



BRILL

JOURNAL OF JEWISH LANGUAGES 2 (2014) 1–29



brill.com/jjl

Reciprocal NP-Strategies in Jewish Dialects of Near Eastern Neo-Aramaic in Light of Parallel Semitic Constructions

Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel

Abstract

This article focuses on the origin of the forms of various NP-strategies for expressing reciprocity in the Jewish dialects of North Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA). The discussion concerning the origin of these forms is of special interest when considering their historical relationship with their regional ancestors from Late Aramaic (Syriac, Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, and Mandaic). This discussion is conducted in light of what has been previously discussed concerning similar constructions among the Semitic languages and cross-linguistically. This article also elaborates on the relationship between reciprocal constructions and sociative- comitative- collective expressions.

Keywords

reciprocal constructions – sociative and comitative expressions – Aramaic – North Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA) – typology – grammaticalization

Introduction

Reciprocal constructions are often defined as grammatical means for encoding symmetric relations (Lichtenberk 1985: 21, Kemmer 1993: 102, Nedjalkov

* I wish to thank Steve Fassberg for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this article, and to Yona Sabar for his guidance regarding some of the data. In addition I am grateful for the extremely helpful comments of the two anonymous readers. A shorter version of this article was read at the Colloquium in the memory of Professor Ze'ev Ben-Ḥaim, The Academy of the Hebrew Language, December 2013.

2007: 6). A symmetric relation, in turn, is defined as a relation in which there are two participants (A and B), and A stands to B in the same relation as B to A. The current article focuses on reciprocal constructions that have received various designations by scholars: nominal strategies (König & Kokutani 2006), pronominal strategies (Nedjalkov 2007a: 12), and NP-strategies (Evans 2008). For our purposes, constructions fall within the scope of the current discussion based on the following criterion (for a more detailed definition see Bar-Asher Siegal forthcoming):

The encoding is non-verbal, i.e., verbs in the relevant constructions are transitive (unlike verbal encoding of reciprocity). Thus, comparing (a), a reciprocal sentence, which denotes symmetric relation between its participants, with (b), they are the same in terms of the predicate and argument structure:

- (1) (a) James and Beth love each other.
 (b) James loves Beth.

I will use the term NP-strategies, since the relevant expressions, those which constitute the constructions, always occupy the positions of the NP-arguments of the verb. This article focuses on the origin of the forms of various NP-strategies in the Jewish dialects of North Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA). The discussion concerning the origin of these forms is of special interest when considering their relationship with their regional ancestors from Late Aramaic. This discussion is conducted in light of what has been previously discussed concerning similar constructions among the Semitic languages (Bar-Asher Siegal 2011, 2012, and forthcoming).

The structure of the article is as follows: the next section presents a central typological division between the reciprocal NP-strategies found among the Semitic languages, and the historical relations between these types of constructions. This typology sets the foundations for the presentation of such constructions, in the following section, in the history of Aramaic in general. With this background, the subsequent section is dedicated to the various NP-strategies found in the Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects, pointing to the possibility of various types of relationship between them and the forms found in the dialects of Late Eastern Aramaic. The last two sections are dedicated to specific phenomena in some of the Jewish dialects: the similarity between the reciprocal NP-strategy and the sociative adverb in two dialects, and a unique type of emergence of such a construction in one dialect.

A Typology of the NP-Strategies for Expressing Reciprocity among the Semitic Languages

Among the constructions found in the Semitic languages a significant division is observed between two types:¹

- I. The two-unit constructions: constructions with two components where each component occupies a different argument position of the verb.
- II. The one-unit constructions: constructions with one-unit expression, which co-refers with plural subjects and occupies only the non-subject position as required by the verb.

In addition there are hybrid constructions which appear similarly to the two-unit constructions but have some characteristics of the one-unit constructions.

In Bar-Asher Siegal (forthcoming) I have argued that among the Semitic languages, as far as is known to us, all one-unit constructions developed from two-unit constructions. For many of them, there is some evidence that a hybrid construction was a middle stage between the two phases. I will illustrate these constructions following the attested development in Akkadian. The two-unit construction consists of a repetition of *aḥum*, “brother,” while the one-unit type contains the variants *aḥāmiš/aḥāiš/aḥājiš*. The former was predominant in the earlier dialects, while the latter developed only in the Middle Babylonian and Middle Assyrian (Bar-Asher Siegal 2011).

Stage I two-unit constructions:

| | | | |
|--|---------|---|---|
| [NP ₁ , NP ₂ ... NP _n .NOM] | VERB.SG | reciprocal-pronoun ₁ .NOM.SG | reciprocal-pronoun ₂ .ACC.SG |
| Topic | | Subject | Object |

The topic is in brackets as it is optional. When it does appear, though, it is in the nominative which may be attributed either to the fact that in Semitic languages with morphologically overt cases, the case for the topic is also nominative; or alternatively, it could also be attributed to the fact that it has the same referent as the subject of the sentence.

¹ Cf. Haspelmath's (2007) division between *bipartite anaphor* and *single-part anaphor*.

(2) Old Babylonian:

atta u nakri-ka ah-um ina pāni ah-im
 you and enemy-POSS.2.M.SG brother-NOM from brother-GEN
udappar
 withdraw.DUR.3.M.SG

“You and your enemy will withdraw from each other” (YOS 10 47:81).

The fact that “you and your enemy” in (2) function as the topic and not as the subject is indicated by the form of the verb (3.M.SG rather than 2.PL); thus an agreement between the verb and the first nominal element of the reciprocal construction.

Stage II hybrid constructions:

The only formal change is that the verb is in a plural form:

[NP₁, NP₂...NP_n, NOM] VERB.PL reciprocal-pronoun₁ NOM.SG reciprocal-pronoun₂ ACC.SG
 Topic Subject Object

While one might assume that the plural agreement reflects a reanalysis of the nominative topic as the subject, the plural agreement seems to have come about for a different reason. This could in fact be a good example of the known phenomenon of semantic rather than morphological agreement (Corbett 2006: 155–160). In the case of reciprocals, this is due to the fact that part of the meaning of a reciprocal relation is that more than one set occupies the subject position. This phenomenon is attested in Akkadian in a few rare examples, as in the following one:

(3) Old Babylonian:

ah-um ah-am lā ibaqqarū
 brother-NOM brother-ACC NEG raise.a.claim.DUR.3.M.PL
 “None should raise claims against the other” (YOS 8 99:19f).

Stage III one-unit constructions:

The last stage is a typical example of a topic reanalyzed as a subject. Consequently, the two separate pronouns are conceived as one unit, namely, the one-unit reciprocal pronoun:

[NP₁, NP₂...NP_n, NOM] VERB.PL reciprocal-pronoun₁ reciprocal-pronoun₂ ACC.DU/PL
 Subject Object

Once there is another subject in the sentence, a “reciprocal-pronoun₁” can no longer be the subject and so it must be analyzed, like “reciprocal-pronoun₂”, as part of an expression that produces the reciprocal meaning. As a result, both of the original pronominal expressions occupy the same syntactic position. It is in fact more accurate to describe it in the following way, indicating that at this stage there is only one element occupying the object position:

| | | |
|--|----------------|--------------------|
| <u>[NP₁, NP₂...NP_n-NOM]</u> | <u>VERB.PL</u> | <u>RECP.ACC.PL</u> |
| Subject | | Object |

(4) Late Babylonian:

māt-āt-i ana aḥeiš iqabbûni
 country-F.PL-OBL to RECP say.DUR.3.M.PL
 “The countries say to each other . . .” (Craig ARBT 1 26:8 NA).

