The Neo-Aramaic dialects are modern vernacular forms of Aramaic, which has a documented history in the Middle East of over 3,000 years. Due to upheavals in the Middle East over the last one hundred years, thousands of speakers of Neo-Aramaic dialects have been forced to migrate from their homes or have perished in massacres. As a result, the dialects are now highly endangered. The dialects exhibit a remarkable diversity of structures. Moreover, the considerable depth of attestation of Aramaic from earlier periods provides evidence for the pathways of change. For these reasons the research of Neo-Aramaic is of importance for more general fields of linguistics, in particular language typology and historical linguistics. The papers in this volume represent the full range of research that is currently being carried out on Neo-Aramaic dialects. They advance the field in numerous ways. In order to allow linguists who are not specialists in Neo-Aramaic to benefit from the papers, the examples are fully glossed.
1. Introduction

This paper presents a selection of primary data from the hitherto unstudied NENA dialect of the Jews of the town of Dohok, located in north-western Iraq (this dialect is henceforth referred to as ‘Jewish Dohok’). Glossing is provided for a part of the texts to ensure accessibility for readers who are not NENA specialists and notes on noteworthy linguistic features are supplied. These texts are complemented by a brief grammatical study, which is based on the texts. This study surveys selected features of verbal semantics1 of Jewish Dohok. In particular, the study focuses on verbal forms with a grammatical function that is distinct from the function of the corresponding forms in many other NENA dialects. This demonstrates the importance of studying each dialect in its own right. The paper aims to situate the Jewish Dohok dialect typologically within the broader NENA family. In addition, it draws attention to certain less prototypical functions of the verbal forms in question. Such functions apparently reflect the subjective creative use of the tense-aspect-mood system in order to achieve a particular discourse effect.

1 The terms ‘verbal semantics’, ‘grammatical semantics’ and ‘grammatical functions’ are used here synonymously. These refer to the tense-aspect-mood system in its various grammatical and pragmatic applications.
The Jewish Dohok dialect is most closely affiliated with a group of Jewish dialects that were historically spoken West of the Great Zab River, and are known by their speakers and scholars as Lišana Deni (‘our language’). Dialects belonging to this group were spoken also in Zakho, Amedia, Betanure, Nerwa (north-western Iraq) and Challa (south-eastern Turkey). Today, the Jewish Dohok dialect is on the verge of extinction, having only about twenty remaining active speakers. These speakers were born in the 1930s or 1940s in Dohok, or in the 1950s in Israel. As far as I know, all of them live today in Israel, mostly in the Jerusalem area.

In the following section, two folk tales are presented. I recorded these in 2018 in Castel (near Jerusalem). They were narrated by Mr Tzvi Avraham (aged 79).

The stories presented here give a taste of the rich oral literature of the NENA-speaking Jews.\(^2\) Though stories such as the ones presented here were narrated in the Jewish community in Aramaic, many of them are likely to have been Kurdish (or Arabic) in origin (Sabar 1982, xxxii). The folktales are indeed sometimes situated in the realia of the Kurdish world—a fact illustrated in the following stories by the direct speech in lines 19 and 20 of the first story. A part of this speech is given in Bahdini Kurdish.\(^3\) Other stories, however, appear to be distinctly Jewish, as shown by their ideological character. This was the view of the narrator himself. I have collected several stories that feature the figure of a poor, yet wise Jew, who—contrary to everyone’s expectation—emerges as the hero of the story. Such folktales are apparently aimed at raising the morale of the Jews by presenting them in a very positive light (e.g. showing their resourcefulness).

---

2 See Aloni (2018) for the folk literature of the Lišana Deni Aramaic speakers. All of the other communities of the area—NENA-speaking Christians, as well as Kurdish- and Arabic-speaking communities—also possess a wealth of oral literature. These different story-telling traditions have historically undoubtedly been in contact with one another (e.g., Coghill 2009).

3 For background on the folk literature of the Aramaic-speaking Jews, see Sabar (1982) and other publications by this author.
2. The Verbal System of Jewish Dohok

In addition to their cultural value, the following folktales also attest to the complexity of the verbal system. The verbal system of Jewish Dohok, as is the case with that of other NENA dialects, can convey nuanced meanings of tense, aspect and mood, and enliven and structure the narrative, e.g., draw attention to noteworthy situations, divide story units (cf. Coghill 2009; Khan 2009). Some noteworthy forms found in the stories are used as the starting point of the grammatical survey. Reference will also be made to ‘the corpus’. This is a body of Jewish Dohok texts consisting of orally-delivered personal narratives, folktales and descriptions of customs that I have collected from five different speakers.

Methodologically, this study draws from the notions of Function Grammar (Dik 1997), which maintains that the meaning of a given verbal form is context-dependent, in that it emerges from the interaction of the form with the other arguments in the context. The relevant context may be the clause or the broader discourse. In some cases a form conveys a general meaning, but the specific meaning arises from the contextual usage of the verbal form. In such cases, the verbal form is said to be ‘unmarked’ for the specific contextual meaning (Comrie 1976, 111–12). For example, while the future is most often ‘perfective’ (that is, the clause does not focus on the internal temporal composition of the situation such as its iteration or temporal duration), in Jewish Dohok, there is only one form for the expression of futurity. This means that the prototypically-future verbal form itself is aspectually unmarked and the specific aspect of the verb depends on contextual usage. A similar question of interaction between different factors contributing to ‘meaning’ applies to lexical semantics: sometimes—though not always—grammatical meaning interacts with lexical meaning (Comrie 1976, 41–51), suggesting that lexical meaning may also be a relevant factor in the semantics of verbs.4

4 For the application of an approach which is more structuralist in nature, see Hoberman (1989, 123–24; Lišana Deni dialects), and for a functional
The following overview of the verbal system will aid the reader in following the stories and the grammatical survey. Jewish Dohok has four inflectional bases: šaqəl, šqəl, šqul and šqil. The šaqəl form is semantically the most versatile one. Its grammatical meaning is determined by a verbal prefix or its absence. In addition to these bases, the infinitive form šqala is also used in some constructions.

The table below presents the inventory of verbal forms, their prototypical grammatical functions and the glosses used to mark them in this paper. A category is left blank if the form is considered unmarked for that feature (i.e. it may express different values of this feature). In light of the aforementioned versatility of šaqəl, I have adopted a glossing system in which only the meaning-specifying verbal affixes—and not the inflectional base itself—are tagged. The base itself is glossed only with the lexical meaning of the verb.

Table 1: Forms based on šaqəl

| Form   | Gloss | Tense      | Aspect   | Mood           |
|--------|-------|------------|----------|----------------|
| Ø-šaqəl| IRR-  | present,   |          | irrealis       |
|        |       | future     |          |                |
| la šaqəl| NEG IRR-| future     |          | irrealis (including negative imperative) |
| k-šaqəl| HAB-  | present    |          | realis         |

study which pays special attention to discourse parameters and discourse functions of verbal forms, see Cohen (2012; Jewish Zakho dialect).

5 The default way of referring to inflectional categories of the verb in this article is by their morphological pattern—by using an exemplary verbal form from the root š-q-l ‘to take’—rather than by their TAM functions.

6 This idea has been suggested to me by Paul Noorlander, to whom I express my gratitude for consultation in devising the glossing system.
| Form       | Gloss | Tense | Aspect       | Mood      |
|------------|-------|-------|--------------|-----------|
| wəl k-šaqəl | PROG  | present | progressive  | realis    |
| la k-šaqəl  | NEG HAB- | present | realis      |           |
| p-šaqəl     | FUT-  | future  | predictive   |           |
| la-p-šaqəl  | (no negation of p-šaqəl) |           | predictive   |           |
| qam-šaqəl-le** | PFV-  | past    | perfective   | realis    |
| Ø-šaqəl-wa  | IRR- PST | past  | habitual     | realis    |
| k-šaqəl-wa  | HAB- PST | past   | habitual     | realis    |
| p-šaqəl-wa  | FUT- PST | future | habitual     | realis    |

*This applies to Patterns II, III and IV (whose traditional names in Semitic philology are, respectively, ‘stems II and III’ and ‘the quadriliteral stem’). In these forms, when realis h always begin with m, the future prefix b-/p- has been lost after being assimilated to the following m, e.g.: *b-mašxən-Ø (FUT-warm_up-he) ‘he will warm up’ > *m-mašxən > mašxən. This has led to their merger with the šaqəl forms, i.e.: Ømašxən-Ø (IRR-warm_up-he) ‘he may warm up’. In order to indicate this morphological ambiguity, all Pattern II, III and IV šaqəl forms and those that may have been underlying p-šaqəl are glossed as IRR/FUT.

