E.A. Zabelina

DISTRIBUTION OF COMPLEMENTIZERS IN THE URMI VARIETIES OF URMIYA[1]

The aim of the paper is to analyze the complementizer distribution in Urmi, a North Eastern Neo-Aramaic variety, as spoken nowadays in the village of Urmiya, Krasnodar Krai (Russia). The families of Urmi speakers mostly come from Iran, Armenia and Georgia, so the system of complement-marking in their varieties is compared to the patterns of the respective regional Urmi varieties, reported in the literature. The Urmi varieties in Urmiya display a variation in complementizer marking that is not directly accounted for by the initial dialectal division. Urmiya varieties also display some innovations. For instance, semantic contrasts in complements of perception verbs can be expressed by interrogative manner words: this pattern, even though typologically expectable, has so far been unattested in Urmi. The distribution of complementizers in the subjunctive has a functional basis, at least in elicited data: different-subject constructions tend to be more frequently introduced by a complementizer than same-subject constructions. I show that several of the innovations can be accounted for, or at least favoured by contact influence. The contact influence of Russian on complementation manifests as instances of both matter- and pattern-borrowing, but does not go deeper than complementizer marking and, probably, word order permutations. Thus, the distribution of complementizers in the Urmi of Urmiya is different from the distributions reported in the literature for Urmi of other regions, which reflects the fact that complement-marking is more prone to contact influence and innovations than deeper layers of syntax and morphology.

Keywords: *complementation, complementizer, language contact, functional typology, pattern-borrowing, grammaticalization, North Eastern Neo-Aramaic, Urmi.*

Introduction

The paper aims at analyzing the distribution of complementizers in Urmi, a North Eastern Neo-Aramaic language. To that end, I examine the distribution of complementizers across semantic contexts in typological perspective and assess the influence of Russian on the complementation in Urmiya.

North Eastern Neo-Aramaic (NENA) is a group of fairly diverse dialects/languages that belong to the Semitic language family. Speakers of NENA identify themselves as Assyrians[2] (*suráyə/+aturáyə*). Formerly, Assyrians lived on the territories of the present Iran, Iraq and Turkey. Following the tragic upheavals of the last century[3], they moved to other regions, forming diaspora communities all over the world, including Russia. There is only one settlement in Russia where Assyrians constitute a majority of the population, viz. the village of Urmiya in the Krasnodar Krai.

In the village of Urmiya, there coexist several NENA varieties. Urmi (*urməžnáya*) is the most prominent and prestigious variety. It is represented by several groups, based on the waves of migration to the village. However, they do not always seem to cluster along the regional lines. Currently, all the NENA varieties in the village are under the profound influence of Russian, which is used for communication with the speakers of other dialects and languages.

Sentential complementation is a linguistic phenomenon whereby a predication functions as a complement of another predicate (Noonan, 2007: 52), such as in the English sentence below.

(1) John thought$_{CTP}$ [that$_{COMP}$ Mary was right].

Formal distinctions in complementation correlate with distribution over semantic contexts (Givón, 1980, 2001; Cristofaro, 2003). Complementation and complementizers, markers identifying a complement clause as such, have long been object of linguistic research (Givón, 1980; Noonan, 2007; Dixon & Aikhenvald, 2006; Schmidtke-Bode, 2014; Boye & Kehayov (eds.), 2016, among other). Yet, coexistence of several complementizers in a language and their distribution across complement types and contexts remains an intriguing topic for exploration.

[1] This study was supported by RFBR, grant No. 20-012-00312 “Documentation of Northeastern Neo-Aramaic spoken in Russia”.

[2] A term which is used to cover all Aramaic-speaking Christians or the Nestorian Christians only (Coghill, 1999: 5).

[3] For details on the history of the Assyrian people, see (Khan, 2016a: 1–7).

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 1, I analyze the complementation marking in the regional varieties of Urmi on the basis of the published data. In Section 2, I discuss the distribution of complementizers observed in the field work data on Urmi of Urmiya, against the background of the previously documented varieties. Section 3 is dedicated to the putative emergence of a new specialized complementizer in the varieties of Urmiya.

1. Distribution of complementizers in UI, UA and UG

The regional varieties of Urmi, documented in (Khan, 2016a-d), will be referred to as UA (Urmi of Armenia), UG (Urmi of Georgia), and UI (Urmi of Iran).

The system of sentential complementation was deduced from the corpus of texts and the description of the Urmi syntax (Khan, 2016b; Khan, 2016d). I sampled ~10 000 symbols from the texts in each variety, viz. UI, UA and UG, manually extracted sentences with sentential complements[4] and annotated them for predicate morphology, its ontological type, and complementizer use. The resulting sample contains 502 instances of complementation.

1.1. General features

The least reduced *indicative*[5] complement type is used with predicates of utterance and cognition: here, the connection between the two situations is the loosest (Givón, 2001: 41). In Urmi, it also partly covers perception complementation. The *subjunctive* type is used for irrealis complements[6] of modal, desiderative, speech causation predicates.

