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The aim of this thesis is to give a systematic description of some aspects of Kurdish verbal construction. It is also an attempt to define the nature of the different sets of personal suffixes, characterizing their functions according to their deep structures.

The introduction states the purpose for writing the thesis, and outlines some relevant principles of the theoretical framework used.

Chapter 1 describes the phonemic transcription used in this work.

Chapter 2 specifies some of the typological characteristics of Kurdish, and deals mainly with the order of the main elements of the sentence.

Chapter 3 outlines the system of the phrase structure rules by which simple Kurdish sentences are generated.

Chapter 4 describes the morphology of the Kurdish verb.

Chapter 5 deals with the concept of cliticization. It specifies the rules by which a non-subject element can be replaced by a personal suffix. Some problems concerning the syntactic functions of the personal suffixes are discussed. It concludes that the different sets of personal suffixes have the same syntactic and semantic functions, but that the function of each suffix in any particular sentence is governed by the tense of the verb and the structure of the sentence.

Chapter 6 deals with the copula. It discusses also some of the semantic areas that the copula covers in Kurdish. The main conclusion is that the copula in Kurdish has an overt form only in the 3rd person singular of the present tense and in the past tense.
Chapter 7 deals with the Modals.

Chapter 8 deals with the passive. It concludes that Kurdish has only a truncated (agentless) passive.

Chapter 9 deals with the two different types of causative construction, synthetic and analytic. It discusses the question whether these two types have different deep structures.

This thesis ends with a bibliography.
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<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adv</td>
<td>Adverb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>Agreement marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asp</td>
<td>Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aux</td>
<td>Auxiliary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caus</td>
<td>Causative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp</td>
<td>Complement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comptv</td>
<td>Comparative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conj</td>
<td>Conjunction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cop</td>
<td>Copula</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Demonstrative Adjective(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Det</td>
<td>Determiner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>Direct Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPrf</td>
<td>Derivational Prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSuf</td>
<td>Derivational Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>Empty Morpheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>Embedded Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESAg</td>
<td>Embedded Subject Agreement marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp</td>
<td>Imperative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impf</td>
<td>Imperfective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ImpM</td>
<td>Imperative Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ind</td>
<td>Indicative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>InM</td>
<td>Infinitive Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Izf</td>
<td>Izafe Case</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loc</td>
<td>Locative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mdf</td>
<td>Modifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Main subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neg</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) The demonstrative adjectives ama 'this' and awa 'that' frame the noun they modify in the form am - N - a as in am kurş - a 'this boy' and aw kurş - a 'that boy'. DA here refers to the second part of the demonstrative adjectives which is a.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NF</td>
<td>Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>Object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obl</td>
<td>Obligatory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opt</td>
<td>Optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass</td>
<td>Passive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perf</td>
<td>Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers</td>
<td>Person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers1</td>
<td>Personal Suffix from set No. 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers2</td>
<td>Personal Suffix from set No. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pers3</td>
<td>Personal Suffix from set No. 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl</td>
<td>Plural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM</td>
<td>Phrase Marker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PN</td>
<td>Possessive Noun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poss</td>
<td>Possessive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>Prepositional Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pref</td>
<td>Prefix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prep</td>
<td>Preposition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PreS</td>
<td>Presentencial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pres</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prev</td>
<td>Preverbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pron</td>
<td>Pronoun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PastP</td>
<td>Past Participle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Sentence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sb</td>
<td>Subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Structural Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Structural Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sg</td>
<td>Singular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNP</td>
<td>Subject Noun Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub</td>
<td>Subjunctive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suf</td>
<td>Suffix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tns</td>
<td>Tense</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr</td>
<td>Transitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vi</td>
<td>Intransitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP</td>
<td>Verb Phrase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VS</td>
<td>Verb Stem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vt</td>
<td>Transitive verb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Marks sentence boundary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Marks the boundary between two connected sentences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Asterisk - indicates a deviant sentence
( ) Parentheses - enclose optional element in a rule
→ Arrow - is used to rewrite rule
⇒⇒ Double arrow is used in transformational rule
₀ Zero - indicates the absence of the element on the surface
- Boundary between morphemes of the same word
// Obliques - enclose phonological units
" " Enclose quotation
[ ] Enclose phonetic elements and syntactic features
INTRODUCTION

Kurdish is a northwestern Iranian language spoken by about 12,000,000 people in Kurdistan. Kurdistan is situated in the heart of Asia Minor and occupies the greater part of the mountainous region extending between the Black Sea and the steppes of Mesopotamia on one side, and the Anti-Taurus range and the Iranian Plateau on the other. Today Kurdistan includes portions of Iraq, Iran, Turkey, Syria and the Soviet Union.

As regards the question of the origin of the Kurds, we are confronted with more than one theory. Some rely on linguistic evidence and consider them Indo-European in origin since their language is Iranian. Others relate them to other Asiatic groups like the Chaldeans and Georgians. Whatever the historical implications of Kurdish may be, and from whatever source it may have derived, is not our concern, since we are here dealing with it synchronically. However, its close relationship to Persian is obvious.

Kurdish has been influenced by Arabic, as it has also been influenced by all the languages with which it has cultural and geographical contact, such as Turkish and Persian.

---

(1) Inadequate census information prevents any clear understanding of the total number of Kurds. Confusion is total. The variations in population estimates are between 6,990,000 and 16,470,000. See Short, M. and McDermott, A. (1975).

(2) For different opinions about the origin of the Kurds and their language, see MacKenzie, P.N. (1961a), Minorsky, V. (1940) and Wahbi, T. (1974).
Kurdish uses three different systems of writing. Each part of Kurdistan uses the script used in the country to which it belongs politically. In Iraq and Iran, Kurdish is written with a modified Arabic script. In Turkey and Syria the Kurds use the Roman alphabet and in the Soviet Union a modified Cyrillic alphabet. In Iraqi Kurdistan several unsuccessful attempts have been made to adopt the Roman alphabet since 1931. (3)

Two main dialects are recognized in Kurdish. They are called Northern and Southern Kurmanji or Kurdish. "The dividing line runs approximately from the southern shore of Lake Urmia to the nearest point of the greater Zab and then down to the Tigris confluence."(4) Each dialect embraces several subdialects which are mutually intelligible, while the differences between the two main dialects are greater and are not fully mutually intelligible. (5)

In Southern Kurdistan for the past two centuries, the city of Sulaimaniya has been a cultural centre. During this period it has produced many poets and writers, and since the beginning of the twentieth century many weekly and daily newspapers and journals have been published. Studies in schools of other parts of Kurdistan in Iraq have been in this adopted dialect. Poets and writers of other regions started writing in it. Because of all these historical reasons the Sulaimaniya dialect became the standard Kurdish of

---

(3) See Edmonds, C.J. (1931 and 1933), and Wahbi, T. (1933).
(5) For instance, Northern Kurdish is fully ergative in the past tense, while Southern Kurdish has lost this element and is considered as an accusative language (see Bynon, T. (1979)).
Southern Kurdistan. At present, Kurdish departments in Baghdad and Sulaimaniya Universities and the Kurdish Academy in Iraq use this dialect. The influence of the other dialects on this adopted one during the last few decades has been excessive. Many words and expressions from other dialects were grafted on to it, and for this reason it is no longer considered a regional dialect. This is one of the ways of establishing a standard.

Since 1787, when the first Kurdish grammar was written, (6) Kurdish has been the subject of many studies compiled both in Kurdistan and elsewhere, written by native and foreign scholars. (7) Most of them concern themselves only with morphological features of the verb; syntactic and semantic problems are either totally ignored or treated without reference to the larger units such as the sentence. This study deals in purely synchronic terms with the description and analysis of the verb phrase and the positions and functions of the personal suffixes within the verb phrase. Aspects of morphology will be discussed where necessary, but the emphasis will be on the syntax of the verb. To the extent necessary for our purpose the structure of the sentence and other syntactic components in which the verb plays a fundamental role will also be discussed.

As a synchronic study, no historical considerations will be discussed. Many aspects, which have traditionally been accounted

(6) Maurizio Garzoni (1787), "Grammatica e Vocabolario della linga Kurda", Composti dal P. Roma MDCCLXXXVII.

The construction of the verb phrase in Kurdish is different from that of familiar European languages. It constitutes such a complex structure that, if it is not unique to Kurdish, then it is possessed by only a very few other languages. As has been noticed,

the most difficult part of any language is usually the part that deals with the verb. Learning a language is to a very large degree learning how to operate the verbal form of that language. (8)

Therefore, it should not be expected that a complete and precise delineation of the field can be provided.

Only simple sentences will be considered, and since certain apparently simple sentences have complex deep structures, I will examine the structure of complex sentences to the extent relevant to the present study.

The primary device in the generation of various verbal constructions is syntactic rules. Morphological features specify the syntactic relationships of the verb to the major constituents of a sentence. Basing the analysis of verbal construction solely on morphology is not adequate, as there are pairs of sentences in which the verbs are superficially similar but basically different. For example, the phonetic sequence amnāsit could mean you know me or I used to know you. These two semantic interpretations can be explained in terms of syntax. For the essential differences between them is in the nature of the relationship between the different components of the verb and the other parts of the sentence.

This study is not corpus-based, but it is based on my own

judgment of grammaticality. The illustrative examples were elicited
directly from personal notes, and were corroborated by extensive
checking with the reaction of other native speakers.

In my research I have relied mainly upon the work of Professor
D.N. MacKenzie (1961) to describe and analyse many grammatical
aspects, especially those which deal with morphology.

The theoretical framework used in this study differs from that
of the more traditional descriptions. The approach used is more
or less that of Transformational grammar as proposed by Chomsky in
Aspects of the Theory of Syntax (1965), henceforth Aspects.

As this work is, to my knowledge, the first attempt to analyse
Kurdish in terms of Transformational grammar (TG), it is necessary
to give a brief outline of its implications.

Generative Transformational grammar is a linguistic theory
based on the work of Chomsky. It seeks to relate sound and meaning
in natural language. The core of the theory is the concept of
sentence. It enables us to relate superficially distinct sentences
and distinguish superficially identical sentences. According to
Chomsky, the object of the linguistic analysis must be to discover
what is universal and regular in man's innate ability to understand
and produce sentences that he has never heard or produced before.
In constructing a generative grammar of a language, the linguist is
attempting to construct a model of the native speaker's linguistic
competence, that is, of what he knows about his language.

John Lyons defines the value of the terms 'generative' and
'transformational' as follows.

The term 'generative' is usually understood to
combine two distinguishable senses: (i) 'projective'
(or 'predictive'); and (ii) 'explicit ('formal' v. 'informal').... It was first introduced in the sense of 'projective' (or 'predictive') to refer to any set of grammatical rules which, explicitly or implicitly, described a given corpus of sentences by 'projecting' them upon, or treating them as a 'sample' of, a larger set of sentences. A grammar of this kind is 'predictive' in that it establishes as grammatical, not only 'actual' sentences but also 'potential' sentences.... Most of the grammars that have ever been written throughout the history of linguistics are generative in the first sense of the term.... But the term 'generative' was subsequently used in this section in a rather particular sense of 'explicit'.... This approximates to, and indeed derives from, one of the senses in which the term 'generative' is employed in mathematics.... This second, more or less mathematical, sense of the term 'generate' presupposes, for its applicability to grammar, a rigorous and precise specification of the nature of the grammatical rules and their manner of operation: it presupposes the formalization of grammatical theory.... (9)

If we use the term transformational in a general and rather informal sense, rather than in the particular sense in which it is defined in any one theory, we can say, quite reasonably, that the 'deeper connexions' between sentences which 'cut across the surface grammar' are transformational relationships. (10)

The transformational theory has undergone significant modification since 1957 when it was first proposed. (11) Different versions and stages can be distinguished. In its first stage, the rules are derived into three components: i) a set of phrase structure rules which generate the underlying phrase marker; ii) the transformational rules will produce the derived phrase marker which consists of a series of

---

(9) Lyons, J. (1968), pp. 155-157

(10) Ibid., p. 248.

(11) When Chomsky published his Syntactic Structures in 1957, structural linguistics entered a new phase. Although it originated in America, the theory it presents incorporates the most important ideas of Saussure, Sapir, Trubetzkoy and Jakobson, combining them with recent insights in the fields of mathematical logic and psychology.
formatives, then iii) the morphophonemic rules will specify the phonological realization of the sentence by converting the string of formatives into a phonetic representation. By this stage, the rules generate a highly restricted class of basic structures - kernel sentences, as Chomsky calls them - and the more complex structures - non kernels, such as passive, negative, question, etc. sentences - were derived from the kernels by various transformations. Thus the task of a generative grammar was to generate the well-formed sentences of a language and to describe the syntactic and phonological structure of each. Semantics was held to fall outside the domain of transformational grammar, and was regarded as a matter of a separate theory of language use.

In 1965 in Aspects of the Theory of Syntax, Chomsky presented a more comprehensive theory which differed from his earlier theory in a number of aspects. The scope of the theory was extended to include semantics as well. In this stage the grammar of a language consists of three sets of rules: syntactic, semantic and phonological. The term 'standard theory' is used to refer to the theory of grammar outlined in Chomsky's Aspects....

Research since 1965 has led progressively to a questioning of standard theory. Various proposals as to how the Aspects theory should be modified have now been put forward. Chomsky's own modification (including some other scholars') of the 1965 version of TG is referred to as the 'extended theory'. On the other hand many different schools of linguistics have emerged recently presented by their authors as replacing the standard theory. The most influential of these theories are Fillmore's 'Case grammar', and 'Generative semantics', which was proposed by Lakoff, McCawly, Ross
etc. However, it is not my intention to engage in a lengthy justification of TG. It has been done far more ably and fully than is possible in a study such as this. The present study deals with less problematic and controversial areas of simple sentences. Therefore a grammatical model based on standard theory is sufficient for this purpose.

The special properties of standard theory are summarized below.

The syntactic component consists of a base that generates deep structures and a transformational part that maps them into surface structures. The deep structure of a sentence is submitted to the semantic component for semantic interpretation, and its surface structure enters the phonological component and undergoes phonetic interpretation. The final effect of a grammar, then, is to relate a semantic interpretation to a phonetic representation — that is, to state how a sentence is interpreted. This relation is mediated by the syntactic component of the grammar, which constitutes its sole 'creative' part. (12)

Thus, the syntactic component, which is finite, is regarded as central in the sense that it is the generative part of the system, it specifies an infinite number of structures which underly actual sentences. The semantic and phonological components are interpretive, since they operate on the output of the syntactic component. They provide each structure generated by the syntactic component with a semantic interpretation (for deep structure) and phonological representation (for surface structure).

The base itself consists of two parts or subcomponents: the branching rules or categorial subcomponent and the lexicon. The categorial subcomponent consists of a set of rules similar to the phrase structure rules of the earlier system. These rules define

the grammatical functions and grammatical relations and determine an abstract underlying order. The lexicon characterises the individual properties of particular lexical items that are inserted in specified positions in base phrase-markers. The lexicon lists all the lexical items of the language and associates with each the syntactic, semantic and phonological information required for the correct operation of the rules. Thus the semantic interpretation of a sentence depends on its lexical items and the grammatical functions and relations represented in the underlying structures in which they appear.

The distinction between grammatical and logical subjects and objects is an elusive one and can lead to confusion, since the criteria set up for a particular language cannot be applied to another. In Aspects, functional notions like subject, object, etc. are distinguished from categorial notions such as NP, VP, etc. The grammatical functions are defined in terms of relations holding between grammatical categories like NP, VP in a given phrase-marker.

The notion 'subject' as distinct from the notion NP designates a grammatical function rather than a grammatical category, it is, in other words, an inherently relational notion. We say, in traditional terms that in \[\text{"sincerity may frighten the boy"(13)}\], sincerity is an NP (not that it is the NP of the sentence), and that it is (functions as) the subject-of the sentence (not that it is a subject).... It is necessary only to make explicit the relational character of these notions by defining 'subject-of' for English, as the relation holding between the NP of a sentence of the form NP Aux VP and the whole sentence. 'Object-of' as the relation between the NP of a VP of the form V NP and the whole VP, etc. (14)


(14) Ibid., pp. 68-69.
Thus the deep structure subject of any sentence generated by the grammar is defined in terms of \([\text{NP}, S]\) (i.e. that NP which is directly dominated by S), and the deep-structure object in terms of \([\text{NP}, VP]\) (that NP which is directly dominated by VP), etc.

For Kurdish, too, the subject of a sentence refers to the NP directly dominated by S in a given phrase marker, the object of a sentence to the NP directly dominated by VP and so on. Thus the term DC indicates the NP which precedes the verb within the verb phrase, and IO indicates the prepositional phrase which follows the DO.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Sb} & \quad \text{DO} & \quad \text{IO} & \quad V \\
\text{min nāma - ēk bo Āzād a - nēr - m.}
\end{align*}
\]

\[\begin{align*}
I & \quad \text{letter a to A. Impf send Ag} \\
& \quad \text{I will send a letter to Azad.}
\end{align*}\]

A generative grammar is characterized by its concern for formulating a relatively small number of rules which, nevertheless, account for the infinitely large number of new sentences possible within a given language. A transformation must be a productive process and there must be a regular predictable semantic and syntactic relationship between any two sentences derived from the same underlying structure.

So far some of the properties of TG have been given. Other properties will be discussed when relevant and necessary.

Following the Aspects model, the syntax contains two types of rules. 1) The Phrase-structure rules, generating a hierarchy of syntactic categories and relations. The terminal positions will be filled by complex symbols consisting of morphemes plus their associated syntactic features. The phrase structure rules and lexical
transformations jointly constitute what is called the base component of the grammar. Thus the lexicon is part of base rules. ii) The transformational rules which operate on the string produced by the base, mapping them into an acceptable surface structure by means of deletion, insertion and permutation of elements. iii) The phonological component of the grammar assigns a phonetic interpretation to the syntactic description.

All transformations are either obligatory operations triggered by the presence in the deep structure of a special element, or optional operations. They are without semantic effect.

The term structural index SI is used to specify the structures on which the transformation can be operated, and structural change SC, which indicates the change affected by transformation.

The rules are not ordered cyclically. The numbers indicate only the order in which they are discussed.

In this work the examples are followed by a word rank literal translation in English. Structural markers which appear in English and have no equivalent overt form in Kurdish will be put in parentheses in the English translation.

