



Razi University



Linguistics Society of Iran

Typology of Negation in the Ardalani Variety of Sorani Kurdish

Roya Tabei¹, Shoja Tafakkori Rezayi², Amer Gheitury³, and Mostafa Hasrati⁴

1. PhD of Linguistics, Department of English Language and Linguistics, Faculty of Literature and Human Sciences, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran. E-mail: tabei.roya@razi.ac.ir
2. Corresponding Author, Associate Professor of Linguistics, Department of English Language and Linguistics, Faculty of Literature and Human Sciences, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran. E-mail: sh.tafakkori@razi.ac.ir
3. Associate Professor of Linguistics, Department of English Language and Linguistics, Faculty of Literature and Human Sciences, Razi University, Kermanshah, Iran. E-mail: amer@razi.ac.ir
4. PhD in Applied Linguistics, Humber Polytechnic, Toronto, Canada. E-mail: hasrati@yahoo.co.uk

Article Info

ABSTRACT

Article type:

Research Article

Article history:

Received: 07 Aug 2024

Received in revised form: 16 Nov 2024

Accepted: 18 Nov 2024

Published online: 21 Dec 2024

Keywords:

negation,
symmetric negation,
asymmetric negation,
aspect,
Ardalani Kurdish.

The present study aims to explore negation patterns in Ardalani, a variety of central Kurdish (Sorani) spoken mainly in Sanandaj, within the typological framework proposed by Miestamo (2005). This framework explains the main negation patterns found in the languages of the world as symmetric, asymmetric, and symmetric-asymmetric. Although Miestamo applied this typological framework to analyze a wide range of languages, none of the Kurdish dialects are represented in his study. The data used in the present study comprises 263 negative sentences with their affirmative counterparts, which were obtained from the spoken Sorani material broadcast on Kurdistan Radio and Television. The results indicate that Ardalani follows a symmetric-asymmetric pattern. It reveals a symmetric pattern in the past tense with perfective and imperfective habitual aspect but displays an asymmetric pattern in the imperfective continuous aspect and modal structures. For the sentences in the imperfective continuous aspect, the speakers apply either A/Fin/Neg-LV or A/Cat/ATM. In the former, the verb loses finiteness and the features move to the available copula in the structure. In the latter, the aspect changes from continuous to habitual, a more common strategy. Modal structures also follow A/Cat/ATM, in which the modal marker is removed and replaced with the negation marker. However, the modal content remains semantically the same as its affirmative counterpart.

Cite this article: Tabei, R., Tafakkori Rezayi, Sh., Gheitury, A., & Hasrati, M. (2024). Typology of Negation in the Ardalani Variety of Sorani Kurdish. *Research in Western Iranian Languages and Dialects*, 12 (4), 33-52. <http://doi.org/10.22126/jlw.2024.10963.1783> (in Persian).



© The Author(s).

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22126/jlw.2024.10963.1783>

Publisher: Razi University

1. Introduction

As a universal category, negation has been considered as the most inseparable basic notion in natural languages, resulting in uniquely different negation paradigms (Horn, 1989; Weiss, 2002; Willis et al., 2013). As a grammaticalized content present in all natural languages (Miestamo, 2017), negation is defined by Miestamo (2005) as a logical operator that changes the truth value of a proposition P to its opposite $\neg P$. Accordingly, negation can involve the addition of negative particles within affirmative structures to change them to their negative counterparts. However, Zeijlstra (2004) argues that negation interacts in various forms with other elements in sentences, resulting in greater complexity in negation patterns among languages; a phenomenon beyond the simple change in the value of a proposition to its opposite value. These complex patterns of negation have prompted numerous semantic, morphological, syntactic and typological studies, each focusing on different aspects affected by negation following Klima (1964). Recent works by Miestamo (2003, 2005, 2017) provide a logical classification of languages based on the various interactions of negation with other elements in sentences, including symmetric, asymmetric and symmetric-asymmetric negation.

Studies on the negative structures of Iranian languages can be categorized into three main types: syntactic, morphological and typological studies. Ahangar (2014), Gholamalizadeh et al. (2017), Moradi (2012), and Hosseini-Maasoum (2012) have focused on syntactic properties of negation in Iranian languages, specifically dealing with negative markers and their positions within sentence structures. Shaghaghi (2002) distinguishes between syntactic and morphological negation and examined 1509 words morphologically negated by six negation prefixes, primarily applied to verbs (na-), nouns (zed-), and adjectives (bi-). The combination of these prefixes and nouns results in changes in categories, mostly converting hosts into adjectives. What follows is a brief outline of negation studies on Iranian languages presented chronologically.

Akhlaghi (2007) carried out a descriptive typological study on the status of negation in Assyrian (the Tehrani variant), in which sentences are negated by prefixes læ- and le- attached to verbs. In Assyrian, attaching negation to verbs alters the order of enclitics, shifting them from the verb's final position to its initial position, where they function as proclitics.

In a more recent study, Ahangar et al. (2014) studied the morphological features of Sarhadi Granchin Balouchi verbs. They observed that negation is realized in the form of prefixes such as næ-, attached to the indicative verb stem, and mæ- attached to imperatives and subjunctives. They revealed that the language displays some changes in structure between affirmative declarative forms and their negative counterparts due to the attachment of negation prefixes. In fact, the findings indicated that the prefix b-, representing the subjunctive, is omitted, while the subjunctive content is maintained. Despite these observations, the study did not incorporate a typological approach to analyze this structural change.

Despite studies carried out to deal with negation in Iranian languages, this topic, which is an important linguistic concept in Kurdish languages, has not received significant scholarly attention. Drawing upon the typological framework proposed by Miestamo (2005, 2017), the present study aims to explain the negation system in Sorani Kurdish (Ardalani) as a variety with a single sentential negative marker, næ-, prefixed to main verbs, auxiliaries, and light verbs. Negative structures in Kurdish are supposedly distributed along a continuum that ranges from structures with no change in affirmative structures and their negative counterparts to structures with complete changes both in sentences and their paradigms. Alternatively put, some sentences, like (1b), show no difference between the affirmative and negative structures except for the presence of the negation marker. In contrast, there exist some structures in which the status of clitics is influenced by the negative marker, changing them from enclitics to proclitics, as in (2b). Moreover, certain negative constructions exist in which the suffix

indicating the aspect is deleted, as in (3b), or the finite verbs are replaced with nonfinite ones as in (4b).

