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1. Research Question

The ultimate source of inspiration for the present study is our ambition to offer a detailed description of the history of the Aramaic verbal system. A key event in this history is what Goldenberg used to call ‘the morphological revolution’, i.e. the shift, within Eastern Aramaic, from the Middle Aramaic\(^2\) verbal systems to those of Modern Aramaic. In the course of this shift, Eastern Aramaic gave up the inherited suffix conjugation\(^3\) (*qatala*) and the prefix conjugation (*yaqtulu*) and developed a new repertoire of verbal forms, all of whose bases were deverbal adjectives in earlier stages of Aramaic’s history.

We start our historical investigation with Ṭuroyo, since the verbal system of this language, with its two Preterites, qaṭəl-Preterite for most intransitive verbs of the G-stem vs. L-Preterite qṭəlle for transitive ones, seems to be more conservative than that of North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA). It may represent

---

1  The research was supported by RFBR grant 19-012-00475.
2  The term ‘Middle Aramaic’ is used in this paper to refer both to unwritten varieties of Aramaic spoken throughout the 1\(^{st}\) millennium AD and the literary registers of those that were committed to writing during the same period (Jewish Palestinian Aramaic, Syriac, Mandaic, etc.).
3  With the exception of Neo-Mandaic, which retained the suffix conjugation.
a stage that used to exist in some of the ancestor languages of NENA as well.\footnote{If we adhere (as we do) to the \textit{Stammbaum} model in historical linguistics, we cannot accept a hypothesis according to which all NENA known to us had one and the same ancestor in the Middle Aramaic period. Positing a shared ancestor for all NENA is tantamount to claiming that out of all Eastern Middle Aramaic varieties only three had produced progeny that survived into modern times: the ancestor of NENA, the ancestor of Turoyo and Mlaḥsó and the ancestor of Neo-Mandaic.}

Various studies have attempted to establish how the Eastern Aramaic L-Preterite \textit{qṭəlle} developed historically.\footnote{See Coghill (2016), with exhaustive references to earlier studies.} As far as we know, however, there have been no corpus-based studies of the diachronic pathway that led to the \textit{qaṭəl}-Preterite of Turoyo, i.e. how the Central Semitic adjective \textit{*qaṭṭīl} became verbalised.

In Aramaic, \textit{*qaṭṭīl} started as an adjective expressing permanent properties and ended up being the base of various verbal forms in the past tense domain. The functional range of \textit{*qaṭṭīl} in the modern Aramaic verbal system is not restricted to the G-stem intransitive Preterite of Turoyo. \textit{*Qaṭṭīl} is the Perfect of both transitive and intransitive verbs in Mlaḥsó (Jastrow 1994, 45, 52f.). Moreover, in certain village varieties of Turoyo (in particular, Midon and Kfarze), \textit{*qaṭṭīl} is the base for the Passive Preterite of III-y verbs. Thus, in these villages, the Passive Preterite of the verb \textit{ḥzy} is \textit{ḥazı} (‘he was seen’) rather than \textit{ḥze}.\footnote{See comparative paradigms in Ritter (1990, 378).}

The latter form exists in Midyat and some village dialects. This has been inherited directly from the Middle Aramaic ancestor of Turoyo, while the former (\textit{ḥazı}) developed within Turoyo by analogy with the 1 f.s. and 3 f.s. intransitive Preterite forms of IIIy verbs: \textit{baxyono} ‘I (f.) wept’: \textit{ḥazyono} ‘I (f.) was seen’, \textit{baxyo} ‘she wept’: \textit{ḥazyo} ‘she was seen’, \textit{baxi} ‘he wept’: \textit{x;} x = \textit{ḥazi} ‘he was seen’.\footnote{We owe the suggestion of this analogical development to a personal communication of Paul Noorlander.} In Ma’lula, a Western Neo-Aramaic variety, \textit{*qaṭṭīl} of intransitive G-stem verbs functions both as a dynamic past
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verbal form and a stative (or continuous) present tense form, depending on the lexical semantics of the root and even on the utterance context.9

By contrast, in both NENA10 and Neo-Mandaic,11 reflexes of *qaṭṭīl have not produced new finite verb forms but rather are extant only in nominal forms (i.e., adjectives and substantives).

In this paper, we restrict the scope of the study to a comparison of the data collected from Classical Syriac and Ṭuroyo. For the Ṭuroyo data, we have drawn upon our Verb Glossary of Ṭuroyo (in progress).12 According to our glossary of verbs, Ṭuroyo has over 200 verbal roots with a qaṭəl-Preterite. Around 100 of them are of Aramaic origin, the majority of the remainder are of Arabic origin.

2. Prehistory of the Qaṭəl-Preterite: *Qaṭṭīl Outside Aramaic and in Early Aramaic

The Ṭuroyo qaṭəl-Preterite is the end product of the complete verbalisation of *qaṭṭīl, originally a deverbal adjective pattern. This pattern (in the guise of qaṭilo) still continues in Ṭuroyo for adjectives, including deverbal ones, i.e. as the ‘participle’ of certain intransitive verbs.13

8 “Das Perfekt,” according to Werner Arnold, see, e.g., Arnold (2006, 22) and Arnold (1999).

9 Compare tarbīl kamuʿō ti šawwille ‘the way of stone piles, the one he had made’ (Arnold 2006, 68, l. 26) with ngōb nḥōmyin ... ṣunyōṭun šawwīyan xanni ‘if we see ... [that] their wives do so (= are also disloyal to their husbands)’ (Bergsträsser 1915, 27: 16f.). See Correll (1978, 63–68) for numerous examples of this verbal form. Correll’s interpretation of its grammatical meaning is unfortunately dogmatic. For him, it is “das Resultativpartizip” in virtually all contexts.

