

## **A syntactic analysis of *Little Pro* in Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji)**

### **Language Dialect: A case study**

**Jemiaa Bapir Sliman**

English Department, College of Basic Education, Salaheddin University - Erbil,  
Kurdistan Region, Iraq

Email: [Jeimy.sliman61@gmail.com](mailto:Jeimy.sliman61@gmail.com)

**Prof. Dr. Ali Mahmood Jukil**

English Department, College of Basic Education, Salaheddin University - Erbil,  
Kurdistan Region, Iraq

Email: [Ali.jukil@su.krd](mailto:Ali.jukil@su.krd)

#### **ARTICLE INFO**

##### **Article History:**

Received: 21/5/2025

Accepted: 24/7/2025

Published: Autumn 2026

##### **Keywords:**

little pro, generative  
grammar, null subjects,  
non-pro-drop language,  
NK, matrix clause,  
embedded clause

##### **Doi:**

10.25212/lfu.qzj.11.4.45

#### **ABSTRACT**

This article investigates the distribution and licensing of the empty category known as little pro within the framework of Generative Grammar, focusing on Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji). While pro-drop languages such as Italian, Spanish, Persian, and Central Kurdish allow subject omission in finite simple clauses due to rich subject–verb agreement, Kurmanji exhibits a more restricted pattern. The main aim of this study is to determine whether little pro can be licensed in various types of simple clauses in Kurmanji, thereby positioning it within broader cross-linguistic theories of subject omission. The study adopts a qualitative approach based on a textual analysis of selected clause structures. It is conducted within the framework of Government and Binding (GB) theory, particularly addressing the relationship between verb agreement, clause type, and the licensing of null subjects. The findings reveal that although Kurmanji permits pro-drop in many cases, specially in intransitive and non-past transitive constructions, it does not license little pro in all simple clauses. In past transitive constructions, where the subject is marked with oblique case and agreement holds between the verb and the object, the subject cannot be omitted. In such cases, an overt subject is required to maintain grammaticality. Overall, the data suggest that Kurmanji is a partial pro-drop language: it allows

subject omission in some clause types but not in others due to limitations in its verbal agreement system. This investigation contributes to our understanding of empty categories and syntactic variation within Kurdish dialects and pro-drop typology more broadly.

## **1. Introduction**

In generative grammar, *empty categories* refer to syntactic elements that have no overt phonological form but fulfill important structural roles within sentence composition. Four primary types of empty categories are commonly identified: NP-trace, which is left behind when a noun phrase moves; wh-trace, generated by *wh*-movement in interrogatives; PRO, the invisible subject of non-finite clauses in control structures; and little *pro*, a null pronoun that may occupy the subject position of finite clauses in specific languages. Each of these categories operates under distinct syntactic principles and appears in specific grammatical environments (Trask, 1993, p.90). PRO typically occurs in non-finite embedded clauses, such as in English language, and is controlled by an antecedent in the matrix clause. It cannot appear in finite contexts. Conversely, *little pro* is licensed in finite clauses but only in *pro-drop* languages, those with rich verbal agreement systems which enable the omission of overt subjects without causing ambiguity. In this way, little *pro* serves as the finite clause equivalent of PRO (Krivochen and Kosta, 2013, p.75,90).

### **1.1 Problem of the Study**

Although empty categories have been widely studied in many languages, little research has focused on Kurdish, particularly the Kurmanji dialect. Previous studies have often classified Kurmanji as a non-pro-drop language, without adequately examining the contexts in which subject omission may in fact be licensed. This insufficiency in research creates difficulties for understanding the syntactic behavior of null subjects in Kurmanji and limits broader typological comparisons with others pro-drop and non-pro-drop languages.

## **1.2 Aim of the Study**

It aims to investigate the position of Kurmanji within established linguistic theories on subject omission, emphasizing how little pro is licensed across different syntactic environments.