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. a) $\text{f}\ddot{\text{u}}:$ -m
goPST¹ 1SG²
'I went.'</p> <p>2. a) $\text{xw}:\text{a}:\text{r}\text{d}$ =am
eatPST Cl⁴.1SG
'I ate.'</p> <p>3. a) $\text{m}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{n}$ $\text{f}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{f}\text{t}$ $\text{æ}-$ $\text{xw}\ddot{\text{a}}$ -m
1SG food ASP eat
'I eat food.'</p> <p>4. a) $\text{x}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{r}:\text{k}$-$\text{ø}$-$\text{a}\text{n}$ $\text{æ}-$ $\text{g}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{r}\text{j}$-$\text{a}\text{n}$.
busy ø 3PL ASP cry 3PL
'They are crying.'</p> | <p>b) $\text{n}\ddot{\text{a}}$ - $\text{f}\ddot{\text{u}}:$ -m
NEG³ goPST 1SG
'I didn't go.'</p> <p>b) $\text{n}\ddot{\text{a}}$ =m- $\text{xw}:\text{a}:\text{r}\text{d}$
NEG Cl.1SG eatPST
'I didn't eat.'</p> <p>b) $\text{m}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{n}$ $\text{f}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{f}\text{t}$ na:- $\text{ø}-$ $\text{xw}\ddot{\text{a}}$ -m
1SG food Neg $\text{ø}-$ eat 1SG
'I don't eat food.'</p> <p>b) $\text{x}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{r}:\text{k}$ $\text{g}\ddot{\text{a}}\text{r}\text{j}:\text{n}$ ni: -$\text{j}\ddot{\text{a}}$ -n
busy cry Neg to bePRSNT 3PL
'They are not crying.'</p> |
|---|--|

Kurdish is a term that covers a dialect group of western Iranian languages that belong to the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European family of languages (Abdulla, 1967; Fattah, 1997; Haig & Matras, 2002; Thackston, 2006), spread across parts of eastern Turkey, Soviet Armenia, northern Syria, Iraq, and western Iran, as well as Khorasan in Iran (McCarus, 1958). Kurdish is considered a dialect-rich language (Matras & Akin, 2012; Shahsavari, 2010, cited by Sheykh Esmaili & Salavati, 2013), with its dialectal diversity serving as a key linguistic feature. Various scholars have proposed classifications for Kurdish, including those by McDowall (2005), Thackston (2006), Kreyenbroek (2005), among others; however, the current study adopts the classification proposed by Tavadze (2019). He considers the harsh physical-geographical territory and political issues as the main reasons for Kurdish division into several distinct dialect groups, called Northern (Kurmanji), Central (Sorani,) and Southern Kurdish. According to Tavadze, Kurdish is mainly divided into “3+1+1” parts, in which 3 stands for the three dialect groups and 1+1 for Zazaki and Gorani, as he believes that most European and Kurdish philologists do not consider Zazaki and Gorani as Kurdish. Central Kurdish is classified into four varieties: Babani, Hawlery, Mukriyani, and Ardalani. The data of the current study are from the Ardalani variety, which is the communicative variety in Sanandaj and nearby territory including Western Azerbaijan Province, Divandare, Marivan, Kamyaran, and Dehgolan.

The stimuli consist of 263 negative sentences and their affirmative counterparts obtained from the spoken Ardalani material available in programs broadcast on Kurdistan Radio and Television. One source of data was a documentary named “Riga”, “pathways”, a popular TV series focusing on poorly-known and untouched villages in the Kurdistan Province. Local people introduce their villages, handicrafts, traditions, local music, local food, and local games in Kurdish. From this series, 108 negative sentences were selected from episodes released in winter 2020. Additionally, 94 negative sentences were taken from a comedy movie called, “Zamen-e-moe'tæbær”, “valid guarantor”, broadcast during Nowrouz 2020. Furthermore, 61 frequently occurring negative structures were identified in daily conversations. Importantly, one of the authors is a native speaker of Ardalani Kurdish.

2. Typological Framework of Negation

Miestamo (2005) observes that negative structures differ significantly from the structures

1. past
2. singular
3. negation
4. clitic

of affirmatives in languages worldwide- a difference seemingly caused by the interactions between negation and other elements such as aspect and mood markers, verb finiteness, and the domain of emphasis within the sentence. Focusing on standard negation in clauses, he proposes typological classifications based on changes resulting from negative elements in clauses. These changes form the basis for classifications as symmetric, asymmetric, and symmetric-asymmetric, which are briefly discussed below following the explanation of standard negation in (2-1).

2.1 Standard Negation

Standard negation, as defined by Payne (1985), refers to a type of negation that applies to minimal and basic sentences containing a single predicate and a limited number of noun phrases, and occasionally adverbial modifiers. Miestamo (2005) reiterates that it is the most fundamental language-specific way of negating declarative main clauses in natural languages. Payne (1985) and Dahl (1979) classify standard negation into three subtypes: negative affixes, negative particles, and negative verbs. Examples include the negative prefix in Czech (5b), the negative suffix in Lezgian (6b), and the negative circumfix in Chukchi (7b).

5. a) vol-al

call-PST.3SG

“He was calling/called.”

b) ne-vol-al

NEG-call-PST.3SG

“He was not calling/did not call.”

(Janda & Townsend, 2000, pp. 34-37; as cited in Miestamo, 2017, p. 409)

6. a) xürünwi-jri ada-waj meslät-ar ãaçu-zwa
villager-PL(ERG) he-ADEL advice-PL taker-IMPF

“The villagers take advice from him.”

b) xürünwi-jri ada-waj meslät-ar ãaçu-zwa-č
villager-PL(ERG) he-ADEL advice-PL taker-IMPF-NEG

“The villagers take advice from him.”

(Haspelmath, 1993, pp. 127 & 245; as cited in Miestamo, 2017, p. 409)

7. a) čejwə-rkən

go-DUR

“(S)he goes.”

b) a-nto-ka (itə-rkən)

NEG-go.out-NEG be-DUR

“(S)he does not go out.”

(Kämpfe & Volodin, 1995, pp. 68-69; as cited in Miestamo, 2017, p. 409)

According to Zeijlstra (2004), Italian uses a single negative particle as its standard negation marker, shown in (8a). Catalan uses both a negative particle and an optional negative adverb, as shown in (8b). In French, the negative marker consists of split particles placed before and after matrix verbs, (8c). German uses a single negative particle for standard negation, which is shown in (8d).

8. a) Gianni **non** ha telefonato

Gianni **neg** has called

“Gianni didn’t call.”

b) *No* serà (*pas*) facil

Neg be.FUT.3SG **neg** easy

“It won’t be easy.”

- c) Jean *ne* mange *pas*
 Jean **neg** eats **neg**
 “Jean doesn’t eat.”
- d) Hans kommt *nicht*
 Hans comes **neg**
 “Hans doesn’t come.”

(Zeijlstra, 2004, pp. 1-2)

Standard negation is an auxiliary verb in Forest Entz (Siegl, 2015, p. 47), which hosts verbal inflections, as shown in (9).

9. a) mud’ Dudinka-xan d’iri-đ?
 1SG Dudinka-LOS.SG live-1SG
 “I live in Dudkinka.”
- b) mud’ Dudinka-xan **ni**-đ? d’iri-đ?
 1SG Dudinka-LOS.SG **NEG**-1SG live-1CNG
 “I do not live in Dudkinka.”

(Miestamo, 2017, p. 410)

The negative sentences demonstrate that each language applies a unique way to negate its affirmative structures, which is referred to as standard negation.

2.2 Symmetric Negation

Miestamo (2003, 2005, 2017) examines 297 languages in terms of structural differences between affirmative and negative clauses caused by the use of negative markers. Accordingly, he recognizes three classes of negation: symmetric, asymmetric, and symmetric-asymmetric. According to Miestamo, in symmetric negation, the only difference between the affirmative declaratives and their negative counterparts is the presence of the negative marker. For instance, as can be seen in (10b), the presence of the negative particle *inte* in Swedish does not result in structural changes between the affirmative in (10a) and its negative counterpart in (10b).