Complement constructions for the majority[7] of types can be either asyndetic or introduced by a complementizer: *kat* for the UI and UA, *yan*(*ət*) for the UG. The distribution of complementizers across semantic contexts is summarized in Table 1.

Table 1

Basic complementizer frequency across contexts in the UI, UG and UA

Semantic type	UI			UG			UA			Total, %
	N	Σ	%	N	Σ	%	N	Σ	%	
utterance[8]	16	91	**18**	0	28	**0**	0	17	**0**	12
indirect polar question	0	5	0	0	2	NA	0	2	NA	0
propositional attitude	1	6	17	0	0	NA	0	0	NA	17
knowledge	5	9	56	0	1	NA	3	4	75	57
perception	1	11	9	2	10	20	1	7	14	14
speech causation	2	9	22	1	2	NA	1	1	NA	33
desiderative SS[9]	0	14	0	1	2	NA	0	8	0	4
desiderative DS	0	0	NA	0	1	NA	0	0	NA	NA
Modality	0	37	0	0	16	0	0	11	0	0
Total	25	182	14	4	62	6	5	53	11	11

[4] Identification of complements was based on the semantics of the matrix predicate attributable to one of the defined types (Noonan, 2007) and the presence of a verbal clause, functioning as a complement, within the same sentence.

[5] I adopt the terminology from (Noonan, 2007). *Indicative* stands for the type that most closely resembles declarative main clauses, and *subjunctive* is a cover term for non-reduced, non-declarative moods. *Reduced* complement type only allows for limited expression of participants and grammatical categories.

[6] In main clauses, the subjunctive verb form expresses deontic modality (Khan, 2016b: 113).

[7] Urmi also has a *reduced* complement type: it occurs with phasal predicates (Khan, 2016b: 192). This type is never introduced by a complementizer, so it is not discussed further.

[8] The main utterance verb in Urmi, viz. *amər* I 'say' displays grammaticalization tendencies. For that reason, only full-fledged finite forms of *amər*, as well as other utterance verbs were taken into account.

[9] Here and elsewhere in the paper, SS stands for same subject, DS for different subject.

Generally, 15% of the *indicative*-type complements have a complementizer.

Predicates of knowledge, which are often considered semi-factive (Noonan, 2007: 129; Karttunen, 1971), take a complement with a complementizer more often than any other type. Commentative predicates are virtually missing in the data, but the only found example is marked with a complementizer. Thus, for "strong" factive and semi-factive predicates, around 60% examples were found to be syndetic[10].

Utterance and propositional attitude[11] predicates, on the contrary, mostly take asyndetic complements.

The complements of perception verbs, at least in the UI and UG[12], are formally heterogeneous. They are mainly asyndetic, but sometimes a complement involves additional morphological features: an optional presentative[13] marker *ina*, copula omission or deictic copula. Deictic copulas designate "that a particular resultant state comes into the perception of the referent in question for the first time" (Khan, 2016b: 180), which entails the *state-of-affairs* immediate perception reading[14]:

(2) *xzí-l* *xa-* *nára* *+rába* *+ɟùra|*
see.PST-LS.3M one river(M) very big.M
ʾína *nášə* ***dúna*** *bədváḳa* *nùynə.*
but person(M).PL NEAR.3PL seize.PROG fish(F).PL
'He saw a very large river and people catching fish.' (A 9:2)

On the contrary, only indirect perception instances with no additional morphology were found to be occasionally marked with a complementizer. It is impossible to sort out immediate perception automatically, but if we exclude instances with special morphology, the ratio of complementizer-marked examples goes up to 19%.

Idiosyncratically, indirect polar question is the single indicative type that is always asyndetic (Khan, 2016b: 478):

(3) *xázz-ən* *b-ḳabl-ìtun-li.*
see.PRS-SS.1M FUT-accept.PRS-SS.2PL-LS.1SG
'<I have come to speak with you> to see whether you will accept me.' (A 36:5)

In the *subjunctive* type, only 5% complements are syndetic. Several examples of speech causation complements are marked with *kat*.

(4) *ʾána* *muyy-é-li* *bèta|* *mə́r-ri* *ḳa*
I bring.PST-SS(O).3PL-LS.1SG home say.PST-LS.1SG to
d-á ***ḳat-*** *ḳúdmə* *bašl-àt-lun.*
OBL-DEM1.SG COMP tomorrow cook.PRS-SS.2F-LS.3PL
'I brought them home and said to her to cook them tomorrow' (A36:15).

[10] Factive complements are known to be often syndetic, but "no researcher has found an effect based on factivity alone" (Staum, 2005: 8).

[11] "Predicates expressing positive propositional attitude are the most likely predicates to be used parenthetically" (Noonan, 2007: 125).

