

Shuan Osman Karim

6 Pattern borrowing/convergence in the Southern Kurdish Zone

Abstract: A cursory examination of the grammar of Kurdish and Gorani varieties shows the existence of convergence. In this chapter, I examine several obvious and several less apparent examples of pattern borrowing (in the sense of Sakel 2007), grammatical constructions borrowed from a donor language and expressed with inherited formatives in the recipient language. Based on new data and new analyses, I refute some long-standing examples of convergence and propose some potential ones.

Keywords: Kurdish, Gorani, Contact, Convergence

1 Introduction

Fattah's (2000) study "Les dialectes kurdes méridionaux" has given us great insight into the diversity of Southern Kurdish varieties. Additionally, recent works like Mahmoudveysi et al. (2012) and Mahmoudveysi & Bailey (2013), coupled with previous works such as Hadank (1930), MacKenzie (1956), and Blau (1989) begin to clarify the picture of Gorani varieties. Although there is much that remains unknown about these languages, it is clear that the diversity among them increases as their geographical distance increases from the Hewramî¹ core (for the most complete description of a core Hewramî variety, see MacKenzie 1966). The more peripheral varieties, such as Shabaki, Bājalāni, Gawrajui, Zerdeyane, Kaka'i, Macho, and others, are spoken in the heart of areas with substantial populations speaking Kurdish, Aramaic, Turkic, and possibly Indo-Aryan varieties.

In contrast, the towns and villages in the Hewramî core are deep in the Zagros mountains. It may be inferred from their location that, in the words of (Urban 2020), "this mountain world offers a refuge space granting freedom and autonomy," with implications for "social structures," as well as "language geography, linguistics

¹ Here I use the term Hewramî to refer to the Gorani varieties spoken in the regions Lihon, Jawero, Pawe, Text, and Rezaw, and the term Gorani to refer to all the languages of the Gorani subbranch of Iranian including Hewramî varieties.

Shuan Osman Karim, University of Cambridge, Julius-Maximilians-Universität Würzburg

tic diversity, patterns of language contact and spread, and perhaps, as has been argued especially recently, language structure”. One such implication is a conservative quality that is a defining characteristic of the varieties of the Hewramî core, although there has never been a study of these varieties from the perspective of how geography influences multilingualism and language convergence.

My thesis in this chapter is that as one moves away from the Hewramî core, there are areas where the local Kurdish varieties have what may be seen as Hewramî features in their grammar. In these same zones, there are likewise Gorani varieties that have taken on a Kurdish character (For a discussion of how Gorani varieties differ as they move further away from the Hewramî core, see Naqshbendi this volume). This may be, as MacKenzie (1961) suggested, the result of Kurdish displacing a Gorani substrate. Although, this theory has been dismissed in recent times, perhaps due to an anachronistic view of substratum effects that were prevalent in MacKenzie’s time (see Leezenberg 1993).

Based on limited data from grammars and innovative studies of specific phenomena in Southern Kurdish and Gorani, I attempt to update the record and make some predictions for future study of Gorani and Kurdish contact. In section 2, I look at possible contact-induced convergences. I begin in section 2.1 with features in Kurdish proposed by MacKenzie (1961) to be the result of a Gorani substratum. Then, in section 2.2, I outline some Kurdish features that appear in Gorani varieties and Gorani features in Kurdish varieties, some of which are not likely to be the result of mutual inheritance. Since the focus of this chapter is superficial convergence, I do not attempt to establish through the principles of historical linguistics whether any feature has been innovated, inherited, or contact-induced. If a form or pattern was present in a known ancestor, I claim that it is a possible example of inheritance. Likewise, if a form has a known developmental cline in one group, I claim that it is a possible example of borrowing from that group into another.

2 Kurdish-Gorani convergence

The logical place to begin when discussing Kurdish-Gorani contact is with MacKenzie’s (1961) seminal study on *The Origins of Kurdish*, where he first proposes the displacement of the Goran by a Kurdish invasion. In this study, MacKenzie proposes several innovations in Kurdish that have given it a Gorani character separating it from Northern Kurdish (Kurmançî). Here I focus on MacKenzie’s (1961) morphological claims; for a discussion of the validity of MacKenzie’s (1961) sociolinguistic analysis, see Leezenberg (1993).

After addressing the arguments of MacKenzie (1961) and Leezenberg (1993), I continue to examine the phenomenon of Kurdish-Gorani convergence. In this chapter, I take convergence to mean that similar patterns occur in multiple varieties. This convergence has several possible explanations: (1) mutual inheritance: they are similar because the pattern was preserved from a common ancestor; (2) borrowing: they are similar because the pattern in one language was modeled after the pattern in the other; and (3) coincidence: they are similar because the pattern was generated by a typologically common process. I make some proposals based on the comparison of forms in Kurdish and Gorani varieties as to directionality when possible. These proposals are based on the ways that some varieties differ from a core. For Gorani, I assume that the varieties known as Hewramî represent that conservative core. The data for core Hewramî comes primarily from MacKenzie (1966) supplemented by Paweyane forms from a variety of sources such as Christensen & Benedictsén (1921), Mahmoudveysi & Bailey (2019), Holmberg & Odden (1966), and my own field notes. For the languages of the Gorani Periphery, data comes from studies such as Shabaki/Bajelanî (MacKenzie 1956), Gawrajuî (Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012), and Zerdeyane (Mahmoudveysi & Bailey 2013). For Kurdish, I propose the most conservative core to be varieties like Erbil-Rewanduz Soranî (MacKenzie 1961a) or Mukriyanî (Öpengin 2016). The latter assumption is based on the conservation of case, the full imperfective prefix *de-*, remnant ergativity, and other features. It is often assumed that Northern Kurdish or Kurmancî is the most conservative group as it has more fully preserved case, number, and gender marking on nouns and an ergative system that is more than the remnants found in Central Kurdish. However, I take the view common among historical linguists that varieties that appear conservative have also innovated, and varieties that appear highly innovative preserve features perhaps lost in more conservative varieties. There is some evidence to suggest that in Kurmancî, innovation along one axis preserved things along another; see Karim (2021). Additionally, MacKenzie (1961) proposed convergences between Gorani and Central Kurdish based on where Central Kurdish differed from Kurmancî but agreed with Gorani. Leezenberg (1993) suggests that Central Kurdish differs from Kurmancî in many of these examples due to innovations in Kurmancî, a view that I believe will stand the test of time.

Following Sakel 2007: 15), there are generally two types of borrowings Matter (MAT) and Pattern (PAT). With MAT borrowings, “morphological material and its phonological shape from one language is replicated in another language”. With PAT borrowings, “only the patterns of the other language are replicated, i.e. the organization, distribution and mapping of grammatical or semantic meaning, while the form itself is not borrowed”. Many studies have proposed hierarchies of borrowability, e.g., Haugen (1950), Matras (2007), Matras (2007a), etc. According to Matras

(2007a), that hierarchy ranges from nouns, the most easily borrowed, to inflectional affixes, the least easily borrowed 1.

(1) Nouns, conjunctions > verbs > discourse markers > adjectives > interjections > adverbs > other particles, adpositions > numerals < pronouns > derivational affixes > inflectional affixes

Note that all the elements of the hierarchy 1 are MAT borrowings. Discussion of PAT borrowings tends to be associated with linguistic areas (*sprachbünde*) following Sakel (2007: 16). Both MAT and PAT borrowing are relevant to the languages of the Kurdish zone, defined as any place where people who consider themselves to be Kurds live. However, I focus mainly on the convergence of patterns in this chapter.

2.1 MacKenzie's (1961) "substratum" effects

MacKenzie (1961), citing Professor K. Barr, attributes some differences within Kurdish to Gorani influence on the Southern dialects.² He further argues that "there is no avoiding the conclusion that [Central] dialects of Kurdish have overlaid a Gorani substratum,³ while the Northern dialects have to a much greater extent preserved their purity" (MacKenzie 1961: 86). Leezenberg (1993) rejects this claim asserting that in addition to Gorani contact, the convergences between Central and Southern Kurdish and Gorani could also be explained as common inheritance, "parallel innovations of a Sprachbund-like nature, as prestige borrowings, or as innovations specific to Kurmanji". He provides a more theoretically-driven approach rooted in the tradition of Thomason & Kaufman (1988). His goal is to analyze the type of contact that resulted in the borrowing from Gorani found in Central and Southern Kurdish. Essentially, he challenges the narrative, conjured up by MacKenzie's (1961) use of the term *substratum*, of a Gorani-speaking population shifting to Kurdish and bringing along aspects of their language as a result. His ultimate conclusion is that

2 Based on the Kurdish varieties surveyed by MacKenzie (1961a) in his (1960–61) "Kurdish Dialect Studies," it is likely that what he meant by Southern Kurdish is what scholars today would refer to as Central Kurdish. These varieties are characterized by the retention of "remnant ergativity" as described in Jügel (2009), the near complete loss of case, the likely complete loss of gender, and (sometimes lenited) imperfective prefixes. He does not include any references to varieties that have a total loss of ergativity, ones that lack imperfective markers, or those with imperfective suffixes or circumfixes, all characteristics of Southern Kurdish.

3 There is no way of knowing what precisely MacKenzie (1961) meant by *substratum* by his analysis. However, it is unlikely that in 1961 the term carried much of the theoretical weight it does today (p.c., Leezenberg apud p.c., MacKenzie); see Leezenberg (this volume).

the borrowings attested in Kurdish are of the type that could be prestige borrowing from an elevated literary Gorani. The so-called Gorani Koiné flourished during the Erdelan dynasty as many Erdelanî poets produced their poetry in this variety. The Erdelan dynasty was a time and place when the Gorani language flourished, and many poets composed in Gorani despite being speakers of other varieties.

