

# Alignment in eastern Neo-Aramaic languages from a typological perspective

Noorlander, P.M.

# Citation

Noorlander, P. M. (2018, October 31). Alignment in eastern Neo-Aramaic languages from a typological perspective. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66714

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)	
License:	<u>Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the</u> <u>Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden</u>	
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/66714	

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page



# Universiteit Leiden



The handle <u>http://hdl.handle.net/1887/66714</u> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Noorlander, P.M. Title: Alignment in eastern Neo-Aramaic languages from a typological perspective Issue Date: 2018-10-31

# 5. ALIGNMENT SPLITS IN NENA BASED ON VERB-RELATED PROP-ERTIES

Our discussion of alignment in NENA continues with the realis perfect and splits within the inflection of the 'perfective'. This chapter is divided between simple constructions based on the 'perfective' (q*țil*-) and compound verbal forms ultimately based on nominal forms of the verb such as the resultative participle (q*țila*) which is morphologically and sometimes also functionally similar to the 'perfective' inflectional base. I use the terms simple and compound to distinguish between the two, because synthetic as opposed to analytic/periphrastic does not fully qualify due to the grammaticalization of finite verbal forms out of formerly analytic constructions in several dialects.

One should note that the terms 'preterit' and 'perfect', though functionally motivated, should be taken loosely and are in principle morphological categorizations. The 'preterit' (*qtal-le* 'He killed') in NENA dialects, for instance, can express retrospective and resultative aspect, sometimes even proximative (Noorlander 2017), apart from the recent or perfective past in indicative clauses. Compound 'perfects' based on the resultative participle (*qtila* 'killed') in turn can also express perfective past events in narrative discourse and can be used interchangeably with 'preterit' forms (e.g. in Christian Barwar, Khan 2008a:669-672).

There are four main realis perfect constructions in NENA:

- the 'perfective' (qțil-form) itself;
- preverbal TAM-marking added to the 'perfective' (qtil-form);
- distinct subject and/or agent coding in the 'perfective' (qțil-form).
- compound perfect based on the resultative participle (*qțila*) and a 'copula'.

As we will see, the coding of the agent and/or subject is not symmetric across the 'preterits' and 'perfects' in all dialects. Dialects may even mix these constructions across intransitives and transitives. It is an important distinction whether dialects prefer preverbal TAM-marking or TAM-marking via distinct sets of dependent person forms or both.

In all of the so-called 'dynamic-stative varieties', it is the transitive realis perfect that stands out and displays the greatest diversity, since the difference in subject coding for the intransitive-resultative (e.g. qim- $\emptyset$ ) creates a gap for the transitive counterpart:

(1)

PRETERIT (DYNAMIC)REALIS PERFECT (STATIVE)TR.qt = l - le 'He killed''He has killed'ITR.qim - le 'He rose' $qim - \emptyset$  'He is/has risen'

Compound vebal forms may interact with the 'perfective' and manifest converging or diverging alignment patterns. Both the compound perfect and the intransitive-resultative based on the 'perfective' penetrate the expression of the realis perfect but differently per dialect. The transitive realis perfect and transitive 'perfective' constructions are presumably morphologically adapted to the 'imperfective'. The morphosyntactic pattern of the 'imperfective' appears to be favored in transitive constructions overall and incidentally even triggers morphological adaptation.

## 5.1. Verb-Related Splits in Simple Verbal Forms

The preceding discussion mainly concentrated on argument-related properties in alignment splits. Morphosyntactic alignment also interacts with several verb-related properties which could be subsumed under semantic transitivity in NENA dialects (Khan 2004a:295-305, 2007a). We will concentrate on the two sets of person indexes that are suffixed to the 'perfective' inflectional base (*qțil*-). Although the majority of dialects make no distinction between S (e.g. *qim-la* 'She rose') and A (e.g. *qțal-la* 'She killed'), the marking of the S in the 'perfective' shows considerable diversity in a minority of dialects.

Lexical semantics is not a necessary determinant for transitive coding but they do evince some effects. As schematized in (2) below, agent-like coding (i.e. the L-set) will tend to cluster around the semantic properties on the right edge and hallmark an increase in the salience of the effect, sometimes increased agentivity, and perfective, punctual and dynamic event properties (cf. Khan 2004a:304-305). Patient-like coding (i.e. the E-set), as in inchoative or antipassive constructions, tends to cluster around the left edge and trigger a decrease in the salience of the effect correlating with a non-punctual, result stateoriented type of situation. In addition, when the patient is expressed as oblique (i.e. prepositional), it will tend to be less affected than when it is coded like the P (i.e. the E-set).

250

	E-suffix (⊇)		(⊆) L-suffix
	INTRANSITIVE		TRANSITIVE
	S argument		A argument
	patient-like		agent-like
Animacy	inanimate	8	nimate, human
Agentivity	uncontrolled		controlled
TAM scale	stative > resultative > perfect > perfective past		
Dynamism	stative		dynamic
Punctuality	non-punctual		punctual

#### (2) Intransitive vs. transitive subject indexes

It should be noted that, regardless of semantics, agent coding may also occasionally be extended to intransitive verbs when they co-occur with a transitive verb. The L-suffixes that mark the agent of a transitive verb are attracted to an immediately preceding intransitive verb. Normally, the intransitive verb *zyl* 'go' is inflected through E-suffixes but in (3) below it takes an L-suffix to index the subject argument due to the following transitive verb:

 (3) *?ay-zíl-wa-la mír-wa-la baqa Mərza Xănăká* she-go<sub>PFV</sub>-PST-S:3FS say<sub>PFV</sub>-PST-A:3FS DAT PRN PRN
 'She went (and) said to Mərza Xănăka.' (J. Sanandaj, W Iran; Khan 2009: 375)

All in all, it will be shown that the distinction in subject-marking does not evince a neat split between agentive and patientive verbs. It is the more agent-like marking of subjects that seems to be less predictable. This does not mean that agentive features such as control are completely irrelevant (cf. Khan 2004a:304). Verbs that are oriented towards a state (stative) or endpoint (telic) as well as a subject that lacks or has little control/agentivity favor patient-like marking. One purely morphological exception is the existential, respectively, copula verb *hwy* 'be'. The stronger implication of a patient-like effect increases the agent-like subject coding (Khan 2004a:304-305, 2007a), yet, as we will see, this does not always apply.

# 5.1.1. Split Subject and Agent-Marking in South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish Varieties

Intransitive verbs may take P-like coding  $(S_P)$  or A-like coding  $(S_A)$ . There is no clear-cut distribution but semantic factors pertaining to agentivity, affectedness and lexical aspect do play a role. We shall first discuss several lexical verb classes and finally proceed to other relevant factors in more detail following Khan (2004a:295-305).

South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish dialects show ergative alignment in the 'perfective'. The marking of the S is not uniform, however, and where the S is differentiated, this is not entirely arbitrary and semantic and morphological transitivity play a role. While most intransitive verbs ergatively align the S with the P (henceforeth  $S_P$ ), there are a few classes of intransitive verbs that accusatively align the S with the A (henceforth  $S_A$ ) as illustrated in (4) below. Compare *?by* 'swell' and *nwx* 'bark' in J. Sulemaniyya:

(4) Split subject-marking (J. Sulemaniyya; Khan 2004a:298-300)

a.	(S <sub>P</sub> patient-like intransitive)	
	zbot-í ?əby- <b>a</b>	'My finger swelled.' (E-set)
b.	(S <sub>A</sub> agent-like intransitive	e)
	kalbá nwəx- <b>le</b>	'The dog barked.' (L-set)

Fluid subject-marking may also occur. One single verb may occur in either  $S_A$  or  $S_P$  forms, e.g. *nqəs-la* 'She pricked' and *nqis-a* 'It<sub>F</sub> pricked' (Khan 2009:304; see further below). Although intransitive verbs mainly belong to stem I, other stems may also be intransitive, e.g. *gəndər-*Ø 'It<sub>M</sub> rolled' vs. *zərzər-re* '(The horse) neighed' (Khan 2004a:300).

Khan (2004a:295-305)<sup>155</sup> argues that the transitive semantics and/or morphosyntax of the clause specifies the selection of L-suffixes for the marking of the s which would otherwise be marked differently. Khan (2004a:304-305, 2007a:152-153) concludes that the following major factors condition this:

1. The action has an affectee that is expressed by an object.

2. The subject of the clause possesses the properties of an agent, such as being the controller and instigator of the action.

3. The verb has punctual Aktionsart.

4. The predicate is dynamic, expressing action rather than non-action.

<sup>155</sup> Cf. Khan (2007a:148-152, 2008b:73-75, 2009:302-308).

As already mentioned in §4.3.3, verbs conveying a telic, punctual and dynamic event such as *?xl* 'eat' and *pqy* 'shoot' may omit the patient, while the coding of the agent remains the same. The patient *tfanga* for example may be omitted in (5b):

(5)	J. Suleman	<b>niyya</b> (NE Iraq; Khan 2	004a:297, 301)
	[P]	[V-A]	
a.	tfanga	pqe-le	(patient specified)
	rifle:FS	shootpfv-A:3MS	
	'He shot a	gun.'	
	[V-S <sub>A</sub> ]		
b.	pqe-le		(patient unspecified)
	shoot <sub>PFV</sub> -S:3	MS	
	'He shot.'		

The coding of the agent may also be omitted for the same verbs, so that the agent is left unspecified:

	[P] 🔶	[V-P-A]	
c.	tfangăké	pəqy-a-le	(specified agent)
	rifle:FS:DEF	shootpfv-p:3fs-a:3ms	
	'He fired th	ne rifle.'	
	[S] 🔶	$[V-S_P]$	
d.	tfangăké	рәду-а	
	rifle:FS:DEF	shoot <sub>PFV</sub> -S:3FS	
	'The rifle w	vas fired (by sb.).'	(agent unspecified)
	'The rifle ex	xploded.'	

Apart from Khan's first factor, one might conclude from Khan's factors that agent-like intransitives ( $S_A$ ) are treated like such patient omission constructions.

The classes of verbs that typically instantiate  $S_A$  or  $S_P$  are summarized in Table 35 (on the next page). Examples are all taken from the Jewish dialect of Sulemanniyya (Khan 2004a) that are representative for all such varieties that exhibit ergative inflection in the 'perfective'. The shades of meaning in between are more variable. The top row verb class comprising verbs denoting a patient-oriented state or (dis)position such as *zəde-Ø* 'be afraid' and the bottom row comprising an agent-oriented activity such as *ţSəl-le* 'play'. These represent the

two types of intransitive constructions that are considered the maximal opposites of one another.

VERB CLASS	CODING	EXAMPLES
state, (dis)position	E-set	<i>nəxip-</i> Ø 'be ashamed', <i>zəde-</i> Ø 'be
		afraid', <i>piš</i> -Ø 'remain'
change of state, (dis)position		kəpin-Ø 'become hungry', səmiq-Ø
		'become red', <i>tiw-</i> Ø 'sit'
uncontrolled process		<i>pil-</i> Ø 'fall', <i>mil-</i> Ø 'die', <i>šəre-</i> Ø 'slip',
		<i>pəqe-</i> Ø 'explode'
controlled activity		rəqil-Øʻdance', məṭe-Øʻarrive', lip-
		Ø 'learn', <i>pəriq-</i> Ø 'finish'
reflexive: 'washing'		səxe-Ø 'wash, bathe', xəpe-Ø 'id.'
reflexive: 'grooming', 'putting		<i>lwəš-le</i> 'dress', <i>šləx-le</i> 'undress',
on/off'		<i>gre-le</i> 'shave'
sound emission, incl. bodily reac-		<i>nwəx-le</i> 'bark', <i>tpəl-le</i> 'sneeze',
tions, animal sounds		<i>gərgəm-le</i> 'thunder'
copula, existence ( <i>hwy</i> )		<i>ye-le</i> 'be'
patient omission, mainly typically		<i>xəl-le</i> 'eat', <i>šte-le</i> 'drink', <i>țุîəl-le</i>
human activities	L-set	ʻplay', <i>ḥqe-le</i> 'speak'

Table 35. Patient-like or agent-like marking of the S in J. Sulemaniyya

Source: Data from Khan 2004a:298-30

The verbs that are most likely to receive patient-like coding (i.e. the E-set) are those that typically denote a situation oriented towards one single participant that registers a transitory state, e.g.  $naxip-\emptyset$  'He was ashamed',  $kanip-\emptyset$  'He became hungry'. Those verbs that are most likely to receive agent-like coding (i.e. the L-set) are those that at least imply a change in a patient-like argument, even though no such patient argument is expressed explicitly. These include transitive verbs of which the patient may be omitted, e.g. xal-le 'He ate', in which the ergative coding of the A is retained. As Khan points out (2009:303):

The use of the transitive inflection for these verbs, therefore, can be explained by the fact that there is an implied 'latent' affectee of the action, although this is not necessarily specified.

The stronger the implication of a patient, the more likely the A-like coding.

Generally, S<sub>A</sub>-marking includes, for example, inherently reflexive verbs related to grooming or putting something onto onself such as (6a) and (6b).

254

(6)	Reflexives (J. Sule	emaniyya; Khan 2004a:258, 296, 300;	; 2007a:150)
a.	lwəš- <b>le</b>	'He dressed himself.'	(reflexive, S <sub>A</sub> )
b.	kse- <b>le</b> ba-bațaní.	'He covered himself with a blanket.'	(reflexive, S <sub>A</sub> )

Unlike other reflexive constructions, these verbs are not constructed together with a reflexive pronoun with additional person indexing through 'possessive' suffixes, e.g.

c.	noš-aw	məndy- <b>a</b> -la	tex.	(reflexive object pronoun)
	rfl-3fs	throwpfv-P:3fS-A:3fS	down	
	'She thre	ew <b>herself</b> down.'		

There are reasons to treat (6a) and (6b) as a type of patient omission<sup>156</sup>. Firstly, the patient can also be made explicit, e.g. *jal-éf lawš-i-le* 'He put on **his clothes**', *taqn-éf gary-a-le* 'He shaved **his beard**' (J. Sanandaj; Khan 2009:303). Moreover, these verbs can also be inflected in a patient-like fashion in an agentless construction:

d.	lwiš- <b>Ø</b>	'He was dressed (by sb. else).'	(agentless, S <sub>P</sub> )
e.	kəse- <b>Ø</b>	'He was covered (by sb. else).'	(agentless, S <sub>P</sub> )

The causative counterpart of these verbs also follows the pattern of patientless constructions. The causative of J. Sulemaniyya *lwaš-le* 'He got dressed', for instance, is stem III *malbaš-le* 'He dressed sb.' (Khan 2004a:586) like patientless constructions such as *xal-le* 'He ate' corresponding with stem III *mxal-le* 'He fed sb.' (Khan 2004a:588). All of this suggests that they are, in fact, hardly distinct from patientless constructions where the patient is not expressed but clearly implied. An important difference, however, is that the agent of reflexive verbs is much more so affected than other verbs that have an implicit patient. One could view the explicit patient as a supplementary extension of a self-oriented action where the primary affectee is still most agent-like. That is, clauses like *jal-éf lawš-i-le* 'He put on his clothes' literally mean 'He dressed (in) clothes'. In the derived causatives of this verb, the additional object is also semantically secondary but more theme-like, e.g. *jullé labl-i-wa julle malbiš-i-wa-le* 'They took

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>156</sup> For a different view, see Coghill (2016:71-73) who considers this a type of fluid subject-marking.

his clothes and dressed him **in clothes**' (Khan 2004a:566.13), lit. 'they used to dress him clothes'. It would, therefore, be interesting to investigate whether the agentless forms *lwiš-Ø* 'He was dressed (by somebody else)' could also combine with such a secondary object, i.e. *lwiš-Ø jullé* 'He was dressed (in) clothes (by somebody else)'.

This notwithstanding, there are other intransitive constructions that are understood as reflexive but their subjects do not align with the A. These are notably *sxy* and *xpy* conveying 'wash (oneself)', for example:

f.	bronăké xip-Ø- <b>la</b>	'She washed the child.'	(transitive, A = L-set)
g.	хір- <b>а</b>	'She washed, bathed.'	(reflexive, s = E-set)

Thus, a verbal form like *xip-a* would not denote an agentless intransitive event like 'She was washed (by sb. else)' and no other affected participant is implied than the subject. There is presumably a less strong implication of a patient for verbs like *xpy* 'wash' than verbs like *lwš* 'dress'. They do not take a secondary object like *lwš* 'dress' and the patient of 'wash' is the sole, primary affectee.

Semelfactive verbs in turn, including animate and inanimate sound emissions and less controllable bodily reactions such as *phr* 'yawn', *šhl* 'cough' and so forth are well-known in typological literature to share features with primary transitive verbs (Lazard 1998:136-139; cf. Sorace 2000:877). They are not equivalent in all dialects (see further below). In J. Sulemaniyya, all such intransitives verbs are inflected like the A:

(7) Semelfactives (J. Sulemaniyya; Khan 2004a:300, 2007a:151; transcription adapted)<sup>157</sup>

a.	kalbá nw	'әх- <b>le</b>	'The dog barked.'
	<b>a</b> (	-	

b. ?ewá gərgəm- <b>le</b>	'The cloud thundered.'
---------------------------	------------------------

Lazard (1998:139) suggests that such verbs tend to take  $S_A$  coding, because they imply a single, instant, manifestation impressing on a perceiver via the senses (see §2.3.1). This is morphosyntactically realized in an implicit P that that triggers  $S_A$  coding. Indeed, such verbs may take a cognate object in NENA, for example:

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>157</sup> These verbs correspond with Central Kurdish (Sulemani) phrasal transitives composed of *kirdin* 'do' and an indefinite noun phrase (Khan 2007b).

(tapoltá) tpəl-**le** 'He sneezed (a sneeze).' C.

In what follows, we will examine more sophisticated distinctions on the basis of the following factors that correlate with S<sub>A</sub> or S<sub>P</sub> coding:

- agentivity or animacy; •
- affectedness; •
- aspectual factors; •
- morphological factors.

#### Agentivity or Animacy 5.1.1.1.

Other dialects in NW Iran will differentiate between semelfactives on the basis of agentivity. The subject's agentive properties, Khan's second factor, come into play here. In J. Qarah Hasan, for instance, (8a) 'bark' as an animal noise verb is distinct from (8b) 'sneeze' as a bodily action in which the latter is presumably viewed as an uncontrolled process (like *pil-\phi* 'fall') instead. The subject of *tpl* 'sneeze' in (8b) is more patient-like than the subject of *nwx* 'bark' in (8a) through lack of control.

(8)	J. Qarah Hasan (W Iran; Khan 2009:306)
-----	--

a.	nox-le	'It <sub>M</sub> barked.'	(S <sub>A</sub> , controlled)
b.	tpil-Ø	'He sneezed.'	(S <sub>P</sub> , uncontrolled)

Such instantaneous bodily reactions are known to lead to ambiguity in the degree of control of the s (Khan 2009:305; cf. Sorace 2000:877). It would be interesting to know, however, whether the verb in (8b) could take a cognate object or not. If not, this could also explain why the S is not marked like the A.

In the related dialect J. Sanandaj, animacy plays a role. If the subject is inanimate, the verb is categorized as intransitive and takes E-suffixes, compare:

(9) **J. Sanandaj** (W Iran; Khan 2009:294, 304-306)

	[S]	[V-S <sub>A</sub> ]	
a.	xmara	sre-le	(S <sub>A</sub> , animate)
	donkey:мs	bray <sub>PFV</sub> -3 <sub>MS</sub>	
	'The donke	y brayed.'	
	[S]	[V-S <sub>P</sub> ]	
b.	?ewá	gərgám-Ø	(S <sub>P</sub> , inanimate)
	cloud:мs	thunder <sub>PFV</sub> -3MS	
	'The cloud	thundered.'	

The inanimate subject *?ewá* 'cloud' of *grgm* 'thunder' in (10b) is inherently more patient-like than the animate subject *xmara* 'donkey' in (10b). Again, the animal noise verb is  $S_A$ . Note that the inanimate subject in (10b) is not necessarily less instigating than the A, so that the choice of between the  $S_P$  and  $S_A$  from depends on animacy in J. Sanandaj and not instigation/agentivity.

This also seems to hold for bivalent verbs that combine with prepositional complements and generally involve an aimer and a target as participants. Compare the alternation for the verb *nqs* 'prick' in (11) below. The subject is either animate or inanimate. When the subject is inanimate, the verb receives S<sub>P</sub> coding (E-suffixes), if it is human and instigating, it receives S<sub>A</sub> coding (L-suffixes) (Khan 2009:304). This is a fluid type of subject-marking conditioned by agentivity.

# (10) Animate (A-like) vs. inanimate (P-like) s (J. Sanandaj; Khan 2009:304, 543)

	,				
	[S]	[V-S]	[OBL]		
a.	baxtăké	nqəs- <b>la</b>	ga-?il-í	(S <sub>A</sub> , human)	)
	woman:FS:DEF	prick <sub>PFV</sub> -3FS	at-hand-my		
	'The woman p	ricked (lit. at	:) my hand.'		
b.	xmatá	nqis <b>-a</b>	ga-?il-í	(S <sub>P</sub> , non-human)	)
	needle:FS:DEF	prick <sub>PFV</sub> -3FS	at-hand-my		
	'The needle pri	icked (lit. at)	my hand.'		
b.	'The woman pr xmatá needle:FS:DEF 'The needle pri	ricked (lit. at nqis- <b>a</b> prick <sub>PFV</sub> -3FS icked (lit. at)	c) my hand.' ga-?il-í at-hand-my my hand.'	(S <sub>P</sub> , non-huma	n]

Animacy and agentivity also correlate. Khan (2009:304) notes that verb *ylp* 'learn' may also manifest this alternation depending on control. The A-like coding entails that the human subject learnt something through deliberate effort (controlled) and P-like coding entails that the human subject was taught something (uncontrolled).

# (11) Controlled (A-like) vs. uncontrolled (P-like) (J. Sanandaj; Khan 2009:304, 543)

a.	?ó	rába	məndixané	yləp- <b>le</b>	(controlled, more A-like)
	he	many	thing:PL	learnpfy-3MS	
	'He	learnt	many things	(by himself).'	
b.	?ó	rába	məndixané	yálip <b>-Ø</b>	(uncontrolled, more P-like)
	he	many	thing:PL	learnpfy-3MS	
	'He	learnt	many things	(when taught by	y somebody else).'

Nevertheless, one should note that the cross-linguistically, most typically agent-like intransitive verbs are controlled activities such as 'dance' (Croft 1998:52-53; see §2.3.1.). It is striking, then, that the most agent-like intransitive subject is treated like the P in Jewish Sulemaniyya, e.g.  $raqil-\phi$  'He danced'. This is a noteworthy exception to Khan's second factor (agentivity). Khan (2007a:150) points out that such verbs lack an implicit patient and do not have a labile counterpart with a transitive valence pattern. Clearly, however, such verbs could potentially take an object (cp. English *We danced the tango*) and some of them do, for example, *ylp* 'learn'. The agent-like experiencer is coded like the A in the transitive valence pattern but like the P in the intransitive counterpart:

(12)	2) J. Sulemaniyya (NE Iraq; Khan 2004a:301, 2007a:					
a.	torá lip-le	'He learnt Torah.'	(A = L-set)			
b.	lip- <b>Ø</b>	'He learnt.'	(s = E-set)			

As we will see further below, Khan (2007a:150) explains such exceptions in J. Sulemaniyya on the basis of aspect.

