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This study analyzes three unmarked-marked verbal pairs that exist in the Neo-Aramaic dialects of Christian Barwar and Christian Urmi. Each pair is analyzed for the opposing forms’ formal and functional differences, with an emphasis on function. It is argued that despite the fact that the morphemes affixed to the marked forms are aspectual prefixes, the marked forms’ main functional differences from their unmarked counterparts are pragmatic ones. Chapter I presents an introduction to the study, including information about the dialects analyzed and the study itself. Chapter II focuses on the marked forms that signal relationships between events in the discourse. This chapter first explores the unmarked *qatūl* form versus the marked *ḥd-qatūl* form, wherein it is argued that the marked form signals to the listener to interpret the marked event in relation to another event in the nearby discourse. The same unmarked *qatūl* form is then presented in opposition to the marked *i-qatūl* form, and it is claimed that the marked form indicates a sequence-final event. Chapter III is an analysis of the unmarked *qṭille* form versus the marked *qəm-qatūl* form, and it is determined that the marked form is used to represent the event from the point of view of the object. Chapter IV presents concluding remarks.
# CONTENTS

## CHAPTER

### I. INTRODUCTION .............................................................................................................1

- The Neo-Aramaic Dialects of Christian Barwar and Christian Urmi ......1
- Verb Paradigms .............................................................................................................2
- Purpose and Scope of the Study .................................................................................3
- General Hypothesis ......................................................................................................4
- Data Considerations ....................................................................................................5
- Approach ......................................................................................................................6

### II. MARKING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EVENTS: THE UNMARKED qātāl FORM VS. THE MARKED bēd-qātāl FORM AND THE MARKED i-qātāl FORM ........................................................................................................7

- The Unmarked qātāl Form vs. the Marked bēd-qātāl Form .........................7
- The Unmarked qātāl Form .........................................................................................8
- Current Research on Function .................................................................................8
- The Marked bēd-qātāl Form .......................................................................................10
- Current Research on Function ..............................................................................11
- Hypothesis ................................................................................................................13
- Argumentation ...........................................................................................................13
- Dependency Relationships ......................................................................................13
- Pragmatic Implications of Marking Discourse Dependency ........................17
- Conclusion .................................................................................................................18
The Unmarked qaṭṭ Form vs. the Marked i-qaṭṭ Form......................18
The Unmarked qaṭṭ Form..........................................................19
The Marked i-qaṭṭ Form..........................................................19

Current Research on Function .............................................20

Hypothesis.................................................................................22

Argumentation ..........................................................................22

Sequence-Final Event Marking.............................................22

Pragmatic Implications of Sequence-Final Event Marking ....26

Conclusion..................................................................................26

III. MARKING POINT OF VIEW: THE UNMARKED qaṭṭle FORM VS. THE
MARKED qaṭṭle Form .................................................................28

The Unmarked qaṭṭle Form vs. the Marked qaṭṭle Form ..........28

The Unmarked qaṭṭle Form ......................................................29

Current Research on Function .............................................30

The Marked qaṭṭle Form..........................................................30

Current Research on Function .............................................32

Hypothesis.................................................................................33

Argumentation ..........................................................................33

Object Definiteness .................................................................33

Establishing an Object’s Identity in the Discourse .................37

Referencing the Established Object.......................................39

Pragmatic Implications of Representing Events from the Point of
View of the Object ...................................................................40

The qaṭṭle Form and the Passive Voice ....................................43
Verbs that do and do not Allow the $qam\text{-}qat\ell$ Form..........................44

Conclusion ........................................................................................................47

V. CONCLUSION ..................................................................................................49

Findings ..............................................................................................................49

Future Research .................................................................................................49

REFERENCES .....................................................................................................51

APPENDIX A: List of Abbreviations ....................................................................53


**TABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Verb Paradigm for the <em>qaṣl</em> Form</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Verb Paradigm for the <em>qtille</em> Form</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The Neo-Aramaic Dialects of Christian Barwar and Christian Urmi

Aramaic is a Semitic language that first appeared in northern Syria in the ninth century, B.C., and remained the dominant language in the Fertile Crescent until it was overtaken by Arabic in the seventh century, A.D. (Gragg & Hoberman, 2012:147). According to Gragg and Hoberman (ibid), “There are now several hundred thousand speakers of Aramaic, perhaps more, known as Assyrians or Chaldeans, speaking something between four and ten distinct languages.” These languages are often divided into dialect groups. North Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA) is one group of these dialects that is spoken by both Jewish and Christian communities in Turkey, Iraq, and Iran (Doron & Khan, 2012:226). The focus of this study will be on two of these NENA dialects: Christian Barwar and Christian Urmi, both spoken by Assyrian Christians.

Despite the fact that these two dialects may be considered relatively distant from one another in the NENA group geographically (with C. Barwar situated in northwest Iraq and C. Urmi in northwest Iran), they share many elements from phonology to morphology to vocabulary. There are several reasons for this. First, some features of C. Urmi may have been adopted into the C. Barwar dialect when speakers of C. Barwar inhabited Urmi as refugees of war in the first part of the twentieth century, particularly during the Kurdish uprising of the 1960s. Another hypothesis is that the influence from Urmi may have come from “the koine dialect of the Assyrian Christian refugee communities of the Iraqi towns, which was based on the C. Urmi dialect” (Khan, 2008:17). Additionally, many features of “educated” and literary Neo-Aramaic used across dialects were originally based on those of C. Urmi (Khan, 2008:18). This
long-term influence of C. Urmī on C. Barwar makes analyzing the two dialects together both possible and fruitful.

**Verb Paradigms**

The present study deals with varying verb forms in C. Barwar and C. Urmī (referred to for the remainder of the study as simply Barwar and Urmī) and, therefore, it is necessary to understand how these forms are constructed. Modern Aramaic is a language with template morphology, made up of consonant bases that are inflected with a variety of vowels to create the language’s verb forms¹. The basic verb paradigms for Barwar-- the *qaṭāl* paradigm and the *qtille* paradigm, from which all other forms derive-- are presented in Tables 1 and 2, adapted from Khan (2008:299-307). Paradigms for Urmī are much the same, minus small differences in the inflectional endings for person, number, and gender (PNG). In these paradigms, the templates are referred to by their typical consonant-vowel combination patterns (e.g. *CVC* for a form whose template is generally inflected by vowel insertion between the two base template consonants), without reference to the PNG inflectional endings².

**Table 1. Verb Paradigm for the *qaṭāl* Form (CVC)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Template base: <em>pθx</em> 'to open'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ According to Gragg and Hoberman (2012:182), NENA has “entirely lost” the Semitic prefix & suffix conjugations indicating tense, aspect, and modality that they had in the past. In NENA, these conjugations have been replaced with “a highly elaborated system of tenses, aspects, and moods based on the older Aramaic participles and gerunds.”

² There are certain lexical items that defy these general inflectional patterns. For example, many words beginning with *m*- or *k*- and appearing in the CCV form are still considered by Khan (2008) to be in the *qaṭāl* form, but analysis of this is not relevant to the present study, and must, therefore, be set aside for another time. Additionally, when a word begins with a vowel (such as *azəl*, from the root *z*l ’to go’), the *qaṭāl* form interpretation remains despite the lack of an onset consonant.
Table 2. Verb Paradigm for the *qtîlle* Form (CCV)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>ms.</td>
<td><em>pθîxle</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fs.</td>
<td><em>pθîxla</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td><em>pθîxly</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>ms.</td>
<td><em>pθîxlux</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fs.</td>
<td><em>pθîxlax</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td><em>pθîxlexu</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>s.</td>
<td><em>pθîxli</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pl.</td>
<td><em>pθîxlen</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These two paradigms make up the bases of all forms to be analyzed in this study, which are discussed in the following section.

**Purpose and Scope of the Study**

In both Barwar and Urmi, there exist marked and unmarked verbal forms in each tense that many scholars have claimed have overlapping functions. The notion of “markedness” here is adopted from Comrie (1976). He explains that, “where we have an opposition with two or more members…it is often the case that one member of the opposition is felt to be more usual, more normal, less specific than the other,” and that member is considered the unmarked form (111). The distinction between these unmarked forms and their marked counterparts is made in several ways. First, “the marked category signals the presence of some feature, while the unmarked category simply says nothing about its presence or absence” (112). Additionally, unmarked categories “tend to have less morphological material than marked categories” (114). Therefore,
in this study, the unmarked forms are classified as such because there are relatively few restrictions on their use, and they contain no additional morphology beyond their basic inflected roots and PNG endings. The marked forms, on the other hand, have more extensive usage restrictions and contain additional affixes that modify them. What makes these marked and unmarked forms interesting is that any functional distinctions between them have yet to be fully described.

