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 semantics\(^1\) 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.\textsuperscript{5} 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.\textsuperscript{6} The base itself is glossed only with the lexical meaning of the verb.

\textbf{Table 1: Forms based on šaqəl}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ø-šaqəl</td>
<td>IRR-</td>
<td>present,</td>
<td></td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la šaqəl</td>
<td>NEG IRR-</td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td>irrealis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(including negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>imperative)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-šaqəl</td>
<td>HAB-</td>
<td>present</td>
<td></td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{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.

\textsuperscript{6} This idea has been suggested to me by Paul Noorlander, to whom I express my gratitude for consultation in devising the glossing system.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>wəl k-šaqəl</td>
<td>PROG</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>progressive (non-stative?)</td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la k-šaqəl</td>
<td>NEG HAB-</td>
<td>present</td>
<td></td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-šaqəl</td>
<td>FUT-</td>
<td>future</td>
<td></td>
<td>predictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la-p-šaqəl</td>
<td>(no negation of p-šaqəl)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>predictive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qam-šaqəl-le**</td>
<td>PFV-</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø-šaqəl-wa</td>
<td>IRR- -PST</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>habitual</td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k-šaqəl-wa</td>
<td>HAB- -PST</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>habitual</td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p-šaqəl-wa</td>
<td>FUT- -PST</td>
<td>future in the past, past</td>
<td>habitual</td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*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, which realis h always begin with m, the future prefix b-/p- has been lost after being assimilated to the following m, e.g.: *b-маšкən-Ø (FUT-warm_up-he) ‘he will warm up’ > *m-маšкən > маšкən. This has led to their merger with the šaqəl forms, i.e.: Øмаšкən-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 underlyingly p-šaqəl are glossed as IRR/FUT.

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šqolle</td>
<td>PFV.</td>
<td>past</td>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šqol-wa-le</td>
<td>PFV. -PST</td>
<td>anterior</td>
<td>perfective</td>
<td>realis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

table 3: Forms based on the infinitive (šqala)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Mood</th>
<th>Resultativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>copula</td>
<td>bə-šqala</td>
<td>present</td>
<td>continuous (in stative verbs)</td>
<td>realis</td>
<td>resultative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>continuous (non-dynamic)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

table 4: Forms based on the imperative (šqul)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Mood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šqul</td>
<td>IMP.</td>
<td>irrealis: imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>la-šqul</td>
<td>(no negation of šqul)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
<th>Resultativity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>copula + šqila</td>
<td>RES.</td>
<td>resultative, experiential perfect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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. ‘ǝθ-wa xa-beθa d-Ø-‘āyə̂š-Ø-wa…’
   EXIST-PST a-house REL-IRR-live-he-PST
   There was a household who used to live on...

2. bab-ət beθa d-Ø-‘āyə̂š-Ø-wa mən ściw-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.

3. g-ezǝl-Ø-wa go ṭūra,‘ q-qāṭe-Ø-wa ściw-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 rəš xmara 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. \( g\text{-}ew\text{ød}\text{-}Ø\text{-}wā\text{-}lu \ kā\text{-}rt\text{a,}' \)
   \( \text{HAB}\text{-}make\text{-}he\text{-}PST\text{-}them \ \text{bundle\text{-}FS} \)
   and bind them in a bundle.

6. \( g\text{-}dā\text{ré}\text{-}Ø\text{-}wa\text{-}lu \ kā\text{-}rt\text{a}' \ rōš \ x\text{mara} \ d\text{ide}.' \)
   \( \text{HAB}\text{-}place\text{-}he\text{-}PST\text{-}them \ \text{bundle\text{-}FS} \ \text{on donkey} \ \text{his} \)
   He would put them [as] a bundle on his donkey’s back.

7. ‘\( u\text{-}g\text{-}nā\text{böl}\text{-}Ø\text{-}wa\text{-}lu \ šū\text{qa},' \ gō\text{-}mzābōn\text{-}Ø\text{-}wa\text{-}lu.' \)
   \( \text{and-HAB}\text{-}take\text{-}he\text{-}PST\text{-}them \ \text{market}, \ \text{HAB}\text{-}sell\text{-}he\text{-}PST\text{-}them \)
   He would take them to the market and sell them.

8. \( g\text{-}mēθe\text{-}Ø\text{-}wa \ ī\text{xala} \ ta \ y\text{alunk\text{-}e} \ d\text{ide}.' \)
   \( \text{HAB}\text{-}bring\text{-}he\text{-}PST \ \text{food.} \ \text{to child\text{-}PL} \ \text{his} \)
   Then, he would bring food for his children.

