Songül Gündoğdu, Ergin Öpengin, Geoffrey Haig,
Erik Anonby (eds.)

Current issues in Kurdish linguistics

University
of Bamberg
Press

5
Asymmetries in Kurmanji morphosyntax[1]

Songül Gündoğdu

Abstract: The current paper aims to investigate different morphosyntactic realization of the constituents (case vs. adposition) and their linear ordering (preverbal vs. postverbal) in a Kurmanji clause through an event structure analysis. Based on the data from Muş Kurmanji (MK), it discusses that there is a relation between the morphological form of the constituents and their status as encoded in the verb's meaning in MK; that is, structural participants are realized with case morphology while constant participants are introduced with adpositions. It further argues that the reason why MK makes a distinction in the linear ordering of structural participants is indeed a word-order property (VG) retained from proto-Kurdish and further constrained by the morphosyntactic properties of Kurmanji.

1 Introduction

Kurmanji (also known as Northern Kurdish) employs two morphological tools to indicate clausal constituents: case marking (direct vs. oblique) and adpositions (prepositions, postpositions, and circumpositions). Case marked NPs[2] generally encode event participants such as agent, patient and recipient, while adpositional phrases introduce a wide range of semantic roles

---

[2]Whether the case-marked noun phrases are NP (noun phrase) or DP (determiner phrase) is an issue beyond the scope of this paper. Given that such a distinction does not make any difference for the discussion here, for the sake of simplicity, I take all noun phrases as NPs.

like causee, patient recipient, benefactor, addressee, location, source and path.[3] However, case morphology and the adpositional system in this language overlap in expressing certain participant roles such as patient and recipient. Furthermore, in some instances this overlap is sensitive to the position of the constituent (preverbal vs. postverbal) in the clause. The current study investigates the following three asymmetries attested in Kurmanji clauses based on data collected in Muş – a city located in the eastern part of Turkey (henceforth, Muş Kurmanji – MK):[4]

i Verbs having an OBL patient and those having an ADP patient;[5]

ii OBL recipients with *give* and ADP recipients with *send*;

iii ADP recipients are preverbal while OBL-marked recipients and spatial goals are postverbal.

The current paper will demonstrate that the morphological realization of the constituents and their linear ordering in MK are sensitive to the correlation between verb meaning and event type. For instance, there are certain verb classes (e.g., activity verbs, motion verbs) which pattern alike with respect to argument realization properties, pointing to the existence of certain event types. Considering the MK data, I will provide an explanation for these asymmetries through an *event structure approach* which analyzes verb meaning and argument representation through event structure templates (specifically Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2007; Levin 1999, 2011; Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998, 2000, 2008).

---

[3]Note that in this study, the semantic role patient is used in line with Dowty's *Patient Proto-Role*, which covers all the patient/theme properties that can function as an object in a clause. Dowty (1991: 572) specifies the contributing properties for the Patient Proto-Role as follows: "(a) undergoes change of state, (b) incremental theme, (c) causally affected by other participants, (d) stationary relative to movement of another participant and (e) does not exist independently of an event, or not at all". Furthermore, the terms *object* and *patient* are sometimes used interchangeably in this study to refer to a clausal object but none of these terms directly refer to *direct object.*

[4]According to the tentative classification of Kurmanji dialects in Öpengin & Haig (2014), Muş Kurmanji is located in the Northern Kurmanji dialect region. The MK data used in this study were collected in the form of spontaneous speech from seven native speakers of Kurmanji living in the different villages and districts of Muş during September 2015 and October 2017.

[5]Abbreviations used in this text: ADP adposition(al), DIR direct case, DIRC directional, EZ ezafe, F feminine, INDF indefinite, M masculine, NEG negation, NP noun phrase, OBL oblique case, PL plural, PROG progressive, PRS present, PST past, PTCP participial, S singular, SBJV subjunctive, V verb.

The structure of the paper is as follows: proceeding from this Introduction, Section 2 presents the asymmetries observed in MK through examples, and Section 3 proposes an event structure explanation for these asymmetries. The position of certain constituents with respect to the verb in MK will be further elucidated through a discussion on dialectal variation and contact influence in Section 4. Finally, the last section presents concluding remarks along with the issues (e.g., lexicon-syntax mapping) left for further study.

2   Asymmetries in MK morphosyntax and implications

In MK, a clausal object either carries Oblique case or it is adpositional, and this variation is sensitive to the verb type.[6] Verbs like *şikandin* 'break', *anîn* 'bring', and *xwarin* 'eat' have OBL-marked objects, while other verbs such as *hez kirin* 'like/love (lit. love do)', *temaşe kirin* 'watch', *bawer kirin* 'believe' and *nêrîn* 'look' take ADP objects. The same verb cannot mark its object with OBL or ADP in the same environment. To illustrate, the verb *şikandin* 'break' (1a) can only have an OBL object while the object of the verb *nêrîn* 'look' must be adpositional (2a). Not meeting these conditions leads to ungrammaticality, as in putative (1b) and (2b) (objects in bold).

(1)   a.   *Min **der-ê   wan**   şikand.*
            1S.OBL door-EZ.M 3PL.OBL break.PST.3S

            'I broke their door.'

      b.   * *Min [**ADP + derê wan**] şikand.*

---

[6]A few remarks on the case and adposition system of MK would be useful to follow the data provided in the paper easily. Just like other Kurmanji dialects, MK has a stable two-term case system: DIR and OBL. The nouns in the DIR are unmarked while those in the OBL are mostly overtly marked. Specifically, feminine singular nouns are marked by *-ê* and plural nouns by *-an* in the OBL. Although the expression of the OBL is generally absent with masculine nouns in this dialect, they have an overt OBL-marking *-î* when they are modified by a demonstrative and a quantifier, or when they are indefinite. Also note that the adpositional system of MK contains three groups of adpositional forms: basic prepositions (e.g., *ji*, *li*, *bi*, *bê*), locational nouns (e.g., *nav* 'inside', *bin* 'bottom', *ber* 'front', *ser* 'head/top', *pişt* 'behind') and postpositional particles (e.g., *ra* and *da*). Basic prepositions can be used alone as simple adpositions, such as *ji* 'from', *li* 'at', *bi* 'with' and *bê* 'without', or they can be combined with a locational noun, forming compound adpositions as in *li ber* 'in front of', *ji ber* 'because of', *li ser* 'on, upon, over', etc., or they can further be used in combination with a postpositional particle, yielding circumpositions such as *ji ... ra* 'for, to', *bi ... ra* 'together with', *di ... ra* 'through' (Gündoğdu 2018). In this paper, all types of adpositions are glossed as ADP.

