Yaron Matras (Manchester)

Kurmanji complementation:
Semantic-typological aspects in an areal perspective

Abstract

Kurmanji clause-linking devices are generally a) finite, and b) subject to variation in respect of the choice of morphological device that marks the link. There are several options for marking complement clauses in the language: zero-marking (paratactic apposition of clauses), mood, simple and complex complementisers, and reinforcement of subject agreement through deictics and anaphora. The paper discusses the distribution of clause-linking devices, based on their occurrence in a corpus of tape-recorded and transcribed conversational narratives. The findings are related to the predictions on semantic-typological universals of complementation. A brief discussion of the areal position of Kurmanji follows, in conclusion of which I propose that the principal isogloss shared by the languages under discussion is their reliance on finite verbs even in the most tightly-integrated complex constructions.

1. Introduction

Complementation is generally regarded in the typological literature as a particular type of clause-combining, where a predication stands as the argument of a predicate (see Noonan 1985). Such a situation can be viewed from the perspective of different kinds of verbs. For instance, Dixon 1995 distinguishes "primary" verbs that do not allow a predicate argument, "primary" verbs that allow but do not require a predicate argument (such as *hear* or *say*), and "secondary" verbs, which require a predicate argument (i.e. modal verbs such as *can* or *must*). Alternatively, the focus can be placed on information structure and the conceptual levels at which relations between agents and events, and between the speaker and propositions, are established and processed ("construal relations"; see Verspoor 2000, Givón 1980, 1990). In this perspective, complementation is seen as one of various devices that allows to integrate the propositional representation of two or more events.

A number of general parameters have been suggested in the literature which allow to describe complementation structures cross-linguistically. Givón 1980, 1990 has argued that there is a universal correlation between event integration, and the structural devices used to combine the clauses that represent these events. Languages will generally tend to distinguish more tightly integrated events from those that are combined but potentially independent of one another. Quite often, the representation of event integration is iconic: Predicates representing events that are semantically independent will take on a form that is similar to that of predicates in simple clauses, while those that represent tightly-integrated, semantically dependent events will be marked more specifically for their syntactic dependency on the main predicate of the complex clause. Event independence pertains, semantically, to the likelihood of occurrence of the event irrespective of the outcome of the main

clause event. There are however additional parameters that help condition the degree of event integration. One of those is the degree of active involvement of the subject/agent of the main clause in the activity/event portrayed in the complement clause, especially the degree of control that is exercised by the subject/agent of the main clause on the subject/agent of the complement clause. The stronger the control, the more likely is the main clause event to effect the outcome of the complement event, and so the more tightly integrated the two events are.

These semantic-pragmatic parameters of event-linking condition syntactic constraints on clause-linking in complementation. The most obvious syntactic constraint is the split between actual, factual or realis, and potential, non-factual or irrealis constructions. DIXON 1995 argues that this is a universal distinction that is observed cross-linguistically. Two types of actual or realis constructions have been identified by FRAJZYNGIER 1991 and by FRAJZYNGIER & JASPERSON 1991 as reflecting observations on actual reality or events ("de re" domain), as opposed to reference to the domain of speech or propositions ("de dicto" domain; see also HORIE 2000). A further dimension that DIXON 1995 identifies as universal in tendency is the co-referentiality of the subjects in the two parts of the construction. Within the irrealis domain, same-subject constructions are usually referred to as "modality", while for different-subject constructions GIVÓN 1990 employs the term "manipulation".

These distinctions can be marked in individual languages by a range of different structures which seem to fall primarily into three domains of grammar (cf. DIXON 1995, NOONAN 1985): The form of the verb, which marks out especially the dependency relation of the complement verb (through a converb, or, in the case of finite constructions, through the mood of the verb, e.g. subjunctive); independent particles (complementisers), which may be sensitive to the degree of semantic integration or factuality; and anaphoric devices which mark out the coreferentiality status of the subject of the complement construction (such as independent pronouns, agreements markers, or types of converbs).

Applying the iconicity model to these dimensions, GIVÓN 1990 notes that the strongest bond, correlating with a tighter syntactic integration of a main predication with its complement, will be found with modality complements (same-subject, irrealis), followed by manipulation complements (different-subject, irrealis), followed by cognition complements (realis). Beyond principal correlations of this kind, however, it is recognised that the interaction of the relevant dimensions such as actuality/factuality and control may result in a continuum of structures expressing different degrees of semantic bonds and so different degrees of syntactic integration. Individual predicates such as *intend* and *fear* express different degrees of subject control, which may be reflected in the structure of the embedded complement (see WIERZBICKA 1988, NOONAN 1985). Similarly, a continuum between aspect (internal organisation of the event) and mood (external attitude to the event) is expressed through the contrast of the predicates *begin* and *want*, and may find its way into the encoding of syntactic linking of the main and complement predications in individual languages. GIVÓN (1990) attempts to capture the gradient, scalar nature of integration in a principle of manipulative success and agentivity. It anticipates that if an agent displays stronger intent, the probability of accomplishing the intended task increases, and if an agent possesses more natural control over the manipulee, the manipulation is likely to be more successful. The semantic relations between different subjects may thus play a role in the encoding of complements. For example, animate subjects are more likely to exercise effective control over non-animate subjects (*I want the chair to stand there*) than over animate subjects (*I want him to stop shouting*).

