CLAUSE COMBINING, ERGATIVITY, AND COREFERENT DELETION IN KURMANJI

YARON MATRAS
University of Manchester

ABSTRACT

A distinction is commonly made between morphological or surface ergativity, and syntactic or deep ergativity, based on what Dixon has termed the "pivot" behavior (S/A vs. S/O) of a language. Since marked constructions enable an S/A pivot to function even in some deep ergative languages, deep or syntactic ergativity might be interpreted as gradational, depending on the degree to which ergative morphology interferes with the grammar of clause integration and referent coherence. For spoken Kurmanji, a northwest Iranian language with surface ergativity, tentative restrictions on zero-anaphora in conjoined clauses are identified which relate to ergative agreement patterns. These are compared to the distribution of zero-anaphora in other complex constructions involving clause combining. Surface ergativity is found to be one of a variety of factors which may promote re-location of the subject referent in a language in which non-finite structures play a peripheral role, and multi-clause constructions are under pressure to replicate the structure of single proposition clauses.

1. Introduction

The basic facts of ergative morphology in Kurmanji (or northern Kurdish, a northwest Iranian language) have been summarized by Bynon (1979; 1980), Payne (1979), Bubenik (1989; 1992) and Matras (1992), and appear in some of the more recent grammars and manuals of the language.[1] An earlier examination of a number of syntactic properties of transitive clauses in the language (Matras 1992) has shown that Kurmanji on the whole has merely "surface"-ergativity, and syntactic operations generally show similar

patterns in transitive and in intransitive clauses. However, it was suggested that some cases of subject coreferentiality in combined clauses might be affected to a certain extent by the ergative morphology.[2] This paper examines the rules for coreferential marking of continuous subjects in combined clauses in Kurmanji more closely in an attempt to determine which conditions govern zero-anaphora on the one hand, and the distribution of overt personal pronouns marking coreferential subjects on the other.

More specifically, it is concerned with the extent to which the ergative morphology of the transitive subject NP and the difference in verb agreement patterns in transitive and intransitive clauses interfere with the universal tendency to omit overt reference to highly continuous subjects in semantically related conjoined clauses, as well as with the devices which speakers have at their disposal for marking reference continuity when zero-anaphora is considered inadmissible.

2. Zero-anaphora and the S/A pivot in ergative languages

Syntactic ergativity is known to differ from morphological ergativity in the way in which S (the intransitive subject), A (the transitive subject) and O (the transitive direct object) are grouped in complex syntactic operations. Much discussion has been devoted to the question of the subject of ergative languages and its behavior in relation to universal subject properties such as reflexivization, relativization, and equi-control (cf. Keenan 1976; Anderson 1976; Sasse 1978). It appears that of these features, only those relations which Dixon (1994: 152–177, and earlier) terms "pivot" are in fact crucial to an understanding of the extent to which ergativity is reflected in the syntax of a language. Dixon's "pivot" pertains to the coreferentiality of the subject, as reflected in the surface representations (S, A) of conjoined clauses. Secondary verbs that modify a main verb, such as modals, as Dixon (1994: 134-136) points out, are in any language likely to have the same subject (S or A) as the verb to which they are linked (cf. Givón 1995: 246, 257). Similarly, the control over reflexive pronouns is a property of the universal category of semantic subject, and the behavior of ergative languages in this respect is found to be no different from that of nominative-accusative languages. Thus, it is the pivoting behavior of a language, a feature inherently linked to the rules and grammar of coreference, which ultimately helps define the degree of syntactic ergativity.

Dixon (1994: 157–160) proposes a basic framework for pivot investigation which should help determine the degree of ergative syntax exhibited by a language. Universal generalizations on the options available for allowing S/A coreferentiality in ergative systems are difficult to make since, as Givón (1995: 250–251) has recently pointed out, full documentation on behavior-and-control properties in languages is still largely missing. But on the whole, absolute restrictions on the coreferentiality cf S and A in conjoined clauses appear to be rare,[3] although the types of strategies adopted by languages to allow such coreferentiality vary. For example, while an ergative language may allow the S/A-pivot, it might not rely entirely on the rules for anaphoric referent tracking in order to express subject continuity across the transitive/intransitive boundary, that is, where clauses differing in transitivity are combined. In Chechen (Nichols 1983) zero-anaphora with a transitive verb can be coreferential with the subject NP of an intransitive verb and vice versa, but coreferentiality versus non-coreferentiality (SS vs. DS) may be indicated by the form of the converb used in the conjunct clause. Similarly in Enga, a Papuan language (Li and Lang 1979), an intransitive and a transitive verb may be conjoined and reference to the subject of the sentence-medial verb may be deleted, but instead of taking a tense and person-number marker this verb takes a suffix indicating coreferentiality of the subjects, as well as simultaneity versus consecutiveness of events.

In Newari (Genetti 1988) ergative case marking on the subject NP of a transitive clause is optional if this clause is followed in a complex construction by an intransitive clause, the subjects of both clauses are coreferential, and the second occurrence of the subject is expressed by zero-anaphora.[4] The choice of case (ergative or absolutive) on the subject NP depends on the topicality of the direct object in the transitive clause: the more topical the object, the more transitive the entire construction, and so the more likely it is for the subject to appear in the ergative case. The interesting point is that in Newari, when the subject of a transitive clause is coreferential with that of a topical intransitive clause, the ergative pattern is dropped. Thus, the formal properties of ergative morphology yield to the grammar of referential coherence, which in turn is sensitive to the pragmatics of clause topicality.

Dixon (1994: 180–181; based on Kibrik 1990) discusses Chamalal (northeast Caucasian), where the preference given to S/A coreferentiality over morphological ergative marking is just as striking. In Chamalal it is possible to express a coreferential subject through zero-anaphora in the second clause when the first clause is intransitive and the second is transitive.

But when the first clause is transitive and the second intransitive, the absolutive subject NP of the second clause must be moved to before the first clause in order to allow zero-anaphora in the transitive clause. Thus ultimately the grammar of subject continuity and referent coherence has preference over the formal features of ergative morphology. But at the same time it is apparent that ergative morphology is treated as a barrier to the option of zero-anaphora continuous reference when clauses differing in transitivity are combined.

The impression that speakers of ergative languages seek an option allowing them to overcome this barrier is supported by historical processes in some languages. Givón (1990: 887–889) reports on Amahuaca, a Panoan language from Amazonian Peru, where conjoined clauses, having historically adopted a reference tracking device from dependent adverbial clauses, may now show either absolutive-to-absolutive or absolutive-to-ergative continuity. Speakers thus have a choice between an S/A and an S/O pivot. According to Haspelmath (1993: 337–338), in literary and older Lezgian coordination is only possible if both predicates are either transitive or intransitive, but in the modern language this restriction no longer applies, and the coreferential subjects of coordinated intransitive/transitive and transitive/intransitive clauses may be expressed by zero-anaphora in the second clause. Finally, even in Dyirbal, the classical "deep" ergative, S/O pivot language, the antipassive construction allows for an underlying transitive agent marked by zero-anaphora to become the coreferent of the subject of an intransitive clause (Schmidt 1985; Nedergaard Thomsen 1994).[5] Cooreman (1988) has even found that in actual Dyirbal discourse, occurrences of the accusative coreference pattern outnumber those of the ergative pattern by more than two to one, and the S/O pivot is reflected only minimally.[6]

Several preliminary observations can therefore be made concerning ergativity and coreference in combined clauses: a) The natural tendency to express highly continuous subjects through zero-anaphora might be blocked in ergative languages in combined clauses which differ in transitivity, since different case-marking and agreement patterns in transitive and intransitive clauses interfere with the usual grammatical devices which support the retrieval of the semantic subject; b) Ergative languages, however, seek to overcome this restriction on the natural requirements of connected discourse either by using secondary (marked) constructions for the purpose of clause combining, or by introducing restrictions on the occurrence of ergative morphology, or simply by allowing the semantic-pragmatic S/A coreferent

pivot to function independently of case and agreement patterns;[7] c) Since the pivot factor is the most crucial in determining the degree of syntactic ergativity, ergative languages might be placed on a continuum with respect to the restrictions imposed on the S/A pivot. The more marked the construction which allows for an S/A pivot to occur, the "deeper" ergativity is in the language. The degree of syntactic ergativity could, accordingly, be regarded as the degree to which ergative morphology infiltrates the grammar of coherence and continuity of roles, participants and referents in discourse.

3. The ergative pattern in formal and spoken Kurmanji

In this section I present the facts of ergative formation in formal or literary Kurmanji, followed by observations based on the results of recent work with informants from the Turkish part of Kurdistan.[8] As in the other Indo-Iranian languages, ergativity in Kurmanji shows a tense/aspect-based split. Case opposition (nominative or "direct" vs. oblique) in Kurmanji appears in the pronominal system, and with feminine nouns, but, with few exceptions, not with undetermined masculine nouns.[9] In past tenses in formal and literary Kurmanji, clauses are ergative: the subject of the transitive clause (A) appears in the oblique case, while the direct object (O) takes the nominative and agrees with the verb:

(1) *min   tu   dît-î*
     I:OBL you:NOM saw-2:SG
     'I saw you'

(2) *te   ez   dît-im*
     you:OBL I:NOM saw-1:SG
     'You saw me'

(3) *min   ew   dît-in*
     I:OBL 3:PERS:NOM saw-PL
     'I saw them'

(4) *(e)wan   ez   dît-im*
     they:OBL I:NOM saw-1:SG
     'They saw me'

In past tense intransitive clauses, the subject (S) remains in the nominative and agrees with the verb:

(5)   *ez   çû-m*
      I:NOM went-1:SG
      'I went'

(6)   *tu   çû-yî*
      you:NOM went-2:SG
      'You went'

Due to the tense/aspect-based split, in present tenses both transitive and intransitive clauses have a nominative-accusative type formation. Thus, examples (1) and (2), 'I saw you' and 'You saw me', show reversed case-assigment and agreement patterns when compared to their present-tense counterparts in (7) and (8):

(7)   *ez   te   di-bîn-im*
      I:NOM you:OBL PROG-see-1:SG
      'I see you'

(8)   *tu   min   di-bîn-î*
      you:NOM I:OBL PROG-see-2:SG
      'You see me'

Intransitive clauses, on the other hand, have the same case assignment and agreement patterns in past and present tenses, and so case and agreement in (5) and (6) correspond to those in (9) and (10):

(9)   *ez   di-ç-im*
      I:NOM PROG-go-1:SG
      'I am going'

(10) *tu   di-ç-î*
      you:NOM PROG-go-2:SG
      'You are going'

These rules on the distribution and formation of the ergative construction prevail in grammars of the language and in most publications in Kurmanji. In the spoken language, at least in the central and southern regions of the Kurmanji-speaking areas in Turkey (or Turkish Kurdistan), however, it appears that the structural formation of past-tense transitive constructions is subject to variation, indicating that the language is in a stage of transition.