NP-strategies in the History of Aramaic²

The first attestations of an NP-strategy for expressing reciprocity in the history of Aramaic are in the book of Daniel, and then in Middle Aramaic. In

2 For a preliminary survey of the data in the Western dialects see Dalman (1905: 114–115) and Fassberg (1990: 126–127). In addition to those mentioned here, there are at least two more constructions found in the history of Western Aramaic. In Christian Palestinian Aramaic the following is found:

w-hawu memallel-in pleg-hon ‘in pleg
 and-be.3MPL speak.PTCP-M.PL part-POSS.3.M.PL with part
 “And they were talking to each other” (Luke 4: 36).

This construction is similar both in terms of the construction itself and in terms of its components to that found in Classical and Standard Arabic:

danā ba‘ḏ-u-hum min ba‘ḏ-in
 approach.PST.3.M.SG some-NOM-POSS.3.M.PL from some-GEN.IND
 “They approached each other” (AS 161, Kremers 1997: 31).

This similarity is striking since otherwise Christian Palestinian Aramaic and Arabic are not related. The use of the Arabic construction in the Neo-Western Aramaic dialect of Ma'lula (*ba‘ḏi*+pronoun) should be reconsidered in light of this. (For the use of *ba‘ḏi*+pronoun as a one-unit construction in Standard Arabic see Cantarino 1975: 137). The influence of Arabic on the dialect of Ma'lula is not surprising, as most speakers of this Aramaic dialect are bilingual, also speaking Arabic. However, considering the data from Christian Palestinian Aramaic, the “influence” in the case of the reciprocal construction may be more natural.

this period and following it in Late Aramaic we encounter two constructions which can be classified as hybrid constructions, since they appear as two-unit-constructions with a plural verb. Both consist of a repetition of an element, the one of the demonstrative pronouns³ and the other of the cardinal number “one.” In Daniel the former appears:

- (5) (a) *wě-’arkubb-āt-ēh* *dā’* *lē-dā’* *nāqēš-ān*
 and-knees-PL-POSS.3.M.SG DEM.F.SG to-DEM.F.SG strike.PTCP-F.PL
 “And his knees were striking one another” (Dan. 5:6).
 (b) *wě-lā’* *lehēwōn* *dābēq-īn* *dēnā* *’im dēnā*
 and-NEG be.FUT.3.M.PL adhere.PTCP-M.PL DEM.M.SG with DEM.M.SG
 “But they will not adhere to one another” (Dan. 2:43).

This formula is found in other Aramaic dialects, among them Qumran (Muraoka 2011: 51) and Samaritan (Stadel 2013: 42). However, it remains unclear whether these are attestations of higher registers, imitating the Biblical style, or whether this is a genuine phenomenon. Similarly, although this is not the standard construction in the Jewish Late Western dialects,⁴ in the late *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan*, independent sentences, which do not translate biblical verses, also use the following formula:

- (6) *u-qrebu* *den* *lē-den*
 and-approach.PST.3.M.PL DEM.M.SG to-DEM.M.SG
 “And they approached each other” (*Tg. Ps.-J Num.* 21:14).

Thus, since these sentences are independent of a Hebrew source, they may reflect another variation of Palestinian Aramaic.

3 Demonstrative pronouns are also the standard component of the reciprocal NP-strategy in Mishnaic Hebrew, and occasionally in Biblical Hebrew. Concerning the relationship between the two languages in this regard, see Bar-Asher Siegal (2012).

4 There are rare examples of demonstratives with the reciprocal function in Galilean Aramaic, see *inter alia* *y. Yebam.* 10:6, (and in a similar context in *y. B. Mešī’a* 2:5) and *Lam. Rab.* 1:46. Being rare, such sentences may be examples of an archaic formula or a variation retained in certain dialects.

A repetition of “one”⁵ is found already in Middle Aramaic⁶ and is common also in the Western Late Aramaic dialects and in Syriac (7). The emergence of a one-unit construction through a fusion of the two forms is found in the various Late (including Syriac) Eastern dialects (8).⁷

(7) (a) Targumic Onqelos:

ḥameš yērt̄-ān yēḥwīyān melāpēp-ān ḥēdā im ḥēdā
 five curtain-PL.be.FUT.3.F.PL join.PRS.PASS-F.PL one.F with one.F
 “The five curtains should join each other” (Exod. 26:3).⁸

-
- 5 It should be noted that the use of “one” in such a construction is common cross-linguistically (Nedjalkov and Geniušienė 2007: 426) and is occasionally found in other Semitic languages as well. Nöldeke (2001: 354), for example, provides evidence for an equally rare formula in Arabic. Similarly, in Bar-Asher Siegal (2011: 35) there is reference to an Akkadian example from the Neo-Assyrian period in which the two-unit pronouns consist of a repetition of *īštēn* “one.” In these languages, this repetition is rare and there are sound independent reasons to speculate on Aramaic influences for such occurrences. It is interesting to note that a repetition of the lemma ‘one’ in the two-unit is found a few times in Biblical Hebrew. One may consider one example (Ezek 33:30) as an Aramaic expression (with the Aramaic form *ḥad* for the cardinal number “one” followed by its Hebrew gloss (Bar-Asher Siegal 2012: 226). Similarly, Driver (1925: 44) notes a formula consisting of a repetition of *wāḥad* “one” in the colloquial Arabic of Syria and Palestine. This can also be regarded as a reflection of an Aramaic substrate.
- 6 There is some evidence that this formula was also used in Qumran Aramaic, although, part of the expression is restored. See Muraoka (2011: 51).
- 7 Syriac has both the western and the eastern constructions in accordance with Boyarin’s (1981) classification of Syriac as a dialect situated between the east and the west of the Late Aramaic dialects. Similarly, Cook (1994) speaks about Syriac as a representative of Central Aramaic. Nöldeke (1875: 349–350, n. 2 §242) proposes that the form of the one word consisting of a repetition of another pronominal expression and its usage may suggest the influence of Indo-European pronouns. See also Macuch (1965: 415, n. 57) and Sokoloff (2002: 362). In view of the discussion on the typology of the Semitic NP-strategies (Bar-Asher Siegal, forthcoming), it is feasible that these pronouns developed in the Aramaic languages independently of any external influence.
- 8 The Aramaic translator of the Pentateuch, Onkelos, regularly translated Biblical expressions containing *ʾiš* “man,” *ʾāḥāw* “his brother” with the respective Aramaic words: *gəbar* and *ʾāḥohī*. The important examples are those in which an authentic expression is used in the translation. In the example mentioned above, it is interesting that the translation deviates from the Hebrew expression which is probably connected to the use in Hebrew of *ʾiššā* “woman” and *ʾāḥōtāh* “her sister” to refer to inanimate objects. As noted in Bar-Asher Siegal (2012), in some languages, such as Mishnaic Hebrew, pronominal expressions were not bleached when used with inanimate participants. It is beyond the scope of this article to review examples

(b) Galilean Aramaic:

'innūn pēlīg-īn *ḥdā 'al ḥdā*
 they be.at.variance.M.PL one.F on one.F
 “They are at variance with each other” (*y. Hal.* 3: 2).

(7) (c) Syriac:

məpaqqed-nā *lā-kon dā-taḥbun* *ḥad*
 command.PTCP.M.SG-1.SG to-2.M.PL REL-love.FUT.2.M.PL one.M
lā-ḥad
 to-one.M
 “I command you that you love one another” (*John* 15:17).

(8) (a) Syriac:

wa-mall-un=waw *'am ḥadādē*
 and-speak-PTCP-M.PL=be.PST.3.M.PL with RECP
 “And they spoke to each other” (*Luke* 4: 36).

(b) Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (=JBA):⁹

hekā de-nāšēq-ān *'ar 'ā wa-rqī'ā* *ḥadāde*
 where REL-kiss.PRS-F.PL earth and-heaven RECP
 “The place where earth and heaven touch each other” (*B. Bat.* 74a).

(c) Mandaic:¹⁰

ḥdadia *gazria*
 RECP circumsized.PRS.3.PL
 “They circumcise each other” (*Gy* 224: 10).

