Functional Tools in Kurdish: Historical Roots and Contemporary Usage, Negation Tools as a Model[1]

Alavên Fonksiyonel ên Kurdî: Koka Dîrokî û Bikaranîna Nûjen, Alavên Neyîniyê wekî Model

Marwan HAMAY •

Abstract

This study investigates the negation tools "ne" and "me" in the Kurdish language, analyzing their syntactic and semantic functions. These markers denote general negation and imperative prohibition, respectively, and are vital for understanding Kurdish linguistic evolution and cultural significance. Employing a historical-comparative methodology, the research traces their origins to the Indo-European language family, linking them to ancient languages such as Sanskrit and Avestan.

The study analyzes historical texts and contemporary examples, such as "Wî nekariye xwe bigihîne te" (He couldn't reach you) for "ne" and "Heval zû meçe" (Friend, do not go quickly) for "me." Validation involves phonetic and semantic comparisons with Indo-European cognates, supported by grammatical analysis and expert consultations. Key findings highlight the historical continuity of "ne" and "me" from ancient forms to modern usage, underscoring their role in preserving Kurdish cultural identity. This research contributes to understanding the resilience of Kurdish as a vibrant language within the Indo-European tradition and its relevance in multicultural contexts, where language serves as a vital marker of heritage. The study encourages further exploration of Kurdish linguistic heritage and its implications for identity in a globalized world.

Keywords: Kurdish language, negation tools, historical linguistics, contemporary usage, cultural identity.

Kurte

Ev lêkolîn alavên inkarê "ne" û "me" yên di zimanê kurdî de vedikole, bi berçavgirtina fonksiyonên wan yên sintaksî û semantîkî. Ev alav, ku bi rêzdarî negirtina giştî û qedexekirina fermana împaratorî nîşan didin, ji bo

---

fehmkirina pêşkeftina zimên û girîngiya wê ya çandî girîng in. Lêkolîn koka wan a dîrokî bi malbata zimênên Hind-Ewropî ve girê dide, têkiliyên bi zimênên kevnar ên wekî Sanskrit û Avestan saz dike.

Bi karanîna metodolojiya dîrokî-bijartî, ev lêkolîn bi analîza etîmolojîkî koka wan a Proto-Hind-Ewropî ji nû ve ava dike, ku bi nirxandina bikaranîna wan a nûjen re tê temamkirin. Mînakên dîrokî û kurdî yên hemdem, wek "Wî nekariye xwe bigihîne te" (Wî nekarî gihêje te) ji bo "ne" û "Heval zû meçe" (Heval, zû neçe) ji bo "me," tê nîşandan. Encamên lêkolînê di ronahîkirina domdariya dîrokî ya kurdî wekî zimanek zindî destnîşan dikin. Hebûna domdar a "ne" û "me" ji formên kevn heta serîlêdanên wan ên heyî nîşan dide, ku li gorî daxwazên ragihandina nûjen adapte bûye. Ev lêkolîn girîngiya çandî ya kurdî di navbera settingên pir-çandî de zêde dike, ku ziman wekî mertalek li dijî asîmîlasyonê xizmet dike. Bi girêdana zimênnasiya dîrokî bi bikaranîna nûjen re, ev lêkolîn bingehek ji bo nirxandina têkiliya dînamîkî ya di navbera pêşkeftina zimên û berxwedana çandî de datîne, ku ramanên hêja pêşkêşî dike ku teşwîqî lêkolînên zêdetir ên mîrata zimênî ya kurdî.

Peyvên Sereke: Zimanê kurdî, alavên neyîniyê, zimênnasiya dîrokî, bikaranîna nûjen, nasnameya çandî.

Introduction

The exploration of functional tools in linguistics is a cornerstone for understanding the intricate mechanisms that govern language structure and evolution. These tools, encompassing particles, affixes, and markers that facilitate grammatical relationships, are pivotal in shaping how meaning is conveyed and negotiated within a linguistic system. In the Kurdish language, negation tools stand out as particularly significant due to their role in expressing denial, prohibition, and contrast, which are essential for effective communication and cultural expression (Blau, 1965, p. 147). Specifically, the negation markers "ne" and "me" serve as critical indicators of syntactic and semantic boundaries, offering a window into the language's historical development and its adaptability in contemporary contexts. This focus on negation is not merely an academic exercise; it addresses how these tools reflect the socio-cultural dynamics of Kurdish-speaking communities, where language preservation is often intertwined with identity and resistance against linguistic assimilation.

