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<tr>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>Distribution of D-marked demonstrative</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>Kurmanji near-deixis demonstratives</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>Alternative linkers</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>Independent genitive pronouns in JAm. or JZ.</td>
<td>293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>Determiners of Judi-Dialects</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>Distribution of apocopate construct state</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>Double marked ACs</td>
<td>314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Distribution of juxtaposition constructions</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Borrowed AC markers</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>Properties of ordinal constructions</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Abbreviations

Geographic place names refer to dialects spoken in these locations. Abbreviations of grammatical categories typeset in **small caps** are given on page xvii.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Attributive Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ak.</td>
<td>Kurmanji, Akre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akk.</td>
<td>Akkadian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALC</td>
<td>Analytic Linker Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ap.</td>
<td>Apocope (Construct State)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td>NENA, Alqosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alt.</td>
<td>alternative form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ank.</td>
<td>NENA, ‘Ankawa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App.</td>
<td>Apocope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arab.</td>
<td>Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>NENA, Arbel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azr.</td>
<td>Azeri Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>NENA, Barwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td>NENA, Barzan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td>NENA, Baz (Hakkari)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCE</td>
<td>Before the Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td>NENA, Beşşan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td>NENA, Betanure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHeb.</td>
<td>Biblical Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bin.</td>
<td>Sorani, Bingrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td>NENA, Bohtan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Consonant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Christian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td>NENA, C. Aradhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ch.</td>
<td>chapter (in references)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cl.</td>
<td>Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMand.</td>
<td>Classical Mandaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj.</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td>NENA, C. Sanandaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSC</td>
<td>Construct State Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURm.</td>
<td>NENA, C. Urmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAC</td>
<td>Double Annexation Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diar.</td>
<td>Kurmanji, Diyarbakır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>NENA, Diyana-Zariwaw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DLC</td>
<td>Dative Linker Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ed.</td>
<td>edited (by), editor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f., ff.</td>
<td>and following page(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fn.</td>
<td>footnote (in references)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>NENA, Gaznax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawr.</td>
<td>Gorani, Hawrami</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>NENA, Hertevin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrg.</td>
<td>Interrogative pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq.</td>
<td>Iraqi Arabic, Baghdad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Jewish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JAm.</td>
<td>NENA, Amadiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JArd.</td>
<td>NENA, J. Aradhin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JBA</td>
<td>Jewish Babylonian Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JČal.</td>
<td>NENA, Challa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td>NENA, Jilu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td>NENA, J. Koy Sanjaq</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>NENA, J. Sanandaj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>NENA, J. Sulemaniyya and Ḥalabja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td>NENA, J. Urmi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>NENA, J. Zakho</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbreviation</td>
<td>Explanation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KAmd.</td>
<td>Kurmanji, Amadiya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ker.</td>
<td>NENA, Kerend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurm.</td>
<td>Kurmanji Kurdish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSul.</td>
<td>Sorani, Sulemaniyya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lit.</td>
<td>literally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maˈl.</td>
<td>WNA, Maˈlūla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malt.</td>
<td>Maltese (Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MHeb.</td>
<td>Modern Hebrew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid.</td>
<td>NWNA, Midin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morc.</td>
<td>Moroccan Arabic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muk.</td>
<td>Sorani, Mukrī</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun / Nominal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE</td>
<td>North-Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NENA</td>
<td>North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NMand.</td>
<td>Neo-Mandaic, Khorramshahr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW</td>
<td>North-Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWNNA</td>
<td>North-Western Neo-Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NrT</td>
<td>NENA, Nerwa Texts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p.c.</td>
<td>Personal communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per.</td>
<td>Persian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep.</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>NENA, Qaraqosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rdz.</td>
<td>Sorani, Rewandiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>NENA, Rustaqā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruw.</td>
<td>NENA, Ruwandiz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td>NENA, Sardarid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>South-Eastern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sin.</td>
<td>Kurmanji, Sinjar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sol.</td>
<td>NENA, Solduz and Šīnō</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sor.</td>
<td>Sorani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sur.</td>
<td>Kurmanji, Sûrçi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syr.</td>
<td>Syriac</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turk.</td>
<td>Turkish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Vowel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Western</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WNA</td>
<td>Western Neo-Aramaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q.</td>
<td>Quantification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Secondary</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Glossing Conventions

The glossing of the examples follows the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Comrie, Haspelmath, and Bickel 2008), with some additions. The following glosses are used:

1, 2, 3 1st, 2nd, 3rd person  
A Agent-like argument  
ABS Absolute state  
ACC Accusative  
ADJ Adjectival derivation  
AGR Agreement features  
AUX Auxiliary  
CAUS Causative  
COMP Complementizer  
COMPR Comparative  
COP Copula  
CST Construct state  
DAT Dative  
DEF Definite  
DEM Demonstrative  
DET Determiner  
DIR Directional  
EMPH Emphatic state  
DIST Distal  
EZ Ezafe  
EX Existential particle (∃)  
F, FS Feminine (singular)  
FREE Free state  
FUT Future  
GEN Genitive  
IMP Imperative  
IMPF Imperfect  
IND Indicative  
INDF Indefinite  
INF Infinitive  
INV Invariable form  
LNK Linker  
M, MS Masculine (singular)  
NOM Nominative  
NEG Negation  
OBL Oblique  
ORD Ordinal  
P Patient-like argument  
PASS Passive  
PL Plural  
POSS Possessive pronominal suffix  
PRO Pronominal primary  
PROG Progressive  
PST Past  
PTCP Active participle  
PRF Perfect  
PROX Proximal  
REFL Reflexive  
REL Relativizer  
RES Resultative participle  
SBJV Subjunctive  
SG Singular  
SUPER Superlative  
V CST Vocalic nucleus of CST suffix
Notes regarding the glossing of verbs

1. The present and preterite bases of NENA and Kurdish verbs are not glossed explicitly. Instead, the verbal base is glossed by an English verb in base form (do) or past form (did) respectively. The past participle (done) is used as gloss for the NENA resultative (passive/perfect) participles, followed by the res gloss.

2. The explicit glossing of agent (A) and patient (P) pronominal arguments of the verb is only done when both arguments appear.

3. A verb is glossed as subjunctive (sbjv) or indicative (ind) only when the two forms are different.

Brackets and symbols

( ) In gloss: gender of nouns
   In text or translation: context of an example
   In translation only: material added to clarify the translation
   In tables: form with restricted use

(?) Uncertain gloss

[ ] Important constituent

{ } Optional element

/ Alternative formulations

* In examples: unattested or ungrammatical form
   In historical discussions: reconstructed form

. Gloss separator

- Morpheme boundary

= Clitic boundary

ˈ Intonation boundary

Ŵ, Ź word-stress, utterance-stress

... Hesitation in speech; elided material

∅ Paradigmatic/Morphological Zero (lack of overt element)

‡, ↔ Apposition
→ Dependency (Attributive) relation

⇔ Co-reference

The general format of examples is detailed on page 16.
Abstract

North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic (abbreviated NENA) is a group of dialects (or languages) spoken in the area ranging geographically from south-east Turkey through northern Iraq to western Iran. These dialects are descendants of unknown vernacular varieties of Aramaic which were spoken in this area since antiquity, side by side with “official” (and documented) varieties of Aramaic, such as Imperial Aramaic and later Classical Syriac, as well as other dominant languages, such as Persian or Turkish. In modern times most of the NENA dialects in the region have been spoken in zones where different variants of Kurdish (of the Iranian language family) are the dominant means of communication.

The grammar of Neo-Aramaic is in many respects quite different from previous strata of Aramaic. It is well known, for instance, that the verbal system of NENA is quite distinct from that of classical Semitic. A less researched topic is the NENA nominal phrase. The thesis examines this domain, and in particular the expression of adnominal modification, expressed traditionally by *annexation*, also known as the Construct State Construction (=CSC), a hallmark of Semitic grammar. In the context of this study, the notion of *attributive construction* is defined as any grammatical pattern expressing adnominal modification, or more technically, an *attributive relationship*.

The aim of the thesis is to describe in detail the variety of attributive constructions present in the various documented NENA dialects, and to relate the changes that took place in this domain to possible influences from contact languages, as contrasted with internal developments possibly motivated by universal tendencies of language change. In general, it is difficult to distinguish between internal developments of a given language and those that arise due to language contact. The NENA dialects are in a unique position, in which we have access to both historical strata and to language contact data. Thus, they provide a “laboratory” setting in which we can try to separate the role of universal factors from the particular historical and geographical factors in the grammatical development of NENA.

Following the typologies of Plank (1995) and Goldenberg (2013a: ch. 13) each attributive construction is characterized by the type of marking on the primary (the head) and the secondary (the dependent): Each member can be marked by a simple
marker or by a pronominal (cross-reference) marker. The notion of construct state (=cst), omnipresent in grammars of Semitic languages, is discussed and re-framed as a functional category marking the primary of an attributive construction (cf. Creissels 2009). The occurrence of a pronominal head in the CSC standing in apposition with an explicit nominal (such as Akkadian ša or Syriac $d$-; see Goldenberg 1995: 4) is re-framed as a pronominal secondary marker, dubbed linker (=lnk).

Classical Syriac (2nd–7th century CE) is taken as the departure point of the investigation, being an approximation of NENA precursors. It exhibits three main attributive constructions exemplified by various translations of the expression ‘the house of the king’ (followed by in-line glossing):

1. Construct State Construction (CSC): $beṯ \ malkā$ [house.cst king]
2. Analytic Linker Construction (ALC): $baytā \ d= malkā$ [house.lnk= king]
3. Double Annexation Const. (DAC): $bayt-ēb \ d= malkā$ [house-his.lnk= king]

Building on the analysis of Cohen (2010), who treats the Jewish dialect of Zakho, the thesis demonstrates that in NENA three distinct morphemic markers are related to the Classical Aramaic linker $d$-: a retention of the proclitic linker $d$-, a genitive prefix $d$-, and a construct state suffix $-əd$. Within this framework, the attributive systems of four NENA dialects are studied in detail: the Jewish Zakho, Christian Qaraqosh, Jewish Urmī, and Jewish Sanandaj dialects.

In the Jewish dialect of Zakho, we find the CSC represented by two variants, one in which the primary is marked by apocope, similarly to the historical construct state, and one in which it is marked by the suffix $-əd$.

4. Apocopate CSC: $bēs \ ḥakōma$ [house.cst king]
5. Neo-CSC: $bēs-əd \ ḥakōma$ [house-cst king]

Additionally, we find the ALC with an alternative linker form $dīd$:

6. Alternative ALC: $bēsa \ dīd \ ḥakōma$ [house.lnk king]

This dialect also exhibits a genitive case marker present on certain demonstratives and determiners:

7. Genitive marking: $bēs \ d-aw \ ḥakōma$ [house.cst gen-def.ms king]

In the dialect of Qaraqosh, on the other hand, the apocopate CSC is restricted to idiomatic constructions. The genitive case prefix, moreover, is not apparent as a regular morpheme. Only the Neo-CSC (as in example (5)) and the ALC with a $d$-linker are productive attributive constructions.

8. Retention of the classical ALC: $bētā \ d= malka$ [house.lnk= king]
In the Jewish dialect of Urmi we find, on the other hand, numerous innovations. The linker is replaced by the element ay, homophonous with a near-deixis demonstrative.

(9) Alternative ALC: bela ay ʿšultana [house LNK king]

In contrast to the classical Semitic logic, moreover, it can be preceded by a construct state primary:

(10) Construct state marked ALC: bel-ət ay ʿšultana [house cst LNK king]

The last example can be tentatively explained by positing an optional agreement-in-state rule operating between the explicit primary and the linker, which syntactically is in construct state, although it is not morphologically marked as such.

The system of the Jewish dialect of Sanandaj is even more altered, and is clearly affected by language contact. Almost no markers stemming from the linker d- are retained (except an optional genitive marking), and instead a zero-marked juxtaposition construction is frequently used:

(11) Juxtaposition construction: bela šah [house king]

In addition, this dialect (as well as other neighbouring dialects) has borrowed the Iranian Ezafe marker (=ez) as a functional equivalent to the construct state marking:

(12) Ezafe marking: bela-e šah [house-ez king]

In order to relate these constructions to contact languages, a further chapter details the attributive system of Kurdish dialects within the same typological and notional framework. This is followed by a discussion of the distribution and development of the various constructions, sampled in 26 different NENA dialects. The study concludes that the pivotal change in the NENA system occurred with the transformation of the Classical Aramaic DAC (example (3)) into the Neo-CSC (example (5)) by way of the encliticization of the linker d- to the primary, in line with the claimed universal tendency of encliticization of functional elements (cf. Lahiri and Plank 2010). Most other developments in the NENA system are related, in one way or another, to this initial change. Following the work of Cohen (2015), the study relates this change to a head-marking preference found in the NENA speaking zone and shared with numerous contact languages such as Kurdish, Persian, Arabic and Turkish. The emergence of genitive case marking, on the other hand, is attributed specifically to pattern replication (in the sense of Matras and Sakel 2007b) of the Kurmanji oblique case, a hypothesis that is corroborated by the wider distribution of this type of marking in the NENA dialects of the Kurmanji speaking area. Other attributive constructions, such as those exhibiting alternative linker forms, juxtaposition, or borrowed morphemic material, are also scrutinized in detail.
Zusammenfassung


Das Ziel dieser Arbeit ist es, die Vielfalt an Attributivkonstruktionen in den verschiedenen dokumentierten NENA-Dialekten zu beschreiben und die Verände-


(1) Status-constructus-Konstruktion: beṯ malkā [Haus.cst König]
(2) Analytische-Linker-Konstruktion: baytā d= malkā [Haus lnk= König]
(3) Doppelannexion-Konstruktion: bayt-ēb d= malkā [Haus-sein lnk= König]


Im jüdischen Dialekt von Zakho finden wir den CSC durch zwei Varianten repräsentiert: In der ersten wird der Primärausdruck durch eine Apokope markiert,
ähnlich dem historischen Status constructus; in der zweiten wird er durch das Suffix -əd markiert.

(4) Apokopische CSC: bēs ḥakōma [Haus.cst König]
(5) Neu-CSC: bēs-əd ḥakōma [Haus-cst König]

Zusätzlich finden wir die ALC mit einer alternative Linker-Form did:

(6) Alternative ALC: bēsa did ḥakōma [Haus.lnk König]

Dieser Dialekt wies auch einen Genitivmarker auf, der in bestimmten Demonstrativpronomen und Artikeln vorkommt:

(7) Genitiv-Markierung: bēs d-aw ḥakōma [Haus.cst gen-def.ms König]

Im Dialekt von Qaraqosh ist die apokopische CSC aber auf idiomatische Konstruktionen beschränkt. Außerdem ist das Genitiv-Präfix nicht eindeutig als reguläres Morphem attestiert. Nur die Neu-CSC (wie in Beispiel (5)) und die ALC mit einem d-Linker sind produktive Attributivkonstruktionen.

(8) Beibehaltung der klassischen ALC: ṣēta d= malka [Haus.lnk König]

Im jüdischen Dialekt von Urmi finden sich andererseits zahlreiche Innovationen. Der Linker wird ersetzt durch das Element ay, welches mit einem nah-deiktischen Demonstrativpronomen homophon ist:

(9) Alternative ALC: bela ay ʿšultana [Haus.lnk König]

Im Gegensatz zur klassischen semitischen Logik kann ihm außerdem ein Status-constructus-Primärausdruck vorangehen:

(10) Status-constructus-markierte ALC: bel-ət ay ʿšultana [Haus.cst.lnk König]

Letzteres Beispiel kann eventuell durch eine optionale Kungruenz-in-Status-Regel erklärt werden, die zwischen dem expliziten Primärausdruck und dem Linker operativ ist, welcher syntaktisch im Status constructus ist, obwohl er nicht morphologisch als solcher markiert ist.

Das System des jüdischen Dialekts von Sanandaj hat sich sogar noch mehr verändert und ist eindeutig von Sprachkontakt beeinflusst. Es sind fast keine Marker, die vom Linker d- abstammen, erhalten (abgesehen von einer optionalen Gentivmarkierung); stattdessen wird oft eine null-markierte Juxtapositionskonstruktion verwendet:

(11) Juxtapositionskonstruktion: bela šah [Haus König]
Zusätzlich hat dieser Dialekt (wie auch andere benachbarte Dialekte) den iranischen Ezafe-Marker (=ez) als ein funktionales Äquivalent zur Status-constructus-Markierung entlehnt:

(12) Ezafe-Markierung: bela-e šah [Haus-ez König]
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Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Aim and scope of the research

The current research can be situated at the crossroads of several sub-fields of linguistics: historical linguistics, areal linguistics and language contact, as well as dialectology, all informed by linguistic typology and framed within structuralist linguistics (see the second chapter for a more precise statement of the theoretical framework). More precisely, we wish to study the variation in a specific language group, namely the North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic dialects (=NENA, belonging to the Semitic language family – see below for further information), examine the diachronic origin of the attested variation, and relate it to language contact with neighbouring languages as well as to general typological tendencies.

The NENA group is well suited for such a study for several reasons: first and foremost, it offers a rich variety of dialects, of which many have in recent years been described, thus providing a firm empirical underpinning to the research.\footnote{We use the traditional term “dialects”, but it should be borne in mind not all these dialects are mutually intelligible, and they may represent varieties of different “languages” of the NENA group.} Secondly, as these dialects span a large geographic area, covering north Iraq, south-east Turkey and west Iran, they have been in contact with different languages and language families (mostly Turkish, Azeri, Kurdish, Persian and Arabic), thus providing the possibility to study the effects of differing language contact situations. Thirdly, previous strata of Aramaic are known and documented, giving the possibility to add diachronic depth to the study. In short, the NENA languages are in a unique position, in which we have access to both historical strata and to language contact data. Thus, they provide a “laboratory” setting in which we can try to disentangle the role of “pure” language-internal change from changes originating in particular language contact situations. Our conclusions, we hope, could inform linguists looking at linguistic change in languages which do not have this wealth of information.
As we are working in a language contact framework, we are interested mainly in overt patterns, or – more technically, constructions – prone to replication from one language to another. Thus, a specific construction (with a given function) is defined in terms of the linear (syntagmatic) ordering of its elements, together with the morphological cues present on each element. In contrast to some formal approaches, we are less interested in covert elements, or the hierarchical (syntactic) relations between the elements. As such, the research is focused on the “surface” manifestation of linguistic content.

To establish the effects of language contact, we adopt the framework of Matras and Sakel (2007b), distinguishing between pattern replication and matter replication. The latter consists of a case of a foreign morpheme integrated in a recipient language’s native system. Pattern replication, on the other hand, is a more complex process, where a construction, as defined above, is copied from a model language to a recipient language, without necessarily copying any specific morphemic material. This is typically done by the identification of a key element of a given construction in the model language (the pivot), finding a morphemic counterpart in the recipient language with a partial similarity in function, and then copying the construction using the morphemic material of the recipient language, effectively extending its functional load. When a construction is copied with (possible partial) transfer of morphemic material we speak of pattern-cum-matter replication. On the other hand, when a certain construction is not attributed to effects of language contact, but reflects rather a (presumed) “natural” development of the language, we shall use the term internal development.

In order to achieve both breadth of dialectal coverage and depth of linguistic analysis, we are bound in this work to restrict our attention to one linguistic domain. Much attention has been given in the literature to the verbal system of NENA dialects, which presents a drastic change as compared to the pre-modern strata of Aramaic (see inter alia Coghill 2016; Goldenberg 2000; Gutman 2008). Less attention has been given to the nominal domain, although there too we find important re-arrangement of linguistic material. For this reason, the current research concentrates on the nominal system of NENA, and in particular the domain of adnominal modification. As we shall see, this research domain may be of special interest for typologists, as the nominal system of NENA (as in Semitic languages in general) is marked by a preference for head-marked constructions. It is my impression that the research of head-marked constructions has been under-represented in typological literature, a lack which this work attempts to remedy.

In classical Semitic languages, Aramaic included, adnominal modification of one noun by another is typically expressed by the annexation construction (Hebrew: smixut סְמִיכוּת, Syriac: smixūtā, Arabic: ىَدَأْفا إِضَابة) in which the head-noun is marked by a special morphological form, the construct state. In NENA we find both a functional retention of this category alongside morphological inno-
1.1. AIM AND SCOPE OF THE RESEARCH

The NENA attributive constructions are especially interesting from our point of view, as on the one hand they show traits typical of Semitic languages, but on the other hand they manifest effects of language contact. Thus, the research questions which we wish to answer are two-fold:

1. What is the extent of the variation among attributive constructions in the documented NENA dialects? Which different constructions exist in the various dialects to express the attributive relationship?

2. How do these constructions relate to the contact languages of NENA vis à vis the historical background of NENA? In other words, what was the role of language contact in shaping the synchronic manifestations of the attributive constructions in NENA dialects?

By answering the first question we expect to give a detailed typological view of the attributive constructions within the NENA group. Given the rich variation of structure within these dialects, we believe these results should be informative to any typologist or linguist interested in similar constructions. The answer to the second question will permit us to formulate plausible hypotheses as to how these constructions may develop over time, with or without influence from contact languages. These conclusions may in turn inform linguists working on language change and language contact in the nominal domain of other languages.

Structure of the book The rest of this introductory chapter gives some general information regarding the NENA dialects. The second section gives a rough outline of the Noun Phrase structure in NENA dialects, while the third section outlines the methodology used in the research, listing in particular the dialects surveyed.

The second chapter is devoted to the theoretical and methodological foundation of the research. It introduces the theoretical framework of this research, namely structuralist linguistics, and within it the notions of attributive relation and attributive constructions. These notions are anchored moreover within the traditions of linguistic typology and Semitic linguistics. A synthesis of these approaches yields the methodology used in the current research.

The third chapter presents the attributive system of Syriac, a well-documented Aramaic language of the Classical Aramaic period, which can serve as a good approximation of the language stratum preceding the NENA dialects. When appropriate, references to other Classical Aramaic languages (notably Jewish Babylonian Aramaic) are given as well.
The fourth chapter gives a “bird’s-eye view” analysis of some of the most important AC markers present in NENA dialects, all related to the Classical Aramaic linker \( d^- \), and therefore dubbed \( D \)-markers. This chapter, moreover, introduces the important theoretical notions of clitic and phrasal affix, and relates them to the current research.

Chapters five to eight give an in-depth analysis of the attributive system of four select NENA dialects, representing different corners of the NENA-speaking area: These are the Jewish dialect of Zakho (Iraq), the Christian dialect of Qaraqosh (Iraq), the Jewish dialect of Urmi (Iran), and the Jewish dialect of Sanandaj (Iran). As all examples are glossed, we hope these chapters could be useful for typologists wishing to gain access to the data of these dialects.

The ninth chapter gives a cross-dialectal survey of attributive constructions in Kurdish dialects, being the main contact languages of NENA. Due to the lack of detailed description of Kurdish dialects, much information is drawn from pedagogical grammars of standard Kurmanji and Sorani. Some comments on other Iranian languages, such as Persian and Gorani dialects, are given as well.

The tenth and eleventh chapters present the key results of the research, as they deal with the development of the AC systems of NENA dialects. Both chapters present a comparative synchronic view of each construction discussed, as well as hypotheses and claims regarding the development path of each construction and the relation to contact languages.

The tenth chapter deals especially with the development of \( D \)-marked constructions, i.e. those constructions which contain a reflex of the Classical Aramaic linker \( d^- \). These include the Neo-cst \( \ae d \) construction marked by the suffix \( \ae d \), the genitive marking by prefix \( d^- \), as well as the development of various alternative linker forms. This chapter is tightly related to the fourth chapter.

The eleventh chapter deals with the development of other constructions, namely the apocope construct state construction, various double-marked constructions, the juxtaposition construction and the borrowing of AC morphemes from Iranian languages (the Ezafe and the clausal subordinator). This chapter contains also a case study of the ordinal sub-system of NENA as compared to contact languages (both Kurdish and Iraqi Arabic) and to the anterior stratum approximated by Syriac.

Finally, the General Conclusions give an outlook on the main results, and suggest further research prospects.
1.2 Overview of the NENA dialects

1.2.1 Genetic affiliation and general information

The term “Neo-Aramaic” refers to a group of languages and dialects spoken today, which are descended from ancient Aramaic, a branch of Northwest Semitic. Aramaic, in its various forms, has been spoken continuously from the beginning of the 1st millennium BCE. We shall divide this long stretch of time into the following 3 periods (cf. Beyer 1986):²

1. Early Aramaic: c. 850 BCE (first attested inscriptions) – 200 CE

2. Classical Aramaic: c. 200 – 700 CE (decline of spoken use)

3. Neo-Aramaic: The present-day dialects, attested since the 16th century

With the emergence of Classical Aramaic, around the 2nd century CE, a major split between its western and eastern branches became visible. The western branch has only one surviving descendent, namely the Western Neo-Aramaic language (=WNA), spoken in 3 villages in Syria.³

In this book, we shall concentrate on the eastern branch, and thus use the unqualified term Classical Aramaic to refer specifically to Eastern Classical Aramaic. This branch has many surviving contemporary dialects, which are divided into 3 major groups:⁴

Neo-Mandaic This is the smallest group, which is spoken by the Mandaeans community in Iran and diaspora countries (in the past also in southern Iraq). The number of speakers is estimated to be some hundreds (Poizat 2008: 16).

North-Western Neo-Aramaic This group consists today of the Ṭuroyo language (known natively as Surayt), which is mainly spoken by Syriac Orthodox Christians originating from the Tur ʿAbdin region in south-eastern Turkey. Poizat (2008: 16) estimates the number of speakers to be around 50,000. Another documented language of this group, Mlaḥšô, is considered today to be extinct.

²Our Early Aramaic is sometimes divided into 3 distinct phases: Ancient Aramaic (c. 850 – 700 BCE), Imperial Aramaic (c. 700 – 200 BCE) and Middle Aramaic (c. 200 BCE – 200 CE) (Fitzmyer 1979; Kaufman 1997), but this level of detail is not needed in the current research.

³The current geographic situation of these speakers is unclear, as at least some of the speakers have been dislocated due to Syrian civil war (see Gutman 2015a).

⁴See also the discussion of Hoberman (1988: 557, fn. 2), who coined the term North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic.
North-Eastern Neo-Aramaic  This is the most diverse language group, geographi- 
cally, ethnically and linguistically. It has been spoken mainly in northern Iraq 
and to a lesser extent in western Iran, south-eastern Turkey, and north-eastern 
Syria by Jews and Christians, though by now many speakers have moved to 
western countries. The number of speakers does not exceed half a million.

As mentioned above, the present research concentrates on the North-Eastern 
Neo-Aramaic group (=NENA), as it shows the greatest linguistic variation. The high 
diversity of this group can be attributed first and foremost to its wide geographic 
spread, leading to diverse contact situations (see below). There exists, moreover, 
a major socio-linguistic divide between the dialects spoken by Jews (now mostly in 
Israel) and those spoken by Christians (now both in their homelands and in diaspora), 
even when they are in close geographical proximity (this point is neatly exemplified 
by Mutzafi 2015 regarding the dialects of Salamas).

Texts in NENA can be dated as far back as the 16th-17th centuries, these being 
Christian and Jewish religious texts (Jewish: Sabar 1976; 1984b; Christian: Men-
gozi 2002; 2011). Earlier strata are undocumented, but we may assume that Syriac, 
a form of Classical Aramaic spoken from the 1st century up to (at least) the eight 
century, can serve as an approximation of the pre-NENA dialects. Indeed, as Syriac 
is continuously used as a liturgical language of the Christian NENA speakers, they 
often see it as the classical form of their own language. This view has led to the usage 
of the somewhat misleading term “Neo-Syriac” for NENA.

1.2.2 Dialectal division of the NENA group

As mentioned, NENA dialects are often divided into Christian and Jewish dialects. 
From the genealogical point of view, however, one cannot simply postulate a Proto-
Jewish-NENA versus a Proto-Christian-NENA. The picture is rather more complex 
and still unknown to a large extent, especially since the anterior strata of NENA 
dialects were undocumented spoken varieties.

---

5 A short history of the speakers and their language, including their move to diaspora communities 
with a special emphasis on France, is given by Alichoran and Sibille (2013).

6 This estimate is based on the summation of the number of speakers of North-Eastern Aramaic 
languages according to the Ethnologue (Lewis, Simons, and Fennig 2013), which yields 466,000 speak-
ers. A slightly more conservative estimate (375,000 speakers) can be found by summing the number 
of speakers per country given by Poizat (2008: 16–18).

7 At this stage of the research, it is unclear whether a unique proto-NENA language dating to 
the Classical Aramaic period existed, or whether the NENA dialects are descendants of various unat-
tested dialects, which were contemporary with Syriac. The latter option may be more plausible, as 
some NENA dialects show stronger affinities with Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (=JBA). See also the 
While the internal classification of the Christian dialects is yet unclear, the Jewish dialects can be divided on a phonological and morphological basis into 3 main groups (Mutzafi 2008b) which are related geographically to the Zab river:

- The Cis-Zab group (also called Lišana Deni ‘our language’), spoken in western Iraq, for instance in the cities of Zakho and Dohok.
- Central-Zab, such as the dialects of Sandu and Barzani.
- The Trans-Zab group, which itself is divided into 3 major clusters:
  - The Inter-Zab group, around the town of Arbel (in Iraq).
  - The North-Eastern Trans-Zab group, around the city of Urmī (in the Iranian West Azerbaijan province). This group came under the influence of the Azeri language.
  - The South-Eastern Trans-Zab group (also called Hulaula ‘Judaism, Jewish Language’), spoken around the towns of Sanandaj (in the Iranian Kurdistan province) and Khanaqin (in Iraq).

Many of the Christian dialects, regardless of their geographic location, show affinities with the Jewish Cis-Zab group.

### 1.2.3 Geographical spread of NENA and contact situation

The NENA group spans a large geographic area: It spreads from South-Eastern Turkey (as far north as the city of Van and as far west as the city of Cizre in the Şırnak Province), through northern and eastern Iraq (as far south as Khanaqin) up to western Iran (as far north as Salamas in Iranian Azerbaijan, as far south as Kerend and as far east as Bijar in Iranian Kurdistan).

The area covered by the NENA dialects is largely contained within the Kurdish language zone, and indeed the NENA dialects have been in close contact with Kurdish dialects, both of the Kurmanji group and the Sorani group. The divide between NENA speakers and Kurdish speakers within this language area is related to religious and ethnic factors: While Kurds, both Muslims and Yezidis, speak Kurdish, Jews and Christians of various denominations speak different dialects of NENA (the latter also speak NWNA). It is clear that the religious differences have prevented to some extent the mixing of these groups, and thus acted as a guardian of the linguistic diversity. Yet the close proximity of the speakers, spanning possibly several millennia, has led to mutual influence both regarding the language and other aspects of society (for a historical and socio-linguistic survey of the contact situation see Chyet 1995; a detailed linguistic treatment of the contact situation of the NE-Trans-Zab dialects is given by Garbell 1965a; Pennacchietti and Orengo (1995) offer
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a bird’s-eye linguistic view while a comprehensive linguistic treatment is presented by Coghill forthcoming). Today Aramaic is a minority language, and thus NENA scholars have generally focused on the influence Kurdish exerted on it (but see Chyet 1997 for a study of Aramaic loanwords in Kurdish). In the past, however, Aramaic enjoyed a large prestige (at least up to the Arabic conquest starting at the seventh century), and thus the possibility of it acting as a donor language should not be neglected.

Another Iranian language which has been in contact with NENA is Persian. In modern times, it came into contact with NENA speakers of Iran (living in the provinces of Iranian Azerbaijan and Iranian Kurdistan) as an official state language. The contact, however, is much longer in time.

On some dialects (mostly those of Iranian Azerbaijan) there has been, moreover, an extensive influence from Azeri (see Garbell 1965a, which treats Azeri as a Turkish dialect).

Amongst Semitic languages Arabic (both standard and vernacular) had an influence, being the state language of Iraq, and spoken in the area since the Arab conquest. Indeed, some Jewish communities of the region, as well as the inhabitants of Mosul, spoke Arabic (see map of Jastrow 1990: 4). Hebrew and Syriac have been used as liturgical languages by the Jewish and Christian communities respectively, and thus also had an influence on the spoken language, though this influence may be mostly lexical.

In this work, we shall concentrate especially on the contact effects of Kurdish dialects, due to their prominent situation with regard to NENA.

1.3 Noun Phrase structure in NENA

Aramaic nominals (nouns, adjectives as well as pronominal forms) are marked morphologically by two grammatical features, number (sg vs. pl) and gender (m vs. f). In NENA, the gender feature is normally only marked for the singular nominals; some animate nouns (typically gentilic nouns) may inflect for gender also in the plural forms (e.g. in Qar.: Khan 2002a: 212). These features are typically morphologically overt on nominals of Aramaic origin, while loan-nouns and loan-adjectives may be non-inflecting or show only partial inflection for the number feature.

Attributes typically follow the head noun. One type of attribute, namely adjectives, inflects to show agreement in its grammatical features with its head noun. For this reason, Semitic adjectives are traditionally said to be in apposition with the head noun, in the sense that they share the same grammatical features as the head noun and are co-referent with it.8 Other types of attributes, particularly nouns, are

---

8Cf. Cohen (2008: 28): “Apposition is here defined as the property of two or more entities sharing the same syntactic status in a given syntactic setting: a characteristic example is the Semitic Adjective, which reflects the same syntactic information as the entity to which it refers.” See also Section 2.1.1.
not necessarily in apposition with their head noun, but rather stand in an *attributive relation* with it. In this case the head-noun is normally marked morphologically by a special form, the *construct state*. These concepts will be explained in greater detail in the next chapter. In either case, the attribute is best analysed as a phrasal element, as it may itself be expanded by an attributive complement, or be determined independently of the head noun.

As described by Jastrow (2005), Early Aramaic varieties, such as Biblical Aramaic, mark also the category of determination by means of morphological inflection. In this system, the so-called “emphatic state” marks definite nominals, while the “absolute state” marks indefinite nominals. Attributive adjectives, moreover, agree in this feature as well with their head-noun. With time, however, the definite value of the emphatic state had became eroded, such that in Classical Aramaic, represented for instance by Syriac, the emphatic state became the unmarked form of the noun. Jastrow (2005: 146) notes that this situation has led NENA to mark definiteness by various periphrastic strategies, such as indexing on the verb (for nouns in object position), or the usage of demonstrative pronouns. According to Jastrow, only NWNA Ṭur ʿAbdin dialects have developed a fully consistent definite article paradigm pre-posed to the NP (see also Jastrow 2002: 20f.):

1. **Determiner–Noun Phrase**

   Mid.  \( u=\) bayto= rabo
   \( \text{DEF.MS}=\) house(\( \text{MS}=\) big.\( \text{MS} \))
   'the big house' (Jastrow 2002: 21)

In NENA the marking of definiteness is less consistent, as various discourse and syntactic strategies can be used. Nonetheless, according to the analysis put forward by Cohen (2012: 20–27), the dialect of JZax. has a set of elements which act as determiners, both definite and indefinite. These include short forms of the inflecting demonstrative pronouns for marking definiteness, as well as the numeral \( xa \) ‘one’, which marks indefinite specific nouns. Complicating the picture is the fact that also a \( \emptyset \) acts as a ±def., *generic* determiner. According to Cohen (2012: 22) this is a true determiner standing in paradigmatic opposition with the overt determiners, and not merely a lack of such an element. In the following example we render it explicit, but subsequently we shall not mark its presence.

2. **Determiner–Noun**

   JZax.  as–wa xa göra ... aw göra
   \( \text{EX–PST INDF} \text{ M}\( \text{AN} \) DEF.MS man

---

Eran Cohen kindly shared with me an as yet unpublished paper elaborating this analysis. See Cohen (forthcoming) in the bibliography.
‘There was a man... the man...’ (Cohen 2012: 22 (3))

(3) 0 Determiner–Noun

JZax. 0 ’arya lá =g- dámáx lá =hoya rāš 0 xǝzēna

det lion neg ind lie neg =be.sbjv on det treasure

‘A lion (any lion) does not lie down, unless it is on top of a treasure’ (Cohen 2012: 23 (13))

Table 1.1 presents the main components of the determiner system of JZax., extracted from Cohen (2012: 21).[^10]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definite</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indefinite</td>
<td>xa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>ēma ‘which’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarked/Generic</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1: The Determiner system of JZax.

The usage of these elements as indefinite and definite determiners has been recognized for other NENA dialects by other scholars. Thus, Khan (2008a: 287f.) writes:

[T]he cardinal numeral “one” is often used as an indefinite article [...] Of special importance in this respect in all dialects is the system of demonstrative pronouns, which in some contexts are most idiomatically translated by the English definite article. Neither the cardinal numeral nor the demonstratives, however, correspond in distribution exactly to that of the indefinite and definite articles of English.

As English is by no means the standard by which articles (or determiners) should be defined, it seems safe to analyse these elements as definite and indefinite determiners, albeit less grammaticalised than the Germanic type. The determiner system presented in Table 1.1 is in all likelihood present in most, if not all, NENA dialects, with some minor modifications.[^11] Yet in the glossing, we follow in general the terminology used by the descriptions of the respective dialects, glossing these elements

[^10]: Cohen’s table includes more elements, some of which can act also as independent pronouns, but we do not need to go into these details here. Note that the use of xa as a plural indefinite determiner is only available before quantified plural nouns yielding a meaning of approximation (see example (7) on page 12).

[^11]: One such difference is that in some dialects, the indefinite determiner (and numeral ‘one’) inflects as well, being xǝa or da for feminine (e.g. Beš.: Sinha 2000: 165).
either as DEF (definite determiners) or DEM (attributive demonstrative pronoun). An important difference between this system and the Old Aramaic system is the fact that the determiners have phrasal scope: They typically open the NP and they appear only once. In this respect they are similar to the Western European articles. Moreover, Cohen (2012: 21) analyses the determiners as being the head of the Noun Phrase (“noun group” in his terminology). Using an alternative terminology, we may thus call the determined Noun Phrase a Determiner Phrase, or DP. We shall however stick with the general term Noun Phrase, and distinguish only when necessary between a Determined NP and a Bare NP.

Notwithstanding the above, it is worth noting that in some cases the determiner appears NP internally, intervening between a noun and its attribute. In such cases we may prefer to analyse the determiner as being syntactically associated with the attribute (which is phrasal):

(4) **Noun—Determined Adjective**

JZax. axōnā [āw rūwa]  
brother DEF.MS big.SG  
‘the older brother’ (Cohen 2012: 214)

Another paradigmatic slot of the Noun Phrase identified by Cohen (2012: 25) is that of a Quantifier, appearing between the Determiner and the nominal. As this is an optional slot, there is no need to posit a $\emptyset$ quantifier. Cohen gives examples as the following:

(5) **Determiner—Quantifier—Noun**

JZax.ʾan ʾəṣra nāše  
DEF.PL ten people  
‘the ten people’ (Cohen 2012: 25 (30))

(6) **Determiner—Quantifier—Noun**

JZax. xa xa yarxa  
INDEF one month  
‘about one month’ (Cohen 2012: 25)

(7) **Determiner—Quantifier—Noun**

---

12 In Barw., we find three series of attributive demonstratives: Speaker deixis, Far deixis and Default (Khan 2008c: 148). We took the liberty to gloss the latter, representing short forms of the demonstratives, as definite determiners.

13 Some dialects, such as JSul., have borrowed a suffixed definite marker from Sorani, namely the suffix -eke (Khan 2004: 232).

14 Interestingly, such a phrase-internal position correlates with the alleged original position of the Northwest Semitic article, which, according to the theory advanced by Pat-El (2009), was at first an adnominal marker.
Establishing a similar Quantifier slot (separate from the Determiner slot) in other NENA dialects would require further examination, but one finds similar examples in other dialects, as the following:

(8) **Determiner-Quantifier-Noun**

Alq. \( \text{xāʾ} \) 'ārba=xamša gārre.'

\( \text{INDF(?)} \) four=five loops

‘about four or five loops.’ (Coghill 2003: 295 [A:90])

Judging by such examples, we tentatively generalise Cohen’s analysis to the NENA group as a whole. Admitting this, the full pattern of the NENA Noun Phrase is the following, though the order of elements may vary:

\[
\text{Det}^{+}\{\text{Quant}\}^{+}\text{Noun}^{\{\text{Attr}_{NP}\}}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bare NP</th>
<th>Determined NP (=-DP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 1.2: The NENA Noun Phrase structure

We note that the quantifier as well as the attribute are optional. The determiner, on the other hand, is always present, but it may be a \( \emptyset \). The attribute is typically an NP on its own (either bare or determined), considering also adjectival phrases as a sub-type of NPs. We note, moreover, that the noun may be replaced by an adjective, and, as we shall see in the subsequent chapters, a special type of pronoun, namely a pronominal linker.

1.4 Data sources and methodology

The Cambridge NENA database (see in the bibliography under Khan, ed.) lists currently 137 different dialects, but only about 20 dialects have extensive grammatical descriptions. For this research, I have collected data from 26 different dialects using the available grammatical descriptions as well as published texts. When possible, the recordings of texts deposited in the *Semitisches Tonarchiv* (see in the bibliography under Arnold, ed.) were consulted as well to validate the examples. In some cases, moreover, I was able to conduct fieldwork with speakers of the dialects.

The dialects surveyed in this book are listed in Table 1.3 on page 14, alongside their geographical region (using the classification of the Cambridge database) and the religious community of the speakers (Jewish or Christian). For each dialect a
3–4 letters abbreviation is given, which will be used subsequently in this book. The sources used for each dialect are listed as well. Sources whose audio recordings are publicly available are marked with a ♫ symbol (the URL is given in the bibliographic reference).

The amount of information gathered from the different sources varies considerably. Seven dialects (marked in bold in Table 1.3) contributed each between 100 and 200 examples to the research database, together amounting to two-thirds of the NENA data-points in it. Not surprisingly, amongst these are the 4 dialects to which survey chapters are devoted. The remaining dialects contributed each between 8 to 60 examples each. Data from the dialects of Khabur (Talay 2008) were collected as well, but for methodological reasons are not treated in the book.

The data collected was registered in a Microsoft Access database. In this database all the various ACs found in the different NENA dialects surveyed, as well as other languages under investigation (mainly Kurdish and Syriac), were listed, and linked to appropriate examples. The classification of the ACs in the database was done according to the principles outlined in Section 2.4 on page 35. An example of the data-entry form is given in Figure 1.1 on page 15.

While many of the consulted NENA grammars have sections labelled “Annexation”, “Attributes” or the like, the concept of the attributive construction as defined in the current work is normally not described in any single section of the grammar, requiring collection of examples from numerous sections in a given grammar. The data assembly started with the collection of ACs headed by nouns modified by various attributes (nouns, adjectives, clauses etc.). Only subsequently were examples with other types of primaries (pronouns, adjectives, adverbials etc.) collected, yielding possibly a less systematic picture of these combinations.

It should be noted that the listing of the different constructions is purely qualitative, as no quantitative data were gathered from the corpora. Thus, any remark regarding the usage frequency of a given construction is based on comments given in the consulted grammars.

The database design permits to query cross-dialectally the presence of a specific construction, with or without limitations to the parts-of-speech involved. This possibility was invaluable for conducting the comparative research, constituting the core of the current study (see chapters 10–11).

**Format of examples** The NENA examples given in this work are all taken from the database. While the database conserves the original transcription system of each source, in the book I have attempted to normalize the different transcriptions to a

---

15 An exception is the grammar of JZax., Cohen (2012).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Abbr.</th>
<th>Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alqosh</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td>Coghill 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amêdya</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>JAmd.</td>
<td>Greenblatt 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aradhin</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td>Krotkoff 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aradhin</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>JArd.</td>
<td>Mutzafi 2002b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbel</td>
<td>NE Iraq</td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>Khan 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barwar</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>Khan 2008c; 2009a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barzani</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td>Mutzafi 2002a; 2004b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baz</td>
<td>SE Turkey</td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td>Mutzafi 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bēşpən</td>
<td>SE Turkey</td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td>Sinha 2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betanure</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td>Mutzafi 2008a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bohtan</td>
<td>SE Turkey</td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td>Fox 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challa</td>
<td>SE Turkey</td>
<td>JČal.</td>
<td>Fassberg 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diyana-</td>
<td>NE Iraq</td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>Napierkowska 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zariwaw</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaznax</td>
<td>SE Turkey</td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>Gutman 2015c; own fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hertevin</td>
<td>SE Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>Jastrow 1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jilu</td>
<td>SE Turkey</td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td>Fox 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koy Sanjaq</td>
<td>NE Iraq</td>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td>Mutzafi 2004a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Nerwa</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>NrT</td>
<td>Sabar 1976; 1984b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qaraqosh</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>Khan 2002a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rustaqqa</td>
<td>NE Iraq</td>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>Khan 2002b; own fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanandaj</td>
<td>W Iran</td>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td>McPherson and Caldani 2013;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Panoussi 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanandaj</td>
<td>W Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>Khan 2009b; own fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardarid</td>
<td>NW Iran</td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td>Younansardaroud 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Ḥalabja</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urmı</td>
<td>NW Iran</td>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td>Garbell 1965a,b; Khan 2008b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zakho</td>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>Avinery 1988; Cohen 2010; 2012;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goldenberg and Zaken 1990;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sabar 2002; 2007</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.3: Dialects surveyed in the research, with most prominent dialects in **bold**.
Figure 1.1: Example of data entry in the accompanying database
standard system, namely that of Khan (2008b,c; 2009b).\footnote{Note that older publications of Khan, such as Khan (1999; 2004) use a slightly different system. The main difference has to do with the transcription of a short \(\hat{i}\)-\(\hat{a}\) vowel, which in later works is transcribed as \(\hat{a}\), while in earlier works it is transcribed as \(\hat{i}\). Notwithstanding the question of transcription, it should be noted that not in all dialects is the difference between a tense \(\hat{i}\) and a lax \(\hat{a}\) phonemic (see for instance the discussion of Gaz. phonemic inventory in Gutman 2015c). Another change concerns the rendering in NENA dialects of a fricative \(\theta\) consistently as \(\theta\) rather than \(\hat{\theta}\). Especially affected is the transcription system of Younansardaroud (2001), which I have simplified by removing the vocalic-timbre marks as well as most timbre superscripts (cf. Younansardaroud 2001: 20). The hard timbre which is marked by her as superscript \(\hat{\theta}\) is marked here with a \(\cdot\) sign, in accordance with Khan (2008b).}

All examples have a title stating the categories of the members of the AC under discussion. Thus, a title of \textbf{Noun Phrase-Adjective} means that the example illustrates an AC with a noun phrase modified by an adjective, irrespective of the question of the ordering of the adjective and the noun phrase in the example itself, and the possibility of other (typically embedded) ACs appearing in the example.

The dialect or language of the example is given under the example number, in an abbreviated form (see List of Abbreviations on page xv). The examples are glossed according to the Leipzig Glossing Rules (Comrie, Haspelmath, and Bickel 2008) with some additions (see Glossing Conventions on page xvii).

Typically, the examples are cited using the source’s page number where they are discussed (unless they are cited directly from a corpus). The original example number (if available) is given in parenthesis. If the author gives a reference to his own corpus (typically a letter+number combination), this is given in square brackets.

The format of examples is illustrated below.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{Primary–Secondary}
\item \textbf{Lang.} Example text
\item \textbf{Glosses}
\item ‘Translation’ (Source: page (example number) [Textual reference])
\end{itemize}
Chapter 2

Attributive Constructions: Typological and Semitic Perspectives

2.1 Theoretical Framework

The current research, while informed by advances in linguistic typology, is situated methodologically within the structuralist current of linguistics, which analyses language as a system of oppositions, be they between the consecutive constituents of an utterance (the so-called syntagmatic axis) or between possible constituents at a given point in discourse (the paradigmatic axis). The usage of these analytical concepts will be further clarified below. While the structuralist tradition is interested mainly in the description of a single language, we can profitably extend these tools to compare and contrast several languages, as we do in the current study.

In structuralist linguistics, *morphemes* are defined by way of opposition along the paradigmatic axis: Whenever an element of language (a *signifiant* in Saussurian terms) stands in opposition in a given *environment* (or *syntagm*) with other elements and its exchange by these other elements co-varies systematically with a difference in “meaning” broadly conceived (a *signifié*), this element can be identified as a *linguistic sign*. Minimal signs, i.e. those that are not analysable in terms of smaller signs, are considered to be *morphemes*. As simple as this procedure is, we note that it is possible to apply it in quite different ways, in accordance with the understanding of the term “environment” used above. If by “environment” we mean a well-formed utterance, we get the classical notion of a *structural paradigm*. If, on the contrary, we allow for opposition within smaller environments such as word-forms we get the notion of a *morphological paradigm*. The elements identified as morphemes would be different in each case: For instance, a grammatical case marker attached to a noun-stem, whose usage is obligatory in certain environments may not be considered a morpheme within the classical approach (as it does not stand in opposition within
a well-formed utterance), but it can be seen as a morpheme in the morphological approach, as the word in isolation shows variation in case. In this study we opt for the latter approach - namely, morphemes are defined relative to word-forms in isolation, and not relative to full utterances.

Linguistic structuralism is normally equated with no a priori categories of language, as these should be defined on a per-language basis using the analytical method sketched above. Yet, as this research follows the footsteps of previous scholars, we will operate within a framework assuming the existence of three general grammatical relations in language, described in the next section. Of these, the attributive relationship shall be seen as the abstract functional correlate of the concrete grammatical patterns we examine, the attributive constructions (ACs). This is further explained in Section 2.1.2. In structural terms, the attributive relationship is the signifié of several different signifiants.

The rest of the chapter is devoted to anchoring these terms in the traditions of linguistic typology (Section 2.2), and of Semitic linguistics (Section 2.3). Section 2.4 synthesizes from these different approaches one methodology used in this study.

### 2.1.1 The three relations

In this book, we rely on a simple dependency model of morpho-syntax admitting three basic dependency relations holding between elements of a clause:

1. The predicative relation, holding between a subject and a predicate.
2. Theattributive relation, holding between a head and its attribute.
3. The completive/objective relation, holding between a predicative construction and a complement.

This theory was advocated by the Israeli linguist Gideon Goldenberg (1930–2013), who himself credited the German philologist Karl Ferdinand Becker (1775–1849) as being one of its early forefathers (see Becker 1830: 10; Goldenberg 1987; 2013a: ch. 11; Cohen 2008: 37f. and Gutman 2015b).

Goldenberg saw the theory as both general in scope and at the same time especially adequate to the Semitic family:¹

¹Goldenberg clearly saw these relations as valid cross-linguistic notions, but he did not address the question whether they represent linguistic universals, nor did he tie them to any nativist conception of language. It seems, rather, that the cross-linguistic validity of these notions stems from the fact that they represent syntactic correlates of necessary communicative functions of language such as assertion (the predicative relation), qualification of referents (the attributive relation) and of events (the completive relation).
The recognition of three essential types of grammatical relations, or bonds, has been a major approach to syntactic analysis commonly pursued in linguistics during the last two centuries. With regard to Semitic languages and in connexion with case declension such a conception appositely reflects the very structure of the languages involved. (Goldenberg 2013a: 142)

This is so, since the case-marking classical Semitic languages (classical Arabic, Akkadian and Ugaritic) have exactly three cases, which correspond well with the three mentioned relations. Regarding linguistic change in Semitic languages, he asserted that by using this theory “we may be able to better understand the meaning of changes in some innovative languages and thus perhaps even to measure typological innovation” (Goldenberg 2013a: 142). Since the aim of this book is exactly to investigate change in modern Semitic languages, namely the NENA branch, the usage of this theory seems especially adequate.

To the three above-mentioned dependency relations, one must add apposition, not being a dependency relation, but rather an equivalence relation. In this framework, two elements are considered to be in apposition, whenever both are governed by the same dependency relation, share potentially the same grammatical features (number, gender, case and definiteness – if explicitly marked), and are co-referential. In such conditions, they can replace each other syntactically, though we note that on semantic and discursive grounds, the two may not be equivalent, as one element may take a higher information load.²

2.1.2 The attributive relationship and its manifestation

In this book, we are interested only in one of the above-mentioned relations, namely the attributive relation. This is the dependency relationship within the NP domain which holds between a head noun (or pronoun) and a second nominal element (the attribute or dependent) qualifying the head noun (cf. Goldenberg 1995: 1–2; Cohen 2013). This notion is closely related to Jespersen’s notion of junction (Jespersen 1924 [1992]: ch. VIII). We note that semantically, there is no restriction on the type of the qualification involved, which may range from possession to qualification of some property of the head.

²See also Cohen’s definition given in footnote 8 on page 9. Acuña-Fariña (1999: 65) rejects a similar notion of apposition claiming that “[i]f a syntactic relationship of this type is to be posited, then that relationship must be applicable to a number of other constructions, and not just to one construction”, and contrasts it with the widely applicable notion of dependency. Yet, in our framework, apposition is not a syntactic relation sensu stricto, i.e. a dependency relation, but rather an equivalence relation. Compare again with Cohen (2008: 38): “It must be stressed that apposition [...] is not in itself a relationship, but rather a repetition of a syntagm, and occasionally, of the relationship itself.” As such, the notion of apposition is applicable to a wide range of constructions.
In structuralist terms, the attributive relation is a *signifié* (function) whose *signifiant* (form, i.e. morpho-syntactic exponent), is an *attributive construction* (=AC). We use the term *Construction* here as denoting a linear ordering of segmental (and possibly super-segmental) material together with paradigmatic slots, “place-holders” so to speak, which can accommodate either an open group of elements (i.e., a lexical paradigm, often corresponding to some part of speech), or a closed group of elements (i.e., a functional paradigm, often corresponding to an inflectional paradigm of some morpheme), to which a specific function is tied. In a given language, we may find many different attributive constructions. While all of these encode an attributive relationship, they may be used in different syntactic contexts, or convey different semantic or stylistic nuances. We will only linger upon these differences as far as they are insightful for our comparative purposes.

In every AC we expect to find two paradigmatic slots corresponding to the head and the attribute. In some cases, however, the two elements in question are split across two separate NPs which stand in apposition to each other, rather than in an attributive relationship. In such a configuration, it is often the case that the attributive relationship holds within one of the NPs, in which the other NP is being represented pronominally. In virtue of this, we can identify one NP as being the qualified, and the second NP as being the qualification, and posit an *indirect attributive relationship* between them (cf. the term *indirect annexation* used by Goldenberg 2000: 79). Yet in such a case we cannot accurately use the terms “head” and “attribute” for these NPs, as they imply a direct attributive relationship between the two elements. To overcome this terminological problem we shall use the notions of *primary* and *secondary* to denote the two members, in line with Plank (1995: 38):

The nominals in relation will be neutrally referred to as “primary” and “secondary.” Attributes are prototypical secondaries vis-à-vis their heads [...] but on referential and distributional grounds, secondary rank is also justified for the appositum in apposition or for a nominal indirectly related to another as a secondary predicate or the like.

Prototypically, we expect the primary and the secondary to be nouns, but we do not exclude other nominal elements, chiefly pronouns and adjectives. Moreover, as we shall see, the secondary can also be a prepositional phrase (a PP), or even a clause.

---

3 The notion of *construction* was popularized by the proponents of Construction Grammar (Croft 2011; Goldberg 1995). It corresponds in fact to an abstract understanding of the long-standing Saussurian notion of *linguistic sign*, i.e. a coupling of *form* and *function*.

4 It is often the case that the qualifying NP follows in discourse the qualified NP, in accordance with the general tendency of pronouns to be anaphoric rather than cataphoric.

5 These terms clearly bear affinity to the same terms introduced by Jespersen, but note that his usage is more broad, as it applies equally well to cases of junction as well as nexus (Jespersen 1924 [1992]: 97).
Moreover, in Semitic languages the same constructions are often used with adverbial elements (prepositions or conjunctions) as primaries. While these uses can be seen as peripheral, and not strictly realizing an attributive relationship, they are sometimes illuminating for our comparative purposes, and thus will be taken into account.

### 2.2 ACs from a typological perspective

The notion of the attributive relationship, and the corresponding ACs, is clearly a very broad, unifying concept. Many typological studies, on the other hand, look at a restricted set of ACs as their object of study. Thus, Ultan (1978) establishes a typology of possessive constructions, i.e. ACs whose secondary is a nominal possessor. More recently, Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2003) discusses the "Possessive noun phrases in the languages of Europe". A similar restriction is taken by Nichols and Bickel (2013), discussed further below. The restriction applied is basically a semantic one. Another quite common division of the domain of ACs is according to the syntactic category of the secondary: Dryer, looking at word-order phenomena, separates ACs whose secondary is a noun (a "genitive"), an adjective or a relative clause (Dryer 2013a,b,c). Gil (2013), on the other hand, examines to what extent these three categories are differentiated across the languages of the world.

In the framework of Canonical Typology, Nikolaeva and Spencer (2013) pose inalienable possession and attributive modification (by adjectives) as two separate canonical constructions, while alienable possession and modification by noun are their non-canonical counterparts. While they too split the AC domain, using both semantic and syntactic criteria, they do acknowledge that "there is some deeper link between the two constructions" (Nikolaeva and Spencer 2013: 209), by examining languages in which these functions are expressed identically, specifically the Ezafe marking of Iranian languages (which shall be examined carefully in this dissertation; see Section 4.2).

It is not surprising that large scale typological studies attempt to focus on a

---

6Ultan elaborates a quite complex typology, taking into account both the locus of marking (see Section 2.2.1), and the type of marking: whether it is syntactic or morphological on the one hand, and whether it indexes features of the possessed noun or the possessor. Yet at the end he reduces this typology to a simple locus typology. Unfortunately, the lack of clear definitions of the various marking categories and the sparse use of examples renders his work less than insightful.

7Goldenberg (2013a: 235) comments on Gil's approach: "[t]he constitutional identity of constructions with genitive nominals, adjectives, and relative complexes will in any case belong to the profoundest level of language structure, not to be regarded as different semantic types of attributions that collapsed due to imperfect differentiation".

8Note that their use of the term construction is different than ours, as it is not tied to a specific manifestation in language.
restricted domain of constructions, using various semantic and syntactic criteria to delimit it. Such criteria, in line with Haspelmath’s notion of *Comparative Concepts* (Haspelmath 2010), assure the typologists they are comparing like with like. As we are interested in a restricted and similarly shaped set of languages (namely, the NENA languages and their contact languages), we have the leisure of defining a broader object of study. Of course, more comprehensive accounts can be found in the typological literature as well. Thus, Fairbanks (1979) starts by treating equally cases of adnominal modification by nouns, PPs and clauses, although his main interest is nominal modification. Another broad account, discussed in more detail below, is that of Plank (1995).

In the following, we shall examine in more detail the typologies of Nichols and Bickel (2013) and Plank (1995).

### 2.2.1 Head-marking vs. dependent-marking typology

Following the pioneering work of Nichols (1986), Nichols and Bickel (2013) classify possessive constructions (and subsequently languages) according to the *locus* of marking, i.e. whether the construction is marked morpho-syntactically on the head (primary in our terminology) or the dependent (secondary), irrespective of the order of these two constituents.\(^9\) Since the marking of each locus is independent, this simple typology yields 4 types of marking: head-marking, dependent-marking, double-marking and no marking.\(^11\)

While this typology succeeds at capturing large geographical distributions, it suffers from two shortcomings rendering it somewhat simplistic at the descriptive level.

First, there is no differentiation between syntactic marking and morphological marking. Rather, the authors agglomerate the two under the heading “overt morphosyntactic marking”.\(^12\) Thus, the preposition *of* in the English phrase *the price of oil* is considered to be a case of dependent-marking, probably due to its syntactic co-constituency with the dependent, on par with an inflectional genitive case marker.\(^13\)

---

\(^9\)For each language, they consider only one construction, which “is [the] default or has the fewest restrictions.”

\(^10\)Such a classification has in fact been proposed earlier by Ultan (1978), but in less clear terms.

\(^11\)A fifth category, is dedicated to “low-frequency but systematic further patterns”. These are cases where the markers could not be easily associated with either the head or the dependent, but they represent only 2.5% of their sample (i.e. 6 languages).

\(^12\)By syntactic marking we mean marking achieved by a separate syntactic element, typically bearing phrasal scope, while morphological marking is achieved by inflection of a word, possibly (but not necessarily) having narrow scope on that word only. Recently, Haspelmath (2011) has suggested that this distinction is void and cannot be applied consistently across various languages, yet we find it important in studies of language change, like the current one.

\(^13\)Cf. Fairbanks (1979: 36): “The main distinction between the genitive inflection and the
Since the syntactic constituency of an element may be disputed in some cases (especially if it cliticizes to another element), this can lead to analytical difficulties.\(^\text{14}\)

Secondly, the typology does not differentiate between two quite distinct types of markers: pure relational markers versus pronominal markers, which represent the antipodal locus (i.e. the opposite member of the construction). Thus, in Turkish, in which we find both head-marking and dependent-marking, the two markers are of quite distinct type:

\begin{equation}
\text{(1) Noun–Noun} \\
\text{Turk.} \quad \text{çocuğ-\{un\} araba-sı} \\
\text{child-\{gen\} car-poss.3} \\
\text{‘the child’s car’ (Bozdömëir 1991: 49)}
\end{equation}

The dependent-marker is purely relational (a genitive case),\(^\text{15}\) while the head-marker is pronominal. This is crucial, since the expression araba-sı is by itself a well-formed NP meaning ‘his car’. A similar criticism is made by Goldenberg (2013a: 229):

Attributive, or possessive, syntactic relations are commonly regarded as being marked either on the head or on the dependent attribute, not only by stem form or case, but also by personal morphemes, as if the possessive relation in “the man his-house” (for “the man’s house”) is marked by “his” on the head term “house” […] Pronominal morphemes, however, like other nominals or nominalizations, are not markers of the head-dependent relation, but belong with the termini [=loci, primary or secondary] between which the relation is apprehended.

These two shortcomings were addressed to some extent by a more elaborate typology, presented in the section.

### 2.2.2 Plank’s adnominal typology

A more elaborate typology of adnominal modification is presented by Plank (1995). It is not restricted to a specific semantic domain of ACs, and indeed no specific restrictions are put on the secondary, except it being of nominal nature. As Plank (1995: 38) puts it:

\begin{quote}
pre/postposition is that the genitive inflection is inseparable from its noun and it must be repeated in certain situations."
\end{quote}

\(^{14}\)Indeed, as we shall see in Section 4.2, such a controversy exists around the Persian Ezafe particle. Nichols and Bickel classify it without further comment as a head-marking instance.

\(^{15}\)The usage of the genitive case in Turkish is in fact not obligatory. When it is used it marks the secondary, and consequently the entire AC, as definite. In this it is similar to Turkish accusative case, which marks only definite objects. See Bozdömëir (1991: 49f.).
The following taxonomy of marking patterns is therefore intended to be neutral (a) as to whether the nominal to be related to another is a noun or something else (such as a derived adjective), and (b) as to whether its relationship is one of [direct] attribution or of some other kind (such as apposition) — and indeed, whether this relationship is that of an immediate adnominal constituent or not.

As mentioned above (Section 2.1.2), Plank re-introduces the terms primary and secondary to refer to the two nominal members of the construction, which he symbolizes as X and Y, a practice we shall follow.

Disregarding the word order of the two elements, Plank opts for an elaborate head vs. dependent marking typology, in which he differentiates between pure relational markers and pronominal markers, which he calls “relatedness-indicators”.

The relations identified may be those of secondary [pure dependent marking] or of primary [pure head-marking] or of both [pure double-marking], with the markers normally associated, morphologically or syntactically, with the respective nominals themselves. Relatedness-indicators may occur on the secondary [pronominal dependent marker], reflecting some property of the primary that it belongs with (such as its number, gender/class, person, or case); or they may be on the primary [pronominal head marking], reflecting some property of the secondary that it belongs with, or on both [pronominal double marking].

(Plank 1995: 38)

Since each one of the 4 markers type is in principle independent of the others, this yields 16 construction types. In fact, in the case of no marking at all, Plank distinguishes between syntactic juxtaposition of the primary and secondary (X#Y), and morphological compound of them (X+Y). However, except for this distinction, and judging from the citation above, syntactic and morphological markings are considered alike. Plank acknowledges, however, the possibility of a third locus of marking, namely “markers of the entire construction, linking primary and secondary without forming a morphological co-constituent of either [...] (‘associative’ markers or lexical items such as ‘thing’, ‘possession/belong’, ‘place’)” (Plank 1995: 39). He

16We use here the term pronominal in the basic meaning of representing (and possibly substituting) a noun. In a similar typology proposed by Riester (2001: ch. 2), such markers are termed “agreement markers”. Riester’s typology is further elaborated in that it distinguishes between “local agreement”, i.e. a marker exhibiting features of its own constituent, and “non-local agreement”, i.e. a marker exhibiting features of the other constituent. Only the latter would be considered relatedness-indicators in Plank’s system.

17Thus Koptjevskaja-Tamm (2003: 656) commenting on Plank’s work, writes: “[this] taxonomy does not distinguish morphological boundedness and syntactic association.”
dubs these items *Links*. The elements may themselves carry pronominal markers of
the primary, the secondary or both, adding 4 more construction types.\footnote{He does not list construction types where both the link and the primary or secondary are marked. If all these combinations would be marked, there would be 64 construction types.}

_Prima facie_, we would expect such “links” to form a syntactic co-constituent with
the secondary (see Section 2.3.4), so it is not clear what distinguishes them from
normal secondary marking in Plank’s typology.\footnote{Indeed, later on Plank acknowledges this difficulty: “No 7. [X Y-sec-x], [is] not always easily
distinguished from No. 17, X Link-x Y” (Plank 1995: 51).} Examining the accompanying ex-
amples does not clarify this point. Notwithstanding this possible confusion, Plank’s
typology is important in that it raises the question of distinguishing morphologi-
cal marking vs. syntactic marking, and more importantly, it makes a clear difference
between pronominal markers and pure relational markers. The typology adopted in
this study is based to a large extent on Plank’s typology.

### 2.3 ACs from a Semitic perspective

In the Semitic language family, the typical AC is the “annexation” or _construct State
construction (=CSC), in which the primary is marked by a special morphological form,
the _construct state_.\footnote{The use of the term _construct state_ alone to name the construction is thus misleading. Unfortunately, such a usage is prevalent in certain formal schools of linguistics, and even made it way to the Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics (Benmamoun 2005).} In Semitic grammars, the primary in this construction is
normally called _nomen regens_, and the secondary _nomen rectum_, but we will stick to the
terms primary and secondary.

#### 2.3.1 Relational nouns and the category of state

In Semitic languages, nouns (as well as other nominals) are inflected not only for the
familiar categories of _number, gender_ and possibly _case_, but also for the category of
_state_ (cf. for Hebrew Van Hecke 2013: 579; Doron and Meir 2013: 581). In contrast
to the other categories, the category of state is not “projecting”, i.e. it is invisible for
elements outside the NP in which it occurs. It may be for this reason that it has
often been ignored in linguistic studies as a fundamental morpho-syntactic category
of language, although it is in fact not restricted to Semitic languages.\footnote{But see Retsö (1984–1986: 344; 1997: 268, especially fn. 3), who treats the notion of state as
a morphological category in Semitic languages, albeit as representing “allo-morphic variation”, as he
relies on the notion of structural paradigms (see Section 2.1). The converse position, denying the
validity of the category of state, is concisely advocated by Faust (2012: 2): “What is ‘the construct
state’? surely not a primary linguistic notion.”}
Basically, the category of state encodes the **syntactic valency** of a noun, i.e. whether it must be followed by a complement or not.\(^{22}\)

It is instructive to contrast this phenomenon with the notion of **semantic valency** of nouns, i.e. the number of argument they have in their semantic structure. It is a well known fact of language that some nouns (like *man*) can appear by themselves, while others (e.g. *son*) conceptually require some specification. Barker (1995: 8) calls the second group **relational nouns** and the first **non-relational nouns**. The relational nouns are particular in that they denote relations over pairs of referents, while the non-relational denote simple referents (see also Nikolaeva and Spencer 2013: 216f.). In terms of valency, the relational nouns are semantically bi-valent, while the non-relational are semantically mono-valent (counting the referent of the noun itself as one argument). In many languages, this semantic difference is not related to any morpho-syntactic category. Other languages do mark the difference. One common possibility cross-linguistically is to encode the difference of valency by distinguishing two classes of nouns, namely alienable vs. inalienable nouns, the latter representing relational nouns mandatory complemented by a possessor. For instance, in the American Navajo language the root *-beʾ* ‘milk’ cannot appear by its own, but must be possessed: *bi-beʾ* ‘her milk (from her breasts)’ or *ʾa-beʾ* ‘something’s milk’ (Bickel and Nichols 2013).

In contrast to languages which mark semantic valency, which is inherent to the nominal lexeme, state morphology, marking syntactic valency, encodes *ad-hoc* whether in a given context a noun should be understood as relational (i.e. requiring a complement) or as potentially non-relational (self-sufficient).\(^{23}\) The former is marked by the **construct state**, while the latter is marked by the **free state**,\(^{24}\) which is typically also the citation form of a noun.\(^{25}\) By way of analogy, the construct state

---

\(^{22}\)Semantically, this complement may be conceived as a mandatory argument of some sort of the noun, or as an adjunct qualifying the noun, but this distinction is neutralised syntactically. Of course, from a syntactic view point, a mandatory adjunct is *de facto* an argument.

\(^{23}\)As the non-relational form is the unmarked form it does not exclude the possibility for a noun to receive a complement. Indeed, inherently relational nouns, such as kinship terms, may still appear in the non-relational form in languages with state morphology. Note also that in Semitic languages the construct state applies as well to other nominal elements (such as adjectives or numerals) when they are mandatory accompanied by a complement. It is important to stress that in such a system inherently relational nouns (inalienable nouns) are not distinguishable morpho-semantically from non-relational nouns. This is clearly stated by Pat-El (2013b) for BHeb. The claim to the contrary of Meltzer-Asscher and Siloni (2013) regarding the existence of a syntactic class of inalienable nouns in MHeb. is factually wrong, as their alluded ungrammatical or infelicitous examples are neither ungrammatical nor infelicitous.

\(^{24}\)Some authors use the traditional term **absolute state** as opposed to construct state. Apart from being less self-explanatory, this term is problematic in the context of Aramaic, as will be explained below.

\(^{25}\)A similar proposal, cast in a more formal apparatus, is given by Heller (2002). Heller sees construct state nouns as denoting functions from individuals to individuals, in contrast to free state
is the nominal parallel of causative morphology in verbs: both add one syntactic argument to the argument structure of their host.

In light of the above, it is clear why the state category is non-projecting. In contrast to case, which signals what kind of dependent a noun is, and therefore should be accessible by constituents outside the NP, the state morphology determines whether a nominal governs another nominal NP-internally, and therefore is invisible outside the domain of the NP. Intrinsically, state morphology is a head-marking device.

Thus defined, it is clear that the construct state, or rather state morphology, is not a phenomenon restricted to Semitic languages. In this vein, Creissels (2009: 74) proposes to use the notion of construct form “as a general label for noun forms that are obligatory in combination with certain types of noun dependents and cannot be analyzed as instances of cross-referencing in the genitive construction”.26 Such a definition equates the construct state with the primary relation marker of Plank (1995).27 Creissels goes on to identify construct state forms in a variety of African languages, ranging from Nilotic languages in the east to Wolof in the west.

A terminological word of caution is appropriate here. Notwithstanding the above conception of the construct state notion, it should be noted that in grammars of pre-modern Aramaic a three-way state distinction is given, opposing absolute state, emphatic state and construct state. Both the absolute state and the emphatic state are in fact instances of the free state, as defined above, and the opposition between them is related to the domain of determination: In the earliest stage of Aramaic, the emphatic state was used to mark nouns as definite (as early forms of Aramaic lack a syntactic definite article; see Section 1.3),28 while the absolute state was in general used to mark nouns as indefinite. In this setting, the three-way state distinction is justified, in that a construct state noun is by itself not determined, but rather the entire CSC inherits its determination feature from its secondary (see Section 2.3.3).

With time, the definite value of the emphatic state was eroded, and it became the nouns which denotes individuals.

26Creissels prefers the term construct form over construct state due to the confusion arising from the use of the former as a construction label. We shall stick to the traditional term, but note that the notion of construct state can relate both to the morphological marking, and to the syntactic position of a primary (not necessarily marked as such). When in doubt, we will use the term construct state marking or construct state form.

27An alternative term, proposed by Dixon (2010: 268) is pertensive “based on the Latin verb pertinere ‘to belong’”. The term has not gained wide usage, as far as I am aware of. Dixon uses this term, moreover, as designating both simple markers and pronominal markers. It may be for this reason that he does not simply adopt the notion of construct state, although he is aware of the partial equivalence between the two (Dixon 2010: 310, fn. 16.2). I am grateful to Adam Pospíšil, who drew my attention to this term.

28For possible origins of the emphatic state, unique to Aramaic among Semitic languages, see König (1901).
default form of the free noun, the absolute state being restricted to specific syntactic contexts (Jastrow 2005; Muraoka 1997: 22, §18).

### 2.3.2 The Construct State Construction across Semitic languages

From the above discussion it should be clear that the CSC is essentially a head-marking construction, as in the following Hebrew example (contrast with בַּיִת ‘house.

\[(2) \text{Noun–Noun (Head-marked AC)}\]

\[\text{BHeb. בֵּית הַמֶּלֶךְ} \]

\[\text{bēṯ ham-mɛlɛḵ} \]

\[\text{house.cst def-king} \]

\[\text{‘the house of the king’} \]

In Hebrew the construct state nominals are characterized by “lighter vocalisation” in comparison with their corresponding free state. Sometimes they are marked by specific suffixes, namely -ā for feminine singular nouns (in contrast to free form -a) and -ē (MHeb. -ēy) for masculine plural nouns (in contrast with -īm). All these changes can be explained by the primary losing word stress, and forming one phonological word with the secondary (Van Hecke 2013: 580). This explanation, however, is diachronic, as in Modern Hebrew these forms prevail even when the primary gets its own stress, as is evident from cases where two construct state primaries are conjoined:

\[(3) \text{Conjoined Nouns–Noun Phrase}\]

\[\text{MHeb. מִרְיָם יוֹסֵף וּמִשְׁנֵי} \]

\[\text{[mor-ey ve= talmid-ey] [bet ha-sefer]} \]

\[\text{teacher-M.PL.cst and= pupil-M.PL.cst house.cst def-book} \]

\[\text{‘teachers and pupils of the school’} \]

Biblical Hebrew allows not only nouns as secondaries, but also other elements, such as prepositional phrases and clauses (Cohen 2013: 236).

---

29In the Semitic languages which mark case, namely Akkadian and Classical Arabic, it is a double-marked construction; see discussion further down in this section.

30In Biblical Hebrew it is generally accepted that only one nominal can occur as primary, as the counter-examples are extremely rare (Verhej 1989: 210); Gesenius (1909: 433, §128a, note 1) lists 4 such tentative cases, of which only one is really clear (Ezekiel 31:16): מִבְחַרוְתּוֹב־לְבָנוֹן ‘the choice and best of Lebanon’ (King James translation). Yet we find other cases of intervening material between a construct state primary and its secondary; see Freedman (1972). In Syriac too we find a rare occurrence of conjoined primaries; see example (11) on page 45. Similar examples are attested in Modern Written Arabic (Badawi, Carter, and Gully 2004: 138f.).
The CSC of Pre-modern Aramaic is similar in essence to Hebrew. The AC system of Syriac shall be treated in detail in Chapter 3.

In Akkadian and Classical Arabic, which manifest the old Semitic case system, the secondary is further marked by the genitive case, giving effectively rise to a doubly marked construction. In Akkadian, the construct state is created by removing the mimation, i.e. an -m~n suffix, typical of free state nouns. In some texts, the singular construct state forms are further characterized by losing the case endings, though they may surface before pronominal secondaries (Goldenberg 2013a: 144).

(4) **Noun–Noun (Double-marked AC)**
Akk. bit-∅ awil-i-m  
house-cst man-gen-free  
‘man’s house’ (Goldenberg 2013a: 232)

Clausal secondaries in Akkadian are marked by a special verbal form, the **subjunctive**:

(5) **Noun–Clause (Double-marked AC)**
Akk. bit-∅ ipuš-u  
house-cst made.3ms-sbjv  
‘house (which) he made’ (Cohen 2010: 80)

The situation in Classical Arabic is similar to Akkadian, in that the nunation (from Arabic تنوين tanwin), or -n suffix, disappears, while case endings, however, are retained. In Arabic, the nunation occurs in complementary distribution with definite article, and therefore is normally seen as an exponent of the indefinite. This analysis, however, is challenged by Lyons (1999: 91–94). He argues that the nunation (in a variant form), can co-occur with the definite article in plural and dual nouns, and thus cannot mark indefiniteness. While he analyses it as “a semantically empty marker of nominality” (Lyons 1999: 93f), he notes that it is always dropped in the construct state. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that the nunation is a marker of the free state. The lack of nunation of definite singular nouns may be then tentatively explained as resulting from a principle of economy, as the primary of the CSC cannot in general be determined by a definite article. Conversely, the absence of nunation coupled with the absence of a definite article is a clear indicator of the construct state,

---

31 We refer here to the functional similarity between Arabic and Akkadian. Whether the two are historically related is of course a separate question. We note, however, that also Hebrew free.m.pl suffix -im, as well as Aramaic abs.m.pl suffix -in lose the /m/ or /n/ segments respectively in construct state. *Prima facie*, it seems reasonable to assume that all these functionally and phonetically elements share a common origin.

32 A similar position is maintained by Retsö (1997), who investigates also the origin of this system.

33 The exception for this is the CSC headed by adjectives, a construction termed in Arabic Grammar *impure annexation*. See Goldenberg (2002: 204ff.) for further details and analysis.
as in the following example.\textsuperscript{34}

(6)  \textbf{Noun–Noun (Double-marked AC)}  
\textbf{Arab.}  
bayt-u-∅ l-malik-i  
house-NOM–CST DEF–king-GEN  
‘The house of the king.’

In Modern Arabic dialects, both the case endings and the nunation are gone, giving rise to pure juxtaposition of the primary and secondary, the only indicator of the CSC being the lack of definiteness marking on the primary:

(7)  \textbf{Noun–Noun (Juxtaposition)}  
\textbf{Iraq.}  
bēt ‘ali  
house A.  
‘Ali’s house’ (Erwin 2004: 370)

(8)  \textbf{Noun–Noun (Juxtaposition)}  
\textbf{Malt.}  
omm Pawlu  
mother P.  
‘Paul’s mother’ (Fabri 1996: 230)

A remnant of the construct state marking is however found in feminine nouns, which in Classical Arabic are written with a \textit{tā’ marbūṭa} letter (\textdegree) word-finally. This letter represents a /t/ phoneme, which is however not pronounced at the edge of a phonological word. In the CSC, such a primary forms one phonological word with the secondary, and ends therefore with an -(a)t segment, effectively marking the construct state in opposition to the free state ending -\textit{a}.

(9)  \textbf{Noun–Noun (Head-marked AC)}  
\textbf{Iraq.}  
sayyār-at ‘ali  
car–FS.CST A.  
‘Ali’s car’ (Erwin 2004: 370)

(10)  \textbf{Noun–Noun (Head-marked AC)}  
\textbf{Malt.}  
nann-t Pawlu  
grandmother–FS.CST P.  
‘Paul’s grandmother’ (Fabri 1996: 232)

(11)  \textbf{Noun–Noun (Head-marked AC)}  
\textbf{Morc.}  
mədras-t Nadya  
school–FS.CST N.

\textsuperscript{34}The situation, however, is complicated by the fact that a certain class of nouns is never marked by the nunation.
‘Nadia’s school’ (Benmamoun 2005: 479)

2.3.3 The CSC and determination

From the above examples, an important characterisation of the classical CSC is apparent, namely the impossibility to mark the definiteness feature on the primary. Instead, the entire NP represented by the CSC acquires its definiteness feature from the marking on the secondary (see Doron and Meir 2013: 587f.). If a CSC is embedded within another one, only the very last secondary can be marked for definiteness, implying definiteness for the entire CSC:

\[
\text{Noun–Noun Phrase (embedded CSC)}
\]

MHeb.  

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{liśka-t} & \text{נְסִי} \\
\text{of} & \text{president} \\
\text{ha-mədina} & \text{def} \\
\text{state} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘the office of the president of the state’

In formal linguistic literature, this phenomenon has been termed (in)definiteness spreading as if the definiteness marking “spreads” from the secondary to the entire CSC (cf. Danon 2008). From a constructionist point of view we can argue that the CSC has only one available slot for marking the definiteness, this slot being tied to the secondary. The marking, however, bears on the entire CSC and not on the secondary directly. Such a view is especially fortunate for cases where a marking of definiteness on the secondary entails definiteness of the entire construction, but not of the secondary itself. This is particularly the case when the secondary is understood non-referentially, as in the following example, where \textit{kala} ‘bride’ does not refer to any particular bride, while the entire expression may refer to a specific wedding gown:  \(^{35}\)

\[
\text{Noun–Noun}
\]

MHeb.  

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{simla-t} & \text{חַי} \\
\text{gown} & \text{bride} \\
\text{DEF} & \text{DEF} \\
\end{array}
\]

‘the wedding gown’

As Verhej (1989) notes, whenever several conjoined nouns appear as the secondary, they must agree in definiteness in order to produce a felicitous CSC.\(^{36}\) This again

\(^{35}\)Danon (2008) brings further converse examples where a definite-marked secondary entails definiteness only on the secondary. In such cases, we may assume the definiteness marking to be local to the secondary, the CSC being ambiguous between full-scope and secondary only definiteness. We note, however, that syntactically, any definiteness marking on the secondary triggers definite agreement of adjectives with the CSC.

\(^{36}\)Verhej’s observation regards Biblical Hebrew, but it is by and large valid for Modern Hebrew as well.
shows that the marking of definiteness on the secondary is rather mechanical, and it relates to the marking of definiteness of the entire construction.

From the discussion in Section 2.3.1, we see that there is nothing in our definition of the construct state that entails the lack of definiteness marking on the same noun. Rather, the situation of the CSC is comparable to the complementary distribution of determiners and genitives in other languages (such as English: *the president’s office*). A possible explanation of this cross-linguistic phenomenon, based upon the linguistic principle of economy, is given by Haspelmath (1999).

In some modern Semitic languages the situation is somewhat different: While generally there is still only one slot for marking definiteness, its position is sometimes changed. This is especially clear in colloquial Modern Hebrew, where the definiteness marking of the CSC appears regularly before the primary, especially when the secondary is non referential. In such cases, one may see the CSC as comparable to morphological compounding (Borer 2008; see also Gutman 2014). Thus, example (14) on this page has the same meaning as example (13) on the previous page, the difference being mainly in register. Note, however, that while the ‘bride’ of example (13) on the preceding page could be understood as referential to a specific bride, this is impossible in the following example.

(14) **Noun–Noun**  
MHeb. הַשֵּׁמֶלֶת כָּלָה ha-simla-t kala  
def-gown-fs.cst bride  
‘the wedding gown’

In NENA as well, we find sporadically cases where the determiner appears before the primary, but without implying a compound reading.

(15) **Noun–Noun**  
JZax. ʾō šul nāţōr-e  
def.ms affair.cst guard(s)-poss.3ms  
‘the affair of his guards’ (Cohen 2012: 121 (134))

In modern Arabic vernaculars, on the other hand, the definiteness marking is still regularly maintained on the secondary:

(16) **Noun–Noun**  
Iraq. wuṣṣ-l-at l-iqmaš  
piece-fs.cst def-cloth  
‘the piece of cloth’ (Erwin 2004: 371)
2.3.4 The Analytic Linker Construction

As an alternative to the CSC, virtually all Semitic languages allow for an alternative AC, which we shall term the Analytic Linker Construction (=ALC) or simply the Linker Construction.\(^{37}\) The essence of this construction is that the primary is in the free state, while the secondary is following a third element with which it forms a syntactic (but not morphological) co-constituent. We shall term this element linker (glossed LNK), in resonance with Plank's Link, with some reserves regarding this terminology below.

Thus, in Modern Hebrew, the analytic alternative to example (13) on page 31 is the following:

\[(\text{Noun–Noun})\]

MHeb. הבַית־שהָלֵך

ha-bayit [šel ha-melek]

DEF-house.FREE LNK DEF-king.FREE

‘the house of the king’

The linker is treated in the literature as a preposition or as a genitive marker (a.k.a. nota genitivi), or sometimes both (cf. the genitive preposition of Doron and Meir 2013: 582). In fact, as Goldenberg (1995: 3–6) claims, it is best treated cross-Semitically as a pronominal element being notionally in construct state, and capable of standing in apposition with an optional explicit nominal antecedent being in free state.\(^{38}\) This is represented schematically as follows:

\[
\{X_{\text{FREE}}\} \leftrightarrow [\text{LNK} \mapsto Y]_{\text{CSC}}];_{\text{ALC}}
\]

Note that linker, being a pronoun heading a CSC is quite special in that it acts as a head of a complex NP, in contrast to most pronouns which replace an entire NP.

From a diachronic viewpoint, the linkers of many Semitic languages are in fact cognate with the Akkadian construct state pronoun ša.\(^{39}\)

\[(\text{Pronoun–Noun})\]

Akk. ša šarr-i-m

PRO.CST king-GEN-FREE

‘that of the king’ (Goldenberg 2013a: 232)

\(^{37}\)In the literature, we find this construction termed analytic genitive construction (see inter alia Bulakh 2009; Grassi 2013). The term genitive construction should be understood in this context as equivalent to our attributive construction, as no genitive case marking is necessary implied.

\(^{38}\)As we shall see, we find exceptions to this rule, such as the rare Syriac example (35) on page 53 or more systematically in JUrm.; see Section 7.3.1.

\(^{39}\)The Hebrew linker šel, present in example (17) on the current page is in fact particular in that it has incorporated the preposition l- ‘to’ (Goldenberg 2013a: 240).
The term *linker* may seem unfortunate for an element which can serve as an independent syntactic head. We note, however, that even when no primary is explicitly present, the linker mediates between an understood primary and a necessarily present secondary. Moreover, from the point of view of discourse frequency, more often than not it does link between two explicit nominal elements, bleaching its pronominal value and rendering it rather a construction marker. When necessary, we shall differentiate between a *pronominal linker*, capable of standing by its own, and a *pure linker*, necessarily standing between two elements, being effectively a simple secondary marker.

The question of the different semantics of the ALC and the CSC has been much researched in the literature of Semitic languages (for MHeb. see for instance Shelzinger and Ravid 1998 and bibliography there). The exact function difference is outside the scope of this work, and we shall only briefly touch this question regarding the languages we study.

### 2.3.5 Goldenberg’s typology of ACs in Semitic

Goldenberg (2013a: ch. 14) presents an elaborate typology of ACs in Semitic languages. Following his previous works (Goldenberg 1995), he sees the CSC (the *genitive construction* in his terminology) as the basic exponent of the attributive relationship in Semitic languages. His classification is based first and foremost on the important observation that the attributive relationship is not restricted to nouns, but can in fact hold also between other phrasal categories. Thus, the secondary (attribute) can be a noun, a pronoun, a prepositional phrase (PP) or a clause, while the primary (head) can be a noun or a pronoun (and in fact also adverbal elements, namely prepositions or conjunctions). The various combinations yield 8 different patterns, presented in Table 2.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Attribute</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.1: Members of the attributive relationship (Goldenberg 2013a: ch. 14)

Syntactically, all these patterns can in principle be expressed by the CSC. Yet,
when a pronoun is involved, they may (or sometimes must) be expressed morphologically. For instance, Pattern B is normally expressed by attaching a possessive pronominal suffix to the head noun, yielding a morphological construction somewhat different from the CSC. Moreover, adjectives, according to Goldenberg, are simply morphological realisations of pattern C, where a pronoun, denoting a referent, and a nominal attribute denoting a quality, are fused together into one word.

Pronominal elements play a further important role in Goldenberg's classification, since they permit the extension of the basic AC, be it the syntactic CSC or a morphological construction, into more elaborate periphrastic constructions. This is possible, since the pronominal elements can stand in apposition (in the sense defined in Section 2.1.1) to other NPs. For instance, example (18) on page 33, being an instance of Goldenberg's Pattern C, can be extended by adding a nominal primary appositional to the pronominal head of the CSC, yielding the ALC.