# 5.1.1.2. Degree of Affectedness

The coding of the patient (Khan's first factor) interacts with transitive semantic factors. The choice of intransitive or transitive coding and the degree of effectiveness on the part of the agent is generally connected with the greater degree of affectedness on the part of the patient (cf. Tsunoda 1981, 1985, see §2.3.3).The alternation between (13a) and (13b) depends mainly on whether the patient is more definitively affected or not (cf. Tsunoda 1985). In (13a), the less affected patient is encoded as oblique through the preposition *ba*-. The patient *yalaké* is only partially affected and the verb literally conveys 'became attached to' (Khan 2004a:304). The direct counterpart to this is (13b). The patient is completely affected, and this is expressed in the primary transitive morphosyntax.

(13) **OBL opposed to P** (J. Sulemaniyya; Khan 2004a:304)

a. *hanga dwiq-a bă-yalaké* (OBL, less affected) 'The bee stung the child.'

[P] [V-P-A]

b. *yalăké dwəq-*Ø-**la** (P, more affected) 'She seized the child.'

### 5.1.1.3. Aspectual Factors

Thus far we have observed splits based upon verbal classes and properties of arguments (Khan's first and second factor). Variation in S-marking is also partly conditioned by properties of the situation or event as a whole, i.e. aspect (Khan's third and fourth factor). This concerns punctuality and dynamism. In (14) below, for instance, the difference in punctuality plays a role, and in (15), the degree of dynamism (Khan 2008b:73-74).

(14)	Punctual (A-like)	vs. durative (P-like) (J. Sulemaniyya;	Khan 2004a:305)
a.	torá lip-le	'He learnt Torah.'	(A, punctual)
b.	ga-maktáb lip- <b>Ø</b>	'He learnt at school.'	(S <sub>P</sub> , non-punctual)

Khan (2004a:301) explains that patient-like form of *ylp* 'learn' in (14b) refers to a "more diffuse, durative activity, spread over a long period of time, although presented perfectively as a unitary whole". Hence, the choice of patient-like over agent-like coding depends on durativity.

The difference between *prq* 'finish' and *bdy* 'begin' in (15) interacts with action-dynamics (Khan 2004a:304). *prq* 'finish' in (15b) expresses the cessation (endpoint) of an activity resulting in an enduring state of completion (i.e. durative and stative) and, hence, aligns with the P. *bdy* 'begin' entails the initiation of an event with a greater degree of dynamism and, hence, aligns with the A.

(15)	Active-dynamic (A-like) vs. stative (P-like) (J. Sulemaniyya; Khan					
	2004a:301)					
a.	haštá (m)pərq-a-le	'He finished the work.'	(stem II transitive)			
b.	pəriq- <b>Ø</b> m-xalá	'He finished eating.'	(S <sub>P</sub> , more stative)			
c.	bde <b>-le</b> b-xalá	'He started eating.'	(S <sub>A</sub> , more dynamic)			

The S<sub>P</sub> construction, therefore, seems to be favored for durative and stative situations (in accordance with Hopper and Thompson's transitive semantics, see §2.3.3). We could schematize this as follows:

### (16) Lexical aspect

LESS TRANSITIVE	MORE TRANSITIVE
durative	punctual
stative	dynamic
E-set (⊇ S)	L-set (⊇A)

260

Nevertheless, one should note that many dynamic verbs such as  $paqe-\emptyset$  'explode' (also punctual) and  $rqil-\emptyset$  'dance' are not  $S_A$  verbs.

## 5.1.1.4. Morphological Factors

Purely morphological factors can also be imporant determinants. As expected, the absence or presence of object coding can result in A-like coding. Firstly, there are intransitive verbs that exhibit dummy, non-referential 3fs. object coding compare (17a-b) below. Lazard (1998:137) calls this an anti-impersonal construction. The referentiality of the P is reduced but some third person morphology is maintained (see §2.3.1). A-like subject coding is used, because the E-suffixes are reserved for the non-referential P. Hence, a verb like *gxk* 'laugh' in (17a) is generally treated differently from *bxy* 'cry'. One single lexeme *?rq* in (17b) can express a semantic distinction between 'flee' and 'run' that is reflected in the type of inflection<sup>158</sup>. The verb *gxk* 'laugh' can also occur without transitive coding to express an incidentical occurrence of laughter (Khan 2009:308).

(17)	Verbs with	non-referential	3fs. ob	oject (J. Sa	anandaj; Khan 2009:307-308)
a.	gəxk <b>-a-le</b>	'He laughed'	VS.	bəxe- <b>Ø</b>	'He wept'
b.	?ərq <b>-a-le</b>	'He fled'	VS.	riq- <b>Ø</b>	'He ran'

When such verbs take a prepositional complement, the coding remains A-like, e.g. *gəxkale gai* 'He laughed at me' (Khan 2009:515). Dialects may differ in this respect. Compare *pşx* 'rejoice' in Jewish Saqqiz and Sanandaj:

c.	J. Saqqiz	J. Sanandaj		
	(Israeli 1998:118)	(Khan 2009:52	23)	
	pəṣx- <b>a-le</b>	pəşix- <b>Ø</b>	'He rejoices'	

The same verb *psx* 'rejoice' takes A-like subject coding and combines with a prepositional complement in Jewish Sulemaniyya:

(18) J. Sulemaniyya (NE Iraq; Khan 2004a:582)
 [V+S=A] [OBL]
 pşəx-le ba?éu 'He was happy with him'

<sup>158</sup> Semantically, verbs that exhibit a dummy object typically belong to the middle voice (cf. Mengozzi 2005).

VERB-RELATED SPLITS IN SIMPLE VERBAL FORMS

The verb *hwy* 'be' takes A-like subject coding in all these dialects, e.g. *ye-le* 'He was'. This is most likely morphologically motivated. The L-suffixes are presumably a means to express the past. A paradigm based on the E-series would have been morphologically identical to the present copula forms. Compare the forms for J. Sulemaniyya (Khan 2004a) below:

(19)		PAST		PRESEN	T
	=ye- <b>le</b>	'He was'	<i>=ye-</i> ØʻI	He is'	
	=ye- <b>la</b>	'She was'	= <i>y</i> - <i>a</i>	'She is'	
	=ye- <b>lan</b>	'We were'	=y-ex	'We are'	etc.

#### 5.1.1.5. Complex Predicates

Complex predicates or light verb constructions where the verb takes a dummy full NP also occur, most of which are replicated either in material or pattern from Persian and/or Kurdish combining with *?wl* 'do' or  $x \phi r$  'become' (e.g. Khan 2009:153), e.g. *?ila wi-le* 'He began', lit. 'He hand-did'. The verb itself determines the S<sub>A</sub> or S<sub>P</sub> coding. The construction may also be applied to non-Iranian material, e.g. *milá xir-* $\phi$  'He was circumcised', lit. 'He became circumcision' (Khan 2009:586). They can also combine with additional referential object coding, e.g. *tahdíd wil-a-le* 'He threatened **her**', lit. 'He threaten-did her' (Khan 2009:109).

#### 5.1.2. Dynamic-Stative Subject-Marking

While aspectual factors play a role in the fluid subject marking in the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties, this is more grammaticalized in the activestative alignment that occurs, among others, in dialects that are otherwise described as neutral. The marking of the S in the 'perfective' is fluid between patient-like and agent-like coding depending on aspect. Doron and Khan (2012) refer to these dialects as 'dynamic-stative'. Although I follow their terminology in this monograph, the aspectual opposition is primarily between perfective against resultative or retrospective aspect.

Among the Trans-Zab Jewish dialects, we noted that the southeastern Trans-Zab subgroup including Sulemaniyya (NE Iraq) and Sanandaj (W Iran) patterns ergatively. Active-stative fluid subject-marking is found further to the northwest in Iraqi Kurdistan and Iranian Azerbaijan. They minimally group together S and A through the L-set (*dmax-lan* 'We slept' : *nšaq-lan* 'We kissed'), but they differentiate between E-suffixes and L-suffixes to mark the subject depending on aspect, as illustrated below.

- (20) Fluid s-marking conditioned by TAM
   J. Urmi (NW Iran; Garbell 1965; Khan 2008b)
   a. (perfective aligns with the A)
- *dmax-le* 'He went to sleep.'
- b. (resultative aligns with the P) *\*dmix-\$\vec{\mathcal{Q}}\$* 'He is askep, has gone to skep.'

The patient-like inflection (i.e. E-set) for the S serves to denote an observed state resulting from a prior event. This can generally encompass stative, resultative, or retrospective (i.e. perfect) aspect, all of which are properly subsumed under the imperfective aspect focusing on a continuous result state against the perfective past representing the event completed in the past as a whole. This covariation is a fluid type of subject-marking where the  $S_A$  form (i.e. L-set) expresses the perfective past (i.e. wholly completed dynamic event) and the  $S_P$  form (E-set) the perfect or resultative (i.e. an enduring result state). The result-oriented  $S_P$  form (E-set) interacts with a fundamental distinction between transitive and intransitive realis perfect constructions. As a realis perfect, it is generally confined to the expression of result states of which its continuation in the actual present is inferred from direct perceptible evidence. In expressing the transitive counterpart, the 'dynamic-stative dialects' must have recourse to other means of coding.

The aspectual nuances and temporal context of the 'perfective' construction ( $S_A$  form) itself can be extended to the durative present in NENA dialects in general. In Christian Barwar, for example, it not only expresses the perfective past, but also a continuous result state in the present (cf. Maclean 1895:143-144, §54), such as *hadiya di-li ?ana* 'Now I know' (Khan 2008a:615), which can also have ingressive nuances, such as *kpin-ne* (< *\*kpin-le*) 'He has become hungry' (ibid.), or proximative *miθ-le* 'He is about to die' (Noorlander 2017). Several dialects, however, have grammaticalized this distinction through preverbal TAM-markers that indicate the realis perfect. These are, for example, the particles *?ale* in J. Barzani and *lā* in J. Arbel and J. Rwanduz<sup>159</sup>:

#### (21) Consistent subject-marking but distinctive TAM preverb

J. Barzani J. Arbel

(N Iraq; Mutzafi 2002a) (NE Iraq; Khan 1999)

 $^{159}$  This is presumably a fossilized 3fs. form of the copula 'It\_F is' (Khan 2007d).

a.	(Ø)	he-le	(Ø)	?ilye-le	'He came.'	(preterit)
b.	?ale	he-le	lā	?ilye-le	'He has come.'	(perfect)

Preverbal TAM-marking added to the 'perfective' is also found in Christian dialects, namely C. Sanandaj (Panoussi 1990, transcription modified):

(22)	(Ø)-?ise-le	'He came'	(preterit)
	gi-?ise-le	'He has come'	(perfect)

There is, therefore, either a tense-aspectual distinction between perfect or preterit by the choice of a preverbal actualizing TAM-marker (J. Arbel  $l\bar{a}$  *qim-le* 'He has risen' vs. ( $\phi$ ) *qim-le* 'He rose') or by the choice of person agreement markers (J. Urmi *qim-\phi* 'He has risen' vs. *qim-le* 'He rose').

Jewish Rustaqa, a dialect located near to Rwanduz and bordering Arbel and Urmi, combines these two strategies. The same particle generally and redundantly accompanies the patient-like form (*qim*- $\emptyset$  'He is risen') in a fluid type of S-marking. The actualizer *lā* together with E-suffixes to mark the subject (*lā qim*- $\emptyset$  'He is risen') shifts the event viewpoint to a state resulting from prior action (Khan 2002b:404) against the agent-like form, as compared below. There appears to be no semantic difference between the presence or absence of the actualizer *lā*; it always combines with the S<sub>P</sub> form.

# (23) Fluid s-marking and distinctive TAM preverb

**J. Rustaqa** (NE Iraq; Khan 2002b:404)

a.	(Ø)	dye-le	'He came	(but might	not be here).'	(dynamic)
----	-----	--------	----------	------------	----------------	-----------

b.  $l\bar{a}$  dye- $\emptyset$  'He has come and is here now.' (stative)

Finally, fluid subject-marking is not peculiar to Trans-Zab Jewish dialects or recently documented dialects. Mengozzi (2002b:38-39; 2005:249-250) notes that the usage of E-suffixes to mark the subject co-existed alongside L-suffixes in the earlieast Christian NENA textual witnesses in North Iraq (17<sup>th</sup> century), e.g.

(24)	su-li	'I became old'	(perfective, s = L-set)
	siw-en	'I have become old'	(resultative, s = E-set)

264

In a few other dialects, there are traces of earlier tense-aspect-sensitivity<sup>160</sup>. In J. Bétanure, for instance, only the intransitive verb *pyš* 'remain' retains an s<sub>P</sub> form expressing a perfect, e.g. *šop-əd kepe lá-piš* 'No trace of stone has remained' (Mutzafi 2008a: 68). The same formation of the verb *?zl* 'go' (*zil-a* 'She is gone') has grammaticalized into a proximative auxiliary 'be about to' in the Christian dialects of the Mosul plain from its resultative sense 'be gone to' (Borghero 2008:85; Coghill 2010:375; cf. Rhétoré 1912:156). In Jewish Barzani (Mutzafi 2002a), s<sub>P</sub> forms are found for the modal auxiliary *mşy* 'be able', e.g. *mşil-ən* ~ *ḥmil-ən* 'I<sub>M</sub> would be able' vs. *mşe-li* 'I was able' (preterit). The earliest NENA texts also retain examples of this type, e.g. *?əθy-a sā?əd* 'The hour has come' (Sabar 1976: fn. 56), *la snīq-*Ø 'It isn't needed' (Sabar 2002:242a).

Among the more recently documented Christian dialects, fluid subjectmarking is still productively found in the western periphery such as C. Hertevin (SE Turkey; Jastrow 1988):

(25)	dmeḥ-li	'I fell asleep'	(perfective, s = L-set)
	dmiḥ-en	'I have fallen asleep'	(resultative, s = E-set)

In terms of grammatical aspect, then, the E-suffixes that mark the S are further removed from the perfective past than the L-suffixes that mark the A on the TAM scale in (26), where L-set becomes less likely and E-set more likely from right to left.

(26)	<b>Tense-Aspect-Mood</b>	l sc	ale		
	IMPERFECTIVE				PERFECTIVE
	resultative-stative	>	perfect	>	preterit
	←				
				-►	L-set (⊇A)
	E-set (⊇s)				

The patient-like E-set (minimally for the s), therefore, if it exists in a NENA variety, will not be more grammaticalized to the right than the agent-like L-set (minimally for the A) on this scale. This aspectual scale applies particularly to stem I verbs to which most intransitive verbs belong. The L-suffixes are subject indexes with an inherent proclivity towards a perfective, punctual and dynamic

```
<sup>160</sup> Cf. also J. Koy Sanjaq in §5.3.3.
```

tense-aspectual profile (Khan 2004a:304-305). Diachronically, then, the qțil-form with E-suffixes is generally less grammaticalized in NENA dialects along the path from resultative to perfective past, while the qțil-form with L-suffixes has fully grammaticalized and sporadically still betrays traces of its original resultative-stative source.

# 5.1.3. TAM-Sensitive Alignment Splits

The inflection of the 'perfective' (*qțil*-) constitute the basis of both perfective past (preterit) and resultative or realis perfect constructions in several NENA dialects. The preterit and realis perfect as such may express the following different types of alignment:

- accusative perfect against neutral preterit;
- ergative and tripartite perfect against accusative preterit.

# 5.1.3.1. Accusative-Neutral Split

The previous subsection concerned a distinction in the marking of the s. Intransitive verbs can occur in a patient-like subject form to denote the realis perfect (E-set) and an agent-like subject form to denote the preterit (L-set). This is is also found for transitive verbs in the dialect of Bohtan (SE Turkey; Fox 2009). In Bohtan, spoken by Christians, the E-set is used to mark the realis perfect for intransitive verbs as in other Christian varieties such as Hertevin (SE Turkey; Jastrow 1988), for example:

(27)	C. Bohtar	<b>1</b> (SE Turkey; Fox 2002:72	2, 73.3, 2009)
a.	qəm-li	'I got up, rose.'	(preterit, action-focus s = L-set)
b.	qim-ən	'I <sub>M</sub> am up, have risen.'	(perfect, result-focus s = E-set)

This dialect, however, is unique in that the 'perfective' not only inflects for different subject indexes but also different agent indexes. The E-set not only combines with the *qțil*-base to mark the S but also the A in the realis perfect, as exemplified below.

c. *ġze-***Ø***-wa xa xalma* '**He** had seen a dream.' (perfect, **A** = **E-set**)

The object indexes belong to the L-set:

	d.	ġz- <b>ən</b> -na (< -ən + -la)	<b>'I</b> <sub>M</sub> have seen her.'	(perf., <b>A = E-set</b> , P = L-set)
--	----	---------------------------------	--	---------------------------------------

e. *mutw-ax-la* 'We have put them.' (perf., A = E-set, P = L-set)

The tense-aspect-conditioned inflection of the 'perfective' (qtil-) affects S and A alike. The L-set consistently encodes the P. The L-set marks both the S and A only in the perfective past (qam-li 'I rose' :  $\dot{gz}\acute{eli}$ -li-la 'I saw her') where the E-set marks both the S and A in the realis perfect (qim-en 'I<sub>M</sub> have risen' :  $\dot{gz}$ -an-na 'I<sub>M</sub> saw her'). In light of this, the realis perfect inflection of qtil- can be considered both semantically and morphosyntactically closer to the imperfective in expressing a state which continues relative to the temporal reference point. Indeed, the perfect and the 'imperfective' (qatal-) share completely the same morphosyntax in C. Bohtan. This constitutes a tense-aspect-conditioned split between accusative and neutral within one morphological subsystem. It is the marking of the S as well as A that differs but the patient-marking is stable throughout. The two subsystems are represent in (28) and (29) below.

#### (28) Preterit: Neutral

a.	(intransitive)	
	qəm- <b>li</b>	'I rose.'
	rise <sub>PFV</sub> -S:1SG	
b.	(transitive)	
	ġzé-li-la	'I saw her
	seepfv-A:1SG-P:3fs	

#### (29) Realis perfect: Accusative

a.	(intransitive)	
	qim-en	'I rose.'
	risepfv-s:1ms	
b.	(transitive)	
	gz- <b>ən-na</b>	'I <sub>M</sub> saw her.'
	seepfv-A:1MS-P:3FS	

Other dialects will express the transitive realis perfect differently, most often on the basis of the preterit, e.g. Jewish Arbel *lā qim-li* 'I have risen' : *lā ġze-li* 'I have seen'.

The alignment is split along the TAM scale between neutral for the perfective past and accusative for the perfect which is closer to the aspectual profile of the 'imperfective' inflection:

#### (30) Tense-Aspect-Mood scale

IMPERFECTIVE		PERFECTIVE
perfect	>	preterit
ACCUSATIVE (E-SET)		NEUTRAL (L-SET)

## 5.1.3.2. Ergative-Accusative Split

The previous subsection mentioned Jewish Rustaqa (NE Iraq; Khan 2002b) among the dialects that exhibit fluid subject-marking conditioned by aspect. We may conclude from the following examples that the resultative also has a transitive counterpart that leads to a complex system of ergative and tripartite alignment similarly to the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish dialects discussed in §4.2.3.

Subject indexes may vary between agent-like and patient-like coding alongside pre-verbal TAM-marking. The TAM marker  $l\bar{a}$  together with the E-series denoting the subject shifts the event viewpoint to a state resulting from prior action (Khan 2002b:404) against the agent-like form, as given below.

(31)	J. Ru	staqa (N	IE Iraq; Khan 2002b:404)	
a.	(Ø)	dye-le	'He came (but might not be here).'	(dynamic, S = L-set)
b.	( <b>l</b> ā)	dye-Ø	'He has come and is here now.'	(stative, s = <b>E-set)</b>

There is no distinction in agent coding between the preterit and perfect.  $l\bar{a}$  expresses the realis perfect for transitive verbs where the L-suffixes mark the agent in Jewish Rustaqa:

(32) J. Rustaqa (NE Iraq; Khan 2002b:404)

a.	(Ø)	qțil-le	'He killed.'	(preterit A = L-set)
b.	(Ø)	qim-le	'He stood up.'	(preterit s = L-set)
c.	lā	qțil <b>-le</b>	'He has killed.'	(perfect A = L-set)
d.	lā	qim- <b>Ø</b>	'He is (risen and now) up.'	(perfect s = E-set)

The choice of subject coding between E-suffixes and L-suffixes would be enough for intransitive verbs but the TAM-marking regularly precedes intransitive verbs just as the transitive counterpart. The only difference is the use of the Eset for subject person marking in the realis perfect.

Jewish Rustaqa, however, is also a person-restricted dialect. In marking the P, the E-set is limited to the 3fs. and 3pl, while non-third person arguments require an independent prepistional object (Khan 2002b:405), for example:

268

(33)	(lā) qțil <b>-ā-</b> le	'He (has) killed <b>her</b> .'
(34)	(lā) qțil-le <b>?ill-i</b>	'He (has) killed <b>me</b> .'

Consequently, we not only have a split between the 'perfective' and 'imperfective' but we also have a split within the 'perfective' that is sensitive to TAM.

There are, thus, two subsystems that each have their own variation in alignment patterns. This is reviewed in (35). The dynamic and perfective aspect exhibits a markedness shift in accusative alignment depending on the type of patient-marking (see §4.2.1). The case-marking system penetrates the agreement system:

(35) Accusative: Preterit (J. Rustaqa, NE Iraq; Khan 2002b)

a.	(intransitive)		
	priq- <b>le</b>		' <b>He</b> finished.'
	finishpfv-S:3MS		
b.	(transitive, 3	8fs. and 3pl	. patient)
	qțil-i- <b>le</b>		' <b>He</b> killed them.'
	killpfv-P:3PL-A:3	MS	
c.	(transitive, r	non-third p	erson or third person patient)
	qțil- <b>le</b>	?ill-ox	' <b>He</b> killed you <sub>MS</sub> .'
	killpfv-A:3MS	овј-2мѕ	

The realis resultative or perfect counterpart evinces an ergative and tripartite pattern depending on the type of patient-marking that is conditioned by person. While the tripartite pattern is available for all persons, the ergative type is limited to the 3fs. and 3pl. This is illustrated in (36) and (37) below. The accusatively and ergatively patterning person forms (i.e. the E-suffixes) are inaccessible to the first and second person. The *?all*-series trigger an accusative or tripartite pattern but are both necessary for non-third person reference. Third person referents may appear in all constructions. What is interesting to note, then, is that ergative alongside tripartite alignment is found in the realis perfect rather than the preterit in this Jewish dialect. The same pattern is found for the preterit in South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties like J. Sulemaniyya (NE Iraq) (see §4.2.3).

(36) Ergative: Realis perfect (J. Rustaqa, NE Iraq; Khan 2002b)

a.	(intransitive)				
	<i>lā</i> actz	priq-i finish <sub>PFV</sub> -s:3PL	<b>'They</b> are finished.'		
b.	(tran	sitive, 3fs. or 3pl.	patient)		
	<i>lā</i> actz	<i>qțil-<b>i</b>-le</i> kill <sub>pfv</sub> -p:3pl-a:3ms	'He has killed <b>them</b> .'		
(37)	Tripa	artite: Realis per	<b>fect</b> (J. Rustaqa, NE Iraq; Khan 2002b)		
a.	(intra	ansitive)			
	<i>lā</i> actz	<i>priq-et</i> finish <sub>PFV</sub> -s:2мs	'You <sub>MS</sub> are finished.'		
b.	(tran	sitive, non-third p	erson or third person patient)		

transitive, non-third person or third person patient)
 *lā* qțil-li ?ill-ox 'I have killed you<sub>MS</sub>.'
 ACTZ killppv-A:1MS OBI-2MS

The alignment is split along the TAM scale between the grouping of S and A for the dynamic focus that generally expresses the perfective past and the distinction between S and A through either ergative or tripartite alignment for the result focus which is closer to the aspectual profile of the 'imperfective' inflection:

#### (38) Tense-Aspect-Mood scale



Thus, Christian Bohtan and Jewish Rustaqa evince another morphosyntactic split within the inflection of *qțil-*, the 'perfective'. The difference seems to be purely morphological. The dialects show two very distinct splits but the cutoff point along the TAM scale is similar. The perfective past is expressed in a neutral fashion in Christian Bohtan where all grammatical functions are marked by the L-set (much like Jewish Urmi), while the realis perfect patterns accusatively exactly like the 'imperfective'. Jewish Rustaqa evinces how the ergative-tripartite person indexing alignment in 'ergative dialects' is confined to the resultative and perfect and exists alongside the perfective past that patterns accusatively like 'accusative dialects' (such as Jewish Arbel).

