The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

Amir Karimipour

University of Mashhad
Iran

Shahla Sharifi

University of Mashhad
Iran

Amir Karimipour: University of Mashhad, Iran. | E-mail: amir.karimipour@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir
Shahla Sharifi: University of Mashhad, Iran. | E-mail: sh-sharifi@um.ac.ir

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

2

Abstract

This paper is an attempt to investigate hyper-raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish (henceforth IK), a southern dialect of Kurdish, spoken in Iran. In particular, we aim to argue that these constructions, which involve the extraction of a DP out of a finite CP, represent an A-movement which 'leaves behind a resumptive pro in the extraction position' for assigning case-marking and further concord-agreement relations, the operation which was proposed by Ademola-Adeoye (2011) regarding hyper-raising, hyper-ECM and copy raising in language. Results show that IK permits subject-to-subject and also object-to-subject raising. The latter, with its effects on the matrix verb, has not been discussed so much in literature and is stipulated to be a language-specific feature found in IK. It seems safe to conclude that parametric analysis of IK raising structures might be more plausible instead of imposing a strict pattern of raising (definitely English-type pattern) on this dialect.

Keywords: IK; hyper-raising; main clause; finite clause; matrix verb.

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

3

1. Introduction

Raising predicates are unaccusatives that take as their sole argument a clausal internal argument (Halpert, 2016). Raising can be exemplified by the English sentences:

1. (a) I believe **him** to be a linguist.

    (b) **He** appears to be a good linguist.

It has been argued that the noun phrases (DPs) marked with bold font are 'raised', because they show morphosyntactic properties of the matrix verb's argument (direct object or subject), while semantically they belong to the embedded clause (Serdobolskaya, 2009).

Postal (1974) and Perlmutter and Postal (1983) pose some arguments respecting raising in English and Japanese language:

   (i) raising is possible from complement clauses only;

  (ii) only the subject of the lower clause can be raised;

 (iii) the raised DP occupies the syntactic position of one of the matrix verb's complements (subject or direct object);

 (iv) the dependent clause does not occupy this position.

Although the constructions analogous to English raising are cross-linguistically widespread, e.g. in Altaic, Caucasian, North American and other languages (see Serdobolskaya [2005] for details), they do not show the same morphosyntactic properties as the English and Japanese constructions. In many languages, the raised DP does not have the morphosyntactic properties of the main verb's direct object, even if it seems to belong to the matrix clause. The grammatical role of the raised DP (subject, direct object or indirect object) within the embedded clause also differs among languages (Serdobolskaya, 2009).

For example, English requires raising out of nonfinite TP, but prohibits it out of a finite clause. This distinctive feature leads to the ungrammaticality of the sentences in (2b) and (3b):

2. (a) John$_i$ seems t$_i$ to eat pizza.

    (b) * It seems John to eat pizza.

3. (a) It seems that John eats pizza.

    (b) * John$_i$ seems (that) t$_i$ eats pizza.

Zulu, by contrast, prohibits raising out of a nonfinite TP but allows it out of a finite CP, as (4) shows:

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

4

4. (a) ku- bonakala [ukuthi uZinhle u- zo- xova ujeqe]
        seems that   AUG.1Zinhle   1S- FUT- make AUG. 1steamed.bread

    (b) uZinhle$_i$ u- bonakala [ukuthi t$_i$ u- zo- xova ujeqe]
        AUG.1Zinhlei   is- seem   that t$_i$ at- FUT make AUG.1steamed.bread

    (c) uZinhlei   u- bonakala[t$_i$ uku- (zo-) xova ujeqe]
        AUG.1Zinhle$_i$ 1s- seem   t$_i$ INF- (FUT-) make AUG. 1steamed.bread
        It seems that Zinhle will make bread.

Typical approaches to raising view the English-type pattern as standard, while the Zulu pattern of "hyper-raising" is treated as exceptional (e.g. Ura, 1994).