Thus, while "pure" ergative constructions of the type presented above still appear in the spoken language — examples of such constructions provided by informants will be cited later on — for the translations of (1)–(4), I obtained the following Kurmanji versions:

(11) *min   te   dît*
       I:OBL you:OBL saw-Ø
       'I saw you'

(12) *te   min   dît*
       you:OBL I:OBL saw-Ø
       'You saw me'

(13) *min   ewana   dît*
       I:OBL they:NOM/OBL saw-Ø
       'I saw them'

(14) *ewana   min   dît*
       they:NOM/OBL I:OBL saw-Ø
       'They saw me'

(11)–(14) show a pattern of ergative reduction resembling that of at least one of Kurmanji's relations among the northern Iranian Pamir languages, Rošani (Payne 1979; 1980): It abolishes verb agreement with the object, using a neutral form of the verb, and re-introduces oblique (=accusative) marking of the object into past-tense transitive clauses while keeping the oblique (=ergative) marking on the subject, resulting in the rarely attested "double oblique system" (cf. Comrie 1978), with no verb agreement.[10] Dorleijn (1996: 68), in a recent investigation of the structure of transitive clauses in spoken varieties of Kurmanji from southeastern Turkey, presents the following breakdown of syntactic constructions in past-tense transitive clauses among speakers whose Kurmanji dialects are considered "stable", that is, not exposed to particularly intensive contact with Turkish:

absolute figure:	508 (100%)
ergative/absolutive type:	68.3%
double oblique, no agreement:	26.7%
double oblique, subject agreement:	4%
nominative/accusative type:	1%

The breakdown for speakers of the Diyarbakir dialect, which has been shaped by prolonged Kurmanji-Turkish contact, shows, on the other hand, a

majority of double oblique constructions. Most of those have no agreement (48.6%), and only some have subject agreement (10%). A relatively high percentage of past-tense transitive constructions among Diyarbakir speakers are of the nominative/accusative type (40.2%), and only 1.2% show full ergative constructions. The differences between Diyarbakir and non-Diyarbakir speakers leads Dorleijn to consider language contact as a factor significantly promoting the decay of ergativity in the language.[11] But there are also language-internal factors involved in this development. Based on the low frequency of occurrence of double oblique constructions with subject agreement, Dorleijn (1996: 117) argues that there is a strong tendency towards interdependency of the nominative (or "direct") case and verb agreement, that is, ergative-type verb agreement is likely to be lost once the direct object (O) is assigned the oblique case. The transition from a nominative to an oblique marking of the direct object appears to begin in the third person plural, where for pronouns the nominative/oblique distinction is completely lost and a unified form in *(e)wan(a)* emerges; it continues to the second person singular, where the pronominal forms *tu* (nominative) and *te* (oblique) tend to merge in one form displaying the allmorphs *ti, te, tu* (Dorleijn 1996: 132); it finally reaches the third person singular, where the pronouns *ew* (nominative), *ewî* (oblique masculine), *ewê* (oblique feminine) are often interchangeable. According to Dorleijn (p. 125), second person singular and third person plural objects are generally least resistant, while first and second person plural objects are most resistant to conversion into the oblique case. Finally, Dorleijn (p. 132) argues that the collapse of the ergative pattern is further reinforced by a partial levelling of verb agreement patterns, notably a re-interpretation of the second person singular ending *-î* as the participle ending *-î* and so a third person (or default) agreement marker.

The following examples provide an illustration of the variability of case and agreement patterns in past tense transitive constructions in the corpus of the present study:

(15) *ew   ji   mi   sual   kir ku ewî   ḥeta*
     he:NOM from I:OBL asked-Ø   that he:OBL until

     niha pere   daye   min
     now money gave-Ø I:OBL

     'He asked me whether he had already given me some money'

(16) *ew   di-zanîbû   ku ew   carekê min   dîtîbû*
      he:NOM PROG-knew-Ø that he:NOM once   I:OBL had:seen-Ø
      'He knew that he had seen me once (before)'

(17) *min di-zanîbû   ku min carekê ewî   dîtîbû*
      I:OBL PROG-knew-Ø that I:OBL once   he:OBL had:seen-Ø
      'I knew that I had seen him once (before)'

The matrix verbs in (15)–(17) are all treated as transitive in formal Kurmanji, as are the embedded verbs *dan* 'give' in (15) and *dîtin* 'see' in (16)–(17). In formal Kurmanji, one would therefore expect all clauses in (15)–(17) to display ergative constructions. In the examples cited here, however, a mixed pattern appears. First, of the transitive subjects (A's), only those in the first person appear consistently in the oblique case (example 17), while for third person A's nominative and oblique case markings seem to be interchangeable. Second, pronominal direct objects appear in the oblique case, instead of the expected nominative: *min* 'me' in (16), *ewî* 'him' in (17) (in (15) *pere* 'money', being a masculine noun, takes no oblique ending). Finally, verb-agreement patterns are usually ambiguous. As a rule, in both formal and spoken Kurmanji, matrix verbs which have a complement clause carry the default form of the third singular. This is best seen in (17) — *min dizanîbû* 'I knew'. In the embedded clauses, however, it is impossible to tell whether agreement is default or with the object in (15) and (17), and default or with the subject in (16).

The reduction of the ergative construction is occasionally documented in Kurmanji texts written by semi-professional writers (as there is no education system operating in Kurmanji, authors are often left to take their own decisions regarding both orthographical and grammatical conventions; cf. Matras 1989):[12]

(18) *te   min dîn kir*
      you:OBL I:OBL mad made-Ø
      'You have driven me mad'

(19) *piranî-ya   komel-ên   endam-ên*
      majority-DET:F association-DET:PL member-DET:PL

      federasyon-ê li bajar-ên   xwe Newroz-ê
      federation-OBL in town-DET:PL REFL Newroz-OBL

pîroz kir-in
celebrated-PL
'Most of the federation's member associations celebrated Newroz
(=Kurdish New Year) in their own towns'

(18) shows a double oblique pattern with no verb agreement. In (19), the author apparently aims at a full nominative-accusative construction: the actual syntactic subject of the sentence is *piranî* 'majority', a singular noun, which is modified in the *Izafe* attributive construction by the 'member organizations of the federation', a plural noun. The oblique case in *federasyon-ê* 'federation' is due to the position of the word as a dependent in the attributive construction, and not as an A in a past tense transitive clause. The case of the complex subject noun phrase is impossible to determine since the morphology of the *Izafe* attributive construction takes precedence over case marking in the language. The oblique marking on *Newroz-ê* however shows the conversion-to-oblique of the direct object. Finally, it appears to be the plural semantics of *piranî* 'majority' in the subject noun phrase which triggers the plural agreement on the verb.

Informants' intuitions suggest that we might be dealing with a pragmatic alternation, i.e. with a device related to the topicality of the referent. Such distribution of ergative case marking appears, as mentioned above, in Newari (Genetti 1988), but also in Waxi, an Iranian language of the Pamir group, related to Kurmanji (Bashir 1986).[13] Dorleijn (1996: 68, footnote 20) points out that speakers evaluated the difference between the ergative and the double oblique construction as one of speech style, the ergative construction being the more formal. The actual function of the nominative/oblique alternation needs to be investigated further on the basis of uncontrolled discourse; for the present study it is sufficient, though necessary, to bear in mind that we are dealing with a language which allows for variation, and is probably in a stage of transition as regards the rules on the structure and distribution of syntactic patterns in past-tense transitive clauses.

To summarize the structural features of simple past tense transitive clauses in spoken Kurmanji, let us recall the following:

– Ergative constructions alternate with double oblique constructions.
– In the latter, there is generally no verb agreement.
– Null-agreement on the verb is identical to third person singular agreement.
– There is a unified form in all cases for the pronoun in the third person

plural. In the third person singular, and possibly in the second singular as well, nominative and oblique forms tend to be interchangeable. Only first person singular and plural and second person plural pronouns retain two distinct case forms, and so transitive subjects (A) are expected to differ consistently from intransitive subjects (S) only for these persons.

How can the facts about case marking and agreement patterns in collo-quial Kurmanji be expected to interfere with the grammar of coreferential subject marking, e.g. to impose constraints on the surface representation of a syntactic pivot? In the third person, full nouns show a strong reduction of case marking even in formal Kurmanji. In colloquial speech, the levelling of pronominal forms and the tendency towards null-agreement (which equals default or third person agreement) can be expected to rule out a structural constraint on the coreferentiality of third person S and A. Thus there is no reason to assume that zero-anaphora, if admissible in the language at all, would be ruled out for the third person in combined clauses that are tightly integrated semantically, but differ in transitivity. In the first person, however, S and A remain morphologically distinct and show different agreement patterns: S always agrees with the verb, since first person agreement, unlike the second person, is not affected by phonological reduction or morphologi-cal levelling. The first person transitive subject A, however, does not agree with the verb, regardless of whether agreement is with the direct object (i.e. "full" ergative type) or default (as usually found in double oblique construc-tions). Should there be ergativity-related restrictions on zero-anaphora in combined clauses, one would therefore expect them to apply to the first person, rather than to the third.

