

## R e v i e w s

**Jastrow, Otto, Shabo Talay, and Nikita Kuzin. 2024. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Midyat (Midyoyo). Band II: Glossar. Semitica Viva 64. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. XVIII, 408 pp. ISBN 978-3-447-39468-0.***

This volume 64 of the series ‘Semitica Viva’ is part of a set describing the ʿTuroyo dialect of Midyat [Midyaḏ]. It is the necessary companion to volume 59 (Jastrow and Talay 2019), which contains the texts of which the work under review now presents the vocabulary. A third volume, containing the grammar, is in preparation.

Ideally, the glossary should be used in conjunction with the texts to which it provides the lexical key. There are, however, certain advantages in reading the book independently. This is especially so in the present case since the work under review is much more than a glossary to a particular collection of texts; it also has a programmatic aim and is intended to serve as a model for the future lexicography of ʿTuroyo. The volume consists of an introduction explaining the guiding principles of the work (IX–XVII), the glossary itself (1–340), a list of verbs (341–361) and a German-Midyoyo vocabulary (363–407).

A great deal of thought has gone into the composition of this book, and the result is highly successful. Not only is the method of presentation excellent, but the lexical contents themselves are also of great interest. This is particularly true of the vocabulary illustrating various aspects of traditional life in Aramaic-speaking ʿTur ʿAbdin.

The ʿTuroyo speech of ʿTur ʿAbdin, while pretty homogeneous, is by no means uniform. The Midyoyo dialect treated here differs slightly from forms of the language described elsewhere, most especially the dialect of Midin, with which many readers will be familiar from the well-known and much-used *Laut- und Formenlehre*



des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Midin im Tūr ‘Abdīn of Jastrow (1993), one of authors of the present work. A few dialectal differences may be mentioned here.

When the open medial syllable of the infinitive *qtolo* is closed to form the nomen vicis (\**qtol-to*), the shortened vowel in the now closed syllable may take on various qualities (Ritter 1990: 58). In the dialect of Midin the vowel is *a*: *q̄tal-to* (Jastrow 1993: 172–173). In the Midyat dialect attested here, at least in Ily roots, the nomen vicis may have the vowel *i*: **qyimto**<sup>1</sup> ‘resurrection > uproar’, **syimto** ‘manufacture’ (fem. of **syomo**). For the infinitive III, against the Midin form *taqtolo* (Jastrow 1993: 116), the present dialect has *tiqtilo*, e.g. **tidmixo** ‘to put to sleep’, with further examples on p. 295. The root **mty** III ‘to bring’ usually appears as **nty** ~ **nty** III (*m̄t* > *nt*). Instead of the general Turoyo innovated *-ote* ending of the fem. pl., Miḍwoyo typically retains the more original *-oto* (< *-ātā*). Some of the dialectal differences are of a lexical kind. An interesting case occurs s.v. **zarzāmine**, lit. ‘basement, cellar’. This word is used metaphorically to mean ‘a loss, a ruin’, i.e. financially ‘rock bottom’. A certain speaker, however, did not use this word but **nuqro**<sup>1</sup> ‘hole, ditch’ instead. It is then explained that in the villages for **nuqro** in this meaning they say **gurto**. But **nuqro**<sup>2</sup> (in Bissorino) also means ‘frying-pan’, and for **nuqro** in this sense ‘we’ say **taḡno**.

Each entry is illustrated by at least one concrete example from the corpus published in the text volume.<sup>2</sup> The examples are all translated and references given to the places of their occurrence in the text volume. The entries are accompanied by short bibliographical references to further literature and by etymological information.

References are frequently given to the unfinished, posthumous *Wörterbuch* of H. Ritter (1979), certainly the most significant predecessor of the present *Glossar*. The two works, however, are very different. Ritter’s *Wörterbuch* is devoted primarily to the noun (with textual references, but without actual examples), whereas the *Glossar* under review covers all areas of the vocabulary, including the verbs. The nouns are presented in alphabetical sequence (**ḥalwo** ‘milk’, **ḥlowo** ‘milking’), while the verbs are listed according to their root consonants (**ḥlw** ‘to milk’). Many of the nouns listed here are not recorded in Ritter’s *Wörterbuch* (this is often pointed out). On the other hand, a great deal of lexical information regarding Turoyo (including Miḍwoyo) verbal roots and verb formation is given in Ritter’s *Grammatik* (1990), which is of a prominently lexical character. For reasons not explained, Ritter’s extensive description of the Turoyo verb, replete with details of morphology and richly illustrated with examples, is not referred

<sup>1</sup> Words in **bold** font indicate entries in the Glossary.

<sup>2</sup> Exceptions are rare. Meaning (1) of **āṣās** ‘basis’ is unexemplified, as against the adverbial usage ‘basically’ of meaning (2). Meaning (1) of **sawko** ‘hair of the head’ has just the gloss, whereas meaning (2) ‘branch’ is illustrated by an example. For the relation between ‘hair’ and ‘branch’ see Mutzafi (2006: 91–93).

to in the present work. For many of the verbal roots listed here, a pointer in the direction of Ritter would have been very helpful. For example, the very first two entries of the *Glossar*, the highly irregular verbs ʾbʿ ‘to wish’ and ʾby/hw ‘to give’, would have gained considerably by references to Ritter, *Grammatik* 730ff. and 586ff. respectively; further **mṭy** ~ **nṭy** Ritter 382ff.

The contents of the present *Glossar* are richer and more varied than is customary in most works of this kind, not only by inclusion of particles (-**ste** ~ -**stene**), proper names (**Aḥlah**, **Anḥil**, **Mirde** (= Mardin), **Qamišlo** [sic], **Slayman** ~ **Sleman**) and a colourful array of interjections (ā<sup>cccc</sup>**aww**, **āy āy āy**, **āy w ūy**,<sup>3</sup> **čīʿ**, **čzzzz**, **didi-dididi**, **hīhīhīī**, **lam**, **ššššš**, **tātātātā**, **ūūūū**, **xrrppp**), but also by many idiomatic usages, especially of common nouns (**ido**, **lebo**, **rišo**), verbs (ʿ**ty**, **hwy**, **hwy-l**, **mḥt**, **mḥy**, **nfl**, **nfq**, **nṭy**, **qym**,<sup>4</sup> **sym**, **šql**) and prepositions (ʿ**al**, **b**, **l**, **m**, **qum**). There is also a good deal of grammatical information, often indicated by the symbol ⊗.

## Grammar

The grammatical details are particularly welcome, for they both clarify and supplement the information available in other works of reference, e.g. the phonemic status of vowel length and consonant gemination, usually correlating with Aramaic vs. Arabic etymology: ‘**am**’ ‘with’ vs. ‘**ām**’ ‘general’ (< مآ); ‘**amo**’ ‘people’ vs. ‘**ammo**’ ‘paternal uncle’ (< عم). The gemination in Arabic words, however, is not always retained. For example, in **gamo** ‘anguish’ the *mm* of the Arabic source *gamm* has been simplified as in comparable native Aramaic words (cf. ‘**amo**’ ‘people’ < ‘*ammā*’), so that the *a*-vowel of **gamo**, now in an open syllable, comes to be pronounced long. The phonemic contrast *l* : *l̄* is revealed by pairs such as **milla** ‘community’ vs. **milla** ‘she said’ (e.g. s.v. ʾ**mr**); **mkafalle** ‘he wound in a shroud’ (**kfn**<sup>2</sup>) vs. **mkafalle** ‘he polished’ (**kfr**).

