



**HAL**  
open science

# Grammar in usage and grammaticalization of dan 'give' constructions in Kurmanji Kurdish

Salih Akin, Myriam Bouveret

► **To cite this version:**

Salih Akin, Myriam Bouveret. Grammar in usage and grammaticalization of dan 'give' constructions in Kurmanji Kurdish. Myriam Bouveret. GIVE constructions across languages, 29, John Benjamins, pp.223-243, 2022, Constructional Approaches to Language, 9789027208422. 10.1075/cal.29.09aki . hal-03949788

**HAL Id: hal-03949788**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03949788>**

Submitted on 20 Jan 2023

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Grammar in usage and grammaticalization of *dan* ‘give’ constructions in

## Kurmanji Kurdish

Salih Akin and Myriam Bouveret

University of Rouen, Dylis and University of Rouen-Lattice/ENS/Paris 3

salih.akin@univ-rouen.fr, myriam.bouveret@univ-rouen.fr

### Abstract

Belonging to the family of Indo-European languages, Kurdish is part of the Iranian group of this family, which gathers several modern languages such as Balochi, Ossetic, Persian, Tadjik, etc. The two main dialects that are closely related to each other are the *Kurmanji* dialect and the *Sorani* dialect. The *Kurmanji* dialect, spoken by 65% of the Kurds, appears more archaic than the other dialects in its phonetic and morphological structure. Yet, *Kurmanji* and *Sorani* are two dialects that have the greatest number of common linguistic characteristics. We focus on two dominant grammatical categories used with *dan* ‘give’ in Kurmanji Kurdish, light verb constructions (LVC) and causative constructions illustrating the language change property. If light verb construction is a common use of the verb *give* in many languages, the causative form is dominant in the Kurdish language, as illustrated through our various corpora, dictionaries, recent online newspapers and the Manchester Kurdish Dialects Database<sup>1</sup>.

The Kurdish Kurmanji dialect is a very dynamic language showing many signs of neological forms: new words appearing in the newspapers, as well as lexicalization and grammaticalization phenomena. New grammatical constructions, new idioms and new compounds formed with *dan* are motivated by the need for expressivity, which illustrates the usage-based grammar principle and the *pragmatic inference mechanism* described by Traugott 1989 and Bybee 2014. We have categorized three kinds of causative constructions. Our main hypothesis in this paper is the use of *dan* as a causative auxiliary, that is to say a case of grammaticalization of a frequent verb following the chain from full meaning towards grammatical meaning. This use has been described in Gougenheim 1929 for the French verb *donner* ‘give’ and was attested in Bouveret study 2012. We argue that the causative use of *dan* as an auxiliary construction is a major grammatical fact in the Kurmanji Kurdish. As described in grammaticalization literature, the wide usage of a very common verb, and its extensive productivity can lead to this bleaching process from full verb towards auxiliary. The grammaticalization process for *dan* is also proved in Kurmanji Kurdish through the use of light verb constructions and the high productivity of the verb in compounds as we will see in the following section. We claim in this paper that this grammaticalization of

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://kurdish.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/>

*dan* in Kurmandji Kurdish corresponds to a typological fact found in other languages (Gougenheim 1929, Von Waldenfels 2012, Newman 1997, 1998).

*Keywords: dan, causative construction, Kurmanji Kurdish, grammaticalization, language change*

*Grammaticalization is usually defined as the process by which a lexical item or a sequence of items becomes a grammatical morpheme, changing its distribution and function in the process (Meillet 1912, Lehmann 1982, Heine and Reh 1984, Heine, Claudi and Hünnemeyer 1991, Hopper and Traugott 1993). If grammaticalization is the creation of new constructions (...), then it also can include cases of change that do not involve specific morphemes, such as the creation of word order patterns. (Bybee 2014: 146)*

## **1. Introduction**

Kurdish belongs to the family of Indo-European languages and is part of the Iranian group of this family, which includes several modern languages such as Balochi, Ossetic, Persian or Tadjik. Kurdish is spoken by 35 million speakers living in four countries: Iraq, Iran, Syria and Turkey. Due to the absence of national institutions, Kurdish has developed a polydialectal structure and many dialects are spoken, *Kurmanji*, *Sorani*, *Gorani* and *Dimili*. The Kurmanji-speaking area is located in the south-eastern and eastern parts of Turkey, the northern part of Iraq and Syria, as well as in the north-west of Iran. Several Kurmanji-speaking enclaves are scattered throughout Central Anatolia and some former Republics of the Soviet Union. The Sorani-speaking area covers the north of Iraq and the western part Iran. Dimili-speaking Kurds live in the western part of Kurdish settlements in Turkey, and the Gorani-speaking community is located in the south of Iraqi Kurdistan (Khamandar 2003).

The two main dialects that are closely related to each other are the Kurmanji dialect and the Sorani dialect. The Kurmanji dialect, spoken by 65% of the Kurds, appears more archaic than the other dialects in its phonetic and morphological systems. However, Kurmanji and Sorani are the two dialects that have the greatest number of common linguistic characteristics. The morphological features that distinguish them are a distinct system of case marking (nominative and oblique), and gender marking for nouns and pronouns, as well as an agentive construction for the past tenses of transitive verbs.

Besides this polydialectal structure, Kurdish is written in three distinct alphabets. The first script that was used to transcribe Kurdish was a slightly modified Arabic alphabet, notably with the addition of diacritic marks. Kurdish had then to adapt itself to the alphabets of the countries in which it failed to be fully recognized. It is therefore written in the Latin alphabet in Turkey and

Syria, in the Arabic alphabet in Iraq and Iran, and in the Cyrillic alphabet in the Republics of the former Soviet Union.

Generally speaking, the sociolinguistic situation of Kurdish mirrors the political situation of the Kurds. In Iraq, Arabic and Kurdish are two Iraqi official languages since the adoption of the constitution in October 2005. Kurdish is the official language of the Kurdistan region, the language of education, business and administration (Hirori 2005). Iran and Syria are the two countries where Kurdish does not have any political or institutional status. It is taught neither in public nor in private schools in these countries (Hassanpour 1992). However, the oral and written use of Kurdish is tolerated, and so is the publishing of non-political articles. In Turkey, Kurdish has undergone the most repressive policies with respect to its spoken and written usages, as well as in regard to its teaching and usage in printed material. Since the beginning of the 21st century however, in its attempt to join the European Union, Turkey has abolished the ban on speaking Kurdish, allowed private teaching of the Kurdish language in 2004 and set up a public television channel broadcasting in Kurdish in January 2009, namely TRT-6. However, despite the restricted introduction of Kurdish in the education system as an optional language (Akin & Araz, 2014), the Turkish government still refuses any possibility of public education in Kurdish in schools, since the article 42 of the Constitution forbids the teaching of a language other than Turkish as the primary language of education.