(19) Noun ↔ Pronoun–Noun

Akk. mārum [ša šarr-i-m]
son Pro.cst king-gen-free
'the king's son' (Goldenberg 2013a: 232)

Goldenberg's analysis of the ALC in Syriac is given in Section 3.4, while a more elaborate extension, the Double Annexation Construction, involving two appositions, is presented in Section 3.5 in the context of Syriac.

Goldenberg's pronominal elements are similar to Plank's relatedness-indicators. Yet their definitory property is that they are pronouns, i.e. they substitute a noun in an AC, and as such they can form an independent NP constituent together with their antipodal locus. Inflectional properties reflecting number, gender, person, or case of a co-referenced noun are incidental and do not need to appear. For instance, the Akk. construct state pronoun ša, shown in example (19) on this page, does not inflect.

2.4 Typology of ACs used in this study

The typology of attributive constructions used in this study is informed both by Plank's typology (see Section 2.2.2) and Goldenberg's typology (see Section 2.3.5), while being adapted to the languages studied, namely the NENA dialects.

In the classification of the ACs we are interested, on the one hand, in the morphemic make-up of the constructions (syntagmatic axis) and, on the other hand, by the categorical variation available for the primaries and secondaries (paradigmatic axis). The two axes are detailed in the two sections below.
2.4.1 Syntagmatic axis

We distinguish between two loci of marking (primary and secondary) and two types of marking: simple relation-markers and pronominal markers (“relatedness-indicators” in Plank’s terminology). Ignoring the possible accumulation of markers on one locus, and leaving aside the question of the ordering of the elements, this leads to 7 principal constructions. These are listed below, with some comments regarding their usage in the context of NENA (but note that not all constructions are used in all dialects). The terminology used and the relevant glossing conventions used for each construction are introduced here as well.

**Juxtaposition** The “zero-marking” strategy – the two members of the construction are merely juxtaposed to each other.

**Simple primary marking** The primary is marked morphologically by the construct state (glossed cst), yielding the construct state construction (CSC). In the NENA dialects, we shall differentiate between three types of construct state: a “classical” construct state characterized by phonological reduction of the corresponding free state, typically apocope of the last vowel; a suffixed marker -əd, typically replacing the last vowel; and a suffixed marker originating in the Iranian Ezafe.\(^{40}\)

**Simple secondary marking** The secondary is marked morphologically by means of genitive case (glossed gen). In NENA dialects only some determiners can be marked by genitive case. Alternatively, in Syriac we find a dative preposition (glossed dat) marking the secondary (see Section 3.6). A clausal secondary can be marked as such by means of a relativizer (glossed rel).

**(Simple) double marking** Both the primary and the secondary are marked with the above markers. As in the NENA dialects genitive marking is normally only possible with some secondaries, we treat this as a variant of the CSC.

**Pronominal secondary marking** A pronominal linker (glossed lnk, representing the primary, intervenes between the two construction members, bonding syntactically with the secondary (see Section 2.3.4), yielding the analytic linker construction (ALC). Note that the secondary may additionally be marked by genitive case. In this construction, an explicit nominal primary may appear in free state, or more rarely in construct state (see Section 7.3.1). If the pronominal element is not an overt linker but is fused morphologically with the secondary,

\(^{40}\)In the interlinear glossing of examples the two first types shall be differentiated as .cst vs. -cst, while the Ezafe shall be glossed as -ez. In abstract representations of constructions, however, we shall use the gloss .cst to encompass all three types.
2.4. Typology of ACs used in this study

As is the case of adjectives according to Goldenberg’s analysis, we get agreement features (marked as \textit{agr}); in this case we shall speak of the \textit{juxtaposition-cum-agreement} construction.

**Pronominal primary marking** The head noun is marked by a pronominal suffix representing the secondary. Following the traditional terminology in Semitic studies, we call these suffixes \textit{possessive suffixes} (glossed \textit{poss}), although their usage is wider than denoting possession only.\footnote{Cf. Ornan (1964: ch. 2) who uses the Hebrew term \textit{כינוי קניין} \textit{ki}nuy qinyan ‘possessive pronoun’.} In NENA this construction occurs without an explicit nominal secondary, the suffix effectively representing the secondary. In other languages, such as Turkish, we find this marking co-occurring with an explicit nominal secondary (which may or may not be marked by genitive case – see example (1) on page 23).

**Pronominal double marking** In this construction both the primary and the secondary are marked with the above pronominal markers, yielding the \textit{double annexation construction} (DAC).\footnote{In the usage of this term we follow Goldenberg (2013a: 234, fn. 15), who credits Ornan (1964: 124 [2011: 85]) for introducing this term in Hebrew as \textit{סמיכות כפולה} \textit{smixut kfula}. In descriptive grammars of Hebrew (e.g. Glinert 1989: 34) as well as in typological works referring to Hebrew (e.g. Comrie and Thompson 2007: 366) it is often translated as \textit{Double Genitive}. For the use of the term \textit{Genitive} in this respect see footnote 37 on page 33.} Such a construction is very rare in NENA, but is found in Syriac (see Section 3.5).

The different strategies are summarized in Table 2.2, together with the labels we use in this study. Following Plank (1995: 39), \textit{X} represents the primary, \textit{Y} the secondary, while \textit{x} and \textit{y} are co-referential pronominal markers. Subscripts represent morphological marking. Curly brackets indicate optional elements, while square brackets delimit independent NPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition</td>
<td>\textit{X}</td>
<td>\textit{Y}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genitive case marking</td>
<td>\textit{X} \textit{y}_{\textit{GEN}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct state construction</td>
<td>\textit{X}<em>{\textit{GST}} \textit{Y}</em>{{\textit{GEN}}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juxtaposition-cum-agreement</td>
<td>\textit{X} \textit{y}_{\textit{AGR}}</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytic linker construction</td>
<td>{\textit{X}_{\textit{gst}}}</td>
<td>{\textit{x}<em>{\textit{LRK}} \textit{Y}</em>{{\textit{GEN}}}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possessive suffix marking</td>
<td>{\textit{X} \textit{y}_{\textit{POSS}}}</td>
<td>{\textit{Y}_{{\textit{GEN}}}}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Double annexation construction</td>
<td>{\textit{X} \textit{y}_{\textit{POSS}}}</td>
<td>{\textit{x}<em>{\textit{LRK}} \textit{Y}</em>{{\textit{GEN}}}}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.2: Principal Attributive Constructions

In addition to these terms, we shall use occasionally the more general terms \textit{head-marking}, \textit{dependent-marking} and \textit{double-marking}, as explained in Section 2.2.1.
2.4.2 Paradigmatic axis

For a fine-grained classification of the ACs, we are interested in the question of which elements can appear as primaries and as secondaries apart from nouns. The classification of these elements is a necessary methodological choice, and does not reflect any cross-linguistic claims regarding the universality of the proposed categories.

Our classification is based on the traditional distinction between Parts-of-Speech (Nouns, Pronouns, Adjectives, Participles, Infinitives, Adverbs). Additionally, we make a distinction between one-word elements and phrasal constituents. We distinguish CP Nouns [=Complex Predicate Nouns] as a special functional sub-category of nouns which participate, together with a light verb, in complex predication structures. Complex predication is quite common in Iranian languages such as Persian (see for instance Samvelian 2012), and has been borrowed to some extent into some NENA dialects. On the other hand, we conflate into one category of Adverbials all elements which head phrases of adverbial function, be they prepositions, conjunctions or adverbs, following Cohen (2010). In the case of the analytic linker construction, where no explicit primary appears besides the pronominal linker, we shall treat this absence as a Zero (Ø) primary.

In the secondary position we observe two further categories: ordinal numerals (‘first’, ‘second’, etc.) and clauses. Thus, as possible primaries or secondaries we distinguish between the following categories:

1. Noun [Phrase]
2. Pronoun
3. CP Noun
4. Infinitive [Phrase]
5. Participle [Phrase]
6. Adjective [Phrase]
7. Ordinal
8. Clause
9. Adverbial
10. Zero (Ø)

The rationale for this choice is that often one and the same element can take all three functions, depending on its complements, such as the English word ‘before’. In the example titles, however, we give more precise labels (Preposition, Conjunction, Adverb), unless we wish to emphasize the general adverbial nature of the element in question.
2.4.3 Synopsis

The different syntagmatic and paradigmatic possibilities for ACs in NENA, as analysed in the current work, are given in Table 2.3. The first column gives the two ordering possibilities of primary and secondary, while the other columns show the variation available at each morphemic slot.

The primary may be marked by construct state morphemes of various types: apocope (=Ap.), the native suffix -əd, or Ezafе marking, or it may stay unmarked (∅). Following the apocopate construct state (or a variant thereof) we may find a “possessive” suffix, which functions as a pronominal secondary.

As for the secondary marking, we find two main markers: A pronominal linker and/or a genitive case. These may independently be present (+) or absent (∅). Adjectives and ordinals may show additionally agreement features (AGR), while a relativizer may precede a clausal secondary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Order</th>
<th>Primary (X)</th>
<th>CST [± poss]</th>
<th>LNK</th>
<th>GEN</th>
<th>Secondary (Y)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X Y</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>Ap. [± poss]</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participle</td>
<td>-əd</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td>-EZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero (∅)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[± AGR] Clause</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y X</td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CP Noun</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CP Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Infinitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Participle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adjective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Adverbial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Zero (∅)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[± AGR] Clause</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.3: Parameters of an AC structure
Chapter 3

Attributive Constructions in Syriac

The point of departure of this study is Syriac, taken to be an approximation of the precursor(s) of the NENA dialects of the Classical Aramaic period. While it is sometimes assumed that all NENA dialects developed from a unique undocumented Proto-NENA dialect (cf. Hoberman 1988), such an assumption is uncertain at the current state of our knowledge. A plausible alternative assumption is that the dialectal continuum observed in NENA existed also in the Classical Aramaic period. Be this as it may, only few Eastern dialects of that period left traces as literary languages. Arguably, among these Syriac is the best documented. Thus, in the absence of contrary evidence, we assume that any constructions extant in Syriac existed as well in the pre-NENA dialects. This assumption is supported by the fact that the constructions surveyed in this chapter are by and large extant also in two other documented Eastern Classical Aramaic languages, namely Jewish Babylonian Aramaic and Classical Mandaic. Where relevant, some comparative notes regarding these two languages are given as well.

The research into ACs in Syriac, often termed “genitive” in the literature, is of course old and vast, and in the following I cannot expect to innovate much. Rather, the aim of the current section is to position the data about the Syriac attributive system in the framework described in Section 2.4, to facilitate comparison with the NENA dialects and contact languages.

My point of departure is the seminal article of Goldenberg (1995), “Attribution in Semitic Languages”, in which he masterfully analyses the basic constructions available in Syriac. A further extension of these ideas is given in Goldenberg (2013a: ch. 14), particularly in pp. 236ff. regarding Syriac.

The data in this survey are drawn from two types of sources: On the one hand, I have consulted Syriac grammars, notably the classical grammars of Duval (1881) and Nöldeke (1898) as well as the pedagogical grammars of Muraoka (1997; 2013). On the other hand, I have drawn extensively on textual studies of various Syriac texts of the Peshiṭṭa – The book of 1 Kings (Williams 2001), The Gospel of Matthew
(Joosten 1996), *Sirach (The Wisdom of Ben-Sira)* (Van Peursen 2007) and *The Prayer of Manaseb* (Gutman and Van Peursen 2011) – as well as *The Book of the Laws of the Countries* of Bardaisan (Bakker 2011). In all cited examples I have indicated both the primary source (if given) and the secondary source in which I have found the example. Whenever possible, I have tried to verify the correctness of the example in the primary source. To round off the picture, I have also gathered numerous examples directly from the first part of the *Acts of Thomas* published by Wright (1871: 1–160) (and reproduced in the chrestomathy of Muraoka 1997: 30*–40*), as well as some examples from the Syriac dictionary of Payne Smith (1903). Some further examples were taken from specialized articles cited below.

The chapter is organised as follows: The next section gives a brief reminder regarding the three morphological states present in Syriac. Section 3.2 discusses the use of possessive pronominal suffixes, while the three subsequent sections deal with the three main attributive constructions of Syriac, namely the construct state construction (Section 3.3), the analytic linker construction (Section 3.4), and the double annexation construction (Section 3.5). Section 3.6 deals with the marginal dative linker construction, while Section 3.7 presents the juxtaposition-cum-agreement construction used by adjectival secondaries. Section 3.8 concludes this chapter with some general remarks.

### 3.1 The three states in Syriac

Following the discussion in Section 2.3.1, recall that Syriac, like other Aramaic languages of antiquity, possesses a 3-way state distinction in nouns, namely the *construct state*, and two free states: the *absolute state* and the *emphatic state*, the latter being the citation form of nouns and adjectives. In Syriac, the absolute state is used only in specific syntactic environments (especially with adjectives used predicatively), while the emphatic state is the commonly used form of the (free) noun (Muraoka 1997: 22). Morphologically the emphatic state is marked by means of an -ā suffix (in the singular), which is absent in the absolute and construct states. The ms absolute and construct states, moreover, are identical in form.

---

1. I would like to thank my colleague Ralph Barczok for helping me in finding some of the more obscure primary sources.

2. In all cases the Syriac text is reproduced as it appears in the source cited. For the sake of consistency, however, it is always transcribed according to the East-Syriac vocalisation system, which indicates length only for the vowels /a/ and /e/. Unpronounced letters are generally not transcribed except in some suffixes and clitics in which they are printed as superscript letters. Spirantization, which is usually not phonemic, is not transcribed.
3.2 Possessive pronominal suffixes (X-y.poss)

Syriac, as all Semitic languages, has a set of pronominal suffixes, which attach to nouns and prepositions (Muraoka 1997: 19; Goldenberg 2013a: 88). Following the conventional terminology, we shall call these suffixes “possessive pronouns”. These suffixes attach to the “pre-suffixal” nominal stem (Goldenberg 2013a: xix), which can be derived from the emphatic state by dropping off the emphatic state suffix -ā. Consequently, the possessive pronouns, just like the construct state ∅ suffix (i.e., lack of suffix), stand in opposition to the emphatic state suffix -ā.

(1) Noun–Pronoun

Syr. ܐܬܪܗ=
Haymānut-ēh
faith-poss.3ms
‘his faith’ (Muraoka 1997: 70, §91c)

(2) Noun–Pronoun

Syr. ܐܒܬܣ=
Ba= šm-ēh
In= name-poss.3ms
‘by his name’ (Peshitta, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: A3; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 90 (3A))

The possessive pronouns are strongly bound to the head noun, and have scope over it alone. Thus, they should be seen as morphological word-level inflectional suffixes (see Section 4.1). Whenever two nouns are conjoined, each noun must have its own possessive suffix (contrast with example (51) on page 57):

(3) Conjoined Nouns–Pronoun

Syr. ܪܘܫܡ=
Rugz-āk w=ḥemt-āk
rage-poss.2ms and=fury-poss.2ms
‘your rage and your fury’ (Peshitta, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: A3; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 90 (4A))

While syntactically the N+poss construction is parallel to an NP, morphologically it acts as a single noun.3

---

3The behaviour of the suffixed noun as a single noun can be illustrated by the observation of Van Peursen (2007: 187, fn. 21), who notes that in the corpus of Sirach the maximal chain of construct state nouns consists of two construct state nouns and one final noun, irrespectively of the question whether the final noun bears a possessive suffix or not.
3.3 The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

The formally simplest, though not most frequent, attributive construction in Syriac is the construct state construction (CSC), in which the primary appears in the construct state.

(4) Noun–Noun
Syr. ܡܠܟܐ ܫܡܝܐ
malkut šmayyā
kingdom.cst heaven
‘kingdom of heaven’ (Peshîṭta, Matthew 11:11; Muraoka 1997: 61, §73a)

Muraoka (1997: 61) notes that this construction “tends to be confined to standing phrases verging on compound nouns”, citing the following examples:

(5) Noun–Noun
Syr. ܓܙܪ ܝܢܐ
gzär dinâ
decision.cst judgement
‘verdict’ (Muraoka 1997: 61, §73a)

(6) Noun–Noun
Syr. ܒܪ ܚܪܐ
gleb ḥērē
son.cst free.pl
‘a free-born man’ (Muraoka 1997: 61, §73b)

In such idiomatic cases, the secondary is non-referential. Furthermore, in idiomatic usage, we find also cases where the secondary is a PP:

(7) Infinitive–Prepositional Phrase
Syr. ܡܣܡ ܒ= ܪܝܫܬ
msām b= rišā
put.inf.cst in= head
‘death penalty’ (Duval 1881: 338, §357a)

(8) Noun–Prepositional Phrase
Syr. ܡܡܦܩ ܒ= ܪܘܚܐ
mappaq b= ruḥā
utterance.cst in= spirit
‘an excuse’ (Duval 1881: 338, §357a)

The compounding is sometimes reflected in the orthography when the expression is spelt as one word (with possible further phonetic reductions), such as ܡܠܟܐ ܫܡܝܐ
msām-b-rišā ‘death penalty’ used as an alternative spelling of example (7) (Payne Smith 1903: 285), or the frequently occurring ܒܪܢܐ bar-nāšā ‘man’ (lit. son-man).

The morpho-syntactic independence of the two members of the construction is apparent, on the other hand, when they are separated by intervening material, notably second position clitics, be they certain conjunctive adverbs⁴ or the enclitic personal pronoun. It should be noted, however, that such cases are not so frequent and these clitics tend to normally appear after the entire CSC (Van Peursen and Falla 2009: 69).⁵

(9) **Noun–Noun**

Syr. ܢݪܥܪ ܕݪ ڸܠܡܐ
bnay =dēn  Balhā
son.pl.cst =however B.
‘the sons of Bala, however’ (Zachariae Episcopi Mitylenes, Anectoda Syriaca Vol. 3, ed. Land 1870: 39, 16 apud Nöldeke 1898: 157, §208A)

(10) **Noun–Noun**

Syr. ܘܿܢܒܪܐ ܚܕܝܩܐ
dēn bnašā
bnay =’ennon zaddiqē
son.pl.cst =3pl righteous.pl.
‘They are sons of the righteous.’ (S. Ephræmi Opera vol. 2 ed. Benedictus 1740: 384 D; Nöldeke 1898: 158, §208A)

In these examples, the primaries must carry word-stress, otherwise clitics could not attach to them. Thus, following the discussion in Section 2.3.2, they confirm the view that construct state in Syriac as in many other Semitic languages is not merely a phonological artefact resulting from stress shift, but is rather a marker of a morpho-syntactic category. Further evidence to this is adduced by the quite rare case where two conjoined nouns appear in construct state.⁶

(11) **Conjoined nouns–Noun**

Syr. ݪܡܚܕܝܩܐ ܫܡܚܰܕܱ_hsâh-hon
[kātbay w= qāryay] šmāhay-hon
writing.cst and= reading.cst names-poss.3m.pl.
‘writing and reading their names’ (Zachariae Episcopi Mitylenes, Anectoda Syriaca Vol. 3, ed. Land 1870: 136, 14 apud Nöldeke 1898: 158, §208A)

---

⁴See Van Peursen and Falla (2009: 67) for the term “conjunctive adverb”.

⁵See further Van Peursen (2007: 183) who defines the CSC as an indivisible “phrase atom”.

⁶Recall that while this usage is very rare in Syriac and other classical Semitic languages, a similar construction is quite frequent in Modern Hebrew (mostly in the written style, see example (3) on page 28) and Modern Written Arabic (Badawi, Carter, and Gully 2004: 138f.), hinting that this is in fact a natural development of the language.
Noun phrases, including inflected possessed nouns, can regularly appear as secondaries of the CSC, whether they represent an AC (leading to a chain of constructs\(^7\)), a conjoined NP, or a combination of both.

(12) **Noun–Possessed Noun**

Syr.  ना'ग्रा  ṛुḥ-āk
na’grat ruḥ-āk
prolonging.cst spirit-poss.2ms

(13) **Noun–Noun Phrase**

Syr.  लै= ‘अय [बना  नासा]
l= ‘āyn [bnay nāṣā]
to= eye son.pl.cst man

(14) **Noun–Conjoined Nouns**

Syr.  भकय [तेшибहाः  उ ’ीकरा]
sawkay [tešbuḥtā w= ’iqārā]
branch.pl.cst praise and= honour

(15) **Noun–Conjoined Noun Phrases**

Syr.  भकय [[मेसमक  तेशबहा= [िकरा  दा= झाः  ओम]
bēt [[mesmak tešboḥṭā] w= [iqārā da= l= ‘ālam]]
house.cst support.inf.cst praise and= honour lnk= to= eternity.abs
‘a house of support of praise and eternal honour’ (*Peshiṭta*, Sirach 1:19 *apud* Van Peursen 2007: 210)

Moreover, the secondary can be determined by an attributive demonstrative:

(16) **Noun–Determined noun**

Syr.  रुमी अतत हाउ मल्का
Rumi ’attat haw malkā
R. wife.cst dem.ms king
‘Rumi, wife of this king’ (Simeon Beth-Arsamensis, *Homeritarum martyrium*, ed. J. S. Assemanus 1719: 368, 2; Duval 1881: 339, §357f\(^9\))

\(^7\)Van Peursen (2007: 187) notes that at most one embedded CSC occurs as the secondary of the CSC in the corpus of Sirach. See also footnote 3 on page 43.

\(^8\)The form तूर = unattested elsewhere – is understood to be a synonym of तूर naggirat ‘patience’, or a corruption thereof (Muraoka 1997: 37*, fn. 62).

\(^9\)Duval gives mistakenly the wrong page number (365).
In the context of the ALC, such a demonstrative is arguably a definite article (Pat-El 2010: 65; see discussion in Section 3.4.6.

### 3.3.1 Adjectives and Participles as primaries

The CSC can be headed by other part-of-speech categories as well, notably participles and adjectives. A CSC headed by a participle yields a nominalisation of a verbal phrase, where the secondary corresponds to an argument (not necessarily a direct one) of the primary.

(17) **Participle–Noun Phrase**

Syr. ṭāliyān kūnâ[tā d= malkā]

from sit.pl.ptcp.cst thrones LNK= king

‘from those who sit on royal thrones’ (*Pesbiṭta*, Sirach 40:3; Van Peursen 2007: 203)

A CSC composed of an adjectival primary and nominal secondary is quite peculiar in its semantics, as it is the primary (the adjective) which qualifies the secondary (the noun), yet the entire phrase acts as an adjective phrase. Thus, in the following example, *saggi ḥnānā* ‘great.cst compassion’ should be understood as ‘bearer of great compassion’. The example shows, moreover, the equivalence of such CSCs to regular adjectives.10

(18) **Adjective–Noun**

Syr. ḫnānā ṭā’ār māryā ngir ruḥā wa= mraḥmānā = saﬃg

2ms =3ms Lord long.cst spirit and= merciful and= great.cst

compassion

‘You are the Lord, long-suffering and merciful and of great compassion.’

(*Pesbiṭta*, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: A7; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 217 (7a))

### 3.3.2 Adverbial secondaries

Deviating further from the typical noun+noun AC, adjectives and participles in construct state can be followed also by adverbials (PPs or Adverbs), including infinitives

---

10See Goldenberg (2002) for an analysis of the phenomenon in Arabic, and Doron (2014) for a analysis of the phenomenon in Modern Hebrew, cast in formal semantics terminology. In NENA, on the other hand, such examples are very rare (see Qar. example (35) on page 142), and in most dialects virtually non-existent.
headed by the preposition l- (Muraoka 1997: 76, §96b; Brock 1997: 53ff.).

Of particular interest is the usage of the secondary b= kull 'in all', which according to Brock (1997: 54ff.) was used in sixth- and seventh-century translations as the equivalent of Greek superlatives.

(19) **Adjective–Prepositional Phrase**

Syr.  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{d}= & \text{ hakkimay} \quad \text{b}= \text{ kull (yawn\r{\'}ye)} \\
\text{LNK}= & \text{ wise.M.PL.CST in=} \text{ all Greek.PL} \\
\end{align*}\]

‘of the most wise (the Greeks)’ (Eusebius, *Theophania* ed. Lee 1842: II.; Brock 1997: 55)

We note that a similar construction has been conserved in NENA to express superlatives, using however nominal secondaries including the pronoun kull ‘all’ itself; see examples (32)–(33) on page 108 for JZax. and example (31) on page 172 for JUrm.

Another noteworthy usage of adverbial secondaries is the usage of infinitives headed by the preposition l-, which seems to have entered regular usage in Syriac in the sixth or seventh century as well (Brock 1997: 57f.):

(20) **Participle–Infinitive**

Syr.  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{w}= & \text{ y\d{a}d\r{\'}ay} \quad \text{l}= \text{ mab\r{\'}\r{a}šu} \\
\text{and}= & \text{ know.PTCP.M.PL.CST to=} \text{ harm.INF} \\
\end{align*}\]

‘and who know how to harm’ (Babai, *Commentary on Evagrius’ Centuries*, Cod. Vatic. syr. N. 178, f. 8b, ed. Frankenberg 1912: 22, 2; Brock 1997: 58)

Among other examples of adverbial secondaries, we may note the following:

(21) **Adjective–Prepositional Phrase**

Syr.  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{šappirat}= & \text{ ḥezwā} \\
\text{beautiful.F.PL.CST in=} \text{ appearance} \\
\end{align*}\]

‘beautiful in appearance’ (*Peshīṭṭa*, Genesis 12:11; Nöldeke 1898: 158, §206)

(22) **Participle–Prepositional Phrase**

Syr.  

\[\begin{align*}
\text{ā\r{\'}ellay}= & \text{ gnonā} \\
\text{enter.PTCP.M.PL.CST to=} \text{ bridal_chamber} \\
\end{align*}\]
'those who enter the bridal chamber' (Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871: مَّعَبِّدُ)

(23) **Participle–Adverb**
Syr. مَّوتُكَ قَلِيلًا
mātyay qalilāʾit
die.PTCP.M.PL.CST quickly

3.3.3 **Adverbial primaries**

As for adverbial primaries, many prepositions of Syriac can be analysed as being adverbial nouns in construct state. Thus, the preposition مَّتَذ مَّتَذ qdām ‘before’ is the construct state of مَّذ مَّذ qdāmā ‘front’.

(24) **Adverbial Noun–Noun**
Syr. مَّذ مَّذ qdām yawmā
time.CST day
'yesterday' (Payne Smith 1903: 490)

Similarly, nouns in construct state may join basic prepositions to form adverbial expressions:

(25) **Adverbial Phrase–Noun**
Syr. مَّذ مَّذ مَّذ مَّذ b= yad mār-an
in= hand.CST master-poss.1PL
'by our Lord' (Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871: مَّعَبِّدُ)

3.3.4 **The proclitic d– as a pronominal primary**

A category which is quite restricted from appearing as primary, if not completely absent, is that of pronouns. According to my survey, none of the independent personal pronouns, demonstrative pronouns or interrogative pronouns can appear as a primary of the CSC construction. This is not surprising, given that in general these elements do not show state distinctions. However, according to Goldenberg (1995) one element, namely the proclitic d–da– can serve as a pronominal head. Thus, he draws a parallel between the following two cases, arguing that both instantiate an attributive relationship (a “Genitive Construction” in his words).

(26) **Noun–Noun**
Syr. deḥlat 'alāhā
fear.cst God
‘fear of God’ (Goldenberg 1995: 4)

(27) Pronoun–Noun
Syr. d= alāhā
PRO= God
‘that12 of God’ (Goldenberg 1995: 4)

The syntactic equivalence between the d- proclitic and a construct state noun is especially clear when it is used to repeat anaphorically a construct state primary, as in the following conjoined NP.13

(28) Noun–Conjoined Nouns
Syr. nbiyay Baʿlā wa=d= hugbe
prophets.cst B. and PRO shrines
‘the prophets of the Baal and those of the shrines’ (Peshiṭta, 1 Kings 19:1; Williams 2001: 21)

While the proclitic d- certainly qualifies as being pronominal by virtue of replacing a noun, it is hardly justifiable to see it morphologically (rather than syntactically) as being in construct state, since it does not have a corresponding free state.14 Therefore, while example (27) on the current page clearly represents an ACs, it is not exactly an instance of the CSC.15

As we shall see in the following section, the most frequent function of the d- proclitic is to stand between an overt NP and its attribute. Therefore, as discussed in

12Goldenberg translates this phrase as “N of God”.
13Pace Williams (2001: 8) we are not dealing here with a “mixed construction” (as example (35) on page 53), but rather with two conjoined ACs. This structure should furthermore be contrasted with example (14) on page 46 in which we have one AC, consisting of a primary modified by two conjoined secondaries.
14It can be traced back to the Northwest Semitic pronominal *ðū, of which Aramaic retained the fossilized genitive form *ðī which evolved into d- (Gzella 2011: 437). As such, it is etymologically related to the demonstrative pronouns, as is evident from the fs demonstrative pronoun hāḏē, but synchronically it is hard to see it as the construct state form of the former. See also Duval (1881: 297, §316): “Le pronom s [d-] est un ancien démonstratif, qui se subordonne un mot ou une phrase, comme un nom à l’état construit”.
15Bar-Asher Siegal (2013a) presents a competing analysis, according to which d- is in essence a subordinating particle, introducing always clausal secondaries (cf. Section 3.4.2). A noun following d- should be understood, according to this idea, as a clause representing a predicative possessive construction, in which only the possessor is overtly expressed as a topic. While this idea is thought provoking, it suffers from some shortcomings: first, it requires the postulation of a null existential particle in each such case. More importantly, the expression of possessors as topics is unknown in Aramaic outside this context.
Section 2.3.4, we shall call it a pronominal linker or simply linker (glossed lnk). In cases such as example (27) on the facing page, we may say that it links between an implicit referent and the secondary.\textsuperscript{16}

\subsection*{3.4 The analytic linker construction (X lnk Y)}

Probably the most frequent AC in Syriac is the construction where the primary and the secondary are mediated by the pronominal linker \textit{d(a)-}. This construction, which we term the \textit{analytic linker construction} (=ALC) is illustrated by the following examples:\textsuperscript{17}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(29)] \textbf{Noun–Noun}
\begin{verbatim}
Syr.  deḥltā  d= alāhā
emph lnk God
\end{verbatim}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(30)] \textbf{Noun–Noun}
\begin{verbatim}
Syr.  malkutā  da= šmayyā
kingdom emph lnk= heaven
\end{verbatim}
\end{itemize}

\begin{itemize}
\item[(31)] \textbf{Noun–Noun}
\begin{verbatim}
Syr.  šliḥā  d= alāhā
apostle lnk= God
\end{verbatim}
\end{itemize}

Goldenberg (1995) analyses this construction as two constituents standing in apposition to each other, only the latter being a “Genitive Construction”. In our terminology, however, the entire construction qualifies as being an AC, the primary

\textsuperscript{16}Goldenberg calls this element a \textit{pronominal head}, a term which may raise some confusion since every pronoun serves as a head of its phrase. Another term found in the Semitic literature, following the work of Pennacchietti (1968) is \textit{determinative pronoun}. Wertheimer (2001), using a somewhat different perspective, analyses the \textit{d-} as \textit{a translatif}, a term due to Tesnière denoting a conversion morpheme, as the \textit{d-} can convert a noun to an attribute, a clause to a noun, etc.

\textsuperscript{17}See footnote 37 on page 33 for the use of the term \textit{analytic genitive construction}. The very same construction with the linker \textit{d-} is attested in other Eastern Classical Aramaic languages, such as Classical Mandaic (Häberl 2007), and Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (Bar-Asher Siegal 2013b: 93, §4.3).

\textsuperscript{18}Goldenberg translates this example as “fear \textit{of God}”, emphasizing the nominal nature of the linker, which is not apparent in the English translation otherwise.
and secondary standing in *indirect attributive relationship*.19 Goldenberg’s analysis, contrasted with our naming scheme, is presented in the Table 3.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goldenberg’s terminology</th>
<th>Apposition</th>
<th>Genitive Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Head</td>
<td>Attribute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deḥlā</td>
<td>d-</td>
<td>alāhā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>malkutā</td>
<td>da-</td>
<td>šmayyā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Linker</th>
<th>Secondary Attribution Construction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 3.1: Goldenberg’s analysis of the ALC, contrasted with our terminology

The pronominal nature of the linker *d-* becomes evident when it appears without an immediate nominal antecedent, such as in examples (27)–(28) on page 50. We treat such cases as having a zero (*∅*) primary, and we shall indicate the position where a nominal primary could have appeared by the symbol *∅*.20 The following famous quotations illustrate this (and see also example (61) on page 60):

(32) *∅–Noun*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syr.</th>
<th>lā metrāʾē =ʾat <em>∅</em> d= alāhā ʾellā <em>∅</em> da= bnay= nāšā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neg.</td>
<td>think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2SG <em>∅</em> LNK= God but <em>∅</em> LNK= son.PL.CST= man</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘You are not thinking of things of God but of things of men.’ (*Peshîṭta*, Matthew 16:23; Muraoka 1997: 71)

(33) *∅–Noun*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syr.</th>
<th>habaw hākēl <em>∅</em> d= qesar l= qesar w= <em>∅</em> d= alāhā l= alāhā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>give.IMP.PL then <em>∅</em> LNK= Caesar to= Caesar and= <em>∅</em> LNK= God to= God</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Give then that which is of Caesar to Caesar and that which is of God to God.’ (*Peshîṭta*, Matthew 22:21; Muraoka 1997: 71)

19Compare with the formulation of Goldenberg (2000: 79) discussing this construction: “We may call ‘indirect annexion’ a construction in which the head noun is represented by a formal head substitute […] and the full noun which is replaced by that formal substitute precedes the kernel annexion as in ṭarāʾē ḫwān [rūḥa [d-gudša]].” The bracketing of the example clearly shows the unity of the whole construction.

20This *∅* is thus a paradigmatic zero. In Saussurian terms it relates *in absentia* to a possible antecedent. Cf. Muraoka (1997: 70): “At times the nucleus noun phrase to be qualified by the following Dalath [=*d-* linker] phrase is wanting”.
An intervening clitic can easily be attached to the primary in this constriction:

(34) **Noun–Noun**

Syr. | sogā =gēr da= bnayā  
---|---
multitude →indeed LNK= sons  
'many children, indeed' (*Acts of Thomas*, ed. Wright 1871: ɾ˺m)

Since the primary does not directly govern the secondary, it must appear in the free state, typically being the emphatic state in Syriac. There are, however, some rare exceptions to this rule.\(^{21}\)

(35) **Noun–Possessed Noun**

Syr. | yawmay d= ṭaliut-¹  
---|---
day.PL.CST LNK= youth-POS.1SG  
‘the days of my youth’ (*S. Ephremi Opera* vol. 3 ed. S. E. Assemanus 1743: 429; Duval 1881: 339, §357g)

As Duval (1881) notes, this construction should be kept apart from the similar-looking sequence of morphemes corresponding to a simple CSC, in which the linker is an integral part of the secondary, lacking an explicit primary (here noted as ∅).

(36) **Noun–Noun Phrase**

Syr. | yawmay [∅ d= bēt Dokletianos]  
---|---
day.PL.CST ∅ LNK= house.CST D.  
‘the days of those of the house of D.’ (*Julianos der Abtrünnige*, ed. Hoffmann 1880: 24, 9 *apud* Duval 1881: 339, §357g)

Whenever two conjoined nouns appear as secondaries, the linker is normally repeated:

(37) **Noun–Conjoined Nouns**

Syr. | qālā d= ṣepunwātā w= d= hadrulē  
---|---
voice LNK= bagpipes.PL and= LNK= water_organ.PL

\(^{21}\)Nöldeke (1898: 155, §205B, fn. 1), however, sees such cases as textual errors. Similarly, Hopkins (1997: 25, fn. 6) comments on it: “The correctness of this construction is not well established and most of the examples alleged in the literature are plain blunders occurring in unreliable sources or the result of mistaken analysis of the text.” In the context of the J. Urmi NENA dialect, where such constructions are regular, we analyse tentatively this phenomenon as *agreement-in-state*; see Section 7.3.1.

Cases without the repetition of the linker appear as well, especially if the conjoined nouns form an idiomatic expression, as in the first of the following two examples:

(38) **Noun–Conjoined Nouns**

Syr. ܕܝܬܪܐ ܕܡܡܐ ܕܡܡܐ ܐܒܠܡܐ ܐܒܠܡܐ
dārē d= [besrā wa= dmā]
generation.pl LNK= flesh and= blood
‘the generations of flesh and blood’ (*Peshitta, Sirach* 14:18 *apud Van Peursen 2007: 209*)

(39) **Noun–Conjoined Nouns**

Syr. ܕܘܒܪܐ ܕܝܒܬܐ ܕܝܒܬܐ ܡܠܐ ܡܠܐ ܟܼܪܼܼܐ ܟܼܪܼܼܐ ܓܼܒܼܫܼܼܢܼܼܐ ܓܼܒܼܫܼܼܢܼܼܐ
nāmusē d= [rāqāmāyē w= ursāyē w= ‘arbāyē]
laws LNK= Rakamaens and= Edessans and= Arabs

In contrast to the CSC, both the primary and the secondary can be expanded to multi-word NPs, as in the following example:

(40) **Noun Phrase–Noun Phrase**

Syr. ܒܪܐ ܡܫܠܡܢܐ ܡܫܠܡܢܐ ܝܡܡܐ ܝܡܡܐ ܪܗܡܐ ܪܗܡܐ
d [brā mšalmānā d= [raḥmē mšalmānē]
sion perfect ms LNK= mercy(pl) perfect m.pl

The secondary itself can be a CSC:

(41) **Noun–Noun Phrase**

Syr. ܒܛܕܝܘܢܐ ܓܼܒܼܫܼܼܢܼܼܐ ܘܬܪܼܼܼܐ ܒܛܕܝܘܢܐ
tarā d= [bēt gnonā]
door LNK= house.cst bridal bed
‘the door of the bridal chamber’ (*Acts of Thomas*, ed. Wright 1871: حجرة)

Similarly, a noun inflected with a possessive pronominal suffix can act as a primary or as a secondary of the ALC. Its usage as a primary should not be confused with the DAC discussed in Section 3.5.

(42) **Possessed Noun–Noun**

Syr. ܝܡܡܐ ܡܫܠܡܢܐ ܝܡܡܐ ܝܡܡܐ ܐܒܠܡܐ ܐܒܠܡܐ
id-ēh d= yamminā
hand-poss 3ms LNK= right(fs)
The analytic linker construction (X lnk Y)

‘his right hand’ (Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871: مَعِيَّ)

(43) Noun–Possessed Noun

Syr. لوٰهٰی دُ = ‘abd-aw
comp = servant–pl POSS 3 MS

‘companion of His servants’ (Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871: مَعِيَّ)

Cases of conjoined nouns acting as a primary are possibly limited. Van Peursen (2007: 204) notes that in the book of Ben-Sira such potential constructions are rendered instead by a conjunction of two ACs, the first being the ALC and the second the possessive suffix construction:

(44) Conjoined Nouns–Noun

Syr. [kol matlē d = ḫakkimē] w = [uḥdātat-hon]
all PROVERBS LNK = wise–PL and = riddles–POSS 3 PL

‘all the proverbs of the wise and their riddles’ (Peshitta, Sirach 50:27; Van Peursen 2007: 204)

This may, however, be an artefact of this text being translated from Hebrew. In the source text this construction would have been rendered by a CSC which prohibits (in classical Hebrew) conjoined primaries. Indeed, in other sources we find such cases regularly:

(45) Conjoined Nouns–Noun

Syr. [tarbitā w = ʿumlāyā] d = pagrā
growth and = perfection LNK = body


(46) Conjoined Noun–Noun Phrase

Syr. [hadāyā wa = mdabrānā] d = aylēn da = [mhaymēnin and = guide and = conductor LNK = who–PL LNK = believe.PTCP M–PL ABS
b–ēh]

in 3 MS

‘and guide and conductor of those who believe in Him’ (Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871: مَعِيَّ)

(47) Conjoined NPs–Participle

Syr. [ḥakkīmīn da = laḥ̱ānīn b–ēh]
Attributive Constructions in Syriac

[[bēt gawsā] wa nāhā] d = ʾališē
gawās refuge and rest  LNK= afflict.PASS.PTCP.EMPH.M.PL
’refuse and repose of the afflicted’ (Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871: ฌุุญ)

A somewhat unusual usage of the linker construction is to introduce a secondary noun which is appositive to the primary. It could tentatively be assimilated with cases of adjectival secondaries in the ALC, which are normally analysed as reduced relative clauses (see Section 3.4.3), but in contrast to those cases, the secondary is in the emphatic state.

(48) Noun–Noun

Syr. gabrey-hen d = gelyāʾē
man.pl-poss.3f.pl LNK= G.M.PL
‘their men, (who are) the Gelians’ (Bardaisan, Book of the Laws of the Countries ed. Drijvers 1965: 44:17 apud Bakker 2011: 121)

We note that in this case, the linker is appositive not only to the primary, but also to the secondary.

3.4.1 Pronominal secondaries

Pronominal secondaries are realized in the ALC by means of the possessive pronominal suffixes (see Section 3.2) attached to an allomorph of the linker, namely dil-. Diachronically dil- can be analysed as a combination of the linker d- with the dative preposition l- but synchronically it is simply the allo-form the linker takes when it attaches to the pronominal suffixes.22

As Gutman and Van Peursen (2011: 90) note, it is difficult to establish a functional difference between this construction and the possessive suffix construction, as different manuscripts of the same text may use one or the other construction. Muraoka (1997: 71), on the other hand, states that this construction puts some emphasis on the secondary. This may be related to the fact that unlike the pronominal suffixes, the base dil- can bear stress. We can contrast examples (1)–(3) on page 43 with the following:

(49) Noun–Pronoun

22The same form is found in CMand. (Macuch 1965: 404, §260). In JBA, on the other hand, the form is normally did- (Bar-Asher Siegal 2013b: 108), though we find the form dil- as well in “rare and dialectal use” (Sokoloff 2002: 331). Nöldeke (1875: 332, fn. 2) proposes to analyse the form did- as originating in d + yād ‘LNK+hand.cst’ (cf. Garbell 1965b: 60), but it seems more plausible to explain it as a cognate of dil- mutated by assimilation (Bar-Asher Siegal 2013b: 108). The earliest attested form, from the Early Aramaic period, is ʾdil-.
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Syr. 

haymānutā dil-ēh

faith.EMPH LNK-POSS.3MS

‘his faith’ (Muraoka 1997: 70, §93c)

(50) Noun–Pronoun

Syr.

ba= šmā dil-āk

in= name.EMPH LNK-POSS.2MS

‘by your name’ (Peshitta, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: B3; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 90 (3B))

(51) Noun Phrase–Pronoun

Syr.

ḥemtā w= rugzā dil-āk

fury.EMPH and= rage.EMPH LNK-POSS.2MS

‘your fury and rage’ (Peshitta, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: B5, Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 90 (4B))

As the last example shows, in contrast to the possessive suffix construction, when the linker construction is used, one pronominal secondary is enough for a conjoined NP primary, as the linker can be appositive to an entire NP (compare also with examples (44)–(45) on page 55).

The syntactic autonomy of the linker permits it, moreover, to precede the primary:

(52) Noun–Pronoun

Syr.

dil-ēh seprā

LNK-POSS.3MS book

‘his book’ (Muraoka 1997: 71, §91f)

3.4.2 Clausal secondaries

Relative clauses in Syriac cannot be introduced by the CSC; Rather, the ALC is obligatory used (Goldenberg 2013a: 236f.). For this reason, the linker d- is referred by some authors also as relative pronoun (Muraoka 1997: 21, §15). It can be co-referent with any argument (or adjunct) of the relative clause.

23 Other classical Semitic languages allow the usage of the CSC with clausal secondaries, notably Akkadian, but also Classical Hebrew, Arabic and Ge’ez (Goldenberg 2013a: ch. 14).

24 We use the term clause here to cover verbal clauses with finite verbs. Nominal clauses, and in particular clauses with participial predicates are treated in the next section.
(53)  Noun (subject)–Clause
Syr. nabyā d= etā lwāt-an
prophet LNK= came to-POSS.1PL
‘the prophet who came to us’ (Muraoka 1997: 63, §77)

(54)  Noun (object)–Clause
Syr. nabyā d= šaddar-t-ēh lwāt-āk
prophet LNK= sent-A1SG-P3MS to-POSS.2MS
‘the prophet whom I sent to you’ (Muraoka 1997: 63, §77)

While we agree with Goldenberg (1995) that d- represents one and the same morpheme regardless of the material that follows it, it is worthwhile noting that the distribution of d-Clause is somewhat different from d+Noun, implying that these combinations are not equivalent (Van Peursen 2007: 245f.). This can be illustrated by cases in which the same primary is expanded both by a nominal and a clausal secondary. In such cases, the two d- phrases are not conjoined (contrast with example (37) on page 54):

(55)  Noun–Noun+Clause
Syr. [b= šo‘itē d= sābē] da= [šma‘-u men 'abāh-ayhon]
in= tales LNK= elders LNK= heard-3PL from fathers-POSS.3PL
‘the discourse of the elders, which they have heard from their fathers’ (Peshiṭta, Sirach 8:9 apud Van Peursen 2007: 232)

Notwithstanding the pronominal nature of the linker d-, in its usage as a relative pronoun it does not co-occur with a zero primary, according to my survey. Instead, an explicit pronominal primary can occur in this construction, yielding either a “free relative”, or, less frequently, a non-restrictive relative clause.

(56)  Pronoun–Clause
Syr. [šalḥa-n i] mqabbel
‘he who receives me receives him who has sent me251 (Peshiṭta, Matthew 10:40; Muraoka 1997: 87, §111)

(57)  Pronoun–Clause
Syr. 251Note that the first relative clause is in fact a participial clause, treated in the next section.
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\[ \text{at} \ d= \ \text{esar-t-āy} \ l-yammā \]
\[ 2\text{ms}\ \text{lnk=} \ \text{bound-A}2\text{ms}\text{-p}3\text{ms} \ \text{acc-} \text{sea} \]

‘You, who bound the sea’ (Peshīṭṭa, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: B3; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 221 (3a))

As Gutman and Van Peursen (2011: 87) note, the interrogative pronoun man ‘who’, which typically introduces non-specific free relatives as in example (56), can in fact also introduce free relatives referring to specific referents, as in the following example:26

(58) Pronoun–Clause
Syr. \[ \text{מָנָן} \ d= \ \text{chad-t} \ \text{la-thomā} \]
who \text{lnk=} \ held-A2\text{ms}\text{-} \text{acc-abyss}

‘Who held\textsuperscript{27} the abyss’ (Peshīṭṭa, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: B3; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 221 (3b))

A quite distinct usage of the d\textsuperscript{+}Clause pattern occurs when d\textsuperscript{+} serves as a complementizer. This is the case when d\textsuperscript{+} introduces complements of verbs, be they direct object or adverbial complements. These constructions are arguably not ACs at all, as their function is not to modify an implied referent. Indeed, in these cases, no nominal antecedent appears before the d\textsuperscript{+}, and one could argue that no nominal primary is possible at all in this position. Nonetheless, we list these examples for the sake of completeness, but we gloss the d\textsuperscript{+} in this function as COMP.28

(59) Verb–Clause
Syr. \[ \text{šarri} \ da= \ \text{nmalel} \]
begin\textsuperscript{prf}.3\text{ms} \ COMP= \ speak\textsuperscript{impf}.3\text{ms}

‘He began to speak.’ (Peshīṭṭa, Mark 12:1; Muraoka 1997: 65, §82)

(60) Verb–Clause
Syr. \[ \text{שֵּׁתוּל} \ \text{לָאֵל} \ \text{רָאֵל} \ \text{לָוַי} \]

\textsuperscript{25}Peripherally to this, we note that in Modern Hebrew the pronouns introducing free relatives are frequently preceded by the definite accusative marker \text{et ‘et}, rendering them syntactically (but not necessarily semantically) definite.

\textsuperscript{27}In the Syriac text, the verb appears in the 2\textsuperscript{nd} person, yet the grammatical context seems to require a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person. Indeed, in another version of the same text, the verb appears in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} person; see discussion of Gutman and Van Peursen (2011: 87f.).

\textsuperscript{28}Wertheimer (2001: 275) argues that both functions of d\textsuperscript{+}, introducing relative clauses or complement clauses, stem from its more general function as a conversion morpheme (\textit{translatif} in her terms), and in both cases we deal with nominalizations: as a relativizer it nominalizes clauses into adjectives, while as a complementizer it nominalizes clauses into nouns (“substantives”).
3. Attributive Constructions in Syriac

ʾāzel ʾnā d= etayyeb l-kon ʾatrā
go.PTCP =1SG COMP= prepare.IMPF.1SG to-poss.2M.PL place
*I go to prepare a place for you.* (Peshítta, John 14:2; Muraoka 1997: 65, §82)

The distinct functions of d- serving either as a complementizer or as pronominal linker are especially clear in the rare cases where two d- morphemes follow, each with another function, as in the following example:

(61) 0–Noun

Syr. ṣm ʾaššakḥat ʾidā d= 0 d= šāqyā ʾbši
was_found.3FS hand(fs) COMP= 0 LNK= cupbearer =3FS
*the hand was found to be that of the cupbearer* (Acts of Thomas, ed. by Wright 1871: 59).

The d- morpheme functions likewise as a complementizer when it follows an adverbial acting as a conjunction. We note that in such cases the attributive relationship is already marked by the construct state of the adverbial. Compare the following with example (24) on page 49:

(62) Adverbial Noun–Clause

Syr. ṣm qdām [d= neqrē tarnāglā]
front.CST COMP= call.IMPF.3MS cock
*before a cock crows* (Payne Smith 1903: 490)

The structure of this example is superficially parallel to that of examples (35)–(36) on page 53, in that the d- follows an element in construct state. The fine difference is that here it acts as a complementizer (nominalizing an event), and thus does not designate any implied referent.

3.4.3 Adjectives and participles as secondaries

Adjectives and participles are closely related in Syriac. Both show nominal inflection, and are characterised by the fact that in predicative position they commonly appear in absolute state. Moreover, with a 3rd person subject, they can dispense with the enclitic personal pronoun (e.p.p.) which normally appears after predicative nominals. In the following examples, the two categories are kept separate, but in some cases it

---

29The 0 primary refers to the noun ʾidā ‘hand’, which can be analysed as having been raised out of the CP to serve as the subject of the matrix-clause. See also Muraoka (1997: 35*, fn. 51). The continuation of this sentence is given in example (79) on page 65.
is difficult to tease them apart.

As explained in Section 3.7, adjectives used attributively stand in apposition with their head noun and thus agree with it in state, being most commonly the emphatic state. The usage of absolute state, on the other hand, is typical of the predicative use of adjectives and participles. Moreover, in absolute state they can appear as secondaries in the ALC. As the absolute state is typical of predicative function, these secondaries are often considered in Syriac grammars as elliptical relative clauses, lacking an explicit subject argument (Muraoka 2013: 66, §94; Van Peursen 2007: 211ff.).

It is quite difficult to find cases of single-word adjectival secondaries following a nominal primary in this construction. Van Peursen (2007) gives the following example as a case of d+Adjective:

(63)  Noun–Participle
Syr.  

nas̱ d= s̱ab
man LNK= old.ABS.MS
'an old person' (Peshîṭta, Sirach 8:6 apud Van Peursen 2007: 211)

Yet most cases of adjectival secondaries introduced in this construction are multi-word expressions:

(64)  Noun–Adjective Phrase
Syr.  
meskēnā d= [hay w= ‘azziz b= gušm-ēh]
miserable LNK= alive.ABS and= vigorous.ABS in body-POSS.3MS
'a poor man who is alive and sound in his body' (Peshîṭta, Sirach 30:14 apud Van Peursen 2007: 212)

(65)  Noun–Adjective Phrase
Syr.  
la’butā w= āsoṭutā d= [lā metbaʿāyā]
avidity(FS) and= intemperance(FS) LNK= NEG necessary.ABS.FS

---

30 This distinction is also true in JBA; see Bar–Asher Siegal (2013b: 63).
31 Alternatively, Goldenberg (1983: 115, §§9–10) analyses these elements as being quasi-verbal conjugated predicates, of which the 3rd person marker is a 0. Yet also appositive nominal secondaries in emphatic state can appear in a similar syntactic structure, as example (48) on page 56.
32 Bakker (2011: 129, fn. 117) argues that the secondary modifies only the second noun, arguing that "it would seem superfluous to specify intemperance with the notion of not being necessary". We note however, that it is the second noun that means "intemperance". Nonetheless, given that the adjective has a singular form, it is probably correct that it modifies only one of the nouns.
This tendency is inverted whenever there is no overt primary. In such cases, we can easily find single-word adjectives following the linker. In such cases, the adjective is effectively nominalized, as the following example demonstrates:

(66) \( \emptyset – \text{Adjective} \)

Syr. ʿbed-ū \( \emptyset \) d= šappir

\( \text{do} . \text{IMP-PL} \emptyset \text{LNK=} \text{beautiful.MS.ABS} \)

‘Do what is good’ (Peshiṭta, Matthew 5:44; Muraoka 1997: 87, §111)

According to Wertheimer (2001: 271), who discusses similar cases with clausal secondaries, the nominalisation is achieved exactly due to the lack of an overt primary.

We find similar expressions with the pronominal primary ܡܕ Phần meddem ‘something’:

(67) \( \text{Pronoun–Adjective} \)

Syr. meddem d= šappir

something \( \text{LNK=} \text{beautiful.MS.ABS} \)

‘something (that is) beautiful’ (Peshiṭta, Sirach 23:5; Van Peursen 2007: 211)

Longer, phrasal adjectival secondaries can also follow \( \emptyset \) or pronominal primaries:

(68) \( \emptyset – \text{Adjective Phrase} \)

Syr. w= \( \emptyset \) [qalil tāb]

\( \text{and=} \text{LNK=} \text{light.MS.ABS very} \)

‘and what is very light’ (Peshiṭta, Sirach 22:18 apud Van Peursen 2007: 199)

Participial phrases following pronominal primaries are quite regular. See the participial secondaries in example (56) on page 58 or example (46) on page 55, or the following example:

(69) \( \text{Pronoun–Participial Phrase} \)

Syr. hālēn d= \{lā \{neg\} ʿābr-ān\}

\( \text{DEM.PL. LNK=} \{\text{NEG}\} \text{pass.PTCP-ABS.F.PL} \)

‘those that are \{not\} transitory’ ( Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871: 104)

In contrast to the case of clausal secondaries with finite verbs (see Section 3.4.2), participial secondaries can co-occur with \( \emptyset \) primaries, though this does not happen
very frequently:

(70)  \( \emptyset \)-Participial Phrase  
Syr.  
\( \text{w= emar l=} \)  \( \emptyset \text{ d= [ātēn } \text{ 'amm-ēh] } \)  
and= said  to= \( \emptyset \text{ LNK= come.PTCP.ABS.M.PL with-poss.3MS } \)  
‘and he said to those who were coming with him’ (Peshīṭta, Matthew 8:10; Muraoka 1997: 87, §111)

(71)  \( \emptyset \)-Participial Phrase  
Syr.  
\( \emptyset \text{ d= [šallīṭ } \text{ gēr } \text{ b= kol] (had } z^{b}u) \)  
\( \emptyset \text{ LNK= rule.PTCP.MS.ABS however in= all one } =3\text{MS } \)  
‘He who controls all (is one).’ (Muraoka 1997: 87, §111)

For discussion of the factors motivating the appearance of adjectives in the ALC versus simple apposition, see Section 3.7.1.

### 3.4.4 Adverbial secondaries

Similarly to adjectival secondaries, adverbial secondaries are usually considered to be reduced clauses. Being in fact PPs, they always consist of multiple words (considering the preposition itself, being a proclitic, as a separate syntactic word):

(72)  Noun–Prepositional Phrase  
Syr.  
\( \text{ʾilānē } \text{ da= } \text{ b= pardaysā } \)  
\( \text{tree.PL LNK= in= garden } \)  
‘the trees in the garden’ (Peshīṭta, Genesis 3:2; Muraoka 1997: 72)

We find the preposition \( \text{ʾak } \) ‘as’ followed by \( d+\text{PP} \). If the PP is seen as a reduced clause, such cases should be treated as similar in structure to example (62) on page 60, where the \( d \)- serves as a complementizer.

(73)  Conjunction–Prepositional Phrase  
Syr.  
\( \text{ʾak d= } \text{ ba= šmayyā } \)  
as  \( \text{COMP= in= heaven } \)  
‘as in heaven’ (Muraoka 1997: 64, §78)

(74)  Conjunction–Prepositional Phrase  
Syr.  
\( \text{ʾak d= } \text{ b= aksnāyā } \)  
as  \( \text{COMP= in= stranger } \)
'as upon a stranger' (*Acts of Thomas*, ed. Wright 1871: 331)

### 3.4.5 Numerals as ordinal secondaries

An noteworthy usage of this construction is to form ordinal numerals out of the cardinal numerals. The construction is especially interesting, since the secondary, i.e. the numeral, agrees in gender with the primary.\(^{33}\) Example (75) can be directly contrasted with example (105) on page 74.\(^{34}\)

(75) **Noun–Ordinal**

Syr. ḫıwma da = ṭēn
day(MS) LNK = two.M
‘the second day’ (Nöldeke 1898: 178, §239)

(76) **Noun–Ordinal**

Syr. ḫıwma da = ṭēn
day(MS) LNK = two.M
‘the second day’ (Nöldeke 1898: 178, §239)

This construction too can be used without an explicit primary:

(77) **∅–Ordinal**

Syr. ḫıwma da = ṭēn
day(MS) LNK = two.M
‘a third one’ (*Peshitta*, Sirach 23:16 *apud* Van Peursen 2007: 258)

---

\(^{33}\)This construction is conserved in many NENA dialects, although the gender distinction is lost in some; see Section 11.5.2.

\(^{34}\)When the numeral functions as a cardinal, it typically precedes the quantified noun without any marking of an attributive relation:

(i) **Noun–Cardinal**

Syr. ḫıwma da = ṭēn
day(MS) LNK = two.M
day
‘once in three days’ (Payne Smith 1903: 614)

Similarly to the ordinal, the cardinal agrees in gender with the modified noun. The linker *d-* appears only sometimes following the cardinal *ʾālef* ‘thousand’, but in this construction the cardinal acts syntactically as a primary (see Nöldeke 1898: 177, §239).
3.4.6 The ALC with a correlative

The ALC exhibits a variant construction in which the linker is preceded by a demonstrative or interrogative pronoun, traditionally termed “correlative” (Nöldeke 1898: 175f., §236). This happens especially frequently with clausal secondaries. Pat-El (2010) discusses this construction, bringing inter alia, the following example:

(78) **Noun Phrase–Clause**

Syr. ܒܕ ܐܘܒܕܐ ܝܕܗܡ ܗܕܒܕܕ

[ʾid-ēh hand-poss.3ms lnk= right(fsm) dem.fs lnk= struck.3ms on Judas ‘his right hand with which he had struck Judas’ (Acts of Thomas, ed. by Wright 1871)]

In the same textual source we find another such example, but with an enclitic personal pronoun intervening between the primary and the demonstrative pronoun. This example is the continuation of example (61) on page 60:

(79) **Noun–Clause**

Syr. ܒܕ ܐܘܒܕܐ ܝܕܗܡ ܗܕܒܕד

d= šaqyā gw haw da= mhā-y = bwa l-Yhudā lnk= cupbearer =3.fs dem.ms lnk= struck-p.3ms =pst acc-J.

‘it was that of the cupbearer who had smitten Judas’ (Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871)

While structurally the pronoun may be analysed as a pronominal primary (see the analysis of Wertheimer 2001: 274), functionally Pat-El argues that it should be seen as a definite article, marking the attribute, and thus the entire AC, as definite.\(^{35}\) Indeed, such a demonstrative, acting as a definite article, can precede nominal primaries as well (see also examples of Pat-El 2010: 67):

(80) **Noun–Noun**

Syr. ܒܕ ܐܘܒܕܐ ܝܕܗܡ ܗܕܒܕד

rawmā haw da= šmayyā height dem.ms lnk= heaven ‘the height of heaven’ (Peshitta, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: A10; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 91 (7A))

This last example is parallel functionally to example (85) on page 67, which uses instead a proleptic pronoun to render the AC definite. This is discussed in the following

\(^{35}\)It is interesting to note the parallelism between this construction and the classical Semitic CSC, in which the definite article is attached to the secondary, as discussed in Section 2.3.3. See in this context also example (16) on page 46
section.

3.5 Double annexation construction (X-\textit{y.poss} LNK Y)

Another frequent AC used in Syriac is a variant of the ALC with a proleptic (i.e., cataphoric) possessive pronominal suffix attached to the primary, indexing the secondary. Following Goldenberg (2013a: 234, fn. 15) we shall term this construction the Double Annexation Construction (=DAC).

\begin{verbatim}
(81) Noun–Noun
Syr. 걱apsedゥ
regl-awhi da šliḥa
foot–PL.Poss.3MS LNK= apostle
‘the feet of the apostle’ (\textit{Acts of Thomas}, ed. Wright 1871: 234)

(82) Noun–Noun
Syr. 걱apsedゥ
mell-aw d= mārya
word–PL.Poss.3MS LNK= Lord
‘the words of the Lord’ (Muraoka 1997: 88, §112d)

(83) Noun–Noun
Syr. 걱apsedゥ
šm-āh d= attētā
name–Poss.3FS LNK= woman
‘the name of the woman’ (Goldenberg 2013a: 236)
\end{verbatim}

Goldenberg (2013a: 234) analyses this construction as “a complex construction made of a sequence of two correlated annexions N$^1$–PRON$^2$ – PRON$^1$–N$^2$, identical indices indicating coreferentiality”. Schematically, he represents the construction as if there were two appositions involved:

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{cc}
\hline
Head & Attribute \\
\hline
šm- & -āh \\
\uparrow & \uparrow \\
d- & attētā \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Goldenberg’s representation of the Double Annexation Construction}
\end{table}

\footnote{See footnote 42 on page 37 for further information on this term.}

\footnote{The apposition between the two attributes must be understood as an indirect apposition, or merely co-reference, since each attribute is governed by another head.}
The syntactic independence of the two phrases is demonstrated by cases where an intervening clitic appears:

(84) **Noun–Noun**  
Syr.  
’āh-aw da Yhudā  
brother–poss.3ms =1sg lnk= Judas  
‘I’m the brother of Judas’ (*Acts of Thomas*, ed. Wright 1871: 㺍)  

According to Muraoka (1997: 61f.) the DAC is used “when both nouns ... are logically determined”. Indeed, we find this construction as an alternative to the determination by means of a “correlative” demonstrative pronoun (contrast with example (80) on page 65):

(85) **Noun–Noun**  
Syr.  
rawm-āh da šmayyā  
height–poss.3fs lnk= heaven(fs)  
‘the height of heaven’ (*Peshitta*, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: B9; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 90 (7B))  

It is not exact, however, to claim that both constituent nouns are determined. Rather, it is the AC as a whole which is determined. Thus, we can find cases where the secondary is indefinite, albeit with a generic reading.

(86) **Noun–Noun**  
Syr.  
napš-ēh d= meskēnā  
soul–poss.3ms lnk= poor  

(87) **Noun–Noun**  
Syr.  
’bād-ēh d= naggārā  
work–poss.3ms lnk= carpenter  

The secondary may be expanded into a multi-word noun phrase or a possessed noun:

(88) **Noun–Noun Phrase**  
Syr.  

br-ēh  d= [alāhā ḥayyā]
son–poss.3ms lnk= God alive.ms
‘the son of the living God’ (Peshiṭṭa, Matthew 16:16; Muraoka 1997: 62, §73f)

(89) Noun–Possessed Noun
Syr. ܒܬܟ ܐܠܒܬܐ
da= qnom-āh  d= alāhut-āk
‘in the nature of Your Godhead’ (Acts of Thomas, ed. Wright 1871: 19)

The primary, on the other hand, cannot be a possessed noun, as the possessive suffix is a marker of the construction itself (contrast with example (42) on page 55). Whenever the primary is expanded to a multi-word NP, the possessive suffix is attached to the head noun itself, or if some head nouns are conjoined, to each of them (cf. Duval 1881: 340, §359b):

(90) Noun Phrase–Noun
Syr. ܚܝܠ ܝܕܝܪ ܡܪܒܒܐ ܕ ܐܠܗܐ
d= hayl-ēh  d= alāhā
‘the great power of God’ (Peshiṭṭa, Acts 8:10; Muraoka 1997: 89, §112j)

(91) Conjoined Nouns–Noun
Syr. ܪܙܒܢ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܪܒܒܐ
d= zn-aw  d= kyānā
time–poss.3pl and= manner–poss.3ms lnk= nature

The DAC can also be embedded in a larger AC. This is the case of example (86) on the preceding page, which is embedded in the following example. Note that the definite value of the DAC is propagated to the entire AC:

(92) Noun–Noun Phrase
Syr. ܡܪܒܒܐ ܐܠܗܐ ܡܪܒܒܐ
d= meskēnā
bitterness lnk= soul–poss.3ms lnk= poor
‘the bitterness of the soul of a poor man’ (Peshiṭṭa, Sirach 35:20 apud Van Peursen 2007: 207)

The secondary can itself be pronominal, leaning on the linker dil-:

(93) Noun–Pronoun
3.5. Double annexation construction (X-y. poss lnk Y)

Only in such cases can we find a possessive pronoun on the primary which is not of the 3rd person:

(94) **Noun–Pronoun**

Syr. הוד תמי

sepr-ēh  dil-ēh

book-poss.3MS lnk-poss.3MS

‘his book’ (Muraoka 1997: 71, §91f)

The DAC is found also with adverbial heads, serving to mark the secondary as definite (Mengozzi 2005a: 371). According to Pat-El (2013a: 324), it spread from nominal primaries to prepositional primaries due to the fact that most of the prepositions in Semitic languages are derived from nominal forms.

(95) **Preposition–Noun**

Syr. 工程技术

ʿamm-hēn  da= bnāt-ēh

with-poss.f.pl lnk= daughters-poss.3MS

‘together with his daughters’ (Muraoka 1997: 88, §111c)

(96) **Preposition–Noun**

Syr. ʿamm-ēh  d= malkā

with-poss.ms lnk= king

‘with the king’ (Mengozzi 2005a: 377)

In such cases, one may question whether the linker can be analysed as standing in apposition with the prepositional primary, as it does with nominal primaries. Mengozzi (2005a: 372), making a parallel between the cases of nominal primaries and prepositional primaries, suggests that the answer is positive:

The construction [with a prepositional primary] is a variant of the genitive phrase with proleptic pronoun [= DAC with nominal primary]. The determinative pronoun [= d-] functions in [the former case] as a “pro-preposition”, in that it resumes the head of the prepositional phrase, i.e. the preposition itself.

Cohen (2015: 118), on the other hand, writing on a similar construction occurring in the NENA J. Zakho dialect, suggests that such an analysis is implausible: “In this position, there is no motivation for the pronoun d- to occur, since there is no
sense in pronominally representing the preposition (as there is, e.g., between two nouns, where \(d\) perfectly represents the first noun)."

Indeed, Mengozzi’s position is somewhat contradictory: a pronoun cannot become a “pro-preposition” without losing its pronominal status. Thus, his analysis in fact implies that the \(d\)-morpheme in this position is no more pronominal, but rather serves as a pure linker connecting the preposition to its complement. An alternative solution reveals itself if we observe carefully the linguistic facts: In Syriac, a \(d+Noun\) combination never occurs directly after a bare preposition, but only after a preposition followed by a proleptic pronoun.\(^{38}\) Thus, it seems reasonable to postulate that the \(d\-) represents not the proposition but rather the referent introduced by the proleptic pronoun.\(^{38}\) Thus, it seems reasonable to postulate that the \(d\-) represents not the proposition but rather the referent introduced by the proleptic pronoun. As for the secondary, it could be analysed as a reduced equational relative clause, specifying the referent of these pronouns, somewhat similarly to example (48) on page 56.\(^{39}\) Thus, example (96) on the preceding page should be literally translated as ‘with him, who is the king’, but, of course, the heavy pragmatic markedness that is associated with such an English translation is not present in the Syriac original (except for the marking of the secondary as definite).\(^{40}\)

As the \(d\)- linker is co-referential both with the possessive suffix and the secondary, we get schematically a skewed picture of the grammatical relations in this construction, as compared to Table 3.2 on page 66:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Head Attr.</th>
<th>Head Attr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ʿamm- -ēh</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d-</td>
<td>⇐⇒ malkā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3: Relations within a DAC headed by a preposition

### 3.5.1 Variants of the DAC (X-{y.poss} LNK-y.poss LNK Y)

A variant of the DAC is a construction in which the possessive suffix is not attached to the primary noun, but rather to the linker \(dl\)-, yielding a quite elaborate structure:

\(^{38}\)This is also true of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (Bar-Asher Siegal 2013b: 95).

\(^{39}\)But note that in this example the secondary specifies the nominal primary, and not the possessive suffix.

\(^{40}\)This analysis is in some respects similar to the analysis of Bar-Asher Siegal (2013a) of \(d\)- followed by nouns (see footnote 15 on page 50), in that both assume that \(d+Noun\) can be interpreted as a clause. However, the type of clause involved, and the scope of this analysis (which is in our case quite limited) marks a clear difference between the two approaches.
(97)  Noun–Noun
Syr.  ﻟﺎم ﺱﺎمٌ ﻣﺷﺎم
mšamsānē dil-āh d= meltā
ministers LNK-POSS.3FS LNK= word(fs)
‘ministers of the word’ (*Peshiṭṭa*, Luke 1:2; Muraoka 1997: 88, §112h)

As the linker is syntactically independent it can precede, together with the secondary, the primary (compare with example (52) on page 57):

(98)  Noun–Noun Phrase
Syr.  ﻴاز ﻱاز ﻳاز ﻴاز
[dil-hon da= treʾsar šliḥē] šmāḥē
LNK-POSS.3M.PL LNK= twelve apostles names
‘the names of the twelve apostles’ (*Peshiṭṭa*, Matthew 10:2; Muraoka 1997: 88, §112h)

This construction can even appear without a primary (i.e., with a ∅ primary) in predicative position. This is the case in the following example, in which the inflected dil- linker is separated from the d- linker by an enclitic personal pronoun, which serves to mark the AC as being predicative:41

(99)  ∅–Noun
Syr.  ﻟﺎم ﺱﺎم ﺱﺎم ﻣﺷﺎم
(w= qālā hānā d= ḥadutā) ∅ dil-āh ∅u d= meštutā
and= sound DEM.MS LNK= joy ∅ LNK-POSS.3FS ∅MS LNK= feast(fs)
‘and this sound of rejoicing is that of the wedding-feast’ (*Acts of Thomas*, ed. Wright 1871: 63)

A highly elaborate variant of this construction occurs when the possessive suffix is attached both to the primary noun and to a linker. If not for its rareness, we might term this a triple annexation construction:

(100)  Noun–Noun
Syr.  ﻣﺷﺎم ﺱﺎم ﻣﺷﺎم ﻣﺷﺎم
mhaymanay-āh dil-āh d= Estēr
eunuchs-POSS.3FS LNK-POSS.3FS LNK= E.
‘the eunuchs of Esther’ (*Peshiṭṭa*, Esther 4:4; Williams 2001: 8)

At the other extreme, a variant of the DAC in which the linker is completely lacking does not exist in Syriac as such, although it is attested in the contemporary Galilean Aramaic, a Western Classical Aramaic language (Hopkins 1997: 25). Only

the word ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ kul ‘all’, which could be analysed as standing in attributive relation to its complement, shows this syntax regularly: 42

(101) **All–Noun**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syr.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ Máy</td>
<td>b= kul-hin beryāt-āk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in= all-POS.3F.PL creature.F.PL-POS.2MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘in all Your creatures’ (<em>Acts of Thomas</em>, ed. Wright 1871: ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6 *The dative linker construction (X-{y.poss} DAT Y)*

As an alternative to the usage of the *d*- pronominal linker, we find cases where the dative/allative preposition ﬀ l- ‘to’ (glossed here DAT) is used (Duval 1881: §362). 43

(102) **Noun–Noun Phrase**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syr.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ</td>
<td>b= nešē l= [malkā d= hunāye]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in= women DAT= king LNK= Huns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘amongst the women of the king of Huns’ (<em>Chronique de Josué le Stylite</em> ed. Martin 1876: 18, 1; Duval 1881: 342, §362)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Such cases are, however, quite rare, and often it is difficult to say whether the preposition is a pure marker of the AC, or rather contributes some semantic content. 44

The above construction can be seen as a parallel of the ALC, but with a dative linker instead of a pronominal one. Similarly, a rare alternative to the DAC exists as well: In this construction the secondary is indexed by a possessive pronoun on the primary, followed by the preposition l-.

---

42 It is interesting to note that this peculiar syntax of the word kul is conserved in many NENA dialects. A survey of different Syriac constructions involving kul can be found in Williams (2001: ch. 3).

43 As for the usage of prepositional linkers, Williams (2001: 8) lists also the “the partitive construction with ﬀ [=men ‘from’]” as a “genitive construction”. In this case, however, the preposition contributes semantically to the partitive reading, and should therefore be analysed as a contentful head of a PP, rather than an AC marker. See Joosten (1996: 56) for more examples of the partitive construction.

44 Thus, in the second example cited by Duval (1881: 342, §362), ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ qubšā l-reglayk ‘a footstool for your feet’ (*Peshitta*, Acts 2:35), the l- seems to fulfil its ordinary function as a contentful preposition rather than a marker of an AC. This phrase, moreover, is a literal translation of the Biblical Hebrew ﬀ ﬀ ﬀ hădom lə-reglɛ̄kā (Psalms 110:1). One may speculate that such BHeb. constructions may indeed be the source for the Syriac construction. The BHeb. construction is said to be used especially when a definite secondary follows an indefinite primary (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 157; Jenni 2003: 63). Given the rarity of the Syriac construction, it is difficult to tell whether this is true in Syriac as well. As for the colloquial Arabic usage of a similar construction, see below.
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(103) **Noun–Noun**

Syr. ʃm-āh l= emm-ch
name-poss.3FS dat= mother-poss.3MS
‘the name of his mother’ (Matthew 13:55, Curetonian (ed. Burkitt 1904) and Sinaitic (ed. A. S. Lewis 1910) manuscripts apud Joosten 1996: 56)

(104) **Noun–Noun**

Syr. ēmm-āh l= kaltā
mother-poss.3FS dat= bride

This construction is discussed in length by Hopkins (1997), who credits Gold-enberg (1979: 324) for being the first to note it, as only three examples of it are attested in the standard version of the *Peshitta* (Ruth 1:2; 2:19; Luke 1:27). In all of these cases, as in example (103) on this page, the primary is the noun ʃmā ‘name’.

The prepositional linker l- differs from the pronominal linker d-, in that it does not represent a noun. In this sense, it is a truly a pure marker of the AC. In this respect we may cite Polotsky (1961: 254), who writes regarding a similar construction in Ge’ez:

The complement introduced by la- therefore lacks the ability, which an apposition ought to possess, of leading a separate syntactic existence; and this accounts for the fact the analytical construction really makes the impression of a unified whole, rather than of two separable elements in apposition.

Hopkins (1997: 30ff.) suggests that the origin of this construction belongs to a colloquial register of Aramaic, and for this reason it is nearly absent from literary sources. He attributes the existence of a similar construction in the vernacular Eastern Arabic dialects to an Aramaic substratum. He shows, moreover, that this construction gave rise to the “normal possessive construction” of Western Neo-Aramaic, in which the l- preposition has been encliticized to the head, yielding an -il suffix

---

45 Erwin (2004: 380) notes that in Iraqi Arabic this construction (with the possessive suffix) has always a definite secondary. See for instance the following example:

(i) **Noun–Noun**

Iraq. sadiq-a l- ‘ali
friend-poss.3MS dat= A.
‘Ali’s friend’ (Erwin 2004: 380)
functioning as a construct state marker (see example (23) on page 282), parallel to the NENA -əd suffix (see Section 4.3).

### 3.7 Adjectival attribution by apposition (X Y.AGR)

Goldenberg (1995: 8) qualifies adjectives as follows:

> If we admit that adjectives have to do both with the carrier of the quality etc. and with the attributed quality itself, then the form “adjective” is recognized as an attributive complex with pronominal reference and attribute as distinguishable components, the former represented by the inflectional markers and the latter given in the lexeme involved. The implied attributive relation marks the adjective as the morphological exponent of that relation, and consequently as the morphological correlate of the genitive complex.

Goldenberg’s “pronominal reference” is our pronominal linker, while his “attribute” is our secondary. Thus, in our terminology, he equates an adjective to a link + Secondary phrase. Indeed, just as the linker stands in apposition with the primary to be qualified, the adjective stands in apposition with the noun it qualifies, giving raise effectively to a juxtaposition-cum-agreement construction. Nonetheless, for simplicity we shall refer to the adjective as being simply a secondary.\textsuperscript{46}

The equivalence between the adjective and the linker phrase is especially clear in the case of ordinal secondaries. These can be realised using the linker construction (see Section 3.4.5 and especially example (75) on page 64), or by adjectival derivation of the ordinal:

\begin{equation}
\text{Noun–Ordinal}
\end{equation}

\begin{tabular}{l}
Syr. & \\
yawmā trayānā & \text{day} (ms) second. ms \\
\end{tabular}

‘the second day’ (Nöldeke 1898: 178, §239)

\textsuperscript{46}While Goldenberg’s conception of the adjective is appealing in its structural elegance, it does not provide us with any operational criterion to distinguish between adjectives and inflecting nouns (e.g. those which designate animate beings). The key difficulty lies in the fact that there are no clear criteria to demarcate words which designate a “carrier of quality” (=adjectives) from those which designate directly a “substance” or “entity” (=nouns). For example, if the Hebrew adjective šāb ‘aged man’ can be analysed as ʾiš śebā ‘a man of old age’ (Goldenberg 1995: 9), shouldn’t also the noun yeled ‘child’ be analysable in principle along similar lines? The apparent difference between the two lies not in their structure but rather in their distribution, as yeled is rarely used as a modifier of another noun.
The equivalence is schematized in Table 3.4, to be contrasted with Table 3.1 on page 52 (cf. Goldenberg 2013a: 236).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apposition</th>
<th>Head</th>
<th>Attr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yawmā</td>
<td>da-</td>
<td>trēn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yawmā</td>
<td></td>
<td>tarayānā</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4: Adjectival attribution according to Goldenberg, contrasted with our terminology

Notwithstanding the constitutional equivalence between adjectives and the linker phrase, in Syriac, as in other Semitic languages, there is a morphological difference between the two: While the $d$- linker is an uninflecting particle, the “pronominal reference” within the adjective is made overt by the very inflecting character of the adjective, which agrees with its primary in gender, number and determination.47

(106) **Noun–Adjective**

Syr.  
$malk-ā$ $ṭāb-ā$ / $malk-ātā$ $ṭāb-ātā$


‘a good king / good queens’ (Muraoka 1997: 72, §9.1)

On the other hand, adjectives and linker phrases show many similar syntactic properties: Just as the linker phrase can stand alone without any explicit primary, so too can an adjective be used independently without any antecedent, as in the following example (the adjectives are marked as **bold**):

(107) **∅–Adjective**

Syr.  
$haw$ $d= madnāh$ $šemš-ēh$ 'al $ṭāb-ē$ $w= DEM.MS$ $LNK= ris.CAUS.PTCP.MS$ $sun–POSS.3MS$ $on$ $good–M.PL.EMPH$ and=

' al $biš-ē$

on bad.M.PL.EMPH

‘He who makes his sun rise above the good ones and the evil ones’ (*Peshiṭta*, Matthew 5:45; Muraoka 1997: 76, §96d)

47In Syriac, the agreement in determination is apparent by the agreement in state (absolute or emphatic). This is also true in principal in JBA, although some examples seem to indicate that attributive adjectives are always in emphatic state, irrespective of the state of the primary (Bar–Asher Siegal 2013b: 64).
Similarly, the adjective can sometimes precede its primary, just as the linker can (see example (98) on page 71):

\[(108) \quad \text{Noun–Adjective}
\]
\[\text{Syr.} \quad \text{ القادمَة} \quad \text{السُّتَّة}
\]
\[\text{qadmāytā šetestā}
\]
\[\text{first.}_\text{fs} \quad \text{foundation}_\text{fs}
\]
\[\text{‘the first foundation’ (Muraoka 1997: 69, §91a)}
\]

Finally, just as we find cases of the ALC with a demonstrative preceding the linker phrase rendering it definite (see Section 3.4.6), Pat-El (2010: 66f.) notes that this happens also with adjectival secondaries.

\[(109) \quad \text{Noun–Conjoined adjectives}
\]
\[\text{Syr.} \quad \text{ل}= \quad \text{صِبْيَانَة}= \quad \text{الحَر}
\]
\[\text{l= šebýanā =gér haw} \quad \text{[rabbā w= qaddišā]}
\]
\[\text{to= will}_\text{ms} = \text{indeed}_\text{dem.ms} \quad \text{big}_\text{ms} = \text{ms} \text{and}= \text{holy}_\text{ms}
\]
\[\text{‘to that great and holy will’ (Bardaisan, Book of the Laws of the Countries}
\]
\]

In spite of all these similarities, it is worth noting that the adjective itself can appear as part of a linker phrase, i.e. as the secondary of the ALC. The conditions governing this usage are briefly discussed in the next section.

### 3.7.1 Juxtaposition vs. the ALC with adjectival secondaries

The usage of the juxtaposition-cum-agreement construction (in either order), as well as the independent usage of adjectives, should be regarded as the default AC for adjectival secondaries. But, as we saw in Section 3.4.3, adjectives can also appear as secondaries of the ALC, with or without overt primaries. For example, Van Peursen (2007: 211) states that \(\text{حكَم} \text{ā} \quad \text{‘wise.EMPH’ alternates freely with}
\]
\[\text{حكَم} \text{d=bakkim ‘wise.ABS’}, both corresponding to Hebrew חכם \text{ḥakam ‘a wise}
\]
\[\text{person’}.
\]

Moreover, Van Peursen (2007: 212) notes that it is difficult to establish a “functional difference” between the two constructions, but rather the linker construction is more frequent in certain contexts. In our interpretation, these contexts are (a) the occurrence of a (multi-word) AdjP as secondary or (b) the occurrence of a pronominal primary, \(\emptyset\) included.\(^{48}\)

The usage of the linker construction in cases like (a) may be motivated by the desire to delineate the phrasal nature of the secondary, and thus avoid any ambiguity as for the scope of modifiers of the adjective. The motivation for (b) may lie in the

\(^{48}\)If no explicitly primary appears, the linker fully assumes its pronominal role.
desire to clearly express the pronominal head extant in the adjective. This is achieved by attaching to the adjective an explicit pronominal head, namely the linker.49

3.8 Conclusions

In this chapter we have surveyed the various ACs of Syriac. As is well known, three main constructions are used: the construct state construction, the analytic linker construction and the double annexation construction. The former is the least productive of the three, being used mostly with fixed expressions or specific primaries, while the latter two are used more frequently. The alternation between these two seems to be chiefly related to questions of determination. The latter two constitute the source for the Neo-CSC present in NENA dialects, as is discussed in Section 10.3.1.

Some marginal ACs of Syriac are variants of the DAC as well as the dative linker construction. The latter may be the source of Neo-CSC in WNA.

Beyond these constructions we find the juxtaposition-cum-agreement construction used with attributive adjectives, a construction which is extant in all strata of Aramaic.

---

49 We may tentatively analyse an adjective appearing in absolute state as expressing the adjectival lexeme alone without a pronominal head, in contrast to the emphatic state of the adjective, which is “the formal expression of its structure as a nomen adjectivum, which includes an inherent pronominal reference to the qualified substantival entity” (Goldenberg 1991: 718). If this is true, the linker is effectively an extraction of the pronominal head from the adjective.
Chapter 4

The D-markers in NENA Dialects

In all the NENA dialects we find AC markers which are cognate with the Syriac linker \( d(a) \)- (discussed in Section 3.4), which must have existed also in the NENA precursors of the Classical Aramaic period. These are easily identifiable by virtue of containing a segment /\( d \)/ or /\( t \)/, accompanied optionally by a schwa before or after it. The probable unified historical origin of these markers has led many scholars to analyse them synchronically as variants of one and the same particle, termed in general “the annexation/genitive particle \( d \)”. For example, Jastrow (1988: 25) writes in his description of Her.: “Die Annexion eines Nomens an ein vorangehendes Leitwort (Genetivverbindung) erfolgt durch die Genetivpartikel \( d \), die zwischen die beiden Nomina tritt.” This particle is assumed to have different allomorphs, varying both regarding its voice feature (/\( d \)/ vs. /\( t \)/), and – more importantly – regarding its attachment as an enclitic to the primary or as a proclitic to the secondary.\(^1\) This is most clearly stated by Fassberg (2010: 44): “The Cl[assical] Aram[aic] relative pronoun \( \gamma /\gamma \) [=\( di-/d- \)] has allomorphs in J[ewish] Challa: \(-\delta d, -d, d-, \'\delta d-\).” Other scholars use in general the same practice, including Khan in his detailed descriptions of various NENA dialects.

While we agree that these elements must all be ultimately derived from a common ancestor morpheme \( d- \) (see the diachronic treatment in Chapter 10), one of the claims advanced in this study is that these forms, which we may subsume under the name D-markers, represent in fact different morphemes, differing in their morpho-syntactic distribution and, to a finer degree, in their pragmatic implication. More precisely, we distinguish between 1) a head-marking (phrasal) suffix \(-\delta d\), equivalent functionally to construct state marking, 2) a dependent-marking pronominal proclitic \( d-\), and 3) a dependent-marking genitive (phrasal) prefix \( d-\). In this we follow Cohen (2010; 2012) in his description of JZax., although his terminology is somewhat different. In

\(^1\)The phonological attachment is not always clearly stated in the descriptions, as sometimes we find the \( d \) written as a separate word standing between the two. This is the usual practice in Jastrow’s description cited above.
our view, the separate existence of these morphemes can be observed in most NENA dialects, albeit with differing levels of clarity.

As distinct morphemes, we expect their semantic-pragmatic (their signifié or “meaning” in a broad sense) to differ as well. This is indeed the case, but as this difference is very fine, we shall not use it as a decisive criteria. Instead, we shall establish their separate linguistic existence relying chiefly on their distributional properties. Accordingly, as written above, two shall be characterized as affixes and one as a clitic.

We are aware, of course, that these terms are hotly debated in recent linguistic literature, and their relevance to typology, or linguistics in general, has been cast in doubt (cf. most recently Haspelmath 2015). Therefore, in the first section of this chapter, we shall discuss our understanding of these terms, and why they should be relevant for our study. In the second section we shall present the usage of these terms in a similar and highly relevant linguistic debate, namely the analysis of a Persian AC marker, the so-called Ezafe. This debate is interesting not only due to the similar analytical and methodological problems posed by this marker, but also due to the similar properties shared by the Ezafe and the NENA AC markers, bearing in mind the contact situation between the Iranian languages using the Ezafe (chiefly Kurdish and Persian) and NENA dialects. Finally, in the last two sections we shall use the concepts discussed in the former sections to affirm the distinction between the three above-mentioned NENA morphemes.

The claims put forward in this chapter bear a general character, claiming validity for all NENA dialects. Yet, as these dialects are quite different (some could be considered to be different languages), it is clear that not all the details of our claims would be true for each and every dialect. Some dialects, moreover, are not well enough documented at this stage in order to test our claims. To overcome this methodological difficulty, we establish our claims with examples of Barw., possibly the best documented dialect so far (Khan 2008c), with sporadic examples from other dialects. Given that Cohen (2010) has put forward a similar analysis for JZax., we hope in this way to show that the three morphemes are differentiable at least in principle across NENA, opening the way for further research on this question. Moreover, as we posit a clitic-affix continuum, we have a certain methodological leeway: The three morphemes may be diverging to different degrees in each dialect, yet still show the same general pattern. While in this chapter we take a bird’s-eye view perspective, recall that in the subsequent chapters four dialects (JZax., Qar., JSan. and JUrm.) are examined in further detail.
4.1 Clitics, affixes, and phrasal affixes

In this study, we shall use the notions clitics and affixes to designate different types of bound morphemes, i.e., morphemes which cannot stand by themselves, but have to attach to other morphemes in order to form a self-standing phonological word, i.e., a stress-unit.  

While these terms are commonplace in current linguistic analysis, they are not always used alike by different linguists, and thus we find it necessary to clarify our understanding of these terms in the context of this study.