The derivation of the one-unit pronoun in Syriac and JBA was probably the following:

ḥad ḥad > **ḥad ḥad* > **ḥadḥad+ē* > *ḥēdādē*

- A univerbation of the two components of the two-unit construction into one.
- The elision of the second /h/ in the second form seems to be a result of haplology.

of indefinite pronouns, used in symmetric relations, such as the combination of *ḥad* “one” and *ḥabr* + possessive pronoun “friend” (see for example Macuch [1965: 416], in the case of Mandaic).

9 In very few examples of this dialect it is possible to find the non-fused expression with the repetition of the cardinal number *ḥad/ḥadā*, especially in the expression *ben ḥad ləḥad* “between each other” (*Yoma* 10a, *Qidd.* 71b and *B. Mešī'a* 84a).

10 See Macuch (1965: 415).

- The addition of the plural/dual marker \bar{e} .
- The loss of the consonant results in a lengthening of the next vowel ($a > \bar{a}$).

Bar-Asher Siegal (forthcoming) demonstrates how the first three changes are common cross-linguistically in parallel developments. In addition, the JBA and the Mandaic forms reflect a shift of $h > h$ in initial position (see Bar-Asher Siegal 2013: 3.1.3.2).

Reciprocal Construction in the Eastern Neo-Aramaic Dialects and their Relations to their Late Aramaic Ancestors

Turning to the Neo-Eastern dialects, their relationship to the Late Eastern dialects is of interest. The various forms may shed some light on the relations between them and their regional ancestors, as it is possible to suggest different relationships between what is found in these dialects and what is attested in Syriac, JBA, and Mandaic. This section proposes four types of different relations between the Neo- and the Late dialects found in different dialectal regions of the Neo-Aramaic dialects.

A Retention of the Two Types of Constructions from Late Aramaic

One might have thought that since JBA and Mandaic have only the one-unit construction and since Syriac has both the (two-unit) hybrid and the one-unit construction, this indicates that the retention of the two-unit construction in Syriac is archaic. Accordingly, the assumption would have been that, in reality, Syriac had, at some level/register, only the one-unit construction. Considering what is attested in at least one Jewish Neo-Aramaic dialect from the region of the border between Southeast Turkey and Northwest Iraq (Challa), such an hypothesis should be rejected. This dialect has both a two-unit construction with a repetition of the cardinal number “one” and a one-unit construction, historically related to the Syriac one-unit construction. Considering (9), this is a clear example of a hybrid construction, from Challa, as the verbal plural form stands in between the two elements:

- (9) *xa lu mšabohe ʾal-xé*
 one COP.3.PL praise.PRF to-one
 “One is praising the other” (Fassberg 2010: 48).

Since the two elements of the construction are separated, it is clear that one part is the subject and the other the object. Next to this construction this dialect has also the one-unit pronoun:

- (10) The Jewish Neo-Aramaic dialect of Challa:

rāqqe-lu *mā-ǧdād(e)*

far.PL-COP.3.PL from-RECP

“They are far from each other” (Fassberg 2010: 47–48).

Thus, it is possible that this dialect retains what has been in Syriac: that the two constructions co-existed alongside each other.¹¹ While in Syriac the etymological relation between the two- and the one-unit constructions was apparent, this is not the case in most of the Neo-dialects, but nonetheless their existence may shed light on the nature of the phenomenon in Syriac.

Derivative One-unit NP-strategies of the Late-Aramaic Form

Overall, as Talay (2008: 208–210) notes, the dialects from Southeast Turkey (and North Syria) have forms that are clearly descendants of the Syriac one-unit pronouns with various expected sound shifts. Below are the forms attested from this region:

| | |
|---------------|--|
| <i>hdade</i> | Hertevin (Jastrow 1988: 31) |
| <i>áxdade</i> | Āl, Tāl, Tall, Hurmāz, Gundāk, Gəəsa. Sarspido |
| <i>áxdade</i> | Walṭo |
| <i>áǧdade</i> | Halmun, Tall Tammər, Mazra |
| <i>áǧdade</i> | Bespine (Sinha 2000: 75) |
| <i>úxdade</i> | Berəǧnaye |
| <i>úxdalə</i> | Arbuš |
| <i>áxdalə</i> | Iyyəl |
| <i>áǧdalə</i> | Ġilu |
| <i>úxdalə</i> | Bāz, Lewən |
| <i>údalə</i> | Timur |
| <i>údalə</i> | Barwar, Dīz, Gawar, Marbišo, Nočiya, Qočanəš |
| <i>údāl</i> | Sara |

Similar forms are attested also in Northwest Iraq, as, for example *ǧdade* in Qaraqoşh (Khan 2002: 84) and Barwar (Khan 2008b: 153). Likewise, the

11 A similar situation, in which the two-unit construction from which the one-unit construction developed still operates alongside the one-unit-construction, is known from other languages as well. For a discussion on such a phenomenon in Modern Hebrew and Italian see Bar-Asher Siegal (forthcoming).

Neo-Mandaic dialect of Khorramshahr has a form that reflects a shift of *ḥ*>*h*, as found in JBA and Classical Mandaic:¹²

- (11) *ani kol=waxt qə=haz-én ḥədādā*
 we always IND=see.PTC-1.PL RECP
 “We always see one another” (Häberl 2009: 161–162).

Forms in NENA Deriving from Unattested Forms

While forms similar to *ḡdād(e)* or *ḥədādā* clearly derives from forms similar to what is found in Late Aramaic, I would like to raise the option that some of the forms found mostly in Northeast Iraq as in the Jewish dialects of Sulemaniyya, Koy Sanjaq, and Arbel developed independently from the fusion of the cardinal number “one” *ḥad*, i.e., the form from which the Late Aramaic one-unit construction developed: **ḥadḥade*. In this group of dialects the common one-unit construction has the pronominal expression *dáxle*, as illustrated in the following example from the Jewish Neo-Aramaic dialect of Koy Sanjaq:

- (12) *nšíqlū l-dáxle*
 kiss.PST.PL by¹³-RECP
 “They kissed each other” (Mutzafi 2004: 64).

Khan (1999: 88) proposed two possible derivations for the form *dixle* (1–2) and Mutzafi (2004: 2004: 221) added a third (3):

- 1) *ḥdāde* > **dxade* > *dixle* (<=the second phase reflects a metathesis)
- 2) The origin of the form was *d-o xēnā* (*d* is a relative pronoun with a formula found in Christian Urmia).¹⁴
- 3) **d-áxdāde* > *dáxle*¹⁵

12 For different forms in Neo-Mandaic see Macuch (1965: 415–416).

13 I translated the preposition *l* as “by” in a historic way, in order to avoid the discussion of whether this should be considered an ergative case (see Bar-Asher 2008).

14 For similar forms in the dialects of Amedia and Zakho see below. Such forms with the particle *d-*, are restricted, however, to expressions which involve also other prepositions, and seem to be related to the demonstrative that is part of this formula.

15 This proposal probably assumes that the origin of the /d/ is the determinative pronoun. Although one-unit expressions indeed appear cross-linguistically with such a pronoun in genitive constructions, it is unclear to me what the process of grammaticalization was, in which such a particular use of the form was generalized to be used in all syntactic positions. Moreover, such a development is unknown from other languages. It is possible, however, that this appearance of the *d-* is related to Khan’s second proposal. See below

It seems, however, simpler to propose the following development for their origin:

(reconstructed) **ḥadḥade* > **ḥadḥadê* > *dixle*

- 1) The first development indicates a different haplology than the one found in Syriac;
- 2) The shifts of *ḥ* > *x* and *d* > *l* are known from other words in this dialect as well. The latter occurred only in the second fricative *d* and not in the first. This could be explained if assumed that the aspiration of the postvocalic /*d*/ was still active when the haplology took place. Thus, shifting to the initial position, the allophone [*d*] of /*d*/ is expected. Otherwise, as noted by Khan (1999: 31), the shift of *d* > *l* did not take place consistently and has occasional exceptions (cf. the form *údale* from Barwar, Dîz, Gawar, Marbišo, Nočiya and Qočanəş).
- 3) This analysis assumes that the stress at the relevant stage was on the ultima. This assumption can be justified, as in Late Eastern Aramaic there was an apocoptation of final (historically long and short) vowels.¹⁶ Such a phenomenon never took place in agreement markers (compare *malkî* > *malk* “my king” to *malkî* > *malkî* > *malkî* “kings” in JBA). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that the stress was conditioned by syntactic and morphological categories, and since the ending *e* at the end of **ḥadḥade* was originally an agreement marker, that the stress was on the ultima. In the reconstructions I use the sign ˘ for the reconstructed location of the stress.

