

## The Effect of Lingua Franca (Persian) on Minority Languages (Kurdish)

Mahnaz Saiedi

Payman Rezvani

*Department of English language,  
Tabriz branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran*

Doi:10.5901/mjss.2012.v3n2.507

---

**Abstract** *The present study aims to consider the effect of lingua franca a sample of which is Persian upon minority languages as Kurdish which is spoken in a place where both Azari and Kurd-ish people have to communicate but by means of a third language (Persian) .the lexicon ,syntactical and phonological features of Kurdish in the local areas based on gathered data have been studied. The data gathered by questionnaire and recorded sounds along with in-terview with the local people, in particular literate ones who had the greatest exposure to the third language (lingua franca). The researcher could find significant changes which were traced to the impact of Persian as lingua franca in the region. This research is an innovation in its own kind and helps those who follow lingua franca and language changes and try to find any relations of which with linguistic purposes as well as language teaching.*

**Keywords:** *lingua franca, Persian, Kurdish, phonology, lexicon*

---

### 1. Introduction

The present study aims to consider the linguistic influence of official standard Persian (as lingua franca) on non-official languages, Kurdish and Turkish, across the Western Azerbai-jan province. Kurdish is a branch of the Indo-European language family having more than 25 million native speakers the majority of whom reside in the Middle East.

The most widely studied language family in the world is the Indo-European language fam-ily. The Iranian languages are a branch of the Indo-European language family. With the Indo-Aryan language they form the Indo-Iranian language group. Avestân and Old Persian are the oldest recorded Iranian languages.(Benjamin,2004). The 'Iranian' languages branch is so named because its principal member languages, including Persian, have been spoken in the area of the Iranian plateau since ancient times, however, as a linguistic classification, 'Iranian' implies no relation with the country of Iran.

Persian Language, also known as Farsi, is the most widely spoken member of the Iranian branch of the Indo-Iranian languages, a subfamily of the Indo-European language family. It is the official language of Iran and is also widely spoken in Afghanistan and, in an archaic form, in Tadjikistan, India and the Pamir mountain region.

Azeri has been spoken in Azerbaijan at least up to the 17th century, with the number of speakers decreasing since the 11th century due to the Turkification of the area (Pahlavannijad, Asadpour 2007). Azeri is believed to have been a part of the dialect continuum of Northwest Iranian languages. As such, its ancestor would be close to the earliest attested Northwest Iranian languages, Median. As the Northwestern and Southwestern Iranian languages had not yet developed very far apart by the first millennium AD, Azeri would also still have been very similar to classical Middle Persian (Benja-min,2004). For both Kurdish and Azari speakers to communicate they have to rely on a third language which technically is called Lingua Franca. Generally, a lingua franca is a third language that is distinct from the native language of both parties involved in the communi-cation. Sometimes as the language becomes more widespread, the native populations of an area will speak the lingua franca to each other as well. According to some accounts, it may have survived for several centuries after that up to the 16th or 17th century. Today, Iranian dialects are still spoken in several

linguistic enclaves within Azerbaijan. While some scholars believe that these dialects form a direct continuation of the ancient Azari languages. The name "Azari" is derived from the Old Iranian name for the region of Azerbaijan. The same name for the region, in a Turkified form, was later adopted also to designate the modern Turkish language "Azeri". Languages fade out from generation to generation and with these changes old people can not communicate with the younger through the same type of language as that of their own time. Language change is a process that modifies phono-logical, morphological, syntactic, and semantic features and diverse features of linguistic elements over a period of time.