The work, as will be seen from its title, covers only some of the aspects of the Kurdish verb phrase. My attempt towards an explicit grammar of the Kurdish verb has barely scratched the surface of a total grammatical study. Many aspects and problems remain unsolved. There is, however, such a wealth of interesting linguistic problems in the Kurdish language as to justify deeper studies of it for many generations.
CHAPTER I

PHONOLOGY

Many grammatical aspects of Kurdish can be handled only with reference to the phonological system of the language. To account for them and in order to give the reader the general idea of the phonological relevance of the orthographically specified material given in this work, it is necessary to illustrate some aspects of the Kurdish phonological organization. Our treatment will be restricted to an outline.

1.1 Consonants:

Following the customary methods, (1) by using minimal pairs of words, which are different in respect to only one sound, as a clue to discover the inventory of phonemes in Kurdish, twenty-nine distinctive consonantal phonemes can be recognized. Following the International Phonetic Association's (IPA) method of classification, (2) they can be represented as follows:

(See next page)

The phonemic transcription used is basically that proposed by MacKenzie. It differs from the IPA symbols in the following respect. Keywords and minimal pairs have been given in the table also.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>IPA symbols</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Meaning respectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/p/</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>pīr</td>
<td>čap̣a</td>
<td>čap̣</td>
<td>old, clap, print</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/b/</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>bīr</td>
<td>rubār</td>
<td>(qasāb)</td>
<td>think, stream, butcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/t/</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>task</td>
<td>astūr</td>
<td>lat</td>
<td>tight, thick, piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/d/</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>dask</td>
<td>kādīn</td>
<td>wīṛ</td>
<td>handle, trough, tiny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/k/</td>
<td>k</td>
<td>kar</td>
<td>cāka</td>
<td>pāk</td>
<td>donkey, goodness, clean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/g/</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>gar</td>
<td>lagan</td>
<td>ūrag</td>
<td>if, vessel, root</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/č/</td>
<td>č</td>
<td>qal</td>
<td>pāqīa</td>
<td>ūfaq</td>
<td>crow, bean, stiff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/f/</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>fēḷ</td>
<td>bafīr</td>
<td>kaf̣</td>
<td>trick, snow, foam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>IPA symbols</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Meaning respectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/v/</td>
<td>v</td>
<td>vyān</td>
<td>govār</td>
<td>mirov</td>
<td>name, journal, human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/s/</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>sāwā</td>
<td>birsī</td>
<td>kas</td>
<td>little, hungry, person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/z/</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>zāwā</td>
<td>bizn</td>
<td>barz</td>
<td>bridegroom, goat, high</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʃ/</td>
<td>ʃ</td>
<td>ūr</td>
<td>pišū</td>
<td>āš</td>
<td>lion, rest, mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʒ/</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>žer</td>
<td>hažār</td>
<td>mwež</td>
<td>beneath, poor, prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/x/</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>xwā</td>
<td>taxta</td>
<td>nax</td>
<td>God, wood, depth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ār</td>
<td>ārūm</td>
<td>wihr</td>
<td>run, lord, cattle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>ḥawt</td>
<td>(lahîm) (roh)</td>
<td>seven, solder, soul</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ẹ/</td>
<td>ẹ</td>
<td>(ẹsā)</td>
<td>(lañat) (nañnañ)</td>
<td>Jesus, damned, mints</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/h/</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>hawr</td>
<td>bahār</td>
<td></td>
<td>cloud, spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʒ/</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ğawr</td>
<td>pārca</td>
<td>māč</td>
<td>fat, piece, kiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʒ/</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>ğawr</td>
<td>kunjī</td>
<td>ganj</td>
<td>oppression, sesame, young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/m/</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>miwān</td>
<td>kamar</td>
<td>kam</td>
<td>guest, waist, little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/n/</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>nīwān</td>
<td>xunīa</td>
<td>bān</td>
<td>between, blossom, floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ŋ/</td>
<td>ŋ</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>bāŋ</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/l/</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>lēw</td>
<td>kīlīl</td>
<td>čīl</td>
<td>lip, key, forty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ʒ/</td>
<td>ʒ</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>plīng</td>
<td>čīl</td>
<td>---, tiger, branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>ōrūn</td>
<td>biřīn-</td>
<td>kār</td>
<td>hunt, cut, deaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/r/</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>lūn</td>
<td>biřīn</td>
<td>kār</td>
<td>----, wound, donkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/w/</td>
<td>w</td>
<td>wak</td>
<td>hāwīn</td>
<td>kaw</td>
<td>like, summer, partridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/y/</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>yak</td>
<td>bayān</td>
<td>kaw</td>
<td>one, dawn, when</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes**

a) - All these sounds are produced with an egressive pulmonic air-stream mechanism.

b) - Words in brackets indicate that they are loans. No word of Kurdish origin can be found having those phonemes in the positions indicated.

c) - No minimal pairs can be found between /x/ : /ŋ/, /ʃ/ : /v/, and /y/ : /s/. /x/ and /ŋ/ are neutralized in some words:

/ xam/ or / xam/ sorrow
/ bāx/ or / bāŋ/ garden

d) - /h/ finally, /ŋ/ medially and finally, and /y/ in all positions occur only with loans.

e) - /h/ does not occur finally.
f) - /ŋ/ occurs only finally.
g) - /r/ and /ř/ do not occur initially.

1.2 Vowels

There are eight vowels in Kurdish. They are /i e a ū u o ă/. Following Daniel Jones' system of classification the diagram following shows the phonetic values of these phonemes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Orthography</th>
<th>IPA symbols</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Medial</th>
<th>Final</th>
<th>Meaning respectively</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>māsī</td>
<td>work, life, fish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/i/</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>woman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/e/</td>
<td>ē</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>we, beneath, river</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ē/</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>room, two</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/u/</td>
<td>ū</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>hope, hole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/o/</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>calm, old, why</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/ă/</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>water, work, wind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/a/</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>ūn</td>
<td>duty, donkey, blossom</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes
a) - Length is not distinctive either in consonants or in vowels.
b) - /i/ occurs only medially.
c) - /u/ does not occur initially.
d) - /u/ does not occur finally.
e) - /i, a, u/ have relatively shorter inherent duration than /I, e, a, o, u/.

1.3 Syllabic structure

The possible syllabic structure for words in Kurdish may be summarized by the formula:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
(C) (C) \ [V] (C) (C)
\end{array}
\]

where the round brackets indicate that the enclosed item may be optionally chosen, the item between brackets is to be chosen, and \( \chi \) indicates that the two consonants denoted are mutually exclusive. This implies that i) every syllable must have a vowel, and ii) clusters (5) of two consonants may occur either initially or finally. Examples of all possibilities are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CCVC</th>
<th>pyāw</th>
<th>man</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CVCC</td>
<td>dast</td>
<td>hand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVC</td>
<td>min</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VCC</td>
<td>ark</td>
<td>duty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCV</td>
<td>xwā</td>
<td>God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CV</td>
<td>gā</td>
<td>cow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VC</td>
<td>ās</td>
<td>mill</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| V         | a (of Impf) as in a - xo - m | I eat
|           |      | Impf eat  |

(5) A cluster, is a sequence of two or more consonants within the structure of one single syllable.
1.4 Juncture features

Two successive vowels do not occur in Kurdish. Either a semi-vowel comes between as in

/āzā - a/ \[→ \] [aza(y)a]

brave is

/nū - ān/ \[→ \] [nū(w)ān]

sleep Past Caus

or they will be reduced to one by the process of elision.

Elision is the reduction of two adjacent vowels to one, as in the suffixation of the first person plural personal suffix morpheme /īn/ to a word like birsī 'hungry'. The two (ī)s will be reduced to one.

/birsī - īn/ \[→ \] [birsīn] we (are) hungry

It is possible for two successive vowels to occur initially. In this case they will be separated by a glottal stop, as in

/a - āān - m/ \[→ \] [aʔāānm] I embroil

Impf embroil I

When two consonants come together by the process of suffixation, the neutral vowel (ī) will occur between them if the suffix added does not form a new syllable

/xwārd - n/ \[→ \] [xwārdin] to eat

eat Past InM

/xwārd - mān/ \[→ \] [xwārdmān] we ate

eat Past we

However, the transcription used in this work is systematic phonemic. The same morpheme always shows the same form in different phonetic environment. Therefore, the appearance and disappearance of any vowel or semi-vowel due to their phonetic environment will be ignored, unless
necessary. The morphemes of the same word will be separated by dashes.

\[ \text{Kuřakān} \rightarrow /kur - aka - ān/ \text{ the boys} \]

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
boy & the Pl
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

1.5 Stress

A word in Kurdish consists of one to six syllables. When it is pronounced in isolation, one of the syllables will receive heavier stress than the others. This syllable is said to have inherent or potential stress. The position of the stress in Kurdish words of more than one syllable is predominantly on the final syllable, with few exceptions:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
āsō & horizon \\
bayānī & tomorrow
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Examples for exceptions:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
čúnka & because \\
bóya & thus \\
bážām & but
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

In long words more than one syllable may be stressed, and if so, one of them receives more stress than the others. This kind of word is said to have secondary stress besides its primary stress.

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
qutābxānā & school \\
\text{gālāwēz} & Canopus
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

(the symbol / is used here to indicate the inherent or primary stress and \ to indicate the secondary stress.)
The addition of affixes to words may or may not alter the position of the stress. In general it depends on the type of the affix, that is whether it is derivational or inflectional. Affixes may have the form of prefixes or suffixes.

A derivational suffix is one which, if added to a word, forms a new word with a new meaning. On its addition to any word, the original stressed syllable will lose its identity and the stress moves over to the new final syllable. It is a general rule in Kurdish that the stress is on the final syllable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>guft</th>
<th>flower</th>
<th>guft-dan</th>
<th>vase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bâg</td>
<td>garden</td>
<td>bâkman</td>
<td>gardener</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Derivational prefixes have no effect on stress. If added to any word, the stress remains on the original final syllable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>girtin</th>
<th>to hold</th>
<th>ha-girtin</th>
<th>to carry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

An inflectional affix is added to a word to change its form to express its relationship to the other words of the sentence or phrase. If the morpheme added is a suffix, the stress remains where it was:

(şma) hat - In we came

come Past Ag

utumbil - I ᾿Azād Azad's car
car Izf A.

The plural morpheme /an/ is an exception. It behaves like a derivational suffix.

Certain inflectional prefixes are always stressed. They are the negative, imperative and subjunctive particles.
In the case of compound verbs where the imperative particle is not needed, the stress will be on the first element of the compound.

\[ \text{dā} - \text{nīs} - \text{a} \quad \text{sit down} \]
\[ \text{DPrf sit ImpM} \]

Other suffixes

Some suffixes cannot be classified within either of the groups mentioned above. They are of two types: those which behave like derivational suffixes, i.e. where the stress moves to the final syllable if added. These are the definite particle \(-\text{aka} \ 'the'\) and the comparative and superlative morphemes \(-\text{tir} \) and \(-\text{tirīn}\).

\[ \text{kur} \quad \text{boy} \quad \text{kur}-\text{aka} \quad \text{the boy} \]
\[ \text{āsān} \quad \text{easy} \quad \text{āsān}-\text{tir} \quad \text{easier} \]
\[ \text{āsān}-\text{tirīn} \quad \text{easiest} \]

and those which behave like inflectional suffixes, i.e. they have no effect on the stress when added. These are the conjunction particles \(-\text{iš} \), \(\text{u} \ 'also, and'\), and the indefinite particle \(-\text{ek} \ 'a'\).

\[ \text{Rizgar-iš} \quad \text{hāt.} \quad \text{Rizgar came also} \]
\[ \text{R. also come Past} \]
\[ \text{Āhāng u Āwāz} \quad \text{Āhang and Āwaz} \]
\[ \text{brādar-ek} \quad \text{a friend} \]
If two phonologically identical but grammatically different suffixes are added to the same word, the stress will move to the final syllable with the derivational suffix and remain in its old position with the inflectional suffix. For example, /n/ is the surface component of the derivational suffix which forms verbal nouns from the past tense stem of the verbs. It is also the surface component of the 3rd person plural suffix. If it added to the past tense stem of a verb, for example nуст- 'sleep Past', the meaning will be 'to sleep' if the stress is moved to the final position and 'they slept' if the stress remains in the old position.

nуст - /n/  to sleep
nуст - /n/  they slept

Thus stress is contrastive in Kurdish.
In his paper on language universals, Greenberg (1) classifies the languages of the world into three major types. He suggests that an order typology could be based on the relative order of its meaningful elements; i.e. every language shows particular order of its basic elements, subject, object and verb. This order depends on the nature of the relationships that hold between the units which hierarchically form its immediate constituents. The three types are:

Type I: contains verb-initial languages VSO such as
       Berber, Nandi, Arabic, etc.

Type II: contains verb-medial languages SVO such as
       English, Albanian, Modern Greek, etc.

Type III: contains verb-final languages SOV such as
       Persian, Amharic, Hindi, etc. (2)

Although the dominant surface order in Kurdish is clearly SOV,


(2) According to Greenberg, when the verb is final, the only possible order will be SCV, since the dominant order is almost always one in which the subject precedes the object. The other two possibilities will take the orders VSO and SVO (universal I). However, the orders VCS, CVS and OSV are found, e.g. Malagasy, Hixkaryana and Apurina respectively.
it seems that it does not always match the basic principles observed by Greenberg for SOV languages.

Kurdish is a prepositional language. (3) This aspect can be illustrated by the following examples.

bo ʻAzād.              for ʻAzād
for A.
tā bayānī              till tomorrow

till tomorrow

This is against the tendency reported by Greenberg that "with overwhelmingly greater than chance frequency, languages with normal SOV order are postpositional." (Universal 4).

However, patterns consistent with Greenberg’s observation may be found in Kurdish. For instance, his universal 2 reads, "in languages with prepositions, the genitive almost always follows the governing noun." Kurdish, as it has been discussed above, is a prepositional language, its genitive always follows the noun, as in

kur - I  to  your son
'son  Izf  you

And in his universal 5 he points out that, "if a language has

(3) Some prepositions have verbal postpositional alternatives. These can occur only with certain verbs. For instance, the preposition ba 'to' has the verbal postposition a as an alternative.

min ba to  a - da - m.  min adam - a to.
I to you Impf give Ag to you

With this verb if the NP of the IO is expressed in a personal suffix the postposition will take the form ə.

min  a - t - da - m - ə.
I Impf you give Ag to

I give (it) to you.
dominant SOV order and the genitive follows the governing noun, then
the adjective likewise follows the noun." Kurdish, which shows an
SOV order on surface, its adjective like its genitive follows the noun.

kiş-i javan  beautiful girl
girl Izf beautiful

Universal 22 reads, "in comparisons of superiority, ... with
overwhelmingly more than chance frequency, if the only order is
adjective - marker - standard, the language is prepositional."
The following examples illustrate what is meant by these elements.
However, Kurdish allows two different orders of such elements.

a) gawra - tir la to bigger than you
big Comptv than you
Adj - Marker - Standard

b) la to gawra - tir (4)
    than you big Comptv
    Standard - Adj - Marker

For Greenberg type (a) is typical of prepositional languages.
This is consistent with Kurdish being a prepositional language.
The fact that the genitive and adjective follow the head in a
prepositional language, and that the comparison has the order Adj -
marker - standard, may be the characteristics of SOV languages.
Analysis shows that all these are consistent with Kurdish being an
SOV language. What is not consistent with Greenberg's proposal is
Kurdish being a prepositional and SOV language. However, Greenberg
is aware of such exceptions apparent in Kurdish as being an SOV and
prepositional language. He gives Persian as an example. Historically,

(4) The data presented by Greenberg does not contain such order
    of comparison elements.
Persian is one of the languages closest to Kurdish. They show a great similarity. Both are prepositional, their adjective and genitive follow the noun they qualify, and both seem to be of SOV type on surface. Thus Kurdish could be added to the list of the exceptions to the principles suggested by Greenberg.

Lehmann\(^\text{(5)}\) distinguishes two types of languages: those in which the verb precedes the object (VO) and those in which the verb follows the object (OV). For him consistent OV languages are agglutinative, and consistent VO languages tend to be inflectional.

Kurdish can be considered as a mainly agglutinative language in which "individual grammatical categories may be fairly easily assigned to morphemes strung together in the structure of the word."\(^\text{(6)}\)

For instance:

\begin{align*}
\text{Impf} & \quad \text{we see them} \\
\text{Ipa} & \quad \text{they see we} \\
\text{one of your sons} & \quad \text{a your son} \\
\text{Past allow} & \quad \text{Past eat}
\end{align*}

Kurdish is mainly agglutinative as this type of word structure predominates. Other types can also be recognized. The past tense stem is not predictable from the present, and vice versa, i.e. the past tense morpheme is merged closely with the present stem, as in:

\begin{align*}
\text{Past allow} & \quad \text{Past eat}
\end{align*}

This provides instances of inflectional characteristics.


Many syntactic relationships in Kurdish are not marked by suffixes. They are achieved by the use of a class of monomorphemic particles exhibiting no formal paradigms.

Examples of these isolating types are:

- **tā** till
- **ka** when, who, that
- **la** in, at

The analysis presented above is somehow consistent with Kurdish being an OV language. Further examinations of Kurdish as an OV language in the light of Lehmann's proposal reveal exceptions.

Lehmann proposes a fundamental principle of placement of categorial entities which represent modifiers. By this principle, modifiers are placed on the opposite side of a basic syntactic element from its primary concomitant. The object is the primary concomitant of the verb. Therefore modifiers that modify the head object such as adjective and genitive should occupy the position opposite to the verb. And the entities which represent verbal modifiers such as negation and causative should occupy a position opposite to the object. According to this principle, in an OV language, the nominal modifiers must precede the noun and the verbal modifiers must follow the verb. The order can be illustrated in the following:

Nominal modifier - O - V - Verbal modifiers.

Kurdish seems to be an exception with respect to the generalization given by Lehmann. Although on the surface Kurdish shows the order OV, its nominal modifiers almost always follow the head noun. This aspect of Kurdish has already been pointed out earlier in this chapter.
Concerning verbal modifiers such as the negation particle and causative element, some, such as the negative element, precede the verb, while others such as the causative modifier follow the verb.

\[
\text{Mdf} \hspace{1em} V \hspace{1em} \text{Mdf}
\]
\[
\text{mā - ĭ - sūt - ūn - m.}
\]
\[
\text{Neg it burn Caus I}
\]

I will not cause it burning.

