(1) aiša bižike herne (< herna $+\varepsilon$ ?)

Aisha bizike(f.) bought
'Aisha bought the bizike (I saw it happen)'
(2) aiša bižike herna (<herna $+a$ ?)

Aisha bizike(f.) bought-EV
'Aisha bought the bizike (it's reported)'
(3) aiša non herna (< herna + Ø?)

Aisha bread(m.) bought
'Aisha bought the bread (I saw it happen)'
(4) aiša non herno (< herna +o ?)

Aisha bread(m.) bought-EV
'Aisha bought the bread (it's reported)'
Evidential forms seem to be characterized by agreement with the Absolutive argument that's like the adjective-introducing Ezafe vowel, or the morpheme that shows up where you'd expect a present-tense copula. Non-evidential forms have agreement suffixes that look like the suffixes on attributive adjectives (or, equivalently, on nominative nouns).
(5) ali ne weš bi
or
Ali un- well was
'Ali was sick (I saw)'
(6) ali bio ne weš

Ali was-EV un- well
'Ali was sick (I hear)'
(7) ali bi bi ne wعš

Ali was was un- well
'Ali had been sick'?
(8) aiša bižike pot bi bi

Aisha bizike(f) cook was was
'Aisha cooked the bizike in the distant past'?
...or maybe just a pluperfect? The absence of agreement with the object is surprising--maybe I mistranscribed this one.
(9) ali bekiya šereb šimito

Ali maybe wine drank-EV
'Maybe Ali drank the wine'
(10) \#ali bekiya šereb šimit

Ali maybe wine drank (non-EV)
Failure to use evidential form with an adverb like bekiya 'maybe' is odd, since it suggests that you witnessed the event yourself and thus ought to know for sure.
(11) ali ya šereb šimit, yaki qawa šimite (or yaži, instead of yaki)

Ali either wine(m.) drank or coffee(f.) drank
'Ali either drank wine or drank coffee'
(12) ali šcreb šimit(*o), mi bí čimane xo di

Ali wine drank (*EV) I with eyes-EZ self's saw
'Ali drank wine, I saw it with my own eyes'
(13) A: šand $\quad$ se bi?
last.night how was
'What happened last night?'
B: aiša hesen pačikyerd
Aisha Hasan kissed
'Aisha kissed Hasan'

A: heya, $\varepsilon z$ inam kyena ke ina žumini pačikyerd...
yes I-NOM belief do that they-OBL each.other kissed
'Yes, I believe that they kissed each other...'
...hamati zuri kena. to e ne di.
but you-NOM lie do you-OBL them-NOM not saw
'...but you're lying. You didn't see them.'
tì uža ne biya.
you-NOM there not were
'You weren't there.'
(14) layiki čiver ya kyerd=ya yaki da=ja
boy-OBL door or did=open or gave=place 'the boy maybe opened the door or closed it...'
...hama $\varepsilon z$ ne zana [e či kerd]
but I-NOM not know [he-OBL what did
'...but I don't know what he did'
(15) layiki ya kitab wend yaki šereb šimit boy-OBL or book read or wine drank 'The boy either read a book or drank wine'
(16) ewre tai čie xirabi bi
today some things bad-PL were
(17) ewre čüo $\mathrm{d} \varepsilon$ xìrab bi
today thing-EZ that bad was
(18) domani berbai
children-NOM cried
(19) ya mehemedi kutike xo kerd vindi, or Muhammad-OBL dog-EZ self's did lost
yaki aiša fištane xo kerd qilerin
or Aisha dress-EZ self's did dirty
'Either Muhammad lost hs dog, or Aisha ruined her dress'
(20) layiki ya čiver kerd=ya, yaki da =ja
boy-OBL or door did=open or gave=place
'The boy either opened the door or closed it'
(21) ya layiki čiver kerd=ya, yaki da =ja
or boy-OBL door did=open or gave=place
'Either the boy opened the door, or closed $\mathrm{it}^{\prime}$
(22) ya layiki čiver kerd=ya, yaki čen $\varepsilon$ k
or boy-OBL door did=open or girl
'Either the boy opened the door, or the girl did'
waxto ke ali ne weš bi, e gyere do
bišimitene
time-EZ that Ali un well was he-OBL must salty.yogurt.drink drink-PAST.INF
I actually didn't get this one straight; does it mean:
'When Ali was sick, he had to drink $d o$ ', or
'When Ali was sick, he should have drunk do (but didn't)'?
(INF is probably a misnomer for an irrealis mood, or something, but I'll just keep calling it INF. The second $\dot{\mathrm{i}}$ in bišimitene has a tendency to drop, but I'll consistently write it)
(24) layik ya čai yaki do šimeno
boy or tea or do drinks
čai bišime!
tea drink-IMP.2SG
'Drink the tea!'
gyere layiki ya čai yaki do bišimo
must boy-OBL or tea or do drink-INF
'The boy has to drink either tea or $d o$ '
layik ya čai šimeno yaki do (šimeno)
boy or tea drinks or do drinks
ya layik čai yaki do šimeno
or boy tea or do drinks
ya layik čai šimeno yaki do (šimeno)
or boy tea drinks or do drinks
ya layiki čai šimit yaki do (šimit)
or boy-OBL tea drank or do drank
gyere layiki ya čai yaki do bišimiten $\quad$ (...hama ne šimit)
must boy-OBL or tea or do drink-PAST.INF
but not drank
'The boy should have drunk either tea or do (...but he didn't)'
gyere layiki ya čai bišimitene yaki do
must boy-OBL or tea drink-PAST.INF. or do
gyere ya layiki čai bišimitene yaki do (bišimitene)
must or boy-OBL tea drink-PAST.INF. or do drink-PAST.INF.
(34) ya gyere layiki čai bǐ̌imiten $\varepsilon$ yaki do (bǐ̌imitene)
or must boy-OBL tea drink-PAST.INF. or do drink-PAST.INF.
ya gyere layiki čai yaki do bišimitene
or must boy-OBL tea or do drink-PAST.INF
(36) ne zo (*ya) e šimit (yaki) ne šimit un known? or he-OBL drank or not drank 'We don't know if he drank it or not'
(37) layiki ne qawa neki do šimit boy-OBL neither coffee nor do drank 'The boy drank neither coffee nor $d o$ '
*layiki ya qawa yaki do ne šimit
boy-OBL or coffee or do not drank
(39) ya layiki yaki čeneke dina ra žü qawa ne šimite or boy or girl them-DAT from one coffee not drank-FEM 'Either the boy or the girl didn't drink coffee'