2. Complementation and clause-linking in Kurmanji

Kurmanji offers an interesting case study in relation to complementation, due to the over-whelmingly finite nature of its clauses, including subordinated clauses. A morphological form of nominalisation of predicates appears in the language, but its role in clause-linkage is marginal, and it does not appear in complementation. HENGEVELD 1998 includes Kurmanji data in his sample of adverbial clause structures from European languages. Employing dependent verb forms only in adverbial clauses expressing Means and Anteriority, Kurmanji is one of the sample languages that remains consistent in its use in adverbial subordination of verb forms which HENGEVELD refers to as "independent". The latter is perhaps not the best choice of a term in our present discussion context, due to the role played by the subjunc-tive, which marks the verb semantically for irrealis, but arguably also syntactically as depen-dent on the predicate of another clause. In any event, the dependent verb remains finite, and the subjunctive is not inherently a dependent verb form either, appearing also in the imper-ative, optative, counterfactual, and future tense.

In an areal perspective, Kurmanji can be said to be part of a larger linguistic area that relies primarily on finite complementation. This so-called "infinitive-reduction" isogloss com-prises the Balkans and Anatolian Greek (and some Turkic languages, though not Ottoman Turkish) in the west, related north-western Iranian languages such as Sorani and Persian in the south-east, and co-territorial languages such as some Neo-Aramaic dialects, Domari (the neo-Indic language of the Doms), as well as Arabic.

Several structural resources participate in the linguistic encoding of complementation. The first is purely semantic, based on the hearer's interpretation of the link between two clauses in a paratactic construction (*I said, I will arrive*). Parataxis of this kind tends over-whelmingly to be supported in Kurmanji by the order of clauses, whereby the main clause precedes the complement clause. The semantic relation between the clauses is marked out more overtly in irrealis complements by the subjunctive marking of the complement predi-cate. The subjunctive itself is marked by a variety of means, most commonly by the absence of an habitual-progressive marker *di-* from the present verb stem, quite often by the prefix-ing of a subjunctive marker *bi-* in its place, and with some verbs by a suppletive subjunctive verb stem (*her* 'go.SUBJ' to -*ç-* 'go'). The most overt marking of complements is achieved through the placement of a complementiser in the position opening the complement clause, and following the main predicate. Kurmanji possesses a general subordinator *ku/ko*, which can assume the role of a linking particle in a variety of linked clauses, including simultaneity, condition, relative clauses, and complements. It can also follow virtually any other, more spe-cialised subordinator, in a complex linking device (*gava ku* 'when', *ji ber ku* 'because', etc.). Kurmanji does not encode the realis:irrealis opposition in the choice of complementiser, which is the case in some other languages with finite complementation, as in the Balkans (Romanian Albanian, Bulgarian, Macedonian, Greek, Romani, as well as Serbo-Croatian) or in Classical Arabic. However, the distinction is maintained through the choice of indica-tive vs. subjunctive mood on the complement predicate.

Co-referentiality status of the subjects is typically expressed by verb agreement, and optionally by the presence of deictic or, respectively, anaphoric reference to the subject. Such overt pronominal reference may appear in both equi- (same-subject) and non-equi- (differ-ent subject) constructions. An important point to note is the presence of morphological split ergativity in Kurmanji (MATRAS 1992–1993, 1997; HAIG 1998). Since complements are pred-icates that are arguments of other predicates, we are dealing with main predicates that are

transitive (in the sense that they allow, logically at least, direct object arguments), and hence subject to the ergative construction (which in Kurmanji, as elsewhere in Indo-Iranian, appears in the past tense). The complement predicates however may or may not appear in the ergative construction, depending on their transitivity status. This could potentially lead to ambiguity in the subject-agreement devices employed across the complex construction. Past-tense predicates that have complements are indeed treated as ergative in the language; however, there is no obvious correlation between ergativity in the main clause and overt pronominal reference to the subject of the complement predicate, which latter one might anticipate as a disambiguation strategy (see MATRAS 1997, and see discussion below).

Perhaps the most problematic aspect of the structure of complementation in Kurmanji, then, is the actual choice of devices. Both the presence or absence of a complementiser, and the presence or absence of overt pronominal subject-reference (in addition to agreement markers), are optional. Although mood is expressed in the language by the subjunctive, and so irrealis complements are marked indirectly as such, there is no obligatory encoding of the principal classes of complements. Rather, the resources that are available are employed at the pragmatic level of clause combining, and are dependent on speakers' choices at the local level of the utterance.

3. Previous statements on Kurmanji complementation

Complementation, like other aspects of clause-level syntax and syntactic typology, is an area that is neglected in traditional descriptive outlines of Kurdish dialects. BEDIR-KHAN & LESCOT 1970 [1986] are to some extent the exception, as they add to the list of conjunctions also some observations on their distribution. According to them, embedded clauses expressing supposition, possibility, purpose, or intent are introduced by *ko* + subjunctive. Other subordinated clauses can be marked by a conjunction, usually *ko*, + indicative, or by *ko* with correlative "adverb or preposition" (*wilo … ko* 'such … that'). Zero-conjunction is a further possibility, which according to the authors is common in purpose clauses, as well as with the verbs *karîn* 'can', *zanîn* 'know', *lazim bûn/gerek/divêt* 'must'.

