IJDL

International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction

15th Volume (2018)

|peniope|
München

IJDL - International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction
is edited by Eugen Hill, Martin Kümmel and Stefan Schumacher.

Address of editorial office:
Institut für Sprachwissenschaft (Indogermanistik)
Universität Wien
Sensengasse 3a
1090 Wien
Austria

IJDL is published semi-annually in June and December. Annual subscription rate is 44 Euro including VAT, excluding shipping costs. Please order at your bookseller or at the publisher: Verlag Anja Urbanek, Straubinger Str. 30g, 80687 München, Germany, tel +49-(0)89-88 98 89 01, fax +49-(0)89-88 98 89 02, anja@peniope.de.

|peniope| Verlag Anja Urbanek
www.peniope.de

editors-in-chief: Eugen Hill, Martin Kümmel, Stefan Schumacher (address see above)
printing and binding: CPI buchbücher.de GmbH, Zum Alten Berg 24, 96158 Birkach
Printed in Germany • ISSN 1614-5291

Klasse Person

Festschrift für Wolfgang Schulze
anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstags
am 29. Januar 2018

Herausgegeben von Andreas Hölzl & Peter-Arnold Mumm

International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction 15 (2018): 45–69

Relation of agreement clitics to verb stems in Caucasian Albanian[1]

by Alice C. Harris and John Duff

Abstract: The ancient Biblical translations recently published as *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai* (Gippert, Schulze, et al. 2009, *CAPMS*) provide the first large corpus of Caucasian Albanian (CA), an extinct member of the Nakh-Daghestanian language family. The language is notable for a complex system of clitics, including person markers very similar to those found in Udi, a modern language of the same family (Harris: 2002). These clitics can occur in a wide variety of positions, including enclitic to the verb or enclitic to certain verb-external elements. Examining the distribution of these two clitic positions within *CAPMS*, we observe frequent variation in placement. This variation contrasts with the tightly restricted, prioritized system for clitic placement proposed for Udi by Harris (2002). The evidence examined here suggests a semi-prioritized system of preference, but not determination, for the position of the person-marking clitic in CA. The study confirms and further explains the statement by the editors of *CAPMS* that the clitic is more tightly bound to the verb in CA than in Udi.

Keywords: Caucasian Albanian, Aluan, Udi, clitics, person marking.

The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai (henceforth *CAPMS*) published by Wolfgang Schulze and his colleagues in 2008, is a rich compendium of information on the Caucasian Albanian (CA) language. In a single place it provides information on the unique writing system of CA and on the physical status of texts found in St. Catherine's Monastery on Mt. Sinai in 1975, the texts themselves, a grammar of the language of the texts, an index of words and forms used in the texts, and more. Our chief interest is in the grammar; although relatively compact, it is thorough and accurate.

We were interested by the following statement; emphasis added.

[1] We are grateful to Brian Joseph and Craig Melchert for comments on this project.

(1) CA clauses reveal an agreement pattern that comes close to that of Modern Udi. This means that agreement clitics are used in a bipolar sense here: They agree with the subject or (less often) an object of the clause and focus their cliticisation host. Contrary to Udi, however, **agreement clitics are strongly bound to verbal stems in CA**, as long as they do not have copular function. (*CAPMS*, II–52)

In this paper we elaborate on the statement presented in bold above, synthesizing the evidence from *CAPMS* with Harris's (2002) extensive work on the clitics of Udi. Our goal is to present a detailed descriptive account of the differences in clitic placement which the authors allude to. We assume that the authors mean by the phrase "strongly bound" that clitics "lean on" the verb stem more often than in Udi.

In section 1 below, we describe the clitics of Udi and those of CA, drawing for the latter exclusively on *CAPMS*. From this we turn in section 2 to a description of the positions of clitics, that is the "strength of the bonds between clitics and verb stems", in Udi. This turns out to revolve around three types of sentences associated with extra-verbal clitics - those with negative particles, questioned constituents, and (other) focused items. We show in sections 3 and 4 that clitics in CA occur in essentially the same positions as in Udi. However, in sections 5 and 6 we discuss one difference between the clitic distributions in the two languages, in cases of questioned constituents and other focused items. All of this is consistent with *CAPMS* and elaborates on it. In section 7 we consider the possible influence of the textual sources. Section 8 provides a brief conclusion.

As placement of clitics in subordinate clauses is somewhat different, this study is limited to placement of clitics in main clauses. We have included only those portions of the palimpsests that were transcribed from the source with confidence, signified by black printing in *CAPMS*. Further, although a variety of clitics appear in our examples, our generalizations relate only to subject person markers (PMs), the clitics that persist into Udi.

1. Agreement clitics in Udi

Udi possesses a set of person-number clitics which reflect cases.

	Nominative-Ergative	Dative	Genitive
1 Singular	*zu*	*za*	*bez*
2 Singular	*nu*	*va*	*vi*
3 Singular	*ne*	*t'u*	*t'a*
1 Plural	*yan*	*ya*	*beš*
2 Plural	*nan*	*va, va^{ʕ}n*	*e^{ʕ}f*
3 Plural	*q'un*	*q'o*	*q'o*

Table 1. Person Agreement Clitics in Vartašen Udi

These are often referred to as person markers, PMs. There are several other clitics in Udi and many others in CA. Only one of these, *=q̇a* [hortative, future], is discussed below. In this paper we examine the nominative-ergative and dative sets in CA.

As *CAPMS* notes, in CA, the third person marker *-ne* is used for both singular and plural. Further, this marker is optional, as shown in (2), as made clear in Gippert, Schulze et al. (2008: II-53). Other person markers are also sometimes omitted; an example occurs in (44).

(2) *Rakelen* *voe-ķa-hē* *ġarmol* *ičē*[2]
Rakel-en voe-ķ-a=h-e-y[3] ɣar-mo-l iče-y
Rachel-ERG weeping-say-TV-be-TV-PST child-PL-ON self-GEN
Rachel wept over her children' (Mt 2: 18)

[2] All CA examples in this paper are from the texts in *CAPMS*. The first line of each example shows the text as represented in *CAPMS*, while the second line represents our analysis. In the second line, a hyphen indicates a boundary that we believe to be that of a constituent morpheme, while an equal sign (=) indicates a boundary with what we believe to be a clitic. Morpheme-internal clitics in Udi are bracketed with <...>. Some consonants of CA, e.g. *ķ* and *q̇*, are the same as (or cognate to) the intensives or ejectives that Harris (2002) transcribes with an apostrophe, e.g. *k'* and *q'*. Others, e.g. *ġ*, represent a different sound, in this case [ɣ].