(2) a.   *Mêsîçî* **li tor-ê**   *di-nêr-e.*
          fisher.DIR ADP fish net-OBL PROG-look.PRS-3S

          'The fisherman is looking at the fish net.'

     b.   * *Mêsîçî* **torê** *dinêre.*

Likewise, morphological marking and the position of recipients display differences based on verb type. The verbs *dan* 'give' and *firotin* 'sell' mark their recipient with OBL case and place them in the immediate postverbal position, whereas the verb *şandin* 'send' expresses its recipient through ADP in the preverbal position, as in (3)–(4) (recipients in bold face).

(3) *Ser-ê*   *mal-ê*   *dewar-ek-î*   *bi-d-e*   **te.**
     head-EZ.M house.OBL cattle-INDF-OBL SBJV-give.PRS-3S 2S.OBL

     'Let each house give **you** a head of cattle.'

(4) *Xwed-ê* **ji** **wî**   **ra** *ayet* *şand.*
     God.OBL ADP 3S.OBL ADP verse send.PST.3S

     'God sent **him** the verse of the Koran.'

In fact, the distinction that appears in linear ordering is not specific to the recipients of these two types of verbs. We observe a similar restriction on the distribution of other goal constituents, namely goals of verbs of movement, recipients of verbs of transfer, and addressees of verbs of speech (Haig 2014: 413). For instance, just like the recipient of *şandin* 'send', addressees also appear in preverbal position and are adpositional (5). On the other hand, goals of verbs of movement show up in postverbal position and mostly bear OBL case (6).[7]

(5) *Ez* **ji** **we**   **ra** *meselek-î*   *bi-bêj-im.*
     1S.DIR ADP 2PL.OBL ADP topic.INDF-OBL SBJV-say.PRS-1S

     'I will tell you about a topic.'

(6) a.   *Me*   *kêrî-yê*   *anî*   **gund.**
          1PL.OBL flock-OBL bring.PST.3S village.OBL

          'We brought the flock to the village.'

---

[7]These verbs may sometimes take adpositional postverbal goals, although it is not common (Haig 2014). These adpositional postverbal goals are expressed by location nouns, which evolve historically from nouns (Haig 2014; Haig & Thiele 2014), like *ber* 'in front of', *nav* 'inside', *ser* 'on/above', *cem* 'next to', as in *ber min* 'in front of me', *nav malê* 'inside the home' and *cem wî* 'next to him'. Since, unlike functional prepositions, they are derived from nouns, they do not pose problems for the analysis in this study.

b. *Her   sê   bi   hev   ra   ket-in   ç'al-ê.*
every three ADP each other ADP fall.PST-PL culvert-OBL

'All three of them fell into the culvert together.'

These examples clearly indicate that the morphological form and linear ordering of certain participant roles are totally dependent on the verb type; in other words, they reflect a distinction associated with specific verbs. The next section will focus on the lexical semantics of the verbs in order to identify the reason for this distinction.

3   An event structure proposal

Theories of argument realization (Baker 1988, 1997; Borer 1998; Cuervo 2003; Hale & Keyser 1993, 2002; Larson 1988; Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2005; Marantz 1997; Ramchand 2002, 2008, 2013, among others) aim to account for the relation between the verbs and their syntactic context by distinguishing between their structural and idiosyncratic aspects of meaning in terms of event structure and root. One intuitive idea is that verbs in sentences express events and arguments encode participants of events (Cuervo 2003). However, these theories differ in the way that arguments of a verb are projected in syntax, which aspects of verb meaning are relevant to argument realization, and how verbs get their meaning. For instance, "projectionist" approaches propose that argument structure of a verb is projected into syntax through theta-role assignment and subcategorizational features (Baker 1988, 1997; Bresnan 1982; Chomsky 1981; Grimshaw 1990; Larson 1988). The idea at the heart of this view is that there is a lexicon where each verb is stored with semantically (e.g., theta roles) and syntactically (e.g., number of arguments) relevant information, and that the argument structure of a verb is determined based on this lexical information. On the other hand, "constructivist" approaches take the opposite view of argument structure, emphasizing the idea that verb meaning resides in the syntactic context. That is, the lexical entry of a verb registers only its core meaning (root) and the meaning of a verb is determined compositionally within the syntactic structure it builds up (Borer 2005; Chomsky 1995; Hale & Keyser 2002; Halle & Marantz 1993; Marantz 2013; Ramchand 2008). Although they seem different, the main idea of both approaches is similar: each verb has its own argument structure realization, either stored in the lexicon or determined within the syntactic context.

The MK data clearly demonstrate that certain groups of verbs pattern alike with respect to argument realization properties. This implies that there are a number of verb classes which share the same semantic structure which in turn determines their morphosyntactic realization. Therefore, an event structure approach that takes a number of primitive predicates (e.g., ACT, CAUSE, BECOME, etc.) to determine the event type of certain verb classes, and their grammatical behaviors seems superior to argument realization approaches that treat every verb differently.[8] In order to account for the morphosyntactic asymmetries observed in this dialect, I will draw on the event-structure-based approaches in the literature, specifically from those proposed by Levin (1999, 2011), Levin & Rappaport Hovav (2007), and Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998, 2008).

In their work, Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998) argue that event structure denotes the representation of verb meaning and determines various grammatical properties, including the realization of arguments. In their approach, the meaning of a verb is bipartite: event structure and core meaning. The former refers to the structure that the verbs share with other verbs of the same semantic type, so it is the *structural facet* of verb meaning which defines the possible event types. In contrast, the latter is directly relevant to what is idiosyncratic to that verb, thus it is the *idiosyncratic facet* of verb meaning that differentiates one verb from others sharing the same structural facets of meaning (i.e., constant).[9] The authors assume a small set of event structure templates that contain the inventory of possible event types, which are to some extent aspectually motivated, namely simplex and complex event structure templates. Simplex event templates consist of one single sub-event whereas complex event templates contain two sub-events:

(7)   Simple event structure templates
        a. [x ACT<*MANNER*>]   (activity)
        b. [x <*STATE*>]   (state)
        c. [BECOME [x <*STATE*>]]   (achievement)

---

[8]Note that some constructivist approaches integrate the event structure templates into syntax successfully through an "event decompositional" syntactic model. See Cuervo (2003), Hale & Keyser (1993, 2002), and Harley (1995) for sample applications and further discussion.