4. Coreferent subjects and clause integration

Given the facts of morphological ergativity, and the universal properties of reference and iconicity of referential coherence (the tendency to express highly continuous referents grammatically through zero-anaphora; cf. Givón 1983; 1990, Ch. 20), one would expect a language with morphological ergativity to follow one of two rules:

(20) a. To allow, in principle, zero-anaphora coding of a continuous subject in combined clauses, even when different agreement

rules operate in each of the clauses; in other words not to restrict the S/A pivot.

b.   Not to allow such coding when the combined clauses differ in transitivity, that is to apply a restriction on the grammar of coreference accompanying the S/A pivot.

Alternatively, there might not be a definite rule on (20), and (20a), being the more permissive, might apply but be overruled under certain conditions by a restriction of the type suggested in (20b). Note that spoken Kurmanji is typically not a pro-drop language, and so it does not allow for subject omission in simple assertive sentences. The questions which (20) raises are thus twofold: First, to what extent does one use zero-anaphora rather than overt pronominal reference when the language is ergative, and clauses can show either transitive or intransitive agreement patterns? And second, to what extent do reference strategies applied in clause coordination, where the S/A pivot surfaces, differ from those in other complex constructions (embeddings, adverbial clauses) where subject-control is universal?

Dixon (1994: 157–160), in his framework for pivot investigation, mentions nine basic possibilities for one common NP to occur in two syntactically linked clauses, if one considers as basic syntactic functions S, A and O. However, we know that Kurmanji does not allow an S/O pivot. In a sentence such as 'I came and you saw me', overt reference to the O of the second transitive clause, 'me', cannot be omitted, although object agreement with the verb at least in the literary language might supply a structural possibility for doing so:[14]

(21) *ez   hat-im   û   te   dît-im
     I:NOM came-1:SG and you:OBL saw-1:SG

Of course there is the possibility of rendering the sentence by means of a passive construction (as Dixon does in the pivot test for English), thus 'I came and (I-Ø) was seen by you'. Such a construction is of little interest to our investigation since in Kurmanji the passive construction uses the verb *hatin* 'to come' as an auxiliary. The O of the underlying transitive construction becomes the subject of an intransitive clause, an S, and thus indistinguishable from other S's. The underlying A may be expressed as a prepositional object with *ji* 'from', but such occurrences are rare even in prose. Finally, the passive construction seldom appears in spoken Kurmanji, which is the focus of this study. We are thus left with two syntactic relations, S and

A, and four possible occurrences of coreferential NPs in combined clauses: S-intrans/S-intrans, S-intrans/A-trans, A-trans/A-trans, and A-trans/S-intrans.

If restrictions of the type suggested in (20) are found in the language only in certain environments, one would expect their distribution to follow the universals of clause integration and referential coherence, which in turn correlate with the semantics and pragmatics of propositional chaining in discourse. The point of departure here is Givón's (1990, Ch. 19) hypothesis on the iconic relation between event and clause integration: The more two events are integrated semantically and pragmatically, the more the clauses that code them can be expected to be integrated grammatically, including the grammar of referential coherence. On the far side of the integration continuum one finds complement constructions, i.e. complex constructions where an embedded clause serves as an argument of the main clause. In complement constructions, the most tightly integrated clauses are expected to be those which encode a single event: complements of verbs of modality and manipulation (see Givón 1990: 516–537), while the least tightly integrated are those in which two separate events are represented: complements of verbs of cognition, perception, and utterance, or epistemic verbs.

The domain of adverbial clauses — syntactically dependent clauses which encode two separate events — will be represented below by purposive clauses, since these typically have the same subject in their main clause and might therefore be expected to show greater integration with regard to referential coherence. For the Dyirbal of younger speakers, Schmidt (1985) has found that purposive clauses are the only clauses in which the antipassive construction appears regularly. This suggests that the relation between a main and a purposive clause is more highly grammaticalized and therefore retains more conservative features and a stereotyped construction, while other complex constructions drift away from the older pattern of clause integration and copy the patterns of, in the Dyirbal case, English. For Kurmanji it will be interesting to find out which of the two semantic-pragmatic features of purpose clauses, subject-coherence or event-independence, is given priority in the morphosyntactic representation of subject-marking and clause-linkage devices.[15]

Below I choose examples in which the subject antecedent is represented by a pronoun, rather than a full noun. This is done in order to capture the extent to which zero-anaphora may be applied or restricted, assuming that, following the hierarchy of participant tracking in discourse (Givón 1983, and elsewhere), a pronominal referent is more likely to be continued by zero-

anaphora than is a full nominal referent. I begin with constructions that are
more tightly integrated syntactically — complements of modality and
manipulation -, move on to epistemic complements and purpose clauses, and
finally I examine coreference patterns in coordinated clauses.

5. Complement clauses

5.1 *Subjunctive complements*

Most modality verbs are treated in Kurmanji as transitives. In the past
tense, their subjects are marked for the ergative (oblique) case. Complement
clauses are always finite, and those of modals take the subjunctive. Now the
subjunctive is always formed on the basis of the present root of the verb; the
present root can itself form the subjunctive, or else it may be preceded by a
non-indicative affix *bi-*. Since ergativity in the language is conditioned by a
tense/aspect-based split, and only past tense transitives take ergativity,
subjunctive clauses will always show a nominative-accusative pattern. The
prototypical formation for past tense modal constructions with subjunctive
complements in Kurmanji is thus the following:

(22) $[[[A_{i\ ergative}][matrix\ verb\ (past\ tense)]][[S_i$
         or $A_{i\ nominative}][embedded\ verb\ (subjunctive)]]$

The subject of the past-tense matrix (modal) verb is a transitive subject
or an A, and is ergative, appearing in the oblique case. The coreferential
subject of the subjunctive complement may either be an S or an A, depend-
ing on the embedded verb, but it will always appear in the nominative, being
the subject of a verb which appears in the subjunctive and so in a form
based on the present root, which does not trigger ergativity. Complements
may or may not be introduced by a subordinating conjunction *ku*, and they
may either show equi-deletion, or mark the coreferent subject overtly with a
pronoun.

5.1.1 *Syntactic roles*
In the literary language, equi-deletion in modal complements is common,
and *ku* seldom appears. Things are different, however, in the spoken lan-
guage. Here, equi-NP deletion is favored in transitive complements, but

intransitive complements tend to show either overt pronominal marking of the coreferential subject, or a subordinating morpheme:

(23) *min   di-xwest   av   vexw-im*
I:OBL PROG-wanted-Ø water drink:SUBJ-1:SG
'I wanted to drink some water'

(24) *min   di-xwest   ez   her-im   mal-ê*
I:OBL PROG-wanted-Ø I:NOM go:SUBJ-1:SG home-OBL
'I wanted to go home'

(25) *min   nikaribû   derî vek-im*
I:OBL NEG:could-Ø door open:SUBJ-1:SG
'I couldn't open the door'

(26) *min   nikaribû   ez   li mal-a   xwe bi-mîn-im*
I:OBL NEG:could-Ø I:NOM in house-DET:F REFL SUBJ-stay-1:SG
'I couldn't stay at home'

(27) *min   destpêkir kilam-ek-î   bêj-im*
I:OBL started-Ø song-INDEF-OBL say:SUBJ-1:SG
'I started to sing a song'

(28) *min   destpêkir ku raqsbik-im*
I:OBL started-Ø that dance:SUBJ-1:SG
'I started to dance'

As indicated in (22), the subject of a past tense modal verb ('want', 'be able to', 'begin') is treated in Kurmanji as an A: the first person pronoun in (23)–(28), which is the subject of the modal (matrix) verb, appears regularly in the oblique case. The verb itself is in the default form of the third singular. In the complements, the verbs chosen for the sample show an alternation of transitives and intransitives, and so of A's and S's. Remember that ergativity will not appear in any of the subjunctive complement clauses due to the tense/aspect-based split in Kurmanji. But since the past tense modal construction is ergative, (23)–(28) allow us to examine the interaction of A's with A's — as in examples (23), (25), (27) — compared to the interaction of A's with S's — as in (24), (26), and (28) — as regards the grammar of coreferent subjects in semantically tightly-integrated clauses. The following picture emerges: When the A of the matrix clause is the coreferent of an A in the complement, zero-marking appears throughout for the subject of the complement. When however the A of the matrix clause is the co-

referent of an S in the complement, either the S-subject of the complement is expressed by a pronoun, as in (24) and (26), or the complement is introduced by a conjunction *ku*, as in (28). Thus, in the tightly-integrated clause combinations exemplified by the modal constructions, Kurmanji is consistent in allowing the A-A pivot, but less so in admitting the A-S pivot. For first persons in complements of the verbs 'want', 'be able to' and 'begin', the following generalization can therefore be made as regards the admissibility of zero-marking of the coreferent subject:

(29)   A-A > A-S

Is the difficulty in allowing a straightforward A-S pivot here related to the morphology of the constructions, that is, to the difference in case and agreement patterns between the A-clause and the S-clause? Comparing the argument structures of the complement clauses in (23)–(28), we find that there is a tendency towards retaining one overt argument. In transitive complements, there is always an overt representation of an O. In the intransitive complements, the tendency is to retain an overt representation of S. Transitive second arguments and intransitive single arguments thus assume complementary roles in similar positions. Now the intransitive subject S and the transitive object O are known to share a number of universal semantic and syntactic features, beside the morphological property of having absolutive marking in ergative systems. Keenan (1984) discusses shared control properties, thematic role features (theme and patient), existence dependency on the verb, and selectional restrictions. Moravcsik (1978) points to the fact that verbs show restrictions on the choice of single core arguments of intransitive verbs, that is S-arguments, which are similar to those imposed on the choice of objects of transitive verbs or O-arguments. Ergative subjects of transitive verbs, or A-arguments, on the other hand, are only restricted by very general semantic properties such as animacy. Especially the restrictions on selection lead Mithun (1994: 255–257) to the conclusion that absolutive intransitive subjects and their absolutive transitive object counterparts are generally the "more immediately involved" participants in an action. This would account for the structure of overt argument marking in complements in spoken Kurmanji: The fact that Kurmanji is more likely to allow equi-subject deletion of A in transitive modal complements may be attributed to the saliency of O, which remains present. Similarly, the tendency to recover the subject of intransitive modal complements overtly can be regarded as an expression of the saliency of S. The grammar of clause-linkage and the

pragmatics of referential coherence in modal constructions might thus interact with role-related semantic properties.