[3] Cliticized *=(i)h-e-y* forms a periphrastic imperfect. In the rest of the article we will abbreviate by using just *=hē* , glossed as IMPF. The same form occurs as a light verb, and in those instances we gloss it as 'be' with its affixes.

(As an aside we should note that most readers will find it odd that a clitic, such as *=h* in this example, may occur closer to the root, here *ḳ-* 'say', than affixes, *-e*, *-y*. *CAPMS* analyzes *=h* (*ihesown* 'be') as a verb with its own suffixes which has cliticized to the main verb 'say', and we agree that this appears to be true. Therefore we tentatively show these also as clitics. A similar issue arises in (25) regarding a pronoun, *o* 'he' with the dative case marker *-u* and in other examples. Again we agree that the whole appears to cliticize to the verb.)

Basic word order in Udi is SOV, but the order is very flexible. It is important that focused elements generally occur immediately before the verb. This is illustrated in (3–5) for negatives, question words, and other focused constituents.

(3) *Taral* *te=ne* *čur-exa*[4] (Taral)
lazy NEG=3SG stay-LV.PRS
'Taral [the name means 'lazy'] does not stay.'

(4) *baba* *evaxt'* *eɣ-al=a* (Taral)
father.ABS when come-FUTII=Q3SG
'When will Father come?'

(5) *mal=zu* *bɣa-b-sa* *xe* *sun-t'-i=q'an* (Taral)
wares=1SG find-LV-PRS water some-OBL-GEN=AND
' "…wares I will find and some water."'

In (3–5), the negative marker, question word, and the other focused element are underlined. Each immediately precedes the finite verb.

Case marking is generally ergative-absolutive, but in Udi definite direct objects are in the dative rather than absolutive.

(6) *q'ačal-ɣ-o-n* *bez* *täng-in-ax* *bašq'-al=q'un*
thief-PL-OBL-ERG my money-OBL-DAT steal-FUTII=3PL
'Thieves will steal my money.'

[4] "Taral" is the title of an unpublished text. Udi examples not otherwise attributed are from Harris's fieldwork.

In (6), 'money' is definite, and it must occur in the dative case. (3–4) above illustrate absolutive subjects of intransitive verbs, and (5) illustrates an absolutive indefinite direct object.

2. The bonds between clitics and verb stems in Udi

Clitics in Udi can occur in four positions: (i) enclitic to the verb, (ii) endoclitic in the verb, in intermorphemic position, (iii) endoclitic in the verb, in intramorphemic position, and (iv) external to the verb. The distinction between (ii) and (iii) is whether the clitic occurs between morphemes or inside the root morpheme. The conditions on the occurrence of each of these are strict (Harris 2002, 2008). These four are illustrated in (7–10), respectively, from Harris (2002). Clitics are in bold.

(7) *sa* *käsib-un* *k'u*[*a*] *ta-γ-a=**s*** (Taral)
one poor-GEN house.DAT go-LV-SUBJVI=**1SG**
'[it is better that] I go to a poor house'

(8) *t'ošama-**ne**-p-e* *mähl-in-a* (Taral)
sweep=**3SG**=LV-AORII yard-OBL-DAT
'[the king's wife] swept the yard'

(9) *käi-te* *ba<**ne**>k-e* (Taral)
dawn-that be$_1$<**3SG**>be$_2$-AORII
'when it became dawn'

(10) *ma=**z*** *ta-γ-o* (Taral)
where=**1SG** go-LV-FUTI
'where will I go?'

We assume that the allusion in (1) to the agreement clitics being more "strongly bound" to the verb stem in CA than in Udi is a reference to environment (iv), illustrated in (10), and in this section we explore that environment more fully.

If the verb in Udi stands in the future II, the subjunctive I, the subjunctive II, or the imperative, the PM must be enclitic to the verb, no matter what other conditions exist. This is referred to as Rule 1; an example is given in (11).

(11)	*uk'-a=i=**n***	*p'uran*	*mand-a*	*nu*	*irazi*	*bak-a=**n***
	say-SUBJVI-PAST=**2SG**	again	stay-PURP	NEG	agreement	be-SUBJVI=**2SG**

'You should say you will not agree to stay again.'

The verbs of the two clauses are in the subjunctive II (subjunctive I + *-i*) and subjunctive I, both tenses of Rule 1, and the PMs are enclitic to the verbs.

If the verb is not in one of the tenses named in Rule 1, the agreement clitics must occur outside the verb under any one of three conditions: (a) the clause or the verb is negated, (b) the clause is a content question, (c) a constituent other than the verb or sentence is focused. These conditions are presented in this order because (a) takes precedence over (b) and (c), and (b) takes precedence over (c) (Harris 2002).

There are three (or more) negative particles in Udi: *ma* prohibitive, *nu*/*nut*/*nut'* used with certain tenses, and the more neutral *te*. As mentioned above, the normal order for negatives in Udi is immediately before the verb, as in (12a); rarely the negative immediately follows the verb, as in (12b).

(12)	a.	*nana-n*	*te=**ne***	*buˁya-b-e*	*p'aˁ*	*ačik'alšey*
		mother-ERG	NEG=**3SG**	find-DO-AORII	two	toy.ABS
		'Mother did not find two toys.'				
	b.	*nana-n*	*buˁya-b-e*	*te=**ne***	*p'aˁ*	*ačik'alšey*
		mother-ERG	find-do-AORII	NEG=**3SG**	two	toy.ABS
		'Mother did not find two toys.'				

The PM is required to be enclitic to the negative in either position. Under no circumstances can a word intervene between the negative and the verb in Udi (Harris 2002). We can see that the negative, together with its clitics, is a separate word, not part of the verb, by the fact that it can move, as in (12). In addition, in languages in general, consultants are generally unwilling to repeat part of a word. Yet Udi consultants can say *te=ne* without the verb, confirming that in Udi *te* is not part of the verb.

A clitic *=q'a* forms a subjunctive together with a verb in the aorist I tense (with the suffix *–i*) in Udi. When *=q'a* occurs, it is always immediately before the PM. Example (13) shows this clitic following the negative particle *ma* and immediately preceding the PM *=n(e)*.