[12] No such morphological features were attested in the UA sample.

[13] Here, *ina* is annotated as 'but': one of its main functions is to introduce unexpected information (Khan, 2016b: 427).

[14] Immediate perception involves sentential state-of-affairs as a complement, while indirect perception complement designates a proposition (Lehmann, 2019). It is cross-linguistically common for the distinction of immediate and indirect perception to be formalized (Dik & Hengeveld, 1991).

Otherwise, the use of a subjunctive type does not seem to be automatically triggered by the matrix verb. For instance, *xašəv* I 'consider' normally takes an indicative complement, but in the example below (5) it takes a subjunctive one[15].

(5) *ʾána* *bəxšáv=ən* *brát-an* *yavv-áx-la*
I consider.PROG=1SG girl(F)-P.1PL give.PRS-SS.1PL-LS.3F
ḳa- *d- àha.*
to OBL-DEM1.SG
'I think we shall give our daughter to him' (A35(S): 5).

Desiderative verbs are mostly asyndetic in the sample: 96% instances are coreferential, and they cross-linguistically tend to be reduced[16]. However, the only complement-marked instance in the data is same-subject: due to their scarcity of the data, it is not clear whether it is a specifically UG-feature.

Modal verbs do not normally take complements headed by a complementizer.

To sum up, both the least and the most semantically bound types naturally tend to be asyndetic: neither parenthetical constructions of propositional attitude, nor constructions with modal verbs represent a full-fledged polypredication that would require a complementizer. Complementizers are concentrated in the middle of the binding hierarchy, namely around the knowledge predicates. Indirect perception complements can be treated along with them, as they are semantically and formally close, contrasting to the immediate perception complements at least in the UI and UG. *Subjunctive* complements are generally less often complement-marked than *indicative* complements, the only type that is syndetic with a certain regularity is speech causation.

1.2. Dialectal variation

Utterance complements are often *kat*-marked (18%) in the UI, and always asyndetic in the UG and UA[17]. For non-basic utterance predicates, the share of *kat*-marked complements is even higher, 50%[18]. Owing to that, the total share of syndetic complements is higher in the UI than in the other two varieties, especially UG.

In the UG, several minor features are also outstanding. First, *kat* is not used as a complementizer, particles *yanət* (*yan*) and *ṭ-i*[19] are reported to partly cover this function (Khan, 2016b: 485).

Second, within the *subjunctive* type, the complementizer *yan*(*ət*) occurs in desiderative complements that are asyndetic in the other varieties.

(6) *+xárta* R*ʾužé* R *+bayy-í=va*
then already want.PRS-SS.3PL=RETR
yán *ḳem-í=va* *ʾaz-ì=va.*
COMP rise.PRS-SS.3PL=RETR go.PRS-SS.3PL=RETR
'Then they already wanted to get up and go.' (A51:7)

[15] Cf. similar patterns for the cognate verb *xošev* in Hebrew (Noonan, 2007: 135).

[16] Cf. partly overlapping focused study of desiderative constructions on the same corpus (Khan, 2016d) that also shows that same-subject desiderative constructions tend to have less heavy marking: out of 190 desiderative constructions, 89% are same-subject and asyndetic, while within the rest 11% of different-subject constructions one complement is introduced by the complementizer *kat* (Zabelina, 2017).

[17] An additional search throughout all the texts in the Urmi of Armenia revealed only one contentious example with the verb *ǯarǯər* 'make a buzz' in the sense of 'shout'.

[18] High frequency matrix verbs discourage the presence of an overt complementizer (Staum, 2005: 12).

[19] The particle ***ṭ-i*** is used for factive complements (Khan, 2016b: 491). It is attested in the sampled data once, and even that example might be treated as relativization, so it is not counted as a basic complementizer here.

Third, a polar question complement is once attested with a conjunction *ən* ‘if’.

(7) R *í* R *+xárta ɟašúḵ-u=va ḵ̂ámxa p̂-ìd-u|*
and then look.PROG-P.3M=3.RETR flour(M) with-hand(F)-P.3M
ʾən- *jīs ḵ̂ámxa bitáy=əva.*
if- good flour(M) come.PROG=3.RETR
‘Then he checked the flour with his hand (to see) whether the flour was flowing well’. (B17:8)

In sum, the main dialectal difference is the overt complementizer marking of utterance complements that is only found in the UI. The range of semantic types that allow a complementizer is also slightly differing: in the UG, indirect polar questions and desiderative complements can at least occasionally contain complementizers. Moreover, the UG system features a formally different complementizer: probably it accounts for the subtle difference in the distribution over contexts.