Neo-Aramaic languages are always of interest from the point of view of historical Aramaic grammar. In Classical Syriac the plural of ‘*ammātā*’ ‘paternal aunt’ is, as expected, ‘*ammātā*’, the form which has its (almost) regular continuation in Miḏin Ṭuroyo ‘*amtoṭe*’ (Jastrow 1993: 220; cf. below n. 27). In Miḏyoyo, however, the pl. of ‘**amto**’ is ‘**amtoṭo**’, in which the *t* of the sg. fem. ending is treated as the 3rd radical, to which the suffix of the fem. pl. is then added. This phenomenon, with its variations, has a long history in Aramaic and the *Glossar* produces further instances. To the Miḏin examples in Jastrow (1993: 220)<sup>5</sup> add: **gurto** ‘ditch’

<sup>3</sup> This and **ōōōwīh** ‘oh weh’ bear a curious resemblance to the frequent Hebrew exclamation אוי ואבוי (based on Proverbs 23:29).

<sup>4</sup> Section 5 of the entry **qym** concerns the grammaticalized (i.e. mostly uninflected) ingressive usage of the root in the sense ‘dann, daraufhin’ (Ritter 1990: 562–563). On this feature, in Ṭuroyo and more generally, see Contini (1997: 154–157).

<sup>5</sup> See on this feature also Tezel (2003: 213 n. 65).

> **gurtoŋo**,<sup>6</sup> **qalto** ~ **qalŋo** ‘dunghill’ > **qaltoŋo**, **sisto** ‘mare’ > **sistoŋo**. The older forms still exist beside these innovated *-toŋo* plurals: **ħapŋo** ‘a grain’ > **ħap-poto**, and sometimes the two alternate: **qalto** ~ **qalŋo** > **qalote/o** ~ **qaltoŋo**.

The *Glossar* also provides further material for the history of various verbal roots. As is well known, Neo-Aramaic as a whole often shows drastic developments in this area, developments which are apt to throw light on processes in earlier Aramaic (and other Semitic languages). One may mention e.g. *rkb* ‘to ride’, which appears here both with its original sequence of radicals as **rkw** III and also metathesized as **rxw** I and III (in stem III original *markawle* and innovated *marwaxle* alternate).<sup>7</sup> Much more complicated are cases of weak roots such as ‘to give’ (*yhb*), for which it is no longer possible to give a discreet root; in the present work forms of ‘to give’ are listed on the first page under **’by/hw** and the imperative separately under **haw**.<sup>8</sup> Following the fluctuation already present in older Aramaic (*rbb*, *rw/yb*, *rby*, *yrb*), the verbal notion ‘to be big’ appears here as **rby** (*rby*) and **yrbw** (*yrb*) while the adjective is **rabo** (*rbb*). The Aramaic root *slq* ‘to rise’ continues to appear in its old form **slq**, but also has an alternant **ysq**. The preterite of **’zl** ‘to go’, usually *azzé*, *azzá*, has the variants **zile**, **zila**. Shifting roots occur in nouns too. Noteworthy are a few instances of agglutination of the article, resulting in the reassignment of familiar old Semitic roots to new places in the dictionary. Thus, the Miḏyoyo words for ‘roof’ (*’gr*, Syriac *eggārā*) and ‘excrement’ (*xr’*) appear in the *Glossar* under N: **niġore** and **niħre** respectively.

Among the valuable data provided on grammatical topics we may single out pronouns and copulas etc. (**hat**, **-hat**, **hatu**, **-hatu**, **kitwe**, **kitwo**, **kityo**, **latwo**, **latyo**, **layt**, **-no**, **-we**, **-wi**, **wux**, **-yo**), the optative use of the preterite (**ħaru**, **raħiq**), the preposition *l-* marking the agent of the ‘ergative’ preterite conjugation (**l-**, section 5),<sup>9</sup> the ethic dative (**’ty + l**, **’zl + l**, **nyħ + l**, **qrš + l**), and some unusual combinations of prepositions with their pronominal suffixes (**bōx**, **būno**, **lōx**, **lūno**).

It is particularly useful to have indications of the passive conjugations of various verbs (**’xl**, **b’ġ**, **čyk**, **mħt**, **mly**, **nql**, **nqw**, **qwr**, **qyt** III, **rđy** III, **twr**). The existence of a passive conjugation is one of the hallmarks of Ṭuroyo (as opposed to other Neo-Aramaic dialects) and it is important to have the details, particularly as some of the active and passive forms coincide, e.g., s.v. **mħt** *māħit* is both active present ‘he places’ and passive preterite ‘it was placed’. The glossary lists a small number of old *\*maqŋal*, *\*maqŋalā* verbal nouns (here sometimes called

<sup>6</sup> Jastrow (1993: 215 n. 1) considered this a Kurdish word.

<sup>7</sup> Tezel (2003: 198) mentions a third variant: *rxw*.

<sup>8</sup> On this root in Aramaic dialects see Fox and Fassberg (2020).

<sup>9</sup> It is not only the nominal subject/agent which can be marked in this way, but also the pronominal; see the entries **lōx** and **lūno**. Another example of **lūno** in this function is quoted in the entries **bāla** and **maħit b-əqdolo**.

‘infinitives’) of the kind **mahwo** ‘to be ~ be born’ (*hwy*), **mamro** ‘speaking’ (*mr*), **matyo** ‘to come’ (*ty*), **muklo** ‘food’ (sic, with *k*; √I ʿxl, III ʾkl). This closed list, examples of which are restricted to various types of weak roots (Jastrow 1993: 115, 192), is of interest from several points of view. The underlying noun patterns and their roots are not always easily identifiable. **mahwo** ‘to be (born)’ is here referred to **hwy**. But the word also means ‘to give’, in which sense (Ritter 1990: 610–611, 628—not occurring in the *Glossar*) it belongs to the historical root *yhb*, whose Miḏyoyo reflexes, as mentioned, are entered here under **by/hw** and **haw**.

## Etymology

A notable feature of the *Glossar* are the etymologies, covering both the native Aramaic stock and the many loanwords, in particular from Kurdish, Turkish and Arabic.