**The alternative to šqəlle, used with object suffixes.
Table 2: Forms based on šqöl-le

| Form      | Gloss | Tense | Aspect | Mood |
|-----------|-------|-------|--------|------|
| šqöl-le   | PFV.  | past  | perfective | realis |
| šqöl-wa-le| PFV. -PST | anterior | perfective | realis |

Table 3: Forms based on the infinitive (šqala)

| Form       | Gloss   | Tense    | Aspect               | Mood    | Resultativity            |
|------------|---------|----------|----------------------|---------|--------------------------|
| copula     | in-(taking) | present | continuous (in stative verbs) | realis | resultative               |
| bo-šqala   |         |          | continuous (non-dynamic) |         |                          |

Table 4: Forms based on the imperative (šqul)

| Form       | Gloss | Mood                      |
|------------|-------|---------------------------|
| šqul       | IMP.  | irrealis: imperative      |
| la-šqUIL   | (no negation of šqUL)    |                           |

Table 5: Forms based on the resultative participle (šqila)

| Form       | Gloss | Resultativity              |
|------------|-------|----------------------------|
| copula + šqILA | RES.  | resultative, experiential perfect |
3. Texts with Comments on Selected Grammatical Features

3.1. Transcription and Translation Conventions

As the overview of the verbal system will have made apparent, the complexity of the meanings of verbal forms cannot be fully captured by a glossing system. The glosses that are used here, therefore, are conventional. The table above may be consulted for a more nuanced characterisation of the forms.

As for the transcription, a minimalist system is used. This assumes a phonetically predictable opposition of long vowels (open, unaccented syllables) and of short ones (elsewhere). Consequently, vowel length or shortness is only indicated when not predictable from this rule. One of the exceptions to this are monosyllabic words with a with an open syllable (the most common of which are xa ‘one, a certain’, la ‘no’ and verbal negator, ma ‘what’ ta ‘for (+noun)’), which are always short. Being lexically predictable, shortness in these words is not marked. Monosyllabic prepositions and conjunctions (that is, with the exception of monophonemic ones) are transcribed as separate words. In the vast majority of cases, however, they do not carry nucleus stress, and lexical stress in them is inaudible.

Typically, only nucleus stress is marked (‘), and the end of an intonation unit is indicated by the symbol ‘’’. Sometimes, however, a single intonation unit apparently has two nucleus stresses, both of which are indicated. Lexical stress is only indicated when it is not penultimate (in morphologically complex verbal forms, this typically has implications for vowel length, which is also marked).

The symbols ‘-’ and ‘=’ are employed in the transcription. ‘=’ is used for enclitics. In Jewish Dohok, the only certain (i.e. phonetically verifiable) type of clitic is the present copula, so this sign is used only in those cases. The symbol ‘-’ is used for certain units that are morphologically complex, but prosodically are one word. This is done to make the reading more transparent.
Foreign words and phrases which reflect spontaneous code-switching, rather than being loans, are marked with superscript ‘H’, ‘A’ and ‘K’. These indicate, respectively, Modern Hebrew, Arabic or Bahdini Kurdish as the source. In these words, phonological detail, i.e. vowel length and lexical stress, is not indicated. Morphologically unintegrated loanwords are not parsed.

The recordings of the two stories are available online at https://nena.ames.cam.ac.uk/.

Text 1: A Man is a Wolf to a Wolf

1. ʾǝθ-wa xa-beθa d-Ø-‘āyǝš-Ø-wa…'
   EXIST-PST a-house REL-IRR-live-he-PST
   There was a household who used to live on…

2. bab-ǝt beθa d-Ø-‘āyǝš-Ø-wa mǝn ʂìw-e.‘
   father-GEN house REL-IRR-live-he-PST from wood-PL
   …a father of a household who used to make his living by woodcutting.⁷

3. g-ezǝl-Ø-wa go ṭùra,‘ q-qāṭe-Ø-wa ʂìw-e.‘
   HAB-go-he-PST in mountain, HAB-cut-he-PST wood-PL
   He used to go to the mountain and cut wood.

4. g-meθè-Ø-wa-lu,‘ Ø-dārē-Ø-wa-lu rǝş xmarǝ dide,‘
   HAB-bring-he-PST-them, IRR-place-he-PST-them on donkey his
   He would bring them, place them on his donkey

⁷ Sentence 2. is not its own clause, but rather a correction to sentence 1., itself unfinished. This is reflected in the translation.
5. \( g\-
\textit{ewṓd}-\O-\textit{wā}-\textit{lu} \) \( kār-ta, \)
\HAB\-make-he\-PST\-them bundle-FS
and bind them in a bundle.

6. \( g\-
\textit{dārē}-\O-\textit{wa}-\textit{lu} \) \( kār-ta \) \( rəš\ \textit{xmara\ \textit{dide}}. \)
\HAB\-place-he\-PST\-them bundle-FS on donkey his
He would put them [as] a bundle on his donkey’s back.

7. \( \textit{ʾu-g-nābṓl}-\O-\textit{wa}-\textit{lu} \) \( šūqa, \)
\HAB\-take-he\-PST\-them market, \HAB\-sell-he\-PST\-them
He would take them to the market and sell them.

8. \( g\-
\textit{meθe}-\O-\textit{wa} \) \( ùxala\ \textit{ta\ yalunk-e\ \textit{dide}}. \)
\HAB\-bring-he\-PST food. to child-PL his.
Then, he would bring food for his children.

9. \( \textit{ʾu-k-eθe}-\O-\textit{wa} \) \( kəxl\-i\-wa \)
and\-HAB\-come-he\-PST. \HAB\-eat-they\-PST

10. \( g\-
\textit{ʿeš-i-wa} \) \( b\-\textit{at-ʾànna}, \)
\HAB\-live-they\-PST in-GEN\-these, from selling-GEN wood-PL.
When he came, they would eat and live on this, from the selling of the wood.

11. \( xa\ \textit{yoma\ zōl-le\ l-tūra}, \)
\One\ \textit{day} \ PfV\-go-he to\-mountain, \FUT\-cut-he wood-PL,
One day he went to the mountain—he would cut trees,

12. \( xze\-le \) \( xa\-gūrga. \)
\PfV\-see-he a\-wolf.
and he saw a wolf.
13. ʾaw gurga g-emǝr-Ø ta-le
   that mǝ waṭ ʾǝθya?
   what COP.PRS.you ms RES.come.ms?

   This wolf said to him ‘Why have you come?’

14. g-emǝr-Ø ʾana g-ǝb-ǝn
g-ʾeš-ǝn b-ǝt qaṭʾ-ǝn šiw-e.
   HAB-say-he I HAB-want-Ims
   HAB-live-Im in-GEN IRR-cut-Im wood-PL.

   He said ‘I want to... I make my living by woodcutting.’

15. gǝ-mzabn-ǝn-nu go šuqa
   HAB-sell-Im them in market
   ʾu-Ø-máʾyǝš-ǝn yalunk-e didi.
   and-IRR/FUT-sustain-I child-PL my

   I sell it in the market and provide for my children.

16. bǝ-d-è ʾana g-ʾeš-ǝn.
   In-GEN-this I HAB-live-Im

   In this way I make my living.’

---

8 Note that the modal word is gǝbǝn is followed by a realis form, though irrealsis forms are standard in such contexts. These two verbs are therefore not a single construction but are separated by a hesitation. This is indicated in the translation. Indeed, it is the only attestation of such a sequence of verbs (modal verb + realis verb) in my corpus. The informant himself rejected other such constructions during an interview.

9 The activity ‘woodcutting’ in the construction gʿešǝn bǝt qaṭʾǝn šiwe in the sentence above is expressed by a finite form (literally ‘I live by that I cut wood’), rather than by the infinitive qṭaʾa ‘cutting’. The infinitive is expected here, and is in fact attested after the verb ʾ-ʾy-š ‘to make a living’ in sentences 9–10 above: gʿešiwa (...) mǝn mzabonat šiwe.
17. \( g\text{-}em\text{-}r\text{-}\varnothing \) ʾana b-yāw-ən-nox kud-yom
\( \text{HAB-say-he} \quad \text{I} \quad \text{FUT-give-l-you} \quad \text{every-day} \)
\( xa \quad \text{lira} \quad \text{kurkamāna}. \)

one coin golden

He replied ‘Every day, I will give you one golden coin.

18. s-i \( m\text{-}asr\text{-}\varnothing \) ta yalunk-e didox. \( ^{!} \)
\( \text{IMP.go-you}_{\text{MS}} \quad \text{IMP.spend-you}_{\text{CS}} \quad \text{to child-PL} \quad \text{your}_{\text{MS}} \)

Go, spend it on your children.’

19. \( g\text{-}em\text{-}r\text{-}\varnothing \), \( ^{k} x\text{e}r\text{a} \ x\text{udē}^{k} = \text{la}, \)
\( \text{HAB-say-he} \quad \text{God’s favour}^{k} = \text{COP.PRS.she} \)

He said ‘it is God’s favour,

20. \( ^{k} x\text{e}r\text{a} \ x\text{udē}^{k} \) b-ət kərmānji g-em-r-i. \( ^{!} \)
\( ^{k} \text{God’s favour}^{k} \quad \text{in-GEN Kurmanji} \quad \text{HAB-say-they} \)

\( ^{k} \text{God’s favour}^{k}! \) They said it in Kurmanji.

21. šqāl-le\(^{10}\) lira kurkamana dide mən gūrga
\( \text{PFV.take-he} \quad \text{coin} \quad \text{golden} \quad \text{his} \quad \text{from wolf} \)

He took his golden coin from the wolf.