Thus through the analysis given above, it can be seen that, although Kurdish seems to be an OV type language on the surface, it is not always consistent with what was proposed by Lehmann. However, he makes a distinction between languages which are consistent and those which are inconsistent in their syntactic patterns, a consistent language being the type which shows no exceptions to the patterns shown above, and an inconsistent language being one which shows exceptions. Furthermore, he assumes that inconsistent types are undergoing change. If this observation is correct, the simultaneous existence of patterns of both types in Kurdish is probably because Kurdish is undergoing change. But from which type to which? This needs historical consideration.

Orders other than SCV can occur in Kurdish to mark stylistic variants or topicalization.

\[
\text{O} \hspace{1em} \text{Sb} \hspace{1em} V
\]
\[
am \vline a \tilde{\text{Azād}} \vline kīfī \vline ĭ
\]
This flower DA A. buy Past Ag

This flower, Azad bought (it).
In verb phrases where the subject and object are represented by personal suffixes the orders VSO, SVO, and OVS are found.

V  Sb  O
bînî - măn - ît.
see Past we you
We saw you (Sg).

Sb  V  O
a - tăn - nârd - n.
Impf you send Past they
You (Pl) used to send them.

O  V  Sb
a - yân - nêr - m.
Impf they send I
I send them.

In short, the orders SOV, OSV, OVS, VSO and SVO can all occur in the surface in Kurdish, and one should be chosen as the order in underlying structure. However, in this work Kurdish will be considered as an SOV language. In deep structure the subject and object of the sentence are represented as autonomous words. It will be considered that all these different orders can be derived from the same deep structure. They are derived by the application of different transformational rules. The object of this work is to show that these variations can be derived by a precisely defined and justifiable set of rules from the same deep structure.
CHAPTER 3

KURDISH PHRASE STRUCTURE RULES

Since this thesis is primarily concerned with verbs and verbal construction in Kurdish, it is not proposed to offer a detailed and systematic description of its whole grammatical structure.

The study of verbs and verbal constructions in Kurdish presents a number of problems including those involving their relationship with the other major constituents of the sentence. For this reason it is necessary to give first a brief sketch of Kurdish syntax.

Simple sentences in Kurdish can be generated by the following system of phrase structure (PS) rules. This is a condensed statement; it can be developed and expanded as necessary in the following chapters.

1 - S  \[\rightarrow (\text{PreS}) \text{ NP} + \text{VP} \]
2 - VP \[\rightarrow \text{Aux} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{(NP)(PP)V} \\ \text{Comp Cop} \end{array} \right] \text{(Adv)} \]
3 - NP \[\rightarrow \text{N} + \text{Det} + \text{No} \]
4 - PP \[\rightarrow \text{Prep} + \text{NP} \]
5 - V \[\rightarrow \text{VS} \]
6 - Aux \[\rightarrow \text{Tense Aspect (Modal)} \]
7 - Comp \[\rightarrow \text{NP, PP, Adj, Adv} \]
8 - Adv \[\rightarrow \text{Loc, time, reason ... etc.} \]

PS rule 1 develops sentence (S) into a noun phrase (NP) and a verb phrase (VP), preceded by an optional presentential (PreS) element.
This rule accounts for the fact that every sentence in Kurdish must consist of a NP as a grammatical subject and a verb phrase as a predicate.

PreS

Question (Q), negation (Neg), Imperative (Imp) ... are handled by introducing the Presentential element into PS rules. If any or more of these are chosen, obligatory transformations will generate the correct sentence.

PS rule 2 defines the VP as consisting of an obligatory constituent of verb (V) preceded by optional constituents of NP and Prepositional phrase (PP), or a copula (Cop) with its complement (Comp). Either of these sequences are preceded by the Auxiliary (Aux). Round brackets indicate that the enclosed item may be optionally chosen, and the items without brackets are to be chosen. The rule separates the copula from the verb proper since the two categories differ from each other in many respects as we shall see in the following chapters. PS rule 2 accounts for the fact that the object precedes the verb.

\[ Sb \ O \ V \]

\[ \text{Ahang panîr affoş - št.} \]

A. cheese sell Ag

Ahang sells cheese.

PS rule 3 defines the NP as a constituent consisting of a noun (N), determiner (Det) and number (No).

The structure of a NP may be very complex. Its discussion is beyond the scope of this work. There is, however, one aspect of the NP which is relevant to the present work which should be discussed,
and that is the inherent syntactic features of lexical items. These play a role in selectional restrictions and non-lexical transformations to determine the choice of the relevant pronoun or personal suffix to express the subject and non-subject constituents.

Chomsky\(^1\) proposed that each lexicon in a language must contain certain subcategorial features. These features specify its semantic, syntactic and phonological properties. The noun in English, for instance, must be classified into human and non-human in order to account for the selection of who or which as the relative pronoun. It must also be classified into proper or common to account for the distribution of the determiner ... and so on. Each of these features specifies a value along a particular dimension of classification. These features will be shown in square brackets with a + or - sign to indicate their presence or absence. Thus, for example, the word kic 'girl' in Kurdish is represented in the lexicon as [+ noun], [+ human], [+ female], [- married]. It is relevant to our discussion to list the personal pronouns of Kurdish with their features.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min} & \quad [+ \text{1st}] \quad [+ \text{Sg}] \quad \text{I} \\
\text{to} & \quad [+ \text{2nd}] \quad [+ \text{Sg}] \quad \text{you (sg)} \\
\text{aw} & \quad [+ \text{3rd}] \quad [+ \text{Sg}] \quad \text{he, she, it} \\
\text{ëma} & \quad [+ \text{1st}] \quad [+ \text{Pl}] \quad \text{we} \\
\text{ëwa} & \quad [+ \text{2nd}] \quad [+ \text{Pl}] \quad \text{you (pl)} \\
\text{awën} & \quad [+ \text{3rd}] \quad [+ \text{Pl}] \quad \text{they}
\end{align*}
\]

The problem we face here is how to determine the person of those lexical items which are not pronouns. However, it has been suggested that every noun in the lexicon of a language is marked with the feature

\(^1\) Chomsky (1965) p. 75.
The evidence for this proposal is that the noun in both subject and object positions can be replaced with a 3rd person pronoun as in

tiği minal - aka - än a - šo - āt.
A. child the Pl Impf wash Ag

Azad washes the children
aw awān a - šo - āt.
he they
He washes them.

FS rule 4 defines the PP as consisting of a NP preceded by a preposition.

FS rule 5 re-writes the verb as a constituent consisting of the stem. The verb stem consists of a series of syntactic features which indicate that each verb enters into several overlapping types of classification including transitive vs intransitive ... and the like.

FS rule 6 defines the Aux as a component consisting of Tense, Aspect and Modal. Of these the tense and aspect are obligatory and the modal is optional. Each of these will be discussed elsewhere.

Adverb

The adverb is characteristically the modifier of a verb. As it has been defined in PS rule 8, locative, time, reason, etc. are adverbial categories realized in the surface as single nominals: bayānī 'tomorrow', prepositional phrase labar to 'because of you' etc. and their expansions.

More than one type and more than one from each may appear in a sentence. They present a number of problems. Firstly, their
positions in relation to the other constituents of the sentence are flexible. Secondly, their order depends more on the stylistic factor of length than on the underlying categories involved. Because of that these adverbials cannot be treated as recursive categories forming a hierarchic structure. For instance,

\[
\text{min dwéné la Hawlér ëwāra nān - m xwārd.}
\]
I yesterday in Hawler evening food Ag eat Past

\[
là Hawlér dwéné min ëwāra nān - m xwārd,\]
In Hawler yesterday I evening food Ag eat Past

\[
ëwāra la Hawlér min nān - m xwārd dwéné.\]
evening in Hawler I food Ag eat Past yesterday

\[
là Hawlér ëwara min nān - m xwārd dwéné.\]
In Hawler evening I food Ag eat Past yesterday

... etc.

Yesterday evening I ate in Hawler.

All are synonymous. The position and the orders of the adverbs differ in each sentence.
CHAPTER 4

THE VERB

This chapter is an attempt to outline the characteristics of the Kurdish verb by specifying its paradigmatic and morphological properties. The outline given here is not intended to be exhaustive. It provides background information only for those aspects of the verb which will be discussed in detail in other chapters. Those details which are not relevant to the scope of the present study will be ignored. The definition of the Kurdish verb will be in terms of generative theory. The verb in Kurdish may consist of:

4.1 The stem.

Kurdish verbs are inflected only for a two-way tense contrast, present and past. This is reflected in each verb by having two stems known as past stem and present stem. All forms are based on one or the other of these, e.g.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Past stem</th>
<th>Present stem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xwârд -</td>
<td>xo -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mird -</td>
<td>mir -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hêşt -</td>
<td>hêl -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wit -</td>
<td>ûê -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nârd -</td>
<td>nêr -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Through these examples it can be noticed that the past and present
stems are not mutually predictable. In this work the present stem will be considered as the base. The phonological rules will specify the phonological realization of the morphemes. Thus the sequence xo past together is realized as xward, HSL past as hēst, HSL present as hēst etc.

Any attempt to discover a set of systematic rules to derive the present stem from the past or infinitive or vice versa would be futile. However, for pedagogical purposes one can list the past stems and derive the present stems from them. For this, different rules must be stated with many exceptions and irregularities. The infinitive is obtained by simply adding the suffix /-n/ to the past tense stem of the verb. The infinitive has all the characteristics of a nominal form. Thus the infinitives of the verbs given above will be xward-n, mird-n, hēst-n, wit-n and nārd-n. I suggest that in the deep structure of a sentence the verb occurs in the stem form.

4.2 Tense

Tense is an area in which the relation between syntax and semantics is highly complex. Its primary function is to relate the time of the event referred to in the sentence to the time of the utterance.

Schools of grammar differ in their opinion with regard to the tense and the relation of the tense to temporal time.

Traditionalists represent one extreme by identifying tense with temporal time, defining it as the primary grammatical expression of distinction of time. They recognize three tenses: past, present and future. And it has often been supposed that this three-way

opposition of tense is a universal feature of language. (2)

The transformationalists deny the existence of a direct correspondence between tense and physical time. They consider time as

a universal concept with three divisions, past time, present time and future time.

The concept is universal in that the units of time are extra-linguistic. They exist independently of the grammar of any particular language. In our use, however, we make linguistic reference to these extra-linguistic realities by means of the language specific category of tense. (3)

Following the traditional conception, most Kurdish grammars identify tense and time. They divide it into past, present and future. However, in Kurdish the distinction between tense and time is obvious. There is no one-to-one correspondence between them. The dichotomy of temporal past and present is not reflected in the tense. This is apparent in passive and synthetic causative constructions. The past tense forms of passive and causative are formed by the addition of passive and causative morphemes to what is called the present stem of the verb, as in,

kuž : is the present stem of the verb kuştin 'kill'.  
kuz - r - ā  kužrā  be kill Past  
kill Pass Past  
nū : is the present stem of the verb nustin 'sleep'.  
nǔ - ā - n  nū(w)ān  cause to sleep Past  
sleep Past Caus

(3) Quirk, R. (1972) p. 84.
And the present tense stems of some passive verbs are derived from the past tense stem of the verb, as in wit- and wîst- which are the past tense stems of the verbs wîtîn 'say' and wîstîn 'demand' respectively. Their passive present tense stem will be:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{wit - r - ė} & \quad \text{be say Pres.} \\
\text{say Pass Pres} \\
\text{wîst - r - ė} & \quad \text{be demand Pres.} \\
\text{demand Pass Pres}
\end{align*}
\]

Moreover, a non-past time may be expressed by a form known as past.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{bayānî} & \quad \text{ka hāt - m pē - m biē.} \\
\text{tomorrow when come Ag to me tell} \\
\text{Past} \\
\text{Tell me tomorrow, when I come.}
\end{align*}
\]

The expression bayānî 'tomorrow' indicates future time while the event of coming is expressed in the past tense. These examples illustrate very clearly that the opposition of the past and present tense in Kurdish is not a matter of time. Tense is realized as a syntactic and time as a semantic concept.

Morphologically, no specific form can be assigned to tense. The tense morpheme is merged with the stem.

4.3 Aspect

Kurdish grammars used the term tense in a very broad sense, so that each of the different forms nûstîm 'I slept' anûstîm 'I was sleeping' nûstibûm 'I had slept' bînû 'sleep' (Imp) anûm 'I am sleeping' .... etc. counts as a distinct tense.

It is now more usual to restrict tense to syntactic contrasts
in the verb whose basic semantic function is to indicate the location in time of the event expressed in the sentence, and to use the term Aspect to cover oppositions based upon the notion of duration, frequency, completion, incompletion, ... etc. (4)

"As the general definition of aspect, we may take the formulation that Aspects are different ways of viewing the internal temporal constituency of a situation." (5) An example is best to illustrate this point.

In Kurdish, the contrast between xwārdīm 'I ate' and axom 'I am eating, I will eat' is clearly of tense, past vs present, while that between xwārdīm 'I ate' and amxwārd 'I was eating, I used to eat', both in the past, does not involve tense. They are different in aspect.

As far as aspect is concerned, three types can be recognized in Kurdish: perfective, imperfective and perfect.

Perfectivity is not expressed by an overt grammatical element on the surface. The verb will be in perfective aspect when it is in the past and unmarked for imperfective and perfect aspects, as in:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{xwārd - m} & \quad \text{I ate} \\
\text{eat Past I}
\end{align*}
\]

The form with the prefix /a-/ is marked for the imperfective. Kurdish can express imperfective both with the past and present, as in

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a - xo - In} & \quad \text{we eat} \\
\text{Impf eat we}
\end{align*}
\]

Kurdish can express perfect both with past and present tenses. The past perfect element is phonologically realized as /bû/ on the surface, and the present perfect as /ûa/, which basically consists of the morpheme /û/ of the past participle and the copula /a/. Both the present and past perfect use the past tense stem. A set of rules will move the tense and aspect elements to their proper position: I will call them permutation rules. Then another set of rules will specify their phonological realization - phonological rules. For instance in the sentence

\[
\text{ewa nûst} - \text{ bû} - \text{ n.}
\]

you sleep Past Perf Ag

You (pl) had slept.

The verb is in what is referred to in Kurdish grammars as pluperfect; its deep structure is represented in the following diagram.

![Diagram](attachment:diagram.png)

\[
\text{ewa} \quad \text{NU Past Perf} \quad \text{By permutation rules}
\]

\[
\text{nûst} - \text{ bû} \quad \text{By phonological rules}
\]
Then the agreement rules will introduce an appropriate personal suffix. In this sentence the personal suffix will be /n/. This will be discussed below.

Similarly in the sentence

\[
\text{to a - řoyišt - Ít.} \\
\text{you Impf go Past Ag} \\
\text{You were going.}
\]

the verb is in the past imperfective. It will have the deep structure

\[
S \\
\text{NP} \quad \text{VF} \\
\quad \text{Aux} \\
\quad \text{Tns. Asp VS} \\
\quad \text{to Past Impf RO}
\]

\[
\text{to Impf RO Past} \quad \text{By permutation rules} \\
\text{a - řoyišt -} \quad \text{By phonological rules}
\]

Then the agreement marker /It/ will be introduced giving the above surface.

The imperfective marker /a-/ occurs obligatorily with the present tense stem, while its occurrence with the past tense stem is optional. When the modal occurs it will receive the tense and aspect elements. In this case the main verb will be marked for the present subjunctive (semantically tenseless), as in:

\[
\text{aw a - ři - twanî bi-řo-āt.} \\
\text{he Impf Ag can Past Sub go Ag} \\
\text{He could go.}
\]
4.4 Mood

a) - Subjunctive: The present subjunctive is formed by the addition of the prefix bi to the present stem of the verb.

Present stem xo eat
Present Sub bi - xo may eat

The perfect subjunctive is formed from the past stem of the verb with the present subjunctive of the auxiliary verb bun.
A stressed (i) is added to a stem ending in a consonant before the auxiliary.

Past stem xwārd eat Past
Perfect Sub xwārd - i - bi may Past eat

The subjunctive has many uses in Kurdish, including what might be expressed in some languages as optative, desiderative, conditional etc. It is also used in certain structures where the infinitive is used in English, as in:

min a - m - awēt bi - ūro - m.
I Impf Ag want sub go Ag
I want to go.

Syntactically the occurrence of bi is accounted for by the introduction of certain transformations such as Imperative, conditional causative etc. as we shall see in the following chapters.

b) Imperative: All Kurdish grammars confine the imperative to the 2nd person singular and plural. Morphologically, the imperative is formed from the present stem of the verb plus the prefix bi. With the singular, if the stem ends in a consonant the suffix /-a/ occurs
following the stem of the verb. With the plural the suffix /n/ of the 2nd person plural occurs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>xwârîn</th>
<th>eat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present stem</td>
<td>xo</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>bi - xo</td>
<td>You (sg)  eat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bi - xo - n</td>
<td>You (pl)  eat</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>ĭwânîn</th>
<th>look</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present stem</td>
<td>ĭwân -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imperative</td>
<td>bi - ĭwân - a</td>
<td>You (sg) look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bi - ĭwân - n</td>
<td>You (pl) look</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wara 'come', biço 'go', bê 'come', are exceptions to the generalization given above.

The prefix bi of the imperative is mutually exclusive with the negative particle. It is also omitted if the verb has any derivational prefix.

| bi - xo       | eat       |
| ma - xo       | do not eat|
| ĭâa - ka      | run       |
| DPrf do       |           |
| haâ - gira    | carry     |
| DPrf take     |           |

We notice through the above brief outline of the morphological form of the imperative that the singular is not followed by a personal suffix.

- every singular imperative ends in a vowel. The plural imperative ends in the suffix /n/ of the 2nd Plural, and its structure is identical with that of the 2nd Pl subjunctive. It
has been noticed that "in very many languages which inflect the verb for person, number, tense, etc. the form of the verb which occurs in 2nd personal singular imperative sentence is uninflccted for these categories". (6) Kurdish imperative seems to be one of the languages that fall within this type.

Generative theory assumes that the underlying structure of the imperative sentence Go home in English is the sentence You will go home. The presence of You is attested by the reflexive transformation:

shave yourself

*shave myself

and the presence of will is further attested by Tag-question formation:

Go home, will you?