Below, (“From one-unit to two-unit pronouns”), I will mention the possibility of a slightly different derivation for one of the dialects, but the essence of the proposal, i.e., that it derives from the older (reconstructed) form of the Eastern dialects, remains the same.

Having this option in mind it is possible to suggest a similar developments for the forms ʔ*exde* in Benature (Mutzafi 2008: 44) and ʔ*əjde* in Amedia (Greenblatt 2011: 83), found in Northwest Iraq.

**ḥadḥadê* > **ḥadḥadê* > **ḥdê* > ʔ*exde*

regarding such constructions, and to its restrictions to prepositional phrases. See also the previous note.

16 It must be noted that it is impossible to reconstruct the position of the stress for Late Aramaic, see *inter alia* Morag (1988: 117–119).

Accordingly there was first an haplology and the first syllable *had* elided, or that the first element *had* was deleted, as is the case in various Arabic dialects (Bar-Asher Siegal forthcoming). In addition a prosthetic *aleph* was added, and consequently the vowel /a/ after the *h* was elided.¹⁷ However, one can equally propose that these forms developed from the forms found in Southeast Turkey, such as *ʔəgdade* (Halmun) with a secondary haplology:

ʔəgdade > ʔəgdade > ʔəgde

The Emergence of a New One-unit Pronoun

In the dialect of Amedia, along with the one-unit forms *ʔəgde* and *ʔəgdade* reciprocity is expressed by a two-unit construction, with expressions consisting of the elements *xa o xit* ... (Greenblatt 2011: 83). With similar components, in the dialect of Zakho, based on the examples found in Sabar (2002), one may encounter the emergence of a new univerbation (at least at the phonological level). When the pronominal expression is the direct object of the sentence the NP-strategy is expressed with the following forms: *xawxit* (p. 94); *xa-ʔawxit* (p. 162); *xauxit* (p. 234); *xauxét* (p. 296), all forms are *de facto* the same (Sabar p.c.). With prepositions, such form may appear with the two elements separated, with the addition of the particle *d-*.

- (13) (a) *q̄til-lu xa-ʔawxit ž-de*
 kill.PST-3.M.PL one-another on-DEM
 “They killed each other on account of this one” (Sabar 2002: 162).
- (b) *la m̄hak-ax xa m̄ən d-o xeta*
 NEG speak-PRS.1.PL one from REL-DEM.M.SG other
 “ We don’t speak to each other” (Greenblatt 2011: 83).

These expressions, which consist of *xa* “one” and *xit* “another” (derived for Late Aramaic *axrī(n)tā* [Sabar 2002: 196]), are most likely calque of the equivalent Kurdish expression, which consists of *yek* “one” and *din* “another.”¹⁸ As for the element *-o-* this is probably historically the demonstrative. If this is the right etymology, then 1) its appearance before the second element may indicate definiteness (Khan 2008a), as it is common in many languages that (only) the second element in the two-unit construction is marked as definite (English: one ... the other; Modern Hebrew *exad* “one” ... *ha-šeni* “the second”); 2) this is a frozen formula, as it does not decline according to its antecedent (this is

17 On the similar emergence of prosthetic vowels see Bar-Asher (2009: 236–237).
 18 I owe this observation to one of the anonymous readers.

common in such a stage of grammaticalization, see Bar-Asher Siegal forthcoming). As for the appearance of *d-* before the prepositional phrase, this is probably a token of a more general phenomenon of its appearance before demonstratives in prepositional phrases (Greenblatt 2011: 84).

Thus, we encounter the emergence of a state in which one dialect has two forms of the one-unit construction, with different components: *xa-ʿawxit* and *ǰzāze* (Sabar 2002: 95), both deriving in different historical stages from fusions of two separated elements. However, they reflect different stages in the process of the grammaticalization, as in one the prepositions are positioned before the entire expression (*mā-ǰdade*) and in the other they are still inserted between the second component (*xa mən d-o xeta*).

Reciprocal Constructions and Collective, Sociative, and Comitative Expressions¹⁹

Considering the forms discussed in the previous section from the Jewish Neo-Aramaic dialect of Koy Sanjaq (Mutzafi 2004), *dáxle*, in the context of the adverbial meaning of “together,” has two variants: either *bdáxle* or *báxle*. Similarly, in the Jewish Neo-Aramaic dialect of Sulemaniyya (Khan 2004), while the regular reciprocal pronoun is *lúxle*, in the context of the adverbial meaning of “together” again there are two variants *blúxle*, or most frequently *búxle*. Khan (2004: 259) explains the variations of the adverbial sense of “together” as a result of a reanalysis of the *l* at the beginning of *lúxle* as a preposition, hence its elision.

This explanation is problematic for two reasons: first, it is unclear why it occurs only with this preposition, as *lúxle* appears with other prepositions and is only elided in this function; second, while it may explain the Sulemaniyya form, it cannot explain the form of Koy Sanjaq since *d-* is not a preposition. Moreover, the sociative meaning of the reciprocal meaning is usually attained with the sociative preposition. Thus in Sulemaniyya, the expected preposition

19 I will be using the terms collective, sociative, and comitative interchangeably. For some, a comitative expression, unlike its sociative counterpart, can be used with a singular subject (Nejalkov and Nedjalkov 2007a: 1135). Others have emphasized that while the sociative expression implies that all participants are equally involved in an action, the comitative expression denotes that the subject referent takes part in an action initiated by another party (Kuular 2007). This distinction, however, is not important for our discussion of the semantic connections between both types of expressions and the reciprocal constructions.

is *min-* (Khan 2004: 346–347) and in Koy Sanjaq it is *gal-* (Mutzafi 2004: 175). In order to propose a different explanation for these forms, a further exploration of the relation between reciprocal constructions and collective, sociative, and comitative expressions is necessary.

While semantically-speaking, collectivity and reciprocity are clearly not the same (as emphasized by Wierzbicka 2009), there is an established cross-linguistic connection between sociative and collective expressions, on the one hand, and reciprocal expressions, on the other hand. As various studies have demonstrated, similar expressions are used with verbal forms for both functions (Lichtenbeker 1985: 28–29). In Latin, for example, the prefix *com-* has a sociative meaning and is also added to reciprocal actions (see Zaliznjak and Shmelev 2007). Similarly, the post-verbal particle *kan3* in Lao has both functions (Enfield 2011).²⁰ Based on such evidence, Evans et al. (2007) and Evans et al. (2011), among others, argue that “act jointly” is part of the meaning of “prototypical reciprocal clauses.”

In the context of the NP-strategies, the relation between the semantic categories is related to the fact that many languages demonstrate a semantic equivalence between reciprocal pronominal expressions with sociative markers (case or pre-/post-position) and the collective adverb, as illustrated in English with the expressions: “with each other” and “together” (see also Nedjalkov and Nedjalkov 2007a: 983–986 and Wierzbicka 2009: 154). As for the pronominal expression, this phenomenon is related to the fact that sociative expressions in sentences like “James ate **with Paul**” (14a) are not an argument of the verb and can therefore be added to other verbs. Subsequently, when both participants appear in the subject position (14b), the use of the reciprocal pronoun is expected and is semantically equivalent to the use of the collective adverb “together,” used in (14c):

- (14) a. James ate with Paul.
 b. James and Paul ate with each other.
 c. James and Paul ate together.