MacKenzie (1961) proposes several direct Gorani borrowings. There is a synthetic passive construction built with *-rê/ra-* in Central Kurdish and *-y/-ya* in Gorani but absent from Northern Kurdish that MacKenzie considers a borrowing from Gorani. Leezenberg (1993), on the other hand, points out that the *y*-form passive is well attested in Avestan, Old Persian, and Sanskrit. Therefore, the Kurdish form could be explained by mutual inheritance alone.

MacKenzie (1961) proposes that the definite suffix *-eke*, occurring in Gorani and Zazaki, must also be borrowed from Gorani, as it is notably absent from Kurmancî. According to Leezenberg (1993), this alone is not a good basis for assuming massive substrate effects and language shifts. However, there may be a reason to reject this as convergence entirely. A form of the *k*-type definite suffix can be found in many Iranian languages (Karim in-review).⁴ Additionally, there is some evidence that builds a circumstantial case that this marker once existed in Northern Kurdish and was lost (Karim 2021: ch. 4).⁵ In light of these two points, I propose that this, too, is likely an example of mutual inheritance and not necessarily Gorani borrowing.

Additionally, MacKenzie (1961) proposes what he calls the open-compound construction⁶ is also an example of Gorani borrowing. This construction features a reduced form of the *ezafe* particle when a noun phrase is definite (e.g. Central Kurdish: *kiç-î cwan* ‘beautiful girl’ vs. *kiç-e cwan-eke* ‘the beautiful girl’). For MacKenzie (1961), this was clear evidence of Gorani borrowing as they both share this construction. However, the phenomenon is much more widespread with examples

4 Emāmzāda Esmā’īlī (Fars): *doft-ak-ō* ‘the girls [girl-DEF-PL]’ (Windfuhr 2012), Buşehrī (Fars): *î havā-y-akū* ‘this weather’ (Windfuhr 2012), Gionī (Lor): *asp-{Ø gap-eka* ‘the big horse [horse-DEF. EZ big-DEF]’ (McKinnon 2001), Northern Lori: *-(e)ka* (McKinnon 2011), Dezfuli and şuştari (S Lori): *-aka* (McKinnon 2011), Bakhtiāri (S Lori): *-ekū* (McKinnon 2011), *-(e)ke* (Anonby & Taheri-Ardali 2019: 452), Central Kurdish: *-eke* (MacKenzie 1961a), Southern Kurdish: *-aka -aga* and *ağa* (Fattah 2000: 245), Hewramī (Lihon): *-aka* (MacKenzie 1966), Paweyane: *-eke* (Holmberg & Odden 1966), Zerdeyane: *-aka* (Mahmoudveysi & Bailey 2013), and Gawrajuī: *-aka* (Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012).

5 Note that the ultimate source of the *k*-form definite suffixes are the Proto-Indo-Iranian diminutive/evaluative extension **-Vkā*. These forms are retained in Northern Kurdish, e.g., on kinship terms *mêrik* ‘husband,’ *jinik* ‘wife,’ etc. The forms of the diminutive extension that were lost in Northern Kurdish according to (Karim 2021: ch. 4) were intervocalic, i.e., when followed by a demonstrative clitic or *ezafe* particle.

6 The open-compound construction (MacKenzie 1961b) is also referred to as the close *ezafe* Thackston (2006) and the definite *ezafe* (Karim 2022).

in Colloquial New Persian (Samvelian 2005; Karim 2022, e.g., *pesær-e bozorg* ‘big boy’ vs. *pesær-ø bozorg-é* ‘the big boy’ McKinnon 2011) and Luri (e.g. *kwak-e gap* ‘big boy’ vs. *kwak-ø gap*-aka ‘the big boy’ McKinnon 2011). It seems that this, too, can be seen as a more widespread phenomenon with parallels across the Iranian languages.

Perhaps the only one of the morphological changes proposed by MacKenzie (1961) that may have been Gorani borrowing is the postverb *-ewe*, which is a preverb in northern and western Northern Kurdish *ve-* and western Southern Kurdish varieties *ew-* (<PIr. *apa ‘away’). Gorani has preserved a medial stage in the shift from preverb to postverb, where it is preverbal in the infinitive (Paweyane: *ewe-wardey* ‘to drink’) and postverbal in finite forms (e.g., Paweyane: *muwery-ewe* ‘you drink’). The motivation for this shift is not necessarily clear. In Central and Southern Kurdish, the postverb *=ewe* (also *=ew*, *=ewe*, *=o*, and *=oewe*) has a different (vowel-initial) phonological shape than all other preverbs (e.g., *ra=*, *da=*, *wer=*, *ber=*, *he=*, etc.) This could be the motivation for both the developments in Kurdish and Gorani, which are not identical. The postverbal position is a feature of Central and Southern Kurdish, and the ambifixial preverbs (e.g., *=ewe=*, *=ene=*, and *=ere=*) are a feature of Gorani. Other preverbs with the same phonological shape lost their initial vowels, e.g., the *we-* in *westan* ‘to stop’ (<PIr. *awa + *stā ‘to stand’), as did the cognate of the *=ewe* in Northern Kurdish *ve=*. As *ewe* does not behave as expected, for Central Kurdish, I tentatively count it among Gorani patterns in Kurdish.

These “convergences” form the core of the Gorani substratum hypothesis proposed by MacKenzie (1961). Leezenberg (1993) proposes that mutual inheritance is a better explanation for convergence between Gorani and Central Kurdish. Places where Gorani and Central Kurdish agree but not Northern Kurdish are better explained by innovation in Northern Kurdish than convergence. This is certainly true for the use of pronominal clitics in Gorani and Central and Southern Kurdish, which are well attested in Old, Middle, and New Iranian languages. They were lost in Northern Kurdish and not innovated in Central Kurdish. A further example that Leezenberg (1993) does not include is the simplified *ezafe* system. MacKenzie (1961) proposed that Gorani and Central and Southern Kurdish had simplified their *ezafe* (attribution marking) systems by eliminating case, number, and gender distinctions. However, it may be the case that Kumancî and Zazaki have innovated gender and sometimes case marking on the *ezafe* (Karim 2021). According to Karim (2021: 208ff), a phonological reduction of intervocalic *k* before the loss of gender may have preserved gender marking on both the possessor and possessum in possessive constructions and on definite accusative arguments and ergative agents. This proposal is based on early sound changes affecting languages of the Northern belt, including Zazaki, Tati, and Talyshi (and even Sogdian, dating back to the Middle Iranian period). Northern Kurdish does not genealogically belong to this

group. However, it often converges with these languages in terms of morphology and phonology.

Leezenberg (1993) rightly rejects MacKenzie's (1961) examples, but there are other examples that MacKenzie (1961) missed. I believe there is a greater range of actual morphological borrowing between Gorani and (Central) and Southern Kurdish. However, these changes did not affect the core of Central Kurdish or the Hewramî core of Gorani. From here on, I confine my discussion to what I propose to be actual convergence. These convergences can be understood as changes in peripheral varieties, resulting in similarities with other local languages. I restrict this discussion to Kurdish-Gorani contact. However, I acknowledge that there are examples of Gorani-Aramaic and Kurdish-Aramaic contact, explored in Khan and Mohammadirad (this volume), as well as possible examples of Gorani-Turkic and Gorani-Indo-Aryan contact that have yet to be explored.

2.2 Kurdish patterns in Gorani and Gorani patterns in Kurdish

As in other Iranian languages, Kurdish and Gorani have two verbal stems traditionally referred to as past and present, although the present-tense stem is more accurately categorized as non-past. The non-past stem serves as the basis for the present subjunctive, present/future indicative (glossed non-past), imperative, and prohibitive. The past-tense stem is the basis for the past-imperfective, the perfective (glossed past), the present perfect, the past perfect, the past subjunctive, and several conditional moods. Through the remainder of this chapter, the distinction between MAT and PAT is largely irrelevant as it focuses only on pattern convergence in the verbal system of Kurdish zone varieties. Each variety employs native formatives, albeit from different sources, to create the same verbal pattern, e.g., (TAM)-STEM(-TAM)-AGR.

Kurdish and Hewramî verbal categories are presented for comparison in Table 1, where Kurdish is represented by the Central Kurdish variety of Hewlêr (my field notes) and Gorani is represented by the variety of Lihon (MacKenzie 1966). The non-past stem of 'to give' is *de-* in Kurdish and *de-*⁷ in Hewramî, although the addition of the suffixes beginning with the mid-vowels *ê* and *o* obscure the final vowel *e*. However, the Hewramî form is distinguished by lenition signified by *ð*. According to MacKenzie (1966), this is a non-syllabic schwa. Perhaps the current

7 I give all examples in the standard (Hawar) Kurdish script to facilitate comparability between varieties. The exceptions to this convention are limited to my use of *e* in Hewramî (following the orthography of Holmberg & Odden 1966) for what would be *e* in the Hawar script. I use this convention regardless of the system employed by the original authors.

best understanding comes from Naghshbandi (2020), who concludes that this realization is a velarized alveolar approximate [ɾʷ]. The past stem is *da-* in Kurdish and Hewramî. The inflectional formatives and choice of stem mark the differences between the language groups.

Table 1: TAM categories ‘give.3sg’.

