

Al-Saraf, Jade Ann (2018) A contrastive study of loaned vs. non-loaned lexicon in Iraqi Arabic. PhD thesis. SOAS University of London. <http://eprints.soas.ac.uk/26657>

Copyright © and Moral Rights for this thesis are retained by the author and/or other copyright owners.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder/s.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

When referring to this thesis, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given e.g. AUTHOR (year of submission) "Full thesis title", name of the School or Department, PhD Thesis, pagination.

**A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF LOANED VS. NON-LOANED
LEXICON IN IRAQI ARABIC**

JADE ANN AL-SARAF

Thesis submitted for the degree of PhD

2018

Department of Linguistics
SOAS, University of London

Abstract

Drawing upon data which was collected during fieldwork with native speakers combined with transcriptions from television programs in the Baghdadi dialect, this thesis provides an original description and contrastive analysis of loaned and non-loaned lexicon in the Arabic dialect spoken in Baghdad, Iraq. The presence of a loan in a language does not mean that there is not also a non-loaned alternative to express the same notion, raising the question: why do a loan and a native, non-loaned alternative exist side-by-side, especially as loans are generally seen as filling referential gaps? And also: what motivates speakers of Iraqi Arabic to pick one form over the other—what is the division of labor between the loan and its non-loaned alternative(s)?

This thesis analyzes four loans in particular, *hamm* ‘too’, *balkit* ‘perhaps’, *-siz* (a suffix denoting the lack of a trait) , and *-čī* (a suffix denoting a profession or trait) and compares them with their non-loaned alternatives. This thesis more accurately outlines the principal functions of these loans, and, for each function, indicates the most accurate non-loaned counterpart, providing deeper insight into the true behavior of these loans that current dictionaries and reference grammars of Iraqi Arabic fail to account for. This new understanding of the loans draws attention to the previously under-analyzed and under-emphasized complexity of the loaned Iraqi Arabic lexicon and also aids us in better understanding the manner(s) of loan integration and maintenance in this particular language variety.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	10
Transcription Chart.....	11
Glossing Conventions	13
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	14
1.1 Introduction.....	15
1.2 Thesis Topic.....	15
1.3 Thesis Outline	17
CHAPTER TWO: ARABIC AND LANGUAGE CONTACT	20
2.1 Chapter Outline.....	21
2.2 What is Arabic?: Standard vs. Dialectal Arabic.....	21
2.3 Iraqi Arabic	22
2.4 The Historical Language Contact Situations of Iraq.....	24
2.4.1 Sumerian and Akkadian.....	25
2.4.2 Aramaic and Arabic	26
2.4.3 Persian Rule	27
2.4.4 Ottoman and Mamluk Rule.....	29
2.4.5 Summary of Historical Language Contact.....	32
2.5 Language Contact	32
2.6 The Sociolinguistic Situation of Baghdad and Related Dialectal Features.....	33
2.7 The Linguistic Situation of Iraq and Surrounding Areas	36
CHAPTER THREE: BILINGUALISM, BORROWING, LOAN INTEGRATION & MAINTENANCE, AND THE PRINCIPLE OF CONTRAST.....	41
3.1 Chapter Outline.....	42
3.2 Bilingualism.....	42
3.3 Borrowing	42
3.4 Loan Integration and Maintenance	44
3.5 The Principle of Contrast	46
CHAPTER FOUR: SIGNFICANCE & CONTRIBUTION AND DATA COLLECTION & METHODOLOGY	48
4.1 Chapter Outline.....	49

4.2	The Significance and Contribution of the Present Work to the Existing Literature	49
4.3	Methodology and Data Collection	51
CHAPTER FIVE: HAMM		58
5.1	Chapter Outline	59
5.2	Etymology of <i>hamm</i>	60
5.3	Additive <i>hamm</i>	62
5.3.1	Additive Focus Particles	62
5.3.2	Analysis.....	65
5.3.2.1	Additive <i>hamm</i> and <i>'ayðan</i>	66
5.3.2.2	Focusing the Subject	69
5.3.2.3	Focusing an Object	73
5.3.2.4	Focusing an Adjective.....	73
5.3.2.5	Focusing a Genitive Construction.....	75
5.3.2.6	Focusing a Location.....	79
5.3.2.7	Focusing the Object of a Preposition	81
5.3.2.8	Focusing a Preposition of Time	82
5.3.2.9	The Case of <i>hamm...hamm</i>	84
5.3.2.10	Conclusion of Section	88
5.4	Scalar Hamm.....	89
5.4.1	Scalar Focus Particles	89
5.4.2	Analysis.....	92
5.4.2.1	Scalar <i>hatta</i> vs. Scalar <i>hamm</i>	93
5.4.2.2	Focusing a Subject	97
5.4.2.3	Focusing an Object	98
5.4.2.4	Focusing a Prepositional Phrase	98
5.4.2.5	Focusing a Hypothetical Construction	99
5.4.2.6	Conclusion of Section	100
5.5	The <i>hamm</i> of Emphasis.....	100
5.5.1	Intensifiers.....	101
5.5.2	Analysis.....	103
5.5.2.1	<i>şudug</i> vs. Emphatic <i>hamm</i>	103
5.5.2.2	Intensifying a Noun.....	107

5.5.2.3	Intensifying an Adjective	109
5.5.2.4	Intensifying an Active Participle.....	110
5.5.2.5	Intensifying a Verb	110
5.5.2.6	Conclusion of Section	114
5.6	Concessive <i>hamm</i>	114
5.6.1	Concessive Cancellative Discourse Markers	115
5.6.2	Analysis.....	117
5.6.2.1	<i>ma ‘a ḍālik</i> and <i>ma ‘a hāḍa</i> vs. <i>hamm</i>	117
5.6.2.2	Cancelling Prior Discourse	121
5.6.2.3	Conditional Sentences	122
5.6.2.4	Conclusion of Section	128
5.7	Overall Conclusions of the <i>hamm</i> and Theoretical Implications	128
5.8	Room for Further Research.....	133
CHAPTER SIX: BALKIT		134
6.1	Chapter Outline	135
6.2	Background and Introduction.....	135
6.3	Etymology of <i>balkit</i>	137
6.4	Defining Modality.....	139
6.5	The Scope of Modality.....	141
6.5.1	The Scope of the Modalities Served by the Modals Under Analysis.....	146
6.6	Existing Literature on Modality in Arabic	148
6.6.1	Existing Literature on Modality in Iraqi Arabic	151
6.7	Data Collection and Methodology	153
6.8	Analysis.....	156
6.8.1	Epistemic Possibility	157
6.8.2	Deontic Modality	165
6.8.2.1	Deontic Ability.....	165
6.8.2.2	Deontic Permission (Granting)	168
6.8.2.3	Deontic Permission (Eliciting).....	169
6.8.2.4	Deontic (Polite Request).....	170
6.8.3	Dynamic Ability.....	173
6.8.4	Boulomaic	176

6.8.5	Summary of the Modals.....	177
6.9	Negation of the Modals.....	179
6.9.1	Overview of Negative Modality	179
6.9.2	Overview of How the Modals Under Analysis Are Negated.....	179
6.10	Analysis.....	180
6.10.1	Epistemic Modality	180
6.10.2	Deontic Modality	182
6.10.2.1	Deontic Ability.....	182
6.10.2.2	Deontic Permission (Granting)	183
6.10.2.3	Deontic Permission (Eliciting).....	184
6.10.3	Dynamic Ability.....	185
6.10.4	Boulomaic	187
6.10.5	Summary of the Negative Section	188
6.11	Overall Conclusions of the Modals and Theoretical Implications	189
6.12	Room for Further Research.....	193
CHAPTER SEVEN: -SIZ AND -ČI		194
7.1	Chapter Outline.....	195
7.2	Background and Introduction.....	195
7.3	Defining Affix Borrowing	197
7.4	What is Productive?	198
7.5	Constraints on Suffix Productivity.....	199
7.6	-siz and -či in Iraqi Arabic vs. Turkish.....	202
7.6.1	-siz.....	203
7.6.2	Summary of -siz in Iraqi Arabic vs. Turkish.....	206
7.6.3	-či	207
7.6.4	Summary of -či in Iraqi Arabic vs. Turkish	209
7.7	The Syntactic categories of -siz and -či.....	211
7.8	Data Collection and Methodology	214
7.9	Analysis.....	217
7.9.1	General Remarks on <i>bala</i>	218
7.9.1.1	<i>bala</i> Occuring in Conjunction with Nouns	219
7.9.1.2	<i>bala</i> Occuring in Conjunction with Verbs	220

7.9.1.3	<i>bala</i> Occuring in Conjunction with Pronominal Suffixes.....	221
7.9.2	General Remarks on ‘ <i>adīm</i> ’	222
7.9.2.1	Vocative ‘ <i>adīm</i> ’.....	223
7.9.2.2	Nominal ‘ <i>adīm</i> ’	224
7.9.2.3	Predicative ‘ <i>adīm</i> ’	225
7.9.2.4	Referential ‘ <i>adīm</i> ’	225
7.9.2.5	Attributive ‘ <i>adīm</i> ’.....	226
7.9.2.6	Existential ‘ <i>adīm</i> ’	226
7.9.3	General remarks on - <i>siz</i>	227
7.9.3.1	Vocative - <i>siz</i>	233
7.9.3.2	Nominal - <i>siz</i>	234
7.9.3.3	Predicative - <i>siz</i>	235
7.9.3.4	Referential - <i>siz</i>	236
7.9.3.5	Attributive - <i>siz</i>	236
7.9.3.6	Existential - <i>siz</i>	240
7.9.4	Conclusion of ‘ <i>adīm</i> , <i>bala</i> , and - <i>siz</i> ’	241
7.9.5	General Remarks on <i>abu il-</i>	243
7.9.5.1	Occupations Involving Food and Beverages.....	245
7.9.5.2	Occupations Involving Goods and Instruments	245
7.9.5.3	Negative Traits.....	245
7.9.5.4	Abstract Traits.....	246
7.9.5.5	Physical Traits.....	246
7.9.5.6	Animal Names	247
7.9.5.7	Ownership	247
7.9.5.8	Inanimate Objects	247
7.9.5.9	Nominal <i>abu il-</i>	248
7.9.5.10	Predicative <i>abu il-</i>	248
7.9.5.11	Referential <i>abu il-</i>	249
7.9.5.12	Existential <i>abu il-</i>	249
7.9.6	General Remarks on - <i>či</i>	249
7.9.6.1	Occupations Involving Food and Beverages.....	254
7.9.6.2	Occupations Involving Goods and Instruments	255

7.9.6.3	Negative Traits.....	256
7.9.6.4	Nouns Already Denoting Agents, Professions, or Occupations	257
7.9.6.5	Morpho-Phonological Effects of <i>-čī</i>	257
7.9.6.6	Nominal <i>-čī</i>	258
7.9.6.7	Predicative <i>-čī</i>	259
7.9.6.8	Referential <i>-čī</i>	259
7.9.6.9	Existential <i>-čī</i>	261
7.9.7	Conclusions of <i>abu il-</i> and <i>-čī</i>	261
7.10	Overall Conclusions and Theoretical Implications of <i>-siz</i> and <i>-čī</i>	265
7.11	Room for Further Research.....	268
CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION.....		270
8.1	Chapter Outline.....	271
8.2	Summary of the Findings of this Thesis	271
8.2.1	<i>hamm</i>	271
8.2.2	<i>balkit</i>	272
8.2.3	<i>-siz</i> and <i>-čī</i>	273
8.3	Shared Implications of the Findings	273
8.4	Manners In Which This Thesis Could Be Expanded Upon	277
8.5	Other Loans Worthy of Future Research	280
8.5.1	<i>kawdan</i>	281
8.5.2	<i>‘ala mūd</i>	283
8.5.3	<i>hīč</i>	284
8.5.4	<i>xōš</i>	286
8.6	Concluding Remarks.....	288
BIBLIOGRAPHY		289

Acknowledgements

There are several people to whom I am deeply indebted for their help and support throughout the duration of my PhD. It goes without saying that a few sentences of cleverly-strung-together words could never express the extent of the gratitude I feel towards these individuals, but I shall do my best nonetheless.

First and foremost thanks to my beloved father for not only offering me his constant and unwavering support, but for being my Arabic teacher and instilling in me the indispensable linguistic fluency needed to carry out this thesis. Thank you for nurturing my love and appreciation for our language and for also teaching me how to see beyond the war and destruction of Iraq, to see the beauty that remains in its language, its culture, and in the hearts of its people. Thanks also to my mother for her constant prayers and never-ceasing sweet words of encouragement. Furthermore, I must thank my brother for chauffeuring me to and from the library all of these years (and for stopping to get me coffee and ice cream on the way with little protest).

I must extend the utmost thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Chris Lucas, for his invaluable comments on my drafts, his insightful life and career advice, and for offering sincere moral and academic support. He has exercised with me an amount of patience I did not know was possible for a single human being to possess.

Transcription Chart

Consonants

ء	ʾ	glottal stop
ب	b	voiced bilabial stop
پ	p	voiceless bilabial stop
ت	t	voiceless dental stop
ث	θ	voiceless dental non-sibilant fricative
ج	j	voiced postalveolar affricate
ج	ʒ	voiced palato-alveolar sibilant fricative
چ	č	voiceless palato-alveolar sibilant affricate
ح	ħ	voiceless pharyngeal fricative
خ	x	voiceless velar fricative
د	d	voiced alveolar stop
ذ	ð	voiced dental fricative
ر	r	alveolar trill
ز	z	voiced alveolar fricative
س	s	voiceless alveolar fricative
ش	ʃ	voiceless palatal alveolar sibilant
ص	ṣ	pharyngealized voiceless alveolar sibilant
ط	ṭ	pharyngealized voiceless alveolar stop
ض/ظ	ḍ	pharyngealized voiced dental fricative
ع	ʕ	voiced pharyngeal fricative
غ	ɣ	voiced velar fricative
ف	f	voiceless labiodental fricative
ق	q	voiceless uvular stop
ك	k	voiceless velar stop
گ	g	voiced velar stop
ل	l	alveolar lateral approximant
ل	ɭ	emphatic lateral approximant
م	m	bilabial nasal
ن	n	alveolar nasal

و	w	voiced labiovelar approximant
ي	y	palatal approximant

Vowels

Long

ا or آ	ā	open front unrounded vowel
و	ū	close back rounded vowel
ي	ī	close front unrounded vowel

Diphthongs

ؤ	ō	close-mid back rounded vowel
ئ	ē	close-mid front unrounded vowel

Short

ا	a or e	open front/close-mid front unrounded vowel
ي	i	close front unrounded vowel
و	u	close back unrounded vowel

Turkish vowels

ü	y	close front rounded vowel
ı	u	close back unrounded vowel

Glossing Conventions

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
DUAL	dual
F	feminine
FIL	filler
FUT	future
IMP	imperative
M	masculine
NEG	negative
PL	plural
POSS	possessive
PRS	present
PROG	progressive
PST	past
PTCP	participle
Q	question marker
S	singular
SR	subordinate
VOC	vocative

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 Introduction

This thesis is a contrastive analysis of loaned and non-loaned lexicon in the Arabic dialect spoken in Baghdad, Iraq. As is well known, Arabic was not always the language of the region now called Iraq. Widely considered to be the cradle of civilization by the western world, Iraq has a long history of multiculturalism, population shifts, and contacts between an array of cultures and languages including, but not limited to, Sumerian, Akkadian, Aramaic, Persian, Turkish, Kurdish, and English. It is widely accepted in the field of Arabic dialectology that Iraqi Arabic has a long history of linguistic changes as a result of this contact, and there is little doubt that many loans are still current and in daily use (although the number of loans still in use may have declined over recent years) (Bateson 1967:104). The existence of foreign elements in the language of Iraqi Arabs has long been attested, and there is evidence of loans being recorded in Iraqi Arabic over 1000 years ago (e.g., al-Farazdaq (728/1998); al-Jāḥiḍ (868/1895); al-Ḥarīrī (1122/1881)). For instance, al-Jāḥiḍ (868/1895) writes that ‘the people in the cities talk according to the language of the Bedouin immigrants that had settled there, which is why you find lexical differences between the people of Kufa and Basra and in Syria and Egypt’. He adds that in Kufa, for instance, the influx of Persians to the area resulted in a number of Persian loans, noting that the inhabitants of Kufa said *jahār-sūg* ‘crossroads’ (from Persian *čahār* ‘four’ + *sū(g)* ‘road’). Moreover, there is even evidence of one of the Persian loans to be analyzed here, *hamm* ‘also; even; really; nevertheless’ (see Chapter 5), in al-Ḥarīrī’s (1122/1881) *kitāb durrat al-ḡawwāṣ fī awḥām al-xawāṣṣ*.

1.2 Thesis Topic

The fact that the loans in Iraqi Arabic are not restricted to nouns, but are also found in more functional morphology and in syntax presents much to be explored. This thesis analyzes four loans in particular, *hamm* ‘also; even; really; nevertheless’, *balkit* ‘maybe; perhaps; hopefully’, *-siz* (a suffix denoting lacking, usually of some trait), and *-či* (a suffix denoting occupations or traits associated with the item denoted by the base to which it is appended) and compares them with their non-loaned alternatives. It also discusses how the generally-accepted interpretations of the terms in question fail to encapsulate the multifacety of their functions and thus highlights their varying functions and underlines the divisions of labor between apparently synonymous items, including the semantic and syntactic constraints by which they are bound.

In principle, there are many different ways in which loans can be approached and analyzed. We may explore the manner in which they entered Iraqi Arabic, from which languages they have been borrowed, and when and in which contact situations. We may also examine their impact on the Iraqi Arabic lexis, exploring how they enter into word-forming patterns within Iraqi Arabic, as well as their impact on the meanings and implications between different items. Alternatively, it is also possible to analyze them solely from the point of view of their pragmatic or stylistic effects (Durkin 2014:11). A recent important trend in the study of borrowing has been to explore lexical borrowing within the context of broader matters of language contact and to further categorize the numerous types of linguistic borrowing which typify various contact situations (Durkin 2014:12). For the purposes of the present work, we will examine the impact the loans under analysis have had on the Iraqi Arabic lexis by uncovering their true functions and the divisions of labor between them and their non-loaned counterparts.

Now let us discuss the research questions to be addressed in this thesis. The presence of a loan in a language does not mean that there is not also a non-loaned alternative to express the same notion, raising the question of why a loan and a native, non-loaned alternative exist side-by-side, especially as loans are generally seen as filling referential gaps (Weinreich 1953:79; Hockett 1958:404-7; Myers-Scotton 2002:41). In order to determine the reasons for such coexistence, this thesis explores the division of labor between the loans under analysis and their non-loaned alternatives by uncovering the various functions of these loans and seeks to answer:

What are the true functions of these loans which current studies and dictionaries have heretofore failed to encapsulate?

What are the syntactic and semantic constraints by which the loans under analysis are bound?

Carrying on from the coexistence of these items, a principal theme of the analyses conducted in this thesis is: Can true synonymy exist in a language?

Finally, were the loaned suffixes under analysis borrowed directly or indirectly?

Uncovering the semantic and syntactic constraints by which the loans under analysis are bound will help to unearth the divisions of labor between the loaned terms and their non-loaned alternatives, providing us with a better understanding of the factors motivating Iraqi Arabic

speakers to use one form over another. It will further shed light on the question of whether true synonymy can exist in a language, and an exploration of the loaned suffixes and a determination of whether they were borrowed directly or indirectly will better our understanding of loan integration and maintenance into Iraqi Arabic.

Each chapter treats a different loan and its related non-loaned alternatives and discusses the semantic and syntactic constraints binding them. Additionally, through the uncovering of the divisions of labor between the loan and its counterparts, each respective chapter also treats the question of whether or not true synonymy exists. Due to this divided nature of the chapters, each chapter of this thesis can be thought of as a standalone study in its own right.

1.3 Thesis Outline

Chapter 2 begins by outlining the contents of the chapter (2.1) and presents background information by defining ‘Arabic’ (2.2) and ‘Iraqi Arabic’ and the dialects therein (2.3). As all of the loans under analysis will have entered Iraqi Arabic as a result of the historical language contact situations of Iraq, a chronological overview of these contact situations will be set forth (2.4), followed by a discussion of how we can understand language contact in general (2.5). An outline of the sociolinguistic situation of Iraq and Baghdad specifically as well as the dialectal features bound therein and how these features impact on the employment of the loans under analysis are then set forth (2.6), and the chapter wraps up with an overview of the linguistic situation of Iraq and the surrounding areas, in order to better understand the language situation of the region (2.7).

We then continue to Chapter 3 which begins with a chapter outline (3.1) and an overview of bilingualism (3.2), borrowing (3.3), loan integration and maintenance (3.4), and the Principle of Contrast (3.5). Chapter 4 begins with an outline of the chapter (4.1) before setting forth the significance and contribution of this thesis to the existing literature on language contact in Iraqi Arabic and cross-linguistically (4.2). An overview of the methodology and data collection of this thesis is subsequently provided (4.3).

Chapter 5 explores the loaned *hamm* against the non-loaned *’ayḍan* (both of which have been traditionally described as serving an additive function and are both translated as meaning ‘also, too, or as well’ (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964; Clarity, Stowasser & Wolfe 2003; Nasrallah & Hassani 2005). The chapter begins with a chapter outline (5.1) and a summary of *hamm*’s

etymology (5.2). In this chapter, I argue that *hamm* is far more complex and multifaceted than the current understanding of it can account for, and I present four distinct functions of *hamm*: an additive function ‘also’ (König 1991) (5.3); a scalar focus particle ‘even’ (König 1991) (5.4); an intensifier ‘really’ (Ito & Tagliamonte 2003) (5.5); and a concessive cancellative discourse marker ‘nevertheless, however, still’ (Bell 2009) (5.6). A conclusion of the chapter is then presented (5.7) followed by a discussion of room for further research (5.8).

Chapter 6, continues our contrastive analysis by exploring the loaned modal *balkit* ‘perhaps, maybe; hopefully’ and its non-loaned alternatives *yigdar*, *mumkin*, and *yimkin*, beginning with a chapter outline (6.1) and some background on the topic (6.2). The etymology of *balkit* is then discussed (6.3) and modality (6.4) and the scope of modality (6.5) are set forth, followed by an overview on the existing literature on modality (6.6). The data collection methods are then presented (6.7), and, drawing largely upon Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994), the modals are analyzed as they occur (in affirmative instances) epistemically (6.8.1), deontically (6.8.2), dynamically (6.8.3), and boulmaically (6.8.4), focusing on the semantic and syntactic constraints which bind them in order to shed light on their respective functions and divisions of labor. Negative modality is then discussed (6.9) and the modals are analyzed as they occur in negative instances (6.10), followed by a presentation of the overall conclusions of the analysis of the modals as they occur in affirmative and negative instances (6.11), before wrapping up with a discussion of points worthy of further research (6.12).

Chapter 7 treats the loaned suffixes *-siz* and *-či* (the former of which implies lacking and the latter of which denotes a profession or characteristic) against their non-loaned counterparts ‘*adīm* and *bala* (*blayya*), and *abu il-*, respectively. The items in question are analyzed by drawing upon and building on Masliyah’s (1996) brief and concise analysis of the loans in question. The chapter begins with a chapter outline (7.1) and an introduction and background section (7.2). Affix borrowing is then defined (7.3) and a discussion of what is productive (7.4) as well as the constraints on suffix productivity (7.5) are set forth. An overview of how *-siz* and *-či* behave in both Turkish and Iraqi Arabic is presented (7.6) and their syntactic categories are explored (7.7). The methodology and data collection procedures are summarized (7.8), before turning to the analysis (7.9). *bala* (7.9.1), ‘*adīm* (7.9.2), and *-siz* (7.9.3) are analyzed first, followed by *abu il-* (7.9.5) and *-či* (7.9.6). The overall conclusions and theoretical implications of *-siz* and *-či* are

then set forth (7.10), and the chapter wraps up with a discussion of room for further research (7.11).

Chapter 8, beginning with a chapter outline (8.1), concludes this thesis by presenting a summary of its findings (8.2), discussing *hamm* (8.2.1), *balkit* (8.2.2), and *-siz* and *-či* (8.2.3), respectively. The shared implications of these findings are then discussed (8.3), followed by an exploration of manners in which this thesis could be expanded upon (8.4). Other loans which were not analyzed in this thesis, but which are still deserving of further research, are then set forth (8.5) (i.e., *kawdan* ‘because’ (8.5.1); ‘*ala mūd* ‘because’ (8.5.2); *hīč* ‘thus, so, such; nothing, not at all’ (8.5.3); and *xōš* ‘good, well’ (8.5.4). We then end with some concluding remarks (8.6).

CHAPTER TWO: ARABIC AND LANGUAGE CONTACT

2.1 Chapter Outline

This chapter provides an overview of the Arabic language and language contact in order to provide an adequate understanding of the language variety under analysis and the factors leading up to the acquisition of the loans in question. As there is a difference between standard and dialectal Arabic, and then again between the various dialects of Arabic, and since this thesis focuses on the Iraqi Arabic dialect specifically, the chapter begins by defining ‘Arabic’ (2.2) and then ‘Iraqi Arabic’ specifically and the dialects therein (2.3). As the loans under analysis will have entered Iraqi Arabic as a result of Iraq’s historical situations of linguistic contact, and to shed light on the intensity of the contact between Iraqi Arabic and other languages, the historical language contact situations of Iraq are summarized (2.4) with a focus on the contact between Sumerian and Akkadian (2.4.1), Aramaic and Arabic (2.4.2), the language situation under Persian rule (2.4.3) and then Ottoman and Mamluk rule (2.4.4). We then turn to a discussion of how we can understand language contact in general (2.5), followed by an exploration into the sociolinguistic situation of Baghdad and the related dialectal factors and how these factors impact on the employment of the loans under analysis (2.6), before wrapping up with an overview of the linguistic situation of Iraq and the surrounding areas, in order to better understand the languages spoken in the region (2.7).

2.2 What is Arabic?: Standard vs. Dialectal Arabic

Though the lay understanding is that ‘Arabic’ refers to a single language which is spoken in countries as widely separated as Iraq, Tunisia and Morocco, it is in fact only the literary form of Arabic– that is, the classical language of the Qur’an (Classical Arabic/CA) and its grammatically and phonologically similar modern counterpart (Modern Standard Arabic/MSA)– that is common to all countries in the Arab world. Thus, ‘Arabic’ (which belongs to the Afro-Asiatic language family, and more specifically to the Central Semitic branch), encompasses both the standard/literary form of Arabic, which serves as the literary language of all Arabic-speaking nations, and the colloquial varieties (also called ‘dialectal’ or ‘vernacular’ varieties) of Arabic. Modern Standard Arabic is not spoken natively and is described as ‘literary; written; standard; and formal’ (Altoma 1969:3). Muslims believe that the Qur’an was revealed to the prophet Muhammad in Classical Arabic, and this is the language variety used in numerous literary texts written from the 7th century onwards. It is utilized in formal situations including, but not limited

to, religious sermons, lectures, news broadcasts, political speeches, and the majority of written activities. Little distinction is made between Classical Arabic and Modern Standard Arabic in the Arab world as they are collectively referred to as *al-fuṣḥā* ‘the language of eloquence’ in Arabic; they can be thought of as being two registers of one language (e.g., Classical Arabic is used when reciting the Qur’an and Modern Standard Arabic is used in political speeches).

Regarding the colloquial Arabic varieties, some are mutually unintelligible, and as a whole these varieties could be described as a ‘sociolinguistic’ language (Bassiouny 2009:2). That is, they would likely be considered to constitute more than one language, but they are commonly clustered together as a single language for political and/or religious reasons. If the colloquial varieties were to be considered multiple languages, it is unclear how many languages they would constitute, since they make up a dialect chain with no clear boundaries. If we view all of these varieties as a single language, then Arabic is one of the top six languages in the world by number of native speakers. It also serves as the liturgical language of 1.6 billion adherents of Islam.

Categorizing the colloquial dialects of Arabic has been and remains a difficult task. According to Palva (2006), the usual classification of the Arabic dialects distinguishes between the five following geographic groups: I) Arabian Peninsula (Gulf); II) Iraqi (Mesopotamian); III) Syro-Lebanese (Levantine); IV) Egyptian; and V) North African (Maghrebi). The following section will discuss the dialects comprising ‘Iraqi Arabic’ and explain the manner in which these dialects should be classified.

2.3 Iraqi Arabic

The term ‘Iraqi Arabic’ (which is also commonly referred to as ‘Mesopotamian Arabic’ and ‘Baghdadi Arabic’), encompasses a number of mutually intelligible sub-varieties specific to certain regions, religions, and socioeconomic groups. Since Haim Blanc’s *Communal Dialects in Baghdad* (1964), it has become widely accepted in the realm of Arabic linguistics that the Arabic dialects spoken in Iraq can be classified into two main dialect groups which roughly correlate to a regional sub-division (Blanc 1964:6). Blanc termed these dialect groups *Gilit* and *Qeltu*, appellations derived from how ‘I said’ is expressed in the dialects in question. These terms illustrate two of the most distinctive features differentiating the groups: in the *Gilit* dialects, the reflex of the Standard Arabic /q/ is /g/, and the 1st person singular perfect inflectional suffix is -t,

whereas in the *Qeltu* dialects, the Standard Arabic /q/ is retained, and the form of the aforementioned suffix is *-tu*. The *Gilit* dialects are spoken by the Muslim population (sedentary and non-sedentary) of Baghdad and Lower Iraq, while the *Qeltu* dialects are spoken by the non-Muslim urban population of Baghdad and Lower Iraq and by the sedentary population (Muslim and non-Muslim) of Northern Iraq (Blanc 1964:6). Furthermore, the *Qeltu* dialects trace their origin to the sedentary spoken Arabic of medieval Iraq, while the *Gilit* dialects are of non-sedentary or Bedouin provenance (Jastrow 1978). The *Gilit* dialects bear some similarities with the dialects of the Arabian Peninsula (which are typically regarded as being of Bedouin origin) as they share many salient ‘Bedouin features’ (e.g., the affrication of /k/ to /č/). It would further appear that the introduction and utilization of these Bedouin features are in all likelihood the result of historical factors which have impacted on Iraq over the years, namely the Bedouin diaspora and its influence on the region (Blanc 1964; Palva 2006). While the presence of salient Bedouin features such as the affrication of /k/ to /č/ in Iraqi Arabic might make it tempting to cluster it with the dialects of the Arabian Peninsula, such affrication appears to be phonetically conditioned in Bedouin dialects, while such is not the case in Iraqi Arabic, and thus it would seem that Iraqi Arabic is a *Bedouinized* dialect, i.e., a dialect that possesses some Bedouin features, as opposed to a fully Bedouin dialect (Blanc 1964:6). Despite it being Bedouinized, Iraqi Arabic is still an urban dialect, unlike the Bedouin dialects of the Arabian Peninsula, which suggests that Iraqi Arabic should indeed be treated as its own distinct dialect group.

For the purposes of this thesis we are concerned specifically with the dialect of Iraqi Arabic spoken in Baghdad, known as ‘Baghdadi Arabic’. Baghdad is the most populated city in Iraq, as well as the center of commerce, media, and the governing circles. Baghdadi Arabic has traditionally been divided into three communal dialects: Muslim Baghdadi, which, as the name implies, is spoken by the Muslim population of Baghdad, Christian Baghdadi, which is spoken by the Christian population, and Jewish Baghdadi, spoken by the Jewish population (Muslim Baghdadi belongs to the *Gilit* dialect group while the Christian and Jewish dialects belong to the *Qeltu* group) (Blanc 1964:5). Jewish Baghdadi is no longer spoken in Iraq (although it still exists as a diaspora language), and it appears that Christian Baghdadi has been experiencing a steep decline for the past several decades (see Abu-Haidar 1991). Continuing from this, the Muslim variety of Baghdadi Arabic began to gain prestige over its Christian counterpart in 1918 AD, when the economic and social power in Baghdad (and Iraq as a whole) began returning to its

Muslim population (Blanc 1960). As Muslims occupy the governing circles and socio-economic elite in Iraq, in addition to constituting the majority of the population, the Muslim dialect of Baghdadi Arabic serves as the vernacular standard and lingua franca of Iraq (Abu-Haidar 1991), in addition to being the main language variety used in Iraqi media, i.e., television programs, songs, movies, etc. For these reasons, in the past it would not have made sense to speak about ‘Iraqi Arabic’, rather ‘Arabic dialects spoken in Iraq’, one of which is Muslim Baghdadi. Since Muslim Baghdadi has become the vernacular standard and lingua franca of Iraq, however, it makes sense to refer to it as ‘Iraqi Arabic’. Now that we have defined ‘Arabic’ and clarified the language variety on which this thesis focuses, let us turn to an exploration of the historical language contact situations of Iraq.

2.4 The Historical Language Contact Situations of Iraq

As the intensity and duration of the contact situations between Iraqi Arabic and other languages will have surely influenced borrowing into Iraqi Arabic, and because the loans under analysis will have entered the language as a result of these situations of contact, we shall now briefly summarize the historical language situation of the region now called Iraq (by drawing upon Versteegh 2001:490-501).

In the early Islamic centuries, Arabic spread to the conquered territories, where the inhabitants also adopted Arabic as their new language, and thus, the number of loans incorporated from their languages into Arabic is limited in comparison to the amount of loans borrowed from Arabic. This is likely because, with the dominance and reverence of Islam in the region, the new speakers sought to communicate in Arabic, and native words from their own languages would not have been very useful in communicating with Arabs, especially as the Arabs themselves were rarely bilingual, and, consequently, could not have played a role in the adoption of loans from these languages into Arabic. That said, the area surrounding Iran experienced quite a special situation, and, although it is unclear to what extent speakers in this area shifted to Arabic in the first three or four centuries following the Islamic conquests, we know that Middle Persian, which served as the literary language of the Sassanid Empire, served as a prestige language for some time from which many loans were adopted by Arabic (Asbaghi 1988). During this time, it is likely that Arabic immigrants had to learn Persian to function in society, and thus adopted Persian words into Arabic, while in Ottoman Turkey intellectuals had

Arabic, Persian, and Turkish in their linguistic repertoires. However, many questions surrounding the effects of the linguistic contact between Arabic and other languages remain unanswered, and these questions include, amongst others: how is it that a number of identical function words have been borrowed cross-dialectally (e.g., *balki(t)* ‘maybe’, *hamm* ‘also, too’), as well as by other languages? Also, is it possible to differentiate two layers of borrowing in all situations, and, if so, who carried the first layer? Such questions relate to source of Arabic interference and the situations in which this interference occurred, and, in this respect, the exploration of loans is exceedingly pertinent to the discussion of cultural influence in general (Versteegh 2001:501). Let us begin our overview of the historical language contact situations of Iraq, beginning with Sumerian and Akkadian.

2.4.1 Sumerian and Akkadian

The earliest recorded language of Iraq is Sumerian, which is not demonstrably related to any other known language. From c. 3300 to 3000 BC Sumerian went through a ‘proto-literate’ period in which records were purely logographic, possessing no phonological or linguistic content. The Kish tablet (c. 3500 BC) is the oldest document stemming from the proto-literate era, while records containing unambiguously linguistic content (which are identifiably Sumerian) are those found at Jemdet Nasr and date to the 31st or 30th century BC. From c. 2600 BC, the logographic symbols were simplified using a stylus to imprint the symbols into wet clay, this archaic wedge-shaped cuneiform mode of writing existed side-by-side with the archaic pre-cuneiform mode (Geller 1997).

Sumerian was gradually replaced by Akkadian, an east Semitic language (which was also written in the cuneiform script), as a spoken language by c. 2000 BC (although a debate surrounds the exact date), and there is evidence of texts written entirely in Akkadian from c. 2500 BC. However, Sumerian remained a sacred, literary, scientific, and ceremonial language in Iraq up to the 1st century AD (Woods 2006). During the 3rd millennium BC, the Sumerians and Akkadians experienced a very intimate cultural symbiosis which also included widespread bilingualism; the influence that the two languages in question had on one another is apparent in all areas, ranging from large-scale lexical borrowing to phonological, syntactic, and morphological convergence, consequently prompting scholars to refer to Akkadian and Sumerian

in the third millennium as an area of linguistic convergence (i.e., Sprachbund) (Deutscher 2007:20).

Little scholarly attention has been directed towards the historical language contact between the early Arabs and the early inhabitants of what is now Iraq, thus it is difficult to hypothesize which items may be loans from Sumerian or Akkadian. It is worth noting that some have set forth a number of Standard Arabic lexical items (which also occur in Iraqi Arabic) which they propose may well be loans from Akkadian. For instance, Jeffery (1938:222-223) speculates that *furāt* ‘Euphrates’ comes from the Akkadian *purattu* which lends the same implication (although he adds that it is unclear whether it is more likely a direct loan or one through Aramaic). Another possible loan he suggests is *sāḥir* ‘magician’ from the Akkadian *sāxiru* which lends the same implication, although the Arabic realization of the Akkadian /x/ as /ḥ/ suggests an Aramaic intermediary. That said, he points out that Mesopotamia’s strong association with magic and the exact semantic match suggests that this is indeed a loan from Akkadian. There is also evidence of Akkadian remnants in toponyms, such as *Bābil* ‘Babylon’ from the Akkadian *bab-ilu* ‘Gate of God’ (from *bab* ‘gate’ + *ilu* ‘god’) (Mark 2011), and *Ūr* ‘Ur’ (once a prominent city in Sumerian times in what is now southern Iraq), could stem from the Sumerian *uru* ‘city’.

2.4.2 Aramaic and Arabic

Akkadian was gradually replaced by the Central Semitic language, Aramaic, between 1200 BC and 100 AD. Aramaic, which had become common in Iraq, became the official provincial administrative language throughout the Neo-Assyrian Empire, and then the Achaemenid Persian Empire; although Akkadian fell into disuse, both it and Sumerian continued to be used in temples for several centuries. The latest cuneiform document which was positively identified as being Akkadian comes from the first century AD.

Aramaic was gradually replaced by Arabic, although the Arabization of Iraq took many centuries to complete. There was already a Christian, Arabic-speaking population of semi-settled tribesmen on the western edge of the *sawād* (the alluvial plain which has always served as the ‘hub’ of Iraqi civilization) before the Arab conquest of Iraq in the mid-7th century AD (Holes 2007:123). The majority of the population at that time must have spoken various dialects of Aramaic and would have been Jewish or Christian. There would have undoubtedly been a

scattering of Persian-speaking land-owning nobility in the rural areas and a class of Persian-speaking civil servants in the towns, governing what was at that time a province of the Sassanian Empire, but ‘we know precious little of the detail of Arab settlement in Iraq over the succeeding centuries, and virtually nothing about how Arabic replaced Aramaic as the language of daily life’ (Holes 20007:123).

Although there has been considerable work on the existence of Aramaic loans in Levantine Arabic (e.g., Féghali 1918; Barbot 1961; Arnold and Behnstedt 1993), to date no systematic investigation of Aramaic loans in Iraqi Arabic has been carried out. That said, it has been posited that the salient Iraqi Arabic particle of existence *āku* is a remnant of the Aramaic particle of existence *’k’* (see Müller-Kessler 2003), although others have deemed it an internal development from Arabic *kān* ‘to be’ (see Holes 2007).

Many have pointed to another Aramaism in Iraqi Arabic, namely the peraphrasis of the direct object through the conjunction of the dative preposition *-l(i)-* and a clitic pronoun (e.g., Malaika 1959:63), for instance:

- | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------|
| 1) dazz-a | l- ṣadīq-a | l-iṣ-ṣūg |
| send.PST.3MSG-3MSG | for-friend-3MSG | to-the-market |
| ‘He sent his friend to the market (lit.: he sent-him-for-friend-his).’ ¹ | | |

2.4.3 Persian Rule

Iraq was ruled by a sequence of Persian dynasties after c. 500 BC (i.e., the Achaemenids, Parthians, Sassanids, and Seleucids), and, although local governments existed in Iraq, they remained under Persian control until 600 AD. During the Achaemenid Empire, Old Persian (an Indo-European language of the Indo-Iranian branch) was the language of the ruling elite, while Aramaic was the imperial communicative language used throughout the empire, and Elamite (a language isolate) was used for economic affairs. Following the conquest of Alexander the Great, Aramaic was replaced by Greek (an Indo-European language of the Hellenic branch) and only in the second half of the Parthian period (from the 1st century onwards) did Parthian (an Indo-Iranian language) come to be inscribed on coins and inscriptions (along with their Greek equivalent) (Daryaee 2013:99). The Sassanids did not lose this multilingual view of the empire,

¹ Informant data

although now the dominant languages (alongside Middle Persian) were those of the preceding dynasty, i.e., Greek and Parthian. For centuries Greek remained the language of knowledge and science from India to the Mediterranean Basin, and the fact that Middle Persian was emerging as the dominant language at the heart of the empire alerts us to the cultural and linguistic preoccupation of the Sassanians (Daryaei 2013:99). However, this description of the imperial languages paints a false picture of the linguistic diversity of the Sassanian Empire— Iraq was dominated by Semitic (Aramaic and Arabic) speaking people, and the Persians were a minority, and in order to linguistically connect the provinces of the empire, the Sassanians had to establish a certain structure— this must have been established through Persian and non-Persian speaking administrators as well as bilinguals in order to deal with the local administration and imperial orders (Daryaei 2013:100-102).

There are loans of Persian provenance which occur in Iraqi speech, the majority of which are nouns, many of which relate to daily items such as items pertaining to the household or food.

xāšūga ‘spoon’

čangāl ‘fork’

čafčīr ‘spatula, large serving spoon’

čarpāya ‘bed’

čarčaf ‘sheet’

dōšag ‘mattress’

parda ‘curtain’

gubba ‘room’

dārsīn ‘cinnamon’

pāča ‘a traditional Iraqi dish of boiled cow or sheep's feet and/or head’

jāma ‘glass, windshield’

xāna ‘warehouse’

čihra ‘face’

čilāq ‘strong kick’

čāra ‘cure, remedy’

klāw ‘winter hat’

There is also a very frequently-occurring adjective of Persian provenance, e.g., *xōš* ‘good, well’. Interestingly, while non-loaned adjectives get inflected for gender and number, *xōš* does not. Furthermore, although non-loaned adjectives follow the noun they modify, *xōš* precedes it, e.g.:

- 2) *hiya* *xōš* *bnēya*
 she *Xōš* girl
 ‘She’s a good (respectable) girl.’

As mentioned in 1.1, the loaned particle *hamm* ‘also; even; really; however’, which is under analysis, is also of Persian provenance.

2.4.4 Ottoman and Mamluk Rule

Contact between Arabic and Turkish in particular date back to the 9th century AD, yet the many traces of Turkish in both Standard Arabic and the colloquial varieties mainly resulted from the Ottoman rule of the Arab world for half a millennium or more (Procházka 2005:191). The area that is now Iraq first fell under Ottoman rule when, in 1534, the Ottoman army, led by Sultan Suleyman the Magnificent (1520-66), took power from the Safavids (of Iran) led by Ismail Shah. The Persians retook control of Baghdad in 1623, under the leadership of Shah Abbas (1587-1629), but despite Ottoman armies being deployed to the city in 1626 and 1630, it was not returned to Ottoman rule until 1638 (following a series of military maneuvers by the Ottoman sultan, Murad IV). In the early 18th century, the Mamluks (i.e., freed slaves mostly of Georgian origin who converted to Islam) started asserting authority over the region. Although the Mamluks learned Ottoman Turkish (a Turkic language of the Oghuz branch) for their administrative and military functions and at least enough Arabic to pray, they, to some degree, spoke their native language (i.e., Georgian, a Kartvelian language) among themselves (Hathaway & Barbir 2008:232). The Mamluk ruling elite was comprised mostly of Georgian officers who successfully asserted autonomy from their Ottoman overlords (Hathaway & Barbir 2008:232). The Mamluks, first extending their rule over Basra, eventually controlled the Euphrates and Tigris river valleys from the Arab Gulf to the foothills of Kurdistan. In 1831 the Mamluk period ended, when a plague and severe flood devastated Baghdad, consequently enabling Mahmud II, the Ottoman sultan, to reinstate Ottoman sovereignty over Iraq.

In 1914, with the start of World War I, British troops began infiltrating the empire and occupied the port of Basra (in the south of Iraq). In an attempt to take over Baghdad, a British military force moved north in 1915 but was held off by a stiff defense from the Ottoman Army in the marshes of Iraq about halfway between Basra and Baghdad (near the town of Kut Al Amara). In April 1916, cut off from supplies, British troops surrendered. In December 1916, a second effort was mounted from Basra; the British Army occupied Baghdad on March 11, 1917. In 1918, the Allied Powers created Iraq after the end of World War I (with Baghdad as its capital), and, in 1920, Iraq was assigned by the United Nations to Great Britain as a mandate.

Ottoman Turkish was the variety of Turkish used during the Ottoman Empire. It was one of the three languages (i.e. Ottoman Turkish, Arabic, and Persian) constituting the basis of Ottoman elite culture. In the 14th century AD, Persian was the language of the Seljuk (a Turkish Muslim (Sunni) dynasty that gradually adopted Persian culture) court in Konya. In the late 15th century AD Ottoman Turkish emerged (in its classical form). Despite Ottoman Turkish being the language of the court and government of the Ottoman Empire, the subjects of the Ottoman Empire were free to use their native languages amongst themselves; however, any communication with the government had to be carried out in Ottoman Turkish, as, throughout the vast Ottoman bureaucracy, the Ottoman Turkish language was the official language (Hanioglu 2008:34). However, on account of the low literacy rate among the public (about 2-3% until the early 19th century and about 15% at the end of the 19th century), ordinary individuals had to hire *arzuhalcılar* (i.e., special ‘request-writers’) in order to communicate with the government (Mansel 2011). In Mesopotamia specifically, most of the population spoke Arabic, and Ottoman Turkish served as the language of government and the lingua franca of the elite and held prestige throughout the entire Empire. For instance, although a vizier might not have been, by origin, a Turk, for all official and the majority of written purposes he would use Turkish and not his native tongue.

Procházka (2005) expressed that he searched for Turkish loans in the modern colloquial dialects of Arabic, relying mainly on published studies, and he found that the number of loaned items in any given dialect was generally proportional in intensity and length of Ottoman rule in the area in question (p.191). In countries like Iraq, which were under direct Ottoman rule for shorter periods of time than other Arab countries, Procházka (2005:191) posits that there are between as little as 200 and as many as 500 surviving loans from Turkish. Furthermore, prior

studies on the Turkish influence in the Arabic dialects, in particular Prokosch (1983) and Reinkowski (1998), have demonstrated that over the last 80 or 90 years the quantity of items of Turkish origin actually employed by Arabic speakers has decreased (Procházka 2005:192). However, ‘the proportions of Turkish used in the various domains has remained constant—the only exceptions being the domains of government and military, in which most of the Turkish words became obsolete after the independence of the Arab states in the aftermath of World War II’ (Procházka 2005:192). The majority of the loans of Turkish provenance in Iraqi Arabic relate to things such as household items, foods, and titles, e.g.:

bēg ‘sir’

ṭoba ‘ball’

‘arabana ‘carriage, cart’

čakmača ‘glove compartment [of a car]’

čaṭal ‘fork’

dondurma ‘ice cream’

dōlma ‘cooked vegetables stuffed with rice and minced meat’

basturma ‘a seasoned, air-dried, cured beef’

gēmar² ‘a type of thick clotted cream’

There are also suffixes of Turkish provenance in Iraqi Arabic (Masliyah 1996):

-siz ‘denotes lacking’

-či ‘denotes an occupation or trait’

-li ‘forms relational adjectives’

-loğ ‘forms abstract nouns’

Additionally, there is at least one adjective of (Irano-)Turkish³ provenance in Iraqi Arabic, namely *zangīn* ‘rich, wealthy’, which functions just like a non-loaned adjective in that it follows the noun it modifies and gets inflected for both gender through the suffixation of the Arabic feminine suffix *-a* (i.e., *zangīna*), and number through the application of the Arabic ‘broken

² There is speculation that this entered Turkish via Mongolian and is ultimately of Mongolian origin.

³ Although it would seem it is ultimately a loan of Persian origin (i.e., *sangīn*), the exact phonological match between the Iraqi and Turkish forms suggest a Turkish intermediary.

plural' pattern (i.e., *zanāgīn* (MPL)) or the feminine plural suffix *-āt* (i.e., *zangīnāt* (FPL)). Now let us continue with a discussion of how language contact works.

2.4.5 Summary of Historical Language Contact

As was discussed above, although Iraqi Arabic has experienced an extensive history of language contact, it would seem that Arabic was overwhelmingly the more prestigious language among the Arab community in Iraq, and it would further seem that the language situation and the related dynamics therein did not necessarily necessitate speakers of Iraqi Arabic to be fully, or even moderately, bilingual, thus implying that the level of contact between Iraqi Arabic and other languages was relatively slight. Therefore, that Iraqi Arabic has borrowed, incorporated, and maintained such highly functioning items which expand beyond basic lexis such as those under analysis (e.g., *-siz* and *-či* (morphemes), *balkit* (modal), *hamm* (additive particle, scalar particle, intensifier, and concessive cancellative marker)) is extremely interesting to those interested in language contact and language change, and uncovering the divisions of labor between the loaned items and their non-loaned counterparts could help to provide insight into what motivates the borrowing of highly functional items when the language contact situation between the source and donor languages is slight. The following section provides insight into how we can understand language contact in general.

2.5 Language Contact

We can trace the origins of the linguistic study of language contact to at least the historical and comparative tradition of the nineteenth century, when William Dwight Whitney (1881) explicitly discussed the position of borrowing in linguistic change, and Hugo Schuchardt (1884) documented an array of complex situations of language contact. The latter half of the twentieth century, especially, saw an increasing realization in the field of linguistics that language contact indeed has a large contributing role in language change. Language contact has traditionally been interpreted as the use of different languages at the same time in the same geographical area and occurs when two or more languages or language varieties interact; when speakers of different languages interact closely, especially over long periods of time, it is usual for their languages to be influenced by each other (although any influence is often asymmetric, with one language or variety being more influenced than the other(s)). Language contact can occur as a result of

migration, between adstratum languages, or at language borders (i.e., the line separating two language areas), with an intrusive language serving as either a substratum or a superstratum. The loans under analysis are remnants of the aforementioned historical language contact situations that have impacted on Iraq over the previous centuries. Now that we have a solid understanding of Iraqi Arabic and the language contact situations by which it has been affected, let us continue with a discussion of the sociolinguistic situation of Baghdad and the related dialectal features.

2.6 The Sociolinguistic Situation of Baghdad and Related Dialectal Features

The largest ethnic group of Iraq is comprised of Arabic-speaking Arabs (75-80%). Kurds account for about 15-20% of the population, and Assyrians, Iraqi Turkmen, and smaller minority groups such as Armenians, Mandeans, Iranians, Circassians, Yazidis, and Kawliya comprise the remaining 5-10%.⁴ Arabic is the majority and official language of Iraq. Although Kurdish (which is spoken by the ethnic Kurdish population) became the second official language of Iraq in 2004, the Kurdish population is predominantly concentrated in the so-called “Iraqi Kurdistan” (i.e., northern Iraq, a region that is officially autonomously governed by the Kurdistan Regional Government (KRG)). Minority languages such as Neo-Aramaic, Turkmen, Armenian, and Farsi are also spoken by their respective minority populations.

Regarding the religious demographics of Iraq, the majority of the population adheres to Shi’ite Islam (approximately 65%), followed by Sunni Islam (approximately 30%), and Christianity and other religions (<5%), and the makeup of Baghdad in particular is similar.⁵

Since the American-launched 2003 invasion of Iraq, Iraq, and specifically Baghdad, has seen a tremendous uprising in religious conflict and a consequent civil war between Muslims and Christians, and, perhaps even more so, between Sunni and Shi’ite Muslims. News sources such as Al-Jazeera and BBC claim that Christians and Christian areas have become specific targets for attacks in Baghdad since the American invasion, with some sources claiming that the Christian population of Baghdad is as low as 0.6%, dropping from 6% in 2003.⁶ Regarding Baghdad’s Jewish population, it was estimated that there are fewer than seven Jews remaining in Baghdad

⁴ <https://esa.un.org/unpd/wpp/>

⁵ <https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/iz.html>

⁶ <https://www.worldwatchmonitor.org/2017/06/half-syria-iraqs-christians-left-since-2011-says-report/>

as of 2008.⁷ As for the Shi'ite/Sunni divide, DAESH, a radical Wahabi group known for their radical interpretation of Islam, entered Iraq in 2014, and the organization and its supporters have since perpetrated terrorist attacks (including bombings, shootings, beheadings, etc.) targeting Shi'ite Muslims in particular⁸ (for example, DAESH claimed responsibility for the July 2016 Karrada bombing in Baghdad which left at least 323 dead and hundreds more injured, saying they deliberately targeted Shi'ites). They have also been known to target Christians, Yazidis, Druze, and Mandeans, as well.⁹ Thus, to say that the sectarian situation is tense, would be a gross understatement.

Since Blanc's (1964) categorization of Baghdadi Arabic into three distinct ethno-religious dialects (i.e., Christian Baghdadi, Jewish Baghdadi, and Muslim Baghdadi), it has become accepted in the realm of Arabic dialectology that Muslims, Christians, and Jews have their own respective ethno-religious dialects. However, Blanc did not make note of the Sunni vs. Shi'ite sectarian split nor did he further split Muslim Baghdadi into more precise ethno-religious dialects on such bases, despite the fact that differences have been noted between dialects spoken by Sunnis and Shi'ite in various Arabic dialects (see Bassiouney 2009:106).

It is well known in the realm of Arabic dialectology that within each respective dialect there are salient features that allude to sociolinguistic implications such as a speaker's socio-economic status, education-level, and religious affiliation. These salient features can be phonological, syntactical, or lexical in nature. However, due to the instable political and security situation of Iraq for the last several decades, to the best of my knowledge, no recent studies have treated this topic in the Iraqi context. Blanc (1964) described certain phonological features as being 'typically Christian', maintaining that the realization of /r/ as /ɣ/ serves as a hallmark of Christian identity in Baghdad and cities in the south of Iraq, of Baghdad. The earliest known mention of this replacement of /r/ with /ɣ/ was made in the 9th century by Al-Jahīḏ of Basra (Blanc 1964), indicating that these salient differences are by no means a recent development.

Similar instances of shibboleths have been noted in other Arabic dialects, too. For instance, Suleiman (2004) discussed how certain Arabic words served as shibboleths during the

⁷www.nytimes.com/2008/06/01/world/middleeast/01babylon.html?_r=1&oref=slogin&partner=rssnyt&emc=rss&pagewanted=all

⁸<https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jul/03/baghdad-bombings-dozens-killed>

⁹ https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/morning-mix/wp/2014/06/13/isis-beheadings-and-the-success-of-horrifying-violence/?utm_term=.83399bf7a7d7

civil war in Lebanon (1975-1990) and were used to identify ‘the enemy’. He points out that Lebanese militants wanted to distinguish Lebanese from Palestinians, thus the Lebanese militants would elicit from each person who passed through any of the numerous checkpoints the word for ‘tomato’ (which is realized as /bandūra/ by Lebanese and /banadūra/ by Palestinians). He adds that the mere insertion of a single phoneme (/a/) in the Palestinian pronunciation led to imprisonment or death, and consequently many Palestinians began to suppress their salient Palestinian pronunciation in favor of the Lebanese pronunciation for safety and security.

Shibboleths are not confined to phonology, but exist on the lexical and morpho-syntactic levels, as well. For instance, on a recent trip to Beirut, I personally witnessed a conversation in Lebanese Arabic between two speakers, with one commenting to the other ‘You must be Shi’ite’, when the addressee asked the commentator how he knew this, he replied ‘because you said *ma ‘āš* ‘not anymore’. We [Sunnis] say *ma ‘ād*.’ This was not a remark on differing phonological realizations between the two sects, but rather a remark on differing morpho-syntax, namely the discrepancy in the manners of negation of the two forms of ‘not anymore’, with *ma ‘ād* reflecting a mono-partite negative marker (*ma*) and *ma ‘āš* reflecting a bi-partite one (*ma* + *š* with an apparent assimilation of the final *d*). As for an example of lexical discrepancies, it has been noted that, as regards Jewish Baghdadi Arabic, the word of ‘yesterday’ is *bohi* in contrast with the Muslim Baghdadi variant, *il-bārḥa* (Kronfeld 2016:108).

The recently-evolved sectarian tensions in Iraq have given way to a political split between the country’s Sunni and Shi’ite populations, with the former, in general, backing Turkey and the latter Iran. Although the Iran-Iraq war (1980-1988) severely soured relations between the two nations, the fight against the so-called “Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant” (DAESH) has seen a formal military alliance emerge between Iran and Iraq (both of which are headed by Shi’ite governments) with Iran publically supplying arms, ammunition, and military support and training to the Iraqi military (and to the Iraqi Shi’ite militias in particular). Regarding Turkey, relations between Iraq’s Shi’ite government and Turkey’s Sunni government have been strained, as Turkey has deployed a series of Turkish troops onto Iraqi soil, carrying out attacks on PKK (i.e., The Kurdistan Workers’ Party) targets and engaging in other military interventions in Iraq.¹⁰ Tensions escalated even more after Turkey’s recent refusal to withdraw its troops from Iraqi soil, despite Iraq’s demands, with Erdogan stating that he had a ‘historical responsibility’,

¹⁰ www.hurriyetdailynews.com/turkey-hits-pkk-targets-in-iraq-syria--112396

claiming that he was responsible for protecting Mosul's Sunni population [against the Shi'ite militias], which is historically linked to Turkey.¹¹ Thus, generally-speaking, Iraq's Sunni population shares political and religious sentiments with Turkey, while its Shi'ite population shares political and religious sentiments with Iran. This is of particular interest to us, as the loans under analysis in the present work are of Persian or Turkish origin, and, that their etymology is common knowledge to the general Iraqi population (see 7.9.3; 7.9.6), combined with the aforementioned political allegiances of Iraq's Shi'ite and Sunni populations, it would not be farfetched to speculate that the employment of these loans might be favored or shunned by Iraqi Arabic speakers on the basis of such political associations. Furthermore, the informants readily indicated some sectarian implications that the employment of certain lexical items could bear (see 7.9.3). However, the sociolinguistic implications lent by such items have yet to be investigated, and although such an investigation would certainly be timely, it is beyond the scope of the present work. Now that an outline of the sociolinguistic situation of Baghdad specifically and the associated dialectal features have been set forth, let us continue with an overview of the linguistic situation of Iraq and the surrounding areas, in order to better understand the languages spoken in the region.

2.7 The Linguistic Situation of Iraq and Surrounding Areas

Although the data furnished by the existing literature combined with the mass scale forced migration out of Iraq and internal displacement of Iraqis within Iraq makes it difficult to sketch an accurate picture of the modern linguistic situation of Iraq and the surrounding areas, it is possible, through the use of the existing data and by the data from my informants, to sketch a tentative outline of the dialect area. Mesopotamian (or 'Iraqi') Arabic stretches from the Persian Gulf along and between the Euphrates and Tigris rivers, stretching north until almost the sources of those rivers in the Anatolian plateau in Turkey (Blanc 1964:5). As this language variety is spoken in such a vast area, it is unsurprising that regional variation is great, 'the more so as the population is separated, in many points, by large stretches of desert with a nomadic population and, in addition, by large non-Arabic speaking concentrations (Blanc 1964:5)'. Despite this, we may speak of a 'Mesopotamian Dialect Area', namely a rough geographical area in which

¹¹ www.aljazeera.com/news/2016/10/erdogan-historical-responsibility-iraq-161018133432623.html

‘Mesopotamian Arabic’ is spoken. The variations of this dialect can be divided into two main dialect groups, each of which shares a large number of basic features and correlates to a rough regional or geographic subdivision. Blanc (1964) was the one to provide the nomenclatures *Gilit* and *Qeltu* to these dialect groups (both of which reflect the manner in which ‘I said’ is realized in each respective dialect) and arguably no accurate updated description of the distribution of these dialects has yet been published. Thus, the description that shall now be provided will briefly discuss the main language varieties in the area and provide a brief description of their respective geographic distribution. This description merely serves an illustrative purpose, to provide a general overview and summary of the languages and language varieties spoken in Iraq and the bordering countries (i.e., Jordan, Syria, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait, Iran, and Turkey) in order to paint a general picture of the dialect area.

The *Qeltu* variety is spoken in the Upper Khabur area in Syria in Al-Hasakah, Deir Ezzor, and Ar-raqqa, as well as in Turkey, namely in Sirnak, Siirt, and Mardin, while the *Gilit* variety is spoken along the Euphrates River east of Aleppo in Syria, and it is also spoken in Kuwait (along the Iraq-Kuwait border). It is also spoken in the Khuzistan Province in Iran. Both the *Gilit* and *Qeltu* varieties are spoken by Iraqi refugee communities in Turkey (namely in Istanbul, Ankara, and Samsun) as well as in refugee communities in Jordan (namely in Amman) and Syria (namely Damascus).

Kurdish, a continuum of Northwestern Iranian languages, is also spoken in Iraq (as well as in Turkey, Iran, and Syria). Kurdish can be divided into three dialect groups which roughly correspond to regional subdivisions, namely Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji), Central Kurdish (Sorani), and Southern Kurdish (Palewani) (see Hassanpour 1992). Northern Kurdish, the most spoken variety of the three dialect groups, is spoken by an estimated 80% of all Kurds, and is spoken mainly in the Kahramanmaraş, Malatya, Sivas, Adıyaman, Gaziantep, Şanlıurfa, Ağrı, Erzurum, Muş, Mardin, Batman, Hakkâri, Konya, Ankara, and Aksaray provinces (and surrounding areas) in Turkey, as well as in the Al-Hasakah Governorate in Syria, and the Sinjar distinct and Dohuk governate in Iraq. Central Kurdish, the most spoken Kurdish variety in Iraq and Iran is spoken south of Lake Urmia in Iran (stretching roughly to the outside of Kermanshah), as well as in the Iraqi governates of Erbil, Sulaymaniyah, Kirkuk, and Diyala and the surrounding areas. Predominantly spoken in western Iran and eastern Iraq, Southern Kurdish

is spoken in the Iranian provinces of Kermanshah and Ilam. As for Iraq, it is spoken in the Khanaqin region, stretching to Mandali, as well as in Kirkuk.

Like Iraq, the majority language in neighboring Jordan and Syria is Arabic, namely Levantine Arabic, which is closely related to the Mesopotamian *Qeltu* varieties. Levantine Arabic is also spoken in Iraq by Syrian refugee communities, particularly in refugee camps along the Iraqi-Syrian border. In Iraq's other border country, Saudi Arabia, Arabic (namely the Gulf, Najdi, and Hejazi dialects) is the most prominent language. Gulf Arabic is spoken along the shores of the gulf, while Hejazi Arabic is predominantly spoken in Saudi Arabia's western region (i.e., Mecca, Medina, Jeddah, and Yanbu'), and Najdi Arabic is spoken in central Saudi Arabia (i.e., the Riyadh, Kharj, Qaseem, Jabal Shamaar, Najd, and Zufi regions) (see Ingham 1994). Saudi Arabia's lucrative oil industry has attracted many expatriates and migrant workers to the Kingdom, namely from India, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Egypt, and thus Hindi, Urdu, Tagalog, and Egyptian Arabic are spoken by their respective communities throughout the country. In Kuwait, Gulf Arabic is spoken, although along the Iraq-Kuwait border, the dialect spoken is akin to that found in the southern region of the Basra province, in Iraq.

In neighboring Iran, Persian (a western Iranian language within the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European language family) is the majority language. It is also spoken in Iraq by Iraqis of Iranian origin, namely in Karbala, Najaf, and Basra, and by Gulf Arabs of Iranian origin throughout Kuwait, and in Manama and Muharraq in Bahrain. Turkish, a member of the Oghuz group of Turkic languages, is the majority language in neighboring Turkey. Turkmen, another Turkic language also of the Oghuz branch, is spoken within Turkmen minority communities in Iraq, namely in the north of the country. Neo-Aramaic, a Semitic language, is a minority language spoken primarily, although not exclusively, by Assyrian and Chaldean Christians in pockets throughout the plain of Urmia in northwestern Iran to Mosul in northern Iraq, as well as bordering regions in northeast Syria and southeast Turkey. Other languages including Mandaic (spoken by Mandaens in Iran and Iraq), Shabaki (spoken by the Shabak people in Mosul, Iraq), Armenian (spoken by the Armenian diaspora in Iraq, Iran, Syria, and other Middle Eastern countries), and Domari (spoken by the nomadic Dom people) are spoken by smaller scattered communities.

Blanc (1964:2) set forth the map below which sketches the Mesopotamian dialect area, and although it is admittedly vague, to the best of my knowledge no in-depth, descriptive map of

the dialect area has been set forth. That said, as there is an ample amount of overlap between the languages and the geographic locations in which they are spoken (in some instances several languages are spoken in the same geographical area) combined with the matter in which many of the languages are scattered over various areas, any detailed map would be very convoluted and difficult to decipher.



CHAPTER THREE: BILINGUALISM, BORROWING, LOAN INTEGRATION &
MAINTENANCE, AND THE PRINCIPLE OF CONTRAST

3.1 Chapter Outline

As many linguists emphasize that language contact, and consequently borrowing, depends on bilingualism, this chapter begins by summarizing bilingualism (3.2) and borrowing (3.3), respectively. In order to better understand how the loans under analysis entered Iraqi Arabic, the manner in which loans are integrated and maintained in the recipient language is discussed (3.4), and, as a principal theme of the present work is to determine whether true synonymy can exist in a language, we then explore Clark's (1988) Principle of Contrast (3.5).

3.2 Bilingualism

Many linguists (e.g., Matras & Sakel 2007:1; McMahon 1994:201) emphasize that language contact, and consequently borrowing, depends on bilingualism (and they generally distinguish between two types of bilingualism: individual and societal bilingualism, the former of which occurs when an individual speaks two or more languages, while the latter occurs when two or more languages are spoken in a given society). Although they can vary regarding the form or extent of bilingualism, nearly all societies are bilingual, although a consensus has yet to be reached regarding how 'bilingualism' should be defined. The question 'what is bilingualism?' has traditionally attracted many different answers ranging from loose stipulations of nothing more than the mere ability or practice of utilizing two languages (e.g., Edwards 2008:88) to stringent stipulations of equally-balanced fluency in both languages (e.g., Thiery 1978:146). Baetens Beardsmore (1982) termed these two ends of the spectrum 'minimalist' (i.e., the former) and 'maximalist' (i.e., the latter) in approach. For the purposes of this thesis, I take 'bilingualism' to be somewhere between the two extremes of the continuum—that is an individual is regarded as bilingual, in my view, if he can, at the very least, produce meaningful utterances in the foreign language beyond mere greetings and cultural phrases.