[9]In fact, such a distinction also exists in other verb-meaning-based argument structure approaches; for instance, *structural facet* corresponds to *semantic structure* of Grimshaw (1990), or *structural configuration* of Hale & Keyser (1993). Likewise, *idiosyncratic facet* is the *semantic content* or *head* inserted in the structure in these studies, respectively.

(8)   Complex event structure template

[[x ACT*<MANNER>*] CAUSE [BECOME [y *<STATE>*]]]   (causative)
(Levin 1999: 9)

It is crucial to specify that two types of participants are encoded in an event structure: "structural participants", which are required as well as licensed by virtue of both the event structure template and by the verb meaning, and "constant participants", which are only required and licensed by virtue of the constant alone.[10] In Levin's work, structural participants are expressed by variables as "x" and "y" and constants are indicated as underlined variables such as "y". The main idea is that simplex event templates have only one structural participant but may have one or more constant participants based on the idiosyncratic meaning of the verb. Complex event templates have two structural participants and may have constant participants if licensed. For instance, *sweep* is an activity verb that needs minimally a *sweeper* and a *surface*, hence its meaning is associated with two participants: the structural participant *sweeper* and the constant participant *floor*, as in *I swept the floor*. Similarly, a causative (or accomplishment) verb such as *break* has two structural participants: the actor who breaks and the undergoer which is broken.

3.1   Two types of verbs

The fact that verbs introduce their objects in different morphological forms is not specific to MK or Kurmanji in general. Croft (1993) points out that although languages are not uniform in argument realization of non-causative psych-verbs (e.g., *fear*), they are consistently uniform in the argument expression of causative psych-verbs (e.g., *frighten*). Levin (1999) also observes that languages are uniform in expressing the arguments of causative verbs such as *cut*, *kill* and *break*, but they display variation in the argument realization of non-causative verbs in general like *sweep*, *greet* and *answer*. The object(-like) arguments of these latter verbs show more than one potential morphosyntactic realization in English and across languages. Levin proposes that verbs with complex/causative event structures are core transitive verbs (CTV): they are obligatorily transitive, since they have two structural participants required by the event structure template, and these participants are

---

[10]Grimshaw & Vikner (1993) also establish a dichotomy between arguments based on their behavior: structure arguments are licensed by semantic structure while content arguments are licensed by the semantic content.

mapped onto syntax as subject and direct object. On the other hand, non-causative verbs are two-argument verbs with simplex event structures. They are non-core transitive verbs (NCTV) thus they may – but need not – be transitive as the constant participant (i.e., the argument licensed by the verb's core meaning) does not fall under the event structure-to-syntax mapping principle and is generally realized as oblique argument in syntax. In fact, the contrast that we observe in the morphosyntactic realizations of objects in MK is similar to the distinction between CTV and NCTV made by Levin (1999). This contrast stems from the fact that the objects in this dialect differ in their status with respect to their source in the event structure template.

When we look at verbs with ADP objects in MK, we see that they are all activity verbs like *nêrîn* 'look' (simplex verbs) and *temaşe kirin* 'watch', *hez kirin* 'like/love (lit. love do)', *se'h kirin* 'listen' (complex verbs). The significant point is that the objects of these verbs do not carry the properties of a typical direct object in Kurmanji. Direct objects in this language are non-adpositional and achieve subjecthood under passivization (Haig 2002: 20) as illustrated in (9). On the contrary, ADP objects are always adpositional (2a is repeated as 10a) and they cannot be the subject of the passivized verb (10b).

(9)   a.   *Zarok-an*   ***pişîk-ê*** *kuşt.*   (ACTIVE)
          child-PL.OBL cat-OBL kill.PST.3S

          'The children killed the cat.'

      b.   ***Pişîk*** *hat*   *kuştin.*   (PASSIVE)
          cat.DIR come.PST.3S kill

          'The cat was killed.'

(10) a.   *Mêsîçî*   ***li*** ***tor-ê***   *di-nêr-e.*
          fisherman.DIR ADP fish net-OBL PROG-look.PRS.3S

          'The fisher is looking at the fish net.'

      b.   * ***li*** ***tor-ê***   *hat*   *nêrîn*
          ADP fish net-OBL come.PST.3S look

However, verbs with ADP objects behave parallel to the verbs with true direct objects with respect to the ergative alignment in past tense constructions.[11] Based on this observation, Haig (2002) makes a distinction between

---

[11]Kurmanji displays an ergative pattern in past tense constructions, where the subject of an intransitive verb (S) is treated similarly to the object of a transitive verb (O) and differently from the transitive subject (A); thus, transitivity and intransitivity of the verb in this language are assessed with respect to ergative alignment in past tense constructions.

clausal and lexical transitivity in Kurmanji, proposing that "only transitive verbs can govern a direct object; intransitive verbs cannot. However, not all transitive verbs govern a direct object" (2002: 20). According to this classification, transitive verbs have direct objects while lexically transitive verbs do not; but the latter group licenses ADP objects. I argue that in MK, verbs with ADP objects are indeed non-core transitive verbs; they are all single activity verbs with simple event templates consisting of two participants: structural and constant participants.[12] The structural participant of these verbs is the doer of the action (actor or initiator) and they are morphologically realized as a case-marked NP. The constant participant of these verbs, on the other hand, may be a person, a thing, a location or manner (oblique argument) and their morphological realization is an ADP phrase.[13] For instance, the event template of a NCTV like *nêrîn* 'look' can be expressed as follows: (Note that 'y' stands for the constant participant in (11).)