2. Urmiya varieties

2.1. General features

Assyrians in the Russian village of Urmiya identify themselves with different ethnic subgroupings and speak in different varieties. Urmi is represented by two groups, conventionally differentiated here as “Old Urmi” and “New Urmi”. “Old Urmi” speakers’ ancestors came from Iran, they migrated to Urmiya around the year of its foundation (1924). There are only few senior speakers in this group living in the village now. “New Urmi” speakers migrated to Urmiya since 1990s from Georgia and Armenia. Since families of Urmi speakers in Urmiya came from Iran, Armenia and Georgia, their varieties can be compared with the three varieties examined above: the UI (“Old Urmi”), UG (“New Urmi” of Georgia), and UA (“New Urmi” of Armenia). I analyzed elicited data and checked them against the background of texts collected from “New Urmi” and “Old Urmi” speakers[20]. These texts were recorded in Urmiya in 2019 and 2021.

The morphosyntactic distinction of types (*indicative* vs. *subjunctive* vs. *reduced*) in all the Urmi varieties in Urmiya is retained. However, complementizer distribution does not coincide with any of the subsystems discussed above.

2.2. Complementizers

For the majority of the speakers and varieties, the basic complementizer is *kat*, as in the UI and UA. In several idiolects, this complementizer can surface as either *kati* or *ki*. These variants are in free variation with *kat* for all speakers who use them, so they will not be discussed further.

Another general complementizer attested only in the corpus for the Old Urmi, is *što*, borrowed from the Russian subordinator *čto*. Neither *yan* nor *ṭ-i* reported for the UG in (Khan, 2016b) are attested in our data.

Some varieties also feature specialized, semantically marked complementizers for specific contexts (see 3, for Urmi).

2.3. Distribution over contexts

The distribution based on the elicited data is absolutely uniform.

[20] The corpus of recorded narratives contains 22417 tokens at the moment of access. It is yet under construction, but later will be made available for the public use. The corpus has been created by the team of linguists studying the NENA of Urmiya, the creation has been guided by Maria Ovsjannikova.

Table 2

Distribution of complementizers in the Urmi varieties of Urmiya based on elicited data

	Old Urmi	"New Urmi" of Armenia	"New Urmi" of Georgia
utterance	*kat*	*kat*	*kat*
indirect polar question	asyndetic, WO	asyndetic, WO	asyndetic, WO
propositional attitude	*kat*	*kat*	*kat*
knowledge	*kat*	*kat*	*kat*
perception	*kat*	*kat*	*kat*
desiderative SS	*kat*	*kat*	*kat*
desiderative DS	asyndetic	asyndetic	asyndetic
speech causation	*kat*	*kat*	*kat*

However, texts recorded from the same speakers reveal some differences. In the sentential complements of propositional attitude, knowledge and certain commentative predicates, the complementizer *kat* is consistently overt in the elicited data (arguably, due to the priming effect of the stimulus in Russian). However, in the corpus, at least the complements of knowledge verbs lack a complementizer as often as feature an overt complementizer (this is true for both New Urmi of Armenia and New Urmi of Georgia)[21].

The complements of utterance verbs are less frequently introduced by *kat* even in the elicited data. Corpus data display major discrepancies. For Old Urmi, none of the 34 examples of reported speech in the corpus contained a complementizer, even though nearly all the elicited examples from the same speakers were introduced by *kat*. For the New Urmi of Armenia, 12% of the utterance complements in the corpus are syndetic. For the New Urmi of Georgia, 9% complements of this type are introduced with a complementizer *kat/ki*. Thus, in the varieties of Armenia and Georgia utterance complements are even more often complementizer-marked than in the Old Urmi, unlike the distribution attested in (Khan, 2016d).

One common feature for all the varieties in Urmiya is that indirect polar questions are never introduced by a complementizer, but instead often display a change in word order, so that the finite verb precedes the subject:

(8) *áni* *+bukə́r-run* *cáms-a* *á* *báxta*
they ask.PST-3PL can.PRS-SS.3F DEM1.SG woman(f)
bášl-a *+xálta*
cook.PRS-SS.3F food(F)
'They asked whether this woman can cook' (AGG fieldwork data).

This phenomenon might reflect the influence of Russian, where such predicate-fronting is common in polar questions. However, the Russian complementizer *li* that also occurs in these contexts has not been attested in Urmi, probably because of its non-peripheral (post-predicate) position in the clause.

In elicited data, perception complements make up a specific system, which is common for practically all the varieties. Interrogative manner words *dax*(*i*) or *muğğurra*, both meaning 'how', are consistently used to report of immediate perception (see Section 3). Indirect perception complements feature the basic complementizer *kat*.

Thus, the *indicative* type is organized similarly to the distribution presented in Section 1: complements are most regularly marked with a complementizer for verbs of knowledge, while reported speech and propositional attitude complements are normally asyndetic. However, perception

[21] In Old Urmi there were too few examples, but all were introduced by *što*.

complementation is differently organized: in elicitation, the opposition of indirect perception and immediate perception is expressed by means of different complementizers: the basic complementizer *kat* is contrasted to *dax*(*i*) or *muğğurra*, unattested in this function in the available descriptions.