10. a) hund-ar-na skäll-er ute
 dog-PL-DEF bark-PRES outside
 “The dogs are barking outside.”
- b) hund-ar-na skäll-er inte ute
 dog-PL-DEF bark-PRES NEG outside
 “The dogs are barking outside.”

(Miestamo, 2017, p. 411)

As a matter of fact, negative markers sometimes cause changes in verbal paradigms; symmetric paradigm, however, shows no such changes. In other words, symmetric negation demonstrates an obligatory one-to-one correspondence between affirmative and negative paradigms. (11) illustrates the verbal paradigm for *chanter*, ‘to sing’, in French, where this correspondence is maintained in its negative forms.

11. a) chanter ‘to sing’, present

1sg je chante	je ne chante pas
2sg tu chantes	tu ne chantes pas
3sg il/elle chante	il/elle ne chante pas
1pl nous chantons	nous ne chantons pas
2pl vous chantez	vous ne chantez pas
3pl ils/elles chantent	ils/elles ne chantent pas

b) chanter ‘to sing’, imperfect

1sg	je chantais	je ne chantais pas
2sg	tu chantais	tu ne chantais pas
3sg	il/elle chantait	il/elle ne chantait pas
1pl	nous chantions	nous ne chantions pas
2pl	vous chantiez	vous ne chantiez pas
3pl	ils/elles chantaient	ils/elles ne chantaient pas

(Miestamo, 2017, p. 412)

2.3 Asymmetric Negation

Asymmetric negative structures are recognized as constructions that exhibit various structural differences in negative sentences compared to their affirmative counterparts. Various subtypes within asymmetric negation are as follows.

2.3.1 Asymmetry in Verb Finiteness (A/Fin)

Miestamo (2005, 2017) believes that, in the A/Fin type, matrix verbs turn into their nonfinite counterparts in negative structures, although a finite element is added to compensate for finiteness loss and host the relevant morphemes. Unlike nonfinite verbs, finite verbs function as the main predicates in independent clauses (Haegeman, 1994; Hornstein et al., 2005), while they lose such a role when negative markers are added, resulting in asymmetric negation. Accordingly, Miestamo (2005, 2017) calls this change "deverbalization", in which verbal features like tense, aspect, mood, and agreement are lost. He asserts that once the verb is deverbalized as a result of negative insertion, it is improbable for it to be changed back into its finite form. He further suggests that this one-way change could be recognized as a principle in asymmetric negation.

In sentence (12) from Apalai (Kohen & Kohen, 1986, p. 64), the negative marker is the deverbalizing suffix *-pyra*, which is attached to the main verb in (12b). Then, *ken*, as a copula, is added to the sentence hosting tense, mood, and person markers. In (13) from Evenki (Nedjalkov, 1994, p. 2), the negative marker is a negative auxiliary that acts as a finite element. In addition, main verbs change into participles in negative structures. Miestamo (2005) divides these two patterns into A/Fin/Neg-LV and A/Fin/NegVerb, respectively.

12. a) isapokara [Ø]-ene-no
 jakuruaru.lizard [1>3]-see-impst
 ‘I saw a jakuruaru lizard.’
 b) isapokara on-ene-**pyra** a-ken
 jakuruaru.lizard 3-see-neg 1-be.impst
 ‘I did not see a jakuruaru lizard.’
13. a) nuḡan min-du purta-va b̄u -che-n
 he 1sg-dat knife-acc give-pst-3sg
 ‘He gave me the knife.’
 b) nuḡan min-du purta-va e-che-n b̄u-re
 he 1sg-dat knife-acc neg-pst-3sg give-ptcp
 ‘He did not give me the knife.’

(As cited in Miestamo, 2017, p. 413)

2.3.2 Asymmetric Non-realized Negation (A/NonReal)

A/nonReal negation is exclusively used to negate non-realized states of affairs. In Maung (Capell & Hinch, 1970, p. 67), there is a differentiation between realis and irrealis moods in affirmative structures, represented in (14a-b), respectively, while this distinction is absent from negative constructions, and consequently the only available mood is irrealis, as in (14c).

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| 14. a) η i-udba
1sg>3-put
'I put.' | b) ni-udba-ji
1sg>3-put-IRR.NPST
'I can put.' | c) marig ni-udba-ji
NEG 1sg>3-put-IRR.NPST
'I do not [/cannot] put.' |
|---|---|---|

2.3.3 Asymmetric Negation changing the Domain of Sentence Emphasis

Some languages depict differences between affirmative structures and their negative counterparts in terms of sentence emphasis. In other words, negation sometimes affects the domain of sentence emphasis. In Meithei (Chelliah, 1997, pp. 133 & 228), the affirmative non-hypothetical paradigm differs from the affirmative assertive one. The presence of negative markers, however, results in some changes in this paradigm such that non-hypothetical is lost. In this language, assertive structures are considered emphatic structures in which the domain of emphasis is much stronger than the non-hypotheticals.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 15. a) təw-ɪ'
do-nhyp
'(She) does.' | b) təw-e
do-ass
'(Yes, she) has.' |
| c) əy fotostat təw-tə-e
I photostat do-neg-ass
'I haven't made copies.' | |

(As cited in Miestamo, 2017, p. 415)

2.3.4 Asymmetric Negation changing Syntactic Category

Negation may also result in some changes in the way syntactic categories, like Tense, Aspect and Mood are marked. In Tera (Newman, 1970, pp. 128 & 142), the perfective aspect marker used in negative constructions, as in (16b), differs from the one used in affirmative structures, (16a); each construction has distinct perfective aspect. This kind of negation is called A/Cat/TAM, changing Tense-Aspect-Mood.

- | | |
|--|---|
| 16. a) ali wa` masa koro
buy donkey
'Ali bought a donkey.' | b) ali nə masa goro a Ali pfv
Ali pfv buy kola neg
'Ali didn't buy kola.' |
|--|---|

(As cited in Miestamo, 2017, p. 415)

3. Typological Status of Kurdish Negation: Ardalani Variety

The following part is dedicated to analyzing Ardalani Kurdish data in the framework of typological classification proposed by Miestamo (2005). Subsection 3-1 attempts to find the standard negation markers of Ardalani. Subsection 3-2 focuses on negation in past tense structures with perfective aspect. Subsection 3-3 is on negation in past tense structures with imperfective habitual aspect. Subsection 3-4 tries to explain the status of negation in the present tense with habitual aspect. Subsection 3-5 is dedicated to explaining negative structures with imperfective continuous aspect. Finally, subsection 3-6, studies the status of negation in modal structures.

3.1 Standard Negation in Ardalani

Following Amin (1979), it is believed there are four negative markers in Sorani Kurdish, Ardalani variety, including $n\grave{a}$ -, na :-, ni :-, and $m\grave{a}$ -, all attached as prefixes to verbs including simple verbs, as in (17b), light verbs in compound verbs, as in (18b), and main verbs in phrasal verbs, as in (19b).

17. a) η u: -m
goPST 1SG
'I went.'

- b) **næ-** ʃu: -m
Neg goPST 1SG
 “I did not go.”
18. a) ka:jæ=m kərd
 game CL.1SG doPST
 “I played.”
 b) ka:jæ=m **næ-kərd**
 game CL.1SG **Neg-doPST**
 “I did not play.”
19. a) hæʃ=m gərd
 Prtcl CL.1SG getPST
 “I took it.”
 b) hæʃ=m **næ-gərd**
 Prtcl CL.1SG **Neg getPST**
 “I did not take it.”

