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1.1.0. Background information

Domari (also Dom or Domi) is the language of the Dom minority of Palestine/Israel and Jordan. The origin of the group appears to be in an Indian caste of nomadic service-providers, who specialised in trades such as metalwork and entertainment. The name *dom* is cognate with those of the *rom* (Roma or Romanies) of Europe and the *lom* of the Caucasus and eastern Anatolia, both of which are Indian diasporas living outside the Indian subcontinent and specialising, traditionally or historically, in similar trades, as well as with the names of the *duk* of the Hunza valley, and indeed the *dom* of India itself, who are similarly known as low-caste commercial nomads. Among the Palestinian Dom one can hear claims that they arrived in the country as camp-followers of the forces of Salāḥ ad-Dīn al-Āyūbī (Saladin), in the 12th century CE. Historical confirmation of this version is yet to be established. However, the Turkic (including Azeri) and especially Kurdish element in Domari, point to an emigration via the Kurdish regions, possibly in connection with the advancement of the Seljuks.

The earliest known attestations of the Dom and their language in Palestine date from the early 19th century. There are two branches of the community, whose separation goes back at least to the beginning of the 20th century and in all likelihood much earlier, but who maintained close contact until the 1948 war and the separation of Israel, Gaza, and the West Bank (the latter under Egyptian and Jordanian rule, respectively). The first was based mainly in Jaffa (now part of Tel Aviv), on the Mediterranean coast, but travelled along the coast and to the Lower Galilee region in the north of the country. Members of this group engaged in occupations that included bear- and monkey-leaders, dancers and musicians. They became refugees in 1948, when Jaffa was conquered by Israeli forces, and have since been settled in refugee camps in northern Gaza. Their number is unknown.

The second group was based in Jerusalem, travelling throughout the West Bank region between Nablus in the north, and Hebron in the south. The primary trade of the men was metalwork, while the women supported their families by selling various artefacts, or by begging. Although musicians and dancers appear to have existed among this group, too, members of the group nowadays tend to distance themselves from such occupations, as well as from the Dom community of Gaza, with whom these occupations are associated. Metalwork and the nomadic lifestyle was abandoned in the early 1940s, when the Dom men took up regular employment in the British administration’s environmental health department as rubbish-collectors, sewage workers, and caretakers in public lavatories, and the families moved into permanent dwelling within the walls of Old City of Jerusalem (where the community is still based today). They continued to specialise in these jobs under the
Jordanian administration after 1948, then under the Israeli administration after 1967, with the first generation retiring once the Israeli pension and social security system was introduced in the early 1970s. The younger generation, including both men and women, are now engaged in a variety of occupations, mainly as wage labourers. Part of the community left for Amman, Jordan during the 1967 war. Others have been moving out of the crowded neighbourhood in the Old City and into various West Bank suburbs during the past two decades. It is therefore difficult to estimate the total number of community members, but it definitely does not exceed 1500, and is probably closer to 700-800.

The Dom are Sunni Muslims, like their Palestinian neighbours, with whom they appear to share most of their customs and way of life. Traditional dress and tattoos are found only among very elderly women in the community, and there are virtually no remaining stories, songs, or marriage or other customs or habits that are unique to the Dom. An exception is begging, which is still a common way of earning a living among middle-aged women of the Jerusalem community (and is still common among younger Dom girls from Gaza and from settlements in the West Bank). Many Jerusalem Dom families host relatives from Jordan who come to the city during the Ramadan month in order to earn money by begging in front of the entrance to the haram or Mosque complex. The most frequently cited Dom ritual is the pilgrimage to Nabi Musa (according to Muslim tradition, the burial place of the prophet Moses), in the nearby Judean Desert. Although the place attracts Muslim pilgrims from all sectors of Palestinian society, the Dom have their own celebration at the site, in early April. It seems that in earlier generations, bride price was paid, as among the nomadic Beduins, by the bridegroom to the family of the bride, while among the city-dwellers it was paid to the wife and remained under her control. It is not clear to what extent the older practice remains in view of the rising number of mixed marriages, and indeed the nearly complete absence of marriages within the Dom community during the past two decades.

1.1.1. Alternate names

The Dom are referred to by their Arab-Palestinian neighbours as nawar, and the latter are usually ignorant of the existence of the self-appellation dom. Depictions of the group and references to them in European literature have tended to adopt the term ‘Gypsies’ (‘Zigeuner’, etc.), used to refer to the Roma of Europe; this is also the case in Israel, where the Dom are referred to in the Hebrew press as tsosanim (originally a loanblend of German/Yiddish Zigeuner/tsigeyner, with Biblical Hebrew tsos’an ‘a region in Egypt’, the
assumed country of origin, cf. ‘Gypsy’ < ‘Egyptian’). Elsewhere in the Middle East, related groups are known as qurbātī (Syria) or karačī (Anatolia, Iraq). In Egypt and Sudan, names such as gajar, ḥalabi and bahlawān are used to refer to various groups of commercial nomads, among whom may also be groups related to the Dom.

1.1.2. Genetic affiliation

Domari is an Indo-Aryan language, belonging apparently to the Central group, i.e. closely related to Hindi, Punjabi, and Gujarati. A precise classification of the language within Indo-Aryan is difficult due to the time lapse since its separation from its original territory, and the uncertainty surrounding the age or even the relative chronology of some of the isoglosses that separate it from other Indo-Aryan languages. The most salient isoglosses connecting it with Central Indian languages, such as Hindi, are the shift of Old Indo-Aryan (OIA) /r̥/ to a vowel /u, i/, as in Sanskrit mṛṣṭaḥ > Domari (na)mṛṣṭa ‘ill’, Sanskrit śṛṅ- > Domari sin- ‘to hear’; of OIA /kṣ/ to /k/, as in Sanskrit aṅkṣi > Domari iki ‘eye’; of the OIA cluster /sm/ to /m/, as in Sanskrit asmña, tusme > Domari eme ‘we’, itme ‘you.pl’; and of OIA /y/ to /dž/, as in Sanskrit yuvatiḥ > Domari džuwir ‘woman’.

However, like Romani, Domari also retains several conservative features that are no longer found in the languages of Central India, most notably consonant clusters such as /st/ in xast ‘hand’ (Sanskrit hasta), /št/ in (na)mṛṣṭa ‘ill’ (Sanskrit mṛṣṭaḥ), or /dr/ in drak grape (Sanskrit drākṣa), and dental consonants in historically intervocalic position, as in gara ‘gone’ (Sanskrit gataḥ). These conservative features are shared with some of the Northwestern Indo-Aryan languages, as are Domari innovations such as the voicing of dentals following /n/ (Sanskrit danta, Domari dand ‘tooth’; Sanskrit pancan, Domari pandžes ‘five’) and the renewal of the past-tense conjugation through the adoption of enclitic person suffixes (kard-om ‘I did’, kard-os-is ‘he did it’), these too being shared with Romani.

It appears, therefore, that Domari originated in the Central area, but moved to the Northwest at an intermediate stage in its development, retaining conservative traits, and adopting some Northwestern innovations, a history that closely resembles that of Romani. The two languages also share the retention of much of the Middle Indo-Aryan present-tense set of person concord markers, and, like some languages of the Northwest, the consonantal forms of Layer I case endings in -s- (masculine) and -n- (plural), as well as the (innovative) agglutination of Layer II case endings (mansa-ska ‘for the man’, Romani manušes-ke), which constitute clitics in other languages, and the adoption of ‘remoteness’ tense markers on the verb (Domari -a, Romani -as). Nevertheless, the two languages are separated by
several isoglosses, the older of which include the merger of OIA /s, ś, ṣ/ into /s/ in Domari (except in the cluster /št/), while Romani retains /s:š/, and on the other hand the preservation of OIA initial /v/ as /w/ in Domari, against its merger with /b/ in Romani (Sanskrit varṣa, Domari wars, Romani berš). Romani shows additional phonological innovations that are not shared with Domari. In conclusion, it can be said that Domari is an archaic Central Indo-Aryan language that shares several innovations with the Northwest Indo-Aryan languages, and which therefore resembles Romani quite closely.

1.1.3. Geographic location and number of speakers

Domari is a dispersed, non-territorial language, spoken in traditionally nomadic and socially segregated communities throughout the Middle East. Fragmented attestations of the language place it as far north as Azerbaijan and as far south as northern Sudan. The present description is based on the variety spoken in Jerusalem, which appears more or less identical to those spoken in Jaffa/Gaza and Amman. At the time of writing there are no precise figures about the number of fluent speakers in Jerusalem. However, competence in the language tends to be limited to those born before 1950, and so to not more than 10% of the entire community, or around 50-70 individuals. No figures are available for other communities, but the age distribution of speakers appears to be similar, at least for the Dom of Gaza and Amman. The language is thus declining, and is currently highly endangered. Dom communities also exist in Syria, Lebanon, and Iraq. From descriptions of the communities of villages in the Beqaa valley of Lebanon, and in Damascus, it appears that there too the language is spoken only by the older generations. A report from the Iraqi-Jordanian border area from 2002 suggests that there are semi-nomadic Dom communities in which the language is preserved even by the younger generation. All speakers of Domari are also fluent in Arabic, which they use both in transactions with outsiders as well as within the family, and on the whole the community is in the process of shifting to Arabic.

1.2.0. Linguo-geographic information

1.2.1. Dialects

Documentation of Domari outside Jerusalem is fragmented and limited to word lists, most of them collected in the early years of the 20th century. While some differences are
apparent among the lexical and phonological forms attested, the informal nature of the
documentation, including non-systematic notation conventions, does not allow us to say
much about dialect differences. A prominent isogloss separating the northern dialects of
Syria and Lebanon from those of Palestine and Jordan appears to be the use of the
demonstrative *uhu in the north for the 3rd person singular pronoun, while in the south the
form is *pandži, apparently derived from a honorific form of the 3rd person reflexive
pronoun *pan (attested as a reflexive in Azerbaijani Domari). In Sudan, the only
attestation of the language is in the form of a lexicon, which appears to be used as an in-
group or secret language, embedded into Arabic, by a group known as Bahlawān.

Oddly, the tiny community of speakers in Jerusalem shows traces of two distinct
varieties of the language. Speakers, though aware of the differences, are unable to attribute
them to any historical merger of populations in the past nor to any contemporary social
division, except a tentative and very vague correlation with age. The variables in question
concern a number of morphological processes, for which there is, almost consistently, a
difference between a ‘conservative’ and a ‘new’ form. The features tend to cluster, so that
any one speaker will tend toward consistency in the choice of either ‘conservative’ or ‘new’
variants. The variants in question involve, for example, the ‘conservative’ retention of the
3rd person plural subject affix -ndi as opposed to the ‘new’ use of the simplified -dī, the
retention of the dative marker -ta as opposed to -ka (a blend of -ta and the benefactive
marker -ke and/or ablative/genitive -ki), retention of the sociative marker -san versus its
replacement through the Arabic preposition *maʕ ‘with’, as well as, in phonology, the
retention of the affricate /č/ versus its replacement by /š/. Although there is, seemingly, a
generation split, with the relatively ‘younger’ speakers tending toward the ‘new’ set of
variants, the same type of variation was already observed by Macalister (1914), and so it is
not a product of recent innovation that emerged among the present-day generation of
speakers.

1.3.0. Sociolinguistic situation

1.3.1. Functional status of the language

Domari is now limited to the older generations and is used strictly within the family or with
close neighbours who are members of the community. Communication with outsiders in
Domari is largely limited in Jerusalem to occasions on which relatives from Amman come
to stay in Jerusalem for a short period. There is no known use or even attempt to use
Domari in any other form of communication, institutions, media, nor in writing. The
language does not enjoy any form of official recognition. It is making way to Arabic, which is the primary language of cross-generation communication within the family, the language of transactions with neighbours and the outside community, and the language of the workplace, media, religion, and school. Some mainly younger members of the Jerusalem community are also fluent in Hebrew, having worked in West Jerusalem, usually in industry, construction, or services. Domari is an endangered language, and its Palestinian variety can certainly be classified as being nearly extinct.

Apart from the ‘Para-Domari’ – or, Domari-based lexicon – used by the Sudanese Bahlawān as an in-group language, Domari has also influenced the vocabularies of other secret or in-group languages in the Middle East. Domari vocabulary can be found in various such jargons, including those of the Kawli and Luli of Iran. In Palestine itself, a traditionally nomadic group of metalworkers referred to as ‘Kurds’ employ an in-group lexicon which is based partly on Kurdish, and partly on Domari. The two populations intermarry and many elderly Dom have some command of this jargon, referred to by them as ‘Kurdish’.

1.4.0. Periods in the history of the language

In the absence of any written attestation of the language, the periodisation of Domari relies on an interpretation of language-internal developments, in relation to related languages as well as to contact languages. As mentioned above, Domari can be assumed to have emerged as a Central Indo-Aryan language. Its archaic features might suggest an immigration into the northwestern regions of the Indian subcontinent sometime during the very early transition period from Middle Indo-Aryan to New Indo-Aryan, in the early medieval period. The innovations shared with the languages of the Northwest could suggest that Domari remained in this region of the Indian subcontinent at least until the 10th century CE. There followed a period of contact with (southern) Kurdish, which has contributed lexical vocabulary as well as, arguably, influenced the shape of some grammatical constructions (e.g. the postposed indefinite marker on nouns, cliticisation of person markers, the external vocalic marker of remote tense). Turkic words also entered the language during this period, which therefore might be termed the ‘Seljuk’ period in the development of the language. Early contacts with Arabic appear to have been with Beduin and rural varieties, either within or outside Palestine. Thus the pronunciation of ‘coffee’ in Domari is qahwa, cf. Jerusalem Arabic ʔahwe. Palestinian Domari as documented by Seetzen in the early 19th century, though identical in most vocabulary and grammatical features to present-day
Jerusalem Domari, shows numerous (Ottoman) Turkish loanwords which appear to have disappeared from today’s active vocabulary. Seetzen’s notes therefore appear to represent a period of active bilingualism, not just in Arabic, but also in the official language of administration at the time, Turkish.