Katz and Postal (1964) advance the thesis that the transformations which map the deep structures into surface structures are meaning-preserving. They noticed that generative grammar (then) was inadequate (for English), because there was a semantic problem in claiming that Go home, You go home and You will go home are all derived from the same deep structure. To overcome this they introduced the abstract morpheme Imp into the deep structure of the imperative which they abbreviated to RIM with a dictionary sense "I request that". (7) This morpheme will trigger certain transformations which can give Go home and its absence in the deep structure will retain the declarative sense of the sentence. However, the ambiguity in the English type You will go home between declarative and imperative does not exist.


(7) Katz and Postal (1964) p. 76.
for Kurdish with the singular because in declarative sentences such as *I request that you go, You will go, You should go, etc.* the verb is always expressed in the subjunctive.

a - biro

- *hazakam biro - It*  I request (that you) go
- *abē biro - It*  You must/may go
- *amawē biro - It*  I want you to go

b - *biro - It*  In the sense go

* *hazakam biro
* *abē biro
* *amawē biro

In all the sentences in (a) and (b), biro is imperative and biro-It is the subjunctive form of the 2nd Sg.

However, ambiguity does exist with the plural as the structure of subjunctive and imperative are identical in the plural.

To generate an imperative sentence in Kurdish the abstract morpheme Imp will be introduced into the deep structure of the sentence. This will serve as a trigger for a series of transformations of which the last will be subject-deletion rule. The rule is formalized as follows:

SI:  X - Imp - NP - VS - X

1 2 3 4 5

⇒ Obl

SC:  1 2 3 4 5

SUB-DEL is optional as the subject can in fact occur as a surface of an imperative.
4.5 **Negation**

In general three categories of negation are recognizable in Kurdish according to form and function.

1) - Pre-verbal negation like na, ma, etc. which precede the stem of the verb, as in:

\[
\text{min nā - xo - m}
\]

I Neg eat Ag

I do not eat.

2) - Affixial negation equivalent to un-, in-, -less in English, such as nā, bē, etc.

\[
\text{nā - pyāw coward}
\]

Neg man

\[
\text{bē - mēšk stupid}
\]

-less brain

3) - Forms marked [+Neg] such as hīč 'never, nothing', hīčkas 'nobody' etc.

Discussion in this section will centre on negation of the first type only.

To analyse and describe the preverbal negation in Kurdish, it is necessary to start with some illustrative examples.
A

1) - ēma a - nū - Ín
   we Impf sleep Ag
   We sleep.

2) - to Šoyišt - Ít
   You go Past Ag
   You went

3) - awān a - Šoyišt - n.
    they Impf go Past Ag
    They were going.

4) - agar awān nūst - bi - n
    if they sleep Past Sub Ag
    If they have slept.

5) - agar to · bi - nū - Ít.
    if you sub sleep Ag
    If you sleep.

6) - aw zor āzā -(y) a.
    he very brave is
    He is very brave.

7) - (to) bi - nū.
    you Imp sleep
    (You) sleep.

8a) - Rizgār ćolaka - aka - ī bar - dā.
    R. sparrow the Ag DPrf give Past
    Rizgar released the sparrow.

B

ēma nā - nū - Ín.
Neg
We do not sleep.

to na - Šoyišt - Ít.
Neg
You did not go.

awān na - a - Šoyišt - n.
Neg Impf
They were not going.

agar awān na - nūst - bi - n.
Neg
If they have not slept.

agar to na - nū - Ít.
Neg
If you do not sleep.

aw zor āzā nī - (y) a.
Neg
He is not very brave.

(to) ma - nū.
Neg
(You) do not sleep.
In these examples 3 sentences are negativized As. The verb in 1 is in the present indicative. The negative particle has the form nā.

In 2, 3 and 4 the verbs are in the past, past imperfective and past subjunctive respectively. In all the negative particle has the form na.

In 5 the verb is in the present subjunctive. The negative particle has the form na.

In 6 the verb is copula, and the negative particle has taken the form nī.

In 7 the verb is imperative, the negative particle has the form ma.

In 8 and 9 the verbs are compound, consisting of a derivational prefix and the stem of the verb. The negative particles occur preceding the stem of the verbs.

From the preceding it can be noticed that the negative particle has four different forms on the surface, nā, na, nī and ma. When the verb is in the past tense the form is always na, while with the present tense the form of the negative particle depends on the mood, aspect and type of the verb (copulative vs. non-copulative).
We can also conclude that the negative particle always occurs immediately preceding the stem of the verb, and is mutually exclusive with the imperative and subjunctive element bi when it occurs as a prefix. The negative particle is also mutually exclusive with the imperfective marker a with the present tense.

The occurrence of the negative particle in Kurdish can be illustrated by the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ind.</td>
<td>nā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cop.</td>
<td>nī</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imp.</td>
<td>ma</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nā which occurs only with the present indicative cannot be considered as consisting of na + a because there is a similar situation where two (a)s occur sequentially without being fused, e.g. sentence 3.

In Chomsky (1957) negation was treated as an optional transformation operating on the underlying structure of the corresponding affirmative sentence. In this conception, transformation changes the meaning. But this conception of grammatical transformation was changed when Katz and Postal (1964) argued that all transformations are meaning-preserving. Klima (1964) independently postulated a negative morpheme NEG in the deep structure of all negative sentences. He generates sentence negation in the base component of the grammar as an optional constituent NEG attached to the main S as a daughter node. He then has a sequence of transformations which accounts for the occurrence of Neg in a wide variety of surface structure configurations. The negative transformation is
no longer optional.

One of the fundamental conclusions in Klima (1964) is that all negative sentences should be accounted for by a single deep structure constituent NEG, i.e. only one NEG is allowed per sentence. However, in Kurdish, in sentences with modals, two NEGs can occur, as in:

10) - min nā - twān - m na - ūro - m.
     I Neg can Ag Neg go Ag
     I must go. (Lit. I cannot not go.)

This sentence does not mean,

11) - min a - twān - m bi - ūro - m.
     I Impf can Ag sub go Ag
     I can go.

Sentence 10 implies obligation, while 11 is volitional and means "I can go but I am not obliged." This can be noticed through the following examples:

12) - "min nā - twān - m na - ūro - m, baḥām nā - ūro - m.
     I Neg can Ag Neg go Ag but Neg go Ag
     In the sense,
     I cannot not go but I will not.

13) - min a - twān - m bi - ūro - m, baḥām nā - ūro - m.
     I Impf can Ag sub go Ag but Neg go Ag
     I can go but I will not.

When only the modal is negativized,

14) - min nā-twān - m biro - m.
     I Neg can Ag go Ag
     I cannot go.
and when only the main verb is negativized,

15) - min a - twān - m na - ṭo - m.
I Impf can Ag Neg go Ag
I can stay.

With respect to Klima's proposal, the simultaneous occurrence of two NEGs within the same simplex sentence can be accounted for only by considering the modal(Aux) as a higher verb, postulating the following deep structure to 10.

\[
\begin{align*}
S & \leftarrow \text{NEG} \quad \text{NP} \\
    & \quad \text{VP} \\
    & \quad \text{NP} \quad \text{V} \\
    & \quad \text{S} \quad \text{VP} \\
    & \quad \text{min} \quad \text{biṭom} \quad \text{atwānim}
\end{align*}
\]

By an EQUI - SUB deletion rule the embedded subject NP will be deleted. A series of other transformational rules will give the surface as in 10.

Following Klima, to generate a negative sentence, the negative morpheme will be introduced in the base. The NEG - replacement transformation moves Neg to the position preceding the stem of the verb. The rule can be formalized as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SI: } & X \rightarrow \text{NEG} \rightarrow \text{VS} \rightarrow X \\
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \quad \Rightarrow \text{Obl} \\
\text{SC: } & 1 \quad \emptyset \quad 2+3 \quad 4
\end{align*}
\]

Then a set of phonological rules such as follows will specify its
phonological component.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{NEG - Sub - NU - Pres} & \rightarrow / na - bi - nū / \rightarrow / na - 0 - nū / \\
\text{NEG - Impf - NU - Pres} & \rightarrow / nā - a - nū / \rightarrow / nā - 0 - nū / \\
\text{NEG - Impf - NU - Past} & \rightarrow / na - a - nūst / \rightarrow / na - a - nūst / \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[\text{... etc.}\]

4.6 Compound Verbs

Compound verbs are very common and productive in Kurdish. They are formed by a prefix, suffix, nominal or prepositional phrase followed by a verb.

- Ra - girt - n stop (vt)
  Pref take Past InM
- xwar - n - awa drink
  eat Past InM Suf
- šet - bū - n go mad
  mad become Past InM
- ba kār hēnā - n use
  to work bring Past InM

The compound verbs have a complex structure in the lexicon. They are verbal idioms which enter into the structure of the sentence in the same manner as simple verbs. The verb receives all the inflectional affixes, and the preverbals which precede the stem of the verb behave like a prefix already discussed. Thus with the past transitive the personal suffix attaches the first constituent.
Semantically, a compound verb acts as a single verbal unit. The meanings of some compound verbs are equal to the sum of the meaning of the individual units, as in

\[ \text{Iś} \ kird \ - \ n \quad \text{work} \]

work do Past InM

\[ \text{ba kār} \ hēnā \ - \ n \quad \text{use} \]

to work bring Past InM

Others cannot be translated literally into other languages without the special meaning being lost, as in

\[ \text{la bar kird} \ - \ n \quad \text{memorize} \]

in \ ? \ do Past InM

\[ \text{bar dā} \ - \ n \quad \text{release} \]

? give Past InM
And some can be metaphorically explained, as in

dar ㅈ  n  pass (exams)
out go Past InM

The rules for deriving compound verbs play a significant role in the nativization of many foreign words: talafon kirdin 'Phone', majbûr bûn 'oblige', haj kirdin 'pilgrimage', etc.

4.7 Concord

For historical reasons, Kurdish grammars distinguish between what are traditionally called personal pronoun suffixes and personal endings or verbal suffixes. However, as will be shown in this work, there are no formal or semantic criteria for distinguishing between these two types of personal suffixes in modern Kurdish, as both can occur with the same parts of speech and show the same functions. Their occurrences and functions are relative to the structure of the verbal construction and the tense of the verb. The differences are solely a matter of surface structure.

To discuss this point, analysis requires the classification of the verbs into transitive and intransitive.

The transitive verb is one which takes an object NP and can be passivized, as in:

\[
\begin{matrix}
\text{Sb} & \text{O} & \text{V} \\
\text{şma mäst a} & \text{ffoş} & \text{In.} \\
\text{we yogurt Impf sell} & \text{Ag} \\
\text{We sell yogurt.}
\end{matrix}
\]
The yogurt was sold.

And the intransitive verb is one which does not take an object NP and cannot be passivized, as in:

\[ \text{Sb} \quad \text{V} \]

\[ \text{mināb} - \text{aka} - \text{n} \quad \text{nūst} - \text{n}. \]

\[ \text{child the Pl sleepPast Ag} \]

The children slept.

In Kurdish a formal distinction between transitive and intransitive verbs is made in the past tense, in which tense their conjugation is not the same. Each group requires a different set of personal suffixes to express the agreement of the verbs in number and person with the subject noun phrase of the sentence. These two sets are traditionally called pronoun suffixes and verbal suffixes.

'Pronoun suffixes' indicate the set of personal suffixes which occur with the stem of transitive verbs in the past tense. They are:

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
\text{Sg} & \text{Pl} \\
\text{1st} & -m & -\text{mān} \\
\text{2nd} & -t & -\text{tān} \\
\text{3rd} & -i & -\text{yān} \\
\end{array}
\]

'Verbal suffixes' indicate the set of personal suffixes which occur with the stem of the intransitive verbs in the past tense. They are:
Transitive and intransitive verbs have the same conjugation with the present tense stem. Both take a set of verbal suffixes identical to the above set except in the 3rd Sg, in which āt or ēt occur (8), while with the past tense stem the 3rd Sg shows no overt form. Thus we can distinguish three different sets:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Set No. 1</th>
<th>Set No. 2</th>
<th>Set No. 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-t</td>
<td>-t(t)</td>
<td>-t(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ā</td>
<td>-∅</td>
<td>-ā(t), ē(t)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-mān</td>
<td>-ān</td>
<td>-ān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-tān</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-yān</td>
<td>-n</td>
<td>-n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although sets No 2 and 3 differ only in 3rd Sg, for the sake of analysis these will be considered as two different sets.

In this and the following chapters, I will attempt to define the nature of these clitics in a precise manner and to characterize their

(8) This variation is due to the phonological environment. If the present stem ends in /o/ or /a/, the personal suffix will take the form /ā(t)/ as in xo 'eat' axo -āt \(\rightarrow\) axwāt 'he eats', ka 'do, make' aka - āt \(\rightarrow\) akāt 'he makes'. And if the present stem ends in any other vowel or consonant, the personal suffix will take the form /ā(t)/, as in mū 'sleep' anū - ēt \(\rightarrow\) anvēt 'he sleeps', ᵁ 'go' aḵ - ēt \(\rightarrow\) aḵēt 'he goes'. /t/ is optional, it can be deleted.
functions according to their deep structures. I also discuss the nature of the rules which generate the sentences in which these suffixes occur.

From the above, it is noticed that concord represents a particular problem in Kurdish, for more than one set of inflectional suffixes can be recognized of which the occurrence depends not only on the syntactic features of the subject NP, but on the tense (past and present) and the type (transitive and intransitive) of the verb as well. Thus in addition to the syntactic features of the subject NP, a set of complex symbols in terms of tense and transitivity of the verb must be proposed. The functions of the three sets as agreement markers can be illustrated in the following diagram:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Transitive</th>
<th>Intransitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Past</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The verb agrees with its subject NP in number (singular and plural) and person (1st, 2nd and 3rd). The agreement is marked in all the forms. The subjects which agree with their verbs are not the deep structure subjects. This is apparent from the following passive example, in which the verb agrees with the NP that became subject by passivization.

\[
\text{awān kuẓrā - n.} \\
\text{they kill PassPast Ag} \quad \begin{array}{c} +3rd \\ + Pl \end{array} \\
\text{They were killed.}
\]
The latter point indicates that the rules of agreement belong to the transformational component and not to the base.

The exponents of set No 1 can be appropriately identified as separate morphemes, as the morphemes for the person and number can be identified formally.

\[ \text{xwād} - m - ān. \]

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{eat} \\
\text{Past} \\
\text{we ate.}
\end{array}
\]

It is not possible to assign any order to exponents representing personal suffixes in the other sets. Assigning any order would be speculative. Moreover, 2nd and 3rd Pl each consists of one phoneme of which their segmentation to a series of morphemes would be impossible. Such problems could be avoided by making use of syntactic features representing inflectional suffixes at the level of surface structure in the form of complex symbols. The agreement rules assign to the verb all the feature specifications for the number and person of the subject NP, then the type and the tense of the verb will assign all other features discussed above. These symbols would be converted to an appropriate personal suffix by rules of phonology. Thus the feature combination:

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{1st Person} \\
\text{Plural} \\
\text{Transitive} \\
\text{Past}
\end{array}
\]

will be converted to \text{mān}, and
The process through which the agreement operates is seen in the following rule:

\[
V \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix}
+ VS \\
A Person \\
B Number \\
C Tense \\
D Tr
\end{bmatrix} / \begin{bmatrix}
+ SNP \\
A Person \\
B Number
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where A can be 1st, 2nd or 3rd person, B can be singular or plural, C can be past or present and D can be transitive or intransitive.

The rules for deriving the agreement markers are obligatory. After the person ending is obligatorily derived from the features of subject NP we can delete the subject NP by an optional transformational rule, as in:

\[
\text{min } x\text{ward} - m. \Rightarrow x\text{ward} - m
\]

\[
I \text{ eat Past Ag}
\]

\[
\text{min } x\text{ward}-m \text{ and } x\text{ward}-m \text{ have the same meaning 'I ate'}.
\]

4.8 Positional rules:

In this section the rules that determine the positions of the personal suffixes will be discussed.

One of the main peculiarities of the personal suffixes of set No 1 is that they have no fixed position. This depends on the
structure of the verb phrase.

Examining all the possible structures of the verb phrase occurring, it will be noticed that the suffixes of set No 1 can occur with the following constituents:

\[ \text{DO - Prep - IO - Verb} \]

When all the constituents mentioned above occur simultaneously, the suffix will follow the DO.

\[ \text{Sb DO Prep IO V} \]

\text{awan nāma - ēk - yān bo Āzād nārd.}
\text{they letter a Ag to A. send Past}
\text{They sent a letter to Azad.}

If either the DO or IO occurs by itself, then the pronoun suffix immediately follows it. Thus when the DO occurs by itself:

\[ \text{Sb DO V} \]

\text{awan nāma - ēk - yān nārd.}
\text{they letter a Ag send Past}
\text{They sent a letter.}

When the IO occurs but not the DO

\[ \text{Sb IO V} \]

\text{awan bo Āzād - yān nārd.}
\text{they for A. Ag send Past}
\text{They sent (it) for Azad.}
When the preposition occurs but not the DO and IC NPs, the suffix will follow it:

\[ Sb \quad Prep \quad V \]
\[ awān \quad bo - yān \quad nārd. \]
\[ they \quad for \quad Ag \quad send \quad Past \]
\[ They \quad sent \quad (it) \quad for \quad (him). \]

When only the verb occurs by itself, the suffix occurs within its structure. With a structurally compound verb, which contains one or more inflectional or derivational prefixes, the personal suffix occurs following the first prefix.

\[ Sb \quad Pref \quad VS \]
\[ awān \quad a - yān - nārd. \]
\[ They \quad Impf \quad Ag \quad send \quad Past \]
\[ They \quad used \quad to \quad send \quad (it). \]

The personal suffix will follow the stem of the verb where there is no prefix.

\[ Sb \quad VS \]
\[ awān \quad nārd - yān. \]
\[ They \quad send \quad Ag \quad Past \]
\[ They \quad sent \quad (it). \]

From the above discussion it can be concluded that the suffixes of set No 1 will be suffixed to the first constituent in the hierarchy:

\[ DO - IO - Prep - \otyping{ref} - VS \quad \ldots \quad Rule \quad No \quad 1 \]

The DO and IC here are full-form constituents, i.e. nominal or pronominal. Sets No 2 and 3 have fixed position within the structure of the verb phrase. They always follow the stem of the verb. \ldots \quad Rule \quad No \quad 2
̣ema nūst - In.
we sleep    Ag
Past      We slept
̣aw - aka a - kuž - ēt.
water the Impfboil Ag

The water is boiling.

