

---

## Contact-induced change and passivization in low-resourced languages of Iran

---

Hiwa Asadpour<sup>1</sup>, Soudabeh Eslami<sup>2</sup>, Mansoureh Delaramifar<sup>3</sup> & Masoumeh Zarei<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*JSPS International Fellow, University of Tokyo, Japan & Goethe University Frankfurt,* <sup>2</sup>*University of Tübingen,* <sup>3</sup>*University of Sistan and Baluchestan,*

<sup>4</sup>*Allameh Tabataba'i University*

asadpour@lingua.uni-frankfurt.de, soudabeh.eslami@student.uni-tuebingen.de, delarami.m@gmail.com, zareimasoumeh26@gmail.com

This study examines passivization in minority languages of Iran such as Zanjani and Shahsevan Azeri (Turkic), Sistani Persian and Garusi Kurdish (Iranian) which are under the superstrate of Persian as the official language of this country and are also exposed to intra-regional linguistic contact. The aim is to discuss different features relevant to passive constructions and to find evidence for the role of language contact in forming the passive structures of the languages of the region. We want to track which features are regionally restricted and which ones are distributed in a larger span of space. The methodology is based on fieldwork study and the data is collected through visual questionnaires. The clauses with passive construction which are extracted from the recorded voices will be the basis for the analysis and the study of contact-induced change in a selection of languages in Iran. The following examples illustrate the passive formation of the English clause of “the child who is being pulled” in these languages:

- |               |             |              |            |                           |                            |
|---------------|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|
| (1) Persian   | an          | baççe'i      | ke         | keşid-e                   | mi-şav-ad                  |
|               | <i>that</i> | <i>child</i> | <i>who</i> | <i>pull.PST-PRF</i>       | <i>PROG-become.PRS-3SG</i> |
| (2) Sistani   | am          | goçaka       | ke         | kaşid-a                   | me:-şo                     |
|               | <i>that</i> | <i>child</i> | <i>who</i> | <i>pull.PST-PRF</i>       | <i>PROG-become.3SG</i>     |
| (3) Garusi    | ew          | zañuege      | ke         | di-kiş-irili              |                            |
|               | <i>that</i> | <i>child</i> | <i>who</i> | <i>PULL-PASS-3SG</i>      |                            |
| (4) Zanjani   | o           | uşağ         | ki         | çek-il-ir                 |                            |
|               | <i>that</i> | <i>child</i> | <i>who</i> | <i>PULL-PASS-PROG.3SG</i> |                            |
| (5) Shahsevan | o           | uşaq         | ke         | çek-el-er-e               |                            |
|               | <i>that</i> | <i>child</i> | <i>who</i> | <i>PULL-PASS-PROG-3SG</i> |                            |

As mentioned above, in general, Persian (1) and Sistani Persian (2) diathesis is analytic, i.e., a combination of an auxiliary with a main verb, whereas Garusi Kurdish (3) uses a synthetic passivization, i.e., the verb form changes and different suffixes attach to the stem of the verb. Similar to Garusi Kurdish, the construction of passive in Zanjani (4) and Shahsevan (5) Turkic is synthetic. They are also characterized by adding the passive suffix to both transitive and intransitive stems.