Alignment in eastern Neo-Aramaic languages from a typological perspective

Noorlander, P.M.

7. OVERVIEW AND CONCLUSIONS

The overall purpose of this monograph has been to capture typologically the variation in which alignment is manifested in Eastern Neo-Aramaic languages (excluding Neo-Mandaic). This study concludes with the findings regarding correlations of alignment types and the related scales known from typological literature. Since this chapter is organized to avail readers of a reference guide and general overview, it presents abundant references to the relevant sections of this thesis. For convenience's and clarity's sake, a few representative examples are restated and reviewed.

The typological approach proved to be useful and accessible in disentangling the diversity in Eastern Neo-Aramaic. Using the more uniform 'imperfective' as a common frame of reference was found to be helpful in comparing the diverging alignment phenomena. It is not uncommon, however, that relationships between constructions and argument encoding turn out to be rather complex and/or asymmetric. What the Eastern Neo-Aramaic alignment systems clearly demonstrate is that the S, A and P, although grouped in some grammatical respects, can lead a life of their own. Intransitive and transitive constructions can vary independently of one another. The same construction can occur across dialects in rather different uses. Alignment variations and changes, therefore, are strictly based on the interaction of different intransitive and transitive constructions through agreement, prepositional marking, free person forms, and diachronic and system-internal factors, all of which seem to be largely independent of how we classify the entire arrangement of grammatical functions as a whole.

The main alignment types that were identified are summarized in Section 7.1. Although ergative constructions are always marginalized in some way, the treatment of S and P never seem to be exactly the same, and there is no unambiguous example of ergative case-marking in NENA, it would be simplistic to say that ergativity in itself is in decay. Furthermore, ergativity is one among several other types manifested in Eastern Neo-Aramaic. Historically, the L-suffixes are closely related with the dative preposition *l-* and some correlations inevitably remain present even in a synchronic perspective, so that it is tempting to consider the L-suffixes, in a very basic sense, a kind of dative dependent person forms. Independent dative person forms differ to a much greater extent across dialects and more closely correlate with the prepositional marking of full nominals than the L-suffixes. Yet, those independent pronouns that are based on the

dative preposition *l-* and its allomorphs exhibit a clear tendency to become increasingly dependent on the verb like the L-suffixes and grammaticalize into verbal suffixes.

Several alignment splits conditioned on verbal or aspectual scales occur in Eastern Neo-Aramaic (Section 7.2.). The differences in alignment types are inextricably linked with the historical development of the verbal inflection from an intransitive resultative construction to a transitive perfective past. This is confirmed by that fact that the coding of the S (and A) which is typically manifested in verbal agreement correlates more strongly with the expression of TAM than the coding of the P, especially differential object marking. The L-suffixes are more grammaticalized as indicators of the A in the expression of the transitive perfective past, while the E-suffixes as indicators of the S tend to 'lack behind' in the expression of the intransitive resultative.

While alignment types do seem to evince correlations in verb-related properties (Section 7.2 and 7.3.), argument-related scales only indirectly influence the alignment types (Section 7.2). Mainly the coding of the P is affected by such scales in differential object marking. The fundamental difference among dialects is the coding of the S which is insensitive to such scales, and the alternative strategy that is chosen as opposed to the inverted 'perfective' construction. The transitive perfective constructions dedicated to pronominal Ps are largely independent of intransitive constructions. Consequently, different alignment types only indirectly unfold in the differential indexing of arguments.

7.1. Overview of Major Alignment types

7.1.1. Intransitive/Transitive Alignment Types

The grouping of the S with other core arguments on the level of morphology (i.e. coding properties) or syntax (i.e. behavioral properties) is the defining characteristic of an alignment type (Croft 2012:259; §2.2.3.3). In this approach, ergative alignment entails the similar treatment of S and P in its coding or behavioral properties (Comrie 1978, cf. Dixon 1979). In the most typical example of morphological ergativity, the verb expresses agreement only with the S and P and only the A is case-marked (§2.2.3.3). This coherent type of ergativity does not exist in Neo-Aramaic. The rare phenomenon of ergative syntax where the S and P share behavioral properties is not attested either.

Nevertheless, morphological ergativity is manifested under certain conditions. It is restricted by

(i) the inflectional base of the verb (*qṭil-*/*qəṭl-* or the related resultative participle *qṭila*/*qəṭlá*; §5.3.5);
(ii) the tense, aspect and, to some extent, the mood that the verb expresses (§5.1);
(iii) and the position of the A and/or P arguments on the prominence hierarchy (§4.2.3).

The precise circumstances under which ergativity is manifested needs to be determined for each dialect (subgroup) independently. The TAM of the verb that conditions ergative alignment differs across dialects and the relevant factors of the prominence hierarchy also need not be the same. The inflectional base of the verb, however, is always a determining factor and the ergative alignment is structurally linked with the so-called 'perfective' *qṭil-* and/or the resultative participle (*qṭila*).

7.1.1.1. Ergative Alignment

Where ergativity is observed, it is part of a so-called alignment split conditioned by verb-related and/or argument-related properties. An illustrative example of ergative agreement is repeated in (1a) below. The E-set (*-a*) indexes the S and A, while only the L-set (*-le*) indexes the P and precedes the coding of the A (§4.2.3).

(1) **J. Saqqiz** (W Iran)

	[S]		[V-S]	
a.	*daé*	*piré*	*dmix-**a***	(intransitive)
	mother:FS	old	sleep$_{PFV}$-3FS	
	'The old woman slept.' (Israeli 1998:100)			
	[A]	[P]	[V-P-A]	
b.	*ḥatán*	*kaldá*	*nišq-**a**-le*	(transitive)
	groom:MS	bride:FS	kiss$_{PFV}$-3FS-3MS	
	'The bridegroom kissed the bride.' (ibid. 186)			

Ergative alignment as such is thus far only documented for Jewish NENA dialects of Iraqi and Iranian Kurdistan comprising the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish dialect bundle. These are referred to as 'ergative dialects'. In Central Neo-Aramaic, ergative verbal person marking also occurs in Ṭuroyo (SE Turkey, NE Syria) which is illustrated in (2). In Ṭuroyo, there is a major subclass of basic verbs that takes an alternative 'perfective' base *qaṭil-* against *qṭil-* (such as

damix- for *dmx* 'sleep' below instead of *dmix-* as in NENA). Its overall typology is similar to the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties (§6.1.1).

(2) **Ṭuroyo** (SE Turkey; Jastrow 1985, 1992)
[V-S]
a. *damix-**o*** (intransitive)
sleep$_{PFV}$-3FS
'**She** fell asleep.'
[V-P-A]
b. *nšiq-**o**-le* (transitive)
kiss$_{PFV}$-3FS-3MS
'He kissed **her**.'

Apart from the perfective past and perfect, ergativity also occurs in the expression of the irrealis perfect (5.3.5), while the imperfective past and present (both realis and irrealis) never pattern ergatively in any dialect. It is confined to the resultative in the Jewish dialect of Rustaqa. Ergative alignment is limited to the third person and to differential indexing of prominent NPs in all dialects (§4.2.3). In actual transitive clauses, non-third person agents freely combine with third person patients. The S and A are grouped in trigger potential similarly to other verbal constructions such as the 'imperfective'. Moreover, the coding of the S is not uniform and constitutes a split between S$_A$ and S$_P$ verbs, some of which may also co-vary (§5.1.1 for NENA, §6.2.1.4. for Ṭuroyo).

Compound verbal forms expressing the realis present perfect in the Jewish varieties of Iranian Kurdistan may also pattern ergatively (§5.3.5). As expected, the resultative participle agrees with the S and P, illustrated by the feminine singular in (3a) and (3b) below, and the 'copula' (=*ya*) also groups the S and P, while the agreement with the A (*axonawali* 'my brothers') is unexpressed. The realis perfect as constructed in (3b) is confined to prominent full NPs and third person forms for both the A and P while the S is unrestricted. (The irrealis pendant of the perfect follows the same pattern and restrictions as the preterit.)

(3) **J. Saqqiz** (W Iran; Hopkins 2002:292)
[V-S]
a. *hi-**ta**=**ya*** (intransitive)
come-FS=3FS
'**She has** come.'

	[A]	[V-P]	
b.	*axonawal-i*	*xzi-**ta=ya***	(transitive)
	brother:PL-my	seen-FS=3FS	
	'My brothers have **seen her**.'		

Other potentially even rarer examples of how ergative alignment is manifested are the following where the overt coding of the A enjoys special treatment (see also the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction at the end of this subsection). To the best of my knowledge, these are not identified as ergative in other scholarly work. Yet, if my analysis of the dependent person forms in C. Hertevin (SE Turkey) is correct, the A is distinctly marked by a special set of person forms called the 'L-E-series' (that mixes the L- and E-set) such as *-laḥ* and *-leton* in (4c) and (4d), while the S and the P are expressed by the L-set. This manifestation of ergativity is limited to the first and second person forms (§4.4.3).

(4) **C. Hertevin** (SE Turkey; Jastrow 1988:76)

	[V-S]	
a.	*te-leḥon*	(intransitive)
	come$_{PFV}$-2PL	
	'You$_{PL}$ came.'	
b.	*te-lan*	
	come$_{PFV}$-1PL	
	'We came.'	
	[V-A-P]	
c.	*ḥzá-**láḥ**-leḥon*	(transitive)
	see$_{PFV}$-1PL-2PL	
	'**We** saw you$_{PL}$.'	
	[V-A-P]	
d.	*ḥze-**letón**-nan*	
	see$_{PFV}$-2PL-1PL	
	'**You$_{PL}$** saw us.'	

Several NENA dialects make use of two very distinct basic transitive constructions. The special transitive perfective past construction based on the 'imperfective' (*qaṭəl-*) is used in several NENA varieties (§4.4.2), as illustrated for the Christian dialect of Koy Sanjaq in (5) below. The E-set serves to index the A and the L-set marks the P like the S, as shown in (5c) below. This so-termed

qam-qaṭəl-construction is paradigmatically linked with the 'perfective' (*qṭil*-) in the expression of the preterit or perfective past.

(5) **C. Koy Sanjaq** (NW Iraq; Mutzafi 2004b)

	[V-S]		
a.	*səmax-**le***	'**He** stood.'	(intransitive preterit)
	stand$_{PFV}$-3MS		
	[TAM-V-A-P]		
b.	*qa-ġazy-a-**le***	'She saw **him**.'	(transitive preterit)
	PFV-see$_{PFV}$-3FS-3MS		

Although the *qam-qaṭəl*-formation in (5c) is obviously partly parasitic on transitive morphosyntax of the 'imperfective' (cp. example (4) above), there is a conspicuous morphosyntactic division between S and A but overlap between S and P that suggests ergative alignment. It is the A that is treated differently by means of the E-set (*-a*), and the P is grouped with the S by means of the L-suffixes (*-le*), albeit attached to a different inflectional base (*qam-qaṭəl-*).

In actual transitive clauses, the L-E-series and *qam-qaṭəl*-construction freely combine with patient marking of all persons (e.g. *qa-ġaz-ax-le* 'We saw him', *ḥzé-láḥ-le* 'We saw him'), but, in several dialects, the *qam-qaṭəl*-form is obligatory in the expression of first and second person patients and some of them also masculine third singular patients. This would indicate that this ergative alignment is necessary for the expression of the first and second person. Most typical intransitive verbs cannot occur in such construction (e.g. ***qa-samx-a* 'She stood', ***te-l-eton* 'You$_{PL}$ came'). They neither combine with (indefinite) full nominal patients nor the omission of the patient where forms like *ġze-le baxta* 'He saw a woman' are preferred.

Transitive constructions generally make a difference in the coding of the P in Neo-Aramaic, especially patient indexes (§4.4). The marking of one argument is sensitive to that of the presence of the other. The omission, independent and full nominal expression of the P may favor a different construction and full nominal patients in general may be differentially indexed. In the case of the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction, the verb completely adapts to the inflection of the 'imperfective' only when the patient is expressed as a dependent person form. The resulting ergative alignment is found, only in the presence of the P expressed as a dependent person form.

Regarding compound verbal forms in the perfect, special treatment of the A is also found in the participial agreement in the realis perfect of Jewish dialects of

Iranian Azerbaijan (§5.3.3). The feminine singular agent evinces an additional /t/-element of the resultative participle form *ˁqtəl-ta* 'killed'. This is only realized for the A, as shown in (6b) below. Neither the S, as illustrated by the ∅ symbol in (6a) and (6b), nor the P expressed by the L-suffix in (6c) and (6d) trigger such morphology. Thus, we observe ergative marking (A≠S=P), although confined to the feminine singular and realis perfect.

(6) **J. Urmi** (NW Iran; Khan 2008b)

	[V	-S	-PAST]		
a.	*dmíx*	∅	*-an*	*-wa*	(intransitive)
	slept		-1FS	-PST	
	'I$_F$ had slept.'				
b.	*dmíx*	∅	*-en*	*-wa*	
	slept		-1MS	-PST	
	'I$_M$ had slept.'				

	[V	-A	-A	-PAST	-P]	
c.	*ˁqtəl*	***-t***	*-án*	*-wa*	*-le*	(transitive)
	killed	-FS	-1FS	-PST	-3MS	
	'**I$_F$** had killed him.'					
d.	*ˁqtil*	∅	*-én*	*-wa*	*-la*	
	killed		-1MS	-PST	-3FS	
	'I$_M$ had killed her.'					

Ergative case-marking is only unambiguously attested in Ṭuroyo (§6.1.3). The dative preposition *(e)l-* marks the agent NP (*u-Ṭayawo* 'the Muslim') in (7b), while both the S and P are zero-marked. The ergative case-marking is optional and mainly conditioned by agent focus. A similar type of case-marking is documented in NENA but the status of the agent is more ambiguous due to close interaction with impersonal constructions.

(7) **Ṭuroyo** (ʕIwardo, SE Turkey)

	[V-S]	[S]		
a.	*aθi-∅*	*u-Malke*	*aʃm-a*	(intransitive)
	come$_{PFV}$-3MS	the-PRN:M	with-3FS	
	'Malke came with her.' (Ritter 1967-71, 33/34)			

	[V]	[ERG→A]	[P]	
b.	*ḥze-le*	***l-u-Ṭayawo***	*u-med-ano*	(transitive)
	see$_{PFV}$-3MS	DAT-the-Muslim:MS	the-thing:MS-DEM:MS	
	'**The Muslim** saw this thing.' (ibid. l. 37)			

7.1.1.2. Accusative Alignment

Accusative alignment predominates either in agreement or prepositional marking (§3.3.1, §3.3.2, §4.2.1). Although ergativity is never as coherent and unrestricted like the accusative pattern in Eastern Neo-Aramaic, it would be misleading to consider it something abnormal that dialects seek to solve or dispose of. Nevertheless, accusative alignment is the most common. All Neo-Aramaic languages display this pattern in the 'imperfective' (including the imperative; §3.3) and most of them also in other grammatical 'domains' such as compound verbal forms expressing the perfect and/or progressive (§5.2.2). An illustration is repeated below for dependent person forms in the 'imperfective'. The affix *-ax* from the E-set marks both the S and A while the affix *-loxun* representing the L-set marks the P and follows the coding of the A.

(8) **J. Amidya** (NW Iraq; adapted from Hoberman 1989:35, Greenblatt 2011:95)
[V-S]
a. *k-damx-**ax*** (intransitive)
IND-sleep$_{PFV}$-1$_{PL}$
'**We** sleep.'
[V-A-P]
b. *k-šamʕ-**áx**-loxun* (transitive)
IND-hear$_{PFV}$-1$_{PL}$-2$_{PL}$
'**We** hear you$_{PL}$.'