22. ʾu-θe-le l-šūqa. \( ^{!} \)

\( \text{and-PFV.come-he} \quad \text{to-market}. \)

and came to the market.

\(^{10}\) The definite direct object \( \text{lira kurkamana dide} \) is not referenced with an object suffix on the verb. In the past tense in Jewish Dohok, we would expect here the following construction: \( qam\text{-}šāqəl\text{-}\varnothing \text{-le} \) (pfv-take-he-him) \( \text{lira kurkamana dide} \). In NENA, definite objects are generally referenced with an object suffix on the verb itself. For a recent study on object marking in NENA, see, for instance, Coghill (2014).
23. ʾu-zun-ne   ta gyane   ʾîxala
         and-PFV.buy-he to himself food

             ʾu-jull-e   ta yalunk-e dide,¹
         and-cloth-PL to child-PL his.

and bought food for himself, and clothes for his children,

24. ʾu-ʾmabsut⁴  mər-re   ta bâx-t-e¹
         and-ʾpleased⁴ PFV.say-he to wife-FS-his

and pleased, he told his wife

25. walla ʾana xze-li xa-xûra¹
         indeed I PFV.meet-I a-friend

go ṭura¹ bale ʾurgā = le.
         in-mountain but wolf = COP.PRS.he.

‘Indeed, I met a friend on the mountain, but he is a wolf.

26. kud-yom  g-emǝr-Ø
         every-day HAB-say-he

             ʾana b-yāwèn-nox xa kurkamàna.¹
         I FUT-give-I-you₃ one golden

“Every day”—he said—“I will give you one golden coin.”

27. ʾūd-le-li ʾədyo kurkamàna.¹
         PFV.make-he-me today golden.

He has given me today a golden coin.’

28. kud-yom g-ezǝl-Ø l-ṭura
         every-day HAB-go-he to-mountain
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\[\text{'u-g-ewəð-Ø} \quad \text{siw-e'}\]

and-HAB-make-he  wood-PL

So every day, he goes to the mountain, cuts wood

29. \[\text{'u-k-eθe-Ø} \quad \text{gurga} \quad \text{g-yāwəl-Ø-le} \quad \text{kurkamāna}.\]

and-HAB-come-he  wolf  HAB-give-he-him golden

and the wolf comes and gives him a coin.

30. \[\text{pøš-le} \quad \text{xà} \quad \text{yarxa,}' \quad \text{trè,}' \quad \text{tlāha,}' \quad \text{xa} \quad \text{šà-ta}'.\]

PFV.stay-he  one  month  two,  three,  one  year-FS

One month went by, then two, three, one year.

31. \[\text{bax-t-e} \quad \text{g-əmra}\]

wife-FS-his  HAB-say-she

\[\text{walla} \quad \text{hatxa} \quad \text{xòš} \quad \text{naša,}' \quad \text{ḥaš = ile}'.\]

indeed,  such  good  man  good-COP.PRS.he

His wife said ‘Indeed, what a kind man! He is good.

32. \[\text{ʾana} \quad \text{g-əban} \quad \text{Ø-ʾoð-an-ne} \quad \text{qàðr-e,}'\]

I  HAB-want-IF  IRR-MAKE-IF-him  dish-PL

I want to make some dishes for him,

33. \[\text{Ø-qaðr-an-ne} \quad \text{'u-Ø-ʿazm-ax-le} \quad \text{kəs-lan} \quad \text{l-bèθa}'.\]

IRR-treat-IF-him  and-IRR-invite-we-him  by-us  to-house

Let’s host him, invite him for a feast at our house.

34. \[\text{Ø-ʾoð-ax-le} \quad \text{xa-ʾixala} \quad \text{basima}'.\]

IRR-MAKE-we-him  some-food  good

We shall prepare some good food for him,
35. ʾu-Ø-mstaʿwn-Ø  
go beθa  
kəs-lan
and-IRR/FUT-help_oneself-he  
in house-MS  
by-us

ʾu-Ø-dq-ax  
qāḍr-e.\textsuperscript{1}
and-IRR-hold-we  
banquet-PL

he will enjoy himself at our house, and we will feast together.'

36. g-emər-Ø  
ta-la  
šūq-Ø-le.\textsuperscript{1}
PRS-say-he  
to-her  
IMP.leave-you\textsuperscript{cS}-him.

gūrg-ā = le.\textsuperscript{1}  
ḥēwan = ile.\textsuperscript{1}
wolf-COP.PRS.he  
animal-COP.PRS.he

He says to her ‘Leave him alone. He’s a wolf. He’s an animal.

37. mā  
baθe-Ø  
naš-e\textsuperscript{11}  
naš-e  
b-zād\textsuperscript{2}-i.\textsuperscript{1}
what  
FUT-come-he  
in man-PL?  
man-PL  
FUT-fear-they

What does it mean “He will come among people”? People will be afraid.

38. Ø-mbārbəʿā-Ø-lu  
gurga  
Ø-yaʾel-Ø  
go ma-θa.\textsuperscript{1}
IRR/FUT-alarm-he-them  
wolf  
IRR-enter-he  
in city-FS.

A wolf that enters the city will alarm them.’

\textsuperscript{11} This construction is likely to be a calque from Modern Israeli Hebrew. There, the interrogative ‘what’ can be used before future forms to express the speaker’s disapproval of the predicated eventuality, for instance, ‘what [do you mean] that he should come?!’ Incidentally, constructions such as this one are likely to be the ‘missing link’ in the grammaticalisation of interrogatives (‘what’) into negators. This development has been posited for, inter alia, mā in Modern Standard and some dialectal varieties of Arabic. In the present example, the meaning ‘what’ is possible, assuming an ellipsis (see translation). The implicature of this clause, however, may be understood as ‘[Surely] he won’t come!’
39. \textit{g-əmr-a} là', là', \textit{mar-Ø-re.} \textit{Ø-‘aθe-Ø.}}

PRS-say-she no, no, IMP.say-you\textsubscript{cs} him IRR-come-he

She said ‘No, no, tell him to come.’

40. \textit{zəl-le} \textit{g-emər-Ø} \textit{tà-le,}¹

PFV.go-he PRS-say-he to-him

\textit{g-emər-Ø} \textit{‘ana} lèb-i \textit{Ø-‘aθ-ən.}¹

PRS-say-he I NEG-can-I IRR-come-I\textsubscript{m}

So he went and told the wolf, but he said ‘I can’t come.’

41. \textit{gùrgā = wən,} \textit{k-əxl-ən} \textit{nàš-ə.}¹

WOLF = COP.PRS.I PRS-eat-I man-PL

I am a wolf. I eat people.

42. \textit{b-aθ-ən} \textit{go ma-θa} kull-u \textit{Ø-mbάrbə-‘i.}¹

FUT-come-I\textsubscript{m} in city-FS all-they IRR/FUT-alarm-they

If I come to town, everyone will be alarmed.’

43. \textit{zəl-le} \textit{mər-re} ta-bax-ta hátxa \textit{g-emər-Ø}

PFV.go-he PFV-say-he to-wife-FS such PRS-say-he

gurga.¹

wolf

So the man went and told his wife, this is what the wolf said.

44. \textit{‘az g-əmr-a} \textit{šud} \textit{Ø-‘aθe-Ø} b-lèle, \textit{xàška.}¹

so PRS-say-she let IRR-come-he in night.MS darkness

So she said ‘Let him come at night, when there is darkness.’
45. \(bə-d-aw\) \(wāxt\) \(l-əθ-wa\) \(beher-ūθa\).

\text{in-GEN-that} \text{time.MS} \text{NEG-EXIST.PST} \text{light-FS.}

At that time, there were no lights.

46. \(l-əθ-wa\) \(\text{A}^{c} \text{an-ṭariq}\) \(\text{H} \text{menorōt}\).

\text{NEG-EXIST-PST} \text{by way of} \text{Hlamps}\)

\(\text{A}^{k} \text{ahraba}\) \(l-əθ-wa\).

\(\text{A}^{e} \text{electricity}\) \(\text{NEG-EXIST-PST}\)

There was nothing like lamps. There was no electricity.

47. \(xəška\) \(wewa\).

\text{darkness} \text{COP.PST.he}

It was dark.

48. \(u-pāyəš-Ø-wa\) \(xəška\).

\text{and-IRR-stay-he} \text{darkness}

\(kull-a\) \(ma-θa\) \(xəška\) \(wawa\).

\text{all-she} \text{city-FS} \text{darkness} \text{COP.PST.she.}

When it got dark, the whole city would be dark.

49. \(g-əmr-a\) \(dammət\) \(Ø-payəš-Ø\) \(xəška\).

\text{PRS-say-she} \text{when} \text{IRR-stay-he} \text{darkness}

\(šud\) \(Ø-əθe-Ø\).

\text{let} \text{IRR-come-he}

She said ‘Let him come after it gets dark.

50. \(bēθ-Ø-an\) \(wele\) \(bə-dumāhik\) \(dət ma-θa\).