In current linguistic thinking, the most common distinction between the two types is related to their syntactic status: While affixes are considered to be building blocks of words, clitics have the syntactic and distributional properties of full-fledged words, but happen to be phonologically deficient in that they are typically devoid of stress. Thus, in a recent characterisation of clitics the framework of Canonical Typology, Spencer and Luis (2013: 140) write: “the canonical clitic is an element which has the form of a canonical affix [i.e. it is phonologically bound] and the distribution of a canonical function word”.

Indeed, the distinction between affixes and clitics lies to a large extent on a modular view of language, differentiating two sub-systems: One, morphology, has to do with the “make-up” of words, while the second, syntax, has to do with arrangement of words in discourse. In the last century, this distinction has received various formalisations (and at times denied altogether), but the core insight justifying this distinction remained the same: While words can combine together to form sentences in a seemingly limitless fashion, the building blocks of words combine in a much more limited and regular fashion. In this view, affixes fall under the domain of morphology while clitics are treated syntactically. Thus, the bond between a host and an affix is stronger than the one holding with a clitic. A corollary of this is that clitics can attach phonologically to a certain word while forming a syntactic constituent with another word (cf. Klavans 1985).

Yet the keystone of this partition, the notion of word, or more precisely the morpho-syntactic word, has remained an elusive concept and defied any attempt to define it cross-linguistically. This has recently led Haspelmath (2011) to reject the validity of this notion and subsequently the dichotomy between morphology and syntax (see more references there). In a follow-up article, Haspelmath (2015) claims that

---

2In the scope of this research, dealing exclusively with stress-accent languages, we equate the notion of phonological word with the notion of stress unit: a sequence of morphemes carrying exactly one stress-accent. Cf. Garbell (1965b: 39): “A minimal free form constituting a stress unit is a word.”

3Needless to say, we shall use the terms suffixes and enclitics to denote those bound morphemes which attach backwards, and prefixes respectively proclitics to denote those which attach forwards.

4This notion can be formalised as a transition probability: The probability of an affix following a host should be higher than the probability of a clitic following its host. For the sake of this study we leave this notion at an intuitive level.
the notion of clitic cannot be defined consistently cross-linguistically, and therefore he suggests to dispense with it altogether.

While Haspelmath's argumentation is compelling, his suggestion to abolish this terminology is not helpful. He suggests to replace these terms with the terms “plenimorph” and “minimorph”. Not only would this add to the terminological inflation in linguistics, but these terms do not address the issue at hand: “Plenimorphs” are simply lexical bases, while “minimorphs” are functional morphemes, covering both affixes and clitics. Indeed, it may be that the notion of clitic is not useful in a large scale typological survey where clearly defined comparative concepts are needed. However, in a smaller study, covering typologically or genealogically related languages, these notions can be proven useful, as they permit to discern between different levels of attachment of morphemes to their hosts, on the one hand, and distinguish distributional classes on the other hand. Moreover, in the field of language change and grammaticalisation, it is a well known fact that independent morphemes can become more and more bound to their hosts, finally becoming grammatical affixes. As this is a gradual process, it is convenient to use the label “clitic” to designate intermediate stages of such processes.\(^5\)

Thus, our suggestion is to understand the notions of \textit{affix} and \textit{clitic} not as absolute terms, but rather as relative terms, which can be fully appreciated only in the context of a study of a specific language, or a group of related languages. Hence, we can use different criteria proposed in the literature, such as those famously proposed by Zwicky and Pullum (1983), to gauge the proximity of a morpheme to its host, and not as categorical distinctions. Needless to say, “morphology” and “syntax” are not considered in such a view as distinct modules of language, but rather as “end points” on a continuum which permit us to classify different types of linguistic signs.\(^6\)

Of special importance for us is the \textit{selectivity criterion} proposed by Zwicky and Pullum (1983). Since inflection is normally associated with a specific word-class (nominal inflection, verbal inflection, etc.), morphemes which attach only to a specific word-class are typically \textit{affixes}, especially if they stand in grammatical opposition with other such morphemes, encoding different values of a specific grammatical feature associated with the stem. From a cognitive point of view, this probably means that these morphemes are associated mentally with this word-class. From a language change perspective, if they originated in free forms, we can say their usage has been maximally restricted to a sub-part of the lexicon, reaching the endpoint of a grammaticalisation process. Bound morphemes which have a freer distribution, on the other hand, are typically \textit{clitics}, as they conserve better the distributional freedom.

---

\(^5\) A neat analysis of such a process, showing that the same source morpheme may be grammaticalised differently as a clitic and as an affix, is given by Lahiri (2003) treating the TAM system of Bengali.

\(^6\) In this respect, our approach is similar to that of Canonical Typology, which defines grammatical notions in terms of “ideals” with possible deviations; see Brown and Chumakina (2013).
4.2 The Persian Ezafe: clitic or phrasal affix?

In several Iranian languages, ACs are marked by a morpheme known as Ezafe (the Persian adaptation of the Arabic term إضافة 'annexation'), which is typically attached phonologically to the primary. A detailed description of the usage patterns of the Ezafe in Kurdish dialects is given in Chapter 9. Here, we shall consider the case of the Persian Ezafe, and briefly survey the controversy accompanying its grammatical analysis. A more detailed discussion can be found in Haig (2011: §3.1), as well as in the papers cited below.
In Persian, the Ezafe is a -(y)e morpheme attaching to the primary of an AC, whether the primary is phrasal or not, as in the following illustrative example of Samvelian (2007a):

(1)  
Noun Phrase–Noun
Per. این کتاب کهنی پی ارزش مریم
in [ketâb-e kohne]-ye bi arzeš]-e maryam
DEM book-EZ ancient-EZ without value-EZ M.
‘This ancient worthless book of Maryam.’ (Samvelian 2007a: 606)

Analyses of the Ezafe provide two competing accounts of the syntactic status of the Ezafe. The basic question is whether the Ezafe forms a morpho-syntactic constituent with the primary (to which it attaches phonologically) or with the secondary. In the latter case, it must be a clitic, since there is a mismatch between its phonological attachment and syntactical attachment, while in the former case it could be seen as an inflectional affix, encoding construct state. The earliest formulation of this debate, which I am aware of, is given by Fairbanks (1979: 41), who treats the Ezafe as a preposition associated syntactically with the secondary, but gives the following remark in an endnote:

In conversation with Charles A. Ferguson he has pointed out to me that the isafe may be considered an inflection of the preceding noun, an inflection that would mark the noun as one that is determined. This is another indication of the tenuousness of the distinction between inflections and prepositions or postpositions. I would prefer to consider the immediate constituents of kitab e buzurg [book ez big] ‘the big book’ as kitab / e buzurg, although e is enclitic to kitab. This is the equivalent to considering I’ll go to have the immediate constituents I / ll go although ll is enclitic to I. (Fairbanks 1979: 43, note 1)

We note that these two competing analyses may affect our understanding of the Ezafe as head-marking or dependent-marking (see Section 2.2.1), if these concepts are understood as indicating syntactic association. Indeed, some authors associate the Ezafe with the notion of case, which is typically understood as a dependent-marking device. Samiian (1994), working within X-bar theory, sees the Ezafe as a “dummy case assigner”, while Larson and Yamakido (2006) treat it as a genitive case-marker. In both accounts, the Ezafe is syntactically associated with the secondary. A similar position, in the framework of LFG, is advocated by Bögel and Butt (2013) and Bögel, Butt, and Sulger (2008), who analyse the Urdu Ezafe (which is borrowed from Per-

---

7Larson and Yamakido (2006) discuss mostly data from Kurdish Zazaki, but they apply their analysis to Persian as well.
The Persian Ezafe: clitic or phrasal affix?

It is not our intention to discuss these proposals in detail, but they raise an interesting methodological question: Given that the Ezafe in Persian is always phonologically attached to the primary, why do these authors prefer to analyze it as a clitic syntactically attached to the secondary, thus implying a phonology-syntax mismatch?

One answer is that the Ezafe is marked not on the head of the phrase it modifies, but rather phrase-finally. For example, in case of a conjoined phrase acting as a primary, the Ezafe appears only once phrase-finally:

(2) Cojoined NPs–Noun

Per. كلاه سفید و لباس زرد مریم
[kolâh-e seifd va [lebâs-e zard]-e maryam
hat–ez white and dress–ez yellow–ez M.

‘Maryam’s white hat and yellow dress’ (Samvelian 2007a: 630)

Yet, as Samvelian (2007a: 624) notes, wide scope over coordination does not necessarily entail clitic status. Indeed, the unique marking of conjoined nouns by one affix is a phenomenon known in the literature by the name of “suspended affixation”, coined by G. L. Lewis (1967) in the context of Turkish (for more recent studies, see Kabak 2007 or Broadwell 2008). The similar phenomenon where a suffix belonging to a head is marked phrase-finally on a complement is known in the literature under the name “Suffixhäufung” (Plank 1995: 50).

Another, meta-linguistic, reason may lie in the fact the “architecture” of formal grammars have been geared toward the syntax of major European languages, which are mostly dependent-marking. Therefore, they do not provide easy provisions for head-marking morphemes. Thus Haig (2011) comments: “all the proposals [...] are faced with the same dilemma: how to fit the Ezafe particle into a theoretical framework which provides no category that readily accommodates it.”

If, on the other hand, we acknowledge the category of construct state in our

---

8To be exact, they allow for two possible analyses: X [ez Y] or [X ez Y] but they rule out the structure [X ez] Y.
9We note that in Kurmanji Kurdish such an analysis may be more plausible, as an independent Ezafe can appear without an overt primary, thus forming a constituent with the secondary. The situation in Kurdish is discussed in more detail in Chapter 9.
10The difficulty to admit an analysis in which the Ezafe is head-marking is explicitly stated by Bögel and Butt (2013: 317): “This is problematic because the head is difficult to access for agreement purposes and it is also difficult to state a constraint that just when the XP+ezafe is initial, the XP is restricted to be nominal (or a PP). The licensing of the modifying XP also becomes a matter of stating a long distance dependency between the ezafe and the modifying constituent that must be propagated up and down through various levels of the tree.” We note that these are technical difficulties related to the grammatical framework, rather than conceptual difficulties.
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4.3 The *d*- proclitic vs. the *-əd* suffix

Cohen (2010) is the first to clearly state the different syntactic status of the *d*- proclitic and the *-əd* suffix. Cohen’s analysis relies on the assumption that the proclitic *d*- retains the pronominal function of the Syriac pronominal linker *d*-, in that it can head an NP.\(^{13}\) This possibility is clearly illustrated in the following poetic Qar. example (=example (84) on page 153):\(^{14}\)

\[
(3) \quad d_{\text{LNK}} \quad \text{Noun}
\]

Qar. kə-mzámi də = ʾurxàṭa.  
IND-<sing,3PL>LNK= roads  
(The people) of the roads sing.’ (Khan 2002a: 279 [Poetry 29])

\(11\) See also Thackston (2006a: 11–17) who treats the Kurmanji Ezafe as “Construct Case”. The term “construct” is appropriate, but not so the term “case”, which should be reserved for dependent-marking morphology.

\(13\) The pronominal enclitics can also occur after finite verbs to designate their complements, but in this position they exhibit different paradigmatic oppositions, and should arguably be treated differently. This is somewhat reminiscent of the situation in Semitic languages, where the pronominal suffixes can appear as complements both after verbs and nouns.

\(14\) Recall that unlike most pronouns which replace an entire NP, the pronominal linker heads a complex NP. This is due to the fact that it replaces a construct state noun, which must be followed by a complement. See also Section 2.3.4.

\(15\) In JZax. the regular form of the linker is in fact *did*. The form *d*- is almost exclusively restricted to clausal secondaries, except in the context of possessive pronominal suffixes, where the two forms are allomorphs. See Section 5.3.
In Barw. we find $d$- headed NPs in predicative position:\(^{15}\)

(4) **$d_{lnk}$—Determined Noun**

Barw. lɛ́wət $d=$ áwwa 'āθṛa

NEG.COP-2MS LNK= DEM.PROX.MS country

‘You are not one of this country.’ (Khan 2008c: 112 [A25:82])

Cohen argues that if the -$əd$ form is equivalent to the $d$- proclitic, it must also be a pronominal linker (a “pronominal nucleus” in his terminology), representing pronominally the primary to which it is attached. He notes, however, that the suffixed form -$əd$ attaches not only to nominal primaries but also to prepositional primaries, as in the examples below. Since a preposition is not a noun, it cannot be said to be represented pronominally by a pronominal element, and thus we must conclude that the -$əd$ form is not a pronominal element, but rather a pure primary marker (“nucleus marker” in his terminology), different from the pronominal proclitic $d$-.$^{16}$

(5) **Preposition—Noun**

JZax. ’əmm-$əd$ gōra with-cst man

‘with the man’ (Cohen 2010: 82)

(6) **Preposition—Noun**

Barw. qám-$ət$ gə̀ppa before-cst cave

‘before the cave’ (Khan 2008c: 442 [A8:28])

Cohen’s argument is convincing but it may be undermined by inverting it, claiming that a possible conclusion is rather that the $d$- proclitic is a pure relational marker rather than a pronominal one (explaining away the cases where it heads an NP as a kind of primary ellipsis). Alternatively, one may claim that the -$əd$ attaching to some prepositions is a lexicalised element, which should be kept apart from the -$əd$ suffix following a nominal primary. Instead of trying to refute such attacks, I shall substantiate Cohen’s claim on different grounds, showing that the distribution of the $d$- morph is different from the -$əd$ morph. In essence, we shall argue that while the $d$- morph is indeed a proclitic, the -$əd$ morph is better seen as a nominal suffix, since it stands in paradigmatic opposition to other nominal suffixes. In this claim, we reproduce the line of argumentation of Samvelian (2007a; 2008), who argues that the Persian and Kurmanji Ezaf morphemes should be analysed as inflectional affixes.

---

\(^{15}\)This example is complicated by the fact that we would expect a genitive marking of the demonstrative pronoun as well. See footnote 41 on page 98 for a possible solution.

\(^{16}\)See also the discussion following the Syriac examples (95)–(96) on page 69.
It is important to stress that -əd and d- cannot be considered allomorphs: Their presence is normally not conditioned by any grammatical or phonological factors, but is rather a deliberate choice of the speaker (reflecting some stylistic or pragmatic choice; see below Section 4.3.7). For example, given the Barw. primary kθawa 'book' and secondary qaša 'priest', both kθaw-ət qaša and kθawa t-qaša are grammatical expressions meaning 'the book of the priest' (Khan 2008c: 488). On the other hand, the two morphs cannot be considered as free variants either (disregarding for the sake of argument the fine difference in function), as in some grammatical environments, detailed below, their distribution is different.

Let us first consider the forms attaching to the secondary, namely d- and its variant forms də- ʾəd- t-. These elements are phonologically bound forms, as they normally lack stress, forming instead a stress-unit together with the first word of the secondary. In doing so, they show very low selectivity of their host (if any at all), and can attach to nouns, adjectives, verbs (being part of an attributive clause), the negator la and various adverbs. In this respect, it seems reasonable to treat them as proclitics.

Similarly, these elements show no sensitivity whatsoever to the morpho-syntactic structure of the primary, as long as it is nominal in nature (i.e. it has a nominal head). They can, moreover, be separated from the primary by intervening material, and stand in a separate intonation group. This is expected under the analysis of d- as a pronominal head, separate from its antecedent (the primary), and forming an NP together with the secondary. Given that a syntactic head is typically conceived of as a syntactic word (i.e., not an inflectional element) this fact too establishes it as a proclitic.

What about the form -əd? At first sight, in accordance with the quotes given at the beginning of the chapter, we may consider -əd to be an enclitic version of the same morpheme. Evidence for this includes the fact that -əd can appear phrase-finally, having wide scope over the entire phrase, such as in the following examples:

(7) **Noun Phrase–Noun**
Barw. [ʾo ɓθ- ə t yə̀mm-i.
  def.mS== house-freE.Sg small-cst mother-poss.1sg
‘the small house of my mother’ (Khan 2009a: 76)
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(8) Noun Phrase–Noun
JZax. [gōra qamāy]-ət [d-anya baxt-āsa]
man first.ms-cst gen-dem.pl woman-pl
‘The first husband of these women’ (Cohen 2012: 101 (49))

A closer look, however, reveals some differences that distinguish it from the *d*-proclitic, rendering it rather a phrasal suffix. Following Samvelian (2007a) we can apply different criteria of Zwicky and Pullum (1983) to show that the -əd morph is rather inflectional in nature, while the *d*-morph is (as anticipated) a clitic.

4.3.1 Selectivity with respect to the host

As stated above, the *d*-proclitic is not selective at all. The -əd morph, on the other hand, is rather selective: With the exception of some lexically determined adverbials (mostly prepositions but also some conjunctions), it can only occur directly after nominals (nouns, pronouns and adjectives). Indeed, NP-finally, it can only attach to nominals.20

4.3.2 Arbitrary gaps

The *d*-proclitic does not show any arbitrary gaps in its distribution. The -əd morph, on the other hand, shows idiosyncratic gaps in its attachment to prepositions. While some prepositions require the -əd suffix before full nominal complements, other prepositions cannot occur with it. Yet another class of prepositions can optionally with the -əd suffix. Before pronominal complements, realized as possessive suffixes, the -əd suffix is typically absent.

The exact distribution of the -əd suffix with different prepositions is different from dialect to dialect. As an example, the distribution of -əd with Barw. prepositions is given in Table 4.2 on the next page (Khan 2008c: 432–445).21 We note that the forms that do not take an -əd suffix generally lack stress, and pro-cliticize to their complement, while those that take the -əd suffix are phonologically independent.

4.3.3 Morpho-phonological idiosyncrasies

The *d*-proclitic does not show any major morpho-phonological idiosyncrasies, although it presents variant forms which may be motivated phonologically. The same

---

20 Note that in principle an NP containing a relative clause may end in a verb or an adverb, but the -əd morph does not attach to such NPs.

21 We disregard cases of */d/ segments appearing before demonstrative pronouns following prepositions, as this is considered to be the genitive *d*-discussed in Section 4.4.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No suffix</th>
<th>Optional</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ax- ‘like’</td>
<td>bahs-/báhsət ‘about’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b- ‘in, at’</td>
<td>bar-/báθər/báθrət ‘about’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bēn-/bēl- ‘between’</td>
<td>qam-/qámət ‘before’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gu- ‘in’</td>
<td>xo-/xOt ‘under’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bal- ‘until’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kos- ‘by’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l- ‘to’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mən-/m- ‘from’</td>
<td>barqúlət/barqúlət ‘opposite’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qa- ‘for’</td>
<td>č̭ənnək̭ɛ́rət ‘around’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reš- ‘upon’</td>
<td>qámθət ‘in front of’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-la- ‘without’ [&lt;LNK+NEG]</td>
<td>šáwpət ‘instead’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tla-/ta- ‘for’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Distribution of -əd suffix with Barw. prepositions before a full nominal

is true in general for the -əd suffix as well. In JAmd., however, we find one exceptional form discussed by Greenblatt (2011: 71, fn. 27): The Arabic loan-word jamaʿa ‘community’ takes the construct state form jamaʿa-t rather than the expected *jamaʿ-əd. Whether this is a true morphological idiosyncrasy replicating the Arabic construct state morphology or a phonetic artefact related to the presence of the pharyngeal /ʕ/ is hard to tell without further investigation.

4.3.4 Morphological paradigm

The most important criterion according to Samvelian (2007a: 627) to distinguish an affix from a clitic is the criterion of “Haplology”, devised by Miller (1992) following Zwicky (1987). In fact, this criterion boils down to showing that a morpheme stands paradigmatically in opposition (i.e., in a paradigmatic complementary distribution) with other morphemes, forming in essence a morphological paradigm, and thus revealing its affixal nature (see also Section 2.1). Indeed, this is spelt out in greater clarity, from a structural perspective, in Samvelian (2008). These arguments are in essence repeated here for our case.

The -əd morpheme does not simply attach to its host, but rather stands in opposition with a set of other nominal-final morphemes, most conspicuously the Aramaic nominal inflectional endings -a-e, but also the possessive pronominal suffixes.\footnote{The -əd morpheme stands also in opposition with definite suffix -ake, borrowed from Sorani, in the dialects which have it, such as JKoy. or JSul. (Mutzafi 2004a: 62; Khan 2004: 232).} Indeed, we never find an -əd morph attaching to a noun or a preposition ending in a
possessive suffix, even if their scope is different. In such cases we must use the *d*-proclitic, as stated explicitly by Khan (2008c: 490), who gives the following example:

(9) **Noun–Noun**

Barw. jull-éy t= yāwne

clothes-Poss.3PL LNK= doves

‘their clothes of doves’ (Khan 2008c: 490 [A14:80])

The nominal endings *-a*-e are clearly inflectional suffixes as they have single-word scope, as is the case with the possessive pronominal suffixes in most dialects. Since the *-əd* morph stands in opposition to these suffixes, it forms part of the same inflectional system. Thus, most naturally it should also be treated as an inflectional suffix.

It should be noted, that even if one maintains the enclitic status of *-əd*, the fact that it cannot follow these suffixes differentiates it from the proclitic *d-*, which has no such restriction. Formally, we oppose the licit construction [X-Poss _d_-əd=Y] to the illicit combination *[X-Poss-_əd Y]*. This alone should suffice in showing that these are two different morphemes, which cannot merely by analysed as phonological variants of one and the same entity.

As a suffix, the *-əd* morph marks construct state, while the *-a*-e ending marks free state combined with number. This permits us to recognize three potential morphemic slots following the NENA nominal stem (with optional marking of pronominal secondaries): Gender + Number + State. The actual realisation of these slots, however, is subject to much fusion and idiosyncrasy (especially regarding the marking of gender), so that very often only one or two distinct suffixes are discernible on top of the stem. Some typical examples, reoccurring in many dialects, are given in Table 4.3 on the following page.

---

23 Quite exceptional are the dialects of JSan. and JSul., in which the possessive pronominal suffixes may be phrase-final, such as in the example [ʾaxon-a ruw]-i ‘my elder brother’ (brother-free big-Poss.1sg) (Khan 2009b: 251; 2004: 262). This may very well be under influence of Sorani, which allows similar constructions, such as [bira gewr]-ek-em ‘brother big-Def-Poss.1sg’ (War., MacKenzie 1961: 81).

24 One may argue that there is no principal restriction disallowing a clitic to stand in opposition with an affix. I’m unaware of such analyses in the literature, but in any case, such an analysis goes against the very spirit of the notion of paradigmatic opposition. In the structuralist tradition, which we follow, the fact that two elements stand in opposition is an evidence that they share the same privilege of occurrence and thus the same grammatical status, for instance part-of-speech category. Thus, unless other reasons are invoked, one would naturally assume that affixes and clitics should appear in different paradigmatic slots.

25 A similar claim is made by Samvelian (2008) to distinguish the Kurmanji suffixed Ezafe from the independent (“demonstrative”) Ezafe (see her examples (47) and (48)). In NENA the situation is clearer than in Kurmanji, since the suffix *-əd* is typically added to a nominal stem, and not to a fully
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>State [+ pron.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>∅ (M)</td>
<td>-a (SG.FREE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅ (M)</td>
<td>-e (PL.FREE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an (M.PL)</td>
<td>-e (FREE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-t (F.SG)</td>
<td>-a (FREE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aṭ (F.PL)</td>
<td>-a (FREE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅ (M)</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>-əd (CST)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-an (M.PL)</td>
<td>-əd (CST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-t (F.SG)</td>
<td>-əd (CST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-aṭ (F.PL)</td>
<td>-əd (CST)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>∅ (M)</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td>-i (CST+POSS.1SG)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Some typical NENA nominals suffixes (NIL=neutralised feature)

4.3.5 Conjunction criterion

Samvelian (2007a: 630) shows that the Ezafe has wide scope over a conjoint NP (see example (2) on page 85). This is true also for the -əd suffix, as in the following examples:

(10) Conjoined Nouns–Noun
Barw. [bab-a ᵇ w yəmm]-ət yala
father-FREE =and mother-CST child
‘the father and the mother of the boy’ (Khan 2008c: 488 [A15:9])

(11) Conjoined Nouns–Noun
Qar. [wánat= u toráθ]-əd Baǧdèdə
sheep= and cows-CST B.
‘the sheep and cows of Qaraqosh’ (Khan 2002a: 276 [F:1])

As noted in our discussion of the Persian example, such examples are characteristic of clitic status. For example, Spencer and Luis (2013: 134) state that a “clitic canonically takes wide scope over a coordinated phrase”. Yet, such cases are also accommodated by the analysis of -əd as a phrasal affix. Moreover, we may analyse such examples as cases of “suspended affixation”. If such an analysis is accepted we

\[ \text{fledged noun.} \]

\[ ^{26} \text{Note that the table is not meant to be exhaustive, given the richness of morphological patterns of NENA nouns.} \]

\[ ^{27} \text{Under this analysis, we must see the free state suffix }-a \text{ in example (10) on this page as a default nominal suffix, compatible with the phrase-final construct state suffix.} \]
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see that suspended affixation is an areal phenomenon, as it encompasses NENA, Iranian languages, and Turkish (for which the term was coined). In another respect, the single construct state marking conserves the logic of classical Semitic languages, in which it is generally not possible to conjoin directly two nouns marked for construct state, and instead alternative formulations are used.\(^{28}\) Indeed, in such a view we may say that the first noun baba ‘father’ is not under the morphological scope of the $\bar{a}d$ suffix, but its relationship with yala ‘child’ is rather inferred pragmatically.

Yet, in contrast to the Persian Ezafe, the analysis of $\bar{a}d$ as a suffix becomes truly clear in those dialects, Barw. and JUrm., which show an alternative construction in which both conjoined nouns are marked by the $\bar{a}d$ suffix, though no explicit conjunction appears:\(^{29}\)

\[(12)\]  Conjoined Nouns–Noun  
Barw. ['aql-ət iḥ-\bar{a}d] ay baxta  
\text{leg-cst hand-cst def.fs woman}  
‘the legs and hand of that woman’ (Khan 2008c: 488 [A10:10])

\[(13)\]  Conjoined Nouns–Noun  
JUrm. [id-\bar{a}d ṭeš-\bar{a}d] [gor-aw]  
\text{hand-cst head-cst man-poss.3fs}  
‘the hands and head of her husband’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

The possibility of repeating the $\bar{a}d$ suffix on both nouns indicates that in these dialects the $\bar{a}d$ marker has shifted, at least partially, from being a phrasal suffix to a word-level suffix.\(^{30}\) This corroborates the idea that in all dialects $\bar{a}d$ has acquired some affixal features, albeit in different degrees. Moreover, these dialects provide the clearest evidence for a distributional differentiation between the $d$- proclitic and the $\bar{a}d$ suffix, as there is no motivation for the $d$- proclitic to be doubled in this environment.

\(^{28}\)Recall that in MHeb. we do find such constructions; see example (3) on page 28. See also the highly unusual Syriac example (11) on page 45.  
\(^{29}\)Example (12) on the current page from Barw. is given by Khan as ‘aqlətiðəd-ay-baxta, but we may consider the attachment of the $d$ segment to the following demonstrative as a matter of syllabification of fast speech, since clearly the head noun has a construct state ending.  
\(^{30}\)In JUrm., in fact, we hardly find any evidence of $\bar{a}d$ being phrasal at all. We note, moreover, that the repetition of the $\bar{a}d$ suffix on each conjoint is coupled, both in Barw. and in JUrm., with the lack of an over coordination conjunction. The occurrence of this construction may very well be related to Turkish influence, which allows the asyndetic conjunction of possessed and non-possessed alliterative nouns. See the discussion in Section 7.2 regarding examples (8)–(9) on page 168.
4.3.6 Prosodic autonomy

The syntactic autonomy of the linker \( d- \) is corroborated by the prosodic structure, as it may stand at the beginning of a prosodic phrase, separate from the primary. This fact can be observed in the grammatical descriptions of G. Khan, who indicates prosodic phrase boundaries by a small vertical line ‘.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(14) Noun–Noun} & \quad \text{Barw. } \text{rıxa’} \text{ t=} \text{ xa=} \text{ kallaš’} \\
& \quad \text{smell} \text{ LNK=} \text{ INDF=} \text{ carrion} \\
& \quad \text{‘the scent of a carrion’ (Khan 2008c: 399 [C8:5])}
\end{align*}
\]

The -\( əd \) suffix, on the hand cannot induce a prosodic break: It is bound to the primary serving as its host, and in general is followed immediately by the secondary in the same prosodic phrase (just as \( d- \) is followed immediately by the secondary). Thus, aside from some exceptional cases, the -\( əd \) suffix stands always in the middle of a prosodic phrase.

The difference in prosodic autonomy has implications for the semantics of the different forms (see next section), but bears also on their syntactic status, as mediated by language acquisition. According to recent language acquisition theories, functional elements standing at the edges of prosodic phrases play a special role in acquiring syntactic structure, as they serve to “tag” the prosodic phrase with a syntactic label (Christophe et al. 2008; Gutman et al. 2015). We note that the \( d- \) linker can serve in such a function, effectively becoming a functional head of its NP, while -\( əd \) cannot. This may explain the mechanism of language change as well: The encliticization of \( d- \) as -\( əd \) leads to the loss of its role as tagging the category of its phrase in the process of language acquisition. It thereby loses its status as a syntactic head and is consequently reanalysed as an inflectional suffix.

4.3.7 Semantic differentiation

The above criteria show that on distributional grounds the \( d- \) proclitic and the -\( əd \) suffix should be treated as two separate morphemes. As such, we would expect each to have a different semantic load. The exact semantic difference between the two constructions, however, is difficult to pinpoint and is outside the scope of this work.\(^{31}\) In this respect, the comments of Khan (2008c: 489ff.), the most detailed study of a NENA dialect, may be illuminating (the emphasis is mine):

\[
\text{The structural difference between the } k\text{ba}'\text{wot qâša construction } [=\text{CSC]}
\]

\(^{31}\) A similar question arises in the field of Syriac, where the exact usage conditions of the CSC, the ALC and the DAC are compared. See for example Meyer (2012), Williams (2001: ch. 2), and Joosten (1996: ch. 4).
and the kḫawa t-qaša construction [-ALC] reflects different degrees of prosodic bonding between the nouns. The first noun in the kḫawa t-qaša construction is prosodically more independent than the first noun in the kḫawət qaša construction. [...] The kḫawa t-qaša construction is a “heavier” form of coding than the more compact kḫawət qaša construction. This heavy coding is sometimes used to give particular salience to a newly introduced referent that plays an important role in the discourse [...] When these referents are mentioned subsequently in the discourse, they are typically present with the lighter coding of the kḫawət qaša construction [...] The heavy coding of the kḫawa t-qaša construction may be used to give prominence to the clause as a whole. [...] The looser prosodic connection between the two components in the kḫawa t-qaša construction is sometimes used as a device to give prominence to the dependent noun rather than to the phrase as a whole.

In essence, the -əd suffix creates a prosodically and pragmatically tighter bond between the primary and the secondary, presenting them as one NP, while the d-proclitic presents the two elements as two separate NPs mediated by the pronominal linker d-, which stands in apposition with the first NP. Formally, we may contrast [X-əd Y]NP with XNP₁ ↔ [d_{link}=Y]NP₂. This, in turn, permits the speaker to assign some sort of pragmatic emphasis to one of the component NPs, both of them, or the clause as a whole.

4.4 The d- proclitic vs. the d- genitive prefix

An important analytic discovery made by Cohen (2010) is the distinction between two separate d- shaped morphemes: One is the proclitic linker (“pronominal nucleus” in Cohen’s terms) and the other is a d- prefix marking genitive case on a handful of morphemes, mostly definite determiners and demonstrative pronouns which begin with a glottal stop (sometimes left untranscribed or unpronounced)

32 A similar view is advanced by H. J. Polotsky in his yet unpublished grammatical notes about JZax.
33 This includes also the interrogative determiner ēma ‘which’. See discussion in footnote 45 on page 282.
34 Thus, these words can also be considered to be vowel-initial. We leave open the question whether the initial glottal stop is merely a phonetic artefact.
35 Note that in the description of Diy. by Napiorkowska (2015: 93) the d- prefix precedes a glottal stop in the genitive pronouns, rather than replacing it (e.g. d-ʾawwa [gen-dem.3ms]). The initial glottal stop is in fact not a strict requirement: In JZax. Cohen (2012: 109) lists also the distal demonstratives/determiners wā(ha) (ms) and yā(ha) (fs) as having genitive forms duā(ha) and dyā(ha),
case ("attributive" marking in Cohen’s terms\textsuperscript{36}). In other words, these morphemes (all of pronominal origin) inflect for case, as is illustrated in Table 4.4 for the definite determiners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Determiner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-GEN</td>
<td>?-aw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+GEN</td>
<td>d-ay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>an PL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: Case-inflected definite determiners in JZax. (Cohen 2010: 88)

The main reason for establishing this category is that the $d$- prefix appears where a linker is not expected, namely after primaries already marked for construct state (by the $\sim d$ suffix or by apocope), after prepositions (whether they are marked by $\sim d$ or not) and after the linker itself.\textsuperscript{37}

These possibilities are illustrated in the following JZax. and Barw. examples:

(15) **Noun–Noun**
JZax. brāt $d$-ay baxta
daughter.CST GEN-DEF.FS woman
‘the daughter of the woman’ (Cohen 2012: 110)

(16) **Preposition–Noun Phrase**
JZax. mən $[d-o$ bohna rwīxa$] d- [d-o jwanqa]$] from GEN-DEF.MS breath(MS) wide.MS LNK= GEN-DEF.MS younger ‘from the patience of this youngster’ (Cohen 2012: 106)

(17) **Noun–Noun**
Barw. ahwālt-$\rightarrow$ $d$$-\rightarrow$ na$\tilde{s}$a
condition-CST GEN-DEF.MS man

respectively. In other dialects the distal forms are ‘awāba and ‘ayāba, which may be the ancestral forms of the forms in JZax.

\textsuperscript{36}Cohen (2010: 90) identifies the same prefix also before the subordinated present copula, to which the term “genitive” seems inappropriate, yet the term “attributive” may fit. For other dialects, however, the establishment of subordinate form of the copula could not be made with certainty. On the other hand, we sporadically find the $d$- prefix before the deictic adverb axxa ‘here’ in other dialects, maybe since it contains an implicit demonstrative ‘in this place’.

\textsuperscript{37}It is interesting to note that in Neo-Mandaic we find also that possessive pronominal suffixes attach to a $d$- base after certain prepositions and construct state loan-nouns. Häberl (2007) claims that this modern $d$- is not related to the Classical Mandaic linker but arose rather from the metathesis of the final two root consonants of CMand. qadmia ‘to, for’. Yet, if our analysis of the NENA $d$-genitive prefix is correct, we may tentatively suggest that the NMand. $d$- is the very same genitive marker (with a more limited distribution), reflecting an areal phenomenon preceding the emergence of the modern Aramaic dialects.
4.4. The *d-* proclitic vs. the *d-* genitive prefix

‘the condition of that person’ (Khan 2008c: 399 [B5:8])

(18) **Preposition–Noun**
Barw. qám [d-áyya  qə̃ṣṣət]
before **GEN-DEM.PROX.FS story**
‘before this story’ (Khan 2008c: 442 [A16:5])

Analysing the apparently spurious *d-* prefixes as genitive case markers provides a clear justification for their appearance. Formally, we distinguish between the patterns [X.*cst d*gen*Y]*NP and X*NP1 ↔ [d*lnk*Y]*NP2, treating prepositions and the linker itself as being functionally in construct state.

We note that such an analysis implies a revolution in Aramaic grammar: While Proto-Semitic is supposed to have case markers (on the evidence of Akkadian and Classical Arabic), Aramaic had lost all case marking by its earliest attestations (beginning of the first millennium BCE). Thus, the genitive *d-* represents a structural innovation in Aramaic. We note that the *d-* segment acting as a genitive prefix is highly selective, since it attaches virtually only to demonstratives and definite determiners (but see footnote 36 on the preceding page).

A similar distinction between the two *d-* morphemes is made in the native grammar of Marogulov (1976: 41f.) treating CUrm. He distinguishes between a pronominal *d-* (which he writes as a separate particle) and a prefix *d-* attached to demonstrative pronouns after prepositions, which in his terms has no function (“le son *d* n’ayant aucune fonction spéciale”):

(19) **Preposition–Noun**
CUrm. qa d-ô nə̃ṣə
to **GEN-DEM.MS man**
‘to this man’ (Marogulov 1976: 41)

We note that in the genitive function, the *d-* element cannot stand at the beginning of a prosodic phrase, unlike the linker *d-* (see discussion in Section 4.3.6 about the importance of the prosodic autonomy).

Taking into account more dialectal data, we find further justification for their differentiation.

---

38 A notable exception is found in some Aramaic inscriptions from Sam‘al dating from the 8th century BCE, where m.pl. nouns conserve an archaic distinction between nominative and oblique cases (Dion 1978: 117).

39 Traditionally, the linker *d-* itself is sometimes called *nota genitivi*, but due to its pronominal status, it should not be assimilated with a genitive case marker; see Goldenberg (2013a: 253, fn. 27).
4. The D-markers in NENA Dialects

4.4.1 Phonological shape

In Barw., the $d$- linker is normally realised as $t$- (Khan 2008c: 396). If it attaches to a word beginning with a glottal stop, it is normally realised as an unaspirated $t$-, which is phonetically expected.\(^{40}\)

(20) Noun–Noun
Barw.  tre= pánxe $t=$ ṭrxe
    two= grinding_stones LNK= watermill
    ‘two stones of a watermill’ (Khan 2008c: 399 [A24:13])

Appearing, however, before the demonstrative pronouns, normally beginning with a glottal stop, it takes rather the voiced form $d$-, as in examples (17)–(18) on the preceding page. This is expected, if the $d$- morph does not attach before the glottal stop, but rather replaces it, as in Table 4.4 on page 96.\(^{41}\)

4.4.2 Dialectal distribution

Also in dialects where the $d$- linker has disappeared as such we find the $d$- prefix before determiners. This is the case in JSan., where we can find the $d$- prefix even after the Ezafe suffix:\(^{42}\)

(21) Noun–Noun
JSan.  fešár-e d-o màc
    pressure-EZ GEN-DEM.MS water
    ‘the pressure of the water’ (Khan 2009b: 200 [A:59])

The fact that the $d$- prefix is retained in such environments while the $d$- linker in general has disappeared is easily explained if we consider the two to be separate morphemes, subject to different language change processes.

4.4.3 Phrase-internal marking

Similarly to the construct state suffix $-əd$, which in most dialects is a phrasal suffix (see example (10) on page 92), the genitive $d$- prefix in JZax. must be analysed as

\(^{40}\)This is also the case before the indicative copula appearing in subordinate clauses.

\(^{41}\)In other respects, the data from Barw. sometimes obscures the presence of a genitive prefix as it marks the appearance of only one $d$ segment. Thus, we have čádra $d$-ô-malka ‘the tent of that king’ where we would expect čádra $d$-ô-malka and ríxə $d$-ô-xámra ‘the smell of that wine’ instead of ríxə $d$-ô-xámra. Especially in the second case, it seems plausible to assume that the actual forms are subject to a process of phonetic de-gemination (cf. Cohen 2012: 122 who speaks of “phonetic simplification” in similar cases).

\(^{42}\)In contrast to JZax., however, the usage of the $d$- genitive prefix is optional in JSan.
phrasal prefix, judging by examples such as the following:

(22)  **Noun–Conjoined nouns**

JZax. ‘uz-lu xıtbe did d-áw jwanqa ú= ’áy xamsa
made–3PL wedding LNK GEN–DEF.MS youngster and= DEF.FS maiden
‘they made the wedding of that youngster and that maiden’ (Cohen 2012: 304 (205))

The analysis of d- as a genitive prefix is justified by the fact that it follows linker did, and cannot therefore assume a pronominal role. However, it marks only the initial determiner aw, and not the subsequent determiner ay. Thus, we can conclude it appears, as an inflectional morpheme of determiners, only as a phrase-initial marker, or in other words as phrasal prefix.\(^{43}\)

In Barw., on the other hand, we find cases where the genitive d- occurs phrase-internally. This happens in cases where a secondary noun is further modified by an adjective which is preceded by a determiner. In such cases, the internal determiner is marked as genitive.

(23)  **Noun–Noun Phrase**

Barw. gnáy-ət [táwra d-ó= gòra]
fault–CST ox GEN–DEF.MS= big.MS
‘the fault of the big ox’ (Khan 2008c: 517 [D2:19])

Adjectives in Barw. stand in apposition to their head-noun. Therefore, the d- marker is not marking a dependency relationship between the adjective gorą and the noun it modifies (tawra ’ox’). Rather, it is induced in virtue of the entire NP being in genitive case due to its attributive relation with the primary noun gnaya ‘fault’. Similarly to the -əd suffix in Barw., it seems that also the d- prefix has undergone a further development to become a word-level marker, permitting it to appear phrase-internally.\(^{44}\)

We note that there is no motivation for a linker d- to appear in this position.

A similar example is found in CArd., where the genitive marking is induced by a prepositional head:

(24)  **Preposition–Noun Phrase**

CArd. tla [ōjax d-ay xēta]
for clan(FS) GEN–DEF.FS other.FS
‘for the other clan’ (Krotkoff 1982: 49 [113])

\(^{43}\) Cohen (2012) brings a case of phrase-internal d- marker attaching to the copula (example (86) on page 122). This d- is arguably different from the genitive one, as it attaches to a quasi-verbal form, although Cohen subsumes both as markers of the “attributive” function (see footnote 36 on page 96).

\(^{44}\) Unfortunately I could not come across any examples of conjoint genitives mirroring exactly the JZax. example.
4.5 Conclusions

In this chapter, I have shown that on various synchronic distributional grounds, we can distinguish between three different morphemes in NENA related to the Classical Aramaic proclitic linker $d\-$. One is simply a retention of this morpheme in NENA, conserving in essence its pronominal nature, while the two other morphemes are pure relational markers: the head-marking construct state suffix $-\textit{d}$ and the dependent-marking genitive case marker $d\-$. The distinction between the three morphemes is primarily based on distributional reasons. The different environments where they can be found are summarised in Table 4.5.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N. stem-$\textit{d}$</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep-$\textit{d}$</td>
<td>$d_{\text{lnk}}=Y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>$d_{\text{lnk}}=Y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$d_{\text{lnk}}=$</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X,$\text{cst}^{45}$</td>
<td>$d_{\text{gen}}\text{-DET} Y$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep,${\text{cst}}$</td>
<td>$d_{\text{gen}}\text{-DEM}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>${X}$ $d_{\text{lnk}}=$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Distribution of D-markers: a) construct state suffix $-\textit{d}$; b) linker $d\-$; c) genitive prefix $d\-$ (X and Y indicate any phrasal primary or secondary).

We have conceptualised this distinction in terms of the strength of the bond between these morphemes and their hosts, calling the two latter morphemes “affixes”, while maintaining the “clitic” nature of the original linker. Their affixal nature stems from the high selectivity of the hosts: the $-\textit{d}$ suffix appears almost exclusively on nominal hosts, while the $d\-$ prefix is restricted to determiners and demonstratives (which are related historically). On the other hand, their clitic origin is apparent in the fact that both these morphemes show phrasal placement: In general they appear either phrase-finally ($-\textit{d}$) or phrase-initially ($d\-$), yet some dialects show a further development in that they allow these markers to appear phrase-internally, as word-level inflectional suffixes.

$^{45}$Recall that in this context the notation ,$\text{cst}$ marks any type of construct state marking, be it an $-\textit{d}$ suffix, apocope or an Ezafe morpheme; see footnote 40 on page 36. Note also that prepositions need not be explicitly marked as construct state in order to induce genitive case.
Chapter 5

Attributive Constructions in the Jewish dialect of Zakho

The study of the AC system of JZax.\(^1\) is made easy due to the fact that the main source on which we rely, Cohen (2012), uses a conceptual framework similar to ours. A more exact formulation would be that Cohen’s framework inspired ours. Indeed, chapters 2 and 4 of his work, “The attributive relationship” and “Apposition” respectively, address directly the issues at hand. A similar and concise analysis is also presented in Cohen (2010). The present survey, therefore, repeats to some extent the claims presented in these sources. Nevertheless, our treatment is innovative in the classification of the construction according to the typology discussed in Section 2.4. This permits, moreover, a transparent comparison of this dialect’s system to the other dialects discussed in the following chapters.

As noted in Section 1.3, Cohen (2012: 20–27) identifies a system of definite and indefinite determiners in the grammar of JZax., an analysis which we adopt here.

Cohen’s examples are based mainly on Polotsky’s unpublished transcribed Zakho texts, as well as some published sources (see Cohen 2012: 5–8 for details).\(^2\) Two other sources used in this chapter are Avinery (1988), a collection of texts of JZax., and Sabar (2002). The latter is a dictionary devoted to the Cis-Zab Jewish dialects of north-west Iraq (see Section 1.2.2), of which JZax. constitutes an important part. We only use examples which are identifiable as JZax. examples (by virtue of their source, or being explicitly marked as such).

Cohen (2012) and Sabar (2002) use the sign <i> to denote the phonemic schwa

\(^1\)We maintain the J. in the abbreviation, since there exists also a Christian (Chaldean) dialect of Zakho, as reported by Hoberman (1993). Due the scarcity of information on this dialect, it is not included in our survey.

\(^2\)Cohen’s examples refer to the page number of Polotsky’s transcribed texts. As these texts are as yet unpublished, I have not reproduced this number in the citations, but rather referred to Cohen’s page and example numbers.
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([ə]-[ɪ]), while Avinery (1988) uses the sign <ɪ>. As explained on page 13 we use instead the <ə> symbol.

This chapter is organised as follows: In Section 5.1 we discuss the usage of the possessive pronominal suffixes. Subsequently, the two main ACs of JZax. are discussed: The construct state construction is treated in Section 5.2 and the analytic linker construction in Section 5.3, the latter being the richest one in terms of paradigmatic variation. The marking of secondaries by genitive case, which is compatible with both these constructions, is treated in Section 5.4. A rare case of the double annexation construction is discussed in Section 5.5, while the juxtaposition construction is handled in Section 5.6. Section 5.7 gives some general conclusions and comparative remarks.

5.1 Possessive pronominal suffixes (X-y.poss)

A pronominal secondary can be realised as a possessive pronominal suffix (glossed poss), which attaches directly to the stem of the primary noun.

(1) **Noun–Pronoun**

JZax. ēha brāt-i
def.PL daughter-poss.1sg
‘this daughter of mine’ (Cohen 2012: 98 (28))

If there are any further secondaries they follow the inflected noun:

(2) **Noun–Pronoun**

JZax. ʾaw brōn-e rūwa
def.3MS son-poss.3MS big.MS
‘this older son of his’ (Cohen 2012: 98 (29))

As noted in Section 2.4.1, the term “possessive suffix” is traditional; its usage is in fact wider than denoting solely possession, similarly to other ACs. For instance, it can attach to an infinitive to denote one of its arguments (here its subject):

(3) **Infinitive–Pronoun (subject)**

JZax. u= zaʾ-li b-ād ʾizāl-i ʿal knašta
= be_lost-1SG in-cst go.INF-1SG to synagogue
‘And I got lost while going to the synagogue.’ (Cohen 2012: 99 (34))

Moreover, it can attach to a preposition to denote its complement:

(4) **Preposition–Pronoun**

JZax. ʾmm-i
with-poss.1sg
5.2 The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

JZax. has two construct state markers: the suffix -əd−ət and apocope (phonological reduction). Cohen (2012: 97) states: “the functional distinction between them is not clear, and for now it must be regarded as mere [free] variation”. He gives the following two examples, in which the noun xabra ‘word’ (pl. xabre) is put in construct state. Note that in this case, both markings neutralize the number distinction.

(5) Noun–Noun
JZax. xabr-ət xōr-e
word-cst friend−poss.3ms
‘the words of his friend’ (Cohen 2012: 97 (2))

(6) Noun–Noun
JZax. (p=) xabar xōr-e
in= word.cst friend−poss.3ms
‘(by) the words of his friend’ (Cohen 2012: 97 (21))

The apocopated form is constructed by removing the free state-cum-number suffixes -a ‘free.sg’ or -e ‘free.pl’. Due to the resulting consonant cluster at the end of *xabr, an epenthetic ə is inserted.

Nouns (including infinitives, see Section 5.2.5) as well as adjectives can appear with both construct state markers, while pronouns as well as adverbials appear only with the -əd suffix. Primary pronouns typically appear with clausal secondaries (see Section 5.2.2).

Rarely, the construct state suffix appears NP finally, but only when the NP ends with an adjective, as in the following example (=example (8) on page 89):

(7) Noun Phrase–Noun
JZax. [gōra qamāy]-ət [d-anya baxt-āsa]
man first.ms−cst gen−dem.pl woman−pl
‘The first husband of these women’ (Cohen 2012: 101 (49))

---

3Cohen (2012: 92) relates the apocopate form to the ancient absolute state, i.e. the Early Aramaic free indefinite form. It seems more appropriate to relate it directly to the Classical Aramaic construct state. In any case, for singular nouns the two forms were mostly identical. Some apocopate construct state forms can not be easily traced to ancient Aramaic construct state forms, and must be considered innovated, such as the form bax, apocopate form of bxatā ‘woman, wife’ (Cohen 2010). See the discussion in Section 11.1.

4As adverbials do not have a full free form we cannot postulate an apocopate form for them, making the above statement trivial for this category.
As discussed in Section 4.3, such examples are accommodated under the analysis of the -əd suffix as a phrasal suffix.

5.2.1 Pronominal, ordinal and adverbial secondaries

We find a variety of categories which can occupy the secondary position: pronouns, ordinal or PPs (adverbial phrases). The primary in each case can be marked by both construct state markings:

(8) Noun–Pronoun
JZax. šəmm-ət gyāne
name-cst refl POSS.MS
‘his own name’ (Cohen 2012: 115 (106))

(9) Noun–NP headed by pronoun
JZax. ʾaqlās [xa mānn-u]
feet.PL.cst one from-3PL
‘the feet of one of them’ (Cohen 2012: 115)

(10) Noun–Ordinal
JZax. baxt-ət tre
wife-cst two
‘the second wife’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (6))

(11) Noun–Ordinal
JZax. gōr tre
man.cst two
‘(the) second man’ (Cohen 2012: 84 (7))

(12) Noun–Prepositional Phrase
JZax. rubʿ-ət mānn-u
quarter-cst from-POSS.PL
‘a quarter of them’ (Cohen 2012: 117 (113))

(13) Noun–Prepositional Phrase
JZax. ū=ʾan nāš ŋam-e
and=DEF.PL.person.cst with-POSS.MS
‘and the people with him’ (Cohen 2012: 117 (112))

5.2.2 Clausal secondaries

Clausal secondaries, whether full clauses or infinitival phrases, can appear regularly in the CSC.

(14) Noun–Infinitival Phrase
The following example is especially interesting, since the secondary consists of two conjoined infinitives. Moreover, it is split by the occurrence of the copula *la*, marking the entire CSC as a predicate. In JZax. (as in many other NENA dialects), the copula is a second-position clitic with respect to the predicate phrase.\(^5\) Yet as this example clearly shows, the copula cannot split the construct state primary from its secondary and thus appears instead after the first conjoined secondary.\(^6\)

\[\text{Noun–Conjoined infinitives} \]

\[\text{JZax. } \text{urx-ət } [\text{iẓāla}=\text{la } [\text{ū}=\text{la } dāra] \]

\[\text{way-cst go-INF =COP.3FS and= NEG return-INF} \]

\[\text{‘It is a road of going and not returning.’ (Cohen 2012: 111 (87))} \]

As stated, full clauses can appear as well in the secondary position. The primary noun can have various functions in the relative clause (subject, object, etc.)

\[\text{Noun (subject)–Clause} \]

\[\text{JZax. } \text{šaps-ət } zəl-la \]

\[\text{week-cst went-3FS} \]

\[\text{‘Last week (lit. The week that passed)’ (Avinery 1988: 191 (1617))} \]

\[\text{Noun (subject)–Clause} \]

\[\text{JZax. } \text{ʾō māṭar } [\text{kuš-le xapča}] \]

\[\text{DEF.MS rain-cst fell-3MS a-little} \]

\[\text{‘This rain which fell (=rained) a little’ (Avinery 1988: 171 (1274))} \]

\[^5\text{In other words, the copula typically appears after the first minimal unit of the predicate. A similar behaviour is exhibited by the Syriac enclitic personal pronoun, which can be seen as precursors of the copula; see Gutman and Van Peursen (2011: 121ff.) for a discussion and examples.}\]

\[^6\text{Such cases should be clearly differentiated from cases where the copula itself is part of the secondary, in which case it can appear directly after the primary in a special attributive form (see Section 5.4.2).}\]
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(20) **Noun (object)–Clause**
JZax. xabər-ət mīr-rē-la
word(s)-CST said-3MS-DAT3FS
‘the words he told her’ (Cohen 2012: 97 (24))

(21) **Noun (object)–Clause**
JZax. xabər [mxē-la baxt-e b-ət ʾarya]
word(s)-CST struck-3FS wife-poss.3MS in-CST lion
‘the words his wife said about the lion’ (Cohen 2012: 97 (23))

Interrogative pronouns can head the CSC with clausal secondaries. In such cases they act as a head of a “free relative”, loosely speaking. In this construction, they are always marked by the construct state suffix.7

(22) **Pronoun–Clause**
JZax. (mən) mā-d mər-ri-lox
from what-CST told-A1SG-DAT2MS
‘from what I told you’ (Cohen 2012: 94 (4))

(23) **Pronoun–Clause**
JZax. manī-t ḫawī ḥmīla qām-ox (b-āse
who=CST sbjv.be.3MS stood.res.ms before-2MS fut-pass_aux.3MS
l-qṭāla)
to-kill.inf
‘whoever is standing in front of you will be killed’ (Cohen 2012: 96 (14))

To this group we may tentatively add the pronoun/quantifier kud ‘each’:

(24) **Pronoun–Clause**
JZax. ku-d ʾāwəz-lox hawūsa
each-CST sbjv.do.3MS-DAT.2MS favor
‘anyone who does you a favor’ (Cohen 2012: 94 (1))

In the above example we analyse kud as having a base-form ku augmented by a construct state suffix. However, a free form of kud is not attested (Cohen 2012: 94, fn. 5), though historically it is very probably derived from *kull + d (Sabar 2002: 181b).8 Moreover, as Cohen (forthcoming: 3) notes, disregarding its construct state marking, it can be equated with a determiner of the JZax. system. Thus, we may reasonably question whether this should be seen as a genuine instance of construct

---

7As Cohen (2012: 96) notes, the free forms of the interrogative pronouns are used as markers of either direct or indirect questions. We do not find apocopate forms of the interrogative pronouns in JZax.

8The form kull, meaning ‘all’, is used in JZax. only together with possessive pronominal suffixes. Compare this with example (43) on page 143 of Qar. and see further Khan (2002a: 282f.).
The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

state marking, or rather a fossilized remnant of it. Interestingly, in NrT we do find instance of ku (Sabar 2002: 181b), but these may be cases of back-formation.

Finally, we note that the interrogative ēma ‘which’ can be complemented directly by a noun-phrase, which embeds in it a clause. In this case too, the construct state-marked interrogative pronoun functions rather as a determiner:

(25) Pronoun–Noun Phrase
JZax. ēm-ət [julle d= [ājəb-le labb-ox]] (tlōb mən d-e
clothes LNK= please-3MS heart-POS.2MS take.IMP from GEN-DEF
tent
‘Ask for whatever clothes which please you from that tent’ (Cohen 2012: 96 (16))

5.2.3 Adverbial primaries

Many adverbials are in fact nouns used adverbially, such as the noun waʿda ‘time’ (thus example (15) on page 105 can be understood adverbially: ‘when he comes’). These behave as nouns, having potentially two construct state forms: one suffixed and one apocopate, besides their free forms.

In contrast to these, we find true prepositions or conjunctions (often monosyllabic, or shorter). Some of these take a construct state suffix obligatorily when complemented by a syntactic word, be it a noun or a pronoun. Such is the case of ʾəmm-əd [with-cst] (example (5)=example (26) on the current page):

(26) Preposition–Noun
JZax. ʾəmm-əd gōra
with-cst man
‘with the man’ (Cohen 2010: 82)

(27) Preposition–Pronoun
JZax. əmm-ət gyān-e
with-cst REFL-3MS
‘(together) with itself’ (Cohen 2012: 115 (106))

We can nevertheless identify the base form, as it appears together with the possessive pronominal suffixes (see example (4) on page 103). Moreover, we know it stems etymologically from classical Aramaic ʿim (Sabar 2002: 97a).

Some prepositions allow for two forms to appear before syntactic words: one with the suffix -əd and one without it. The shorter form should not be seen as an apocopate form, as it is not derived from a full free form (except for those prepositions derived from nouns), but should rather be seen as the “simple” form of the
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preposition (see also the system of Barw. in Table 4.2 on page 90). Functionally, the simple form is equivalent to a construct state marked form, yet from the point of view of our classification system it represents an unmarked primary. In this vein, contrast the following construct state marked example with example (102) on page 126, representing an unmarked juxtaposition construction.9

(28) **Preposition–Noun**
JZax.  b-əd ballūre
in-cst flute
‘with a flute’ (Cohen 2010: 85 (16))

The construct state marked form can precede phrasal and clausal secondaries:

(29) **Preposition–Infinitival Phrase**
JZax. ʾəmm-ət [maʾore did-a]
with-cst transfer.INF LNK-3FS
‘while transferring her’ (Cohen 2012: 111 (87))

(30) **Preposition–Participial Phrase**
JZax. (u= šqīl-a-le nunīsa) b-ət [kēf-e ʾəsya]
and= took.P3FS-A3MS fish in-cst joy-poss.3MS came.RES
‘(And he took the fish) with his joy attained (=happily).’ (Cohen 2012: 122 (142))

(31) **Adverbial–Clause**
JZax. (uz-le ʾōha ʾərba) māṭu-t mir-rā-le
did-3MS DEM.MS sheep how-cst said-3FS-DAT.3MS
‘(The sheep did) as she told him.’ (Cohen 2012: 104 (67))

5.2.4 Adjectival primaries

Adjectives heading the CSC typically yield a superlative reading, whenever the secondary is a plural noun or pronoun:

(32) **Adjective–Noun**
JZax. rūw-ət ganāw-e
big.MS-cst thief-PL
‘the biggest/head thief’ (Cohen 2012: 100 (41))

(33) **Adjective–Pronoun**

9The preposition b- ‘in’ should be kept apart from its homonym particle b-, which joins the infinitive to form a gerund (Cohen 2012: 99, fn. 9; Sabar 2002: 103a). Note, moreover, that the preposition b-əd can precede an infinitive (without forming a gerund), as in example (3) on page 102.
5.2. The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

JZax. 'aw zōr kull-u
   def.ms small.cst all-3pl
   'the smallest of them all' (Cohen 2012: 100 (42))

Note that the primary adjective exhibits the gender and number features of the referent, while the secondary has plural marking.\(^\text{10}\)

A formally related construction, though functionally different, is the “emotive genitive”.\(^\text{11}\) In this construction, loaded with some emotional emphasis, the semantic head of the construction is expressed as a secondary, while the adjectival primary agrees with it:

(34) Adjective–Noun
JZax. pappūk-ət xmāra
   pitiful.ms-cst donkey
   'the poor donkey, that poor of a donkey' (Cohen 2012: 100 (46))

Gai (1993: 270), analysing a similar construction of CUrms., explains it as follows:

[B]y inserting the subordinating \(d\) the noun is converted to \(nomen rec-tum\), i.e., a subordinated one \([=\text{secondary of the CSC}]\), and by lowering the status of the noun, the status of the adjective, its subordinator in the nominal phrase, rises. [...] Thus, the communicatively more important element has the more important syntactic status, while the communicatively secondary element has the secondary syntactic status.

Cohen (2012: 101) mentions a third case of an adjectival primary, namely the use of the Arabic loan-word \(ġēr\) ‘other’. However, it is not clear synchronically why it should be considered as an adjective rather than a type of quantifier or pronoun.

5.2.5 Infinitival primaries

Infinitives can be expanded by one of their arguments in the CSC. As a general rule, infinitive of transitive verbs are expanded by their object argument, while those of intransitive verbs are expanded by their subject. Most often the infinitives are marked by the construct state suffix, but also the apocopate form is available.

(35) Infinitive–Noun (subject)

\[^{10}\text{The superlative preceding the qualified noun is clearly an areal phenomenon: It is present in Arabic, Sorani (MacKenzie 1961: 68; Thackston 2006b: 19), and Kurmanji (Thackston 2006a: 28). In the latter, the superlative adjective is sometimes marked as construct state. Compare also to the Syriac example (19) on page 48.}\]

\[^{11}\text{This term was coined by Hopkins (2009), who identifies the characteristic syntactic and semantic features of the construction and exemplifies it from various Semitic languages, including NENA. Gai (2013) attempts to trace this construction back to Akkadian.}\]
5.3 The analytic linker construction (X lnk Y)

The common form of the pronominal linker in JZax. is did. It may be analysed as an expansion of the Classical Aramaic linker d- with an overt construct state suffix yielding də- + -əd = did. Yet contrary to regular cases where a construct state suffix appears, the linker did is compatible with possessive pronominal suffixes, as in ex-
ample (41) on this page, and thus the ending -i’d must be seen as an integral part of the linker itself.\footnote{Diachronically, we find the same form before possessive pronominal suffixes in JBA, and we may relate it as well to the Syriac dil-. See Section 10.5.2 for a discussion of its development.}

(41) **Noun–Pronoun**
JZax.  qaḥra did-ox
      grief LNK-2MS
   ‘your grief’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (5))

In the context of a pronominal secondary realised as a possessive suffix, the linker is in syntagmatic complementary distribution with the proclitic linker d-: The base did- is used exclusively with the monosyllabic singular possessive pronouns, while d- is used with the bisyllabic plural ones; see Table 10.9 on page 293 (Cohen 2012: 453).

(42) **Noun–Pronoun**
JZax.  lišāna  d-ěni
      language LNK-POSS.1PL.
   ‘our language’ (Cohen 2012: 85 (347))

In other contexts, the proclitic d- is restricted almost exclusively to clausal secondaries, thus functioning similarly to a relativizer (see Section 5.3.2, but see also the rare exceptions in example (64) on page 116, example (83) on page 121 and example (65) on page 117).

The basic use of the linker is to create an indirect attributive relationship between a primary noun (whether explicit or implicit) and a secondary noun. This relationship is indirect, since it is the pronominal linker that stands in direct attributive relationship with the secondary. The primary noun, which is most frequently explicit, stands syntactically in apposition with the linking pronoun, and is never marked for construct state in JZax.:

(43) **Noun–Noun**
JZax.  xa ṭēra did ḥukūm
      INDF bird LNK sovereignty
   ‘a royal bird’ (Cohen 2012: 96 (18))

Pronouns which are realised as independent words, such as the reflexive pronouns, are treated in the same way as nouns:

(44) **Noun–Pronoun**
JZax.  (sē-le  al) bāţer did gyān-e
      came-3MS to city LNK REF'L-3MS
‘(he came to) his own town’ (Cohen 2012: 132 (176))

Whenever the secondary consists both of a pronominal suffix and a full noun, the linker is repeated:

(45) **Conjoined Nouns–Pronoun+Noun**
JZax. [ḥāl ū= quṣṭa] did-i ū= did xa ṭēra
situation and= story LNK-1SG and= LNK INDF bird
‘the story of me and a bird’ (Cohen 2012: 106 (74))

We note in passim, that in the last example the primary itself consists of a conjunction of two nouns (being in this case an idiomatic expression). Noun phrases are quite common as primaries of the ALC, especially those consisting of a noun modified by an adjective:

(46) **Noun Phrase–Noun**
JZax. [ʾāy ʾasəqsa turta] did ḥakōma
DEF.FS ring(FS) broken.FS LNK king
‘the broken ring of the king’ (Cohen 2012: 102 (51))

Compare the last example to the less common construction exhibited in example (7) on page 103.

Semantically, we note that in some cases the adjective seems to have a wide scope over the entire AC, notwithstanding its syntactic position.13

(47) **Noun Phrase–Noun**
JZax. (āna ...) [brōna yakāna] did yāmm-i
1SG ... son only LNK mother-POSS.1SG
‘(I am [...]) my mother’s only son.’ (Cohen 2012: 102 (52))

5.3.1 **Verbal nouns as members of the ALC**

Infinitives can appear both as primaries and as secondaries of the ALC. As secondaries, they are analogous to nouns:

(48) **Noun–Infinitive**
JZax. narʾa did [qtāʾ-ət dār-e]
axe LNK cut-CST tree-PL
‘an axe to cut trees’ (Cohen 2012: 132 (177))

---

13This is not related specifically to JZax., but it is interesting to note the phenomenon. An alternative analytic possibility is to see the adjective as a primary of an embedded ALC: [Noun [Adj. LNK Noun]].
When an infinitive is the primary of the ALC, the secondary is an argument of the infinitive, either its subject or object. In the latter case, if the infinitive is part of a verbal periphrastic expression, one could argue that the relation to its nominal complement is a completive relation rather than an attributive one (see Section 2.1.1 and cf. Cohen 2012: 100). However, it is interesting to see that formally this relation is expressed by the same construction.

Thus, in the following example the infinitive *mēsōye* ‘to bring’ functions both as the primary of an ALC with its objective argument as a secondary, and as a secondary of a wider ALC. We note that in the contrast to the object *nāše* ‘people’, the locative adverbial *qam məšpaṭ* ‘before the court’ is not marked by a linker.

\[(49) \quad \text{Infinitive–Noun (object)}\]
\[\text{JZax.} \quad (hūl-lē-lu sūla did) mēsōye did nāše qam məšpaṭ \]
\[\text{gave-3MS-DAT3PL task LNK bring. INF LNK people before court} \]
\[\quad \text{‘(He gave them) the task of bringing the people in front of court.’ (Cohen 2012: 111 (87))}\]

Pronominal arguments are also linked by means of the same construction, as can be seen in examples (15) on page 105 and (80) on page 121.

Parallel to example (45) on the facing page, whenever both a pronominal and a nominal argument are expressed, the linker is repeated:

\[(50) \quad \text{Infinitive–Pronoun+Noun (subjects)}\]
\[\text{JZax.} \quad 'ixāla\textsuperscript{14} did-a u= did gōr-a \]
\[\text{eat.INF LNK-POS-3FS and= LNK man-POS.3FS} \]
\[\quad \text{‘her and her husband’s food (eating)’ (Cohen 2012: 106 (73))}\]

Of special interest are cases in which the object of an infinitive is expressed pronominally on a linker, while it appears in immediate apposition to an explicit nominal object. These are in fact cases of *prolepsis*, discussed by Cohen (2012: 142–4).

We note that there are two possible realisations of the full object: It may be a secondary of an ALC standing in apposition to the first linker. In this case the nominal may be marked by genitive case (on which see Section 5.4).

\[(51) \quad \text{Infinitive–Pronoun/Noun (object)}\]
\[\text{JZax.} \quad u= pāš-la mahōye did-a, dēd d-ē baxta \]
\[\text{and= became-3FS assist\_delivery.INF LNK-3FS LNK GEN-DEM.FS woman} \]
\[\quad \text{smāx-ta} \]
\[\text{pregnant-FS} \]
\[\quad \text{‘She started to assist her in delivery, this pregnant woman.’ (Avinery 1988:}\]

\textsuperscript{14}The infinitive *'ixāla* functions here practically as a normal noun, denoting ‘food’. Yet in general it still functions as an infinitive (see Sabar 2002: 93), and thus deserves its place here.
5. Attributive Constructions in the Jewish Dialect of Zakho

Alternatively (and more frequently), only the explicit object appears, standing in apposition with the pronominal secondary. In this case it is not marked as genitive, since it does not stand in direct attributive relation with a linker. This is shown in the following example, taken from the same story as the previous one.

(52) **Infinitive–Pronoun/Noun (object)**

JZax. ปาษ-لا Ṣmādye did-e ṭaw ṭūma
became-3FS throw-INF LNK-3MS DEF.MS garlic

‘She started to throw it, the garlic.’ (Avinery 1988: 53 (6))

It is important to note that the object of an infinitive may also be introduced by the accusative/locative preposition ṣl (see Sabar 2002: 96), in which case an AC is not used. The functional equivalence of the two constructions, as apparent in the following example, suggests indeed that the AC serves in such cases to instantiate a completive relation. The following example illustrates the two possibilities:

(53) **Infinitive–Pronoun (object)**

JZax. (ū = ปาษ-لا 텸-ぁ ṭāl-a maraq) ṃhāqa ṣll-e ṭ xī̄qā did-e and- became-3FS for-3FS desire touch.INF ACC-3MS and hug.INF LNK-3MS

‘(and it became her desire) to touch him and hug him’ (Cohen 2012: (40))

Not only infinitives can act as primaries of this construction, but also resultative participles, which form part of the analytic perfect tense. Here again, functionally this is a completive relation, which is formally realised as an AC. The following example is analogous to example (52) on the current page.

(54) **Participle–Pronoun (object)**

JZax. ṭama ṃè-lu mukı̄m-e did-a ṭā y bāzār
why COP.PST-3PL blackened.RES-PL LNK-3FS DEF.FS city

‘why had they blackened the town’ (Cohen 2012: 144 (7))

5.3.2 Clausal secondaries

Clausal secondaries (i.e., relative clauses) can follow both the linker did and the shorter form d-, apparently in free variation. We note that the form d- is typically reserved in JZax. for clausal secondaries. In both cases, the clausal secondary stands in direct attributive relation with the linker, which represents the modified primary. In this respect it is similar to a relative pronoun, except that it is external to the relative clause; indeed, inside the relative clause we normally find a second pronominal index representing the primary.
5.3. The analytic linker construction (X lnk Y)

(55) **Noun (subject)–Clause**

JZax. (ta) [d-aw gūra] dīd [wē-wa-le faqīr]
for GEN-DEF.MS man LNK COP.PST-PST-3MS poor
‘(to) the man who was poor’ (Cohen 2012: 120 (121))

(56) **Noun–Clause**

JZax. (rīš) kursi d= wē-la tūta rē-c
on chair(MS) LNK= COP.PST-3FS sat.res.fs on-3MS
‘(on) the chair on which she was sitting’ (Cohen 2012: 134 (189))

(57) **Noun Phrase–Clause**

JZax. u= [trē sūsə-wāsa did-i] dīd [ʾāna g-rakw-en ʾəll-u]
and= two horse-PL LNK-1SG LNK 1SG IND-ride-1SG on-3PL
‘and two of my horses which I ride’ (Cohen 2012: 135 (190))

Pronouns may also act as primaries of the ALC with clausal secondaries. Such is the case of the interrogative pronoun mani ‘who’ in the following example. We note that in this example mani itself acts as a secondary of a CSC headed by the pronoun kud ‘every’:

(58) **Pronoun–Clause**

JZax. ku-d [mani dīd [yāwəl pāre ta șādāqa]]
every-CST who LNK sbjv.give.3MS money for charity
‘each one who gives money for charity...’ (Cohen 2012: 96 (13))

We can contrast this example with examples (23) and (24) on page 106, in which both mani and kud are primaries of a construct state-marked AC with a clausal secondary. We note that kud cannot act as the primary of the ALC due to its inherent construct state marking.

5.3.3 Numerals as ordinal secondaries

Numerals serving as ordinal secondaries occur frequently in this construction:

(59) **Noun–Ordinal**

JZax. ṣāba gabāra dīd tre
dem.ms hero LNK two
‘the second hero’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (11))

(60) **Noun–Ordinal**

JZax. baxta dīd ṭēlāha
dem.fs woman LNK three
‘the third wife’ (Cohen 2010: 85 (12))
As Cohen (2010: 85) points out, a phrase headed by a pronominal linker is the syntactic counterpart of an adjective. This is especially clear in the case of ordinal numerals, since the ordinal “first” is always expressed as a morphological adjective:

\[(61) \text{Noun–Ordinal} \]
\[\text{JZax. } \text{ē} \text{ baxtā qamē-sa} \]
\[\text{DEM.FS woman first-FS} \]
\[\text{‘the first wife’ (Cohen 2010: 85 (11))} \]

For an elaboration of this point in the context of Syriac, see the discussion in Section 3.7.

### 5.3.4 Adverbials as secondaries

Adverbials, whether true adverbs, or PPs, can occur following a linking pronoun:

\[(62) \text{Noun–Adverb} \]
\[\text{JZax. } \text{kū-d źāgīl dīd tam} \]
\[\text{every-CST worker LNK there} \]
\[\text{‘any worker (who was) there’ (Cohen 2012: 116 (109))} \]

\[(63) \text{Noun–Prepositional Phrase} \]
\[\text{JZax. } \text{aw gōrā dīd go māyā} \]
\[\text{DEF.MS man LNK in water} \]
\[\text{‘the man in the water’ (Cohen 2012: 132 (175))} \]

\[(64) \text{Noun–Adverbial Phrase} \]
\[\text{JZax. } \text{xabra d= [la l= dūk-e]} \]
\[\text{word LNK= NEG to= place~poss.3MS} \]
\[\text{‘inappropriate word (lit. word not in its place)’ (Cohen 2012: 217 (11))} \]

Given that the linker \( d- \) typically precedes clausal secondaries, the last example’s secondary may be understood as a reduced clause, lacking a copula.

Note that adverbials (prepositions or conjunctions) cannot serve as primaries of the ALC. This is not surprising, since a pronominal element cannot in general represent a preposition. Moreover, adverbials by virtue of their function are equivalents of construct state nouns which require a complement, and are as such incompatible with the linker. When a linker occurs after a preposition, it refers anaphorically to an implicit primary (see example (71) on page 118).

### 5.3.5 Linkers without an explicit primary

As explained in Section 2.3.4, the linker is seen as pronominal since it is capable of heading an AC without any explicit nominal preceding it, functioning analogously to
a construct state noun. Yet in JZax. at least, the linker is different from fully fledged pronouns in that it does not in general replace an entire determined noun-phrase, but rather only the head noun of a bare noun-phrase (see Table 1.2 on page 12). Thus, whereas a normal pronoun would not normally follow a determiner, the pronominal linker usually requires a definite determiner to precede it, as the following examples show. For clarity of exposition, we put a $\emptyset$ symbol in the examples, where an overt primary could have occurred.

(65) $\emptyset$–Ordinal
JZax. ʾay $\emptyset$ d= tre'
  def.fs $\emptyset$ lnk= two
  'the second (one$_{ps}$)' (Cohen 2012: 95 (7))

(66) $\emptyset$–Ordinal
JZax. ʾaw $\emptyset$ did tre
  def.ms $\emptyset$ lnk two
  'the second (one$_{ms}$)' (Cohen 2010: 84 (8))

This construction is also common with clausal secondaries, yielding a kind of “free relative”:

(67) $\emptyset$–Clause
JZax. ʾay $\emptyset$ d= g-əbá-wā-le
  def.fs $\emptyset$ lnk= ind-want.a3fs-pst-p3ms
  'the one$_{ps}$ who wanted him’ (Cohen 2012: 134 (183))

(68) $\emptyset$–Clause
JZax. ʾaw $\emptyset$ did hāyē =b-e all-i
  def.ms $\emptyset$ lnk sbjv.be.3ms =in-3ms acc-1sg
  'the one$_{ms}$ who can defeat me’ (Cohen 2010: 84 (9))

In some cases, as in the following example, the linker is seemingly coalesced with the genitive marking of the copula (see discussion of example (91) on page 123). Alternatively, such cases could be analysed as case of asyndetic free relative clauses (see example (110) on page 129) with an attributive marked copula.

(69) $\emptyset$–Clause
JZax. ʾan $\emptyset$ d-īlu ʾasye m= qabél mənn-an
  def.pl $\emptyset$ {lnk}.gen-cop.pl came.res.pl from= before from-1pl
  ‘those who came before us’ (Cohen 2012: 122 (141))

One may wonder whether the determiners themselves should not be simply analysed as pronouns in the primary position of an AC. To this Cohen (2012: 134) answers: “The dets ay, aw and an are neither pronouns nor do they function as such, and
hence cannot be suspected to be antecedents. In all these examples, what we have are in effect determined complex nominal syntagms.” Other cases, however, do cause an analytical ambiguity. Such is the case of xa ‘one’ in the following example, where it can be analysed both as a indefinite determiner or as an indefinite pronoun. Cohen (2012: 111f.) seems to imply that xa in this position is a determiner.\(^\text{15}\) Note, moreover, that the noun phrase introduced by xa is itself the secondary of CSC headed by pumma ‘mouth’.

\[(70)\] \textbf{Pronoun/∅–Clause}  
JZax. (mən pumm-ət) xā {∅} d= [la ʾāwaz gāzanda mən from mouth–CST INDF.PRO/DET {∅} LNK= NEG SBJV.do.3MS complaint from baxt-e]  
wife–poss.3MS  
‘(from the mouth of) someone who does not complain about his wife’ (Cohen 2012: 112 (89))

In some cases, however, the linker does appear without an overt determiner or nominal element immediately preceding it, and these require some further examination.\(^\text{16}\) The first case occurs whenever the linker is complemented by a pronominal suffix, such as in the following examples (the relevant expressions are marked in \textbf{bold}).\(^\text{17}\)

\[(71)\] \textbf{∅–Pronoun}  
JZax. mā=xulla qaḥra did–ox zōdan–ta =la mən ∅ did–i  
what=RHETORIC grief(fs) LNK–2MS superior–fs =cop.3FS from ∅ LNK–1SG  
‘Is your grief superior to mine?’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (5))

\[(72)\] \textbf{∅–Pronoun}  
JZax. ha=wē-la šasqsa did–a ’əmm–i ü= kaffiyə did–a ü= ∅  
here–cop.3FS ring LNK–3FS with–1SG and= scarf LNK–3FS and= ∅  
did–i lēw–u kas–li  
LNK–1SG NEG.COP–3PL at–1SG  
‘Here is her ring with me and her scarf, but mine are not with me’ (Cohen 2010: 84, fn. 7)

---

\(^\text{15}\) One may argue that the long version [xā] present in the example represents necessarily a pronoun (cf. Sabar 2002: 191). Yet the vowel-lengthening may be due to prosodic reasons, like the lack of a stress-bearing nominal following xa, and as such cannot be taken as a clear indication of grammatical status. See also the similar example (109) on page 128 where xa does not have a long vowel.

\(^\text{16}\) We dismiss cases where did forms part of a conjoint attributive complex, such as in examples (45) on page 112 or (50) on page 113, as in such cases we can argue that both did phrases are leaning on the same primary noun.

\(^\text{17}\) Cohen (2012: 138) writes on the complex LNK-POS: “The latter is a pronoun, rather than an adjective”, but at the same time did/d– is considered to be on its own a “construct-state pronoun” (Cohen 2012: 452).
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Such cases call for two analyses: Either the combination LNK+POSS has been grammaticalised as an independent genitive pronoun (possibly due to the inherent definiteness of the pronominal suffix\(^{18}\)), or it simply forms a bare NP that has a \(\emptyset\) determiner (which is defined by Cohen (2012: 454) to be “±definite; generic”). The latter option may be more adequate, since we find a similar example with an overt determiner (but note the somewhat unexpected non-definite meaning):

\[
\text{(73) } \emptyset–\text{Pronoun} \\
\text{JZax. ay } \emptyset \text{ d-ōhun (mərta } =\text{la) }
\]
\[
\text{DEF.FS } \emptyset \text{ LNK-3PL said.RES.FS } =\text{COP.FS}
\]
\[
\text{‘One\textsubscript{fem} of them (has said).’ (Cohen 2012: 138, fn. 36)}
\]

Another case where a linker construction appears without an overt determiner is in predicative position. In this position it may well be a bare NP, as the predicate position is quite flexible syntactically (it can accommodate as well bare adjectives or adverbial phrases). The following two examples constitute a question/answer pair, both having a predicative \(\text{đid}\).

\[
\text{(74) } \emptyset–\text{pronoun} \\
\text{JZax. } \emptyset \text{ did mani } =\text{le } \ōqadda māl?}
\]
\[
\text{\ emptyset LNK who } =\text{COP.3MS so\_much property}
\]
\[
\text{‘Whose is so much property?’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (12))}
\]

\[
\text{(75) } \emptyset–\text{noun} \\
\text{JZax. } \text{g-əmr-i: } \emptyset \text{ did flāna nāša } =\text{le}
\]
\[
\text{IND\_say\_3PL } \emptyset \text{ LNK certain man } =\text{COP.3MS}
\]
\[
\text{‘They say: it is of a certain man.’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (12))}
\]

Finally, we note a quite different usage of the \(d\)-morpheme without a nominal primary, namely its usage as a complementizer, such in the following examples:

\[
\text{(76) Verb–Clause} \\
\text{JZax. } \text{(u= xa lá= k-i\,c-wa) d= } \text{‘anya trē’ baxt-ās}
\]
\[
\text{and= one NEG\_know\_PST COMP= DEM.PL two woman\_PL.CST}
\]
\[
\text{d-ō gōra } =\text{lu}
\]
\[
\text{GEN\_DEM.MS man } =\text{COP.3PL}
\]
\[
\text{‘(But nobody knew) that these two are wives of the same man.’ (Cohen 2012: 121 (136))}
\]

\[
\text{(77) Verb–Clause}
\]

\(^{18}\text{Recall that the definiteness of the Semitic CSC is typically determined by the secondary; see Section 2.3.3.3.} \)
JZax. (la rʾāš-le) d= d-ilta ḥmāl-ta mālʾēl mān-e
NEG felt-3MS COMP= GEN-COP.3FS stood.RES-RES above from-3SG
‘He didn’t feel she is standing above him.’ (Cohen 2012: 124 (143))

One may reasonably argue that when used as a complementizer, did/d- is not part of an AC, and is thus distinct from the linker. Further evidence to this is adduced by the fact that in some cases, such as in example (76) the copula does not appear in its genitive form, as expected in an AC.

5.4 Genitive marking of secondaries

As discussed in Section 4.4, all determiners and demonstratives of JZax. which start with a glottal-stop or a vowel have a special genitive allomorph, formed by removing the glottal stop and prefixing the genitive d- marker. These include the definite articles (see Table 4.4 on page 96), some demonstratives and the interrogative determiner ēma ‘which’. As mentioned there, the discovery and analysis of this phenomenon in JZax. is due to Cohen (2010), but it occurs in other dialects as well. As the facts motivating this analysis are the clearest in JZax., we repeat them here briefly.

First, as stated above, the d- prefix appears only before a closed set of determiners and demonstratives, and not before other any ʾ or vowel-initial word (compare (17) on page 105), thus excluding a simple phonological conditioning of its appearance.

Second, note that the d- prefix appears after primaries with a suffixed construct state marker, primaries marked by apocopate construct state, as well as unmarked invariable primaries:

(78) Noun–Noun
JZax. pumm-ād d-aw nāša
mouth-CST GEN-DEF.MS man
‘the mouth of the man’ (Cohen 2012: 107 (76))

(79) Noun–Noun
JZax. bēs d-aw gōra
house.CST GEN-DEF.MS man
‘the house of the man’ (Cohen 2012: 107 (75))

(80) Noun–Infinitival Phrase

\[\text{Paradigmatically, it can be replaced by other complementizing particles, such as ʾnnu ‘that’ or hakān ‘whether’, attesting to its different status. See also the discussion regarding the similar Syriac examples (59)–(62) on page 59.}\]

\[\text{Clearly, such a phonological conditioning took part in the diachronic emergence of the marker, but it is no longer operative. In NrT (texts from the 17th century) we find examples like ʾsimm-ād d-ʾslāba ‘name of God’ (Sabar 2002: 38, §2).}\]
5.4. Genitive marking of secondaries

The first example proves that the \textit{d-} prefix is distinct from the construct state marker, while the second and third examples show that it occurs also when no /\textit{d}/ segment is called for by a construct state marking.

The last point can also be exemplified when the genitive marking follows an adverbial which normally do not get the \textit{-əd} suffix:

(81) **Preposition–Noun**

\begin{tabular}{ll}
JZax. & mən d-ay xzèna \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
from & \textit{GEN-DEF} treasure \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{JZax.} & \texttt{mən d-ay xzèna} \\
\texttt{from} & \texttt{\textit{GEN-DEF} treasure} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{mən d-ay xzèna} \\
\texttt{from} & \texttt{\textit{GEN-DEF} treasure} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{mən d-ay xzèna} \\
\texttt{from} & \texttt{\textit{GEN-DEF} treasure} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{mən d-ay xzèna} \\
\texttt{from} & \texttt{\textit{GEN-DEF} treasure} \\
\end{tabular}

In contrast to other dialects, the genitive marking is obligatory whenever its appearance conditions are met. The very few exceptions listed by Cohen (2012: 108, fn. 15) can probably be explained by speech \textit{lapsi} (or transcription errors), rather than a systematic optionality.

As we will see below, the genitive marker is also distinct from the linking pronoun, with which it can co-occur.

5.4.1 Genitive marking following the linker

Since the linker stands in direct attributive relationship with its complement (the secondary), the latter is marked by genitive case whenever possible:

(82) **Noun–Noun**

\begin{tabular}{ll}
JZax. & ʾōda did d-aw göra \\
room & \textit{LNK GEN-DEF.masc} man \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{ʾōda did d-aw göra} \\
\texttt{room} & \texttt{\textit{LNK GEN-DEF.masc} man} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{ʾōda did d-aw göra} \\
\texttt{room} & \texttt{\textit{LNK GEN-DEF.masc} man} \\
\end{tabular}

We find also a case of genitive marking following the short linker \textit{d-}, as in the following example (=example (16) on page 96). In the original source it is written as a separate word, but we can safely assume it procliticizes to the following word. Given that \textit{d-} typically comes before clausal secondaries (see Section 5.3.2), it is possible we are dealing here with a phonetic simplification of the sequence \textit{did d-əo} > \textit{d= d-əo}.