The vast majority of NENA dialects also expresses the perfective past also accusatively (§4.2.1). The same sets of person forms are used in the same morphological order but the role they denote is inverted. In the illustration below, the L-set (*-loxun*) marks the S and A, while the E-set (*-ax*) expresses the P and precedes the coding of the A. The use of the E-set to mark first and second patients is only attested for dialects that show this grouping of S and A through the L-set. Varieties that manifest this pattern are referred to as 'accusative dialects'.

(9) **J. Amidya** (NW Iraq; adapted from Hoberman 1989:36, Greenblatt 2011:101)
[V-S]
a. *dmix-**loxun*** (intransitive)
sleep$_{PFV}$-2$_{PL}$
'You$_{PL}$ slept.'
[V-P-A]

b. *šmiʕ-áx-**loxun*** (transitive)
hear$_{PFV}$-1$_{PL}$-2$_{PL}$
'You$_{PL}$ heard us.'

In most dialects where the 'perfective' patterns accusatively, however, the P is expressed differently from the E-set, for example by another set known as the *ʔəll*-series such as *ʔəllí* in (10b) below. Although this is at least originally an independent set of dative person forms and geared to express objects independently (§4.1.2), it may freely attach to the preceding verbal form in post-verbal position, e.g. *ġzé-lox=əlli* 'You$_{MS}$ saw me' (§4.1.3). This cliticization generally does not occur in the 'imperfective' where the L-set remains the preferred expression of object indexes.

(10) **J. Arbel** (NE Iraq; Khan 1999)
[V-S]
a. *dmix-lox* (intransitive)
sleep$_{PFV}$-2$_{MS}$
'You$_{MS}$ slept.'
[V-A] [P]
b. *ġze-lox* ***ʔəll-í*** (transitive)
see$_{PFV}$-2$_{MS}$ OBJ-1$_{SG}$
'You$_{MS}$ saw **me**.'

In compound verbal forms, accusative alignment appears in similar constructions as the above (§5.2.2). In the majority of dialects, the resultative participle expresses agreement with the S and A in gender and number like adjectives, as indicated by the distinctly feminine singular morpheme *-t* in (11a) and (11b), and a set of person forms termed the 'copula' expresses the agreement in person, gender and number with the same roles. Depending on the dialect, the P may be expressed dependently or independently, usually distinct from the 'imperfective' and 'perfective', although the *ʔəll*-series may also be used (§5.2.2). In (11b) below, the affix *-ux* expresses the P and attaches to the resultative participle (*zrəcta* 'scratched') and precedes the 'copula' (=*van*) that marks the agreement with the A.

(11) **C. Urmi** (NW Iran; adaped from Hetzron 1969:116-117)
[V-S-S]
a. *dmáx-te=van*
slept-FS=1FS
'I_F have slept.'
[V-A-P-A]
b. *zrə́c-t-**ux**=van*
scratched-FS-2MS=1FS
'I_M have scratched you_{MS}.'

Accusative alignment is also manifested in differential case-marking. The full nominal *ʕaqubraké* 'the mouse' in (12b) below, for example, is marked by the preposition (*əl)l-*. This is the same preposition that serves as the base of *ʔəll-* series, i.e. independent object person forms. Case-marking in general is accusative in virtually all dialects that use this coding strategy in DOM regardless of the type of agreement (§4.2).

(12) **J. Koy Sanjaq** (NE Iraq)
[V] [S]
a. *qim-le* *šeraké*
risePFV- 3MS lion:MS:DEF
'The lion rose.' (Mutzafi 2004a:191.22)
[A] [V] [DOM→P]
b. *šeraké* *dwiq-le* ***l-ʕaqubraké***
lion:MS:DEF seizePFV-A:3MS DOM-mouse:MS:DEF
'The lion caught hold of the mouse.' (ibid. 189.15)

7.1.1.3. Other Basic Alignment Types

Not all constructions were clearly identifiable as accusative or ergative in Eastern Neo-Aramaic. First of all, a few dialects manifest neutral agreement (A=S=P) which involves the morphologically identical marking of S, A and P through the L-set, as illustrated below for the Jewish dialect of Urmi (§4.2.2). This is documented for Jewish dialects of Iranian Azerbaijan such as Urmi and Salamas in the eastern periphery, and Turkish Christian dialects in the western periphery such as Bohtan and Hertevin and the dialect of Mlaḥso in Central Neo-Aramaic (distinct from Ṭuroyo). These were referred to as 'neutral dialects'. What characterizes these dialects further is a type of fluid subject-marking conditioned by TAM (see §5.1.2).

(13) **J. Urmi** (NW Iran)

	[S]	[V-S]	
a.	*ləbb-ew*	*pləx-**le***	(intransitive)
	heart:MS-his	open$_{PFV}$-3MS	

'His heart opened (= He cheered up).' (Khan 2008b:459)

	[P]	[V-A-P]	
b.	*tará*	*pláx-**le-le***	(transitive)
	door:MS	open$_{PFV}$-3MS-3MS	

'He opened (lit. it$_M$) the door.' (Garbell 1965:140)

The L-suffixes are used in a strict order: patient indexes always follow agent indexes so that that V-P-A affix arrangements do not occur (e.g. *pláx-la-le* 'She opened it$_M$', **'He opened it$_F$'). Neutral alignment is sometimes confined to the absence of agreement (e.g. Siewierska 2004:52), since the morphologically identical person indexes generally do display a distinct affix position (§2.2.5). I prefer to consider phonologically identical sets of person forms to be an indication of neutral alignment (A=S=P) (cf. Siewierska 2003), even when they occur in a fixed linear order, but this may be considered accusative in typological studies on agreement because the S and A are closer to the stem. Yet, one could also argue that the S and P are alike in both constituting the final suffix of the verbal form. Thus, similarly to word order, it cannot be unambiguously determined which suffix is grouped with the S, so that the position of affixes is only a determining factor, if the position relative to the verb is clearly distinct (i.e. prefixal vs. suffixal) (§2.2.5). This does not preclude that the relative linear position contributes to role discrimination and is different from word order in other respects (for example, flexibility).

Secondly, tripartite alignment (A≠S≠P) is manifested in the inflection of the 'perfective' and compound verbal forms. As displayed in (14) below, the E-set (*-na*) marks the S, the L-set (*-li*) marks the A and the P is expressed independently by the *ʔəll*-series. This type is common to the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties that otherwise also manifest ergative alignment (§4.2.3). In Jewish Rustaqa, it is confined to the perfect like the ergative pattern (§5.1). It is available for all persons and the typical expression of the first and second persons, except for Jewish Saqqiz where only the third person singular is expressed in a tripartite fashion. Clauses with full NPs that do not involve differentially marked patients such as indefinite arguments are also treated in this manner, since the patient is zero-marked and the S is distinct from the A.

(14) **J. Sulemaniya** (NW Iraq; Khan 2004a)

	[V-S]			
a.	*kwiš-na*		‘I_M descended.’	(intransitive)
	descend$_{PFV}$-1MS			
	[V-A]	[P]		
b.	*qṭəl-li*	*ʔəll-áx*	‘I killed you$_{FS}$.’	(transitive)
	kill$_{PFV}$-1SG	OBJ-2FS		

Person indexing in compound verbal forms may also evince tripartition (§5.3.3). The following example for the realis perfect in Jewish Urmi represents the coding of the S via the E-set (*-i*), the A through a different set akin to the ‘copula’ (*-u*) and the P by the *ʔəll*-series (*-lle*). This is limited to the third person. This notwithstanding, the compound perfect in Jewish Urmi also shows split subject marking, indicating that the S of some intransitive verbs do align with the A.

(15) **J. Urmi** (NW Iran; Khan 2008b)

	[V-S]		
a.	*kwiš-i*	‘They descended.’	(intransitive)
	descend$_{PFV}$-3PL		
	[V-A-P]		
b.	*qṭil-u-lle*	‘They killed him.’	(transitive)
	kill$_{PFV}$-3PL-3MS		

Thirdly, horizontal verbal person marking (S≠A=P) groups the A and P by the L-suffixes. This is at least attested for Ṭuroyo (§6.1.1) and Jewish Saqqiz (4.2.3.4), and partly also in the realis perfect of Hertevin (§4.4.3). The subject index in (16) below belongs to the E-set (*-ono*), while both the agent and patient indexes belong to the L-set. The agent index (*-li*) always precedes the patient index (*-lax*). It is confined to dependent first/second person forms in the ‘perfective’[216].

(16) **Ṭuroyo**

	[V-S]		
a.	*damix-ono*	‘I_F went to sleep.’	(intransitive)
	sleep$_{PFV}$-1FS		

[216] Conversely, the realis perfect in C. Hertevin presumably shows horizontal alignment confined to the third person where A and P are grouped by the L-set (e.g. *hole wéd-le-la* ‘He has made it$_F$’) against the S marked by the E-set (e.g. *hole dmiḥ-Ø* ‘He has slept’).

[V-A-P]

b. *ḥzé-**li-lax*** ‘**I** saw **you$_{FS}$**.’ (transitive)
see$_{PFV}$-1SG-2FS

Horizontal case-marking also occurs in Ṭuroyo, at least in the dialect of the village of Raite (§6.1.3). The dative preposition *(e)l-* marks both the A and P, while the S remains zero-marked. It should be noted that the S of some intransitive verbs may also be overtly case-marked.

(17) **Ṭuroyo** (Raite, SE Turkey)

	[S]	[V]		
a.	*Ḥasané Aliḵi*	*qayəm-Ø*		(intransitive)
	PRN	rise$_{PFV}$-3MS		
	‘Hasan Aliki rose.’ (Ritter 1967-71, 95/145)			
	[DAT→A]	[V]	[DAT→P]	
b.	***l-ʕAli***	*grəš-le*	***l-u-sayfo***	(transitive)
	DAT- PRN:MS	pull$_{PFV}$-A:3MS	DAT-the-sword:MS	
	‘**Ali** drew **the sword**.’ (ibid. 107/116)			

7.1.2. Ditransitives and Combinations

It was established that all four major ditransitive alignment types occur in Eastern Neo-Aramaic languages (§3.4). Indirective constructions (T=P≠R) appear to be preferred overall, open to virtually all transitive verbs, combinable with all types of arguments and possible in all clause types. Dialect-specific dative prepositions are used to express the R distinctly (§3.3.1).

Neutral alignment (T=P=R) or double object constructions are lexically or grammatically restricted. In a few dialects, a ditransitive verb can take two object indexes from the L-suffixes but this is confined to third person themes and ‘imperfective’ constructions, and the affix order is always V-T-R (§3.2.4). The double object construction is lexically restricted to verbs such as ‘teach’, factitives and verbs of filling and covering (2.3.4).

Secundative constructions (T≠P=R) are even more limited. The grouping of P and R is confined to pronominal arguments. The T is expressed by a special series of dependent person forms (known as the ‘enclitic copula’) and restricted to the third person (§3.4.1).

The tripartite pattern (T≠P≠R) is rare. It is only found in ‘perfective’ constructions comprising dependent third person forms (§5.1.2, §.3.4.1).

My research revealed no significant preferences for combinations of intransitive/transitive and ditransitive alignment types and no evidence for a possible connection between ergative and indirective alignment (cf. Siewierska 2004:63). Ergative and ditransitive tripartite alignment may be possibly connected (for third person dependent forms in Ṭuroyo) besides horizontal and indirective alignment (for the first/second person dependent forms; §6.1.2). All dialects and alignment types readily combine with indirective and secundative alignment.

This notwithstanding, there is a connection between monotransitives and ditransitive constructions in the combination of dependent person forms across the major TAM split between the 'perfective' and 'imperfective'. The L-suffixes represent a set of dative person forms that correlate with the dative preposition *(əl/e)l-* at least diachronically (though not necessarily also synchronically). In 'imperfective' and similar verbal constructions (such as the imperative, compound progressive etc.), the L-set is used to express objects (P, T, R). In the 'perfective', however, it is generally confined to the expression of the R. The use of the L-set to express the R (or related roles such as predicative possessors, §3.5) is, therefore, independent of this split and may be found across the verbal system. Its use as A indexes is peculiar to the 'perfective'. Consequently, the coding of the A and the R are potentially identical only in the 'perfective':

(18) **J. Amidya** (NW Iraq; Hoberman 1989:108)

[V-A-R]	[P]
*hu-**le-li***	*pare*
give$_{PFV}$-3$_{MS}$-1$_{SG}$	money

'**He** gave **me** money.'

In most 'accusative dialects' of NENA such as J. Amidya, this double L-set construction consisting of two consecutive L-suffixes is only possible in 'perfective' ditransitive constructions where the secondary L-suffix can only be used to encode the R. In neutral dialects, it is naturally available for all object indexes (e.g. *xze-le-li* 'He saw me'; J. Urmi, NW Iran; Khan 2008b) which is presumably an extension of its application in the 'imperfective' (§4.4.1). Even in the 'imperfective', the verb may take two object indexes from the L-set in a few dialects such as J. Zaxo and C. Hertevin (see §3.2.4). The first L-set denotes the theme, the second the recipient. The first L-set is restricted to third person Ts. Interestingly, this same person restriction on the first L-set occurs everywhere else where the L-set is doubled in C. Hertevin, suggesting that there is a connection

between the two. Thus, unlike the majority of NENA dialects, the restriction of third person agent indexes before patient indexes parallels the restriction of third person themes before recipient indexes:

(19) **C. Hertevin** (SE Turkey; Jastrow 1988:63)

		[A]	[P]	
		[3]	[1,2,3]	
a.	*ḥzé-*	***le***	*-li*	'**They** saw me.'
	see$_{PFV}$	3PL	1SG	
		[T]	[R]	
		[3]	[1,2,3]	
b.	*hál-*	***le***	*-li*	'Give **them** to me!'
	give:IMPV	3PL	1SG	

Stacking of L-suffixes appears to be avoided depending on person reference and not a particular role by itself, since it disfavors both Ts and As which is rather unusual. Conversely, stacking of L-suffixes is incompatible with third person patients in Ṭuroyo. The second L-suffix of the third person in a construction like *ftáḥ-li-**le*** can only refer to the R conveying 'I opened **for him**'. This is connected with the preference of horizontal alignment for the first/second persons in the 'perfective' where the L-suffix does merge all objects (i.e. *ḥzé-li-**lax*** 'I saw **you$_{FS}$**' = *hú-li-**lax*** 'I gave (**to**) **you$_{FS}$**'; §6.1.2).

Similarly, though also somewhat differently, independent expression of object person forms parallels prepositional indirect object constructions (§4.1.2.2). An independent *ʔəll-*series of object person forms is used in the 'perfective' derived from the dative preposition *(ʔəl)l-* to express both the P and the R:

(20) **C. Ashitha** (SE Turkey; Borghero 2006:193, 200-202)

	[V-A]	[R/P]	[T]
a.	*hiw-le*	***ʔəll-i***	*mexulta*
	give$_{PFV}$-3MS	DAT-1SG	food:FS
	'He gave **me** food.'		

b. *xze-le* ***ʔəll-i***
see$_{PFV}$-3$_{MS}$ DAT-1$_{SG}$
'He saw **me**.'

The inflectional systems differ here. The *ʔəll*-series is the favored expression of the P in the 'perfective' but of the R in the 'imperfective' where dependent person forms, the L-set, are preferred to mark the P.