2.0.0. Linguistic description

2.1.0. Phonology

2.1.1. Inventory of sounds

Vowels

Figure 1: Inventory of vowels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Front</th>
<th>Central</th>
<th>Back</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close</td>
<td>i i:</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>u u:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ɨ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close-mid</td>
<td>e e:</td>
<td></td>
<td>o o:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-mid</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td>õ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>æ æ:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open</td>
<td>a a:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Domari vowel phonemes are /a, e, i, o, ʌ, ɔ, u/, of which two, /ʌ, ɔ/, are peripheral. Most of the ‘main’ vowel phonemes, namely /a, e, i, u/, show considerable variation, both in their individual realisation, as well as among the different phonemes. A nice illustration of vowel phoneme contrasts is provided by the set of demonstratives: /a’ha/ ‘this’ (M.SG), /u’hu/ ‘that’ (M.SG), /i’hui/ ‘this’ (F.SG), /e’he/ ‘these’. The contrast among open and back vowels is rather rare and limited to a few words: /ba’y-om/ ‘my wife’, /bɔ’y-om/ ‘my father’; /pandži/ ‘he/she’, /pandžes/ ‘five’. Short vowels are more diverse in quality than long vowels. Interchangeability is common among adjacent articulatory positions, the most common interchangeable pairs being [a-æ], [a-ɑ], [a-ʌ], [u-i], [o-u], [e-ɛ], [e-æ], [e:-i:], [o:-u:]. Variation is often the product of regressive assimilation triggered by distinct
grammatical endings: [wu'da] ‘old man’, [wi'di:] ‘old woman’. Variation among adjacent vowel positions, partial centralisation of high vowels and the fronting of raised back vowels [u > ʉ > i; u > ʊ > i] are processes that are shared with Palestinian as well as with northern Levantine Arabic, and with Kurdish – all significant contiguous languages in the recent history of Domari. From among the overall inventory of vowel sounds, only [ɔ] and [ʌ], both rather infrequent, are not shared with local Palestinian Arabic. Prothetic and epenthetic vocalisation around consonant clusters may also be regarded as a regional phenomenon. Pharyngealisation of dental consonants usually triggers the backing of surrounding a-vowels.

Vowel length is generally distinctive for the ‘main’ vowel phonemes /a, e, i, o, u/, though the duration of a vowel in a given word may vary considerably. Length is characterised by an almost melodic lengthening of the vowel, best recognisable in first syllable position in bi- and multi-syllabic words: [doʊme] ‘Doms’, [ʔuʊjar] ‘town’. A rare minimal pair is [tɒt] ‘sun, heat’, and [tʊt] ‘sedentary Arab, Fallah’, confirming nonetheless the distinctive function of length opposition. Length is often compromised, however, usually in final position, as well as in pre-final positions in grammatical endings, showing [eː > e] and [iː > i]: [θʰreːnɪː] ‘we are’, alongside [θʰreni]. Among the long vowels, only the a-vowels show variation in quality, triggered, as in Arabic, by the following consonant: [baɑd] ‘grandfather’, [tʊt] ‘sedentary Arab, Fallah’, [wææ j] ‘wind’.

Consonants

Figure 2: Inventory of consonants (IPA symbols)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>labial</th>
<th>dental</th>
<th>dental-pharyngalis ed</th>
<th>Palato-alveolar</th>
<th>velar</th>
<th>uvular</th>
<th>Pharyngeal</th>
<th>glottal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless stop</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>(tʃ)</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>q</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced stop</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dʒ</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ʔ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasal</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral</td>
<td>l</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(l)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trill</td>
<td>r</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiceless fricative</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>š</td>
<td>ſ</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>(χ)</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voiced fricative</td>
<td>(v)</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>ž</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>γ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-vowel</td>
<td>w</td>
<td></td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There is a tendency towards convergence with Arabic, evident both in the incorporation of Arabic lexical loans without any obligatory phonological adaptation, and so in the wholesale accommodation of Arabic phonemes, as well as in the infiltration of Arabic sounds into the inherited (non-Arabic) component.

Perhaps the most conspicuous feature is the pharyngealisation of dentals, which is distinctive within the Arabic component, but to a large extent variable within the Indic or pre-Arabic component. We thus have the alternations [doːm, doːm] ‘Dom’, [tæt, tæt] ‘heat’, [moːtur, moːtur] ‘urine’. Conventionalisation of pharyngealisation in non-Arabic items can be found in the tendency towards progressive assimilation, where a Domari ending follows an Arabic stem, as in [tawˈleːta] ‘on the table’, Arabic tawle and Domari dative ending -ta.

There are in addition quite a few non-Arabic lexical items which seem to have adopted pharyngealisation and which display it consistently; examples are [doːnd] ‘tooth’, [moːt] ‘person’, [wɑːt] ‘stone’.

The pharyngals [h] and [ʔ] appear to be restricted to the Arabic component. There are other consonants that may be assigned predominantly but not exclusively to Arabic loan material. Thus [y] appears occasionally in pre-Arabic items, as in [jeˈɣer] ‘horse’, [biɣ] ‘moustache’, as does [q] – [qaˈʃɪ] ‘food’, [qoːɬɒm] ‘I opened’, alternating frequently with [k]: [kaˈpi, qaˈpi] ‘door’ (<Turkish kapi), [kaʃtɔˈta, qaʃtɔˈta] ‘small’. [q] is further subject to variation with [χ], as in [qoːɬɒm, χoːɬɒm] ‘I opened’, [qal, χal] ‘said’ (discourse particle introducing quotations in narratives, from Arabic qāl ‘he said’). The realisation in Domari of underlying [q] in Arabic-derived words such as [ʔaχwa] ‘coffee’ points to an early adoption of this component and to its current perception as an integral part of the Domari system. When conversing in Arabic, Doms will consistently adopt the Jerusalemite pronunciation [ʔaχwe]. The etymological Arabic consonants [θ] and [ð] however do not appear in the material, and their contemporary Palestinian Arabic cognates [t] and [d,z] are found instead. A further consonant that is typical of the Arabic lexical component is [ʔ], though it also functions regularly within the pre-Arabic component indicating verb negation in final position: [biːrɛʔ] ‘s/he does not fear’.

Incongruent with the contiguous Arabic system are the sounds [p], [ɡ] (found in Egyptian, but not in Palestinian Arabic), as well as [tʃ] (found in rural dialects of Arabic in the regions surrounding Jerusalem to the west and northwest, an outcome of palatalisation of underlying [k]: čalb < kalb ‘dog’). All four are restricted to the pre-Arabic component: [piˈɾɪn] ‘nose’, [ɡʊɾˈgiː] ‘throat’, [ʃanˈɪʃmɪma] ‘next to me’ (čanɛʃ-i-m-ma ‘in my vicinity’). Although the [p-b] contrast remains on the whole distinctive – cf. [paˈʃɪjoːm] ‘my husband’,
\[\text{[ba'jo:m]} \text{ ‘my wife’} – \text{there are signs of its partial retreat. In initial position, [p] often}
\text{undergoes lenisation: [p\text{\textsuperscript{u}tur}] ‘son’, [\text{\textsuperscript{p}and\text{\textsuperscript{d}}}] ‘s/he’. In medial position, fricativisation can}
\text{be observed: [kafi\text{\textsuperscript{j}}a] ‘door(acc.)’. Also contrasting with Arabic we find, though marginally}
\text{in the corpus, a voiced labio-dental fricative [v], in variation with [w]: [rov\text{\textsuperscript{rom}}] alongside}
\text{[row\text{\textsuperscript{rom}}] ‘I wept’, occasionally replacing underlying Arabic [w] as in [u\text{\textsuperscript{v}lidrom}] ‘I was
\text{born’. A velar l-sound also appears rather marginally in [\text{\textsuperscript{f}a\text{\textsuperscript{l}}}] ‘well, waterhole’, [s\text{\textsuperscript{a}l}] ‘rice’;}
\text{it is shared with southern Kurdish, and with Arabic in ‘\textit{älltah, yáltah}, and in the environment}
\text{of pharyngals, as in \textit{xall\text{\textsuperscript{s}}}.”}

\text{A case of sound convergence with Arabic is the status of the alveo-palatal affricates}
[dʒ] and [tʃ]. The first exists in principle in the inherited inventory of Palestinian Arabic,
\text{but is undergoing reduction to a simple fricative [ʒ]. This process is reflected in Domari as}
\text{well; a general retreat of affricates becomes apparent when one compares our material with}
\text{that discussed by Macalister. Some words tend to maintain the underlying affricate rather}
\text{consistently: [la'\text{\textsuperscript{d}}ʒi] ‘shame’ [dʒu\text{\textsuperscript{d}}ʒi] ‘Egyptian’. Affricates are also generally retained}
\text{following dentals: ['\text{\textsuperscript{p}and\text{\textsuperscript{d}}}i] ‘s/he’, [m\text{\textsuperscript{a}n\text{\textsuperscript{d}}}] ‘inside’. Elsewhere, there is variation, and in}
\text{pre-consonantal position, general reduction: [dʒa, ʒa] ‘go’, [xu'\text{\textsuperscript{d}}ʒoti, xu'ʒoti] ‘yesterday,
\text{[ʒib, ʒib] ‘tongue’, but [ʒi\text{\textsuperscript{n}}:m] ‘my tongue’. The voiceless counterpart, which lacks an}
\text{Arabic match, undergoes a similar though more radical change. In the speech of most}
\text{speakers interviewed, the affricate is, except among the oldest speakers, almost entirely lost}
\text{in initial position – [\text{\textsuperscript{f}r\text{\textsuperscript{d}}om}] ‘I spoke’ < č\text{\textsuperscript{irdom}}, [\text{\textsuperscript{o}:n\text{\textsuperscript{i}}}] ‘girl’ < č\text{\textsuperscript{o}nī} – and subject to}
\text{variation in medial position: [la'\text{\textsuperscript{f}}i:, la'\text{\textsuperscript{i}:}] < lā\text{\textsuperscript{c}i} ‘girl’.”}

\text{Gemination is typical of the Arabic component – [h\text{\textsuperscript{b}b\text{\textsuperscript{o}}:mi]} ‘I like’, from Arabic
-\textit{hibb-} – though stem gemination also occurs sporadically in inherited (pre-Arabic) lexical}
\text{items: [\text{\textsuperscript{t}l\text{\textsuperscript{i}}\text{\textsuperscript{l}}la]} ‘big’, [ka'3\text{\textsuperscript{a}}] ‘(non-Dom) man’. More widespread distinctive gemination can also}
\text{be the result of consonant assimilation at the attachment point of grammatical affixes:}
[xizi\text{\textsuperscript{w}i\text{\textsuperscript{d}}e:ssan}] < xiznaw\text{\textsuperscript{i}dē\text{\textsuperscript{s}}-san ‘you.PL made them laugh’, but [xizi\text{\textsuperscript{w}i\text{\textsuperscript{d}}e:ssan}] <}
\text{[xiznawi\text{\textsuperscript{d}}e\text{\textsuperscript{s}}-san ‘they made them laugh’; [la'\text{\textsuperscript{h}}hari] > lah\text{\textsuperscript{a}r-\textit{i}} ‘he sees you’, but [la'\text{\textsuperscript{h}}hari] <}
\text{lahar-\textit{i} ‘he sees’, [kur\text{\textsuperscript{j}}amma] < kuriya(n)-\textit{ma ‘in the houses’, but [kur\text{\textsuperscript{j}}ama] < kuriya-\textit{ma}
\text{‘in the house’.”}

\text{2.1.2. Prosody}

\text{Domari has word-level stress, contrasting with the Arabic phoneme-level stress (with}
\text{accentuated long vowels). Stress falls on the last syllable of lexical items (\textit{ūyār ‘town’}, as}
\text{well as on the grammatical markers for gender/number (s\text{\textsuperscript{n}-\textit{á/s\text{\textsuperscript{n}}-\textit{e ‘boy/boys’})}. Layer I}
case inflection (see below; dōm/dōm-ās ‘Dom.NOM/ACC.’), possessive personal markers on the noun (boy-óm ‘my father’), person inflection in prepositions (atni-r ‘about you’), subject concord markers on the verb (lahed-óm ‘I saw’), and the postposed synthetic negation marker on the verb (inmangam-ē? ‘I don’t like’). Unstressed grammatical markers are Layer II case markers (ūyár-ma ‘in the town’), tense markers (see below; lahedóm-a ‘I had seen’), and enclitic object markers (lahedóm-ir ‘I saw you’). In these accentuation patterns Domari, disregarding its particular forms of enclitic object and possessive personal markers and of synthetic negation, matches exactly the features of accentuation encountered in conservative dialects of European Romani. The most noticeable difference between the two languages is the treatment of recent loan nouns. In Romani, European-origin nouns usually maintain their original non-ultimate stress in nominative forms. In Domari, Arabic nouns are adapted to ultimate accentuation patterns: baladiyyā ‘municipality’ < Arabic baladīyya. Exceptions are proper nouns, which retain their original stress in the nominative form – āhmad – but adapt in inflected forms – āhmadās (ACC.).

2.1.3. Syllable structure

The typical syllable structures are CV, CVC(CVC), CVCV, CVCCV. Attested word-initial clusters include /tk, tq, tm, tn, tl, th, tf, ts, tś, tš, th, tw, bk, dr, gr, kl, kr, kw, mh, mn, mr, rk, rf, st, sk, sn, sr, št, šr, šl, šm, fr, fl, xr, xl/. Word-internal clusters are quite common and do not seem to be limited, while word-final clusters are rare and tend to be avoided. In sentence-medial position, clusters of more than two consonants (-C CC-) are avoided through the insertion of an epenthetic vowel [e, i, ɪ] between the first and the second consonant in the sequence.

Lexical roots usually contain up to three syllables. These can usually be followed by up to three syllables of grammatical affixes in nouns, and even more in the case of verbs: consider xiz-naw-id-e-san-a ‘they had made them laugh’, containing the root xiz- ‘to laugh’, the causative marker -naw-, the perfective marker -id-, the 3.PL subject marker -e, the 3rd person plural object marker -san-, and the remoteness tense marker -a.

2.2.0. Morphophonology

2.2.1. Phonological structure of morpheme and/or word; morpheme-to-syllable correspondence
Apart from assimilation of consonantal segments in the attachment points of grammatical affixes, as discussed above, the only morphological units that adjust to syllable structure are combinations of the enclitic object pronoun and the external tense markers -i (progressive) and -a (remote). In the absence of these tense affixes, i.e. in the subjunctive and simple past, consonantal markers of object pronouns are attached to the subject concord marker as an independent syllable, with -i at its onset: laha-m ‘(that) I see’ (subjunctive), laha-m-ir ‘(that) I see you’; lhado-m ‘I saw’, lhado-m-ir ‘I saw you’. When external tense markers are present, i.e. in the present indicative, in the perfect, and in the pluperfect, pronominal object clitics lose their independent syllable status and are incorporated into the same syllable of the tense marker: laha-m-i ‘I see’, laha-m-r-i ‘I see you’; lhado-m-i ‘I have seen’, lhado-m-r-i ‘I have seen you’; lhado-m-a ‘I had seen’, lhado-m-r-a ‘I had seen you’.

2.3.0. Semantics and grammar

Domari shows a mixed morphological type. At the level of the expression of grammatical relations, it is overwhelmingly analytic in the expression, for instance, of attributes to the predication, deictic reference, and most local relations. On the other hand, the expression of valency as well as both subject and object concord is synthetic. Expressions of modality and tense and aspect are mixed. At the level of morphological structure, the language shows an older layer of inflectional morphology, which comprises Layer I case marking on the noun, the marking of aspect on the verb, and the marking of subject/object and possessor/object concord on verbs and nouns/location expressions, respectively. Agglutinative morphology is found with Layer II case affixes, verb derivational marking, and tense marking. In Arabic loans which retain Arabic inflection, such as modals and auxiliaries, as well as ‘broken’ plurals in nouns, inflection is fusional.