9. ‘\( u\text{-}k\text{-}eθe\text{-}Ø\text{-}wa \ k\text{-}əxl\text{-}i\text{-}wa \)
   \( \text{and-HAB}\text{-}come\text{-}he\text{-}PST. } \ \text{HAB}\text{-}eat\text{-}they\text{-}PST \)

10. \( g\text{-}eš\text{-}i\text{-}wa \ b\text{-}ət\text{-}‘ānn\text{a},' \ mən \ m\text{zabon\text{-}st} \ sīw\text{-}e.' \)
    \( \text{HAB}\text{-}live\text{-}they\text{-}PST \ \text{in\text{-}GEN\text{-}these,} \ \text{from selling\text{-}GEN} \ \text{wood\text{-}PL.} \)
    When he came, they would eat and live on this, from the selling of the wood.

11. \( xa \ y\text{oma} \ zəl\text{-}le \ l\text{-}tū\text{ra},' \ b\text{-}qāte\text{-}Ø \ sīw\text{-}e,' \)
    \( \text{One day PFV\text{-}go-he} \ \text{to\text{-}mountain, FUT\text{-}cut-he} \ \text{wood\text{-}PL,} \)
    One day he went to the mountain—he would cut trees,

12. \( x\text{ze\text{-}le} \ xa\text{-}gūrg\text{a}.’ \)
    \( \text{PFV\text{-}see-he} \ \text{a\text{-}wolf.} \)
    and he saw a wolf.
13. ʾaw gurga g-emǝr-Ø ʿa-le

that, wolf HAB-say-he to-him

mà wǝt ʾǝθyaʔ?

what COP.PRS.you_ms RES.come.ms?

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

14. g-emǝr-Ø ʿana g-ǝb-ǝn

HAB-say-he I HAB-want-Iₘ

g-ʿeš-ǝn b-ǝt qaṭʾ-ǝn šiw-e.

HAB-live-Iₘ in-GEN IRR-cut-Iₘ wood-PL.

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

15. g-ǝmzabn-ǝn-nu go šuqa

HAB-sell-Iₘ-them in market

ʾu-Ø-máʾāyǝš-ǝn yalunk-e ʿādi.

and-IRR/FUT-sustain-I child-PL my

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

16. bǝ-d-è ʿana g-ʿeš-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 irrealis 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 ʿāwe in the sentence above is expressed by a finite form (literally ‘I live by that I cut wood’), rather than by the infinitive qaṭʾa ‘cutting’. The infinitive is expected here, and is in fact attested after the verb ʿ-y-š ‘to make a living’ in sentences 9–10 above: gʿešwǝ (…) mǝn mzabonat ʿāwe.
17. \textit{g-emər-Ø} 'ana b-yāw-ən-nox kud-yom
   HAB-say-he I FUT-give-I-you every-day
   xa lira kurkamâna.\textsuperscript{1}
   one coin golden

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

18. \textit{s-i maṣrəf-Ø ta yalunk-e didox.}\textsuperscript{1}
   IMP.go-you\textsubscript{MS} IMP.spend-you\textsubscript{CS} to child-pl your\textsubscript{MS}

   Go, spend it on your children.’

19. \textit{g-emər-Ø, ḳxera xudē ḳ=la,}\textsuperscript{1}
   HAB-say-he ḳGod’s favour\textsuperscript{K} = COP.PRS.she

   He said ‘it is ḳGod’s favour\textsuperscript{K},

20. \textit{ḥxera xude ḳ-b-ət kərmâνji g-əmr-i.}\textsuperscript{1}
   ḳGod’s favour\textsuperscript{K} in-GEN Kurmanji HAB-say-they

   ḳGod’s favour\textsuperscript{K}! They said it in Kurmanji.

21. \textit{šqǝl-le\textsuperscript{10} lira kurkamana dide mən gùrga}\textsuperscript{1}
   PFV.take-he coin golden his from wolf

   He took his golden coin from the wolf

22. \textit{ʾu-θe-le l-šùqa.}\textsuperscript{1}
   and-PFV.come-he to-market.

   and came to the market

\textsuperscript{10} The definite direct object \textit{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: \textit{qam-šāqəl-Ø-le} (pfv-take-he-him) \textit{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 ʾīxala
   and-PFV.buy-he to himself food
   ʾu-jull-e ta yalunk-e dide,  
   and-cloth-PL to child-PL his.

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

24. ʾu-ʾmabsuṭ mǝr-re ta bàx-t-e  
   and-ʾpleased PFV.say-he to wife-PS-his

   and pleased, he told his wife

25. walla ʾana xze-li xa-xùra
   indeed I PFV.meet-I a-friend
   go ṭura bale  gùrgā = 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-yāwǝn-nox xa kurkamàna.  
   I FUT-give-I-you m one golden

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

27. ʾùd-le-li ʾədyo kurkamàna.  
   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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ʾu-g-eşəd-Ø siw-e
and-HAB-make-he wood-PL

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

29. ʾu-k-eθe-Ø gurga g-yāwəl-Ø-le kurkamàna.
and-HAB-come-he wolf HAB-give-he-him golden

and the wolf comes and gives him a coin.