Tense is recognized as the main factor determining the appropriate form of the negative prefix for verbs, as *na:-* is the form used in present, *ni:-* is used before *bu:n* ‘to be’ in the present tense, while all past verbs take *næ-* as the negative marker, and imperatives are negated by either *mæ-* or *næ-*. The findings from Kurdish data analysis reveal that *næ-* is more productive than other markers which appear with high frequency and fewer restrictions within clauses. Sentence (20a) is a Kurdish declarative clause in past tense with completive aspect in an unmarked environment. As the negative counterpart of this sentence, (20b) shows negative marker is the prefix *næ-*. Sentences (20b), (21b), and (22b) illustrate that this prefix negates the simple past, the past progressive, and subjunctives, respectively. Furthermore, the prefix *næ-* is also used to answer polar questions before swearing *waw*.

20. a) ha:t- əm
 comePST 1SG
 “I came.”
 b) æ- ʃu: -m
 Asp goPST 1SG
 “I was going.”
 c) bə- ʃ -ə
 MD goSUBJ¹ 1SG
 “I should go.”
21. a) **næ-** ha:t -əmə
Neg comePST 1SG
 “I did not come.”
 b) **næ-** æ- ʃu: -m
Neg Asp goPST 1SG
 “I was not going.”
 c) **næ-** ʃ -ə
Neg goSUBJ 1SG
 “H shouldn’t go.”
22. a. mən =ət di:?
 1SG CL.2SG seePST
 “Did you see me?”

- b) **næ-wæ-** ھا:
Neg to God
 “No, I swear to God.”

Unlike *næ-*, *na:-* is limited to the present tense. Besides, whenever it attaches to verbs, the imperfective aspect affix, *æ-*, is removed (23b).

23. a) **æ-** ڤ - ە . b) **na:-** ڤ - ەڤ
 Asp goPRSNT 1SG **Neg** goPRSNT 1SG
 “I go.” “I do not go.”

mæ- is another negation marker that is used in imperative structures; it deletes the imperative marker *bə-* (24b).

24. a) **bə-** رۆ
 IMPR-GO
 “Go.” b) **mæ-**رۆ
Neg-Go
 “Do not go.”

The negative marker *ni:-* is even more restricted than the above markers, as it exclusively negates *bu:n* ‘to be’, in the present tense (25b).

25. a) **hæ** -m.
 to bePRSNT 1SG
 “I am.” b) **ni:-** -j -æ -m
Neg to bePSRNT 1SG
 “I am not.”

In light of the discussion above, we may conclude that *næ-* should be considered as the standard negation marker in the Ardalani variety. Using various negation markers is not restricted to the Ardalani variety. Indeed, as in distinct studies on Kurmanji, spoken in Turkey, Gündoğdu and Yakut (2016), Gündoğdu (2014), Thackston (2006) and Bedirxan and Lescot (1997) have also recognized three negation markers including *næ-*, *ne-*, and *ni-* which are chosen based on the tense; *næ-* is used in the present continuous, and *ne-* for the other tenses. They believe that *ni-* appears as a prefix with the modal verb *karin* ‘can’ in all tenses and the verb ‘*za:nin*’ ‘to know’, in just the simple present tense.

Prefixes *næ-*, *na:-*, *ni:-* and *mæ-* constitute negative markers in Ardalani Kurdish clauses which are systematically attached to verbs. Some Ardalani structures, such as the simple past with perfective aspect, as we shall see in the following section, are neutral to the presence of negation. However, some others are structurally affected by negative markers; consequently, they become different from their affirmative counterparts.

3.2 Negation in Past Tense with Perfective Aspect in Ardalani

The following structures illustrate Kurdish sentences with perfective aspect and different lexical aspect. The findings from Kurdish data suggest that all negative structures in Kurdish with perfective aspect are strictly identical to their affirmative construction, except for the presence of the negative marker *næ-* illustrated in sentences (26-31). Sentence (26a) is a structure containing an activity predicate in past tense with perfective aspect. Its negative counterpart in (26b) shows no changes, neither structurally nor semantically, except for the presence of negation. Like (26), the main verb in (27) shares the same feature with the verb in (26); the only difference is that the main predicate is a transitive one. As the following sentences indicate, transitivity plays no role in negation. Negation does not change the structure of affirmative sentences in the past tense and in the perfective aspect. Clearly, such a structure follows symmetric negation.

(Past Tense-Perfective-activity)

26. a) **mən** gərja: -m
 1SG cryPST 1SG
 “I cried.”

b) mən nə- gerja: -m
1SG Neg cryPST 1SG
“I didn’t cry.”

27. a) fʃeʃt -ma:n xwa:rd.
food CL.1PL eatPST
“We ate food.”

b) fʃeʃt -ma:n nə-xwa:rd.
food CL.1PL Neg eatPST
“We didn’t eat food.”

(Past Tense-Perfective-accomplishment)

28. a) kəteb-əkæ=m hæna:rd.
book Def CL.1SG sendPST
“I Sent the book.”

b) kəteb-əkæ=m nə- hæna:rd.
book Def CL.1SG Neg sendPST
“I didn’t send the book.”

(Past Tense-Perfective-Achievement)

29. a) mən=ta:n gəm kərd.
1SG CL.2PL lose doPST
“You lost me.”

b) mən=ta:n nə- gəm kərd.
1SG CL.2PL Neg lose doPST
“You didn’t lose me.”

(Past Tense-Perfective-Semelfactive)

30. a) əw pəzm -i:
he/she sneezPST 3SG
“He sneezed.”

b) əw nə- pəzm -i:
he/she Neg sneezPST 3SG
“He didn’t sneeze.”

(Past Tense-Perfective-Stative)

31. a) mən ma:ndu: bu: -m
1SG tired to bePST 1SG
“I was tired.”

b) mən ma:ndu: nə -bu: -m
1SG tired Neg to bePST 1SG
“I wasn’t tired.”

Unlike the negative Kurdish sentences in the past tense with perfective aspect, which generally represent a one-to-one correspondence with the elements of affirmative sentences, the elements of negative paradigm in the past tense with perfective aspect apparently lack such correspondence. According to Kurdish data on negation, the plausible factor affecting the paradigm is transitivity of verbs, leading to clitic movement from the final position hosted by verb to the position hosted by negation marker. As the paradigms (32) for intransitive verb *gərja:n* ‘to cry’ reveal, there is a one-to-one correspondence between affirmative paradigm and its negative counterpart. However, at first glance, there is no one-to-one such correspondence in paradigm (33) devoted to transitive verb *xwa:rdən* ‘to eat’. The addition of a negative marker to the transitive verb results in displacing clitics from the final position hosted by verb to the position hosted by negative marker *nə-*.

