon as distinctive feature of stem II.

This dropping of m-, however, never brought about a complete merger of

\textsuperscript{131)} In stem I the old Imperative *qọ̄ṭol has survived and this is the only base common to all MA that is still used exactly as it was in the past.

\textsuperscript{132)} Here again Kutscher 1969 is referred to as providing the most persuasive argument.

\textsuperscript{133)} Stem III retains m- in all the bases. This difference may be ascribed to the fact that with the general loss of consonantal gemination the participle of stem II approached the basic stem I in phonetic form: *maqattēl<*m-gātel>qātel. m- of stem III, on the contrary, was reinterpreted as the first root consonant of quadriliteral verbs, so it was never dropped but further provided the structural stability of stem III and quadriliterals as well.

\textsuperscript{134)} Jastrow 1988: 37 for the three verbs: madare ‘he winnows’ [√dry II (Pael)], mṣāle ‘he prays’ and mḥayer ‘he is at a loss.’ The last one is borrowed from Arabic (hāra ‘to be at a loss,’ and hāyyara ‘to bewilder’) and in MEA I could find its cognate in Nerwa (Sabar 1976: 139 [stem I+III], 1984: 274 [stem I]), in Zakho (Avinery 1988: 229 [stem I+III] and Hoberman 1989: 163 [stem I]) and in Alqosh (Lidsbarski 1896: I-258/6 etc. +II-450 and Maclean 1901: 90b [stem I]) but the exact equivalent in stem II is only in Nerwa (Sabar 1984: 299).

For Mlahsō see Jastrow 1985b: 267.

\textsuperscript{135)} Sachau 1895: 42+49. and Jacobi 1973: 90+102.
stem I and II despite the mutual similarity in the Imperfective base thanks to the different inflectional base employed for Perfective/Resultative in MEA. Outside of MEA, the older form of the passive participle (maqattal) has survived to this day and it occupies a relevant syntactic function in each MA. If this had been the case with MEA too, the levelling of all the inflectional bases of stem II could have taken place since the change of syllabic structure and the stress would have caused a phonetic similarity between them: *maqattal > *m-qatit-le > *qat-it-le > qatelle. This is exactly what happened in H. But MEA had recourse to quite another type of passive participle: *maqiatal > *m-qit > qit or *mqit > mquit. The final results of the change depend both on the retention of m- and on the compensatory lengthening. This is, as is well-known, nothing but a surviving form of an old Semitic passive pattern and in Aramaic it is attested in Biblical Aramaic (perfect Pual and Hophal), some Targums (passive participle of Pael) and Babylonian Aramaic (passive participle of Pael and Apel).  

If so, the situation leads us to the fact that H now turns back from MEA to the direction of MCA that has preserved *maqattal.

Lastly the form of verbal nouns should be mentioned. Since the verbal system of H does not make use of Infinitives or Verbal Nouns, Jastrow does not list their forms in the chapters that deal with verbs but he simply left it to the morphology of nouns for stem I (CCaCa, p. 79). As regards those of the other stems, though he does not mention explicitly, we find that he surely knows them in that he notes it in reference to the stress (p. 21) and in ‘Glossare’ he also marks (Inf.) after the entry. In the verbal system of H these are utterly irrelevant with no role allotted to them, but for the purpose of comparison they play a striking role to show us a clear-cut picture. So we list Verbal Nouns collected from the texts to determine their forms first.

a) stem II:

(1) beroqa 'lightning' from √brql II.  
47) hile le beroqet (§37 twice) 'the lightnings struck'  
(2) dabora 'to look after, rear' from √dbrl II.  
48) tob šola la peš-le 'ellāh šol-an hwe-le, ḫewane dabora (§12) 'any- 
more a job did not remain, only our-job became to rear animals'

---

136 For Babylonian Aramaic we can now look to Morag’s work (1988: 151 + 161 and the notes there). We cannot stress the importance of this book too much because this is the only grammatical description of Babylonian Aramaic based on the reliable manuscripts and the Yemenite reading-tradition. We have at last obtained a reliable description of this important, but hitherto ill-grounded, language.