The *subjunctive* type in Urmiya is fairly often marked with a complementizer *kat*. In elicited data, non-coreferential complements of the desiderative predicate *+bayyə* I 'want' (9) and speech causation (10) favour the use of a complementizer.

(9) *+ávun* *byáy=əl* ***kat*** *a* *náša*
he want.PROG=3M COMP DEM1.SG man(M)
máxxa *az-íni*
from_here go.PRS-SS.3M.LONG
'He wants this man to get out of here' (OMG fieldwork data).

(10) *áni* *+ṭlə́b-lun* ***kat*** *áyən* *zámr-a*
they ask.PST-3PL COMP she sing.PRS-SS.3F
'They asked her to sing' (AGG fieldwork data).

The morphosyntactic make-up of this type formally coincides with the purpose[22] clausal construction in Urmi (11), which reflects the semantic affinity between these contexts.

(11) *màу-u=na* | ***ka̰t-*** *+ka̰ṭl-ì-lə.*
bring.PROG-P.3M=3PL COMP kill.PRS-SS.3PL-LS.3M
'They bring him to kill him.' (A3:31)

It goes in line with the observation that "[c]onstructions used in purpose clauses are often extended to complements of manipulative and desiderative predicates due to shared semantic components of finality and intentionality <...>" (Cristofaro, 2014: 9).

In the coreferential desiderative complements, a slightly reduced morphosyntactic subtype is used instead, with no overt complementizer and no nominal subject (12).

(12) *áyən* *byáy=əla* *gášk-a* *film*
she want.PROG=3F watch.PRS-SS.3F movie
'She wants to watch a movie' (VMS fieldwork data).

However, corpus data contradict the claim that different-subject constructions tend to be complement-marked. For the New Urmi of Armenia, none of the desiderative constructions, including 4 different-subject ones, has a complementizer:

(13) *ána* *len* *+byáya* *ka* *díyy-ax* *párm-i*
I NEG.1SG want.PROG to OBL.PRON-P.2F slaughter.PRS-SS(S).3PL
'...I don't want them to slaughter you...' [210819_lii_AL_AR_ES_Zheltaya_korova]

In Old Urmi and New Urmi of Georgia, only same-subject desiderative complements were sampled. Among them, one contentious example was introduced by *kat*.

[22] Diachronically, *kat* is a marker of purpose. Presumably, it can be traced back to the object preposition *ka* and relativizer *t* (Khan, 2016b: 476).

(14) *lá* *<+bi-l...>* *+báyyə=va* *káša*
neg want.PST-LS.3M want.PRS.SS.3M=RETR priest(M)
kát *<avíva-ni>*
COMP be.PRS.SS.3M.RETR-AUG
'He didn't want to become a priest <...>' [190710_vms_MO_Poezdka_v_Echmiadzin].

Thus, desiderative complementation in Urmiya displays a tendency to differentiate same-subject and different-subject predications, which is only obvious in elicitation. Typologically[23], "optative" contexts (speech causation and complements of the verb 'want' with different subjects) are more often syndetic than same-subject desiderative constructions.

In addition to the typological considerations, we can, again, suspect the influence of Russian to play a role. In Russian, same-subject constructions have neither complementizers, nor overt subjects (15), while different-subject constructions allow overt subjects and are introduced by a special subjunctive complementizer (16), which is contrasted to the default indicative complementizer (17).

(15) *Petja* *xočet* *ujti.*
Petya want.PRS.3SG leave.INF
'Petya wants to leave'.

(16) *Petya* *xočet,* ***čtoby*** *Maša* *ušla.*
Petya want.PRS.3SG COMP.SUBJ Masha leave.PST.SG.F
'Petja wants Masha to leave.

(17) *Petya* *skazal,* ***čto*** *ujdët.*
Petya say.PST.SG.M COMP leave.FUT.3SG
'Petya said that [he] would leave'.

Thus, complements of same-subject desiderative constructions show the affinity with complements of modal verbs that have a coreferential subject and are not normally introduced with a complementizer.

The distribution of corpus data collected in Urmiya against the corpus data from (Khan, 2016d), is summarized below.

Table 3

Distribution of complementizer marking in the Urmi of Urmiya

	Old Urmi, *kat*/***što***			UI, *kat*	"New Urmi" of Armenia, *kat*			UA, *kat*	"New Urmi" of Georgia, *kat*			UG, ***yan***(***ət***)
	N	Σ	%		N	Σ	%		N	Σ	%	
utterance	0	34	**0**	18%	5	43	12	0%	4	44	9	0%
knowledge	2	2	NA	56%	4	9	44	75%	5	9	56	NA
perception	1	6	17	9%	0	16	**0**	14%	1	6	17	20%
speech causation	1	1	NA	22%	1	1	NA	NA	0	1	NA	NA
Desiderative C	1	1	NA	0%	0	12	0	0%	0	2	0	0%
desiderative NC	0	0	ND	ND	0	4	0	ND	0	0	ND	NA
Modal	0	5	0	0%	0	45	0	0%	0	11	0	0%

[23] Naturally, when there is a change of subject across subordinate clause boundaries, complementation construction tends to display heavier coding. Same-subject or coreferential complements are generally claimed to be more frequently asyndetic (Staum, 2005: 11).