7.1.3. Interactions of Prepositional Marking and Agreement

As across languages of the world and the Semitic family in general, accusative alignment prevails in Neo-Aramaic. The accusative grouping is preferred in both case-marking and agreement but not to the same degree for each coding property. The agreement system can differ greatly in type and complexity from case-marking. Indeed, alignment splits are rather common in verbal agreement, while, regardless, case-marking patterns accusatively in the majority of dialects. This is most likely connected with the historical development of the TAM split in general where the 'perfective' agreement originated in the adjectival inflection of an originally resultative participle developing suffixal person forms similarly to the active participle.

Independent prepositional object person forms are generally included in the prepositional marking of full object NPs. The pronominal Ps can be prepositional while full nominal Ps need not be. Independent objects, and distinct strategies of object marking in general, are required when dependent equivalents are not available[217] irrespective of alignment type. In Neo-Aramaic studies, this has been connected with a decline of originally ergative alignment. This dissertation, however, shows that, synchronically, there is no connection with a particular alignment pattern (§4.2). There is a connection with a usage decline of particular sets of dependent person forms. This is generally the E-set in the 'perfective' which may be completely obsolete as object indexes. In Ṭuroyo, this also includes a set of object indexes related to the 'possessive suffixes' in the imperative (§6.1.2) and, in J. Sulemaniyya, the 'possessive suffixes' in the compound verbal forms expressing the perfect progressive (§5.2.3).

Similarly, only dependent person forms qualify as agreement markers and can index a coreferential nominal[218]. The *ʔəll*-series, otherwise independent like

[217] Unversal G. in Haspelmath (2013:222).
[218] Universals A. and B. in ibid.

full NPs, may be phonetically reduced and attach to an immediately preceding verb, becoming increasingly dependent on it (e.g. *ġzélox=əlleu* 'You$_{MS}$ saw him' for *ġzelox ʔəlléu* in J. Arbel). As dependent person forms, they may be used in the indexing of masculine singular NPs in the 'perfective' alongside the E-set for the feminine singular and common plural, if available. The third person Ø-morpheme from the E-set, for example, is not used in Jewish Arbel but the corresponding person form from the *ʔəll*-series is the only means to index a masculine singular NP (§4.1.2.1).

Consistent with cross-linguistic tendencies, case-marking and agreement of full NPs usually converge, but some combinations are contrary to this tendency. This is summarized in the tables below for respectively splits with accusative and splits with ergative case-marking.

Table 45. *Splits with accusative case-marking*

CASE MARKING	AGREEMENT	DIALECTS
(A=S≠P) accusative	(A=S≠P) accusative	most of NENA and Ṭuroyo (e.g. J. Amidya, C. Ashitha)
(A=S≠P) accusative	(A=S=P) neutral	Jewish dialects in NW Iran (e.g. J. Urmi) Christian dialects in SE Turkey (e.g. C. Bohtan; Mlaḥso)
(A=S≠P) accusative	(A≠S=P) ergative	SE Trans-Zab Jewish (e.g. J. Sulemaniyya)

Table 46. *Splits with ergative case-marking*

CASE MARKING	AGREEMENT	DIALECTS
(A≠S=P) ergative	(A≠S≠P) tripartite	possibly archaic Iraqi NENA dialects
(A≠S=P) ergative	(A≠S=P) ergative	Ṭuroyo both rural and urban dialects
(S≠A=P) horizontal	(A≠S=P) ergative	Ṭuroyo dialect of Raite

In all combinations, however, the case-marking is differential in some way. Transitive clauses with full NPs will often show no grammatical marking of the object. If they do express this, accusative indexing of full NPs is readily found alongside or combined with accusative case-marking in Aramaic in general (§3.3.2, §4.2.1). Ergative indexing may also be combined with ergative case-marking in Ṭuroyo in the 'perfective' (§6.1.3). The E-set, for example *-i* in (21) below, indexes the P and the full nominal is zero-marked like the S, while the

dative preposition *(e)l-* and the L-set mark the A. The dative marking of the agent is optional and focalizes it.

(21) **Ṭuroyo** (Iwardo, SE Turkey)

	[S]	[V-S]	
a.	*aḥ-ḥete*	*nafiq-i*	
	the-wheat:PL	go.out$_{PFV}$-3PL	
	'The wheat went out.'		
	[P]	[V-P-A]	[ERG→A]
b.	*aḥ-ḥeṭ-ani*	*xil-i-**le***	***l-u-moro***
	the-wheat:PL-DEM:PL	eat$_{PFV}$-3PL-3MS	DAT-the-master:MS
	'**The owner** ate this wheat.' (Ritter 1967-71, 55/11)		

Case-marking and agreement can also diverge with respect to alignment. If they do, the agreement is expected to be accusative and the case-marking ergative, while the other way around, accusative case-marking but ergative agreement is strongly disfavored (Comrie 1978:340; Dixon 1979:92, 1994:95-96; §2.5.1). There are examples scattered across NENA dialects, especially early scribal idiolects, that normally group the S and A accusatively by the L-set where a focalized agent NP is marked by the dative but it is not altogether clear whether this is to be understood as either ergative or passive-like, because the agent agreement is not overtly expressed (§4.3.5). The independent dative person form in the transitive construction in (22) below, for example, is not indexed on the verb (***qṭil-ēna-lox*). The person marking is tripartite, since the S is marked by the L-set in such dialects (*qəm-lox* 'You$_{MS}$ rose'), and the P is marked by the E-set.

(22) **Early J. Nerwa** (Literary, NW Iraq; Goldenberg 1992:121)

	[ERG→A]	[V-P]
a.	***lāl-ox***	*qṭīl-ēna*
	DAT-2MS	kill$_{PFV}$-1MS
	'It is **you** who killed me.'	
	[V-S]	
b.	*qīm-lox*	
	rise$_{PFV}$-2MS	
	'You rose'.	

In the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish variaties, the case-marking is accusative and the indexing ergative, grouping the S and P by the E-set (§4.2.3). Both,

however, are two distinct strategies of differential object marking that combine only exceptionally. In Jewish Sulemaniyya, accusative case-marking and ergative indexing of full NPs can be exceptionally be combined in differential object marking:

(23) **J. Sulemaniyya** (W Iran)

	[S]	[V-S]	
a.	*yalé*	*qim-**i***	
	child:PL	rise$_{PFV}$-3PL	
	'The children rose.'		
	[DOM→P]	[V-P][219]	
b.	***lă-yalé***	*ləbl-**i**-le*	*ta-baġdád*
	DOM-child:PL	take$_{PFV}$-3PL-3MS	DAT-PRN
	'He took **the children** to Baġdad.' (Khan 2004a:326)		

Neutral agreement, where all arguments are marked by the L-set, also combines with accusative case-marking (§4.2.2):

(24) **J. Urmi** (NW Iran)

	[S]	[V-S]	
a.	+*šultaná*	+*dmə́x-le*	
	king:MS	sleep$_{PFV}$-3MS	
	'The king slept.'		
	[A]	[DOM→P]	[V-A-P]
b.	+*šultaná*	***ʔəl-bron-éw***	*nšáq-le-le*
	king:MS	DOM-son:MS-his	kiss$_{PFV}$-3MS-3MS
	'The king kissed **his son**.' (Garbell 1965:178)		

Horizontal case-marking through the dative preposition *(e)l-* also occurs in Ṭuroyo but this does not appear to combine with indexing (§6.1.3). The reason for this is presumably the close structural link between the L-set and the dative preposition that typically both mark a full nominal in other constructions, such as the recipient, predicative possessor, and a definite patient in the 'imperfective'.

[219] Note that, strictly speaking, the verb is ditransitive and *yalé* 'children' is a theme, but it serves to show the possible combination of ergative indexing and accusative case-marking.

Agreement itself can also evince more refined combinations of alignment in terms of phonological form, position, and trigger potential. In Aramaic, the grouping of S and P in terms of trigger potential is never found, so that there is a clear preference for accusative alignment in this respect. The trigger potential may diverge from the phonological form. The indexing of full nominal Ps is more restricted and context-dependent than the indexing of the S and A. The differential indexing is only ergative in phonological form in the 'perfective'. The following examples from Jewish Sulemaniyya demonstrate the special treatment of the P. The overt expression of the S and A is unconditional.

(25) **J. Sulemaniyya** (NE Iraq; illustration based on Khan 2004a, 2007a:148-149, 154)

	[A]	[P]	[V(-P-)A]	
a.	*gora*	*baxtaké*	*nəšq-**a**-le*	(definite P)
	man:MS	woman:DEF:FS	kiss$_{PFV}$-3FS-3MS	
	'The man kissed the woman.'			
b.	*goraké*	*baxta*	*nšəq-le*	(indefinite P)
	man:DEF:MS	woman:FS	kiss$_{PFV}$-3MS	
	'A man kissed a woman.'			
	[S]	[V-S]		
c.	*baxtaké*	*qim-**a***		(definite S)
	woman:DEF:FS	rise$_{PFV}$-3FS		
	'The woman rose.'			
d.	*baxta*	*qim-**a***		(indefinite S)
	woman:FS	rise$_{PFV}$-3FS		
	'A woman rose.'			

Finally, with respect to ditransitive clauses, the case-marking and agreement remain generally both indirective, since identical case-marking of two full NPs is disfavored. An exception is Jewish Urmi where indirective agreement (T=P≠R) may combine with neutral case-marking (T=P=R) (§4.2.2).

In the final analysis, there are no clear-cut distribution patterns in usage of either case-marking and/or agreement and the two coding properties do not appear to be in conflict in monotransitive constructions. First/second person objects are preferably independent and prepositional like demonstrative pronouns and full nominals due to the person role constraint in the 'perfective'.

7.1.4. Ergative-like Markedness

Alignment types are sometimes further differentiated by their relative morphological and functional markedness (e.g. Dixon 1979, 1994; Croft 1988, 2001:138-146; §2.2.6). It is the isolated argument, not grouped with the S, in typologically marked systems that is realized as ∅ and/or has a greater potential to trigger overt agreement:

(26) **Implicational distribution of zero vs. overt coding**
If the unmarked arguments, i.e. nominative (S+A) or absolutive (S+P), show overt case-marking and can control agreement, the marked arguments, i.e. accusative (P) or ergative (A), will also do so**.** (after Croft 2001:139-146)

The 'marked nominative' and 'marked absolutive' types go against this tendency.

We did not observe such marked alignment types of case-marking in NENA or Central Neo-Aramaic, since the S is, on the whole, never prepositional. The one exception would be Ṭuroyo where the agent-like S of S_A verbs may be marked by the dative like the A, showing a split in subject coding. Otherwise, the isolated argument is overtly marked in accusative or ergative case-marking and rarely both the A and P. No marked ditransitive alignment types were established either.

Most markedness considerations can be made in agreement. The possible zero realization and the trigger potential for overt agreement are the main factors in the markedness of agreement. The set of person forms that has most zero realizations is considered an unmarked instance of the expression of the S. We noted that the potential candidate for this would be the E-set where the 3ms. form is ∅. The L-set does not have any zero realizations. In addition, the trigger potential for overt agreement is (apart from the agentless 'perfective' form) higher for the S and A than the P throughout the verbal system in all dialects regardless of the morphological marking.

First of all, ergative grouping of the S and P by the E-set is typically only manifested in dependent third person forms and the differential indexing of definite NPs in South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish and Ṭuroyo (§4.2.3). The A always triggers agreement alongside the P. This is an evident asymmetry in the overt expression of agreement, since in coherently ergative agreement the S and P would have a trigger potential greater or equal to the A. As expected, however, the zero realization is only found for the third masculine singular S and P:

(27) **J. Saqqiz** (W Iran; based on Israel 1998)

[V-S]

a. *dmix-**Ø*** (intransitive)
sleep$_{PFV}$-3$_{MS}$
'**He** slept.'

[V-P-A]

b. *nšiq-**Ø**-la* (transitive)
kiss$_{PFV}$-3$_{MS}$-3$_{FS}$
'She kissed **him**.'

Interestingly, we observed that the P does show a greater trigger potential than the A in the realis present perfect expressed through a compound verbal form in the 'ergative dialects' of NENA in Iranian Kurdistan (§5.3.5). The verb only indexes the S and P, as illustrated in (28) below. The agreement with the P is again dependent on definiteness, but the A never triggers agreement and this is expected for an ergative pattern. The expression of the A in this construction is limited to third person. Since the agreement is always with the P and triggered by definiteness, there is no resulting ambiguity. When there is no agreement, however, the unmarked 3ms. singular is used. Without differential case-marking of the P, the clause would be potentially ambiguous. The P-V word order preference contributes to argument disambiguation.

(28) **J. Saqqiz** (W Iran; Israeli 1998:100-101)

	[S]	[V-S]		
a.	*blan-ú*	*dmix-**én***		
	daughter:$_{PL}$-his	slept:$_{NONFS}$-3$_{PL}$		
	'His daughters slept.'			
	[A]	[P]		[V-P]
b.	*branaké*	*il-é*	*bab-év*	*nišq-**én***
	son:$_{MS:DEF}$	hand:$_{PL}$	father:$_{MS}$-his	kissed:$_{NONFS}$-3$_{PL}$
	'His daughter has not seen her brothers.'			

The overt vs. zero marking also plays a role in the participial agreement in the compound perfect of Jewish Sulemaniyya (and Ḥalabja) conditioned by gender (§5.3.1). Unlike the closely related 'ergative dialects' like J. Saqqiz above, the person forms always pattern accusatively: the 'copula' expresses the S and A, and the P is expressed by a different set (the *ʔəll-*series or the 'possessive suffixes'). The non-feminine singular forms coincide into *qəṭl-* before the patient person indexes against the feminine singular. The main distinction is between overt

agreement for the feminine singular (*qṭəl-t-*) against non-feminine singular (*qəṭl-Ø-*). In transitive clauses, the feminine singular triggers participial agreement irrespective of the A or P function of the argument. Thus, essentially, ergative alignment is manifested, when the P is non-feminine singular and the A is feminine singular, while accusative alignment is manifested, when the P is feminine and the A is non-feminine singular.

(29) **J. Sulemaniyya** (NE Iraq; based on Khan 2004a)

a. *nšəq-**t**-aw=ye* (agreement with the P)
kissed-FS-3FS=3MS
'He has kissed **her.**'

b. *nšəq-**t**-ew=**ya*** (agreement with the A)
kissed-FS-3MS=3FS
'**She has** kissed him**.**'

c. *šmix-**ta**=**ya*** (agreement with the S)
watied-FS=3FS
'**She has** waited**.**'

The trigger potential for person and number coding is the same for all grammatical functions, but the overt agreement in gender and number on the participle shifts in the direction of the morphologically marked category, the feminine singular, regardless of the role. The S and the non-participial coding (i.e. the 'copula' and the 'possessive' suffixes) remain unaffected.

A similar phenomenon results in special marking of the A in the compound perfect of Jewish Urmi. Only the feminine singular agent evinces an additional /t/-element (§5.3.3). Other arguments, including feminine singular objects, do not show this morphology. The overt agreement is not just conditioned by gender and number (as in Jewish Sulemaniyya) but also conditioned by the A role. If the analysis is correct, this would be an instance of a marked ergative agreement pattern, since the A triggers overt agreement but not the S and P.

Secondly, the accusative alignment of dependent person forms in NENA repeated below for has been analyzed as 'marked nominative' (Barotto 2015) or 'extended ergative' (Doron and Khan 2012; cf. Mengozzi 2002b:45, fn. 144) due to a conflation of case-marking and agreement typology. Clearly, these NENA dialects are typically accusative in terms of trigger potential but only arguably 'marked nominative' in terms of phonological form:

(30) **J. Amidya** (NW Iraq; adapted from Hoberman 1989:36, Greenblatt 2011:101)

[V-S]

a. *dmix-**le*** (intransitive)
sleep$_{PFV}$-3MS
'**He** slept.'