## **1.3 Research questions**

To guide this investigation, the following research questions are addressed:

1. Under what syntactic conditions is little pro licensed in Northern Kurdish?
2. And to what extent does subject-verb agreement influence the distribution of pro?
3. How does the morphological similarity between person forms affect the interpretation of null subjects

## **1.4 Significant of the Study**

The current work is significant as it fills a gap by analyzing the presence of little pro in simple clauses of Kurmanji, contributing new insights to generative grammar and the understanding of null subjects. It also supports Kurdish language research and enriches knowledge of pro-drop language typology.

## **1.5 Previous Study**

Little attention has been given to empty categories in Kurdish particularly in Kurmanji, similarly the phenomena of pro-drop has also, received limited scholarly attention as this dialect of Kurdish is often considered a non-pro-drop language. This view is reflected in previous studies on *little pro* in Northern Kurdish (NK), notably in the work of Vian Sliman Haji (2007), entitled “Empty Categories in the Light of Government and Binding Theory” in the Kurmanji dialect, and the dissertation of Muhemmed Salih Barwari (2004), titled “Topics in Government Binding Theory with Reference to English and Kurdish.” However, both researchers devoted only a small portion of their studies to the issue of *little pro*, and their analyses primarily served to support the broader claim that Kurmanji does not allow subject omission. (Barwari, 2004, p.138, Haji, 2007, p.146) In contrast, the current study concentrates specifically on the occurrence of little pro in simple clauses and aims to identify the types of simple

clauses in which *pro* can occur or be omitted, highlighting key differences in its distribution.

## 2. Little *pro*

*Little pro* (also referred to as *baby pro*) is a null determiner phrase (DP) that appears in the subject position of certain clauses, particularly in languages that exhibit rich verbal agreement morphology. Although it is not overtly pronounced or written, *pro* functions syntactically as a full noun phrase and receives structural Case, just like an explicit subject. (Carnie, 2007, p.417).

Jaeggli and Safir (1989) outlined that, in the works of Chomsky (1981, 1982) and other scholars, two types of null elements are typically distinguished. In Chomsky (1982), these are labeled as PRO and *pro*. PRO is considered a pronominal anaphor, while *pro* is viewed as a simple pronoun. PRO is believed to be universally present in all languages, but its occurrence is restricted to the subject position of non-finite clauses within each language. This restriction is explained by Binding Theory (Chomsky, 1981), particularly conditions A and B, which lead to the 'PRO theorem' stating that PRO appears only in positions that are ungoverned. The reference of PRO is explained by a separate control theory. In contrast, the occurrence of *pro* is not universal. For instance, English and French do not permit a null subject in finite clauses, whereas languages like Italian and Spanish do allow this. This raises the important question of how to properly define the Pro-Drop or Null Subject Parameter. Following Chomsky (1981, 1982) and building on Taraldsen's (1978) work, the distribution of *pro*-drop is determined by the principle of recoverability, also called the 'identification hypothesis' by Jaeggli (1982). According to this principle, a pronoun can be omitted only if crucial information about its reference can be recovered from other elements in the sentence. In languages such as Italian or Spanish, the subject in a finite clause may be omitted because the verb's rich agreement system provides enough information to identify the missing subject. However, in languages like English, *pro*-drop in finite clause subjects is disallowed because the verb's agreement morphology is too limited to recover the subject's reference accurately (Jaeggli and Safir, 1989, p.185). Pro-drop and non-pro drop language are distinct in a parameter called *pro*-drop parameter. Chomsky (1988) referred to this parameter, which specifies whether

the subject of a clause can be omitted (Chomsky, 1988, p.64). Consider the example below in Italian that allow pro-drop.

**1 (a)-** Io                      mangio    la    pizza.  
              I-1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>-NOM    eat-pres. the   pizza-ACC  
              I eat the pizzaa.