The purpose of this study is to identify and describe the functional differences between these unmarked-marked pairs. These pairs are generally described in the literature along the lines of tense (though this is to be debated herein), and these tense distinctions are as follows: the unmarked qatāl form with a future tense interpretation and the marked bad-qatāl form, also mainly found in the future tense; the unmarked qatāl form with a present tense interpretation\(^3\) versus the marked i-qatāl form, also generally in the present tense; and the unmarked qīlā form versus the marked qom-qatāl form, which are mainly found in the past tense. While these unmarked-marked pairs are not the only verbal forms of interest in Barwar and Urmi, they have been selected because they are marked specifically through particle prefixation. In-depth exploration of verb forms modified by suffixes such as -wa is also warranted, but is beyond the scope of the current study. Therefore, these suffixes are touched on only briefly herein when doing so supports the analysis of the forms in focus.

**General Hypothesis**

As Frajzyngier (2004:55) explains, “If a language has two tense and/or aspectual systems with identical temporal or aspectual values coded by each system, the two systems also have functions other than the coding of aspect or time.” With this in mind, the hypothesis that will be

\(^3\) It is not in error that the qatāl form appears in a marked-unmarked pair in both the future tense and the present tense. This will be discussed in the following sections.
put forth in this study is that though the particles prefixed to the verbal bases of the unmarked forms to create the marked forms are aspectual prefixes, they are used not simply to convey aspectual meaning, but rather, to carry out pragmatic discourse functions.

**Data Considerations**

Methods of data collection for this study varied based on dialect. All data from Barwar was gathered from Geoffrey Khan’s 2008 grammar of Barwar, including spoken data from the narrative genre. Narrow glosses are not provided in this grammar and, therefore, all glosses contained in the present study have been supplied by this author and not Khan (2008). The transcriptions and translations, however, have not been altered beyond the addition of bold text, which has been added for the sake of clarity. All data from Urmi was collected by this author and other students in a linguistics course at the University of Colorado at Boulder through elicitation, narrative, and conversation. All of the data from Urmi is spoken data, and narrow glosses were produced by this author. No published data was considered, as there has been no grammar of the dialect published to date. Examples will be identified for dialect within the text.

It should also be noted that some phonological differences exist between the dialects, most notably in the prefixes of two of the three marked forms. In Urmi, the prefix of the marked form appearing with a past interpretation is produced as the unreduced *qam-*p, while in Barwar it is reduced to *qəm-*p. The reduced form (*qəm*-qat*) has been selected to serve as the name of this form to follow the approach of Khan (2008). Similarly, the marked form generally associated with the future tense carries a prefix that is produced as the unreduced *bət*- in Urmi, while in C.

---

4 As the author is not a fluent speaker of Barwar, some gaps in knowledge must be taken into consideration when reviewing the narrow glosses provided herein. Portions of glosses appearing in brackets should be interpreted as items that may or may not be accurately glossed since the item did not appear in the lexicon volume of Khan’s (2008) grammar. Additionally, items glossed with a question mark are undetermined at this point for the same reason. The author has attempted to provide as much specific detail about the morphemes that appear in the transcriptions despite the fact that these morphemes are not separated by Khan (2008).
Barwar it is reduced to $b\delta d$, $b\tau t$, $b\tau$, or $t\tau$. Following Khan (2008) again, this marked form is referred to herein using the most prevalent Barwar pronunciation, $b\delta d$-$q\tau \rho l$.

**Approach**

This study will be structured as follows: in Chapter II, the unmarked $q\tau \rho l$ form will be presented in opposition to both the marked $b\delta d$-$q\tau \rho l$ form and the marked $i$-$q\tau \rho l$ form, with all forms analyzed for both form and function. In Chapter III, the form and function of the unmarked $q\tilde{t}l$le form versus the marked $q\tilde{w}m$-$q\tau \rho l$ form will be examined. These chapters will include a brief introduction to the forms in question, including analysis of tense, aspect, and valence requirements. Presentation of current research on the functions of the forms will follow. Then, original hypotheses will be presented, followed by argumentation for these hypotheses. Each chapter ends with concluding remarks, and a broader conclusion on findings and directions for future research will be presented in the final chapter, Chapter IV.
CHAPTER II
MARKING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EVENTS:
THE UNMARKED qat\(\text{\textael}l\) FORM VS. THE MARKED b\(\text{\textael}d\)-qat\(\text{\textael}l\) FORM AND THE MARKED i-qat\(\text{\textael}l\) FORM

As mentioned in the previous chapter, the marked forms in Barwar and Urmì seem to be used to carry out pragmatic functions. The current chapter will explore the two unmarked-marked pairs whose pragmatic function is to code a specific relationship between events. First, the pair of the unmarked qat\(\text{\textael}l\) form and the marked b\(\text{\textael}d\)-qat\(\text{\textael}l\) form will be analyzed, followed by an analysis of the pair of the same unmarked form and the marked i-qat\(\text{\textael}l\) form.

**The Unmarked qat\(\text{\textael}l\) Form vs. the Marked b\(\text{\textael}d\)-qat\(\text{\textael}l\) Form**

The unmarked qat\(\text{\textael}l\) form and the marked b\(\text{\textael}d\)-qat\(\text{\textael}l\) form are the two forms in opposition that appear mainly with future tense interpretations. Example (1) illustrates the unmarked qat\(\text{\textael}l\) form in Barwar, and (2) displays the marked b\(\text{\textael}d\)-qat\(\text{\textael}l\) form in the same dialect\(^5\).

(1) \(\text{\textael}n\)a q\(\text{\textael}\)m\(\text{\textael}\)n \(\text{\textael}z\)n \(\text{\textael}m\)ra.

\begin{tabular}{lll}
COP.1SG & ? & go & church \\
\end{tabular}

I shall go to church.

(2) \(\text{\textael}\)y \(\text{\textael}q\)\(\text{\textael}\)\(\text{\textael}\)h\(\text{\textael}\)a \(\text{\textael}f\)-\(\text{\textael}\)\(\text{\textael}\)za.

\begin{tabular}{ll}
DEM channel PFV-go \\
\end{tabular}

\(^5\) The intentional nature of (1) and the predictive nature of (2) may be noted here, but because both the unmarked and marked forms may be used to code either intention or prediction, the difference is inconsequential to this analysis.
The channel will flow.

Both forms contain the CVC base, while the marked form carries the additional ʰbad- prefix (which is in some cases phonologically reduced, as discussed in Chapter I). In the following section, the unmarked form will be analyzed, and that section will be followed by an analysis of the marked form in an effort to illuminate the functional differences between the two.

**The Unmarked ʰqat̪əl Form**

Though the unmarked ʰqat̪əl form is used mainly with a present tense interpretation, it may also be used in future or past tense contexts in which the tense is generally coded in a nearby clause. The ʰqat̪əl form is then to be interpreted as taking on that same time reference (Khan, 2008:570-580). Aspectually, the ʰqat̪əl form may be used to represent either perfective or imperfective aspect. Khan claims that the form expresses imperfective aspect in habitual realis actions while it expresses the perfective aspect in the narrative realis present, subordinate complement clauses, and both the deontic and predictive irrealis future (ibid). There do not appear to be any restrictions on the valence of the verbs in the ʰqat̪əl construction.

**Current Research on Function**

The lack of restrictions in tense, aspect, and valence shows that the unmarked ʰqat̪əl form is by far the most versatile verb form in NENA. Khan (2008:570-574) explains that the ʰqat̪əl form has “a wide range of functions,” both realis and irrealis. These functions include representing foreground events in the narrative present, which is seen in (3), from Barwar.

(3) ᵇəl̪yə, ʰap-xa-xēta ʰəxəl̪ə. ʰəxəl̪ə.

go.down also-one-another eat.3SGF
She **goes down** and **eats** also another one.

Additionally, habitual actions that include the present often appear in the unmarked *qatəl* form, as displayed in (4), also from Barwar, though temporary situations are also represented in this form.

(4) *kut-bēθa mbašəl xa-məndi.*'

*>every-house.F cook one-thing*

Every household **cooks** something.

The past can be represented in the *qatəl* form, as displayed by (5), from Barwar, though current research provides no functional explanation for this choice.

(5) *ʾu-sīqle ta-f-āxəl məndi.*'

*>CONJ.COORD-went.3SGM [PREP.?]-PURP-eat thing*

He **went up** to eat something.