Etymologies are in principle offered for every word, even when the matter is in doubt or it is uncertain by which of several possible routes the word reached Miḏyoyo (e.g. **bāla** pp. XI, 37). References to published etymological discussions could occasionally have been more generous—e.g. the relationship between **nux-royo** ‘betrothed’ and classical *mķirā* is treated at length by Tezel (2003: 103–105), who on pp. 248–249 also discusses the mysterious **u‘do** ‘now’. In many cases the compilers indicate that the etymology is unclear (**fuḡo**, **knfl**, **tfk**) or unknown (**twy**). Sometimes, no etymological information is offered at all (**čalkoyo**, **sīfoqo**, **šlbt**, **u‘do**, **xid**), even in cases where the source of a word seems pretty clear or a reasonable suggestion can be made, e.g. **haqqa** ‘so much’ (*\*hal qadr* vel sim.—cf. **miqqa**, **qādar**); **kliča** ~ **kīliča** ‘a type of sweetmeat’ (Turkish *küliçe* and Persian *koluče* ~ *keliče*);<sup>10</sup> **l-qul** ‘before’ (Aramaic *l-qbl*); **sāwāl** ‘flocks’ (Kurdish *sewal* < Arabic سواد); **sefo** ‘lap’ (Syriac *seppā* ‘threshold’, like **lebo** ‘heart’ < *\*leb-bā* etc.); **suḡlo** ‘grape’ (ܘܫܘܠܐ, Targumic סגולה);<sup>11</sup> **šayro** ‘bracelet’ (שַׁיָּר, Hebrew שַׁיָּר [Isaiah 3:19], Arabic سوار = Kinderib *swāra*); **šeno** ‘cliff’ (Syriac *šennā* lit. ‘tooth’); **tamo** ‘there’ (ܬܡܘܢܐ); **tanuro** ‘oven’ (ܬܢܘܪܐ); **ṭayro** ‘eagle, large bird’ (ܬܝܪܐ, Arabic طائر / طير and Anatolian *ṭayr*).

**šdoqat** ‘gefüllte Innereien’, a favourite dish in the region, corresponds to e.g. J. Zakho *sijoqe*, Syrian Arabic *sdjāqq* (Barthélemy 1935ff. 335), all derived from Turkish *sucuk*. The proximate etymon of **zābaš** ‘watermelons’ is Arabic. Ritter (quoted here) records this item as *jābāš* (= [žabaš]) and with initial ج it can be found in many Arabic dictionaries: Berggren (1844) s.v. ‘Melon’, Dozy (1881), Barthélemy (1935ff.), Wehr (1985) etc. For the variations in the form of the word see Behnstedt and Woidich (2011: §177) ‘Wassermelonen’ and for the *s-j*

<sup>10</sup> The word also occurs other Neo-Aramaic dialects (Sabar 2002: 186; Khan 2008: 1084, 1313) and in Arabic (Dozy 1881 1: 482; Barthélemy 1935ff.: 724).

<sup>11</sup> For Aramaic ܘܫܘܠܐ etc. = Hebrew שַׁיָּר see Bauer (1935: 168).

etc. dissimilations involved in the words **šdoqat** and **zābaš** cf. **dōzdān** ‘purse’ < Turkish *ciizdan* (< Persian).

The Aramaic etymons are given according to their form in the western pronunciation of Classical Syriac. This has both advantages and disadvantages. On the one hand, the heritage language of Miḏyoyo (and Ṭuroyo in general) is western Syriac, whose forms often provide the exact etymon; on the other hand, western (Jacobite) Syriac has obscured certain historical distinctions of pronunciation, rendering this tradition in some ways less original than the eastern (Nestorian) variety. For purposes of etymological clarity, a historical, philological transcription would sometimes have been helpful, e.g. *passatā* (rather than *fasto* as given) would have made it clear that the root of **fasto** ‘rag’ is *pss* and that its *t* is the feminine ending.<sup>12</sup> In some cases the Miḏyoyo forms recorded in the present work align more clearly with the eastern than with the western pronunciation of Classical Syriac. There are several cases in which the western shift of closed  $\bar{e} > \bar{i}$  is not observed in the modern Miḏyoyo equivalents. While in ‘**ito** ‘church’ and **rišo** ‘head’ the western Syriac and Miḏyoyo vowels coincide, this is not the case with ‘**eḏo** ‘festival’, **kefo** ‘stone’ and **reho** ‘smell’. These cases are pointed out in the relevant entries.

In nouns of the CvCC- pattern Miḏyoyo quite often has a stem vowel *a* where the old language has *e*: **aḏno** ‘ear’, **naqwo** ‘hole’, **raḡlo** ‘foot’, **tawno** ‘straw’, **zawlo** ‘dung’; in some cases these *a*-forms match eastern, not western Syriac: **halxo** ‘going’, **raqḏo** ‘dance’. This *qatlo* ~ *qetlo* alternation continues an old trait in Syriac (Nöldeke 1898: §§45, 94A, B). While some of these may show the shift \**i*CC > *a*CC,<sup>13</sup> the \**i/e* vowel is often retained: ‘**inwe** ‘grapes’, **mišho** ‘but-ter’, **nišro** ‘eagle’, **šimšo** ‘sun’. There are even cases where the Ṭuroyo/Miḏyoyo *a*-form seems not to continue a Syriac precedent at all: **danwo** ‘tail’ does not correspond to Syriac *dunbā* (= \**dumbā*), but reflects a more original pattern along the lines of the Targumic ܕܢܒܐ recorded in e.g. Dalman (1922; cf. ܕܢܒܐ, ܕܢܒܐ etc.).<sup>14</sup>

Such small details raise the question of the ancestry of Ṭuroyo and its position within the huge variety of Aramaic dialects. For example, the word **femo** ‘mouth’ is equivalent to classical ܦܡܘܡܐ *pummā* (given here on p. 74 in western Syriac form as *fumo*), but cannot be a direct descendant of it. Ṭuroyo **femo** is a reflex of \**pimmā* (like **emo** ‘mother’ < \**immā*, **lebo** ‘heart’ < \**libbā* etc.), a shape of the word associated rather with Palestine. A number of Ṭuroyo features seem to point westwards to Palestine rather than eastwards to Syriac. One may mention the entry **admo** ‘blood’. The eastern Aramaic dialects (particularly significant here is

<sup>12</sup> In this case the eastern pronunciation would also have simplified the gemination: *pastā*. As indicated here, the word means ‘palm of hand’, but the sense ‘rag’ is already present in the literary sources and widespread in Neo-Aramaic dialects.

<sup>13</sup> This shift (= Philippi’s Law) certainly occurs in Ṭuroyo, but is of very uneven application; see Fassberg (2013: 98–99).

<sup>14</sup> Further cases of Syriac \**qutlā* > Ṭuroyo *qatlā* are mentioned by Tezel (2003: 107).

Syriac) overwhelmingly have forms of the word opening with *d*: ܕܡܐ *dmā*, NENA *damma* etc., whereas western (Palestinian) varieties consistently show the addition of initial ܐ: ܐܕܡܐ, ܐܕܡܐ. Such prosthetic forms appear in Galilean, Samaritan, Christian Palestinian and in Western Neo-Aramaic (*eḏma*) and they find an exact parallel in Ṭuroyo/Miḏyoyo **admo** (sic, with plosive *d*, showing the secondary status of the initial *a*-).<sup>15</sup> Ṭuroyo has a tendency to add secondary, prosthetic vowels to etymologically biradical nouns; thus not only **admo**, but also e.g. **abro** ‘son’, pl. **abne** and **išmo** ‘name’. These words likewise have western affinities, both old (CPA) and modern (WNA *ebra*, *e/ušma*). The dialectal distribution, however, is complicated, for forms such as *ebra* ‘son’ also turn up in the east (Hertevin, Christian Sanandaj and Neo-Mandaic).