32. (*gərja:n* - Simple Past-Perfective)

1SG	<i>gərja:-m</i>	<i>næ- gərja:-m</i>
2SG	<i>gərja:-j</i>	<i>næ- gərja:-j</i>
3SG	<i>gərja:-ø</i>	<i>næ- gərja:-ø</i>
1PL	<i>gərja:-jn</i>	<i>næ- gərja:-jn</i>
2PL	<i>gərja:-n</i>	<i>næ- gərja:-n</i>
3PL	<i>gərja:-n</i>	<i>næ- gərja:-n</i>

33. (*xwa:rdæn* - Simple Past-Perfective)

1SG	<i>xwa:rd=əm</i>	<i>næ=m- xwa:rd</i>
2SG	<i>xwa:rd=ət</i>	<i>næ=t- xwa:rd</i>
3SG	<i>xwa:rd=i:</i>	<i>næ=j- xwa:rd</i>
1PL	<i>xwa:rd=ma:n</i>	<i>næ=ma:n- xwa:rd</i>
2PL	<i>xwa:rd=ta:n</i>	<i>næ=ta:n- xwa:rd</i>
3PL	<i>xwa:rd=ja:n</i>	<i>næ=ja:n- xwa:rd</i>

In Kurdish, personal pronouns are divided into two subtypes including “separable personal pronouns” and “inseparable personal pronouns”, with the latter further divided into grammatical person and clitics indicating agreement with the subject. Kurdish grammatical persons are invariably attached to all verbs in the present tense and all intransitive verbs in the past tense. The affixes representing grammatical persons are presented in Table 1.

Table (1). Kurdish grammatical persons

person	number		
	Singular	Plural	
1 st person	-əm	-i:n	
2 nd person	-i: (-i:t)	-ən	
3 rd person	ø	-ən	

Kurdish clitics appear as enclitics which are mostly used in past tense indicating subject agreement. They are as follows.

Table (2). Kurdish clitics

person	number		
	Singular	Plural	
1 st person	=əm	=ma:n	
2 nd person	=ət	=ta:n	
3 rd person	=i:	=ja:n	

Negative paradigm in Kurdish is greatly affected by verbal transitivity. As a matter of fact, in the affirmative paradigm, the past stems act as hosts for subject agreement enclitics. Negative marker, however, changes the order of the enclitics making them move from the final position of verbs to the position hosted by the negation marker. It would appear that the Kurdish paradigm in the past is asymmetric belonging to (A/Cat) subtype.

Determining the dominant principles on Kurdish clitics, Ebrahimi and Daneshpazhouh (2008) believe that Kurdish clitics are enclitics which mostly appear in past tense hosted by the leftmost phrases of the sentence and the leftmost component of phrases, except for subject NP, since these clitics signify subject agreement. On closer examination, we find that such a clitic movement in the negative paradigm is triggered by the prominent feature of Kurdish clitics, whereby enclitics move from the final position hosted by stem to the leftmost component of the phrase like the negation marker *næ-*, or other alternatives preceding stems. Nevertheless, such a movement does not confirm the asymmetric paradigm. Miestamo (2005) believes that such structures are still classified as symmetric negation because the dominant principle of clitics of a language makes such movement possible. Therefore, such structures

are still symmetric.¹

These findings are supported by the negative paradigm for Kurdish compound verbs, since the enclitics which have already been attached to the preverb, the noun *mæla*, ‘swimming’ in (34), as the leftmost component of verb phrase, is not triggered to move and attach to the negation marker, *næ-*, before the light verb *kərdən*, ‘do’. Overall, negative constructions and paradigms of Ardalani Kurdish in the simple past tense with perfective aspect are symmetric.

34. (*mæla* *kərdən* - Simple Past-Perfective)

1SG	<i>mæla</i> =m <i>kərd</i>	<i>mæla</i> =m <i>næ-kərd</i>
2SG	<i>mæla</i> =t <i>kərd</i>	<i>mæla</i> =t <i>næ-kərd</i>
3SG	<i>mæla</i> =j <i>kərd</i>	<i>mæla</i> =j <i>næ-kərd</i>
1PL	<i>mæla</i> =ma:n <i>kərd</i>	<i>mæla</i> =ma:n <i>næ-kərd</i>
2PL	<i>mæla</i> =ta:n <i>kərd</i>	<i>mæla</i> =ta:n <i>næ-kərd</i>
3PL	<i>mæla</i> =ja:n <i>kərd</i>	<i>mæla</i> =ja:n <i>næ-kərd</i>

3.3 Negation in Past Tense with Imperfective Habitual Aspect in Ardalani

Sentences (35-39) illustrate verbs in past tense with imperfective habitual aspect. As an instance of symmetric negation, the negative constructions below indicate no structural distinction vis-à-vis their affirmative counterparts, except for the negation marker. In sentence (35a), the main verb is an intransitive predicate with imperfective habitual aspect marked by the marker *æ-*. As the negative counterpart (35b) shows, negation does not affect the elements of the sentence and the only difference is the presence of the negative marker *næ-* in a position before the aspect marker in the verb phrase. The same is true for the examples (36) containing the verb *xwa:rdən* ‘eating’ a transitive verb in the past with imperfective aspect, (37), where an accomplishment predicate *həna:rdən*, ‘sending’ appear in the past with an imperfective aspect, (38) representing an achievement predicate *gəm kərdən*, ‘losing’, in past tense and imperfective aspect, and (39) for *pəzmi:n* ‘to sneeze’.

(Past Tense-Imperfective-Activity)

35. a) *mən æ- gərja: -m.*
 1SG ASP cryPST 1SG
 “I was crying.”
- b) *mən næ- æ- gərja: -m.*
 1SG Neg ASP cryPST 1SG
 “I was not crying.”
36. a) *mən ʃəʃt=əm æ- xwa:rd.*
 1SG food CL.1SG ASP eatPST
 “I was eating food.”
- b) *mən ʃəʃt=əm næ- æ- xwa:rd.*
 1SG food CL.1SG Neg ASP eatPST
 “I was not eating food.”

(Past Tense-Imperfective-Accomplishment)

37. a) *kəteb-əkə=m æ- həna:rd.*
 book DEF CL.1SG ASP sendPST
 “I was sending the book.”
- b) *kəteb-əkə=m næ- æ- həna:rd.*
 book DEF CL.1SG Neg ASP sendPST
 “I was not sending the book.”

1. Refer to Miestamo (2005, p. 68) for studying more cases

(Past Tense-Imperfective-Achievement)

38. a) mən kətəb-ækæ =m gəm æ- kərd.
1SG book DEF CL.1SG lose ASP doPST

“I was losing the book.”

b) mən kətəb-ækæ =m gəm næ- æ- kərd.
1SG book DEF CL.1SG lose Neg ASP doPST

“I was not losing the book.”

(Past Tense-Imperfective-Semelfactive)

39. a) mən æ- pəʒi: -m
1SG ASP sneezPST 1SG

“I was sneezing.”

b) mən næ- æ- pəʒi: -m
1SG Neg ASP sneezPST 1SG

“I was not sneezing.”

The following tables illustrate negation paradigms for the intransitive verb *pəʒmi:n* ‘to sneez’ (40) and the transitive verb *rəfa:ndən* ‘to seize’ (41). As (40) indicates, the paradigm for the verb *pəʒmi:n*, ‘sneezing’, bears no structural changes caused by negation. In all persons, the negative marker *næ-* is added to the verb in a position before the aspect marker *æ-* and the structure remains unchanged. Unlike (40), the paradigm illustrated in (41), for the verb *rəfan:ndən*, ‘seizing’, indicates some changes in the verb structure caused by negation. The affirmative verb has the structure *aspect marker+clitic+past root*. However, when *næ-* is added, the clitic gets moved from the position after the aspect marker *æ-* to the position before the aspect marker realized as *negative marker+clitic+aspect marker+past root*. In such a situation, *næ-* plays the role of host for the clitic. For example, the verb *æ=m-fəra:nd*, ‘I was seizing’, changes to *næ=m-ə-fəra:nd*, ‘I was not seizing’. As such, on the face of it, the paradigm for transitive imperfective verbs seems to represent an asymmetric negation model, since negation changes the order of phrasal verb prefixes. In spite of changes in order, the paradigm still remains symmetric, since the clitic order change is the result of the dominant restrictions of Kurdish clitics; in Kurdish, clitics join the leftmost element in the phrase. As the paradigm shows, the leftmost element in the verb phrase is the negative marker *næ-*, so the clitics are supposed to move and join the leftmost element. Miestamo (2005, 2017) considers such structures still symmetric.