This study aims to fill a notable gap in the existing literature by specifically analyzing the historical and contemporary roles of "ne" and "me" as functional tools within Kurdish. While previous research has concentrated on lexical and phonological aspects of Kurdish, the functional significance of these negation markers has received limited attention. By investigating their etymological roots and practical applications, this research contributes to a deeper understanding of Kurdish grammar and syntax, linking historical insights with modern usage.

The Kurdish language occupies a distinctive niche within the Indo-European language family, specifically within the Northwestern Iranian branch of the Indo-Iranian subgroup (Hock & Joseph, 2009, p. 58). This classification situates it alongside ancient languages such as Avestan and Pahlavi, as well as modern relatives like Persian and Pashto, reflecting a shared heritage that spans millennia. The Indo-European framework, which includes major language groups such as Germanic, Slavic, and Indo-Aryan, provides a rich tapestry of linguistic evolution, with Kurdish contributing uniquely through its dialectal diversity and historical

interactions with neighboring tongues. Its geographic location in the Middle East has facilitated contact with non-Indo-European languages, such as Semitic and Turkic varieties, yet its core grammatical and lexical features retain a strong Indo-European imprint (Hamay, 2024). This positioning underscores the importance of studying Kurdish as a lens to explore the historical migrations, cultural exchanges, and phonological shifts that have shaped the family, particularly through the lens of functional elements like negation.

The study seeks to map these tools' etymological development, linking them to Proto-Indo-European precursors, and to assess their syntactic roles and pragmatic functions in modern Kurdish discourse. This approach will highlight their evolution from historical linguistic forms to their current utility, providing a comprehensive understanding of their enduring relevance.

Rather than embarking on an extensive review of existing literature, this study carves out a focused niche within Kurdish linguistic research by concentrating on the negation tools "ne" and "me" as a case study. By avoiding a broad survey, the research positions itself as a targeted investigation into how these specific markers sustain the language's vitality amid external influences. This focus aligns with efforts to document and analyze Kurdish as a living language, offering insights that complement broader Indo-European studies and support the preservation of its linguistic heritage. The study's emphasis on practical usage and historical continuity positions it as a valuable addition to the field, encouraging further exploration of syntactic features in Kurdish dialects.

Negation in Kurdish exhibits a structured yet flexible system, predominantly centered around the tools "ne" and "me." The marker "ne" is versatile, serving to negate nouns by preceding them independently, as demonstrated in examples such as "Ez ne mamoste me" (I am not a teacher), "Tu ne mamoste yî" (You are not a teacher), and "Ew ne mamoste ye" (He is not a teacher) across various pronominal forms. This tool also negates pronouns, as in "Kesê ku ez li hêviyê me, ne ew e" (The one I am waiting for is not him), and present tense verbs, where it replaces the progressive marker "di-" to form negatives like "Ez nekim" (I do not do) and "Tu nakî" (You do not do). Additionally, "ne" functions as a prefix in adjective formation, creating terms such as "nezan" (ignorant), "nexweş" (sick), "nemir" (immortal), "neçar" (helpless), and "newêrek" (brave), enriching the language's expressive capacity. In some dialects, "nîn" or "nin" is used colloquially to denote absence rather than negation (e.g., "ez mamoste nîn im" - I am not a teacher), though this introduces complexity due to its semantic shift toward indicating non-existence rather than denial (Blau, 1965, p. 154).

In contrast, "me" is specialized for negating imperative moods, a usage prevalent across Kurdish-speaking regions and rooted in ancient Aryan traditions. This is evident in examples like "Heval zû meçe" (Friend, do not go quickly), where "me" precedes the verb to prohibit action (Blau, 1965, p. 147). The historical depth of these negation patterns is further illuminated by comparative linguistics, where "ne" aligns with Old English "ne" as a primary negator, as noted by Hock and Joseph (2009, p. 171): "the original Old English word of negation was ne, as in ic ne wat 'I don't know'," suggesting a shared Proto-Indo-European origin that evolved differently across languages. This evolution is marked by syntactic shifts, such as the transition

from pre-verbal to post-verbal negation in English, a process that Kurdish has not fully mirrored, retaining "ne" and "me" as distinct markers (Hock & Joseph, 2009, p. 272). These patterns underscore the Kurdish language's resilience and its adaptation of functional tools to meet communicative needs across time.