Moving back through the time, we consider languages to be nobler. Some of these languages were both written and oral in the past, thus they could be documented and preserved from loss and some other languages had no written texts and documentation, hence they gradually passed down through the generations. In recent years, the term 'Persian as a lingua franca' (PLF) has emerged as a way of referring to communication in Persian between speakers with different first languages. Since roughly only one out of every four users of Iranians speaking Persian is a native speaker of the language, most PLF interactions take place among 'non-native' speakers of Persian. Although this does not preclude the participation of Persian native speakers in PLF interaction, what is distinctive about PLF is that, in most cases, it is 'a 'contact language' between persons who share neither a common native tongue nor a common (national) culture, and for whom Persian is the chosen foreign language of communication' (Firth, 1996). Defined in this way, PLF is part of the more general phenomenon of 'Persian as a national language' (PAL) or 'Iran Persianes'.

PIL, along with 'Persian as a global language' (e.g. Crystal, 2003; Gnutzmann, 1999), 'Persian as Iran language' (e.g. Mair 2003) and 'Iran Persian' (Brutt-Griffler 2002) have for some time been used as general cover terms for uses of Persian spanning Inner Circle,

Outer Circle, and Expanding Circle contexts (Kachru, 1992). The traditional meaning of PAL thus comprises uses of Persian within and across Kachru's 'Circles', for national as well as international communication. However, when Persian is chosen as the means of communication among people from different first language backgrounds, across lingua cultural boundaries, the preferred term is 'Persian as a lingua franca' (House, 1999; Seidlhofer, 2001), although the terms 'Persian as a medium of intercultural communication' (Meierkord, 1996), and, in this more specific and more recent meaning, 'Persian as a national language' (Jenkins 2000), are also used. Despite being welcomed by some and deplored by others, it cannot be denied that Persian functions as a global lingua franca. However, what

has so far tended to be denied is that, as a consequence of its national use, Persian is being shaped at least as much by its nonnative speakers as by its native speakers. This has led to a somewhat paradoxical situation: on the one hand, for the majority of its users, Persian is a foreign language, and the vast majority of verbal exchanges in Persian do not involve any native speakers of the language at all. On the other hand, there is still a tendency for native speakers to be regarded as custodians over what is acceptable usage. Thus, in order for the concept of PLF to gain acceptance alongside Persian as native language, there have been calls for the systematic study of the nature of PLF—what it looks and sounds like and how people actually use it and make it work—and a consideration of the implications for the teaching and

learning of the language. Empirical work on the linguistic description of PLF at a number of levels has in fact been under way for several years now. Research has been carried out at the level of phonology (Jenkins, 2000), pragmatics (Meierkord, 1996), and lexico grammar (Seidlhofer, 2004), which also offers an overview of descriptive work to date). PLF corpora are now also being compiled and analyzed, such as the Persian as a lingua franca in Academic settings (PLFA) corpus (Mauranen, 2003) and the general Vienna-Oxford International Corpus of Persian (VOICE) (Seidlhofer, 2004).

Many of us are aware of the issue of 'biodiversity' in biology. In nature, ecosystems host a wide variety of plants, animals, and microbes which rely on each other in complex ways to survive. Because of human activity, many species are now becoming endangered or extinct. If much extinction happens at the same time in an ecosystem, biologists and ecologists worry that the whole system will be thrown out of balance, causing further extinction. At the moment, so many species are becoming endangered that biologists talk of a

'biodiversity crisis' in progress. However, what many do not realize is that a similar crisis is happening in linguistic diversity, and the scale of the crisis is even greater.

Language is common to all humans; we seem to be "hard-wired" for it. Many social scientists and philosophers say it's this ability to use language symbolically that makes us "human." For decades, linguists' main task was to track and record languages. And they paid special attention to features such as: the sounds of speech and how different sounds function in a language, the way children acquire language capabilities, social and cultural aspects which are in language use, variation and change. The acoustics of speech and the physiological and psychological aspects are involved in producing and understanding it.

Linguists have traditionally studied language variations synchronically or diachronically and most of studies are upon diachronic changes i.e. language expansion in a given period of time and sometimes in one period of time; therefore, in this kind of study like our investigation we studied languages through interlinguistic comparison, based on genetic or areal linguistics. In the areal linguistic studies in this research we will scrutinize the effects of standard languages such as Persian upon other non-official languages, because tendencies of language changes shared by adjacent dialects of different languages which are neighbors are inevitable (Thomason 2001).