(11)   a.   [x ACT*<MANNER>* y̲]

       b.   [x ACT*<NÊRÎN>* y̲]

       c.   [SUBJECT ACT*<NÊRÎN>* A̲D̲P̲ ̲O̲B̲J̲E̲C̲T̲]

Core transitive verbs with complex event structure templates have obligatory OBL objects, which qualify as true direct objects in MK. They have two structural participants: actor (subject) and undergoer (direct object), both of which are morphologically realized as case-marked NPs. The event template of a verb like *şikandin* 'break' would be a good example of a CTV. It should be noted that what is idiosyncratic to a CTV is the state it lexicalizes, thus *şikestî* 'broken' in (12b) is the state that the event *şikandin* 'break' lexicalizes in its event structure template. (12) roughly means that there is an external causer (i.e., subject) which acts upon an object (i.e., undergoer) and changes its state.

(12)   a.   [[x ACT*<MANNER>*] CAUSE [BECOME [y *STATE*]]]   (causative)

       b.   [[x ACT *<MANNER>*] CAUSE [BECOME [y *ŞİKESTÎ*]]]
            [SUBJECT ACT*<MANNER>* CAUSE [BECOME OBL OBJECT *ŞİKESTÎ*]]

---

[12] Note that stative verbs like *zanîn* 'know' in MK also have ADP objects, which is in line with the fact that stative verbs represent simple events just like single activity verbs.

[13] The majority of non-core transitive verbs in this dialect constitute complex predicates which are classified as "unergative complex predicates" in Gündoğdu (2016). Due to space limitation I will not elaborate on them here but the reader is referred to this study for a detailed syntactic account of these verbs.

However, there are a few verbs such as *dîtin* 'see' and *xwandin* 'read' which are definitely not core transitive verbs but nevertheless license OBL objects in MK. In fact, these verbs behave like a core transitive verb in terms of morphological marking of their objects in many languages (e.g., English, Turkish, Persian, Japanese, Basque, Warrungu, etc.) (Tsunoda 1985). It seems that such verbs have a strong preference for a transitive syntactic frame in these languages, and this is why they require their object to be Oblique-marked just like core transitive verbs in MK (as throughout Kurmanji).

3.2 Two types of recipients

As stated in Section 2, the form of the recipients in this dialect is also sensitive to the verb type, as *give*-type verbs have OBL recipients while *send*-type verbs have ADP recipients. I will argue that this difference is due to the fact that these verbs lexicalize different properties of "transfer" information in their event structure, hence this distinction is morphosyntactically reflected.

Investigating the different argument realizations of three-participant constructions such as *give*, *sell*, *send* in dative alternations across languages under the "verb sensitivity approach", Levin & Rappaport Hovav (2007) and Levin (2011) argue that *give*-type verbs (e.g., *give*, *sell*, *hand*, *rent*) inherently lexicalize only caused possession in their meaning. Therefore, these verbs are only associated with the change of possession or "caused possession" event type (13). On the other hand, *send*-type verbs (e.g., *send*, *mail*, *ship*, etc.) inherently lexicalize spatial goals and thus their roots are associated with caused motion as they denote a physical change of location of the theme (14):

(13) Caused possession:
    'X$_{agent}$ ACT CAUSE Y$_{recipient}$ HAVE Z$_{theme}$'
    (adapted from Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2007)

(14) Caused motion:
    'X$_{agent}$ ACT CAUSE Z$_{theme}$ BE LOC Y$_{spatial goal}$'
    (adapted from Levin 2011)

Both event templates have three inherently involved participants, but they differ in lexicalizing the participant that denotes a change: *give*-type verbs lexicalize the agent, theme and recipient (change of possession), whereas *send*-type verbs lexicalize the agent, theme and spatial goal (change of location). In English, the participant roles in the caused possession event type

can give rise to two syntactic configurations, namely (a) double-object construction (DOC) – V NP NP, and (b) the *to*-prepositional ditransitive variant – V NP to NP.

(15)   a. *Sandy gave Terry a copy of the new grammar.*

     b. *Sandy gave a copy of the new grammar to Terry.*
    (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2007: 1)

Nevertheless, this event type lacks a conceptual path and thus it does not entail a physical transfer of possession from a source to a goal/recipient but rather it merely denotes a change of possession taking place between the original possession and the recipient. Therefore, in both syntactic configurations, only the caused possession is encoded, regardless of the recipient being realized as the first object in DOC or as the complement of the preposition *to* (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 2007; Levin 2011). Even though the roots of *send*-type verbs do not inherently lexicalize caused possession, they may be associated with the caused possession in some languages, e.g., English:

(16)   a. *Mary sent some newspapers to the library.*
       (spatial goal-caused motion)

    b. *Mary sent some newspapers to Jane.*
       (caused motion or caused possession where *Jane* is interpreted as a recipient)

    c. *Mary sent Jane some newspapers.*
       (caused possession where *Jane* is interpreted as the recipient)

The basic distinction between the event structures of these two verb types, based on which participant role is lexicalized, is crucial for the MK data. Morphological marking seems to point to a distinction between structural and constant participants in MK: structural participants are realized with case morphology while constant participants are expressed by adpositions. If this is the case, then we expect to find that the recipient of *dan* 'give' (and also *firotin* 'sell') appears in OBL as it lexicalizes caused possession, whereas the recipient of *şandin* 'send' is expressed through ADP since it does not lexicalize caused possession. Furthermore, since *şandin* 'send' lexicalizes *caused motion* as it refers to a physical change of location, we expect to find the location as an OBL spatial goal – the constituent denoting the spatial endpoint of the

event. This is what we get in MK; *give*-type verbs have OBL recipients (17) while *send*-type verbs have ADP recipients but OBL spatial goals (18):[14]

(17) *ser-ê   mal-ê   dewar-ek-î   bi-d-e   te.*
      head-EZ.M house.OBL cattle-INDF-OBL SBJV-give.PRS-3S 2S.OBL

      'Let each [person] give **you** a head of cattle.'

(18) *Min   nan-ê   wan   **ji   wan   ra**   şand   zevî-yê.*
      1S.OBL bread-EZ.M 3PL.OBL ADP 3PL.OBL ADP send.PST.3S field-OBL

      'I sent them their meal to the field.'

To summarize, the fact that the recipients of *give*-type verbs and of *send*-type verbs carry different morphology is not arbitrary, but rather is sensitive to the event structure of these verbs; more specifically, it depends on whether the recipient is the structural participant (i.e., inherently lexicalized) or the constant participant (i.e., licensed by the idiosyncratic meaning of the verb). However, the reason why the recipients of these verbs appear in different positions within the clause still needs explanation.