5.1.2 *Person split*

The morphological dimension becomes apparent when first person coreferents are compared to their third person counterparts. Here we find no difference between the treatment of A-A and A-S coreferent subjects when the verb 'want' appears in the matrix clause:

(30) *wî   di-xwest   mekîna-k-ê   bi-kirr-e*
      he:OBL PROG-wanted-Ø car-INDEF-OBL SUBJ-buy-3:SG
      'He wanted to buy a car'

(31) *wî   di-xwest   her-e   mal-ê*
      he:OBL PROG-wanted-Ø go:SUBJ-3:SG home-OBL
      'He wanted to go home'

Zero-marking of the coreferent subject appears both in (30), where the subject of the complement clause is an A, and in (31), where it is an S. Note that although the subject of the matrix verb 'want' takes the oblique form *wî* (keeping in mind that for third person pronouns oblique and nominative forms are often interchangeable), agreement patterns in both the main and the complement clauses are similar, the verb appearing in a default/third person form in the matrix clause, and, having a third person subject, in the third person in the non-ergative complement clause. In sentences with 'want' as a matrix verb, the rule presented in (29), where A-A structures are more likely to allow zero marking of coreferent subjects than A-S structures, therefore does not seem to apply for third person subjects. This allows for a tentative generalization about the admissibility of zero-marking for coreferent subjects in complement clauses, and perhaps in clause combinations through-out the language:

(32) 3rd person > 1st person

Third person coreferent subjects are more likely to allow zero-marking, while first person coreferent subjects will be marked overtly by a pronoun, or will at least show a complementizer *ku* marking the beginning of a new clause.

5.1.3 *Verb semantics*

The generalization in (32) pertains to modal verbs of the 'want' type, where semantic integrality of the two clauses is extremely tight and where the matrix verb conveys no independent action or event. Let us look at an example with matrix verbs that are somewhat more independent semantically, that is, where the verb conveys a more intense process of reflection on intentions and the subject is consequently more agentive. Here one would expect the close, though somewhat less tight semantic integration to be reflected in the grammatical strategies employed to join the two clauses. (33)–(36) show clauses with complements of the verb 'take a decision', literally in Kurmanji 'give one's (own) decision'. The subject is the first person in (33)–(34), and the third person in (35)–(36). Each pair shows an A-subject in the complement of the first sentence (with the transitive verb 'leave'), and an S-subject in the complement of the second, respectively (with the intransitive verb 'go'):

(33) *min   qerar-a   xwe da   ku ez*
     I:OBL decision-DET:F REFL gave-Ø that I:NOM

     gund-ê   xwe terkbik-im
     village-DET:M REFL leave:SUBJ-1:SG
     'I decided to leave my village'

(34) *min   qerar-a   xwe da   ku ez*
     I:OBL decision-DET:F REFL gave-Ø that I:NOM

     her-im   bajêr
     go:SUBJ-1:SG town:OBL
     'I decided to go to town'

(35) *wê   qerar-a   xwe da   gund-ê*
     she:OBL decision-DET:F REFL gave-Ø village-DET:M

     xwe terkbik-e
     REFL leave:SUBJ-3:SG
     'She decided to leave her village'

(36) *ew   qerar-a   xwe da   ku*
     she:NOM decision-DET:F REFL gave-Ø that

     her-e   bajêr
     go:SUBJ-3:SG town:OBL
     'She decided to go to town'

Notice first that the hierarchy presented in (29), which shows, for first person coreferent subjects with 'want'-type main verbs, that the A-A sequence is more likely to admit zero-marking in the complement than A-S, does not apply for subjects with the matrix verb 'take a decision' in (33)–(34): In both examples, the complements are introduced by *ku*, and the subject of the complement clause assumes overt pronominal marking. But notice also that in requiring both *ku* and an overt marking of the coreferential subject, these sentences assume a less tight structural integration than modal constructions with 'want'-type main verbs. Thus, in addition to the argument structure of the clause and the status of the subject as A or S, which figures elsewhere in the language as a trigger for, or conversely a barrier to, zero-marking, and in addition to the person split which favors zero with third person and a pronoun or *ku* with first persons, (33)–(34), compared with previous examples, show that there is also a semantic conditioning pertaining to the choice of the matrix verb, even within the group of modal constructions with subjunctive complements. The more agentive semantically the A-subject of the main clause, the less tight the structural integration appears to be and so the more likely for complementizers and coreferent subject pronouns to appear in the complement.

Let us now turn to the third person subjects in (35)–(36). Significantly, in (35) the A-subject of the matrix clause *wê* 'she' appears in the oblique case, while its counterpart in (36) is nominative — *ew*. There is no syntactic reason for this alternation; indeed in (33)–(34) both subjects in this position are oblique. Rather, the alternation here is an example of the interchangeable usage of case marking with third person pronouns, discussed above. There are two features of (35)–(36) which contrast with their first person subject counterparts in (33)–(34): First, a rule somewhat similar to (29) — for zero-marking of coreferent subjects, A-A > A-S — appears for third person subjects. Thus, (35), which has an A-A sequence, allows zero, while (36), with an A-S sequence, allows zero but uses a complementizer *ku*, thus inserting a break between the two clauses. The rule favoring A-A sequences in terms of equi-subject deletion, suggested in (29), pertained to first person subjects in subjunctive complements of 'want'-type modal constructions. Remember that third person subjects in such constructions showed no restrictions on zero-marking of coreferents. (35)–(36) illustrate that the higher the semantic agentivity of the initial (matrix) subject, and so the more — in a sense — independent the matrix event is, the less relaxed the

conditions for zero-marking are for third person subjects. Significantly, similar rules on subject sequencing then apply, as in the cases leading to our generalization (29). Thus, (29), while pertaining to the specific case of first person subjects in the mentioned type of modals, proves nevertheless to be a hierarchy of more general validity in the language, which can be encountered in other environments as well.

The second contrasting feature between the example clusters (33)–(34) and (35)–(36) is the extent to which structural material is employed to connect the two clauses, or, put more precisely from a different perspective, the extent to which structural material may be regarded as unnecessary when the clauses are connected: Clearly, clause combinations with third person subjects require less such material than those with first person subjects. While in (36) no overt pronoun appears, and in (35) there is use of neither a pronoun nor a complementizer, in (33)–(34) both pronoun and *ku* are needed in the complement clause. This confirms the person hierarchy for zero-marking likelihood, third person > first person, suggested in (32).

At first glance, the facts of the person split seem to run contrary to the universal tendency to keep track more closely of the identity of third person referents (cf. Comrie 1983: 25).[16] Whether a connection can be drawn between the relaxation of rules on referent-tracking and the relaxation of case-marking and agreement patterns relevant to the distinction between ergative and nominative-accusative clause structures remains to be determined. At any rate, the discussion so far shows that the person hierarchy interacts not only with the hierarchy of syntactic roles (A- vs.S-subjects, see (29)), but also with a hierarchy of semantic integration: The verb 'take a decision', though classifiable as modal, involves more intensive cognitive action on the part of the subject, and so it could be defined as expressing "reflective intent". As such it is higher on the "binding scale" for verbs (Givón 1990: 552), and its complement is therefore more likely to be more loosely integrated with the main clause.

5.1.4 *The role of antecedents*

Equi-deletion by definition applies to coreferents of previously mentioned entities, in our case, subject entities. We have seen above that conditions on equi-deletion can be relaxed when both subjects share surface case marking, syntactic roles, and at least surface agreement patterns (that is, default and third person agreement can be treated as one). In general terms, Kurmanji clearly favors equi-deletion when the subject has already been explicitly

mentioned in its role as subject. Thus there is a preference for zero in the complement of a personal modal construction, but a preference for both *ku* and an overt pronoun in complements of impersonal modals. In (37)–(38), the first subject is an S, the second an A; in terms of syntactic roles both examples are identical, yet the treatment of equi differs:

(37) *ew mecbûr bû xan-ê xwe bi-froş-e*
he obliged was house-DET:M REFL SUBJ-sell-3:SG
'He had to (= was obliged to) sell his house'

(38) *lazim bû ku ew mal-a xwe bi-froş-e*
necessary was that he house-DET:F REFL SUBJ-sell-3:SG
'He had to (= it was necessary that he) sell his house'

The condition evident from (37)–(38), namely personal constructions > impersonal constructions, as far as the preference for zero marking of coreferents is concerned, applies to subject antecedents in other environments as well. In fact, *ku* + pronoun, which we have already encountered with first person subjects in less tightly integrated modal constructions with the verb 'take a decision' in (33)–(34), is the preferred structure not only in impersonal modal constructions, but also in subjunctive complements involving manipulation, that is, different subjects:

(39) *ewî di-xast ku ez j-ê ra*
he:OBL PROG-wanted-Ø that I:NOM for-him POST

av-ê b-în-im
water-OBL SUBJ-bring-1:SG
'He wanted me to bring him water'

(40) *min di-xast ku ew ji mi ra*
I:OBL PROG-wanted-Ø that he:NOM for-me POST

av-ê b-în-e
water-OBL SUBJ-bring-3:SG
'I wanted him to bring me water'

(41) *min di-xast ku ew her-e mal-ê*
I:OBL PROG-wanted-Ø that he:NOM SUBJ:go-3:SG home-OBL
'I wanted him to go home'

(42) *ewî di-xast ku ez her-im mal-ê*
he:OBL PROG-wanted-Ø that I:NOM SUBJ:go-1:SG home-OBL
'He wanted me to go home'

No difference occurs between the treatment of first person/third person sequences and the reversed order, nor between different combinations of syntactic roles of the respective subjects, and A-A and A-S behave alike. However, we do encounter the person split again in manipulation clauses in which the subject of the subjunctive complement has an antecedent in the main clause:

(43) *min   ji   wan ra   ricakir ku   derî vek-in*
      I:OBL from they POST asked-Ø that door open:SUBJ-PL
      'I asked them to open the door'

(44) *wan-a   ji   min   ra   ricakir   ku   ez*
      they-EMP from I:OBL POST asked-Ø that I:NOM

      derî   vek-im
      door open:SUBJ-1:SG
      'They asked me to open the door'

In (43), where the object *wan* 'them' serves as an antecedent for the third person plural subject of the complement clause (='that they open the door'), the complement is introduced by *ku*, but no overt pronominal reference to its subject is added. In (44), where likewise an object *min* 'me' serves as an antecedent for the subject of the complement clause, both *ku* and the first person pronoun are needed.