This semantic affinity is probably the reason why in many languages, the adverbial collective expression becomes part of the sociative preposition in a process of reinforcement (see Lehmann 1995: 22), such as “together with” in English or its Modern Hebrew equivalent *yaxad im* (lit. “together with”). In

20 Vol. 3 of Nedjalkov (2007b) is devoted to languages with a reciprocal-sociative polysemy. For a discussion of the historical relationship between these two categories, see Kemmer (1993), and Heine and Miyashita (2008).

other languages, a sociative expression with a reciprocal pronoun is the standard way to express collective actions. This is the case, for example, in JBA in which the equivalent for the English expression “together” is *bəhade*²¹ *həḏāde* “with each other.”

Alongside the use of pronominal expressions in a sociative-collective sense, one finds also collective expressions in clear reciprocal contexts. In Biblical Hebrew,²² the adverb *yaḥdāw* “together” appears several times in reciprocal contexts, in conjunction with other reciprocal expressions:

21 *bəhade* is a preposition that developed in JBA (alongside the historical *im*). It is etymologically related to the cardinal number *ḥad* from which JBA’s reciprocal pronoun *ḥadāde* also developed.

22 The use of pronominal expressions in the same context and with the same meaning as sociative expressions may explain the evolvement of other sociative expressions with such pronouns. In light of this observation, an interesting phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew should be reviewed:

wa-yēhī *kē-šom’-ām* *’et kol* *had-dēbār-īm* *pāḥādū* *’iš*
and-be.IPF.3.M.SG as-hear.INF-POSS.3.M.PL ACC all DEF-thing-M.PL fear. PRF.3.M.PL man to
’el rē’-ehū
fellow-POSS.3.M.SG

“Now it came to pass, when they had heard all the words . . .” (Jer. 36:16).

The translation of the end of this verse: *pāḥādū* *’iš ’el rē’-ehū* is a challenge. The verb *paḥad* “to fear” is intransitive and thus a goal complement following the preposition *’el* “to” is not expected. It is usually translated (the following translation is from JPS 1917) as “when they had heard all the words, they turned in fear one toward another,” assuming an ellipsis of the verb with the meaning of “to turn.” However, it is possible to suggest “they were frightened together” as another translation. Similarly, in the following verse:

wě-nipaštī-m *’iš ’el ’āḥ-īw* *wě-hā’āb-ōt*
and-smash.PRF.1.SG-ACC.3.M.PL man to brother-POSS.3.M.SG and-DEF-father-M.PL
wě-hab-bān-īm *yaḥdāw*
and-DEF-son.M.PL together

“I will smash them one against the other, parents and children together” (Jer. 13:14).

Conversely, the two final expressions of each clause could be conveyed by the word “together”: “I will smash them (together), parents and children together”, which is the case also for several other verses of the Hebrew Bible. (See also Gen. 43: 33; Jer. 36:16; Ez. 24: 23; Is. 13: 8. While one could theoretically explain the use of the preposition in each of these verses independently, the current proposal relies on the fact that this is a repeated phenomenon in Biblical Hebrew.) I believe that the use of unspecified pronouns in this sociative sense as well justifies their evolvement as an alternative means to convey this semantic function.

- (15) *kī yinnāšû* *ʾānāšīm yaḥdāw ʾiš wē-ʾāḥ-īw*
 as fight.RECP.IPF.3.M.PL men together man and-brother-POSS.3.M.SG
 “If two men are fighting” (Deut. 25: 11).²³

Thus, although *yaḥdāw* “together” does not contribute to the reciprocal meaning, it is still present in the sentence. Halevy (2011: 406) argues that the appearance of this adverb indicates that the reciprocal meaning is not lexicalized. It is unclear, however, in what way a collective adverb renders the reciprocal meaning, if not contained in the verb in the first place. Therefore, it is more likely that in Biblical Hebrew, the appearance of the adverbial expression disambiguates between the distributive and the collective readings of the verbal reciprocal form. Consider the following sentence:

- (16) *nōʾāšū yaḥdāw*
 consult.PST.3.M.PL together
 “They consult with each other” (Ps. 71:10 and see also Isa. 45: 21).

Without *yaḥdāw*, there is some ambiguity over whether the members of the subject (“those who watch for my life”) are consulting among themselves or with other people. The adverb *yaḥdāw* makes it clear that the former reading is intended. The reciprocal pronominal expression with the sociative meaning could have achieved a similar function of disambiguating, as demonstrated in a parallel sentence in Akkadian (Standard Babylonian):

- (17) *mušend-û ša ʿBelt-i ša Uruk itti aḥāmeš imtalkū=ma*
 fowler-PL.NOM of Lady-GEN of Uruk with RECP consult.RECP.PST.3.M.PL=and
 “The fowlers of the Lady of Uruk consulted with each other” (CT 39 30: 32).

It is once again evident that the two semantic functions of reciprocity and collectivity are mutually relevant and expressed in similar contexts. With this deeper understanding, it is now possible to return to the fact that the Jewish dialects of Sulemaniyya and of Koy Sanjaq from Northeast Iraq have two variants for the forms of the sociative adverbs with the meaning of “together”: *blīxle-bīxle* and *bdāxle-bāxle* respectively.

I would like to suggest that neither *bāxle* nor *bīxle* originate from the reciprocal pronoun *ḥēdādē* but rather derive from an independent adverb **bāḥadi(t)* “in one” meaning “together.” Phonologically speaking, this development could

23 See *inter alia*, 2 Sam. 2: 16; Isa. 45: 20, 21; Amos 3: 3; Ps. 71: 10.

have occurred, in light of regular sound shifts that took place in these dialects ($h > x$; $d > l$):

**bəḥadi*²⁴ > *báxle*

This is semantically very likely as adverbs with the sense of “together” frequently derive from the cardinal number “one” as, for example, the Akkadian adverb *ištēniš* (*ištēn+iš* “one + adverbial ending”). Support for this proposal may be found in the older Eastern Aramaic dialect, the Jewish Babylonian dialect in which the sociative preposition **bəḥadi* > *bəḥadi* is in all probability another example of an adverb becoming a preposition (see Bar-Asher Siegal 2013: §2.2.3.1.2).

Accordingly, *báxle* and *bíxle* are the original adverbs with *bdáxle* and *blíxle* being secondary, as a result of an attraction to the reciprocal pronouns in their respective languages. This proposal can be supported by a similar development in the history of Mandaic. As Macuch (1965: 415–416) notes, in the Neo-Mandaic dialect which he describes, the form *behdādi* is used as the sociative adverb “together,” although in this dialect neither the reciprocal expression *hdādi* nor the preposition *b-* function actively. Such a form must have originated as a result of a similar attraction to the one I propose for the Neo-Eastern Aramaic dialects.

Thus, I would like to suggest that since in certain environments the reciprocal NP-Strategy and the sociative adverb are semantically equivalent, and since the forms happen to be phonologically very close (*bdáxle* and *báxle*), the latter was attracted to the former. Before proposing some parallel development in another language, I should admit the speculative nature of my proposal. However, we should remember the motivation for this explanation. The fact that in the relevant dialects the bi-forms appear only with the category that functions as the sociative adverb as well and not with other function, suggests that one should not seek for a regular phonological/morphological explanation, but for an explanation that is related to this specific function.