Of most relevance to the current section, though, is that the *qatəl* form is also used for future events. This is seen in (1), above, and also in (6), from Barwar. Khan (2008:574) claims that the form functions in these cases to convey an element of will, intention, obligation, request, or permission related to the future.

(6) *ʾamrənnəx xā-məndi.*'
I shall tell you something.

It is this future interpretation that will be focused on in this section in order to contrast it with the marked *bəd-qatəl* form, which mainly appears with a future interpretation. Its use in the present tense will be focused on later in the chapter.

**The Marked *bəd-qatəl* Form**

The marked *bəd-qatəl* form generally carries a future tense interpretation, as seen in (2), above, but there are some cases in which the present tense is represented with this form instead. A present tense interpretation of the *bəd-qatəl* form is seen in (7), from Barwar.

(7) ʾərbe máxe l-gədəde,’ t-ázi xa-fətra,’ ʾal-saliqə zornə.’

sheep.PL [gather] DEF-RECIP.PRO PFV-go.3PL one-while PREP.to-tune pipe

He gathers the sheep together and they go off for a while according to the tune of the pipe.

As for aspect, a verb in the *bəd-qatəl* form should be understood as being perfective since “it presents actions delimited with a start and end point” (Khan, 2008:599). This is in contrast with the unmarked form, which has a variable aspectual value, as discussed above. Therefore, the *bəd*-prefix should be interpreted as an aspectual prefix since its addition converts the variable nature

---

6 In NENA verbs, the present tense is also used for habitual situations like the one represented in (7).
of the *qat̪əl* form’s aspect to a strictly perfective one. There appear to be no requirements for the
number of arguments in the *bəd-qat̪əl* form.

**Current Research on Function**

Khan (2008:602-604) argues that the “basic” function of the *bəd-qat̪əl* form is marking of
the future tense. However, he claims that beyond that and the implementation of a perfective
interpretation, the *bəd-qat̪əl* form codes discourse dependency. He argues that this discourse
dependency can take many forms, including temporal sequentiality, as seen in (7) from Barwar,
repeated below as (8), in which the going off event is meant to be viewed as occurring after the
gathering event.

(8) `ʾrbe máxe l-gdāde,’ *t-ázi xa-fātra,’ *al-saliqə zōrna.’
   sheep.PL [gather] DEF-RECIPI.PRO PFV-go.3PL one-while PREP.to-tune pipe
   He gathers the sheep together and they go off for a while according to the tune of the pipe.

Another form of discourse dependency marking that Khan (2008) argues the *bəd-qat̪əl* form is
used for is indicating contextual relevance to a preceding clause. This may appear as
backgrounding, as seen in (9), from Barwar, in which the ‘say’ verb appears to introduce
background information about the purpose of fasting.

---

7 The argument that all *bəd-qat̪əl* form verbs should be understood as perfective may be called into question in light
of instances such as that seen in (7) and others presented in the present study, but Khan (2008) explains that the form
should indeed be interpreted as perfective despite such examples because, as mentioned above, the form presents an
event with a start and end point. Additionally, even when an event is iterative, Khan (2008:599) states about the *bəd-
qat̪əl* form that “the speaker uses the form that is appropriate to express each individual perfective occurrence of the
iterated situation.” It may be argued that this is not the case, but that argument will not be made here. Rather, Khan’s
interpretation will be accepted since it neither weighs heavily on nor alters our hypothesis about the pragmatic
function of the *bəd-qat̪əl* form.
The Rogation of the Ninevites was also observed (in our community). They would fast during it. They would say “The cocks and the chickens, and also the small lowly creatures (should observe the fast).”

Foregrounding may also be seen as a function of the bəd-qatəl form according to Khan (2008), as this is another case of discourse dependency. Example (10), also from Barwar, illustrates this foregrounding. In this example, the ‘come’ event is meant to be understood with the background of the speaker’s social status to illuminate it; the coming should be seen as shocking due to the information given in the previous clause.

(10) ’āna  hāwɔn Qāra Tēzdin,’ matbānɔt xārje-w  bārjɔt
COP.1SG  Qara Tezdin  collector  tax.PL-CONJ.COORD  and such
boṭanɔye.’  f-āθe  xa-ˈárxa  ‘ax-d-áwwa’
people of Botan  PFV-come.3SGM one-guest  like-PREP.?-DEM
gu-bêθi’  ’u-  pâlɔt leðɔn lêkèle  zâla,’
PREP.to-house.GEN1SG CONJ.COORD-?  ?  [leave.3SGM] PN
lêka  là!’
[leave] NEG
I am Qara Teždin, the collector of all taxes of the people of Botan, and a guest comes like this into my house and leaves without me knowing where on earth he was going!

Coghill (2010:367) addresses the bad-qatāl form’s discourse dependency function as well when she explains that in most NENA dialects, “The b-future expresses a future which is…contingent on the fulfilment (sic) of a condition.”\textsuperscript{8} Such a condition would necessarily create discourse dependency, as the marked event could not be fully understood without the awareness of the condition.

However, the fact that none of the marked verbs in (7)-(10) carry a future tense interpretation, and the fact that the future may be indicated by either the marked or the unmarked form signal that analyzing the bad-qatāl form as a future-indicating form is incorrect. Similarly, Khan’s implication that the discourse dependency type (foregrounding, backgrounding, and so on) may be identified hinges on subjective interpretation of the utterances. This shows that another hypothesis needs to be considered

**Hypothesis**

It will be argued here that the bad-qatāl form is not a future marker at all. Rather, it appears to be exclusively a dependency marker, indicating that the listener must interpret the marked event in relation to something else in the nearby discourse context. The dependency relationship type is not morphologically marked and, therefore, need not be specified.

**Argumentation**

**Dependency Relationships**

\textsuperscript{8} Coghill (2010) also, however, goes on to contradict Khan’s (2008) hypotheses about the bad-qatāl form in several ways, possibly because she is analyzing NENA dialects generally while Khan analyzes Barwar in particular.
It has been mentioned above that the particles prefixed to the unmarked forms to create the marked forms should be considered aspectual prefixes (in the case of the *bəd-* form a perfective one). Using aspectual forms to mark pragmatic dependency is not a new concept. One place this is found is in the English progressive. According to Frajzyngier, et. al. (2008:91), the English progressive in all tenses “can provide the background for the interpretation of another proposition.” They go on to explain that in English:

“All progressive forms must be interpreted in connection with another proposition, or event, or time. Clauses containing the progressive form are thus pragmatically dependent clauses, in that either they provide the background for the temporal interpretation of other clauses or must be interpreted in connection with some other situation or proposition” (ibid).

While there is no basis for arguing for a connection between the marked *bəd-* form in NENA and the English progressive specifically, recognition of the ability of aspectual forms to code pragmatic functions is vital to an understanding of the current analysis, as the *bəd-* form seems to represent a pragmatically dependent clause that must be interpreted in relation to something else in the discourse.

The function of the *bəd-* form signaling that the listener must interpret the marked utterance in relation to something else can be seen in the following example from Barwar (example (11)). In this case, what the marked event should be interpreted with is the hypothetical situation in the protasis of the utterance. This dependence may be seen as both temporal and situational in that the marked event should be understood as following the unmarked event and also as the effect in a cause and effect relationship. Therefore, one specific dependency type cannot be objectively determined.
In the preceding examples, as well as others to come, only one event is marked in the *bəd*-qaṭəl form, signaling to the listener that he or she must interpret that event in relation to something else. Example (12) below, from Urmi, shows that this is not the only way to utilize the form. In (12), both events are represented with the *bəd*-qaṭəl form. The marked ‘come’ verb may be understood as referring to the previously specified date of the nineteenth, while the marked ‘stay’ verb could be interpreted in relation to the previously mentioned coming. However, it is also possible that both verbs are marked because the relationship that should be understood is one of codependence.

(12)  
\[
\text{bəs pxelit alaha itfāsa bi-dʒarxa but-etija u}
\]

but power God nineteen PREP.in-month PFV-come.3SGF CONJ.COORD

\[
\text{but-pefa laxa qa tla juma-ne}
\]

PFV-stay.3SGF here PREP.for three day-PL

But with the power of God, the nineteenth in the month she will come, and she will stay here for three days.

The same may be the case in (13), also from Urmi; both verbs are marked because they can be interpreted as codependent, and in this case co-occurring.
I will **love** you the moment you **listen** to the words I say.

Once again we see that the specific dependency type cannot be objectively determined because all types are marked in the same way: with the *bəd-qətəl* form.