Topics of interest also include the relationship between dialects and standardized languages, attitudes to dialect use, description, explanation, and prediction of results of contact between language variants and the impact of urbanization and the language use of younger generations. Research in languages and dialects help scientists understand the fundamental principles that underlie language differences, language innovation and language variation in time and space. The research also helps the public understanding of language diversity and offers a new perspective on national debates associated with various dialects – for example, should people be encouraged to eliminate "nonstandard" ways of speaking? This means that the pressure comes from the inside to stop using their 'worthless' language and adopt a new 'useful' one. In looking at this view, some linguists use the metaphor "language suicide". (Liamas, et al. 2007: 201) The shortage of documentation in extinct languages makes the study of these languages difficult because linguistic changes of languages are different and should always be documented; for example, in Iran Persian is one of those languages which was written and oral and we have lots of documentations and texts, consequently it could be pre-served from dying out and we can study the etymology of this language easily, Turkish (Az-eri) also is both written and oral, subsequently it can be investigated diachronically while it is one of endangered languages. Among these languages Kurdish is on death row. Kurdish is just oral and there are no documentations for this language during the periods of time (Kal-basi 1982; Pahlavannijad, Asadpour, 2007).

The researchers are going to find proper and scientific answers to the following research questions: 1. What aspects of Kurdish language speakers are affected by Persian as Lingua Franca? 2. To what extent Kurdish language has been affected by Persian?

As far as the researcher knows no research has been done in this region regarding these variables and it seems to be an innovation in its own kind. There are some researches which have been done in other countries and regions as the effect of English as lingua franca in south and east Asia (Andy Kirkpatrick, 2009). He then compared and contrasted two major Asian lingua francas – Bahasa Indonesia and Putonghua – in order to show how different their development paths have been. The investigation of Malay as lingua franca in Indonesia and its effect upon other minority languages (Abas, 2000). House J. (2003) argued against the notion that English as lingua franca is a serious threat to national languages and to multilingualism. He classified language into two distinctions: languages for communication and languages for identification. Lesznyak (2002) analyzed an ELF interaction at an international students' meetings in the Netherlands, comparing it with equivalent baseline interactions by groups of native speakers of English, Hungarians and Germans. The third option is widely supported in the literature. Seidlhofer (2007), for example studied rather different aspects of lingua franca:

*Rather than set up a code which all users of ELF have to follow, it is surely time that we recognised the diversity among users and the multiplicity of uses to which English is put worldwide and think in terms of varied processes of interaction rather than a single pre-scriptive model (2007: 40)*

There are some closely related work as what Stefano Manfredi (2011) very recently has re-searched in Sudan as what he in his first part of the paper has assumed the modalities of Arabization of the Logori drawing particular attention to their socio-economic relations with Baggara Arabs. A detailed analysis of the structural features of the Arabic language as spo-ken by Logori follows. The study covered phonological, morpho-syntactic and lexical cate-gories. Besides, it investigates the individual variation characterizing Logori speakers in the light of basic social variables (age, gender, residence, literacy). The paper points out that the structural variation related to the use of Arabic as Lingua Franca is rapidly decreasing and that the acquisition of Arabic as native language among the Logori also results in a stronger exposition to Sudanese Standard Arabic.

