

# Disentangling mutually shared innovations, shared retentions, coincidence, and contact phenomena in Southern Kurdish and Gūrānī

---

Shuan Osman Karim

karim.56@osu.edu

Ohio State University

MECHS



- MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993)

- MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993)
  - mutually shared innovations

- MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993)
  - mutually shared innovations
  - Shared retentions

- MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993)
  - mutually shared innovations
  - Shared retentions
  - coincidence

- MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993)
  - mutually shared innovations
  - Shared retentions
  - coincidence
  - contact

- MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993)
  - mutually shared innovations
  - Shared retentions
  - coincidence
  - contact
- New research sheds light on some of these points



- MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993)
  - mutually shared innovations
  - Shared retentions
  - coincidence
  - contact
- New research sheds light on some of these points
- Proposed Convergences

- MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993)
  - mutually shared innovations
  - Shared retentions
  - coincidence
  - contact
- New research sheds light on some of these points
- Proposed Convergences
- Outstanding Problems

## Problems in the Literature

---

MacKenzie (1961), citing Professor K. Barr, attributes some differences within Kurdish to Gorani influence on the Southern dialects. He further argues that “there is no avoiding the conclusion that [Central and Southern] dialects of Kurdish have overlaid a Gorani substratum<sup>1</sup>, while the Northern dialects have to a much greater extent preserved their purity” (MacKenzie, 1961, 86)

---

<sup>1</sup>There is no way of knowing what precisely MacKenzie (1961) meant by substratum. It is unlikely that in 1961 the term carried much of the theoretical weight that it does today.

Leezenberg (1993) rejected MacKenzie's (1961) claim, asserting that in addition to Gorani contact, the convergences between Central and Southern Kurdish and Gorani could also be explained as common inheritance, "parallel innovations of a Sprachbund-like nature, as prestige borrowings, or as innovations specific to Kurmancî."

# MacKenzie's (1961) proposed convergences I

- Passive

## MacKenzie's (1961) proposed convergences II

cf. Germiyanî: *dêm kirdin*

- definite suffix *-eke*, occurring in Gorani and Zazaki (following Hadank, 1930, 1932), must also be borrowing from Gorani, as it is notably absent from Kurmancî (MacKenzie, 1961).
  - According to Leezenberg (1993), this alone is not a good basis for assuming massive substrate effects and language shift.
  - K-type markers:
    - Emāmzāda Esmā'īlī (Fars): *doft-ak-ō* 'the girls [girl-DEF-PL]' (Windfuhr, 2012),
    - Bušehrī (Fars): *ī havā-y-akū* 'this weather' (Windfuhr, 2012),

## MacKenzie's (1961) proposed convergences III

- Gīonī (Lor): *asp-Ø gap-eka* “the big horse [horse-DEF.EZ big-DEF]” (McKinnon, 2001),
- Northern Lori *-(e)ka* (McKinnon, 2011),
- Dezfuli and Šuštari (S Lori): *-aka* (McKinnon, 2011),
- Bakhtiāri (S Lori): *-ekū* (McKinnon, 2011),
- *-(e)ke* (Anonby & Taheri-Ardali, 2019, 452),
- Koroshi Balochi: *-ok* (Nourzaei, 2020)
- Central Kurdish: *-eke* (Mackenzie, 1961),
- Southern Kurdish: *-aka -aga* and *ağa* (Fattah, 2000, 245),
- Hewramî (Lihon): *-akæ* (MacKenzie, 1966),
- Paweyane: *-ækæ* (Holmberg & Odden, 2008),



## MacKenzie's (1961) proposed convergences IV

- Zerdeyane: *-aka* (Mahmoudveysi & Bailey, 2013),
- Gewrecû: *-aka* (Mahmoudveysi et al., 2012)
- definite suffixes without the /k/ (DEF = DIM)
  - Sîvandi has *-u* [M.SG.DEF] and *-e* [F.SG.DEF] (Windfuhr, 1991);
  - Judeo Isfahanî has *-e* [SG.DEF] (Windfuhr, 1991);
  - Khuri has *-u* [SG.DEF] (Windfuhr, 1991);
  - Kermani languages have *-u* (Borjian, 2017a);
  - the Median dialects (Kašan) have *-a/-e* (Borjian, 2012);
  - Keša'î has *-é* (Borjian, 2017b);
  - Kumzari has *-ō* (Anonby, 2019, 631),
  - Colloquial New Persian *-(h)e*, etc.