10 Nöldeke (1868, 99); Khan (2008, 411).

11 Macuch (1965, 185ff.). See also Macuch (1993, 383) (hamīm ‘heiße’), Macuch (1993, 116: 193) (zalīl ‘eng’).

12 On the project of the Verb Glossary of Ṭuroyo, see Furman and Loesov (2015).

13 See Jastrow (1967, 117ff., 229ff.)
2.1. The Etymology of *Qaṭṭīl

Diachronically, the verbal adjective *qaṭṭīl developed as follows: qaṭil → qaṭīl → qaṭṭīl. All three patterns have in common that they denoted property adjectives, and as a matter of fact this use is preserved for all the three patterns in various Central Semitic languages, e.g. Biblical Hebrew, Syriac, and Classical Arabic. This use as a property adjective must have been the original one for each of the three derivations in question.

In written Central Semitic languages apart from Aramaic, *qaṭṭīl is well-documented in Biblical Hebrew and Arabic. In both languages, it mostly expresses enduring properties of human beings. The respective nominals may be syntactically both substantives and adjectives, as the following lists illustrate.

**Biblical Hebrew** (complete list):

ʿālīz ‘exultant’, ʿārīṣ ‘violent, powerful’, ʿattīq ‘old; removed, set apart’ (<Aram., Wagner 1966, no. 229), ʿabbīr ‘strong, powerful’, ʿaddīr ‘mighty’, ʿammīṣ ‘strong’, bārīḥ ‘fugitive’, kabbīr ‘strong, mighty’, pārīṣ ‘burglar’, ṣaddīq ‘innocent, just’, šallīt ‘having power’ (<Aram., Wagner 1966, no. 309), taqqīp̄ ‘mighty’ (<Aram., Wagner 1966, no. 330), yaqqīr ‘precious, dear’ (hapax in Jr 31:20; < Aram.?).

**Arabic** (selected examples):15

ʿirrīḍ ‘mean, malevolent’, ʿiššīq ‘lover’, ḏikkīr ‘having a retentive memory’, ḏillīl ‘steeped in deviation’, ḏillim ‘very unfair’, fiḥḥūr ‘self-important’, ḥibbīṯ ‘very bad’, ḥirriq ‘very generous’, ḥittīr ‘one who frequently acts with treachery’, mirrīḥ ‘joyful’.

Our perusal of dictionaries shows that the lexicon of written Arabic has hardly more than some fifty tokens of the *qaṭṭīl pattern.

---

14 See Barth (1894, 51), Brockelmann (1908, 354), Bauer and Leander (1927, 192), Kuryłowicz (1973, §46), Fox (2003, 267 f.).

15 Note the “attenuation” a > i in the first syllable of the base. In Classical Arabic, this is a regular shift a > i/. CGI.
2.2. *Qaṭṭil in Biblical Aramaic

It is in Aramaic, unlike Arabic and Biblical Hebrew, that *qaṭṭil first becomes a productive noun pattern that is regularly derived from verbal roots. Biblical Aramaic (BA) has twelve *qaṭṭil derivations, as many as Biblical Hebrew, though the Aramaic Biblical corpus is circa fifty times smaller than that of Hebrew.

*qaṭṭil also started its life in Aramaic as an adjective expressing permanent properties. Thus, in Biblical Aramaic, *qaṭṭil expresses properties, including the basic lexical items: ‘āmmīq ‘deep’, ‘attīq ‘old, aged’, ḥakkīm ‘wise’, ḥassīr ‘wanting, deficient’, qaddīs ‘holy’, rahḥīq ‘far’, saggī ‘great, much, many’, šallīṭ ‘powerful, mighty’, šappīr ‘beautiful’, taqqīp̄ ‘strong, mighty’, yaqqīr ‘difficult, honourable’, yaṣṣīḇ ‘well established’, yattīr ‘extraordinary, exceeding’.

The innovative and productive nature of *qaṭṭil in Aramaic of the 1st millennium BC stands in sharp relief when we compare the Biblical Aramaic adjectives from the list above with their Biblical Hebrew cognates, most of which display the patterns *qaṭil, *qaṭal, and *qaṭul, which are retentions from the proto-Semitic stage and no longer productive in Central Semitic: ʿāmōq ‘deep’, ḥāḵām ‘clever, skillful’, ḥāsēr ‘one in want’, qāḏōs ‘holy’, rāḥōq ‘far’, yāqār ‘scarce, precious, valuable’, yōṭēr ‘excessive’.

Thus Biblical Hebrew adjectives derived from the same roots as BA qaṭṭil adjectives were mostly formed using archaic patterns, while Biblical Hebrew qaṭṭil tokens are scarce and partly borrowed from Aramaic.

Syntactically, these Biblical Aramaic nominals are used as verbal arguments, attributive adjectives and nominal predicates. The qaṭṭil of Biblical Aramaic still behaves syntactically as a nominal. We find, however, one instance where a qaṭṭil adjective derived from a dynamic verb inherits the argument structure of the source verb (2):
(1)  
\[ malkū \ldots dī \ ti-šlaṭ \ b-ḵol \]
kingdom.INDET.S DEP 3FS-rule.PC in-all

\[ 'ar'-ā \land-DET.S \]

‘A kingdom … that will rule in the whole earth.’  
(Dan 2: 39)