[V-P-A]

b. *nšiq-Ø-**le*** (transitive)
kiss$_{PFV}$-3MS-3MS
'**He** kissed him.'

The E-set of object indexes is more restricted in usage than the L-set in the majority of NENA dialects, however, and may even be confined to the 3pl. (*-i*) and 3fs. (*-a*), so that the zero realization of a third masculine singular object person form is impossible. Perfective past forms like *xze-la* could only mean 'She saw' and not ***xze-Ø-la* 'She saw him'. Other strategies to express such objects have to be used, such as the *ʔəll*-series in Jewish Arbel *ġze-le ʔəlléu* 'He saw him' (NE Iraq; Khan 1999:119) or the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction in C. Aradhin *qam-xāz-ən-ne* 'I saw him' (NW Iraq; Krotkoff 1982:28).

In a few 'accusative dialects' such as Jewish Zakho (Gutman 2008), it is possible that the agent NP is overtly expressed without triggering agreement. The L-suffixes that encode the A may be omitted without violating the P status of the patient (§4.3.4). The agent receives no coding reference to its role. A prominent P still triggers agreement, as exemplified below. The expression of the A in this construction is limited and generally marginalized to the third person, especially third person plural.

(31) **J. Zaxo** (NW Iraq)

	[S]	[V-S]	
a.	(Ø-)*xūrās-e*	*zəl-lu*	
	friend:PL-his	go$_{PFV}$-3PL	
	'His friends went.'		
	[A]	[V-P-A]	[P]
b.	(Ø-)*xūrās-e*	*fhīm-a-**Ø***	(Ø-)*zāya*
	friend:PL-his	understand$_{PFV}$-3FS-3PL	matter:FS
	'His friends understood the matter.' (Gutman 2008:74)		

Doron and Khan (2012; cf. Barotto 2015) consider this peculiar treatment of the A to be evidence of ergativity in these morphologically 'accusative dialects'. The

S and P are evidently not grouped in phonological form (L-set vs. E-set). One could only argue that this is an ergative grouping (A≠S=P) in terms of trigger potential: the S and P trigger agreement to the exclusion of the A. The A is not obligatorily expressed. (Yet, one should note that agreement with the P is also not obligatory). The overt agreement with the S and P but zero expression of the A is typologically unusual (see, for instance, Bickel et al. 2013; §2.5.1) but also restricted in these dialects *vis-à-vis* transitive constructions that do show agent agreement. The A needs to be contextually identifiable, for instance by another preceding or following verbal construction. All else being equal, intransitive and transitive verbs pattern alike in these dialects. It is only this restricted agentless perfective clause that shows peculiarities, while overt agreement with the A is favored in most contexts. In my view, this a special truncated transitive construction (Keenan and Dryer 2007:330) that is neither fully passive nor fully ergative. Despite the fact that there is no special verbal morphology, the agentless form features in impersonal labile alternations. Although this is not prototypical for a passive, object coding is sometimes also retained in impersonal passives (Givón 1990:581-583; §4.3.1). Its correlation with agent reference reducing devices such as the impersonal passive would explain why especially third person (plural) agents can be omitted, and not subject indexes, as a reanalyzed passive (Gutman 2008).

Finally, a similar case of lack of overt agreement with the agent in otherwise accusatively aligned constructions is the participial predicate of the compound perfect (§5.2.3). The 'copula' and the participle agree with the S and the A. The third person enclitic 'copula' may also be omitted entirely, while the participial inflection is the only remaining agent (or subject) coding:

(32) **C. Barwar** (NW Iraq)
a. *qṭil-a*(=Ø) *xá-neriye*
killed-MS(=3MS) a-goat:MS
'He has killed a male goat' / 'A male goat has been killed.' (Khan 2008a, A31:4)

The same resultative construction can also express the passive, so that, when the two referents belong to the same gender and number and the patient is not differentially marked, the functions have to be inferred from the context. Naturally, when the two referents are of distinct gender and number, there is no ambiguity, since the A controls the agreement. Word order may also contribute to role disambiguation but is not definitive. Although the agent regularly precedes

the verb (A-V-P), the patient may be focalized to pre-verbal position (Khan 2008a:752). The remaining agreement is generally controlled by the agent in P-V-A order. When the agent also precedes the verb (P-A-V), however, agreement may be controlled by the patient like the subject, while the agent is zero-marked. This resembles the ergative alignment in the compound perfect of the Jewish varieties of Iranian Kurdistan.

b.	[P]		[A][-COP:P]	[RPP-P]
	ʔayya	*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)

On the whole, the S and A are higher in trigger potential than other functions. It is mainly third person agents that can lack overt agreement, especially in constructions based on the resultative participle. The feminine singular is morphologically most salient and this may even be the sole trigger of agreement regardless of the role. The masculine singular is generally the least marked of the third person, realized as (Ø).

7.1.5. Agreement Inversion

Concerning suffixal person forms, a V-P-A sequence is more common for dependent person forms that morphologically align accusatively (Siewierska 2004:167). By contrast, this is the sequence displayed by the ergative alignment in the SE Trans-Zab Jewish dialects and Ṭuroyo. Nevertheless, it does not hinge on a certain alignment type in other dialects, since it also found for accusative alignment, but it does hinge on the agreement inversion depending on an 'imperfective' or 'perfective' inflectional base (§3.2.1). In transitive constructions, the E-set marks the A in the 'imperfective', but the P in the 'perfective', and the other way around for the L-set. The sequence of the 'imperfective' (*qaṭəl-*) is V-A-P but inverted by V-P-A in the 'perfective' (*qṭil-*). There are indications that these sequences are analogically extended to other verbal constructions, and this is ultimately triggered by the distinct coding of the P.

The person role constraint also restricts the V-P-A affix order in the 'perfective'. It is possible that there is a connection with this sequence, since the same restrictions are also found where V-P-A is expressed in compound verbal forms denoting the perfect or progressive (§5.2.2). In Christian Urmi, the V-P-A order is unrestricted by person in both the preterit and the compound perfect (and pro-

gressive), as illustrated in (33a) and (33b) below. In Jewish Sulemaniyya, the V-P-A order is confined to third person patients for both the preterit and the compound perfect (and progressive), as shown in (33c) and (33d). Importantly, although the preterit distinguishes the S from the A in J. Sulemaniyya, the progressive does not and shows an accusative grouping. Thus, the sequence does not correlate with an alignment type in this respect. This notwithstanding, there might be an indication of a correlation between the V-P-A order and accusative alignment. It is precisely in dialects where the 'perfective' is accusative in grouping the S and A by the L-set that the E-set marking the P is unrestricted in a V-P-A-sequence like (33a) below. Hence, the agreement inversion is only complete in dialects that are accusative throughout.

(33)

	C. Urmi (Literary, NW Iran; Marogulov 1979:58)	**J. Sulemaniyya** (NE Iraq; based on Khan 2004a)
	PRETERIT	PRETERIT
	[V-P-A]	[V-P-A]
a.	*šqil-**ət**-li*	c. *gərš-**a**-le*
	take$_{PFV}$-2MS-1SG	pull$_{PFV}$-3FS-3MS
	'I took **you$_{MS}$**.'	'He pulled **her**.'
	COMPOUND PERFECT	COMPOUND PERFECT
	[V-P-A]	[V-P-A]
b.	*šqíl-**ux**=vən*	d. *gəršš-**aw**=ye*
	taken-2MS=1MS	pulled-3FS=3MS
	'I$_M$ have taken **you$_{MS}$**.'	'He has pulled **her**.'

In other dialects, the inflection of the 'imperfective' penetrates the inflection of the 'perfective', promoting a V-A-P sequence (cf. Mengozzi 2002b:46). We observed a possible tendency to normalize the use of the E-set or L-set at the cost of either to encode a specific grammatical function (S, A, P) by morphologically adapting transitive coding in analogy to the 'imperfective', the predominant morphosyntax. The 'perfective' and 'imperfective' morphology become mixed. The double L-set construction, the L-E-series and the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction are alternatives to the E-set analogical to the 'imperfective' and seem to be geared to make the L-suffixes in V-A-P sequence as in the 'imperfective' the regular expression of pronominal Ps throughout the verbal system, as illustrated in (34).

(34) **Alternative strategies to mark the P**

	V:IPFV	A	P	
	˚qaṭəl	-E	-L	E-SET AND L-SET IN THE 'IMPERFECTIVE'
	V:PFV	A	P	
a.	*qṭil*	-L		INDEFINITE FULL NOMINAL P
b.	*qṭil-*	-L	*ʔəll-*	PREPOSTIONAL P (§4.1.2)
c.	*qṭil*	-L	-L	DOUBLING OF L-SET (§4.4.1)
d.	*qṭil*	-L-E-	-L	BLENDING OF L-SET AND E-SET (§4.4.3)
e.	*qam-qaṭəl*	-E	-L	THE *qam-qaṭəl*-CONSTRUCTION (§4.4.2)

These constructions, however, are not necessarily promoting accusative morphosyntax for dependent person forms (*pace* Mengozzi 2002b, 2005; Barotto 2015; Coghill 2016), since the S is not affected and remains expressed by the L-set. The double L-set construction, for example, manifests a type of neutral alignment. The L-E-series rather manifests ergative alignment (confined to first/second person agents), and the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction also a pattern that can be characterized as ergative (preferred for first/second person patients).

Possibly, the dialects differ to what extent ambiguity is tolerated. The constructions above differ at what price the L-suffixes facilitate patient indexes in accordance with the 'imperfective' as an alternative to the E-set. This may be at the expense of morphological argument discrimination in the double L-set construction (*xzé-li-la* 'I saw her'), as all arguments are identical in phonological form, at the expense of the marking of the A by replacement through L-E-series (e.g. *ḥzé-l-én-na* 'I saw her') and is at the expense of the inflectional base and agent coding in the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction (*qam-xaz-ən-nax* 'I$_M$ saw her'). What differentiates the L-E-series and *qam-qaṭəl*-construction from the double L-set construction could the more close approximation of the 'imperfective' to maintain morphological distinction between the A and P.

This analogy also inspires morphological adaptation of the perfect in 'dynamic-stative dialects' and the compound progressive and perfect on the basis of the morphological parallelism between the enclitic copula and the E-set and between the *ʔəll*-series and the L-set (§5.2.5). The phonetically reduced enclitic copula does not fully assimilate with the E-set in the third person. This indirectly influences the alignment manifestations. Jewish Urmi, for example, displays tripartite alignment for the third person indexes and accusative only for the first and second person indexes in the realis perfect. Third person S, A and P are each marked distinctly. This is consistent with the prominence scale, since the accusative type is favored for the higher ranking person referents.

7.2. Verb and Aspect-related Scales and Splits

7.2.1. The Tense-Aspect-Mood scale

I established to what extent Eastern Neo-Aramaic shows an alignment split based on TAM. Typologically, the semantic properties are often non-past, imperfective and imperative for the accusative type and past, perfective and non-imperative for the ergative type (§2.3.2). The major splits between perfective and imperfective aspect in Eastern Neo-Aramaic, however, mainly depend on inflectional base: *qṭil-* as opposed to *qaṭəl-* (or *qoṭəl-)* which are the end result of specific historical developments of the resultative and active participles respectively. The agreement (i.e. E-set) controlled by the P in the 'perfective' reflects the original adjectival agreement with the patient-like S of the resultative construction, while the agreement (i.e. E-set) controlled by the agent in the 'imperfective' reflects the original agreement with the agent-like S of the active participle. In addition, alignment types other than accusative and ergative are conditioned by TAM. Even ditransitive coding was found to be dependent on TAM. Yet, when there is a split, the accusative is favored in the imperfective (present).

First of all, the TAM-conditioned split represents first and foremost a constructional split. Aspectual factors are secondary. Moreover, the alignment for *qṭil-*, or the 'perfective', may not be different from that of *qaṭəl-*, or the 'imperfective', but the constructional split is generally characterized by an agreement inversion. The agent and object indexes function the same way in the 'perfective' and 'imperfective', but the same sets of person forms denote the opposite grammatical function in either aspectual 'domain'. The L-suffixes mark the P for *qaṭəl-* but the A for *qṭil-*, the E-suffixes mark the A for *qaṭəl-* but the P for *qṭil-*. Whether this leads to an additional distinction in alignment depends primarily on variation in the coding of the S in the concerning dialect(s).

In South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties, the 'imperfective' is accusatively aligned but the 'perfective' ergatively (§4.2.3):

(35) **J. Sulemaniyya** (NE Iraq; illustration based on Khan 2004a, 2007a)

	ERGATIVE			ACCUSATIVE	
	PERFECTIVE (PRETERIT)			IMPERFECTIVE (PRESENT)	
	[P]	[V-P-A]		[P]	[V-A-P]
a.	*baxt-i*	*nəšq-**a**-le*	b.	*baxt-i*	*năšəq-**Ø**-la*
	'He kissed my wife.'			'He kisses my wife.'	

	PERFECTIVE (PRETERIT)		IMPERFECTIVE (PRESENT)	
	[S]	[V-S]	[S]	[V-S]
c.	*baxtaké*	*qim-**a***	d. *baxtaké*	*qem-**a***
	'The woman rose.'		'The woman rises.'	

It is mainly the transitive construction that is treated differently, while the S is consistent. On the other hand, some subjects of intransitive verbs do align with the A in the 'perfective', showing split subject marking:

	[S]	[V-S]		[S]	[V-S]
e.	*baxtaké*	*tpəl-**la***	f.	*baxtaké*	*tapl-**a***
	'The woman sneezed.'			'The woman sneezes.'	

In virtually all South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties, the ergative with accompanying split subject marking embodies also the realis and irrealis perfect and resultative aspect which are generally expressed by constructions based on the copula or *hwy* 'be' and the resultative participle that be considered to comprise allomorphs of *qṭil-* (§5.3.5). These constructions constitute a separate, uniform subsystem where ergative alignment is manifested:

(36) **Accusative-ergative split**

IMPERFECTIVE > RESULTATIVE-STATIVE > PERFECT > PRETERIT

ACCUSATIVE ERGATIVE

Contrary to what we might expect typologically (cf. Malchukov 2015), however, the compound perfect and resultative in Sulemaniyya (and Ḥalabja) pattern accusatively (§5.3.1). Ergativity is only manifested in the simple *qṭil*-based forms.

Intransitive 'perfective' clauses are completely distinct from the 'imperfective' only in dialects that systematically group the S and A by the L-suffixes (§4.2.1), as illustrated below. Consequently, accusative alignment prevails across TAM categories in the majority of dialects. In addition, the ergative *qam-qaṭəl-*construction based on the inflectional base *qaṭəl-* is found across these dialects and competes with *qṭil-* in the expression of the preterit, or perfective past (§4.4.2). All that is changed is the preverbal TAM-marking, while the morphosyntax specific to the inflectional base is kept intact.

(37) **J. Amidya** (NW Iraq; illustration based on Hoberman 1989; Greenblatt 2011)

	ACCUSATIVE PERFECTIVE (PRETERIT)			ACCUSATIVE IMPERFECTIVE (PRESENT)	
	[P]	[V-P-A]		[P]	[V-A-P]
a.	*baxta*	*šmiʕ-a-**le***	c.	*baxta*	*šaməʕ-**ø**-la*
	'He heard the woman.'			'He hears the woman.'	
	[S]	[V-S]		[S]	[V-S]
b.	*baxta*	*qəm-**la***	d.	*baxta*	*qem-**a***
	'The woman rose.'			'The woman rises.'	