Analyses of raising have largely been viewed through the lens of the English-type raising profile. An account of English needs to determine what factor(s) force raising to occur out of nonfinite clauses and what factor(s) prohibit raising from occurring out of finite clauses. On both of these issues, multiple factors have been proposed to play a role. For example, case theory predicts that the subject of an embedded nonfinite TP must move to matrix [Spec,TP] for nominative case and the EPP motivates expletive insertion or CP raising even when case is not at stake. To prevent movement, both the Activity Condition and phases have been invoked (Chomsky, 2000, 2001): nominals that have case are predicted to be unavailable for A-movement and material in the complement of C is predicted to be trapped, each of which rule out A-movement from embedded [Spec,TP] (Halpert, 2016).

It is generally assumed that all "regular" clauses are CPs which have T-heads with complete agreement and tense features (inherited from C) that are required for nominative case valuation of the subjects. However, some infinitives are bare TPs which lack a C-phase layer. Since T's features are inherited from C, the T-heads of these clauses lack complete agreement and tense features, and the clauses are deemed defective (Chomsky, 2001: 6). Raising constructions are examples of constructions whose complements are considered defective:

5. (a) It seems that he loves mashed potatoes.

    (b) He seems to love mashed potatoes.

The embedded clause in (5a) is a CP. This implies that T has a complete set of grammatical features (φ-features and tense); therefore, the embedded subject *he* gets nominative case. Once the case feature of *he* has been valued, *he* becomes "frozen in place" (i.e. it becomes inactive) and can no longer be involved in any syntactic operation (Chomsky, 2001: 80). As already stated, one distinctive feature of raising predicates such as *seem* is that they are unaccusative and do not assign an external thematic role. For this reason, it is possible for an expletive—a semantically null element like *it*—to be inserted as the subject of a raising predicate (as in 5a).

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

5

The study of raising constructions has attracted the attention of scholars in the recent decades. Carstens and Diercks (2013) assess the Lubukusu and Lusaamia HYPER-RAISING constructions. They argue that the findings of the research challenge some central notions of minimalist theory. (i) Case theory is not universally adequate to explain NP distribution, and must be parameterized. In particular, Luyia languages (and likely many more Bantu languages) do not have abstract Case as part of their grammars. (ii) When N's position is consistently in the DP's left edge, it amalgamates with D. If N has grammatical gender, DP accordingly inherits this feature. (iii) Nominal gender is [+valued, -interpretable]. Due to this combination of properties, it satisfies the Active Goal Requirement and is never deactivated by Agree relations. This leads to the common phenomenon of iterating DP-internal concord; and in N-to-D languages, it leads to HYPERAGREEMENT and HYPERACTIVITY. (iv) Clarifying the properties of specific heads within the CP field can yield important insights into cross-linguistic variation with respect to movement phenomena and A-relations.

Serdobolskaya (2009) considers the phenomenon of raising from a functional-typological perspective. Taking crosslinguistic data into account leads to the conclusion that the definition of raising should be reformulated. She proposes that at least three distinct types of constructions, attested cross-linguistically, are similar to raising as usually understood; these are raising to direct object/subject, raising to the left periphery of the lower clause, and raising to the left periphery of the matrix clause. She makes clear that constructions involving clause reduction should be analyzed separately from raising; however, this demonstrates syntactic properties very similar to raising.

Jenks and Rose (2017) take the close match of contemporary theories of control and raising with the Moro facts as a compelling argument for the cross-linguistic validity of these theories as well as their maturity. They claim that every major theoretical distinction that had been proposed not only finds an empirical correlate in Moro, but in many cases the analyses which have been proposed in the literature find overt morphological support. As they state, this kind of morphological evidence cannot be found in most European languages. They conclude that these morphological facts make Moro an ideal language on which to conduct additional theoretical work on raising and control.