The above examples suggest that the introduction and movement of the agreement marker are transformational phenomena.
5.1 *Pronominalization*: The problem of whether the anaphoric structure is generated directly by the base rules or is transformationally derived is an elusive one and will not be discussed here. In 'Aspects' anaphora is handled by transformations causing substitution or deletion. (1) The process or result of using a pronoun instead of a NP is called pronominalization.

Two types of pronominalization are recognized in Kurdish. These are dependent upon whether the anaphora is represented in a pronoun or a personal suffix. As far as the former type is concerned, the conditions imposed on the simple pronominalization transformation in Kurdish appear to be identical to those required in English and proposed by Lees and Klima. (2) According to their proposal, the second NP will be replaced by a pronoun when two referentially identical NPs occur in connected discourse. If the second occurrence is part of the same simplex sentence, the pronominal replacement is always reflexive. In surface structure terms, reflexivisation consists of replacing the second NP by the abstract noun *xo* 'self' followed by an appropriate possessive pronoun. The rule will introduce *xo* to the base; this

will serve as a trigger to convert the second NP into an appropriate possessive suffix by copying the same syntactic features concerning the number and person. The transformational rule can be expressed as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
SI: & \quad X - NP_1 - NP_2 - X \\
& \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \\
SC: & \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad xo + \begin{bmatrix} Foss \\ + No \\ + Pers \end{bmatrix} \\
& \quad 4
\end{align*}
\]

Condition \( NP_1 = NP_2 \)

... Rule No 1

This can be illustrated by the following example. The sentence:

* \( \text{*min min a - ṣo - m.} \)

\( I \quad I \quad \text{Impf wash Ag} \)

will be realized on surface

\( \text{min xo - m ȧsom.} \)

self my

\( I \quad \text{wash myself.} \)

On the other hand, if the two occurrences are from different component sources, the subordinate one is replaced by a simple pronoun, as in:

\( \text{Azād bayānī yēt, aw pē - m aḥēt.} \)

\( A. \quad \text{tomorrow come he to I say} \)

Azad is coming tomorrow, he will tell me.
Azād and aw 'he' are referentially identical. The structure that underlies this sentence is:

Azād bayānl yēt, Azād pēm aiēt.

The second NP is replaced on the surface by a free-form pronoun of the appropriate number and person, as it is in the same environment as the first NP. A rule such as follows can be formed to derive such sentences.

\[
\text{SI: } X - \text{NP}_1 - (Y) - \text{NP}_2 - X \\
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \\
\Rightarrow \text{Obl}
\]

SC: 1 2 3 4
   [Pron]
   [\text{Pron} + \text{No}]
   [\text{Pron} + \text{Pers}]

Condition \text{NP}_1 = \text{NP}_2

... Rule No 2

The term cliticization will be used to indicate the process of pronominalization where the substituted element is a personal suffix.

The sentence in which a non-subject element is expressed in a personal suffix represents the type of anaphora where the anaphoric relation crosses the sentence boundary. In such constructions, two or more personal suffixes occur - one to express the subject NP (agreement marker) and the others to express the non-subject constituents of the sentence, DO, IO and Possessive noun. This type of construction is very common in spoken Kurdish. This chapter is an attempt to define this type of pronominalization, finding out the rules that generate it.
Two different types of cliticization can be recognized in Kurdish. I will propose the terms simple and complex cliticization to distinguish between them. Simple cliticization refers to the process whereby a NP is cliticized, the choice of the personal suffix not being dependent on the tense of the verb. Complex cliticization, on the other hand, refers to the process whereby a NP is cliticized, the choice of the suffix varying according to the tense of the verb.

5.2 Simple cliticization:

The NP of a prepositional phrase, and the NP which is attached to another head NP by means of the Isafe case, can be replaced by a personal suffix from set No. 1 by copying the syntactic features of the NP irrespective of the type and the tense of the verb, as in:

1. \( a - \text{min bo} \text{ ãwa} \) \( a - \text{nûs} - \text{m.} \)

   I to you [\(+2nd\) \(+Pl\)] Impf write Ag

\( b - \text{min bo} \text{ - tân} \) \( a - \text{nûs} - \text{m.} \)

   you [\(+2nd\) \(+Pl\)]

   I write to you.

2. \( a - \text{to bo} \text{ ãma} \) \( - t \text{ nûsî.} \)

   you to we [\(+1st\) \(+Pl\)] Ag write Past

\( b - \text{to bo} \text{ - mân} \) \( - t \text{ nûsî.} \)

   we [\(+1st\) \(+Pl\)]

   You wrote to us.
3. a - min bo to a - girye - m.

I for you [+2nd] Impf cry Ag

b - min bo - t agiryem.

I cry for you.

4. a - min bo - t giryā - m.

cry Past Ag

I cried for you.

I propose that the syntactic features of number and person are derived from the features of the NP in the underlying structure.

Technically, the process of replacing a NP by a suffix is a transformational operation. The substitution operation will be carried out by a rule such as,

\[
\text{SI: } X \rightarrow \text{Prep } [^+\text{No} [^+\text{Pers}]] - X
\]

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{SC: } 1 & 2 & [^+\text{Pers1}] [^+\text{No}] [^+\text{Pers}] & 4 \\
\]

\[
\rightarrow \text{Opt}
\]

5.3 Complex cliticization:

With this type, the NPs of the DO, IO or possessive noun (marked by means of the Iṣafe case) of the sentence can be cliticized but the choice of the suffix will be relative to the tense of the verb. To illustrate the point examples are required.
5. a - min to - m nārd.
   I you [+2nd] Ag send Past
   b - min nārd - m - It.
      Ag [+2nd]
   I sent you.

6. a - min to - m a - nārd.
   I you [+2nd] Ag Impf send Past
   b - min a - m - nārd - It.
      I Impf Ag send Past [+2nd]
   I used to send you.

7. a - DO Xwā to - I bo min nārd.
   God you [+2nd] Ag for I [+1st] send Past
   b - DO Xwā bo min - I nārd - It.
      Ag [+2nd]
   c - DO Xwā to - I bo nārd - m.
      Ag [+1st]
   d - DO Xwā bo - I nārd - m - It.
      Ag [+1st] [+2nd] [+Sg] [+Sg]
   God sent you for me.

8. a - DO aw utumbili - aka - I ēwa - I ffošt. Poss
   he car the Izf. you [+2nd] Ag sell Past
   b - DO aw utumbiliaka - I ffošt - n.
      Ag [+2nd] [+Pl]
   He sold your (Pl) car.
In the sentences given above, 5a and 5b are synonymous. The DO in 5a is expressed by a pronoun, while in 5b it is expressed by the personal suffix it which is from set No. 2. The personal suffix has the same syntactic features of the pronoun concerning person and number.

6a and b, 7a, b, c and d, and 8a and b are all respectively synonymous in the same way. In 7a the DO and the IO are expressed by pronouns. In 7b the DO is expressed by the personal suffix it which has the same syntactic features as the pronoun it replaces. In 7c the IO is expressed by the suffix m having the same syntactic features as the pronoun it replaces. In 7d both the DO and IO are expressed by suffixes.

In 8a the possessive construction is expressed by a NP attached to the head by means of the Izafe case. In 8b the same semantic element is expressed by a suffix from set No 2 with the same syntactic features.

Notice that the suffixes in all cases follow the stem of the verb, and the verbs are all in the past. To conclude, an informal description of this type of Kurdish sentences might contain the following statement:

With a transitive verb, the NPs of the DO, IO or possessive noun of a sentence, can be expressed by a personal suffix from set No 2, with the past tense stem. The personal suffix substituted for a NP will have the same syntactic features concerning the person and the number. The suffixes occupy the position following the stem of the verb.

Now consider the following examples, sentences in which the verbs are in the present tense.
9. a - min to a - nēr - m.
    I you :\textsuperscript{2nd} Impf send Ag

b - min a - t - nēr - m.
    I send you.

10. a - Xwā aw bo ēma a - nēr - ēt.
    God he :\textsuperscript{3rd} for we :\textsuperscript{1st} Impf send Ag

b - Xwā bo ēma - I anērēt.

c - Xwā aw - mān bo anērēt.

d - Xwā bo - mān - I anērēt.

God sends him for us.

11. a - aw utumbil - aka - i ēwa a - ifōš - ēt.
    he car the Izf you :\textsuperscript{2nd} Impf sell Ag

b - aw utumbilaka - tān afōsēt.

He sells your (Pl) car.

9 a and b, 10 a, b, c and d, and 11 a and b are all respectively synonymous. In 9a the DO is expressed by a pronoun, while in 9b it is expressed by a personal suffix from set No 1. The suffix follows the prefix a, which precedes the stem of the verb. The substituted personal suffix has the same syntactic features as the pronoun to 'you'.
In 10a the DO and IO, are both expressed by the pronouns aw 'he' and ema 'we'. In 10b the DO is expressed by the suffix ı, which is from set No 1 having the same syntactic features as the pronoun aw. The suffix follows the IO.

In 10c the IO is expressed by a suffix in the same way. It follows the DO.

In 10d both the DO and IO are expressed by suffixes, and both sequentially follow the preposition bo 'for'.

In 11a the possessive is expressed by the pronoun ëwa 'you (Pl)', which is attached to the head by means of the Izafe case. In 11b the same semantic element is expressed by a personal suffix from set No 1, following the DO.

From the preceding we can conclude that, with a transitive verb, the NPs of the DO, IO and possessive construction of a sentence can be replaced by a personal suffix from set No 1 with the present tense. The personal suffix substituted for a NP will have the same syntactic features concerning the person and number. The position of the suffix is determined by the structure of the sentence. It is similar to that discussed in positional rules in the previous chapter.

The functions of the personal suffixes as non-subject elements can be illustrated in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Past</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pers</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Sg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>mān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>tān</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>yān</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For pedagogical purposes, using this table, any NP can be replaced by a personal suffix on surface. For instance, in the sentence,

\[
\text{Sb} \quad \text{DO} \\
\text{Azad kit\eb - aka - \text{an} - I} \quad \text{bo \text{\text{"e}ma n\text{ard}.}} \\
\text{A. book the Pl Ag for we send Past}
\]

Azad sent the book/for us.

The DO kit\ebak\an 'the books' has the features $[+3\text{rd}] [+\text{Pl}]$ and the verb n\text{ard} 'sent' has the feature $[+\text{Past}]$. According to the table, the syntactic features,

\[
[+ \text{Past}] \\
[+3\text{rd}] \\
[+\text{Pl}]
\]

will be converted to $/n/$, which is a personal suffix from set No 2. This will replace the DO.

\[
\text{DO} \\
\text{Azad n - I bo \text{\text{"e}ma n\text{ard}.}} \\
\text{Ag}
\]

Then the suffixes will move to the appropriate positions according to the positional rules. I which expresses the SNP of the sentence belongs to set No 1 will move to follow the first constituent of the hierarchy. The first constituent of the hierarchy here will be, after removing the DO, the IO \text{\text{"e}ma} 'we'. And n which belongs to set No. 2 will move to follow the stem of the verb. The sentence eventually will have the surface:

\[
\text{Sb} \quad \text{IO} \quad \text{DO} \\
\text{Azad bo \text{\text{"e}ma - I} n\text{ard - n.}} \\
\text{A. for we Ag send they Past}
\]

Azad sent them for us.
Similarly, in the sentence,

```
DO 10
Azad kitēb - aka - an bo ēma a - nēr - ēt.
A. book the PI for we Impf send Ag
```

Azad sends the books for us.

The NP of the IO ēma 'we', can be replaced by a personal suffix by the same procedure. ēma has the syntactic features [+1st] [+Pl], and the verb has the feature [+Present]. According to the table the syntactic features:

```
[+Pres]
[+Pl]
[+1st]
```

will be converted to mān which is from set No 1. This will replace the IO. Its position will be determined by the positional rule and will in this sentence be following the DO kitēbakān 'the books'. The derived sentence will have the surface:

```
DO 10
Azad kitēbakān - mān bo anērāt.
```

Azad sends the books for us.

And so on.

The examples presented and discussed so far suggest strongly that the introduction and the movement of the personal suffixes are transformational phenomena.

For the sake of analysis, at this point two different rules will be stated, one for each tense.

The substitution operation will be carried out by transformational rules such as:
Where NP can be the DO, IO or possessive noun of the sentence.

Where NP can be the DO, IO or possessive noun of the sentence and Prev represents the first constituent of the hierarchy.

It has been pointed out earlier that the rules for deriving the subject agreement marker are obligatory, and the rules for deleting the SNP after deriving the agreement marker are optional. However, the rules for deriving the non-subject suffix are optional, and the rules for deleting the full-form non-subject constituent are obligatory after a personal suffix has been produced. Thus,

\[
\text{I you send Ag becomes}\]

\[
\text{min to anër - m.}\]

\[
\text{I Impf you send Ag becomes}\]

\[
\text{min a - t - nër - m.}\]

\[
\text{I I send you.}\]
but not,

\[
\begin{align*}
&\text{DO} \quad \text{DO} \\
&*\text{min to a} - t - \text{nēr} - \text{m}, \\
&I \quad \text{you Impf you send Ag}
\end{align*}
\]

Comparing the rules of deriving non-subject suffixes complexly with the agreement rules, it will be noticed that they are identical with respect to the opposite tense. This implies that in any verbal construction, if a non-subject constituent is expressed by a personal suffix, the two personal suffixes (the other being the agreement marker) will exchange their functions on surface by changing only the tense of the verb, while all the elements remain in their places, as in:

1) \( (\text{aw}) \) bo \( \text{ēma} - I \text{ nārd} - n. \)  
   for we Ag send past they  
   He sent them for us.

2) \( (\text{awān}) \) bo \( \text{ēma} - I \text{ a} - \text{nēr} - n. \)  
   for he Impf send Ag  
   They will send it for us.

3) \( (\text{min}) \) utumbilaka - m kīfī - it.  
   car the Ag buy past you  
   I bought your car.
Poss  Sb
(to) utumbilikaka - m a - kir - it.
you car the  I Impf buy Ag
You will buy my car.

The only exception to the rules discussed is the verb want 'want' and its compounds. With this verb, the personal suffixes of the different sets always have the same functions.

Sb  O
a - mån - wist - it.
Impf we want past you
We wanted you.

Sb  O
a - mån - awē - it.
want
We want you.

Through the discussion given above, it will be noticed that, when two personal suffixes occur within the same structure of a verbal construction, one from set No 1 and the other from the other sets, the suffix from set No 1 always precedes the other. Thus when the stem of the verb is the only constituent of the hierarchy, i.e. when the verb, structurally, is simple and aspectually not marked for imperfective, the two suffixes occur sequentially following the stem of the verb. The order they take is as follows:

Sb  DO
VS - Pers1 - Pers2 .... rule No 6

VS  Sb  DO
ēma nārd - mån - it.
we send past Ag you

Except when the subject is in 3rd Sg, in which case the order will be:
5.4 Cliticizing of the DO and IO simultaneously

a) With the past tense:

When the DO and IO are both cliticized, in the case of the past tense, the two suffixes from set No.2 occur sequentially following the stem of the verb, showing the order:

\[ \text{VS - IO - DO} \] \hspace{1cm} \text{Rule No 8}

as in:

\[ \text{xwà la sand - m - n.} \]

God from Ag take past I they

God took them from me.

which is derived from the deep structure:

\[
\begin{align*}
xwà \quad \text{awān} & \quad \text{I la min} \quad \text{sand.} \\
\text{they}^{[+3\text{rd}]} & \quad I^{[+1\text{st}]} \quad \text{I}^{[+S\text{g}]} \\
\end{align*}
\]

According to rule No. 4 the syntactic features will be moved to the position following the stem of the verb, and according to rule No 8 they will take the order IO - DO, following the stem of the verb.

\[
\begin{align*}
xwà \quad \text{la} \quad \text{sand} & \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{I}^{[+1\text{st}]} \\
\text{I}^{[+S\text{g}]} \end{array} \right] \quad \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{I}^{[+3\text{rd}]} \\
\text{I}^{[+I\text{fl}]} \end{array} \right] \\
\end{align*}
\]
These will be converted to appropriate suffixes by phonological rules. The output (after the application of the agreement rule) will be,

\[ Xwālē - I \text{ saw} - m - n. \]

When the DO or IO, or both, are in the 3rd Sg, obviously they will be represented by the zero morpheme. This explains how the DO or IO are understood as 3rd Sg when no overt forms represent them on the surface. It implies also that the occurrence of the DO with the transitive verb is obligatory in the past. Thus a sentence such as:

\[ \text{min bīnī - m.} \]
\[ \text{I see Past Ag} \]
\[ \text{I saw (it).} \]

is derived from the deep structure,

\[ \text{min aw} - m \text{ bīnī.} \]
\[ \text{I he} \left[ +\text{3rd} \right] \text{ Ag see past} \]

in the following way.

As the tense of the verb is in the past, rule No 4 should be applied. The syntactic features will be moved to the position following the stem of the verb.

\[ \text{min bīnī -} \left[ +\text{3rd} \right] \left[ +\text{sg} \right] \]

Then the features will be converted to an appropriate suffix, which, according to the table given on page 78, will be \( \emptyset \), giving the surface,
min bînî - m - Ø.
I see Past Ag him
I saw him.

If the DO is in any other person rather than 3rd Sg, it will be expressed in an overt form, when it is cliticized.

```
min to - m bînî.
I you [+2nd] [-Ag see past]
I saw you.
min bînî [+2nd] +3sg]
```

The phonological rules will convert [+2nd] to It and, after the Agreement rule is applied, the output will be:

```
min bînî - m - It.
I saw Past Ag you
I saw you.
```

To cliticize only the IO of the sentence:

```
DO
xwā kuṟaka - I la Mîrzā sand.
God son [+3rd] [-Ag from M. [+3rd] take past
God took the son from Mirza.
Xwā kuṟaka - I la sand [+3rd]
Xwā kuṟaka - I lē sand - Ø by phonological rules.
God took the son from him.
```

To cliticize only the DC of the same sentence:

```
xwā la Mîrzā sand [+3rd] [-Ag]
Xwā la Mîrzā - I sand - Ø.
he
God took (him) from Mirza.
```
To cliticize both the DO and IO:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Xwā la sand} & \quad \text{[+3rd]} \quad \text{[+3rd]} \\
\text{IO DO} & \\
\text{Xwā le} & \quad \text{- I sand} & \quad \text{- 0} & \quad \text{- 0} & \\
\text{he he} & \\
\text{God took (him) from (him).}
\end{align*}
\]

Rules Nos 4 and 8 can be combined into a single rule, as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{SI: } & \quad X - \text{NP}_1 - \text{NP}_2 - \text{VS(+ Past)} - X \\
\text{SC: } & \quad 1 \quad \emptyset \quad \emptyset \quad 4 \quad [3 \text{ Pers2}] \quad - [2 \text{ Pers2}] \quad 5 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \text{Opt}
\end{align*}
\]

where \( \text{NP}_1 \) is the DO, and \( \text{NP}_2 \) the IO.