In MATRAS 1997 I interpreted elicited translations of questionnaire sentences. I will summarise here in brief the principal findings. Although ergativity does not appear to play a role in constraining co-referentiality of the subjects in the two parts of the complex construction (a role which one might anticipate due to the differing agreement patterns in ergative and nominative clauses), a transitive:intransitive split was nevertheless found elsewhere, namely in the overt representation of the coreferential subject of the complement clause itself:

(1) *Min*   *dixwest*   *av*   *vexwim*
     I.OBL   PROG.wanted.ø   water   SUBJ.drink.1SG
     'I wanted to drink water'

(2) *Min*   *dixwest*   *ez*   *herim*   *malê*
     I.OBL   PROG.wanted.ø   I.NOM   SUBJ.go.1SG   home.OBL
     'I wanted to go home'

In both (1) and (2), the main clause containing the modal verb is in the past tense and hence ergative, while the complement is in the subjunctive, and hence nominative. The subjects of both parts of the construction are, in both examples, coreferential. In (1), the complement

predicate is transitive, and it does not take an overt pronominal subject, while in (2) the complement is intransitive, and it does take an overt subject. There is no explanation for this state of affairs which would result from the plain morphosyntax of agreement in the two sentences. The contrast of agreement markers – default third person on the past-tense modal verb, and first person on the complement verb – is the same in both examples. The only apparent condition is one of "sentence aesthetics", a kind of symmetry between the argument structures of the two complement clauses. Indeed, this split was not upheld by the conversational data taken into consideration for the present study. Its appearance in the elicitation data suggests that speakers' judgements on well-formedness, under which symmetry would fall, are among the pragmatic considerations that trigger the presence or absence of overt pronominal reference to subjects in a complex construction.

A further finding was a person split:

(3)　*Min*　　*dixwest*　　　*ez*　　*herim*　　*malê*
　　　I.OBL　PROG.wanted.ø　I.NOM　SUBJ.go.1SG　home.OBL
　　　'I wanted to go home'

(4)　*Wî*　　*dixwest*　　　　*here*　　*malê*
　　　he.OBL　PROG.wanted.ø he.NOM　SUBJ.go.3SG　home.OBL
　　　'He wanted to go home'

Both examples show coreferential subjects, where the main clause contains a modal verb in the past tense and hence an ergative construction, and the complement clause contains an intransitive verb in the subjunctive. In (3) the subject is the first person, in (4) it is the third person. In (3), the subject is repeated in the complement clause, in (4) it is not. Once again, there is no obvious explanation for the split, although in (3) the change in agreement patterns is more obvious due to the fact that the default agreement of the modal verb contrasts with the first person agreement in the complement, while in (4) it is identical. Such a trigger was shown in MATRAS (1997) to apply as a general constraint to addition clauses, where the first clause was intransitive and the second transitive (*I stood up and opened the door*), speakers generally favouring an overt pronoun with the first person, where there was a more obvious clash in agreement patterns. In the examples seen here, (3)–(4), deictic prominence might simply be a contextual, pragmatic trigger motivating the choice of an overt pronoun.

With direct or plain modality, then, that is with irrealis, same-subject complement clauses, integration devices varied between zero-conjunction and zero-anaphora, and zero-conjunction with overt anaphora, both with the subjunctive marking of the dependent predicate. The more complex device was found to appear rather consistently in the less tightly integrated clauses, expressing reflective intent (i.e. an intention that is reflected upon by the agent, and so where the goal is not within obvious reach and control is therefore low), manipulation (different-subject irrealis), and complements of verbs of cognition (realis complements, indicating independent events):

(5)　*Min*　*qerara*　　　　*xwe*　*da*　*ku*　*ez*　　*herim*　　　*bajêr*
　　　I.OBL　decision.POSS.F　REFL　gave.ø　COMP　I.NOM　SUBJ.go.1SG　town.OBL
　　　'I decided to go to town'

(6)　*Ewî*　*dixwast*　　　*ku*　*ez*　*herim*　　　*malê*
　　　he.OBL　PROG.wanted.ø　COMP　I.NOM　SUBJ.go.1SG　home.OBL
　　　'He wanted me to go home'

(7) *Ewî*   *dizanibû*   *ku*   *ew*   *nexweş* *e*
     he.OBL   PROG.knew.PLUP.Ø   COMP   he.NOM   ill   be.3SG
     'He knew that he was ill'

To summarise, there was firstly a reflection of universal tendencies in the elicited Kurmanji data. The realis:irrealis distinction appears consistently, though it is marked on the verb using the indicative:subjunctive opposition that is employed elsewhere in the language, and so not in a way that is particular to complement clauses. Complements in less tightly-integrated clauses show more complex syntactic integration devices that complements expressing more tightly-integrated events. A similar contrast applies to different-subject constructions (manipulation clauses) as opposed to same-subject constructions (modality), and to subject control (reflective intent as opposed to plain modality). In addition, pragmatic considerations may play a role in selecting overt anaphora; the interplay with agreement patterns is not obvious here, but it cannot be excluded.

4. Complement clauses in conversational narratives

The following is the result of an evaluation of a corpus of conversational narratives of circa 11,000 words, which includes around 100 verbal complements. The narratives were recorded from four speakers, all young men, originating from Rawandiz, Diyarbakir, Mardin, and Tunceli. The corpus allows a division of complement structures into several types.

4.1. Modal complements

The first type includes modal complements with subjunctive marking and no conjunction. This is found for all occurrences of *karîn* 'can', most occurrences of *xwestin* 'want' as well as for additional modals:

(8) *Ha*   *ez*   *dikarim*   *meselek/*   *mesela*   *qertala*   *ji*
     PART   I.NOM   PROG.can.1SG   story.INDEF   story.POSS.F   eagle.OBL.PL   for
     we   *ra*   *bêjim.* ...
     you.PL.OBL   DAT   SUBJ.say.1SG
     Qertal   *diçine*   *şerê*   *ewika,*   *dixwazin*
     eagle   PROG.go.PL.NAR   war.POSS.M   such.OBL.PL   PROG.want.PL
     herne   *şerê*   *mirîşka.*
     SUBJ.go.PL   war.POSS.M.   hen.OBL.PL
     'I can tell you a story/the story of the eagles. ... The eagles go to war against those, they want to go to war against the hens.'