#### 5.1.4. TAM-Marking through Verbal Person Marking

What appears to be most central to the two major inflectional systems in NENA is the fundamental difference in marking between agent coding (*qțil*-L vs. *qațal*-E). What is first and foremost peculiar to the 'perfective' against the 'imperfective' is the alignment of the S with any other function but rather reserving the L-series for the A in the perfective past. The morphosyntactic differences are particularly morphologically conditioned and not merely aspectual as such (cf. Polotsky 1979:208; Haig 2008:9 on Iranian). Otherwise we would expect that perfective aspect *per se* would always trigger agreement inversion, but this is not the case. It is also dependent on the type of inflectional base (i.e. *qțil*-). This will be demonstrated by an alternative (transitive) *qam-qațal*-preterit. Tense-aspect discrimination, however, is crucial in the selection of either an E-set of subject indexes or L-set of subject indexes, the latter minimally also denoting the A in the perfective past.

A *qaţal*-based construction found across dialects serves to indicate the preterit of transitive clauses with pronominal patients and competes with the 'perfective' (*qțil*-). All that is changed is the preverbal TAM-marking, for example:

(39)	<b>TAM-preverbal</b>	<b>preterit</b> (J. Amidya; Hobermaı	n 1989:103-104)
------	----------------------	--------------------------------------	-----------------

c.	<b>k</b> -šam≀-i-la	'They hear her.'	
	IND-hearipfv-A:3pl-p:3fs		
d.	<b>qam</b> -šamᡗ-i-la	'They heard her.'	(= šmi§-a-lu)
	PFV-hear <sub>IPFV</sub> -A:3PL-P:3FS		

The perfective past preverb *qam*-, or dialectal variants thereof, is added to the 'imperfective' inflectional base to render it equivalent to the perfective and create a (transitive) preterit. In both cases, the morphosyntax specific to the inflectional base is kept intact. (40) offers a comparison of two preterits.

qam-	našəq-	ax-	lu	qamnašqaxle	'We kissed them.'
PFV-	IMPFV	А	Р		
TAM-	STEM-	E-set	L-set		
	PFV	Р	А		
	nšiq-	ax-	lu	nšiqaxle	'They kissed us.'

Although the tense-aspectual meaning of *qam-qaţal-* is identical with *qțil-* and the morphology that follows these bases remains unchanged, the cross-referencing is inverted. These two types of preterit constructions, however, are not functionally equivalent (see §4.4.2.1).

This notwithstanding, aspect does play a fundamental role in constructions based on *qțil*-. It is not true that such a *qțil*-form will inevitably exhibit an L-set of agent indexes, yet such a construction will tend do so when it expresses the perfective past, or preterit. The perfective pastness and the L-set of agent indexes generally go hand in hand. As discussed in §5.1, the dialect of Bohtan (Christian, SE Turkey; Fox 2009), for instance, does not differentiate in inflectional base but only in the set of agent indexes. The E-set or the L-set mark a difference in tense-aspect, so that agent indexing is conditioned by TAM, for example:

(41)	C. Bohtan (SE Turkey; based on Fox 2002, 2009)			
a.	ġze- <b>li</b> -la	'I saw her.'	(preterit, A = L-set)	
b.	ġz- <b>ən</b> -na (< -ən + -la)	'I have seen her.'	(perfect, A = E-set)	

Note that Ps are regularly marked through the L-set in both *qațəl*- and *qțil*-based verbal forms in the Bohtan dialect, e.g.

c. xoz-an-na (< -an + -la) 'I see her.' (present, A = E-set)

There is no E-set of patient indexes. Rather the E-set only expresses the S and A in the perfect such that even the third person forms that would express the patient in the majority of NENA denote the agent rather than the patient (Fox 2009:52-54):

d. *ptix-i-le* **'They** have opened it<sub>M</sub>.' ( $\neq$  \*\*'He has opened **them**')

Christian Bohtan is unique in this respect. The agreement inversion is totally absent and the choice of inflection for subject agreement is completely tenseaspect-sensitive, treating both intransitive and transitive verbs alike.

Other dialects like Jewish Urmi are mixed in this respect. They do show partial agreement inversion but employ the E-set also in subject-marking. J. Urmi, for instance, is similar to C. Bohtan above in its neutral alignment in the preterit (*xzé-li-la* 'I saw her'). Tense-aspect-conditioned marking is limited to the S only:

+dməx-li	'I fell asleep.'	(preterit)
+dmix-en	'I <sub>M</sub> have fallen asleep.'	(perfect)

And yet, the E-suffixes may still be an alternative expression of third person patients in the preterit: *xazy-a-li* 'I saw **her**' occurs besides *xzé-li-la* 'I saw her'. Interestingly, however, according to Khan's (2008b:259) informants for Jewish Urmi, the two types of patient-marking are not functionally equivalent. The doubled L-set typically expresses remote past events, while the person-constrained forms with an E-suffix typically express recent past events:

xzé-le-la	'He saw her.'	(back then)
xəzy-a-le		(just now)

The tense nuance between remote and recent pastness that correlates with the type of patient-marking resembles the difference between preterit and perfect in subject coding (e.g. *dmix-a* 'She has just fallen asleep'). Possibly, an intransitive form like *dmix-a* 'She has (just) fallen asleep' is influencing the tense-aspectual profile of forms like *xazy-a-le* 'He saw her just now'.

One should note most NENA dialects express the <u>transitive</u> realis perfect differently from Christian Bohtan. The transitive counterpart can be differentiated by a distinct TAM preverb. In J. Rustaqa, a dialect closely related to Urmi, the TAM-marking preverb  $l\bar{a}$  marks the difference for transitive verbs (see §5.1.2).

It is a noteworthy fact that in all of these dialects where the S and P are grouped through the E-set, this is constrained by person, so that forms like \*\**nšiq-an-na* 'She kissed **me'** do not occur (cf. Goldenberg 1992:125). Such forms with non-third person patients tend to be blocked particularly in dialects where the S is marked by means of the same E-set (*qim-an* 'I rose, have/am ris-en' : \*\**nšiq-an-na* 'She kissed **me**'). Diachronically, the person split possibly indicates that first/second person enclitics have not fully grammaticalized to the P function in all NENA dialects, especially when their S-marking function is still present (which would account for why only accusative varieties can be person-unrestricted).

Early Christian Iraqi scribal idiolects might constitute a possible exception. They appear to reflect archaic uses of the E-set to mark both the S and P for all persons (Mengozzi 2002b). Some early Jewish texts also exhibit a few traces of an E-set of subject indexes (Sabar 2002:49), e.g. .g.  $?\partial\theta y$ - $a s\bar{a}$ ? $\partial d$  'The hour has come' (Sabar 1976: fn. 56), la snīq- $\phi$  'It isn't necessary' (Sabar 2002:242a). Pa-

tient-like subject indexes (e.g. *siw-en* 'I<sub>M</sub> have become old',  $y\theta$ -an 'I<sub>M</sub> have come') co-existed for result-oriented nuances alongside the predominately agent-like subject indexes (e.g. *su-li* 'I became old',  $y\theta$ -*li* 'I came') for the perfective past (Mengozzi 2002b:38-39; 2005:249-250). The earliest witnesses from Iraq, therefore, bear witness to active-stative alignment where person-marking used to be unrestricted (Mengozzi 2005) but do not evince a coherent from of ergative alignment. The default expression of the S is identical with the A (Mengozzi 2002b:38). Accordingly, Mengozzi (2002b:44-46) notes that "when Neo-Aramaic first appears in written sources" the transitive and intransitive inflection is "based on a non-ergative paradigm" and shows a system that "cannot be regarded as ergative in itself".

There is, then, no complete and coherent manifestation of ergative alignment in NENA. The two sets of person markers are not entirely neutral in relation to TAM, especially as subject and/or agent indexes. The E-set typically lacks behind in the grammaticalization from resultative to preterit (see §5.4). In C. Bohtan, this even applies to the agent for all persons (e.g. *ptix-i-le* 'They have opened it<sub>M</sub>'). Apart from the inflectional base, dialects mark TAM distinctions through preverbs and/or subject and agent coding. Although the split between imperfective and perfective aspect is mainly morphological depending on inflectional base (*qatal-* vs. *qtil-*), TAM semantics clearly contributes. All major dialect types but especially 'dynamic stative dialects' indicate that the L-set also has a TAMmarking function in opposition to the E-set in the expression of the s and/or A.

### 5.2. Compound Verbal Forms

While the 'imperfective' is the general expression of the indicative imperfective aspect and the 'perfective' may be used to express the resultative or perfect as we saw in the previous section, speakers can generally also avail themselves of compound verbal forms. Compound verbal forms combine a 'copula' or the verb *hwy* 'be' with the infinitive or agent noun or the resultative participle in the expression of the progressive respectrively perfect. One should note that such compound 'perfects' based on the resultative participle (*qțila* 'killed') can also express perfective past events and replace 'preterit' forms based on *qțil*- (e.g. in Christian Barwar, Khan 2008a:669-672). We will concentrate on accusative patterns in the majority of diaelcts and postpone other types in Trans-Zab Jewish varieties to the next section. Generally, the 'copula' cliticizes to the verbal element in the expression of the realis, non-negated, present, unless it attaches to

another element for pragmatic purposes. The deictic copula and negative copula are independent and precede the verbal element.

### 5.2.1. Perfect and Progressive

Eastern Neo-Aramaic languages employ a set of enclitic person forms generally termed the "enclitic copula" (Khan 2012). This series is principally used to construct non-verbal clauses denoting the present affirmative, or non-negative, as exemplified in (42a-b). They may also serve as the basis for analytical verbal constructions or even verbal inflection in NENA. The enclitic 'copula' is widely used in compound verbal forms based on a verbal noun, the infinitive ( $qtala \sim$ *qatole* 'killing') or agent noun (*qatola* 'killer'), or a verbal adjective, the resultative participle (*qtila* 'killed'), in the expression of mainly the progressive or the perfect as illustrated in (1b-c). This subsection will discuss the main types of compound verbal forms across NENA dialects. Not all dialects have grammaticalized a resultative participle and 'copula' to the expression of a perfect. In J. Arbel (NE Iraq; Khan 1999:284-285), for instance, the resultative participle is entirely confined to intransitive verbs and a few transitive verbs expressing durative situations entailing close proximity between agent and patient such as *rkiwá* 'ride' (< 'having mounted') and 'dwell'. The orientation of the resultative participle is generally ambiguous. This is discussed in greater detail in §5.2.3.

(42) J. Koy Sanjaq (NE Iraq; Mutzafi 2004a:190.18, 48, 125, 130)

a.	šer=wen	(nominal predicate)
	lion:ms=s:1ms	
	'I <sub>M</sub> am a lion.'	
b.	gis-ta=wan	(adjectival predicate)
	tired-FS=S:1FS	
	'I <sub>F</sub> am tired.'	
c.	rxāša=wex	(progressive)
	walk:INF=S:1PL	
	'We are walking.'	
d.	rxiša=wex	(perfect)
	walk:rpp:ms-s:1pl	
	'We have (lit. are) walked'	

First of all, the 'copula' varies greatly in NENA (cf. Khan 2012:32). The paradigms in (43) provide some insight.

		- (F	······		
	С.	J. Zaxo	J. Sule-	C. Urmi	J. Urmi
	Hertevin		maniyya		
	SE Turkey	NW Iraq	NE Iraq	NW Iran	NW Iran
	(Jastrow	(Cohen	(Khan 2004a)	(Marogulov	(Khan
	1988)	2002)		1976) <sup>161</sup>	2008b)
3ms	=ile	īle (le)	=y(e)	=ilə	=ile
FS	=ila	īla (la)	=ya	=ila	=ila
PL	=ini	īlu (lu)	=yen	=ina	=ilu
2ms	=ihət	wət	=yet	=ivət	=ilet
FS	=ihat	wat	=yat	=ivat	=ilat
PL	=əḥton	wētun	=yetun	=itun	=iletun
1MS	=ina	wən	=yen	=ivən	=ilen
FS	=ina	wan	=yan	=ivan	=ilan
PL	=əḥnaḥ	wax	=yex	=ivax	=ilex

#### (43) The basic 'copula' (present affirmative) in NENA

These person forms are used as the present affirmative, or non-negative, 'copula' and often contract with the final vowel of the host when they cliticize (see §3.1.1). The third person forms that evince an /l/-segment are noteworthy, e.g. 3ms. =*ile* and =*ila*, and should not be confounded with other sets of person forms such as the L-suffixes<sup>162</sup>. The same holds for the forms in J. Urmi where /l/ is found in the entire paradigm.

The negative and past counterpart of the 'copula' is expressed via an additional set, as illustrated in (44) below. In adition, it is common for NENA dialects to have a presentative or deictic set of 'copula' directing the attention to an observed state of affairs (more or less 'Look/I see here he is').

#### (44) **C. Sat** (SE Turkey, Mutzafi 2008:29)

	PRESENT				PAST
	AFFIRMATIVE		NEGATIVE	DEICTIC	AFFIRMATIVE
3ms	=(i)le	'He is'	layle	haydole	=(i)wa
3pl	=(i)na	'They are'	layna	haydona	=(i)wa

<sup>161</sup> Transcription modified. See now Khan (2016a:248).

<sup>162</sup> The grammaticalization of such phonetically reduced elements are notoriously difficult to contextualize historically. Khan (2001) believes the NENA third person copula forms that evince an /l/-element are diachronically related to the L-suffixes through a presentative construction \*i-le 'behold, him'. But note that this would fail to explain the third person singular restriction on the /l/-element.

	PRESENT				PAST
	AFFIRMATIVE		NEGATIVE	DEICTIC	AFFIRMATIVE
2pl	=(i)wutun	'You <sub>PL</sub> are'	laywutun	haydowutun	=(i)wútuwa
1pl	=(i)wax	'We are'	laywax	haydowax	=(i)waxwa
etc.		etc.			

The 'copula' verb *hwy* 'be' is a suppletive pendant to these forms in other TAM contexts, such as the subjunctive and future (see further below).

The resultative participle is inflected for number and gender like other adjectives, although for gender only in the singular. The paradigm for stem I verbs is as follows:

#### (45) **Resultative participle**<sup>163</sup>

MS q*țil-a* (~ qə*țl-a*) 'killed' FS q*țil-ta* (~ q*țəl-ta*) PL q*til-e* (~ qə*țl-e*)

The resultative participle can be combined with the 'copula' to form an (analytical) perfect or resultative construction, as exemplified for C. Karəmlesh (NW Iraq) below. The perfect is used for transitive and intransitive verbs alike where the 'copula' and participle generally express grammatical agreement<sup>164</sup>. Generally, the final vowels of the participle /a/ or /e/ and initial vowel of the 'copula' /i/ will undergo contraction to /e/, e.g. C. Karəmlesh ms. *šqila* 'taken' + ms. *=ila* 'He is'  $\rightarrow$  *šqílela* 'He has taken'.

(46) C. Karəmlesh (NW Iraq, Borghero 2008:80-81)

a.	PRESENT AFFIRMATIVE			
	INTRANSITIVE		TRANSITIVE	
3ms	zíle=lə	'He has gone'	šqíle=lə	'He has taken'
3fs	zálte=la	'She has gone'	šqálte=la	'She has taken'
2pl	zíle=wutun	'You_{MPL} have gone'	šqíle=wutun	'You_{MPL} have taken'
etc.				

<sup>164</sup> Deviating agreement patterns are discussed in §5.2.5, compare example (42d) *rxiša=wex* 'We have walked' (no agreement).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>163</sup> The variable forms in parentheses are mainly found in Trans-Zab Jewish dialects.

The resultative participle can also combine with the deitic 'copula' which always precedes it:

b.	DEICTIC			
Змѕ	k-ilə zila	'He has gone'	k-ilə šqila	'He has taken'
3fs	k-ila zəlta	'She has gone'	k-ila šqəlta	'She has taken'
2pl	k-iwutun zile	'You <sub>MPL</sub> have gone'	k-iwutun šqile	'You <sub>MPL</sub> have taken'

For past tense reference, the past 'copula' is used:

C.	PAST	
Змѕ	šqile=wa	'He had taken'
3fs	šqəlte=wa	'She had taken'
2pl	šqile=wutunwa	'You <sub>MPL</sub> had taken'

The verb *hwy* 'be' complements the enclitic 'copula' to form a perfect in various (dialect-dependent) moods and tenses such as the subjunctive or past irrealis:

(47)	C. Urmi (Literary	, NW Iran; M	larogulov 1976:53; transcription mine)
a.	Ø-hoy-a	prəq-ta	'that she be finished'
	SBJ-be <sub>IPFV</sub> -S:3FS	finished-s:FS	
b.	<i>bit-hoy-an-wa</i> FUT-be <sub>IPFV</sub> -s:1FS-PST	<i>prəq-ta</i> finished-s:Fs	' $I_F$ would have finished.'

Other than the perfect, an uninflectable agent noun or infinitive, generally together with the preposition *b*- 'in' e.g. *bə-šqala* 'in-taking', may be used to form a progressive, generally by a similar type of construction involving a 'copula':

(48) C. Karəmlesh (NW Iraq, Borghero 2008:82-83)

a.	BASIC	b. DEICTIC	
3ms	b-šqále=lə	k-ilə bə-šqala	'He is taking'
3fs	b-šqále=la	k-ila bə-šqala	'She is taking'
2pl	b-šqále=wutun	k-iwutun bə-šqala	'You <sub>MPL</sub> are taking'

Some dialects, mainly Christian and Jewish in NW Iraq, deviate from this pattern. In these dialects, the basic 'copula' generally precedes the verbal form and cliticizes only when it follows a non-verbal or less verbal predicate. In examples (49a-c) below, the copula is independent before the predicate and is

interpretable as either verbal or non-verbal. In examples (49d-f), the copula is enclitic and a more verbal interpretation is not available, so that the copula cannot be realized as such in the progressive.

(49)	J. Beta	<b>J. Betanure</b> (NW Iraq; Mutzafi 2008a:50-51, 63, 66)		
	COP PRE	ED		PRED=COP (non-verbal or less verbal only)
a.	?ile	tāma	d.	tấma=yle
	'He is there.'			ʻid.'
b.	?ile	тіθа	e.	míθa=yle
	'He has died/is dead'			'He is dead'
c.	?ile	bə-šwāqa	f.	**bə-šwấqa=yle
	'He is l	eaving'		

Finally, the perfect and progressive are not necessarily both found in every dialect but often come together (cf. Khan 2007d). In C. Koy Sanjaq (NE Iraq; Mutzafi 2004b), for example, only the (analytic) perfect is based on a construction involving the 'copula'. The progressive involves a special preverbal TAMmarker  $l\bar{a}$  before the indicative 'imperfective', e.g.  $l\bar{a}$  *g*- $n\bar{a}$ šaq- $\emptyset$  'He is kissing'. Similarly, other dialects use such a TAM-maker to express both the perfect and progressive on the basis of the 'perfective', respectively, 'imperfective', e.g.  $l\bar{a}$  *qtal-le* 'He has killed',  $l\bar{a} \phi$ -*qatal*- $\phi$  'He is killing' (J. Rustaqa; Khan 2002b).  $l\bar{a}$  is presumably a fossilized 3fs. form of the copula *ila* 'It<sub>F</sub> is' (Khan 2007d). Thus, as expected, it is entirely up to the dialect.

To recapitulate, the progressive and perfect are compound verbal forms based on a verbal noun and the resultative participle. The agent and subject indexes are marked by a special set, the 'copula', that also expresses the subject of non-verbal clauses. The basic copula that expresses the realis, non-negated present often cliticizes to the verb. The past copula may also cliticize to the verb while the deictic and negative copulas are independent. Dialects differ in what respect they have grammaticalized an agent-orientation and perfect aspect for resultative constructions. A patient-orientation is still available in dialects that have a perfect.

#### 5.2.2. Object Person Forms

In the compound verbal forms expressing the perfect or progressive, the marking of object person forms is generally based on prepositions or on adnominal pronominal suffixes. We confine ourselves to accusative alignment in this subsection. The following major types of constructions are found among the NENA dialects (cf. Kapeliuk 2008):

- (i) object indexes belonging to the set of 'possessive' suffixes;
- (ii) independent object person forms of an *?all-set* or *?abb-set*;
- (iii) dependent object person forms of an *?all-set* or *?abb-set*.

Object person forms in the compound verbal forms, thus, are generally different from the 'imperfective' and 'perfective'. There is some overlap in the relative order of dependent person forms, generally the same as the 'perfective' (V-P-A) rather than the 'imperfective' (V-A-P). The *?all*-series may also be found in the 'perfective' but much less so in the 'imperfective' (see §4.1.2)

## 5.2.2.1. 'Possessive' suffixes

In the first type, the originally nominal form of the verb takes object indexes from the otherwise adnominal set that denotes the posessor. This can be schematized as follows:

PA/S(b-)VN-POSS+ COPRPP-POSS+ COP(+ PTCP agreement with A/S)

The patient is marked by the 'possessive' suffixes typical for nouns:

### (50) C. Qaraqosh (NW Iraq; Khan 2002a:363)

a. k-ina šqil-ə DEIX-A:3PL taken -PL 'They have taken.'
b. k-ina šqil-əħ (cf. l DEIX-A:3PL taken-P:3MS

'They have taken him.'

(cf. bab-ah 'his father')

(51) **C. Urmi** (Literary, NW Iran; Marogulov 1979:46, 58; Hetzron 1969:117, transcription mine)

			I KOUKLODIVL
a.	dmíx=ələ	b.	bə-dmáx=ələ
	slept-s:ms=s:3ms		in-sleep:INF-S:ЗмS
	'He has slept.'		'He is sleeping.'

c. *šqál-t-u=vat* taken-a:FS-P:3MS=A:2FS You<sub>FS</sub> have taken **him**.' d. ayya +b-qtál-u=la she in-kill:INF-P:3MS=A:3FS
+ova naša that man 'She is killing (lit. him) that man.'

The 'copula' encodes the S and A, and when combined with the resultative participle, there is also subject agreement, e.g. C. Qaraqosh *kila šqalta* 'She has taken' (NW Iraq), C. Urmi *šqálta=vat* 'You<sub>FS</sub> have taken' (NW Iran). The patient indexes are added to the participle, e.g. C. Qaraqosh *kila šqalt-i* 'She has taken **me**', literally 'She is my taken (one)'. The 'copula' may cliticize to this form, e.g. C. Urmi fs. *šqalta* 'taken' + -**u** 'his' + 2fs. =vat 'you<sub>FS</sub>.are'  $\rightarrow$  *šqált-u=vat* 'You<sub>FS</sub> have taken **him**'. The same holds for the progressive but the verbal noun does not inflect for agreement. Patient indexes are also used in differential indexing, as in (52b) above. This parallels the accusative pattern of the preterit in the 'perfective' system where the E-set marks the P and the L-set the A. Compare:

(52) C. Urmi (Literary, NW Iran; Marogulov 1979:58, transcription mine)
 PRETERIT
 [V-P-A]

```
a. šqil-ət-li
take<sub>PFV</sub>-p:2MS-A:1MS
'I took you<sub>MS</sub>.'
PERFECT
[V-P-A]
```

b. *šqil-ux=vən* taken:MS-P:2MS=A:1MS 'I<sub>M</sub> have taken you<sub>MS</sub>.'