\text{house-our} \text{DEIX.COP.PRS.he} \text{in-outskirts} \text{GEN city-FS}

Our house is on the outskirts of town.
51. $b\-aθe\-Ø$  $kωs\-lan$  $beθa$  $’u\-b\-àzəl\-Ø.$
  FUT-come-he  by-us  house  and-FUT-go-he

$čũxa$  $la$  $k\-xāzè\-Ø\-le.$
  nobody  NEG  HAB-see-he-him

He will come straight to our house and go back. No one will see him.’

52. $g\-emər\-Ø$  $bax\-t\-i$  $b\-oð\-a\-lox\-Ø$
  PRS-say-he  wife-FS-my  FUT-make-she-you$_{ms}$

$xα\-’azime$  $bâš.$
  some-banquet  good.

So he told the wolf ‘My wife will make for you a great banquet.’

53. $mər\-re$  $tα\-le$  $b\-àθ\-ən,$  $g\-emər\-Ø$  $b\-àθ\-ən.$
  PFV.say-he  to-him  FUT-come-I$_{m}$  PRS-say-he  FUT-come-I$_{m}$

He replied to him ‘I will come,’ he said ‘I will come’

54. $g\-emər\-Ø,$  $^{H}tov^{H},$  $b\-àθ\-ən.$
  PRS-say-he  $^{H}$good$^{H},$  FUT-come-I$_{m}$

The wolf said ‘Well then, I will come.’

55. $θεlε,$  $baxtε$  $qam\-qadrαlε$  $’u\-’udlα$  $’i\-xαlα$  $bαsima$  $tαlε,$
  He came, his wife showed him hospitality for him and made good food for him,

56. $’u\-pεšlε$  $’ašεrtα$  $kαs\-lυ,$  $xεlε,$  $sεtεlε$  $’u\-mυhκεlυ.$
  And he stayed the evening at theirs, he ate, drank and they spoke.
57. \textit{pəšla^{12} drangi, 'g-emər ʾana b-azən l-ṭūra.'}

It got late, [so] he says ‘I will go [back] to [the] mountain.’

58. \textit{qəmle \ldots māre beθa ži zəlle qam-maxzele ʾurxa ʾu-mpəɖle.'}

He got up \ldots the house owner also went and showed him the way, and he went out.

59. \textit{ʾu-ʾawa yĭʾəlle l-ʾòya,' gurga ḥməlle go tằra.'}

[As] that one entered, the wolf waited at the door.

60. \textit{gurga ḥməlle go tằra,' šame ma bàmri bāθər zəlle.'}

The wolf waited at the door to hear what they will say after he has left.

61. \textit{baxte ži g-əmrə wallа xòš,' xōš xùrə ʾətlox.'}

His wife says ‘Indeed, a good, good friend you have.

62. \textit{xōš xùrə=le ʾo gurga.'}

[A] good friend he is, that wolf.

63. \textit{bāle xa-məndi qūṣur ʾibe.'}

But there is a flaw in him.

64. \textit{g-emər ṭala mà ʾibe qūṣur?'}

He says to her ‘What flaw is there in him?’

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{12} Note that it is the feminine singular subject suffix that is used non-referentially for the impersonal construction \textit{pəšla drangi} (pfv.stay-she late ‘it got late’). Indeed, the non-referential use of a feminine singular subject affix is common in NENA. Moreover, a feminine non-referential object morpheme is also attested in many NENA dialects, for instance: \textit{ʾəraq-a-le} (pfv.run-her-he ‘he fled’). For non-referential object affixes and likely contact dimension with Kurdish, see Mengozzi (2007).
\end{flushleft}
65. \( g\text{-}əmrə ṭale rixa...^{1} \) \( raba rixa \) \( là \) \( basima \) \( k\text{-}eθe \) \( mən \) \( pəmme.^{1} \)

She says to him ‘A smell, a lot of bad smell comes out of his mouth.

66. \( rixa \) \( là \) \( basima \) \( k\text{-}eθe \) \( mən \) \( pəmme.^{1} \)

A bad smell comes out from his mouth.’

67. \( ^{H}əz\text{h} \) \( g\text{-}emər \) \( gùrgā = le \) \( ^{2}ɔhā = le.^{1} \) \( mà \) \( ^{2}oḍən?^{1} \)

So he says ‘He is a wolf, this he is. What should I do?’

68. \( şmə\text{'}le gurga muhkela hatxa \) \( ^{3}əlle,^{1} \) \( xriówa.^{1} \)

The wolf heard [how] she spoke in this way about him, maliciously.

69. \( qam\text{-}dārele \) \( go \) \( nəθe\text{'} \) \( ^{4}u\text{-}qḥə̀rre,^{1} \) \( krə̀ble.^{1} \)

He kept it to himself (lit. he put it in his ear), and he was upset he became angry.

70. \( g\text{-}emər \) \( ^{5}ana \) \( g\text{-}oḍənnu \) \( hawùθa,^{1} \) \( ^{6}ani \) \( k\text{-}par\text{'}ila \) \( tali bət \) \( xriówùθa.^{1} \)

He says ‘I do them a favour and they pay me back with evil.

71. \( g\text{-}əmrı rixa \) \( raba \) \( pis \) \( g\text{-}napəq \) \( mən \) \( pəmme.^{1} \)

They say “A very dirty smell comes out from his mouth.””

72. \( zəlle \) \( l\text{-}tùra.^{1} \) \( durdət \) \( yom \) \( q\text{-}qayə̀m \) \( māre \) \( bèθa,^{1} \) \( g\text{-}ezəl \) \( ta \) \( şìwe.^{1} \)

He went to the mountain. The next day the house owner gets up and goes for wood.

73. \( gurga \) \( žiθèle,^{1} \) \( g\text{-}emər, \) \( şqullox \) \( ’ədyo ži xa lira kurkamàna,^{1} \) \( bāle \) \( mən \) \( ’ədyo,^{1} \) \( là \) \( ^{7}k\text{-}eθət,^{1} \) \( ʰəl \) \( ’arbi \) \( yome \) \( xèta.^{1} \)

The wolf came and says ‘Take for yourself also today one golden coin, but from today [onwards], don’t come, until forty more days.
74. *bāle šqulle nāra didox.*
   But take your axe.

75. *nāra didox šqulle, g-emār, mxile go rēši, kmā ʿibox!*
   Take your axe,’ he says ‘[and] hit my head (lit. hit it on my head)\(^\text{13}\) as [hard as] you can.

76. *ʿu-tūrre reši bōt nāra.*
   And break my head with [the] axe.’

77. *g-emār màto māxɔnne go rešox? b-qatłɔnnox?*
   He says ‘How [is it that] I should hit your head? Will I kill you?’

78. *g-emār là-q-qatłɔtti.*
   He says ‘You won’t kill me.’

79. *g-emār ʿatta ʿan māxɔtte nāra go rēši, ṣan b-axlɔnnox.*
   He says ‘Now either you hit me [with the] axe on my head or I will eat you.

80. *xzi, mà gəbət?*
   Look, what do you want?

81. *ʿēn là-māxɔtte nāra go rēši, ṣan b-axlɔnnox.*
   If you don’t hit me on my head, I will eat you.’

---

\(^{13}\) The verb *m-x-y* ‘to hit’ takes as its direct object argument the noun *nāra* ‘axe’, referred to here by the object suffix on the verb: *mx-i-le go reš-Ø-i* (imp. hit-you\(_{ms}\)-it on head-my) lit. ‘hit it on my head’, while *go reši* ‘on head’ is an adjunct. The same argument structure is attested with this verb in sentences 79 and 81 below.
82. ‘aw naša źi faqıra,’ km a də-mšèl, qam-maxe ël go rëše,‘ qam-sälə̀hle gurga.’
This poor man, he hit him\(^{14}\) on his head as [hard as] he could [and] the wolf forgave him.

83. ‘u-zə̀lłe,’ gurga źi qam-yəsərre reš gyąne,’ brindar = ile.’
And he went, the wolf bandaged his head—he was wounded.

84. g-emər ṭale bas ʿarbi yoma xeta b-àθət.’
He says to him ‘Only after another forty days will you come again.

85. bas ʿarbi yoma xeta b-àθət ’b-axlə̀nnox.’
Only, in another forty days will you come, [otherwise] I will eat you.’

86. zə̀lłe,’ muḥkele ta baxta, g-emər ḥāl ‘u-másəlre didi,’ ṭəhā = la.’
He went and spoke to [his] wife, he says ‘My situation is this.

87. gurga mərre ṭali là-k-ëθət ʿarbi yoma xeta ’axxa.’
The wolf told me “You will not be coming here for another forty days.”

88. ḤtòvH.’ pədlu ʿarbi yôme,’ qəmle ʿaw naša\(^{15}\) xa-ga-xə̀t,’
Good. Forty days passed by, the man got up once again,

\(^{14}\) In the Aramaic text, the suffix le ‘him/it’ refers to the axe, not the wolf; see note on line 75 above.