(9) *Zor*   *min*   *ḥez dikir*   *bêm/*   *biçim*   *bo Suêd.*
     much   I.OBL   PROG.wished.Ø   SUBJ.come.1SG   SUBJ.go.1SG   to Sweden
     'I wanted very much to come/to go to Sweden.'

(10) *Min*   *dixast*   *Kurdistanê*   *bimînim,*   *ye'nî*   *min*
     I.OBL   PROG.wanted.Ø   Kurdistan.OBL   SUBJ.stay.1SG   that.is   I.OBL
     miḥawilekir   *bimînîm.*
     tried.Ø   SUBJ.stay.1SG
     'I wanted to stay in Kurdistan, that is I tried to stay.'

Examples (9) and (10) contradict the impression gained through elicitation (MATRAS 1997) as though there is a preference for first person coreferential subjects to appear overtly in intransitive complements of past-tense modals (cf. example (2)).

There are however some complements of plain modality (modal verbs with same-subject) in the corpus that are introduced by the complementiser *ku*. Their distinguishing feature is generally related to agent-control:

(11) *Tirî   li jor   bûye,   rîvî   xwastiye   ku   tirî   bixwe*
     grape   above   was.NAR   fox   wanted.NAR   COMP   grape   SUBJ.eat.3SG
     'The grapes were above, the fox wanted to eat the grapes'

In example (11) from a traditional story that is embedded into the conversation, the complementiser accompanies an act of volition, though the contextual emphasis is on the difficulty the fox encounters in achieving its goal, and so on weak agent-control.

(12) *lê   vê   demê,   em   hewldidin   û   dixebitin,*
     but   this.OBL   time.OBL   we.NOM   PROG.try.PL   and   PROG.work.PL
     ku   dersên   zimanê   kurdî   têxin
     COMP   lesson.POSS.PL   language.POSS.M   Kurdish   SUBJ.place.PL
     nav   dersên   almanî   berî   nîvroyê
     between   lesson.POSS.PL   German   before   noon.OBL
     'At this time we are trying and working to move the Kurdish language classes together with the German classes to the morning'

In example (12), the modal verb itself is complex: 'to try and work towards'. It indicates already the intensity and reflective character of the volitional act, implying thereby greater difficulty in achieving the target. Agent-control is weak, and the speaker provides an indication that the goal can only be achieved through a prolonged process of discussion and consultation, possibly with others who are not encoded as agents (the agent *em* 'we' refers here to those responsible for Kurdish language instruction; but school timetables are set in consultation with the school authorities). Not only is agent-control weak, but the complex modal verb suggests that a series of independent actions is taken in order to achieve the goal, thereby attributing to the two events portrayed in the two clauses relative independence of one another. This rather loose integration, for modality relations, is expressed by the presence of the complementiser *ku*.

(13) *Ji   çar   hawir   dijmina   xwastiye   ku   wî* [=gelê kurd]
     From   four   side   enemy.OBL.PL   wanted.NAR   COMP   it.OBL
     esîmîlebike   û   bifetisîne
     SUBJ.assimilate.3SG   and   SUBJ.choke.PL
     'From four sides the enemies wanted to assimilate it [=the Kurdish nation] and to choke it'

In example (13), we have again a simple modal verb, *xwastin* 'want'. However, as in (11), the goal of the action is considered difficult to achieve, and, as in (12), it entails a series of repetitive actions on the part of the agents, stretching in this particular example throughout the course of history. Here too, weak agent-control and relative event independence are expressed through the placement of the complementiser *ku* at the beginning of the complement clause.

We can thus see that while modality in same-subject constructions appears to be a condition for zero-complementiser, complementisers may appear in this type of structure, subject

to a semantic-pragmatic interpretation on the part of the speaker of the conditions on agent control and relative event independence. Impersonal modals, which BEDIR-KHAN & LESCOT (1970 [1986]) discuss together with personal modals as taking zero-conjunction, in fact favour both a complementiser and an overt subject:

(14) *îmkan   û   derfet   hene,   ku   mirov   zimanê*
      possibility and   chance   exist.PL COMP   one   language.POSS.M
      xwe   hînbibe
      REFL   SUBJ.learn.3SG
      'There are opportunities and chances to learn one's own language'

(15) *Ev   jî   astengîk   e   li pêşiya   me,   divê*
      this   too   hurdle   be.3SG before.POSS we.OBL   must
      ku   em   vî   jî   çareserbikin.
      COMP   we.NOM this.OBL too   SUBJ.solve.PL
      'This too is a hurdle which we face, we need to overcome this too.'

In example (14), we are dealing arguably not just with an impersonal modal, but also with relative event independence, the conditions that are referred to being in existence irrespective of actual attempts made by people to study their language. The lack of an antecedent however evidently doesn't allow for zero-anaphora even in more tightly-integrated impersonal modals, as in (15). Referential ambiguity is apparently associated with overall weak syntactic integration, triggering the use of *ku* + pronoun.