1.1. Resumptive analysis of finite hyper-raising

Ademola-Adeoye (2011) provides and discusses a comprehensive collection of empirical data that show that many languages of the world manifest long A-movement of the subjects of embedded finite clauses to the subject position (hyper-raising) or object position (hyper-ECM) of the main clause. She notes that what all the hyper-raising and hyper-ECM constructions have in common is that they license null subjects (*pro*-DPs)—a correlation that she labelled *Ura's generalisation* (after a similar observation made in Ura, 1994). She also takes into account the observation that pro drop languages like Shona, Greek and Japanese

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

6

allow hyper-raising and hyper-ECM, while non pro drop languages like Yoruba and Igbo have copy raising. Based on this observation and Ura's generalisation, she then suggests that languages which allow hyper-raising and hyper-ECM must be pro drop languages because the gap in the subject position of the embedded finite clauses from which hyper-raising and hyper-ECM has occurred is filled by *pro*. In languages with copy raising, which do not have null pronouns, the embedded subject position is realized by an overt pronoun. Hence, from her point of view, these constructions are identical in all crucial respects, with the main difference being that the pronominal resumptive copy is a full lexical pronoun in the latter languages, whereas it is a null pronoun in languages with hyper-raising and hyper-ECM, implying that A-movement of DPs out of finite clauses triggers *resumption*, i.e. the occurrence of a (null) pronoun in the embedded subject position.

She argues that languages with hyper-raising, hyper-ECM or copy raising allow for the formation of recursive big DPs, i.e. DPs in which a pronominal head selects another DP (DP-COMPL), in the subject position of embedded finite clauses. The theta-role associated with the subject is assigned to the complex big DP, which includes DP_{COMPL}. The big DP also agrees with the embedded T, its case feature is valued as nominative and the DP moves to [Spec, T]. However, although the whole big DP counts as the argument of the embedded verb, both DPs need case. Assuming that pronominal DPs are not case assigners, this means that DP_{COMPL} still has an unvalued case feature. It therefore is still active, and its φ-features are available as the goal for a probe in the matrix clause. Eventually, DP_{COMPL} moves out of the embedded clause into the matrix clause, leaving behind the remnant big DP, stranding its pronominal head (which is *pro* in languages with hyper-raising and hyper-ECM and an overt pronoun in copy raising languages). Her proposal that recursive DPs can be formed to allow the generation of "extra" DPs makes the interesting prediction that we also find instances of "successive-cyclic" long A-movement which is realised in languages such as Shona, Greek, Turkish, Japanese, Chinese and Korean.

This paper probes the hyper-raising constructions in IK. In order to achieve this goal, we will take Ademola-Adeoye's proposal of resumptive analysis of hyper-raising into account. The main questions which will be investigated in this study are as follows:

1. Which constructions in IK are considered as hyper-raising? What are the characteristic features of such constructions?

2. Are Ademola-Adeoye's ideas respecting cross-linguistic similarities of hyper-raising constructions also attested in IK?

This paper has the following outlines. In section (1), theoretical bases of the study were presented. In Kurdish language section (2), a brief overview of Kurdish and its varieties is given. In section (3), Ilami Kurdish data will be analyzed. Finally, in section (4), concluding remarks of the study will be pointed out.

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

7

2. Kurdish language

Kurdish as a new western Iranian language has speakers dispersed within broad geographical areas of Iran, from west, encompassing Kurdistan, West Azerbaijan, Kermanshah and Ilam, to the east (Khurasan), Iraq, Turkey, mainly in the east and southeast of the country, and Syria. There are also Kurdish speakers settled in east of Caspian Sea, central Anatolia and also Armenia, Azerbaijan and Turkmenistan. Based on approximations, Turkey, Iran and Iraq shelter 43, 31 and 18 percent of the Kurds, respectively. There are 6 percent of the Kurds living in Syria and the remaining 2 percent live in the former Soviet Union, mainly Armenia and Azerbaijan (Gunter, 2004: xxv-xxvi).