30. pǝš-le xà yarxa, trè, tlâha, xa šà-ta.
PFV.stay-he one month two, three, one year-FS

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

31. bax-t-e g-əmrə
wife-FS-his HAB-say-she

waḷḷa hatxa xòš naša, ḥāš = ile.
indeed, such good man good-COP.PRS.he

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

32. ʾana g-ǝban Ø-ʾəd-an-ne qàdr-e,
I HAB-want-IF IRR-MAKE-IF-him dish-PL

I want to make some dishes for him,

33. Ø-qàdr-an-ne ʾu-Ø-ʾazm-ax-le kəs-lan 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. Ø-ʾəd-ax-le xa-ʾixala basīma
IRR-MAKE-we-him some-food good

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

      ʾu-Ø-doq-ax  qàdr-e.^1
      and-IRR-hold-we  banquet-PL

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

36. g-emər-Ø  ţa-la  šùq-Ø-le.^1
     PRS-say-he  to-her  IMP.leave-you_{CS}-him.

      gùrg-ā = le.^1  hèwan = ile.^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. mà  b-aθe-Ø  go naš-e?^11  naš-e  b-zàd^2-i.1

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

38. Ø-mbärbaʿā-Ø-lu  gurga  Ø-yaʿəl-Ø  go ma-θa.1
      IRR/FUT-alarm-he-them  wolf  IRR-enter-he  in city-FS.

    A wolf that enters the city will alarm them.’

---

^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. g-əmr-a là, là, mar-Ø-re. Ø-ʔəθe-Ø.
   PRS-say-she no, no, IMP.say-youcs-him IRR-come-he
   She said ‘No, no, tell him to come.’

40. zəl-le g-emər-Ø tà-le,î
   PFV.go-he PRS-say-he to-him
   g-emər-Ø ʾana l-èb-i Ø-ʔaθ-ən.î
   PRS-say-he I NEG-can-I IRR-come-IM
   So he went and told the wolf, but he said ‘I can’t come.

41. gùrgā = wən, k-əxl-ən nàš-e.î
   WOLF = COP.PRS.I PRS-eat-I man-PL
   I am a wolf. I eat people.

42. b-αθ-ən go ma-θa kull-u Ø-mbàrbə-ʾi.î
   FUT-come-IM in city-FS all-they IRR/FUT-alarm-they
   If I come to town, everyone will be alarmed.’

43. zəl-le mər-re ta-bax-ta hätxa g-emər-Ø
   PFV.go-he PFV-say-he to-wife-FS such PRS-say-he
   guṛga.î
   wolf
   So the man went and told his wife, this is what the wolf said.

44. ʾaz g-əmr-a šud Ø-ʔaθe-Ø b-lèlè, xàška.î
   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  wàxt\textsuperscript{1}  l-əθ-wa  beher-ūθa\textsuperscript{1}.
    in-GEN-that\textsubscript{m}  time.MS  NEG-EXIST.PST  light-FS.

    At that time, there were no lights.

46.  l-əθ-wa  ^\textsuperscript{\textsc{c}}\textsuperscript{an-tariq}\textsuperscript{A}  ^\textsuperscript{\textsc{h}}menorôt\textsuperscript{H}
    NEG-EXIST-PST  by way of  ^\textsuperscript{\textsc{h}}lamps\textsuperscript{H}

    ^\textsuperscript{\textsc{a}}kahrab\textsuperscript{A}  l-əθ-wa\textsuperscript{1}

    There was nothing like lamps. There was no electricity.

47.  xəška  wewa\textsuperscript{1}
    darkness  COP.PST.he

    It was dark.

48.  ’u-pāyəš-Ø-wa  xəška\textsuperscript{,1}
    and-IRR-stay-he  darkness

    kull-a  ma-θa  xəška  wawa\textsuperscript{1}
    all-she  city-FS  darkness  COP.PST.she.

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

49.  g-əmr-a  dammēt  Ø-payəš-Ø  xəška\textsuperscript{1}
    PRS-say-she  when  IRR-stay-he  darkness

    šud  Ø-’aθe-Ø\textsuperscript{,1}
    let  IRR-come-he

    She said ‘Let him come after it gets dark.

50.  beθ-Ø-an  wele  bə-dumâhik  dət ma-θa\textsuperscript{1}
    house-our  DEIX.COP.PRS.he  in-outskirts  GEN city-FS

    Our house is on the outskirts of town.
51. \textit{b-aθe-Ø kəs-lan beθa ʼu-b-åzəl-Ø}.\footnote{1}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
FUT\-come\-he & by\-us \hline
house & and\-FUT\-go\-he
\end{tabular}

\textit{čũxa la k-xāzè-Ø-le}.\footnote{1}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
nobody & NEG \hline
HAB\-see\-he\-him
\end{tabular}

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

52. \textit{g-emər-Ø bax-t-i b-oð-a-lox-Ø}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
PRS\-say\-he & wife\-FS\-my \hline
FUT\-make\-she\-you\_MS
\end{tabular}