The non-coincidence of the given Syriac etymons with the actual Miḏyoyo forms is noticeable in the matter of *bgdkpt*, a somewhat elusive topic on which a good deal of work remains to be done. The situation was, of course, by no means uniform or stable in Classical Syriac, where hesitation often obtains between plosive and spirant alternant.<sup>16</sup> In Miḏyoyo too there are minor *bgdkpt* fluctuations: **katfo** ~ **kaṭfo** ‘shoulder’,<sup>17</sup> **qalto** ~ **qaṭto** ‘dunghill’. Neo-Aramaic dialects, such as Ṭuroyo, can often shed light on the history of these things, for the shapes of the modern words are not necessarily direct reflexes of what happens to be attested in the classical language(s). The Syriac ancestors given in the book may accordingly sometimes be slightly at variance with those which actually lie behind the Miḏyoyo entries. The most frequent cases are those in which the posited etymon contains plosive *b*, whereas the Miḏyoyo equivalent clearly goes back to a spirant, viz. *\*ḥ* > *w*: ‘**inwe** ‘grapes’,<sup>18</sup> **dahwo** ‘gold’, **danwo** ‘tail’, **garwono** ‘leprous’, **gawro** ‘man’, **ḥalwo** ‘milk’, **ḥawlo** ‘rope’, **ḥawro** ‘friend’, **karsʿwono** ‘lopped vine branch’, **kayiwo** ‘sick’, **malḥowo** ‘winnowing-fan’, **nagiwo** ‘dry’, **naqwo** ‘hole’, **qaqwinto** ‘partridge’,<sup>19</sup> **qariwo** ‘near/godfather’, **qariwuṭo** ‘godfatherhood’, **ruʿo** ‘quarter’, **sowo** ‘old (man)’, **šawo** ‘seven’, **tawno** ‘hay’, **zawlo** ‘dung’. Some of these cases may be of a merely typographic nature caused by the omission of the diacritical mark, i.e. *b* for *ḥ*. Cases of the opposite phenomenon, viz. the etymon contains spirant *ḥ*,

<sup>15</sup> As opposed to the spirant *d* of **adno** ‘ear’ (ܐܕܢܐ, \*ʾδn), where the opening vowel was always present.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Rudolf and Waltisberg (2020: 30–31).

<sup>17</sup> *katfo* with plosive *t* may (also) reflect the influence of Anatolian Arabic (Kinderib *kaṭaf*; Jastrow 2005: 121).

<sup>18</sup> Classical Syriac has sg. *ʿenbatā*, pl. *ʿenbe* with expected distribution of *b* vs *ḥ*. In Ṭuroyo a new sg. *ʿunwo* (Ritter 1979: 24) has been formed after the pl. The same seems to have happened in the case of **naqwo** ‘hole’. Such adaptations are clearly old and attest to different schools of pronunciation within Syriac. For example, Bar Hebraeus gives the antecedent of **naqwo** as *neqbā* (plosive), whereas the (eastern) tradition reflected by the Urmia OT of 1852 has *neqbā* (spirant) following the pl. *neqbe*.

<sup>19</sup> ܩܩܘܝܬܐ. This word has a variant spelling ܩܩܘܝܬܐ.

whereas modern Miḍyoyo has a plosive *b*, are rare. **yabibto** ‘pipe’ (Syriac *abbuḫtā*) may reflect assimilation *\*b...ḫ > b...b*. In the light of Syriac *zabnā* and the regular *zona*-type equivalents in NENA dialects, **zabno** ‘time’ is very unexpected; perhaps one should consider the influence of *zmn*, whether from Aramaic (which, according to dialect, has both *zbn* and *zmn*—Syriac has *zbn* for the noun, but *zmn* for the verb) or Arabic; beside **zabno** Miḍyoyo also has Arabic *zāmān* ~ *ḫāmān*, and elsewhere in Ṭuroyo the expected *zawno* occurs. The reflexes of *\*b* and *\*ḫ* are far from simple.<sup>20</sup> For **ṣubḥo** (*ṣubḥā*) see below n. 22.

For other *bgdkpt* letters a few interesting features may be mentioned. The spirant *ḏ* of **raqḏo** ‘dance’ goes against the plosive *d* of its etymon *reqdo* (eastern *raqdā*), having been adapted to the verbal root **rqḏ** ‘to dance’, where the spirant is fully in order. Similarly, **halxo** ‘going’ < Syriac *helko*, eastern *halkā*) with spirant *k/x* has been drawn into the phonology of the matching verbal root **hlx**. The plosive *t* of **firto** ‘bran’ and **katfo** ‘shoulder’ (~ **katfo**) is not present in the Syriac source, which in both words shows a spirant (*farto* [parr<sup>3</sup>tā] and *katfo* [katpā])

In some cases, the contrast between Classical Syriac and Ṭuroyo (Miḍyoyo) is morphological. The *\*fa<sup>c</sup>ul* pattern of **raḥuqo** ‘distant’<sup>21</sup> does not match the *\*fa<sup>c</sup>il* pattern of the suggested etymon *raḥiqo* and similarly **yaquro** (Jastrow 1993: 231 n. 2). The equivalent of **yaroqo** ‘green’ (*\*yarrāq*) in literary Syriac is *yurrāq* (Nöldeke 1898: §117); the forerunner *yoruqo* (= eastern *yāroqā*) given here is expressly marked by Brockelmann as Neo-Syriac.

## Languages in contact

Perusal of this *Glossar* throws up many interesting data for the study of languages in contact—in fact, the field of Neo-Aramaic as a whole provides a classic stage for investigations of this kind. In many respects, Ṭuroyo participates in an areal Sprachbund, in which various features are shared across linguistic boundaries. Thus, echo-constructions with *m*-, well known in Turkish, are found throughout Anatolia, including Miḍyoyo: ‘**ammo-mammo** ‘uncles and all’, **qar‘o mar‘o** ‘heads and the like’.

The interaction of Miḍyoyo with Arabic, its Semitic neighbour, is of particular interest. The inherited Semitic roots shared by Ṭuroyo and Arabic are in principle separate from each other, each belonging to a particular language and having a particular meaning, but geographical proximity, varying degrees of bilingualism and shared Semiticity mean that there is a considerable degree of overlap and

<sup>20</sup> The reading tradition and vernacular pronunciation do not necessarily go together, resulting in doublets of the kind *zawno* ~ *zabno* ‘time’ and *ḥawro* ~ *ḥabro* ‘friend’ (Tezel 2003: 21 n. 7).

<sup>21</sup> For the fem. of Miḍyoyo **raḥuqo** one expects **raḥuqto** rather than **raḥiqto** (= [raḥəq-to]?) as given in the entry; cf. **xaṣuno** ‘coarse’, fem. **xaṣunto** etc.

interpenetration. This subject has been studied by S. Tezel, *Arabic Borrowings in Šūrāyt/Ṭūrōyo within the Framework of Phonological Correspondences* (2011).