2.3.1. Parts of speech; criteria for their identification; expression of universal grammatical notions (overview)

The distinction between parts of speech is made primarily on the basis of their inflectional potential, taking into account also their distributional and referential features. Since predications can be verbal as well as non-verbal – in the latter case, marked by a non-verbal
predication marker –, and since word order is flexible, neither the position nor the mere appearance within a predication is crucial to determining the status of an element. Consider the following kinds of predications:

Noun-Verb
(1) dōmiya mr-i  
woman die.PERF-F.SG  
‘the woman died’

Verb-Verb:
(2) gar-om kamk-am  
go.PERF-1.SG work-1SG.SUBJ  
‘I went to work’

Noun-Noun:
(3) bar-om grawar-ēk  
brother-1SG.NOM chief-PRED.M.SG  
‘My brother is the chief’

Noun-Adjective:
(4) zara till-ēk  
boy big-PRED.M.SG  
‘The boy is big’

Pronoun-Pronoun:
(5) aha ama-k-ēk  
this.M.SG.NOM 1.SG-BEN-PRED  
‘This is for me’

Noun-Preposition
(6) zara šanš-i-r-m-ēk  
boy next.to-SG.OBL-2SG-LOC-PRED  
‘The boy is next to you’

Non-finite verbs (participles) can assume a similar status to nouns and adjectives in non-verbal (non-finite) predications; compare
The status of tilla as an adjective in the above sentence is determined by its function as an attribute to zara 'boy', and characterised by its position, pre-posed to the noun, and its inflectional agreement with the head. The example below illustrates the same word functioning as a noun:

(9)  
\[\text{till-a} \quad \text{mind-ird-ěk}\]  
\[\text{big-M.SG.NOM} \quad \text{stand-PERF-PRED.M.SG}\]  
‘The big one / the chief / the king is standing’

Alongside combination potential (agreement with the head), referential topicality is thus a crucial distinguishing factor between nouns and adjectives.

On this basis of inflectional potential, distributional potential, and pragmatic referential function, we can identify the following parts of speech: **Verbs** describe processes, and take tense-aspect affixes and obligatory person inflection. **Nouns** describe stable entities, and take case inflection (which is sensitive to class, incorporating gender and number), and in the case of referentially dependent nouns (nouns referred to in relation to contextual entities) they may also carry person inflection. There is thus a continuum, ranging from possession-relevant nouns such as kury-oman ‘our house’, to more ambivalent nouns such as ?dis-oman ‘our day’ (in a figurative sense). **Pronouns** (including demonstratives and person indefinites) refer to context-bound entities and may take case inflection, but not person inflection. **Adjectives** describe attributes of other entities, take agreement and potentially case inflection, but not person inflection. This latter factor distinguishes adjectives from nouns: consider tilla ‘big’, but till-osan ‘their chief/king’, lit. ‘their big one’. **Prepositions** and **location adverbs** may either accompany nouns without inflection, or take person inflection when they modify a contextually known entity.
In some cases, they can take Layer II case inflection markers, and can serve as carriers of
the non-verbal predication. Elements that carry no inflection at all can be referred to
collectively as **particles**, though they differ considerably in their distribution and
referential potential, which justifies the identification of sets such as interrogatives,
quantifiers, conjunctions, and so on. Note however that clear-cut distinctions between, for
instance, discourse markers, adverbs, and focus particles are not always easy to arrive at.
Figure 3 summarises the main parts of the speech and their inflectional potential, and
illustrates the affinities and differences between the more closely related parts of speech:

Figure 3: The inflectional potential of parts of speech in Domari

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of speech</th>
<th>Inflectional potential</th>
<th>tense/aspect</th>
<th>person</th>
<th>Layer I case</th>
<th>Layer II case</th>
<th>non-verbal predication marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>finite verb</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participle</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noun</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pronoun</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preposition</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>particle</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Taking a broad view of ‘lexical’ in the sense of unbound morphemes (lexical entries), we
could say that Domari adopts lexical means of expression for stable entities (nouns), stable
attributes of entities (adjectives), states, experiences, processes, events and actions (verbs),
quantifiers, attributes of an entire predication (adverbs), and operators at the clause and
interaction levels (conjunctions, interjections and discourse markers). Participants and local
relations are expressed both lexically and morphologically. Tense, aspect, and mood are
expressed morphologically, while modality is expressed lexically. Syntactic adjacency along
with morphological agreement indicate relations between elements in the clause.

2.3.2. Nominal categories

The Domari noun has two genders, masculine and feminine. Masculine nouns often end in
-a (*qrar*-a ‘Beduin man’, *šōn*-a ‘son’, *zar*-a ‘boy’, *snot*-a ‘dog’), while feminine nouns often
end in -i (qarr-i ‘Beduin woman’, šōn-i ‘daughter’, lāš-i ‘girl’), brar-i ‘cat’) or in -iya (dōm-iya ‘Dom woman’). Nouns of both genders can end in consonants: bar ‘brother’ (M), bōy-i ‘father’ (M), payy- ‘husband’ (M), bēn ‘sister’ (F), day- ‘mother’ (F), bay- ‘wife’ (F). The gender of Arabic nouns (masculine vs. feminine) is generally retained in Domari. Grammatical gender distinction is neutralised in the plural, though the formation of the plural is based on the singular and so it often formally reflects the gender of the singular, and with animates gender is lexicalised (cf. dōm-e ‘Dom men’ vs. dōm-inya ‘Dom women’). Gender agreement appears with verbs in the 3SG perfective (barom šird-a ‘my brother said, vs. bēnom šird-i ‘my sister said’), though this is neutralised when a pronominal object clitic is added (barom/ bēnom šird-os-is ‘my brother/sister said it’); gender agreement also appears in the non-verbal predication marker (barom mišt-ěk ‘my brother is ill’, vs. bēnom mišt-ik ‘my sister is ill’). Adjectives in preposed position also agree in gender with the following nouns (er-a till-a zar-a ‘the big boy came’, vs. er-i till-i lāš-i ‘the big girl came’); there is, however, a tendency to place adjectives in post-nominal position, as non-verbal predications (er-a zar-a till-ěk ‘the boy came, being big = the big boy came’).

2.3.3. Number

Number is generally expressed on nouns by the ending -e (dōm-e ‘Dom men’ vs. dōm-inya ‘Dom women’). In principle, this can also apply to preposed adjectives (qišt-u kury-e ‘the small houses’). The plural predicative ending is -ěni (ehe dōm-ěni ‘these are Doms’), which is also the preferred construction with adjectives (kury-ěni qišt-ěni ‘small houses’). In finite verbs, as well as in the pronominal system, number marking is intertwined with person marking, and each person has its individual singular and plural form. An exception are oblique pronominal affixes, which serve as direct and indirect object markers on finite verbs, as possessive markers on nouns, and as prepositional objects on prepositions and local relations adverbs. Here, plurality is indicated by suffixing -an to the person stem of the singular (kury-om ‘my house’, kury-oman ‘our house’; lahadem-īs ‘I saw him/her’, lahadem-īsan ‘I saw them’).

The present-day generation of speakers of Jerusalem Domari has only retained Indo-Aryan forms for the lower numerals ek- ‘one’, dies ‘two’, taranes ‘three’, štares ‘four’, pandžes ‘five’, as well as das ‘ten’ and siyyak ‘one hundred’. Arabic numerals are used for all other numbers, including ordinal numerals and fractions. A full set of Indic numerals is attested in Macalister (1914), and appears to be still in use among some speakers in Gaza.
2.3.4. Case; expression of possession

Like other New Indo-Aryan languages, Domari shows a three-layered case system. Layer I case markers are selective remnants of Old Indo-Aryan case inflection forms. At this level, there is a distinction between the nominative, which is the case of the subject/agent/undergoer/experiencer

(10)  
\[ \text{ehe} \quad \text{dööm-e} \quad \text{raw-ardi-e} \quad \text{min} \quad \text{dary-osan-ki} \]  
these.PL.NOM Dom-PL.NOM travel-PERF-3PL from place-SG.NOM-3PL-ABL  
‘Those Doms left their place (of temporary residence)’

(11)  
\[ \text{b-ir-e} \quad \text{portkil-an-ki} \quad \text{dööm-e} \]  
fear-PERF-3PL Jew-PL.OBL-ABL Dom-PL.NOM  
‘The Doms were afraid of the Jews’

and the oblique, which is the case of the direct object:

(12)  
\[ \text{t-ird-a} \quad \text{man-as} \]  
put-PERF-3SG.M bread-M.SG.OBL  
‘He put the bread’

(13)  
\[ \text{lah-ad-om} \quad \text{kažž-as} \]  
see-PERF-1SG man-M.SG.OBL  
‘I saw the man’

(14)  
\[ \text{kol-d-om} \quad \text{kapi-ya} \]  
open-PERF-1SG door-F.SG.OBL  
‘I opened the door’

Layer II markers follow the oblique ending. There are five distinct Layer II markers: Dative (-ta, or with some speakers -ka), Locative (-ma), Benefactive (-ke), Sociative (-sanni or -san), and Ablative (-ki).

The Dative in -ta generally expresses contact which does not explicitly entail containment. With location expressions and verbs of motion it expresses the goal of a motion:
(15) gar-om kam-as-ta
    go.PERF-1SG work-M.SG.OBL-DAT
    ‘I went to work’

(16) bidd-i dža-m kury-a-ta
    want-1SG go-1SG.SUBJ house-F.SG.OBL-DAT
    ‘I want to go home’

(17) t-ird-om kubay-ē ṭawl-ē-ta
    put-PERF-1SG cup-F.SG.OBL table-F.SG.OBL-DAT
    ‘I put the cup on the table’

or the location of a state:
(18) lak-ed-om-s-i wēs-r-ēk kurs-a-ta
    see-PERF-1SG-3SG-PRES sit-PERF-PRED.M.SG chair-F.SG.OBL-DAT
    ‘I have seen him sitting on the chair’.

Further types of contact expressed by the Dative can be with means and instruments –

(19) mamnūʕ-ī xūl-š-ad gor-yan-ta
    prohibited-PRED ride-SUBJ-3PL horse-PL.OBL-DAT
    ‘They are not allowed to ride horses’

(20) ʕazifk-and-i rabbab-ē-ta
    play-3PL-PRES rabbab-F.SG.OBL-DAT
    ‘They play the rabbab’

– or among humans:

(21) ti'arraf-hr-ēn baʻid-ē-man-ta
    meet-LOAN.ITR.PERF-1PL REC-PL-1PL-DAT
    ‘We met one another’

Finally, the Dative can also express an abstraction analogous to actual contact:

(22) sm-ar-i dōm-an-ta
hear-3SG-PRES Dom-PL.OBL-DAT
‘He hears about the Dom’

(23) š-ird-om abu-s-ke putr-ē-m-ta
say-PERF-1SG to-3SG-BEN son-PL-1SG-DAT
‘I told him about my sons’

(24) dawwir-kar-ad-i putr-o-s-ta
search-LOAN.TR-3PL-PRES son-SG.NOM-3SG-DAT
‘they are looking for his son’

(25) lagiška-d-e ehe raqqāš-an-ta
argue-PERF-3PL these.PL dancer-PL.OBL-DAT
‘they had an argument about those dancers’.

The Dative in -ta is confined to a group of speakers, generally the oldest among the fluent speakers, while in the speech of the others this form has been entirely replaced by -ka, which covers exactly the same functions. This development appears to be the result of a levelling within the Layer II paradigm, triggered by the presence of two other forms in -k-, namely the Benefactive in -ke(ra) and the Ablative/Prepositional in -kī.

The Locative in -ma, by contrast, expresses contained location, either stative –

(26) šar-y-and-i kury-i-s-ma dōm-an-kī
hide-ITR-3PL-PRES house-SG.OBL-3SG-LOC Dom-PL.OBL-ABL
‘they are hiding in the houses of the Doms’

– or directional –

(27) ere hindar āyar-ma
come.PERF-3PL here town-LOC
‘They came here into the town’.

Here too, analogous abstractions can be found:

(28) kay-ma kallam-ōk atu? dōm-as-ma!
what-LOC speak-2SG.PRES you Dom-M.SG.OBL-LOC
‘What are you speaking (in)? In Domari!’.

The **Benefactive** is the case of the recipient and beneficiary:

(29) š-ird-om  dāy-i-m-ke
say-PERF-1SG mother-SG.OBL-1SG-BEN
‘I said to my mother’

(30) tu qayıš putr-i-m-ke!
put food son-SG.OBL-1SG-BEN
‘serve food for my son!’

(31) t-om-is  ple  şadiq-i-m-ke
give.PERF-1SG-3SG.OBL money friend-SG.OBL-1SG-BEN
‘I gave money to my friend’.

The **Sociative** is rare, having been almost entirely replaced by a preposition (Arabic ma’ ‘with’); it is used in a comitative function:

(32) š-ird-om  bøy-i-m-san
speak-PERF-1SG father-SG.OBL-1SG-SOC
‘I spoke with my father’.

The **Ablative** is found in its original meaning expressing source only among the older speakers, and, it seems, only in expressions implying initial containment –

(33) kil-d-om  kury-a-kī
exit-PERF-1SG house-F.SG.OBL-ABL
‘I went out of the house’

– while non-containment is expressed through an added preposition (Arabic min ‘from’):

(34) sin-d-om  min zar-es-kī
hear-PERF-1SG from boy-M.SG.OBL-ABL
‘I heard from the boy’.
Here, the preposition must not be interpreted as merely reinforcing the synthetic Ablative marker. Rather, the Ablative serves as a Prepositional case:

(35) ama xarrif-r-om ma' ʂāḥb-i-m-ki
I speak-PERF-1SG with friend-SG.OBL-1SG-ABL
‘I spoke with my friend’ (cf. Sociative ʂāḥbim-san)

(36) ama gar-om la kury-i-s-ki
I go-PERF-1SG to house-SG.OBL-3SG-ABL
‘I went to his house’ (cf. Dative kuryis-ta).

Among the younger among the fluent speakers, who have generalised the use of the ablative preposition min, the Ablative no longer has an independent semantic function and is confined to this use as a Prepositional case.

**Possession** is expressed by consonantal person markers: 1sg -m, 2sg -r, 3sg -s, 1pl -man, 2pl -ran, 3pl -san. Possessive markers are attached to a vowel, so-to-speak a first-layer possessive marker. At the level of this first layer, number and case of the possessed noun are distinguished. Number distinction only appears in the nominative: kury-o-s ‘his house’, kury-ĉ-s ‘his houses’; putr-o-m ‘my son’, putr-ĉ-m ‘my sons’; dîr-o-m ‘my daughter’, dîr-ĉ-m ‘my daughters’. When the possessed noun appears in non-subject position, the vowel indicates oblique case: cf. boy-o-m ‘my father’, but lahedom boy-i-m ‘I saw my father’; kury-o-m ‘my house’ and kury-o-r ‘your house’, but garom min kury-i-m-ki la kury-i-r-ki ‘I went from my house to your house’. The origin of this possessive case inflection is not clear, but it could derive from some form of relativiser or determiner which once mediated between the head noun and a postposed possessive pronoun, agreeing with the head in number and case. Gender agreement may have been levelled at a later stage. The erosion and simplification of this paradigm is still ongoing, and we only find case distinctions in the singular forms – -om, -or, -os vs. -im, -ir, -is, – while the plural forms are, so far, only documented with a single vowel attachment (-oman, -oran, -osan) for nouns in different thematic roles.