This language has three main dialect groups. The northern Kurdish dialects usually called *Kurmanji* are spoken in northwest Iraq, Turkey and Khurasan, in Iran (Gunter, 2004: xxv-xxvi). Regarding the central Kurdish dialects, there are two main dialects, namely, Mukri, which is spoken in Iran, to the south of Lake Urmiya, and Sorani, to the west of Mukri, in the province of Erbil, in Iraq. The southern Kurdish dialect group includes Kermanshahi, Laki (and also Ilami) (Mackenzie, 1963; Oranskij, 1979: 35-36; Asatrian, 2009: 12).

The linguistic variations of these dialects are so great that it is possible to say that every tribe and every valley has its own dialect. It seems that this phenomenon is common to all people living in mountainous areas. Although the lexical resource of Kurdish is basically Iranian, it has been influenced by Arabic, especially in the religion domain. It should be stated that, as the majority of the Kurds are Muslims (with a minority of Jews and Yazidis), naturally the language of the Koran is essential for them (Bois, 1966: 111-112).

IK, a less studied dialect, is one of the Kurdish varieties, which is spoken by about 200 000 individuals in Ilam, a small mountainous city located in the west of Iran. Generally speaking, IK is a satellite-framed variety. Accordingly, manner component is usually encoded in the verb, while path is expressed through satellites which accompany the verb. However, it shows some idiosyncratic characteristics, too.

By the way, Ilami, like many Iranian varieties, has lost its gender and case marking systems in nouns and pronouns. This can be considered as a sharp distinction in comparison with the owning varieties of Kurmanji which mark gender and/or different cases. In contrast, IK has pronominal affixes used to construct case relations which are not usually found in northern dialects of Kurdish (Karimipour and Rezai, 2017; Bynon, 1979).

3. Findings

In this section, Kurdish data will be analyzed. It is noteworthy that for the presentation of IK data, three levels including IPA-transcription (line 1), literal translation (line 2) and idiomatic translation (line 3) are given.

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

8

In order to make raising constructions in IK, a DP is moved out of complement clause of the sentence which is introduced by the subjunctive mood of the verb. It should be pointed that Kurdish, like Persian and other Iranian languages, lacks nonfinite clause, hence the raising regularly takes place out of finite clauses. The following examples are illustrative:

1. jæ nijæ-məne   [**ej**   tʃəgi   ære danəʃga].
   this not-seem.PRS.3SG   s/he   go.3SG.SBJV   for   university.
   It does not seem that he has gone to university.

2. jæ   məne   [**wan** hæ dɑwræ   buwəsən].
   this   seem.PRS.3SG   they just there   stay.3PL.SBJV
   It seems that they have stayed there.

3. jæ   məne   [**maɫ-ə   xwæm-an**   mærɑsəm dɑʃtuwən].
   this   seem.PRS.3SG   **family-EZ self-PL**   party   have.3PL.SBJV
   It seems that our family has a party.

4. jæ   məne   [**sara** kətaw-æ   dɑj-æ   parsɑ].
   this   seem.PRS.3SG   **Sara** book-DEF   give.3SG.SBJV-to   **Parsa**
   It seems that Sara has given the book to Parsa.

In all the examples mentioned above, the DP (i.e. pronouns in the first two examples and nouns in the next two) can be moved to the upper clause. As the result of the raising, the following forms are respectively derived:

5. jæ   **ej**   nijæ-məne   [*pro* tʃəgi   ære danəʃga].
   this s/he not-seem.PRS.3SG   *pro* go.3SG.SBJV   for university.
   He does not seem to have gone to university.

6. jæ **wan**   məne   [*pro* hæ dɑwræ   buwəsən].
   this they   seem.PRS.3SG   *pro*   just there   stay.3PL.SBJV
   They seem to stay there.

7. jæ   **maɫ-ə   xwæm-an** məne   [*pro* mærɑsəm   derən].
   this family-EZ self-PL   seem.PRS.3SG   *pro* party   have.3PL.SBJV
   Our family seems to have a party.