In Bar-Asher Siegal (2011: 30–33) I have proposed a similar development in the context of the Akkadian dialects, in which we encounter the following variants: *aḥāmiš/aḥāiš/aḥājīš* as the one-unit reciprocal pronoun and as the sociative adverb “together.” As an attempt to deal with various problems

24 It is reasonable to assume stress on the ultima in earlier stages of Aramaic for the same reasons mentioned earlier, as in other adverbs (such as *akatti* “still” in JBA) the ultima was not apocopated. Similarly, while in JBA /t/ apocopates in final position, it does not in adverbial forms.

regarding the etymology of these forms and at the same time also providing an explanation for the co-existence of the forms with a /w/ and those with a /j/, I proposed different etymologies for each function of these forms:

aḥayiš consists of the dual ending *ay*, and this is the origin of the one-unit construction to express reciprocity;

**aḥāwiš* (>*aḥāmiš*) is the origin of the adverb “together.” This proposal relies on the etymology of *aḥāwiš* “like brothers/friendship.” Similar abstract nouns, close in meaning, with the consonant /w/ are found in other Semitic languages.

It is conceivable that these forms merged into one in the course of Akkadian history. This development could take place as a result of their phonological resemblance and the fact that in certain contexts they are semantically equivalent. In order to illustrate the semantic equivalence, if we have in mind the data mentioned above regarding the fact that sociative expressions and reciprocal pronouns appear in similar contexts, considering the sentence in (18), while it appears with the sociative preposition *itti*, it could likewise appear without it:

- (18) *mār-ē ša PN u PN₂ itti aḥāmeš ušabšu*
 child-PL.GEN of PN and PN₂ with RECP make.be.DUR.3.M.PL
 “The children whom PN and PN₂ will have together” (VAS 6 61:17 [NB]).

Accordingly, the meaning of sentence (18) could have been expressed in an early undocumented period in one of the following two ways:

- *mār-ē ša PN u PN₂ itti aḥayiš ušabšu.*
- *mār-ē ša PN u PN₂ aḥāmeš ušabšu.*

Thus, it is possible to suggest similar motivation for the development in the Neo-Aramaic dialects and for Akkadian. Accordingly, the similarity in sound and the fact that in many environments these expressions share the same meaning led to a merging of the two forms.

As we have considered the relationship between reciprocity and the sociative adverb, I would like to comment on an ostensibly grammatical note about the relationship between these expressions, which can be found in a Babylonian medical commentary from the fourth century BCE (from Uruk). As will become clear (see also the next section), this is relevant for our current discussion in more than one way:

- (19) *ištēniš*: *kīma*: *ištēn itti aḥāmiš* 𐤒.𐤒²⁵
 together like one with RECP mix.IMPV.2.M.SG
 “‘Together’: like: one, mix them with each other” (BRM 4 32: 8, [SB]).

This commentary provides instructions regarding how to mix some ingredients together. According to the translation provided here, the interpreter tells the priest (hence the imperative form) that the meaning of the sociative adverb *ištēniš*, in this context, is to mix the various ingredients “with each other.”

However, this interpretation is not the only possible one, as there is a philological difficulty regarding this line: there is a disjunction sign (:) after *kīma* which indicates that this is part of the interpretation. As Uri Gabbay informs me (p.c.), the term *kīma* is elsewhere unknown. Maul (2009: 72) translates it as a term of interpretation: “wie” and Geller (2010: 171) translates it as “when.” There is, however, a more serious problem, previously unnoticed, regarding the meaning of *ištēn* in this context. Maul proposes that this line should be translated as “išten itti aḥāmēš 𐤒.𐤒 (= ‘das eine vermischt du zusammen mit dem uebrigen [Ingredienzien]’), and Geller “‘when’ one is mixed with one another.” The problem lies in this being a combination of two different constructions. Akkadian has either the two-unit pronoun construction: *ištēn itti ištēn* (lit. one with one) or the one-unit pronoun construction *itti aḥāmēš* (“with each other”) with a plural subject (Bar-Asher Siegal 2011). The combination of the two together (*ištēn itti aḥāmiš*) as a two-unit construction is striking. Therefore, I propose an alternative two-part reading for this entry, reflected in the translation above. The first part is an etymological note and the second provides the meaning in its context. This entry should thus be read in the following way:

| | |
|----------------------------|---|
| <i>ištēniš</i> : | Together |
| <i>kīma</i> : <i>ištēn</i> | There are two options: a) <i>ištēniš</i> = <i>kīma ištēn</i> (i.e. “together” = “like one”) b) like: one [i.e. <i>ištēniš</i> [together] derived from (lit. is similar to) <i>ištēn</i> [one] |
| <i>itti aḥāmiš</i> 𐤒.𐤒 | [it means—] mix (the ingredients) with each other |

25 In the next entry it is written: 𐤒.𐤒: *balālu*, which indicates that the *Sumerogram* 𐤒.𐤒 means *balālu* “to mix.”

According to John Wee, (p.c.), the (a) interpretation is preferable since *ša*, and not *kīma*, is used to indicate lexical derivation. The disjunction sign (:) after *kīma* is still problematic and is most likely an error, or meant to indicate something that remains unclear to us.²⁶ Thus, according to this reading of the text, we may encounter here an ancient linguistic comment concerning the relationship between reciprocity and collectivity.

According to the alternative reading, this text exhibits an innovation of a new two-unit construction, consisting of the cardinal number “one” *ištēn* and the previous one-unit pronoun *aḥāmiš*. Although, this is an unattested construction, it is possible that such a construction was developed in one of the Jewish Neo-Aramaic dialects, as will be demonstrated in the following section.

From One-Unit to Two-Unit Pronouns

As noted earlier, the path of development from two-unit to one-unit construction, is regularly found throughout the history of various Semitic languages. An interesting development in the opposite direction, namely, from one-unit to two-unit constructions, can be found in the Jewish Neo-Aramaic of Arbel.²⁷ While all speakers of the Arbel dialect use the component *dixle*—the one-unit pronoun found in the Northeast dialects—for some speakers it is only the second component of a two-unit pronoun, with *xa* “one” as the first element:²⁸

- (20) *mxélu* *xá l-dixle*
 beat.PST.3.PL one to-RECP
 “They beat one-another” (example [3] from Khan 1999: 223).

26 I wish to thank Uri Gabbay, Eckart Frahm, and John Wee for discussing the meaning of this text with me.

27 Khan (1999) interviewed various informants and found a clear distinction between informant L and the others. Khan (p.c.) informed me that informant L had a different background from the other informants. He lived in Jerusalem and spoke Neo-Aramaic and Arabic, whereas the others came from rural villages and spoke Neo-Aramaic and Kurdish. It is also possible that he was more influenced by Modern Hebrew (although in one example mentioned by Khan [11], it can be seen that for this speaker, *xá l-dixle* became syntactically one-unit).

28 See also Greenblatt (2011: 83) for a similar example in the dialect of Amedia. Note, that in the similar construction the components are *xa* and *’ajde*; while otherwise the one-unit construction may appear as *’ajdade*.

How did this construction emerge? Without specific historical data, there are two alternative explanations. According to the first, the two-unit pronouns evolved from the form *dixle* found in other dialects, with the addition of the first element *xa*, probably under the influence of another language with a two-unit pronoun (perhaps Modern Hebrew, Kurdish, or one of the other dialects with two-unit constructions, see above). Alternatively, this construction can be seen as a reflection of an old phenomenon. For this hypothesis one should be aware of the following details:

- a. As noted earlier all the one-unit forms found in the eastern dialects of Aramaic derive from **hadhadē*, a fusion of the repetition of *had* “one” with an agreement marker.
- b. *xa* is the form of the cardinal number “one” in the NENA dialects. (The final /d/ of the Late Aramaic word for the cardinal number *had* “one” apocopated.)

It is, therefore, conceivable that the two-unit pronouns consisting of the elements *xa* and *dixle* resulted from a reanalysis of the components of the one-unit pronoun as two-unit pronouns:

**hadhadē > *xadxadē > *xadxalē > *xa dxalē > *xa daxalē > xa dixle*

The last change, with regards to the vowels, is the expected phonological change in classical Aramaic: 1) the shortening of the unstressed vowel; 2) the addition of a short vowel in a sequence of two *schwas*. (See above regarding the location of the stress.) According to this analysis it is understood why the first /d/ did not change to /l/.

