

Jewish Babylonian Aramaic נוּלָא (B. Bava Meši'a 67a, etc.): Its Meaning and Etymology

GARY A. RENDSBURG
RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

This article treats the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (JBA) 3rd person singular pronoun נוּלָא *nawla*, attested four times in the vast rabbinic corpus: three times in the Babylonian Talmud and one time in Tractate Sofrim. First, it is shown that the form is epicene, as it can have both masculine and feminine antecedents. Second, the four attestations reveal a specialized meaning for the form, to wit, 'this-one' or 'that-one' (as opposed to the other one) when there are specifically two items under discussion. Which is to say, the form נוּלָא *nawla* is not used for simple 'he' or 'she' or 'this' or 'that', for which JBA and other Aramaic dialects have familiar and widely attested forms. Third, the article proposes that the form is borrowed from the Hurro-Urartian family, well known for its epicene pronouns. See, for example, Hurrian *anni=lla, ani=lla*, etc., Urartian *i=ne=lə, ina=ne=lə*, etc. Even though these forms are plural forms, while נוּלָא *nawla* is a singular form, comparative evidence demonstrates that when pronouns are borrowed from one language to another, they at times may jump person and number.

הַנָּאָהֶב וְהַנְּעִים
to the memory of Saul Levin,
(July 13, 1921–March 4, 2021)

The vast majority of the lexical items registered in Michael Sokoloff's magisterial dictionaries of the various Aramaic dialects of late antiquity have a clear meaning and a clear etymology. Nonetheless, occasionally one encounters a word that defies one or the other, or at times even both. One such item is the word נוּלָא, attested in the Babylonian Talmud (henceforth B.), Bava Meši'a 67a, and (to the best of my knowledge) only three other times (see anon).

Sokoloff's entry reads as follows: "נוּלָא n. (uncertain) sg. אַתָּה וְנוּלָא אַחֵי . . . are kinsmen *BM* 67a(14)," with the additional note (in smaller font) "Perh. a PN."¹ For secondary literature, Sokoloff cited a) Moshe Beer, *The Babylonian Amoraim*; b) Shelomo Morag on the vocalization as preserved in a Cairo Geniza document; and c) the Yemenite oral tradition as recorded by Yosef 'Amr.

Author's note: I gratefully acknowledge the kind assistance of the following colleagues, who answered queries, provided references, and offered feedback on earlier drafts of the article: Joshua Blachorsky (New York University), Robert Brody (Hebrew University), James Nathan Ford (Bar-Ilan University), Charles Häberl (Rutgers University), James Russell (Harvard University), Aaron Rubin (Pennsylvania State University), Azzan Yadin-Israel (Rutgers University), and especially, אַחֵרִין אַחֵרִין חֲבִיב, Aaron Koller (Yeshiva University). Their assistance on various points raised in the article does not necessarily translate into accession to the main argument made herein. I alone remain responsible for said argument and for any errors present in the article.

Abbreviations may be found in the *SBL Handbook of Style*, <https://cpb-us-w2.wpmucdn.com/voices.uchicago.edu/dist/2/96/files/2016/06/the-sbl-handbook-of-stylesblhs-2f93p03.pdf>.

1. Michael Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan Univ. Press, and Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2002), 735 (henceforth: *DJBA*). Technically, this entry is no. 2 נוּלָא, since no. 1 נוּלָא is the well-known word 'loom'.

The latter two references, as indicated, treat the vocalization only, which we repeat here as נַוּלָה in the former, and as נוּלָה in the latter.² For Beer's treatment, see below, nn. 16–17.

Additional information regarding נוּלָה (henceforth, when transliterated, simply *nawla*) was provided by Theodore Kwasman in his review essay of Sokoloff's *DJBA* in the pages of this journal,³ including the different readings from the various manuscripts, though in general that information has little or no bearing on the present treatment. Nonetheless, for the sake of completeness, herewith:⁴

את ונוּלָה אחי (edd., Es, F, V²³);

את ונוּלָה אחי (Es);

את ונוּל' אחי (M);

אנת ונוּלָה אחי (H).

To place the phrase in its larger context, I present here the relevant section of the Talmudic discussion, divided into sense-units:⁵

ההיא איתתא דאמרה ליה לההוא גברא. זיל זבון לי ארעא מקריבאי. אזל זבן לה. אמ' ליה. אי מתרמו לי זווי מהדר(ת) [ה] לה גיהלי. אמ' ליה. אנת ונוּלָה אחי. אמ' רבה בר רב הונא. כל אנת ונוּלָה אחי סמכא דעתיה ולא גמר ומקני.⁶

A serviceable translation, from the (first) English version of the Steinsaltz Talmud project, follows:⁷

A certain woman said to a certain man, “Go [and] buy land for me from my relatives.” He went [and] bought [it] for her. He [the seller] said to him: “If I will have money, will you return it to me?” He said to him, “You and she [i.e., ונוּלָה] are relatives.” Rabba bar Rav Huna said: Whenever someone says, ‘You and she [i.e., ונוּלָה] are relatives’, [the seller] relies [on this], and does not completely decide and sell.

2. Shelomo Morag, *Vocalised Talmudic Manuscripts in the Cambridge Geniza Collections*, vol. 1: *Taylor-Schechter Old Series* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1988), 29, with reference to T-S F2(1).177, fol. 2v, lines 10–11 (= text no. 92 in Morag's edition); and Yosef 'Amr, *Talmud Bavli, Menuqqad 'al pi Mesoret Yehude Teman*, 20 vols. (Jerusalem: Hoša'at ha-Menaqqed, 1980), vol. 13: fol. 67a. Re. the former: note that Morag called this folio 2v, while at <https://fjms.genizah.org/> this folio is presented as 1v. The document is a two-folio fragmentary manuscript of Halakhot Gedolot, which quotes B. Bava Meš'at 67a here. For a convenient introduction to this Geonic collection, see Yehoshua Horowitz, “Halakhot Gedolot,” *Encyclopaedia Judaica*, 2nd ed. (Detroit: Macmillan Reference USA, 2007), 8.259–61.

3. Theodore Kwasman, “A New Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic,” *JAOS* 132 (2012): 77–99, at 93.

4. The sigla (see *DJBA*, 58) are as follows: Es = Escorial (Madrid) G-I-3; F = Florence II-1-8; H = Hamburg 165; M = Munich 95; V23 = Vatican 115. All of the manuscripts available at the Saul and Evelyn Henkind Talmud Text Databank of the Saul Lieberman Institute of Talmud Research of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America (<https://www.lieberman-institute.com/>) read similarly. In addition to the afore-cited ones, these include Vatican 117, Cremona (Archivio di Stato 33, 35, 57–58, 79–85), and Krakow (Jagiellonska Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Biblioteka Fr 1203, 1544).