Jewish dialects of the northeastern periphery in NE Iraq and NW Iran and Christian dialects in SE Turkey show dynamic-stative subject marking that is conditioned by TAM (§5.1.2). The alternation between S_A and S_P constructions depends on the 'perfective' inflectional base (*qṭil-*) and is not found in the 'imperfective'. The S aligns with the A in the perfective aspect but with the P in the perfect and/or resultative:

(38) **J. Urmi** (NW Iran; Garbell 1965; Khan 2008b)

a. (transitive preterit)
[V-P-A]
*xəzy-**a**-le* 'He saw **her**.'
see$_{PFV}$-3FS-3MS

b. (intransitive preterit aligns with the A)
$^{+}$*dməx-le* 'He went to sleep.'
sleep$_{PFV}$-3MS

c. (intransitive realis perfect aligns with the P)
$^{+}$*dmix-**a*** '**She** has gone to sleep.'
sleep$_{PFV}$-3FS

The opposition between action and result-state focus of the intransitive situations correlates with their degree of grammaticalization from resultative to preterit. Intransitive resultative and/or perfect patient-like forms like *dmix-a* interact with resultative and/or perfect forms based on the enclitic 'copula' and resultative participle. By and large, the patient-like form (i.e. the E-set) will never be higher on the grammaticalization scale from resultative-stative to preterit than the agent-like form (i.e. L-set). There are only subtle differences between dialects in terms of aspect. In Jewish Rustaqa (NE Iraq), both the participial

(*qṭila*) and the patient-like (*qṭil-*) construction express an intransitive resultative-stative, whereas, in Jewish Urmi (NW Iran), only the participial construction with the analytic copula can be used to express resultative-statives and the patient-like form denotes the realis perfect (§5.3.3) .

This notwithstanding, in all such 'dynamic-stative dialects', it is the transitive realis perfect that displays diversity. The difference in subject coding creates a gap for a transitive realis perfect that may manifest an alignment split:

(39)

	PRETERIT		REALIS PERFECT	
TR.	*qṭəl-le*	'He killed'		'He has killed'
ITR.	*qim-le*	'He rose'	*qim-*Ø	'He is/has risen'

The difference may be entirely based on the set of person indexes attached to the 'perfective' (*qṭil-*). The A and S are grouped by the E-set in the perfect similarly to the 'imperfective' (*qaṭəl-*):

(40) **C. Bohtan** (SE Turkey; Fox 2009)

	PRETERIT		PERFECT	
TR.	*qṭəl-le*	'He killed'	*qṭil-*Ø	'He has killed'
ITR.	*qəm-le*	'He rose'	*qim-*Ø	'He has risen'

In addition, the L-set is used to express patient indexes throughout the inflectional system. Consequently, one cannot speak of either a patient-like form or agreement inversion in this dialect (§5.1). Only the marking of the A is distinguished in the same way as the S:

	PRETERIT		PERFECT	
TR.	*qṭál-le-lā*	'He killed them'	*qṭil-**i**-le*	'**They** have killed him'
	qṭál-li-lux	'I killed you$_{MS}$.'	*qṭil-**ət**-li*	'**You$_{MS}$** killed me'

A similar pattern is documented for Mlaḥso (§6.3.3), although the perfect is distinguished from the preterit by a special inflectional base with a C*a*C*i*C-template, *qaṭíl-*Ø 'He has killed'. The transitive perfect can be considered both semantically and morphosyntactically closer to the imperfective, sharing the same morphosyntax. This constitutes a tense-aspect-conditioned split between accusative and neutral.

The gap may also be filled by a derivation of the 'perfective' through preverbal TAM-modification (§5.1). The TAM marker *lā* together with the patient-

like form denoting the subject expresses the resultative in J. Rustaqa (NE Iraq) against the agent-like form expressing the transitive perfect, as reviewed below.

(41) **J. Rustaqa** (NE Iraq)

	PRETERIT		PERFECT/RESULTATIVE	
TR.	*qṭil-le*	'He killed'	*lā qṭil-le*	'He has killed'
ITR.	*qim-le*	'He rose'	*lā qim-Ø*	'He is up, risen'

The S and A are grouped for the dynamic focus that generally expresses the perfective past and S and A are distinguished for the result focus which is closer to *qaṭəl-* in its aspectual meaning. The alignment split is in accordance with Malchukov (2015)'s TAM hierarchy:

(42) **Accusative-ergative split in J. Rustaqa**

IMPERFECTIVE | PERFECTIVE < PERFECT < RESULTATIVE-STATIVE

ACCUSATIVE ERGATIVE

Finally, ditransitive constructions are also conditioned by TAM. This does not necessarily lead to distinctions in alignment. We observed that pronominal themes tend to be expressed independently in the 'perfective' in several NENA dialects, while the same *ʔəll-*series expresses only the R in the 'imperfective' (§4.1.2.2). In Ṭuroyo, both ergative and ditransitive tripartite alignment are confined to the third person in the 'perfective' (§6.1.2).

On the whole, the differences in subject coding seem to reflect the degree of grammaticalization from of intransitive resultative to perfective past via the perfect (e.g. Bybee and Dahl 1989). The use of the E-set as subject indexes tends to be closely associated with the resultative-stative and/or perfect akin to the imperfective aspect more so than the use of the L-set as agent indexes to express the perfective past. Following Goldenberg (1992)'s suggestions, it is plausible that resulting incoherence is simply levelled out differently in the respective dialects by the innovation of new transitive realis perfects. Even for the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish dialects, it is plausible that the patient-like intransitive resultative (*qim-Ø* 'He is up') grammaticalized via the perfect ('He has risen') to preterit ('He rose'), replacing the preterit that used to be inflected like the A (*qim-le* 'He rose'). Language contact with ergative Iranian languages and innovative compound verbal constructions expressing the resultative and/or

perfect could have pushed the patient-like intransitive resultative into a preterit.

7.2.2. Split and Fluid Subject Marking

Ṭuroyo and South-Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish dialects show split subject marking and occasionally also fluid subject marking. While the S of most intransitive verbs ergatively groups the S with the P (S_P, i.e. the E-set), the S of a few classes of intransitive verbs groups the S with the A (S_A, i.e. the L-set). A few verbs may also co-vary between S_A or S_P forms. Although the variation in S-marking is not completely arbitrary, it does not evince a clear-cut distribution and is lexicalized for most verbs (§5.1.1).

In Ṭuroyo, basic verbs (stem I) come in two subclasses in the 'perfective', (Ia) taking a CC*i*C-template (*ftiḥ-o* 'It$_F$ opened') and (Ib), so-called 'neuter' verbs, taking a C*a*C*i*C-template (e.g. *damix-o* 'She fell asleep'). The (Ib) subclass always takes P-like coding of the S, and only the (Ia) subclass can combine with A-like coding (§6.2.1.4). Ṭuroyo not only shows split subject-marking in agreement but also in case-marking:

(43) **Ṭuroyo** (Raite, SE Turkey)
[S=P]
a. **(Ø-)*Ḥasan Paša*** *mayəθ-Ø*
PRN:MS die$_{PFV}$-3MS
'**Ḥasan Paša** died.' (Ritter 1967-71, 96/26)
[S=A]
b. ***l-Nari*** *malax-le*
DAT-PRN:MS walk$_{PFV}$-3MS
'**Nari** walked.' (ibid. l. 229)

Generally, the verbs that are most likely to take S_P coding are those that typically entail an affectee of a state or uncontrolled process such as *kpn* 'be/become hungry'. One exception is the existential or copula verb *hwy* 'be' in NENA that is explained morphologically. The same verb belongs to the (Ib) subclass in Ṭuroyo (*hawi-Ø* 'He was, became, was born').

By and large, when the verb is more semantically transitive event in more strongly implying some effect and denotes a punctual and dynamic event, the S_A forms are favored, even though no patient-like effect is expressed explicitly. Semelfactives, especially animal sound emissions such as 'bark' and more or less

controllable bodily reactions such as 'laugh' generally prefer S_A coding which is a typical feature of languages with ergative alignment (cf. Lazard 1998:136-139).

Causal factors pertaining to agentivity sometimes play a role in Jewish dialects of Iranian Azerbaijan. Control or animacy may sometimes determine compatibility with S_P or S_A coding. A lesser degree of control is not always compatible with the S_A coding for verbs 'sneeze' and 'cough', to review:

(44) **J. Qarah Hasan** (W Iran; Khan 2009:306)
a. *nox-le* 'It$_M$ barked.' (S=A, controlled)
b. *tpil-Ø* 'He sneezed.' (S=P, uncontrolled)

An inanimate subject such as a natural force is also not always compatible with S_A coding, to review:

(45) **J. Sanandaj** (W Iran; Khan 2009:294, 304-306)
[S] [V-S_A]
a. *xmara* *sre-le* (S=A, animate)
donkey:MS bray$_{PFV}$-3MS
'The donkey brayed.'
[S] [V-S_P]
b. *ʔewá* *gərgám-Ø* (S=P, inanimate)
cloud:MS thunder$_{PFV}$-3MS
'The cloud thundered.'

Verbs that denote controlled activities show notable differences. When the verb can combine with a P, the agent-oriented construction where the P is omitted and not expressed explicitly generally takes the same A-like coding. When verbs of dress and grooming are used intransitively, the meaning can be reflexive without distinction in subject coding (e.g. *lwəš-le* 'He dressed'). Typologically speaking, such controlled activities would be expected to be S_A verbs (Croft 2001:162-165; §2.3.1). Nevertheless, the S_P verbs also include controlled activities such as 'dance' and 'learn'. Ṭuroyo and NENA closely resemble each other in this respect. Only a few of such activities such as 'swim' take S_A coding in Ṭuroyo (*sḥe-le*) but S_P coding in NENA (*səxe-Ø*). The overall similar distribution in Ṭuroyo and NENA is likely not incidental and parallels the categorization of stative or middle verbs in other Aramaic and Semitic languages.

Aspectual factors also play an important role. Telicity does not appear to be a significant trigger. Lexically, durative and stative situations do trigger P-like

coding, while punctual and dynamic situations trigger A-like coding. An S_P verb like *tym* 'finish' entails the cessation of an action and is more state and endpoint-oriented than an S_A verb like *bdy* 'begin' which is inherently more action and agent-oriented. The durative and stative correlate with the 'imperfective' where the A and S are also marked by the E-set.

A verb can occur in both S_P and S_A constructions, showing fluid subject marking. Similar semantic conditioning tendencies can be observed. Fluid subject marking can be conditioned by agentivity. Control may be a contributing factor: The A-like coding of *ylp* 'learn', for example, implies deliberate effort (controlled), while the P-like coding implies that the S learnt by being taught (uncontrolled). Animacy also contributes: When the S is an inanimate agent, the verb takes S_P coding, and, when the S is human and instigating, the S_A coding is preferred:

(46) **J. Sanandaj** (W Iran; Khan 2009:304, 543)

	[S]	[V-S]	[OBL]	
a.	*baxtăké*	*nqəs-**la***	*ga-ʔil-í*	(S_A, human)
	woman:FS:DEF	prick$_{PFV}$-3FS	at-hand-my	
	'The woman pricked (lit. at) my hand.'			
b.	*xmatá*	*nqis-**a***	*ga-ʔil-í*	(S_P, non-human)
	needle:FS:DEF	prick$_{PFV}$-3FS	at-hand-my	
	'The needle pricked (lit. at) my hand.'			

Fluid subject marking is also conditioned by aspect. Punctuality seems to be the primary contributing semantic factor in Ṭuroyo. The S_A construction favors a punctual reading:

(47) **Ṭuroyo** (SE Turkey; Ritter 1990:85)

a.	*kfəl-le*[220]	'He became hungry'	(S_A, punctual)
b.	*kafən-Ø*	'He starved'	(S_P, durative)

A grammatical type of fluid subject marking conditioned by TAM is found in Jewish dialects of the northeastern periphery and Christian dialects in SE Turkey besides early scribal idiolects from N Iraq (§5.1.2). The S_P (i.e. E-set) construction generally denotes an observable (i.e. realis) state resulting from a prior event that can encompass stative, resultative, or perfect aspect (*dmix-Ø* 'He is asleep,

[220] < **kfən-le*.

has fallen asleep, has slept'). These can be viewed as subset of the imperfective aspect, while the S_A form (i.e. L-set) expresses the perfective past viewed from a complete whole (*dməx-le* 'He went to sleep, slept').

Finally, we noted that a split in the coding of the S is also attested for non-ergative alignment. In the Jewish Urmi compound perfect, the coding of S and A is distinct for the third person (§4.6.3). Some semantically intransitive verbs are classified like primary transitive verbs and take transitive coding instead. The resulting split parallels South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish. The main typological difference is the treatment of controlled activities such as 'dance' that do take transitive coding in Jewish Urmi (e.g. *rqil-é* 'He has danced') but intransitive in the 'ergative dialects'. Conversely, semelfactives or sound emission verbs such as 'bark' take intransitive coding in Jewish Urmi (e.g. *nwix*-Ø 'It$_M$ barked') but transitive in the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish dialects. Presumably, telicity and dynamism play a greater role than punctuality in the Jewish Urmi perfect (Khan 2008b:73).

7.3. Lability and Ergativity

7.3.1. Lability, Passive, and Agent omission

Several Eastern Neo-Aramaic languages can employ an agentless 'perfective' form where the E-set is used to denote the patient and the agent is not expressed by agreement (e.g. *xabuše xil-i* 'The apples were eaten'). Although this is reminiscent of the passive, the NENA dialects usually prefer other passive voice constructions such as impersonal third person plural agent coding (§4.3.2). This construction was analyzed differently depending on whether the dialect groups the S with the P by the E-set or not.

Virtually all basic effective transitive verbs are labile in the so-called 'ergative dialects' (and, similarly, 'dynamic-stative dialects' such as Jewish Urmi). Based on semantic and morphological factors (§4.3.3), I established that the agentless 'perfective' form expresses the S and not the P in 'ergative dialects' (and similarly 'dynamic-stative dialects' like Jewish Urmi). Consequently, constructions like *xil*-Ø 'It$_M$ was eaten' or *qṭil*-Ø 'He was killed' should be understood as ultimately derived from inchoatives like *plix*-Ø 'It$_M$ opened' and *twir*-Ø 'It$_M$ broke'. It should be noted that, in the Christian dialect of Bohtan (SE Turkey), closely related to the 'dynamic-stative' varieties, such a patient orientation is never available and an agent orientation is always preferred in order to express the perfect (e.g. *xil*-Ø 'He has eaten', *qṭil*-Ø 'He has killed').

Where lability is found in most other dialects, this is generally not distinct from the accusative pattern in the 'imperfective'. If no patient index is present, there is no morphosyntactic distinction between a transitive or intransitive valence pattern apart from word order tendencies and differential object marking. There is a tendency for the P to follow the verb, and the S to precede it, but this is not fixed. There is also a tendency for object indexes to become a means to differentiate the transitive from the intransitive valence pattern (cf. Givón 1976:168). When a dialect can avail itself of a so-called *qam-qaṭəl*-construction for perfective transitive clauses with object indexes, the intransitive valence pattern is always expressed by a *qṭil*-based form while the transitive valence pattern is ultimately based on the 'imperfective' *qaṭəl*- to index the P:

(48) **J. Betanure** (NW Iraq; Mutzafi 2008a:256.399, 266.426)

	[S]	[V-S]	
a.	*tarʔa*	*pθəx-le*	(intransitive, inchoative)
	door:MS	open$_{PFV}$-3MS	
	'The door opened.'		
	[P]	[V-A-P]	
b.	*tarʔa*	*qam-pāθx-i-le*	(transitive, causative)
	door:MS	PFV-open$_{IPFV}$-3PL-3MS	
	'They opened the door.'		