### *1.1. Object of the paper*

“Grammar is not a static, closed or self-contained system, but is highly susceptible to change and highly affected by language use.” (Bybee 2003: 145)

The Kurmanji dialect is neither taught nor standardized, but some workshops in the diaspora are trying to standardize the lexicon and the orthography (Akin 2011), which allows us to observe the emergence of standard constructions and their stabilization.

Our paper will focus on two dominant grammatical categories for which the verb *dan* ‘give’ is used in Kurmanji Kurdish: light verb constructions (henceforth LVC) and causative constructions. Light verb constructions may be a common use of the verb ‘give’ in many languages (see Mélaç and Tournadre, this volume), but the dominant use of the causative form is a very salient property of *dan* in the Kurdish language, as illustrated in the various corpora

investigated for the present paper, dictionaries, recent online newspapers and the Manchester Kurdish Dialects Database<sup>2</sup>.

The Kurdish Kurmanji dialect is a very dynamic language showing many signs of neological forms: new words appearing in the newspapers, as well as lexicalization and grammaticalization phenomena. New grammatical constructions, new idioms and new compounds formed with *dan* are motivated by the need of expressivity. As stated by Bybee 2014:

“In the grammaticization literature, the mechanism of change in this example has been called pragmatic inference (Traugott 1989, Hopper and Traugott 1993). It is widely accepted that an important feature of the communication process is the ability to make inferences (...). When the same pattern of inferences occurs frequently with a particular grammatical construction, those inferences can become part of the meaning of the construction. (Bybee 2014:156).

Causative constructions with *dan* have never been investigated in the Kurdish linguistic literature, which motivated our choice of analysing these constructions. The Kurmanji dialect generally uses the light verbs *dan* ‘give’ and *kirin* ‘make’. This pattern of evolution for the verb ‘give’ has been attested in several languages. It has been described in Gougenheim 1929 for the French verb *donner* ‘give’. As described in the grammaticalization literature, as the usage of a common verb expands to a greater variety of contexts, its large productivity can lead to a bleaching process and a decategoization from a full verb to an auxiliary. The process of semantic bleaching for *dan* can also be observed in Kurmanji Kurdish in light verb constructions (see table 2), as the high productivity of the verb in compounds as we will see in the following section. This syntactic and semantic expansion process that is observable with *dan* in Kurdish corresponds to a cross-linguistic phenomenon found in several other languages (Gougenheim 1929, Von Waldenfels 2012, Newman 1997, 1998).

Even if these constructions are systematic in Kurmanji Kurdish, on the one hand in the survey on the Kurdish dialects<sup>3</sup>, the test of translation into Kurdish of a causative sentence such as ‘He caused Ahmed to get arrested’ did not trigger any occurrence of *dan* constructions. On the other hand in the Manchester Kurdish Database<sup>4</sup> the causative *dan* sentences are associated with a lexicalized causative form (see section 3.3.2) : *guvaştin*, *şidandin*, *jidandin*, *perçiqandin*, *pilçiqandin*, *astenandin*, *perxandin* whereas no occurrence of the causative *dan* verb is attested

---

<sup>2</sup> <http://kurdish.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/>

<sup>3</sup> <http://kurdish.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/>

<sup>4</sup> Ibidem.

in Sorani (another Kurdish dialect spoken in Iraqi and Iran Kurdistan). Sorani Kurdish uses another form: “kuşîn, gûşîn, hilşîn, helgûşîn”. Studies on causative constructions in Sorani have mainly been discussed so far with the causative morpheme –an (see Hiba Gharib 2012) and indeed, in the Sorani dialect, the causative construction with *dan* does not exist.

This paper will illustrate the notion of construction from several perspectives:

- a) Constructions are Usage-based entities
- b) Constructions are grouped in small families
- c) Constructions as form-meaning pairs can be polysemic units
- d) Constructions are found within a lexical-grammatical continuum
- e) Phenomena of lexicalisation and grammaticalization are illustrated through through language use

Our paper further illustrates that a very basic form in human activities, such as *give*, is a very productive form and leads to semantic or syntactic changes. Micro-changes are also observable in synchrony through phenomena of morphological derivation, lexicalization and grammaticalization.

We will first describe the Kurmanji language and its characteristic from the point of view of traditional grammars. In a second part, we will analyze our corpus data, and the different cases of verbal constructions. In a third section, we show the productivity of the form through nominal compounds. This study will be based on *dan* constructions in three corpora, written and oral ones, described in section 1.4 below.

## 1.2. Traditional grammars

The early documented descriptions of the Kurmanji Kurdish date from the late 18th century and can be considered an attempt of exogrammatisation, that is to say the grammatisation of an undocumented and unknown language by grammarians” (Auroux 1992, 28). Missionaries and orientalist, residing in Kurdistan, carried out the first descriptions. Their perspective was mostly a monographic approach on varieties of the visited regions. Father M. Garzoni (1734-1804) is the pioneer of research, with his *Grammatica e Vocabolario della lingua Kurda*, which appeared in Rome in 1787. Abbots Ph.D. Fossum (1919) and P. Béidar (1926) continued the work undertaken by Garzoni, each of them publishing a grammar of the language. Furthermore, British officers serving in Mesopotamia also contributed to the description of Kurmanji (Soane 1919, Jardine, 1922).

These grammatical descriptions will be continued in the 1930s by Kurdish researchers, writers, politicians, and language activists. D. Bedir Khan (1893-1951) is the author of the first grammar written in Kurdish. In his research, he was assisted by young French officers such as Pierre Rondot and Roger Lescot. In 1970, R. Lescot published a revised and extended version of Bedir Khan's grammar. The movement continued in the following years with the publication of a grammar by Badilli in Ankara in 1965. In the 1990s, two grammars were published in Europe (Civan, 1992 Biçuk, 1997). Finally, S. Tan published another grammar in 2000 in Turkey and G. Aygen (2007) published another one in Germany. Much of these grammar descriptions raise several problems, the most important of which is the training of the grammarians. Apart from Aygen (2007), none of the authors had received linguistic training. The motivations for their initiatives can be grouped into two categories: utilitarian approaches in the case of officers and missionaries and linguistic, political activism in the case of Kurdish authors.

### *1.3. Salient linguistic characteristics of Kurmanji Kurdish*

Like the Bask language and other Iranian languages (Osset, Balutchi), Kurdish possesses ergative constructions (Dorleijn 1996, Matras 1992-1993, Haig 2002). These constructions are used for the transitive verbs in the past tenses by marking the subject of the action, which becomes oblique or ergative. In ergative rules, the complement of the object is not marked and remains in absolute case (normally unmarked case).

However, these constructions currently show significant developments and especially in the language contact context, going from partial ergativity (split ergativity) to the lack of ergativity (Dorleijn, 1996).