5.1.5 *Structures and preferences: a summary*
On the whole, there appears to be a hierarchy of structural features used to integrate two clauses one of which is the indicative (modal) main clause, the other a subjunctive complement. This hierarchy may be arranged as follows in terms of structural complexity:

(45) zero-anaphora > *ku* **or** pronoun > *ku* **and** pronoun

The examples discussed so far reveal that a series of factors conditions the choice — or one should rather say the preference — for one or the other edge of the hierarchy in (45): surface syntactic roles (A vs. S), person (first vs. third), the semantics of the main verb (and so the potential semantic independence of the two clauses), and the availability of an antecedent for the subject of the second clause in the main clause (degree of equi). Bearing in mind that subjunctive complements are considered semantically tightly-integrated into the complex modal construction, a feature which is reflected

in the choice of the subjunctive expressing dependency/modality overtly on the verb, the sensitivity to a series of additional factors is quite remarkable. (46) summarizes the preferences seen so far; their arrangement corresponds to the hierarchy in the choice of structures as displayed in (45):

(46) syntactic role: A-A > A-S
person: 3rd person > 1st person
matrix verb semantics: −agentivity > +agentivity of A
equi availability: same subj > different subj
+antecedent > −antecedent

5.2 *Indicative complements*

Indicative complements support the expectation that lower semantic integrality of two combined clauses will be reflected in less tight syntactic integration, and that this connection will be significant with regard to the admissibility of zero-anaphora marking of coreferent subjects (cf. discussion in 4.1.3). The following examples (47)–(50) show a matrix verb which is transitive and, in the past tense, in principle ergative, though here again we encounter the interchangeability of case-marking options for third person pronominal subjects:

(47) *ewî   di-zanîbû   ku ew   nexweş e*
he:OBL PROG-knew-Ø that he:NOM ill   is
'He$_i$ knew that he$_i$ was (lit. 'is') ill'

(48) *min   di-zanîbû   ku ez   nexweş im*
I:OBL PROG-knew-Ø that I:NOM ill   am
'I knew that I was (lit. 'am') ill'

(49) *ew   di-zanîbû   ku ew   carekê min   dîtîbû*
he:NOM PROG-knew-Ø that he:NOM once   I:OBL had:seen-Ø
'He$_i$ knew that he$_i$ had seen me once (before)'

(50) *min   di-zanîbû   ku min   carekê ewî   dîtîbû*
I:OBL PROG-knew-Ø that I:OBL once   he:OBL had:seen-Ø
'I knew that I had seen him once (before)'

In the complements, (47)–(48) take the present tense. The temporal interpretation is based here on the main clause. Since the complement verb is the copula 'be', an intransitive, ergativity in the complement is ruled out.

At least for first person subjects, and optionally for third persons, one can therefore expect different case-marking and agreement patterns in the main and in the complement clauses. In (49)–(50), however, the complement includes a transitive verb in the pluperfect. Here, case and agreement patterns in the main and the complement clauses should be expected to match. The strategies of interest for our discussion, however, are identical in all examples, and *ku* + overt pronoun is used throughout. Notice that none of the prominent factors specified in (46) as promoters of zero-marking in subjunctive complements — such as A-A sequences, third person equi — appear to operate in such a way in indicative complements. Indeed, the structural features involved in clause combining of the type illustrated here resemble those of different-subject subjunctive clauses, or manipulative constructions.

Crucial for the degree of integration of the two clauses and so for the choice of referential marking is the degree of independence of the embedded complement clauses. Unlike complements of verbs of modality/manipulation, which convey irrealis events and must appear in the subjunctive, complements of verbs of cognition/perception/utterance (epistemic verbs) may be placed on a realis-irrealis continuum. Characteristic of the complements of the verb 'to know' in (49)–(50) is their realis interpretation. Tense/aspect/mood selection for the complement verbs is free of restrictions, since they convey independent events. The subjects of independent events, like those in DS (different subject) constructions or in single-proposition simple clauses, are expressed by overt pronouns.

Other epistemic verbs, however, are ambiguous in this sense, that is, they can take either an indicative or a subjunctive complement. A nice illustration of the realis-irrealis continuum for epistemic complements, and of its relevance to referential tracking devices, is provided by the translations obtained for various complements of the verb 'to ask'. When the question relates to an event which is yet to happen, the complement verb takes the subjunctive, and speakers have a choice between zero-anaphora and overt pronominal reference:

(51) *ew   pirsî   gelo   kar-e   li vir bi-mîn-e*
     he:NOM asked-Ø whether can:SUBJ-3:SG here SUBJ-stay-3:SG
     'He$_i$ asked whether he$_i$ could stay here'

(52) *ewî   sual kir ku ew bi-kar-e*
     he:OBL asked-Ø that he:NOM SUBJ-can-3:SG

li vê derê bi-mîn-e
here   SUBJ-stay-3:SG
'He_i asked whether he_i could stay here'

Thus in (51)–(52), different verbs are chosen for 'ask', but both forms are past tense transitives. The variation in case assignment to the third person pronominal subject of the main clauses is characteristic of the language, and has been pointed out above several times already. The subjunctive prefix which is added to the present tense root to form the subjunctive in *bi-kare* is optional. A subordinating conjunction appears in both examples: in (51) it is *gelo* 'whether', while in (52) *ku,* with which we are familiar from the above discussion, is chosen. Thus on the whole, (51)–(52) are quite similar. The differences between them in the marking of coreferential subjects (zero in (51), pronoun in (52)) can therefore be attributed to 'choice', rather than 'constraints' or even general tendencies.

But when the question rendered by the verb 'to ask' pertains to an event which has already occurred, the complement is considered independent, its verb is indicative, and its subject is expressed by an overt pronoun, even if it has an antecedent in the main clause:

(53) *ew   ji   textor pirsî   gelo   ew   gelek nexweş e*
      he:NOM from doctor asked-Ø whether he:NOM very ill   is
      'He_i asked the doctor whether he_i was (lit. 'is') very ill'

(54) *ew   ji   mi   sual kir ku ewî ḥeta*
      he:NOM from I:OBL asked-Ø that   he:OBL until
      niha pere   daye   min
      now money gave-Ø I:OBL
      'He_i asked me whether he_i had already given me some money'

Note that the same strategy, namely a conjunction (*gelo* or *ku*) + overt pronoun, is applied both in (53), where the sequence of syntactic roles is A-S, and in (54) where it is A-A. The conclusion to be drawn here is that indicative complements, like different-subject constructions, will favor both a conjunction and a pronoun, or, with reference to the likelihood of equi-reference deletion:

(55) subjunctive complements > indicative complements

In this respect, the behavior of combined clauses in Kurmanji is not unexpected: subjunctive complements are an instance of close syntactic

integration, which reflects tight semantic integration of the two clauses. Equi-subject deletion (zero marking) and the absence of a subordinating conjunc-tion are further features of this tight structural integration. Particular to Kurmanji, though, is perhaps the interaction with some of the other factors, as presented in (46), and so, although one is inclined to characterize Kur-manji as a language that tends to favor overt pronominal marking of corefer-ential subjects in complement clauses, and so to treat referential tracking in combined clauses much like that in simple clauses, one must also point out the general preference of an A-A pivot, particularly for third person pronomi-nal subjects, in subjunctive complements.

6. Purpose clauses

Purpose clauses typically have the same subject as their main clauses. On the other hand, they convey an event which is typically distinct from that conveyed by the predicate of the main clause. Purpose clauses therefore provide an interesting case based on which the interaction of referent continuity and event coherence can be checked once again. Recall that Kurmanji only has finite clauses, and so we can expect a rather isomorphic coding of the main event and the purpose event, at least as regards the predicate. The semantic connection between the two clauses is indicated either by *ku*, or by the preposition *ji bo* 'for', functioning as a subordinating conjunction. The verb of the purposive clause itself appears in the subjunc-tive, and so again, as in subjunctive complements, one can expect, due to the tense/aspect-based split that conditions ergativity in the language, nomina-tive-accusative case and agreement patterns in the purposive clause. With main clauses with past-tense transitive verbs, we will therefore encounter differing case and agreement patterns in the main and the purpose clauses:

(57) *mi   gund-ê   xwe terk kir ji bo ez   kar peydabik-im*
I:OBL village-DET:M REFL left-Ø   for I:NOM work find:SUBJ-1:SG
'I left my village in order to find work'

(58) *mi   gund-ê   xwe terk kir ji bo ez*
I:OBL village-DET:M REFL left-Ø   for I:NOM

li bajêr   rûn-im
in city:OBL live:SUBJ-1:SG
'I left my village in order to live in the city'

In both examples (57)–(58) the main verbs are transitive, and so their subjects are A's. Both verbs appear in the past tense, and both A's are marked for the oblique and show no agreement with the verb. In (57), the subject of the purpose clause is an A, while in (58) it is an S. Both are coreferential with the main clause subject. But there is no difference between the devices used to mark the subject of the purpose clauses in (57)–(58): in both cases, conjunction + pronoun occur. Thus it appears that overt marking of the coreferent subject is a general property of all but the most tightly integrated (semantically) combined clauses in the language. Different syntactic roles of coreferent subjects (A vs. S) and conflicting case and agreement patterns (ergative vs. nominative) can further be ruled out as a possible trigger for overt subject marking by the following examples, where the subjects of the main clauses are S's and so nominative:

(59) *ez   çû-m   bajêr   ji bo ez   kar   bi-ger-im*
      I:NOM went-1:SG town:OBL for   I:NOM work SUBJ-find-1:SG
      'I went to town to find work'

(60) *ez   zû   rabû-m   ji bo ez   bi-ç-im   bajêr*
      I:NOM early got:up-1:SG for   I:NOM SUBJ-go-1:SG town:OBL
      'I got up early to go to town'

Again we see that neither referential identity of the subjects (equi), nor identical case-marking, nor identical syntactic roles will automatically trigger equi-deletion in combined clauses of the types examined — complements and purpose clauses -, but that the pragmatics of reference coherence yield to the grammar of rather loose syntactic integration of clauses in the language, except where a series of factors combine to promote equi-deletion, as expressed in (46).