The coding of the intransitive valence pattern can also traverse the TAM split (§6.4). The intransitive coding is morphologically adapted on the level of stem morphology for passive and anticausatives in the dialect Mlaḥso closely related to Ṭuroyo. Mlaḥso, which displays neutral agreement, uses a dedicated intransitive construction on the basis of, ultimately, an 'imperfective' base (*mepseḥ-le* 'It$_M$ opened'). What expresses the difference in TAM is the choice of the E-set or L-set of person forms (cf. *mepseḥ-Ø* 'It$_M$ opens'). Consequently, special anticausative voice morphology (*me*CC*e*C-) is used to express the patient orientation (*tarʕó psiḥ-le* 'He opened the door' vs. *tarʕó mepseḥ-le* 'The door opened').

Complete omission of agent agreement is possible in 'accusative dialects' and can result in the retention of the transitive coding in a type of impersonal labile alternation. The agentless 'perfective' forms are effectively truncated transitive constructions, since the patient possesses properties of the P (contrary to the S) such as differential object marking and the agent can still be referential (§4.3.4). Such dialects allow the omission of agent agreement, presumably of

virtually every transitive verb. These agentless 'perfective' forms cannot be fully characterized as either passive or ergative. It is distinct from the passive prototype in that the patient retains object coding (e.g. *xil-a* 'People ate it$_F$', the E-set) and distinct from the ergative in that this object coding is clearly distinct from the S (e.g. *dməx-la* 'She slept', the L-set). The word order may be like the transitive or intransitive valence pattern of labile alternations. Third person, especially third person plural reference to the agent can be maintained (i.e. *xil-a* '(He/she/they) ate it$_F$') and be semantically indistinct from the corresponding fully transitive, active construction. The agent may be overtly expressed in the dative like recipients (e.g. *l-kalwe xil-a* 'It$_F$ was eaten by dogs') or completely zero-marked like the A (e.g. *kalwe xil-a* 'It$_F$ was eaten by dogs'). The latter is clearly not passive-like (§4.3.5). Yet, these constructions can evince focal marking of the agent much like differential and optional agent marking found in languages where ergative alignment predominates (2.4.3). In terms of agreement, an ergative grouping is only obtained in trigger potential. The zero realization of the A represents a distinct treatment from the overt agreement with the S and P (§4.3.3.). Nevertheless, I suggested that the agentless 'perfective' form expresses the event from the bare viewpoint of the endpoint, and that the agent's recoverability from the context is determinant in identifying an agent and retaining object coding. I also suggested a possible pattern replication from the equivalent agentless and ergative construction in Kurdish.

Ṭuroyo differs from NENA in this respect. Virtually all verbs, including intransitives, can occur in a type of impersonal labile alternation (6.2.1.4). Thus, even subject coding may be simply left unexpressed (e.g. *rʕim*(-Ø) *šešwone* 'It$_M$ swarmed (with) ants'). The agent is not overtly expressed in such impersonal constructions. At the same time, Ṭuroyo personal labile alternations manifest ergative alignment (e.g. *ftiḥ*-Ø 'It$_M$ opened').

The agent may also be omitted in the compound perfect where the agreement with the agent is generally expressed by the 'copula' and, usually also, the resultative participle (§5.2.3). Insofar as speakers perceive a patient-like argument to be more salient, the construction will not be agent-oriented and the agreement is controlled by the patient. Indeed, the agreement with the patient and lack of agreement with the agent is key to distinction in orientation. The agent can be overtly expressed, and may be morphologically identical with the P in the corresponding active through the dative preposition *(ʔəl)l*-. A greater structural cohesion between the P and the verb are determinant for the active as opposed to passive interpretation:

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

	[V-A]	[COP:A]		[V-S]	[COP:S]	
a.	*qṭíl-a*	*winwa*	c.	*qṭil-a*	*winwa*	
	killed-MS	PST:1MS		killed-MS	PST:1MS	
	'I$_M$ had killed.'			'I$_M$ had been killed.'		
	[V-P]	[COP:A]		[V-S]	[COP:S]	[OBL]
b.	*qṭíl-**əlle***	*winwa*	d.	*qṭil-a*	*winwa*	***ʔəlle***
	killed:MS-DAT:3MS	PST:1MS		killed-MS	PST:1MS	DAT:3MS
	'I$_M$ had killed **him**.'			'I$_M$ had been killed **by him**.'		

There is one respect in which the compound perfect with a patient orientation resembles ergative alignment. When the agent NP precedes the verb, it may be zero-marked like the A (e.g. *baxta* Ø*-babi=la qṭilta* 'The woman was killed by my father'). It is the marked voice opposition that suggests it is passive.

7.3.2. Antipassive and Patient Omission

Most transitive verbs maintain an agent orientation and show no shift in the coding of the agent in patient omission constructions. The agent remains expressed by the L-set. In the South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties that show split subject marking, the stronger implication of an effect generally results in transitive coding (§5.1.1).

Similarly, there are intransitive verbs that occur in an anti-impersonal construction expressing dummy, non-referential (3fs.) object coding. When these verbs combine with a patient-like argument, the subject is coded like the A. Complex predicates or phrasal verbs reminiscent of noun incorporation in 'ergative languages' also occur where the intransitive or transitive verb takes a dummy nominal object element, most of which are transferred from Persian and/or Kurdish combining with *ʔwl* 'do' or *xØr* 'become' (e.g. Khan 2009:153). This is different from other languages that evince ergative alignment where non-referential dummy objects favor intransitive coding (Givón 1985a).

A few verbs, however, do display a difference reminiscent of antipassive voice constructions typical for certain 'ergative languages'. A semantically agent-like participant is expressed like the P instead. The antipassive-like construction expresses situations with semantically reduced transitivity (§2.3.3). In NENA, the antipassive-like intransitive construction involves a decrease in the degree of affectedness on the part of the patient-like argument (§4.3.3). It may also be used to express reflexives. In terms of aspect, the intransitive (antipassive) verbal forms can express a durative activity, while the transitive ('ac-

tive'/'ergative') refers to a punctual activity. The durative aspect correlates with the imperfective aspect constructions where the A and S are also marked by the E-set.

Non-human agents are not always compatible with the A-function, for which the antipassive-like form is preferred. The antipassive may be enhanced with a patient-like argument coded as oblique:

(50) **J. Sanandaj** (W Iran; Khan 2009:522)

	[A]	[V-A]	[P]	
a.	*hangăké*	*nqəs-la*	*ʔəl-í*	(ergative)
	bee:FS:DEF	prick$_{PFV}$-3FS	OBJ-1SG	
	'The bee stung me.'			
	[S]	[V-S]		
b.	*xmatá*	*nqis-**a***		(patientless antipassive)
	needle:FS:DEF	prick$_{PFV}$-3FS		
	'The needle pricked.'			
	[S]	[V-S]	[OBL]	
c.	*xmatá*	*nqis-**a***	*ga-ʔil-í*	(antipassive)
	needle:FS:DEF	prick$_{PFV}$-3FS	at-hand-my	
	'The needle pricked my hand.'			

Similarly, human agents can be coded like the A in both constructions, but agents need not be, when they do not act deliberately. This shows that the degree of agentivity (i.e. control, instigation) is a significant, contributing factor. Similarly to subject marking, the marking of the agent can be split depending on agentivity. The A-like coding entails that the human argument deliberately initiates an action while the P-like coding rather entails that the something happens to the human argument:

(51) **J. Sanandaj** (W Iran; Khan 2009:304, 543)

a.	*ʔó*	*rába*	*məndixané*	*yləp-**le***	(controlled, more A-like)
	he	many	thing:PL	learn$_{PFV}$-3MS	
	'He learnt many things (by himself).'				
b.	*ʔó*	*rába*	*məndixané*	*yálip-**Ø***	(uncontrolled, more P-like)
	he	many	thing:PL	learn$_{PFV}$-3MS	
	'He learnt many things (when taught by somebody else).'				

Ṭuroyo differs in several respects from NENA. When a verb exhibits an antipassive-like alternation, the transitive valence pattern takes transitive coding in NENA, expressing the agent by the L-set instead (unlike the S). In Ṭuroyo, several 'neuter' verbs can combine with a P in the same way as the 'imperfective' (e.g. *šamiʕ-o-le* 'She heard him') but contrary to most other transitive verbs such as *qṭl* 'kill' and *twr* 'break' that more strongly imply an effect (e.g. *twir-o-le* 'He broke it$_F$') (§6.2.1). These neuter verbs generally do not alternate with primary transitive verbs, do not express a passive orientation, and never seem to have a strong implication of a patient-like effect. The agent-like argument in this C*a*C*i*C-perfective is, strictly speaking, not the A. They constitute a special subclass of verbs mainly denoting intransitive or lowly transitive situations such as mental states. Ergative alignment is used for primary transitive verbs but a class of stative verbs always occur in this antipassive-like construction. Primary transitive verbs may be incompatible with the antipassive in certain languages. A few of such two-argument experiencer verbs (e.g. *yaləf-Ø* 'He learnt' and *iləf-le* 'He learnt') in Ṭuroyo may occur with either the A-like or P-like coding depending on what appears to be punctuality (§6.2.1.4). The A-like coding is preferred for the punctual reading. This is similar to fluid subject marking:

(52) **Ṭuroyo** (SE Turkey)

a.	*iləf-**le** qroyo*	'He learnt to read.'	(punctual, A-like)
b.	*yaləf-**Ø** qroyo*	'He learnt to read.'	(durative, P-like)

At the same time, it could indicate an instance where it is the intransitive coding that overrides alignment splits. In some languages where the alignment is split conditioned by TAM, the (ergative) transitive coding is preferred for primary transitive verbs such as 'break' even in the TAM constructions where other transitive verbs would follow a different (non-ergative) pattern. In Ṭuroyo, it would be the other way around. The primacy of an intransitive verbal class favors non-ergative coding regardless of TAM.

By contrast, most strategies to mark the P differently from the E-set in the 'perfective' are morphologically parallel with the 'imperfective' in NENA (§4.4). In some cases, the coding of the agent is also modified. An extreme case we discussed is the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction (§4.4.2), not found in the Trans-Zab Jewish dialect bundle or Central Neo-Aramaic, also correlates with transitivity alternations. This is not dependent on verbal class but on the nature of object coding. Reviewed below, the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction combines with an object index and

is used in dialects where the S and A are grouped by the L-set in the perfective past:

(53) **J. Betanure** (NW Iraq; based on Mutzafi 2008a, compare p. 266.426 and 239.440)

	[V-S]		
a.	*xəl-le*		(intransitive)
	eat$_{PFV}$-3MS		
	'He ate.'		
	[V-A]	[P]	
b.	*xəl-le*	*xabūša*	(transitive but identical with intransitive)
	eat$_{PFV}$-3MS	apple:FS	
	'He ate an apple.'		
	[V-A-P]	[P]	
c.	*qam-ʔāxəl-Ø-la*	*xabūša*	(transitive but distinct from intransitive)
	PFV-eat$_{IPFV}$-3MS-3FS	apple:FS	
	'He ate the apple.'		

It is the opposite of an antipassive voice construction. In the antipassive, the coding of the agent is typically distinct from the A in the transitive valence pattern in the absence of the patient. In the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction, the coding of the agent is distinct from the S in the presence of a patient index but the same as the S in the absence of a patient index. It results in a major distinction in the coding of the agent. The morphosyntax of transitive clauses without a patient index is not distinguishable from intransitive clauses. Yet, transitive clause that include a patient index are morphologically adapted to the transitive coding of 'imperfective' constructions. Therefore, the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction is arguably more transitive and not compatible with patient omission constructions. It is, however, compatible with anti-impersonal constructions with dummy third person object coding that are semantically intransitive.

7.4. Argument-Related Scales and Splits

7.4.1. Patient-Related Scales

An argument's position on the prominence scale is generally assumed to correlate with the overt coding and trigger potential of agreement (§2.4). The S, in turn, is typically realized as zero (§2.4.1). Arguments ranking lower in promi-

nence are expected to evince the same coding properties as the S, while Ps that are highly prominent are not, since they are differentially marked either in case-marking or agreement. Therefore, differential object marking tends to reflect a distinction between the grouping of P with S (P=S) for lower ranking arguments and differentiation of P and S (P≠S) for higher ranking arguments. In alignment splits based on an argument's relative position on the prominence scale, ergative alignment (A≠S=P) tends to be found for the lower ranking arguments, while non-ergative alignment for the higher ranking arguments.

Most Eastern Neo-Aramaic languages make a distinction between several transitive constructions depending on the relative position of the P on the prominence scale. The 'perfective' and 'imperfective' show considerable overlap in terms of differential indexing and case-marking patterns. Even though the exact conditions of prominence (though mainly definiteness) differ per dialect, they are generally the same as with the 'perfective' and 'imperfective' constructions, despite the fact that the role marking of the agreement morphology is inverted. This demonstrates that some speakers have no difficulty in handling agreement inversion. Yet, dialects can differ strongly to what extend they overtly express the P-function. In some dialects such as Mlaḥso, object coding is rather simple and there is hardly any object coding altogether, so that object anaphora are simply unexpressed (§6.3.1). In yet other dialects such as Christian Hertevin, transitive constructions with an object index are extremely more complex than those without (§4.4.3).

What is evidently complicating, however, is person reference. Indeed, it is the absolute person reference of the P in the 'perfective' that influences most alignment variation. First/second person are not compatible with the P role in the inverted 'perfective' construction (e.g. ***nšiq-ax-loxun* 'You$_{PL}$ kissed us') in the majority of Eastern Neo-Aramaic (§4.1.1). In several NENA dialects, the 3pl. and/or 3fs. may also be incompatible and sometimes even completely for all persons (as in Mlaḥso). This person role constraint closely correlates with a decrease in the use of the E-set as object indexes and the increase of other, innovated object marking strategies (cf. Mengozzi 2005; Khan 2007a; Coghill 2016) but not necessarily a decrease of ergativity. First/second person forms, being most topic-worthy, play a key role in the birth of DOM (e.g. Bossong 1985; Haig 2008:152). Alternative strategies to mark the P in the 'perfective' are available in all dialects. Generally, when a NENA dialect employs a different strategy for first/second person forms, this strategy is also available as an alternative for third person forms. Interestingly, by contrast, the two strategies are complementary and always preferred for a particular person category in Ṭuroyo. Moreover,

alternative strategies may co-vary for all persons in person-unrestricted dialects where the inverted 'perfective' construction is compatible with all persons in the P function. Conversely, there are dialects where the 'alternative' strategy is completely conventionalized for all persons and the E-set does not express the P at all. Thus, only Ṭuroyo and the dialects where the E-set of object indexes is obsolete manifest a symmetric system, while all other varieties are asymmetric. Table 47 below provides an overview of the person-based alignment splits in the perterit and Table 48 (on the next page) of person and/or gender-based splits in the perfect. One should note, however, that the splits are not complementary in NENA dialects. The third person, sometimes the third masculine singular obligatorily, is included in the distinct set of the first/second person forms in NENA. Also, independent pronouns and full nominals do not pattern ergatively in C. Hertevin, even though the dependent third/second person forms point to ergative alignment (§4.4.3.4).