(13) *göle* *ma=**q'a=n*** *box-ec-i* (Recipe 4: 14)
much NEG=**SUBJV=3SG** boil-LV-AORI
'It should not boil much.'

The clitic sequence *=q'a=*PM occurs in positions (ii-iv) described above.

Questioned constituents must immediately precede the verb in Udi, as illustrated in (14).

(14) *okt'omber-a* *evaxt'=**t'u*** *täy-sa?*
Okt'omber-DAT when=**2SG** thither-PRS
'When are you going to Okt'omber?'

Unless the verb is in one of the tenses named in Rule 1 or a negative is present, the PM must be enclitic to the questioned constituent. In (14) the /n/ of the second person singular clitic *=nu* assimilates to the preceding [t'].

Other focused constituents must also immediately precede the verb, as we saw in example (5). And here, too, the PM is obligatorily enclitic to the focused constituent unless there is a Rule 1 environment, a negative, or a question word. Harris (2002) refers to the rule that requires the PM to be outside the verb in these three environments as Rule 2, and we adopt that terminology here. Additional examples for each type of focus can be found in Harris (2002, 2008).

Thus, the PM in Udi is enclitic to the verb (environments (i) above), if the verb is in the future II, the subjunctive I, the subjunctive II, or the imperative. In other tense-aspect-mood categories (TAMs) it stands outside the verb, enclitic to a focused element (including a negator or questioned constituent). We do not discuss the two, lower ranked, endoclitic positions in this paper. One might say that the PM is tightly bound to the verb in environments (i-iii) and less tightly bound in the fourth environment, when it is outside the verb. We understand (1) as stating that PMs occur outside the verb in CA less often than in Udi, and our goal in this paper is to show why this is true.

In §3 we take up the equivalent of Rule 1 in CA. Equivalents of Rules 2a, 2b, and 2c in CA are discussed in §§4, 5, and 6, respectively. We find that all of these exist in CA, but the interaction of Rules 2b and 2c in particular is not yet set in the grammar.

3. Tense-Aspect-Mood contexts (Rule 1) in CA

In CA if a verb form is in the present or imperative TAM, the PM must be enclitic to the verb form.[5] We tentatively believe that the imperfect TAM and the future formed with the future participle also belong in this category, but we have few examples that are relevant to determining this (some are presented elsewhere in this paper). Henceforth we refer only to the present and imperative as definitively Rule 1 contexts. In contrast, the past (aorist) and pluperfect are clearly not Rule 1 contexts.

Noorlander and Stilo (2015) show that in CA/Udi and in other unrelated languages in this linguistic area (including Aramaic, Armenian, and some Iranian languges) zero-marked present tenses such as that in CA regularly become subjunctives. Stilo and Noorlander (2015) show that in many of these languages a past converter, derived in CA from the verb *ihesown* 'be', forms various past tenses, including in CA/Udi the imperfect. Thus, while the names of the tenses in Rule 1 in CA differ somewhat from those in Rule 1 in Udi, the forms are much the same. The imperative (and possibly the participial future) occurs in Rule 1 in both CA and Udi. The present tense of Rule 1 in CA became the subjunctive I of Rule 1 in Udi, and the imperfect (which may be a Rule 1 tense in CA) became the subjunctive II, which is certainly a Rule 1 tense in Udi.

Further, CA and Udi differ in that the position enclitic to the verb is the default in CA; in Udi it is doubtful that there is true default position. Examples (15–16) show the effects of Rule 1 in CA.

(15) *in'a-iha-**nown***
in'a-ih-a=**nun**
peaceful-be-TV.IMP=**2PL**
'be reconciled' (Mt 5: 24)

(16) *zow-al* *vas* *owḳa-z*
zu=al vas u-ḳ-a=**z**
I=AND you.DATII word-say-TV.PRS=**1SG**
'I will also say to you' (Mt 16: 18)

[5] This statement does not apply to zero copulas. In CA zero copulas, there is no phonologically-present verb form, and instead the PM seems to be enclitic to the focus of the clause.

In (15), the PM *–nown* immediately follows the verb, *in'aiha-*, while in (16), the PM *–z(u)* is enclitic to the verb *owk'a*.

4. Negative contexts (Rule 2a) in CA

4.1 Simple contexts

Our interest is in the position external to the verb, because it is there that the bond between clitics and the verb stem could be said to be weak in Udi, as discussed in §2. To distinguish the rules that require or permit PMs to be outside the verb from the rule that requires PMs to be enclitic to the verb in certain tense-aspect-mood categories, we continue to refer to these as Rule 2 and Rule 1, respectively.

As in the modern language, in CA negation requires the PM to be outside the verb. CA possesses the same negators as Udi, including *ma*, *now* and *nowt,* and *te.* As in Udi, each normally precedes the verb, and the PM is enclitic to it. The negators *ma* and *te* are illustrated in (17–19); the negators *now* and *nowt* are discussed separately below.

(17) *ma-**q̇a-nan**-baha-båhē* *ćowdown* *üwxownax̣*
ma=**q̇a=nan** baha-bå(h)-e-y ćudu-n üwxun-ax̣
PROHIB=**HORT=2PL** in-go-TV-PST heaven-GEN kingdom-DATIII
'you will not enter the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 5: 20)[6]

(18) *te-**zow**-ari* *šad-biyesa*
te=**zu** ar-i šad-biy-e-sa
NEG=**1SG** come.PST-PST loose-do-TV-INF
'I have not come to dissolve…' (Mt 5: 17)

(19) *te-**n ˜n**-ʕi-biq̇ay*
te=**n ˜n** ʕi-biq̇-a-y
NEG-**2PL** ear-receive-TV-PST
'you have never listened' (J 5: 37)

In (17), the PM *=nan* [2PL] is enclitic to the negator *ma*, together with the hortative/future enclitic *=q̇a* (equivalent to Udi *=q'a* SUBJUNCTIVE). Past

[6] Two versions of this verse appear in *CAPMS*. In the other version, the clitic *=q̇a* is missing. This is probably an error.

tense stems are formed in two ways; some verbs require *-e* as the thematic vowel, while others require *-a* (Gippert, Schulze, et al. 2008: II–44). All verbs require the past tense marker, *-y*. The verb in (17) requires *-e* (and past tense + *=q̇a* forms the modal future). The verb in (18) is irregular, and the verb in (19) requires the thematic marker *-a*. Thus, these examples show that verbs of both regular types and irregular verbs all occur in environments where the PM moves to the negator.

