

## GOAL CONSTITUENTS ACROSS KURMANJI DIALECTS

Songül Gündoğdu

Muş Alparslan University – Boğaziçi University, TURKEY

**Aim:** The current study investigates the variation observed in the morphological form and the position of goal constituents across Kurmanji dialects spoken in Turkey, and proposes that (i) the distribution of goals is sensitive to morphological form (case vs. adposition), the adposition type (preposition vs. circumposition-postposition) and the verb-type, and (ii) the variation observed across Kurmanji dialects is mostly conditioned by language contact (Haig 2014) and language areal typology (Stilo 2005, 2009) and it is structurally represented by different featural content of the lexical heads in I-syntax (Ramchand 2002, 2008).

**Data:** In Kurmanji Kurdish, *goal* is a cover term used for *locational goals of verbs of motion*, *recipients of verbs of transfer*, and *addressees of verbs of speech* (Haig 2014: 413). Goal constituents in this language appear in different positions in a clause; i.e., they might appear in the preverbal or in the immediate postverbal position, and they carry different morphological marking; i.e., they are either marked with Oblique case (OBL) or they are introduced by adpositional phrases (ADP). The position of ADP goals is more flexible than OBL-marked goals in the clause; the occurrence of OBL-marked goals is restricted to the immediate postverbal position whereas ADP-goals show up mostly in the preverbal position but they may also appear in the postverbal position (Haig 2014, Haig&Thiele 2014, Haig&Öpengin forthcoming, Gündoğdu 2016). A closer look at Kurmanji dialects spoken in Turkey reveals that the position and morphological means of goal constituents display variation across dialects; (i) an OBL-marked goal in one dialect may be ADP-goal in another dialect or vice versa, (ii) in parallel with this, the same goal appears in the preverbal position in one dialect while it is placed in the immediate postverbal position in another dialect (see examples in (1)), and/or (iii) the goal constituent which is introduced in the form of ADP in all dialects may be of different types of adpositions (2). Note that the data for this study come from Hakkari, Van, Şırnak, Mardin, Muş, Bingöl, Malatya and Adıyaman, and these places are determined based on the tentative classification of Kurmanji-internal variation into major regional dialects made by Öpengin& Haig (2014). (Goals are in **bold**.)

(1) *Addressee of verbs of speech*

- a. *Bahar-ê ev-ê ne-gût-e min* (Hakkari)  
Bahar-OBL DEM-OBL.F NEG-say.PST-DIR 1SG.OBL  
'Bahar didn't say this **to me**.'
- b. *Te evî ji min ra ne-got* (Muş)  
2SG.OBL DEM-OBL.M ADP 1SG.OBL ADP NEG-say.PST  
'You didn't say this **to me**.'

(2) *Recipient (of send-type verbs)*

- a. *Henê **bû min** pare virekir.* (preposition - Van)  
'Henê sent money **to me**.'
- b. ***Diya xo ra** sêv şandin.* (postposition - Malatya)  
'They sent apples **to their mother**.'
- a. *Min **ji wan ra** her tiştî şand.* (circumposition - Bingöl)  
'I sent **them** everything.'

**Findings:** The distribution of goals across Kurmanji dialects seem to be sensitive to the morphological marking and verb-type (event structure, Levin 2011):

- Goals appearing in the preverbal position are always adpositional in all dialects
- Goals appearing in the immediate postverbal position are either OBL-marked or ADP. The southernmost dialects (Hakkari, Van, Mardin, Şırnak) mostly tolerate ADP goals in this domain while northernmost dialects generally (Muş, Bingöl) do not.
- The recipient of *give-type verbs* is almost always OBL-marked and appears in the immediate postverbal position (Malatya seems to be exceptional) while the recipient of *send-type* is always adpositional and mostly shows up in the preverbal position (although the dialects like Şırnak and Adıyaman sometimes may place it in the immediate postverbal domain).

- The locational goals of verbs of motion are always in the immediate postverbal position across dialects (allative reading is only available in this position); however, their morphological form may vary depending on the dialect region (some dialects such as Muş, Erzurum and Bingöl prefer OBL-marked while other dialects tolerate both ADP and OBL forms.)
- The dialects that have the adposition *ji...ra* or *...ra* express *addressees* and *recipients of send-type verbs* with these adpositions. On the other hand, the dialects that do not develop one of these adpositions introduce *addressee* as OBL-marked in the immediate postverbal position while express *recipients of send-type verbs* through prepositions *bo/bû/ba*.