Methods

The present study employs a historical-comparative approach to analyze the negation tools "ne" and "me" in the Kurdish language, focusing on their etymological development and syntactic roles. This methodology, as articulated by Ohnesorge (2021), involves juxtaposing historical linguistic patterns across diverse cases, integrating detailed case studies with comparative techniques to explore causal relationships, temporal processes, and contextualized comparisons (p. 4). By applying this framework, the research traces the origins of "ne" and "me" back to their Proto-Indo-European roots, examining their evolution through the Indo-Iranian branch, particularly in relation to Avestan and Sanskrit, while assessing their contemporary usage in Kurdish syntax.

Data for this study is sourced from a combination of historical texts and contemporary Kurdish sentences, ensuring a comprehensive temporal scope. Historical data includes etymological records from ancient Indo-European languages such as Sanskrit and Avestan, where negation markers like "ná" and "nōiṯ" provide critical insights into the ancestral forms of "ne," and "mā́" and "mā" offer parallels for "me." These texts are supplemented by scholarly compilations of Proto-Indo-European reconstructions, as noted by Pyysalo (2017), who emphasizes the importance of comparing identical morphemes to establish linguistic heritage (p. 259). Contemporary data comprises a corpus of Kurdish sentences, including examples like "Wî nekariye xwe bigihîne te" and "Heval zû meçe," collected from spoken and written sources to reflect current usage patterns, thereby bridging historical origins with modern practice. The selection criteria for these data sources included relevance to the study's focus, linguistic diversity, and representation across different Kurdish dialects.

The verification of the origins of "ne" and "me" involves a meticulous process of phonetic and semantic comparison with other Indo-European languages, adhering to the comparative method recognized as a gold standard by Raipovna (2021, p. 4987). Phonetic analysis focuses on the evolution of the initial nasal consonant "n" in "ne" across languages like Latin "nōn" and Greek "nē," as well as the vocalic shift in "me" from "*méh1" to Avestan "mā." Semantic comparison assesses the consistency of negation functions, such as general denial for "ne" and prohibitive commands for "me," across Sanskrit, Avestan, and Kurdish contexts. This dual analysis allows for the reconstruction of their Proto-Indo-European forms and confirms their shared heritage, while accounting for regional phonetic variations and syntactic adaptations that have shaped their development over time.

To ensure the reliability of the findings, the study utilizes a combination of grammatical analysis and expert consultation as validation tools. Grammatical analysis involves dissecting the syntactic structures of Kurdish sentences containing "ne" and "me," examining their

positional consistency and morphological interactions with verbs, nouns, and adjectives. Consultations with linguistic experts specializing in Indo-European and Kurdish philology provide peer review and validate the phonetic and semantic alignments with historical data. This process included structured interviews and collaborative discussions, ensuring that the insights gained were incorporated into the analysis. This rigorous validation process enhances the scientific credibility of the study, ensuring that the conclusions drawn about the historical and contemporary roles of "ne" and "me" are grounded in both empirical evidence and scholarly consensus.

While this study provides valuable insights, it is important to acknowledge potential methodological limitations. Factors such as the availability of historical texts, dialectal variations within Kurdish, and the subjective nature of linguistic interpretation may influence the findings. Future research may address these limitations by expanding the sample size and incorporating a broader range of dialects to enhance the robustness of the conclusions.

Findings

The analysis of the negation tool "ne" reveals its deep historical roots within the Kurdish language, tracing back to the Proto-Indo-European root "*nē," which signified "no," "not," or "non-existent" (Pokorny, 2007, p. 2181). This etymological connection is evident in its widespread use across Kurdish syntactic structures, as exemplified by the sentence "Wî nekariye xwe bigihîne te" (He couldn't reach you), where "ne" precedes the verb to negate the action. The persistence of "ne" aligns with its counterparts in ancient Indo-European languages, such as the Sanskrit "ná" and Avestan "na," reflecting a shared phonological and semantic heritage within the Indo-Iranian branch (Mallory & Adams, 1997, p. 395). This continuity suggests that Kurdish has retained a pre-verbal negation pattern, a trait also observed in Pahlavi (MacKenzie, 1986, p. 58) and Avestan (Bopp, 2009, p. 662), where negation markers similarly modified verbal and nominal elements. The transformation of "nē" into Kurdish "ne" illustrates a phonetic stabilization, preserving the initial nasal consonant "n," which further evolved into prefixed forms like "nezan" (ignorant) and "nexweş" (sick) in adjective derivation. This linguistic retention underscores the Kurdish language's historical linkage to the broader Indo-European family, highlighting a consistent syntactic role that has adapted to modern usage while maintaining its ancient roots.