3.3   Two types of positions for goal constituents

Levin (2011) observes that the actual realization of the caused possession and caused motion event schema shows differences across languages due to different types of morphosyntactic resources that languages make use of for expressing these schemata. She finds that (i) some languages have the same realization for both goals and recipients while (ii) in other languages there are two realizations for recipients, one of which is shared by the goal and (iii) still other languages allow two realizations of goals, one of which is the same as the recipient. As illustrated in (17) and (18), the event schema of three participant verbs such as *give* and *send* in MK corresponds to the morphosyntactic realization attested in type (ii) languages (19):

---

[14]In fact, the verb *dan* 'give' can also lexicalize a caused motion event structure in MK, because we find sentences where *dan* 'give' has a spatial goal, which is OBL-marked occurring in the postverbal position:

Kimik-ê bi-d-e   ser-ê   xwe!
cap-OBL SBJV-give.PRS-2S head-EZ.M. self
'Wear the cap!' (lit.: 'Give the cap on your head!')

However, in such cases, *dan* 'give' semantically patterns with the verb *danîn* 'put' rather than expressing a giving event. See Gündoğdu (2018) for further discussion.

(19) a. *dan* 'give' = NP<small>AGENT</small> NP<small>OBJECT</small> VERB<small>GIVE</small> **NP<small>RECIPIENT</small>**

  b. *şandin* 'send' = NP<small>AGENT</small> **PP<small>RECIPIENT</small>** NP<small>OBJECT</small> VERB<small>SEND</small>
  NP<small>SPATIAL GOAL</small>

The recipient of *dan* 'give' and the spatial goal of *şandin* 'send' appear in the same position and as the structural participants of these verbs; they are both OBL-marked. However, the recipient of *şandin* 'send' shows up in the preverbal position and is introduced with an ADP as the constant participant of this verb.

So far, what we observe in MK, viewed through the lens of the proposals of the event structure approach (along with the claims of the verb sensitivity approach), is that this dialect reflects the distinction between structural and constant participants not only through morphology (case vs. adposition) but also through the position of the constituent with respect to the verb (pre- vs. post-predicate). Therefore, structural participants other than the actor/initiator and patient/theme/undergoer appear in the immediate postverbal position of the clause, e.g., the recipient of *dan* 'give' and the spatial goal of *şandin* 'send'; whereas the constant participants appear in the preverbal position. This proposal receives further support from other goal constituents in MK. Recall from Section 2 that the addressee patterns alike with the recipient of *şandin* 'send'; both are adpositional and appear in the preverbal position. Similarly, the goals of verbs of movement display the same properties as the spatial goal of *şandin* 'send': they bear Oblique case and show up in the immediate postverbal position. Therefore, the MK data points to two different goal positions in the sentence (20):

(20) **G**OAL (RECIPIENTS, ADDRESSEE)   **V**ERB   **G**OAL (RECIPIENTS, SPATIAL GOAL)

To this end, I wish to address the following question: How should we approach addressee constituents in the preverbal position and spatial goal constituents in the postverbal position? I suggest that the addressees of speech verbs showing up in the preverbal goal position in MK are not inherently lexicalized, and thus they are constant participants just like the recipient of *şandin* 'send'. In other words, the addressee is not, in fact, a part of the event structure; whereas the meaning of the verb *gotin* 'say/tell' already implies the presence of a hearer or listener.

Likewise, in addition to *şandin* 'send', there is a group of verbs of movement that place their spatial goals in the postverbal position. Below is a list of these verbs attested in the MK data:

(21)   Verbs with spatial goals in MK:

    a.   *anîn*   'bring'
        avetin   'throw'
        birin   'carry, take to somewhere'
        danîn   'put, leave'
        xistin   'put'
        berdan   'release'

    b.   *derketin*   'go out, leave'
        hatin   'come, arrive'
        ketin   'fall, enter'
        çûn   'go'

The verbs in (21a) are just like the verb *şandin* 'send' in terms of their event schema because each denotes a physical change of location of the object as a result of a caused motion. Therefore, their spatial goals are indeed inherently lexicalized and licensed both by the verb root and its event structure. On the other hand, the verbs in (21b) are all path verbs (Levin & Rappaport Hovav 1995; Kudrnáčová 2008) which obligatorily encode the directionality of the motion, thus Rosen considers this type of verbs to be "verbs of inherently directed motion" (1984: 74). In fact, the inherent directionality of path verbs in general necessitates a spatial grounding or an achieved location (the second type of result verbs in Rappaport Hovav & Levin 1998). Kudrnáčová (2008: 35) explains the semantics of path verbs as follows: "they express pure translation by specifying the motion of an entity as changes in the entity's positions with respect to a spatial reference point". Consequently, the directional path encoded in path verbs is obligatory and non-additive. This suggests that the spatial goals of path verbs are also licensed by the verb root as well as its event structure. In fact, all spatial goals in MK carry the properties of a final state of the event or the result subevent (resultee), in terms of Ramchand (2002, 2008), which means that they are not only encoded in the event schemata but are also expressed as an argument of the predicate in syntax. Based on this observation, I take spatial goals of path verbs as the same as the spatial goals of verbs of caused motion in MK and claim that they are all linked to a position in the event structure of the verb as its structural participants. This explains why they usually carry case morphology in the same way as the structural participants do in MK and similarly why they occur

in the immediate postverbal position just like other non-actor/non-patient structural participants in this dialect.

4   Further issues: Dialectal variation and language contact

The morphosyntactic asymmetries attested in MK demonstrate that the distinction between structural vs. constant participants is reflected morphologically (case vs. adposition) and linearly (preverbal vs. postverbal):

| Structural participants (OBL) | VERB | Structural participants (OBL) |
| Constant participants (ADP) | | |

However, the question as to why some structural participants appear in the preverbal position while others are placed in the postverbal position is still unresolved. Given that structural participants are already distinguished by case morphology from other types of participants, why does MK need to make a further distinction between structural participants through linear ordering in a clause? The phenomenon of postverbal goals and variation observed in their positions in other Kurmanji dialects provide us with insights that help to answer to this question.

