

The typology of connectivity and complex constructions in Kurdish dialects

Yaron Matras

1. Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of structures involved in connectivity and complex construction formation in the dialects of Kurdish. Connectivity is understood broadly as a device to convey an overarching category that is composed of two or more propositional units. Typical semantic connections between sentences and utterances are addition, contrast, disjunction as well as various devices that mark sequentiality. Complex constructions are understood as the structural integration of two or more propositional units into the framework of the single syntactic unit of a sentence, in such a way that creates a hierarchical asymmetry between them, referred to as subordination (cf. Cristofaro 2003). Subordinated constructions include relative clauses, complement clauses and adverbial clauses. I take a functional-typological perspective that views connectivity and complex sentences as the grammatical encoding of the relations between states of affairs. Based on the iconicity principle the configuration of structural devices involved in marking the relations between sentences and clauses is expected to reflect conceptualisations of event integration, continuity and accessibility of information, perceived power relations among participants including agency and control, factuality, and expectations of causal chains and degree of presupposition (cf. Givón 1990, Langacker 1991, Hengeveld 1998).

Descriptive accounts of individual Kurdish dialects tend to cover the inventory of connectors that conjoin clauses and sentences (e.g. Kurdoev 1957, McCarus 1958, Blau 1980) and in part the interplay of clause type and verb inflection, particularly in connection with complement, purpose, and conditional clauses (e.g. MacKenzie 1961, pp. 131-140, pp. 2003, 213; Bedir Khan and Lescot 1970, pp. 335-339; Thackston 2006a, pp. 72-70; McCarus 2009, pp. 620-626; Öpengin 2016, pp. 129-136; see also Yusupova 2017, pp. 99-104, and Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012, pp. 59-61 for Gorani, and Paul 1998, pp. 138-161, for Zazaki). As yet there has been no attempt to compare the relevant structures across varieties of Kurdish. The questions to be addressed in the present study are: What are the structural characteristics of connectivity and complex constructions and how is subordination expressed? What is the interplay of connectors, verb inflection, and the coding of participants, and how does it relate to semantic-pragmatic hierarchies of event integration and information accessibility and to patterns of morphological alignment and participant tracking? What are the etymological sources of connectors including grammaticalisation pathways and contact influences and how are various connectors, connector types, and overall configurations distributed among the varieties and regions?

I draw on data from the Manchester Database of Kurdish Dialects (MDKD), relying both on elicited phrases and on the corpus of transcriptions of free speech. The latter consists of extracts of typically up to 6-7 minutes from semi-

structured interviews usually comprising around 20-30 minutes each, recorded in conjunction with the questionnaire elicitation fieldwork that populates the comparative database of phrases. Speakers were asked a standardised set of questions eliciting biographical narratives, descriptions of life history episodes and routines such as village life, migration, weddings and other celebrations, as well as transmitted or traditional stories. The free speech corpus that is available on the online resource documents just a fragment of the recorded data due to limitations on staff resources during the project's active lifetime. All data are at the time of writing available in transcription, English translation, and audio on the University of Manchester's Dialects of Kurdish project website, which also hosts the other components of the MDKD. The corpus comprises around 50,000 words from speakers originating from 71 different locations. Of those, 44 represent varieties of Kurmanji-Bahdini or Northern Kurdish (NK), including 25 from Turkey, 10 from Syria, and 9 from Iraq. Sorani or Central Kurdish (CK) varieties are represented by a total of 25 samples, including 14 from Iraq and 11 from Iran. Southern Kurdish (SK) varieties are generally under-represented in MDKD and not all are identified as such in the online resource itself. I follow Belelli (this volume) in identifying as varieties of the SK group the MDKD samples from the locations Baghdad (F001, F002), Khanaqin (S057), Sahne (G001) and Kermanshah (S013). Of those, only 2 are also represented in the free speech corpus: Khanaqin in Iraq (S057) and Sahne (G001) in Iran. I also draw on a selection of questionnaire elicitation phrases from the MDKD. Due to the project's research priorities (see editors' Introduction, this volume) the coverage of complex sentences in the questionnaire-based corpus is not comprehensive, but it can be relied on here for aspects of complementation, relative clause and conditional clause formation. Throughout this chapter examples are identified by MDKD sample code and location; free speech sources also give the transcription segment number. Sample codes beginning in K- for 'Kurmanji' represent NK, those beginning in S- for 'Sorani' are generally CK with the exception of the SK samples Khanaqin (S057) and Kermanshah (S013).

As stated above, the aim of this chapter is to provide an overview of connectivity and complex constructions. Section 2 surveys coordination and chaining with attention to conjunctive/additive and focused conjunctive constructions, selected issues of alignment and co-referentiality, disjunctive and adversative constructions and sequentiality. Section 3 covers relative clauses. Section 4 discusses complement clauses with attention to phasals, modals, manipulatives, desideratives, and complements of perception, knowledge, propositional attitude and utterance. Section 5 then surveys adverbial subordination including co-temporal, anterior and posterior, reason, purpose, concessive, and conditional constructions. I conclude with a discussion of broader areal features, general traits of Kurdish, features of NK and CK and some specific regional developments.

2. Coordination and chaining

Haspelmath (2007) defines coordination as the combining of two or more units of the same type. This general definition allows to accommodate both structural-

typological considerations (where 'type' is understood as the composition of sentences), semantic perspectives such as the processing of expectations arising from causal chains (Rudolph 1996), and interactional dimensions around the chaining of information units in the build-up of information transfer from speaker to listener within the context and setting of particular types of discourse (e.g. Ehlich and Rehbein 1986, Redder 1989). For Schiffrin (1987), connectors like 'and', 'but' and 'or' operate simultaneously at three levels: the ideational level of the proposition (content or information), the action level (sequential ordering of the speakers' actions) and the exchange or turn management level. Thus 'and' coordinates idea units, optionally segmenting them into topics, and continues an action by the speaker; 'but' contrasts idea units and signals the speaker's return to a previous action in order to process expectations arising from it, and so it has interactional relevance in showing that a starting point has precedence over other interactional goals; while 'or' marks the provision of options for the hearer and is thus more hearer-oriented. For Rudolph (1996), contrast is given when two propositions belong to the same conceptual domain and are both valid, but differ in regard to at least two properties. Contrast is linked to causality as it expresses a broken causal chain, whereby a presupposed chain of events by which proposition A is expected to lead to proposition B is rejected by the reality that is manifested in proposition B. That mental configuration is often referred to as denial of expectation or a negation of the implications associated with the first proposition. Adversatives therefore are said to have a double function of addition (connecting the two propositions) and separation (inviting the hearer to consider the second proposition as being in contrast with the first one).

Haspelmath (2007) identifies the particle or affix that is used to conjoin units as the 'coordinator' and the various semantic linkers as conjunctive, disjunctive, and adversative. The conjunctive (additive) category is said to display the greatest structural diversity, ranging from elliptic structures or non-constituent coordination, where a second explicitly conjoined constituent is absent, to comitative marking with 'also, too', while adversative (contrastive) coordination is always binary. These semantic distinctions are not always clear-cut, however. Thus emphatic coordination such as 'both .. and' and emphatic negative coordination with 'neither .. nor' can be said to have a contrastive element since the hearer expects just a single unit. Rudolph (1996) points out that languages tend to have a primary contrastive expression or 'main adversative connective' but some also have semantically specialised ones. Concessive expressions, for example, are less frequent and usually more complex, as the concessive relation marks background causality and the rejection of an imaginable conclusion. Concession can therefore be said to combine contrast with the de-ranking of a proposition (Cristofaro 2003; see also Crevels 2000).

In terms of the types of coordination listed by Haspelmath (2007) Kurdish shows asyndetic coordination, where no coordinator is present; bisyndetic coordination, reserved for emphasis (both A and B); and monosyndetic coordination, which is the predominant form. In this way, Kurdish patterns in a way that is similar to most European languages (Haspelmath 2007, p. 17) as well as neighbouring languages such as Persian and Arabic. The monosyndetic

coordination types found in the corpus are both the prepositive A co-B (where co- stands for coordinator) and the postpositive type A B-co, the latter appearing primarily in CK. Coordinators are generally independent particles, though the CK postpositive construction relies on the enclitic particle *-îş*.

In his discussion of the CK Mukri dialect, Öpengin (2016, pp. 129-133) notes a preference for juxtaposition in the conjoining of clauses (asyndetic coordination) when two verbs express parallel events. Juxtaposition or asyndetic paratactic ordering is also flagged by Yusupova (2017, pp. 99-104) for literary Gorani and by Bedir Khan and Lescot (1970, pp. 335-339) for formal Kurmanji. Descriptive accounts of individual Kurdish varieties otherwise tend to list a similar inventory of conjunctions. Drawing on Öpengin (2016, pp. 129-133) as an example, we can expect *û* and *we* ‘and’ for conjunctives, *yân* ‘or’ for disjunctive (other sources list *ya* or *an*, or *ga ... ga* for Gorani), *hem .. hem* ‘both .. and’ for positive contrastive conjunctive and its negative counterpart *ne .. ne* ‘neither .. nor’ (or *çi .. çi* as listed for Sorani by Blau 1980, pp. 149-156, *nam .. nam* for Gorani by Yusupova 2017, pp. 99-104). According to Öpengin (2016, p. 133), the additive clitic *-îş* is used in Mukri for contrastive coordination, to topicalise an argument that differs among two coordinated clauses that are otherwise parallel (cf. Yusupova 2017, pp. 99-104 on Gorani *-îç*). Attested adversatives include *eman*, *beîam* and *welî* for CK (Öpengin 2016, p. 132). Fattah (2000, p. 692ff.) presents a similar inventory and distribution for SK dialects. The postpositive construction is not described for NK (Kurmanji) dialects but is attested in the corpus for some NK varieties of northern Iraq. Descriptive accounts of NK otherwise tend to give little attention to clause combining.

2.1 Conjunctive/additive

Asyndetic conjunctive coordination is frequently found where two predications convey overlapping events rather than temporal succession and are presented as a single integrated state of affairs:

- (1) K-030 Nusaybin, Turkey: 20
ez wê dr-ê di-rûnişt-im mi ji
 I.NOM that.OBL place-OBL PRG-sat-1SG I.OBL from
xwe re k'ît'ab di-xwend-in
 REFL to book PRG-read-PL
 ‘I would sit there and read books.’

The conjunctive coordinator *û* (also *we/-w* in CK) organises predications as separate information units or demarcated states of affairs:

- (2) K-033 Qamishli, Syria: 28
mi derisand k'îmya sal-a ç'ara, û mi
 I.OBL studied chemistry year-F fourth and I.OBL

derisand k'ullîy-a rîyada sal-a didûwa
 studied faculty-F maths year-F second
 'I taught chemistry in the fourth year, and I taught at the mathematics department during the second year.'

In NK, *û* appears in the serialisation of predications in an event sequence, often opening with background actions leading to the main event in the story (in the following case a major change in the narrator's life):

(3) K-021 Mosul, Iraq, 11:

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
| <i>Û</i> | <i>ez</i> | <i>çû-m/</i> | <i>yeñî</i> | <i>min</i> | <i>hindek</i> | <i>tişt</i> |
| and | I.NOM | went-1SG | that.is | I.OBL | some | thing |
| <i>ji</i> | <i>xwe</i> | <i>re</i> | <i>kirî-n</i> | <i>û</i> | <i>ev,</i> | |
| from | REFL | to | bought-PL | and | this | |
| <i>û</i> | <i>ş/</i> | <i>xelek</i> | <i>kir-n-e</i> | <i>dest-ê</i> | <i>mi</i> | <i>de</i> |
| and | | bracelet | did-PL-PRF | hand-M | I.OBL | in |
| <i>hingî,</i> | | | | | | |
| then | | | | | | |
| <i>û</i> | <i>paş</i> | <i>şuxl-ê</i> | <i>xwe</i> | <i>me</i> | <i>k'emil</i> | <i>kir</i> |
| and | after | work-M | REFL | we.OBL | continue | did |
| <i>û</i> | <i>ez</i> | <i>ç'û-m-e/</i> | <i>ez</i> | <i>ç'û-m-e</i> | <i>şemman,</i> | <i>Urdun.</i> |
| and | I.NOM | went-1SG-PRF | I.NOM | went-1SG-PRF | Amman | Jordan |

'And I went/ that is I bought some things for myself and so on,
 and then they put bracelets on my wrist,
 and then we arranged our things
 and I went/ I went to Amman, Jordan.'

Note that the temporal sequencing is highlighted by combining the coordinator with a temporal deixis: *û paş* 'and then'. I return to sequential devices below.

A further use of the coordinator *û* is to signal continuation of the speaker's turn, for example where the speaker provides an afterthought or clarification for a preceding proposition:

(4) K-030 Nusaybin, Turkey, 31-32:

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------------|
| <i>k'es-ê</i> | <i>go</i> | <i>li</i> | <i>bajêr</i> | <i>bû-n</i> | | |
| person-EZ.PL | REL | in | town.OBL | was-PL | | |
| <i>ê</i> | <i>di</i> | <i>nav</i> | <i>bajêr</i> | <i>bi</i> | <i>xwe</i> | <i>de,</i> |
| PL | in | among | town.OBL | with | REFL | in |
| <i>nava</i> | <i>Nisêbîn-ê</i> | <i>de,</i> | <i>bajar-î</i> | <i>bû-n.</i> | | |
| among | Nusaybin-OBL | in | town-OBL | was-PL | | |
| <i>Û</i> | <i>Nisêbîn</i> | <i>bajar-ek-î</i> | <i>gelekî</i> | <i>piçûçik</i> | <i>bû,</i> | |
| and | Nusaybin | town-INDEF-EZ | very | small | was | |

'Those who were in the city, inside the city itself, inside Nusaybin, they were city-dwellers.
 And Nusaybin was a very small city.'

In the CK samples, *û/-w* appears primarily as a linker of nominal entities including infinitive forms. However, it can also link finite predications when the speaker is drawing a generic inventory of actions, as in the following two descriptions of celebrations:

(5) S-027 Erbil, Iraq, 9:

| | | | | | |
|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| <i>Heſleye</i> | <i>xwardin</i> | <i>de-xur-ê</i> | <i>û</i> | <i>ſîrinatî</i> | |
| wedding | food | PRG-eaten-3SG | and | sweet | |
| <i>de-xur-êtin</i> | | | | | |
| PROG-eaten-PL | | | | | |
| <i>û</i> | <i>kurr-eke-ſ</i> | <i>ew</i> | <i>ſite-y</i> | <i>ke</i> | <i>le</i> |
| and | boy-DEF-too | he | thing-EZ | REL | in |
| <i>bo</i> | <i>afret-eke-y</i> | <i>kirdî-ye</i> | <i>weku</i> | <i>zêrr,</i> | <i>altûn,</i> |
| for | woman-DEF-EZ | bought-PRF | like | gold | gold |
| <i>ew</i> | <i>ſit-an-ey</i> | <i>pêwe</i> | <i>de-kr-êtin.</i> | | |
| this | thing-PL-EZ | out | PRG-done-PL | | |

‘At the wedding, food is eaten and sweets are eaten, and the things that the man has bought for the woman, such as gold, those things are displayed.’

(6) S-034 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq, 38:

| | | | | |
|---------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------------|-------------|
| <i>Duwayî</i> | <i>Newroz-ewe</i> | <i>hemûy</i> | <i>e-ç-ê</i> | |
| after | Newroz-INT | all | PRG-go-3SG | |
| <i>bo</i> | <i>seyran,</i> | <i>bo</i> | <i>deſt û der,</i> | |
| for | picnic | for | outdoors | |
| <i>agir</i> | <i>kird-in-ewe-w</i> | <i>barbekî-w</i> | <i>yaprax</i> | |
| fire | make-INF-INT-and | BBQ-and | vine leaves | |
| <i>û,</i> | <i>le geſ</i> | <i>biryani-w</i> | <i>ça-w</i> | <i>goſt</i> |
| and | with | biryani-and | tea-and | meat |
| <i>û</i> | <i>em</i> | <i>hemû</i> | <i>e-kirr-êt</i> | |
| and | these | all | PRG-bought-3SG | |
| <i>û</i> | <i>em</i> | <i>hemû</i> | <i>e-bir-êt.</i> | |
| and | these | all | PRG-brought-3SG | |

‘After Newroz they all go to have a picnic in the countryside, building fires and barbecues and stuffed vine leaves with biryani, and tea and meat and all these are bought and are all brought along.’

Conjunctive linking also appears in CK samples where elaboration is required through a conjoined state of affairs in order to complete an information category that would otherwise not be understood. The conjunctive particle *û* and the postpositive conjunctive clitic *-îſ* both perform this function:

- (7) S-037 Bukan, Iran, 27:
Îtir, ew kate ême mendał bûy-n
 well that when we child was-PL
û ew şit-ane-man ne-de-zanî.
 and that thing-PL-1PL NEG-PRG-knew
 ‘Well, at that time we were kids and we didn’t know about these things.’

- (8) S-076 Mawat, Iraq, 30:
min zor minał bû-m,
 I much child was-1SG
zor-îş e-tirsa-m be şew
 much-too PRG-feared-1SG at night
ke e-rroyşt-me derewe
 COMP PRG-went-1SG outside
 ‘I was a little child and I was very scared when we went outside in the night.’

As a conjunctive device for chaining events, CK samples tend to rely on a combination of the particle *û/-w* and the clitic *-îş*:

- (9) S-037 Bukan, Iran, 13:
Duway ew-ekan-ê,
 after that-DEF.PL-OBL
kitse zor zor zor de-tirsa
 girl very very very PRG-feared
W-emin-îş/ emin dişxoş-îm de-da-w
 and-I-too I happy-1SG PRG-gave-and
m-kut: “le çî de-tirs-î?”
 I-said on what PRG-fear-2SG
 ‘After that the girl was very afraid.
 And I/ I would console her saying: “what are you afraid of?”’

- (10) S-051 Saqqez, Iran, 29-30:
Le ber dirg-aka-y e-westa-n
 at on gate-DEF-OBL PRG-stood-PL
û musafir-ekan-îş be sef
 and passenger-DEF.PL-too at line
da-ne da-ne e-rroyşt-in.
 gave-PL gave-PL PRG-went-PL
 ‘They stood at the gate
 and the passengers began leaving in a queue.’

2.2 Focused conjunctive

In NK, the postpositive particle *jî* expresses conjunctive focus that contrasts referents and states of affairs, indicating that continuity or a resulting state of affairs is unexpected or otherwise particularly noteworthy, often as it gives rise to an event that is regarded as precarious:

(11) K-027 Muradiye, Turkey, 2-3:

| | | | | | | |
|------------|---------------|------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------|------------|
| <i>me</i> | <i>ç'end</i> | <i>heb</i> | <i>deprem</i> | <i>dîti-bû-n</i> | | |
| we.OBL | some | piece | earthquake | saw-PLU-PL | | |
| <i>ema</i> | <i>hindik</i> | <i>ne</i> | <i>zêde</i> | <i>di-hejîya-n.</i> | | |
| but | litte | not | very | PRG-shaken-PL | | |
| <i>Me</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>go</i> | <i>ev</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>feynî</i> | <i>ye.</i> |
| we.OBL | too | said | this | too | same | is |

'We had experienced a few earthquakes,
but small, they didn't shake much.
And so we thought that this would be the same.'