To sum up, the Urmi varieties of Urmiya generally retain the Neo-Aramaic system of complementation as represented in (Khan, 2016d). However, only the general cross-linguistically established tendencies are intact in complementizer marking: namely, optional marking of *indicative* complements, with the consistent marking of factive complements. Perception complements are mostly unmarked, but a speaker can express immediate perception by using a specialized complementizer, grammaticalized from the interrogative manner word. In the *subjunctive* type, elicitation reveals a semantically motivated distribution: complementizers tend to appear in "optative" contexts where the change of subjects occurs across the clause boundary. However, this tendency is obscured in the corpus data for all the varieties, so it might be not specific for Urmiya. Regional distribution of complementizers is probably lost: *yan*(*ət*) and *ṭ-i* reported for the UG are not found in the New Urmi of Georgia as complementizers. Regional complementizer distribution patterns have also blurred: the variation is not directly accounted for by dialectal division.

3. dax as a perception complementizer

The interrogative manner word *dax*(*i*) 'how' is regularly found in elicitation of immediate perception complements, in all varieties of Urmiya.

(18) *ayən* *+bəšmay=əla* ***dax*** *bəzmar=əna* *səprə*
she hear.PROG=3F how sing.PROG=3PL bird(M).PL
'She hears birds singing'. (OMG fieldwork data).

In some cases, instead of *dax* another manner word, *muğğurra* 'how', 'what kind of' was used. There is no indication of such usages in (Khan, 2016).

(19) *ayən* *+bəšmay=əla* ***muğğurra*** *səprə* *bəzmar=əna*
she hear.PROG=3F how bird(M).PL sing.PROG=3PL
'She hears birds singing'. (OMG fieldwork data).

This usage is probably primed by the subordinator *kak* 'how' used in the Russian stimulus, but in the corpus data, a similar usage of *dax* is also found.

(20) *+xúlma* *xzí-li* ***dax*** *bəsxáy=ənva* *gu* *yáma*
dream(M) see.PST-LS.1SG how swim.PROG=1SG.RETR in sea(F)
'I saw a dream that I was swimming in the sea'. [210814_jsb_VSh_AL_Son_pro_devushek]

Similative verbs such as 'resemble' or 'be like', manner adverbials and deictics are among the most common sources of complementizer grammaticalization (Chappell, 2008: 3). The shift from the meaning 'how' to a perception complementizer[24] is, therefore, not unusual (Heine & Kuteva, 2002: 274, 258; König, 2015; Boye & Kehayov (eds.), 2016; Treis & Vanhove (eds.), 2017).

Function words are particularly prone to borrowing (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988: 74; Matras, 1998), but pattern-borrowing is generally rarer than matter-borrowing. The latter is exemplified by the complementizer *što*, borrowed from Russian: in the speech of some Old Urmi (21) as well as several non-Urmi Neo-Aramaic speakers of Urmiya, it has practically ousted *kat* as a general complementizer.

[24] Reports of perception are claimed to be "inherently more similative than reports of speech" (Meyerhoff, 2002: 252).

(21) *+purmí-li* ***što*** *zvín-u=na* R *sudyá* R
understand.PST-LS.1SG COMP buy.RES.PL-P.3M=3PL judge
'I understood that they bought (=bribed) the judge' [190708_vms_SS_Grabiteli_Rostov].

However, even in their idiolects, perception complement clauses in elicitation are introduced by *dax*, rather than Russian *kak*:

(22) *áyən* *šmí-la* ***dax*** *səprə* *bəzmár=əna*
she hear.PST-LS.3F how bird(M).PL sing.PROG=3PL
'She heard birds sing' (VMS fieldwork data).

Arguably, the *dax* pattern, even if borrowed, is conventionalized rather than situational, as a similar usage is also found in the literary Assyrian corpus (Lyavdansky et al.):

(23) *+spay* *mabyun=əva* ***dax*** *mən* *gami* *+al* *pat=ət*
good be_seen.PROG=3.RETR how from boat(F) on face(F)=REL
miyya *+musli-lun* *lodka*
water(PL) bring.down.PST-LS.3PL boat
'It was clearly seen how the boats were brought down from the ship onto the water surface' (Christian Urmi Corpus: Levedev Rovinzonь d Arxangelsq.txt)[25].

Thus, in the Urmi varieties of Urmiya, the interrogative manner word has been consistently identified with the Russian subordinator of the same meaning. It is elicited in the contexts of immediate perception for all the Urmi varieties and infrequently occurs in spontaneous speech. More research is needed to determine whether *dax* is established as an actual specialized complementizer in the Urmi of Urmiya.