\textit{xa\-ʿazime bāš.}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
some\-banquet & good.
\end{tabular}

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

53. \textit{mər-re ṭa-le b-àθ-ən},\footnote{1} \textit{g-emər-Ø b-àθ-ən}.\footnote{1}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
PFV\-say\-he & to\-him \hline
FUT\-come\-I\_M & PRS\-say\-he FUT\-come\-I\_M
\end{tabular}

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

54. \textit{g-emər-Ø, \textsuperscript{H}tov\textsuperscript{H}, b-àθ-ən}.\footnote{1}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
PRS\-say\-he & \textsuperscript{H}good\textsuperscript{H}, \hline
FUT\-come\-I\_M
\end{tabular}

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

55. \textit{θële},\footnote{1} \textit{baxte qam-qaðrāle ʼu-ʼudla ʾīxala basima ṭale},\footnote{1}

He came, his wife showed him hospitality for him and made good food for him,

56. \textit{ʼu-pəšle ʾāṣərtə kə slu},\footnote{1} \textit{xəlle, štele ʼu-muḥkèlu}.\footnote{1}

And he stayed the evening at theirs, he ate, drank and they spoke.
57. *pāšla*\(^{12}\) drāngi, 'g-emər ʾana b-azən l-ṭūra.'
   It got late, [so] he says ‘I will go [back] to [the] mountain.’

58. qəmle … māre bēθa ži zəlle qam-maxzele ʿurxa ʿu-mpəqle.'
   He got up … the house owner also went and showed him
   the way, and he went out.

59. ʿu-ʿawa yiʾolle l-ʾọya, ʰurgə ḥməlle ʰur tāra.'
   [As] that one entered, the wolf waited at the door.

60. ʰurgə ḥməlle ʰur tāra,’ šame ma bāmrə bāθər zəlle.'
   The wolf waited at the door to hear what they will say
   after he has left.

61. baxte ži g-əmrə waḷḷa xōš,’ xōš xūra ḥṭloxl.‘
   His wife says ‘Indeed, a good, good friend you have.

62. xōš xūrə = le ’o ʰurgə.’
   [A] good friend he is, that wolf.

63. bāłe xa-məndi qūṣur ’iβe.’
   But there is a flaw in him.’

64. g-emər ṭala mà ’iβe qūṣur?’
   He says to her ‘What flaw is there in him?’

\(^{12}\) Note that it is the feminine singular subject suffix that is used non-
referentially for the impersonal construction *pāšla drāngi* (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: ʿāraq-a-le (pfv.run-her-he ‘he fled’). For non-referential object affixes and likely contact dimension with Kurdish, see Mengozzi (2007).
65. g-əmra ṭale rixa... raba rixa là basima k-eθe mən pəmme.

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

66. rixa là basima k-eθe mən pəmme.

A bad smell comes out from his mouth.’

67. Həaż g-emər gùrgā = le ʾōhā = le. mà ʾoðən?

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

68. šmèle gurga muhkela hatxa ʾolle, xriówa.

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

69. qam-dārele go nàθe ʾu-qḥə̀rre, kròble.

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

70. g-emər ʾana g-oðənnu hawùθa, ani k-parʾila tali bət xriwùθa.

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

71. g-əmrì rixa raba pis g-napəq mən pəmme.

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

72. żelle l-tùra. durdət yom q-qayəm märə bèθa, g-ezəl ta şìwe.

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

73. gurga žiθèle, g-emər, šqullox ῖdyo ži xa lira kurkamâna, bāle mən ῖdyo, là -k-eθət, ḥəl ῖrbi yome xəta.

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,⁵ g-emǝr, mxile go rèši,⁶ kmà 'ibox!⁶*
   Take your axe,’ he says ‘[and] hit my head (lit. hit it on my head)¹³ as [hard as] you can.

76. *'u-tûre reši bêt nāra.*¹
   And break my head with [the] axe.’

77. *g-emǝr màto màxǝnne go rešox?⁷ b-qatlɔnnox?⁷*
   He says ‘How [is it that] I should hit your head? Will I kill you?’

78. *g-emǝr là-q-qatlɔtti.*¹
   He says ‘You won’t kill me.’

79. *g-emǝr 'atta 'an màxǝtte nāra go rèši,⁷ 'àn b-axlɔnnox.¹*
   He says ‘Now either you hit me [with the] axe on my head or I will eat you.

80. *xzi, mà gǝbǝt?¹*
   Look, what do you want?

81. *'ēn là-màxǝtte nāra go reši,¹ 'àn b-axlɔnnox.¹*
   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. ʾaw naša ʿzi faqira, kma də-mṣèle, qam-māxele go rèše, ḥqam-sālə̀ḥle gurga. This poor man, he hit him\textsuperscript{14} on his head as [hard as] he could [and] the wolf forgave him.