(83) **Noun Phrase–Noun**

\begin{tabular}{ll}
JZax. & (mən) d-o bɔhna rwixa d= d-o jwanqa \\
from & \textit{\textit{GEN-DEM.mS breath(mS) wide.mS LNK= GEN-DEM.masc} youngster} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{(mən) d-o bɔhna rwixa d= d-o jwanqa} \\
\texttt{from} & \texttt{\textit{\textit{GEN-DEM.mS breath(mS) wide.mS LNK= GEN-DEM.masc} youngster}} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{(mən) d-o bɔhna rwixa d= d-o jwanqa} \\
\texttt{from} & \texttt{\textit{\textit{GEN-DEM.mS breath(mS) wide.mS LNK= GEN-DEM.masc} youngster}} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{(mən) d-o bɔhna rwixa d= d-o jwanqa} \\
\texttt{from} & \texttt{\textit{\textit{GEN-DEM.mS breath(mS) wide.mS LNK= GEN-DEM.masc} youngster}} \\
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{ll}
\texttt{\texttt{JZax.}} & \texttt{(mən) d-o bɔhna rwixa d= d-o jwanqa} \\
\texttt{from} & \texttt{\textit{\textit{GEN-DEM.mS breath(mS) wide.mS LNK= GEN-DEM.masc} youngster}} \\
\end{tabular}
5.4.2 Genitive marking of clauses

As we have seen above (Section 5.2.2), clauses may act as secondaries. In some cases, their secondary status is marked by the very same prefix d-. Indeed, JZax. has developed a special series of “genitively” marked copulas, which consist of the normal (indicative present) copula preceded by d-. While the copula is the marked element, the scope of the marking should be understood as the entire secondary clause. As Cohen (2010) notes, this innovation of JZax. is similar to an Akkadian construction, but no direct influence can be adduced.21

(84) Noun–Clause
JZax. (b-əd) ḥaqq-əd d-īlu ʾasye man mōṣal
in–cst price–cst gen–cop.3pl came.res from M.
‘at the price which they had come to you from Mosul’ (Cohen 2012: 119 (116))

(85) Noun–Clause
JZax. (psōx) xā sandūq [d-ile mutwa go qurnis–ət čappe]
open.imp INDF chest gen–cop.3ms placed.res in corner–cst left
‘open a chest that is placed in the left corner’ (Cohen 2012: 119 (119))

As we see, the genitive marking appears both after nouns with suffixed cst marker or in apocopate cst form. It is worthwhile noting that the d- prefix occurs even when the copula is not the first element of the attributive clause, though this must occur quite rarely, as the following example is unique in my survey:

(86) Noun–Clause
JZax. (qam mesē-li ʾal) d-ay qaṣər [matməryam d-ila
pst brought.a3pl–p1sg to gen–def castle.cst VM. gen–cop.3ps
ʾal-e]
on–3ms
‘(They brought me to) the castle, on which (the statue of) Virgin Mary is.’22
(Cohen 2012: 119 (117))

The genitive marking appear also in ACs headed by adverbial conjunctions, whether they are invariable or construct state marked:

21 It should be noted that the genitive marking of clauses is different from the subjunctive mood (i.e. šaqəl forms without a pre-verbal particle) which exists in JZax. and other dialects. While the subjunctive mood is frequently found with embedded clauses, it adds a semantic mood value to the utterance, in contrast to the genitive marker, which is a pure grammatical mark of secondary position. Moreover, the subjunctive form can appear in matrix clauses, as example (92) on page 124 shows.
22 If we assume dīla does open the relative clause, we get the quite odd interpretation “the castle of Virgin Mary, whose (statue) is on it”.
5.4. Genitive marking of secondaries

(87) **Conjunction–Clause**
JZax. mən hīng-əd d-īla hwīsa
from then-cst gen-cop.3fs born.res.fs
‘from the time she was born’ (Cohen 2012: 120 (127))

(88) **Conjunction–Clause**
JZax. čukūn d-īw-ət qarīwa l= ləbb-i
since gen-cop-2ms close.ms to= heart-poss.1sg
‘since you are close to my heart’ (Cohen 2012: 121 (130))

The same genitive copula is used also for clausal secondaries of the ALC, i.e. following the linker:

(89) **Noun (subject)–Clause**
JZax. ō gōra did d-i-le go namūsiy-e
dem.ms man lnk gen-cop-3ms in bed-poss.3ms
‘the man who is in his bed’ (Cohen 2012: 119 (120))

(90) **Noun (subject)–Clause**
JZax. ʾē baxta d= d-ī-la baxt-e
dem.fs woman lnk= gen-cop.3fs woman-poss.3ms
‘that woman who is his wife’ (Cohen 2012: 122)

In the last example we note that the d- linker cliticizes to the d- genitive marker. This resulting d=d cluster is sometimes simplified to a de-geminated /d/, serving in both functions (cf. Cohen 2012: 122):

(91) **Noun (subject)–Clause**
JZax. ay ʾurxa d-il-a msukar-ta mən qam mšalxāne ē= def.fs road lnk.gen-cop-3fs closed.res-fs from before robbers and=
ganāwe thieves
‘the road which is closed because of robbers and thieves’ (Cohen 2012: 121 (137))

The genitive marking of clauses, on the other hand, is possible only whenever the secondary clause uses the indicative copula. When no such copula is present, such as when a form of the verb ‘to be’ is used, no genitive marking is apparent. This is exemplified by example (23) on page 106 and possibly also by example (109) on page 128. Similarly the existential particle (glossed ex), combined here with the preposition b- ‘in’ to denote ability, has no genitive marking:

(92) **Pronoun–Clause**
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JZax. (šaql-axni) mā-t [ī-b-an mtāš-ax go jēbē-ni]
sbjv.take-1PL what-CST EX-in-1PL sbjv.hide-1PL in pocket.PL-poss1PL
‘Let’s take whatever we can hide in our pockets.’ (Cohen 2012: 96 (20))

5.5 Double annexation construction (X-y.poss lnk-y)

In general the DAC is not used in JZax. A rare usage of it occurs when the secondary
is pronominal, in which case a possessive pronoun can be suffixed both to the primary
noun and to a linker. This yields some added pragmatic emphasis.

(93) Noun–Pronoun
JZax. baxt-i did-i
woman-poss.1SG lnk-1SG
‘my own wife’ (Cohen 2012: 113, fn. 19)

5.6 Juxtaposition (X Y.{agr})

By juxtaposition we mean a construction in which the two members of the AC are
put adjacent to each other, without any further marking (except for the possibility of
agreement). This type of construction is reserved in JZax. for several quite distinct
cases, which are detailed below.

5.6.1 Adjectival attribution

Adjectives are normally directly juxtaposed after the primary noun. Syntactically,
they stand in apposition with the primary noun; the attributive relationship itself is
expressed indirectly by agreement of the adjective with the head noun. The inflection
of adjectives, however, is mostly restricted to adjectives of Aramaic origin, especially
with regard to the gender feature.

(94) Noun–Adjective
JZax. xa jwanqa sqil-a
INDF youth(MS) beautiful-MS
‘a beautiful youth’ (Cohen 2012: 214)

(95) Noun–Adjective
JZax. xa xamsa sqal-ta
INDF maiden(FS) beautiful-FS
‘a beautiful maiden’ (Cohen 2012: 214)

The ordinal qamāya ‘first’ acts as an adjective, as is seen in example (61) on page 116.
Borrowed adjectives sometimes do not inflect (or inflect only for number). This is the case of the adjective ʿāqāl 'wise', borrowed from Arabic (Sabar 2002: 246a). In such cases we get a truly zero-marked AC:

(96) **Noun–Adjective**

JZax. ʾaxōnā ʿāqāl

brother wise(inv)

'(the) wise brother' (Cohen 2012: 214)

Occasionally an inflecting definite determiner precedes the adjective, instead of the primary noun (Cohen 2012: 215). The reasons for this are unclear, and may be related to some unknown semantic or stylistic factors. One syntactic possibility is that it marks the grammatical features of a non-inflecting (or partially inflecting) adjective, as in the following example (=example (4) on page 11):

(97) **Noun–Adjective**

JZax. axōnā aw rūwa

brother DEF.MS big,SG23

'more older brother' (Cohen 2012: 214)

Another motivation might be the occurrence of a possessed noun as the primary, which normally is not marked by a determiner preceding it:

(98) **Noun Phrase–Adjective**

JZax. axōn-e aw ʿāqāl

brother-POSS.3MS DEF.MS wise(inv)

'his wise brother' (Cohen 2012: 214)

Recall, however, that similar examples occur also in Syriac (see example (109) on page 76).24

5.6.1.1 **Inverse order juxtaposition (Y X)**

Cohen (2012: 214, fn. 2) mentions that “in a small number of cases”, the adjective precedes the noun, creating an inverse juxtaposition construction:25

(99) **Noun–Adjective**

JZax. aw fita ṭūra

def.MS huge(inv) ROCK(MS)

---

23 Note that rūwa 'big' inflects only for number in JZax. (Sabar 2002: 288b).

24 Another possibility suggested by Eran Cohen (p.c.) is that the determiner imitates the position of the Kurmanji linker Ezafe, which precedes the adjective (see Section 9.4.1 as well Subsection 10.3.2.2.5 on page 278). For possible relationship to the Semitic heritage see footnote 14 on page 11.

25 Recall that the title of examples follows always the order Primary–Secondary.
‘the huge rock’ \(^{26}\) (Cohen 2012: 214, fn. 2)

(100) **Noun–Adjective**

JZax. ʾē fita brāta

\textit{dem.pl. huge daughter}

‘this grown-up girl’ (Avinery 1988: 124 (680))

Interestingly, Sabar (2002) mentions a variant of this construction with the construct state suffix, which is very similar to the “emotive genitive” construction presented in example (34) on page 109.

(101) **Noun–Adjective**

JZax. xa fit-\(a/\)ad göra

\textit{INDF huge-FREE/CST man}

‘a huge person’ (Sabar 2002: 263a)

### 5.6.2 Adverbial primaries

As mentioned in Section 5.2.3, prepositions which are not explicitly marked with a construct state \(-əd\) suffix cannot be considered to be marked by apocope, since they do not have a free form (unless they are derived from nouns). In these cases they are merely juxtaposed before their complement, as in the following example (contrast with example (28) on page 108):

(102) **Preposition–Noun**

JZax. b= bəllūre

\textit{in= flute}

‘with a flute’ (Cohen 2010: 85 (15))

Nonetheless, most prepositions induce an attributive relationship, as is clear from the occurrence of genitive marked secondaries following them, such as in example (81) on page 121.

Cohen (2012: 104) does mention, however, one preposition, \(bēb\) ‘with’, which does not induce genitive case, and thus formally always realises a juxtaposition pattern:\(^{27}\)

(103) **Preposition–Pronoun**

\(^{26}\)Sabar (2002: 172a) lists \(ṭūra\) as ‘mountain’, but we follow here the translation given by Cohen.

\(^{27}\)Sabar (2002: 108) lists this preposition as being possibly from Kurdish origin, while Mutzafi (2008a: 121) gives a possible Aramaic etymology \(b-ēb\) consisting of the preposition \(b\)– ‘in’ repeated with a proleptic pronoun. Given that Kurdish Kurmanji prepositions induce oblique case, the Aramaic etymology may be the correct one.
It is interesting to note that a preposition can be diachronically derived from a apocopate construct state noun, without being any more synchronically connected to it. Such is the case of the preposition rəš ‘on’, derived from the noun rēša ‘head’, still present in the dialect. The former is a phonologically reduced form of the construct state of the latter, rēš. While synchronically the noun can also occur as rēšəd, the preposition is invariable. The contrast is neatly shown in the following example (continuing example (43) on page 111):

(104) Preposition–Noun Phrase
JZax. rəš [rēš-ət manî-t yātū-wa]
on head-cst who-cst sbjv sit-pst
‘on the head of whomever it would sit’ (Cohen 2012: 96 (18))

5.6.3 Adverbial secondaries

Nouns, as well as pronouns, can be modified by at least some adverbial secondaries without any AC marking, neither on the primary nor on the secondary:

(105) Noun–Prepositional Phrase
JZax. xá quṭē’fa mux quṭē’f-ət ʾədyo ġzē-li
INDF cluster like cluster-cst today saw-1SG
‘a cluster like the cluster I saw today’ (Cohen 2012: 217 (12))

(106) Pronoun–Prepositional Phrase
JZax. xá mənn-ēni
one from-1PL
‘one of us’ (Cohen 2012: 217 (14))

5.6.4 Clausal secondaries

Clausal secondaries can follow an indefinite primary noun asyndetically, i.e. without any particular marking. Cohen (2012: 138) tentatively relates this pattern to Arabic influence, whether direct or indirect, as in Arabic too the construction is confined to indefinite primaries.\textsuperscript{29}

\textsuperscript{28}The derivation of the preposition ‘on’ from the noun ‘head’ is probably a pattern borrowing from Kurdish, where the word ser has the same two meanings (Noorlander 2014: 206).

\textsuperscript{29}“Most asyndetic adjective clauses […] are] perhaps modeled after the Arabic ([but] this phenomenon also occurs in NENA dialects that are clearly outside the Arabic speaking area)” (Cohen 2012: 137f.). See discussion in Section 11.3.1.
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(107) **Noun–Clause**

JZax. (u = ṣāna gāḇ-ēn ṭāʾ-ət-tə) [xa xamsa] [hōyə-and= 1sg IND.want-1sg look-A2MS-DAT.1sg IND maid sbjv.be.3MS mān māšpāḥā bāṣ] from family good‘I want you to look for a maid (who) is from a good family.’ (Cohen 2012: 137 (214))

Such asyndetic clauses may be related to examples like the following:

(108) **Noun–Clause(?)**

JZax. (mpəq-le mān xā = ṣāl) [xa ṣālya] [ʾēn-e smōq-e] came_out-3MS from one= side INDF lion eye-poss.3MS red-pl.‘From one side came out a lion, his eyes red’ (Cohen 2012: 225 (63))

Cohen (2012: 225) classifies such cases as “non-clausal adjectival nexus”. In his view, while these are expressions of a predicative relation (a *nexus*, see Section 2.1.1), they are not clausal, since they lack a copula. Nevertheless, since nominal clauses lacking a copula do occur (albeit rarely) in NENA dialects, we may relax the usage of the term “clause” to include such cases as well.

The morpheme *xa*, followed by an asyndetic attributive clause, presents the same analytical difficulty we saw in example (70) on page 118. Either we analyse it as an indefinite pronoun (‘someone’), which is followed directly by an attributive clause, and is not marked as construct state (contrast with the construct state pronouns in examples (22)–(25) on page 106), or we analyse it as an indefinite determiner, followed by a ∅ primary noun + relative clause, which renders the structure parallel to the above examples:

(109) **Pronoun/∅–Clause**

JZax. (la ḡzē-lu) xa {∅} [šāmm-e hāwe qaramā́n] neg saw-3PL INDF.PRO/DET {∅} name-poss.3MS sbjv.be.3MS Q.‘They did not find anyone whose name is Qaraman.’ (Cohen 2012: 137 (216))

Note that in either analysis, *xa* introduces a discourse referent, which is referred to in the secondary clause by the 3ms pronominal indices.

The latter analysis may also be preferred due to the rare occurrence of a similar structure introduced by a *definite* determiner. In such examples, as the following, we

---

30 Cf. Goldenberg (2013a: 257) who writes: “such syntagms are not conceived as asyndetically embedded sentences, which in Neo-Aramaic would require a copula [...] In other words, such syntagms might be said to incorporate the cohesive or relational, but not the assertive, constituent of the nexus.”
also posit the occurrence of a ∅ primary.31

(110)   ∅–Clause
JZax.  an ∅ k-sêm-i mânn-an
       DEF.PL ∅ IND–hate–3PL from–1PL
       ‘those who hate us’ (Cohen 2012: 138 (217))

5.6.5 Infinitival primaries

As we saw in Section 5.2.5, infinitives can be marked by construct state morphology. This marking, however, is not obligatory, probably due to the verbal nature of infinitives: When followed by an object argument, the infinitive can induce a completive relation, which is manifested by the unmarked juxtaposition construction, rather than a marked attributive relation. Contrast the following example with example (38) on page 110 (which is the continuation of this example):

(111)   Infinitive–Noun
JZax.  (baš xlë-la ’all-i) ’wāza xôrûs–ax (mân ...)
       more pleased–3PS to–1SG make.INF friendship–poss.2PS than ...
       ‘Befriending you (pleases me more than befriending emirs’ and pashas’ daughters.’ (Cohen 2012: 99 (38))

5.7 Conclusions

J. Zakho has three types of AC markers (construct state marking, the linker, and genitive case), but only two can co-occur at the same time, as the cst and lnk marking are in complementary distribution. In other words, JZax. has two slots of marking the AC, presented in Table 5.1. Note that these slots do not correspond directly to head-marking vs. dependent marking, as the first slot opposes the head-marking construct state markers attaching to the primary with the dependent marking linker, which attaches syntactically and phonologically to the secondary.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>cst (~2d, App.)</td>
<td>± gen(d–)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>lnk (d–, did)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: AC markers in JZax.

31Note though that such cases are unusual, in that a definite primary would normally not allow an asyndetic relative clause. Cohen (2012: 138) mentions that such examples are only found in one source (Sabar 2007), which is a unique genre of autobiographical account.
The dialect presents both innovative and conservative aspects of the AC system, as compared to Classical Aramaic (of which we take Syriac as the main point of comparison). First and foremost, it conserves the classical Semitic logic of the attributive relation marking: This relation must be either marked directly on the primary noun (by means of construct state marking), or indirectly by means of a pronominal linker. Moreover, the distinction between nominal/clausal attribution, in which the attributive relationship is overt, and adjectival attribution, in which it is covert (formally realised only by agreement) is strictly kept. We find in JZax., however, innovated morphological material available for marking the construct state, most notably the suffixed construct state -əd marker, and to a lesser degree novel apocopate forms. Cohen (2015: 121ff.) suggests that the development of the -əd suffix is related to pattern replication from the co-territorial Kurmanji, yet an internal development stemming from encliticization of the Classical Aramaic d- linker to the primary is possible as well (see discussion in Section ⒌⒊2).

Another related morphological innovation is the introduction of the variant form düd as an independent linker, in contrast to a base appearing only with possessive pronominal suffixes as in JBA. This may be explained by the resemblance of the düd linker to a d- linker augmented by the construct state -əd suffix; see Section 10.3.2 for a discussion. We note that all the above discussed innovations do not change the basic logic of the system, but rather affect only the forms involved.

Structurally more innovative is the introduction of genitive marking in certain morphological environments (certain determiners, and the indicative copula). While genitive marking existed in ancient Semitic languages, it is unknown in prior strata of Aramaic, and must be considered as an innovation. It is clearly innovative in that it constitutes an additional marker of ACs (on top of the construct state marking or the linker). Moreover, in some cases, such as ACs headed by simple prepositions, it reveals the existence of an attributive relation which could in earlier strata only be posited abstractly. In this respect, the innovation of genitive marking is more important structurally than the innovation of new construct state forms, although it affects only a restricted number of grammatical items. Nonetheless, the overall effect of this innovation on the attributive system is small, as it only adds morphological marking in restricted cases, without restructuring any AC.

Another point which can be considered innovative is the usage of the linker in marking completive relations, following infinitives as well as resultative participles (see Section 5.3.1). This phenomenon, however, is situated at the periphery of the attributive system, and is in fact related to the development of periphrastic verbal constructions.

Another innovation, as compared to earlier strata of Aramaic, is the possibility of introducing relative clauses directly after primaries marked for construct state, ir-
respective of the type of marking (apocope or the -əd suffix). While this possibility existed in ancient Semitic languages (such as Biblical Hebrew), it must have been reintroduced in NENA. Indeed, the usage of clausal secondaries after apocopate construct state primaries is specific to the J. Cis-Zab group, as it is only clearly attested there. To be sure, it does not appear in Syriac. This innovation can be understood as filling a syntactic gap (or asymmetry) in the system which existed in previous Aramaic dialects, including Syriac, since it extends the possibility of marking ACs with nominal secondaries either by the linking pronoun or by the construct state marking to clausal secondaries as well. As such, it can be said to be an internally motivated development (due to the general force of analogy), but see again Cohen (2015: 123) who suggests that this possibility is due to pattern replication from Kurmanji. In the realm of relative clauses, we see also the innovation of asyndetic relative clauses (see Section 5.6.4), which is known in other Semitic languages, but not in Aramaic. Here, the suggestion of borrowing from Arabic (Cohen 2012: 138) seems plausible; see further discussion in Section 11.3.1.

As for the phonological material, JZax. is clearly conservative, as it recycles the same material for the new morphological devices. The D-markers derive from the Classical Aramaic linker d-, which by various cliticization and re-analysis processes yielded the construct state suffix -əd (see Section 10.3) and the genitive prefix d- (Section 10.4). The linker did existed already in Classical Aramaic (in particular in JBA) as a pronominal base of the independent genitive pronouns, but it has been reanalysed in JZax. as an independent linker, capable of introducing full nominal secondaries (see Section 10.5.2). Thus, no morphemes are borrowed from contact languages.

In summary, notwithstanding the possibility of language contact, it seems that most of the JZax. features regarding the AC system can be explained, at least in principle, by processes of internal development. These processes “shuffle around” morphemic material (making essentially analytical forms synthetic), but keep the essential logic of the system intact.

---

33See Table 11.1 on page 309 and the following JAmd. example for another J. Cis-Zab dialect showing this construction:

(i) **Noun–Clause**

JAmd. ḥil yom gawar-wa-la
until.3cst marry.3ms-pst-p3fs
‘until the day he married her’ (Greenblatt 2011: 73)
Chapter 6

Attributive Constructions in the Christian Dialect of Qaraqosh

The data of the Qaraqosh dialect (=Qar.) is based on Khan (2002a). Note that the town name Qaraqosh is referred to as Bağdedo in the dialect itself, as will be apparent in some of the examples below.¹

Compared to JZax., Qar. presents a more conservative system of ACs, as we shall see below. With respect to the AC system, the dialect is quite similar to the neighbouring dialect of Alqosh (=Alq.), described by Coghill (2003), but still somewhat more conservative.

The main ACs in Qar. are the suffixed CSC (see Section 6.2) and the ALC (see Section 6.3). Due to the frequent resyllabification of the /d/ segment, however, it is not always easy to distinguish between the two. This fuzzy situation may be related to the conservative nature of the dialect. Moreover, in contrast to JZax., there is no regular genitive d- marking, although some cases may resemble it (see example (76) on page 151). In Gospel translations we find also the DAC (see Section 6.4.2).

The chapter discusses also some other constructions found in Qar.: The use of the possessive pronominal suffixes, in which Qar. has some particularities, is discussed in the next section. Double marking due to hesitation is discussed in Section 6.4.1. Juxtaposition constructions, on the periphery of the AC system of Qar., are discussed in Section 6.5.

¹The examples are cited referring to the page in the grammar in which they are treated. Examples which are part of the texts collected by Khan are furthermore indicated by a textual reference, using Khan’s notation system in square brackets. The single letters refer to informants’ free speech, while the labels Proverbs, Play, Poetry and Gospel refer to recordings of a collection of proverbs, a theatre play, poetry recitation, and a Gospel translation. Note that the recordings of informant K (including the proverbs) are publicly available (see link under Khan 2002a in the Bibliography).
6.1 Possessive pronominal suffixes (X-y.poss)

Qar., like all NENA dialects, has a series of pronominal possessive suffixes, that can attach freely to nouns. The possessive pronouns replace the last vowel of the noun, which corresponds to the free state and number marking. As a consequence, when the number distinction is expressed solely by this vowel, it is lost. Such is the case of the noun *tora* ‘ox’ with the plural form *tora*:

(1) **Noun–Pronoun**

Qar. tór-əḥ

ox(en)-3MS

‘his ox(en)’ (Khan 2002a: 76)

Qar., however, exhibits a special feature, in that the plural possessive pronominal suffixes retain the number distinction of the head noun: These suffixes transform a plural /-ə/ suffix to an /-e/ suffix, instead of suppressing it. As Khan (2002a: 77) notes, this is an archaism of the dialect, which conserves the reflex of an original *ay*:

(2) **Noun–Pronoun**

Qar. tór-∅-hən

ox(en)-SG-POSS.3PL

‘their ox’ (Khan 2002a: 77)

(3) **Noun–Pronoun**

Qar. tor-é-hən

ox(en)-PL-POSS.3PL

‘their oxen’ (Khan 2002a: 77)

The possessive suffix attaches strictly to the primary noun. A modifying adjective appears after this complex (contrast with example (59) on page 147):

(4) **Noun Phrase–Pronoun**

Qar. sús-əḥ kōma

horse-POSS.3MS black

‘his black horse’ (Khan 2002a: 280)

An interesting phenomenon particular to this dialect is the insertion of an /-ətt/ suffix (glossed here as) before the possessive pronoun in some feminine nouns, such as *ʾarnūwa* ‘rabbit’:

(5) **Noun–Pronoun**

Qar. ʾarnuw-ə́tt-əḥ

rabbit-FS-POSS.3MS

‘his rabbit’ (Khan 2002a: 204)
As most of the nouns which behave in this way are loan words of Arabic, Khan (2002a: 206) relates this phenomenon to the retention of the Arabic tāʾ marbūṭa, which is an -ət suffix appearing in construct state feminine nouns. In this account, the gemination of the /t/ segment may be explained by a merger with the Aramaic feminine suffix -ta, yielding -ət + -ta = -ətta, noting that the final -a vowel is dropped before the possessive suffixes. The gemination could also be explained on phonological grounds, as a mean to conserve the short [ə] vowel in a closed syllable. Either way, we note that in contrast to the Arabic tāʾ marbūṭa, the Qar. -ott is not a generalized feminine construct state marker, as it appears only before possessive pronouns, and not before full nominal secondaries.

Another possibility which Khan raises is that the -ott segment may be related to the linker did, akin to the NWNA “heavy” possessive suffixes which contain the linker d-, but this seems less plausible due to the restricted distribution of this suffix with feminine nouns only.

Infinitives, as well as particles, take the same possessive suffixes as nouns. These suffixes mark then the complements of the verbal lexeme (see also Section 6.2.7):

(6) **Infinitive—Pronoun**

Qar. (xālṣa) lyāš-əḥ

finish.3FS knead.INF—POSS.3MS

‘(She finishes) kneading it.’ (Khan 2002a: 364 [B:132])

(7) **Participle—Pronoun**

Qar. k-īna šqil-əḥ Mašlāyə

IND—COP.3PL taken.RES—POSS.3MS M._inhabitants

‘The people of Mosul have taken it.’ (Khan 2002a: 363 [S:49])

Some prepositions may also take the possessive pronominal suffixes:

(8) **Preposition—Pronoun**

Qar. txiθ-əḥ

under—POSS.3MS

‘under it’ (Khan 2002a: 80)

Other prepositions, which cannot take this suffix, have a suppletive allo-form which appears only with the possessive suffixes. Such is the case of ʾeka-gib—‘at’ or da-ġdal—‘for’:

(9) **Preposition—Pronoun**

---

2Khan (2002a: 204) notes that the final /a/ of Arabic loan—words, which corresponds to tāʾ marbūṭa (in its free state form), is often pronounced as [ə].

3See footnote 11 on page 265 for an example.
6.2 The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

The marking of the primary by the construct state suffix -əd is the most common type of AC in Qar., but its identification is not always easy, due to phonological considerations. Indeed, very often the construct state suffix syllabifies with the subsequent secondary, rendering it similar to the linker construction, discussed in Section 6.3. At the same time, the historical apocopate construct state is only retained in a handful of expressions, discussed below.

6.2.1 The historical construct state marking

The historical construct state marking, characterized synchronically by an apocope of the primary noun (minimally the removal of the free state suffix), is found only in a handful of “closely knit-phrases” (Khan 2002a: 209), i.e. proper nouns or fixed expressions (compounds), with either opaque semantics (see example (13) on the next page) or transparent semantics (see example (14) on the facing page). Additionally, we find the primary bi ‘house.cst’ in the meaning of ‘family/house of’ used productively with a referential secondary (see example (15) on the next page).4

4For a discussion of the various types of compounds in NENA, see Gutman (2014).
that in example (14) the word bάχατ ‘wife.cst’ is formed from bάxta ‘wife.free’ by
the removal of the free state suffix -a and the insertion of an epenthetic ə.

(13)  Noun–Noun (opaque semantics)
Qar.  bί=  guba; bί=  yılda; bα=  zar’a
house.cst= hole  house.cst= birth; son.cst= field
‘tunnel’, ‘Christmas’, ‘seed’ (Khan 2002a: 209)

(14)  Noun–Noun (transparent semantics)
Qar.  bάχαt  bαbα; syαm=  ḫα
wife.cst father laying.cst= hand
‘step-mother, ordination’ (Khan 2002a: 209)

(15)  Noun–Noun (productive expressions)
Qar.  bί  xάθnα; bί=  Şάβα; bί=  ‘άμm-i
house.cst groom house.cst= S.  house.cst= uncle-poss.1sg
‘family of the groom, of S., of my paternal uncle’ (Khan 2002a: 209 [S:93])

In this respect, Qar. differs from JZax., in which the apocopate construct state is
totally productive (see example (6) on page 103 among others).

6.2.2  The suffixed construct state formation

The productive formation of the construct state is made with the help of the -(ə)d
suffix, which originates in the encliticization of the linker d-;5  The suffix replaces
the final vowel of the primary (if it ends in a vowel), leading often to a neutralisation
of the number distinction of the primary noun:

(16)  Noun–Noun
Qar.  kθάw–əd  qάšα
book-cst priest
‘the book of the priest’ (Khan 2002a: 276)

In some cases, especially after liquid consonants following a vowel, the [ə] segment
is not present, alluding to its epenthetic status.

(17)  Noun–Noun
Qar.  gúr–d  málθα
men–cst town
‘the men of the town’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [F:96])

Khan treats the construct state marker and the linker as two manifestations of the same annex-
ation particle d; see Chapter 4 for similar opinions of other scholars. For the development of the
construct state suffix see discussion in Section 10.3.
Some specific nouns seem to combine a historical apocopeate construct state form with an -əd suffix. Such is the case of the nouns ʾəbra ‘son’ and brata ‘daughter’:

(18) Noun–Noun
Qar. bàrd ʾaxón-ʾi
son.cst brother-poss.1sg
‘the son of my brother’ (Khan 2002a: 207)

(19) Noun–Noun
Qar. bàrtəd ʾàmma
daughter.cst paternal_uncle
‘the daughter of a paternal uncle’ (Khan 2002a: 207 [S:40])

As Khan (2002a: 208) mentions, in some cases the /d/ segment is phonetically syllabified with the secondary. This happens predominantly when the secondary starts with a vowel (often preceded by an epenthetic glottal stop) or a consonant cluster, in which case an epenthetic [ə] is added after the /d/. These cases are still in principle differentiable from the linker d- (treated in Section 6.3), thanks to the replacement of the final (free state) vowel of the primary (typically an -a for singular nouns) by an [ə] (glossed in such cases as V_cst), or its complete elision in some cases (typically when the last consonant of the primary is a liquid).⁶

(20) Noun–Noun
Qar. yál -d= ʾaxóna
child(ren) -cst= brother
‘children of the brother’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [F:3])

(21) Noun–Noun
Qar. ʾıt-ə -də ʾŠmòni⁷
church-V_cst -cst= S.
‘the church of Shmoni’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [K:21])

The syllabification of the construct state suffix with a vowel-initial secondary is not automatic however, as example (18) on the current page and the following

⁶The elision of a final schwa in a CVC> CV environment seems to be a regular phonological process in Qar. and the neighbouring Alq. dialect (cf. Coghill 2003: 73). Since only a schwa is thus elided (and not the vowel [a]), the lack of a final vowel is a clear indication of an underlying -əd suffix. On the other hand, when a schwa is present, it is often difficult in normally paced speech to tell it apart from an /-a/ suffix, which is often realised as [ə]. When the primary noun ends in the free state with an [ə] (such as some plural nouns or infinitives) it is impossible to tell the difference between the two constructions in normal speech. Indeed, Coghill (2003: 298), describing the neighbouring Alq. dialect, notices that it is often impossible to tell whether the /d/ segment is associated with the primary or the secondary, as in nāšə-d-jéš ‘men of the army’.

⁷This is the text as it appears in the corpus. In the grammar, it is cited erroneously as ʾito d-ʾAšmoni.
example show (contrast with example (20) on the facing page):

(22)  **Noun–Noun**
Qar.  bāb-ʾaxón-ʾə́mm-i
father–brother–mother
‘the father of the brother of my mother’ (Khan 2002a: 276 [B:25])

Conversely, the suffix may syllabify with the secondary even when the above mentioned phonological conditions are not fulfilled.

(23)  **Noun–Noun**
Qar.  kθayáθ-də = Baġdèdə
chickens–cst = B.
‘the chickens of Qaraqosh.’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [B:105])

In some cases, the /d/ segment is assimilated to the following segment. In Khan’s transcription the assimilated segment is written as a proclitic of the secondary:

(24)  **Noun–Noun**
Qar.  ʾilan-z = záʾθa
tree–cst = olive
‘olive tree’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [K:56])

In cases where the resulting geminate is de-geminated, the only indicator of the construct state is the lack of the final free state vowel on the primary, and its replacement by an [ə] (in which cases it fully assumes the role of construct state marking, and is thus glossed cst):

(25)  **Noun–Noun**
Qar.  ʾár-Baġdèdə
land–B.
‘the land of Qaraqosh’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [S:48])

When the primary consists of conjoined nouns, one construct state suffix is sufficient for the entire phrase, as in the following example (=example (11) on page 92; compare to the other examples there). 8

(26)  **Conjoined nouns–Noun**
Qar.  [wánat–u toráθ]-də Baġdèdə
sheep= and cows–cst B.
‘the sheep and cows of Qaraqosh’ (Khan 2002a: 276 [F:1])

---

8Note that wánat is the plural form of ʾuwana, wana ‘female sheep’ and not an apocopate form (Khan 2002a: 727).
6.2.3 Adverbial primaries

Recall that we use the term *adverbial* as a cover term for both conjunctions and prepositions, as these often assume an adverbial function (see footnote 43 on page 38). However, the CSC of Qar. admits only prepositions (taking nominal complements) as primaries:

(27) **Preposition–Noun**
Qar. rı́š-əd kalθa
on-cst bride
‘on the bride’ (Khan 2002a: 239 [K:41])

(28) **Preposition–Noun Phrase**
Qar. txı́θ-əd [dınw-əd ḥaywā̀n]
under-cst tail-cst animal
‘under the tail of the animal’ (Khan 2002a: 240 [B:75])

In some cases, only the /-ə/ segment remains of the construct state suffix (compare with example (25) on the previous page):

(29) **Preposition–Noun**
Qar. txı́θ-ə sūdyaʾ-’u= txı́θ-ə làḥma
under-cst warp and= under-cst weft
‘under the warp and under the weft’ (Khan 2002a: 240 [B:22])

(30) **Preposition–Noun**
Qar. bāθr-ə bāb-əḥ
behind-cst father-poss.3ms
‘behind his father’ (Khan 2002a: 233)

Conversely, when the secondary is vowel-initial the /d/ segment tends to syllabify with the secondary (compare with example (20) on page 138). In such cases, the /ə/ segment tends to fall.

(31) **Preposition–Noun**
Qar. txı́θ-ə -d= āql-əḥ
under -cst= foot-poss.3ms
‘under his foot’ (Khan 2002a: 240 [F:38])

The same analysis holds for the prepositions mən ‘from’ and maš ‘like’, though in their case we do not find instances of the forms mənn-əd and maš-əd before consonantal-initial secondaries.⁹ Instead, we find cases of the simple form of the

⁹The form mənn-əd, however, is attested in other dialects, including NrT (see example (59) on page 335), JUrnn. (see example (18) on page 170) and Boh., as illustrated by the following example:
preposition (without a /d/ segment) in the juxtaposition construction; see Section 6.5.2.

(32) **Preposition–Noun**
Qar. \(\text{mən} \ -d= \ áda \ \text{gdiša}\)
from -\text{cst}= \text{DEM.PROX.MS} pile
‘from this pile’ (Khan 2002a: 238 [B:94])

(33) **Preposition–Adverb**
Qar. \(\text{mən} \ -d= \ àxa\)
from -\text{cst}= here
‘from here’ (Khan 2002a: 238 [F:11])

(34) **Preposition–Noun**
Qar. \(\text{max} \ -d= \ ada \ \text{gora}\)
like \text{cst}= \text{DEM.PROX.MS} man
‘like this man’ (Khan 2002a: 238)

As the above examples show, in many of these cases the vowel-initial element opening the secondary is a demonstrative pronoun. The attachment of the /d/ segment to it may be the first step in the path of its reanalysis as a genitive case marker conditioned morphologically by the presence of a demonstrative pronoun (see Section 10.4). This reanalysis has not taken place in Qar. (or at least, not completely), as the attachment of the /d/ segment to the secondary is still conditioned by a vowel-initial phonological environment (as example (31) on the preceding page shows), rather than being morphologically conditioned by the presence of certain demonstratives. Moreover, as example (115) on page 160 shows, the /d/ segment does not appear consistently before demonstrative pronouns where a genitive marking would be expected. See, however, example (76) on page 151 for a case where positing a genitive prefix seems to be the best analytical possibility.

### 6.2.4 Adjectival primaries

There are two distinct types of cases in which adjectives appear as the head of the construct state construction. In the first case, akin to the “impure annexation” in Arabic, the adjectival lexeme is modified syntactically by a secondary noun (which semantically can be seen as a primary of the adjectival lexeme). The resulting AC is

(ii) **Preposition–Noun**
Boh. \(\text{mann}-\text{at} \ \text{karačiık}e\)
from-\text{cst} gypsies
‘from the Gypsies’ (Fox 2009: 99)
an adjectival phrase which modifies another noun (compare with the ALC in example (77) on page 152): 10

(35) **Adjective–Noun**
Qar.  (góra) xwár-əd kósa  
man white-cst hair  
‘a white-haired (man)’ (Khan 2002a: 281)

In the second case we find an “emotive genitive”, in which the noun posing as a secondary is in fact the semantic head, and the use of the adjective as a primary (and subsequently as a syntactic head) adds emotional value to the phrase (compare with the JZax. example (34) on page 109 and see footnote 11 there.)

(36) **Adjective–Noun**
Qar.  mḥúsy-əd əmyàn-i'  
absolved ms father_in_law-poss.1sg  
‘my late father-in-law’ (Khan 2002a: 281 [Play 13])

(37) **Adjective–Noun**
Qar.  b- āḏa  hajím-əd  māʿraḍ'  
in= DEM.PROX.MS collapsed-cst showroom  
‘in this accursed showroom’ (Khan 2002a: 281 [Play 107])

### 6.2.5 The primary nafṣ ‘the same’

An interesting example of borrowing a construct state construction together with its primary (a matter-cum-pattern replication in the sense of Sakel 2007), is the borrowing of the Arabic function word ﻟﻔﺲ nafṣ. This word, originally meaning ‘soul’, has been grammaticalised in Arabic into a reflexive pronoun, and as head of the CSC into a determiner meaning “the same”:

(38) **nafṣ-noun**
Arab.  َل-اُکل  
nafṣ-u l-ʾakl-i  
soul-NOM DEF-food-GEN  
‘the same food’

In Qar., the reflexive pronoun is roxa, a native Aramaic word meaning ‘soul’ (see Khan 2002a: 84). 11 The morpheme nafṣ has been borrowed, however, in its deter-

---

10 Compare this with the Classical Arabic example basanu l-waḡh-i ‘beautiful.cst DEF–face–GEN’ (Goldenberg 2013a: 277). See Goldenberg (2002: 204ff.) for a discussion.

11 This need not be a pattern replication, as this meaning is a common source for reflexive pronouns cross-linguistically. A single example of matter replication of this sense is attested in Qar. as nafṣ-wa
minative function with the meaning the same. Moreover, its syntactic position as the head of a CSC is replicated, albeit being marked with NENA morphology, namely the construct state -əd suffix.

(39)  Adjective–Noun
Qar. náfís-əd ʾəxàla
same-cst food
‘the same food’ (Khan 2002a: 642 [F:77])

6.2.6 Clausal secondaries

The suffixal CSC can also introduce a clausal secondary:

(40)  Noun–Clause
Qar. sókə-d k-maθéhə
sprigs-cst ind-bring.3pl
‘the sprigs that they bring’ (Khan 2002a: 209 [K:56])

(41)  Noun–Clause
Qar. (nádir xáz-ət) béθ-əd lé-bə tawə̀rta.
rarely see-2ms house-cst neg.ex-in.3ms cow
‘(You rarely see) a house that doesn’t have a cow in it.’ (Khan 2002a: 477 (4) [B:100])

In the following examples, the construct state suffix syllabifies with the clause, which starts either with a vowel-initial copula, or a consonant cluster (contrast with example (40) on this page).

(42)  Noun–Clause
Qar. maθwáθ-d =ina= xáḏran Baḡdèdə
villages -cst= cop.pl= around B.
‘the villages that are around Qaraqosh’ (Khan 2002a: 209 [F:22])

(43)  Pronoun–Clause
Qar. kūll mán əd= g-nápəl b= idàθ-əs
all who -cst= ind-fall in= hands-poss.3pl
‘anybody who falls into their hands’ (Khan 2002a: 480 (4) [Play 135])

Note that in the last example the pronoun mani ‘who’ loses its final /i/ vowel in presence of the construct state suffix.

‘themselves’ (Khan 2002a: 739).
6.2.7 Infinitives in the CSC

Infinitives of transitive verbs can appear as primaries of the CSC, having their objective complement as the secondary. We do not find infinitives of intransitive verbs in this position, in contrast to JZax., where infinitives can take their verbal subject as secondaries (see examples (35)–(36) on page 110).

(44) **Infinitive–Noun (object)**
Qar. (ʾəm-mólpi susawāθa) štáy-əd ʿəràq u= xál-əd
FUT-teach.3PL horses drink.INF-CST araq and= eat.INF-CST
bšála d= nāša.
cooked_food LNK= people
‘(They would teach the horses) to drink arak and eat the food of people.’
(Khan 2002a: 369 (1) [F:66])

(45) **Infinitive–Pronoun (object)**
Qar. qṭál -də= ġḏáḏə
gift.INF-CST -CST= each_other
‘fighting each other’ (Khan 2002a: 275 (21))

(46) **Infinitive–Noun (object)**
Qar. (dúkθ-əd) ḥfád-əd làxma
place-CST store.INF-CST bread
‘(the place of) the storage of the bread’ (Khan 2002a: 276 [B:15])

As the last example shows, an infinitive can also appear as a secondary of a CSC. In this case, it is akin to a regular noun, as the following example shows:

(47) **Noun–Infinitive**
Qar. yóm -də= gwàra
day.CST -CST= marry.INF
‘wedding day’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [K:40])

6.3 The analytic linker construction (X LNK Y)

Qar. has retained the usage of the linker as an important element of its AC system. However, due to the phonological considerations explained above regarding the construct state suffix, it is not always clear whether a specific occurrence of a proclitic d- should be analysed as a linker or rather as re-syllabified construct state suffix. As a general rule, if we can identify a free state suffix on the primary (sg: -a; pl: -ə), we assume a proclitic d- is indeed the linker. Note, however, that the plural free state suffix is ambiguous since an [ə] is also part of the construct state suffix.
In most cases, the linker can be analysed as being pronominal, i.e. representing a noun. In some cases, however, this analysis is not tenable, as we shall see below.

In Khan’s transcription, the linker can occur in a variety of phonological shapes, be it d-, də-, ʾəd-. In many cases, this variation can be explained by the realisation of an epenthetic [ə] which breaks up a consonant cluster (cf. Khan 2002a: 64f.). A truly different morphemic shape is found in the rare form dəd-.\(^\text{12}\)

(48) **Noun–Noun**
Qar. bšála d= nàšə
cooked_food LNK= people
‘the food of people’ (Khan 2002a: 207 [F:66])

(49) **Noun–Noun**
Qar. xəlxálə də= sə̀hma
bangles LNK= silver
‘bangles of silver’ (Khan 2002a: 207 [Poetry 29])

(50) **Noun–Noun**
Qar. zònaˈ dəd= roxáθa xəškanəˈ
time LNK= souls dark.pl.
‘the time of dark souls’ (Khan 2002a: 209 [Poetry 8])

In principle the linker may assimilate to the first consonant of the secondary. One such example may be the following:

(51) **Noun–Noun**
Qar. ʾén-ə n= náša
eye–FREE.PL LNK= man
‘the eyes of a man’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [B:127])

This analysis relies on the possible identification of the suffix -ə as a plural free state ending. Yet as this kind of assimilation normally happens in “fast speech” (Khan 2002a: 208), it is rather more probable that such examples should be understood as cases of the CSC, with a re-syllabified suffix -əd, similarly to example (24) on page 139.

When the secondary is a pronoun realised as a pronominal suffix, the linker takes the form did--dəd-.\(^\text{13}\) These forms are mostly used with those Arabic loanwords which cannot be inflected directly with the possessive pronominal suffixes (for which see Section 6.1):\(^\text{14}\)

\(^{12}\)Khan analyses the form dəd- as a repetition of the “annexation particle” d-, and classifies its occurrence together with examples (102)–(103) on page 157.

\(^{13}\)The vowels [i] and [ə] are in allophonic complementary distribution, depending on the syllable structure. The latter is used in closed syllables.

\(^{14}\)From a typological point of view, the linker qualifies as being a “possessive noun” in the sense...
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(52) **Noun–Pronoun**  
Qar. tarkı̄z did-əḥ‘  
concentration LNK-POSS.3MS  
‘his concentration’ (Khan 2002a: 271 [F:47])

(53) **Noun–Pronoun**  
Qar. ʾaṭfāl= did-əḥ‘  
children= LNK-POSS.3MS  
‘his children’ (Khan 2002a: 271 [B:22])

In one case, the linker is doubled before a possessive suffix. This may be due to an ad-hoc re-analysis of the LNK+POSS construction as a genitive pronoun, which is compatible with a preceding linker (see general discussion in Section 10.5.1):

(54) **Noun–Pronoun**  
Qar. šúrṭa də= də̀d-xu‘  
police LNK= LNK-POSS.2PL  
‘your police’ (Khan 2002a: 271 [F:77])

As expected from a pronominal linker, the linker phrase has a certain prosodic and syntactic autonomy vis-à-vis the primary. The primary and secondary can be separated prosodically (see example (50) on the preceding page) and by intervening material:

(55) **Noun–Noun**  
Qar. (ʾu= ʾə́t-la) bàlṭat k-ə́mí-hə,‘  
and= EX-3MS knives IND-call.A3PL-P3MS LNK= wood  
‘It has “knives” – so they call it – of wood.’ (Khan 2002a: 278 (14) [K:28])

Of interest is also the possibility to negate the linker, thus denying the existence of the specified primary. Note also in this case the repetition of the linker before each conjoint secondary:

(56) **Negated noun–Conjoined nouns**  
Qar. (lā pəšli= b-ə) qāṭta,‘lā d= xəṭṭīθə= w lā d= sʾərtə.’  
NEG remain= in-3MS stick NEG LNK= wheat= and NEG LNK= barley  
‘No stick remains in it, neither of wheat nor of barley.’ (Khan 2002a: 277 (4) [B:62])

In the following poetic example, two linker phrases are topicalised before their pri-
The analytic linker construction (X \text{lnk} Y)

maries. For clarity, the secondaries and primaries are marked with corresponding subscripts in the glosses:

(57) \textbf{Noun–Noun}
Qar. \(\text{də} \text{rxmlěa} \text{k-óda} \text{'ida,} \text{ màθ-an,} \text{ 'u= \text{də} \text{šláma} \text{LNK} = \text{love}_Y \text{ IND}= \text{do festival}_X \text{ village-poss.1PL and= LNK= peace}_Y \text{ k-péša} \text{ yawɔnta'} \text{ IND}= \text{become dove}_X \text{ 'Of love it makes a festival - our town - and of peace it is a dove.' (Khan 2002a: 278 (11) [Poetry 18])}

Finally, whenever the primary consists of a noun qualified by an adjective, the ALC is regularly used. This can be contrasted with the situation in JZax., in which the CSC is available in such cases; see example (7) on page 103.

(58) \textbf{Noun Phrase–Noun}
Qar. \([qála \text{ šåpya} \text{ də} \text{ zamira' sound pure LNK= pipe} \text{ 'with the pure sound of the pipe'} (Khan 2002a: 278 (9) [Poetry 2])

(59) \textbf{Noun Phrase–Pronoun}
Qar. \([bëθa \text{ rába} \text{ dïd-əḥ LNK=poss.3MS} \text{ 'his big house'} (Khan 2002a: 271)

With a pronominal secondary, an alternative formulation is possible, with the adjective following the possessive suffix; see example (4) on page 134.\footnote{In CArd. we find a similar alternative construction, making use additionally of the linker:}

6.3.1 Verbal nouns as primaries

As the following examples show, infinitives as well as active participles can be complemented by their object by means of the ALC:

(60) \textbf{Infinitive–Noun (object)}
Qar. \((\text{'u= k-ódi) palō's d= ḥxåḷa' and= IND=do.3PL share-INF LNK= food}

\footnote{In CArd. we find a similar alternative construction, making use additionally of the linker:}

\begin{enumerate}
\item \textbf{Noun Phrase–Adjective}
CArd. \(\text{qalp-e diy-e aw zårə hull-poss.3MS LNK-poss.3MS def yellow} \text{'Its yellow hull'} (Krotkoff 1982: 22 [19])
\end{enumerate}
'They make a division of food.'\(^{16}\) (Khan 2002a: 369 (10) [K:10])

\((61)\)  **Participle–Noun (object)**
Qar.  mšadr-an-ı́θa  də=  šliḥa
send–PTCP–FS  LNK= apostles
‘the sender of the apostles’ (Khan 2002a: 368 (1) [Play 111])

### 6.3.2 Clausal secondaries

The ALC is also compatible with clausal secondaries:

\((62)\)  **Noun–Clause**
Qar.  léša  də=  k–ód–ax  áxnı  lāxma  mənn–əh
dough  LNK= IND–do–1PL  1PL  bread from–3MS
‘dough from which we make bread’ (Khan 2002a: 209 [K:22])

\((63)\)  **Noun–Clause**
Qar. ʾəb=  māya  ’əd=  iyēwa  səryə
in=  water  LNK= COP.PST  dirty
‘in water that was dirty’ (Khan 2002a: 476 (11) [K:12])

As these examples show, the linker is often followed directly by a verb or a copula.

In case of conjoined attributive clauses, the linker can be repeated:

\((64)\)  **Noun–Conjoined Clauses**
Qar.  súsə  d=  áxl’  gúrgur=  u  marāqa  =w  d=  sātə  ‘ərəq’
horse  LNK= eat  burghul= and  soup  =and  LNK= drink  araq
‘a horse that eats burghul and soup and drinks araq’ (Khan 2002a: 475 (8) [F:79])

As we saw above in the context of nominal secondaries, the linker phrase can be separated from its primary, affirming the pronominal nature of the linker.

\((65)\)  **Noun–Clause**
Qar. ʾu=  nāšə  makix= iyēwa  d=  g–ʾēši  bgáw–aḥ’
and=  people  simple= COP.PST  LNK= IND–live.3PL  in–3FS
‘and the people were simple, those who lived in it’ (Khan 2002a: 475)

In some cases a pronoun, either interrogative or demonstrative, is inserted between the primary noun and the linker. This pronoun should be understood as standing in apposition to both elements.

\(^{16}\)This example appears as such in the transcribed corpus, but in the recording the speaker is saying *muqāsam–əd əxala* ‘division.CST food’, using the Arabic loan-word *muqāsama*. Indeed, the usage of an Aramaic infinitive as a complement of a light verb is quite odd.
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(66) Noun Phrase–Clause
Qar.  fa= ʾáwwal mʊndi ma= dɔ= k-ɔɗi’
and= first thing what= LNK= IND-do.3PL
‘the first thing they do’ (Khan 2002a: 482 (21) [S:52])

(67) Noun–Clause
Qar.  há  dûkɔɔa ʾɛkɔ d= ʾiwa  dɔrɔa  gɔw-ah.’
behold place where LNK= COP.PST laid.res in-3ps
‘Behold the place where he was laid.’ (Khan 2002a: 482 (22) [Gospel 25 = Mark 16:6])

When a demonstrative pronoun is used, it usually follows a prosodic break:

(68) Noun–Clause
Qar. ʾu= ʾətlan birɔɔa Baγʋdɔɔa,’ ʾàn dɔ= k-mə́ndi-wa’
and= EX-1PL wells B. DEM.PL LNK= IND-depend.3PL-PST
gɔɗdɔɔɔ’
B._inhabitants
‘And we have wells in Qaraqosh, upon which the inhabitants depended.’
(Khan 2002a: 369 (5) [K:87])

As in Syriac (see Section 3.4.2), we note also the use of d- as a complementizer. While these may resemble formally an AC without a primary (see Section 6.3.6), the syntactic function of this d- is different, as it introduces a clausal complement of a verb (but see footnote 28 on page 59).

(69) Verb–Clause
Qar. ʾáxni g-báʾax d= šákxax l= ʾane’
1PL IND-want.1PL COMP= complain.1PL about= DEM.DIST.PL
“We want to complain concerning those people.’ (Khan 2002a: 505 (1) [F:73])

As a complementizer, d- can also introduce an adverbial purpose clause.

(70) Verb–Clause
Qar. darɛ-wa-l tɔama,’ ʾɔd= ˫ɔawɔ’
put.3PL-PST-P3ms there COMP= dry.3ms
‘They used to put it there to dry.’ (Khan 2002a: 494 (8) [K:52])

6.3.3 Adverbial primaries

The d- morpheme is used following adverbials serving as conjunctions, i.e. complemented by a clause. Superficially, these constructions may be assimilated to the ALC
with clausal secondaries discussed above. Yet as the *d-* in such cases cannot be said to represent pronominally the conjunction, we prefer to analyse the *d-* morpheme in this position as a complementizer, as in examples (69)–(70) on the preceding page.

(71) **Conjunction–Clause**
Qar. ḥāl ḏə mṭīḥə lə ḏə dūkə (ʿamūqt= elə)
until COMP= arrived.3PL TO= INDF.FS place deep= COP
‘until they arrived at a place (that was deep).’ (Khan 2002a: 477 (10) [S:26])

(72) **Conjunction–Clause**
Qar. ḥāl ḏəd = ʾāθə ʾidaˈ
until COMP= SBJV.COME festival
‘until the festival came’ (Khan 2002a: 494 (8) [K:52])

The principal difference between the linker and the complementizer is that the linker stands in apposition to its primary, while the complementizer is governed by the conjunction. This is represented schematically in Table 6.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conj.</th>
<th>[COMP</th>
<th>Clause]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>[LNK</td>
<td>Clause]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.1: Complementizer and linker constructions

In some respects, however, the complementizer *d-* is quite similar to the linker *d-*. For instance, with conjoined complement clauses, it can be repeated before each conjoint (compare the structure to example (64) on page 148). Note also the variation between the forms *dəd* and *d-*.  

(73) **Conjunction–Conjoined Clauses**
Qar. ʿə́mma ḏəd = k-oḏı́-la b= idāθθə ʿwa= ḏə = g-dáre tūma bgāw-aḥˈ
in= hands and= COMP= ind-put garlic
when COMP= IND=DO.A3PL.-P3FS in= hands and= COMP= ind-put garlic
‘when they make it with their hands and put garlic in it’ (Khan 2002a: 488 (5) [S:77])

Other data also support the idea that the difference between the complementizer *d-* and the linker *d-* is not so great. This is the case when the interrogative pronoun *ma* ‘what’ is inserted between the conjunction and the *d-* morpheme.  

17 Functionally, *ma* does not serve here as an interrogative pronoun, but rather as a kind of indefinite pronoun, representing the event described in the complement clause.
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(74) **Pronoun–Clause**

Qar. ʾə̇m = qāmā má d = yadṣ’-la’
from= before what LNK = know-P3PS
‘before he knew her’ (Khan 2002a: 492 (3) [Gospel 1 = Matthew 1:18])

In such cases the conjunction governs the interrogative pronoun, which in turn stands in apposition to the linker. The apposition between the interrogative pronoun and the linker can be deduced from cases in which the linker is absent:

(75) **Pronoun–Clause**

Qar. m = qāmā ma= máṭax ʾə̇l18 Mār Qurṭāya
from= before what= reach.1PL to= M. Q.
‘before we reach (the monastery) of Saint Q.’ (Khan 2002a: 492 (2) [K:79])

The two possibilities are represented schematically in Table 6.2.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conj. ➔ Intrg.</th>
<th>Intrg. ➔ Conj.</th>
<th>LNK ➔ Clause</th>
<th>Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 6.2: Combinations of conjunctions and interrogative pronouns

In contrast to conjunctions, prepositions cannot in general be followed by a d-morpheme, neither as a linker nor as a complementizer. Examples where this seems to be the case were analysed above as cst-marked prepositions where the -d suffix was resyllabified with the secondary; see examples (31)–(34) on page 140. We find, however, one case which cannot be explained in this way, due to the conservation of the final /-a/ vowel at the end of the preposition, which excludes the occurrence of an -əd suffix. This is the case of the preposition ʾeka ‘at’:

(76) **Preposition–Noun**

Qar. ʾeka= d = áwa xaña xənna
at= GEN(?)= DEM.DIST.MS square(fs) other.MS
‘in the other square’ (Khan 2002a: 234 [B:186])

Such cases may arise by analogy to the above mentioned examples, and may represent the first signs of an emerging genitive marker.

### 6.3.4 Adjectival primaries

In one instance, an adjectival primary is modified by a noun with the aid of the linker. The construction is similar to the “impure annexation” of Arabic, except for the fact

---

18The preposition ʾə̇l, absent in the original transcript, can be heard in the recording. This is immaterial to the current discussion.
that linker replaces the construct state marking of the primary present in Arabic (contrast with example (35) on page 142, and the Arabic example given there).

(77) Adjective–Noun
Qar. xliθ-i smóqta də= pàθa'
  sweet.poss.1sg.red.lnk= face
‘my rosy-faced sweet-heart’ (Khan 2002a: 281 [Poetry 3])

6.3.5 Pronominal primaries

We find some cases of pronominal primaries in the ALC. According to my survey, in such cases the secondary is always clausal. The analysis of these cases as representing the ALC rather than the CSC relies on the fact the final vowel of the primary noun is not altered, and moreover the /d/ marker cannot be said to replace a free state suffix. Yet from a prosodic point of view the distinction is quite fuzzy, as the /d/ segment is often syllabified with the pronominal primary.

Different types of pronouns can act as primaries. We find personal pronouns, as in the following example:

(78) Pronoun–Clause
Qar. w= âhu d= lá g-laqə́m-wa'
  and= 3ms.lnk= neg.ind.catch-pst
‘anyone who did not catch it’ (Khan 2002a: 479 (1) [B:172])

Interrogative pronouns are quite common:

(79) Pronoun–Clause
Qar. ’u= šqə́lhə ma= d= šqə́lhə m= Bağdèdə.'
  and= took.3pl.what= lnk= took.3pl.from= B.
‘And they took what they took from Qaraqosh.’ (Khan 2002a: 480 (1) [F:4])

(80) Pronoun–Clause
Qar. w= éma d= g-laqə́m-wa ’ádi qìtta zùrta'
  and= which.lnk= ind.catch-pst dem.stick small
‘whichever (person) caught the small stick’ (Khan 2002a: 480 (7) [B:172])

When the initial pronoun is a demonstrative pronoun, two analyses are possible. Either we analyse the demonstrative as the primary element, as in the preceding examples, or we analyse it as determiner, in which case there is no primary (we mark its absence by a (0)). The latter analysis is possible since the linker acts as a syntactic head, due to its pronominal nature. Recall that such an analysis was suggested for JZax., in which phonologically reduced demonstratives serve as determiners (see Section 5.3.5).
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Interesting to note is a short version of the plural demonstrative anə, which resembles the determiner of JZax. (see also example (68) on page 149):

(82)  Pronoun/∅–Clause
Qar. 'an {∅} də= g-náṭri xə̀θna‘
DEM.PL {∅} LNK= IND-guard.PL groom
‘Those who look after the groom.’ (Khan 2002a: 479 (7) [K:44])

Similar analytical difficulty is present in the case of the element xa, which can be interpreted either as an indefinite pronoun or an indefinite determiner. Yet in the following example, the fact that xa follows the quantifier ay ‘any’ (borrowed from Arabic) renders the pronominal interpretation more plausible (compare with JZax. example (70) on page 118). Be it as it may, we show both possibilities in the glossing:

(83)  Pronoun/∅–Clause
Qar. 'āy= xa {∅} d= ilo már’a ḥabābs
any= INDF.PRO/DET {∅} LNK= COP ill pustules
‘anyone who is ill with pustules.’ (Khan 2002a: 479 (1) [S:16])

It should be noted, moreover, that a determiner category has not been posited by Khan for Qar. The analysis required to establish the existence of such a category is outside the scope of the work, and therefore we shall leave the two possibilities open.

6.3.6 Linkers without an explicit primary

In subject position, cases of the ALC without a preceding primary are quite rare, and seem to be restricted to formal genres. We may allude to example (57) on page 147, where the (semantic) primary appears after the construction, or to the following example, where no primary appears at all (=example (3) on page 86). For convenience, we mark the place of the absent primary by the symbol ∅, without implying the existence of a ∅ morpheme there.

(84)  ∅–Noun
Qar. kə-mázámri ∅ d= 'urxàθa.
IND-sing,3PL ∅ LNK= roads
‘(The people) of the roads sing.’ (Khan 2002a: 279 (21) [Poetry 29])

19Khan (2002a: 82) explains that “[t]he final /ə/ may be elided altogether when the pronoun is closely connected to what follows by the relative particle d-.” See also footnote 63 on page 285.
A similar example is attested in the Gospels translation, with a clausal secondary:

(85) \(\emptyset\)–Clause
Qar. (əmbûrx =clá) ∅ d= áte b= šámm-əh ∅d= rább-i.’
blessed =COP ∅ LNK= come.3MS in= name-poss.3MS LNK= lord-poss.1SG
‘Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.’ (Khan 2002a: 482 (1)
[Gospel 19 = Matthew 23:29])

Clausal secondaries following a linker without an immediate primary occur rarely also in cleft sentences.

(86) \(\emptyset\)–Clause
Qar. ʾu= ’anda =l ∅ d= k-ōdî-la da= gupta.’
and= DEM.PROX.MS =COP ∅ LNK= IND-make.A3PL.-P3FS into= cheese
‘It is this that they make into cheese.’ (Khan 2002a: 508 (2) [S:73])

As a predicate, on the other hand, a linker phrase can easily appear without an immediate primary (as the latter is typically mentioned in the subject position). The predicate position is easily recognized as it is normally marked by a following copula.

(87) \(\emptyset\)–Noun
Qar. fá ʾāda pāšma’ ∅ ’as= sáw-i =iwa.’
and= DEM.PROX.MS garment ∅ LNK= grandfather-poss.1SG =COP.PST
‘This pāšma belonged to my grandfather.’ (Khan 2002a: 279 (16) [F:112])

(88) \(\emptyset\)–Noun
Qar. ’āhi ʾiyáwa ∅ d= ʿazla.’
3FS 3FS.COP.PST ∅ LNK= wool
‘It was of wool.’ (Khan 2002a: 279 (18) [K:29])

(89) \(\emptyset\)–Pronoun
Qar. ʾəxála léla ∅ did-ux.’ kása léla ∅ did-ux?’
food NEG.COP ∅ LNK-poss.2MS stomach NEG.COP ∅ LNK-poss.2MS
‘The food is not yours, but the stomach is indeed yours!’ (Khan 2002a: 273 (10) [Proverbs 11])

Occasionally a nominal subject acting as primary is lacking altogether in the sentence, though it appears in the textual context. Such are the following examples, the first one being poetic:

(90) \(\emptyset\)–Noun
Qar. bàd-péša ∅ d= rəxmùθa ’u= ∅ d= bəsmúθa ’u= bənyànə.ˈ
fut-become.FS ∅ LNK= love and= ∅ LNK= delight and= buildings
‘It will become (a town) of love, delight and buildings.’ (Khan 2002a: 279
(20) [Poetry 4])

(91)  ø–Pronoun
Qar.  ø did-ən =ina’
 ø LNK-POS.1PL =COP.3PL
 ‘They are ours.’ (Khan 2002a: 273 (9) [S:49])

6.3.7 Ordinal secondaries

Ordinals are regularly formed by placing cardinal numerals as secondaries of the ALC. These agree with the primary noun, possibly by analogy with adjectives (see example (108) on page 159), though morphologically the agreement pattern is different:

(92)  Noun–Ordinal
Qar.  góra d= tré
 man LNK= second.MS
 ‘the second man’ (Khan 2002a: 225)

(93)  Noun–Ordinal
Qar.  báxta d= táttə
 woman LNK= second.FS
 ‘the second woman’ (Khan 2002a: 225)

This construction, however, is often avoided in favour of the construction using borrowed Arabic numerals, as in examples (110)–(111) on page 159.

6.4 Double marking constructions

6.4.1 Simple double marking (X.CST LNK Y)

The occurrence of an AC marked both by a construct state suffix and a linker happens mostly due to hesitation according to Khan (2002a: 208). The following examples illustrate this (the ... sign signals the hesitation):

(94)  Noun–Noun
Qar.  šäkl-əd ... d= fărwa
 form–CST ... LNK= fur
 ‘the form of a fur’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [K:17])

(95)  Noun–Noun
Qar.  ’arút-əd ... dɔ-həşə
 Friday–CST ... LNK= suffering
 ‘Good Friday’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [K:77])
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(96) **Infinitive–Noun (object)**
Qar. (ʾáhu 3 ms kə-mšaḡə́l-wa ind -work-PST in= sew.INF ... LNK shoes)
‘He used to work at the making of shoes.’ (Khan 2002a: 369 (4) [K:50])

(97) **Infinitive–Noun (object)**
Qar. ʾəl = to ʾastòy-ədˈ drink. caus-INF -cst ... lnk= sheep lnk=poss.3PL and= people
‘to provide drinks for their sheep and for people’ (Khan 2002a: 369 (5) [K:87])

(98) **Pronoun–Noun**
Qar. (ʾu = and k-zAlan ind -go.1PL pl άg-máṭax) ind -reach.1PL pl hál = link ekəd until άd = lnk = ʾàrʾaˈ land
‘We go until we reach the land.’ (Khan 2002a: 390 (19) [K:78])

Indeed, even when there is no hesitation sign in the transcribed corpus, listening to the examples reveals a hesitation, which I have marked in the following examples: 20

(99) **Noun–Clause**
Qar. əl = 'én-əd ... də = kə- ... masxé- wa-la qadšta Sàra to= spring-cst ... lnk= ind- ... make_swim.3PL-PST-3FS St. S.
‘to the spring in which they made Saint Sarah swim’ (Khan 2002a: 209 [K:12])

(100) **Adverbial–Pronoun**
Qar. (yəʾə́l-wa-la káθlaka '3ll-əh) ... 'an= ्tariq-əd²¹ ... 'an= 'urxa-əd entered-PST-3FS Catholicism to-3FS ... by= way-cst ... by= way-cst ... də= xxu (šə̀mm-əḥˈ ... Márail Yoḥanna Dilémi.)
... lnk= one name-poss.3MS ... M. Y. D.
‘(Catholicism entered it) by means of one (whose name is Mar Yoḥanna Dilemi.)’ (Khan 2002a: 479 (2) [K:1])

Of special interest are cases where the primary noun is the reflex of the historical construct state, i.e. without a /-d/ suffix. This shows we are not dealing with a simple repetition of the /d/ segment.

(101) **Noun–Noun**

---

20 Recall that only the recordings of informant K are publicly available.
2¹ The words 'an tariq-əd are not present in the transcript, but are clearly audible in the recording. Indeed, the speaker first uses the Arabic loan-expression 'an tariq with an Aramaic construct state suffix, before correcting to the native Aramaic word 'urxa (but still employing the Arabic preposition 'an).
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Qar. ʾu = bī ... d = Aqlimus.
and= house. CST ... LNK= A.
‘and the family of Aqlimus.’ (Khan 2002a: 544 [K:18])

All these cases can be analysed as instances of two appositive ACs, in which the first one is lacking a secondary, due to a difficulty of the speaker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>↑</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNK</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.3: Appositive repetition of an AC due to hesitation

However, the same construction is used “sporadically”, according to Khan, also where no hesitation is present (I could not verify this by listening to these examples):

(102) **Noun–Noun**
Qar. b= paqārt-əd d= ánec hāwāwin
in= neck-CST LNK= DEM.DIST.PL animals
‘on the neck of those animals’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [B:72])

(103) **Infinitive–Noun**
Qar. dyāq-t-ət d= lābbawàθa
beat.INF-PS-CST LNK= hearts
‘the beating of hearts’ (Khan 2002a: 208 [Poetry 14])

The first case may be explained by the emergence of a “genitive” marker before a demonstrative pronoun (see examples (32)–(34) on page 141 for a discussion, as well as example (76) on page 151), while the second one is taken from a poetic text, which may explain its peculiar syntax. 22 Two other cases which Khan (2002a: 209) mentions as repetition of the /d/ particle are simply cases where the /dəd/ allomorph of the linker is used (see example (50) on page 145).

Another exceptional case of seemingly double marking is the following example, in which the primary is marked by a /-ə/ suffix, while the secondary is marked by the /əd/ allomorph of the linker. Although it resembles cases of a re-syllabified construct state suffix (see examples (20)–(24) on page 138), it differs from them by the intervening glottal stop. Again, the poetic origin of this example may explain its

---

22It is also possible that the linker is in fact a resyllabified construct state suffix. If this is true, the doubling of the /d/ segment may be explained by the phonological constraint of conserving the short [ə] vowel in a closed syllable. Note that the schwa cannot be elided (as is sometimes the case), since it follows a consonant cluster in both cases.
peculiar morpho-phonology.\(^\text{23}\)

\[(104)\quad \textbf{Noun–Noun}
\]
\[\text{Qar. māθ-ə ʾəd= dérə ʾu= ʾitàθa}
\]
\[\text{town-CST LNK= monasteries and= churches}
\]
\[\text{‘town of monasteries and churches’} \](Khan 2002a: 208 [Poetry 17])

To summarize, the cases of double marking which are not motivated by production-difficulties (i.e. hesitation) are highly exceptional.

### 6.4.2 Double annexation construction (X-y.\textit{poss} LNK Y)

Another type of double marking, which occurs only in the Gospel translations, arises from a direct translation of the Syriac double annexation construction (see Section 3.5).

\[(105)\quad \textbf{Noun–Noun}
\]
\[\text{Qar. Yósəf ʾə́br-əḥ əd= Dawı̀dˈ}
\]
\[\text{Y. son-POSS.3MS LNK= D.}
\]
\[\text{‘Joseph, the son of David’} \](Khan 2002a: 279 (22) [Gospel 3 = Matthew 1:20])

### 6.5 Juxtaposition (X Y)

Juxtaposition in principle does not serve as an AC in Qar., as it cannot be used to modify a noun by a noun.\(^\text{24}\). However, it is used in some tangential cases:

#### 6.5.1 Adjectival modification

Adjectives follow their primary, and – if inflecting – agree in number (and possibly in gender) with it:

\[(106)\quad \textbf{Noun–Adjective}
\]
\[\text{Qar. ʾənšə surayə}
\]
\[\text{women Christian.PL}
\]
\[\text{‘Christian women’} \](Khan 2002a: 212)

\[(107)\quad \textbf{Noun–Adjective}
\]

\(^\text{23}\)The sources marked as Poetry are transcriptions of recitations of poems, which may obey specific metrical rules, on the one hand, or try to imitate a classical syntax, on the other hand.

\(^\text{24}\)A possible exception is the phrase \textit{ḥŭ́kum Qaraqòš} ‘the governance of Qaraqosh’ (Khan 2002a: 3; 643 (83)), but the usage of the Arabic name of Qaraqosh indicates that the entire expression is borrowed from Arabic.
6.5. Juxtaposition (X Y)

Qar. baxta bāš
woman good(INV)
‘a good woman’ (Khan 2002a: 220)

The ordinal ‘first’ behaves as an adjective:

(108) Noun–Ordinal (first)
Qar. bāxta qamēθa
woman first_FS
‘the first woman’ (Khan 2002a: 225)

6.5.1.1 Inverse order adjectives

In some cases an adjective can precede the primary.\(^{25}\) This is the case for the Kurdish–borrowed adjective xoš ‘good’ which occurs regularly before the noun, as in the following example:\(^{26}\)

(109) Noun–Adjective
Qar. xoš 'amμμάθa
good(INV) mothers
‘good mothers’ (Khan 2002a: 281 [Play 120])

Arabic ordinals, used often instead of the Aramaic equivalents, are regularly placed before their nominal primaries, mirroring the Arabic construction (contrast with examples (92)–(93) on page 155 as well as (108)).\(^{27}\)

(110) Noun–Ordinal (first)
Qar. ʾawwal yoma
first day
‘the first day’ (Khan 2002a: 516)

(111) Noun–Ordinal
Qar. ʾu=θálθθóma and= third day
‘the third day’ (Khan 2002a: 640 [F:72])

\(^{25}\)Recall that in the titles of the examples we always follow the order Primary–Secondary.

\(^{26}\)This adjective shows also exceptional order in Kurdish, which normally has post-nominal adjectives. Its irregular syntax is due to the fact that it originates in Turkic languages (Turkish hoş, Azeri xoş), which regularly have pre-nominal adjectives.

\(^{27}\)In Arabic, the numeral is formally in construct state, but this is no longer apparent in the borrowed expression.
The word \textit{xənna} ‘other’, although semantically not a typical adjective\footnote{Unlike a typical adjective, it does not refer to an attribute (i.e., quality) of the referent, but rather signals that it is different from a similar previously-mentioned referent. Indeed, Khan (2002a: 285) classifies it as a “non-attributive modifier”.} behaves syntactically as one insofar it agrees with the modified noun in number and gender. Unlike typical adjectives, however, it may variably appear before or after the noun (compare to example (39) on page 143).

\begin{itemize}
\item[(112)] \textbf{Noun–Adjective}
\begin{itemize}
\item Qar. (ʾə́t-lan) xə́rta ṭá́ː́lta
\item \text{ex}-1\text{pl} other.\text{fs} game
\item ‘(We have) another game.’ (Khan 2002a: 285 [K:35])
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

Finally, “emotionally charged” adjectives may appear before their noun. This is possible related to the “emotive genitive” construction shown in examples (36)–(37) on page 142:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(113)] \textbf{Noun–Adjective}
\begin{itemize}
\item Qar. məskı́n-ə ġgedáy-ə
\item poor-\text{pl} inhabitants-\text{pl}
\item ‘the poor inhabitants of Qaraqosh’ (Khan 2002a: 281 [B:68])
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

### 6.5.2 Adverbial primaries

Most adverbials attach to their complements without any special marking. Compare the following example to example (34) on page 141:

\begin{itemize}
\item[(114)] \textbf{Preposition–Noun}
\begin{itemize}
\item Qar. máx [tóbba zùrta]
\item like ball(\text{fs}) small.\text{fs}
\item ‘like a small ball’ (Khan 2002a: 238)
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

Note also the following example, in which the preposition is directly followed by a vowel-initial demonstrative pronoun (with an epenthetic glottal stop), without any special marking (unlike in JZax., where it would take genitive marking):

\begin{itemize}
\item[(115)] \textbf{Preposition–Noun}
\begin{itemize}
\item Qar. (zə́l-le) hál ṭá́́ya máθa
\item went-3\text{ms until dem.dist.\text{fs} village}
\item ‘He went as far as that village’ (Khan 2002a: 235)
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

A preposition may appear unstressed and cliticize to its complement:
(116) **Preposition–Noun**
Qar. ʾeka= nəšwàθa
at= relatives
‘at the home of relatives’ (Khan 2002a: 234 [K:5])

(117) **Preposition–Adverb**
Qar. mən= táma
from= there
‘from there’ (Khan 2002a: 238 [F:86])

(118) **Preposition–Adverb**
Qar. hal= daha
until= now
‘until now’ (Khan 2002a: 235 [K:87])

Conjunctions can also precede their clausal complement without any special marking. Such cases may be assimilated to asyndetic attributive clauses (see Section 6.5.4), but have a wider distribution (contrast with example (73) on page 150):

(119) **Conjunction–Clause**
Qar. fa= ʾə́mma zálh= ʾə́mma
and= when go.3PL= say.3PL to= grandfather POSS.1SG
‘and, when they go and tell my grandfather’ (Khan 2002a: 489 (12) [F:25])

### 6.5.3 Infinitival primaries

The complement of an infinitive may be attached to it without any marking (contrast with examples (44)–(46) on page 144 showing the CSC and example (60) on page 148 exhibiting the ALC, as well as the doubly-marked examples (96)–(97) on page 156):

(120) **Infinitive–Noun (object)**
Qar. (xálṣi) wáda ay= ráqqə’
finish.3PL do.INF DEM.PROX= dish
‘They finish making those raqqa.’ (Khan 2002a: 369 (6) [B:134])

### 6.5.4 Clausal secondaries

Certain restrictive clausal secondaries may follow their primary without any marking. This occurs exclusively with indefinite primary nouns. It may allude to Arabic influence, which has a similar distribution of asyndetic relative clauses only after indefinite primaries. Judging by the examples given by Khan (2002a: 477) such examples occur most frequently when the matrix-clause is an existential clause.

(121) **Noun–Clause**
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Qar. ʾə́t-lan ʾəxáltə k-amáx-la harısa.
ex-1pl dish ind-say.a1pl-f3fs harisa
‘We have a dish called harisa.’ (Khan 2002a: 477 (9) [K:62])

One exceptional case is the following (the second half of example (71) on page 150):

(122) Preposition–Clause
Qar. lə́ ḡdə dūkə ʿamùqt= elə
to= infs fs place deep= cop
‘to a place that is deep’ (Khan 2002a: 477 (10) [S:26])

Cases of attributive nominal clauses which lack a copula (similar to the “non-clausal adjectival nexus” of JZax. example (108) on page 128) also occur. Note that the subject of such attributive clauses is always definite by virtue of a possessive pronoun.

(123) Noun–Clause
Qar. ʾı́θə náša lə́bb-əḥ nı́xa b= áḍa yòma?
man heart-poss.3ms content in= dem.prox.ms day
‘Is there a person whose heart is content nowadays?’ (Khan 2002a: 478 (14) [Play 96])

A similar example occurs with an indefinite pronominal primary xa (=end of example (100) on page 156):

(124) Adverbial–Pronoun
Qar. xaʾ š̄m̄m-əḥ M̄ʾr Yoḥána Diləmi.
one name-poss.3ms M. Y. D.
‘one whose name is Mar Y.D.’ (Khan 2002a: 479 (2) [K:1])

6.6 Conclusions

The dialect of Qar. has in principle two loci of marking: the primary (by the construct state -əd suffix) and the secondary (by the d- linker). The two strategies are in principle mutually exclusive, but in some peripheral cases they are used simultaneously, as explained in Section 6.4. As we saw, however, the distinction between the two types of marking is not always so clear, due to the frequent re-syllabification of the /d/ segment of the construct state suffix with vowel-initial secondaries. Since the emergence of the construct state suffix is related (at least partly) to the re-syllabification of the linker with the primary (see Section 10.3), the flux between the two constructions in Qar. may be related to its conservative nature (Khan 2002a: 10).

An important source of impact on Qar. is Arabic. Geographically, Qaraqosh is located near the Arabic speaking regions of Iraq (only 32 km away from Mosul), and
as such it is influenced by Arabic more than other dialects. While Khan (2002a: 9) claims that the Arabic influence is relatively recent, judging by the lexical material, we see that the dialect possess many constructions which are similar to Arabic ones. These include the replication of the Arabic tāʾ marbūṭa (example (5) on page 134), the Arabic adjectival AC (“Impure Annexation”; example (35) on page 142 and example (77) on page 152), the integration of the Arabic nominal modifier nafs (see Section 6.2.5) and ordinal numbers (examples (110)–(111) on page 159) and possibly also asyndetic clausal secondaries (see Section 6.5.4). On the other hand, direct Kurdish influence is harder to pinpoint, except for the pre-nominal use of the Kurdish (originally Azeri) loan-adjective xoš ‘good’ (example (109) on page 159).
Chapter 7

Attributive Constructions in the Jewish Dialect of Urmı

The data for JUrm. is based on two different sources: Garbell (1965b) and Khan (2008b). For consistency, we use the transcription system of Khan (2008b). In citations of examples from Khan (2008b), the reference to the section number in the corpus is given in square brackets, when available.

The richest and most prominent AC strategy of JUrm. is head-marking. Pronominal head marking is covered in Section 7.1 while the construct state construction is addressed at Section 7.2. In contrast to JZax. and Qar., in JUrm. we have reasons to believe the construct state -əd suffix is a word-level inflectional suffix rather than a phrasal suffix.

Alongside the CSC we find in JUrm. the analytic linker construction using an alternative linker form ay (see Section 7.3). Moreover, it differs from the typical ALC in that the primary is normally marked as construct state, making it a double-marked construction. Another additional marking is the usage of genitive marking, covered in Section 7.4, yielding triple-marked constructions. The classical double annexation construction, occurring rarely in JUrm. is covered in Section 7.5.

The usage of the borrowed relativizer ki before clausal secondaries is discussed

---

1I have also conducted fieldwork with Rabbi Ḥaim Yeshurun, a speaker of JUrm. currently living in Israel, as well as consulted the corpus of Ben-Rahamim (2006), but no examples from these sources are presented here. Regarding Garbell's description, it should be noted that it covers several dialects of Iranian Azerbaijan (as well as the neighbouring Turkish territory), which she divides into a northern group (JUrm. and neighbouring dialects) and a southern group (J. Solduz and Šino). The data used here is based on her description of the northern group, of which JUrm. is considered to be representative.

2Note especially the marking of emphatic (velarized) words by an initial ‘+’ sign. In some examples I have added a missing emphasis mark between parenthesis (‘), when such a mark was justified according to the sources’ lexica. Note that in Garbell’s work, the lack of emphasis may be due to dialectal variation, as her work describes several related dialects, as explained in the previous footnote.
in Section 7.6. Finally, the limited use of juxtaposition is presented in Section 7.7. The usage of inverse juxtaposition (secondary preceding the primary), clearly due to language contact, is shown in Section 7.8.

7.1  Possessive pronominal suffixes (X-y.poss)

In JUrm., as in other NENA dialects, a possessive pronominal suffix can attach directly to a noun or to a preposition:

1. **Noun–Pronoun**
   
   JUrm. bel-ew
   
   house-poss.3ms
   
   ‘his house’ (Khan 2008b: 56)

2. **Preposition–Pronoun**

   JUrm. mənn-ew
   
   from-poss.3ms
   
   ‘from him’ (Khan 2008b: 196)

Two possessed nouns can be conjoined asyndetically, with the repetition of the possessive pronoun:

3. **Asyndetically Conjoined Nouns–Pronoun**

   JUrm. da-ew dad-ew
   
   mother-poss.3ms father-poss.3ms
   
   ‘his parents’ (Garbell 1965a: 171)

Garbell (1965a: 171, §2.32.11) attributes the latter possibility to Azeri influence: “On the border between syntactical and stylistical interference of T[urkish Azeri] with the dialect is the extremely frequent occurrence of two asyndetic heads in a nominal phrase, more often than not alliterative”.

She compares the above example to the following Azeri example:³

4. **Asyndetically Conjoined Nouns–Pronoun**

   Azr. anna-si baba-si
   
   mother-poss.3sg father-poss.3sg
   
   ‘his parents’ (Garbell 1965a: 171)

³It should be noted that the asyndetic construction is not limited to possessed nouns. Garbell (1965a: 171) gives also the Azr. example gille glale ‘grasses strings, vegetation’.
7.2 The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

JUrm., like the NENA dialects surveyed in the previous chapters, has a suffixed construct state marker -əd, related to the Classical Aramaic linker d-. Garbell (1965a: 171) claims this “is clearly due to the impact of the K[urdish] relation suffix -i [=Ezafe]”, an idea which is discussed in Section 10.3.2. The exact form of the suffix varies: Normally it is realised as /əd/-/ət/, but following stems whose last vowel is /a/ it is optionally realised as /at/-/ad/ (Khan 2008b: 174), a phenomenon which may be seen as local vowel harmony.4

(5) Noun–Noun
JUrm. tar-əd bela
door-cst house
‘the door of the house’ (Khan 2008b: 174)

(6) Noun–Noun
JUrm. ‘dá-ət/-at brona
mother-cst son
‘the mother of the boy’ (Khan 2008b: 174)

(7) Noun–Noun
JUrm. gor-ət tre reše
man-cst two heads
‘the man of two heads’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

In contrast to JZax. (example (7) on page 103) and Qar. (example (26) on page 139), we do not find in JUrm. (according to our survey) cases where an NP is marked phrase-finally by a single -əd suffix. Such cases seem to require the ALC (see Section 7.3). An apparent exception is example (32) on page 173, where a participial phrase is marked by a final -əd suffix. Yet this apparent phrasal-final marking is only possible since the participle itself is the last element of the phrase.5 Another possible deviation is example (87) on page 186, where an optional construct state suffix appears phrase-finally on a noun occurring as secondary of a CSC. Here again, the construct state suffix may be explained by the availability of the construct state on the final noun.

Thus, in JUrm. it seems safe to analyse -əd as a word-level inflectional marker, rather than a phrasal suffix.6 Such an analysis is corroborated by cases where two asyndetically conjoined nouns occur in the primary slot, and each is marked by an

---

4 In this it may reflect some influence of Turkish, in which vowel harmony is abundant.
5 In this we disagree with Khan (2008b: 230), who draws from this example the quite general conclusion that “[i]f the head of the annexation [=the primary] consists of a phrase in which one noun is dependent on another, the annexation inflection is placed only on the head of this phrase”.
6 Cf. Garbell (1965b: 54, §2.12.2), who treats the construct state markers, both the -əd suffix and apocope, as inflection in relation of nouns.
-əd suffix ((8)=example (13) on page 93):

(8) Asyndetically Conjoined Nouns–Noun
JUrm. [id-əd reš-əd] gor-aw
    hand-cst head-cst man-poss.3fs
‘the hands and head of her husband’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

(9) Asyndetically Conjoined Nouns–Noun
JUrm. [naš-ət xəzmaw-ət] ḥatān
    people-cst relatives-cst groom
‘the family and relations of the bridegroom’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

From a language contact angle, we may relate such cases to the availability of asyndetic conjunction in JUrm., which Garbell (1965a: 171) attributes to Azeri influence (see discussion of example (3) on page 166). While the asyndetic conjunction of nouns is not restricted to ACs, the repetition of the -əd suffix may facilitate the asyndetic conjunction, as the conjoined nouns are often alliterative in this construction. We note, moreover, that the -əd suffix seems to block the occurrence a coordinating conjunction following it.7

We find asyndetic conjunction of nouns also in secondary position, as in the following example. Khan (2008b: 235) restricts the occurrence of asyndetic conjunction (whether in an AC or not) mainly to a “few sets of tightly-knit nouns”.

(10) Noun–Asyndetically Conjoined Nouns
JUrm. šūl-ət [góra baxtā]
    affair-cst man woman
‘the affairs of a husband and wife’ (Khan 2008b: 230 [48])

7.2.1 Apocopate construct state marking

Alongside the suffixed construct state -əd morpheme, JUrm. can mark construct state nouns by means of apocope. In these nouns, the final free state vowel, typical of words of native Aramaic origin, is elided (see Section 11.1 for a discussion of the development of these forms).

(11) Noun–Noun
JUrm. bron əčči šənne
    son-cst sixty years
‘a man 60 years old’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

7Judging by the few examples we have, the conjoined possessed nouns appear to be semantically inalienable nouns, but it is not clear whether this a real restriction of the construction.
In feminine nouns, except brata ‘daughter’, the feminine-gender marker \(-t\) is elided as well (Garbell 1965b: 55), unlike in the apocopate construct of Classical Aramaic. Contrast the following two examples:

(12) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm. \(pq\text{ar} \ ay \ d-o \ gor\text{a}\)  
neck.cst LNK GEN-DEM, DIST, MS man  
‘the neck of that man’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

(13) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm. \(br\acute{a}t \ i\acute{s}\text{ultanà}\)  
daughter.cst king  
‘the daughter of the king’ (Khan 2008b: 175 [29])

Khan (2008b: 175) qualifies the occurrence of the apocopate CSC as happening “occasionally”, and gives no semantic or functional qualifications of it. Garbell (1965b: 55) sees the apocope as a zero suffix being in free variation with the \(-\text{\~d}\) suffix (the only restriction being that the stem should not end in a consonant cluster). Indeed, judging by the examples, the two types of marking are functionally equivalent, though the suffixed marking seems to be more frequent.

Prosodically, we note that when the primary is marked by apocope, it is sometimes devoid of stress, and cliticizes to the secondary, as in the following example:

(14) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm. \(t\acute{a}r= \ i\acute{s}\text{mmè}\)  
door.cst= heavens  
‘the door of heaven’ (Khan 2008b: 175 [52])

Some nouns have an apocopate form which is not restricted to the contexts where we would expect a construct state noun (i.e., head of a CSC). Khan (2008b: 161) lists the nouns \(na\acute{s}a\) ‘person’ and \(gaba\) ‘side’ as having short variants \(na\acute{s}\) and \(gab\) respectively, used “predominantly when they are indefinite”. Diachronically, these apocopate forms may be derived from the absolute state, which was used in indefinite contexts (see Section 2.3.1). As it is hard to establish whether such forms should be analysed as marked for construct state when they serve as primaries, we have in general not analysed them as being marked for construct state.

### 7.2.2 Adjectival primaries

An adjective modified by a noun can appear as a primary of the CSC:

(15) **Adjective–Noun**
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JUrm. ó ‘torbá ‘mlit-át fassé dehwé’
       dem.dist bag full.fs-cst money gold_piece.pl
       ‘the bag full of gold coins’ (Khan 2008b: 219 [60])

An adjective appearing in the primary position of the CSC followed by a plural noun yields a superlative meaning. The grammatical information regarding the referent (gender and number) is marked inflectionally on the adjective, which is the syntactic head. A similar construction is found JZax.; see example (32) on page 108.

(16) Adjective–Noun
JUrm. sqal-t-ət niše
       beautiful-fs-cst women(pl)
       ‘The most beautiful woman’ (Garbell 1965b: 55)

7.2.3 Adverbial primaries

Some prepositions may be marked by the construct state suffix when complemented by a noun. Mostly this is optional (see Section 7.7.3 for examples), but for some prepositions it seems to be obligatory. Thus, the preposition bod ‘because’, adapted from the Kurdish preposition bo ‘because’, always appears with a construct state suffix -d (Garbell 1965a: 166).