(12) K-027 Muradiye, Turkey, 13:

| | | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| <i>Gund-ê</i> | <i>me</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>gelek</i> | <i>sar</i> | <i>e.</i> |
| village-M | we.OBL | too | very | cold | is |
| <i>Em</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>usa</i> | <i>gund</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>ma-n.</i> |
| we.NOM | too | thus | village | in | stayed-PL |

'And our village is very cold.
And so we just stayed in the village like that.'

In CK, the postpositive clitic can be used for conjunctive focus:

(13) S-042 Khalifan, Iraq, 18-19:

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
| <i>Ewca</i> | <i>rrism-eç-î</i> | <i>dî</i> | <i>wahanê</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>me</i> | <i>girt.</i> |
| then | picture-IDF-EZ | other | nice | in | we.OBL | took |
| <i>Dûy</i> | <i>hincî-ş,</i> | <i>ewca</i> | <i>ewe-ş</i> | <i>xelaz</i> | <i>bû.</i> | |
| after | then-too | then | that-too | finish | was | |

'Then he took such a nice of picture of us.
So then, then that too was over.'

Both NK and CK samples use *hem .. hem* 'both ... and' for emphatic conjunctive effect, expressing an unexpected addition that is needed in order to complete an information category. Typically, the conjoined units are of two orders: the first presupposed (often a reiteration of immediately preceding verbalised content), the second new. In both NK and CK the construction often incorporates the focused conjunctive particle or clitic, respectively:

- (14) K-059 Kulp, Turkey, 34:
em jî çû-n wê derê,
 we too went-PL there
hem çû-n wê derê,
 both went-PL there
hem jî çû-n Qulp-ê
 both too went-PL Kulp-OBL
 ‘We also went there,
 we went there and we also went to Kulp’

- (15) S-045 Shaqlawa, Iraq, 2:
Xesûw-ek-im he-bû, hem
 mother-in-law-IND-1SG exist-PST both
dak-îş bû hem
 mother-too was both
xesû-ş bû
 mother-in-law-too was
 ‘I had a mother-in-law,
 She was both a mother and a mother-in-law to me’

2.3 Alignment and co-referentiality

Matras (1997) describes co-referent deletion as optional in Kurmanji but constrained to some degree by the morphological marking of the agent and different agreement patterns in past-tense transitive and intransitive clauses (ergativity). Overt pronominal marking is preferred when the clash in agreement and case marking is most pronounced. Thus, co-referent deletion is more likely to occur with third person subjects where case marking is often blurred due to analogical levelling and agreement with the verb is in the default form, whereas with first person subjects co-referent deletion is avoided across predications with different alignment patterns. Also discussing Kurmanji, Haig (1998, pp. 161-162) remarks that co-referential subject deletion is common in literary texts regardless of the morphological marking of A (the transitive Agent) but that speaker consultants showed a preference for deletion when the subjects were in the same morphological case. Discussing Zazaki, Paul (1998, p. 140) mentions a similar pattern to the one observed by Matras (1997), namely a tendency for the omission of co-referential subjects across different alignment patterns for third person subjects while co-referential first and second person subjects are repeated.

Data from the free speech corpus appear to confirm these impressions: In NK, co-referential subjects tend to be expressed overtly through a pronoun in the second clause when the clauses differ in alignment (transitive-intransitive), but no such tendency is observed in CK, where instead A (the transitive agent) is marked by a clitic on the direct object of the transitive clause and S (the intransitive subject) is marked through agreement on the intransitive verb:

(16) K-021 Mosul, Iraq, 106:

me xilas kir û em hat-ne dereng
we.OBL finish did and we.NOM came-PL.PRF late
'We finished and we came late.'

(17) S-051 Saqqez, Iran, 9:

subhan-êk-man xuard û suwar-î qetar bûy-n
breakfast-IDF-1PL ate and board-EZ train was-PL
'We had breakfast and boarded the train.'

The elicitation data confirm these tendencies for the subordinated sentence 'When I was young, I knew the town' which contains a co-referential first person subject in a past tense intransitive and transitive clause. Across 37 samples in MDKD that contain the phrase, all NK samples but 2 show repetition of the pronoun while all CK samples appear to avoid an overt pronoun in the second clause (showing insetad inflectional subject marking on the intransitive verb and enclitic subject marking on the direct object of the transitive clause), with an optional subject pronoun at the beginning of the construction:

(18) K-009, Şırnak, Turkey:

waxtê ez gênc bû-m min bajar nas-di-kir
when I.NOM young was-1SG I.OBL town knew-PRG-did
'When I was young, I knew the town'

(19) S-012, Erbil, Iraq:

men ke buçuk bû-m gund-eke-m de-nasî
I when small was-1SG town-DEF-1SG PRG-knew
'When I was young, I knew the town'

2.4 Disjunctive

The free speech corpus contains relatively few instances of disjunctive coordination. Disjunction can be expressed by paratactic (asyndetic) means when the speaker presents a chain of options:

(20) S-048 Baneh, Iran: 65:

Kabra xo na-zan-ê to baş î,
man REFL NEG-know-3SG you good are.2SG
xirap î, çî-t
bad are.2SG what-2SG
'The man doesn't know if you are good, or you are bad, or what you are.'

In NK samples from Turkey, reduplication with sound substitution to /m/ is found, replicating a structure from Turkish to express an open alternative unit

within a circumscribed general information category (in this case the participants in a wedding):

(21) K-023 İmranlı, Turkey, 26:

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|
| <i>Zarî</i> | <i>me,</i> | <i>t'abî</i> | <i>qıcık</i> | <i>im,</i> | |
| child | am.1SG | of course | girl | am.1SG | |
| <i>afêdersin</i> | <i>damat</i> | <i>mamat</i> | <i>kes-an</i> | <i>nas</i> | <i>na-k-im.</i> |
| excuse | groom | (m)groom | someone-OBL.PL | know | NEG-do-1SG |

'I was a child, so of course I was small, excuse me I did not know the groom or anyone.'

Disjunctive coordinators are (*y*)*an* (mainly in NK) and *ya* (mainly CK and SK). The monosyndetic structure 'co A' is used to override a previous information unit and introduce an alternative realisation of the same information category as part of the speaker's unfolding plan for the utterance:

(22) K-021 Mosul, Iraq, 79:

| | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------|----------------|---------------|--------------|---------------|
| <i>zava</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>hema</i> | <i>nefs-ê</i> | <i>cil-ê</i> | <i>xwe</i> |
| groom | too | exactly | self-OBL | dress-M | REFL |
| <i>li</i> | <i>xwe</i> | <i>di-k-e,</i> | | | |
| on | REFL | PRG-do-3SG | | | |
| <i>an</i> | <i>cil-ê</i> | <i>kurdî</i> | <i>li</i> | <i>xwe</i> | <i>di-k-ê</i> |
| or | dress-M | Kurdish | on | REFL | PRG-do-3SG |

'The groom wears his own dress, or he wears Kurdish garments.'

In NK the disjunctive coordinator is sometimes combined with the conjunctive focus marker *jî* to shift the focus away from the previous realisation of the information category, emphasising the annulment of the previous information unit and its substitution by a new one:

(23) K-027 Muradiye, Turkey, 22:

| | | | | | |
|-------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| <i>ç'il</i> | <i>pêncî</i> | <i>metre</i> | <i>yan</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>belkî</i> |
| forty | fifty | metre | or | too | maybe |
| <i>şêst</i> | <i>heftê</i> | <i>metre</i> | <i>ani-n-e</i> | <i>dûr</i> | |
| sixty | seventy | metre | brought-PL-PRF | far | |

'They moved it away by forty to fifty or maybe sixty to seventy metres.'

The monosyndetic disjunctive coordinator can also be repeated in the chaining or listing of a series of optional information units as possible realisations of a single information category, within an unfolding plan for the utterance:

(24) K-036 Duhok, Iraq, 23

| | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| <i>kezaxe</i> | <i>b-it</i> | <i>yan</i> | <i>kolanê</i> | <i>b-it</i> |
| pruning | be.SBJ-3SG | or | digging | be.SBJ-3SG |
| <i>yan</i> | <i>çinînê</i> | <i>b-itin</i> | | |

or picking be.SBJ-PL
 ‘Be it pruning or digging or picking.’

Disjunctive coordination can operate at the discourse level, as the speaker returns to the manner of presenting a proposition rather than to the content of the information category itself:

- (25) S-037 Bukan, Iran, 6
bûy-n-e wekû refîq-êk,
 was-PL-PRF like friend-IDF
ya wekû be lay-î ziman-î
 or like in-EZ language-EZ
xo-man bi-lê-m wekû dost-êk
 REFL-1PL SBJ-say-1SG like lover-IDF
 ‘We were like friends,
 or as I would say in our language like lovers.’

The bisyndetic structure ‘co A co B’ is used as part of a pre-planned utterance structure to indicate contrasting information units as alternative realisations of the same information category:

- (26) S-039 Sardasht, Iran, 18:
Meîmûlen-îş le talar-ekan ya nehar
 usually-too in hall-DEF.PL or lunch
de-de-n êstakanê ya şam de-de-n
 PRG-give-PL now or dinner PRG-give-PL
 ‘And usually in the halls, now they either serve lunch or they serve dinner.’

The following example illustrates two different disjunctive structures: the first (monosyndetic) introduces an explanatory state of affairs as an enhancement rather than alternative realisation of a preceding information category, while the second (bisyndetic) provides a pre-planned organisation template for information units that constitute alternative realisations of an information category (indicating here that just one of the two families is grieving):

- (27) K-042 Zakho, Iraq, 16-17:
ne divêt gele qerebalix çêb-it.
 not must much noise become.SBJ-3SG
An êk carî heger an
 or one time if or
mal-a bîk-ê an mal-a zava-yî
 house-F bride-OBL or house-F groom-OBL
tazi-yek heb-it.
 mourning-IDF exist.SBJ-3SG
 ‘They don’t want much noise to be made.
 Or in case either the family of the bride or the family of the groom have a period of mourning.’

2.5 Adversative/Contrastive

Like the other coordination types adversative meanings can be derived from a paratactic (asyndetic) structure, building on presuppositions and an anticipated causal chain that is broken:

(28) K-025 Çukurca, 2:

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|----------------------|------------------|
| <i>gund</i> | <i>bi</i> | <i>gund</i> | <i>ç'û-n-e</i> , |
| village | on | village | went-PL-PRF |
| <i>kes-ê</i> | <i>qebûl</i> | <i>ne-kir-in-e</i> . | |
| person-OBL | accept | NEG-did-PL-PRF | |

'They went from village to village, but nobody accepted them.'

Explicit expression of adversative coordination relies on the prepositive monosyndetic structure 'co A', though sometimes we find combinations of coordinators, as in NK in Turkey *lê ema*. There is a variety of adversative coordinators in the corpus with apparent regional as well as individual preferences. The adversative *belê* occurs in NK samples from the Hakkari province in Turkey, while its cognate *belam* is found in CK and the related *lê* is found in some NK samples from Turkey and Syria, often alongside one of the other coordinators, apparently correlating with exposure to Kurmanji literacy, as far as our meta-data reveal. The coordinator *ema/hema/ama* coinciding with the Turkish adversative *ama* (a contrastive focus marker from Arabic) is found in NK samples from Turkey and some CK samples from Iran. The coordinator *bes* borrowed from Arabic appears in NK samples from Syria and Iraq and in some CK and SK samples from Iraq. The Persian borrowing *welî* is found in CK and SK samples from Iran. The contrastive-adversative is thus the most frequently borrowed coordinator, in line with predictions on the structural borrowing of connectors (Matras 1998, 2020).

Adversatives indicate a broken causal chain at the ideational level, re-directing the hearer to correct an expectation that arises from an immediately preceding proposition:

(29) K-090 Erzincan, Turkey, 3:

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------|----------------|
| <i>beklemîş</i> | <i>dikin-ê</i> | <i>belkî</i> | <i>di-b-ê</i> | | |
| wait | see-OBL | maybe | PRG-become-3SG | | |
| <i>tene</i> | <i>goşt</i> | <i>bi-d-ine</i> | <i>me,</i> | <i>ema</i> | <i>ne-d-in</i> |
| only | meat | SBJ-give-PL | we.OBL | but | NEG-give-PL |

'We waited to see whether they might just give us meat, but they didn't.'

(30) S-057 Khanaqin, Iraq, 28:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| <i>resmîyen</i> | <i>faîd</i> | <i>Diyale-s,</i> | <i>muḥafeze-y</i> | <i>Diyale,</i> |
| officially | belong | Diyala-OBL | province-EZ | Diyala |
| <i>belam</i> | <i>mentiqe-y</i> | <i>Kurdî</i> | <i>ye,</i> | |

| | | | | |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| but | region-EZ | Kurdish | is | |
| <i>hukûmet-î</i> | <i>Kurdî-ş</i> | <i>yarmetî</i> | <i>de-t,</i> | |
| government-EZ | Kurdish-too | help | give-3SG | |
| <i>bes</i> | <i>Îraq</i> | <i>na-twan</i> | <i>yarmetî</i> | <i>bi-de-t</i> |
| but | Iraq | NEG-can.3SG | help | SBJ-give-3SG |

‘Officially it belongs to Diyala, the Diyala province,
but it is a Kurdish region, the Kurdish government helps,
but Iraq doesn’t want to help.’

At the discourse level, the adversative returns to a previous position in the speaker’s turn, revising the hearer’s expectation in regard to the action that the speaker will deliver from that turn:

(31) S-035 Kalar, Iraq, 2:

| | | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------------|---------------|
| <i>Wela</i> | <i>çîrok</i> | <i>na-zan-im,</i> | |
| EXC | story | NEG-know-1SG | |
| <i>bes</i> | <i>bas-î</i> | <i>jiyan-im</i> | <i>e-k-em</i> |
| but | talk-EZ | life-1SG | PRG-do-1SG |

‘Well, I don’t know any stories, but I will talk about my life.’

2.6 Sequential

Sequential chaining involves the ordering of propositions attributing to them a relationship of succession either in the reconstruction of events or in regard to their position in the speaker’s organisation of utterances and turns, or both. The samples differ considerably in their inventory and distribution of sequential markers by dialect group, region and contact language as well as by individual speaker.

Four types of function are discussed in connection with the sequential ordering of information units: a) the temporal succession of reconstructed events in narration and descriptions, b) the sequential ordering of elements when taking an inventory in descriptions, c) the consequential relationship between an event or state of affairs and a preceding event, and d) the sequencing of utterances as turns or parts of turns in relation to the sharing of information and exchange of views between speaker and hearer through actions such as self-prompts and response initiation, re-affirmation of the hearer’s point of view, adding a perspective, and elucidation. The first three are tightly connected and we often find combinations of devices that bring about a layered or combined effect as well as overlap in the use of individual connectors to cover temporal ordering and inventory-taking, or temporal ordering and consequential reading. Turn-management devices are often borrowed discourse particles.

Temporal succession of events can be expressed by means of a relational expression (adposition) or deictic temporal reference equivalent to ‘thereafter’ or ‘then’. In NK, we find combinations of the preposition *piştî* ‘after’ and the adverbs *paşî* ‘later on’ and *hingî* ‘then’, each of which can also appear on its own:

- (32) K-021 Mosul, Iraq, 6:
ewilî ez dît-im,
 first I.NOM saw-1SG
paşî piştî hingî me dît/
 then after then we.OBL saw
hat-in ez xwast-im
 came-PL I.NOM wanted-1SG
 'First she saw me,
 then they came and asked for me.'

In CK, we find a corresponding use of the relational marker *duway* 'after, finally':

- (33) S-034 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq, 20:
Şeş mang le Erdin bû-m,
 six month in Jordan was-1SG
duwayî rroşt-im-ewe bo Kurdistan
 then went-1SG-INT to Kurdistan
 'I was in Jordan for six months,
 Then I went back to Kurdistan.'

In NK, the same device can be used to build **descriptive inventories** of routine events in generic descriptions as long as the information units appear in temporal succession:

- (34) K-042 Zakho, Iraq, 3-5
- | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|
| <i>Ewilî</i> | <i>di-bêj-in</i> | <i>kurê/[..]</i> | <i>mi</i> | <i>girtî</i> |
| first | PRG-say-PL | boy-OBL | we.OBL | took |
| <i>kiç-a</i> | <i>filan</i> | <i>kes-î</i> | <i>bi</i> | <i>dil-ê</i> |
| girl-F | any | person-OBL | at | heart-M |
| <i>me</i> | <i>ye,</i> | | | |
| we.OBL | is | | | |
| <i>Piştî</i> | <i>hingî [..]</i> | <i>ç-in</i> | <i>mal-a</i> | <i>bab-ê</i> |
| after | then | go-PL | house-F | father-M |
| <i>kiçik-ê,</i> | | | | |
| girl-OBL | | | | |
| <i>Piştî</i> | <i>hingî</i> | <i>yañî</i> | <i>dê</i> | <i>êk</i> |
| after | then | that.is | FUT | one |
| <i>û</i> | <i>du</i> | <i>nas</i> | <i>k-in</i> | <i>ewilî,</i> |
| and | two | know | SBJ.do-PL | first |
| <i>piştî</i> | <i>hingî</i> | <i>dê</i> | <i>kiçik</i> | <i>mi</i> |
| after | then | FUT | girl | we.OBL |
| <i>girtî</i> | <i>rism-ê</i> | <i>kurik-î</i> | <i>bîn-it</i> | |
| took | picture-M | boy-OBL | see.SBJ-3SG | |
| <i>an</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>hema</i> | <i>wusa</i> | <i>rû-bi-rûyî</i> |
| or | too | exactly | thus | face-to-face |

| | | | | |
|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|------------|
| <i>êk</i> | <i>û</i> | <i>du</i> | <i>bi-bîn-in.</i> | |
| one | and | two | SBJ-see-PL | |
| <i>Dê</i> | <i>piştî</i> | <i>hingê</i> | <i>qerar-a</i> | <i>xwe</i> |
| FUT | after | then | decision-F | REFL |

d-in.

give.SBJ-PL

'First they say to the boy, we saw this particular girl that we liked

Then, [...] they go together to the girl's father's house, [...]

Then, the girl we saw will see a picture of the boy, or they will just see each other face-to-face.

Then they will make their decision.'