Another specificity of the verb is its temporal system and the use of the evidential as an emerging grammatical category (Akin 2006, Bulut 2000). The origin of evidentiality seems to result from a contrastive difference between the preterit and the perfect tenses. The perfect, also called "narrative preterit" in some grammar textbooks (Bedir Khan & Lescot 1970), is used in two senses: it refers to an action in the past having a result in the present and it expresses an action not observed in the past, hearsay, an indirect experience. Thus, it seems that evidentiality emerges as the second use of the perfect tense, which confers a value expressing the lack of commitment from the speaker.

The dominant word order in Kurdish is Subject-Object-Verb (SOV). Modifiers follow the nouns they modify. Motion and transfer verbs generally modify the word order, which becomes Subject-Verb-Object (SVO).



Verbs have two stems: present and past. Present stems can be simple or secondary. Simple tenses are formed by the addition of personal endings to the two stems. Secondary stems consist of a root + suffixes that indicate transitivity, intransitivity, and causativity. Kurmanji Kurdish has three tenses (present, past, and future), two voices (active and passive), two aspects (imperfective and perfective), and four moods (indicative, conditional, imperative, and potential). The TAM categories are marked with the perfective/imperfective suppletion.

#### 1.4. *The corpora*

Our work is based on three corpora, referred to as corpus A, B, C. To begin with, three dictionaries (corpus A) are part of our data. The first dictionary *Le Dictionnaire Kurde-Français* (Kurdish-French Dictionary) has been compiled by August Jaba and published in 1879 in St. Petersburg. The second dictionary, *Dictionnaire kurde-français*, contains the most recent and exhaustive lexicon (85,000 entries) of the Kurmanji dialect published in 2017 by the Kurdish Institute of Paris (Nezan 2017). The third one is a Kurdish-Turkish dictionary published by the Kurdish Institute of Istanbul (Farqîn 2005). This dictionary was made on the basis of the Turkish language and contains a significant quantity of neologisms. The corpus will allow us to observe the arising of new forms or productive forms involving *dan*.

Our main corpus is the CCKNT (Corpus of Contemporary Kurdish Newspaper Texts), consisting of 483 written Kurmanji texts, totalling around 214,000 words. It contains texts from two Kurdish publications: *Azadiya Welat*, a weekly Kurdish newspaper, and *CTV*, a company which broadcasted news items in Kurdish on the Internet. The corpus is available in digital form and is therefore open to a number of computer-aided applications. The CCKNT texts were downloaded from the Internet between April and July 1999. We parsed it with Word Sketch Engine in order to obtain some quantitative data on the use of *dan* in modern language.

This corpus was compiled as part of a project on modern Kurdish syntax, conducted from 1999-2001 at the *Seminar für Allgemeine und Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft* at the University of Kiel (Germany). The project was funded by a grant awarded to Professor Ulrike Mosel by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*. The CCKNT proved to be an invaluable data base for investigating Kurdish syntax, as well as many other issues of the emergent written language - some potential applications are discussed below. We therefore decided to make it available to other scholars working on similar areas. The corpus and accompanying documentation were designed and compiled by Geoffrey Haig (2001) (Corpus B). The main corpus is completed

with another one, made with recent articles from online and written newspapers (Rudaw 1, Netkurd, Sputniknews 2) (Corpus C).

## 2. Analysis

### 2.1. Results

Our results show the following ratios:

Table n°1: *dan* constructions in our main corpus, corpus B 214,000 words.

RESULTS	LVC	Causative	Others	TOTAL
<i>dan</i> 'to give'	49%	45%	6%	100%
<i>dide</i> 'he/it gives'	66%	32%	2%	100%
<i>didin</i> 'they give'	73%	20%	7%	100%
<i>didan</i> 'they gave'	67%	11%	22%	100%
<i>daye</i> 'he/it has given'	92%	6%	2%	100%
<i>dida</i> 'he/it used to give'	85%	15%	0%	100%
<i>dayî</i> 'given'	100%	0%	0%	100%
<i>dabû</i> 'he/it had given'	90%	10%	0%	100%
<i>bide</i> 'give' (2PS)	97%	1%	1%	100%
<i>bidin</i> 'give' (PL)	75%	17%	8%	100%
TOTAL	79%	16%	5%	100%

The light verb construction (LVC) is the most frequent construction. The causative form in our corpus (see Table 2) is the second construction in use, nearly as frequent as the LVC for *dan* forms 45% (less frequent for the other tenses and forms 16% in total). This means that the verb *dan* is mainly used with a high degree of semantic generalization. The light verb constructions are cases of semantic bleaching. We can notice that the uses of *dan* are found both in the lexicon and in the grammar, with on one side cases of lexicalization (light verb construction, LVC) and on the other side cases of grammaticalization (causative constructions) which clearly illustrates the capacity of a construction (CXG) to be found on a lexicon-grammar continuum. We annotated the most frequent forms in use, based on a sample of 100 examples when the sample was available, and we parsed it with Word Sketch Engine. Without syntactic tree existing for the language, we had to annotate the corpus by hand and could not rely on lemmatization. We therefore annotated the most frequent forms retrieved with Word sketch Engine, and focused on the two dominant categories: light verbs and causative constructions.

## 2.2. Polysemy and productivity of *dan* in synchrony

### 2.2.1. Definition and examples of *dan* in dictionaries

A quick overview of *dan* entries in dictionaries shows that it covers a large domain of grammaticalized and lexicalized uses as a noun, verb, idioms, light verb and causative constructions. The extensive use of the verb *dan* causes a significant productivity, which resulted in the high polysemy of *dan*.

Only two dictionaries mention *dan* as a noun (Farqîn 2005 and Nezan 2017). *Dan* means *öğün* ‘repast, meal’ *vergi* ‘tax’, *nimet* ‘boon’ (Farqîn 2005:427), *grain* ‘seed’, ‘solid food’, ‘husked and crushed wheat, not boiled’, and ‘period corresponding to about one third of a day and punctuated by a meal’ (Nezan 2017: 330). The latter meaning seems to be an entrenched calque from Aramic *êdana* ‘time’, which also refers, by extension, to the ‘moment where food is given to livestock’ (id.).

The polysemy of *dan* as a noun is amplified in its use as a verb, which seems to be its generic usage. The first Kurdish-French dictionary edited by Jaba (1879) and the more recent one edited (Nezan 2017) propose the following forms and meanings. Both dictionaries mention two forms of *dan*; *dàin*, and *dan* in Jaba’s dictionary (p.173) and *dan* and *dayîn* in Nezan’s dictionary (p.331), while Farqîn’s dictionary uses the form *dan* (2005 : 427). The forms are significantly closer; *dàin* seems to be a phonetic transcription of the archaic form of the verb, as it is reflected by *dayîn*. In the current uses of the verb, the form *dan* is recurrent and systematically present in all causatives constructions.