\(^{15}\) The word order in both of these verbal clauses is predicate—subject: pədlu ʿarbi yôme lit. ‘passed by forty days’, and qəmle ʿaw naša lit. ‘got up that man’. Such word order occurs occasionally in Jewish Dohok—mostly with intransitive verbs, as is the case with these two verbs.
89. *ẕelle l-ṭūra,*¹ *ẕelle xzele gūrga,*¹ *g-emər țale,* *g-emər țā̀ ʼaxxa,*¹
he went to [the] mountain, he went and saw the wolf [who] says to him, he says ‘Come here’,

90. *g-emər țèlox,*¹ *g-emər șqullox xa lira kurkamana xèta.*¹
he says ‘[since] you have come,’ he says ‘take for yourself another golden coin.’

91. *g-emər șrîla*¹ *‘e kafiya mən reši ʼu-xzi,*¹ *duktət mxelox ʼo narà əlla.*¹
He says ‘Untie this scarf from my head and see [the] place [which] you hit [with] that axe (lit. see [the] place you hit your axe on it).’

92. *qam-șārela mən ʼāqə̀le,*¹ *wela trə̀șta.*¹
He untied it from his head (lit. mind)—it had healed.

93. *g-emər mà k-xazət?*¹
He says ‘What do you see?’

94. *g-emər wele reșox trīṣa.*¹
He says ‘Your head has healed!’¹⁶

95. *g-emər k-xàzət?*¹ *g-emər świrət¹⁷ nāra .didox¹ qam-māxətte baθər ʼarbi yôme,*¹ *trə̀șle reši.*¹
He says ‘Do you see?’ He says ‘The wound of your axe [which] you had hit—after forty days, my head has healed.

¹⁶ Note the unusual syntax: deictic copula—subject—predicate. The canonical order would be subject—copula—predicate (*reșox wele trīṣa*), or perhaps copula—predicate—subject (*wele trīṣa reșox*).

¹⁷ The etymology of this word is unknown to me.
96. bāle xabrat bāxtox mərra ŭali' ḥöl məθa' lā-g-našən-ne.¹
    But your wife’s word, which she said to me, till death I will
    not forget.’

97. g-emər mà mərra ŭalox?¹
    He says ‘What did she say to you?’

98. g-emər ʾaxtoxun, baxtox muhkèloxun,¹ baxtox mərra ʾo gugra
    xoš nāšā = le, ḫâš = ile, balé xa-rixə pîs k-eθe mən pəmme.¹
    He says ‘You, your wife spoke, your wife said “This wolf
    is a good man, but a bad smell comes out of his mouth.”’

99. šwirət xàbra' lā-k-eθe nşaya.¹
    [A] wound [caused by a] word is not forgotten.

100. šwirət ḍə̀rba' nàša g-našèlè.¹
    A wound [caused by] a blow [a] man forgets.

101. šwirət xàbra' ḥəl moθa' nəša lā-g-našèlè.¹
    [But] a wound [caused by a] word until death does [a] man not forget.

102. lazəm yà' e nəša məto məhke.¹
    A man should know how to speak.

103. dər bāl,¹ mən ’ədyo pēʃ¹ lā-k-eθə l-ṭura.¹
    Watch out [that] from today onwards, you do not enter
    the mountain.

¹ A Kurdish loanword, compare Jewish Zakho pēv(a) (Sabar 2002, 254).
Text 2: The True Lie

1. ʾәθwa xa-ḥakòma, mәrrә ta dawәltә dide—
   There was a ruler, he said to his state—

2. ta kùllu naše go dawәltә—
   to all [the] people in [the] state—

3. bә-daw wәxtʾ kud màθaʾ dawәltә wawa.ʾ
   At that time, every city was [a] state.

4. k-ṣarxίwāla dawәltә.ʾ
   They used to call it a state.

5. mәrrә ta dawәltә dide:
   He said to his state

6. ʾana g-әbәn ta ḥukum dìdi… ta parlamәn dìdi—
   ‘I want for my government… for my parliament…

7. ʾana g-әbәn xa… meθəτүli xa mdagәl ҭali xa-dүgәl19
   I want [some]one, [I want you] to bring me [some]one who would tell me a lie

8. la hawe-bi ʾamәrәnne kulle mәndi mәn ʾilәhә = la,ʾ
   [so that] I could not say all things are from God,

---

19 In Jewish Dohok, the originally plural form dugl-e lie-pl has evidently been generalised to the singular, meaning ‘a lie’. Contrast this with the form dugla in Jewish Zakho (Sabar 2002, 138).
9. \( d\text{-}ʾamrənnə^1 \ ʾo \ dūglē = la, \) \(^{20}\) \( ṭrōsā = wət, \ ʾo \ dūglē = la. \)
so that I would say “This is [a] lie, you are right, this is [a] lie.”

10. \(^{4}Hv^1\text{-}ʾana \ g\text{-}yāwōnnoxun \ ṯlà \ yome. \) 
And I give you three days.

11. \( lā\text{-}meθōtūli \ xa \ mdāgōlli \ xa\text{-}dugle \ d\text{-}maṭe \ l\text{-}ʾaqwli, \) 
[If] you do not bring me [some]one [who] will tell me a lie that would be acceptable to me (lit. would enter my reason),

12. \( rešoxun \ mafərənnə. \) 
I will cut off your heads (lit. make them fly).

13. \( b\text{-}qatlōnnoxun, \ rešoxun \ b\text{-}qeshənnə. \) 
I will kill you, I will cut off your heads.’

14. \( kullu \ zdē\text{-}lu^1 \ ʾu\text{-}zəllu^1 \) 
All were afraid and went,

15. \( məθelu \ naše \ d\text{-}ʾamri… \) \(^1\) \( mdagli \ dūglē. \) 
brought people who would say... would lie [a] lie.

16. \( xa \ ṯèłe, \ ʿg\text{-}emər^1 \ ʾana \ b\text{-}amrən \ xa\text{-}məndi \ xēt \ žik. \) 
One [person] came [and] says ‘I will tell something else too.’

---

\(^{20}\) The clause \( ʾo \ dūglē = la \) (this \( _m \) lie.ms-cop.prs.she), which appears here twice, exhibits a lack of agreement between the subject and the copula. The subject (expressed by the demonstrative) is masculine singular, whereas the copula is feminine singular.
17. ‘u-ḥakōma ʾzik mərre,’ k-xāzōtula kəsta dət-pàre,’ kəs dət zùze,’ zuzət dēhwa?’
   And the ruler also said ‘Do you see [the] bag of money, bag of coins, golden coins?

18. ‘e kəsta wela mliθa zùze,’
   Look, this bag is full of coins,

19. kud də-mdagəl ṭali dūgla’
   [and] every[one] who would tell me a lie

20. ‘amron dūglē = la ‘āqəli q-qate,’ dūglē = la,’
   [about which] I would say “My mind decides (lit. my mind cuts) [that] this is a lie,”

21. ‘è b-yāwə́nna ṭale.’
   I will give this to him.

22. ‘u-ana ṭlə yome b-yāwönnoxun,’ b-qatlə̀nnoxun.’
   And I will give you three days, [then] I will kill you.’

23. xa g-emər ʾana xzeli bət ʾèni’
   One says ‘I saw with my [own] eyes

24. xa-nàša’ tule raš kanūšta.’
   a man [who] sat on top of [a] broom.

25. duqle kanūšta’ ʾu-fərre šêmme.’
   He seized a broom and flew into the sky.’
26. ṭele kəs ḥakōma,  g-emər ʾana hätəxə xzeli bət ʾeni.
   He came to [the] ruler [and] says ‘I saw this with my own eyes.’

27. g-əmər kulle məndi mən ʾilāhā = le.
   [The ruler] says ‘All of this is from God.

28. ʾilaha ṣibə ῥawəd hətxa.
   God can do this.’

29. xa dārele rəš kanūšta ʾu-məfərre šəmme.
   Someone may put [a man] on top of [a] broom and make him fly to the sky.

30. ʾeḥa ləwa dugle.
   This was not [a] lie.

31. xa-xət ṭele, g-emər ʾana xzeli kəlba
   Another one came and says ‘I saw [a] dog

32. yə̀lle ʾu nuqət xṃətə.
   [that] entered into the eye of a needle.

33. xzeli yə̀lle ʾu nuqət xṃətə.
   I saw him [when he] entered in the eye of [a] needle.’

34. g-emər ʾeḥa ləwa dugle,
   [The ruler] says ‘This was not a lie.’

---

21 Note that the accent is pre-penultimate, rather than penultimate. Such accent retraction occurs sometimes in forms near the end of intonation units.
35. *g-emǝr ʾilaha ʾìbe ʾawǝð hatxa.*
   He says ‘God can do this.’

36. ʾattǝ ḥakòma, ṁa d-g-ǝmrile
   Now this ruler, what[ever] they tell him,

37. ʾawa duqle b-ʾiða dǝt-ʾilàha.
   he continued to swear by God (lit. he seized the hand of God)

38. ʾilaha ʾìbe ʾawǝð.
   [saying,] ‘God can do [this].’

39. zǝllu… xa wewa huḍaya go šùqa,
   They went … there was a Jew in the market (lit. one he was a Jew in the market)

40. tāləbwa ṃnedavòt,
   [who] he used to beg,

41. ʿāyəšwa bǝt ṃnedavòt. g-yāwiwa ṭale ʾu-bʿāyìšwa.
   [who] used to live off alms. They used to give him and he would live off [that].