(17) Preposition–Noun
JUrm. gá-at Urmı
       in-cst U.
       ‘in Urmı’ (Khan 2008b: 194 [136])

(18) Preposition–Noun
JUrm. mənn-ət bela
       from-cst house
       ‘from the house’ (Khan 2008b: 196)

(19) Preposition–Asyndetically Conjoined Nouns
JUrm. bá-at [⁺kalo ‘hatàn]
       for-cst bride groom
       ‘to the bride and groom’ (Khan 2008b: 193 [93])

(20) Preposition–Pronoun
JUrm. bo-d= ma
       because-cst= what
       ‘Why?’ (Khan 2008b: 191)

Similarly, some conjunctions are in fact interrogative adverbs augmented with the construct state suffix (cf. examples (37)–(38) on page 174).
7.2. The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

7.2.4 The pronominal primary od

In rare cases, the distal singular demonstrative pronoun o appears in the construct state form od after some prepositions, such as bod ‘because’ (itself marked obligatorily by the construct state suffix; see example (20) on the preceding page). This pronoun allows the introduction of a clausal complement of the preposition (yielding an apparent composite conjunction bod od).

(23) Pronoun–Clause
JUrm. bo-d= ó-d hála zürt =ela
because-cst= DEM-cst still young =cop.fs
‘because of the fact that she is still young’ (Khan 2008b: 374 [74])

The construct state pronoun od is compatible with the relativizer, as is shown in examples (101)–(102) on page 189.

7.2.5 Pronominal, Ordinal and Adverbial secondaries

A pronoun can occupy the secondary slot:

(24) Noun–Pronoun
JUrm. bel-ət máni
house-cst who
‘whose house’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

(25) Noun–Pronoun
JUrm. (g=) bel= nôš-u
in= house.cst= refl-3pl
‘(in) their own house’ (Khan 2008b: 215 [158])

8In this we agree with Khan (2008b: 374), but disagree with Garbell (1965b: 61) who sees the /od/ segment as an allomorph of the construct state ending.
Modification by ordinal numerals uses the same construction, whether the numeral is marked as ordinal suffix \(-minji\), or not:

(26) **Noun–Ordinal**
JUrm. baxt-ət awwal
   woman-cst first
   ‘the first woman’ (Khan 2008b: 187)

(27) **Noun–Ordinal**
JUrm. yom-ət tre-manji
day-cst two-ORD
   ‘the second day’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

(28) **Noun–Ordinal**
JUrm. bel-ad arbi =w xa
   house-cst forty =and one
   ‘the forty-first house’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

Interestingly, also adverbial modification (either by a PP or by an adverb) can occur with this construction:

(29) **Noun–Prepositional Phrase**
JUrm. ktab-ət b= id-ew
   book-cst in= hand-poss.3MS
   ‘the book in his hands’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

(30) **Noun–Adverb**
JUrm. ‘qatt-ət təxya
   piece-cst below
   ‘lower piece’ (Khan 2008b: 600)

(31) **Participle–Adverb**
JUrm. ‘samx-an-ət tə́xya
   stand-PTCP-cst below
   ‘the one/those standing below’ (Garbell 1965b: 84)

Note that the last example has a participle as its primary. Khan (2008b: 78) notes that normally the participle is used “as a noun or adjective describing a characteristic, time-stable property of a referent”. This nominal character is retained also when participles are complemented by an object, as in the following example, which has a participial phrase as its primary (regarding the initial position of the complement, see Section 7.8.2).

\(^9\)Garbell (1965a: 166, §1.22.3) explains this suffix is a combination of the Sorani (originally Persian) ordinal suffix \(-emin\) and the Azr. ordinal suffix \(-ji\).
7.2. The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

(32) **Participial Phrase–Noun**

JUrm. [ixala bašł-an-ət] sultana
    food cook-PTCP-CST king
    ‘the king’s cook’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

7.2.6 Clausal secondaries

Nouns in construct state may be complemented by participial or infinitival phrases, which can be seen as reduced relative clauses (for the order of elements inside these phrases, see Section 7.8):

(33) **Noun–Participial phrase**

JUrm. naš-ət [bar-ew yarq-an-əc]
    people-CST after-POS3MS run-PTCP-PL
    ‘people that run after him’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

(34) **Noun–Infinitival Phrase**

JUrm. bel-ət [ixala bašole]
    house-CST food cook.INF
    ‘house of food cooking, kitchen’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

A noun may also be complemented like this by a clause, but, according to Garbell (1965b: 88), only when the clause has no NP functioning as a subject argument (i.e., it has only the obligatory pronominal subject marking on the verb).

(35) **Noun–Clause**

JUrm. šat-ət adya
    year-CST SBJV.come.3FS
    ‘the coming year’ (Garbell 1965b: 88)

(36) **Noun–Clause**

JUrm. gor-ət [bron-ew qətə́ł-wa-λe]
    man-CST son-POS3MS killed-PST-3MS
    ‘the man whose son he had killed’ (Garbell 1965b: 88)

Note that in the last example, bronew ‘his son’ cannot be the subject of the clause due to the above mentioned restriction.

The interrogative pronouns ma ‘what’ and mənī ‘who’ can also be complemented by a clause in this construction:

---

10 Garbell qualifies this type of clause as a VP, which implies that the subject suffix on the verb is merely an agreement marker. Note, however, that the subject of the embedded clause may be different than the primary noun, as in example (36). The only restriction is that the subject must be expressed pronominally as a verbal suffix. See, however, example (39) on the following page for a possible counter-example of Garbell’s assertion.
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(37) Pronoun–Clause
JUrm. má-t abyát
who-cst sbjv.want.2fs
‘whatever you want’ (Khan 2008b: 358 [10])

(38) Pronoun–Clause
JUrm. máni-t áde
who-cst sbjv.come.3ms
‘whoever comes’ (Khan 2008b: 357 [32])

In case of a these primaries, the following example shows that Garbell’s above mentioned restriction does not hold. This may be due to the fact that the construct state suffix has been grammaticalised into the primary pronoun, and is not felt any more as such, or it may indicate that Garbell’s assertion is simply wrong.

(39) Pronoun–Clause
JUrm. má-t nāš m= əlhá abè
what-cst man from= God sbjv.want.3ms
‘whatever a person wants from God’ (Khan 2008b: 358 [109])

For the alternative strategy of using a relativizer, see Section 7.6.

7.3 The analytic linker construction (X lnk Y)

JUrm. uses the morpheme ay as a linker, and not the inherited d- (as we find in JZax. and Qar.). It is identical in form to the singular proximal demonstrative ay (which Garbell 1965b: 58 qualifies as an “archaic” form), and very probably related to it diachronically, but contrary to the latter, it does not inflect according to number. Nonetheless, in some cases it is difficult to decide between the two possible analyses (as example (73) on page 182).

Garbell (1965a: 171) relates the linker ay to the “relational morpheme of [Kurdish, which] is likewise demonstrative in its origin”. She notes moreover that in the related dialects of Southern Persian Azerbaijan (J. Solduz and Šino) the Sorani marker i is used in the same position. Similarly, Khan (2008b: 176) writes: “It is likely to have developed under the influence of the izafe construction in Iranian languages. It appears not to be a direct loan from Iranian, in which the izafe is in principle monosyllabic (e, i, a), but rather an imitation of the izafe using Aramaic morphological material”. For an evaluation of these proposals see Section 10.5.4.

In general ay is an independent phonological word, as it carries stress. Quite often, however, it cliticizes forward to the secondary or, sporadically, backward to
the primary. The latter possibility is especially frequent with adverbial primaries, which tend to cliticize forward on their own account (but see example (47) on the following page).

The pronominal origin of ay, and – more importantly – the fact that it can form an AC without an explicit primary (see Section 7.3.6), are the main motivations to analyse it as a pronominal linker, rather than a simple secondary marker. As such, it forms an independent syntactic (and sometimes prosodic) constituent with the secondary. From a comparative perspective, it may be seen as the functional equivalent of the d- or did linkers of other dialects. Yet in contrast to the dialects surveyed in the previous chapters, in JUrm. the linker regularly occurs with construct state marked primaries, as examined in Section 7.3.1. In fact, cases where the primary is marked by the free state (i.e., the default form) are only found “sporadically” according to Khan (2008b: 175).

(40) Noun–Noun
JUrm. o ağa ay ašqalοn
DEM.DIST.SG lord LNK A.
‘that lord of Ascalon’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

(41) Noun–Noun
JUrm. gora ay tre rešè
man LNK two heads
‘the man of two heads’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

Yet as noted in Section 7.2, whenever the primary is a noun phrase (rather than a simple noun), the CSC is generally not available, and the ALC becomes the sole option (ignoring possible circumlocutions). Since the construct state marking in JUrm. is not phrasal, the primary NP cannot be marked as construct state:

(42) Noun Phrase–Noun
JUrm. [tq-ət aqla] ay naš
place-CST foot LNK man
‘human footprints (lit. place of foot of man)’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

(43) Noun Phrase–Noun Phrase
JUrm. [zóra broná] áy [tmánya ʿačča šənnè]
small son LNK eight nine years
‘the young boy of eight or nine years’ (Khan 2008b: 175 [141])

In such cases the linker may form an independent prosodic constituent with the secondary:

---

11 Information about stress and cliticization is given only in Khan (2008b), where clitic boundaries are marked by an hyphen.
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(44) **Noun Phrase–Noun**
JUrm. \[xa=\] danká ‘torbà] ay= ixalà
one= unit bag LNK= food
‘a bag of food’ (Khan 2008b: 176 [22])

(45) **Noun Phrase–Noun**
JUrm. kúl-lu ‘ktabèˈ ay= dunyèˈ all-3PL books LNK= world
‘all the books of the world’ (Khan 2008b: 176 [29])

We find one case where two separate secondaries appear, each in its own prosodic phrase. Note that the linker phrase \( \text{áy awuršúm} ‘of silk’ \) is adjacent to the adjective \( \text{sqilè ‘beautiful}.)\) which refers semantically to the primary \( \text{gory-át awuršúm ‘silk stockings’} \). Yet syntactically the adjective can be analysed as being an attribute of the pronominal linker itself:

(46) **Noun Phrase–Asyndetically Conjoined Nouns**
JUrm. \( \text{zao gory-át awuršúm} ‘\text{áy šušà, ‘\text{áy awuršúm sqil-è’}} \)
one= pair stockings.CST silk LNK nylon LNK silk beautiful-PL.
stockings shining-pl brought.RES.FS for-CST bride
‘She has brought a beautiful pair of silk stockings, of nylon, of silk, shining stockings for the bride’ (Khan 2008b: 219 [94])

We find also rare cases where the linker forms a prosodic constituent with the primary, but note that in following example the primary and the secondary are co-referential, atypically for an AC. In this case, the \( \text{ay} \) element may equally well be analysed as a demonstrative pronoun, followed by a prosodic stress due to hesitation:  

(47) **Noun–Noun**
JUrm. brona =ày ‘hatán son =L NK/DEM.SG groom
‘the son (who is) the groom’ (Khan 2008b: 219 [79])

7.3.1 **Linker following a construct state (X-CST LNK Y)**

The typical usage of the linker is following a construct state marked primary:

\[12\] According to Khan’s transcription it is the noun that loses the stress and apparently “procliticizes” to the stressed linker. Yet since in JUrm. the default stress placement is on the ultimate syllable, especially before intonation boundaries (Khan 2008b: 46), it is more plausible to analyse this case as an enclitization of the linker to the primary, with a default stress placement on the resulting phonological word.
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(48) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm. əgá-əd ay ašqalón

dem.dist.sg lord-cst lnk A.

‘that lord of Ascalon’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

(49) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm. gor-ət ay tre reše

man-cst lnk two heads

‘the man of two heads’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

This construction can easily be iterated:

(50) **Noun–Noun Phrase**

JUrm. ó dem.dist.sg raı́s-ət áy [komsér-ət áy Urmı]

dem.dist.sg head-cst lnk police-cst lnk Urmı

‘the head of police of Urmı’ (Khan 2008b: 230 [134])

We note that the primary can also be marked by the apocopated construct state, as in the following example (=example (12) on page 169; cf. the free state pqarta ‘neck’):13

(51) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm. pqar ay d-o gora

neck.cst lnk gen-dem.dist.ms man

‘the neck of that man’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

These cases, appearing regularly, pose a problem to the analysis of ay as a classical pronominal linker. As outlined in Section 2.3.4, the essence of the classical Semitic ALC, is that the linker stands in apposition with a free state nominal (the primary, in our terminology), the latter being outside the scope of the attributive relation, strictly speaking. Yet this analysis is not tenable whenever the primary is explicitly marked by construct state. One possible solution is to argue that the linker and the primary are still in apposition, yet the primary “agrees” in state with the linker, which is syntactically in construct state. This means that both the primary and ay head this type of construction, similarly to cases where two construct state nouns head a CSC as in examples (8)–(9) on page 168. The resulting construction, moreover, is one cohesive NP, as is clear from the fact that the primary in construct state cannot be separated from the following linker.

Yet this analysis is challenged by cases where the linker intervenes between a construct state marked preposition and its complement:

(52) **Preposition–Noun Phrase**

---

13Regarding the genitive marking, see Section 7.4.3.
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JUrm. (zə́l-lu)  gëb-əd ay=  ['raww-ət ay=  komsër]
went-3PL at-CST LNK= chief-CST LNK= police
‘They went to the chief of police’ (Khan 2008b: 198 [127])

(53) Preposition–Noun
JUrm.  gā-at  ay=  daxlà
in-CST LNK= agriculture
‘in agriculture’ (Khan 2008b: 198 [152])

We cannot argue that a pronominal element stands in apposition with a preposition, as the latter is not nominal. We have, thus, to concede, that at least in the latter cases *ay* has lost its pronominal force, and is in fact a simple marker of the prepositional phrase, a *pure linker*. As such, it approaches the status of a phrasal genitive marker.

7.3.2 Syllabification of the construct state suffix with the linker

Some analytic confusion arises from cases in which the linker *ay* is preceded by /d-/ segment. At first sight, we may assume this segment is the genitive prefix (discussed in Section 7.4), which can occur before vowel-initial pronominal elements. This assumption, however, is incoherent with our view that the linker is not governed by the primary, but rather stands in apposition with it.14

The solution to this difficulty is to analyse the /d-/ segment as part of the construct state suffix -əd, which has been resyllabified with the linker due to phonological reasons.15

In some cases, we see that a vestige of the vocalic nucleus of the construct state suffix (/ə/ or /a/, glossed in both cases *V_CST*) remains attached to the primary, while in other cases the vowel is elided.

(54) Noun–Noun
JUrm.  bél-ə  -d=  áy  *flankás
house-V_CST -CST= LNK so_and.so
‘the family of so-and-so’ (Khan 2008b: 175 [72])

(55) Noun–Proper Noun
JUrm.  yá  ‘šultán-a  -d=  áy  Pahlawi’
DEM.PROX.SG king-V_CST -CST= LNK P.
‘that king (Reza Shah) Pahlavi’ (Khan 2008b: 370 [169])

---

14In other words, while the linker marks the secondary, it does not constitute a part of it. This is true even if we see *ay* as a pure marker of the AC, as suggested in the previous section. Of course, we must be assured that we are not in fact dealing with the homophonous demonstrative pronoun *ay* in genitive case.

15Cf. Khan (2008b: 175): “The consonant of the genitive enclitic may be syllabified with the *ay* particle.”
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A similar resyllabification occurs with prepositional primaries. In these cases it is further motivated by the fact that the prepositions themselves cliticize to the linker as a whole.

(56) **Preposition–Noun**

JUrm. əl-d = ay ‘amart-èw

*ACC-CST* = LNK palace-POS.3MS

‘his palace’ (Khan 2008b: 198 [45])

(57) **Preposition–Noun**

JUrm. ba-d = ay elcyè

*for-CST* = LNK messengers

‘for the messengers’ (Khan 2008b: 198 [77])

Note that in the last examples the construct state morpheme is realized as a sole /d/ without a vocalic nucleus: Contrast example (57) on the current page with example (19) on page 170.

7.3.3 Adjectival secondaries following an apparent linker

We find sporadic cases where an adjective follows an ay morpheme, which *a priori* could be analysed as a linker. Such an analysis would reinforce the idea that the JUrm. ALC is a pattern replication form Kurmanji, as in Kurdish adjectives follow the Ezafe (see Section 9.4.1). Yet following closer scrutiny, and given the rarity of such occurrences, we prefer to analyse ay in these cases as being the demonstrative pronoun ay. Thus, in the following case ay can be analysed as a definite determiner attached to the adjective rather than the possessed noun (compare with JZax. example (97) on page 125).¹⁷

(58) **Noun–Adjective**

JUrm. [kpan-aw] ay ‘rast

shoulder-POS.3FS DEF.SG right(INV)

‘her right shoulder’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

¹⁶The preposition əl ‘to’ serves in this case as an accusative preposition, i.e. marking an object of a phrase. It is thus not rendered in the translation.

¹⁷As discussed in footnote 24 on page 125, Eran Cohen has suggested that this very placement of a determiner in the pre-adjectival position may itself represent pattern replication of the Ezafe construction. If this is true, this development may be regarded as a pre-cursor to the re-analysis of the demonstrative pronoun as a linker. Yet the rarity of this construction hints against such a scenario, at least in the context of JUrm. An alternative possibility is to consider ‘rast’ as a noun meaning ‘the right side’; see discussion of the Kurm. example (62) on page 242.
In the following example ay is also a definite determiner, serving to nominalize the adjective:

(59)  
**Preposition–Adjective**

JUrM.  
\[ \text{gáll-} \text{d-} \text{áy smoqà, idá smoqà} \]

\[ \text{with-V CST DEF.SG red.MS hand(MS) red.MS} \]

‘with red (colour), a red hand’ (Khan 2008b: 198 [173])

7.3.4 **Infinitival phrases as secondaries**

Infinitive phrases as well can appear as secondaries in the JUrM. ALC.

(60)  
**Noun–Infinitive**

JUrM.  
\[ \text{(gə=) tkán-} \text{d-} \text{áy [ləxmá zabonë]} \]

\[ \text{in shop-V CST -CST= LNK bread sell.INF} \]

‘in the shop of bread selling’ (Khan 2008b: 291 [174])

(61)  
**Noun–Infinitive**

JUrM.  
\[ \text{lèle} \text{-d=} \text{áy [pardin šaroë]} \]

\[ \text{night -CST=} \text{LNK curtain untie.INF} \]

‘the night of the releasing of the curtain’ (Khan 2008b: 291 [84])

7.3.5 **Ordinal and Adverbial secondaries**

We find also ordinals and adverbs as secondaries in the ALC:

(62)  
**Noun–Ordinal**

JUrM.  
\[ \text{gor-} \text{át ay tre-manji} \]

\[ \text{DEM.DIST.MS man-CST LNK two-ORD} \]

‘that second man’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

Compare the above example to (27) on page 172.

(63)  
**Noun–Adverb**

JUrM.  
\[ \text{qayd-} \text{át ay= lòka} \]

\[ \text{custom-CST LNK=18 there} \]

‘the custom of the place’ (Khan 2008b: 230 [151])

---

18 Arguably, the ay element here could be an instance of the demonstrative ay serving to nominalize the adverb. Khan translates indeed this example as ‘the custom of that place’. Compare with example (86) on page 185 and see also example (70) on page 182 and the discussion following it.
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7.3.6 Linkers without an explicit primary

As explained in Section 2.3.4, the ALC is analysed as a construction in which the linker is standing in attributive relationship with the secondary, and in apposition with the primary. As such, we expect the linker to be able to occur without an explicit primary. This expectation is indeed borne out, but only whenever the linker phrase acts as the predicate of the clause.

(64) ∅–Noun
    JUrm.  ay šabbat
    LNK Sabbath
    ‘belonging to the Sabbath’ (Garbell 1965b: 88)

(65) ∅–Ordinal
    JUrm.  ay arbi
    LNK forty
    ‘the fortieth’ (Garbell 1965b: 88)

(66) ∅–Pronoun
    JUrm.  (kalòˈ) ay= noš-èw (=ila.)
    bride  LNK= REPL-3MS =COP.FS
    ‘The bride belongs to him.’ (Khan 2008b: 233 [81])

(67) ∅–Infinitive
    JUrm.  áy šaqolè (=lc)
    LNK buy,INF =COP.MS
    ‘It is worth buying.’ (Khan 2008b: 292)

(68) ∅–Infinitival Phrase
    JUrm.  áy [lebbá qyalà] (=we-la)
    LNK heart  burn.INF =COP.PST-FS
    ‘It was liable to burn the heart, it was pitiable.’ (Khan 2008b: 293 [121])

(69) ∅–Asyndetically conjoined infinitives
    JUrm.  bålè źkár wad-én ki= did-ànˈ ṭába ṭába ∅ ay= xazoèˈ ṭába ∅
    but  thought do-1MS REL= GEN-1PL much much ∅ LNK= see.INF much ∅
    ay= šamoè ilá.
    LNK= hear  COP.3FS
    ‘but I think that our (wedding) is very much something to see and something
to hear about’ (Khan 2008b: 233 [71])

One case where we find a linker phrase which is not in predicative position is after the adverbial magon ‘like’, itself appearing in predicative position:

(70) ∅–Adverb
JUrm. magón \( \emptyset \) ay= láxxa là k-awyá-wa
like \( \emptyset \) LNK= here NEG IND=bc.FS=PST
'It was not like (the situation) here' (Khan 2008b: 198 [106])

In this case, we may reasonable interpret the *ay* as referring pronominally to an implicit 'situation', in essence nominalizing the adverb *laxxa* 'here'. An alternative analysis would be to see *ay* as a pure linker standing between *magon* and its complement, but in this case we would expect *magon* to be marked with the construct state suffix, as in examples (52)–(53) on page 178.

### 7.4 Genitive marking of secondaries

Demonstrative and interrogative pronouns, which are normally vowel-initial\(^{19}\) are marked by a genitive prefix *d-* when they appear as secondaries, either as determiners of NPs or as full NPs by their own right. The motivation to analyse this segment as a genitive marker (rather than a phonological artefact) is given in Section 4.4. The possible development path of this marker is discussed in Section 10.4.

In general, we expect the primary to be marked as construct state, either by means of the \(-\text{ad}\) suffix or by apocope. This exception is indeed borne out in some cases:

(71) **Noun–Noun**
JUrm. dád-\(\text{-}_\text{ct}\) d-\(\text{-}_\text{d}\) broná
father-\text{CST} GEN-DEM.DIST.SG son
'the father of that son' (Khan 2008b: 175 [70])

(72) **Noun–Pronoun**
JUrm. baxt-\(\text{-}_\text{d}\) d-\(\text{-}_\text{ay}\)
wife-\text{CST} GEN-DEM.PROX.MS
'the wife of this (man)' (Garbell 1965b: 86)

(73) **Noun–Noun**
JUrm. bel d-\(\text{-}_\text{ay}\) gora
house.CST GEN-DEM.PROX.MS man
'the house of this man' (Khan 2008b: 175)

Khan (2008b: 175) brings some cases in which the primary is apparently left unmarked.\(^{20}\)

\(^{19}\)Note that JUrm. does not have initial glottal stops (Khan 2008b: 35).

\(^{20}\)In Khan’s analysis this is the default case. For him there is only one *d* morpheme, which is a particle that can attach either to the primary as an "annexation enclitic" or to the secondary’s determiner as a prefix. Moreover, he does not consider reduced nouns, such as *bel* ‘house’ in example (73) as being in construct state, but rather as lacking the enclitic, which is attached to the following demonstrative (Khan 2008b: 174f.). See Section 4.3 for our arguments against such an analysis.
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(74) **Noun–Noun**
JUrm. nišán d-o pardá
sign.(cst?) GEN-DEM.DIST.SG curtain
‘the symbolic meaning of that curtain’ (Khan 2008b: 175 [88])

(75) **Noun–Noun**
JUrm. áy xabúša d-émnu yalè =le?
DEM.PROX.SG apple GEN—which child =cop.3MS
‘This apple belongs to which child?’ (Khan 2008b: 175)

Both these examples may be, however, explained differently: In example (74), the primary nišán ‘sign’ can be analysed as being an instance of apocopated construct state, since there exists a long variant nišána.

As for the example (75) on the current page, judging by Khan’s translation ('This is the apple of which child?') it seems that he analyses xabúša d-émnu yalè as one NP. Yet it seems more reasonable to analyse áy xabúša as the subject NP, and d-émnu yalè as a predicate NP, in which case d-émnu is an independent genitive pronoun, lacking an explicit primary. Functionally, the genitive marking without an explicit primary is somewhat similar to the pronominal linker d-, otherwise absent in JUrm., as it can be said to assume a pronominal role of representing the primary.

### 7.4.1 Genitive marking following adverbials

Prepositions stand in a direct attributive relation with their complement, and thus induce a genitive marking on it, irrespective of the question whether the preposition itself is marked as construct state or not.

(76) **Preposition–Noun**
JUrm. dowr-at d-o bela
around-CST GEN-DEM.DIST.SG house
‘around that house’ (Khan 2008b: 194)

(77) **Preposition–Pronoun**
JUrm. dowr-at d-o
around-CST GEN-DEM.DIST.SG
‘around that one, around it’ (Khan 2008b: 194)

(78) **Preposition–Noun**
JUrm. bar d-o gora
behind GEN-DEM.DIST.SG man
‘behind that man’ (Khan 2008b: 192)

(79) **Preposition–Pronoun**
Of interest are cases in which the adverbial has a part of the construct state suffix, namely the vowel /ə/, followed by a genitive marked pronoun. Such cases are akin to those in which the /-d/ segment of the construct state suffix has resyllabified with the following element (compare with Section 7.3.2). Yet if we assume that the pronominal determiners are genitive marked, we must conclude that the d-prefix does double duty in these cases, taking part both in the construct state suffix, and in the genitive prefix. In other words, while phonologically it is a simple /d/ segment, syntactically it is understood as geminated. 21

7.4.2 Independent genitive pronouns

All personal pronouns have a genitive allomorph, which is formed from combination of did-+poss (Khan 2008b: 58). These forms appear whenever we expect a pronoun in an attributive position and this pronoun cannot be expressed as a pronominal suffix for morphological reasons (Khan 2008b: 233; contrast with examples (1)–(2) on page 166).

Preposition–Noun

(80) JUrm. 𝐚𝐫𝐚𝐥𝐠-ə -d-emnu naše
in-between-V\textsubscript{CST} -CST.GEN-which people
‘between which people?’ (Khan 2008b: 196)

Preposition–Pronoun

(81) JUrm. qulb-ə -d-o gorā
drom=stead-V\textsubscript{CST} -CST.GEN-DEM.DIST.SG man
‘instead of that man’ (Khan 2008b: 196)

---

21This analysis is independent of the question whether diachronically we had a geminated /d-d/ in this position. In fact, the resyllabification of the construct state -əd suffix may have been the trigger for the innovation of the d-prefix, prior to any gemination. See discussion in Section 10.4.
The first example has a primary noun kalo ‘bride’ which does not end in an /a/ vowel, and thus cannot take a regular pronominal suffix. Similarly, the preposition bod ‘because’ cannot take a pronominal suffix on it, since it ends obligatory with the construct state marker.

We note that semantically there is a certain overlap between the 3rd person genitive pronouns (ms: didew; fs: didaw; pl: didu) and the independent demonstratives with genitive marking (sg: do; pl: dune; see examples (77) and (79) on the preceding page). This is expected, as the same overlap appears in the non-genitive case. Indeed, without the genitive marking, the distal demonstratives o ‘that’ and une ‘those’ are identical to the independent pronouns (Khan 2008b: 55f.).

In JUrm., the did- base is bound to the pronominal suffixes, and cannot occur before free standing nominals. Consequently we analyse it as a genitive base, and not as a pronominal linker, in contrast to JZax. (see Section 5.3) and Qar. (examples (52)–(54) on page 146). This point shall be discussed in more detail in Section 10.5.1. Unlike the d- genitive marker, however, in some cases it has a certain pronominal value, especially when it acts as the head of an NP in predicative position (but see example (75) on page 183 for a similar analysis of the d- prefix). Formally, we analyse such cases as having a ∅ primary, as an explicit noun could appear in the primary position.

(84) ∅–Pronoun
JUrm. ma-t át-ti l-át-ti kúll-u ∅ did-àx =ilu.
what-cst exist-1sg NEG-exist-1sg all-3ms ∅ GEN-2fs =cop.3ms
‘Whatever I have is all yours.’ (Khan 2008b: 233 [8])

### 7.4.3 Genitive case following the linker ay

A demonstrative or interrogative pronoun appearing after the linker will also be marked by the genitive prefix d-. Together with the construct state marking this yields a triple-marked construction (see also example (12) on page 169):

(85) Noun–Noun
JUrm. tre be-át ay d-ay gora
two eggs-cst LNK GEN-DEM.PROX.sg man
‘the two eggs of this man’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

(86) Noun–Noun
JUrm. ‘qayd-át áy d-ò= tka
custom-cst LNK GEN-DEM.DIST.sg= place
‘the custom of that place’ (Khan 2008b: 176 [144])
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Note that example (85) on the previous page shows neatly the difference in function and in marking of the linker ay and the demonstrative ay.

An independent genitive pronoun can also occur as a secondary following the linker. This seems to further indicate that the genitive base did- should not be confounded with the linker. Note also the optionality of the construct state marking at the end of the primary NP.

(87)  Noun Phrase–Pronoun
JUrm. [ǰull-ət ‘šultanul-a/ət] ay did-cw
clothes-cst royalty–free/cst LNK GEN-3MS
‘his royal clothes’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

7.5 Double annexation construction (X-y.poss LNK Y)
Garbell (1965b: 87) mentions that “in rare cases” a double genitive construction can occur. In such cases, the apposition between the primary noun and the linker is quite clear:

(88)  Noun–Noun
JUrm. tar-cw ay d-o gora
gate–poss.3MS LNK GEN–DEM.DIST.MS man
‘that man’s gate’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

7.6 Usage of relativizer (X REL Y)
The linker ay is in complementary distribution with the relativizer ki, which appears only before clausal secondaries.\(^\text{22}\)

(89)  Noun–Clause
JUrm. qūš ki = [baxtä =ila]
bird REL= wife =COP.3FS
‘the bird who is the wife’ (Khan 2008b: 353 [46])

(90)  Noun Phrase–Clause
JUrm. [xa ‘jahal jwanqa], ki [atta ‘matóy-le]
INDF young youth REL now arrive.INF-3MS
‘a young man who has just reached maturity’ (Garbell 1965b: 88)

\(^\text{22}\)This complementary distribution is reminiscent of the alternation between ke and ya in JSan. discussed in Section 8.5. In the latter case, however, both forms serve as relativizers. According to Garbell (1965a: 171f.) the relativizer is borrowed from Azeri Turkish, while the usage of the linker (as well as the construct state suffix) stems from pattern replication of Kurdish.
With the use of *ki*, there is clearly no restriction as for the appearance of an explicit subject NP in the relative clause, in contrast to clausal secondaries following the construct state marking, which may have such a restriction according to Garbell. Contrast the following example with examples (35)–(36) on page 173:

(91) **Noun–Clause**  
JUrm. xa xabra *ki* [naš la ‘miss-e ód-le]  
INDF thing REL man NEG can-3MS SBJV.do.A3MS-P3MS  
‘a thing that no one can do’ (Garbell 1965b: 88)

The primary may moreover be a pronoun:

(92) **Pronoun–Clause**  
JUrm. ó *ki* = [la dhál-le g= qór-át dad-éw]  
3SG REL = NEG knocked-3MS in= grave-cst father-poss.3MS  
‘the one who did not beat on the grave of his father’ (Khan 2008b: 356 [69])

Interestingly, sometimes a clause-like complement lacking a finite verb can appear in this construction (Khan 2008b: 361).

(93) **Noun–Infinitive phrase**  
JUrm. (⁺hudaé m=) [pálg-át ‘wárxa] *ki* [knāštá izalá] (der-í-wa  
Jews from= half-cst way REL synagogue go.INF return-3PL-PST  
gól-barə)  
‘(Jews turned back from halfway) along the road that they had gone to the synagogue’ (Khan 2008b: 361 157)

(94) **Pronoun–Noun**  
JUrm. ána *ki* = [⁺dāqna-xwára]  
1SG REL = beard-white  
‘I, who am an elder’ (Khan 2008b: 356 [17])

Note that in the last two examples adding a copula to the secondaries would make them full clauses. In particular, the infinitive *izalá* ‘go’ could combine with a copula to form the progressive tense. Thus, these cases may merely represent a possibility to omit the copula in relative clauses.

### 7.6.1 Adverbial primaries

Some adverbial primaries use the relativizer construction to govern clausal secondaries, such as *magon* ‘like’ in the following example (but this is optional; see example (119) on page 193):
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(95) **Adverbial–Clause**
JUrm. \( \text{magon} = \text{ki’ [k-yèt’]} = \text{like= REL IND=know.2MS} \)
\( ‘\text{as you know’ (Khan 2008b: 373 [51])} \)

Of interest is the adverbial \( \text{hal ‘until’ which uses the same construction both for clausal and nominal complements.} \)

(96) **Adverbial–Clause**
JUrm. ‘\( \text{hal = ki = [yá ‘sultán-a -d-áy Pahlawi’ adyè-le].’} \)
\( \text{until = REL = DEM.PROX.sg king-cst -cst=LNK P came-3MS} \)
\( ‘\text{until king (Reza Shah) Pahlavi came’ (Khan 2008b: 370 [169])} \)

(97) **Adverbial–Noun Phrase**
JUrm. ‘\( \text{hal = ki = [lel= x lulá]} \)
\( \text{until = REL = night.cst= wedding} \)
\( ‘\text{until the wedding night’ (Khan 2008b: 371 [73])} \)

The latter case may be interpreted as a clausal complement in which the copula has been omitted as in examples (93)–(94). It seems more reasonable, however, to analyse the element \( \text{ki as if it has been integrated into the adverbial hal. The following example, in which the whole expression hal \( \text{ki} \) governs a genitive case, corroborates this view:} \)

(98) **Adverbial–Noun**
JUrm. ‘\( \text{hal = ki = d-o = lelé (=} \)
\( \text{until = REL = GEN=DEM.DIST.ms= night =also} \)
\( ‘\text{until that night’ (Khan 2008b: 371 [82])} \)

7.6.2 Relativizer following the construct state (X-cst rel Y)

Similarly to the linker, the relativizer may follow a head noun which is marked by the construct state suffix. In this case, as in examples (35)–(36) on page 173, it seems that the clause cannot have an NP subject argument.

(99) **Noun–Clause**
JUrm. \( \text{naš-ət ki [lóka wé-lu]} \)
\( \text{people-cst rel there cop.pst-3pl} \)
\( ‘\text{the people who were there’ (Garbell 1965b: 55)} \)

(100) **Noun–Clause**
JUrm. \( \text{o brát-ət ki [midyá-wa-lu gall-ew]} \)
\( \text{DEM.DIST.sg girl-cst rel brought.p3fs-pst-a3pl with-3ms} \)
\( ‘\text{that girl whom they had brought along with him’ (Garbell 1965b: 88)} \)
Similarly to the suggestion about the linker in Section 7.3.1 (see on page 177), such cases may be analysed as if the primary noun agrees in the state feature with the relativizer, which could be understood as being syntactically in construct state. We note, however, that the construct state marking is not a simple variant of the construction, as it restricts the class of secondary clauses following it to those that do not contain a subject NP. Thus, we may postulate that \( \text{kì,cst} \) is grammatically different from \( \text{kì} \), albeit the forms are identical.

In some restricted cases, the relativizer can follow the construct state pronoun \( \text{od} \) (see Section 7.2.4). Khan (2008b: 374–5) mentions this construction as occurring only after the prepositions \( \text{bod} \) ‘because’ and \( \text{reš} \) ‘on’.

(101) **Pronoun–Clause**

\[ \text{JUrm. bo-d= \text{ód} \text{ki'} xàlifà kotàk dahàl-le} \]

because\(\text{-cst=} \text{DEM-cst REL teacher blow beat.A3MS-P3MS} \]

‘because of the fact that the teacher beats him’ (Khan 2008b: 374 [139])

(102) **Pronoun–Clause**

\[ \text{JUrm. (mqé-\text{lan}) reš= d-ó-d \text{ki} \text{'kalò} \text{ki=} \text{bratà} \text{spoke-1PL on= GEN-DEM-cst REL bride REL.(when)= girl} \text{yadlà-wa'} \text{jùwe súla=} \text{š g-od-i-wa}.{'} \text{give_birth.FS-PST different work=} \text{also IND-do-3PL-PST} \]

‘(We have spoken) about the fact that a daughter-in-law, when she gave birth to a girl, people acted differently.’ (Khan 2008b: 375 [120])

As for adverbial primaries, those which normally take the construct state suffix will do so also when followed by a clausal complement introduced by the relativizer \( \text{kì} \).

(103) **Adverbial–Noun**

\[ \text{JUrm. m=qulb-ə́t from=stead-cst REL= come.3MS at= hospital ACC-1SG sec.3MS} \]

‘instead of coming to the hospital to see me’ (Khan 2008b: 569 [148])

### 7.6.3 Relativizer in construct state (X rel-cst Y)

Above we claimed that the relativizer \( \text{kì} \) may sometimes be considered to be in construct state syntactically speaking, although it is not marked as such morphologically. JUrm. seems to corroborate this claim by some cases in which the relativizer is explicitly marked by a construct state suffix: \( \text{kì-t} \). This seems to happens, though, only after a handful of adverbials. Khan (2008b) gives the following three cases:

(104) **Adverbial–Clause**

\[ \text{JUrm. \text{hàl kì-t} [idàyle léle -d=} \text{áy} [pardin šaroè]} \]

until REL-cst come-INF.3MS night \( \text{-cst=} \text{LNK curtain untie.INF} \)
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‘until the night of the releasing of the curtain came’ (Khan 2008b: 291 [84])

(105) **Adverbial–Clause**

JUrm. ‘ḥal kī-t  ya= bronā’ ya  axōn-i  zōra  lḥbb-ēw
until REL–CST DEM= son  DEM brother–1sg small heart–poss.3ms
zil’
went.3ms
‘until the boy, my young brother, had fainted’ (Khan 2008b: 371 [142])

(106) **Conjunction–Clause**

JUrm. bar  kī-t ⁽⁺⁾dmāx-lan lele
after REL–CST slept–1pl. night
‘after we went to bed’ (Khan 2008b: 369)

The restriction of this marker to these conjunctions only may indicate, however, that kī is no longer felt as a relativizer in these cases, but as a part of the conjunction. Indeed, there are other occurrences of the adverbial ḥal-kī (examples (96)–(98) on page 188), which suggest the same view.

### 7.7 Juxtaposition (X Y.{agr})

Juxtaposition of two nouns is used only marginally in JUrm. as means of marking an attributive relation. Two examples of this kind are the following:

(107) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm. naṣa  tre  reše
man two heads
‘the two-headed man’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

(108) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm. ṣamha ilane
festival trees
‘Festival of the Trees (holiday of Tu Bi-Shvat)’ (Khan 2008b: 587)

The first example may be motivated by the intervention of a numeral between the primary and the secondary (but contrast with example (7) on page 167). The second example is an idiom related to Hebrew שמחת אלנאות simḥa-t ʾilanot, which refers to the Jewish Holiday of טו בשבט Tu Bi-Shvat. Yet in Hebrew, the word simḥa-t is clearly marked by the fs construct state suffix -t.

Juxtaposition as means of marking an AC is regularly found, on the other hand, with adjectival secondaries. On the periphery of the AC system we find juxtaposition of nouns standing in apposition, as well as in adverbial phrases. These cases are
discussed in the following subsections.

### 7.7.1 Adjectival secondaries

Juxtaposition-cum-agreement is chiefly used in JUrm. for expressing adjectival attribution (but often the adjective precedes the head, see Section 7.8).

While most adjectives of Aramaic origin agree with the primary, some adjectives, mostly of foreign origin, are invariable in form, and thus show a pure juxtaposition pattern. Some other loan-adjectives do show agreement but only for number (Khan 2008b: 181).

(109) **Noun–Adjective**

JUrm. gi’lasta smuq-ta
cherry(fs) red–fs
‘the red cherry’ (Garbell 1965b: 83)

(110) **Noun–Adjective**

JUrm. tkana šušaband
shop glass-covered(inv)
‘a glass-covered shop’ (Garbell 1965b: 84)

### 7.7.2 Nominal quantification and apposition

Juxtaposition is regularly used when two nouns are in apposition with each other, but these cases do not fall normally under our definition of an AC. Yet some of these cases can be considered as borderline ACs, since one noun qualifies the other. This is for instance the case when the head noun is part of a quantifying expression (Q. NP), as in the following examples (see further Khan 2008b: 233f.). The following example illustrates the analytical ambiguity of such expressions: One the one hand, the primary and the secondary are co-referential and share the same grammatical feature (plurality), and could thus be qualified as appositional to each other. On the other hand, the secondary ‘clothes’ clearly qualifies the primary, as it designates the type of ‘sets’.

(111) **Q. Noun Phrase–Noun**

JUrm. [tre daste] julle
two sets clothes
‘two sets of clothes’ (Garbell 1965b: 85)

---

23 To illustrate this, note that one may say “These are clothes” as well as “These are two sets”.

24 The syntactic ambiguity of quantification is clearly manifested in Hebrew morpho-syntax, where numerals appear in construct state when followed by a definite nominal, and in free state when followed by an indefinite one.
In this class of examples we may also include the use of the numeral classifier *danka* ‘unit’ (pl. *danke*). The usage of a classifier, as well as the classifier itself, is a matter-cum-pattern replication from Kurdish (or possibly Azeri), in which it originally means ‘grain’ (Garbell 1965a: 172, §2.3.2.12.4(a)).

(112) **Q. Noun Phrase–Noun**

**JUrm.** [xa danka] baxta

on unit woman

‘one woman’ (Garbell 1965a: 172)

The apposition between the two elements can be illustrated by the fact that the primary can stand alone, without an explicit secondary:

(113) **Q. Noun Phrase–∅**

**JUrm.** isra danke

ten unit.pl

‘ten (people or objects)’ (Garbell 1965a: 172)

Other quantification examples, however, are more clear-cut in that the primary and the secondary are not co-referential, as in the following example:

(114) **Q. Noun Phrase–Noun**

**JUrm.** [kəmma (^b)ate] hudeae

few Houses Jews

‘a few Jewish houses’ (Garbell 1965b: 85)

Another example of juxtaposition verging on apposition is the following, where the secondary noun marks the biological sex of the primary noun *quš* ‘bird’, which by itself has no inherent grammatical gender (see glossary of Khan 2008b: 569). In this respect, the nominal secondaries of the following example are not unlike adjectives (compare to example (89) on page 186):

(115) **Noun–Noun**

**JUrm.** quš gorá (ba=) quš baxtá (mar-è)

bird man to= bird woman say-3ms

‘The male bird (says to) the female bird’ (Khan 2008b: 219 [45])

### 7.7.3 Adverbial primaries

Adverbial primaries, which are not marked by the construct state suffix, effectively yield a juxtaposition construction.

(116) **Preposition–Noun**
7.8 Inverse juxtaposition (Y X)

The usage of inverse constructions, in which the secondary precedes the primary, is not uncommon in JUrm., but it is restricted to two domains: adjectival and adverbial attribution, and complementation of verbal nouns.\(^{25}\)

7.8.1 Adjectival and adverbial secondaries

Adjectives commonly precede the head noun in JUrm. This is attributed by Garbell (1965a: 172, §2.32.12 (2)) to Azr. influence. As is the case with the post-nominal position of adjectives (see Section 7.7.1), adjectives of Aramaic stock normally agree in gender and number with the primary noun, while loan-adjectives are often uninflecting.

\(^{25}\)Recall that in the example headings we list consistently the categories of the AC in the order Primary–Secondary.
Noun–Adjective

JUrmi. kor naš-e
blind(INV) people–PL
‘blind people’ (Garbell 1965a: 167)

When two adjectives modify a noun, they are generally placed around the noun (Garbell 1965b: 84). It is the adjective with larger scope which appears before the noun:

Noun Phrase–Adjective

JUrmi. zúr-ta [tkana šušaband]
small–FS shop(FS) glass-covered(INV)
‘a small glass-covered shop’ (Garbell 1965b: 84)

Adverbials modifying an adjective appear before it. Consequently, we may get an adjectival phrase preceding a noun, in which an adverbial precedes an adjective.

Adjective–Adverb

JUrmi. [raba xriwa] naš
much bad.MSPerson
‘a very bad person’ (Garbell 1965b: 84)

Adjective–Prepositional Phrase

JUrmi. [ba= taltoe šbir-e] naš-e
for= hang.INF good–PL person–PL
‘people good for hanging’ (Garbell 1965b: 84)

Adjective–Prepositional Phrase

JUrmi. [mən-nox biš zudda] naš-e
from–2MS more brave(INV) person–PL
‘men braver than you’ (Garbell 1965b: 84)

We find also the adverbial magon ‘like’ modifying directly a noun in this way:

Adverbial–Noun

JUrmi. magon-ox ‘hasid-e
like–2MS pious_man–PL
‘pious people like you’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

Finally, ordinals may also precede a primary noun. In contrast to the post-nominal placement of ordinals (shown in examples (27)–(28) on page 172), the primary noun is not marked as construct state in this case. Note that the ordinal has always an invariable form.

Noun–Ordinal
7.8. Inverse Juxtaposition (Y X)

JUrm. tre-mənji gora
two-ORD man
‘The second man’ (Khan 2008b: 187)

(128) Noun Phrase–Ordinal
JUrm. tmənya-mənji [lél-ət ay elá]’
eight-ORD night-CST LNK festival
‘on the eight night of the festival’ (Khan 2008b: 217 [104])

7.8.2 Verbal nouns as primaries

Verbal nouns, i.e. infinitives and participles (active or resultative), have their complements preceding them, just as normal verbs do. In the Semitic realm this is clearly an innovation. Indeed, the JUrm. OV order, available throughout the verbal system, is attributed by Garbell (1965a: 172, §2.3.2.2.1) to Kurmanji or Azeri influence.

(129) Infinitive–Noun
JUrm. ‘hatān massoe
groom wash.INF
‘the washing of the groom’ (Khan 2008b: 291)

(130) Participle–Noun
JUrm. masy-çe doq-ana
fish-PL catch-PTCP
‘fish-catcher, fisherman’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

(131) Participle–Adverb
JUrm. lóka hawy-an-e
here be-PTCP-PL
‘those present there’ (Garbell 1965b: 84)

(132) Participle–Prepositional Phrase
JUrm. reš suse ‘rkıwa
on horse mounted.RES
‘mounted upon a horse’ (Garbell 1965b: 87)

Example (131) could be contrasted with example (31) on page 172, in which the adverb follows a participial in construct state. For a participial phrase acting as the primary of an AC see example (32) on page 173.

Of interest are also cases of definite direct objects of infinitives. These may be part of a prepositional phrase headed by the accusative-marking əl preposition, as well as being indexed on the infinitive by a pronominal possessive suffix.

(133) Infinitive–Noun
Attributive Constructions in the Jewish Dialect of Urmí

JUrm. əl- d-o gora ‘qatol-ew
ACC= gen-dem.dist.ms man kill.inf-poss.3ms
‘the killing of that man’ (Khan 2008b: 291)

Such cases accentuate the “double” status of complements of infinitives, being both genitive (as complements of nouns), and accusative (as complements of verbs).

7.9 Conclusions

JUrm. presents an intricate and complex system of ACs, exploiting to a maximal extent the various marking possibilities. Indeed, we find examples with up to three simultaneous AC markers: a primary marked by construct state, a secondary marked by genitive case, and in between a linker (see Section 7.4.3)

The various AC markers of JUrm. and their possible combination are presented in Table 7.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X ± CST (¬d, App.)</td>
<td>± LNK (ay)</td>
<td>± GEN (d-, did-) Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.1: AC markers in JUrm.

Where does this complexity stem from? A possible answer is that the language has borrowed through language contact various AC marking strategies, which synchronically “co-exist” in the same system. Indeed, some elements are clearly borrowed: The ki relativizer is borrowed both formally and functionally from Azeri Turkish (Garbell 1965a: 172). Moreover, as Garbell (1965a: 171f.) suggests, the Kurm. Ezafe construction may be the source of the JUrm. linker construction, relexicalized with native morphological material, and possibly also the source of the suffixed construct state marking. While these claims may be challenged (see Section 10.3 and Section 10.4 for a discussion), the result of the interaction of the different processes involved, be they pattern or matter replication and/or internal change, is an entangled and quite complex system.

The most striking structural innovation in JUrm. is the co-occurrence of a construct state primary with a linker in the ALC. This construction, unattested in previous strata of Aramaic (but found in some other NENA dialects in different forms; see Section 11.2), presents an analytic challenge to our conceptual framework. We have attempted to resolve this difficulty by postulating an agreement in state rule or by re-analysing ay as a non-pronominal linker (see Section 7.3.1). It seems reasonable to assume that language contact must have played a certain role in the emergence of this not so typically Semitic construction.
The analytic difficulties revolving around the occurrences of the morpheme *ay* (is it a pronominal linker? A secondary marker? Or simply a demonstrative pronoun?) as well as the */d*/ segment (is it part of the construct state suffix? A genitive prefix? Both?), seem moreover to be typical of a system which is still in a state of flux.

The use of juxtaposition construction for quantification, involving the numeral classifier *danka* ‘unit’ (see examples (112)–(113) on page 192) must be a case of pattern-cum-matter replication from Kurdish or Azeri. For the question whether this construction is in general due to language contact see Section 11.3.2.1.

A similar case where language contact must be in play is the usage of the inverse juxtaposition construction (described in Section 7.8). The positioning of adjectives before their nominal primaries is due to Azeri influence, while the positioning of complements before their verbal nouns is related either to Kurmanji or to Azeri influence (or both).

Notwithstanding these changes, JUrm. has preserved some of the typical characteristics of a classical Semitic system: First, it shows a clear demarcation between adjectival attribution (expressed by juxtaposition-cum-agreement) and nominal attribution (the CSC as well as the ALC). Second, the use of the CSC with clausal secondaries, while absent in previous strata of Aramaic, is a classical Semitic pattern. Note, however, that it has been superseded to some extent by the use of the borrowed relativizer *kt*.26

To conclude, compared to the dialects surveyed so far JUrm. seems to present the most complex system, rich in its variety of constructions, and the most innovative one compared to the Classical Aramaic AC system. Yet we find it keeps also some conservative aspects typical of Semitic languages.

---

26 The usage of a dedicated relativizer (differentiated from a more general linker) is by itself not unprecedented in the Semitic realm. For example, in BHeb., we find šɛ- or ʾăšɛr exclusively in the role of relativizers (Waltke and O’Connor 1990: 331, §19.2).
Chapter 8

Attributive Constructions in the Jewish Dialect of Sanandaj

The Iranian city of Sanandaj is located at the eastern extremity of the NENA speaking zone. Compared to the three dialects surveyed so far, the grammar of the Jewish dialect of Sanandaj (JSan.) is the most divergent. This is certainly true for the AC system, which will be surveyed below, but can also be said about other domains of grammar, such as the verbal system. While the latter is outside the scope of this work, we note two innovative features of the verbal system, which are of relevance to our survey: First, the language exhibits an OV order (in contrast to the typical VO order found in most NENA dialects); and second, the language makes extensive use of complex predication, i.e. predicates consisting of a combination of a light verb and a noun (termed here CP noun).¹ These and other features are in all probability related to an extensive language contact with Sorani and Persian (Khan 2009b: 11ff.).² While one may speculate that the divergence of JSan. is related to its peripheral location, we note that the Christian dialect spoken in the same city (CSan.) presents a much more conservative grammar, but unfortunately it has not yet received a detailed grammatical description.³

The data for JSan. is based mainly on the grammatical description of Khan (2009b).⁴ Additional examples are drawn from an elicitation session I have con-

¹For an elaborate syntactic and semantic analysis of complex predication in Persian, see Samvelian (2012).
²As Khan (2009b: 11) notes, the Kurdish dialect of Sanandaj is not systematically described. Instead, we refer to standard Sorani for the sake of comparison. It should also be noted that Hawrami, a Gorani language closely related to Kurdish, is spoken in the vicinity of Sanandaj.
³See however Heinrichs (2002) and Panoussi (1990) and the list of publications given in McPherson and Caldani (2013).
⁴Khan’s examples are cited according to the page in the grammar in which they are treated. Additionally, a reference to the textual corpus, if available, is given in square brackets according to Khan’s system: a letter indicating the informant (A–E) and a sentence number. I have also consulted the
ducted in Jerusalem with an elderly native speaker of the dialect, Ḥabib Nurani. JSan. is in some respects similar to JSul., of which we give some comparative examples drawn from Khan (2004). We present also some sporadic comparisons with Neo-Mandaic, another Neo-Aramaic language spoken in Iran.

The structure of the chapter is as follows:

First, we treat the usage of the possessive pronominal suffixes. In contrast to most other NENA dialects, these are phrasal suffixes, as discussed in Section 8.1.

A major difference in JSan. in comparison to the dialects discussed so far is that the main AC in JSan. is not the CSC, but rather the zero-marked juxtaposition construction, which is discussed in Section 8.2. This construction has two further variants: juxtaposition with agreement of the secondary with the primary (see Section 8.3), and inverse juxtaposition with the secondary preceding the primary (see Section 8.4).

The use of borrowed Iranian relativizers with clausal secondaries is discussed in Section 8.5.

While JSan. does not make use of the Neo-CSC found in other dialects, it has a structural parallel formed by marking the primary with the Iranian Ezafe suffix. This construction, as well as the idiomatic retention of the historical CSC and the possible emergence of a new CSC related to stress retraction, is discussed in Section 8.6.

From the above it is clear that JSan. has hardly retained any reflex of the Classical Aramaic d- linker. Indeed, in JSan. we find only one reflex of this linker, namely the genitive marking of vowel-initial demonstratives. This is discussed in Section 8.7. On the other hand, JSan. has retained to a small extent the usage of the dative preposition ū- for marking secondaries, as discussed in Section 8.8.

Conclusions and a general discussion of the various constructions are presented in Section 8.9.

8.1 Possessive pronominal suffixes (X-y.poss)

As in other NENA dialects, a pronominal secondary may be expressed by a possessive suffix. The possessive suffix replaces the inflectional suffix (-a or -e) of the nominal primary it attaches to:

(1) Noun–Pronoun
JSan. bel-ef
house–poss.3ms

grammatical description of Schaller (2007), but as this description is mostly devoted to the verbal system, no examples are drawn from there.

3 In Khan’s description, he is marked as informant A.
A particularity of JSan. in comparison with most other NENA dialects is that the possessive pronoun is suffixed NP-finally, rather than directly on the primary noun, whenever the NP consists of a Noun+Adj. combination (Khan 2009b: 251).

\[ \text{(2) Noun Phrase–Pronoun} \]
\[ \text{JSan.} \quad [\text{xa } ^{\text{ā}x\dot{o}n\dot{a} } \text{xet}]^{\text{ā}f} \]
\[ \text{INDF brother other–poss.3FS} \]
\[ \text{‘another brother of hers’ (Khan 2009b: 53 [A:6])} \]

A similar pattern is found in JSul.:

\[ \text{(3) Noun Phrase–Pronoun} \]
\[ \text{JSul. } ^{\text{ā}x\dot{o}n\dot{a}} \]
\[ \text{brother–free} \]
\[ \text{ruww-ı́ big–poss.1SG} \]
\[ \text{‘my elder brother’ (Khan 2004: 262 [R:94])} \]

In our terminology, this distribution makes the possessive suffixes of JSan. and JSul. phrasal suffixes rather than word-level suffixes (see Section 4.1). The usage of the possessive suffixes NP-finally may very well be due to pattern replication from Sorani (see example (4) on page 225).

When attached to a verbal noun (such as an infinitive or a CP noun of a transitive verb), the pronoun denotes the object:

\[ \text{(4) Infinitive–Pronoun} \]
\[ \text{JSan. } (^{\text{ʾila } \text{di-li } \text{ba=) gāroš-ef}}^{\text{6}} \]
\[ \text{hand placed–1SG in= pull.inf–poss.3MS} \]
\[ \text{‘(I began) to pull him.’ (Khan 2009b: 331)} \]

\[ \text{(5) CP Noun–Pronoun} \]
\[ \text{JSan. } ^{\text{daʾwāt-ı́ }} \]
\[ \text{invitation–poss.1SG ind–do–3PL} \]
\[ \text{‘They will invite me.’ (Khan 2009b: 482 [D:8])} \]

When attached to a preposition, it denotes its complement. Note, however, that not all prepositions allow for a suffixed pronoun.

\[ \text{(6) Preposition–Pronoun} \]

\[ ^{6}\text{One may want to analyse the combination } \text{ba+infinitive as forming a gerund, as in JZax. (see footnote 9 on page 108). As I am unaware of a gerund category in JSan., I prefer to analyse the preposition } \text{ba here, as well as in example (16) on page 204, as forming part of the verbal complex.} \]
JSan. reš-ef
   on-poss.3ms
‘on it’ (Khan 2009b: 224)

Interestingly, a pronoun attached to a true adverb can convert it to a noun:

(7) Adverb–Pronoun
JSan. (gbé-wa  xa=párča  zayrá  dā-en  ba=)  lāxa-u
     ind.want.3ms-pst  indf=fabric  yellow  place-3pl  on=  here-poss.3pl
‘(They had to put a yellow patch on) their (body place) here.’? (Khan 2009b: 579 [A:78])

8.2 Simple juxtaposition (X Y)

The paradigmatically richest and most common construction in JSan. is the juxtaposition construction, devoid of any special marking. In cases where a noun is modified by another noun, the juxtaposition construction is the functional parallel in JSan. of the CSC or the ALC in the previously surveyed NENA dialects.

(8) Noun–Noun
JSan. lišana  bšəlmane
     language  Muslims
‘the language of the Muslims’ (Khan 2009b: 199)

In this JSan. is very similar to JSul., which also makes extensive use of the juxtaposition construction:?

(9) Noun–Noun

---

?From the context we can gather that the informant pointed on a spot on his body (‘here’) referring to the same spot on the body of the referents.

?Yet, in contrast to JSan., JSul. also makes use of the Neo-cst suffix -əd, as well as the linker d:-

(i) Noun–Noun
JSul. xázm-əd  kaldà
     family-cst  bride
‘the family of the bride’ (Khan 2004: 192 [A:8])

(ii) Noun–Noun
JSul. mäšxa  d=  zetùne
     oil  link= olives
‘olive oil’ (Khan 2004: 192 [R:98])

---
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JSul. šəmma brona
     name son
‘the name of the boy’ (Khan 2004: 192)

While the above usage of the juxtaposition construction in JSan. and JSul. for
nominal modification marks these dialects as special in comparison to the majority
of NENA dialects, we find also more “trivial” cases of juxtaposition, such as its usage
with adverbial secondaries:

(10)   Noun–Prepositional Phrase
JSan. ʾo gorá ga= läxa (hărux-i =ye)
     DEM.M man in= here friend-POSS.1SG =COP.3MS
‘the man here (is my friend)’ (Khan 2009b: 252)

Another common use cross-dialectally of the juxtaposition construction, not absent
in JSan., is in quantification expressions (see also example (56) on page 214):

(11) Q. Noun Phrase–Noun
JSan. [xa lewan] rəzza
     one cup rice
‘one cup of rice’ (own fieldwork)

Adjectival and ordinal secondaries normally appear in the juxtaposition with agree-
ment construction, discussed in the next section. Yet, when the lexical items in
question are invariable, such as loan-adjectives or the loan ordinal ʾăwal ‘first’, we
get the simple juxtaposition construction:

(12) Noun–Adjective
JSan. mal-ăwae qarwa
     village-PL near(INV)
‘nearby villages’ (Khan 2009b: 207)

(13) Noun–Ordinal
JSan. gora ʾăwal
     man first(INV)
‘the first man’ (Khan 2009b: 213)

We find also clausal secondaries, yielding an “asyndetic relative clause”.

(14) Noun–Clause
JSan. (mät-i-wa-le ga=) xá =t*ka [qărirə hăwę].'
     put-A.3PL-PST-P.3MS in= INDEF =place cool SBJV.be
‘They put it in a place that was cool.’ (Khan 2009b: 381 [A:83])
Asyndetic clausal secondaries can also follow pronominal primaries, such as the indefinite pronoun xa ‘one’. In the following example we find two asyndetic relative clauses, one embedded in the other.²

(15)  **Pronoun–Clause**
JSan. (bár kûle’ kyà-wa’) xa = [sawzi =ye,’ šaplultà after all IND.come.3FS-PST one= vegetable =COP.3MS š.
kəmr-ı-wa baq-éf].’
call-A.3PL-PST for-POS.3MS
‘(After everything else there came) something that is a vegetable, which is called šaplulta.’ (Khan 2009b: 382 [B:68])

Examples of clausal secondaries following demonstrative pronouns acting as primaries are given in Section 8.7.3.

Occasionally, the juxtaposition construction is used with an infinitival primary followed by a nominal secondary, corresponding to the direct object of a transitive verbal lexeme.¹⁰

(16)  **Infinitive–Conjoined Nouns (objects)**
JSan. (šerúʾ wi-lu ba=) yâlòpè hulaulà =u’ yâlòpè fâransà =u’ ‘əbri,’ start do-3PL in learn.INF Judaism =and learn.inf French =and Hebrew fârsì.
Persian
‘(They started) to learn Judaism, and to learn French, Hebrew and Persian.’ (Khan 2009b: 330 [B:12])

Similarly, prepositions or conjunctions are complemented by nouns or clauses without any special marking:

(17)  **Preposition–Noun**
JSan. reša mez
on table
‘on the table’ (Khan 2009b: 224)

(18)  **Conjunction–Clause**
JSan. mangól [ga= lìxa k-olì]
as in= here IND-do.3PL.

²Note that the embedded relative clause is separated from its primary sawzi by the copula and a prosodic break. Alternatively, it could be analysed as an asyndetically conjoined relative clause governed as well by the primary xa.

¹⁰Such cases can also be analysed as exponents of the completive/objective relation rather than the attributive one (see Section 2.1.1). Yet we prefer their analysis as attributive constructions, as discussed in Section 8.4.
An adjective can also serve as the primary of the juxtaposition construction, whenever it is further specified by a nominal secondary. While this is as an adverbial specification of an adjectival lexeme, formally it uses the same juxtaposition construction as the above examples (compare to example (47) on page 212, where the AC is explicitly marked by the Ezafe suffix):

\[(19) \quad \text{Adjective–Noun} \]
\[
\text{JSan.} \quad \text{(tamám-e yomá) hārīk haštā (xirā \[=y\])} \]
\[
\text{entire–ez day busy work become.res =cop.3ms} \]
\[
\text{‘(All day he has been) busy with work’ (Khan 2009b: 570)} \]

8.3 Juxtaposition-cum-agreement (X Y.agr)

Similarly to other NENA dialects, inflecting adjectives (which are typically but not exclusively of Aramaic origin) formally use the juxtaposition construction, and at the same time show agreement features with the primary noun.

\[(20) \quad \text{Noun–Adjective} \]
\[
\text{JSan.} \quad \text{bela rūwa} \]
\[
\text{house(ms) big.ms} \]
\[
\text{‘a big house’ (Khan 2009b: 251)} \]

Similarly, ordinals above one, juxtaposed to their primary, can optionally agree with the it, similarly to adjectives. Note that ordinals are derived from the corresponding cardinals by means of the suffix \(-\text{min}\), being of Persian or Sorani origin (see Section 9.3.4):

\[(21) \quad \text{Noun–Ordinal} \]
\[
\text{JSan.} \quad \text{baxta tre-min-{ta}} \]
\[
\text{woman(fs) two-ord-{fs}} \]
\[
\text{‘the second woman’ (Khan 2009b: 213)} \]

8.4 Inverse juxtaposition (Y X)

Of special interest are constructions in which the order of the secondary and the primary is reversed, so that the secondary precedes the primary. There are two

\[\text{11} \quad \text{An alternative analysis of this example is to see only the prepositional phrase ga lāṣa as the complement of mangál, the verb kolí being the main verb. This would correspond to the translation ‘They do as (it is) here’}.\]
distinct kinds of these constructions, one which involves a verbal noun acting as a primary, and the second which involves an adjective or an ordinal as the secondary.\footnote{Recall that the titles of the examples always reflect the order \textit{Primary–Secondary}, irrespective of the order of these constituents in the example.}

### 8.4.1 Verbal nouns as primaries

Under the category of verbal nouns we include the infinitive and the active participle.\footnote{The resultative participle, on the other hand, does not participate in ACs, as its distribution is restricted to some compound tenses (Khan 2009b: 90–96). Some resultative participles have acquired an adjectival meaning, but in this case they do not function differently to other inflecting adjectives (Khan 2009b: 204).} These nouns have the particularity that they can be complemented by a secondary which acts semantically as the direct object of the verbal lexeme. Moreover, we include in the category of verbal nouns also nouns participating in complex predicate formation (CP nouns), as their secondaries are semantically the direct object of the entire complex predicate. We note that the extensive usage of complex predication in JSan. originates in the replication of an Iranian, probably Persian, pattern (of which see Samvelian 2012).

One may doubt whether constructions involving verbal nouns together with their complements should be regarded as ACs, rather than expressing simply a complective/objective relation (see Section 2.1.1). However, since verbal nouns behave categorically as nouns (they share the privilege of occurrence of nouns), and complementation of nouns yields by definition an AC, it seems justifiable to regard these constructions as ACs, albeit of a special kind. Two observations strengthen this claim: First, we observe that these nouns and their complements do participate sporadically in explicitly marked ACs (see examples (71)–(5) on page 218 for verbal nouns modified by a possessive suffix). Secondly, whenever their complement is an independent pronoun it is explicitly marked as genitive (see Section 8.7.4).

Notwithstanding the above analysis, we observe that verbal nouns expanded by a complement exhibit a key property of the verbal phrase of JSan., namely the pre-verbal position of the complement. We note, \textit{in passim}, that the OV order of JSan. is very probably a contact feature originating in Iranian languages, as most NENA dialects have a VO order. Thus, we get ACs of an inverse juxtaposition type, in which the secondary precedes the primary (and see also example (40) on page 211):

\begin{enumerate}
\item [(22)] \textbf{Participle–Noun}
\begin{quote}
JSan. xola gaṛš-ana
rope pull–\textsc{ptcp}
‘rope puller’ (Khan 2009b: 252)
\end{quote}
\item [(23)] \textbf{Infinitive–Noun}
\end{enumerate}
8.5. Usage of relativizer (X rel Y)

Clausal secondaries can be marked as such by the use of a relativizer. Two distinct relativizers are available in JSan.: ya and ke, both borrowed from Iranian languages. In particular, we find ke as a relativizer in Persian (Balaý and Esmai1 2013: 136).

---

14This example is particularly peculiar in that the adjective disagrees in gender with the head noun. It may be that some speakers treat ‘áyza as an invariable adjective, being probably of foreign origin.
The relativizer *ya* is used mostly with definite primaries, while the relativizer *ke* has no such restriction. The exact distribution of these relativizers is outside the scope of this work. Prosodically, both relativizers are part of the clausal secondary, as they often cliticize to its first word.

(27) **Noun–Clause**
JSan. ‘o= našé ya= [da’wát k-ol-i-wa-lu]’
def= people rel= invitation ind=do apl= pst=p3pl
‘the people whom they invited’ (Khan 2009b: 378 [A:42])

(28) **Pronoun–Clause**
JSan. ‘onyé yá [tābāqā ʾāwāl =ye-lū]’
3pl rel= class first =cop.pst-3pl
‘those who were the first class’ (Khan 2009b: 379 [B:5])

(29) **Noun–Clause**
JSan. xá=‘da našé ke= [ga=xá meydā́n smix =ēn]’
inf= few people rel= in=indf square stood res =cop.3pl
‘a group of people who were standing in a square’ (Khan 2009b: 380 [A:109])

In JSul., we find conversely the cognate relativizer *ga~ka* mostly with definite primaries, in restrictive relative clauses (Khan 2004: 414):

(30) **Noun–Noun**
JSul. yóma ga= gezí ta= Meròn’ mil-a.’
day rel= go=3pl to= M. died=3fs
‘she died on the day that they went to Mount Meron.’ (Khan 2004: 415 [R:185])

In JSan., we find the relativizer *ke* following certain adverbials, notably *qāme* ‘before’:

(31) **Conjunction–Clause**
JSan. qāme ke hétt’
before rel sbjv. come=2ms
‘before you came’ (Khan 2009b: 391)

In this usage, it can also combine with the Ezafe marking; see example (55) on page 213.

The relativizer *ya* occurs once in the corpus of Khan (2009b) complementing a temporal adverb. In this case, the entire construction gets a temporal meaning:

(32) **Adverb–Clause**

---

15A similar restriction is found with the relativizer *ke* borrowed in NMand. (Häberl 2009: 165).
8.6 The construct state construction (X.cst Y)

JSan. has 3 different morphological means which can be classified under the broad category of construct state as defined in Section 2.3.1:

8.6.1 The historical construct state marking

The historical Classical Aramaic construct state marking, formed by apocope of the primary noun, is not productive any more in JSan., yet a reflex of it is retained in some collocations and idioms. For example, in the following example, the noun bela ‘house’ appears as a reduced form be with the meaning ‘family of’ (compare Qar. example (15) on page 137):

(33) Noun–Noun
JSan. be kalda  
house.cst= bride  
‘family of the bride’ (Khan 2009b: 201)

Similarly, two prepositions of nominal origin have retained an apocopated form alongside their full form. These are the prepositions reša ‘on’ (derived from the noun reša ‘head’ by pattern replication of Kurdish; see footnote 28 on page 127) which also has the apocopated form reš, and the preposition txela ‘under’ which also has the apocopated form txel. While both forms require a complement, we consider only the apocopated one to be positively marked as construct state.

(34) Preposition–Noun
JSan. reša/reš mez  
on/on.cst table  
‘on the table’ (Khan 2009b: 224)

(35) Preposition–Noun
JSan. txela/txel mez  
under/under.cst table  
‘under the table’ (Khan 2009b: 225)
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8.6.2 The Ezafe construction

The closest structural parallel of JSan. to the Neo-CSC present in other dialects is the borrowed Ezafe construction, in which an Ezafe suffix \(-e\) marks the primary as such.\(^{16}\) The form of the Ezafe in JSan. seems to indicate a Persian origin, an assumption which is corroborated by its frequent usage with Persian words (see example (42) on the next page).\(^{17}\)

Indeed, the usage of the Ezafe is most frequent “when the noun is an unadapted loanword that ends in a consonant rather than in a nominal inflectional vowel” (Khan 2009b: 199). These loanwords are not necessarily of Iranian origin. For instance, in the following example the primary is the Mishnaic Hebrew loan noun Hebrew שַׁמָּשׁ šămmaš.

\[(36) \text{Noun–Noun} \]

JSan. šămáš-e kništà
beadle–ez synagogue
‘the beadle of the synagogue’ (Khan 2009b: 199 [A:43])

We note that a similar restriction appears in JSul., where the Sorani borrowed Ezafe suffix \(-i\) is most frequently used with loan-words (Khan 2004: 192f.):

\[(37) \text{Noun–Noun} \]

JSul. maktáb-i hulayè
school–ez Jews
‘school of Jews’ (Khan 2004: 514 [R:141])

Khan (2009b: 199) also gives examples (possibly elicited) of native Aramaic primaries marked by the Ezafe. In these cases, the final number suffix (sg: \(-a\) or pl: \(-e\)) is normally retained, but can also be elided in “fast speech” (in which case the stress falls on the Ezafe suffix).

\[(38) \text{Noun–Noun} \]

JSan. bel-{á}-e bárux-i
house–{sg}–ez friend–poss.1sg
‘the house of my friend’ (Khan 2009b: 199f.)

\[(39) \text{Noun–Noun} \]

JSan. bat-{é}-e bárux-i
houses–{pl}–ez friend–poss.1sg

---

\(^{16}\)The variant form \(-y\) is found in my fieldwork data.

\(^{17}\)The Persian Ezafe is \(-e\), while the Sorani is normally \(-i\) (but see Section 9.3 for possible variation). Note that in the nearby Hawrami dialect the plural Ezafe is realized as \(-e\) (Holmberg and Odden 2008: 133).
'the houses of my friend' (Khan 2009b: 199f.)

The plural of *bela* ‘house’ can be the irregular form *baté* or the regular *belé*. Therefore, one could argue that in example (38) on the facing page the primary’s number distinction is lost. Yet, in my own elicitation I observed a slight phonetic difference between *belé* ‘houses’ and *bel-é* ‘house.sg-ez’: In the latter form the Ezafe is produced as [æ] (and not as the expected [e]), which is understandable if we consider this vowel to be a coalescence of a singular suffix /-a/ and an Ezafe suffix /-el/. On the other hand, the coalescence of the Ezafe suffix with the plural suffix yields a construction identical to the juxtaposition construction, as Khan (2009b: 200) notes.

Similarly to the Neo-CSC of other NENA dialects, as well as the CSC of classical Semitic languages (such as BHeb. or Akk.), the Ezafe construction can be used not only with nominal secondaries, but also with infinitival or clausal secondaries:

(40) **Noun–Infinitival phrase**  
**JSan.** (ʾanā) ḥawšālā-e ʾāra tārōšē (lit-i =u)’  
1SG patience-EZ land build.INF NEG.EX-1SG =and  
‘(I don’t have) the patience to build on the land.’ (Khan 2009b: 571 [C:6])

(41) **Noun–Clause**  
**JSan.** ʾo[bax-tā-e ləx-m-ākè k-o-r-a-wa-le =o]ˈ  
def woman-EZ bread-DEF IND-do-A3FS-PST-P3MS =open  
‘the woman who made (lit. opened) the bread’ (Khan 2009b: 381 [B:22])

In contrast to the classical Semitic CSC, however, the Ezafe construction is also used with adjectival or ordinal secondaries. In some cases, where both the primary and the secondary are Persian words, the entire expression can be seen as a code-switch to Persian, as in the following example, where the AC corresponds to Per.

(42) **Noun–Adjective**  
**JSan.** ləbās-e xārāb (lōš-wa)ˈ  
clothing(MS)-EZ bad(INV) wear.3MS-PST  
‘(He wore) ragged clothes.’ (Khan 2009b: 251 [A:108])

When used with native Aramaic adjectives as secondaries, these inflect as expected:18

Optional inflection of adjectives following the Ezafe is attested sporadically also in Hawrami:

(i) **Noun–Adjective**  
**Hawr.** žān-i zīl-{x}  
woman-EZ big-{FS}  
‘big woman’ (Holmberg and Odden 2008: 130, fn. 2)
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(43) **Noun–Adjective**
JSan. bel-{á}-e rūwa
house(m)-{sg}-ez big,ms
'a big house' (Khan 2009b: 251)

(44) **Noun–Adjective**
JSan. pəstan-e 'ista
gown(f)-ez beautiful,fs
'a beautiful gown' (own fieldwork)

Ordinals behave similarly to adjectives. The loan-ordinal ʾăwaḷ 'first' is invariable, while higher ordinals show optional agreement:

(45) **Noun–Ordinal**
JSan. gorá-e ʾăwaḷ
man-ez first(INV)
'the first man' (Khan 2009b: 213)

(46) **Noun–Ordinal**
JSan. baxtá-e tre-min-{ta}
woman(fs)-ez two-ord-{fs}
'the second woman' (Khan 2009b: 213)

We note that adjectives can also serve as the primary of the Ezafe construction (compare example (19) on page 205):

(47) **Adjective–Infinitive**
JSan. ('o= tré) ḥarik-é šyakà (=-ye-lu)'
def= two busy-ez wrestle.inf =cop-3pl
'The two of them were busy wrestling.' (Khan 2009b: 331 (2))

The Ezafe construction can easily be embedded. In the following examples, the primaries are NPs consisting themselves of the Ezafe construction:

(48) **Noun Phrase–Adjective**
JSan. [pəstan-e kald]-e zārif
gown-ez bride-ez beautiful(INV)
'a beautiful bridal gown' (own fieldwork)

(49) **Noun Phrase–Noun**
JSan. [bel-e smoq]-e tat-i
house-ez red(m)-ez father-poss.1sg
'the red house of my father' (own fieldwork)

In such cases the Ezafe behaves very similarly to its Persian model, and can similarly be
analysed as a phrasal suffix (see Section 4.2). We find also cases where the secondary consists of the Ezafe construction:

(50) Noun–Noun Phrase
JSan. bel-e [brat-e ʾamm-i]
house–EZ daughter–EZ aunt–POS
‘the house of my cousin (daughter of my aunt)’

(51) Quantifier–Noun Phrase
JSan. tamam-e [bat-e tat-i]
all–EZ houses–EZ father–POS
‘all the houses of my father’

Conspicuously missing, in contrast to the Persian model, are cases with adverbial secondaries (see example (1) on page 84). In Khan’s description we find only one such case, consisting of the fixed prepositional phrase ʿaša ḥaḍa ‘aside’, borrowed through Persian from Arabic ʿaša ḥaḍa (Khan 2009b: 569).

(52) Noun–Prepositional Phrase
JSan. tănurá-e ʿaša ḥaḍa
oven–EZ on–EDGE
‘a separate oven’

Productive prepositional phrases are lacking from Khan’s description, and did not show up in my elicitation. On the other hand, prepositions and nouns serving as adverbials can appear as primaries of the Ezafe construction. When complemented by clauses the relativizer ke is sometimes used as well:

(53) Preposition–Noun
JSan. dawr-e mez
around–EZ table
‘around the table’

(54) Adverbial noun–Clause
JSan. wáxt-e [hiye bel-àn]
time–EZ came.3MS house–1PL
‘when he came to our house’

(55) Adverbial noun–Clause
JSan. ta= zămân-e ke= [ʾanà xlulá wili]
until= time–EZ REL= 1SG wedding did.1SG
‘Until the time that I married’

19 Surprisingly, the speaker translated ‘aunt’ as ʾamma and not the expected ʾamta (cf. Khan 2009b: 538).
Another case where the Ezafe construction is not found is whenever the primary is a noun serving to quantify the secondary. In such cases the juxtaposition construction is used. Consider the following example, where the secondary itself is an Ezafe construction (compare example (11) on page 203).

\[ (56) \text{Q. Noun Phrase–Noun Phrase} \]
\[ JSan. \quad [xa \text{ lewan}] \ [reza-\gamma \text{ yarixa}] \]
\[ \text{one cup rice(m)-ez long(m)} \]
\[ 'one cup of long rice' \ (own fieldwork) \]

### 8.6.3 Stress retraction as emerging construct state marking

In JSan., stress is commonly word-final. However, in non-pausal contexts, the stress of nouns and pronouns may be retracted (Khan 2009b: 53). While this phenomenon occurs more widely than just in ACs, it may be seen as an *emerging* construct-state marking.\(^{20}\) Consider the following example, with attention to the stress position on the head:

\[ (57) \text{Noun–Noun} \]
\[ JSan. \quad bróna Jāhā̀n \]
\[ \text{son J.} \]
\[ 'the son of Jahan' \ (Khan 2009b: 53 [A:17]) \]

The same phenomenon of stress retraction occurs on the noun ʾăxóna ‘brother’ appearing before an adjective in example (2) on page 201.

### 8.7 Genitive marking of secondaries

A reflex of the Classical Aramaic linker *d-* is retained in JSan. only in one environment, namely optionally preceding vowel-initial demonstrative pronouns. As such, it has the same distribution as the genitive prefix *d-* found in other dialects, and indeed, in JSan. too it can be analysed as a genitive prefix, as it has no pronominal force typical of the linker *d-*\(^{21}\). The detailed argumentation for this analysis is given in Section 4.4, and see in particular Section 4.4.2 regarding JSan.

The situation in JSan. can be contrasted with the situation in the closely related dialects of Kerend and Qarah Hasan, which have lost all trace of the *d-* linker and al-

---

\(^{20}\)Recall that the historical Semitic construct state began also as a prosodic phenomenon of stress-shift; see Section 2.3.2.

\(^{21}\)Cf. however Khan (2009b: 200), who assimilates it to the linker, or “genitive particle” in his terminology: “The Aramaic genitive particle *d* is used only when the dependent component of an annexation construction contains a demonstrative pronoun.” Khan uses the notion “particle” but in fact it is a bound morpheme.
ways use the unmarked independent pronouns in the secondary position (Khan 2009b: 11, and see example (62) on the next page).

In the following, we discuss separately the occurrence of genitive marked demonstratives as determiners and conversely as independent genitive pronouns. A third subsection is devoted to genitive marked demonstratives preceding clausal secondaries.

8.7.1 Genitive determiners

Demonstrative pronouns used as determiners of secondaries take an optional genitive marking both after nominal and adverbial primaries. Since the marking is optional, in contrast to Jzax., the unmarked forms cannot be analysed as non-genitive, but must rather be seen as unspecified forms ($\pm$GEN):

(58) Noun–Pronoun
JSan. bela {d}-o naša
house {GEN}–DEM.DIST man
‘the house of that man’ (Khan 2009b: 200)

(59) Preposition–Pronoun
JSan. reša/reš {d}-o mez
on/on.CST {GEN}–DEM.DIST table
‘on that table’ (Khan 2009b: 224)

Note that in the last example, the preposition reša can appear either in its full form or in its apocopate construct state form reš. Similarly, the genitive prefix also follows primary nouns marked as construct state by means of the Ezafe (=example (21) on page 98):

(60) Noun–Noun
JSan. fešár-e d-o màe
pressure–EZ GEN–DEM.DIST water
‘the pressure of the water’ (Khan 2009b: 200 [A:59])

8.7.2 Independent genitive pronouns

The demonstrative pronouns may also appear as independent pronouns in the secondary position. In this case they are obligatorily marked by the genitive prefix.

(61) Noun–Pronoun
JSan. bela d-o
house GEN–3SG
‘his house’ (Khan 2009b: 200)
This situation can be contrasted with the closely related dialects of Kerend and Qarah Ḥasan, where such marking is always absent:

(62) **Noun–Pronoun**

Ker. bela  o
house 3SG
‘his house’ (Khan 2009b: 11)

As with the genitive determiners, the genitive marking also appears after prepositions, including those marked by apocopate construct state (compare to example (59) on the previous page and contrast with example (6) on page 202). We note that the prepositions often pro-cliticize to their complement, obscuring the fact that the d- is part of the secondary:

(63) **Preposition–Pronoun**

JSan. ba= d-o
in= GEN-3SG
‘in it’ (Khan 2009b: 218)

(64) **Preposition–Pronoun**

JSan. reša/reš  d-o
on/on.CST GEN-3SG
‘on it’ (Khan 2009b: 224)

Here too, the genitive marking also occurs after the Ezafe, irrespective of the category of the primary (and see also example (71) on page 218):

(65) **Noun–Pronoun**

JSan. belá-e d-o
house-EZ GEN-3SG
‘his house’ (Khan 2009b: 200)

(66) **Preposition–Pronoun**

JSan. ba-dawr-e d-o
in-around-EZ GEN-3SG
‘around it’ (Khan 2009b: 220)

(67) **Adjective–Pronoun**

JSan. (ʾāt hāmešá) ḥārīk-e d-èa
2SG always busy-EZ GEN-DEM.SG
‘You are always busy with this.’ (Khan 2009b: 570 [A:102])
8.7.3 Genitive pronouns preceding clausal secondaries

Certain prepositions can be complemented by a clausal secondary, with the help of an intervening demonstrative pronoun, itself marked by the genitive prefix.

(68) Preposition–Clause
JSan. bar= d-èa [ʾay hášta wil-à-lu]
after GEN–DEM.PROX.SG DEM.PROX work(FS) did–P.FS–A.3PL
‘after they had done this work’ (Khan 2009b: 392 [B:17])

(69) Preposition–Clause
JSan. qámė d-óa [ʾána b= ʿolám hena’]
before GEN–DEM.DIST.SG 1SG in= world come.SBJV–1MS
‘before I was born’ (Khan 2009b: 392 [A:50])

The genitive marking shows that the demonstrative pronoun in each example acts as the secondary, i.e. the direct complement of the preposition. As it is followed by a clause, we cannot analyse the demonstrative pronoun in this position as an NP determiner.\(^{22}\) Indeed, Khan (2009b: 392) writes that “[the] demonstrative pronoun […] is bound anaphorically to the following content clause”. Yet what is the exact syntactic relation between the demonstrative and the clause? The role of the demonstrative pronoun is to provide a nominal head acting as the complement of the preposition. As a nominal head, it governs the clause and embeds it within an NP. It follows that the demonstrative pronoun and the clause stand in an attributive relation with each other. Yet this relationship is not marked, as it is instantiated by the juxtaposition construction, discussed in Section 8.2. Only the attributive relation between the preposition and the demonstrative pronoun is positively marked by means of a genitive case prefix. The two attributive relations are schematized in Table 8.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prep.</th>
<th>→₁</th>
<th>[DEM</th>
<th>→₂</th>
<th>Clause]_{NP,GEN}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genitive-marked</td>
<td>Zero-marked</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.1: Clausal complement of a preposition mediated by a demonstrative

In other dialects, we find that also the second attributive relationship is marked by means of a construct state marking of the pronominal primary. Such is the case in JUrm., as is shown in examples (101)–(102) on page 189. In fact, also in JSan. we find examples in which this relation is marked by a relativizer which follows the demonstrative pronoun.

\(^{22}\) In JZax., we find rare cases where a determiner is followed directly by a clause, as in example (110) on page 129, yet in such cases the determiner/demonstrative pronoun has referential power, quite distinctly from the cases discussed here.
8.7.4 Genitively marked complements of verbal nouns and verbs

The genitive case is also used to mark complements of verbal nouns, be they infinitives, participles, or complex-predicate nouns. When this marking appears alongside another AC marking, such as the Ezafe in the following example, it is quite clear that we are dealing with a marking of the attributive relation.

(71) CP Noun–Pronoun
JA San. daʿwă ́t-e did-ăxun (wili)’
invitation-EZ GEN-2PL (did.1sg)
‘I invited you.’ (Khan 2009b: 482 [D:8])

Yet, in other cases, we find the genitive marking as the sole exponent of the attributive relation, as in the following example which instantiates the inverse juxtaposition construction (see Section 8.4.1):

(72) CP Noun–Pronoun
JA San. (kŭ ́le ʾaṣər) did-án daʿwàt (k-ol-ı́)
every evening GEN-1PL invitation IND-do-3PL
‘They will invite us every evening.’ (Khan 2009b: 480 [D:6])

Such cases pose an analytic difficulty as JA San. makes use of the genitive pronouns also to mark complements of finite verbs.

(73) Verb–Pronoun
JA San. did-ox graš-li
OBL-2MS pulled-1SG
‘I pulled you.’ (Khan 2009b: 159)

(74) Verb–Pronoun
JA San. d-o graš-le
OBL-3MS pulled-A.3MS
‘He pulled him.’ (Khan 2009b: 159)

In light of such examples, we may re-interpret the *d–di–* morphemes not as genitive case markers but rather as oblique case markers, fusing together accusative and genitive marking. This may be regarded as a development due to language contact, as oblique case is known in Iranian languages, notably in Kurmanji (see Section 9.3.1),
which is however not in direct contact with JSan., but also in Hawrami (MacKenzie 1966: 13), spoken in closer proximity to Sanandaj. Khan (2009b: 158) proposes an alternative cause, explaining example (73) on the facing page as being a derivation of example (75) below, in which the accusative preposition həl was dropped. The genitive marking is thus justified, as the pronoun is a complement of a preposition:

(75) **Verb–Pronoun**
JSan. həl= did-ox grəš-li\(^{23}\)
\(\text{ACC \_Prep} = \text{GEN-2MS pulled-1SG}\)
‘I pulled you.’ (Khan 2009b: 158 [modified])

Be that as it may, the development of d-\textit{did} into an oblique case marker permits us to analyse its occurrence in example (72) as marking the object of the entire verbal complex \textit{da\textquotesingle wát k-ol-ı́} ‘they invited’ rather than marking an attributive secondary of \textit{da\textquotesingle wát} alone. Yet, taking into consideration clear cases such as example (71), we prefer to analyse \textit{did}– first and foremost as a genitive case marker, being an exponent of the attributive relation, whenever this is possible, and see any other grammatical functions as being secondary.