The combination with full nominal objects in this construction type can also be based on adnominal possession. The object NP is marked by the genitive linker =ad typical for adnominal possessors in the annexation of noun phrases (Khan 2002a:367-368):

(53) C. Qaraqosh (NW Iraq; Khan 2002a:367) *k-ilə* xil-əd xabušə DEIX-A:3MS eaten-LK apples 'He has eaten apples.' This also applies to object person forms in Jewish Zakho. They are marked by means of the independent possessive pronouns based on *did*-, an augmented form of the linker =ad, to which 'possessive' suffixes are added:

(54)	<b>J. Zakho</b> (NW Iraq; Cohen 2012:142-143)						
	PERFECT				PROGRESSIV	/E	
a.	le(w)ən	qțīl-a	dīd-a	b.	wən	bə-šqāla	dīd-a
	NEG:A:1MS	kill:RPP-A:MS	lk-3fs		A:1MS	in-take:INF	lk-3fs
	'I <sub>M</sub> have not killed <b>her</b> (lit. her's)'			'I <sub>M</sub> am taki	ng <b>her</b> (lit	. her's).'	

## 5.2.2.2. Independent object person form

Secondly, pronouns are expressed independently through prepositional person forms:

			_
	A/S	Р	
( <i>b-</i> )VN	=COP	ОВЈ	
RPP	=COP	OBJ	(+ PTCP agreement with A/S)

This is mainly the dative *(?al)l*- in the majority of NENA dialects but other prepositions such as *(?ab)b*- can also be employed, compare (55)-(56) below.

(55)	<b>J. Sulemaniyya</b> (NE Iraq; Khan 2004a:137-139)				
	PERFECT			PROGRESSIVE	
a.	xzita=ya	?ill-ux	b.	garoša=y	?ill-a
	see:RPP:A:FS=A:3FS	obj-2ms		in-pull:INF-A:3MS	OBJ-3FS
	'She has seen <b>you</b> <sub>MS</sub> .'			'I <sub>M</sub> am pulling <b>her</b> .'	

### 5.2.2.3. Attached ?all-set or ?abb-set

Thirdly, the prepositional person forms can become increasingly adhesive to the non-finite verbal form such that it supersedes the 'copula'. The *?all*-series or *?abb*-series are regularly cliticized when placed after the verb:

(56) C. Txuma (Gundək, SE Turkey; Talay 2009:226.73) dax=it b∂-xzáya=bb-a how=A:2MS in-see:INF=OBJ-3FS 'What do you<sub>MS</sub> reckon of (lit. how are you seeing) her?

This is similar to type (i) in morphological dependency but the means of coding is the same as type (ii):


The *?all*-series in (57) and *?abb*-series in (58) are attached to the verbal base. The relative order of person indexes (V-P-A) is distinct from the same object person form in the 'perfective', e.g. *xzelé=ll-an* for *xzele ?all-an* 'He saw **us**' (C. Ashitha, SE Turkey; Borghero 2006:193), but rather similar to the E-set, e.g. *qțil-at-li* 'I killed **you**<sub>FS</sub>'.

(57)	) C. Ashitha (SE Turkey; Borghero 2006:195, 198)					
	PERFECT		PROGRESS	SIVE		
a.	qtíl- <b>əllax</b> =iwin	b.	wewa	mbašól- <b>əlla</b>		
	kill:rpp:a:ms-p:2fs=a:1ms		PST:A:3FS	cook:INF-P:3FS		
	'I <sub>M</sub> have killed <b>you</b> <sub>FS</sub> .'		'She was	'She was cooking <b>it</b> <sub>F</sub> .'		
(58)	<b>C. Txuma</b> (Mazṛa, SE Turkey; Talay	200	9:162.4, 19	90.1)		
	PERFECT		PROGRESS	IVE		
a.	moqyám-te- <b>bbɛ</b> =la	b.	bə-qráya	- <b>bbe</b> =lε		
	raise:RPP-A:FS-P:3MS=A:3FS		in-call:INF-I	in-call:INF-P:3PL=A:3PL		
	məskənta		pləštaye	pləštaye		
	education		Palestinian:PL			
	'She has enabled <b>him</b> to study.'		'They cal	l <b>them</b> Palestinians.'		

#### 5.2.3. Lability and Dative Marking of the Agent

The resultative participle and the 'copula' or the verb *hwy* 'be' not only serve as the basis for a passive but also a compound perfect (see §4.3.2 and §4.3). Both are originally resultative constructions and their ambiguity in orientation is a type of lability. Word order and the presence an object or agent complement can be important differentiating factors. This is further complicated by the identical case-marking of the object or the agent. There are some parallels with the focal dative agents in the perfective past.

A resultative is a verbal construction typically derived from telic verbs that expresses an acquired state: a state that implicitly results from a previous event and which directly or indirectly affects a subject (Nedjalkov 1988, 2001; Haspelmath 1994). Resultatives are, strictly speaking, voice-neutral (Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988:16) and can be patient-oriented, subject-oriented and agentoriented. Subject-orientations for result states are found for intransitive verbs like J. Koy Sanjaq *dmixa=wen* 'I<sub>M</sub> am asleep', *kpinta=wan* 'I<sub>F</sub> am hungry', *ytiwe=le* (*\*ytiwa-yle*) 'He is seated'. The predication of a result state is also found for transitive telic verbs that typically form agent-orientations in resultative constructions (see Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988) such as *dwq* 'hold', *šql* 'take', *lwš* 'wear, put on', *tfn* 'carry', *lyp* 'learn' (Kapeliuk 2008, cf. Nöldeke 1868:308, §150). In J. Arbel (NE Iraq; Khan 1999:284-285), the resultative participle is entirely confined to such lowly transitive types of verbs in this usage besides intransitive verbs, e.g. *rkiwa=wen* 'I am riding', *skina=wet* 'You<sub>MS</sub> dwell'. In several dialects, the agent-orientation is available for virtually all transitive verbs in the expression of the perfect and perfective past. The possible connotation of an anterior change of state in the implied event leading to the result restate in resultatives is made explicit in the perfect (compare English resultative *He is gone* and perfect *He has gone*) and the resultant state in the present is absent in the perfective past.

Certain typical change-of-state verbs belonging to stem I, however, are labile and essentially voice-neutral in their resultative construction. A verb like *twr* 'break' can, therefore, express the following semantic ambiguity in Jewish Koy Sanjaq. The resultative participle *twirta* agrees with the subject expressed by the enclitic copula *=ila* 'She is'. It can express an intransitive state that is either patient-oriented (imply some external cause) or subject-oriented (anticausative, spontaneous) or a transitive perfect that is agent-oriented:

(59)	<b>J. Koy Sanjaq</b> (NE Iraq; Mutzafi 2004a:106)				
	twir-té=la (< *twirtá=ila)				
	broken-FS-she.is				
a.	'She is broken.'	(patient or subject-oriented, intransitive, stative)			
b.	'She has broken.'	(agent-oriented, transitive, dynamic)			

The basic 'copula' is generally enclitic, following the participle. It may also alternate with an independent deictic copula. This is illustrated in the following examples from Christian Barwar. The forms with the deictic copula are mainly used to express the perfect and pluperfect (Khan 2008a:673-675).

(60)	<b>C. Barwar</b> (NW Iraq; Khan 2008a)					
	BASIC		DEICTIC			
	qțil-ɛ=le		ho-le	qțil-a		
	killed-ms=3ms		deix-3ms	killed-мs		
a.	'He has killed.'	с.	'He has killed.'		(A, dynamic)	
b.	'He is killed.'	d.	'He is kille	ed.'	(S, stative)	

Virtually any telic transitive verb is labile in this respect. These constructions are diathetically ambiguous between a dynamic-transitive perfect and stative-intransitive resultative. The orientation (subject/agent/patient) has to be contextualized. What applies to the construction based on the deictic 'copula' as illustrated in (60c) and (60d), generally also applies to other tense and modal categories of the perfect or passive based on the auxiliary *hwy* 'be'.

The third person enclitic 'copula' may also be omitted entirely, so that the participial inflection is the only remaining agent or subject coding (Khan 2008a:669-671). In general, a verbal form in the immediate coding takes the argument coding, e.g.  $2\partial\theta y \cdot \varepsilon = le \ wira = \emptyset$  'He came (and) entered' (ibid. 670). Yet, such forms can also take a P and occur independently, for example:

e.  $qtil-a(=\emptyset)$  xá-neriye killed-ms(=3ms) a-goat:ms 'He has killed a male goat.' (Khan 2008a, A31:4)

Note that this clause could theoretically also mean 'The male goat (is) killed'.

These Christian and Jewish dialects, therefore, have the following system where the resultative or perfect constructions neatly parallel the preterit (perfective past) except for the passive which may be illustrated by the following example from Christian Barwar:

(61) C. Barwar (NW Iraq; Khan 2008a)

	PRETERIT	RESULTATIVE
TR.	qțil-le	qțilɛ=le
ITR.	qim-le	qimε=le
PASS.	qțil-Ø	qțilɛ=le

In the following subsections, we discuss how the ambiguity in orientation can be resolved by the relative position of the 'copula', a greater degree of integration into the verbal system, or the presence of an object or agent complement.

The main point will be that the presence of a P is immediately determinant for an agent-orientation. A patient-oriented construction may be expanded by a dative agent, marked by the preposition (*?al*)*l*-. Such dative agents exhibit some peculiar characteristics reminiscent of dative agents used with the agentless 'perfective' form. They may be used to express agent focus and overt casemarking may be lacking in focalized pre-verbal position which is otherwise not a feature of oblique arguments. Patient and agent person forms are even morphologically identical, when they are both marked through the corresponding *?all*-series. Dialects can disambiguate between them by attaching the pronominal object immediately to the participle, by putting the 'copula' immediately before the participle or by omitting the 'copula' encoding the agent entirely. The latter is limited to the third person.

# 5.2.3.1. Position of the 'Copula'

Some dialects, mainly those in North West Iraq, can differentiate between a dynamic-transtive perfect and stative-intransitive resultative by the relative position of the basic 'copula'. If the 'copula' precedes the participle, the orientation is ambiguous, but when it follows it, the construction is always intransitive. Jewish Betanure, for example, distinguishes the patient-orientation from the agentorientation through the cliticized post-verbal position of the copula in (62).

(62)	<b>J. Betanure</b> (NW Iraq; Mutzafi 2008a)					
	COP PRED		PRED=COP			
	?ile	šqil-a		šqil-a=yle		
	Змѕ	taken-MS		taken-мs=3мs		
a.	'He has	s taken.'	С.	**'He has taken'	(dynamic)	
b.	'He is t	aken.'	d.	'He is taken.' (only)	(stative)	

# 5.2.3.2. Verbalization

The aspectual opposition between the intransitive stative-resultative and transitive perfect also correlates with their integration into the verbal system (Kapeliuk 2008; cf. Mutzafi 2004a:105-109; Khan 2008a:653-659). In J. Koy Sanjaq, for instance, the difference is partly found in agreement pattern and negation. The resultative-stative, for example, conforms to other adjectives by expressing agreement in the plural, while the perfect lacks this. As illustrated in (63) below, the participle *šwiqé* is in the plural and agrees with the first plural subject in the resultative *šwiqe=wex* 'We are left', while in the corresponding perfect, it takes the unmarked masculine singular form *šwiqa=wex* 'We have left'. The agentoriented perfect, therefore, will lack agreement as opposed to the patientoriented resultative for transitive verbs: *nšiqa=wex* 'We have kissed' as opposed to *nšiqe=wex* 'We are kissed'.

(63)	pl.	šwiqé	+	=wex	šwiqe=wex	'We are left'	(resultative)
	sg.	šwiqá	+	=wex	šwiqa=wex	'We have left'	(perfect)

### 5.2.3.3. Objects

The ambiguity in orientation is absent in the presence of an object. When the object is pronominal, it is expressed by attaching a pronoun from the *?all*-series (see §4.1.3)<sup>165</sup>. This is given for Christian Barwar below. The enclitic 'copula' denoting the A is attached to the preceding participle, and the *?all*-set denoting the P is attached to the copula. If the copula is deictic and precedes the participle, the patient person form attaches immediately to the participle itself:

(64)	<b>C. Barwar</b> (NW Iraq; Khan 2008a)				
	BASIC		DEICTIC		
a.	qțílɛ=l- <b>əlle</b>	b.	ho-la	qțil-t- <b>əlle</b>	
	killed-ms-a:ms-p:3ms	DEIX-A	:3fs	killed-fs-p:3мs	
	'He has killed <b>him</b> .'	'She has killed <b>him</b> .'			

The agent-marking enclitic 'copula' is completely mobile and can move to the front, e.g. ku=t=ile qtil-alle 'Each that **has** killed him' (Khan 2008a, A24:43). The *?all*-series regularly attaches to participle when the 'copula' precedes it.

When the clause contains two full NPs, the A function of the noun is typically indicated by agreement. When the gender and number differs between the arguments, the verbal construction always agrees with the A as it does with the S, and the respective roles are clear, for example:

c.	[A]	[COP-A]	[RPP-A]	[P]
	?aw-naša	ho-le	dwiq-a	baxta
	DEM-man:MS	deix-a:3ms	seize:RPP-A:MS	woman:MS
	'The man ha	s seized the w	oman.' (Khan 20	)08a:657)

 $^{165}$  These can fully merge with the L1-series (Khan 2008a:283), see §4.1.3 and §5.2.5.

When the patient is differentially marked, this will automatically disambiguate between the roles of the arguments. Differential object marking can be via indexing (the *?all-series*) or via case-marking (the dative preposition *țla*), for example:

d.	[A]-[COP:A]		$[RPP:A-P] \longrightarrow [P]$					
	?at=it		qțíl- <b>əlle</b>	xuww	'e			
	you=A:2мs		killed:A:MS-P:3MS	snake:	٩S			
	'Are you	(the one	who) has kille	ed (lit. <b>hi</b> n	m) the	snake?'	(Khan	2008a,
	A24:45)							
e.	[A]		[BE:A]	[RPP	-A]	[DOM-	→P]	
	awwa	xuwwe	t-awe-Ø-wa	qțil-	а	țla-bi	ron-i	
	DEM:MS	snake:мs	FUT-beipfv-A:3MS-P	ST killed	I-A:MS	DOM-SO	n:MS-my	
	'The snake	e would h	ave killed <b>my s</b>	<b>son</b> .' (Kha	n 2008a	a, A9:6)		

The coding of either role may be completely lacking and the roles have to be inferred from the context. This applies when the two referents belong to the same gender and number and when the patient is not differentially marked. In (65a) below, the status of the argument *bron-i* is ambiguous, since no object is present, while, in (65b), an object is present. Both arguments are morphologically unmarked (ms.) but it is pragmatically obvious what their respective role is (a human agent against a fruit).

(65) C. Barwar (NW Iraq) (ambiguous) a. [S/A] [COP] [RPP] bron-i ho-le xil-a son:MS-my deix-3ms eat:RPP-MS 'My son has eaten' 'My son is/has been eaten (by sth.)' (Khan 2008a, A18:2) b. (active) [A] [COP] [RPP] [P] ho-le xil-a xabuša xon-ux brother:MS-your:MS DEIX-A:3MS eat:RPP-MS apple:мs 'Your<sub>MS</sub> brother has eaten an apple.' (Khan 2008a:678)

The A argument regularly precedes the verb. The P argument, however, may be fronted, yielding the reverse word order:

c.	(fron	ited object)		
		[P]=[COP]	[RPP]	[A]
	la	xawxɛ=le	xil-a	xon-i
	NEG	peach:MS= COP:3MS	eaten-MS	brother:MS-my
	'No, a	a peach my brother	has eaten	.' (Khan 2008a:678)

Word order, then, may be an important clue but it is not definitive. Without the presence of an agent in (65c), the clause  $la xawx\varepsilon = le xila$  would mean 'A peach is/has been eaten'.

# 5.2.3.4. Dative Agents

In the patient-oriented constructions, the patient is the S and controls agreement and the full NP remains unmarked. The agent is expressed by the dative preposition (*?al*)*l*-, such as *l-xamyana* 'by father-in-law' below. In terms of word order, the dative agent may be put before the verb but will not precede the topical patient, as shown in (66b).

(66) <b>C. Barwar</b>	(NW Iraq)
-----------------------	-----------

a.	[S: patient	[RPP-	s]	[OBL: agent]	
	Dalle	dwiq	-a	l-xəmyana	
	PRN:MS	seized	-MS	DAT-father-in-	law
	'Dalle has	been seize	ed <b>by he</b>	r father-in-	law.' (Khan 2008a, C8:7)
b.	[S]		[OBL][=	COP+S]	[RPP+S]
	xabuša	šmoq-a	l-dább	<b>ɛ</b> =le	xil-a
	apple:мs	red-мs	рат <b>-bea</b>	::мs=3мs	eaten-MS
	'The red a	pple has b	een eate	en <b>by the be</b>	<b>ar</b> .' (Khan 2008a, D2:65)

There is, however, an unusual feature in the marking of the agent in this type of construction. The dative case-marking of the agent NP may be absent when it is focalized to pre-verbal position (Khan 2008a:752). The remaining agreement, therefore, is controlled by the patient, while the agent remains unmarked such as *babi* 'my father' in (66c) below.

c. [S/P] [A][=COP+S/P] [RPP+S/P]
 *?ayya yalaxta Ø babi=la zqir-ta* DEM:FS handskerchief:FS father:MS=3FS weaven-FS
 'This handkerchief has been woven (by) my father.' (Khan 2008a, A37:12)

This is reminiscent of the agentless 'perfective' that may also lack agreement with a zero-marked agent NP placed before the verb (see §4.3.4 and §4.3.5). It is unknown whether the construction in (66c) is also person-restricted. *Ceteris paribus*, however, this is not typical for an oblique argument, while the A is normally not case-marked. At the same time, the patient retains all S-like properties in controlling the verbal agreement. Although this coding is ergative-like, it is a marked voice construction that alternates with the more typical passive.

Moreover, since Khan (2008b) does not provide examples for pronominal agents in the passive, we have no information regarding this for C. Barwar. For a closely related dialect, C. Ashitha (NW Iraq), Borghero (2005:330) notes that pronouns are maked by the dative in the same way as full nominals:

(67)	C. Ashith	<mark>a</mark> (NW Ira	aq; Borghero 2005:330)
a.	qțiltɛ=la	l-gora	'She was killed <b>by a man</b> .'
b.	qțilɛ=le	?əll-a	'He was killed <b>by her</b> .'

The orientation of the partciple is distinguished morphologically in C. Ashitha. In the patient-oriented, or passive, construction, the 'copula' follows the participle and the *?all*-series denoting the agent remain separate. In the agent-oriented, or active, construction, the *?all*-series attaches immediately to the participle:

(68) **C. Ashitha** (NW Iraq; Borghero 2005:334-336)

	ACTIVE			PASSIVE		
a.	qțíl- <b>əlla</b> =le		C.	qțil-ɛ=le		?əlla
	killed:ms-dat:3fs=3	MS		killed-мs=3	MS	DAT:3FS
	'He has killed <b>h</b>	er.'		'He was k	tilled <b>by her</b>	,
	ACTIVE			PASSIVE		
b.	qțíl- <b>əlle</b>	winwa	d.	qțil-a	winwa	?əlle
	killed:ms-dat:3ms	PST:1MS		killed-мs	PST:1MS	dat:3ms
	ʻI <sub>M</sub> had killed <b>h</b> i	i <b>m</b> .'		$I_M$ had be	en killed <b>by</b>	him.'

The forms  $qtil-\varepsilon=le$  'He was killed' and qtila winwa 'I<sub>M</sub> had been killed' could equally mean 'He has killed' and 'I<sub>M</sub> have killed' when they combine with a nominal object (Borghero 2006:176). The cohesion of the *?all*-set with the verbal form is determinant for the agent orientation. This seems to be a well-balanced system but it is somewhat unexpected. Indeed, the *?all*-series can, at the same time, be employed in the preterit to mark the object independently of the verb, e.g. *xze-li ?allax 'I saw you<sub>FS</sub>' (Borghero 2006:192; see §4.1.2). It is conceivable*  this parallelism would have superimposed or at least influenced an active reading on the forms in (69c)-(69d) where the same person form is expressed independently but it does not exhibit this effect at all. On the contrary, it is the attachement of an object person form from the *?all*-set to the verb that signals that the construction is transitive and agent-oriented to differentiate it from the intransitive patient-oriented counterpart (cf. Givón 1976:168).

Finally, it should be pointed out that focal dative marking of the agent also occurs in these resultative constructions. We can illustrate this for the Christian dialect of Aradhin (NW Iraq; Krotkoff 1982). The situation is even more complex this dialect spoken further south to Barwar and Ashitha. Dative case-marking of the agent is also possible, for example:

(69) C. Aradhin (NW Iraq; Krotkoff 1982:34, 39)

a.	xil-a	l-kalba
	eaten-MS	DAT-dog
	'It <sub>M</sub> (i.e. t	he dough) was eaten <b>by a dog</b> .'
h	čajl a	allchan

 b. sqil-a əllehən taken-MS DAT:3PL
 'It<sub>M</sub> was taken by them.'

Note that the third person enclitic copula may be lacking in this construction. Krotkoff (1982:34) notes his informants' interpretation of (69a) fluctuates between active 'A dog has eaten it' and passive 'It was eaten by a dog'. The first interpretation readily applies to independent person forms with assertive focus occurring in pre-verbal position:

c. *álli=le* wiδ-a DAT:1SG-3MS done-MS 'It is <u>I</u> (who) did it<sub>M</sub>.'

This is a pseudo-cleft sentence where the 'copula' *ile* 'It is' focalizes the agent. This would otherwise be reserved for the unmarked independent person forms (to illustrate: **āna** *iwan dmixa* '**I'm** (the one who is) asleep'). Quite confusingly, however, this same *?all*-series is the regular means to mark independent object person forms in the transitive perfect (Krotkoff 1982:34-35), for example:

d.	wənwa	хәzy-а	əlle	'I had seen <b>him</b> (the man).'
	PST:1MS	seen-MS	dat:3ms	

e. *ile mkúsy-alle* 3PL covered-DAT:3MS 'They have covered **it**<sub>M</sub>.'

Binding to the participle as exemplified in *mkúsy-alle* is only possible for the object complements as in Christian Ashitha. The agent complement is always expressed separately, so that (69e) could never mean 'He covered them'.

In the construction based on the resultative participle, therefore, the agent and object complement are morphologically identical. It is the dative agent construction, however, that usually lacks a 'copula' form denoting the patient (Krotkoff 1982:34, 39). The presence of an agent-marking 'copula' delineates the difference between the two. For this reason, the dative agent construction appears to be confined to third person patients, such that neither **\*\*ile** *qțila alla* '**He was** killed by her' nor **\*\*iwan** *qțila alla* '**I** was killed by her' are possible but only ( $\phi$ ) *qțila alla* '**He was** killed by her'. When, however, the agent is in focus, such as *alli* in (70c), the third person masculine singular 'copula' is present as a focus marker and denotes an expletive subject only ('It is X who...'). (70) below summarizes our observations for Christian Aradhin. Consequently, when the first and second person enclitic copula is present, the *?all*-series will always be interpreted to mark the object rather than the agent. The third person enclitic copula is avoided in the passive, unless it represents a (non-referential) focus marker.