40. (*pəʒmi:n* - Past Continuous-Imperfective)

1SG	æ-pəʒmi:-m	næ-æ-pəʒmi:-m
2SG	æ-pəʒmi:-t	næ-æ-pəʒmi:-t
3SG	æ-pəʒmi:-∅	næ-æ-pəʒmi:-∅
1PL	æ-pəʒmi:-n	næ-æ-pəʒmi:-n
2PL	æ-pəʒmi:-n	næ-æ-pəʒmi:-m
3PL	æ-pəʒmi:-n	næ-æ-pəʒmi:-m

41. (*rəfa:ndən* - Past Continuous-Imperfective)

1SG	æ=m-rəfa:nd	næ=m-æ-rəfa:nd
2SG	æ=t-rəfa:nd	næ=t-æ-rəfa:nd
3SG	æ=j-rəfa:nd	næ=j-æ-rəfa:nd
1PL	æ=ma:n-rəfa:nd	næ=ma:n-æ-rəfa:nd
2PL	æ=ta:n-rəfa:nd	næ=ta:n-æ-rəfa:nd
3PL	æ=ja:n-rəfa:nd	næ=ja:n-æ-rəfa:nd

The findings from Kurdish data reveal that negative constructions and negative paradigms

for the past tense with imperfective aspect follow a symmetric negation model. Moreover, despite the changes in the order of enclitics in the paradigm of transitive verbs, the paradigm remains symmetric. This is because the changes in the enclitic order result from the dominant restrictions of Kurdish enclitics, as previously discussed.

3.4 Negation in Present Tense with Imperfective Habitual Aspect

Kurdish imperfective is realized by the aspect marker *æ-* with the stem indicating the tense. Unlike the past habitual imperfective, the negation marker in the present with an imperfective habitual aspect is *na:-*. Sentences (42-46) illustrate affirmative structures in the present tense with imperfective aspect and their negative counterparts. The sentences show that the negation marker *na:-* causes the aspect marker *æ-* to be deleted, although semantically the imperfective content still remains intact. A close examination reveals that when the negation marker *na:-* is attached to the verb in negative constructions, the aspect marker *æ-* gets omitted. Based on the examples mentioned above, the omission does not seem explicable in terms of a phonological process triggered by the addition of the negation marker. Therefore, the differences in the realization of the two negation markers, *næ-* and *na:-* used with the past and present tenses, respectively, cannot be explained as instances of phonological changes such as hiatus resolution, as they occur in exactly the same phonological environments. Consequently, the deletion of the aspectual marker *æ-* in the present goes beyond a simple phonological change, necessitating further careful investigation.

(Present Tense-Imperfective-Activity)

42. a) *mən æ- gəɾj -əm.*
 1SG ASP cryPRSNT 1SG
 “I am crying.”
- b) *mən na: ø- gəɾj -əm.*
 1SG Neg ø- cryPRSNT 1SG
 “I amnot crying.”
43. a) *mən fəʃt æ- xwæ -m*
 1SG food ASP eat 1SG
 “I am eating food.”
- b) *mən fəʃt na:- ø- xwæ -m*
 1SG food Neg ø- eat 1SG
 “I am not eating food.”

(Present Tense-Imperfective-Accomplishment)

44. a) *tʊ kətəb-əkæ æ- nər -i:t.*
 2SG book DEF ASP sendPRSNT 2SG
 “You are sending the book.”
- b) *tʊ kətəb-əkæ na:- ø- nər -i:t.*
 2SG book DEF Neg ø- sendPRSNT 2SG
 “You are not sending the book.”

(Present Tense-Imperfective-Achievement)

45. a) *mən kətəb-əkæ gəm æ -kæ -m.*
 1SG book DEF lose ASP doPRSNT 1SG
 “I am losing the book.”¹
- b) *mən kətəb-əkæ gəm na: ø- -kæ -m.*
 1SG book DEF lose Neg ø- doPRSNT 1SG
 “I am not losing the book.”

1. It refers to a possible event in the future.

(Present Tense-Imperfective-Semelfactive)

46. a) æwa:n æ- pəzm -ən.
 3PL ASP sneezPRSNT 3PL
 “They are sneezing.”
- b) æwa:n **na:-** ø- pəzm -ən.
 3PL **Neg** ø- sneezPRSNT 3PL
 “They are not sneezing.”

According to Miestamo (2005, 2017), negation can affect the marking of grammatical categories, classifiable under the A/Cat subcategory. Kurdish data reveal that, in spite of the deletion of the aspect marker from the matrix verbs, the content of imperfective habitual aspect remains unchanged. Therefore, the present habitual imperfective undergoes changes under negation so that the marker is omitted and *na:-* acts as both the negation marker and the imperfective aspect marker simultaneously; it is thus asymmetric falling under the A/Cat subtype. Furthermore, there is a distinction between the affirmative paradigm and its negative counterpart in the present with imperfective aspect. Paradigms (47) and (48) illustrate the verbs *pəzmi:n* ‘to sneeze,’ and *ʃa:p kərdən* ‘to print,’ respectively.

47. (pəzmi:n -Simple present-Imperfective)

1SG	æ-pəzm-əm	na:-ø-pəzm-əm
2SG	æ-pəzm-i:	na:- ø-pəzm-i:
3SG	æ-pəzm-ət	na:- ø-pəzm-ət
1PL	æ-pəzm-i:n	na:- ø-pəzm-i:n
2PL	æ-pəzm-ən	na:- ø-pəzm-ən
3PL	æ-pəzm-ən	na:- ø-pəzm-ən

48. (ʃa:p kərdən - Simple Present-Imperfective)

1SG	ʃa:p æ-kæ-m	ʃa:p na:- ø-kæ-m
2SG	ʃa:p æ-kæ-j	ʃa:p na:- ø-kæ-j
3SG	ʃa:p æ-ka:-t	ʃa:p na:- ø-ka:-m
1PL	ʃa:p æ-kæ-jn	ʃa:p na:- ø-kæ-jn
2PL	ʃa:p æ-kæ-n	ʃa:p na:- ø-kæ-n
3PL	ʃa:p æ-kæ-n	ʃa:p na:- ø-kæ-n

Having a close look at the paradigms for the verb *pəzmi:n*, ‘sneezing,’ and *ʃa:wpekəwtən* ‘seeing suddenly,’ in (47) and (48), respectively, reveals that these verbs follow the same changes observed in negative sentences compared with their affirmative counterparts. Predicate *pəzmi:n*, ‘sneezing,’ in (47) shows that the verb conjugation undergoes some changes due to negation. As mentioned before, *na:-* is supposed to be considered as the negative marker in the present tense. When *na:-* is added to the structure, the aspect marker *æ-* is omitted. However, native speakers agree that the verbs still retain their imperfective aspect, despite the absence of this marker. Paradigm (47) represents an intransitive verb in present with imperfective aspect. As the conjugation shows, negative marker *na:-* causes the aspect marker to be omitted, although the aspect content remains stable.