Table 1: Examples of Negation Tools in Kurdish

Negation Tool	Example Sentence	Translation
ne	Ez ne mamoste me	I am not a teacher
ne	Tu ne mamoste yî	You are not a teacher
ne	Kesê ku ez li hêviyê me, ne ew e	The one I am waiting for is not him
me	Heval zû meçe	Friend, do not go quickly
me	Keko tev medin	Brother, do not move it

Negation Tool	Example Sentence	Translation
me	Derî ji kesî re vemeke!	Do not open the door for anyone!

The negation tool "me" demonstrates a specialized function within Kurdish, particularly in negating imperative moods, with its origins traceable to the Proto-Indo-European root "*méh$_1$" (Mallory/Adams, 1997, p. 672), an archaic form associated with prohibitive commands. This is vividly illustrated in the example "Heval zû meçe" (Friend, do not go quickly), where "me" precedes the imperative verb to enforce a prohibition.

The historical trajectory of "me" connects it to related forms in ancient Indo-European languages, such as the Sanskrit "mā́," Avestan "mā," and Ancient Greek "mā: μή," all of which served to negate commands (De Vaan & Lubotsky, 2014, p. 105). In Avestan, this is mirrored in constructions like "māca tąm ząm kāraiiən mā āpō hərəzaiiən" (Do not let them cultivate this land, nor let them draw water), where the prohibitive marker precedes the verb, a pattern paralleled in Kurdish syntax (De Vaan & Lubotsky, 2014, p. 105). The stability of "me" as a distinct marker for imperatives in Kurdish, used widely across Kurdish-speaking regions, reflects its deep embedding in the Indo-Iranian linguistic tradition, suggesting a direct inheritance from Proto-Indo-European through the Iranian lineage, particularly Avestan, with minimal phonetic alteration.

Contemporary usage of these negation tools is richly demonstrated through specific Kurdish sentences that reflect their integration into daily communication. The tool "ne" appears in diverse contexts, such as "Ez ne mamoste me" (I am not a teacher), "Tu ne mamoste yî" (You are not a teacher), and "Kesê ku ez li hêviyê me, ne ew e" (The one I am waiting for is not him), showcasing its versatility in negating nouns and pronouns. For present tense verbs, "ne" replaces the progressive marker "di-" as seen in "Ez nekim" (I do not do) and "Tu nakî" (You do not do), while its prefixed form generates adjectives like "nemir" (immortal) and "neçar" (helpless).

In contrast, "me" is consistently applied to imperatives, as in "Keko tev medin" (Brother, do not move it), "Lo lawo tu meke, melezîne!" (Boy, do not do it, do not hurry!), and "Derî ji kesî re vemeke!" (Do not open the door for anyone!), reflecting its specialized role in prohibitive expressions. These examples highlight the active presence of "ne" and "me" in modern Kurdish discourse, illustrating their adaptability to contemporary syntactic needs while preserving their functional integrity.The historical continuity of these negation tools in Kurdish is a testament to the language's enduring linguistic heritage, rooted in its Indo-European and Iranian ancestry. The evolution of "ne" from "nē" demonstrates a phonetic and syntactic lineage that extends through Avestan "na" and Sanskrit "ná," with further parallels in Hittite "natta" and Latin "nōn," indicating a widespread Indo-European pattern of pre-verbal negation (Mallory & Adams, 1997, p. 395).

This continuity is reinforced by the development of prefixed negation forms derived from the same Proto-Indo-European root "*nē", which has evolved into a variety of negation prefixes widely attested across Indo-European languages, suggesting a shared morphological

innovation that underscores their historical interconnectedness (Mallory & Adams, 2006, p. 422). In Latin, this root manifests as the prefix "in-", as seen in terms like "inutilis" (useless) and "incertus" (uncertain), where the original nasal consonant "n" is preserved and combined with additional morphological elements to extend its negating function (De Vaan, 2008, p. 301). Similarly, in the Germanic languages, the prefix "un-" emerges (Woodard, 2008, p. 224), exemplified by "unhappy" (not happy) and "unachtsam" (careless), reflecting a parallel retention of the "n" sound adapted to new phonetic environments.