(70)	<b>C. Aradhin</b> (NW Iraq; Krotkoff 1982)						
	A-ORIENTATION, DATIVE PATIENT				P-ORIENTATION, DATIVE AGENT		
a.	ile	qțil-a	əlla	с.	qțil-a	əlla	
	Змѕ	killed-мs	dat:3fs		killed-мs	dat:3fs	
	'He h	as killed <b>h</b>	ier.'		'He was killed <b>by her</b> .'		
b.	iwən	qțíl <b>-ə</b> l	lla	d.	<b>álli</b> =le	qțil-a	
	1мs	killedм	s-dat:3fs		DAT:1SG=3M	ıs killed-мs	
	'I have killed <b>her</b> .'				'It <sub>M</sub> is I (v	who) have killed him.'	

# 5.2.4. Contraction and Secondary E<sub>2</sub>-series

Synthetic and analytic constructions may converge or overlap at several points in some NENA dialects. The enclitic copula has reduced variants that partially or completely merge with the E-suffixes, giving rise to a secondary  $E_2$ -set where

the merger is not complete. Similarly, the cliticized *?all*-series may merge with the L-suffixes (see also  $\S4.1.3$ )<sup>166</sup>.

Certain contractions of the enclitic 'copula' and the vocalic ending of the nominal form of the verb result in person indexes that are (near)-identical with the E-suffixes. J. Sulemaniyya contractions in the progressive such as *garošét* 'You<sub>MS</sub> are pulling' out of \**garošá=yet* (INF+COP) are phonologically identical with the E-suffixes: -*ét*, as in *garš-ét* 'You<sub>MS</sub> pull' (Khan 2004a:100). So, too, in C. Ashi-tha, contracted forms may alternate with uncontracted forms that are indistinct from the E-set. The contracted past perfect *qtil-in-wa* 'I<sub>M</sub> had killed' of the uncontracted *qtila win-wa* 'I<sub>M</sub> had killed' parallels the E-suffixes and past convertor -*in-wa* as in the past 'imperfective' *qatl-in-wa* 'I<sub>M</sub> used to kill' (Borghero 2005:332). The structural cohesion between the verb and the enclitic 'copula' is virtually on the same level as the core verbal system.

The transitive realis perfect and progressive is regularly formed with the 'copula' and *?all*-series. In C. Barwar, the coding of the A and P by means of reduced variants, however, is partially merged with the E-suffixes and and L-suffixes. The resultative participle expresses agreement with the agent. Reduced variants of the copula that are virtually identical with the E-set denote the agent. The patient can be expressed by L-suffixes or *?all*-series attached to these reduced variatns. Forms like \**qtila=iwat ?alle* 'You<sub>MS</sub> have killed him' have converted through contracted forms like *qtil-at=alle* into *qtil-at-le*<sup>167</sup>, for example:

#### (71) Perfect with reduced 'copula' (C. Barwar, NW Iraq; Khan 2008a:180,

280-	281, 284)			
	PERFECT		COPULA	E-set
2ms	qțíl-ət-le	'You <sub>MS</sub> killed him'	=iwət	-ət
FS	qțílt-ət-le	'You <sub>FS</sub> have killed him'	=iwat, =iwət	-at
PL	qțíle-tu-le	etc.	=iwɛtu, =iwitu	-itu
1ms	qțíl-ən-ne		=iwən	-ən
FS	qțílt-ən-ne		=iwan, =iwən	-an
PL	qțíl-əx-xe		=iwəx	- <i>∂X</i>

The reduced enclitic 'copula' is morphologically near-identical with the E-set and could hardly be considered a separate set.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>166</sup> The relationship between this merger and the 'imperfective' is discussed in §5.2.5.<sup>167</sup> The same holds for C. Ashitha (SE Turkey), see Borghero (2005).

Their form is virtually identical with the E-set except for the third person. We shall consider these a secondary  $E_2$ -set (like the secondary  $L_2$ -set). The third person looks rather different and is *-al* or *=l*, persumably derived from 3ms. *=ile*, 3fs. *=ila* and 3pl. *=ile*.

	PERFECT			COPULA
Змѕ	qțíl-əl-le	'He has killed him'	besides <i>qțilɛ=l-əlle</i>	?ile
FS	qțílt-əl-le	'She has killed him'	besides <i>qțiltɛ=l-əlle</i>	?ila
PL	qțíl-əl-le	etc.	besides <i>qțile=l-əlle</i>	?ilε∕a∕ey

Non-reduced covariants of the 'copula' are used, when no coalescence occurs, for example, in the present and past tense:

(72) 'copula' set and E-set alternations (Khan 2008a:189-190)<sup>168</sup>

'COPULA'		E-SET	
príqtɛ=wən	~	priqt-ən	'I <sub>F</sub> have finished'
príxtɛ=wənwa	~	príxt-ən-wa	ʻI <sub>F</sub> had flown'

Where the 'copula' is independent such as the negative 'copula' or deictic 'copula', the reduced variants are not used:

(73)	<b>C. Barwar</b> (NW	/ Ira	q; Khan 2008a	a:284, 286)	
	<b>l-εn</b> qțíl-əlle	(<	*qțil-a ?əlle)	' <b>IM have not</b> killed him'	(negative)
	<b>ho-n</b> qțíl-əlle			' <b>I<sub>M</sub> have</b> killed him'	(deictic)

Among Jewish dialects, contracted forms can be out of synch with their uncontracted counterparts. This is the case in Jewish Urmi where the synthesis of a formerly analytic construction constitutes the basis of an inflectional paradigm no longer synchronic with the 'copula'<sup>169</sup> as compared in (74) below for the first person.

<sup>169</sup> Only a non-verbal clause can take the full form of the enclitic copula in J. Urmi (Khan 2008b282).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>168</sup> Third person forms do not show this same alternation, e.g. *príqtɛ=la* 'She has finished' and *príxta=wawa* besides *príxtɛ=yawa* and *prixtɛ-wa* 'She had flown'.

Progressive (J. Urmi (NW Iran; Khan 2008b:84)					
PROGRESSIV	'COP'	E-set			
⁺qatol-én	<	*qațolá=len	' $I_M$ am killing'	=ilen	-en
⁺qatol-án	<	*qațolá=lan	ʻI <sub>F</sub> am killing'	=ilan	-an
⁺qatol-áx	<	*qațolá=lax	'We are killing'	=ilax	-ax
	Progressiv PROGRESSIV ⁺qatol-én ⁺qatol-án ⁺qatol-áx	Progressive (J PROGRESSIVE (qa †qatol-én < †qatol-án < †qatol-áx <	Progressive (J. Urmi (NW Iran PROGRESSIVE (qaţol- + E(2)-SET) +qatol-én < *qaţolá=len +qatol-án < *qaţolá=lan +qatol-áx < *qaţolá=lax	Progressive (J. Urmi (NW Iran; Khan 2008b:84)PROGRESSIVE $(qa tol - + E(2)-SET)$ *qatol-én < *qatolá=len 'I <sub>M</sub> am killing'*qatol-án < *qatolá=lan 'I <sub>F</sub> am killing'*qatol-áx < *qatolá=lax 'We are killing'	<b>Progressive</b> (J. Urmi (NW Iran; Khan 2008b:84)PROGRESSIVE $(qa \downarrow ol + E(2)$ -SET)'COP'*qatol-én < *qatolá=len 'I <sub>M</sub> am killing'=ilen*qatol-án < *qatolá=lan 'I <sub>F</sub> am killing'=ilan*qatol-áx < *qatolá=lax'We are killing'=ilax

These endings are completely identical with the E-set found in the rest of the verbal system. They only differ in the third person morphems  $-\acute{e}$ ,  $-\acute{a}$  and  $-\acute{u}$  based on 'copula' forms =*ile*, =*ila* and =*ilu*, for example:

PROGRESSIV	/E			'COP'	E-SET
⁺qatol-é	<	*qațolá=le	'He is killing'	=ile	-Ø
⁺qatol-ú	<	*qațolá=lu	'They are killing'	=ilu	-i

Unlike first and second person agent indexes, which combine with the L-suffixes, these third person forms combine with an *?all*-series denoting the patient, for example:

	PERFECT			
(75)	⁺qtəlt-an-ne	<	*qțəlta + =ilan + -le	'I <sub>F</sub> have killed him'
	⁺qțil-u-lle	<	*qțilé + =ilu + -le	'They have killed him'

Negation and past tense are not expressed by special forms of the 'copula' in Jewish Urmi. The past convertor *wa* and negator *la* are used instead:

(76)	+qtəlta-n-ne	'I <sub>F</sub> have killed him'	(present)
	+qtəltá-n-wa-le	'I <sub>F</sub> had killed him'	(past)
	la +qtəlt-an-ne	'I <sub>F</sub> haven't killed him'	(negative)

To sum up, the enclitic 'copula' may be phonetically reduced and merge with the E-set in originally compound verbal forms. The same applies to the *?all*-series in relation to the L-set. The difference between the 'enclitic' copula and the E-set is marginalized to the third person where a residue of the copula is still observed. This gives rise to a secondary  $E_2$ -set for the third person, while the first and second person are fully merged with the primary  $E_1$ -set.

# 5.2.5. Compound Verbal forms Modeled on the 'Imperfective'

The compound verbal forms may partially or completely converge with the 'imperfective' inflectional system. They may also interact with the person role constraint in the 'perfective' in this respect because of morphological identity. The presence of dependent object person forms favors a construction that is modelled on the 'imperfective' (see §4.4).

The enclitic 'copula' and the enclitic pronominal objects based on dative *(?al)l-* (the *?all-*series, see §4.1.3) are best considered inflectional endings in some of the compound verbal forms constructions discussed in the previous section where they become hardly distinguishable from the E<sub>1</sub>-set and L<sub>1</sub>-set. In C. Barwar, for example, the A and P are expressed in the compound verbal forms by means of reduced variants of the present, non-negated copula and the *?all-*series that strongly resembles their coding through the use of E<sub>1</sub>-and L<sub>1</sub>-suffixes in the 'imperfective'. Compare the following transitive forms of the perfect and 'imperfective':

# (77) **C. Barwar perfect and imperfective** (NW Iraq; Khan 2008a:280-281, 284)

	PERFECT		:	IMPERFECTIV	Е
2мѕ	qțíl-ət-le	'You <sub>MS</sub> killed him.'		qațl-ət-le	'You <sub>MS</sub> kill him.'
FS	qțílt-ət-le	'You <sub>FS</sub> have killed him.'		qațla-t-le	'You <sub>FS</sub> kill him.'
PL	qțíle-tu-le	etc.		qațli-tu-le	etc.
1ms	qțíl-ən-ne			qațl-ən-ne	
FS	qțílt-ən-ne			qațla-n-ne	
PL	qțíl-əx-xe			qațl-əx-xe	

Presumably, originally uncontracted forms like \*qtila=iwat ?alle 'You<sub>MS</sub> have killed him' converted through contracted forms like qtil-at=alle into qtil-at-le in analogy to the 'imperfective' in C. Barwar<sup>170</sup>. If we consider the E<sub>1</sub>-set person forms -*a* and -*i* to be gender agreement markers in the 'imperfective', then they pattern exactly like the gender agreement of the resultative participle in the perfect<sup>171</sup>, so that we obtain the following parallel:

	PERFECT		IMPERFECTIVE
MS	qțil-Ø-	:	qațl-Ø

<sup>170</sup> The same holds for C. Ashitha (SE Turkey), see Borghero (2005).

<sup>171</sup> This agreement is absent in the corresponding analytical progressive based on an indeclinable verbal noun *qtala* (Khan 2008a:287), e.g. *qtal-at-le* 'You<sub>FS</sub> are killing him'.

	PERFECT		IMPERFECTIVE
FS	qțil-t-	:	qațl-a-
PL	qțil-e-		qațl-i-

The same is true for the past tense with past convertor -wa-, compare:

	PERFECT	IMPERFECTIVE
(78)	qțílt-ən-wa-le :	qațlá-n-wa-le
	'I <sub>F</sub> had killed him.'	ʻI <sub>F</sub> would kill him.

It should be noted that the stress pattern between the two forms is still distinct in C. Barwar.

The third person forms are (the  $E_2$ -set) (derived from 3ms. =*ile*, 3fs. =*ila* and 3pl. =*il* $\varepsilon$ ) are different but also follow the affix order of the E-suffixes in the 'imperfective'. Their characteristic -*al*-element in the transitive present perfect is also found with the past convertor, merging the perfect with the 'imperfective', for example:

	PERFECT		IMPERFECTIVE
(79)	qțílt-əl-le :		qațla-le
	'She has killed him	ı.'	'She kills him.'
	qțílt-əl-wa-le	:	qațlá-wa-le
	'She had killed hin	n.'	'She would kill him.'

The processes of analogy and phonetic erosion can lead to considerable mixing. Khan (2008a:284) notes that the reduced variants of the E<sub>2</sub>-series, for instance, can combine with either the *?all*-series or L<sub>1</sub>-series, i.e. *qtíl-an-alle* besides *qtíl-an-ne* for 'I<sub>M</sub> have killed him'. Even the third person 'copula' set (fs. =*ila*, ms. =*ile*, pl. =*ilɛ*) may be (though rarely is) fully expressed before the L<sub>1</sub>-suffixes e.g. *qtíltɛ-la-le* (< \**qtilta* + =*ila* + *-le*) 'She has killed him'. It alternates with a construction based on the *?all*-series (Khan 2008a:284), for example:

(80)	rápy-ɛlə-lle	<	*rəpya=ile ?əll-a	'He has thrown it <sub>F</sub> down.'
	rípe-lə-lle	<	*ripe=ilɛ ?əll-e	'They have attacked him.'

The merger of the compound progressive and perfect with the 'imperfecitve' is virtualy complete in Jewish Urmi. The transitive progressive and transitive realis perfect is identical to that of the inflection of the 'imperfective' apart from the third person. The morphemes and stress pattern<sup>172</sup> of non-third person indexes is indistinguishable from the 'imperfective'. Compare the following forms of the perfect and 'imperfective':

<b>IPERFECTIVE</b>
atl-an-ne
F kill him.'
ı ⁺qatl-an-ne
don't kill him.'
atl-án-wa-le
would kill him.'

The third person agent indexes constitute an  $E_2$ -set and are  $-\acute{e}$ ,  $-\acute{a}$  and  $-\acute{u}$  consistent with the 'copula' forms =*ile*, =*ila* and =*ilu*. Unlike first and second person subject and agent indexes that are identical with the  $E_1$ -set, these third person forms combine with an *?all*-series denoting the patient, for example:

(82) +qtil-u-lle < \*qtilé + =ilu + ?əll-e 'They have killed him.'

Importantly, the compound perfect's merger with the 'imperfective' would potentially also affect the interpretation of the 'perfective'. Person-restricted dialects such as J. Urmi disallow the marking of non-third person patients by the  $E_1$ -set in the perfective past. One should note that if they did allow so, the two constructions would completely converge for the masculine singular forms of first and second person agent indexes. The J. Urmi perfect and pluperfect ms. forms, for instance, would be phonologically identical with preterit and plupreterit ms. forms but with inverted morphosyntax (as the 'imperfective', for example:

<sub>1</sub> -set)
, I.

 $^{172}$  Ultimate stress on nominal forms facilitates this analogy in J. Urmi, i.e.  $^+qtil\acute{a}$  'killed one'.

It is conceivable that these two constructions would be incompatible. And yet, it is interesting to note how delicate this verbal system is such that a compound perfect form like +qtil-**án**-ne '**I**<sub>M</sub> had killed him' that potentially could be conflated to be an instance of the 'perfective' (qtil-) together with the E<sub>1</sub>-set can neatly co-exist with preterit forms like +qtil-**a**-le 'He killed **her**'<sup>173</sup>.

The analogy between the 'imperfective' and compound perfect creates an interesting split between transitive and intransitive constructions of the perfect (and progressive) in both C. Barwar and J. Urmi. This is similar to the perfective past transitive constructions that are adapted to the 'imperfective' we discussed in the previous subsections. The L<sub>1</sub>-suffixes that mark the patient in the compound verbal forms that are analogically modeled on the 'imperfective' result in a noteworthy difference in transitive and intransitive coding. This is illustrated by the pluperfect in C. Barwar. Every verb <u>without</u> object indexes can freely use the full form of the past 'copula' but a verb <u>with</u> object indexes adapts to the past 'imperfective'<sup>174</sup>, for example:

(	[84]	) Split in transitivit	y coding in C. Barwar	(Khan 2008a:190,	284-286
			,	(	

a.	[-P]	príxa=wətwa ~ príx-ət-wa	'You <sub>MS</sub> had flown'
	[P: fNP]	pθíxa=wətwa (tăra)	'You <sub>MS</sub> had opened (a door)'
		~ pθíx-ət-wa	
	[P: PRO]	рθíx-ət-wa-le	'You <sub>MS</sub> had opened $it_M$ '

These constructions, therefore, make a subtle difference between an A with and without a P index. The omission or independent expression of the P favors a different construction. The verb adapts morphologically to the inflection of the 'imperfective' particularly when the patient is a dependent person form. The difference between intransitive and transitive coding is even stronger for third person referents. They are as follows:

b.	[-P]	príxta=wawa <sup>175</sup> ~ prixtɛ-wa	'She had flown'	
	[P: fNP]	qțílt-əl-wa (gawṛa)	'She had killed (a man)'	

<sup>173</sup> These two are incompatible in the Christian dialect of Bohtan where the transitive realis perfect is fully based on the 'perfective' (qtil-), i.e. qtil-a-na 'I have killed her' and qtil-a-li'She has killed me' (both qtil- + E<sub>1</sub>-set), see §5.1.

 $^{174}$  Only an intransitive verb can take a reduced form of the past copula, cf. *príxɛwa* 'He had flown', *prixətwa* 'You<sub>MS</sub> had flown' (Khan 2008a:190).

<sup>175</sup> Also *prixte=yawa*.

[P: PRO] *qtílt-əl-wa-le* 'She had killed him'

Third person 'copula' forms are reduced to *-al-* before the past convertor *-wa*and an L-suffix denoting the patient. The presence of two person indexes favors the coding of the 'imperfective' and, interestingly, the same agent index *-al-* is analogically restored for transitive verbs without an object index. Hence, one obtains the form *qtílt-al-wa* (instead of *qtílta=wawa*) on the basis of *qtílt-al-wale* (instead of *qtílta=wawa ?alle*). Such patient indexes are lacking, for example, in contexts where the P is an indefinite full nominal:

(85) *?ay* šwíq-t-al-wa majma tama
 she leave:RPP-FS-A:3-PST tray there
 'She had left a tray there.' (Khan 2008a, A4:53)

And yet, we will never find this morphology on an intransitive verb, so that forms like *\*\*prixt-al-wa* for 'She had flown' are impossible. The S is treated differently from both the A and P.

To conclude, the coding of A and P in the compound verbal forms in C. Barwar and J. Urmi is analogically levelled to that of the 'imperfective'. Through post-verbal cliticization, the basic 'copula' and *?all*-series assimilate fully to the E<sub>1</sub>-suffixes and L<sub>1</sub>-suffixes in the 'imperfective'. Consequently, transitive clauses are treated differently systematically in the compound perfect and progressive and are adapted to the more frequent pattern found in the 'imperfective' system, especially for the first and second person agent indexes. While gender and number agreement always groups the S and A, the S, A, and P, are all treated differently in a tripartite fashion for the third person indexes. The first and second person favor an accusative grouping of S and A throughout.

# 5.3. Constructional Splits in Trans-Zab Jewish Dialects

After the introduction of compound verbal forms in general the focus shifts to the expression of the perfect. In many NENA dialects, the perfect is expressed through a compound verbal form consisting of the resultative participle and the copula. There are some interesting features pertaining to agreement and case-marking from the perspective of voice and alignment<sup>176</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>176</sup> See also Coghill (2016:81-84, 272-283) who briefly discusses dialects with nonaccusative alignment in the perfect and the gap for a transitive perfect.

The remaining subsections deal with Trans-Zab Jewish dialects. Trans-Zab Jewish dialects vary greatly in their treatment of intransitive verbs in general as well as the transitive realis perfect (see Khan 2008b:2-7, 146-148; 2009:5-9, 327-329). Western Iranian dialects such as Saqqiz, Sanandaj and Kerend and NE Iraq such as Sulemaniyya and Halabja manifest ergative alignment in the perfective past (see §4.2.3). In the realis perfect, however, these 'ergative dialects' strongly diverge. Trans-Zab Jewish dialects in NE Iraq and NW Iran that show fluid subject-marking also evince considerable differences. In all of them, it is the transitive realis perfect that stands out and displays the greatest diversity, since the difference in subject coding creates a gap for the transitive counterpart.

(86)	PRETERIT	r (perfective)	REALIS PERFECT (RESULTATIVE)
TR.	qțəl-le	'He killed'	'He has killed'
ITR.	qim-le	'He rose'	<i>qim-Ø</i> 'He is/has risen'

Moreover, there are several morphological properties that can manifest agreement in the compound verbal forms, namely the participial agreement, the 'copula' or  $E_2$ -set and some other person index such as 'possessive suffixes' or an *?all*-series. What is common to these dialects is that the inflectional base is different for transitive and intransitive verbs (transitive *palța* 'taken out' vs. intransitive *plița* 'gone out') and the 'copula' is not mobile and takes a distincitive /y/-base (=y(e) 'He is', =ya 'She is').

# 5.3.1. Person Role Constraint

Compound verbal forms can also evince person role constraints similarly to the 'perfective' in a NENA dialect. A dependent person form marking the patient of first or second person, for example, cannot be combined with dependent person forms marking the agent in the Jewish dialect of Sulemaniyya (Khan 2004a). When the patient is of first or second person reference, it must be expressed independently<sup>177</sup>.

Two types of object coding occur in the present progressive: (i) 'possessive' suffixes and (ii) independent *?all*-series. The forms are given below.

<sup>177</sup> Conversely, in Jewish Koy Sanjaq (NE Iraq), when the A is first/second person, the P is expressed by L-suffixes, whereas, when the A is third person, the P is expressed by 'posses-sive suffixes' (Mutzafi 2004a:100-101).

[87]	Person-role split in the progressive (Khan 2004a:139)				
	(ii) INDEPENDENT	(i) dependent			
3pl	garošá=y ?əll-ú	garoš- <b>u</b> =ye	'He is pulling	them'	
FS	garošá=y ?əll-á	garoš- <b>aw</b> =ye	etc.	her'	THIRD PERSON
MS	garošá=y ?əll-é	garoš- <b>ew</b> =ye		him'	
1sg	garošá=y ?əll-í			me'	
2pl	garošá=y ?əll-ăxún			you <sub>PL</sub> '	NON-THIRD
	etc.			etc.	PERSON

(97) Borson role calit in the progressive (Vhan 2004a:120)

Only third person referents can occur as dependent object person forms. They are suffixed between the verb (*garošá* 'pulling') and the coding for A (=y(e) 'He is') in construction type I (second column). By contrast, the progressive combines with all persons when the patient is not dependent but expressed independently by a preposition instead (e.g. *?ill-í*, first column). This parallels the person restrictions on the E-suffixes that mark the patient before the L-suffixes that mark the agent in the 'perfective':

	INDEPENDENT	DEPENDENT		
Змѕ	grəš-le <b>?əll-áw</b>	gərš- <b>a</b> -le	'He pulled	her'
1sg	grəš-le <b>?əll-í</b>			me'

The person role constraint in Jewish Sulemaniyya as such does not hinge either on a particular alignment type per se (i.e. ergativity) or a particular TAM property *per se* but presumably on a specific combination of dependent person forms in a specific order (V-P-A).