The Domari genitive-possessive construction is based on a generalisation of the 3sg possessive marker. It employs the singular possessive marker on the head, irrespective of the actual number of the possessor-determiner, while the determiner itself appears in the ablative-prepositional case (possibly replacing an underlying genitive case in similar function and form). The word order in this format is consistently head-determiner.
(37)  
\[ \textit{kury-o-s kažž-as-kī} \]
house-SG.NOM-3SG man-M.SG.OBL-ABL
‘The man’s house’

(38)  
\[ \textit{grawar-o-s dōm-an-kī} \]
chief-SG.NOM-3SG dom-PL.OBL-ABL
‘The leader (chief, or Mukhtar) of the Doms’

If the determiner itself is marked for possession in a multiple possessive construction, then the possessive affix may, variably however, carry the oblique form:

(39)  
\[ \textit{bəy-o-s šādiq-i-m-kī} \]
father-SG.NOM-3SG friend-SG.OBL-1SG-ABL
‘My friend’s father’

but also

(40)  
\[ \textit{kury-o-s bār-o-m-kī} \]
house-SG.NOM-3SG brother-SG.NOM-1SG-ABL
‘My brother’s house’.

If the head is not in subject position, it takes whatever case reflects its syntactic role; a non-nominative case will then trigger an oblique form of the possessive marker on the head:

(41)  
\[ \textit{kury-o-s} \]
house-SG.NOM-3SG
‘His house’

but

(42)  
\[ \textit{ama t-ird-om-i kury-i-s-ma bār-o-m-kī} \]
I put-PERF-1SG-PRES house-SG.OBL-3SG-LOC brother-SG.NOM-1SG-ABL
‘I live [= have settled in] my brother’s house’

(43)  
\[ \textit{zaman-i-s-ma nohr-an-kī} \]
time-SG.OBL-3SG-LOC red-PL.OBL-ABL
‘In the time of the British (rule)’.

Note that Layer II case affixes follow the possessive marker (kury-is-ma ‘in his house’).

Alongside the principal genitive-possessive construction, a morphologically ‘weaker’ form expressing multiple possession can be found. It involves a determiner-possessor that is inflected for person, preceding a head that lacks phoric reference to the possessor:

(44) boy-i-m kuri
father-SG.OBL-1SG house
‘My father’s house’.

From a comparison with related and contiguous languages, it would seem that this might represent a simplified form of an underlying det-head construction inherited from Indic; its distribution in the corpus however does not quite support such an interpretation, as the construction seems to surface more frequently among less-fluent speakers. The analytic genitive in kāk-, cited by Macalister, appears sporadically – 

tonis giš plēm kākīm ‘I gave him all my money’. Noteworthy is that, although at first glance this seems to copy the Arabic analytical genitive-possessive in tabā‘-, albeit based on an indigenous particle most likely of deictic-relative origin, the possessive inflection on plēm ‘my money’ is nevertheless retained. It is yet to be established whether this has constrastive function (as in Arabic, bēt-i tabā‘-i ‘my own [nobody else’s] house’, cf. bēt-i or l-bēt tabā‘-i ‘my house’).

### 2.3.5. Verbal categories: voice, tense and aspect, mood, transitivity

The verb stem may be followed by derivational extensions expressing transitivisation (i.e. causative, usually in -naw-) or de-transitivisation (i.e. passive, in present -y-, past & subjunctive -i-). This derivation is quite productive: ban-ari ‘he shuts’ > ban-y-ari ‘it is being shut’; šar-dom ‘I hid (tr.)’ > šar-i-rom ‘I hid (intr.)’; qē-ror ‘you ate’ > q-naw-idor ‘you fed’, etc.

Aspect consists of the opposition between progressssive (or non-completion), expressed by the present, imperfect, subjunctive; and perfectivity (or completion), expressed by forms based on the historical past participle – preterite or ‘unspecified perfective’, perfect, pluperfect. Perfective categories are formed through an extension to the verb stem in -d- or -r-, derived from MIA -t-: lahe-d-om ‘I saw’, ga-r-a ‘he went’.

'Mood' refers to the explicit marking of the subjunctive/optative. This is only applicable to some verbs which employ an historical optative extension in -š- for this purpose. For other verbs, the subjunctive is identical to the present indicative, except for its lack of tense specification. Other verb classes have generalised the use of the historical optative extension in -š- to indicative forms as well.

Tense is expressed in the final, right-most position in the verb layout. There are two such affixes, which I call the contextualising marker (-i) and the de-contextualising or remoteness marker (-a). The contextualising marker figures in the present (laham-i ‘I see’) and perfect (lahedom-i ‘I have seen’). Its function is the actualisation of an action or its result within the currently activated context of the speech event. The de-contextualising marker forms the imperfect when added to the present form (laham-a ‘I was in the habit of seeing’), and the pluperfect when added to the unspecified perfective form (lahedom-a ‘I had seen’). Its function is to emphasise the demarcation between the action conveyed by the verb, and the currently activated speech context. Note that it does not intervene with the aspectual qualities of progressivity (present as well as imperfect) or perfectivity (plain perfective as well as pluperfect).

2.3.6. Deictic categories

Person can be expressed for subject roles by free-standing personal pronouns (ama ‘I’, atu ‘you.SG’, pandži ‘he/she’, eme ‘we’, itme ‘you.PL’, pandžan ‘they’). There are only isolated traces of personal pronouns carrying object inflection – specifically, in the first person of the benefactive case: ama-ke ‘for me’, emin-ke ‘for us’. In other object roles, and for all other persons, person is expressed by the set of nominal person agreement markers, attached to a local expression: ab-ur-ke ‘for you’, ab-san-ke ‘for them’, wāš-im ‘with me’, wāš-is ‘with him/her’. This same set of nominal person markers is used with nouns to indicate possession: ben-om ‘my sister’, ben-or ‘your sister’. Verbs carry, potentially, two sets of person agreement markers: one indicating subject agreement, the other indicating (direct) object agreement: lah-am-i ‘I see’, lah-am-r-i ‘I see you’; lah-ar-i ‘he sees’, laha-r-m-i ‘he sees me’. There are two sets of subject agreement markers; the first accompanies present stems (laha-r- ‘he/she sees’, laha-čk- ‘you.SG see’, etc.), the second accompanies perfective stems (laha-d-a ‘he saw’, laha-d-or ‘you.SG saw’). The first, present set is a continuation of the Old Indo-Aryan set of agreement markers. The second set derives from late Middle Indo-Aryan enclitic object pronouns, and is such is related to the set of person markers indicating the direct object on the verb, the indirect object of local relation expressions, and the possessor of nouns (see sample inflection paradigm below).
Definiteness may be expressed overtly in Domari through accusative case endings, which distinguish generic or indefinite direct objects from those that are contextually or situationally specified: thus

(45) *ama piy-am-i* *guld-as*
I drink-1SG-PRES tea-M.SG.OBL
‘I am drinking my tea’ (with situational reference to a particular cup of tea)

but

(46) *ama in-mang-am-e’* *piy-am* *gulda*
I NEG-ask-1SG-PRES.NEG drink-1SG.SUBJ tea.NOM
‘I don’t like drinking tea’

(47) *ama šar-d-om* *pl-an*
I hide-PERF-1SG money-PL.OBL
‘I hid the money’

but

(48) *šar-d-om* *ple*
hide-PERF-1SG money.PL.NOM
‘I hid some money’.

This device is rather common in languages that lack overt definite articles, but have regular case inflection, such as Hindi or Turkish.

Indefiniteness may be expressed overtly by a postposed indefinite marker *-ak*, which evidently derives from an underlying form of the numeral ‘one’ *ek*, reminding of the suffixed indefinite markers of various languages in India, but also of northern Kurdish (Kurmanji):

(49) *diš-ak kamkar-and-a*
day-INDEF work-3PL-PAST
‘One day they were working’
(50) *bidd-ak šar kiy-ak*
want-2SG hide.2SG.SBJ what-INDEF
‘You want to hide something’

(51) *ama lah-ed-om kažža-k*
I see-PERF-1SG man-INDEF
‘I saw a man’

(52) *ehr-a wāši-m qušša-k*
become.PERF-3SG.M with-1SG story-INDEF
‘Something (lit. ‘a story’, < Arabic qušša) happened to me’

(53) *fī dēy-ak min dēy-i-s-ki l-ʔirāq*
in town-INDEF from town-SG.OBL-3SG.ABL Iraq
‘In one of the towns of Iraq’.

Note that the indefinite marker overrides oblique case assignment, which is reserved for definites (*ama lahedom kažż-as ‘I saw the man’*).

Demonstratives inflect for gender, number, and case, and distinguish near and situational orientation (nominative M.SG *aha*, F.SG *ihi*, PL *ehe*, oblique *er-* with appropriate class endings), from remote (oblique *or-*; a distinct nominative exists only for M.SG *uhu*). Location adverbs are *hindar* ‘here’ (also *hnēn*) and *hundar* ‘there’ (also *hnon*).

There are three kinds of expressions of spatial and local relations. Pre-Arabic case relation expressions are generally used with pronominal reference: *wāš-īs* ‘with him/her/it’, *atn-īr* ‘about you’, *ab-san-ke* ‘for them’, *nkā-m* ‘in my possession’. A number of prepositions of Arabic origin are also integrated into this pattern: *min-š-īs* ‘from him/her/it’ (Arabic *min* ‘from’), *ʕan-k-im* ‘about me’ (Arabic *ʕan* ‘about’). Functionally, these expressions correspond directly to the semantic slots of the nominal case paradigm, such as Sociative/Comitative, Dative, Benefactive, Locative, and Ablative. With nominal referents, these relations tend to be expressed by free-standing and uninflected Arabic prepositions:

(54) *min bar-i-m-ki*
from brother-SG.OBL-1SG.ABL
‘from my brother’ (Arabic *min* ‘from’)

(55) *baʃd ḥarb-as-ki*
after war-M.SG.OBL-ABL
‘after the war’ (Arabic *ba’d* ‘after’).

Note that the noun carries the prepositional case marker (Ablative) -*ki*. An additional set of expressions covers more specific spatial relations. It includes *mandža* ‘in’, *bara* ‘out’, *paš* ‘behind’, *agir* ‘in front’, *atun* ‘above’, and *axär* ‘below’. These expressions are used as adverbial modifiers accompanying case-inflected nouns:

(56) *kury-a-ma* *mandža*
house-F.SG.OBL-LOC inside
‘Inside the house’

(57) *kury-a-ma bara*
house-F.SG.OBL-LOC outside
‘Outside the house’.

Often, the same expressions are used in a Dependent-Head construction:

(58) *mandž-i-s-ma kury-a-ki*
inside-SG.OBL-3SG-LOC house-F.SG.OBL-ABL
‘Inside the house’ (lit. ‘in its-inside from-the-house’).

Some, albeit few Arabic expressions are also integrated into this pattern:

(59) *žamb-i-s-ma läč-a-ki*
next.to-SG.OBL-3SG-LOC girl-F.SG.OCL-ABL
‘Next to the girl’ (< Arabic *žamb* ‘next to’).

All particles used at the discourse level to establish relationships with the discourse context are borrowed from Arabic. This includes clause combining particles (*u* ‘and’, *bass* ‘but’, *ya* ‘or’, *laʔinno* ‘because’), sentential adverbs (*bi-l-marra* ‘at all’, *bilʔāxar* ‘finally’), discourse markers (*yaʔni* ‘that is’), interjections, and relative pronouns (*illī*).

Negation of the present indicative verb involves both a prefix *n*- and a suffixed glottal stop: *mangamsani* ‘I like them’ > *nmangamsané?* ‘I don’t like them’. In some negative constructions, the second component appears on its own: *piyamé?* ‘I don’t drink’. The negated form of *ašte* ‘there is’ is *nhé?*. Other tenses generally take the negator *na*, the
imperative may take *ma* – both preceding the verb. Domari also employs Arabic negators. Arabic *mā ... -iš* or either one of its two components attaches to the inflected Arabic verbs *kān-* and *sār-* and to the quasi-verb *bidd-*.

Non-verbal predications are negated using Arabic *mišš*: *pandži mišš mištēk* ‘he is not ill’.

2.3.7. Lexical classes (semantic/grammatical classes)

Adverbs and function words consist of a number of subgroups. Expressions of specific local relations may accompany nouns, and may also inflect for anaphoric possession (referring back to the noun which they qualify; see above). Conjunctions and particles are similarly divided into those that are uninflected, such as *ū* ‘and’, *bass* ‘but’, and those that may refer back to a topic, such as *liʔann-o* ‘because (he/it)’.

Non-finite verb forms are limited in Domari to the participle, which is always derived from the perfective stem, and which always carries a predicative ending, marking gender and number: *mind-ird-ēk* ‘standing (M.SG)’, *mind-ird-ik* ‘standing (F.SG)’, *mind-ird-ēni* ‘standing (PL)’. Masdars occur indirectly, in the incorporation of a simplified form of the Arabic verb, derived from the Arabic subjunctive (imperfective) stripped of its person inflection, into a carrier verb indicating valency and marking out the verbal root as a loan: *š(t)ri-k-amī* ‘I buy’, Arabic *yi-štri* ‘that he buy’.

Interrogative pronouns are *ki* ‘what’, *kawax* ‘when’, *krēn* ‘where’, *kēkē* ‘why’, *kāni* ‘who’, *kēhē* ‘how’, and the Arabic loan *qaddēš* ‘how much’. Indefinite pronouns typically derive from interrogatives: *kiy-ak* ‘something’ (literally ‘a what’), *ēk-ak* ‘somebody’ (literally ‘a one’), and in a negated predication ‘nothing, nobody’ or ‘anything, anybody’. The Arabic *hāḏžak* ‘something, anything’ is also common, and Arabic forms are generally used for other indefinites forms, and an Arabic indefinite marker is used to express universal functions: *kull ēkak* ‘everyone’.

Adjectives in Domari are a peculiar class. The overwhelming tendency in discourse is to use them in a fashion that resembles, and derives from, a predicative construction, though the meaning of this construction is shifting to that of a plain attribution:

(60) er-e dom-ēni bizzot-ēni  
come.PERF-3PL Dom-PRED.PL poor-PRED.PL  
‘Poor people arrived’ (= ‘it is people, being poor, who arrived’).
The trigger for this shift in meaning is possibly the post-nominal position of the adjective in Arabic, which the Domari predicative construction is able to replicate. Adjectives are further odd in that their comparative and superlative forms are fully suppletive, being derived wholesale from Arabic: *tilla* ‘big’, *ʔakbar* ‘bigger’; *qištota* ‘small’, *ʔazgar* ‘smaller’. Presumably, this is related to the pressure to borrow non-positive marking in adjectives, but the inability to isolate an Arabic non-positive marker due to the fusional, introflectional nature of the Arabi comparative. Speakers are thus tempted to borrow the Arabic non-positive form itself, associated with it non-positive attributes.