137 CS Pael barreq ‘to shine, flash’ (Margoliouth’s Supplement 65a). Other dialects uses this root in stem III (Apel): U, Zakho, Mosul and Tari (Lidzbarski 1896: II-422). This is used in the example as a simple noun in the plural.

138 This is treated as Pael=stem II in CS as well as in other MEA dialects.
49) gallak zahmât-ile dâbor-ehen (289) 'much trouble-it-is to rear-them'

(3) šâbola 'to bloom' from šâbl II.139

50) 'âttore tob l-šâbola, l-qyama la mhe-la bala. (211) 'then any-more it [ = tetton (f.) 'tobacco'] did not pay heed to blooming, standing high'140

(4) xâpora (190) 'to till, cultivate' from xpr II.141

For this see example 27d above.

(5) mdâroya (626).142

b) stem III:

(6) maçoşa 'to collect' from ḥyš III.

51) mâçoşa mahec-lah (390) 'you (f.) collected [cognate object]'

(7) mandora 'to level (the roof)' from quadrilateral ḥndr.

(8) metoya 'to bring' from ty III.

52) zi-lan l-tarpâ metoya, w l-kese metoya, w l-gârâwata mandora (311) 'we went to bring leaf [-fodder], and to bring timber, and to level the roof'

Though the number of the instances is limited, we find here a peculiar trait of verbal nouns: (A) used as noun, it can be a subject (47, 49), a predicate (48), a second member of the genitive construction (27d)143 and an object (50, 51), or it can take PS-B functioning as object (49, 27d); (B) having a verbal force, it can take an object noun (48, 52 three times).144 This taken for granted, what counts to us is their form. For stem II we establish CâCoCa with a varinat of mCâCoCa for the three verbs that retain m- prefix. Regarding stem III we do not possess by mishap an instance of a strong verb, but nevertheless we can set up for it maCCâCoCa on the basis of the weak verbs above and a quadrilateral one that patterns itself after stem III.

When we turn to the Infinitive/Verbal Noun of stem II in other MA languages (Table 7), we notice a very simple fact that western dialects (MCA and MWA) replaced an older infinitive with *CuCCâCa > *CuCCôCo/a, which

139) CS šábbel 'to form spikes.' Cf. šēlā 'grass, herbage' and šēlēlā 'grass with good smell' (Manna 764a). Maclean lists this root in stem III for the subgroup C (1901: 201a).

140) See note 121 above.

141) Though the *x is retained despite the general change *x > h, Arabic etymology (hafara) is denied, for in that case we are forced to explain Arabic h-x. See Jastrow 1988: 5-6. Other dialects of MEA employ this root as stem I (U xprâ, Aradhin, Amadiya, Zakho and Gzira), but Pael (=stem II) xâppar is attested in CS (Broekelmann’s Lexicon 250b, Manna 256b, Audo 1-365a).

142) For this see Jastrow 1988: xxiii. Nonetheless, this form of the verbal noun with m- is unquestionable seeing that this verb retains its m- throughout. See note 154 above.

143) When a loanword, ending in a consonant, stands as first member of a genitive construction, the second member comes directly after it without a relative particle d. See Jastrow 1988: 26.

144) See do., p. 21.
is nothing but a nomen actionis of CS, while MEA replaced it with *(m-) CaCCôCê. It is an established fact that this form parallels Babylonian Aramaic *CaCCûCê > CaCCawCê and Mandaic CaCuCia [-ia = 1] and that MEA reflects this form, or the form similar to it, current in certain parts of Mesopotamia during the time of Late Aramaic. Hence the corresponding form of H we have confirmed just above should be regarded as another attestation of it absolutely different from that of MCA. To be sure the number of instances is very limited but notwithstanding it cannot be denied that this language shares the common heritage inherited from the similar stratum of the variations of Late Aramaic which was widespread in Mesopotamia, recorded or not. With the forms of Babylonian Aramaic and Mandaic in view, we can perhaps go on to say that there should have been at least two variations of spoken Late Aramaic languages among Aramaic dialects of the region prior to MA period, one without m- prefix like Babylonian Aramaic and Mandaic, and the other that have retained it which have left no written record, though.