8. jæ **sara**   məne   [*pro* kətaw-æ   dɑj-æ   parsɑ].
   this Sara   seem.PRS.3SG   *pro* book-DEF   give.3SG.SBJV-to   Parsa
   Sara seems to give the book to Parsa.

It is worth mentioning that the examples mentioned above, all represent subject-to-subject raising. In the same vein, there are also cases of object-to-subject raising which allows the DP (object of the finite-clause) to move and land in the subject position of the matrix verb. Look at the following illustrations:

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

9

9. a) jæ   dəmənəs   [sɑrɑ miwe-læ   ʃurti].
        This   seem.PST.3SG   Sara   fruit-PL   wash.3SG.SBJV
        It seemed that Sarah has washed the fruits.

    b) jæ miwe-læ   dəmənijan   [sɑrɑ   *pro* ʃurti].
        This   fruit-PL   seem.PST.3PL.PASS   Sara   *pro* wash.3SG.SBJV
        The fruits seemed to be washed by Sara.

10. a) jæ   dəmənəs   [sɑrɑ ləbɑs-elæ   dürɑni].
         This   seem.PST.3SG   Sara   dress-PL   sew.3SG.SBJV
         It seemed that Sara has sewed the dresses.

     b) jæ ləbɑs-elæ   dəmənijan   [sɑrɑ   *pro*   dürɑni].
         This dress-PL   seem.PST.3PL.PASS   Sara   *pro* sew.3SG.SBJV
         The dresses seemed to be sewed by Sara.

In the examples given above, the object of the complement clause, which is a finite CP in the subjunctive mood, is raised to the upper clause. However, as the verb is unaccusative, there is no specified slot available for the object of the matrix verb, which means that the raising verb must have one internal argument. This is the reason why the matrix verb is automatically passivized and the raised DP becomes the subject of the passive verb. The passivization of the matrix verb and the assignment of a due case to the raised DP can be evidence of the fact that we deal with a hyper-raising construction. A second piece of evidence that raising has occurred is that the matrix verb checks its φ-feature with the raised DP in the past tense.

Beside the similarities observed between English and IK, there is one baffling point. In English language, the argument position in the matrix verb is filled by an expletive pronoun (i.e. *it*) in the absence of the raised NP. Accordingly, when the DP is moved to the subject position, the use of the null pronoun together with the DP is no longer plausible as in (11):

11. (a) There seems to be a vampire in the city.

     (b) A vampire$_i$ seems t$_i$ to be in the city.

     (c) *There a vampire seems to be in the city.

We should keep in mind that in Kurdish examples mentioned so far, 'jæ' as an expletive pronoun occupies the subject position of the matrix verb. It is expected that when the DP of the lower clause moves to the subject position of the main clause, the null pronoun disappears, but this is not the case.

Furthermore, in both the expletive constructions and the raising constructions, the matrix verb is inflected in third person singular, provided that the verb tense is present. As can be

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

10

seen below, in both cases regardless of the person and number of the raised NP, the verb is conjugated in 3rd person singular:

12. jæ **imæ**   wæ gwənɑj nɑw   [*pro* bədekari-jə fəre   dɑʃtimən].
    This we   with sin   not.being.PRS.3SG   *pro* debt-INDEF much   have.1PL.SBJV
    We seem to have too much debt.

13. jæ **maɬ-ə**   **xwæ-mɑn**   məne   [*pro*   mærasəm   derən].
    this   family-EZ   self-PL   seem.PRS.3SG   *pro*   party   have.3PL.SBJV
    Our family seems to have a party.

Considering the following examples which are inflected in past tense, we notice that, on the contrary, in such sentences, the matrix verb adjusts its person and number features with the raised DP:

14. jæ imæ   dəmænəsim   [*pro* bədekari-jə   fəre   dɑʃtuwimen].
    This we   seem.PST.1PL   *pro* debt-INDEF   much   have.1PL.SBJV
    We seemed to have too much debt.