In contrast, the Greek language exhibits a transformation of this root into the prefix "-a-", as observed in "ἄιστος (áístos)" (invisible) and "ἀμαυρός (amaurós)" (obscure), where the initial "n" has undergone a phonetic shift due to historical sound changes (Köbler, 2007, p. 24). The Sanskrit language follows a similar pattern with the prefix "-a-" in "a-dharmika" (illegal) and "a-vidya" (ignorance), indicating a shared derivational process within the Indo-Iranian branch (Macdonell, 1893, p. 24; 20). In Avestan, this is mirrored by forms such as "a-asha" (untruth) and "a-mithra" (dishonesty), further illustrating the root's adaptability across Iranian languages (De Vaan & Lubotsky, 2014, p. 12). This linguistic evolution from the Proto-Indo-European "*nē" to these diverse prefixes is governed by well-documented phonetic laws, where the retention of the "n" sound in Latin and Germanic contrasts with its assimilation or loss in Greek, Sanskrit, and Avestan, reflecting regional phonological variations. Collectively, the presence of this common negation tool "ne/nē" in Kurdish, alongside its manifestations in ancient and modern Indo-European languages, affirms the shared origins and deep linguistic kinship that bind Kurdish to this expansive language family, highlighting its role as a living testament to these historical processes.

The regional diversity of Kurdish dialects further enriches the application of "ne" and "me," reflecting variations that underscore their adaptability across different linguistic landscapes. In Northern Kurdish (Kurmanji), "ne" consistently negates verbs and nouns with a uniform pre-verbal placement, as in "Ez ne diçim" (I am not going), while Southern Kurdish (Sorani) may exhibit slight phonetic shifts, such as "na" in informal contexts, indicating a localized evolution influenced by contact with Persian (Chyet, 2003, p. 89). Similarly, "me" retains its imperative function across dialects, with examples like "Meçîne!" (Do not go!) in Sorani, showing a stable prohibitive role despite minor morphological adjustments. This dialectal variation highlights the flexibility of these tools in accommodating regional phonetic and syntactic preferences, reinforcing their role as dynamic elements within Kurdish's linguistic diversity while preserving their core Indo-European heritage.

Moreover, "ne" and "me" play a significant role in enhancing the expressive power of Kurdish poetry and oral traditions, where negation serves as a stylistic device to convey emotion and cultural narratives. In classical Kurdish poetry, "ne" is often used to emphasize absence or denial, as in the line "Ne xewna min e" (It is not my dream) from a traditional verse, amplifying the poet's longing (Rizgar, 2000, p. 145). Likewise, "me" appears in folk songs to issue prohibitions with rhythmic intensity, such as "Me bîr bike" (Do not forget), adding a layer of urgency to communal storytelling. This artistic application demonstrates how these negation tools transcend mere grammatical function, contributing to the aesthetic and emotional depth of

Kurdish cultural expression and linking linguistic heritage to the creative traditions that sustain the language's vitality.

Discussion and Conclusion

This study confirms the profound historical continuity and contemporary functional significance of the negation tools "ne" and "me" in the Kurdish language, establishing a direct and unbroken lineage from their ancient Indo-European origins to their modern syntactic applications. The analysis demonstrates that "ne," derived from the Proto-Indo-European (PIE) root *nē, has evolved into a versatile and indispensable marker for general, or declarative, negation across nominal, pronominal, and verbal phrases. This function is vividly illustrated in sentences such as "Wî nekariye xwe bigihîne te" (He couldn't reach you), where its obligatory pre-verbal placement preserves a classic PIE syntactic structure. This rigid positioning is not merely a historical remnant; it serves a crucial cognitive function by providing an immediate signal of sentence polarity, thus reducing processing load for the listener.

 Concurrently, "me," which originates from the distinct PIE prohibitive particle *méh$_1$, has steadfastly retained its specialized and exclusive function in negating imperative moods, as evidenced in "Heval zû meçe" (Friend, do not go quickly). The maintenance of this functional duality is a remarkable feat of linguistic conservatism. It reflects a sophisticated grammatical architecture, mirroring the fundamental Indo-European tendency to formally distinguish between a statement of non-reality (declarative negation) and a command to prevent an action (prohibitive negation)—a semantic and syntactic distinction that has been lost in many modern Indo-European languages, including English, but remains robustly active in Kurdish.