Thus far we have discussed the four peculiarities separately, but all these, taken together, can imply a surprising fact which dismays us greatly. As Table 7 shows, excepting MM that lacks explicit verbal nouns, those MA languages which derive their Infinitive/Verbal Noun from *(m-)CaCCôCê invariably use *(m-)CuCCaC for Perfective/Resultative base and passive participle (MEA), while on the other hand those which derive it from *CuCCâCâ use *(m-) CaCCaC for the same purpose (MCA and MWA). This parallelism was so firmly established that, when I first read the text of Jastrow 1971, the existence of Perfective base CaCeC despite the overall similarity of H to MEA strucked me as an enigma and now its form of Verbal Noun CaCoCa confirms that H is indeed an enigma due to the cross correspondence, one to MCA and the other to MEA. Granted that a Semitic language is best characterized according to its verbal system and considerable efforts have been concentrated on this subject in Semitic linguistics, this duplicity H has in the verbal system alone can claim its independence from either of them. Compared with this, what

146) Stem III shows a similar distribution. In MEA *maCCôCê is used and in MCA *taCCâlû > taCCoCo, which had not been fixed as nomen actionis of Aphel even in CS (Nöldeke do., p. 76; Costaz, Grammaire 1964: 54; Mingana, Clef 1905: 77-8), whereas in MWA a new pattern came into use on the analogy of stem II: muCCôCö-ta.
148) Whether the retention/loss of m- prefix is secondary or not, this remark holds good, since it does not count here when the change took place, before the period of Babylonian Aramaic or after it.
4. Lexical Items

4.1. Items Parallel to MEA

The twofold nature of H is likewise to be seen in the lexical items and the following, though much limited in number, will show it. Items run roughly from nouns and particles to verbs in the alphabetical order.

(1) *ēqqū 'today': as is proven by Nöldeke (1868: 160–1) and Maclean (1895: 156), this word is comprised of a demonstrative element *hād-149 and *yawmā 'day', thus > ēd-ūyāmā > *ēdyū > *ēdīyū > ēdyū. From U to Gzira this is a universal form for 'today' and the vestige of *yawmā is still left in northern Azerbaijan īdyom and in Tkhuma ʾadjum as a variant of ʿidū and ʾadjū respectively. This conforms to the prevailing tendency that demonstratives precede nouns in Lower Mesopotamia. But the formation is quite different in MCA, yauμna < yawmo-hānō. Here the demonstrative *hānā 'this(m.)' follows 'day' and it reflects the same formation in CS yawmnān(ā) < yawmā-đānā.

(2) ʾbrāta 'daughter': admittedly MEA stands against CS and its obedient daughter MCA, for the former (e.g., U ʾbrātā) has inherited Mesopotamian Late Aramaic (Babylonian and Mandaic) form, ʾbārattā < *bārātā < *bin-a-tā. But CS bar-tā and MCA bar-tō is a secondary formation from CS bar 'son' (with feminine -tā) < *ban < *bin.150

(3) *ḥakma 'some': *komā 'how many/much' has been brought into use in this sense in MA as MCA kmo shows it. But MEA (U ʾxaḵma, Aradhin, Zakho and Mosul) prefixed to it xa-/ḥa- (presumably *xaḏ 'one'). This formation is still very clear in Azerbaijan xa kimma, but Mosul šādmā is a bit puzzling. Note that Gzira kmā' approaches MCA.