83. ʿu-zə̀lle, gurga ʿzi qam-yāsərre reš gyàne, brindar = ile. And he went, the wolf bandaged his head—he was wounded.

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

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

86. zə̀lle, muḥkele ta baxta, g-emər ḥāl ʿu-māsəle didi, ʾèhā = la. He went and spoke to [his] wife, he says ‘My situation is this.

87. gurga mərrre ṭali là-k-eθət ʿarbi yoma xeta ʿaxxa. The wolf told me “You will not be coming here for another forty days.”

88. ḥtòv\textsuperscript{15} ṭədlu ʿarbi yòme, qəmle ʿaw naša x-a-ga-xə̀t, Good. Forty days passed by, the man got up once again,

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

\textsuperscript{15} The word order in both of these verbal clauses is predicate—subject: ṭədlu ʿarbi yòme 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. *zəlle l-ṭūra,*1 *zəlle xzele gūrga,*1 *g-emǝr tale,* *g-emǝr θǝ̀ 'axxa,*1
he went to [the] mountain, he went and saw the wolf
[who] says to him, he says ‘Come here’;

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

91. *g-emǝr šrìla*1 ʾe kafiyə mǝ̄n reši ʾu-xzi,*1 duktǝt mxelox ʾo 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-šārela mǝ̄n ʿāqə̀le,*1 wela trǝṣta.*1
He untied it from his head (lit. mind)—it had healed.

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

94. *g-emǝr wele rešox triša.*1
He says ‘Your head has healed!’16

95. *g-emǝr k-xazăt?*1 *g-emǝr šwirǝt17 nāra didox*1 *qam-mǝxǝtte
baθǝr ʾarbi yǝme,*1 trǝṣle 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 (*rešox wele triša*), or
perhaps copula—predicate—subject (*wele triša rešox*).
17 The etymology of this word is unknown to me.
96. \(bāle xabrat bāxtox mərra ṭali\)  hare məθa \(lā-g-nāšən-ne\).¹
   But your wife’s word, which she said to me, till death I will not forget.’

97. \(g-emər mā mərra ṭalox?\)
   He says ‘What did she say to you?’

98. \(g-emər ʾaxtoxun, baxtox muhkəloxun, baxtox mərra ʾo gugra xoš nāšā=le, ḩāš=ile, balē xa-rixax pīs k-eθe mən pəmme.\)
   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. \(šwirət xābra lā-k-eθe nšaya.\)
   [A] wound [caused by a] word is not forgotten.

100. \(šwirət ḍə̀rba naša g-našele.\)

101. \(šwirət xābra ḥə̀l moθa naša lā-g-našele.\)

102. \(lazəm yàʾe naša məṭo maθke.\)
    A man should know how to speak.

103. \(dər bāl, mən ʾədyo pēv(a) lā-k-eθe t-lṭura.\)
    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, mәrre ta dawәltә dide—'
   There was a ruler, he said to his state—

2. ta k৲llu naše go dawәltә—'
   to all [the] people in [the] state—

3. bә-daw wәxt‘ kud màθә' dawәltә wawa.'
   At that time, every city was [a] state.

4. k-әәrәxәwәla dawәltә.'
   They used to call it a state.

5. mәrre ta dawәltә dide:'
   He said to his state

6. ʾана g-әәәn ta ḥukum dәdi... ta parlamәn dәdi—'
   ‘I want for my government... for my parliament...

7. ʾана g-әәәn xa...' meθәtәli xa mdagәl ṭali xa-dәgәl19'
   I want [some]one, [I want you] to bring me [some]one
   who would tell me a lie

8. la hәwe-bә ʾәmәrnәnne kүlle mәndi mәn ʾiλәhә = la,'
   [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

so that I would say “This is [a] lie, you are right, this is [a] lie.”

10. *Hyʾl-ʾana g-yāwǒnnoxun țlà yome.*

And I give you three days.

11. *là-mɛtʊli xa mdāgɔlli xa-dugle d-mate l-ʾaqɔli,*

[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. *rɛsɔnxun mafɔrɔnne.*

I will cut off your heads (lit. make them fly).

13. *b-qɑtɔnnoxun,* *rɛsɔnxun b-qeʃɔnne.*

I will kill you, I will cut off your heads.’

14. *kullu zdɛlʊˈ ʾu-zɔllu*

All were afraid and went,

15. *mɔðɛlu naʃe d-ʾamri… mɔdλi dʊglɛ.*

brought people who would say… would lie [a] lie.

16. *xa əθɛl, ʾg-ɛmɔr* *ʾana b-amrɔn xa-mɔndi xɛt ʃiki.*

One [person] came [and] says ‘I will tell something else too.’

---

20 The clause *ʾo ḏuglē = la* (this, lie/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-ḥakòma ʾzik mǝrre,’ k-xāzòtula kòsta dǝt-ǝrǝ, kǝs dǝt zùze,’ zuzət dēhwa?’
And the ruler also said ‘Do you see [the] bag of money, bag of coins, golden coins?