When both the DO and IO are cliticized simultaneously, the derived structure will be unacceptable if the personal suffix which represents the IO begins with an (i) vowel.

*\text{xwā bo - I nārd - It - n.}*

God to Ag send Past you they

which is derived from:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{xwā awān - I bo to nārd.} \\
\text{God they Ag to you send Past} \\
\text{God sent them to you.}
\end{align*}
\]

This could be because such an order of grammatical elements fails to conform to permitted phonological patterns of the language. In this case the (i) vowel will be reduced to (i), but this often creates ambiguity.
If the IO is in 3rd Sg only the DO will be cliticized, as the resulting structure coincides with that of other giving a different meaning. Thus the surface:

\[
xwā \text{ bo } - I \text{ nārd } - \text{ it.}
\]

could apparently be derived from the deep structures (a) and (b) as follows.

\[
a - \text{ DO [God he [+3rd] Ag to you [+2nd]] send Past [+Sg] nārd.}
\]

\[
xwā \text{ bo } - I \text{ nārd } - \text{ it.}
\]

\[
\text{Ag [he [+3rd] you [+Sg]] send Past [+2nd] it.}
\]

\[
b - \text{ DO [God you [+2nd] Ag to he [+3rd] send Past [+Sg] nārd.}
\]

\[
xwā \text{ bo } - I \text{ nārd - } \phi.
\]

\[
\text{he [he [+3rd] you [+2nd] send Past [+Sg]] it.}
\]

The surface given above is used only in the sense (a).

The structures where both DO and IO have the form \(-n\) (2nd and 3rd Pl) are ambiguous, as in,

\[
xwā \text{ bo } - I \text{ nārd } - n - n.
\]
which could mean

a - God sent them to them.
b - God sent them to you (Pl).
c - God sent you (Pl) to them.

At the end of this thesis, tables for all possible structures, where the DO and IO are cliticized with the past tense, are given.

b) With the present tense:

With the present tense stem, the cliticized DO and IO with suffixes, both from set No. 1, may occur sequentially following the preverbal, which will be the preposition in this case, showing the order:

\[ \text{Prep} \rightarrow \text{IO} \rightarrow \text{DO} \quad \ldots \quad \text{Rule No 10.} \]

as in,

\[ \text{IO DO} \]
\[ \text{ēma bo - tān - 1 a - ĕn - ën.} \]
\[ \text{we for you it Pref bring Ag} \]
\[ \text{We bring it for you (Pl).} \]

Which is derived from the deep structure:

\[ \text{ēma aw bo ĕwa a - ĕn - ën.} \]
\[ \text{we he [+3rd] for you [+2nd] Pref bring Ag} \]

As the tense of the verb is in the present, rules No. 5 and 10 are applied. According to these rules the syntactic features will move to follow the Prev which is the preposition bo 'for' here. Then these features will be converted to the appropriate suffixes:
Alternatively the suffix which represents the DC may be received by the first prefix (3) which precedes the stem of the verb. Therefore, with the present tense two different rules for cliticizing are required. The second rule is defined as follows:

\[
\text{SI: } X \rightarrow \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{NP1} \\ +\text{No} \\ +\text{Pers} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow \text{Prep} \rightarrow \text{NP2} \rightarrow \text{Pref} \rightarrow \text{VS} (-\text{Past}) \rightarrow X \\
\]

\[
\text{SC: } 1 \rightarrow \emptyset \rightarrow 3 \rightarrow 4 \rightarrow 5 + \left[ \begin{array}{c} +\text{Pers1} \\ +\text{No} \\ +\text{Pers} \end{array} \right] \rightarrow 6 \rightarrow 7 \\
\Rightarrow \text{Opt}
\]

where NP1 is the DO, NP2 the IO and Pref represents the first prefix which precedes the verb stem, derivational or inflectional. The occurrence of the IO NP is obligatory with this rule.

To cliticize the DO of the above sentence using rule No 11 the syntactic features of the DO will be moved to the position following the first prefix:

\[
\text{ēma bo } \text{ēwa } a - \left[ \begin{array}{c} +3\text{rd} \\ +\text{SG} \end{array} \right] - \text{hēn} - \text{In.}
\]

Then these features will be converted to the appropriate suffix by phonological rules. The ultimate output will give the surface,

\[
\text{ēma bo } \text{ēwa } a - \text{I} - \text{hēn} - \text{In.}
\]

we for you (Pl) Impf it bring Ag

We bring it for you (Pl).

(3) At least one prefix obligatorily occurs with the present stem.
Using the different types of cliticization discussed above is a
free variation phenomenon and all the types are equally common in
spoken language.

Rules 5, 10 and 11 can be collapsed into a single rule as follows:

\[
X \rightarrow NP_1 - NP_2 - \text{Prev.} - \text{Pref} - \text{VS (Past)} - X
\]

\[
1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \quad \Rightarrow \text{Opt}
\]

\[
1 \quad \emptyset \quad \emptyset \quad 4 + \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Pers} \\
+\text{No} \\
+\text{Pers.}
\end{array} \right] \quad (5) - \left[ \begin{array}{c}
\text{Pers} \\
+\text{No} \\
+\text{Pers.}
\end{array} \right] \quad 6 \quad 7
\]

... Rule No 12.

Where \( NP_1 \) is the DO, \( NP_2 \) the IO, \( \text{Prev} \) represents the first element of
the hierarchy and \( \text{Pref} \) represents the first prefix which precedes the
stem of the verb. 5 is put in parentheses to indicate that it can
occur in this position.

It is not possible to cliticize a NP which is qualified by
a possessive noun. Thus in the sentence:

\[
\text{aw kitēb - aka - I to - I bo ēma hēnā.}
\]

\[
\text{he book the Izf you Ag to we bring Past}
\]

He brought your book to us.

the DO kitēbaka 'the book' cannot be cliticized as it is qualified
by a possessive noun.

It is not possible to cliticize, in complex manner, the
possessive noun in the presence of the IO. Thus the following
version of the sentence given above is not acceptable.

\[
\text{aw kitēb - aka - I bo ēma hēnā - īt.}
\]

\[
\text{DO I0 Poss Ag}
\]
By the application of the rule No 4.

A single rule for cliticization in Kurdish can be formed by collapsing all the rules discussed above into one, as shown on the next page.

5.5 Cliticization and the prepositions.

The preposition always governs the NP which follows it, if the latter is expressed in a full-form constituent.

min hangwîn - m bo ēwa hêna.
I hony Ag for you bring Fast

I brought hony for you (Pl).


Vase the on table the Loc is

The vase is on the table.

If the NP which is governed by the preposition is expressed by an
Where NP1 is the DO, NP2 the IO or possessive noun, Prev represents the first element in the hierarchy, Pref represents the first prefix which might precede the stem of the verb.

5 is put in parentheses to indicate that 2 can occur following 5 also.
enclitic pronoun, the governed constituent may directly follow the preposition:

\[
\text{Azad bo - tän a - hën - ët.}
\]

Azad for you Impf bring Ag

Azad brings (it) for you.

The governed enclitic may be attached to a constituent preceding the preposition. Thus, when the DC occurs in the above sentence:

\[
\text{ëma hangwín - tän bo a - hën - ën.}
\]

we honey you for Impf bring Ag

we will bring honey for you (Pl).

When changing the tense of the verb in this sentence, while all the constituents of the verbal construction remain in their place, the functions of the personal suffixes will be exchanged. In this case, the preposition governs the personal suffix which follows the stem of the verb.

\[
\text{(ëwa) hangwín - tän bo hëñë - ën.}
\]

you honey Ag for bring we Past

You (Pl) brought honey for us.

A group of discontiguous units may thus form one constituent in terms of IC analysis.\(^4\) The above examples illustrate that Kurdish verbal constructions show this pattern. The surface syntactic relations between the components of a verbal construction depend on the structure of the verbal construction and the tense of the verb.

\(^{4}\text{Robins, R.H. (1971), p. 222.}\)
The form taken by a preposition ending in a, depends on the
type of NP governed by it. If the NP it governs is expressed in
a full-form constituent, a will remain as it is:

\[
\text{min la to a - tirs - m.}
\]
I of you Impf frighten Ag
I am frightened of you.

If the NP governed by the preposition is expressed by an enclitic
pronoun, the a of the preposition will take the form ū:

\[
\text{min le - t atirs - m.}
\]
of you

Notice that changing the tense of this sentence does not affect the
functions of the personal suffixes. This is because the verb is
intransitive.

\[
\text{min le - t tirsā - m.}
\]
I of you frighten Ag Fast
You scared me.

In the case of the preposition ba 'to, by', b will additionally be
devoiced and become p:

\[
\text{Āzād ba to a - āē - āt}
\]
A. to you Impf tell Ag
Azad will tell you.
\[
\text{Āzād pē - t aliēt.}
\]
to you

The reason behind this variation in form appears to be purely phonological.
ba and la cannot bear stress; the stress occurs on the full-form
constituent the preposition governs. When the full-form is replaced
by an enclitic pronoun, a will become ẹ enabling the preposition
to receive the stress. ẹọ and ẹẹ are allomorphs of la and ba
respectively.
The verb bun is a multivalent item; it occurs in different syntactic positions showing different functions, the various functions and meanings being indicated by the different selection restrictions the verb bun enters into. In this chapter the verb bun will be discussed as it occurs in its copulative function. Other functions of bun will be discussed elsewhere.

6.1 Form

Most Kurdish grammarians consider that the ending personal suffixes perform a copula function beside the other function already discussed. There are at least two reasons for this situation. The first is historical. (1) The second includes conclusions drawn as the result of a process of morphological identification being applied to Kurdish sentences. In Kurdish sentences which are the translation-equivalent of English sentences containing the verb to be in its copulative use, the unit which is structurally a counterpart of the English verb to be is a personal suffix following the noun or the adjective predicate in the present tense.

(1) MacKenzie, D.N. Personal communication.
The copula construction in general is the cause of much linguistic speculation. In Kurdish questions about copula construction may be raised, as for example, the problem of whether or not there are verbless sentences in Kurdish in which the predicate consists of a noun-personal suffix or adjective-personal suffix.

In Kurdish the personal suffixes as they occur with a noun or adjective can be looked at in three different ways.

1) They perform copula function only.

2) They express the agreement of subject NP with the predicate only. That is to say, the predicative noun or adjective would be combined directly with the subject NP without copula.

3) They function in both of the above ways simultaneously as a copula and an agreement marker.

As we realize from our discussion of Kurdish syntax structure, the subject NP and the predicate agree in number and person and the rules for deriving agreement markers are obligatory. The element that performs this task is a personal suffix. This is a general phenomenon in Kurdish. Thus the personal suffixes which occur with the noun or adjective predicate cannot be copulas only, since there must be an agreement marker there.

To discuss whether these suffixes perform both functions
simultaneously, it is necessary to discuss various possible ways in which the copulative sentence behave in Kurdish. Now consider the following sentences:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min āzā - m.} & \quad \text{I am, you are ... brave.} \\
to āzā - It. & \\
aw āzā - (y)\text{a.} & \\
ēma āzā - İn. & \\
ēwa āzā - n. & \\
awān āzā - n. & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The predicate in these sentences consists of an adjective followed by a personal suffix. The only difference between these personal suffixes and those which occur with the stem of the verbs is in 3rd Sg. In the copulative sentence for 3rd Sg the suffix /-a/ occurs. If we put all these sentences in the past tense, the past tense stem of the verb būn, which can be correctly translated as 'to be', occurs preceding the personal suffixes. In the 3rd Sg it will replace the suffix /-a/.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{min āzā bū - m.} & \\
to āzā bū - It. & \\
aw āzā bū. & \\
ēma āzā bū - İn. & \\
ēwa āzā bū - n. & \\
awān āzā bū - n & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The personal suffixes remained as they were in the present tense to perform their main function which is the expression of agreement. By this we can conclude that the suffix /-a/ which occurs only with the 3rd Sg in the present tense performs the present tense function of the verb būn in its copulative function. In all other forms the equational sentence contains no overt verbal element in the present tense.
The distribution and occurrence of the Kurdish copula can be illustrated by the following diagram:

Since the copula disappears in certain constructions, it will be assumed that these sentences will be derived by deletion of the copula. These facts can be accommodated in additional conditions on the structural change, for instance the deletion of the copula in the present where the subject of the sentence is not in 3rd sg.

A set of phonological rules such as given below will specify the phonological realization of copula on surface.

/ Pres - Cop / \[ \rightarrow \begin{cases} \quad \text{- a} & \text{Condition: SNP is in 3rd Sg} \\ \quad \text{- } & \text{Condition: SNP is not in 3rd Sg} \end{cases} \]
/ Past - Cop / \[ \rightarrow \text{bu} \]

For the reasons discussed above, the copula is separated from the verb proper in the phrase structure rules.

The present tense stem of the verb bu'n, bi, if used in an equational sentence, will function as an auxiliary giving the semantic function of futurity.

min ızā a - bi - m.
I brave Impf be Ag
I will be brave.
6.2 Meaning.

In this section some semantic areas covered by the predicates that occur with the copula will be discussed briefly under the following headings:

1) - Identity: By this is meant the identification of one entity with another:

Hawlàr Arbîl - a
H. A. Cop

Hawler is Arbil. (Names for the same city.)

Identity also involves comparison. In this case the sentence is marked intonationally:

Āzād pyāw - a.
A. mān Cop

Azad is (like) a man.

The hearer in this case will understand that Azad is a child but he behaves like a grown up person.

In establishing an identity there is no constraint that the second NP should be an animate if the first is an animate.

xošawîst - m guā - a.
beloved my flower Cop

My beloved is a flower.

2) Role: By this is meant a context which attributes a particular function to the subject.

Āzād āsingir - a.
A. blacksmith Cop

Azad is a blacksmith.
3) - Class membership: By class membership is meant the relation of belonging between an individual, expressed by the subject NP, and a class, which will be expressed by the complement.

\[
\text{Jwāmēr Kurd - a.}
\]

\[
J. \quad \text{Kurd Cop}
\]

Jwamer is a Kurd.

Jwamer is a member of a class of persons characterized as Kurds.

4) - Class inclusion: By class inclusion is meant the relation of belonging between all members of a class and a further class.

\[
faylī - \text{aka - ān Kurd - ņ - n.}
\]

\[
F. \quad \text{the Pl K. Cop Ag}
\]

The Faylis are Kurds.

or

\[
faylī Kurd - n.
\]

5) - Location: The locative may complement the copula. In the predicate a place is expressed in which something represented by the subject NP exists.

\[
\text{Āzād la Hawlēr - a.}
\]

\[
A. \quad \text{in H. Cop}
\]

Azad is in Hawler.

6) - Directional: The entity expressed in the subject NP is directed towards or from the thing or person expressed in the complement.
7) - Universal truth: The predicate may be an expression of a universal phenomenon that expresses an unavoidable fact of life, such as something must happen or exist as a concept.

\[
\text{dwayl hamū - mān mird - n - a.}
\]

The end of all our death.

8) - Description: The complement that occurs with the copula may be an adjective that qualifies or describes the entity expressed by the subject NP.

\[
\text{czyā - I safīn bars - a.}
\]

The mountain Safin is high.

9) - Possessive: In a possessive construction expressed in a copulative sentence, the entity expressed in the subject NP (owned) belongs to the person or thing (owner) expressed in a NP immediately attached to the copula. The relationship between the owner and the owned may be expressed by a NP in the Izafe case preceding the NP that expresses the owner, as in,

\[
\text{Āzād birā - I min - a.}
\]

Azad is my brother.
If the entity expressed in the subject NP belongs as a whole to the owner, the NP which expresses the owner will be preceded by the word hī which means 'of'.

\[\text{utumbil - aka hī āzād - a.}\]
\[\text{car the of A. Cop}\]

The car is Azad's.

A NP inflected for possession may occur as a complement of copula.

The predicate elements will take the order

\[\text{NP - Poss Cop}\]

as in

\[\text{Āzād birā - m - a.}\]
\[\text{A. brother my Cop}\]

Azad is my brother.

but when the NP is inflected for 3rd Sg possession, the possessive pronoun will follow the copula and the empty morpheme /t/ will occur between them. The order of the elements will be:

\[\text{NP - Cop - t - Poss}\]

Thus the sequence

\[\text{Āzād birā - ī - a.}\]
\[\text{A. brother his Cop}\]

will be realized on the surface as:

\[\text{Āzād birā - (y) a - t - ī.}\]
\[\text{A. brother Cop EM his}\]

Azad is his brother. (2)

---

(2) This is the case whenever the copula /a/ and the 3rd Sg. personal suffix /ī/ of set No 1 occur together, for instance with the verb when marked for present perfect by /u/, which basically consists of the past participle morpheme /ū/ plus the copula /a/. When the subject is in 3rd Sg, the agreement marker will be /ī/.

\[\text{min xwārd - ū - m - a.}\]
\[\text{aw xwārd - ū -(y)a - t - ī.}\]
\[\text{I eat Fast PstP Ag Cop}\]
\[\text{he eat Past PstP Cop EM Ag Perf - Perf}\]

I have eaten. He has eaten.
In Kurdish the concept of existence and the idea of possession are conveyed by the verb habūn which is derived from the verb būn, in its copulative function, by the addition of the morpheme /ha/.

The type of the personal suffix which occurs with the verb habūn determines whether the verb is conveying an existential concept or a possession idea.

The verb habūn conveys the concept of existence if it occurs with a personal suffix from set No 2 or 3.

\[ \text{êma awsā ha - bū - ìn.} \]
we then exist Ag

We then existed.

The verb habūn conveys the idea of possession if it occurs with a personal suffix from set No 1. The morpheme /ha/ in this case will behave as a prefix, i.e. the personal suffix will follow it.

\[ \text{êma awsā ha - mān - bū.} \]
we then Ag

We then had (it).

The personal suffix will follow the complement if it occurs:

\[ \text{êma xānū - ēk - mān ha - (y) a.} \]
we house a Ag have

We have a house.