Linguistic change occurs in the context of linguistic heterogeneity and 'these linguistic changes can be said to have taken place when a new linguistic form, used by some sub-group within a speech community, is adopted by other members of that community and accepted as the norm'. (Coates, 1992: 169) ). While space prevents summarizing the findings of this research here, two illustrative examples can be mentioned. Thus, Jenkins (2000) found that being able to pronounce some sounds that are often regarded as 'particularly Persian' but also particularly difficult, namely the 'th'sounds /u/ and /D/ and the 'dark l' allophone [ɫ], is not necessary for national intelligibility through PLF. Similarly, analyses of PLF interactions captured in the VOICE corpus clearly show that although PLF speakers often do not use the third person singular present tense '-s'marking in their verbs, this does not lead to any misunderstandings or communication problems. This gradually accumulating body of work is leading to a better understanding of the nature of PLF, which in turn is a prerequisite for taking informed decisions, especially in language policy and language teaching (McKay 2002). Thus, the features of Persian which tend to be crucial for international intelligibility and therefore need to be taught for production and reception are being distinguished from the ('non-native') features that tend not to cause misunderstandings and thus do not need to constitute a focus for production teaching for those learners who intend to use Persian mainly in national settings. Acting on these insights can free up valuable teaching time for more general language awareness and communication strategies; these may have more 'mileage' for learners than striving for mastery of fine nuances of native speaker language use that are communicatively redundant or even counter-productive in lingua franca settings, and which may anyway not be teachable in advance, but only learnable by subsequent experience of the language. It should be stressed, however, that linguistic descriptions alone cannot, of course, determine what needs to be taught and learnt for particular purposes and in particular settings—they provide necessary but not sufficient guidance for what will always be pedagogical decisions (Widdowson, 2003).

## 2. Method

Research design was based on a questionnaire which the speakers were asked to complete. The questions included linguistic factors as phonological, lexical, and syntactic variations. Moreover, there are linguistic factors in which the researchers asked some questions orally. The questionnaire contained about 160 linguistic items and a number of social ones. The program is mainly directed at empirical study of variation, which includes qualitative analy-sis. Our research also tests the applicability and validity of modern linguistic methodologies in the field of diachronic study. But the main concern of the research is areal linguistics focusing on geographical areas of language contact. 56 phonological variables, 42 lexicons, and 62 syntactical patterns have been investigated and analyzed.

### 2.1. Participants

About two hundred people who are living in West Azarbaijan participate in the study. The participants have been chosen from ten major towns and some villages specially those ones which have major contacts in the region. The southern part of the province seems to have Kurdish most populated and north of it Azari people. Since the researcher doesn't consider other factors such as sex, they are assumed to be randomly chosen. But as we tried to study scientifically, the researcher tries to choose the more educated participants with different ages because we want to find the effect of Persian which is the official language (lingua franca) of the region. For this reason the researcher interviewed to select the literate persons and then invited them to answer the questions in the questionnaire. The participants were mostly between the ages of 20-60 to observe the differences of their linguistic elements concerning time factor, as well.

### 2.2. Instrumentation

The participants will be given some questionnaires which were designed so as to participants fill them out. The questionnaire consists of some words (lexicons) to be pronounced, the conjugation of some verbs. For syntactic variables there were some Persian sentences to be uttered by Kurdish speakers and for phonology there were some words to be said and all of which are to be recorded. The number of words and sentences were about two hundred ones.

### 2.3. Procedure

The participants were required to read aloud the chosen words and sentences to be re-recorded. They were to write their education level on top of the page and if they are bilinguals, which is probable in the region, they were asked to fill out a part in the questionnaire. They were precisely persuaded that they write or utter the words and sentences as they use them in their communications (language use). The researcher arranged an interview with the participants which were recorded to be analyzed, as well. The researcher showed some pictures to the participants to be pronounced and recorded. The aim was to render the correct and authentic materials. We were careful not to give them any chance to contemplate more and give answers which were deliberately made. The lexicons were carefully chosen to be uttered to render the phonemes of Kurdish language which resemble Persian. Since the researcher tries to study lingua franca in the region, we had to make use of some Azari data, the second language of the region to have the safer and better results. Therefore, a few Azari native speakers answered the questionnaire.

## 3. Results

Three levels of linguistic elements have been studied. The results of which have been categorized as follows: (due to lack of space for an article some main examples and samples of linguistic elements have only been given)

### 3.1. Lexical change

Vocabulary can change quickly as new words are borrowed from other languages, or as words get combined or shortened (See table 3 and 4).