3.5 Negation in Structures with Imperfective Continuous Aspect in Ardalani

The imperfective continuous aspect in Kurdish is made by a conjunct verb *xəri:k bu:n* ‘to be busy,’ which is added to the imperfective structure, the aspect marker *æ-*, and a stem either in the past or present (Tabei et al., 2021). Unlike other negative constructions, the negative structure in continuous aspect is a bit complicated. The findings from Kurdish data reveal that structures with the imperfective continuous aspect are incompatible with negation, leading to ungrammatical structures. As sentences (49) and (50) demonstrate, it is inappropriate to

negate the conjunct verb, the main verb, or both of them simultaneously. Negative paradigms for verbs *gərja:n*, ‘to cry,’ as an intransitive verb, and *ma:l kərdən*, ‘to build a house,’ as a transitive verb, show the same incompatibility.

(Present Tense-Imperfective Continuous-Activity)

49. a) *xəri:k-ø-ən æ- gərj-ən.*
 busy ø 3PL ASP cry 3PL
 “They are crying.”
 b) **xəri:k (ni:-) jə -n (na:) gərj-ən.*
 busy Neg to bePRSNT 3PL Neg cry 3PL
 “They are not crying.”*

(Past Tense-Imperfective Continuous-Accomplishment)

50. a) *xəri:k bu: -m ma:l =əm æ- kərdə.*
 busy to bePST 1SG house CL.1SG ASP doPST
 “I was making a house.”
 b) **xəri:k nə -bu: -m ma:l =əm nə- æ- kərdə.*
 busy Neg to bePST 1SG house CL.1SG Neg ASP doPST
 *‘‘I was not making a house.’’

As the negative counterpart (49b) shows, it is not possible to negate either the matrix verb *gərja:n*, ‘crying,’ or the conjunct verb *xəri:k bu:n*, ‘being busy.’ Regardless of the lexical aspect, the grammatical aspect blocks the negative marker. As such, sentences (49b) and (50b) are excluded.

Furthermore, paradigm (51), for the verb *gərja:n*, ‘crying,’ and paradigm (52) for the verb *ma:l kərdən*, ‘building a house,’ both exclude negation, so there is no negative conjugation for verbs in the imperfective continuous in Kurdish.

51. (*gərja:n* - Present Continuous- imperfective)

1SG	<i>xəri:k-əm æ-gərj-əm</i>	* <i>xəri:k-əm nə-æ-gərj-əm</i>
2SG	<i>xəri:k-i: æ-gərj-əj</i>	* <i>xəri:k-i: nə-æ-gərj-əj</i>
3SG	<i>xəri:k-æ æ-gərj-e</i>	* <i>xəri:k-æ nə-æ-gərj-e</i>
1PL	<i>xəri:k-i:n æ-gərj-əjn</i>	* <i>xəri:k-i:n nə-æ-gərj-əjn</i>
2PL	<i>xəri:k-ən æ-gərj-ən</i>	* <i>xəri:k-ən nə-æ-gərj-ən</i>
3PL	<i>xəri:k-ən æ-gərj-ən</i>	* <i>xəri:k-ən nə-æ-gərj-ən</i>

52. (*ma:l kərdən* - Present Continuous-imperfective)

1SG	<i>xəri:k bu:-m ma:l=m æ-kərdə</i>	* <i>xəri:k bu:-m ma:l=m nə-æ-kərdə</i>
2SG	<i>xəri:k bu:-j ma:l=t æ-kərdə</i>	* <i>xəri:k bu:-j ma:l=t nə-æ-kərdə</i>
3SG	<i>xəri:k bu:-ø ma:l=i: æ-kərdə</i>	* <i>xəri:k bu:-ø ma:l=i: nə-æ-kərdə</i>
1PL	<i>xəri:k bu:-jn ma:l=ma:n æ-kərdə</i>	* <i>xəri:k bu:-jn ma:l=ma:n nə-æ-kərdə</i>
2PL	<i>xəri:k bu:-n ma:l=ta:n æ-kərdə</i>	* <i>xəri:k bu:-n ma:l=ta:n nə-æ-kərdə</i>
3PL	<i>xəri:k bu:-n ma:l=ja:n æ-kərdə</i>	* <i>xəri:k bu:-n ma:l=ja:n nə-æ-kərdə</i>

Kurdish speakers apply two strategies regarding negation incompatibility with the imperfective continuous aspect. As the first strategy, all grammatical markers of finite verbs in negative constructions are removed and changed to bare infinitive. Since conjunct verb, *xəri:k bu:n*, ‘to be busy,’ which serves as the imperfective continuous marker, is present and agrees in number, person, tense, and aspect with main verbs, it plays the role of the main verb extending its grammatical markers to the whole sentence. Miestamo (2005, 2017) classifies such changes under asymmetric negation A/Fin/Neg-LV. According to this subtype, when the verb loses its grammatical markers, a new element, mostly a copula, is added to the negative

prefixes *næ-*, *na:*, *ni:-*, and *mæ-*, which are always attached to main verbs, light verbs, copula, and auxiliary verbs. Close examination of Kurdish data indicated that *næ-* has the highest frequency in negative structures among these markers. As a result, it can be considered as the standard negative marker in Kurdish.

Following the typological classification proposed by Miestamo (2005, 2017), Kurdish can be grouped in symmetric-asymmetric negation type. Indeed, Kurdish follows symmetric structures and paradigms in past perfective and imperfective negation, where the affirmative structures remain unchanged structurally and semantically. Further examination reveals that the negative paradigm for transitive verbs in the past, with either perfective or imperfective aspect, undergoes structural changes. As the data reveals, verb clitics attached to the aspect marker *æ-* in affirmative sentences change hosts and attach to the negative marker *næ*. This indicates asymmetry due to the reordered clitic structure.

Mohammad Ebrahimi and Daneshpazhouh (2008) believe that Kurdish clitics are enclitics that primarily occur in the past tense, hosted by the leftmost phrases of the sentence and the leftmost component of phrases, except for subject NPs, since these clitics signify subject agreement. Upon closer examination, we find that this clitic movement in negative paradigms is triggered by the prominent feature of Kurdish clitics: enclitics move from the stem's final position the leftmost component of the phrase, typically the negative marker *næ-* or its alternatives preceding the stem. Nevertheless, this movement does not classify these paradigms as asymmetric.