Additionally, the *bəd*-prefix is found in a similar construction that further points to the *bəd-qətəl* form’s discourse dependency signaling function: the *bəd-qətəlwa* form. In the *bəd-qətəlwa* form, the past tense suffix –*wa* is affixed to the *bəd-qətəl* form to indicate an event that took place prior to speech time. When this form is used, it expresses an event that is either temporally sequential to, logically sequential to, or elaborating on what precedes it (Khan, 2008:605-608). The temporal sequentiality function appears in (14), from Barwar.

When the beginning of the (Lent) fast came, we **would** take all our vessels, we **would** take them all and put ash on them to clean them.

Khan (2008:606) claims that in this case the temporal sequentiality is seen in that the *bəd-qətəlwa* verbs follow the unmarked form of the coming of the fast, but it seems that in this case...
there is also a dependency relationship between the \textit{bəd-qətəlwa} verbs and the events that follow; 
they must be interpreted together. Because the only function of the \textit{–wa} suffix is to convert the 
tense to past, it follows that the \textit{bəd-qətəl} form is expressing the discourse dependency function 
that is found also in the \textit{bəd-qətəlwa} form, and in this form also, the specific dependency type 
cannot be determined.

\textbf{Pragmatic Implications of Marking Discourse Dependency}

The overarching pragmatic implication of signaling that the listener must interpret the 
marked event in relation to something else could be that he or she simply makes his or her 
meaning as clear as possible. This could encompass temporal relationships, cause and effect 
relationships, backgrounding and foregrounding relationships, or any number of other types of 
relationships between discourse elements. By indicating that an event in the \textit{bəd-qətəl} form is 
dependent on something else, the speaker guides the listener to make appropriate associations 
between discourse elements. However, there may be an additional, underlying implication of 
using the marked form: the speaker may add validity to his or her assertions. Khan (2008:578) 
explains that, in addition to other instances, when “the speaker asserts that something will take 
place and is committed to the truth of the assertion,” he or she uses the \textit{bəd-qətəl} form. The 
usage of the form may relate, then, to the truth value of the utterance; by marking the verb in the 
\textit{bəd-qətəl} form, the speaker is pointing to something else in the discourse that is connected to the 
event in question which makes that event valid. This may also be one reason that the form tends 
to occur in the future tense more often than in other tenses; future events are undetermined since 
they have yet to occur, and by marking the event as related to something else and, therefore, as 
containing a greater truth value, the speaker is asserting the accuracy of the utterance that may 
have otherwise been more open to doubt.
Conclusion

Khan (2008:598-605) argues that the bəd-qaṭəl form codes the future tense usually and other tenses occasionally. The analysis presented here shows that this is not the case; the form is not a tense indicator at all. What appears to be true instead is what Khan (2008) explores only briefly: prefixation of the bəd- particle not only functions as an aspectual marker for the perfective, but the resulting marked form’s pragmatic function is as a signal for a discourse dependency interpretation of the event. Specifically, we have claimed that the form indicates that the listener must interpret the marked utterance in relation to something else. The particular discourse dependency type is not marked and is, therefore, not able to be objectively determined. Future research should be done to discover ways in which the appearance of the form may be consistently predicted.

The bəd-qaṭəl form, though, is not the only form to carry out the pragmatic function of marking relationships between events. This function as carried out by the i-qaṭəl form is explored in the next section.

The Unmarked qaṭəl Form vs. the Marked i-qaṭəl Form

Most commonly seen with a present tense interpretation, the unmarked-marked verbal pair to be addressed in this section is the qaṭəl form, displayed in (15), and the i-qaṭəl form, as seen in (16), both from Barwar. It should be noted than the i- particle is produced as y- when occurring before a vowel in Barwar, which is displayed in (16) and other examples to follow.

(15)  yâðəx  hòla  tlixe  ‘ánna bâte’  ‘u-lêla-xəzye  ‘askarwáθa.

We know that the houses have been destroyed and no armies have been seen.
In the morning the people go to church and take communion.

As described above, the unmarked qaṭāl form is made up of the CVC base. The i-qaṭāl form is made up of this same base but with the addition of the i- prefix.

**The Unmarked qaṭāl Form**

Please see above for a tense/aspect/valence analysis of the unmarked qaṭāl form, as well as discussion of the form’s function in the present tense, which is relevant to the current analysis.

**The Marked i-qaṭāl Form**

Like the qaṭāl form, the i-qaṭāl form is mainly found with a present tense interpretation, as seen in (16), above, but it may also be used in the future tense when the verb is negated, as seen in (17), from Barwar. The tense interpretation exists based on discourse context (Khan, 2008:590-604).

(17) \textbf{lè-y-axlena.}'

NEG-IPFV-eat.3SGF

I shall not eat.
The *i-qat̪əl* form is also used in the past tense, obtaining this tense indication either through context or when the past tense –*wa* suffix is added. The form with a past tense interpretation appears in (18), also from Barwar.

(18) \(\text{zab̪ənwa 'iləna, 'b-ə-ga náše} \quad \text{xéne 'i-zənî.'}\)

sell.PST tree PREP.?-DEF.REF-then person.PL other IPFV-buy.3PL

He would sell the tree. Then other people would **buy** it.

There do not appear to be any restrictions on the valence of the verbs in the *i-qat̪əl* form. Unlike the unmarked *qaṭəl* form, though, the *i-qat̪əl* form always codes imperfective aspect, which is the common function of the *y-* prefix in Semitic languages. Therefore, like the other particle prefixes analyzed in this study, the *i-* prefix should be analyzed as an aspectual prefix.

**Current Research on Function**

While Khan (2008:591-593) implies that the function of the *i-qat̪əl* form often overlaps that of the *qaṭəl* form, he argues that the main function of the *i-qat̪əl* form is two-fold. First, it is used to express habitual events, which he claims are often “characteristic and sometimes permanent” properties of the subject (590). He uses the following example (19) among others to illustrate this point.

(19) \(\text{'āyya y-amr̪əxla māma̪tâ. ’}\)

DEM IPFV-call.1PL.3SGF baptism

We **call** this “baptism.”
However, verbs appearing in the *i-qatāl* form are not, in fact, always habitual or characteristic. Therefore, Khan (2008:591) proposes a second function: that the *i-qatāl* form is used to denote differences in “discourse prominence,” specifically that a verb marked in this form “tends to be used in clauses denoting situations to which the speaker wishes to draw particular attention in a section of discourse.” Often, the form signals a climactic event or another critical event, or it may represent an event with “high information value.” Consider (20), from Barwar, which Khan uses to illuminate his claims.

(20) 

\[
\text{tālme} \cdot \text{himan-} t \text{ qāmxa lešile leša} \cdot \text{ lu-} \text{i-xāme}, ' \text{ dēre xmirā} \\
\text{talme} \text{ when-} t \text{ flour [knead] dough CONJ.COORD-IPFV-rises put yeast} \\
\text{gāwe} \text{ i-xāme}, ' \text{i-mēthi sēla.}' \\
\text{through IPFV-rise IPFV-bring griddle} \\
\text{Talme: When they knead the dough and it rises, they put yeast in it and it rises,} \\
\text{they bring a griddle.}
\]

In his own words, Khan (2008:592) argues that “In the preparation of the dough, its rising (*i-xāme*) is presented as the crucial event that will then allow the process of baking to advance... The kneading (*lešile*) and adding of yeast (*dēre xmirā gāwe*) are auxiliary activities.” Additionally, when addressing the marking of the bringing of the griddle, Khan goes on to say that that event (*i-mēthi sēla*) is marked because it should be considered a “noteworthy feature” of the preparation of this type of bread (ibid). While these marked events may, indeed, carry special importance in the discourse, Khan’s (2008) terminology is vague and open to subjective interpretation; he offers no specific details about what it means for an event to be crucial or
noteworthy, nor is there any mention of to what the events are crucial. The following section presents a differing hypothesis, followed by argumentation.

**Hypothesis**

It will be argued here that when an event is marked in the *i-qatal* form, the speaker is indicating that it is the final event in a sequence.

**Argumentation**

**Sequence-Final Event Marking**

To begin looking at how the *i-qatal* form’s sequence-final event marking functions, example (20) is repeated below as (21).

(21) təlme’ ḫman-t ǧämxa løšile ƚeša’ ƚu-ƚi-xâme,’ dēre xmira
talme when-? flour [knead] dough CONJ.COORD-IPFV-rises put yeast
gáwe ḫi-xâme,’ ḫi-mêthi sêla.’
through IPFV-rise IPFV-bring griddle
Talme: When they knead the dough and it rises, they put yeast in it and it rises, they bring a griddle.