2.4.0. Sample paradigms

Figure 4: Personal pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1SG</th>
<th>2SG</th>
<th>3SG</th>
<th>1PL</th>
<th>2PL</th>
<th>3PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>ama</td>
<td>atu</td>
<td>pandži</td>
<td>eme</td>
<td>itme</td>
<td>pandžan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>amake</td>
<td>aburke</td>
<td>abuske</td>
<td>eminke</td>
<td>abranke</td>
<td>absanke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>nkím</td>
<td>nkír</td>
<td>nkís</td>
<td>nkíman</td>
<td>nkíran</td>
<td>nkísan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>atním</td>
<td>atnír</td>
<td>atnís</td>
<td>atníman</td>
<td>atníran</td>
<td>atnísan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>wáším</td>
<td>wášír</td>
<td>wášís</td>
<td>wášíman</td>
<td>wášíran</td>
<td>wášísan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>minkím</td>
<td>minkír</td>
<td>minkíś</td>
<td>minkíman</td>
<td>minkíran</td>
<td>minkísan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The non-nominative cases are in most cases (with the exception of the Benefactive in the first person singular and plural) composed of local relation expressions with a person suffix.
Figure 5: Demonstratives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Proximate</th>
<th>Remote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M.SG</td>
<td>F.SG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>aha</td>
<td>ihi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>eras</td>
<td>era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>eraske</td>
<td>erake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>erasma</td>
<td>erama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>erasta</td>
<td>erata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>erassan</td>
<td>reasan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>eraski</td>
<td>eraki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Verbs:

Figure 6: Transitives: šar- ‘to hide (something)’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>šarami</td>
<td>šaram</td>
<td>šarama</td>
<td>šardom</td>
<td>šardomi</td>
<td>šardoma</td>
<td>šar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>šarēk</td>
<td>Šar</td>
<td>šarēya</td>
<td>šardor</td>
<td>šardori</td>
<td>šardora</td>
<td>šar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M</td>
<td>šarari</td>
<td>šarar</td>
<td>šarara</td>
<td>šarda</td>
<td>šardayi</td>
<td>šardaya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F</td>
<td>šarari</td>
<td>šarar</td>
<td>šarara</td>
<td>Šardī</td>
<td>Šardēyi</td>
<td>Šardēya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>šarani</td>
<td>šaran</td>
<td>šarana</td>
<td>šardēn</td>
<td>šardēni</td>
<td>šardēna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>šarasī</td>
<td>šaras</td>
<td>šarasā</td>
<td>šardēs</td>
<td>šardēsi</td>
<td>šardēsa</td>
<td>šaras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>šara(n)di</td>
<td>šarad</td>
<td>šara(n)da</td>
<td>šarde</td>
<td>šardeyi</td>
<td>šardeya</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 7: Analytic verb forms (auxiliaries):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>kān ‘used to do’</th>
<th>sār ‘to begin to do’</th>
<th>bidd- ‘to want to do’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>kunt šarama</td>
<td>širt šarami</td>
<td>biddi šaram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG,M</td>
<td>kunt šarēya</td>
<td>širt šarēk</td>
<td>biddak šar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG.F</td>
<td>kuntī šarēya</td>
<td>širtī šarēk</td>
<td>biddešar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M</td>
<td>kān šarara</td>
<td>šār šarari</td>
<td>biddo šarar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F</td>
<td>kānat šarara</td>
<td>šārat šarari</td>
<td>biddha šarar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>kunnā šarana</td>
<td>širnā šarani</td>
<td>biddnā šarān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>kuntū šarasā</td>
<td>širtū šarasī</td>
<td>biddkom šaras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>kānut šara(n)da</td>
<td>šārū šara(n)di</td>
<td>biddhom šarad</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 8: Transitive verbs with object pronouns:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3SG-1SG</td>
<td>šarammi</td>
<td>šararim</td>
<td>šararma</td>
<td>šardosim</td>
<td>šardosmi</td>
<td>šardosma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG-2SG</td>
<td>šaramri</td>
<td>šaramir</td>
<td>šaramra</td>
<td>šardomir</td>
<td>šardomri</td>
<td>šardomra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG-3SG</td>
<td>šaramsi</td>
<td>šaramir</td>
<td>šaramsa</td>
<td>šardomis</td>
<td>šardomsi</td>
<td>šardomsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG-1PL</td>
<td>šararmani</td>
<td>šararman</td>
<td>šararmana</td>
<td>šardosman</td>
<td>šardosmani</td>
<td>šardosmana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG-2PL</td>
<td>šaramrani</td>
<td>šaramran</td>
<td>šaramrana</td>
<td>šardomran</td>
<td>šardomrani</td>
<td>šardomrana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1SG-3PL</td>
<td>šaramsani</td>
<td>šaramsan</td>
<td>šaramsana</td>
<td>šardomsan</td>
<td>šardomsani</td>
<td>šardomsana</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 9: Assimilation patterns with object pronouns (object pronoun -san ‘them’):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pres.Ind.</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>šaramsani</td>
<td>šardomsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>šarēssani</td>
<td>šardorsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.M</td>
<td>šarasani</td>
<td>šardosan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG.F</td>
<td>šarirsani</td>
<td>šardosan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>šaransani</td>
<td>šardēnsan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>šarassani</td>
<td>šardēssan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>šarassani</td>
<td>šardesan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other intransitive inflection classes have the following features: A tendency to adopt the subjunctive form as an indicative present: kilšami ‘I exit’, subjunctive kilšam, past kildom. They include the verb hošami ‘I become’, hrom ‘I became’ (the non-enclitic version of the copula paradigm). Some intransitive are not derived, and so do not show -y- extension to the present stem: rowami ‘I cry’, subjunctive rošam, past rowrom. Some roots show an extension in -t- in present stem: nastami ‘I flee’, past nasrom. Irregular intransitives include šūšami ‘I sleep’, past sitom; awami ‘I come’, past ērom; džami ‘I go’, past garom.

The perfect is the preferred from with most predications that do not involve lexical verbs: ama mišтahromi ‘I am ill/ have fallen ill’, pandži mištēk ‘he is ill/ has fallen ill’. The Present Indicative forms are found sporadically: šatšānomi ‘I am thirsty’. The set is productive in particular in the adaptation of intransitive loan verbs from Arabic: ama skunn(h)omi ‘I live’, pandži skunn(h)ori/ skunnēk ‘he lives’ (Arabic -skun- ‘to live’).
Nouns:

Figure 12: Nominal inflection classes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Masculines in NOM -a, OBL -as</th>
<th>Masculines in NOM -C, OBL -as</th>
<th>Masculines in NOM -C, OBL -i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>šōna ‘boy’</td>
<td>dom ‘Dom man’</td>
<td>xudwar ‘child’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šōnas</td>
<td>šone</td>
<td>dom</td>
<td>dome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šōnaske</td>
<td>šonan</td>
<td>domas</td>
<td>doman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šōnasma</td>
<td>šonamma</td>
<td>domasma</td>
<td>domamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šōnasta</td>
<td>šonamma</td>
<td>domasta</td>
<td>domanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šōnassan</td>
<td>šonnassan</td>
<td>domassan</td>
<td>domassan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šōnaski</td>
<td>šonanki</td>
<td>domaski</td>
<td>domanki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nouns</th>
<th>Feminines in NOM -i, OBL -(y)a</th>
<th>Feminines in NOM -a, OBL -ē</th>
<th>Feminines in NOM -C, OBL -i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>laši ‘girl’</td>
<td>domiya ‘Dom woman’</td>
<td>ūyar ‘city’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>laši</td>
<td>lašye</td>
<td>domiya</td>
<td>domiyē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lašya</td>
<td>lašyan</td>
<td>domiyē</td>
<td>domiyan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lašyake</td>
<td>lašyanke</td>
<td>domiyēke</td>
<td>domiyanke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lašyama</td>
<td>lašyamma</td>
<td>domiyēma</td>
<td>domiyamma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lašyata</td>
<td>lašyanta</td>
<td>domiyēta</td>
<td>domiyanta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lašyasan</td>
<td>lašyassan</td>
<td>domiyēshan</td>
<td>domiyassan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lašyaki</td>
<td>lašyanki</td>
<td>domiyēki</td>
<td>domiyanki</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group {Masculines in NOM -a, ACC -a} includes primarily inherited Indo-Aryan masculines, such as kaža ‘man’, ACC kažas, mana ‘bread’, ACC manas. The group {Masculines in NOM -C, ACC -as} is widespread, and includes animates as well as inanimates, inherited nouns as well as loans: dis ‘day’, ACC disas; qird ‘monkey’ (<Arabic) ACC qirdas, kōmir ‘coal’ (< Turkish) ACC kōmras; lağiš ‘fight’ (nominalisation), ACC lagšas; but note also gēsu ‘wheat’, ACC gēswas. Somewhat less frequent is the group {Masculines in NOM -C, ACC -i}, which attracts many Arabic loans, such as bustān ‘garden’, ACC bustānī, but also Pre-Arabic words, such as titin ‘tobacco’, ACC titnī. Among the feminine nouns is the group of inherited feminines in {NOM -i, ACC
-\(y\)a}, e.g. gori ‘horse’, ACC gorya. The group \{Feminines in NOM -a, ACC -\(\varepsilon\}\) attracts also the numerous Arabic loans that are, in Arabic, feminines in -a: lamba ‘lamp’, ACC lambē, šažara ‘tree’, ACC šažarē. The group \{Feminines in NOM -C, ACC -\(\check{r}\}\} however is not lexx common: džuwir ‘woman’ ACC džuwri.

Figure 13: Nouns with possessive markers: bar ‘brother’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SG.Nom.</th>
<th>SG.Obl.</th>
<th>PL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1SG</td>
<td>barom</td>
<td>barim</td>
<td>barēm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2SG</td>
<td>baror</td>
<td>barir</td>
<td>barēr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3SG</td>
<td>baros</td>
<td>baris</td>
<td>barēs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1PL</td>
<td>baroman</td>
<td>bariman</td>
<td>barēman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2PL</td>
<td>baroran</td>
<td>bariran</td>
<td>barēran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PL</td>
<td>barosan</td>
<td>barisan</td>
<td>barēsan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14: Adjectives and participles: till- ‘big’, mindird- ‘standing’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>attributive</th>
<th>predicative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adjective</td>
<td>participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.SG</td>
<td>till</td>
<td>tillēk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.SG</td>
<td>tilli</td>
<td>tillik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>tille</td>
<td>tillēni</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.0. Morphosyntax

2.5.1. Word structure

The basic structure of word forms consists of the lexical root, followed by derivational suffixes, and finally by inflectional suffixes. The morphologically most complex word form belongs to verbs. The lexical root is followed optionally by a valency-changing marker (causative or passive), and with Arabic borrowing, by a loan-verb adaptation marker (deriving from one of the Domari roots, ‘to do’ or ‘to become’). This is followed by a perfective marker (in the past or perfective tenses), which is then followed by subject and (optionally) object concord markers, and finally by an external tense marker:
2.5.2. Word formation

Domari has few productive derivational morphemes. The deverbal nominaliser -iš often creates quasi-gerunds/infinitives (or ‘masdar’) used in nominal reference to an activity: našiš ‘dancing’, from našy- ‘to dance’; mangiš ‘begging’, from mang- ‘to ask’. Some derivations also function as plain nouns: qayiš ‘eating; food’, from q- ‘to eat’. An agentive/adjectival suffix -na is similarly attached to verbal roots: mangišna ‘beggar’,
bayyina ‘coward’ (from by- ‘to fear’). A feminine derivation marker -iya forms feminine counterparts to animate nouns: dôm ‘Dom man’, dōmiya ‘Dom woman’. Among the most productive derivation markers in the language is the verbalising marker -k(ar) (from kar- ‘to do’). It often attaches to the masdar forms of inherited verbal roots to form new verbs: mangiškade ‘they begged’, from mangiš ‘begging’, based on mang- ‘to ask’; qayiškadi ‘she cooked’, from qayiš ‘dish of food’, from q- ‘to eat’. Alongside -hr- (from hr- ‘to become’), it acts as a loan verb adaptation marker for Arabic verbal roots: sîlka ‘he asked’, Arabic - sîl-; dżawizahre ‘they married’, Arabic -dżawwiz-. Further derivation markers in the verbal domain include the causative markers -naw-/aw- – qami ‘I eat’, qnawami ‘I feed’, biyami ‘I fear’, bnawami ‘I scare’; kildom ‘I left’, klawidom ‘I removed/pulled/raised’ – and the passive marker, present stem -y-, past stem -i-: marari/marda ‘he kills/killed’, maryari/marîra ‘he is being killed/was killed’. Compounding is rare, and occurs in isolated words such as gištane ‘all’ (giš ‘all’, and Turkish-derived tane ‘item’), and the place-name guldî-dey ‘Hebron’ (lit. ‘sweet-town’, named after its vineyards).

2.5.3. Simple clause structure. Subject-object relations; syntactic positions; types of simple clause

Domari is a nominative/accusative language. There are two types of predicates: lexical verbs, which agree with the subject (and may also carry pronominal object reference), and non-verbal or copula predications. The copula is enclitic, and may attach to nouns, adjectives, adverbs and especially local relation adverbs, often following Layer II markers (mindž-i-s-m-ēk ‘(is) in the middle’; kury-a-m-ēk ‘(is) at home’), or verb participles, as well as pronouns. Subject agreement with lexical verbs is based on a person/number system, while copula agreement in the 3SG also encodes gender. Yes-no questions are marked by intonation only, wh-questions by a set of interrogative pronouns, usually occupying the first position in the sentence, accompanied by question intonation, and usually V-S order

(61) krēn gar-a bar-o-r?
where go.PERF-3SG.M brother-SG.NOM-2SG
‘Where did your brother go?’