#### **Gender-Conditioned Hierarchical Agreement** 5.3.2.

The morphosyntax of the perfect evinces some interesting peculiarities in the Jewish variety of Sulemaniyya and Halabja (NE Iraq; Khan 2004a) which are 'ergative dialects'. The inflectional base of transitive verbs differs in the perfect similarly to the perfective past. Unlike the perfective past, however, the perfect is generally accusative. The ergative agreement in the perfect is marginal and conditioned by feminine gender expressed only in the singular. The S consistently triggers overt participial agreement, whereas the A and P do so depending on gender.

Similarly to the preterit, intransitive and transitive verbs are distinguished by means of a shift in syllable structure where the intransitive base consistently maintains a long front vowel /i/. The masculine singular form of the resultative participle and the third feminine singular inflection of the perfective for the s and P are identical:

#### (88) Preterit and perfect in J. Sulemaniyya (NE Iraq; Khan 2004a:98; 2005)

ITR.	smix-a	' <b>She</b> waited'	smixá=y	'He <b>has waited</b> '
	PRETERIT		PERFECT	
TR.	<b>šəql-a-</b> le	'He bought <b>it</b> <sub>F</sub> '	<b>šəqlá</b> =y	'He <b>has bought</b> '
	PRETERIT		PERFECT	

The transitive stem I verbs conjugate similarly to the equivalent stem III verbs, e.g. preterit *mrədx-a-le* 'He boiled it<sub>F</sub>' and perfect *mrədxá=y* 'He has boiled'. The resultative participle encodes gender and number agreement. The position of the 'copula' is stable in J. Sulemaniyya and does not attach to the subject but always attaches to the predicate. The paradigms of intransitive and transitive verbs are as follows:

-	-	-			-	
	INTRANS	TIVE		TRANSITIVE		
MS	qțilá	+COP		qəţlá	+COP	
3	smixá	= <i>y</i>	'He has waited'	šəqlá	= <i>y</i>	'He has bought'
2	smix-ét		'You <sub>MS</sub> have waited'	šəql-ét		'You <sub>MS</sub> have bought'
1	smix-en	а	'I <sub>M</sub> have waited'	šəql-ena		'I <sub>M</sub> have bought'
	INTRANSI	TIVE		TRANSITIV	/E	
FS	qțiltá	+COP		qţəltá	+COP	
3	smixta	=ya	'She has waited'	šqəlta	=ya	'She has bought'
2	smixta	$=yat^{178}$	<sup>3</sup> 'You <sub>FS</sub> have waited'	šqəlta	=yat	'You <sub>FS</sub> have bought'
1	smixta	=yan	"IF have waited'	šqəlta	=yan	"IF have bought"
PL	qtilé	+COP		qəţlé	+COP	
3	smix-én		'They have waited'	šəql-én		'They have bought'
2	smix-etu	n	'You <sub>PL</sub> have waited'	' šəql-etur	1	'You <sub>PL</sub> have bought'
1	smix-éx		'We have waited'	šəal-éx		'We have bought'

#### (89) **Perfect paradigms in J. Sulemaniyya** (NE Iraq; Khan 2004a:98; 2005)

The participle and 'copula' often undergo contraction. For example, \**smixé* + =*yetun* > *smixetun* 'You<sub>PL</sub> have waited'

<sup>178</sup> The feminine singular forms in *-yat* and *-yan* may also contract, e.g. *smixtá-yan* > *smixtán* (Khan 2004a: 998).

In such contracted forms, stress is the only distinction against the preterit inflected for E-suffixes (Khan 2004a:99, 2005:366). Compare:

(90) smíx-ex 'We waited' qțil- + E-suffixes
 smix-éx 'We have waited' qțila + enclitic 'copula'

Generally, the alignment is accusative in the perfect in J. Sulemaniyya as in most NENA dialects. The participle and 'copula' will agree with the A or S and mark the object independently, for example *xzita=ya* **?all-ux** 'She has seen **you**<sub>MS</sub>'. This construction is available for all persons as in the progressive (e.g. *garoša=y* ?all-ux 'He is pulling you<sub>MS</sub>').

Dependent person forms may also be used as patient indexes for the third person. The alignment is more complex, however. First of all, the P need not be expressed independently of the verb but must be attached to the participle as a 'possessive' suffix. The participle takes (adnominal) person indexes, e.g. šaql-éw 'taken **him**'. Like the E-suffixes, however, this is restricted to third person referents, e.g. -éw 'his', -áw 'her' and -ú 'their'. It should be noted that, when the third person patient is marked on the participle through the 'possessive' series, this parallels the marking of the patient in the preterit through the E-series. The 'copula' in the perfect resembles the L-suffixes in the preterit. Compare the parallel sentences in preterit and perfect in (91) below.

(91) J. Sulemaniyya (W Iran; Khan 2004a:522 R:163)

	[P]		[V-P- A]
a.	ay-bratá	ma=ya	mi-t- <b>aw</b> =yet?
	DEM:FS-girl:FS	why=3 <sub>MS</sub>	bring:RPP-P:FS-P:3FS=A:2MS
	'Why (lit. is it	м) have you <sub>MS</sub> bro	ought <b>this girl</b> ?'
b.	aya	ma=ya	my- <b>a</b> -lox?
	DEM:FS	why=3 <sub>MS</sub>	bring <sub>PFV</sub> -P:3FS-A:2MS
	'Why (lit. is it	M) did you <sub>MS</sub> brin	g <b>her</b> ?'

The person forms always pattern accusatively, the 'copula' expressing the S and A. The resultative participle, however, can agree either with the A or the P in this construction. This depends on the <u>gender(-number) hierarchy</u>, given in (92) below.

(92) Gender(-number) hierarchy

FS > non-FS (PL, MS)

The participle indexes the gender and number of the feminine singular outranking the non-feminine irrespective of its role as either the A or P. The masculine singular and the plural forms *qațla*, respectively, *qațle* coincide into *qațl*- before the 'possessive' suffixes against the feminine singular *qțalta* which is rediced to *qțalt*- and renders any distinction between the masculine singular and the plural obsolete. The main difference, then, is fs. *qţal-t*- against non-fs. *qațl-*Ø-.

First of all, when all referents are non-feminine singular, participial inflection does not express anything other than non-feminine singular reference, so it could refer to either participant, as illustrated in (93). Forms like našq-ew=yex 'We have kissed him' (93c) and našq-u=yet 'You<sub>MS</sub> have kissed them' are ambiguous with respect to their agreement with either A or P; their underlying declension could be našqa (ms.) or našqe (pl.) or no agreement at all. We simply cannot tell on the basis of these forms. The participle effectively only agrees with the S. The null marking is horizontal, grouping the A and P.

(93)	Null agreement with the non-fem	inine	singular P/A (Khan 2004a)
	A/P = non-FS		A/P = non-FS
a.	nəšq-Ø-ew=yex	c.	nəšq-Ø-u=yet
	kiss:rpp-nonfs-p:3ms-a:1pl		kiss:rpp-nonfs-p:3pl=a:2ms
	'We have kissed him.'		'You <sub>MS</sub> have kissed them.'
	S = non-FS		S = non-FS
b.	šmix-á=y	d.	šmix-én (= smix-e + =yén)
	wait:RPP-S:MS-S:3MS		wait:RPP-S:3PL
	'He has waited.'		'They have waited.'

When feminine singular is involved, the participle will always express agreement with the feminine argument, irrespective of its role. When it is the P argument, the person index marks the P accusatively but the participle agrees ergatively with the P in gender and number like the S:

(94)	Ergative agreement with t	he P (Khan 2	004a)
	P = FS > A = non-FS		$\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{FS} > \mathbf{A} = \mathbf{non} - \mathbf{FS}$
a.	nšəq <b>-t-</b> aw=ye	с.	nšəq <b>-t-</b> aw=yetun
	kiss:rpp-p:fs-p:3fs=a:3ms		kiss:rpp:fs-p:3fs=a:2pl
	'He has kissed <b>her.</b> '		'You <sub>PL</sub> have kissed <b>her</b> .'
	S = FS		

b. *šmix-ta=ya* wait:RPP-S:FS=S:3FS

#### 'She has waited.'

When the feminine singular is the A argument, the participle agrees accusatively with the A like the S:

(95)	Accusative agreement with the A (Khan 2004a)		
	A = FS > P = non-FS		A = FS > P = non-FS
a.	nšəq- <b>t</b> -ew=ya	b.	nšəq <b>-t</b> -u=yat
	kiss:rpp-fs-p:3ms=a:3fs		kiss:rpp-fs-p:3pl=a:3fs
	' <b>She</b> has kissed him.'		<b>'You<sub>FS</sub></b> have kissed them.'
	S = FS		S = FS
b.	šmix <b>-tá</b> =ya	d.	šmix- <b>tá</b> =yat
	wait:RPP-s:FS=s:3FS		wait:RPP-S:FS=S:2PL
	' <b>She</b> has waited.'		<b>'You<sub>PL</sub></b> have waited'.

When all arguments are feminine singular, it is impossible to discern with which argument the participle agrees.

The same holds for the indexing of full NPs. When a full nominal P is not indexed, the participle agrees with the A, for example:

(96) Agreement with A (Khan 2004a:490.72)
[A] [P] [V+A] *?ana noši noši jullé kaldá xiţ-ţa-yan*I myself myself clothe:PL bride:FS sew:RPP-FS-A:1FS
'I<sub>F</sub> myself, on my own, sewed the clothes of a bride.'

When a full nominal P is indexed, the gender determines participial agreement. A salient, feminine singular patient such as *ay-bratá* 'this girl' in (97) below may trigger overt participial agreement with the P.

(97)	<b>Agreement with P</b> (Khan 2004a:522.163)			
	[P] <b>←</b>		[V+P]-[A]	
	ay-bratá	ma=ya	mi-t- <b>aw</b> =yet?	
	DEM:FS-girl:FS	why=3MS	bring:RPP-P:FS-P:3FS=A:2MS	
	'Why (lit. is it	M) have you <sub>MS</sub> bro	ought <b>this girl</b> ?'	

Thus, agreement with femine singular arguments overrides agreement with non-feminine singular arguments (Khan 2004a:137-138, 157) and the alignment depends on the properties of a co-argument. All functions S, A and P can

trigger agreement. It only patterns either ergatively or accusatively, when a non-fs. argument is additionally involved. The non-feminine singular arguments are ambiguous only in transitive clauses. Only non-feminine singular S triggers overt participial agreement, while the A and P do not. The morphosyntax shifts in the direction of the morphologically more marked feminine singular, regardless of the function. Only the A and P are treated differently depending on gender, while the S remains unaffected and the person indexes (i.e. the 'copula' and the 'possessive' suffixes) remain accusative throughout.

In sum, the gender agreement of the participle is irrespective of the A or P function of the argument. The agreement potential is the same for all functions (S, A, P) but not for all genders (feminine singular vs. non-feminine singular). It is the feminine singular argument *per se* that triggers overt agreement, not the function. Non feminine singular arguments arguably do not trigger participial agreement in transitive clauses, since there is no overt morphology that distinguishes between masculine singular or common plural (contrary to intransitive clauses). The resultative participle expresses agreement in gender and number with the P only for the third person and never first and second person. The ergative grouping of the S and P, then, only occurs, if the P is expressed as a dependent person form of the third person feminine singular, and no competing feminine singular A is involved.

# 5.3.3. Splits and Co-Variation in the Realis Perfect

North West Trans-Zab Jewish dialects in Iraqi Kurdistan and Iranian Azerbaijan exhibit active-stative fluid subject-marking (see §5.1.2). They have a tense-aspect-conditioned split for 'perfective' *qțil*- between the E-set as subject indexes for the raelis perfect and the L-set for the preterit (i.e. *+dmix-a* 'She is asleep, has gone to sleep' vs. *+dmax-la* 'She slept'). The transitive counterpart of the simple intransitive perfect or resultative strongly differs across such dialects. The compound verbal constructions are competing and converging with the fluid subject marking.

Thus, the 'perfective' (qtil-) and resultative participle (qtila) both constitute a possible basis for perfect constructions that may either complement each other or compete. The North West Trans-Zab Jewish dialects considered here all showed an intransitive construction based upon the 'perfective' and the E<sub>1</sub>-set of person forms. It is the transitive realis perfect construction that is somehow derived. The transitive realis perfect based on the resultative participle is partially merged but completely complementary with the intransitive resultative based on the 'perfective' in North Western Iranian Jewish dialects such as J. Urmi. As a result, Jewish Urmi shows tripartite alignment for the third person indexes in the realis perfect. The morphology presumably also evinces a marked ergative pattern in isolating the A for the feminine singular.

There are interesting parallels between the split subject marking in Jewish Urmi in the perfect and split subject marking in the 'ergative dialects'. Apart from possible idiosyncracies, a major difference is the treatment of controlled activities such as 'dance' and semelfactives such as 'bark'. Controlled activities are probably not compatible with the result state focus of the intransitive coding.

# 5.3.3.1. Competing Resultatives

In many respects, intransitive resultative or perfect forms like dmix-Ø are akin to compound verbal forms based on the enclitic 'copula' and resultative participle. In J. Rustaqa, for instance, the same sense of the intransitive resultative-stative is available for a construction based on the participle:

(98)	J. Ru	<b>staqa</b> (NE Iraq;	Khan 2002b:404) <sup>179</sup>	
a.	lā	xmil-et	'You <sub>MS</sub> are standing.'	(TAM + qțil- + E-set)
b.		xmil-a=wet	ʻid.'	(RPP <i>qțila</i> + encl. 'copula')

Based on Khan (2002b), we can assume the following system for J. Rustaqa. The schema below gives the first person feminine forms for the two types of resultatives and the preterit; one ('resultative I') based on the 'perfective' (qtil-), the other ('resultative II' represented in gray shade) based on the resultative participle (qtila):

#### (99) Two resultatives in J. Rustaqa (NE Iraq; Khan 2002b)

	PRETERIT	RESULTATIVE I	RESULTATIVE II	
	PFV			
TR.	qțil-li	lā q		
ITR.	dmix-li	(lā) dmix-na	dmixá=wena	RPP-based

<sup>179</sup> Third person enclitic 'copula' forms (=*ile*, =*ila*, =*ilu*) presumably undergo contraction (e.g. *dmixe-le* < \**dmixa=ile*). Khan (2002c) does not provide an example of this contraction but we can infer this from the contraction with noun phrases elsewhere.

Note how it is the intransitive constructions that show distinct verbal inflection. In principle, the transitive resultative  $l\bar{a}$  qtil-li with preverbal TAM-marking functions as the transitive counterpart to both 'resultative I' ( $l\bar{a}$ ) dmix-na and 'resultative II'  $dmix\dot{a}=wena$ .

In a closely related Jewish dialect, Koy Sanjaq (NE Iraq), the TAM-marker  $l\bar{a}$  is absent but 'resultative I' forms like *rxiš*-Ø 'He has walked' (Mutzafi 2004a:82) do occur. They are marginal and are largely supplanted by the second resultative construction, respectively, compound perfect. 'Resultative II' forms like *dmixe=lū* 'They are asleep' (RPP+COP) are more common than 'resultative I' forms like *dmix-i* 'They are asleep' (*qțil-* + E-set) (Mutzafi 2004a:78, 105, 108). The compound perfect is, however, fully available for transitive verbs, so that we obtain the following system:

#### (100) Two resultatives in J. Koy Sanjaq (NE Iraq; Mutzafi 2004a)

	PRETERIT	RESULTATIVE I	RESULTATIVE II	
	PFV	/-based		
TR.	qțil-li	qțilá=	wen(a)	
ITR.	dmix-li	dmix-en(a)	dmixá=wen(a)	RPP-based

It is the second resultative ( $qtil\dot{a}$ =wena) that serves as the transitive counterpart to the 'resultative I' based on the 'perfective' (dmix-ena) in J. Koy Sanjaq<sup>180</sup>.

In both J. Rustaqa and J. Koy Sanjaq, there is some overlap between the 'perfective' (*qțil-*) and resultative participle (*qțila*) in either direction. In dialects further north in North West Iran such as Urmi, however, there is a mixed system with complete complementary distribution between the two types of resultatives (Khan 2008b:82-83). Transitive verbs have a complete system of their own based on the resultative participle and a secondary  $E_2$ -set ultimately based on but not identical with the enclitic 'copula' (*plix-é* <\**plixa=ile* 'He has opened'). Intransitive verbs are inflected for the familiar  $E_1$ -set, for example:

<sup>180</sup> The alignment of person indexes is tripartite in Jewish Koy Sanjaq (NE Iraq). The coding of the P differs depending on the person of the A. The copula indexes and the participle always agrees with the A. When the A is first/second person, the P is expressed by L-suffixes, e.g. *lbil-tá=wan-ne* 'I<sub>F</sub> have taken **him** along', whereas, when the A is third person, the P is expressed by 'possessive suffixes', e.g. *nsiq-t-ew=ila* 'She kissed **him'** (Mutzafi 2004a:100-101). Although I cannot fully address this here, I presume this alternation is ultimately derived from ditransitives, where the third person copula marks the the theme and attaches to an L-set that reveals the same forms as the 'possessive suffixes'.

#### 310 CONSTRUCTIONAL SPLITS IN TRANS-ZAB JEWISH DIALECTS

(10)	(101) <b>J. Urmi</b> (NW Iran; Khan 2008b:263, 83)				
a.	xa tara	plix-é	'He opened a door.'	(tr., <i>qțilá</i> , A = E <sub>2</sub> )	
b.	tara	plix-Ø	'The door has opened.'	(itr., <i>qțil</i> -, S = E <sub>1</sub> )	
c.	o-tara	plixe=le	'The door is open.'	(adj., <i>qțilá</i> , S = COP)	

The two systems complement each other entirely and constitute a paradigmatic relation, as illustrated in (102) below. The feminine forms highlight the difference between verbal base. The construction based the resultative participle inflects for gender like the nominal form (fs. *qțilta* 'killed') and is combined with the  $E_1$ -series for the first and second person and the  $E_2$ -series for the third person. If the intransitive form had the same basis, it would inflect in the same way, i.e. \*\**dmixt-án* 'She has slept' but this is impossible.

### (102) Two resultatives in J. Urmi (NE Iraq; Khan 2008b)

PRETERIT RESULTATIVE I+II

	PFV	RPP-BASED
TR.	+qtəl-li	⁺qtəlt-án
ITR.	+dməx-li	+dmix-an

This also applies to their relative past tense forms that take the past convertor - *wa* instead of the past copula. Compare:

#### (103) Equivalent forms with 'past convertor'

	PRETERIT	RESULTATIVE I+II
	PFV	RPP-BASED
TR.	+qtál-wa-li	+qtəlt-an-wa
ITR.	+dmáx-wa-li	+dmíx-an-wa

# 5.3.3.2. Alignment Spltis and Gender-Conditioned Ergativity

Jewish Urmi has a split between accusative and tripartite alignment depending on mood (realis as opposed to irrealis). Whenever the verb takes an object index in the perfect, this is marked by the L-suffixes (analogically to the 'imperfective', see S.2.5): '*qtalt-an-ne* 'I<sub>F</sub> have killed **him**.'

A more analytic construction is preferred in the <u>ir</u>realis mood. The auxiliary verb *hwy* 'be' is employed together with the participle, both agreeing with the subject and agent. The unmarked 'imperfective' form ( $\emptyset$ -hawe) of hwy expresses the subjunctive. The intransitive and transitive verbs pattern alike in this analytic construction, for example:

(104) Irrealis perfect in J. Urmi (NE Iraq; Khan 2008b:82, 142)			
RESULTATIVE II			
TR.	⁺qtəl-tá=hawy-a	'She may have killed'	
	⁺qtəl-tá=hawy-a-le	'She may have killed him'	
ITR.	⁺dməx-tá=hawy-a	'She may have gone to sleep'	

In terms of alignment, then, the irrealis perfect is accusative, and this is expected, because the inflection is fully based on the 'imperfective' form of *hwy* 'be'. When we confine ourselves to the realis perfect, however, the alignment pattern is best considered to be tripartite for the third person indexes and accusative only for the first and second person indexes. The first and second person subject and agent indexes are expressed by the E<sub>1</sub>-set (*+dmix-an* 'I<sub>M</sub> have slept' : *+qtalt-an* 'I<sub>M</sub> have killed'). Third person S and A are differentiated by the primary E<sub>1</sub>-set (*plix-\varnotheta* 'It<sub>M</sub> is opened') and secondary E<sub>2</sub>-set (*plix-\varepsilon* 'He has opened (sth.)'). The patient index may be a primary L<sub>1</sub>-set or secondary L<sub>2</sub>-set. (35) illustrates this tripartite pattern.





Finally, there is one subtle aspect in which the A is isolated. The resultative participle only agrees with the A and this is only overt in the feminine singular. No such overt agreement is found for the S and the P. Morphologically speaking, the transitive construction evinces more differentiation for the A than for the P which is also distinct from the S for feminine singular argments. The difference is not visible for the masculine singular and the (common) plural. We may illustrate this with the first person coding. The  $\emptyset$  symbol indicates that we observe no difference with the intransitive verbs here.

(106) 1MS	+qtil-Ø-án-wa-la	'I <sub>M</sub> had killed her.'
	+dmíx-Ø-ən-wa	'I <sub>M</sub> had gone to sleep'

1pl	+qtil-Ø-áx-wa-la	'We had killed her.'
	⁺dmíx-Ø-əx-wa	'We had gone to sleep'

Although the inflectional bases of the transitive verbs is diachronically different from that of intransitives (resultative participle q til a + enclitic copula vs. perfective q til + E-set), there is no such distinction synchronically apart from which morpheme takes the stress (the person index or the inflectional base, respective-ly,).

The feminine singular, by contrast, shows an additional /t/-element of originally the resultative participle form +qtal-ta 'killed' that inflected like an adjective. This is distinct from intransitive verbs, for example:

(107) 1FS	⁺qtəl- <b>t</b> -án-wa-le	'I <sub>F</sub> have killed him.'	(transitive)
	+dmíx-Ø-an-wa	'I <sub>F</sub> had gone to sleep'	(intransitive)

Thus, we observe special marking of the A in the feminine singular. This agreement is not just gender conditioned (as in Jewish Sulemaniyya see §5.3.1) but also conditioned by the A role. It is, therefore, ergative agreement for the feminine singular and accusative agreement for the masculine singular and the (common) plural. If this is correct, this would be an instance of a marked ergative agreement pattern. In the unmarked ergative, the S and P trigger overt agreement but not the A (see §2.2.6). In Jewish Urmi, the A triggers overt agreement but not the S and P.