The examples in (20) make a perfect minimal pair, with (20a) showing the typical order in an affirmative, and (20b) the typical order in a negative.

(20) a. *ta-båhē-**q̇a-n***
ta-båh-e-y=**q̇a=ne**
away-go-TV-PST=**HORT=3**
'(they) will pass away' (Mt 24: 35)

b. *ma-**q̇a-n**-ta-båhē*
ma=**q̇a=n(e)** ta-båh-e-y
PROHIB=**HORT=3** away-go-TV-PST
'(they) will not pass away' (Mt 24: 35)

Notice that in (20b) the clitic *=q̇a* immediately follows *ma* and immediately precedes the PM, just as in (13) from the modern language. Similarly, in (18) the PM immediately follows *te*, just as in Udi (12). We argue below that the negators *ma* and *te* and the clitics that follow them constitute a word distinct from the verb and its affixes and clitics.

Note first that negators and verbs are distinct words in Udi, as discussed in §2. There is also specific evidence in CA that negators are not part of the verbal word. Examples (21-24) show that clausal negation can occasionally be separated from the verb.

(21)	*sa*	*zow*	*te*	*ġowšowy-ġaraχoc*	*heq̇al-**zow***	*powlaygan*
	sa	zu	te	ɣušuy-ɣar-aχ-oc	heq̇-al=**zu**	pulaygan
	but	I	NEG	man-son-DATIII-ABL[7]	receive-PTCP.FUT=**1SG**	testimony.ABS

'But I shall not receive testimony from mankind….' (J 5: 34)

[7] In Nakh-Daghestanian languages, it is common to have two cases on a single noun.

(22) *te* *Mowsen-**ne**-v^{ʕ}a-daġē* *śowm* *ćowdowaχoc*
te Muse-n=**ne** vʕa daɣ-e-y śum ćudu-aχ-oc
NEG Moses-ERG=**3** you(PL).DATI give-TV-PST bread.ABS heaven-DATIII-ABL
'Moses did not give to you bread from heaven' (J 6: 32)

(23) *ma-**ġa-v^{ʕ}a**-eṭowaχay-ġüwe-hē* *å ˜aχ ˜c*
ma=**ġa=vʕa** eṭuaχay ġüw(e)-(i)h-e-y å ˜aχ- ˜c
PROHIB=**HORT=2PL.DATI** therefore afraid-be-TV-PST them.DATIII-ABL
'therefore do not be afraid of them'(Mt 10: 26)

(24) *te-**ne**-išow-al-å ˜aχoc-mowç' ˜r-hē*
te=**ne** išu=al å ˜aχ-oc muç' ˜r-(i)h-e-y
NEG=**3** anyone=AND them.DATIII-ABL clean-be-TV-PST
'and no one of them was cleansed'(L 4: 27)

Examples (21–22) both represent contrastive focus, which is discussed below. For present purposes they show that *te* is an independent word. In (21), for example, *te* negates 'from mankind'; in this sense the meaning is rather 'but it is not from mankind that I shall receive testimony'. (On the failure of *=zu* to cliticize to *te* see §4.2.) The verbs in (23) and (24) are complex, each consisting of the light verb *(i)hesown* 'be' and an incorporated adjective -- *ġüw(e)* 'afraid' and *mowç' ˜r* 'clean', respectively. Cross-linguistically it is rare for a verb to incorporate (in the sense of noun incorporation, as used here) a second element. Further, verbs are likely to incorporate adjectives and generic nouns, but not clausal conjunctions such as *eṭuaχay* 'therefore' or indefinite pronouns such as *išu* 'anyone' (Mithun 1984, 1986, Baker 1985, 1988, 1996, Rosen 1989, 1990, Jacques 2012, among other sources). Additional examples showing *te* as a separate word even when it is a clausal negator, are (30–32) below, while (27–29) show *ma* as a separate word under similar circumstances.

Thus we have argued that the negatives *ma* (prohibitive) and *te* (general negation) are distinct words that precede a finite verb form, and that the PM is generally enclitic to them (Rule 2a).

We have postponed the discussion of the negative particles *now* and *nowt* because they are a little different. Unlike the others, they may be used as privative prefixes (not illustrated here). Also, just as the English auxiliaries *is* and *would* may cliticize or not (*she's* beside *she is*, *you'd* beside *you*

would), the CA negative *now* (and perhaps *nowt*) can procliticize to vowel-initial verbs, being reduced to *n-*, as in (25) and (26).

(25) *n-aa-oow-hē*
n=aa=o-u=hē
NEG=know=3SG.M-DATI=IMPF
'he did not know' (lit. 'he was not knowing') (Acts 12: 9)

(26) *n-owḳa-**ġa-žan***
n=u-ḳ-a=**ġa=žan**
NEG=word-say-TV=**HORT=1PL**
'let's not say' (2 Cor 9: 4)

The negators *ma* and *te*, on the other hand, do not cliticize to the verb.

4.2 Rule interaction

As in Udi, Rule 1 trumps Rule 2a. That is, if the clause is in one of the Rule 1 TAM categories (present or imperative) and contains a negative, it will follow Rule 1, not Rule 2a. In (27–29) the PMs cliticize to the verb, not to the negative.

(27) *ma-ġüw-biya-**nan*** *å˜aχoc*
ma ġüw-biy-a=**nan** å˜aχ-oc
PROHIB afraid-do-TV.IMP=**2PL** them.DATIII-ABL
'do not be afraid of them' (Mt 10: 28)

(28) *ma-båa-**nan***
ma bå-a=**nan**
PROHIB think-TV.IMP=**2PL**
'do not think' (Mt 5: 17)

(29) *ma-owṗa-**nan**-ḳa*
ma uṗ-a=**nan**=ḳa
PROHIB kill-TV.IMP=**2PL**=QUOT
'[it was said to the ancestors] "you shall not kill"' (Mt 5: 21)

The prohibitive negator *ma* is used in two contexts – the modal future, where it occurs together with the clitic *=ġa*, and the imperative, where it lacks *=ġa*. The latter is one of the TAM categories definitely included in

Rule 1 (see section 3), and hence examples with *ma* but without *=q̇a* have the PM enclitic to the verb, as seen in (27-29), while in those examples that have both *ma* and *=q̇a* these are enclitic to the negator, as in (23).