Imperatives are expressed by the imperative form of the verb, which is normally identical to the respective subjunctive form of 2nd persons.
Domari word order can be described as flexible. Out of context, simple declarative clauses are likely to show S-V-O order:

(62)  
\[ \text{day-o-m} \quad \text{nan-d-i} \quad \text{man-as} \]
mother-SG.NOM-1SG bring-PERF-3SG.F bread-M.SG.OBL
‘My mother brought the bread’

(63)  
\[ \text{day-o-m} \quad \text{gar-ǐr-i} \quad \text{kury-a-ta} \]
mother-SG.NOM-1SG return-PERF-3SG.F home-F.SG.OBL-DAT
‘My mother returned home’

In context, anaphoric continuation of subject through subject-agreement on the verb (pro-drop) is common. While the object is not likely to occupy the first position, the demotion of topical subjects to final position is very common:

(64)  
\[ \text{gar-ǐr-i} \quad \text{kury-a-ta} \quad \text{day-o-m} \]
return-PERF-3SG.F home-F.SG.OBL-DAT mother-SG.NOM-1SG
‘My mother [who had been mentioned in the previous context] returned home’

Topicalisation of objects is typically achieved by left-dislocation, in the nominative case, with subsequent object pronominal resumption:

(65)  
\[ \text{ū} \quad \text{ama manaʃّ-ka-d-os-im} \quad \text{dž-a-m} \quad \text{hnōna} \]
and I prevent-LOAN.TR-PERF-3SG-1SG go-1SG.SUBJ there
‘And me, he prevented me from going there’

2.5.4. Clause combinations

Most clause combinations are achieved by means of coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, all with which are borrowed from Arabic. Conjunctions are generally uninflected function words, though liʔann- ‘because’ may agree with the continuing subject of both clauses (if this subject is identical). In this case, Arabic agreement inflection is used. Note the following examples for coordination:

(66)  
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } \text{lamma kunt} \quad \text{ama qaʃtőt-ik} , \quad \text{na nēr-ded-im} \\
\text{when was.1SG I small-PRED.F.SG NEG send-PERF-3PL}
\end{align*}
When I was small, they didn’t send me to [any] school.
And [so] I stayed at home like a servant
And I was always I mean at home, not going out nor coming, nor do they take me anywhere.

‘I did not go out because it was raining’

Embeddings, where the subordinated clause is a constituent, show the only use of indigenous wh-elements in subordinated clauses:

‘I don’t know where he lives’

‘I have understood what he said’

Isolated examples in the corpus illustrate nevertheless the beginning infiltration of Arabic structures even here: Žaname‘ Ėș biddi karam ‘I don’t know what I want to do’ (< Arabic Ėš).

Relative clauses are introduced through the Arabic relativiser illi. Like Arabic, Domari too has an obligatory resumptive pronoun for all positions except the subject. Where only
one object appears, resumption of the head noun is indicated through object pronominal clitics on the verb (direct object) or a location expression (indirect object):

(70)  kažža illi lah-erd-om-is  xužoti
  man  RE see-PERF-1SG-3SG  yesterday
  ‘The man whom I saw [him] yesterday’

(71)  läši illi š-ird-om  wāši-s
  girl REL  speak-PERF-1SG with-3SG
  ‘The girl whom I spoke to [her]’

In principle the same strategy may be followed when the relative clause contains two objects:

(72)  mana illi t-or-is  ama-ke
  bread REL  give-PERF-2SG-3SG 1SG-BEN
  ‘The bread which you gave [it] to me’

(73)  ple illi t-or-san  ama-ke
  money REL  give-PERF-2SG-3PL 1SG.BEN
  ‘The money(pl) which you gave [them] to me’

At the same time there is also a tendency to employ an Arabic resumptive pronoun for a head noun that is the direct object of the relative clause, while the indirect object is expressed as a pronominal clitic on the verb. Arabic inflection is then used to mark agreement in gender and number between the Arabic resumptive pronoun and its Domari head noun:

(74)  mana illi t-or-im  iyyā-h
  bread REL  give-PERF-2SG-1SG RES-3SG.M
  ‘The bread which you gave me [it]’

(75)  ple illi t-or-im  iyyā-hum
  money REL  give-PERF-2SG-1SG RES-PL
  ‘The money(pl) which you gave me [them]’
Note that this has a double effect on the expression of syntactic relations within the sentence: Firstly, what is generally marked as an indirect object, namely the benefactive of the verb ‘to give’, is expressed as a pronominal clitic using the set of markers and the position in the verb normally reserved for direct objects. Second, Arabic inflection is used productively within the Domari sentence. I shall return to this latter point briefly below.

Complementation and purpose clauses

The key features of complementation structures in Domari are the split between subjunctive and indicative complements (indicated in Domari, as in Arabic, through the choice of mood in the subordinated clause), the presence of a conjunction, and the choice of a modal expression that requires a modal complement. There are only two modal expressions in Domari that are inherited: sak- ‘to be able to’, and mang- ‘to ask’, which latter is restricted to different-subject modal constructions (manipulation). Other modal expressions are Arabic, and carry, if inflected, Arabic inflections: lāzīm ‘must’ (impersonal), ṣār- ‘to be begin’ (inflected), bidd- ‘to want’ (nominal inflection), xallī- ‘to allow’ (inflected).

As in Arabic, with same-subject modality no complementiser appears between the main and the complement clause, and the subordinated verb is finite and subjunctive (biddī karam ‘I want to do’). Manipulation clauses equally require no conjunction, but an overt representation of the manipulee must be present; the subordinated verb is likewise in the subjunctive:

(76) ama mang-ed-om minš-is šrī-k-ar mana
    I ask-PERF-1SG from-3SG buy-LOAN.TR-3SG.SUBJ bread
    ‘I asked him to buy bread’

(77) ama š-ird-om abu-s-ke aw-ar wāšī-m
    I say-PERF-1SG to-3SG-BEN come-3SG.SUBJ with-1SG
    ‘I told him to come with me’

(78) ama bidd-i atu šrī-k-a man-as
    I want-1SG you buy-LOAN.TR-2SG.SUBJ bread-M.SG.OBL
    ‘I want you to buy the bread’

In purpose clauses there is variation in the presence vs absence of a conjunction (which is, if present, always Arabic-derived). The split may be said to follow a continuum of semantic
integration, or in some instances, control by the main actor over the action conveyed by the purpose clause, thus resembling the distribution in Arabic:

(79) *nan fray-Č-m wark-am-san!*

bring.IMP clothe-PL-1SG wear-1SG.SUBJ-3PL

‘Bring my clothes for me to wear’

(80) *ama er-om kury-a-ta (Yaşān) lah-am-ir*

I come.PERF-1SG house-F.SG.OBL-DAT COMP see-1SG.SUBJ-2SG

‘I came home (in order) to see you’

(81) *ama t-om-ir ple (Yaşān) šrī-k-a mana*

I glve.PERF-1SG-2SG money COMP buy-LOAN.TR-2SG.SUBJ-2SG bread

‘I gave you money to buy bread’

(82) *ama qol-d-om qapiy-a Yaşān nik-š-ī*

I open.PERF-1SG door-F.SG.OBL COMP enter-2SG.SUBJ-2SG

‘I opened the door so that you may enter’

Indicative complements follow epistemic verbs. The subordinated verb is in the indicative, and the complement is always introduced by an (Arabic) conjunction *inn-*, which may assume either an impersonal or an inflected form (carrying Arabic inflection):

(83) *ama sin-d-om inn-o/inn-ak atu*

I hear-PERF-1SG COMP-3SG/COMP-2SG you

$īš-hr-or-i hīnēn

live-LOAN.ITR.PERF-2SG-PRES here

‘I heard that you live(d) here’

Adverbial clauses
Domari has converbs which express a co-occurring action. They are based on the attachment of the predicative suffix to the perfective form of the verb. The same function however can also be assumed by the finite present form of the verb, once again matching Arabic, which has two options, present participle and present/future, to express simultaneous action:
Other adverbial subordinations draw on Arabic conjunctions. Noteworthy is the distribution of tense and mood forms: Anteriority triggers, as in Arabic, the subjunctive in the subordinated clause. Realis conditionals show the present tense in both parts of the construction. Irrealis (counterfactual) constructions have unspecified perfective in the subordinated clause, and pluperfect, introduced by the Arabic particle kān, in the main clause:

(87) qabel mā dža-m xallas-k-ed-om kam-as
before COMP go-1SG.SUBJ finish-LOAN.TR PERF-1SG work-M.SG.OBL
‘Before I left I finished my work’

(88) lamma kunt ama qaštōt-ik, na nēr-ded-im madāris-an-ka.
when was.1SG I small-PRED.F.SG NEG send-PERF-3PL schools-PL.OBL-DAT
‘When I was small, they didn’t send me to school’

(89) iza wars-ar-i, n-aw-am-e’
if rain-3SG-PRES NEG-come-1SG-NEG
‘If it rains, I shall not come’

(90) law ēr-om xužoti kān laher-om-s-a
if come.PERF-1SG yesterday was see-PERF-1SG-3SG-PAST
‘If I had come yesterday, I would have seen him’
2.6.0. Lexical borrowings

Pre-Arabic loans in Domari include Persian elements (e.g. *pl-e* ‘money’, Persian *pul*), Kurdish (e.g. *zara* ‘boy’, *saľ* ‘rice’, *dey* ‘town’, Kurdish *zaro, saľ, deh*), and Turkic (biy ‘moustache’, *kapī* ‘door’, guzel ‘nice’). Much of the lexicon, in all likelihood even the majority of the lexical types (though not necessarily tokens) used in any Domari conversation, comes from Arabic; this includes 50% of the Swadesh list entries of assumed ‘core vocabulary’. Arabic items include numerals above 5 (excluding 10 and 100). Arabic nouns are incorporated with their plural counterparts (although Indic plural endings may be added on top of those): *musilm-in-e* ‘Muslims’ (Arabic *musilm-in*), *zīm-e* ‘men’ (Arabic *zīm*). Arabic verbs are adapted using the verbalising markers -*k-* (transitive) and -(h)o/*-hr- (intransitive) (see above). Arabic vocabulary loans include basic vocabulary items such as *zahra* ‘flower’, *šadžara* ‘tree’, *ʔasbaʕ* ‘finger’, *qamar* ‘moon’, *šāhīb* ‘friend’, *taʕbān* ‘tired’, *ʔišahr-* ‘to live’ (Arabic -*ʔiš*-), *fakirahr-* ‘to think’ (Arabic -*fakkir*-), *ʔišilk-* ‘to ask’ (Arabic -*ʔišl*-).

In the area of grammar, Arabic provides a series of modal verbs and auxiliaries, including ‘want’ (*bidd-*), ‘must’ (*lāzim*), ‘begin’ (*ṣār-*), ‘stop’ (*baṭṭal-*), ‘continue’ (*baqi-*), and the aspectual auxiliary for the habitual-frequentative (*kān-*); all these carry Arabic-derived person and tense-aspect inflection and Arabic negators (*mā*). The entire inventory of unbound prepositions is Arabic-derived (*min* ‘from’, *baʕd* ‘after’, *qabil* ‘before’, *minšān* ‘for’, *šan* ‘about’, and so on), as are the comparative and superlative forms of adjectives (including the lexical form: thus Indic-derived *tilla* ‘big’, Arabic-derived *akbar* ‘bigger’). All conjunctions, co-ordinating and subordinating, are Arabic (e.g. *ū* ‘and’, *yā* ‘or’, *bass* ‘but’, *liʔann-* ‘because’, *baʕd mā* ‘after’, *lamma* ‘when’, *iza* ‘if’, and so on), as are focus particles (*ḥatta* ‘even’, *bass* ‘only’), discourse markers (*yaʕnī, absar, baʕdēn*), most indefinite expressions, and most non-deictic adverbs, including phasal adverbs (e.g. *lissa* ‘still’). Arabic-derived are also the complementiser introducing complement clauses *inn-*), along with its agreement inflection with the subject of the complement clause, the relativiser *illi*, and the direct object resumptive pronoun in relative clauses *iyyā*-), along with its Arabic agreement inflection with the head noun.
Appendix: Narratives

Background

A number of legends and biographical narratives told by Muḥammad Dīb have already been published in Hebrew by Yaniv (1980). They include, in an edited form, two stories that are also presented here: The first is described by Yaniv as the principal tradition among the Doms pertaining to their origin. It connects the Dom with the tribe of Banī Qēs, which was divided into two clans – Banī Rabī‘a, led by Klēb, and Banī Murra, led by Džassās. A feud broke out between the two clans during the period of the Islamic conquests, as a result of which Džassās killed Klēb. Klēb’s son (or in some versions, brother), Sālem ez-Zīr, then took revenge and killed Džassās. He also punished Džassās’s clan, Banī Murra, by ruling that they should remain nomadic entertainers, forbidding them to ride horses and allowing only the use of donkeys. The Doms descend from Banī Murra, who travelled first to India, then to various countries in the Middle East, some of them settling in Jerusalem. The second story tells about the Persian king Bahram Gūr, who invited entertainers from India to settle in his kingdom. He gave them land and expected them to become farmers, but when they disappointed him and continued to make a living as dancers and musicians, he expelled them, ruling that they should remain nomads forever, as punishment.

Both legends have the theme of ‘ancestral guilt’, which is common among peripatetic groups as an explanation of their origin and position in society (Casimir 1987). A similar variant of the legend of Banī Rabī‘a and Banī Murra is presented in Meyer (1994:1-4), who recorded it from Doms in Damascus. Another version was recorded by Canova (1981) among the Nawar of Egypt, and a similar legend portraying ez-Zīr as the king who ordered the Gypsies into exile and nomadism is mentioned by Newbold (1856:291) in connection with the Helebi of Egypt.

The story of Bahram Gūr is told by the Persian poet Firdusi in his Shahnameh from the 11th century. The text describes how the Persian king invited a population of some 10,000 Indian musicians, called luri, in or around 420 AD, to come to Persia and serve as official performers. After attempts to settle them failed, the Luri remained nomadic entertainers. The story receives historical confirmation in various Arabic and Persian chronicles, with at least one source, Ḥamza Iṣfahānī, pre-dating Firdusi (Grierson 1887). The immigration of various northern Indian populations to the Persian Gulf area during the reign of the very

1 For Romani legends see for example Pickett & Agogino (1960), and see discussion in Casimir (1987:378-380).
same Sassanide king Bahrām V, is rather well described by Byzantine historians (cf. Wink 1990: 156). A legend resembling the Bahrām Gūr story, which relates to the Luti peripatetics of Luristan, was recorded by Amanolahī & Norbeck (1975:3).

The legend thus obviously has a well-established oral and written tradition in the Middle East, and is likely to be have some factual basis as well, though a clear connection between the Luri and today’s Dom, Rom, or Lom cannot be established. The story nonetheless dominates discussions of the origin of the Gypsies in popular literature, and one cannot exclude the possibility that it was adopted by the Jerusalem Dom community rather recently. In fact, while the legend of ez-Zīr and the two clans appears to be well-known to most if not all adult members of the community, it is not clear whether anyone other than the Mukhtar is at all familiar with the story of Bahrām Gūr.2

The legends as told by Muhammad Dīb in Domari include several modifications and mixtures of themes. Firstly, the names of the tribes are slightly altered, with Banī Qēs and Banī Murra figuring as the two rival clans, while Banī Rabi‘a is not mentioned at all. In Legend 1, the daughter of the Syrian King Tubba Ḥassān seeks revenge from Klēb, who had killed her father. She has her servant smuggle a sheep with an infectious mange into Klēb’s grounds, hoping to inflict illness on his entire household. The sheep however is killed by Klēb’s guards. She then turns to Džassās for help, thereby triggering the feud between the two clans, which ultimately leads to the expulsion of the Doms, the descendants of Džassās. Thus we have as additional themes the origin of the tribes in Syria, and a woman who incites rivalry between the related clans. Noteworthy is the fact that the key line, where the Old Lady calls upon Džassās to kill Klēb, is presented as a rhyming verse in Arabic (Legend 1, Segment 28), indicating that the Domari version is likely to be adopted from Arabic, rather than vice versa. There are two possible conclusions from this: The legend has either been adopted from non-Dom, Arabic-speaking peripatetics in the Near East, or its principal target audience is external, rather than internal (cf. Casimir 1987:376).