In CK, the expression can also indicate succession in the delivery of information units at the level of the speaker's organisation of the utterance in descriptions, independently of temporal succession:

(35) S-031 Piranshahr, Iran, 17-19:

| | | | | |
|-------------------|------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|
| <i>Grranît</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>nawç-ekan-î</i> | <i>Pîranşar-u</i> | <i>Serdeşt</i> |
| granite | in | district-DEF.PL-EZ | Piranshar-and | Sardasht |
| <i>girranît-î</i> | <i>zor</i> | <i>benawbangî</i> | <i>he-ye</i> | |
| granite-EZ | much | well-known | exist-3SG | |
| <i>Duwaye</i> | <i>merrmerrî</i> | <i>he-ye,</i> | <i>wek</i> | <i>berd-î</i> |
| then | marble | exist-3SG | like | rock-EZ |
| <i>merrmerr</i> | <i>be</i> | <i>tsînî</i> | <i>heye.</i> | |
| marble | in | layer | exist.3SG | |
| <i>Duwaye</i> | <i>êwe-ş/</i> | <i>deryatse-yeç-î</i> | <i>zor</i> | <i>benawbang</i> |
| then | that-too | lake-IDF-EZ | very | famous |
| <i>le</i> | <i>Zirêbarî</i> | <i>he-ye.</i> | | |
| in | Zeribar | exist-3SG | | |

'Granite in the districts of Piranshar, and Sardasht is well known for granite.

Then it has marble, it has marble rocks in layers.

Then it has a famous/ lake in Zeribar.'

Two further CK markers of successive ordering are *îtir*, which is widespread in CK samples from Iraq and also found in Saqqez and Baneh in Iran, and *îdî* which appears in the CK and SK dialects of Iran in Sahne, Sardasht, and Naqadeh as well as in neighbouring Choman in Iraq (its NK equivalent *êdî* 'already' is not found in the corpus in sequential function). Both assume a similar role in drawing a sequential inventory in descriptions:

(36) S-056 Altun Kupri, Iraq, 19:

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| <i>Felaḥetî,</i> | <i>îtir</i> | <i>temate</i> | <i>bû,</i> | <i>îtir</i> | <i>bamye</i> | <i>bû,</i> |
| farming | then | tomato | was | then | okra | was |
| <i>îtir</i> | <i>zûrrat</i> | <i>bû,</i> | <i>kundzî</i> | <i>bû,</i> | <i>bîber</i> | <i>û</i> |
| then | corn | was | cucumber | was | pepper | and |
| | | | | | | <i>îtir</i> |

'Farming, then there was tomatoes, then there was okra, then there

was corn, there were cucumbers, peppers, and so on.'

(37) S-039 Sardasht, Iran, 26:

îdî duwaya bûk-u zawa de-be-n-ewe maê
 then after bride-and groom PRG-bring-PL-INT home
 'And then they take the bride and the groom home.'

In a similar function, some NK samples from Turkey draw on the Turkish borrowing *ondan sonra*:

(38) K-068 Kozluk, Turkey, 53-54

mesela işçi ne, li xest-ê
 for example worker are in hospital-M
Batman-ê da di-şixul-in, memûr in.
 Batman-OBL in PRG-work-PL civil servant are
Ondan sonra meflim he-ne
 that.ABL after teacher exist-PL
 'For instance there are workers, who work at the Batman hospital, they are civil servants,
 And then there are teachers.'

NK varieties in Syria and Iraq borrow the Arabic conjunctive connector *fe* which indicates **consequence**, inviting the hearer to process a new information unit explicitly against the background of a previous one that has been successfully completed:

(39) K-021 Mosul, Iraq, 71-72:

xelk-ê di-îezimîn-in gelek şalem t-ê cem
 people-OBL PRG-invite-PL much people PRG-come.3SG among
wa,
 them.OBL
Fe t-ê-n, keyf û xweşî t-ê-n
 and PRG-come-3PL joy and happiness PRG-come-3PL
 'They invite the people and many people come to their place.
 And so they come, they come in joy and happiness.'

In the CK samples, the markers *îtir* and *îdî* can be used to indicate a temporal sequence with consequential implication marking the first state of affairs as the point of departure that enables and facilitates the one that follows (a function that is not covered in the corpus by the sequential marker *duway*):

(40) S-048 Baneh, Iran, 22-24:

Fêrî döner bû-m, fêrî pîtza bû-m.
 learn kebab was-1SG learn pizza was-1SG
Îtir wirde wirde iş-eke fêr bû-m

| | | | | | |
|----------|-------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|---------------|
| then | step | step | work-DEF | learn | was-1SG |
| <i>û</i> | <i>îtir</i> | <i>daway</i> | <i>wereqe-y</i> | <i>îş-im</i> | <i>e-kird</i> |
| and | then | after | document-EZ | work-1SG | PRG-did |

'I learned to make döner kebab, I learnt to make pizza
So I learnt the job step by step,
and so then I applied for a work permit.'

(41) S-054 Choman, Iraq, 2-4:

| | | | | |
|---------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------|---------------|
| <i>wez-î</i> | <i>Kurdistan</i> | <i>be</i> | <i>îam</i> | <i>nexoj</i> |
| situation-EZ | Kurdistan | in | general | bad |
| <i>bû,</i> | <i>xelik</i> | <i>feqîr</i> | <i>bû.</i> | |
| was | people | poor | was | |
| <i>Îdî</i> | <i>eme</i> | <i>şînayîn</i> | <i>e-kir [...]</i> | |
| then | we | green.space | PRG-did | |
| <i>Îdî</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>meziray-ê</i> | <i>şînayîn</i> | <i>e-kir,</i> |
| then | in | countryside-OBL | green.space | PRG-did |
| <i>pêwîst</i> | <i>bû</i> | <i>îdî</i> | <i>şînayî</i> | <i>aw</i> |
| necessary | was | then | green.space | water |

bi-dey-n
SBJ-give-PL

'The situation in Kurdistan was generally bad, the people were poor
So we created green areas, [...]
So we created green areas in the countryside
so we had to water the green areas.'

Note the flexible position of these sequential markers: They typically occur in utterance-initial position but are not restricted to that position, and they can be combined with other connectors like *û* 'and'. This reflects the way they operate at the pragmatic level of organising and evaluating propositional units rather than as syntactic markers of clause connectivity. The marker *îtir* is also found in the corpus in a semi-grammaticalised function resembling that of a correlative in conditional and temporal constructions, where the subordinated clause sets out the pre-condition against which the successive event can take place:

(42) S-055 Kirkuk, Iraq, 68:

| | | | | |
|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|------------|
| <i>ew</i> | <i>minat-e</i> | <i>tozê</i> | <i>gewre</i> | <i>bû,</i> |
| this | child-DET | a little | big | was |
| <i>îtir</i> | <i>sûnet</i> | <i>he-ye</i> | | |
| then | circumcision | exist-3SG | | |

'[when] This child has grown up a bit, then there is circumcision.'

A widespread marker that specialises in ordering events in a temporal as well as consequential sequence is *înca/îca/îja/ewca* (from 'this time') found in the corpus in both NK and CK samples. Here too, the state of affairs introduced by the marker is dependent on the fulfilment of the preceding state of affairs, hence the combination of temporal succession and consequential readings:

- (43) S-033 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq, 15:
Pasport-î êraqî-yan derkird,
 passport-EZ Iraqi-3PL obtained
înca ray-an kird/ sefer-yan kird bo Urdin
 then way-3PL did travel-3PL did to Jordan
 ‘They obtained Iraqi passports,
 So then they left/ they travelled to Jordan.’

- (44) K-059 Kulp, Turkey, 48:
Yanî şûn-a wî de mekteb-ek tezê çêkir-in,
 that.is place-F it.OBL in school-IDF new constructed-PL
îca em çû-n mektev-ek dinê.
 then we went-PL school-IDF other
 ‘They built a new school in its place,
 So then we went to the other school.’

In some NK samples, *î(n)ca* takes on additional functions at the level of the organisation of actions of speech, introducing the speaker’s meta-comment on the state of affairs that is described at the ideational or propositional level:

- (45) K-024 Tatvan, Turkey, 29-30:
Piştê sê ç’ar saî-an me
 after three four year-PL we.OBL
t’emaşê kir k’estane girtîye.
 look did chestnut grew
Înca ç’i k’estanê mezin bî-n
 then what chestnut big was-PL
ç’i k’estanê xweş bî-n.
 what chestnut nice was-PL
Me wan k’estan-an ti-anîya,
 we.OBL these.OBL chestnut-OBL.PL PRG-brought
da-tanîya se sûb-ê,
 PRG-brought on oven-OBL
me ji xwe re ç’êtikir
 we.OBL from REFL to created.PRG
me ti-xwar.
 we.OBL PRG-ate
Înca ç’îrok-a min-a baxç-ê ev e.
 then story-F I.OBL-F garden-OBL this is
 ‘After three or four years, we looked and saw that the chestnut had grown.
 And what big chestnuts, what delicious chestnuts they were!
 We would bring those chestnuts, put them in the oven,
 we would prepare them for ourselves and we would eat.
 So this is my story with the garden.’

A transition from temporal-consequential ordering and the marking of pre-conditions for the realisation of states of affairs, to a device that is used for **turn management**, is found for *îtir*. Here, it signals a return to a preceding position as the point of departure for the completion of an adjacency pair and the speaker's self-prompt in response to the hearer's question:

(46) S-054 Choman, Iraq, 43-44:

Interviewer:

| | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|
| <i>Çi,</i> | <i>çî-yan</i> | <i>e-kird,</i> | <i>çwan</i> |
| what | what-3PL | PRG-did | how |
| <i>dest-yan</i> | <i>pê</i> | <i>e-kird?</i> | |
| hand-3PL | in.it | PRG-did | |

'What did they do, how would they start?'

Speaker:

| | | | | | |
|--------------|------------------|-----------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| <i>Îtir,</i> | <i>kiç</i> | <i>û</i> | <i>kurrek</i> | <i>lo</i> | <i>xo-yan</i> |
| then | girl | and | boy | in | REFL-3PL |
| <i>qise</i> | <i>e-kird-in</i> | <i>be</i> | <i>dizî,</i> | <i>pêştir,</i> | |
| talk | PRG-did-PL | on | secret | earlier | |

'So, first the boy and the girl would talk to each other secretly.'

The domain of turn management otherwise shows high susceptibility to borrowing as a result of which samples differ by region, contact language, and individual preference. In some samples we find *wele* or *wiḥayî* (of Arabic origin, also replicated from Turkish and Persian, respectively) in a role similar to that of *îtir* in the above example, processing the hearer's question as a point of departure for completion of the adjacency pair but here signalling the possibility of non-compliance with expectations, i.e. the likely introduction of a dispreferred second:

(47) K-059 Kulp, Turkey, 14-15:

Interviewer:

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|----------------|
| <i>Çima</i> | <i>jê</i> | <i>re</i> | <i>di-bê-n</i> | <i>Kanika?</i> |
| why | from.it | to | PRG-say-PL | Kanika |

'Why do they call it Kanika?'

Speaker:

| | | | | |
|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|
| <i>Wele</i> | <i>e-jî</i> | <i>ni-za-m</i> | <i>çima</i> | <i>di-bêj-in</i> |
| EXC | I.NOM-too | NEG-know-1SG | why | PRG-say-PL |

'Well, I don't know either why they call it that.'

By contrast, *îşte* borrowed from Turkish into some of the NK samples signals re-affirmation of the shared point of departure as it introduces a preferred second in the completion of the adjacency pair:

(48) K-068 Kozluk, Turkey, 8-9:

Interviewer:

| | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------|
| <i>Şîranî</i> | <i>peqlawa</i> | <i>meqlawa</i> | <i>tişte</i> | <i>na-xwaz-in?</i> |
| sweet | baklava | (m)baklava | something | NEG-want-PL |

'Don't they ask for any sweets, baklava or similar things?'

Speaker:

| | | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|------------|--------------|----------------|
| <i>Ee</i> | <i>îste</i> , | <i>ewil</i> | <i>tev</i> | <i>diyar</i> | <i>di-k-in</i> |
| DM | DM | first | all | decide | PRG-do-PL |

'Yes well, at the beginning they decide on everything.'

Internal to the speaker's own turn, *îste* serves to re-affirm a state of affairs that has been introduced while further elucidating it, using a preceding proposition as a shared anchor for the introduction of a new one:

(49) K-028 Pertek, Turkey, 42:

| | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>Yanî</i> | <i>ç'iqas</i> | <i>îste</i> | <i>penir-ê</i> | <i>te</i> |
| that.is | how much | DM | cheese-M | you.SG.OBL |
| <i>he-b-e-jî</i> | <i>pez-ê</i> | <i>te</i> | <i>he-b-e-jî</i> , | |
| exist-SBJ-3SG-too | sheep-EZ.PL | you.SG.OBL | exist-SBJ-3SG-too | |
| <i>îste</i> | <i>disa-jî</i> | <i>feqîr-jî</i> | <i>he-bû</i> | <i>yanî.</i> |
| DM | still-too | poor-too | exist-PST | that.is |

'No matter what cheese you have, sheep you have, well, there was still poverty.'

Another Turkish borrowing, *neyse*, introduces an added or new perspective in a speaker-oriented manner, re-capitulating the presupposition or shared information but with no explicit activation of hearer-sided expectations:

(50) K-023 İmranlı, Turkey, 8-9:

| | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|------------|--------------|------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
| <i>Derk'et</i> , | <i>şev</i> , | <i>"va</i> | <i>hat</i> , | <i>vay</i> | <i>nîvan-î</i> | <i>me</i> | <i>hat."</i> |
| fell | evening | they | came | these | guest-EZ | we.OBL | came |
| <i>Neyse</i> | <i>nîvan</i> | <i>du</i> | <i>t'ene</i> | <i>sê</i> | <i>t'ene</i> | <i>mêr</i> | <i>ine.</i> |
| DM | guest | two | time | three | time | man | are |

'He went out, at night, "they've arrived, our guests have arrived."
Anyways, the guests were two or three men.'

Finally, all samples show the discourse particle *yanî*, originally Arabic (from 'that means') but part of the common stock of particles of all languages in the region. It is used as filler and tag, signalling mere elucidation (rather than adding a new perspective) of the speaker's statement, again without explicitly processing hearer-sided expectations:

(51) S-052 Kamyaran, Iran, 19:

| | | | | | |
|------------------|--------------|-----------------|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| <i>Zor</i> | <i>calib</i> | <i>e</i> , | <i>yanî</i> | <i>eslen</i> | <i>serinc</i> |
| very | noteworthy | is | that.is | essentially | attention |
| <i>na-dey-ne</i> | <i>ew</i> | <i>şit-ane.</i> | | | |
| NEG-give-PL | this | thing-PL | | | |

'It is interesting, that is essentially we don't pay attention to such things.'

(52) K-037 Kobani, Syria, 23:

| | | | | | | | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|----------------|---------------|-----------|
| <i>Kobanê</i> | <i>di</i> | <i>vê</i> | <i>tişt-ê</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>pir</i> | <i>meşhûr</i> | <i>e,</i> |
| Kobani | in | this.OBL | thing-OBL | in | very | famous | is |
| <i>yanî</i> | <i>navdar</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>di</i> | <i>vê</i> | <i>şixul-ê</i> | <i>de.</i> | |
| that.is | famous | is | in | this.OBL | work-OBL | in | |

‘Kobani is very well known, that is, it is famous in this regard.’

2.7 Summary of coordinators and sequential markers

One of the striking features of the connectors and particles covered in this section is their strong tendency toward polyfunctionality, semantic and in particular pragmatic. A taxonomy of connectors must therefore take into consideration several simultaneously operating functional domains. First, we find a distinction between items that allow the speaker to order information units as part of a gradually unfolding plan for the utterance, contrasting with those that are used for pre-planned ordering in the shape of bisyndetic templates for conjunctive and disjunctive focus, respectively (*hem .. hem* ‘both .. and’, *yan .. yan* ‘either or’). Next, connectors and particles show different degrees of reliance on presupposed or shared information. These range from the lower side of intervention with hearer-sided processing, exhibited by items like conjunctive/additive connector *û*, the pre-planned focused connector *hem*, and the disjunctives *ya* (unfolding plan) and *ya(n) ..ya(n)* (pre-planned), to more moderate intervention such as the conjunctive focus markers *jî* and *-îş* and the various temporal and consequential sequencing devices that re-focus hearer-sided expectations and shared information, and on to more explicit intervention with hearer-sided expectations through adversative connectors and turn-management particles. Finally we see the relevant elements operating at three different plains (cf. Schiffrin 1987): the internal organisation of propositional content and relations between events; the ordering of the speaker’s actions of speech; and the organisation of turns at the interactional level. A grammaticalisation path presents itself in the transition between the latter two domains and we find devices of temporal ordering in reconstructed event chains assuming functions at the discourse level that process hearer expectations and infiltrate turn-management strategies. The relationship between these levels must therefore be seen as a cline; this is well illustrated by the way in which markers of temporal ordering assume consequential meanings, and consequential markers indicate second-turns in adjacency pairs.

The plurality of markers in the corpus is a reflection of these productive grammaticalisation paths. The shared stock of connectors covers the primary coordinating functions conjunction (addition) and disjunction, including their focused or emphatic counterparts as well as to some extent contrast (adversative), subject to the impact of contact languages. These are widely shared not just across the Kurdish varieties but also with neighbouring languages, particularly Iranian and Turkic languages and in part also Arabic and Neo-Aramaic. We find on the other hand rather clear divisions between NK and CK in the form and distribution of many of the markers that convey temporal sequencing and consequential ordering, as well as different adversative

connectors and turn-management particles, reflecting the high susceptibility to contact influence of markers that convey a high degree of intervention with hearer-sided processing of propositions and turns (cf. Matras 1998).

The difference in morphological typology between NK and CK, which latter relies more heavily on clitics, is reflected in the nature of the focus markers NK *jî* compared to CK *-îş* as well as in referent tracking in the conjoining of past-tense transitive and intransitive clauses.

3. Relative clauses

Relative clauses are subordinate clauses that function as modifiers of nouns. They are embedded into noun phrases, delimiting the reference to an NP by specifying its role as the state of affairs described in the relative clause (Andrews 2007; Givón 1990, pp. 645ff). Restrictive relative clauses involve two states of affairs, one of which is dependent and provides specification about a participant of the other, identifying it within a set of possible referents by means of a proposition that is known to the hearer; non-restrictive relative clauses provide additional information about a participant without identifying it within a set of possible referents (Cristofaro (2003, p. 195ff; Givón 1990 pp. 645ff).

Drawing on the structural parameters described in these and other sources, Kurdish relative clauses can be described as external to and generally following the head NP. They are separated from that NP by a linker or relativiser that is also used in other subordinating functions and does not take nominal case. A coreferential NP within the relative clause is either omitted or expressed pronominally; resumptive pronouns are usually limited to positions that rank lower on the accessibility hierarchy as formulated by Keenan and Comrie (1977). The verb form in Kurdish relative clauses is finite and not de-ranked (cf. Cristofaro 2003). A distinctive trait of Kurdish relative clauses is the reliance on nominal attributive (*ezafe*) markers, often in combination with the uninflected subordinator.