3.3 Borrowing

With language contact and bilingualism comes borrowing. Only a small number of linguistic communities have been able to exist without some form of contact with other peoples—commonly through economic or commercial relations; the consequence of this is that their language will have come into contact with one or more other languages or language varieties and will almost certainly bear some evidence of this (Moravcsik 1978:110). Consequently, it is

widely accepted in the field of linguistics that ‘borrowing’ is a frequent by-product of language contact, i.e., one language (more precisely speakers of the language) will take linguistic features from another language and incorporate them into its own; these incorporations are commonly referred to as ‘loans’ and the process is known as ‘linguistic borrowing’—‘any linguistic material—phonological rules, grammatical morphemes, sounds, syntactic patterns, discourse strategies, semantic associations [etc.]—can be borrowed’ (Haugen 1950:152).

In linguistic borrowing the donor need neither be aware of the loan nor consent to it, while the recipient need not repay it (Haugen 1950:212), and it has been pointed out many times that the employment of the term ‘borrowing’ to refer to this process has many flaws, and it is, in effect, used metaphorically (Durkin 2014:3). In many ways ‘influence’ would be a more appropriate term, however ‘borrowing’ has been used to describe this process since the 19th century and has become firmly entrenched in the literature, so much so that most linguists do not think of it as a metaphor any longer (Durkin 2014:3). Furthermore, as alternative metaphors, such as ‘adoption’ or ‘stealing’, are at least equally arbitrary, I shall retain the commonly-used term ‘borrowing’ here.

Matras & Sakel (2007:1) use the term ‘borrowing’ ‘as a cover-term for the adoption of a linguistic feature into a language as a result of some level of bilingualism in the history of the relevant speech community’, and bilingualism, in this context, is a result of language contact. Other linguists have adopted a broader view regarding borrowing. Thomason & Kaufman, for example, define borrowing as ‘the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that language’ (1988:37). The best known and most widely-cited approach to contact-induced change is that of Thomason & Kaufman (1988), who make the distinction between two main types of contact-induced change, i.e., ‘borrowing’ and ‘interference through shift’. According to Thomason & Kaufman, borrowing ‘is the incorporation of foreign features into a group’s native language by speakers of that language: the native language is maintained but changed by the addition of the incorporated features’ (1988:37), while ‘interference through shift’ occurs when ‘a group of speakers shifting to a target language fails to learn the target language perfectly’ (1988:39). One problem that Thomason & Kaufman face with the distinction in question is that there are many situations in which both processes occur simultaneously. Nonetheless, Thomason & Kaufman demonstrate that dissimilar linguistic consequences arise from the two main types of change, and they present an analytic

framework which not only distinguishes between the two types but also between demographically diverse situations and between intensity of contact.

In borrowing, slight contact evokes light to moderate borrowing of non-basic lexis, whereas intense contact may provoke structural and wholesale lexical borrowing, particularly at the phonological and syntactic levels (Thomason & Kaufman 1988:38). Furthermore, in regards to interference through shift, significant structural changes in morphology and syntax are likely to be evoked by larger groups acquiring the target language imperfectly (the so-called ‘substratum effect’), while there is likely to be little or no interference if the shifting group is small (Thomason & Kaufman 1988:38).

Winford (2005) and various others have promoted viewing contact-induced change in line with an alternative framework, i.e., van Coetsem’s (1988) framework, which, in contrast to other approaches, such as the aforementioned Thomason & Kaufman (1988), is not founded on concepts of a sociological nature but rather on the concept of cognitive dominance, i.e., which of the two (or more) languages in the repertoire of an individual or community is, in some sense, cognitively ‘primary’ (Lucas 2015). However, I will not go into detail about this alternative framework because the primary focus of this thesis is not on the precise ways the loans under investigation entered Iraqi Arabic but rather on the synchronic behavior of these loans. If we apply Thomason & Kaufman’s perspective, since there is no evidence of a large-scale shift to Iraqi Arabic (as was demonstrated in section 2.4), we can deduce that the loans to be analyzed clearly entered Iraqi Arabic via borrowing.

3.4 Loan Integration and Maintenance

A subject that has received plenteous linguistic consideration is the question of how languages borrow and integrate loans. One manner in which loans are integrated into the recipient language is through adaptation, which causes the borrowing to appear more like an indigenous item of the borrower language and can involve both phonology and morphosyntax. If an item undergoes phonological adaptation, its pronunciation adapts to the sound patterns and phonological system of the borrower language, in that the phonemes of the borrowed item will be replaced by the nearest indigenous sounds of the borrower language (Zenner & Kristiansen 2014). As for morphological adaptation, the morphological rules and patterns of the borrower language will be applied to the borrowed item. For instance, in Iraqi Arabic, Iraqi Arabic inflectional morphology,

such as the plural suffix *-āt*, gets applied to a loan, e.g., *fāyl* ‘file’ *fāyl-āt* ‘files’. Logically following adaptation is what Picoche & Marchello-Nizia (1989:339) refer to as ‘naturalization by more considerable transformations’, e.g., when the borrower language begins to create derivations for the borrowing that are not present in the donor language, and therefore, the borrowing develops independently of the donor language and is treated like a non-loaned lexical item of the recipient language. For instance, the Iraqi Arabic *agāt-i* ‘my sir, my master’, as per the rules governing suffixation in Iraqi Arabic, has been formed on the basis of elongating the final vowel, adding the feminine suffix *-t*, and appending the 1SG possessive suffix *-i* to the Irano-Turkic *āga* ‘sir, master’.

Adaptation logically precedes naturalization by more considerable transformations in that it would be quite difficult, if not impossible, to derive words from a loaned item which has not been adapted to the borrower language (be it phonologically or morphosyntactically). Moreover, despite borrowing being exceptionally widespread, not every loan is predestined to be integrated into the borrower language; many loans are merely transitory and dissipate in a rather short time. For instance, indigenous items frequently coexist with the borrowed items in instances wherein borrowing occurs for reasons other than to fill a referential gap, and not all doublets survive in such cases. However, where both items do remain, one of the two frequently experiences a small change in meaning, and, in some instances, the indigenous item comes to denote a more specific or even abstract meaning.

In order to answer the complex question of why some borrowings are so short-lived while others are relatively long-lived, we can set forth two main reasons. Firstly, a borrowing is likely to be maintained if it represents an item for which no equivalent exists in the borrower language. Secondly, borrowings will remain in a language if the indigenous equivalent is seen as more cumbersome—take the example of the English loan *barrakit* ‘I parked the car’ in Iraqi Arabic (from English *park*) which ‘saves’ four syllables over its indigenous equivalent *waggafit is-sayāra*. An understanding of the manner in which loans are integrated and maintained is of interest to us for the present work as it will help us to better uncover the divisions of labor between the loans and their non-loaned counterparts.

3.5 The Principle of Contrast

A principal theme of the analyses conducted in this thesis is whether or not true synonymy can exist in a language, as uncovering the divisions of labor between the loaned terms and their non-loaned alternatives will help shed light on the finer nuances of their semantic implications. For an exploration of this theme, I turn to Clark (1988) who posits that different words have different meanings, referencing the Principle of Contrast, which plays an indispensable role in language maintaining is usefulness as an avenue of communication (p. 317). A longstanding goal of lexical research has been to expose the subtle distinctions between words (e.g., Bolinger 1977, McCawley 1978). The Principle of Contrast suggests that no true synonyms exist, and ‘any difference in FORM in a language indicates that there is a difference in MEANING’ (Clark 1988:318). However, because the same form may be employed to convey several meanings, the reverse does not hold; while languages do not permit true synonymy, they readily tolerate polysemy. The differences in meaning may be very subtle, and two words may coincide in all but one or two crucial contexts, or the differences may be blatantly apparent, such that the distribution of the words rarely or never overlap at all. Clark refers to these as the two extremes and posits that languages typically encompass a vast range of possibilities in between (1988:319). The Principle of Contrast does not work on its own; the Principle of Conventionality is one pragmatic principle with which it works and it can be defined as: ‘for certain meanings, there is a conventional form that speakers expect to be used in the language community, i.e., if one does not use the conventional form that might have been expected, it is because one has some OTHER, contrasting meaning in mind’ (Clark 1988:319).

Clark admits that there is evidence that contradicts the Principle of Contrast. Such evidence primarily stems from data on word pairs that do not appear to exhibit any differences in reference and therefore in meaning (Merriman 1986; Gathercole 1987), and said evidence can be categorized under several headings: subordinates, words for objects, and relational words (Clark 1988:325). One piece of evidence provided against the Principle of Contrast, for instance, is that young children at times produce two different words bearing the same reference (Merriman 1986, Gathercole 1987); this typically occurs in children under the age of two while they are acquiring new (and often more appropriate) terms. Clark provides the following example, ‘a child who previously used only *wau-wau* might use both *wau-wau* and *dog*, say, for dogs’. She

continues that the problem with such instances arises from the lack of data available to conclude sameness of reference or extension, namely that previous studies do not contain enough information regarding the precise range of such pairs, and consequently on the accurate degree to which they overlap (1988:326). Importantly, Clark maintains that overlap, although a violation of Mutual Exclusivity (i.e., children's tendency to apply labels to categories at the same level in a fashion that is mutually exclusive), is not intrinsically a violation of the Principle of Contrast (1988:327). As for the evidence for/against the Principle of Contrast, Clark concludes that the evidence against the Principle of Contrast is indeterminate and that the data does not allow one to conclude for certain that the uses and extensions of two words are identical; if two terms merely overlap in reference in some contexts, but not in all (e.g. *dog* and *pet*), then this does not defy the Principle of Contrast.

CHAPTER FOUR: SIGNIFICANCE & CONTRIBUTION AND DATA COLLECTION & METHODOLOGY

4.1 Chapter Outline

This chapter presents a discussion of the significance of the present work and the contribution that it makes not only to the existing literature on loans in Iraqi Arabic and other Arabic varieties, but also the contribution it makes to research on loans in general, i.e., cross-linguistically (4.2). The chapter wraps up with an in-depth discussion of the data-sourcing methods (4.3) (as different methodological practices have been adopted for the different chapters comprising this present work, only the general, shared properties of the methodological practices are discussed here, with more specific details of methodology and data collection presented in each respective chapter).

4.2 The Significance and Contribution of the Present Work to the Existing Literature

Studies that focus on language contact and borrowing in a particular language appear to be largely concentrated within certain language families; language contact and loans to or from European languages, for instance, are well-described in the existing literature, as are some pidgins and creoles (e.g., Singler & Kouwenberg (2008)) and various languages of the Amazonia (e.g., Aikhenvald 2010). However, there is an evident gap in the description of language contact and loans as they arise in Iraqi Arabic in particular. This could be, in part, due to the diglossic situation of the Arab world, with the standard form (*al-fuṣḥā*) being overtly associated with the Qur'an (which Muslims perceive as the verbatim word of God as revealed to the prophet Muhammad by the angel Gabriel), rendering the standard form of Arabic to be widely considered the sacred and the purest form of Arabic. Consequently, in order to avoid 'tainting' *al-fuṣḥā* ('the eloquent language'), there are academies that regulate which items enter Standard Arabic (although no such regulation exists for which items enter the Arabic dialects), oftentimes creating Arabic equivalents for the new item which does not possess an Arabic terminology by drawing upon already-existing Arabic roots (e.g., *ḥāsūb* 'computer' which is comprised of the trilateral Standard Arabic root *ḥ-s-b* 'to calculate').

Since Arabic is centered on a trilateral root system, it has extreme productiveness of verbal and nominal patterns (Versteegh 1997:181). However, the use of Greek and Latin suffixes and prefixes (which offer a powerful means of expanding the scientific lexicon in most Western languages) is absent in the derivational morphology of Arabic (Versteegh 1997:181). Arabic's

structure and trilateral system have restricted and continue to restrict loan integration prompting the Arabic academies to turn to an Arabic device for new word formation known as *qiyās* ‘analogy’ which consists of applying Arabic morphological patterns to existing or borrowed sets of radicals (Versteegh 1997:181). For example the Standard Arabic *hātif* ‘unseen man whose voice is heard’ is utilized to mean ‘telephone/cellular phone’ in Standard Arabic, while Iraqi Arabic uses the English loan *mōbāyl* to convey the same meaning. The lack of such regulation in Iraqi Arabic suggests that loan acquisition and integration occurs differently than in Standard Arabic, further underlining the importance and significance of a study such as this thesis.

Turning to the colloquial Arabic varieties in particular, they are perceived in the Arab world as ‘slang’, ‘common’, and even ‘the language of the uneducated’, and therefore, they are generally not deemed worthy of linguistic research in the Arab world (Bassiouney 2009). Moreover, due to several decades of political instability in Iraq and the consequent difficulty for researchers to enter/Iraqis to exit Iraq, there has been little recent linguistic work on Iraqi Arabic, and to date there has been no in-depth linguistic analysis of loans in Iraqi Arabic specifically, despite the long-standing evidence of loans in this language variety. The studies that have been undertaken on Iraqi Arabic are rather niche and succinct, for instance a brief discussion of the phonological changes experienced by Turkish loans in Iraqi Arabic (Reinkowski 1995) or the morphological adaptations of Turkish loans (Reinkowski 1998). There are also some works written in Arabic, such as an exploration of Persian loans which have been ‘Arabized’ and integrated in Iraqi Arabic (Rev. Addi Shirr 1965) and a presentation of Persian Vocabulary in Iraqi Arabic (‘Abd al-Ḥamīd al-Ḥabba 2002). Consequently, coverage to date on the influence of language contact on Iraqi Arabic specifically is patchy. That said, there is a wealth of material for research on loans in the Arabic dialects, and due to the large discrepancy between the languages with which each dialect has been in contact, the dialects should not be grouped collectively, rather research should be carried out on each respective dialect. Of course, it is interesting to know what, if anything, collective instances of contact-induced change in any language have in common, but the field would also benefit from more specific and extensive research on Iraqi Arabic in particular. An exploration of loans in Iraqi Arabic will be of interest to both Arabists and researchers of contact-induced change, because, as Iraq is today largely monolingual, many of the loans in question will have entered Iraqi Arabic long ago and have since become integral components of the present-day language. Research on such loans

consequently provides further insights both into the history of this variety of Arabic and into wider questions of loan acquisition, incorporation, and maintenance. An extensive look at how loans occur in an Arabic dialect will be telling in that we will be one step closer to determining if contact-induced change and borrowing is indeed as generalized across the various language families as many of the aforementioned studies seem to suggest. Furthermore, since Arabic has some unusual properties, it will be interesting not only to Arabists; it will be interesting to see what borrowing in Arabic can tell us how we should understand borrowing in general.

4.3 Methodology and Data Collection

I will now set forth a brief overview of the methodology and data collection approaches that were adopted for the analyses, followed by a discussion of the concepts that are necessary to properly understand the later chapters and the questions that they seek to answer. The data for the present work was collected through a combination of fieldwork with native speakers of Iraqi Arabic, compilations of online written data from social media, and transcriptions from current Iraqi television programs. A large, transcribed corpus of naturalistic spoken Iraqi Arabic would be ideal for this study, however it was impractical to try to produce one as a result of the current security situation in Iraq and the time constraints of this thesis.

I deliberately decided against working with Iraqis within diaspora communities, as diaspora languages are inevitably influenced by the culture(s) or language(s) of the place in which the diaspora speakers have taken up residence. Furthermore, in diaspora communities, there tends to be a lot of dialect mixing (Milroy 2002); Iraqis will mix with many speakers of other Arabic dialects, and, as not all the Arabic dialects are mutually intelligible, many Iraqis may start speaking a hybridized variety of Arabic. Taking this into consideration, I carried out fieldwork during a three-week stay in Istanbul, Turkey in October 2015 (funded through fieldwork grants from the UK Philological Society and SOAS, University of London), as the current security situation in Iraq unfortunately made travel to Baghdad infeasible.

Through a personal contact from Iraq, I was connected with eight native speakers of the Baghdadi dialect of Arabic who normally reside in Baghdad and who were temporarily in Istanbul for business or leisure purposes, as an alternative to in-situ fieldwork in Iraq. It is understood that my participants' ability to travel outside of Iraq suggests that they are mobile individuals and thus it is possible that they have had a fair amount of contact with other

languages, and therefore this method perhaps might be rendered by some as not ideal. However, given the fact that Baghdad has an operating airport with daily flights into and out of Baghdad, many Iraqis have the ability to travel in and out of the country, not just the participants in this study. Doing fieldwork amongst native Iraqi Arabic speakers was beneficial in that it enabled me to directly elicit information from my research participants. Furthermore, sourcing linguistic data using a combination of data elicited from consultations with human participants in Istanbul and data extracted from the media provided a solution for the inability to travel to the region where the language variety under analysis is spoken. This method undertaken was the most feasible alternative to in-situ fieldwork, as the informants are normally residents of Iraq and therefore enabled me to gather linguistic data which would be similar to that which would have been accumulated had I conducted the research in Baghdad itself. It is hoped that by combining data sourced from media with the data collected during my fieldwork has resulted in an in-depth, comprehensive, and accurate linguistic analysis which will help fill the gap in the existing literature.

During my fieldwork trip, I conducted several in-depth interviews with each of the eight informants. My informants ranged in age from 23 to 74 and included males and females, Sunni and Shi'ite Muslims, all of whom were born, raised, and are normally resident in Baghdad. They were all educated to Bachelor's level or above, and all interaction with the participants was carried out solely in Arabic. It should be borne in mind that representing a language (or even part of a language) is a challenging task, since we are neither aware of the full scope of variation in languages nor of all the contextual variables which must be included to encapsulate all variations. Therefore we must note here that the analyses in the present work cannot be said to be representative of the native Iraqi-Arabic-speaking population on the whole, as lexical differences can occur at the micro level, between different speakers of the same language variety.

During the interviews I provided the informants with acceptability-judgment questionnaires to complete, and I also elicited examples and explanations of the usage of the items under analysis. As these interviews were recorded and transcribed, they were preserved in both audio and electronic form. The questionnaires contained questions pertaining to how the loans and their non-loaned alternatives are expressed in Iraqi Arabic and what the exact division of labor is semantically, syntactically, in terms of register (etc.) between them. The data yielded by these questionnaires will be presented in more depth in the analysis section of each respective

chapter. The questionnaire elicited responses which were then analyzed to confirm or reject my hypotheses about the function of loans in Iraqi Arabic and the motivation of Iraqi Arabic speakers to use them, set up on the basis of what had been extrapolated from my preliminary analysis and my own knowledge of the language, and the data elicited from these questionnaires were supplemented with the data elicited from my informants during the interviews.

The questionnaire presented several types of questions. For example some of the questions presented sets of sentences in Iraqi Arabic; in one of the sentences in the set, the loan under analysis was used, but in the other sentence(s) in the set, the non-loaned alternative(s) was used; other than the substitution of the loan for the non-loaned alternative the sentences were identical. The participants were asked to select which sentences (if any) containing the non-loaned alternatives yielded the same semantic implication as the one containing the loan, in order to determine the extent of the interchangeability between the loans and their non-loaned alternatives. The questionnaires also included sets of sentences in which each sentence presented an item under analysis in a different syntactic location, and the participants were asked to indicate the sentences which yielded the same semantic implications, to uncover if the syntactic location of the loan and non-loaned alternatives have any bearing on the implication of the sentence and to further determine if the loaned and non-loaned alternatives behave similarly or differently in terms of syntax and semantics. Furthermore, these questions provided much greater precision into the understanding of the manner in which the loans and non-loaned alternatives occur in Iraqi Arabic by testing the validity of further hypotheses about the collocation of particular loans with other relevant portions of sentence structure such as personal pronouns and verbs.

In addition to the questionnaires, during the interviews, I provided my informants with sentences containing the loan and asked them to provide a sentence that lent the same implication without using said loan. Furthermore, I provided them with a list of the loans and non-loaned alternatives and asked them to provide me with meaningful sentences using the items provided and then to elaborate on the implications they intended to convey. Such elicitation from human participants yielded data that would be impossible to gather in any other capacity.

I also gathered data from television programs in Iraqi Arabic, such as *id-dars il-'awwal* and *ana w-il-majnūn*, the former of which is a sitcom centered on the daily lives of the teachers and students at a high school in Baghdad and the latter of which revolves around the trials and

tribulations faced by a widowed lawyer in Baghdad. Additionally, I extracted examples from *il-hārib*, a hit action series from Turkey about an ex-police officer who cannot outrun his past and is catapulted into a war with his old Turkish mafia adversaries. This program was dubbed specifically into the Baghdadi dialect for the Iraqi audience by LANA TV, an Iraqi general entertainment channel based in Baghdad. It is understood that data collected from scripted television programs are not entirely representative of naturalistic speech, which is why I supplemented this data with the questionnaires and consultations with native speakers. As specific loans are focused on, only relevant passages of dialogue from Iraqi television programs were transcribed and included in the analysis (i.e., I extracted and transcribed the excerpts of discourse which contained the loans under analysis, along with appropriate context). More specifically, I was careful to not merely transcribe and include isolated sentences/phrases containing the loans under analysis, but to transcribe and include surrounding sentences in order to lend the loans enough context to be analyzed. Transcribing the examples in this manner yields data which more accurately represents the manner in which and in what contexts the loans are used, while analyzing the sentences/phrases containing the loans in isolation would not afford us such insight and consequently would run the risk of yielding inaccurate results.

In addition to the data collected from human informants and that transcribed from television programs, I collected online data written in Iraqi Arabic, the majority of which was sourced from comments written on Facebook pages with very high levels of traffic and hundreds of thousands of ‘followers’ (i.e., Facebook users who subscribe to that particular page and receive updates whenever those pages post new content such as a photo, status, video, etc.). I selected pages which frequently see high levels of interaction between users, namely sites that generally post content which often stimulates conversations or debates, thus enabling my example pool to be comprised of data similar to spoken interaction, as opposed to being a compilation of many solitary and isolated statements. It should be noted here that I was careful to include Facebook pages which are aimed specifically at the Iraqi population and were therefore less likely to attract comments from other (non-Iraqi) Arabic speakers. The main Facebook pages from which I gathered data were: The Iraqi Ministry of Education¹², Al-Baghdadia news

¹² <https://ar-ar.facebook.com/Iraq.Ministry.of.Education/>

channel¹³, the University of Baghdad¹⁴, and the page for a very popular Iraqi talk show entitled the Al-Basheer Show¹⁵.

I compiled all of my data into a searchable, computerized document. As it contained handpicked elements, I kept it compartmentalized, in order to retain the ability to include/exclude elements when searching, as well as to be able to search the entire document. I searched this data to confirm or reject my previous hypothesizes as well as to build upon and expand them, and I transcribed and glossed the examples I selected to use in the present work. The analysis of the data was conducted in stages. Firstly, I analyzed the online-sourced media. In order to determine that the written online material I collected was indeed Iraqi Arabic and not another dialect or mixture of dialects, I searched for salient Iraqi Arabic features, e.g.:

اني āni ‘I’

كلش kulliṣ ‘very, a lot’

هوايه hiwāya ‘very, a lot’

اكو āku ‘there is’

Once I had confirmed that all of the examples I had sourced were indeed Iraqi Arabic, I searched specifically for examples of the items under analysis and subsequently searched for patterns between said examples to determine if I could pinpoint any salient similarities or differences, and I made hypotheses as to the functions served by the loans. After uncovering the ‘core’ or ‘basic’ functions of the loaned items through my analysis of the written online data, I transcribed excerpts of spoken Iraqi Arabic from the television programs mentioned above to further add to my example pool, and I conducted the aforementioned acceptability-judgment questionnaires and interviews with native speakers to confirm or reject my hypotheses and to provide deeper insight into the true behavior of the items under analysis.

Through carefully eliciting linguistic information from my participants and analyzing the media and written data, combined with observing the collocation patterns and syntactic placement of the items in question, I was able to draw upon context and my own knowledge of the language to uncover the syntactic and semantic divisions of the items in question and to

¹³ <https://www.facebook.com/elbaghdadia/>

¹⁴ https://www.facebook.com/mass.media.college2013/?ref=py_c

¹⁵ <https://ar-ar.facebook.com/albasheershow/>

further rule out other possible functions. For instance, as will be discussed in the chapter on *hamm* (i.e., Chapter 5), in order to determine that the function of *hamm* was additive in a particular example (as opposed to serving another function), I searched for the other elements that were being ‘added to’ and searched for clues that would clearly indicate ‘addition’. For instance, the expression of agreement (such as when speaker A agrees with speaker B) often indicated a clear instance of the item being used in an additive sense, e.g.:

1)

أ: ارید گھوہ.

A: arīd gahwa
want.PRS.1SG coffee
‘I want coffee.’

ب: وانی ہم ارید گھوہ.

B: w-āni **hamm** arīd gahwa
and-1SG HAMM want.PRS.1SG coffee
‘I, too, want coffee.’

Conversely, in order to confirm that an instance of *hamm* was not additive, for instance, and was in fact serving one of the three alternative functions, I ensured that there did not seem to be any suggestion of addition, thus cancelling the likelihood of *hamm* serving an additive function, e.g.:

2)

طعمها ما یعجبني هوایه بس هم راح اكلها.

ṭa’am-ha ma yi’ajib-ni hiwāya bass **hamm**
flavor-3FSG NEG please.PRS.3MSG-1SG a lot but HAMM
rāḥ akl-a
FUT eat.PRS.1SG-3MSG
‘I don’t like the way it tastes, but I’ll still eat it.’

In this particular example, it would seem that the likelihood of *hamm* serving an additive function is very low, as there is no mention of something which could be added to, and it would

seem more likely that *hamm* is actually functioning as a concessive cancellative discourse marker, cancelling the speaker's admission of not liking the flavor of the food item to which he is referring and implying that despite the unappealing flavor, he will eat it. It is understood that one could argue that in an example such as this there is a possibility that in the prior discourse someone other than the speaker indicated that they would eat the dish, and then the speaker, in turn, expressed his dislike for the food, but posited that he, too, would eat it, and thus *hamm* is actually serving an additive function. However, such hypothetical situations do not concern us, since, as will be demonstrated in our analysis of *hamm*, very careful attention has been paid to the prior discourse in the examples that are provided in the body of the chapter on *hamm*, and the prior discourse included in the examples elucidate the researcher's justification for positing that *hamm* in that example serves a particular function over another. Now that an explanation of the methodology and data collection has been set forth, let us move on to an in depth evaluation of *hamm* and a discussion of its four distinct functions.

CHAPTER FIVE: HAMM

5.1 Chapter Outline

The main aim of the present chapter is to present semantic and syntactic analyses and comparisons of the loan ultimately of Iranian origin, *hamm*, and its non-loaned counterparts *'ayḍan*, *ḥatta*, *ṣudug*, and *ma 'a ḍālik/ma 'a hāḍa*, and to present a discussion of the various constraints binding the semantic interpretation of *hamm*'s various functions, which I claim to be motivated by the semantic and syntactic relations and properties discussed in this analysis.

Both *hamm* and *'ayḍan* are typically described as serving a purely additive function and are both defined 'also, too, as well' (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964; Clarity, Stowasser & Wolfe 2003; Nasrallah & Hassani 2005). Consequently, they are generally described as being interchangeable, the main difference being that the former is colloquial and consequently typically perceived as being appropriate for every day, informal speech, whilst the latter is standard and generally seen as appropriate for more formal speech—essentially the difference is perceived as being largely diglossic in nature. However, as the analysis reveals, the semantic implications lent by these items are far more complex and multifaceted than this basic understanding can account for, and they are not as interchangeable as the existing literature claims. In fact, *hamm* adheres to varying syntactic and semantic constraints in varying contexts and environments and serves four distinct functions: 1) an additive focus particle; 2) a scalar particle; 3) an intensifier; and 4) a concessive cancellative discourse marker. It should be noted that several realizations of *hamm* exist in Iraqi Arabic, namely *hammēna*, *hammēn*, and *hammatēn*. However, the present work will focus on the realization *hamm*, as, based on the researcher's knowledge of the language, this is the most frequently-occurring realization, and, furthermore, the length and time constraints by which the present work is bound prevent us from exploring the alternate realizations. It should be borne in mind, however, that it is indeed possible that *hamm* and *'ayḍan* embody functions beyond those stated here, and thus the categorizations of their functions presented should not be regarded as exhaustive. That said, the categorizations of their functions presented can be said to encapsulate their principal functions.

The present chapter begins with an overview of the etymology of *hamm* along with a brief summary of the manner in which *hamm* has been defined as it occurs in Persian, Turkish, and varying Turkic languages (5.2). By drawing upon König (1991), *hamm*'s additive function is treated first (5.3), beginning with a definition of additive focus particles and an overview of how

said items function cross-linguistically (5.3.1). We then progress onto our analysis, beginning with an overview of the manner in which additive *hamm* and *'ayḏan* function in Iraqi Arabic and the semantic and syntactic constraints by which they are bound (5.3.2.1), before continuing with an overview of additive *hamm* specifically (5.3.2.2-5.3.2.10). After this, we turn to scalar *hamm* (5.4), and, drawing upon König (1991) and Bell (2009), move onto an overview of scalar focus particles (5.4.1) in order to set up our analysis of scalar *hamm* against its non-loaned counterpart *ḥatta* (5.4.2.1), before turning to the analysis of scalar *hamm* specifically (5.4.2.2-5.4.2.6). We then treat *hamm*'s function as an intensifier (5.5), that is instances in which it would appear that *hamm* is used solely for emphatic purposes and has a function similar to English *indeed*, *really*, *seriously*. Drawing upon Ito & Tagliamonte (2003) the term 'intensifier' is explained and its function described (5.5.1), before moving on to the analysis (5.5.2) which begins with a contrastive exploration of *ṣudug* and emphatic *hamm* (5.5.2.1), before investigating emphatic *hamm* specifically (5.5.2.2-5.5.2.6). Following this, an analysis of concessive cancellative *hamm* is presented (5.6), treating the contexts in which *hamm* functions as a concessive cancellative discourse marker. It would seem as though concessive *hamm* lends similar implications to those lent by the non-loaned *ma 'a ḥāḏa* or *ma 'a ḏālik* 'still; however; nevertheless'. Drawing upon Bell (2009) and Dascal & Katriel (1977) 'concession' and 'cancellation' are defined (5.6.1), and the analysis (5.6.2) begins with this function of *hamm* being contrasted with its non-loaned counterparts *ma 'a ḏālik/ma 'a ḥāḏa* (5.6.2.1). After this, concessive cancellative *hamm* is investigated specifically (5.6.2.2-5.6.2.4), followed by a conclusion of the chapter and the related theoretical implications (5.7). After the four distinct functions of *hamm* have been defined and analyzed, the chapter wraps up with a discussion highlighting aspects deserving of further research (5.8).

5.2 Etymology of *hamm*

hamm is purely of Iranian origin and can be traced to Avestan (Haug & Jamaspasana 1867). Avestan, which has historically also been referred to as 'Zend', was an Eastern Iranian language belonging to the Indo-European family and is known for its liturgical use in Zoroastrianism, namely as the language of the Zoroastrian scripture known as the Avesta, from which the language derives its name. Avestan was in use in ancient Margiana, Arachosia, Bactria, and Aria, i.e., present-day Afghanistan and parts of Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, and Pakistan.

Avestan continued to be used in new compositions long after ceasing to be a living language, due to its sacred status. It would seem as though the Iraqi Arabic *hamm* made its way from Avestan through the various stages of Persian which led to Modern Persian. *hamm* as it occurs in Persian (where it is realized as *ham*) has been defined as ‘also; together’ (Rafiee 2015:195) and ‘also, likewise’ (Sen 1829:212).

In addition to Persian, the existence of *hamm* has been attested in Turkish (wherein it is realized as *hem*); it has been defined as ‘and’ (Vaughan 1709:45) and instances of *hem...hem...* ‘both...and...’ (p.49) have also been attested. There is also evidence of *hem* in Azerbaijani, which Schönig (1998:257) describes as a conjunction of Arabo-Persian origin, defining it as ‘also’. Additionally, he notes that it occurs in Turkmen as well where it lends the same semantic implication (p. 269). Furthermore, there is evidence of *hem* in Tartar and Bashkir (defined by Berta (1998:296) as a conjunction functioning as ‘and’. It is also found in Chaghatay, where clauses and phrases can be linked by the ‘coordinative conjunction’ which implies ‘also’, and the Chaghatay *hem...hem...* functions as ‘both...and...’—all forms are claimed to be copied from Persian (Boeschoten & Vandamme 1998:174).

Turning to instances of *hamm* (and its varying realizations) as it occurs in Arabic dialects specifically, *ham* is found in Khuzistani Arabic (a variety of Iraqi (*Gilit*) Arabic) wherein it implies ‘too’ and ‘indeed, well’ (Matras & Shabibi 2007:143); there is also evidence of *ham...ham* ‘both...and...’ in Khuzistani (Matras & Shabibi 2007:145), as well as Gulf Arabic (Feghali 2004:131).

As has been noted, Iraqi Arabic has a vast history of linguistic contact with both Persian and Turkish, and Persian and Turkish also have a long history of contact between one another. Furthermore, given the fact that *hamm* (in its respective realizations) occurs in modern day Persian and Turkish (as well as in various Turkic languages) and that *hamm* was present in these languages during the time in which Iraqi Arabic was in contact with them, it is difficult to discern if Iraqi Arabic borrowed *hamm* directly through Persian or if it acquired it via Turkish. There is evidence, however, of *hamm* occurring in Iraqi Arabic as far back as 1122 AD, as it is attested in al- Ḥarīrī (1122/1881). The available evidence surrounding the etymology of *hamm* suggests that *hamm* made its way from Avestan through the various stages of Persian and points to a direct borrowing from Persian, however, a borrowing of this item from Persian via Turkish cannot be entirely ruled out. Now that an etymological background and definitions of *hamm* as it

occurs cross-linguistically has been set forth, we will begin our contrastive analysis with the manner in which *hamm* and *'ayðan* function as additive focus particles.

5.3 Additive *hamm*

As we will begin our analysis of *hamm* and *'ayðan* with an investigation of their function as additive focus particles, let us turn to a background of additive focus particles, by drawing upon König (1991).

5.3.1 Additive Focus Particles

Additive *hamm* and *'ayðan* and their corresponding counterparts as they occur in other languages are generally categorized as adverbs and focus particles, and, depending on the context of the sentence, focus particles ‘relate’ to varying parts of the sentence, which can mean one of the three following things (König 1991:11; cf. Jacobs 1991:8ff): I) Focus particles focus on a specific part of a sentence; II) Focus particles combine with a specific constituent; III) Focus particles have a specific semantic scope. As we aim to uncover the semantic and syntactic constraints of *hamm* and *'ayðan* only the first and third properties are the focus of this present discussion.

Focus particles generally partition a sentence into two parts: a highlighted or focused part and a backgrounded part, and, as pointed out by König (1991:11), this is assumed to be an aspect of their grammatical structure and this aspect has both semantic and phonological interpretation. It is important to note here that the present discussion will not deal with the phonological interpretation (e.g., intonation, stress, etc.) of the focus particles under analysis, and thus no assumptions about intonation/stress can be made from that perspective.

Focus particles can be ‘additive’ (also known as ‘inclusive’) or ‘restrictive’ (also known as ‘exclusive’) (König 1991:33). Additive particles (e.g., *also*, *too*, *even*, *either*, *in particular*, *let alone*, etc.) comprise a handful of alternatives as potential focus values for the variable of their scope, while restrictive particles (e.g., *exactly*, *only*, *merely*, etc.) imply that the relevant open sentence is not fulfilled by any of the alternatives under consideration (König 1991:33). Although not every focus particle in English (or other languages) fits into one of these two groups, this binary distinction is an important one to make for the majority of, if not all, languages, as there appears to be at least one additive and one restrictive particle in every

language. That is to say it appears that the division in English between *also/too* and *only* can be expressed in every language (König 1991:34). *hamm* in Iraqi Arabic, in its additive and scalar readings, is an additive or inclusive focus particle (it does not act as a focus particle in its emphatic and concessive cancellative readings), and thus we are concerned only with additive (inclusive) particles for the purposes of the present work.

Many works on the semantic and syntactic properties of focus particles (e.g., Karttunen and Peters 1980; Jacobs 1991; and Rooth 1985) have demonstrated that these elements share a large number of properties, however the similarities in the function and behavior far outweigh the differences, and they should consequently be viewed as a special subclass of adverbs, namely ‘syncategorematic words’ or ‘function words’ (König 1991:11). That being said, it should be noted here that none of the above-mentioned works focus on the focus particles *too*, *as well*, or *also* in particular (some do not even concern them at all) and they range from semantic analyses of the focus particles *let alone* to *just* or *only*. Out of the above mentioned works it is only König’s (1991) framework and terminology in which we are interested, as this is the most comprehensive cross-linguistic survey of modality. Moreover, the influence a focus particle has on the meaning of a sentence depends on the semantics of two main components of the sentence itself: ‘I) on that of its focus and II) that of its scope’ (König 1991:29). König (1991:29) illustrates the former of these two dependencies with the following examples from English:

- 1) a. FRED also bought a new car
b. Somebody other than Fred bought a new car.
- 2) a. Fred also bought a NEW CAR.
b. Fred bought something other than a new car.

In 1)a. and 2)a. the presupposition that *also* lends to the sentence can roughly be expressed by 1)b. and 2)b. respectively, and, according to König, as the sentences in question only differ in the location of their focus, it must be this fact that accounts for the contrast in meaning (1991:29). It is now a well-established fact in many studies that the contribution that a focus particle makes to the meaning of a sentence is also dependent on its scope (cf. Jacobs 1991; König 1991; Taglicht 1984; Kay 1990). In order to demonstrate the relevance of scope in the semantic analysis of focus particles, König provides a minimal pair similar to the following (1991:30):

- 3) a. She also eats APPLES very rarely.
b. Very rarely does she also eat APPLES.

According to König (1991:30), the implication that *also* lends to the meaning of such sentences is:

- 4) a. She eats something other than apples very rarely.
b. She eats something other than apples.

These contributions have been implied by replacing an appropriately restricted existential quantifier for the particle's focus, but the sentences in which this replacement has been carried out are not the same in both cases, in that in 4)a., we have taken the whole sentence, while in 4)b. the initial adverbial has been omitted (König 1991:30). As the focus is exactly the same in both sentences, it cannot be responsible for the discrepancy in meaning; since the corresponding sentences without *also* do not differ in a similar fashion, this discrepancy cannot solely be due to the fact that *very rarely* (a quantificational adverb) occurs in a different location in the two sentences (König 1991:30):

- 5) a. She eats apples very rarely.
b. Very rarely does she eat apples.

Through examples 1-5 we were able to observe the manner in which the focus and scope of a focus particle influence the implication the focus particle lends and this will be further demonstrated as it occurs in Iraqi Arabic specifically in sections 5.3.2-5.4.2.6. In order to explore the interaction between focus particles and their focus in a sentence, let us briefly summarize the manner in which they have been described in the existing literature (see König 1991:32): a focus conveys informativeness and highlighting (e.g., Bolinger 1985); a focus forms a relationship between the meaning of a focused expression and a set of alternatives (e.g., Jacobs 1988; Rooth 1985); a focus conveys 'new information' (e.g., Selkirk 1984). The information conveyed by the focus of additive *hamm* is explored in the discussion of the syntactic constraints.

In some cases languages offer more than one possibility to indicate that a particular constituent is in the scope of the particle. For instance, Dutch and German use prosody (in

particular, stressed vs. unstressed variants of the particles) to remedy ambiguity when a proposition is compatible with more than one scope reading. Benazzo & Dimroth (2015) investigate the basic additive particles in French, Italian, Dutch and German (*aussi*, *anche*, *ook*, and *auch*, respectively). They describe these items as sharing the same additive reading, despite some cross-linguistic variation related to where they occur syntactically in a sentence (i.e., the way syntactic positioning is exploited to mark scope and/or absolute restrictions), positing that these additive particles are ‘optional elements’ that can occur in different syntactic placements within a sentence, and the mobility of all four of the items in question is exploited by their speakers to indicate which part of the sentence is affected by the additive meaning.

The syntactic position of additive focus particles which seek to highlight which component of the utterance is influenced by the particle’s additive reading is not the same cross-linguistically (Benazzo & Dimroth 2015:13). In instances of addition in Iraqi Arabic in particular, the question arises: how is the focus of the sentence reflected syntactically? As is illustrated in the analyses of the present chapter, these additive focus particles have syntactic constraints which convey their focus to the hearer. In this additive sense, the items in question focus a subject, object, adjective, preposition of time, location, prepositional phrase, a noun in a genitive construction, verb, or the independent clause immediately preceding *hamm*/*’ayḍan* indicating that this ‘focused’ element is the item that is being ‘added’. Now that we have illustrated the difference between focus and scope and provided an overview of how additive particles function cross-linguistically, we can proceed to our analysis of the loaned focus particle *hamm* and its non-loaned counterpart *’ayḍan*.

5.3.2 Analysis

Although both *hamm* and *’ayḍan* are generally defined as meaning ‘too, also, as well’, the analysis indicated that *hamm* should actually be divided into four distinct functions while *’ayḍan* only serves one function— that of addition. It must be noted, however, that it is indeed possible that *hamm* and *’ayḍan* embody functions beyond those stated in this thesis, and thus the categorizations of their functions presented here should not be regarded as exhaustive. That said, these categorizations can be thought of as encapsulating their principal functions.

We will now explore the traditional interpretation of *hamm* and *’ayḍan*, that of addition (which I refer to as ‘additive *hamm*/*’ayḍan*’ or ‘*hamm*/*’ayḍan* of addition’) wherein these items

imply ‘too, also, as well’, beginning with a brief overview of *’ayðan*. As the focus of the present chapter is largely on the function of *hamm* as opposed to *’ayðan*, and that these two items are seemingly interchangeable in all additive instances (save for the question of register and *hamm...hamm...* (see section 5.3.2.9)), the brief illustrative comparison of *’ayðan* and additive *hamm* which we will now set forth will suffice for the purposes of the present work— the discussion of *’ayðan* should not be regarded as an in-depth or exhaustive investigation. To begin, let us first consider a sentence which does not contain any additive particles.

5.3.2.1 Additive *hamm* and *’ayðan*

6)

علي شرب عصير.

‘Ali širab ‘aşır
‘Ali drink.PST.3MSG juice
‘‘Ali drank juice.’¹⁶

As no additive particle is included in 6), no reference is made to any elements apart from those which are explicitly mentioned in the example itself (the elements ‘juice’ and ‘‘Ali’), and no sense of addition is reflected. Let us now consider the same sentence, but this time with the inclusion of *’ayðan*:

7)

علي ايضاً شرب عصير.

‘Ali ’ayðan širab ‘aşır
‘Ali ’AYÐAN drink.PST.3MSG juice
‘‘Ali, too, drank juice.’¹⁷

In 7) apart from *’ayðan* we have three constituents: *‘Ali* (subject), *širab* ‘drank’ (verb), and *‘aşır* ‘juice’ (object). As no prior discourse or context is alluded to in this example, one could argue that the implication lent by *’ayðan* in 7) is ambiguous and embodies two possible foci (the subject or the object): 1) ‘Ali in addition to someone else drank juice or 2) ‘Ali drank juice in

¹⁶ Informant data

¹⁷ Informant data

addition to drinking something else. However, the syntactic placement of *'ayðan* in 7) (wherein it occurs immediately after the subject) indicates that someone not explicitly mentioned in the sentence (i.e., someone other than 'Ali) drank juice, and thus *'ayðan* serves to focus the subject. To illustrate this further consider the following example in which context is added to 7):

8)

حسن شرب عصير وعلي ايضاً شرب عصير.

Ḥasan	širab	‘aṣīr	wa	‘Ali	’ayðan	širab
Ḥasan	drink.PST.3MSG	juice	and	‘Ali	’AYÐAN	drink. PST.3MSG

‘aṣīr
juice
‘Ḥasan drank juice and ‘Ali drank juice too.’¹⁸

When context (i.e., *Ḥasan širab ‘aṣīr* ‘Ḥasan drank juice’) is added to *‘Ali ’ayðan širab ‘aṣīr* ‘‘Ali drank juice too’, it becomes clear that someone other than ‘Ali drank juice. The context, combined with the syntactic placement of *'ayðan* cancels the possibility of 8) implying that ‘Ali had drank something not explicitly mentioned in the sentence in addition to drinking juice. If the focus of *'ayðan* were the object as opposed to the subject, however, then *'ayðan* would occur immediately after the object (in this instance *‘aṣīr* ‘juice’), consider:

9)

علي شرب عصير ايضاً.

‘Ali	širab	‘aṣīr	’ayðan
‘Ali	drink. PST. 3MSG	juice	’AYÐAN

‘‘Ali drank juice too.’¹⁹

In 9), as in 7), no prior discourse or context is provided to ascertain whether ‘Ali in addition to someone else drank juice or if ‘Ali drank juice in addition to drinking something else, and thus the focus is revealed in the syntactic location of *'ayðan*— as the syntactic placement of *'ayðan* differs from its placement in 7), its focus differs as well. Consider the same example with context added:

¹⁸ Informant data

¹⁹ Informant data

10)

علي شرب گهوه وشرب عصير ايضاً.

‘Ali širab gahwa ū širab ‘ašīr ‘ayḏan
 ‘Ali drink.PST.3MSG coffee and drink.PST.3MSG juice ‘AYḌAN
 ‘‘Ali drank coffee and he drank juice too.’²⁰

When context (‘*Ali širab gahwa* ‘‘Ali drank coffee’) is added to [‘*Ali*] *širab ‘ašīr ‘ayḏan* ‘[‘Ali] drank juice’ it is clarified that ‘Ali drank something other than juice. Here, as in 8), the context, combined with the syntactic placement of ‘*ayḏan*, cancels the possibility of the subject (‘Ali) being the focus. Thus, we have seen that it is namely the syntactic placement of ‘*ayḏan* that denotes the focus. Sentences 7-10 illustrate the most basic interpretation of ‘*ayḏan*, that of addition, the general definition provided in Iraqi Arabic grammars and dictionaries (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964; Clarity, Stowasser & Wolfe 2003; Nasrallah & Hasani 2005).

In examples 7-10 presented above, *hamm* can replace ‘*ayḏan* without altering the implication lent by the sentence, save for the matter of register, which does not concern us here. Consider example 8, but with ‘*ayḏan* replaced with *hamm*:

11)

حسن شرب عصير وعلي هم شرب عصير.

Ḥasan širab ‘ašīr ū ‘Ali **hamm** širab
 Ḥasan drink.PST.3MSG juice and ‘Ali HAMM drink.PST.3MSG
 ‘ašīr
 juice
 ‘Ḥasan drank juice and ‘Ali drank juice too.’²¹

Due to *hamm*’s placement immediately after ‘Ali it is clear to us that ‘Ali is being focused, thus implying that ‘Ali, in addition to Ḥasan, drank juice. Consider example 10 but with ‘*ayḏan* replaced with *hamm*:

²⁰ Informant data

²¹ Informant data

12)

علي شرب گهوة وشرب عصير هم.

‘Ali širab gahwa ū širab ‘aṣṭīr **hamm**
 ‘Ali drink.PST.3MSG coffee and drink.PST.3MSG juice HAMM
 ‘‘Ali drank coffee and he drank juice too.’’²²

As a result of *hamm*’s placement immediately after ‘*aṣṭīr* ‘juice’, it is clear that ‘*aṣṭīr* is the focus, thus the example implies that ‘Ali drank juice in addition to drinking coffee. As can be inferred from the examples presented up to this point and their associated discussion, encapsulating the general principles which would predict to which element a focus particle refers in a particular instance has strict syntactic grounds, and it is through a combination of the context/prior discourse combined with syntax that any possible ambiguity regarding which function a particular instance of *hamm* may be serving is ruled out. Therefore, as has been demonstrated, even if the element which the additive focus particle modifies is not explicitly mentioned in the sentence, the focus of *hamm*/’*ayḍan* does not pose any ambiguity. Now that the most basic function of *hamm*/’*ayḍan* has been illustrated, let us proceed with a more in-depth analysis of additive *hamm* specifically as it occurs varying syntactic locations and its subsequent foci.

5.3.2.2 Focusing the Subject

When focusing a subject, additive *hamm* occurs immediately after the subject, consequently indicating it as the focus. The item that is being ‘added to’ is generally mentioned in the prior discourse. Consider:

²² Informant data

13)

أ: تعتقد نظمي راح يگدر يدبرها؟

A: ti‘ataqid Nađmi rāḥ yigdar yidabbir-ha
 think.PRS.2MSG Nađmi FUT able.PRS.3MSG arrange. PRS.3MSG-3FSG
 ‘Do you think Nađmi will be able to manage it?’

ب: اكيد يگدر. مو شغلة صعبة.

B: akīd yigdar mu šugla ša‘aba
 certainly able.PRS.3MSG NEG task difficult
 ‘Certainly he can. It isn’t a difficult task.’

أ: هو يفهم بالامور التقنية بس. هذا مشكلته. من ينزل للشارع ميدبرها وهذا ليخوفني.

A: huwa yiftahim b-il-amūr it-tiqnīya bass
 3MSG understand.PRS.3MSG in-the-matter.PL the-technological only
 hāḏa muškilt-a min yinzil
 this problem-3MSG when descend.PRS.3MSG
 l-iš-šāri‘ ma ydabbir-ha wa hāḏa
 to-the-street NEG arrange.PRS.3MSG-3FSG and that
 li-yxawwif-ni
 which-scare.3MSG-1SG

‘He understands technological matters only. That’s his problem. When he goes out into the street he can’t handle it, and that’s what scares me.’

ب: إي. اني هم خايف.

B: ī āni **hamm** xāyyif
 yes 1SG HAMM scared
 ‘Yes, I’m scared, too.’²³

²³ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 19 15.50

In 13) *hamm* occurs immediately after the subject, the 1SG pronoun, *āni*, focusing it. Such placement of *hamm* indicates that someone other than the subject is also scared, and the prior discourse indicates that B is expressing agreement with A's statement about being scared. Thus, through the use of *hamm* the implication lent here is: Yes, I (B), too (in addition to A), am scared.

We should point out that additive *hamm* can also occur in negative statements, lending a sense of 'negative addition'. When additive *hamm* is negated in such contexts it lends an implication similar to that of the English 'neither' or 'not either'. In negative constructions, the syntactic placement of *hamm* does not change—it still occurs immediately after the item it is focusing which is then immediately followed by the negative particles *mu* or *ma*. In simple terms, *ma* negates verbs (except for imperatives which are negated with *la*) and *mu* negates everything else, although some speakers alternate between *mu* and *ma* rather freely, however such discrepancies do not concern us here. We will not explore *hamm* as it arises in negative sentences beyond this example, as, *hamm* itself cannot be negated. Thus, additive *hamm*, even when arising in negated sentences, functions just like it does in affirmative sentences—it indicates that something is being added. For the sake of illustration let us consider an example in which *hamm*, when focusing the subject, occurs in negative statements, consider:

14)

أ: هذا فياض كلب. دا يلعب من ورا ظهري بس الله كشفه. واني دا اتحاسب على افعاله؟ ليش ما تروح هسه تسأله؟

A: hāḏa Fēyāḏ kalb da yil'ab min wara ḏahr-i
 that Fēyāḏ dog PROG play.PRS.3MSG from behind back-1SG
 bass alḷāh kišaf-a wa āni da atḥāsib
 but God expose.PST.3MSG-3MSG and I PROG account.PRS.1SG
 'ala af'āl-a lēš ma trūḥ hassa tisā'al-a
 on action.PL-3MSG why NEG go.PRS.2MSG now ask.PRS.2MSG-3MSG
 'Feyad is a dog. He is going behind my back, but God exposed him. And I'm [being held]
 accountable for his actions? Why don't you go now and ask him?'

ب: اني دا اسألك الك واريد تجوبني، ايرول. سنين وياكم خنت صديق بيبكم؟

B: āni da as'al-ak il-ak ū arīd-ak
 1SG PROG ask.PRS.1SG-2MSG to-2MSG and want.PRS.1SG-2MSG
 itjawwib-ni Āyrol snīn wiyyā-kum xinit
 answer.PRS.2MSG-1SG Āyrol year.PL with-2PL betray.PST.1SG
 ṣadīq bī-kum
 friend in-2PL
 'I'm asking you directly, and I want you to answer me, Āyrol. In all the years I've been with
 you have I ever betrayed one of you?'

أ: واني هم ما خنتك صار أكثر من اربعين سنة وياك.

A: ū āni **hamm** ma xint-ak ṣār
 and 1SG HAMM NEG betray.PRS.1SG-2MSG become.PST.2MSG
 akθar min arba'in sana wiyyā-k
 more than forty year with-2MSG
 'And in the over 40 years I've been with you, I haven't betrayed you either.'²⁴

In 14), through B's utterance of *snīn wiyyā-kum xinit ṣadīq bī-kum*? 'In all the years I've been with you have I ever betrayed one of you?' the implication is 'I have never betrayed you'. Through *hamm*'s occurrence immediately after *āni* 'I', combined with the placement of the negative particle *ma* immediately after *hamm*, A's response *ū āni hamm ma xint-ak ṣār akθar*

²⁴ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 17 19:25

min arba ‘īn sanna wiyyā-k implies ‘And in the over 40 years I’ve been with you, I haven’t betrayed you either’. Thus, the following is yielded by *hamm*: neither B has betrayed A nor has A betrayed B.

5.3.2.3 Focusing an Object

When focusing the object of a sentence, *hamm* occurs immediately after the object, consider:

15)

هاك. إلزم. يلا. اقتلني. واقتل نرگل هم. حتى تدخل للسجن واني اموت. وانت تخلص مني. يلا. اقتني.				
<i>hāk</i>	<i>ilzam</i>	<i>yalla</i>	<i>iqtin-ni</i>	<i>wa</i>
take.IMP.2MSG	hold.IMP.2MSG	go on	kill.IMP.2MSG-1SG	and
<i>iqtıl</i>	<i>Nurgul</i>	hamm	<i>hatta</i>	<i>tidxul</i>
kill.IMP.2MSG	Nurgul	HAMM	in order to	enter.PRS.2MSG
<i>l-is-sijin</i>	<i>w-āni</i>	<i>amūt</i>	<i>w-inta</i>	
to-the-prison	and-1SG	die.PRS.1SG	and-2MSG	
<i>tixluş</i>	<i>min-ni</i>	<i>yalla</i>	<i>iqtin-ni</i>	
finish.PRS.2MSG	of-1SG	go on	kill.IMP.2MSG-1SG	
‘Take [it]. Take [it]. Go on. Kill me. And kill Nurgul, too, so you can go to prison and I will die, and you’ll be rid of me. Go on, kill me.’ ²⁵				

Here, *hamm* immediately follows the object, Nurgul, thus focusing it and indicating that someone in addition to Nurgul should be killed. This syntactic placement of *hamm* combined with the prior discourse indicates that the implication lent by additive *hamm* here is ‘Kill me and kill Nurgul (in addition to killing me)’.

5.3.2.4 Focusing an Adjective

When additive *hamm* focuses an adjective, *hamm* occurs immediately after the adjective being focused. Consider:

16)

		أ: وين رايحة؟
A: <i>wēn</i>	<i>rāyha?</i>	

²⁵ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 23 36:30

where going.PTCP.FSG

‘Where are you going?’

ب: انت شعليك؟ يعني لازم اگوللك وين رايحة ووين جاية؟

B: inta š-‘allē-k? ya‘ani lāzim agul-l-ak wēn
2MSG what-on-2MSG FIL must say.PRS.1SG-to-2MSG where
rāyḥa ū wēn jāya?
go.PTCP.FSG and where come.PTCP.FSG

‘What’s it to you? I mean, I must tell you where I’m going and where I’m coming [from]?’

أ: السيد عصمت امرني اذا ارتان وياچ اني لازم اوصلج للمكان اللي تريديه.

A: is-sayyid ‘Aṣmat amar-ni iḏa Artān wiyyā-č āni
the-sir ‘Aṣmat order.PST.3MSG-1SG if Artān with-2FSG 1SG
lāzim awaṣl- ič l-il-makān illi trīdī-h
must deliver.1SG-FSG to-the-place which want.PRS.2FS-3MSG

‘Mister ‘Aṣmat ordered me: if Artān is with you, I must take you to wherever you want.’

ب: إي افتهمت. اني چنت ويا ارتان. شتريد؟

B: ī iftahamit āni činit wiyya Artān š-trīd
yes understand.PST.1SG I be.PST.1SG with Artān what-want.PRS.2MSG

‘Yes, I understood. I was with Artān. What do you want?’

أ: انت ليش ضايجة؟

A: inti lēš ḏāyija
2FSG why annoyed.PTCP.FSG

‘Why are you annoyed?’

ب: هذا من اوامر بابا؟ لازم تسألني اني ليش ضايجة هم؟

B: hāḏa min awāmir baba lāzim tisān-ni āni
this from order.PL dad must ask.PRS.2MSG-1SG 1SG
lēš ḏāyija **hamm**
why annoyed.PTCP.FSG HAMM

‘Is this one of my father’s orders? You must ask me why I’m annoyed, too?’²⁶

²⁶ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 11 35:35

In this instance, *hamm* immediately follows *ḍāyija* ‘annoyed’, and thus focuses it and indicates that *ḍāyija* is the constituent being added. The interpretation lent here is ‘Is that one of my father’s orders? You must ask me why I’m annoyed too (i.e., ask me why I’m annoyed in addition to asking where I’m coming/going?)’ It should be noted that although the adjective in question (*ḍāyija* ‘annoyed’) is glossed as a participle, for the purposes of this example it is an adjective in that it modifies the subject.

5.3.2.5 Focusing a Genitive Construction

When focusing a possessive or genitive construction, *hamm* immediately follows said construction. In Iraqi Arabic, there are several types of genitive constructions. One of these forms is known in Arabic grammar as *iḍāfa*. An *iḍāfa* construction is formed by placing the item that is being possessed (in its indefinite form) immediately in front of the possessor (in its definite form), e.g., *kitāb iṭ-ṭālib* ‘the student’s book’. When additive *hamm* focuses an *iḍāfa* construction in Iraqi Arabic, the *iḍāfa* is, in a sense, treated as a single entity, in that the items comprising the *iḍāfa* cannot be split, and thus when focusing an *iḍāfa*, *hamm* occurs after the last item in the *iḍāfa*. Consider:

17)

اني كلش ضايح من حياتي. غسل المواعين عليي وغسل الملابس هم صار عليي.						
āni	kulliṣ	ḍāyij	min	ḥayāt-i	ḡasil	il-muwā‘īn
1SG	very	annoyed.PTCP.MSG	from	life-1SG	washing	the-dish.PL
‘alē-ya	ū	ḡasil	il-malābis	hamm	ṣār	
on-1SG	and	washing	the-clothes	HAMM	become.PST.3MSG	
‘alē-ya						
on-1SG						

‘I’m so fed up with my life. Washing the dishes is my responsibility, and washing the clothes has also become my responsibility.’²⁷

Here, we have the *iḍāfa* construction *ḡasil il-malābis* ‘the washing of the clothes’. *hamm* occurs immediately after this phrase, thus focusing it. The implication lent here is ‘washing the clothes, in addition to washing the dishes, has become my responsibility’.

²⁷ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 20 33:40

In addition to expressing possession through the means of *iḏāfa*, possession can also be expressed in Iraqi Arabic through the use of the genitive *māl*. In such instances the item being possessed occurs in its definite form followed by *māl* and *māl*, in turn, is followed by the possessor, also in its definite form, e.g., *il-kitāb māl iṭ-ṭālib* ‘the student’s book’. Like the *iḏāfa* construction, possessive constructions containing *māl*, when focused by additive *hamm*, are treated as a single entity, with *hamm* occurring after the last item in the *māl* construction, consider:

18)

اشتريت الجرياية من ذاك المحل. وميز الطعام مال المطبخ هم من عندهم.							
aštarēt	ič-čarpāya	min	ḏāk	il-maḥall	ū	mēz	iṭ-ṭa‘ām
buy.PST.1SG	the-bed	from	that	the-shop	and	table	the-dining
māl	il-maṭbax	hamm	min	‘and-hum			
POSS	the-kitchen	HAMM	from	at-3MPL			
‘I bought the bed from that store, and the kitchen’s dining table is also from there.’ ²⁸							

Due to *hamm*’s syntactic placement immediately after it, we can see that the focus of *hamm* is the genitive construction *mēz iṭ-ṭa‘ām māl il-maṭbax* ‘the kitchen’s dining table’. The implication lent by *hamm* here is ‘I bought the kitchen’s dining table, in addition to the bed, from that store.’

Possession in Iraqi Arabic can also be expressed through the use of possessive suffixes which are appended to the item being possessed. As is the case in both the *iḏāfa* and *māl* constructions, items containing possessive suffixes are treated as single entities when focused by additive *hamm*— a possessive suffix and the item to which it is appended cannot be separated. Consequently, when an item containing a possessive suffix is the focus of additive *hamm*, *hamm* occurs immediately after said suffix, consider:

²⁸ Informant data

19)

مو مهم شلون صار هذا بس سرحات هسه مو بس مشكلتي هو مشكلتكم هم. فكرو شلون نحل هاي المشكلة.

mu muhimm šlōn šār hāḏa bass Sarḥāt hassa

NEG important how happen.PST.3MSG this but Sarḥāt now

mu bass muškilt-i huwa muškilt-kum **hamm**

NEG only problem-1SG 3MSG problem-2PL HAMM

fikkrū šlōn inḥill hāy il-muškila

think.IMP.2PL how solve.PST.1PL this the-problem

‘It’s not important how this happened, but now Sarḥāt isn’t just my problem, he’s your problem too. Think about how we can solve this problem.’²⁹

In this instance, *hamm* immediately follows *muškilt-kum* (problem-2PL ‘your problem’).

Syntactically speaking, it would seem as though *hamm* is focusing not only ‘problem’ or ‘your’ but ‘your problem’, as an entity, on account of the fact that in Arabic, possessive suffixes are fused to the noun being possessed and thus *hamm* cannot occur between *muškila* and *-kum*.

However, semantically, it would seem that *-kum* ‘your (2PL)’ is, in fact, the focus of *hamm* here. It is implying ‘Sarḥāt is your problem too (in addition to my problem).’

There is yet another manner in which additive *hamm* can focus possession, namely in conjunction with the preposition *il-* ‘to’, which, in some contexts, acts as a possessive particle. In such instances, *hamm* occurs immediately after the item being possessed and the possessor is expressed through the suffixation of a pronominal suffix to *il-* ‘to’, which occurs after *hamm*. Consider:

²⁹ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 18 28:20

20)

اريد حقنا كله توبشو اغلو حقنا اللي صار لسنين ناكروه والشركة اللي انت چنت تديرها ومسيطر عليها كل هاي الفترة. لازم تدفع كل الدين. لازم نتفاهم على بقية الامور والملحقات هم. مثلا المصرف اللي بنيتة حضرتك خلف الشركة وصار يحمل اسم توبشو اغلو. هذا المصرف هم النّا. يلا أوقع على التنازل.

arīd	ḥaqq-na	kull-a	Tōpšō Ōḡlō	ḥaqq-na	illi
want.PRS.1SG	right-1PL	all-3MSG	Tōpšō Ōḡlō	right-1PL	that
ṣār	l-snīn	nākr-a		w-iš-šarika	
become.PST.3MSG	for-year.PL	deny.PTCP.MSG-3MSG		and-the-company	
illi	inta	činit	itdīr-ha		wa
that	2MSG	be.PST.2MSG	control.PRS.2MSG-2FSG		and
imsēṭir	‘allē-ha	kull hāy	il-fatra		lāzim
control	on-2FSG	all this	the-period		must
tidfa‘	kull	id-dēn	lāzim		nitfāhim
pay.PRS.2MSG	all	the-debt	must		understand.PRS.1PL
‘ala baqīyit	il-amūr	w-il-mulaḥiqāt			hamm
on remainder	the-matter.PL	and-the-accessory.PL			HAMM
miṭilan	il-maṣraf	illi	binēt-a		ḥaḍritak
for example	the-bank	which	build.PST.2MSG-3FSG		2MSG
xalf	iš-šarika	wa	ṣār		
behind	the-company	and	become.PST.3MSG		
yihmil	ism	Tōpšō Ōḡlō	hāḍa il-maṣraf		hamm
bear.PRS.3MSG	name	Tōpšō Ōḡlō	this the-bank		HAMM
il-na	yalla	awaqqa‘	‘ala it-tināzul		
to-1PL	hurry	sign.IMP.2MSG	on the-concession document		

‘I want what’s ours—all of it, Tōpšō Ōḡlō. Our share that you’ve been denying for years and the company that you’ve been running and controlling all this time. You have to pay all the debt. We must come to an understanding about the rest of the matters and accessories, too. For example, the bank that you built behind the company which carries the name ‘Tōpšō Ōḡlō’. That bank is also ours. Go on, sign the concession documents.’³⁰

³⁰ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 36 4:45

Here, *hamm* occurs immediately after *maşraf* ‘bank’ and before *il-na* ‘to us’. Due to the syntactic placement of *hamm*, we can see that *maşraf* is the added property— through the use of *hamm*, the speaker is conveying that the bank, in addition to the company and shares, is theirs.

5.3.2.6 Focusing a Location

When focusing a location or place, additive *hamm* occurs immediately after the item denoting location. Consider:

21)

أ: ابني، انت وين؟ جوبني، براق. گولي انت وين هسه؟ وهذا الكلب شيسوي بيك؟

A: ibn-i inta wēn jawwab-ni Burāq gul-l-i
 son-1SG 2MSG where answer.IMP.2MSG-1SG Burāq tell.IMP.2MSG-to-1SG
 inta wēn hassa wa hāḏa il-kalb š-īsawwī bī-k
 2MSG where now and that the-dog what-do.PRS.3MSG with-2MSG
 ‘My son, where are you? Answer me, Burak. Tell me, where are you now? And what is that dog doing to you?’

ب: ما اعرف وين. اني ابحمام.

B: ma a‘ruf wēn āni ib-ḥammām
 NEG know.PRS.1SG where 1SG in-bathroom
 ‘I don’t know where [I am]. I’m in a bathroom.’

أ: براق، اسمعني، ابني. باوع على يمينك، باوع على يسارك هم. إطلع برا وشوف اي شي حتى اجيك واخذك.

A: Burāq isma‘-ni ibn-i bāw‘ ‘ala
 Burāq listen.IMP.2MSG-1SG son-1SG look.IMP.2MSG on
 yamīn-ak bāw‘ ‘ala ysār-ak **hamm**
 right-2MSG look.IMP.2MSG on left-2MSG **HAMM**
 iṭli‘ barra wa šūf ayy šī ḥatta
 exit.IMP.2MSG outside and see.IMP.2MSG any thing so
 ajī-k wa āxuḏ-ak
 come.PRS.1SG-2MSG and take.PRS.1SG-2MSG
 ‘Burāq, listen to me, my son. Look to your right. Look to your left, too. Go outside and see anything so that I can come and get you.’³¹

The item denoting the location is *ysār* ‘left’. In this particular example, the 2MSG possessive suffix *-ak* is appended to *ysār* rendering *ysār-ak* ‘your (2MSG) left’. *hamm* occurs immediately after *ysār-ak* implying that ‘your left’, is being added (in addition to another location). Drawing upon the prior discourse indicated, we can determine that *ysār-ak* ‘your left’ is being added to *yamīn-ak* ‘your right’. Thus, the implication lent here is ‘look to your left in addition to looking to right.’