In this vein, we consider the following example to be showing a conjoined NP in the secondary position of the inverse juxtaposition construction, although only the pronominal complement is marked by genitive case.

(76) **CP Noun–Pronoun+Noun**
JSan. (ʾaxtú pl tămà) [did-ı́ =u daăk-ı́] daăk-ı́ (ław kol-étun)
\(\text{2PL \_why} = \text{GEN-1SG \_and mother-poss.sg invitation neg ind.make-2pl}\)
‘Why do you not invite me and my mother?’ (Khan 2009b: 482 [D:8])

Similarly, we consider pronominal complements of infinitives as being in genitive case, as in the following example, exhibiting again the inverse order of constituents:

(77) **Infinitive–Pronoun**
JSan. (ʾila di-le ba=) did-i găroše
\(\text{hand placed-3ms in=} \text{GEN-1SG pull.inf}\)
‘He began to pull me.’ (Khan 2009b: 331)

8.8 Dative marking of secondaries

The elicitation session revealed two examples of an elaborate construction in which the primary is marked by an Ezafe suffix and the secondary is marked by the da-

\(^{23}\)I took the liberty of changing the agent from 3\textsuperscript{rd} to 1\textsuperscript{st} person, in order to provide a clear parallel to the previous example.
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In both cases, a short pause or hesitation is marked after the primary, which may explain the speaker’s need to re-mark the secondary as such by means of the preposition. We note that the usage of the dative preposition to mark secondaries is not an innovation but rather a retention, as it is attested also in Syriac (see Section 3.6). A similar usage of this preposition is attested in Neo-Mandaic (Häberl 2009: 152).

(78) Noun Phrase–Noun
JSan. [xa= dana bela]-e ... əl= [brata amm-i] one= unit house–EZ DAT= daughter aunt–POSS.1SG ‘one house of my cousin’ (own fieldwork)

(79) Noun Phrase–Noun
JSan. [bel-e house–EZ raba ‘ayza]-y ... əl= tat-i house–EZ much beautiful(MS) DAT= father–POSS.1SG ‘the very beautiful house of my father’ (own fieldwork)

We note that a similar usage of the dative preposition is found in JSul., but without the Ezafe marking:

(80) Noun Phrase–Pronoun
JSul. ʾaxonàʼ brother biš= more= zor-ăke ʾəl did-àn’ brother more= small–DEF DAT GEN–1PL ‘the younger brother of ours’ (Khan 2004: 262 [R:104])

Similarly, in predicative position we find secondaries marked by the dative preposition. The semantic primary in such cases is the subject of the clause, but it does not form a syntactic constituent with the secondary. Therefore, we treat this construction as lacking a primary.

(81) ∅–Noun
JSan. ay bela [∅ əl= tat-i] =y DEM.PROX house ∅ DAT= father–POSS.1SG =COP ‘This house is my father’s.’ (own fieldwork)

Again, we find a very similar construction in JSul.: 

(82) ∅–Noun
JSul. ʾay= belā [∅ əl= barux-i] =ye.’ DEM= house ∅ DAT= friend–POSS.1SG =COP ‘This house belongs to my friend.’ (Khan 2004: 262 (9))

I did not find any mention of this usage in Khan (2009b).
Other dialects use the linker $d^{-}$ in the predicative position (see for instance examples (87)–(88) on page 154 on Qar.). As JSan. has lost the linker $d^{-}$, it uses instead the dative preposition $əl^{-}$.

### 8.9 Conclusions

The AC system of JSan. is highly divergent in comparison to most other NENA dialects, and in particular the dialects surveyed in the previous chapters. This divergence is at least partly related to extensive language contact with Sorani and Persian.

The most important innovation of JSan. (and related dialects such as Ker.) is the loss of the Classical Aramaic linker $d^{-}$. Not only is the linker as such lost, but also its head-marking reflex, the $\sim d$ construct state suffix found in other dialects, is absent in JSan. The loss of these markers is clearly correlated with the rise of the usage of the zero-marked juxtaposition construction in the dialect, discussed in Section 8.2. Yet the usage of the juxtaposition construction is not necessarily a direct consequence of the loss of the D-markers: The D-marked constructions can coexist with the juxtaposition construction, as is the case in JSul. (see examples (i)–(ii) on page 202). Rather, it is probable that the juxtaposition construction itself is contact induced, as will be discussed in Section 11.3.2.2.

The only remnant of the $d^{-}$ linker in JSan. is the genitive prefix $d^{-}$ used before vowel-initial demonstrative pronouns (see Section 8.7). Indeed, this very retention has been one of our arguments in favour of the analysis of the /$d$/ segment in this position as a genitive prefix, since it follows an independent development path as compared to the linker $d^{-}$ (see Section 4.4.2). Possibly through contact with Kurdish or Hawrami, the $d^{-}$-prefix in JSan. shows moreover some progress towards becoming an oblique case marker (see Section 8.7.4). In the closely related dialects of Kerend and Qarah Hasan, on the other hand, even the genitive prefix is lost.

Another interesting retention shared by JSan. and JSul. is the sporadic usage of the dative preposition $əl^{-}$ to mark secondaries, found also in Syriac (see Section 8.8 and compare to Section 3.6). Again, it seems that this retention is correlated with the demise of the usage of the linker $d^{-}$.

Alongside the extensive usage of the juxtaposition construction, we find another construction replacing structurally the Semitic CSC, namely the Iranian Ezafé construction, present both in JSul. and JSan. The fact that this construction is still largely confined to loan-words may indicate that its introduction to these dialects is a relatively late process, not directly related to the loss of the D-markers or the usage of the juxtaposition construction. On the other hand, it may be an indication of the cyclic nature of language change: The loss of old grammatical markers (the D-markers) is subsequently compensated by adoption of new grammatical markers (the Ezafé). This reasoning has also led us to postulate the possible emergence of a
new construct state marking due to stress shift (see Section 8.6.3).

The grammatical developments discussed above have caused an important structural change in JSan.: In contrast to the situation in Classical Aramaic, conserved in most NENA dialects, the distributional distinction between nominal secondaries (occurring typically after construct state nouns or the linker) and adjectival secondaries (occurring typically after free state nouns) has been levelled, as both the Ezafe construction and the juxtaposition construction treat these two types of secondaries alike, the only difference being that native adjectival secondaries agree in gender and number with the primary. On the other hand, clausal secondaries are sometimes signalled as such, as they are optionally preceded by borrowed relativizers in both these constructions (see discussion in Section 8.5).

Finally, another important effect of language contact is the emergence of the inverse juxtaposition construction, in which the secondary precedes the primary. When this construction occurs with verbal nouns as primaries (see Section 8.4.1), this can be explained as a consequence of the general shift of the language to an OV order in the verbal domain. The usage of the inverse construction with ordinal secondaries (see Section 8.4.2) is most probably a converging borrowing from Arabic and Sorani (see Table 11.5 on page 342). The rare usage of the inverse construction with adjectival secondaries may also be related to contact (possibly with Azeri), but this requires further investigation.
Chapter 9

Attributive Constructions in Kurdish Dialects

The following chapter surveys the AC system of several Kurdish dialects. As it is not my intention to outline a complete grammar of these constructions in Kurdish, it is less detailed than the previous chapters devoted to NENA dialects. Moreover, the data will be presented in a cross-dialectal manner, contrasting the Kurmanji and Sorani dialectal groups. The aim of the chapter is to analyse and situate the linguistic data of these languages in the same typological framework used for the NENA dialects, in order to facilitate the comparison between the two groups.

The examples are drawn mainly from the dialectal data present in MacKenzie (1961) as well as the grammars of standard Kurmanji and Sorani written by Thackston (2006a,b). Sorani examples were further cited from Blau (1980) and to a lesser extent from Abdulla and McCarus (1967), a grammar of the Sulemaniyya dialect. Standard Kurmanji data was complemented by the descriptions of Bedir Khan (1960) and Bedir Khan and Lescot (1970). Some further Kurmanji dialectal data was drawn from Blau (1975), a description of the dialects of Amadiya and Sinjar. Some additional examples were drawn from Samvelian (2008). For sake of consistency, I have opted to normalize the transcription of all varieties and sources to the Latin transcription of Kurdish used in Kurmanji. The examples from Thackston (2006b) and Blau (1980)

1 In the following, references to Sorani (Sor.) and Kurmanji (Kurm.) refer either to the standardized varieties or the dialectal clusters (MacKenzie’s Group I and Group II respectively), with reference to particular dialects clearly indicated, if these are available in the cited source. The abbreviations of dialect names are similar to those used by MacKenzie (1961: xi), but note that our use of Sor. is wider than his and that we use KSul. for his Sul. and KAm. for his Am. (consult the list of abbreviations on page xv). When citing MacKenzie (1961) the numerical reference to his corpus (MacKenzie 1962) is given in square brackets, if available.

2 This system was developed by the Emir Djeladet Bedir Khan in the 1930’s. Notice especially that in this system the vowel [e] is rendered <e>, [e] is <ê> and [a] is <a>. Thus, the suffix -eke is an apocopated form of the definite determiner -eke in Sorani, while it is the indefinite suffix in Kurmanji.
are also cited in the standard Sorani orthography using Arabic script.

The original examples in the above sources (with the exception of Samvelian 2008) are not glossed. For clarity, I have added glosses according to my own analysis. In cases where I could not determine with certainty the function of a certain morpheme (or segment) I have put a question mark in the glosses.

The chapter is organised as follows:

In Section 9.1 the possessive pronominal enclitics, present only in Sor. dialects, are treated.

The most prominent AC markers in Kurdish are the various Ezafe morphemes. Section 9.2 gives an overview of the different forms found in standard Kurmanji and Sorani, and motivates the differentiation of three distinct types of Ezafe morphemes, discussed in the following sections.

Section 9.3 discusses the Construct Ezafe Construction, which can be seen as the Kurdish equivalent of the NENA Neo-CSC. The marking of secondaries by the oblique case, present in Kurmanji dialects, is discussed in Section 9.3.1.

Section 9.4 discusses the Linker Ezafe Construction, which can be seen as the Kurdish equivalent of the NENA ALC.

Section 9.5 discusses the usage of the Compounding Ezafe, especially productive in Sorani.

Clausal secondaries appear regularly in one of the Ezafe constructions, yet they can also appear in some alternative constructions, which are discussed in Section 9.6.

The usage of the Juxtaposition Construction is presented in Section 9.7. The rare usage of inverse juxtaposition is discussed in Section 9.7.4.

Finally, Section 9.8 concludes this chapter with some general remarks and comparative prospects.

9.1 Possessive pronominal enclitics (X-y.poss)

Sorani (but not Kurmanji) has a series of unstressed possessive pronominal morphemes. Thackston (2006b: 15) qualifies them as enclitics, while MacKenzie (1961: 76) treats them as suffixes. As these elements show promiscuous attachment, attaching both to verbs (as objects; see Thackston 2006b: 37) and to nouns as well as prepositions, we prefer to analyse them as clitics (see Section 4.1).³

To this system the following signs are added: The unaspirated (or pharyngealized) consonants are indicated by a lower dot, such as in <ṭ> (in the standard writing system this distinction is not marked). The trilled [r̚], indicated in Kurmanji orthography sometimes as a digraph <rr> is here rendered as <ř>. The Sorani [l]-[ɬ] is rendered as <ł>. Stress is marked by means of an accent, when apparent in the source.

³A thorough analysis of their status would require an investigation of their behaviour with verbal hosts, which is beyond the scope of this work. See, in this respect, Samvelian (2007b), who examines their attachment to verbs and prepositions, and concludes, in a final account, that these elements are
The possessive pronominal enclitics normally follow the definite or indefinite suffix, with the expected meaning:

1. **Noun–Pronoun**
   
   Sor. \textit{kùr-eké}=m
   
   son\text{-}\text{DEF}=\text{POSS.1SG}
   
   ‘my son’ (Thackston 2006b: 16)

2. **Noun–Pronoun**
   
   Sor. \textit{kùr-êk}=im
   
   son\text{-}\text{INDEF}=\text{POSS.1SG}
   
   ‘a son of mine’ (Thackston 2006b: 16)

When the noun is left unqualified, this typically yields a figurative or generic meaning:

3. **Noun–Pronoun**
   
   Sor. \textit{kùr}=im
   
   son=\text{POSS.1SG}
   
   ‘sonny (form of address for a young boy)’ (Thackston 2006b: 16)

The possessive enclitics can appear after compound nominals consisting of a Noun+Adj. combination mediated by the compounding Ezafe (see Section 9.5).

4. **Compound Noun–Pronoun**
   
   Sor. \textit{[kuř-e-korpe]-ké}=m
   
   son\text{-}\text{EZ-newborn-DEF}=\text{POSS.1SG}
   
   ‘my infant son’ (Thackston 2006b: 53)

The same clitic placement is found when the compounding Ezafe is missing due to phonological conditions. The following War. example can be compared to the JSul. example (3) on page 201:

5. **Compound Noun–Pronoun**
   
   War. \textit{[bira-gewr]-ek}=em
   
   brother\text{-}\text{BIG-DEF}=\text{POSS.1SG}
   
   ‘my elder brother’ (MacKenzie 1961: 81 [204])

rather affixes.
Finally, the possessive enclitics can follow the focus enclitic -(i)ş ‘also’.

(6) **Noun–Pronoun**

Sor. ێارەکەشیان
par-ek-ş=yan
money-DEF=also=poss.3pl
‘their money too’ (Thackston 2006b: 16)

(7) **Noun–Pronoun**

Sor. ڕەڤێکەنیشەم
refîq-ek-an=îş=im
friend-DEF-PL=also=poss.1sg
‘even my friends’ (Thackston 2006b: 17)

We note that in Kurmanji, the lack of possessive pronominal enclitics entails the use of full pronouns which are marked by the oblique case (see example (15) on page 229).

### 9.2 The three Ezafe morphemes in Kurdish

In Section 4.2 we presented briefly the Persian Ezafe, and the dispute regarding its morphemic status (suffix or clitic) and its syntactic attachment (with the primary or the secondary). Since the Persian Ezafe attaches phonologically to the primary, we concluded, with Samvelian (2007a; 2008), that the simplest account of the Persian Ezafe is to view it as a phrasal affix attaching morphologically and syntactically to its primary, marking the latter as being in construct state, i.e. wanting a complement.

The situation in Kurdish dialects is somewhat more complex. First, in Kurmanji, the Ezafe morpheme inflects for gender, number, and definiteness. More importantly, we find three distinct types of Ezafe markers, differing in their phonological attachment:

**Construct Ezafe** Devoid of stress, attaching phonologically to the primary (-ez).

**Linker Ezafe** Can carry stress, and can appear without an immediate primary (lnk.ez).

**Compounding Ezafe** Devoid of stress, forming part of a nominal compound (-ez-).

The various forms of the Ezafe in standard Kurmanji and Sorani are shown in Table 9.1 on the facing page.

Leaving aside for the moment the compounding Ezafe, we note that the (definite) construct Ezafe and the Linker Ezafe share the same form, except for a weak consonantal onset (Kurm.: /y-/; Sor.: /b-/) marking the latter. In fact, in dialectal data this onset is absent at times. Thus, a natural assumption is to conflate the
9.2. The three Ezafe morphemes in Kurdish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kurmanji</th>
<th>Sorani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>FS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct</td>
<td>DEF  -ê  -a  -ên  -î</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDF  -î  -e  -ên  -î</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linker</td>
<td>yê  ya  yên  hî</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compounding</td>
<td>-e-</td>
<td>-e-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.1: The Ezafe forms in standard Kurmanji and Sorani

two sets, arguing these are prosodic variants of each other, one being an enclitic and the other (possibly) a proclitic. This is the approach taken by Haig (2008: 77) and elaborated upon in Haig (2011). Yet as Samvelian (2008) argues (for Kurm.), there are distributional reasons for distinguishing the two series: The construct Ezafe is in complementary distribution with the oblique case endings (present only in Kurm.), and thus cannot follow them, while the linker Ezafe is indifferent to the constitution of the primary.

(8)  Noun Phrase–Adjective
Kurm. [mal-a van jin-an]  *=a / ya biçük
house–EZ.FS DEM.PROX.OBL.PL woman–OBL.PL *=EZ.DEF.FS / LNK.EZ.FS small
‘these women’s small house’ (Samvelian 2008: examples (47) and (49))

Since the construct Ezafe is in opposition to the oblique case endings, Samvelian (2008) analyses it as a suffix (or rather as a phrasal suffix), similar to the Persian Ezafe, while the linker Ezafe is analysed by her as an independent syntactic particle. A similar conclusion is reached by Schroeder (1999: 53). Recall that we used a similar approach to tease apart the NENA construct state suffix ~əd and the proclitic linker d– (see Section 4.3).

In this study we adhere to Samvelian’s analysis, and we shall treat the different types of Ezafe in different sections below. It should be noted, though, that this analysis is especially suitable for Kurm. In Sor., we do not have inflectional case endings, and thus the above argument is not applicable. Yet as the Sorani construct Ezafe appears only after nominal elements (the linker Ezafe occurring only without an immediate primary), we treat it on a par with the Kurmanji construct Ezafe.

4 In Sor., on the other hand, nouns can be inflected by the possessive enclitics, discussed in Section 9.1. It would be interesting to see if the construct Ezafe is compatible with these enclitics, but unfortunately we do not have data regarding this question.
9.3 The construct Ezafe construction (X.cst Y)

As explained above, all Kurdish dialects make use of the construct Ezafe, a suffix attaching to the primary phrase, marking it as construct state. The different varieties of Kurdish differ as to the number of inflectional forms the Ezafe exhibits, reflecting various number and gender distinctions. Generally speaking, the number of forms increases as one travels from the south-eastern extremity of Kurdish speaking areas to the north-western extremity. In this perspective, it is useful to take into account also dialects of languages close to Kurdish, such as Gorani in the south-east and Zazaki in the north-west.\(^5\)

In the southern Kurdish dialects of our survey, namely the Sorani dialects, the construct Ezafe has a fixed form -î\(^{-}\)~i\(^{-}\)~y.\(^6\) Note that the usage of an uninflected Ezafe is found also in the Gawrâjû Gorani dialect, spoken in the southern extremity of the Kurdish speaking zone, near the city of Kerend (Mahmudweyssi et al. 2012: 16); this Ezafe has the form -e\(^{-}\)~y, akin to the uninflected Persian Ezafe -(y)e.

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{(9)} Noun–Noun
\begin{itemize}
\item Sor. \begin{tabular}{p{5cm}p{5cm}}
ktawi\text{-}ek\text{-}an\text{-}i & qutabhane\text{-}yêk
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
student\text{-}DEF\text{-}PL\text{-}EZ school\text{-}INDF
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘the students of a school’ (Thackston 2006b: 10)
\end{tabular}
\end{itemize}
\item \textbf{(10)} Noun–Noun
\begin{itemize}
\item KSul. \begin{tabular}{p{5cm}p{5cm}}
ser\text{-}i & binädem
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
head\text{-}EZ man
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l}
‘men’s heads’ (MacKenzie 1961: 63 [49])
\end{tabular}
\end{itemize}
\end{itemize}

As example (9) on the current page shows, the primary and secondary can be independently marked as definite or indefinite. If they are left unmarked, as in example (10) on this page, the AC may be interpreted generically.

The same construction can be used with a full pronominal secondary, as an alternative to the usage of the possessive enclitics (see Section 9.1), for “special emphasis” (Abdulla and McCarus 1967: 179).

\begin{itemize}
\item \textbf{(11)} Noun–Pronoun
\end{itemize}

\(^5\)For the geographical span of the Kurdish dialect clusters and the related languages, I rely chiefly on the map of Izady (1992: 171). He qualifies our Kurmanji as “North Kurmânji” and Sorani as “South Kurmânji”, and attributes both Zazaki and Gorani to the “Pahlawâni group”.

\(^6\)Thackston transcribes the Ezafe as a lax i\(^{-}\), separated from its host. Other authors, however, as well as the standard Sorani Arabic orthography, treat the Ezafe as a tense i (in Arabic script: ﯿ), attached to its host. After vowels it is realised as the glide /y/. In line with our analysis of the Ezafe as a suffix, we transcribe it attached to its host, but we keep the formal variation intact.
KSul. nàv-i mìn
name−EZ 1SG
‘*my name*’ (Abdulla and McCarus 1967: 179)

As we travel northwards, roughly to the Inter-Zab region (between the Little Zab and the Great Zab rivers), more variation appears. In some Sorani dialects (namely, Muk. and Rdz.) the Ezafe may appear as *(y)e following a vowel (MacKenzie 1961: 62).

(12) **Noun–Pronoun**
Rdz. kursî−(y)e mìn
seat−EZ 1SG
‘*my seat*’ (MacKenzie 1961: 62 [484])

This is purely a phonological variant of the Ezafe. More interesting is that some north-eastern Sorani dialects (Bin., Piž. and Muk.) exhibit an optional Ezafe form, −ê, reserved for feminine singular nouns (MacKenzie 1961: 61). This is shown by the following example:

(13) **Noun–Proper Noun**
Muk. xušk−ê Mîr Zêndîn
sister−EZ.FS M. Zêndîn
‘Mir Zendin’s sister’ (MacKenzie 1961: 61 [30])

In the same dialects, whenever the primary has plural sense but no formal marking of this (as an unmarked noun can be interpreted singularly or-plurally), an extra particle *de* may follow the Ezafe.7.

(14) **Noun–Noun**
Bin. pyaw−î de paše
man−EZ PL king
‘the king’s men’ (MacKenzie 1961: 62 [319])

The same marker is used whenever the primary consists of a conjunction of two singular nouns. We note that in such cases the Ezafe is attached phrase-finally.

(15) **Conjoined nouns–Pronoun**
Bin. [dak ú bab]−i de to
mother and father−EZ PL 2SG
‘thy mother and father’ (MacKenzie 1961: 62 [349])

7It is a curious fact that this plural Ezafe marker has a similar form to the Aramaic linker *d*-. Yet as the Aramaic linker is not related in any way to marking of plurality, we must assume this is a pure coincidence.
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Among the Kurmanji dialects, a distinction between the two genders is obligatory, as is shown in Table 9.1 on page 227. Most dialects also have a separate plural Ezafe, though sometimes it is assimilated with the masculine singular form. The usage of the plural form as well as the feminine form is shown in the following example, which shows also the possibility to embed the Ezafe construction:

(16) **Noun–Noun Phrase**

Kurm. kitêb-ên [keç-a mirov]
book-EZ.DEF.PL girl-EZ.FS man
‘the man’s daughter’s books’ (Thackston 2006a: 13)

In some older literary texts, we find the same plural particle as in the Sorani dialects mentioned above (see examples (14)–(15) on the preceding page). Such is the case, for instance, in the poetry of the Kurdish poet Malaye Jaziri of Bohtan (1570-1640)\(^8\):

(17) **Noun–Adjective**

Kurm. çêşm-ên di siyeh
cye-EZ.DEF.PL PL black
‘black eyes’ (Malaye Jaziri, Diwân, ed. Hartmann 1904: 217; MacKenzie 1961: 159, fn. 2)

The Kurmanji Ezafe, just like the Sorani Ezafe shown in example (15) on the previous page, attaches phrase-finally to the primary, and has scope over the whole primary phrase. The inflectional features carried by the Kurmanji Ezafe suffix are, however, only dependent on the noun to which it directly attaches (see also example (58) on page 241):

(18) **Conjoined nouns–Pronoun**

Kurm. [dê û bav]-ê min
mother and father-EZ.DEF.MS 1SG.OBL
‘my mother and father’ (Bedir Khan 1960: 2)

(19) **Conjoined nouns–Pronoun**

Kurm. [ker, hesp û mehîn]-a min
donkey, horse and mare-EZ.DEF.FS 1SG.OBL
‘my donkey, horse and mare’ (Bedir Khan 1960: 2)

This behaviour indicates that the Kurmanji Ezafe should be analysed as a phrasal suffix: It is tied to the nominal inflectional system, yet it has wide phrasal scope (see Section 4.1 and in particular the table on page 83).

Likewise, if the last noun of the primary has a plural sense by itself, it will receive

---

\(^8\)These years are given by Izady (1992: 176), who writes the poet’s name as *Mullâ-i Jaziri*. 
the plural Ezafe suffix. In such cases, the plural sense may be inferred pragmatically also for the other nouns of the primary, as in the following example.\(^9\)

(20) **Conjoined nouns–Noun**

Kurm.  [şexsiyet û rewşenbir]-ên kurd-an
personality(\(FS\)) and intellectual-\(\text{EZ.DEF.PL}\) Kurdish-\(\text{OBL.PL}\)
‘personalities and intellectuals of the Kurds’ (Thackston 2006a: 15)

Bedir Khan notes that this pattern only arises with the conjunction û ‘and’. When the primary NP consists of nouns joined using the disjunctive conjunction (\(y\)an ‘or’, each element must belong to a separate AC.

(21) **Disjoined Nouns–Pronoun**

Kurm.  hesp-ê min an mehin-a min
horse-\(\text{EZ.DEF.MS}\) 1SG.OBL or marc-\(\text{EZ.DEF.FS}\) 1SG.OBL
‘my horse or my mare’ (Bedir Khan 1960: 2)

The Kurm. Ezafe inflects also according to the definiteness of the noun. Yet, in contrast to its number and gender inflection, the (in)definiteness feature is not carried by the Ezafe suffix, but rather it co-varies with the presence of a singular indefinite suffix -\(\text{êk} \) (MacKenzie 1961: 158-160) or a plural indefinite suffix -\(\text{in} \) (Bedir Khan and Lescot 1970: 78).

(22) **Noun–Noun**

Kurm.  hejmár-ek-e kovár-ê
issue(\(FS\))-\(\text{INDF.EZ.INDF.FS}\) journal-\(\text{OBL.FS}\)
‘an issue of that journal’ (Thackston 2006a: 12)

(23) **Noun–Noun**

Kurm.  mehín-in-e keçk-ê
mare-\(\text{PL.EZ.INDF.PL}\) girl-\(\text{OBL.FS}\)
‘some mares of the girl’ (Bedir Khan and Lescot 1970: 306)

As these allo-forms depend on the explicit presence of an indefinite suffix, Samvelian (2008: 16) rejects the notion of the *indefinite Ezafe*, analysing these forms instead as post-affixal forms. She shows that an indefinite plural noun not marked by the suffix -\(\text{in} \) takes the normal form of the Ezafe -\(\text{ên} \):

(24) **Noun–Adjective**

Diar.  pênc kur-ên ganc
five boy-\(\text{EZ.PL}\) young

\(^9\)Note that a Kurm. noun without Ezafe or oblique case marking is unmarked for number, and may be interpreted either as plural or as singular according to the context.
‘five young boys’ (Samvelian 2008: example (45))

This pattern, however, could equally well be analysed as a neutralisation of the definiteness feature of the plural Ezafe (as presented in Table 9.1 on page 227). Such a neutralisation may be motivated by the fact that the explicit marking of plural indefinite nouns by means of the suffix -ën is quite rare (judging by the sources consulted), and that the indefinite plural Ezafe -e is identical in form to the indefinite feminine form, as is shown in examples (22)–(23) on the previous page.

Samvelian (2008: 16) substantiates further her claim by citing MacKenzie (1961: 158), who mentions that in Sûrçi dialect, the indefinite form (termed by him “Secondary Ezafe”), follows “apparently” also the definite suffix -eke:

(25)  
Noun–Adjective  
Sur.  
mirow-eke-y xwarê  
man-DEF-EZ.MS lower  
‘the lower man’ (MacKenzie 1961: 160 [517])

Yet most Kurmanji dialects lack the definite suffix -eke, which is more typical of Sorani dialects. Thus, leaving aside such exceptional examples (whose status seems to be questioned by MacKenzie himself), it seems justifiable to regard the singular Ezafe forms -î (MS) and -e (FS) as allo-morphic forms signalling indefiniteness of the primary noun.10

The same cline of explicitness can also be found regarding the marking of the secondary by oblique case. This is treated in Section 9.3.1.

9.3.1 Oblique marking of secondaries

Kurmanji exhibits a bipartite case system, opposing the unmarked direct case with a marked oblique case, visible on nouns and pronouns. On nouns, the oblique case is marked by suffixes, which express moreover the gender and number features of the host noun. A particularity of the masculine singular oblique suffix is that it appears only if the host noun is qualified by a determiner. These suffixes are shown in Table 9.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oblique</td>
<td>∅ / -î</td>
<td>-(y)ê</td>
<td>-(y)an</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9.2: Kurmanji case endings

10Note, however, that -î is also used in some contexts where no indefiniteness is implied, such as with adverbial primaries; see Section 9.3.6.
The oblique case marks the dependents of both the attributive relation and the completive relation (see Section 2.1.1). It subsumes thus both the genitive case and the accusative case (and in the Kurm. context, also the ergative case). We note, moreover, that similarly to the Ezafe the oblique suffixes can have phrasal scope, appearing on the final noun of conjoined nouns, and only optionally on the preceding nouns.\(^\text{11}\) This is demonstrated by the following example, in which the oblique case takes the accusative role.

\[(26)\] Verb–Conjoined Nouns (objects)  
Kurm. \([\text{jin-}\{\text{ê}\} \ u \ \text{kur-i}] \ \text{di-bin-im} \)  
\text{woman-\{OBL.FS\} and boy-OBL.MS IND-see-1SG}  
\text{‘I see the woman and the boy’ (Samvelian 2008: example (41))}\]

In this study, we are interested mainly in the genitive function of the oblique case, namely the marking of AC secondaries. This is shown in the following example (as for the oblique demonstrative, see Table 10.7 on page 288):

\[(27)\] Noun–Noun  
Kurm. \([\text{mıróv-ek-i}] \ [\text{w-i \ welát-i}] \)  
\text{man-INDF-EZ.INDF.MS DEM.DIST-OBL.MS country-OBL.MS}  
\text{‘a man of that country’ (Thackston 2006a: 12)}\]

For examples of feminine and plural oblique endings, see examples (20)–(22) on page 231.

It is important to note that the Ezafe suffix and the oblique suffix are morphologically in complementary distribution, although notionally they mark independent features, the Ezafe being related to the state category.\(^\text{12}\) Thus, a secondary noun itself acting as primary is only marked by the Ezafe. An oblique suffix, if present at all, can only be marked in such cases at the end of the secondary phrase:

\[(28)\] Circumposition–Noun Phrase  
Kurm. \([\text{di [gund-ên kurd-ên Kurdistan-a Türkiye-yê]} \ \text{de} \)  
\text{in village-EZ.PL Kurd-EZ.PL Kurdistan-EZ.FS Turkey-OBL.FS in}  
\text{‘in the villages of the kurds of Turkey’s Kurdistan’ (Thackston 2006a: 13)}\]

Kurmanji dialects also have a series of full oblique pronouns, which can be used as secondaries. These are the functional equivalents of the Sorani possessive pronominal

\(^{\text{11}}\) In this respect it is also somewhat different to the Ezafe, as the Ezafe can only appear on the last conjoined noun, since it must be followed immediately by the secondary.  
\(^{\text{12}}\) Pace Thackston (2006a: 7) who speaks of construct “case”. In the Zazaki language, related to Kurmanji, a noun can be marked both for oblique case and the construct state by means of a specially inflected Ezafe (Todd 2002: 43; and see further Larson and Yamakido 2006; Samvelian 2008; Plank 2012).
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enclitics, described in Section 9.1. For example, the direct pronoun ez ‘I’ has the oblique form min (see its occurrence also in examples (18)–(19) on page 230):

(29)  Noun–Pronoun
Kurm.  kitêb-a  min
book-EZ.DEF.FS 1SG.OBL
‘my book’ (Thackston 2006a: 18)

In contrast to nouns, an oblique pronoun can further be marked by the Ezafe suffix:

(30)  Pronoun–Noun
Kurm.  min-ê  bêçâra bibina
1.SG.OBL-EZ.MS poor   look.IMP
‘Look at me, poor thing’ (Samvelian 2008: example (39))

In contrast to Kurmanji, the south-eastern Sorani dialects (and notably the dialect of Sulemaniyya, which is the basis for standard Sorani) have no case system at all. The Sorani dialects to the north, however, show an oblique suffix for singular secondaries:

(31)  Noun–Noun
Bin.  lep-î  dest-î
palm-EZ hand-OBL.MS
‘palm of the hand’ (MacKenzie 1961: 59)

(32)  Noun–Noun
Bin.  zîn-î  maîn-ê
saddle-EZ mare-OBL.FS
‘saddle of the mare’ (MacKenzie 1961: 59)

Yet this may in fact be an instance of the linker Ezafe discussed in Section 9.4 phonologically encliticized to the primary, as it does not necessarily show the inflectional features of its host pronoun, as would be expected from the construct Ezafe. Thus, in the following example, the Ezafe suffix -a shows agreement with the primary mal ‘house’ rather than with the pronoun min (given that the speaker is a man):

(i)  Pronoun–Noun
Kurm.  mal-a  [bîra-yê  min]-a  biçuk
house.EZ.FS  brother-EZ.MS 1.SG.OBL-EZ.FS small
‘my brother’s small house’ (Samvelian 2008: example (40))

See example (65) on page 242 for a clear case of the linker Ezafe following min.

The plural is marked by a case-neutral suffix -ân (MacKenzie 1961: 58).
9.3.2 Adjectival secondaries

The Ezafe construction is used also with adjectival secondaries. In Kurmanji, adjectives differ from nouns by the fact that they never inflect and thus do not take an oblique suffix (MacKenzie 1961: 163).

(33) Noun–Adjective
Kurm. mirov-êk-î mezin
man-EZ.DEF.MS big
‘a big man’ (Thackston 2006a: 14)

(34) Noun–Adjective
KSul. tûtik-êk-î piçkołe
dog-INDEF-EZ small
‘a little dog’ (MacKenzie 1961: 63 [69])

As the above examples show, the primary can be determined by the indefinite suffix in both Kurmanji and Sorani. In Kurmanji dialects, a definite sense is obtained by using the definite Ezafe:

(35) Noun–Adjective
Kurm. mirov-ê mezin
def.msm滋
‘the big man’ (Thackston 2006a: 14)

In Sorani, however, a primary noun followed by an adjective is not normally combined with the definite suffix -eke. Instead, whenever a definite primary is needed, the compounding Ezafe is used (see Section 9.5). It seems, however, that the construct Ezafe construction is compatible with a definite primary, if the adjective has a descriptive, rather than restrictive, sense (see Thackston 2006b: 12, fn. 1).

(36) Noun–Adjective
Sor. دەرەسەیەکانی سەخت
ders-ek-an-i sext
lesson-DEF-PL-EZ hard
‘the lessons, which are hard’ (Thackston 2006b: 12)

Whenever a primary is modified by more than one adjective, several alternative patterns are available. The adjectives may be conjoined to form one secondary phrase:

15Note, however, that the denominal adjective derivational suffix -i is conspicuously similar to the masculine singular oblique ending, making an historical connection between the two possible. This recalls the situation in the Semitic domain, where a formal similarity can be observed between the Arabic adjectival ending -yy and the genitive case -i. The usage of the oblique suffixes as derivational suffixes is much clearer in the case of the Kurm. ordinals; see Section 9.3.4.
Noun–Conjoined Adjectives

KSul. minal-êk-i [pis û poxil]
child-INDF-EZ dirty and filthy
‘a filthy, dirty child’ (MacKenzie 1961: 63)

Noun–Conjoined Adjectives

Kurm. keç-ên [por-zer û çav-şîn û kesk]
woman-EZ.PL hair-yellow and eye-blue and green
‘blonde and blue- and green- eyed women’ (Thackston 2006a: 98)

Another possibility is to chain the subsequent adjectives by Ezafe suffixes, as the following Sorani examples show. In such cases we might expect the two adjectives to have different scopes (the first qualifying the primary noun only, while the second qualifies the N+Adj. combination), yet this is not apparent from the translations:

Noun–Adjectives

Sor. ﺷﺎرێﻜﯽﮔﻪورەیتازە [shar-êk-î gewre]-y taze
city-INDF-EZ big-EZ modern
‘a big modern city (une grande ville moderne)’ (Blau 1980: 60)

Noun–Adjectives

KSul. [kiç-êk-i jwan]-i çwar-de =sáî
girl-INDF-EZ pretty-EZ four-teen =year
‘a beautiful, fourteen-year-old girl’ (MacKenzie 1961: 63)

This latter possibility seems to be unavailable for Kurmanji dialects, which instead make use of the linker Ezafe construction in such cases (see Section 9.4). This is correlated with the fact that the Kurmanji Ezafe is a nominal inflectional suffix, incompatible with adjectives, which never inflect. The Sorani Ezafe, on the other hand, does not prima facie form part of an inflectional system, and in this respect shows clitic behaviour (but see footnote 4 on page 227).

9.3.3 Adjectival primaries

In Sorani, we find that adjectives extended by nominal complements get the Ezafe suffix:

Adjective–Noun

16See however the rare usage of the Kurmanji linker Ezafe î in examples (72)–(74) on page 244, which, notwithstanding the difference in analysis, is very similar formally to the construct Ezafe in the above cited Sorani examples.
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The example is very similar to the NENA JSan. example (47) on page 212.

In Kurmanji, we do not expect to find such examples, as adjectives are normally not marked by the construct Ezafe (see discussion at the end of the previous section).

Yet Samvelian (2008) affirms the existence of this construction:

(43) **Adjective–Noun**

Kurm. Azâd ašiq-ê Narmîn-ê ya

A. in_love–EZ.MS N.–OBL.FS COP.3MS

‘Azad is in love with Narmin.’ (Samvelian 2008: example (15))

We note, however, that Thackston (2006a: 197) lists this construction only in combination with the verb ‘to be’ (‘ašiq-e ... bûn), rendering it possibly a fixed collocation.

### 9.3.4 Ordinal secondaries

Ordinals follow the Ezafe as regular secondaries. In standard Kurm. they are derived from the cardinal numerals by a fixed oblique plural suffix -yan, except for the numeral ‘first’, which has a special form ewel(i) in which we can recognize the masculine singular oblique ending -î. Alternatively, they take the suffix -ê(m(in)) of Persian origin (Thackston 2006a: 25).

(44) **Noun–Ordinal**

Kurm. roj-a sisi-yan
day–EZ.DEF.FS three–OBL.PL

‘(on the) third day’ (Thackston 2006a: 25)

(45) **Noun–Ordinal**

Kurm. car-a yek-em
time–EZ.DEF.FS one–ORD

---

17 According to MacKenzie (1961: 170, §274.(a)), the Kurmanji dialects form ordinals by the suffix -ê (see example (85) on page 247, which he relates to the identically formed superlative suffix (MacKenzie 1961: 164, §268.(b)). In this case, it is the equivalent of Sorani suffix -în serving as a superlative (MacKenzie 1961: 68, §190.(b)); see footnote 31 on page 255.
‘the first time’ (Thackston 2006a: 25)

In Sorani, ordinals are similarly derived from the cardinal numerals by means of the suffix -(h)em (MacKenzie 1961: 72f).

(46) Noun–Ordinal
KSul. řêga-y sê-hem
third-ord three-ord
‘the third road’ (MacKenzie 1961: 72 [47])

Alternatively, Sorani uses a longer ordinal suffix -(h)emin (borrowed in NENA JUrm. and JSan.; see example (27) on page 172 and example (46) on page 212). Yet when ordinals are derived by the full suffix -emin, they are not used in the Ezafe construction, but rather in the inverse juxtaposition construction (see example (117) on page 255).

9.3.5 Adverbial secondaries

In Kurmanji, prepositional phrases can regularly occur as secondaries following the construct Ezafe.18

(47) Noun–Prepositional Phrase
Sor. rojname-yek-e [bi kurdi]
newspaper-INDF-EZ.INDF.FS in Kurdish
‘a newspaper in Kurdish’ (Thackston 2006a: 14)

In Sorani, this construction is not mentioned in the sources consulted, except by Samvelian (2008), who lists it as a regular construction:

(48) Noun–Prepositional Phrase
Sor. xânu-y [la sar šâx]
house-EZ at head mountain
‘the house on the mountain’ (Samvelian 2008: example (19))

9.3.6 Adverbial primaries

Some nominals and adverbs can be used as prepositions. In Kurmanji, they may be marked by a frozen uninflected Ezafe -î termed by MacKenzie (1961: 200) the “Generic” Ezafe. We note, moreover, that complements of prepositions in Kurm. are regularly marked by the oblique case.

18 The usage of construct state marker followed by Prepositional Phrases is known also in the Aramaic domain. For Syriac, see examples (19)–(22) on page 48; for JZax., see examples (12)–(13) on page 104; JUrm.: example (29) on page 172.
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(49) **Adverbial Noun–Noun**
Ak. nêzîk-î ḫakim-i
near-εz judge-OBL.MS
‘near the judge’ (MacKenzie 1961: 161 [602])

See also example (58) on page 241 for the usage of the circumposition ji ali-γê ḫakim-i
... ve [from side-εz.MS ... from] introducing a passive agent.

In Sorani, an adverbial noun is similarly sometimes marked by the Ezafe (but see example (115) on page 254):

(50) **Adverbial Noun–Pronoun**
KSul. la dwâ-y min
at last-εz 1SG
‘after me’ (Abdulla and McCarus 1967: 75)

9.3.7 Verbal nouns as primaries

Verbal nouns, be they infinitives or nouns participating in complex predication (CP nouns), can be complemented by an argument following the construct Ezafe. Note that Kurm. infinitives have feminine gender and are therefore marked by fs Ezafe (Thackston 2006a: 32).

(51) **Infinitive–Pronoun (subject)**
Kurm. çûyîn-a min
go-INF-εz.DEF.FS 1SG.OBL
‘my going’ (Thackston 2006a: 33; see example (65) on page 242 for a fuller context)

(52) **Infinitive–Noun Phrase (object)**
Sor. bo twanîn-i [cm dyarî kirdin-i [cêga-i Mir for be_able.INF-εz DEM.PROX clarification do.INF-εz position-εz M.
Gewre] =γê]
G. =DEF
‘in order to enable this clarification of Mir Gawra’s position’ (Thackston 2006b: 12)

(53) **CP Noun–Noun (object)**
KSul. swar-î ḥexṣ bû
horseman-εz steeed was

---

19 Compare to the Aramaic situation: Syriac participles: examples (22)–(23) on page 49; JZax. infinitives: Section 5.2.5; Qar. infinitives: Section 6.2.7 JUrm. participles: example (31) on page 172; JSan. CP noun: example (71) on page 218.
‘He mounted his steed.’ (MacKenzie 1961: 65 [66])

The argument occupying the secondary can also be an indirect object. Such is the case in the following example, in which the direct object ͞vē kağez-ē is governed directly by the verb, while the indirect object is governed by a CP noun.

(54) **CP Noun–Noun (indirect object)**

Ak.

vē kağez-ē teslim-î [filan wezir-i]

DEM.PROX.OBL. letter-OBL.FS giving-EZ such_and_such vizier-OBL.MS

bi-k-e sbjv-do-2sg

‘Give this letter to such and such a vizier!’ (MacKenzie 1961: 161; MacKenzie 1962: 274 [603])

9.3.8 Clausal secondaries and the use of the relativizer

Relative clauses, or in other words clausal secondaries, make use of the Ezafe construction as well, with the addition that normally a special particle, a relativizer, introduces the clause. Thus, the Ezafe signals that the primary is to be modified, while the relativizer marks the clause as a secondary.\(^{20}\) In Sorani, the relativizer is ͞ke while in Kurmanji it is ͞ku.\(^{21}\)

(55) **Noun–Clause**

Sor.

سەرەی کۆرەکەی کە نوستیوو

ser-i [kuř-ekê-î ke nustibû]

head-EZ boy-DEF-EZ REL slept.3MS

‘the head of the boy, who has fallen asleep’ (Thackston 2006b: 73)

(56) **Noun–Clause**

Sor.

نەوەدەسەی کە تۆ کەرتووەتە

ew kiras-e-y ke [to kiři-w-t-e]

DEM.DIST dress-DEF-EZ REL 2SG bought-PRF-2SG-COP.3SG very long

=ć

=COP.3SG

‘The dress that you bought (is very long).’ (Blau 1980: 156)

---

\(^{20}\)In Sorani, Thackston distinguishes between the Ezafe introducing a relative clause, being a tense -î, and the regular Ezafe, being a lax i. As we saw, other authors transcribe the regular Ezafe as a tense i as well, rendering this distinction apparently artificial.

\(^{21}\)Haig (2011) treats ͞ku as a complementizer, while Thackston (2006a) regards it as a relative pronoun. Since we are dealing here only with cases where ͞ku is followed by a relative clause, we will treat it as a relativizer (glossed REL), without committing to its general status. Recall that the under-dot of ͞k/ signals an un-aspirated and pharyngealized consonant, a phonemic distinction that is normally not marked in standard Kurm. orthography (Thackston marks it with an underscore).
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In Kurmanji dialects alone, an independent (i.e. not suffixed) Ezafe may appear between a primary and a secondary. This happens most frequently whenever the primary is a noun phrase, rather than a simple noun. A nominal secondary, as
expected, marked with the oblique case (which is however $\emptyset$ for undetermined masculine singular nouns), while adjectives remain uninflected.

The linker Ezafe is very similar in form to the definite suffixed Ezafe, except that it is usually preceded by the segment $y$- (which can, however, be elided in certain dialects and certain phonological environments). Thus, as discussed in Section 9.2, it is possible to consider the two forms as essentially one and the same morpheme, which cliticizes to the primary whenever it follows it immediately. Nonetheless, following the argumentation of Samvelian (2008), we distinguish between the two cases as manifesting different constructions. Moreover, we note that in accordance with our framework the independent Ezafe has all the characteristics of a pronominal linker, as it can represent alone the primary (see Section 9.4.4), sharing with it moreover the number and gender features.

The linker Ezafe is used most often when the primary consists of a noun phrase, ending with an adjective or another element which cannot take the construct Ezafe suffix (such as an oblique marked noun, see example (8) on page 227).

(62) **Noun Phrase–Noun**

Kurm. [dest-ê rast-ê] yê Cengî

hand-EZ.DEF.MS right-ADJ\textsuperscript{22} LNК.EZ.MS C.

‘Jengi’s right hand’ (Thackston 2006a: 15)

(63) **Noun Phrase–Noun**

[hejmar-ek-e nû] ya kovar-ê

issue-INDF-EZ.INDF.FS new LNК.EZ.FS journal-obl.MS

‘a new issue of the journal’ (Thackston 2006a: 15)

(64) **Noun Phrase–Pronoun**

[kitêb-ek-e nû] ya min

book-INDF-EZ.INDF.FS new LNК.EZ.FS 1SG.OBL

‘a new book of mine’ (Thackston 2006a: 19)

In Section 9.3.7 we saw that an infinitive may be connected to its argument by means of the Ezafe. When more than one such argument is expressed, the linker Ezafe can be used, as is shown in the following example:

(65) **Infinitive Phrase–Noun (indirect object)**

[çûyîn-a min] [ya hotêl-ê]

go.INF-EZ.DEF.FS 1SG.OBL LNК.EZ.FS hotel-obl.FS

‘my going to the hotel’ (Thackston 2006a: 33)

\textsuperscript{22}The $-\tilde{e}$ suffix seems to be a manifestation of the suffix deriving an adjective from a noun, as discussed by MacKenzie (1961: 164, §267b). In such a case rast could be understood as a noun or an adverb meaning ‘the right side’.
Note that the linker Ezafe follows the oblique pronoun min ‘I’. Contrast this with example (30) on page 234, where the construct Ezafe seems to be used.

### 9.4.1 Adjectival and adverbial secondaries

Like the construct Ezafe, the linker Ezafe may be followed by adjectives:

(66) **Noun Phrase–Adjective**

Ak. [wakil-ê xô] yê ‘am
agent-EZ.DEF.MS REFL LNK.EZ.MS general
‘his own general agent’ (MacKenzie 1961: 163 [685])

(67) **Noun Phrase–Adjective**

Kurm. (keç-a) [xweh-a min] ya ciwan
girl-EZ.DEF.FS sister-EZ.DEF.FS 1SG.OBL LNK.EZ.FS young
‘my younger sister’s daughter’ (Bedir Khan 1960: 3)

(68) **Noun Phrase–Adjective**

Kurm. [darbe-yek-e mezin] ya ekonomik
blow-INDF-EZ.INDF.FS great LNK.EZ.FS economic
‘a great economic blow’ (Thackston 2006a: 16)

(69) **Noun Phrase–Conjoined Adjectives**

Kurm. [heval-ê min] yê [delal ú qênc]
friend-EZ.DEF.MS 1SG.OBL LNK.EZ.MS dear and good
‘my dear good friend’ (Bedir Khan 1960: 3)

Note the surprising scope relations in the last examples, whereby the secondary adjective headed by the linker Ezafe seems to have prior scope over the primary noun rather than over its direct pronominal or adjectival secondary (compare with examples (39)–(40) on page 236). This is not always the case, however, as the following examples show:

(70) **Noun Phrase–Conjoined Adjectives**

Kurm. [(keç ú jîn]-ên Ewrupî] yên [por-zer ú çav şîn yan
girl and woman-EZ.DEF.PL European EZ.PL hair-yellow and eye blue or
cav kesk]
eye green
‘blonde and blue- or green- eyed European girls and women’ (Thackston 2006a: 16)

(71) **Noun Phrase–Prepositional Phrase**

Kurm. [rojname-yek-e rojane] ya [bi kurdî]
newspaper-INDF-EZ.INDF.FS daily LNK.EZ.FS in Kurdish
‘a daily newspaper in Kurdish’ (Thackston 2006a: 16)

Thackston (2006a: 16) notes that “[a]n optional – and fairly rare – alternative masc. sing. construct extender [=linker Ezafe] uses the same ending as the indefinite, ī”, but note that this form does not inflect:

(72) Noun Phrase–Adjective
Kurm. [șaîr-ek-î kurd] ī bijarte
    poet-INDF-EZ.INDF.M. Kurd LNK.EZ recognized
‘a recognized Kurdish poet’ (Thackston 2006a: 16)

According to Bedir Khan (1960: 3) (see also MacKenzie 1961: 158, §263.(c).(ii)), this is the standard way to modify a primary by a supplementary adjective (in addition to the possibility of conjoining two adjectives as in examples (37)–(38) on page 236 or examples (69)–(57) on the previous page):

(73) Noun Phrase–Adjective Phrase
Kurm. [heval-ê delal] ī qênc
    friend-INDF.M. 1SG.OBL LNK.EZ.M. good
‘my dear and good friend’ (Bedir Khan 1960: 3)

(74) Noun Phrase–Adjective
Kurm. [taxe-yê bajêr] ī dûr
    neighbourhood-INDF. PL city.OBL LNK.EZ far
‘One of the city’s far-away neighbourhoods’ (Bedir Khan 1960: 3)

We note that this construction is quite similar to the construction used in Sorani, shown in examples (39)–(40) on page 236, except that in Sor. the ī morpheme is analysed as the construct Ezafe.

9.4.2 Clausal secondaries

Clausal secondaries seem to appear especially frequently in the linker Ezafe construction when they are separated from the primary by intervening material, as in the following examples (compare to the NENA Qar. example (65) on page 148). Note also the usage of the relativizer to mark the clausal secondary, as after the construct Ezafe (see Section 9.3.8):

(75) Noun Phrase–Clause
Kurm. [tûr-ek mezin] (hebû), [yê ku di hindir-ê xwe de
    bag-INDF big had LNK.EZ.DEF.MS REL in inside-INDF.MS REL in
    şekir ... dihewandin]
sugar ... contained
'(There was) a big bag, which contained in it sugar.' (Thackston 2006a: 75)

'(The sound of the village dogs once again awoke) Sherko, who was almost flying from happiness.' (Thackston 2006a: 75)

9.4.3 Aspectual usage of the Ezafe with verbal secondaries

A quite distinct usage of the linker Ezafe with clausal (or rather verbal) secondaries, standing outside the domain of the attributive system, is its usage as a tense/aspect marker. This usage is discussed extensively by Haig (2011), who terms it “the tense Ezafe”, and who relates it to a reanalysis of the Ezafe in cleft sentences (“constructions where the initial NP was a left-dislocated topic” in his words) as an aspectual marker. As such, it can combine with a verb in the present indicative to add a progressive aspect (MacKenzie 1961: 205), and generally occurs with the perfect in affirmative statements (MacKenzie 1961: 210). The Ezafe agrees in such cases with the non-oblique argument of the verb (typically the subject, but also the object in the ergative construction).

It is worth noting that similar constructions exist in the NENA Sardarid (NW Iran) and ‘Ankawa (NE Iraq) dialects, both of which are in contact with Kurmanji dialects. In these NENA dialects the Aramaic d- linker is used as an aspectual marker. In Sar. it occurs only with a special form of the copula, while in Ank. it occurs more
generally before present tense verbs.

(79)  **Pronoun–Verb**
Sar.  ana d-un bə-taya
1SG LNK-COP.1SG in-come.INF
‘I am coming (*Ich komme gleich*).’ (Younansardaroud 2001: 139)

(80)  **∅–Verb**
Ank.  {ʾāy-la} də k-šaqəl
{COP-3MS} LNK= IND-take.3MS
‘He is taking {right now}.’ (Borghero 2013: 78)

A thorough discussion of the Ank. construction is given by Borghero (2013: 77ff; 2015), who terms this construction the “Pseude-Relative”. She compares it to the neighbouring Kurmanji dialects, and relates it to a broader cross-linguistic and Semitic setting (yet she does not mention the Sar. construction). She mentions that in other Semitic speaking areas it has been proposed as an areal feature (see details and references there).

### 9.4.4 Lack of primary

The Kurmanji linker Ezafe can head an NP by itself, without any preceding primary, as the following examples show. MacKenzie (1961: 162) terms it accordingly a “demonstrative” Ezafe; in the current terminological framework it falls neatly under our definition of a pronominal linker (linking in this case an implicit referent with the secondary). In such cases we treat the primary as a ∅, and in the examples we put a ∅ sign where an explicit primary phrase could appear. (The brackets indicate elements outside the AC under consideration).

(81)  **∅–Noun**
Ak.  ∅ ya Haşim-i (maz-tir =e)
∅ LNK.EZ.FS H.-OBL.MS big-er =COP
‘Hashim’s (daughter) is bigger.’ (MacKenzie 1961: 163)

(82)  **∅–Pronoun**
Ak.  (ev kitēb-e) ∅ yêt min (=in)
DEM.PROX book-DEF ∅ LNK.EZ.PL 1SG.OBL =COP.PL
‘These books are mine.’ (MacKenzie 1961: 163)
The linker Ezafe construction (X lnk Y)

Appearing before adjectives or ordinals, the linker Ezafe without primary nominalizes them:

(83)  ⌀–Adjective
Sur.  (gor-îa) ⌀ yê dî
turn-EZ.DEF.FS ⌀ LNК.EZ.MS other
‘the other one’s turn’ (MacKenzie 1961: 163 [530])

(84)  ⌀–Adjective
Sur.  (mez) ⌀ yê xwar-ê
in_front ⌀ LNК.EZ.MS down-ADJ
‘in front of the lower one ms’ (MacKenzie 1961: 163 [517])

(85)  ⌀–Ordinal
Ak.  ⌀ yê dw-ê ... ⌀ yê sé-yê
�� LNК.EZ.MS two-ORD ... ⌀ LNК.EZ.MS three-ORD
‘the second (man)... the third one’ (MacKenzie 1961: 163 [562])

Appearing before a clausal secondary, it introduces a free relative clause (marked additionally by a relativizer):

(86)  ⌀–Clause
Kurm.  ⌀ [ya ku ji min re derî ve- kir] (berdest-k-a wê
�� LNК.EZ.FS REL FOR 1SG.OBL for door open-do servant-EZ.DEF.FS 3FS.OBL
bû).
was
‘The one ms who opened the door for me was her servant.’ (Thackston 2006a: 76)

Sorani too has a linker Ezafe, (b)i, but in contrast to Kurm. it uses it exclusively to head independent NPs, i.e. ACs without an explicit primary. MacKenzie (1961: 66) uses again the term “demonstrative” Ezafe, a name which may be more appropriate here due to the lack of a primary. Yet for the sake of consistency, we treat this as a case of the linker Ezafe with a ⌀ primary, on a par with the Kurm. data (and gloss accordingly). Similarly to the Sor. construct Ezafe, it does not convey any gender or number features, though an optional plural marker can follow it.

(87)  ⌀–Noun
Bin.  ⌀ i baxewan-ekê-y
�� LNК.EZ gardener-DEF-OBL.MS

---

25 We note that without the weak consonantal onset /b/, it is in fact identical in form to the Sor. construct Ezafe. Indeed, in Sorani the two may be one and the same morpheme appearing with or without primaries.
‘the gardener’s’ (MacKenzie 1961: 59 [304])

(88) 0–Noun Phrase
Sor.  kinase soror danh bi ra gowordi minhe
(esp-e sur-eke) 0 hi [bra gewre-y min] (=e)
horse-ez.def red-def 0 lnk.ez brother big-ez 1sg.obl.cop
‘(The red horse is) my elder brother’s.’ (Blau 1980: 64)

(89) 0–Pronoun
KSul. 0 hi ke
0 lnk.ez who
‘whose?’ (MacKenzie 1961: 66)

(90) 0–Pronoun
Muk. 0 i xo-m (le) 0 i tu (pitir =e)
0 lnk.ez refl-1sg from 0 lnk.ez 2sg bigger =cop
‘Mine (is bigger than) thine.’ (MacKenzie 1961: 66 [242^29])

(91) 0–Pronoun
Sor.  kiteb-eke ya 0 hi min =e ya 0 hi to (=ye)
book-def or 0 lnk.ez 1sg =cop or 0 lnk.ez 2sg =cop
‘(The book is) either mine or thine.’ (Blau 1980: 64)

Like the Kurm. linker Ezafe, it is used as well to nominalize adjectives:

(92) 0–Adjective
KSul. 0 hi shin
0 lnk.ez blue
‘the blue one’ (MacKenzie 1961: 66)

(93) 0–Adjective
Piž. 0 i de di =§ (=in hen)
0 lnk.ez pl other =also =pl.a ex.pl
‘(We have) other ones too.’ (MacKenzie 1961: 67)

9.5 The compounding Ezafe construction

A special form of the Ezafe, -e- (=æ), can be used whenever the resulting AC should be treated syntactically as a single compound noun rather than an NP. In Kurmanji

The terminology regarding this element varies. MacKenzie (1961: 64, §185) calls it “a compound vowel”, while Blau (1980: 58) terms it “particule de liaison”. Thackston (2006b: 11), writing of Sorani, uses the term “the close Izâfa construction”, but restricts it to cases of adjectival secondaries. Note that MacKenzie (1966: 18) describes the existence of the same “compound vowel” in the Gorani Hawrami
dialects, this usage seems to be restricted to lexicalised compounds.\(^{27}\)

(94) **Noun–Noun**
Ak. jan-e-ser
ache-ez-head
‘headache’ (MacKenzie 1961: 215)

(95) **Noun–Adjective**
Ak. kêz-e-řeş
beetle-ez-black
‘cockchafer’ (MacKenzie 1961: 216)

Such lexicalised compounds are also found in Sorani dialects. In these dialects, however, the usage of the compounding Ezafe is more widespread, and not confined to lexicalised compounds. Indeed, it is used systematically (but not exclusively) whenever a definite primary is modified by an adjective. In such cases, the primary and secondary form a syntactic non-lexicalised nominal compound, as is evident by the fact that the definite suffix appears after the secondary.

(96) **Noun–Adjective**
Sor. ﻫﯚﺗێلهباﺷﻪﻛﻪ
[hotêl-e- baş]-eké
hotel-ez-good-DEF
‘the good hotel’ (Thackston 2006b: 11)

Normally, in such cases, the adjective is interpreted restrictively (or, in other words, intersectively). Contrast the following example with example (36) on page 235:

(97) **Noun–Adjective**
Sor. ﻫﯚتێلهسەختەکە
[ders-e- sext]-ek-an
lesson-ez-hard-DEF-PL
‘the hard lessons’ (Thackston 2006b: 12)

One may be tempted to analyse the compounding Ezafe in Sor. as an allomorph of the construct Ezafe conveying the feature of definiteness, as such a distinction exists in Kurm. (see Table 9.1 on page 227). The difficulty with such an analysis is two-fold. Firstly, as example (36) on page 235 shows, a definite primary can be followed by the construct Ezafe. Secondly, a non-definite primary can be followed dialect, but there it is restricted to definite compounds. It is also reported to be found in the Gorani Gawraj dialect, where it is tentatively analysed as a compound marker (Mahmudweyssi et al. 2012: 16).

\(^{27}\)Functionally, we may equate this to the historical construct state construction in some NENA dialects where it is only used for lexical compounds, such as Qar. (see Section 6.2.1).
by the compounding Ezafe, even when the resulting expression is not a lexicalised compound:

(98) **Noun–Noun**

Ksul. kilk-e- ker-ez
tail-EZ- donkey-INDF
‘a donkey’s tail’ (MacKenzie 1961: 65 citing C.J. Edmond’s unpublished description of Ksul.)

Thus, it is safer to claim that the Sorani -e is simply an Ezafe-like morpheme which permits the creation of syntactic nominal compounds, which is furthermore frequently used with combinations of definite primaries with restrictive adjectives.

We note, finally, that the same morpheme is also used in some compounds where the order of the primary and secondary is reversed:

(99) **Noun–Noun**

Sor. nergis-e- cař
narcissus-EZ- field
‘field of narcissi’ (MacKenzie 1961: 142)

(100) **Noun–Adjective**

Sor. berz-e piyaw-eč
high-EZ man-INDF
‘a great man’ (Blau 1980: 61)

Judging by this and the other examples given by Blau (1980: 61), it may be that the reverse order in the case of adjectival secondaries is related to their evaluative nature.

### 9.6 Alternatives constructions for clausal secondaries

As discussed in Section 9.3.8 and Section 9.4.2, clausal secondaries regularly appear in the construct and linker Ezafe constructions, normally following a relativizer. Yet in Sorani the Ezafe morpheme can be replaced by other morphemes suffixed to the primary (Blau 1980: 156). These morphemes are related, formally or semantically, to the domain of determination.

First, the Ezafe may be replaced by a suffix -ê(k), identical in form to the indefinite suffix, but without conveying any indefinite sense (glossed “INDF”).

(101) **Noun–Clause**

Sor. کرەسە کە نەو کەپەییهە زۆر دەبێتە
This recalls the situation in Persian, where the suffix -i can be used both as an indefinite determiner and an Ezafe-like suffix introducing relative clauses. Samvelian (2006), who discusses this situation, concludes that these are two separate morphemes (regardless of a possible diachronic connection). The latter morpheme, moreover, should be distinguished from the Ezafe, as it conveys an intersective semantic value, appearing only before restrictive relative clauses. Judging by the Sorani examples, this may be true also for this language.

Syntactically, the -ê(k) suffix differs from the Ezafe, in that it does not require the secondary to follow it immediately:

(102) Noun–Clause
Sor. كراسی بکرە حەچ پێت جوانە
[kiras-ê] bi-kiř-e [ke pê-t ciwan =e] dress-“INDP” SBJV-buy-2SG REL for-2SG beautiful =COP.3SG
‘Buy the dress that pleases you (Achète-toi la robe qui te plaît).’ (Blau 1980: 157)

It is important to recall, moreover, that the indefinite suffix -êk by itself is compatible with the Ezafe (see for instance example (39) on page 236 and also discussion of Samvelian 2006: 27).

Alternatively, the Ezafe becomes redundant if the primary is determined by a demonstrative and the corresponding short definite suffix -e:

(103) Noun–Clause
Sor. تام پێاوە کە نۆ دەبێتە برا گەورەیەنە
em piyaw-e [ke to de-y-bîn-i] (bira gawra-y min DEM.PROX man-DEF REL 2SG IND-P.3SG-see-A.2SG brother big-EZ 1SG =e) =COP.3SG
‘This man that you see (is my elder brother).’ (Blau 1980: 156)

Also in this construction, the secondary can be separated from the primary by intervening material. This is the case in the following example, which differs from (102) only by the explicit definite determination of the primary:

(104) Noun–Clause
Sor. نەو کراسە بکرە حەچ پێت جوانە
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[ew kiras-e] bikiře [ke pê-t ciwan =e]
dem.dist dress-DEF sbjv-buy-2SG rel in-2SG beautiful =cop.3SG
‘Buy the dress that pleases you.’ (Blau 1980: 157)

Here too, it should be noted that the definite suffix -e is compatible with the Ezafe, as is shown in example (56) on page 240 (and contrast with example (101) on the previous page).

Finally, descriptive relative clauses can be introduced solely by the relativizer:

(105) Noun Phrase–Clause
Sor. باوکه‌که‌سەمرۆکی‌نام‌خێڵکەتۆد
[bawk-im] [ke serok-i em xêl-e bû]
father-poss.1SG rel head-EZ DEM.PROX tribe-DEF was.3SG
‘my father, who was the head of the tribe’ (Blau 1980: 156)

The exact usage conditions of these different constructions are, however, outside the scope of this work.

9.7 Juxtaposition (X Y)

We find distinct cases where Kurdish dialects make use of the juxtaposition construction. In this construction no Ezafe is apparent, though the oblique case may still appear.

In some cases the lack of Ezafe is phonologically motivated: Some Kurmanji dialects, for instance, drop the Ezafe marker after a vowel-final primary. In such cases we may analyse the Ezafe as having a ∅ allomorph:

(106) Adjective–Noun
Ak. tejî-∅ jêř
full-∅ gold
‘full of gold’ (MacKenzie 1961: 161 [567])

(107) Noun–Noun
Ak. cê-∅ germ-ê
place-∅ warmth-obl/fs
‘place of warmth’ (MacKenzie 1961: 159 [545])

In the Sorani War. dialect, on the other hand, we find the juxtaposition construction without an apparent phonological trigger. Thus, we analyse such an example as lacking an Ezafe altogether:

(108) Noun–Noun
Juxtaposition (X Y)

This may be an areal phenomenon, as the juxtaposition construction is also found in Persian (Balaÿ and Esmaïli 2013: 209), as well as in Gorani, in particular in the Gawrajû dialect (Mahmudweyssi et al. 2012: 16), and in the Hawrami dialect, though in the latter it seems to be restricted to indefinite primaries (Holmberg and Odden 2008: 130f.).

9.7.1 Quantification expressions

We find the juxtaposition construction also in the special case where the primary can be analysed as quantifying the secondary. Such cases may be seen as being on the borderline of the AC system, since the relationship between the primary and the secondary is not a typical attributive relationship (see discussion in Section 9.7.2).

For Sorani dialects, MacKenzie (1961: 63, §18.28) gives a wealth of examples of this construction (which he terms the “partitive relation”), including the following ones:28

(109) **Q. Noun Phrase–Noun**

KSul. [yek hegbe] pare

one bag money

’a bag of money’ (MacKenzie 1961: 63 [29])

(110) **Q. Noun Phrase–Noun**

War. [çwar fewc] ‘esker

four battalion soldier

‘four battalions of soldiers’ (MacKenzie 1961: 64 [265])

(111) **Q. Noun–Noun**

Muk. parw-êk nan ú çor-êk ew

morsel-INDF bread and sip-INDF water

’a morsel bread and a sip of water’ (MacKenzie 1961: 64 [9333])

For Kurmanji dialects, MacKenzie (1961: 161, §264.28(c)) gives only three examples with the primary bindek ‘a little’, which may be seen as a fixed expression:

(112) **Q. Noun–Noun**

Sur. hind-ek pare

measure-INDF money

’a little money’ (MacKenzie 1961: 161 [514])

28The same construction is attested also in the Gorani Hawrami dialect (MacKenzie 1966: 20).
In a footnote, however, he cites Kurdoev (1956), who contrasts the following two examples, the first one instantiating the quantifying juxtaposition construction, while the second one is the normal Ezafe attributive construction:

(113) Q. Noun–Noun
Kurm. revok-ek hesp
herd–INDF horse
‘one herd of horses’ (MacKenzie 1961: 161, fn. 1 citing Kurdoev 1956: 34)

(114) Noun–Noun
Kurm. revok-a hesp-a
herd–EZ FS horse–OBL.PL

9.7.2 Adverbial primaries

Edmonds (1955: 497) reports that nouns used as prepositions in Southern Kurdish (=Sor.) are used without the Ezafe (but see example (50) on page 239):

(115) Adverbial Noun–Noun
Sor. nizîk bewk-i-ewe (ra westa =bu).
near30 father–poss.3SG–POSTPOSITION up stood =was
‘(He was standing) near his father.’ (Edmonds 1955: 497)

9.7.3 Compounds

Another case of juxtaposition is apparent in compounds. As discussed in Section 9.5, compounds are typically formed with the aid of the “compounding Ezafe”. Yet they can also occur without it:

(116) Noun–Adjective
Ak. deḥle–ręş-ik
thorn–black–DIM
‘blackberry bush’ (MacKenzie 1961: 215)

To this we may add compound adjectival expressions like por–zer ‘blond’ (lit. hair-yellow) or çav–şîn ‘blue-eyed’ (lit. eye-blue) found in example (38) on page 236.

29 Unfortunately, I could not consult the original article of Kurdoev.
30 While the English gloss ‘near’ may be understood as primarily being a noun or an adverb, Edmonds (1955: 497) explicitly lists nizîk as a noun.
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9.7.4 Inverse juxtaposition (Y X)

Inverse juxtaposition is quite restricted in Kurdish dialects. MacKenzie (1961: 73) notes that Sor. ordinals formed by the suffix *-emin* always precede the qualified noun (compare with examples in Section 9.3.4):

\[(117) \quad \text{Noun–Ordinal} \]
\[\text{KSul. yek-emîn car} \]
\[\quad \text{one-ORD time} \]
\[\quad \text{‘the first time’ (MacKenzie 1961: 73)} \]

This is expected insofar as the suffix *-emin* is in fact composed of two parts: *-em*, being the ordinal suffix proper, and *-în*, being a superlative suffix (MacKenzie 1961: 68, §190.2).31 Superlative adjectives regularly precede the head noun:

\[(118) \quad \text{Noun–Adjective (superlative)} \]
\[\text{KSul. (bo) aza-tirîn serbaz} \]
\[\quad \text{for brave-COMPR-SUPER soldier} \]
\[\quad \text{‘(for) the bravest soldier’ (MacKenzie 1961: 68)} \]

Also, in some nominal compounds the secondary precedes the primary noun:

\[(119) \quad \text{Noun–Noun} \]
\[\text{KSul. osta-jin} \]
\[\quad \text{craftsman-woman} \]
\[\quad \text{‘craftsman’s wife’ (MacKenzie 1961: 142)} \]

Inverted compounds are also found in Kurm. dialects, especially with adjectival secondaries; see MacKenzie (1961: 215) for some examples.

9.8 Conclusions and comparative prospects

In this chapter we have surveyed the various ACs found in Kurmanji and Sorani dialects. As detailed grammars of specific Kurdish dialects are still scarce, many claims and examples are based on the standard varieties of these two dialect groups.

As we saw, the AC system of the various Kurdish dialects revolves around the various Ezafe constructions, which we have divided into three distinct types, as discussed in Section 9.2: Construct Ezafe, Linker Ezafe and Compounding Ezafe. This distinction, while motivated by internal reasons, permits us to draw parallels between these constructions and similar NENA constructions. Especially the construct Ezafe

---

31 The formal relationship between ordinals and superlatives is known also in other languages of the area, notably Arabic. See in this respect footnote 10 on page 109 and footnote 49 on page 340.
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construction can be seen in some respects as the equivalent of the NENA Neo-CSC, as both make use of a suffixal marker to flag the primary, while the linker Ezafè construction is the equivalent of the NENA ALC, as both make use of pronominal linkers.

The parallels between these constructions, however, are not complete: In Kurdish the Ezafè morphemes are used to introduce all types of secondaries, be they nouns, adjectives, relative clauses, or prepositional phrases. Most NENA dialects, on the other hand, keep the Semitic distinction between adjectival modification, marked by juxtaposition-cum-agreement and nominal/clausal modification, marked by the construct state. Yet another difference is the usage of adverbial primaries: In Persian, only prepositions formed from nouns can be marked by the Ezafè, while in NENA also core prepositions can be marked by the construct state suffix (the latter being true also of Persian, see Samvelian 2008: example (16)).

As we saw, the Ezafè morphemes of Sorani and Kurmanji are in some respects quite different: In Standard Kurmanji, the construct Ezafè takes part in the nominal morphology, and as such is best treated as a nominal phrasal suffix. In addition to the construct Ezafè we distinguish an independent, pronominal linker Ezafè, which is typically used after NP primaries, but can also occur without a primary. In Kurmanji, moreover, only the linker Ezafè can regularly be used to chain several modifiers of one primary.

In standard Sorani, on the other hand, the Ezafè is a fixed, uninflected particle. While we treat this Ezafè too as a phrasal suffix mainly due to its selective attachment to nominal hosts, it is more clitic-like than its Kurm. counter-part. Indeed, in the Sor. case it is possible to argue that the linker Ezafè is simply an allomorph of the construct Ezafè, occurring when no explicit primary is present.

Comparing these facts to the situation in NENA shows that, by and large, most NENA dialects are similar in some respects to Kurmanji and in some respects to Sorani (and in some respects to neither). First, we note that in all NENA dialects, the construct state suffix (be it of Aramaic origin, or a borrowed Ezafè) is uninflected, like the Sorani Ezafè. On the other hand, as in Kurmanji, in most NENA dialects the construct state suffix occurs in complementary distribution with a similarly shaped linker, which can appear either with or without an explicit nominal primary. Moreover, as discussed in Section 4.3, the NENA construct state suffix -əd can be analysed

32 An exception is the peripheral dialect of JSan., which has borrowed the Iranian Ezafè together with its distribution; see Section 8.6.2.
33 Looking at the dialectal map, we see a continuum of change, as discussed in Section 9.3. The dialects located at the Inter-Zab region, Muk. and Bin. included, present characteristics of transitional dialects. This is to a large extent also true of the Inter-Zab NENA dialects.
34 In some exceptional NENA dialects, notably JUrm., the linker can co-occur with a construct state suffix, unlike the Kurmanji linker. See Section 7.3.1 regarding JUrm., and Section 11.2 for a general discussion.
These partial similarities raise the question of to what extent the NENA Neo-
CSC is related to the Construct Ezafe Construction. This question is treated in
depth in Section 10.3.2.

Another domain of possible contact is the emergence of NENA genitive marking
(discussed in Section 4.4). This development may be related to the usage of the
oblique case in Kurmanji dialects, although the latter is used in a wider syntactic
domain. This question is discussed in Section 10.4.

Yet another plausible influence of Kurmanji dialects on some NENA dialects,
discussed in Section 9.4.3, is the usage of the linker $d$- as a verbal aspectual marker
in Sar. and Ank., on the model of the aspectual use of the Kurmanji Ezafe marker.
This functional similarity has been previously observed by Borghero (2013: 77ff.).

In the Sorani-speaking region, we see that some NENA dialects, JSan. and JSul.
in particular, have re-analysed their possessive enclitics as phrasal suffixes, very likely
under influence of Sorani dialects (see Section 9.1 and compare with Section 8.1).
The same dialects have generalised the usage of the juxtaposition construction as an
AC. This too may be related to the influence of Sorani dialects. This possibility is
explored in Section 11.3.2.2.

While trying to be exhaustive, the survey of the Kurdish AC systems given in
the present chapter can certainly not do justice to the extent of dialectal complexity.
Indeed, such an investigation would merit a monograph on its own. It is my hope
that this chapter may provide an adequate seed for such a study.
Chapter 10

The Development of D-markers in NENA dialects

In the previous chapters we have surveyed some AC systems of certain NENA dialects from a synchronic perspective. We have seen that these dialects permit a wealth of constructions to mark the attributive relation, while at the same time some key strategies re-appear. In this and the following chapter we take a broad cross-dialectal view and compare the occurrence of the main constructions across all NENA dialects in our survey. This comparison will permit us to formulate some plausible hypotheses regarding the origin of these constructions. A key question in this regard is to evaluate the role language contact played in the NENA developments, as opposed to internal developments. Of course, both these factors play a role in the development of every language, but sometimes they can be shown to go hand in hand, while on other occasions they seem to block each other. As contact languages, we consider especially Kurdish dialects, whose AC system was presented in some detail in Chapter 9. To assess the internal development scenarios, we treat Syriac, whose AC system was presented in Chapter 3, as an approximative Proto-NENA stage, without entering into the methodological debate whether a Proto-NENA existed at all. Some allusions, moreover, will be made to other classical forms of Aramaic (notably JBA), Early Jewish Neo-Aramaic (NrT), as well as other Neo-Aramaic varieties (WNA and Mı̄d.).

In this chapter we concentrate on the development of the D-markers in NENA dialects, i.e. AC markers containing a /d/ segment which is a reflex of the Classical Aramaic d- linker or a cognate thereof. As such, the chapter is closely tied to Chapter 4, which presents the synchronic analysis of these markers in NENA dialects. While this chapter aims to track the development of these markers, it has a comparative part as well, as it presents the distribution of the various constructions cross-dialectally.

To situate the development of the D-markers, Section 10.1 discusses first the retention of the Classical Aramaic Analytic Linker Construction (=ALC, i.e. Syr. bayta d=malka ‘the house of the king’, see Section 3.4) in NENA dialects. Section
10.2, on the other hand, discusses the non-retention of the Syriac Double Annexation Construction (=DAC, i.e. Syr. bayt-ēb d=malkā, see Section 3.5)

Section 10.3 discusses the arguably most prominent AC in NENA, namely the Neo-Construct State Construction (=Neo-CSC, i.e. Beṣ. bayt-əd malka). In particular, Section 10.3.1 discusses the origin of this construction, whether it is the Classical Aramaic ALC or rather the DAC. Section 10.3.2 discusses the role language contact might have played in its development.

Section 10.4 discusses the development of the genitive prefix d-, with a special emphasis on the role of language contact.

Section 10.5 discusses the distribution and development of alternative linkers in NENA. The usage of the linker did is discussed both as a basis for the attributive pronouns (Section 10.5.1) and as an independent linker (Section 10.5.2). Other linkers are discussed as well, notably ad or od (Section 10.5.3), and the JUrm. ay linker, in which the /d/ segment is arguably no more apparent (Section 10.5.4). Section 10.5.5 discusses the possible grammaticalisation of mar- ‘owner’ as a linker; while it is not related to the d- linker, it it treated here due to its possible functional equivalence.

10.1 The distribution of the inherited ALC: X d-Y

As we saw in Chapter 3, the main AC in Syriac is the Analytic Linker Construction (=ALC), a linker construction in which a linker d- mediates between the primary and the secondary, without any further marking on the primary. This construction, with the very same linker d- (sometimes realized /də-/ or even /ʾəd-/2) is retained in many NENA dialects, but often with various restrictions. We distinguish between cases where the secondary is a pronoun, on the other hand, must be treated separately, as well as cases where the primary

---

1 We use the term Neo-Construct differently from Mutzafi (2004b: 3, fn. 15), who uses it to refer to the innovated apocopated construct state formation, not being a reflex of the historical construct state formation. Since the distinction between the historical and the innovated apocopated construct state formations is not always obvious, we subsume both under the heading Apocopate-CSC, reserving the term Neo-CSC for the forms marked by the suffix -əd, stressing the fact that this is the main structural (head-marking) equivalent of the classical Semitic construct state in NENA dialects. A discussion of the development of the innovated Apocopate-CSC and the retention of the historical CSC is found in Section 11.1.

2 While the form /ʾəd-/ can be seen as a phonetic variant of d-, with the schwa added as an epenthetic vowel, it may also represent an alternative linker form, similarly to ad or od discussed in Section 10.5.3. Since in all dialects in which we find the form /ʾəd-/ we find also the basic form /d-/1, this question does not affect the current discussion.
is an adverbial. In the present discussion we exclude cases where we consider the
*d-* segment to be re-analysed as a morphological genitive marker, i.e. preceding a
vowel-initial determiner/pronoun (these cases are discussed in Section 10.4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>N <em>d</em>-Noun</th>
<th>N <em>d</em>-Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South-East Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JČal.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JArd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAmad.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iran</td>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Iraq</td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.1: Dialectal distribution of Noun + *d-* + Noun/Clause constructions. (+) indicates cases where the primary is $\emptyset$ or pronominal.

Out of the 24 dialects surveyed in Table 10.1 the *d-* appears as mediating between two nouns only in 10 dialects. Moreover, the usage of this construction is often qualified. Thus, Khan (2004: 192) reports that in JSul. this construction is used in “isolated instances”. In Barw. it is reported to be in occasional use only (Khan 2008c: 398). In CArd. an N *d*-N construction is not found (in my survey),
but the construction \([N+Adj.] \ d-N\) is found once.\(^3\) The usage of the construction is often motivated by morpho-phonological factors: Thus, in JCal. it is used when the primary is a loan-word, typically not adapted to Aramaic word-structure (Fassberg 2010: 46). In Jil. Fox (1997: 60) asserts that the linker appears after primaries ending in consonants, those being in fact also unadapted loan-words.

Considering clausal secondaries, we find this construction in three more dialects: JZax., Betn., and Arb.\(^4\) The most common type of clausal secondaries are those which start with a copula, which is typically vowel-initial. This phonological environment may have been favourable for the retention of the \(d\)-linker as a relativizer, as the linker could easily syllabify with the vowel-initial copula, creating an “optimal” CV syllable.\(^5\) Support for this idea comes from JZax., which has gone beyond mere retention of the \(d\)-linker, and has re-analysed the combination \(d+\text{cop}\) as an attributive form of the copula (Cohen 2010; see discussion in Section 10.5.2).

The construction is entirely lacking in Iranian-located dialects\(^6\) as well as the peripheral dialects of Turkey (with the exception of Her.). In other words, the \(d\)-linker is better conserved in the central dialects, while it is lost in the periphery.

From the above, two conclusions arise: First, the use of the ALC, which was a major AC construction in Eastern Classical Aramaic has been greatly reduced in modern dialects. Secondly, the \(d\)-linker in its role as a relativizer proved to be more durable, possibly due to the favourable role played by copular secondaries, as explained above.

The reason for the decline of the ALC in NENA can be attributed to two main reasons: 1) The replacement of the \(d\)-linker by other linkers (see Section 10.5); 2) The replacement of the linker construction by a head-marking construction, namely the Neo-CSC (Section 10.3).

---

\(^3\) In general there is a tendency to use the ALC with phrasal primaries, possibly due to the prosodic independence of the \(d\)-phrase. Nevertheless, phrasal primaries can appear also in other ACs, notably the Neo-CSC.

\(^4\) It should be noted that these dialects make use of the ALC for nominal secondaries, but with other linkers. Thus, JZax. and Betn. use the linker \(d\text{id}\) (see Section 10.5.2), while Arb. uses the linker \(od\) (Section 10.5.3).

\(^5\) The retention of morphemic segments before vowels (including glottal stops, these being weak consonantal onsets) is a well-known phenomenon in NENA, especially in the verbal domain: In some dialects, the indicative marker \(k\)- is only conserved before vowel-initial (or /ʔ/-initial) verbal stems (e.g. Arb.: Khan 1999: 248).

\(^6\) It is interesting to note that in Sar. the \(d\)-marker survives only with the copula, as a verbal aspectual marker (see example (79) on page 246). This shows that the one of the last uses of the \(d\)-marker before its disappearance from the NENA AC system is with clausal secondaries, and more precisely with copular secondaries. In JSan. and JUrm., on the other hand, the \(d\)-survives as a genitive marker on certain pronouns.
10.2 The Syriac DAC: X-y.poss d-Y

While the use of the ALC has been reduced in NENA, its fate has been better than the Double Annexation Construction (=DAC). Recall that the DAC is a construction in which the secondary is indexed by a possessive pronoun on the primary, followed by the d- linker and the secondary itself (for example, bayt-ēh d=malkā ‘the king’s house’). This construction has completely disappeared from NENA dialects. The only attested cases I could find of this construction in a modern NENA corpus are the Gospel translations in Qar., which clearly preserve the original Syriac wording (see Section 6.4.2).

10.3 Development of the Neo-CSC in NENA: X-əd Y

As stated above, the ALC and DAC, extant in Syriac, have been to a large extent replaced by the Neo-CSC of NENA, in which the primary is marked by a suffixed morpheme -əd. As Table 10.2 on the following page shows, this construction is extant in all surveyed NENA dialects, with the notable exception of JSan. The extent to which the construction is used with primaries and secondaries other than nouns, however, varies quite a lot. Some of the major categories are given in Table 10.2, with the notable exclusion of adverbial primaries (i.e. prepositions and conjunctions), as these are lexically determined in each dialect.

Two questions arise regarding this diachronic development of this marking:

1. What is the origin of the Neo-CSC? Is it the ALC, the DAC or both?

2. How did the Neo-CSC develop? Specifically, what is the role of language contact?

In the following sections, we shall attempt to answer these questions.

---

7 This is not to imply that it died out. Rather, as shown in Section 10.3.1, it seems to have evolved into the Neo-CSC. Yet, in its Classical form, the DAC does not occur in NENA dialects (Pace Mengozzi 2005a: 383) who claims that “it is still used in certain varieties of NENA”). Only with pronominal secondaries do we find a similar construction in some dialects, used chiefly to disambiguate the usage of 3rd person possessors (see example (37) on page 296).

8 Some of the variation, however, is probably attributable to variable corpus sizes available for each dialect.

9 As for adjectival secondaries, these are only producible in Arb. (see example (22) on page 279) and to a limited extent, which is probably non-productive, in Barw. (e.g., xattat romaye ‘roman wheat’; Khan 2008c: 523) and Barz. (kalekūvid ʾurwa ‘the great wild ram’; Mutzafi 2004b: 4, fn. 33).
### Table 10.2: Distribution of the suffixed construct state. (+) indicates clausal secondaries following only pronominal primaries or a construct state tautological infinitive (Her. only).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Primaries</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>Ordinal</th>
<th>Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>Adj.</td>
<td>Inf.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JCal.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JArd.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAmd.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iran</td>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Iraq</td>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10.3. Development of the Neo-CSC in NENA: X-əd Y

10.3.1 Origin of the Neo-CSC

Mengozzi (2005a: 378–380), following Khan (1999: 169), gives three possible hypotheses regarding the emergence of the Neo-CSC. In all accounts, it is clear that the suffixed segment /-d/ results from the encliticization of the Syriac proclitic d-. What is less clear is the source of the schwa vowel which precedes it, forming the suffixed morpheme /-əd/-ət/. Recall that the schwa replaces as a vocalic nucleus the free state endings /-a/-e/ of words of Aramaic origin. Indeed, this replacement of the free state endings is one of the main reasons we alluded to in considering the -əd ending as a morphologically integrated suffix of the noun stem (see Section 4.3.4).

Mengozzi (2005a: 379f.), citing Khan (1999: 169), mentions three hypotheses regarding the origin of the schwa:

1. It results from a phonetic reduction of the /-a/-e/ free state suffixes appearing on the primary of the ALC.

2. It is a reflex of a fossilized 3ms possessive pronoun -ēb originating in the DAC, which was phonetically attenuated to -ə (often realised as [i] or [ə]).

3. It is a reflex of a demonstrative element ə<ay, originating in the ALC with an inserted demonstrative pronoun acting as determiner (i.e. primary + dem+ LNK+ secondary; see Section 3.4.6 for Syriac examples).

To this we may add two supplementary hypotheses:

4. It is an epenthetic vowel added before a -d suffix (following the removal of the free state suffixes where present).

5. It is a reflex of the Sorani Ezafe suffix -î (= [i]~[ɪ]), or an fossilized and attenuated Kurmanji 3ms Ezafe suffix -ē~-i (= [e]~[i]).

Nouns of foreign origin ending in consonants can also get the -əd suffix in some dialects, such as the Kurdish loan xadām ‘servant’ in the following example:

(i) Noun–Noun Phrase
Arb. xadām-it [bā́b-it ḫiyā faqīr]
servant–CST father–CST DEM.PROX poor.sg
‘the servant of the father of this poor man’ (Khan 1999: 424 [S:31])

Foreign nouns whose final vowel is not seen as the free state ending may get a simple /-d/ suffix in the construct state (see Section 4.3.3). Recall also that in JUrm. the suffix may be /-ad/ under the influence of vowel harmony (see Section 7.2).