TAM	K Hewlêr	G (Lihon)
NPST.SBJ	<i>bi-dat</i> (< *bi-de-et)	<i>bi-ð-o</i>
NPST	<i>de-dat</i> (< *de-de-et)	<i>mi-ð-o</i>
NPST.IMP	<i>bi-de</i>	(<i>bi-</i>) <i>ð-e</i>
NPST.PRH	<i>me-de</i>	<i>me-ð-e</i>
PST	<i>da</i>	<i>da</i>
PST.IPFV	<i>de-da</i>	<i>d-ê(n)</i>
PRS.PRF	<i>da-y-e</i>	<i>da-n</i>
PST.PRF	<i>da-bû</i>	<i>da-b-ê(n)</i>
PST.SBJ	<i>da-b-ê</i>	<i>da-b-o</i>
PST.COND	<i>bi-da-ya-ye</i>	<i>dɛ(n)</i> (< *da-a ⁸ -ê(n))
PST.PRF.COND	<i>bi-da-b-a</i>	<i>dɛ-bîɛ(n)</i> (< *da-ê-bâ-ê(n))

Among the non-past forms, both Kurdish and Hewramî seem to have parallel constructions. The subjunctive and imperative are formed with the prefix *bi* attached to the non-past stem. The non-past indicative is formed by the addition of an imperfective prefix *de-* in Kurdish and *mi-* in Paweyane and peripheral Gorani, but only with certain verbs in core Hewramî; the present is the exclusive domain of the imperfective. The prohibitive is formed with the prohibitive prefix *me-* in Kurdish and *me-* in Hewramî.

The past forms differ both superficially and substantially between the languages. The perfective (plain) past is unmarked in both Kurdish and Hewramî. The past imperfective is marked with the same imperfective prefix as the non-past tense. In Kurdish, *de-* attached to the past-tense stem *da*. However, Hewramî builds the past imperfective on the non-past stem *de-* with an opaque⁹ imperfective form-

⁸ This reconstruction is based on MacKenzie’s (1966) claim that the source of *ɛ* is a coalescence of *a* and *ê*. Note that according to MacKenzie (1966), the vowels *ɛ* and *e* are differentiated by length and not duration.

⁹ Windfuhr (1995) proposed that the Hewramî imperfective “derived from earlier optative endings **-ê/-ên*, which already in OIr. could express imperfective past”. However, there seem to be some phonological issues with this reconstruction, e.g., the Paweyane second-person singular ending *-îşî*, the *n* formative in all but the third-person singular, etc.

ative $-\hat{e}(n)$.¹⁰ The interpretation proposed by Karim (2020) is that this should be seen as an imperfective stem differing from both the non-past and past stems.

The present perfect is formed from the past participle, which is the past-tense stem with the suffix $-i/y$ in the Kurdish variety of Hewlêr and the enclitic copula $-e$.¹¹ In Hewramî, the present perfect is formed in the same way. The example *dan* obscures the difference between the past stem and the past participle. The past stem inflects for number and gender in Hewramî: masculine singular $-\emptyset$ feminine singular $-e$, and plural (underspecified for gender) $-\hat{e}$. In contrast, the participle endings are masculine singular $-e$ feminine singular $-\hat{e}$, and plural (underspecified for gender) $-\hat{e}$. The masculine and feminine perfective forms merge for phonological reasons with the vowel-final verb *da-* ‘give’. However, the difference is clear with a consonant final stem, e.g., *kerð* ‘did him’ *kerðen* ‘have done him’. Just as in Kurdish, the Hewramî enclitic copula $-n$ completes the present perfective construction.

The past perfect differs between the groups. In Kurdish, the past form of the copula $-bû$ is added to the past stem. By contrast, Hewramî adds the imperfective of the copula to the participle.

The past subjunctive is the same in both groups. It is built on the past tense stem *da-* and the non-past tense of the copula *b-* with only the person-number suffixes differing between the languages.

The formatives that make up the two conditional moods are synchronically opaque. I share some thoughts on these forms based on Karim (2020), which are based on the reconstruction of imperfective markers. Note that these proposals are speculative. The Hewramî past conditional *dε* is a combination of the past stem with a suffix *a* and the imperfective forming suffix $\hat{e}(n)$, which in the imperfective attached to the non-past stem. Likewise, the past perfect conditional is formed by the past participle with the past stem of the copula, a suffix *a*, and the imperfective-forming suffix. This is obscured by the phonological coalescence of the stem-final *a* and the suffix-initial $-\hat{e}$, resulting in ε and the coalescence of like vowels *a* and *a* to a single *a*. The Kurdish forms are synchronically opaque. Karim (2020) evaluates the possibility of Kurdish using the same formatives as Hewramî. The first point of divergence is the inclusion of the subjunctive prefix *bi-* with both conditionals. Objectively, this prefix does not occur with the Hewramî forms. However, this may be a result of the use of the participle, as opposed to the past stem, in Hewramî. The Kurdish form is built with the past stem, the old past passive participle. The Kurdish past conditional has the formative $-(y)a$ followed by the enclitic copula *ye*.

¹⁰ The *n* of the imperfective suffix does not surface in the third-person singular. I have included it here as it shows in all other person-number combinations and can be considered part of the imperfective marker.

¹¹ The participle suffix $-\hat{u}/w$ is more common than $-i/y$ and other forms such as $-ey$ also occur.

The ultimate origin of the suffix *-(y)a* is unknown. However, Karim (2020) reconstructs an imperfective stem-forming suffix *ya* (< *-da) for all of Kurdish based on its existence in Southern Kurdish varieties and remnants preserved in morpho-syntax. Likewise, the past perfect conditional can be understood as the copula with the same *-a* suffix. These proposals favor shared patterns between Kurdish and Hewramî. However, the formative *-a* in the Hewramî conditionals is unaccounted for and could be cognate with the *-a* in the Kurdish conditionals. As Hewramî did not have an imperfective suffix in *-a* (< *-da), the Kurdish and Hewramî forms are either not cognate or the Kurdish form is not imperfective.

Taking the verbal categories of the core varieties described in Table 1 as a starting point, There are several possible examples of pattern borrowing in the Kurdish zone.

2.2.1 Kurdish imperfective symmetry

One example of possible pattern borrowing is the symmetry of the Kurdish imperfective system that occurs in the Gorani variety of Gawraju as described in Mahmoudveysi et al. (2012). In Table 2, the Kurdish Model provided by the Central Kurdish variety of Hewlêr (my field notes) is juxtaposed with the Gorani variety of Gawraju (Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012) and two models from the Hewramî core Lihonî (MacKenzie 1966) and Paweyane (Christensen & Benedictsens 1921). In Lihonî, the non-past tense (imperfective) is characterized by an imperfective prefix *mi-* with some verbs (e.g., *mi-ðê-w* ‘I give’ and not with others (e.g., *ker-û* ‘I make’).¹²

Table 2: The Kurdish symmetrical system in Gorani.

	K Hewlêr	G Gawraju	G Pawe	G Lihon
NPST				
1SG	<i>de-ke-m</i>	<i>me-ker-im</i>	<i>me-ker-û</i>	<i>ker-û</i>
2SG	<i>de-ke-ît</i>	<i>me-ker-î</i>	<i>me-ker-î</i>	<i>ker-î</i>
3SG	<i>de-kat</i> (< *de-ke-et)	<i>me-ker-ê</i>	<i>me-ker-o</i>	<i>keró</i>
1PL	<i>de-ke-în</i>	<i>me-ker-am</i>	<i>me-ker-im</i>	<i>ker-mê</i>
2PL	<i>de-ke-n</i>	<i>me-ker-ê</i>	<i>me-ker-dê</i>	<i>ker-dê</i>
3PL	<i>de-ke-n</i>	<i>me-ker-in</i>	<i>me-ker-an</i>	<i>ker-á</i>

¹² To my knowledge, there has never been a systematic study of the linguistic (morphological, phonological, morphological, syntactic, or semantic) conditions that dictate which verbs belong to the *mi-* prefix category and which belong to the affixes category. Note that there is a similar phenomenon in New Persian, where the verb *dašten* ‘to have’ does not take the imperfective prefix *mi-* in the non-past tense (e.g., *dar-em* ‘I have’), but virtually all other verbs do (cf. *mi-kon-em* ‘I make’).

Table 2 (continued)

	K Hewlêr	G Gawraju	G Pawe	G Lihon
PST				
1SG	<i>de-kird-im</i> ¹³	<i>me-kerd-im</i>	<i>ker-ên-ê</i>	<i>ker-ên-ê</i>
2SG	<i>de-kird-ît</i>	<i>me-kerd-î</i>	<i>ker-ê-şî</i>	<i>ker-ên-î</i>
3SG	<i>de-kird-Ø</i>	<i>me-kerd-Ø</i>	<i>ker-ê-Ø</i>	<i>ker-ê-Ø</i>
1PL	<i>de-kird-în</i>	<i>me-kerd-yam</i>	<i>ker-ên-mê</i>	<i>ker-ên-mê</i>
2PL	<i>de-kird-in</i>	<i>me-kerd-iê</i>	<i>ker-ên-dê</i>	<i>ker-ên-dê</i>
3PL	<i>de-kird-in</i>	<i>me-kerd-în</i>	<i>ker-ên-ê</i>	<i>ker-ên-ê</i>

In contrast, the Hewramî variety spoken in Pawe city (Iran) has regularized the imperfective prefix as *me-* affixed to all verbs in the non-past tense. With this prefix, the asymmetry of the Gorani system is most clear. There is either a prefix conjugation or no imperfective marker in Lihonî and a prefix conjugation in Paweyane in the non-past tense, and there is a suffix conjugation in the past tense or perhaps a unique imperfective stem in the past.