³¹ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 20 11:25

This example is particularly interesting because, due to the suffixation of the 2MSG ‘you’ to *ysār*, *hamm* could arguably be focusing a possessive construction, like those seen in 5.3.2.5, as again we are faced with an instance in which a possessive suffix, in this case the 2MSG *-ak*, is appended to a noun. That said, ‘your left’ is the focus of *hamm*, not only because the possessive *-ak* cannot occur on its own and thus cannot occur separately from *ysār*, but because in the prior discourse we have *yamīn-ak* ‘your right’, the item to which *ysār-ak* is being added. The implication lent by *hamm* here is ‘look to your left in addition to looking to your right’. Furthermore, *yamīn* ‘right’ and *ysār* ‘left’ must be definite in this context in Arabic in order to be syntactically correct. In order to be made definite, they can either have the definite article *il-* ‘the’ appended to them (i.e., *il-yamīn* and *il-ysār*, respectively) or a possessive suffix appended to them. Thus, consider the same sentence, but with the possessive suffixes replaced by the definite article:

22)

باوع على اليمين، باوع على اليسار هم.						
bāw‘	‘ala	il-yamīn	bāw‘	‘ala	il-ysār	hamm
look.IMP.2MSG	on	the-right	look.IMP.2MSG	on	the-left	HAMM
‘Look to the left, look to the right, too.’ ³²						

The focus of *hamm* here is *il-ysār* ‘the left’ which is being ‘added’ to *il-yamīn* ‘the right’. Here, the implication lent by *hamm* is ‘look to the right in addition to looking to the left’. It could also be argued that *ysār-ak* in 21) is functioning as the object of a preposition, as, *hamm* occurs immediately after the object of a preposition which it focuses. Thus, in 21), *hamm* comes immediately after *ysār-ak* ‘your left’. ‘your left’ is not only a location or place, but it is also the object of a preposition (in this case ‘*ala* ‘on, over’). However, due to the syntactic constraints of *hamm* illustrated until this point, regardless of the semantic function *ysār-ak* serves here, be it a location, a possessive construction, or an object of a preposition, the position of *hamm* would not be affected.

5.3.2.7 Focusing the Object of a Preposition

Now consider the following in which *hamm* focuses the object of a preposition:

³² Informant data

23)

أ: انت مو وعدتني تأخذني لبطلة ويمبلدون، مو صحيح حبيبي؟

A: inta mu waʿadit-ni tāxuð-ni l-baṭlat
 2MS NEG promise.PST.2MSG-1SG take.PST.2MSG-1SG to-championship
 Wimbildōn mu ṣaḥīḥ ḥabīb-i
 Wimbledon NEG correct dear-1SG
 ‘Didn’t you promise me you’d take me to the Wimbledon championship? Isn’t that right, sweetheart?’

ب: إي، راح اخذچ لأي مكان تريدن، حبييتي واخذچ لويمبلدون هم.

B: ī rāḥ āxuð-ič l-ayy mukān
 yes FUT take.PRS.1SG-2FSG to-any place
 trīdīn ḥabībt-i wa āxuð-ič
 want.PRS.2FSG dear-1SG and take.PRS.1SG-2FSG
 l-wimbildōn **hamm**
 to-Wimbledon HAMM

‘Yes, I will take you to anywhere you like, sweetheart, and I’ll take you to Wimbledon, too.’³³

When focusing the object of a preposition, *hamm* occurs immediately after the object of the preposition (in this particular example *l-* ‘to’ is the preposition’ and *Wimbildōn* ‘Wimbledon’ is the object of the preposition). As per Arabic grammar constraints, the object of a preposition occurs immediately after the preposition. Thus, the interpretation lent here is ‘I’ll take you to Wimbledon in addition to taking you wherever you want.’

5.3.2.8 Focusing a Preposition of Time

It would further seem as though additive *hamm* can focus a preposition of time. When doing so, *hamm*, as we have seen in the other additive examples thus far, immediately follows the preposition of time. Consider:

³³ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 22 3:25

24)

أ: المرة الفاتت احنه چنا متوترين شوية، استاذ عصمت. لا تزعل علينا.

A: il-marra	il-fātat		ihna	činna	mitwattirīn	šwayya
the-time	which-pass.PST.3FSG		we	be.PST.1PL	nervous.PL	a little
ustāḏ	‘Aṣmat	la	tiz‘al		‘allē-na	
mister	‘Aṣmat	NEG	upset.PRS.2MSG		on-1PL	

‘Last time we were a bit nervous, Mr. ‘Aṣmat. Don’t be mad at us.’

ب: ما يحتاج تحچون عن الماضي. من تطرق المصيبة بابنا لازم كنا نباوع عليها. اني گتلكم ذاك اليوم وهسه هم اعيدها.

B: m-ayḥtāj	tiḥčūn	‘an	il-māḏi	min
NEG-need.PRS.3MSG	talk.PRS.2PL	about	the-past	when
tiṭruq	il-muṣība	bāb-na	lāzim	kun-na
knock.PRS.2FSG	the-calamity	door-1SG	must	all-1SG
inbāw‘	‘allē-ha	āni	gitil-kum	
look.PRS.1PL	on-3FSG	1SG	tell.PST.1SG-2PL	
ḏāk	il-yōm	wa	hassa	hamm
that	the-day	and	now	HAMM
				repeat.PRS.1SG-3FSG

‘It’s not necessary for you to talk about the past. When misfortune knocks on our door we must all look at it. I told you that day and I am repeating it now too.’³⁴

In the example in question, *hamm* arises immediately after the preposition of time *hassa* ‘now’, focusing it. The implication lent by *hamm* here is ‘I’m repeating it now too, in addition to having already said it that day in the past’. Let us also consider:

³⁴ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 20 21:20

25)

أ: وينه براق؟

A: wēn-a Burāq
 where-3MSG Burāq
 ‘Where is Burāq?’

ب: براق؟ براق راح يسافر ويه الاصدقاء، يا مدام.

B: Burāq Burāq rāḥ īsāfir wiyya
 Burāq Burāq go.PST.3MSG travel.PRS.3MSG with
 il-iṣḍiqā’ ya madām
 the-friend.PL VOC Madame

‘Burāq? He’s going travelling with his friends, Madame.’

أ: طبعا البارحة ماكو واليوم هم مو موجود. صحيه. اريد اشوفه. مشتاقته.

A: ṭab ‘an il-bārḥa m-āku w-il-yōm **hamm** mu mawjūd
 of course. the-yesterday NEG-there is and-the-day HAMM NEG present
 ṣaḥḥī-h arīd ašūf-a mištāgat-l-a
 wake.IMP.3MSG want.PRS.1SG see.PRS.1SG-3MSG miss-PTCP-to-3MSG
 ‘Of course. Yesterday he wasn’t here and today he isn’t [going to be] here either. Wake him
 up. I want to see him. I miss him.’³⁵

Again, *hamm* immediately follows the preposition of time, in this instance *il-yōm* ‘today’, focusing it. The implication *hamm* lends here is ‘Buraq isn’t [going to be] here today in addition to not having been here yesterday’.

5.3.2.9 The Case of *hamm...hamm...*

There is another instance of *hamm*, seemingly an extension of its additive function, which implies ‘both...and...’, namely *hamm...hamm....*. In such instances, *hamm* occurs immediately before each of the two conjuncts and serves to indicate that the statement being made applies to each conjunct (with the second conjunct being introduced by *wa/ū* ‘and’). It is interesting to note that this construction also exists in Turkish and Persian (*hem...hem...* and *ham....ham....*, respectively), wherein these respective realizations also occur before each conjunct (Kerslake & Göksel 2014:134). In *hamm... hamm...* constructions in Iraqi Arabic, conjuncts can be verbs,

³⁵ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 18 2:40

adjectives, or nouns. Furthermore, it would seem as though the removal of *hamm...hamm...* would have little semantic bearing on the implication of the sentence, with the difference being that the sentence with *hamm...hamm...* contains a more explicit reference to ‘bothness’, while the one without *hamm...hamm...* does not. It is worth noting here that this construction can only imply ‘both...and...’, and that *hamm*, whether used in the construction in question or used only once, cannot imply ‘both (of)’ in the sense of referring to two people or things that are regarded and identified together, for which the non-loaned *iθnēn* ‘two’ is used. Let us consider the following example in which *hamm...hamm...* presents two conjunct verbs:

26)

أ: اني تعبانة، ارتان. احس وكأنو ضايعة وكأنو محد عندي. مرّات اگول لو اني ما شايفة بابا بس اني اشتاگلّه.

A: āni	ta‘abāna	Artān	aḥiss	w-ka’ inū	ḏāy‘a
1SG	tired	Artān	feel.PRS.1SG	and-as if	lost.PTCP.FSG
wa-ka’ inū	ma-ḥadd	‘and-i	marrāt	agūl	lō
and-as if	NEG-one	at-1SG	time.PL	say.PRS.1SG	if
āni	ma	šāyifa	bāba	bass	āni
1SG	NEG	see.PTCP.FSG	dad	but	1SG
aštāg-l-a					
miss.PRS.1SG-to-3MSG					

‘I’m tired, Artān. I feel as though I’m lost, and as if I don’t have anyone. Many times I say ‘if only I hadn’t seen my father’, but I miss him.’

ب: حياتي، هذا كله راح يمر. اني يمج. شنو رايچ؟ تعالي اخذج لبيتنا. هم تغيرين الجو وهم تتعرفين على بابا.

B: ḥayāt-i	hāḏa	kull-a	rāḥ	yimurr
life-1SG	this.3MSG	all-him	FUT	pass.PRS.3MSG
āni	yamm-ič.	šinū	rāyy-ič	ta‘ālī
1SG	next-you.2FSG	what	opinion-your.2FSG	come.IMP.2MFG
axḏ-ič		l-bēt-na	hamm	itgēyirīn
take.PRS.1SG-2FSG		to-house-1PL	HAMM	change.PRS.2FSG
ij-jaw	ū	hamm	tit‘arrufīn	‘ala bāba
the-weather and		HAMM	meet.PRS.2FSG	on dad
‘Sweetheart, all of this will pass. I’m next to you. What do you say? Come, I’ll take you to our house. You’ll get a change of scenery and you’ll get to meet my father.’ ³⁶				

Here we can see that the first instance of *hamm* occurs immediately before *itgēyirīn ij-jaw* ‘you’ll get a change of scenery’ and the second occurs immediately before *tit‘arrufīn ‘ala bāba* ‘you’ll get to meet my father’, and thus both of these constituents are being added, implying ‘you’ll get both a change of scenery and the opportunity to meet my father’. Let us now consider *hamm...hamm...* when presenting two adjectives as alternatives:

³⁶ *il-hārib* (part 2) Episode 39 4:20

27)

اني صرت كلش اتوتر من هاي البنية. لكت واحد مثل الكمر. هم غني وهم وسيم. شخصيته قوية ولحد هسه ما تقبل بيه.

āni	širit	kulliš	atwattar	min	hāy
1SG	become.PST.1SG	very	nervous.PRS.1SG	from	this
il-bnēya	lagat		wāḥid	miθil	il-gumar
the-girl	find.PST.2FSG		one	like	the-moon
hamm	ḡani	ū	hamm	wasīm	
HAMM	rich	and	HAMM	handsome	
šaxšīt-a		qawwīya	ū	li-ḥadd	
personality-3MSG		strong	and	to-limit	
hassa	ma	tiqbal		bi-h	
now	NEG	accept.PRS.3FSG		in-3MSG	

‘This girl makes me very tense. She found a perfect man. He’s both rich and handsome. He has a strong personality and until now she hasn’t accepted him.’³⁷

In this example the speaker places the first instance of *hamm* immediately before *ḡani* ‘rich’ and the second *hamm* immediately before *wasīm* ‘handsome’ to indicate the inclusion of each of these constituents, thus implying ‘He’s both rich and handsome’.

hamm...hamm... constructions can also occur with two nouns as conjuncts:

28)

فقدت هم المحفظة وهم الجواز.

fiqadit	hamm	il-maḥfaḍa	ū	hamm	ij-jawāz
lose.PST.1SG	HAMM	the-wallet	and	HAMM	the-passport

‘I lost both my wallet and my passport.’³⁸

Here there first *hamm* precedes *il-maḥfaḍa* ‘the wallet’ and the second *hamm* precedes *ij-jawāz* ‘the passport’ to indicate that both of the items in question are being referred to (as opposed to just one).

³⁷ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 37 36:00

³⁸ Informant data

5.3.2.10 Conclusion of Section

As has been demonstrated in this section, although *hamm* does indeed serve an additive function as the current literature and definitions provided in Iraqi Arabic grammars and dictionaries claim, bound to this additive function are syntactic constraints which have a significant bearing on the focus it modifies. In short, additive *hamm* focuses the item or phrase immediately preceding it, indicating that this ‘highlighted’ section is the element being added. Additive *hamm* also assumes a rather unique construction, *hamm...hamm...*, which implies ‘both...and...’. Interestingly, as demonstrated in the section above, additive *hamm* occurs only once and focuses a word or phrase by occurring immediately after it. However, in *hamm..hamm...* constructions, as opposed to immediately following the item/phrase it focuses, *hamm* occurs immediately before each of the two conjuncts it modifies.

5.4 Scalar Hamm

Now that *hamm*'s additive function has been explored, let us turn to an analysis of its scalar function, beginning first with an overview of scalar focus particles.

5.4.1 Scalar Focus Particles

Another distinct function of *hamm* is that of a scalar focus particle (i.e., an additive particle which consistently prompts an ordering), similar to the English *even*. It would seem that in instances of scalar *hamm*, *hamm*'s non-loaned (near-) equivalent is *ḥatta*, which implies 'even; in order to; and, until'. Dictionary definitions of the Standard Arabic *ḥatta* define the term in question as follows: '(prep.) until, till, up to, as far as; (conj.; with perf.) until, till; (with subj.) until, that, so that, in order that; — (particle) even, eventually even; and even; (with preceding negation) not even, and be it only— *ḥatta law* even if' (Wehr 1979:183) and this is its function in Iraqi Arabic, as well. That said, scalar *hamm* only seems to alternate with *ḥatta* in regards to its implication of 'even'— scalar *hamm* does not encapsulate the full range of semantic implications that are lent by *ḥatta*. In order to demonstrate the division of labor between the two items in question, references to and comparisons with *ḥatta* will be made where relevant; a brief syntactic and semantic exploration of *ḥatta* will be presented, before moving on to a more specific analysis of *hamm* in particular. As the focus of the present chapter is on the functions of *hamm*, the analysis of *ḥatta* should not be regarded as an in-depth or exhaustive investigation.

To better understand *hamm*'s scalar function, let us turn to an overview of scalar implicature and scalar reasoning. In order to set forth a precise definition of scalar implicatures, Gazdar (1979) defines a 'scale' as 'a set of contrastive expressions of the same category, which can be arranged in a linear order according to their semantic strength' (König 1991:39). Seuren (1988) classifies words like *even* as 'presupposition triggers'. A rough characterization of the notion 'presupposition' is that through the usage of particular constructions or expressions a speaker sets forth particular propositions as being established or taken for granted by the hearer, for instance *Can you even speak French?* wherein *even* suggests the speaker's 'presupposition' that the hearer cannot, in fact, speak French (König 1991:54). We will follow Seuren (1988), Burton-Roberts (1989), and König (1991) in analyzing the semantic notion of presupposition. That is, presuppositions are treated as systematic properties of types of sentences as opposed to

incidental properties of tokens of utterances (König 1991:54). Particles like *even* ‘trigger the presupposition that there is an alternative value under consideration that satisfies the open sentence in the scope of the particle’ (König 1991:55). Moreover, *even*’s evaluative focus value ranks high. To simplify this, we will follow Karttunen & Peters (1979) and König (1991) in viewing scale in terms of likelihood: ‘the focus value of *even* is characterized as the most unlikely to satisfy the open sentence in the scope of the particle’ (König 1991:56). This means that scalar particles prompt an order for the value of the focus particle and the alternatives under consideration in a particular statement also convey an evaluation (König 1991:43). Consider the following example containing *even* (König 1991:57):

29) Harry believes that even Kohl will be eloquent.

If one were to utter this statement, the belief that Kohl is the least likely individual to be eloquent can either be attributed to Harry or the speaker (König 1991:57). On account of this seemingly deictic character of evaluations, König (1991) analyzes evaluations as conventional implicatures and draws a sharp distinction between evaluations and presuppositions. In short, a presupposition expressed by a scalar particle is an implied assumption concerning the world or background belief pertaining to an utterance whose veracity is presumed, while an evaluation is not a truth-conditional aspect of meaning (König 1991:56). For the present work, we are only concerned with presuppositions, as this is the concept that is expressed by scalar *hamm*.

We will now draw upon Israel (2011:235-237) to discuss an aspect related to scalar implicature, namely scalar reasoning. Scalar reasoning, which relies on an ability to consider a situation with respect to other potential situations, and to consequently draw inferences about potential situations on such bases, is not a linguistic phenomenon, but rather a general, non-logical, conceptual ability dependent on a type of scalar construal ability. Rather than manipulating objective facts to uncover legitimate implications, scalar reasoning involves a form of cognitive pattern completion developed from the manner in which a given type of situation is interpreted. As a result, pragmatic factors, which impact on how a given sentence will be inferred in context, are more influential in establishing whether a particular sentence supports a scalar interpretation than are referential or logical properties. The manner in which a proposition containing a scalar particle may be understood can be split into two types: scalar construal, when it is understood as contrasting with other propositions in a scalar model, or as a simple construal,

when it simply expresses information about a given situation. Consider for example *Al ate the cow tongue*. An utterance like this would generally receive a simple construal, in which the hearer interprets it as conveying information about a sole act of eating cow tongue on the part of a sole individual. However, with appropriate background assumptions/prior knowledge and when occurring in the right context, the same exact sentence could also generate scalar inferences.

As cow tongue is not common to the American or British palate and is generally perceived as a more ‘exotic’ food, the implication here could easily be interpreted as a remark on Al’s lack of inhibition when it comes to eating food. This type of interpretation would likely necessitate a context in which a selection of foods is available, and cow tongue is considered the least likely to be appealing. Thus, given this context, such a sentence could imply that Al was daring enough to taste everything, including the least appealing of the offerings. It should be noted that, at least in its orthographical representation, *Al ate the cow tongue*, does not possess any explicit markers for either a simple or structural construal.

A scalar construal could be ‘forced’ on any basic sentence, by, for example, indicating the focus prosodically by using a fall-rise intonation on the determined scalar focus. Another way would be to insert a scalar focus particle (e.g., *even*) either immediately preceding the intended scalar focus (*Al*, *ate*, or *the cow tongue*), or it could be placed immediately before the verb, in which case the focus can be any of the three possibilities. Moreover, it is necessary that a given scalar construal ‘be compatible with the information structure of the context in which it occurs’. Thus, let us consider the examples below:

30) Even Al ate the cow tongue.

31) Al ate even the cow tongue.

A sentence comprising a subject focus like that in 30) can serve as an answer to *Who ate the cow tongue*, however it cannot serve as an answer to *What did Al eat?*; whereas a sentence containing a focus like that found in 31) can only answer the latter of these two questions. As words like *Al* and *cow tongue* do not characteristically conflict with an ordered group of alternatives on a conceptual scale, they cannot force a scalar construal by themselves, although polarity items (i.e., scalar operators that describe an intangible entity with regard to a particle set of alternatives as ranked on a conceptual scale) do. Furthermore, polarity items, as scalar operators, inflict a scalar construal on how a given sentence is interpreted, and, consequently, they necessitate that the

pragmatic context and the scalar construal they inflict be compatible with one another. The choice between a simple and scalar construal is essentially pragmatic in nature, as, in general, scalar construal is dependent on the manner in which the content of a sentence is incorporated into a larger propositional context. However, a scalar construal, unlike an implicature, for instance, is a manner of retrieving expressed content, as opposed to being a type of expressed propositional content in and of itself; it is a way of saying something, and not something that can be said or implicated. As a result, the presence of a scalar operator can grammatically constrain a scalar construal, although scalar construals are effectively pragmatic in nature. *Even* brings about scalar implicature and the value of *even* is generally associated, on a likelihood scale, as the lowest ranked element. Consider the following examples containing *even* and the implications they lend:

32) Even Ann was able to reach the top shelf.

(Ann is short, and it would not be expected for her to be able to reach the top shelf.)

33) Even Ann wasn't able to reach the top shelf.

(Ann is tall, and it would be expected that she would be able to reach the top shelf.)

Now that adequate background on scalar implicature has been provided, we shall now turn to an exploration of scalar implicature as it occurs in Iraqi Arabic specifically.

5.4.2 Analysis

First, a brief overview of the manner in which scalar *hatta* functions will be presented, followed by a more in-depth explanation of scalar *hamm*. It should be noted that the analysis presented here revealed a significant amount of overlap and apparent interchangeability between *hatta* and scalar *hamm* in terms of both syntax and semantics— semantically and syntactically these two items function seemingly identically, although no stringent claims can be made regarding pragmatics, frequency of use, sociolinguistic implications, or other factors which may prompt a speaker of Iraqi Arabic to select one form over the other. Nonetheless, it can certainly be said that *hatta* and scalar *hamm* differ in terms of register, with the former being non-loaned and more standard and the latter being loaned and more colloquial. Due to the seeming interchangeability of these two items, only a few examples of scalar *hatta* will be presented here,

for the sake of illustration. It should be noted that scalar particles are a type of additive particle, the main differentiating factor between scalar particles and what we referred to above as ‘additive particles’ is that the former prompts an ordering (scale) for the values in question and the latter indicates the addition of a property (König 1991:37-38). Thus, any distinctions made between scalar and additive particles mean the distinction in this sense, and not that scalar *hamm* is not an additive particle. Let us now compare scalar *hatta* and scalar *hamm*.

5.4.2.1 Scalar *hatta* vs. Scalar *hamm*

When functioning as a scalar particle, *hatta*, like *hamm*, occurs immediately before the item or clause it seeks to emphasize—this highlighted part brings about a surprising focus value, that is, the use of *hatta* implies that the highlighted part is, at least on the part of the speaker, unexpected to occur. Scalar *hamm* can be distinguished from *hamm*’s other functions in that, with scalar *hamm*, *hamm* immediately precedes the item or phrase it modifies, while with additive *hamm*, for instance, it occurs immediately after the modified constituent. Such variation in syntactic placement seems to be obligatory in both cases, save for the additive construction *hamm...hamm...* ‘both... and...’ in which each conjunct occurs immediately before the focused element, a syntactic exception which appears to be a result of borrowing the Irano-Turkic *hem...hem...* construction (bearing the same implication) along with its associated syntax.

It is understood that one could see an instance of scalar *hamm* and posit that it is actually serving an additive function, as opposed to a scalar one, thus, for illustrative purposes, let us consider the distinction between the English additive *too* vs. the scalar *even*: *John also reads SHAKESPEARE* vs. *John even reads SHAKESPEARE* (König 1991:37). *Even* is an additive particle, and both of these sentences in question imply that John reads authors other than Shakespeare. However, there is a clear distinction between the implications of the two particles, namely *also* indicates the addition of a property, while *even* prompts an ordering (scale) for the values in question (König 1991:37-38). The values included by *even* are regarded as ranking lower than the value provided, and, this ordering, in many contexts, can be expressed in terms of likelihood (König 1991:38). The values included by *even* are the more likely candidates for the variable of the relevant open sentence (i.e., *John reads X*), and, depending on the value replacing the variable, becomes either true or false. As a result, the focus value is characterized

as an unexpected or surprising one. The example with *even* therefore implies that Shakespeare is difficult to read (König 1991:38).

Turning to the distinction between scalar *hamm* and emphatic *hamm*, although they both precede the constituents they seek to modify, context solves any possible ambiguity of the modal reading lent by *hamm*— in scalar contexts, a surprising or unexpected focus value is brought about, while in emphatic contexts, an air of intensification is lent. As for *hamm*'s function as a concessive cancellative discourse marker, this function is easily distinguishable from *hamm*'s other functions as concessive cancellative *hamm* occurs in a Y clause in order to cancel the X clause (see section 5.6). Now let us investigate the manner in which *ḥatta* highlights a subject:

34)

اسمعي. هاي الطاولة كل النواب گاعدين بيها وحتى مدير الامن گاعد وياهم.					
ismaʿī	hāy	iṭ-ṭāwila	kull	il-nuwāb	gāʿidīn
listen.IMP.2FSG	this	the-table	every	the-representative.PL	sitting.PTCP.MPL
bī-ha	wa	ḥatta	mudīr	il-aman	gāʿid
in-3FSG	and	ḤATTA	director	the-security	sitting.PTCP.MSG
wiyyā-hum					
with-3MPL					

‘Listen, all of the representatives are sitting at this table, even the security director.’³⁹

We can see here that *ḥatta* immediately precedes *mudīr il-aman* ‘the security director’. Through his employment of *ḥatta*, the speaker implies that he did not anticipate the security director’s attendance. Now let us consider the manner in which *ḥatta* highlights an object by occurring immediately before it:

³⁹ Informant data

35)

زوجته ترفض تذب شي بالزباله حتى الطماسة الفاسدة.

zajwt-a tirfuḏ itḏibb šī b-iz-zibāla **ḥatta**
 wife-3MSG refuse.PRS.3FSG throw.PRS.3FSG thing in-the-trash ḤATTA
 iṭ-ṭamāṭa il-fāsida
 the-tomato.PL the-rotten

‘His wife refuses to throw anything in the trash, even rotten tomatoes.’⁴⁰

ḥatta, in this particular instance, occurs immediately before *iṭ-ṭamāṭa il-fāsida* ‘the rotten tomatoes’, and implies that the subject refuses to throw anything in the trash including rotten tomatoes. As rotten tomatoes are typically thrown away, that the subject refuses to dispose of them brings about, through the use of *ḥatta*, an unexpected focus value. Also consider:

36)

شلون نثق باعلام يكذب حتى على المرجعية؟

šlōn inṭiq b-i‘alām yikaḏḏib **ḥatta** ‘ala il-marja‘īya
 how trust.PRS.1PL in-media lie.PRS.3MSG ḤATTA on the-clergy

‘How can we trust a media source that lies even about the Shi’a clergy?’⁴¹

The Shi’a clergy is the highest level of Shi’a authority (after the Qur’an, prophets, and imams) which, within the confines of Islamic law, makes legal decisions for adherents of Shi’a Islam. Given the reverence encapsulating the Shi’a clergy, adherents of Shi’a Islam hold the clergy in high regard, considering the clergy members to be honest, honorable, and God-fearing beings. Thus, lying about the clergy, or even speaking ill of them, would be regarded as blasphemous and would consequently bring about a surprising or unexpected focus value. Through the use of *ḥatta* the speaker is making a remark on the media source’s credibility, emphasizing that they blaspheme against the highest-regarded religious authority. Such interpretation would likely necessitate a context in which the speaker and the addressee are Shi’a Muslims, and, given such context, such an utterance could imply that the media source lies about a range of matters making it not credible, and that lying about the clergy completely, in the eyes of adherents of

⁴⁰ Informant data

⁴¹ Informant data

Shi'a Islam, eradicates any credibility the media source may have had. Emphatic *hamm* and *hatta* are interchangeable with each other on the semantic and syntactic level. To illustrate this, consider example 36 again and simply replace *hatta* with *hamm*:

37)

شلون نثق باعلام يكذب هم على المرجعية؟

šlōn	inθiq	b-i'alām	yikaððib	hamm	‘ala	il-marja'īya
how	trust.PRS.1PL	in-media	lie.PRS.3MSG	HAMM	on	the-clergy

‘How can we trust a media source that lies even about the clergy?’⁴²

Now that we have explored an overview of the manner in which scalar *hamm*'s non-loaned counterpart, *hatta*, functions and how its syntactic placement influences what aspect of the sentence it focuses, let us explore the manner in which the loaned *hamm* functions in scalar contexts. *hamm*, when serving a scalar function, like its non-loaned counterpart, occurs immediately before the word or phrase it highlights. It can highlight a range of different elements, and the addition of *hamm* to a sentence makes a clear difference in the interpretation of that sentence. For illustrative purposes, first consider a sentence that does not contain *hamm*:

38)

علي نجح بالامتحان.

‘Ali	nijaḥ	b-il-imtiḥān
‘Ali	succeed.PST.3MSG	in-the-exam

‘‘Ali passed the exam.’’⁴³

The implication lent here is simply ‘‘Ali passed the exam’’, and, as there is no inclusion of *hamm*, no surprising or unexpected focus value is brought about. Through the utterance in question, no judgment is made regarding any expectation or anticipation that ‘Ali would pass. Consider the same sentence, but this time with the inclusion of *hamm*:

⁴² Informant data

⁴³ Informant data

39)

هم علي نجح بالامتحان.

hamm ‘Ali nijah b-il-imtiḥān

HAMM ‘Ali succeed.PST.3MSG in-the-exam

‘Even ‘Ali passed the exam.’⁴⁴

If a speaker were to utter 38), he may mean nothing more than a neutral piece of information that ‘Ali passed the exam. In the same context, however, if he were to utter 39), the use of *hamm* would clearly imply some additional information, roughly: people apart from ‘Ali passed the exam; ‘Ali’s passing was contrary to expectation; and ‘Ali was not as likely to pass the exam as the others who passed were. Simply, if the utterance containing *hamm* is U and the proposition conveyed by this utterance minus *hamm* is U*, then it could be said that an utterance of U suggests that at least one other proposition, U_j, which only differs from U* in the element in the focus of *hamm* in U, is both true and less surprising than U*. An implication that not-U* was expected in the circumstances is also possible. Now that a basic overview of scalar implicature has been forth, let us now turn to a more detailed analysis of scalar *hamm* and the syntactic and semantic constraints by which it is bound.

5.4.2.2 Focusing a Subject

When focusing a subject, scalar *hamm* occurs immediately before the subject, consider:

40)

هم الشيوخ عندهم فيس.

hamm iṣ-šuyūx ‘and-hum fēs

HAMM the-sheikh.PL at-3MPL Facebook

‘Even the sheikhs have Facebook.’⁴⁵

As ‘sheikh’ is an Arabic title for prominent Islamic leaders or clerics and that sheikhs are revered in the Arab world, it would seem as though, through the use of *hamm*, the speaker is making a remark on the popularity and prevalence of Facebook, and it would further seem to imply a scale of the likelihood of certain types of people to have Facebook accounts: Facebook is so

⁴⁴ Informant data

⁴⁵ Informant data

widespread that even sheikhs, revered Islamic leaders/clerics whose status as a religious figure separates them from the average person and are thus considered less likely to participate in worldly activities like social media, have Facebook accounts. We can contend that instances such as these are instances of scalar *hamm* as opposed to additive *hamm* because of the syntactic placement of *hamm* and the context (which clearly points to a surprising or unexpected focus value)—there is no indication of addition, emphasis, or cancellation.

5.4.2.3 Focusing an Object

Scalar *hamm*, when focusing the object of a sentence, immediately precedes said object, consider:

41)

						الاجانب كلشي ياكلون هم لحم الخنزير.	
il-ajānib	kull	šī	yāklūn	hamm	laḥm	il-xanzīr	
the-foreigner.PL	every	thing	eat.PRS.3PL	HAMM	meat	the-pig	
‘Foreigners (i.e., not Arabs) eat everything even pork.’ ⁴⁶							

As pork meat is considered ‘unclean’ and the consumption of it forbidden according to Islamic dietary laws, the implication lent by *hamm* here appears to be a remark on the lack of the subject’s inhibition when it comes to observing religious doctrine. This type of interpretation would likely necessitate a context in which the subject is Muslim, and thus such an utterance could imply that the subject participates in a range of activities that are considered forbidden according to religious laws on a scale of least offensive to most offensive and that the consumption of pork is considered among the worst sins for a Muslim to commit. Given such context, the use of *hamm* here brings about a surprising or unexpected focus value.

5.4.2.4 Focusing a Prepositional Phrase

In order to focus a prepositional phrase, scalar *hamm* occurs immediately before it, consider:

⁴⁶ Informant data

hamm	b-ankaltra	yilibsūn	dišdāša
HAMM	in-England	wear.PRS.3PL	dishdasha

‘Even in England they wear dishdashas.’⁴⁷

As *dishdashas*, traditional long robes with long sleeves worn by men in the Arabian Peninsula and Iraq, are not common to the western wardrobe and are generally regarded as a more ‘exotic’ and ‘oriental’ garment, it would seem that the speaker is commenting on the subjects’ lack of effort when it comes to assimilating, suggesting that there is a scale concerning the appropriateness of wearing a *dishdasha* in certain countries (with Iraq and the countries in the Arabian Peninsula being at the more appropriate end of the scale and England being at the more inappropriate end of the scale). It would further seem that the interpretation lent by such an utterance is that *dishdashas* comprise the staple of the subjects’ wardrobe, so much so that the subjects wear them regardless of the societal clothing norms of their host country.

5.4.2.5 Focusing a Hypothetical Construction

Another construction in which *hamm* occurs in Iraqi Arabic is *hamm lō...* ‘even if...’ which seems to alternate with the non-loaned *hatta lō...* *hamm lō...* is used in conditional statements and refers to a hypothetical situation which may or may not come to be fulfilled, or a hypothetical situation in the past contrary to fact. The *hamm lō...* construction tends to occur in bipartite clauses, with the *hamm lō...* clause (the X clause) presenting the hypothetical scenario, and the other clause (the Y clause) presenting the result. However, the various possible constructions of the Y clause are not pertinent to us for the purposes of the current work, as the semantics and syntax of the Y clause are not constrained by the semantics and pragmatics of the X clause, and therefore should be thought of as two separate clauses which just happen to occur in the same sentence. In the *hamm lō...* construction, *hamm lō...* tends to occur at the very head of the sentence and occurs immediately before the word or phrase it focuses. *hamm lō...* implies that whether something is the case or not, the result would be unaffected, consider:

⁴⁷ Informant data

43)

هم لو حلوة ميخالف همزين انتي مو حلوة.

hamm	<i>lō</i>	<i>ḥalwa</i>	<i>ma-yxālif</i>	<i>hammzēn</i>	<i>inti</i>
HAMM	if	pretty	NEG-to differ.3MSG	good thing	2FSG
mu	<i>ḥalwa</i>				
NEG	pretty				

‘Even if you were pretty, it wouldn’t matter, good thing you aren’t pretty.’⁴⁸

The implication is that the person to whom the speaker is referring is not pretty, but that even if she were pretty, it would not make any difference to the speaker. Now that the manner in which *hamm* can evoke a scalar function has been analyzed, let us turn to a brief summary of scalar *hamm*.

5.4.2.6 Conclusion of Section

As has been illustrated above, scalar *hamm* brings about a surprising or unexpected focus value and also presents a degree of scale. It was also demonstrated that scalar *hamm* alternates with the non-loaned *ḥatta* and these two items appear to be bound by the same syntactic and semantic constraints and are thus interchangeable, at least on a semantic/syntactic level. It was further outlined that in scalar contexts *hamm* and *ḥatta* occur immediately before the items they focus and are both bound by strict semantic and syntactic rules. Finally, scalar *hamm* can occur in conditional statements wherein it refers to a hypothetical situation which may or may not come to be fulfilled, or a hypothetical situation in the past contrary to fact.

5.5 The *hamm* of Emphasis

Let us continue our analysis with an explanation of *hamm* as it functions in emphatic contexts, beginning first with an overview of intensifiers.

⁴⁸ Informant data

5.5.1 Intensifiers

An interesting trait of *hamm* is that in certain instances it serves a distinct function as an intensifier, used solely for emphatic purposes. That is, in such contexts it cannot be translated as ‘too’, ‘as well’, ‘either’, ‘even’, or ‘nevertheless’, as doing so would render the translation inaccurate, rather it merely lends emphasis, implying something along the lines of ‘seriously’ or ‘really’. Comparing this function of *hamm* to its non-loaned (near-)equivalent(s) is a complex matter, as the use of intensifiers tends to be associated with nonstandard language varieties and colloquial usage (Ito & Tagliamonte 2003:260). For example, Ito & Tagliamonte (2003:260-261) point out that Stoffel states that intensifiers are ‘exceedingly numerous’ in ‘vulgar parlance and in the dialects’ (1901:122), and Fries (1940:204-5) breaks up a collection of intensifiers in American English into ‘vulgar’ as opposed to ‘standard’ forms, with words including *real*, *so*, and *pretty* being attributed to ‘vulgar’ English, and *very*, amongst others, being attributed to ‘standard’ English. That said, the analysis indicates that the implication lent by emphatic *hamm* is similar to that of the non-loaned *şudug*.

Defining the term *intensifier* has proved to be a difficult task, and the terminology used to refer to intensifiers is not always uniform (Ito & Tagliamonte 2003:258). Stoffel (1901) refers to them as ‘intensive adverbs’, Bolinger (1972:18) calls them ‘degree words’ and does not separate them from downtoners, and Quirk et. al (1985:567) term them ‘amplifiers’, while Ito & Tagliamonte (2003:258) call them ‘intensifiers’. Bolinger (1972:17) describes these intensifiers as ‘those adverbs that maximize or boost meaning. In other words, these are adverbs that scale a quality up’.

Quirk et al. (1985) divide intensifiers into three semantic categories: *amplifiers* (which scale upwards from a presumed norm), *downtoners* (which scale downwards and typically lower the effect of the force of the items it is modifying), and *emphasizers* (which denote a general heightening effect on the item it is modifying), whereas according to Ito & Tagliamonte (2003) there are two semantic categories— ‘intensifiers and downtoners’ and they further split intensives into ‘maximizers’ (e.g., ‘extremely’, ‘completely’, ‘absolutely’) and ‘boosters’ (e.g., ‘really’, ‘very’) (p. 258). Tagliamonte & Roberts (2005:280) define intensifiers as ‘adverbs that boost or maximize’ and present the following examples:

- 44) I think it's **pretty** exciting.
- 45) Oh, Janine, the **really** hot dancer girl.
- 46) Trust me, it was actually—it was **very** funny.
- 47) And this is **so** weird.
- 48) Well, Frank has to quit college because his **super** fertile girlfriend is having three babies!

For the purposes of this study, intensifiers are modifiers which do not contribute to the propositional meaning of a clause, but rather serve to enhance and provide supplementary emotional context to the word or constituent they modify; intensifiers are not a proper lexical category in and of themselves. For the present work, we are only concerned with intensifiers as 'boosters', as based on the analyses of the data, this is the manner in which *hamm* functions in Iraqi Arabic.

The examples below demonstrate *hamm*'s function as an intensifier. In these examples, *hamm* merely implies emphasis, and were it to be removed, the implications lent by the statements would remain intact, however without an air of emphasis. It should be noted that some of the examples provided could have more than one implication, although such discrepancies seem to arise in an effort to accurately convey their interpretation in English. The scope of this study, however, is to explore the items under analysis and to uncover the implications that they lend. As stated, the translations in this study are provided solely for illustrative purposes, and thus we must not let them cloud our perception of their Arabic implications.

Although the additive and scalar functions of *hamm* appear to have clear syntactic constraints which bind their foci as well as their syntactic implications (as was illustrated in sections 5.3.2.2-5.4.2.6), it would seem that emphatic *hamm* cannot definitively focus a particular constituent of a sentence, as stress, in combination with emphatic *hamm*, plays a large role in marking just exactly which constituent is being intensified. Since the present work only treats semantics and syntax, stress will not be treated—only an overview of the syntactic/semantic constraints of *hamm* will be made based on examples wherein the constituent being intensified is arguably apparent from the context and prior discourse.

There are two main factors signifying *hamm*'s function as an intensifier, namely syntactic placement and context. As the examples below illustrate, emphatic *hamm* occurs immediately before the word or clause it intensifies, while additive *hamm* occurs immediately after the word or phrase it focuses. Furthermore, in instances of additive *hamm* the prior discourse indicates the element being 'added', whereas in instances of emphatic *hamm*, there is no indication, or any reason to believe, that anything is being 'added', and thus, *hamm* must serve a function other than that of addition.

There are also clear indicators pointing to a sharp distinction between emphatic *hamm* and scalar *hamm*. Despite indeed being the case that both emphatic *hamm* and scalar *hamm* occur in the same syntactic environment (both preceding the items or clauses they modify), in instances of emphatic *hamm*, the context supports a notion of emphasis. Instances of scalar *hamm* possess no such emphatic context, but rather possess an implication that an event, which is regarded by the speaker as being surprising or unlikely, will come about.

5.5.2 Analysis

Let us begin our analysis of *hamm*'s function as an intensifier with an overview of its non-loaned counterpart *şudug*.

5.5.2.1 şudug vs. Emphatic hamm

Although emphatic *hamm* indeed alternates with the non-loaned *şudug*, this is only the case in certain contexts, as *şudug* has a larger semantic and syntactic range than does *hamm*. One of the most distinguishing features of *şudug* is that it can occur independently in declarative and interrogative statements (much like the English *really* or *seriously*) whereas emphatic *hamm* cannot occur on its own in any context. The discussion of *şudug* that will now be set forth principally seeks to highlight the differentiating features of *şudug*, that is the instances in which *şudug* can occur but emphatic *hamm* cannot, as, save for these highlighted salient differentiating features, these two items appear to be, more or less, interchangeable. Our exploration of *şudug* should not be considered exhaustive, but rather serves to better elucidate the divisions of labor between it and emphatic *hamm*. Let us first consider the manner in which *şudug* can occur in isolation (i.e., as the only item in a statement or clause), prior to the sentence or statement it seeks to emphasize:

49)

أ: شوف اگولك، سرحات. ليش ما تجي تشتغل عندي ونخلص من هاي العداوة ونشتغل سوى؟ وراح نحقق اهوايه ارباح.

A: šūf agūl-ak Sarḥāt lēš ma tiji
 look.IMP.2MSG tell.PRS.1SG-2MSG Sarḥāt why NEG come.PRS.2MSG
 tištuḡḡul ‘and-i wa nixluṣ min hāy il-‘adāwa
 work.PRS.2MSG at-1SG and save.PRS.1PL from this the-antagonism
 wa ništuḡḡul suwa wa rāḥ inḥaqqaq hiwāya arbāḥ
 and work.PRS.1PL together and FUT achieve.PRS.1PL a lot profit.PL
 ‘Look, Serhat. Why don’t you come work for me and we drop this hostility and work together? We’ll earn a lot of profits.’

ب: امبين صاير تنسى ابسرعة موتك هو هم غاية عندي.

B: imbayyin šāyir tinsa ib-sura‘a mōt-ak
 it seems be.PTCP.MSG forget.PRS.2MSG with-speed death-2MSG
 huwa hamm ḡāya ‘and-i
 3MSG still destination at-1SG
 ‘It seems you’ve quickly started to forget that I still want to kill you.’

أ: صدگ؟ بس اكيد انت فرحت من شفتني عايش.

A: **šudug** bass akīd inta firaḥit min
 ŠUDUG? but certainly 2MSG happy.PST.2MSG when
 šifit-ni ‘āyiš
 see.PST.2MSG-1SG alive.PTCP.MSG
 ‘Really? But certainly you were happy when you saw me alive.’⁴⁹

Here, *šudug* occurs on its own in an interrogative statement, implying ‘really?’ or ‘seriously?’ It occurs in response to B’s declaration that he still wishes to kill A. In A’s response to this statement, A utters *šudug* to express surprise, as if B’s statement was unexpected by A.

There are also instances of emphatic *šudug* occurring at the very end of a statement, intensifying the statement that precedes it— a seeming extension of isolated *šudug*, consider:

⁴⁹ *il-hārib* (part 2) Episode 28 15:30

50)

صح رجال مثقف دكتور نتمنى يسوي شي ويخدم العراق صدغ.

ṣaḥ	rijāl	muṯaqqaf	doktōr	nitmanna	yisawwi
correct	man	cultured	doctor	wish.PRS.1PL	do.PRS.3MSG
ṣī	wa	yixdam	il-‘Irāq	ṣudug	
thing	and	serve.PRS.3MSG	the-‘Irāq	ṢUDUG	

‘True, he [the prime minister] is an educated man, a doctor. We hope he does something to serve Iraq, seriously.’⁵⁰

ṣudug’s occurrence at the very end of the statement in question intensifies the speaker’s hope that the subject does something to serve Iraq. In such instances, *ṣudug* occurs as a type of ‘after thought’, in that, in speech, there is generally a distinct pause between the last word of the sentence or phrase and *ṣudug*. As a result, this type of *ṣudug* behaves as *ṣudug* does when occurring in isolation, and as *hamm* cannot occur in isolation, *hamm* cannot occur in contexts such as that presented in this example.

Another attribute of *ṣudug* which is not shared by emphatic *hamm* is that *ṣudug* can function as a noun, implying ‘truth’. Consider:

⁵⁰ Informant data

51)

سمعت خبر يگول الناجحين من الدور الاول ينضافلهم على كل مادة 5 درجات. واحد يعرف هذا الخبر صدگ لو چذب؟

sima‘it	xabir	yigūl	in-nājihīn		
hear.PRS.1SG	information	say.PRS.3MSG	the-succeed.PTCP.MPL		
min id-dōr	il-‘awwal	yinqāf	il-hum	‘ala	kull
from the-round	the-first	add.PRS.3MSG	to-3MPL	on	every
māda xamsit	darajāt	wāhid	yi‘aruf		hāḏa
section five	mark.PL	one	know.PRS.3MSG		this
il-xabir	şudug	lō	čiḏib		
the-information	SUDUG	or	lie		

‘I heard that those who passed the first round will get five bonus points. Does anyone know if this information is true or false [lit. a truth or a lie]?’⁵¹

In this instance, *şudug* does not highlight or modify a particular constituent, rather it functions like a noun and is employed by the speaker to enquire about the veracity of a piece of information.

Although both *hamm* and *şudug* can intensify a particular word or clause, it seems that *hamm*’s syntactic placement is more or less confined to the position immediately preceding the highlighted aspect, however *şudug* has much more syntactic fluidity. The examples of *şudug* that have been explored thus far highlighted the syntactic/semantic environments differentiating *şudug* from *hamm*, i.e., we discussed the manners in which *şudug* can occur but emphatic *hamm* cannot. For the sake of comparison let us explore a behavior of *şudug* that is seemingly interchangeable with emphatic *hamm*, for instance, when *şudug* immediately precedes the intensified part of the statement:

⁵¹ Informant data

52)

اني اريد اطلّك. ما اگدر استمر وياك بعد. صدگ ما اگدر ابقی.

āni	arīd	aṭallig	ma	agdar	astamirr
1SG	want.PRS.1SG	divorce.PRS.1SG	NEG	can.PRS.1SG	continue.PRS.1SG
wiyyā-k	ba‘ad	ṣudug	ma	agdar	abqa
with-2MSG	anymore	ṢUDUG	NEG	can.PRS.1SG	stay.PRS.1SG

‘I want a divorce. I can’t continue with you anymore. Seriously, I can’t stay.’⁵²

Here, the speaker employs *ṣudug* to strengthen and emphasize her statement to her husband that she wants a divorce and cannot continue with him. As the inclusion of *ṣudug* serves to intensify the statement, the removal of *ṣudug* would remove the emphasis lent by it. *ṣudug* can be replaced by *hamm* in the above example and the emphatic implication would be maintained, consider:

53)

هم ما اگدر ابقی.

hamm	ma	agdar	abqa
HAMM	NEG	can.PRS.1SG	stay.PRS.1SG

‘Seriously, I can’t stay.’⁵³

Now that an overview of *ṣudug* and *hamm* has been set forth and that we have a clear idea of their divisions of labor, let us turn to an analysis of emphatic *hamm* specifically.

5.5.2.2 Intensifying a Noun

When intensifying a noun, *hamm* occurs immediately before said noun, consider:

⁵² *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 20 26:25

⁵³ Informant data

54)

اضْرِبْهُ. اقْوَى. اقْوَى. يلا براق ابسرعة.				
uḏrub-a	uḏrub-a	aqwa	aqwa	yalla
hit.IMP.2MSG-3MSG	hit.IMP.2MSG-3MSG	harder	harder	come on
Burāq	ib-sura'a			
Burāq	with-speed			
'Hit him. Hit him. Harder. Harder. Come on Burāq, quickly.'				
The speaker pulls man Buraq is fighting aside				

تعال، يلا جبان. انت هم رجال؟				
ta'āl	yalla	jabān	inta hamm	rijāl
come.IMP.2MSG	come on	coward	2MSG HAMM	man
'Come here, come on, coward. Are you really a man?' ⁵⁴				

Here it would seem that *hamm* adds supplementary emphasis. If *hamm* were to be removed, we would be left with *inta rijāl?* 'Are you a man?', a rather neutral statement wherein the speaker is neither making implicit nor explicit insinuations about the addressee's masculinity. However, through the inclusion of emphatic *hamm* in an interrogative statement, based on the perceived cowardice of the addressee, the speaker questions the addressee's masculinity, and thus seeks clarification 'are you really a man?' Although syntactically the placement of emphatic *hamm* here mimics that of additive *hamm*, we can rule out the possibility of this instance of *hamm* lending an additive reading on account of the context. For instance, in the example in question, the speaker, just before uttering the sentence containing *hamm*, addressed the hearer as *jabān* 'coward'. The use of this item serves as further evidence that the speaker is indeed questioning the addressee's masculinity. Moreover, there is no indication that anything is being added.

⁵⁴ *il-hārib* (part 2) Episode 5 41:30

5.5.2.3 Intensifying an Adjective

55)

أ: اوف اوف اوف. شوف الناس وين ساكنين واحنه وين ساكنين. هذول امنين يجيبون كل هاي الفلوس؟

A:	ūf	ūf	ūf	šūf	in-nās	wēn	sāknīn	wa
	FIL	FIL	FIL	look.IMP.2MSG	the-people	where	live.PTCP.MPL	and
	iḥna		wēn	sāknīn	haḏōl	im-nēn	yijībūn	
	1PL		where	live.PTCP.MPL	those	from-where	bring.PRS.3MPL	
	kull		hāy	il-flūs?				
	all		this	the-money.PL				

‘Oof, oof, oof. Look at where these people live and where we live. Where did they get all this money from?’

ب: انت شعليك يا اخي؟ انطيني اللي بيدك وروح.

B:	inta	š- ‘allē-k	ya	ax-ī?	intī-ni
	2MSG	what-on-2MSG	VOC	brother-1SG	give.IMP.2MSG-1SG
	illi	b-īd-ak		u-rūḥ	
	which	in-hand-2MSG		and-go.IMP.2MSG	

‘What business is that of yours, my brother? Give me what’s in your hand and go.’

أ: اه. هم صحيح.

A:	ah	hamm	ṣaḥīḥ
	FIL	HAMM	correct

‘Ah, right (emphatic).’⁵⁵

In this example, *hamm* immediately precedes *ṣaḥīḥ* ‘right’. In contexts such as the example in question, there is no logical indication that anything is being ‘added’ by the use of *hamm*, and, even trying to conceptualize this example as lending an additive function, e.g., ‘also right’, or ‘right too’, makes neither syntactic nor semantic sense here. Rather, it would seem that *hamm* is not actually contributing to the propositional meaning of the clause, but rather is providing supplementary emphatic enhancement to the word it is modifying, i.e., *ṣaḥīḥ* ‘right’. Were *ṣaḥīḥ* to occur without *hamm*, it would imply that A is agreeing with B that where the owners of

⁵⁵ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 11 13:41

the house got the money to live in such splendor was indeed none of his business. As *ṣaḥīḥ* occurs with *hamm* as in *hamm ṣaḥīḥ* (and that *hamm* is the only other constituent apart from *ṣaḥīḥ*), however, it is clear that *ṣaḥīḥ*, an adjective, is being intensified here.

5.5.2.4 Intensifying an Active Participle

56)

راح اسألك سؤال. انت هم شاييف وجهك بالمرايا؟ ها؟ شلون تمشي بين الناس وانت بهذا الشكل المقرف؟

rāḥ	as'al-ak	su'āl	inta	hamm	šāyif	wajh-ak
FUT	ask.PRS.1SG-2MSG	question	2MSG	HAMM	see.PTCP.MSG	face.2MSG
b-il-mrāya	ha	šlōn	timšī	bēn	in-nās	
in-the-mirror	Q	how	walk.PRS.2MSG	amongst	the-person.PL	
w-inta	ib-hāḏa	iš-šakl	il-muqrif			
and-2MSG	in-this	the-form	the-disgusting			

‘I will ask you a question. Have you really seen your face in the mirror? Huh? How do you walk amongst people when you look so disgusting?’⁵⁶

Here, *hamm* serves to add emphasis to the statement *šāyif wajh-ak b-il-mrāya*? ‘Have you seen your face in the mirror?’ Taking into consideration the supplementary context *šlōn timšī bēn in-nās w-inta ib-hāḏa iš-šakl il-muqrif*? ‘How do you walk amongst people when you look so disgusting?’, we can see that the speaker is implying that the hearer is grotesque in appearance. We can further observe that *hamm* emphasizes the speaker’s awe that the hearer goes out in public despite his unattractive appearance and suggests that if the hearer had indeed seen himself, he would be too embarrassed to walk in public.

5.5.2.5 Intensifying a Verb

hamm can intensify a verb in all tenses and when doing so occurs immediately before the appropriately conjugated verb:

⁵⁶ *il-hārib* (part 2) Episode 34 9:10

57)

أ: توقعك صحيح، فيصل. حكمة المحامي جان ورا القضية. لكيت صديق اله وخليته يحجي. وبعدها قتلته لأن طلع ما تفق وياي. وهسه الشي الوحيد اللي ممكن يخلصنا من كابوس توبشوا غلو هو قتل حكمة.

A: tuwaqaʿ-ak	ṣaḥīḥ	Fāyṣal	Ḥikmat	il-muḥāmi	čān
expectation-2MSG	correct	Fāyṣal	Ḥikmat	the-lawyer	be.PST.3MSG
wara	il-qaḏīyya	ligēt	ṣadīq	il-a	wa
behind	the-matter	find.PST.1SG	friend	to-3MSG	and
xalēt-a	yiḥči		wa	baʿad-ha	
make.PST.1MSG-3MSG	speak.PRS.3MSG	and		after-3FSG	
qitilt-a	liʿan		ṭilaʿ		ma
kill.PST.1SG-3MSG	because		turn out.PST.3MSG		NEG
tifaq	wiyyā-ya	wa	hassa	iš-šī	il-waḥīd
agree.PST.3MSG	with-1SG	and	now	the-thing	the-only
illi	mumkin	yixalliṣ-na	min	kābūs	Tōpšō Ōḡlō
which	can	save.PRS.3MSG-1PL	from	nightmare	Tōpšō Ōḡlō
huwa	qitil	Ḥikmat			
3MSG	kill.PST.3MSG	Ḥikmat			

A: ‘Your expectation is correct, Fāyṣal. Ḥikmat the lawyer was behind the matter. I found a friend of his and I made him talk, and after that I killed him, because he ended up not agreeing with me. Now the only thing that can save us from the nightmare of Tōpšō Ōḡlō is killing Ḥikmat.’

ب: راح انطيه فلوس.

B: rāḥ	anṭī-h	flūs
FUT	give.PRS.1SG-3MSG	money.PL
‘I’ll give him money (I’ll pay him off).’		

أ: هم تنطيه؟ ادري امنين تجيب هاي الفلوس؟

A: hamm	tinṭī-h	adri	im-nēn	itjīb
HAMM	give.2MSG-3MSG	know.PRS.1SG	from-where	bring.PRS.2MSG
hāy il-flūs				
this the-money.PL				

‘You’ll seriously give him money? Can I know where you’re going to get the money from?’⁵⁷

If we consider the context uttered by A: *adri im-nēn itjīb hāy il-flūs* ‘Can I know where you’re going to get the money from?’ we can conclude that the A is skeptical of B’s ability to gather enough money to pay off Hikmat and consequently A employs *hamm* to imply ‘will you really give him the money (will you really pay him off)?’ Thus, *hamm* in such contexts serves as an expression of skepticism on behalf of A, implying ‘really?’ or ‘seriously?’ Consider also:

58)

أ: تولاي، راح اسألج سوال.

A: Tūlāy, rāḥ as’al-ič su’āl
Tūlāy, FUT ask.PRS.1SG-2FSG question
‘Tūlāy, I’m going to ask you a question.’

ب: يلا اسئل ابسرعة.

B: yaḷḷa is’al ib-sura’a
hurry ask.IMP.2MSG in-speed
‘Hurry, ask quickly.’

أ: انتي هم حبييتي ابحياتج؟

A: inti **hamm** ḥabēti ib-ḥayāt-ič
2FSG HAMM love.PST.2FSG in-life-2FSG
‘Have you really ever been in love in your life?’⁵⁸

We can see here that *hamm* does not contribute to the propositional meaning of the statement in which it is uttered, but rather serves to provide supplementary emotional context to the constituent it modifies, namely *ḥabēti ib-ḥayāt-ič* ‘have you ever been in love in your life?’ Through emphatic *hamm* A is testing the veracity of his skepticism regarding whether B has been in love and thus *inti hamm ḥabēti ib-ḥayāt-ič* implies ‘have you really ever been in love in your life’.

If the verb being intensified by *hamm* occurs in conjunction with a tense-marking particle (e.g., a future or progressive particle), then *hamm* occurs immediately before that

⁵⁷ *il-hārib* (Part 2) Episode 27 13:30

⁵⁸ *il-hārib* (part 2) Episode 19 21:00

particle and the appropriately-conjugated verb occurs immediately after the particle. Consider the following example in which *hamm* emphasizes a future tense verb— *hamm* occurs immediately before the future particle, *rāḥ*, which is then preceded by an appropriately-conjugated present tense verb:

59)

أ: ارتان، ابنك داهم المصرف وخطف المديره وشرط علي اذا ما اوقع على عقد التنازل، راح يُقتل المديره.

A: Artān	ibn-ak	dāham	il-mašraf	ū	xaṭaf
Artān	son-2MSG	raid.PST.3MSG	the-bank	and	kidnap.PST.3MSG
il-mudīra	ū	šaraṭ	‘allē-ya	iḏa	ma
the-director	and	condition.PST.3MSG	on-1SG	if	NEG
awāqī‘	‘ala	‘aqid	it-tināzul	rāḥ	yuqtul
sign.PRS.1SG	on	contract	the-abdication	FUT	kill.PRS.3MSG
il-mudīra					
the-director					

‘Artān, your son, raided the bank and kidnapped the director, and he put conditions on me: If I don’t sign the abdication contract, he will kill the director.’

ب: انت شدتحي؟

B: inta š-d-tiḥčī
2MSG what-PROG-say.PRS.2MSG
‘What are you saying?’

أ: مثلما سمعت. احي اليوم حتى يتحاسب ارتان عن المصرف والمداهمة.

A: miθil-ma	simā‘it	ajī	il-yōm	ḥatta
as-SR	hear.PST.2MSG	come.PRS.1SG	the-day	in order to
yithāsib		Artān ‘an	il-mašraf	w-il-mudāhama
account.PRS.3MSG		Artān about	the-bank	and-the-raid

‘As you heard. I came today for Artān to be held accountable for the bank and raid.’

ب: شنو؟

gun shots

عصمت علي هاي شكو؟

B: šinū ‘Ašmat ‘Ali hāy š-aku

What ‘Aṣmat ‘Ali that what-there is

‘What? *gun shots* ‘Aṣmat ‘Ali, what’s going on?’

أ: جماعتي. لا تحاول، إيروول. اريد اعرف هسه، ابنك هم راح ينكسر قلبه عليك؟ لو الفلوس عمته؟

A: jamā‘t-i la thāwil Āyrōl arīd a‘ruf
 group-1SG NEG try.PRS.2MSG Āyrōl know.PRS.1MSG know.PRS.1MSG
 hassa ibn-ak **hamm** rāḥ yinkisar galb-a ‘allē-k lō
 now son-2MSG HAMM FUT break.PRS.3MS heart-3MSG on2MSG or
 il-flūs ‘amt-a
 the-money.PL blind.PST.3FSG-3MSG

‘My men... Don’t try [to fight them], Āyrōl. I want to know now, your son, will his heart really break for you? Or has the money blinded him?’⁵⁹

Due to the syntactic placement of *hamm* combined with the context *lō il-flūs ‘amt-a?* ‘or has the money blinded him?’ we can see that A is expressing skepticism regarding whether B’s son really cares about B’s well-being, positing that money is more important to him. The implication lent by *hamm* here is ‘will your son’s heart really break for you?’

5.5.2.6 Conclusion of Section

In this section examples have been set forth demonstrating the manner and contexts in which *hamm* functions as an intensifier. In such instances *hamm* alternates with the non-loaned *ṣudug*. Although both of these items function as intensifiers, it was demonstrated that *ṣudug* is not bound by the same rigid syntactic constraints by which *hamm* are bound, with *ṣudug* possessing syntactic flexibility than *hamm*. Additionally, it was further demonstrated that *ṣudug* can function as a noun to imply the veracity of a statement.

5.6 Concessive *hamm*

We will now turn to a discussion of the last of *hamm*’s functions under analysis, that of a concessive cancellative discourse marker.

⁵⁹ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 36 26:05

5.6.1 Concessive Cancellative Discourse Markers

In some contexts, *hamm* functions as a ‘concessive cancellative discourse marker’, and it roughly lends the same implication as the non-loaned *ma ‘a hāḏa* or *ma ‘a ḏālik* ‘still’, ‘however’, ‘nevertheless’. Let us now summarize the main points set forth by Bell (2009:1912-1914) to help us better understand cancellative discourse markers, cancellation, and concession. Bell expresses that ‘the concept of cancellation is an attempt to describe more precisely the kind of inferential work the hearer/analyst does in establishing and weakening previously held assumptions as the discourse unfolds... Cancellative discourse markers shape meaning by canceling or cutting away unintended speaker meanings’ (p. 1913). Dascal & Katriel (1977) compare the process of cancellation to peeling away layers of meaning much like one would peel away (and discard) the layers of an onion. According to Dascal & Katriel several layers of meaning constitute an utterance ‘... ranging from the more to the less explicit, from an inner ‘core’ of content to contextually conveyed implicatures via layers and sub-layers such as presuppositions, modality, illocutionary force and felicity conditions’ (p. 153). Bell (2009), however, argues that it is too rigid to stratify implicatures in this manner, as cancellation serves not to uncover different and new layers, but rather to peel away unintended implications as a whole rather than as layers. Bell treats the cancellative discourse markers *likewise*, *nevertheless*, *still*, and *yet*, and maintains that the items in question have a dedicated or core function as cancellative, although he acknowledges that they may, at times, serve a different function. He adds that although *still*, *yet*, *likewise*, and *nevertheless* are ‘core concessive cancellative markers’, the functions they contribute to the facilitation of communication vary, as do their cancellative effects. He goes on to explain that each of these item’s ‘special effects’ can be differentiated on the basis of three broad interconnected criteria: speaker perspective, variability of scope, and degree of concession.

Cancellative markers (e.g., *still*, *however*, *but*, *nevertheless*, etc.) ‘provide an instruction as to what aspect of information, derivable from the prior discourse, either globally or locally is to be canceled by the current message. An aspect of information is any piece of information, either explicit or implicit, in the form of an assumption or implication, which is derivable, though not necessarily derived, by the hearer from the prior discourse’ (p. 1913), consider the following examples gleaned from Bell (2009:1913):

60) I gave Jimmy tuna for dinner. **But** I forgot that he was allergic to fish.

61) I hope you'll examine these cases on your own. The tour, **however**, continues at the next case on the left.

62) A: We had a very nice lunch. I had an excellent lobster.

B: Did you get to ask him about the money **though**?

63) It was raining heavily. **Yet** they played tennis.

64) I really don't feel like going to work today. **Still**, it is Friday.

65) (A and B are discussing the merits of an actor for a part in a remake of Beau Geste.)

A: He speaks French.

B: **Nevertheless**, he's not tall enough.

but, in 60) implies the cancellation of the positive action of giving Jimmy food; *however* in 61) signals that the speaker is redirecting the topic of the conversation to the tour and cancelling the speaker's focus on 'these' cases; *though* in 62) points to the cancellation of the previous topic in the prior discourse ('I had a very nice lobster') and helps to change the topic (to that of money) in the current message; in 63) *yet* indicates that an assumption can be derived from the ideational content of the prior discourse, that is that bad weather conditions led to the tennis match being cancelled or rescheduled, is cancelled in the current message; in 64) it would seem that *still* suggests that the prior discourse somewhat reduces or cancels the speaker's disappointment of having to work that day by the reminder in the current message that the situation is not as bad as the speaker thinks, as at least it is the last day of the work week; *nevertheless* in 65) cancels the prior discourse ('He speaks French' which serves as a case for selecting the actor on the basis of his language proficiency), by issuing a counterexample which makes the actor unsuitable for the role. As the above examples illustrate, cancellation can function on a range of aspects, and the core feature of cancellation differs from additives in that cancellation cancels assumptions about the discourse in a manner contrary to the manner in which additives build onto and confirm assumptions pertaining to the discourse.

There are two distinguishing properties of a concessive cancellative marker. Firstly, a concessive cancellative marker indicates the speaker's acceptance of the validity or truth of the

previous discourse segment, and secondly, it suggests that an expectation in the shape of a consequence or effect resulting either implicitly or explicitly from the previous discourse is cancelled in the upcoming message. The analysis below will elaborate on *hamm*'s behavior as a concessive cancellative marker.

5.6.2 Analysis

Let us now turn to an analysis of concessive cancellative *hamm* and its non-loaned counterparts *ma'a ḍālik* and *ma'a hāḍa* 'however, nevertheless, still'.

5.6.2.1 *ma'a ḍālik* and *ma'a hāḍa* vs. *hamm*

Due to the fixed syntactic nature of concessive *hamm*, and its non-loaned counterparts *ma'a ḍālik* and *ma'a hāḍa*, they appear to be, for all intents and purposes, interchangeable at the semantic and syntactic levels, and thus *ma'a ḍālik* and *ma'a hāḍa* will be discussed only briefly—the examples of them that we will now discuss merely serve an illustrative purpose. Both *ma'a ḍālik* and *ma'a hāḍa* cancel the prior discourse, implying that despite what was mentioned in the prior discourse (X), something contrary will be the case (Y). They typically occur as the very first word in the Y clause, or, if the clause is introduced by a conjunction, then they immediately follow the conjunction. Consider *ma'a ḍālik* first:

66)

						اني مريض مع ذلك راح احضر الاجتماع.
āni	marīḥ	ma'a ḍālik	rāḥ	aḥḍar	il-ijtimā'	
1SG	sick	MA'A ḌĀLIK	FUT	attend.PRS.1SG	the-meeting	
'I'm ill, but nevertheless I will attend the meeting.' ⁶⁰						

Here, the X clause 'I'm ill' is negated by *ma'a ḍālik* in the Y clause 'nevertheless I will attend the meeting'. The implication implied here, then, is 'Despite being ill, I will attend the meeting'.

⁶⁰ Informant data

67)

التذكرة كلش غالية ومع هذا راح اشترىها.

it-taḏkara	kulliṣ	ġālīya	wa	ma ‘a hāḏa	rāḥ
the-ticket	very	expensive	and	MA ‘A HĀḌA	FUT

aštari-ha
buy.PRS.1SG-3FSG

‘The ticket is very expensive. However, I will buy it.’⁶¹

In this instance, the X clause ‘the ticket is very expensive’ is cancelled by the Y clause containing *ma ‘a hāḏa*, ‘however, I will buy it’. The implication lent by *ma ‘a hāḏa* is that despite the expense of the ticket, the speaker will purchase it.