(2)  
\[ w-malk-īn \ taqqīp-īn \ hāw-ō \ 'al \]
and-king-IND.3PL mighty-IND.3PL be.SC-3MPL over

\[ yorušlām \ w-šallīt-īn \ b-ḵōl \ ṭāḇār \]
gn and-rule.QATTĪL-MPL in-all crossing.CST.S

\[ nahār-ā \ w-midd-ā \ ḫāl \ wa-ḥālāk \]
river-DET.S and-tribute-DET.S tribute and-tribute.IND.3S

\[ mity̱eheb \ l-hon \]
to.be.given.PTCP.MS to-3MPL

‘And mighty kings were over Jerusalem, and ruling in all Beyond-the-River, and tribute, custom and toll were paid to them.’  
(Ezra 4: 20)

The syntagm \( malkīn \ldots šallītīn \ b-ḵōl \ ṭāḇār nahārā \) ‘kings ruling in all Beyond-the-River’ in (2) replicates the argument structure of the finite verb \( šlṭ \) ‘have power, rule’. Both the derivation of a \( qaṭṭīl \) form (here \( šallītīn \)) from a fairly dynamic verb and its syntactic usage are atypical for Biblical Aramaic and foreshadow the career of \( qaṭṭīl \) in Middle Aramaic, which is represented in this paper by Classical Syriac.
3. *Qaṭṭīl in Syriac

We have searched for qaṭṭīl tokens in the Compendious Syriac Dictionary (CSD, J. Payne Smith 1903) and Peshitta New Testament (PNT). In CSD, we have found some 180 qaṭṭīl lexemes whose existence seems reliable. Of these, we have found some 64 in the PNT. We have found 207 vocalised words following the qaṭṭīl pattern in R. Payne Smith’s (1879–1901) Thesaurus Syriacus (TS), Sokoloff’s (2009) Syriac Lexicon (SL) and CAL (the online Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon) alongside CSD. Our principal source is CSD, where the tokens are either independent lemmata, such as šappīr ‘fair, good, lovely’ (CSD, 590), or nominal forms in verb entries, usually labelled ‘part. adj.’, e.g. sallīq (CSD, 379).

Unfortunately, these data cannot be accepted uncritically. The identification, in CSD or TS, of a form as qaṭṭīl rather than qṭīl is not always reliable. Note that J. Payne Smith employs the term ‘part. adj.’ in verb entries, both for qaṭṭīl and qṭīl tokens,\(^\text{16}\) while most qṭīl tokens she labels as ‘pass. part’. In verb entries of CSD, the meanings of nominal forms are not uniformly provided. Furthermore, we have been unable to find textual evidence for several qaṭṭīl tokens that appear in the dictionaries.

3.1. From Property Adjective to Verbal Adjective

A major difference between Biblical Aramaic and the Syriac NT regarding qaṭṭīl is that in PNT qaṭṭīl is formed not only from unambiguous property roots, but also from stative and dynamic verbal roots. Some of the examples are ṣabbīḏ ‘lost, gone astray’, ṣazzīl ‘(is) gone’, ṣattī ‘having come’, ṣallīl ‘having entered’, dabbīq ‘close to, cleaving’, daḥḥīl ‘fearing’, dammīḵ ‘asleep’, naḥḥīṯ ‘having gone down’, tammīh ‘amazed’. It stands to reason that these are used almost exclusively as predicates rather than independent nominals or attributive adjectives. Due to their semantics, they cannot be easily employed independently in specifically nominal forms.

\(^{16}\) I.e. for qṭīl tokens with non-trivial meanings, in particular those derived from intransitive verbs.
syntactic functions. This means they were formed in order to serve as predicates in the first place, by analogy with the predicative use of the property adjective ṣaṭṭīl. Further research is required to establish the relative chronology of ṣaṭṭīl derivations, i.e. to answer the question which verbs (in terms of the four Vendlerian classes)\textsuperscript{17} were the first to form purely predicative ṣaṭṭīl forms. We speculate, however, that it was stative verbs that were the first to produce them, by analogy with property adjectives:

ḥakkīm ʾāt ‘You are wise’ > tammīḥ ʾāt ‘You are amazed’

The shared feature of the two kinds of clauses is as follows. Both were thought of as stative, while tammīḥ ʾāt was also resultative, i.e., it encoded a stative situation that was thought of as ‘having come about’ rather than a property that ‘always’ existed of itself.

\(3\)

\(\text{a. } \text{w-ṭammīḥ-īn.}\text{waw } \text{kul-hon}\)
\(\text{and-be.amazed.QATTĪL-MPL-PST.3MPL } \text{all-3MPL}\)
\(\text{ʾaylēn } \text{d-ṣāmʾ-īn.}\text{waw } \text{l-ḥ}\)
\(\text{DIST.PL DEP-listen.PTCP-MPL-PST.3MPL } \text{to-3MS}\)

Greek original (Act 9:21 BNT):

\(\text{eksista-nto } \text{de pant-es}\)
\(\text{be.amazed.IMPF.REFL-3PL } \text{TOP every-MPL}\)
\(\text{hoi } \text{akou-ont-es}\)
\(\text{ART.MPL listen.PTCP.PRS.ACT-NOM.MPL}\)

‘All those who were listening to him \textit{were amazed.}’

\textsuperscript{17} \textit{I.e., stative verbs, atelic verbs, telic events (accomplishments), and punctual situations (achievements).}
b. ṭāmr-ā l-ēh ṣāttă hāy mār-y lā
   say.SC-3FS to-3MS woman VOC lord-1S NEG

   dawlā l-āk w-ḇērā ʿammiqā
   bucket to-2MS and-well deep

Greek original:

   leg-ei aut-o e gyn-e
   say-PRS.ACT.3S PRON.PERS-DAT.MS ART.NOM.FS woman-NOM.S

   Kyri-e, aute antlem-ā ech-eis
   lord-VOC.MS and.not bucket-ACC.NS have-PRS.ACT.2s

   kai to phrear est-in bathy
   and ART.NS well.NOM.S be-PRS.ACT.3S deep.NOM.NS

(Jn 4:11 BYZ)

   ‘The woman told him, My lord, you do not even have a
   bucket, and the well is deep.’