(4) ḥathā/hada 'so, thus': though the former has analogical ḥ-, both of them have corresponding forms in MEA. Some have only one, U ḥaḵa, Azerbaijan ḥātxa~(h)āxxa and Gzira ḥātxa; Mosul ḥādax, while others have both (Tkhuma, Aradhin and Zakho). So the latter hada must have dropped final -x (= -h in H). But quite different is MCA hauxa which Siegel compares with CS ḥākan pronounced hōkan in the Jacobite tradition.151

---

149) Not necessarily compared with CS ḥādē 'this (f.)' and in Babylonia demonstratives with d- abound.
150) MWA has a similar formation ber-ča, but Samaritan Aramaic has bēratta~bīrta (Macuch). So we are still left helpless before unwavvelized brt' in Galilean Aramaic and Christian Palestinian Aramaic.
(5) ḫena(m.), ḫeta(ṣ.), ḫenē(pl.) ‘other’: there seem to be three types of languages. The first group reflects CS (‘)xṛēnā, (‘)xṛētā, (‘)xṛānē as in MCA: ḫrēnō, ḫrētō, ḫrēnē. The second is those which have dropped -r as in U xīna, xīta, xīni, Aradhin and Nerwa. But some of Jewish dialects use undeclinable xētā-xet as in Zakho, Azerbaijan and (seemingly) Gzira.

(6) lele ‘night’: Late Aramaic has this word as CS laylē (absolute) and lēlyā (determinate), of which MCA adopted the latter as lālēyō, while MEA inherited the former as in U leli, Zakho lēlē, etc.

(7) tōre ‘time (fois)’: for this U uses gāhra borrowed from Persian gāh ‘time’ which is also found in others (Aradhin and Zakho). But Zakho usually makes use of garrā (etymology unknown to me) when in subgroup C tōrī is used or in Alqosh tōrā (Maclean 1901: 110b). This word in MCA, however, is naqqa/ naqqa borrowed from Anatolian Arabic,152 so H belongs in this respect to the western group of MEA. Curiously enough these words are all feminine except that in Alqosh.

(8) √’ty III ‘to bring’: MEA employs this root invariably and has in addition another one √my II153 though used less frequently. MCA on the other hand uses the latter exclusively and the former has been lost.154 Azerbaijan, too, has lost this root itself and uses another one for it.155

(9) √’zl ‘to go’: This word is common to both MCA and MEA but in the former the Imperative has -x, thus (‘i)zīx(m.), (‘i)zīx(f.), (‘i)zīxu(pl.). On the other hand in MEA s- appears instead: U sī(sg.), simun(pl.) or Aradhin sī, se, so. Jastrow gives se/say(-yok), sayyon for H (p. 39), which is a conclusive sign of common origin of these Imperative forms to MEA. The suppletive root used in U except in Subjunctive √rxṣ (CS rōxeṣ ‘to creep’) is not attested in H.

(10) √syh l/b- ‘to arrive at’: We find this cognate in Alqosh. Maclean’s item (1901: 262a) is nothing but the one found in Lidzbarski’s text (1896: I-236 + I-187 + 525)157 and this comes from Iraqi Arabic gāhī ‘to come (to one).’158

154) Jastrow 1985a: 102 but according to Siegel (cited above, p. 202) Imperatives are used quite in disguise.
155) See Garbell 1965. The new one is √∅-d-j/∅ (285a) and its stem III is √m-d-j/∅ (287a) or √w-d-j/∅ (293a) whose etymology is unclear. But note that *t in this dialect undergoes a drastic change.
156) Jastrow 1985a: 73. -x may be a remnant of ‘dativus ethicus’ in CS: zel-l-ās/ek/pāhōn ‘go to you!’ But undoubtedly reinterpretation of this -x has taken place according to the PS-B of MCA (-ox, -ax, -ux). See Nödeke 1904: 177.
157) belki gyāşā six-lā ‘perhaps it [perdā(f.) ‘stone’] hit him [the blind man].
Generally MEA has incorporated the preposition l- used to indicate a dative object into its paradigm except Infinitive and certain forms of Subjunctive and passive participle. Thus in Zakh Khwā (Infinitive), hiwa (pass. part.) but yāwil (Subj.), hūl-ī (Perf.) and hāl (Imperat.). But in MCA it conjugates without l- (Imperative haw) and H has this l- in Imperative as hal, hallon but in other inflected forms it has no l- (Jastrow 1988: 41).