Example (16) is an exception to the loose integration of impersonal modals:

(16) *Gava   yêkemîn   divê   xwe   û   zimanê   xwe*
      step.POSS.F first   must   REFL and   language.POSS.M REFL
      bike   yek.
      SUBJ.do.3SG one
      'The first step must be to unite [one] with one's own language.'

Here, there is no personal subject, but a generic one. The case is comparable with that exemplified by (14). However, the subject itself appears as part of the direct object in the transitive complement clause ('to unite **one** with one's own language'). The use of the reflexive pronoun *xwe* in the direct object simulates co-referentiality with the subject of the main clause, in other words, it indicates that a continuous subject is contextually retrievable. Indeed, the appearance of the reflexive can be interpreted in pragmatic terms as an instruction to the hearer to search for the coreferential subject antecedent and, failing to find one, to interpret it contextually. The reflexive thereby solves the problem of a missing antecedent, achieving referential continuity and so tighter clause integration. This option makes it unnecessary to resort to the alternative, weak-integration option *ku* + pronoun seen above.

4.2. Complements of epistemic verbs

As anticipated, complements of verbs of cognition and utterance, such as *gotin* 'say', *dîtin* 'see', *zanîn* 'know', are treated as weak on the integration scale and are introduced by *ku* + pronoun. The verb is independent and appears in the indicative:

(17)　　*ye'nî　her çiqes　zanin　ku　wî　wextî　em*
　　　　that.is　although　know.PL　COMP　that.OBL　time.OBL　we.NOM
　　　　ne/　em　ji　hev　ra　ze'f　nebaş　bûn
　　　　not　we.NOM　from　RECIP　DAT　quite　bad　was.PL
　　　　'That is, although they know that at the time we [were] not/we were not so good to one another'

(18)　　*li　me　direhîn,　didîtin　ku　ew　zarok*
　　　　on　we.OBL　PROG.looked.PL　PROG.saw.PL　COMP　that　child
　　　　didene　ser　me,　ye'nî　li　me　dixen
　　　　PROG.give.PL.NAR　on　we.OBL　that.is　on　we.OBL　PROG.beat.PL
　　　　'They looked at us, they saw that these children were attacking us, that is, they were beating us'

The complementiser allows to integrate even direct speech, as illustrated in (19), where the verb *'efubiken* 'forgive' appears in the subjunctive/imperative:

(19)　　*ji　me　ra　mektuba　dişînin　carna　dibêjin*
　　　　for　we.OBL　DAT　letter.OBL.PL　PROG.send.PL　sometimes　PROG.say.PL
　　　　ku　me　'efubiken
　　　　COMP　we.OBL　SUBJ.forgive.PL
　　　　'Sometimes they send us letters, they say to us [that] 'forgive us''

On the other hand, integrated indirect speech with verbs of cognition may also appear in a paratactic structure, with no complementiser:

(20)　　*Hûn　zanin　mirîşk　çine*
　　　　you.PL　know. PL　hen　what.is. PL
　　　　'You know what hens are'

(21)　　*me　zanîbû　bavê　me　ji　Batimanê*
　　　　we.OBL　knew.PLUP　father.POSS.M　we. OBL　from　Batman.OBL
　　　　were,　ez　û　birayê　xwe　çuyne
　　　　SUBJ.come.3SG　I.NOM　and　brother.POSS.M　REFL　went.PL.NAR
　　　　pêşiya　wî.
　　　　before　he. OBL
　　　　'We knew [that] our father would be coming from Batman, I and my brother went to meet him.'

In (20), the embedding of the question resembles direct speech. Similarly, in (21) the use of the future/subjunctive tense in *were* 'will/would come', resembles situation-directed speech. As seen in (19), even direct speech may be integrated by means of a complementiser. It follows that direct speech, and indirect speech in constructions that resemble direct speech, constitute the transitional area between parataxis and syntactically integrated complements. We might interpret this as a representation in Kurmanji of the distinction between the domains "de re" and "de dicto", as proposed by FRAJZYNGIER 1991 and by FRAJZYNGIER & JASPERSON 1991. Direct, situational portrayal of events, as in (20) and (21), would constitute the "de re" domain, where integration is paratactic and not highlighted by a complementiser. The "de dicto" domain would indicate portrayal of the event as processed, from the perspective of the discourse narration, as in (17) and (18). The case of (19) might be viewed as a switch in encoding strategies during the utterance.

4.3. *The control continuum*

The role of semantic control has been alluded to above. Manipulation complements are generally considered lower on the integration scale than same-subject modality complements; nonetheless strong control may be reflected in tighter integration, as the agent-manipulator possesses a natural authority over the manipulee:

(22) *Em bêjîn Tirkî/ dewlet dijminê me ye,*
    we.NOM say.PL Turk/ state enemy.POSS.M. we.OBL be.3SG
    zimanê   me qedexe kiriye, nahêle em
    language. POSS.M. we. OBL forbidden did.ø NEG.let.3SG we.NOM
    zimanê   xwe fêrbibîn.
    . language. POSS.M. REFL SUBJ.learn.PL
    'We say the Turks/the state is our enemy, it has outlawed our language, it doesn't let us learn our language.'