15. jæ **maɬ-ə**   **xwæ-mɑn**   dəmænəsən [*pro* mærasəm   dɑʃtuwən].
    this   family-EZ   self-PL   seem.PST.3PL *pro* party   have.3PL.SBJV
    Our family seemed to have a party.

16. jæ miwe-læ dəmənijan   [sɑrɑ   *pro*   ʃurti].
    This   fruit-PL seem.PST.3PL.PASS   Sara   *pro*   wash.3SG. SBJV
    The fruits seemed to be washed by Sara.

So it will be highlighted later in this paper how tense split in IK can be determinant with respect to the null pro-verb and DP-verb agreement which might also explain the co-occurrence of the expletive 'jæ' along with the raised DP in the subject position of the matrix verb.

3.1. Number of NPs raised at a time

Some languages as Quechua and Irish allow more than one DP to be raised out of the complement clause (Serdobolskaya, 2009). Evaluating the Kurdish data, we notice that it is not usual to raise more than one DP at a time. If more than one DP are raised, the sentence is ungrammatical:

17. (a) jæ   dəmənəs   [sɑrɑ ləbɑs-elæ   düɑni].
        This   seem.PST.3SG   Sara dress-PL   sew.3SG.SBJV
        It seemed that Sara has sewed the dresses.

    (b) jæ sɑrɑ dəmænəs   [*pro*   ləbɑs-elæ   düɑni].
        This Sara seem.PST.3SG   *pro*   dress- PL   sew.3SG.SBJV
        Sara seemed to have sewed the dresses.

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

11

(c) jæ   **ləbɑs-elæ**   dəmənijɑn   [sɑrɑ *pro* dörɑni].
    This   dress-PL   seem.PST.3PL.PASS   Sara   *pro* sew.3SG.SBJV
    The dresses seemed to be sewed by Sara.

(d) *sɑrɑ_i ləbɑs-elæ_j dəmənijɑ/n [*pro pro* dörɑni].

As can be seen, in (17b) and (17c), the subject and the object are raised to the main clause, respectively. However, in (17d), the simultaneous raising of subject and object leads to the ungrammaticality of the sentence. This pattern has also been observed in languages like English, Japanese, Niuean, Mari and Modern Greek (Serdobolskaya, 2009).

3.2. Resumptive analysis of hyper-raising in IK

The standard treatment of raising constructions in recent versions of Generative Grammar, such as the Minimalist Program (Chomsky, 1995, 2001, 2005) is based on the premise that raising is only possible from defective clauses (Ademola-Adeoye, 2011).

This is mainly based on the assumption that, since in English and a few other studied languages DPs of finite clauses are not licensed to raise, other languages' cannot either.

Nevertheless, there are cross-linguistic studies attesting that not only there are cases of finite raising constructions amongst languages, but also there are remarkable variations respecting the ways through which such constructions are formed across the world's languages.

As already stated, IK does license raising out of finite CPs. Following Ademola-Adeoye (2011), it can be said that a big DP is generated and theta-marked in the embedded clause of the constructions which trigger raising. The resumptive pronoun and its DP$_{COMPL}$ show concord-agreement and therefore share all relevant features. However, the nominative case assigned inside the embedded clause is only available for the resumptive pronoun as the head of big DP, while the specific configuration inside the big DP prevents the complement DP of the resumptive pronoun from getting case (essentially, because the resumptive pronoun is not a case assigner). This is the reason why the overt subject DP must enter an agreement relation with an element in the matrix clause from which it then receives (nominative or accusative) case.

Serdobolskaya (2009) states that a DP can affect either its case marking, as in English and Japanese, its agreement pattern (Long Distance Agreement) or its constituency properties. There are a number of constructions where no morphological evidence for raising can be observed, yet there is evidence that raising to the matrix clause has occurred (e.g. in Malagasy [Keenan, 1976], Cuzco Quechua [Muysken and Lefebvre, 1988] and Komi-Zyrian and Mari [Serdobolskaya, 2005]).