**(b)-** *pro* mangio la pizza.

\*Eat the pizza

The subject (io) is deleted because the verbal agreement can identify the null subject. However, some non-pro drop languages like English never allow null subject as the following example:

**2 (a)-** They work hard.

**(b)-** \**pro* work hard.

Within the framework of Binding Theory, the empty category *pro* operates as a pronoun and can be seen as the silent counterpart of overt pronouns like *I*, *you*, or *they*. It is characterized by the features [-anaphor] and [+pronominal], which classify it as a true pronoun rather than an anaphor. As a result, *pro* is governed by Principle B of the Binding Theory, meaning it must be free, or not bound within its local syntactic domain. This distinction plays an important role in understanding how null subjects function in pro-drop languages. (Kim & Sells, 2008, pp. 71–72)

## **2.1 Little *pro* in NK**

### **2.1.1 Pro-drop Overview in Indo-European Languages**

Languages within the Indo-European family can generally be divided into two categories based on the necessity of overt subject pronouns. In languages such as English and French, the presence of subject pronouns (e.g., *he*, *she*, *it*) is mandatory; omitting them typically renders a sentence ungrammatical. Conversely, languages like Spanish and Italian exhibit what is known as the *pro-drop* phenomenon, whereby subject pronouns can be freely omitted without compromising grammatical integrity (Carnie, 2007, p.35)

In pro-drop languages, the external subject argument is not explicitly expressed but is instead left syntactically empty (Cook and Newson, 1996, p.55). This is made

possible because verbal morphology in these languages encodes sufficient information, such as person and number, to identify the subject. This feature is similarly observed in Central Kurdish dialects (CK), Spanish and Persian, where the inflectional properties of the verb provide cues about the omitted subject. Consequently, based on the theoretical framework of empty categories, the subject position in such languages remains unfilled by an overt element but is understood to be occupied by an implicit, null pronoun (*pro*) as following examples:

**3 (a)- Min**                      gulekân                      âw      dede-      m.

I- 1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>-OBL    flowers<sub>PL</sub>-ABS      water give- pres    1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>

‘I water the flowers.’

**(b)-** Gulekân                      âw      dede-**m**.

Flowers<sub>PL</sub>-ABS    water    give-1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>-pres

‘Water the flowers.’

**(c)-** Gulekâni-                      **m**      âw      dâ.

Flowers<sub>PL</sub>- ABS    1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>    water    gave-past

‘Watered flowers.’

**4 (a)-** Yo                                      riego                                      la      flores                                      (Spanish)

I-1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>-NOM      water- pres-1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>      the      flowers<sub>PL</sub>-ACC

I water the flowers.

**(b)-** Riego                                      la      flores.

Water-pres-1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>    the    flowers<sub>PL</sub>-ACC

Water the flowers.

**5 (a)- Man**                      golha                      ra                      ab-      midaha      **m**. (Persian)

I- 1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>-NOM-    flowers<sub>PL</sub>-ACC    Obj-IND      water -give      1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>- pres

‘I water the flowers.’

**(b)-** Golha                      ra                      ab -      midaha-      **m**.

Flowers<sub>PL</sub>-ACC    Obj-IND      water    give- pres    1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>

‘Water the flowers.’

In all three languages mentioned above, the sentences (3b), (4b), and (5b) show that the external subject is omitted, while the verb reflects subject agreement in person and number. Additionally, in CK in the past tense, the object also carries the subject agreement in (3c). In contrast, English does not permit such omission, as it results in

an ungrammatical sentence.

### 2.1.2 Chomsky's Five Criteria and NK's Deviations

Chomsky (1981) categorized several properties of languages that allow pro-drop, as follows:

- i. missing subjects
- ii. free inversion in simple sentence
- iii. long Wh-movement of subject
- iv. apparent violations of the (that-t) filter
- v. empty expletives

(Chomsky, 1981, p.240)

These syntactic features are typically associated with pro-drop languages, which are expected to exhibit them consistently. However, such properties are not universally applicable across all languages. An analysis of these properties in Kurmanji (NK) is carried out to assess whether the language aligns with the characteristics of pro-drop systems.

1. The Kurmanji dialect of Kurdish language regarded as a partial pro-drop language in which an overt subject is required in the simple finite clauses where sub-verb agreement is absent; otherwise, the sentence becomes ungrammatical.