The symbiosis of the two languages comes to the fore in matters related to the above-mentioned *bgdkpt*. For example, in the borrowed noun ‘**āmade** ‘baptism’ the plosive *d* of Arabic عمادة is pronounced with the spirant *ḏ* of the corresponding Ṭuroyo verbal root ‘**md** ‘to baptize’. The verbal forms derived from the Aramaic root ‘*md* show, as expected, spirant *ḏ*; the noun **ma‘modiṭo** ‘baptism’, on the other hand, has plosive *d*. The verb **šlw** ‘to crucify’ has *w* < \**b* according to expectations; the noun ‘cross’, on the other hand, is **šlibo** with plosive *b* as in the Arabic equivalent *šalīb*. Similarly, the noun **šubḥo** ‘praise’ has *b* as in Arabic as against the spirant *ḥ* of its Aramaic etymon.<sup>22</sup>

These *bgdkpt* fluctuations work in subtle ways, not always easily understood. For example, for the verbs ‘to enter’ and ‘to break’ the Syriac roots *ʿbr* and *tbr* are given as etymons. From the similar shape of the two *Ilb* roots one would expect the modern descendants to have symmetrical reflexes. But it is not so. The present tense of ‘to enter’ in Miḏyoyo is *ʿobir* with plosive *b* (s.v. **ʿbr**), whereas that of ‘to break’ is *towir* with *w*, i.e. < spirant \**b* (s.v. **twr**). Various factors, internal and external, are at work here. The unexpected *b* of *ʿobir* (\**qāṭil*) may be due to generalization of *b* of the intransitive preterite *ʿabir* (\**qattīl*), where *b* (< \**bb*) is perfectly in order. On the other hand, the plosive *b* of Anatolian Arabic *ʿbr* ‘to pass/enter) may well have been a contributory factor. As for the transitive Aramaic root \**tbr*, the *b* was never doubled; nor is there a functional Arabic counterpart of similar form and meaning which could have exerted an influence. The root ‘to break’ is therefore **twr** throughout the paradigm. The verbal root **ʿwd** ‘to do’ < *ʿbd*, somewhat unexpectedly, has plosive *d* throughout the conjugation,<sup>23</sup> whereas the noun ‘work’ fluctuates **wodo** ~ **wodo**. Sometimes *bgdkpt* phenomena are accompanied by semantic differences too: native **brx** ‘to bless’ does not have the same semantics as **brk** < Arabic.

An interesting pair is **mamlāke** ‘homeland’ and **mamlaxto** ‘kingdom’, a doublet of the ‘same’ word. While **mamlāke** is evidently Arabic (< مملكة, no doubt helped by Turkish *memleket*), the identity of **mamlaxto** is less clear-cut. The two spirants *xṭ* point to Aramaic, but no genuine Aramaic noun מלמלחא\* has yet been discovered.<sup>24</sup> The Ṭuroyo word is a hybrid, an Arabic noun having been given Aramaic phonology.

<sup>22</sup> Neither eastern nor western Syriac had plosive *b* in the word بعصب; the former apparently pronounced *šuxā*, the latter *šubḥo* (Rudolf and Waltisberg 2020: 28).

<sup>23</sup> This may be due to generalization of the *d* of preterite *ʿwidle*, where the blocking of spirant \**ḏ* before *l* would conform to certain Neo-Aramaic patterns; similarly with *t/t*: *manḥatle* s.v. **nḥt** III ‘to take down’, *nkitle* s.v. **nkt** ‘to bite’. Note, however, spirant forms such as *mawqadle* s.v. **yqd** III ‘to ignite’, *mamiṭle* s.v. **myṭ** III ‘to put to death’. Some such instances of unexpected plosive *d/t* may be due to Arabic influence, e.g. *ḥsidle* ‘he harvested’ s.v. **ḥṣd** (in this case the whole root may belong to حصد rather than Syriac حصد).

<sup>24</sup> Ostensible examples occurring sporadically in Samaritan and Mandaic are of Hebrew and/or Arabic origin.

At first blush, it seems that similar adaptations to native Aramaic phonology may occur with Turkish words too. Long ago in the western pronunciation of Syriac the plosive ~ spirant alternation  $p \sim \bar{p}/f$  had been neutralized in favour of  $f$ . The natural preference for  $f$  over  $p$  has been extended to the Turkish (< Slavic) word *şapka* ‘cap’, which in Miḏyoyo appears as **şafqa**. One could be tempted to think that the spirant  $f$  in this word is of Aramaic origin. But the matter is not so simple. This pronunciation also occurs in Anatolian Arabic *şafqa* (Kinderib) and Kurdish, whereas Aleppo Arabic, on the other hand, has a plosive: *şabqa* (Barthélemy 1935ff.: 376). Since there are wider areal implications, it is likely that Miḏyoyo adopted the pronunciation **şafqa** ready-made from outside. This  $fq$  combination may belong to the phenomenon seen in **taxtōr** ‘< doctor’ and **waxt** ‘time’, viz. \*stop + stop \* $kt, qt$  > spirant + stop  $xt$ . The entry **naqdo** ‘Brautgeld’ has a variant *naxdo* (Jastrow 1993: 170).

The Arabic loanwords do not always appear in their conventional forms, but frequently show smaller or greater phonological differences, e.g. the acquisition of emphasis in **āšāš** ‘basis, basically’ (via Turkish *esas*). The shift ʾ > ʿ in **awwil** ~ ‘**awwil**’ ‘first’ has a parallel in the not infrequent occurrence of  $h$  in place of etymological ʾ or  $h$ . This takes places in independent Arabic words: **makrūh** ‘loathsome’, **mūkafāha** ‘remuneration’, **qaḥwe** ‘coffee’, as well as in Arabic roots integrated into Miḏyoyo: **qhīroyo** ‘furious’. The Miḏyoyo root for ‘to speak’ is **ğğl**, derived from Arabic *šgl*, in which neither the phonology (*šgl* > *jgl*) nor the meaning (‘work’ > ‘speak’) are what an Arabist would expect.

In the linguistic melting-pot of Anatolia it is often difficult to identify the source of such changes. Some of them will already have been present in the donor language, i.e. Anatolian Arabic; others may have developed later within Ṭuroyo itself. Often a Kurdish intermediary, viz. Arabic > Kurdish > Ṭuroyo, must be considered, e.g. **hāyam** ‘epoch’, in which Arabic (?) *ayyām* lit. ‘days’ has acquired an initial  $h$ -. In other cases, Anatolian Turkish may have served as intermediary.