7. Coordination

Kurmanji only allows finite complement clauses, even where modal and purpose clauses with coreferent subjects are concerned. Complement and purpose clauses in which the coreferential subject is marked overtly by a pronoun basically mirror-image the structure of single proposition clauses. Given that this is often the case even in tightly-integrated embeddings, we might expect independent, chained (coordinated) clauses to show similar

restrictions on zero-anaphora. Our investigation of the S/A pivot in coordinated clauses in Kurmanji focuses on closely related sequences. But even here, we might still anticipate factors such as the person split to condition the choice of referent-tracking devices. The main issue remains therefore the competition between the tendency to copy the structure of single proposition clauses by using overt pronominal reference to subjects on the one hand, and the use of zero-anaphora to mark the referential coherence of multi-propositional sentences on the other.

The spoken language can generally be expected to restrict zero-anaphora to shorter sequences: it is easier to track a more distant referent in written texts than it is in spoken discourse, where reference is more immediate. If we compare short sequences of chained clauses in the spoken language, we find that there are no apparent restrictions on zero-anaphora when both clauses are intransitive and show subject-verb agreement. This pertains to both third and first person subjects:

(61) *ew   rabû   û   çû   derve*
      he:NOM stood-Ø and went-Ø out
      'He stood up and went out'

(62) *ew   çû   hindur û ji xwe ra   rûnişt*
      he:NOM went-Ø inside and for REFL POST sat-Ø
      'He went inside and sat down'

(63) *ez   rabû-m   û   çû-m   derve*
      I:NOM stood-1:SG and went-1:SG out
      'I stood up and went out'

(64) *ez   çû-m   hindur û ji xwe ra   rûnişt-im*
      I:NOM went-1:SG inside and for REFL POST sat-1:SG
      'I went inside and sat down'

In (61)–(62), respectively, both clauses show third person pronominal subjects, in (62)–(63) the subject is in the first person. Throughout (61)–(63), the sequence of syntactic subject roles is S-S, and zero is admitted in the second clause. The conclusion, once more, is therefore that in coordination there is no restriction of zero-marking of coreferent subjects if both subjects are S's.

However, when the sequence of syntactic subject roles for the coreferents is S-A, we encounter the person split. In (65)–(66), the subject is in the third person. In the first clause, with the verb *hatin* 'come', it is an S; in the

second clause, with the verb *gotin* 'say' in (65) and *xwestin* 'want' in (66), it is an A. Zero is admissible in the second clause of both examples:

(65) ew   hat   hindur û   got   rojbaş
     he:NOM came-Ø inside and said-Ø good-day
     'He came inside and said "good day"'

(66) ew   hat   hindur û   dixwest   bi   mi
     he:NOM came-Ø inside and wanted-Ø with I:OBL

     re   xeberbid-e
     POST speak:SUBJ-3:SG
     'He came inside and wanted to speak to me'

(67) ez   hat-im   hindur û   min   got   rojbaş
     I:NOM came-1:SG inside and I:OBL said-Ø good-day
     'I came inside and said 'good day''

(68) ez   hat-im   hindur û   min   dixwest
     I:NOM came-1:SG inside and I:OBL wanted-Ø

     ez   bi   wî   re   xeberbidim
     I:NOM with he:OBL POST speak:SUBJ-1:SG
     'I came inside and wanted to speak to him'

(67)–(68) replicate (65)–(66), but the subjects are now in the first person. Zero cannot be used to mark the coreferential subject of the second clauses, and a pronoun appears instead. Since the verbs all appear in the past tense, and since the first clause is intransitive and has an S, while the second is transitive and has an A, the pronouns used in each of the clauses to denote the subject differ in case and agreement: the first clause is absolutive (nominative), the second is ergative.

This leads to the conclusion that conflicting case marking and agreement patterns in transitive and intransitive clauses do in fact impose a restriction on the S-A pivot, as seen in coordination of S-clauses with A-clauses in the language. Now if ergative morphology imposes genuine morphosyntactic constraints on referent tracking devices, one would expect those constraints to apply to third person subjects as well, yet no restrictions on zero-marking of coreferent subjects can be seen in (65)–(66). However, we have seen earlier that in the reduced ergative construction of spoken Kurmanji the verb generally assumes a default form, which is identical with the verb form of the third person singular. While the transitive verb does not, in strict syntactic terms, agree with the third person singular subject of the first clause, it

does not "disagree" either; in other words there is no obvious interruption in agreement patterns in mixed constructions with third person singular continuous subjects. A possible explanation for the fact that morphological constraints do not apply for third person singular subjects is that in cases like (65)–(66) the subject referent is retrieved through the seeming continuity in agreement patterns. While possible in the third person, this is ruled out for the first person subject, where the collision of agreement followed by non-agreement motivates speakers to favor overt pronominal marking of the coreferential subject.

If our hypothesis is correct and first person subjects may not take zero-anaphora in constructions like (67)–(68) due to the change in agreement patterns when shifting from an intransitive to a transitive clause, one would expect the restriction on zero-anaphora to be relaxed when verb agreement patterns are identical in both clauses, or when the second clause is intransitive, thus showing subject-agreement on the verb. This seems indeed to be the case; when personal endings on the intransitive verb help express the identity of the first person subject, there is greater flexibility in the choice of referent tracking devices:

(69) *min   çant-ê   girt   û   çû-m   mal-ê*
      I:OBL bag-OBL took-Ø and went-1:SG home-OBL
      'I took the bag and went home'

(70) *min   derî vekir   û   derket-im derve*
      I:OBL door opened-Ø and went-1:SG out
      'I opened the door and went out'

(71) *min   çant-ê   girt   û   ez   çû-m   mal-ê*
      I:OBL bag-OBL took-Ø and I:NOM went-1:SG home-OBL
      'I took the bag and went home'

(72) *min   derî vekir   û   ez   derket-im derve*
      I:OBL door opened-Ø and I:NOM went-1:SG out
      'I opened the door and went out'

In (69)–(70), the subject appears in the first person singular. The subject of the first clauses in each of the examples is an A and therefore marked for the oblique case. There is no subject-agreement, and agreement can be interpreted as either default or object-oriented (but notice that in (69), as in (71), the direct object *çanta* 'bag', a feminine noun, takes the oblique case as well — *çantê*). In both examples (69)–(70), the second clause is intransi-

tive and so its subject is an S. Overt reference to the coreferential S-subject is deleted, i.e. the coreferential subject in the A-S sequence is zero-marked. Examples (71)–(72) however show exactly the same sentences with an overt pronominal expression, in the nominative case, of the coreferential S-subject in the second clause. Zero-marking with first person subjects in A-S sequences is thus optional, but possible.

Variation also occurs in coordinated clauses when the sequence of syntactic subject roles is A-A. In (73), overt pronouns in the oblique case appear in both clauses:

(73) *min derî vekir   û   min te   dît*
      I:OBL door opened-Ø and I:OBL you:OBL saw-Ø
      'I opened the door and saw you'

Example (74) shows a combination of A-A and A-S; as might be expected, A-A, as in (73), takes a pronoun for the coreferential subject in the second clause, while A-S, as in (69)–(70), takes zero:

(74) *min çant-a   xwe girt, min derî*
      I:OBL bag-DET:F REFL took-Ø I:OBL door

      vekir   û   çû-m   derve
      opened-Ø and went-1:SG out
      'I took my bag, opened the door, and went out'

But in (75), with similar patterns of transitivity and so syntactic roles, zero occurs for both coreferent subjects in the second and third clauses, whether coordination is expressed by a conjunction or by serialization:

(75) *min çant-a   xwe girt, derî vekir*
      I:OBL bag-DET:F REFL took-Ø door opened-Ø

      û   derket-im derve
      and went-1:SG out
      'I took my bag, opened the door, and went out'

But note that while first person coreferential subjects may or may not take zero-anaphora in A-S and in A-A sequences, when presented with a contrast of first and third person subjects, informants consistently used zero-anaphora for the third, but overt pronouns for the first person coreferential subjects:

(76) *ewî   gund-ê   xwe terkkir û*
he:OBL village-DET:M REFL left-Ø and

jîyan-ek-e   nû li bajêr   destpêkir
life-INDEF-DET:F new in city:OBL started-Ø
'He left his village and started a new life in the city'

(77) *ewî   gund-ê   xwe terkkir û   çû   bajêr*
he:OBL village-DET:M REFL left-Ø and went-Ø city:OBL
'He left his village and moved to the city'

(78) *min   gund-ê   xwe terkkir û*
I:OBL village-DET:M REFL left-Ø and

jîyan-ek-e   nû li bajêr   min destpêkir
life-INDEF-DET:F new in city:OBL I:OBL started-Ø
'I left my village and started a new life in the city'

(79) *min   gund-ê   xwe terkkir û   ez   çû-m   bajêr*
I:OBL village-DET:M REFL left-Ø and I:NOM went-1:SG city:OBL
'I left my village and moved to the city'

Zero appears in the second clause following the conjunction in (76), where the sequence is A-A, and in (77), where it is A-S; in both examples the subjects are third persons. However, with first person subjects both in (78), with A-A, and in (79), with A-S, there is a preference to insert an overt pronoun (notice in (78) that the subject pronoun need not immediately follow the conjunction). Since we know from (69)–(70) and from (75) that first person subjects may allow zero, (78)–(79) can be taken to show a preference, one which clearly contrasts with the preference demonstrated for third person subjects in (76)–(77). To summarize the picture obtained for clause coordination in Kurmanji, two tendencies connected to the admissibility of zero-marking of coreferential subjects can be pointed out:

(80) 3rd person > 1st person

(81) S-S > A-S, A-A > S-A

While both involve factors that have been encountered and defined as relevant above, in the discussion of subjunctive complements, only (80) is in fact identical with a hierarchy expressed above, in (32). Although syntactic roles have been found to be help condition the appearance of zero for first person subject coreferents in combined clauses (cf. 29), (81) actually points

in a different direction: While in subjunctive complements with first person subjects Kurmanji was found to favor the A-A pivot, in coordination it favors an S-S pivot. The common feature is nevertheless the difficulty in treating clauses which differ in transitivity in a similar way as those which do not differ in transitivity, when clauses are combined.