H has generalized the prefix me- for all inflectional bases (Jastrow p. 43). MEA has mu-/me- for Perfective and ma- for Imperfective and MCA has maw-/mo-. The Imperative of stem I of this root is tu and tuwən (Jastrow ibid.) and this parallels those of MEA, Aradhin tu or U tuj as against MCA itau.

4.2. Items Parallel to MCA

13) 'ebra 'son': This and 'abro in MCA exhibit a reasonable change from CS brōnā, but MEA discarded it in favor of its diminutive brōnā 'little son' and left the former in compounds and phrases: U brūna. When the correspondence of brata is taken into account (see item 2 above), 'son' and 'daughter' of H have followed separate ways between the two larger families.

14) hdade 'one another': this was in CS xδdδē (Nöldeke 1904: 188). Therefore this form of H is a faithful reflex of it alongside of Aradhin gdē, Mosul xδdδē and MCA hδdδē. But there are two innovations found in others. One is U udab and the other is analytical expressions in Jewish dialects: Zakh xawxēta, Azerbaijan x-e-xa and Gzira xā ga xēta. Tkhum possesses the first two: 'δδxδδe and δdδe.

15) kepta 'shoulder': if this goes back to katpā (CS), we may compare it with MCA katpo (Midin) and katpo (Mizah). (Some of) MEA use, however, quite a different word: U ruqa and Aradhin rūša < CS rašā 'shoulder-blade.'

16) maye 'water': Mosul and Jewish dialects preserved the old form: Mosul mājā, Gzira mājā, Zakho/Nerwa māyā and Azerbaijan mae/moe (Hat). Others, on the contrary, changed the vowel: U mije and Tkhum/Aradhin mīja. MCA belongs to the first group: māye.

17) saxla 'child': this seems to have nothing to do with U saxla < CS sakhā (skl) 'stupid' but rather its cognate is found in MCA saxlo 'youngling'

159) See Polotsky 1961: 29+32 and according to him Soviet U has incorporated l- even into its Infinitive.

160) Siegel p. 179 cited above.

161) Maclean 1901: 236a and Macuch-Panousi (Neusyr. Chrest., 1974, Wiesbaden, Otto Har- rassowitz, p. 102b) assume Arabic 'dl 'to be equal' but Nöldeke 1868: 164 thinks otherwise: 'ax (x)da lē 'like one to them (3)'

162) For Zakh Polotsky 1967: II-111b explains xa-aw-xēta 'one that(m.) other' but ga in Gzira is unclear. Azerbaijan has yde 'only as axis of prepositions' (Garbell 1965: 77) that sounds very similar to the first one.
borrowed from Anatolian Arabic or Kurdish (\(\sqrt{sxl}\)).\(^{163}\)

\((18)\)  \(\sqrt{nq}q\) 'go/come out' and \(\sqrt{n}l\) 'go out/escape': U, Aradhin, Tiari and Azerbaijan make use of only the latter while Alqosh, Zakho, Gzira and MCA employ the former. In this point Amadiya resembles H in using both of them.

5. Conclusion

It goes without saying that a language or a dialect is recognized as such only when it is conceived of as possessing a bundle of features that no other one possesses it as a whole, even though some of them may be shared by others. Since no language, however, can possess a set of features totally different from others in its every detail excepting a rare isolated one,\(^{164}\) every language should be thought of as a set of features some of which distinguish it from others and the rest of which are in common with them. Then we might ask what can be such features as to separate it from others, or what characteristics make up a combination that leads us inevitably to call it independent. In my view it rests on the notion of independence or on the framework within which the set of features is judged, but we must not forget that such a judgement is only of relative significance. Even the well-known dichotomy of sedentary/nomadic or eastern/western Arabic dialects cannot be a conclusive criterion since these dichotomies count on more than one feature. Contrarily the dichotomy of q̟̂l̂̂tu/ĝ̟l̂̂l̂̂it dialects in Mesopotamia is an absolute one because it is the dichotomy that applies only one criterion to every dialect within a rather limited well-defined area.