C. yawsep̄ dēn baʿl-āh kēnā-hwā
   PN TOP husband-3FS honest-PST.3MS

Greek original (Mt 1:19 BNT):

   Ioseph de ho aner aut-es,
   PN.NOM TOP ART.DEF.MS husband-NOM.S PRON.PERS-GEN.FS

   dikai-os on
   righteous-NOM.MS be.PTCP.PRS.ACT.NOM.MS

   ‘Joseph, her husband, was a decent man.’
d.  lbūš-ēh  hewwār-ḥwā
clothes-3MS  white-PST.3MS

Greek original (Mt 28:3 BNT):

en  de  to  endym-a
be.IMPF.ACT.3s  TOP  ART.NOM.NS  garment-NOM.NS

aut-ou  leuk-on
PRON.PERS-GEN.MS  white-NOM.NS

‘His clothes were white.’

The predicate of (3a) has the same morphological shape qaṭṭīl as the predicate of (3b) and the same surface syntax as those of (3c) and (3d), while the predicative adjectives in (3c) and (3d) have morphological patterns other than qaṭṭīl. In (3a), w-ṭammīhīn-ḥwaw (semantically, a stative-resultative predicate) translates the Greek finite (Imperfect) form eksistanto, while the qaṭṭīl-predicate of (3b), w-ḇērā ‘ammiqā (semantically, a property adjective), translates the Greek predicative adjective (with the present-tense verbal copula) estin bathy ‘is deep’. In (3c) and (3d), Syriac predicative property adjectives translate Greek predicative property adjectives (note that in 1d the Syriac adjective is in the determined state).

3.2. From Stative-Resultative to Dynamic Perfect

What one observes in Syriac is a verbalisation stage of qaṭṭīl even more advanced than that of a stative-resultative predicate: qaṭṭīl lexemes formed from dynamic roots can take the kinds of verbal arguments and adjuncts that exclude a stative-resultative interpretation. This means these forms are no longer stative-resultative nominal predicates but rather dynamic verbal forms. The contexts show that these verbal forms encode
past events and can express a perfect or anterior. They could be used as translations of past tense forms of the Greek NT texts. Consider the following examples, which come both from translations and original texts:

(4) w-ʾen-bū d-šārē-ʾnā l-hon kaḏ
and-even.if DEP-dismiss.ptcp.ms-1s to-3mpl while
šāy-m-in l-bāttay-hon ʿāyp-in b-ʾurḥā
fast.ptcp-mpl to-house.pl-3mpl be.tired.ptcp-mpl on-way
gēr ʾnāšā men-hon men ruḥqā ʾattī-ʾin
for some from-3mpl from distance come.qattīl-mpl

Greek original (Mk 8:3 BYZ):

kai ean apoly-s-o aut-ous
and if release-aor-sbjv.act.1s pron.pers-acc.mpl
nest-eis eis oik-on aut-on
hungry-acc.mpl (in)to house-acc.ms pron.pers-gen.mpl
ekly-the-sontai en te hod-o,
become.weary-pass-fut.3mpl in art.dat.fs way-dat.fs
tin-es gar auton apo
pron.indf-nom.mpl because pron.pers-gen.mpl from
makrothen hek-asin
far.away come.perf.act.3mpl

‘And if I let them go home while they are fasting, they will faint on the way, for some of them have come from far away.’
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(5) \( w^{-ezz}l \cdot ehyt \cdot ah \) \( w^{-esk}hl \cdot ah \)
and-go.SC-3FS to-house-3FS and-find.SC-3FS

\( bahr \cdot ah \) \( kadj \) \( ramy \cdot ah \) \( b\cdotarsa \)
daughter-3FS while lie.PTCP.PASS-3FS on-bed

\( w\cdotnapp\cdotiq \) \( menn \cdot ah \) \( sh\cdotd \cdot ah \)
and-go.out.QATTIL.MS from-3FS demon-3FS

Greek original (Mk 7:30 BNT):

\( kai \) \( apelth \cdot ousa \) \( eis \) \( ton \)
and go.away.AOR-PTCP.ACT.NOM.FS (in)to ART.ACC.MS

\( oik \cdot on \) \( aut \cdot es \) \( heur \cdot en \) \( to \)
house-ACC.MS PRON.GEN.FS find.AOR.ACT.3S ART.ACC.NS

\( paid \cdot on \) \( beble \cdot men \cdot on \) \( epi \) \( ten \)
child-ACC.NS throw.PRF-PTCP.PASS-ACC.NS on ART.ACC.FS

\( klin \cdot en \) \( kai \) \( to \) \( daimon \cdot on \)
bed-ACC.FS and ART.ACC.NS demon-NOM.NS

\( ekselelyth \cdot os \)
get.out.PRF-PTCP.ACT-ACC.NS

‘She went to her house and found that her daughter was lying upon the bed and that her demon had gone out of her.’
Yešū́'

Greek original (Jn 6:17 BNT):