Table 47. *Overview of person splits in the 'preterit'*

1ST/2ND PERSON (V-A-P)	3RD PERSON (V-P-A)	DIALECTS
(A=S≠P) accusative	(A=S≠P) accusative	across NENA dialects (e.g. J. Challa, J. Barzani, J. Arbel)
(A=S=P) neutral	(A=S≠P) accusative	NW Iranian Jewish dialects (e.g. J. Urmi)
(A≠S≠P) tripartite	(A≠S=P) ergative	South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish (e.g. J. Sulemaniyya)
(S≠A=P) horizontal	(A≠S=P) ergative	Ṭuroyo (SE Turkey), J. Saqqiz (W Iran)
(A≠S=P) ergative	(A=S≠P) accusative	*qam-qaṭal*-construction in Khabur, Iraq and Iran, L-E-series in C. Hertevin (SE Turkey)

In several dialects, independent object person forms like the *ʔall*-series are preferred, especially for the first/second person, treating them like full nominals. Such person splits are first and foremost a constructional split and have no direct bearing on ergativity (§4.2). It demonstrates that a particular set of argument indexes (i.e. the E-set) is gradually being replaced depending on the dialect. The same constraint simply works out differently in each dialect (group) and what is pertinent to alignment is only the marking of the S and its relationship to other core arguments.

Table 48. *Overview of person and gender-based splits in the 'perfect'*

1ST/2ND PERSON	3RD PERSON	DIALECTS
(A=S≠P) accusative	(A=S≠P) accusative	most of NENA dialects
(A=S≠P) accusative	(A≠S≠P) tripartite	NW Iranian Jewish dialects
(A≠S≠P) tripartite	(A≠S=P) ergative	most of Trans-Zab Jewish (NE Iraq, W Iran)
(S≠A=P) horizontal	(A≠S=P) ergative	Ṭuroyo (identical with preterit)
FEMININE	NON-FEMININE	DIALECTS
(A≠S=P) ergative / (A=S≠P) accusative	(S≠A=P) horizontal	J. Sulemaniyya and Ḥalabja (NE Iraq)
(A≠S=P) ergative	(A=S≠P) accusative	NW Iranian Jewish dialects

Both 'accusative dialects' such as Jewish Arbel (NE Iraq) and 'ergative dialects' such as Jewish Sulemaniyya (NE Iraq), it leads to a difference in the independent or dependent expression of objects in 'perfective' constructions. This is illustrated in (54) below. The independent expression by the *ʔəll*-series is favored, when no dependent person forms (i.e. the E-set) are available. The prepositional marking system penetrates the person marking system. Consequently, the main difference between these two dialects is the coding of the S. Since the S is marked by the L-set in Jewish Arbel, there is no distinction in the relationship between the S and other core arguments. Both first/second and third person forms pattern accusatively, albeit through different coding properties. By contrast, since the S is marked by the E-set in Jewish Sulemaniyya, only the third person forms pattern ergatively and the first/second person forms follow a tripartite pattern (A≠S≠P). This concurs with the predications based on cross-linguistic tendencies. Cross-linguistically, object person forms tend to be coded independently (Siewierska 2004:46-47) and independent person forms, if restricted, typically refer to human referents, especially in the R function (ibid. 60-61). In line with this, the *ʔəll*-series otherwise mark the R. The ergative-tripartite person split is consistent with the prominence scale, since the S and P groups the lower ranking persons. Yet, it should be noted that tripartite alignment is equally attested for the third person (i.e. *qṭəl-le ʔəlla* 'He killed her') which counters the prominence scale.

(54) **Accusative and tripartite compared**

	J. Arbel (Khan 1999)		**J. Sulemaniyya** (Khan 2004a, 2007a)	
	ACCUSATIVE-ACCUSATIVE		ERGATIVE- TRIPARTITE	
	[V-S]		[V-S]	
a.	*qəm-**la***	e.	*qim-**a***	
	'**She** rose.'		'**She** rose.'	
	[V-P-A]		[V-P-A]	
b.	*qəṭl-a-**le***	f.	*qəṭl-**a**-le*	(dependent)
	'**He** killed her.'		'He killed **her**.'	
	[V-A] [P]		[V-A] [P]	
c.	*qṭəl-**le** ʔəllax*	g.	*qṭəl-le ʔəllax*	(independent)
	'**He** killed you$_{FS}$.'		'He killed you$_{FS}$.'	
	[V-S]		[V-S]	
d.	*qəm-**lax***	h.	*qim-**at***	
	'**You$_{FS}$** rose.'		'**You$_{FS}$** rose.'	

In Ṭuroyo (SE Turkey) and the Jewish dialects like Saqqiz (W Iran) and Sanandaj (W Iran), horizontal alignment is confined to first/second person arguments alternating with ergative for the third person. Again, in NENA, the ergative pattern of the third person also shows signs of conflict with the prominence scale, namely: these West Iranian Jewish dialects manifest an alternative tripartite pattern for the third person alongside the ergative.

Neutral alignment is necessary for first/second person forms in the North West Iranian Jewish dialects such as Urmi and this alternates with accusative for the third person only. The fact that neutral alignment is preferred also shows that the differential marking is not geared to disambiguate the A from the P in phonological form. Again the fundamental difference between the two in terms of alignment is the coding of the S while the transitive constructions are similar:

(55) **Horizontal and neutral compared**

	J. Urmi (Khan 2008b)		**Ṭuroyo** (Miden, cf. Jastrow 1985)
	ACCUSATIVE-NEUTRAL		ERGATIVE-HORIZONTAL
	[V-S]		[V-S]
a.	*qəm-**la***	b.	*qayim-**o***
	'**She** rose.'		'**She** rose.'

[V-P-A]
c. *xəzy-a-**le***
'**He** saw her.'
[V-A-P]
d. *xzé-**le-lax***
'**He** saw **you**$_{FS}$.'
[V-S]
e. *qəm-**lax***
'**You**$_{FS}$ rose.'

[V-P-A]
f. *ḥəzy-**o**-le*
'He saw **her**.'
[V-A-P]
g. *ḥzé-le-lax*
'He saw you$_{FS}$.'
[V-S]
h. *qayim-**at***
'**You**$_{FS}$ rose.'

A morphologically very different phenomenon is the *qam-qaṭəl*-formation to express the preterit. Yet, functionally, it is a type of differential object marking in that first/second person objects need to be marked by the L-set in this *qam-qaṭəl*-preterit against the alternative *qṭil*-preterit available for the third person, as reviewed below. Differential object marking has at least partly motivated the construction of an entirely distinct verbal form dedicated to the higher ranking P arguments.

(56) ***qṭil-* and *qam-qaṭəl*-preterit compared**
J. Zaxo (based on Cohen 2012:458-465)
[V-S]
a. *qəm-**la***
'**She** rose.'
[V-P-A]
b. *xəzy-ā-**le***
'**He** saw her.'
[V-A-P]
c. *qam-xāzé-∅-**lax***
'He saw **you**$_{FS}$.'
[V-S]
d. *qəm-**lax***
'**You**$_{FS}$ rose.'

Regardless of alignment type, a prominent (primarily definite) P generally determines the prepositional marking and/or overt expression of cross-indexes of the P. (57) is an illustration of such DOM constructions in the 'perfective' based on the morphological pattern of Trans-Zab Jewish varieties. Differential prepositional marking and indexing can occur independently or combined.

(57) **Differential object marking**

	[A]	[(DOM→)P]	[V(-P)-A]	
a.	*ḥatán*	***ʔəl-kaldá***	*nšəq-le*	(diff. case-marking only)
	groom:MS	DOM-bride:FS	kiss$_{PFV}$-3MS	
b.	*ḥatán*	***kaldá***	*nəšq-**a**-le*	(diff. indexing only)
	groom:MS	bride:FS	kiss$_{PFV}$-3FS-3MS	
c.	*ḥatán*	***ʔəl-kaldá***	*nəšq-**a**-le*	(both strategies combined)
	groom:MS	DOM-bride:FS	kiss$_{PFV}$-3FS-3MS	

'The bridegroom kissed **the bride**.'

Differential case-marking by itself does not generally lead to distinct alignment types across dialects, since, by and large, the A is not overtly case-marked. The main opposition is between neutral for lower ranking arguments and accusative for the higher ranking ones. DOM may sometimes even involve several prepositions in a single dialect, e.g. *qa-*, *ṭla-* and *l-* in Barwar (Khan 2008a:784ff.). Incidentally, it results in horizontal case-marking (S≠A=P) in the Raite dialect of Ṭuroyo (6.1.3).

When we consider the differential indexing of full NPs, on the whole, the E-set of object indexes seems to be preferred in this function rather than the expression of pronouns. This preference may indicate that the agreement with the P in the inverted *qṭil*-base still reflects at least partially a vestige of what historically used to represent adjectival agreement in number and gender with nouns which is gradually replaced by a person indexing system. The differential indexing of patients by other transitive 'perfective' constructions is not always and not equally available in all dialects. The *qam-qaṭəl*-formation, for example, is preferred for pronominal arguments and, therefore, the L-set can function as a pro-index rather than a cross-index, because, depending on the dialect, co-referential nominals can be incompatible. In the Christian dialect of Hertevin, the main usage of the E-set as object indexes is the indexing of topical, full nominal patients and, thus, a co-referential nominal is strongly preferred. The special transitive 'perfective' construction with the L-E-series denoting the agent must be used similarly to the *qam-qaṭəl*-formation, when the P is pronominal and, necessarily, when it is first/second person (e.g. *ḥzé-l-en-naḥ* 'I saw you$_{FS}$'). Presumably, the alternative constructions become more readily included in the differential indexing via the third masculine singular, since, in some dialects, the *ʔəll*-series may be included as post-verbal cross-indexes.

This only indirectly influences the manifestation of alignment types where again the coding of the S is crucial. The E-set as patient indexes is limited to the

differential indexing of definite full NPs in the 'perfective' to the same degree as it the L-set as patient indexes in the 'imperfective'. Consequently, this also limits the manifestation of ergative agreement to definite full NPs (§4.2.3). By the same token, NPs of lower ranking in prominence follow a tripartite pattern, when the expression of the P is zero only because the S and A are kept distinct. The same holds for fully overt accusative agreement (§4.2.1) and neutral agreement (§4.2.2): They are confined to higher ranking NPs. Also, depending on the dialect, the alternative strategies can also be used in the differential indexing of third masculine singular Ps (because of the 3ms. zero realization in the E-set). In the end, the transitive constructions in (56) are functionally not very different across dialects, it is the intransitive constructions that differ.

At first value, this is remarkable, since one would not expect such grouping with S and P to be dependent on differential object marking. Ergative agreement for the higher ranking nominals is in direct conflict with the expectations for alignment splits. Differential P-marking is usually associated with non-ergative patterns, precisely because the properties of the P are central to its overt expression (and not the A). Yet, this need not surprise us, since the coding of the S is independent of such referential factors. It simply demonstrates, that, although accusative in terms of trigger potential, differential object marking is not confined to a particular morphological alignment (cf. Bossong 1985). Similarly, differential object marking by the preposition *(ʔəl)l-* is found alongside accusative (§4.2.1), neutral (§4.2.2) and ergative (§4.2.3) agreement. From the perspective of the variation within NENA, then, the possible combination of ergative agreement and accusative case-marking in South Eastern Trans-Zab Jewish varieties makes perfect sense. The same constructions are found across dialects, but the difference is the marking of the S (which is not sensitive to the prominence scales).

Ergativity in itself, therefore, plays no role in the constructional preferences for person referents. Other factors presumably do contribute. Affix order, for instance, is not altogether insignificant. The V-P-A order is only available for the third person while the V-A-P order is necessary for the first/second person. Indeed, it seems that the proximity between the agent coding and the verbal stem is preferred in the constructions where the P is first/second person. This also holds for compound verbal constructions where ergativity does not occur even in the dialects that evince ergative alignment in the perfective past (§5.3.1). The compound progressive in Jewish Sulemaniyya, for example, requires independent expression of first/second person objects by means of the *ʔəll-*series (*gorašá=y* ***ʔəll-ax*** 'He is pulling you$_{FS}$'), while a V-P-A order is available for third person ob-

jects by means of a different set of affixes (*garoš-**áw**=y* 'He is pulling her') (§5.2.2). The imperative in Ṭuroyo also shows a similar split to the 'perfective' without a trace of ergativity, although affix order need not play a role here.

7.4.2. Agent-Related Scales and Splits in Transitivity Coding

The (ergative) distinction between A and S (A≠S) may also depend on argument-related scales (§2.4.3). Following the prominence scale, A arguments ranking lower on such scales are not expected to show the same coding properties as the S. This is partially supported by the fact that arguments that are inanimate are possibly incompatible with the A-function or may be distinctly marked. Similarly, one would not expect ergative marking to be confined to the higher ranking first and/or second persons and neutral or accusative alignment to the lower ranking person category.

While the P and R can be marked by various prepositions, the A, if applicable in the dialect, can be marked only by the dative preposition *l-* and its allomorphs. The special marking of the A in Ṭuroyo is optional and always combined with overt agent agreement (§6.1.3). At least one of the conditioning factors of this ergative construction is agent focus. The dative preposition *(e)l-* is used to express the unexpectedness of the A reminiscent of other languages that show differential or optional A-marking. It should be pointed out, however, that zero coding is also found for A arguments in focus, but overt marking of the A clearly correlates with agent focus. This dative agent construction is combinable with either differential ergative agreement or differentially, identically marked dative Ps, when such a focal agent combines with a prominent patient. The covariation between an overtly and zero-coded A closely resembles predicative possessor constructions.

A less clear but also possible instance of focal A-marking is attested in NENA dialects where the L-suffixes group the S and A in the preterit (§4.3.5). This analysis is complicated by the connection with impersonal passives. There is a strong tendency to reduce the referentiality of the agent and restrict the person reference to the third person and especially third person plural. Only the L-suffixes denoting the A may be omitted in the agentless 'perfective' form while the verb expresses agreement with a salient P. Often another verb in the immediate context expresses the same topical referent:

(58) **C. Ashitha** (Literary, NW Iran; Polotsky 1996:17, transcription modified)

θe-lay	***šqil-a*(-Ø)**	*baxta*	*b-xurṭūθa*	*w=zəl-lay*
come$_{PFV}$-3PL	take$_{PFV}$-3FS(-3PL)	woman:FS	by-force	and-go$_{PFV}$-3PL

'They came, **took** the woman by force and went.'

This agentless 'perfective' construction in these dialects is possibly akin to some languages such as Konjo (Friberg 1996) where agent agreement is absent, when the A is focal (Siewierska 2004:160-162). The lack of agreement in itself is not clearly connectable with agent focus in NENA but when the agent is a full nominal, focalization may be involved. Interestingly, the full nominal agent can be either zero-marked or marked by the dative preposition *(ʔəl-)l-*. When the agent nominal is marked by the dative, it is often focal, but there is no agent agreement as in Ṭuroyo. In addition, there is referential continuity between such dative agents and subsequent agent L-suffixes:

(59) **Early C. Alqosh** (Literary, NW Iraq; Mengozzi 2002a)

šqīl-Ø(-Ø)	***l-māl[ā]ʾxē***	*w-nube-Ø-**lay***	*drē-Ø-**lay***	*b-gehan[ā]*
take$_{PFV}$-3MS(-3PL)	DAT-angel:PL	and-carry$_{PFV}$-3MS-3PL	put$_{PFV}$-3MS-3PL	in-PRN

'**Angels** took him and carried him and put him in Gehenna.' (J6 142.79d)

If this is a type of focal ergative case-marking, then it combines with tripartite indexing, since the S (i.e. L-set) is marked distinctly from the P (i.e. E-set). Historically, such dative agents and the L-suffixes were similar instances of the same preposition, one nominal and the other pronominal. Synchronically, this relationship is complicated by the fact that the L-suffixes are fully grammaticalized verbal suffixes and other person forms are expressed like full nominals by the same preposition.