Hoberman asks if there is a 'dialectal split' in MA comparable to q̟̂l̂̂tu/ĝ̟l̂̂l̂̂it dialects in addition to Maclean's *t and *d.\(^{165}\) My answer is 'yes, there is' and it is the passive participle of Late Aramaic *maquṭṭal/maquaṭṭal which all the MA languages have and which acts as Perfective base in the verbal system apart from MWA and MM that have their own linguistic history independent enough to provide them with clearly distinct features. The Perfective that employ this old passive participle with PS-C as its subject marker is admittedly the most symbolic of all types of verbal inflections in MA. Then it is safely to be said that this deserves to be a qualified criterion by which all the MA languages are dichotomized. It is true that 'abro/brōna 'son' may be used but this does not represent a typical linguistic feature of any MA language. Now let us call this criterion (\(m)luqis/(m)laqas' split using a hy-

---

163) Anatolian Arabic saxal 'kid' (Vock-Waldner 199) and Kurdish sekel (M. A. Jaba: Dictionnaire kurde-français. 1879, Petersburg [Reprint 1975, Osnabrück, Biblio Verlag]. p. 237a). Lane's Lexicon (1825c) lists saxaln 'an infant that is an object of love to his parents' and saxaln 'lamb, kid.'

164) We cannot think of even such a language, now that there should be a certain similarity if it were to be a human language.

pothetical root to do justice to all the MA members and 'kill' off an old tradition to use √qtl. Equally significant is Infinitive/Verbal Noun because it shows a similar distribution, but MM seems to lack it and we do not know its form in Mlahső yet. So (m)luqis/(m)laqas' split should imply this too, though it is not named as such in the term.

The dialect of H is, seen thus, very suggestive. It belongs to (m)laqas dialect but at the same time its verbal noun looks toward the opposite direction. Therefore, as has been stated above, this is the only dialect of this kind at the moment when we are waiting for more data concerning Mlahső. It is in this respect that H deserves to be independent and in my view enough has been shown to this effect.

But what is more important, this is the language that goes back to a certain spoken Late Aramaic which had been situated between Upper Mesopotamia (CS vs. its daughter MCA) and Lower Mesopotamia (Babylonian Aramaic, Aramaic of incantation texts and Classical Mandaic vs. MEA). According to what I said above in this section, some of Late Aramaic languages happened to be recorded as a cultural vehicle of the nation who spoke it. When recorded, it was brought into being with a set of features that happened to be there. Those that failed to be bundled by mere chance were left unrecorded. Of course the language, once recorded, exercises a great influence on the area of the culture whose vehicle the language is.

So geographically speaking, those that were recorded occupy only limited parts of the vast area where we know Aramaic was once used and the Aramaic spoken in the rest of the area continued to be used without written records. If so, we must take this vast area as one continuum stretching from the Mediterranean coast to the eastern part of Iran, not as a jumble of language areas independent and secluded from the rest. Of those left unrecorded, some must have been replaced by Arabic without our notice in the course of time. But some others may have lived to this day in a remote place beyond our contact. And H is undoubtedly one of those left unrecorded. Then, as Hoberman says, we can avail ourselves of what data MA languages furnish to us so as to reconstruct a distribution of linguistic features of Late Aramaic left un-

---

166) I do not assert that MCA has inherited all the linguistic traits of CS and that MCA has innovated nothing. The same is true with MEA. As to MM, it has not always inherited the innovational tendency that Classical Mandaic had germinally. For this see Takashina 1986: 76-86.