In this example, the kneading of the dough is in the unmarked *qatal* form, but the following action of the rising is marked in the *i-qatal* form. The same is true in the following clause, in which the putting in of the yeast is in the unmarked form while the rising is again in the *i-qatal* form. This may be because the kneading and the putting in of yeast are preliminary events in a process that culminates in the rising of the dough. The bringing of the griddle then appears in the *i-qatal* form because it is the only event in that sequence and is, therefore, also a sequence-final
event. These sequences of events are parts of a larger sequence of events—the baking of the bread from start to finish—and by marking the sequence-final events therein, the speaker is able to break up a longer narrative into its component pieces.

Consider also example (22), from Urmî. In this sequence, the speaker is explaining his young granddaughter’s difficulty learning to speak.

(22) bas b-daj-e-wax q’at bit-etj-a xa juma patîx
CONJ.but PROG-know-3SGM-1PL COMP PFV-come-3SGF one day open
lifan-o sabap b-fmaj-e-la tre lifan-e har
CONJ.tongue-GEN.3SGF because PROG-hear-3SGM-3SGF two tongue-PL PREP.at
e-dana i-hamzm-a surît u i-hamzm-a
DEF.REF.time IPFV-speak-3SGF Assyrian CONJ.COORD IPFV-speak-3SGF
mglîs

English
But we know that she will come one day will open her tongue because she is hearing two languages at the same time. She speaks Assyrian and she speaks English.

In the sentence following what is displayed here, the speaker moves on to the new topic of how much his granddaughter loves to clean. By producing the ‘speak’ verbs in the i-qatîl form, the speaker is indicating that the current sequence has come to an end, and a new sequence is about to begin. As seen in example (20) about the baking of the talme bread, the overall topic is not abandoned following the appearance of the i-qatîl form; following what appears in (20), the rest
of the bread making process is described, and following (22), the granddaughter continues to be the topic. Instead of necessarily indicating the end of the topic as a whole, the specific sequence within the overall topic is shown to be ending.

Example (23), from Barwar, illustrates this sequence-final event marking further.

(23) `u-bár mtǎmɔziwale rɔzza, `bέna níxa níxa, `hál
CONJ.COORD-after clean.3PL.PST.3SGM rice time slow slow until qayɔmwə. `iθwale xà-yarxa, `tɾə-yarxe hatxáne, `tłāθə, `bέna
[grow].PST EXIST.PST.3SGM one-month two-month.PL like this three time `i-sàmarq.`
IPFV-[brown]

After they cleaned the rice,…(they did this) until it gradually grew. It took one month, two or three and then it would become brown.

Here we can see that the ‘clean’ event is produced in the unmarked form because it is an earlier part of the rice cultivating sequence. The ‘grow’ event is likewise unmarked. It is not until the sequence-final event—becoming brown—appears that the marked i-qatɔl form is produced.

What follows this sequence-ending event is a description of the harvesting season that occurs after the cultivation is complete.

The same sequence-final marking occurs in (24), from Barwar, below. In this example, the bringing event is unmarked, while the sequence-final event of going back is marked in the i-qatɔl form.
Every morning the servant of that girl brought her tea and breakfast, then would go back.

Following this marked sequence-final event, the narrator goes on to describe how happy the girl was with her lover, which represents a new sequence within the same overall discourse topic. Example (25) shows sequence-final marking with the *i-qatәl* form clearly.

Perhaps (I shall find) a brother of mine, my sister, a relative of mine*. He still loved his sister.

This section appears at the end of a narrative in which a problem challenging the protagonist’s love is presented. Khan (2008:594) argues that the ‘love’ verb is marked because of its unexpected temporal persistence. However, as in those examples presented above, the *i-qatәl* form is also used to indicate the end of a sequence. Specifically, the situation has been presented, and the speaker is indicating that, in the end, the man still loved his sister. This enduring love is
shown to be the end point for the sequence, and in this case, the narrative as a whole. Only one sentence follows what appears in (25), and it is a sentence of quoted speech.

**Pragmatic Implications of Sequence-Final Event Marking**

As described above, the addition of the aspectual *i*-prefix to the base *qaṭ̣āl* form that produces the marked *i-qaṭ̣āl* form converts the base form’s variable aspectual value to a necessarily imperfective one. When an event is imperfective, it is unbounded, meaning that often no endpoint is indicated. However, it is often useful to indicate that the *immediate relevance* of an event is ending. The *i-qaṭ̣āl* form resolves this issue by providing the speaker with the pragmatic option of representing the endpoints of discourse sequences without indicating the completion or endpoint of the events themselves. Doing so lends greater organizational specificity to longer sections of discourse by breaking them down into their component sequences.

**Conclusion**

Khan (2008) hypothesizes that the function of the *i-qaṭ̣āl* form is to represent habitual events and events that are prominent in the discourse, meaning that they are in some way climactic, crucial, or noteworthy. It has been argued here that, in fact, events are marked in the *i-qaṭ̣āl* form when they represent the final event in a sequence. Khan’s (2008) hypothesis and that presented in the current study may, nevertheless, be reconciled with one another: when an event is the final event in a sequence, it is usually by nature climactic in some way, as is seen with the marked ‘rise’ verbs in example (20) and others displayed in this chapter; if this were not the case, a sequence would be unlikely to end since there would have been no point to it or the sequence would still be incomplete. By representing events in the *i-qaṭ̣āl* form, the speaker is making a pragmatic discourse decision to represent the endpoint of an event sequence, providing his or her
listener with a way to understand the sequence within the structure of the larger narrative. Future research exploring a potentially similar sequence-final event marking function for perfective events would be valuable, as it would illuminate the current argument further.

The marking of relationships between events that has been explored in this chapter is not the only pragmatic function carried out by the verbal forms marked with the addition of a particle prefix. In the following chapter, the marked-unmarked verb form pair that appears mainly with a past tense interpretation will be explored in an effort to illuminate another pragmatic function carried out by such a marked form.
CHAPTER III
MARKING POINT OF VIEW:
THE UNMARKED qṭille FORM VS. THE MARKED qəm-qatōl FORM

In this chapter, it will be argued that the marked qəm-qatōl form is used to code not relationships between events as is the case with the forms analyzed above, but rather to code the point of view from which the event is represented. Before this hypothesis is fully presented and explored, though, the two forms in opposition must be put forth.

The Unmarked qṭille Form vs. the Marked qəm-qatōl Form

In contexts with past tense interpretations, the marked-unmarked pair is made up of the unmarked qṭille form, as displayed in (26), and the marked qəm-qatōl form, seen in example (27). Both examples are from Barwar.

(26) ʐala pćiłe m-màθa.'
PN left.3SGM PREP.from-village
He went off and left the village.

(27) qəm-qabólle šlåme tîwa l-ʔāra.'
PFV-accept.3SGM greeting.PL sitting DEF-floor
He (Māmo) accepted his greetings while sitting on the floor.
As can be seen in these examples, the *qtille* form is made up of the CCV base, while the *qəm-qaṭəl* form is made up of the CVC base and the *qəm-* prefix. In the following section, the *qtille* form will be analyzed, and that analysis will be followed by an analysis of the *qəm-qaṭəl* form and the functional differences between the two.

**The Unmarked *qtille* Form**

The unmarked *qtille* form generally indicates the past tense. This is seen in examples (28) and (29), both from Barwar. This past tense may be recent or not, and is often translated as either the simple past or the present perfect.

(28)  *txirri*  *xā-məndi xēna.*

remember.PST one-thing more

I have (just) remembered something else.

(29)  *krēle*  *gu-d-a-* 'āskar *

smite.PST PREP.to-PREP.?-DEF.REF-army

He smote the army.

In some constructions, however, the form may code anteriority to another event and not necessarily a past time reference (Khan, 2008:618). Example (11), repeated here as (30) presents such a situation in Barwar.

(30)  *ʾən-* *kpinni,*  *f-axlömne.*

COND-become.hungry PFV-eat.1SG.3SGM
If I get hungry, I shall eat it.

In these cases, it is anteriority alone that is expressed by the qtille form as opposed to any particular tense distinction.

Aspect, on the other hand, is specific and consistent; the qtille form strictly codes perfective aspect (Khan, 2008:614). Example (31) illustrates this in Barwar.

(31) málka mšadòrèle’ feròsse diye’ ́ tla-gòàla.’

king send.PST.3SGM warrior.PL GEN3SGM PURP-RECIP.PRO

The king sent his warriors to wrestle with him.