We should note here that in instances in which *hamm* is used to imply concession, it may or may not occur in conjunction with *ma ‘a ḏalik* or *ma ‘a hāḏa*. In such instances, *ma ḏalik/ma ‘a hāḏa* immediately precedes *hamm* as in *ma ‘a ḏalik hamm...* and *ma ‘a hāḏa hamm...*, respectively (note that the subject may be inserted between *ma ḏalik/ma ‘a hāḏa* and *hamm*). It should be noted, however, that *ma ‘a ḏalik*, *ma ‘a hāḏa*, and *hamm* can each serve a cancellative concessive function in and of themselves. That is to say that the employment of any one of these items in a concessive cancellative context would suffice, and therefore *hamm*’s collocation with them could be rendered as superfluous. That said, it would seem that *hamm*’s collocation with such items which also serve as concessive cancellative discourse markers further supports the hypothesis that *hamm*’s functions range beyond that of addition and provides further evidence of *hamm*’s concessive function in such instances.

It is also worth noting that the X clause and Y clause need not be uttered by the same person— another person can utter the Y clause to cancel the X clause that was uttered by another speaker. Consider an instance of *ma ‘a hāḏa hamm...*:

⁶¹ Informant data

68)

أ: يوري غال هالمكان كلش امن الكم.

A: Yūri gāl h-āl-mukān kulliṣ aman il-kum
 Yūri say.PST.3MSG this-the-place very secure for-2PL
 ‘Yuri said this place is very secure for you.’

ب: مع هذا انتي هم كوني حاذرة.

B: **ma‘a hāḏa** inti **hamm** kūni ḥāḏra
 MA‘A HĀḌA 2FSG HAMM be.IMP.2FSG cautious.PTCP.FSG
 ‘With that (regardless), still be cautious.’⁶²

In this particular example, the X and Y clauses are said by two different speakers. A uttered X ‘Yuri said that this place is very secure for you’, and B’s employment of *hamm* in Y ‘With that, still be cautious’ seeks to decrease A’s confidence or trust in Yuri’s suggestion that the location was very secure, urging her to be cautious, despite Yuri’s assertion of its safety. Now let us turn to an instance of *ma‘a ḏālik hamm...* In contexts in which *ma‘a ḏālik hamm* occurs, it cancels the prior discourse, implying that despite what was mentioned in the prior discourse (X), something contrary will be the case (Y). Consider:

⁶² *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 40 23:15

69)

أ: بابا، ليش بعد ما تجي للبيت؟

A: bāba lēš ba‘ad ma tiji l-il-bēt
 dad why still NEG come.PRS.2MSG to-the-house
 ‘Dad, why don’t you come home anymore?’

ب: اني وابوك انفصلنا، حبيبي.

B: āni w-abū-k infaṣṣalna ḥabīb-i
 1SG and-father-2MSG separate.PST.1PL sweetheart-1SG
 ‘Your father and I separated, sweetie.’

ج: مع ذلك هم راح اشوفك.

C: **ma‘a ḏālik** **hamm** rāḥ ašūf-ak
 MA‘A ḌĀLIK HAMM FUT see.PRS.1SG-2MSG
 ‘However, I will still see you (i.e., despite the separation).’

أ: شوكت لعد؟

A: šwakit la‘ad?
 when then
 ‘When then?’

ج: كل إسبوع راح اجي لإهنا واشوفك.

C: kull isbū‘ rāḥ ajī l-ihnā w-ašūf-ak
 every week FUT come.PRS.1SG to-here and-see.PRS.1SG-2MSG
 ‘Every week I will come here and see you.’⁶³

In the example above, B’s and C’s separation (X) is being cancelled by C’s statement *ma‘a ḏālik hamm rāḥ ašūfak* ‘However, I will still see you’ (Y). Thus, Y implies ‘Despite our separation, I will still see you.’ Furthermore, Y is diminishing or cancelling any doubts that A may have that he might no longer see his father as a result of his parents’ recent separation. Now that concessive cancellative *hamm*’s counterparts have been discussed, let us begin our analysis of this function of *hamm* by uncovering its functions and exploring the syntactic and semantic constraints governing them.

⁶³ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 30 22:30

5.6.2.2 Cancelling Prior Discourse

When serving a concessive function, *hamm* cancels the prior discourse, implying that despite what was mentioned in the prior discourse (X), something contrary will be the case (Y). *hamm* typically occurs as the very first word in the Y clause, or, if the clause is introduced by a conjunction, then *hamm* immediately follows the conjunction.

70)

عندي سؤال هو كلش قديم بس هم راح اسئلكم بيه.

‘and-i su’āl kulliš qadīm bass **hamm** rāḥ as’al-kum bi-h
at-1SG question very old but HAMM FUT ask.PRS.1SG-2PL in-3MSG
‘I have a very old question, but I’ll still ask you guys it.’⁶⁴

In this example, ‘*andi su’āl kulliš qadīm* ‘I have a very old question’ (X) is cancelled by *bass hamm rāḥ as’al-kum bi-h* ‘but I will still ask you guys it’ (Y). Thus, Y implies despite this question being very old (and possibly no longer relevant), the speaker will ask it. It would further seem that Y is cancelling or diminishing the importance of the fact that the question is very old. Also consider:

71)

تأخرت بس هم راح اتفرج على المباراة.

ta’axxarit bass **hamm** rāḥ atfarraj ‘ala
be late.PST.1SG but HAMM FUT watch.PRS.1SG on
il-mubārā
the-match
‘I’m late, but I’ll still watch the match.’⁶⁵

Here, *ta’axxarit* ‘I’m late’ (X) is cancelled by *hamm rāḥ atfarraj ‘ala il-mubārā* ‘I will still watch the match’ (Y). Thus Y implies despite the speaker being late, he still desires to watch the match. Furthermore, it would seem that Y is decreasing the impact of the speaker being late and the effect it would have on his ability to watch the match. Let us now explore this function of *hamm* as it occurs in conditional statements.

⁶⁴ Informant data

⁶⁵ Informant data

5.6.2.3 Conditional Sentences

One context in which *hamm* clearly serves a concessive cancellative function is in conditional sentences. In such instances we are met by the construction ‘*lō... hamm...*’ ‘if...still...’. In order to aid our elucidation of the implication that is lent by the concessive function of *hamm* in conditional sentences we will break the sentences into two clauses, the *lō* clause (X) and the *hamm* clause (Y); The *lō* clause is the conditional clause and discusses hypothetical situations or known factors while the *hamm* clause is the result clause which expresses the consequence of X. It should be noted here that *lō* is similar to the English *if*, but is generally used for contrary to fact conditions or for scenarios that are less likely to be fulfilled, however the semantic implications of *lō* are not of interest to us here, as *hamm* is the item lending the concessive cancellative implication. *lō* has no bearing on the concessive cancellative effects of *hamm*—the X and Y clauses are separate clauses, each with its own syntax and semantics. Consider:

72)

أ: عافية عليج. ادفع فلوس حتى ابني يتعلم واروح ادخله إجامعة اهلية وانتي تروحين تلغين التسجيل بدون ما تگوليلي.

A: ‘āfiya	‘allē-č	adfa‘	flūs	ḥatta
bravo	on-2FSG	pay.PRS.1SG	money.PL	in order to
ibn-i	yit‘allam		w-arūḥ	adaxxil-a
son-1SG	learn.PRS.3MSG		and-go.PRS.1SG	enter.PRS.1SG-3MSG
ib-jāmi‘a	ahlīya		w-inti	trūḥīn
in-university	private		and-2FSG	go.PRS.2FSG
tilgīn			it-tasjīl	bedūn-ma
cancel.PRS.2FSG			the-registration	without
itgulī-l-i				
say.PRS.2FSG-to-1SG				

‘Bravo. I pay money in order for my son to learn and I go and enroll him in a private university and you go and cancel the (his) registration without telling me.’

ب: اتوسل بي هوايه، عصمت. يعني لو اني ما ساعدت ابني هم چان صار هذا الموضوع.

B: itwasil	bi-ya	hiwāya	‘Aṣmat	ya‘ani	lō
plead.PST.3MSG	with-1SG	a lot	‘Aṣmat	FIL	if

āni	ma	sā‘adit	ibn-i	hamm
1SG	NEG	help.PST.1SG	son-1SG	HAMM
čān	šār		hāḏa	il-mawḏū‘
be.PST.3MSG	happen.PST.3MSG		this	the-topic

‘He pleaded with me a lot, ‘Aṣmat. I mean, [even] if I didn’t help my son, this topic (situation) still would have arisen.’

أ: لا تكذيبين علي. هذا ميگدر يتخذ قرار بوحده. اكيد انتي شجعتيه وتركتيه الدراسة.

A: la	tikḏibīn	‘allē-ya	hāḏa	ma
NEG	lie.PRS.2FSG	on-1SG	this	NEG
yigdar	yitaxxuḏ	qarār	ib-waḥd-a	
able.PRS.3MSG	adopt.PRS.2MSG	decision	in-own-3MSG	
akīd	inti	šijja‘itī-h		wa
certainly	2FSG	encourage.PST.2FSG-3MSG		and
tirraktī-h		id-dirāsa		
leave.PST.2FSG-3MSG		the-study		

‘Don’t lie to me. He couldn’t have made this decision by himself. You surely encouraged him and made him quit his studies.’⁶⁶

In this *lō...hamm...* construction in question, there are two known factors of which we are aware from the prior discourse which is also included in the example, namely: B helped her son; B’s son dropped out of university. B is expressing that if she did not help her son (X), the situation still would have arisen (he still would have dropped out of university) (Y). Thus, it would seem that *hamm* cancels or somewhat reduces B’s responsibility for her son dropping out of university by her plea in the Y clause that he would have dropped out of university regardless of her help. In this example, the implication that is lent by B is that X was the case, but even if X were not the case, Y would have still occurred. Let us also consider:

⁶⁶ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 17 17:05

أ: إحجي شترید؟

ب: ع بالچ ما اگدر اوصل لچ؟ لو تروحين لآخر الدنيا هم اجي لچ.

Until now, we have explored instances of *lō...hamm...* constructions wherein the *hamm* clauses have been affirmative. However, there are also instances of *lō...hamm...* constructions wherein the *hamm* clause is negated. In such instances, the implication lent by the *lō...hamm...* is ‘if... still would not...’ The difference between a *lō...hamm...* construction wherein the *hamm* clause is affirmative and a *lō...hamm...* construction wherein the *hamm* clause is negative is that

124

of semantics: in the former scenario, in Y something occurs despite X, whereas in the latter scenario, in Y something, despite X, does not happen. Consider:

74)

لو المتنبي كاتب الانشاء هم ما جان حظوله درجة كاملة.

lō	Al-Mutanabbi kātib	il-inšā'	hamm	ma	čān
if	Al-Mutanabbi write.PTCP.MSG	the-essay	HAMM	NEG	be.PST.3MSG
ḥaṭṭō-l-a	daraja	kāmila			
put.PST.3MPL-to-3MSG	mark	full			

'If Al-Mutanabbi⁶⁸ were the author of the essay, they still wouldn't have given him full marks.'⁶⁹

Here we have another hypothetical situation in X where X was/is counterfactual. In the *lō...hamm...* construction in question, there is a factor that is implied from the current message, namely: the speaker did not get full marks on his Arabic exam and presumably no one else got full marks, either. Therefore, *hamm* cancels the possibility of anyone receiving full marks no matter the eloquence of their Arabic, with the speaker maintaining that even if Al-Mutanabbi, a 10th century Iraqi poet who is widely considered to be the greatest poet in the Arabic language, were the author of the essay, the examiners still would not have awarded him full marks.

In *lō...hamm...* constructions, the removal of *hamm* would also remove the concessive cancellative effect—the constructions would remain conditional statements, however without the cancellation. An exploration of *lō...hamm...* constructions without the occurrence of *hamm* in the Y clause will provide further evidence for the claim the *hamm* is indeed responsible for the cancellation that arises in such statements, thus they will be briefly explored here. In *lō...hamm...* constructions the X clause serves as the conditional clause, while Y serves as the concessive cancellative clause (Y contradicts or cancels what was expressed in X). If *hamm* were removed from these constructions, however, the X clauses would maintain their functions as conditional clauses, but the Y clauses would serve more as clear-cut 'result' clauses: If X were to be fulfilled, then Y would be fulfilled (as a result or consequence of the fulfillment of X). With

⁶⁸ Al-Mutanabbi (915AD-965-AD) was an Iraqi poet and is considered one of the greatest poets in the Arabic language.

⁶⁹ Informant data

the removal of *hamm* comes the removal of cancellation. Consider again example 73, but this time with *hamm* removed:

75)

ع بالچ ما اگدر اوصل لچ؟ لو تروحين لآخر الدنيا احي لچ.

‘a	bāl-ič	mā	agdar	awšil-l-ič	lō	trūhīn
on	mind-2FSG	NEG	can.PRS.1SG	arrive.PRS.1SG-to-2FSG	if	go.PRS.2FSG
l-āxir	id-dinya	aji l-ič				
to-end	the-world	come.PRS.1SG-to-2FSG				

‘You think I can’t find you? If you go to the end of the world, I’d find you.’⁷⁰

Here, we have the conditional clause ‘If you went to the end of the world’ (X), and the result clause ‘I’d find you’ (Y), thus implying ‘If you go to the end of the world, then, as a result of that, I’d find you.’ As we saw in 73), however, when the same sentence included *hamm*, the implication was ‘If you go to the end of the world, despite that, I’d still find you’. That is, the lack of *hamm* lends to the Y clause the implication of ‘as a result of X...’, whereas the inclusion of *hamm* lends to the Y clause ‘despite X...’ Thus, it would seem as though the difference between *lō* constructions without *hamm* and those containing *hamm* is similar to the difference in English between *if...then* and *if...still* respectively. In 75), *hamm* was simply removed from 73) (the example which initially contained *hamm*), in order to further demonstrate the semantic impact the inclusion/exclusion *hamm* has on a sentence. Let us now consider an example of *lō* exactly as the researcher came across it—no element was added or removed:

76)

لو چان اعراف غير شي چان گتلكم.

lō	čān	a‘ruf	gēr	šī	čān
if	be.PST.3MSG	know.PRS.1SG	other	thing	be.PST.3MSG
gitil-kum					
tell.PST.1SG-2PL					

‘If I had found out anything else, I would have told you guys.’⁷¹

⁷⁰ Informant data

⁷¹ Informant data

Here, we have the conditional clause ‘If I had found out anything else’ (X), and the result clause ‘I would have told you guys’ (Y), thus implying ‘If I had found out something else (more information), then, as a result of that, I would have told you guys [that I had more information]’. The implication is that the speaker did not have any information, and, as a result, he did not/could not have possibly informed the others.

As we saw from the examples containing *hamm* above, if *hamm* were inserted into the Y clause, we would arrive at:

77)

لو چان اعرف غير شي هم چان گتلكم.					
lō	čān	a‘ruf	ġēr	šī	hamm
if	be.PST.3MSG	know.PRS.1SG	other	thing	HAMM
čān		gitil-kum			
be.PST.3MSG		tell.PST.1SG-2PL			

‘If I had known [found out] anything else, I still would have told you guys.’⁷²

We can extract two factors from this statement, firstly, the speaker did not find out any new information, and secondly, the speaker told the hearers a piece of information. The implication, here, then, is that the speaker told the hearers a piece of information, but he did not find out any new or additional information. However, if he had found out new information, he still would have told the hearers whatever information he told them. As we can see, the inclusion/exclusion of *hamm* does not have any impact on the implication lent by the X clause. In 76) and 77), the X clauses are identical and counterfactual—the speaker did not know any additional information. However, the inclusion/exclusion of *hamm* heavily impacts the implication of the Y clause. In 76) in particular, the Y clause (which excludes *hamm*) is counterfactual—it was not fulfilled (Y = ‘I would have told you’, indicating that the speaker did not tell the hearers), while in 77) (wherein the Y clause contains *hamm*) the Y is factual—it was fulfilled (Y = ‘I still would have told you’, indicating that the speaker did tell the hearers).

⁷² Informant data

5.6.2.4 Conclusion of Section

In this section, *hamm*'s concessive cancellative function was explored. It was demonstrated that, when serving a concessive cancellative function, *hamm* cancels the prior discourse, implying that despite what was mentioned in the prior discourse (X), something contrary will be the case (Y). In such contexts, *hamm* alternates with the non-loaned *ma 'a ḏālik* and *ma 'a hāḏa* 'still; however; nevertheless'.

5.7 Overall Conclusions of the *hamm* and Theoretical Implications

This chapter has explored the functions of the loaned *hamm* against their non-loaned counterparts. The analyses revealed that contrary to the definitions of *hamm* provided in Iraqi Arabic reference grammars and dictionaries which define it as serving an additive function similar to the English 'too', 'also', or 'as well', and which describe it as the Iraqi Arabic 'equivalent' of the non-loaned *'ayḏan* 'too', 'also', 'as well', *hamm* actually serves four distinct functions. In addition to its additive function in which it alternates with *'ayḏan*, *hamm* also serves a scalar function, alternating with the non-loaned *ḥatta* 'even'. In scalar contexts *ḥatta* and *hamm* occur immediately before the item or clause they focus, bringing about a surprising focus value. Furthermore, the analysis revealed a high degree of overlap, syntactically and semantically, between *ḥatta* and *hamm*. Another function of *hamm* is that of an intensifier, alternating with the non-loaned *ṣudug*, implying 'really' or 'seriously'. It was demonstrated that *ṣudug* has more syntactic flexibility than *hamm* and a wider semantic range as well, with *ṣudug* being able to occur on its own and further possessing the ability to function as a noun implying 'truth', although the same does not hold true for emphatic *hamm*. *hamm*'s function as a concessive cancellative discourse marker was also explored. In such contexts, *hamm* alternates with the non-loaned *ma 'a ḏālik* and *ma 'a hāḏa* 'however', 'regardless', cancelling the prior discourse and implying that despite what was mentioned in the prior discourse (X), something contrary will be the case (Y).

It was discussed in section 5.3.1 that when serving an additive function, *hamm* and *'ayḏan* (and their corresponding counterparts as they occur in other languages) are generally categorized as adverbs and how, depending on the context of the utterance, *hamm* and *'ayḏan* 'relate' to varying parts of the sentence. We saw König's (1991:11) tri-partite description of focus particles: I) Focus particles focus on a specific part of a sentence; II) Focus particles

combine with a specific constituent; III) Focus particles have a specific semantic scope. As the aim of the present work is to uncover the semantic and syntactic constraints of *hamm* only the first and third properties are relevant to us. Thus, let us take properties I) and III) and apply them to *hamm*. In applying these properties, we can see that, in regards to the first criterion, *hamm* indeed focuses a particular part of a sentence, namely the element that is being added:

78) Kāḍim	yīštiḡḡul	b-il-wazāra	ū	Jāsim	hamm
Kāḍim	works.PRS.3MSG	in-the-ministry	and	Jāsim	HAMM
yīštiḡḡul		bi-ha			
works.PRS.3MSG		in-3FSG			
‘Kāḍim works at the ministry and Jāsim also works there.’					

In the above example we can see that the highlighted or focused part is *Jāsim hamm* ‘Jāsim too’, while the backgrounded part is the rest of the sentence, namely *yīštiḡḡul bi-ha* ‘[he] works there’. That is to say, we can indeed split the example above into two clauses, separated by the conjunction *ū* ‘and’, namely *Kāḍim yīštiḡḡul b-il-wazāra* ‘Kāḍim works at the ministry’ and *Jāsim hamm yīštiḡḡul bi-ha* ‘Jāsim also works there’, and we can note that the clause containing *hamm* is the part of the sentence being focused. While, as far as the third criterion is concerned, the semantic scope of *hamm* is clearly indicated by *hamm*’s semantic placement— *hamm* immediately follows the element it is focusing. If we were to take the same example, however, yet move the syntactic placement of *hamm*, *hamm*’s scope would be altered, consider:

79) Jāsim	yīštiḡḡul	bi-ha	hamm
Jāsim	works.PRS.3MSG	in-2FSG	HAMM
‘Jāsim works there too.’			

Here, we can see that the semantic scope of *hamm* is constrained by *hamm*’s syntactic placement, as, since *hamm* has been moved to the end of the statement, its scope has also been altered, thus implying ‘Jāsim works there too (i.e., in addition to working elsewhere).

Moreover, it was explained that König (1991:29) posits that the influence a focus particle has on the meaning of a sentence is dependent on the semantics of two main components of the sentence itself: ‘I) on that of its focus and II) that of its scope’ Thus, drawing upon König (1991:29), let us apply this claim to our findings of *hamm*:

80) ‘Ali **hamm** ištara bēt jidīd
 Ali HAMM buy.PST.3MSG house new

- a) ‘‘Ali also bought a new house (i.e., in addition to something else).’*
 b) ‘Somebody other than Ali bought a new house.’

81) ‘Ali ištara bēt jidīd **HAMM**
 ‘Ali buy.PST.3MSG house new HAMM

- a) ‘‘Ali (i.e., in addition to someone else) bought a new house also.’*
 b) ‘‘Ali bought something other than a new house.’

In 80) and 81) the presupposition that *hamm* lends to the sentence can be roughly expressed by 80)b and 81)b, respectively, and, in line with König, as the sentences in question only differ in the location of their focus, it must be this fact that accounts for the contrast in meaning (1991:29).

In analyzing *hamm*’s scalar function, we analyzed the implied assumptions concerning the world or background beliefs expressed by *hamm* (König 1991:56). Scalar reasoning, which relies on an ability to consider a situation with respect to other potential situations, and to consequently draw inferences about potential situations on such bases, is not a linguistic phenomenon, but rather a general, non-logical, conceptual ability dependent on a type of scalar construal ability. Israel (2011:235-237) discusses an aspect related to scalar implicature, namely scalar reasoning. Drawing upon Israel (2011) it is clear that *hamm*, by immediately preceding the intended scalar focus, brings about a scalar construal. Consider:

82) **hamm** Fādi širab il-‘arak
 HAMM Fādi drink.PST.3MSG the-‘arak
 ‘Even Fādi drank the ‘arak.’

83) Fādi širab **hamm** il-‘arak
 Fādi drink.PST.3MSG HAMM the-‘arak
 ‘Fādi drank even the ‘arak.’

Continuing from this, it is apparent that a sentence comprising a subject focus like that in 82) can serve as an answer to *Who drank the arak?*, however it cannot serve as an answer to *What did Fādi drink?*; whereas a sentence containing a focus like that found in 83) can only answer the latter of these two questions (Israel 2011:236).

An interesting trait of *hamm* is that in some instances it serves a distinct function as an intensifier, used solely for emphatic purposes. That is, in such contexts it cannot be translated as ‘too’, ‘as well’, ‘either’, ‘even’, or ‘nevertheless’, as doing so would render the translation inaccurate, rather it merely lends emphasis, implying something along the lines of ‘seriously’ or ‘really’. We discussed that defining the term *intensifier* has and continues to be a complex task; adding to this complexity is that the terminology employed to refer to intensifiers is not always uniform. Furthermore, some have proposed that intensifiers be divided into several semantic categories depending on the role the intensifier plays, be it one of amplification (wherein the intensifier scales upwards from a presumed norm), downtoning (wherein it scales downwards and typically lowers the effect of the force of the items it is modifying), or one of emphasis (in which it denotes a general heightening effect on the item it is modifying) (Quirk et al. 1985). Ito & Tagliamonte (2003), however, only differentiate between two semantic categories— ‘intensifiers and downtoners’ and they further split intensives into ‘maximizers’ (e.g., ‘extremely’, ‘completely’, ‘absolutely’) and ‘boosters’ (e.g., ‘really’, ‘very’) (p. 258). Based on the examples we analyzed of emphatic *hamm* above, it is clear that it functions as a ‘booster’. As *hamm*, when serving an emphatic function, merely enhances and provides supplementary emotional context to the word or constituent it is modifying and thus does not contribute to the propositional meaning of a clause, we can see that the manner in which *hamm* behaves is akin to the behavior of what Ito & Tagliamonte (2003) term ‘boosters’.

In addition to the additive, scalar, emphatic functions served by *hamm*, we also explored the manner in which it functions as a concessive cancellative discourse marker, and in such instances it roughly lends the same implication as the non-loaned *ma ‘a hāḏa* or *ma ‘a ḏālik* ‘still’, ‘however’, ‘nevertheless’. Let us now summarize the main points set forth by Bell (2009:1912-1914) (discussed in 5.6.1) to help solidify our understanding of cancellative discourse markers, cancellation, and concession. Bell (2009) expresses that ‘the concept of cancellation is an attempt to describe more precisely the kind of inferential work the hearer/analyst does in establishing and weakening previously held assumptions as the discourse unfolds’ (p. 1913). In

line with Bell's (2009) description and definition of cancellative markers, *hamm* provides 'an instruction as to what aspect of information, derivable from the prior discourse, either globally or locally is to be canceled by the current message', and Bell continues that 'an aspect of information is any piece of information, either explicit or implicit, in the form of an assumption or implication, which is derivable, though not necessarily derived, by the hearer from the prior discourse' (p. 1913). In order to further reiterate *hamm*'s function as a concessive cancellative discourse marker, let us apply Bell's aforementioned claims and consider the following examples:

84) bida yinzil il-maṭar bass **hamm**
begin.PST.3MSG descend.PRS.3MSG the-rai but HAMM
li'abō kurat il-qadim
play.PST.3MPL ball the-foot
'It started raining, but they still played football (regardless of the rain).'

hamm here indicates that an assumption can be derived from the ideational content of the prior discourse (i.e., the bad weather conditions led the football match to be postponed). However, this is cancelled in the current message. Also consider:

85) ma 'and-i wahis atla' il-yōm bass **hamm** rāḥ
NEG POSS-1SG desire exit.PRS.1SG the-day but HAMM FUT
arūḥ l-il-maktaba
go.PRS.1SG to-the-library
'I don't feel like going out to day, but I'll still go to the library.'

In this instance *hamm* indicates that the the speaker's lack of desire to go out, is cancelled by the current message wherein he says he will go to the library.

As the above examples illustrate, and in line with Bell's (2009) claims, the core feature of concessive cancellative *hamm* differs from its additive reading in that cancellation cancels assumptions about the discourse in a manner contrary to the manner in which additives build onto and confirm assumptions pertaining to the discourse. Thus, we can 'define' *hamm* as it occurs in Iraqi Arabic by the following chart:

Function	non-loaned [near-] equivalent	English translation
additive focus particle	<i>ʿayḏan</i>	too; also; as well
scalar focus particle	<i>ḥatta</i>	even
intensifier	<i>ṣudug</i>	really; seriously
concessive cancellative marker	<i>ma ʿa ḏālik</i> and <i>ma ʿa hāḏa</i>	however; nevertheless

5.8 Room for Further Research

The analysis presented above illustrated that although *hamm* and *ʿayḏan* have traditionally been described as both serving an additive function and occur seemingly interchangeably, with their main differentiating feature being that the former is loaned and more colloquial and the other is non-loaned and more formal. *hamm*, in fact, serves four distinct functions: 1) an additive focus particle; 2) a scalar focus particle; 3) an intensifier; and 4) a concessive cancellative discourse marker. It is only the additive function that is shared by both *hamm* and *ʿayḏan*. In its three other functions, *hamm* alternates with non-loaned items other than *ʿayḏan*, namely *ḥatta*, *ṣudug*, and *ma ʿa ḏālik/ma ʿa hāḏa*, respectively. As the main aim of this chapter was to uncover the true functions of *hamm* beyond that of addition, the comparisons made between *hamm* in its various functions against its non-loaned counterparts principally served an illustrative purpose and should not be considered exhaustive. Furthermore, this analysis focused on the syntactic and semantic constraints binding the items under analysis. It would certainly be interesting, however, to conduct an in-depth socio-pragmatic comparison between *hamm* and its non-loaned counterparts in order to uncover the factors that might prompt speakers of Iraqi Arabic to employ one over the other.

This analysis specifically explored the realization *hamm*, although varying realizations exist (e.g., *hammēn*, *hammēna*, *hammatēn*, etc.). I know from my own knowledge of the language, combined with the close work I conducted with my informants, that some speakers maintain more than one realization of *hamm* in their linguistic repertoires. For instance, a speaker might regularly employ both *hamm* and *hammēna*, and an exploration into these varying realizations would be interesting to determine what prompts speakers to use varying realizations of seemingly the same item.

CHAPTER SIX: BALKIT

6.1 Chapter Outline

This chapter presents a contrastive analysis of the loaned modal *balkit*, which has generally been translated as ‘perhaps, maybe, possibly’ (Clarity, Stowasser & Wolfe 2003:43), and its non-loaned alternatives *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *yigdar*. *yimkin* and *mumkin* are also typically defined as ‘perhaps; maybe; possibly’ (Clarity, Stowasser & Wolfe 2003:43;111), and thus are generally perceived as being more or less interchangeable with *balkit*, and *yigdar* is typically defined as ‘can’. However, as will be revealed in this analysis, the implications lent by these modals are far more complex and multifaceted than this basic definition can account for, and these terms are not as interchangeable as the existing literature and translations seem to suggest. This chapter begins by providing some background information of the modals in question (6.2) and then the etymology of *balkit* is discussed (6.3). As this chapter focuses on modality specifically, the term ‘modality’ will be defined (6.4) and the ‘scope of modality’ as it occurs generally will then be considered by drawing namely upon Palmer (1990) and von Wright (1951) (6.5) followed by a discussion of the scope of modality served by the modals under analysis (6.5.1). Following this, a summary of the existing literature on modality in Arabic (6.6) and Iraqi Arabic specifically (6.6.1) are presented in order to situate this present work therein. We then turn to an explanation of the data collection and methodology for this chapter (6.7), before moving on to our analysis of the modals under analysis (6.8), beginning with epistemic possibility (6.8.1), deontic modality (6.8.2), dynamic ability (6.8.3), and boulomaic modality (6.8.5). The modal functions are then briefly synthesized (6.8.5) before turning to a discussion of the manner in which these modals are negated (6.9-6.10.4). The negative modality section is then synthesized and summarized (6.10.5) before the overall conclusions and theoretical implications of the modals are discussed (6.11). The chapter wraps up with a discussion highlighting some aspects deserving of further research (6.12).

6.2 Background and Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to conduct a semantic analysis and comparison of the loaned item *balkit* and its non-loaned counterparts *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *yigdar*, and to present a discussion of the various constraints on their interpretation, which I claim to be motivated by the semantic relations and properties discussed in this analysis. It should be noted that there are various realizations of *balkit*, namely *balki*, with instances of *balkin* and *balčīn*, as well, although

the latter two realizations do not appear to be pure Baghdadi but rather are found in Iraqi dialects south of Baghdad (however, they may be heard in Baghdad as well). In the present work we focus exclusively on the realization *balkit* (with references to the boulomaic construction containing *balkit* namely *balkit allāh* made where applicable).

In regards to the items in question, *balkit* is a modal adverb, *yimkin* is an impersonal modal verb, *mumkin* is a participial modal adjective, and *yigdar* is a modal regular verb. Although modal auxiliaries (e.g., English: *may, might, can, could, must*; German: *dürfen* ‘may’, *können* ‘can’, etc.), have played a dominant role in the study of modality in the past, in addition to the modal auxiliaries, there is a wide range of terms in English which should be treated as ‘modals’ (Perkins 1983:19) and such is the case for Iraqi Arabic, as well. Consequently, it should be further noted that Iraqi Arabic has other (non-loaned) modals which express possibility and capability, such as *yijūz* ‘to be possible, permissible’ and *iḥtimāl* ‘possible’. However, as these items are semantically quite different from *balkit* (and from *mumkin, yimkin, and yigdar*) they will not be treated in the present work. *mumkin, yimkin, and yigdar* have been selected to be contrasted with the loaned *balkit*, as these terms are generally treated as being, more or less, interchangeable (although as will be demonstrated in the analysis (6.8.1-6.10.5), this is not the case). Furthermore, it would seem as though *mumkin, yigdar, and yimkin* occur more frequently than other modals, and they also tend to occur in similar contexts to one another, thus making them more suitable for analysis. It should also be borne in mind that non-loaned modals which imply definiteness or [near] certainty also exist, e.g., *akīd* ‘definitely, certainly’, but such modals were not presented due to the fact that *balkit, mumkin, yimkin, and yigdar* do not imply definiteness and thus do not alternate with modals expressing certainty. In regards to the modals under analysis, it is necessary to distinguish between four types of modality: epistemic, deontic, dynamic, and boulomaic. As for epistemic modality, it is possible in many languages to express at least two types of epistemic judgments, a ‘strong’ judgment and a ‘weak’ one (Palmer 1986:57) and the same holds true for Iraqi Arabic. As will be revealed by section 6.8.1 below, in specific epistemic contexts, *mumkin* and *yimkin* are indicative of greater possibility, while *balkit* is indicative of a lesser possibility. The speaker’s choice of modal derives from a belief in the (future) actuality of his proposition, and this belief both justifies and governs his choice of modal. As far as deontic modality as it occurs in Iraqi Arabic is concerned, it can be divided into deontic ability, which involves the subject’s ability to carry out a task (arising from external

factors), and deontic permission (requesting and granting), which deals with an external factor permitting an action or event. As will be elucidated, not all of the modals which express deontic modality can express all of these deontic categories. When we speak of dynamic modality, we mean the modality which does not express the speaker's opinion and in which the speaker does not affect or influence the situation. Dynamic modality can be separated from deontic modality, in that, in regards to dynamic modality, the conditioning factors are internal—the subject's own willingness or ability to act (Mitchell & al-Hassan 1994:44). Boulomaic modality, on the other hand, expresses the speaker's hopes, desires, or wishes.

As will be outlined, the investigation revealed that *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit* can lend epistemic possibility readings in quantitative contexts (i.e., contexts in which the degree of likelihood can be quantitatively measured) and neutral contexts (i.e., contexts in which there is no indication of quantitative measurability of the degree of likelihood) (6.8.1). In quantitative contexts, *mumkin* and *yimkin* indicate a higher degree of likelihood of occurring, and although Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994) posit that *mumkin* indicates a higher degree of likelihood than *yimkin*, the informants in this study indicated overlap between these two items with both *mumkin* and *yimkin* implying 'it is very likely that.../it is rather likely that...' while *balkit* indicates the lowest quantitative ability out of the items in question, implying something along the lines of 'it is possible, although not very likely, that...' When occurring in neutral contexts, these three terms can occur interchangeably implying a neutral 'it is possible that...'

It will further be demonstrated that deontic implication of ability can be yielded by *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *yigdar* (6.8.2.1); deontic permission (granting) by *mumkin* and *yigdar* (6.8.2.2); deontic permission (requesting) by *mumkin*, *yigdar*, and *balkit* (6.8.2.3); and polite requests by *balkit* and *mumkin* (6.8.2.4). We will also explore the dynamic ability readings lent by *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *yigdar* (6.8.3), as well as the boulomaic reading lent by *balkit* (6.8.4). Thus, we can say that the modals in question as they occur in Iraqi Arabic express epistemic, deontic, dynamic, and boulomaic modalities, although none of these modals express all four of these modalities on their own.

6.3 Etymology of *balkit*

It seems to be widely accepted that the Iraqi Arabic *balkit* is of foreign origin: *bal* 'rather, on the contrary' was borrowed from Arabic into Persian and the Persian suffix *-ki* (a conjunction 'that;

which’) was added. In Persian, where the term in question is realized as *balkeh*, it has been defined as ‘but’ or ‘however’ (Sen 1829:26) and ‘perhaps; but; rather; on the contrary; suppose...’ (Lambton 1954:243; Haim 2000:84). It would also seem that in colloquial Persian in particular *balkeh* is sometimes used in the sense of ‘perhaps’ (Lambton 1954:243). *balkeh* in turn was borrowed from Persian into Turkish where it is realized as *belki* (Erdal 1991:18). Vaughan (1709:43) defines Turkish *belki* as ‘of doubting... *belky* [*belki*], perhaps’, and more recent reference grammars and dictionaries define it as it occurs in Turkish ‘perhaps, maybe’ (e.g., Aksan et al. 2016:209) or simply ‘perhaps’ (e.g., Kerslake & Göksel 2014:209). Others elaborate on their definitions to also encapsulate ‘even’ and ‘but’ and even add that when occurring with the particle *de* as in *belki de* it means ‘as likely as not’ (İz, Hony & Alderson 1984:65).

balkit (and its varying realizations) is widespread, occurring in several dialectal varieties of Arabic, Turkish and Persian, and it is also present in many other Turkic languages as well. Many Eastern Arabic dialects possess a word containing the element *bal-*: ‘Persian *balkeh*, Turkish *belki* and the dialects of Iraq and the Gulf *balkin*, *balcin* or *balkit*’ (Ingham 1994:125). Ingham (1994:125) compares the function of *balkit* (and its varying realizations) in the Gulf and Iraqi Arabic dialects to that of the Standard Arabic particle, *la ‘alla*, stating that, as it frequently occurs at the beginning of a sentence, it is, in a sense, also a conjunction, the action of which being dependent on the previous sentence. He adds that the nearest English equivalent is the antiquated *happen* or *mayhap*, as it was still used in the dialects in Northern England at the time of his writing, although in modern standard English it would seem as though there is no direct equivalent (Ingham 1994:126). There is also evidence of *belki* in various Turkic languages such as Tartar, Bashkir, and Chaghatay, wherein it implies ‘but, on the contrary’ (Berta 1998:296; Boeschoten & Vandamme 1998:174).

Taking into consideration how widely-spread *balkit* is cross-linguistically, especially in the Turkic languages, hypothesizing that *balkit* entered Arabic ‘from Persian via Turkish’ does not seem at all farfetched (if, that is, by ‘from Persian via Turkish’ we mean from Arabic to Persian then Turkish and back to Arabic through Turkish). It would further seem that the varying realizations of *balkit* in the Arabic dialects also indicate direct borrowing from Turkish. If we consider the realization of this item in the dialect of Aleppo, for instance, we are faced with *barkadan*. In Turkish, *belki* can be bound to *-de* or *-den* as in *belkide* or *belkiden* (İz, Hony & Alderson 1984:65), and it would not seem difficult to conceive that the realization *barkadan* is a

corruption of the Turkish *belkiden*. If we turn to the Iraqi Arabic realization, *balkit*, it would seem possible that this too indicates a direct loan from Turkish, with a natural devoicing of the *-de* in the Turkish *belkide* resulting in *balkit*. Now that sufficient background regarding the etymology of the loan in question has been set forth, we shall proceed with a definition of the term ‘modality’.

6.4 Defining Modality

Words like *balkit*, *yimkin*, *mumkin*, and *yigdar* are generally classified as ‘modals’ and the field in which they are concentrated is known as ‘modality’. Although many criteria have been set forth, explicitly or implicitly, for the definition of modality, it certainly is not easy to determine what modality actually is; the problem arises from the fact that various disciplines and sub-disciplines have each approached modality from different angles, and in each case the nature of the objective has come to be expressed with regard to the means of approach (Perkins 1983:1).

The term ‘modal’ is generally used by linguists in order to refer to a syntactically-defined subset of auxiliary verbs which are perceived as expressing modality (e.g., English *may*); despite the fact that lexical items which belong to other syntactically-defined categories (e.g., *possibility*, *possible*, and *possibly*) appear to convey the same type of meaning. Before Perkins (1983), such items were seldom thought of as modals in their own right, rather they were used by linguists, seemingly incidentally, as paraphrases to express the meanings of the modal auxiliaries which were the principal point of interest (Perkins 1983:1-2). As a result of close scrutiny, it soon became clear that the isolation of the modal auxiliaries from other modal words had semantic grounds, and it further became clear that no two modal expressions could be said to bear the exact same meaning (Perkins 1983:2).

A rather helpful, concise definition of modality is that of Lyons’ (1977:452) who suggests that modality deals with the speaker’s ‘opinion or attitude’. Many definitions follow in line with Lewis’ (1946:49) statement that ‘the proposition is assertable; the contents of the assertion... can be questioned, denied or merely supposed, and can be entertained in other moods as well’. Palmer (1986:16) defines modality as ‘the grammaticalization of speakers’ (subjective) attitudes and opinions’, and according to Taleghani (2008:11), modality concerns ‘the status of the proposition that describes the event’. Any definition of modality should initially recognize that it is a semantic term, consequently making it non-language specific, a belief which is

supported by the view that since we all share the same world and largely have rather similar relationships, basic linguistic functions are very similar in different language communities (Ali 1994:12). As can be seen from the above definitions, the real problem in defining modality is that the notion itself is vague, leaving room for a vast range of possible definitions; modality is associated with such varied notions as objectivity, subjectivity, opinions, attitudes (towards addressees and propositions), non-factivity, non-assertion, necessity, and possibility (Ali 1994). For the purposes of this present work, I take ‘modality’ to refer to the linguistic means which allow speakers to attach expressions of attitude, obligation, ability, desire, and belief to statements.

For illustrative purposes, let us briefly consider the expression of modality in English, followed by Iraqi Arabic in particular. Hermerén (1978:10) sets forth the the following list of four ways that modality can be expressed in English:

- I) NOUNS such as *chance*, *hope*, *presumption* and *expectation* (‘There is no chance etc. that he will succeed’); *intention* and *determination* (‘His intention etc. to learn English is admirable’).
- II) ADJECTIVES such as *conceivable*, *possible*, *likely* and *obvious*; *appropriate* and *necessary* which can all occur in the impersonal construction ‘it is...that’. Other adjectives, such as *sure* and *surprised*, occur in a personal construction like ‘I am...that...’, whereas adjectives such as *able* and *willing* occur in the construction ‘I am...to...’. A third group of adjectives, such as *doubtful* and *certain*, can occur both in a personal and impersonal construction.
- III) ADVERBS such as *hardly* and *perhaps* (‘He will hardly etc. go there’); *evidently*, *assuredly*, *fortunately*, *regrettably*, *surprisingly* and *strangely* (‘Evidently, etc. he was a dangerous criminal’).
- IV) VERBS:
 - a) MAIN VERBS like *doubt*, *think*, *believe* and *predict* (‘I doubt etc. that he will win’); *suggest* (‘I suggest that he should have an apple’); *want*, *prefer*, *desire*, *permit* and *forbid* (‘He wants etc. me to win’).
 - b) MODALS, i.e., *shall*, *should*, *will*, *would*, *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must* and *ought*.

Modality in Iraqi Arabic specifically, on the other hand, can be expressed by, but is not limited to:

- I) NOUNS expressing hope, chance, doubt, etc., e.g., *bala šakk* ‘without a doubt’ *iḥtimāl* ‘chance, possibility’; intention and determination, e.g. *qaṣd* ‘intention’, *nīya* ‘aim, intention’.
- II) ADJECTIVES expressing likelihood, possibility, obviousness, suppositions, necessity, anticipation, and permission, e.g., *wāḍiḥ* ‘obvious’, *mafrūḍ* ‘supposedly’, *ḍarūrī* ‘necessary’, *mitawaqqa* ‘anticipated, expected’, *masmūḥ* ‘permitted’.
- III) ADVERBS expressing possibility, likelihood, surprise, etc., e.g. *akīd* ‘definitely’, *ṭaba’an* ‘certainly’, *mumkin* ‘maybe, possibly’, *nādiran* ‘hardly’, *fajā’atan* ‘surprisingly’.
- IV) VERBS: expressing doubting, thinking, believing and predicting, suggesting, preferring, wishing, preventing, prohibiting, and intention: e.g., *yišakk* ‘to doubt’, *yiḍunn* ‘to think, believe’, *yitšawwar* ‘to imagine, believe’, *yi’ataqid* ‘to believe’, *yitqirah* ‘to suggest’, *yirīd* ‘to want’, *yifaḍḍil* ‘to prefer’, *yitmanna* ‘to wish’, *yixalli* ‘to let’, *yimna* ‘to prevent’, *yiḥarrim* ‘to prohibit’, *yuqṣud* ‘to intend’, *yimkin* ‘maybe, possibly’, *lāzim* ‘necessary’, *yigdar* ‘can’, *yajib* ‘should’.

It should be noted here that no distinction has been made between main verbs and modal verbs in Iraqi Arabic (although Hermerén (1978) made such a distinction for verbs in English), as Iraqi Arabic verbal patterns are the same for main and modal verbs.

6.5 The Scope of Modality

Now that we have discussed the outline and aims of the present chapter and defined modality, let us expand on our discussion with an exploration of the scope of modality. When treating modality, many scholars (e.g., Sweetser 1982) make a binary distinction between deontic and epistemic modality (two of von Wright’s (1951) four modes), the former in essence concerns influencing actions, events or states and expresses what Searle (1983:166) terms ‘directives’, and the latter makes a judgment about the truth of the proposition (Palmer 1990:6). Essentially, with epistemic modals, speakers tell their hearers (truly or falsely) how things are, whereas with deontic modals, speakers get their hearers to do things (Palmer 1990:10). The line between epistemic and deontic modality is not always clear, and they sometimes overlap. The notions of

necessity and possibility are related to epistemic modality (and also to von Wright's alethic). However, as to set an obligation is to make it necessary and to grant permission is to make an action possible, they can also be used to express deontic modality (Palmer 1990:8). Palmer (1990:8) explains that the difference between *must* and *may* as both deontic and epistemic can be clarified in terms of necessity and possibility; 'epistemic modality can be paraphrased as *possible that...*, deontic modality as *possible for...*'.

Lyons (1977:452) recognizes the distinction between deontic and epistemic modality as referring to 'the speaker's opinion or attitude towards the proposition that the sentence expresses or the situation that the proposition describes' and defines deontic modality as 'concerned with the necessity or possibility of acts performed by morally responsible agents' (p. 823) and epistemic modality as 'concerned with matters of knowledge or belief' (p. 793). Palmer (1990:10) suggests that deontic and epistemic modalities are essentially subjective in English, and that they express the 'opinion or attitude' of the speaker, and, consequently, both of these modalities are concerned with non-factual utterances, and furthermore, conversely, 'simple declarative sentences... are, strictly speaking, non-modal'. To illustrate epistemic modality, Perkins (1983:10) sets forth this example 'if one believed that acupuncture cured acne, then it could be said that his proposition 'acupuncture cures acne' is true *relative to* his own set of personal beliefs, although it might not be true according to the doctrines of western medical science'. Similarly in deontic modality, if one were summoned to appear in court on the account of some misdemeanor, then according to British law his appearance 'cannot but occur'; if he decided not to appear, that would not alter the fact that relative to the country's laws he *must* appear. Although this binary distinction is both semantically and formally the most clear-cut distinction of the English modals, other distinctions, such as dynamic modality in particular, appear totally valid; it is important to note that Palmer (1990:8) points out that it is both usual and convenient to make a binary distinction between epistemic and deontic modality, but that doing so is inaccurate as most modals are used both epistemically and deontically and are themselves neither deontic nor epistemic (Palmer 1990:8). However, as such terminology is less complex than discussing 'modals used epistemically/deontically', and is unlikely to lead to confusion, such a distinction is frequently adopted (Palmer 1990:8). That being said, the general concern that arises is that it is not sufficient to categorize each modal as deontic, epistemic, etc.,

and, as pointed out by Portner (2009:36), epistemic and deontic modalities do not encapsulate all options of modality in natural language— as a result additional categories are necessary.

Aristotle (cf. in particular *De Interpretatione*, Chs. 12-13) was one of the first to write about what is now referred to as ‘modality’. The notions of possibility, impossibility, and necessity, as well as the relations which are believed to exist between them were central to his discussions, and they, according to Perkins (1983:6), constitute the basis of modal logic. In von Wright’s pioneering work on modal logic, he divides modality into four ‘modes’, namely: I) the alethic modes or modes of truth; II) the epistemic modes or modes of knowing; III) the deontic modes or modes of obligation; and IV) the existential modes or modes of existence (1951:1-2). von Wright acknowledges that the last of his four modes, which belongs to quantification theory, is frequently not considered to be a branch of modal logic, however he adds that there are vital similarities between it and the other modes. von Wright sets out his four modes in a table, and, according to Palmer (1990:2), we are presumably to suppose that the organization into columns is significant:

<i>Alethic</i>	<i>Epistemic</i>	<i>Deontic</i>	<i>Existential</i>
necessary	verified	obligatory	universal
possible		permitted	existing
contingent	undecided	indifferent	
impossible	falsified	forbidden	empty

These categories are essentially those of a logician and von Wright’s motivation for outlining them is, openly, to examine their formal structure in terms of truth tables, etc., with regard to quantification theory (Palmer 1990:6). In contrast, the linguist must aim simply to investigate the type of modalities that are distinctly identifiable in language and the systems which they exhibit (Palmer 1990:6).

The main concern of logicians has been alethic modality (i.e., the objective truth that exists in the world), although it has little place in ordinary language, and the term ‘epistemic’ (i.e., the subjective truth that exists in an individual’s mind) has been used by linguists to refer to the use of *must* and *may* (modal auxiliaries) as in *He must be there, He may be there* (Palmer 1990:6). von Wright mentions that the word *possible* is used epistemically in ordinary language, however, in his system *possible* is classified as comprising part of alethic modality, and the word

undecided comprises epistemic modality (Palmer 1990:7). An explanation for this is that epistemic modality in language is typically, perhaps always, what Lyons (1977:792) refers to as ‘subjective’, as it is not merely concerned with ‘objective’ verifiability in the light of knowledge, rather it relates to an inference by the speaker (Palmer 1990:7). Alethic and epistemic modalities are often associated with one another although the question of whether they are two distinct modalities does not concern us for the purposes of the present work. Deontic modality also has a place in ordinary language. The modal verbs are used to express that which is permitted, obligatory, or forbidden, but, much like epistemic modality, it is usually subjective, as the speaker is the one who permits, obliges, or forbids (Palmer 1990:7).

Rescher (1968:24-6) proposes a more extended system than von Wright’s, asserting that ‘a proposition is presented by a complete, self-contained statement which, taken as a whole, will be true or false: The cat is on the mat, for example’ continuing that ‘when such a proposition is itself made subject to some further qualification of such a kind that the entire resulting complex is itself once again a proposition, then this qualification is said to represent a modality to which the original proposition is subjected’. Rescher (1968:9) presents eight different types of modalities, and, according to Perkins (1983:9), presents ‘one of the most comprehensive summaries of the conceptual domain of modality’; Rescher’s modalities are as follows:

I) *Alethic modalities*, relating to the notion of truth itself:

It is necessarily true (or: false) that p

It is actually true (or: false) that p

It is possibly true (or: false) that p

II) *Epistemic modalities*, relating to knowledge and belief:

It is known (or: X knows) that p

It is believed (or: X believes) that p

It is accepted (or: supposed, assumed) that p

It is anticipated (or: expected) that p

III) *Temporal modalities*, relating to time:

It is sometimes the case that p

It is mostly the case that p

It is always the case that p

It has always been the case that p

It was yesterday the case that p

IV) *Boulomaic modalities*, relating to desire:

It is hoped (or: X hopes) that p

It is feared (or: X fears) that p

It is regretted (or: X regrets) that p

It is desired (or: X desires) that p

V) *Deontic modalities*, relating to duties:

It ought to be brought about that p

It ought to be avoided (or: prevented) that p

It is forbidden to bring it about that p

It is permissible to bring it about that p

VI) *Evaluative modalities*:

It is a good thing that p

It is a perfectly wonderful thing that p

It is a bad thing that p

VII) *Causal modalities*:

The existing state of affairs will bring it about that p

The existing state of affairs will prevent (or merely: will impede) is coming out that p

VIII) *Likelihood modalities*:

It is likely that p

It is probable that p

It is worth noting here that it has been claimed that the number of modalities one decides upon is, to a certain extent, just ‘a matter of different ways of slicing the same cake’, and that, consequently, despite Rescher’s (1968) inclusion of more sets of principles of modality than is usually common, his summary is not definitive by any means (Perkins 1983:10).

Lyons (1977:725) sets forth the relevance of the theory of speech acts as a general framework for modality; Searle (1975:1-29) further develops this theory and summarizes the results in one of his later works (i.e., Searle 1983:166) arguing that there are five fundamental categories of illocutionary actions:

- I) Assertives: where the speaker tells the hearer (truly or falsely) how things are
- II) Directives: where the speaker gets the hearer to do things
- III) Commissives: where the speaker commits himself to doing things
- IV) Declarations: where the speaker brings about changes in the world with his utterances
- V) Expressives: where the speaker expresses his feelings and attitudes

Although Searle's approach to the problems differs from those previously mentioned, it still provides a useful semantic framework when discussing modality, as it 'refers to the issues in terms of 'meaning'' (Palmer 1986:13-14). Furthermore, although 'assertives' are described in reference to the speaker's 'commitment' or 'belief', they 'mark dimensions', and thus 'the degree of belief or commitment may approach or even reach zero', and although they also encompass statements of facts (which Rescher's definition of modality excludes), they must be concerned with the whole of epistemic modality, adding the directives largely correspond to deontic modality.

For the purposes of this chapter, we are not concerned with all of the modals which occur in Iraqi Arabic, but rather just a select few, and, therefore, we need not, and in fact are unable to, explore many different types of modality. Consequently, we shall only explore the types of modality which are embodied by the modals under analysis, namely epistemic, deontic, dynamic, and boulomaic modalities.

6.5.1 The Scope of the Modalities Served by the Modals Under Analysis

A brief summary of epistemic, deontic, dynamic, and boulomaic modalities (as we understand them for the purposes of the present work) will now be presented in order to set up a background for the analysis and to provide better insight into the divisions of labor between *balkit* and its non-loaned counterparts. Epistemic modality is concerned with the judgment value a speaker attributes to the likelihood or possibility of a proposition being fulfilled and such value judgements dictates his choice of modal. For instance, 'John will probably get the job' yields an epistemic reading as it is making a judgment value of the likelihood of John getting the job, with *probably* indicating that the speaker perceives a high likelihood of the proposition being true.

Unlike epistemic modality, deontic modality refers to acts not propositions. Deontic modality, as is yielded by the modals under analysis, can be divided into deontic ability and deontic

permission, the former of which pertains to the subject's ability (resulting from external factors) to carry out a given task while the latter pertains to something that is permitted by an external source. For example, 'He can travel to Iran without a visa' demonstrates deontic ability as it reflects the subject's ability to carry out a task resulting from external forces (namely the laws pertaining to visas) while 'You may sit in the blue chair' demonstrates deontic permission as the ability for the addressee to sit in the blue chair is contingent upon the permission granted to him by the speaker.

As the data gathered for the present work indicated that a mere binary distinction between epistemic and deontic modalities would not suffice, the present work will also treat dynamic and boulomaic modalities. Dynamic modality, a modality related to deontic modality, indicates a subject's willingness or internal capabilities as opposed to external factors, that is it describes an objective ability or favorable circumstances: 'he is capable of'; 'there is a likely possibility that...' (Grigore 2015:261). Although both dynamic and deontic modalities convey events that have yet to be actualized, that is events that are merely potential, the fundamental distinction between deontic and dynamic modality is that in regards to the former the conditioning factors are external to the individual denoted as the subject (i.e., the subject is permitted, ordered, etc., to act) whereas in regards to the latter they are internal (i.e., the subject is willing, able, etc., to act) (Palmer 1990:70).

Boulomaic modality concerns what is necessary or possible given an individual's desires. This type of modality is classed by Perkins (1983:11) as a type of dynamic modality on account of its 'disposition' meaning, and it could further be said that the disposition stems from the desire of a human source and is thus, consequently, akin to deontic volitive modalities, wherein the subject strives to impinge on the world. Boulomaic modality spans on a scale from not-desiring by not opposing to desiring. Essentially, boulomaic modality expresses the speaker's desires, hopes, or wishes. For example, 'I hope to travel around the world for a year' expresses boulomaic modality as it expresses the speaker's desire or wish to travel the world.

Turning to how these modalities are expressed via the modals under analysis, *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit* can all imply epistemic modality (section 6.8.1). The analysis presented in this chapter demonstrates that the terms in question can indicate varying degrees of likelihood of the proposition being fulfilled. That is to say in the epistemic sense (in quantitative contexts) there is an overlap between *mumkin* and *yimkin* in that, amongst the speakers who differentiate between

the modals, there is a tendency for them to use both *mumkin* and *yimkin* to express a medium to high level of likelihood regarding the level of commitment the speaker has towards the belief of the truth of the proposition, while *balkit* is reserved for instances of low likelihood and can even imply a sense of ‘there is a possibility of this occurring by mere coincidence’. However, the analysis further shows that this is not always the case, in that only some speakers appear to differentiate between the items in question in quantifiable epistemic contexts. When occurring in neutral contexts of epistemic possibility, *balkit*, *yimkin*, and *mumkin* are interchangeable. While *balkit* can occur deontically to request permission (in such instances it can be replaced by *mumkin* or *yigdar*), it cannot be used to grant it, although *mumkin* and *yigdar* can. *balkit* and *yimkin* do not lend a dynamic reading, although *yigdar* and *mumkin* do and in such instances can be used interchangeably. Out of the modals under analysis, it is only *balkit* that can lend a boulomaic reading, and it also occurs in the fixed boulomaic construction *balkit allāh*. That some of the modals can be classified by several different types of modality is down to context, as will be elucidated in the analysis.

6.6 Existing Literature on Modality in Arabic

There has been an ample amount of work on modality as it occurs in English and other European languages. While there has also been work conducted on languages spoken outside of Europe, explorations of modality as it is expressed in Arabic, and more specifically dialects of Arabic, are extremely limited and not much work had been published on the topic since the mid 90’s (e.g., Azer 1980, Ali 1994, Bahloul 1994, Mitchell & al-Hassan 1994) until recently (as will be discussed in section 6.6.1 below). In an attempt to expand the meagre literature on modality in Arabic, Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994) conducted a synchronic study of mood, modality and aspect. They focused on Educated Spoken Arabic (ESA) (a form of conversational Arabic employed by educated Arabic speakers from one or more Arab countries). Their study makes special reference to the Educated Spoken Arabic varieties spoken in Egypt and the Levant (namely Jordan, Lebanon, Palestine, and Syria). Their decision to study Educated Spoken Arabic was motivated by their awareness of this type of Arabic’s existence as a decidedly important form of spoken Arabic whose grammar is generally shared by the countries of the Levant and Egypt. They continue that they chose material from *informal* educated speech for two main reasons: first, significant variance among speakers might ostensibly be expected in speech closer

to vernacular Arabic. Second, the semantics and grammar of mood, aspect, and modality are such as to necessitate the use of material principally, although not entirely, sourced from the mother-tongue end of the stylistic spectrum of discourse, whereas other topics, for example sentence structure, may similarly attract features that arise in written language (p. 2). Although Iraqi Arabic is not explicitly referenced in their study, it still proves a valuable framework for this analysis, as we can use their findings as a reference point to determine the extent to which these findings carry over to the findings of the present work on Iraqi Arabic. The points below summarize Mitchell & al-Hassan's (1994:46-47) findings.

The most common modals used to express possibility in Educated Spoken Arabic are *muḥtamal* 'it is likely...'; Levantine *jāyiz*, Egyptian *gāyiz* 'It is possible...'; and *byimkin* (Levantine only)/*yimkin*/*mumkin* 'It may be...'. Central to our discussion is Mitchell & al-Hassan's assertion that there is a continuous scale of possibility/probability, which they explain as a further overlapping of necessity and possibility (however the modals we are exploring in particular do not express necessity). Householder & Cheng (1971:92-3) speak of a scale ranging from 'the barely imaginable' to 'the almost inevitable', and the existence of a continuous scale between the modals suggests that there is indeed contrast between them. According to Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994:47), *mumkin* (which they translate as 'very likely') ranks higher on the likelihood scale than *yimkin* (which they translate as 'might be possible'), and they present the following examples to illustrate this point:

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|------------------|-------|
| 1) mumkin | tišūf-hum | hināk |
| MUMKIN | see.PRS.2MSG-3PL | there |
| 'You can see them there.' | | |
| 2) yimkin | tišūf-hum | hināk |
| YIMKIN | see.PRS.2MSG-3PL | there |
| 'You may (perhaps) see them there.' | | |

Consider the following examples (Egyptian and Levantine, respectively) Mitchell & al-Hassan present to illustrate their likelihood scale— the translations provided are that of Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994:47):

- 3) **mumkin** yirūḥ
MUMKIN go.PRS.3MSG
'He may well go' or 'He is likely to go'
- 4) **yimkin** yirūḥ
YIMKIN go.PRS.3MSG
'He may go.'
- 5) **mumkin** yikūn rawwaḥ
MUMKIN be.PRS.3MSG go.PST.3MSG
'He may well have gone.'
- 6) **yimkin** yikūn rawwaḥ
YIMKIN be.PRS.3MSG go.PST.3MSG
'He may have gone.'

They present the following examples of *yimkin* as expressed in Levantine Arabic:

- 7) **yimkin** kunt 'āsi bi šarāḥt-i
YIMKIN be.PST.1SG harsh in outspokenness-1SG
'I may have been harsh in my outspokenness.'
- 8) **yimkin** bi ṭarī' -i l-il-bēt it'arriḍ li-matā'ib
YIMKIN in way-1SG to-the-house expose.PRS.1SG to-difficult.PL
'I may be exposed to difficulties on my way home.'

However, they do not explicitly state their reasoning behind the divisions of labor they have drawn between *mumkin* and *yimkin*, thus leaving one to wonder on what basis does *mumkin* lend a greater implication of likelihood than does *yimkin*. Although *balkit* was not one of the modals under analysis in Mitchell & al-Hassan's study, my own analysis indicated that, on the likelihood scale, *balkit* would be ranked the lowest, lending an implication similar to that of the English 'perhaps'. The section on epistemic possibility below (6.8.1) will explain this in more depth.

6.6.1 Existing Literature on Modality in Iraqi Arabic

Since Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994) interest in the topic of modality as it occurs in the Arabic dialects specifically has increased, and *Romano-Arabica*, a peer reviewed, annual, international journal published by the University of Bucharest's Center for Arab Studies, dedicated its 2016 issue to 'Modalities in Arabic'. The volume treated topics such as *Modalities and Modalization as Seen by the Arab Grammarians* (Anghelescu 2016), *The Notion of Modality in Arabic Linguistics: the Origin and Development* (Matskevych 2016), and *Renditions of the Arabic Modality kāda in Morisco Translations of the Qur'an* (Chiru 2016). Grigore (2015) also produced an article entitled *Expressing Certainty and Uncertainty in Baghdadi Arabic*.

Grigore's (2015) work will now be discussed briefly and the key points summarized, as the existing literature on modality in Iraqi Arabic is extremely limited, and Grigore's (2015) article provides a clear and concise exploration into the manner in which certainty and uncertainty are expressed in the dialect in question. Due to this, it can serve as a valuable point of reference for the present work, despite the fact that out of the modals under analysis Grigore only treats *yimkin* (with a fleeting mention of *yigdar*). Furthermore, the fact that he focuses on the expression of certainty/uncertainty specifically is of particular interest of us, because the article in question fits into the wider literature on modality by reiterating the widely-held concepts in the field and by further applying them to Iraqi Arabic specifically.

Grigore's definitions of epistemic modality are the basis for his analysis, and these definitions keep in line with the widely-held belief that modality refers to the speaker's commitment to the truth of a proposition— epistemic modality may be divided, based on the speaker's attitude, into epistemic/cognitive judgment (including the evaluation of possibility and necessity) and evidentiality (expressed by evidentials, which Grigore defines as 'the sources of knowledge' (p. 261)). We will now discuss some of the examples extracted from his analysis. They will be very briefly outlined here, just to paint a picture as to the existing literature on modality in Iraqi Arabic, because my close work with native speakers and my analysis indicate that *yimkin* only serves an epistemic reading, contrary to Grigore's claims that *yimkin* encapsulates epistemic possibility, deontic permission, and dynamic ability. Therefore, the claims made by Grigore shall not be expanded on beyond these examples. Grigore posits that in its epistemic reading *yimkin* expresses a hypothesis and consequently implies uncertainty,

translating it as ‘maybe; it is possible’. Consider first the example he presents to outline epistemic possibility (p. 261-262):

- 9) **yimkin** inhizim min il-bēt
 YIMKIN escape.PST.3MSG from the-house
 ‘Maybe he ran away from home.’

He contends that when lending a deontic permission reading it implies ‘it is allowed to’, consider:

- 10) **yimkin** tirja‘ li-ahl-ak gabul nihāyit is-sana
 YIMKIN return.PRS.2MSG to-family-2MSG before end the-year
 ‘You may return to your family before the end of the year.’

For *yimkin*’s dynamic reading, he posits that it implies ‘there is a likely possibility that...; he is capable of’ and expresses favorable circumstances or an objective ability:

- 11) **yimkin** ysāfir bācīr
 YIMKIN travel.PRS.3MSG tomorrow
 ‘He can leave tomorrow.’

He states that there are instances in which the epistemic and deontic readings of *yimkin* overlap (although he does not provide explicit examples of such instances) but adds that such ambiguity can be eradicated on the basis of the main verb in the statement—*yimkin* expresses an epistemic reading if the main verb in the sentence denotes a factual state:

- 12) hā-ṭ-ṭābūga tiṭṭantaḥ wa **yimkin** tōga‘ ‘ala rās-ak
 this-the-brick dangle.PRS.3MSG and YIMKIN fall.PRS.3MSG on head-2MSG
 ‘This brick is dangling and it might drop on your head.’

He further posits that *yimkin* is deontic when the main verb in the statement ‘denotes an action whose agent is a human which assumes it’ and illustrates this with the following example (and indicates that *yimkin* can be replaced with *yigdar* in this example to lend the same deontic implication) (p. 262):

13) **yimkin** yihmil hā-l-gūnīya li-s-sirdāb
 YIMKIN carry.PRS.3MSG this-the-sack to-the-cellar
 ‘He can carry this sack down to the cellar.’

My close work with the informants indicated that *yimkin* never alternates with *yigdar* to express a deontic (or dynamic) reading, contrary to the claims set forth by Grigore. It is indeed difficult to determine what specific modal reading is being lent by any given modal, and thus if we wish to accurately determine which sense of modality we should attribute to each modal under analysis we must consider such concepts as the time at which the sentence was expressed, the identity of the speaker, and the intention of the speaker, that is the context. As will be demonstrated throughout the analysis (6.8), taking the context of the propositions into consideration will allow us to extract accurate semantic interpretations of them, allowing for the unattested interpretations to be ruled out.

6.7 Data Collection and Methodology

The data for this chapter was collected through a combination of transcriptions from television programs broadcast in the Baghdadi dialect specifically (the details of which were mentioned in section 4.2) and data elicited from eight native speakers of Iraqi Arabic through their participation in interviews and the completion of acceptability judgment questionnaires. The preliminary analysis for this chapter was heavily dependent on the data collected from the native Iraqi Arabic speakers, as different types of modality are used to indicate the necessity or possibility of an event and are further employed to strengthen or weaken a speaker’s commitment to the truth value of a statement. Furthermore, Mitchell & al-Hassan’s (1994) well-known work on Arabic modality asserts that *mumkin* and *yimkin* in particular indicate varying degrees of likelihood when lending an epistemic reading. In order to uncover if this was also the case for Iraqi Arabic, it was necessary to investigate the manner in which the modals are used and interpreted by a number of native speakers, as the researcher’s (or, in fact, any lone researcher’s) sole linguistic intuition would not suffice. Furthermore, the modals under analysis, in their epistemic possibility readings, can occur in two differing manners— one in which the epistemic possibility can be, to some extent, quantified, and the other in which the possibility is seemingly neutral, that is a possibility exists but there is no clear quantifiable reference as to the

degree of this possibility. This binary distinction should not be thought of as two different types of epistemic readings, but merely as two contexts in which the epistemic modals under analysis can be expressed.