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

19. kud dǝ-mdagǝl ǝtli dûglǝ’
[and] every[one] who would tell me a lie

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

21. ‘è b-yāwǝnna ǝtale.’
I will give this to him.

22. ‘u-ana ǝtla yome b-yāwǝnnoxun,’ b-qaṭlǝnnoxun.’
And I will give you three days, [then] I will kill you.’

23. xa g-emǝr ‘ana xzeli bǝt ‘èni’
One says ‘I saw with my [own] eyes

24. xa-nǝša’ tule rǝş kanûsta.’
a man [who] sat on top of [a] broom.

25. duqle kanûsta’ ʾu-ﬀǝrre ǝsomme.’
He seized a broom and flew into the sky.’
   He came to [the] ruler [and] says ‘I saw this with my own eyes.’

27. ʼg-emǝr kulle mǝndi mǝn ʾilàhǝ = le.
   [The ruler] says ‘All of this is from God.

28. ʾilaha ʾìbe ʾawed ḥatxa.
   God can do this.’

29. xa dārele rǝš kanùšta ʼu-mǝfǝrre 21 šǝmme.
   Someone may put [a man] on top of [a] broom and make him fly to the sky.

30. ʾeha lèwa dugle.
   This was not [a] lie.

31. xa-xǝt θèle, ʼg-emǝr ʼana xzeli kǝlba
   Another one came and says ‘I saw [a] dog

32. ʾiʾǝlle/go nuqbat xmǝta.
   [that] entered into the eye of a needle.

33. xzèli ʾiʾǝlle/go nuqbat xmǝta.
   I saw him [when he] entered in the eye of [a] needle.’

34. ʼg-emǝr ʾeha lèwa 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. *ʾatta ʾo ḥakòma,* ma d-g-ǝmrile*

   Now this ruler, whatever 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 huðaya go šùqa,*

   They went … there was a Jew in the market (lit. one he was a Jew in the market)

40. *ṭāləbwa ḥnedavòt,*

   [who] he used to beg,

41. *ʿāyəšwa bǝt ḥnedavòt.* 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-ʾemri ḥāl ʾu-másale ʾèha=la.*

   They say ‘The situation is this.’
44. $g\-m\text{\textordmasculine}} n\-\text{\textordmasculine} \- \text{\textordmasculine} \- \text{\textordmasculine}} '\text{\textordmasculine}} m\text{\textordmasculine}} d\text{\textordmasculine}} t\text{\textordmasculine}} x\text{\textordmasculine}} \- d\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   He says ‘Take me, I will tell him a lie.’

45. $H\text{\textordmasculine}} \- \text{\textordmasculine}} '\text{\textordmasculine}} z\text{\textordmasculine}} ' a\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} ' a\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} \- x\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   And I, in fact, want him to tell me it was not a lie.

46. $'a\text{\textordmasculine}} g\-b\text{\textordmasculine}} ' a\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   I want him to tell me it was not a lie.

47. $z\text{\textordmasculine}} n\text{\textordmasculine}} x\text{\textordmasculine}} b\text{\textordmasculine}} t\text{\textordmasculine}} \text{\textordmasculine}} h\text{\textordmasculine}} \text{\textordmasculine}} \text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} \text{\textordmasculine}} \text{\textordmasculine}} m\text{\textordmasculine}} x\text{\textordmasculine}} n\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} t\text{\textordmasculine}} \text{\textordmasculine}} u\text{\textordmasculine}} g\text{\textordmasculine}} r\text{\textordmasculine}} x\text{\textordmasculine}} k\text{\textordmasculine}} x\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} k\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   Buy me a royal suit and take me to [the] bathhouse, and I shall wash, change and shave, shoes and everything new,

48. $'u\text{\textordmasculine}} n\text{\textordmasculine}} n\text{\textordmasculine}} k\text{\textordmasculine}} h\text{\textordmasculine}} k\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   and take me to [the] ruler, I shall tell him such a lie [that] he will say [that] it is [a] lie.

49. $'a\text{\textordmasculine}} g\-b\text{\textordmasculine}} ' a\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   I want want him to say [that] it is [a] lie.’

50. $g\-\text{\textordmasculine}} t\text{\textordmasculine}} t\text{\textordmasculine}} H\text{\textordmasculine}} t\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   They say to him ‘Fine!’

51. $z\text{\textordmasculine}} n\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} \text{\textordmasculine}} p\text{\textordmasculine}} d\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} \text{\textordmasculine}} s\text{\textordmasculine}} q\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   He went to the market. They passed by the market and he says ‘Buy me seven big jugs,

52. $'u\-s\text{\textordmasculine}} a\text{\textordmasculine}} h\text{\textordmasculine}} m\text{\textordmasculine}} r\text{\textordmasculine}} z\text{\textordmasculine}} k\text{\textordmasculine}} n\text{\textordmasculine}} l\text{\textordmasculine}} t\text{\textordmasculine}}$.
   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. ἡτὸν. γὰρ μάξαλσι b-gyänù. 1 zuñnu τάλε ὁσ’α l’ine’ ὡ-σο’α ἁμμαρέ’ ὡ-ζαλλυ κὸς ἥκομα.’