Regardless of whether the *xa dixle* pair is the result of an addition of *xa*, or a reanalysis of **xadixle*, it nonetheless represents the unexpected shift from a one-unit to a two-unit construction.

Returning to the end of the previous section, if our reading of sentence (19) in Akkadian is rejected, the alternative reading reflects a similar development: *ištēn itti aḥāmiš* “with each other” (lit. “one with each other”), thus the element *ištēn* “one” was added to the previous one-unit pronoun *aḥāmiš*, and a similar development to what has been proposed here must be assumed for the Akkadian construction as well.

This observation may have interesting implications for a broader theoretical issue in historical linguistics, namely, the unidirectionality hypothesis, one of the most central issues in the study of the process of grammaticalization, which claims that the direction of grammaticalization is always one way, from

less grammatical to more grammatical forms and constructions.²⁹ Nedjalkov (2007) among others considers the development from the two-unit construction to the one-unit construction to be a token of grammaticalization, and therefore, potentially the example from the Jewish Neo-Aramaic of Arbel could be seen as a counter-example to the unidirectionality hypothesis.

However, Norde (2009) rightly demonstrates that one should be careful when speaking about degrammaticalization, i.e., the process of development in the opposite direction to that expected, and in presenting counter-arguments for the unidirectionality hypothesis. In our case, while on the formal aspect, it is easy to recognize that the one-unit form is usually more detached from its lexical origin, on the functional level, both constructions are part of the grammar in a similar sense. This, therefore, is not a perfect example of degrammaticalization.

An attempt to characterize the relations between the different types of development is beyond the scope of the current discussion. It is, however, significant that hypothetically a shift from one type of construction to another can take place in either direction. This indicates that, at least from the semantic point of view, both types of constructions equally express the same semantic functions.

Concluding Notes

Maclean (1895: x, xv) already noted the following concerning the relationship between the Neo-Eastern dialects and their Late Aramaic ancestors:

Origin of the Vernacular: It would appear that the dialects, though sufficiently different to make it difficult for a man to understand one of a distant district, are yet sufficiently alike to argue a common origin. This origin, however, we can hardly seek in the written or classical language. It would be a mistake to look on the spoken Syriac as a new creation, springing from the ruins of the written tongue; the former may indeed in a sense be called *The New Language*, as it has greatly developed its

29 For Heine et al. (1991), and Traugott and Heine (1991), unidirectionality is part of the definition of grammaticalization. For Lehmann (1995), Haspelmath (1999 and 2004), and Heine (1994 and 1997) unidirectionality is a constraint on grammatical change in general. Campbell (2001), Janda (2001), and Joseph (2001 and 2005) criticize the inclusion of this hypothesis as part of the definition of the phenomenon. For a critical review of the literature on unidirectionality, see chapter two in Norde (2009).

grammatical structure in an analytical manner, and has dropped many of the old synthetic forms, but much or most of it was doubtless in use side by side with the written classical Syriac for centuries. It retains in many cases forms less developed than corresponding forms in the written language.

Although, I must admit that some of the proposals that were suggested throughout this article are rather speculative, if they are accepted (for the reasons that were mentioned earlier) it is possible that the forms of the NP-strategy to express reciprocity with the origin of a repetition of the cardinal number one *had* can tell a similar story regarding the relationship between the NENA dialects and their Late-Aramaic ancestors:

- 1) A two-unit construction with a repetition of *had* seems to be a common feature of all of the Aramaic dialects, attested already in Middle Aramaic. Only in the Eastern dialects, the two separated units went through a process of univerbation and fused into a form of the one-unit construction (“NP-strategies in the history of Aramaic”). Such forms are attested in all of the Late Eastern Aramaic dialects and in most of the Neo-Eastern dialects (“Derivative one-unit NP-strategies of the Late-Aramaic form”).
- 2) Syriac retained the two constructions, as it has both the two- and one-unit constructions. A similar phenomenon is still attested in a Neo-Eastern dialect from the region of the border between Southeast Turkey and Northwest Iraq (“retention of the two types of construction from Late Aramaic”).
- 3) The univerbation of the two components of the two-unit construction into one resulted in all forms of the Late Aramaic dialects with the elision of the second /h/ as a result of haplology (**hadhad* > *hadhad*+ē). It has been suggested that some of the forms, especially those from Northeast Iraq (Sulemaniyya, Koy Sanjaq, and Arbel), developed from the older form which is reconstructed from the stage before the elision of the second /h/. It was suggested that it is possible that other dialects (such as Benature) attest to a similar development (“Forms in NENA deriving from unattested forms”).
- 4) The dialect of Zakho exhibits a recurrence of univerbation. (“The emergence of a new one-unit pronoun”).
- 5) The opposite direction seems to occur in the dialect of Arbel, in which a two-unit constructions evolved from a one-unit construction (“From one-unit to two-unit pronouns”).

References

- Bar-Asher, Elitzur A. 2008. "The Origin and the Typology of the Pattern *qtil li* in Syriac and Babylonian Aramaic." In *Sha'arey Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Jewish Languages in Honor of Moshe Bar-Asher*, eds. Aharon Maman, Steven Fassberg, and Yochanan Breuer. Jerusalem: Hebrew University (in Hebrew), 360–392.
- . 2009. "The Imperative Forms of Proto Semitic and a New Perspective on Barth's Law." *Journal of American Oriental Society* 128: 233–255.
- Bar-Asher Siegal, Elitzur A. 2011. "Notes on Reciprocal Constructions in Akkadian in Light of Typological and Historical Considerations." *Semitica et Classica* 4: 23–42.
- . 2012. "Diachronic Syntactic Studies in Hebrew Pronominal Reciprocal Constructions." In *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, eds. Cynthia Miller & Ziony Zevit. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 209–244.
- . 2013. *An Introduction to the Grammar of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- . forthcoming. "Notes on the History of Reciprocal NP-strategies in Semitic Languages in a Typological Perspective." *Diachronica* 31 (2014).
- Boyarin, Daniel. 1981. "An inquiry into the formation of the Middle Aramaic dialects." In *Bono Homini Donum: Essays in Historical Linguistics in Memory of J. Alexander Kerns*, eds. Yoël L. Arbeitman & Allan R. Bomhard. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 613–650.
- Campbell, Lyle. 2001. "What's wrong with grammaticalization?" *Language Sciences* 23: 113–161.
- Cantarino, Vicente. 1975. *Syntax of Modern Arabic Prose*. Vol. 3. Bloomington: Indiana University Press for the International Affairs Center.
- Cook, Edward M. 1994. "A New Perspective on the Language of Onkelos and Jonathan." In *The Aramaic Bible: Targums in their Historical Context*, eds. Derek R. G. Beattie & Martin J. McNamara. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 142–156.
- Corbett, Greville. 2006. *Agreement, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Dalman, Gustaf. 1905. *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch : nach den Idiomen das palästinischen Talmud des Onkelostargum und Prophetentargum und der jerusalemischen Targume*. 2. Aufl. ed. Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs Buchhandlung.
- Driver, Godfrey Rolles. 1925. *A Grammar of the Colloquial Arabic of Syria and Palestine*. London: Probsthain & Co.
- Enfield, Nick J. 2011. "Descriptions of Reciprocal Situation in Lao." In *Reciprocals and Semantic Typology*, eds. Nicholas Evans, Alice Gaby, Stephen C. Levinson, & Asifa Majid. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 129–147.