The Arabic loanwords in Ṭuroyo often supply indirect testimony to the Anatolian Umlaut-*imāla*: **dēlye** ‘grape vine’, **ğehil** ‘young person’, (**mīrğane** > pl.) **mīreğin** ‘corals’, **šīwerib** ‘moustache’, **telit** ‘third’. The entry **čēz** ‘dowry’ with  $\bar{e}$  differs from *čāz*, the Anatolian Arabic cognate adduced, in which no *imāla* occurs. Both forms derive from Arabic جهاز. It would seem that of the two old Arabic variants *jahāz* ~ *jihāz*<sup>25</sup> the Anatolian *čāz* (thus Kinderib) reflects \**jahāz*, whereas Miḏyoyo **čēz** harks back to an Arabic dialect which continued \**jihāz* and therefore exhibits the expected *imāla*.

The symbiosis of the two languages finds expression also in the realm of morphology. The pl. ending *-īye* (< Arabic *-īyya*) is characteristic of the *nisba* ending

<sup>25</sup> In Classical Arabic *jahāz* is preferred; *jihāz* is considered substandard. A third variant *juhāz* is also recorded.

-i, e.g. **ḥārami** ‘thief’ > pl. **ḥāramiye**. By extension it may be applied to nouns which terminate in *-i* of different origin: **mištīri** ‘customer’ (Arabic *šry* VIII) > pl. **mištīriye**. The pl. pattern *fa‘ā’il* is productive outside its traditional limits: **qīṣṣa** > **qīṣayīṣ** ‘stories’, (\**šiqqa* >) **šiqayiq** ‘pieces’ (both without *imāla*). There are semantic differences too. For example, the phenomenon of an Arabic plural becoming a singular (not unusual in Turkish and other languages of the area) is also observable in Miḍyoyo: **ḡī/īrān** ‘neighbour’, **ūṣūl** ‘custom’ (the formal Arabic sg. **aṣ‘l** ‘Ursprung’ has a separate entry).

The Arabic elative pattern *af‘al* may be extended to non-Arabic words. Thus, the comparative of Kurdish **pīs** ‘bad’ is **apyas** ‘worse’<sup>26</sup>—both words have their own entries in the *Glossar*. The Arabic participle *xāli* ‘empty’ (\**qāṭil*) has been given a new Ṭuroyo morphology: **xalyo**, f. **xliṭo**, pl. **xalye**, just like native **ḥalyo**, f. **ḥliṭo**, pl. **ḥalye** ‘sweet’ (\**qatīl*). In a similar way Arabic *xašīn* ‘rough’ (\**qatīl*) has been slotted, it would seem, into the Ṭuroyo adjective pattern \**qattūl*: **xašuno** with matching Aramaic inflections; likewise **fisoro** ‘explanation’ shows Arabic *fsr* II (*tafsīr*) transferred to a Ṭuroyo *pa‘el* noun pattern (\**quttālā*).

Ṭuroyo is possessed of a highly composite vocabulary. The core lexicon, predominantly Aramaic, has been amplified by a large accretion of loanwords. Many of these are Arabic. When two cognate roots, Aramaic and Arabic, exist side by side, it may happen that the Arabic form is preferred over its Aramaic equivalent. For ‘to scrape, card (cotton)’ the Syriac root *ḥrg* ܚܪܓ was presumably available. It did not, however, survive and was superseded by the related Arabic *ḥlj* ܚܠܝܓ instead; the Miḍyoyo root for this idea is therefore **ḥlḡ**.

Sometimes cognate Aramaic and Arabic words are in competition for the same semantic slot. The word for ‘paternal aunt’ appears both in Aramaic and in Arabic form: **‘amṭo** ~ **‘amme**. In this root *‘mm* the etymological and semantic match is audible and transparent. This allows mutual influences to take effect, so much so that it may be hard to say to which language a given form belongs. The masc. form of our word, viz. **‘ammo** ‘paternal uncle’, shows how complicated things actually are (and always have been). The ending *-o* of **‘ammo** and the pl. suffix of **‘ammone** suggest an Aramaic derivation. This, however, does not go well with geminate *mm*—in western Syriac gemination has been simplified and in Ṭuroyo is typical of Arabic loans; moreover, *‘ammā* in the meaning ‘paternal uncle’ can hardly be said to exist in Aramaic. Accordingly, the authors posit Arabic *‘amm* ʻamm as the primary etymon of **‘ammo**. This is in all likelihood correct. But this **‘ammo** ‘paternal uncle’, of Arabic origin, is also given as the masc. counterpart of fem. **‘amṭo** ‘paternal aunt’, thus implying an etymological m./f. unit, the aunt being derived from the uncle by addition of the fem. ending (like m. **ḥolo** ‘maternal uncle, *avunculus*’ vs. **ḥilto** ‘maternal aunt, *matertera*’ and ʻamm vs. ʻamma). Functionally this may be so; derivationally it arouses doubts. The sg. ending *-to* of **‘amṭo** and

<sup>26</sup> As in Anatolian Arabic (Jastrow 2005: 23).

its pl. **amtoṭo** (Midin *‘ammote*)<sup>27</sup> make a very Aramaic impression, an impression reinforced by the existence in Syriac of *‘ammātā* ‘paternal aunt’. It may be, however, that **ammo** and **amto** were never a morphological m./f. pair derived from a single root within Aramaic. It is noticeable that while the fem. ‘paternal aunt’ *‘ammātā* is well attested in Classical Syriac, the masc. \**‘ammā* ‘paternal uncle’ has not (yet?) been found there.<sup>28</sup> The masc. form *‘ammā* is of course a familiar word in Syriac, but it is used in the wider collective meaning ‘kinsmen’, i.e. ‘people, nation’. This *‘ammā* developed naturally in Aramaic and is listed in the *Glossar* as **amo**, i.e. ungeminated [‘āmo] ‘Leute, Volk, Bevölkerung’ (cf. Syriac *šattā* ‘year’ > Midyoyo **šato** etc.). Against this, in Aramaic as a whole *‘ammā* meaning ‘paternal uncle’ is utterly marginal and probably intrusive. Along the Syriac-Ṭuroyo spectrum it seems that the fem. **amto** ‘paternal aunt, *amita*’ continues older Syriac usage, whereas the vacant masc. slot \**‘ammā* ‘paternal uncle, *patruus*’ was filled by other means: Syriac used *dādā* (continued by Mlahsô *dozo*) to express this, while Ṭuroyo adopted the Arabic word. Lack of etymological symmetry, lexical variation etc. in kinship terms such as these is well known in many languages (see, e.g. Nöldeke 1904: 97; 1910: 77–78). The present case is further complicated by the existence of various *amo-* forms in Kurdish.