This construction is probably the source of the NWNMA Midin “heavy” possessive suffixes, which originated in the encliticization of the sequence ay-d+poss to a primary noun, yielding for instance ‘ubāṣr-ayde ‘his house’. See Jastrow (1985: 52, §47; 2002: 58), who offers, however, a different development path.
Mengozzi (2005a: 380) prefers the second hypothesis, since it explains the occurrence of prepositional primaries with the -əd ending. Prepositions in Classical Aramaic cannot appear in the ALC, but rather must appear in the DAC (if a linker is present at all). Thus, only a DAC-origin hypothesis can explain their distribution with the -əd ending in NENA.¹² Mengozzi’s examples are reproduced in Table 10.3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical Aramaic</th>
<th>NENA dialects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baytā</td>
<td>d=malkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house.FREE</td>
<td>LNK=king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*āmmā</td>
<td>d=malkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*with.FREE</td>
<td>LNK=king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAC</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bayt-ēb</td>
<td>d=malkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>house-poss.3MS</td>
<td>LNK=king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾāmm-ēb</td>
<td>d=malkā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-poss.3MS</td>
<td>LNK=king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Neo-CSC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾumm-əd</td>
<td>king</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with-CST</td>
<td>malka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾəlləd</td>
<td>malka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ʾəbbəd</td>
<td>malka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>king</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.3: Mengozzi’s argumentation regarding the origin of the Neo-CSC

A further fact substantiating this hypothesis is the fact the DAC is virtually absent in NENA dialects, as discussed in Section 10.2. This is easily explained if the DAC evolved into the Neo-CSC. The fact that the ALC remains to a certain extent in NENA, as shown in Section 10.2, indicates conversely that it was probably not the source of the Neo-CSC.

To round off the picture in favour of this hypothesis, we note that Socin (1882: 122) (cited by Tsereteli 1965: 230) brings the Jil example šı́mm-o-d báxta ‘the name of the woman’, in which the -o- element corresponds to the 3fs possessive suffix. This construction looks very much like the Neo-CSC, as the d- linker is encliticized to the primary, yet the fs possessive suffix is a clear indication of a DAC-origin. This example seems to reflect an earlier stage of NENA in which the possessive suffix was not yet fossilized and attenuated as an /ə/ segment. No such example, however, is attested in modern descriptions of NENA dialects (including Fox 1997 describing Jil.), so this example may rather reflect a certain purist or prescriptive approach to language (imitating the Syriac construction) rather than normal usage. Indeed, judging from the examples of Mengozzi (2005a: 374f.), already Early Christian NENA (manuscripts of the 17th century) had a fossilized, and possible phonetically attenuated,

¹²As some prepositions, notably l- and b-, do not occur in the DAC in Syriac, we have to further assume analogy across prepositions to explain their construct state marked forms ʾllad and ʾbbad. According to Nöldeke (1875: 330, §231), in CMand. the preposition b- does occur “very occasionally” (ganz vereinzelt) in the DAC, but not the preposition l- (see also Pat-El 2012: 112).
3ms possessive suffix in the DAC.\textsuperscript{13} Also some Neo-Aramaic writers using the 19\textsuperscript{th} century Syriac script developed by missionaries in Urmi, notably Paul Bedjan, wrote a fossilized 3ms possessive suffix on the primary preceding a proclitic d- (Murre-van den Berg 1999: 192, §6.2.6; 198, §6.3.6, fn. 33).\textsuperscript{14}

While the DAC-origin hypothesis seems thus highly plausible, it does not exclude the alternative explanations completely. First, as Mengozzi (2005a: 382) himself notes, this origin is problematic in explaining the use of the -əd suffix before clausal secondaries, since in Syriac these could only appear in the ALC. In order to explain the availability of the Neo-CSC construction in such cases, Mengozzi brings forth the first hypothesis, namely the ALC-origin hypothesis, and concludes that “the phonetic reduction that gave rise to the endings -ed, -it, etc. neutralized the morphophonetic oppositions between two earlier constructions [the ALC and the DAC]”.\textsuperscript{15}

In order to reconcile the two origins, we can posit a double-origin hypothesis. In such a scenario, following the transformation of the DAC to the Neo-CSC, cases where the d- linker of the ALC is cliticized to the primary (as may happen due to prosodic reasons), are levelled by analogy to the Neo-CSC: e.g. ALC bayt-əd malka > Neo-CSC bayr-əd malka. This would naturally also include cases with clausal secondaries.

One may wonder why the DAC (bayt-ēh d=malḵā) was completely transformed into the Neo-CSC, while the ALC remains in complementary distribution with the latter. This is partially answered by the hypothesis that the transformation ALC>Neo-CSC is a later development, that may not yet have reached its culmination.\textsuperscript{16} Yet also structural reasons may be called upon:

First, since the 3ms possessive suffix is normally realized in NENA as a vowel -e or -u, the encliticization of the d- to it is highly facilitated, being in fact a phonetic re-syllabification.\textsuperscript{17} In the ALC, however, the primary may in principal end

\textsuperscript{13}Confusingly, it was spelled sometimes as a final Syr. Aleph ܐ, rendering it orthographically similar to the free state suffix.

\textsuperscript{14}Note, however, that Murre-van den Berg (1999: 175), who adopts an ALC-origin view of the -əd suffix, sees this fossilized 3ms possessive suffix as a post-hoc adaptation of the -əd suffix to grammar of Syriac.

\textsuperscript{15}He relates, moreover, the extended usage of the -əd suffix to the Kurdish Ezafe, a question which we shall examine in more detail below.

\textsuperscript{16}In this respect, it would be interesting to follow the recent evolution of this construction in contemporary NENA dialects, now spoken for a large part in the diaspora.

\textsuperscript{17}In Classical Aramaic a weak consonantal segment /h/ follows the vocalic nucleus yielding -ēb. Yet in most NENA dialects this segment has been elided, or conserved only in restricted morphophonological contexts (e.g. in in JZax. before a 3\textsuperscript{rd} person copula; see Cohen 2012: 450). In some dialects it has been conserved or even strengthened to /ḥ/ segment (Coghill 2008: 96). The latter is the case for instance in Alq., yet this had no effect on the emergence of the Neo-CSC in the dialect. This hints that the elision of the /h/ segment in the possessive suffix of the DAC was independent of its development in other places, in line with the idea that the possessive suffix of the DAC was fossilized.
in a consonant (especially if it is an unadapted loan-word) thus preventing such a resyllabification, and conserving the availability of the ALC.

Second, from a more general point of view, the principle of economy seems to have played a role. In Classical Aramaic, the marking of the primary by a possessive pronoun was part of a more general strategy of using proleptic pronominal suffixes to mark definiteness. Yet over time the role of the proleptic pronoun as marking definiteness of the DAC must have eroded (probably hand-in-hand with the its fossilization), as we find in NENA the Neo-CSC used with indefinite nouns:

(1) **Noun–Noun**

JAm. xa šaqqīḥ-əd meye

INDF channel-cst water

‘a channel of water’ (Greenblatt 2011: 72)

The erosion of the definiteness value arose possibly due to the development of other means to mark definiteness (see Section 1.3), or since ACs are in general definite anyhow (cf. Haspelmath 1999: 231). Be it as it may, this led necessarily to the reanalysis of the proleptic pronoun as a pure primary-marker of the AC, on top of the linker, rendering the DAC a double-marked AC. But, by the principle of economy, it is preferable to transform the double-marked DAC to a single-marked Neo-CSC, thus reducing the cognitive burden of marking the construction on two separate loci. The ALC, on the other hand, is single-marked (dependent-marked), thus showing equal structural complexity as the head-marked Neo-CSC.

What about the other hypotheses mentioned above? Regarding the third hypothesis, Mengozzi asserts that no evidence for the origin construction (X DEM LNK Y) is found in the Early NENA manuscripts he investigated. In Syriac, we find instances of this construction (see Section 3.4.6 and notably example (80) on page 65: rawmā baw dav šmayyā ‘the height of heaven’), but not with prepositions as primaries. In any case, assuming this would be the origin of the Neo-CSC would require further explanation of the disappearance of the emphatic state suffixes (-ā in the cited example), unless we assume they coalesced with the demonstrative pronoun. It is rather
more probable that such a construction developed into an alternative linker such as *ad* or *od*, discussed in Section 10.5.3.

As for the fourth hypothesis, while the schwa segment in the -əd suffix arose from an attenuation of the 3ms possessive suffix, synchronically one could indeed argue that in most NENA dialects it has been re-analysed as merely an epenthetic vowel, enabling the syllabic addition of the -d suffix to the nominal stem.23 Thus, in the Barw. dialect, whenever a primary noun ends in a vowel other than -a or -e serving as the Aramaic inflectional ending, only a /-d/-/t/ suffix is added (Khan 2008c: 397). The same phenomenon happens sometimes when the primary ends in a liquid, as in the following Gaz. example:

(2) **Noun–Noun**

Gaz. ahl-d Gaznax
people-cst G.

'the people of Gaznax' (Gutman 2015c: 318 (7))

Thus, synchronically one could argue that the schwa is not a phonemic part of the -əd suffix, but rather an epenthetic vocalic nucleus needed due to the removal of the vocalic free state suffixes (but see the Qar. example (25) on page 139, where the schwa is the sole exponent of the construct state).

What about the idea that the schwa is related to the Ezafe particle? Assuming that it results from the Kurmanji Ezafe raises analytical difficulties, since the latter shows gender and number inflection, so one would have to stipulate an extra step of fossilization of the Ezafe suffix, which is not observed in Kurm. The Sor. Ezafe, on the other hand, may be a better candidate, as it is an uninflecting particle. This idea gains further support from the fact that in some dialects, especially in NE Iraq, an Ezafe suffix -i stands in complementary distribution with an -əd suffix (see Section 11.4.1.1). Given the phonetic similarity of the schwa and this Ezafe (both roughly

---

23 A similar claim is made by Spitaler (1938: 112, §107.f) regarding the schwa segment in the WNA Neo-cst suffix -əl. I am grateful to my friend Ivri Bunis for drawing my attention to this reference.

24 Khan (2008c: 397) reports one possible exception to this rule, occurring supposedly when -əd is suffixed to "[a]n unadapted loanword that has a final vowel that it has retained from the source language". In such cases the schwa is retained by an insertion of the glide /y/. He brings one example of this phenomenon:

(i) **Noun–Noun**

Barw. habba-y-ət xattəθa
seed-cst wheat_grain

'a seed of grain' (Khan 2008c: 397)

Yet the validity of this analysis can be questioned, as in the Iraqi Arabic dictionary of Woodhead and Beene (1967: 89) habbiya is listed as a variant of habba. Thus, the /y/ segment is simply part of the lexical stem, and the schwa replaces the final -a.
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realized as [i]), it may indeed be the case that bilingual speakers conflated the two. Yet, since we observe the -əd suffix also in dialects which have not integrated any Ezafe marking, and also in the Kurmanji speaking area, it seems rather implausible to place the origin of the schwa in a matter replication of the Ezafe. As for the different question of whether the Neo-cst suffix -əd developed due to pattern replication of the Kurdish Ezafe, this is dealt with in the next section (see in particular Subsection 10.3.2.2.1).

To conclude this section, we present the development of the Neo-CSC, as outlined above, in six distinct stages shown in Table 10.4 on the facing page. To better apprehend the fossilization of the possessive suffix, the model Syriac expression is bayt-āb d=malktā ‘house of the queen’, but we assume also the plural possessive suffixes shifted to 3ms -ēb.

10.3.2 The role of language contact

According to the scenario outlined in Table 10.4 on the next page, the key stages in the emergence of the neo-construct state suffix -əd were the encliticization of the linker d- to the primary (stage 3) and its subsequent reanalysis as a head-marking suffix (stages 4–5). The encliticization itself may be quite natural due to the syllabic structure (the primary ending in a vowel, either due to the emphatic state suffix, or the possessive suffix) as well as to the frequent prosodic boundness of the primary and secondary. Furthermore, Lahiri and Plank (2010) have suggested (from a Germanic perspective) that cross-linguistically there may be a tendency of encliticization of functional elements to preceding hosts. Yet encliticization does not necessarily mean reanalysis as a head-marking construction. Thus, a natural question is: What led to the re-analysis?

A possible answer is to suppose that some external factor, such as language contact, may have played a role in this reanalysis. Indeed, such a proposal has been made by Cohen (2015: 121ff.). Cohen, examining data from JZax., argues that its Neo-CSC emerged as a pattern replication (in the sense of Matras and Sakel 2007b) from co-territorial Kurmanji Kurdish. A similar proposal was made by Garbell (1965a: 171, §2.21.2) regarding JUrm., attributing its Neo-CSC to Sorani influence (“Central Kurdish” in her terminology). Note, however, that also JUrm. is co-territorial with Kurmanji (see map of Izady 1992: 171).

In the following sections we shall present Cohen’s proposal, and then evaluate it, taking into account data from different NENA dialects as well as Kurmanji and Sorani Kurdish and Syriac.

---

25 For example, while Lahiri and Plank (2010: 376) claim that the expression “drink a pint of milk a day” is prosodically organised as [drink a][pint of][milk a][day]. Yet the preposition “of” cannot be said to have been reanalysed as a head-marker.

26 The argumentation in this section is similar to the presentation in Gutman (2016⁺), but with
10.3. Development of the Neo-CSC in NENA: X-əd Y

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classical Aramaic</th>
<th>DAC</th>
<th>ALC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 Initial state</td>
<td>bayt-āb d=malktā</td>
<td>bayt-ā d=malktā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 The DAC possessive suffix is fossilized to the 3ms form -ēb, possibly losing its definiteness marking function.</td>
<td>bayt-ēb d=malktā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The DAC possessive suffix loses its consonantal coda and is centralized to -ə.</td>
<td>bayt-ə d=malktā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The d-linker of the DAC re-syllabifies with the primary. This happens occasionally also in the ALC.</td>
<td>bayt-ə=d malktā</td>
<td>bayt-a=d malktā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The resulting -əd segment in the DAC is reanalysed as a unitary construct state suffix.</td>
<td>bayt-əd malktā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 By analogy, the -ad sequence in the ALC (-ed in plural) is levelled to the construct state suffix -əd.*</td>
<td>bayt-əd malktā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The /ə/ segment is re-interpreted as an epenthetic vowel, added only when the syllabic structure requires it.</td>
<td>bayt-{ə}d malktā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The Neo-CSC construction co-exists in complementary distribution with remnants of the ALC.

Table 10.4: Possible development path of the DAC and the ALC into the Neo-CSC, tracing the development of the model expression ‘house of the queen’.

NENA | Neo-CSC | ALC
---|---|---


10.3.2.1 Parallels between Kurmanji and NENA Attributive Constructions

Recall that in Kurmanji Kurdish the Ezafe morpheme marking attribution can be suffixed to the head noun (see (3) below=example (16) on page 230) or, when it does not directly follow the head noun, appear as an independent morpheme (see the morpheme in bold in (4) below=example (63) on page 242; see further Section 9.2 and the following sections).

(3) Noun–Noun Phrase
Kurm. kitêb-ên [keç-a mirov]
book-EZ.PL. girl-EZS. man
‘the man’s daughter’s books’ (Thackston 2006a: 13)

(4) Noun Phrase–Noun
Kurm. [hejmar-ek-e nû] ya kovar-ê
issue-INDF-EZS. new LNK.EZS. journal-OBL.MS
‘a new issue of the journal’ (Thackston 2006a: 15)

Cohen argues that the independent Ezafe morpheme acted as a pivot in the pattern replication of the Neo-CSC. The proclitic pronominal linker d- was matched to the independent Ezafe, and consequently was encliticized to the construction’s head and reanalysed as a head-marking suffix by analogy with the suffixed Ezafe.\(^27\) We note that this proposal supposes that the d- was encliticized to a noun in the ALC, not the DAC.

As a further piece of evidence for the affinity between the two languages Cohen notes that both in Kurmanji and in NENA a head-marked noun can precede a clausal attribute, as in the following examples (=example (60) on page 241 and example (20) on page 106):

(5) Noun–Clause
Kurm. tişt-ên [min nivisîbûn]
thing-EZ.PL. 1SG.OBL. written
‘the things I had written’ (Thackston 2006a: 77)

(6) Noun–Clause
JZax. xabr-ît mîr-rē-la
word-CST said-A3MS-DAT3FS
‘the word(s) he told her’ (Cohen 2012: 97 (24))

\(^{27}\)From a diachronic perspective, also within the Iranian language family the suffixed Ezafe arose from the encliticization of an independent element (Haig 2011). Haider and Zwanziger (1984) claim more specifically that it originates in a relative pronoun, which lost its case inflection and subsequently became the Ezafe.
10.3.2.2 Mismatches between the Kurmanji and NENA constructions

Notwithstanding the appeal of the above explanation of the source of the NENA Neo-CSC, it presents some difficulties. First, it is worth noting that this is a somewhat unusual kind of pattern replication, as outlined in Matras and Sakel (2007b: 836). According to their model, it is the “functional scope” of the source construction which is replicated to the recipient language. Yet in this case, it is not the functional scope which is replicated (since the Ezafe and the $d$- linker have the same functions to begin with) but rather the distributional-prosodic properties of the Ezafe, namely its possibility to occur as a head-marking suffix, rather than an independent morpheme, which is replicated.

Second, looking closely at the linguistic data from a cross-NENA perspective, we see that there is no perfect match between the Kurmanji construction and the parallel NENA construction. It should be immediately emphasized that the observed mismatches, surveyed below, cannot preclude an imperfect pattern replication scenario. Indeed, Matras and Sakel (2007b: 836) clearly state that any pattern replication must be accommodated to constraints of recipient language. Yet, given that in some respects the NENA construction is in fact more similar to the Sorani Ezafe construction (and in some respects to neither), these mismatches may indicate that the Kurmanji Ezafe construction is not necessarily the sole or even the main source of this linguistic change.

Indeed, since we encounter the Neo-CSC both in the Kurmanji speaking-area and the Sorani speaking-area,\(^{28}\) if we assume that it results from language contact with one source language, we must further explain its propagation throughout the NENA speaking-zone (either by a wave model, or by assuming a common ancestor). Yet, given the partial similarity with each of the proposed source languages, such an assumption is not necessary. Accordingly, the aim of the following arguments is to show that the different facets of Neo-CSC cannot be attributed to contact with a single language, but they are better explained as an areal phenomenon related to the very long history of language convergence in this linguistic area.

10.3.2.2.1 Non-inflection of the NENA construct state marker

In contrast to the Kurmanji linker Ezafe, the Classical Aramaic linker $d$- does not inflect. Thus, any pivot matching between the two is partial at most. Moreover, the resulting construct state $-ad$ suffix does not inflect as well, again in contrast to the Kurm. construct Ezafe. Indeed, given that there is a general tendency of the languages of the area to evolve towards morphological simplification and loss of nominal inflection, it would

\(^{28}\) Arguably, in the Sorani speaking area, the Neo-CSC is somewhat less wide-spread, as some dialects, in particular JSan. and JSul. prefer the juxtaposition construction – see Chapter 8. However, as our sample of this area (NE Iraq and W Iran) is less comprehensive, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions out of this observation.
be strange if the Aramaic linker would suddenly gain inflection. 29 Yet Kurmanji is one of the exceptional languages that have conserved a relatively rich nominal morphology, as attested also by the conservation of its case system. Thus, one may wonder whether Kurmanji is the best candidate for pivot matching of the d- linker. Of relevance is the fact that Early Jewish Cis-Zab NENA (see Section 1.2.2) made use of inflecting demonstrative determiners joined to an enclitic d- linker, presenting a better parallel to the inflecting Ezafe. This can be observed in the Nerwa Texts (=NrT), Jewish homilies from the 16th century written in Nerwa in NW Iraq, whose language is close to the ancestor stratum of JZax: 30

(7) 0–Noun

NrT   [ ... ] אוד גמאָ [ ... ] ādā dem
      =aw = anwār ... u= āw = d ġamām
      dem.ms = lnk lights and = dem.ms = lnk clouds

‘that (the pillar) of fire ... and that of clouds’ (Pošat Wayobi Bəšallāh 22:5 ed. by Sabar 1976: 68)

(8) Noun–Clause

NrT   שבעוהאידוממקהלך šəḇûʿa, oath(fs)
      =d mōm-ax-lux
      oath(fs) dem.fs = lnk put.pst-1sg-a2ms

‘the oath which you put us under’ (Pošat Wayobi Bəšallāh 4:3 ed. by Sabar 1976: 43)

Thus, if Kurmanji was indeed the model language, one could expect a pivot match with these inflecting “linkers”. However, although such inflecting elements are conserved in some NENA dialects such as C. Barw. or J. Arb. (see Section 10.5.3.1), they are never encliticized as such to the head–noun (see further Section 10.5.3.1). 32

From the point of view of inflection, the NENA Neo-cst suffix is in fact more similar to the Sorani Kurdish uninflecting Ezafe, which is always a fixed -i̯-y, as in the following example (=example (10) on page 228): 33

(9) Noun–Noun

29 This was kindly pointed out to me by a reviewer of Gutman (2016+).
30 Arguably, the /-d/ segment in these examples is already re–analysed as the construct state suffix, as it regularly occurs also with nominal heads in NrT. Be this as it may, in some earlier state at least the demonstrative pronoun and the linker must have been conceived as independent morphemes.
31 The comma, indicating a possible prosodic break, is added to the apparatus by Sabar and is not part of the original manuscript (see Sabar 1976: XLVII).
32 The fact that such an encliticization is in principle possible may be confirmed by NWNA Mı̄d.: See footnote 11 on page 265.
33 In fact, there is no grammatical gender in Sor.
As mentioned in Section 10.3.1, the phonetic similarity between the Sorani Ezafe and the /ə/ segment of the NENA construct state suffix -əd and their similar distribution, may have led bilingual speakers to conflate the two, but it is unlikely to have been the source of the schwa segment. It is equally unlikely that the Sorani Ezafe could have served as a pivot morpheme comparable to the Aramaic d- linker, given their different distribution: In contrast to the d- linker, the Sorani Ezafe cannot appear as an independent morpheme, except in those few cases in which it is not preceded by any nominal head at all (see examples (87)–(93) on page 248).\(^34\)

### 10.3.2.2.2 Clausal secondaries and the usage of a subordinating particle

In Kurmanji (as well as Sorani), clausal secondaries tend to follow the subordinating particle ku (Sorani ke), as in the following example (=example (57) on page 241 and see further there):

\begin{equation}
\text{Kurm.} \quad [\text{wi ziman}]-ê \quad [\ku \text{li-ber mir-in-ê ye}]
\end{equation}

\text{DEM.DIST.OBL language-EZ.MS REL before die-INF-OBL.FS COP.3SG}

\text{“this language, which is on the verge of dying.” (Thackston 2006a: 75)}

The relativizer can in general only be omitted when the Ezafe-marked head of the NP acts as the object of the clausal attribute such as in example (60) on page 241 (Thackston 2006a: 77).

Most NENA dialects, on the other hand, do not have a dedicated relativizer in this position, but rely either on the construct state ending or on the linker d- (or derivative forms of it), example (20) on page 106 being typical. One dialect which does mimic completely the Kurdish pattern is JUrm., situated at the eastern periphery of the Kurmanji speaking area, which has borrowed the Kurdish particle, as can be seen in the following example (=example (99) on page 188):\(^35\)

\begin{equation}
\text{JUrm.} \quad \text{naš-it} \quad [\text{ki lóka welu}]
\end{equation}

\text{people-CST REL there COP.PST-3PL}

\(^34\)Due to its pronominal nature, the d- linker itself can also appear without a nominal antecedent preceding it (see examples (32)–(33) on page 52). Yet, judging by NENA examples, outside the predicative position it typically appears with a nominal antecedent or with a demonstrative/determiner preceding it, as in examples (7)–(8) on the facing page. Thus, it seems that the case of phrase-initial d- linkers are not frequent enough to drive this kind of language change scenario.

\(^35\)As Garbell (1965b: 88) notes, clauses without an explicit subject NP can optionally appear directly after the construct state suffix.
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Another dialect which borrowed the particle, but without any construct state marking, is JSan., located in the southern limit of the Sorani speaking area.\footnote{In general attribution is marked by mere juxtaposition in JSan. (see Section 8.2), so it should come as no surprise that no construct state marking is present. JSan. has also borrowed the actual Persian Ezafe morpheme which can co-occur with the relativizer following some conjunctions (see example (55) on page 213).} This construction is shown in the following example (=example (29) on page 208 and see further Section 8.5):

(12) **Noun–Clause**

JSan. \(\text{xá}=\text{\char'126}\text{\char'126}\text{xá} \text{meydán smix}=\text{\char'126}\text{\char'126}\text{en}\)

\[\text{INDF=few people REL=in=INDF square} \text{stood.RES=COP.3PL}\]

\(\text{‘a group of people who were standing in a square’ (Khan 2009b: 380 (1))}\)

With the exception of these dialects, we see that most NENA dialects do not in fact replicate the typical clausal attribution construction available in Kurmanji.

### 10.3.2.2.3 Marking of prepositions with the construct state suffix

In NENA, many prepositions can be optionally marked by the construct state suffix. This could be readily explained for prepositions of nominal origin, but it also holds true for “pure” prepositions which cannot be related to any noun, yielding variant forms such as ʾəbb-əd ~ b- ‘in’, ʾəll-əd ~ ʾəll- ~ l- ‘to’, mənn-əd-m- ‘from’ (Goldenberg 2000: 79).

Recall that this fact was one of the main reasons for positing a DAC-origin for the Neo-CSC construction, following Mengozzi (2005a) (see Table 10.3 on page 266 in particular).

In contrast to the situation in NENA, in Kurmanji only prepositions of nominal origin can be marked by the Ezafe. Cohen mentions in this respect the Kurmanji temporal conjunctions, namely dema, gava, çaxê and wexta. To this short list we could add some more prepositions of nominal character, which take invariably a un-inflecting Ezafe -î. The relation of this suffix to the inflecting Ezafe is somewhat obscure, since this form normally follows the indefinite suffix -ek. This is shown in the following examples ((13)=example (49) on page 239 and see further there):

(13) **Adverbial Noun–Noun**

Ak. \(\text{nêzik-i } \text{hakim-i}\)

\(\text{near-EZ judge-OBL.MS}\)

\(\text{‘near the judge’ (MacKenzie 1961: 161 [602])}\)

(14) **Adverbial Noun–Adverb**

KAmd. \(\text{piş-î } \text{hingî}\)

\(\text{back(F)-EZ then}\)
‘after that’ (MacKenzie 1961: 161)

In other words, in contrast to NENA, basic Kurdish prepositions such as *di* ‘in’ (taking part in circum-positional expressions) never take an Ezafe ending.

(15) **Preposition–Noun**

Kurm. di gund-an de
in village–PL.OBL in
‘in the villages’ (Thackston 2006a: 13)

We can conclude that, in NENA, construct state marking on prepositions is more readily available than in Kurmanji, and, moreover, this marking is morphologically more transparent. In this, NENA resembles in fact Persian, where we find the Ezafe marking also on some prepositions which cannot be considered to be of nominal origin (Samvelian 2008: (16)).

### 10.3.2.2.4 Adjectival primaries

In NENA adjectives can stand as the heads of an attributive construction, and consequently be marked by the construct state suffix. Such constructions can have several functions, such as marking the adjective as superlative or as *emotive* (see for example Section 5.2.4 regarding JZax.). Another usage, not necessarily the most frequent, is the specification of the adjectival lexeme itself, as in the following example (=example (35) on page 142):

(16) **Adjective–Noun**

Qar. góra xwár-əd kósa
man white–CST hair
‘a white-haired man’ (Khan 2002a: 281)

This last usage is typical of Semitic languages, and has been labelled in Semitic grammatical tradition *impure annexation*. It appears also in Syriac, in which we find the adjective in the original construct state forms, as in the following example (=example (18) on page 47).

(17) **Adjective–Noun**

Syr. ʾat =ḫu māryā ngir ruḥā wa= mraḥmānā w= saggi
2ms =3ms Lord long.CST spirit and= merciful and= great.CST
ḫnānā
compassion
‘You are the Lord, long-suffering and merciful and of great compassion.’

---

37 See Goldenberg (2002) for an analysis of the phenomenon in Arabic, and Doron (2014) for a analysis of the phenomenon in Modern Hebrew, cast in formal semantics terminology.
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(Peshītta, Prayer of Manasseh, ed. Baars and Schneider 1972: A7; Gutman and Van Peursen 2011: 217 (7a))

In Kurmanji, however, such a construction is rarely found, as adjectives do not inflect in Kurmanji, and cannot receive an Ezafe suffix (but see example (43) on page 237 for a possible counter-example). It is rather in Sorani that we find a similar construction, in which adjectives are head-marked by the Ezafe, as in the following example (=example (42) on page 237):

(18) Adjective–Noun
KSul. tûş-î em derd-e
'afflicted' DEM.PROX trouble-DEF
'afflicted by this trouble' (MacKenzie 1961: 65 [67])

We note, however, that the corresponding NENA construction (example (35) on page 142) occurs also in dialects which are in contact with Kurmanji dialects. Thus, two possibilities arise: either the construction was borrowed from Sorani and spread beyond the original contact zone; or, more likely, it is a retention of a construction that already existed in the language, but with new morphological marking.

10.3.2.2.5 Adjectival secondaries Another challenge for the pattern borrowing theory is the fact that, while adjectives may follow the Ezafe in Kurmanji (see example (63) on page 242), this is not the case in most NENA dialects. Adjectives in these dialects never follow a construct state noun. Rather, they stand in apposition with a free (non-construct) head noun, while agreeing in number and gender features. This is demonstrated in the following example (=example (95) on page 124):

(19) Noun–Adjective
JZax. xa xamsa sqal-ta
'indf maiden(fs) beautiful-fs
'a beautiful maiden' (Cohen 2012: 214)

Yet in Syriac, we find an alternative structure, in which adjectives in absolute state (glossed abs) can follow the d-linker:

(20) Noun Phrase–Noun
Syr. [ruh-ēh d= nāšā] da= thirā
spirit(fs)-POS.3MS LNK= man LNK= broken.ABS.FS
'the broken spirit of the person' (Peshītta, Sirach 4:2 apud Van Peursen 2007: 232)
As discussed in Section 3.4.3 the absolute state of adjectives in Syriac is typical of their predicative usage, and consequently the adjectival secondary in this construction is normally considered to be a nominal clause without an explicit subject argument, or alternatively a quasi-verbal predicate with a $\emptyset$ exponent of the subject.\footnote{Recall that other nominal predicates, including emphatic state adjectives, require generally in Syriac a mention of the subject in the form of the enclitic personal pronoun. For a discussion of the use of the different states of the adjective, see Goldenberg (1991).} Be that as it may, from the perspective of the overt constituents such examples are parallel to the following Kurmanji pattern:

\begin{align*}
\text{(21) Noun Phrase–Adjective} \\
\text{Kurm.} & \quad [\text{name–Ez.Ms DEM.Dist.Obl man–Obl.Ms Ez.Ms rastin }] \notag \\
& \quad \text{name–Ez.Ms DEM.Dist.Obl man–Obl.Ms Ez.Ms real} \\
& \quad \text{‘that man’s real name’ (Thackston 2006a: 15)}
\end{align*}

Examples such as the above could trigger in NENA the same pivot matching process Cohen describes in JZax. for adoption of the Neo–CSC with nominal and clausal attributes; however in most NENA dialects it does not occur with adjectives. An exceptional dialect in this respect is Arb. which has cases like the following (and see also example (43) on page 297):

\begin{align*}
\text{(22) Noun–Noun} \\
\text{Arb.} & \quad \text{brát-it rubtá} \\
& \quad \text{daughter–Cst big.Fs} \\
& \quad \text{‘the eldest daughter’ (Khan 1999: 229 [Y:109])}
\end{align*}

Note that, similarly to the Syriac construction, but unlike the Kurmanji one, the adjective agrees with the head noun. The discrepancy is not surprising, given that adjectives in Kurmanji cannot inflect.

Acknowledging the exceptional case of Arb., how can the lack of this construction in the majority of dialects be explained? One possible reason may lie in the above mentioned claim that the adjectival attribute in Syriac is a minimal nominal clause, marked as predicate by the absolute state. In NENA, however, the absolute state is no longer productively used, and reduced clauses are in general not possible any more, due to the innovation of a quasi-mandatory copula paradigm (Goldenberg 2000; 2005).\footnote{Occasionally, nominal sentences without a copula are found, typically in introductory clauses (see the Diy. examples in Napiorkowska 2015: 315, §13.3). Such clauses are also reported in the dialect of Tél–Kepe (Coghill, p.c.). See also the apparently asyndetic relative clauses lacking a copula in JZax. example (108) on page 128 or Qar. example (123) on page 162, though their clausal status is debated. As for the disappearance of the absolute state, the situation in NENA can be contrasted with that in WNA, where adjectives can still appear in absolute state (Arnold 1990: 363), and adjectival secondaries following a linker can be found:}
A second reason may lie in the inflecting nature of the Aramaic (indeed Semitic) adjective. In contrast to Kurdish, the Aramaic inflecting adjective can be referential and can stand by its own without an explicit nominal antecedent or linker (see Syr. example (107) on page 75). Thus, cases like Syr. example (20) on page 278 or Arb. example (22) on the previous page are superfluous, both with respect to the multiple-marking (AC marker + agreement), and with respect to the existence of a simpler juxtaposition + agreement pattern. Given that already in Syriac the usage-conditions of the ALC with adjectives are difficult to pin-point (see discussion in Section 3.7.1), it is indeed natural that NENA dialect ousted this construction rather than further grammaticalising it.\footnote{As noted in footnote 24 on page 125, Eran Cohen (p.c.) suggested to me that it is rather constructions like \textit{axōna aw ṭa'w} ‘the older brother’ (=example (97) on page 125), in which the determiner moves to the pre-adjectival position, that replicate the Kurmanji structure. Yet a similar construction existed already in Syriac (see example (109) on page 76).}

We note that in both accounts, internally-motivated developments are more prominent than a possible contact-induced pattern replication scenario, thus blocking the occurrence of this construction in most NENA dialects.

10.3.2.3 Interim Conclusions

While the pattern borrowing hypothesis has merit in its simplicity and apparent elegance, it raises some difficulties in that the Kurmanji pattern is not exactly replicated in most NENA dialects. Indeed, taking a broad cross-dialectal perspective, we can establish parallels with various aspects of the Kurmanji pattern (such as the use of adjectives in Arb., or the relativizer in JUrm.), but no single dialect seems to replicate entirely the Kurmanji pattern. While pattern replication is never expected to be perfect, it raises the question of whether Kurmanji is indeed the sole source language. In some respects, as we saw, the NENA pattern is in fact more similar to the Sorani pattern. Table 10.5 on the next page presents the features discussed above, contrasting 3 NENA dialects, Early J. Cis-Zab NENA (NrT), and the two main Kurdish varieties.

Clearly, there is a functional similarity between the Ezafe marking and the construct state marking, in that both are head-markers of attribution, and a diachronic similarity in that both originated in encliticization.\footnote{The functional similarity has been noted before, for instance by Mengozzi (2005a: 381), and by Mutzafi (2004b: 4, fn. 33).} Cohen (2015: 121ff.) attributes

(i) Noun–Adjective
Ma’l. hanna, ti ipiel
\begin{verbatim}
DEM.MS LNK stingy.ABS
‘he who is stingy’ (Arnold 2006: 16)
\end{verbatim}
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Table 10.5: Comparison of the CSC and ALC across NENA dialects, Syriac and Kurdish. The example numbers refer to a Kurdish example of respective feature. (+) or (-) indicate some reservations discussed in the appropriate section.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N(P) LNK N(P)</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.cst N(P)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNK inflects</td>
<td>(63)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cst inflects</td>
<td>(16)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N(P) LNK Cl.</td>
<td>(60)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.cst rel Cl.</td>
<td>(57)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep.cst N</td>
<td>(13)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj.cst N</td>
<td>(18)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. secondary</td>
<td>(21)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The functional similarity to a specific Kurmanji pivot matching and pattern replication, but a viable alternative is to relate it to a more general phenomenon of areal linguistic convergence favouring head-marking of attributive constructions.

As stated above, the encliticization process itself, while being clearly an innovation in NENA, may be internally motivated, in line with a universal tendency of encliticization of functional elements to preceding hosts, as proposed by Lahiri and Plank (2010: 395). It is rather the re-analysis of the resulting /əd/ segment as a construct state suffix which may need an external impetus. Yet in contact situations like the one discussed here, we cannot in fact reliably rule out one explanation in favour of the other. We concur with Cohen that the Kurmanji pattern probably played a role in the formation of the NENA Neo-CSC. Yet, following the encliticization process, it could also have arisen out of internal analogy with the existing historical construct state marking, or due to contact with other languages of the area exhibiting construct state or head-marking morphology.42 It seems that a reasonable position would be to relate the Neo-CSC to a linguistic feature present in the NENA/Kurdish Sprachbund, namely a preference to head-mark attributive constructions, without relating its source to any specific language.43 Such a position can explain the partial similarities with Kurmanji and Sorani as well as ancient Aramaic strata. One can also go further and propose that the head-marked Iranian construction might have its origin in the original construct state construction of Aramaic (Classical Aramaic or possibly

42These may include Arabic, Syriac or Hebrew in liturgical use, other Iranian languages or Kurdish dialects using the Ezafe construction and even Turkish.

43One may argue that the preference of head-marking is going beyond the nominal domain, since also in the verbal domain we observe a preference for indexing arguments on the verbs rather than marking the arguments by means of case or adpositions.
anterior strata), which was a language of high prestige in the region in antiquity.\textsuperscript{44}

An argument in favour of this more general explanation is the rise of a Neo-CSC in WNA. In these dialects a similar suffixed construct state marker -\textit{il} arose out of the Syriac dative linker construction (see Section 3.6).

\begin{equation}
\text{(23) Noun–Noun}
\begin{align*}
\text{Ma'\textl.} & \quad \text{ber-\textl.} & \quad \text{gabrōn} \\
& \quad \text{daughter-cst} & \quad \text{man} \\
& \quad \text{‘the daughter of the man’ (Arnold 1990: 301)}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

Since WNA was not in contact with any Iranian language (as far as we know) we must conclude that, in this case, the encliticization + reanalysis of the DLC yielding the -\textit{il} suffix were mostly internal processes, possible influenced by the vernacular Arabic dialects, which, however, show construct state marking by stem reduction (and not by suffix). If such influence took place, it was purely a functional one, favouring a head-marked AC, in line with the hypothesis outlined above regarding a general areal preference for head-marking.

\section*{10.4 Development of the genitive prefix}

Following the argumentation in Section 4.4, we treat a \(/d/\) segment preceding certain demonstratives which begin with a glottal stop or a (semi)-vowel as a genitive marker.\textsuperscript{45} In some dialects the justification for such an analysis is clearer, while in others still more research is needed, but as it occurs in quite distinct corners of the NENA speaking-area, it seems reasonable to conclude that it is a cross-NENA phenomenon, representing a possible shared feature of the NENA precursors.\textsuperscript{46}

In Table 10.6 on page 284 we contrast four environments where we find D-marked demonstratives (acting as determiners unless stated otherwise).\textsuperscript{47} The D-markers in the first environment may be analysed either as genitive markers or as linkers, while in

\textsuperscript{44}While at this stage of our knowledge this suggestion is speculative in nature, we note that Middle Persian, in which the Ezafe construction started to stabilize, is contemporary with Classical Aramaic, and was clearly influenced by Aramaic by means of the Pahlavi (Aramaic-based) script. The elucidation of this question, however, is outside the scope of the current research.

\textsuperscript{45}The JZax. interrogative pronoun \textit{ēma} ‘which’, which exhibits the genitive form \textit{dēma} can tentatively be analysed as being composed of a frozen demonstrative pronoun \textit{ē} (identical to the feminine demonstrative pronoun) + interrogative \textit{ma} ‘what’. An alternative analysis in which the \(/d/\) segment is a reflex of the Semitic interrogative *\textit{ay} (cf. BHeb. \(\text{"ay}\)) is less viable due to the presence of the interrogative element \(/\textit{ma}/\), while BHeb. \(\text{"ay}\) normally combines with deictic elements (\(\text{"ay}, \text{"a\textsuperscript{f}p}\) etc.). Be it as it may, we assimilate \textit{ēma} to the category of demonstratives in the current discussion.

\textsuperscript{46}For the possibility that this development represents a wider areal phenomenon, encompassing also Neo-Mandaic, see footnote 37 on page 96.

\textsuperscript{47}Recall that Cohen (2010: 90) identifies the same \textit{d-} prefix as an “attributive” marker of the subordinated copula in JZax. (also Section 5.4.2). However, as similar copular forms in other dialects...
the other 3 environments their analysis as genitive markers is more straightforward, as a linker analysis is hardly tenable (see again Section 4.4):\textsuperscript{48}

1. Following a noun in free state (e.g. JAm. šula d-ēyya sawa’a ‘the job of this dyer’\textsuperscript{49}): Such cases can simply be analysed as instances of the ALC, in which $d\textsuperscript{-}$ serves as a linker.\textsuperscript{50} Of special interest are dialects which exhibit the $N\ d\ N$ construction (see Table 10.1 on page 261), but not the $N\ d\ [\text{DEM}\ N]$ construction (JČal., JIl., Alq. and Qar.),\textsuperscript{51} and, conversely, dialects which do not have $d\textsuperscript{-}$ before nouns but preserve it before demonstrative pronouns (only JSan.).

2. Following a linker (e.g. JZax. ʾōda did $d\text{-}aw\ gōrā$ ‘the room of the man’\textsuperscript{52}): only a handful of dialects (with various linker shapes) show this pattern. Since this pattern exhibits a morpheme serving as a linker, the subsequent $d\text{-}$marker is naturally analysed as a genitive marker.\textsuperscript{53}

3. Following a noun in construct state: the construct state may be marked by an $\sim$\textit{d} suffix (JIl. xabr-$\sim$d a sawa ‘the word of this old man’\textsuperscript{54}), by Ezafe (JSan. $fəsər\text{-}e\ d\text{-}o\ mət$ ‘the pressure of the water’\textsuperscript{55}) or by apocope (JZax. bēs $d\text{-}aw\ gōrə$ ‘the house of the man’\textsuperscript{56}).

4. Following a preposition: the preposition itself may be marked as construct state (Betn. $bd\ d\text{-}avya\ nūrə$ ‘by this fire’\textsuperscript{57}), or not (Betn. $gu\ d\text{-}é\ =\ dānə$ ‘at that time’\textsuperscript{58}).

As in the development of the Neo-$\text{cst}\ ¬d$ suffix, in tracing the development of the genitive prefix $d\text{-}$ we must clearly distinguish between 1) the phonological process are yet to be investigated, we do not include them in the current comparative study.

\textsuperscript{48}Note that a minus mark in the table indicates a lack of a certain construction in the database, but we cannot completely exclude its existence in a given dialect, especially for the less-described dialects.

\textsuperscript{49}Greenblatt 2011: 72.

\textsuperscript{50}The dialects marked by (-) are those in which the available examples include only loan-nouns as primaries, lacking the distinct $\sim$\textit{a} free state suffix, e.g. JZax. $sabab\ d\text{-}o\ ʾīzəla\ dīd\text{-}ax$ ‘the reason of your going’ (=example (80) on page 121).

\textsuperscript{51}In Diy., the latter construction is found, but Napiorkowska (2015: 95) mentions that “the independent relative particle [in fact, the genitive prefix] on its own is not always sufficient to express the genitive [=attributive] relation/possession, .e.g.: ?čtawə $d\text{-}awən$”.

\textsuperscript{52}Example (82) on page 121.

\textsuperscript{53}In Gaz., the genitive marking is not certain in this position; see Gutman (2015c: 316 (22)). In Diy. I have found this pattern only with an independent demonstrative: čtawə ‘$səd\text{-}\ d\text{-}awən$ ‘his book’ (Napiorkowska 2015: 95).

\textsuperscript{54}Example (7) on page 313.

\textsuperscript{55}Example (60) on page 215.

\textsuperscript{56}Example (79) on page 120.

\textsuperscript{57}Mutzafi 2008a: 121 [500].

\textsuperscript{58}Mutzafi 2008a: 120 [354].
### Table 10.6: Distribution of D-marked demonstrative following 1) Free state nouns 2) Linkers 3) Construct state nouns 4) Prepositions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>FREE d+DEM</th>
<th>LNK d+DEM</th>
<th>CST d+DEM</th>
<th>Prep. d+DEM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South-East Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JĆal.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J Ard.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C Ard.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J Amd.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(–)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iran</td>
<td>J Urm.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Iraq</td>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J Koy.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J Sul.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iran</td>
<td>J San.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C San.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ker.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
leading to a retention of the $d$- prefix before the above-mentioned determiners, and 2) the morphological reanalysis of this segment as a genitive marker. Indeed, it is the second stage that may explain the differences in distribution of the genitive prefix in various NENA dialects.

Considering the first stage, recall that the $d$- prefix is retained before those determiners and pronouns that begin either with a weak consonantal onset (typically a glottal stop $ʾ$ but also the semi-vowels $/w/$ and $/y/$) or with a vowel. From an articulatory perspective, all these cases can be considered to be vowel-initial. Thus, a natural hypothesis is to assume that the genitive prefix originated in the Classical Aramaic linker $d$-. As explained above, the linker $d$- of the ALC or DAC could resyllabify with vowel-final primaries for syllabic reasons; yet this resyllabification was blocked whenever the secondary started with a vowel. This tendency may be still operative in some NENA dialects, although exact statistics are hard to gather. As an illustration, in the grammar of JAm., out of the 4 examples given by Greenblatt (2011: 72) representing the ALC, 3 have vowel-initial secondaries.

This explanation readily explains the retention of the $d$- segment before the vowel-initial demonstratives, but it does not provide any reasons for its reanalysis as a genitive marker. Indeed, since the $d$- linker is retained as a proclitic in such a scenario, there is no change whatsoever in the construction: the ALC and the DAC remain the same. This corresponds to the first column of Table 6 on the preceding page (free $d$+DEM), but does not explain the occurrence of the $d$- prefix in the other columns.

A second hypothesis may solve this difficulty. According to this hypothesis, the origin of the genitive $d$- is not in the $d$- linker but rather in the Neo-Ge suffix -$əd$. Given a vowel-initial secondary, the final $/d/$ of the -$əd$ suffix would have tendency to syllabify with the secondary. This would leave, however, a stranding schwa at the end of the primary. Since a schwa in an open syllable is phonologically undesirable (cf. Coghill 2003: 89), the speakers may rearrange the phonological material in two distinct ways:

1. Dropping the schwa altogether.

2. Geminating the final $/d/$ segment, leaving the schwa in a closed syllable.

---

59 An initial glottal stop may in these cases be considered as a phonetic support for the initial vowel, rather than a phonemic segment.

60 See footnote 5 on page 262.

61 The fourth example has a $/t/$-initial secondary, leading to assimilation of the linker to $/t/$.

62 I’m indebted to my supervisor, Eleanor Coghill, for providing me with this idea.

63 This is in line with a general phenomenon of eliding final schwas in some NENA dialects, especially when this does not result in a consonant cluster. See Khan (2002a: 49f.) and Coghill (2003: 88f.).
In either case, we note that the result is the same: The primary can be interpreted as being marked for construct state, either by apocope (first case) or by -əd suffix (second case), followed by the secondary marked by a prefix d-. In the Qaraqosh dialect such a resyllabification is still operative. It is not restricted to determiners, and it happens not only before vowel-initial secondaries, but also before consonant clusters, as the following examples show (=examples (20)–(21) on page 138):

(24) **Noun–Noun**

Qar. ŋal -d= axòna
child(ren) -CST= brother
'children of the brother' (Khan 2002a: 208 [F:3])

(25) **Noun–Noun**

Qar. ʾı́t-ə -də= Šmòni
church-V_CST -CST= S.
'the church of Shmoni' (Khan 2002a: 208 [K:21])

In one example of Qar., we find the gemination of the /d/ segment before an attributive demonstrative, providing the exact environment where it could be reanalysed as a genitive prefix, though this did not seem to happen in Qar. (=example (102) on page 157 with a different gloss):

(26) **Noun–Noun**

b= paqárt-əd= áne ḥawāwín
in= neck-CST GEN(?)= DEM.DIST.PL animals
'on the neck of those animals' (Khan 2002a: 208 [B:72])

In other dialects, where the genitive prefix is better established, we also observe examples of the intermediate stage, where the primary is marked only by a schwa suffix, instead of a full -əd suffix or apocope. This is the case in Barw.:

64It may very well be the case that similar resyllabification processes are operative in other dialects as well, but due to transcript normalisation practised generally by linguists, this is not always evident in the corpus data. The grammars of Khan are exceptional in this respect, in that the transcription strives to reflect the prosodic structure of the language as accurately as possible.

65In Barw. we also find examples of resyllabification of the construct state suffix before the copula, which may be the first stage for the creation of a special subordinated copula, as in JZax. (see Section 5.4.2):

(i) **Noun–Clause**

Barw. kū= duk-ə -t= ила mčθ-ət-ə-li.'
every= place-V_CST -CST= COP.3FS bring-A2MS-P3FS-DAT1SG
'Bring her to me wherever she is.' (Khan 2009a: 82)
Development of the genitive prefix

(27) **Noun–Noun**

Barw. gušādr-ō d-āwwa sūsa
in= chest-cst GEN-DEM,MS horse
‘in the chest of this horse’ (Khan 2008c: 397 [A14:67])

In JUrm. we find this phenomenon with adverbial primaries (=example (81) on page 184):

(28) **Adverbial Noun–Noun**

JUrm. ‘m-qulb-ō d-o gorā
from-stead-cst GEN-DEM,DIST,SG man
‘instead of that man’ (Khan 2008b: 196)

As the above Qar. examples show, the prosodic resyllabification of the /d/ segment with secondaries is not restricted to demonstrative secondaries. Yet only with demonstratives was this segment re-analysed as a genitive prefix, leading in turn to its occurrence in contexts where there was no d- segment initially, such as in the following example (=example (23) on page 99):

(29) **Noun–Noun Phrase**

Barw. gnāy-ūt [tāwra d-o= gōra]
fault-cst ox GEN-DEF,MS= big,MS
‘the fault of the big ox’ (Khan 2008c: 517 [D2:19])

This leads to the following question: Why was the d- segment reanalysed as a genitive marker only before demonstratives? This question is even more pertinent, as the reintroduction of a genitive case marker goes against the above-discussed areal preference of head-marking and the lack of a case system in Aramaic since antiquity. Moreover the fact that this marker is a prefix goes against the cross-linguistic dispreference of prefixes.

One possibility is that the vowel-initial demonstratives occur in high frequency amongst the vowel-initial secondaries. Since the number of these items is quite limited, their appearance with the d- marker is high enough to permit a reanalysis.

Setting aside pure frequency effects, one may seek a structural motivation for reanalysis. Thus, Khan (2009a: 71) suggests that the introduction of the d- segment in these contexts arises from an analogy to the genitive independent pronouns, some of which start with d-. As an example, he shows the analogy between Barw. bethā diy-a

---

66 As noted in footnote 45 on page 282, the interrogative pronoun ēma ‘which’ is analysed here as containing a demonstrative pronoun element ē. Also, we leave aside the question of the d- marked subordinated copula, which has only been clearly analysed as such in JZax. (but see previous footnote).

67 Haspelmath (2011) claims that cross-linguistic generalisations about affixes are problematic due to the difficulty of defining the notion of affix as a comparative concept. Dryer (2015), however, shows how to establish it as a comparative concept and affirms the above mentioned tendency.
and *beβa d-ay*, both meaning ‘her house’. This, however, would seem to explain only the occurrence of *d-* with independent demonstrative pronouns; its co-occurrence with attributive demonstratives would need a further step of analogy.

Another possible source of analogy is language contact. As is shown in Table 10.7, Kurmanji Kurdish possesses a series of oblique demonstratives, which, in contrast to the nominative demonstratives, are consonant initial (Thackston 2006a: 10). We note that, similarly to the NENA demonstratives, the Kurmanji ones function both attributively and independently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NOM</th>
<th>OBL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td><em>vi</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td><em>ev</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td><em>van</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.7: Kurmanji near-deixis demonstratives

Kurmanji oblique case is used for 3 main functions:

1. Marking of complements of verbs, corresponding to an accusative use.\(^{69}\)

2. Marking nominal complements (typically possessors) of Ezafe-marked nominal heads, corresponding to a genitive use.

3. Marking complements of adpositions, corresponding also to a genitive case (at least in the Semitic case-marking languages).

We note that the NENA innovated genitive prefix occurs in functions 2 and 3. In these environments the Kurmanji oblique demonstratives may have served as pivots for the reanalysis of the *d+DEM* complex as a case-marked demonstrative pronoun. The similar syllabic structure of the two elements (CV) may have been a further facilitating factor.

As Cohen (2015: 124) notes, such an hypothesis poses a difficulty, since the NENA *d-* marked demonstratives are not used for complements of verbs, i.e. in an accusative context.\(^{70}\) We may solve this difficulty, however, by assuming that the

\(^{68}\) The series of the far-deixis demonstratives is the same, with the /v/ replaced by /w/.

\(^{69}\) In the past tense, which exhibits an ergative alignment, the ergative argument is marked in the oblique case.

\(^{70}\) An exceptional dialect in this respect is JSan., which does use the *d-* marker to mark complements of verbs; see Section 8.7.4 and in particular example (74) on page 218. In other NENA dialects, the genitive case is sometimes used to mark complements of verbal nouns, i.e. infinitives (cf. Sabar 1976: 37, fn. 8) as well as complex-predicate nouns, but this is in all probability related to the nominal character of these heads.
NENA speakers didn’t generalize the occurrence of the $d$-segment outside its initial domain of appearance, but restricted its reanalysis to the AC domain.

A partial corroboration of the above hypothesis lies in the fact the usage of genitive demonstratives seems to be more restricted in the non-Kurmanji speaking areas (roughly North-East Iraq south of Arbel and West-Iran). Thus, while about 80% of the dialects surveyed in the Kurmanji-speaking area show genitive case after prepositions, this is true only in about half of the dialects in the non-Kurmanji speaking area. Similarly, marking of genitive case after the linker is present only in the Kurmanji-speaking area. Indeed, from Table 10.6 on page 284 we may tentatively conclude that the innovation of the genitive marker as such occurred at first in North-West Iraq, in the heart of the Kurmanji speaking zone, and spread out from there.

### 10.5 Development of alternative linkers

In Section 10.1 we surveyed the distribution of the inherited Syriac linker $d$-. Many dialects, however, exhibit alternative linker forms, which may co-exist or supersede the $d$- linker. Table 10.8 on the following page summarizes the various alternative linkers we find in each dialect. The first column, essentially identical to the first column of Table 10.1 on page 261, states whether the $d$- linker ($/~d/~/d~/-t/$) is found in each dialect before nominal secondaries. The second column gives alternative forms which function as linkers in each given dialect. The third column gives the bases of the independent attributive pronouns (formed as base + possessive suffix, often termed “independent genitive pronouns”), which in some respects can be analysed as linkers (see discussion below).

#### 10.5.1 Bases of independent attributive (genitive) pronouns

Before discussing the forms of the independent attributive pronouns’ bases, we must clarify their relation to the (independent) pronominal linkers. Given a form like did-i, there are two distinct synchronic analyses available:

1. **did-** is a pronominal linker representing a primary; The possessive suffix -i represents a pronominal secondary. This is clearly the case in JZax., where we find examples such as the following (part of example (71) on page 118). To
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>d- linker</th>
<th>Alt. linker</th>
<th>Pronominal base</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South-East Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>did</td>
<td>did-, d- (alt. 2&amp;3pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>did-, d- (2&amp;3pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ad</td>
<td>diy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ad</td>
<td>diy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>əd</td>
<td>diy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JČal.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>əd</td>
<td>did-, d- (1&amp;2pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>diy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>did, (ʔod)</td>
<td>did- (sg), d- (pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAr.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>did- (sg), d- (pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>diy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>diy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>dəd</td>
<td>did- (sg), d- (pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAmd.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>dəd</td>
<td>did- (sg), d- (pl)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>əd</td>
<td>did-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>əd</td>
<td>diy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>əd</td>
<td>did-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iran</td>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ay</td>
<td>did-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>əd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Iraq</td>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>did-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>əd</td>
<td>did-, diy-, d- (alt. 3pers.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>ot</td>
<td>did-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>od</td>
<td>did-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td>did-, d- (alt. 3pers.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>did- (1&amp;2), d- (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>did-, diy-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ker.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.8: Alternative linkers
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clarify the analysis, the two pronominal elements are represented in the literal translation by subscripts.

(30) **Preposition–Pronoun**

JZax. man did-i

from LNK–poss.1sg

‘from mine, lit. from that, which belongs to me’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (5))

2. *did-* is a semantically empty base, present only to enable the possessive suffix -*i* to stand as part of an independent word. In this case we speak of it as a *genitive* base, as the resulting word is the genitive counter-part of the independent (nominative) pronoun *ana* ‘I’. This is the case in JUrm., where we find the following example (=example (83) on page 184):

(31) **Preposition–Pronoun**

JUrm. bo-d did-ew

because-cst= gen–poss.3ms

‘because of him₂’ (Khan 2008b: 192)

*Apriori*, in dialects where the attributive pronominal base and the linker have the same form (ignoring allophony related to stress placement⁷⁴), there is no reason to analyse them as two different morphemes, and the first analysis should be favoured. Thus, in these dialects, the pronominal linker, similarly to other nouns which it replaces, can be followed either by a noun or by a pronominal possessive suffix (see for instance the discussion of the JZax. linker in Section 5.3).

In other dialects, where the form of the linker differs from the attributive bases (such as JUrm., where the linker *ay* is clearly distinct from the pronominal base *did-*), the motivation for such an analytical move is weaker, and the second analysis is probably more appropriate. Indeed, in some of these dialects the independent attributive pronouns occur after construct state marked prepositions or nouns; see JUrm. example (31) on the current page or Barz. example (8) on page 313. As this is atypical for a pronominal linker (see Section 2.3.4), it is a further indication that they should be analysed as separate morphemes semantically bleached of a pronominal primary. The dialectal distribution of this construction is given in Table 11.2 on page 314, and see also discussion in Section 11.2 there.

It should be noted, however, that in predicative position the difference between the two functions (linker vs. genitive) is neutralised, since predicates are in general

---

⁷⁴Thus, *did-* is equivalent to *dæd*, and arguably also *diy-* is equivalent to *d*– with a glide inserted for phonological reasons (see footnote 79 on the following page).
non-referential and thus lack pronominal force. Thus, an independent genitive pronoun, just as a pronominal linker, can appear in predicative position without an explicit primary. This is illustrated in JUrmt. example (84) on page 185 and the following similar Arb. example:

\[(32) \quad \emptyset\text{-Pronoun} \]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Arb.} & \text{kullà } \emptyset \text{ did-ōx } = \text{ ilu.}' \\
& \text{all } \emptyset \text{ GEN-poss.2MS } = \text{ COP.3PL}
\end{array}
\]

'They all belong to you.' (Khan 1999: 220 [S:84])

Considering now the form of these bases, we see that across the NENA dialects they present a coherent form being in general did- or diy- (with the rare exception of Sar. ad-). We can thus safely assume these forms stem back to the NENA precursors. The form did- as a pronominal base is present since antiquity in JBA, where it is usually assumed to be a product of assimilation of the Official Aramaic pronominal base dil-, which is in turn retained in Syriac (Bar-Asher Siegal 2013b: 108). Since no NENA dialects shows the base dil-, we can assume that in this respect the NENA precursors diverged from Syriac and was closer to JBA. As for the form diy-, present especially in Turkey and some Iraqi dialects (as far south as Tel-Kepe), this may result from a further phonetic mutation of did-, or as a phonetic extension of the simple linker d(i)- before possessive suffixes. If the latter view is true, this may mean that the ancestors of these dialects never made use of a did- base, but rather contended with a d- base, identical to the erstwhile linker. Indeed, in many NENA dialects (mostly Jewish) we find that the base d- is also used alongside a did- base, but it is normally restricted to some or all of the plural persons. The reason for this seems to be syllabic: the plural pronominal suffixes are bi-syllabic, while the singular one are mono-syllabic. Using alternatively the d-
and did- bases guarantees bi-syllabicity across the paradigm. This is demonstrated in Table 10.9 with the paradigm from JAm. (Greenblatt 2011: 81), which is identical to the paradigm of JZax. (Cohen 2012: 453) except for the marking of length. A similar system is attested in NrT (Sabar 1976: 135), representing early J. Cis-Zab dialects. This corroborates the idea that the d- linker was available in Proto-Cis-Zab to act as a pronominal basis, and possibly also in other NENA precursors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>did-i</td>
<td>d-eni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2M</td>
<td>did-ux</td>
<td>d-oxun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F</td>
<td>did-ax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3M</td>
<td>did-e</td>
<td>d-obun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3F</td>
<td>did-a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.9: Independent genitive pronouns in JAm. or JZax.

### 10.5.2 The did linker

In a group of dialects in North-West Iraq (JZax., Betn., JAm.), as well as Her., we find that the Syriac d- linker is replaced for the most part by the form did (~dì̄d ~dəd) pre-nominally. In JZax. did also appears alongside d- in its role as a relativizer (as in JAm.), and as a complementizer.\(^81\)

Assuming that the role of did- as a genitive pronominal base is prior to its use as a linker, a natural hypothesis would be that these dialects generalised its use from a pre-suffixal linker to a general linker, capable of appearing before any secondary (nominal as well as clausal). We note, indeed, that in these dialects, there is no reason to analyse the pre-suffixal base and the linker did as two separate morphemes.

Another possibility is to relate the appearance of the did linker to the emergence of the Neo-cst suffix -əd discussed above. As we have noted in the previous chapters, the linker is functionally equivalent to a noun in construct state. With the emergence of the suffix -əd the speakers had the possibility to mark this explicitly by suffixing -əd to the linker itself, yielding /d(ə)/ + /-əd/ = /dəd/~/did/.\(^82\) We note that in all dialects which have the did linker the suffix -əd is highly productive. Further evidence may be alluded by the fact that in Early J. Neo-Aramaic, namely NrT this being

\(^{81}\)This may be true also of Betn. and Her., but I haven’t found such occurrences in the available sources.

\(^{82}\)The form /did/ is found frequently in JZax. Note that /i/ is simply the long counterpart of /s/. In some dialects closed mono-syllabic words are always realised with a long vocalic nucleus (cf. Gutman 2015c: 307, fn. 6). Thus the lengthening of the vowel in did is an automatic phonological process related to the fact that it becomes an independent stress-bearing word.
The closest predecessor of JZax., JAmd. and Betn., the -əd suffix is productive but no did linker is apparent, except as a pre-suffixal basis. Thus, it seems indeed that the development of the -əd suffix pre-dated that appearance of did as an independent linker, at least in the case of the Jewish dialects.\footnote{The form did is also lacking from the Early Christian Neo-Aramaic poetry published by Mengozzi (2002; 2011), where only di-~diy- and dil- are present (see glossary of Mengozzi 2002: 205f). These poems, however, originate in the region of Alqosh, where the did linker did not develop at all.}

The two above explanations are in fact not mutually exclusive but rather complementary. The development of the neo-construct suffix -əd may have eased the integration of the pre-suffixal basis did- as an independent linker, due to its reanalysis as /d+əd/. This may also explain why in these dialects the usage of the original linker form d- has diminished, occurring in some dialects (such as JZax.) predominantly with clausal secondaries.

10.5.3 The ad, od and ʾəd linkers

Both in South-East Turkey and in Iraq we find linkers consisting of a vowel + /-d/. The forms ad and od stem in all probability from the demonstrative + linker construction present in Syriac (see Section 3.4.6). We note that, in Syriac, the pre-linker demonstrative, traditionally termed “correlative”, appears especially (but not exclusively) before clausal secondaries, but in the NENA dialects where such linkers appear they are regularly followed by nominal secondaries. This may hint that the situation in Syriac was rather exceptional compared to the precursors of these NENA dialects.

As for the linker ʾəd, it may result from a phonetic reduction of the former linker forms, or it may be a phonetic variant of the simple linker /d(ə)-/\footnote{See also footnote 2 on page 260}. For the present discussion we leave this question open, and we shall concentrate on the clear forms ad and od.

10.5.3.1 J. Arbel contrasted with C. Barwar

Khan (1999: 224) analyses the Arb. linker ʾot as stemming from ʾo + t ‘the one of’, and Pat-El (2010: 67) relates it to the Syriac construction, explaining it as a “conflation of a Syriac-like *baw d-”. Indeed, the singular (far-deixis) demonstrative pronoun in Arb. is ʾo, with no number distinction (Khan 1999: 85). The emergence of the linker ʾot may be seen as product of the same process leading to the emergence of the Neo-cst -əd suffix, namely resyllabification of d- with the preceding element and their subsequent reanalysis as one morpho-syntactic unit (see Section 10.3.1). In this case, however, a further step of grammaticalisation took place, since the ʾot linker lost the sg number feature associated with the original demonstrative:
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Moreover, *pace* Pat-El, in contrast to the Syriac source construction, the *ʾot* linker does not induce a definite reading on the entire NP, and it can have an indefinite antecedent (possibly with a generic reading):85

Furthermore, in contrast to demonstratives, the linker itself can serve as a generic indefinite head:

Thus, we can conclude that *ʾot* was grammaticalised as a general pronominal linker, losing the grammatical features and semantic weight associated with the original demonstrative pronoun element *ʾo*. This can be contrasted withNrT, representing Early J. Cis-Zab Neo-Aramaic, where the forms *ʾaw-d* and *ʾay-d* can still be analysed as inflecting demonstrative pronouns with a definite semantic value followed by an enclitic -d linker or construct state suffix (see examples (7)–(8) on page 274 and discussion there). A similar situation exists in Barw., where an *ʾo-t* element is clearly segmentable into two distinct elements, an inflecting attributive demonstrative (which we analyse as a definite determiner in Barw.86) and a clitic linker:87

---

85 Such examples, however, are relatively rare, possibly due to the general tendency of attribute constructions to be definite (Haspelmath 1999).
86 See footnote 12 on page 11. Preceding a linker it marks the linker phrase as definite.
87 The /t/ segment is bound phonologically both forward and backward in Khan’s transcription. We assume both the determiner /t/ and the linker t are proclitics.
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(38) **Noun–Noun**
Barw. xón-e diy-e ’o= t= Ninwe’
brother–poss.3ms gen–3ms def.ms lnk= Nı̀nweˈN.
‘His brother from Nineveh’ (Khan 2008c: 493 [A13:3])

(39) **Noun Phrase–Clause**
Barw. yale ’an= t= xal-i
children def.pl= lnk= uncle–poss.1sg
‘The children of my maternal uncle’ (Khan 2008c: 493 (32))

(40) **Noun Phrase–Clause**
Barw. (ʾə́θyɛ-le) came–3ms def.ms man gen–3fs def.ms= lnk= cop.pst.3ms bought–p3fs
‘(He came back,) her husband, the one who had brought her.’ (Khan 2008c: 957 [A12:53])

(41) **Noun–Noun–Clause**
Barw. bráta [d-o= Xáno Lapzérin,’ d-o= t= wewa
daughter gen–def.ms X. L. gen–def.ms= lnk= cop.pst.3ms
bə́nya Dəmdə̀maʒ]
built D.
‘the daughter of that Xano the Golden Hand, who had built Dəmdə̀ma’
(Khan 2008c: 957 [A11:17])

Khan (2009a: 83f.) notes that in Barw. this construction is available only for definite antecedents with non-restrictive relative clauses, while in Arb. the usage of ʾot is generalised to restrictive relative clauses as well. He considers, moreover, the Barw. situation to be “typologically more archaic”.

On the other hand, also in Arb. we find alongside the linker ʾot attributive demonstratives marked by construct state suffix: the plural demonstrative pronoun ļimdi and the singular (near-deixis) demonstrative pronoun ĵyyá. In contrast to the linker they conserve their definite reading:

---

88We find yet another distribution in JSul., where ʾot heads only free (antecedent-less) relative clauses, whether they are definite or not (Khan 2004: 418). Note that the demonstrative pronoun ĵod in JSul. does not carry number or gender features (Khan 2004: 77). For the sporadic use of od in JUrm., see Section 7.2.4.
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(42) **Pronoun–Clause**

Arb. *mindī yāyā-t zwin-ni bāq-āw’ nbil-lu-lleu.*

‘The thing that I bought for her - they took it’ (Khan 1999: 388 [L:408])

(43) **Noun Phrase–Noun Phrase + Clause**

Arb. *simūn, nāś-īt sarāy kul-lū qṭolūn-nu’ ʾinna-t rūww-аkē ʾōd go.imp people-cst S. all-3pl kill.imp-3pl dem.pl-cst great-def lnk did-xūn ʾinna-t itiwē-lu b= sarāy.*

‘Go and kill all the people of the *sarāy* (government office), your great men, who reside in the *sarāy*’ (Khan 1999: 170, 510 [Y:174])

In some NENA dialects, Arb. included, adjectives can be nominalized by means of a demonstrative pronoun:89

(44) **∅–Adjective**

Arb. *ʿō zurtā*

‘the small one’ (Khan 1999: 229 [L:214])

Quite exceptionally in Arb., however, the demonstrative pronoun in this environment is interchangeable with the linker *ʾot*:

(45) **∅–Adjective**

Arb. *ʾot= rabtā*

‘the big one’ (Khan 1999: 230 [B:10])

Indeed, the latter possibility is available in Arb. as part of the general availability in this dialect of having adjectival secondaries following a construct state head (see example (22) on page 279). Yet the similarity with Sorani linker Ezafe construction used to nominalize adjectives (see example (92) on page 248) should not be overlooked. In Barw. a similar construction is also available, but only when the secondary “adjective is extended by an intensifier or by the comparative particle *biš*” (Khan 2008c: 509).

(46) **∅–Adjective Phrase**

Barw. *ʾo =t biš= daqiqa*

‘the one that is thinner’ (Khan 2008c: 509 [B10:49])

89According to my survey, similar patterns exist in JAm., Barw., CArd., Diy., JZax and Qar., and possible more dialects.
This is reminiscent of the situation in Syriac, in which the linker \(d\)- is used especially when preceding multi-word adjective phrases (see discussion in Section 3.7.1).

In Arb., we find rare instances of construct state marked primaries preceding the linker. While these are marginal in Arb., they may represent the first step of a process of grammaticalisation in which the construct state \(-\dot{a}d\) suffix becomes obligatory in ACs, irrespectively of the appearance of the appearance of the \(d\)- linker or a derivative thereof. Synchronically, this may be analysed as an (optional) agreement-in-state pattern between the primary and the linker (see also Section 11.2):

(47) **Noun–Noun**

Arb. jirān-ʾ it ʾ ūt hu lāʾ ē ʾ ŋa ซาqlāwa
neighbour-cst LNK Jews in= Š.
‘the neighbour of the Jews in Shaqlawa’ (Khan 1999: 224 [L:411])

In JKoy., discussed below, this process has gone further.

### 10.5.3.2 J. Koy Sanjaq

The linker \(\dot{o}d\) of JKoy. can similarly be analysed as a grammaticalised combination of the far-deixis demonstrative \(\dot{o}\) + construct state suffix \(-d\). In this dialect the original linker \(d\)- is not used any more. A peculiarity of JKoy. is that the linker often follows a construct state primary, becoming effectively a construct state agreement marker. It can co-occur with (pro)nominal and clausal as well as ordinal secondaries:

(48) **Noun–Pronoun**

JKoy. bel-a ʾ od did-i
house–FREE LNK GEN–1 SG
‘my house’ (Mutzafi 2004a: 62)

(49) **Noun–Noun**

JKoy. b= wāxt-ād ʾ od bāb-ew
in= time–CST Lnk father–poss.3 MS
‘in the time of his father’ (Mutzafi 2004a: 63 [N 8])

(50) **Noun–Clause**

JKoy. māndixān-ād ʾ abe ʾ men Šār
items–CST Lnk want.3 MS from city
‘the items that he wants from town’ (Mutzafi 2004a: 63 [N 6])

(51) **Noun–Ordinal**

JKoy. yarx-ād ʾ od xamšā
month–CST Lnk five
‘the fifth month’ (Mutzafi 2004a: 168)
As in Arb., the linker has lost the definite interpretation associated with the demonstrative, and can head generic-indefinite relative clauses:

(52)  ☞–Clause
JKoy. ʾod šté-le mən yá= má’e damudast mîl-le
LNK drank-3MS from DEM.PROX.SG= water immediately died-3MS
‘whoever drank from this water died immediately’ (Mutzafi 2004a: 63)

In prepositional phrases, furthermore, the linker has entirely lost its pronominal status and has become a pure linker. We note that it can only (optionally) follow construct state marked prepositions, establishing as noted above an agreement-in-state pattern between the prepositional primary and the linker:

(53)  Preposition–Noun/Pronoun
JKoy. gā́w {=ʾod} bela / did-ew
in –CST LNK house GEN-3MS
‘in the house/in him’ (Mutzafi 2004a: 174)

10.5.3.3  J. Barzani

Mutzafi (2004b: 3, fn. 15) mentions the existence of the linker (“independent particle of annexation”) ʾod in this dialect. As the corpus is quite limited, we find only one clear example of its usage with a clausal secondary:90

(54)  Noun–Clause
Barz. Xajoke, ʾod zal-lan šūwá naqle ṯāb-ā-lan
LNK went-1PL seven times asked-P3FS-A1PL
‘Khajoke, to whom we went seven times and asked for her hand’ (Mutzafi 2004b: 4 (7))

Additionally, we find an example with an adjetival secondary. In this case, the usage of the linker seems to be motivated by a contrastive focus on the adjective.

(55)  Noun–Adjective
Barz. (ʾat-wa-li xa xona), xon-i ḫad zora
EX-PST-1SG INDF brother brother-POS.1SG LNK small.MS
‘I had a brother, my youngest brother’ (Mutzafi 2004b: 9 (13))

90There is another example with a ☞ primary in the corpus, yet the translation is a bit strange: ʾod gāwər ʾod hāwe ‘whoever [wishes] to marry or to be [something]’ (Mutzafi 2004b: 6 (31)). An alternative is to understand the word ʾod as the imperative form of the verb wāda ‘to do’ (attested in the corpus), in which case the translation would be ‘make him marry, make him be’. Another theoretical possibility is that ʾod is used in this example as a complementizer, but such a usage is not attested elsewhere in the corpus.
10.5.3.4 Judi-dialects

In the Judi-dialects (in our survey Beṣ. and Gaz.) we find a similar linker *ad* which has almost entirely replaced the simple linker *d-*. 

(56) **Noun–Noun**
Beṣ. suraye *ad* kaldán Christians LNK= Chaldean 'Chaldean Christians' (Sinha 2000: 212 (179))

(57) **Noun–Ordinal**
Beṣ. bayta *ad* tre house LNK= two 'the second house' (Sinha 2000: 169)

(58) **Noun Phrase–Noun**
Gaz. šula zaḥme *ad* d-awa zalame work hard LNK GEN-DEM.MS man ‘the hard work of this man’ (Gutman 2015c: 316 (22))

In these dialects we find a series of determiners (i.e. exclusively attributive demonstratives), all starting with *a-* , presented in Table 10.10 (adapted from Sinha 2000: 73). The linker form *ad* has thus effectively erased all gender/number information, in line with its grammaticalisation as a generalised linker.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>FS</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>áw</td>
<td>áy</td>
<td>án</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.10: Determiners of Judi-Dialects

10.5.3.5 J. Zakho

In JZax. we do not generally find an *ʾod* linker, but rather a *dīd* linker (see Section 10.5.2). In the context of Bible translations, however, the uninflecting form *ʾod* is regularly used as a translational equivalent of the Hebrew relativizer יְהִי אָשֶׁר *āšer* (Sabar 1983: 5; Goldenberg and Zaken 1990: 152)

(59) **Noun–Clause**
JZax. (mpaq-la man) d-ay düka *ʾod* [wēla tāma kutru left-3FS from GEN-DEM.FS place LNK COP.PST.3FS there both kalāsa did-a ʾəmm-a]. daughter_in_law.PL GEN-3FS with-3FS
‘(She left) the place where she was with both her daughters-in-law.’ (Ruth 1:7; Goldenberg and Zaken 1990: 153)

The usage of the form ʾōd may reflect some kind of archaism, as similar (though inflecting) forms are present in Early J. Cis-Zab Neo-Aramaic (see examples (7)–(8) on page 274). Its composite form, moreover, may relate to a meta-linguistic reflection on ăšɛr as a complex form.91 In either case, the non-inflection of ʾōd parallels the fixed nature of ăšɛr, rather than originating in a process of grammaticalisation.

10.5.4 The J. Urmi ay linker

The JUrm. linker ay (see Section 7.3) poses a special problem regarding its origin, as it does not contain any /d/ element. The linker is identical in form with the demonstrative pronoun ay, which Garbell (1965b: 58) lists as an “archaic” variant of the singular proximal demonstrative pronoun ya. Like the JKoy. linker discussed above, most often than not it occurs after construct state marked primaries, in which case the /d/ segment of the construct state suffix re-syllabifies frequently with the linker, giving rise to the form d-ay, reminiscent of the genitive marking of demonstrative pronouns. When this does not happen, it is an indication that ay is indeed the linker, as in the following example (=example (48) on page 177):

(60) Noun–Noun
JUrm. lél-ət ay= xulû
night–CST LNK= wedding
‘the night of the wedding’ (Khan 2008b: 175 [93])

Unlike the demonstrative pronoun, the linker ay does not inflect for number, making it easily identifiable as such after plural primaries, such as ‘children’ in the following example:92

(61) Noun–Noun Phrase
JUrm. dəmm-ə́t ay= [yâl-ət ay gomè]
blood–CST LNK= child(ren)–CST LNK Muslims
‘the blood of the children of the Muslims’ (Khan 2008b: 230 [101])

The demonstrative pronoun origin of the linker leads Khan (2008b: 8) to suggest that it is an “imitation of the Kurdish relational morpheme (izafe), which is demon-

91In fact, the common view today is that ăšɛr is ultimately derived from a construct state form of an Akkadian noun ašru ‘place’ (Klein 1987: 59). Yet its phonetic similarity to the relativizer ʾe–easily leads to the idea that it is a complex form containing the relative (cf. Gesenius 1909: 465, §138, fn. 1).

92Note that, due to the construct state suffix -əd, the morphological plural marking is erased, and the plural meaning is deduced from the textual context.
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strative in origin” closely following the suggestion of Garbell (1965a: 171, §2.32.12). Later on, Khan (2008b: 176) elaborates on this idea, presenting effectively the adoption of the linker as a kind of pattern replication:

It is likely to have developed under the influence of the *izafé* construction in Iranian languages. It appears not to be a direct loan from Iranian, in which the *izafé* is in principle monosyllabic (*e*, *i*, *a*), but rather an imitation of the *izafé* using Aramaic morphological material.

A difficulty, however, with the above proposal is found in the fact that the Ezafe arouse out of a relative pronoun, not a simple demonstrative (Haider and Zwanziger 1984). Moreover, the pronominal origin of the Ezafe is quite old, going back at least to Middle Persian (spoken up to the 7th century) pre-dating the earliest attestation of NENA dialects by a millennium at least.

From a structural viewpoint, as we saw above (Section 10.3.2.1), the Kurdish Ezafe is typically encliticized to the primary, which is rarely the case with the linker *ay* (see example (47) on page 176). Furthermore, in contrast to the Ezafe, the *ay* linker does not introduce a clausal secondary, but instead the relativizer *ki* is used (see also discussion in Subsection 10.3.2.2.2 on page 275). Similarly, adjectival secondaries are not introduced by the linker *ay* (although we do find rare examples in which adjectives follow the homophonous determiner *ay*; see Section 7.3.3 and compare with Subsection 10.3.2.2.5 on page 278). One may wonder also regarding the form of the JUrm. linker: If the JUrm. speakers were indeed to borrow the Ezafe as a demonstrative pronoun element, wouldn’t it be more natural to use the JUrm. demonstrative pronoun *ya* as a pivot, being identical in form to the Kurm. *fs* Ezafe? Considering all these facts, it seems that the association of the *ay* linker to the Iranian Ezafe is hardly justified.93

A possible alternative explanation is to assume that the linker *ay* originated in a compound linker *ay-d*, analogical to the linkers discussed above. Subsequently, due to a phonological reduction, the linker became *ay*. The environment which promoted such a reduction may be exactly the same environment which led to the development of genitive marked demonstratives following the *-əd* suffix (see Section 10.4), as in the following example (=example (86) on page 185):

(62) **Noun–Noun**

JUrm.  *'qayd-*ət  áy  d-d=  tka  
custom–CST  LNK  GEN–DEM. DIST. SG=  place

‘the custom of that place’ (Khan 2008b: 176 [144])

93Garbell (1965a: 171, §2.32.12) notes that in J. Solduz and Šino the Ezafe particle *i* (apparently of Sorani origin) is borrowed, but this does not entail that *ay* is also borrowed, notwithstanding its functional similarity. Note that these localities, in contrast to Urm, are on the border of the Sorani speaking area. Regarding borrowing of the *i* Ezafe see Section 11.4.1.1.
Another minor factor may have been that the conflation of *ay*-d could lead to the form *ād-*āt which is identical to the independent 2sg pronoun. The desire to avoid ambiguity may have played a role in the dropping of the /d/.

Some support for this idea comes from comparing nominalized ordinal numbers. Comparing the following two examples (=example (65) on page 117 and example (65) on page 181), we see that JZax. *ay*-d corresponds closely to JUrm. *ay*:

(63) **Zero–Ordinal**

**JZax.** *ay d= tre*

DEF.FS LNK= two

‘the second one (fs)’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (7))

(64) **Zero–Ordinal**

**JUrm.** *ay arbi*

LNK forty

‘the fortieth’ (Garbell 1965b: 88)

A similar piece of evidence in favour of this account comes from the Bible translation written in the J. Ruwandiz dialect, described by Rees (2008). In this translation, the particle *אַי* is used as a relativizer serving as the translation equivalent of BHeb. relativizer *אֲשֶׁר* (Rees 2008: 27). Recall that in JZax. Bible translations the equivalent of *אֲשֶׁר* is consistently *ʾod*, as described in Section 10.5.3.5. Thus, once again, we see that *ay* corresponds to a DEM+CST combination in JZax. While these similarities are first and foremost functional and distributional, they corroborate the idea that *ay* as a linker (in JUrm.) or a relativizer (in Ruw.) originated in *ay*-d.

10.5.5 **Emerging grammaticalisation of *mārā***

Quite distinct from the linkers that developed from the *d*- linker, in some dialects we find reflexes of the construct state of the Aramaic word *mārā* ‘owner, master’, marking possession of qualities and goods.

(65) **mara–Noun**

**Alq.** *mar= ʾérwe*

owner.CST= sheep

‘sheep owner’ (Coghill 2003: 250)

(66) **mara–Noun**

---

94In contrast to JUrm., it is not used before nominal secondaries. In such context, the Ruw. translation uses consistently the Neo-CST suffix -*ət*, being the translation equivalent of the BHeb. construct state (Rees 2008: 82). Yet Rees (2008: 27) tentatively relates this use of *ay* to JUrm. influence.
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Qar.  gora mari šafqa
       man owner.cst hat
   ‘a man with a hat’ (Khan 2002a: 211)

(67)  Noun–Noun
JZax.  baxta mara/mare pare
       woman owner/owner.cst money
   ‘a woman possessing money’ (Khan 2004: 193)

Cohen (2012: 225) notes that when the secondary denotes a quality, the entire construction is similar to an adjective (similarly indeed to phrases headed by a linker):

(68)  mara–Noun
JZax.  mare qūwəta
       owner strength
   ‘possessor of strength, strong’ (Cohen 2012: 225 (60))

In JZax. we find also an example where mare is followed by an interrogative pronouns:

(69)  mara–Interrogative Pronoun
JZax.  mare mā wē-tən?
       owner what cop-2ms
   ‘What is on your mind’ (Sabar 2002: 210)

In all these dialects mar- has lost its gender inflection, though in Alq. and JSul. it inflects for number. In Qar. and JZax. it is completely invariable. In these expressions mar- keeps to a large extent its original lexical semantics of ownership (clearly so in examples such as JZax. mare bēsa ‘landlord’), so we can not properly speak of a grammaticalisation of mar-. Yet in some respects it shows the first signs of grammaticalisation, such as the loss of its inflectional features, and its usage as a grammatical head of adjectival-like phrases. If its usage became wider and more abstract it might emerge as a new linker.

10.6 Conclusions

In this chapter we traced the development of the various D-markers in NENA dialects. We showed that virtually all the developments involved can be explained by prosodic mechanisms of re-syllabification and cliticization. Yet the grammaticalisation of the resulting segmental material (be it the suffix -əd, the genitive prefix d-, or indeed linkers such as od) needs a further stage of morpho-syntactic re-analysis. It is in this last stage where language contact may play a crucial role. Nonetheless,

---

as we showed in the discussion of the emergence of the Neo-cst suffix -əd (Section 10.3.2), it is quite difficult to pinpoint the influence to a specific model language, due to the profusion of the features of these AC systems throughout the languages of the regions, forming effectively a Sprachbund.

To summarize our claims, we present the following model of development of the different D-markers. The division into stages helps conceptualize the process, but it should not be taken as a strict chronological ordering of the steps involved.

**Stage 1** The d- linker of the Classical Aramaic DAC transforms, by means of encliticization, into the Neo-cst suffix -əd (Section 10.3).

**Stage 2** Due to analogy, the same process occurs to a limited extent with the d- linker of the ALC. In contrast to the DAC, the ALC remains in complementary distribution with the Neo-CSC.

**Stage 3** The -əd suffix procliticizes to vowel-initial secondaries, being reanalysed as a genitive marker before vowel-initial demonstratives, possibly under the influence of Kurmanji (Section 10.4).

**Stage 4** In some dialects, the emergence of the -əd suffix facilitates the generalisation of the pronominal base did- as an independent linker (Section 10.5.2).

**Stage 5** In other dialects, combinations of dem+lnk d- are grammaticalised to become new linkers such as Arb. ot (Section 10.5.3.1) or Gaz. ad (Section 10.5.3.4). In JUrm., the /d/ segment is lost, giving rise to the linker ay (Section 10.5.4).

As we shall in the next chapter, these developments triggered further changes in the attributive systems of the NENA dialects.
Chapter 11

Further Development of Attributive Constructions

In the last chapter we discussed the development of D-marked attributive constructions in NENA dialects. In this chapter we discuss further changes of the AC system, of which only some are related to the D-markers.

The first section deals with the apocopate construct state marking, functionally a variant of the -əd suffix, whose development may reflect both the retention of the historical construct state and innovative forms.

Section 11.2 discusses the re-introduction of various double-marked attributive constructions, following the loss of the DAC discussed in the previous chapter.

Section 11.3 presents a true innovation of NENA, very possible motivated by the influence of contact languages: the introduction of a productive zero-marked juxtaposition construction in the core of the AC system of various dialects.

Section 11.4 discusses further clear cases of contact influence, namely matter replication (borrowing of morphemes) from contact languages, notably the Iranian Ezafe (Section 11.4.1) and subordinator particle (Section 11.4.2).

In lieu of conclusions, we present in Section 11.5 a case study concerning a sub-domain of the AC system, namely nominal modification by ordinals. As we shall see, this sub-system is symptomatic of the entire AC system, as it shows both high variation and uniformity across dialects, model languages and anterior strata.

11.1 Apocopate construct state: retention and renewal

Alongside the innovation of the Neo-cst suffix -əd, discussed in Section 10.3, in many NENA dialects we find nominals marked for construct state by apcope, i.e.
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the omission of their free state suffix, usually -a or -e. The apocope is occasionally extended to a preceding consonantal segment.