5. I cite the text from MS Hamburg 165 = Hamburg, Staats- und Universitätsbibliothek, Cod. hebr. 19 (165) (Gerona, 1184), which in turn serves as the basis for the presentation at Ma'agarim (<https://maagarim.hebrew-academy.org.il/>). Note that the relevant form (indeed phrase) appears twice, with variant spelling: אנת ונוּלָה אחי and אנת ונוּלָה אחי.

6. According to Ma'agarim (see previous note), the Talmudic text is cited several centuries later in a responsum by R. Joseph ibn Abitur (d. 1024), per MS Montefiore (London) 98, with the same expression in place, albeit with minor variation: את ונוּלָה אחי.

7. Adin Steinsaltz, *The Talmud: The Steinsaltz Edition*, vol. 4: *Tractate Bava Metzia, Part IV* (New York: Random House, 1991), 114 (with some slight adjustments to the spelling and punctuation). For an expansive translation, see Adin Even-Yisrael Steinsaltz, *Koren Talmud Bavli: The Noé Edition*, vol. 26, Bava Metzia, Part Two (2016), 37 (also available at www.sefaria.org), with bold words reflecting the Talmudic text, and with words in regular font added to aid the reading.

The reader will notice that the key word נוּלָא *nawla* (2x) is rendered ‘she’ here.⁸

Kwasman further observed, “Rashi (ad loc.) states that the Geonim considered נוּלָא to be a personal pronoun with the meaning ‘he or she’. Rashi himself interprets the word as a personal name.”⁹ Herewith Rashi’s original Hebrew comment: את ונוּלָא אחי – אתה והיא קרובים אתם ותתרוצו ביניכם ונוּלָא לשון ארמי בין בזכר בין בנקבה כשרוצה לומר אתה והוא או אתה והיא כן ראיתי בתשובת הגאונים ואני אומר שזה שמה. To repeat, per Kwasman’s summary (see above), Rashi learned from Geonic sources that the key word נוּלָא is an Aramaic pronoun used for either masculine or feminine, that is, it may serve for either ‘he’ or ‘she’.¹⁰ This analysis, accordingly, informs the above translation with ‘she’. Rashi’s own understanding of our term as a proper noun (ואני אומר שזה שמה) is reflected, for example, in the Soncino translation, “You and Nawla, he replied, are relatives.”¹¹

The same information is conveyed in the commentary section of the Steinsaltz Talmud project (whose translation appears above), as follows: “The word נוּלָא— translated as ‘she’ in our commentary—appears nowhere else in Talmudic literature, and its etymological derivation is obscure [emphasis added]. In our translation and commentary, we have followed the Geonic tradition, which reports that נוּלָא is the Aramaic pronoun for the 3rd person of indeterminate gender (‘he’ or ‘she’ in English). *Rashi* gives this explanation, but also suggests that נוּלָא might be a proper noun, i.e., the name of the woman who wanted to buy the land.”¹²

Kwasman’s final contribution to our subject is his astute reference to B. Giṭṭin 68b (in a *sugya* dealing with Solomon and Ashmedai) as presented in the Cairo Geniza fragment C.U.L. T-S F1(1).31, fol. 1r, lines 21–22.¹³ The standard wording (e.g., ed. Vilna) is as follows:¹⁴

יומא חד הוה קאי לחודיה אמר ליה

One day, he was standing alone (with him), he said to him¹⁵

But the Geniza fragment reads:¹⁶

8. See also in the afore-cited translation available at www.sefaria.org, with the following: “You and she [*venawla*] are relatives” (with the bracketed item in the original).

9. Kwasman, “New Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic,” 93.

10. It is tempting to consider the possibility that Rashi’s specific source may be R. Şemaḥ ben Palṭoy, Gaon of Pumbedita (872–890) (and great-grandfather of Sherira Gaon), especially since his comments on the word נוּלָא were incorporated into *Šiṭṭa Mequbbešet* of R. Bezalel Ashkenazi (sixteenth century). Moreover, tradition holds that R. Şemaḥ compiled a dictionary of the Babylonian Talmud, though nothing of said work has been preserved. Though I must emphasize: my nod to R. Şemaḥ here is merely a case of “thinking aloud”; if anything, the notion is made less likely by the fact that this sage actually understood the passage slightly differently.

11. H. Friedman, “Baba Mezi’a,” in *The Babylonian Talmud*, ed. I. Epstein: Neziḳin, vol. 4, part 2 (London: Soncino, 1935), 392—though with a footnote, “[A proper noun; others: ‘and so-and-so’, ‘and she’.]”

12. *The Talmud: The Steinsaltz Edition*, vol. 4: *Tractate Bava Metzia, Part IV*, 114.

13. The Geniza fragment may be viewed at <https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-TS-F-00001-00001-00031/1>.

14. The manuscripts available at the Lieberman Institute database (see n. 4 above) all read similarly. These include Munich 95, Arras 889, Vatican 130, Vatican 140, Bologna (Archivio di Stato Fr. ebr. 145), and Bazzano (Archivio Storico Comunale Fr. ebr. 10, 21).

15. One presumes that “with him” is to be understood here, since Solomon addresses Ashmedai. This is stated explicitly in the Geniza fragment version.

16. The same information is conveyed by Moshe Beer, *The Babylonian Amoraim: Aspects of Economic Life* (Ramat-Gan: Bar-Ilan Univ. Press, 1974), 48 n. 93 (Hebrew)—though Beer (in the days before Geniza documents were as readily available as they are today in the digital age) a) cited the passage from a secondary source, and b) cited it with a slight change, using ונוּלָא instead of ונוּלִיָּה. The comment in the Steinsaltz Edition (see above) that נוּלָא in B. Bava Mezi’a 67a is the only attestation in Talmudic literature does not take this Cairo Geniza document into account. Nor does it consider the next example, based on a reading known to the Geonim.

יומא חד הוה יתיב איהוא ונווליה בביתא א' ליה

One day, he and he sat in the house, he said to him

Clearly, this reading demonstrates that the form נוולא is an epicene pronoun (per Rashi's first suggestion) and not a proper noun (per his second suggestion).¹⁷ Note that in B. Bava Meši'a, the antecedent of נוולא is a woman, while in B. Gitṭin 68b, the antecedent of נווליה is a man.