καὶ ἐμβαντεῖσας εἰς πλοῖον
and get.into.AOR-PTCP.ACT-NOM.MPL into ship-ACC.NS

erch-ontō peran tes thalass-es
come-IMPF.MED.3pl on.the.other.side ART.GEN.FS sea-GEN.FS

eis Kapharnaoum. kai skoti-a ede
into GN and darkness-NOM.FS already

egegon-ei kai oupo elelyth-ei
take.place.PLUPRF.ACT.3S and not.yet come.PLUPERF.ACT.3S

pros aut-ous ho Iesous
to PRON-ACC.MPL ART.NOM.MS PN

‘And they sat in a boat and were going to Capernaum. And it became dark, and Jesus had not (yet) come to them.’
'(Anastasius) was unwilling to meet him (Qawad) in battle, that blood might not be shed on both sides; but he sent him money by the hand of Rufinus, to whom he gave orders that, if Qawad was on the frontier and had not yet crossed over into the Greek territory, he should give him the money and send him away.' (JS 46)
kull-ḥē ṣeṭbanni w-ṣiḥaddaṭ ba-ṣqāl
all-3MS rebuild.sc.3MS and-restore.sc.3MS by-care

ṭaʾnā d-Ewlogis hegmonā d-Urhāy
decision DEP-PN governor DEP-GN

‘And the wall of Batnan-Qastra in Serug, which had collapsed into ruin, was completely rebuilt and restored by the decision of Eulogius, the governor of Edessa.’ (JS 83)

(9) ʾaḥen lā ʾamīt-ḥē b-mawṭā
though NEG kill.sc.3MS-acc.3MS with-death

kyānāyā ʾellā b-haw da-hṭīṭā
natural but with-dist.ms dep-sin

mayyīṯ-hwā
die.qattīl.ms-pst.3MS

Though he (God) did not kill him (Adam) with natural death, he had still died a death of sin (IshGn 064).18

In (4) men ruḥqā ʾatti̇n, the adjunct men ruḥqā ‘from afar’ corroborates a dynamic past interpretation of ʾatti̇n. The same applies to (5) w-nappīq mennāḥ še’dāḥ. In (6), the two Greek pluperfects (skotia ede egegonei and oupo eleluthei... ho Iesous) were rendered differently in Syriac. The first one was translated with Preterite + hwā (ḥeškaṭ-hwāt lāḥ), the second by qattīl + hwā (lā ʾatti-hwā). This is because Syriac ḫaššīḵ denoted a property with the senses ‘obscure, under a cloud, in darkness, ignorant’

18 I.e., Mar Ishodad of Merv believes that Adam had died a spiritual death of sin even before he left the Garden of Eden.
(CSD, 162), and, therefore, would be inappropriate in this text as a rendering of a dynamic event. In (7), *wa-‘dakkēl lā ‘abbir l-ḥēr rōmāyē*, besides the endpoint of crossing, there is a phasal particle *‘dakkēl* ‘not yet’, well known for its propensity to combine with a PERFECT. In (8), *šūrā ... d-nappīl-hwā ... kullēh ‘etbannī*, the form *nappīl-hwā* clearly has an eventive pluperfect force. In (9), *b-haw da-hṣīṭā mayyiṭ-hwā*, the predicate is clearly dynamic.

Thus, *qaṭṭīl* predicates in (4)–(9) are not stative but rather past dynamic (eventive, fientive). Semantically, they are perfects, not resultatives, as we consider (with mainstream functional typology) the RESULTATIVE to be a sub-class of stative situations but the PERFECT to encode dynamic situations.19

So, the Syriac evidence for dynamic *qaṭṭīl* points to a ‘mature’ Perfect, which is employed as both an absolute and a relative tense: i.e., in narrative, a *qaṭṭīl*-Perfect has a reference point different from speech time. In other words, our Syriac *qaṭṭīl*-Perfect can function as both a shifter (or ‘deictic’) PERFECT and as a PLUPERFECT.20 In the latter case, it may have an appropriate marker -(h)hwā,21 which, as we have seen, may be used with all kinds of nominal predicates in Syriac.

Symmetrically, another innovative construction, *qtīl lēh*, provides both active PERFECT and analytical PLUPERFECT for Syriac transitive verbs:22

---

19 We use small caps for linguistic universals, such as PERFECT or PASSIVE.
20 Or as a verb form employed to introduce ‘nachgeholte Information’ [recovered information], to use an elegant term of Harald Weinrich (1985).
21 It anticipates relative tense markers in Modern Aramaic, which are etymologically related to this -hwā.
22 See also numerous examples in Bar-Asher Siegal (2014) and Coghill (2016, 306–27).
(10) **hānnā** dēn **meddem** da-*snē* lā
PROX.MS TOP something DEP-wicked NEG

**ḇīḍ** l-*ēh*
do.QTĪL.MS to-3MS

Greek original (Lk 23:41 BNT):

**hout-os** de **oud-en** atop-on
PRON.DEM-NOM.MS TOP PRON.INDEF-ACC.NS wrong-ACC.NS
epraks-en
do.AOR-ACT.3S

‘But this one has done nothing bad’

(11) **šbāb-aw** dēn w-*/aylēn* da-*hzē-hwā*
neighbour.PL-3MS TOP and-DIST.PL DEP-see.QTĪL.MS-PST.3MS

**l-hon** men qādim d-*ḥādar-hwā*
to-3MPL from former DEP-beg.PTCP.MS-PST.3MS

**āmr-in-hwaw** lā-*hwā* hānnaw haw
say.PTCP-MPL-PST.3MPL NEG-be.SC.3MS PROX.MS DIST.MS
d-*yāṭēb-hwā* w-*ḥādar*
DEP-sit.PTCP.MS-PST.3MS and-beg.PTCP.MS

Greek original (Jn 9:8 BNT):

**hoi** **oun** geiton-es **kai** **hoi**
ART.NOM.PL TOP neighbour-NOM.MPL and ART.NOM.PL

teor-ount-es aut-on to
see-PTCP.PRES.ACT-NOM.MPL PRON-ACC.MS ART-ACC.NS
Studies in the Grammar and Lexicon of Neo-Aramaic

proteron   hoti   prosait-es   en
earlier   that   beggar-NOM.MS   be.IMPF.3S

e-leg-on:   ouch   hout-os   est-in
IMPF-say-3PL   not   PRON.DEM-NOM.MS   be-PRS.3S

ho   kathe-men-os   kai   prosait-on
ART.NOM.MS   sit-PTCP.PRS-NOM.MS   and   beg-PTCP.PRS-NOM.MS

‘His neighbours and those who **had formerly seen** him begging said, “Isn’t this the [same man] who used to sit and beg?”’