This is sort of interesting in light of the facts we talked about the next week, where negation licenses NPIs in subject position. Apparently the subject is capable of scoping outside negation (since the positive polarity item ya...yaki can modify the subject here; (38) suggests that this is indeed a positive polarity item) but, since NPIs can also be in subject position, the subject can also scope inside negation. At least, that's one way of describing it. See (50-55) for more on scope...
(40) ne layiki neki čeneke qawa šimite
neither boy-OBL nor girl coffee drank-FEM
(41) hem layiki hem(i)ki čeneke qawa šimite
all boy-OBL all girl coffee drank-FEM
'Both the boy and the girl drank coffee'

I remember we had examples with three conjuncts, showing that hem doesn't mean 'both', but I don't seem to have them written down.
ina hem qawa šimite hem(i)ki čai šimit they-OBL all coffee drank-FEM all tea drank 'They both drank coffee and drank tea'
(43) ?? hem ina čai hem(i)ki do šimit
all they-OBL tea all do drank
(44) ali wazeno $\mathrm{k} \varepsilon$ ya qawa yaki do bišmo Ali wants that or coffee or do drink-INF-3sg 'Ali wants to drink coffee or $d o$ '
(45) ali waštene ke ya qawa yaki do bišimitene

Ali wanted that or coffee or do drink-PAST.INF
ya ali wazeno ke qawa yaki do bišmo...
or Ali wants that coffee or $d o$ drink-INF
'Ali either wants to drink coffee or $d o . . . '$
...hama ez ne zana o k ${ }^{\mathrm{h}}$ amy̌i šimeno.
but I not know he which will-drink
(49) *...hama $\varepsilon z$ ne zana o wazeno ke $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{h}}$ amǰi bišmo.
but I not know he wants thta which drink-INF
(50) ali ne qawa neki čay wazeno bišmo

Ali neither coffee nor tea wants drink-INF
both > not: 'Ali wants to drink neither coffee nor tea'
(51) ali hem qawa hemki čay ne wazeno bišmo

Ali all coffee all tea not wants drink-INF
not want > both: 'Ali doesn't want to drink both coffee and tea'
you can also get both > not want reading, with a big pause after qawa.
(52) ali ya čai yaki qawa wazeno bišmo

Ali or tea or coffee wants drink-INF
(53) ali ya čai wazeno bišmo yaki qawa

Ali or tea wants drink-INF or coffee
(54) hem ali hemki mehemed čay ne wazene bišme all Ali all Mohammed tea not want-PL drink-INF.PL
both > not: 'Both Ali and Mohammed don't want to drink tea'
(55) ne ali neki mehemed (ne) wazene (ke) čay bišme neither Ali nor Mohammed (not) want-PL that tea drink-INF.PL
(56) kitabe mi esto
book-EZ Poss my exist-Masc
'I have a book'
(57) qelema mi esta
pen-EZ my exist-Fem
'I have a pen'
(58) qelema to $\varepsilon$ sta
your
'You have a pen'
(59) qelema de esta his
'He has a pen'
(60) qelema da $\varepsilon$ esta
her
'She has a pen'
(61) qelema ma esta
our
'We have a pen'
qelema šima $\varepsilon$ sta
your-PL
'You (pl) have a pen'
qelema dina $\varepsilon$ sta
their
'They have a pen'
(64) kitabe heseni esto
book-EZ Hasan-OBL exist-Masc
'Hasan has a book'
(65) kitabe to $\mathrm{mi} \mathrm{d} \varepsilon \varepsilon$ sto
book-EZ your me-OBL at exist-Masc
'I have your book'
(66) kitabe to mi dero
book-EZ your me-OBL at.is-Masc
'I have your book'