Our third attestation, at B. Nidda 25b, is known to us only indirectly. The standard reading (e.g., ed. Vilna) is as follows:¹⁸

אמר רבי זעירא זכה בה רב ביבי בשמעתיא דאנא והוא הוינא יתבינן קמיה דרבי יוחנן . . .

R. Ze'ira said, 'Rav Bibi merited [that his ruling/tradition/etc.] was heard [i.e., accepted]. As I and he were both sitting before Rabbi Yoḥanan, . . .

But the Geonim knew of a different reading, as follows:¹⁹

אמר רבי זירא זכה בה רב ביבי בשמעתיא אנא ונוולא הוה יתיבנא קמיה דרבי יוחנן

Minor differences aside (as occurs when any two textual witnesses are compared), note the use of אנא ונוולא "I and he" in this version, instead of the standard reading אנא והוא "I and he," with the form נוולא in place, with a masculine antecedent (to wit, R. Bibi). To repeat, we know of this reading only indirectly, but it is an early one (to wit, Geonic) of great significance.

In sum, based on a survey of all witnesses to the Babylonian Talmud, we can aver that the corpus of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic texts attested to three instances of נוולא *nawla*.

A fourth attestation occurs in Tractate Sofrim 11:3, as transmitted in Bodleian MS Oppenheim 726 (= Neubauer, no. 370.12), fol. 211v.²⁰ Note that the framework and indeed the entire tractate are in Hebrew, but in this particular passage the conversation is couched in Aramaic. Moreover, although the context of Tractate Sofrim is situated in the Land of Israel (as opposed to Babylonia),²¹ in this passage, the episode is set specifically in the synagogue of the Babylonians (either in Sepphoris or Tiberias, the two great rabbinic centers in the Galilee),²² where, one may assume, the dialect of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic could be heard.²³

ר' יוסי הוה מפקד לרב עולא חז[נ]א דכנישתא דבבלאי. כד היא חדא אורייתא. תהא ניילא אחורי פרוכתא. וכד אינון תרתין. תהא מוביל חדא ומייתי חדא.²⁴

17. Beer, *Babylonian Amoraim*, 48–49, concurred, as he rendered the Aramaic phrase את נוולא אחי into Hebrew as אתה והיא אחים "you and she are relatives" (lit. 'brothers/siblings').

18. The manuscripts available at the Lieberman Institute database (see n. 4 above) all read similarly. These include Munich 95, Vatican 111, Vatican 113, and Modena (Archivio Storico Comunale 24).

19. See Robert Brody, Carmiel Cohen, and Yehuda Zvi Stampfer, eds., *Oṣar ha-Ge'onim he-Hadaš: Masseket Bava Meši'a* (Jerusalem: Ofeq Institute, 5772 [2012]), 194.

20. The manuscript is available online at <http://bav.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/digitized-items-hebrew-manuscripts> > MS Oppenheim 726 > fol. 211v (= image 428/476).

21. For general background on Tractate Sofrim, see H. L. Strack and G. Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, trans. Markus Bockmuehl (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1991), 248; and Eyal Ben-Eliyahu, Yehudah Cohn, and Fergus Millar, *Handbook of Jewish Literature from Late Antiquity, 135–700 CE* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2013), 54–55.

22. Stuart S. Miller, *Sages and Commoners in Late Antique 'Erez Israel: A Philological Inquiry into Local Traditions in Talmud Yerushalmi* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2006), 163 n. 47.

23. Rav 'Ulla is presumably 'Ulla II, who traveled back and forth between Eretz-Israel and Babylonia (see Strack and Stemberger, *Introduction to the Talmud and Midrash*, 96), in which case R. Yose would be either Yose II bar Zabda or Yose bar Abin (*ibid.*); see further n. 26.

24. Reading with MS Oppenheim 726 as presented at Ma'agarim, with punctuation, etc., added.

R. Yose would command Rav ‘Ulla, the *ḥazzan* (overseer) of the synagogue of the Babylonians: When there is one Torah, let it (ניילא) be behind the *parokhet* (curtain). And when there are two, you should carry one and bring one.²⁵

Here the form appears as ניילא, but there can be no doubt that the same morpheme is intended. Once again, our form serves as an epicene pronoun, in this case with a feminine antecedent, the word אורייתא ‘Torah’, with reference to a single Torah scroll.²⁶

Apparently unaware of the form ניילא, most manuscripts of Tractate Sofrim read תהא גיילאה תהא אהורי פרוכתא (*vel sim.*)²⁷ “let him roll it behind the *parokhet*.” This reading presumably arose due to the obvious connection between rolling and a Torah scroll—though one may wonder how such action could be accomplished behind the *parokhet*.²⁸ Regardless, the rule of *lectio difficilior* provides some primacy to the reading ניילא in Bodleian MS Oppenheim 726.²⁹

The context of the four passages cited here—three from the Babylonian Talmud proper and one from Tractate Sofrim (one of the so-called “minor tractates” thereto)—allows us to reach the true understanding of the form, as intimated by Kwasman already. The form נוּלָא/ניילא is an epicene 3rd person pronoun,³⁰ serving as the equivalent to Hebrew הוּא/היא, English ‘he, she, it’, German ‘er, sie, es’, etc.³¹

But what is the source of the form נוּלָא *nawla*? Are we able to establish an etymology? Especially in light of the comment in the Steinsaltz Edition highlighted above: “*and its etymological derivation is obscure.*”

The two great lexicographers of rabbinic literature in the nineteenth century, Jacob Lewy and Alexander Kohut, each proposed an etymology for נוּלָא *nawla*, though to my mind neither is convincing. First, Jacob Lewy, in his monumental *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, interpreted the word as a common noun meaning ‘Freigebig, Wohlwollende, Edle’, with a nod to Arabic *nāl*, a far reach in my esti-

25. Thus literally, even if the expected sense is to bring one Torah scroll forth and to leave the other in the Ark, that is, behind the *parokhet* (curtain). For a different translation, with an attempt to smooth out some of the difficulties, see Israel W. Slotki, “Masseketh Soferim,” in *The Minor Tractates of the Talmud: Masseketh Ketannah*, ed. A. Cohen, 2 vols. (London: Soncino, 1965), 1.261.