The morphological coding and linear positioning of participants display variation across Kurmanji dialects.[15] This variation is mostly conditioned by language contact (Haig 2014) and areal linguistic typology (Stilo 2005; 2009), and the distribution of goals in all dialects is sensitive to the verb type. However, in addition to the verb type, the morphological form of the goals as well as the type of the adpositions that goals are expressed by (preposition vs. circumposition vs. postposition) seem to have an influence on this distribution. To the best of my knowledge, spatial goals of verbs of motion are always in the immediate postverbal position in all Kurmanji dialects, since an allative reading is available only in this position;[16] however, their morphological form may vary depending on the dialect region. Some dialects such as Muş and Malatya prefer OBL spatial goals while other dialects like Hakkari and

---

[15] See Haig (2014) and Haig & Thiele (2014) for more examples and extensive discussion on the regional variation observed in Kurdish with respect to preverbal and postverbal goals.

[16] "Allative" expresses a motion to or toward a given referent.

Şırnak tolerate both ADP and OBL spatial goals.[17] Furthermore, in all dialects, the recipient of *give*-type verbs is almost always OBL-marked and appears in the immediate postverbal position[18], while the recipient of *send*-type verbs is always adpositional and shows up in the preverbal position. In contrast, the morphological form and the position of addressee display variation. For instance, unlike MK ((5) is repeated as (22)), in the southeastern section of Kurmanji (in and around Duhok and Hakkari provinces), addressees are case-marked and postverbal (23):

(22)   *Ez   **ji   we   ra**   meselek-î   bi-bêj-im.*
       1S.DIR ADP 2PL.OBL ADP topic.INDF-OBL SBJV-say.PRS-1S

       'I will tell you about a topic.'

(23)   *Henê   meselek   gût-e   **min.***
       Henê.OBL topic.INDF.DIR say.PST.3S–DIRC 1S.OBL

       'Henê told me about a topic.'

Drawing attention to the fact that the appearance of goal constituents (G) in the immediate postverbal position in an OV language like Kurdish is typologically unusual, Haig (2014) and Haig & Thiele (2014) assert that this unusual word order (OVG) emerges as a result of contact-induced change. Haig (2014) argues that an original 'proto-Kurdish' had V(erb)G(oal) order which was characterized through early Aramaic/Iranian contact. In due course this pattern has undergone changes in some Kurmanji dialects due to contact with various languages. For instance, in the southernmost Kurmanji dialects, VG order has been mostly preserved due to the contact with Neo-Aramaic, which is a VO language, and thus goals are predominantly postverbal. On the other hand, goals are overwhelmingly preverbal in the Kurmanji dialects to the north and west (which Haig labels as Central Anatolian dialects) because of the influence of Armenian and Turkish varieties, both of which are OV languages. In keeping with his analysis, MK is one of the dialects in which

---

[17]The data for this section come from 13 Kurmanji speakers living in different districts of Hakkari, Van, Şırnak, Mardin, Muş, Bingöl, Malatya and Adıyaman provinces. 11 of them were undergraduate students at Muş Alparslan University and 2 of them were working in Malatya when the data were elicited.

[18]Malatya Kurmanji is exceptional to some extent because not all recipients of all *give*-type verbs exhibit the same properties; e.g., the recipient of *dan* 'give' is adpositional and appears in the preverbal position, whereas the recipient of *firotin* 'sell' is OBL and postverbal. I will mention this distinction while discussing the example given in (24).

certain goals have been shifted to preverbal position due to language contact with Armenian and Turkish whereas southeastern dialects like Hakkari Kurmanji mostly preserve the VG order retained from proto-Kurdish.

Furthermore, variation across dialects also has something to do with the adpositional system of a given dialect. Despite being an OV language where postpositions are the norm (Dryer 2013), Kurmanji has prepositions, postpositions and circumpositions. Stilo (2005, 2009) proposes that Iranian languages are sandwiched between prepositional (Semitic) and postpositional (Turkic, Armenian, Indic) patterns, and they resolve this conflict by creating an intersection zone which accommodates both patterns. As an Iranian language bordering an area between prepositional Neo-Aramaic and postpositional Armenian and Turkic, Kurmanji has both opposite typologies (e.g., preposition and postposition) and a hybridized pattern formed by the merge of these two opposites (e.g., circumpositions). The southernmost dialects (e.g., Hakkari) are mostly prepositional and goals are predominantly postverbal; on the other hand, northern and western dialects have circumpositions or independent postpositions and use both pre- and postverbal positions actively to disambiguate goal types. In fact, the dialects that shift certain goal constituents to the preverbal position as a result of language contact (Haig 2014) are those that have developed circumposition *ji ... ra* (e.g., Muş) or independent postposition *... ra* (e.g., Malatya). For instance, MK introduces addressee (22) through *ji ... ra*, while Malatya Kurmanji places both the addressee and the recipient of the verb *dan* 'give' in the preverbal position (24).[19] Note that the goal arguments introduced within circumpositions are always preverbal, and postverbal placement of such phrases is not an option.

(24)   a. *Bahar-ê   vaha   **mi**   **ra**   ne-got.*
           Bahar-OBL as such 1S.OBL ADP neg-say.PST.3S

           'Bahar didn't tell **me** like that.'

---

[19] There is also an example from Şahînê Bekirê Soreklî's book *Roja dawîn ji jiyana Mistê kurê Salha Temo* (1982) in which the recipient of the verb *dan* 'give' is introduced with the preposition *bi* 'with' in the preverbal position. The author of the book is from Kobanê, Syria. (I would like to thank Ergin Öpengin for bringing this sentence to my attention.)

> *Min sandiqeke tijî şûşeyên kazozê li dera hanê dî. Were ez yekê **bi te** dim; bi rê va vexwe...*
> ('I saw there a box full of bottles of soft drink. Come, I **give you** one; drink it on your way...')

b. *Zana **Rojday**   **ra**   kitap da-y-e.*
Zana Rojda.OBL ADP book give.PST-PTCP-COP.3S

'Zana gave the book **to Rojda**.'

As mentioned previously, the recipient of *send*-type verbs is preverbal in all dialects. Assuming that the addressee is also a type of recipient (Goldberg 1995),[20] northern and western dialects demonstrate that there is a tendency to shift human goals expressed by recipient roles to the preverbal position while reserving the postverbal position for locational/spatial goals for allative reading.