These sentences should not be interpreted as passive, since the agents are given prominence by special particles (in both the originals and translations) and by the context.\(^{23}\) The fact that corresponding verbal forms in the Greek original are active transitive further supports this.

Thus, one could surmise that Classical Syriac might have had a Perfect tense roughly comparable with German or Italian. This Perfect would have had two shapes depending on the respective verb’s value of transitivity. In the individual Syriac corpora we have perused, the dynamic qaṭṭīl is predominantly derived from intransitive telic verbs of motion, though even in such verbs it is rare. The data of our sample are as follows:

- Aphrahat, *Demonstrations* (written in 337–345 C.E.), 77,505 words. 2 verbs with dynamic qaṭṭīl: ’bd ‘perish’ (2 tokens), npl ‘fall’ (1 token). Total: 3 tokens.\(^{24}\)
- Peshitta New Testament (PNT) (composed perhaps in the 5\(^{th}\) century C.E.), 101,479 words. 4 verbs with dynamic qaṭṭīl: ’ty ‘come’ (3 tokens), ’ll ‘enter’ (1 token),

---

23 In terms of pragmatics, **PASSIVE** is demotion (most often, deletion) of agent.

24 Aphrahat 10:194, 14:270, 19:360.
ʾbd ‘perish’ (4 tokens), npq ‘go out’ (1 token). Total: 9 tokens.\(^{25}\)

- Eusebius, *Church History* (translated into Syriac no later than 462 C.E.), 63,194 words. 4 verbs with dynamic qaṭṭīl: ʾbd ‘perish’ (1 token), ʿrq ‘flee’ (1 token), mrd ‘escape’ (1 token), nḥt ‘go down, land’ (3 tokens). Total: 6 tokens.\(^{26}\)

- Chronicle of Joshua Stylite (written in 507 C.E.), 15,434 words. 2 verbs with dynamic qaṭṭīl: ʾbr ‘cross’ (1 token), npl (1 token). Total: 2 tokens.\(^{27}\)

- Ishodad, *Commentary on the Pentateuch* (written around 850 C.E.), 77,252 words. 10 roots with dynamic qaṭṭīl: ʾty ‘come’ (1 token), ʾzl ‘go’ (2 tokens), ʿrq ‘flee’ (1 token), ʾbd ‘perish’ (1 token), myt ‘die’ (1 token), npl ‘fall’ (1 token), npq ‘go out’ (1 token), sgd ‘bow’ (1 token), škn ‘settle or rest upon’ (1 token), yqd ‘burn (intr.)’ (1 token). Total: 11 tokens.\(^{28}\)

- Bar Ebroyo, *Ecclesiastical History* (written in the 13\(^\text{th}\) century C.E.), 82,373 words. 5 verbs with dynamic qaṭṭīl: ʾty ‘come’ (1 token), ʾzl (1 token), ʿll ‘enter’ (1 token), ʿrq ‘flee’ (4 tokens), ḥrb ‘get ruined’ (1 token). Total: 8 tokens.\(^{29}\)

The number of dynamic qaṭṭīl tokens in each of the individual corpora is small, but, throughout the nine centuries of Syriac literature examined for this study, the qaṭṭīl pattern tends to express the PERFECT consistently in the context of essentially the same tightly-knit group of telic/punctual verbs. In more detailed terms of lexical semantics, these are, for the most part, either verbs of motion or patientive intransitives, such as ʾbd ‘perish’, myt ‘die’, and ḥrb ‘get ruined’. This fact remains to be explained.

\(^{25}\) Mt 18:11; Mk 7:30, 8:3, 11:20; Lk 8:30, 15:6, 15:9, 19:10; Jn 6:17, 11:19.
\(^{26}\) Eusebius 52, 56, 148, 149, 210, 317.
\(^{27}\) JS 46, 83.
\(^{28}\) IshGn 64, 123, 127, 188; IshEx-Dt 8, 25, 67, 109, 117, 137.
\(^{29}\) BH 1:331, 1:411, 2:783, 3:23, 3:71, 3:311, 3:317, 4:429.
Moreover, throughout our corpus, the grammatical reading of individual deverbal tokens of *qaṭṭīl* still depends on the lexical semantics of the respective verb. For example, in Syriac, *dammīḵ* invariably denotes ‘he is asleep’ (not ‘he fell/has fallen asleep’). It expresses a state contemporaneous with a reference point, as observed in (12):

(12)  

| Arabic | English |
|--------|---------|
| `w-hā` | and-TOP |
| `zawʿā` | moving |
| `rabbā-hwā` | great-PST.3MS |
| `b-yammā` | in-sea |
| `ʾaykannā` | so that |
| `d-ʾelpā` | DEP-boat |
| `te-ṭkassē` | 3FS-be.covered.PC |
| `men` | by |
| `gall-ē` | wave-PL |
| `hū dēn` | 3S TOP |

Yešū’ *dammīḵ-hwā*  

PN sleep.QATTĪL.MS-PST.3MS  

Greek original (Mt 8:24 BYZ):  