**6 (a)-**  $\hat{A}r\hat{i}$                        $xan\hat{i}$                        $ki\hat{r}\hat{i}$ .  
Ari-3<sup>rd</sup><sub>SG</sub>-OBL    house <sub>SG</sub>-ABS    bought-past 3<sup>rd</sup><sub>SG</sub>  
Ari bought the house.

**(b)-** \* $xan\hat{i}$   $ki\hat{r}\hat{i}$   
'house bought'

2. NK prohibits subject-verb inversion due to its strictly fixed SOV word order which fills all argument positions, leaving no syntactic flexibility for inversion.

**7 (a)-**  $hngo$                        $Ar\hat{i}$                        $d\hat{i}t$   
you 2<sup>nd</sup><sub>PL</sub>-OBL    Ari-ABS    saw-past 3<sup>rd</sup><sub>SG</sub>  
You saw Ari.

**(b)-** \* $d\hat{i}t$   $hngo$   $Ar\hat{i}$ .  
\*saw you Ari.

3. Long-distance Wh-movement of subjects and violation of that-t filter are blocked in Kurmanji because the language does not permit overt Wh-movement at the surface level. Instead of moving to the front of the clause, Wh-elements remain in their base position (in situ) (Barwari, 2004, p.139)

**8 (a)-** Min hevalên xwe dohî gehandi- n  
 I-1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>- OBL friends <sub>PL</sub>-ABS my-<sub>GEN</sub> yesterday dropped off-past 3<sup>rd</sup><sub>PL</sub>  
 I dropped off my friends yesterday.

**(b)-** Te-OBL kî-ABS dohî gahandi- n  
 You-2<sup>nd</sup><sub>SG</sub>-NOM who-ACC yesterday dropped off-past 3<sup>rd</sup><sub>PL</sub>  
 Who did you drop off yesterday?

**(c)-** Te hevalên xwe kengî gehandi- n  
 You-2<sup>nd</sup><sub>SG</sub>-NOM friends <sub>PL</sub>-ACC your-<sub>GEN</sub> when dropped off-past 3<sup>rd</sup><sub>PL</sub>  
 When did you drop off your friends?

4. The non-pro-drop languages such as English, typically require overt dummy subjects like *it* or *there* in subject position (Cook and Newson, 1988, p.113). However, NK does not require such explicit subject in these contexts, thereby allowing null expletive.

**9-** dîyare hon diçi- ne seyranê.  
 clear-pred you-2<sup>nd</sup><sub>PL</sub>-OBL go-pres- 2<sup>nd</sup><sub>PL</sub> picninc-ABS  
 (it) is clear that you go to picnic.

### 2.1.3 Morphological Limitations and Inflectional Weakness in NK (Kurmanji)

According to Barwari (2004), the inflectional paradigm is not sufficiently rich to distinguish all six persons, particularly due to the identical forms of the 2nd and 3rd person plural, which do not license *pro*. As a result, the presence of a null subject in these clauses leads to ungrammaticality. This demonstrates that rich inflection alone is insufficient to license *pro*; the whole paradigm must be rich to do so (Barwari, 2004, p. 142). Consider the paradigm in (10b): However, the current study believes that the inability of the last two persons to support pro-drop should not invalidate the possibility of licensing *pro* in the first four persons, where the inflection is sufficiently rich. In other words, there is no reason to disregard the pro-drop potential of the richly inflected forms due to the limitations of the others. Moreover, it is not

ungrammatical to recover the content of *pro* in these clauses, but the ambiguity caused by the identical 2nd and 3rd person plural forms prevents clear interpretation.