## MacKenzie's (1961) proposed convergences V

- the open-compound construction (MacKenzie, 1961; close ezafe Thackston, 2006; and the definite ezafe Karim, 2021). is also an example of Gorani borrowing.
  - The ezafe is reduced in definite constructions:
    - Central Kurdish: *kiç-î cwan* 'beautiful girl' vs. *kiç-e cwan-êke* 'the beautiful girl'
    - Hewramî: *kitêb-æ sîaw-ækæ*
  - This phenomenon is more widespread:
    - Colloquial New Persian: *pesær-e bozorg* 'big boy' vs. *pesær-Ø bozorg-é* 'the big boy' (Samvelian, 2005);
    - Luri *kwak-e gap* 'big boy' vs. *kwak-Ø gap-aka* 'the big boy' (McKinnon, 2011)

## MacKenzie's (1961) proposed convergences VI

- I suggest that this pattern represents a formal medial stage between reverse ezafe constructions and the canonical ezafe the grounds of formal semantics (Karim, 2021).
- the postverb =*ewe*:
  - The switch from preverb to post verb is (likely) phonologically motivated in Hewramî
    - Northern Kurdish: *ve-xwarin* vs. *ve-dixwe*
    - Central Kurdish: *xwardin-ewe* vs. *exwat-ewe*
    - Paweyane: *æwæ-wardæy* vs. *muwæro-wæ*
  - Kurdish does not shift any other preverbs to postverbal position while Hewramî does.
    - Paweyane: *æræ-niştæy* vs. *minişo-ræ*

## MacKenzie's (1961) proposed convergences VII

- Hewrami: *ænæ-kærdæy* vs. *(mi)kæro-næ*
- The simplified Ezafe: MacKenzie (1961) proposed that Gorani and Central and Southern Kurdish had simplified their ezafe (attribution marking) systems by eliminating case, number, and gender distinctions.

**More complex does not equate to  
more conservative!**

---

# Ezafe- and case- marking in Zazaki and Kurmancî I

- Zazaki M.SG.OBL suffix is from the *-aka* (Gippert, 2009).

# Ezafe- and case- marking in Zazaki and Kurmancî II

- The alternative construction N-DEF-EZ A is a viable source for the “complex ezafat,” compare: the Sogdian vocalic declension with the NK/Z ezafat:

		Sogdian V	Kurmancî Ez	Zazaki Ez
DIR	M	$-\bar{e}$	$-\hat{e}$	$-\hat{e}$ GEN
	F	$-\bar{a}$	$-a$	$-a$
	PL	$-\bar{e}(t)$	$-\hat{e}(n/t/ti/di)$	$-\hat{e}$
OBL	M	$-\bar{e}$	$(-\hat{i})^2$	$\begin{bmatrix} -\hat{e} \\ -a \\ -\hat{e} \end{bmatrix}$
	F	$-\bar{e}$	$(-\hat{e})$	
	PL	$-\hat{e}ti [-\bar{e}n]$	$(-\hat{e})$	

## Assuming an original ezafe, $-î$ , lost after the definite suffix

- Zazaki precedent for  $a-î \rightarrow a$ , e.g.,  $wāy-āy \check{y}ey$  [sister-EZ:F.SG 3SG.M.OBL] “his daughter” (Hadank, 1932, 73).



## Assuming an original ezafe, $-\hat{i}$ , lost after the definite suffix

- Zazaki precedent for  $a-\hat{i} \rightarrow a$ , e.g., *wāy-āy jey* [sister-EZ:F.SG 3SG.M.OBL] “his daughter” (Hadank, 1932, 73).
- There is a precedent in Hewramî where the ezafe is blocked after the stressed suffixes  $-\acute{a}$ , and  $-\acute{ê}$  for phonological reasons (MacKenzie, 1966).