The interplay of (80) and (81) is a rather straightforward confirmation that ergativity does indeed interfere, to some extent, with the grammar of referential continuity and so with the surface manifestations of the pivot behavior of the language: Zero is most likely where there is least conflict in case marking and morphological agreement patterns, and where furthermore agreement patterns can be expected to express subject identity: With third person subjects, and with the S-S pivot for first person subjects. It is least likely where a conflict in case and agreement patterns emerges: potentially with first persons (except in S-S sequences), particularly in S-A sequences with first person subjects. Speakers thus tend to avoid referential ambiguity which might result from the switch into different morphological agreement patterns. The solution adopted in such cases is to copy the referential tracking structure of single proposition clauses, that is to repeat the overt pronominal reference to the coreferential subject.

8. Conclusion

The evidence presented in this study points to two main types of restrictions which are imposed on the surface marking of the S/A pivot in Kurmanji: a) semantic-pragmatic restrictions, which basically exclude equi-deletion in all but the most tightly-integrated combinations of clauses (certain modal complements and single-event coordination), b) morpho-syntactic restrictions, which are connected to the surface-representation of grammatical relations in the language. The latter are found to correlate with the language's ergative morphology. Thus, overt pronominal marking of the coreferential subject in coordinated clauses is preferred when the collision of agreement patterns is most extreme. But the significance of ergativity in this respect, however apparent for first person subjects, seems on the whole peripheral. It does not affect zero-anaphora marking of subjects in the third person singular; moreover, the restriction imposed on zero-anaphora by ergative morphology coincides with a general flexibility in the choice of

devices marking continuous subject referents in other complex constructions such as embeddings.

Deep ergative languages have been shown to develop constructions which enable them to ease the restrictions imposed on the S/A pivot. Above I have interpeted this as an accomodation of the natural requirements of connected discourse within the ergative syntax (cf. Cooreman, Fox and Givón 1984), or in the extreme case as "syntax yielding to discourse-pragmatics". But Kurmanji differs from languages like Dyirbal and Ama-huaca in that it does not have an S/O pivot, and the grammatical devices which carry the S/A pivot are neither secondary, marked, or derived. It also differs from Lezgian, where the straightforward, surface S/A pivot is con-sidered to be only a recent innovation. In fact, the evidence suggests that the restrictions imposed by ergative morphology on the surface features of the S/A pivot in Kurmanji are a result of a general uncertainty in the spoken language with respect to the pragmatic reliability, and so the applicability of zero-anaphora as a referent tracking device. This uncertainty is triggered by a variety of factors, some of which are semantic-pragmatic, others are at least by implication structural.

The solution adopted to overcome the structural barrier involves partly avoiding zero-anaphora, which in many other languages is one of the most essential features of multipropositional discourse. Consider once more Newari, where with zero-anaphora the structure and discourse prominence of the second clause in coordinated constructions determines the choice of case on the common subject of both clauses, and Chamalal, where with zero-anaphora ergative morphology on the common subject is dropped if coordi-nation involves a transitive and an intransitive clause. In both languages agreement and/or case marking patterns on the subject are adjusted in anticipation of this subjects's continuity into a second, conjoined clause in which different agreement/case patterns occur. Thus, in combined clauses in these languages, at least in those involving a transitive and an intransitive clause, the sequence needs to be planned and structured in advance in order to accomodate zero-anaphora. In Kurmanji, however, almost the opposite occurs. When a change in agreement patterns is suspected to lead to a breakdown of the usual referent-tracking devices in multipropositional clauses, modification takes place, and speakers turn to referent tracking strategies reminiscent of single-proposition clauses.

In embeddings, equi-deletion is easier if a subordinating morpheme is inserted before the complement. This means that syntactic integration and

referential coherence can be treated as complementary strategies of clause combining. But it also confirms the weakness of zero-anaphora as a device capable of integrating closely-related propositions in a complex construction: even in modal embeddings, adjoined clauses can assume rather loosely integrated surface forms. There appears to be a general tension between continuity of the surface subject in combined clauses and embeddings, and the independence of actors in the underlying propositions, a tension which is made apparent by alternating solutions for marking subject continuity.

In essence we are dealing with a competition of deeper patterns of sentence arrangement, manifested by the tendency to copy the structure of single-proposition, independent clauses in multipropositional or chained constructions. This competition can be explained by a need for isomorphism of clause structure throughout the language: Overt subjects are regarded as a necessary feature of finite clauses, both dependent and independent. Resistance to equi-deletion is certainly not a universal of languages with finite modal complements, and equi-deletion is in fact the rule in unmarked constructions of this type in languages like Persian, Arabic, Greek, or Romani. The reduction of zero-anaphora in equi-constructions in Kurmanji might nonetheless be regarded as a language-specific reflection of finiteness and of the fact that absolute co-referent deletion is unknown even in the most tightly integrated modal constructions.

There are several indications of change taking place in Kurmanji, including the ongoing collapse of the system of case-marking and the reduction of the ergative construction. Structures in transition often show pragmatic rather than formal distribution rules, and are more often open to choice, rather than be subjected to constraints. An investigation of the distribution at the clause level of devices which do not follow formal constraints is bound to be limited, and so there appears to be no clear-cut explanation for the reasons behind certain choices made by speakers. The features identified for overtly marked coreferent subjects appear nevertheless to be relevant considerations which speakers take into account while choosing one of two admissible structures. Zero-anaphora is thus likely to occur in clause combinations where subject control is universal, event integration is especially tight, syntactic roles of the subject are compatible, and interference from conflicting morphological case and agreement patterns is least expected.

Author's address:

Yaron Matras
University of Manchester
Department of Linguistics
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL
United Kingdom
e-mail: y.matras@man.ac.uk

ABBREVIATIONS

1:SG	first singular	NOM	nominative
3:PERS	third person pronoun	O	direct object
3:SG	third singular	OBL	oblique
A	transitive subject	PL	plural
DET	Izafe-determiner	POST	postposition
DS	different subject	PROG	progressive
EMP	emphatic marker	REFL	reflexive pronoun
F	feminine	S	intransitive subject
INDEF	indefinite marker	SS	same subject
M	masculine	SUBJ	subjunctive
NEG	negation		

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

NOTES

1. Cf. Kurdoev (1957), Bakaev (1965), Bedir-Khan & Lescot (1970), Bedir-Xan (1977), Hajo (1980), Wurzel (1994), Barnass and Salzer (1994). However, Blau (1975: 71) and Mackenzie (1961: 193) interpret the ergative formation of transitive clauses as a passive construction.

2. See Matras (1992: 149). The problematic example involved a coordinated construction in which the first person subject was introduced by a nominative pronoun in an intransitive clause, then marked again by an overt oblique pronoun in the conjoined transitive clause. A counter-example showing zero-anaphora in the second clause was only found for third person subjects. The signifance of this is discussed below.

3. But there are languages which clearly favor the absolutive as the referential pivot, such as Dyirbal, or Yup'ik (for the latter see T. Payne 1982).

4. The idea that something is expressed by zero might seem misleading, since we are not concerned here with deletions in the formal sense, i.e. with transformations. Nevertheless, the communicative expectation that a topic be continued may result in zero-anaphora actually conveying an instruction to the hearer to "continue current activation", as Givón (1990: 916) puts it, of a previously mentioned referent.

5. Schmidt's (1985) discussion of the linguistic behavior of younger speakers of Dyirbal suggests that the syntactic environments in which antipassive constructions are applied are in fact restricted, and that there is a preference for either loosely conjoining clauses through juxtaposition, or even for borrowing coordinating patterns from English. Thus there appears to be a need to re-arrange the system of clause combining in order to allow an S/A coreference pattern. It is true that these observations are made on the basis of an ongoing process of language death. Nevertheless, one might choose to interpret the data as a confirmation of Dik's (1980: 113–126) prediction according to which ergative patterns of the Dyirbal type (type II) are a universal exception since they constitute a transitional state, a prediction recently challenged by Nedergaard Thomsen (1994) with reference to the productivity of the antipassive construction. The analysis of Dyirbal as a language in transition, and of its antipassive construction as an old pattern of patient topicalization conserved in grammaticalized form, is also supported by Cooreman, Fox and Givón (1984).

6. Dixon (1994: 209, footnote 3), however, argues in response that the fact that topic or theme tends to be in terms of underlying S and A does not relate to ergativity, which is a grammatical category.

7. On the relation of ergativity and the natural requirements of discourse see Cooreman (1988), as well as Cooreman, Fox and Givón (1984). Comrie (1983: 35) discusses the tendency of grammaticalized switch reference systems to mark a referential relation on the clause as a whole, rather than just on the noun phrases of referents. One might therefore expect a similar behavior to apply to the underlying structure of coreferential relations as well, and it is not surprising that some ergative systems go through a shift of syntactic arrangements in order to accommodate a more straightforward subject coreferent marking than is foreseen under the normal conditions of ergative morphology.