For Standard Sorani, McCarus (2009, pp. 620-626) notes that relative clauses are introduced by the subordinator *ke* and that the relative connector (*ezafe* or nominal attributive marker) *-î* precedes it if the antecedent is definite and the relative clause is restrictive, while a resumptive pronoun in the form of an enclitic marker appears when the head noun is not the subject of the relative clause. Blau (1980, p. 156) notes that in Sorani the *ezafe* particle can function as relativiser without *ke* and that *ke* can follow the *ezafe* marker *-y* or the definitive particle *-e*. For Mukri, Öpengin (2016, pp. 114-116) names three relativizing elements: the particle *ke* for restrictive and non-restrictive relative clauses, the *ezafe* suffix *-î* for restrictive relative clauses, and the oblique form of the third person pronoun *ewî*. The latter matches the form *ewey* recorded by MacKenzie (1961, pp. 131-133) for CK. For NK there is agreement that the relativiser *ku* follows the attributive (*ezafe*) particle, which is inflected for gender or number, while a relative clause that is not adjoined to the head noun is introduced by the

independent attributive (ezafe) marker *-yê* etc. (MacKenzie 1961 pp. 203-204; Bedir Khan and Lescot 1970, pp. 335-339; Thackston (2006a, p. 75).

In the MDKD free speech corpus we often find the pragmatic equivalent of relative clauses expressed by a paratactic structure:

- (53) S-055 Kirkuk, Iraq, 50:
mesela ênca xelik he-bû pare-y da-ana
 for example then people exist-PST money-OBL PRG-brought
 ‘So for example there were people who would bring money.’

Non-restrictive relative clauses appear seldom in the corpus, and a paratactic elaboration strategy is preferred:

- (54) K-099 Ad Darbasiyah, Syria, 6:
mezn-ê wan meselen ti kar-i bê
 big-M they.OBL for example you.SG.NOM can-2SG say.SBJ.2SG
Abû newaf
ewî xwe kirîy-i mezn-ê azîza anha
 he.OBL REFL made-PRF big-M Aziza now
 ‘You can say that their head figure is Abu Nawaf
 who nowadays has nominated himself as the head of Aziza.’

Canonical non-restrictive relative clauses are rare:

- (55) S-039 Sardasht, Iran, 2:
yêk-ek le melay-ekan-î nêw
 one-IDF in mullah-DEF.PL-EZ among
şar-î d-ên-in eh/ ke bi-twan-ê
 city-OBL PRG-bring-PL REL SBJ-can-3SG
xutbe-w ew şit-ane-y ke
 sermon-and that thing-PL-OBL REL
he-ye bi-xwên-êt-ewe
 exist-3SG SBJ-read-3SG-INT
 ‘They bring one of the local Mullahs uh/ who can give a sermon, read what has to be read.’

- (56) K-033 Qamishli, Syria, 19:
xuh-a mi, a huqûq di-xwend
 sister-F I.OBL F law PRG-studied
li camiî-a Heleb-ê,
 in university Aleppo-OBL
wêna ez qane kiri-bû-m ez
 she.OBL I.NOM convince did-PLU-1SG I.NOM
veger-im xwendin-ê
 return.SBJ-1SG study-OBL
 ‘My sister, who was studying law at the university of Aleppo, she

convinced me to return to studying.’

The majority of relative clauses in the corpus are restrictive; their NP is typically specified by a determiner:

(57) S-039 Sardasht, Iran, 17:

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|---------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <i>ew</i> | <i>xetk-e</i> | <i>ke</i> | <i>bang</i> | <i>de-krê-n</i> |
| this | people-DET | REL | invite | PRG-done-PL |
| <i>bo</i> | <i>xo-yan</i> | <i>şit-êk</i> | <i>d-ên-in</i> | |
| for | REFL-3PL | thing-IDF | PRG-bring-PL | |

‘The people who are invited bring something.’

(58) K-048 Kanyder, Iraq, 26:

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| <i>Ez</i> | <i>yêkek</i> | <i>bû-m</i> | <i>ji</i> | <i>wa</i> | <i>pêşmerg-êd</i> | |
| I.NOM | one-IDF | was-1SG | from | those.OBL | fighter-EZ.PL | |
| <i>ku</i> | <i>beşdarî</i> | <i>di</i> | <i>Şorriş-a</i> | <i>Gulan-ê</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>kirdi</i> |
| REL | part | in | uprising-F | Gulan-OBL | in | did |

‘I was one of the soldiers who took part in the Gulan uprising.’

Relative clauses attached to a head noun indicating place of location are used to supplement information on location in connection with a main clause:

(59) K-028 Pertek, Turkey, 26:

| | | | | | |
|--------------|-----------|------------------|------------|---------------|-----------|
| <i>der-ê</i> | <i>ku</i> | <i>çêre</i> | <i>lê</i> | <i>pirr</i> | <i>e,</i> |
| place-EZ.PL | REL | pasture | in.it | many | is |
| <i>me</i> | <i>ew</i> | <i>te-bir-in</i> | <i>wan</i> | <i>der-an</i> | |
| we.OBL | that | PRG-bring-PL | those.OBL | place-OBL.PL | |

‘The places where there are many pastures, we would bring them to such places.’

Relative clauses can also encode a secondary state of affairs that is used to modify a principal state of affairs without being attached to a head NP. In NK, these are typically introduced by the independent attributive particle along with the subordinator *ku*. In CK they are typically introduced by the demonstrative with attributive particle *ewe-y* in conjunction with the subordinator *ke*:

(60) K-078 Şemdinli, Turkey, 31:

| | | | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-----------|----------------|-----------|------------|----------------|
| <i>yêd</i> | <i>ko</i> | <i>wi</i> | <i>zeman-i</i> | <i>ez</i> | <i>bîr</i> | <i>ne-ke-m</i> |
| EZ.PL | REL | that.OBL | time-OBL | I.OBL | mind | NEG-do-1SG |

‘Those things of that time I do not forget.’

(61) K-068 Kozluk, Turkey, 65:

| | | | | | | | |
|----------|-----------|------------------|----------|--------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| <i>A</i> | <i>ku</i> | <i>di-xwîn-e</i> | <i>û</i> | <i>derva</i> | <i>ye</i> | <i>ez</i> | <i>im,</i> |
| F | REL | PRG-read-3SG | and | outside | is | I.NOM | 1SG |

navbera wan da
among they.OBL in
‘Among them the only one who studies and who is away is me.’

(62) S-075 Khalakan, Iraq, 17:

Ewe-y ke min xo-m be bîr-im d-ê,
this-EZ REL I REFL-1SG at mind-1SG PRG-come.3SG
car-êk rûxêndr-awe
time-IDF destroyed-INT
‘As far as I remember it has been destroyed once.’

The relativiser is in most cases the same linker or particle that serves as subordinator in complement clauses and often also as temporal and conditional subordinator, and is almost invariably based on the deictic-interrogative stem *k-*. NK varieties generally have *ku/ko* with the occasional variants *ki* and the voiced counterparts *go* (primarily in southeastern Turkey and sporadically elsewhere) and *gi* (in Syria). Outliers are the NK varieties of the Aleppo region in Syria, which show *han* (a demonstrative particle). CK and SK varieties have *ke* (but SK in Iran shows *ki*). The MDKD elicitation corpus has the following phrases that contain relative clauses:

‘The woman we saw in the market was rich’
The people we met at the market were poor
‘Yesterday I did not buy any of the books you told me about’
‘That book that he had bought in Diyarbakir is lost’

Here, the most common relativisation strategies for both NK and CK/SK samples are a) the independent attribute (*ezafe*) marker, and b) the combination of attributive marker and relativiser:

(63) ‘The woman we saw in the market was rich’

K042 Zakho, Iraq

ew jink-a me li bajêr-î dît zengîn e
that woman-F we.OBL in town-OBL saw rich is

S034 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq

ew jin-e-y bini-man le şar-eke dewlêmen e
that woman-DET-EZ saw-1PL in town-DEF rich is

K062 Kurtalan, Turkey

ew jink-a ku me li bajêr dît zengîn bû
that woman-F REL we.OBL in town.OBL saw rich was

S050 Qoshachay, Iran

ew jin-e-y ke le şar-e dît-man pûtdar bû
that woman-DET-EZ REL in town-DEF saw-1PL rich was

The absence of a relativiser is widespread especially in the NK varieties of northern Iraq (Bahdini), in the neighbouring provinces of Hakkari in Turkey (Yüksekova, Şemdinli, and Çukurca) and Derik in Syria (Qesirdib, Dêrka Ber Avê, and Beroj) as well as in the geographically fairly proximate CK varieties of Shaqlawa in Iraq and Oshnaviyeh in Iran. It is otherwise found sporadically in NK varieties of Turkey and Syria and in CK in Iran.

The choice of strategy tends to be consistent across the elicitation phrases for each sample/location. Mixtures occur where CK samples use the determiner *-e* in place of the attributive marker, accompanied by *ke*:

(64) S049 Marivan, Iran

ew xelk-e-y le bazar bînî-man hejar bû-n
 that people-DET-EZ in market saw-1PL poor was-PL
 'The people we met at the market were poor.'

(65) S049 Marivan, Iran

ew kitêb-e ke ew le Dîyarbekir-î kirrî win buwe
 that book-DET REL that in Diyarbekir-OBL bought list was-PRF
 'That book that he had bought in Diyarbakir is lost.'

Use of the relativiser with the definite in place of the attributive marker is also found in SK samples:

(66) G001 Sahneh, Iran

aw kitaw-e ki me ve dîyarbekr sen-üm gom bî
 that book-DET REL I at Diyarbekir bought-1SG lost was
 'That book that I had bought in Diyarbakir is lost.'

(67) S057 Khanaqin, Iraq

ew jin-e ke dîm le şar-ege dewlemen e
 that woman-DET REL saw-1SG in town-DEF rich is
 'The woman I saw in the town is rich.'

NK samples in the free speech corpus show some instances of the uninflected, secondary attributive marker *-î* where the head NP of the relative clause is composed of two nouns in an attributive relation:

(68) K-058 Bismil, Turkey, 30:

car-ek-ê heval-ê min-î ku gundiy-ê me
 time-IDF-M friend-M I.OBL-EZ REL villager-M we.OBL
bû, *ew jî di-çû*
 was he too PRG-went
 'Once my friend who was from our village also went along.'

A further relativisation strategy appears in a series of NK samples from Syria and Iraq (Sersink, Zakho, Chiay Syan, Kanyder, Mosul, Basselhâya, Doda, Rajo, Xirbe Cihwa, Dêrka Ber Avê, Beroj, Sewîdiyê, Sabahiya, Kobane, as well as Suruç in Turkey, which is close to Kobane). Here, the relative clause follows the main clause, which also contains the head noun, and is introduced by the oblique demonstrative/pronoun *ewê*:

- (69) K037 Kobane, Syria
min duhnî ti kîtab ne-kirî-n
 I.OBL yesterday any book NEG-bought-PL
ew-ê te ji min re got-in
 that-OBL you.SG.OBL from I.OBL to said-PL
 'Yesterday I did not buy any of the books you told me about.'

Pronominal resumption through independent pronouns is exceptional in the phrase elicitation corpus, most samples showing head noun resumption for object NPs in the form of object agreement on the verb:

- (70) K031 Dolunay, Turkey
însan-ê go me li p'azar-ê dît-in feqîr bû-n
 people-EZ.PL REL we.OBL in market-OBL saw-PL poor was-PL
 'The people we met at the market were poor.'

- (71) S076 Mawat, Iraq
ew kes-ane-y ke bînî-man-in le bazarr hejar bû-n
 that person-PL-EZ REL saw-1PL-PL in market poor was-PL
 'The people we met at the market were poor.'

The exceptions all involve the same phrase cited above, in just four NK samples from Syria and Turkey, where the direct object head NP is resumed in the relative clause through the oblique pronoun *wan*. Note that Kozluk and Kurtalan in Turkey are in rather close geographical proximity, while the sample collected in Raqqa represents a Kurdish-speaking community whose origins are in the Aleppo province, to which Basselhâya also belongs. Hence, we are dealing apparently with a regional feature, in this case of two separate regions:

- (72) 'The people we met at the market were poor.'

K068 Kozluk, Turkey

ew kes-ê ku me li market-ê wan
 that person-EZ.PL REL we.OBL in market-OBL they.OBL.PL
nas kir feqîr bû-n
 know did poor was-PL

K062 Kurtalan, Turkey

ew însan-ên me li market-ê wan
 that person-EZ.PL we.OBL in market-OBL they.OBL.PL
nas kir feqîr bû-n

know did poor was-PL

K043 Basselhâya, Syria

ew xelk-î me wan bazar da dîtî fuqara bû-n
that people-EZ we.OBL they.OBL.PL market in saw poor.PL was-PL

K100 Raqqa, Syria

ew xelk-ê han-ê me li sûk-ê wan dît
that people-M DET-M we.OBL in market-OBL they.OBL.PL saw
feqîr bû-n
poor was-PL

Elicitation phrases for some NK samples from Turkey show evidence of Turkish contact influence: the modifying (relative) clause precedes the main clause, and within the relative clause, adverbial modifiers precede the head noun, resembling in those two aspects the structure of gerundial constructions that serve as relative clauses in Turkish:

(73) K023 İmranlı, Turkey

dîyarbek'ir-ê k'îtab girt anda bû
Diyarbakir-OBL book bought lost was
'That book that he had bought in Diyarbakir is lost.'

(74) K067 Kağızman, Turkey

market-ê meriv-ê em dît-in ewana feqîr bû-n
market-OBL person-EZ.PL we.NOM saw-PL they poor was-PL
'The people we met at the market were poor.'

(75) K072 Ergani, Turkey

mi li bajêr jinik-ek dî zengîn bû
I.OBL in town.OBL woman-IDF saw rich was
'The woman I saw in the market was rich.'

Such constructions are rare even in the elicitation corpus and are not encountered in the free speech corpus. They might therefore be considered to be ad hoc emulations of the model phrases that were read out to the consultants in Turkish and are therefore not necessarily indications of ongoing structural change. Nonetheless, the free speech corpus does present us with a number of examples from NK varieties in Turkey where the same two features occur (preposed relative clause, and preposed adverbial modifiers), albeit introduced by an independent attributive particle following the model of canonical relative clauses in NK:

(76) K-063 Özalp, Turkey, 19:

Lê vê gav-ê yê ku li gund ma-n-e,
but this.OBL village-OBL EZ.M REL in village stayed-PL-PRF
gelek kê m kes
very few person
'But in this village those who have stayed in the village are just a few

people.'

It is quite possible that constructions of this kind provide a bridge that facilitates the ad hoc replication of pivotal features of the Turkish model.

4. Complement clauses

A complement clause is defined as a notional sentence or predication that describes a proposition (fact, activity, or potential state) and is a core argument (subject or object) of a predicate (Noonan 2007 [1985], Dixon 2006). Like other subordinations, complement clauses display a cognitive asymmetry between the main clause, which for the speaker is the base, and the subordinated clause; it follows that the complement clause is pragmatically non-assertive and lacks its own illocutionary force (Cristofaro 2003; Langacker 1991). A principal difference to other subordinations (adverbial clauses) is that the set of verbs that can take a complement is restricted. Noonan (2007 [1985]) and Cristofaro (2003) identify as complement-taking predicates phasals ('begin'), modals ('must', 'can'), desideratives and manipulatives ('want', 'tell'), verbs of perception ('see', 'hear'), knowledge and acquisition of knowledge ('know', 'learn') and propositional attitude of various kinds including positive, commentative, assertive, and negative ('try', 'regret', 'believe', 'doubt'), and verbs of utterance ('say'). A general distinction is made between Fact-type and Potential-type complement clauses (Givón 1990; Dixon 2006, Kehayov and Boye 2016).

Typological studies identify links between the semantics of the states of affairs involved in complementation, their conceptual status, and the structural encoding of the relations between them. Fact-type complements typically encode something that has taken place. They are therefore more likely to show tense aspect marking that is independent of the main clause. They are often introduced by a complementiser that typically also has other functions in the language such as a marker of a relative clause. Potential-type complements capture the potentiality of the involvement of the subject of the complement clause in an activity. They have less structural similarity to the main clause, tend to lack tense-aspect choices that are available in the main clause, and often have a special form of the verb (cf. Dixon 2006). Cristofaro (2003, pp. 124-125) identifies a hierarchy of semantic integration involving various types of de-ranking configurations such as the likelihood of restricted forms of the verb and co-referent deletion: phasals > modals > manipulatives > desideratives > perception > knowledge > propositional attitude > utterance. To the parameter of event independence (pertaining to the likelihood of occurrence of the event irrespective of the outcome of the main clause event) Givón (1990, pp. 515-562) adds the degree of active involvement of the subject/agent of the main clause in the activity/event portrayed in the complement clause, especially the degree of control that is exercised by the subject/agent of the main clause on the subject/agent of the complement clause. The stronger the control the more likely it is that the main clause event will affect the outcome of the complement event and so the more tightly integrated the two events are. The combination of factors

gives rise to a continuum of structures expressing different degrees of semantic bonds and, following the iconicity principle, different degrees of syntactic integration. Thus, strong manipulative intent and agentivity or power over the manipulee implies greater control and hence tighter structural integration. Kehayov and Boye (2016) find that agent control can play a role in the presence or composition of complementisers, which cross-linguistically are likely to derive from interrogative/relative subordinators.

For Kurmanji, Matras (2002) discusses the interplay of factuality (event independence) and control (including coreferentiality) in the gradient of event integration relating to manipulative success and agentivity in complement clauses. Modal complements, especially ‘can’, tend not to take a complementiser, though one appears when there is a need to emphasise agent control. The latter is linked to the difficulty in achieving the intended outcome, or the complexity of the volitional act (such as durativity in ‘to try repeatedly to do something’), the complexity of the goal, or the uncertain degree of control over the agent of the target action. Complements of factual or epistemic verbs like ‘say’, ‘know’ and ‘see’ are generally introduced by a complementiser. Manipulation complements are generally lower on the hierarchy of control. But when the primary agent has control over a secondary agent (as in the example ‘the state doesn’t let us study’, Matras 2002, p. 58) then structural integration is tighter. Control and intensity of the effort are reflected in the likelihood of coreferential deletion in same-subject complements (see also Matras 1997). Matras (2002, pp. 60-62) points out that Kurmanji belongs to a linguistic area finite complementation is common. That usually also entails a split between factual (epistemic or realis) and potential (irrealis or non-factual) complements, marked by the indicative and subjunctive moods respectively, and reliance on complementisers and the option of overt coreferential subject marking in the complement clause. Discussing Zazaki, Paul (1998, pp. 138-161) notes that complements of modal verbs can occur with or without the complementiser *ki* but that the verbs ‘say’ and ‘ask’ take a paratactic structure. For Mukri, Öpengin (2016, pp. 129-136) notes that complements of verbs of volition often occur without a complementiser. Other descriptions of Kurdish complementation tend to make do with reference to the complementiser and the availability of tense-aspect forms in the complement clause.