**10 (a)-**

|                 | Sg           |             | Pl            |            |
|-----------------|--------------|-------------|---------------|------------|
| 1 <sup>st</sup> | Az di-axivim | I speak     | Em di-axivîn  | We speak   |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> | To di-axivî  | You speak   | Hon di-axivin | You speak  |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> | Ew di-axivît | S/he speaks | Ew di-axivin  | They speak |

**(b)**

|                 | Sg                   | Pl                   |
|-----------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| 1 <sup>st</sup> | <i>pro</i> di-axivim | <i>pro</i> di-axivîn |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> | <i>pro</i> di-axivî  | <i>pro</i> di-axivin |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> | <i>pro</i> di-axivît | <i>pro</i> di-axivin |

**(c)**

|                 | Sg                                                                  | Pl                                                           |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1 <sup>st</sup> | Min nân xâr.<br>I ate the bread.<br><i>*pro</i> nân xâr.            | Me nân xâr.<br>We ate the bread.<br><i>*pro</i> nân xâr.     |
| 2 <sup>nd</sup> | Te nân xâr.<br>You ate the bread.<br><i>*pro</i> nân xâr.           | Hingô nân xâr.<br>You ate the bread.<br><i>*pro</i> nân xâr. |
| 3 <sup>rd</sup> | Wî / Wê nân xâr.<br>He / She ate the bread.<br><i>*pro</i> nân xâr. | wân nân xâr.<br>They ate the bread.<br><i>*pro</i> nân xâr.  |

As stated by Nariman Khoshnaw (2015), in Kurmanji the attached pronouns are overtly expressed with the group of absolutive subject pronouns; as seen in (10a), however, the verbs with oblique subject pronouns do not take any attached pronouns as shown in (10c) (Khoshnaw, 2015, p. 63).

The paradigm in (10c) demonstrates that subject omission is not allowed in ergative structures, such as transitive constructions marked with oblique case on the subject and absolutive case on the object. A similar example is syntactically illustrated in (11).

**11 (a)-** Min                      kitêb                      xwend- Ø  
 I-1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>-OBL    book-ABS    read. Past 1<sup>st</sup><sub>SG</sub>

'I read the book.

**(b)-** \**pro* kitêb xwend.

\**pro* read the book.

**12 (a)-** Me                      tî                      dît-                      î  
 We- 1<sup>st</sup><sub>PL</sub>-OBL    you-2<sup>nd</sup><sub>SG</sub>-ABS    saw-past    2<sup>nd</sup><sub>SG</sub>

We saw you.

**(b)-** \**pro* tî dîtî

\* *pro* saw you.

In these examples, the agreement is between verb and object not the subject, so that null subject is not licensed.

### 3. The methodology

#### 3.1 Research design

This research adopts a qualitative design grounded in the principles of generative grammar. It concentrates on the syntactic examination of clause structures in Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji), with the objective of exploring how little *pro* is distributed and licensed in simple clauses.

#### 3.2 Method

The research relies on textual analysis as the primary method. The analysis is conducted on selected clause structures in Northern Kurdish, based on the principles of Government and Binding Theory.

#### 3.3 Procedures

The analysis was carried out in two stages. First, Presenting a theoretical framework of literature review and key concepts explanation.

Second, exploring little *pro* in simple clauses to identify the conditions under which it may be omitted or present.

### **3.4 Data Collection**

The data were collected from a variety of academic sources, including syntax textbooks, Kurdish grammar references, linguistic dictionaries and dissertations.

### **3.5 Data analysis**

A qualitative textual analysis is conducted to identify and explain the occurrence of little pro in simple clauses of Kurmanji (NK).

## **4. Results**

This section presents the findings of the study regarding the distribution and licensing of *little pro* in Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji):

Kurmanji is considered a partial pro-drop dialect of the Kurdish language.

Kurmanji allows subject omission in some clauses types and null expletive but lacks properties like wh-movement and subject verb inversion.

It licenses subject omission (little pro) in some types of clauses due to its relatively rich inflectional verb system, which supports null arguments.

Certain simple finite clauses that lack sufficient subject–verb agreement require an overt noun phrase to satisfy the EPP, thereby disallowing pro-drop.

The agreement system in Kurmanji lacks distinct morphological marking between second- and third-person plural forms. This morphological under-specification leads to ambiguity not ungrammatically when the subject is omitted, which prevents the licensing of little pro in such contexts.