Notice that (27) forms an almost perfect minimal pair with (23). In (23), the light verb is *(i)hesown* 'be, become', and it has the past tense form (thematic vowel *-e* plus *-y*), which permits Rule 2a to apply in this instance. In (27), on the other hand, the verb is *biyesown* 'do, make'; this verb form is in the imperative, which requires Rule 1 to apply, overriding Rule 2a.

Examples below show that Rule 1 also applies with the negator *te*, so that in the designated tenses, the PMs must be enclitic to the verb, not to the negator *te*. (21) is repeated here as (31).

(30)	*te*	*ē*	*ḳa-**žan***	*žan*	*Samaraown-n ˜n*	*vown*
	te	ē	ḳ-a=**žan**	žan	Samaraun=nun	vun
	NEG	well	say-TV.PRS=**1PL**	we	Samaritan=2SG	you

'"don't we say well (that) you are a Samaritan?"' (J 8: 48)

(31)	*sa*	*zow*	*te*	*ġowšowy-ġaraχoc*	*heq̇al-**zow***	*powlaygan*
	sa	zu	te	ɣušuy-ɣar-aχ-oc	heq̇-al=**zu**	pulaygan
	but	I	NEG	man-son-DATIII-AB	receive-PTCP.FUT=**1SG**	testimony.ABS

'But I shall not receive testimony from mankind….' (J 5: 34)

Thus, in negative present and imperative, clitics are in the default position, enclitic to the verb (Rule 1); in other TAMs, PMs are enclitic to the negator (Rule 2a). Clearly these rules are incompletely settled into the grammar, and there are occasional examples where the expected order is not found. One is in example (32).

(32)	*te-**ne**-bow*		*išow*
	te=**ne**	bu	išu
	NEG=**3SG**	be.PRS	man.ABS

'There is no man [who does something in secret…]' (J 7: 4)

Thus (32) is an exception to the rules and analysis presented here.

Another salient difference between *now/nowt*, on the one hand, and the negatives *te* and *ma*, on the other, is that in main clauses the former are used almost exclusively in the TAM categories included in Rule 1 (and are

not used in the past tense). In Udi, too, *nu/nut* can only be used in TAMs named in Rule 1 (Harris 2002: Chapter 6, §1). Therefore, *now* and *nowt* seldom or never have PMs (or other pronouns) enclitic to them, as the other negatives do. Examples (33-34) illustrate the Rule 1 order with these negatives.

(33) *now-efa-**nan*** *zaχ*
nu efa=**nan** zaχ
NEG keep=**2PL** I.DATIII
'you do not receive me'(J 5: 43)

(34) *now-besa-**žan**-hē* *gåχownown*
nu bes-a=**žan**=hē gåχun-un
NEG ask-PRS=**1PL**=IMPF glory-GEN
'we did not seek glory' 'we were not seeking glory' (1 Thess 2: 6)

In conclusion, negation and its interaction with the placement of clitics in CA is very, very similar to that in Udi. In both, negative elements are independent words; in CA but not in Udi *now* (and perhaps *nowt*) can optionally procliticize to the verb as *n-*. In both CA and Udi, agreement clitics are attracted to negative elements and occur enclitic to them; this is Rule 2a. In both languages, Rule 1 takes precedence over Rule 2a. Rule 1 requires PMs to be enclitic to the verb if it is in certain TAMs; the TAMs are present and imperative (and possibly the imperfect and the participial future in *-al*) in CA, and future II, subjunctive I, subjunctive II, and imperative in Udi. (The past converter (imperfect formant), *-hē*, follows the agreement clitics in CA; its reflex in Udi, *-i*, likewise follows the PMs.) In main clauses, the negative particles *now* and *nowt* are effectively limited to the Rule 1 TAMs in both CA and Udi.

5. Content question contexts (Rule 2b) in CA

5.1 Simple contexts

In §4 we argued that Rule 2a in CA is essentially the same as in Udi and that its effects in interaction with Rule 1 are essentially the same. The same cannot be said of Rule 2b. In Udi, Rule 2b **requires** agreement PMs to be

enclitic to question words, words such as ‘who’, ‘what’, ‘where’. In CA, Rule 2b **permits** agreement PMs to be enclitic to question words. Examples (35–37) illustrate PMs enclitic to question words.

(35) *ha-šow-**ne*** *hůya-hē* *ihesownaẋ* *beši*
hašu=**ne** hůy-a-hē ihesun-aẋ beši
who=**3** believe-TV=IMPF hearing-DATIII us.GEN
‘who has believed hearsay of us?’ (J 12: 38)

(36) *hašow-**ne*** *bal’-aha* *zow* *n-aha-**zow**-al-bal’*
hašu=**ne** bal’-ah-a zu n=ah-a=**zu**=al bal’
who=**3** ill-be.PRS-TV.PRS I NEG=be.PRS-TV=**1SG**=AND ill
‘Who is ill and I am not ill, too? (2 Cor 11: 29)

(37) *yaṭen-**nown**-besa* *zaẋoc*
yaṭen=**nun** bes-a zaẋoc
why=**2SG** ask-TV.PRS me.DATIII.ABL
‘how do you ask [for something to drink] of me?’ (J 4: 9)

Note that question words (interrogative pronouns) are hosts of clitics, as is still true in Udi. In (35–37), PMs are enclitic to question words. It appears that some question words are more likely to attract PMs than other question words. For example, although *ya* ‘what’ is a fairly commonly occurring question word, we found few examples of its attracting clitics.

5.2 Rule interaction

It is especially remarkable that (37) and the first clause of (36) are in the present tense, and we would therefore, on the basis of Udi, expect Rule 1 to trump Rule 2b here. Instead, Rule 2b wins. In (38) we find that the rules interact differently. Here the verb is past, not a Rule 1 tense. Therefore we expect Rule 2b to apply, attracting the PM *-ne*; instead we find the PM in the default position, enclitic to the verb.