Additionally, there do not appear to be any restrictions on the valence of the verb in the qtille form. Example (30), above, shows the form used with one argument, and example (31), also above, shows it with two.

Current Research on Function

According to Khan (2008), the qtille form is used to code a past perfective event, though it is apparent from the analysis above that it also functions to code temporal anteriority to another event in the discourse. As this is the unmarked form, it carries few restrictions on its use beyond those for coding anteriority (whether between events or between the event and speech time) and perfective aspect. In the following section, the marked qəm-qatal form will be analyzed with particular attention to contrasts with the unmarked form.

The Marked qəm-qatal Form
As described above, the qəm-qašəl form is created by attaching the qəm- prefix to the CVC qašəl base. This verbal base is usually found in present, future, and imperfective constructions. However, the qəm-qašəl form is used exclusively to represent the past tense with perfective aspect, as seen in (32) and (33), from Barwar. Therefore, the qəm- prefix should be understood as a perfective aspectual marker.

(32) \textit{qəm-paθəxle}

PFV-open.3SGM  
He \textbf{opened} it.

(33) \textit{qəm-doqəṭli xošəṭli gu-gəma}.

PFV-seize.1SG confine.1SG PREP.to-basement  
You \textbf{seized} me and \textbf{confined} me in the basement.

Unlike the qṭille form, the qəm-qašəl form specifically codes the past tense and not relative temporal anteriority to another event.

Also unlike the unmarked form, the qəm-qašəl form requires a valence of at least two, which are necessarily a subject and an object. Without an object, the qəm-qašəl form is not possible. Therefore, only transitive verbs allow the qəm-qašəl form. Additionally, the object must be marked on the verb as a pronominal suffix. This is seen in (34), from Barwar.

(34) \textit{qəm-qayəšle kəwse diye}.

PFV-cut.3SGM hair GEN.3SGM
He cut his hair.

The pronominal object suffix may appear alongside an explicit mention of the object, as in (34), above, or it may stand alone if the object’s identity is clear based on the context, as is the case in (35), in which the identity of the object has been previously established.

(35)  \text{rzigel,}\ ' \text{qəm-mattūle} \ ' \text{hātxa l-`āra.} '

\begin{tabular}{llll}
\text{finish.PST.3SGM} & \text{PFV-put.3SGM} & \text{upon} & \text{DEF-floor}
\end{tabular}

He finished it and put it on the floor.

Though these marked and unmarked forms have distinct requirements for their use as described above, the functional difference between the two has been addressed minimally in the literature. The following section will explore the explanations offered in the current research.

**Current Research on Function**

According to Khan (2008:609), the basic function of the \text{qəm-qatal} form is to express the occurrence of a perfective event that took place in the recent past. This event may also have relevance to the present time. However, the alternative \text{qtille} form also carries out this function. Therefore, Khan claims that the difference between the two forms is simply a matter of “versatility”, and that there “is no functional difference” between them (ibid). Gutman (2008:80-81) echoes this claim and extends it by emphasizing that the meanings of the two forms are interchangeable. This claim may seem true on the surface, but as can be seen already through the above analysis of the varying requirements of each form, it is not supported by the data.
Therefore, the true function of the \textit{qəm-qatəl} form still needs to be described. The following sections will present a hypothesis and argumentation.

**Hypothesis**

As the result of collaboration with Dr. Zygmunt Frajzyngier of the University of Colorado at Boulder, it will be argued here that the \textit{qəm-qatəl} form is used to represent the marked event from the point of view of the object. In order to build the case for this hypothesis, restrictions and allowances of the form will be described.

**Argumentation**

**Object Definiteness**

Not only does the \textit{qəm-qatəl} form require an object, but that object must be definite. This may be the case because it is only when an object has an established identity in the discourse that it may have a point of view of the marked event. In this paper, the term ‘definiteness’ is used in relation to information sharing between interlocutors. According to van Deemter and Kibble (2002:xi), “Information sharing involves distinguishing between parts of an utterance that express \textit{given} information (e.g., because the information has been shared before) and parts that express \textit{new} information.” Therefore, in order to be considered definite, the information must already be in the common ground, meaning that all discourse participants can determine its specific identity. Without this necessary, established identity in the discourse, the object cannot have a point of view and cannot occur in the \textit{qəm-qatəl} form.

Elicited examples of interrogatives in Urmii illustrate the necessity of definiteness effectively, as only those questions containing objects that are definite may be marked in the \textit{qəm-qatəl} form, while others are not. This is seen first in polar questions, as in (36)-(40).
(36) \(qəm-xaz-it-le\) \(xlul-e\)?
PFV-see-2SGM-3SGM wedding-GEN.3SGM
Did you see his wedding?

(37) \(qəm-xaz-it-le\) \(xlula\)?
PFV-see-2SGM-3SGM wedding
Did you see the wedding?

(38) \(*qəm-xaz-it-le\ xa xlula\)?
Did you see a wedding?

(39) \(qəm-baqrut-le\ o-buqara\)
PFV-ask-3SGM DEF.REF-question
Did you ask the question?

(40) \(*qəm-baqrut-le\ xa buqara\)?
Did you ask a question?

It is apparent in these examples that the identity of the object of the utterance must already have
been established in the discourse for the \(qəm-qafol\) form to be possible. The same is seen in
content questions, as illustrated in (41)-(43).

(41) \(eni\ mn\ denne\ qəm-awid-le\)
which PREP DEM-PL PFV-do-3SGM
Which one of those did he do?

(42) *xlul-it mani qəm-xazi-wa-lox?

'Whose wedding did you see?'

(43) *mudi qəm-awd-le?

'What did he do?'

In these examples, the qəm-qatəl form is only possible when the answer options are known in the discourse, as in (41), containing the option “which one of those”; both speaker and listener understand which established objects are in question.

Khan (2008:609) explains that “the qəm-qatəl form is the usual means of expressing pronominal objects of the 1st and 2nd person on a past perfective verb.” In these cases, both participants are already necessarily established as having definite identities in the discourse through the discourse context, as they are already “familiar discourse referents” (Roberts, 2002:89). Therefore, the qəm-qatəl form is always possible when the object is in the first or second person, assuming there is a pragmatic purpose. This purpose may be quite simple: those involved in speech are generally more likely to represent events from their own point of view or that of their speech partner. Example (33), repeated below as (44), from Barwar, and (45), from Urmi, illustrate this use.

(44) qəm-doqəṭli xošəṭli gu-gọma.

PFV-seize.1SG confine.1SG PREP-basement
You **seized** me and **confined** me in the basement.

(45) \(qam\)-**baj-\*m-ax** \(e\)-daqqa \(qam\)-**xaz-\*m-ax**

PFV-love-1SG-2SGF DEF.REF-moment PFV-see-1SG-2SGF

I **loved** you the moment I **saw** you.

In (44), as with most instances of past perfective events with first person objects, the events are represented from the point of view of the speaker\(^9\). It seems natural that one would represent his or her own experience from his or her own point of view, and by marking the utterance with the \(q\*m\)-**qat\*al** form, the speaker is indicating that he is doing so. In (45), on the other hand, the object is ‘you’. By producing this utterance in the marked form, the speaker is representing the event from the point of view of his beloved, emphasizing the fact that she was the one who was receiving this love.

Third person objects, on the other hand, are more restricted due to the fact that they have not necessarily been introduced into the discourse previously and, therefore, may lack a definite identity. Without a definite identity, an object cannot have a point of view. In both Barwar and Urmi, if a third person object is being mentioned for the first time, the \(q\*m\)-**qat\*al** form is not allowed. Such an example of this restriction is seen in (28) from Barwar, repeated below as (46), in which the unmarked qtille form is used instead.

(46) **txirri** \(x\*a\)-m\*\(\&\)ndi x\*\(\&\)n\*

\(^9\) Khan (2008:PAGE) explains that in this example, both verbs should be considered to be marked despite the fact that the second verb lacks the \(q\*m\) prefix. He claims that the prefix is omitted because the prefix from the first verb should be understood as applying to both and may, therefore, be dropped on from the second verb, while the marked interpretation remains. This omission seems to be a stylistic option as opposed to a necessity, as back-to-back marked forms without particle omission are attested in the data.
remember.PST one-thing more

I have (just) **remembered** something else.

In this case, the *qom-qat'el* form would be infelicitous because the object is indefinite; without an established identity, an object cannot have a point of view. However, once the object is made definite, the *qom-qat'el* form is possible if the discourse context calls for it.