The Kurdish model provided by Hewlêrî shows a prefix conjugation regardless of tense. The Gorani variety of Gawraju has the inherited imperfective prefix *me-* in the non-past tense. However, Gawrajuî does not feature the inherited past imperfective. Instead, it builds an innovative past imperfective using the Kurdish pattern: the inherited imperfective prefix *me-*, past tense stem *kerd*, and the past tense person number endings. Additionally, there is a partial convergence of person-number markers between Kurdish and Gawrajuî, with the Kurdish non-past first-person singular *-im*, third-person singular *-ê(t)*, and third person *-(i)n* replacing the inherited forms *-û*, *-o*, and *-an*, respectively. In the past, the Kurdish first-person singular *-(i)m* replaces the inherited *-an* (Paweyane) *-a* (Lihon), and a nasal third-person plural marker *-în* replacing the inherited *-ê*.¹⁴

2.2.2 Gorani imperfective asymmetry/imperfective stem

Just as the imperfective symmetry of Kurdish became a part of the Gorani variety of Gawraju, some Southern Kurdish varieties spoken in historically Gorani areas

¹³ Note that the K Hewlêr forms follow the ergative pattern in the past (imperfective). Thus, *dekir-dim* translates to ‘used to make me’ and must occur with an agent affix in VP second position. This is different from G Lihon, for instance, where *kerênê* translates to ‘I used to make’.

¹⁴ These formatives are based on the perfective-past conjugation, not the imperfective, e.g., Lihonî: *kerd-a(nê)* ‘made me,’ *kerd-i* ‘made you,’ *kerd-Ø* ‘made him,’ *kerd-e* ‘made her,’ *kerd-imê* ‘made us,’ *kerd-idê* ‘made y’all,’ *kerd-ê* ‘made them’.

have developed an asymmetrical system like Gorani, albeit using inherited formatives. These convergences can take several different forms, as illustrated in Table 3 (G Lihon: MacKenzie 1966, K Kirmanşa: Fattah 2000, G Pawe: Christensen & Benedictsen 1921, K Bilawâr: Fattah 2000, K Bijâr: Fattah 2000, and K Hewlêr: my field notes).

Table 3: The Gorani asymmetrical system in Kurdish.

		G Lihon	K Kirmanşa ¹⁵	G Pawe	K Bilawâr	K Bijâr	K Hewlêr
NPST.IPFV	1SG	<i>b-û</i>	<i>bu-m</i>	<i>me-w-û</i>	<i>e-w-im</i>	<i>d-u-im</i>	<i>de-b-im</i>
	2SG	<i>b-î</i>	<i>bû-d</i>	<i>me-w-î</i>	<i>e-ÿ-d</i>	<i>d-u-îd</i>	<i>de-b-ît</i>
	3SG	<i>bó</i>	<i>bu-d</i>	<i>me-w-o</i>	<i>e-w-id</i>	<i>d-u-Ø</i>	<i>de-b-êť</i>
	1PL	<i>b-îmê</i>	<i>bû-m</i>	<i>me-w-im</i>	<i>e-ÿ-n</i>	<i>d-u-man</i>	<i>de-b-în</i>
	2PL	<i>b-îdê</i>	<i>bû-n</i>	<i>me-w-dê</i>	<i>e-w-in</i>	<i>d-u-in</i>	<i>de-b-in</i>
	3PL	<i>b-á</i>	<i>bu-n</i>	<i>me-w-an</i>	<i>e-w-in</i>	<i>d-u-in</i>	<i>de-b-in</i>
PST.IPFV	1SG	<i>b-ên-ê</i>	<i>bû-a-m</i>	<i>b-ên-ê</i>	<i>e-ÿ-a-m</i>	<i>d-ü-at-im</i>	<i>de-bû-m</i>
	2SG	<i>b-ên-î</i>	<i>bû-a-y(d)</i>	<i>b-î-şî</i>	<i>e-ÿ-a-yd</i>	<i>d-ü-at-îd</i>	<i>de-bû-ît</i>
	3SG	<i>b-ê-Ø</i>	<i>bû-a-d</i>	<i>b-ê-Ø</i>	<i>e-ÿ-a-Ø</i>	<i>d-ü-at-Ø</i>	<i>de-bû-Ø</i>
	1PL	<i>b-ên-mê</i>	<i>bû-a-ym</i>	<i>b-ên-mê</i>	<i>e-ÿ-a-yn</i>	<i>d-ü-at-iman</i>	<i>de-bû-in</i>
	2PL	<i>b-ên-dê</i>	<i>bû-a-yn</i>	<i>b-ên-dê</i>	<i>e-ÿ-a-n</i>	<i>d-ü-at-in</i>	<i>de-bû-n</i>
	3PL	<i>b-ên-ê</i>	<i>bû-a-n</i>	<i>b-ên-ê</i>	<i>e-ÿ-a-n</i>	<i>d-ü-at-in</i>	<i>de-bû-n</i>

Here, I use the verb ‘to be’ as an example because several southern Kurdish varieties only feature the imperfective stem on verbs ending in high vowels.¹⁶ However, some Southern Kurdish varieties feature the imperfective-stem formatives on all verbs, e.g., Kirmanşahî. In Hewramî Lihon, the non-past imperfective¹⁷ is formed by the non-past stem *b-* and the person-number suffixes, e.g., *b-û* [be.NPST-1SG]. The past-imperfective stem is formed by the non-past stem *b-* and the imperfective forming suffix *-ê(n)*. Then, the past-imperfective person-number suffixes are added, e.g., *b-ên-ê* [be.NPST-IPFV-1SG] or alternatively *bên-ê* [be.PST.IPFV-1SG] as proposed by Karim (2020). Likewise, in the Southern Kurdish variety of Kirmanşa, the non-past

¹⁵ The Kirmanşa forms presented here are from Fattah’s (2000) Kirmianşîah (2), which differs from what is observed in other parts of Kirmanşa, e.g., past tense *bim*, *bid*, *bi*, etc. with no distinction between perfective and imperfective except with the negation marker, e.g., *ne-* [NEG.PRFXV-] *nye-* [NEG.IPFV-].

¹⁶ The past imperfective of ‘to be’ in these varieties is primarily used to express the irrealis mood.

¹⁷ The primary function of the non-past imperfective of the copula is as a narrative tense, expressing timeless aspects of stories.

imperfective is formed by the non-past stem *b-* and the person-number suffixes, e.g., *bu-m* [be.NPST-1SG]. This variety does not feature an imperfective prefix.¹⁸ Just as in Hewramî Lihon, the past-imperfective stem is formed by the non-past stem *bu-* and the imperfective forming suffix *-ya* with the coalescence of the high vowel *u* and the glide *y* as the high-front-rounded vowel *ü*. Then, the past-imperfective person-number suffixes are added, e.g., *bü-a-m* [be.NPST-IPFV-1SG] or alternatively *büa-m* [be.PST-IPFV-1SG].

There is a similar convergence between Paweyane and the Southern Kurdish varieties of Bilawâr and Bijâr (Karim's (2020) Southern Kurdish type 1). The non-past imperfective is built from the imperfective prefix, the non-past stem, and person endings, e.g., Paweyane: *me-w-û*, Bilawâri: *e-w-im*, Bijâri: *d-u-im* [IPFV-be.NPST-1SG]. Of course, the convergence in the non-past is not significant here as it is identical with the core Kurdish form, Hewlêrî: *de-b-im* [IPFV-be.NPST-1SG]. In the past imperfective, the Southern Kurdish varieties shown here diverge from the Kurdish core with a unique past-imperfective stem or suffix conjugation. This parallel is inexact due to the fact that the imperfective prefix is retained in the past as well. Compare Paweyane *b-ên-ê* [be.NPST-IPFV-1SG] with Bilawâri *e-û-a-m* and Bijâri *d-û-at-im* [IPFV-be.NPST-IPFV-1SG], perhaps better characterized as Paweyane *bên-ê* [be.PST-IPFV-1SG], Bilawâri *e-ûa-m*, and Bijâri *d-ûat-im* [IPFV-be.PST-IPFV-1SG]. According to Karim (2020), the presence of the prefix in the past (and negative) is the preservation of an older circumfix **de-V-da*, and the Kurdish core forms built on the past-tense stem with the prefix constitute leveling. However, the etymological discussion constitutes a tangent from the main point here; the (Southern) Kurdish varieties spoken closest to the core Hewramî area show a unique past-imperfective stem differing from the stem by the addition of a suffix. The same is true of the varieties of the Hewramî core.

2.2.3 *m-* series imperfective

The imperfective prefixes of the Hewramî core and the Gorani periphery are characterized by the *m* formative. This may be related to the Persian *mi-* prefix with vowels differing from expectation in analogy to other verbal prefixes, e.g., Lihonî *mi-* in analogy to *bi-*, etc. I foresee the development of these forms and the selection of stems in Lihonî to be an important area of exploration in Gorani linguistics.

¹⁸ A remnant of the imperfective prefix is preserved as a unimorphated negative-imperfective marker *nye-* (< **ni-de*); see Karim (2020) for more details.

tics. In Kurdish, the most widespread imperfective prefix is *di-*. However, across the Kurdish zone there are several others, e.g., NK Sersink *ti-*, Tepkê *t-*, Hewlêr: *de-*, Sleymanî: *e-*, Bijari: *d(i)-* (past), Kolyâi: *=y* (preposed enclitic), and Kordali *Ø-*. According to Karim (2020), these all have a unified etymon, a proposal rejected by MacKenzie (1961a) due to a lack of Southern Kurdish evidence, which preserves the totality of variation observed in Northern and Central Kurdish combined. Regardless of whether one accepts Karim’s (2020) proposal about its origins and scope, an imperfective circumfix **(d)(e)-V-ya* can be reconstructed minimally for Southern Kurdish. All these elements, as well as the Hewramî forms, occur simultaneously in some varieties.

In the Southern Kurdish varieties of Bisitun, Çîhr, Hârsin, Pâyrawand, and parts of Sahana are referred to as Laki-Kermanşahî. These varieties are seen as an intermediary between Kurdish to the north and Northern Luri to the south. The tendency among linguists is to consider these as separate languages and not a direct members of the Kurdish continuum. However, issues of language, religion, and ethnicity are complex in the region. In this chapter, I wish to avoid imposing a determination; see Gholami (this volume) for a discussion on internal distinctions versus external ascriptions. Here, I will use the term Laki-Kermanşahî to refer to these varieties while grouping them under the Kurdish umbrella.