## Assuming an original ezafe, $-î$ , lost after the definite suffix

- Zazaki precedent for  $a-î \rightarrow a$ , e.g., *wāy-āy jey* [sister-EZ:F.SG 3SG.M.OBL] “his daughter” (Hadank, 1932, 73).
- There is a precedent in Hewramî where the ezafe is blocked after the stressed suffixes  $-â$ , and  $-ê$  for phonological reasons (MacKenzie, 1966).
- It is telling that of the hundreds of paradigmatic permutations possible in Zazaki nearly all of them are built from the formatives  $-a$ , and  $-ê$ .

## Assuming an original ezafe, $-\hat{i}$ , lost after the definite suffix

- Zazaki precedent for  $a-\hat{i} \rightarrow a$ , e.g., *wāy-āy jey* [sister-EZ:F.SG 3SG.M.OBL] “his daughter” (Hadank, 1932, 73).
- There is a precedent in Hewramî where the ezafe is blocked after the stressed suffixes  $-\acute{a}$ , and  $-\acute{ê}$  for phonological reasons (MacKenzie, 1966).
- It is telling that of the hundreds of paradigmatic permutations possible in Zazaki nearly all of them are built from the formatives  $-a$ , and  $-\hat{e}$ .
- In Kurmancî (some varieties), sequential ezafat revert to  $-\hat{i}$ , e.g., *Xanîyê wanî buha* (Ekici, 2007).

## Question:

Based on the evidence for a substratum presented by MacKenzie (1961), Leezenberg (1993) was right to reject his hypothesis.

Question: Is there more evidence that MacKenzie (1961) missed.

There may be a greater range of morphological borrowing between Gorani and (Central) and Southern Kurdish. However, these changes did not all affect the core of Kurdish or the Hewramî core of Gorani.

# Kurdish-Gūrānī Convergences

---

# Outline of Kurdish-Gūrānī convergence

- Definite Suffix (again?)

# Outline of Kurdish-Gūrānī convergence

- Definite Suffix (again?)
- Imperfective Marking

# Outline of Kurdish-Gūrānī convergence

- Definite Suffix (again?)
- Imperfective Marking
  - Hewramî > SK



# Outline of Kurdish-Gūrānī convergence

- Definite Suffix (again?)
- Imperfective Marking
  - Hewramî > SK
  - Hewramî > SK (Laki)

# Outline of Kurdish-Gūrānī convergence

- Definite Suffix (again?)
- Imperfective Marking
  - Hewramî > SK
  - Hewramî > SK (Laki)
  - (S)K > Gawraju'î

# Outline of Kurdish-Gūrānī convergence

- Definite Suffix (again?)
- Imperfective Marking
  - Hewramî > SK
  - Hewramî > SK (Laki)
  - (S)K > Gawraju'î
- Past Perfect Conditional

## Definite Suffix (again?)

- There is much evidence that the k-form definite suffix is a wide-spread inherited Iranian feature.

## Definite Suffix (again?)

- There is much evidence that the k-form definite suffix is a wide-spread inherited Iranian feature.
- However, the suggestion that the oblique suffix is from the \*-akā̃ conflicts with the possibility of inheritance.

## Definite Suffix (again?)

- There is much evidence that the k-form definite suffix is a wide-spread inherited Iranian feature.
- However, the suggestion that the oblique suffix is from the \*-akā̃ conflicts with the possibility of inheritance.
- If M.SG.OBL -î is from the k-form suffix, the definite suffix -æ̃kæ̃ must be a secondary development.

## Definite Suffix (again?)

- There is much evidence that the k-form definite suffix is a wide-spread inherited Iranian feature.
- However, the suggestion that the oblique suffix is from the \*-akā̃ conflicts with the possibility of inheritance.
- If M.SG.OBL -î is from the k-form suffix, the definite suffix -æ̃kæ̃ must be a secondary development.
- Furthermore, we know that Kurdish has lent this formative to other regional languages, e.g., Iraqi Turkmani: *oγlan-akâ* [boy.SPEC] (Bulut, 2019, 368), Arbel (Jewish): *belā-ke* [house-DEF] (Khan, 2019, 322), etc.

# Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish) I

- The inherited Gorani imperfective system is characterized by two features:



## Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish) II

- Other varieties adopted this same strategy whenever negation cooccurred with the imperfective prefix *de-*, *nye-ke-m* and *nye-kird-im* (Myaxâs, Ilâm, Mîhrân, Rikâ (Sarna), Sâleh âbâd, Warmîzyâr, Zurbâtiya, Kordali, Kałhor (Shahabad), Camcamât, Harasam, Kîrmanšâh, Qasırîşirin, Sanjabi, Xâtesa:)

## Imperfective Marking (Kurdish > Gorani)

- The inherited Kurdish imperfective system is characterized by two features:

# Imperfective Marking (Kurdish > Gorani)

- The inherited Kurdish imperfective system is characterized by two features:
  1. IPFV-: *de-*: *de-ke-m*

# Imperfective Marking (Kurdish > Gorani)

- The inherited Kurdish imperfective system is characterized by two features:
  1. IPFV-: *de-: de-ke-m*
  2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *de-...-da:*

# Imperfective Marking (Kurdish > Gorani)

- The inherited Kurdish imperfective system is characterized by two features:
  1. IPFV-: *de-: de-ke-m*
  2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *de-...-da:*  
Biĵ.: *d-ü-â[t]-im* (Fattah, 2000),

- The inherited Kurdish imperfective system is characterized by two features:
  1. IPFV-: *de-: de-ke-m*
  2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *de-...-da:*  
Biĵ.: *d-ü-â[t]-im* (Fattah, 2000),  
Šër. south: *a-čv-â-m*

# Imperfective Marking (Kurdish > Gorani)

- The inherited Kurdish imperfective system is characterized by two features:
  1. IPFV-: *de-: de-ke-m*
  2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *de-...-da:*  
Biĵ.: *d-ü-â[t]-im* (Fattah, 2000),  
Šër. south: *a-čv-â-m*
- The prefix pattern was adopted by Gorani varieties replacing the past-tense imperfective stem:

# Imperfective Marking (Kurdish > Gorani)

- The inherited Kurdish imperfective system is characterized by two features:
  1. IPFV-: *de-: de-ke-m*
  2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *de-...-da:*  
Biĵ.: *d-ü-â[t]-im* (Fattah, 2000),  
Šër. south: *a-čv-â-m*
- The prefix pattern was adopted by Gorani varieties replacing the past-tense imperfective stem:  
Gawraju: *ma-kar-im* and *ma-kard=im* (Mahmoudveysi et al., 2012)



## Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish/Laki)

- In the varieties of Bisitun, Cıhr, Harsin, and Pâyrawand the inherited Kurdish imperfective system underwent expected phonological changes  $d \rightarrow w, y, \ddot{w}, \emptyset / V\_$

## Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish/Laki)

- In the varieties of Bisitun, Cıhr, Harsin, and Pâyrawand the inherited Kurdish imperfective system underwent expected phonological changes  $d \rightarrow w, y, \ddot{w}, \emptyset / V\_$
- Laki borrows the Gorani prefixes over the inherited (bipartite) Kurdish system:

# Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish/Laki)

- In the varieties of Bisitun, Cîhr, Harsin, and Pâyrawand the inherited Kurdish imperfective system underwent expected phonological changes  $d \rightarrow w, y, \ddot{w}, \emptyset / V\_$
- Laki borrows the Gorani prefixes over the inherited (bipartite) Kurdish system:
  1. IPFV-: *e-ke-m*

# Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish/Laki)

- In the varieties of Bisitun, Cıhr, Harsin, and Pâyrawand the inherited Kurdish imperfective system underwent expected phonological changes  $d \rightarrow w, y, \ddot{w}, \emptyset / V\_$
- Laki borrows the Gorani prefixes over the inherited (bipartite) Kurdish system:
  1. IPFV-: *e-ke-m*
  2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *e-...-ya*

# Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish/Laki)