The data provided here demonstrate that OBL-marked goal constituents do not survive in the preverbal domain in all Kurmanji dialects, and that those appearing in the preverbal position are always adpositional. This observation implies that the linear order of goal constituents in this language is sensitive to morphological marking. It seems that more than two OBL-marked constituents cannot be licensed in the preverbal domain; therefore, a third case-marked constituent is obligatorily placed in the postverbal position. I propose that Kurmanji imposes the following general restriction on the linear order of constituents:

(25)   *In a Kurmanji clause, at most two case-marked NPs (subject and direct object) are licensed in the preverbal position.*

To sum up, dialectal variation suggests that goal constituents appear in the postverbal position in Kurmanji due to the VG order retained from proto-Kurdish. The reason why some goal constituents are shifted to the preverbal position in some dialects is because of the contact these dialects have had with OV/postpositional languages such as Armenian and Turkic. MK is one of the dialects which has a long history of language contact with Armenian and Turkish, and has thus developed circumpositions, and has shifted addressees to the preverbal position. I suggest that, as a result of language contact, MK has adapted its synchronic grammar in such a way that it ends up with a morphological and linear distinction between structural and constant participants.

---

[20]In many languages, addressees of speech verbs are marked with dative case or with dative-like prepositions. This overlap is generally explained through addressee being construed as the recipient of the speech act, which is indeed the information being transferred.

5   Conclusion

In this paper, I have provided an event structure analysis in order to account for salient asymmetries attested in Kurmanji morphosyntax. The data have demonstrated that there is a relation between the morphological form of the constituents and their status as encoded in the verb's meaning in MK; that is, structural participants are realized with case morphology while constant participants are introduced with adpositions. Therefore, I have proposed that the objects of core transitive verbs are structural participants and thus are marked with OBL case. In contrast, the objects of non-core transitive verbs (or single activity verbs) are constant participants and thus are expressed through adpositions. Similarly, although both *send*-type verbs and *give*-type verbs license recipients as their event participants, the status of the recipient is different in the event structures of these verb groups. Recipients of the former group (caused-motion verbs) are not inherently lexicalized but are only licensed by the verb meaning, hence it is a constant participant. The recipients of the verbs in the latter group (caused-possession verbs) are inherently lexicalized thus are the structural participants of the verbs. This distinction is also morphologically reflected in MK; the recipient of *send* is adpositional, while the recipient of *give* is case-marked. Further evidence for the distinction between structural and constant participants comes from other participant roles (i.e., goal constituents); that is, the spatial goals of motion verbs and path verbs are structural participants and they are case-marked whereas the addressees of speech verbs are expressed with adpositions, since they are constant participants.

Furthermore, I have suggested that the reason why MK makes a distinction in the linear ordering of structural participants is indeed a word-order property (VG) retained from proto-Kurdish and further constrained by the morphological properties of Kurmanji. The data from other dialects as well as the findings in the literature have demonstrated that postverbal goals are preserved in the southernmost dialects, while certain goal constituents have been shifted to the preverbal position in certain dialects under the influence of contact with OV languages. I have argued that MK is one of these dialects and that it adapts its synchronic grammar in such a way that it ends up with a distinction between structural and constant participants – a distinction that is reflected morphologically and linearly.

The current paper does not deal with the event structure–syntax mapping, however. Given that syntactic structure is built on the information (event type, number of participants, etc.) encoded in a verb's event structure, the

structural vs. constant participant distinction must be preserved within the syntactic configuration. Rappaport Hovav & Levin (1998: 113) propose the following principle to regulate event structure–syntax mapping:

(26) THE STRUCTURE PARTICIPANT CONDITION: There must be an argument XP in the syntax for each structure participant in the event structure.

Thus, each structural participant must be expressed in syntax, whereas constant participants may but need not be expressed in the syntactic structure without violating this principle. Constant participants may have their syntactic expression through language-specific rules (oblique–argument linking rule). The fact that structural participants are case-marked in MK while constant participants are expressed by adpositions implies that the status of the event participants is preserved within the syntactic structure. It can be asserted at this point that structural participants check their case feature at relevant functional heads while constant participants as oblique arguments get their case feature checked by the adposition head. However, the position where event participants merge in syntax and their possible case relations within this configuration are issues that necessitate further study.

References

Baker, Mark. 1988. *Incorporation: A theory of grammatical function change.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Baker, Mark. 1997. Thematic roles and syntactic structure. In Haegeman, L. (ed.), *Elements of grammar: Handbook in Generative Syntax*, 73–137. Dordrecht: Kluwer.

Borer, Hagit. 1998. Deriving passive without theta roles. In Lapointe, S. G. & Brentari, D. K. & Farrell, P. M. (eds.), *Morphology and its relation to phonology and syntax*, 60–99. Stanford, CA: CSLI.

Borer, Hagit. 2005. *Structuring sense.* Vol. 2: *The normal course of events.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Bresnan, Joan. 1982. *The mental representation of grammatical relations.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pisa lectures.* Dordrecht: Foris.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Croft, William. 1993. Case marking and the semantics of mental verbs. In Pustejovsky, J. (ed.), *Semantics and the lexicon* (Studies in Linguistics and Philosophy 49), 55–72. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. (`https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-1972-6_5`).

Cuervo, María Cristina. 2003. *Datives at large.* Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation. (`http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/7991`) (Accessed 2018-12-04).

Dowty, David. 1991. Thematic proto-roles and argument selection. *Language* 67(3). 547–619.

Dryer, Matthew S. 2013. Relationship between the order of object and verb and the order of adposition and noun phrase. In Dryer, M. S. & Haspelmath, M. (eds.), *The World Atlas of Language Structures Online*. Leipzig: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. (`http://wals.info/chapter/95`) (Accessed 2019-03-27).

Goldberg, Adele E. 1995. *Constructions: A Construction Grammar approach to argument structure*. University of Chicago Press.

Grimshaw, Jane. 1990. *Argument structure.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Grimshaw, Jane & Vikner, Sten. 1993. Obligatory adjuncts and the structure of events. In Reuland, E. & Abraham, W. (eds.), *Knowledge and language*, 143–155. Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands. (`https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-011-1842-2_7`).