In Table 4, I show the juxtaposition of the Laki-Kermanşahî variety of Bisitun with the Southern Kurdish variety of Bilawâr and the Goranî varieties of Pawe and Gawraju (G Gawraju: Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012, G Pawe: Christensen & Benedictsen 1921, L Bisitun: Fattah 2000, and K Bilawâr: Fattah 2000). As described in section 2.2.1, the Gorani variety of Gawraju shows the Kurdish core model of imperfective marking; the past imperfective is formed with the imperfective prefix, the past stem, and the person-number markers. As described in section 2.2.2, the Southern Kurdish variety of Bilawâr features a unique past imperfective stem; compare *w-* [NPST], *wä-* [PST.IPFV], and *bû-* [PST]. This is in line with the core Hewramî pattern, e.g. Paweyane: *w-* [NPST], *bê(n)-* [PST.IPFV], and *bî-* [PST].

Table 4: M-prefixes in Laki-Kermanşahî.

		G Gawraju	G Pawe	L Bisitun	K Bilawâr
NPST(IPFV)	1SG	<i>me-w-im</i>	<i>me-w-û</i>	<i>=e me-w-m</i>	<i>e-w-im</i>
	2SG	<i>me-w-î</i>	<i>me-w-î</i>	<i>=e me-w</i>	<i>e-w-d</i>
	3SG	<i>me-w-u</i>	<i>me-w-o</i>	<i>=e me-w-(d)</i>	<i>e-w-id</i>
	1PL	<i>me-w-am</i>	<i>me-w-im</i>	<i>=e me-w-m</i>	<i>e-w-n</i>
	2PL	<i>me-w-e</i>	<i>me-w-dê</i>	<i>=e me-w-dan</i>	<i>e-w-in</i>
	3PL	<i>me-w-in &</i>	<i>me-w-an</i>	<i>=e me-w-n</i>	<i>e-w-in</i>

Table 4 (continued)

		G Gawraju	G Pawe	L Bisitun	K Bilawâr
PST.IPFV	1SG	<i>me-wîs-îm</i>	<i>bên-ê</i>	<i>=e me-wwa-m</i>	<i>e-wwa-m</i>
	2SG	<i>me-wîs-î</i>	<i>bî-şî}</i>	<i>=e me-wwa-y</i>	<i>e-wwa-yd</i>
	3SG	<i>me-wîs</i>	<i>bê-Ø</i>	<i>=e me-wwa-Ø</i>	<i>e-wwa-Ø</i>
	1PL	<i>me-wîs-yam</i>	<i>bên-mê</i>	<i>=e me-wwa-ym</i>	<i>e-wwa-yn</i>
	2PL	<i>me-wîs-îe</i>	<i>bên-dê</i>	<i>=e me-wwa-ydan</i>	<i>e-wwa-n</i>
	3PL	<i>me-wîs-în</i>	<i>bên-ê</i>	<i>=e me-wwa-n</i>	<i>e-wwa-n</i>

Laki-Kermanshahî varieties, represented here by the variety of Bisitun, are characterized by the Southern Kurdish and Gorani forms side by side. Laki-Kermanshahî features the Kurdish imperfective prefix *e-* and the past tense imperfective past imperfective stem *wwa-* (< *bya) exactly as the Southern Kurdish of Bilawâr. The one difference is that the imperfective prefix *e-* surfaces as a preposed enclitic *=e*. However, this is not strange when compared to other regional languages. Of the Southern Kurdish varieties that compose their past-imperfective forms in this way (i.e., with a circumfix), SK Dinawar, Bilawâr, Pâyrawand, Kolyâi, Qorwa, and Bayray, the latter three show the imperfective marker as both a prefix and a preposed enclitic. Compare the sentences in (1). When a vowel-final word precedes the verb, the imperfective prefix occurs as the enclitic *=y*, and it occurs as the prefix *e-* in all other environments (reflecting the original prefix *de- with the expected postvocalic outcome of *d).

- (1) a. *xormâ=y xwa-m*
 date=IPFV eat.NPST-1SG
 ‘I eat dates’ (Bay. Xayrsuni, Fattah 2000: 372)
- b. *ar a-çü-n*
 PV IPFV-go.PST-3PL
 ‘they went out’ (Bay. Xayrsuni, Fattah 2000: 437)

In Laki-Kermanshahî, the Gorani imperfective prefix is superimposed on top of the Kurdish system yielding not one but three separate imperfective formatives, pushing the limits of multiple exponence. The form *=e me-wwa-m* can be parsed as [=IPFV IPFV-COP.PST.IPFV-1SG].

2.2.4 *ni-* negative imperfective

Another widespread feature of the Kurdish varieties spoken in near proximity to the Gorani-speaking areas is the Gorani negative-imperfective marker *ni-*. In the Hewramî variety of Pawe (Paweyane), the main negation marker is *ne-* used with all forms except for the non-past formed with the imperfective prefix *me-*; see Table 5. This is true of Hewramî/Gorani varieties that have generalized the *m*-form imperfective marker to all verbs (and for some varieties, all tenses). However, the Hewramî varieties with the negation marker *mé-* in the non-past tense do not use this negative marker regardless of the imperfective strategy; compare Hewramî Lihon: *kerû* ‘I make’ *mékerû* ‘I don’t make’ and *miðêw* ‘I give’ *mêðew* ‘I don’t give’ with the forms from Paweyane in Table 5.

The core Kurdish strategy for negation is similar to the Hewramî model in that there is a main negative prefix *ne-*, used with the past-tense forms and the non-past subjunctive, and there is a unique non-past imperfective negative marker. For the vast majority of Kurdish varieties, this negation marker is *na-*, reflecting the expected outcome of the inherited negation marker **ne-* and the inherited imperfective marker **de-*, with the sound change, sometimes referred to as Zagros *d*.¹⁹ In Central Kurdish, the past imperfective consists of the imperfective indicative form with the addition of the inherited negation marker *ne-* preserving the separability of both the negation and imperfective markers; e.g., Zaxo: *ne-di-kirim* ‘wasn’t doing me’ Sleymani: *ne-? e-kirdim* ‘wasn’t doing me’. Note that these past-imperfective forms must be later developments through analogy as neither the sequences *e? e* nor *edi* would result from regular sound changes. In contrast with Central Kurdish, Southern Kurdish varieties show much more diversity. Some varieties have the expected *na-* prefix (e.g., Dinawar, Bilawâr, Sahana, Kolyâi, Qorwa, and Bayray). Some varieties show other negative imperfective markers from **ne-de* due to regular sound changes, e.g., Qorwa (in part): *neye-* and Xânaqin: *nee-*.

Many other Southern Kurdish varieties show the reflex of the Gorani negative imperfective marker *ni-*. However, in some cases, this is obscured by regular sound changes, i.e., Zagros *d*. Some of these groups contain many varieties. In Table 5, I show what might be considered a representative sample. In the Laki-Kermansahî²⁰ variety of Hârsin, where the peripheral Gorani imperfective marker *me-* is used

¹⁹ According to (McCarus (2009), “As a widespread regional feature, termed the “Zagros *d*” (Wind-fuhr), postvocalic *d* is softened to glide-like *-i-*, or *-w-*, and contracts with adjacent high vowels: *a-da-m* note *a-ia-m* ‘I give’; *nadir* ~ *nair* ‘Nadir’ (masc. proper name); *bad* ~ *bai* ‘bad’; *xwa* ~ *xuwa* ‘God’ [*< *xuda*]).” (597)

²⁰ I call the *me-* and *ni-* markers Gorani because of their existence in peripheral, but not core, Gorani varieties. N.B. these markers are even more prolific in Laki, occurring in every variety.

Table 5: Negation across the Kurdish zone.

	G Pawe	K Bijâr	L Hersin	K Xânaqin	K Sanjabi
NPST	<i>mekerû</i>	<i>dikem</i>	<i>=e mekem</i>	<i>kem</i>	<i>kem</i>
NEG.NPST	<i>nimekerû</i>	<i>nîkem</i>	<i>nimekem</i>	<i>nyekem</i>	<i>nyekem</i>
PST.IPFV	<i>kerênê</i>	<i>dikirdim</i>	<i>=e mekirdim</i>	<i>ekirdim</i>	<i>kirdyam</i>
NEG.PST.IPFV	<i>nekerênê</i>	<i>nîkirdim</i>	<i>nimekirdim</i>	<i>neekirdim</i>	<i>nyekirdyam</i>
PST	<i>kerdan</i>	<i>kirdim</i>	<i>kirdim</i>	<i>kirdim</i>	<i>kirdim</i>
NEG.PST	<i>nékerdan</i>	<i>nekirdim</i>	<i>nekirdim</i>	<i>nekirdim</i>	<i>nekirdim</i>

outright, the negative marker *ni-* attaches directly to it. In the Southern Kurdish variety of Bijâr, the negative imperfective marker *nî* is the expected outcome of the Gorani negative marker *ni-* and the extant imperfective prefix *d(i)-*. Likewise, in SK Sanjabi, the negative imperfective marker *nye-* is the expected outcome of the Gorani negative **ni-* and the inherited imperfective marker **de-*, the only remnant of the imperfective marker in Sanjabi and similar varieties. The variety that points to a Gorani origin most is the Southern Kurdish variety of Xânaqin. Many residents of Xânaqin belong to the Bâjalân tribe and were historically Gorani (i.e., Bâjalâni) speakers. In this variety, the negative imperfective marker is *nye-* (< **ni-de-*) in the non-past tense but not in the past tense, where *ne-e* is observed (< **ne-de-*). This is odd from a Kurdish perspective as there is no clear reason why the *ni-* form would be licensed in the non-past tense but not in the past, given that they are morphologically marked in the same way. One possible explanation for this asymmetry is that Gorani/Hewramî features this imperfective strategy only in the non-past tense; cf. G Pawe in Table 5. The pattern was copied from Gorani.