In terms of agreement, overt expression of the A is dependent on gender and number in the compound realis perfect in certain Trans-Zab Jewish dialects. In Jewish Sulemaniyya, the feminine singular triggers agreement regardless of role, but, if my analysis is correct, in Jewish Urmi and presumably dialects akin to it, special marking of the A is confined to the feminine singular, so that the feminine singular aligns ergatively while the masculine singular aligns neutrally (§5.3.1).

Verbal constructions can depend on the animacy of the A in dialects that the group the S and P by the E-set. In Jewish Sanandaj, this is marginal and also lexically motivated by the meaning of the verb. In a transitivity alternation, a non-human agent receives intransitive coding similar to the P, while a human agent

receives the transitive coding of the A (§5.1.1.1). This demonstrates that highly animate arguments are not always compatible with the P-like coding in the S role and that inanimate arguments are not always compatible with the A-function and require an intransitive verbal construction instead. While this clearly interacts with voice, it is the lower ranking argument (inanimates) that favors marking distinct from the A.

Similarly, person reference correlates with or confines A-marking. The trigger potential of the P outranks the A and even for third person in the compound realis perfect of West Iranian Jewish dialects (§5.3.5). The A is confined to the third person and realized as ∅. It shows neither prepositional marking nor agreement, while a prominent P, though also confined to the third person, freely triggers such coding properties. A first/second person A must be expressed via a different construction based on the 'perfective'. No such restrictions are found for the S, however. As expected, therefore, the ergative pattern is confined to lower ranking persons and it is the A that is zero-coded. A tripartite pattern unfolds, when the A is first/second person.

Moreover, I suggested that relative ranking of person may have contributed to the conventionalization of the person role constraint in the 'perfective' (§4.1.1). When the P outranks the A in person, the use of the E-series or inverted 'perfective' construction seems to be more acceptable for speakers of otherwise person-restricted dialects (e.g. *šqil-ax-la* 'She took us'), whereas, when both the A and P are maximally topicworthy, the construction is impossible (e.g. ***šqil-ax-loxun* 'You$_{PL}$ took us'). The fact that a balanced third person expression is possible indicates that role disambiguation is not significant in itself. The relatively lower ranking of the A is presumably significant in the choice of transitive 'perfective' constructions. It is conceivable that this also played role in the development of the person role constraint. The person role constraint is grounded in agent-related properties. An agent-like topicworthy argument is not compatible with the P coding. When we consider that first/second persons are more topicworthy and attract agent-like properties more so than the third persons, we can expect a conflict between two potential agents to be greater for arguments of the highest person reference and, thus, in such transitive clauses where the A and P are both maximally topicworthy, i.e. the first/second person clustering role association. This is complicated further by the agreement inversion. The P in the 'perfective' is coded like the A in the 'imperfective'. The potential for agent-likeness may become somewhat greater through morphological identity. While this is, strictly speaking, independent of alignment type, the disambiguation between two poten-

tial agents would arguably be even more important, when the P marked by the E-set possibly also aligns with the S. This could explain why the person role constraint is fiercest in the dialects where the E-set can express the S alongside the P and why such person restrictions are not found in the intransitive constructions, since no such a conflict would arise. Moreover, it is possible that such first/second person clustering associations (***šmiʔ-ax-loxun* 'You$_{PL}$ heard us') were never possible in the ancestors, and that the original *šmiʕ l*-construction was an impersonal construction to begin with.

Furthermore, special marking of the A may also be dependent on person reference. Typologically, the Christian dialect of Hertevin shows a rather complex agreement system in the 'perfective' (§4.4.3). Yet, if my analysis is correct, the first/second person pattern ergatively, while the 3ms. patterns neutrally and the 3fs. and 3pl. patterns either neutrally (e.g. *wéd-la-lehen* 'She made them') or accusatively (e.g. *wid-i-la* 'She made them'). This would be an interesting counterexample to the predictions of the prominence scale, since it is the highest ranking arguments that pattern ergatively while the lower ranking persons do not. Typologically, independent pronouns and full nominals would not be expected to pattern accusatively alongside ergatively aligned dependent person forms but they do in C. Hertevin.

The reason for this special marking of the A is presumably connected with the possible conflict sketched above. The first/second person coding of the E-set triggers an agent-orientation. The E-set as objects indexes is only available in the inverted 'perfective' construction and confined to the 3fs. and 3pl. The special marking of the A is manifested in the E-set as fused with an inserted /l/-element akin to the L-suffixes, instantiating a separate set that I termed the 'L-E-series'. This formation of the L-E-series is clearly analogical to transitive 'imperfective' constructions where the E-set always marks the agent:

(60) **C. Hertevin** (SE Turkey; based on Jastrow 1988)

	[V	-P	-A]	
a.	*wid*	*-a*	*-le*	'He made it$_F$'
	make$_{PFV}$	-3FS	-3MS	
b.	*wid*	*-en*	*-noḥ*	**'You$_{MS}$ made me$_M$' but possibly 'I have made you'
	make$_{PFV}$	-1MS	-2MS	
	[V	-A	-P]	
c.	*wéd* **-l**	*-én*	*-noḥ*	'I$_M$ made you$_{MS}$'
	make$_{PFV}$	-1MS	-2MS	
d.	*ʔod*	*-en*	*-noḥ*	'I$_M$ make you$_{MS}$' (imperfective)
	make$_{IPFV}$	-1MS	-2MS	

The insertion of the /l/ is presumably also connected with the distinction in the marking of TAM for subjects that is expressed by the choice of sets of person forms, namely the E-set for the realis perfect (e.g. *dmiḥ-en* 'I fell asleep') and the L-set for the perfective past (e.g. *dmeḥ-li* 'I slept'). In a related Christian dialect of Bohtan, this is completely grammaticalized for the agent and there is no inverted 'perfective' construction. The E-set expresses the A and S in the realis perfect as in the 'imperfective' (e.g. *xil-a-le* 'He has eaten it$_F$', *ġz-ən-nux* 'I$_M$ have seen you$_{MS}$') but the L-set expresses all grammatical functions in the perfective past (e.g. *xəl-la-le* 'She ate it$_M$', *ġze-li-lux* 'I$_M$ saw you$_{MS}$'). What differs between the two tenses, is the expression of the agent (§4.7.2.). The /l/-insertion in Hertevin, then, functions similarly to the L-set of agent indexes in Bohtan in the expression of the perfective past. A form like *wed-en-noḥ* in (cc) could, in theory, be interpreted as perfect 'I$_M$ have made you$_{MS}$' in C. Hertevin.

Perfective transitive clauses with an object index can be treated very differently from those without and this creates a constructional split (§4.7). Although this is primarily motivated by the properties of the P, it can also affect the coding of the A. A co-referential nominal patient is not obligatory and sometimes even impossible in such constructions. The L-E-series in C. Hertevin only manifest themselves in the combination with a dependent object person form (that may cross-index a co-referential NP). Similarly, the *qam-qaṭəl*-construction also requires transitive coding but the marking of the A is the same for all persons. I suggested that these two constructions may have been partly motivated by a dialect-dependent disfavor of doubled L-suffixes in the 'perfective'.

In addition, compound verbal forms analogical to the 'imperfective' also treat such transitive clauses differently and this affects the coding of the A, especially of the first/second persons. Without an object index, the A agreement is indistinct from S agreement. This also connects with the person role constraint. Two potential agents may be in conflict in the combination of two dependent forms in the 'perfective'. The adaptation to the 'imperfective' presumably offers a simple solution, normalizing the use of the L-set to mark the object. The merger of the compound perfect with the 'imperfective' also yields forms virtually identical with that of the 'perfective', because of the correspondence between the resultative participle (*qṭila*) and the 'perfective' inflectional base (*qṭil-*). A few person-restricted dialects would have completely merged the compound perfect and transitive 'perfective' constructions in the masculine singular forms of first/second person agent indexes, if such forms would have been available in

the 'perfective' (§5.2.5). Such perfect and pluperfect ms. forms would be phonologically identical with equivalent preterit and plupreterit constructions while the person indexing patterns like the 'imperfective'. The first/second person markers of the E-set denote the A rather than the P, while the third person markers of the E-set remain available to mark the P rather than the A in the preterit:

(61) **J. Urmi** (NW Iran; based on Khan 2008b)

PERFECT (⁺*qtila* + $E_{1/2}$-set)		PRETERIT (⁺*qtil-* + E_1-set)
⁺*qtil-**ən**-ne*	:	**⁺*qtil-**ən**-ne*
'**I**$_{M}$ have killed him.'		'He killed **me**$_{M.}$'
⁺*qtil-**ə́n**-wa-le*	:	**⁺*qtil-**ə́n**-wa-le*
'**I**$_{M}$ had killed him.'		'He had killed **me**$_{M.}$'

7.4.3. Ditransitive Constructions and the Prominence Scale

Ditransitive constructions can be studied in terms of role and prominence ranking associations (§2.4.4, §3.4). Higher ranking arguments are associated with the R role, while lower ranking arguments are associated with the T role. Ditransitive constructions can show complex interactions of differential indexing and case-marking.

This monograph briefly touched upon such phenomena in Eastern Neo-Aramaic. In both NENA and Central Neo-Aramaic, generally, when both the T and R are pronominal, only one of them can be expressed by the E-set or L-set on the verb (§3.4.2). An exception is found in a few dialects where an 'imperfective' verbal construction can comprise two object indexes from the L-set (§3.2.4). The 'clustering' pronominal association alternates between an indirective construction where the R is prepositional and a secundative construction where the third person T is represented by a special set of person forms known as the enclitic 'copula' (§3.4.1). There is no balanced person split. The indirective pattern is available to all person role associations but it is necessary for higher ranking themes. The secundative pattern, however, is incompatible with higher ranking themes. The T is necessarily third person.

In clauses containing full NPs that are not differentially marked, indirective alignment is preferred when the arguments are of equal ranking, although lexically restricted double object constructions also occur. A prepositional full nominal R is favored in the combination with a pronominal T. Conversely, a zero-marked full nominal T is favored in the combination with a pronominal R.

The preposition used in differential P-marking is generally identical with the dative preposition that marks the R (§3.3.1). The prepositional marking of the R is not sensitive to the prominence scale. There is a cross-dialectally strong tendency to avoid the joint marking of both the T and R by the same preposition but there are exceptions (§4.2.2.2). This is an important difference between premodern Aramaic languages such as Syriac and the Eastern Neo-Aramaic varieties discussed in this dissertation. Syriac allows the identical case-marking of the T and R (§2.4.3).

Since the T cannot be case-marked in indirective constructions, another coding property is used instead, so that differential indexing is generally only controlled by the T. This appears to be triggered primarily by definiteness. When the theme is omitted, the recipient may become available for differential indexing alongside its indirective prepositional marking. In a few exceptions, the R is not overtly case-marked but may be indexed like the P instead of the T. Even though differential case-marking and indexing may be freely combined in the marking of the P, they are generally not combined in the marking of the T alongside the R. An exception is Jewish Urmi and presumably closely related dialects where differential case-marking of the T (T=P=R) occurs alongside differential indexing of the T (T=P≠R) (§4.2.2).

Thus, on the whole, the two coding properties seem to be balanced. Agreement is associated with themes, while case-marking is associated with recipients. Agreement with the T overrides agreement with the R, while case-marking of the R blocks the identical case-marking of the T.

The dative agent construction in Ṭuroyo bears close resemblance to the expression of recipients and predicative possessor constructions (§6.1.3). The dative marking of the A is optional and may indicate agent focus. It can be combined with tripartite or ergative indexing. The ergative indexing of the P is differential. Generally, the identical case-marking of both the A and P is avoided, so that the distribution of agreement with the P and case-marking of the A is similar overall to the T and R in the ditransitive constructions. In at least the dialect of Raite, however, both the A and P can be identically case-marked but there seems to be no additional agreement with the P.

Furthermore, such focal agents in the 'perfective' can be identically marked as recipients. Both the A and R can be prepositional and cross-indexed by L-suffixes. In Ṭuroyo, therefore, prepositional As in the 'perfective' are treated in the same ways as recipients, especially as the recipient and agent-like argument in the predicative possessor constructions where the possessor is cross-indexed

by L-suffixes and optionally marked by the dative. This could point to a parallel historical development.

7.5. Concluding Remarks and Outlook

The alignment variation in NENA and Central Neo-Aramaic is generally characterized in the literature as a departure from the ergative and a shift towards accusative alignment. The ergative morphology is exceptional within Aramaic and Semitic in general and is dissolved by accusative constructions driven by its overall accusative syntax. Strictly speaking, however, the findings of this study indicate that this picture is simplistic. The accusative grouping of the S with the A to the exclusion of the P is neither necessarily being promoted nor ergativity necessarily being diminished. It is not unlikely that further research will reveal even more variation than noted in this study. Yet, despite (or perhaps rather because of) the astonishing variation in modern Aramaic, there is no witness to a fully coherent ergative type in the data we have. Where it is observed, the conditions are not always what we might expect typologically. From the perspective of Neo-Aramaic syntax, however, ergativity is as compatible as the accusative or other alignment types with the agreement and case-marking systems.

Further research is needed to investigate the implications for historical dialectology, possible diffusion of constructions, and interdialectal communications, taking into account the speakers' religious identity. There is no synchronic evidence that compels us to assume that the grouping of S and P ever was coherent for Eastern Neo-Aramaic. Historically, ergativity or its possible functional motivations are not necessarily the ultimate trigger of the splits observed. Alignment has probably been unstable to begin with due to the inherent versatile nature of the resultative participle (*qṭil-*) that the alignment variation is based on, ergativity being one of several possible outcomes. In the evolution of constructions, the S and P (or the A) may lead a life of their own, and the relationship between them need not be symmetric. Transitive and intransitive constructions are likely not to have had the same status from the beginning. The historical potential for ergative agreement hinges on the resolution of the adjectival agreement with the original S into the expression of the P. Person forms play a key role in the coding of alignment in NENA and Central Neo-Aramaic.

Finally, this study barely touched upon the role of language contact, because the material in Neo-Aramaic is already so complex in itself. The agentless 'perfective' construction and dative agent construction (§4.3.5), for example, are interpretable as transitive possibly at least partialy on the model of the Kurman-

ji Kurdish agentless and ergative construction (see Haig 2008:262-268), while the intransitive constructions in these dialects are rather distinct from Kurdish. Other issues raised in this thesis may also be partially motivated by replications from neighboring languages by bi- or multilingual speakers. Alignment does not appear to be a stable feature in Iranian languages either (cf. Dorleijn 1996; Mengozzi 2005; Haig 2008). This also has direct bearing on the debate whether language contact with Iranian contributed to the development of alignment in Neo-Aramaic (e.g. Khan 2004b, 2007b; Haig 2008). Contact-induced convergence with ergative neighboring languages could have played a role in the emergence of ergativity. The fluid subject-marking that also lies at the basis of the 'accusative dialects' in general does not seem to comply with the patterns of non-Aramaic languages in the area. Pattern replication from ergative neighboring languages could at least partly explain why the 'ergative dialects' lost this original fluid subject marking and adapted the subject coding to pattern in contiguous (Iranian) languages.

Again, we should bear in mind that intransitive and transitive constructions may differ in this respect, and that alignment may well not be completely copied from one language into the other. The identical marking of the A and P, for example, is typologically unusual in the development of alignment systems (e.g. Palancar 2002) but it is a well-known feature of some Iranian languages (e.g. Payne 1980; Bossong 1985).

The findings of this synchronic study, then, may serve as a fertile ground for further research regarding the historical development of alignment systems and the possible role of language contact.