- In the varieties of Bisitun, Cıhr, Harsin, and Pâyrawand the inherited Kurdish imperfective system underwent expected phonological changes  $d \rightarrow w, y, \ddot{w}, \emptyset / V\_$
- Laki borrows the Gorani prefixes over the inherited (bipartite) Kurdish system:
  1. IPFV-: *e-ke-m*
  2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *e-...-ya*

# Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish/Laki)

- In the varieties of Bisitun, Cıhr, Harsin, and Pâyrawand the inherited Kurdish imperfective system underwent expected phonological changes  $d \rightarrow w, y, \ddot{w}, \emptyset / V\_$
- Laki borrows the Gorani prefixes over the inherited (bipartite) Kurdish system:
  1. IPFV-: *e-ke-m*
  2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *e-...-ya*

↓

  3. =IPFV (NEG-)IPFV-: *=e (ni-)me-ke-m*

# Imperfective Marking (Gorani > Kurdish/Laki)

- In the varieties of Bisitun, Cıhr, Harsin, and Pâyrawand the inherited Kurdish imperfective system underwent expected phonological changes  $d \rightarrow w, y, \ddot{w}, \emptyset / V\_$
- Laki borrows the Gorani prefixes over the inherited (bipartite) Kurdish system:

1. IPFV-: *e-ke-m*

2. IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *e-...-ya*

↓

3. =IPFV (NEG-)IPFV-: *=e (ni-)me-ke-m*

4. =IPFV (NEG-)IPFV-STEM-PST.IPFV: *=e (ni-)me-...-ya*

töwîrg=a ma-wāry-ā-ø

hail=IND IND-rain.PST-IMP?=-3SG

‘It was hailing hailstones’ (Belelli, 2022, 6:186)

## Past Perfect Conditional?

- According to MacKenzie (1966), there are tenses associated with irrealis including the imperfective, perfect conditional (pro), and pluperfect (apo).



# Past Perfect Conditional?

- According to MacKenzie (1966), there are tenses associated with irrealis including the imperfective, perfect conditional (pro), and pluperfect (apo).
  - The pluperfect STEM.PST-COP.IPFV: *amεbê(n)-*

# Past Perfect Conditional?

- According to MacKenzie (1966), there are tenses associated with irrealis including the imperfective, perfect conditional (pro), and pluperfect (apo).
  - The pluperfect STEM.PST-COP.IPFV:  $am\epsilon b\hat{\epsilon}(n)-$
  - The perfect conditional STEM.PST-COP.PST.IPFV:  $am\epsilon bi\epsilon(n)-$

# Past Perfect Conditional?

- According to MacKenzie (1966), there are tenses associated with irrealis including the imperfective, perfect conditional (pro), and pluperfect (apo).
  - The pluperfect STEM.PST-COP.IPFV: *amεbê(n)-*
  - The perfect conditional STEM.PST-COP.PST.IPFV: *amεbie(n)-*
- Kurdish has two conditional forms that seem to calque MacKenzie's (1966) pluperfect and perfect conditional

# Past Perfect Conditional?

- According to MacKenzie (1966), there are tenses associated with irrealis including the imperfective, perfect conditional (pro), and pluperfect (apo).
  - The pluperfect STEM.PST-COP.IPFV:  $am\epsilon b\hat{e}(n)$ -
  - The perfect conditional STEM.PST-COP.PST.IPFV:  $am\epsilon bi\epsilon(n)$ -
- Kurdish has two conditional forms that seem to calque MacKenzie's (1966) pluperfect and perfect conditional
  - 1st conditional (SBJ-)STEM.PST=IPFV=COP:  
 $(bi-)hat=a=ye$

# Past Perfect Conditional?

- According to MacKenzie (1966), there are tenses associated with irrealis including the imperfective, perfect conditional (pro), and pluperfect (apo).
  - The pluperfect STEM.PST-COP.IPFV: *amεbê(n)-*
  - The perfect conditional STEM.PST-COP.PST.IPFV: *amεbiε(n)-*
- Kurdish has two conditional forms that seem to calque MacKenzie's (1966) pluperfect and perfect conditional
  - 1st conditional (SBJ-)STEM.PST=IPFV=COP:  
*(bi-)hat=a=ye*
  - 2nd conditional (SBJ-)STEM.PST-COP.PST-IPFV:  
*(bi-)hat-ib-a*