The examples presented in the analysis illustrating epistemic possibility in quantitative contexts specifically were extracted from informant data— they present scenarios in which the degree of likelihood can, at least to some extent, be measured quantitatively. Such formulated constructions were necessary to accurately portray the quantitative measurement that the epistemic modals can convey, as they provide adequate context to indicate that the epistemic modals can indeed indicate a seemingly quantitative degree of likelihood. Gleaning these particular examples in this manner, as opposed to extracting them from television programs for example, uncovered the divisions of labor between the items in question by testing the extent to which and the manner in which Iraqi Arabic speakers differentiate between the modals and assessed whether the assertions set forth by Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994) regarding their differentiating features is applicable to the Iraqi Arabic context. In order to reach our conclusions, the informants were presented with scenarios which presented varying quantitative degrees of likelihood of occurring and were asked to select the most appropriate item (out of the modals under analysis) to accurately reflect their associated likelihood of occurrence; the responses were used to confirm or reject my own hypotheses about the manner in which the modals under analysis function. The scenarios resembled the following:

14)

اكو 100 تفاحة بالچيس. 85 منهن خضرا وال15 الباقية حمرا. اذا اختار وحدة منهن بشكل عشوائي _____ راح اختار تفاحة خضرا.

āku	mī'at	tufāḥa	b-ič-čīs	xamsa ū	θamānīn	min-hin
there is	hundred	apple	in-the-bag	five and	eighty	from-3FSG
xuḍra	wa	il-xamsit 'ašr	il-bāqīya	ḥamra	iḏa	
green	and	the-fifteen	the-remaining	red	if	
iḏa	axtār	wāḥda	min-hin	b-šakl	'ašwā'ī	
if	select.PRS.1SG	one	from-3FPL	in-shape	random	
_____	rāḥ	axtār		tufāḥa	xuḍra	
_____	FUT	select.PRS.1SG		apple	green	

'There are 100 apples in a bag. 85 are green and 15 are red. If I select one apple at random _____ I will select a green apple.'

It is realized that there are items which denote certainty and definiteness in Iraqi Arabic, such as *akīd* 'certainly, surely', and this point was raised to my informants in my consultations with them. However, these informants demonstrated that *akīd* denotes definiteness and indicated that the scenarios, like the example presented above, indicate a degree of uncertainty, adding that *akīd* has no place in sentences expressing any degree of uncertainty.

It should also be noted here that if Mitchell & al-Hassan's (1994) findings concerning epistemic modality carry over to Iraqi Arabic, we would expect the scenarios with a high quantitative likelihood of occurring (like the one above wherein the likelihood of selecting a green apple is 85%) to yield a *mumkin* response, those with a rather medium likelihood of occurring to yield a *yimkin* response, and those with a very low level of likelihood to yield a *balkit* response. The questions with which the informants were presented set forth scenarios ranging from those with a 99% chance of occurring to those with a 5% chance of occurring, and, therefore, it was anticipated that they would indicate a relatively regular degree of differentiation regarding which of the three items they would select as being the most appropriate response to reflect the likelihood of the given scenarios occurring. However only four of the eight informants made a seemingly clear and consistent distinction between the epistemic modals under analysis, indicating an overlap between *mumkin* and *yimkin*, but reserving *balkit* for instances of lower

likelihood. Of the remaining four informants, two did not indicate any differentiation, appearing to employ the epistemic items under analysis interchangeably, in that they gave dissimilar responses to scenarios which presented the exact same degrees of likelihood of occurring (although if they indeed differentiated between the items, they would have presented the same item as the most appropriate response for both questions). The other two informants selected *yimkin* for every question that elicited information about epistemic modality. When I asked these four informants why they did not differentiate between the items, they all expressed that the scenarios were exactly the same, just with different degrees of likelihood, thus suggesting that some Iraqi Arabic speakers, although recognizing the various degrees of likelihood, do not interpret the items under analysis as indicating various degrees of likelihood or do not find it necessary to differentiate between them. The fact the some informants did not seem to distinguish at all between the items and that the others demonstrated an overlap between *yimkin* and *mumkin* but a distinction between these two items and *balkit*, indicates that it is not imperative to differentiate between the items in question in their epistemic readings, but that some Iraqi Arabic speakers do. This could further suggest that modals other than *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit*, i.e., ones with higher/lower degrees of probability may be more appropriate responses for the questions presented. Due to such discrepancies in the responses (with some informants distinguishing between the epistemic modals and others not) the analyses presented below treat only the manner in which Iraqi Arabic speakers who demonstrate clear divisions between the epistemic items do so. The data that was yielded for the deontic, dynamic, and boulomaic modal readings, however, revealed much greater consistency and agreement between the informants, in that all informants demonstrated clear, consistent, and congruent distinctions between them. Now that we have outlined the manner in which the data for the present chapter was collected, we will move on to the analysis, beginning with the manner in which epistemic possibility is expressed by the modals in question.

6.8 Analysis

Let us now turn to the analysis of the modals categorized by modal reading. We will treat affirmative instances of the modals first, before turning to the manner in which they are negated.

6.8.1 Epistemic Possibility

mumkin, *yimkin*, and *balkit* can all lend epistemic possibility readings in quantitative and neutral contexts, and although there is some overlap between them in such instances, there is also a distinct division of labor. Let us begin first with an exploration of how these items occur in quantitative contexts, beginning with *mumkin* and *yimkin*. The data yielded by the questionnaires indicated that when used to express possibility both *mumkin* and *yimkin* can be seen as expressing a medium to high level of possibility (above 50% likelihood of occurring but less than 100%). Epistemic *mumkin* and *yimkin* tend to occur towards the head of the sentence, before the appropriately-conjugated verb, yet after the subject (if the subject is explicitly stated). Let us first consider an instance of epistemic possibility occurring in a quantitative context with a high likelihood of occurring (90%):

15)

اكو صندوق بيه 10 طماطات. 9 منهن ممرودة ووحدة مو ممرودة. اذا اختار 1 منهن بشكل عشوائي ممكن/يمكن راح اختار طماطة ممرودة.

āku	ṣandūg	bī-h	‘ašra	ṭamāṭāya	tis‘a
there is	box	in-3MSG	ten	tomato.PL	nine
min-hin	mamrūda	ū	wāḥda	mu	mamrūda
from-3FPL	squished	and	one	NEG	squished
iḏa	axtār	wāḥda	min-hin	b-šakl	‘ašwā’ī
if	select.PRS.1SG	one	from-3FPL	in-shape	random
mumkin/yimkin	rāḥ	axtār		ṭamāṭa	mamrūda
MUMKIN/YIMKIN	FUT	select.PRS.1SG		tomato	squished

‘There is a box containing ten tomatoes, nine of which are squashed and one is not. If I select one at random I will probably select a squashed tomato.’⁷³

As this scenario has a high quantitative possibility of occurring, the informant data revealed that both *mumkin* and *yimkin* are appropriate. Now consider the following example, wherein the quantitative possibility of occurring is decreased, although still high (70%):

⁷³ Informant data

16)

اكو چيس به 10 برتقالات. 7 منهن ناضجة وال3 الاخرى مو ناضخة. اذا اختار 1 منهن بشكل عشوائي ممكن/يتمكن راح
اختار برتقالة ناضجة.

āku	čīs	bī-h	‘ašra	bortuqālāt	saba‘a	min-hin
there is	bag	in-3MSG	ten	orange.PL	seven	from-3FPL
nāḍija	ū	il-tlāθ	il-uxra	mu	nāḍija	iḏa
ripe	and	the-three	the-other	NEG	ripe	if
axtār		wāḥda	min-hin		b-šakl	‘ašwā’ī
select.PRS.1SG		one	from-3FPL		in-shape	random
mumkin/yimkin	rāḥ	axtār		bortuqāla	nāḍija	
MUMKIN/YIMKIN	FUT	select.PRS.1SG	orange	ripe		

‘There are ten oranges in a bag, seven of which are ripe and three of which are not. If I select one at random I will probably select a ripe orange.’⁷⁴

Although the quantitative likelihood of occurring in this example is less than that of 15), given a 70% likelihood of occurring, the scenario is still more likely to occur than not, and therefore either *mumkin* or *yimkin* is acceptable.

Now consider the following example, wherein the quantitative possibility of occurring is decreased yet again, this time to 50%, and thus the likelihood of occurring or not occurring is equal:

⁷⁴ Informanta data

17)

اكو 4 استكانات چاي علميز. 2 منهن بيهن نعناع وال 2 الباقية ما بيهن نعناع. اذا اختار 1 منهن بشكل عشوائي ممكن راح
اختار الجاي اللي بيه نعناع.

āku	arba‘a	istikānāt	čāy	‘ā-l-mēz	iθnēn	min-hin
there are	four	cup.PL	tea	on-the-table	two	of-3FPL
bī-hin	na‘nā‘	wa	il-iθnēn	il-bāqīya	ma	bī-hin
in-3FPL	mint	and	the-two	the-remaining	NEG	in-3FPL
na‘nā‘	iḏa	axtār		wāḥda		min-hin
mint	if	select.PRS.1SG		one		from-3FPL
b-šakl	‘ašwā‘ī	mumkin/yimkin		rāḥ		axtār
in-shape	random	MUMKIN/YIMKIN		FUT		select.PRS.1SG
ič-čāy	illi	bī-h	na‘nā‘			
the-tea	which	in-3MSG	mint			

‘There are four cups of tea on the table, two of which have mint and the two remaining do not have mint. If I selected one of them at random maybe I will select a tea with mint.’⁷⁵

We can see in this example that the speaker has an equal chance of selecting either a tea with mint or one without. The informant data indicated that either *mumkin* or *yimkin* would be suitable in this type of scenario, but that the likelihood of the proposition was still ‘too likely’ for *balkit* to be deemed appropriate.

Let us now analyze *balkit* as used to express epistemic possibility in a quantitative context. In such contexts *balkit* denotes a low probability value, and it implies something along the lines of ‘I’m fairly sure this isn’t true’—*balkit* indicates the lowest level of likelihood and the highest level of doubt out of the epistemic modals under analysis. My close work with native speakers indicated that *balkit* is used to imply that the speaker does not accept responsibility for, or particularly believe in the propositional content of what he is saying. Furthermore, if the likelihood of a scenario actually occurring is reduced below a 50% chance (i.e., making the proposition, quantitatively, more unlikely than likely), *balkit* is the most appropriate modal. Like *mumkin* and *yimkin*, *balkit* tends to occur at the head of a statement, after the personal pronoun and before the verb. Consider:

⁷⁵ Informant data

18)

اكو 3 قمصان بالديلاب. 2 منهن سودا وواحد ابيض. اذا اختار واحد منها بشكل عشوائي بلكت راح اختار قميص ابيض.

āku	tlāθ	qamṣān	b-id-dīlāb	iθnēn	min-hin	sōda
there is	three	shirt.PL	in-the-closet	two	from-3FPL	black
ū	wāḥid	abiaḏ	iḏa	axtār	wāḥda	min-hin
and	one	white	if	select.PRS.1SG	one	from-3FPL
b-šakl	‘ašwā’ī	balkit	rāḥ	axtār	qamīṣ	abyaḏ
in-shape	random	BALKIT	FUT	select.PRS.1SG	shirt	white

‘There are three shirts in the closet, two of which are black and one is white. If I select one at random perhaps I will pick a white shirt.’⁷⁶

In this particular instance, the likelihood of randomly selecting a white shirt is 33%. The responses presented by the informants indicated that *balkit* is the most appropriate response, as it implies the lowest degree of likelihood.

When the likelihood of the scenario occurring is dropped even further, for instance to 5%, the responses yielded by the questionnaire indicated that *balkit* was again the most appropriate response, consider:

⁷⁶ Informant data

19)

اكو عشرين فناجين كهوة علميز. 19 منهن بهن شكر و 1 منهن بلا شكر. اذا اختار 1 منهن بشكل عشوائي بلكت راح اختار كهوة بلا شكر.

āku	‘ašrīn	finājīn	gahwa	‘ā-l-mēz	tis‘at‘aš
there are	twenty	cup.PL	coffee	on-the-table	nineteen
min-hin	bī-hin	na‘nā‘	wa	il-waḥid	il-bāqi
from-3FPL	in-3FPL	mint	and	the-one	the-remaining
ma	bī-h	na‘nā‘	iḏa	axtār	wāḥid
NEG	in-3MSG	mint	if	select.PRS.1SG	one
min-hin	b-šakl	‘ašwā‘ī	balkit	rāḥ	axtār
from-3FPL	in-shape	random	BALKIT	FUT	select.PRS.1SG
gahwa	bala	šakar			
coffee	without	sugar			

‘There are twenty cups of coffee on the table, nineteen of which contain sugar and one does not. If I select one of them at random perhaps I will select a coffee without sugar.’⁷⁷

As the likelihood of selecting a coffee without sugar is quantitatively very unlikely, the use of *balkit*, while not entirely ruling out the possibility of selecting a coffee without sugar, implies ‘Perhaps, I will select a coffee without sugar (although I’m fairly sure I won’t)’. As we can infer from the examples of quantitative epistemic *balkit*, *balkit* implies something along the lines of ‘it is possible, although not very likely, that...’

Now let us turn to neutral contexts of epistemic modality, wherein there is no explicit quantifiable degree of the likelihood of the proposition, beginning with *mumkin*. Although Mitchell & al-Hassan’s (1994) pioneering work on Arabic modality speaks of the varying degrees of epistemic likelihood expressed by *mumkin* and other modals, the analysis revealed that it is also possible for *mumkin* to express seemingly neutral epistemic modality, that is in some contexts the use of *mumkin* can allude to merely any degree of possibility or likelihood, or, perhaps more accurately, to the existence of possibility itself, implying something along the lines of ‘it is possible that...’ with no epistemic value judgment of the degree of likelihood being connoted. It was further determined that in such epistemic contexts, the informants demonstrated

⁷⁷ Informant data

much more overlap and a seeming interchangeability between the modals, despite conveying much clearer divisions of labor in clearly quantitative contexts.

Consider:

20)

أ: ممكن الشرطة ما تنتبه سيارة السجن من توگف؟

A: **mumkin** iš-šurṭa ma tintibih sayyārit is-sijin
 MUMKIN the-police NEG notice.PRS.3MSG car the-prison
 min togaf
 when stop.PRS.3FSG

‘Is it possible that the police weren’t paying attention to the prison vehicle when it stopped?’

ب: ممكن سيدي لأن السيارة اكيد توگفت اكثر من مرة بازدحان.

B: **mumkin** sayyid-i li’an is-sayyāra akīd itwaggafat
 MUMKIN sir-1SG because the-car certainly stop.PST.3FSG
 akṯar min marra b-izdiḥām
 more than once in-traffic

‘It’s possible, sir, because the car certainly stopped more than once in traffic.’⁷⁸

Here we can see the manner in which A uses *mumkin* to inquire about the possibility of the police not paying attention to the prison vehicle. The implication lent here is ‘is it possible that...’ without alluding to any degree or scale of likelihood. The response uttered by B, which also includes *mumkin*, affirms that there is indeed a possibility that the police were not minding the vehicle. Now that we have seen the manner in which *mumkin* lends an epistemic reading, let us consider the manner in which *yimkin* occurs epistemically in non-quantifiable instances.

⁷⁸ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 25 7:40

21)

اني ما دا احس بحبه الي. يگولي احبج بس ما الها اي طعم. ما چان هيچ بالبداية يمكن ما چنت افهم. ما ادري.

āni	ma	da	aḥiss	ib-ḥobb-a	il-i
1SG	NEG	PROG	feel.PRS.1SG	in-love-3MSG	for-1MSG
yigūl-l-i			aḥibb-ič	bass ma il-ha	ayy ṭa‘am.
say.PRS.3MSG-to-1SG			love.PRS.1SG-2FSG	but NEG to-3FSG	any flavor
ma	čān		hīč	b-il-bidāya	yimkin
NEG	be.PRS.3MSG		like this	in-the-beginning	YIMKIN
ma	činit		afham	ma adri	
NEG	be.PST.1SG		understand.PRS.1SG	NEG know.PRS.1SG	

‘I don’t feel his love for me. He says ‘I love you’, but it doesn’t have any flavor. It wasn’t like this in the beginning. It’s possible I didn’t understand. I don’t know.’⁷⁹

Here we can see another instance in which *yimkin* indicates a neutral possibility, in that there is no indication of any quantitative measurement. The speaker uses *yimkin* to present her speculation that it was possible that she did not understand the situation between her and her partner in the early days of their relationship.

Now that an exploration of *yimkin*’s implication of epistemic possibility has been set forth, let us move on to the manner in which *balkit* lends a neutral epistemic possibility reading, consider the following:

⁷⁹ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 10 20:15

22)

لازم اكو شي غلط. ارجع واسألها. هاي مسؤوليتي كمربي. بلكت عندها مشكلة وياه اهلها.

lāzim	āku	šī	ġalaṭ	arjaʿ
must	there is	thing	wrong	return. PRS. 1SG
w-asaʿ al-ha		hāy	masʿūlīt-i	ka-murrabi
and-ask. PRS.1SG-3FSG		this	responsibility-1SG	as-educator
balkit	ʿand-ha	muškila	wiyya	ahl-ha
BALKIT	at-3FSG	problem	with	family-3FSG

‘There must be something wrong. I’ll go back and ask her. This is my responsibility as an educator. It’s possible she has a problem with her family.’⁸⁰

Here we are faced with an epistemic possibility reading of *balkit*, with the speaker uttering *balkit* to allude to the possibility that the subject is experiencing familial problems— *balkit* connotes the theoretical possibility of the proposition of the subject facing familial problems being true. Much like we saw with *mumkin* and *yimkin*, instances of *balkit* like the one in question indicate that *balkit* can also serve a seemingly ‘neutral’ epistemic reading, in that it highlights theoretical possibility, but there is no evidence indicating a quantitative degree of likelihood of the statement being true or untrue.

As the analysis yielded an overlap between *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit*, we can conclude that the implication lent by any one of them in unquantifiable contexts is one of relative impartiality wherein the speaker neither harbors clear certainty nor substantial doubt about the proposition being fulfilled— the speaker has neither high nor low expectations of the truth value of the statement in which these epistemic modals are uttered in such contexts. These examples outlined above refer simply to the possibility of an event; ‘it is possible for the fact to be explained, it is explainable’; no ability or permission is involved, but the possibility is ‘neutral’ (Palmer 1990). *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit* as they occur in the above examples and in similar contexts indicate that the proposition is possible or likely, and although it signals that the speaker has some doubt about the truth of the propositional content, it does not necessarily mean that the speaker believes the proposition to be either true or false.

⁸⁰ *id-dars il-’awwal* Episode 15 15:40

6.8.2 Deontic Modality

Now let us turn to our analysis of the manner in which deontic ability is expressed, beginning with *mumkin*.

6.8.2.1 Deontic Ability

When implying deontic ability, *mumkin* expresses the subject's ability to perform a given task on account of external factors, consider:

23)

أ: صارلك زين لو بعدك؟ لو تريد ناخذك للمستشفى؟

A: šār la-k zēn lō baʿad-ak lō trīd
become.PRS.3MSG to-2MSG good or still-2MSG or want.PRS.2MSG
nāxǝ-ak l-il-mustašfa
take.PRS.1PL-2MSG to-the-hospital

‘Are you feeling better, or not yet? Or do you want us to take you to the hospital?’

ب: لا، ما بي شي. ماكو اي داعي.

B: la ma bi-ya šī māku ayy dāʿī
no NEG with-1SG thing there is not any need

‘No, there’s nothing wrong with me. There’s no need [to take me to the hospital].’

أ: زين إحيلي عن الحادث.

A: zēn iḥčī-l-ī ʿan il-ḥādith
good tell.IMP.2MSG-to-1SG about the-accident

‘Good. Tell me about the accident.’

ب: اني ما عندي شي ممكن اقول الك سيدي. لمن وكفت بالإشارة هجموا عالسيرة اثنين مُقَنَّعين ما اعرف منين اجو. ضربوني وفقدت الواعي.

B: āni ma ʿand-i šī **mumkin** agūl il-ak
1MSG NEG at-1SG thing MUMKIN say.PRS.1SG to-2MSG
sayyid-i lamin wiggafit b-il-išāra hijamō
sir-1MSG when stop.PST.1SG in-the-light attack.PST.3MPL
ʿā-l-sayyāra ithnēn muqanaʿīn ma aʿruf im-nēn
on-the-car two masked man.PL. NEG know.PRS.1SG from-where
ijaw ǝīrbō-ni ū fiqadit il-wāʿī
come.PST.3MPL strike.PST.3MPL-1SG and lose.PST.1SG the-consciousness

‘I don’t have anything I can tell you, Sir. When I stopped at the traffic light two masked men attacked the car. I don’t know where they came from. They hit me, and I lost consciousness.’⁸¹

⁸¹ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 25 6:45

In the example above, we can see *mumkin* is used to express deontic ability (as B's loss of consciousness resulted from the outer world namely being hit by the two masked men), with B explaining to A that he does not have anything to tell him about the accident as he lost consciousness, and thus *mumkin* expresses that B does not have the deontic ability to perform the action of telling A about the accident.

The expression of deontic ability can also be expressed by *yigdar*, which serves a fully verbal function, in that it gets conjugated to reflect the gender and number of the subject as well as the tense. It generally occurs in declarative sentences immediately after the subject (if the subject is explicitly stated)—*yigdar* abides by the same syntactic constraints as any other transitive verb in Iraqi Arabic (although we need not discuss verbal syntax here), consider:

24)

أ: استاذ، اعتقد دخلوا المحطة المترو.

A: ustāḏ	aʿtaqid	dixlō	li-muḥaṭṭit	il-metrō
sir	believe.PRS.1SG	enter.PST.3MPL	to-station	the-metro

‘Sir, I believe they went into the metro station.’

ب: شدتگول ندخل ورائهم؟

B: š-d-itgūl	nidxul	warā-hum
what-PROG-say.PRS.2MSG	enter.PRS.1PL	behind-3MPL

‘What do you say? Should we go in after them?’

ج: وشنگدر نسويلهم بين الناس قابل نرمي عليهم؟

C: wa š- nigdar	insawwī-l-hum	bēn	in-nās
and what-can.PRS.1PL	do.PRS.1PL-to-3MPL	amongst	the-people
qābil	nirmī	ʿalē-hum	
other than	shoot.PRS.1PL	on-3MPL	

‘And what can we do to them in front of people other than shoot at them?’⁸²

Here, *nigdar* is used to express deontic ability, with C asking what ability he and his colleagues have to trail the individuals they are following, or more specifically, he is questioning the objective ability they have resulting from the outer world (namely the presence of other people in the train station).

⁸² *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 25 5:45

Interestingly, and quite unlike the other modals under analysis, is that deontic *yigdar* can occur in conjunction with a preposition, namely *l-* ‘to, from’, as in *yigdar l-*. Such a construction seems to be an offshoot of deontic *yigdar* and implies ‘to do what one can’.

25)

أ: انت تكذب علي ارتان. شلون غدروا ينهزمون منك؟

A: inta	tikðib	‘allē-ya	Artān	šlōn	gidraw
2MSG	lie.PRS.2MSG	on-1SG	Artān	how	can.PST.3MPL
yinhizimūn		min-ak			
escape.PRS.3MPL		from-2MSG			

‘You’re lying to me, Artān. How were they able to get away from you?’

ب: المحطة اليوم مزدحمة شسوي. هذا اللي اقدر له.

B: il-muḥaṭṭa	il-yōm	mizdaḥama	š-sawwī	hāḏa	illi
the-station	the-day	crowded	what-do.PRS.1SG	this	which
agdar		l-a			
can.PRS.1SG		to-3MSG			

‘The station was crowded today. What could I do? I did what I could.’

أ: إذا انت صدگ هذا اللي تگدر له فمشکلتنک چبيرة.

A: iḏa	inta	şuduq	hāḏa	illi	tigdar	l-a
if	2MSG	really	this	which	can.PRS.2MSG	to-3MSG
fa-muškilt-ak			čibīra			
then-problem-2MSG			big			

‘If this is really [all] you could do, then you have a big problem.’⁸³

Here *agdar l-* implies that B did what he could given the external factors (i.e., the crowded station) that prevented him from capturing those he was chasing.

6.8.2.2 Deontic Permission (Granting)

When granting permission, *mumkin* generally occurs in declarative statements before an appropriately-conjugated present tense verb and after the personal pronoun (if the personal

⁸³ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 25 10:25

pronoun in used). This type of permission is the (external) possibility granted by an outer authority. Consider the following example:

26)

ممکن تلعب ویه الاصدقاء بعد ما تكمل اكلک.

mumkin til‘ab wiyya il-iṣḍiqā’ ba‘ad-ma itkammil
MUMKIN play.PRS.2MSG with the-friend.PL after-SR finish.PRS.2MSG
akl-ak
food-2MSG

‘You may play with your friends after you finish your food.’⁸⁴

Here, an external force, namely the speaker, is granting the addressee permission to play with his friends after he finishes eating.

yigdar can also be used to express deontic permission. When doing so, *yigdar* is conjugated to reflect the gender and number of the individual being granted the permission. As *yigdar* is a personal verb, it would seem that *yigdar* is much more ‘direct’ than its counterparts, consider:

27)

تگدر تطلع شوکت ما تريد.

tigdar tiṭl‘a š-wakit-ma trīd
can.PRS.2MSG leave.PRS.2MSG what-time-SR want.PRS.2MSG
‘You may leave whenever you want.’⁸⁵

The implication lent here is that the speaker is permitting the addressee to leave whenever he wishes.

6.8.2.3 Deontic Permission (Eliciting)

Continuing from this, a speaker may utilize *mumkin* to elicit permission— the speaker can ask the addressee to grant him permission to undertake a task, consider:

⁸⁴ Informant data

⁸⁵ Informant data

28)

ممکن اگعد هنا و انتظر المحامي؟

mumkin	agu‘ud	hinānā	wa	antaḏir	il-muḥāmi
MUMKIN	sit.PRS.3MSG	here	and	wait.PRS.3MSG	the-lawyer

‘May I sit here and wait for the lawyer?’⁸⁶

In this example, the speaker employed *mumkin* to enquire as to whether or not it is permissible for her to sit in a particular place whilst she waited for the lawyer. Consider the manner in which *yigdar* can be employed to elicit permission:

29)

اگدر احجي و يه المدير فد دقيقتين؟

agdar	aḥči	wiyya	il-mudīr	fad	daqīqtēn
can.PRS.1SG	speak.PRS.1SG	with	the-director	some	minute.DUAL

‘May I speak with the director for two minutes?’⁸⁷

Now let us explore *balkit*:

30)

بلكت نلتقي بعد الدرس؟

balkit	niltaqi	ba‘ad	id-dars
BALKIT	meet.PRS.1PL	after	the-lesson

‘May we meet after the lesson?’⁸⁸

6.8.2.4 Deontic (Polite Request)

Perhaps one of the most frequently-occurring manners in which *mumkin* is used in Iraqi Arabic is to make polite requests, such as the requesting of food or drink, or asking someone to fulfill a request. In such instances, *mumkin* tends to occur at the beginning of the clause and then the item or act being requested is stated. In the event that the speaker is requesting an item, there is no need for the explicit denotation of the verb (e.g., *bring*, *give*), as it is implied. *mumkin* can occur in conjunction with *min faḏlak* ‘please’, although it is not obligatory, consider:

⁸⁶ *ana w-il-majnūn* Episode 1 25:37

⁸⁷ Informant data

⁸⁸ Informant data

31)

ممکن اثنین چای من فضلك.

mumkin iθnēn čāy min faḏl-ak
 MUMKIN two tea from thanks-2MSG
 ‘Two teas, please.’⁸⁹

In this instance, the speaker uses *mumkin* to request two teas. Although syntactically and semantically possible and appropriate, the speaker does not employ a verb (e.g., *tinī-ni* ‘give me’; *itjīb-li* ‘bring me’) as the use of *mumkin* makes it clear that the speaker is making a request for two teas and the inclusion of a verb would be rendered superfluous.

Let us now consider how *mumkin* can be employed in conjunction with a verb to request that an action be fulfilled. In such instances the action is explicitly stated by the placement of the appropriately-conjugated present tense verb immediately after *mumkin*. Consider:

32)

أ: عصمت موجود؟ لازم اسأله كم سؤال.

A: ‘Aṣmat mawjūd lāzim as’al-a kam su’āl
 ‘Aṣmat present must ask.PRS.1SG-3MSG few question
 ‘Is ‘Aṣmat here? I need to ask him a few questions.’

ب: عزیزتی ممکن توصلین الاستاذ المكتب والدچ.

B: ‘azīzt-i **mumkin** itwaṣṣilīn il-ustāḏ il-maktab wālīd-ič
 dear-1SG MUMKIN deliver.PRS.2FSG the-gentleman to-office father-2FSG
 ‘Sweetheart, could you please take the gentleman to your father’s office?’⁹⁰

Here, we can see how B uses *mumkin* to request that the addressee fulfill his request, implying something along the lines of ‘could you please...’ As there is no imperative used here, B is making a request as opposed to giving an order. Now let us consider *yigdar*:

⁸⁹ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 37 24:20

⁹⁰ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 25 12:00

33)

تگدر تفتح الشباچ؟

tigdar	tiftaḥ	iš-šubbāč
can.PRS.2MSG	open.PRS.2MSG	the-window

‘Can you open the window?’⁹¹

Here *yigdar* is used to make a request. As *yigdar* gets conjugated to denote the addressee, it is much more direct than *balkit* or *mumkin*, and, as a result, the informants indicated that *yigdar*, when used to make requests, is not as polite as are *mumkin* or *balkit*.

When utilized to elicit permission, *balkit* occurs in interrogative statements, typically at the head of the clause, consider:

34)

بلکت اشرب جگاره؟

balkit	ašrab	jigāra
BALKIT	drink.PRS.1SG	cigarette

‘May I smoke a cigarette?’⁹²

We can see here that *balkit* in this example is used much like how *mumkin* would be in similar environments (sociolinguistic and pragmatic factors aside) and lends an implication of ‘could you please...’. It should be noted here that although *mumkin*, *yigdar*, and *balkit* can all occur in these types of environments, there are some sociolinguistic constraints differentiating them, in that my informants indicated during my consultations with them that *mumkin* was ‘more polite’ than *balkit*, attributing this discrepancy in register to *mumkin*’s non-loaned status. They further indicated that both *mumkin* and *balkit* were more polite than *yigdar*, as *yigdar*’s conjugation makes it more ‘direct’. However, the fine-grained nuances of this sociolinguistic variation do not concern us here.

⁹¹ Informant data

⁹² Informant data

6.8.3 Dynamic Ability

When utilized to express dynamic modality, *mumkin* modifies the subject, expressing a ‘matter of fact’ type of statement, that is to say, it does not express the speaker’s opinion, and the conditioning factors are internal. In such instances the appropriately-conjugated present tense verb immediately follows *mumkin*. Consider:

35)

وهسه الشي الوحيد اللي ممكن يخلصنا من كابوس توبشوا غلو هو قتل حكمة.

ū	hassa	iš-šī	il-wahīd	illi	mumkin	yuxalliṣ-na
and	now	the-thing	the-only	that	MUMKIN	save.PRS.3MSG-1PL
min	kābūs	Tōpšō Ōḡlō	huwa	qitil	Ḥikmat	
from	nightmare	Tōpšō Ōḡlō	3MSG	killing	Ḥikmat	

‘Now the only thing that can save us from the nightmare of Tōpšō Ōḡlō is killing Ḥikmat.’⁹³

The implication lent by dynamic *mumkin* here is that the killing of Ḥikmat is seemingly the only solution to the speaker’s problem. Although, it is understood that one could argue that the above statement is an expression of the speaker’s opinion, there clearly is not any indication of degree of likelihood or probability in the statement in question and certainly none of permission.

Furthermore, *qitil Ḥikmat* ‘killing Ḥikmat’ in this sentence is the agent performing the action of saving the speaker from the nightmare that is Tōpšō Ōḡlō and reflects ‘the killing of Ḥikmat’’s ability to save them. Therefore, the reading lent by this instance of *mumkin* is that of dynamic ability. Let us also consider:

⁹³ *il-hārib* (Part 2) Episode 27 13:30

36)

أ: انت ما متزوج؟

A: inta ma mitzawwij
2MSG NEG married
You're not married?

ب: تعتقدن اني ممكن اتزوج؟

B: ti'ataqidīn āni **mumkin** atzawwaj
believe.PRS.2FSG 1SG MUMKIN marry.PRS.1SG
'Do you think I can get married?'⁹⁴

Here is another instance of dynamic *mumkin*, wherein the speaker employs *mumkin* to indicate that he does not possess the internal ability or willingness to get married. There is no indication that he does not possess the physical ability to get married, and thus this instance of *mumkin* is clearly not deontic.

yigdar can also be used to express dynamic modality. Let us consider:

⁹⁴ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 44 6:00

37)

أ: استاذ عصمت، ما دتشفو اكو شي غريب؟

A: ustāḏ ‘Aṣmat ma da-tšūf āku šī ġarīb
 sir ‘Aṣmat NEG PROG-see.PRS.2MSG there is thing strange
 ‘Mr. ‘Aṣmat, you don’t see that there’s something strange?’

ب: شوف استاذ. فوگ هذا الفندق عندي هوايه معامل وشريكات لازم اديرها واعتقد تگدر تفتهم انو مستحيل اراقب كل شي
 واعرف شيصير بهاي الاماكن وبكل التفاصيل.

B: šūf ustāḏ fōg hāḏa il-funduq ‘and-i hiwāya
 look.IMP.2MSG sir above this the-hotel at-1SG many
 mu‘āmil ū šarīkāt lāzim adīr-ha wa
 factory.PL and company.PL necessary manage-3FSG and
 a‘taqid **tigdar** tiftahim inū
 believe.PRS.1SG can.PRS.2MSG understand.PRS.2MSG that
 mustaḥīl arāqib kull šī ū a‘ruf
 impossible monitor.PRS.1SG every thing and know.PRS.1SG
 š-iṣīr ib-hāy il-amākin ū ib-kull it-tifāṣīl
 what-happen.PRS.3MSG in-this the-place.PL and in-every the-detail.PL

‘Look, sir, in addition to this hotel, I have a lot of factories and companies I must take care of, and I believe you can understand that it’s impossible for me to monitor everything and to know what’s happening in these places and all the details.’⁹⁵

This particular instance is interesting in that it occurs in a value judgment made by B about A, namely that he believes A has the ability to understand his position. Although *tigdar* occurs in a value judgement here, it is the implication lent by *tigdar* that concerns us here, namely its dynamic ability reading. Through the use of *tigdar* B is indicating his proposition that A possesses the internal ability (e.g., he is intelligent enough) to understand that B has many responsibilities and thus cannot be expected to know all of the activities occurring in the factories and companies he runs.

⁹⁵ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 25 14:20

6.8.4 Boulomaic

Out of the modals under analysis, *balkit* is unique in that it is the only one which can imply a boulomaic reading (i.e., it expresses hopefulness or desire). An extension of its boulomaic reading is the construction *balkit aḷḷāh*. While *balkit* itself lends several modal readings, *balkit aḷḷāh* only lends a boulomaic one. When expressing boulomaic modality, *balkit* tends to occur at the head of the sentence and may be followed immediately by *aḷḷāh* ‘God’ as in *balkit aḷḷāh*. The addition of *aḷḷāh* to the proposition appears to add a sort of emphatic effect and clearly expresses hopefulness. It would further seem that *balkit aḷḷāh* can only express hopefulness and the interpretation is never context-based. However, if *balkit* occurs on its own (without being immediately followed by *aḷḷāh*) then the sense of hopefulness is extrapolated entirely from the context, as syntactically *balkit* functions in the same manner when used to express boulomaic modality as it does when expressing epistemic modality. Consider:

38)

امه هسه بغرفة العمليات بلكت تنجح العملية.					
umm-a	hassa	ib-ḡurfit	il-‘amalīya	balkit	tinjah
mother-3MSG	now	in-room	the-operation	BALKIT	succeed.PRS.3FSG
il-‘amalīya					
the-operation					
‘His mother is in the operating room, hopefully the operation is successful.’ ⁹⁶					

The example in question is a nice example of boulomaic *balkit* in that the context clearly indicates an air of hopefulness as opposed to possibility. It would seem that *balkit* is used to indicate the speaker’s hope or wish that the subject’s mother have a successful surgery. Also consider:

⁹⁶ Informant data

39)

العراق يتخرب بس بلكت يتحسن الوضع.

il-‘irāq	yitxarrab	bass	balkit	yithassan
the-Iraq	to be destroyed.PRS.3MSG	but	BALKIT	improve.PRS.3MSG
il-waḏa‘				
the-situation				

‘Iraq is destroyed but hopefully the situation improves.’⁹⁷

Here, through *balkit*, the speaker is revealing his hope that despite Iraq having been destroyed the situation in Iraq will improve. As we can see, in instances of boulomaic *balkit* the implication lent by *balkit* is something akin to ‘hopefully’. Let us now consider the unambiguous *balkit alḷāh*:

40)

بلكت الله تنجح بالامتحان.

balkit	alḷāh	tinjah	b-il-imtiḥān
BALKIT	ALḶĀH	succeed.PRS.2FSG	in-the-exam

‘Hopefully (I hope to God) you pass the exam.’⁹⁸

If we consider the boulomaic readings of *balkit* and *balkit alḷāh*, we notice a sociolinguistic difference between the two forms, namely the obvious fact that the latter contains *alḷāh* ‘God’ (providing an either conscious or subconscious reference to *alḷāh*). We can say that instances of boulomaic *balkit* indicate ‘hopefully’, while instances of *balkit alḷāh* suggest ‘I hope to God’.

6.8.5 Summary of the Modals

As has been demonstrated in the analysis above, epistemic modality can be expressed by *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit*, and all three of these items can occur in either quantitative or neutral contexts, the former of which relates to a quantifiable degree of likelihood of the proposition being fulfilled, while the latter expresses a form of epistemic modality that cannot be quantitatively measured but rather indicates an unquantifiable existence of possibility. It was

⁹⁷ Informant data

⁹⁸ Informant data

further explicated how, when occurring in quantitative contexts of epistemic modality, there is an overlap between *mumkin* and *yimkin*, with them both expressing a medium to high degree of possibility, while *balkit* is reserved for instances of lower likelihood and even suggests a high degree of unlikelihood. As pointed to in section 6.7, the fact the some informants consciously opted for *yimkin* for every response combined with the fact that others appeared to use all three of the items in question interchangeably, and that the others demonstrated an overlap between *yimkin* and *mumkin* but a distinction between these two items and *balkit*, indicates that it is not imperative to differentiate between the items in question in their epistemic readings, but that some speakers do—this could further suggest that modals other than *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit*, i.e., ones with higher/lower degrees of probability may be more appropriate responses for the questions presented. In neutral contexts of epistemic possibility, all three of these items imply an immeasurable amount of uncertainty and denote a seeming impartialness on behalf of the speaker’s belief in the likelihood of a proposition being fulfilled.

Furthermore, the modals under analysis can be utilized to express several types of deontic modality: deontic ability (*mumkin* and *yigdar*), the deontic granting of permission (*mumkin* and *yigdar*), and the deontic requesting of permission (*mumkin*, *yigdar*, and *balkit*), with polite requests being a seeming offshoot of the requesting of permission. As expressed above, the close work with the informants indicated that there are some sociolinguistic factors at play regarding which modal is most appropriate in instances of making polite requests, with *mumkin* being perceived as more polite than *balkit*. While *yigdar* can also be used to make requests, these requests are not necessarily ‘polite’ in that, perhaps due to the fact that *yigdar* is a fully-functioning verb that gets conjugated to reflect the subject, it is perceived as more direct than *balkit* and *mumkin*. Continuing from this, dynamic ability (which can be expressed by *mumkin* and *yigdar*) can be differentiated from deontic modality, in that with dynamic modality the determining factors are internal—the subject’s internal willingness or ability to perform an action. Finally, in the case of boulomaic modality, the reflection of wishes, hopes, or desires, a unique quality of the loaned *balkit*, in that, out of the modals under analysis, it is the only one which can express this type of modality.

In sum, epistemic *balkit* can be thought of as implying ‘perhaps; it’s possible although unlikely that...’ in quantitative contexts, while *mumkin* and *yimkin* overlap in quantitative contexts and imply ‘it’s probable that...; maybe’. In neutral (non-quantifiable) epistemic

contexts, *balkit*, *mumkin*, and *yimkin* all imply ‘it’s possible that..’. When expressing deontic/dynamic ability *mumkin* and *yigdar* imply ‘can’, and in instances of deontic permission *balkit*, *mumkin*, and *yigdar* imply ‘it is permissible; it is allowed’. Finally, boulomaic *balkit* implies ‘it is hoped that...’ and instances of *balkit allāh* suggest ‘I hope to God’.

6.9 Negation of the Modals

Now let us continue our analysis of *balkit* and its non-loaned counterparts by exploring an overview of negative modality followed by an analysis of the manner in which *balkit* and its counterparts are negated.

6.9.1 Overview of Negative Modality

There is a lot of overlap between the deontic and epistemic interpretations in negative statements, particularly in regards to the modals in question, and, at times, it appears as though the differentiation between deontic and epistemic interpretations is contextual. Therefore, for an accurate understanding of modality interpretively and structurally, a discussion of the interaction between modals and negation is imperative (Taleghani 2008:105). As for epistemic possibility, the distinction is easily characterized as ‘possible not’ and ‘not possible’ (Palmer 1995:9), while negative deontic ability can be characterized as ‘cannot’ or ‘unable to’. ‘Negative epistemic possibility’, for the sake of this present work, should be taken to mean how the modals are used epistemically to express that something is not possible, while ‘negative ability’ should be taken to mean how the modals are used to express lack of ability. Negative deontic permission can be thought of as the lack of permission (something along the lines of ‘may not’ or ‘not permitted to’). In terms of boulomaic modality, the modal reading itself cannot be negated, although by placing the negative particle, *ma*, after *balkit* ‘it is hoped that X is not the case’ can be expressed.

6.9.2 Overview of How the Modals Under Analysis Are Negated

Of particular interest to us for the present work is the fact that not all of the modals under analysis can be negated in Iraqi Arabic. Out of the epistemic items under analysis, it is only *mumkin* that can be negated. Epistemic *mumkin* is negated by placing the negative particle *ma* immediately before it. As *mumkin* lends several modal readings, it is important to note that the location of *mumkin* within the statement plays a large role in determining the scope of the

statement, that is the location of *mumkin* within the statement will influence its semantic interpretation and determine whether it lends a reading of negative epistemic modality or negative deontic/dynamic modality. It is possible for *ma* to occur immediately before *mumkin* (i.e., *ma mumkin*) or immediately after *mumkin* (i.e., *mumkin ma*). *ma mumkin* connotes negative epistemic modality ('it is not possible that...'), negative deontic/dynamic ability ('cannot'), and negative permission (granting) ('you may not...'). *mumkin ma*, on the other hand, connotes epistemic modality where the statement, but not the modality, is negated ('it is possible/probable that... not') and negative permission (requesting) ('could you not...?'). Furthermore, as, out of the modals under analysis, *yigdar* is a fully-functioning regular verb (adhering to the Arabic syntactic constraints of reflecting gender, number, and tense), *yigdar* is negated just like any other verb in Iraqi Arabic, i.e., with the negative particle *ma* immediately preceding it, as in *ma yigdar*, and thus *yigdar ma* is neither syntactically nor semantically acceptable. *ma yigdar* (and its various conjugations) can lend negative deontic (both ability and permission) and dynamic modal readings. Perhaps one of the most interesting differences between *balkit* and its non-loaned counterparts is that it would seem as though it is not possible to negate *balkit* in its epistemic reading, and thus placing the negative particle *ma* in front of the modal to render *ma balkit* is not semantically/syntactically acceptable in Iraqi Arabic, although instances of *balkit ma* do not appear to pose any issues. That epistemic *balkit* cannot be negated in the same manner as epistemic *mumkin* indicates that this lack of possibility must be denoted in another manner, for example through the use of items like *mustahīl*, *ma mumkin*, or *ma yigdar*, although an investigation into these alternatives is beyond the scope of the present work.

6.10 Analysis

We will begin our analysis of negative modality as it pertains to the modals under analysis with an analysis of epistemic modality first.

6.10.1 Epistemic Modality

Out of the epistemic modals under analysis, it is only *mumkin* that can be negated in Iraqi Arabic. When doing so, the Iraqi Arabic negative particle *ma* is placed immediately before *mumkin* as in *ma mumkin*. Consider:

41)

أ: انت صدگت استاذ معتز يبيع الاسئلة؟ استاذ معتز مستحيل يسويها. هذا إنسان مخلص وشريف. انت تدري اكثر من مرة ينطيني دروس خصوصية مجاناً؟.. لأن هو يعرف ظروفك كلش زين. مثل هيجي إنسان مستحيل يبيع ضميره بفلوس الدنيا كلها.

A: inta	şiddagit	ustāð	Mo‘ataz	yibī‘
2MSG	believe.PRS.2MSG	mister	Mo‘ataz	sell.PRS.3MSG
il-as’ila	ustāð	Mo‘ataz	mustaḥīl	yisawwī-ha
the-question.PL	mister	Mo‘ataz	impossible	do.PRS.3MSG-3FSG
hāða	insān	muxliş	ū	şarīf
inta	tidrī			
this	man	sincere	and	honorable
2MSG	know.PRS.2MSG			
akθar	min	marra	yinṭī-ni	durūs
xuşuşıya				
more	than	once	give.PRS.3MSG-1SG	lesson.PL
private				
majānan	li’an	huwa	yi’aruf	ḡurūf-i
kulliş				
free	because	3MSG	know.PRS.3MSG	situation.PL
very				
zēn	miθil	hīčī	insān	mustaḥīl
yibī‘				
ḡamīr-a				
good	like	such	man	impossible
sell.PRS.3MSG				
conscious-3MSG				
b-flūs	id-dinya	kull-ha		
in-money	the-world	all-3FSG		

‘You believed that Mr. Mo‘ataz sells the answers [to the exams]? It’s impossible that Mr. Mo‘ataz would do that. He’s a sincere and honorable man. Do you know that more than once he gave me free private lessons because he knows my [difficult] situation very well. It’s impossible for such a person to sell his conscience for all the money in the world.’

ب: بصراحة اني شكيت من حالي ميمون.. بس اني گلت استاذ معتز انسان نظيف وطاهر. ما ممكن يبيع ضميره مقابل المادة.

B: ib-şarāḡa	āni	şakkēt	min	ḡačā-l-i	Mēmūn
in-honesty	1SG	doubt.PST.1SG	when	tell.PST.3MSG-to-1SG	Mēmūn
bass	āni	gilit	ustāð	Mo‘ataz	insān
nāḡīf	ū				
but	1SG	said.PST.1SG	mister	Mo‘ataz	man
clean	and				
ṭāhir	ma	mumkin	yibī‘		ḡamīr-a
pure	NEG	MUMKIN	sell.PRS.3MSG		conscience-3MSG
muqābil	il-māda				

instead the-material

‘Honestly, I doubted it when Mēmūn told me, and I said: Mr. Mo‘ataz is a pure-hearted man— It’s not possible that he’d sell his conscience for money.’⁹⁹

This snippet of dialogue is an especially good example of negative epistemic modality in that the context surrounding the conversation itself is clearly epistemic and concerned with the theoretical possibility of Mr. Mo‘ataz selling exam answers, with the speakers speculating whether such claims are true or false. Furthermore, the example in question presents a clear indication that *ma mumkin* and *mustahīl* ‘impossible’—a clearly epistemic modal indicating the lack of possibility—lend the same implication. The interchangeability between *ma mumkin* and *mustahīl* is clear when A uses *mustahīl* in his declaration *miθil hīcī insān mustahīl yibī ‘ḍamīr-a b-flūs id-dinya kull-ha* ‘It’s impossible for such a person to sell his conscience for all the money in the world’, and B uses *ma mumkin* to seemingly reiterate A’s statement and to further concur, positing *ustāḍ Mo‘ataz insān nāḍīf ū tāhīr ma mumkin yibī ‘ḍamīr-a muqābil il-māda* ‘Mr. Mo‘ataz is a pure-hearted man—It is not possible that he’d sell his conscience for money.’ The implication lent by *ma mumkin* in this particular example is ‘It is not possible/it is impossible for Mr. Mo‘ataz to sell exam answers.’

6.10.2 Deontic Modality

We will now turn to the various manners in which the various deontic readings of the modals can occur in negative senses.

6.10.2.1 Deontic Ability

When expressing deontic modality both *mumkin* and *yigdar* can be negated. In such instances the negative particle *ma* occurs immediately before these items as in *ma mumkin* or *ma yigdar* which indicate ‘cannot’ or ‘is not possible’ or ‘unable’ as in ‘I cannot attend the meeting’, consider the following instance of *ma mumkin*:

⁹⁹ *id-dars il-’awwal* Episode 4 3:15

42)

عندي موعد عند الطبيب فما ممكن احضر الاجتماع.

‘and-i	maw‘ad	‘and	iṭ-ṭabīb	fa	ma	mumkin
at-1SG	appointment	at	the-doctor	so	NEG	MUMKIN
aḥḍar	il-ijtimā‘					
attend.PRS.1SG	the-meeting					

‘I have a doctor’s appointment, so I can’t attend the meeting.’¹⁰⁰

The context surrounding this example indicates that *ma mumkin* here lends a deontic ability reading— there are external factors preventing the speaker from attending the meeting, namely the doctor’s appointment. Now consider *ma yigdar*:

43)

وحتى تلزم السرحات تورطتنا بمشكلة ما نكدر نحلها.

ū	ḥatta	tilzam	il-Sarḥāt	itwarriṭit-na
and	in order to	catch.PRS.2MSG	to-Sarḥāt	involve.PRS.2MSG-1PL
ib-mušmila	ma	nigdar	inḥill-ha	
in-problem	NEG	can.PRS.1PL	solve.PRS.1PL-3FSG	

‘And in order to catch Sarḥāt, you got us into a problem we can’t solve.’¹⁰¹

Here external factors (i.e., the addressee’s involvement in trying to catch Sarḥāt) are preventing the speaker from being able to solve the problem. Through this utterance, the speaker is implying that she and the addressee do not possess the ability to solve the problem.

6.10.2.2 Deontic Permission (Granting)

Deontic permission can be negated to express the lack of permission. Both *mumkin* and *yigdar*, preceded by the negative particle *ma*, can be employed to indicate that someone is not permitted to do something. Consider *ma mumkin* first:

¹⁰⁰ Informant data

¹⁰¹ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 25 15:55

44)

ما ممكن تروح للسنيما وياه الاصدقاء.

ma mumkin trūḥ l-is-sinama wiyya il-iṣḍiqā'
NEG MUMKIN go.PRS.2MSG to-the-cinema with the-friend.PL

'You are not allowed to go to the cinema with your friends.'¹⁰²

Through the negation of *mumkin* here, the speaker is expressing that she does not permit the addressee to go to the cinema with his friends. Now consider *ma yigdar*:

45)

ما تكدرون تطلعون باجر.

ma tigidrūn tiṭla'ūn bāčir
NEG go.PRS.2PL exit.PRS.2PL tomorrow

'You are not allowed to go out tomorrow.'¹⁰³

Through the use of *ma yigdar* here, the speaker is telling the addressee that they do not have permission to go out tomorrow.

6.10.2.3 Deontic Permission (Eliciting)

The deontic eliciting of permission can also be negated. In such instances the negative forms of *mumkin* and *balkit* can be used. To negate the eliciting of permission the negative particle *ma* is placed immediately after the respective modal as in *mumkin ma* or *balkit ma*. Consider *mumkin ma* first:

46)

ممکن ما تحجي بصوت عالي؟ عندي صداع.

mumkin ma tiḥči ib-šōt 'āli 'and-i ṣudā'
MUMKIN NEG speak.PRS.2MSG in-voice high at-1SG headache

'Could you not speak so loudly? I have a headache.'¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Informant data

¹⁰³ Informant data

¹⁰⁴ Informant data

Due to the syntactic placement of the negative particle *ma* here, the possibility of this example serving any reading other than that of eliciting deontic permission is not possible, since the other modal readings of *mumkin* are negated by placing *ma* in front of *mumkin* as in *ma mumkin*. Furthermore, the context, ‘I have a headache’ further indicates that this sentence implies ‘could you not speak so loudly?’ Now consider *balkit ma* as it occurs in the same type of context:

47)

بلكت ما تخلي بصل بالشورية؟ عندي حساسية.

balkit	ma	itxalli	buşal	b-iş-şōrba	‘and-i	ḥasāsīya
BALKIT	NEG	put.PRS.2MSG	onion.PL	in-the-soup	at-1SG	sensitivity

‘Could you not put onions in the soup? I’m allergic.’¹⁰⁵

We can see how *balkit*, when occurring in negative instances of requesting deontic permission, is bound by the same syntactic constraints as is *mumkin*— *ma* occurs immediately after it. This placement of *ma*, like was the case in example 46) with *mumkin*, eradicates the possibility of *balkit ma* lending a reading other than that of the deontic requesting of permission. The context ‘I’m allergic’ is a further indicator that *balkit ma* is used to imply ‘could you not put onions in the soup?’

6.10.3 Dynamic Ability

The analysis revealed that *mumkin*’s dynamic reading can also be negated to express negative dynamic ability (or, more accurately, dynamic inability). In such instances, *mumkin* is once again negated by placing the negative particle *ma* immediately before it (i.e., *ma mumkin*) as is *yigdar* (i.e., *ma yigdar*). Let us explore *ma mumkin* first. When lending a negative dynamic reading *ma mumkin* occurs immediately before an appropriately-conjugated present-tense verb, consider:

¹⁰⁵ Informant data

48)

أ: شدتسوي انت؟

A: š-da-tsawwī inta
 what-PROG-do.PRS.2MSG 2MSG
 ‘What are you doing?’

ب: دا اشوف انتو محتاجين عامل حتى يساعدكم بالشغل.

B: da ašūf intū miḥtājīn ‘āmil ḥatta
 PROG see.PRS.1SG 2PL need.PTCP.PL worker to
 yisā‘id-kum b-iš-šugul
 help.PRS.3MSG-2PL with-the-work

‘I see that you need a worker to help you with [serving the customers].’

أ: بس انت مو مجبور تسوي هيچي حتى اني معجبة بيك.

A: bass inta mu majbūr itsawwī hīčī ḥatta āni
 but 2MSG NEG obligated do.PRS.2MSG such to 1SG
 mu‘ajiba bī-k
 like in-2MSG

‘But you don’t have to do that to make me like you.’

ب: هذا قراري. ما ممكن اغيره.

B: hāḏa qarār-i **ma** **mumkin** aḡēyir-a
 this decision-1SG NEG MUMKIN change.PRS.1SG-3MSG

‘This is my decision. I cannot change it.’¹⁰⁶

The example in question clearly lends a dynamic reading in that B uses *ma mumkin* to express the internal conditioning factors preventing him from changing his mind, namely his own willingness to act. Now let us turn to *ma yigdar*:

¹⁰⁶ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 36 24:10

49)

اني اريد اطلّك. ما اقدر استمر وياك بعد. صدك ما اقدر ابقى.

āni	arīd	atallig	ma	agdar	astimirr
1SG	want.PRS.1SG	divorce.PRS.1SG	NEG	can.PRS.1SG	continue.PRS.1SG
wiyyā-k		ba‘ad	ṣudug	ma	agdar
with-2MSG		more	really	NEG	can.PRS.1SG
					stay.PRS.1SG

‘I want a divorce. I can’t continue with you anymore. Seriously, I can’t stay.’¹⁰⁷

This instance clearly lends a negative dynamic reading in that the speaker uses *ma agdar* to express the internal conditioning factors preventing her from continuing her relationship with the addressee, namely her own willingness to act.

6.10.4 Boulomaic

As for *balkit*’s boulomaic reading, although the modality itself cannot be negated, it is possible, through the placement of the negative particle *ma* immediately after *balkit* (i.e., *balkit ma*), to express the desire, wish, or hope that something will *not* happen. If negating the boulomaic modal phrase *balkit alḷāh*, *ma* occurs immediately after *alḷāh* as in *balkit alḷāh ma*. Both *balkit ma* and *balkit alḷāh ma* occur immediately before an appropriately-conjugated verb or adjective, consider:

50)

بلكت ما موجود هسه لأن ما اريد اشوفه.

balkit	ma	mawjūd	li’an	m-ārīd
BALKIT	NEG	present	because	NEG-want.PRS.1SG

ašūf-a
see.PRS.1SG-3MSG

‘Hopefully he isn’t there, because I don’t want to see him.’¹⁰⁸

As *balkit* serves epistemic, deontic permission (requesting), and boulomaic readings, but that its epistemic reading cannot be negated means that the example in question could either imply

¹⁰⁷ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 20 26:25

¹⁰⁸ Informant data

deontic permission or boulomaic modality. As both of these modalities are negated by placing the negative particle, *ma*, immediately after *balkit* (i.e., *balkit ma*), context solves any possible ambiguity regarding which modal reading *balkit ma* is seeking to imply. More importantly, in instances of requesting deontic permission, *balkit ma* occurs in an interrogative statement, whereas in boulomaic instances, it occurs in an affirmative statement, as we can see illustrated by the example above. That the example in question is affirmative and that the context points to the speaker's lack of desire to see the subject, we can conclude that this is indeed a boulomaic reading and implies 'hopefully he isn't there'.

Now let us take a look at the boulomaic construction *balkit alḷāh*, which, out of the modalities under analysis, only serves a boulomaic reading. *balkit alḷāh* behaves much like *balkit*, however, while the latter can lend a bit of ambiguity due to its ability to lend several modal readings, as *balkit alḷāh* only lends a boulomaic reading, the possibility of such ambiguity is eradicated. Like *balkit*, *balkit alḷāh* is negated by placing the negative particle, *ma*, after it, consider:

51)

بلكت الله ما راح يصير هيج شي.						
balkit	alḷāh	ma	rāḥ	yīṣīr	hīč	šī
BALKIT	ALḶĀH	NEG	FUT	become.PRS.3MSG	such	thing
'I hope to God such a thing won't happen.' ¹⁰⁹						

Let us now turn to a summary of how *balkit* and its non-loaned counterparts function in negative instances.

6.10.5 Summary of the Negative Section

Our exploration of *mumkin*, *yimkin*, *balkit*, and *yigdar* is interesting, because the analysis revealed that the syntactic placement of the negative particle *ma* has a large bearing on the type of modality that is expressed. For example, it was revealed that *mumkin ma* implies 'it is possible that...not...' while *ma mumkin* implies 'it is not possible that...'. It was further demonstrated that in instances of negative deontic and dynamic modalities, *ma yigdar* was considered the most appropriate modal choice by the informants, and despite the fact that natural language does not

¹⁰⁹ Informant data

generally adhere to very strict rules of logic, negation follows along rather logical lines (Palmer 1990:9). Perhaps of most interest to us is the fact that out of the modals under analysis only *mumkin* and *yigdar* can be negated by adding the negative particle *ma* immediately before them (i.e., *ma mumkin*; *ma yigdar*) to indicate negative modality. It would seem, however, that it is indeed possible to place the negative particle *ma* immediately after *balkit* (i.e., *balkit ma*) to imply ‘it is possible that... not...’, as was the case with the other epistemic modals as well.

6.11 Overall Conclusions of the Modals and Theoretical Implications

This chapter presented a discussion of the loaned *balkit* against its non-loaned counterparts *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *yigdar* in their affirmative and negative forms. It was revealed how the modals under analysis each serve more than one modality and we further uncovered the overlap in the modalities served by them. We explored how, with the epistemic modals under analysis, speakers tell their hearers (truly or falsely) how things are, whereas with deontic modals, speakers, either by asking for their permission or requesting them to fulfill a task, get their hearers to do things (Palmer 1990:10) or express ability resulting from external factors. It was further demonstrated how with the dynamic modals, ability arising from internal factors is denoted, and the manner in which the boulomaic modal express wishes, hopes, and desires.

Although previous works on Arabic modality (Mitchell & al-Hassan 1994) have asserted that with the epistemic modals speakers make judgments about the truth of their propositions (with different modals indicating different degrees of ‘likelihood’), the analysis indicated, at least in the case of Iraqi Arabic, that this is only the case for some speakers, in that while some speakers demonstrate clear divisions of labor between the modals under analysis, others employ them rather interchangeably. As was also elucidated, although there is potential ambiguity in the interpretations of the terms under analysis, such ambiguity is usually resolved by context (Palmer 1990:6). This chapter has demonstrated that although subjectivity is an exemplifying characteristic of epistemic modality (Palmer 1990:52), the fact that Iraqi Arabic speakers have a variety of items at their disposal which express similar modal notions and that some speakers demonstrate strict divisions of labor between them while others do not reveals that such subjectivity exists in varying degrees.

In section 6.6 above the main points set forth by Mitchell & al-Hassan’s (1994) findings regarding modality in Arabic were discussed, as, although their study does not explicitly

reference Iraqi Arabic, it is a valuable reference point to determine the extent to which these findings carry over to the findings of the present work on Iraqi Arabic. It must be reiterated here, however, that Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994) do not explicitly state their reasoning for dividing the divisions of labor between the modals they analyzed in the manner in which they did. Central to our discussion was Mitchell & al-Hassan's (1994:46) mention of a continuous scale of possibility and Householder & Cheng's (1971:92-93) claim that there exists a scale ranging from 'the barely imaginable' to 'the almost inevitable'. Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994:46-47) indicated that the most frequently-used modals to express epistemic possibility in Educated Spoken Arabic are *muḥtamal* 'it is likely...'; Levantine *bijūz*, Egyptian *yigūz*; Levantine *jāyiz*, Egyptian *gāyiz* 'It is possible...'; and *byimkin* (Levantine only)/*yimkin/mumkin* 'It may be...'. They further posited that such modals can be placed on a scale from the barely imaginable to the almost inevitable, maintaining that *mumkin* (which they translate as 'very likely') ranks higher on the likelihood scale than *yimkin* (which they translate as 'might be possible').

Bearing in mind these aforementioned claims and applying them to the findings yielded by the analysis presented above, it was revealed that there are two epistemic contexts in which the modals under analysis function in Iraqi Arabic: a quantifiable one and a 'neutral' or non-quantifiable one. In quantifiable instances there is an overlap between *mumkin* and *yimkin* in that these two items both express a medium to high level of certainty regarding the likelihood of a given statement: if the likelihood of occurring is 50% or above yet short of 99%, both *mumkin* and *yimkin* are appropriate. If it is below 50%, then *balkit* is appropriate. In non-quantifiable epistemic contexts, however, it was revealed that *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit* are interchangeable. Thus, the analysis of this chapter indicated that in terms of continuous scale of possibility and where the modals under analysis fit therein, it would seem that such a scale is only relevant or applicable in quantifiable contexts: *balkit* is closer to 'the barely imaginable' end of the continuum, while *mumkin* and *yimkin* denote a range from 'more likely than not' to 'very likely but not inevitable'. Therefore, as is the case with most languages, in Iraqi Arabic, too, it is possible to convey varying epistemic judgments: a 'strong' judgment and a 'weak one' (Palmer 1986:57). That these modals exist on such a continuum further suggests that there is indeed contrast between them, and, as the analysis revealed, epistemic and deontic modalities alone do not encapsulate the varying modalities expressed by the modals in question— a mere binary distinction between epistemic and deontic modalities fails to fully encapsulate the range of

modalities lent by them. On account of this, an exploration of other modal categories, namely boulomaic and dynamic modalities, was imperative for an accurate understanding of these items (Portner 2009:36).

For the deontic and dynamic modalities specifically, we made reference to Grigore's (2015) work which provides a clear and concise exploration of this topic as it occurs in Iraqi Arabic specifically, and due to this, it can serve as a valuable point of reference for the present work, despite the fact that out of the modals under analysis Grigore only treats *yimkin* (with a fleeting mention of *yigdar*). The analysis and close work with native speakers revealed that, contrary to Grigore's (2015) claim that *yimkin* in Iraqi Arabic encompasses epistemic possibility, deontic permission, and dynamic ability, *yimkin*, in fact, only lends an epistemic possibility reading, overlapping with *mumkin*. That said, it was revealed that both *mumkin* and *yigdar* lend both deontic ability and permission readings, as well as dynamic ability readings. Finally, although not treated in by Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994) or Grigore (2015) the analysis revealed that, out of the modals in question, *balkit* is the only one that lends a boulomaic reading.

Although there is indeed a fair amount of overlap between the modals in question, several modals can lend the same type of modal reading and the same modal can lend readings of different types of modality. The syntactically-oriented approach to modality which motivates most linguistic treatments is geared towards underlining the similarities (as opposed to the differences) between the modals and their paraphrases (Perkins 1983:20). However, as the aim of the present work is to determine the divisions of labor between the selected loaned items and their counterparts as well as the motivation of Iraqi Arabic speakers to choose a loaned form over a non-loaned form or vice versa, we are principally concerned with the division of labor between the modals and the modalities they serve (that is we are interested more in the differences which set them apart than in the similarities which group them together). Thus, it was uncovered that although many of the items under analysis coincide semantically and syntactically in many contexts, each respective modal occurs in at least one crucial context in which the others do not (Clark 1988:319). For example, *balkit* can lend an epistemic possibility reading, a deontic reading, and a boulomaic reading. In instances of epistemic possibility, it overlaps with *mumkin* and *yimkin*, while in instances of deontic modality it overlaps with *mumkin* and *yigdar*. However, there is a clear crucial context in which *balkit* differs from its non-loaned counterparts, i.e., it serves a boulomaic reading while its counterparts do not. In sum, *mumkin*, *yimkin*, *balkit*, and

yigdar are not as interchangeable or synonymous as traditional definitions of these terms may suggest.

Regarding the negation of the modals, that items such that *balkit* cannot be negated with the negative particle *ma* in any of its readings and that its negation must instead be reflected by another word all together indicates that there is room for research regarding the negation of modals in Iraqi Arabic. This demonstrates another division of labor in the modals and further supports the notion of the Principle of Contrast in that there is at least one critical instance in which *balkit* and its counterparts do not overlap. The chart below indicates the modal readings lent by each respective modal.

	<i>mumkin</i>	<i>yimkin</i>	<i>yigdar</i>	<i>balkit</i>
Epistemic Possibility	X	X		X
Deontic Ability	X		X	
Deontic Permission (Granting)	X		X	
Deontic Permission (Requesting)	X		X	X
Deontic Permission (Polite Request)	X		X	X
Dynamic Ability	X		X	
Boulomaic				X

The chart below indicates the modals in their readings of negative modality.