The first two dictionaries mention close meanings: ‘to give’, ‘to clear / to settle’, ‘to offer’ (Jaba); to give’, ‘to offer’, ‘to present’ (Nezan). However, Farqîn’s dictionary offers a big panel of 31 meanings, the first ones being *vermek* ‘to give’, *bahşetmek* ‘to endow’, *atfetmek* ‘to impute / to ascribe’ *iletmek* ‘to transmit’. The meanings presented in Farqîn’s dictionary sharply contrast with Jaba and Nezan’s entries both in quantity and diversity. They seem to be a direct effect of the Turkish language taken as model in the description of the Kurmanji lexicon. Despite this language contact effect, all dictionaries list a great variety of meanings, which shows the vivid polysemy of *dan*.

Several compounds are formed with *dan* in which it functions as a verb. Compounds are based on the structure of *word + dan*. The preceding word is generally a noun: *avdan* (water + *dan*) ‘to water’, *rûdan* (face + *dan*) ‘to happen’, *sozdan* (promise + *dan*) ‘to promise’, *nîşandan* (sign, clue + *dan*) ‘to show’, *hewldan* (effort + *dan*) ‘to strive’, etc. One can also find compound made

up of *dan* with prefixes, preverbs and prepositions: *hildan* (verbal prefix meaning ‘elevation’ + *dan*) ‘to lift, to rise’, *vedan* (preverb meaning introduction, going down, closing + *dan*) ‘to separate, to dig, to return’, *berdan* (before, in front of + *dan*) ‘to let, to abandon’. Noun + Verb Compounds are lexicalized can be also used, like any other verb, as substantive.

Along these uses, *dan* appears in light verb constructions (LVC) and causatives. LVC seem to be very productive in the canonical structure *noun + dan*: *piştgirî dan* (support + *dan*) ‘to support’, *zîrar dan* (damage + *dan*) ‘to damage’, *agahî dan* (information + *dan*) ‘to inform’, *ders dan* (lesson + *dan*) ‘to teach’, *sêdare dan* (post + *dan*) ‘to hang’, *rûmet dan* (respect + *dan*) ‘to respect’, *can dan* (life + *dan*) ‘to die’, *guh dan* (ear + *dan*) ‘to consider’, *encam dan* (result + *dan*) ‘to result’, etc. In some LVC, *dan* precedes the noun: *dan dest* (*dan* + hand) ‘to deliver’, *dan der* (*dan* + place) ‘to show, to exteriorise’, *dan çêran* (*dan* + insult) ‘to insult’. Some other LVC involve three words: *dan ber hev* (*dan* + before + reciprocity pronoun) ‘to compare’, *dan ber xwe* (*dan* + before + reflexive pronoun) ‘to target’. These constructions with *dan* in the first position are recent neologisms elaborated by lexicographers, otherwise in the syntax of the Kurdish language, the light verb generally has tendency to follow the noun. Evidence of this tendency is also given by two other major light verbs, *kirin* ‘to do, to make’, and *bûn* ‘to be, to become’. No similar construction (LVC verb in first position) was found in the corpus with these two verbs *kirin* and *bûn*. LVC in the Kurdish language conforms to an SOV order, whereas LVC with *dan* use this specific syntactic order, verb in the first position. This seems to indicate the specific status of *dan* in light verb constructions.

Finally, causative constructions are mentioned in three dictionaries as a function of *dan*. Nezan’s dictionary explains this function in terms of ‘auxiliary verb followed by an infinitive’ (2017:331) and gives the following examples: *dan çêkirin* ‘to make built / construct’, *dan kirin* ‘to make (someone) make / to make an order’. Two other dictionaries give many examples in which *dan* has a causative function.

This dictionary overview shows the polysemy and multifunctionality of *dan*. The present chapter focuses on its verbal constructions.

### 2.2.2. Newspapers

In our corpus, *dan* with an agentive subject can be found with a concrete meaning of ‘offer’ (1). The agentive subject construction is attested with a transitive syntax for an abstract meaning of transfer, the most salient being either for a communication meaning (2) or a legal meaning (3). The last case of transitive construction is similar to the French one, with the meaning of producing (4), in a non-agentive construction.

(1)  
 Çînê Da zanîn ku ew jî dixwazin leşkeran bidin  
 Chine.OBL give. PST.SG know.INF that 3P.DIR also want.PRES.P soldiers.PL give.SUB.PR  
 L S

hêz-ên navneteweyî ya Ku Li Kosova-yê bi cih bibin  
 force-GEN.PL international GEN That In Kosovo-ADP install. 3PL.FUT

‘China let us know that they also wanted to send troops to the international forces who would be willing to stay in Kosovo’

(2)  
 emê der barê çek-ên Kîmyewî Û bombe-yên napalm-ê (...)  
 1-OBL.PL about weapon-GEN.PL Chemical And bomb-GEN.PL napalm.OBL

Hatine bikaranîn, kurte-agahi-yekê bidin.  
 come.PERF.3PL use.INF short-announcement-OBL give.SUBJ.PRS.3PL

‘We are going to make a short announcement concerning the chemical weapons and napalm bombs’

(3)  
 Bêyî ku agahi-yek bidin birêveberî-yê derî-yên  
 Without That information.IND give.SUB.PRS.PL management door-GEN.PL  
 bord.OBL  
 dezgeh-ê mor kirin<sup>5</sup>  
 institution.OBL seal.PRET.3PL

‘Without giving any information, they sealed the doors of the institution’

(4)  
 Dar-ên sêv-ê Sêv Didin  
 tree-GEN.PL apple.OBL apple.DIR give.PRS.3PL

‘Apple trees produce apples.’

Numerous phraseological expressions as well as many light verbs constructions (LVC) are attested in the dictionaries and in our corpora. Many lexicalized expressions are formed with *dan* which can be graduated from more strictly fixed, idioms, to less fixed. They are described in the following section (3.1).

### 3. Verbal constructions

<sup>5</sup> <https://krd.sputniknews.com/nuce/201701035072464-enstituya-kurdi-seroke-pesin-ape-musa-hat-girtin/>

### 3.1. Light verb constructions (LVC)

The LVC as phraseological units are either already lexicalized, found in dictionaries and in our corpora (3.1.1.) or more recently attested (3.1.2). In both cases, they show great productivity and regular patterns (3.1.3). They are also very frequent constructions, the most frequent ones attested in our data (see section 2.1).