The distribution of complementisers in the MDKD corpus resembles that of relativisers: NK generally has *ku* and its variant *ki*, with the voiced variants *go* mainly in southeastern Turkey and *gi* in Syria. CK and SK varieties have *ke*. Two distinctive features stand out: In Syrian NK, the borrowing of Arabic *inû/ino* is common, for both factual and non-factual complements. A number of NK samples from Syria and southeastern Turkey have a specialised complementiser *qey* that appears only after the verbs ‘say’ and ‘think’.

In the following I review data from MDKD in regard to the hierarchy of verbs postulated by Noonan (2007 [1985]) and Cristofaro (2003), cited above. The relevant predicates that appear in the corpus are: ‘begin’ (phasals), ‘can/cannot’, ‘know how to’ (modals), ‘let’, ‘allow’ (manipulatives), ‘want’ (desiderative), ‘see’, ‘hear’ (perception), ‘know that’ (knowledge), ‘try’, ‘think’ (propositional

attitude), and ‘say’ (utterance). Most are covered by the corpus of elicited phrases and for the others I supplement data from the free speech corpus.

4.1 Phasals

Free speech samples that contain the verb ‘begin’ do not show complementisers. In the example below the embedded verb appears in the subjunctive. The subject of the complement is implied through the antecedent in the main clause and is not repeated:

- (77) K-078 Şemdinli, Turkey, 19:
Tax-ê seri dest pê kir-in xanî çêkir-in
 area-M upper hand in.it did-PL house built-PL
 ‘The upper neighborhood started to build houses.’

The following example is a rare case in which the complement appears in a nominalised (infinitive) form; such constructions are apparently more common in the literary language (both Sorani and Kurmanji) but do not in our corpus (but see below, on modals):

- (78) S-073 Halabja, Iraq, 16:
Dîsan-ewe dest kir be awadankird-in-ewe
 again-INT hand did at build-INF-INT
 ‘They started to build houses again.’

4.2 Modals

The elicitation corpus contains the phrases ‘I can open the door’ and ‘I cannot drink the water’, neither of which shows a complementiser in any of the samples. Both phrases always show the present subjunctive in the complement and no repetition of the coreferential subject through an overt pronoun (merely in the agreement on the complement verb):

- (79) S073 Halabja, Iraq
na-twan-im aw bi-xo-m
 NEG-can-1SG water SBJ-drink-1SG
 ‘I cannot drink the water’
- (80) K044 Akre, Iraq
e di-şê-m derk-î vek-im
 I.OBL PRG-can-1SG door-OBL open-1SG
 ‘I can open the door’

The elicitation phrase ‘I know how to read’, also expressing ability, stands out in the corpus as the only phrase in which a nominalised complement appears, in

altogether 13 from a total of 93 responses, all representing NK dialects from Anatolia; this might be a replication of the Turkish nominalised construction (*okumayı biliyorum*):

- (81) K074 Doğubeyazıt, Turkey
ez xwend-in-ê zan-im
 I.NOM read-INF-OBL know-1SG
 'I know how to read'

The most widespread response, covering 40 samples from Iran, Iraq and Syria, shows the interrogative 'how' as complementiser and the complement verb in the subjunctive:

- (82) S040 Urmia, Iran
emin da-zan-im çon bi-xwên-m-ewe
 I PRG-know-1SG how SBJ-read-1SG-INT
 'I know how to read'

- (83) K020 Zakho, Iraq
ez di-zan-im çawa bi-xwîn-im
 I.OBL PRG-know-1SG how SBJ-read-1SG
 'I know how to read'

Given this distribution one cannot exclude the immediate influence of the elicitation languages. In the case of the nominalised response, the model is Turkish, which has an infinitive for the complement predicate and similar word order as (81) above. In the other cases the models are Persian and Arabic, which employ the interrogative 'how' as complementiser. Of the remaining samples, 35 with no particular regional distribution showed the subjunctive with no complementiser, while 5 samples, all but one CK, showed the subjunctive with a complementiser:

- (84) K065 Yüksekova, Turkey
di-zan-im bi-xîn-im
 PRG-know-1SG SBJ-read-1SG
 'I know how to read'

- (85) S022 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq
e-zan-im bi-xwên-im-ewe
 PRG-know-1SG SBJ-read-1SG-INT
 'I know how to read'

4.3 Manipulatives

Manipulatives are considered here to be those instances of complementation where the subject of the main clause performs an action that is intended to prompt or impact an action by a different subject that is conveyed by the complement clause (non-prototypical cases being those of self-prompt, as in ‘I allow myself to do something’, etc.). The structure employs the general template of non-factual or potential complements, with the complement verb in the present-subjunctive. The subject of the complement is either specified, or derived from an antecedent through verb agreement:

(86) K-030 Nusaybin, Turkey, 18:

bav-ê mi ne-hişt ez bi-ç'-im-e sinav-ê
 father-M I.OBL NEG-let I.NOM SBJ-go-1SG-DIR exam-OBL
 ‘My father did not let me go to the exam.’

(87) K-068 Kozluk, Turkey, 13:

na-hêl-in bûk bi-ç-e
 NEG-let-PL bride SBJ-go-3SG
 ‘They don’t let the bride go.’

(89) S-055 Kirkuk, Iraq, 37:

kabira heta ew kiçe e-b-ête helahişî
 man until that girl PRG-become-3SG lawful
qebûl na-ka-n derç-ête derewe legetya.
 accept NEG-do-PL go-3SG out with.3SG
 ‘Until the girl becomes the man’s wife lawfully they do not accept that she should go out with him.’

Complementisers of the type *ke/ku* etc. tend to appear where there is interruption of some kind and a need to re-focus the relationship between main and complement predicate, or when the potential for the realisation of the goal action expressed by the complement is not taken for granted:

(90) S-042 Khalifan, Iraq, 24:

qibûl bi-ke-n le min ew rrism-ey,
 accept SBJ-do-PL in I that picture-OBL
yaşnî, ke lê bi-gr-im be-w newf-ey
 that.is COMP in.it SBJ-take-1SG at-and way-OBL
 ‘You allow me to take this picture, I mean, in this way.’

(91) S-039 Sardasht, Iran 6:

Swênd-yan de-d-en ke ew kurr-e
 oath-3PL PRG-give-PL COMP that boy-DET
aga-y lew kiçe-y bê
 care-EZ on girl-OBL be.SBJ.3SG

'They take an oath that the boy will take care of the girl.'

Cases of 'passive' manipulation, where no agent control is purported, appear not to show explicit marking of the manipulative relation:

- (92) K-090 Erzincan, Turkey, 2:
me beklemîş kir berxik-ê şerjêk-in
we.OBL wait did lamb-OBL slaughter-PL
'We waited for them to slaughter the lamb.'

4.4 Desiderative

Phrases from the elicitation corpus that contain the verb 'want' in same-subject constructions – 'I wanted to go to Batman', 'Azad wanted to sing at the wedding', 'The woman also wanted to sin' – show a tendency for the complement to appear in the subjunctive without a complementiser and with no overt marking of the coreferential subject:

- (93) S042 Khalifan, Iraq
wîst-im bi-ts-im-e Batman-ê
wanted-1SG SBJ-go-1SG-DIR Batman-OBL

An exception is the phrase 'I wanted to go to Batman', where in 33 of altogether 90 samples – all NK varieties from Syria and southeastern Turkey as well as Mosul in Iraq – show repetition of the first person subject pronoun:

- (94) K037 Kobane Syria
min di-xast ez her-im Batman-ê
I.OBL PRG-wanted I.NOM go.SBJ-1SG Batman-OBL

A further 5 samples (NK varieties from Turkey, and a SK sample from Iran) show a complementiser and no repetition of the coreferential subject, while one single NK sample from Turkey shows both:

- (95) K090 Erzincan, Turkey
ez di-xaz-im ku her-im-e Batman-ê
I.NOM PRG-want-1SG COMP go.SBJ-1SG-DIR Batman-OBL

- (96) G001 Sahne, Iran
me e-twast-im ke bi-ç-im-e batman
I PRG-wanted-1SG COMP SBJ-go-1SG-DIR Batman

- (97) K061 Adilcevaz, Turkey

min xwest kir ku ez her-im Batman-ê
 I.OBL want did COMP I.NOM go.SBJ-1SG-DIR Batman-OBL

The modal verb ‘want’ is considered transitive since it has a potential direct object, represented in the cases discussed here by the complement clause. In the first person singular, case marking clearly differentiates nominative *ez* from oblique *mi(n)*. The complementiser acts as a supporting device, re-focusing attention to the thematic-syntactic roles in the complement clause.

By contrast, in the phrase ‘Azad wanted to sing at the wedding’, from a total of 91 samples only 12 employ a complementiser and none show pronominal repetition of the third person coreferential subject:

(98) S050 Qoshachay, Iran
Azad de-yewîst ke le şayîda goranî bi-î-e
 Azad PRG-wanted COMP in wedding song SBJ-say-3SG

(99) K062 Kurtalan, Turkey
Azad xwest ku li defwet-ê strana bêj-e
 Azad wanted COMP in wedding-OBL song say-3SG

4.5 Perception

Verbs of perception are factual or epistemic verbs and convey experience that is real and verifiable. Their complements are regarded as independent events. That independence is expressed by the flexibility of tense-aspect choices on the complement verb. In the free speech corpus, most relevant instances show a preference for paratactic linking:

(100) S-054 Choman, Iraq, 27:
çû wênder û dît-bû-y kes lewê nîye
 went there and saw-PLU-3SG person there is.not
 ‘He went there and he saw that there was nobody there.’

(101) K-034 Sabahiya, Syria, 14:
hege we dît agir vêk’et, mi zor/ wî kuştîye
 if you.OBL.PL saw fire lit I.OBL much he.OBL killed.3SG
 ‘If you see that the fire is lit, then I won/ I have killed him.’

The outlier is an NK variety from Syria, where there is a stronger preference for the (Arabic-derived) complementiser, possibly modelled on Arabic:

(102) K-055 Rimêlan, Syria 46:

pê di-ħis-in inû meşakil he-ne
 in.it PRG-hear-PL COMP problems exist-PL
 'We hear that there are problems.'

The elicitation corpus contains the phrase 'I saw Ahmed arriving in his house', which contains a co-temporal embedding with different subjects in the main and complement clauses. Various strategies are found: In a relatively small number of responses (13) the construction is rendered as a temporal adverbial clause ('I saw Ahmed when he arrived ..'). In altogether 40 samples, with no particular regional distribution, an asyndetic structure appears:

(103) S033 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq
eħmed-im bînî geyşte mał-î xo-y
 Ahmad-1SG saw entered house-EZ REFL-3SG

(104) K069 Siverek, Turkey
mi dî Eħmed gîha mal
 I.OBL saw Ahmas entered house

Further 33 samples, again with no particular regional distribution, show a complementiser introducing the complement clause.

(105) S031 Piranshahr, Iran
emin eħmed-im dît ke geyşte mał-ê
 I Ahmad-1SG saw COMP entered house-OBL

(106) K025 Çukurca
min dît ku Ğeħmed geħişt mał-a xwe
 I.OBL saw COMP Ahmad entered house-F REFL

Note that with both options CK dialects place the subject of the complement clause within the main clause, preceding the main verb. In effect the CK structure presents a complete transitive main clause of which the subject of the complement clause is a direct object. The complement clause follows externally to the main clause, adding information on the activity undertaken by that direct object.

4.6 Knowledge

Complements of verbs of knowledge are factual or epistemic complements that encode independent events. This is again reflected in the availability of choice of tense-aspect on the complement verb. In the free speech corpus, knowledge complements do not show complementisers:

- (107) K-062 Kurtalan, Turkey, 13:
ez zani-bû-m ez-ê îne her-m-e mal-ê
 I.NOM know-PST-1SG I.NOM-FUT Friday go.SBJ-1SG-DIR house-OBL
 'I knew that I was going home on Friday.'
- (108) S-051 Saqqez, Iran, 7:
E-m-zanî bilêt-î qetar heta Salonîk be
 PRG-1SG-knew ticket-EZ train till Thessaloniki in
sê hezar û çuwar şed Diraxma ye
 six thousand and four hundred drachma is
 'I knew that train ticket to Thessaloniki was three thousand four hundred Drachmas.'

The elicitation corpus contains the phrase 'I know that he understands Arabic' with 77 samples showing no complementiser compared with 40 samples with a complementiser, with no obvious regional distribution:

- (109) K010 Tunceli, Turkey
ez di-zan-im ew erepçe famdik-e
 I.NOM PRG-know-1SG he Arabic understand.PRG-3SG
- (110) S015 Sanandaj, Iran
min e-zan-im ke ew arabî e-zan-ê
 I PRG-know-1SG COMP he Arabic PRG-know-3SG

For the phrase 'I did not know that his father had died' both options are attested, but here only 55 samples show no complementiser while in 37 a complementiser is present. Some samples thus show a preference for complementiser in the second, negative phrase, but not in the first:

- (111) K031 Dolunay, Turkey
ez zan-im ew ferebî zan-ê
 I.NOM know-1SG he Arabic know-3SG
 'I know that he understands Arabic'
- (112) K031 Dolunay, Turkey
mi ni-zani-bû go bav-ê wî ç'û-ye
 I.OBL NEG-knew-PST COMP father-M he.OBL went-3SG.PRF
rehmet-ê
 blessing-OBL
 'I did not know that his father had died'

That pattern is not universal across the corpus, however, and there are pairs that show the reverse preference; hence we must assume that the presence of the complementiser is optional in principle.

With verbs of knowledge a semantically specialised complementiser can occur, derived from an interrogative, which specifies the ontological domain of the embedded predication. It can occur on its own, or accompanying the generic complementiser:

- (113) S-051 Saqqez, Iran 18:
na-zan-im çon hat-ûn ta ew-ê-ş.
 NEG-know-1SG how came-PL till that-OBL-too
 'I don't know how they had even got there.'

- (114) S-051 Saqqez, Iran 68:
ewa agadar bû-n ke min
 they aware was-PL COMP I
bo çî lewya da-nîşt-ûm
 for what there PRG-sat-1SG
 'They were aware why I was sitting there.'

4.7 Propositional attitude

For the elicitation phrase 'I think that Canan is ill', 61 samples in the corpus do not show a complementiser, while 24 samples do show one, of which 22 are NK varieties mainly from Syria and southeastern Turkey. In all cases, the complement verbs take independent tense-aspect marking:

- (115) S037 Bukan, Iran
min fikir bi-k-im Canan nexoş e
 I think SBJ-do-1SG Canan ill is

- (116) K086 Muş, Turkey
ez di-fikir-im go Canan nexweş e
 I.NOM PRG-think-1SG COMP Canan ill is

Of the samples that take complements, 8 are NK varieties from Syria and Turkey that use the specialised complementiser *qey*, which only appears in the corpus in this phrase, while 3 more are NK dialects from Syria that use Arabic-derived *inû* in this position:

- (117) K069 Siverek, Turkey
ez bê-m qey Canan nexweş e
 I.NOM think-1SG COMP Canan ill is

- (118) K099 Ad-Darbasiyah, Syria
e di-ḥis-im inû kînan nesax̣ i
 I.NOM PRG-think-1SG COMP Canan ill is

A small number of NK samples (4) indicate propositional attitudes through the modal marker *belkî* ‘maybe’ while others employ modality particles borrowed from Turkish, which, in the case of İmranlı, is embedded into the Turkish clause configuration where the complement is preposed:

- (119) K103 Rajo, Syria
e di-bê-m belkî Kînan nexaş e
 I.NOM PRG-think-1SG maybe Canan ill is

- (120) K074 Doğubeyazıt, Turkey
Canan zankî nexweş e
 Canan suppose ill is

- (121) İmranlı, K023, Turkey
canan-ê nexweş e dîye ez di-zan-im
 Canan-M ill is saying I.NOM PRG-know-1SG

In the free speech corpus we find examples of an external state of affairs serving as expression of propositional attitude; here the complement is introduced by a (Arabic-derived) complementiser, possibly emulating an Arabic model construction, and the subject of the complement is expressed overtly by a pronoun despite the presence of an antecedent in the role of a possessor in the main clause:

- (122) K-055 Rimêlan, Syria, 9:
şadet û teqalîd-ê me inû
 custom and tradition-EZ.PL we.OBL COMP
em ḥina çêdik-in
 we.NOM henna create.PRG-PL
 ‘It is our custom and tradition to make henna.’

For ‘try’, we find a complementiser in one NK sample from Syria but not elsewhere; this may be attributed to contact with Arabic, though the example arguably presents an ambiguous case of potential agent control of the target action:

- (123) K-100 Raqqa, Syria, 7:
ez muḥawele di-k-im inû

I.NOM attempt PRG-do-1SG COMP
ez alî wa bi-k-im
 I.NOM help they.OBL.PL SBJ-do-1SG
 'I try to help them.'

- (124) S-075 Khalakan, Iraq, 24:
xetik miḥewelee de-k-a xanû-y bi-k-a
 people attempt PRG-do-3G house-OBL SBJ-do-3SG
 'People try to build houses.'

4.8 Utterance

Complements of utterance verbs are factual and show independent tense-aspect assignment. Data from the free speech corpus suggest that use of the complementiser is optional and asyndetic or paratactic configurations are common:

- (125) S-073 Halabja, Iraq, 21:
e-lê-n jîyan-man zor xoş bû
 PRG-say-PL life-1PL very nice was
 'They say that life was very pleasant.'

- (126) K-029 Kâhta, Turkey, 14:
di-wê-n ki dijmin-ê ew-ê bî-ye
 PRG-say-PL COMP enemy-M this-OBL was-PRF.3SG
 'They say that he was the enemy of whatever.'

As with other factual complements, such as those of knowledge verbs, the generic complementiser can accompany a specialised complementiser derived from an interrogative that delineates the ontological domain of the complement state of affairs:

- (127) K-023 İmranlı, Turkey 3:
deng na-k-e ki nîvan k'î-ye
 sound NEG-do-3SG COMP guest who-is
 'He did not say who the guests are.'

4.9 Summary of complement clauses

Kurdish dialects share the same typology of complement clauses: Complements are overwhelmingly finite, with a distinction between fact-based, and non-fact or potential complement predicates, and the choice of the present subjunctive mood in the latter. A general subordinator that also functions as a relativiser

appears optionally subject to pragmatic constraints of information accessibility and agent control.