`kai idou, seism-os megas`  

and TOP shaking-NOM.MS large.NOM.MS  

| Greek | English |
|--------|---------|
| `e-gen-eto` | AOR-occur-MED.3S |
| `en te` | in ART.DAT.FS |
| `thalass-e` | sea-DAT.FS |
| `hoste` | so.that |
| `to` | ART.ACC.NS |
| `ploi-on` | ship-ACC.S |
| `kalypt-esthai` | hide-INF.PRS.PASS |
| `hupo` | under |
| `ton kymat-wn` | ART.GEN.NPL |
| `aut-os` | wave.GEN.NPL |
| `de e-katheud-en` | himself-PRON.NOM.MS |
| `TOP IMPF-sleep-3S` |

---

30 As against Ṭuroyo, where all finite *qatol* forms have the perfective aspectual reading. Thus, *damax* is ‘he slept’, ‘he fell asleep’, see below.
'And look, a great commotion arose in the sea, so that the boat was being covered by waves. But he, Jesus, was asleep.'

The predicate *dammīḵ-*hwa* is a translation of the Greek Imperfect e-katheud-en ‘was sleeping/asleep.’

Most importantly, this is the only token of *dammīḵ* in the standard text of the Peshitta for both OT and NT. Otherwise, in this corpus, the situation ‘be asleep’ is rendered by the adjective *dmeḵ* for the Present (e.g., Mark 5:39 PNT) and *dmeḵ-*hwa* for the Past (e.g., Acts 12:6 PNT). It stands to reason that the morphological form of the Syriac adjective *dmeḵ* is a reflex of the archaic pattern *qaṭil*, no longer productive in Central Semitic (see Sections 1.1. and 1.2 above). Thus, *dammīḵ* is an inner-Syriac innovation that had not existed in earlier Aramaic. The same applies to *nappīq* and ʾattī. By contrast, ṭuroyo *daməx* corresponding to Syriac *dammīḵ* expresses ‘he fell asleep’, while *damixo*, the erstwhile determined form, means ‘asleep’, e.g. *ono damixo-no* ‘I am asleep’.

### 3.3. Summary

In sum, throughout our Syriac sample, *qaṭṭīl* derivations of intransitive te⁰lic verbs have the force of the PERFECT (or a PLUPERFECT when used as relative tense with a reference point in the past in narrative). Yet, their use to express these grammatical meanings is not obligatory, because *qtal* also appears with the same functions in texts. Consider three Syriac renderings of the same Greek verse, Jn 6:17:

---

31 The manuscript tradition has preserved a few more occurrences of *dammīḵ* where the standard text has *dmeḵ* or *dāmeḵ* (e.g., Act 12:6).

32 See Kiraz (1996, 100f.)
(13) \textit{w-iteḇ\textsuperscript{w} ba-s̄p̄ittā w-ṭāṭēn-h\textit{waw} l-\textit{ebrā la-Ḳp̄arnaḥum w-ḥeškaṭ-h\textit{wāt lāḥ w-lā \textit{ʾattī-h-wā lwaṭhon Yešū]} (PNT).}

\textit{(PNT) w-lā ʾattī-h-wā}

\textit{and-NEG come.qattīl.ms-pst.3ms}

\textit{w-iteḇ\textsuperscript{w} ba-s̄p̄ittā w-ṭāṭēn-h\textit{waw} l-\textit{ebrā la-Ḳp̄arnaḥum mettol d-ḥeškaṭ-h\textit{wāt lāḥ w-lā \textit{eṭā-h-wā lwaṭhon Yešū]} (S).}

\textit{(S) w-lā \textit{eṭā-h-wā}}

\textit{and-NEG come.pst.3ms-pst.3ms}

\textit{w-iteḇ\textsuperscript{w} ba-s̄p̄ittā w-ṭāṭēn-h\textit{waw} l-\textit{ebrā d-yamṭā la-Ḳp̄arnaḥum w-ḥeškaṭ-h\textit{wāt lāḥ w-lā \textit{eṭā lwāṭhon Yešū]} (C).}

\textit{(C) w-lā \textit{eṭā}}

\textit{and-NEG come.pst.3ms}

‘And they sat in a boat and were going to Capernaum. And it became dark, and \textbf{Jesus had not} (yet) \textit{come} to them.’

In PNT, the ‘pluperfect’ sense is rendered by the \textit{qaṭṭīl} form, while S uses the \textit{qṭal}, and C uses the \textit{qṭal-wā} form.

In the Classical Syriac corpus, \textit{qaṭṭīl} need not be restricted to derivations of telic verbs to express the \textit{perfect}. Thus, \textit{tammīh} sometimes has the meaning ‘he became amazed’, and even \textit{yabbīš} in certain contexts seems to express ‘it has dried up’ (cf. Mk 11: 20 PNT). These facts will hopefully be dealt with in the course of our further research.
4. The Development from an Assumed Middle Aramaic Ancestor of Ṭuroyo to the Ṭuroyo of Today

The transition from the Middle Aramaic past-tense repertoire to the Neo-Aramaic repertoire of Ṭuroyo seems broadly straightforward. The new Perfect (qaṭṭīl) takes root and its use increases exponentially, and finally ousts the old Preterite (qṭal) to become the basic Past tense. This follows the well-known typological pathway, which is found, for example, in Western European languages like French, certain dialects of Italian and most of contemporary German.

Our aim is to trace the development of the Ṭuroyo verbal system in as much detail as possible. This study is still in progress. For the moment, we have undertaken a comparison of qaṭṭīl formations found in CSD with approximately one hundred Ṭuroyo verbs of Aramaic origin that have qaṭəl-Preterites. It stands to reason that Proto-Ṭuroyo was not identical to Edessan Syriac, yet we have no better starting point for a diachronic study of Ṭuroyo than Syriac.