Mutzafi (2004b: 3, fn. 15; 2008a: 92) makes a distinction between innovated apocopated construct state nouns (which he terms “Neo-construct”) and retentions of the ancient construct state forms. For example, in Betn. he differentiates between beθ ‘house of’ and be ‘household, family of’, both derived from bela ‘house’ (Mutzafi 2008a: 92). While some couplets can easily be distinguished due to some irregular morpho-phonological processes which took place in the historical form (for instance, from bron ‘son’ we find the innovated construct state bron and the historical construct state bər2), in general it is not always clear what the philological basis for this distinction is. We note, for instance, that Mutzafi (2004b: 3, fn. 15) asserts that nāš ‘people of’ is an innovated construct state form of nāšā, but Mutzafi (2008a: 92) lists it as a “possible old construct form”. Synchronically, moreover, the source of apocope plays no role: If a given dialect allows the regular usage of apocopate construct state nouns, the innovated and historical forms are morpho-syntactically equivalent, with the exception that some historical construct state nouns may only appear as part of lexicalised compounds (see examples (1)–(2) on page 310). Therefore we prefer to subsume the two under one category of apocopate construct state and reserve the term Neo-Construct for the truly innovated suffix -əd discussed in the previous chapter.

The distribution of the apocopate CSC is given in Table 11.1 on the facing page, which should be compared to Table 10.2 on page 264, showing the distribution of the Neo-CSC.

As noted in Section 3.3, the Syriac CSC “tends to be confined to standing phrases verging on compound nouns” (Muraoka 1997: 61). This is in general quite true also for the historical CSC in many NENA dialects, which do not make productive use of the apocopate construct state, but in which we find lexicalised compounds in which the primary is derived from an historical apocopate construct state. For instance, in Qar. and Alq. the historical construct state form bar ‘son of’ is only used as part of some lexicalised compounds (Khan 2002a: 211; Coghill 2003: 251). Note the

1This is of course only possible with nouns which exhibit the free state suffix; unadapted loan-words are thus excluded.
2The latter is the construct state of brā ‘son’, extant in Classical Aramaic, but not used as such in NENA. Diachronically, bron was derived from brā by addition of the diminutive suffix -ona, but in NENA it is the regular form of the noun.
3The situation for this noun is in fact more complex, as the form nāš appears sometimes in various dialects in contexts where a construct state is not regularly expected. In these cases it may represent a retention of the historical absolute state singular form (Khan 1999: 173), or possible a phonological process of final vowel elision, as it is found also in plural use: For instance, in Arb. we find nāš xriwé ‘bad people’ (Khan 1999: 229 [B:13]), and in JZax. ʾan nāš ʾimmé ‘the people with him’ (Cohen 2012: 117 (112)) (=example (13) on page 104).
4In these dialects bar does not represent a separate noun at all, and consequently it is not syn-

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Primaries</th>
<th>Secondaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noun</td>
<td>Adj.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JČal.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JArd.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAmd.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iran</td>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Iraq</td>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.1: Distribution of apocopate construct state excluding compounds. (-) marks dialects where only a handful of nouns can act as primaries.
varying degree of lexicalization as manifested by the plural marking: In example (1) it is phrase final, while in example (2) it is also marked on the primary.

(1) Noun–Noun
Alq. bar- zar-a, bar- zar-ә
    son.cst- crop-sg son.cst- crop-pl
‘seed, seeds’ (Coghill 2003: 251)

(2) Noun–Noun
Alq. bar- nāš-a, bne- nāš-ә
    son.sg.cst- man-sg son.pl.cst- man-pl
‘human, humans’ (Coghill 2003: 251)

Such compounds are fixed phrases forming one conceptual unit, and the secondary is normally non-referential. Therefore, they cannot be considered as true productive ACs, and they are excluded from Table 11.1.5

Other dialects allow additionally a semi-lexicalised usage of the historical apocopate construct state. In these cases only a handful of nouns can act as primaries (typically kinship nouns such as bar ‘son of’,6 and the construct state noun be ‘house of’), but the secondary is referential (example (4)=example (33) on page 209).7

(3) Noun–Noun
CSan. yoḥana bar ‘am-ī
    Y. son.cst uncle-poss.1sg
‘my cousin John’ (Panoussi 1990: 125 (7))

(4) Noun–Noun
JSan. be= kalda
    house.cst= bride
‘house/family of the bride’ (Khan 2009b: 201)

chronically in construct state. Yet we gloss it as such for the clarity of exposition.

5 For more information about compounds in Neo-Aramaic see Gutman (2014).

6 Contrast with the usage of bron, which we find also as a grammatical head, but indicating age and not kinship (=example (11) on page 168):

(i) Noun–Noun
JUrm. bron [ičči šinne]
    son.cst sixty years
‘a man 60 years old’ (Garbell 1965b: 86)

For a kinship use of bron, see example (6) on page 312.

7 Maclean (1895: 27–34, §16.(ii)) gives an extensive list of such expressions, including fixed compounds.
11.1. Apocopate construct state: retention and renewal

The last usage is also attested in Early J. Neo-Aramaic:

(5) **Noun–Noun**

NrT יishə’āl
bē yisra’ēl
house.cst I.
‘the people of Israel’ (*Pساط Wayhī Bṣallāḥ* 1:25, Sabar 1976: 38; see there fn. 16)

Dialects which allow only such cases are marked with (−) in Table 11.1.8

However, even dialects which permit a productive use of apocope for marking construct state primaries (+ marking in the Table 11.1) make in fact a quite limited use of this possibility, both in terms of frequency and in terms of categorial diversity of primary and secondary. As Table 11.1 shows, most dialects allow only N+N combinations in this construction, which is less extensive than the Syriac usage, which allowed also adjectival and infinitival primaries. The extension to clausal secondaries, a clear innovation, is attested only in JZax. and the closely related JAmd. dialect. Indeed, it seems that only JZax. generalised the usage of the apocopate construct state marking to be completely equivalent to the suffixed construct state marking. It is probably no coincidence that also the suffixed construct state marking is the most extensive in this dialect, as shown in Table 10.2 on page 264.9

How can the renaissance of apocopate construct state marking in JZax. and neighbouring dialects be explained? Judging by NrT, the apocopate construct state is hardly available in the Early Jewish Cis-Zab Neo-Aramaic, example (5) on this page being typical.10 As in NrT the suffixed construct state marker is highly productive, we can tentatively conclude that the apocopate construct state is a recent innovation, appearing after the innovation of the -əd suffix as marker of construct state, rather than being a retention of the historical apocopate construct state. Moreover, the occurrences of the historical construct state cannot account for the renewal of this marking type, as they are constrained to specific expressions, and also since they often exhibit an irregular morphology, as the form be (construct state of besa ‘house’) shows.

---

8 Some dialects which are marked with + may in fact fall into this category, as the table is generally based on the explicit statement of such a limitation in the respective grammars.

9 The data may contain a certain bias towards the JZax. data, as the attributive relation has been specifically investigated in this dialect by Cohen (2010; 2012: ch. 2). Yet, at least amongst the well documented dialects, it is clear that no dialect matches its extensive usage of construct state-marking, both suffixed and apocopate.

10 One may doubt whether NrT is truly representative in this respect. Yet, since we do not have other J. NENA sources of this time, and since in general the dialect is quite similar to an archaic form of JZax., we regard this corpus tentatively as an approximation of the precursor of JZax. Note also that Sabar (2002) writes that NrT “may be considered ‘classical’ JNA” [=J. Cis-Zab Neo-Aramaic].
Additionally, we can relate the renewed apocopate marking to the innovation of the genitive marking, discussed in Section 10.4. Recall that the development of the genitive prefix involved a resyllabification of the -əd suffix with a vowel-initial determiner, sometimes leaving behind a bare primary, without any suffix at all, as in the following Barw. example:

(6) Noun–Noun
Barw. brōn = d-o = naša
son.CST GEN-DEF.MS= man
‘the son of that man’ (Khan 2008c: 400 [A9:2])

After the d- prefix was reanalysed as a genitive marker, the bare form of the primary could have been reanalysed as a construct state form equivalent to the suffixed form bron-əd, and could consequently also occur without a genitive prefix following it. This hypothesis is corroborated by the fact that all those dialects that developed a productive apocopate construct state marking have also developed a genitive prefix, as is clear from comparing Table 11.1 on page 309 and Table 10.6 on page 284. Moreover, this explains why most dialects restrict this development to N+N combinations.

Be the source of the apocopate CSC as it may, it is clear, however, that the dialect of JZax., and possibly also JAmd., went one step further, as they extended the usage of the apocopate construct state marking to more contexts, most notably clausal secondaries. In the context of JZax., the latter development may be explained by the innovation of a d- marked subordinate copula, mirroring the d- marked genitive demonstrative pronouns in the clausal domain (see Section 5.4.2; also Cohen 2010: 90; 2012: 119ff.). As a consequence, the domain of usage of the apocopate construct state was extended and levelled by analogy with the usage domain of the suffixed construct state. As no neighbouring language shows a similar construct state marking, we must conclude that this was an internal development specific to JZax. and possibly neighbouring J. Cis-Zab dialects.

11.2 Re-development of double marking

In Section 10.3.1 we asserted that the Neo-CSC was preferred to the DAC by the force of economy, since single head-marking is preferable to double-marking of head and dependent. Countering the force of economy is the force of clarity, which leads
to a preference for more elaborate structures in order to ensure the correct transfer of the linguistic message. As is well known, these two forces shape language and cause cyclic changes in which marking is reduced and then re-introduced in another shape. The NENA AC domain is no exception, as we observe the re-emergence of double-marked constructions.\textsuperscript{12} Table 11.2 on the next page shows some possibilities of double marking of (pro)nominal secondaries following a construct state marked primary.

One type of double marking is the genitive case marking, which, by the very nature of case marking, marks the attributive relation on the secondary independently of the marking of the primary. Yet in NENA the genitive case is normally not enough to instantiate an attributive relation, and therefore it appears typically alongside a construct state marked primary. One class of such genitive double marking is the \textit{d-} prefix that appears on demonstrative pronouns (pre-nominal and independent), whose distribution is shown in the first column of Table 11.2 on the following page. The development of this double marking has been discussed in Section 10.4.\textsuperscript{13} Here one example should suffice:

\begin{enumerate}[label=(\arabic*)]
\item \textbf{Noun–Noun}
\begin{verbatim}
Jil. xabーレ d-a sawa
word-CST GEN-DEM old_man
\end{verbatim}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{quote}
\texttt{Noun–Noun}\\
\texttt{Jil. xabr-əd d-a sawa}\\
\texttt{word-CST GEN-DEM old man}\\
\texttt{‘the word of this old man’ (Fox 1997: 60)}
\end{quote}

Another class of genitive double marking is the use of independent attributive pronouns (e.g. \textit{did-i}~\textit{diy-i}) after construct state nouns, as shown in the second column of Table 11.2. As discussed in Section 10.5.1, such pronouns can be analysed either as \texttt{LNK+POSS} or as \texttt{GEN+POSS}. In the latter case, we expect them to follow construct state nouns, which is indeed the case for many dialects.

\begin{enumerate}[label=(\arabic*)]
\item \textbf{Noun–Pronoun}
\begin{verbatim}
Barz. yāl-{əd} did-i
child(ren)-CST GEN-POSS.1SG
\end{verbatim}
\end{enumerate}

\begin{quote}
\texttt{Noun–Pronoun}\\
\texttt{Barz. yāl-{əd} did-i}\\
\texttt{child(ren)-CST GEN-POSS.1SG}\\
\texttt{‘my children’ (Mutzaft 2002a: 66f.)}
\end{quote}

It is worthwhile noting that, with the exception of two dialects (JAm. and Betn.), the base \textit{did-} is not used in such dialects as a linker (see Table 10.8 on page 290), which is coherent with the idea that it has been reanalysed as a genitive base, bleached of a pronominal reference.

The two exceptional dialects (JAm. and Betn.) are amongst those dialects which

\textsuperscript{12}Structurally, however, the NENA double-marking differs from the Classical Aramaic construction. In the Syriac DAC, the primary was marked by a pronoun indexing the secondary, while in the NENA double constructions, the primary is marked by a construct state marker.

\textsuperscript{13}Note that the first column of Table 11.2 is identical to the third column of Table 10.6 on page 284.
### Table 11.2: Double marked ACs. 

(-) = rare/doubtful occurrences; (Cl) = marginally occurring with clausal secondaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Secondary marking after CST primaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GEN-DEM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South-East Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JÇal.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JArd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAmd.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iran</td>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Iraq</td>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
present a more profound structural change, namely they allow the independent linker itself (with nominal or pronominal secondaries) to occur after a construct state noun, against the logic of Classical Semitic languages, in which the linker is supposed to be in apposition with a free state noun (see Section 2.3.4.)

(9) Noun–Noun
JAm. dar-ət dəd xaye
tree-CST LNK life
‘the Tree of Life’ (Greenblatt 2011: 73)

Consequently, the following example, while being formally similar to example (8), is analysed differently, in that did- is understood as a linker and not as a genitive marker.

(10) Noun–Pronoun
JAm. beθ-əd did-i
house-CST LNK- POSS. 1sg
‘my house’ (Greenblatt 2011: 81)

The occurrence of this construction with nominal secondaries is presented in the third and fourth columns of Table 11.2. As the table shows, it occurs regularly also in JUrm. (see Section 7.3.1) and in JKoy. (see examples (49)–(51) on page 298).

In these dialects it is difficult to analyse the linker as a genitive exponent, since it is sometimes followed by a separate genitive morpheme, as the following example shows.

(11) Noun–Noun
Betn. ṃāy-əd did d-ê kθēθa
water-CST LNK GEN- DEM chicken
‘the broth of that chicken’ (Mutzafi 2008a: 42 [548])

It seems rather that these dialects have generalised the usage of construct state marking to occur also before the linker, against the above mentioned logic of Classical Semitic languages. We note that in the dialects in which this is especially prominent, namely JUrm. and JKoy., the linker is very probably derived from an erstwhile CST-marked demonstrative pronoun (see Section 10.5.3 and Section 10.5.4) standing in apposition to the primary. Moreover, in Betn., JAm. and JKoy. the linker has a visible construct state form, as it ends with -əd--d. It seems, therefore, that these dialects have developed an agreement-in-state pattern, in which two nominal elements in apposition can optionally agree in their construct state marking. This is especially plausible in JUrm. in which we see that two asyndetically coordinated nouns agree in state (see example (8) on page 168), considering that asyndetic coordination is formally similar to apposition.
Sporadic evidence of this construction is found also in Arb. (see example (47) on page 298), Qar. (see Section 6.4.1), Alq., and Barw. In these dialects this construction can at least partly be explained as resulting from some kind of *lapsus* or hesitation in speech, as in the following example.

(12) **Noun–Noun**
Barw. qúww-ət ... t= 'urusnāye'
force-cst ... lnk= Russians
‘the force ... of the Russians’ (Khan 2008c: 399 [B7:8])

Indeed, even in Syriac we find rare occurrences of a similar construction with apocryphal construct state, which are normally explained as errors (see example (35) on page 53 and the accompanying discussion).

Two dialects of Turkey, namely Beš. and JČal. restrict this construction to occur only with clausal secondaries (Beš. and JČal.).

(13) **Noun–Clause**
Beš. m= qam d-ayyá sāhadut-əd d= wəd-la
from= before gen-dem testimony-cst lnk= made-3fs
‘because of this sacrifice (lit. testimony) she made’ (Sinha 2000: 212 [186])

In this case we may tentatively relate this to the Kurm. pattern, where a clause is introduced both by the Ezafe and the relativizer (see Section 9.3.8). Yet the rarity of the construction in these dialects does not permit us to state this with certitude.

However, in other dialects we find direct evidence of such a relation, as a borrowed relativizer is used on top of a construct state marked primary or a linker (see for instance JKoy. example (51) on page 332 and Sar. example (55) on page 333). The distribution of this construction is shown in the fifth column of Table 11.2 on page 314. This development may be seen as a case of pattern-cum-matter replication of the relativizers, which in the source languages (Kurm., Sor. and possible Per.) appear regularly after an Ezafe morpheme, paralleling the linker or the construct state marking (see Section 11.4.2). This development, moreover, may have had an indirect influence on the development of \textit{cst+lnk} construction discussed above, as the relativizer may have been perceived as the pre-clausal counterpart of the linker.

11.3 Loss of all marking: Juxtaposition constructions

In various dialects we find ACs that are not marked at all. The primary and secondary are simply juxtaposed one after the other. We consider here cases of Noun + Noun

\[14\] I am grateful for Eran Cohen for this idea.
and Noun + Clause. The distribution of these constructions is presented in Table 11.3 on the following page, which shows that these constructions are often limited to a certain grammatical domain. In all cases, we must consider two main scenarios for the emergence of these constructions: The construction may originate in the loss of previous markers (for phonological or morphological reasons), or the construction as such may be innovated or borrowed into the language.

11.3.1 Clausal secondaries

Clausal secondaries juxtaposed to their primaries are typically called asyndetic relative clauses. As Table 11.3 shows, in the majority of dialects this construction is restricted to cases where the antecedent noun is indefinite. The following is a typical example:

(14) Noun–Clause

Barw. ʾiθ-waˈ ex= rabban, tīw- wu= xa= gəppiθa.

‘There was once a monk who lived in a cave.’ (Khan 2008c: 961 [A15:1])

This example presents a typical usage situation of an asyndetic relative clause: The antecedent is introduced by the particle of existence and an indefinite determiner, and subsequently qualified by a clause. In such cases one may reasonably doubt the validity of the relative clause analysis, as an alternative analysis in terms of two separate clauses is viable as well (‘There was once a monk. He lived in a cave.’). Thus, the relative wide distribution of this construction should be taken with a grain of salt, as in some cases the examples can be disputed. Paradoxically, the less-disputable cases are those where the secondary is a reduced clause, as these cannot occur as matrix clauses; see JZax. example (108) on page 128 and Qar. example (123) on page 162.

Cohen (2012: 138) raises the possibility that these constructions are a replication of an Arabic pattern. Indeed, Arabic innovated a pattern in which asyndetic relative clauses can occur after indefinite nouns (Badawi, Carter, and Gully 2004: 494; for the historical development see Pat-El 2014). This idea is corroborated by the fact that most of the dialects which exhibit this construction are located in Iraq, at most 100km away from the Arabic–speaking urban center of Mosul. We may similarly

---

15 We exclude adjectival secondaries, since these are normally marked by agreement of the adjective with the primary noun. While some loan-adjectives do not inflect, and thus attach to the noun in a pure juxtaposition construction, this is better seen as lexical property of these adjectives rather than the emergence of a new AC strategy.

16 It should be noted that even in those dialects marked as INDF exceptions to the rule may occur.

17 Paradoxically, the less-disputable cases are those where the secondary is a reduced clause, as these cannot occur as matrix clauses; see JZax. example (108) on page 128 and Qar. example (123) on page 162.

18 The Jewish NENA speakers of the region had regular contacts with the Jewish community of Mosul, which was predominantly Arabic speaking but also bilingual NENA–speaking Jews originating in Kurdistan (Sabar 1976: XXV; 1984a; 1990: 54). Moreover, in the region we find also other Arabic speaking Jewish communities; see the map of Jastrow (1990: 4)
### Table 11.3: Distribution of juxtaposition constructions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Secondary Noun</th>
<th>Secondary Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South-East Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td>(+)</td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JÇal.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td></td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAr.</td>
<td></td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAmd.</td>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td></td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iran</td>
<td>JUr.</td>
<td>Q</td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Iraq</td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td>(-)</td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>Q’</td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>INDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q = quantification primaries; INDF = indefinite primaries.
11.3. Loss of all marking: Juxtaposition constructions

assume there were connections between the speakers of JUrm. and the J. communities in Iraq.\(^{19}\) As for the C. Her. dialect in Turkey, this was in close geographical proximity to an Arabic vernacular.

Yet Arabic is not the only possible source. An alternative source may be a Sorani construction, in which the primary is marked by an -êk suffix before a clausal secondary (this suffix is often reduced to ê, but is clearly distinct from the Ezafe -i). The secondary may furthermore be marked by the relativizer ke, but this is not always the case.

As discussed in Section 9.6, the -êk suffix is identical to the indefinite suffix, and may very well be historically related to it, although synchronically it does not convey an indefinite sense (i.e. the primary may be definite). If we assume that in a prior stage of the language it was simply the indefinite marker, we get the following formal construction: N-INDF {REL} Clause. Since the relativizer is optional to some extent, it is easy to see how this construction could be the source of the NENA construction. Furthermore, even if the -êk was never functionally identical to the indefinite suffix (or cognate with it), a speaker of NENA with knowledge of Sorani might mistakenly analyse it as the indefinite suffix, leading effectively to the same kind of contact influence.

Since not all NENA dialects which exhibit this construction are in direct contact with Sorani, for this hypothesis to be correct, at least some dialects must have developed this construction by propagation through another NENA dialect. As we saw above, this may also be true (to a lesser extent) if the source is Arabic.

A difficulty is presented by those dialects which do not restrict the use of asyndetic relative clauses to indefinite primaries, but allow it also with definite primaries, as in the following Jilu example:

\[(15) \quad \textbf{Noun–Clause} \]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Jil.} & \quad \text{ไกล-ลิ  o  นาชา ค่ม เมื่อ-ลิ ที่มัล} \\
& \quad \text{saw-1SG DEF.MS man PST hit.A3MS-P1SG yesterday} \\
& \quad \text{‘I saw the man that hit me yesterday.’ (Fox 1997: 81)}
\end{align*}
\]

In JSan. (see examples (14)–(15) on page 203) this may be understood as part of the larger tendency to omit all AC markers in this dialect (see Section 11.3.2.2). In the other dialects, mostly present in Turkey with the exception of JAmd., the source of this generalised construction is not clear. It should be noted, moreover, that amongst these dialects, only Boh. makes use of the generalised juxtaposition construction regularly and extensively. Since the speakers of Boh. lived through several stages of immigration, and came in contact with various languages (Fox 2009: 3–5), the exact

\(^{19}\) As anecdotal evidence I can mention the case of Rabbi Ḥaim Yeshurun, whom I interviewed in Israel, who moved from Nerwa to Urmì around 1940.
source (and time of appearance) of this construction is difficult to pinpoint.\footnote{20 For instance, currently Boh. speakers reside in Russia, and speak Russian as well. As some varieties of Russian allow asyndetic relative clauses (Murelli 2011: 397), this could theoretically be the source of the construction in Boh.}

11.3.2 Nominal secondaries

11.3.2.1 Quantification expressions

With nominal secondaries, the juxtaposition construction is less common in NENA. Here again, we have to identify a special sub-type which reoccurs in several dialects, namely the case where the primary quantifies the secondary, as in the following examples:

(16) Q. Noun Phrase–Noun
Barw. \[xa\] = \[rešā\] tuma
\[one\] = \[head garlic\]
‘one head of garlic’ (Khan 2008c: 494 [B10:19])

(17) Q. Noun Phrase–Noun
Arb. \[tré\] tannakèˈtins\[xīṭṭeˈgrain\]
‘two tins of grain’ (Khan 1999: 239 [B:116])

These cases are in the borderline of the AC domain, as semantically the secondary is in fact the head of the expression (see discussion in Section 7.7.2). Syntactically, we may prefer to analyse the primary as a phrasal extension of the quantifier slot, which we assume is generally available in the NENA NP (see discussion in Section 1.3 and Table 1.2 on page 12). Given such an analysis, it is no surprise that no AC marking is found.

Another possibility is to relate it to the Classical Arabic \(\text{تَمْيَزّ}\) tamyīż construction, in which a counted or measured noun appears in the accusative, rather than genitive, case (Schulz 2004: 157). In Classical Arabic this construction is also used for the specification of material, and indeed, we find the last usage also in sporadic examples of NENA:

(18) Noun–Noun (material)
Arb. Ŝiqilyê dehwàˈrings  gold
‘rings of gold’ (Khan 1999: 239 [L:466])
While a direct influence of Classical Arabic on NENA might seem implausible,\(^{21}\) the classical construction may have been mediated through the vernacular Iraqi Arabic dialect, which lost case markings but retained the general structure of this construction (though allowing optional marking of construct state on the primary).

(19) **Q. Noun–Noun**

Iraq. \(\text{ḥafna}-\{t\}\) timman
handful–{fs,cst} rice
‘a handful of rice’ (Erwin 2004: 375)

(20) **Noun–Noun (material)**

Iraq. \(\text{sā'a}\) ȩdāhab
watch gold
‘a gold watch’ (Erwin 2004: 375)

Alternatively, we may postulate this as a common Semitic feature, which is preserved in NENA although not present in Syriac.\(^{22}\)

Yet an alternative motivation is the fact that in some Kurdish dialects we also find the juxtaposition construction expressing quantification (the “partitive relation” of MacKenzie 1961: 63f.). As discussed in Section 9.7.1, in Kurmanji dialects this usage seems to be quite limited, while in Sorani dialects it is widespread. The following example is from the dialect of Sulemaniyya (=example (109) on page 253):

(21) **Q. Noun Phrase–Noun**

KSul. \([\text{yek} hēgbe]\) pare
one bag money
‘a bag of money’ (MacKenzie 1961: 63 [29])

Thus, this construction may reflect an areal phenomenon rather than a specifically Semitic heritage.

### 11.3.2.2 General usage

A more general usage of the juxtaposition construction is found in two regions: Turkey and the Iraqi–Iranian border area (that is, outside the historical core of the NENA dialects). In Turkey, only Boh. seems to use this construction regularly, in alternation with D-markers:

\(^{21}\)One cannot completely rule out an influence of written Arabic on NENA, as the Early J. NENA homilies available to us (NrT) might have been redacted from Judeo-Arabic sources (Sabar 1984a: 201). Be it as it may, Sabar (1984a: 202) notes that the Arabic elements in these texts belong to the northern Iraqi qeltu dialects, which are of course different from the standard Classical Arabic.

\(^{22}\)It is interesting to note that we find similar construction in Modern Hebrew. Thus, we find the ubiquitous colloquial example נָמָּה פַּלַּאֵפֶל mana falafel ‘one portion of falafel’, in which no construct state marking is present.
(22) **Noun–Noun**
Boh.  
\[\text{tara gumota} \]
\[\text{door stables} \]
\[\text{‘the door of the stables’} \] (Fox 2009: 93)

Fox (2009: 92) postulates that this construction “may be the result of complete assimilation followed by simplification of the resulting geminate cluster: \(*\text{tarədgumota} > *\text{tarəg gumota} > \text{tara gumota}.*\) The difficulty with this explanation is that it does not explain the restoration of the Aramaic free state suffix -a. One may try to save this explanation by suggesting that the d marker assimilated to the following consonant when it was still procliticized to the secondary (i.e. before the emergence of the construct state suffix -əd), yet it is unclear why this happened specifically in this dialect. Given the complex immigration history of the Bohtan speakers (see end of Section 11.3.1 on page 320) we cannot preclude some unknown language contact motivating this construction.

In the other NENA dialects of Turkey, the construction is quite limited: In JČal. we find it in a few expressions (notably yoma šapsa ‘the Sabbath day’), and in Her. it occurs only when the primary is a loan-noun without an Aramaic inflectional ending. In the latter dialect, given that many of the Her. examples given by Jastrow (1988: 26) have primaries of Arabic origin, such as the following example, it may be more specifically a matter-cum-pattern replication of the Arabic CSC, in which the primary is normally left unaltered (unless it is a feminine noun).

(23) **Noun–Noun**
Her.  
\[\text{šekl ḫa zalama} \]
\[\text{appearance INDF man} \]
\[\text{‘the appearance of a man’} \] (Jastrow 1988: 26 [576])

A productive and extensive usage of the juxtaposition construction is found in our survey only in JSul. and JSan. in the Iraqi-Iranian border area. In Iraq we find this construction also in Diy., but apparently only with the primary šəmma ‘name’:

(i) **Noun–Noun**
Diy.  
\[\text{šəmma sawun-i} \]
\[\text{name grandfather-poss.1sg} \]
\[\text{‘my grandfather’s name’} \] (Napiorkowska 2015: 315)
cannot be analysed any more as designating the free state.

(24) Noun–Noun
JrSe. šəmma brona
name son
‘the name of the boy’ (Khan 2004: 192)

(25) Noun–Noun
JrSe. brona mələk
son king
‘the son of the king’ (Khan 2007: 202)

It is not entirely clear how this construction developed. The limited geographical extent of this constructions points to a language contact origin, possibly from Sorani. Indeed, Khan (2007: 202) suggests that this construction results from the identification of the compounding Ezafe -e (see Section 9.5) with the Aramaic inflectional ending -a.24 Thus, he compares example (25) on the current page with the following KSe. example:

(26) Noun–Noun
KSe. kuř-e- paşa
son-ez- king
‘the king’s son’ (MacKenzie 1961: 64 [25])

This idea, however, poses some difficulties. First, as discussed in Section 9.5, the compounding Ezafe creates a nominal compound consisting of the two members of the construction. Consequently, the bond between the two members cannot be interrupted by other grammatical elements. For instance, a demonstrative pronoun can envelop such a phrase, but not intervene in the middle, judging by the examples at my disposal:

(27) Noun–Noun
Se. Nam əzê- baş-é
em [hotêl-e- baş]-é
dem.prox hotel-ez- good-dem
‘this good hotel’ (Thackston 2006b: 11)

In JrSe., by contrast, we find intervening demonstrative pronouns and even complex secondaries, as in the following example:

(28) Noun–Noun Phrase

24Both are pronounced [æ]. The difference in transcription results from our decision to use the Kurdish Latinized orthography for Kurdish dialects (see footnote 2 on page 224).
Another difficulty relates to the fact that the compounding Ezafe itself is not borrowed in JSul., nor in JSan. If it were borrowed, we would expect it to appear on non-Aramaic loan-words (which normally lack an Aramaic inflectional ending) acting as primaries, but this is not the case. A scenario in which the Aramaic inflection ending is confounded with Ezafe seems implausible without the borrowing of the actual morpheme.

One could assume that the Ezafe was quickly reanalysed as $\emptyset$ marking in the NENA dialects concerned, and then extended to nouns not ending in $-a$. Yet in this case we have to assume that the borrowed morpheme did not leave any trace. In fact, the compounding Ezafe is omitted following nouns ending in some vowels, such as $[a]$ or $[e]$ (MacKenzie 1961: 64). This means that, even if it was borrowed and used following a native Aramaic noun, it was realised as a $\emptyset$ rather than confounded with the Aramaic inflectional ending. This would provide an easy explanation for the juxtaposition construction used with plural primaries ending in $-e$:

(29) **Noun–Noun**
JSul. bate Šlomo
houses Š.
‘the houses of Shlomo’ (Khan 2004: 192)

Yet an alternative and arguably simpler hypothesis is to directly relate the NENA juxtaposition construction to a similar unmarked construction which is extant in some Sorani dialects, in particular War., which is geographically close to Sulemaniyya.\(^{25}\) This is shown in the following example (example (108) on page 253):

(30) **Noun–Noun**
War. meł Ḥacî
house Ḥ.
‘the house of Haji’ (MacKenzie 1961: 62, fn. 2 [246])

Such cases, if frequent enough, may provide a seed for the juxtaposition construction in JSul., without positing a borrowing and reanalysis of the compounding Ezafe as equivalent to the Aramaic free state ending, though such a possibility cannot be completely excluded.

\(^{25}\)The War. juxtaposition construction seems to be most frequent with primaries marked by the indefinite suffix $-êk$ (MacKenzie 1961: 62, fn. 2), which may in some contexts replace the Ezafe (see Section 9.6, but it does not exclude unmarked definite primaries.)
On a broader view, as mentioned in Section 9.7, the juxtaposition construction is possibly an areal phenomenon, as it also attested in Gorani and in Persian. These languages may more easily account for the existence of the juxtaposition construction in JSan., due to their closer geographical proximity to the latter dialect.

### 11.4 Matter replication

The constructions discussed above all make use of native Aramaic morphemic material, irrespective of the question of whether the development of these structures was influenced by language contact. In some dialects, however, we see clear "borrowing" of morphemic material from Iranian languages, termed by Matras and Sakel (2007b) **matter replication**. As Table 11.4 on the next page shows, two types of morphemes are borrowed as grammatical markers of ACs: the Ezafe marker (in two shapes: e and i) and a subordinating particle of the general form /kV/. Moreover, the table makes clear that most of the matter replications took place in North-East Iraq and the Iranian regions. North-West Iraq is practically immune from this type of borrowing. This may indicate a more intensive contact situation in the former regions.

#### 11.4.1 Borrowing of the Ezafe

Only in two dialects, Rus. and JSan., is the Ezafe truly generalised. It is probably no coincidence that these dialects have by and large lost the inherited D-marking of ACs. Judging moreover by the data of JSan. (Section 8.6.2), it seems that the introduction of the Ezafe is relatively recent, as its usage is still to some extent privileged with loan-expressions. Moreover, it is quite probable that the Ezafe, which was first introduced into the language by way of loan-expressions, has expanded its usage domain due to the loss of the inherited D-marker.26 A case in point in JSul., which shows an intermediate stage of development: It has abandoned to a large extent the D-markers in favour of a juxtaposition construction (see Section 11.3.2), but the Ezafe markers are still constrained to loan-expressions.

In the following subsections we survey the occurrence of the Ezafe in the different geographical regions of the NENA-speaking area.

#### 11.4.1.1 North-East Iraq: i Ezafe

Three out of five dialects in the North-East Iraq region exhibit usage of the Ezafe particle -i, in all probability borrowed from the co-territorial Sorani dialects (cf. Khan 2002b: 408).

---

26 For an elaboration of this idea in terms of "forgetting" the construct state marking, see Gutman (2015a).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Dialect</th>
<th>Ezafē</th>
<th>Subordinator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South-East Turkey</td>
<td>Her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boh.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beş.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gaz.</td>
<td>$(e)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JČal.</td>
<td>$(e, i)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAr.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CArd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barw.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Betn.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JAm.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barz.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alq.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-West Iran</td>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td>$ki-{t}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sar.</td>
<td>$qād, či$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North-East Iraq</td>
<td>Rus.</td>
<td>$i$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>$(i)$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JKoy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ka$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>$(i)$</td>
<td>$ga-ka$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>$e$</td>
<td>$ke, ya$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CSan.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.4: Borrowed AC markers. Parentheses indicate restricted or marginal use.
Khan (1999: 169) speculates that the 
\-i morpheme is a reduction of the ay
demonstrative, which is used as a linker in JUrm., and as a relativizer in the Bible translation of Ruwandiz (see Section 10.5.4). We maintain, however, that the two
morphemes should not be confounded, not least since a reduction of ay would normally yield an ə vowel.\textsuperscript{27}

Another hypothesis given by Khan (1999: 168) is that the \-i segment results
from the elision of the \textit{d} segment of the construct state \textless ay\textgreater suffix, following the assimilation of the latter to the initial consonant of the subsequent word (i.e. the secondary).\textsuperscript{28} The fact that the \textit{i} morpheme can occur following an \textless ay\textgreater suffix is counter-indicative of this idea. Yet the phonetic similarity between the vocalic nucleus of the \textless ay\textgreater suffix (namely, the /ə/ segment) and the /i/ segment may have led bilingual speakers (of Sorani and NENA) to perceive the /ə/ segment as being the \-i
Ezafe, thus enhancing the availability of the latter morpheme. Indeed, Khan (1999: 169) tentatively suggests such a link: “It may be more than a coincidence, however, that \-i is also the izafe particle in the Kurdish dialects of the region (MacKenzie 1961: 61–64) and this may have had an influence on the Neo-Aramaic form.” Weighing the (admittedly meagre) evidence, it seems that a purely internal phonological process cannot account for the distribution of the \-i suffix. Rather, it must have been initially borrowed from Sorani, and only subsequently could there be a reanalysis of a stranding /ə/ of the \textless ay\textgreater suffix as the Ezafe.

\subsection{J. Rustaqa}

In this dialect the Ezafe suffix has replaced the native D-markers, except following some interrogative pronouns discussed below (Khan 2002b: 408f.). In most cases it is appended after the Aramaic \textit{a} ending, but in some cases it replaces it, similarly to the native \textless ay\textgreater suffix.\textsuperscript{29}

(31) \textbf{Noun–Noun}

Rus. šiwa-i xabuše
\hspace{1em} tree-\textit{ez} apples
\hspace{1em} ‘an apple tree’ (own fieldwork)

(32) \textbf{Noun–Noun}

Rus. baxt-i Šlomo
\hspace{1em} wife-\textit{ez} Š.
\hspace{1em} ‘the wife of Shlomo’ (Khan 2002b: 409)

\textsuperscript{27}See in this respect also footnote 93 on page 302.
\textsuperscript{28}Ideally, an /i/ and an /ə/ should be distinct phonetically, but in lax pronunciation both may be produced as [i].
\textsuperscript{29}I have conducted some interviews with elderly Rus. speakers in Israel, November 2012. Due to the complexity of the material and time constraints I have not yet been able to transcribe it in full, so my data relies mostly on Khan (2002b). I could however verify the existence of the Ezafe suffix.
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As in Sorani, the Ezafe can appear before a clausal secondary:

(33) **Noun–Clause**

Rus. ʾo gora-y [timmal idye-le] (dost =c)
DEF man-EZ yesterday came-3MS friend =COP
‘The man who came yesterday (is my friend).’ (Khan 2002b: 409)

Khan (2002b: 409) does not mention cases of the Ezafe mediating between a noun and an adjective. He does however give a case where the Ezafe is used to nominalize an adjective:

(34) **∅–Adjective**

Rus. (šáqil) i rabta
take.IMP EZ big,FS
‘(Take) the big one!’ (Khan 2002b: 409)

This usage is analogous to the independent Ezafe in Sor. (see example (92) on page 248).

The historical $d$- linker is only conserved as apparent construct state marking after some interrogative pronouns preceding clausal secondaries, in which case it transforms them to indefinite pronouns:

(35) **Pronoun–Clause**

Rus. manni-t [ade bel-an] (pašix)
who-CST come house-POS.1PL please.SBJV.3MS
‘Whoever comes to our house (will be pleased).’ (Khan 2002b: 409)

(36) **Pronoun–Clause**

Rus. ma-t [kayf-ox made] (ʾol)
what-CST pleasure-POS.2MS bring.3MS do.IMP
‘(Do) what brings you pleasure!’ (Khan 2002b: 409)

The fact that the erstwhile construct state $-d$ suffix is conserved in this context hints that the $-əd$ construct state suffix was operative in a precursor of Rus. The indefinite pronouns *mannit* ‘whoever’ and *mat* ‘whatever’ must have conserved this segment since they have been grammaticalised as such. Yet the $-d$/segment does not operate any more as a true construct state suffix, and indeed it can be followed by the Ezafe suffix.

(37) **Pronoun–Clause**

---

30The same indefinite pronouns are found in other dialects as well. See JZax. examples (22)–(23) on page 106 and JUrm. examples (37)–(38) on page 174.
Rus. manni-t-i abe (maṣe hade)
who-cst-ez sbjv.want.3ms can.3ms come sbjv.3ms
‘Whoever wants (can come).’ (Khan 2002b: 409)

(38) Pronoun–Clause
Rus. ma-t-i abet (ʿol)
what-cst-ez sbjv.want.2ms do.imp
‘(Do) what you want!’ (Khan 2002b: 409)

Additionally, we find the historical did-pronominal base. In the following example it appears after the MHeb. loan-expression עָלָה חדש ʿole ḥadaš ‘new immigrant to Israel’.

(39) Noun Phrase–Pronoun
Rus. hole hadaš did-an
immigrant new gen-1pl
‘our new immigrants’ (own fieldwork)

11.4.1.1.2 J. Arbel In Arb., we find the i Ezafe virtually only in the speech of one informant of Khan (1999), originating from the town of Batas (50 km north-east of Arbel). Occasionally, the Ezafe appears after the native -əd suffix, as in the following example:

(40) Noun–Noun
Arb. kullā mamlakát-it =i31 Kurdistán
all towns-cst ez= K.
‘all the towns of Kurdistan’ (Khan 1999: 169 [B:146])

More frequently, however, it replaces it:

(41) Noun–Noun
Arb. kolān-ı̆ mšilmāne
street-ez Muslims
‘the streets of the Muslims’ (Khan 1999: 168 [B:47])

(42) Noun–Pronoun
Arb. ʾizl-ı̆ did-i
wool-ez gen-1sg
‘my wool’ (Khan 1999: 219 [B:127])

(43) Noun–Adjective

31 Khan transcribes this example with the Ezafe i attached to Kurdistán. Listening to the example, it sounds to me rather syllabified with the preceding word.
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Arb.  b= şalm-ī komé
      in= face(PL)-EZ black.PL
‘with a dark face’ (Khan 1999: 229 [B:111])

Khan (1999: 168) attributes the latter occurrences to the elision of the /d/ segment of the -əd suffix, and transcribes the ending as <ı̆> which phonetically should be understood as [ə] or [i]. As discussed at the introduction of Section 11.4.1.1 we prefer to treat all these cases as borrowing of the Ezafe. The co-occurrence of the Ezafe with an adjective ((43) above) is typical of the Iranian construction, but extant in Arb. also with the native -əd suffix (see example (22) on page 279).

Note also the following example, where Khan analyses the -i as the Ezafe, most probably because the -i suffix does not replace the primary’s -a ending.

(44) Pronoun–Noun Phrase
Arb.  hemà-i [xà tpurt-it hula’a]
      which–EZ INDF fingernail–CST Jew
‘whatever fingernail of a Jew’ (Khan 1999: 170 [Y:182])

11.4.1.1.3 J. Sulemaniyya and Ḥalabja In JSul. the Ezafe seems to occur only after loanwords, both nouns and prepositions (Khan 2004: 192f.).

(45) Noun–Noun
JSul.  ḥukmát-i ʿIráq
      government–EZ I.
‘the government of Iraq’ (Khan 2004: 192 [A:5])

(46) Noun–Pronoun
JSul.  maktab-i did-an
      school–EZ GEN–1PL
‘our school’ (Khan 2004: 253)

(47) Adverbial–Noun

32Listening to the available recordings, moreover, I could not hear a clear difference between the -ı̆ and -i suffixes. Thus, in Khan (1999: 540 [B:145]) we find the expression b-dáwr-ı̆ Páša-i Kòra ‘In the time of P. K.’. To my ear, the two -i suffixes sound identical, notwithstanding the fact that the first one replaces an -a ending. Note the second one is clearly a Kurdish Ezafe as it is part of a Kurdish proper noun.

33This example is exceptional also in that it is produced by another informant, resident of Girdmāla, 20 km south of Arbel.

34The preposition bāyn- ‘between’ appearing in (47) is listed by Khan (2004: 598) as originating in Kurdish. Of course, it must be ultimately borrowed from Arabic ُبَيْنَ baUna. While Aramaic has a cognate preposition ben the diphthong /ay/ seems to indicate a foreign origin, or at least a merger of the two.
JSul.  ga-báyn-i ʾo= gudá =w ʾo= loʾā
  in-between-EZ DEF= wall =and DEF= room
  ‘between the wall and the room’ (Khan 2004: 214 [V])

As discussed in Section 11.4.1, the usage of the Ezafe only with loan-expressions in these dialects may indicate that in general the Ezafe found in NENA dialects was imported through loan-expressions, and only subsequently its usage was extended to native primaries in some dialects, such as JSan. discussed in the next paragraph.\(^{35}\)

11.4.1.2 West Iran: J. Sanandaj

Among the sampled dialects of Iran, we find the Ezafe only in JSan., as detailed in Section 8.6.2.\(^{36}\) The form of the Ezafe \(-e\) is indicative of its Persian origin, as well as its typical occurrence inside Persian phrases. Its usage, however, has been extended beyond the domain of fixed Persian phrases, as discussed there.

11.4.1.3 South-East Turkey

In South-East Turkey, the usage of the Ezafe is sporadically attested, in very particular usage. Thus, in JČal. we find the following loan-phrase. While the nouns are of Arabic origin, the usage of the Ezafe indicates the expression must have been borrowed from Kurmanji.

(48)  Noun–Noun
JČal. ʾawlād-e rasâl
  children-EZ Messenger
  ‘descendant of the Messenger’ (Fassberg 2010: 56)

A possible productive use can be found in the following example:

(49)  Adverbial–noun
JČal. tuxm-i xalwa la pâyəš go xədyawâs did-u
  kind-EZ milk NEG remain in breasts.CST GEN-3PL
  ‘No trace of milk remains in their breasts.’ (Fassberg 2010: 56, fn. 46)

An interesting development is presented by the Judi-dialects, where the Ezafe ending has been grammaticalised to become a lexical ending meaning ‘descendant of’\(^{37}\). This

\(^{35}\)It is interesting to note that also in the Turkic languages of Iran the Persian Ezafe is normally borrowed only as part of Persian expressions, and only rarely with native Turkic words. See Kiral (2006) for a discussion.

\(^{36}\)Garbell (1965a: 171, §2.32.12) mentions the usage of the Sor. Ezafe \(i\) in J. Solduz and Şino, but we have no further information on this. See footnote 93 on page 302.

\(^{37}\)I am grateful to Joseph Alichoran, for pointing this out for me.
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indicates that the Ezafe was only borrowed as part of proper names in these dialects.

(50) **Noun–Noun**

Gaz. Yaqo-ye Musa
Y.-ez M.
‘Yaqo son of Musa’ (Gutman 2015c: 317 (25))

11.4.2 Borrowing of subordinating particles

11.4.2.1 North–East Iraq

In JSul. and JKoy. we find the Sorani subordinator *ka* borrowed. The Sor. particle can act both as a relativizer and as a complementizer (much like the NENA linker *d*-*did*), and it appears in the two roles also in the recipient NENA dialects. In JKoy. it is borrowed simply as *ka*, while in JSul. it often appears as *ga*. In both dialects, it can co-occur as a relativizer with any other available AC marking (such as the JKoy. linker *od* or the JSul. construct state ending).

(51) **Noun–Clause**

JKoy. ʾoʾaqubronaʾod ka xlişwåle
dem.dist.sg mouse lnk rel saved-pst-3ms
‘that mouse who had been saved’ (Mutzaﬁ 2004a: 63 [N 20])

(52) **Noun–Clause**

JSul. bábaʾó=brona ga=libl-ā-le ḥajı́=yle.’
father dem=son rel=tok-p3fs-a3ms ḥajı́cop.pst.3ms
‘The father of the boy who took her away was a ḥāji.’ (Khan 2004: 414 [R:146])

(53) **Pronoun–Clause**

JSul. ʾó-d ga=k-imir-án-wa zarandà=y
pronoun-cst rel=ind-say-1sg-pst tough =cop
‘the one whom I was just saying was tough’ (Khan 2004: 418 [R:135])

As a complementizer we find the following example:

(54) **Verb–Clause**

JSul. kāyén-wa ga=ʾó bratá il= d-ə=bróna gbà.’
know.3pl.-pst comp=dem girl to=gen-dem=boy want.3fs
‘They would know that the girl loved the boy.’ (Khan 2004: 440 [R:29])

The reason for this shift is not clear. It may stem from an analogy to the existing preposition *ga* ‘in’. 
11.4.2.2 North-West Iran

In North-West Iran we find various forms of the relativizer which may be borrowed from Kurmanji \( ku \)\(^{39} \), from Persian \( \& kæ \) or from Azeri \( kî \). Younansardaroud (2001: 180) relates the Sar. form \( čt \) to the Persian relativizer \( kæ \),\(^{40} \) while Garbell (1965a: 172, §2.32.1.(5)) relates the JUrm. form \( kî \) to the Azeri source. The only evidence for a Kurm. influence may be the use of the uvular /q/ segment in Sar. \( q̄d \), which may correspond to the unaspirated \( q \) of the Kurm. relativizer. Yet it may also be related to preposition \( qa, qāt \) ‘for’ present in the dialect.

The /d/ segment of Sar. \( q̄d \) is probably a retention of the Aramaic \( d^- \), and can be analysed as an explicit construct state marking of the relativizer. This marking can be optionally found in JUrm. as well, in the form \( kît \) (see Section 7.6.3).

Various examples of the relativizer in JUrm. are given in Section 7.6. The usage in Sar. is quite similar. Note that it can optionally co-occur with construct state marking on the primary:

\[
\text{(55) Noun–Clause} \\
\text{Sar.} \quad \text{‘o} \, \text{čtav}-{\&d} \, \text{q̄d/či at zvin-\&t len mačuḥa} \\
\text{DEF book-\{cst\} REL 2MS bought-2MS NEG.COP.1SG found} \\
\text{‘The book that you bought, I cannot find (it).’ (Younansardaroud 2001: 181)}
\]

11.4.2.3 West-Iran

In West-Iran we find the relativizer \( ke \) only in JSan., and not in adjacent CSan. In this case, a Persian as well as a Sorani origin is possible. Given the great impact of Persian on this dialect, the former option seems preferable. Alongside the \( ke \) relativizer we find also a \( ya \) relativizer, which may be related to the Persian Ezafe, the latter sometimes appearing with an initial glide. We note indeed that while \( ke \) is compatible with the primary-marking Ezafe, this is not the case with \( ya \). Various usage examples of both are given in Section 8.5.

11.5 Case study: The marking of ordinal numbers

To show the diversity of NENA dialects in a nutshell, it is illuminating to study a system on the fringes of the AC system, namely the qualification of nouns by ordinal numbers. Ordinal numbers (‘first’, ‘second’, etc.) are akin to adjectives in many languages, in contrast to the cardinal numbers (‘one’, ‘two’, etc.) which relate directly to quantification. In Semitic languages, and in NENA in particular, ordinals show a special behaviour, mixing characteristics of adjectives with those of nominal

\(^{39}\)This is the form of standard Kurm., but the Urmia dialect may show some variation.

\(^{40}\)It is not clear whether she relates the form \( q̄d \) as well to a Persian origin.
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attributes.\textsuperscript{41} The NENA ordinal system is interesting in that it conserves some characteristics of ancient strata (as shown by its affinity to Syriac), while at the same time it shows similarities to contact languages.

As the ordinal ‘first’ behaves specially in some respects, it deserves a separate discussion in the next section, followed by a treatment of the higher ordinals.

11.5.1 The ordinal ‘first’

A particularity of the ordinal ‘first’ in Semitic languages is that every Semitic language-branch has a unique form to express it, and it is thus not part of a shared Semitic heritage, but rather an independent innovation of each branch (Loewenstamm 1955). The ordinal ‘first’ shows often, moreover, a special morpho-syntactic behaviour as compared to the other numerals, and NENA is no exception.

In many NENA dialects we find an adjectival ordinal \textit{qamā́ya} ‘first’, related to Syriac \textit{qadmā́yā}. Like other adjectives, it usually appears after the qualified noun and agrees with it in number and gender, as in the following example (=example (71) on page 338).

\begin{align*}
(56) \quad \text{Noun–Ordinal (first)} \\
\text{Alq.} & \quad yóma \quad qamá́ya \\
\text{day (ms) first (ms)} & \quad \text{‘the first day’ (Coghill 2003: 293 [A:137])}
\end{align*}

This ordinal can be nominalized like other adjectives, namely by putting a determiner before it:

\begin{align*}
(57) \quad \emptyset–\text{Ordinal (first)} \\
\text{CArd.} & \quad aw \quad qamá́ya \\
\text{DEF (ms) first (ms)} & \quad \text{‘the first’ (Krotkoff 1982: 22 [112])}
\end{align*}

Some dialects have borrowed the Arabic ordinal \textit{aawwā́l} ‘first’. In Arabic, both the written standard and the Iraqi vernacular, this ordinal (like others) can appear after the qualified noun as an inflecting adjective, or preceding the qualified noun while forming with it a CSC, invariably in the \textit{ms} form (Schulz 2004: 224; Erwin 2004: 366f.).\textsuperscript{42} The adjectival usage of \textit{aawwā́l} has not been adopted in NENA, but in several

\textsuperscript{41}For example, in the Biblical Hebrew phrase \textit{yómm̄ haš-ššiš} ‘the sixth day’ (Genesis 1:31), the ordinal \textit{ššiš} agrees in gender and number with the head \textit{yómm} as an adjective, but the placement of the definite article \textit{ba–} is typical of the Hebrew CSC. Incidentally, a similar construction is found in Iraqi Arabic; see example (61) on the facing page.

\textsuperscript{42}To be sure, in the written standard language the ordinal ‘first’ can inflect in the pre-nominal position as well, but the \textit{ms} form is frequently used with disregard for gender agreement (Badawi,
NENA dialects we find the uninflecting ordinal ʾawwal (or a similar form) preceding the qualified noun, mimicking the structure of the Arabic CSC.

(58) **Noun–Ordinal (first)**
Arb. ʾawwal baxtá
first woman
‘the first woman’ (Khan 1999: 181)

Fassberg (2010: 92, fn. 102) notes that the form ʾawwal is attested in Palestinian Aramaic since the Middle Ages, and also in NENA it is found in the earliest strata, namely NrT, as shown in the examples below. Note, however, that these are very particular occurrences, having in common the adverbial meaning of ‘first time’.

(59) **Noun–Ordinal (first)**
NrT אראֹי איל אָור פֶּלטוֹלָה מְדוֹקָה
ʾāhin we-la ʾawwal jār d= plɔt-la mənn-əd quwatt-i
3FS COP.PST-3FS first time LNK= left-3FS from–CST strength–POSS.1SG
‘It was the first time that it came out of my potency.’  (*Midraš Parašat Wayhī* 29:3 ed. by Sabar 1984b: 85, line 27)

(60) **Adverbial Clause–Ordinal (first)**
NrT אוולמאדמירתי ʾawwal ma-d mîrr-ət-ti
first what–CST said–P2MS–A1SG
‘at first when I told you’  (*Midraš Parašat Wayhī* 27:29 ed. by Sabar 1984b: 51, line 2)

In vernacular Iraqi Arabic we find additionally a construction in which the ordinal appears as a secondary of the CSC.

(61) **Noun–Ordinal**
Iraq. yōm il-ʾawwal
day(MS) DEF–first.MS
‘the first day’ (Erwin 2004: 367)

(62) **Noun–Ordinal**
Iraq. san-t il-ʾūla
year–FS.CST DEF–first.FS

---


Fassberg (2010: 92, fn. 102) apparently did not consult the actual examples but only the occurrence of ʾawwal in the glossary of Sabar (1984b: 248). For this reason he relates it to the somewhat different construction in example (63) on the following page. Note that a similar restricted use of ʾawwal is found also in contemporary NENA, such as in C. Alqosh, where it is found only in the expressions ʾawwal-ga ‘the first time’ and ʾawwal-mendi ‘firstly’ (Coghill 2003: 284).
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‘the first year’ (Erwin 2004: 367)

A similar construction is found in some NENA dialects, but the ordinal ‘āwwal never inflects. Both in Iraqi Arabic and in NENA this construction is in fact not limited to the ordinal ‘first’.

(63) **Noun–Ordinal (first)**
JČal. yom ʾawwal
day.cst first
‘the first day’ (Fassberg 2010: 92)

(64) **Noun–Ordinal (first)**
Arb. ṭrēʾ yom-ʾit ʾāwwal
two- day-cst first
‘two first days’ (Khan 1999: 181[B:72])

While this construction seems thus to be a pattern-cum-matter replication from vernacular Arabic, we find in Arb. the Kurdish Kurmanji form ʾāwwalı́ alongside ʾāwwal (cf. Khan 1999: 181).

(65) **Noun–Ordinal (first)**
Arb. gor-ʾit ʾāwwalı́
man-cst first
‘the first man’ (Khan 1999: 181)

The above example may further hint at a Kurmanji influence, if we consider the -əd suffix to be the functional equivalent of the Kurdish Ezafe, since in Kurdish (both Kurmanji and Sorani) ordinals follow the Ezafe (see Section ⒐⒊4). Instead of arguing decisively in favour of one option or another, it seems that similarly to other domains of the AC system, this pattern (head-marked primary followed by an ordinal) represents an areal phenomenon (see further discussion of this in the next section).

Finally, in the dialects of JSul. and JSan. we find the Arabic ordinal ‘first’ (borrowed through Sorani following the noun without any further marking. This is expected in these dialects, given their widespread usage of the juxtaposition construction (see Section 11.3).

(66) **Noun–Ordinal (first)**

---

44In Kurmanji orthography it is written ewel(i). As discussed in Section 9.3.4 the final -i ending probably reflects a lexicalised Kurm. oblique ending.

45In Sorani we find the forms ʾewel and hewel (Hakem 2012: 48) alongside the regularly formed yêkem (Thackston 2006b: 18).

46In JSan. an Ezafe may intervene, or alternatively the ordinal may precede the head. Compare examples (45) on page 212, (13) on page 203 and (25) on page 207.
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JSul. gorá hawwál
first man
‘the first man’ (Khan 2004: 277)

11.5.2 Higher ordinals

In most NENA dialects, the remaining ordinals are formed by putting a cardinal numeral after a construct state noun or a linker. In some dialects the numeral agrees, moreover, with the head noun in number and gender (at least for the numerals 2–10).\(^{47}\) This system is clearly inherited from prior strata of Aramaic, as it appears in Syriac as well (see Section 3.4.5).

Recall that in Syriac the numeral must appear after the linker \(d\)-, as described in Section 3.4.5. In NENA dialects, however, we find the numerals after different kinds of linkers, as well as the Neo-CSC (-əd suffix) and apocopate CSC. Thus, in NENA we see a generalisation of the Syriac pattern in that all types of construct state heads, irrespective of their forms, can govern a numeral acting as an ordinal. This is shown in the following examples ((69)=example (60) on page 115).

(67) **Noun–Ordinal**
JČal. yom tre
day.cst two
‘the second day’ (Fassberg 2010: 92)

(68) **Noun–Ordinal**
JČal. yarx-əd ’arba
month-cst four
‘the fourth month’ (Fassberg 2010: 45)

(69) **Noun–Ordinal**
JZax. ē baxta did ṭḷāha
def.fs woman lnk three
‘the third wife’ (Cohen 2012: 95 (8))

The closest resemblance to Syriac is shown by the Qar. dialects, where an agreeing numeral is preceded by the linker \(d\)-, as in the following example (=example (93) on page 155). Note that Qar. has also borrowed an Arabic pattern; see example (82) on page 341.

(70) **Noun–Ordinal**
Qar. báxta d= tə́ttə
girl lnk= second.fs

\(^{47}\)In general, this happens in the dialects which have conserved a gender distinction in the cardinal system.
‘the second woman’ (Khan 2002a: 225)

As a linker is pronominal, it suffices to nominalize the ordinal, yet it is often preceded by a determiner. Consider the following two Alqosh examples:

(71) **Noun–Ordinal**

Alq. *yôma qamáya lêθ =u' de= trê lêθ =u'*

*day(1s) first.MS NEG.EX =and LNK= two.MS NEG.EX =and*

‘The first day there was nothing, and the second (day) there was nothing.’

(Coghill 2003: 293 [A:137])

(72) **Zero–Ordinal**

Alq. ‘c= t= xámmeš

*DEF.FS LNK= five.FS*

‘the fifth one’ (Coghill 2003: 293 [A])

See also the similar JZax. examples (65)–(66) on page 117.

While these constructions clearly show continuity with Syriac, they are also structurally similar to constructions in neighbouring languages. As we saw in examples (61)–(62) on page 335, the Iraqi Arabic CSC is also used with inflecting ordinals as secondaries.

(73) **Noun–Ordinal**

Iraq. *marr-t iθ-thânya

time-FS.CST DEF=second.FS*

‘the second time, the next time’ (Erwin 2004: 367)

Note that in contrast to the NENA and Syriac constructions, the secondary is a true adjectival ordinal, distinct from the corresponding cardinal form, e.g. *θnēn ‘two’* (see Erwin 2004: 268).

The NENA construction is, moreover, similar to the construction found in the neighbouring Iranian languages. Thus, both in Kurm. and Sor., as well as in Per., we find the ordinal numbers follow an Ezafe marked head noun, which is functionally equivalent to a construct state noun in Aramaic. Similarly to example (71) on the current page, the ordinals can also be nominalized by appearing after an independent Ezafe (example (74)=example (44) on page 237; example (75)=example (46) on page 238; example (76)=example (85) on page 247).

(74) **Noun–Ordinal**

Kurm. *roj-a sisi-yan

day=EZ.DEF.FS three-OBL.PL*

‘(on the) third day’ (Thackston 2006a: 25)

(75) **Noun–Ordinal**
KSul. řégá-y sê-hem
third-ez three-ord
‘the third road’ (MacKenzie 1961: 72 [47])

(76) Zero–Ordinal
Ak. yê dwê ... yê sê-yê
ez.ms two-ord ... ez.ms three-ord
‘the second... third one’ (MacKenzie 1961: 163 [562])

Morphologically, the Kurdish numerals show some differences in comparison to native Aramaic numerals. First, in accordance with some NENA dialects but in contrast with the Syriac construction and the more conservative NENA dialects, the numerals do not show gender or number features. In contrast to all NENA dialects and the ordinals appearing in the Syriac linker construction, the ordinals are clearly marked as distinct from the corresponding cardinals by a dedicated suffix. In this respect they show a certain affinity with the Syriac adjectival ordinals which are marked by the derivational suffix -āyā, but recall that these ordinals are used in the adjectival juxtaposition-cum-agreement construction (see example (105) on page 74).

Given the partial similarities with Syriac, vernacular Arabic, as well as with Kurdish dialects, should the NENA construction be related to internal developments or to language contact? Some authors prefer the latter option. Garbell (1965a: 172) asserts that the NENA construction is an “exact parallel to the K[urdish] construction.” Noorlander (2014: 214) claims that the Syriac linker construction was used only in a “chronological sense” (i.e. for enumerating days, months etc.) and that in NENA its scope was “extended and [it] ultimately replaced the originally [Syriac-like] productive ordinal adjectives [...] most likely due to contact with Kurdish.” Yet, just as in the case of the adoption of the Neo-CSC suffix -əd (see Section 9.3.2), we cannot be sure what the precise role of language contact was, or even what the direction of borrowing was: from Kurdish to Aramaic or vice versa (or both, in different periods). Even the disappearance of agreement features of the numerals, which may be attributed to a Kurdish origin, reflect an areal (and possibly universal) tendency to erode inflectional features with time.

While pattern replication is thus difficult to ascertain, we find clear cases of matter borrowing, namely the borrowing of the Sor. derivational affix -emin. In Sor., an ordinal thus marked must precede the head noun, as in the following example.

---

As discussed in Section 9.3.4, in standard Kurm. the suffix -yan represents the plural oblique case suffix, which is grammatically expected due to the syntactic position of ordinals following the Ezafe. In the dialectal data (as in Ak. above), MacKenzie (1961: 170) reports rather on the usage of the suffix -č, which is possibly related to the superlative suffix (see footnote 17 on page 237). In Sorani, on the other hand, the oblique case is no longer productive, and the suffix -hem, while historically possibly related to the plural oblique case marker, must be seen as an ordinal derivational suffix.
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(=example (117) on page 255):\(^49\)

(77) **Noun–Ordinal**

K Sul. yek-em-in jar
one-ORD-SUPER time
‘for the first time’ (MacKenzie 1961: 73)

The suffix -em(in) is also found in Persian, where it behaves similarly to Sor. (Balay and Esmaili 2013: 262), and is in fact also borrowed into Kurm. (Thackston 2006a: 25), but without changing the post-nominal position of the ordinal.

Some NENA dialects (Arb., JKoy., JSul., JUrm. and JSan.) have borrowed the Sor. ordinal suffix as -\textit{min}, either directly from the latter or through Kurm. (see also Garbell 1965a: 166, §1.22.3). In JUrm. and JSan. the ordinals thus formed can appear before the qualified noun (see examples (80) on the next page and (127) on page 195),\(^50\) while in Arb. and JKoy. the ordinals must follow a construct state noun or a linker, thus showing greater affinity with the Kurm. construction, as well as with the native Aramaic construction.\(^51\)

(78) **Noun–Ordinal**

Arb. baxt-at tre-min
woman-CST two-ORD
‘the second woman’ (Khan 1999: 181)

(79) **Noun–Ordinal**

JKoy. y\textasciitilde{l}d \textasciitilde{d} od tre-min
child \textasciitilde{ Link} two-ORD
‘the second child’ (Mutzafi 2004a: 168)

In JSan. we find in fact both the pre-nominal and post-nominal positions for derived ordinals, the latter optionally following an Ezafe. Although arguably JSan. is the NENA dialect most influenced by Iranian language contact, it permits the optional suffixation of an Aramaic inflectional suffix on top of the Iranian derivational suffix (example (80)=example (26) on page 207; example (81)=example (46) on page 212 and example (21) on page 205).

\(^49\)As discussed in Section 9.7.4, this suffix is composed of two parts: -\textit{em}, the ordinal suffix proper, and -\textit{in}, which is normally used to form superlative adjectives. Superlative adjectives thus marked precede their head noun. \textit{In passim}, we note here two further areal phenomena: 1) The relationship between superlative form and ordinals exists also in Arabic, though only for the ordinal ‘first’. 2) The positioning of superlative adjectives before the qualified noun is found also in Arabic, as well as in NENA; see JZax. examples (32)–(33) on page 108 and footnote 10 there.

\(^50\)In JUrm. we find the suffix -\textit{manji}. Garbell (1965a: 166) explains the ending -\textit{ji} as a further ordinal suffix borrowed from Azeri.

\(^51\)In JUrm. the ordinal suffix may be absent when numerals higher than ten are used, and then the numeral must appear in the CSC or ALC (Khan 2008b: 187).
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(80)  **Noun–Ordinal**
JSan.  tre-min-{ta}  baxta
two-ORD-{FS} woman
‘the second women’ (Khan 2009b: 213)

(81)  **Noun–Ordinal**
JSan.  baxtá-{e}  tre-min-{ta}
woman-{EZ} two-ORD-{FS}
‘the second woman’ (Khan 2009b: 213)

The JSan. ordinal is thus adjectival in nature and resembles the Syriac adjectival ordinals structurally, notwithstanding the use of a loan-morpheme. When following the Ezafé, it approaches moreover the Syriac ordinal linker construction; recall, however, that in Syriac the secondaries of the latter construction are inflecting cardinals (which have a special inflection pattern), rather than the adjectival ordinals.

Finally, in Qar., being in close contact with the Arabic-speaking city of Mosul, we find a pattern-cum-matter replication of the Arabic CSC headed (syntactically) by ordinal adjectives. Compare the following two examples (example (82)=example (111) on page 159):

(82)  **Noun–Ordinal**
ʾu=  θālāθ yóma
and= third day
‘the third day’ (Khan 2002a: 640 [F:72])

(83)  **Noun–Ordinal**
Iraq.  θāliθ  šahar
third.mS month
‘the third month’ (Erwin 2004: 368)

Note that both in the Arabic vernacular and in the Qar. example the ordinal is invariably in the mS form, and also that this construction yields a definite meaning, although no definite marker is present.

11.5.3  Case study conclusions

To conclude, in the sub-system of ordinal numbers the NENA dialects exhibit constructions that continue classical Aramaic strategies while resembling patterns from contact languages. The interaction between these two sources lead to high dialectal variation, each dialect showing a unique combination of constructions and features, as shown in Table 11.5 on the next page.

At the same time, a comparison of the various dialects and contact languages reveals also recurring patterns, notably the CST-marked construction with numeral
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N Num</th>
<th>Num N</th>
<th>N_cst Num</th>
<th>Lnk Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Syriac</td>
<td>+ORD.AGR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+AGR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraqi Arabic</td>
<td>+ORD.AGR</td>
<td>+ORD</td>
<td>+ORD.AGR</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurmanji</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ORD</td>
<td>+ORD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sorani</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ORD</td>
<td>+ORD</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NENA dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N Num</th>
<th>Num N</th>
<th>N_cst Num</th>
<th>Lnk Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE Turkey</td>
<td>JČal.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>JZax.</td>
<td>1st.AGR</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Iraq</td>
<td>Qar.</td>
<td>1st.AGR</td>
<td>=Arab.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NW Iran</td>
<td>JUrm.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+ORD</td>
<td>+{ORD}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Iraq</td>
<td>Arb.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>+{ORD}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Iraq</td>
<td>JSul.</td>
<td>+ (1st.AGR)</td>
<td>1st</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W Iran</td>
<td>JSan.</td>
<td>+ORD.{AGR}</td>
<td>+ORD.{AGR}</td>
<td>+ORD.{AGR}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.5: Properties of ordinal constructions in select NENA dialects and model languages. Ord = numerals marked as ordinals (distinct from cardinals); Agr = numeral agrees with primary; 1st = restricted to ordinal ‘first’, Arab. = Arabic loan-ordinals.

secondaries. This situation is symptomatic of the entire AC system of NENA dialects: While each dialect permits idiosyncratic constructions and variations, the usage of a head-marking construction reoccurs again and again, both in the NENA dialects and in the contact languages.
Chapter 12

General Conclusions

The current study aims at a morpho-syntactic comparison of a particular grammatical domain, the attributive system, across NENA dialects. It is worthwhile noting that this is the first monograph-sized comparison of Neo-Aramaic dialects ever produced, to the best of my knowledge. As such, it is my hope that it will open the way to further broad comparative studies of various grammatical phenomena in this fascinating language group. In order to appeal to a broad linguistic audience, the approach taken in this study combined methodology and insights from various fields of linguistics, namely typology, contact linguistics and historical linguistics.

This study had as its starting point the Semitic Annexation construction, used primarily to modify nominals by other nominals, but also by prepositional phrases and clauses. Following Goldenberg (1995), we identified this construction as the exponent of the attributive relationship, and consequently we defined the notion of attributive construction as any construction marking this relationship. This permits us to move beyond the specific morphological marking associated with the annexation construction (namely the historical construct state) and examine a wider range of constructions sharing a common functional denominator.

In the following sections, we shall summarise the major ideas and contributions advanced by this study. Some of these are contributions to general linguistic theory or linguistic typology. Thus, Section 12.1 discusses the construct state as a cross-linguistic category. Section 12.2 emphasizes the importance of a complex typology of attributive constructions, while Section 12.3 discusses encliticization and cyclicity as possible universals of language change.

Most contributions, however, are specific to the study of NENA dialects: Section 12.4 re-discusses the various morphemic markers developed from Classical Aramaic d-, while Section 12.5 gives a short summary of the variation found within the NENA AC systems. Section 12.6 re-traces in broad lines the developments of these systems.

Section 12.7 concludes again on a mere general tone, addressing the difficulty of establishing the direction of language contact within linguistic convergence zones.
12.1 The Construct State as a cross-linguistic category

In the domain of linguistic theory, this study emphasizes the importance of recognizing State Morphology, and in particular the construct state, as a cross-linguistic category. As discussed in Section 2.3.1, the recognition of the notion of construct state as a valid cross-linguistic category has been suggested before (notably by Creissels 2009). In this work, we proposed to define the category of state as a non-projecting morphological category which marks the syntactic valency of nominals: Construct state nominals require a complement, while free state nominals can do without. The syntactic valency should be kept apart from the semantic valency of nouns, which corresponds to their inherent argument structure. The latter is encoded morphologically in some languages by an alienability split present in the nominal system (Bickel and Nichols 2013), but this is quite different from state morphology, as the latter encodes the ad-hoc valency of a nominal. In a way of analogy, we proposed to see the construct state as the nominal counterpart of causative morphology in verbs: Both add one argument to the argument structure of their host in a given syntactic context.

The construct state thus defined is the mirror-image of genitive case. The latter marks (inter alia) a nominal as a dependent of another nominal, while the former marks a nominal as governing another nominal. Intrinsically state morphology is a head-marking device (cf. Nichols and Bickel 2013). For this reason, state morphology is invisible outside the domain of its NP, i.e. it is non-projecting. Notwithstanding its non-projecting property, we have seen that some NENA dialects, notably JUrM., have possibly developed an optional agreement-in-state rule, by which a pronominal linker, being syntactically in construct state, induces construct state marking on its antecedent, being the primary of the construction (see Section 7.3.1). As such constructions form cohesive NP units, also under this analysis the construct state feature does not project beyond the domain of the NP.

We have claimed, moreover, that the three-way state system present in Early Aramaic should be seen as an idiosyncrasy of these languages. These Aramaic strata distinguish construct state, absolute state and emphatic state. The latter two are instances of the free state, and the opposition between them relates to the domain of determination: The emphatic state was used in the Early strata for definite nouns while the absolute state was in general used for indefinite nouns. The three-way state distinction is justified in that a construct state noun is by itself not determined, but rather the entire NP takes its determination from the complement. As such, the three-state system can be seen as a particular Semitic case of the confounding of (Sprachbunds). Section 12.8 ends the chapter with some suggestions for further research questions and directions.
possessors and determination (cf. Haspelmath 1999). At the semantic level, however, nominal valency and determination are logically independent.

The usefulness of the category of state becomes clear when examining the debate regarding the Persian Ezafe, presented in Section 4.2. The notion of construct state provides a clear notional framework to analyse this particle, thus avoiding much of the controversy surrounding this construction. Moreover, the recognition of a functional category of construct state has permitted us to make comparisons between languages which realize this category differently, be it by the Ezafe suffix, the -əd suffix or apocope. At the same time, the construct state is differentiated from pronominal cross-reference head-marking, thus rendering it different to a mere synonym of the notion of head-marking.

12.2 Complex typology of attributive constructions

Building on the works of Plank (1995) in Typology and Goldenberg (2013a: ch. 14) in Semitic linguistics, we have shown that establishing a simple head- vs. dependent-marking typology of adnominal modification is often too simplistic. Rather, as discussed in Chapter 2, it is profitable to distinguish additionally between two types of markers, namely simple AC markers (construct state and genitive case) and pronominal markers, the latter indexing one member of the construction on the other. The recognition of these different types of markers provides a better account of the diversity of constructions we find in NENA dialects (and in all probability across the languages of the world). It permits one, moreover, to better trace language change, as a pronominal marker can easily fossilize, thereby losing its pronominal value and becoming a simple marker. As discussed in Section 10.3, this is very probably what happened in NENA, whereby the double-marked DAC, containing pronominal primary and secondary markers was simplified to become the head-marked Neo-CSC, exhibiting only a simple primary marker.

12.3 Universal tendencies of language change

In this study we did not take an a priori approach regarding linguistic universals. Yet the observations regarding the changes in the NENA attributive systems corroborate some claims regarding universal tendencies of language change. The emergence of the Neo-CSC (see Section 10.3) supports the idea that enclitization of functional elements to a preceding host (disregarding their syntactic scope) is a universal tendency, which could also explain the general preference of suffixation over prefixation (cf. Dryer 2015). In this respect, the expectations put forward by Lahiri and Plank (2010: 395) are indeed borne out:
There is probably something to be said for the wider validity of the trochaic/dactylic phrasing preference beyond Germanic and these other families; but we won’t say it here. It would be of considerable interest, though, because it would help explain the near-universal preference for suffixing over prefixing. If it does not matter where grammatical words are positioned relative to the lexical words which they belong with syntactically, before or after, since phonologically they will always prefer to associate leftwards; and if cliticisation is what eventually leads to affixation – then the result will be suffixation rather than prefixation whatever the syntactic point of departure.

An important point we have stressed in this regard, however, is that enclitisation by itself is not enough for language change, but it must be accompanied by a subsequent step of re-analysis in order to have a lasting change on the linguistic system. Such a re-analysis may be motivated by external reasons (language contact) or internal factors, such as the force of economy.

Another observation, stemming from the study of re-emerging double-marked constructions (see Section 11.2), is the cyclic nature of language change. While the emergence of the Neo-CSC may have been partially motivated by the economic reduction of a double-marked construction to a single-marked construction, later developments re-introduce double-marked constructions, though in a different guise. We attributed these changes to the meta-linguistic force of clarity, favouring more elaborate structures, but we can equally well relate this to the dynamic nature of linguistic systems, always being in a state of transition. This is due to the creativity of speakers, who constantly create new linguistic constructions, whether consciously or unconsciously.

12.4 Morphemic differentiation of NENA AC markers

As we saw in Chapter 4, many scholars bundle together the various attributive constructions present in the NENA dialects, especially these that contain a reflex of the Classical Aramaic linker $d$-, as one construction exploiting the “annexation particle $d$-”. Building on the work of Cohen (2010) who discusses JZax., we have claimed that at least two, if not three, distinct D-markers should be clearly differentiated across NENA dialects. Most importantly, the suffix $-\eta d$ is analysed as a construct state suffix, instantiating a construction different to that of the linker $d$- (or various alternative linkers). Similarly, the $/d/$ segment itself should be analysed as two distinct morphemic markers: the pronominal linker $d$-, and the genitive prefix $d$-, present before certain demonstratives and determiners. While the genitive prefix is more difficult to ascertain across all NENA dialects (for instance, its presence is debatable in the Qar. dialect; see Chapter 6), it is nonetheless useful to recognize its
potential occurrence in various NENA dialects, in order to trace the development of these constructions.

12.5 Variation and uniformity in NENA dialects

In the introduction we set out two research questions directly related to the study of NENA dialects:

1. What is the extent of the variation among attributive constructions in the documented NENA dialects? Which different constructions exist in the various dialects to express the attributive relationship?

2. How do these constructions relate to the contact languages of NENA vis à vis the historical background of NENA? In other words, what was the role of language contact in shaping the synchronic manifestations of the attributive constructions in NENA dialects?

The research clearly demonstrates that the various NENA dialects present a wealth of different constructions and sub-constructions within the attributive domain. The richness of these systems (within each dialect and across the group as a whole) is due to the wide geographic spread of these dialects, allowing for different source constructions for each dialect’s system: On the one hand, we find numerous diverging contact languages affecting potentially each dialect. On the other hand, the various dialects may themselves be descendants of diverging anterior dialects, representing an ancient undocumented dialectal continuum not necessarily originating in a unique Proto-NENA dialect. Indeed, the high diversity found in the study corroborates rather the view that no unique Proto-NENA dialect of the Classical Aramaic period existed.¹

Yet, glossing over some of the finer details, we see that two constructions (in a broad sense) re-occur again and again in the various dialects:

The construct state construction: In this construction the primary is marked morphologically by the construct state. In the vast majority of dialects this is achieved by the Neo-cst suffix -əd, but we saw that some dialects have revived the use of apocopate cst while others have borrowed the Iranian Ezafe as a construct state marker.

¹Such a view is also advocated by Kim (2008). It is interesting to note that Hoberman (1988: 558f.), while acknowledging the existence of such an ancient dialectal continuum, nonetheless posits the existence of a Proto-NENA dialect, possibly for methodological reasons.
The analytic linker construction: In this construction type a linker is joined syntactically with the secondary, while representing pronominally the primary. In some dialects the linker is a direct reflex of the Classical Aramaic linker $d^-$, while in other dialects alternative linker forms are used, typically reflexes of a DEM+LNK combination or of the pronominal base $did^-$ present in JBA.

It is fascinating to see that while the morphemic material of these two constructions is very often innovated in NENA (such as the ubiquitous Neo-cst suffix $-əd$), they represent in fact continuity with older strata of Aramaic, and indeed with the Semitic language family as a whole, since these two construction types are documented in Semitic languages since their earliest attestations (see Section 2.3). Indeed, as Cohen (2010) notes, the NENA dialects have re-introduced structural features present in ancient Semitic languages but lost in the Classical Aramaic stratum, notably the possibility to have clausal secondaries in the CSC. Evaluating the role of language contact in these developments, we gave a nuanced picture, pointing out that they can be conceived both as products of language contact with diverse languages and as internal developments. The general difficulty with ascertaining language contact is re-iterated in Section 12.7.

Alongside these two construction types, we find two minor construction types occurring in some NENA dialects:

The juxtaposition construction: In a typical grammar of a Semitic language, apposition is expressed by the juxtaposition-cum-agreement construction, which typically occurs with adjectival secondaries. Some NENA dialects, however, have extended the use of juxtaposition (without agreement) to be a genuine marker of the attributive relation, both with nominal and clausal secondaries (see Section 11.3).

The relativizer construction: In dialects which are in intensive contact with Iranian languages, we find a matter-cum-pattern replication of the Relativizer Construction, yielding a construction in which a subordinating particle introduces clausal secondaries (Section 11.4.2).

In contrast to the two former constructions, the two latter constructions can be qualified as true innovations of NENA dialects with respect to anterior strata of Aramaic. The relativizer is clearly an instance of matter replication, but the research corroborates also the hypothesis that the juxtaposition construction is a case of pattern replication, as it occurs especially in areas where intensive language contact with Iranian languages took place. By looking at dialectal Kurdish and Gorani data, we could moreover establish a direct connection with juxtaposition constructions extant in these languages.\(^2\)

\(^2\)As noted in Section 2.3, the usage of the juxtaposition construction with clausal secondaries and indefinite primaries is very probably related to contact with Arabic vernaculars, and indeed this kind
Another innovation found across NENA dialects is the introduction of the \textit{d}- prefix as a genitive case marker of certain determiners and pronouns (mostly demonstratives). We noted that this major innovation in the grammar of Aramaic goes against the supposed universal dispreference of prefixation. Consequently, we attributed it to the effect of language contact, and more specifically to pattern replication of the Kurmanji oblique demonstratives (see Section 10.4).

12.6 Historical development of the NENA ACs

In Chapters 10–11 we have advanced several hypotheses regarding the development of the NENA attributive constructions. These amount to the conception of a “Domino-model” or “chain-reaction”: The initial point for the re-shaping of the NENA AC system was the re-analysis of the DAC (\textit{bayt-ēb d=malkā} ‘house of the king’) as the Neo-CSC (\textit{bet-əd malka}). This pivotal change in the system led to further phonological reshuffles, which eventually brought about the genitive case prefix (Section 10.4) as well as the innovated apocopate CSC (Section 11.1). The latter point is especially worth emphasizing, as we reject the view that the apocopate CSC is a re-generalisation of the historical apocopate CSC.

Also the emergence of new linkers can be related to this “chain-reaction”. We claimed, for instance, that the linker \textit{did}, originally serving only as a pronominal base (e.g. in JBA), could be generalised due to its apparent construct state suffix \textit{-d} (Section 10.5.2). As for other linkers, such as \textit{od} or \textit{ad}, these too are the result of the encliticization of the original linker \textit{d}- to its primary, a development in line with the emergence of the Neo-cst suffix \textit{-əd} (Section 10.5.3). Finally, the emergence of the linker \textit{ay} in JUrm. (and related dialects) originates in a further deletion of the \textit{-d} segment (Section 10.5.4).

Certainly, these claims can be challenged, and to a certain extent they should be seen as hypotheses rather than firm facts. Yet our model has the advantage of giving a unified account to the majority of changes in the NENA attributive systems, thus explaining the striking similarity between many NENA dialects, without necessarily postulating a putative Proto-NENA. The fact that the initial change was motivated by the encliticization of the linker \textit{d}- to the primary, a change which is in line with the claimed universal tendency of enclitization of functional elements (see Section 12.3), means moreover that this change could have happened independently in several pre-NENA dialects, without necessarily sharing a common ancestor of the Classical Aramaic period. This is to some extent corroborated by the fact that also WNA shows a similar re-structuring. Yet the fact that in WNA the subsequent changes of usage (in contrast to the generalized use of juxtaposition to mark the attributive relation) is more widespread across NENA dialects.
did not take place may hint that at least some of the subsequent re-analysis occurred under the influence of language contact.

12.7 Language contact and linguistic convergence

A major research question posed at the outset was to identify which NENA constructions are due to language contact, and which are due to internal developments. It was hoped that clear differences in the geographic distribution of certain patterns would allow the discovery of clear language contact effects. This expectation was borne out only partially. Indeed, according to the data gathered, it seems that the dialects in the south-eastern periphery of the NENA speaking zone, i.e. the dialects in the Sorani Kurdish speaking area (roughly from Arbel southwards), show greater susceptibility to contact effects, as is apparent from the numerous cases of matter replication in these dialects, be it the Ezafe suffix or the Iranian relativizer (see Table 11.4 on page 326). In this vein, it seems reasonable to conclude that the generalized juxtaposition construction found in JSan. and JSul. is a product of language contact (see Section 11.3.2.2).

Yet, as discussed in Section 10.3.2, such a clear assertion becomes more difficult when dealing with the most important construction of NENA, namely the Neo-CSC. Part of the problem lies in the fact that this construction is widespread and occurs in virtually all corners of the NENA speaking zone (see Table 10.2 on page 264). Another difficulty lies in the fact that it shows affinity not only with various Kurdish dialects (both Sorani and Kurmanji) but also with Classical Aramaic languages such as Syriac (see Table 10.5 on page 281). Moreover, the development of the Neo-cst suffix seems to follow from the universal tendency of encliticization of functional elements. The last two factors go against language contact as the source of this construction, yet the great functional and structural similarity with contact languages seems to indicate that some sort of contact must be involved. We concluded that the Neo-CSC is an instance of a linguistic convergence, in line with the areal preference to head-mark attributive constructions, but without positing a specific source language.

This conclusion places the inquiry into the development of the Neo-CSC in a wider context, namely the dynamics of linguistic convergence zones, known also as Sprachbunds.\(^3\) Since the languages in such areas show high structural similarity due to

\(^3\)The recognition of the impact of linguistic convergence areas on the NENA grammar has been highlighted in numerous recent publications. Noorlander and Stilo (2015) discuss the verbal system of NENA dialects as part of the Araxes-Iran Linguistic Area, while Gandon (2016) discusses the relativization strategy of Iranian NENA dialects as part of the Caucasus-Western Iran area. See also the preface of Khan and Napiorkowska (2015: VII): “[T]he historical development of Neo-Aramaic cannot be fully understood without taking into account the structures of the languages with which the dialects have been in contact. [...] the parallels have developed in the Neo-Aramaic dialects by varying degrees of convergence with other languages”.\)
a long history of contact, it is very difficult for any specific grammatical construction to ascertain the direction of contact and consequently whether a given construction is native to a certain language or not. A somewhat similar difficulty is addressed by Pat-El (2013a), who wishes to distinguish between internal developments and language contact between genetically related languages. Methodologically, this is apparently a different question, since in a convergence area we are dealing with non-related languages, yet in both cases we are faced with the difficulty of reconstructing the historical development of languages with abundant structural similarities. Pat-El suggests to remedy the difficulty by scrutinizing 1) intermediate stages of language change processes and 2) the generalization of a construction across categories. As we have seen in the study of the Neo-CSC, these measures are not helpful in this case, since both in NENA and in Iranian languages we can observe intermediate stages and generalisation across categories.

To conclude this point, in convergence zones language contact clearly plays a role, yet it is difficult, and in some cases maybe even impossible, to relate a specific structural feature to one source language. In Section 10.3.2.3 we formulated the (yet speculative) hypothesis, that the preference for head-marking of ACs (i.e., construct state morphology) is originally an Aramaic feature transferred into Iranian languages, and then re-transferred into Neo-Aramaic. If this is true, the Neo-CSC is effectively both a product of contact and of native Aramaic grammar.

### 12.8 Further research questions

The aim of this study was to describe and compare the attributive systems of various NENA dialects, attempting as well to reconstruct their development. Special emphasis was given to the question of the effect of language contact in the emergence of these systems. Yet, from a more general typological point of view two further questions can be asked:

1. Are the NENA AC systems typical or exceptional amongst the languages of the world? Do they show typical patterns of head-marking languages? What do they teach us about head-marking languages?

2. In the study we have traced several changes in the AC systems over time. For instance, we claimed that the emergence of the genitive case was subsequent to the emergence of the Neo-CSC suffix. Are these claims in line with known universals of language change? Do they corroborate exiting implicational universals, or can we deduce new implicational scales from them?

Another further direction of study regards the methodology of the research. Methodologically, the analysis used in this study is purely a qualitative one. The
data gathered could be exploited instead in a quantitative approach, relying on the recent advances in the production of phylogenetic trees in linguistic typology. The availability of constructions in the various dialects, presented in tabular format in Chapters 10–11, could be seen as features fed into this type of analysis. These results may elucidate the question of classification of the NENA dialects, and could be compared with classification done using the traditional comparative method (e.g. Hoberman 1988; Mutzafi 2008b). Moreover, as discussed in the last section, the question of the importance of language contact still remains somewhat ambivalent. One could try to disentangle this question using a phylogenetic tree, by taking into account also data from the contact languages surveyed, and observe whether they cluster with specific NENA dialects. In this respect, while the study has not resolved all the questions we raised, it provides a wealth of ready-made data useful for further investigation.

Finally, the AC system is just one part of the NP domain. In Section 1.3 we have touched briefly upon the question of determination and quantification of the NENA NP, but these questions would in fact profit from a dedicated comparative research. As we saw, this topic is not disconnected from the AC system: In Semitic languages in general, determination interacts with state morphology (Section 2.3.3), and in NENA in particular some of the linkers are clearly related to determiners (notably JUrm. ʾay). Thus, the study of the determination system of NENA would be the natural continuation of the current study. Indeed, as I stated above, it is my hope that this study would provide an example for further in-depth and broad comparative studies of Neo-Aramaic dialects.
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