2.2.5 Directional particle

Another possible example of convergence is the directional particle. This is a verbal formative that conditions the placement of a post-predicate goal. MacKenzie (1961a) refers to this marker as a reduced form of a preposition (presumably *be* 'to') encliticized to the verb. The directional particle is a widespread feature of Kurdish, as illustrated by the examples in (2). It occurs in all varieties of Central Kurdish represented here by the variety spoken in Sleymanî (2c). The northernmost varieties of Northern Kurdish or Kurmancî do not feature the directional particle. However, it does occur in the spoken varieties increasingly as one moves southward, as illustrated in (2a) and (2b). Note that it is not used uniformly in the southernmost varieties, e.g., Zaxo, Gulli, etc.

- (2) a. *ewê* *got=e* *min*
 3SG.OBL.F tell.PST.3SG=DRCT 1SG.OBL
 ‘She told me’. (South Eastern Kurmancî, Haig 2019: 135)
- b. *bav-ê* *xe* *çû-ye* *alwistan-ê*
 father-EZ.M REFL go.PST-DRCT place.name-OBL.F
 ‘His/her father has gone to Elbistan. (Western Kurmancî, Haig 2019: 149)
- c. *bûk=yân* *hênâ=ye* *mâl=ewe*
 bride=3PL bring.PST=DRCT home=ASP
 ‘They brought the bride back home’ (Kurdish Suleymanî, MacKenzie 1962: 62, apud Haig 2019: 280)

The directional particle is not a feature of the languages of the Hewramî core. See (3), where the preposition *pey* ‘to/for’ is employed in a post-predicate construction.

- (3) *lwá* *pey bazâr-î*
 go.PST.3SG to market-M.SG.OBL
 ‘he went to the market’. (MacKenzie 1966: 66)

In contrast, the Gorani variety of Gawraju uses the directional particle regularly; see (4).

- (4) *řeft=e* *asman,* *hame=ye* *wer*
 go.PST.3SG=DRCT sky come.PST.3SG=DRCT down
 ‘(he) went up to the sky, (and) came down’. (G. Gawraju, Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012: 57)

According to Mahmoudveysi et al. (2012: 57), “[i]t seems likely that this is actually the reflex of the simple preposition (w)a, which has become cliticized to the verb”, reflecting MacKenzie (1961a) suggestion for Central Kurdish. Mahmoudveysi & Bailey (2019: 553) include the distribution of the preposition *pey* ‘to’ and the directional particle =*e* as “further areas of morphosyntax that deserve more study”. Additionally, they give example (5), showing the directional particle in the construction *girt=a war* ‘took forth’.

- (5) *řa=w* *ber-řîye=yş* *girt=e* *wer*
 way=EZ2 out-go.INF2=3SG take.PST=DIR.PTCL ahead
 ‘going out, he fled’. (Mahmoudveysi & Bailey 2019: 559)

This context is restricted in comparison to its use for all goals and some “‘resultant state[s],’ treated as a goal[s]” in Gorani Gawraju (Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012: 57), mirroring Kurdish usage. I take this as a sign that the construction is a new addition in Paweyane. Two additional pieces of evidence support this view: the directional particle does not occur in MacKenzie (1966), and it never occurs in the speech of HŞ, a consultant of mine who left Pawe city in the 1970s and relocated to the United States.

Regardless of its ultimate etymon, the directional particle seems to be a feature of Kurdish grammar that has made its way into Gorani Gawraju, and based on Mahmoudveysi & Bailey (2019), it is beginning to make its way into other varieties.

2.2.6 The periphrastic progressive *xerîk bûn*

It is difficult to say what direction the periphrastic progressive *xerîk bûn* was borrowed. It likely represents a regional feature as it occurs in Central and Southern Kurdish and some Gorani varieties but not Hewramî Lihon or the majority of Kurdish varieties.

The *xerîk bûn* periphrastic progressive is formed in with two basic strategies. The first consists of the adjective *xerîk* ‘busy’ to an infinitival form of the verb followed by the copula, which carries TAM and agent agreement, e.g., (6a), (6b), (6c), and (6d). Note that the Kerkûk form shows the order of the ezafe construction without an overt formative. It is unclear whether this is a mistake in the transcription or a feature or the idiolect captured in the Manchester corpus Matras et al. (2016). These examples only differ in the way the direct object of the verb is connected to the infinitive. In G Pawe, the noun precedes the verb forming a compound form *kitêw-ewewaney* ‘book-reading’. In K Urmia²¹ and K Merîwan, the direct object connects to the verb through an ezafe construction.

- (6) a. *kuř-e wuķle-ke xerîk-û kitêw-ewewaney=en*
 boy-EZ.DEF small-DEF.SG.M busy-EZ.GEN book-read.INF=COP.3SG.M
 ‘The small boy is reading books’. (G Pawe, my field notes)
- b. *kurr-e çikoł-eke xerîç-î xwêndinewê kitêb=e*
 boy-EZ.DEF small-DEF.SG.M busy-EZ.GEN read.INF-EZ book=COP.3SG
 ‘The small boy is reading books’. (K Urmia, Matras et al. 2016)

²¹ Note that this example from the Manchester database represents a Mukriyani variety of Central Kurdish, not the indigenous Northern Kurdish variety of Urmia. This is one of several problems with the Manchester database caused by the participation of recent immigrants in the surveys.

- c. *kiç-e biçûk-eke xerîk-î xwendinewe-y kitêb=e*
 girl-EZ.DEF small-DEF.SG.M busy-EZ.GEN read-INF-EZ book=COP.3SG.M
 ‘The small girl is reading books’. (K Merîwan, Matras et al. 2016)
- d. *jîn-eke xerîç (!xerîk-î) sirrînew(e) mêz-ekan=î*
 woman-DEF.SG busy-EZ polish-INF table-DEF-3SG.POS
bû be dirêjayî paşnîwerro
 COP.PST.3SG with length afternoon
 ‘The woman was wiping her tables long into the afternoon’. (K Kerkûk, Matras et al. 2016)

The second strategy is for the adjective *xerîk* to be followed by the copula, which carries TAM and agent agreement and full VP consisting of a finite verbal form, e.g., (7b) and (7a). According to my informant HŞ., this strategy is equally acceptable in Paweyane, e.g., (7c).

- (7) a. *kur-e çikol-eke xerîk=e kitêb de-xwên-êt-ewe*
 boy-EZ.DEF small-DEF.SG.M busy=COP.3SG.M book IPFV-read.NPST-3SG-PV
 ‘The small boy is reading books’. (K Kamyaran, Matras et al. 2016)
- b. *kiç-e biçuk-eke xerîk=e ktêb a xwên-êt-ewe*
 girl-EZ.DEF small-DEF.SG busy=COP.3SG book IPFV-read.NPST-3SG-PV
 ‘The small girl is reading books’. (K Seqiz, Matras et al. 2016)
- c. *kuç-e wuçle-ke xerîk=en kitêw mu-wan-o-we*
 boy-EZ.DEF small-DEF.SG.M busy=COP.3SG.M book IPFV-read.NPST-3SG-PV
 ‘The small boy is reading books’. (G Pawe, my field notes)

The emergence of the *xerîk bûn* construction in Gorani/Hewramî varieties seems to be a later innovation on the core Hewramî reduplicated progressive construction. The progressive aspect occupies a subsection of the imperfective domain. As such, the main verb is in either the non-past (imperfective) or the past imperfective. Either of these forms is preceded by a reduplicant consisting of the non-past stem (also the root of the past imperfective) plus the marker *-ay*, which is phonologically identical with the infinitive suffix *-ay*, albeit attaching to a different stem. In the non-past progressive construction, the imperfective prefix *mi-* is added to both the finite verb and the reduplicant, as in (8a). The past imperfective in (8b) neither shows this marker on the stem nor the reduplicant. Finally, as seen in (8c), the core Hewramî variety of Hewreman Taxt can combine the *xerîk bûn* construction with the inherited reduplicated progressive.

- (8) a. *mi-ďiáy=mi-ďié-w*
 IPFV-PROG=IPFV-see.NPST-1SG
 ‘I am looking’ (MacKenzie 1966: 50)
- b. *ďiáy=ďién-ê*
 PROG=see.PST.IPFV-1SG
 ‘I was looking’ (MacKenzie 1966: 50)
- c. *xerîk=en-a Weray=werû*
 busy=COP- 1SG PROG=see.NPST-1SG
 ‘I am eating’ (Text, field notes of Masoud Mohammadirad)

The most common strategy among the Kurdish varieties in the Manchester corpus for forming the emergent periphrastic progressive is with a locative construction. This takes several forms reflecting the following examples. In the Central Kurdish variety of Sleymanî (9a), the locative circumposition *le* NP=*a* ‘in NP’ surrounds the infinitive form of the verb followed by the copula with tense and person-number marking. The same construction is also used in the Central Kurdish variety of Oshnaviyeh (9b), featuring the locative circumposition *de* NP =*da* ‘in NP’ and the copula (*ye*) ‘he is’. However, this construction differs from K Sleymanî by the inclusion of the form *hali kiye* ‘the state that,’ rendering the periphrasis as ‘he is in the state of reading books’ instead of ‘he is in the reading of books’.