42. šmeʾle, g-emǝr mà-loxun ta parlament.
   He heard [and] says ‘What is [up] with you?’ to the parliament.

43. g-ǝmrı ḥāl ʾu-másale ʾèha = la.
   They say ‘The situation is this.’
44. ֠מַעֲרָא' נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

He says ‘Take me, I will tell him a lie.’

45. ֑וֹנְכָּא' נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

And I, in fact, want him to tell me it was not a lie.

46. 'א נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

I want him to tell me it was not a lie.

47. בּוֹנְכָּא' נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

Buy me a royal suit and take me to [the] bathhouse, and I shall wash, change and shave, shoes and everything new,

48. בּוֹנְכָּא' נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

and take me to [the] ruler, I shall tell him such a lie [that] he will say [that] it is [a] lie.

49. בּוֹנְכָּא' נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

I want want him to say [that] it is [a] lie.’

50. בּוֹנְכָּא' נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

They say to him ‘Fine!’

51. בּוֹנְכָּא' נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

He went to the market. They passed by the market and he says ‘Buy me seven big jugs,

52. בּוֹנְכָּא' נַבְלוּלִי, 'א נַדְגְּלוֹנ ἡ ἀρα-δύγλε.'

and also bring seven donkey drivers for ... so that they can take them to the ruler and place them [in] a line in his reception room.’
53.  ἧτον. ἰδέα μάξουζι β-γύνη. ἵσταν τὰλε σο’α λ’ⁱνε' ἵου-쇼’a ἥμαμμα’ ἤ-ζ IOError κός ḫακόμα.  
Good. They want to save themselves. They bought him seven big jugs and seven donkey drivers and they went to the king.

54.  θελη κός δάργαν’ δότ ḫακόμα, ἤ’αννα τάλμε ἤ-καδύνε, τάλμε ἤ-νάσε,  
They came to the ruler’s gate-keeper, [all] these vessels and jugs, vessels and people.

55.  μά ἢ ila γ-ἔμερι ἤ’αννα ἥρασε, ἥρασ-δ γο τάρα.  
‘What is it?’ say these keepers, the keepers who [are] at [the] gate.

56.  γ-ἔμερι μάλκ μώρρε Ἰδαξ μδάγλα xα-ᾱγλα ταλε.  
They say ‘[The] king told [us that] we should come [and] tell a lie for him.’

57.  μώρρε τα μάλκ’ flan welu Ἰδαξ, μδάγλ xα-ᾱγλα.  
They said to the king ‘Some men have come, [one] will tell you a lie.’

58.  μάλκ μώρρε ἥλυ’ suwun muθον xα’  
The king said to them ‘Go, bring me someone,

59.  βάλε ἡ-χάωε ἡδάγα.  
but he should not be [a] Jew.

60.  ἡ-χάωε ἡδάγα.  
He should not be [a] Jew.’
61. θὲλυ,’ yîʾəllu kûllu’ kəs màlk.¹
They came, they all entered into the ruler’s [presence].

62. ḥməllu go diwan,’ ʾaw huḍaya šîk.¹
They waited in the reception room, this Jew also.

63. qam-mahməllu kullu lʾine dide bət rèza’ ʾu-mən ḥammare baθər lʾine¹
He put all his big jugs in a line and a few of the donkey drivers behind the big jugs.

64. ʾu-g-emər ṭale d-mà,’ mdaglət xa-dṳg’le’ d-ʾana ʿāqli qaṭe dṳg’le=la?¹
And [the ruler] says ‘What? You [want to] tell me a lie which my mind would consider to be a lie (lit. my mind would decide it is [a] lie)?

65. ʾamrənnox dṳg’le=la?¹
I should tell you it is [a] lie?’

66. g-ᵉmər,’ hakoma basîma,’ ʾana lâ-gə-mdaglənnox dugle,’ ʾana g-əmrənnox xa-məndi d-wewa tròṣa.’¹
[The Jew] says ‘Good ruler, I do not tell you [a] lie, I tell you something that was true.

67. tròṣa wewa.’¹
It was true.

68. ʾana lâ-θəli mdaglənnox dugle.’¹
I haven’t come to tell [a] lie.’
69. *g-emǝr mǝ ʾǝtlox?*  
[The ruler] says ‘What have you got?’

70. *g-èmǝr* k-xāzǝttu ʾana lʾinǝ?  
[The Jew] says ‘Do you see those big jugs?’

71. *g-èmǝr* sawǝyi xa-naša dolamǝnt wǝwǝ.  
He says ‘My grandfather was a rich man.’

72. dolamǝnt yāʾāni mǝre dawǝltǝ, dawǝltǝ ʾūhǝle, rǝba dolamant wǝwǝ.  
*dolamant* means somebody with wealth. He had wealth, he was very rich.

73. ʾu-sawǝyox ʾ hakǝma wǝwǝ. snǝqle, l-sawǝyi mdǝyǝn-ne pǝre, zǝze,  
‘And your grandfather was a ruler. He needed my grandfather to lend him money, coins,

74. ʾu-ʾūhǝle xa-šula ʾawǝdwa.  
and he had a job to do.

75. ʾu-ʾūhǝwalu go xazina,  
When they did not have [money] in the treasury,

76. ǝle mdǝyǝnne mǝn sawǝyi, bǝdana lʾinǝ qam-malǝwalu ʾalǝ zǝze, pǝre.  
he came and borrowed from my grandfather, in these big jugs, which they filled for him with golden coins, money.

77. sawǝyi mdǝyǝnne tà sawoyox šoʾa lʾinǝ dǝt zǝze.  
My grandfather lent your grandfather seven big jugs of coins.
78. \( ʾu-ʾatta ʾana pəšli \ldots \) \( ʾhali wele twiɾa \) \( ʾu-θeli ʾšaqlən \) \( denət sawoyi mə̀nnox. \)

And now I became … I have gone bankrupt (lit. my situation is broken) and I have come to take my grandfather’s loan from you.

79. \( ʾāt ʰakòma=\ wət \) \( ʾə̀tlox. \)

You are the ruler [and] you have [enough].

80. \( munə̀xle ʰakoma, \) \( g-eməɾ \) \( ta do nàša \) \( məre lʾine, \)

The ruler sighed (lit. sighed the ruler) and says to this man with [the] big jugs

81. \( ʾimal sawòyox ʾ xa-kalba hatxa ruwa wèwa ʾ dət sawoyi mələk, \) \( ʰakòma ʾ mdayən mənne lʾine d-pərə? \)

‘When was your grandfather such a filthy bastard (lit. big dog) that my grandfather, the king, the ruler, would borrow from him big jugs of money?

82. \( mən ʾèmal ila? \) \( hatxa wewa rùwa. \)

Since when does such a thing happen (lit. since when is it)? He was such a great (filthy bastard).

83. \( sawoyox kalba rùwa wewa. \)

Your grandfather was a filthy bastard.

84. \( g-eməɾ ʾale ʰakòma ʾ mahki ta gyənox, \) \( l-ə-

[The Jew] says to him ‘Ruler, speak to yourself [quietly], [but] do not curse my grandfather.
85. ʾēn ila tròṣaʾ sawoyox wele šqila mən sawoyi pàreʾ mɪlɪlu ’anna l’ine ţàli’ dena di di.ʾ
If it is true—your grandfather had borrowed from my grandfather money—fill these big jugs for me [with the money for] my loan.

86. ʾu-ʾēn ila dùgle,ʾ hàlli kəsta.’
And if it is a lie, give me a bag [of money].’

87. ʾawa ḥakoma krə̀ble,ʾ g-emər šqùl.ʾ qam-māxela ṣàdre,ʾ g-emər ʾèhaʾ qtèle ʾāqəli duglē =la.’
That ruler got angry and says ‘Take.’ He threw the bag his way and says ‘This one I accepted as a lie (lit. this one my mind has determined to be [a] lie)’.

4. Survey of Selected Functions of Verbal Forms

In this section I present a commentary on the grammatical meanings of selected verbal forms (mostly of those attested in the texts above). As remarked, the goal of this section is to highlight some of the more distinctive features of Jewish Dohok in the context of NENA, and to draw attention to certain non-prototypical, creative applications of verbal forms that are intended to create particular discourse effects.

4.1. Expression of Realis Mood through šaqəl-wa

The šaqəl form typically expresses irrealis present and future, while its past counterpart šaqəl-wa is prototypically past irrealis. In addition, however, šaqəl-wa also sometimes occurs in sentences conveying realis mood. The prototypical realis counterparts of šaqəl and šaqəl-wa have the habitual indicative prefix k-, thus k-šaqəl (present) and k-šaqəl-wa (past).  