In (22), natural authority is attributed to the agent 'the state' to exercise full control, expressed by the verb *nahêle* 'does not let', over Kurdish language instruction. Note that the complement is not introduced by a complementiser, but its structure resembles that of modal complements. By contrast, in (23) the agent 'I' has no direct control over the way the materials are received by the friends, as expressed by the verb *hîvîdarim* 'I hope'. The complement is introduced by *ku*:

(23) *ez hîvîdarim jî ki ku heval/ li ser vî   karî*
    I.NOM hope.1SG too PART COMP friend on this.OBL.M work.OBL.M
    jî ki pîçek matiryalêt me alîkarya wan biken
    too PART a.little material.POSS.PL we.OBL help.POSS.F they.OBL SUBJ.do.PL
    'I also hope that our friends/through this work our materials may help them somewhat'

Note now the use of *ku* in (24). Here we have a purpose clause, encoding the goal of the verb *giranya xwe danîn* 'to make an effort (put one's weight on …)'. The construction itself resembles a relative clause in that the complement is an attribute to a nominal head, a placeholder, containing a preposition and an anaphor. Its relevance to our immediate discussion is in the fact that the main verb expresses reflective intent, an effort made to obtain the authority that would allow to control the outcome. Although the complement is not in strict syntactic terms a constituent of the main predicate, the main predicate nevertheless calls for a complement extension. In this borderline case between integration of two events in a modality-type construction, and a purpose clause where the two events can have autonomous status, clause linking relies on *ku*:

(24) *ye'nî bi xwe min giranya xwe didanî ser jê,*
    that.is in REFL I.OBL weight.POSS.F REFL PROG.gave on for.this
    ku kofar sirf bi kurdî û almanî dere.
    COMP journal just in Kurdish and German SUBJ.appear.3SG
    'that is, I made an effort so that the journal would appear just in Kurdish and German'

"Genuine" purpose clauses, where the independent status of the two events is not ambiguous, may show either *ku* or a series of specialised conjunctions, often derived from combinations of a preposition (e.g. 'for') and *ku*:

(25) *sê*   *katzêde* *divê*   *li ser* *hêla*   *ziman*   *û*   *çandî,*
      three time   more   must   on   level   language   and   culture
      folkilora   *kurdî*   *bisekinin*   *ku*   *bikaribin*
      folklore.POSS.F   Kurdish   SUBJ.dwell.PL   COMP   SUBJ.can.PL
      vî   *miletî*   *li ser*   *ling*   *bisekinînin.*
      this.OBL.M   nation.OBL.M   on   foot   SUBJ.keep.PL
      'One must spend three times as much on the level of Kurdish language, culture, and folklore, in order to be able to keep this nation on its feet.'

(26) *Ez*   *bawerim*   *kurd*   *li* •• *van*   *dera*   *gelek*   *xebatên/*
      I   believe.1SG   Kurd   in   this.OBL.PL   place.OBL.PL   very   work.POSS.PL
      gelek   *xebata*   *kirne,*   *ji bo*   *ku*   *mafê*   *dersê*
      very   work. OBL.PL   do.PL.NAR   for   COMP   right.POSS.M   lesson. POSS.M
      zimanê   *zikmakî*   *bi*   *dest*   *bixen.*
      language.POSS.M   native   on   hand   SUBJ.strike.PL
      'I believe the Kurds in •• these areas work hard/work hard in order to obtain the right of native language instruction.'

(27) *ji bo*   *ku*   *em*   *vî*   *karî*   *baş*   *bikin,*
      for   COMP   we.NOM   this.OBL.M   work.OBL.M   good   SUBJ.do.PL
      dibê   *ku*   *em*   *ji*   *cikî*   *pere*   *bigrîn.*
      must   COMP   we.NOM   from   place.INDEF.OBL.M   money   SUBJ.get. PL
      'In order that we do this work well, we must receive money from somewhere.'

To summarise, Kurmanji clause linking devices are open to variation and speakers' choices. A consistent distinction is carried out between realis and irrealis complements. This however is marked through the mood of the verb, and not through a device that specialises in clause-linkage. Overt pronominal reference to subjects interacts with the semantics-pragmatics of complementation, in that it is more likely to appear in the less tightly-integrated constructions where antecedents are less easily retrievable: impersonal modals, different-subject constructions, or, as in (27), preposed subordinated clauses. More variable is the role of *ku*, the principal morphological device marking clause linking in complementation. Its appearance is determined by a series of factors that are related to the semantic integration of the propositions encoded by the two clauses: event independence, manipulative control, and the encoding of the "de dicto" domain. The three devices that are involved in structuring complementation – verb mood, anaphoric reference, and complementiser – thus tend to operate at three distinct levels: the internal evaluation of the event, coherence at the discourse level, and the external processing of the event through its integration with another event, respectively.

5. An areal perspective

Reference to Anatolia as a linguistic area has been made in several recent works (see for instance CHYET 1995, MATRAS 2000, HAIG forthcoming). In this section we are concerned with similarities, in Anatolia and beyond, in the structure of complement clauses. I will be considering in the comparison two of the Neo-Aramaic varieties, based on data from the Jewish dialects of Zakho (Iraq) and Saqiz (Iran), Levantine Arabic, and Domari. The latter is the New Indo-Aryan language spoken by the Dom of Kurdistan, Syria, Jordan, and

Palestine (see Matras 1999). Complementation is an interesting feature to examine in an areal connection, as it does appear to be contact-sensitive and prone to convergence in linguistic areas. The Balkans are an obvious case, as is South Asia. This follows from the observation that contact-related change begins at the level of utterance organisation and communication management (see Stolz & Stolz 1996, Matras 1998).