## Past Perfect Conditional?

- According to MacKenzie (1966), there are tenses associated with irrealis including the imperfective, perfect conditional (pro), and pluperfect (apo).
  - The pluperfect STEM.PST-COP.IPFV: *amεbê(n)-*
  - The perfect conditional STEM.PST-COP.PST.IPFV: *amεbiε(n)-*
- Kurdish has two conditional forms that seem to calque MacKenzie's (1966) pluperfect and perfect conditional
  - 1st conditional (SBJ-)STEM.PST=IPFV=COP:  
*(bi-)hat=a=ye*
  - 2nd conditional (SBJ-)STEM.PST-COP.PST-IPFV:  
*(bi-)hat-ib-a*
- These construction are prolific throughout NK, CK, SK, and Laki. Their etyma is clearest in Hewramî. However directionality is an issue.

# Kurdish-Zazaki Convergences

---

# Outline of Kurdish-Zazaki convergence

- Differential Case Marking:  
“The specially Cappadocian features are the distinction between the def. and indef. acc. in the sg.” (Northern Cappadocian Dawkins, 1916, 97)



# Outline of Kurdish-Zazaki convergence

- Differential Case Marking:  
“The specially Cappadocian features are the distinction between the def. and indef. acc. in the sg.” (Northern Cappadocian Dawkins, 1916, 97)
- Definite Ezafe

# Outline of Kurdish-Zazaki convergence

- Differential Case Marking:  
“The specially Cappadocian features are the distinction between the def. and indef. acc. in the sg.” (Northern Cappadocian Dawkins, 1916, 97)
- Definite Ezafe
- Loss of Pronominal Clitics

## Problems/Summary/Conclusion

---

## Summary of issues

- There is no question that there has been convergence between Kurdish, Zazaki, and Gorani.

## Summary of issues

- There is no question that there has been convergence between Kurdish, Zazaki, and Gorani.
- However, the diachronic study of New Iranian languages is still in its infancy.

## Summary of issues

- There is no question that there has been convergence between Kurdish, Zazaki, and Gorani.
- However, the diachronic study of New Iranian languages is still in its infancy.
- This problem is exacerbated by language endangerment, the lack of documentary efforts, and inaccessibility of existing research.

## Summary of issues

- There is no question that there has been convergence between Kurdish, Zazaki, and Gorani.
- However, the diachronic study of New Iranian languages is still in its infancy.
- This problem is exacerbated by language endangerment, the lack of documentary efforts, and inaccessibility of existing research.
- many seemingly local phenomena are attested across the Iranian world.

## Summary of issues

- There is no question that there has been convergence between Kurdish, Zazaki, and Gorani.
- However, the diachronic study of New Iranian languages is still in its infancy.
- This problem is exacerbated by language endangerment, the lack of documentary efforts, and inaccessibility of existing research.
- many seemingly local phenomena are attested across the Iranian world.
- cyclical recruitment can obscure the reality of borrowing and inheritance.



- Anonby, Christina van der Wal. 2019. Kumzari. In Geoffrey Khan & Geoffrey Haig (eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western asia: An areal perspective*, chap. 4.7, 625–658. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Anonby, Erik & Mortaza Taheri-Ardali. 2019. Bakhtiari. In Geoffrey Khan & Geoffrey Haig (eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western asia: An areal perspective*, chap. 4.3, 445–480. Berlin, Boston: De Gruyter.
- Belelli, Sara. 2022. *The Laki variety of Harsin*. Bamberg: University of Bamberg Press.