In an existential sentence, the subject NP denotes an absolutely existing abstract entity like God, truth, law, etc. habūn in its existential function does not take a complement. The following sentence serves as an example:
*Xwā* ha - (y) a.
God exist
God exists.

The definite particle *aka* 'the' does not occur with the subject NP in an existential sentence:

*Xwā - aka ha - (y) a.*
God the exist

is ungrammatical in the sense 'The God exists'.

By the addition of an adverbial phrase (of place) to an existential sentence, the sentence will have a locative meaning. (The term locative includes both temporal and spatial references).

*(Istā) kitēb - ēk (lanāw jāntā - m - ā) ha - (y) a.*
now book a in case my loc exist
There is a book in my case now.

In fact the existential sentence does not occur without a locative. In other words the existential sentence is implicitly locative, as whatever is, is somewhere and in a particular time.

The concept of existence denotes only the existence of the entity expressed in the subject NP, while the copula implies the existence of the entity expressed in the subject NP and gives it one of the semantic interpretations discussed above.

A type of possessive construction can be formed in copulative sentences with a semantic interpretation different from those discussed already. The morpheme /pē/ is added preceding the copula in such a construction.
This sentence is different from,

\[
\text{min pāra - m pē - (y) a.}
\]
\[
\text{I money Ag have}
\]

in that the former means 'I have money with me now which may not necessarily belong to me' whereas the latter means 'I have money which belongs to me but not necessarily with me'.

The subject NP with this type of possessive construction must have the feature [+ human]. Thus the sentence,

\[
\text{*asp - aka zīn - ī pē - (y) a.}
\]
\[
\text{horse the saddle Ag have}
\]

is unacceptable in the sense 'The horse has a rein'.

In such construction the complement NP (owned) must have the feature [+Portable] or [+Transportable]. Thus among the following sentences:

1. * min xānū - ēk - m pē - (y) a.
   I house a Ag have
   in the sense
   I have a house.

   J. gun a Ag have
   Jwāmēr has a gun.

3. min utumbil - m pē - (y) a.
   I car Ag have
   I have a car,
sentence 1 is unacceptable.

Through the above discussion a close similarity and relationship can be noticed between the copula, having and existence, semantically and on the surface. This close relationship has been found in many other languages. (3)
"The class of modal elements is defined semantically as elements that mark one or more of the following notions: possibility or the related notion of permission, probability or the related notion of obligation, certainty or the related notion of requirement.\(^{(1)}\) In Kurdish they belong to a class of lexical verbs which fulfil the following criteria at the level of syntax.

1 - The modal cannot occur by itself without a main verb in a free context. Thus the sequence:

\[
\text{min abēt ..., I must}
\]

cannot be considered as a meaningful statement when it occurs by itself.

2 - The modal always occurs to the left of the main verb, usually in the beginning of the VP.

\[
\text{to a - twān - īt īrā - ka - īt. you Impf can Ag DPrf do Ag}
\]

You can run.

\(^{(1)}\) Steel, S. (1975).
To abēt am kitēb - a bi - kir - it.  
You must this book DA sub buy Ag  
You must buy this book.

3 - The conjunctive particle /u/ 'and' cannot occur between the main verb and the modal. Thus the sequence:

"min abēt u birom.  
I can and go

is ungrammatical.

4 - The main verb with the modal is always marked for present subjunctive. The modal carries all tense and aspect elements.

According to these syntactic criteria the verbs būn, twānin and wērān which mean 'must' or 'may', 'can' or 'may' and 'dare' respectively, can be considered as modals in Kurdish. Thus verbs such as wētin 'say' etc. cannot - as has been previously proposed by some Kurdish grammarians (2) - be considered as modals.

1 - būn. It occurs always in 3rd sg in its modal function. Formally it behaves as an intransitive verb. It takes āt of 3rd sg with the present tense and Ž with the past. There is a tendency not to pronounce the /t/ of the 3rd sg agreement marker /ēt/. Its chief

meanings are:

i) Obligation or compulsion imposed by the speaker.

\[ \text{to } \text{abēt am } \text{kitēb - a } \text{bikir - īt.} \]
\[ \text{you must this book DA buy } \text{Ag} \]
\[ \text{You must buy this book.} \]

ii) Permission given by the speaker.

\[ \text{qaynākāt } \text{to } \text{abēt bimīnē - īt.} \]
\[ \text{It does not matter you may stay } \text{Ag} \]
\[ \text{It does not matter, you may stay.} \]

Whether it conveys the idea of obligation or permission depends on the position of the inherent or potential stress. If the stress is received by the main verb, the modal abēt will convey the semantic function of obligation.

\[ \text{min abēt birom.} \]
\[ \text{I must go} \]

If the stress is received by the modal abēt, it will convey the semantic function of permission.

\[ \text{min abēt birom.} \]
\[ \text{I may go} \]
\[ \text{I may go.} \]

This case is very clear with the interrogative.

\[ \text{min abēt birom ?} \]
\[ \text{I may do} \]
\[ \text{May I go?} \]
For certainty and emphasis, the word har is added preceding the modal abet. In this case har receives a strong stress.

\[
\text{min har abet bi\text{"o}}.
\]
I certainly must go
Must I certainly go?

Har can modify any NP or verb conveying the semantic function of only.

\[
\text{to har bi\text{"o}.}
\]
You only go
You only go. Or You insist on going.

\[
\text{har } \text{Azad ac\text{"o}.}
\]
only A. go
Only Azad goes.

Twanin 'can, may': This modal agrees with the subject noun phrase (and the main verb) in number and person in all forms. Formally, it behaves as a transitive verb, as it takes a personal suffix to express its agreement with the subject NP in the past.

\[
\text{\text{"e}}\text{ma t\text{"a}n\text{"i} - m\text{"a}n bi\text{"o} - \text{"i}n.}
\]
we can Past Ag go Ag
We could go.

The chief meanings of the modal t\text{"a}n\text{"i} are:

i) Ability, as in

\[
\text{min at\text{"a}n - m aw darka - m.}
\]
I Impf can Ag he dismiss Ag
I can dismiss him.
ii) Permission given by the speaker.

ēwa hamūtān abēt biroñ, tanhā Āzād atwān - ēt bimīn - ēt.
You all must go only A. can Ag stay Ag
You all must go except Azad can stay.

The occurrence of the verb būn restricted to the 3rd sg in its modal function can be accounted for by considering the modal as a higher verb, postulating a deep structure such as follows, to the sentence

\[
\text{min abēt biroñ.}
\]
I must go

I must go.

\[
\begin{array}{c}
S \\
\text{NP} \\
\text{VP} \\
S \\
\text{min biroñ} \\
I \\
\text{go} \\
\text{abēt} \\
\text{must}
\end{array}
\]

in which the tenseless sentence min biroñ 'I (to) go', is embedded under a higher predicate abēt 'must'. The 3rd sg agreement marker of abēt is immediately explained by this analysis. The verb abēt is the main verb in the deep structure and it agrees with its subject which is a sentence min biroñ 'I (to) go'. A raising rule is needed to merge the two clauses into a single clause in surface structure. This rule is called predicate raising.

Unlike būn, twānīn agrees with the subject NP in all forms.
This is explained by the fact that both actions expressed by the modal and the main verb are performed by the same subject NP. The sentence

\[
\text{ema a-twān-in bīro-in.} \\
\text{we Impf can Ag go Ag}
\]

We can go.

will have the deep structure

By an Equi-Subject deletion rule the subject NP of the embedded sentence will be deleted giving the surface above. (3)

Syntactically, the verb wārān 'dare' behaves exactly like twānin.

CHAPTER 8

THE PASSIVE

The passive in Kurdish grammar has been described in exclusively morphological terms. Syntactic and semantic problems of the passive have been either totally ignored or misinterpreted in terms of non-indigenous rules imposed on Kurdish. This chapter deals with the description of the morphological and syntactic natures of the Kurdish passive construction, exploring some of its syntactic and semantic properties.

In Kurdish only transitive verbs have passive forms. Morphologically, in traditional terms, an active transitive verb can be made passive by the addition of the morphemes /rā/ and /rē/ to its present tense stem, except for a few exceptions, the passives of which are formed from the past tense stem of the verb. They are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infinitive</th>
<th>Present stem</th>
<th>Past stem</th>
<th>Passives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>witin</td>
<td>ìê</td>
<td>wit -</td>
<td>wit-rā/rē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wîstin</td>
<td>wē</td>
<td>wîst -</td>
<td>wîst-rā/rē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gāin</td>
<td>gê</td>
<td>gâ(y)</td>
<td>gay-rā/rē</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Due to the Kurdish phonological rules,

1) if /a/ or /ê/ are the last elements of the present stem, they will be changed to /i/ by the addition of the passive morphemes.
Thus /κα/ which is the present stem of the verb κιρδίν 'do' becomes /κι/ and /νη/ the present tense stem of the verb ναν 'put' becomes /νι/, when /κα/ or /νη/ are added to them.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
/κα - κα/ & [κιρα] & \text{was done} \\
/κα - κα/ & [κιρέ] & \text{will be done} \\
/νη - νη/ & [νιρα] & \text{was put} \\
/νη - νη/ & [νιρέ] & \text{will be put} \\
\end{array}
\]

ii) /ο/ will be changed to /υ/ as in ξο the stem of the verb ξωάρδίν 'to eat'.

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
/ξο - κα/ & [ξυρα] & \text{was eaten} \\
/ξο - κα/ & [ξυρέ] & \text{will be eaten} \\
\end{array}
\]

iii) /ι/ of /γιρ/ the present stem of γιρτίν 'to take' becomes /ι/

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
/γιρ - κα/ & [γιρά] & \\
\end{array}
\]

iv) If the stem ends in /γ/, the /γ/ of passive is assimilated to it by a process of elision. This creates ambiguity with some verbs, as in:

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c}
/γογ - κα/ & [γογά] & \text{has been changed} \\
/διγ - κα/ & [διγά] & \text{has been torn} \\
\end{array}
\]

The passive stem undergoes regular conjugation as an intransitive verb. The dichotomy of past and present tense of passive is not reflected in the verb stem, as both past and present stems of passive are formed from what is called traditionally the present stem of the verb. The few exceptions listed above, the passives of which are formed from the past stem of the verb represent the opposite side. What distinguishes the
past tense from the present in passive is the last element of what is called the passive morpheme. Thus the addition of the morpheme /rā/ to the present stem of the transitive verb yields the past stem of the passive.

- **Infinitive**: kuştin to kill
- **Present stem**: kuţ
- **Passive Past stem**: kuţ-rā

And the addition of /rē/ to the present stem of the verb yields the present stem of its passive. The passive present stem of the verb kuştin given above will be kuţ-rē.

Through these examples, it can be seen that the element which expresses the tense in passive is the last element of what is called the passive morpheme. Logically, each passive morpheme should be considered as two elements rather than one. These are the passive element /r/ and the element which expresses the tense, /ā/ for the past, and /ē/ for the present tense.

- **kuţ - r - ā**
  - kill Pass. Past
- **kuţ - r - ē**

Thus the passive morphemes which used to be considered by Kurdish grammarians each as one unit will be considered in this work as consisting of two morphemes. The same phenomenon can be noticed in the forming of the synthetic causative in Kurdish, as we shall see.

After this brief description of morphological construction of the passive verb in Kurdish, syntactic problem will be discussed.

The process of passivization in Kurdish involves the deletion
of the subject of the verb in an active sentence and concomitantly
the verb takes the passive form (as described above), and what
used to be the object becomes the subject in the passive sentence.

\[ \text{Sb} \quad \text{O} \quad \text{V} \]

1) \( \text{Azad utumbil - aka - l frosht.} \)
   \( \text{A. car the Ag sell past} \)
   Azad sold the car.

2) \( \text{utumbil - aka fros - r - a - ç} \)
   \( \text{car the sell Pass Past Ag} \)
   The car was sold.

Syntactically, the passive construction of Kurdish is agentless.
If the agent is expressed in the sentence, the sentence is normally in
the active. The passive is solely used for some special contexts or
if the subject is not known. Thus the opposition which exists between
the passive and the active in English does not exist in Kurdish. English
has what is called full passive in which the agent can occur. Kurdish
has truncated passive in which the agent is not expressed. There are,
however, some instances in Kurdish in which the agent is expressed on
the surface level and in the passive. These can be found only in
newspapers and translations from European languages. For instance

3) \( \text{Witar - èk - la layan sarokawa pëşkaç ki - r - a.} \)
   \( \text{speech a on side president present do Pass Past} \)
   A speech was given by the president.

Kurdish native intuition rejects this sentence and considers it
as an awkward non-indigenous construction imposed on Kurdish.

Some other constructions which are preceded by constituents such
as ba 'by', ba dasti 'at the hand of', ba hoy 'by means of', and can occur with passive constructions have been considered by Kurdish grammarians as agents and constituent ba as agentive particle equivalent to the English agentive particle by. Thus, in the sentences

4) - Mirzā ba xanjar kūž - r - ā.
Mirza was killed with a dagger.

5) - Mirzā ba dast - 1 Jwāmēr kūž - r - ā.
Mirza was killed at the hand of Jwamer.

the phrases xanjar 'dagger' and dasti Jwāmēr 'hand of Jwamer' in 4 and 5 respectively have been considered as agents and ba 'by' which precedes them as an agentive particle equivalent to the English 'by'.

Syntactically the phrase ba xanjar is an instrumental. It can also occur with the active form of the sentence, having the same syntactic function.

6) - Jwāmēr Mirzā - 1 ba xanjar kušt.
Jwamer killed Mirza with a dagger.

Forming the active of the sentence 4 in which xanjar functions as a subject, it will be noticed that the active sentence is not synonymous with passive. Thus the sentence:

7) - xanjar Mirzā - 1 kušt.
The dagger killed Mirza.
does not necessarily mean that Mirza died as a result of stabbing.
Similarly the sentence:

8) - Mirzá ba utumbil kužrā.
M. by car kill Pass Past
Mirza was killed by a car.

means that Mirza was killed by a car accident and he is dead. But in its active form in which utumbil 'car' functions as a subject:

9) - utumbil Mirzá - i kušt
car M. Ag kill Past

it does not necessarily mean that Mirza had a car accident or that he is dead. Probably he was too preoccupied with the thought of having a car and he died because he could not get it. Alternatively he lost all his time thinking about having a car or driving his car which caused his failure, i.e. 'kill' here is used metaphorically.

In sentence 5, Jwamer is a cause in killing Mirza. It does not necessarily mean that he personally performed the killing. Its active form in which dasti Jwámēr 'hands of Jwamer' functions as a subject is not acceptable.

10) - dast - I Jwámēr Mirzá - i kušt.
hands Izf J. M. Ag kill Past
hands of Jwamer killed Mirza.

Now compare the following two sentences:

11) - īš - aka ba Āzād kirā.
work the by A. do Pass Past
The work was done by Azad.
12) - _bagel_iş_ - _aka_ - _l_ _kird_.

A. work  the  Ag  do  Past
Azad did the work.

Sentence 11 means that the work was done by Azad and implies also that he was able to do it, i.e. semantically the phrase _ba_ _Azad_ in this position contains potentiality, while sentence 12 does not imply this semantic element.

Through these examples, we can conclude that the constituents that are preceded by _ba_ and can occur with the passive sentences do not specify the agent of the action. They are instrumental constructions which can also occur with the active forms of the sentences showing the same syntactic and semantic functions.

Although the Kurdish passive construction is agentless in surface, it indicates implicit or understood agency, i.e. the agent is interpreted by the semantic component as an indefinite agent but it does not appear in the surface structure. This point can be illustrated by comparing the following two sentences:

13) -  _Jâm_ - _aka_  _šik_ -  _ēn_ - _r_ - _ā_.
glass  the  break  Caus  Pass  Past
The glass was broken (by someone).

14) -  _Jâm_ - _aka_  _šikā_ -  _ bach_.
glass  the  break  Past  Ag
The glass broke (by itself).

Sentence 13 has a verb with passive form. It is agentless on the surface. It is obvious that semantically it implies external agency. While sentence 14 does not imply any external agency. This indicates that Kurdish passive construction is not agentless in the
In early transformational theory, active and passive were thought to have the same semantic reading. A common underlying structure could be mapped onto two distinct surface structures. The difference in surface was due to the application of an optional passive transformation. However, further investigations revealed that there is no syntactic or semantic rule which can explicitly account for the relationship between active and passive sentences. This led to the situation to be changed in Aspects, in which Chomsky argues that passive and active sentences must be derived from different underlying structures, and that passive must be an obligatory rule. This is supported by a more recent proposal for the transformation of passive analysis.

The analysis given above shows that Kurdish represents another case where passive and active cannot be related transformationally by having a common deep structure. It will be assumed that they are derived from different underlying structures.

According to the observations presented in this discussion, the facts of surface structure in passive are as follows:

a) - The agent of passive is always unexpressed, i.e. Kurdish has only a truncated passive.

b) - The object of the active sentence must be identified with the subject of the passive.

(1) Chomsky (1957), for instance.
(2) Katz and Postal (1964).
c) - The passive form of the verbs contains a passive element.

d) - The object which becomes the subject of the passive sentence will agree with the verb in number and person.

e) - The passive in Kurdish indicates an implicit or understood external agent.

Thus the deep and surface structures of passive in Kurdish can be represented as follows.

```
DS  SS

S   S
Pass NP₁  VP  NP₂              V Passive
     VP
  NP₂  V
```

The inclusion of the passive element in the base accounts for the semantic and syntactic differences between passive and active sentences. The passive element, when present in the deep structure, will trigger the passive transformation by which the underlying subject will be obligatorily deleted (by an ellipsis rule). The underlying object will be identified as a surface subject and the verb will receive the passive element.

The rule for deriving passive in Kurdish can be formulated as follows:

```
SI: X - Pass - NP₁ - NP₂ - VS - X
1  2  3  4  5  6  ⇒ Obl
1  θ  4  θ  5 + 2  6
```
The syntactic structures that convey causative meaning vary from one language to another. In some languages more than one class of causative construction can be recognized. In Kurdish one can distinguish several types of causative construction on syntactic and semantic grounds.

There are basically three types of causative construction in Kurdish, differing from each other at least in their surface manifestation. The first type is an implicit construction involving verbs only semantically analysable as causative but not exhibiting any regular formal relationship to non-causative, i.e. the meaning cause is implicitly contained. This type is referred to as a lexical causative.\(^{1}\) The second type is an explicit causative construction derived from non-causative by means of suffixation. This type is referred to as morphological or synthetic causative construction. The third type is also explicit, formed by means of a higher verb expressed in the phrase \(\text{wa kirdin} 'cause'\) (lit. such to make). This type is referred to as phrasal or analytic causative construction.