**Implications and Proposal:** Drawing attention to the fact that the appearance of goal constituents (G) in the immediate postverbal position in an OV language like Kurdish is typologically unusual, Haig (2014) and Haig&Thiele (2014) assert that this unusual word order (OVG) emerges as a result of contact-induced change. Haig (2014) argues that an original ‘proto-Kurdish’ had VG order which might have been characterized through early Aramaic/Iranian contact, and this pattern has undergone changes in some Kurmanji dialects due to contact with various languages in due course. For instance, in southernmost Kurmanji dialects VG order has been mostly preserved due to the contact with Neo-Aramaic (which is a VO language) thus goals are predominantly postverbal. On the other hand, goals are overwhelmingly preverbal in the northwards and westwards Kurmanji dialects (which he classifies as Central Anatolian dialects) because of the influence of Armenian and Turkish varieties in Anatolia, both of which are OV languages. Similarly, Stilo (2005, 2009) propose that Iranian languages are sandwiched between right-branching (VO)/prepositional (Semitic) and left-branching (OV)/postpositional (Turkic, Armenian, Indic) patterns and they resolve this conflict by creating an intersection zone which accommodates to both patterns. Therefore, we observe that Kurmanji as an Iranian language both displays OVG order and develops prepositions, postpositions and circumpositions (mixed adpositional typology) as a reflection of conflict resolution under language contact. Considering all these facts and data, in line with Haig (2014) and Stilo (2005, 2009) I group Kurmanji dialects spoken in Turkey roughly into two regions based on the adpositional type and the position of the goals; (i) southernmost dialects are mostly prepositional and goals are predominantly postverbal (e.g., Hakkari), (ii) northwards and westwards dialects introduce goals mostly with circumpositions or postpositions and these dialects use both pre- and postverbal positions actively to disambiguate goal-types (e.g., Muş). Furthermore, the fact that OBL-marked cannot survive in the preverbal domain in all Kurmanji dialects implies that the linear order of goal constituents is sensitive to the morphological marking. I propose that Kurmanji poses the following restriction on the linear order of constituents in general:

- (3) a. *At most two case-marked NPs are licensed/allowed in the preverbal position.*
- b. *S and DO are the only case-marked constituents that can appear in the preverbal position.*

To capture the dialectal variation in structural terms, following Ramchand (2002, 2008) I propose that goal constituents in Kurmanji occupy Path and Resultee positions in I-syntax and the variation observed across dialects is due to the different featural content of the lexical heads with respect to [+MOVE] in a dialect; that is, some lexical verbs are specified as [v, V, RvP]/ [v, V, Path] yielding OVG order while some lexical verbs are specified as [v, V, +RvP]/[v, V, +Path] yielding OGV order in certain dialects. For instance, *dan* ‘give’ has only the former I-syntactic structure in all dialects thus its recipient is always postverbal. On the other hand, the verb like *gotin* ‘say’ has the former structure in Hakkari dialect hence its addressee is postverbal but it has the latter structure in Muş dialect thus its goal is preverbal.

**Selected References:** Ramchand, G. (2002). Aktionsart, L-syntax and Selection. In *Proceedings of Perspectives on Aspect Conference* (pp. 1-15). Ramchand, G. (2008). *Verb meaning and the lexicon: A first phase syntax*. Cambridge University Press. Haig, G. (2014). VG Word Order in Kurdish and Neo-Aramaic: Typological and Areal Considerations. Haig, G. and H. Thiele. (2014). ‘Post-predicate Goals in Northern Kurdish and neighboring languages: a pilot study in quantitative areal linguistics’. Paper presented at the *VCK-2*. MAU, October 8-9. Haig, G. and E. Öpengin (forthcoming). Kurmanji Kurdish in Turkey: structure, varieties and status. Bulut, Christiane (ed.) *Linguistic Minorities in Turkey and Turkic speaking minorities of the peripheries*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz. Gündoğdu, S. (2016). ‘Asymmetries in Kurmanji Morphosyntax.’ Paper presented at the *ICKL-3*, August 25-26, UofA. Levin, B. (2011). Verb sensitivity and argument realization in three-participant constructions. Stilo, D. (2005). Iranian as buffer zone between the universal typologies of Turkic and Semitic. *Case studies from Iranian, Semitic, and Turkic*, 35-63. Stilo, D. (2009). Circumpositions as an areal response: The case study of the Iranian zone. *Turkic Languages*, 13,1. Harrassowitz: Wiesbaden. 3-33. Öpengin, E., & Haig, G. (2014). Regional variation in Kurmanji: A preliminary classification of dialects, *Kurdish Studies*, 2(2), 143-176.