---

22 Overview of the use and origin of the habitualindicative prefix across the NENA dialects can be found in Khan (2007) and in Rubin (2018,
As the previous paragraph implies, there is an asymmetry between the verbal forms: the $k$- prefix is omitted in forms conveying realis mood in the past, but in the present, such omission of the prefix is virtually unattested in the corpus.\(^{23}\)

In the texts presented above, $\textit{šaqəl-wa}$ occurs in clauses that can be identified as subordinate relative clauses (though asyndetic), as well as in main clauses (examples 2/39–40 and 1/4 below respectively):

\[2/39–41\]  
\[xə wewa huḍaya go šuqa']\  
There was a Jew in the market  
$\begin{array}{ll}
\text{Ø-tāləb-Ø-wa} & \text{Hnedavôt,} \\
\text{IRR-ask-he-PST} & \text{Halms}, \\
\end{array}$  
‘[who] used to beg,’

\[1/4\]  
$\begin{array}{ll}
g-meθè-Ø-wa-lu, & \text{Ø-dārē-Ø-wa-lu } rəš \\
\text{HAB-bring-he-PST-them} & \text{IRR-place-he-PST-them on} \\
xmara dīde…\]  
donkey his…  
‘He would bring them [and] place them on his donkey…’

---

57:130–39), who presents some alternative reconstructions.  
23 For the past tense, a sample of the corpus (about 4000 words) was studied, and the ratio between $k$-$\textit{šaqəl-wa}$ and $\textit{šaqəl-wa}$ in Pattern I verbs in clauses interpreted as realis was found to be 11:1, though this ratio could be slightly different if the whole corpus were taken into account.  
24 The first number refers to the text (first or second), the second indicates the line within that text.
If the absence of the habitual indicative prefix is a matter of phonetic elision, this elision is highly irregular (i.e. it is not restricted to a single phonetic environment). A more likely explanation for its absence, therefore, is linked to the original semantics of the *k*-prefix and to its process of diachronic grammaticalisation. Namely, the *k*-prefix (and its dialectal variants) most likely originated as a progressive or presentative marker (Khan 2007, 94), which was added to the base *šaqəl*, the latter subsequently becoming restricted to irrealis mood. The progressive and presentative functions are bound especially closely with the (actual) present, since they are typically used to draw attention to situations overlapping with speech time. This, in turn, suggests that the habitual indicative prefix in NENA originated in the present tense (ibid), and only later began its spread into habituality and the past tense. In light of this, it is likely that in Jewish Dohok, the *k*-prefix has not been fully grammaticalised as a marker of realis and habituality. Specifically, it does not always occur in contexts that are not directly associated with the original function of this morpheme, viz. present tense presentative or progressive. This hypothesis would explain the lack of obligatoriness of *k*- in the case of the past.

Partial grammaticalisation can also be postulated for other dialects. C. Barwar, for instance, has the realis prefix *ʾi*-.. According to Khan, however, *ʾi-qatəl* and *ʾi-qatəl-wa*—in contrast to *qatəl* and *qatəl-wa*—are used to indicate ‘discourse prominence’. In other words, *ʾi-qatəl* and *ʾi-qatəl-wa* forms are apparently restricted to clauses conveying a high degree of pragmatic assertiveness (Khan 2008, 590–91). The domain of assertiveness (presenting a situation as new to the listener; Cristofaro 2003, 29–33) is itself likely to be related to the actual present, which draws attention to a situation in the present that is typically assumed by the speaker to be new or surprising for the hearer. Thus, the original domain of the realis prefix is not only the actual present, but also pragmatic assertion. The synchronic distribution of the *ʾi*-prefix in Barwar may still reflect this origin.
4.2. Expression of Emphatic Negative Imperative through la k-šaqəl (prototypically realis)

The negative form la k-šaqəl is used more broadly than its affirmative kšaqəl counterpart, which conveys realis present. The form la kšaqəl negates not only the present, but also the future, which, in the affirmative, is expressed by p-šaqəl. Modally, these future forms convey the sense of ‘near-realis’. That is, it conveys the higher-certainty, predictive type of epistemic future.25

This prototypical function notwithstanding, la k-šaqəl can also sometimes be used for an emphatic negative imperative. Prototypically, the negative imperative is expressed by the irrealis la šaqəl, e.g. la Ø-aθ-ət (NEG IRR-come-you_MS) ‘do not come’.26 One such case is attested in the texts (1/87, see below), and a few parallel examples are found elsewhere in my corpus:

1/87

là-k-eθ-ət (NEG HAB-come-you_MS) ʾarbi yoma xeta ʾaxxa.ʾ

‘You will not be coming here for another forty days.’

H3azH g-əmrī là-k-eθ-etu (NEG HAB-come-you_PL) mən dəšdašaʾ, lazəm zonetu pantaròne.ʾ

‘So they say you won’t be coming [wearing] a thawb, you have to buy trousers.’

Given that la k-šaqəl is typically used for predictive, ‘near-realis’ future, its use for a negative command is likely to be intended to have precisely that effect: it serves to present the event as almost certain. In other words, the command is so emphatic that it must certainly be obeyed. Its fulfilment may, therefore, be expressed as

25 See Akatsuka (1985) on epistemic modality as a scale.
26 For a discussion on different morphological expression of the imperative and for their various pragmatic functions in NENA, see Khan (2010, 65–70) and Hoberman (1989, 136).
if it is certain by using the predictive form. Such an interpretation fits the context of sentence 1/18, in which the wolf threatens to eat the man if he—despite the prohibition—comes again. The second sentence above is a command of a school official to his pupils, so it was uttered from a position of authority.

This function of la k-šaqəl also occurs in other NENA dialects. For example, native speakers of the Christian Shaqlawa dialect describe the difference between an imperative conveyed by the predictive form (corresponding to the Jewish Dohok la kšaqəł) and with the irrealis form (corresponding to la šaqəł) in the following way: ‘the former means that there can be no discussion whether the command will or will not be obeyed, so it sounds much more authoritative.’

4.3. Expression of the Resultative and of the Continuous Aspect (in Stative Verbs)

The resultative construction in Jewish Dohok is composed of the copula (in the 3rd person present, the deictic copula must be used) with the resultative participle šqila, inflected for gender and number of the subject. This is illustrated by the following constructions from the texts:

2/57

\[
\text{flan} \quad \text{welu} \quad \text{ʾə̀ðy-e}, \quad \text{Ø-mdagəl-Ø} \\
\text{some} \quad \text{DEIX.COP.they} \quad \text{RES.come-PL} \quad \text{IRR-lie-he}
\]

\[
\text{xa-dùgla.} \\
\text{a-lie.}
\]

‘Some men have come to tell you a lie.’

2/85

\[
\text{sawoy-ox} \quad \text{we-le} \quad \text{šqila} \\
\text{grandfather-your_{ms}} \quad \text{PFV.be-he} \quad \text{RES.take.MS}
\]

---

27 Private communication with Lourd Chechman.
mən sawoy -i pər-e.
from grandfather-my money-PL

‘Your grandfather had borrowed money from my grandfather.’

In such constructions, the focus of the predication is on the persisting state that follows an event, rather than on the event itself. Such usage is confirmed by other constructions from my corpus.28

This, in turn, indicates that the copula + šqila construction in Jewish Dohok is best understood as a resultative rather than a full perfect.29 In this dialect, it is largely used only with verbs that have a clear state following the activity—typically, stative verbs (e.g. the state of sitting following the event of sitting down). This type of usage is attested in the sentence 2/57 above (flan welu ʾə̀θye), where the focus is on the result of arriving. We can paraphrase: ‘Some men are here.’

The only transitive verbs that can occur in the resultative construction in Jewish Dohok are possessive transitives, such as in 2/85 (sawoyox wele šqila mən sawoyi pare).30 In transitive verbs such as šqila, the focus of the predication is on the subsequent state of having in one’s possession. We can thus paraphrase: ‘my grandfather had a loan.’

28 I am indebted to Paul Noorlander for drawing my attention to this, and for helping me test various verbs in the resultative construction during fieldwork in Jerusalem in September 2019.

29 For the distinction between the two, see (Nedjalkov 2001, 928–30). For the semantic scope of the copula + šqila construction in other NENA dialects, see, for instance, Khan (2008, 653–58). For a historical overview of these constructions, see Noorlander (2018, 328–31).

30 This construction is apparently past. Formally, the word wele can be parsed either as pfv.be-he (root hwy), which is one of the past copulas, or deix.cop.he, that is, the present deictic copula. Contextually, the former interpretation is more likely—if the grandfather was still alive, the king could easily check the truthfulness of the Jew’s claim.
In the case of stative verbs, the resultative function overlaps semantically with the continuous aspect, which also refers to a state that is ongoing at the time of reference and had begun at some point in the past. When asked to produce a sentence that includes a stative verb with continuous meaning (though typically not a verb of cognition, emotion or sensation), speakers commonly use the copula + šqila construction, for example:

ʾaw naša d-wele (DEIX.COP.he) ḫmila (RES.stand.MS) kəs beθa ʾaxɔni = le. (elicitation)

‘That man who is standing (has stopped) by the house is my brother.’

By contrast, in other dialects, the copula + šqila construction has become a full perfect. This is the case in Christian Barwar, where copula + šqila can be used with the verb ‘to kill’ (Khan 2008, 735), there being no direct effect or state of agent resulting from the act of killing. Such perfects express a more abstract situation resulting from a previous event. The construction still does not express a specific event bound to a specific point in time, but rather the event is only an implicature. There is, however, another use of the copula + šqila construction in C. Barwar (as well as in the dialects that come originally from the Ţyare region), which expresses a specific past event in narrative. This is a past perfective, though the event is presented as cognitively distant (typically in fictitious folktales). In this function, the ordinary (‘enclitic’) copula is used, rather than the deictic one (Khan 2008, 669).