# 5.3.3.3. Split Intransitivity

Not all intransitive verbs receive the same coding in the perfect in Jewish Urmi (NW Iran). Some intransitive verbs have transitive coding (i.e.  $E_2$ -set) in the realis perfect similarly to the 'ergative varieties' like Jewish Sulemaniyya (see §5.1.1). There are notable differences between split subject-marking J. Sulemaniyya and J. Urmi. Table 36 below compares the two dialects by using the preterit forms for J. Sulemaniyya and the perfect forms for J. Urmi. Contrary to J. Sulemaniyya, J. Urmi treats atelic verbs that denote a controlled activity such as *rqil-é* 'dance' as transitive consistent with Croft (1998:52-53)'s control hierarchy (see §2.3.1.). Conversely, semelfactives receive transitive coding in J. Sulemaniyya (*nwax-le*) but intransitive (*nwix-Ø*) in J. Urmi. Other verbs that denote a controlled activity like *mty* 'arrive' and *prq* 'finish' are treated the same in both

dialects. Interestingly, J. Urmi differentiates between the putting on (*lwiš-é*) and the putting off of clothes (*šlix-* $\emptyset$ ) which is presumably simply an idiosyncracy<sup>181</sup>. Khan (2008b:74) notes that a likely explanation for the differences is that punctuality is more fundamental in dialects like J. Sulemaniyya due to the perfective past sense of the preterit, whereas a resultant state is more fundamental to the J. Urmi perfect which is not readily available for (atelic) activity verbs like *rql* 'dance'.

		J. Sulemaniyya	J. Urmi
		PRETERIT	PERFECT
		(Khan 2004a)	(Khan 2008b)
state	'be afraid'	zəde-Ø	zəde-Ø
change of state	'become hungry'	kpin-Ø	kpin-Ø
uncontrolled process	'explode'	pəqe-Ø	páqe-Ø
	'dance'	rqil-Ø	rqil-é
	'jump'	nənde-Ø	nəndy-é
	'ride'	rkiw-Ø	rkiw-é
controlled activity	'come out'	pliț-Ø	⁺plit-Ø
	'go'	zil-Ø	zil-Ø
	'arrive'	məțe-Ø	<i>⁺məte-</i> Ø
	'finish'	priq-Ø	priq-Ø
	'bark'	nwəx-le	nwix-Ø
	'yawn'	phər-re	phir-Ø
sound emission	'sneeze'	tpəl-le	tpil-Ø
	'thunder'	gərgəm-le	gərgím-Ø
inhorontly	'wash'	səxe-Ø	sáxe-Ø
roflevive	'undress'	šləx-le	šlix-Ø
Tenexive	'dress'	lwəš-le	lwiš-é

 Table 36. Comparison of subject-marking in J. Suleminiyya and J. Urmi

<sup>181</sup> Possibly, the distinction is similar to J. Urmi *bašlamíš widé* 'begin' (a complex predicate consisting of 'beginning' + 'do') and *priq-Ø* 'finish' in terms of dynamism, i.e. begin vs. stop wearing.

# 5.3.4. Passive and Ergative in the Realis Perfect

Western Iranian Jewish dialects show ergative and tripartite person indexes in the perfective past (like J. Sulemaniyya, NE Iraq, see §4.2.3) but the perfect based on compound verbal forms is more restricted. While the vast majority of NENA dialects uses the 'copula' set as subject and agent indexes, the Western Iranian Jewish varieties use them as patient indexes. Moreover, as we will see, both the agent and the patient are restricted more so than the subject. Although these restrictions are reminiscent of the passive which may also be expressed by the resultative participle in NENA dialects (see §4.3.1 and §5.2.3), it will be argued that this not a passive voice construction in Western Iranian Jewish NE-NA. There are several reasons why the transitive perfect should not be mistaken to be one. We will consider the following reasons:

- (i) word order and case-marking;
- (ii) inflectional base of the participle;
- (iii) referential continuity;
- (iv) differential object marking.

# 5.3.4.1. The Perfect in West Iranian Dialects

The participle is inflected for number and gender like adjectives. In certain forms of the masculine singular and all forms of the plural, the participle and 'copula' mainly (though not always) undergo contraction (e.g. *\*smixé=yetun >* J. Kerend *smix=etun* 'You have stood') similarly to Jewish Sulemaniyya (see §5.3.1). Stress is the only cue to distinguish between these contracted perfect forms and their near-identical preterit counterparts (Hopkins 1989a, 2002). Compare:

(108) **J. Kerend** (W Iran; Hopkins 2002:287, 291)

<b>rqíl</b> -etun '	You <sub>PL</sub> danced'	<i>qțil</i> - + E-suffixes	(preterit)
rqil <b>-étun</b>	'You <sub>PL</sub> have danced	<i>qțila</i> + enclitic 'copula'	(perfect)

In addition, one should note that the position of the 'copula' is stable in these dialects and always attaches to the predicate which normally follows the subject NP (J. Sanandaj, Khan 2009:335-337). Thus, the position of the copula =y after the subject NP *tatóx* 'Your father' in \*\**tatóx*=y *hiyá* 'Your father has come' is not possible but only after the participle: *tatóx hiyá*=y.

The dialects further differentiate between various moods and tenses of the perfect mainly by means of the verb *hwy* 'be'. Intransitive verbs can occur in all perfect constructions alike, for example:

(109) Intransitive perfect forms in J. Saqqiz (W Iran; Israeli 1998:110, 149)

	PRESENT	PAST
REALIS	dmixá=y	dmixēle < dmixá ye-le
	'He has fallen asleep'	'He had fallen asleep'
IRREALIS	dmixá Ø-hawé-Ø	dmixá Ø-hawe-Ø-wa
	'He may have fallen asleep'	'He would have fallen asleep'

Transitive perfect constructions are more restricted. We will concentrate on the realis perfect. The perfect is mainly non-ergative the majority of NENA dialects, even though the 'perfective' may be ergative (for example J. Sulemaniyya, §4.2.3) or active-stative (for example J. Urmi, §4.6.3). In all of them, the 'copula' always expresses the subject and agent. In Western Iranian dialects, this is not the case. The participle as well as the 'copula' agree with the patient in the realis perfect. This is a striking deviation from the more common pattern in the transitive realis perfects among NENA dialects. Following (Khan 2008b:6), we may compare this to North Western Iranian Jewish varieties such as Urmi. Consider the following clauses:

# (110) The perfect in Iranian Jewish dialects (Khan 2008b:6)

	[A]	[P]	[V-A-P]	
a.	šwaw-í	baxt-í	nšiq-e- <b>lla</b>	(NW Iran)
	neighbor:мs-my	woman:FS-my	kissed:nonfs-a:3ms-p:3fs	
	[A]	[P] <b>←</b>	<b>–</b> [V+P]	
b.	šwaw-í	baxt-í	nšəq- <b>ta=ya</b>	(W Iran)
	neighbor:MS-my	woman:FS-my	kissed-P:FS=P:3FS	
	'My neighbor h	as kissed <b>my w</b>	/ife.'	

In North West Iranian dialects, the  $E_2$ -set ending -*e* derived from the enclitic 'copula' (*ile*) agrees with the agent *šwawí* 'my neighbor' while the suffix -*lla* 'her' from the *?all*-series (derived from independent dative person forms) indexes the patient *baxtí* 'my wife'. In the equivalent clause for Western Iranian dialects, the participial inflection reflected in the feminine singular *nšaqta* 'kissed' as well as the 'copula' reflected in the feminine singular *=ya* (otherwise denoting 'She is') index the feminine singular patient NP. Interestingly, there is no overt coding of the agent (Hopkins 2002; Khan 2009:92). This is a major difference with other NENA dialects. Also, given the lack of agreement with the agent, the compound verbal form itself is unspecified for an agent which has to be inferred from the context and can never be a highly topical argument such as the first or second person. Thus, a hypothetical clause like (111) below is not possible.

(111) \*\*aná baxtí nšəq-ta=ya I woman:FS-my kissed-P:FS=P:3FS 'I have kissed my wife.'

The realis perfect is similar to the passive, since the agent is obligatorily zero and incompatible with highly topical agents. In some languages, the agent in the passive construction is limited to the third person and may be omitted (Jelinek and Demers 1983; Croft 2001:288-290). In such languages, the passive cannot be used where the agent is non-third person and the S is third person (either pronominal or full nominal).

Yet, there are good reasons to believe this construction is not to be characterized as passive but as ergative.

# 5.3.4.2. Word order and Case-marking

First of all, the unmarked word order of full NPs in the perfect is consistent with other transitive clauses. Compare the perfect in (112a) with an equivalent preterit clause in (112b) in the Jewish dialect of Saqqiz:

(112) J. Saqqiz (W Iran; Israeli 1998:103)

	[A]	[P]		[V-P]		
a.	brat-év	axonowal-áv	la	xizy <b>-</b> én		
	girl:FS-his	brother:PL-her	NEG	see:rpp:p:pl-p:3pl		
'His daughter has not seen her brothers.'						
	[A]	[P]	[V·	[V-P-A]		
b.	aḥmád	xalist-év	xiz	xizy-a-le		
	PRN	sister-his	see	seepfv-P:3fs-A:3ms		
	'Ahmad saw his sister.'					

The agreement is entirely limited to the patient in the realis transitive perfect (112a) contrary to the preterit where the agent is indexed (i.e. the L-suffixes). The agent NP in (112a) occupies the typical position of the A in the clause. Indeed,

the agent nominal is similarly zero-marked. It is not oblique, as we would expect for a passive.

# 5.3.4.3. Inflectional Base

Secondly, the difference between an agent- or patient-orientation is also reflected in the inflectional base (not for weak verbs like *xzy* 'see' in (112) above but for sound verbs like *grš* 'pull'). Sound verbs differentiate between transitive and intransitive predicates. They differ in the vowel template of the participle similarly to the 'perfective'. Transitive verbal forms have a vowel before the second radical in the masculine and plural base which is a reduced /ə/ (written <*i*> in Israeli 1996 for J. Saqqiz):

# (113) Transitive bases

ms. *gəršá* 'pulled' pl. *gəršé* fs. *grəšté* 

Intransitive verbs such as *smx* 'stand, wait' have a full /i/ and a stable vowel template. This also applies to the intransitive form of transitive verbs:

# (114) Intransitive bases

ms.	smixá	'waited'	grišá	'pulled'
pl.	smixé		grišé	
fs.	smixté		grišté	

Thus, intransitive verbs are stable  $smix\dot{a}=y$  'I have stood',  $smix=\acute{en}$  'I have stood', smixte=ya 'I have stood' etc. Virtually all transitive verbs are labile but there is a morphological distinction between the intransitive and transitive valence pattern. The transitive valence pattern is  $qatl\acute{a}$  or  $qilt\acute{a}$  as in causative piltttiet=a=y 'taken him out' where an agent is still implied against the intransitive  $qtil\acute{a}$  as in anticausative piltttiet=a=y 'He has gone out' (J. Saqqiz, Israel 1998:107). We would expect to find and do find the intransitive verbal form for a passive:  $gris\acute{a}=y$  'He has been taken' (Khan 2009:93)

# 5.3.4.4. Referential Continuity

Co-referential deletion is not expected to be possible for the (oblique) agent in a passive prototype but only for the S (see §4.3.1). In the following examples, how-

ever, an intransitive construction is combined with a transitive one, both in the realis perfect. The agent in the conjoined clause is the same referent as the s. The -Ø affix indicates that the agreement with the agent is not overtly expressed.

(115) <b>J. Kerend</b> (W Iran; Hopkins 2002:292)								
	[S]		[A=S]	[P≠S]	[V+P](-[A])			
a.	hy-a=y	u	(Ø)	zuz-éf	ləbl-á=y(-Ø)			
	come:RPP-S:MS=S:3MS	and	Змѕ	money:MS-his	take:RPP:MS=P:3MS-A:3			
	'He <sub>i</sub> has come and (he <sub>i</sub> has) taken his <sub>i</sub> money.'							
b.	h-ita=ya	u	(Ø)	zuz-áf	ləbl-á=y(-Ø)			
	come:RPP-S:FS=S:3FS	and	3fs	money:MS-her	take:RPP:MS=P:3MS-A:3			
	'She <sub>i</sub> has come and (she <sub>i</sub> has) taken her <sub>i</sub> money.'							
c.	hy-éni	u	(Ø)	zuz-ú	ləbl-á=y(-Ø)			
	come:RPP:S:PL-S:3PL	and	3pl	money:MS-their	take:RPP:MS=P:3MS-A:3			
'They <sub>i</sub> have come and (they <sub>i</sub> have) taken their <sub>i</sub> money.'								

The s of the intransitive verb *hyy* 'come' shows full agreement. It has the same referent as the agent of the following transitive clause. The transitive verb *lbl* 'take' agrees with the definite patient NP which is *zuza* 'money'. In each case there is a distinct reference for the agent as indicated by the possessor on *zuza* and this subject reference is the same as the preceding S of the intransitive verb. Other than the contextualization such as the possessor pronoun and the subject in the preceding intransitive clauses, the agent is not expressed. Accordingly, forms like *lablá=y* 'taken her' still imply agreement with a third person agent, such that a feature [A:3] is arguably part of the construction (cf. Hopkins 2002). Transitive forms like *xazyá=y* '(A:3) seen him' and *palțá=y* '(A:3) taken him out' are active two-argument instances of the realis perfect.

In addition, the patient may be omitted and the verb remains referential to the agent, taking the unmarked 3ms. form (Khan 2009:325). Thus, where the patient is less salient to the event, an agent-orientation may be maintained such as *qry* 'study' in (116a). Similarly, intransitive  $S_A$  verbs such as *šhl* 'cough' in (116b) that take transitive coding in the perfective past also retain an agent-orientation (Khan ibid.). A passive interpretation completely ruled out.

(116) J. Sanandaj (W Iran; Khan 2009:325)

```
a. brat-i qərya=y-Ø
daughter:FS-my study:RPP:MS=3MS-3
'My daughter hast studied.'
```
b. *baxt-i šəhla=y-Ø* woman:FS-my cough:RPP:MS=3MS-3 'My wife has coughed.'

In same subject complements, modal verbs like *?by* 'want' (cf. *?abe-le* 'He wanted') take the agentless transitive form, while the following subjunctive verb in the complement clauses expresses overt subject agreement, for example:

c. *brat-i*<sub>i</sub> *?abya=y-Ø Ø*<sub>i</sub> *Ø-hiy-a* daughter:FS-my study:RPP:MS=3MS-3 SBJ-comeIPFV-S:3FS 'My daughter wanted to come.' (Khan 2009:326)

# 5.3.4.5. Differential Object Marking

The marking of the patient is sensitive to definiteness in the realis perfect which is typical for objects. Agreement, for instance, is only manifested, when the patient argument is salient. Otherwise the compound perfect is in the unmarked masculine singular form, e.g. garšá=y, and does not agree just as in the preterit, e.g. graš-li 'I pulled' (Khan 2009:326). Although it is not uncommon for passives to disfavor non-third person arguments to occur as the oblique agent, it is typical for passives to favor them as the patient. The compound perfect concerned here, however, is <u>not</u> compatible with non-third person arguments either as the agent or patient. The person constraint on the patient, however, is not typical for a passive and it is similar to the ergative preterit. A first person form, for example, cannot be expressed as the patient as in the following hypothetical clause:

(117) *šultana* \*\* *nšəqta=yan* king:MS kiss:RPP:P:FS=P:1FS 'The king has kissed me<sub>F</sub>.'

In addition, it is the patient argument that may receive (differential) casemarking by the dative preposition *(?al)l-*, for example:

## (118) Differential case-marking

	[A]	[DOM-	→P]	[V]	
a.	šulțaná	il	ganawá	qițlá=y	
	king:MS	DOM	thief:мs	pulled	
	'The king has	killed	the thief.'	(J. Saqqiz,	W Iran; Israeli 1998:229)

#### 320 CONSTRUCTIONAL SPLITS IN TRANS-ZAB JEWISH DIALECTS

b. tat-í hal-baxtaké gəršá=y
 father:MS-my DOM-woman:the:FS pulled
 'My father has pulled the woman.' (J. Sanandaj, W Iran; Khan 2009:329)

Similarly, the realis perfect freely combines with independent object person forms, for example:

(119)	J. Sanandaj	(W Iran; Kh	an 2009:324)
	[A]	[V]	[P]
a.	brat-í	gəršá=y	?əl-éf
	girl:MS-my	pulled	obj-3ms
	'My daughte	er has pulled	him.'
b.	Ø	gəršá=y	?əl-í
	A:3	pulled	OBJ-1SG
	'(He/she/it	/they has/ha	ave) pulled me.'

Dependent person forms of the L<sub>1</sub>-suffixes or L<sub>2</sub>-series (see §4.1.3) may attach to the immediately preceding verbal form in J. Saqqiz just as in the preterit:  $nišq\dot{a}=y$ -lan '(He/she/it/they has/have) kissed us' (Israeli 1998:117). First and second person patients are never expressed through the participial agreement or the 'copula', when the perfect is transitive. This is a type of person role constraint also attested for the preterit of these dialects (see §4.1.1). One would expect for a passive that participle and copula would agree with a highly topical patient just as the S but they do not. The patient coding of the perfect mimicks that of the P in the preterit (cf. Khan 2009:323).

Case-marking of the agent does not appear to be possible in these dialects for the realis perfect such that clauses like (120) below do not occur. This is typical for the A.

(120)**	həl-brat-í	gərša=y	?əlí
	DAT-daughter:FS-my	pulled	p:3ms
	'My daughter has	s pulled me.'	

All things considered, it has been established that the transitive realis perfect ( $garš\dot{a}=y$ ) in Western Iranian Jewish dialect is not a passive voice construction. This is supported by the coding and behavioral properties of the agent (lacking oblique case-marking, occupying initial position, co-referential deletion), the verbal form (distinct inflectional base for transitives and intransitives) and the differential marking of the patient. It still remains, however, a restricted and impersonal construction, namely that both the A and P are limited to the third person.

### 5.3.5. Alignment Splits in the Compound Perfect

The perfect of Western Iranian Jewish dialects (Hopkins 2002; Khan 2009:90-92, 295-296, 323-326, 327-329) shows an interesting split between ergative and tripartite alignment depending on person both similarly and differently to the preterit (see §4.2.3). The agreement through the participle and the 'copula' is confined to both third person agents and third person patients in the compound realis perfect. Transitive clauses with two full NPs can freely occur in this construction, but pronouns are treated differently depending on person, showing, as we will see, ergative alignment for the third person and tripartite for the other persons. Contrary to other dialects, the <u>ir</u>realis pendant of this construction also follows this pattern.

The compound realis perfect freely combines with full NPs. When there is no overt agreement with either the A or P, the verb is an unmarked 3ms form. Agreement with full nominal patients is only overtly expressed, when the NP is definite or referential indefinite (Khan 2009:318-319, 326). The indefinite *xa baxta* in (121b) is salient and triggers overt agreement through both the participle and the 'copula', while *baxta* (121a) is not and the lack of agreement is indicated by the non-referential dummy 3ms. verbal form.

(121) J. Sanandaj (W Iran; Khan 2009:326) [A] [P] [V] a. tat-i baxta nəšqa=y kissed:MS=3MS father:MS-my woman:FS 'My father has kissed a woman.' [A] [P] **←** - [V-P] b. tat-i xa haxta nšəq-ta=ya father:MS-my one woman:FS kissed-P:FS=P:3FS 'My father has kissed a certain woman.'

By contrast, the agent NP does not even trigger agreement, when it is a full and definite nominal such as *tati* 'my father' in (121), and even when the patient is omitted, for example:

#### 322 CONSTRUCTIONAL SPLITS IN TRANS-ZAB JEWISH DIALECTS

c. *brat-i* (Ø) *qərya=y* daughter:FS-my studied:MS=3MS 'My daughter has studied.' (Khan 2009:325)

Conversely, the prominent patient retains overt agreement, when the agent is still referential but unexpressed:

 d. (Ø) mašinăké lbəlte=ya car:FS:DEF taken:FS=3FS
 'He has taken the car.' (Khan 2009:518)

This may be expected for ergative agreement morphology. The zero realization of the agent is typologically unmarked for ergative agreement (see §2.2.6). From the perspective of argument salience, the agreement potential of the A is even less than that of the P. Thus, even when the P ranks lower in prominence, the A does not trigger agreement but the P may do so.

Full nominal agents can freely combine with pronominal patients, while not all pronominal agents can do so. The marking of the patient is conditioned by person. Only the third person may be indexed on the compound verbal form. The non-third person forms are necessarily expressed through a different set. This is the *?all*-series of independent person forms in Jewish Sanandaj (Khan 2009), for example *?al-ax* 'you' in (122b) below. Third person forms may also be expressed independently, e.g. *băruxăwali gərša=y ?al-ef* 'My friends pulled him.'

# (122) Variation in patient-marking for the realis perfect (based on Khan

	2009:324)		
	[A: fNP]	[V-P: PRO 3]	
a.	băruxăwali	grəšt <b>e=ya-Ø</b>	
	friend:PL-my	pulled:P:FS-P:3FS	
	'My friends p	oulled <b>her/it</b> <sub>F</sub> .'	
	[A: fNP]	[V]	[P: PRO 1,2,3]
b.	băruxăwali	gərša=y	?əl-ax
	friend:PL-my	pulled	obj-2fs
	'My friends p	oulled <b>you</b> <sub>FS</sub> .'	

If a speaker should wish to express an agent other than the third person, another construction must be used instead of the compound perfect (Khan 2009:94). This is the 'perfective' (*qțil-*) that otherwise expresses the perfective

past where  $L_1$ -suffixes constitute the agent indexes. Thus, it is possible to say (123) below to convey either 'I saw the woman' (preterit) or 'I have seen the woman' (perfect) but it is not possible to include a non-third person agent in the compound perfect as illustrated in (53).

(123) (aná) ('perfective', *qtil-*) baxtaké xəzy-a-li I woman:FS:DEF seepfy-P:3FS=A:1SG 'I saw the woman.' 'I have seen the woman.' (124) (\*\**aná*) *baxtaké* (compound perfect, *qțilá*) xzi-ta=ya-Ø I woman:FS:DEF see:RPP-P:FS=P:3FS 'I have seen the woman.'

For third person agents as such, there are two distinct transitive constructions: *garš-a-le* 'He pulled her' for the preterit, or perfective past, but *graštá=y* '(He) has pulled her' for the realis perfect (J. Sanandaj, W Iran, Khan 2009:94). For first and second person agents, the perfect must be expressed through a transitive 'perfective' construction, e.g. *garš-a-li* 'I have pulled her' (Khan 2009:284). The following variation in the realis perfect is found for a nonreferential agent, an third person agent and a non-third person agent:

#### (125) Variation in agent-marking for the realis perfect (based on Khan

	2009:94)			
	INTRANSITIVE	S		
a.	Agentless:	[1,2,3]		
		grišté=yan		'I <sub>F</sub> have been pulled
	TRANSITIVE	Р	А	
b.	Third person agent:	[3]	[3]	
		grəšt-é=y	Ø	'He has pulled her'
c.	Non-third person agent	Р	А	
	('perfective'-based)	[3]	[1,2]	
		gərš-a	-li	'I have pulled her'

When we consider the person categories in isolation, there is an alignment split between ergative and tripartite. The 'perfective' (qtil-) necessarily also expresses the realis perfect for non-third person agents. The participial agreement and 'copula' in the realis perfect align the S and the P ergatively for third person reference, while the A is left unmarked ( $\emptyset$ ). The L<sub>1</sub>-set and ?all-set attach

to the 'perfective' expressing the A, respectively, the P for non-third person reference, while the S is readily expressed through the construction based on the participle, so that each function is treated differently. The alignment pattern for non-third person arguments, therefore, is tripartite throughout (much like the preterit, see §4.2.3).