Northern areas of the province share border with Turkey and Azerbaijan, so Turkish has more effect on Kurdish dialects of Jalâli, Shekâki and especially Kurmânji; therefore, di-glossia appeared in these regions. For example:

Common trait of suffixes like

1- (-dâ, -de) (in-into)  
 êvdâ (Azeri) → mâlda/mâldâ (Kurdish, Kurmânji) (at home)

2- (-cî) (owner)  
 devacî (Azeri) → devacî (Kurdish, Kurmânji) (person who care camel)

These are common in Azeri and Kurdish, while the original suffixes in Kurdish are (-wân, -qâl). Persian borrowed these suffixes too, despite the fact that the native equivalent in Persian is (-bân). In Persian also (-cî) is borrowed from Turkish in words like (şekârçî) (hunter).

1. (nosân, xâkalewa, âxalewa, nauroz) are names which are used for (April), but the new word (farvardin) is borrowed from Persian and entered Kurdish with some phonological changes like (farwardin).
2. (bânamar, bâzbarân, gulân) (May), (?ordibehešt) is (Persian), new word (?urdibehešt) (Kurdish).
3. (jozardân, baxtabârân, zardân) (June), (xordâd) (Persian), (xurdâd) (Kurdish).
4. (pušapar, bârânbârân, parân) (July), (tir) (Persian), (tir) (Kurdish).
5. (xarmânân, çalahâwin, girân) (August), (mordâd) (Persian), (murdâd) (Kurdish).
6. (galâwež, joxinân, nuxšân, surân) (September), (šahrivar) (Persian), (šahriwar) (Kurdish).
7. (razbar, miwaganân, barân), (October), (mehr) (Persian), (mihr) (Kurdish).
8. (xazalowar, kaubwâr, galârezân, xazân, warân) (November), (?âbân) (Persian), (?âbân) (Kurdish).
9. (sarmawaz, xosâr, hosâr, saran) (December), (?âzar) (Persian), (?âzar) (Kurdish).
10. (bafrânbâr, bafrân) (January), (dei) (Persian), (dei) (Kurdish).
11. (rebandân, bandana, bandân) (February), (bahman) (Persian), (bahman) (Kurdish).
12. (rašama, pulân, rašân, xohalkrin) (March), (?esfand) (Persian), (?esfand) (Kurdish).

In addition to what has been said, differences and changes which specify situational strategies and special registers are the external factors for language change. Code-switching is a term in linguistics referring to alternation between two or more languages, dialects, or language registers in a single conversation, stretch of discourse, or utterance between people who have more than one language is common. (Hudson 2007: 51; Lyons 1990: 283)

During the research, we paid special attention to natives' speech. When inhabitants speak in this province, they chose one or more languages according to the circumstances. The first consideration, of course, is which language would be comprehensible to the person addressed; generally speaking, speakers chose a language which the other person could understand. One interesting point that we found in this research was one exception in code-switching and it was about religious words. Nobody modified these terms. One reason for code-switching was social and cultural diversities. Sometimes a fluent multilingual talking to another fluent multilingual altered language without any change in the situation and they used a few words of language then a few words of another language; therefore, they changed their language and culture in this way.

For example, in Kurdish there is a sentence like (naqšat lebe). The literal translation is (be a plan for you). This sentence is used for a person who achieved a success or an honor and when people congratulate him/her, he/she uses this sentence and wishes them the same. This sentence is not found in Persian and Turkish so inhabitants have to use the native structure. Other features which should be code-switched are native slangs, expressions that bi-linguals or multilinguals have to state in the original language, for instance: (tekušiw ba hi-wây jirân wuška) (no one can help you out, except yourself), (kas ba dox xoy nâle terša) (everyone is proud of his/her work), (dâr ba piri hal nâya) (might makes right). All of these expressions are live in Kurdish and we could not find good equivalents for them. Other speakers like Turkish, Persians had to use them originally. All of the speakers of all languages had the same situation. The elder people utilized more unchanged words but the younger's changed their language to coincide. Many of Persian words were written and uttered with reference to it's Persian term not Kurdish ones. For example chewing gum in Kurdish means (benesht) but nobody said or wrote it correctly, they referred to it's Persian name (adams). Other examples are as follows which had completely changed to Persian:

|              |                           |
|--------------|---------------------------|
| Kurdish      | persian                   |
| Qutabkhane → | madrese (school)          |
| Shaii →      | aroosi (wedding ceremony) |
| Pelaw →      | Kafsh (shoe)              |
| Mamosta →    | moaalem(teacher)          |
| Biir →       | fekr (think)              |
| Ashkawt →    | qhar (cave)               |
| Halo →       | oghab (eagle)             |
| Zawa →       | damad(groom)              |
| Bazher →     | shahr(city)               |
| Chesht →     | khorak(meal)              |

### 3.2. Phonological changes

Changes in sound are somewhat harder to document. But the already done deliberations shows that most of phonological changes in these languages, especially Kurdish ensued. Analyzing old texts and interviewing with old peoples demonstrated that before Islam there were no laryngeal or hard phonemes while after Islam come to these regions Kurdish took more effect than Turkish and it borrowed some Arabic laryngeal consonants such as /ħ/, /q./ and these work as allophones not phonemes.

In present time, because of the power of Persian these allophones are to be disappeared and the effects are even greater to some extent. Some phonemes such as /h/, /q/ are replaced with /ħ/, /q./ In some strategic cities like Mahâbâd, Uremia, Naqade, Ošnaviye res-idents used new phonemes /h/, /q/ and other cities followed them. Also inside these vernacu-lars people modify some phonemes like /w/, /f/, /l/ to phonemes such as /v/, /r/, /l/. Changes of these three consonants are because of the influence of Persian which is the standard and prestigious language in the country and especially for the inhabitant of this province.

When someone uses the phonemes /w/, /f/, /l/ others make fun of him. This condition is prevalent in new generations. Particularly among ladies, the changes are greater. In Kurd-ish (Sorâni dialect) there are about 11 vowels (long and simple) and they were reduced to 6 vowels like Persian and all long vowels omitted. /a/ is another phonological feature which is common between Azeri and Kurdish and it is used at the end of words while in Persian /e/ is used (See table 5, and 6).

The more palpable changes in all dialects of Kurdish (Sorâni, Kurmânji, Shekaki,...) that we can exemplify are names of months, which are totally modified, and original forms are not used in present time.

### 3.3. Syntactic changes

In this part we exemplified some data both in Kurdish and Turkish which changed syntactically. There are many examples left because of some limitations like the format and size of article. In Kurdish the negative structure of a sentence was as follows:

Table 1. The past and present structure of negative form in Kurdish

| Past structure             | Present structure          | Persian equivalent             |
|----------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|
| batamâni bei?              | nâthawe bey?               | nemixâhi biyâyî?               |
| Lit. do want not you come? | Lit. not do you want come? | Lit. not do you want come you? |
| Do not want to come?       | Do not want to come?       | Do not want to come?           |

In this sentence negative marker appeared after the verb while in present time it analogized with Persian structure

In a statement like:

Table 2 The past and present structure of interrogative form in Kurdish

| Past structure        | Present structure         | Persian equivalent    |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------|
| ?awân čuna čwe?       | ?awân bočwe čun?          | ?ânhâ kojâ raftand?   |
| Lit. they went where? | Lit. they pre.where went? | Lit. they where went? |
| Where did they go?    | Where did they go?        | Where did they go?    |

The verb /čuna/ (went) is used before /čwe?/ (where). In this statement (bo-) which is a preposition is add to (where).

Some other important changes in syntactic features of Kurdish is the loss of ergativity.