8. Literary Kurmanji is based on the Cezîrî dialect spoken in southeastern Turkey and northern Syria. The main guidelines for the written Kurmanji of Turkey and Syria were set by Celadet Bedir Xan in the journal *Hawar* in the 1930s (cf. Bedir-Khan & Lescot (1970); for discussion see Matras (1989) and Matras and Reershemius (1991)). My informants are from the districts of Mardin (southeast Anatolia) and Muş (central-eastern Anatolia).

9. Oblique marking with masculine nouns does appear, however, in some of the Kurmanji

dialects spoken in northern Iraq (see Mackenzie 1961), and is also mentioned as an option by Bedir Xan (1977).

10. A somewhat similar pattern may be found in Hindi, where an animate or otherwise discourse prominent direct object takes the dative, the subject is ergative, and the verb assumes a default form.

11. Wurzel (1992: 110) suggests that the weakening of the ergative construction is due to the influence of Turkish (or possibly other national literary languages in the Kurdish areas, none of which are ergative) on educated speakers of Kurmanji who have little knowledge of the written variety of their native language, while among uneducated speakers ergativity, as found in literary Kurmanji, remains intact. While this cannot be ruled out, and indeed Dorleijn's (1996) results seem to point in a similar direction, one must bear in mind that the pattern of re-interpretation of the ergative construction shown here generally resembles that attested in the northern Iranian languages (Payne 1979; 1980), or even in some of the southern Kurdish dialects (Bynon 1980; Mackenzie 1961).

12. Examples from: *Kino digot: Alîkarî bikim.* Çapxana Çand a Kurd, Stockholm, 1984; *Rapora Xebata Federasyona Komelên Kurdistanê li Swêdê* (=Report on the Work of the Federation of Kurdish Association in Sweden), Stockholm 1988.

13. With pronouns Waxi shows oblique marking only in the first and second person singular (Payne 1980: 180), thus corresponding to the trend in Kurmanji.

14. In other varieties of Kurdish, such as Soranî (southern Kurdish or the Suleimaniye dialect), omission of an O-NP is made possible through the presence of two sets of pronominal clitics attached to the verb, one bearing subject agreement, the other object agreement (Bynon 1979). A similar option is available in some of the Pamir languages (Payne 1980). The choice and position of the clitic of course delivers the necessary information about both the subject and the object, and so the conditions under which zero-anaphora operates are quite different. Soranî in turn lacks nominal and pronominal case altogether, and so it is not ergative.

15. It must be pointed out, however, that Schmidt's (1985) study of dying Dyirbal relates to a partial code, which had only been half-learned and was used only in restricted circumstances, and so cannot be considered a full spoken language like Kurmanji.

16. Watanabe (1994: 150) reports that in spoken Japanese discourse, first person subjects are often coded by zero-anaphora even in cases of subject-switch, which often causes a communicative strain. In modern Hebrew, the first person subject in unmarked and unconnected constructions is rarely expressed by an overt pronoun, whereas the third person subject in such constructions **must** be expressed overtly:

(1) a. *nasa-ti   le-tverya*
         went-1:SG to-Tiberias

     b. *?ani nasa-ti   le-tverya*
         I   went-1:SG to-Tiberias
         'I went to Tiberias'

(2) a. **nasa   le-tverya*
         went-Ø to-Tiberias

b.   *hu nasa   le-tverya*
he went-Ø to-Tiberias
'He went to Tiberias'

REFERENCES

Anderson, S.R. 1976. "On the notion of subject in ergative languages". In: Li, Charles N. (ed.), *Subject and topic*. 3–23. New York: Academic Press.

Bakaev, Čerkez. 1965. *Jazyk azerbajdžanskix kurdov*. Moskva: Akademija Nauk.

Bashir, Elena. 1986. "Beyond split ergativity: Subject marking in Wakhi". *Papers from the general session, 22nd regional meeting*. 14–35. Chicago: CLS.

Barnas, Usso B., and Salzer, Johanna. 1994. *Lehrbuch der kurdischen Sprache*. Wien.

Bedir Khan, Mir Djeladet, and Lescot, Roger. 1970. *Grammaire kurde (Dialecte Kurdmandji)*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Bedir-Xan, Kamuran Ali. 1977. *Türkçe izahli kürtçe gramer*. Istanbul: Özgürlük Yolu Yayınları.

Blau, Joyce. 1975. *Le Kurde de 'Amādiya et de Djabal Sindjār. Analyse linguistique, textes folkloriques, glossaires*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Bubenik, Vit. 1989. "An interpretation of split ergativity in Indo-Iranian languages". *Diachronica* 6: 181–212.

Bubenik, Vit. 1992. "On the acquisition and loss of ergativity in the Iranian family of languages". Paper presented at the 5th International Conference on Functional Grammar, Antwerp, August. 1992.

Bynon, Theodora. 1979. "The ergative construction in Kurdish". *BSOAS* 42: 211–224.

Bynon, Theodora. 1980. "From passive to active in Kurdish via the ergative construction". In: Traugott, Elizabeth Closs; Labrum, Rebecca and Shepherd, Susan (eds), *Papers from the 4th international conference on historical linguistics*. 151–163. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Comrie, Bernard. 1978. "Ergativity". In: Lehman, W.P. (ed.), *Syntactic typology*. 329–394. Hassocks: Harvester Press.

Comrie, Bernard. 1983. "Switch-reference in Huichol: a typological study". In: Haiman, John & Pamela Munro (eds) *Switch-reference and universal grammar*. 17–37. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cooreman, Ann. 1988. "Ergativity in Dyirbal discourse". *Linguistics* 26, 717–746.

Cooreman, A., B. Fox and T. Givón. 1984. "The discourse definition of ergativity". *Studies in Language* 8: 1–34.

Dik, Simon. 1980. *Studies in functional grammar.* London: Academic Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. 1994. *Ergativity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dorleijn, Margreet. 1996. *The decay of ergativity in Kurmanci.* (Studies in Multilingualism 3). Tilburg: Tilburg University Press.

Genetti, Carol. 1988. "A syntactic correlate of topicality in Newari narrative". In: Haiman, John and Thompson, Sandra A. (eds), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse.* 29–48. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1983. "Topic continuity in discourse: The functional domain of switch reference". In: Haiman, John and Munro, Pamela (eds), *Switch-reference and universal grammar.* 51–82. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1990. Syntax. *A functional-typological introduction.* Vol. II. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Givón, Talmy. 1995. *Functionalism and grammar.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hajo, Zaradachet. 1980. Indo-Iranische Studien. PhD-Thesis, Free University, Berlin.

Haspelmath, Martin. 1993. *A grammar of Lezgian.* Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Keenan, Edward L. 1976. "Towards a universal definition of subject". In: Li, Charles N. (ed.), *Subject and topic.* 303–333. New York: Academic Press.

Keenan, Edward L. 1984. "Semantic correlates of the ergative/absolutive distinction". *Linguistics* 22: 197–223.

Kibrik, Alexandr. 1990. "As linguas semanticamente ergativas na perspectiva da tipologia sintática geral". *Cadernos de estudios lingüísticos (Universidade Estadual da Campinas)* 18: 15–36.

Kurdoev, Kanat. 1957. *Grammatika kurdskogo jazyka (kurmandži), fonetika, morfologija.* Moskva: Akademija Nauk.

Li, Charles N., and Lang, Ranier. 1979. "The syntactic irrelevance of an ergative case in Enga and other Papuan languages". In: Plank, Frans (ed.), *Ergativity.* 307–324. London: Academic Press.

Mackenzie, D.N. 1961. *Kurdish dialect studies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matras, Yaron. 1989. Probleme der Sprachstandardisierung. Am Beispiel der Orthographie des Kurdischen. MA- Dissertation, University of Hamburg.

Matras, Yaron. 1992. "Ergativity in Kurmanji. Notes on its use and distribution". *Orientalia Suecana*, 41–42, 139–154.

Matras, Yaron and Reershemius, Gertrud. 1991. "Standardization beyond the state: The cases of Yiddish, Kurdish, and Romani". In: von Gleich, Utta and Wolff, Ekkehard (eds), *Standardization of national languages*. 103–123. [*Arbeiten zur Mehrsprachigkeit 42*].

Mithun, Marianne. 1994. "The implications of ergativity for a Phillipine voice system". In: Fox, Barbara, and Hopper, Paul J. (eds), *Voice, form and function*. 247–277. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Moravcsik, Edith. 1978. "On the distribution of ergative and accusative patterns". *Lingua* 45: 233–279.

Nedergaard Thomsen, Ole. 1994. "Dyirbal ergativity and embedding: A functional-pragmatic approach". *Studies in Landuage* 18: 411–488.

Nichols, Johanna. 1983. "Switch reference in the Northeast Caucasus". In: Haiman, John & Pamela Munro (eds). *Switch-reference and universal grammar*. 245–265. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Payne, John R. 1979. "Transitivity and intransitivity in the Iranian languages of the U.S.S.R." In: Clyne, Paul R.; Hanks, Willian F. and Hofbauer, Carol L. (eds), *The Elements: A Parasession on Linguistics Units and Levels*. 436–447. Chicago: CLS.

Payne, John R. 1980. "The decay of ergativity in Pamir languages". *Lingua* 51: 147–186.

Payne, Thomas E. 1982. "Role and reference related subject properties and ergativity in Yup'ik Eskimo and Tagalog". *Studies in Language* 6: 75–106.

Sasse, Hans-Jürgen. 1978. "Subjekt und Ergativ: Zur pragmatischen Grundlage primärer grammatischer Relationen. *Folia Linguistica* 12: 219–252.

Schmidt, Annette. 1985. "The fate of ergativity in dying Dyirbal". *Language* 61: 378–396.

Watanabe, Yasuko. 1994. "Clause-chaining, switch-reference and action-event continuity in Japanese discourse: the case of *te*, *to* and zero-conjunction". *Studies in Language* 18: 127–203.

Wurzel, Petra. 1992. *Kurdisch in 15 Lektionen*. Köln: Komkar.

STUDIES IN LANGUAGE

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL SPONSORED BY THE FOUNDATION
"FOUNDATIONS OF LANGUAGE"

VOLUME 21 (1997)