With reference to the hierarchies of semantic domains and main clause predicates postulated by Noonan (2007 [1985]), Givón (1990), Cristofaro (2003) and Kehayov and Boye (2016) modals show the tightest structural integration, always with a de-ranked complement verb in the subjunctive and no complementiser or overt marking of the coreferential subject. For 'know how' the data show the impact of language contact in the choice of a nominalised complement or semantically specialised complementiser. Phasals rank lower due to the optional preference for overt coreferential subject marking and a complementiser, while on the other hand some samples express the complement verb in a nominalised form. Manipulatives and desideratives assume a similar position. The presence of a complementiser is optional and subject to the speaker's assessment of agentivity and control. In first-person coreferential subject constructions with 'want' NK varieties prefer overt pronominal marking of the subject in the complement clause and often a complementiser. The four domains of factual complements (perception, knowledge, propositional attitude, utterance) tend to rank together and show similar traits, with choice of tense-aspect in the complement reflecting event independence. Complementisers are optional for perception and knowledge, while some NK varieties show a specialised complementiser for propositional attitude, while for utterance there is an apparent preference for paratactic structuring.

5. Adverbial subordination

A subordinate clause is considered adverbial if it modifies another clause in the way that an adverb modifies a proposition and if it can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the main clause (Hengeveld 1998; Thompson et al. 2007). Thompson et al. (2007) distinguish between adverbial clauses that express time, location, and manner, which can be substituted by a single word, and those of purpose, reason, condition, concession, substitution, addition, and simultaneity, which cannot. Cristofaro (2003, pp. 248-272) considers syntagmatic economy and information recoverability as the principal factors that determine the encoding of adverbial subordinations. The need to reduce information complexity and redundancy can be manifested in similarities between the two parts of the construction. As in complement clauses, we expect structural devices to reflect the degree of event independence and manipulative control (cf. Givón 1990, pp. 827-864). As types of adverbial subordinations Cristofaro (2003, p. 157ff.) lists purpose, temporal posteriority, temporal anteriority, temporal overlap, condition, and reason. While temporal clauses entail a predetermined time sequence, in purpose clauses there is no logical entailment about the extent to which the performer of the main state of affairs can control the realisation of the dependent one. Cristofaro (2003, p. 168) therefore postulates the 'adverbial de-ranking hierarchy': purpose > before, after, when > reality condition, reason. While concessive clauses are often included under adverbial subordinations Crevels (2000) argues that they are

only more likely to be expressed as adverbial clauses at the content and epistemic levels, where they express a contrast but where one event does not impede the realisation of the other either in terms of its internal structure (content) or in regard to the speaker's judgement of the contrast between the propositions (epistemic).

For Hengeveld (1998) the relevant semantic dimensions of adverbial clauses are factuality, presupposedness, and dependent versus independent time reference. Adverbial subordinations can be classified along those dimensions as representing the semantic classes of cause, simultaneity, and reason (all factual and non-presupposed), addition, anteriority and concession (factual and presupposed), and purpose (non-factual, non-presupposed). The factuality hierarchy predicts that if a language uses a dependent verb form for a factual relation then it will also use one for non-factual relations of the same order (state of affairs, propositional content and speech act). Hengeveld (1998, pp. 360-361) identifies Kurmanji among a sample of (European) languages as minimal in regard to the presence of dependent verbs across 14 different adverbial relations, suggesting that a dependent verb form is only used for 'means' and 'anteriority' (but see discussion of purpose and conditional clauses below). In areal perspective, Kurmanji stands out in Hengeveld's (1998) sample of languages in contrast to neighbouring languages of the Caucasus and Anatolia, broadly adhering to the types of adverbial clauses found in the Balkans as well as Lithuanian and Russian.

Discussing adverbial subordinations, descriptive accounts of Kurdish dialects make reference to the structural representation of event dependency and to the composition of subordinators. For Kurmanji, Thackston (2006a, pp. 72 ff.) notes that verbs in posterior ('after') and co-temporal ('when') clauses take the indicative while those in anterior clauses ('before') and in purpose clauses ('in order to') take the subjunctive. Subordinating conjunctions generally consist of a preposition followed by *ku*, while in Sorani (Thackston 2006b, p. 71) there is frequent reliance on a preposition and the deictic compositional *ewey ke*. MacKenzie (1961, pp. 131-132) notes that in CK *ke* is used both for relative and subordinate clauses, while *eger* is used as both conditional and temporal subordinator. Also for Sorani, McCarus (2009, pp. 620-626) confirms that subordinators combine the generic subordinator *ke* with adpositions, the adverbial demonstrative *ewe*, and the relative connector *-î*, while temporal clauses are introduced by *ke*; purpose clauses are introduced by *bo awaî* or *heta* with the verb in the subjunctive. Also for Sorani, Blau (1980, pp. 149-156) notes that temporal adverbial clauses take the format of relative clauses, combining a temporal noun (*roj* 'day', *saî* 'year', *wext* 'time') with the suffix *-ê* followed by the general subordinator *ke*. For Zazaki, Paul (1998, pp. 138-161) notes that temporal adverbial clauses take *ki* or *wexo ki*, or a temporal noun with *ki*, while purpose clauses are introduced by *ki*. As in other varieties, specialised subordinators appear for causal clauses (*çimki* or *mademki*) and for conditional clauses (*eger*). For Gorani, Yusupova (2017, pp. 99-104) describes the general subordinator *ke* in temporal clauses often accompanied by *wextê*, as well as the temporal use of *çun* 'how' and the specialised subordinators *er/eger* (conditional) and *herçend* (concessive).

Considerable attention is given to conditional subordination. MacKenzie (1961, p. 136-140) notes for CK that for possible conditions the present subjunctive appears in the protasis (condition) and the indicative in the apodosis (consequence) while for impossible conditions the past conditional is used in the protasis (*bûmaya* ‘if I had been’, *îša-t bikirdaya* ‘if you had done this work’) and the imperfect in the apodosis. For NK, MacKenzie (1961, pp. 203-213) notes that in possible conditions the protasis is marked by the present subjunctive or future tense while the apodosis has present indicative past tense; in impossible conditions the perfect conditional appears in the protasis (*çûbama* ‘if I had gone’) and the indicative present or imperfect appears in the apodosis. A similar distribution is described by McCarus (2009, pp. 620-626) for Standard Sorani and by Öpengin (2016, pp. 135-136) for Mukri. For Zazaki, Paul (1998, pp. 138-161) notes borrowing of the Turkish conditional marker *-se*, which Haig (2019, p. 150) mentions for Western Kurmanji in Turkey.

5.1 Co-temporal

The overall sentence configuration for temporal subordinations is similar across the corpus: The adverbial clause is introduced by a subordinator, usually but not obligatorily preceding the main clause. There is a tendency for matching tense-aspect marking in both clauses to reflect temporal co-occurrence of states of affairs. In NK varieties the co-temporal subordinator is usually the word for ‘time’ in the *ezafe* or attributive form – *wextê, gava, dema, çaxa* – optionally followed by the general subordinator *ku* etc. Here, adverbial subordination essentially takes on the configuration of a relative clause:

(128) K-027 Muradiye, 1:

wextê deprem bû, bav-ê mi Antalya bû
 when earthquake was father-M I.OBL Antalya was
 ‘When the earthquake happened, my father was in Antalya.’

(129) K-063 Özalp, 30:

Wext-a ku e zarok bû-m [...], havîn-an
 time-F COMP I.NOM child was-1SG summer-OBL.PL
ez di-çû-m-e gund
 I.NOM PRG-went-1SG-DIR village
 ‘When I was a child [...], in the summer I would go to the village.’

In some samples, the subordinator *ku* etc. appears on its own, without a modifying temporal noun, to express co-temporality:

(130) K-059 Kulp, Turkey, 50:

ku e mezin bû-m, sal-k-ê me
 COMP I.NOM big was-1SG year-IDF-OBL we.OBL
go em her-in Diyarbekir

said we.NOM go.SBJ-PL Diyarbekir
 ‘When I grew up, one year we said we should go to Diyarbekir.’

For specialised time reference specific temporal nouns can be used:

(131) K-024 Tatvan, 36:

P’aşê, sał-a kû ez hat-im-e dinyay-ê,
 later year-F COMP I.NOM came-1SG.PRF world-OBL
heştê heşt-an da hat-in-e Tetwan-ê.
 eighty eight-OBL.PL in came-PL-PRF Tatvan-OBL
 ‘Later, the year I was born, in eighty-eight they came to Tatvan.’

In CK varieties, the general subordinator *ke* serves as co-temporal subordinator (sometimes in the combination *ewey ke*) while some CK varieties in Iran employ the conditional subordinator *eger* in co-temporal function:

(132) S-059 Qalat Dizah, Iraq, 2:

ême ke mindał bûy-n
 we COMP child was-PL
leget/ leget brader-ekan de-çûy-n
 with with friend-DEF.PL PRG-went-PL
 ‘When we were kids, we would go with/ with friends.’

(133) S-047 Oshnaviyeh, Iran, 9:

eger le Turkiy-ey rra hat-în, teqrîben
 if in Turkey-OBL way came-PL around
eme/ sêzde, tsarde nefer bûy-n.
 we thirteen fourteen person was-PL
 ‘When we came from Turkey, we were around thirteen, fourteen people.’

Combinations with the universal quantifier *her* ‘each, every’ express tight simultaneity or durative/repetitive and ‘open’ co-temporality, in the latter case triggering the subjunctive in the subordinated clause:

(134) S-048 Baneh, Iran, 20:

Min her le Zirîndof ke hat-im
 I every in Zirndorf COMP came-1SG
çû-m-e ser îş lêre
 went-1SG-PRF on work there
 ‘Just as I came from Zirndorf, I started working here.’

(135) S-042 Khalifan, Iraq, 33:

eme herçî e-tsûy-ne şwên-î
 we every PRG-went-PL place-OBL

hûha-yan le me e-kirdê
 'huhâ'-3PL in we PRG-was.done
 'Whenever we went anywhere they were booing us.'

(136) K-025 Çukurca, Turkey, 1:

Heca dem-a murof kom b-in,
 each.time time-F man assemble be.SBJ-PL
mezin-êd me, behs-a gund ti-k-in,
 big-EZ.PL we.OBL talk-F village PRG-do-PL
behs-a zeman-ê bê ti-k-in,
 talk-F time-M gone PRG-do-PL

'Whenever the people gather together, our elderly people, they talk about the village, about the old times.'

5.2 Anterior and posterior

The verb in anterior adverbial clauses takes the subjunctive while the subordinator relies on the preposition 'before', optionally combined with the general subordinator: NK *berî (ku)*, CK in combination with the deictic *pêş ewey (ke)*:

(137) K-056 Sheran, Syria, 4:

berî ku mazoţ li Sûrî buha bi-b-ê,
 before COMP diesel in Syria expensive SBJ-be-3SG
ferd-ê avî li cem me he-bû
 land-EZ.PL irrigation in among we.OBL exist-PST.3SG

'Before the cost of diesel became expensive in Syria, we had irrigated lands.'

(138) S-076 Mawat, Iraq, 36:

pêş ewe-y bi-gey-ne ser kanîy-eke
 before that-OBL SBJ-reach-PL on spring-DEF
seyr-im e-kird le ser kanîy-eke
 look-1SG PRG-did in on spring-DEF

piyaw-ek-î gewre
 man-IDF-EZ big

'Before we reached the spring I saw a big man at the spring.'

Posterior relations are expressed by subordinators based on the preposition 'after': NK *piştî (ku)*, CK and SK *duway ke*. The subordinated verb carries independent tense-aspect:

(139) K-030 Nusaybin, Turkey, 14:

Mekt'eb-a *yatlî* *p'îştî* *go* *mi* *xilas* *kir,*
 school-F boarding after COMP I.OBL finish did
mi *fen lisesî* *qezenc* *kir.*
 I.OBL 'fen 'school admission did
 'After I finished boarding school I was admitted to a sciences ['Fen'] high school.'

(140) S-057 Khanaqin, Iraq, 27:

Duway *ki* *rizgar* *bî,* *Sedam* *ne-ma,*
 after COMP freedom was Saddam NEG-stayed
hat-n-ew *yewaş* *yewaş*
 came-PL-INT slowly slowly
 'After it became free, Saddam was gone, they slowly returned.'

For posterior-durative relations ('until') the specialised subordinators *ta*, *heta* (*ku*) and *heye* are used:

(141) S-048 Baneh, Iran, 4:

fetre-yek-î *zor* *naxoş* *bû* *ta* *lewê* *derçûy-n*
 period-IDF-EZ very bad was till there left-PL
 'It was a very horrible time until we left there.'

(142) K-062 Kurtalan, Turkey, 14:

mi *go* *hêja* *du* *roj* *he-ye*
 I.OBL said still two day exist-3SG
ez-ê *dî-ya* *xwe* *bi-bîn-im*
 I.NOM-FUT mother-F REFL SBJ-see-1SG
 'I said there are still two days until I see my mother.'

When the posterior-durative adverbial clause is preposed it indicates absence of factuality and presuppositionality, triggering the subjunctive and often negation to mark the potential state of affairs in the subordinated predication:

(143) K-059 Kulp, Turkey, 47:

Yanî, *heta* *ku* *ewk* *ne-b-ê [...],*
 that.is until COMP that NEG-be.SBJ-3SG
em *ni-kar-in* *her-in* *gund-ê* *xwe*
 we.NOM NEG-can-PL go.SBJ-PL village-OBL REFL
 'Until this happens [...], we cannot go to our village.'

A similar construction is used to express negative condition:

(144) S-048 Baneh, Iran, 39:

ta *to* *îqame-kew* *ne-b-êt,*

| | | | |
|-------------------|------------|--------------|----------------|
| until | you.SG | permit-IDF | NEG-be.SBJ-3SG |
| <i>na-tuwan-î</i> | <i>hîş</i> | <i>şit-ê</i> | <i>bi-ke-y</i> |
| NEG-can-2SG | any | thing-OBL | SBJ-do-2SG |

'Unless you have a permit you cannot do anything.'

5.3 Reason

A generic connector indicating cause, reason and explanation is *çun* and its derivations (NK mostly *çunkî*, CK mostly *çunke*), which is shared with neighbouring Iranian and Turkic languages. Forms based on the preposition 'in front' are also used: NK *ji ber ku*, CK *le ber ewe (ke)*. Some varieties show borrowings from contemporary contact languages: Arabic *linû* in Syrian NK, Turkish *çünkü* in NK varieties of Turkey and Persian *çun* in the SK sample from Sahne in Iran.

Adverbial clauses of reason typically follow the main clause:

(145) K-021 Mosul, Iraq, 97:

| | | | | |
|--------------|---------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| <i>me</i> | <i>kes-ek</i> | <i>ne-şezimand,</i> | <i>ç'ikû</i> | <i>hingî</i> |
| we.NOM | person-IDF | NEG-invited | because | then |
| <i>mam-ê</i> | <i>min</i> | <i>şemr-ê</i> | <i>xud-ê</i> | <i>kiri-bî.</i> |
| uncle-M | I.OBL | age-M | god-OBL | done-PLU.3SG |

'We did not invite anyone, because my uncle had since died.'

(146) K-060 Karlıova, Turkey, 42:

| | | | |
|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|
| <i>ez</i> | <i>pir</i> | <i>tirsiya-m,</i> | |
| I.NOM | very | feared-1SG | |
| <i>çünkî</i> | <i>pez-ê</i> | <i>xelk-ê</i> | <i>ye</i> |
| because | sheep-EZ.PL | people-OBL | is |

'I was very afraid, because they were somebody else's sheep.'

(147) S-033 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq, 18:

| | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|-------------------|----------------|
| <i>xo-y</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>bîdayet,</i> | <i>be</i> | <i>tema</i> | <i>bû-n</i> |
| REFL-3SG | in | beginning | for | plan | was-PL |
| <i>bi-şo-n</i> | <i>bo</i> | <i>Brîtanya,</i> | <i>çunke</i> | <i>xat-ek-im,</i> | <i>biray-î</i> |
| SBJ-go-PL | to | Britain | because | uncle-IDF-1SG | brother-EZ |
| <i>dayk-im</i> | <i>xo-y</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>Lenden</i> | <i>bû</i> | |
| mother-1SG | REFL-3SG | in | London | was | |

'They were first planning on going to Britain, because an uncle of mine, my mother's brother was in London.'

(148) S-034 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq, 12:

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|------------|
| <i>Hemû</i> | <i>şit-ekan-im</i> | <i>win</i> | <i>e-b-ê</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>ber</i> |
| all | thing-DEF.PL-1SG | lost | PRG-be-1SG | in | for |
| <i>ewe-y</i> | <i>e-y-xat-e</i> | <i>sûç-ewe</i> | | | |

this-EZ PRG-3SG-put-3SG room-INT
 ‘All my things get lost because he puts them in the corners of the room.’

(149) G-001 Sahneh, Iran, 42:

| | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| <i>temîre</i> | <i>xob</i> | <i>bêhtir</i> | <i>ezanim</i> | <i>îdî</i> | <i>çun</i> |
| tamira | well | better | PRG-know-1SG | then | because |
| <i>teqrîben</i> | <i>çwarde</i> | <i>punzde</i> | <i>sal</i> | <i>temîre</i> | <i>e-jen-im</i> |
| around | fourteen | fifteen | year | tamira | PRG-play-1SG |

‘Well I know the Tamira better because it has been almost fourteen fifteen years that I have been playing the Tamira.’

The state of affairs presented as a reason in the adverbial clause is independent and so factual but is introduced as new information that is not presupposed; this is reflected in its positioning after the main clause. The connector that introduces reason clauses can also be used in a paractic arrangement where it typically offers an explanation for the speaker’s preceding assertion:

(150) S-033 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq, 11:

| | | | | |
|------------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|----------------------|
| <i>Êran-yan</i> | <i>be</i> | <i>diî</i> | <i>ne-bû,</i> | <i>çunke,</i> |
| Iran-3PL | on | heart | NEG-was | because |
| <i>Kurd-ekan</i> | <i>zor</i> | <i>rêkûpêk</i> | <i>bû-n,</i> | <i>bes</i> |
| Kurd-DEF.PL | very | orderly | was-PL | but |
| <i>legeî</i> | <i>hukmet-î</i> | <i>Êran</i> | <i>rê</i> | <i>ne-e-kewt-in.</i> |
| with | government-EZ | Iran | way | NEG-PRG-fell-PL |

‘They did not like Iran, because, the Kurds were very correct, but they did not get on well with the Iranian government.’