- Evans, Nicholas. 2008. "Reciprocal Constructions: Towards a Structural Typology." In *Reciprocals and Reflexives—Theoretical and Cross-linguistic Explorations*, eds. Ekkehard König & Volker Gast. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 33–103.
- , Alice Gaby, Stephen C. Levinson, & Asifa Majid. 2011. "Introduction." In *Reciprocals and Semantic Typology*, eds. Nicholas Evans, Alice Gaby, Stephen C. Levinson, & Asifa Majid. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–28.
- , Alice Gaby, & Rachel Nordlinger. 2007. "Valency mismatches and the coding of reciprocity in Australian languages." *Linguistic Typology* 11: 541–597.
- Fassberg, Steven E. 1990. *A Grammar of the Palestinian Targum Fragments from the Cairo Genizah*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.
- . 2010. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Challa*. Leiden: Brill.
- Geller, Markham J. 2010. *Ancient Babylonian Medicine: Theory and Practice, Ancient Cultures*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Greenblatt, Jared R. 2011. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Amadya*. Leiden: Brill.
- Häberl, Charles. 2009. *The Neo-Mandaic Dialect of Khorramshahr*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Halevy, Rivka. 2011. "Reciprocal Constructions between Syntax and Lexicon." *Leshonenu* 73: 401–422.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 1999. "Why Is Grammaticalization Irreversible?" *Linguistics* 37: 1043–1068.
- . 2004. "On Directionality in Language Change with Particular Reference to Grammaticalization." In *Up and Down the Cline: The Nature of Grammaticalization*, eds. Olga Fischer, Muriel Norde, & Harry Perridon. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 17–44.
- . 2007. "Further Remarks on Reciprocal Constructions." In *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2087–2115.
- Heine, Bernd. 1994. "Grammaticalization as an Explanatory Parameter." In *Perspectives on Grammaticalization*, ed. William Pagliuca. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 235–254.
- . 1997. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- , Ulrike Claudi, & Friederike Hiinnemeyer. 1991. *Grammaticalization: A Conceptual Framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- , & Hiroyuki Miyashita. 2008. "The Intersection between Reflexives and Reciprocals: A Grammaticalization Perspective." In *Reciprocals and Reflexives—Theoretical and Cross-linguistic Explorations*, eds. Ekkehard König & Volker Gast. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 169–223.
- Janda, Richard D. 2001. "Beyond 'Pathways' and 'Unidirectionality': On the Discontinuity of Language Transmission and the Counterability of Grammaticalization." *Language Sciences* 23: 265–340.

- Jastrow, Otto. 1988. *Der neuaramäische Dialekt von Hertevin (Provinz Siirt)*. Wiesbaden: O. Harrassowitz.
- Joseph, Brian D. 2001. "Is there Such a Thing as 'Grammaticalization?'" *Language Sciences* 23: 163–186.
- . 2005. "How Accommodating of Change Is Grammaticalization? The Case of 'Lateral Shifts?'" *Logos and Language* 6: 1–7.
- Kemmer, Suzanne. 1993. *The Middle Voice: A Typological and Diachronic Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 1999. *A Grammar of Neo-Aramaic: The Dialect of the Jews of Arbel*. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers.
- . 2002. *The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Qaraqosh*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2004. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Sulemaniyya and Ḥalabja*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2008a. "The Expression of Definiteness in North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic Dialects." In *Aramaic in its Historical and Linguistic Setting*, eds. Holger Gzella & Margaretha L. Folmer. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 209–226.
- . 2008b. *The Neo-Aramaic dialect of Barwar*. Leiden: Brill.
- König, Ekkehard, & Shigehiro Kokutani. 2006. "Towards a Typology of Reciprocal Constructions: Focus on German and Japanese." *Linguistics* 44: 271–302.
- Kremers, Joost. 1997. *How Arabs Speak to Each Other about Themselves: A Study of Nafs and Ba'ḍ in Modern Standard Arabic*. Nijmegen: University of Nijmegen.
- Kuular, Klara B. 2007. "Reciprocals, Sociatives, Comitatives, and Assistives in Tuvan." In *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1163–1229.
- Lehmann, Christian. 1995. *Thoughts on Grammaticalization*. Munich-Newcastle: LINCOM Europa.
- Lichtenberk, Frantisek. 1985. "Multiple Uses of Reciprocal Constructions." *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 5: 19–41.
- Maclean, Arthur J. 1895. *Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac as Spoken by the Eastern Syrians of Kurdistan, North-west Persia, and the Plain of Mosul with Notices of the Vernacular of the Jews of Azerbaijan and of Zakhu near Mosul*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Macuch, Rudolf. 1965. *Handbook of Classical and Modern Mandaic*. Berlin: W. de Gruyter.
- Maul, Stefan M. 2009. "Die Lesung der Rubra dū.dū.bi und kid.kid.bi." *Orientalia NS* 78: 69–80.
- Morag, Shelomo. 1988. *Vocalised Talmudic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Genizah Collections*. Vol. I. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. 2011. *A Grammar of Qumran Aramaic. Supplement*. Leuven: Peeters.

- Mutzafi, Hezy. 2004. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Koy Sanjaq (Iraqi Kurdistan)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- . 2008. *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Betanure (Province of Dihok)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Nedjalkov, Igor, & Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. 2007a. "Reciprocal, Sociative and Competitive Constructions in Karachay-Balkar." In *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 969–1019.
- . 2007b. "Reciprocals, Sociatives, Comitatives, and Assosiatives in Yakut." In *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1593–1642.
- Nedjalkov, Vladimir P. 2007a. "Overview of the Research: Definitions of Terms, Framework, and Related Issues." In *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3–114.
- (ed.). 2007b. *Reciprocal Constructions*. 5 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- , & Emma Š. Geniušienė. 2007. "Questionnaire on Reciprocals." In *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 379–434.
- Nöldeke, Thodore. 1875. *Mandäische grammatik. Mit einer lithographirten tafel der mandäischen schriftzeichen*. Halle.
- . 2001. *Compendious Syriac Grammar*. Translated by Peter T. Daniels. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.
- Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization, Oxford Linguistics*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sabar, Yona. 2002. *A Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dictionary: Dialects of Amidya, Dihok, Nerwa and Zakho, Northwestern Iraq; Based on Old and New Manuscripts, Oral and Written Bible Translations, Folkloric Texts, and Diverse Spoken Registers, with an Introduction to Grammar and Semantics, and an Index of Talmudic Words which have Reflexes in Jewish Neo-Aramaic*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sinha, Jasmin. 2000. *Der neuostaramäische Dialekt von Bēšpān (Provinz Mardin, Südosttürkei): eine grammatische Darstellung*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*. Ramat-Gan: Bar Ilan University Press.
- Stadel, Christian. 2013. *Morphosyntax of Samaritan Aramaic*. Jerusalem: The Bialik Institute.
- Talay, Shabo. 2008. *Die neuaramäischen Dialekte der Khabur-Assyrer in Nordostsyrien: Einführung, Phonologie und Morphologie*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag.
- Traugott, Elizabeth C., & Bernd Heine. 1991. "Introduction." In *Approaches to Grammaticalization*, eds. Elizabeth C. Traugott & Bernd Heine, 1–14. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Wierzbicka, Anna. 2009. "Reciprocity: an NSM approach to linguistic typology and social universals." *Studies in Language* 33: 103–174.

Zaliznjak, Anna A., & Aleksej D. Shmelev. 2007. "Sociativity, conjoining, reciprocity and the Latin Prefix *com-*." In *Reciprocal Constructions*, ed. Vladimir P. Nedjalkov. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 209–229.

Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal

(B.A. Hebrew University, 2002; M.A 2007, Ph.D. 2009 Harvard University) joined the faculty of the Hebrew Language and Jewish Languages and the School of Linguistics at The Hebrew University of Jerusalem as a lecturer in 2010. He is a fellow at the Language Logic Cognitive Center. Previously (2005–2010), he was the lector in Semitics at Yale University, and Lecturer in Semitics at Harvard University (Spring 2012).