167) Hoberman 1988: 558 and note 3. It is a happy duty to note here that I share a basic notion about this with Hoberman. For this purpose the study of incantation texts is of vital importance, be it written in Syriac or Hebrew or Mandaic script. They were written often out of conformity to the religion the script stands for. See, for example, Tapani Harviainen: "An Aramaic Incantation Bowl from Borsippa. Another Specimen of Eastern Aramaic 'Koinè' " in Studia Orientalia ed. by the Finnish Oriental Society, 51 (1981, Helsinki): 14., esp. pp. 19-24.
recorded in the time prior to the beginning of recording MA languages in the last century. If the projection of our knowledge of *written* Late Aramaic is not sufficient, we can retroject what we know of MA languages to fill up lacunae in that continuum of which we know only in scattered spots.

Again as Hoberman deplores, 'we need precise, detailed descriptions' not only of MA dialects but likewise of Late Aramaic (Babylonian, Galilean and Christian Palestinian Aramaic) with basic glossaries at least, based on reliable texts.\(^\text{168}\) In this sense Jastrow's description of H is all the more inestimable in value and he cannot be thanked too much for it.

---

\(^{168}\) Hoberman: "The Phonology of Pharyngeals and Pharyngealization in Pre-Modern Aramaic" in *JAOS* 105 (1985): 221-230, p. 230. For Babylonian we have now Morag 1988 but this does not cover other parts of the grammar than phonology and verbs, and for the other two we are equipped with Israeli scholars' detailed studies and we await descriptive grammars and dictionaries.
### Tables

#### Table 1: Correspondence of *b̀̂gd̃k̃pt̃* in MA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><em>b̀̂</em></th>
<th><em>g̃</em></th>
<th><em>d̃</em></th>
<th><em>k̃</em></th>
<th><em>p̃</em></th>
<th><em>t̃</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urmî (ME-A)</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mosul (ME-D)</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>ɗ</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>ɗ̃</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCA</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>ɗ̃</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 2: Pronominal Suffix (PS) Sets in H

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C’</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>eʷ</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>oː</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>ø</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 5: Tense/Aspect System in H (A, C, C’, D = types of PS as subject marker; O = PS-C used as object)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Resultative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>1 ø₁</td>
<td>pateḥ-Α(O)</td>
<td>4 ptiḥ-[^C,,C’-O]</td>
<td>5 dmiḥ-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>7 ø₁</td>
<td>pateḥ-A-wa(O)</td>
<td>10 ptiḥ-wa-[^C,,C’-CO], (ptiḥ-C’-wa-O)</td>
<td>11 dmiḥ-A-wa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meaning of Each Verbal Form:
1. he opens  2. he will (often) open  3. that he open/May he open!  4. he (has) opened  5. he is asleep  6. open!  7. he was (usually) opening  8. he would (often) open  9. that he might open  10. he had opened  11. he was asleep