Modal complements in these languages generally follow the main predication or modal expression with no connecting complementiser. The complement verb is finite and shows subject-agreement. It appears in the present tense in Aramaic, and in the subjunctive in Arabic and Domari. Note that Domari (Jerusalem dialect) has borrowed the Arabic modal expression for 'want', which also receives Arabic-derived person inflection:

(28) ana   gibən   āzin   l-bēsa   Neo-Aramaic, Zakho
      I   want.1SG.M   go.1SG.M   to-home
      (ana)   gebēna   hizna   bēla   Neo-Aramaic, Saqiz
      I   want.1SG.M   go.1SG.M   home
      ana   biddī   arūḥ   ʕa-l-bēt   Arabic (Levantine)
      I   want.1SG   go.SUBJ.1SG to-the-home
      ama   biddī   džam   kuryata   Domari
      I   want.1SG   go. SUBJ.1SG home.DAT
      'I want to go home'

Constituent order in the languages is identical, when the complement clause is intransitive. With transitive complements, Saqiz Neo-Aramaic shows object-verb order, as in Kurmanji, while the other languages show verb-object order:

(29) ana   gibən   zonen   laxma   Neo-Aramaic, Zakho
      I   want.1SG.M   buy.1SG.M   bread
      (ana)   gebēna   laxma   šaqinna   Neo-Aramaic, Saqiz
      I   want.1SG.M   bread   buy.1SG.M
      ana   biddī   ʾaštrī   xubəz   Arabic
      I   want.1SG   buy.SUBJ.1SG bread
      ama   biddī   šrīkam   mana   Domari
      I   want.1SG   buy.SUBJ.1SG bread
      'I want to buy bread'

Complements of verbs of cognition, on the other hand, are introduced in all the languages by a complementiser, which in different-subject constructions is followed by an enclitic or independent pronoun. Note that Saqiz Neo-Aramaic employs a Persian borrowing, ka (<kæ) as a complementiser, while Domari employs Arabic inno. Word order rules in the follwing intransitive complements are identical for all the languages:

(30) ana   ki'in   di-le   skīna   axa   Neo-Aramaic, Zakho
      I   know.1SG.M COMP.3SG   lives.1SG.M here
      ana   ke'ēna   ka   o   bēle   axai   Neo-Aramaic, Saqiz
      I   know.1SG.M COMP he   lives.3SG   here
      ana   ʕāref   inno   sākin   hōn   Arabic
      I   know.SG.M COMP.3SG.M   lives.SG.M here
      ama   džanami   inno pandži skunnēk   hnon   Domari
      I   know.1SG   COMP he   living.SG.M here
      'I know that he lives here'

Finally, in manipulation complements, we find a tendency in all languages to insert pronominal reference to the non-coreferential subject of the complement predicate. In Arabic, the reference is through an enclitic pronoun that is attached to the complementiser. In Domari, the uninflected Arabic complementiser is used, followed by an independent pronoun. Note once again the object-verb order in Saqiz Neo-Aramaic:

(31)	*ana*	*gibən*	*āhed*		*zonad*	*laxma*	Neo-Aramaic, Zakho
	I	want.1SG.M	you.M		buy.2SG.M	bread	
	(ana)	*gebēna*	*ad*		*laxma*	*šaqlēt*	Neo-Aramaic, Saqiz
	I	want.1SG.M	you. M		bread	buy.2SG.M	
	ana	*biddī*	*inn-ak*		*tištrī*	*xubəz*	Arabic
	I	want.1SG	COMP.2SG.M		buy.SUBJ.2SG	bread	
	ama	*biddī*	*inno*	*atu*	*šrīka*	*mana*	Domari
	I	want.1SG	COMP	you	buy.SUBJ.2SG	bread	

'I want you to buy bread'

What can be said about this very modest sample of languages – Kurmanji, Neo-Aramaic of Zakho and Saqiz, Arabic and Domari – representing part of the linguistic diversity of the Near Eastern area? A comparison of the structural resources that participate in complementation reveals the following picture. First, all languages rely exclusively on finite (independent) verb forms in the complement constructions. Inherently linked to this feature is the reliance on subject-agreement markers for reference continuity. Only some of the languages – notably Kurmanji, Arabic, and Domari – have a mood distinction. In all languages however a distinction is made between realis and irrealis complements, though in Neo-Aramaic the distinction relies exclusively on the insertion of a complementiser in realis complements. Zakho Neo-Aramaic and Arabic employ pronominal clitics that are attached to the complementisers, while in the other languages independent pronouns follow the complements. The order of elements however is identical, and their distribution (the position and conditions on COMP+pronoun/clitic) are similar. Variation is found among the languages in the structure of manipulation complements, some languages relying exclusively on pronouns to indicate switched reference, others on complementisers with pronouns or clitics, Kurmanji allowing also complementisers alone.

To what extent do the similarities among the structures justify an areal, convergence-based approach to the structures of complementation? Given the structural resources that are available, their scalar distribution is, as discussed in the introductory remarks, a universal feature of complementation: higher semantic integration in same-subject modal complements is reflected through closer syntactic integration; the linking of independent events in complements of cognition is reflected iconically through the employment of more complex linking devices, in our case a complementiser and pronominal reference. Manipulation complements take a position in-between the two poles on the continuum, allowing for switched reference marking and/or overt linking through a complementiser. These correlations are predictable on the basis of the semantics-pragmatics of clause-linking. The outstanding shared feature is therefore not the distribution of forms, but the structural resources, most notably the reliance on a general subordinating conjunction as a complementiser (Kurmanji *ku*, Zakho *di*, Saqiz *ka*, Arabic and Domari *inn-*), and the absence of any converb or dependent verb form.