As far as IK is taken into account, it was observed that subject to subject raising in this dialect can partially affect the agreement pattern (LDA) so that the raised DP can control

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

12

the matrix verb inflection in the past tense, although it remains unaffected in the present tense. Object to subject raising confirms the same pattern; moreover, the movement of the object argument leads to the passivization of the matrix verb, as it lacks a separate object argument slot available for the raised object, which is consequently landed in the subject position of the main verb.

It seems safe to say that long A-movement in IK selects CPs whose heads trigger a complete transfer of their φ-features in some cases (i.e. person, number and tense in past tense) and those which do not convey all of φ-features (i.e. person and number in simple tense). This is the reason behind the full agreement of person and number between the raised DP and the matrix verb in past tense and lack of such agreement in the present tense.

In addition, an A-movement is also defensible as far as object-raising is taken into consideration. In such cases, there is also a big DP generated in the object position of the CP which encompasses a resumptive pro and a DP_{COMPL} which is not case assigned in the CP. This undergoes a successive-cyclic movement from [Spec, C] and further to [Spec, T]. It should be stated that movement to [Spec, C] is not always A-bar movement; instead, in hyper-raising, hyper-ECM and copy raising constructions, [Spec, C] can become an A-position. In these constructions, C has an uninterpretable inflectional feature uF which acts as a probe and enters an agreement relation with the corresponding feature of a goal DP (Ademola-Adeoye, 2011). Consequently, its case is checked and, since there is no slot specified for the raised object, it is landed in the subject position. In order to assign a due case, the matrix verb is passivized, which shows a kind of agreement between the raised DP and the matrix verb.

Now, we come back to the question why the null subject can co-occur with the raised DP, which seems to be a language-specific feature of IK. It can be argued that the subject position of the matrix verb is a complex slot, which allows the co-occurrence of the null pro and the raised subject/object at the same time, which seems to be connected with tense split in these constructions. In some cases, there is an agreement between the null subject and the matrix verb (i.e. when the verb has a present tense) and in other cases between the raised DP and the verb (i.e. when the verb has a past tense). Then, the co-occurrence of the null subject and the raised DP does not make any problem for the raised construction, as they do not involve the matrix verb inflection at the same time. It is also worth mentioning that the linear order of this 'complex subject' is a one way trip which only permits 'expletive-raised DP' order and not vice versa. This can also be considered as evidence that the raised DP is landed in the subject position of the matrix verb and not in the free slot in the upper position (e.g. FP).

Correspondingly, the reason why only one argument can be extracted out of CP can also be explained. Since one slot in the complex subject position is filled by the null pro, there is only one another slot available for the raised DP, which can be filled by either the subject

DP or the object DP of the CP. In other words, if we raise two DPs at the same time, the matrix verb cannot concord with both of them in number, person and more importantly passivization in favor of the raised object DP.

4. Concluding remarks

This paper probed the features of hyper-raising constructions in IK. Data revealed that IK permits raising out of finite complement clauses which are identified by the subjunctive mood of the verb. It was also shown that Kurdish permits not only the movement of the subject, but also the object of the subordinate clause, a pattern which does not seem to be widespread across the languages studied so far. When the object moves to the main clause, the matrix verb is automatically passivized. Since there is only one slot in any sort of raising operation, no more than one element can be extracted at a time, which helps the long distance agreement between the raised DP and the matrix verb. On the contrary, it was figured out that the subject position in the main clause seems to be a complex slot having two positions, one of which is filled by the null pro by default. Thus the concord agreement is sometimes between the null pro and the verb and in other cases between the raised DP and the verb. This seems to be a language-particular property of IK, as the universal tendency might be the deletion of the overt expletive after the raising takes place.

5. References

ADEMOLA-ADEOYE, Feyisayo Fehintola, 2011: *A cross-linguistic analysis of finite raising constructions*. Ph.D. diss., University of KwaZulu-Natal.