The following constructions are either retrieved from our three corpora or from our main corpus B. (Azadiya Welat, 1999). Other lexicalized LVC attested in the dictionaries are presented in the table n<sup>o</sup>3 above. These constructions show the great productivity of *dan* as a light verb and can be described through their syntactic frames, with *dan* as a predicate:

Table n<sup>o</sup>3 : LVC Kurmanji Kurdish patterns

	Scheme	Example	Corpus
1	[DI + <i>dan</i> ]	a. zorê dan : ‘to force’ b. piştgirî dan : ‘to support’ c. destek dan : ‘to support’ d. zirar dan : ‘to damage’ e. agahî dan : ‘to inform’ f. Gava wan afiş-ên Newroz when 3PL.OBL poster-GEN.PL Newroz û afişên din dadixistin, and poster-GEN.PL other remove.Imparfait ‘When (they) remove Newroz’s and other posters’ g. xwendekar çûn û îhtar dan students.NOM go.Preterit and warning give.PRET ‘Students went and gave a warning’	A        B
2	[ <i>dan</i> + DI] : 4	dan dest : ‘to render’	A
3	[ADJ + <i>dan</i> ]	belaş + dan : ‘to give for free’	A
4	[ <i>dan</i> +ADV]	dan + pey : ‘to run after’	A
5	[ADV + <i>dan</i> ]	pev + dan : ‘to fight’	A
6	[ <i>dan</i> +PREP+IO]	dan+pêş+yekî : ‘to chase someone’	A
7	[DI+PREP+ <i>dan</i> ]	serî-le-dan : ‘to apply for’	A
8	[ <i>dan</i> +PREP+REFL]	dan+ber+xwe : ‘to set a goal’	A
9	[REFL + <i>dan</i> +PREP]	xwe-dan-ser : ‘to lean on’	A
10	[[ADV+REFL+ <i>dan</i> ]	ber-xwe-dan : ‘to resist’	A
11	[DO+REFL+ <i>dan</i> ]	bala+xwe+dan : ‘to pay attention’	A
12	[REFL+PREP+IO+ <i>dan</i> ]	Du parastvan-ên Hoşyar Zebarî di two body guard-GEN.PL Hoşyar Zebarî in	B

		êrîşeke      bombeyî de attack.IND    bomb	
		jiyan- a      xwe      ji dest dan. life-GEN.SG REFL    lose. PRET	
13	[ <i>dan</i> +RECIP]	dan+hev ‘to put things in order’	A
14	[ <i>dan</i> +PREP+RECIP]	dan+ber+hev ‘to compare’	A
15	[PREP+RECIP+ <i>dan</i> ]	li+hev+dan ‘to mix’ or ‘to fight’	A
16	[DO+AFF ASPECT+ <i>dan</i> ]	bêhn + ve+dan ‘to rest’	A

### 3.2. Light verbs and reflexive forms

The LVC in Kurdish Kurmanji is a very common structure, which is also found in reflexive constructions. The degree of fixity of the LVC varies from weak to strong either in grammatical or lexical constructions. On the one hand, the reflexive construction is purely grammaticalized (see a.) and has a non-compositional meaning (5) on the other hand, it is completely lexicalized as a phrase /idiom? (in b.) with a concrete *dan* meaning in (6) and an abstract *dan* meaning in (7), (8), (9).

a. Syntactic decompositional pronominal form with a reflexive meaning:

(5) xwe dan alî  
‘to put oneself aside’

b. Idiomatic construction (lexicalization):

With *dan* concrete

(6) can-ê xwe dan ‘to scarify oneself’

Ev	welat-ê	ku	me	di ber	De	can-ê	xwe	Daye
this	country-	That	1PL.OBL	for	it	live-	REF	give.PERF
	GEN.SG					GEN.SG		

‘the country for which we have sacrificed/given ourselves’

With *dan* abstract

(7) xwe dan ber  
‘to stand in front of/ to intervene’

(8) dan ber xwe [dan + Prép + xwe]

Malikî:	xeter-a	terorîsm-ê	Hemû	welat-an	dide ber xwe <sup>6</sup>
Malikî :	danger-GEN.SG	terrorism-OBL	all	country-PL	target.PRS.3SG

‘Maliki : the danger of terrorism threatens every country’

<sup>6</sup> <http://kurmanciold.ws.irib.ir/nuce/rojhilata-navin/item/159035-malik%C3%AE-xetera-terror%C3%AEsm%C3%AA-hem%C3%BB-welatan-dide-ber-xwe>

[SUBS-OBJ + xwe-dan]

(9)

Lê digel	Hemû	astengiya	Jî	çapemeni-	kurd	li ser piyan ma	Û	li ber xwe da
despite	all	barrier.PL	Also	press-	Kurdish	stand	and	resist.PST.3SG
				GEN.SG		up.PST.3S		

‘Despite all the barriers, the Kurdish Press, has stood up and has resisted’

### 3.3. Various causative constructions with dan

We have categorized three kinds of causative constructions. Our main hypothesis in this paper is the use of *dan* as a causative auxiliary, that is to say a case of syntactic shift of a frequent verb into an auxiliary following a typical cline of grammaticalization from some content meaning towards grammatical meaning.

Different examples of the causative construction have been found in our corpus, making use of the verb *dan*, and sometimes its equivalent *kirin*. According to Gougenheim 1929, in those causative constructions *give* behaves as a semi-auxiliary of causation. In Bouveret 2012, we developed the analysis further. A similar fact arises in Kurdish, showing a more complicated network of constructions with and without the verb *kirin*. Similar cases of the form GIVE + Infinitive are described in the literature with languages belonging to other language groups than Romance (similar cases are found in French, Italian, Spanish), namely in Russian, Polish and Czech, the three languages belonging to the Slavic family (Von Waldenfelds 2011).

#### 3.3.1. The causative construction [ dan + kirin V-Inf]

Causative constructions with *dan* are systematic in Kurmanji within the (a) intransitive (b)/transitive alternation. In (b), the morpheme -and marks the transitive form of *dan* (see 3.3.2):

(a) fir-în

‘to fly’

(b) fir-and-in

‘to make fly’

(a) meş-în



‘to run ‘

(b) meş-and-in

‘to make run’

(a) ger-în

‘to walk’

(b) ger-and-in

‘to make walk’

We propose to discuss several criteria that allows us to classify the causative constructions. Relying on Levin (1993), Newman (1997), and Shibatani (2002), four criteria can be first applied:

A. Direct causation:

1. Internal direct causation:

(10) “Tay-ên      dar-ê      şkestin”  
branch-GEN.PL    tree-OBL      break.PST.PL

‘The branches of the tree broke’

2. External direct causation:

(11) “Min    Ew      dav da      û      ew      ket      av-ê”  
1SG.OBL    3SG.DIR    push.PST.1SG    and    3S.DIR    fell.PST.3SG    water-  
DIREC

‘I pushed him and he fell into the water’

B. Indirect causation:

(12)

Ba      tay-ên      dar-ê      şkandin  
Wind    branch.GEN.PL.    tree-OBL      break.PST.3PL

‘The wind broke the branch’ (without *dan*)

C. Implicit causation:

(13)

Zivistan    hat,      êş-ên      koçber-an    zêde dibin<sup>1</sup>  
Winter      arrive.PST.1SG    pain.GEN.PL    migrant-PL    increase.PRS.3PL  
‘the winter has arrived, the pain of migrants increased’

D. Manipulative causation

(14) John      Zarok      Rakir  
John      child      stand.PST.SG  
‘John stood the boy up’

We add to those criteria one additional distinction based on Gosselin (1996) (criteria initially applied to modality by the author), which is “the force of validation” from weak to strong causation.