- (9) a. *le řoyştin=a=în*
 in go.INF=IN=COP.1PL
 ‘I am going’. (K Sleymanî, McCarus 2009: 619)
- b. *mindał-e çuk-e de hali kiye xwêndinewe-y kitêb =da=ye*
 child-EZ.DEF small-DEF in state which read.INF-EZ book =in=COP.3SG
 ‘The small child is reading books’. (K Oshnaviyeh, Matras et al. 2016)

The emergence of innovative, progressive marking in languages that feature only a single form for the entire imperfective domain is so typologically common that it has been known to occur many times throughout the history of a language. Deo (2015) has referred to this as a semantically motivated cline. Because of this motivation, it is nearly impossible to say that these constructions did not arise independently in each of these varieties. Likewise, it is impossible to determine directionality as the formatives used in each of these constructions were available in all the languages. The emergence of the *xerîk bûn* construction is merely one case of an innovative feature being shared on both the Kurdish and Gorani branches of Iranian.

2.2.7 Applicatives

Another innovative feature of verbal morphology that seems to be shared between the Kurdish and Hewramî cores is the existence of applicatives (in the terms of Karim & Salehi 2022).²² Although this is a feature shared by both groups, a complete study of this phenomenon has never been attempted for Hewramî. Very little is known about their position in the verbal hierarchy, whether they are stress-attracting formatives, their semantic opacity, or their adpositional status. Additionally, the phenomenon has either developed independently with varying combinatoric properties across time and space in the Iranian world, or they have been inherited from the Middle Iranian ancestors of many modern Iranian languages, e.g., “place-holder constructions” in Middle Persian (MacKenzie 1964; Jügel 2016) and Tat (Suleymanov 2020), and “absolute prepositions” in Laki-Kermanşahî, Khansari, Meymei, Abuzeydabadi, Badrudi, Nikabad-Jondun, Naeini, Yazdi (Zoroastrian), Sivandi, Koroshi, Davani, Nodani, Behbahani, Dashti, Delvari, Lari, Bastaki, Bandari, and Minabi (Mohammadirad 2020).

According to Karim (in-press), Kurdish applicatives (under the area studies designation “Absolute Prepositions”) are a set of verbal formatives, like preverbs, that attach to a verb, deriving a new form that encodes an additional oblique argument in the verbal morphology. This applied phrase can only be in the form of an indexed argument and not an overt nominal object (a common feature of some applicative systems, e.g., locative applicatives in Bukusu, Peterson 2007: 12–14). As the similarities of the systems have not been fully explored, I limit this discussion to point out two basic points: (1) applicatives exist in both groups, and (2) they are not identical.

In Hewramî Lihon, the applicative can attach to the beginning of the verbal complex as in (10a). The applicative *çenê* attaches to *ne-sa-ymê* telling us that the first-person plural oblique argument *ymê* is to be interpreted as an ablative, i.e., ‘from me’. In (10b), the same construction in Kurdish is felicitous with the same meaning.

²² The term applicative was applied to these formations by Karim & Salehi (2022) due to their syntactic, semantic, morphological, and phonological properties. However, the term typically used in the Kurdish linguistic literature has been “Absolute Preposition”. This term is based on the fact that some (but not all) of these formatives have adpositional etyma. It has been employed despite the fact that they are not prepositions but rather part of the verbal system.

- (10) a. *î zemîn=e=tá* *çenê=ne-sa-ymê*
 DEM.PROX land=DEM=2PL.A ABL.APP=NEG-buyPST-1PL.O_{APP}
 ‘You did not buy this land from us’. (MacKenzie 1966: 53)
- b. *em zewî=ye=tan* *lê=ne-kîî-în*
 DEM.PROX land=DEM=2PL.A ABL.APP=NEG-buyPST-1PL.O_{APP}
 ‘You did not buy this land from us’.

In contrast, the Hewramî Lihon sentence in (11a) shows the applicative *penê*, which follows the verb, indicating that the second-person singular oblique argument *-î* should be interpreted as dative. However, in Kurdish (11b), a post-posed form is not allowed while maintaining agreement on the verb. The corresponding construction in Kurdish requires the applicative *pê* to precede the verb to assign a case relation to the indexed noun as in (11c). A post-posed position is possible for full prepositional phrases formed by an adpositional form and its complement (11d).

- (11) a. *nê-wat-î=m=penê*
 NEG-SAY.PST-2SG.O_{APP}=1SG.A=DAT.APP
 ‘Did I not say to you?’ (MacKenzie 1966: 53)
- b. **nê=m-wut-î=pê*
 NEG=1SG.A-say.PST-2SG.O_{APP}=DAT.APP
- c. *pê=m=nê-wut-î*
 DAT.APP=1SG.A=NEG-say.PST-2SG.O_{APP}
 ‘Did I not say to you?’
- d. *nê=m-wut pê=t /* *be to*
 NEG=1SG.A-say.PST to=2SG / to you
 ‘Did I not say to you?’

The inexact parallels between these constructions necessitate that a comparative study be conducted. It is an open question whether these are pattern borrowing, mutual inheritance, or if they feature the same etyma.

3 Conclusion

There are many features shared between the Kurdish and Gorani branches of Iranian. The question of whether these convergences are due to contact phenomena, mutual inheritance, or, as MacKenzie (1961) suggested, substratum effects is not so clear from the data alone. This is in line with Thomason & Kaufman’s (1988) claim that it is difficult to prove a substratum hypothesis without corroborating

socio-historic evidence (Thomason & Kaufman 1988: 111). See Leezenberg (1993) for more on the substratum hypothesis. This chapter has focused on the long-known and recently-proposed convergences and what we know about them. Many of the convergences that MacKenzie (1961) proposed can now be said to certainly be the result of mutual inheritance. However, there are many more that seem to be innovative regional features shared across branches. Among these, there are just a few that can be said to have originated in one branch and spread to another. They are summarized in Table 6. Recall that the four examples of Kurdish forms in Gorani are only in the Gorani variety of Gawraju (Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012).

Table 6: Inheritance and Innovation in the Kurdish Zone.

	Inheritance	K in G	G in K	Unclear
Definite Ezafe	✓			
Synthetic Passive	✓			
<i>k</i> -definiteness marker	✓			
Unique Past-imperfective stem	✓			
Imperfective symmetry		✓		
1SG <i>-im</i>		✓		
3SG <i>-ê</i>		✓		
3PL <i>-in</i>		✓		
<i>m</i> -imperfective			✓	
<i>nî</i> -negative			✓	
Postpositive Preverbs			✓	
Applicative Constructions				✓
Directional Particle				✓
<i>xerîk bûn</i> Progressive				✓

The definite ezafe (MacKenzie’s (1966) open-compound construction), where the ezafe is reduced on the head noun when the adjectival modifier is marked with a definite suffix, is likely inherited and not an example of convergence. This is based on the existence of the definite ezafe in languages across the Iranian world, including Luri and Colloquial New Persian in addition to Kurdish and Hewramî. As Leezenberg (1993) points out, the synthetic passive is also likely inherited, with the Kurdish *-ra* marker extended from the combination of the inherited *-ya* marker with the old non-past form of the verb *kirdin* ‘to do’ **ker-*. Finally, the *k*-form definite suffixes are a widespread Iranian feature that may even be reconstructible for Kurmancî (Northern Kurdish) and Zazaki (following Karim 2021). The absence of this marker from Kurmancî was MacKenzie’s (1961) impetus for suggesting that this was an example of Gorani’s influence on “Southern” (i.e., Central) Kurdish. I consider the use of a unique imperfective stem as a Gorani feature. That being said,

the Southern Kurdish imperfective stem is likely an inherited feature of Kurdish shared between all subgroups of Southern Kurdish with potential remnants in Northern and Central Kurdish. I propose that, following Karim (2020), the preservation of this as opposed to leveling in favor of the more transparent combination of imperfective prefix and past stem was likely reinforced by the Hewramî system.

The clear examples of Kurdish forms in Gorani come from the variety of Gawraju (Mahmoudveysi et al. 2012). Various aspects of the verbal system have been borrowed from Kurdish. This includes a past imperfective built on the non-past-imperfective prefix *me-* and the perfective past-tense stem. In addition to this, some of the Gorani affix person markers have been replaced with the Kurdish equivalents, e.g., the Gorani first-person singular non-past *-û* and the past *-a(n)* were replaced with the Kurdish *-(i)m*. The third-person singular non-past *-o* was replaced by the Kurdish *-ê* in some environments, and the third-person plural non-past *-a(n)* and past *-ê* were replaced by the Kurdish *-(i)n*. The number of convergences with Kurdish in this variety points to the likely hood that this is not a mere coincidence.

Gorani forms in Kurdish seem not to be confined to just a few varieties. The use of the *m*-form imperfective marker, in addition to the inherited Kurdish prefix (and suffix), is a feature of the Southern Kurdish referred to as Laki-Kermanshahî. The use of the *ni-* negative only when occurring before an imperfective prefix is another feature that separates the Northern varieties of Southern Kurdish lacking *ni-*, e.g., Dinawar, Bilawâr, Sahana, Kolyâi, Qorwa, Kirind, and Bayray, from Laki-Kermanshahî and all other Southern Kurdish varieties, e.g., Bijâr, Xanaqîn, Malîkshahî, Myexas, îlam, Mihran, Rîka (Serne), Saleh abad, Wermizyar, Zurbatiye, Kordelî, Kaî hor (Shahabad), Çemçemaî, Heresem, Kirmanshah, Qesri Şîrîn, Sanjabi, Xalêse, Erkwazî, Duşeyx, Îwan, Keprat, Mendilî, Serpol, and Şerwan. Finally, it is not necessarily clear whether *ewe* has the same motivation in Kurdish. Rather, *ewe* may be related to the ambifixial preverbs of Hewramî *ene*, *ewe*, and *ere*. In Hewramî, their position is morpho-phonologically conditioned. It is telling that the postpositive preverb of Kurdish *ewe* is the only vowel initial preverb in Central Kurdish (< PIr: *apa ‘away’). Other preverbs with the same phonological shape lost their initial vowels, e.g., the *we-* in *westan* ‘to stop’ (< PIr: *awa + *stâ ‘to stand’), leading me to count it among Gorani patterns in Kurdish.