**Establishing an Object’s Identity in the Discourse**

A speaker of Barwar or Urmi may introduce an object into the discourse to establish its identity in more than one way. Examples (47) and (48) from Barwar show the introduction of the object through direct means of mentioning the object-- Zal’s hair in (47) and the story in (48)-- prior to the marked form, producing an anaphoric reference. This is the most straightforward way that a speaker may establish the object’s identity.

(47)  *mattuwa*  *semalta* gu-xaše  diye  ‘u-y-asɔqwa’

place.PST ladder.F PREP.to-back GEN3SG CONJ.COORD-PFV-climb.PST
gu-reʃə  semalta  'maqrɔtwa kawsət  Zəlo.  qom-qayisłə  kəwse
PREP.to-head ladder.F cut.PST hair.GEN PN PFV-cut.3SGM hair
diyə  xirre  gu-reʃət  Zəlo  'iθwa  šaqyəθə  brinəne,’
GEN3SGM look.3SGM PREP.to-head.GEN PN COP.PST [scars] wound.PL
gore raba.’
big  very
He would place a ladder on his back and climb up the ladder to cut the hair of Zāl. He cut his hair and looked at the head of Zāl. (He saw) that there were scars of enormous wounds.

(48) möre bābi hāl 'u-qɔʂqɔt hàtxela.' kūlla tuniθa'
say.3SGM dear.GEN1SG [the situation is like this] all story.F
d-e-bráta qɔm-mtanèla' 'u-'áθra 'èkele,'
PREP.?-DEF.REF-girl.F PFV-relate.3SGM.3SGF CONJ.COORD-land how
'u-'èni-wewa twirəlle réše diye.'
CONJ.COORD-who-COP.PST PST.[break].3SGM head GEN3SG
He said ‘My dear, the story is like this.’ He related all of the story about that girl, told where the place was and who had broken his head.

On the other hand, the qɔm-qatɔl form may be used in example (49), elicited from Urmii, due to associative mention. In (49), the thief is only understood as being definite because of his or her inherent association with the theft, which has already been introduced into the discourse.

(49) dzu ixala xzi-li dzinawuta u polisa qɔm-daweq-le
LOC eating PST.see-1SG theft.F CONJ.COORD police PFV-catch-3SGM
l-dzinawa
DEF-thief
While eating, I saw a theft, and a policeman caught the thief
Once the object has an identity in the discourse, the *qəm-qəfel* form may be permitted because then that object may have a point of view.

**Referencing the Established Object**

Additionally, when the *qəm-qəfel* form is used, there is no need for the speaker to restate the identity of the object since the construction already points explicitly to the object that has been established. This is seen in (50), from Urmi.

(50)  
\[
\text{awən } \text{rupa-le } \text{duceʔ-ta } \text{u-ajən} \quad \text{qam-maxj-a-la}
\]

3SGM serve-3SGM ball-F CONJ.COORD-3SGF PFV-hit-3SGF-3SGF

He served the ball, and she hit it.

This contrasts with the requirements of the unmarked form; if the unmarked form is used in the same sentence, the object must be explicitly restated, as shown in example (51), from Urmi, in which ‘the ball’ is repeated in the second clause. If it were not, the listener would be uncertain of the object’s identity beyond knowing its gender, which is always indicated.

(51)  
\[
\text{awən } \text{rupa-le } \text{duceʔ-ta } \text{u-ajən} \quad \text{maxi-la } \text{duceʔ-ta}
\]

3SGM serve-3SGM ball-F CONJ.COORD-3SGF hit-3SGF ball-F

He served the ball, and she hit it.

Once the requirements of the form have been met, however, there must also be a pragmatic purpose for representing an event from the object’s point of view, as doing so is never an absolute requirement. This will be addressed in the following section.
Pragmatic Implications of Representing Events from the Point of View of the Object

As mentioned above, it is common for speakers to represent events in the $qəm-qaṭəl$ form when they or their speech partner is the object of that event, therefore representing it from their own points of view. However, there are other pragmatic implications for this point of view choice. The main implication of representing an event with a third person object from that object’s point of view is that the experience or fate of that object is the focus of the utterance. This can be seen in the fact that the $qəm-qaṭəl$ form is *not* used to explain something about the subject; rather, it emphasizes the event’s effect on the object, which may or may not be resultative. For example, if someone would like to know why someone has a headache, the following explanation (example (52)), in Urmi, may only appear in the *unmarked* form.

(52)  
\begin{align*}
awən & \text{ $fi$-i-le} & xamera juma dwre \\
3SGM & PST.drink-3SGM & 3SGM wine & day & past
\end{align*}

He drank wine yesterday.

The answer to the same question about why someone has a headache could not appear in the $qəm-qaṭəl$ form; the $qəm-qaṭəl$ form may only be used to explain what happened to the object, *not* the subject since the form represents the event from the object’s point of view. Only if one instead asked “what happened to the wine?” could the answer appear in the $qəm-qaṭəl$ form, as displayed in (53), also from Urmi.

(53)  
\begin{align*}
awən & \text{ $qəm$-fat-i-le} & xamera juma dwre \\
3SGM & PFV.drink-3SGM & 3SGM wine & day & past
\end{align*}
He drank wine yesterday.

In the above example (53), the pragmatic purpose for using the \textit{qəm-qəṭəl} form is to explain what happened to the object as an answer to a specific and direct question about the object’s fate.

In addition, if the fate or experience of the object is to be understood as a pivotal or otherwise important event in a narrative or event sequence, the \textit{qəm-qəṭəl} form is used to represent the event from the point of view of the object. Example (54) from Barwar shows that when the speaker wants to emphasize what happened to the object (in this case, the army), the marked form is used.

(54) \textit{krēle gu-d-a-`āskar’ \textit{qəm-mpatpətla’ kūt-xa}}

\textit{smite.PST [PREP.to-PREP.?-DEF.REF]-army PFV-tear.PST.3SGF every-one}

\textit{qəm-xašōlle δa-gōtə.’ mālka zdile.’}

\textit{PFV-throw.3SGM [PREP.?]-side king afraid.COP.PST.3SGM}

He smote the army, he tore them apart and threw them in all directions. The king was afraid.

In this example, the first verb, \textit{krēle}, is unmarked because the speaker is representing the event from the subject’s point of view; he is emphasizing that this is an action that the subject carried out. However, when explaining what specifically was done, the speaker switches point of view and represents the events from the point of view of the object, the army. This is often the case when the speaker is relating events in which the object was a victim in some way. By representing the event from the point of view of the object, the object’s experience of the event is
highlighted. The marked events in (54) should also be interpreted as the cause of the king’s fear, relayed in the following clause. It should be noted, though, that the object need not be animate; the *qən-qatəl* form is often used with inanimate objects when the fate of that object is the most important idea in the discourse context. Consider (55), from Barwar.

(55) *Rustáمو qalînke diye grišle.’ rzîgle,’*

Rustam pipe GEN3SGM smoke.PST.3SGM finish.PST.3SGM

*qən-mattûle hâtxa l-’âra.’ múḥye qâwe’yâwi ’ülle diye.’*

PFV-put.3SGM PREP.on DEF-floor [brought] coffee give.3PL ? GEN3SGM

*šqîlle qâwa țla-şâte,’ ő-qâwači qən-mattûla ’âqle*

take.PST.3SGM coffee PURP-drink DEF.REF-server PFV-put.3SGF foot

*rxš-qalînka’ qən-tawîrre.’*

PREP.upon-pipe PFV-break.3SG

Rustam smoked his pipe. He finished it and put it on the floor. They brought coffee and gave it to him. He took the coffee to drink. The man serving the coffee put his foot on the pipe and broke it.

The verbs for ‘smoked’, ‘finished’, ‘brought’, ‘gave’, and ‘took’ could, theoretically, have been marked, but they were not. Rather, only the two instances of ‘put’ and the verb ‘broke’ are marked. The reason for this may be that it is the fates of those objects that propel the narrative forward; the fact that the pipe was put on the floor allowed the server to put his foot on it, which, in turn, allowed the pipe to be broken. This breaking of the pipe then allows the remainder of the story to progress, as it compels the following events. By marking these events from the objects’
point of view, the speaker is emphasizing that their fates are the most important aspects of the marked events.

**The qəm-qətəl Form and the Passive Voice**

This emphasis on the fate of the object may make it tempting to associate the function of the qəm-qətəl form with that of the passive voice, but this should be avoided. Both Barwar and Urmi have a separate construction for the passive voice, and its function is different from what is carried out by the qəm-qətəl form. This passive construction can be seen in (56) and (57), from Urmi.