Gündoğdu, Songül. 2016. Noun-verb complex predicates in Kurmanji Kurdish: A syntactic account. In Bellamy, K. & Karvovskaya, E. & Kohlberger, M. & Saad, G. (eds.), *Proceedings of ConSOLE XXIII*, 7–9 January 2015, Paris, 383–405. Leiden: Leiden University Centre for Linguistics. (`https://www.universiteitleiden.nl/binaries/content/assets/geesteswetenschappen/lucl/sole/console23-updated.pdf`) (Accessed 2019-08-28).

Gündoğdu, Songül. 2018. *Argument-adjunct distinction in Kurmanji Kurdish*. Boğaziçi University, Istanbul dissertation.

Haig, Geoffrey. 2002. Noun-plus-verb complex predicates in Kurmanji Kurdish: Argument sharing, argument incorporation, or what? *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung (STUF)* 55(1). 15–48.

Haig, Geoffrey. 2014. VG word order in Kurdish and Neo-Aramaic: Typological and areal considerations. In Khan, G. & Napiorkowska, L. (eds.), *Neo-Aramaic and its linguistic context*, 407–425. New York: Gorgias Press.

Haig, Geoffrey & Thiele, Hanna. 2014. Post-predicate goals in Northern Kurdish and neighboring languages: A pilot study in quantitative areal linguistics. Paper presented at the *Second International Conference on Variation*

and Change in Kurdish (VCK-2), 08–09 October 2014, Mardin Artuklu University, Turkey.

Hale, Kenneth & Keyser, Samuel Jay. 1993. On argument structure and the lexical expression of syntactic relations. In Hale, K. & Keyser, S. J. (eds.), *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 53–109. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Hale, Kenneth & Keyser, Samuel Jay. 2002. *Prolegomenon to a theory of argument structure*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Halle, Morris & Marantz, Alec. 1993. Distributed morphology and the pieces of inflection. In Hale, K. & Keyser, S. J. (eds.), *The view from Building 20: Essays in linguistics in honor of Sylvain Bromberger*, 111–176. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Harley, Heidi B. 1995. *Subjects, events, and licensing.* Massachusetts Institute of Technology dissertation.

Kudrnáčová, Naděžda. 2008. *Directed motion at the syntax-semantics interface*. Brno: Masaryk University.

Larson, Richard K. 1988. On the double object construction. *Linguistic inquiry* 19(3). 335–391.

Levin, Beth. 1999. Objecthood: An event structure perspective. In Billings, S. & Boyle, J. & Griffith, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of CLS 35*, vol. 1: *The main session*, 223–247. Chicago: Chicago Linguistic Society, University of Chicago.

Levin, Beth. 2011. Verb sensitivity and argument realization in three-participant constructions: A crosslinguistic perspective [conference handout]. *Conference on Referential Hierarchies in Three-participant Constructions*, 20–21 May 2011, Lancaster University. (`http://web.stanford.edu/~bclevin/lanc11dat.pdf`) (Accessed 2019-01-03).

Levin, Beth & Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 1995. *Unaccusativity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Levin, Beth & Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 2005. *Argument realization.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Levin, Beth & Rappaport Hovav, Malka. 2007. The crosslinguistic study of dative alternations: A verb sensitive perspective [conference handout]. *Conference on Ditransitive Constructions*, 23–25 November 2007, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig.

Marantz, Alec. 1997. No escape from syntax: Don't try morphological analysis in the privacy of your own lexicon. *University of Pennsylvania working papers in linguistics* 4(2). 201–225.

Marantz, Alec. 2013. Verbal argument structure: Events and participants. *Lingua* 130. 152–168.

Öpengin, Ergin & Haig, Geoffrey. 2014. Regional variation in Kurmanji: A preliminary classification of dialects. *Kurdish studies* 2(2). 143–176.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2002. Aktionsart, L-syntax and selection. In Verkuyl, H. J. (ed.), *Proceedings of Perspectives on Aspect Conference*, 1–15. Utrecht: OTS.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2008. *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A first phase syntax*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Ramchand, Gillian. 2013. Argument structure and argument structure alternations. In den Dikken, Marcel (ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of Generative Syntax*, 265–321. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Levin, Beth. 1998. Building verb meanings. In Butt, M. & Geuder, W. (eds.), *The projection of arguments*, 97–134. Stanford, CA: CSLI Publications.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Levin, Beth. 2000. Classifying single argument verbs. In Coopmans, P. & Everaert, M. & Grimshaw, J. (eds.), *Lexical specification and insertion*, 269–304. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Rappaport Hovav, Malka & Levin, Beth. 2008. The English dative alternation: The case for verb sensitivity. *Journal of linguistics* 44(1). 129–167.

Rosen, Carol. 1984. The interface between semantic roles and initial grammatical relations. In Perlmutter, D. & Rosen, C. (eds.), *Studies in relational grammar*, vol. 2, 38–77. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Stilo, Donald. 2005. Iranian as buffer zone between the universal typologies of Turkic and Semitic. In Csató, É. Á. & Isaksson, B. & Jahani, C. (eds.), *Linguistic convergence and areal diffusion: Case studies from Iranian, Semitic, and Turkic*, 35–63. London/New York: Routledge Curzon.

Stilo, Donald. 2009. Circumpositions as an areal response: The case study of the Iranian zone. *Turkic languages* 13(1). 3–33.

Tsunoda, Tasaku. 1985. Remarks on transitivity. *Journal of linguistics* 21(2). 385–396.

University
of Bamberg
Press

Current issues in Kurdish linguistics contains ten contributions which span the field of Kurdish linguistics, both in terms of geography and in terms of the range of topics. Along with several works on Kurmanji (Northern Kurdish) and Sorani (Central Kurdish), two chapters shed light on the lesser-known Southern Kurdish language area. Other studies are comparative, and treat the Kurdish language area in its entirety. The linguistic approaches of the authors are a mix of formal and typological perspectives, and cover topics ranging from geographical distribution and variation to phonology, morphosyntax, discourse structure, historical morphology, and sociolinguistics.

The present volume is the first of its kind in bringing together contributions from a relatively large number of linguists, working in a diverse range of frameworks and on different aspects and varieties of Kurdish. As such, it attests to the increasing breadth and sophistication now evident in Kurdish linguistics, and is a worthy launch for the new series Bamberg Studies in Kurdish Linguistics (BSKL).