Von Waldenfelds proposes two types of permissive causation, relying on Talmy: a continuum extending from a “non reflected passivity (due to indifference, carelessness or negligence)”> to “strong committed sense of granting permission”, towards > “two focal types from non-interference vs permission” (Von Waldenfelds 2012).

In Kurdish, the continuum is not as wide, going from permission to the factitive causation, from a weak causation to a strong causation. Our data show the following semantic values based on the “force of validation” criterion: weak and strong causation.

1. Agentive and weak causation = ‘let know’

(15)

Divê	enerjî	Û	şûr-ê	xwe	bi awa-yekî	xurt	ji bo	azadi-ya
Necessar	energy	and	awareness-	REF	in way-	strong	for	freedom-
y			GEN.SG		GEN.SG			GEN.SG
gel	û	civak-ê		bide		xebitandin.		
people	And	community-OBL		give.SUBJ.PRS.3SG		run.INF		

‘He has to use strongly his energy and his conscience for the liberation of the people and the society.’

(16)

Li	aliy-ê	din	jî	ew	dide	zanîn	ku	ewê
on	side-	other	Also	3SG.NOM	give.PRS.3SG	know.INF	that	3SG
	GEN.SG							
van	pankart-an	bide		berhevkin.				
these	sign-PL	give.FUT.3SG		collect.INF				

‘on the other hand, he informs that he will make collect these signs’

2. Agentive and strong causation= ‘order’

(17)

Komîte-yê	hemû	alav-ên	aş	ên	pêwîst	peyda kirin	û
committee-	all	material-	mill	GEN.PL	Necessary	find.PST.PL	and
OBL		GEN.PL					
aş	dan		xebitandin <sup>7</sup> .				
Mill	give.PST.PL		run.INF				

<sup>7</sup> <http://ku.hawarnews.com/ase-gire-spi-hate-xebitandin/>

‘The committee found all needed material of the mill and made run the mill’

The “force of validation” criteria allows to establish a continuum between weak (indirect) causation where *dan* means let and strong causation (direct) where *dan* is equivalent to ‘order’. The following section will distinguish the different cases of verbal causation constructions with *dan* in sections 3.3.2, 3.3.3 and 3.3.4. Amongst these cases of causation with *dan*, simple and double causation must be distinguished, as a single causation using the verbal form [dan V-Inf] or as a complex causation using the verbal form *dan* + another verbal form *kirin* [ dan + kirin V-Inf] . The [dan V-Inf] construction can also be combined with a morphological causative marker *-and* [ dan + V-and] described in 3.3.3 below.

### 3.3.2. Simple causation [ dan V-Inf]

The simple causation construction is the most frequent one in our corpus, not only the most frequent in the different cases of causation, but the causative form is after the light verb construction (LVC), the most frequent of all the constructions retrieved in our corpus as attested in table (2), in section 2.1., which is clearly a sign of grammaticalization of the verb towards a periphrasal construction. This simple causation is composed with the form *dan* and the transitive verbs in examples (18) and (19):

(18) *dan nasîn* ‘faire connaitre’

em	Nîştîmanperwerî	û	kurdayeti-yê	Bi	Wan	Didin	Nasîn
1PL.NOM	patriotism	and	kurdicity.OBL	By	3PL.OBL	give.PRS.PL	know.INF

‘We teach them/make them know patriotism and Kurdicity’

(19) *dan berdan* ‘faire libérer’

Ji ber	vê	Mustafa Kemal	mecbûr dimîne	Ku	efûyeke	taybet
because	This	Mustafa Kemal	have.PERF.3SG	That	amnesty-GEN.SG	special

Derxe	û	Teslîm Beg	bide	Berdan
promulgate.SUBJ.3SG	And	Teslîm Beg	give.SUBJ.3SG	liberate.INF

‘Because of this, Mustafa Kemal has to promulgate a special amnesty and free Teslîm Beg’

### 3.3.3. Double causation with *dan* + causative morpheme “-and” in the transitive / intransitive alternation [ *dan* + V-and]

This construction shows a case of double causation, one with *dan* and a second one marked with a causative morpheme *-and*. The simple causation with the causative morphologically marked verb appears in (a, b), the double causation with the same construction in addition to a causative *dan* construction is attested in (c) and in example (19). This *-and* morpheme marks the transitivity of an originally intransitive verb and then at the same time does mark the causativity of the verb. This causation alternation can only be found in the intransitive / transitive pairs. This mark is then bound to the capacity of the verb to be transitivized. In the following examples, (b) is transitive and causative whereas (a) is intransitive (equivalent to the English intransitive/transitive alternation seen in *I.walk/2.walk the dog*).

Within the transitive/intransitive alternation, *-and* causative morpheme in (b) brings the agentivity to the causative event. Does the *-and* causative morpheme form come etymologically from *dan*? So far there is no evidence of it due to the lack of research on the etymology of Kurdish.

(a) nas-in

‘know’

(b) nas-and-in

‘make know’ transitive and causative

(c) dan nasandin

‘make know’ (transitive, causative and double causation with *dan*)

In some cases, double causation constructions show an interesting characteristic development of the causative locutional form with *dan*. For instance, the following sentence (20) illustrates the fact that *dan* has become such a prominent causative idiom in Kurdish that it is used even when it is not needed. In (20), *runiştandin* being already a lexicalized causative transitive form as seen in the upper examples (b) would be sufficient and perfectly correct, but the form *dan* is added in the construction, thus providing a double causative construction:

(20)

Dayik	Şemsa Gulbeden	ji ber	hestewari-ya	xwe	bi zor
mother	Şemsa Gulbeden	Because	emotion-GEN.SG	REF	Hardly

Li piya girt û dayik-an wê da runiştandin<sup>1</sup>.  
 On Foot stand.PST and mother.NOM.PL 3SG.OBL give.PST.SG sit.INF

‘The mother Şemsa Gulbeden could hardly stand up, and the mothers stood her up’

In (20) the cause is manipulative with a causer (the mothers) and the causee (the mother Şemsa Gulbeden). In this case the morphological causative lexeme is used in addition to the verb *dan* whereas in other Kurmanji varieties, the ergative can be used (Ergative construction : “*Mamoste em runiştandin*”). In recent online newspapers our google test retrieves 110 occurrences of “*dan rûniştandin*” (as in 20) whereas the standard grammatical form seems to be as in (c) without *dan*. This fact clearly illustrates a case of spreading (extension) of the *dan* manipulative construction with a double causative construction in everyday language uses.