26. True, both of the two R. Yose options (see above, n. 23) are Amoraim of Eretz-Israel, but the setting of the words spoken is crucial. Which is to say, I find it rather striking that the only instance of נוּלָא *nawla* (here ניילא) in the entire vast corpus of rabbinic literature from Eretz-Israel (Palestine) occurs within a conversation taking place in the Babylonian synagogue of either Sepphoris or Tiberias (see above, at n. 22).

27. This is the reading presented at www.sefaria.org, for example; plus it serves as the basis for the translation by Slotki referenced in n. 24.

28. For a fine overview of the various manuscripts of Tractate Sofrim, see Debra Reed Blank, “It’s Time to Take Another Look at ‘Our Little Sister’ Soferim: A Bibliographical Essay,” *JQR* 90 (1999): 1–26.

29. Parallels to the passage in Sofrim 11:3 occur three times in the Talmud Yerushalmi—Y. Yoma 7.1 (44b); Y. Megilla 4.5 (75b); Y. Sota 7.6 (22a)—though in all instances and in all witnesses (at least according to Peter Schäfer and Hans-Jürgen Becker, eds., *Synopse zum Talmud Yerushalmi* [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991–2001]) various forms of the word ‘roll’ (with initial *gimel*) are read. I also checked to see if these passages are attested in Talmud Yerushalmi texts from the Cairo Geniza, but all three are wanting, according to the index of passages in Yaacov Sussman, *Thesaurus of Talmudic Manuscripts* = אוצר כתבי-היד התלמודיים (Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2012), 3.187–89.

30. Henceforth, we are content to use the spelling נוּלָא (note the lemma in *DJBA* and in the title of this article), under which we subsume the various by-forms and spellings.

31. For the sake of completeness, I also note here the use of נוּלָא as the name of a demon (or a category thereof) in the Aramaic magic bowls. For one such example, see Schøyen magic bowl 2053/237, line 8, published as JBA 45 in Shaul Shaked, James Nathan Ford, and Siam Bhayro, *Aramaic Bowl Spells: Jewish Babylonian Aramaic Bowls*, vol. 1 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 204–7, esp. 206. As the editors indicate, the JBA form appears to be a reflex of Mandaic *niula* ‘tormentor, etc.’, for which see E. S. Drower and R. Macuch, *A Mandaic Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1963), 297–98. In any case, the form has no relationship to the JBA pronoun form נוּלָא discussed herein.

mation. Though he also presented the view expressed above, with reference to Rashi and the earlier Geonic literature, using the German glosses ‘jene, jener’.³²

Alexander Kohut, in his comprehensive *‘Arukh ha-Shalem (Aruch Completum)*, proffered the Hebrew glosses הוּא, הוּא, along with the German glosses ‘er, sie; der, die andere’.³³ Toward the end of the entry, Kohut turned his attention to the source of this word, with reference to two Iranian languages, “Afghani” (לִּי אַפְגַּנִּית) and “Zend language” (לִּישׁ צִעֲנָד); by the former, presumably he meant Pashto,³⁴ and by the latter, presumably he intended Avestan.³⁵ Kohut’s proposed etyma include Pashto *nor* ‘other, another’,³⁶ and Avestan *nara* ‘man’, *nāiri* ‘woman’,³⁷ to which he added the following information: נַל בַּלְמִי נַר באהת הלשונוה נַל בַּלְמִי נַר באהת הלשונוה במקום לה נאמר בהקרה—with reference to Ossetian.³⁸ While one respects Kohut’s effort to seek a suitable etymology for נַוּלָא *nawla*, especially from Iranian, in particular Avestan (as was his wont throughout the dictionary),³⁹ the proposal fails on several accounts. One does not feel the need to counter the proposal here in any detail, except to note: a) the Pashto word for ‘other’ takes one too far afield within the Iranian family; b) the Avestan words for ‘man’ and ‘woman’ display gender distinction, whereas נַוּלָא is epicene, as demonstrated above;⁴⁰ c) in general, Avestan and Old Persian display gender distinction in the personal pronouns and deictic/demonstrative pronouns;⁴¹ and d) the syllable structure of the proposed words does not align (e.g., *nar* vs. *nawla*).

32. Jacob Levy, *Neuhebräisches und Chaldäisches Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* (Leipzig: F.A. Brockhaus, 1883), 3.358–359. Levy’s source for Arabic *nāl* was Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Freytag, *Lexicon arabico-latinum* (Halle: C.A. Schwetschke, 1830–1837), 4.354b–355a (especially the latter).

33. Alexander Kohut, *Sefer ‘Arukh ha-Shalem = Aruch Completum* (Vienna: Menorah, 1926), 5.323.

34. Note, incidentally, that Persians refer to Pashto as “Afghani.”

35. While some Zend glosses, comments, etc., are written in other Iranian languages, the majority are expressed in Avestan. For a brief discussion on how the term “Zend language” developed, along with the ensuing confusion, see <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Zend>.

36. For which see Henry Walter Bellew, *A Dictionary of the Pukkhto or Pukshto Language* (London: Thacker, 1867), 167 (s.v. *nor*). While not cited explicitly, one may imagine that this dictionary served as the source for the Pashto term mentioned by Kohut.

37. For which see Ferdinand Justi, *Handbuch der Zendsprache* (Leipzig: F.C.W. Vogel, 1864), 167–68 (s.v. *nar*), 170 (s.v. *nāira*); cited by Kohut, *Sefer ‘Arukh ha-Shalem = Aruch Completum*, 5.323.

38. For Kohut’s words, see *Sefer ‘Arukh ha-Shalem = Aruch Completum*, 5.323. For the nod to Ossetian, see Justi, *Handbuch der Zendsprache*, 168.

39. See Shaul Shaked, “From Bacher to Telegdi: The Lure of Iran in Jewish Studies,” in *Modern Jewish Scholarship in Hungary: The ‘Science of Judaism’ between East and West*, ed. Tamás Turán and Carsten Wilke (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2016), 278. The present instance may find a home within Shaked’s overarching statement, “he [sc. Kohut] often suggested quite impossible etymological connections.”