# (126) **Ergative vs. tripartite alignment in the realis perfect** (based on Khan 2009)

	2007)	
I	FIRST/SECOND PERSON	THIRD PERSON
1	TRIPARTITE	ERGATIVE
ć	a. (intransitive)	c. (intransitive)
	šmix- <b>te=yan</b>	šmix- <b>te=ya</b>
	ʻ <b>I<sub>F</sub> have</b> stood up'	<b>'She has</b> stood up'
ł	o. (transitive)	d. (transitive)
	grəš-li ?əl-ax	grəš- <b>te=ya-</b> Ø
	'I have pulled you <sub>FS</sub> '	'She has pulled <b>her</b> '

In actual transitive clauses, the person categories are expressed differently depending whether they occur in the A or P role. That is, there is both a person split in the coding of the A and the coding of the P. The transitive form of the compound realis perfect as given in (126d) above is completely confined to the third person, both with respect to the A and the P. However, a third person agent may combine with a non-third person form from the *?all-series* just as the preterit, e.g. *garša=y ?al-ax* 'He has pulled you<sub>FS</sub>' like *graš-le ?al-ax* 'He has pulled you<sub>FS</sub>' (Khan 2009:324).

Turning to other moods and tenses of the perfect, the same pattern occurs in the irrealis perfect. In the past realis perfect, the preterit of the (weak) verb *hwy* 'to be' is inflected with L<sub>1</sub>- suffixes (*yele* 'He was') and is employed to expressed a past tense copula, the past counterpart to the enclitic 'copula' (=y(e)'He is'). The past copula is employed in intransitive perfect constructions, e.g. *dmixá ye-le* besides contracted *dmixēle* 'He had fallen asleep' (J. Saqqiz, Israeli 1998:110, 149), but this cannot be employed in a transitive pluperfect construction, e.g. \*\**baxtaké xzitá ye-lan* 'We had seen the woman'. There is, therefore, no past tense counterpart to the compound perfect.

There is, however, an equivalent <u>ir</u>realis perfect. Instead of the 'copula', the subjunctive of *hwy* 'be' ( $\emptyset$ -*hawe*- 'may be' against realis base *k*-*we*- 'is, shall be') is combined with the resultative participle, e.g. *dmixtá=hawy-á* 'She would have slept' (J. Saqqiz, Israeli 1998:119). The two elements often have phonetically

reduced contracted alternants, fusing to one conjugational form through elision, compare rqilé=hawen(i) and rqilá-wen(i) 'They would have danced' (J. Kerend, Hopkins 2002:291ff)<sup>182</sup>. The irrealis transitive perfect is based on the same morphological elements but freely allows agent-marking through the use of L<sub>1</sub>-suffixes to the subjunctive *hwy* in the same way as the preterit, e.g. *graštá=hawy-a* 'pulled her' + **-le** 'he' **>** *graštáwy-a-le* 'He would have pulled her'. The person indexes consist of the L<sub>1</sub>-series to mark the A and the E<sub>1</sub>-series<sup>183</sup> to mark the s and P. Table 37 below offers an overview.

	INTRANSITIVE			
	BASE	S		
	ąțila + hawe	$E_1$ -Set		
3ms	rqila-we	-Ø		'He would have danced'
3fs	rqilta-wy	-a		'She would have danced'
3pl	rqilá-we	-n(i)		'They would have danced'
	TRANSITIVE			
	BASE	Р	А	
	qəțla + hawe	$E_1$ -Set	$L_1$ -Set	
3ms	gəršá-we	-Ø	-le	'He would have pulled him'
3fs	grəštá-wy	-a	-le	'He would have pulled her'
3pl	gəršá-we	-ni	-le	'He would have pulled them'

Table 37. Irrealis perfect in J. Kerend

Source: Based on Hopkins (2002).

The functional distribution of the  $E_1$ -set and the  $L_1$ -set in the irrealis perfect are equivalent to the preterit. The morphosyntax is once again ergative in the expression of the third person, but this is all the more striking given that the inflectional base Ø-hawe 'may/would be' is, in fact, ultimately an '<u>imperfective</u>' (subjunctive) form. Other NENA dialects that have similar coding devices in an irrealis perfect construction have a fully accusative alignment as in the 'imperfective'. In J. Urmi, for example, *graštá=hawy-a-le* would mean 'She may have pulled him' (Khan 2008b:142), not 'He may have pulled her'.

Thus, we observe the following contrast:

<sup>182</sup> Cf. Khan (2009:92) for J. Sanandaj.

 $^{183}$  The inflection is, nonetheless, based on the paradigm of final-y verbs as expected for the verb hwy.



J. Urmi can be considered to be representative of the more common, expected pattern for the perfect in the verbal system. The two irrealis perfect constructions in the two distinct Jewish dialects mirror each other's morphosyntax. It would seem that the ergative coding of the 'perfective' lies at the base of the irrealis inflectional base *qatlawe*- in Western Iranian Jewish dialects like Kerend, while in North Western Iranian Jewish dialects like Urmi the construction is based on the 'imperfective'.

Table 38 at the end of this subsection below gives a brief overview of the ergative patterns attested in the Western Iranian dialects. Morphologically speaking, the three TAM-categories preterit, irrealis perfect and realis perfect constitute a separate uniform subsystem which operates according to principles non-existent in other TAM morphology within these dialects. There is a primary distinction between intransitive and transitive inflectional bases for sound verbs throughout. The two perfects are based on allomorphs of *qtil*- in the preterit along with its accompanying ergative morphosyntax. Finally, the coding associated with the S and P is directly linked with this aspectual stem and marked as close as possible to the verbal base.

Interestingly, it is the <u>realis</u> perfect that is morphosyntactically <u>less</u> transitive than the irrealis, while, semantically, realis mood is said to be a key feature of prototypical transitivity (Hopper and Thompson 1980). From a morphological angle, we also observe that the irrealis perfect is more synthetic and verbal than the realis. Although both essentially employ a verbal adjective, the irrealis incorporates the verb *hwy* into a new inflectional base that can be conjugated like the preterit. This facilitates the use of L<sub>1</sub>-suffixes to mark the agent.

The realis transitive perfect  $(q \neq t | a = y)$  is the most restricted of the three in not permitting the expression of non-third person arguments as either the P or the A. Although this is reminiscent of the passive voice, it otherwise qualifies as

an active transitive construction (see also previous subsection). One might expect the possible oblique expression of a full NP as the agent as in the preterit of some 'accusative dialects' (see §5.2.3) but no examples of this are known for the perfect in 'ergative dialects'.

Lack of overt coding of the A could be explained by the unique nature of the construction itself. Since both the participle <u>and</u> the 'copula' always agree with the P, no agreement morphology is available for the agent, while the 'copula' would always express the A in other dialects. Moreover, the 'copula' is not mobile in these realis perfect forms and cannot be combined with either the L<sub>1</sub>-suffixes, the L<sub>2</sub>-series or the *?all*-series to encode the A (i.e. \*\**nqašté=ya-li* or \*\**?alí nqašté=ya* 'I have kissed her'). This may be blocked, because all forms are equally compatible with case-marked object NPs and the *?all*-series through the dative preposition (*?al)l-*. Nevertheless, one would expect that the 'copula' would become available as an agent index, when the patient is marked different-ly. This is not what we find. Instead, even when the patient coding attaches to the compound verbal form, the unmarked 3ms. is still preferred, leaving the agent unexpressed, e.g. *nišqa=y=lan* '(They/he/she/it has/have) kissed **us'** (J. Saqqiz, Israeli 1998:117).

	BASEPFV	S/P	А
		[3]	[1,2,3]
PRETERIT	rqil-	$E_1$ -Set	
	qțəl-/qəțl-	$E_1$ -Set	$L_1$ -Set
		[3]	[1,2,3]
IRREALIS PERFECT	rqiláwe	$+E_1$ -Set	
	qəțláwe	$+E_1$ -Set	$L_1$ -Set
		[3]	[3]
REALIS PERFECT	rqilá	+COP	
	qəțlá	+COP	Ø

**Table 38.** Ergativity in Jewish NENA in the preterit and beyond

Source: Data based on Khan (2009:94) and Hopkins (2002:297).

## 5.4. Historical Perspective: From Resultative to Preterit

In all likelihood, the accusative NENA dialects presumably once were fluid subject-marking dialects that lost the resultative-intransitive construction from the 19<sup>th</sup> century onwards (Mengozzi 2005:249-250). It is generally assumed that this semantic alignment is a later development subsequent to an ergative system with the split in dialects like Jewish Sulemaniyya and eventually developped into accusative alignment<sup>184</sup>. Following Goldenberg (1992), however, it seems more plausible to me on the basis of the synchronic variation that NENA started out with fluid subject-marking. The resulting gap for the marking of the agent is resolved differently in the respective dialects by the innovation of new transitive realis perfects, including the 'ergative dialects' like Jewish Sulemaniyya. Aspectual factors appear to be crucial in the selection of either patientlike subject indexes (the E<sub>1</sub>-set) or agent-like indexes (the L<sub>1</sub>-set) that reflect the grammaticalization from resultative-intransitive to perfective past. Nevertheless, I should point out that, recently, Khan (2017) came to a view much more in sympathy with Goldenberg (1992) and myself.

Khan (2008b:72-74) explains the development from a lexical split by the increasing grammaticalization of the lexical aspectual meaning of intransitive verbs inflected with L-suffixes. The lexical split found in dialects like J. Sulemaniyya (*nwax-le* 'It barked' vs. *twir-Ø* 'It broke') already sensitive to actionality and punctuality (e.g. *bde-le* 'He began' vs. *priq-\emptyset* 'He finished') besides agency grammaticalized to a tense-aspectual split (twir-Ø 'It has broken' vs. twir-re 'It broke') so that the L-suffixes that mark the agent were extended to all intransitive verbs (nwax-le 'It barked' vs. twar-re 'It broke'). For this reason among others, as noted elsewhere in this monograph, Doron and Khan (2012) approach the accusative dialects as 'extended ergative'. Khan (2008b:74) argues that "the dynamic punctual actionality inherent in the lexical meaning of the verb" as in J. Sulemaniyya grammaticalized so that "the crucial conditioning factor for the use of the L-suffixes" became "the temporal-aspectual contour with which the speaker wishes to present the action". Khan (ibid.) maintains the intransitive 'perfective' inflected with E-suffixes "shifted from preterit to resultative perfect" (*plit-en* 'I went out' > 'I am out, have gone out'), yielding the fluid subjectmarking as found in dialects like Jewish Urmi. This distinct subject coding was subsequently lost in 'extended ergative' dialects and the expression of dynamic,

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>184</sup> See Hopkins (1989), Mengozzi (2002b:42-49), Khan (2002a:385, (2008d:106), Doron and Khan (2012), Barotto (2015:234), Coghill (2016).

punctual action through agent-like subject indexes (L-suffixes) was conventionalized (*pliț-li*, \*\**pliț-en*).

As suggested by Goldenberg (1992:129-130), however, I consider it more plausible that NENA started out with some kind of aspectual fluidity to begin with. A similar split, for instance, is also found in the Eastern Aramaic languages of Late Antiquity such as Syriac, since certain predicates with the *qtil*-form are clearly more stative still. In particular, an agent-orientation is possible for a few transitive verbs under the semantic conditon of close relative proximity (see Nedjalkov and Jaxontov 1988), such as *?hd* 'hold', *šql* 'take (away), hold up, carry', *lbš* 'wear, put on', *grr* 'pull; drag' (cf. Nöldeke 1868:308, §150). They qualified as expressions of an ongoing result state such as (128a). They were equivalent in morphosyntax and overall imperfective aspectual profile to active participle constructions that would express a habitual or ongoing activity, e.g. *šāql-īn l-āh* 'They carry it<sub>F</sub>'. By contrast, most verbs could also occur in the originally dative agent resultative construction where the roles are inverted such as (128b), but the aspectual semantics is different and not stative.

#### (128) Syriac

a.	šqīl-īn	l-āh
	taken-3mpl	dat-3fs
	'They carry	y it <sub>F</sub> .' (cf. Luke 7:14 <i>Pšițta</i> )
b.	šqīl-ā	l-hōn
	taken-3FS	dat-3mpl
	'They have	captured it <sub>F</sub> .' (cf. Life of St. Ephrem the Syrian, Brockelmann
	1905:23.2	1)

Moreover, there are attestetations of intransitive verbs that occur with the precursors of the L-suffixes in Syriac, e.g. *mhalla*<u>k</u> *l*-i 'I have walked' (Nöldeke 1868:219, §279, 1875:382, fn. 2, §263; Van Rompay 1999)<sup>185</sup>. Intransitive forms with L-suffixes could have been aspectually contrastive from those without, e.g.  $l\bar{a} q\bar{lm} l - i$  'I have not stood (up)' vs.  $qayy\bar{lm} - a = n\bar{a}^{186}$  'I<sub>F</sub> am standing'.<sup>187</sup>

<sup>185</sup> This could, of course, point to influence from the spoken language at this time (Khan 2007c:14).

<sup>186</sup> This is the *qațțil*-pattern of the originally resultative participle mostly found for intransitive verbs in Syriac, Western Aramaic, and Central Neo-Aramaic, cf. Țuroyo *mhalax-li* 'I walked' and *qāyim-ono* 'I<sub>F</sub> stood up'.

<sup>187</sup> This does not preclude that certain instances of *šmi*s *l*-constructions were still also interpretable as stative, but the grammaticalization is generally more advanced when it is the

Turning to Neo-Aramaic, both the diachronic and synchronic evidence would indicate that some kind of mixtures already existed in the ancestors of NENA. The resulting incoherence in this mixture is simply levelled out differently in the respective dialects by the innovation of new transitive realis perfects. The system found in the Christian dialect of Bohtan where this same form effectively marks the agent (e.g. *griš-i-le* 'They have pulled') is a case in point. It is possible that such agent-oriented resultatives are ultimately the historical source for this. This historical view approaches the intransitive preterit (*qim-* $\phi$ ) in the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish dialects from the exactly opposite angle: it is innovative rather than archaic. They would have lost subject-marking L-suffixes that once made possible a fluid tense-aspectual alternation with subject-marking E-suffixes. It is the transitive realis perfect that leaves room for innovation (*qtalt-án*), not the intransitive, and this applies to all dialects that exhibit fluid subject-marking. This concurs with the confinement of the grouping of the S and P to the preterit in ergative Jewish dialects (*qim-na* 'I<sub>M</sub> rose').

It seems to me that Khan's original explanation is weaker than Goldenberg's. Khan's original view implies that agent indexes (i.e. L-suffixes) extended from transitive to intransitive verbs in the expression of a perfective past in the vast majority of dialects. Such a functional extension from a separate set of indexes for the A to adopt also S is plausible in itself (cf Dixon 1979, 1994). In the ergative dialects, there is also a split in the marking of S, since a few intransitive verbs also select for L-suffixes such as *lwaš-le* 'dress' and *nwax-le* 'bark', as well as some fluidity *lip-*Ø 'learn' (durative) and *lip-le* 'learn' (punctual). A far less plausible assumption, however, is that the forms with E-suffixes in the preterit 'degrammaticalized' to a resultative (*qim-*Ø 'He rose' > 'He is up, has risen'). There is no independent evidence for this and the development is in itself not straightforward.

Goldenberg's view, on the other hand, already presupposes the availability of subject-marking L-suffixes for all intransitive verbs. Most dialects, therefore, do not need further explanation, only the ergative Jewish ones. For those dialects, the assumption is that the resultative (qim- $\emptyset$  'He is up') grammaticalized via the perfect ('He has risen') to preterit ('He rose'), replacing the preterit with subject-marking L-suffixes (qim-le 'He rose'). Such an account has more explanatory scope and power and argues from a development from resultative to preterit that is typologically more straightforward than that from preterit (back) to

agent-like argument that is marked by the dative (no longer compatible with adverbs such as 'still').

resultative. The compound perfects based on the resultative participle and the enclitic copula would have pushed the subject-marking E-suffixes into the perfective aspectual domain, as illustrated in (129) below. In Western Iranian Jew-ish dialects like J. Kerend, for instance, the transitive preterit partly fulfils the additional function of the transitive realis perfect counterpart of the intransitive which is based on the resultative participle. This process would have started with intransitive constructions as resultatives usually do cross-linguistically. The transitive formation based on this participle lacks behind and is still marginal.

# (129) **Split in the realis perfect for J. Kerend** (W Iran; Hopkins 1989a: 427, fn. 35)



Khan (2004a:306, 314-318) notes that forms like qim- $\emptyset$  can also express the perfect and serve as the dynamic counterpart to the participle-based constructions like  $qim\dot{a}=y$  'He has risen and is now up' which focus on the state resulting from an action. This could point to a formerly resultative usage of qim- $\emptyset$ . The ousting of subject-marking L-suffixes in (129) could be partially triggered by this innovation of an intransitive resultative ( $qimt\dot{a}=yan$  'I<sub>F</sub> am up, have risen') that competes with the intransitive perfect (qim-an 'I<sub>F</sub> have risen') in fluid subject-marking dialects (§5.3.3). J. Sulemaniyya (NE Iraq), closely related to J. Kerend (NW Iran), has innovated a fully productive transitive realis perfect that generally encodes the A through the copula like the S ( $qtalt\dot{a}=yan$  'I<sub>F</sub> have killed'). In J. Sulemaniyya, the transitive realis perfect is fully available besides the intransitive that ousted the original intransitive-resultative.

# 5.5. Summary

The majority of NENA dialects groups the S with the A through the L-suffixes in the preterit (perfective past). Semelfactive verbs such as *nwx* 'bark' typically also align their subjects with the A in South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties where other intransitive verbs align with the P. The A-like coding of the subject becomes increasingly more likely when the situation as a whole is semantically more transitive in implying a patient or patient-like effect. An antipassive-like

construction, where the implication of an effect is reduced but the coding of an agent-like subject aligns with the P, is preferred for durative and/or stative situations. While inanimate or uncontrolling arguments sometimes do not seem compatible with the S<sub>A</sub> construction, control is not as significant a semantic feature, since various S<sub>P</sub> verbs, for instance, denote controlled activities such as *rql* 'dance' (*rqil-a* 'She danced').

The preference for P-like subject coding in durative or stative situations in split S-marking in South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish dialects parallels the fluid S-marking dialects. A few Christian dialects in SE Turkey and a few Jewish dialects in NE Iraq and NW Iran split the coding of S for every verb depending on aspect. The choice over P-like (the E-set) or A-like (L-set) in subject coding is roughly conditioned on dynamic action focus as opposed to result-state focus. There are competing and overlapping compound verbal constructions in these and other dialects with overall the same aspectual profile. They are either based on a combination of the 'perfective' (qtil-) and additional preverbal TAM-modification or the resultative participle (qtila) declined like an adjective and the enclitic 'copula'. In all Jewish and Christian varieties that employ an E-set as subject indexes, beit in ergative or dynamic-stative alignment, it is the transitive realis perfect that is somehow derived and/or treated differently.

Dialects can be characterized as symmetric or asymmetric between transitive verbs such as qtl 'kill' and intransitive verbs such as qym 'rise' in terms of A and S coding across preterit (i.e. perfective past) and perfect (i.e. realis resultoriented) contstructions. With respect to Jewish dialects, the group to the west of the Greater Zab river generally shows symmetry between the preterit and perfect. Dialects such as Jewish Betanure (NW Iraq) expresses this by means of a participial construction (*ile qima* 'He has risen'). Jewish Arbel (NE Iraq), a Trans-Zab Jewish dialect, is also symmetric and expresses the TAM-distinction by a pre-verbal particle  $l\bar{a}$ :

(1)	J. Betanur	<b>e</b> (NW Iraq)	<b>J. Arbel</b> (1	J. Arbel (NE Iraq)		
	PRETERIT	PERFECT	PRETERIT	PERFECT		
TR.	qțil-le	ile qțila	qțil-le	lā qțil-le		
ITR.	qim-le	ile qima	qim-le	lā qim-le		

Within Trans-Zab Jewish, we find further notable differences. Jewish dialects in Iranian Azerbaijan like Urmi and a few in North Eastern Iraq such as Rustaqa exhibit tense-aspect-conditioned subject-marking (represented horizontally for intransitive verbs below). The main difference between the two is the <u>transitive</u> counterpart to the intransitive-resultative that takes P-like subject coding. The transitive realis perfect is based on the resultative participle and 'copula' in J. Urmi (*+qtilé* < *\*+qtila=ile* like Betanure above) but on a preverbal TAM-marker in J. Rustaqa (like Arbel above):

(2)	<b>J. Urmi</b> (NW Iran)		J. Rustaqa	(NE Iraq)
	PRETERIT	PERFECT	PRETERIT	PERFECT
TR.	⁺qtəl-le	⁺qtil-é	qțil-le	lā qțil-le
ITR.	qəm-le	qim-Ø	qim-le	lā qim-Ø

Going further east, Jewish dialects in North Eastern Iraq like Sulemaniyya and Western Iranian varieties like Kerend maintain a distinction between the Eset for the S and the L-set for the A in the preterit (represented below vertically rather than horizontally). Again, the major differences among these varieties are found in the transitive realis perfect. The perfect is completely derived from the resultative participle in J. Sulemaniyya where the feminine singular argument always triggers participial agreement (irrespective of grammatical function) but the 'copula' encodes both the S and A (*qimtan=yan* 'I<sub>FS</sub> have risen', *qtalta=yan* 'I<sub>F</sub> have killed'). In Western Iranian varieties such as Kerend, both the participle and the 'copula' index the S and P and the A is limited to the third person and is not overtly indexed or case-marked. This is unlike other dialects. It is not compatible with first/second person agents (\*\**qtalta=yan* 'I<sub>F</sub> have killed') for which the 'perfective' must be used instead (*qtal-li* 'I have killed').

(3)	) J. Sulemaniyya (NE Iraq)		J. Kerend (NW Iran)		
	PRETERIT	PERFECT	PRETERIT	PERFECT	
TR.	qțəl-le	qəțlá=y	qțəl-le	I. qțəl-li II. qətlá=y	
ITR.	qim-Ø	qimá=y	qim-Ø	II. qimá=y	

Proceeding with the Christian varieties, the most drastic differences are found in the western periphery in the region of Bohtan (SE Turkey). Virtually all Christian dialects are symmetric. The majority patterns like Barwar where the preterit based on the 'perfective' and the perfect based on the resultative participle are neatly symmetric in subject-marking. This also applies to Bohtan, but here the difference is entirely based on the set of person indexes attached to the 'perfective' (*qțil*-), the L-set for the preterit against the E-set for the perfect (both marking the S and A; *qțil-*Ø 'He has killed', *qim-*Ø 'He has risen'):

(4)	C. Barwar (NW Iraq)		<b>C. Bohtan</b> (SE Turkey)	
	PRETERIT	PERFECT	PRETERIT	PERFECT
TR.	qțil-le	qțílɛ=le	qțəl-le	qțil-Ø
ITR.	qim-le	qímε=le	qəm-le	qim-Ø

Further west, Christian Hertevin reveals a system similar to that of Jewish Rustaqa (NE Iraq) where subject-marking is conditioned by aspect. The transitive counterparts are only differentiated by a pre-verbal TAM-marker (*hole*):

(5) C. Hertevin (SE Turkey) PRETERIT PERFECT
TR. qtel-le hole qtel-le
ITR. qem-le (hole) qem-Ø

There are notable differences between the 'neutral dialects'. In both J. Urmi and C. Bohtan, the marking of the agent and subject is tense-aspect-sensitive, while objects are marked by L-suffixes throughout. Only in C. Bohtan, the E-suffixes are not available to mark Ps but are reserved for the expression of the S and A in the perfect (e.g. *qtil-a-le* 'She has killed me', \*\*'He killed her'). In J. Urmi, however, E-suffixes are available to mark third person Ps in the preterit in the expression of the recent past (*xazy-a-li* 'I just saw her') and to mark the S in resultative-stative pendant of the dynamic-stative subject-marking (*qim-a* 'She has risen').