This raises the question of the historical process to which one might attribute convergence in the area. Finite complementation is attested for Classical Arabic, long before contact with

these other languages. On the other hand, Classical Arabic also maintains a distinction between realis and irrealis complementisers ('*anna* and '*an*, respectively), which is no longer maintained in present-day colloquial varieties. The decline of the infinitive in Neo-Aramaic is, on the other hand, recent, and infinitives are attested in some of the Neo-Aramaic varieties, and are even found in the speech of older speakers of the Zakho dialect. Convergence in the domain of complementation would therefore suggest the gradual spread of the isogloss of infinitive-reduction, combined with the isogloss of a generalised subordinator. The first isogloss is shared with other languages of Asia Minor and the Balkans, while the second is not shared with the Balkan languages, which show a realis:irrealis split between specialised complementisers.

This provides a nice illustration of just how relative the notion of convergence is. In essence, what we mean by "convergence" is that in a multilingual settings, isoglosses can cross language boundaries. The lack of a modal infinitive is not a "Balkan feature", but a much wider isogloss that also covers a vast territory east of the Balkans. It coincides with the feature "specialised complementisers" in the Balkans, and with the feature "general complementiser" in the Near East, giving in each case the specific pattern of distribution of clause-linking devices following semantic-pragmatic universals.

Abbreviations

COMP	complementiser	PART	particle
DAT	dative postposition	PL.	plural
F	feminine	PLUP	pluperfect
INDEF	indefinite article	POSS	Izafe-possession
M	masculine	PROG	progressive
NAR	narrative tense	RECIP	reciprocal
NEG	negation	REFL	reflexive
NOM	nominative	SG	singular
OBL	oblique	SUBJ	subjunctive

References

BEDIR KHAN, EMIR DJELADET & LESCOT, ROGER (1986): *Kurdische Grammatik. Kurmancî-Dialekt.* Bonn: Kurdisches Institut.

CHYET, MICHAEL (1995): Neo-Aramaic and Kurdish: An interdisciplinary consideration of their influence on each other, in: IZREEL, SHLOMO & DRORI, RINA (eds.), *Language and culture in the Near East.* Leiden: Brill, 219–252.

DIXON, R. M. W. (1995): Complement clauses and complementation strategies, in: PALMER, F. R. (ed.), *Grammar and meaning: Essays in honour of Sir John Lyons.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 175–220.

FRAJZYNGIER, ZYGMUNT (1991): The de dicto domain in language, in: TRAUGOTT, ELIZABETH CLOSS & HEINE, BERND (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalisation, Vol. 1.* Amsterdam: Benjamins, 219–251.

FRAJZYNGIER, ZYGMUNT & JASPERSON, ROBERT (1991): *that*-clauses and other complements, in: *Lingua* 83, 133–153.

GIVÓN, T. (1980): The binding hierarchy and the typology of complements, in: *Studies in Language* 4.3, 333–377.

GIVÓN, T. (1990): *Syntax. A functional-typological introduction. Vol. 2.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

HAIG, GEOFFREY (1998): On the interaction of morphological and syntactic ergativity: Lessons from Kurdish, in: *Lingua* 105, 149–173.

HAIG, GEOFFREY (forthcoming): Linguistic diffusion in modern East Anatolia: from top to bottom, in: AIKHENVALD, ALEXANDRA & DIXON, R. M. S. (eds.), *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press.

HENGEVELD, KEES (1998): Adverbial clauses in the languages of Europe, in: VAN DER AUWERA, JOHAN (ed.), *Adverbial constructions in the languages of Europe*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 335–419.

HORIE, KAORU (2000): Complementation in Japanese and Korean. A contrastive and cognitive linguistic approach, in: HORIE, KAORU (ed.), *Complementation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 11–31.

MATRAS, YARON (1992–1993): Ergativity in Kurmanji. Notes on its use and distribution, in: *Orientalia Suecana* XLI-XLII,139–154.

MATRAS, YARON (1997): Clause combining, ergativity, and coreferent deletion in Kurmanji, in: *Studies in Language* 21.3, 613–653.

MATRAS, YARON (1998): Utterance modifiers and universals of grammatical borrowing, in: *Linguistics* 36.2, 281–331.

MATRAS, YARON (1999): The state of present-day Domari in Jerusalem, in: *Mediterranean Language Review* 11, 1–58.

MATRAS, YARON (2000): How predictable is contact-induced language change in grammar? in: RENFREW, COLIN; MCMAHON, APRIL & TRASK, LARRY (eds.), *Time depth in historical linguistics*. Cambridge: McDonald Institute, 563–583.

NOONAN, MICHAEL (1985): Complementation, in: SHOPEN, TIMOTHY (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description*, Vol. 2, *Complex constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 42–140.

STOLZ, CHRISTEL & STOLZ, THOMAS (1996): Funktionswortentlehnung in Mesoamerika. Spanisch-amerindischer Sprachkontakt (Hispanoindiana II), in: *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 49.1, 86–123.

VERSPOOR, MARJOLIJN (2000): Iconicity in English complement constructions: Conceptual distance and cognitive processing levels, in: HORIE, KAORU (ed.), *Complementation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 199–225.

WIERZBICKA, ANNA (1988): The semantics of English complementation in a cross-linguistic perspective, in: WIERZBICKA, ANNA (ed.), *The semantics of grammar*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 23–168.

YARON MATRAS
Department of Linguistics
University of Manchester
Manchester M13 9PL, UK
y.matras@man.ac.uk