40. One is less concerned with the proposed Old Persian words *nar* ‘man’ and *nāira* ‘woman’ as nouns, since the process of grammaticalization could be applied here. Parallels occur in Ethiopian Semitic languages, for example, Tigrinya *nəssu* ‘he’ (based on *nəfs* ‘soul’), Amharic *ərsu* ‘he’ (based on *kärs* ‘belly’), and Argobba *kəssu* ‘he’ (based on *kärs* ‘belly’), in addition to other forms within the personal pronoun paradigm. For discussion, see Edward Lipiński, *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997), 305; Aaron Rubin, *Studies in Semitic Grammaticalization* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2005), 23–24; and Grover Hudson, “Amharic *rs* Pronouns,” in *He Bitaney Lagge: Studies on Language and African Linguistics in Honour of Marcello Lamberti*, ed. Luca Busetto et al. (Milan: Qu.a.s.a.r., 2011), 55–66. That said, the crucial difference must be noted: in the cited cases from Ethiopian, the grammaticalized noun is a native feature of the lexis. Kohut’s proposal would require the borrowing of *and* the grammaticalization of an Iranian element to explain נַוּלָא.

41. See conveniently Prods Oktor Skjærvø, “Avestan and Old Persian Morphology,” in *Morphologies of Asia and Africa*, ed. Alan S. Kaye (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007), 2: 937–39. True, later Iranian languages, including Pahlavi and Modern Persian, lack the gender distinction, so that ‘he/she/it, etc.’ is all the same form, but none of the forms is remotely similar to *nawla*.

Where, then, might our word come from? My proposal is to look to Hurrian and Urartian, well known for their epicene pronouns. In both languages one finds 3rd person plural deictic pronouns with the requisite consonants and syllable structure (at least, as best as one can determine). The relevant forms are provided in Fig. 1 (which includes, since it may be relevant, the Hurrian 3rd person plural independent pronoun, in the absolute state; note that the corresponding Urartian form is not attested).⁴²

deictic pronouns (plural, absolute)	Hurrian	Urartian
demonstrative	<i>anni=lla</i>	<i>i=ne=lə</i>
anaphoric, proximity	<i>andi=lla</i>	[Urartian uses a single form; see below]
anaphoric, distance	<i>ani=lla</i>	[Urartian uses a single form; see below]
anaphoric (without the above distinction)	[Hurrian uses two distinct forms; see above]	<i>ina=ne=lə</i>
3rd plural independent pers. pron. (absolute)	<i>mane=lla</i>	[not attested]

Fig. 1. Chart of 3rd person plural deictic pronouns

Now, I am the first to admit to several problems. First, none of the forms in Fig. 1 equates precisely with *nawla* (the presumed Aramaic realization of the word, as implied on several occasions above). Secondly, the forms with the closest phonological match are the deictic pronouns, and not the independent pronoun form. Thirdly, and most importantly, all of the forms listed there are *plural* forms, whereas נוּלָא *nawla* is used as a singular. Fourthly, can one truly posit a borrowing from Hurro-Urartian into Aramaic? Let us address each of these issues *ad seriatim*.

1. As is well known, when a lexeme or morpheme is borrowed from one language to another, the form in the receiving language may not be a precise representation of the original form, but rather an approximation thereof. To take two examples from the domain of pronouns, culled from the data included in the important article “Pronoun Borrowing” by Sarah Thomason and Daniel Everett, note that the Pirahã 1st person pronoun /ɕi/ derives from Nheengatu /ʃi/, while the “Pirahã [3rd person pronoun] /hi/ is also a reasonable nativization of the Nheengatu (or Tenharim) third-person pronoun /ahe/.”⁴³ In both cases, the

42. The information in Fig. 1 is culled from the two chapters by Gernot Wilhelm, “Hurrian” and “Urartian,” in *The Ancient Languages of Asia Minor*, ed. Roger Woodard (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008), 81–104 (at 95), and 105–23 (at 114), respectively. See also Mauro Giorgieri, “Schizzo grammaticale della lingua hurrica,” *La parola del passato* 55 (2000): 220–21.

43. Sarah G. Thomason and Daniel L. Everett, “Pronoun Borrowing,” in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Seventh Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, February 16–18, 2001*, ed. Charles Chang et al. (Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Linguistics Society, 2005), 310–11 (with the direct quotation on p. 311).

phonetic match is not perfect, as explicated further by Thomason and Everett. In addition, in the case of Hurrian and Urartian, we must recall that we are dealing with languages written in the cuneiform script (which was not designed for said languages), with all of the attendant difficulties in determining precise pronunciations of individual words. The transcriptions presented in Fig. 1 are, to a great extent, mere conventions.

Should the reader prefer to see something more specific than the general notions just mentioned, one may wish to propose several potential paths during the course of borrowing, such as:⁴⁴

- a) mane=lla > *name=lla > *nawe=lla > נולא *nawla*; or
 b) ina=ne=la > *ina=me=la > *ina=we=la > נולא *nawla*.

In these two posited paths, in the first step, one sees either metathesis of /m/ and /n/ (in the first instance), or dissimilation of /n/ > /m/ (in the second instance), presumably generated by the presence of the following /l/ in these forms; while in the second step one sees bilabial interchange, /m/ > /w/, akin to what occurs in Late Babylonian.

2. The relationship between deictic pronouns and personal pronouns is well known. Indeed, in a broad array of Semitic languages, the 3rd person independent pronouns are used for far deixis; see, for example, Hebrew בַּיּוֹם הַהוּא (208x in the Bible, e.g., Gen. 15:18) *bay-yōm ha-hūʾ* “on that day” (PREP=DEF.ART.=NOUN + DEF.ART.=3MS PRON).⁴⁵ For an example in the opposite direction, note that “Straits Salish makes use of a set of deictic roots that function syntactically as third person pronouns,”⁴⁶ which otherwise are lacking in the language (spoken in the region of the waterways of Washington State [U.S.A.] and British Columbia [Canada]).

Moreover, and most significantly, in each of the four attestations of נולא *nawla* in Aramaic, note that this pronoun stands in relationship to another person or entity:

B. Bava Meṣi’a 67a—“he and this-one” (fem.), or perhaps “he and that-one” (fem.), that is, the female relative engaged in the land purchase;

B. Giṭṭin 68b—“he and this-one” (masc.), or perhaps “he and that-one” (masc.), that is, the second individual (as indicated above, not a person but rather Ashmedai!) who serves as interlocutor;

B. Nidda 25b—“I and he” (masc.), that is R. Ze’ira, who narrates the episode, and R. Bibi, his colleague;

Sofrim 11:3—“it” (fem.), with reference to the single Torah scroll, with a presumed second Torah scroll not present; though the passage continues with reference to two Torah scrolls.