### 3.3.4. A complex construction: light verb and causative constructions: [ dan + kirin V-Inf]

*Dan* can combine with *kirin*, a standard causative verb attested in Kurdish studies (Manchester Study of Kurdish Language, see note (i)). In those cases, *kirin* is used as a light verb function, thus bringing a causative meaning to the verb, for instance paint becomes ‘cause the surface to be spread/covered with painting’. Constructions with *kirin* appear to be lexicalized causative constructions. By using either *kirin* (a lexicalized LVC of causation) and *dan* (a grammaticalized semi auxiliary of causation), the construction becomes a double causation construction, as in 3.3.2. Instead of being a morphological one this time, the construction is a lexicalized one with a light verb construction in [ dan + kirin V-Inf] . In this case, as in the upper section, we can talk about a complex form of causation, a double causation. Those constructions are agentive, exclusively found with external causation, the following example (21) can be decomposed as: agent + V- (*dan*= make) + V-Inf (*kirin* =causes That) + object Y + result.

(21) *dan çapkirin* ‘print, publish’

ew ji Tirsî nîkarin helbêst-ên xwe yên Ku di sal-ên  
 3PL. ADP Fear can.PL.PRS. poem- REF GEN.PL that in year.GEN.PL  
 NOM NEG GEN.PL

60 û 70'yî de nivîsî-ne, îro bidin çapkirin.  
 60 and 70 ADP write.PERF-ERG Today give.SUBJ.PRS edit.INF

‘because of fear, they can't publish today the poems they have written in the 1960s and 1970s’

(22) dan guftûgokirin ‘faire négociier’

Forûm bi armanc-a ku 'fîkr-a aştî-yê Bidin guftûgokirin'  
Forum With aim-GEN.SG that idea-GEN.SG peace- give.SUBJ. negotiate.INF  
OBL PRS.PL

hate Lidarxistin  
come.PST organize.INF

‘The forum was organized to negotiate the idea of peace’

(23) dan qebûlkinin : faire accepter

Wî got: "Bi zor-ê em nikarin aştî-yê bi dewlet-ê  
3SG.OBL say.PST.SG By force- 1PL can.PRS.NEG peace- to state-  
OBL OBL OBL

Bidin qebûlkinin".  
give.SUBJ.PRS.PL accept.INF

‘He said : we cannot make accept the peace to the state by force.’

To sum up, our data show the following syntactic verbal causation categories:

- Simple causation with *dan*
- Double causation with *dan* + causative morpheme *-and* in the transitive / intransitive alternation
- Light verb causation in a double complex causation with *dan* + *kirin*

As a conclusion, this work has demonstrated that in Kurmanji Kurdish the verb *dan* is extremely productive, as a light verb, as a grammatical form in causation expressions or as a lexicalized form in compound forms.

## Conclusion

The productivity of the form *dan* is attested and analyzed in this paper as a lexical unit, full verb (24), as a morphological unit in the nominal and adjectival compounds (25), as a syntactic unit in causative constructions (26), as a lexicalized unit, fixed idiom (27), quasi fixed idiomatic expression or as a light verb (28):

(24)  
Kurdan penêr, mast, rûn, û hwd. didan ermeni-yan...

Kurdish cheese, yogurt, butter etc. 3PL give.PST. Armenian.PL  
people

‘Kurdish people gave cheese, yogurt, butter etc. to Armenian people’

(25) *ava-dan-î*  
construct-give-substantivation morpheme  
‘fertility’

(26)

Wan Bi ciwani-yê Died nasîn.  
3P.OBL By beauty.OBL make.3PRS know.INF  
‘He make them know by their beauty’

(27)

Ev	biryar	bi	awa-y-ekî	baş	nîşan dide	ku	Dewlet-a	Tirk	Bi
This	decision	by	a way- CONS.SG	clear	show.PRS.SG	that	State- GEN.SG	Turkish	By
çi	çavî	Li	gel-ê	Kurd	û	rêxistin-ên	Wan	dinêre.	
What	eye.OBL	To	people- GEN.SG	Kurdish	And	organisation- GEN.PL	3PL	see.PRE.3S	

‘this decision shows clearly well how Turkish state sees the Kurdish people and its organizations’

(28)

Îcar	em		bal-a	xwe	bidin		lijne-yê.
This	time	3PL.DIR	consideration- GEN.SG	REF	give.SUBJ.PRS. 3PL		committee.OBL

‘This time, let’s consider the committee’.

*Dan* illustrates the syntax-lexicon continuum proposed in Croft 2007, that is to say, the capacity of a lexical item to have different functions. In this regard, *dan* is a polyfunctional unit of the Kurdish language, its functions have been illustrated as a morphological units inside components, as a syntactic unit in causative semi-auxiliary constructions, as a lexical unit or as a syntactic construction within *SVC* or *dan-kirin* constructions.

This polyfunctionality of the form is also illustrated in other chapters of the present survey study of give verbs across languages (see Corre about Khmer, Melac and Tournadre about Tibetan or Badan about Chinese).

The productivity of the form *dan* is also attested through language contact especially with Turkish. This language contact is enhanced with the bilingual capacity of Turkish-Kurdish speakers working in media. The need of expressivity in communication seems to lead to loan translations based on or borrowed from Turkish. For instance, the compounded verbs *serîlêdan*<sup>8</sup> ‘and *jiyana xwe ji dest dan*’<sup>9</sup> ‘to die’ have been recently elaborated from Turkish morphosyntax, respectively from *başvurmak* and *yaşamını yitirmek*. On the other hand, Kurdish diaspora contributed to the emergence of literacy in Kurmanji, especially in Sweden (Scalbert-Yucel 2006). We know for example that the contact with European languages resulted in some influences on the construction of reported speech in Kurmanji (Akin 2002). It would then be interesting to study how European languages have influenced constructions with *dan*.

---

<sup>8</sup> Malbatên li Sûrê serî li                   ÎHD’ê dan  
 familles in Sûr request.PRET        ÎHD  
 ‘Families in Sûr adressed [a request] to ÎHD’  
<https://www.gazetesujin.net/ku/2017/08/malbaten-li-sure-seri-li-ihde-dan/> (14/08/2017)

<sup>9</sup> Meqbûla Ebdulmenan jiyana-xwe ji dest da.  
 Meqbûla Ebdulmenan life-GEN REF. lost.PRET  
 ‘Meqbûla Ebdulmenan died’  
<http://ku.hawarnews.com/meqbula-ebdulmenan-jiyana-xwe-ji-dest-da/> (07/07/2017)



#### ANNEX: List of abbreviations

1	First person
2	Second person
3	Third person
ADP	Adposition
GEN	Genitive (Ezafe)
DIR	Direct case
DIREC	Directional
FUT	Future
INF	Infinitive
IO	Indirect object
NEG	Negative
NOM	Nominative case
OBL	Oblique case
PERF	Perfective
PL	Plural
PRS	Present tense
PST	Past tense
PLU	Pluperfect
REF	Reflexive
SG	Singular
SUBJ	Subjunctive

#### References

- AKIN, S. (2002). Discours rapporté et hétérogénéité discursive en kurde, *Faits de langue*, n°19, 71-84
- AKIN, S. (2006). Le médiatif : l'émergence d'une nouvelle catégorie grammaticale en kurde ?, *7<sup>e</sup> Colloque Chronos*, Anvers, 18-20 sept. 2006