4. Conclusion

The Neo-Aramaic system of complementation as represented in the Urmi of Iran, Armenia and Georgia is largely retained in all the varieties of Urmi in Urmiya. Sentential complementation patterns reflect the traces of both the inherited Semitic system and the contact influence of Russian.

Features retained in the Urmiya varieties that are common with the UI, UA and UG are as follows.

(i) Complements of modal verbs and indirect polar questions are practically always asyndetic.

(ii) Complements of immediate perception verbs are never introduced by the basic complementizer, but they can be formally differentiated by morphosyntactic means.

(ii) Complements of other semantic types are occasionally introduced by a general complementizer.

(iii) Complements of the verbs of knowledge (and, probably, all the factive predicates) are more regularly introduced with a complementizer than any other type.

The following features are specific for the varieties of Urmiya:

(i) The general complementizer is *kat* for all speakers of Urmi in the village.

(ii) In some idiolects, *što*, borrowed from Russian, is also regularly used as a complementizer in speech: it is a case of matter borrowing.

[25] The transcription is modified according to the conventions of the project, translation and glosses are mine (*E. Z.*).

(iii) Immediate perception complements can be introduced by *dax*, an interrogative manner word, putatively on its way to grammaticalization into a specialized complementizer under the influence of Russian: it is a case of pattern borrowing.

(iv) In *subjunctive* complements, complementizers tend to appear in different-subject (non-coreferential) contexts, while same-subject contexts are unmarked; this distinction is functionally motivated.

Regional distribution attested in Urmiya does not coincide with the distribution reported in (Khan, 2016a-d). The UG and UA display a different distribution in that complementizers are less frequent in *indicative* (especially utterance complements), but present in a wider range of *subjunctive* semantic types than in the UI. In Urmiya, in the speech of Assyrians from Georgia and Armenia utterance complements are marked even more often, than in the Old Urmi variety.

Thus, complementizer marking patterns are indicative of the convergence process in Urmiya and reflect the influence of Russian on the Urmi syntax, even though the basic morphosyntactic make-up of the complementation system is retained.

Abbreviations:

1,2,3 – 1,2,3 person; AUG – augment; COMP – complementizer; DEM1 – demonstrative series 1; F – feminine; FUT – future; LONG – long suffix; LS – L-series suffix; M – masculine; NEAR – near deictic copula; NEG – negative; OBL – oblique; OBL.PRON – oblique pronominal; P – possessive; PL – plural; PROG – progressive; PRS – present; PST – past; REL – relator; RES – resultative participle; RETR – retrospective shift; SG – singular; SS – S-series suffix; SS(O) – S-series object suffix; SS(S) – S-series subject suffix.

References:

Boye, Kasper, & Petar Kehayov (eds.). 2016. Complementizer semantics in European languages. De Gruyter Mouton.
Chappell, Hilary. 2008. Variation in the grammaticalization of complementizers from verba dicendi in Sinitic languages. Linguistic Typology. 12. 10.1515/LITY.2008.032.
Coghill, Eleanor. 1999. The Verbal system of North Eastern Neo-Aramaic, Dissertation for the M.Phil. Degree, Faculty of Oriental Studies, University of Cambridge.
Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. Subordination. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Cristofaro, Sonia. 2014. Complementation hierarchies and the development of complement constructions. Paper presented at the workshop 'Clausal complementation and (non)factivity', DGfS, Marburg (5 March 2014).
Givón, Thomas. 1980. The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements. Studies in language. V. 4. № 3.
Dik, Simon C. & Kees Hengeveld. 1991. The hierarchical structure of the clause and the typology of perception-verb complements. Linguistics, 29 (2), 231–259. De Gruyter Mouton.
Dixon, Robert M. W. & Aleksandra Y. Aikhenvald (eds.). 2006. Complementation. Oxford University Press.
Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. World lexicon of grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Karttunen, Lauri. 1971. Some Observations on Factivity. Pap. Linguist. 4, 55–69.
Khan, Geoffrey. 2016a. The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of the Assyrian Christians of Urmi. Vol 1. Grammar: phonology and morphology. Brill, Leiden.
Khan, Geoffrey. 2016b. The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of the Assyrian Christians of Urmi. Vol 2. Grammar: syntax. Brill, Leiden.
Khan, Geoffrey. 2016d. The Neo-Aramaic Dialect of the Assyrian Christians of Urmi. Vol 4. Texts. Brill, Leiden.
König, Ekkehard. 2015. Manner deixis as source of grammatical markers in Indo-European languages. In Carlotta Viti (ed.), Perspectives on historical syntax, 33–60. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Lehmann, Christian. 2019. Christian Lehmann's personal website. URL : https://www.christianlehmann.eu/ling/lg_system/sem/index.html?https://www.christianlehmann.eu/ling/lg_system/sem/proposition_state_of_affairs.html
Lyavdansky, Alexey et al. Christian Urmi Corpus. (Available online at: neo-aramaic.web-corpora.net/urmi_corpus/search).
Matras, Yaron. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. Linguistics, 36, 281–331.
Meyerhoff, Miriam. 2002. All the same? The emergence of complementizers in Bislama. In T. Güldemann, and M. von Roncador (eds), Reported Discourse. A meeting ground for different linguistic domains. Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 341–363.
Noonan, Michael. Complementation. In Shopen T. (ed.). Language Typology and Syntactic Description. V. 2: Complex Constructions. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. P. 52–151.