As such, נולא *nawla* in its four attestations does not come to replace the standard Aramaic pronoun(s), but rather appears to fill a morpho-syntactic slot with a very specific use, to wit, ‘this-one’ or ‘that-one’ when there are two items under discussion.⁴⁷ Kohut appears to have recognized this more than 130 years ago, with his inclusion of ‘der, die andere’ amongst his

44. These two possible paths were suggested to me by my colleague Charles Häberl, though any number of reconstructions could be offered.

45. Lipiński, *Semitic Languages*, 318–20. For Arabic, Geʿez, Mehri, etc., which use separate forms (that is, not the 3rd person pronoun forms), see pp. 322–23.

46. D. N. S. Bhat, *Pronouns* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2004), 17. For detailed analysis, see Eloise Jelinek and Richard A. Demers, “Predicates and Pronominal Arguments in Straits Salish,” *Language* 70 (1994): 697–736, esp. 714–15. On the relationship between 3rd person pronouns and deictic markers, see throughout Bhat, *Pronouns*, especially by consulting the Index of Subjects on p. 317.

47. To state the obvious, note that נולא serves only as the nominative, and is thus not related to the Jewish Babylonian Aramaic dative particle -ניל-, -נהיל-, -ניהל-, which has a totally different origin. See Matthew Morgenstern, *Studies in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic, Based upon Early Eastern Manuscripts* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2011),

glosses (see above). Or to put this in other terms, the form נוּוֹלָא never appears for simple ‘he’ or ‘she’ or ‘this’ or ‘that’, but rather, as indicated, only when it stands for one of two people or one of two items present.

For a somewhat analogous situation, note that Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian borrowed the Hokkien Chinese 1st person singular pronoun *gua* ~ *gue*, with the native form *aku* now restricted for more intimate settings.⁴⁸ Which is to say, the two pronouns, one native, one borrowed, are both present in the language, but they fill distinct semantic-syntactic slots. See also the subtle influence that Greek asserted on deixis in Rabbinic Hebrew, resulting in two different forms evincing distinct deictic scopes.⁴⁹

3. On the problem of the proposed Hurro-Urartian etyma as *plural* forms, whereas נוּוֹלָא serves as the singular, note that once again all manner of unexpected shifts may occur during the borrowing process,⁵⁰ including with pronouns. In their afore-cited article, “Pronoun Borrowing,” Thomason and Everett present “the striking case of two apparently unrelated non-Austronesian (so-called ‘Papuan’) languages of New Guinea that share first- and second-person pronouns, but with reversed meanings: Kambot borrowed the Iatmul word for ‘I’ in the meaning ‘you’, and the Iatmul word for ‘you (feminine)’ as ‘I.’”⁵¹ True, the illustration just provided constitutes an example of person shift (1st and 2nd) and not number shift (singular and plural), but the effect and the process are essentially the same.

4. Finally, there is the question of whether or not a Hurro-Urartian lexeme/morpheme possibly could have entered Aramaic. While our Hurrian sources primarily date to the second half of the second millennium BCE, our latest Urartian sources date to the end of the seventh century BCE—coeval with the downfall of the Assyrian Empire. During this latter period, Aramaic already was widely in use in Mesopotamia, as evidenced by the Assur ostrakon,⁵² the hundreds of Aramaic dockets on cuneiform tablets,⁵³ and the numerous Aramaic loanwords that entered Akkadian during this period.⁵⁴ The point being: the geographical and chronological attestations of Aramaic and Urartian overlap during the Neo-Assyrian period.

In addition, one may ask: Are we to assume that Hurrian and Urartian, or other (unattested) languages from the same family simply died out at the time of our latest sources? By “other (unattested) languages,” I refer to the proposal by Igor Diakonoff and Sergei Starostin

31 (§2.72), 143 (§3.5.2.3.2); and Elitzur A. Bar-Asher Siegal, *Introduction to the Grammar of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic*, 2nd ed. (Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2016), 228, §9.4.1.2.

48. James Neil Sneddon, *Colloquial Jakartan Indonesian* (Canberra: Australian National Univ., 2006), 59.

49. Azzan Yadin-Israel, “Some Uses of Deixis in Rabbinic Hebrew,” *JSS* 60 (2015): 331–40, esp. 333.

50. For just one example, not specifically connected to the present discussion, note German *Handy* ‘mobile phone’, borrowed from English ‘handy’, even though the latter is an adjective, not a noun, and is not especially used by English speakers (either British or American) for the modern technological invention. Which is to say, German *Handy* both jumps grammatical category and reflects semantic extension.

51. Thomason and Everett, “Pronoun Borrowing,” 303. For details, see William A. Foley, *The Papuan Languages of New Guinea* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986), 210.

52. See, for example, Frederick Mario Fales, “New Light on Assyro-Aramaic Interference: The Assur Ostrakon,” in *CAMSEMUD 2007: Proceedings of the 13th Italian Meeting of Afro-Asiatic Linguistics, Held in Udine, May 21st–24th, 2007*, ed. Frederick Mario Fales and Giulia Francesca Grassi (Padua: S.A.R.G.O.N. Editrice e Libreria, 2010), 189–204.

53. The major study remains Frederick Mario Fales, *Aramaic Epigraphs on Clay Tablets of the Neo-Assyrian Period* (Rome: Università degli Studi “La Sapienza”, 1986). For additional evidence, see Grant Frame, “A Neo-Babylonian Tablet with an Aramaic Docket and the Surety Phrase *pūt šēp(i) . . . našū*,” in *The World of the Aramaeans III: Studies in Language and Literature in Honour of Paul-Eugène Dion*, ed. P. M. Michèle Daviau, John W. Wevers, and Michael Weigl (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2001), 100–33, and the literature cited there.

54. Even if the number of such loanwords is not as numerous as various scholars have posited. See the careful and detailed study of Kathleen Abraham and Michael Sokoloff, “Aramaic Loanwords in Akkadian—A Reassessment of the Proposals,” *AJO* 52 (2011): 22–76.

that connects Hurrian and Urartian to modern Eastern Caucasian languages.⁵⁵ Should such a view be accepted, it is clear that Hurro-Urartian and Aramaic interconnections may have persisted well beyond the Neo-Assyrian period.

