

My paper deals with adnominal possession marking in ʤuroyo language (Semitic > Neo-Aramaic). There are two sets of possessive suffixes (table 1).

Set I			Set II		
	SG	PL		SG	PL
3m	-e		3m	-ayde	
3f	-a	-ayye	3f	-ayda	-atte
2m	-ux		2m	-aydux	
2f	-ax	-ayxu	2f	-aydax	-atxu
1	-i	-an	1	-aydi	-aydan

Table 1: Adnominal possession suffixes.

The first set is a retention, it preserves the shape of Aramaic pronominal suffixes, and the second set is a later development, which was formed, presumably, by adding *yđ*, the stem of the noun ‘hand’, as a postposition. The first set cannot be used with the article, while with the second one it is obligatory.

- (1) abr-ux / \*u+abr-ux  
son-POSS1.2MS / \*ART.M.S.+son-POSS1.2MS  
‘Your son’
- (2) ono u+abr-aydax=no / \*abr-aydax  
I ART.M.S.+son-POSS2.2FS=COP.1S / \*son-POSS2.2FS  
‘I am your son’ (RT 61/330)

The second set is productive, while the use of the first set is restricted to nouns of Aramaic origin or those adapted to Aramaic morphology. These nouns belong to three semantic classes, body parts, kinship terms and inherent properties. One may think that the distribution of these suffixes is associated with (in)alienability (cf. Nichols 1988), however, it is rather related to morphosyntactic features of a certain noun. Consider these examples:

- (3) u+gazluz-aydi / \*gazluz-i  
ART.M.S.+chin-POSS2.1SG / \*chin-POSS1.1SG  
‘My chin’ (p.c.)
- (4) i+ġenik-aydi / \*ġenik-i  
ART.F.S.+temple-POSS2.1SG / \*temple-POSS1.1SG  
‘My temple’ (p.c.)

Thus, nouns referring to body parts do not take the first set, against what might be expected. Therefore, I do not use terms ‘inalienable’ and ‘alienable’. Instead of that, following [Karvovskaya 2018], I use the notions of idiosyncratic and non-idiosyncratic strategies.

In [Jastrow 1967] it is claimed that these sets may be used interchangeably with body parts, kinship terms and inherent properties in the dialect of Midin. My study is based on data of the Kfarze dialect of ʤuroyo, where the situation is different from that of Midin. I focus on nominals with part-whole semantics, mostly body parts. Based on the data I assembled, I distinguish four semantic groups (table 2).

[+COUNT, ≥ 3]	[+COUNT, ≤ 2]	[+COUNT, 1]	[-COUNT]
ʤaršo (tooth)	ʤayno (eye)	foto (face)	
šawʤo (finger)	iđo (hand)	femo (mouth)	šaʤro (hair)
ʤafro (nail), etc	barko (knee), etc	hašo (back)	
		lebo (heart), etc	

Table 2: Semantic groups for nominals indicating part-whole relations.

With the first group of nominals the distribution seems to be as follows:

1. PossP [+sg]<sup>1</sup> – the first set is preferable
2. PossP [+pl, -num] – the first set is preferable
3. PossP [+pl, +num, -partitive] – the second set is preferable
4. PossP [+pl, +num, +partitive] – the first set is preferable

Consider an example (context: Nuri and Simon had a fight. Nuri hit Simon):

- (5) twər-le tloto+šawʤ-ote me did-e / \*a+tloto+šawʤ-ot-ayde  
break.PRET-A.3MS three+finger-PL of POSS-3MS / \*ART.M.S.+3+finger-PL-POSS2.3MS  
‘He broke three fingers of his’

In this sentence, if one uses the second set with a numeral, it will mean that Nuri had only three fingers. If a noun denotes a pair entity, [+COUNT, ≤ 2], same rules may apply to it, although specific pragmatic context is required to use a numeral with it. For instance,

(context: Ephrem comes to Isa and says: ‘Have you heard? Maryam fell off the roof and broke her forearms!’ Ephrem asks:)

- (6) hđo druʤ-o twir-o aw at+tarte druʤ-on-ayda?  
one.f forearm-SG break.PST.PASS-F OR ART.PL+two.f forearm-PL-POSS2.3FS  
‘Have both of her forearms been broken or just one?’

With two last groups, [+COUNT, 1], [-COUNT] the usage of first set is preferred, even if there are several objects. (context: I went into the forest and saw many trees there.)

- (7) qar -ayye kul-le yaróqo=wa  
top-POSS1.3PL all-p green=be.PST.3MS  
‘All of their tops were green’

In the talk I will suggest an analysis of syntactic structures for both POSS1 and POSS2 constructions and illustrate how they combine with quantifiers.

<sup>1</sup>PossP — noun phrase with a possessive construction, +sg means that possessee is singular, +pl – plural respectively. +num indicates that there is a numeral in the construction, +part denotes partitive construction, e.g. ‘three of his fingers’

## References

1. Jastrow, O. (1967). Laut- und Formenlehre des neuaramäischen Dialekts von Miḏin im Tur 'Abdin. (Doctoral dissertation). Saarbrücken.
2. Karvovskaya, E. (2018). The typology and formal semantic of adnominal possession. Leiden University.
3. Nichols, J. (1988). On alienable and inalienable possession. In Honor of Mary Haas, 557–610. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110852387.557>
4. RT – Ritter, H. (1969). Ṭuroyo. Die Volkssprache Der Syrischen Christen Des Ṭūr-'Abdīn. A: Texte, Band II. Steiner.