(56) 
\[ \text{xabuʃa } \text{pife-wa } \text{xila } \text{bit } \text{xa-jala} \]
apple PASS-PST eat.? PREP.by one-boy

The apple **was eaten** by a boy.

(57) 
\[ \text{pife-wa } \text{xezia } \text{bit } \text{dii} \]
PASS-PST see.? PREP.by ?.1SG

He **was seen** by me.

It should be noted that when passive sentences are elicited, they are never produced in the qəm-qətəl form, nor is the passive ever produced when the qəm-qətəl form is elicited. This is due to the two forms’ incongruous functions; while the passive voice can be seen as promoting the object to a more subject-like status or demoting the subject to an oblique\(^\text{10}\), the qəm-qətəl form does neither of these things; in fact, the subject is often construed as a very integral part of qəm-

\(^\text{10}\) The functions of promotion and demotion of arguments in passive voice constructions are put forth often by linguists of various schools of thought. However, these functions are not necessarily attested in the NENA passive. This is an issue worth exploring, but exists outside the scope of the current analysis.
qātūl constructions. Rather, the goal of the qām-qātūl form is to represent the event in a different way—from the object’s point of view—and not to alter the roles or involvement of the arguments.

In addition to analyzing texts to support the idea that the qām-qātūl form represents the event from the point of view of the object, analysis of verbs that do and do not allow the construction provides convincing evidence, which will be presented in the following section.

**Verbs that do and do not Allow the qām-qātūl Form**

Verbs of perception are commonly produced in the qām-qātūl form in both Barwar and Urmi. This is seen in (58) and (59), from Barwar.

(58) *Rustāmo brône diyê*  hôle  *gu-bêôa  rištê, ' qām-šâmêla*

PN  son  GEN3SGM REL  PREP.to-house  wake.3SGM  PFV-hear.3SGF

'âyya  săwôta.  'imô-šmiyâle  kribô  râba.  'sab- 'áp- 'aw

DEM  conversation  when-hear.PST.3SGM  angry  very  because-also-[COP.PST]

*râba ferôssa-wêwa ' u-xêlânô.*

very  warrior-COP.PST  CONJ.COORD-strong

Rustam, his son, who was in the house, woke up and **heard** this conversation. When he heard it he became very angry, since he also was a strong warrior.

(59) *qimele  Rustâmo  'u-siqêle. ' gu-d-o-gôppa*

go.3SGM  Rustam  CONJ.COORD-ascended  PREP.to-PREP.?-DEF.REF-cave

*xîrre  'înô-'nâshâ  tâma. 'îwôwâ  'ê dâmôt*

look.3SGM  COP-DEF.REF-person  DEM  PRO.3SGM  DEF.REF  moment
Rustam went up to the cave. He looked and saw that that man was there. When he (the other) saw him, he recognized him. He knew that he was Rustam.

The importance of marking the distinction between the possible points of view comes down to how the speaker wants the listener to understand the utterance; if the utterance is in the marked form, it is to be seen from the point of view of the object, which implies that the object’s experience of the event is important in the discourse context. It should be noted that in both (58) and (59), above, the objects’ experiences set the following events into motion, just as in the other examples described previously.

With some perception verbs, though, marking objectival point of view is not possible. Consider (60)-(63), from Urmi. With the verb for ‘hear’, either the unmarked form or the marked form is possible, but with the verb ‘listen’, the marked form is infelicitous.

(60)  *fmi-li*  *l-zmarta*

PST.hear-1SG DEF-song

I heard the song.

(61)  *qam-fam-i-na*  *zmarta*

PFV-hear-1SG-3SGF song

I heard the song.
(62) *fni-wa-li l-zmarta
listen-PST-1SG DEF-song
I listened to the song.

(63) *qam-fami-wa-li zmarta
I listened to the song

The infelicitous nature of example (63) is likely due to the fact that listening involves inherent agency and experience of the subject and, therefore, point of view of the subject, while hearing does not. If this inherent agency and point of view of the subject exists, the verb may not be marked. Examples (64)-(67), also from Urmi, further this argument. They show that the act of seeing may be marked or unmarked, while the agentive, experiential action of watching is acceptable only in the unmarked form.

(64) awun xzi-a-le dzinawuta
3SGM PST.see-3SGF-3SGM theft
He saw the theft.

(65) qam-xazi-la dzinawuta
PFV-see-3SGF theft
He saw the theft.

(66) awun dzefuq-e-wa l-dzinawuta
3SGM watch-3SGM-PST DEF-theft

He watched the theft.

\[(67) \quad *\text{awun } \text{qam-d3efuq-e-wa } \text{dzinawuta}\]

He watched the theft.

These examples support the argument that the marked form indicates point of view of the object. Additionally, the act of feeling is necessarily an experience from the point of view of the subject in these dialects. With this verb also, the marked form is unacceptable, as seen in (68) and (69), from Urmi.

\[(68) \quad \text{rif-} \text{le } \text{bit } \text{partfa}\]

PST.feel PREP.? cloth

He felt the cloth.

\[(69) \quad *\text{qam-rif-} \text{le } \text{bit } \text{partfa}\]

He felt the cloth.

This emphasizes the point that the qəm-qətəl form represents the marked event from the point of view of the object; if the point of view of the subject is required, the qəm-qətəl form is not acceptable. If either form is allowed, the event will be represented from the point of view of the object only if that object’s experience is integral to the discourse context.

**Conclusion**
By examining instances of the *qəm-qəfəl* form in both Barwar and Urmī and contrasting those instances with those in the unmarked *qtille* form, it is apparent that there is indeed a functional difference between the two, unlike what has been argued in previous studies. Specifically, this difference appears to be a pragmatic one, in that the *qəm-qəfəl* form represents the event from the point of view of the object. As research on this form continues to be carried out, it would be valuable to examine a larger set of data in order to explore more of the restrictions on its use, as well as the appropriateness of the term ‘point of view’, as it is debatable whether this terminology is ideal for use with inanimate third person objects.

In the present and preceding chapters, hypotheses about three marked verbal forms have been presented in an attempt to show that aspectual forms in Barwar and Urmī are used with pragmatic purposes. The following chapter offers concluding remarks.
CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

Findings

From the analyses above, it is clear that all three of the marked forms analyzed—the $bəd$-$qatəl$ form, the $i$-$qatəl$ form, and the $qəm$-$qatəl$ form—all possess functions that set them apart from those of their unmarked counterparts. All three of these marked forms are constructed in a similar way, specifically using the base form of the verbal root and affixing a particle prefix, which we have claimed is, in fact, an aspectual prefix. However, it has been proposed here that these aspectual forms carry out functions that are not solely aspectual in nature, nor do they indicate tense. Rather, the marked forms carry out pragmatic functions, either marking relationships between events or representing objectival point of view. Thus, each marked form provides the listener with information about how the marked event should be interpreted. The $bəd$-$qatəl$ form tells the listener to interpret the event as one that is connected in meaning to another in the nearby discourse, thereby communicating important relationships between events; the $i$-$qatəl$ form tells the listener to interpret the event as the final one in a sequence, functioning as an organizational cue within broader discourse; and the $qəm$-$qatəl$ form tells the listener to interpret the event from the point of view of a pre-established object in the nearby discourse, thereby emphasizing the importance of the experience or fate of the object in question. Each of these functions goes beyond simple marking of tense or aspect and into a more exciting realm of pragmatic communicative specificity, which only adds to the richness of these dialects.

Future Research
As the study of NENA dialects continues, more work needs to be done to further investigate the verbal forms and discourse functions explored in this study. It would be valuable to discover if forms with similar functions exist in other NENA dialects and, if so, how they may differ from what is presented here. Additionally, greater amounts of data should be analyzed with a larger group of native Barwar and Urmi speaking subjects in order to identify differences between speakers as well as any possible differences between dialects. If this were done, a more complete examination of the marked verbal forms would be possible.
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APPENDIX A: List of Abbreviations

AUX = auxiliary
COMP = complementizer
COND = conditional
CONJ.COORD = coordinating conjunction
COP = copula
DEF = definite article
DEF.REF = reference to a definite object
DEM = demonstrative
EXIST = existential
F = feminine
GEN = genitive
IPFV = imperfective
LOC = locative
M = masculine
NEG = negative
PASS = passive
PFV = perfective
PL = plural
PN = proper name
PREP = preposition with undetermined function
PREP.x = preposition with the English meaning x
PREP.? = preposition with an undetermined English meaning
PRO = pronoun
PROG = progressive
PST = past
PURP = purpose
RECIPE.PRO = reciprocal pronoun
REL = relative pronoun
SG = singular