Let us recall that Hurro-Urartian words did penetrate Semitic languages in ancient times. While not directly relevant to the present discussion, we have a profusion of Hurrian loanwords in Ugaritic,⁵⁶ one Hurrian word in the Bible (that is, אֲרֹן־יְהוָה ‘lord, king’ < Hurrian *iwre-ne* ‘lord, king’),⁵⁷ and one Urartian word (that is, כִּיּוּר ‘basin’ < Urartian *kiuru* ‘basin’), though possibly mediated via Akkadian.⁵⁸

Perhaps more germane, given the timespan involved, is the following item, attested at two points on the timeline separated by about 1200(!) years: Hurrian *kirenzi*/**kirezzi* ‘proclamation’, attested in Nuzi Akkadian ca. 1350 BCE,⁵⁹ and later only in Aramaic and Rabbinic Hebrew as the root כ-ר-ז *k-r-z* ‘proclaim, announce’ (Dan. 3:4 as the noun ‘herald’; Dan. 5:29 as the verb ‘announce, proclaim’;⁶⁰ Middle Aramaic dialects as both noun and verb;⁶¹ 28x in Tannaitic sources as the Hiph’l verb;⁶² etc.).⁶³

More relevant still, since it stems from the domain of grammar (as opposed to lexicon), is the proposal by Chaim Rabin to understand the four enigmatic *l*-forms in Gen. 23 preceding the imperative:

Gen. 23:5–6 לֹךְ שָׁמַעְנוּ אֶדְנִי
Gen. 23:11 לֹא אֶדְנִי שָׁמַעְנִי
Gen. 23:13 לֹךְ שָׁמַעְנִי
Gen. 23:14–15 לֹךְ אֶדְנִי שָׁמַעְנִי

55. Igor M. Diakonoff and S. A. Starostin, *Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language* (Munich: R. Kitzinger, 1986). For their summary statement on the demonstrative pronoun, with the reconstruction of proto-Eastern Caucasian **nV* and various echoes thereof in the present-day languages, see p. 82 of the work cited. For positive and more critical reviews of the work of Diakonoff and Starostin, see, respectively, J. A. C. Greppin, “Review of Igor M. Diakonoff and S. A. Starostin, *Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language*,” *Annual of Armenian Linguistics* 8 (1987): 100–2; and Riëks Smeets, “On Hurro-Urartian as an Eastern Caucasian Language,” *Bibliotheca Orientalis* 46 (1989): 260–80. On the possibility that Kassite belongs to the Hurro-Urartian family, see Thomas Schneider, “Kassitisch und Hurro-Urartäisch: Ein Diskussionsbeitrag zu möglichen lexikalischen Isoglossen,” *AoF* 30 (2003): 372–81.

56. See the series of articles by Wilfred W. E. Watson, most recently, “Non-Semitic Words in the Ugaritic Lexicon (8),” *UF* 42 (2010): 831–45.

57. For the historical background of the word, attested in 2 Sam. 24 (and in the parallel text in 1 Chron. 21), see Gary A. Rendsburg, *How the Bible Is Written* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2019), 447.

58. As posited first by Johannes Friedrich, “Zum urartäischen Lexikon,” *Archiv Orientalni* 4 (1932): 66–70. For the most recent treatments, see Paul Mankowski, *Akkadian Loanwords in Biblical Hebrew* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 65–66; Hayim ben Yosef Tawil, *An Akkadian Lexical Companion for Biblical Hebrew* (Jersey City, NJ: Ktav, 2009), 161; and Benjamin J. Noonan, *Non-Semitic Loanwords in the Hebrew Bible* (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2019), 121. Note that the word כִּיּוּר/כִּיּוּר occurs in Aramaic, but only in Jewish and Samaritan dialects (see *CAL*, s.v. <kywr>); hence one concludes that the route was not directly from Urartian or Akkadian into Aramaic, but rather through Hebrew.

59. CAD K, 404.

60. BDB, 1097; *HALOT*, 1902.

61. *CAL*, s.v., <krz>, <krwz>.

62. Ma’agarim, s.v., כ-ר-ז.

63. See the brief but seminal treatment by Aaron Shaffer, “Hurrian **kirezzi*, West-Semitic *krz*,” *Orientalia* 34 (1965): 32–34. Though for a contrary view, see Benjamin J. Noonan, “Daniel’s Greek Loanwords in Dialectal Perspective,” *BBR* 28 (2018): 587–93, with his critique of Shaffer on pp. 590–91. For additional long-range connections, from the legal realm, see Samuel Greengus, “Filling Gaps: Laws Found in Babylonia and in the Mishna, but Absent in the Hebrew Bible,” in *Let Your Colleagues Praise You: Studies in Memory of Stanley Gevirtz* (Part 1), ed. Robert J. Ratner et al. = *Maarav* 7 (1991): 149–72. See further below, n. 72.

as reflexes of the Hurrian *-l-* infix used for a series of non-indicative moods (modal, optative, conditional, desiderative).⁶⁴ In this particular case, the biblical author has adopted a Hurrian morpheme for stylistic purposes, in order to represent the speech of the Hittites (and in one case, Abraham, who assumes this characteristic trait of his interlocutors' speech in his own speech).⁶⁵ The proposal is based on the notion, accepted by many scholars (the present writer included), that the Hittites of the Bible are actually Hurrians, resident in the southern portion of the land of Canaan (as in this case, which takes place in Hebron).⁶⁶

Also from the domain of grammar, specifically phonology, is the theory of E. A. Speiser regarding the origin of spirantization, first in Aramaic and then in Hebrew. Unfortunately, Speiser mentioned the Hurrian impetus for this phonetic shift within Hebrew and Aramaic only in a general survey,⁶⁷ and never, to the best of my knowledge, developed the hypothesis in any sustained fashion. Moreover, as far as I am aware, no one has carried the mantle of this suggestion forward.⁶⁸ Hence, Speiser's suggestion must remain only that, a bare suggestion, awaiting further examination.⁶⁹

Finally, note the spelling הוררט in 1QIsa^a 37:38, with its retention of the /u/-vowel as reflected in the cuneiform spelling Urartu, as opposed to Elephantine אררט,⁷⁰ MT אַרְרַט (pausal: אַרְרַטְ), with the series of /a/-vowels, presumably as the Masoretic default. Even

64. Chaim Rabin, "L- with Imperative (Gen. XXIII)," *JSS* 13 (1968): 113–24. Regardless of the Masoretic vocalization and punctuation (in two cases, bridging verses), Rabin understood them all as the Hurrian *-l-* verbal infix, which, due to the restrictions of Hebrew grammar, was placed before (and not within) the verb. For the Hurrian (and Urartian) evidence, see Wilhelm, "Hurrian," 99–100; Wilhelm, "Urartian," 117–18; and Giorgieri, "Schizzo grammaticale della lingua hurrica," 236–38. For an older treatment, though with many examples cited, see E. A. Speiser, *Introduction to Hurrian* (New Haven: American Schools of Oriental Research, 1941), 153–54, 158.