- AKIN, S. (2011). Language planning in Diaspora : The case of Kurdish Kurmanji dialect, *Journal of Estonian and Finno-Ugric Linguistics*, 2-1, Ed. by Urmas Sutrop, Karl Pajusalu and Mari Mets. Tartu: Tartu Ülikool: 10-29.
- AKIN, S. & ARAZ S. (2014). Kürtçe seçmeli dil eğitimi: Sorunlar ve öneriler. *Taraf*, 21/09/2014
- AYKOC, F. M. (1996) : *Kurdîzan : rûberîna zaravên kurdî*, Veşanên Înstîtûya Kurdî, Berlin, 311 p.
- AUROUX, S. (1994), *La révolution technologique de la grammatisation*, Liège, Mardaga, 216 p.
- BADILI, K., (1965). *Türkçe İzahli Kürtçe Grameri (Kurmançça Lehçesi)* [Grammaire kurde avec des explications en turc (Dialecte Kurmanji)], Ankara Basim ve Ciltevi, 160 p.
- BEIDAR, P., (1926). *Grammaire kurde*, éd. Geuthner, 77 p.
- BEDIR KHAN, Dj. & LESCOT R. (1991). *Grammaire kurde (Dialecte kurmandji)*, Maisonneuve, Paris, 388 p.
- BOUVERET, M. (2008). Give verb-object constructions in French from grammar to idioms. BLS 34, n°1. Proceedings of the 34<sup>th</sup> Annual Meeting of the Berkeley Linguistics Society, Berkeley, CA, February 16, 2008, 35-56.
- BOUVERET, M. (2012). Give verb object constructions in French. Bouveret and Legallois (eds) 2012, John Benjamins publishing company, 99-126.
- BULUT, Ch. (2000). Indirectivity in Kurmanji. *Evidentials : Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 147-184.
- BYBEE, J. (2003). Mechanisms of Change in Grammaticization: The Role of Frequency. B. Joseph, & R. Janda, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Historical Linguistics*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 602–623.
- BYBEE, J. (2014). The New Psychology of Language: Cognitive and Functional. Tomasello M. (ed)., 2014. Volume 2, Psychology Press, 145-147.
- CIWAN, M. (1992). *Türkçe Açıklamalı Kürtçe Dilbilgisi Dilbilgisi* [Grammaire kurde avec des explications en turc], Bölinge, Jina Nû, 224 p.
- DORLEIJN, M. (1996). *The decay of ergativity in Kurmanci*, Tilburg, Tilburg University Press, 183 p.
- FARQINI, Z., (2005) *Ferhenga Kurdî-Tirkî* Institut kurde d'Istanbul 2132 p.
- HAIG, G. (2002). The corpus of contemporary Kurdish newspaper texts (CCKNT) : A pilot project in corpus linguistics for Kurdish. *Kurdische Studien* (1)2. Berlin, 148-155.

- GARZONI, M. (1787). *Grammatica e Vocabulario della lingua kurda*, Rome, éd. Sacra Congregazione di Propaganda Filde, 288 p.
- GOSSELIN, L. (1996). *Sémantique de la temporalité en français. Un modèle calculatoire et cognitif du temps et de l'aspect*, Louvain-la-neuve, Duculot, co. Recherches, 292 p.
- GOUGENHEIM, G. (1929). *Étude sur les périphrases verbales de la langue française*, Les Belles Lettres, Paris.
- HASSANPOUR, A. (1992). *Nationalism and language in Kurdistan, 1918-1985*, San Francisco: Mellon Research University Press, 520 p.
- HIRORI, N. (2005). Rewşa zimanê kurdî li Îraqê. *Nefel*,  
[http://nefel.com/kolumnists/kolumnist\\_detail.asp?MemberNr=10&RubricNr=&ArticleNr=53](http://nefel.com/kolumnists/kolumnist_detail.asp?MemberNr=10&RubricNr=&ArticleNr=53)
- JABA, A. (1879). *Dictionnaire Kurde-Français*, St. Pétersbourg.
- JARDINE, R. F. (1922). *Bahdinan Kurmanji. A grammar of the Kurmanji of the Kurds of Mosul division and surrounding districts of Kurdistan*, Baghdad, the Government Press, 114 p.
- KAMANDAR, F. I. (2003). *Les Dialectes kurdes méridionaux: Etude linguistique et dialectologique*, Peeters, Col. Acta Iranica, 920 p.
- LAMIROY, B. (1999). Auxiliaires, langues romanes et grammaticalisation. *Langages*, n° 13 5, Larousse. 33- 45.
- LEVIN, B. (1993). *English Verb Classes and Alternations: A Preliminary Investigation*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- MATRAS, Y. (1992-1993). Ergativity in Kurmanji. Notes on its use and distribution. *Orientalia Suecana* XLI-XLII, 139-154.
- NEZAN, K. (2017). *Dictionnaire kurde-français*, Paris, Riveneuve Editions, 1995 p.
- NEWMAN, J. (ed.) 1998. *The Linguistics of Giving*. [Studies in Typological Linguistics 36]. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins. 384 p.
- NEWMAN, J. (1996). *Give: A Cognitive Linguistic Study*. [Cognitive Linguistics Research 7] Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 319 p.
- RHEA, S. A. (1880). *Brief Grammar and Vocabulary of the Kurdish Language of the Hakari District*, éd. *American Oriental Studies*, 155 p.
- SCALBERT YÜCEL, C. (2006). La diaspora kurde en Suède. Conservation, production et diffusion d'un savoir linguistique. *European Journal of Turkish Studies, Thematic Issue N°5, Power, ideology, knowledge - deconstructing Kurdish Studies*, URL : <http://www.ejts.org/document771.html>
- SHIBATANI, M. (ed.) (2002). *The Grammar of Causation and Interpersonal Manipulation*. [Typological Studies in Language, 48] 2002. xviii, John Benjamins Publishing Company. 551p.

- SOANE, E. B. (1919). *Elementary Kurmanji Grammar*, Baghdad, the Government Press, 210p
- TAN, S. (2000). *Waneyên rezimanê kurmançî* [Les cours de la grammaire du kurmandji], Weşanên Welat, Istanbul, 192 p.
- THACKSTON, W.M. (2006). *Kurmanji Kurdish: a reference grammar with selected readings*. Iranian Studies at Harvard University [online]. Available at: <http://www.fas.harvard.edu/~iranian/Kurmanji/>
- TRAUGOTT, E. and TROUSDALE, G. (2013). *Constructionalization and constructional changes*, Oxford University Press.
- VON WALDENFELDS, R. (ed.) (2012). *The Grammaticalization of 'Give' + Infinitive: A Comparative Study of Russian, Polish, and Czech*. De Gruyter Mouton. 334 p.