(151) K-021 Mosul, Iraq, 37-38:

| | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|--------------|
| <i>heta</i> | <i>bray-ê</i> | <i>min</i> | <i>ê</i> | <i>kiçik</i> |
| until | brother-M | i.OBL | M | small |
| <i>bi-zewicîn-ê,</i> | <i>wê</i> | <i>wer-ê.</i> | | |
| SBJ-marry-3SG | FUT | come.SBJ-3SG | | |
| <i>Çikû</i> | <i>ew</i> | <i>di-bêj-ê</i> | <i>heta</i> | <i>ez</i> |
| because | he | PRG-say-3SG | until | I.NOM |
| <i>bi-zewicîn-im</i> | <i>da</i> | <i>go</i> | <i>murtaḥ</i> | |
| SBJ-marry-1SG | in | COMP | comfortable | |
| <i>b-ê</i> | <i>û</i> | <i>wê</i> | <i>d-ê.</i> | |
| be.SBJ-3SG | and | FUT | PRG-come.3SG | |

‘Until my younger brother gets married, [that’s when] she will come. Because she says not until I get him married, so that he is comfortable here and she will come.’

(152) K-039 Sersink, Iraq, 14:

| | | | | |
|-----------|---------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| <i>ji</i> | <i>hemî</i> | <i>dewlet-êd</i> | <i>şalem-î</i> | <i>t-ê-tin,</i> |
| from | all | country-EZ.PL | world-OBL | PRG-come-PL |
| <i>bo</i> | <i>dîtn-a</i> | <i>vê</i> | <i>şaneder-ê.</i> | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------|
| for | see-F | this.OBL | Shanidar-OBL | | |
| <i>Çinkî</i> | <i>gelek</i> | <i>gelek</i> | <i>ya</i> | <i>binavûdeng</i> | <i>e.</i> |
| because | very | very | F | famous | is |

'They come from all the countries in the world, in order to see this Shanidar (Cave),
Because it is very famous.'

5.4 Purpose

Purpose clauses are non-presupposed and non-factual. The verb in the subordinated purpose clause generally takes the subjunctive or in cases of counterfactual propositions the past-subjunctive (conditional) and in some cases a nominalised form. The linker is usually a specialised subordinator derived from the preposition 'for': NK *ji bo (ku)*, CK *bo* or *bo ewey*, alongside *sewê ki*. CK varieties in Iran often show the general subordinator *ke* in this function, as do some NK samples, with *ki*. NK varieties in Iraq (Bahdini) and the neighbouring Hakkari province in Turkey have *da (ku/go)* in this role. A subordinator is more likely to be absent when the intended outcome is within reasonable reach of the subject's control.

There are some attested examples of a paractic structure expressing goal or purpose:

(153) K-024 Tatvan, Turkey, 18:

| | | | |
|-------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|
| <i>em-ê</i> | <i>t'am</i> | <i>biç'ûna</i> | <i>tê</i> |
| we.NOM-FUT | just | SBJ-go.COND.PL | FUT |
| <i>me</i> | <i>av-ê</i> | <i>degîş</i> | <i>kira</i> |
| we.OBL | water-OBL | change | do.COND.3SG |

'We were about to go to change the water.'

In a small number of examples, a nominalised form of the verb is used to encode the outcome:

(154) S-076 Mawat, Iraq, 32:

| | | | |
|------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|
| <i>Lem</i> | <i>kanîyeya</i> | <i>eftîyadî</i> | <i>rrawestay-n</i> |
| at | spring | usual | stopped-PL |
| <i>bo</i> | <i>aw</i> | <i>xuwardin-ewe</i> | |
| for | water | drink-INF-INT | |

'Usually we stopped at that spring to drink water.'

(155) K-039 Sersink, Iraq, 14:

| | | | | |
|-----------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| <i>ji</i> | <i>hemî</i> | <i>dewlet-êd</i> | <i>şalem-î</i> | <i>t-ê-tin,</i> |
| from | all | country-EZ.PL | world-OBL | PRG-come-PL |
| <i>bo</i> | <i>dît-n-a</i> | <i>vê</i> | <i>şaneder-ê.</i> | |
| for | see-INF-F | this.OBL | Shanidar-OBL | |

'They come from all the countries in the world, in order to see this

Shanidar (Cave)'

A subordinator, sometimes reinforced by overt pronominal marking of the coreferential subject, captures an intention the outcome of which is not entirely obvious or expected:

(156) S-051 Saqqez, Iran, 25:

suwarî keştî bû-m ke bi-ç-im bo îtalya
on ship was-1SG COMP SBJ-go-1SG to Italy
'I went on board a ship to go to Italy.'

(157) K-100 Raqqa, Syria, 10:

ez hat-im-i ji bo ez zarok-ê
I.NOM came-1SG-PRF for I.NOM child-EZ.PL
xwe jî bi-bîn-im
REFL too SBJ-see-1SG
'I came here so I can also see my children.'

Overt reference to the subject of the purpose clause can be omitted when the outcome effect can be expected, or else is so unpredictable that it cannot be linked to a tangible degree of control:

(158) S-039 Sardasht, Iran, 26:

bûk-u zawa de-be-n-ewe maê-w
bried-and groom PRG-bring-PL-INT home-and
ke be xoşî-w şadî bi-jî-n
COMP on joy-and happiness SBJ-live-PL
'They take the bride and the groom home, to live happily.'

(159) K-029 Kâhta, Turkey, 24:

her sal jî pê rre
every year too on way
qurban-ek kir-in-e ki ne-mir-e.
sacrifice-IDF did-PL-PRF COMP NEG-die-3SG
'Every year they sacrificed an animal so that he would not die.'

5.5 Concessive

Concessive clauses are linked by the specialised subordinator *her çend* (derived from the quantifiers *her* 'every' and *çend* 'some') in combination with the conjunctive focus particle *jî/-îş*. The subordinated verb takes independent tense-

aspect. There is a tendency for the contrast to be expressed as a correlative with the main clause introduced by the adversative coordinator (*bes, ema, etc.*):

(160) K-078 Şemdinli, Turkey, 32:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|------------|----------------|--------------|
| <i>Her</i> | <i>çendan</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>jiyan-a</i> | <i>hingî</i> |
| every | few.OBL.PL | too | life-F | then |
| <i>pîçek</i> | <i>asteng</i> | <i>bî,</i> | <i>nexoş</i> | <i>bî,</i> |
| a little | difficult | was | bad | was |
| <i>nerihetî</i> | <i>bî,</i> | <i>ema</i> | <i>dîsa</i> | <i>jî</i> |
| uncomfortable | was | but | still | too |
| <i>zor</i> | <i>xoj</i> | <i>bî</i> | | |
| very | good | was | | |

'Although life back then was a bit difficult, it was uneasy, it was not comfortable, but still it was also very pleasant.'

(161) K-048 Kanyder, Iraq, 26:

| | | | | | |
|------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|------------------|
| <i>her</i> | <i>çend</i> | <i>şemr-ê</i> | <i>min-îş</i> | <i>kiçke</i> | <i>bû,</i> |
| every | some | age-M | I.OBL-too | girl | was |
| <i>bes</i> | <i>ez</i> | <i>dige</i> | <i>di-çû-m,</i> | <i>dige</i> | <i>cemşet-ê.</i> |
| but | I.NOM | with | PRG-went-1SG | with | group-OBL |

'Although I was young, I would accompany them, the platoon.'

(162) S-034 Sulaymaniyah, Iraq, 34:

| | | | | | |
|-------------|------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| <i>Her</i> | <i>çen</i> | <i>mîwey</i> | <i>tir-îş</i> | <i>hemûy</i> | <i>e-xw-a,</i> |
| every | some | fruit | other-too | all-EX | PRG-eat-3SG |
| <i>hezî</i> | <i>zor</i> | <i>le</i> | <i>penîr</i> | <i>e</i> | |
| like | much | in | cheese | is | |

'Although he eats some other fruits too, and he likes cheese a lot'

Paratactic constructions can also express concessive relationships:

(163) K-058 Bismil, Turkey, 44:

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|------------------|
| <i>Ê</i> | <i>me</i> | <i>saxlem</i> | <i>bû</i> | <i>jî,</i> |
| M | we.OBL | sound | was | too |
| <i>dîsa</i> | <i>bi</i> | <i>wa-re</i> | <i>em</i> | <i>şewitî-n.</i> |
| still | on | they.OBL-TO | we.NOM | burned-PL |

'Although ours was sound, we were still negatively affected by them.'

5.6 Conditional

Conditional clauses are distinctive among adverbial clauses in exhibiting a mutual dependency among the clauses such that the main clause presents a consequence that can be realised only if the condition is also realised. Two basic types of conditions are distinguished: real (possible) and unreal (impossible or counterfactual). The distinction is expressed through particular combinations of tense-aspect-mood marking in the condition and consequence clause. NK and CK varieties only partly share the system of categories: The present indicative NK *di-zan-* ‘know’, CK *e/de-zan*; the present subjunctive *bi-zan-*; the conditional *bi-zanî-ya* (CK also in *-aye*, as in *bi-çû-aye* ‘was’; in some NK varieties of Iraq *di-zanî-ya*); and the past conditional (also labelled past-subjunctive) *bi-zanî-ba* (in some NK varieties in Turkey and northern Syria *bi-zanî-bûya*; in some NK varieties of Iraq *zanî-ba*). NK also has a future tense (*d/w/k*)ê (*bi*)*zan-* and future perfect ê (*bi*)*zanî-ba* or ê (*bi*)*zanî-ya*, in Bahdini varieties also *dê* (*bi*)*zanî-ye*.

Conditional clauses are typically introduced by variants of the conjunction *eger*: In CK *eger* is consistent in NK in southeastern Anatolia and Syria we find aspirated variants *heger*, *hiker*, *heke*, *hek* and in Anatolia also the etymologically related Turkish borrowing *eyer*. Some NK dialects in Anatolia and Syria use the general subordinator *ku*, *ko*, *gi* etc. in conditional clauses. Turkish *-se* accompanies the verb in conditional clauses in several NK samples from Anatolia (İmranlı, Ergani, Suruç, Erzincan):

- (164) K090 Erzincan, Turkey
eyer pir ne-şuxl-î se feqir di-mîn-î
 if much NEG.SBJ-work-2SG COND poor PRG-stay-2SG
 ‘If you don’t work much, you will remain poor.’

Real conditions specify a condition that is yet to be fulfilled and a consequence that can become a true state of affairs if that condition is fulfilled. They therefore have no truth-value since the truth-values of the state of affairs presented in the consequence depends on that of the condition, which has not yet been fulfilled (cf. Givón 1990, pp. 829-830). For the elicitation phrase ‘If you don’t work much, you will remain poor’ (and the parallel phrase ‘If the children go to sleep early their mother will give them candies’) real conditional clauses show a consistent structural pattern: The present subjunctive occurs in the condition. In the consequence, most NK varieties have the future tense (just 5 samples show the present indicative) while CK varieties have the present indicative:

- (165) K068 Kozluk, Turkey
ku tu ne-şixul-î zêde t-ê feqîr bi-mên-î
 COMP you.SG NEG.SBJ-work-2SG much you.SG-FUT poor SBJ-stay-2SG
- (166) S040 Urmia, Iran
eger zor kar-ê ne-k-î feqir de-mên-î
 if much work-OBL NEG.SBJ-do-2SG poor PRG-stay-2SG

NK varieties tend to show an overt coreferential pronoun in the consequence clause, while CK varieties tend not to show one.

With **unreal** conditions, the condition can no longer be fulfilled. It is therefore counter-factual and in that respect it has truth-value (cf. Givón 1990, pp. 831-832). Counterfactual conditionals are represented in the elicitation corpus by the phrase ‘If I had known that you would not come to the wedding, I would not have gone there either’. Here we find the conditional or past-conditional mood in the condition clause and the imperfect in the consequence:

(167) K026 Uludere, Turkey

| | | | | |
|-------------|-----------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|
| <i>hekî</i> | <i>mi</i> | <i>zanî-ba</i> | <i>tu</i> | <i>na-y-ê</i> |
| if | I.OBL | knew-PST.COND | you.SG.NOM | NEG-come-2SG |
| <i>ez</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>ne-d-ç'û-m</i> | <i>dawet-i</i> | |
| I.NOM | too | NEG-PRG-went-1SG | wedding-OBL | |

(168) S052 Kamyaran, Iran

| | | | | |
|-------------|-------------------|---------------|--------------------|-----------------|
| <i>eger</i> | <i>zanî-ba-m</i> | <i>ke</i> | <i>to</i> | <i>na-ye-yt</i> |
| if | knew-PST.COND-1SG | COMP | you.SG | NEG-come-2SG |
| <i>bo</i> | <i>zemawend,</i> | <i>min-îş</i> | <i>ne-d-hat-im</i> | |
| to | wedding | I-too | NEG-PRG-came-1SG | |

(169) K108 Kelhê, Syria

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| <i>heger</i> | <i>mi</i> | <i>bi-zani-ya</i> | <i>tu</i> | <i>na-ç-i</i> |
| if | I.OBL | SBJ-knew-COND | you.SG.NOM | NEG-go-2SG |
| <i>dawet-ê,</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>jî</i> | <i>ne-ti-cû-m</i> | |
| wedding-OBL | I.NOM | too | NEG-PRG-went-1SG | |

(170) S075 Khalakan, Iraq

| | | | | |
|----------------|----------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------|
| <i>eger</i> | <i>bi-m-zany-aye</i> | <i>to</i> | <i>na-ts-î</i> | <i>bo</i> |
| if | SBJ-1SG-knew-COND | you.SG | NEG-go-2SG | to |
| <i>hefla-y</i> | <i>zewac-eke</i> | <i>emin-îş</i> | <i>ne-de-çu-m</i> | |
| party-EZ | wedding-DEF | I-too | NEG-PRG-went-1SG | |

In a number of CK and SK samples from Iran both parts of the construction show the imperfect; this is possibly attributable to the influence of Persian, which lacks a conditional tense/mood:

(171) S038 Naqadeh, Iran

| | | | |
|-------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| <i>eger</i> | <i>de-m-zanî</i> | <i>to</i> | <i>na-y-ê</i> |
| if | PRG-1SG-knew | you.SG | NEG-come-2SG |
| <i>bo</i> | <i>şay-ê</i> | <i>min-îş</i> | <i>ne-d-hat-im</i> |
| to | wedding-OBL | I-too | NEG-PRG-went-1SG |

(172) G001 Sahneh, Iran

| | | | | |
|-------------|--------------------|---------------|------------------|-----------------|
| <i>eger</i> | <i>e-zanist-im</i> | <i>ke</i> | <i>to</i> | <i>na-t-îte</i> |
| if | PRG-knew-1SG | COMP | you.SG | NEG-come-2SG |
| <i>aw</i> | <i>merasime</i> | <i>min-îş</i> | <i>na-çû-m-e</i> | <i>ûre</i> |
| that | wedding | I-too | NEG-went-1SG-PRF | there |

All varieties in the sample show an overt coreferential pronoun in the consequence clause.

In between the two conditional polarities, without and with truth-value, there are potentially intermediate positions where states of affairs can be judged to be unlikely but not altogether impossible (Givón 1990, p. 832). The relevant elicitation phrase is ‘If you had worked hard, you would have earned a lot of money’ (as well as ‘If it hadn’t rained yesterday, we would go to the park’). Here we find a split between NK and CK varieties drawing on their different inventories of tense-aspect-mood categories. As with other unreal conditions, most samples show the conditional or past-conditional tense in the condition clause. Here too, some CK and SK varieties from Iran have the imperfect on both sides of the construction:

(173) S050 Qoshachay, Iran

| | | | | |
|---------------|-------------|------------------|---------------|-----------------|
| <i>eger</i> | <i>be</i> | <i>sextî</i> | <i>kar-it</i> | <i>de-kird,</i> |
| if | in | effort | work-2SG | PRG-did |
| <i>puł-it</i> | <i>zyad</i> | <i>de-skewut</i> | <i>de-bû</i> | |
| money-2SG | much | PRG-earned | PRG-was | |

(174) G001 Sahneh, Iran

| | | | | |
|---------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------|--------------|
| <i>er</i> | <i>firetir</i> | <i>kar</i> | <i>e-kird-î</i> | <i>pül-i</i> |
| if | harder | work | PRG-did-2SG | money-EZ |
| <i>bîştir</i> | <i>ve</i> | <i>dest</i> | <i>e-tîawird-î</i> | |
| more | at | hand | PRG-had-2SG | |

In the consequence clause, NK samples have the future perfect while CK samples have the imperfect. The intermediate category of ‘unlikely but potentially possible’ is thus represented separately in NK but not in CK:

(175) ‘If you had worked hard, you would have earned a lot of money’

K024 Tatvan, Turkey

| | | | | |
|------------|-------------|-------------|----------------------|-----------------|
| <i>ku</i> | <i>te</i> | <i>zehf</i> | <i>bi-xebit-î-ya</i> | <i>tê</i> |
| COMP | you.SG.OBL | much | SBJ-work-2SG-COND | FUT |
| <i>te</i> | <i>zehf</i> | <i>pere</i> | <i>qezenc</i> | <i>bi-kir-a</i> |
| you.SG.OBL | much | money | earn | SBJ-did-COND |

K051 Mosul, Iraq

| | | | | |
|--------------|------------|-------------|------------|----------------|
| <i>heger</i> | <i>te</i> | <i>zehf</i> | <i>şûl</i> | <i>kiri-ba</i> |
| if | you.SG.OBL | gele | work | did-PST.COND |

| | | | | |
|------------|-----------|-------------|-------------|--------------------|
| <i>te</i> | <i>yê</i> | <i>gele</i> | <i>pare</i> | <i>wergirti-ba</i> |
| you.SG.OBL | FUT | much | money | earned-PST.COND |

S075 Khalakan, Iraq

| | | | |
|---------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------------|
| <i>eger</i> | <i>îş-it</i> | <i>zor</i> | <i>bi-kird-aye</i> |
| if | work-2SG | much | SBJ-did-PST.COND |
| <i>par-et</i> | <i>zor</i> | <i>peyda-de-kird</i> | |
| money-2SG | much | find-PRG-DID | |

S047 Oshnaviyeh, Iran

| | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------|
| <i>eger</i> | <i>zor</i> | <i>sext-it</i> | <i>kar</i> | <i>kirdi-ba</i> |
| if | much | hard-2SG | work | did-PST.COND |
| <i>puł-êç-î</i> | <i>zor-it</i> | <i>be</i> | <i>dest</i> | <i>de-hê-n-a</i> |
| money-DEF-EZ | much-2SG | in | hand | PRG-exist-PL-COND |

NK varieties of Turkey and Syria as well as Mosul in Iraq show repetition of the subject pronoun (which agrees with the verb). CK varieties reference it through an enclitic subject particle that is attached to one of the non-verbal constituents of the consequence clause, ‘money’ or ‘much’. The Bahdini NK samples from northern Iraq show subject agreement on the verb but no overt pronoun. Bahdini thus takes up an intermediary position between the two dialect groups.