There are several convergences that are not clearly inherited or loans from Kurdish to Gorani or vice versa. The Applicative forms are not well enough understood to decide if they are independent innovations “cooking with the same ingredients,” inheritance from a common ancestor, or a borrowed pattern. The directional particle is a typically Kurdish feature that shows up in the Gorani variety of Gawraju. This variety has many pattern borrowings from Kurdish, especially in the verbal domain. As such, it is not a stretch to conclude that this has come into the language from Kurdish. However, the phonological post-vocalic lenition of *b* and

syntactic position of “post-predicate goals” ensures that the conditioning environment for the development of the directional particle is available synchronically in G Gawraju. Additionally, this particle may be emerging in other Gorani varieties in recent times. Finally, the periphrastic progressive *xerik bûn* is certainly a regional feature. However, this type of development is very common and the formatives are readily available in all the regional languages. As such, it is impossible to say for certain where it originated or how it spread.

In this chapter, I ignored most convergences in the nominal system, except where suggested by MacKenzie (1961) and discussed by Leezenberg (1993). There are likely more examples of convergence between these languages. As we learn more about the etyma of forms in these languages and the quality of documentation of Iranian languages increases, many new convergences will become apparent.

Abbreviations

1	first person
2	second person
3	third person
A	agent
COP	copula
DEF	definite
DEM	demonstrative
DIR	direct case
DIST	distal
EZ	construct state (ezafe)
F	feminine
IMP	imperative
INDF	indefinite
IPFV	imperfective
INF	infinitive
M	masculine
NEG	negative
NPST	non-past tense
OBL	oblique case
P	patient
PL	plural
PRF	perfect tense
PROH	prohibitive
PROX	proximal
PST	past tense

PTCP	participle
SG	singular
SUB	subjunctive mood.

References

- Anonby, Erik & Taheri-Ardali, Mortaza. 2019. Bakhtiari. In Geoffrey Khan & Geoffrey Haig (eds.), *The Languages and Linguistics of Western Asia: An Areal Perspective*, 445–480. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Blau, 1989. Le Gurânî et Zâzâ. In Rüdiger Schmitt (ed.), *Compendium Linguarum Iranicarum*, 336–340. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Christensen, Arthur & Åge Meyer Benedictsen. 1921. *Les dialectes d'Awroman et de Pawa*. København: B. Lunos.
- Deo, Ashwini. 2015. The semantic and pragmatic underpinnings of grammaticalization paths: The progressive to imperfective shift. *S&P Semantics and Pragmatics* 8(14). 1–52. <https://doi.org/10.3765/sp.8.14>
- Fattah, Ismaïl Kamandâr. 2000. *Les dialectes kurdes méridionaux: étude linguistique et dialectologique (Iranica 37)*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Hadank, Karl. 1930. *Mundarten der Gûrân: besonders das Kändûlâi, Auramânî und Badschâlânî*. Berlin: Verlag der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Haig, Geoffrey. 2019. Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji). In Geoffrey Haig & Geoffrey Khan (eds.), *The Languages and Linguistics of Western Asia: An Areal Perspective*, 106–158. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter.
- Haugen, Einar. 1950. The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language* 26. 210–231.
- Holmberg, Anders & Odden, David. 2008. The Noun Phrase in Hawrami. In Vida Samiian, Donald Stilo & Simin Karimi (eds.), *Aspects of Iranian Linguistics*, 129–152. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Jügel, Thomas. 2009. Ergative Remnants in Sorani Kurdish? *Orientalia Suecana* LVIII. 142–158.
- Jügel, Thomas. 2016. Enclitic Pronouns in Middle Persian and the Placeholder Construction. In Mahmoud Jaafari Dehaghi (ed.), *Quarterly Journal of Language and Inscription 1/1 [1396 h.š.]*, dedicated to Professor Mansour Shaki, 41–63. Tehran:.
- Karim, Shuan Osman. In Review. *Competition between definiteness and plurality in Iranian*.
- Karim, Shuan Osman. 2020, July. *(d)e–(d)a: Rethinking the Origins of the Kurdish Imperfective Affixes* (review draft). Retrieved from <https://lingbuzz.net/lingbuzz/007347>
- Karim, Shuan Osman. 2021. *The synchrony and diachrony of New Western Iranian nominal morphosyntax*. Ohio: The Ohio State University dissertation.
- Karim, Shuan Osman. 2022. Ezafe and the Article. In Simin Karimi (ed.), *Advances in Iranian Linguistics II*, 130–153. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.361.05kar>
- Karim, Shuan Osman. In Press. Absolute Prepositions. In Jaffer Sheyholislami, Geoffrey Haig, Haidar Khezri, Salih Akin & Ergin Öpengin (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Kurdish Linguistics*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Karim, Shuan Osman & Salehi, Ali. 2022. An applicative analysis of Soranî “absolute prepositions”. In Sara Pacchiarotti & Fernando Zúñiga (eds.), *Applicative Morphology: Neglected Syntactic and Non-syntactic Functions*, 263–298. (TiLSM 373). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

- Leezenberg, Michiel. 1993. Gorani influence on central Kurdish: Substratum or prestige borrowing. (unpublished manuscript).
- MacKenzie, David N. 1956. Bājalānī. *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London* 18(3). 418–435.
- MacKenzie, David N. 1961a. *Kurdish dialect studies Vol. I*. London/New York: Oxford University Press.
- MacKenzie, David N. 1961b. The Origins of Kurdish. *Transactions of the Philological Society* 60(1). 69–86. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-968X.1961.tb00987.x>
- MacKenzie, David N. 1962. *Kurdish dialect studies Vol. 2*. London/New York: Oxford University Press.
- MacKenzie, David N. 1964. The 'Indirect Affectee' in Pahlavi. In *Dr. J.M. Unvala memorial volume*. Bombay: Dr. J.M. Unvala Memorial Volume Sub-Committee.
- MacKenzie, David N. 1966. *The dialect of Awroman (Hawraman-i Luhon): Grammatical sketch, texts, and vocabulary*. København: Kommissionær – Munksgaard.
- Mahmoudveysi, Parvin & Denise Bailey. 2013. *The Gorani language of Zarda, a village of West Iran*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Mahmoudveysi, Parvin & Denise Bailey. 2019. Hawrāmī of western Iran. In Geoffrey Haig & Geoffrey Khan (eds.), *The Languages and Linguistics of Western Asia: An Areal Perspective*, 533–568. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Mahmoudveysi, Parvin, Denise Bailey, Ludwig Paul & Geoffrey Haig. 2012. *The Gorani Language of Gawraju, a village of West Iran: texts, grammar, and lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Matras, Yaron. 2007a. The borrowability of grammatical categories. In Jeanette Sakel & Yaron Matras (eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 31–74. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Matras, Yaron. 2007b. The borrowability of structural categories. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 31–74. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Matras, Yaron et al. 2016. *The dialects of Kurdish*. <http://kurdish.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/>
- McCarus, Ernest. 2009. Kurdish. In Gernot Windfuhr (ed.), *The Iranian Languages*, 587–633. London/New York: Routledge.
- McKinnon, Colin. 2001. GIŌNĪ. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*, Vol. XI, Fasc. 1, 1. Retrieved from <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/gioni-giani>
- McKinnon, Colin. 2011. LORI LANGUAGE i. LORI DIALECTS. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*,. Retrieved from <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/lori-dialects>
- Mohammadirad, Masoud. 2020. *Pronominal clitics in Western Iranian languages: Description, mapping, and typological implications*. Université Sorbonne Nouvelle Paris 3 dissertation. Retrieved from <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-02988008/document>
- Naghshbandi, Zaniar. 2020. Nāsūdehā-y enfejār-ī lasavī dr Hawrami guna-y pāwa[The approximantization of alveolar plosives in Hawrami (Paveh Variety)]. *Language Related Research* 11(1). 81–110.
- Öpengin, Ergin. 2016. *The Mukri Variety of Central Kurdish: grammar, texts, and lexicon*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Peterson, David A. 2007. *Applicative constructions*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sakel, Jeanette. 2007. Types of loan: Matter and pattern. In Yaron Matras & Jeanette Sakel (eds.), *Grammatical Borrowing in Cross-Linguistic Perspective*, 15–30. Berlin/New York: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Samvelian, Pollet. 2005. When morphology does better than Syntax: The Ezafe construction in Persian. (Unpublished Manuscript).

- Suleymanov, Murad. 2020. Oblique marking and adpositional constructions in Tat: A mosaic of dialectal convergence and divergence. In Richard K. Larson, Sedigheh Moradi & Vida Samiiian (eds.), *Advances in Iranian Linguistics*, 275–300. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Thackston, Wheeler M. 2006. *Kurmanji Kurdish: A Reference Grammar with Selected Readings*. (<https://sites.fas.harvard.edu/~iranian/Kurmanji>)
- Thomason, Sarah Grey & Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Urban, Matthias. 2020. Mountain linguistics. *Language and Linguistics Compass* 14(9). 212393. <https://doi.org/10.1111/Inc3.12393>
- Windfuhr, Gernot. 1995. Dialectology. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Vol. VII. Fasc. 4, 362–370. Retrieved from <https://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/dialectology>
- Windfuhr, Gernot L. 2012. FĀRS viii. Dialects. In *Encyclopædia Iranica*. Vol. IX. Fasc. 4, 362–373. Retrieved from <https://iranicaonline.org/articles/fars-viii>