The syntactic stability of these markers carries significant implications for communicative efficiency and structural integrity within daily Kurdish discourse. The pre-verbal positioning of "ne" aligns with historical syntax found not only in older Germanic languages like Old English ("ic ne wat") but also across a wide array of ancient Indo-European branches, underscoring its deep heritage (Hock & Joseph, 2009, p. 171). This conserved structure enhances sentence coherence and predictability, allowing for rapid and unambiguous interpretation. Similarly, the prohibitive function of "me" preserves a syntactic tradition echoing Avestan ("mā auui asmanəm frasǔ sa") and Vedic Sanskrit ("mā́"), facilitating crystal-clear directives essential in all human societies (Blau, 1965, p. 147; De Vaan & Lubotsky, 2014, p. 105). This clear and immutable division of labor between "ne" (negating what is not) and "me" (negating what should not be done) allows speakers to navigate complex communicative contexts with a high degree of precision. It is this grammatical clarity that reinforces the tools' practical utility, underscoring a system finely tuned for both declarative statements and social regulation. This robust system stands in contrast to languages where a single negator must be interpreted differently based on context or tone, highlighting the efficiency of the Kurdish model.

Beyond their purely grammatical roles, the findings carry substantial and multifaceted cultural weight, positioning "ne" and "me" as vital emblems of Kurdish linguistic identity and repositories of collective memory. By retaining these distinct markers, Kurdish asserts its unique evolutionary path within the Iranian branch of Indo-European. This linguistic fingerprint distinguishes it clearly from major neighboring languages like Persian, which, despite its shared roots, has generalized its prohibitive negator for broader use, or Turkish, which belongs to an entirely different language family and employs a suffix-based negation system. In a global context where minority languages often face immense pressure from dominant regional or national languages, the steadfast retention of such core, ancient grammatical features serves as a powerful and organic tool for cultural resilience.

This is because language is more than a tool for communication; it is a living archive of a people's history. For Kurdish speakers, the daily, unconscious use of "ne" and "me" becomes a tangible link to a deep ancestral past, reinforcing a sense of continuity and historical legitimacy. The use of "ne" in derivational morphology to create antonyms (e.g., "zan" [knowing] → "nezan" [ignorant]) further showcases the language's unique structural identity. This linguistic particularity fosters a profound sense of pride and belonging, strengthening communal bonds and supporting efforts to safeguard Kurdish identity against the homogenizing forces of globalization and political assimilation. Thus, these two small words become significant signatures of Kurdish heritage, woven into the very fabric of thought and expression.

While this study provides a foundational analysis of the historical and syntactic roles of "ne" and "me," a comprehensive scholarly assessment requires acknowledging its limitations to pave the way for more nuanced future research. The analysis primarily relies on established grammatical descriptions and curated, illustrative examples. It does not incorporate a large-scale, empirical corpus analysis of contemporary spoken and written Kurdish. Consequently, crucial data regarding the frequency of use, subtle pragmatic variations, and potential ongoing linguistic changes—especially among younger, multilingual speakers—may not be fully captured. A corpus-based approach could reveal, for instance, whether language contact is leading to any bleeding between the functional domains of the two negators.

Furthermore, the scope was largely confined to the syntactic and historical dimensions. It did not delve deeply into the sociolinguistic factors that govern negation strategies in practice. For example, dialectal differences in usage (e.g., between the major dialects of Kurmanji and Sorani, as well as smaller dialects) were not systematically compared. Additionally, prosodic features such as stress, pitch, and intonation, which interact critically with negation to convey focus and emotional tone, were outside the purview of this study. Finally, the analysis did not explore the performance of "ne" and "me" in complex syntactic environments, such as in subordinate clauses or in combination with modal verbs, which represents a fertile ground for future investigation.

Building on this study's findings, future research should adopt a multi-faceted and empirically grounded approach to explore the functional versatility of Kurdish negation in greater depth. There is a pressing need for corpus-linguistic studies. The development of a

balanced, comprehensive corpus of modern Kurdish—encompassing academic texts, literature, news media, and digital platforms like social media—would be an invaluable resource. Analyzing such a corpus would allow researchers to quantify usage patterns, identify emerging syntactic trends, and explore the collocational behavior of "ne" and "me."