ASATRIAN, Garnik, 2009: "Prolegomena to the study of the Kurds", *Iran and the Caucasus* 13, 1-58.

BOIS, Thomas, 1966: *The Kurds* (1st English ed.), Beirut: Khayats.

BYNON, Theodora, 1979: "The ergative construction in Kurdish", *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 42 (2), 211-224.

CARSTENS, Vicki, & Michael DIERCKS, 2013: "Parameterizing case and activity: Hyperraising in Bantu" in Seda KAN, Claire MOORE-CANTWELL & Robert STAUBS (eds.): *Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, Amherst, MA: GLSA, 99-118.

CHOMSKY, Noam, 1995: *The minimalist program*, Cambridge: MIT Press.

CHOMSKY, Noam, 2000: "Minimalist inquiries: The framework" in Roger MARTIN, David MICHAELS & Juan URIAGEREKA (eds.): *Step by step: Essays on minimalist syntax in honor of Howard Lasnik*, Cambridge: MIT Press, 89-156.

ONOMÁZEIN 60 (June 2023): 01 - 14
Amir Karimipour and Shahla Sharifi
The analysis of finite raising constructions in Ilami Kurdish

14

CHOMSKY, Noam, 2001: "Derivation by phase" in Michael KENSTOWICZ (ed.): *Ken Hale: A Life in Linguistics*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1-52.

CHOMSKY, Noam, 2005: "Three factors in language design", *Linguistic Inquiry* 36, 1-22.

GUNTER, Michael M., 2004: *Historical dictionary of the Kurds*, Maryland: Scarecrow Press Inc.

HALPERT, Claire, 2016: "Raising parameters" in Somerville KIM et al. (eds.): *Proceedings of WCCFL 33*, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 186-195.

JENKS, Peter, & Sharon ROSE, 2017: "Documenting Raising and Control in Moro" in Jason KAN-DYBOWICZ and Harold TORRENCE (eds.): *Africa's Endangered Languages: Documentary and Theoretical Approaches*, Oxford: Oxford Academic, 207-236.

KARIMIPOUR, Amir, & Rezai VALI, 2017: "Passive constructions in Ilami Kurdish; a role and reference grammar account", *Dialectologia* 19 (2), 109-130.

KEENAN, Edward Louis, 1976: "Remarkable subjects in Malagasy" in Charles LI (ed.): *Subject and Topic*, New York: Academic Press, 247-301.

MACKENZIE, David Neil, 1963: "Kurmandzi, Kurdi, Gurani", *Narody Azii I Afriki* 1, 162-170.

MUYSKEN, Pieter, & Claire LEFEBVRE, 1988: *Mixed categories: nominalizations in Quechua*, Studies in Natural Language and Linguistic Theory, Dordrecht/Boston/London: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

ORANSKIJ, Iosif Mihajlovič, 1979: *Iranskieyazyki v istorčeskomosveŠčenii*, Moskva: Nauka.

PERLMUTTER, David M., & Paul M. POSTAL, 1983: "The relational succession law" in David M. PERLMUTTER (ed.): *Studies in Relational Grammar* 1, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 30-80.

POSTAL, Paul M., 1974: *On raising*, Cambridge, MA, and London: MIT Press.

SERDOBOLSKAYA, Natalia, 2009: "Towards the typology of raising: A functional approach" in Patience EPPS & Alenxandre ARCHIPOV (eds.): *New Challenges in Typology (Trends in linguistics)*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 269-294.

SERDOBOLSKAYA, Natalia, 2005: *Sintaksiceskij status aktantov zavisimoj nefinitnoj predikacii* [Syntactic status of the arguments of nonfinite dependent clauses]. Ph.D. diss., Moscow State University.

URA, Hiroyuki, 1994: *Varieties of raising and the feature-based bare phrase structure theory*. Ph.D. thesis, MIT.