Schmidtke-Bode, Karsten. 2014. Complement clauses and complementation systems: A cross-linguistic study of grammatical organization. Doctoral dissertation, Thüringer Universitäts-und Landesbibliothek Jena.
Staum, Laura. 2005. When Stylistic and Social Effects Fail to Converge: a variation study of complementizer choice. Ms., Stanford University.
Thomason, Sarah G. & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. Language contact, creolization and genetic linguistics. Berkeley University of California Press.
Treis, Yvonne & Martine Vanhove (eds.). 2017. Similative and equative constructions: A cross-linguistic perspective (Vol. 117). John Benjamins.
Zabelina, Elizaveta. 2017. Morfosintaksis sentencial'nyh aktantov pri predikate 'xotet'' v urmijskom novoaramejskom [Morphosyntax of complements of the verb 'want' in Urmi Neo-Aramaic]. In Zabelina, Logvinova (eds.). Semnadtsataya Konferentsiya po tipologii i grammatike dlya molodykh issledovateley. Tezisy dokladov [17th Conference on Typology and Grammar for Young Scholars. Abstracts] (Saint Petersburg, 19–21 November 2020). St. Petersburg: Institute for Linguistic Studies, RAS. 42–45.

Zabelina Elizaveta Aleksandrovna, PhD student.
Institute for Linguistic Studies, Russian Academy of Sciences.
9 Tuchkov lane, St. Petersburg, Russia, 199053.
E-mail: windmill161@gmail.com

Материал поступил в редакцию 25 августа 2022 г.

Е. А. Забелина

РАСПРЕДЕЛЕНИЕ КОМПЛЕМЕНТАЙЗЕРОВ В УРМИЙСКОМ ИДИОМЕ СЕЛА УРМИЯ

Анализируется распределение комплементайзеров по семантическим контекстам в новоарамейском урмийском идиоме, представленном в селе Урмия (Краснодарский край). Семьи носителей в основном родом из Ирана, Армении и Грузии, поэтому оформление сентенциальных дополнений в урмийском Урмии сопоставляется с оформлением в соответствующих региональных разновидностях этого идиома. Варьирование, наблюдаемое в Урмии, напрямую не объясняется исходным диалектным членением. По-видимому, региональные различия, выявляемые в данных по другим разновидностям, нивелированы: так, особый комплементайзер, характерный для урмийского Грузии, в Урмии не засвидетельствован, а распределение по семантическим контекстам в элицитации совершенно однородно. Корпусные данные отражают различия между группами носителей, но они не совпадают с теми различиями, которые определяются для других региональных вариантов урмийского. Кроме того, в урмийском Урмии наблюдаются некоторые инновации. К примеру, противопоставление непосредственного и опосредованного восприятия может быть выражено с помощью разных комплементайзеров: основного и специализированного. Специализированный комплементайзер, вероятно, находится на пути грамматикализации из вопросительного союза со значением 'как': типологически ожидаемое, но не засвидетельствованное еще в урмийском функциональное развитие, требующее дополнительного исследования. Кроме того, по данным элицитации, распределение комплементайзеров в субъюнктиве имеет функциональное обоснование: при прочих равных, скорее разносубъектные конструкции маркируются комплементайзером, чем односубъектные. В корпусных данных эта тенденция менее заметна. Эти инновации могут отчасти объясняться влиянием русского языка, которое проявляется как в заимствовании языкового материала, так и в заимствовании языковой структуры (matter- and pattern-borrowing). Однако в целом это влияние достаточно поверхностное и затрагивает оформление сентенциальных дополнений, но не их структуру. Таким образом, распределение комплементайзеров в урмийском Урмии отличается от распределений в других разновидностях, отражая влияние языковых контактов, притом что основные унаследованные структурные особенности сохраняются неизменными.

Keywords: *комплементайзеры, языковые контакты, функциональная типология, системные заимствования, грамматикализация, северо-восточный неоарамейский, урмийский язык.*

Забелина Елизавета Александровна, аспирант.
Институт лингвистических исследований Российской академии наук.
Пер. Тучков, 9, г. Санкт-Петербург, 199053.
E-mail: windmill161@gmail.com