65. Though I also need to add that a different cogent explanation has been offered by Daniel Sivan and William Schniedewind, "Letting Your 'Yes' Be 'No' in Ancient Israel: A Study of the Asseverative לָא and הֵקֵלָא," *JSS* 38 (1993): 222–24. More recently see William M. Schniedewind, "Linguistic Dating, Writing Systems, and the Pentateuchal Sources," in *The Formation of the Pentateuch*, ed. Jan C. Gertz et al. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 354–55.

66. Parallels to confused ethnonyms are well known: *Gypsies*, as if the Romani came from Egypt; Irish *Sasannah*, Gaelic *Sasannach*, and related terms in other Celtic languages, as if all English people were Saxons; Pennsylvania *Dutch* to refer to the Pennsylvania Germans; *Turks* and *Moors* to refer to Muslims generally in the early modern period, regardless of their country of origin; Arabic *rūmī* (pl. *arwām*) for 'Byzantine(s), Greek Orthodox Christians', who have had no real connection to Rome for more than 1000 years (that is, even before the Great Schism of 1054); Arabic *ifranj* 'Europeans', whether they come from France or elsewhere; etc.

67. E. A. Speiser, "Hurrians and Hittites," in *At the Dawn of Civilization*, ed. E. A. Speiser (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers Univ. Press, 1964), 160.

68. For a sole reference thereto, see Saul Levin, *Semitic and Indo-European: The Principal Etymologies* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995), 56 n. 92 (though with an alternative approach proffered). For a recent thorough discussion of spirantization in Hebrew and Aramaic, see Richard C. Steiner, "Variation, Simplifying Assumptions, and the History of Spirantization in Aramaic and Hebrew," *Sha'arei Lashon: Studies in Hebrew, Aramaic and Jewish Languages Presented to Moshe Bar-Asher*, ed. Aharon Maman, Steven E. Fassberg, and Yohanan Breuer (Jerusalem: Bialik, 2008), 1: *52–*65, though without reference to Speiser's proposal.

69. For general discussion on Hurrian influence on Semitic, including in the domain of the personal pronoun, see Gary A. Rendsburg, "A New Look at Pentateuchal *HW*," *Biblica* 63 (1982): 351–69. For alternative views and further discussion, see J. A. Emerton, "Was There an Epicene Pronoun *HW* in Early Hebrew?" *JSS* 45 (2000): 260–76; Steven E. Fassberg, "The *Kethiv/Qere* הָוָה, Diachrony, and Dialectology," in *Diachrony in Biblical Hebrew*, ed. Cynthia Miller-Naudé and Ziony Zevit (Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2012), 171–80; Josef Tropper, "Das genus-indifferente hebräische Pronomen *HW* im Pentateuch aus sprachvergleichender Sicht," *ZAH* 14 (2001): 159–72; and Moshe Morgenstern, "Ma'arekhet ha-Kinnuyim ha-Perudim be-Qumran: le-Še'elat Toldot ha-'Ivrit bi-Yme ha-Bayit ha-Šeni," in *Sha'arei Lashon* (see previous note), 1: 49–50.

70. In the Aramaic version of the Behistun inscription, col. 1, l. 8, for which see A. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1923), 251.

though our Urartean sources end in the sixth century BCE, the Qumran scribe was heir to the proper pronunciation with /u/ in the first syllable, even at a distance of about four centuries.⁷¹

In light of all that has been stated here in the four enumerated points, there should be no objection to positing the borrowing of a Hurro-Urartian morpheme into Aramaic, even if the term נולא *nawla* appears only sporadically in relatively late material, that is, Babylonian Jewish Aramaic of the Sasanian period (with an echo amongst the Babylonian Jews who lived in the Galilee, per Tractate Sofrim 11:3).⁷² To my mind, a Hurro-Urartian source for Aramaic נולא *nawla*, the 3rd person epicene pronoun (either personal or deictic) attested four times in the corpus of rabbinic literature, with a specific morpho-syntactic scope, remains the best explanation for this rare morpheme.⁷³

71. For further discussion, including the issue of the initial letter *he* (as opposed to *'aleph*), see E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll: IQIsaa* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1974), 102–3.

72. For an example of a loanword that appears in the receiving language centuries or even a millennium-plus after the lending language died out, see Hezy Mutzafi, “Some Lexicographic and Etymological Notes on ‘A Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dictionary,’” *Aramaic Studies* 9 (2011): 311–12, with reference to Syriac *qōtī* ‘spider’ (attested for the first time in the tenth century CE) and Neo-Aramaic (Zakho Jewish dialect) *qota/qo'ta* ‘spider’, derived from Akkadian *qē ettūti*, **qū ettūti* ‘cobweb’ (comprised of *qū* ‘web’ + *ettūti* ‘spider’ (gen.)). For parallel phenomena, see above, n. 63.

73. Naturally, I wondered if there is any latter-day resonance of Aramaic נולא *nawla* in Neo-Aramaic dialects. A survey of the relevant grammars and dictionaries (from the pens of Eleanor Coghill, Steven Fassberg, Jared Greenblatt, Charles Häberl, Otto Jastrow, Geoffrey Khan, Hezy Mutzafi, Yona Sabar, et al.) reveals none, however. Sidebar comment: Various Neo-Aramaic dialects also have epicene 3rd person pronouns and deictic pronouns, though most likely this situation results from Sorani Kurdish and/or Turkish adstratum influence. For examples, see Geoffrey Khan, *A Grammar of Neo Aramaic: The Dialect of the Jews of Arbel* (Leiden: Brill, 1999), 81, 84–85; Hezy Mutzafi, *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Koy Sanjaq (Iraqi Kurdistan)* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2004), 60, 64; and Steven E. Fassberg, *The Jewish Neo-Aramaic Dialect of Challa* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 35, 42. In similar fashion, I wondered if the form seeped into Iraqi Arabic, where once again the answer is apparently in the negative, at least based on the information present in Wallace M. Erwin, *A Short Reference Grammar of Iraqi Arabic* (Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2004); and Mohamed Maamouri, *The Georgetown Dictionary of Iraqi Arabic: Arabic–English, English–Arabic* (Washington, DC: Georgetown Univ. Press, 2013).