---

Kurdish grammars do not refer to analytic causative construction at all. The synthetic construction has been described in purely morphological terms. Syntactic and semantic properties have been totally ignored. This chapter is an attempt to describe the Kurdish causative construction; some of the syntactic and semantic properties will be explored.

One of the main characteristics of Kurdish causative construction is that intransitive verbs can be causativized synthetically and analytically, whereas transitive verbs can be causativized only analytically. Thus there are two ways to express 'cause to sleep' as in 1 and 2 below, while there is only one way to express 'cause to buy' as in 3.

1 - aw minä - aka - i nū - ān.
   he child the Ag sleep Past Caus

2 - aw wā - i kird minä - aka bi - nū - ēt.
   he such Ag do Past child the Sub sleep ESAg
   he caused the child to sleep

3 - to wā - t kird min kiteb - aka bi - kir - m
   you such Ag do Past I book the Sub buy ESAg
   You caused me to buy the book.

Semantically, 1 and 2 seem to be very close. Both appear to be cognitively synonymous. However, further analysis will reveal that there are subtle but clear differences between them. These two different types of causative construction will be discussed shortly.

1 - Synthetic causative:

In the synthetic causative, the element indicating causation is fused with the verb to form a new single derived verb. According to
Comrie, (2) the underlying structure of a synthetic causative construction contains a matrix sentence and an embedded sentence. The former expresses the causing action. The latter has a SNP which expresses the person or thing who/which carries out the action. Thus according to this proposal the underlying structure of a synthetic causative construction such as:

\[ \text{Azad caused the child to sleep.} \]

contains the two sentences:

a - Azad caused matrix sentence

b - The child slept embedded sentence

and it will have \( V \) deep structure represented in the following diagram.

However, it will be shown in this chapter that Kurdish synthetic causative does not have a complex underlying structure.

(2) Comrie, B. (1974)
In Kurdish, only intransitive verbs can be causativized synthetically. This can be achieved by a productive rule which involves the addition of the morphemes /än/ and /ên/ to the stem of the verb.

In the example given above, the tense, as in the passive, is expressed by /ā/ for the past and /ē/ for the present. The second element will be considered as the causative element. Thus the causative verb firān/firēn will be analysed as follows:

- fir - ā - n  
  fly Past Caus

- fir - ē - n  
  fly Pres Caus

If the stem of the verb ends in /ē/, this will be elided when the verb is causativized, as in:

- Sutē -ān  
  burn Past Cause

- Sutē -ēn  
  burn Pres. Cause

A few intransitive verbs cannot be causativized. These include

(3) Except the verb nāsēn 'to know someone' which is a transitive verb and can be causativized synthetically. Its stem is nās-:

- Nās - ān  
  Past Cause know

- Nās - ēn  
  Pres. Cause know
both verbs that have lexicalised transitive counterparts such as 
kawtin - kistin 'fall, fell', and verbs that do not have transitive
counterparts such as ganin 'rot' and zân 'give birth'.

There are a few verbs which can be causativized and have also
lexical transitive counterparts such as mirdin, mirânin, kştin 'die,
cause to die, kill'. Semantically, the derived causative verbs of
this class are not equivalent to their transitive counterparts. This
can be noticed through the following examples.

5 - Jwâmër xo - t kuşt.
    J. self his kill Past
    Jwamer killed himself.

6 - Jwâmër xo - t mir - ân.
    J. self his die Past Caus
    Jwamer caused himself to die.

Sentence 5 means that Jwamer is dead, while sentence 6 means that
Jwamer pretended he is dead, and he is not actually dead. (4)

(4) McCawly (1968) proposed that the lexical and periphrastic
causative sentences are semantically identical, and should
be derived from the same underlying structure. For him a
causative verb such as kill is derived from a complex
semantic structure which contains an abstract verb Cause ,
and can be resolved into components such as cause to die.
Thus the following sentences are considered as semantically
identical.

a - John caused Fred to die.
b - John killed Fred.

However, the analysis given above illustrates straightforwardly
the failure of McCawly's proposed analysis of lexical item and
the hypothesis of lexical decomposition. The verb cûn 'go' is
another example.

c - aw sik - t cû.
he stomach his go Past.
He had diarrhoea (lit. his stomach went).
d - aw sik - t cû - ân.
he stomach his go Past Caus
She had an abortion. (lit. She caused her stomach to go).
The morphologically non-productive forms such as kustin 'kill', xisin 'fell', are referred to as lexical causatives, and the regular forms such as mirăín 'cause to die', sutănîn 'cause to burn' are referred to as productive forms. The former must be listed in the lexicon, while the latter need not be. They must be derived via grammatical processes.

The Synthetic causative construction in Kurdish is not iterative. The causative element appears only once, i.e. a causative of more than one degree cannot be derived morphologically.

2 - Analytic causative construction.

This is a very productive construction in that wā ka can be used with any sentence to form a causative construction. In an analytic causative constructions two sentences are combined, a matrix sentence and an embedded sentence. The matrix sentence contains a SNP corresponding to the causer and a higher verb which is expressed in the phrase wā ka 'cause' (lit. such to make), which may be entered into the lexicon with the inherent feature \([-\text{Cause}\]) .

The embedded sentence consists of the SNP of the embedded sentence corresponding to the person or thing who/which carries out the action, and its verb. For instance the following sentence


The causative morpheme with its associated tense morphemes, also functions as a class-changing derivational suffix by which verbs can be derived from onomatopoeic nouns, e.g. gişăn/gişën 'scream', pirxăn/pirxën 'snore', are derived from giža 'scream' and pirxa 'snore' which are onomatopoeic. The derived verb behaves morphologically as a transitive verb, i.e. with the past tense it takes personal suffixes set No. 1 to express its agreement with the subject NP, and syntactically the derived verb behaves as an intransitive verb, i.e. it does not take an object, as in:

awăn pirxăn-yān
they snore Ag.

They snored.
Sentence 7 has the following alternatives:

8 - ʿAzād wā-ī la min kird kitēb-ēk bi-kiṟ - m.
A. such Ag to I make Past book a Sub buy ESAg

9 - ʿAzād min-ī wā lā kird kitēb-ēk bi-kiṟ - m.
A. I Ag such to make Past book a Sub buy ESAg

Notice that when the embedded subject occurs within the matrix sentence, the preposition la occurs governing it. The embedded subject may occur preceding wā. In this case the preposition will take the form lā.

Assuming that 7 is more basic, 8 and 9 are derived transformationally by rules such as follow:
Unlike the synthetic causative, which is not recursive in Kurdish, analytic causation is an infinitely recursive process in which the embedded sentence contains a verb with an inherent feature [+Cause] plus S, and so on. So that in the sentence:

10 - Āzād wā - ı la Āwāz kird wā la Āhang bi - ka - āt ....
A. such Ag to A. make Past such to A. Sub made ESAg

.... Rizgār binū - en - ēt
R. Sub sleep Caus ESAg

Azad caused Awaz to cause Ahang to cause Rizgar to sleep.

we find two occurrences of the analytic type followed by a synthetic causative. Its underlying structure contains the following sentence:

a - Azad caused Awaz
b - Awaz caused Ahang
c - Ahang caused Rizgar to sleep.

A difference in semantic interpretation between synthetic and analytic causatives can be noticed. The analytic causative often involves action on the part of the causee, while this is not generally the case with the morphologically derived causatives. Thus the
synthetic causative construction

11) - min minä₁-aka - m ṭo - ān.
    I child the Ag walk Past Caus
    I caused the child to walk.

means that the child could not or did not want to walk, and so I
held him up to help him or force him to walk. Its analytic
counterpart does not contain such semantic implication.

12) - min wā - m kird minä₂aka bi - ṭo - āt.
    I such Ag make Past child the Sub walk ESAg
    I caused the child to walk.

probably by ordering him to walk. The causee in the former does
not take the role of an agent, as the volition on his part is not
implied. The causer is involved directly in carrying out the action,
while in the latter the causee functions as an agent capable of
performing the action. In other words, in synthetic causative only
one volitional agent is involved, while in the analytic there are two.

The phenomenon of adverbial modification provides strong evidence
for proving this point. Adverbs with synthetic causative always modify
the causing action. No Kurdish synthetic construction can be found
in which adverbs can modify the causee action, or can create ambiguity
by modifying both actions simultaneously: i.e. in synthetic causation
the causee is not carrying out any action to be modified. Thus in
the sentence:

13) - Āzdā minā₁ - aka - ṭī ba ḏū dast ṭo - ān.
    A. child the Ag by two hand walk Past Caus
    Azad with two hands caused the child to walk.
14) - Āhang Šerko - 1 ba zahmat nū - ān.
A. Sh. Ag with difficult sleep Past Caus
Āhang with difficulty caused Sherko to sleep.

The adverbs ba dū dast 'with two hands' and ba zahmat 'with difficulty' modify the actions performed by the causers Āzad and Āhang respectively. In an alternative analytic construction the adverb may occur modifying the causing action. In this case it will be synonymous with the synthetic counterpart. Thus the sentences:

15) - Āzād ba dū dast wā - 1 kird mināk-aša bi - ūo - āt
A. with two hands sāxh Ag.make Past child the Sub walk ESAg
Azād caused the child to walk on his hands.

16) - Āhang ba zahmat wā - 1 kird šerko bi - nū - āt
A. with difficult such Ag make Past Šh. Sub sleep ESAg
Āhang caused Šerko to sleep with difficulty.

In 15 it was Āzad who used both hands, in 17 it was the child who used his two hands to walk. In 16 it was the causer Āhang who found difficulty in causing Šerko to sleep, while in 18 it was Šerko who found difficulty in sleeping; the causer here deters the causee. The adverb qualifies the action performed by the causee.

In an analytic causative construction both actions may be qualified
by adverbs simultaneously as in:

19) - Āzād ba zaḥmat wa - 1 kird mināā - aka ba dū ...

A. with difficult such Ag make Past child the with two

... dast bi - ṭo aṭat.

hand Sub walk ESAg

These syntactic and semantic differences between synthetic and analytic causative construction are sufficient to consider them having different underlying structures. The difference is in that synthetic causative verb behaves as a single transitive verb, like any lexicalized causative, i.e. it does not come from a complex underlying structure, while in an analytic construction the causative does come from a complex underlying structure. Thus the underlying structure proposed by Comrie for causative construction does not apply to Kurdish synthetic construction. It applies only to the analytic causative construction.
The following are tables for all possible structures where both the DO and IO are cliticized with the past tense in complex manner.

In sentences entitled 'A' are sentences where both the DO and IO are represented by pronouns. In 'B' both the DO and IO are cliticized, in 'C' only the DO is cliticized and in 'D' only the IO is cliticized.

(i) - DO min 'I'

IO to 'you', aw 'he', ëwa 'you (Pl)' and awän 'they'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwā min - I bo to nārd.</td>
<td><em>xwā bo - I nārd - it - m.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God I Ag for you send Past</td>
<td>Ag you I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent me for you (Pl).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwā min - I bo aw nārd.</td>
<td><em>xwā bo - I nārd - φ - m.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Ag he</td>
<td>Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent me for him.</td>
<td>God sent him for me. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwā min - I bo ëwa nārē.</td>
<td><em>xwā bo - I nārd - n - m.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Ag you(Pl)</td>
<td>Ag you I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent me for you (Pl).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwā min - I bo awän nārē.</td>
<td><em>xwā bo - I nārd - n - m.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Ag they</td>
<td>Ag they I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent me for them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo to - I nārd - m.</td>
<td>you Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>you</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo aw - I nārd - m.</td>
<td>he Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>he</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo ʾĪwān - I nārd - m.</td>
<td>you Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>you</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo awān - I nārd - m.</td>
<td>they Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I</strong></td>
<td><strong>they</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(ii) - DO to 'you'.

IO min 'I', aw 'he', ema 'we' and awan 'they'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwa to - I bo min nārd.</td>
<td><strong>IO</strong> xwa bo - I nārd - m - it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God you Ag for I send Past</td>
<td>Ag I you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent you for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwa to - I bo aw nārd.</td>
<td><strong>IO</strong> xwa bo - I nārd - ß - m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you Ag he</td>
<td>Ag he I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent you for him.</td>
<td>God sent him for you. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwa to - I bo ema nārd.</td>
<td><strong>IO</strong> xwa bo - I nārd - ûn - it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you Ag we</td>
<td>Ag we you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent you for us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwa to - I bo awan nārd.</td>
<td><strong>IO</strong> xwa bo - I nārd - n - it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you Ag they</td>
<td>Ag they you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent them for you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(C)</strong></td>
<td><strong>(D)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo min - ī nārd - īt.</td>
<td>I Ag you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Ag you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo aw - ī nārd - īt.</td>
<td>he Ag you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he Ag you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo ēmā - ī nārd - īt.</td>
<td>we Ag you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we Ag you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo awān - ī nārd - īt.</td>
<td>they Ag you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they Ag you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iii) - DO aw 'he'.

IO min 'I', to 'you', aw 'he', ema 'we', ewa 'you(Pl)' and awan 'they'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO xwā aw - ī bo min nārd.</td>
<td>IO DO xwā bo - ī nārd - m - ɸ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God he Ag for I send Past</td>
<td>Ag I he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent him for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| DO xwā aw - ī bo to nārd. | IO DO xwā bo - ī nārd - It - ɸ. |
| he Ag you                 | Ag you he                 |
| God sent him for you.     |                          |

| DO xwā aw - ī bo aw nārd. | IO DO xwā bo - ī nārd - ɸ - ɸ. |
| he Ag he                  | Ag he he                  |
| God sent him for him.     |                          |

| DO xwā aw - ī bo ēma nārd. | IO DO xwā bo - ī nārd - In - ɸ. |
| he Ag we                  | Ag we he                  |
| God sent him for us.      |                          |

| DO xwā aw - ī bo ēwa nārd. | IO DO xwā bo - ī nārd - n - ɸ. |
| he Ag you(Pl)             | Ag you he                 |
| God sent him for you(Pl). |                          |

<p>| DO xwā aw - ī bo awan nārd. | IO DO xwā bo - ī nārd - n - ɸ. |
| he Ag they                | Ag they he                |
| God sent him for them.    |                          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Column 1</th>
<th>Column 2</th>
<th>Column 3</th>
<th>Column 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>DO</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwa</td>
<td>bo</td>
<td>aw</td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>min</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>nard</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they</td>
<td>Ag</td>
<td>he</td>
<td>Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(iv) - DO ʾema 'we', IO to 'you', aw 'he', ʾeva 'you(Pl)', awān 'they'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwā ʾema - I bo to nārd.</td>
<td><strong>IO</strong> xwā bo - I nārd - Iī - In.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God we  Ag for you send Past</td>
<td>Ag you we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent us for you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwā ʾema - I bo aw nārd.</td>
<td><strong>IO</strong> xwā bo - I nārd - ū - In.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we  Ag he</td>
<td>Ag he we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent us for him.</td>
<td>God sent him for us. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwā ʾema - I bo ēwa nārd.</td>
<td><strong>IO</strong> xwā bo - I nārd - n - In.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we  ' Ag you(Pl)</td>
<td>Ag you we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent us for you(Pl).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong> xwā ʾema - I bo awān nārd.</td>
<td><strong>IO</strong> xwā bo - I nārd - n - In.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we  Ag they</td>
<td>Ag they we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent us for them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td>xwā bo to - ๑ nārd - ṭīn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td>xwā bo aw - ๑ nārd - ṭīn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>he Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td>xwā bo แewa - ๑ nārd - ṭīn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td>xwā bo awān - ๑ nārd - ṭīn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they Ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(v) - DO əwa 'you(Pl)'
IO min 'I', aw 'he', əma 'we' and awən 'they'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO əwa - I bo min nārd.</td>
<td>xwā bo - I nārd - m - n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God you(Pl) Ag for I send Past</td>
<td>Ag I you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent you(Pl) for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you(Pl) Ag he</td>
<td>Ag he you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent you(Pl) for him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God sent him to you(Pl). (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you Ag we</td>
<td>Ag we you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent you(Pl) for us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO əwa - I bo awən nārd.</td>
<td>xwā bo - I nārd - n - n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you Ag they</td>
<td>Ag they you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God sent you(Pl) for them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C)</td>
<td>(D)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo min - 1 nārd - n.</td>
<td>xwā ēwa - 1 bo nārd - m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Ag you</td>
<td>you Ag I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo aw - 1 nārd - n.</td>
<td>xwā ēwa - 1 bo nārd - 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>he Ag you</td>
<td>you Ag he</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo ēma - 1 nārd - n.</td>
<td>xwā ēwa - 1 bo nārd - 0.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we Ag you</td>
<td>you Ag we</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IO</strong></td>
<td><strong>DO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo awān - 1 nārd - n.</td>
<td>xwā ēwa - 1 bo nārd - n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they Ag you</td>
<td>you Ag they</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(vi) - DO awān 'they'.

IO min 'I', tu 'you', aw 'he', ema 'we', ēwa 'you(Pl)' and awān 'they'.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(A)</th>
<th>(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO xwa awān - I bo min nārd.</td>
<td>DO xwa bo - I nārd - m - n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God they Ag for I send Fast</td>
<td>Ag I they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God sent them for me.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO xwa awān - I bo to nārd.</td>
<td>*xwa bo - I nārd - t - n.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they Ag you(Pl)</td>
<td>Ag you they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God sent them for you(Pl).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they Ag he</td>
<td>Ag he they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God sent them for him.</td>
<td>God sent him for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they Ag we</td>
<td>Ag we they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God sent them for us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO xwa awān - I bo ēwa nārd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they Ag you(Pl)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God sent them for you(Pl).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO xwa awān - I bo awān nārd.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>they Ag they</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>God sent them for them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) - See P. 88.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(C)</th>
<th>(D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I0</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo min - ī nārd - n.</td>
<td>I Ag they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo to - ī nārd - n.</td>
<td>you Ag they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo aw - ī nārd - n.</td>
<td>he they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo ema - ī nārd - n.</td>
<td>we Ag they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I0</td>
<td>DO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo ëwa - ī nārd - n.</td>
<td>you Ag they</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xwā bo awān - ī nārd - n.</td>
<td>they Ag they</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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