We have found around 50 overlaps between the two groups of verbs. Some 50 intransitive Syriac verbs with qaṭṭīl attested in CSD have direct correspondences in Ṭuroyo and have a qaṭəl-Preterite, while the rest of them (i.e., approximately 130 verbs with qaṭṭīl-derivations) are not in our Verb Glossary of Ṭuroyo and, therefore, most probably have not survived into this language.

The surviving verbs can be neatly divided into two semantic groups: motion and state-and-property (including body posture). In the table below, we present 14 Ṭuroyo motion verbs with Aramaic etymology out of 50 in total. The leftmost column of the table provides glosses of Syriac verbs whose qaṭṭīl forms stand in the next column. In the Ṭuroyo column, we adduce special glosses for Ṭuroyo when the meanings do not match the Syriac ones and we give the Preterite forms of the etymologically related Ṭuroyo verbs.
Table 1: Syriac and Ṭuroyo Correspondences of *Qattîl

| Gloss        | Syriac | Ṭuroyo |
|--------------|--------|--------|
| go           | ʾazzîl | azzé   |
| come         | ʾattî  | aṭî    |
| go down      | naḥḥîṭ | naḥət  |
| fall         | nappîl | nafol  |
| go out       | nappîq | nafəq  |
| go up        | sallîq | salaq  |
| flee, escape | ʾarriq | ʾarəq  |
| escape       | pallîṭ | falot  |
| stand up     | qayyyîm| qayam  |
| run          | rahḥîṭ | rahəṭ  |
| quiver       | raʿīl  | raʿəl  |
| be in motion, tremble | zayyiʾ | zayəʾ ‘fear’ |
| sink         | ūbbîʾ | tawəʾ also ‘fall asleep’; ‘set’ (sun) |
| cross        | ʾabbîr | ‘abər ‘enter’ |

Also worth mentioning is the Syriac verb rkb ‘mount, bestride, ride (a horse)’. CSD (541) only mentions rḵîḇ and not the expected *rakkîḇ. Cognate verbs in Ṭuroyo include raku/roku ‘to get on, to mount (vehicle, horse ‘al)’; raxu/roxu ‘ride, mount (horse)’. Note also lawišo ‘wearing, clothed’, while CSD (235) records lḇiš rather than *labbîš.

Thus, as far as the correspondences of geminated R₂-stops in Ṭuroyo go, we have ʾattî vs. aṭî, ūbbîʾ vs. tawəʾ, ʾabbîr vs. ʾabər. Additional relevant examples from our comparative list include yattîḇ ‘sitting, seated’ (CSD, 198f.) vs. yatu ‘he sat down’, sabbîʾ ‘full, satisfied’ (CSD, 358) vs. sawəʾ ‘he became full/satiated’, and rabbî (CSD, 526: “pass. part.” of rḇāʾ ‘lie down, couch; recline’) vs. rawəʾ ‘it lied down, rested (animals)’, rakkiḵ ‘soft, gentle’ (CSD
540) vs. rakəx ‘it became soft’, 33 rattīḵ ‘fervent, enthusiastic’ (CSD 552) vs. raṭəx ‘to seethe’. The behaviour of second radical stops vs. spirants appears to be unpredictable. 34 This means that, e.g., ati is not an immediate reflex (or a direct descendent) of ‘atti’. The implication is that the qaṭəl-Preterite was derived directly from the ‘new’ (Neo-Aramaic) root at a certain stage of development, and in no instance is it a continuation of the corresponding Syriac qaṭṭīl form.

Our preliminary conclusions are as follows.

We do not know whether qaṭṭīl became an inflectional form that was available for every intransitive verb in the ancestor of Ṭuroyo. (This is a possibility we have been entertaining for a long time in the course of our research.) Due to a lack of adequate Syriac textual corpora at our disposal, it is difficult to identify textual examples even for the 180 qaṭṭīl lexemes recorded in CSD.

Since, phonologically, numerous tokens of the Ṭuroyo Preterite qaṭəl and the deverbal adjective qaṭilo do not go back directly to the corresponding forms attested in Syriac, we believe that all the inflectional forms of Ṭuroyo verbs were derived at a certain period synchronically from the new roots, whether of Aramaic or Arabic origin. This means that we can neither prove nor refute the existence of a Middle Aramaic stage at which a productive finite form of qaṭṭīl of intransitive verbs existed. Finally, the diachronic background for plosive or spirant realisation of etymological stops in Ṭuroyo has to be studied in its own right, as a step forward in the reconstruction of Proto-Ṭuroyo.

Abbreviations

Bibliographical Abbreviations

Aphrahat The Homilies of Aphraates, The Persian Sage. Edited by W. Wright. Vol. 1. The Syriac Text. 1869. London: Williams and Norgate.

33 On this verb, see Furman and Loesov (2016, 41).
34 See also Jastrow (2015, 240).
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C  Curetonian Gospels

CAL  Comprehensive Aramaic Lexicon, http://cal.huc.edu/

CSD  Payne Smith, Jessie. 1957. A Compendious Syriac Dictionary. Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. Payne Smith, D. D. Edited by J. Payne Smith (Mrs. Margoliouth).
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Glossing Abbreviations not in the Leipzig Glossing List

CST construct state
DEP dependent, i.e. the marker of an embedded clause or the dependent within a noun phrase
DET determined state
GN geographic name
INDET indetermined state
PC prefix conjugation
PN proper noun
SC suffix conjugation
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