	<i>mumkin</i>	<i>yimkin</i>	<i>yigdar</i>	<i>balkit</i>
Epistemic Possibility	X			
Deontic Ability	X		X	
Deontic Permission (Granting)	X		X	
Deontic Permission (Requesting)			X	X
Deontic Permission (Polite Request)	X		X	X
Dynamic Ability	X		X	
Boulomaic				X

Now that we have discussed the items in question, let us wrap up this chapter with a discussion with the aspects highlighted by the analysis for further research.

6.12 Room for Further Research

The analysis presented in this chapter uncovered the basic modal distinctions and divisions of labor between the non-loaned *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *yigdar* and the loaned *balkit*, and revealed that, although these items do display some overlap in the modal readings they lend, they also demonstrate differences, and thus they cannot be thought of as being truly synonymous or interchangeable. Moreover, the analysis and consultations with the native speakers further uncovered that although some speakers tend to show clear distinctions between *mumkin*, *yimkin*, *balkit*, and *yigdar*, especially in their quantitative epistemic possibility readings, some speakers employ the items seemingly interchangeably. Thus, it would be interesting to attempt to detect the factors, be they sociolinguistic or otherwise, prompting some speakers to differentiate between them and others not to. Continuing from this, expanding the comparison of *balkit* with other non-loaned modals such as *iḥtimāl* and *yijūz* (which imply ‘possibility’ and ‘it’s permissible’, respectively) would be beneficial in helping to better illustrate a likelihood scale and where the Iraqi Arabic modals fit therein.

The present work focused on the loaned item *balkit*, and although it did make brief note of its varying realizations in Iraqi Arabic (i.e., *balki*, *balkin*, and *balčīn*), it was only its realization as *balkit* which was treated. Although not discussed in the body of this chapter, the consultations with the native speakers, combined with my own knowledge of the language, indicated that many native speakers use more than one realization of *balkit* (for example, some use both *balkit* and *balki* in their daily speech). That some speakers actively use more than one realization of seemingly the same item is interesting and raises the question: why do multiple forms of the same item seem to exist side-by-side in the linguistic repertoire of the same speaker? It further prompts the questions: do these varying realizations lend differing implications or modal readings as the Principle of Contrast suggests (Clark 1988)? Although the constraints on the present work prevented us from exploring these questions, they are indeed worthy of further investigation.

CHAPTER SEVEN: -SIZ AND -ČI

7.1 Chapter Outline

The present chapter explores the loaned suffixes *-siz* and *-či* as they occur in Iraqi Arabic, the former of which implies the lacking of the property indicated by the base to which it is attached and the latter of which denotes a profession, trait, or characteristic associated with the base to which it is appended (Masliyah 1996:293-295). We will explore *-siz* against its non-loaned counterparts, *bala* and *‘adīm*, and *-či* against its non-loaned counterpart *abu il-*. In this chapter, some background information on the topic is set forth (7.2) and affix borrowing is defined (7.3). Then, as the study of productivity is linked to affix borrowing, and that we are particularly interested in the extent of productivity of *-siz* and *-či*, we will discuss the notion of ‘what is productive’ (7.4). The subsequent section explores the general factors constraining suffix productivity (7.5) to provide better insight into the factors constraining the productivity of *-siz* and *-či* in particular. We then continue with a brief overview of *-siz*’s and *-či*’s behavior in both Turkish and Iraqi Arabic (7.6), drawing parallels between their behavior in the two languages in order to point to the salient differentiating features and variances in their degrees of productivity. Following this, we discuss the syntactic categories into which *-siz* and *-či* fit (7.7), in order to determine whether *-siz* and *-či* have been borrowed into Iraqi Arabic as parts of complex loans or if they have become productive suffixes, before moving on to an explanation of the data collection and methodology for the present chapter (7.8). Section 7.9 begins the analysis with 7.9.1 treating *bala*, 7.9.2 treating *‘adīm*, and 7.9.3 treating *-siz*, followed by a summary of these three items (7.9.4). We then turn to an analysis of *abu il-* (7.9.5) and *-či* (7.9.6), followed by a summary of them (7.9.7). The overall conclusions and theoretical implications of the chapter are then set forth (7.10), and 7.11 discusses room for further research.

7.2 Background and Introduction

The main purpose of this chapter is to uncover the divisions of labor between the loaned items *-siz* and *-či* and their non-loaned counterparts *bala* and *‘adīm* and *abu il-*, respectively, and to present a discussion of the various constraints on the productivity of these suffixes, which I claim to be motivated by the syntactic and morpho-phonological relations and properties discussed in this analysis. There are various realizations of *bala* in Iraqi Arabic, for instance *blayya*.

Generally speaking, *blayya* can either precede a noun or take a possessive suffix, whereas *bala* can only precede a noun. When occurring in conjunction with a verb, the subordinating suffix *ma*

occurs after *blayya/bala* and before the appropriately-conjugated verb, i.e., *blayya ma/bala ma*. For the present chapter, we will focus primarily on *bala* except in instances in which a possessive suffix is appended, wherein we will explore its realization as *blayya*, as based on the researcher's knowledge of the language, these are the most frequently-occurring realizations, and, furthermore, length and time constraints prevent us from exploring an all-encompassing range of the various realizations.

As *-siz* and *-či* are loaned suffixes they are examples of the morphological change known as 'affix borrowing' (i.e., the borrowing of a morpheme that is joined before, after, or within a stem or root) and suffixes are the type of affixes that are of particular interest to the present chapter. Suffixes can either be derivational or inflectional, with derivation denoting 'the suffixation of roots or bases to produce new bases in the same or another form class', while inflection is 'a process whereby bases are modified to permit them to stand in certain relationships to one another in larger utterances, in syntactic constructions' (Swift 1963:53). For the sake of the present work the items under analysis are derivational suffixes.

Affix borrowing has received a considerable amount of attention in the recent literature (e.g., Seifart 2015) wherein it is widely assumed that affixes are never borrowed directly, rather they are only borrowed indirectly, i.e., as part of complex loanwords, and, through language-internal analogical extension, over time these affixes may produce hybrid formations by being parsed from complex loanwords and subsequently appended to native stems (Seifart 2015:511), e.g., the *-esque* in *statuesque*. Continuing from this, in terms of possible combinations of bases and affixes in presumably all languages which have derivational morphology, there are strict restrictions—a particular derivational affix can only be appended to bases with certain semantic, syntactic, morphological, or phonological traits (Hay & Plag 2004:565-566). For example, in Iraqi Arabic, as will be explained in more depth in section 7.9.3, *-siz* overwhelmingly gets appended to singular, abstract nouns, although there are instances of it being appended to singular concrete and material nouns, as well. This present chapter seeks to uncover the finer intricacies of restrictions such as these as they pertain to *-siz* and *-či* in order to further shed light on the division of labor between these loans and their non-loaned counterparts. Additionally, there is wider linguistic interest in the close study of these items, beyond the description of the manner in which they function in Iraqi Arabic, as uncovering the general principles and restrictions constraining the suffixation of *-siz* and *-či* to particular bases can help to shed light on

the parsibility of the suffixes under analysis, consequently bettering our understanding of the degree of productivity of these items and of loaned-morpheme integration cross-linguistically.

7.3 Defining Affix Borrowing

Now that a general background of this chapter has been set forth, let us expand on that information with a summary of the literary frameworks upon which we will draw for the present chapter. Weinreich (1953), ascertains that indirect borrowing renders most instances of affix borrowing, save for a residue of cases (p. 31-32) and therefore implies that direct borrowing is exceptional and rare (Seifart 2015:512). It should be pointed out, however, that the lack of evidence regarding direct affix borrowing in the literature should not be interpreted as evidence that direct borrowing does not exist; it is merely an indication that there is only a small amount of languages with substantial historical documentation, and, moreover, affix borrowing overall is not exceedingly common (Sapir 1921:217; Seifart 2015:513). When we speak of direct borrowing, we, in line with Seifart (2015:511) are referring to the separation of an affix arising from the knowledge of the donor language, without the interposition of complex loans within the recipient language. In order to uncover whether *-siz* and *-či* have been borrowed directly or indirectly, and, to determine if these suffixes are indeed productive, and if so to what extent, we will draw upon Seifart's three criteria for indirect affix borrowing (2015:514):

- I) There exists a set of complex loans possessing a loaned affix that share a common, recognizable semantic component, for instance, a set of items containing the same affix and that all designate possibilities or probabilities, e.g., *honorable*, *profitable*, *deceivable*, etc.
- II) There exists a set of loaned doublets, one with and one without the affix, possessing constant, recognizable semantic changes, for example, pairs of complex loans and simplex loans, wherein the loans express the possibility or property of what the simplex loans denote, e.g., *honor-honorable*, *profit-profitable*, *deceive-deceivable*, etc.
- III) Within pairs of simplex loans and corresponding complex loans, simplex loans have greater token frequencies than the corresponding complex loans, e.g., *profitable* occurs less frequently than *profit*.

7.4 What is Productive?

Linked to affix borrowing is the study of productivity, that is the extent to which native speakers apply a particular grammatical process, especially in terms of word formation, and the study of productivity has garnered the attention of many scholars in the last few decades, prompting a considerable surge in the number of publications in the field (e.g., Bauer 2001; Kastovsky 2006; Plag 1999, 2003). Furthermore, there has been an upsurge of research on morphological productivity in particular (e.g., Bauer 2001; Plag 1999; Bolozky 1999). As the productivity of these loaned Turkish affixes is of particular interest to the present work let us now explore some definitions of ‘productivity’. Dietz (1838:221), presumably the first to use the term ‘productivity’, writes that ‘Most formative elements, and the most important of these, on the other hand, have remained living and on account of their strongly-felt meaning. [Bauer’s translation (2001:11-12)], LB.]’, while Hockett (1958:575) ascribes ‘productivity’ to the aspect of language which enables speakers to utter things which have never been uttered before, and Fernández-Domínguez (2010:29) defines ‘productivity’ as ‘... the possibility for language users to coin, unintentionally, a number of formations which are in principle uncountable...’. For the purposes of the present work, we, in line with Plag (1999) view productivity as a derived property, the consequence of other processes and contend that ‘the productivity of a given morphological process can largely be predicted on the basis of the process’s peculiar structural properties and restrictions’ (p. 244).

Despite the fact that word derivation is largely a rule-governed linguistic phenomenon, we frequently observe affixes being used productively to derive new words, while others are rarely or never used for such purposes (Plag 2003:2). For instance, the English nominal suffix *-ness* can often be observed in new derivations (cf. *ecofriendliness*, first attested in 1989, OED), although the suffix *-th* (e.g., *width*), which serves a similar function to *-ness*, it seems, is never found in new derivations (Plag 2003:2). When suffixes are used to form new derivations, some scholars suggest that there are degrees of productivity (using nomenclatures such as ‘very productive’, ‘marginally productive’, ‘immensely productive’, etc.), while others lean towards a clear binary distinction: morphological processes are either productive or they are not (e.g., Booji 1977:5). Within the group who support the idea of degrees of productivity are those who interpret productivity as clear stages on a scale of productivity (typically three stages) ranging from unproductive to fully productive, with an intermediate step in between which Pike

(1967:170) labels ‘semi-active’, while others opt for an infinitely variable scale (Bauer 2001). Although Pike (1967:191) suggests that ‘there may, in fact, be a progressive gradation from highly active to completely inactive, with a number of stages in between’, we are left wondering what the ‘number of stages in between’ imply exactly (Bauer 2001:15-16). Dik (1967:370), on the other hand, explicitly states his stance regarding what ‘semi-productive’ implies, explaining that a morphological process is semi-productive if it applies to ‘an open class of bases and only some of the outputs are acceptable to the native speaker’, and fully productive if it ‘applies to an open class of bases and all possible outputs are acceptable to the native speaker’. The term ‘semi-productivity’ is also employed by Matthews (1974:52) who makes it clear that the term encompasses ‘the majority of lexical formations’, posing the question: ‘if the purpleness of the ceiling is any less secure than the whiteness of the ceiling, then why are a white ceiling and a purple ceiling equally acceptable?’, providing the answer that an adjective plus the affix *-ness* is only semi-productive whereas a noun is fully productive. It should be pointed out that the entire essence of the notion of semi-productivity is that the ‘rule’ of semi-productivity itself permits borderline instances, with Pinker & Prince (1994:231) suggesting that semi-productivity ‘can to some degree be extended to new forms’, although again we are left uncertain about where the borders of ‘some degree’ lie. In sum, the literature suggests that derivational morphological processes (as well as inflectional ones) may be less than fully productive and more than unproductive. We are particularly interested in the degree of productivity of *-siz* and *-či*, as an understanding of this issue will provide insight into loaned-morpheme integration and maintenance in Iraqi Arabic.

7.5 Constraints on Suffix Productivity

We will now consider the factors constraining suffix productivity— what factors favor the productivity of a suffix and which factors prevent it from being productive? Dressler (2007:461) posits that grammatical productivity of morphological patterns occurs gradually and presents the following hierarchical criteria for the degree of productivity:

- I) The integration of loans with unfitting properties are accommodated and integrated into the system of the recipient language in two steps. Firstly, in order for the rules of the recipient language to be applied to a loan, the new loan that still portrays evidence of the source

language must be treated as a non-loaned item, and secondly, any unfitting properties must be modified to accommodate the constraints of rule application. For instance, words in the standard and dialectal varieties of Arabic are overwhelmingly comprised of a trilateral root. Therefore, when a foreign loan-verb is adapted into Iraqi Arabic, it must fit into the trilateral verb pattern in which non-loaned verbs fit. To accomplish this, a trilateral root must be derived from the loan. Take, for instance, the English loanverb in Iraqi Arabic *yibarrík* ‘to park’. A trilateral consonantal root of *b-r-k* is derived from ‘park’ and applied to the Iraqi Arabic verbal pattern *yiCaCCiC* (and /p/ is adapted to /b/), rendering *yibarrík* ‘to park’.

- II) In instances in which the loan already possesses fitting properties, integration only necessitates overcoming the obstacle of foreignness.
- III) Numerous kinds of new, non-loaned ideas represent lower hierarchical productivity criteria, and, as a result, rules that solely apply to new non-loaned items have a lower degree of productivity.

Many linguists have proposed that lexical frequency is a principal contributing factor affecting the parsibility of suffixes, and it is argued that, due to their tendency to be assessed whole, high-frequency forms are not easily parsed, and it has been further argued that there is a direct link between nondecomposability, high lexical frequency, and transparency, and then again, between parsibility and degree of productivity (Hay 2001:1041). Continuing from this, there are two additional factors that contribute to suffix parsibility and productivity, namely morphological composition (i.e., ‘the process in which morphemes are combined to produce a complex word’) and morphological decomposition (i.e., decomposing a new loan and parsing it into its constituent morphemes in order to combine it to form a complex word) (Dressler 2007:465). Moreover, factors like naturalness and semantic coherence tend to favor productivity (see Bauer 2001:20). However, there are also obstacles pertaining to language structure and language use which the coinage of a loan must overcome before it comes to be integrated (Fernández-Domínguez, Díaz-Negrillo & Štekauer 2007:30). We will now discuss these constraints by drawing upon Fernández-Domínguez, Díaz-Negrillo & Štekauer (2007:30-31).

When we speak of structural constraints, we mean the constraints which bind the formation of items at various descriptive levels— phonology, syntax, morphology and semantics. Constraints of a phonological nature tend to involve the seeming ‘ill-formedness’ of the potential

word (child → child-ity*), although additional phonological constraints are treated by the literature (see Bauer 2001:128-29; Giegerich 1999:3-5; Katamba 1993:74-75; Yip 1998). For instance, they can also comprise ‘the segmental constitution of a word’ like in instances in which *-en* is suffixed only to items ending in a fricative or stop, e.g., *neat-en*, *smart-en*, *tight-en* (Fernández-Domínguez 2009:77).

It is also possible for the morphological structure to constrain potential combinations of a base and affix (Bauer 2001:130-31) and two prominent criteria constraining such formations, as set forth by Fernández-Domínguez, Díaz-Negrillo & Štekauer (2007:31) are:

- I) The base to which the suffix will be appended must be part of a ‘morphologically-defined class’, for instance, *-ability* can be appended to adjectives ending in *-able* to refer to nouns denoting a particular quality, but this cannot be done by other suffixes, e.g., *dependable* → *dependability* vs *dependable* → *depend-ize**.
- II) The base to which the suffix will be appended must or must not contain a specific affix (e.g., *polarity*, *peculiarity*, *scalarity* vs. *notorious-ity**, *adventurocity** (Plag 1999:88-89)— in this example the suffix *-ity* cannot be appended to bases ending in *-ory*.

Turning to syntactic constraints, we mean the restriction of the processes of word-formation to constituents of specific syntactic categories (Bauer 2001:133; Plag 2003:63). For instance, the Dutch suffix *-baar* ‘-able’ can only be appended to transitive verbs to derive new adjectives, e.g., *drink-baar* ‘drinkable’ with the transitive base *drink* ‘to drink’ (Booji 2012). Finally, regarding semantic constraints, the referent of a given word limits its semantic scope, in that there is a restriction regarding what items should have a nomenclature. Quirk et al. (1985:1329) set forth a ‘classic’ example for this— adjectives ending in *-ed* where ‘the base must be inalienably possessed by the head noun that the adjective modifies’ (e.g., curly-haired, one-legged, light-skinned vs. *a red-dressed lady, a three-carred man). It should be noted that although the above-mentioned constraints play a large governing role in the formation of items, there are exceptions to said constraints, the details of which do not concern us here (see Bauer 2001:130).

We are particularly interested in the semantic and syntactic constraints binding the productivity of *-siz* and *-či*, as uncovering these constraints will afford us a better understanding of the divisions of labor between them and their non-loaned counterparts. As will be elucidated

in section 7.9.3, my data yielded instances which suggest that *-siz* actually possesses more productivity than Masliyah (1996) suggests. Namely, the base to which *-siz* attaches in Iraqi Arabic need not only be an abstract noun, but can be a concrete or material noun, in that native Iraqi Arabic speakers possess the ability to easily parse *-siz* from its base, and, in turn, to infer the implication lent by a newly-coined *-siz*-containing item, even if these new outputs are not in line with what the majority of Iraqi Arabic speakers might deem ‘proper’ or ‘correct’ Iraqi Arabic speech. Thus, this chapter aims to challenge Masliyah’s (1996:293) claim that the bases to which *-siz* can be appended are restricted to nouns denoting a trait or characteristic and to further contest his contention that *-siz* in Iraqi Arabic is not productive. Furthermore, Masliyah (1996:299) points to the productivity of *-či* (although he does not comment as to the extent of its productivity), noting that *-či* is used freely with commonly-occurring nouns by Iraqi folk poets. Drawing upon this, this present chapter strives to test such outputs as well as to delve deeper into his claims that Iraqi Arabic employs periphrasis instead of derivations with *-či* and to further uncover the division of labor between *-či* and its non-loaned counterpart *abu il-*. Before getting into our analysis, let us first consider a brief overview of the manner in which *-siz* and *-či* function in both Iraqi Arabic and Turkish.

7.6 *-siz* and *-či* in Iraqi Arabic vs. Turkish

We will now outline the behavior of *-siz* and *-či* as they occur in Turkish and Iraqi Arabic, drawing parallels between the Turkish and Arabic forms and indicating their salient differentiating features as well as the variations in their levels of productivity, as an understanding of the similarities and differences of these items as they occur in Iraqi Arabic and Turkish can aide us in determining the factors constraining the types of bases to which these items can be suffixed, further helping to shed light on their levels of productivity in Iraqi Arabic.

7.6.1 *-siz*

Although *-siz* is not inflected for gender in Iraqi Arabic, it is inflected for number by appending the plural *-īya* immediately after *-siz* as in: *damāḡ* ‘brain’ → *damāḡ-siz* ‘a brainless or stupid person’ → *damāḡ-siz-īya* ‘brainless people; stupid people’. The implication lent by *-siz* is similar to that of the English suffix *-less*. In Iraqi Arabic, in addition to the loaned *-siz*, there are a number of non-loaned items that express the lacking of a trait, quality, or item, namely the prepositions: *blayya*, *bala*, *bilā*, *bidūn*, *min dūn*, *min ḡēr* (Clarity, Stowasser & Wolfe 2003:200; McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:83). All of these items are typically defined as ‘without’. It seems as though the latter four are literary, but may be heard (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:83). The constraints on the present work prevent us from exploring all of these forms which express lacking, and thus we will focus on *bala* (*blayya*), as this is the most common form in ordinary Iraqi Arabic speech (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:83).

Another non-loaned counterpart is *‘adīm* (which is inflected for both gender and number, i.e., *‘adīm* (MSG), *‘adīma* (FSG), *‘adīmāt* (FPL), and *‘adīmī(n)* (MPL)) which serves an adjectival function, expressing ‘lacking, not having, without, -less, in-, un-’ in ‘unreal annexation’ (i.e., a type of genitive construction. In Arabic grammar annexation is known as *idāfa* while unreal annexation, with an adjective in the place of the possessee, is *idāfa ḡēr ḥaqīqīya*) (Badawi, Carter, & Gully 2016:838; Wehr 1979:698). In derivations with *‘adīm*, the gender- and number-denoted form of *‘adīm* is employed, followed by a definite noun (i.e., the item that is being ‘lacked’) as in *‘adīmit it-tarbīya* ‘lacking upbringing, mannerless (2FSG)’. Worth noting here is that there are items which seem to frequently collocate with the items with which *‘adīm* frequently collocates, namely nouns expressing traits. Such items are *kaḥīr* ‘much, many’ and *qalīl* ‘little, few’, e.g., *kaḥīr il-axlāq* ‘having many morals’ vs. *‘adīm il-axlāq* ‘having no morals, immoral’; *qalīl il-adab* ‘having little manners’ vs. *‘adīm il-adab* ‘having no manners, impolite’. Although we will not go into depth about the division of labor between these items in the present work, it would suffice us to say that it seems that their main differentiating feature is that each of these items indicates a varying degree of scale, with *qalīl* expressing ‘possessing a little’, *kaḥīr* ‘possessing a lot’, and *‘adīm* implying ‘lacking’. The purposes of the present work do not necessitate an exploration of such degrees of scale, as the variations in the divisions of labor render them not [near-] equivalents, and thus out of these items it is only *‘adīm* and *bala* (*blayya*) with which we are interested in regards to the non-loaned [near-] equivalents of *-siz*.

Let us briefly consider the general behavior of *-siz* as it occurs in both Iraqi Arabic and Turkish. In Turkish, *-siz* is bound by the constraints of vowel harmony, meaning that, based on the last vowel of the stem to which *-siz* is appended, *-siz* can be realized as either /-siz/, /-suuz/, /-suz/, or /-syz/, whereas in Iraqi Arabic, /-siz/ is the only realization of this suffix. In Turkish, *-siz* can be appended to nouns, adjectives, or pronouns to express the lack of a trait or quality, unlike in Iraqi Arabic where it can only append to nouns. The data I drew upon for the behavior of *-siz* as it occurs in Turkish is gleaned from Swift (1963:59-62). We will now discuss six principal points to compare and contrast Turkish *-siz* with Iraqi Arabic *-siz*.

- I) In Turkish, *-siz* can be appended rather freely to common nouns to denote the lack of a trait or quality, and derivations with *-siz* can modify animate and inanimate objects, e.g.:

su	‘water’	su-suz	‘waterless, thirsty’
para	‘money’	para-sız	‘without money, poor’
zarar	‘damage’	zarar-sız	‘harmless, unhurt, undamaged’
şeref	‘honor’	şeref-siz	‘without honor’.
şeker	‘sugar’	şeker-siz	‘sugar free, without sugar’
kafein	‘caffeine’	kafein-siz	‘decaffeinated, without caffeine’

In Iraqi Arabic *-siz* can attach to a base denoting an abstract, material, or concrete noun, and derivations with *-siz* are overwhelmingly restricted to the modification of animate objects, e.g.:

čihra	‘face’	čihra-siz	‘ugly (lit. faceless)’
dīn	‘religion’	dīn-siz	‘irreligious’
adab	‘manners’	adab-siz	‘rude, without manners’

More explanation of the bases to which *-siz* can attach in Iraqi Arabic will be provided in section 7.9.3.

- II) There are also instances in Turkish in which *-siz* can be appended to adjectives, lending an implication similar to that of the English *un-*, although such *-siz*-containing items are rather uncommon, e.g.:

uygun	‘suitable’	uygun-suz	‘unsuitable’
-------	------------	-----------	--------------

Such *-siz*-formations do not occur in Iraqi Arabic, e.g.:

munāsib	‘suitable’	munāsib-siz	‘unsuitable’*
zēn	‘good, nice’	zēn-siz	‘bad’*

III) In addition to *-siz*’s ability to be appended to nouns and adjectives to denote the lack of a trait or quality in Turkish, it may also be appended to pronouns as well (Lewis 1967:62):

on	‘him/her’	on-suz	‘without him’
sen	‘you (2MSG/FSG)’	sen-siz	‘without you’

However, *-siz* cannot be appended to pronouns in Iraqi Arabic. e.g.:

inta	‘you (2MSG)’	inta-siz	‘without you (2MSG)’*
huwa	‘he’	huwa-siz	‘without him’*

IV) As Turkish does not express gender, *-siz*-containing items in Turkish do not get inflected for gender, and they are pluralized by the suffixation of the Turkish plural suffix *-ler*. Derivations with *-siz* in Iraqi Arabic also do not get declined for gender, although they do for number, and are pluralized by appending *-īya* immediately after *-siz*, e.g.:

edep-siz	‘a rude/mannerless individual’	edep-siz-ler	‘rude/mannerless individuals’
adab-siz	‘a rude/mannerless individual’	adab-siz-īya	‘rude/mannerless individuals’

V) Furthermore, in Turkish *-siz* contrasts with *-li* which indicates the presence of a trait or quality, e.g.:

tuz	‘salt’	tuz-lu	‘salted’	tuz-suz	‘salt-free’
şapka	‘hat’	şapka-lı	‘with a hat’	şapka-sız	‘hatless’

There are, however, some exceptions, in that the *-li*-containing item does not always have a *-siz*-containing antonym, e.g.:

paha ‘expense’ paha-lī ‘expensive’ [cf. ucuz ‘cheap’]

In Iraqi Arabic, however, no such contrast with *-li* exists. Instead, the antonyms of *-siz*-containing items in Iraqi Arabic can be expressed several ways, such as the Arabic possessive pseudo-noun ‘*and-*’ combined with a pronominal suffix, e.g.:

šarīf ‘honor, morals’ huwa šarīf-**siz** ‘he has no honor’ [cf. ‘*and-a* šarīf ‘He has honor.’]

Most *-siz*-containing items in Iraqi Arabic also have non-loaned antonyms, e.g.:

damāğ	‘brain’	damāğ-siz	‘stupid’	đaki	‘smart’
adab	‘manners’	adab-siz	‘rude’	mu’addab	‘polite’

kaθīr, which implies ‘possessing a lot of’ also serves as an antonym of *-siz*, e.g.:

axlāq ‘morals’ axlāq-siz ‘without morals, immoral’ [cf. *kaθīr il-axlāq* ‘possessing many morals’]

7.6.2 Summary of *-siz* in Iraqi Arabic vs. Turkish

The main salient factors distinguishing the manner in which *-siz* functions in Turkish from its function in Iraqi Arabic can be summed up in the following five ways:

- I) In Turkish, *-siz* can be appended to nouns, adjectives, or pronouns to express the lack of a trait, quality or characteristic, unlike in Iraqi Arabic wherein it can only append to nouns (mainly abstract nouns, but also concrete and material ones).
- II) *-siz*, as it occurs in Turkish, is highly productive, being able to append to a vast array of nouns, adjectives, and pronouns and these *-siz*-containing items can in turn modify both animate and inanimate objects, while the *-siz*-containing items in Iraqi Arabic are overwhelmingly restricted to the modification of animate objects.
- III) *-siz*-containing items in Turkish are pluralized by the appending of *-ler* to the end of said items, whereas in Iraqi Arabic they are pluralized by appending *-īya*.
- IV) In Turkish *-siz* contrasts with *-li* which indicates the presence of a trait or quality, e.g., *tuz-suz* ‘salt-free’ vs. *tuz-lu* ‘salted’, although in Iraqi Arabic no such contrast with *-li* exists, rather

contrast is expressed by a non-loaned antonym (e.g., *damāğ-siz* ‘brainless, stupid’ vs. *đaki* ‘smart, clever’; *adab-siz* ‘mannerless, rude’ vs. *mu`addab* ‘polite’).

- V) In Turkish, *-siz* is bound by the constraints of vowel harmony, and thus, based on the last vowel of the stem to which *-siz* is appended, *-siz* in Turkish can be realized as /-siz/, /-suz/, /-suz/, or /-syz/, whereas in Iraqi Arabic, /-siz/ is the only realization of this suffix.

Let us now set forth the salient distinguishing features between *-či* as it occurs in both Iraqi Arabic and Turkish.

7.6.3 *-či*

-či as it occurs in Turkish, due to the constraints of vowel harmony, can be realized as /-d̥zi/, /-d̥zu/, /-d̥zy/ (there are also instances in which the /-d̥z/ of this suffix is realized as /-t̥ʃ/ in Turkish, namely after a voiceless consonant), although /-t̥ʃi/ is the only realization found in Iraqi Arabic. In Turkish (where it is orthographically realized as *-ci*) it forms substantives which typically occur as syntactic nominals describing or naming individuals associated in a number of ways with the items expressed by the substantive bases to which the suffix in question is suffixed (Swift 1963:54). The data I drew upon for the behavior of *-ci* as it occurs in Turkish is gleaned from Swift (1963:54-56). We will now discuss four principal points to compare and contrast Turkish *-ci* with the Iraqi Arabic *-či*:

- I) In Turkish *-ci* denotes an agent who has a profession or occupation related to the item denoted by the substantive base to which *-ci* is suffixed:

kaçak	‘smuggled’	kaçak-çı	‘smuggler’
sigorta	‘insurance’	sigorta-cı	‘insurance agent’
süt	‘milk’	süt-çü	‘milkman’
iş	‘work’	iş-çi	‘worker’

-ci can also be appended to the interrogative *ne* what as in *ne-ci* to indicate ‘of what occupation?’, although in Iraqi Arabic it cannot be appended to an interrogative, e.g.,

šlōn	‘how’	šlōn-či	‘of what occupation’*
------	-------	---------	-----------------------

II) In Turkish there are also instances of this suffix being used to form items that express an individual or the quality of being temporarily occupied by the item denoted by the stem to which *-ci* is suffixed:

dava	‘case at law’	dava-cı	‘plaintiff’
dua	‘prayer’	dua-cı	‘intercessor’
kira	‘rent’	kira-cı	‘renter’
ziyaret	‘visit’	ziyaret-çi	‘visitor’

In Iraqi Arabic there are instances of *-çi* denoting an individual or the quality of being temporarily occupied by the item denoted by the base, although such instances appear to be fixed to cognates (this notion of cognates containing *-siz-* and *-çi* in Turkish and Iraqi Arabic will be discussed in section 7.10), e.g.:

da‘aw	‘case’	da‘aw-çi	‘frequent complainer’
-------	--------	----------	-----------------------

Such derivations cannot be extended to an item like ‘renter’ in Iraqi Arabic, as is possible in Turkish, as Iraqi Arabic possesses non-loaned items to denote such a notion (cf. *mustā’jir* ‘renter’).

III) In Turkish there are instances of *-ci* occurring in items that denote an individual or the quality of being associated with a social, religious, philosophical, or political doctrine, itself connected with the item denoted by the stem to which *-ci* is attached:

milliyet	‘nationality’	milliyet-çi	‘nationalist’
cumhuriyet	‘republic’	cumhuriyet-çi	‘republican’
terbiye	‘training, education’	terbiye-ci	‘trainer, educationist’

However, such derivations with *-çi* do not occur in Iraqi Arabic, rather such implications are lent by the Arabic *nisba* (relative) suffix *-i* for masculine derivations, *-īya* for feminine ones, and *-īyīn* for masculine plural and *-īyāt* for feminine plural. Consider the following *nisba* derivations appended to the base *misīḥ* ‘Christ’:

misīḥ-i	‘Christian (MSG)’	misīḥ-īya	‘Christian (FSG)’
misīḥ-īyīn	‘Christians (MPL)’	misīḥ-īyāt	‘Christians (FPL)’

IV) *-ci* can occur in derivations to refer to an individual who habitually partakes in the activity denoted by the substantive:

yalan	‘lie’	yalan-cı	‘liar’
ezber	‘by heart’	ezber-ci	‘memorizer’
paha	‘expense’	paha-cı	‘one who sells goods dearly’

In Iraqi Arabic, there are *-či*-containing items which reflect an individual who habitually partakes in the activity denoted by the substantive, but they overwhelmingly reflect negative qualities:

niswān	‘women’	niswan-či	‘womanizer’
maşlaḥa	‘benefit, interest’	maşlaḥ-či	‘a selfishly opportunistic individual’
sakar	‘the act of getting drunk’	sakar-či	‘drunkard’

In Turkish, as *-ci*-containing items denote a quality or individual associated with the item to which *-ci* is appended, all *-ci*-containing items can occur as modifiers in phrases:

- 1) Ali çok inat-**çı** bir çocuktur
 Ali very stubbornness-**CI** one child
 ‘Ali is a very stubborn child.’

However, such is not the case in Iraqi Arabic, in that *-či*-containing items cannot behave attributively.

7.6.4 Summary of *-či* in Iraqi Arabic vs. Turkish

In Turkish, derivations with *-ci* form substantives which typically occur as syntactic nominals—these derivations refer to individuals associated in four principle ways with the items expressed by the bases to which the suffix in question is appended: a profession or occupation related to the item; an individual or the quality of being temporarily occupied by the item denoted by the stem

to which *-ci* is suffixed; an individual or the quality of being associated with a social, religious, philosophical, or political doctrine, itself connected with the item denoted by the stem to which *-ci* is attached ; an individual who habitually partakes in the activity denoted by the substantive. This suffix as it occurs in Turkish differs from the manner in which it occurs in Iraqi Arabic in the following six principle ways:

- I) *-čī* in Iraqi Arabic tends to be reserved for lower-level, blue collar occupations (e.g., *čāy-čī* ‘tea vendor’, *pača-čī* ‘pača merchant’), however it has a larger semantic range in Turkish, in that it can express blue collar occupations as well as white collar ones (e.g., *gazete-ci* ‘journalist’).
- II) *-čī* is not used in Iraqi Arabic to form items that denote an individual or the quality of being temporarily occupied by the item denoted by the base (save for in cognate items) despite behaving this way in Turkish.
- III) While in Turkish there is a category of derivations containing this suffix denoting an individual or the quality of being associated with a social, religious, philosophical, or political doctrine, itself related to the base to which *-čī* is suffixed, such derivations are formed with the *nisba* suffix in Iraqi Arabic.
- IV) While all derivations containing this suffix can occur as modifiers in Turkish, this is not the case in Iraqi Arabic, since in Iraqi Arabic they only function as nouns.
- V) Iraqi Arabic only accepts the suffixation of *-čī* to nouns, although in Turkish it can be appended to nouns and interrogatives (e.g., *ne-ci* ‘of what occupation’).
- VI) Due to the constraints of vowel harmony in Turkish, the suffix in question can be realized as /-d͡ʒi/, /-d͡ʒu/, /-d͡ʒy/, or /-d͡ʒy/ (there are also instances in which the -j of this suffix is realized as /-t͡ʃ/ in Turkish, namely after a voiceless consonant), although this suffix is only realized as /-t͡ʃi/ in Iraqi Arabic.

Now that we have explored the similarities and differences between *-siz* and *-čī* as they occur in Turkish and in Iraqi Arabic, let us continue with a discussion of the syntactic categories of *-siz* and *-čī* in Iraqi Arabic specifically.

7.7 The Syntactic categories of -siz and -çi

Through the aforementioned respective summaries of the similarities and differences of -siz and -çi as they occur in both Turkish and Iraqi Arabic, it is clear that they behave much more productively in the source language, Turkish, and it is also readily apparent that both the semantic and syntactic range of both these suffixes is much wider in Turkish than in Iraqi Arabic. However, at first glance, their syntactic category in Iraqi Arabic is not so clear, and the reasons for this will be discussed in the current section. Of particular interest to the present chapter is determining whether -siz- and -çi as they occur in Iraqi Arabic are free words, or if these suffixes are parsible entities which can be developed and expanded into productive formations through their suffixation to various bases. In order to aid us in answering this question, let us briefly outline the phonological realization of *tā' marbūṭa* (i.e., the Arabic final -a suffix which typically occurs in grammatically feminine nouns or adjectives), as there are -siz- containing items in which the base ends in a *tā' marbūṭa*, and the manner in which the *tā' marbūṭa* behaves in bases which have a *tā' marbūṭa* in the final position function is, at first glance, contradictory to the morpho-phonological rules by which Iraqi Arabic is bound (-çi, however, adheres to these rules, see section 7.9.6.5 for the morpho-phonological changes brought about by the suffixation of -çi). An understanding of the motivation of the preservation of the *tā' marbūṭa* in -siz-containing items can help to shed light on the parsibility and productivity of -siz in Iraqi Arabic.

As Iraqi Arabic distinguishes between masculine and feminine genders of nouns, adjectives, and verbs, *tā' marbūṭa* essentially serves as an indicator of feminine gender, getting appended to nouns and adjectives to denote feminine declension. While some items, such as those which refer to the occupation of a person or their place of origin have a masculine base, to which *tā' marbūṭa* gets appended to make the feminine form (e.g., *farḥān* 'happy (MSG)' → *farḥān-a* 'happy (FSG)'), other items are inherently feminine, e.g., *ṭawra* 'revolution', *naḡra* 'glance'.

In the pausal form, the final inflectional form (*t*) is not realized phonologically, and in most cases is realized as *a*, (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964) e.g., *amīra* 'princess', *madīna* 'city'. There are exceptions to this, however. For instance, if the *tā' marbūṭa*-containing item occurs as the first item in an annexation, the *t* is pronounced, e.g., *madīnit London* 'the city of London'. Also, when taking a possessive suffix, the *tā' marbūṭa* in Iraqi Arabic is realized as -*t* or -*it*,

allowing the possessive suffix to then be appended to the *t*, e.g., *madīna* ‘city’ → *madīnt-i* ‘my city’, *ġurfa* ‘room’ *ġurfit-hum* ‘their room’. Another manner in which bases ending in *tā*’ *marbūṭa* can accept suffixation is by elongating the *tā*’ *marbūṭa* to *ā* and adding a stress. Thus, we would expect the *tā*’ *marbūṭa*’s which occur in the bases to which *-siz* is appended to either get realized as *t*, or to be elongated to *ā* and stressed, but as such is not the case, this could suggest that *-siz* is a separate word, as opposed to a suffix. Furthermore, native Iraqi Arabic speakers, when realizing *-siz*-containing items orthographically, often insert a space between *-siz* and its base, providing extra circumstantial evidence that *-siz* is treated as a free word in Iraqi Arabic, not a suffix, morpho-phonologically speaking. That said, *-siz* cannot occur on its own (it must always immediately follow the base it modifies), as a free word would be able to do. Thus, the question arises: why is the *tā*’ *marbūṭa* preserved in *-siz*-containing items wherein the base ends in a *tā*’ *marbūṭa*? Another feature of *-siz* is that in order to list the lack of multiple qualities, *-siz* must be appended to every item being lacked (or one of the counterparts of *-siz* must be used), consider:

2)

هو ادب سز وشرف سز وغيره سز.					
huwa	adab- siz	ū	šarīf- siz	ū	ġīra- siz
3MSG	manners-SIZ	and	honor-SIZ	and	virtue-SIZ
‘He’s shameless and has no honor or virtue.’ ¹¹⁰					

3)

هو ادب سز وعديم الشرف.				
huwa	adab- siz	ū	‘ adīm	il-šarīf
3MSG	manners-SIZ	and	‘ADĪM	the-honor
‘He’s shameless and has no honor.’ ¹¹¹				

However, if ‘*adīm*’ is used to express lacking, ‘*adīm*’ need only be used once, with the items being lacked occurring in annexation, with each item occurring with the definite article and the conjunction *ū/w(a)* ‘and’ occurring in between them:

¹¹⁰ Informant data

¹¹¹ Informant data

4)

هو عديم الادب والشرف والغيرة.

huwa	‘adīm	il-adab	w-iš-šarif	w-il-ġira
3MSG	‘ADĪM	the-manners	and-the-honor	and-the-virtue

‘He’s shameless and has no honor or virtue.’¹¹²

In the case of *bala*, however, *wala* ‘nor’ is placed between each additional item that is being lacked, and these lacked items are generally indefinite:

5)

هو بلا ادب ولا شرف ولا غيرة.

huwa	bala	adab	wala	šarif	wala	ġira
3MSG	BALA	manners	or	honor	or	virtue

‘He’s shameless and has no honor or virtue.’¹¹³

That *-siz* must occur after every item that is being lacked suggests that *-siz* is indeed a suffix, as opposed to a free word. For instance, if we look at the manner in which the loaned *-able* functions in English (which is clearly a suffix as opposed to a free word) we can see that it, too, must be appended to every item it modifies, e.g., *he is honor-able, peace-able, and knowledge-eable*.

As for *-či*, when it is appended to bases containing a *tā’ marbūṭa*, it undergoes three specific phonological changes, although, as we saw above, *-siz* does not instigate any phonological changes. If the base to which *-či* is appended ends in a *tā’ marbūṭa*, the *tā’ marbūṭa* is removed entirely, with *-či* immediately following the now *tā’ marbūṭa*-less base, e.g., ‘*arabana* ‘carriage’ → ‘*araban-či* ‘carriage driver’. If, however, the *tā’ marbūṭa* is preceded by a *wa*, there is a tendency for the *wa* to shift to an *aw*, e.g.: *gahwa* ‘coffee’ → *gahaw-či* ‘coffee house proprietor’. Also, if the *tā’ marbūṭa* is preceded by an *ā* and *wa*, as in *āwa*, then the *ā* is shortened and the *tā’ marbūṭa* is deleted, e.g.: *baqlāwa* ‘baklava’ → *baqlaw-či* ‘baklava merchant’; *šaqāwa* ‘joke’ → *šaqaw-či* ‘clown’ ‘jokester’. Such morpho-phonological changes will be discussed in more depth in 7.9.6.5.

¹¹² Informant data

¹¹³ Informant data

Furthermore, like *-siz*, *-či* cannot occur on its own and must occur after every stem which it modifies, e.g.:

- 6) huwa maṣlah-**či** ū niswān-**či** ū sakar-**či**
 3MSG benefit-ČI and woman.PL-ČI and getting drunk-ČI
 ‘He’s an opportunist, womanizer, and drunkard.’¹¹⁴

This demonstrates that the behavior of *-či* is similar to that of a non-loaned suffix, and it further indicates that *-či* is a highly-integrated item in Iraqi Arabic. We can thus hypothesize that *-či* is indeed a suffix as opposed to a free word. Although *-siz* and *-či* are both Turkish suffixes, we have seen through the discussion above how drastically different they are in terms of the internal changes they prompt in the bases to which they are appended. To recap, *-siz* does not affect the stem to which it is appended in any way (the stem for all intents and purposes remains intact), even when the base ends in a phonological environment in which we would anticipate a phonological change, such as stems ending in a *tā’ marbūṭa*. However, in stems ending in *tā’ marbūṭa* to which *-či* is appended, *-či* prompts three changes to the stem: complete deletion of the *tā’ marbūṭa*, diphthongization, and shortening of the vowel in the second to last syllable combined with *tā’ marbūṭa* deletion. Now that we have a clear overview of the items under analysis and the theoretical questions surrounding them, let us explore the data collection and methodological approaches undertaken for the present work.

7.8 Data Collection and Methodology

As the main aims of the present chapter are to uncover the divisions of labor between *-siz* and *-či* and their respective non-loaned counterparts and to determine their degree of productivity, we will draw upon Masliyah’s (1996) work on these suffixes as a framework, as this work is, heretofore, the most in-depth work on the items in question. Masliyah’s (1996) findings were built upon and expanded on through my own knowledge and intuitions of Iraqi Arabic and my analysis of the data which was collected through a combination of transcriptions of excerpts of Iraqi speech (from the television programs *il-hārib*, *ana w-il-majnūn*, and *id-dars il-’awwal*), written comments sourced from social media, and close work with Iraqi Arabic informants (the details of which were discussed in 4.2).

¹¹⁴ Informant data

There is evidence of Turkish suffixes (namely *-li*, *-lik*, *-siz*, and *-çi*) occurring in Iraqi Arabic (e.g., Abu-Haidar 1996; Masliyah 1996). Central to our analysis is Masliyah (1996) which treats the suffixes *-çi* and *-siz*, in addition to the suffixes *-lik* and *-li*, the former of which is used to form abstract nouns and the latter of which is used to form relational adjectives. Masliyah (1996) treats these four Turkish suffixes as they occur in Iraqi Arabic in a concise nine-page exploration of them, providing a compilation, and in some instances, a categorization of these items in list form—they are not put into sentences, analyzed, or otherwise evaluated.

Let us consider a brief summary of Masliyah's (1996) findings regarding *-çi* and *-siz*, in order to situate this analysis therein. Masliyah attests that although adjectives are formed quite freely with *-siz* in Turkish, in Iraqi Arabic, it is restricted to nominal or adjectival items (the differentiation between the two boiling down to context) denoting a trait or characteristic and is not productive (p. 293). He posits that derivations with *-siz* in Iraqi Arabic are restricted to nouns denoting a characteristic or trait, adding that they are not inflected for gender, but are inflected by number through the affixation of the plural suffix *-īya* (e.g., *adab* 'manners' → *adab-siz* 'an rude individual' → *adab-siz-īya* 'rude individuals'). He maintains that *-çi* is very common in Iraqi Arabic and adds that most of the bases to which *-çi* is appended are of foreign origin (more Turkish than Persian) and divides the derivations in Iraqi Arabic containing *-çi* into three groups: the first denoting agents and professions (e.g., *šakar* 'sugar' → *šakar-çi* 'seller of sweets'), the second denoting individuals who engage in habitual activities or behavior (e.g., *šaqāwa* 'joke' → *šaqaw-çi* 'clown, jokester'), and the third denoting individuals who are affiliated in some way, such as membership or allegiance, to the base to which *-siz* is attached (e.g., *zōrxāna* 'body-building gym' → *zōrxan-çi* 'an athlete who belongs to a body-building gym') (p. 295). However, Masliyah does not comment on the fact that *-çi*, unlike *-siz*, is denoted for gender through the suffixation of the feminine *-a* (e.g., *muškila* 'problem' → *muškil-čīya* 'troublemaker (FSG)'), although he does note that derivations with *-çi* are pluralized through the suffixation of *-īya* (e.g., *gahwa* 'coffee' → *gahaw-č-īya* 'coffee vendors').

Since the uncovering of the degree of productivity of *-siz* and *-çi* necessitated consultations with various native speakers in order to garner an accurate picture of the productivity of these items, let us turn to a discussion of the details surrounding the data collection. Each informant was asked to deem a range of derivations containing *-siz* and *-çi* as acceptable or unacceptable in order to further shed light on the semantic implications lent by the

suffixes in question. The informants for this study were presented with a questionnaire comprised of a list of items containing the respective suffixes. Some of these derivations were frequently-occurring items which can be heard in daily Iraqi speech, while others were constructed by the researcher. The informants were presented with the list and asked to assess the acceptability of each item ranging from acceptable/appropriate Iraqi speech to unacceptable/inappropriate Iraqi speech with an intermediate choice in between to allow for indications of semi-productivity, as it was realized that a mere binary distinction between acceptable/appropriate and unacceptable/inappropriate could skew the results and would only test for complete productivity or complete unproductivity. Commonly-heard derivations were mixed in with ‘new’ derivations so as to not guide the informants to select one option over another and the informants were presented with the following instructions followed by a list of derivations containing the item in question:

على طريقته الشخصية بالتحدث اشر على الكلمات التالية هل هي عادية او غريبة او مستحيلة؟

‘Based on your own personal manner of speaking, indicate if the following words are ‘normal’, ‘strange’ or ‘impossible’.

The responses were tabulated and used to confirm or reject my own hypotheses and intuitions regarding the productivity of the suffixes in question and the constraints by which they are bound. Given the diglossic situation of Iraq and strong social and cultural perceptions of what constitutes proper or improper speech, I anticipated that my informants might reject newly coined-derivations as improper Iraqi speech, despite the fact that they may easily be able to understand the implication lent by them and might even produce similar derivations in their personal daily communication. As I have personally heard new outputs containing the items under analysis in Iraqi Arabic conversations, in television programs, etc., my own knowledge and intuition indicated that although Iraqi Arabic speakers may completely reject a *-siz/-čī* derivation in isolation, they would be more likely to accept it if it were presented in an environment that contained appropriate context. Thus, in order to prevent inaccurate results and to cross-check the informants’ responses, I also added derivations with *-siz/-čī* in context, e.g.:

7)

صرنا وطن كهرباء سز لازم نقرا على ضوء الشموع.

şirna	waṭan	kaharabā' - siz	lāzim	naqra
become.PST.1SG	country	electricity-SIZ	must	read.PRS.1PL
'ala	ḡawa'	iš-šumū'		
on	light	the-candle		

'We've become a country without electricity, we have to read by candlelight.'¹¹⁵

The data yielded from such questions will be elaborated upon in 7.9.3.

As for the syntactic constraints by which *-siz* and *-či* are bound, I relied on my own intuition combined with an analysis of the data I extracted from the aforementioned transcriptions and comments, searching for instances of traits such as definiteness, declension for gender/number, as well as syntactic environment like whether the items can occur nominally, predicatively, referentially, attributively, etc. The examples and lists of *-siz*- and *-či*-containing items presented below have been gleaned from various sources such as Masliyah (1996), informant data, and transcriptions from the aforementioned television programs, although they are by no means exhaustive. Now that we have outlined the manner in which the data for the present chapter was collected, we will move on to the analysis.

7.9 Analysis

The analysis will first treat *-siz* against its non-loaned counterparts, beginning with an investigation of the manner in which *bala* functions (7.9.1), followed by an analysis of *'adīm* (7.9.2) and *-siz* (7.9.3), respectively. After a summary of the findings of *-siz*, *bala*, and *'adīm* has been presented (7.9.4), the analysis will continue with an exploration of *abu il-* (7.9.5) against the loaned *-či* (7.9.6). The conclusions of the findings of these items (7.9.7) are then presented followed by a discussion of the overall conclusions and theoretical implications of *-siz* and *-či* (7.10).

¹¹⁵ Informant data

7.9.1 General Remarks on *bala*

As *bala* is a preposition, it differs syntactically from *-siz* and *'adīm*— it cannot occur nominally, predicatively, attributively, referentially, or existentially (consequently, the layout of this particular section will differ slightly from the sections below which treat *'adīm* and *-siz*). Semantically, however, *bala* can lend the same implication as *-siz* and in the same contexts, although the opposite is not the case (see sections 7.9.3-7.9.3.6 for a discussion of *-siz*). Thus we have instances of:

šarīf	‘honor’	bala šarīf	‘without honor’
ḡamīr	‘conscience’	bala ḡamīr	‘without a conscious’
ḡīra	‘virtue’	bala ḡīra	‘without virtue’
axlāq	‘morals’	bala axlāq	‘immoral, without morals’
adab	‘manners’	bala adab	‘without manners, shameless’
damāḡ	‘brain’	bala damāḡ	‘without a brain, brainless’

In addition to indicating the lack of abstract traits or characteristics, *bala* can also point to the lack of tangible items. When doing so, *bala* occurs in the same manner as it does when denoting the lack of a trait or characteristic, immediately before the indefinite noun:

‘anwān	‘address’	bala ‘anwān	‘without an address’
qalam	‘pen’	bala qalam	‘without a pen’
bēt	‘house’	bala bēt	‘without a house, homeless’

Let us consider:

8)

يمكن هسه صارو لاجيين وبلا بيوت.

yimkin	hassa	šārō	lāji' īn	ū	bala	buyūt
maybe	now	become.PST.3MPL	refugee.PL	and	without	house.PL

‘It’s possible they’ve become refugees and homeless now.’¹¹⁶

¹¹⁶ Informant data

Furthermore, *bala* can also imply the lack of an item represented by a gerund or verbal noun, however the same does not appear to be the case for *-siz*. In such instances, *bala* occurs immediately before the verbal noun representing the item being lacked:

nōm	‘sleeping’	bala nōm	‘without sleeping’
tġēyir	‘changing’	bala tġēyir	‘without changing’
ṭabax	‘cooking’	bala ṭabax	‘without cooking’

Like ‘*adīm*’, yet unlike *-siz*, *bala* can be used to present a list of items being lacked. When doing so, it occurs once immediately before the sequence of lacked items, each of which is separated by the negative additive conjunction *wala* ‘nor’:

- 9) **bala** adab wala iḥsās
 BALA manners nor feeling
 ‘without manners or feelings’

- 10) **bala** šarif wala ġīra
 BALA honor nor virtue
 ‘without honor or virtue’

- 11) **bala** ḡamīr wala tarbīya
 BALA conscious nor upbringing
 ‘without a conscious or upbringing’

Another distinguishing feature setting *bala* apart from *-siz* and ‘*adīm*’ is that *bala* can indicate the lacking of both nouns and verbs through *bala* and the subordinating suffix *ma* as in *bala-ma* (as will be explored in section 7.9.1.2).

7.9.1.1 *bala* Occuring in Conjunction with Nouns

When indicating the lack of an item denoted by a noun in Iraqi Arabic, *bala* occurs immediately before the item that is lacked:

12)

اني بلا اخوي رحت.

āni **bala** axū-ya riḥit
I without brother-1SG go.PST.1SG
'I went without my brother.'¹¹⁷

13)

طلعت من البيت بلا فلوس.

ṭila 'it min il-bēt **bala** flūs
exit.PRS.1SG from the-house without money.PL
'I left the house without any money.'¹¹⁸

14)

laḥam **bala** miliḥ
meat without salt
'meat without salt'¹¹⁹

7.9.1.2 *bala* Occuring in Conjunction with Verbs

When indicating the lack of an action, the subordinating suffix, *ma*, occurs immediately after *bala* and before the appropriately-conjugated present tense noun:

15)

طلعت بلا ما اقول شي.

ṭila 'it **bala-ma** agūl šī
exit.PST.1SG without-SR say.PRS.1SG thing
'I left without saying anything.'¹²⁰

¹¹⁷ Informant data

¹¹⁸ Informant data

¹¹⁹ Informant data

¹²⁰ Informant data

16)

بكلامي جرحته بلا ما اقصد.

b-kalām-i	jiraḥt-a	bala-ma	aqṣud
with-language-1SG	wound.PST.1SG-3MSG	without-SR	intend.PRS.1SG

‘I hurt him with my words without meaning to.’¹²¹

7.9.1.3 *bala* Occuring in Conjunction with Pronominal Suffixes

Perhaps one of the most salient features differentiating *bala* from *-siz* and *‘adīm* is that it can take a pronominal suffix to indicate the lack of an entity referred to by a pronoun. In such instances *bala* is realized as *blayya* and the final vowel is lengthened to *ā* and then the appropriate suffix is appended:

blayyā-ya	‘without me’
blayyā-k	‘without you (2MSG)’
blayyā-č	‘without you (2FSG)’
blayyā-ā	‘without him’
blayyā-ha	‘without her’
blayyā-na	‘without us’
blayyā-kum	‘without you (2PL)’
blayyā-hum	‘without them (3MPL)’
blayyā-hun	‘without them (3FPL)’

Consider such a construction when used in a sentence:

17)

مو تدري اموت بلياك؟

mu	tadri	amūt	blayyā-k?
NEG	know.PRS.2MSG	die.PRS.1SG	without-2MSG

‘Don’t you know I’d die without you.’¹²²

¹²¹ Informant data

¹²² Informant data

As we can observe, in order to accommodate the suffixation of the 2MSG suffix *-k*, the final *-a* in *blayya* is lengthened. Now that we have a better understanding of *bala* and its shared and differentiating features with *-siz*, let us explore *-siz*'s other non-loaned counterpart, *‘adīm*.

7.9.2 General Remarks on ‘adīm

‘*adīm* is inflected for both gender and number (although *-siz* is only inflected for number), i.e., ‘*adīm* (MSG), ‘*adīma* (FSG), ‘*adīmāt* (FPL), and ‘*adīmī(n)* (MPL). ‘*adīm* has traditionally been described as serving an adjectival function, expressing ‘lacking, not having, without, -less, in-, un-’ in the Arabic genitive case (Badawi, Carter & Gully 2016:838; Wehr 1979:698)—the appropriate form of ‘*adīm* is employed, followed by a definite noun—i.e., the item that is being ‘lacked’ (e.g., ‘*adīmit it-tarbīya* ‘lacking upbringing; mannerless’). However, as the analysis in this section reveals, although it does indeed serve an adjectival function that expresses lacking, ‘*adīm*, like *-siz*, can occur nominally, predicatively, referentially, existentially, and attributively.

When indefinite, ‘*adīm* and its gender/number-denoting counterparts do not take the definite article *il-*, but the noun expressing the item that is being ‘lacked’ is appended to the definite article, as in ‘*adīm il-*:

tarbīya	‘upbringing’	‘adīm it-tarbīya	‘without upbringing’
adab	‘manners’	‘adīm il-adab	‘shameless’
šarīf	‘honor’	‘adīm iš-šarīf	‘without honor’
iḥsās	‘emotion’	‘adīm il-iḥsās	‘without feelings’
axlāq	‘morals’	‘adīm il-axlāq	‘immoral’

Constructions containing ‘*adīm* can also be made definite, like *-siz*. When made definite, however, both ‘*adīm* and the noun expressing the lacked item take the definite article:

adab	‘manners’	il-‘adīmī il-adab	‘the shameless individuals’
axlāq	‘morals’	il-‘adīmī il-axlāq	‘the immoral individual’

In definite *-siz*-containing items, the definite article, *il-*, is appended only in front of the base to which *-siz* is appended:

damāġ ‘brain’ il-damāġ-siz ‘the idiot’

Additionally, ‘*adīm*’ can be used to list a number of items that are being lacked. In such instances, ‘*adīm*’ occurs only once, whilst the items being lacked are listed with each possessing the definite article and with the conjunction *w* ‘and’ in between each:

18) ‘**adīmī** il-insānīya w-il-iḥsās
 ‘ADĪMĪ.MPL the-humanity and-the-feeling
 ‘lacking humanity and feelings (3MPL)’

19) ‘**adīm** il-adab w-it-tarbīya
 ‘ADĪM the-manners and-the-upbringing
 ‘lacking manners and upbringing (3MSG)’

However, as was discussed in section 7.7, *-siz* must occur after every stem which denotes the item being lacked, separated by *ū/w(a)* ‘and’ between each constituent:

20) ‘aql-**siz** ū damāġ-**siz** ū šarif-**siz**
 sense-SIZ and brain-SIZ and honor-SIZ
 ‘senseless, brainless, and dishonorable’

7.9.2.1 Vocative ‘*adīm*’

There are many instances of ‘*adīm*’ being used as an insult. In such instances, it is typically used to denote someone’s lack of a positive trait, with this lacking of the positive trait implying a negative connotation, and in such contexts it functions much like its loaned, *-siz*-containing counterparts (see 7.9.3). In such instances, the vocative *ya* is usually placed immediately before the ‘*adīm*’-containing construction:

21)

راح اعلمج الادب يا عديمة التربية.

rāḥ a'allim-ič il-adab ya 'adīmit it-tarbīya
FUT teach.PRS.1SG-2MSG the.manner.SG VOC 'adīmit it-tarbiya
'I will teach you [some] manners, you insolent girl.'¹²³

Here, we see that the vocative particle *ya* occurs immediately before the feminine-gender-inflected 'adīmit it-tarbīya 'without breeding', to insult or degrade the addressee. This example is particularly interesting as the context further elucidates the implication lent by 'adīmit it-tarbīya. As the speaker asserts *rāḥ a'allim-ič il-adab* 'I will teach you some manners', the speaker is implying that the addressee lacks manners, and through this assertion, followed immediately by *ya 'adīmit it-tarbīya*, we can further observe that the term in question has a demeaning and insulting connotation about the addressee's character.

Let us now consider an instance in which a masculine agent is being modified by 'adīm in a vocative context:

22)

شكد دفعولك حتى تحجي هيچ كلام يا عديم الضمير؟

šgad difa'ū -l-ak ḥatta tiḥchi hīč kalām
How much pay.PST.3MSG-to-2MSG to speak.PRS.2MSG such language
ya 'adīm iḏ-ḏamīr
'How much did they pay you to say such things, oh you with no conscience?'¹²⁴

Again, we see how 'adīm occurs in insulting or demeaning contexts.

7.9.2.2 Nominal 'adīm

Now let us consider how 'adīm occurs nominally:

¹²³ *il-hārib* (part 2) Episode 34 39:40

¹²⁴ Informant data

23)

العديم الإحساس بجى الولد.

il-‘ adīm	il-iḥsās	bičča	il-walad
the-‘ADĪM	the-feeling	cry.PST.3MSG	the-child

‘The emotionless man made the child cry.’¹²⁵

‘*adīm*, in this particular example, functions nominally as the subject of the sentence.

7.9.2.3 Predicative ‘*adīm*

‘*adīm* constructions, like *-siz*-containing items, often occur predicatively with verbs pertaining to ‘being’, such as *yīṣīr* ‘to become’ or *yīṭli* ‘to turn out to be’, and it seems that these can occur in all tenses, consider:

24)

ظنيت چان خوش ادم بس طلع عديم الأخلاق.

ḡannēt	čān	xōš	adam	bass
think.PST.1SG	be.PST.3MSG	good	man	but
ṭila‘	‘ adīm	il-axlāq		
turn out.PST.3MSG	‘ADĪM	the-morals		

‘I thought he was a good person, but he turned out to be immoral.’¹²⁶

Here, we can see that ‘*adīm* can also occur predicatively, as in this instance, the speaker uses ‘*adīm* to state information about the subject, namely *ṭila‘* ‘*adīm il-axlāq* ‘he turned out to be immoral.’

7.9.2.4 Referential ‘*adīm*

Now consider the manner in which ‘*adīm* occurs referentially, to refer to a constituent:

¹²⁵ Informant data

¹²⁶ Informant data

25)

هو العديم الشرف اللي باعنا للشرطة.

huwa	il-‘ adīm	iš-šarif	illi	bā‘-na	I-iš-šurṭa
3MSG	the-‘ADĪM	the-honor	who	sold-3MSG-1PL	to-the-police

‘He’s the dishonorable man who sold us out to the police.’¹²⁷

In this instance, ‘*adīm*, in conjunction with the demonstrative *illi* ‘who’, refers to *il-‘adīm iš-šarif* ‘the dishonorable man’ who sold out the speaker and his cohort to the police, and thus we can see that ‘*adīm* can occur referentially.

7.9.2.5 Attributive ‘*adīm*

Now consider how ‘*adīm* behaves attributively :

26)

بس چنت ما اتصور انو هذا ارتان العديم الشرف يصّرّف ابهالدناءة.

bas	činit	ma	atšawwar	inū	hāḏa	Artān
but	be.PST.1SG	NEG	think.PRS.1SG	that	this	Artān
il-‘ adīm	iš-šarif	yitšarraf				ib-hā-d-dinā’a
the-‘ADĪM	the-honor	act.PRS.3MSG				with-this-the-sordidness

‘But I didn’t think that Artān, that dishonorable man, could act with such sordidness.’¹²⁸

‘*adīm*, in this example, occurs attributively, in that it modifies the subject, Artān, describing him as *il-‘adīm iš-šarif* ‘that dishonorable man’.

7.9.2.6 Existential ‘*adīm*

Finally, let us consider the manner in which ‘*adīm* occurs existentially:

¹²⁷ Informant data

¹²⁸ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 32 12:40

27)

اكو عديمي الاخلاق حتى بالمرجعية.

āku ‘adīmī il-axlāq ḥatta b-il-marja‘īya.

there are ‘ADĪMĪ the-morals even in-the-clergy

‘There are immoral people even in the clergy.’¹²⁹

Through *āku*, the Iraqi Arabic particle of existence, we can observe that this example is pointing to the existence of ‘*adīmī il-axlāq* ‘immoral people’ in the clergy, pointing to ‘*adīm*’s ability to occur existentially. Now that we have a clear picture of the manner in which ‘*adīm*’ functions, let us turn to our analysis of *-siz*.

7.9.3 General remarks on *-siz*

In Iraqi Arabic, the bases to which *-siz* can attach seem, to an extent, to be restricted to a fixed number of items, namely *-siz* is appended to abstract nouns (in their singular form) denoting positive qualities (e.g., morals, honor, virtue), to indicate the lack of this positive quality, and thus, by extension, the possession of a negative quality (e.g., immorality, lack of honor, lack of virtue), e.g.: *adab* ‘manners’ → *adab-siz* ‘mannerless; rude’. Although there is a tendency for the *-siz*-containing items in Iraqi Arabic to denote abstract traits, there are instances in which they denote material or concrete traits, as well, (Masliyah 1996:294) e.g., *čihra* ‘face’ → *čihra-siz* ‘ugly (lit. face-less)’.

-siz-containing items, which overwhelmingly take a human agent (or at least an animate one), tend to lend a negative connotation and are typically used in an insulting or demeaning manner— *-siz* is generally utilized to modify animate objects like people or animals, or bodies comprised of animate objects (e.g., nations, governments, clergies, political parties, etc.) As will be demonstrated below, in addition to occurring in the vocative, *-siz*-containing items can occur in nominal or verbal sentences, and can behave nominally, predicatively, referentially, existentially, or attributively.