I've just written dero as one word, since it isn't yet clear whether the r is something specific to this postposition--looks like it might be.
(67) qelema to biye
pen-EZ your was-Fem
'You had a pen'
(68) qelema mi to dera
pen-EZ my you-OBL at.is-Fem
'You have my pen'
(69) kitabe to bi
book-EZ your was-Masc
'You had a book'
(70) kitabei šima bi(:)
books-EZ your-PL was-PL
'You-PL had books'
Thought I heard the last vowel as long here, though I could be wrong.
(71) kitabei to este
books-EZ your are-PL
'You have books'
(72) kitabe to bi bi
book-EZ your was was
'You had a book a long time ago'
(73) dinia de zaf meseli este
world in many problems exist-PL
'There are many problems in the world'
(74) domani baxče ma dere
children yard-EZ our in.are
'The children are in our yard'
(can be an answer to 'Where are the children?')
(75) baxče ma d $\varepsilon$ domani $\varepsilon s t e$
yard-EZ our in children exist-PL
'There are children in our yard'
(76) 〕o baxče dero

Jo yard in.is-Masc
'Joey is in the yard'
(77) * baxče ma d $\varepsilon$ j jo $\varepsilon$ sto
yard-EZ our in Jo exist-Masc
(sounds like "Joey is an animal")
(78) bаке ma
garden-EZ our
'our garden'
(79) zaf piyay / issan ${ }^{y}$ i ami partic
many men people came party
'Many men/people came to the party'
(80) domane mi baxče dere
children-EZ my yard in.are-PL
'My children are in the yard'
(81) domani baxče d $\varepsilon n^{y}$ iye / čine children yard in aren't-PL don't-exist-PL
(later investigations suggested that niye is just ne plus the copula e , while čin- is the negative of عst-. So maybe the version with niye means something like '(the) children aren't in the yard', while the version with čine means 'there aren't children in the yard')
(82) jo baxče d $\varepsilon \mathrm{n}^{\text {y }}$ iyo

Jo yard in not.is-Masc
'Joey isn't in the yard'
(83) * j o baxče d $\varepsilon$ čino

Jo yard in doesn't.exist-Masc
(sounds like Joey 'is an animal or a plant')
(84) $\mathrm{t}^{\mathrm{h}}$ as $\varepsilon$ baxče $\mathrm{d} \varepsilon \mathrm{n}^{\mathrm{y}}$ iya
bowl yard in not.is-Fem
('you can say (this)...')
(85) $\mathrm{t}^{\mathrm{h}}$ as $\varepsilon$ baxče $\mathrm{d} \varepsilon$ čina
bowl yard in doesn't.exist-Fem
('...but this is more correct' (than (84)))
(86) * baxče d $\varepsilon \mathrm{t}^{\mathrm{h}}$ as $\varepsilon \mathrm{n}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{iya}$
yard in bowl not.is-Fem
(87) baxče de thas čina
yard in bowl doesn't.exist-Fem
(88) kuliye qelema masa scra e
all pencils-Obl table on are-Pl
'All the pencils are on the table' ("You're not happy")
(89) qعlemi kuli masa sera e
pencils all table on are-Pl
(90) masa sera qelemi $\varepsilon$ ste
table on pencils exist-Pl
'There are pencils on the table'
(91) žüye de kitaba masa sera čine / niye one even books-Obl table on don't.exist-Pl not-are-Pl
'none of the books are on the table' (not > one, *one > not)
(92) kitaba ra žüyモ de xo masa sera čino books-Obl from one even self's table on doesn't.exist-Masc 'none of the books are on the table'
(93) kitaba ra žu masa sera čino
books-Obl from one table on doesn't.exist-Masc
'one of the books isn't on the table' (one > not)
(94) ez kitab masa sera wazen

I book table on want
'I want the book (to be) on the table'
(95) kitab gyere masa sera bo book must table on be-Inf 'The book must be on the table'
(96) gyere kitab masa sera bo
must book table on be-Inf
(97) $\varepsilon z$ kitab masa sera ne wazen

I book table on not want
'I don't want the book (to be) on the table'
(98) gyere kitab masa sera me / ne bo
must book table on Irr.Neg not be-Inf
'The book must not be on the table'
The other place we've seen $\mathrm{m} \varepsilon$, I think, is as the negation that shows up in imperatives.
(99) ti gyere xo de awe bere
you must self on water carry-Inf
'You must take water with you'
The word for 'water' has the usual velar constriction/fricativization around the w , which I won't try to transcribe here.
(100) $\varepsilon$ z xo de awe bena

I self on water carry
'I will take water with me'
(101) mi awe berde

I-Obl water carried-Fem
'I brought water'