While in **amma** and **amto** the etymological Aramaic-Arabic kinship is transparent, it is somewhat less so in the case of native **hašo** ‘back, loins, side’ vs. loaned **xaşra** ~ **xasra** < *خاصرة*, both being reflexes of the Semitic root *xšr*, albeit with semantic differences. Semantic differences also characterize the pair **tny** vs. **ṭny**; the former (Aramaic) means ‘repeat, answer’, while the latter (Arabic) seems restricted to the agricultural context of the second ploughing. A more sharply differentiated split pair is shown by the much-travelled word for ‘pepper’, which appears in Midyoyo both as **bibar** (< Turkish) and **flēfle** (< Arabic). It also happens that an Arabic loan coincides with a native root, producing a homophonous pair: **diqle** ‘he ground’ derives from Aramaic *dqq* (**dyq**<sup>1</sup>), but **diqle** ‘he tasted’ comes from Arabic *ḍwq* (**dyq**<sup>2</sup>); **šy**<sup>1</sup> ‘to send’ is of Arabic origin (*šy*<sup>1</sup>) but **šy**<sup>2</sup> ‘to smear’ is Aramaic (*šw*<sup>c</sup> ~ *š*<sup>c</sup>); further: **kyf**, **qyr**. Homophony of various kinds of course already exists within the native lexicon: **tarfo**<sup>1</sup> ‘leaf’ vs. **tarfo**<sup>2</sup> ‘fingernail’ (\**tpr*); **ṭw**<sup>1</sup> ‘to bake the Eucharistic host’ vs. **ṭw**<sup>2</sup> ‘to fall asleep’, and in rare cases may also result from the meeting of Aramaic and Turkish: **ysq**<sup>1</sup> I ‘to come up’ (\**slq*) vs. **ysq**<sup>2</sup> II ‘to prohibit’ (< Turkish *yasak*).

The word **warzo** ‘melon field’ provides an interesting example of language contact and channels of borrowing in the area. For the etymology of **warzo** Anatolian Arabic *warz* or Kurdish *werz* are here mentioned. This may well be so; *warz* has long been current in Arabic. The fact that Saadia Gaon in 10th century Iraq has the n. agentis *warrāz* ‘husbandman, farmer’ shows that the underlying *warz*

<sup>27</sup> The geminate *mm* is due to analogy with the masc. *‘ammone*.

<sup>28</sup> The mention of this meaning in Manna (1900: 547) probably reflects Neo-Aramaic usage.

must have been common. The term is also widespread in Kurdish. This Iranian word (in one form or another) also travelled to Aramaic (Mandaic **uarza**), including Syriac. Bar Bahlul (10th cent.) records it in the form *barzā* ܒܪܙܐ, glossed (ed. Duval, col. 428) as 'مشاركة الزرع' 'bed of sown seed'.<sup>29</sup> In view of the Persian fluctuation *برز ~ ورز* (and cf. *مرز*), it may be that Ṭuroyo **warzo** is in fact a descendant within Aramaic of the word recorded by Bar Bahlul.

A few trifling observations:

p. XIII: The item referred to as CSD did not appear in 1957, but in 1903. It is desirable to give the date of the original publication, not that of the reprint. Similarly, on p. XV for Barthélemy's *Dictionnaire* the date 1969 refers only to the *Fascicule complémentaire*, not to the dictionary itself, which was compiled and published in installments decades before.

The item DKF = Nezan (2017) is missing from the bibliography on p. XVI.

pp. XVI–XVII: Sokoloff's dictionaries of Jewish Palestinian (2017) and Babylonian Aramaic (2020) exist in later expanded editions.

p. 47: The word **boriye** 'reed' and its plural **boriyat** are fairly clearly Arabic. To the proposed Turkish etymon *boru* add Arabic *بارية* 'reed mat'. This word, in various forms, has long been established in Arabic (references and Judaeo-Arabic data in Blau [2006: 41]) and is still in use in the area (Barthélemy 1935ff. 68 s.v. *bērye*). It has an Aramaic ancestry: Syriac ܒܪܝܐ and Jewish Babylonian ܒܘܪܝܐ.

p. 50: **buqto** 'bundle'. This word is very widespread and occurs in many forms, the relations between which await clarification. To the Arabic *bāqa* mentioned here add, e.g. Turkish *bohça ~ bokça*, Persian *boqče ~ boxče*, with representatives in Kurdish and many Arabic and Neo-Aramaic dialects (Tezel 2003: 93). The word has even reached Israeli Hebrew in the form *búxta*.

p. 93: **ğāt** 'dish', which also occurs in Aleppo (Barthélemy 1935ff. 100), seems to have been borrowed into Arabic from French *jatte*.

pp. 108–109: A rare typesetting error has occurred here in the layout of the two columns (entry **ħalw<sup>3</sup>nīto**). A similar mishap has occurred at the bottom of p. 134.

p. 130: The Arabic etymon of **imān** 'belief' should be *ʾimān*.

p. 139: For **kibāt ~ kibayāt** 'stuffed intestines' similar Turkish and Persian words are mentioned. It could be worth considering an ultimately Semitic origin; cf. Hebrew קִבְּה 'stomach' and the discussion in Nöldeke (1910: 155).

p. 144: The word **kosani** 'beardless' is of interest. The Kurdish and Turkish *kose* and *köse* are adduced in the etymological section. The Arabic *nisba* ending of **kosani** suggests an Arabic source. This word, in one form or another, has been around in Arabic for a very long time (Ullmann 1970: 436–437 s.v. *kawsaj*) and is widely travelled.

<sup>29</sup> *مشاركة* also has an interesting multilingual history; see Krotkoff (1985: 124–125).



pp. 233–234: The Syriac source of **qušro** ‘castle’ is given as *qastro*. This is closer to the further etymon (Latin *castra* > Greek κάστρα), but Syriac also has *qašra*, which is closer to the Miḏyoyo headword.

pp. 236–237: §5 of the entry **qyt** = ‘Feuer fangen, brennen’ (also IIIp[assive] ‘angezündet werden’) invites comparison with the entry **yqd**, the familiar Semitic root in a similar meaning.

p. 264: Despite the headword ܩܘܝܘܐ *sʿb* in Syriac dictionaries, for **syw** ‘to grow old’ it would be better to give the primary etymon *syb*.

p. 265: The derivation of **šābahiye** ‘morning marriage meal’ from Arabic *šabāḥi* seems not quite correct. This word is not like m. **tirki** ‘Turkish’, f. **tirkiye**, i.e. the f. of a nisba adjective, but rather composed of *šabāḥ* + the abstract ending *-iyya*. Cf. Dozy (1881 1: 814); Barthélemy (1935ff. 425).

p. 266: s.v. **šaye**: The expression *bi=šaye d-* ‘through the auspices of, thanks to’ derives from Persian *sāye* ‘shade, protection’ and as well as the Turkish *saye(sinde)* given here is also used in Kurdish and Arabic (Blanc 1964: 152).

p. 287: The noun **tāʿadda** ‘attack, massacre’ certainly belongs to Arabic ‘*dw* V, but is hardly derived from the infinitive *taʿaddin*. Cf. Persian/Turkish nouns such as *tamannā/temenna* ‘wish, salutation’ (also Ṭuroyo [Ritter 1979: 511]) < Arabic *mny* V and *tamāšā/temaša* ‘spectacle’ < Arabic *mšy* VI.

p. 288: Read: Arab. *tābūt*.

p. 296: Read: *tešrəyoṭo*.

p. 306: **ṭir** ~ **ṭr** as in **ṭr-owe** ‘let it be’ belongs to **ṭry** ‘to leave, let’ and has its parallel in other Neo-Aramaic dialects, e.g. Jewish Zakho *štāwe* < *šud hāwe* (< *šbq d-hwy* [Sabar 2002: 295]).

p. 314: Arabic ڤ is here transcribed *ḏ* (*waḏīfa*) but the notation normally used in the book is *ḟ*.

p. 315: Rather than *waraq*, the fem. n. unitatis *waraqa* would be a closer etymon for **waraqto**.