The following *-siz*-containing items are rather frequently-occurring and were accepted by all informants. The items provided in the list are a combination of the items set forth by Masliyah (1996) and gathered by myself based on my own knowledge of the language and the informant

¹²⁹ Informant data

data. After this list, we shall proceed to the analysis with a syntactic exploration of the constraints by which the *-siz*-containing items as they occur in Iraqi Arabic are bound.

damāḡ	‘brain’	damāḡ-siz	‘brainless, stupid’
adab	‘manners’	adab-siz	‘mannerless, rude’
ḡīra	‘virtue’	ḡīra-siz	‘without virtue’ ¹³⁰
axlāq	‘morals’	axlāq-siz	‘without morals’
dīn	‘religion’	dīn-siz	‘irreligious, faithless’
‘aqil	‘brain, sense’	‘aqil-siz	‘brainless, stupid’
šarīf	‘honor’	šarīf-siz	‘without honor’
nāmūs	‘morals’	nāmūs-siz	‘without morals’
muxx	‘brain’	muxx-siz	‘brainless, stupid’
tarbīya	‘education’	tarbīya-siz	‘without breeding’
iḥsās	‘emotion’	iḥsās-siz	‘without feeling’
ḥiya	‘shame’	ḥiya-siz	‘shameless’
‘ār	‘shame’	‘ār-siz	‘shameless’
īmān	‘faith’	īmān-siz	‘faithless’
wijdān	‘conscience’	wijdān-siz	‘without a conscience’
ḡamīr	‘conscience’	ḡamīr-siz	‘without a conscience’

Some such derivations possess stems of Persian origin:

čihra	‘face’	čihra-siz	‘ugly (lit. face-less)’
bičim	‘face’	bičim-siz	‘ugly (lit. face-less)’

It has been suggested that the appending of *-siz* is generally restricted to a seemingly fixed number of items, the bases of which largely denote abstract, non-physical traits which modify animate objects. It has further been stipulated that the usage of *-siz* in Iraqi Arabic is not as productive as it is in Turkish and that in Iraqi Arabic it cannot be appended to any common

¹³⁰ We should note, Masliyah (1996) translated this item as ‘without jealousy’. However, my own personal knowledge of the language and informant data indicated that the translation I provided above ‘without virtue’ is the accurate implication of this item.

noun, as demonstrated by the following examples which, it is claimed, do not constitute acceptable word formations in Iraqi Arabic (Masliyah 1996:293):

nār	‘fire’	nār-siz	‘without fire’*
hawa	‘air’	hawa-siz	‘airless’*

Despite such claims, *-siz* can be applied (semi-) productively to create new abstractions which do not adhere to the tendency indicated by the above claims, although such abstractions may not be regarded as ‘acceptable’ speech by some native Iraqi Arabic speakers. That is to say there are instances of *-siz*-containing items occurring in manners and in contexts which other native Iraqi Arabic speakers may deem inappropriate. For instance, although *-siz* in Iraqi Arabic is overwhelmingly appended to nouns pertaining to abstract traits or qualities to express abstract traits, they can also be appended to concrete or material nouns when an appropriate amount of context is provided. The manner in which *-siz* functions in Iraqi Arabic is such that Iraqi Arabic speakers recognize it as a loaned suffix indicating lacking, and therefore it can occur with a seemingly high level of productivity, given the presence of an appropriate amount of context. It is imperative to note that, when the participants were merely presented with a list of isolated items containing *-siz*, their responses seemed to stay in line with Masliyah’s (1996) claims that *-siz* is not productive and restricted to nouns denoting an abstract, non-physical trait or characteristic of human beings. As was hypothesized, every ‘new’ derivation when presented in isolation was rejected. However, when the same derivations were presented to the informants in context, as long as these new derivations contained bases which were singular abstract, material, or concrete nouns, they were accepted. For instance, when they were presented with *-siz* appended to *kaharabā* ‘electricity’ (i.e., *kaharabā*’-siz) in isolation, they all deemed it as unacceptable. However, when *kaharabā*’-siz was presented in a contextualizing sentence, none of the informants deemed it as ‘unacceptable’, and all informants were able to extrapolate the implication ‘without electricity’ without difficulty, consider:

28)

شوكت يخلص الصيف خاطر الله؟ صعب نتحمل هيج حرارة والمدينة كهرباء سز.

š-wakit	yixluş	iş-şēf	il-xāṭir	allāh	şa‘ab
what-time	finish.PRS.3MSG	the-summer	to-sake	God	difficult
nithammal	hīč	ḥarāra	w-il-madīna	kaharabā’-siz	
bear.PRS.1PL	such	temperature	and-the-city	electricity-SIZ	

‘When will summer end, for God’s sake? It’s difficult for us to bear such temperatures when the city is without electricity.’¹³¹

Let us also consider another sentence in which an item which was typically ‘rejected’ when presented in isolation was accepted when presented in a contextualizing sentence:

29)

تركت الشغل وصرت بيت سز.

tirakit	iş- şugul	wa	şirit	bēt-siz
leave.PST.1SG	the-work	and	become.PST.1SG	house-SIZ

‘I quit my job and became homeless.’¹³²

If we take *kaharabā’-siz* (i.e., an item that was initially rejected by informants but accepted when contextualized) for example, and compare it to the items which were readily accepted, even out of context, (e.g., *tarbīya-siz* ‘without upbringing’, *adab-siz* ‘without manners’) the difference between the typological category of the stems to which *-siz* is attached is clear: *kaharabā’* ‘electricity’ is typologically a ‘material noun’ (i.e., a noun that denotes a material or substance), while *tarbīya* ‘breeding’ and *adab* ‘manners’ are ‘abstract nouns’ (i.e., nouns that denote qualities, states, emotions, processes, relations, concepts, etc.—something that is not material). It would further seem like words like *bēt-siz* ‘homeless’ were also generally rejected out of context, but accepted when contextualized. Words like *bēt* are ‘concrete nouns’ (i.e., nouns that denote something material or something that is perceptible by the senses). On the other hand, when presented with items which clearly contradicted the constraints of being a

¹³¹ Informant data

¹³² Informant data

singular abstract, concrete, or material noun, even when presented in context, they were rejected, e.g.:

30)

إذا ما تريد تجي راح نروح انت سز.

iḏa	ma	trīd	tiji	rāḥ	inrūḥ	inta-siz
if	NEG	want.PRS.2MSG	come.PRS.2MSG	FUT	go.PRS.1PL	2MSG-SIZ

‘If you don’t want to come, we’ll go without you.’*¹³³

As *inta* is a personal pronoun, as opposed to a singular abstract, material, or concrete noun, it cannot accept the suffixation of *-siz*. Furthermore, not all abstract, material, or concrete singular nouns in Iraqi Arabic accept the suffixation of *-siz*, in that *-siz* does not tend to get attached to bases which already denote an unfavorable or undesirable item, e.g.,: *hamm* ‘sorrow’ → *hamm-siz* ‘without sorrow’*; *muškila* ‘problem’ → *muškila-siz* ‘without problems’.* When I enquired about their reasoning for deeming some items inappropriate in isolation but appropriate in context, the informants each explained the semantic implication lent by *-siz*, affirming that it implies lacking and further described the implications lent by the derivations containing these suffixes. The informants posited that although they recognized the implication lent by the new derivations that were presented with in isolation, they perceived them to be very ‘slang’ or ‘colloquial’, and it is interesting to note that every informant recognized these suffixes as loans of Turkish origin. This clear sense of ‘foreignness’ of *-siz* has resulted in it embodying particular socio-economic, religious, and sectarian connotations, the details of which do not concern us here, other than the fact that they seemed to prompt the informants to reject these new derivations with comments like ‘Sunni Muslims are more likely to use these words, as they have Turkish ancestry’ or ‘The people of Mosul use these items much more frequently, as they’ve been more influenced by Turkish’, etc. When these derivations were presented in context, however, the informants explained that the implications lent by these derivations were clear, and they all concurred that Iraqi speakers do produce such derivations.

It should be borne in mind that despite derivations being more likely to be accepted when presented in context, regarding *-siz* in particular, as it seemingly denotes complete lacking, there are some derivations which, although rather frequently occurring, were rejected as unacceptable

¹³³ Informant data

outputs by some informants, not on a semantic or morphological basis, but rather on the basis of cultural or religious perceptions. For instance, although *dīn-siz* ‘without religion, irreligious’ (base: *dīn* ‘religion’) is by no means a new derivation and in fact there is evidence of it occurring in well-known Iraqi proverbs (see McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:543; Masliyah 1996:293), one participant rejected *dīn-siz* as an unacceptable derivation. When asked why, he indicated that everyone is born with *dīn* ‘religion’ (this is a widely-held belief by Muslims). He explained that due to this innate sense of religion, no one can be completely ‘without’ religion, although that individual may not be observant or practicing. That said, he did indicate that *dīn-siz* would imply ‘the lack of religion’, so it is clear that semantically, there was no issue with this derivation, rather the aforementioned factors are what drove him to deem the term in question as improper speech. Based on the aforementioned points, we can conclude that, generally-speaking, abstract nouns are accepted as more suitable stems for *-siz* than concrete or material nouns are, especially when presented in isolation. However, as we have just observed, the inclusion of appropriate context, combined with the general shared understanding by the Iraqi Arabic speaking population of the implication that the affix *-siz* lends, allows for other noun classes, such as material and concrete noun classes, to have a greater degree of productivity than Masliyah (1996) seems to suggest. Furthermore, the fact that the informants were all able to easily parse the suffixes from their bases (both in instances in which they derivations were accepted as appropriate speech and those which they deemed inappropriate speech) and that they were able to describe the implications lent by this suffix, in addition to being aware of its status as a loan of Turkish provenance, indicates that *-siz* is a highly transparent suffix. It has been argued that there is a direct link between nondecomposability, high lexical frequency, and transparency, and then again, a link between parsibility and degree of productivity, and in line with Dressler (2007:465), we can observe that both the morphological composition of the new derivations as well their morphological decomposition contribute to the parsibility and consequent productivity of said derivations. Also, that the informants were willing to accept newly-constructed derivations in context, but not out of context, suggests that *-siz* items are not necessarily unproductive, nor are they fully productive, presenting ‘borderline instances’, wherein, in appropriate contexts, what would otherwise be deemed inappropriate or unacceptable constructions by native speakers are accepted, suggesting that semi-productivity ‘can to some degree be extended to new forms’

(Pinker and Prince 1994:231). Now that a general overview of *-siz* has been set forth, let us proceed to an exploration of the syntactic constraints by which they are bound.

7.9.3.1 Vocative -siz

Let us first explore what is arguably the most common environment in which *-siz* occurs, the vocative, in which such items are utilized to address someone, typically in an insulting or rude manner, often by placing the vocative *ya* in front of the *-siz*-containing item, although the inclusion of *ya* is not compulsory, consider:

31)

							يا تربية سز. يا حقيرة. راح اعلمج الادب.
ya	tarbīya- siz	ya	ḥaqīra	rāḥ	a'allim-ič	il-adab	
VOC	breeding-SIZ	VOC	swine	FUT	teach.1PSG-2FS	the-manners	
‘You insolent girl! You swine! I will teach you some manners!’ ¹³⁴							

In this example, by the feminine declension of *ḥaqīr* (i.e., *ḥaqīra*) ‘swine’ and the appending of the 2FSG pronominal suffix *-ič* to *a'allim* ‘I teach’, we can determine that the person being addressed is female. However, we can also see that the *-siz*-containing item in this example, *tarbīya-siz* ‘without breeding’, did not get inflected for gender, as *-siz* cannot take a feminine declension.

Let us consider another *-siz*-containing item, but this time modifying a masculine agent:

¹³⁴ *il-hārib* (part 2) Episode 34 39:40

32)

أ: شديصير؟

A: š-d-īṣīr

what-PROG-happen.PRS.3MSG

‘What’s happening?’

ب: دا يعمل على الكرسي.

B: da ya‘amil ‘ala il-kursi

PROG work.PRS.3MSG on the-chair

‘He’s working on the chair.’

أ: معقولة؟ شيسوي بيه؟

A: ma‘aqūl š-īsawwī bī-h

seriously what-do.PRS.3MSG with-3MSG

‘Really? What’s he doing with it?’

ج: يا غبي، لمن سالت؟

C: ya ġabi il-man sa‘alit

VOC stupid to-whom ask.PST.2MSG

‘Hey stupid, who are you asking?’

أ: اني ما سالتك، دماغ سز.

A: āni ma sa‘alit il-ak damāġ-siz

1SG NEG ask.PRS.1SG to-2MSG brain-SIZ

‘I didn’t ask you, brainless (stupid).’¹³⁵

In this example we can see that the vocative *-siz* can be used without the vocative particle *ya*. We can further notice, through the use of the 2MSG verb conjugations and pronominal suffixes, that the *-siz*-containing item, *damāġ-siz* ‘brainless, stupid’, is denoting a masculine item. Therefore, we can conclude that there is no difference in the realization of a *-siz*-containing item when used to denote a feminine agent or a masculine one.

7.9.3.2 Nominal *-siz*

Consider the manner in which *-siz* occurs nominally:

¹³⁵ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 36 35:20

33)

الدين سز يريد له ايمان سز.

id-dīn- siz	yirīd	la-h	īmān- siz
the-religion-SIZ	want.PRS.3MSG	to-3MSG	faith-SIZ

‘The tyrant is controlled by a dictator (lit. ‘the non-believer requires a faithless person’).’¹³⁶

We can see how *dīn-siz* ‘non-believer’ occurs nominally, as the subject of the sentence, with the definite article *il-*. However, we can also see how a *-siz*-containing item can occur indefinitely, as the object, *īmān-siz* ‘a faithless person’, occurs without it.

7.9.3.3 Predicative -siz

When occurring predicatively, the *-siz*-containing item occurs in the predicative clause of the sentence, typically in its indefinite form, consider:

34)

أ: اني دماغ سز؟

A: āni damāġ-**siz**

1SG brain-SIZ

‘I’m brainless?’

ب: إي. ومن هسه راح اسميك دماغ سز. تعرف ليش؟ حتى تبطل إتصير غبي.

B: ī	wa	min	hassa	rāḥ	asammī-k	damāġ- siz
yes	and	from	now	FUT	name.PRS.1SG-2MSG	brain-SIZ
ti‘aruf		lēš?	ḥatta	tibaṭṭil		itṣīr ġabi
know.PRS.2MSG	why	so	quit.PRS.2MSG		be.PRS.2MSG	stupid

‘Yes, and from now on I’m going to call you ‘brainless’. Do you know why? So you can stop being stupid.’¹³⁷

This example is particularly interesting for our understanding of the implications lent by *-siz*-containing items as the speaker elucidates to the addressee the reason for calling him *damāġ-siz*: *ḥatta tibaṭṭil itṣīr ġabi* ‘So you can stop being stupid’. Thus, we can see that *damāġ-siz* implies a

¹³⁶ The example is a proverb which was presented by Masliyah (1996:293) who gleaned it from McCarthy & Raffouli (1964:543).

¹³⁷ *il-hārib* (part 1) Episode 36 36:00

similar implication to that of *ġabi* ‘stupid’, another insulting or demeaning manner of describing an agent.

7.9.3.4 Referential -*siz*

When occurring referentially, the -*siz*-containing item is used to refer to an individual (or a group of individuals), consider:

35)

اليوم اريد اروح اشوف هذا الدماغ سز شيريد.					
il-yōm	arīd	arūḥ	ašūf	hāḏa	id-damāġ- siz
the-day	want.PRS.1SG	go.PRS.1SG	see.PRS.1SG	this	the-brain-SIZ
š-īrīd					
what-want.PRS.3MSG					
‘Today I want to go see what this idiot wants.’ ¹³⁸					

Here, *id-damāġ-siz* ‘the idiot’ occurs in conjunction with the demonstrative *hāḏa* ‘this’ to refer to an individual whom the speaker deems to be an idiot.

7.9.3.5 Attributive -*siz*

In addition to occurring in the above-mentioned environments, -*siz*-containing items can also occur attributively, and, in such instances, quite interesting are the syntactic constraints by which they are bound and the functions they serve, in that in a semantic sense, they function as adjectives, whereas in a syntactic sense they often do not. Non-loaned adjectives in Iraqi Arabic often serve a double function of both adjective and noun. Take for instance the non-loaned item ‘*irāqi* ‘Iraqi’, which can function as a noun (e.g., *huwa ‘irāqi* ‘he’s an Iraqi man’) or an adjective (e.g., *huwa ustāḏ ‘irāqi* ‘he’s an Iraqi professor). Non-loaned nouns and adjectives are typically inflected for both gender and number by appending -*a* to the end of the item to make it singular plural (e.g., ‘*irāqīya*) or -*īn* to make it masculine plural and -*āt* feminine plural (e.g., ‘*irāqiyīn* and ‘*irāqiyāt* respectively). -*siz*-containing items can occur with or without the definite article just like any other Iraqi Arabic regular noun (e.g., *tarbīya* ‘breeding, upbringing’ → *tarbīya-siz* ‘an individual without breeding/upbringing’ → *it-tarbīya-siz* ‘the individual without

¹³⁸ Informant data

breeding/upbringing’). There are also instances of *-siz*-containing items occurring attributively, that is there are instances of them serving as direct modifiers of the nominal, consider:

36)

ماكو خبر عن أخوك الأدب سز.

m-āku xabr ‘an axū-k il-adab-**siz**
 NEG-there is news about brother-3MSG the-manners-SIZ
 ‘There’s no news about your rude brother.’¹³⁹

Continuing from this, although *-siz*-containing items inflect for number (by appending *-īya* to *-siz* for both feminine and masculine plurals), they do not inflect for gender, remaining *-siz* for both male and female. Generally, attributive items in Iraqi Arabic occur immediately after the noun they are modifying and get inflected for gender and number, consider:

37)

هو ولد غبي.

huwa walad ġabi
 3MSG boy stupid
 ‘He’s a stupid boy.’¹⁴⁰

When a *-siz*-containing item functions as an adjective, it gets declined for number but not for gender and follows the noun, consider:

38)

هو ولد دماغ سز.

huwa walad damāġ-**siz**
 he boy brain-SIZ
 ‘He’s a stupid boy.’¹⁴¹

Another manner in which items containing *-siz*, when behaving attributively, differ from other Iraqi Arabic adjectives is that, in general, there is a tendency for the *-siz* items to describe

¹³⁹ Informant data

¹⁴⁰ Informant data

¹⁴¹ Informant data

humans in both the singular and plural forms as well as what are perceived as collective groups of humans, e.g., *ša 'ab* ‘people, nation’, *nās* ‘people’, *jēš* ‘army’, or even items like *madina* ‘city’, *dawla* ‘nation, country’, or the names of cities and countries, to refer to its inhabitants as a whole. Consider:

39)

اللغة اللي تحجي بية مال ناس ادب سز.

il-luḡa	illi	tiḥči	bi-ha	māl	nās
the-language	which	speak.PRS.2MS	in-3FSG	POSS	people.SG

adab-siz

manners-SIZ

‘The language you’re using is for insolent people.’¹⁴²

Here we can see that *adab-siz*, like regular non-loaned adjectives, occurs after the item being modified, *nās* ‘people’, and as *nās* is indefinite so is *adab-siz*.

Interestingly, as items containing *-siz* denote the lacking of an attribute often possessed by an animate agent, based on the analysis, it would seem as though *-siz* items cannot occur attributively to modify inanimate objects. Thus, although an item like *damāḡ-siz*, for example, implies something along the lines of ‘stupid’, as does the non-loaned *ḡabi* with which *damāḡ-siz* often alternates, *damāḡ-siz*, it would seem, cannot be used to describe an inanimate object, although *ḡabi* can. Thus consider the following examples in which an animate agent is described:

40)

هو واحد غبي.

huwa	wāḥid	ḡabi
3MSG	person	stupid

‘He’s a stupid person.’¹⁴³

¹⁴² Informant data

¹⁴³ Informant data

41)

هو واحد دماغ سز.

huwa wāḥid damāḡ-siz

3MSG person brain-SIZ

‘He’s a stupid person.’¹⁴⁴

As *wāḥid* refers to an unnamed individual and implies ‘person’ or ‘individual’, and, as it denotes a human agent, it can be modified by a regular Iraqi Arabic adjective or a *-siz*-containing item, thus both *ḡabi* ‘stupid’ and *damāḡ-siz* ‘stupid’ can be used to modify it. Continuing from this, let us now consider contexts in which the item being modified is an inanimate object:

42)

هو كتاب غبي مليء بالدجل والتناقضات والاكاذيب.

huwa kitāb ḡabi malī’ b-id-dajl w-īt-tanāquḏāt

3MSG book stupid full with-the-charlantry and-the-contradition.PL

w-il-akāḏīb

and-the-lie.PL

‘It’s a stupid book full of charlantry, contradictions, and lies.’¹⁴⁵

As we can see *ḡabi* can modify inanimate agents as well as animate ones. Now let us take the same example, but we will replace *ḡabi* with *damāḡ-siz*:

¹⁴⁴ Informant data

¹⁴⁵ Informant data

43)

هو كتاب دماغ سز مليء بالدجل والتناقضات والاكاذيب.

huwa kitāb damāḡ-siz malī' b-id-dajl w-it-tanāquḏāt
3MSG book brain-SIZ full with-the-charlantry and-the-contradition.PL
w-il-akāḏīb.
and-the-lie.PL

'It's a stupid book full of charlantry, contradictions, and lies.'¹⁴⁶

gabi cannot be replaced with *damāḡ-siz* in contexts such as these wherein the item being modified is inanimate. Thus, it would seem that in order for something to be modified by a derivation with *-siz*, that thing must have the ability to possess, whether in reality or in an abstract sense, the item that it is said to be lacking. As books do not have brains, nor are they expected to do so, in an abstract sense or otherwise, *kitāb* cannot be described as *damāḡ-siz* 'brainless, stupid'.

7.9.3.6 Existential *-siz*

-siz-containing items can also be used existentially, to point to the existence of an individual or group of individuals, for instance their existence at a particular location, consider:

44)

اكو ادبسية بالمجتمع.

āku adab-siz-īya b-il-majtam'
there is manners-SIZ-PL in-the-community
'There are immoral people in the community.'¹⁴⁷

Through the use of the Iraqi Arabic particle of existence, *āku*, this example points to the existence of immoral individuals in the community. Now that the behavior of 'adīm, bala, and *-siz* and their salient distinguishing features have been set forth, let us continue with a summary and conclusion of our findings as they pertain to these items.

¹⁴⁶ Informant data

¹⁴⁷ Informant data

7.9.4 Conclusion of ‘*adīm*, *bala*, and *-siz*

As the analysis above revealed, ‘*adīm*, *bala*, and *-siz* all express lacking, and although there is indeed some overlap in their syntactic environments and the semantic implications they lend, there are also stark and salient differences. Both *-siz* and ‘*adīm* can occur nominally, predicatively, referentially, attributively, and existentially, and, depending on the context, possess the qualities of both a noun and an adjective. *bala*, on the other hand, functions only as a preposition. Moreover, it was revealed that ‘*adīm* and *bala* can occur in all instances that *-siz* can, but that the opposite does not hold true. As a preposition, *bala* can be used to express the lacking of indefinite and definite abstract, material, and concrete nouns. Perhaps the most salient features setting *bala* apart from *-siz* and ‘*adīm* is that unlike these two items, *bala* can be used to express the non-occurrence of events (through the use of *bala ma* + the appropriately-conjugated present tense verb) and absence of human agents (through the appending of the appropriate pronominal suffix). Although the analysis revealed that both *-siz* and ‘*adīm* tend to occur in demeaning and insulting contexts, *bala* can occur in these contexts as well, but also in ‘neutral’ instances of lacking (e.g., *laḥm bala miliḥ* ‘meat without salt’). The table below summarizes the type of items to which *bala*, ‘*adīm*, and *-siz* can append.

	<i>bala</i>	‘ <i>adīm</i>	<i>-siz</i>
Abstract Nouns	X	X	X
Concrete Nouns	X	X	X
Material Nouns	X	X	X
Verbs	X		
Pronominal Suffixes	X		
Inflected for Gender		X	
Inflected for number		X	X

The table below summarizes the syntactic behavior of the items in question.

	<i>bala</i>	<i>‘adīm</i>	<i>-siz</i>
Nominally		X	X
Predicatively		X	X
Referentially		X	X
Attributively		X	X
Existentially		X	X

Let us continue from this with an application of Seifart’s framework for affix borrowing to our findings. If we turn to Criterion 1 of Seifart’s three criteria for indirect affix borrowing (2015:514) (mentioned in section 7.3) we can see that the manner in which the *-siz*-containing items in Iraqi Arabic function indeed constitute a set of items which share a common and recognizeable component, namely the affix *-siz*, and that these items all designate the lack of a concrete or abstract item, e.g., *adab* ‘manners’ → *adab-siz* ‘without manners’, *šarīf* ‘honor’ → *šarīf-siz* ‘without honor’, *kaharabā* ‘electricity’ → *kaharabā-siz* ‘without electricity’. In terms of Criterion 2 there indeed exists a set of loaned doublets, one containing the affix and one which does not, portraying perpetual, identifiable semantic changes. For instance, we can see pairs of complex and simplex loans, wherein the complex loans denote the lack of the property of what is denoted by the simplex loans, e.g., *čihrah* ‘face’/ *čihrah-siz* ‘ugly, [lit. face-less]’. Finally, in reference to Criterion 3, within the aforementioned pairs of corresponding simplex and complex loans, the simplex loans possess higher token frequencies than the complex loans with which they correspond, e.g., *čihra* ‘face’ occurs more frequently than *čihra-siz* ‘ugly [lit. face-less]’. Thus, we can see that *-siz* as it occurs in Iraqi Arabic adheres to Seifart’s three criteria for indirect affix borrowing, and we can consequently conclude that *-siz* is a loaned, indirect affix (as opposed to, for instance, a free word).

The productivity of this loaned, indirect affix is difficult to determine for a number of reasons. Although Masliyah (1996) claims that *-siz* is unproductive, this claim does accurately depict the situation of *-siz*. That the majority of Iraqi Arabic speakers recognize derivations containing *-siz* as parsible entities and further recognize *-siz*’s function as an affix denoting lacking has enabled native Iraqi Arabic speakers to produce items containing *-siz* (and for other

Iraqi Arabic speakers to understand these new coinages) beyond the set of *-siz*-containing items which are widely accepted. Furthermore, as was demonstrated above, *-siz* can only be appended to bases with specific syntactic and semantic characteristics, namely *-siz* can only be appended to abstract, material, or concrete singular noun bases, but it cannot be appended to proper nouns or pronouns. The nouns to which *-siz* are appended typically denote items, characteristics, or qualities, the possession of which is perceived as positive or favorable, e.g., *ġīra* ‘virtue’, *axlāq* ‘morals’, *kaharabā* ‘electricity’, *bēt* ‘house’, and the appending of *-siz* indicates the lack of this positive quality, trait, or item, in turn denoting a negative or unfavorable quality or trait, e.g., *ġīra-siz* ‘without virtue’, *axlāq-siz* ‘without morals’. *kaharabā*’-*siz* ‘without electricity’, *bēt-siz* ‘without a house, homeless’. As a result of this, the (semi-)productivity of *-siz* does not pertain to any noun in Iraqi Arabic, and we do not find instances of *-siz* being attached to bases which already denote an unfavorable or undesirable item, e.g.,: *hamm* ‘sorrow’ → *hamm-siz* ‘without sorrow’*, *muškila* ‘problem’ → *muškila-siz* ‘without problems’*.

Based on the manner in which *-siz* functions and the constraints binding its suffixation to particular categories of bases, we can contend that *-siz* as it occurs in Iraqi Arabic is ‘semi-productive’, as such is the case that when *-siz* is appended to an open class of bases, only some of the outputs are deemed acceptable by the native speaker, in line with Dik’s (1967:370) criterion for semi-productivity. Furthermore, if we consider the fact that formations with *-siz* permit ‘borderline instances’, wherein, in appropriate contexts, what would otherwise be deemed inappropriate or unacceptable constructions by native speakers are accepted, we can observe that semi-productivity ‘can to some degree be extended to new forms’ (Pinker & Prince 1994:231). Moreover, as we have seen, although there is indeed some overlap between these items, there are stark salient differences that render them not fully interchangeable or synonymous. Now let us explore the other Turkish suffix under analysis, *-çi*.

7.9.5 General Remarks on *abu il-*

Let us begin our exploration of *-çi* with an investigation of its non-loaned counterpart *abu il-*. *abu il-* literally implies ‘father of’, and in some contexts it lends this literal reading, however derivations with *abu il-* can also denote professions, occupations, or traits and can occur definitely (*abu il-*) or indefinitely (*abu*), e.g.: *abu il-gahwa* ‘the coffee merchant’ vs. *abu gahwa* ‘a coffee merchant’. Furthermore, *abu il-* can be inflected for gender and number through the use

of *umm il-* ‘[lit.] mother of...’ for feminine agents, and *ahil il-* ‘[lit.] people/family of...’ for plural agents. However, due the constraints of the present work, only *abu il-* will be treated, as this is the most frequently-occurring form. It is also worth noting that there are other noun forms which follow a CaCCāC pattern that can, when applied to certain roots, denote occupations, as well, e.g., *bawwāb* ‘doorman’, as well as ones following a C(v)CvCCvC pattern, e.g., *mdallik* ‘masseuse in a Turkish bath’.

Iraqi Arabic occasionally employs periphrasis as opposed to derivations with *-čī*, particularly through the use of *abu il-* (Masliyah 1996:299). That said, there are instances in which a derivation with *-čī* is acceptable but one with *abu il-* is not. For example, *na ‘al-čī* and *abu in-na ‘al* are not counterparts in that, while *na ‘al-čī* denotes someone who makes shoes, *na ‘al* itself implies ‘shoe’, an item which in Iraqi culture bears a connotation pertaining to filth and uncleanness. As a result, to show the bottom of one’s shoe or to toss a shoe at another is a grave insult in Arab culture, and the term *na ‘al* is often used epithetically to convey disgust and disrespect. Thus, in Iraqi Arabic we find derivations containing *na ‘al* such as *ibn in-na ‘al* ‘lit. son of a shoe (the insult is directed at the addressee’s father)’ or *abu in-na ‘al* ‘lit. father of a shoe’. Continuing from this, it is clear why the derivation *abu in-na ‘al* does not serve as a counterpart to *na ‘al-čī* ‘shoemaker’.

Derivations with *abu il-* can denote occupations mainly related to the selling of food and beverages (7.9.5.1), related to goods or instruments (7.9.5.2), negative traits (7.9.5.3), abstract traits (7.9.5.4), physical traits (7.9.5.5), animal names (7.9.5.6), ownership (7.9.5.7), and inanimate objects (7.9.5.8). The lists presented below expand upon Masliyah (1996) and his claims regarding *abu il-*’s alternation with *-čī*, in that I have designated five additional categories (namely the derivations denoting abstract traits, physical traits, animals, ownership, and inanimate objects). Let us begin first with a look at *abu il-* to denote occupations related to the selling of food and beverages. It would seem that, for the most part, in terms of the denoting of occupations pertaining to food and beverages and goods and instruments, as well as (negative) abstract traits, the items expressed with *-čī* can also be expressed through *abu il-* (see section 7.9.5.1-7.9.5.3), although there are exceptions, as was expressed by the example above distinguishing *na ‘al-čī* ‘shoe maker’ and *abu in-na ‘al* ‘father of a shoe’.

7.9.5.1 Occupations Involving Food and Beverages

čāy	‘tea’	abu ič-čāy	‘tea merchant’
gahwa	‘coffee’	abu il-gahwa	‘coffee merchant’
laḥam	‘meat’	abu il-laḥam	‘meat merchant’
kabāb	‘kebab’	abu il-kabāb	‘kebab merchant’
kubba	‘kubba’, ¹⁴⁸	abu il-kubba	‘kubba merchant’
dōlma	‘dōlma’, ¹⁴⁹	abu id-dōlma	‘dōlma merchant’
dondurma	‘ice cream’	abu id-dondurma	‘ice cream merchant’
fawākah	‘fruit’	abu il-fawākah	‘fruit merchant’
falāfil	‘falafel’	abu il-falāfil	‘falafel merchant’
ḥalawīyāt	‘sweets’	abu il-ḥalawīyāt	‘sweets merchant’
baqlāwa	‘baklava’	abu il-baqlāwa	‘baklava merchant’
bahārāt	‘spices’	abu il-bahārāt	‘spice merchant’

7.9.5.2 Occupations Involving Goods and Instruments

kahrabā’	‘electricity’	abu il-kahrabā’	‘electrician’
qfāl	‘lock’	abu il-qfāl	‘locksmith’
tāyrāt	‘tires’	abu it-tāyrāt	‘[car]tire merchant’
sayyārāt	‘cars’	abu is-sayyārāt	‘car merchant’
muxaddarāt	‘drugs’	abu il-muxaddarāt	‘drug dealer’
‘aqārāt	‘real estate’	abu il-‘aqārāt	‘real estate agent’
kamān	‘violin’	abu il-kamān	‘violinist’
‘ūd	‘oud’ ¹⁵⁰	abu il-‘ūd	‘oud player’
dunbag	‘drum’	abu il-dunbag	‘drummer’

7.9.5.3 Negative Traits

Like *-či*, there are instances in which *abu il-* can also be used to denote negative traits:

¹⁴⁸ A meatball comprised of ground meat and bulghur.

¹⁴⁹ Cooked vegetables stuffed with spiced ground meat and rice.

¹⁵⁰ A type of lute frequently featured in Arabic music.

wijhēn	‘two faces’	abu wijhēn	‘a two-faced person’
banāt	‘girls’	abu il-banāt	‘womanizer’
čiđib	‘lie’	abu ič-čiđib	‘liar’

7.9.5.4 Abstract Traits

abu il- can also be used to express abstract traits, although the same does not seem to be the case for *-či*:

xēr	‘benevolence’	abu il-xēr	‘a charitable man’
ġīra	‘virtue’	abu il-ġīra	‘a man of virtue’
šujā ‘a	‘courage’	abu iš-šujā ‘a	‘a brave man’
rāsēn	‘two heads’	abu rāsēn	‘an intelligent man (by extension)’
bōla	‘urine’	abu bōla	‘bed wetter (often said of children)’

7.9.5.5 Physical Traits

Unlike *-či*, the *abu [il-]* construction can be used to denote physical traits possessed by an individual. The traits can either be modified by an adjective or not, consider:

xšēm	‘noses’	abu xšēm	‘a man with a big nose’
‘ayūn sūd	‘black-colored eyes’	abu ‘ayūn sūd	‘a man with black-colored eyes’
ḍaḥka ḥalwa	‘a beautiful smile’	abu ḍaḥka ḥalwa	‘a man with a beautiful smile’
laḥīya	‘beard’	abu laḥīya	‘a bearded man’
šuwārib	‘mustache’	abu šuwārib	‘a man with a mustache’
samra	‘a deep tan’	abu samra	‘a man with a tanned complexion’
naḍārāt	‘eyeglasses’	abu naḍārāt	‘a man wearing glasses’

Thus, while we have instances like *suwālif* ‘stories’ → *suwālif-či* ‘story teller’, as *-či* is already bound to the base (i.e., *suwālif*) *suwālif* cannot be modified by an adjective. As *suwālif-či* can only imply ‘story teller’ and that the types of stories he tells cannot be modified, we cannot use the *-či* construction to imply ‘the teller of beautiful stories’, for instance. This implication can be lent by the *abu il-* construction, however. In such instances the trait that is being modified immediately follows *abu*, and then the adjective (appropriately declined for gender and number) follows that, e.g., *abu suwālif ḥalwa* ‘teller of beautiful stories’.

7.9.5.6 Animal Names

There are also instances of *abu [il-]* constructions used to denote animal names in Iraqi Arabic, although this is not possible for *-či*. It seems that these *abu il-* constructions denoting animals are fixed constructions:

abu il-xiḏḏēr	‘a type of wild green bird’
abu jinnēb	‘crab’
abu xšēm	‘a type of pigeon with a large protuberance above the beak’
abu ja‘al	‘dung beetle’
abu brēṣ	‘a type of lizard’
abu xrēza	‘a type of small, round river fish’

7.9.5.7 Ownership

abu [il-] constructions also occur rather freely in derivations denoting ownership, and such derivations indicate that an individual is the owner of the denoted item, although this is not possible for *-či*.

buyūt	‘houses’	abu buyūt	‘owner of houses’
maḥall	‘shop’	abu maḥall	‘shop owner’
maṭa‘am	‘restaurant’	abu maṭa‘am	‘restaurant owner’
šarika	‘company’	abu šarika	‘company owner’

7.9.5.8 Inanimate Objects

Another feature differentiating *abu il-* from *-či* is that *abu il-* can be used to denote inanimate objects in Iraqi Arabic, while *-či* cannot. Such derivations allude to a quality of a particular item, for example its cost or contents, e.g.:

črūx	‘wheel’	abu črūx	‘wheelchair’
šakar	‘sugar’	abu šakar	‘a food item containing sugar’
alf dīnār	‘one thousand dinars’	abu alf dīnār	‘an object which costs 1000 dinars’

Now let us discuss the manner in which *abu il-* constructions, when denoting individuals engaged in a particular occupation or trait, behave nominally, predicatively, referentially, and existentially.

7.9.5.9 Nominal *abu il-*

Let us first consider its nominal behavior:

45)

ابو اللحية دخل للقهوة بدون ما يگول شي.

abu	il-laḥīya	dixal	l-il-gahwa	bidūn-ma
ABU	the-beard	enter.PST.3MSG	to-the-café	without-SR
yigūl		šī		
say.PRS.3MSG	thing			

‘The bearded man entered the cafe without saying anything.’¹⁵¹

We can see how *abu il-laḥīya* ‘the bearded man’ occurs nominally, as the subject of the sentence.

7.9.5.10 Predicative *abu il-*

46)

چان مؤدب بس بعد ما راح لامريكا صار ابو بنات.

čān	muḥtarram	bass	ba‘ad ma	rāḥ	l-Amrīka
to be.PST.3MSG	respectable	but	after	FUT	to-America
šār	abu	banāt			
become.PST.3SG	ABU	girl.PL			

‘He used to be respectable, but after he went to America he became a womanizer.’¹⁵²

Through this example we can better understand the implications lent by *abu il-*containing items as the speaker points to the manner in which he had previously perceived the subject by using the past tense *čān muḥtarram* ‘he was respectable’. Through his employment of the conjunction *bass* ‘but’ to introduce the following clause combined with the predicate *abu banāt* ‘womanizer’, we can observe the manner in *abu[il-]* serves a predicative function to describe the subject.

¹⁵¹ Informant data

¹⁵² Informant data

7.9.5.11 Referential *abu il-*

47)

مو هو نفس ابو الكبة اللي اشترينا منه قبل؟

mu huwa nafs **abu** il-kubba illi ištārēna min-a gabul
NEG 3MSG same ABU the-kubba which buy.PST.1SG from-3MSG before
'Isn't he the same kubba¹⁵³ merchant we bought from before?',¹⁵⁴

Here, the demonstrative *illi* 'which' is used to refer to the *abu il-kubba* 'the kubba merchant', exhibiting *abu il-*'s referential abilities.

7.9.5.12 Existential *abu il-*

48)

طلبت تكسي؟ اكو ابو تكسي واكف گدام البيت.

ṭilabit taksi āku **abu** taksi wāgif giddām
request.PST.2MSG taksi there is ABU taxi stand.PTCP.MSG in front of
il-bēt
the-house

'Did you call a taxi? There's a taxi driver waiting in front of the house.'¹⁵⁵

In this example, the Iraqi Arabic particle of existence *āku* 'there is' in conjunction with *abu taksi* 'taxi driver' demonstrates how *abu il-* can occur existentially. Now that we have explored the behavior of *abu il-*, let us turn to our analysis of *-čī*.

7.9.6 General Remarks on *-čī*

-čī (or its plural form *-čīya*) in Iraqi Arabic is appended to nouns and occasionally to gerunds, nouns in the CaCCāC form, and active participles in order to denote individuals who are habitually or professionally concerned with, or devoted to, the quality, object, or person denoted by the base to which *-čī* is appended—appending these affixes can sometimes instigate changes

¹⁵³ A meatball-like dish popular in Iraq.

¹⁵⁴ Informant data

¹⁵⁵ Informant data

such as the shifting or omitting of vowels (Al-Khalesi 2006:73), and such changes will be discussed section 7.9.6.5. The implication lent by *-či* is similar to that performed by the English suffix *-ist* as in ‘druggist’ (Swift 1963:54). This suffix can be declined for number (i.e., through the usage of the plural form *-čīya*) and for gender (by the appending of the 2FSG marker *-a*). *-či* is extremely prolific in Iraqi Arabic in that it is able to be affixed to a fair number of words of foreign origin (e.g., stems of English or Persian origin), for instance those which denote jobs or occupations that came about during the 20th century (under British rule), e.g.: *fītar-či* ‘automotive mechanic’, from English *fitter* (locksmith, mechanic) (Biṭunā 2014:73).

When turning to the manner in which *-či* functions in Iraqi Arabic specifically, we are able to divide this suffix into four sub-categories: jobs or occupations related to the production or selling of food and beverages (7.9.6.1); jobs or occupations related to the selling or production of goods or the playing of instruments (7.9.6.2); individuals who habitually partake in unfavorable activities (negative traits) (7.9.6.3); nouns which are already in a form denoting agents, professions, or occupations, in the form CaCCāC and active participles (7.9.6.4).

Masliyah (1996) posits that *-či* is a highly productive suffix in Iraqi Arabic and further posits that it is used seemingly freely by Iraqi poets and presents the following examples (p. 299), e.g.:

sikkān	‘steering’	sikkānči	‘driver’
‘aṭa	‘jeer’	‘aṭači	‘booed person’
taraf	‘luxury’	tarafči	‘an individual who lives in luxury’
xirfān	‘sheep’	xirfānčīya	‘stupid people’ (by extension)
mnattif	‘plucker’	mnattifči	‘feather-plucker’
miltebik	‘confused’	miltebikči	‘mixed up person’
qarya	‘village’	qarwači	‘assistant to village chief’

In order to test the extent of its productivity, I constructed new derivations with *-či* and presented them to my informants. The informant data revealed that *-či* can only be applied (semi-) productively to create new abstractions so long as these new abstractions relate to jobs or occupations related to the production or selling of food and beverages; jobs or occupations related to the selling or production of goods or the playing of instruments; individuals who habitually partake in unfavorable activities (negative traits); and nouns which are already in a

form denoting agents, professions, or occupations, in the form CaCCāC and active participles. It would seem that *-čī* cannot be appended to bases that do not fit these categories, even when these new derivations are presented in contextualizing sentences. The manner in which *-čī* functions in Iraqi Arabic is such that every informant indicated that they were aware that derivations with *-čī* denote occupations or [negative] traits. Thus, if the informants were presented with derivations containing bases that did not refer to occupations or negative traits, there were rejected by the informants both in and out of context. In order to test the productivity of *-čī*, I created new derivations with nouns relating to positive abstract traits or qualities. Consider the following example in which I appended *-čī* to *šarīf* ‘honor’:

49)

اني كلش واثق بالموظف الجديد لأن مؤدب وشرافي.

āni	kulliš	wāṭiq	b-il-muwaḏḏif	ij-jidīd	li'an
1SG	very	confident.PTCP.MSG	in-the-employee	the-new	because
mu'addab	ū	šarīf-čī			
polite	and	honor-ČI			

‘I’m very confident in the new employee because he’s polite and honorable.’*¹⁵⁶

As there do not appear to be any frequently-occurring derivations with *-čī* expressing abstract, positive traits, I hypothesized that such new derivations would not be accepted, and, as expected, every informant rejected this new derivation *šarīf-čī* as unacceptable, despite being in a contextualizing sentence. I also created derivations that would express physical traits (which can also be expressed by *abu il-*), consider:

50)

عمن دا تحجي؟ ابو النظارات لو الشواربي؟

‘a-man	da	tiḥči	abu	il-naḏārāt	lō	iš-šuwārib-čī
about-whom	PROG	speak.PRS.2MSG	ABU	the-glasses	or	the-mustache-ČI

‘Who are you talking about? The man with the glasses or the one with a mustache?’*¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁶ Informant data

¹⁵⁷ Informant data

Again, this was rejected by all informants. The informants did not associate the base as having any relation to an occupation, indicating that, unlike *abu il-*, *-čī* cannot denote physical traits.

I also created new derivations with *-čī* using bases that, in line with the frequently-occurring derivations with *-čī*, denote occupations related to the making or selling of food or beverages and presented them to my informants, consider:

51)

اكلنا فلافل عند الفلافلجي بالكرادة.

akil-na	falāfil	‘and	il-falāfil-čī	b-il-Karrāda
eat.PST.1PL	falafel	at	the-falafel- ČI	in-the-Karrāda

‘We ate falafel at the falafel merchant’s [restaurant] in Karrāda.’¹⁵⁸

This was accepted by all informants as it presents a derivation reflecting the selling of food and there are individuals who specialize in the selling of falafel in particular. Also consider the following example with a new derivation related to the selling of goods:

52)

موبايلي عاطل. راح اشترى موبايل جديد من الموبايلجي يم المحطة.

mōbāyl-i	‘aṭil	rāḥ	aštari	mōbāyl	jidīd
cell phone-1SG	unemployed	FUT	purchase.PRS.1SG	cell phone	new

min	il-mōbāyl-čī	yamm	il-muḥaṭṭa
from	the-cellphone- ČI	next to	the-station

‘My cell phone isn’t working. I’ll buy a new one from the cell phone vendor next to the station.’¹⁵⁹

This derivation was deemed acceptable by all informants as the base denotes a good (namely cellular phones) and there are individuals in Iraq who specialize in the selling of cellular phones.

Additionally, I presented the informants with new derivations which adhered to the morpho-phonological constraints by which the suffixation of *-čī* is bound (see section 7.9.6.5) and appended *-čī* to bases that reflected occupations or negative traits to ensure that my results were as accurate as possible. For instance, I took *dōlma* ‘a dish comprised of cooked vegetables

¹⁵⁸ Informant data

¹⁵⁹ Informant data

stuffed with seasoned rice’ and appended *-či* to it. Abiding by the morpho-phonological constraints binding the suffixation of *-či* to a given base, I removed the final *a*, rendering *dōlm-či*. I also kept the base intact and presented them with *dōlma-či*, as well. When presented in isolation, both of these derivations were rejected, with the informants expressing that, in the case of *dōlm-či*, they could not infer the base to which *-či* was attached and consequently could not infer what the new derivation was seeking to imply. All of the informants, however, were able to recognize *dōlma-či* (the derivation with the intact base that did not undergo any morpho-phonological alterations) out of context, and each postulated that this new derivation would imply something along the lines of ‘someone who sells *dōlma*’. As I did with the new derivations with *-siz*, I placed these new *-či*-containing derivations into contextualizing sentences, consider:

53)

راح ننزل للبصرة حتى ناكل دولمة عند الدولمجي ا هناك.

rāḥ	ninzil	l-il-Baṣra	ḥatta	nākul	dōlma ‘and
FUT	descend.PRS.1SG	to-the-Basra	in order to	eat.PRS.1SG	dōlma at
id-dōlma-či		ihnāk			
the-dōlma-ČI		there			

‘We’ll go to Basra to eat *dōlma* at the *dōlma* vendor’s restaurant there.’¹⁶⁰

Interestingly, all of the informants accepted the realization *dōlma-či* (wherein the base is intact and the final *a* preserved), as opposed to *dōlm-či*, which adheres to the morpho-phonological constraints generally experienced by the other derivations with *-či*. When I enquired as to their motivation for this, they each expressed that *dōlma-či* was more ‘recognizable’ to them, and indicated that they were able to parse *dōlma* and *-či* in order to infer the intended implication lent by this new derivation, but indicated that *dōlm-či* was more difficult to parse, as the base, *dōlm*, did not bear any semantic significance to them. They added that when items like *dōlm-či* were presented in context, however, they were then able to make better speculations as to their intended implications but added that such realizations still sounded strange or unnatural to them. Based on the informant data, it became clear that the internal changes that the base undergoes in order to accommodate the suffixation of *-či* appear to hinder the parsibility and coherence of the

¹⁶⁰ Informant data

base, supporting Dressler's (2007:465) claim that there is a link between parsibility and the degree of productivity.

That the informants found the newly-coined derivations which adhered to the morpho-phonological constraints to be less transparent and consequently more difficult to parse is interesting in that the presence of the internal changes brought about by the suffixation of *-čī* (see 7.9.6.5) indicates a high level of morpho-phonological integration, and more integration of this kind would prompt one to anticipate less constraints regarding the types of bases to which it can attach, and, consequently, a greater degree of productivity, as opposed to less. That the informants tended to reject these realizations both in and out of context, suggests that *-čī* is semi-productive, contrary to Masliyah (1996) who claims *-čī* is 'highly productive'. Now that a general overview of *-čī* has been set forth, let us proceed to an exploration of the manner in which it is used to denote occupations involving food and beverages.

7.9.6.1 Occupations Involving Food and Beverages

My close work with the speakers of Iraqi Arabic revealed that although *-čī* does function semi-productively in that it possesses the ability to be extended to new forms pertaining to food and beverages, goods and instruments, negative traits, and nouns which are already in a form denoting agents, professions, or occupations (i.e., in the form CaCCāC and active participles), when it comes to occupations related to food and beverages in particular, there are constraints on to what *-čī* can be appended. *-čī* can be appended to nouns to denote an occupation or profession pertaining to food and beverages as long as the food or beverage item to which *-čī* is appended is the 'specialty' of the person whom it denotes. For instance, *pāčā-čī* 'pāčā¹⁶¹ seller' is acceptable, because a *pāčā-čī* specializes in the selling of *pāčā* in particular, and he does not, typically, sell things other than *pāčā*. The informants revealed that it is not acceptable, however, to append *-čī* to an item like *frēs* 'strawberries' to render *frēs-čī* 'strawberry seller', as there is not a profession in Iraq that specializes in the selling of strawberries in particular. Consider the following list of derivations with *-čī* denoting occupations related to the selling of food and beverages:

čāy	'tea'	čāy-čī	'tea seller'
čāy xāna	'tea house'	čāyxan-čī	'tea house proprietor'
gahwa	'coffee; coffee house'	gahaw-čī	'coffee house proprietor'

¹⁶¹ A traditional Iraqi dish made from sheep's head, stomach, and trotters.

šakar	‘sugar’	šakarči	‘sweets seller’
pāča	‘pāča’, ¹⁶²	pāčači	‘pāča merchant’
kabāb	‘kebab’	kabab-či	‘kebab merchant’
kāhi	‘bread’ ¹⁶³ ,	kāhi-či	‘kāhi merchant’
māy xana	‘bar’	māyxan-či	‘barman’
kunāfa	‘kunāfa’, ¹⁶⁴	kunaf-či	‘kunāfa merchant’
ṭōrši	‘pickles’	ṭōrši-či	‘pickle merchant’
baqlāwa	‘baklava’	baqlaw-či	‘baklava merchant’
xaḏḏar	‘vegetable’	xaḏḏar-či	‘vegetable merchant’

7.9.6.2 Occupations Involving Goods and Instruments

Much like what we saw above regarding *-či*-containing items denoting occupations or professions related to food and beverages, *-či*-containing items which denote occupations involving instruments and goods reflect an individual’s ‘specialization’ in a particular service/trade, good, or instrument, e.g.:

kamān	‘violin’	kaman-či	‘violinist’
dumbag	‘drum’	dumbag-či	‘drummer’
’ūti	‘iron’	’ūta-či	‘ironer (of clothes)’
na‘al	‘sandal’	na‘al-či	‘sandal maker’
qundara	‘shoe’	qundar-či	‘shoemaker’
sā‘a	‘watch’	sā‘a-či	‘watchmaker’
jōhara	‘jewel’	jōhar-či	‘jeweller’
dukkān	‘shop’	dukkān-či	‘shopkeeper’
bāysikil	‘bicycle’	bāysikil-či	‘bicycle seller’
xāna	‘warehouse’	xān-či	‘warehouse guard’
šabbāḥ	‘morning’	šabbāḥ-či	‘a guard is on watch until daybreak’
ḫitar	‘car mechanic’	ḫitar-či	‘car mechanic’
nīšān	‘target, mark’	nīšān-či	‘sharpshooter’

¹⁶² A traditional Iraqi dish of boiled cow or sheep’s feet and/or head.

¹⁶³ A type of Iraqi bread.

¹⁶⁴ A Middle Eastern cheese pastry soaked in sweet syrup.

dōšam	‘seat’	dōšam-či	‘upholsterer’
pančar	‘a flat tire’	pančar-či	‘tire repairman’
tanaka	‘tin’	tanak-či	‘tinsmith’
nōba	‘round’	nōbat-či	‘guard’
čarxa	‘sharpening’	čarxa-či	‘guard’
mōtōr	‘motor [boat]’	mōtōr-či	‘motor boat operator’
pošta	‘post’	pošta-či	‘postman’
antīk	‘antique’	antīk-či	‘antiques seller’
tōrna	‘tool’	tōrna-či	‘tool repairman’
titin	‘tobacco’	titin-či	‘tobacconist; cigarette maker’
ṭōb	‘cannon’	ṭōb-či	‘gunner; artillery dealer’
‘arabāna	‘carriage, cart’	‘araban-či	‘carriage driver’

7.9.6.3 Negative Traits

In Iraqi Arabic specifically this group seems to largely be comprised of instances in which which *-či* is appended to a stem to denote a negative trait or attribute in particular, e.g.:

xamar	‘alcohol’	xamar-či	‘alcoholic’
qamār	‘gambling’	qamar-či	‘heavy gambler’
niswān	‘women’	niswan-či	‘womanizer’
mašlaḥa	‘interest, benefit’	mašlaḥ-či	‘selfishly opportunistic’
sakar	‘getting drunk’	sakar-či	‘alcoholic’
‘araq	‘‘araq’ ¹⁶⁵	‘arag-či	‘addicted to ‘araq; drunkard’
tiryāk	‘opium’	tiryak-či	‘opium addict’
kēf	‘one’s will’	kēf-či	‘party-goer’
sowālif	‘story, chat’	sowālif-či	‘story teller’
šaqāwa	‘joking’	šaqaw-či	‘clown; joker’
da‘wa	‘lawsuit’	da‘aw-či	‘frequent complainer; plaintiff’
laḡwa	‘idle talk’	laḡaw-či	‘gossiper’

¹⁶⁵ A type of liquor popular in Iraq and the Middle East.

7.9.6.4 Nouns Already Denoting Agents, Professions, or Occupations

Such is the productivity of *-či* in Iraqi Arabic, that there are instances of *-či* being appended to Arabic nouns which are already in a form denoting agents, professions, or occupations, in the form CaCCāC and active participles (Masliyah 1996:298). However, *abu il-* cannot be used with these nouns to create the same implication. Consider:

bawwābči	‘doorman’	abu il-bawwāb*
bawwāšči	‘kisser’	abu il-bawwāš*
mnakkitči	‘joke teller’	abu il-mnakkit*
mbayyiḏči	‘pot tinner’	abu il-mbayyiḏ*
mjabbirči	‘bone setter’	abu il-mjabbir*
mbartīlči	‘one who bribes’	abu il-mbartīl*
mṣannifči	‘joke teller’	abu il-mṣannif*
mtalligči	‘customs broker’	abu il-mtalligči*
mṭahhirči	‘circumciser’	abu il-mṭahhirči*
‘arrākči	‘one who always picks fights’	abu il-‘arrākči*
mdallikči	‘masseur in a Turkish bath’	abu il-mdallikči*

7.9.6.5 Morpho-Phonological Effects of *-či*

Now that the manners in which *-či* functions in Iraqi Arabic have been set forth, let us turn to a discussion of the morpho-phonological effects the suffixation of *-či* has on the stem to which it is appended, as such modifications are clear evidence of *-či* being a suffix as opposed to a free-standing word. The following list expands upon the four internal changes brought about by the suffixation of *-či* outlined by Masliyah’s (1996) and outlines the five main internal changes that can be observed in items to which *-či* is appended.

I) shift of final wa to aw:

da‘wa	‘lawsuit’	da‘aw-či	‘frequent complainer’ ‘plaintiff’
gahwa	‘coffee-house’	gahaw-či	‘coffee-house proprietor’
laḡwa	‘idle talk’	laḡaw-či	‘talkative’

II) loss of final a:

‘arabana	‘carriage’	‘araban-čī	‘carriage driver’
qundara	‘shoe’	qundar-čī	‘shoemaker’
muškila	‘problem’	muškil-čī	‘trouble maker’
xāna	‘warehouse’	xān-čī	‘warehouse guard’
‘iṣāba	‘gang’	‘iṣab-čī	‘gangster’

III) shortening of the vowel in the last syllable:

bistān	‘orchard’	bistan-čī	‘gardener’
dikkān	‘store’	dikkan-čī	‘shop keeper’
tiryāk	‘opium’	tiryak-čī	‘opium addict’
kabāb	‘kabob’	kabab-čī	‘kabob maker and seller’
ḥammām	‘bath’	ḥammam-čī	‘bath keeper’
ṣābūn	‘soap’	ṣābun-čī	‘soap vendor’

IV) shortening of the vowel in the second-to-last syllable combined with the deletion of the vowel in the last syllable:

baqlāwa	‘baklava’	baqlaw-čī	‘baklava seller’
šaqāwa	‘joke’	šaqaw-čī	‘clown’ ‘jokester’

V) vowel change or shift, or character shift:

’ūti	‘pressing-iron’	’ūta-čī	‘ironer’
dunbug	‘drum’	dumbag-čī	‘drummer’

-čī-containing items can occur nominally, predicatively, referentially, and existentially, but it cannot occur attributively. Consider its nominal behavior:

7.9.6.6 Nominal -čī

54)

هسه الكهوجي يعيط: گوم اگعد اهنأك.

hassa	il-gahaw-čī	yi‘ayyiṭ	gūm	ugu‘ud	ihnāk
now	the-coffee-ČI	yell.PRS.3MSG	rise.IMP.2MSG	sit.IMP.2MSG	there

‘Now the coffee house proprietor is yelling: get up and sit over there!’¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁶ Informant data

Here, *il-gahaw-čī* ‘the coffee vendor’ is used nominally as the subject of the sentence.

7.9.6.7 Predicative -čī

Consider how it occurs predicatively:

55)

انت حاسب نفسك بالقانون يعني دا اسمعك تحجي عليك محامي وانت كلك خلك چايچي.

inta	ḥāsib	nafs-ak	b-il-qānūn	ya‘ani	da
2MSG	consider.PTCP.MSG	self-2MSG	in-the-law	FIL	PROG
asma‘-ak	tiḥči	‘allē-k	muḥāmi	w-inta	
hear.PRS.1SG-2MSG	talk.PRS.2MSG	on-2MSG	lawyer	and-2MSG	
kull-ak	xulug	čāy-čī			
all-2MSG	mere	tea-ČI			

‘You consider yourself [to be working in the field of] the law. I hear you saying you’re a lawyer, but you’re merely a tea vendor.’¹⁶⁷

Here, through the speaker uttering *w-inta kull-ak xulug čāy-čī* ‘you’re merely a tea vendor’, we can see that *-čī*-containing items can occur predicatively.

7.9.6.8 Referential -čī

56)

هذا الجايچي اللي بالمحكمة حچالي هوايه اشيء عنه بدون ما اسئله

hāḏa	ič-čāy-čī	illi	b-il-maḥkama	ḥačā-l-i	hiwāya
this	the-tea-ČI	whom	in-the-courthouse	talk.PST.3MSG-to-1SG	many
ašīyā’	‘an-a	bidūn -ma	as’al-a		
thing.PL	about-3MSG	without-SR	ask.PRS.1SG-3MSG		

‘That tea merchant [who works] in the courthouse told me a lot of things about him without me asking.’¹⁶⁸

¹⁶⁷ *ana w-il-majnūn* Episode 1 3:30

¹⁶⁸ *ana w-il-majnūn* Episode 2 15:18

In this example, the demonstrative *hāḍa* ‘this’ is used to refer to *ič-čāy-či* ‘the tea vendor’, and thus we can see that the *-či*-containing item refers to an individual, in this particular instance, the tea merchant who works in the courthouse.

7.9.6.9 Existential -*čī*

57)

خلي نطلع شوية ونشرب چاي. اكو گهوچي بالحديقة مال الجامعة.

xalli	niṭlaʿ	šwayya	ū	nišrab
let.IMP.2MSG	exit.PRS.1SG	a little	and	drink.PRS.1SG
čāy	āku	gahaw-čī	b-il-ḥadīqa	māl il-jāmiʿa
tea	there is	coffee-ČI	in-the-park	POSS the-university

‘Let’s go out for a bit and drink some tea. There’s a coffee vendor in the university park.’¹⁶⁹

In this example, the particle of existence *āku* ‘there is’ introduces *gahaw-čī* ‘coffee vendor’ and the remaining context (i.e., *b-il-ḥadīqa māl il-jāmiʿa* ‘in the university park’) points to the existence of a coffee vendor in the university park, demonstrating the ability of derivations with -*čī* to occur existentially.

We have now seen the manner in which -*čī* functions as well as the phonological changes the appending of it to particular stems prompts, so let us now turn to a summary of the information presented.

7.9.7 Conclusions of *abu il-* and -*čī*

As was revealed above, although there is indeed overlap in the manner in which both -*čī* and *abu il-* function, there are salient features distinguishing the two. In general, it can be said that items taking a -*čī* ending tend to be animate, although such is not the case for *abu il-*, as *abu il-* can also be used to denote inanimate items. Additionally, lower-level occupations such as those denoting specialized general labor tasks or commerce (e.g., tea merchant, vegetable merchant, painter, masseuse in a Turkish bath, circumciser) are more likely to occur in a derivation ending in -*čī* than are more ‘prestigious’ occupations (e.g., professor, director) which are typically denoted by non-loaned items. While -*čī* is overwhelmingly restricted to occupations and the habitual partaking in unfavorable activities, *abu il-* occurs in the aforementioned derivations as well as those which denote more ‘favorable’ traits or qualities (e.g., *abu iḏ-ḏaḥka il-ḥalwa* ‘the one with a beautiful laugh’), as well as physical qualities (e.g., *abu il-uyūn il-asalīya* ‘the one

¹⁶⁹ Informant data

with honey-colored eyes'). *-čī*, which can be inflected for gender and number (through the appending the feminine suffix *-a* and the plural *-īya*, respectively), can denote occupations or habitual qualities pertaining to food and beverages; occupations involving goods and instruments; negative traits; and items that already denote occupations in the CaCCāC and active participle forms. Derivations with *-čī* undergo five main internal changes in order to accommodate the suffixation of *-čī*: the shift of the final *wa* to *aw* (e.g., *gahwa* 'coffee' → *gahaw-čī* 'coffee-house proprietor'); the loss of a final *a* (e.g., *'arabana* 'carriage' → *'araban-čī* 'carriage driver'); the shortening of the vowel in the last syllable (e.g., *bistān* 'orchard' → *bistan-čī* 'gardener'); the shortening of the vowel in the second-to-last syllable combined with the shortening of the vowel in the last syllable (e.g., *baqlāwa* 'baklava' → *baqlaw-čī* 'baklava merchant'); and vowel change or shift, or character shift (e.g., *'ūti* 'pressing iron' → *'ūta-čī* 'ironer').

abu il-, which can be inflected for both gender and number (by the use of the feminine *umm il-* and plural *ahil il-*, respectively), tends to function on the periphrasis of *-čī* in some instances, in that, like *-čī*, it can denote occupations or habitual qualities pertaining to food and beverages; occupations involving foods and instruments; abstract traits, and negative traits. However, in addition to these features it shares with *-čī*, there are salient features distinguishing it from *-čī*, in that, *abu il-*, unlike *-čī*, can be used to express physical traits (e.g., *abu laḥīya* 'a bearded man') and can further occur in fixed constructions to denote animals (e.g., *abu jinēb* 'crab'). Furthermore, unlike *-čī*, *abu il-* does not appear to be able to modify items which already denote an occupation or quality in the CaCCāC and active participle forms, nor do the items which occur in *abu il-* constructions undergo any internal changes to accommodate such a construction. Such differences indicate that these two items cannot be rendered as equivalents or be considered synonymous.

The table below summarizes the semantic implications lent by *abu il-* and *-čī*.

	<i>abu il-</i>	<i>-čī</i>
Occupations (Foods and Beverages)	X	X
Occupations (Goods and Instruments)	X	X
Negative Traits	X	X
Abstract Traits	X	
Physical Traits	X	
Animal Names	X	
Ownership	X	
Inanimate Objects	X	
Nouns Already Denoting Agents, Professions, or Occupations		X

The table below summarizes the syntactic behaviour of the items in question.

	<i>abu il-</i>	<i>-čī</i>
Nominally	X	X
Predicatively	X	X
Referentially	X	X
Attributively		
Existentially	X	X

The degree of productivity possessed by *-čī* is difficult to determine. Like is the case with *-siz*, Iraqi Arabic speakers interpret *-čī*-containing items as parsible entities and further recognize *-čī*'s function as a suffix used to denote occupations or habitual activities. However, we observed how when *-čī* is appended to a stem, the stem can undergo five different internal changes in order to accommodate the appending of *-čī*, although such is not the case for *-siz*-containing items. We can note that many of the internal changes that the stems to which *-čī* is appended undergo are in line with the changes undergone by producing *nisba* adjectives (relative adjectives). As is the case with *-siz*, the fact that many Iraqi Arabic speakers are aware of *-čī*'s foreign origin and function and thus view *-čī*-containing items as parsible entities allows them a sense of freedom when it comes to the productivity of this term, enabling them to coin new terms containing *-čī* and further allowing other speakers of Iraqi Arabic to understand this new coinage although they

may have never come across that particular *-čī*-containing item before. Therefore, although such formations may not occur frequently, we can see that Iraqi Arabic speakers possess semantic coherence and the ability to make new formations. That native Iraqi Arabic speakers can easily parse *-čī* from its base, and that there is evidence of new coinages containing *-čī*, such as those by Iraqi folk poets, for instance, combined with the fact that Iraqi Arabic speakers are able to infer the meaning of seemingly completely new derivations containing this suffix, it is clear that *-čī* ‘can to some degree be extended to new forms’ (Pinker & Prince 1994:231), presenting ‘borderline instances’ wherein, when appended to an open class of bases, only some outputs were deemed acceptable by the informants, thus leading us to contend that *-čī* is ‘semi-productive’ (Dik 1967:370). Continuing from this, the analysis revealed that, in terms of *-čī* in Iraqi Arabic, indeed ‘the productivity of a given morphological process can largely be predicted on the basis of the process’s peculiar structural properties and restrictions’ (Plag 1999:244). That is to say that *-čī* can be appended to nouns (and sometimes gerunds), namely singular nouns denoting lower-level occupations or trades or negative activities or traits with which one is habitually involved. It should be borne in mind, that we are not making general claims about affix combinability in Iraqi Arabic, rather these claims regard the combinability of *-čī*, only. It is understood that this is a loaned suffix which garners certain sociolinguistic perceptions and opinions; the manner in which it is processed may not be applicable to non-loaned suffixes in Iraqi Arabic.

Let us continue from this with an application of Seifart’s framework for affix borrowing to our findings of *-čī*. As was the case with *-siz*-containing items, the manner in which derivations with *-čī* behave in Iraqi Arabic, in line with Criterion 1 of Seifart’s three criteria for indirect affix borrowing, indeed constitute a set of items which share a common and recognizeable component: they all contain the suffix *-čī* and all such items denote an occupation, trait, or quality, e.g., *gahaw-čī* ‘coffee house proprietor’, *sakar-čī* ‘alcoholic’, *qamar-čī* ‘heavy gambler’. In terms of Criterion 2 there indeed exists a set of loaned doublets (one item in the doublet contains *-čī* while the other does not) portraying perpetual, identifiable semantic changes. For example, we can observe pairs of simplex and complex loans, wherein the complex loan denotes an association with what is denoted by the simplex loan (e.g., *qundara* ‘shoe’/*qundar-čī* ‘shoe maker’; *pāčā* ‘*pāčā*’/*pačā-čī* ‘*pāčā*¹⁷⁰ merchant’). Lastly, in regards to the

¹⁷⁰ A traditional Iraqi dish of boiled cow or sheep’s feet and/or head.

third and final criteria, within the aforementioned pairs of corresponding simplex and complex loans, the simplex loans (i.e., the bases of loaned origin) possess higher token frequencies than the complex loans (i.e., derivations with *-čī* which contained a base of loaned origin) with which they correspond, e.g., *qundara* occurs more frequently than *qundar-čī* ‘shoe maker’. Now that both *abu il-* and *-čī* have been treated, let us move on to an overall conclusion and the theoretical implications of our analysis of *-siz* and *-čī*.