Good. They want to save themselves. They bought him seven big jugs and seven donkey drivers and they went to the king.

54. θelu κὸς dargàvan’ dat ἥκομα, ’an na talme ’u-kadùne, talme ’u-nàše,’

They came to the ruler’s gate-keeper, [all] these vessels and jugs, vessels and people.

55. mà ila g-əmri ’anna ḥarrase,’ ḥarras-d go târa.’

‘What is it?’ say these keepers, the keepers who [are] at [the] gate.

56. g-əmri mālək mɔrre ’aθax mdaglax xa-dùgla τάλε.’

They say ‘[The] king told [us that] we should come [and] tell a lie for him.’

57. mɔrru ta mālək’ flan welu ἢθοye,’ mdagəl xa-dùgla.’

They said to the king ‘Some men have come, [one] will tell you a lie.’

58. mālək mɔrre ṭàlu’ suwun muθun xà’

The king said to them ‘Go, bring me someone,

59. bāle là-hawe huδaya.’

but he should not be [a] Jew.

60. là-hawe huδaya.’

He should not be [a] Jew.’
61. ṯēlū, yīʾēllu kūllu kēs màλēk.

They came, they all entered into the ruler’s presence.

62. ḥmēllu go diwan, ʾaw huḏaயa ʾžik.

They waited in the reception room, this Jew also.

63. qam-mahmēllu kullu lʾine dide bēt rèza ʾu-mēn ḥammare baθər lʾine

He put all his big jugs in a line and a few of the donkey drivers behind the big jugs.

64. ʾu-g-emār ʿtāle d-mā, mdaglēt xa-dūgle dʾana ʾāqāli qaṭe dūgłe=la?

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 dūgłe=la?

I should tell you it is [a] lie?’

66. g-ʾemār, ḥakoma basīma, ʾana lā-gə-mdaglənnox dugle, ʾana g-ʾamrənnox xa-məndi d-wewa tròṣa.

[The Jew] says ‘Good ruler, I do not tell you [a] lie, I tell you something that was true.

67. tròṣa wewa.

It was true.

68. ʾana lā-θəli mdaglənnox dugle.

I haven’t come to tell [a] lie.’
69. *g-emər māʾətloxx?*
   [The ruler] says ‘What have you got?’

70. *g-èmər k-xāzəttx ʾana lʾine?*
   [The Jew] says ‘Do you see those big jugs?’

71. *g-èmər sawòyi xa-naša dolamànt wewa.*
   He says ‘My grandfather was a rich man.’

72. *dolamànt yāčāni māre dawəltə, dawəltə ʾə́θwāle, ràba dolamant wewa.*
   *dolamant* means somebody with wealth. He had wealth, he was very rich.

73. *ʾu-sawòyox ḥakòma wewa. snəqle, l-sawòyi mdayən-ne pàre, zùze,*
   ‘And your grandfather was a ruler. He needed my grandfather to lend him money, coins,

74. *ʾu-ʾə́θwāle xa-šùla ʾawəðwa.*
   and he had a job to do.

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

76. *θele mdoyənne mən sawòyi, bo-dana lʾine qam-mālèwalu tału zùze,*
   he came and borrowed from my grandfather, in these big jugs, which they filled for him with golden coins, money.

77. *sawòyi mdoyənne tə sawoyox śoʾa lʾine dət zùze.*
   My grandfather lent your grandfather seven big jugs of coins.
78. ʾu-ʾatta ʾana pašli ... ḥali wele twirʾiʾu-ṭeli šaqiln denət sawoyi mənnox.

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 ḥakɔma =wətʾə́tolx.

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

80. munɔxle ḥakomat,ʾg-emər ta do nāša məɾe lʾine,

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

81. ʾimal sawɔyox xa-kalba hatxa ruwa wèwaʾdət sawoyi màlk, ʾḥakɔmaʾmdayən mənne lʾine d-père?

‘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? ʾhatxa 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-emər ṭaleʾḥakɔmaʾmahki ta gyənɔx, ʾlə-μσaʾɔrət sawoyi.

[The Jew] says to him ‘Ruler, speak to yourself [quietly], [but] do not curse my grandfather.
85. ʾēn ila tròsaʾ sawoyox wele šqila mən sawoyi pàreʾ mılišu ʾanna l’ine ţāli’ dena didi.’

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,’ hàlli kəsta.’

And if it is a lie, give me a bag [of money].’