Concessive conditionals are generally expressed as real conditional clauses, modified by the focus particle NK *jî*, CK *-îş*:

(176) K-036 Duhok, Iraq, 17:

| | | | | |
|------------|----------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| <i>Îca</i> | <i>çi</i> | <i>heke</i> | <i>tu l/</i> | <i>meselen</i> |
| then | what | if | you.SG.NOM in/ | for example |
| <i>li</i> | <i>bajêr-î</i> | <i>bi-j-î</i> | <i>jî,</i> | <i>bes</i> |
| in | town-OBL | SBJ-LIVE-2sg | too | but |
| <i>her</i> | <i>car car</i> | <i>mirov</i> | <i>di-çî-te</i> | <i>gund-î.</i> |
| every | time | person | PRG-went-3SG | village-OBL |

‘Even if you live/ for example in the city, but one often goes to the village.’

(177) S-050 Qoshachay, Iran, 38:

| | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|------------|
| <i>Êstake</i> | <i>û/</i> | <i>eger</i> | <i>roj-êk-îş</i> | <i>bê</i> |
| now | and | if | day-IDF-too | is.SBJ |
| <i>xoşîy-eke,</i> | <i>îhtîmal</i> | <i>e</i> | <i>zahîrî</i> | <i>bê.</i> |
| joy-DEF | likely | is | artificial | is.SBJ |

‘Now even if one day is joyful, it’s likely that it is artificial.’

5.7 Summary of adverbial clauses

Event integration is represented in adverbial clauses through the de-ranking of the subordinated verb and marking of the relation through a subordinator, and

potentially overt marking of co-referential subjects. Verb de-ranking generally takes the form of the subjunctive mood on the subordinated verb, which we find in anterior, reality condition and purpose clauses, the latter sometimes even showing a higher level of de-ranking or dependency in the form of a nominalised subordinated predicate. Purpose clauses are more likely than anterior or condition clauses to omit an explicit subordinator, though this depends on the likelihood of the realisation potential of the state of affairs designated as the goal. Real condition clauses appear more likely to show overt marking of the coreferential subject. Other adverbial clauses that rely on the subjunctive are negative condition and some posterior-durative clauses (but not others). Unreal conditions show a specialised verb form in the condition clause, but the factuality of their non-truth value and tendency to overtly express coreferential subjects should lead us to position them lower on the event integration hierarchy. Co-temporal, posterior and reason clauses show independent tense-aspect selection in the subordinated clause. Reason clauses rely invariably on a specialised subordinator, and the evidence from the speech corpus shows an overwhelming tendency for them to take up a rigid position following the main clause, a constraint that we do not necessarily find for other adverbial clauses. Concessive constructions, finally, require greater complexity of structural marking, namely a specialist subordinator and the conjunctive focus particle as well as often a correlative adversative connector. The contrastive nature of the relationship between the states of affairs points to a lower level of semantic integration. We can thus propose the following hierarchy, which bears strong resemblance to those postulated by Hengeveld (1998) and Cristofaro (2003) based on cross-linguistic samples: purpose > anterior, real condition, negative condition, concessive condition > posterior-durative > unreal and potential condition > co-temporal, posterior > reason > concessive.

Various sources of adverbial subordinators can be identified: Specialised subordinators occur for anterior, posterior, posterior-durative, and concessive relations, but are less likely to occur for co-temporal, conditional, and purpose. Complex subordinators composed of several elements are more likely to be found for purpose, reason, concessive, negative condition and concessive condition. Anterior, posterior, durative, purpose and reason subordinators tend to draw on the prepositions 'before', 'after', 'until', 'for', 'in front of', respectively. Co-temporal forms (like location clauses) tend to draw on nouns, bringing them typologically close to relative clauses, in line with predictions by Thompson et al. (2007) that they are distinct as they can be substituted by single words. Concessives draw on the quantifiers 'every' and 'some'. We find greater uniformity in the origin of subordinators for reason, condition, and durative, where many of the forms are part of a pool of resources shared across the wider region with other Iranian and with Turkic languages, while contemporary borrowings are found for reason (from Arabic and Turkish) and condition (from Turkish).

CK relies strongly on the deictic *ewey* in a structure closely resembling relative clauses. Differences in the inventory of tense-aspect-modality categories are responsible for different configurations of the consequence clause in conditional constructions as well as the distinctions between types of conditional

constructions on the ‘real’ vs. ‘unreal’ continuum. Some CK and SK varieties in Iran show evidence of convergence (with Persian or potentially other languages) in the distribution of tense-aspect categories in conditional constructions. The group of Bahdini and some neighbouring varieties – those designated as South Eastern Kurmanji by Öpengin and Haig (2014) – stand out through a distinctive purpose subordinator and lower likelihood of overt coreferential pronouns in the consequence clause of conditional constructions.

6. Discussion

A comparative perspective on the distribution of features can be taken at several levels: The macro-level takes into consideration the broader areal dimension of historical cross-linguistic contacts in eastern Anatolia, northern Iraq and Iran and the southern Caucasus. Then, within the MDKD corpus, some patterns divide NK from CK (and SK, to the extent that its representation in the corpus allows such statements). Finally, micro-level developments characterise regional groups of samples and those in contemporary contact with particular languages.

Starting with the **macro-areal** a key feature is the predominance of finiteness and the split in the marking of factual and non-factual predicates (indicative vs. subjunctive). This split appears in many of the historical contact languages including Persian and its dialects, Armenian, Azeri, Arabic, and dispersed minority languages like Neo-Aramaic, Anatolian Greek, and Domari. A pool of connecting particles is shared among some of the languages. They include the conjunctive connector *û/we*, disjunctive *ya*, contrastive *ama*, the focused conjunctive construction *hem .. hem*, the discourse markers *yanî* and *wele*, the generic subordinator of the type *ki*, the conditional subordinator of the type *eger*, the reason subordinator *çun* and the posterior-durative particle *(he)ta*, the quantifier *her* that is involved in some subordinating devices and the particle *belê* with a range of affirmative-contrasting meanings. The combination of predominance of finiteness in clause combining, the fact/potential distinction in the verbal system and its distribution across similar hierarchies of event integration, and the shared pool of connectors, necessarily gives rise to considerable similarities in the structural configuration of connectivity in Kurdish and other languages of the region (cf. Matras 2002).

A number of **general traits** of Kurdish emerge from an examination of the sample. While finiteness prevails, there are instances where embedded predications rely on nominal structures, notably in phasal complements and purpose clauses. The reliance on the general subordinator of the type *ki* etc. to convey a range of semantic relations stands out. It is most conspicuous in factual complements and relative clauses but in some samples it extends to co-temporal, manipulative, desiderative, purpose and conditional clauses (in that tentative hierarchical order of frequency or prominence). This might be regarded as a process of grammaticalisation both in the sense of an extension of meaning and syntactic environment and of semantic bleaching as the particle loses its link to presupposition and extends to introduce potential or non-factual states of affairs.

The fact that the presence of the complementiser is optional in manipulation and purpose clauses and that it is linked to agent control and realisation potential is a further feature of that grammaticalisation process. This is in line with observations on other languages where finiteness prevails in complement clauses (cf. Matras and Tenser 2016), and is in line with the grammaticalisation pathways noted by Heine and Kuteva (2002) from relativiser to complementiser, from complementiser to purpose, and from temporal to conditional. Noteworthy is the ‘wrapping’ structure whereby the generic complementiser accompanies an ontological subordinator (lit. ‘I asked that what he wanted ..’), a strategy that is also found in Persian and other languages. Relative clauses rely on the *ezafe* attributive marker and potentially also a relativiser or deictic linker. This hierarchical relationship suggests that it is the nominal attributive marker that is the primary linker and so relative clauses might be said to occupy an intermediate position between complex NPs and complement clauses. There is a tendency for temporal adverbial clauses to contain presuppositions and to be preposed to the main clause, while those of reason contain new information and tend to follow the main clause.

Morphological alignment plays a role in connecting clauses through both paratactic and syndetic constructions, subject to speaker’s choices and the substantially different systems of participant tracking devices in NK and CK (see below). Isolating the impact of alignment is not a simple task as there is an interplay with other factors involved in participant tracking, notably accessibility of information (antecedent retrievability), realisation potential and control in non-factual predications, as well as the ambiguity vs. distinctiveness of person-specific indexical forms (cf. Matras 1997; Haig 1998).

Connectors generally take the monosyndetic prepositive format A co-B, in both coordination and complementation, or co-B A where adverbial subordinations precede the main clause. Focused conjunctives are the exception with the postpositive format A B-co (while pre-planned focused constructions have the bisyndetic format co-A co-B). Focused conjunctives figure in a number of compositional devices, namely in disjunctive, concessive and concessive conditional constructions. Other typical compositional connectors are based on the prepositions ‘before’, ‘after’, ‘on/in front of’ and ‘for’ for anterior, posterior, reason and purpose, respectively, and the combination of quantifiers ‘every’ and ‘some’ for concessive. The only shared connector is the temporal-consequential particle *îca*, a composition of a deictic and temporal component (‘this-time’).

We now turn to relevant differences between the two major Kurdish dialect groups, for which MacKenzie (1961) coined the denominations **North** and **South** and which are separated by a rather dense cluster of isoglosses or Great Divide (Matras 2019). These relate on the one hand to the role of different morphological types and categories, and on the other to different patterns of grammaticalisation of connectors. NK favours overt pronominal marking of coreferential subjects in the first person across alignment boundaries, owing to differences in case representation, while CK makes use of subject clitics in different positions in intransitive and transitive clauses. CK places the subject of co-temporal perception complements as the direct object of the main clause,

while NK positions it as the subject of the complement clause. NK varieties use the future tense in consequence clauses of real conditionals and draw on the future perfect to distinguish the consequence clause of potential conditional constructions. In the absence of a future tense, CK varieties rely on the present-indicative for the consequence of real conditional constructions and have no device to indicate an intermediate position between real and unreal conditional constructions.

In the inventory of particles, the groups tend to differ in the shape of the general subordinator/relativiser, which is usually *ke* and sometimes *ki* in CK and takes on a variety of forms including *ku, ko, kû, ki, go, gi* in NK. The focus particle is generally *jî* in NK and *-îş* in CK though there are cases of ‘crossovers’ in regions alongside the Great Divide. For the adversative (also affirmative) CK has *betam* while the NK cognate is *belê*. A major difference in the structure of subordinators is the reliance in CK on the deictic *ewey*, which combines with prepositional material (and optionally the general subordinator) in a configuration that resembles that of relative clauses; a parallel form is absent in NK. On the other hand, for co-temporal subordinators, NK relies on a combination of temporal nouns in the attributive (*ezafe*) construction (and optionally the general subordinator), mirroring the structure of relative clauses, while CK relies on the general subordinator. The two groups show different forms of anteriority markers –NK *berî* and CK *pêş* – and different markers of temporal sequencing ‘(and) then’ – NK *paşî, (piştî) hingî*, CK *îtir, îdî, duway*.

The discussion offers a number of insights into regional **sub-groupings** within the main dialect groups. The Bahdini NK dialects of northern Iraq and neighbouring dialects in the Hakkari province in Turkey, which Öpengin and Haig (2014) designate as South East Kurmanji (SEK), stand out as a relatively coherent group with distinctive features, some of which are shared with neighbouring dialects of the Derik region in northeastern Syria (cf. Matras 2019). Characteristic features include the frequent absence of a relativiser in relative clauses and reliance instead on the attributive marker and in some cases on the deictic linker *ewê* (the latter also found in NK dialects of Syria and resembling the strategy of some CK varieties). There is some evidence that Bahdini occupies an intermediary position in participant tracking with a lower tendency than other NK samples to use overt pronouns for coreferential subjects, relying instead on person agreement, resembling the reliance in CK on enclitic marking of participants. Distinctive connectors include *da ku* for purpose and, shared with CK, the enclitic focus particle *-îş* as well as the Arabic adversative borrowing *bes*. The CK dialects of Iran show *eger* in co-temporal clauses and *ke* in purpose clauses, and favour the sequential marker *îdî*. They show the imperfect tense in both sides of unreal conditional constructions, apparently converging with Persian or other related regional varieties, and the Persian borrowings adversative *welî* and reason *çun*. NK varieties of Syria stand out through use of the deictic linker *ewê* in relative clauses, shared with Bahdini, and of a specialised complementiser *qey* for propositional attitude (shared with neighbouring dialects in Turkey), and otherwise through the form of relativisers in *gi* and *han* and the Arabic borrowings adversative *bes*, the complementiser *inû*, reason *linû*, and consequential-conjunctive *fe*. The comparatively large

number of NK varieties from Turkey and the extent of their geographical distribution and variation do not allow for an easy sub-classification other than the high density of Turkish borrowings in the domain of discourse particles including *diye*, *neyse*, *işte*, (*ondan*) *sonra*, as well as the conditional particle *-se* and conditional subordinator *eyer*. There is some evidence to suggest an incipient tendency towards preposed relative and complement clauses.

Abbreviations

| | |
|----------|-----------------------------|
| ABL | ablative (Turkish) |
| COMP | complementiser |
| COND | conditional |
| DEF | definite article |
| DET | determiner |
| DIR | directional |
| DM | discourse marker |
| EXC | exclamation |
| EZ | ezafe (nominal attribution) |
| F | ezafe feminine |
| FUT | future particle |
| IDF | indefinite |
| INF | infinitive |
| INT | intensifier aspect |
| M | ezafe masculine |
| NEG | negation |
| NOM | nominative |
| OBL | oblique |
| PL | plural |
| PLU | pluperfect |
| PRF | perfect tense |
| PRG | progressive aspect |
| PST.COND | past conditional |
| REFL | reflexive |
| REL | relativiser |
| SBJ | subjunctive |
| SG | singular |

References

- Andrews, Avery D. 2007. Relative clauses. In: Shopen, Timothy. ed. *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume II: Complex constructions. Second edition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 206-236.
- Bedir Khan, Emir Djeladet and Lescot, Roger. *Grammaire kurde. (Dialects kurmandji).* 1970: Paris: Maisonneuve.
- Blau, Joyce. 1980. *Manuel de kurde. Dialecte Sorani.* Paris: Klincksieck.

- Crevels, Mily. 2000. Concession. A typological study. Amsterdam: University of Amsterdam.
- Cristofaro, Sonia. 2003. Subordination. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dixon, R. M. W. 2006. Complement clauses and complementation strategies in typological perspective. In: Dixon, R. M. W. and Aikhenvald, Alexandra Y. eds. *Complementation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1-48.
- Ehlich, Konrad & Rehbein, Jochen. 1986. *Muster und Institution. Untersuchungen zur schulischen Kommunikation*. Tübinge: Narr.
- Fattah, Ismail Kamandâr. 2000. *Les dialects kurdes méridionaux. Étude linguistique et dialectologique*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Givón, T. 1990. *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction. Volume II*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Haig, Geoffrey. 1998. On the interaction of morphological and syntactic ergativity: Lessons from Kurdish. *Lingua* 105, 149-173.
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2019. Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji). In: Haig, Geoffrey and Khan, Geoffrey. eds. *The languages and linguistics of Western Asia. An areal perspective*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 106-158.
- Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. Coordination. In: Shopen, Timothy. ed. *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume II: Complex constructions*. Second edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1-51.
- Heine, Bernd and Kuteva, Tania. 2002. *World lexicon of grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hengeveld, Kees. 1998. Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe. In: Van der Auwera, Johan. ed. *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 335-419.
- Keenan, Edward L. and Comrie, Bernard. 1977. Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar. *Linguistic Inquiry* 8, 63-99.
- Kehayov, Peter and Boye, Kasper. 2016. Complementizer semantics in European languages: Overview and generalizations. In: Boye, Kasper and Kehayov, Peter. eds. *Complementizer semantics in European languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton. 809-878.
- Kurdoev, Kanat K. 1957. *Grammatika kurdskego jayka (kurmandži)*. Moscow: Akademiya Nauk.
- Langacker, Roger W. 1991. *Foundations of cognitive grammar. Volume II: Descriptive applications*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- MacKenzie, D. N. 1961. *Kurdish dialect studies*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Mahmoudveysi, Parvin, Bailey, Denise, Paul, Ludwig, and Haig Geoffrey. 2012. *The Gorani language of Gawraǰū, a village of West Iran. Texts, grammar, and lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Matras, Yaron. 1997. Clause combining, ergativity, and coreferent deletion in Kurmanji. *Studies in Language* 21:3, 613-653.
- Matras, Yaron. 1998. Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing. *Linguistics* 36-2, 281-331.
- Matras, Yaron. 2002. Kurmanji complementation. Semantic-typological aspects in an areal perspective. In: Haig, Geoffrey & Matras, Yaron. eds. *Kurdish Linguistics. (Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung 54-3)*. Berlin: Akademie. 49-63.
- Matras, Yaron. 2019. Revisiting Kurdish dialect geography: Findings from the Manchester Database. In: Haig, Geoffrey, Öpengin, Ergin and Gundoğdu,

- Songül, eds. *Current issues in Kurdish linguistics*. Bamberg: Bamberg University Press. 225-241.
- Matras, Yaron. 2020 [2009]. *Language contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Matras, Yaron and Tenser, Anton. 2016. Complementizers in Romani. In: Boye, Kasper & Kehayov, Petar, eds. *Semantic functions of complementizers in European languages*. Berlin: De Gruyter. 341-375.
- McCarus, Ernest M. 1958. *A Kurdish grammar. Descriptive analysis of the Kurdish of Sulaimaniya, Iraq*. New York: American Council of Learned Societies.
- McCarus, Ernest M. 2009. Kurdish. In: Windfuhr, Gernot. ed. *The Iranian languages*. London: Routledge. 587-633.
- Noonan, Michael. [1985] 2007. Complementation. In: Shopen, Timothy. ed. *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume II: Complex constructions. Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 52-150.
- Öpengin, Ergin. 2016. *The Mukri variety of Central Kurdish. Grammar, texts, and lexicon*. Weisbaden: Reichert.
- Öpengin, Ergin and Haig, Geoffrey. 2014. Regional variation in Kurmanji: A preliminary classification of dialects. *Kurdish Studies* 2:2, 143-176.
- Paul, Ludwig. 1998. *Zazaki*. Weisbaden: Reichert.
- Redder, Angelika. 1989. Konjunktionen, Partikeln und Modalverben als Sequenzierungsmittel im Unterrichtsdiskurs. In: Weigend, Edda and Hundsnuscher, Franz. eds. *Dialoganalyse II*. Tübingen: Niemeyer. 393-407.
- Rudolph, Elisabeth. 1996. *Contrast. Adversative and concessive expressions on sentence and text level*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. 1987. *Discourse markers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thackston, W. M. 2006a. *Kurmanji Kurdish. A Reference Grammar with Selected Readings*.
- Thackston, W. M. 2006b. *Sorani Kurdish. A Reference Grammar with Selected Readings*.
- Thompson, Sandra A., Longacre, Robert E., and Hwang, Shin Ja J. 2007. Adverbial clauses. . In: Shopen, Timothy. ed. *Language typology and syntactic description. Volume II: Complex constructions. Second edition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 237-300.
- Yusupova, Zare. 2017. *The Kurdish dialect Gorani*. Saarbrücken: Lambert.