## **5. Conclusion**

In conclusion, although little attention has been paid to the study of empty categories in Kurdish, particularly in the Kurmanji dialect, this study has revealed a distinctive framework of subject realization in Kurmanji (Northern Kurdish) through its investigation of *little pro*. Consistent pro-drop languages such as Spanish and Italian permit subject omission in all types of finite clauses due to their robust verbal agreement systems. Based on Chomsky's characteristics of pro-drop languages, Kurmanji exhibits partial pro-drop properties: it permits some subject omission and

null expletives but lacks subject-verb inversion and long wh-movement. Subject omission is restricted to certain finite contexts, such as intransitive and non-past transitive constructions that show subject-verb agreement. However, in past transitive clauses with an ergative-absolutive pattern, null subjects are not allowed because the inflectional verb system lacks sufficient richness to license *pro* due to object-verb agreement, which does not facilitate subject identification. Additionally, morphological similarities among certain person forms create ambiguity, not ungrammaticality, in subject identification; therefore, to avoid this ambiguity, the subject cannot be omitted in clauses involving those persons.

## References

- Barwari, M. S. A., 2004. *Topics in Government and Binding Theory, with Reference to English and Kurdish*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, College of Art, University of Sallahaddin: s.n.
- Carnie, A., 2007. *Syntax: A generative introduction*. Malden: Blackwell.
- Chomsky, N., 1981. *Lectures on Government and Binding: The Pizza Lectures*. Dordrecht: Foris .
- Chomsky, N., 1988. *Language and Problems of Knowledge*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Cook, V. & Newson, M., 1988. *Chomsky's Universal Grammar*. 1st ed. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Cook, V. & Newson, M., 1996. *Chomsky's Universal Grammar*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Black well.
- Haji, V. S., 2009. *Empty Categories on the Light of Government and Binding Theory*. Erbil: Selaheddin University.
- Jaeggli, O. & Safir, K. J. eds., 1989. *The Null Subject Parameter*. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Khoshnaw, N. A., 2015. *Kurdish Grammar: Northern Kurdish Dialect*. Erbil: Rojhalat.
- Kosta, D. G. K. a. P., 2013. *Eliminating Empty Categories*. 1st ed. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.
- Sells, J.-B. K. a. P., 2008. *English Syntax*. USA: CSLI.
- Trask, R. L., 1993. *A Dictionary of Grammatical Terms in Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

## شیکارییه کی پسته سازی بۆ پرۆی بچووک له زاراوهی زمانی کوردی باکوور

(کرمانجی):

لیکۆلینه وهیه کی نموونه

پوخته:

ئهم توێژینه وهیه ههولدهات لیكۆلینه وه بکات له دابه شبوونی که رهسته ی به تال، که وهک "پرۆ" ناسراوه له چوارچێوه ی پێژمانی زاوژیدا. له زمانه جێناو فری-ده رهکانی وهک ئیتالی، ئیسپانی، فارسی و شیوه زاری کرمانجی خواررودا، رسته ی ساده ده توانیت به هۆی دهوله مهندی گیره کی کاره وه، بکه ر لا بدات وههروه ها ده توانیت رێگا به دووباره گه رانه وه ی ئه وه بکه ره بداته وه. له به رامبه ردا، شیوه زاری کرمانجی سه روو شیوازیکی جیاوازی تر پیشان دهات. ئامانجی سه ره کی ئهم لیكۆلینه وهیه دیارکردنی ئه وهیه که ئایا له شیوه زاری کرمانجی سه روو دا، بکه ر ده توانیت له جۆره جیاوازهکانی رسته سادهکاندا لابدریت، به مهش له چوارچێوه ی تیۆرییه زمانه وانیهیه فراوانهکانی جێناو فریده ر جێگیر دهکړیت. ئهم توێژینه وهیه شیوازیکی چۆنایه تی به کارده هینیت که له سه ر شیکاری دهقی پیکهاته ی رسته هه لبژێردراوهکان دامه زراوه وه له چوارچێوه ی تیوری دهسه لات و به سه ته وه دا جی به جی دهکړیت که باس له په یوه ندی ریکه وتنی بکه ر-کار، جۆری رسته و رێبێدانی بکه ری به تال (پرۆ) دهکات. دۆزینه وهکان ئه وه درده خه ن که هه رچه نده کرمانجی سه روو له زۆر حاله تدا رێگه به لادانی بکه ر دهات، به تابه تی له پیکهاتهکانی کاری تینه په ر وکاری رانه بردووی تپیه ردا، به لام له هه موو رسته سادهکاندا مۆله تی پرۆی بچووک نادات. له پیکهاتهکانی کاری رابردووی تپیه ر که ریکه وتن له نیوان بهرکار وکار ههیه، بکه ر ناتوانریت لا بهریت، له م بارۆدۆخه دا بۆ پاراستنی پێژمانیه تی رسته که بکه ر ده بێت به ئاشکراییه ده ربهرپیت. به گشتی داتا کان ئه وه پیشان ده دن که کرمانجی سه روو زمانێکی نیمچه جێناو فریده ره که له هه ندیک جۆره رسته دا به هۆی ریکه وتنی بکه ر-کار رێگه به لادانی بکه ر دهات له هه ندیک تریش به هۆی سنوورداریبوونی سیسته می ریکه وتن، لادانی بکه ر رێگه پیدراو نیه. ئهم لیكۆلینه وهیه به شیوهیه کی فراوان یارمه تی ده ره بۆ تیگه یشتن له که رهسته به تاله کان و جیاوازی سینتاکسی له ناو دایلیکتهکانی زمانی کوردی و تایپۆلۆژی جێناو فریده ر.

## **تحليل نحوي لـ "الضمير مستتر" في لهجة اللغة الكردية الشمالية (الكرمانجية): دراسة حالة**

### **ملخص**

تبحث هذه المقالة في توزيع وترخيص الفئة الفارغة المعروفة باسم "ضمير مستتر" في إطار القواعد التوليدية، مع التركيز على اللغة الكردية الشمالية (الكرمانجية). في حين أن لغات حذف "ضمير مستتر" مثل الإيطالية والإسبانية والفارسية والكردية الوسطى تسمح بحذف الفاعل في الجمل البسيطة المنتهية نظرًا لتوافقها الوثيق بين الفاعل والفعل، فإن اللغة الكرمانجية تُظهر نمطًا أكثر تقييدًا. الهدف الرئيسي من هذه الدراسة هو تحديد إمكانية ترخيص "ضمير مستتر" في أنواع مختلفة من الجمل البسيطة في اللغة الكرمانجية، وبالتالي وضعها ضمن النظريات اللغوية المتقاطعة الأوسع لحذف الفاعل. تعتمد الدراسة على نهج نوعي قائم على تحليل نصي لهياكل جمل مختارة. تُجرى الدراسة في إطار نظرية العمل والربط، مع التركيز بشكل خاص على تناول العلاقة بين توافق الفعل ونوع الجملة وترخيص الفاعل الناقص. تكشف النتائج أنه على الرغم من أن اللغة الكرمانجية تسمح بحذف الفاعل في كثير من الحالات، وخاصةً في صيغتي اللزوم والمتعدي غير الماضي، إلا أنها لا تسمح بحذف الفاعل الصغير في جميع الجمل البسيطة. ففي صيغتي الماضي المتعدي، حيث يُشار إلى الفاعل بحرف مائل ويكون هناك توافق بين الفعل والمفعول به، لا يمكن حذف الفاعل. في مثل هذه الحالات، يلزم وجود فاعل صريح للحفاظ على القواعد النحوية. بشكل عام، تشير البيانات إلى أن اللغة الكرمانجية لغة تسمح بحذف الفاعل جزئيًا: فهي تسمح بحذف الفاعل في بعض أنواع الجمل دون غيرها نظرًا لقيود نظام التوافق اللفظي. يساهم هذا البحث في فهمنا للفئات الفارغة والتنوع النحوي في اللهجات الكردية، وتصنيف الفاعل بشكل أوسع.