Muḥammad Dīb’s narrative then has the Doms migrating to India, and finally returning to the Near East with Saladin’s forces. The migration to India is necessary in order to reconcile the notion of an origin in a pre-Islamic Arab tribe, in Casimir’s (1987) terms the ‘original state’, before the infliction of punishment, with the well-established fact that the Doms speak an Indian language and so must have originated from India. Whether this

---

2 An Israeli anthropologist, who had befriended the Mukhtar during the early 1970s, claimed to have introduced the Mukhtar to the story of Bahrām Gūr (Yigal Tamir, personal communication, 1998).
testifies to a more recent layer of historical awareness, or whether we could be dealing with a contamination with the legend of Bahram Gur, remains unclear. The repeated reference to northern India in both Legends 1 and 2, as well as to the Indian language, suggests that there is indeed an attempt to accommodate information acquired more recently through indirect exposure to an external discussion context about the origin of the Gypsies, into the older and more traditional narrative, updating the latter into a more precise and reliable account.

Legend 2 actually embeds the Bahram Gur story into the context of the legend of ez-Zir. The narrative portrays the Doms initially as Arabs, whose connection to India is not original, but inflicted through their expulsion from their original lands. This allows once again to reconcile the Indian theme with the notion that the Doms were once a self-contained Arab tribe. The tension between self-contained existence and a peripatetic economy, representing the conflict with mainstream sedentary populations, surfaces first in the idea that entertainment professions and nomadism were part of the punishment inflicted by ez-Zir, and then in the failed attempt by Bahram Gur to turn the Doms into farmers. It is then also addressed indirectly in the mentioning of agriculture in connection with the settlement of Doms in Palestine. A further historical theme is the connection drawn between the arrival of the Doms, and the Saladin conquests. This might represent the community’s own historical recollection, but it could also be borrowed from the idea that peripatetics arrived in the region as camp-followers of invading Muslim armies (cf. de Goeje 1903). Likewise, the suggestion that the Doms might have been prisoners of Saladin’s armies, though inconsistent with the camp-follower theme, could be derived ultimately from similar suggestions in the literature, while supporting the overall line which portrays the Doms as reluctant nomads and migrants.

In conclusion, it seems useful to relate the two legends as told by the Mukhtar, to Casimir’s (1987) universal model of the expression of the relation between transgression of norms and values, guilt, and punishment in peripatetic origin legends. Dominating Legend 1 (the story of the two tribes) is what Casimir calls the typical ‘transformation of the niche’ from the original state, characterised by independence (an Arab tribe in Syria), to the resulting state of economic dependency, nomadism, and dispersion. This transformation is the result of punishment inflicted on the group for the transgression of norms and values, in

3 There is of course a gap of several centuries between the Islamic conquests to which De Goeje (1903) refers, and which took place between the seventh and ninth centuries AD, and the Saladin campaigns in the twelfth century.
our case the murder of Klēb, orchestrated in the middle of a sports competition, in response to the request by the Old Lady. Guilt and shame, which accompany the punishment on Casimir’s model, are in this case derived from the tribe’s collective responsibility for the deeds of its leader. Legend 2 presents yet a second such transformation, taking the story of the two tribes as portrayed in Legend 1 as a point of departure. Here, the Doms are already nomads, that is, they are already in the ‘resulting state’. But they are given the chance of promotion to a ‘high rank’ status of independence, through the generosity of the Persian king. Guilt and shame in this case are associated with their inability to make use of this offer and change their habits and lifestyle, which is expressed explicitly in the story (Legend 2/27). Punishment follows this admission of guilt. Further, secondary transformations between high rank/independence and nomadism/dependency are expressed when the Doms’ status as prisoners, on the one hand, and their settlement as farmers, on the other, are addressed.

**Legend 1**

1) ašlos dāmankī, ṣa-zamān ‘awwal,
   origin.3SG dom.PL.ABL in-time early
   The origin of the Doms, early on,

2) ašti di qabile ṭīšrēda kānū țī bilād/
   there.is two tribe.PL live.3PL.IMP were.3PL in land
dēyisma šāmaki.
town.3SG.LOC Syria.ABL
   There were two tribes, they used to live in the land of/ in a Syrian town.

3) nāmosan banī qēs ū banī murra.
   name.3PL Bani Qes and Bani Murra
   Their name was Bani Qes and Bani Murra.

4) tillos banī qēs nāmōs kēb.
   big.3SG Bani Qes name.3SG Klēb
   The leader of Bani Qes, his name was Klēb.

5) tillos banī murra nāmos dţassās.
big.3SG Banī Murra name.3SG Dżassās
The leader of Banī Murra, his name was Dżassās.

6) w-ehe dine māmūn putrēnī.
and.DEM.PL two uncle son.PL.PRED
And those two were cousins.

7) aštī ikaki wudik, bēnos tubba ḥassān.
there.is one.F old.ladyPRED daughter.3SG Tubba Hassan
There was an old lady, the daughter of Tubba Hassān.

8) lamma mardos klēb, marda tubba ḥassān malik ṣ-ṣām,
when killed.3SG.3SG Klēb killed.3SG.M Tubba Hassan King of Syria
When Klēb killed him, he killed Tubba Hassān the King of Syria,

9) biddhā intaqimhōšar/ stadhōšar tāros
want.3SG.F take.revenge.SUBJ.3SG claim.SUBJ.3SG revenge.3SG
min dōmanki, yañī min ehe dine qabilanki.
from Dom.PL.ABL that.is from Dem.PL two tribe.PL.ABL
She wanted to take revenge/ to take revenge from the Doms, that is, from those two tribes.

10) ērī ūala banī murra ūa dżassāsaski, wāšiš
came.3SG.F to Banī Murra to Dżassās.M.ABL with.3SG
na’āḏżēk ‘ažrabi
sheep.PRED mangy.PRED
She came to Banī Murra, to Dżassās, and with her was a mangy sheep.

11) w-ihī na’āḏża tirdī/ tirdī abuske aha/ zayy
and.DEM.F sheep put.3SG.F put.3SG.F on.3SG.BEN DEM.M like
šuṭʿur wa-hāda, šaṭar wa-hāda
perfumes and-that perfume and-that
And this sheep she put/ she put on her this/ like perfumes and all that, perfume and all that.
12) ā širdī absanke īhi naʾdžā qal īhi min assāshā
and said.3SG.F on.3PL.BEN DEM.F sheep said DEM.F from origin.F
min in-nāqiz in-nabi šāleḥ
from DEF.redeemer DEF.prophet Saleh
And she said to them: this sheep, she said, *is descended from the redeemer the Prophet Saleh.*

13) ašṭi nḳis ēkak dusarēk yāʾni ḥdimkari īhi / wudi.⁴
there.is at.3SG one.M black.PRED that.is serves.3SG DEM.F old.lady
She had a black servant, [who was] serving this/ old lady.

14) širdī īhi wudi hayke/ dusaraske hayyos,
said.3SG DEM.F old.lady this.BEN black.M.BEN this.3SG
[This] lady said to/ to this servant of hers,

15) qal par īhi naʾdžē, ū dža bīsātīnesma
said take DEM.F sheep.F.ACC and go gardens.3SG.LOC
klēbaski, xallī rīkar hundar.
Klēb.M.ABL let.3SG graze.SUBJ.3SG there
She said: take this sheep, and go to the gardens of Klēb, let her graze there.

16) aha dusara parda īhi naʾdžē ū bandos,
DEM.M black took.3SG.M DEM.F sheep.F.ACC and tied.3SG.3SG
tirdos hayma/ bustānīsmā klēbaski.
put.3SG.3SG this.LOC garden.3SG.LOC Klēb.M.ABL
[This] servant took [this] sheep and tied her, he put her in Klēb’s garden.

17) ū bustānī tillēk.
and garden.PRED big.PRED
And it was a big garden.

⁴ The repair appears to neutralise case marking, and the form should normally be *widya ‘old.lady.F.ACC’.*
18) ṣārat ʾihī naʿdža qāṭifkari min aha šadžarki
began.3SG.F DEM.F sheep picks.3SG from DEM.M tree.ABL
ū qāri
and eats.3SG
[This] sheep began to pick from [this] tree and to eat.

19) ḥurrāšīnes aha bustānki lakeda ʾihī naʿdžē,
guards.3SG DEM.M garden.ABL saw.3SG.M DEM.F sheep.ACC
fērendis mardedis.
beat.3PL.3SG killed.3PL.3SG
[This] garden’s guards saw [this] sheep, they beat her and killed her.

20) dusara hayyos widyaki ēra širda
black this.3SG old.lady.F.ABL came.3SG.M told.3SG.M
widyake.
old.lady.F.BEN
The old lady’s servant came and told the old lady.

21) ṣārat rōwari.
began.3SG.F cry.3SG
She began to cry.

22) ēra abuske klēb: karwe wudi, rowēk?
came.3SG.M 3SG.BEN Klēb INT old.lady cry.2SG
Klēb [= ḏassās] came to her: what is it, old lady, [why] are you crying?

23) qal: lakedori, hurrāšīnes bustāniski hayki
said saw.2SG.PERF guards.3SG garden.3SG.ABL this.ABL
klēbaski marde naʿdžim ʾillī ʾihī
Klēb.M.ABL killed.3PL sheep.1SG REL DEM.F
assāshā min naʿdžāt in-nābi šāleḥ
origin.3SG.F from sheep.PL DEF.prophet Saleh

5 Note the absence of Layer I marking here, as in other inanimate Arabic loans.

6 This is a mix-up, and the speaker actually means ḏassās.
She said: Did you see, the guards of Klēb’s garden killed my sheep, who is descended from the sheep flock of the Prophet Saleh.

24) šaṛi dżassās abuske: na zṛilhōši atu wudi.
say.3SG Dżassās 3SG.BEN NEG anger.SUBJ.2SG 2SG old.lady
Dżassās says to her: Don’t be angry, old lady.

25) ama dēmri badālis ʔašrin naʔdža ū ʔayyibkami
1SG give.1SG.2SG instead.3SG twenty sheep and improve.1SG
xātror.
Mood.2SG
I shall give you twenty sheep in its place, and I shall cheer you up.

26) qal: la’, ama naqbilome’.
said no 1SG NEG.accept.1SG.NEG
She said: No, I don’t accept.

27) yā imma naʔdžom gardohori, yā imma marēk amake
either sheep.1SG live.3SG either kill.2SG 1SG.BEN
klēbas, yā imma bardika ḥiżrom ndžūmi.
Klēb.M.ACC either fill.SUBJ.2SG lap.1SG stars.PRED
Either my sheep shall live, or you shall kill Klēb for me, or else fill my lap with stars.

28) yaʔni bi-l-ʔarabī: yā naʔdžatī tgūm, yā bitmalli ḥiżrī
that.is in.DEF.Arabic either sheep.1SG stand.3SG.F or fill.2SG lap.1SG
ndžūm, yā imma rās klēb bi-damm yḥūm
star.PL or else head Klēb in-blood turn.3SG.M
That is, in Arabic: Either my sheep shall rise, or you will fill my lap with stars, or else Klēb’s head shall float in blood.

29) dżassās qal: ama gardikaram nāʔdžor insakame’.
Dzassas said 1SG revive.SUBJ.1SG sheep.2SG NEG.can.1SG.NEG
Dżassās said: I cannot revive your sheep.
30) ila ɣēr xuya lamma gardikaris aburke.
but without God when revive.3SG.3SG 2SG.BEN
Only God can revive her for you.

31) ū bardikaram ḥiẓror ndżūmi qal hāda ndżūm
and fill.SUBJ.1SG lap.2SG star.S.PRED said that star.PL
hāda ʂaḻ̌b ʕalayy,
that difficult on.1SG
And to fill your lap with stars, he said, these stars that’s difficult for me.

32) amma-n iza biddek rās klēb marḥabābek!
but if want.2SG.F head Klēb welcome.in.2SG.F
But if you want Klēb’s head, you are welcome to it!

33) dīsak min disanki şār klēb ū dżassās kēlandi
day.INDEF from day.PL.ABL began.3SG.M Klēb and Dżassās ride.3PL
hayta goryanta, şābiqondi.
this.DAT horse.PL.DAT compete.3PL
One day Klēb and Dżassās went out to ride/ horses, they had a race.

34) goryos klēbaski ʂbuqhorî goryos hayki, ka/ dżassāsaski.
horse.3SG Klēb.M.ABL precede.3SG horse.3SG this.ABL Dżassās.M.ABL
Klēb’s horse arrives before/ Dżassās’s horse.

35) dżassās ʃardeya romhi axar ʕabāyiski ū uhu
Dżassās hide.3SG.IMP lance.PRED beneath gown.3SG.ABL and DEM.M
agrisi aha klēb, fēmēs rumuḥma,
in.front.3SG.PRED DEM.M Klēb hit.PRED.3SG lance.LOC
ila piştismēk,
but back.3SG.LOC.PRED
Dżassās was hiding a lance beneath his gown, and just as the other one stood in
front of him, [this] Klēb, striking him with the lance, directly in his back,

36) klibra.
fell.3SG.M
He collapsed.

37) ṣār parari min nhiriski aha klēb qabil mā began.3SG.M take.3SG from blood.3SG.ABL DEM.M Klēb before COMP maršar.
die.SUBJ.3SG Klēb started to take from his own blood, before he died.

38) ū ktibkari dżamāfatiske ahaliske, ehe bani qēs, and write.3SG community.3SG.BEN people.3SG.BEN DEM.PL Banī Qes inni dżassāṣ yudurkedosim ū mardosim.
COMP Dżassāṣ betrayed.3SG.1SG and killed.3SG.1SG
And [in it] he wrote to his community of people, [these] Banī Qes, [saying] that Dżassāṣ betrayed me and killed me.

39) ū ‘ūfa sāmiḥkarassanni, ū maras qabilos ehe and beware forgive.2PL.3PL and kill.SUBJ2PL tribe.3SG DEM.PL banī murra.
Banī Murra
And beware not to forgive them, and kill his tribe, [those] Banī Murra.

40) ĕre ahalos klēbaski, came.3PL people.3SG Klēb.M.ABL Klēb’s people arrived,

41) lakede klēbas, rumuḥ pištismēk ū pandži naza’fkarī. saw.3PL Klēb.M.ACC lance back.3SG.LOC.PRED and 3SG die.3SG
They found Klēb, a lance in his back, and he is dying.

42) ū ktibkadēk balatēṭa inni dżassāṣ mardosim.
and wrote.PRED foor.F.DAT COMP Dżassāṣ killed.3SG.1SM
And he had written on the floorstones that Dżassāṣ killed me.