Miestamo (2005) asserts that such structures are still classified as symmetric negation because the dominant principles of clitics placement within a language make such movements possible, leaving the structures symmetric. The findings also indicate that negative paradigms for the present imperfective habitual aspect are classified under asymmetric negation. In such constructions, the addition of *na:-* results in the omission of the aspect marker *æ-*. The findings suggest that these paradigms align with A/Cat subtype, as verbs in the negative imperfective habitual aspect lose their imperfective marker. An examination of imperfective continuous structures demonstrates that these structures are incompatible with negation, leading to ungrammatical structures. It is inappropriate to negate the conjunct verb, matrix verb, or both simultaneously in such structures. The analysis of Kurdish data in imperfective continuous structures and paradigms indicate that these constructions follow asymmetric negation and can be classified as either A/Fin/Neg-LV or A/Cat/ATM. Kurdish speakers apply two strategies to address negation in such structures. According to the first strategy, grammatical markers of matrix verbs are removed reducing them to the bare infinitive, while the copula in conjunct verb, *xæri:k bu:n*, becomes the main verb. This aligns with the A/Fin/Neg-LV subtype. Based on the second strategy, negative structures undergo aspect-changing, whereby the imperfective continuous aspect is replaced by the imperfective habitual aspect. Temporal adverbs or contextual cues often ensure that the distinction between the two aspects remains clear. This strategy is more common among Kurdish speakers. Similar to imperfective continuous aspect, negation also affects Kurdish modality. Following the classifications proposed by Miestamo (2005, 2017), the negation of modal structures follows the asymmetric model, A/Cat/ATM subtype for modal structures.

Ethical Considerations

Not applicable

Funding

Not applicable

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- Abdulla, J. J. (1967). *Kurdish basic course: Dialect of Sulaimania, Iraq*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Ahangar, A. A., Mahmoodzahi, M., & Jamalzahi, F. (2014). Inflectional structure of verb in Sarhaddi Balochi of Granchin. *Research in Western Iranian Languages and Dialects*, 1(3), 23-48.
- Amin, W. O. (1979). *Aspects of the verbal construction in Kurdish*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis. London: University of London
- Bedirxan, C., & Lescot, R. (1997). *Kurtçe Dilbilgisi (Kurmanci)*. Dos Basm-Yayan.
- Capell, A., & Hinch, H. E. (1970). *Maung grammar*. (Janua Linguarum, Series Practica 98). The Hague: Mouton.
- Chelliah, S. L. (1997). *A grammar of Meithei*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Dahl, Ö. (1979). Typology of sentence negation. *Linguistics*, 17(1/2), 79–106.
- Fattah, M. M. (1997). *A Generative grammar of Kurdish* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Amsterdam.
- Gholamalizadeh, Kh., Tafakkori Rezayi, Sh., & Moghani, H. (2017). A Minimalist approach to the distribution of the sentential negative marker in yes-no questions in Dashtestani dialect. *Language Related Research*, 7(7), 73-95.
- Gündoğdu, S. (2014). Negation in Kurmanji. In S. Manova (Eds.), *Affix Ordering Across Languages and Frameworks* (pp. 154-171). Oxford University Press.
- Gündoğdu, S., & Yaktub, A. B. (2016). Na (Contrastive ‘not’) in Kurmanji Kurdish: A large conjunct ellipsis analysis. *Journal of Semantics-Syntax Interface*, 3(1), 30–48.
- Haegeman, L. (1994). *Introduction to government and binding Theory* (2nd ed.). Blackwell.
- Haig, G., & Matras, Y. (2002). Kurdish linguistics: a brief overview. *STUF-Language Typology and Universals*, 55(1), 3-14.
- Haspelmath, M. (1993). *A grammar of Lezgian*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Horn, L. (1989). *A natural history of negation*. The University of Chicago Press.
- Hornstein, N., Nunes, J., & Grohmann, K. K. (2005). *Understanding minimalism*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hosseini-Maasoum, S. M. (2012). The function of negation category in the syntactic analysis of Persian; An account of the negation process. *Khorasan Journal of Linguistics and Dialects*, 3(5). 17-34.
- Janda, L. A., & Townsend, Ch. E. (2000). *Czech*. Lincom Europa.
- Klima, E. S. (1964). Negation in English. In J. A. Fodor & J. J. Katz (Eds.), *The Structure of Language* (pp. 246-323). Prentice-Hall.
- Kreyenbroek, P. G. (2005). On the Kurdish language. In P. G. Kreyenbroek & S. Sperl (Eds.), *The Kurds A Contemporary Overview* (pp. 53-64). Routledge.
- Matras, Y., & Akin, S. (2012). A survey of the Kurdish dialect continuum. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Kurdish Studies*.
- McCarus, E. N. (1958). *A Kurdish grammar*. Washington Plandograph Company.
- McDowall, D. (2005). *A Modern History of Kurds*. I: B.Tauris.
- Miestamo, M. (2003). *Clausal negation: A typological study* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Helsinki.
- Miestamo, M. (2005) *Standard negation: The negation of declarative verbal main clauses in a typological perspective*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Miestamo, M. (2017). Negation. In A. Aikhenvald & R. Dixon (Eds.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Linguistic Typology* (pp. 405-439). Cambridge University Press.
- Mohammad Ebrahimi, Z., & Danesh Pazhoh, F. (2008). Clitics and their semantic –syntactic relations to verb in Kurdish (Sorani dialect). *Human Sciences*, 58, 41-64.
- Moradi, R. (2012). Subjunctive-negation interaction in Sorani Kurdish. *Journal of Language Research*, 3(1), (4). 99-116.
- Nedjalkov, I. [spelled Nedyalkov in (1994)] 1994 Evenki. In P. Kahrel & R. V. D. Berg (Eds.), *Typological Studies in Negation* (pp. 1–34). (Typological Studies in Language 29). Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Newman, P. (1970). *A Grammar of Tera*. (University of California Publications in Linguistics 57.)

- Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Payne, J. R. (1985). Negation. In T. Shopen (Ed.), *Language Typology and Syntactic Description: Vol. I. Clause Structure* (pp. 197–242). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Shahsavari, F. (2010). Laki and Kurdish. *Iran and the Caucasus*, 14(1), 79–82.
- Shaghghi, V. (2002). Negative prefixes in the Persian language. *Academy Letter*, 5 (4 (20)), 85-96.
- Sheykh Esmaili, K., & Salavati, Sh. (2013). Sorani Kurdish versus Kurmanji Kurdish: An empirical comparison. *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (Vol. 2, pp. 300-305).
- Siegl, F. (2015). Negation in Forest Enets. In M. Miestamo, A. Tamm & B. Wagner-Nagy (Eds.), *Negation in Uralic languages* (pp. 45–73). (Typological Studies in Language 108). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Tabei, R., Tafakkori Rezayi, Sh., & Gheitury, A. (2021). Progressive aspect in Sorani Kurdish: A minimalist approach. *Research in Western Iranian Languages and Dialects*, 9(2), 43-63.
- Tavadze, G. (2019). Spreading of the Kurdish language dialects and writing system used in the Middle East". *Bulletin of the Georgian National Academy of Sciences*, 13(1), 170-174.
- Thackston, W. M. (2006). *Kurmanji Kurdish: A reference grammar with selected readings*. Renas Media.
- Weiss, H. (2002). Three types of negation: A case study in Bavarian. In S. Barbiers, L. Cornips & S. Van der Kleij (Eds.), *Syntactic Microvariation* (pp. 305-332). Electronic Publication: Meertens Institute.
- Willis, D., Lucas, C., & Breitbarth, A. (2013). Comparing diachronies of negation. In D. Willis, C. Lucas & A. Breitbarth (Eds.), *The History of Negation in the Languages of Europe and the Mediterranean: Vol. I. Case studies* (pp. 1-50). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zeijlstra, H. H. (2004). *Sentential negation and negative concord* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Amsterdam. Utrecht: LOT Publications.