7.10 Overall Conclusions and Theoretical Implications of *-siz* and *-čī*

Our analyses of *-siz* and *-čī* as they function in Iraqi Arabic demonstrated that these loaned suffixes are not completely unproductive nor are they fully-productive. Consequently, we can deem both *-siz* and *-čī* as semi-productive, that is to say they are parsible items which, on their own, possess readily identifiable semantic properties expressing lacking and occupations/habitual activities, respectively. They can be appended to various stems by Iraqi Arabic speakers to create new derivations, so long as the stems to which these suffixes are appended fall in line with the constraints mentioned in 7.9.3—in order for a new derivation with *-siz* to be coined, the base generally must be an abstract, concrete, or material singular noun that denotes a seemingly favorable trait or quality and this new derivation is used to modify a singular or collective human agent; for a new derivation containing *-čī* to be coined, the stem to which it is appended generally must be a noun or gerund which denotes an occupation, habit, or affiliation and it must undergo the internal changes expressed in section 7.9.6.5 above.

Based on the data presented in the analysis, we applied Seifart’s (2015) three criteria for affix borrowing to *-siz* and *-čī*, respectively, and we can conclude that *-siz* and *-čī* are indeed loaned affixes (as opposed to, for instance, free-standing words). Let us briefly summarize those findings as they apply to *-siz* and *-čī* collectively in order to point out some important points about these items in regards to how they can inform debates about affix integration and borrowing in Iraqi Arabic and cross-linguistically.

As regards criterion 1, for both *-siz* and *-čī* there exists a set of complex loans containing these suffixes that have a shared, recognizeable semantic component. All *-siz*-containing items designate the lack of a favorable trait and thus, through extension, express a negative trait; all *-čī*-containing derivations designate occupations, the partaking in habitual activities, or traits (usually negative). In line with criterion 2, for both *-siz* and *-čī* there exists a set of loaned

doublets, one which contains the suffix and one which does not, namely pairs of complex and simplex loans exist, wherein the loans denote a property (or in the case of *-siz*, the lack thereof) of what is denoted by the simplex loans, e.g.,

čihra	‘face’	čihra-siz	‘ugly (lit. face-less)’
pāča	‘pāča’, ¹⁷¹	pāča-či	‘pāča merchant’
qundara	‘shoe’	qundar-či	‘shoe maker’

Finally, in terms of criterion 3, within these pairs of simplex loans and corresponding complex ones, the simplex loans occur more frequently than do the corresponding complex ones, e.g., for instance, the loans *čihra* ‘face’ and *qundara* ‘shoe’ occur more frequently than the corresponding *čihra-siz* ‘faceless, ugly’ and *qundara-či* ‘shoe maker’.

We can see that *-siz* and *-či* fall in line with Seifart’s (2015) three criteria for indirect affix borrowing, but there is also more evidence to further suggest that these items have been borrowed indirectly. For instance, many of the bases to which *-siz* is attached are of Arabic origin. However, many of these derivations with bases of Arabic origin also occur in Turkish, thus making it difficult to determine if the derivations which occur in Iraqi Arabic have been borrowed whole (as complex loans) from Turkish or if they are a result of some degree of productivity— seemingly coincidentally producing cognates with those which occur in Turkish. The following derivations in Iraqi Arabic also occur in Turkish. Although the list presented below is by no means exhaustive, it illustrates the Iraqi Arabic and Turkish cognates containing *-siz*:

¹⁷¹ ‘A traditional Iraqi dish of boiled cow or sheep’s feet and/or head.’

Arabic base		Iraqi Arabic	Turkish	
adab	‘manners’	adab-siz	edep-siz	‘mannerless, rude’
ġīra	‘virtue’	ġīra-siz	gayret-siz	‘without virtue’
axlāq	‘morals’	axlāq-siz	ahlak-siz	‘without morals’
dīn	‘religion’	dīn-siz	din-siz	‘irreligious, faithless’
‘aqil	‘brain, sense’	‘aqil-siz	akıl-sız	‘brainless, stupid’
šarīf	‘honor’	šarīf-siz	şeref-siz	‘without honor’
nāmūs	‘morals’	nāmūs-siz	namus-suz	‘without morals’
tarbīya	‘breeding’	tarbīya-siz	terbiye-siz	‘without breeding’
īmān	‘faith’	īmān-siz	iman-sız	‘faithless’
mantiq	‘logical’	mantiq-siz	mantık-sız	‘illogical’
wijdān	‘conscience’	wijdān-siz	vicdan-sız	‘without a conscience’

There are also derivations with *-či* that occur in both Iraqi Arabic and Turkish, whose bases are ultimately not of Arabic provenance (rather the bases are of Turkic or Indo-European provenance). These bases to which *-či* is suffixed are frequently-occurring simplex loans in Iraqi Arabic, e.g.:

Loaned base		Iraqi Arabic	Turkish	
gahwa	‘coffee’	gahaw-či	kahve-ci	‘coffee house proprietor’
čāy	‘tea’	čāy-či	çay-cı	‘tea merchant’
qundara	‘shoe’	qundar-či	kundura-cı	‘shoe maker’
kabab	‘kabab’	kabab-či	kebap-çı	‘kabab merchant’
titin	‘tobacco’	titin-či	tütün-cü	‘tobacconist’
dikkān	‘shop’	dikkan-či	dukkān-cı	‘shop keeper’

However, there are also some derivations wherein the base appears to be etymologically Turkish (and the derivations with *-či* also occur in Turkish), and while said bases do not appear to occur on their own all that frequently, their derivations with *-či* were still readily accepted by the informants. That is to say, all of my informants were able to provide me with the semantic implication lent by the bases. The younger informants said that they understood what the bases

meant, and posited that their parents or grandparents used them, but that they themselves, do not, e.g.:

Turkish base	Turkish derivation	Iraqi Arabic derivation	
boya ‘paint’	boya-cı	bōya-čī	‘painter’
kaçak ‘smuggled’	kaçak-çı	qačag-čī	‘smuggler’
ecza ‘pharmacy’	ecza-cı	azzā-čī	‘pharamacist’

The informant data mentioned above suggests that although the bases themselves may be falling into disuse as simplex loans, their derivations with *-čī* as complex loans are being maintained. Based on the above discussion, we can, in line with Seifart (2015), hypothesize that *-siz* and *-čī* were not borrowed directly, rather indirectly, as part of complex loanwords. Due to the presence of cognates of the derivations occurring in both the donor and the recipient languages, it would not be farfetched to postulate that a cohort of complex loans containing *-siz* and *-čī* were borrowed into Iraqi Arabic, and Iraqi Arabic speakers recognized their bases as either being underlyingly of Arabic stalk or loans which had already been integrated into Iraqi Arabic. As a result, it is likely that they ‘corrected’ the Turkish realizations to resemble the manner in which the bases were already realized in Iraqi Arabic. In order to determine the accuracy of this hypothesis, however, a historical etymological investigation of when the Arabic bases entered Turkish and when they began to serve as bases for the Turkish *-siz* and *-čī* (and when exactly the first attesting of the Iraqi Arabic derivations with the bases under analysis first occurred) would need to be undertaken. Nevertheless, we can see that *-siz* and *-čī* as they occur in Iraqi Arabic adhere to Seifart’s three criteria for indirect affix borrowing and have become semi-productive suffixes. Now let us discuss the room for further research.

7.11 Room for Further Research

The analyses presented in this chapter uncovered the basic salient distinctions and divisions of labor between the loaned *-siz* and *-čī*, and their non-loaned counterparts (‘*adīm* and *bala*, and *abu il-* respectively), and indicated that, despite the loans and their counterparts possessing shared properties, they also demonstrate stark differences, and consequently they cannot be considered synonymous or interchangeable. Although this chapter presented lists of derivations containing these suffixes (and delved into the constraints binding the formations of these items and the

semantic implications lent by them), we were only able to provide an overview of *-siz* and *-či* and their counterparts. Taking into consideration the fact that there are derivations in Iraqi Arabic containing these suffixes wherein the bases are of Turkish origin, .e.g., *bōya-či* ‘painter’ or *qačag-či* ‘smuggler’, and that the bases to which they are attached appear to be falling into disuse as simplex loans, combined with the existence of derivations which have Arabic bases but also occur in Turkish, it would be interesting to delve deeper into these phenomena and to make an attempt to quantify the amount of items containing Turkish bases that do not function as simplex loans in Iraqi Arabic and are assessed whole as well as the items which the bases have etymologically Arabic roots but also occur in Turkish, as doing so would provide more insight into the productivity of these suffixes.

This chapter treated *-siz*’s counterpart, *bala/blayya* ‘without’, and although it briefly pointed to its varying realizations in Iraqi Arabic (e.g., *bilā*, *bidūn*, *min dūn*, *min ġēr*), it was only the realizations *bala* and *blayya* which were treated. Although not stated in the body of this chapter, through the consultations with the native Iraqi Arabic speakers and my own knowledge of the language it is clear that the majority of native Iraqi speakers use more than one of these realizations of *bala* (e.g., some may use *blayya*, *bidūn*, and *min ġēr* in their daily repertoire). Due to the fact that many speakers actively use more than one realization to denote what is seemingly the same implication is interesting and poses the question: why do multiple forms of the same item appear to exist side-by-side in the linguistic repertoire of the same individual? And further prompts the question: do these differing realizations lend varying implications? Although the constraints of this chapter prevented us from investigating these questions, they are worthy of further research to further break down the division of labor between the loaned *-siz* and its non-loaned counterparts. Furthermore, due to *-siz*’s and *-či*’s clear Turkish origin and subsequently socio-economic/sectarian (etc.) connotations embedded therein, it would be interesting to sample a larger scale of informants including a sizeable number of Sunni Muslims, Iraqis with Turkish ancestry, and even Iraqi Turkmen, to determine if there is a correlation between the extent of the usage/productivity of these items and these factors.

Now that all the loans under analysis have been analyzed and contrasted with their non-loaned counterparts, let us turn to a conclusion of this thesis.

CHAPTER EIGHT: CONCLUSION

8.1 Chapter Outline

This chapter presents a summary of the findings of this thesis (8.2) as they pertain to *hamm* (8.2.1), *balkit* (8.2.2), and *-siz* and *-či* (8.2.3), respectively, after which a general discussion of the shared implications of the findings of this thesis is presented (8.3), where the focus will be on the general, rather than the specific. It then discusses the areas of this thesis that could be strengthened or expanded upon were it not for the constraints by which this thesis was bound (8.4), accompanied by a brief discussion of other loans which are worthy of further investigation but which could not be treated (8.5) (i.e., *kawdan* ‘because’ (8.5.1), ‘*ala mūd* ‘because’ (8.5.2), *hīč* ‘thus, so, such; nothing, not at all’ (8.5.3), and *xōš* ‘good, well’ (8.5.4), before ending with concluding remarks (8.6).

8.2 Summary of the Findings of this Thesis

Let us turn to a summary of each respective loan treated in this thesis.

8.2.1 *hamm*

The analysis indicated that, contrary to the popular description and translation of the loaned *hamm* in Iraqi Arabic as serving an additive function and implying ‘too, also, as well’, the implications lent by *hamm* are much more multi-faceted than the current understanding of it can account for, and it, in fact, serves four distinct functions: an additive focus particle ‘too, also, as well’; a scalar particle ‘even’; an intensifier ‘really, seriously’; and a concessive cancellative discourse marker ‘however, nevertheless, still’. In its additive function, *hamm* alternates with the non-loaned *‘ayḍan*, while when serving a scalar function, it alternates with the non-loaned *ḥatta*. In scalar contexts *hamm* and *ḥatta* experience a high degree of overlap semantically and syntactically, with both items immediately preceding the item or clause they focus, instigating a surprising or unexpected focus value. When functioning as an intensifier, *hamm* alternates with the non-loaned *šudug*. It was uncovered that *šudug* possesses more syntactic flexibility than *hamm*, as well as a wider semantic range, with *šudug* being able to occur on its own and further possessing the ability to function as a noun implying ‘truth’, although the same is not true for *hamm*. As a concessive cancellative discourse marker *hamm* alternates with the non-loaned *ma ‘a ḏālik* and *ma ‘a hāḏa*, cancelling the prior discourse and implying that despite what was mentioned in the prior discourse (X), something contrary will be the case (Y).

Since *hamm*'s functions expand beyond merely addition, it would further seem that the general perception of the divisions of labor between *hamm* and *'ayḍan* being rooted in diglossia (with *hamm* being perceived as more colloquial and less formal and *'ayḍan* as more formal and less colloquial) is, in fact, imprecise. In fact, the analysis indicated that the division of labor between the two items in question is rooted in syntax and semantics.

8.2.2 *balkit*

In terms of *balkit* and its non-loaned counterparts *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *yigdar*, it was revealed that, despite there being overlap between these modals, their divisions of labor lie in semantics as well as in syntax, and thus they cannot be thought of as being truly synonymous or interchangeable. Moreover, the analysis and consultations with the native speakers uncovered that although some speakers tend to show clear distinctions between these modals (in their quantitative epistemic possibility readings) other speakers use them seemingly interchangeably. Epistemic modality can be expressed by *mumkin*, *yimkin*, and *balkit*, and all three of these items can occur in either quantitative or neutral contexts. It was further explicated how, when occurring in quantitative contexts of epistemic modality, there is an overlap between *mumkin* and *yimkin*, with them both expressing a medium to high degree of possibility, while *balkit* is reserved for instances of lower likelihood and even suggests a high degree of unlikelihood. In neutral contexts of epistemic possibility, all three of these items imply an apparently vague amount of uncertainty and denote a seeming impartialness on behalf of the speaker's belief in the likelihood of a proposition being fulfilled.

The modals analyzed can be utilized to express several types of deontic modality: deontic ability (*mumkin* and *yigdar*), the deontic granting of permission (*mumkin* and *yigdar*), and the deontic requesting of permission (*mumkin*, *yigdar*, and *balkit*), with (polite) requests (*mumkin*, *balkit*, and *yigdar*) being a seeming offshoot of the requesting of permission). Finally *balkit* (and the construction *balkit alḷāh*) lends a reading of boulomaic modality.

In terms of how the modals under analysis are negated, perhaps of most interest to us is the fact that *balkit* cannot be negated by placing the negative particle *ma* immediately before it (although *mumkin* and *yigdar* can, i.e., *ma mumkin*; *ma yigdar*). It would seem, however, that it is indeed possible to place the negative particle *ma* immediately after *balkit* (i.e., *balkit ma*) to imply 'it is possible that... not...', as was the case with the other epistemic modals as well.

8.2.3 -siz and -čī

Turning to the loaned suffixes *-siz* and its counterparts *bala* and *‘adīm*, and *-čī* and its counterpart *abu il-*, it was demonstrated that *-siz* and *-čī* are neither fully productive nor fully unproductive, rather they are semi-productive— they are parsible items, which, on their own, possess readily identifiable semantic properties expressing lacking and occupations/habitual activities respectively. As a result, these suffixes can be appended to various bases to create new derivations, so long as these bases fall in line with the constraints mentioned in sections 7.9.3 and 7.9.6—for *-siz*, in order for a new term to be coined, the stem must be an abstract, concrete, or material singular noun and it is used to modify a singular or collective human agent; for *-čī* the stem to which it is appended must denote an occupation, habit, or affiliation and undergo the internal changes expressed in section 7.9.6.5. Let us turn to a general discussion of the shared implications of the findings of this thesis.

8.3 Shared Implications of the Findings

In this section, the collective findings will be discussed, in order to consider how our findings regarding borrowing in Iraqi Arabic inform debates about borrowing in general. As only four loans were contrasted against their non-loaned counterparts, we are unable to make definitive claims regarding the implications that our findings have on the study of synonymy or loanword integration, for instance. That said, we can employ these findings to point to the general implications they bear in these domains.

Based on the analyses of the loaned particle *hamm*, the loaned modal *balkit*, and the loaned suffixes *-siz* and *-čī* and their non-loaned (‘near-’) equivalents, it was revealed that some of the loans are polysemous and serve several distinct functions. It was further demonstrated that there is a degree of overlap in the semantic implications lent by the items under analysis and their non-loaned counterparts, and in some instances they even appear seemingly ‘interchangeable’. That said, there exists semantic and syntactic evidence to indicate that the loaned items indeed lend different implications from their non-loaned counterparts— even in instances in which there seemed to be a lot of overlap between a loan and a non-loaned item, and wherein the differences between a loan and a non-loaned item were not blatantly apparent, there are one or two crucial contexts in which the items do not overlap. Based on the analyses

presented, we are able to conclude that the loans and their respective non-loaned counterparts are not synonymous on account of the following four reasons:

- I) Although there are instances in which the loans and the non-loaned counterparts are seemingly interchangeable, the Principle of Contrast, which suggests that no true synonyms exist and that ‘any difference in FORM in a language indicates that there is a difference in MEANING’ (Clark 1988:318), can be applied to the loans in question, as, although experiencing some instances in which they can occur interchangeably, for each loan there is at least one crucial context in which the loan and its counterpart cannot overlap.
- II) Even in instances of seeming interchangeability, my close work with the informants indicated that although an item might both syntactically and semantically overlap in an array of contexts, there is often a variance in register— one form is perceived as more elevated or more formal than the other.
- III) There are instances in which a loan cannot be negated but its counterpart(s) can. For instance, *balkit* itself cannot be negated in any of its modal readings, and despite it being impossible to use *balkit* to indicate negative epistemic possibility, its counterpart, *mumkin* can (i.e., *ma mumkin*). Thus, although they may overlap syntactically/semantically in affirmative instances, they cannot and do not overlap in negative ones, and therefore cannot be considered synonymous or interchangeable.
- IV) As the loans and their respective counterparts comprise different parts of speech (e.g., some are adverbs, others verbs, other suffixes, etc.), there is variation in their associated syntax. If we consider the loaned *-siz*, for instance, and its counterparts *bala* and *‘adīm*, *-siz* is a suffix and must occur immediately after the item it modifies, while *bala*, a preposition, must immediately precede it, and *‘adīm* occurs as the first part of a genitive construction. While an item suffixed with *-siz* can occur nominally, predicatively, attributively, referentially, and existentially, a phrase headed by *bala*, due to its prepositional status, cannot. Thus, although *-siz*-containing items and their parallel derivations comprised with *bala* may lend the same semantic implications, their associated syntactic constraints prevent them from being interchangeable in all contexts, and, as a result, they are not synonymous.

The points outlined above provide further credence to the notion of the Principle of Contrast (which suggests that there is no such thing as true synonymy (Clark 1988:318)) as a cross-

linguistic concept. Furthermore, the fact that each loan occurs in at least one context in which its counterpart(s) cannot better our understanding of the motivation for loans being maintained in Iraqi Arabic despite the existence of non-loaned counterparts.

We were also interested in the manner in which the loans are incorporated and maintained in Iraqi Arabic, and based on the findings of this thesis we can draw some general conclusions about loanword adaptation. It is widely accepted in the realm of language contact that borrowed items are generally altered morphologically and phonologically in order to be integrated into the recipient language. Particularly interesting in this regard are the discrepancies in the adaption of the loaned suffixes *-siz* and *-čī*. Although *-siz* is a suffix, it does not behave like a non-loaned suffix would in that it cannot be inflected for gender, although it can denote number (through the appending of *-īya* immediately after *-siz*, i.e., *-siz-īya*). Furthermore, the appending of *-siz* does not instigate changes to the base that *-siz* modifies. For instance, it was demonstrated how in bases ending in *tā' marbūṭa* the *tā' marbūṭa* is preserved—it is not dropped, changed to *(i)t* or elongated to *ā* to accommodate the suffixation of *-siz*, contrary to the behavior of non-loaned suffixes. That said, *-siz* is bound by perhaps what is one of the most basic constraints of other suffixes in Iraqi Arabic, namely that it must immediately follow the base to which it is appended. Unlike *-siz*, *-čī* behaves much more like non-loaned suffixes in that it can be inflected for both gender and number (through the suffixation of *-a* or *-īya*, respectively). Furthermore, the appending of *-čī* instigates five internal changes to the base to which it is appended; in fact, the changes which it invokes are similar to that of the non-loaned relational suffix *-i* (known in Arabic grammar as *nisba*).

Especially interesting is the claim that if an item is subjected to adaptation on a phonological level, the pronunciation of said item adapts to the phonological system and sound patterns of the recipient language, in that the phonemes of the borrowed item will be traded for the nearest indigenous phonemes of the recipient language (Zenner & Kristiansen 2014). However, it is not imperative that all lexical borrowings experience phonological adaptation when being borrowed into the recipient language. This is especially the case in situations wherein the speech community comes in extended contact with the donor language, and unadapted borrowings can occasionally become a source of new phonemes for the borrower language in instances wherein the phonological inventories of the borrower and donor languages differ. For instance, due to Bedouin influence, Iraqi Arabic has gained the affrication of /k/ to /č/

and the velarization of /q/ to /g/) (Blanc 1964; Palva 2006), as well as /p/ from Persian, Turkish, and English influences, although *p* is restricted to loaned items, e.g., *parda* ‘curtain’, *punka* ‘fan’.

Now let us briefly consider the phonological realization of the loaned *-či*, which, in its source language, Turkish, is realized as /-d͡ʒi/ (the /d͡ʒ/ is devoiced to /t͡ʃ/ when occurring after devoiced final consonants). Hence in Turkish we find instances of *süt* ‘milk’ → *süt-çi* ‘milkman’; *iş* ‘work’ → *iş-çi* ‘worker’. Other Arabic dialects which have also borrowed this suffix realize it with the nearest phoneme that exists in their respective dialects (e.g., Levantine realizes it as /-ʒi/ while Egyptian Arabic realizes it as /-gi/). Although the phoneme /d͡ʒ/ exists in Iraqi Arabic, Iraqi Arabic speakers realize this suffix as /-t͡ʃi/. /t͡ʃ/ does not exist in standard Arabic, but rather is found in the [Gilit] dialects of Mesopotamian Arabic and the Gulf wherein it is a reflex of the Arabic /k/. In Iraqi Arabic /t͡ʃ/ is maintained in numerous loanwords particularly those of Turkish and Persian provenance e.g.:

čākūč ‘hammer’

čāra ‘remedy’

čihra ‘face’

qamči ‘whip’

Thus, if /k/ and /t͡ʃ/ alternate, and that /d͡ʒ/ exists in Iraqi Arabic, combined with the fact that in other dialects that have borrowed this suffix the /d͡ʒ/ has been maintained or assimilated to that respective dialect’s closest realization of /d͡ʒ/, the question that presents itself is: what prompted the /d͡ʒ/ in this particular suffix to be realized as /t͡ʃ/ in Iraqi Arabic? It would not seem farfetched to postulate that Iraqi Arabic speakers, unaware that /d͡ʒ/ gets devoiced to /t͡ʃ/ when occurring after devoiced final consonants in Turkish, perceived the /d͡ʒ/ in this suffix as being underlyingly /t͡ʃ/, and hence the suffix in question is realized in Iraqi Arabic as /-t͡ʃi/. As /t͡ʃ/ does not occur in other dialects of Arabic, such as Levantine or Egyptian, for instance, /d͡ʒ/ could only be realized as /-ʒi/ (i.e., the manner in which /d͡ʒ/ is realized in the Levantine dialect) or /-gi/ (the manner in which /d͡ʒ/ is realized in the Egyptian dialect).

Based on the points listed above, we can conclude that loan adaptation, in general, is not as straight forward as it may seem at first glance, and suggests that there are other contributing

factors to loan adaptation and integration (such as how the loans are analyzed ‘underlyingly’ and further suggests languages may adapt a loan in manners contrary to expectations and norms).

8.4 Manners In Which This Thesis Could Be Expanded Upon

Due to the time and length constraints of this thesis, I was only able to treat the selected loans and their non-loaned counterparts and their principal functions as they became apparent to me through the analysis. It is possible that the functions described do not fully encapsulate the complete range of functions served by these items and that the loans investigated serve functions beyond the scope of those presented and discussed in this thesis. Furthermore, only the most frequently-occurring realizations of the items in question were treated (i.e., *hamm*; *balkit*), but the aforementioned constraints prevented the treatment of their alternate realizations (e.g., *hammēna*, *hammēn*, *hammatēn*; *balki*, *balkin*, *balčit*, *balčīn* etc.). It would be interesting, however, to treat these alternative realizations to uncover if they yield different semantic implications or if they are bound by constraints other than those by which the realizations that were treated by this thesis are bound, especially as, based on my own personal knowledge of the language, I can attest that some speakers of Iraqi Arabic possess more than one realization of the same item in their personal linguistic repertoire (e.g., a given individual may use both *hamm* and *hammēna* in his daily speech). This being the case, the question then arises: why do two (or more) realizations of the seemingly same item exist side-by-side? And do they function differently, as the Principle of Contrast which states that ‘any difference in FORM in a language indicates that there is a difference in MEANING’ (Clark 1988:318) would suggest?

It goes without saying that there are many manners in which this work could be expanded upon. Naturally, in order to get a fully-representative picture of the manner in which *hamm*, *balkit*, *-siz*, and *-čī* and their non-loaned counterparts function, an in-depth semantic and syntactic analysis wherein each loan and its respective counterparts are compared and contrasted across a vast array of contexts and scenarios, including, but not limited to, different clause types and speech acts (e.g., affirmative, interrogative, negative), all tenses, and sociolinguistic domains is necessary, as doing so would help to underline the finer nuances of the divisions of labor between these items. Furthermore, although precautions were taken in order to yield the most accurate data possible and to analyze said data in the most suitable manner, there are parts of the study that perhaps could have been done differently. We will briefly discuss these areas now; it

should be borne in mind that these points we are about to discuss are not the only aspects of this thesis that could benefit from expansion, rather they are perhaps the most apparent.

Regarding Chapter 5, we were interested in uncovering the true functions of *hamm*, pinpointing the non-loaned items with which these functions most closely alternate, and, through highlighting the semantic and syntactic constraints by which they are bound we revealed the divisions of labor between these loans and their non-loaned counterparts. I was unable to undertake an in-depth analysis of *hamm* as it occurs in negative statements and the associated semantic and syntactic constraints therein. However, investigating *hamm* as it occurs in negative statements (along with its appropriate non-loaned counterparts) would provide a more in-depth understanding of the constraints binding *hamm*. For instance, as we saw with *balkit* and its non-loaned counterparts, the syntactic position of the negative particle *ma* influences the modal reading lent by a given statement (see section 6.10). Considering the impact that the syntactic position of *hamm* has on the functions lent by *hamm*, as well as the syntactic overlap of the scalar and emphatic functions, uncovering the manner in which *hamm* functions in negative statements will be interesting especially in regards to how these syntactic constraints carry over to negative statements.

As for Chapter 6, as we were interested in loans and their corresponding non-loaned ‘equivalents’ *balkit* was only contrasted with its non-loaned counterparts. Thus, in the discussion about epistemic possibility, only *balkit*, *mumkin*, and *yimkin* were discussed— all of which express uncertainty. Mitchell & al-Hassan (1994) speak of a scale of varying degrees (ranging from the impossible to almost certain) on which each epistemic modal fits. In order to get a more accurate idea of epistemic possibility and where *balkit* and its counterparts fit therein, a more extensive analysis would need to be carried out wherein not only *balkit*, *mumkin*, and *yimkin* are analyzed, but also wherein modals expressing impossibility and certainty are included (e.g., *mustahīl* ‘impossible’, *akīd* ‘certainly, definitely’, *ṭaba’an* ‘of course’, *bala šakk* ‘without a doubt’, etc.).

Regarding Chapter 7, the analysis investigating the productivity of *-siz* and *-či* indicated that these items are semi-productive and further indicated that although *-siz* does not bring about internal changes to the base to which it is attached, it appears to be more productive than *-či*. The lack of internal changes brought about by the suffixation of *-siz* indicates a low level of morphological integration with the language variety in question, and less integration of this

kind would lead one to hypothesize or even anticipate more constraints regarding the types of bases to which it can attach, and, consequently, less productivity, as opposed to more. It would be interesting, however, to consult with a wider range of participants to determine if any speakers, when creating new derivations with *-siz*, alter the base in any way in order to accommodate the affixation of *-siz* (as is the case with *-čī*) or to see if any speakers accept the addition of a feminine suffix to *-siz* which typically does not get inflected for gender. Although we were unable to explore the gender- and number-denoted forms of *abu il-*, namely *umm il-* and *ahil il-*, it would indeed be interesting to contrast these items with *-čī*, to see if one form is favored over the other, especially as, based on my own knowledge of the language, *-čī*-containing items are generally used to describe masculine agents and depict occupations or traits more frequently associated with men (e.g., *niswan-čī* ‘womanizer’, *gaḥab-čī* ‘whoremonger’, *gahaw-čī* ‘coffee house proprietor’, etc.).

In addition to how the chapters themselves could be expanded upon, this thesis, as a whole, could also be expanded upon, in that the findings yielded by the analysis could serve as a valuable framework for other studies on language contact, including, but not limited to, investigations of other loans as they occur in Iraqi and other Arabic dialects. Moreover, as many Arabic-speaking countries, particularly those bordering Iraq, have been subject to analogous historical and social factors that played a role in the development of the loan situation in Iraqi Arabic, it would not be naïve to posit that the picture painted to describe *hamm*, *balkit*, *-siz*, and *-čī* may also be applicable to other Arabic dialects wherein these loans (in their own respective realizations) also arise. There are a few dialects in particular in which I hypothesize that these loans behave similarly. For example, occurrences of the respective realizations of *balkit* have been attested in Gulf, Levantine, and Egyptian dialects, and *hamm* has been attested in Kuwaiti and Khuzistani Arabic. Furthermore, instances of *-siz* and *-čī* have also been found in the Levantine and Gulf dialects, as well as in Egyptian. Thus, it would be interesting to explore how these loans function cross-dialectally and how they not only contrast with each other in the varying dialects, but also how they contrast with their respective non-loaned counterparts particular to that dialect (e.g., how does the Aleppo dialect’s *barki/barkadan* (i.e., the manner in which *balkit* is realized in the Arabic dialect of Aleppo) alternate with the non-loaned modals *mumkin*, *yimkin* and *(b)yi’dar* (the manner in which *yigdar* is realized in this dialect)?) Such a cross-dialectal investigation of these items could provide further insight into loan integration and

maintenance and could further indicate if the various functions served by the loans are the result of a cross-dialectal phenomenon. Furthermore, *kamān*, an internal development from the non-loaned *kama ann*, is the Levantine, Egyptian, Gulf (etc.) ‘equivalent’ of the Iraqi Arabic *hamm* and is typically described as implying ‘too, also, as well’. Despite it being an internal development, it would be interesting, building upon the findings of *hamm* presented in Chapter 5, to analyze *kamān* and its various functions to uncover its varying counterparts and to determine if *kamān*, despite not being loaned, serves the same functions as does the loaned *hamm*— if the non-loaned *kamān* and the loaned *hamm* both express the same functions, this could suggest that the varying semantic implications lent by *hamm* are the result of internal developments from Arabic.

Furthermore, as was discussed in the *hamm* and *balkit* chapters respectively, it would also seem that the items treated in this thesis were borrowed into many languages, not just Arabic (e.g., many Turkic languages, Aramaic, Kurdish, Persian, etc.), and it would be interesting to uncover how these items function cross-linguistically and to reveal the similarities and differences between the functions they serve in Arabic and other languages. Moreover, it would also be interesting to compare/contrast the manner in which *hamm*, *balkit*, *-siz*, and *-či* function in Iraqi Arabic with how they function in the source languages (*hamm* as it occurs in both Persian and Turkish, *balkit*, as it occurs in Turkish, and *-siz* and *-či* as they occur in Turkish) to determine if aspects of the donor’s language syntactic constraints binding these items have also influenced the syntactic constraints that bind them in Iraqi Arabic, and also to shed light on the variations between the semantic functions of the items as they function in Iraqi Arabic and in the donor language.

8.5 Other Loans Worthy of Future Research

The discussion of the functions of the loans and the comparisons with their non-loaned counterparts discussed in this thesis sets forth only a general overview of these loans as they occur in Iraqi Arabic. Although I was able to reformulate a new and more appropriate description of *hamm*, *balkit*, *-siz*, and *-či* as they occur in Iraqi Arabic, there are a handful of other highly functional loans, whose etymology I traced and identified but could not treat, which are worthy of further investigation, namely *kawdan* ‘because’ (8.5.1), ‘*ala mūd* ‘because, for the sake of’, (8.5.2) *hīč* ‘nothing, not at all’ (8.5.3), and *xōš* ‘good, well’ (8.5.4). A brief discussion of these

items shall now be set forth, as an analysis of them could help to provide greater insight into loan maintenance and integration in Iraqi Arabic and cross-linguistically. Some of these items are particularly salient to Iraqi Arabic in that they do not appear to occur in other dialects, and their etymologies have been virtually unmentioned. Thus, the following paragraphs provide arguments in support of them being loans as opposed to internal developments from Arabic. It should be borne in mind that the arguments below are solely my own personal hypotheses as to their etymologies and it is possible that they are simply internal developments from Arabic.

8.5.1 *kawdan*

One loan in particular is *kawdan* ‘because’. Although I was unable to find an etymological discussion about *kawdan* in the existing literature on Iraqi Arabic, through my own analysis I have concluded that *kawdan* is a compound item comprised of a non-loaned Arabic component and a loaned Turkish component. It is likely that the realization *kawdan* has developed from the non-loaned *min kawn* which lends the same semantic implication. It should be noted here that although examples of *min kawn* can be found in Classical Arabic and perhaps more dated forms of Iraqi Arabic (e.g., Van Ess 1918), this realization does not appear to be readily used in daily, colloquial speech. On the other hand, from my own personal knowledge of Iraqi Arabic, I can attest that *kawdan* is still in use, although it would seem as though perhaps it is not as widely spread in the personal lexicon of native Iraqi Arabic speakers as loans like *hamm*, for instance, may be.

If we examine *min kawn* morphologically, we can divide it into two parts: *min* ‘from’ and *kawn* ‘being’, and in terms of *kawdan*, it, too, can be morphologically spliced into two parts, *kaw-*, which appears to be a reduction of (*min*)-*kawn* ‘being’, and *-dan* which does not bear any semantic meaning in Iraqi Arabic. That said, *-dan* exists in Turkish wherein it implies ‘from’ (and is subject to vowel harmony). We can roughly consider *-dan* to be the Turkish ‘equivalent’ of the Arabic *min*. According to Turkish syntax, *-dan* occurs after, and affixes itself to, the item it modifies, whereas the Iraqi Arabic *min* precedes the item it modifies. Although *kawdan* (or varying realizations) does not seem to occur in Turkish, in Turkish we can observe *yüzünden* ‘because’, comprised of *yüzün* ‘face’ and *den* ‘from’. Considering these points, it is unlikely that the construction *kawdan* was borrowed from Turkish whole, rather, it appears as though *-dan*, perhaps as part of complex items, was borrowed and subsequently appended to *kawn*. That is to

say we can hypothesize that *kawdan* came through *min kawn*, which, adhering to the syntactic rules by which *-dan* is bound, became *kawn-dan*. It would further seem that, perhaps as a result of phonological economy and ease of pronunciation, the final *-n* in *kawn* was dropped resulting in *kawdan*. Consider the following examples of *kawdan*:

- 1) baṭlō-h min iṣ-ṣuḡul **kawdan** čān
 fire.PST.3MPL-3MSG from the-work KAWDAN be.PST.3MSG
 kaslān
 lazy
 ‘They fired him from his job, because he was lazy.’¹⁷²
- 2) āni ma riḥit **kawdan** ma čān ‘and-i
 1SG NEG go.PST.1SG KAWDAN NEG be.PST.3MSG at-1SG
 kēf
 enough
 ‘I didn’t go, because I didn’t have enough [money]’¹⁷³

kawdan alternates with the non-loaned *li’an*, which can occur with pronominal suffixes and nouns, and it would seem that *li’an* can replace *kawdan* in examples 1 and 2 (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:447). However, *li’an* can take pronominal suffixes, but *kawdan* cannot. When accepting a pronominal suffix, the final *n* in *li’an* is geminated when occurring before a definite article or a suffix beginning with a vowel (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:447), e.g.:

- 3) ma ija Xālid wiyyā-na **li’ann-a**
 NEG come.PST.3MSG Xālid with-1PL LI’ANN-3MSG
 čān marīḏ
 be.PST.3MSG sick
 ‘Xālid did not come with us because he was sick.’¹⁷⁴

¹⁷² McCarthy & Raffouli (1964:401)

¹⁷³ McCarthy & Raffouli (1964:407)

¹⁷⁴ Informant data

It would seem that *kawdan* can, in theory, replace *li'ann(-a)* in example 3, although, as *kawdan* cannot accept the suffixation of pronominal suffixes, the 3MSG pronominal suffix cannot be reflected, contrary to what is the case with *li'ann-a*. Now that *kawdan* has been discussed, let us move on to another counterpart of *kawdan*, namely *'ala mūd*.

8.5.2 *'ala mūd*

'ala mūd 'because, for the sake of' has an unclear etymology although the *'ala* component is clearly the Arabic preposition 'on'. McCarthy & Raffouli (1964:447) maintain that the use of *'ala mūd* is rather tricky and claim that no definite rules can be set forth, although they add that *'ala mūd* is used much more frequently with suffixes and nouns. Despite consulting with multiple specialists in Arabic and Arabic linguistics (as well as those in Turkish, Persian, Aramaic and Kurdish), none of whom could provide any insight into its etymology, I was forced to resign myself to the fact that its etymological status was inclusive. That said, I was told by an informant that the *mūd* in *'ala mūd* is, in fact, a loan from English, i.e., 'mood' and that the literal implication of *'ala mūd* is 'for (your, his, her, etc.) mood', consider:

- 4) *ğallēt* **'ala mūd-ak**
 stay.PST.1SG 'ALA MŪD-2MSG
 'I stayed for your sake.'¹⁷⁵

This etymological theory seems logical, especially if we consider the non-loaned (i)l-xāṭir 'for the sake of...' 'because of', with which it seems to alternate, consider"

- 5) *ğallēt* **il-xāṭir-ak**
 stay.PST.1SG IL-XĀṬIR-2MSG
 'I stayed for your sake.'¹⁷⁶

In examples 1 and 2 presented above *kawdan* can be replaced by *'ala mūd*. Let us consider these examples again, although this time we will replace *kawdan* with *'ala mūd*. Other than this modification, the examples are exactly the same, e.g.:

¹⁷⁵ Informant data

¹⁷⁶ Informant data

- 6) baṭlō-h min iṣ-ṣuġul ‘**ala mūd** čān
 fire.PST.3MPL-3MSG from the-work ‘ALA MŪD be.PST.3MSG
 kaslān
 lazy
 ‘They fired him from his job, because he was lazy.’¹⁷⁷
- 7) āni ma riḥit ‘**ala mūd** ma čān ‘and-i
 1SG NEG go.PST.1SG ‘ALA MŪD NEG be.PST.3MSG at-1SG
 kēf
 enough
 ‘I didn’t go, because I didn’t have enough [money].’¹⁷⁸

It would be interesting to compare and contrast ‘*ala mūd*, *li’an*, and *kawdan* by exploring the syntactic and semantic constraints by which they are bound in order to uncover their true functions and divisions of labor.

8.5.3 *hīč*

Another item of particular interest to me, but the etymology of which has traditionally be taken for granted as an internal development of the non-loaned *hākaḏa* ‘thus, so’, is the polysemous *hīč* ‘thus, so, such; nothing, not at all’ (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:468). In Iraqi Arabic, there are also instances of *hīčī* ‘thus, so, such, like this’, although it is always *hīč* when employed in the sense of ‘nothing’ (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:468). It would seem as though *hīč*, in its sense of ‘thus, so’, is an internal development from the non-loaned *hākaḏa* ‘thus, so, such’, and similar internal developments of *hākaḏa* can be observed in other Arabic dialects, as well, e.g., *hēk* (Levantine), *kida* (Egyptian). Consider the following examples which portray the implications lent by *hīč* and *hīč(i)*:

- 8) huwa gal-l-i iktib **hīč(ī)**
 3MSG say.PST.3MSG-to-1SG write.IMP.2MSG HĪČ(Ī)
 ‘He told me to write like this.’¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁷ McCarthy & Raffouli (1964:401)

¹⁷⁸ Informant data

- 10) A: hīč ma sawwāyt šī
Hīč NEG do.PST.2MSG thing
‘You did nothing?’
B: la, hīč
no, Hīč
‘No, nothing!’¹⁸¹

11) **hič** na guft
 HĪČ NEG say.PST.1SG
 ‘He said nothing at all.’¹⁸²

In Turkish, *hiç* also implies ‘nothing, not at all’ and is used to strengthen negatives (and is described as the opposite of *very*) (Yusuf 1961:277). The Turkish *hiç* has been described as ‘a Persian negative adverb’ that is only used in negative and interrogative sentences (Turan 2000:56), e.g.:

- 12) makarnayı ben **hĩč** sev-mi-yor-um
pasta 1SG **Hĩč** love-NEG-PROG-1SG
'I don't like pasta at all.'¹⁸³

¹⁷⁹ McCarthy & Raffouli (1964:468)

¹⁸⁰ McCarthy & Raffouli (1964:468)

¹⁸¹ McCarthy & Raffouli (1964:468)

¹⁸² Steingass (1999:1520)

¹⁸³ Taylan (1984:38)

The discrepancy in the semantic implications lent by *hīč(ī)* and *hīč* in Iraqi Arabic combined with the resemblance in the behavior of *hīč* in Persian and Turkish with the Iraqi *hīč* (when serving an implication of ‘nothing, not at all’) raises the question of whether these words are actually two distinct items with two distinct etymological backgrounds, and, consequently, it would not seem at all farfetched to postulate that *hīč(ī)* ‘thus, so, such’ is derived from the non-loaned *hākaḏa*, while *hīč* in the sense of ‘nothing, not at all’ is in fact a loan of Irano-Turkic provenance.

hīč, when implying ‘nothing, not at all’, seems to alternate with the non-loaned *abadan* ‘never, not at all’, e.g.:

13) abadan	ma	gilit	šī
ABADAN	NEG	say.PST.1SG	thing
‘I said absolutely nothing.’ ¹⁸⁴			

Based on these examples of the manner in which *hīč* functions in Turkish, Persian, and Iraqi Arabic, it would seem as though there are similarities between them. In order to confirm or reject my hypothesis that *hīč(ī)* and *hīč* are two distinct items, however, an in-depth comparative study of *hīč* and *hīč(ī)* would need to be carried out, as well as, possibly, exploring the manner in which the varying respective realizations of *hākaḏa* occur in the varying Arabic dialects to see if there are instances in which those realizations also serve a ‘nothing, not at all’ function. If the respective realizations of *hākaḏa* do not also have a ‘nothing, not at all’ function, this could indicate that *hīč(ī)* and *hīč* are distinct items.

8.5.4 xōš

xōš ‘good, well’ is of Persian origin and defies Arabic syntactic rules in that it predominantly precedes the noun it modifies; it is not inflected for gender or number, and it can only modify indefinite nouns (McCarthy & Raffouli 1964:172), e.g.:

14) huwa	xōš	rijāl
3MSG	XŌŠ	man
‘He’s a good man.’ ¹⁸⁵		

¹⁸⁴ Informant data

- 15) **xōš** fikra
 XŌŠ idea
 ‘[That’s a] good idea.’¹⁸⁶

It would seem that the non-loaned counterparts of *xōš* are *zēn* ‘good, well’ and *ṭayyib* ‘good (often used to modify foods/beverages and people)’, both of which get inflected for gender through the suffixation of the feminine *-a* (i.e., *zēn-a*; *ṭayyib-a*) and number through the suffixation of the feminine plural *-āt* (i.e., *zēn-āt*; *ṭayyib-āt*) and masculine plural *-īn* (i.e., *zēn-īn* and *ṭayyib-īn*). Like other non-loaned adjectives they follow the noun they modify.

ṭayyib can replace *xōš* in example 14, consider:

- 16) huwa rijāl **ṭayyib**
 3MSG man **ṬAYYIB**
 ‘He’s a good man’.¹⁸⁷

zēn can replace *xōš* in example 15, consider:

- 17) fikra **zēna**
 idea **ZĒNA**
 ‘[That’s a] good idea.’¹⁸⁸

The integration of *xōš* is particularly interesting, as, although it does not appear to be ‘fully integrated’ in that it is not inflected for either gender or number and also precedes the noun it modifies, McCarthy & Raffouli (1964) point out that there are instances of *xōš* being applied to the Arabic comparative/superlative pattern (i.e., aCCāC), as in *axwāš* ‘better, best’. They add, however, that said derivation does not appear to be pure Baghdadi. *zēn*, although not of loaned stock, does not typically get applied to the Arabic comparative/superlative pattern, rather, to express the concept of comparative or superlative, *aḥsan* ‘better; best’ is employed (the comparative/superlative form of *ḥasan* ‘good’). *ṭayyib*, can be applied to this

¹⁸⁵ Informant data

¹⁸⁶ Informant data

¹⁸⁷ Informant data

¹⁸⁸ Informant data

comparative/superlative pattern, rendering *aṭiyyab*. A contrastive analysis of *xōš* and *zēn/ṭayyib* would be interesting, in that it would help to uncover the question: if some speakers use *axwāš*, are their instances of *xōš* being further Arabized by some speakers in other ways to exhibit behaviors typical of non-loaned items such as declension for number or gender?

8.6 Concluding Remarks

The central issue with which this thesis was concerned was the manner in which the loans under investigation and their non-loaned counterparts have been heretofore conceptualized. In examining this conceptualization, the degree of interchangeability between the loans and their respective non-loaned counterparts and the divisions of labor distinguishing them were revealed in order to challenge the traditional perception that they are synonymous/interchangeable. This thesis more accurately outlined the principal functions of these loans, and, for each function, indicated the most accurate non-loaned counterpart, providing deeper insight into the true behavior of these loans that current dictionaries and reference grammars of Iraqi Arabic fail to account for. This new understanding of the loans is telling in that it draws attention to the previously under-analyzed and under-emphasized complexity of the loaned Iraqi Arabic lexicon and also aids us in better understanding the manner(s) of loan integration and maintenance in this particular language variety.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abu-Haidar, Farida. 1991. *Christian Arabic of Baghdad*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Abu-Haidar, Farida. 1996. Turkish as a marker of ethnic identity and religious affiliation. In Yasir Suleiman (ed.), *Language and Identity in the Middle East and North Africa*, 117–133. Richmond, UK: Curzon Press.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. 2010. *Language contact in Amazonia*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Aksan, Yeşim, Mustafa Aksan, Ümit Mersinli & Umut Ufuk Demirhan. 2016. *A frequency dictionary of Turkish: A core vocabulary for learners*. London: Routledge.
- al-Farazdaq, Humām ibn Ġālib. 1998 [728]. *Kitāb an-naqā'id: Naqā'id Jarīr wa al-Farazdaq*. Beirut: manshūrāt Muḥammad 'Alī Bēḍūn.
- Al-Ḥabba, Zaki 'Abd al-Ḥamīd. 2002. *Mufradāt fārsīya fī baġdādīyāt 'azīz il-ḥajīya*. Beirut: id-dār il-'arabīya l-il-mawsū'āt.
- al-Ḥarīrī, Abū Muḥammad al-Qāsim Ibn 'Alī bin Muḥammad. 1881 [1122]. *kitāb durrat al-ġawwāṣ fī awhām al-xawāṣṣ: wa fī āxirih aṣ-ṣarḥ li Aḥmad Šihāb ad-Dīn al-Xafāji*. Istanbul.
- al-Jāḥiḍ, Abu 'Uḥmān 'Amr Ibn Baḥr. 1895 [868]. *al-Bayān wa at-tabyīn*. Cairo: al-Maṭba'a al-'ilmīya.
- Ali, Mashail Haydar. 1994. *The expression of modality in Modern Standard Arabic*. London: Birkbeck (University of London). (Doctoral dissertation).
- Al-Khalesi, Yasin M. 2006. *Modern Iraqi Arabic with MP3 files: A textbook*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Altoma, Salih J. 1969. *The problem of diglossia in Arabic: A comparative study of Classical and Iraqi Arabic*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Amuzegar, Hooshang & Farideh Amuzegar. 2007. *How to speak, read, & write Persian (Farsi): Self-teaching method accompanied by three audio cassettes*. Bethesda, MD: Ibex Publishers.
- Anghelescu, Nadia. 2016. Modalities and modalization as seen by the Arab grammarians. *Romanco-Arabica* 26. 9–14.
- Arnold, Werner & Peter Behnstedt. 1993. *Arabisch-aramäische Sprachbeziehungen im Qalamūn (Syrien): Eine dialektgeographische Untersuchung*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Asbaghi, Asya. 1988. *Persische Lehnwörter im Arabischen*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Azer, Hany Amin. 1980. *The expression of modality in Egyptian Colloquial Arabic, its syntax and semantics*. London: School of Oriental and African Studies. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Badawi, Elsaid Muhammad, Michael G. Carter & Adrian Gully. 2016. *Modern written Arabic: A comprehensive grammar*. London: Routledge.
- Baetens Beardsmore, Hugo. 1982. *Bilingualism: Basic principles*. Avon: Tieto.

- Bahloul, Raja. 1994. *Inflectional morphology, negation and the clausal structure in Tunisian Arabic*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Barbot, Michel. 1961. Emprunts et phonologie dans les dialectes citadins syro-libanais. *Arabica* 8(2). 174–188.
- Bassiouny, Reem. 2009. *Arabic sociolinguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Bateson, Mary Catherine. 1967. *Arabic language handbook*, vol. 3. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Bauer, Laurie. 2001. *Morphological productivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bell, David M. 2009. *Nevertheless, still and yet*: Concessive cancellative discourse markers. *Journal of Pragmatics* 42(7). 1912–1927.
- Benazzo, Sandra & Christine Dimroth. 2015. Additive particles in Romance and Germanic languages: Are they really similar? *Linguistik Online* 71(2). 9–30, <http://dx.doi.org/10.13092/lo.71.1776>.
- Berta, Árpád. 1998. Tatar and Bashkir. In Lars Johanson & Eva A. Csató (eds.), *The Turkic Languages*, 283–300. London: Routledge.
- Biṭunā, Gabriel. 2014. The assimilation of English loan words in the spoken Arabic of Baghdad. In Oliver Durand, Angela D. Langone & Giuliano Mion (eds.), *Alf Lahġa wa Lahġa: Proceedings of the 9th AIDA Conference*, 67–78. Münster: LIT Verlag.
- Blanc, Haim. 1960. Style variations in spoken Arabic: A sample of interdialectal educated conversation. In Charles A. Ferguson (ed.), *Contributions to Arabic linguistics*, 81–161. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Blanc, Haim. 1964. *Communal dialects in Baghdad*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik & Marc Vandamme. 1988. Chaghatay. In Lars Johanson & Eva A. Csató (eds.), *The Turkic Languages*, 166–178. London: Routledge.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1972. *Degree words*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1977. *The form of language*. London: Logmans.
- Bolinger, Dwight. 1985. Two views of accent. *Journal of Linguistics* 21: 79–123.
- Bolozky, Shmuel. 1999. *Measuring productivity in word formation: The case of Israeli Hebrew*. Leiden: Brill.
- Booji, Geert. 1977. *Dutch morphology: A study of word formation in generative grammar*. Lisse: Peter de Ridder Press.
- Booji, Geert. 2012. *The grammar of words: An introduction to linguistic morphology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Burton-Roberts, Noel. 1989. *The limits to debate: A revised theory of semantic presupposition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chiru, Daniela-Corina. 2016. Renditions of the Arabic modality *kāda* in Morisco translations of the Qu’ran. *Romano-Arabica* 26. 15–24.
- Clarity, Beverly E, Stowasser, Karl & Ronald G. Wolfe (eds). 2003. *A dictionary of Iraqi Arabic: English-Arabic, Arabic-English*. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press.
- Clark, Eve V. 1988. On the logic of contrast. *Journal of Child Language* 15(2). 317–335.
- Daryaei, Touraj. 2013. *Sasanian Persia: The rise and fall of an empire*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dascal, Marcelo & Tamar Katriel. 1977. Between semantics and pragmatics: The two types of ‘but’– Hebrew ‘aval’ and ‘ela’. *Theoretical Linguistics* 4(1–3). 143–172, <https://doi.org/10.1515/thli.1977.4.1-3.143>.
- Deutscher, Guy. 2007. *Syntactic change in Akkadian: The evolution of sentential complementation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dietz, Friedrich. 1838. *Grammatik der romanischen Sprachen*, vol. 2. Bonn: Weber.
- Dik, Simon C. 1967. Some critical remarks on the treatment of morphological structure in transformational generative grammar. *Lingua* 18: 352–383.
- Dressler, Wolfgang U. 2007. Productivity in word formation. In Gonia Jarema & Gary Libben (eds.), *The mental lexicon: Core Perspectives*. 159–183. Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Durkin, Philip. 2014. *Borrowed words: A history of loanwords in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Edwards, John. 2008. Foundations of Bilingualism. In Tej Bhatia & William C. Ritchie (eds.), *The handbook of bilingualism*, 7–45. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Erdal, Marcel. 1991. *Old Turkic word formation: A functional approach to the lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Feghali, Habaka J. 2004. *The dialects of Riyadh and eastern Saudi Arabic: Grammar, dialogues, and Lexicon*. Hyattsville, MD: Dunwoody Press.
- Féghali, Michel. 1918. *Étude sur les emprunts syriaques dans les parlers arabes du Liban*, <https://doi.org/doi:10.7282/T3M0474W>.
- Fernández-Domínguez, Jesús. 2009. *Productivity in English word-formation: An approach to N+ N compounding*. Bern, Switzerland: Peter Lang AG.
- Fernández-Domínguez, Jesús. 2010. Productivity vs. lexicalization: Frequency-based hypotheses on word-formation. *Poznań Studies in Contemporary Linguistics* 46(2). 193–219.

- Fernández-Domínguez, Jesús, Ana Díaz-Negrillo & Pavol Štekauer. 2007. How is low morphological productivity measured? *Atlantis* 29(1). 29–54.
- Fries, Charles Carpenter. 1940. *American English grammar: The grammatical structure*. New York: Appleton-Century Company.
- Gathercole, Virginia C. 1987. The contrastive hypothesis for the acquisition of word meaning: A reconsideration of the theory. *Journal of Child Language* 14(3). 493–531.
- Gazdar, Gerald. 1979. A solution to the projection problem. *Syntax and Semantics* 11. 57–89.
- Geller, Markham J. 1997. The last wedge. *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie und vorderasiatische Archäologie* 87(1). 43–95.
- Giegerich, Heinz J. 1999. *Lexical strata in English: Morphological causes, phonological effects*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grigore, George. 2015. Expressing certainty and uncertainty in Baghdadi Arabic. *Romano-Arabica* 25: 259–266.
- Haim, Sulayman. 2000. *Persian-English dictionary*. New York: Hippocrene Books.
- Hanioğlu, Şükrü. 2008. *A brief history of the late Ottoman Empire*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hathaway, Jane & Karl K. Barbir. 2008. *The Arab lands under Ottoman rule, 1516–1800*. London: Longman.
- Haug, Martin H. & Jamaspji Minocheherji Jamaspasana. 1867. *An Old Zand-Pahlavi Glossary*. Bombay: Government Central Book Depot.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26. 210–231.
- Hay, Jennifer. 2001. Lexical frequency in morphology: Is everything relative? *Linguistics* 39. 1041–1070.
- Hay, Jennifer & Ingo Plag. 2004. What constrains possible suffix combinations? On the interaction of grammatical and processing restrictions in derivational morphology. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 22(3). 565–596.
- Hermerén, Lars. 1978. *On modality in English: A study of the semantics of the modals*. Lund: Liber Läromedel/Gleerups.
- Hockett, Charles F. 1958. *A course in modern linguistics*. New York: Macmillan.
- Holes, Clive. 2007. Colloquial Iraqi Arabic. In John N. Postgate (ed.) *Languages of Iraq, ancient and modern*. 123–134. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Householder, Fred W. & Robert L. Cheng. 1971. Universe-scope relations in Chinese and Japanese. *Hawaii Language Teacher* 13(1). 34–50.

- İz, Fahir, Henry C. Hony & Anthony Dolphin Alderson. 1978. *The Oxford English-Turkish dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ingham, Bruce. 1994. *Najdi Arabic: Central Arabian*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Israel, Michael. 2011. *The grammar of polarity: Pragmatics, sensitivity, and the logic of scales*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Ito, Rika & Sali Tagliamonte. 2003. Well weird, right dodgy, very strange, really cool: Layering and recycling in English intensifiers. *Language in Society* 32(2). 257–279.
- Jacobs, Joachim. 1991. *On the semantics of modal particles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Jastrow, Otto. 1978. *Die mesopotamisch-arabischen qeltu-Dialekte*, vol. 1. Wiesbaden: Steiner.
- Jeffery, Arthur. 1938. *The foreign vocabulary of the Qur'an*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Karttunen, Lauri & Stanley Peters. 1980. Interrogative quantifiers. In Christian Rohrer (ed.), *Time, Tense, and Quantifiers: Proceedings of the Stuttgart conference on the logic of tense and quantification*. 181–205. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Kastovsky, Dieter. 2006. Typological changes in derivational morphology. In Ans van Kemenade & Bettelou Los (eds.), *The handbook of the history of English*, 151–76. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Katamba, Francis. 1993. *Morphology*. New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Kay, Paul. 1990. Even. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 13(1). 59–111.
- Kerslake, Celia & Aslı Göksel. 2014. *Turkish: An essential grammar*. London: Routledge.
- König, Ekkehard. 1991. *The meaning of focus particles: A comparative perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Kronfeld, Chana. 2016. The joint literary historiography of Hebrew and Yiddish. In Joshua L. Miller & Anita Norich (eds.), *Languages of modern Jewish cultures: Comparative perspectives*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Lambton, Ann K. 1954. *Persian vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lewis, Geoffrey. 1967. *Turkish grammar*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Lucas, Christopher. 2015. Contact-induced language change. In Claire Bower & Bethwyn Evans (eds.), *The Routledge Handbook of Historical Linguistics*. 519–536.
- Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics*. Cambridge, New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Malaika, Nisar. 1959. *Grundzüge der Grammatik des arabischen Dialektes von Bagdad*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.

- Mansel, Philip. 2011. *Constantinople: City of the world's desire, 1453–1924*. London: John Murray.
- Mark, Joshua J. 2011. Babylon. *Ancient History Encyclopedia*, <https://www.ancient.eu/babylon>.
- Masliyah, Sadok. 1996. Four Turkish suffixes in Iraqi Arabic. *Journal of Semitic Studies* 41(2). 291–300.
- Matskevych, Andriy. 2016. The notion of modality in Arabic linguistics: The origin and development. *Romano-Arabica* 26. 55–64.
- Matthews, Peter H. 1974. *Morphology: An introduction to the theory of word structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron & Jeanette Sakel (eds). 2007. *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- Matras, Yaron & Maryam Shabibi. 2007. Grammatical borrowing in Khuzistani Arabic. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical borrowing in cross-linguistic perspective*. 137–150 New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- McCarthy, Richard J. & Faraj Raffouli. 1964. *Spoken Arabic of Baghdad: Anthology of Texts*, vol. 1. Beirut: Librairie orientale.
- McCawley, James D. 1978. Conversational implicature and the lexicon. *Syntax and Semantics* 9. 245–259.
- McMahon, April M.S. 1994. *Understanding language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Merriman, William E. 1986. Some reasons for the occurrence and eventual correction of children's naming errors. *Child Development* 57(4). 942–952.
- Milroy, Lesley. 2002. Introduction: Mobility, contact and language change: Working with contemporary speech communities. *Journal of Sociolinguistics* 6(1). 3–15.
- Mitchell, Terrence F. & Shahir al-Hassan. 1994. *Modality, mood, and aspect in Spoken Arabic*. London: Keegan Paul International.
- Moravcsik, Edith A. 1978. Language contact. In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsik (eds.), *Universals of human language*, 93–123. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Müller-Kessler, Christa. 2003. Aramaic 'k', lyk' and Iraqi Arabic 'aku, maku: The Mesopotamian particles of existence. *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 123(3). 641–646.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 2002. *Contact linguistics: Bilingual encounters and grammatical outcomes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Nasrallah, Nawal & Nadia Hassani. 2005. *Beginner's Iraqi Arabic with 2 Audio Cds: An introduction to the spoken language of Iraq*. New York: Hippocrene Books.
- Palmer, Frank R. 1986. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Palmer, Frank R. 1990. *Modality and the English modals*. London: Longman.
- Palmer, Frank R. 1995. Negation and the modals of possibility and necessity. In Joan L. Bybee & Suzanne Fleischman (eds.), *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*. 453–472. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Palva, Heikki. 2006. Dialects: Classification. In Lutz Edzard & Rudolf de Jong (eds.), *Encyclopedia of Arabic Language and Linguistics*, http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1570-6699_eall_EALL_COM_0087.
- Perkins, Michael R. 1983. *Modal expressions in English*. London: Francis Pinter.
- Picoche, Jacqueline & Christiane Marchello-Nizia. 1989. *Histoire de la langue française*. Paris: Nathan.
- Pike, Kenneth L. 1967. *Language in relation to a unified theory of the structure of human behavior*. The Hague and Paris: Mouton.
- Pinker, Steven & Alan Prince. 1994. Regular and irregular morphology and the psychological status of rules of grammar. In Susan D. Lima, Roberta Corrigan & Gregory K. Iverson (eds.), *The Reality of Linguistic Rules*. 321–352. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Plag, Ingo. 1999. *Morphological productivity: Structural constraints in English derivation*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Plag, Ingo. 2003. *Word-formation in English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Portner, Paul. 2009. *Modality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Procházka, Stephan. 2005. The Turkish contribution to the Arabic lexicon. In Eva Agnes Csató, Bo Isaksson & Carina Jahani (eds.), *Linguistic Convergence and Areal Diffusion: Case Studies from Iranian, Semitic and Turkic*, 191–202. London: Routledge.
- Prokosch, Erich. 1983. *Osmanisches Wortgut im Ägyptisch-Arabischen*. Berlin: K. Schwartz.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Rafiee, Abdi. 2015. *Colloquial Persian*. London: Routledge.
- Reinkowski, Maurus. 1995. *Eine phonologische Analyse türkischen Wortgutes im bagdadisch-arabischen mitsamt einer Wortliste*. Folia Orientalia 31. 89–115.
- Reinkowski, Maurus. 1998. Türkische Lehnwörter im Bagdadisch-Arabischen: Morphologische Adaptation an die arabische Schemabildung und Bedeutungsveränderung. In Nurettin Demir

- & Erika Taube (eds.), *Turkologie heute: Tradition und Perspektive*. 239–253. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rescher, Nicholas. 1968. Truth and necessity in temporal perspective. *The Philosophy of Time*. 183–220.
- Rooth, Mats. 1985. *Association with focus*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts. (Doctoral dissertation.)
- Sapir, Edward. 1921. *An introduction to the study of speech*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co.
- Schönig, Claus. 1998. Azerbaijani. In Eva Agnes Csató & Lars Johanson (eds.), *The Turkic languages*, 248–272. London: Routledge.
- Schuchardt, Hugo Ernst Mario. 1884. *Slawo-deutsches und Slawo-italienisches*. Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky.
- Searle, John R. 1975. Indirect speech acts. In Peter Cole & Jerry L. Morgan (eds.), *Syntax and Semantics*, vol. 3: *Speech Acts*, 59–82. New York: Academic Press.
- Searle, John R. 1983. *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Seifart, Frank. 2015. Does structural-typological similarity affect borrowability? A quantitative study on affix borrowing. *Language Dynamics and Change* 5. 92–113.
- Selkirk, Elisabeth O. 1984. *Phonology and syntax: The relation between sound and structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Sen, Ramdhun. 1829. *A dictionary in Persian and English*. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press.
- Seuren, Pieter A.M. 1988. Presupposition and negation. *Journal of Semantics* 6(1). 175–226.
- Shirr, Addī. 1965. *Kitāb al-alfāz al-Fārisīyah al-mu‘arrabah*. Beirut: al-Maṭba‘a al-Kāthūlikīya.
- Singler, John Victor & Silvia Kouwenberg (eds). 2008. *The Handbook of pidgin and creole studies*. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell Publishers.
- Steingass, Francis. 1999. *A comprehensive Persian-English dictionary*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Stoffel, Cornelis. 1901. *Intensives and down-toners: A study in English adverbs*. Heidelberg: Carl Winters Universitätsbuchhandlung.
- Suleiman, Yasir. 2004. *A war of words: Language and conflict in the Middle East*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Sweetser, Eve E. 1982. Root and epistemic modals: Causality in two worlds. *Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society* 8, 484–507.

- Swift, Lloyd Balderston. 1963. *A reference grammar of Modern Turkish*. Bloomington: Indiana University.
- Tagliamonte, Sali & Chris Roberts. 2005. *So weird; so cool; so innovative*: The use of intensifiers in the television series *Friends*. *American Speech* 80(3). 280–300.
- Taglicht, Josef. 1984. *Message and emphasis: On focus and scope in English*. London: Longman.
- Taleghani, Azita H. 2008. *Modality, aspect and negation in Persian*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Taylan, Eser Erguvanlı. 1984. *The function of word order in Turkish grammar*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Thiery, Christopher. 1978. True bilingualism and second language learning. In David Gerver & H. Wallace Sinaiko (eds.), *Language interpretation and communication*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Turan, Fikret. 2000. *Adverbs and adverbial constructions in Old Anatolian Turkish*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- van Coetsem, Frans. 1988. *Loan phonology and the two transfer types in language contact*. Dordrecht: Foris.
- Van Ess, John. 1918. *The spoken Arabic of Mesopotamia*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Vaughan, Thomas. 1709. *A grammar of the Turkish language*. London: Robinson.
- Versteegh, Kees. 1997. *The Arabic language*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Versteegh, Kees. 2001. Linguistic contacts between Arabic and other languages. *Arabica* 48(4). 470–508.
- von Wright, Georg H. 1951. Deontic logic. *Mind* 60. 1–14.
- Wehr, Hans. 1979. *A dictionary of modern written Arabic: (Arabic-English)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. New York: Linguistic Circle of New York. (Reprinted 1986, The Hague: Mouton).
- Whitney, William D. 1881. On mixture in language. *Transactions of the American Philological Association (1869-1896)* 12: 5–26.
- Winford, Donald. 2005. Contact-induced changes: Classification and processes. *Diachronica* 22. 373–427.

- Woods, Christopher. 2006. Bilingualism, scribal learning, and the death of Sumerian. In Seth L. Sanders (ed), *Margins of writing, origins of culture*, 91–120. Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago.
- Yip, Moira. 1988. The obligatory contour principle and phonological rules: A loss of identity. *Linguistic Inquiry* 19. 65–100.
- Yusuf, Mardin. 1961. *Colloquial Turkish*. London: Routledge.
- Zenner, Eline & Gitte Kristiansen (eds). 2014. *New perspectives on lexical borrowing: Onomasiological, methodological and phraseological innovations*. Boston: Walter de Gruyter.