(38) *i* *haǰin* *axay-hē-**ne*** *powlmowẋ* *vē*
i haǰin axay-he-y=**ne** pul-m-uẋ vē
well how open-be.PST-PST=**3** eye-PL-PL you.GEN
‘so how were your eyes opened?’ (J 9: 10)

In short, it appears that in CA there is no system for determining which rule applies when both Rule 1 and Rule 2b conditions are met. And while Rule 2b exists in the grammar, its application is not obligatory. Notice that for this reason, the statement quoted at the opening of this paper is fulfilled: agreement clitics, in particular PMs, are more strongly bound to verbs in CA than in Udi.

We have shown that Rules 1 and 2a in CA are very similar to the parallel rules in Udi, both in content and in the fact that Rule 1 takes precedence over Rule 2a. A parallel to Udi Rule 2b in CA is similar, but in CA the rule is not obligatory as it is in Udi. Further, CA has not yet established precedence among Rules 1 and 2b. (We do not have enough examples to establish whether there is interaction between Rules 2a and 2b.)

6. Other focus contexts (Rule 2c) in CA

6.1 Simple contexts

There are a fixed number of negators and question words in CA, and therefore it is easy to identify clauses in which Rules 2a and 2b might be expected to apply. This is not true in the same way of focus. Among types of focus, contrastive focus seems easiest to identify in the CA texts, and therefore we give examples here of that type. It is important to take the full context into consideration. We introduce examples below of focused constituents followed by and marked by PMs.

The first two examples are from one verse of the Sermon on the Mount. The two examples represent contrastive focus. The full verse reads "Whosoever dissolves one of these minimal commandments (and) teaches mankind in this way, shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but then, he who performs and teaches (them), he will be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (translation used in *CAPMS*, underlining added ACH/JD). There is a clear semantic contrast between 'the least' and 'great'.

(39) *mal-**ġa-n**-oow-ci-pē*[8]
mal=**ġa=n**=o-u ci-pe-y
little=**HORT=3**=3SG.M-DATI name-LV.PST-PST
'he shall be called the least' (Mt 5: 19)

(40) *bån'i-**ġa-n**-oow-ci-pē*
bån'i=**ġa=n**=o-u ci-pe-y
great=**HORT=3**=3SG.M-DATI name-LV.PST-PST
'he will be called great' (Mt 5: 19)

The clitics, including the PMs, cliticize here to the two words in contrastive focus. This is an example of Rule 2c.[9]

We take the position that *mal* 'little' in (39) and *bån'i* 'great' in (40) are independent words, not incorporated. It would be entirely reasonable for either of these words to be incorporated by a light verb with a meaning such as 'become great' or 'make (someone, something) great'. But it is rare cross-linguistically (see sources cited above) for a word with an incorporated element, such as *ci* 'name' in (39) and (40), to incorporate a second word, which is the analysis given in the first lines of (39) and (40). To further support our analysis in the second lines of (39) and (40), we provide examples of the use of *ci-pesun* 'to name', the verb used in both examples, and examples of *mal* 'little' and *bån'i* 'great' as independent words. Most examples of *ci-pesun* 'to name' involve subordinate clauses, which complicate the basic patttern; one of the simplest examples is that in (41).

(41) *ci-pesa* *ġar* *šaya* *paraoni*
ci-p-e-sa ɣar ša-ya paraon-i
name-say-TV-INF son daughter-GEN pharaoh-GEN
'[Moses refused…] to be called the son of the Pharaoh's daughter' (Heb 11: 24)

[8] This particular verse (cited in both (39) and (40)) is attested twice in the palimsests that form the basis for the *CAPMS*, but in both of these quotations they are identical with respect to PM placement.

[9] In this case, the order in the Greek original may have influenced the choice in CA. The Greek order of (39) is [least he-will-be-called], and of (40) [great will-be-called]. See further §7.

Clearly *ġar* ‘son’ is not incorporated in (41). Taking into consideration all of the examples of the use of this complex verb, we believe that this is a neutral word order, with the name or status following the verb. Although the order in (41) may not be the only neutral order, it is the most common in the *CAPMS*, occurring in 11 out of 14 examples of this complex verb (not including (39–40)) cited in the Index of *CAPMS*. We note, too, that the word expressing the name or status is not always immediately adjacent to the complex verb, as shown in (42).

(42)	*ċi-ḳa-hanayṭ ˜wḳe-hē*		*Vačarn’a*	*Golgota*
	ċi-ḳ-a-hanay=ṭ ˜w-ḳe=hē		Vačar-n’a	Golgota
	name-say-TV.PRS-which=3SG.N.DATI-REL=IMPF		Jew-OBL.GEN	Golgotha
	‘which was called in Jewish [speech] Golgotha’ (J 19: 17)			

In (42), *Vačarn’a* ‘in Jewish’ intervenes between the complex verb *ċi-pesun* ‘to call, name’ and the name *Golgota*. This shows that it is at least not always the case that the name/status is incorporated into the verb, as suggested in the first lines of (39–40).

Examples (43) and (44) show *mal* ‘little’ and *bån’i* ‘great’ in other uses.

(43)	Maryam-al	Yaḳobi	maloya
	Maryam=al	Yaḳob-i	mal-o-ya
	Mary=AND	James-GEN	little-NMZ-GEN
	‘[among whom (there) were Mary Magdalene] and Mary (the mother) of James the less’ (Mk 15: 40)		

(44)	*vown*	*bån’i*	*ixoy*	*ahal*	*deẋoc*	*beši*	*Abrahamaẋoc*
	vun	bån’i	ixoy	ah-al	de-ẋ-oc	beši	Abraham-aẋ-oc
	you	great	more	be-	father-	our	Abraham-
				PTCP.FUT	DATIII-ABL		DATIII-ABL
	‘should you [by any chance] be greater than our father Abraham’ (J 8: 53)						

In (43) the adjective *mal* ‘little’ is nominalized. In (44) *bån’i* is predicative. Both indicate the independence of these words.

An additional argument that *mal* ‘little’ in (39) and *bån’i* ‘great’ in (40) are not incorporated is the fact that in similar sentences in Udi they are not. Other things being equal, we should not posit differences between CA and Udi without strong evidence. Finally, if these adjectives were incorporated, the position of the clitics in (39-40) would be unexplained. Clitics precede

an incorporated noun, here *ċi* ‘name’, only when they are outside the verb. We conclude from this evidence that *mal* ‘little’ in (39) and *bån’i* ‘great’ in (41) are independent words that attract clitics by Rule 2c, just as in Udi.