#### Table 6: Inflectional Bases of Derived Verbs in H (Pa.=Pacl, Aph.=Aphel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperfective</th>
<th>Perfective</th>
<th>Resultative</th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Verbal Noun</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>pateḥ</td>
<td>ptiḥ</td>
<td>dmiḥ</td>
<td>ptuḥ</td>
<td>dmaḥa</td>
<td>open; sleep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II (Pa.)</td>
<td>dabér/ mdare</td>
<td>dabér/ mdare</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>*daber/ *mdare</td>
<td>dābora/ mdaroya</td>
<td>rear/ winnow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III (Aph.)</td>
<td>maḥšem</td>
<td>maḥšem</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>maḥšum</td>
<td>*maḥšoma</td>
<td>eat supper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3: Deictic Copula we- ‘There He Is’ (A, C, D = subgroups of MEA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Urm (A)</th>
<th>Ğiari (C)</th>
<th>Amadiya (D)</th>
<th>Alqoī/Mosul (D)</th>
<th>Zakho (D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ve-li</td>
<td>-la</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>we/wil-le</td>
<td>-la</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-lux</td>
<td>-lax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-li</td>
<td>-li</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: Deictic Copula du/hο- ‘Here He Is’ (A, B, C = subgroups of MEA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>I.  Urm (A)</th>
<th>II. Ğiari (C)</th>
<th>III. Qudshanis (B)</th>
<th>IV. Asitha (C)</th>
<th>Hertevin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>du-li</td>
<td>-la</td>
<td>-na</td>
<td>hū-li</td>
<td>-lā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-vit</td>
<td>-vāt</td>
<td>-tun</td>
<td>-tá</td>
<td>-tā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-vin</td>
<td>-vān</td>
<td>-vāx</td>
<td>-nā</td>
<td>-nā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7: Classification of MA and Some of their Linguistic Features *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Urm</td>
<td>bèta/kləta</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>i/a/ˈu/e</td>
<td>mLəQQəS</td>
<td>LaQusi</td>
<td>㈜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Salamas</td>
<td>biyə/tləa</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>u/o/e</td>
<td>LuQiS</td>
<td>LuQiS</td>
<td>㈜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Azerbaijan (J)</td>
<td>bela/ˈtahə</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e/a/u/e</td>
<td>mLQiS</td>
<td>~LuQiS</td>
<td>㈜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tkhuma</td>
<td>bèta<del>bèta</del>bèsa</td>
<td>ˈida~ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>e/a<del>o/e</del>ay</td>
<td>mLQi Su</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>㈜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tiari</td>
<td>bèsa/ˈtātəa</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>e/a/ahih(n)</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>㈜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Mosul</td>
<td>bèta/tlətəa</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>ç/a/ayhen</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>㈜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Aradhin</td>
<td>bèta/tlətəa</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>e/a(h)/thin</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>㈜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Mangesh</td>
<td>bèta/tlətəa</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>èh/a/h(e/lu)n</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>㈜</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Amadiya (J)</td>
<td>bèta/tləhəa</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>e/a/o/uhun</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>٫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Zakho (J)</td>
<td>bèsa/tləhəa</td>
<td>içə</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e/a/o/uhun~u</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>٫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Gzira (J)</td>
<td>bèsa/tləhəa</td>
<td>içə</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e/a/o/uhun~u</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>٫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Hertevin</td>
<td>bèta/ˈtətəa</td>
<td>ˈida</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>±</td>
<td>e/a/o/e/ən</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>٫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Mlabsö</td>
<td>ˈiʃə</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>åv/??</td>
<td>mLQiS (&lt;*MlQiQaS)</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>٫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>Midin</td>
<td>ˈidə</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e/a/əyye</td>
<td>mLQiS (&lt;*MlQiQaS)</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>٫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>MWA</td>
<td>ˈiʃə</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>e/a/əyye</td>
<td>mLQiS (&lt;*MlQiQaS)</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>mLQiSu</td>
<td>٫</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* modified version of my Table (Takashina 1988: 1642) based on the new material available now; note that some of the data given here are tentative and need more close study. The transliteration of some forms cited here have been changed slightly. + (attested). — (not attested). J (Modern Jewish Aramaic).

**features compared** (1) *t in *bətə/tə ‘house’ and velarization of initial *t of *tələtə ‘three’. *tə means ‘flat’. (2) *d in *ˈida ‘hand’. (3) *ə > o/o. (4) velarization: + for synharmonism (velarization + change of vowel quality within word boundary), ± for velarization with occasional influence on adjacent syllable(s). — for velarized consonants on individual segment level only. (5) 3rd person pronoun suffix: his/her/their [m./f.]. (6) passive participle (orig. Parl in Late Aramaic used as verbal base in the respective conjugation in MA. (7) infinitive/verbal noun (orig. Paol) in MA used in some as inflectional base. (8) compound tense with passive participle and/or infinitive, plus ɣ/hvy ‘to be’ that can conjugate itself with copula ( Hashtable), plus ɣ/hvy that do not conjugate with copula (Hashtable), plus copula only (Hashtable). ɣ/LQS is a hypothetical root for comparison.
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