## References II

- Borjian, Habib. 2012. KASHAN ix. THE MEDIAN DIALECTS OF KASHAN. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/kashan-ix-the-median-dialects-of-kashan>.
- Borjian, Habib. 2017a. KERMAN xvi. LANGUAGES. <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/kerman-16-languages>.
- Borjian, Habib. 2017b. KEŠA'I DIALECT. <http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/keshai-dialect>.
- Bulut, Christane. 2019. Iraqi-Turkic. In Geoffrey Haig & Geoffrey Khan (eds.), *The languages and linguistics of western asia: An areal perspective*, 354–384. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Dawkins, R. M. 1916. Modern Greek in Asia Minor: A study of the dialects of Silli, Cappadocia, and Phrygia with grammar, texts, translations, and glossary (Dawkins) (1916).pdf.pdf.

## References III

- Ekici, Deniz. 2007. *Kurmanji Kurdish Reader*. Dunwoody Press.
- Fattah, Ismaïl Kamandâr. 2000. *Les dialectes kurdes méridionaux: étude linguistique et dialectologique (Iranica 37)*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Gippert, Jost. 2009. Zur dialektalen Stellung des Zazaki. *Die Sprachwissenschaft: Ihre Aufgaben, Methoden und bisherigen Ergebnisse* 47(1). 77–107.
- Hadank, Karl. 1930. *Mundarten der Gûrân : besonders das Kändûlâî, Auramânî und Badschâlânî*. Berlin: Verlag der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hadank, Karl. 1932. *Mundarten der Zâzâ: hauptsächlich aus Siwerek und Kor*. Berlin: Verlag der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften : In Kommission bei W. de Gruyter.

## References IV

- Holmberg, Anders & David Odden. 2008. The Noun Phrase in Hawrami\*. In Vida Samiiian, Donald Stilo & Simin Karimi (eds.), *Aspects of iranian linguistics*, 129–152. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Karim, Shuan Osman. 2021. *The synchrony and diachrony of New Western Iranian nominal morphosyntax*: the Ohio State University dissertation.
- Khan, Geoffrey. 2019. The Neo-Aramaic dialects of northern Iraq. In Geoffrey Khan & Geoffrey Haig (eds.), *The languages and literatures of western asia - an areal perspective*, 305–353. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Leezenberg, Michiel. 1993. Gorani influence on central Kurdish: Substratum or prestige borrowing.

## References V

- Mackenzie, David N. 1961. *Kurdish dialect, studies 1-2. studies 1-2*. London; New York: Oxford University Press.
- MacKenzie, David N. 1961. The Origins of Kurdish. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 60(1). 69–86. doi:10.1111/j.1467-968X.1961.tb00987.x.
- MacKenzie, David N. 1966. *The dialect of Awroman (Hawraman-i Luhon): Grammatical sketch, texts, and vocabulary*. Kobenhavn: Kommissiøner : Munksgaard.
- Mahmoudveysi, Parvin & Denise Bailey. 2013. *The Gorani language of Zarda, a village of West Iran*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Mahmoudveysi, Parvin, Denise Bailey, Ludwig Paul & Geoffrey Haig. 2012. *The Gorani Language of Gawraju, a village of West Iran: texts, grammar, and lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- McCarus, Ernest. 2009. Kurdish. In Gernot Windfuhr (ed.), *The iranian languages*, 587–633. London and New York: Routledge.
- McKinnon, Colin. 2001. GIŌNI.  
<https://iranicaonline.org/articles/gioni-giani>.
- McKinnon, Colin. 2011. LORI LANGUAGE i. LORI DIALECTS.  
<https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/lori-dialects>.
- Nourzaei, Maryam. 2020. Definiteness Marking from Evaluative Morphology in Balochi: Internal Variation and Diachronic Pathway. *Iranian Studies*  
doi:10.1080/00210862.2020.1813555.
- Samvelian, Pollet. 2005. When morphology does better than Syntax: The Ezafe construction in Persian. (*unpublished ms.*) .

- Thackston, Wheeler M. 2006. *Sorani Kurdish: A Reference Grammar with Selected Readings*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University. <https://sites.fas.harvard.edu/~Iranian/Sorani>.
- Windfuhr, Gernot. 1991. CENTRAL DIALECTS.  
<https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/central-dialects>.
- Windfuhr, Gernot L. 2012. FĀRS viii. Dialects.  
<https://iranicaonline.org/articles/fars-viii>.

**Zor supastan ekem!**

---