INTRODUCTION

DATA

(1) Address of verbs of speech
a. Bahar-i
Bahar-OB1, this NEG-say PST-DIREC 1S.OBL
'she didn’t say this to me.'

b. ŋu y r ne
1S.ERG ADP 2S.OBL ADP 'Shall I say something to you?'

(2) Recipients of send type verbs
a. Handi ba ne
Hand ADP 1S.OBL 'He蛮 handed money to me.'

b. v na r sivad
mothers-EZ.F self ADP apple 3PL.OBL sends-PST.PL
'They sent apples to their mother.'

(3) Recipients of give type verbs
a. Zana bixi do miz
Zana book give-PST 1S.OBL
'Zana gave me the book.'

b. Zana Resepgi ne lihان do r-e
(Malaty) Zana Resepgi ADP book give-PST PT-DRC-POR-3S
'Zana gave the book to Resepgi.'

(4) Locational goals of motion verbs (mostly the same across dialects)


LITERATURE REVIEW

Haig and Tribe (2014): the appearance of goal constitutents (G) in the immediate postverbal position in an OV language like Kurdish is typologically unusual, and this unusual OVG order emerges as a result of contact-induced change.

Haig (2014): an original 'proto-Kurdish' had VGO order which might have been characterized through early Aramaic/Iranian contact, and this pattern has undergone changes in some Kurdish dialects due to contact with various languages in the current study concludes that (i) the distribution of goals is sensitive to the morphological marking (OBL vs. ADP), the adposition type (preposition vs. circumposition-postposition) and verb-type (send vs. give, say, go, etc.). (Levin 2011).

PROPOSAL

Why not OBL-goal in the postverbal position?

The current study concludes that (i) the distribution of goals is sensitive to the morphological marking (OBL vs. ADP), the adposition type (preposition vs. circumposition-postposition) and verb-type (send vs. give, say, go, etc.) and (ii) the variation observed across Kurmanji dialects is mostly conditioned by language contact (Haig 2014) and language typological order (Stilo 2005, 2009), and (iii) it is structurally represented by different featural content of the lexical heads in l-syntax (Ramchand 2002, 2008).
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