We turn now to additional examples of clitics attracted to focused elements. The context of (45) is that the source of the bread of life has been discussed; then Jesus says (45).

(45)	*zow-**zow***	*e*	*śowm*	*ġowyown ˜n*
	zu=**zu**	e	śum	ɣuyun- ˜n
	I=**1SG**	that	bread.ABS	life-GEN

‘“[It is] I [who am] that bread of life.”’ (J 6: 35)

The context makes it clear that *zu* ‘I’ is in focus, and the clitic is attracted to it.

The context of (46) is that Jesus is speaking at length to his apostles. The contrastive focus is clear: not ‘you (SUBJECT)…me’ but ‘I…you (OBJECT)’; thus both pronouns and the relationship between them are in focus.

(46)	*sa*	*zow-**zow**-vˤaẋ-bowq̇ē*		*ʒexay-zow*	*vˤaẋ*
	sa	zu=**zu**	vʕaẋ	buq̇-e-y	ʒex-a-y=zu	vʕaẋ
	but	I=**1SG**	you.DATIII	chose-TV-PST	ordain-TV-PST=1SG	you.DATIII

‘[For not you have chosen me], but I have chosen you [and] ordained you’ (J 15: 16)

The PM, *=zu* ‘I’, is enclitic to the independent subject pronoun, which is the primary focus. Thus, in CA, focused items may attract clitics.

6.2 Rule interaction

When we turn to rule interaction, we find that as with Rule 2b, it appears that there is not yet a system to determine the interaction of Rule 2c with other rules. Example (47) seems to provide contexts for Rule 1 (TAMs), Rule 2a (negation), and Rule 2c (focus). It is the last of these that actually applies (contrary to the system in Udi).

(47)	*te*	*oya*	*go-**ne***	*bow=en'e*	*te*	*deya*
	te	o-ya	go=**ne**	bu=en'e	te	de-ya
	NEG	he-GEN	sin=**3**	be.PRS-COND	NEG	father-GEN
	*oya-**ne***		*bow-en'e*			
	o-ya=**ne**		bu=en'e			
	he-GEN=**3**		be.PRS-COND			

'"(it is) not his sin nor his father's or [mother's]"' (J 9: 3)

In (47), one might expect Rule 1 to result in the PM being enclitic to the verb *bu* 'is', since it is present tense. The failure of Rule 1 to apply in this instance may be due to the fact that the expression *bow=en'e*, with the conditional suffix, is used as 'or'. If *bow=en'e* does not count as a verb, we would expect Rule 2a, giving precedence to the negative, to result in *te=ne*. But in CA, Rule 2a does not consistently trump Rule 2c, and here it is 2c that actually applies. The focus is on *oya go* 'his sin', then *deya oya* 'his father's', and those are the sites of the clitics.

Similarly, in (22) above, repeated here as (48), the PM *ne* cliticizes to the focus, *Musen*, not to the negative, which would take precedence in Udi.

(48)	*te*	*Mowsen-**ne**-v^{ʕ}a-daġē*			*śowm*	*ćowdowaχoc*
	te	Muse-n=**ne**	vʕa	daɣ-e-y	śum	ćudu-aχ-oc
	NEG	Moses-ERG=**3**	you(PL). DATI	give-TV-PST	bread.ABS	heaven-DATIII-ABL

'Moses did not give to you bread from heaven [but (it is) my father (who) gives you...bread]' (J 6: 32)

This is thus an additional example of the lack of a system for interaction among the rules of clitic placement in CA.

In (49), repeated from (21), we have again the environments for Rules 2a (negation) and 2c (focus), as well as a possible environment for Rule 1 (if the participial future in *–al* is truly a Rule 1 TAM).

(49)	*sa*	*zow*	*te*	*ġowšowy-ġaraχoc*	*heq̇al-**zow***	*powlaygan*
	sa	zu	te	ɣušuy-ɣar-aχ-oc	heq̇-al=**zu**	pulaygan
	but	I	NEG	man-son-DATIII-ABL	receive-PTCP.FUT=**1SG**	testimony.ABS

'But I shall not receive testimony from mankind….' (J 5: 34)

In (49) the PM *=zu* is enclitic to the verb. This could be interpreted as Rule 1 trumping Rules 2a and 2c (if the *–al* future is a Rule 1 TAM), or as the PM occurring in the default position. In the latter case, it would show again that the interaction between the rules discussed here is still unsettled.

7. The influence of source languages

We cannot fail to address the effect that source languages may have had on specific examples and on the CA language as a whole. In this case, the two likely sources are Greek and Armenian. Since the paper focuses on the position of clitics, and since neither Greek nor Classical Armenian has clitics of a similar type, we must consider the position of agreement affixes and the position of pronouns in the potential source languages.

First we should note that the order of words in the CA Gospels follows that in Greek and Armenian as much as possible. For example, reconsider (16), repeated here as (50).

(50) CA

zow-al	*vas*	*owḳa-z*
zu=al	vas	u-ḳ-a=**z**
I=AND	you.DATII	word-say-TV.PRS=**1SG**

'I will also say to you' (Mt 16: 18)

(51) Greek

καὶ	ἐγώ	δέ	σοι	λέγω
kai	egō	de	soi	legō
and	I.NOM	PART	you.DAT	say.PRS.1SG

'and I say to you'

(52) Armenian

Ew	*es*	*k'éz*	*asem*[10]
and	I.NOM	you.DAT	say.PRS.1SG

'and I say to you'

CA can use personal pronouns in the same way as Greek and Armenian do, and CA places the pronouns in the same way the potential source languages do. On the other hand, *-al* 'and, too' in CA is an enclitic, and it

[10] Greek and Armenian texts are from Haug et al. 2010.

cannot stand at the beginning of the clause, as 'and' does in Greek and Armenian. Note that if we equate the CA clitic *=z(u)* with the agreement suffixes of Greek and Armenian, they occur in the same position in this sentence. Thus, CA follows the order of important elements found in Greek and Armenian.

However, neither Greek nor Classical Armenian has anything comparable to PMs being attracted to negative markers, question words, and other focused elements. Reconsider, for example, (17), repeated here as (53).