Sociolinguistic and dialectological investigations are also crucial. Fieldwork across different Kurdish-speaking regions is necessary to map how the use of these negators varies geographically and socially. Such studies could investigate whether factors like age, gender, education level, and degree of bilingualism influence a speaker's choice or placement of negation, providing a richer picture of the language as it is lived.

Furthermore, experimental psycholinguistic research could offer profound insights into the cognitive processing of Kurdish negation. Studies could be designed to measure sentence processing times or to track eye movements to determine how speakers and listeners parse declarative versus prohibitive negative sentences in real-time. This would provide empirical evidence for the cognitive efficiency hypothesized in our discussion.

Finally, expanding the comparative-historical analysis is a promising avenue. A detailed comparison of the entire negative and prohibitive systems in Kurdish with those in other Iranian languages (like Balochi, Pashto, and Zazaki/Dimli) could illuminate the specific pressures and pathways that led Kurdish to preserve this ancient distinction so faithfully, contributing significantly to both Iranian studies and the broader field of linguistic typology.

In conclusion, the negation tools "ne" and "me" are far more than simple grammatical relics; they are dynamic, living markers that encapsulate the immense historical depth, the sophisticated syntactic machinery, and the enduring cultural identity of the Kurdish language. Their persistence and functional clarity offer a compelling narrative of linguistic resilience, while simultaneously opening up a rich and exciting landscape for future scholarly inquiry.

Çavkanî / References

- Blau, J. (1965). *Kurdish-French-English dictionary*. Publications du Centre pour l'Étude des Problèmes du Monde Musulman Contemporain.

- Bopp, F. (2009). *A comparative grammar of the Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, Latin, Lithuanian, Gothic, German and Slavonic languages* (Vol. 2, H. S. Wilson, Ed.). Cambridge University Press.

- Chyet, M. L. (2003). *A dictionary of Kurdish Persian: Dialects, phrases, and etymology*. Hippocrene Books.

- De Vaan, M. (2008). *Etymological dictionary of Latin and the other Italic languages* (Vol. 7, Leiden Indo-European Etymological Dictionary). Brill.

- De Vaan, M., & Lubotsky, A. (2014). *Introduction to Avestan*. Brill.

- Hamay, M. (2024). *A comprehensive dataset of Kurdish body part terminology with Proto-Indo-European roots* [Data set]. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13926284

- Hock, H. H., & Joseph, B. D. (2009). *Language history, language change, and language relationship: An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics* (2nd rev. ed.). Mouton de Gruyter.

- Köbler, G. (2007). *Altgriechisches Wörterbuch: Altgriechisches Abkunfts- und Wirkungswörterbuch*. Erlangen.

- Macdonell, A. A. (1893). *A Sanskrit-English dictionary*. Clarendon Press.

- MacKenzie, D. N. (1986). *A concise Pahlavi dictionary*. Oxford University Press.

- Mallory, J. P., & Adams, D. Q. (1997). *Encyclopedia of Indo-European culture*. Fitzroy Dearborn.

- Mallory, J. P., & Adams, D. Q. (2006). *The Oxford introduction to Proto-Indo-European and the Proto-Indo-European world*. Oxford University Press.

- Ohnesorge, H. W. (2021). The method of comparative-historical analysis: A tailor-made approach to public diplomacy research. *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41254-021-00227-1

- Pokorny, J. (2007). *Indo-European: Proto-Indo-European etymological dictionary*. Indo-European Language Revival Association/Dnghu Association.

- Pyysalo, J. O. (2017). Proto-Indo-European lexicon: The generative etymological dictionary of Indo-European languages. In *Proceedings of the 21st Nordic Conference of Computational Linguistics (NoDaLiDa 2017)* (pp. 259–263). Linköping University Electronic Press.

- Raipovna, V. S. (2021). Comparative methods in linguistic. *International Journal of Future Generation Communication and Networking, 14*(1), 4986–4992.

- Rizgar, M. (2000). *Kurdish poetry: An anthology of Kurdish poets from the 12th to the 20th century*. Mardin Books.

- Woodard, R. D. (2008). *The ancient languages of Europe*. Cambridge University Press.