---

31 A similar situation is attested in languages such as Chinese or Japanese (Shirai 1998).

32 This usage, though genre-restricted, is arguably typologically the most advanced one, based on the model of diachronic change proposed by Bybee: stative > resultative > perfect > preterite (Bybee, Perkins Revere, and Pagliuca 1994, 81–82).
4.4. Expression of the Continuous Aspect

The texts presented above include no cases of verbal forms that are exclusively dedicated to the marking of continuousness.\(^{33}\) Indeed, in the corpus as a whole, there are very few such forms, even though there are multiple cases of \(k-\text{šaqəl}\) which—contextually—clearly describe predications of a continuous nature.

In NENA dialects in general, there are two main constructions for the expression of the continuous aspect. These also commonly include the progressive function. The first—and more common one—is formed by a copula and \(b\)-Infinitive (in Jewish Dohok, \(\text{wele } bə-\text{šqala}\)), which in dialects such as Christian Urmi has been reanalysed as its own inflectional stem (Khan 2016, 185). In the second construction, a copula or a presentative particle is combined with the prototypically realis present form (in Jewish Dohok, \(\text{wal/hol/hole } k-\text{šaqəl}\)). In many NENA dialects, these constructions are widespread. In the more typologically advanced dialects such as Christian Urmi, Jewish Arbel and Christian Qaraqosh, the (originally) continuous construction has even been extended into non-progressive domains (e.g. habitual present or even perfective past in the narrative) (e.g., Christian Urmi—Khan 2016, vol. 2, 185–200).\(^{34}\)

In Jewish Dohok, however, as mentioned above, the continuous constructions are extremely rare in the corpus. This feature, as well as the restricted function and use of the resultative construction, points to the conservative character of Jewish Dohok, even in relation to the other \(\text{Lišana Denî}\) dialects.

---

33 Following Comrie, ‘continuous’ is used here to describe a state or event which is ongoing at the point of reference (Comrie 1976, 25). A continuous construction can, therefore, be used with both stative and dynamic verbs. By contrast, the term ‘progressive’ implies a progress, which is compatible only with dynamic verbs. The term ‘continuous’ is preferable here, even though many NENA grammars use the term ‘progressive’, since the constructions discussed here can be used in Jewish Dohok—as well as in other NENA dialects—also with stative verbs.

34 On a general discussion on the continuous (in Khan, ‘progressive’) constructions in NENA, see Khan (2007, 95–97).
Another noteworthy feature of Jewish Dohok is that it possesses both of the continuous constructions. These two constructions, moreover,—judging from the available data—have distinct functions.

**Wele bə-šqala**

This construction is only attested twice in the corpus. In both of those cases, it describes a bodily state that is not of a cognitive, emotional or sensory nature. Sentence 3f/36 below describes a state that is ongoing in the time between the Jew’s visits to the king.

\[mà d-g-məθele dərmāne\] \(\text{NEG-COP. PRS.he in-healing)}\). (3f)

‘Whatever medicine they bring and whatever they do, he is not getting better.’

\[zəlle \text{misken} \ o \ huḍaya l-bèθa, \ l-ewe bə-dmàxa \ (\text{NEG-COP.PRS.he in-sleeping}) \ mən zdòʾōθe.ˈ \ (3f)\]

‘The poor Jew went home, he is not sleeping for his fear.’

With other verbs, wele bə-šqala could not be elicited from most speakers.\(^{35}\) This suggests that in Jewish Dohok wele bə-šqala is—in contrast to other dialects—precisely *not* a progressive construction. Rather, it conveys the non-dynamic continuous aspect, but even in this function it is highly restricted, being attested only with physical states.

In many NENA dialects, by contrast, the parallel construction with a copula + b-Infinitive expresses the progressive function. A situation similar to that in Jewish Dohok, however, is attested in early-NENA sources, suggesting that the situation in Jewish

\(^{35}\) When the speakers were presented with such a construction containing a stative verb of cognition, sensory perception or emotion, they accepted it, but said it sounded unnatural or reminiscent of another Lišana Deni dialect (e.g. Jewish Zakho) and rephrased it with a k-šaqal form.
Dohok is a conservative one. Such early-NENA evidence is supplied by the early Christian (apparently archaising) NENA poetry from north-western Iraq (Telkepe and Alqosh), dating to the 17th-19th centuries (Mengozzi 2012). In these texts, (copula +) b-Infinitive is very rare, and functions as a ‘circumstantial modifier or a complement of the predicate, whereas it rarely occurs in combination with the copula’ (Mengozzi 2012, 34, citing Poizat 1999, 173).

Similarly, in Jewish Dohok, wele bə-šqala is only attested with states. In this dialect, however, those states are predicative (i.e. they contain a copula). Thus, in contrast to the early-NENA poetry, they are not necessarily presented as overlapping temporarilily with the predicate of the clause, on which they are syntactically dependent. Rather, they may simply overlap with a given period of time specified by the broader context. Moreover, it remains to be seen how the continuous/progressive in NENA fits with the typical grammaticalisation paths of the progressive. Cross-linguistically, progressive constructions typically involve dynamic verbs, and—according to Bybee, Perkins, and Pagliuca (1994, 133)—often develop from (metaphorically) locative constructions.

Wəl/hol/hole k-šaqəl

In contrast to wele bə-šqala, wəl/hol/hole k-šaqəl is only attested with dynamic verbs in the corpus (five times in total). The first element of these constructions is a presentative particle wəl or hol, or hole (i.e. apparently a fossilised 3ms form). Consider the following examples from the corpus:

θela mən tàma,ʾay baxta ʰmiskênaʰ hole g-baxš-a-lu (PROG HAB-stir-she-them) tlòxe.' (3h)

36 The association of the wəl/hol/hole k-šaqəl construction with lexically dynamic verbs is confirmed from interviews. Speakers showed a tendency to rephrase constructions offered by the interviewer such as *wele b-iθaya ‘he is coming’ as wəl k-eθe ‘look, he is coming’.
She came from there, that poor woman, and [now] **look, she is stirring** the lentils.

\[ g-yāʾəl-wa go màṭbax \quad k-xāpəq-wa-la \quad g-nāšə̀q-wa-la. \quad b-amrá-wā-le \quad d-prùq-li. \quad ʾana \quad wəl \quad gə-mbàšlan \quad (PROG \ \text{HAB-cook-I}), \quad ʾatta \quad gəbe \quad ʾoðan \quad ʾixāla. \]

‘He used to enter the kitchen, hug her, kiss her. [But] she would tell him ‘Leave me’. **Look, I am cooking**, I need to make food now.’

It is the presentative elements—*wəl, hole* or *hol*—that convey the continuous aspect. Presentative particles typically draw attention to an event that can be witnessed by the hearer. This, in turn, often has the purpose of highlighting the significance of the event. In narrative, therefore, presentatives have the effect of placing the listener in the midst of the unfolding events, as if he or she were witnessing them personally.37 This, in turn, means that such presentative forms are likely to be used for situations that are happening in the here-and-now, and are, therefore, aspectually continuous. Still, in light of the rarity of these constructions in Jewish Dohok, it is highly unlikely that the presentative particles in constructions combined with *k-šaqəl* have been fully grammaticalised as continuous markers. Instead, these particles probably perform a discourse function (drawing attention to significant events happening in the here-and-now), which happens to overlap with a grammatical function (marking continuousness).

### 5. Conclusions

This paper has presented two folktales from the hitherto unstudied NENA dialect of the Jews of Dohok accompanied by linguistic glosses (for a part of text), translation and comments on a few noteworthy constructions. These stories exemplify the rich and

---

37 For a discussion on the function of presentative copulas and particles and their possible historical origin, see Cohen (2017).
long-standing genre of orally transmitted folktales, typical for many of the NENA-speaking communities.

These stories were followed by a brief grammatical study of a few aspects of verbal semantics, focusing primarily on features attested in the texts themselves. I concentrated especially on forms and functions that are noteworthy either from the point of view of Jewish Dohok itself, or from the perspective of NENA more broadly. I showed that the prototypically realis and predictive la k-šaqəl can be used for deontic modality (imperative), apparently to create a stronger imperative by presenting it as predictive (‘near-realis’). I also showed that the prototypically past irrealis šaqəl-wa can be used for the realis past. I suggested that this is due to the incomplete grammaticalisation of the k-indicative habitual prefix, which is likely to have originated as a presentative-progressive marker in the present and is not yet obligatory in the past. In addition, I studied the construction copula + šqila (resultative participle), noting that it tends to be used only with stative and possessive transitive verbs. In light of this restriction, it should be analysed as a resultative and not as a fully-developed perfect, in contrast to many other dialects. Additionally, I showed that forms dedicated exclusively to the marking of continuousness are used only marginally. Moreover, one of them is apparently reserved for stative verbs. This is apparently a conservative feature in Jewish Dohok; which distinguishes this dialect even from the closely related dialects, such as Jewish Amedia or Jewish Zakho.
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