(53) CA

*ma-**ġa-nan**-baha-båhē*		*ćowdown*	*üwxownax̣*
ma=**ġa=nan**	baha-bå(h)-e-y	ćudu-n	üwxun-ax̣
PROHIB=**HORT=2PL**	in-go-TV-PST	heaven-GEN	kingdom-DATIII

'you will not enter the kingdom of heaven' (Mt 5: 20)

(54) Greek

οὐ	μὴ	εἰσέλθητε	εἰς	τὴν
ou	mē	eis-elthēte	eis	tēn
NEG	PROHIB	in-go.AOR.SBJV.2PL	into	ART.ACC.SG

βασιλείαν	τῶν	οὐρανῶν
basileian	tōn	ouranōn
kingdom.ACC.SG	ART.GEN.PL	heaven.GEN.PL

'no, you shall not enter (into) the kingdom of the heavens'

(55) Armenian

oč'	*mtanic'ēk'*	*y*	*ark'ayowt'iwn*	*erknic'*
not	enter.2PL	in	kindom.ACC.SG	heaven.GEN.PL

'you will not enter (in) the kindom of heaven'

In (53–55) the main elements, 'not', 'enter', and 'kingdom' are in the same order. If CA were influenced by Greek or Amenian with respect to CA clitics, we may assume that *=nan* 'you PL' would be enclitic to the verb, especially in view of the fact that clitics occur there under some circumstances, as shown above. Other individual examples where PMs are enclitic to negation, question words, and other focused elements are similar, and it is reasonable to conclude that clitics in CA occur enclitic to these three elements because of CA grammar, not because of the order of the sources.

It is possible that the order of words found in sources may affect exceptions, but only in examples where clitics are not attracted to negation, ques-

tion words, and other focused items as expected. Recall that exceptions regarding negation are instead of the type in (33), where clitics have been attracted to the negative, even though Rule 1 might be expected to trump this. That is not explained by the order found in the sources. In CA the attraction of clitics to negation is so consistent, in spite of the orders found in the sources, that we believe that the lack of consistency of attraction to question words and other focused elements is due to the grammar of CA, not to the orders found in the sources. That is, we consider it improbable that those translating the Gospel into CA would follow their own grammar for negation but be overly influenced by the sources for the order with regard to question words and focused elements. We believe that the order of clitics for question words and focused elements in the grammar of CA is truly in flux.

8. Conclusion

We have argued in favor of (1) from *CAPMS*, affirming that clitics (PMs and *=q̇a*) in CA are more closely bound to verbs than in Udi. It was already known that clitics occur outside the verb in Udi under one of three conditions: the clause is negated, there is a question word, or there is focus (other than predicative or whole-clause focus). We have associated these conditions with the rules that govern placement of the PMs outside the verb in Udi, namely Rules 2a, 2b, and 2c. We have shown that clitics in CA follow Rule 2a, though with a few exceptions, and thus occur outside the verb in CA nearly as much as in Udi. In contrast, PMs in CA are only infrequently attracted to question words, as described by Rule 2b. The failure of this rule to apply consistently is one of the major reasons that clitics are more tightly bound to verbs in CA than in Udi. Because it is so difficult to identify focus, it is impossible to assess how often Rule 2c applies, compared with the contexts in which it could apply. Impressionistically, PMs are enclitic to focus less frequently in CA than in Udi, and we believe that this is the secondary reason for clitics being more tightly bound to the verb in CA than in Udi.

CA texts give the impression that there is no system to determine which rule applies when the conditions of more than one rule are met. The exception to this is Rules 1 and 2a, where it seems that the same relationship already exists in CA as in Udi. That relationship requires that Rule 1 take

precedence over rule 2a. The single difference seems to be that the precedence between the two rules is still not as rigid in CA as in Udi, and thus we find a few exceptions in CA.

Abbreviations

In glosses we have used the following abbreviations: HORT hortative/future, LV light verb, SUBJV subjunctive, TV thematic vowel.

References

Baker, Mark C. 1985. The mirror principle and morphosyntactic explanation. *Linguistic Inquiry* 16. 373–415.

Baker, Mark C. 1988. *Incorporation. A theory of grammatical function changing.* Chicago: University of Chicago.

Baker, Mark C. 1996. *The polysynthesis parameter*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gippert, Jost, Wolfgang Schulze, Zaza Aleksidze & Jean-Paul Mahé. 2008. *The Caucasian Albanian Palimpsests of Mount Sinai*. Turnhout: Brépols.

Harris, Alice C. 2002. *Endoclitics and the Origins of Udi Morphosyntax*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Harris, Alice C. 2008[2009]. Placement of person markers in Udi. Supplementary material. In: Alekseev, M.E, T.A. Majsak, D.S. Ganenko & Ju. A. Lander (eds.). *Udinskij sbornik: grammatika, leskika, istorija jazyka*. Moskva: Academia. 223–240.

Haug, Dag T.T., Hanna M. Eckhoff, Mari J. Bordal Hertzenberg, Angelika Müth, Eirik Welo, Olga Thomason, Marek Majer & Marius L. Jøhndal. 2010. *PROIEL: Pragmatic Resources in Old Indo-European Languages*. http://www.hf.uio.no/ifikk/english/research/projects/proiel/. Last accessed 9 October 2017.

Jacques, Guillaume. 2012. From denominal derivation to incorporation. *Lingua* 122. 1207–1231.

Mithun, Marianne. 1984. The evolution of noun incorporation. *Language* 60. 847–894.

Mithun, Marianne. 1986. On the nature of noun incorporation. *Language* 62. 32–37.

Noorlander, Paul M. & Donald Stilo. 2015. On the convergence of verbal systems of Aramaic and its neighbours. Part I: Present-based paradigms. In: Khan, Geoffrey & Lidia Napiorkowska (eds.). *Neo-Aramaic and its Linguistic Context*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press. 426–452.

Norde, Muriel. 2009. *Degrammaticalization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Rosen, Sara Thomas. 1989. Two types of noun incorporation. A lexical analysis. *Language* 65. 294–317.

Rosen, Sara Thomas. 1990. *Argument Structure and Complex Predicates*. New York: Garland.

Stilo, Donald & Paul M. Noorlander. 2015. On the convergence of verbal systems of Aramaic and its neighbours. Part II: Past paradigms derived from present equivalents. In: Khan, Geoffrey & Lidia Napiorkowska (eds.). *Neo-Aramaic and its Linguistic Context*. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias Press. 453–484.