87. ʾawa ḥakoma krə̀ble,’ g-emər šqùl.’ qam-māxela ẓàdre,’ g-emər ʾèha’ qtèle ʿaqəli 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

²² Overview of the use and origin of the habitual indicative 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.\textsuperscript{23}

In the texts presented above, $\text{šaqəl-wa}$ 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\textsuperscript{24}
\begin{verbatim}
xā wewa huḍaya go šùqa\text{š}
\end{verbatim}
There was a Jew in the market
\begin{verbatim}
Ø-ṭāləb-Ø-wa $^{H}$nedavɔt$^{H}$,  
IRR-ask-he-pst $^{H}$alms$^{H}$,
'\[who\] used to beg,'
\end{verbatim}

1/4
\begin{verbatim}
g-məθè-Ø-wa-.lu, $^{1}$ Ø-dārê-Ø-wa-.lu $^{rəš}$
HAB-bring-he-pst-them IRR-place-he-pst-them on

xmara dìde...$^{1}$
donkey his...

'He would bring them [and] place them on his donkey...'
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{57:130–39), who presents some alternative reconstructions.}
\textsuperscript{23} For the past tense, a sample of the corpus (about 4000 words) was studied, and the ratio between $k$-$\text{šaqəl-wa}$ and $\text{šaqəl-wa}$ 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.
\textsuperscript{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 ṭi-. According to Khan, however, ṭi-qaṭəl and ṭi-qaṭəl-wa—in contrast to qaṭəl and qaṭəl-wa—are used to indicate ‘discourse prominence’. In other words, ṭi-qaṭəl and ṭi-qaṭəl-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 ṭi- prefix in Barwar may still reflect this origin.
4.2. Expression of Emphatic Negative Imperative through $la\ k\-\mathit{\text{šaqəl}}$ (prototypically realis)

The negative form $la\ k\-\mathit{\text{šaqəl}}$ is used more broadly than its affirmative $k\mathit{\text{šaqəl}}$ counterpart, which conveys realis present. The form $la\ k\mathit{\text{šaqəl}}$ negates not only the present, but also the future, which, in the affirmative, is expressed by $p\-\mathit{\text{šaqəl}}$. 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, $la\ k\-\mathit{\text{šaqəl}}$ can also sometimes be used for an emphatic negative imperative. Prototypically, the negative imperative is expressed by the irrealis $la\ \mathit{\text{šaqəl}}$, e.g. $la\ \mathit{\text{Ø-əθ-ət}}$ (NEG IRR-come-you\textsubscript{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

$là-k-e\theta\-ət$ (NEG HAB-come-you\textsubscript{MS}) ‘arbi yoma xeta ‘axxa.\(^{1}$

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

$\mathit{\text{H}^2\text{azH}}\ \mathit{g-əmrı\ }là-k-e\theta\-etu$ (NEG HAB-come-you\textsubscript{PL}) $mən\ \text{dašdaša},\ lazəm\ \text{zonetu\ pantaròne}.\(^{1}$

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

Given that $la\ k\-\mathit{\text{šaqəl}}$ 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 kšaqəl) and with the irrealis form (corresponding to la šaqəl) 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 ʾɔdɔy-e, \quad 0-mdagəl-0

\text{xa-dugla}.

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

2/85

\text{sawoy-ox} \quad \text{we-le} \quad šqila

\text{grandfather-your}_{ms} \quad \text{PFV.be-he} \quad \text{RES.take.MS}

27 Private communication with Lourd Chechman.
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 ʾaxòni=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 Ṭyare 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).32

---

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. Indeed, in the corpus as a whole, there are very few such forms, even though there are multiple cases of k-šaqal 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, wele bə-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, wal/hol/hole k-šaqal). 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).

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 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 ba-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.

\[
\text{mà d-g-məθe} \text{ele dərmænæl}^\text{1} \text{u-mà d-g-oði}^\text{1} \text{l-ëwe ba-trása} \text{(NEG-COP. PRS.he in-healing).}^\text{1} \text{(3f)}
\]

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

\[
\text{zæle}^\text{11} \text{mîsken}^\text{11} \text{h} \text{uðaya l-bëθa,}^\text{1} \text{l-ëwe bə-dmæxa} \text{(NEG-COP.PRS.he in-sleeping)}^\text{1} \text{mən zdò'ðæe.}^\text{1} \text{(3f)}
\]

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

With other verbs, *wele ba-šqala* could not be elicited from most speakers.\textsuperscript{35} This suggests that in Jewish Dohok *wele ba-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

---

\textsuperscript{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 temporarily 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, ᵁay baxta ᵃt miskêna ṭlòxe. (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.

\[\text{g-yāʾəl-wa go màṭbax'}) k-xāpəq-wa-la g-nāšə̀q-wa-la.’ b-amrá-wā-le d-prùq-li. ěna wəl gə-mbàšlan (PROG HAB-cook-I), ěatta gəbe ḥođan ḵixāla.}\]

‘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—\(wəl, \text{hole or hol}\)—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 \(k-\text{šaqəl}\) 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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