This excellent glossary is very much more than suggested by its title. Firstly, although designed to serve a particular corpus of texts, it is on a scale that allows it be regarded as a preliminary dictionary of Ṭuroyo, here represented by the Miḏyoyo dialect of Midyat [Miḏyaḏ]. Secondly, it serves as a model for the future lexicography of the language. Thirdly, it provides a great deal of interesting information on various topics: the internal history of Aramaic, the synchronic description of Miḏyoyo, the languages of Anatolia, the mutual influences between them etc. The volume under review marks a great step forward in the lexicography of an important Neo-Aramaic and Semitic language. It is a pleasure to congratulate the three authors on a first-class performance.

## References

- Bar Bahlul, Hassan. 1888–1901. *Lexicon Syriacum: Voces Syriacas Graecasque cum glossis Syriacis et Arabicis complectens e pluribus codicibus edidit et notulis instruxit Rubens Duval*. Paris: Leroux.
- Barthélemy, Adrien. 1935ff. *Dictionnaire arabe-français. Dialectes de Syrie : Alep, Damas, Liban, Jérusalem*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- Bauer, Hans. 1935. ‘Etymologica II’. *Zeitschrift für Semitistik und verwandte Gebiete* 10: 165–171.
- Behnstedt, Peter, and Manfred Woidich. 2011. *Wortatlas der arabischen Dialekte. Band I: Mensch, Natur, Fauna, Flora*. Handbook of Oriental Studies. Section 1: The Near and Middle East 100/1. Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Berggren, J. 1844. *Guide français-arabe vulgaire des voyageurs et des francs en Syrie et en Égypte : avec carte physique et géographique de la Syrie et plan géométrique de Jérusalem ancien et moderne*. Upsal: Leffler et Sebell.
- Blanc, Haim. 1964. *Communal Dialects in Baghdad*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blau, Joshua. 2006. *A Dictionary of Mediaeval Judaeo-Arabic Texts*. Jerusalem: The Academy of the Hebrew Language.
- Brockelmann, Carl. 1928. *Lexicon Syriacum*. 2nd ed. Halis Saxonum: Niemeyer.
- Contini, Riccardo. 1997. ‘Alcuni casi di grammaticalizzazione (e degrammaticalizzazione) in tūrōyo’. In *Afroasiatica Neapolitana: Contributi presentati all’8° Incontro di Linguistica Afroasiatica (Camito-Semitica), Napoli, 25–26 Gennaio 1996*, edited by Alessandro Bausi and Mauro Tosco, 151–168. Napoli: Istituto universitario orientale.
- Dalman, Gustaf. 1922. *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch zu Targum, Talmud und Midrasch*. 2nd ed. Frankfurt am Main: Kauffmann.
- Dozy, Reinhart P.A. 1881. *Supplément aux dictionnaires arabes*. 2 vols. Leyde: Brill.
- Fassberg, Steven E. 2013. ‘Two Biblical Hebrew Sound Laws in the Light of Modern Spoken Semitic’. In *Nicht nur mit Engelszungen: Beiträge zur semitischen Dialektologie. Festschrift für Werner Arnold zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Renaud Kutu, Ulrich Seeger, and Shabo Talay, 95–100. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Fox, Samuel Ethan, and Steven E. Fassberg. 2020. ‘The Verb *Yhb* in Aramaic’. *Aramaic Studies* 18 (2): 268–278.
- Jastrow, Otto. 1993. *Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Midin im Tūr ‘Abdin*. 4th ed. Semitica Viva 9. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jastrow, Otto. 2005. *Glossar zu Kinderib (Anatolisches Arabisch)*. Semitica Viva 36. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Jastrow, Otto, and Shabo Talay. 2019. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Midyat (Midyoyo). Band 1: Texte*. Semitica Viva 59. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2008. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Barwar*. 3 vols. Handbook of Oriental Studies 96. Leiden: Brill.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2016. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of the Assyrian Christians of Urmi*. 4 vols. Studies in Semitic Languages and Linguistics 86. Leiden: Brill.
- Krotkoff, Georg. 1985. ‘Studies in Neo-Aramaic Lexicology’. In *Biblical and Related Studies Presented to Samuel Iwry*, edited by Ann Kort and Scott Morschauer, 123–134. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Maclean, Arthur John. 1901. *A Dictionary of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac as Spoken by the Eastern Syrians of Kurdistan, North-West Persia and the Plain of Mosul*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

- Manna, Abbé Jacques Eugène. 1900. *Vocabulaire chaldéen-arabe*. Mossoul: Imprimerie des pères dominicains.
- Mutzafi, Hezy. 2006. 'On the Etymology of Some Enigmatic Words in North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic'. *Aramaic Studies* 4 (1): 83–99.
- Nezan, Kendal. 2017. *Dictionnaire kurde-français*. Paris: Riveneuve Editions.
- Nöldeke, Theodor. 1898. *Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik*. 2nd ed. Leipzig: Tauchnitz.
- Nöldeke, Theodor. 1904. *Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Nöldeke, Theodor. 1910. *Neue Beiträge zur semitischen Sprachwissenschaft*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Ritter, Hellmut. 1979. *Ṭūrōyo. B: Wörterbuch*. Beirut: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Ritter, Hellmut. 1990. *Ṭūrōyo. C: Grammatik*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Rudolf, Stefanie, and Michael Waltisberg. 2020. 'Phonologie und Transkription des Syrischen'. *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 170 (1): 19–46.
- Sabar, Yona. 2002. *A Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dictionary*. Semitica Viva 28. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 2009. *A Syriac Lexicon: A Translation from the Latin, Correction, Expansion, and Update of C. Brockelmann's Lexicon Syriacum*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press, Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 2017. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. 3rd ed. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 2020. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*. 2nd ed. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press.
- Steiner, Richard C. 1977. *The Case for Fricative-Laterals in Proto-Semitic*. American Oriental Series 59. New Haven, Conn.: American Oriental Society.
- Tezel, Aziz. 2003. *Comparative Etymological Studies in the Western Neo-Syriac (Ṭūrōyo) Lexicon: With Special Reference to Homonyms, Related Words and Borrowings with Cultural Signification*. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 18. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Tezel, Sina. 2011. *Arabic Borrowings in Šūrayt/Ṭūrōyo within the Framework of Phonological Correspondences: In Comparison with Other Semitic Languages*. Studia Semitica Upsaliensia 27. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Ullmann, Manfred. 1970. *Wörterbuch der Klassischen Arabischen Sprache*. Vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Wehr, Hans. 1985. *Arabisches Wörterbuch für die Schriftsprache der Gegenwart*. Arabisch – Deutsch. 5th ed. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

Simon Hopkins

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel | [simon.hopkins@mail.huji.ac.il](mailto:simon.hopkins@mail.huji.ac.il)