43) gara dfinkeda klēbas ū ehra ḥarb bēn went.3SG.M burried.3SG.M Klēb.M.ACC and became.3SG war between banī qēs ū bēn banī murra.
Banî Qes and between Banî Murra
They went and buried Klēb, and war broke out between Banî Qes and Banî Murra.

44) *sab‘a snîn ḥarb* bēnatīsanni, *sab‘a snîn* manda fēyiš
seven years war between.3PL.PRED seven years stayed.3SG.M war bēnatīsan.
between.3PL
*Seven years* there was *war* between them, *seven years* the war continued between them.

45) *bi-l-‘āxir* putros klēbaski nāmosi džalu,
at.DEF.end son.3SG Klēb.M.ABL name.3SG.PRED Džalu
ū sālem ez-zîr aha bāros klēbaski.
and Salem ez-Zir DEM.M brother.3SG Klēb.M.ABL
*In the end*, Klēb’s son, his name was Džalu, and Salem ez-Zir was the brother of Klēb.

46) gara mīnda ka/ džassāsas ū mardedis.
went.3SG.M grabbed.3SG.M Džassās and killed.3PL.3SG
They went and caught Džassās and they killed him.

47) džama‘tēs džassāsakti ehe banî murra,
people.3SG Džassās.M.ABL DEM.PL Banî Murra
‘umurkedā atnis aha sālem ez-zîr, xal:
ordered.3SG.M on.3SG DEM.M Salem ez-Zir said
As for Džassās’s people, [these] Banî Murra, [this] Salem ez-Zir decreed, he said:

48) itme mamnū‘i hōšas hindar.
2PL forbidden.PRED be.SUBJ.2PL here
You are not allowed to remain here.

49) lāzem džas xalāmma hōšas.
must go.SUBJ.2PL wilderness.PL.LOC be.SUBJ.2PL
You must go and live in the wilderness.
50) läzem lamma itme rawasi rawas bi-ḥizz iš-šōb, must when 2PL travel.2PL travel.SUBJ.2PL in.strength DEF.heat w-iddinya agi and.DEF.weather fire.PRED
When you travel, you must travel in the hottest time, when the weather is fire-hot.

51) ū mamnū‘ī itme qolas goryanta.
and forbidden.PRED 2PL ride.SUBJ.2PL horse.PL.DAT
And you may not ride horses.

52) läzem itme qolas bass ehe qaran.
must 2PL ride.SUBJ.2PL only DEM.PL donkey.PL.ACC
You must only ride [these] donkeys.

53) mamnū‘ī arba‘-xamse buyūt skunnhōšas maš ba‘ḍ.
forbidden.PRED four-five houses live.SUBJ.2PL together
You are not allowed to live together, four-five households.

54) läzem tkūn itme mišāṭṭāḥresi
must be.SUBJ.3SG.F 2PL dispersed.COP.2PL
You must remain dispersed.

55) ū itme läzem mašīroran hōšas inni bass
and 2PL must destiny.2PL be.SUBJ.2PL COMP only
yannikaras ū našīšas.
sing.SUBJ.2PL and dance.SUBJ.2PL
And your destiny is that you shall only sing and dance.

56) ahak ūışatoran itme
DEM.M.PRED life.2PL 2PL
Thus is to be your life.

57) ehe dōme itšaṭṭītre ū krēn gare tirde?
DEM.PL Dom.PL dispersed.3PL and where went.3PL settled.3PL
fi ʃamāl l-hind.
in north DEF.India
These Doms dispersed and where did they go and settle? *In northern India.*

58) min uhu waxtaski, mande fi šamāl l-hind.
from DEM.M time.M.ABL stayed.3PL in north DEF.India
From that time on, the remained *in northern India.*

59) tšallimre l-luya l-hindiyye,
learned.3PL DEF.language DEF.Indian
They learned *the Indian language.*

60) ila qisem/ qismak minšisan lamma zhurahra
but part part.INDEF from.3PL when appeared.3SG.M
şallaḥ ed-din ’ayyūbī ü ēre ſala l-‘irāq
Salah ed-Din Ayyubi and came.3PL to DEF.Irag
ü ſala š-šām,
and to DEF.Syria
But part/ one part of them, when Saladin Ayyubi appeared and came *to Iraq and to Syria,*

61) ü ēre ſala falasṭīn ü šārū zaraḵandi ü hāda,
and came.3PL to Palestine and started.3PL farm.3PL and that
And they came *to Palestine* and started to engage in farming and so on,

62) ü mande hindar dôme.
and stayed.3PL here Dom.PL
And the Doms have remained here ever since.

**Legend 2**

1) aşłos dōmankī min eh/ qabīlet idž-dżassās ü klēb.
origin.3SG Dom.PL.ABL from tribe DEF.Dżassās and Klēb
The origin of the Doms is from/ *the tribe of Dżassās and Klēb.*

2) lamma dżassās yudurkeda klēbas ü marda
when Dżassās betrayed.3SG.M Klēb.M.ACC and killed.3SG.M
klēbas,  
Klēb.M.ACC  
When Džassās betrayed Klēb and killed Klēb,

3) putros džassāsaksi/ putros hayki/ klēbaski ēra  
son.3SG Džassās.M.ABL son.3SG this.ABL Klēb.M.ABL came.3SG.M  
marda džassāsas.  
killed.3SG.M Dzassas.M.ACC  
The son of Džassās/ the son of this/ of Klēb came and killed Džassās.

4) džassās kān aha tillos banī murra.  
Džassās was.3SG DEM.M big.3SG Banī Murra  
Džassās was the leader of Banī Murra.

5) banī-murra illi häy/ ehe dōme ya'ñi  
Banī Murra REL this DEM.PL Dom.PL that.is  
Banī Murra which is the/ those are the Doms.

6) banī murra ya'ñi bi-l'äxer laqabosan ya'ñi dōmahre.  
Banī Murra that.is in.DEF.end name.3PL that.is Dom.became.3PL  
Banī Murra, that is, in the end they were called, that is, they became the Doms.

7) putros klēbaski gara marda džassāsas ū  
son.3SG Klēb.M.ABL went.3SG.M killed.3SG.M Džassās.M.ACC and  
ʔumurkeda ʕaširista džassāsaksi inni mamnūʔi  
ordered.3SG.M clan.3SG.DAT Džassās.M.ABL COMP forbidden.PRED  
qilšad goryanta.  
ride.SUBJ.3PL horse.PL.DAT  
The son of Klēb went and killed Džassās and ordered that Džassās’s clan should not  
be allowed to ride horses.

8) ū da’iman xallihum barāriyamma, skunṛhošad  
and always leave.3PL wilderness.PL.LOC live.SUBJ.3PL  
barariyamma.  
wilderness.PL.LOC  
And [that] they should always stay in the wilderness, live in the wilderness.
9) ū ůišatosan hôšad na/ našiš.
and life.3PL be.SUBJ.3PL dance
And [as for] their way of life, they should be/ [it should consist of] dancing.

10) žamūkad ū našišad ū-hâda ya'Mi .
sing.SUBJ.3PL and dance.SUBJ.3PL and.that that.is
They should sing and dance and so on.

11) ū gare skunnahre fi ſamāl l-hind.
and went.3PL lived.3PL in north DEF.India
And they went to live in northern India.

12) ašti ěkaki maliki fi īrān nāmos bahrām gūr.
is one.M king.PRED in Iran name.3SG Bahram Gur
There was a king in Iran, his name was Bahram Gur.

13) snari dōmanṭa.
hear.3SG Dom.PL.DAT
He heard about the Doms.

14) pandžī ūíbra biddō lākar dōman ya'Mi
3SG wished.3SG.M want.3SG.M see.SUBJ.3SG Dom.PL.ACC that.is
kīk e/ ůišatos dōmanki.
how life.3SG Dom.PL.ABL
He wanted to see the Doms, that is, how/ the Doms’ life [was like].

15) ktibkeda kitābak la ūākmaske tabať ſamāl l-hind.
wrote.3SG.M letter.INDEF to governor.M.BEN of north DEF.India
He wrote a letter to the governor of northern India.

16) mangida mišiš inni nēr abuske min'akam
asked.3SG.M from.3SG COMP send.SUBJ.3SG to.3SG several
šeļan min dōmanki.
family.PL.ACC from Dom.PL.ABL
He asked him to send him several Dom families.

17) ḥākmos šamāl 1-hind nērda ḫawālī arbaʾī mīt ʿyēle
governor.3SG north DEF.India sent.3SG.M around four hundred family
min dōmankī,
from Dom.PL.ABL
The governor of northern India sent some four hundred Dom families.

18) tirdosan ehe marākbammaū gare ʿala īrān.
put.3SG.3PL DEM.PL boats.PL.LOC and went.3PL to Iran
He put them on [those] boats and they went to Iran.

19) malakos aha īrān gara istaqbillosan,
kind.3SG DEM.M Iran went.3SG.M welcomed.3SG.3PL
The King of Iran went and welcomed them.

20) ūṭosan bītak, ūṭa la kull kuri
and gave.3SG.3PL land.INDEF und gave.3SG.M to every house
goryak, qameḥ, ū bakarak.
horse.INDEF flour and sheep.INDEF
And he gave them land, and he gave every family a horse, some flour, and a sheep.

21) ‘assās innhom džad kara/ yaʿnī hōšad zayy
so that go.SUBJ.3PL do that.is be.SUBJ.3PL like
muzariʿīne, zirāʾkarad, ḫṣudkarad hāda
farmers.PL sow.SUBJ.3PL harvest.SUBJ.3PL that
In order that they go and do/ that is/ become like farmers, sow and harvest and so on.

22) ʿyēbra atnīsan džumʿa ērā mitxaffik
stayed.away.3SG.M on.3PL week came.3SG.M disguised.PRED
malikos īrānaki bahrām gūr.
knight.3SG Iran.F.ABL Bahram Gur
He was absent for a week, and he came disguised, the King of Iran, Bahram Gur.
23) ēra lakeda kull kuri eh/ aha ʕazifōsēk ehe came.3SGM. saw.3SG.M every house DEM.M play.3SG.PRED DEM.PL ɣananiyankī ɣ rabbābēk ɣ hāda ɣ ehe naʃyandi song.PL.ABL and play.rabbab.PRED and that and DEM.PL dance.3PL ɣ hāda.
and that
He came and saw every family eh/ this one is playing [those] songs and playing the rabbab and so on and the others are dancing and so on.

24) qal ya masaxxame kiyik/ kiyik aha li kardesis?
said oh poor.PL what.PRED what.PRED DEM.M REL did.2PL.3SG
He said: oh you poor things, what is it that you’ve done?

25) ama tōmran innī eh/ gēsu, kiyāsis gēsuki ɣ/ ɣ eh/ 1SG gave.1SG.2PL COMP wheat sacks.3SG wheat.ABL and and ɣ gōrwankī ɣ’aassās innī zirāʔkaras ɣ hṣudkaras and bulls.ABL on.basis COMP sow.SUBJ.2PL and harvest.SUBJ.2PL ɣ kate-ta?
where.PART
I gave you/ so that eh/ wheat, sacks of wheat and/ and eh/ and bulls so that you should sow and harvest, and where is it all?

26) kate gōrwe, kate gēsu ɣ illī tōmis abranke?
where bull.PL where wheat and REL gave.1SG.3SG to.2PL
Where are the bulls, where is the wheat and all that I have given you?

27) qal: yā sidna iḥna bitlaʃiš fi- idnā zirāʃ zirāʃkarān
said oh lord.1PL 1PL emerge.NEG in.hand.1PL farming farm.SUBJ.1PL wala illī sanaʃтан da’iman raqs ɣ yanāk
however REL trade.1PL always dance and song.PRED
They said: oh lord, we are not able to farm/ to farm, our only trade is always dancing and singing.

28) malik z’ilahra minšisan ɣ piʃ nawdōsan
king anger.3SG.M from.3PL and expelled.3SG.3PL
The King became angry with them and he expelled them.
29) gare ehe dōme skunnahre knēn? fī el-mōsel, illī
gent.3PL DEM.PL Dom.PL lived.3PL where in DEF.Mosul REL

fīl-īrāq hādī.
in.DEF.Iraq DEM.F
Those Doms went and where did they settle? *In Mosul, the one that is in Iraq.*

30) lamma zhurahra šalāḥ ed-dīn l-ayyūbī,
when appeared.3SG.M Salah ed-Din l-Ayyubi
When Saladin el-Ayyubi appeared,

31) ūarda giš dēyan,
and took.3SG.M all town.PL.ACC
And conquered all the towns,

32) ū wšil ūa-l-īrāq, ū l-mōsil, ū iḥtallahra
and arrived.3SG.M to DEF.Iraq and DEF.Mosul and conquered.3SG.M
l-mōsil wi-l-īrāq ū hāda,
DEF.Mosul and.DEF.Iraq and that
And he arrived in Iraq, and in Mosul, and he conquered Mosul and Iraq and so on.

33) parda min‘akam ūla min dōmankī yusare
took.3SG.M several family from Dom.PL.ABL prisoners.PL
He took several Dom families prisoner.

34) ū zḥifre ūla sūriyya ū lubnān ū falaṣṭīn ū hāda.
and escaped.3PL to Syria and Lebanon and Palestine and that
And they escaped to Syria and Lebanon and Palestine and so on.

35) ehe dōme illī pardosan yusare istawṭunahre
DEM.PL Dom.PL REL took.3SG.3PL prisoners.PL settled.3PL
hindar hayma fi falaṣṭīn
here this.LOC in Palestine
Those Doms whom he took prisoner settled here in this/ in Palestine.
36) ‘iši skunnahre hayma fī 'ammān ū fī sūriyya ū fī lubnān
something lived.3PL this.LOC in Amman and in Syria and in Lebanon ū hāda ū ‘iši bi yazzē ū hāda twaṭṭanahre hindar.
and this and something in Gaza and that settled.3PL here
Some [went to] live in/ in Amman and in Syria and in Lebanon and so on and some in Gaza and so on, they settled here.

37) yašni min ayyām šalah id-dīn dōme ṯwādžidre dēyamma hindar.
that.is from days Salah ed-Din Dom.PL existed.3PL town.PL.LOC here
That is, since the days of Saladin the Doms have lived here in these towns.
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**List of Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABL</td>
<td>ablative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGENT</td>
<td>agentive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEN</td>
<td>benefactive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAUS</td>
<td>causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>complementiser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td>dative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>feminine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMP</td>
<td>imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IND</td>
<td>indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDEF</td>
<td>indefinite article</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITR</td>
<td>intransitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOAN</td>
<td>loan verb adaptation marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOC</td>
<td>locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEG</td>
<td>negator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM</td>
<td>nominative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>oblique</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAST</td>
<td>(ant) past</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERF</td>
<td>perfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRED</td>
<td>predication suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES</td>
<td>present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REC</td>
<td>reciprocal pronoun (Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REL</td>
<td>relativiser (Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RES</td>
<td>resumptive pronoun (Arabic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>sociative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td>transitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>