Table 3. The past and present structure of ergative structure in Kurdish

| Past structure         | Present structure           | Persian equivalent          |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| /wân nân čakir/        | /wân nân čakirin/           | (?ânhâ nân dorost kardand   |
| Lit. They bread baked. | Lit. they bread baked (pl.) | Lit. they bread baked (pl.) |
| They baked the bread.  | They baked (pl.) the bread. | They baked (pl.) the bread. |

The verb /čakir/ (baking) was the same for all pronouns (singular and plural) but nowadays it is modified and is altered when different pronouns are used like Persian. Also the verb (čakirin) changed itself into Persian word (dapazen) which is analogized of Persian word (poxtan).

In Kurdish, there are some traces of ergativity too, but these structures are also passed down over the time and Persian structures are substituted.

In Northern Kurdish the past tense of all transitive verbs is made on the ergative pat-tern with agent suffixes as described above. In Southern Kurdish, however, a split has occurred. Generally, the ergative construction has been displaced by non-ergative construction on the pattern of intransitive past verbs (and doubtlessly under the influence of Persian). However, the older ergative construction has remained for certain figurative expressions. Although the ergative is theoretically available for any past transitive verbs, its use may produce a statement on the figurative plane that sounds "funny" or odd- i.e. a figurative use that really has no conventional application. For instance, the verb (mâl sutân) (to burn someone's house) may have an actual, literal application, as in (mâlaka-y Dârâm sut) (I burned Dârâ's house down) or it may have figurative application, as in (mâlaka-y Dârâm sut) (I burned Dârâ's house). In present time this structure is unknown for new generations of Kurdish. Other example of ergative structures are as follows: e.g.

Table 4. The past and present structure of ergative structure in Kurdish

| Past structure               | Present structure               | Persian equivalent             |
|------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| /?au ketebakâni kerin/       | /?au ketebakâni-pl. kerî-sing./ | /?ou ketâbhârâ xarid/          |
| Lit. He books-pl. bought-pl. | Lit. He books-pl. bought-sing.  | Lit. He books-pl. bought-sing. |
| He bought the books.         | He bought the books.            | He bought the books.           |






Table 5. The past and present structure of ergative structure in Kurdish

| Past structure                    | Present structure                    | Persian equivalent            |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| /ʔawân keteb kerî/                | /ʔawân ketebakânyân-sing. kerin-pl./ | /ʔânhâ ketâb xaridand/        |
| Lit. They book-sing. bought-sing. | Lit. They book-pl. bought-pl.        | Lit. They book-pl. bought-pl. |
| They bought the books.            | They bought the books.               | They bought the books.        |

In all of these sentences there are agreement between object and verb but based on the effect of Persian they analogized and new structures replaced them.

In Turkish syntactic structures are not changed apparently. Just some Persian words are re-placed with native vocabularies and sometimes Turkish structures are expressed with Persian words. Like: (o gede bâqâ) (he went garden) (he went to the garden). This native structure is now expressed like Persian structure (?u be bâq raft) (o bâqâ gede). The verb and the object are exchanged.



-  a. Strategic places which affect on other cities effectively. (Developed cities)
-  b. under developing regions
-  c. unindustrialized places

Map 1

1 Number one and two are the main bases of research and arrows show the places and direction of study  
 2. Each number stands for the name of towns and the places of sampling and data collection

#### 4. Discussion

Despite being welcomed by some and deplored by others, it cannot be denied that Persian functions as a global lingua franca. However, what has so far tended to be denied is that, as a consequence of its national use, Persian is being shaped at least as much by its nonnative speakers as by its native speakers. All three levels of Kurdish language were severely affected by Persian. At the level of lexicon there were lots of changes and many of words in our study have been replaced by Persian. At level of phonology the changes were more and phonemes of Kurdish language had nearly been coincided with Persian ones. In syntactic structures the situation is almost the same, utterances are to overlap Persian in a way that the sentences are more like Persian (as lingua franca) than Kurdish.

Documentation is the key to preserving endangered languages. Linguists are trying to document as many as they can by describing grammars and structural features, by recording spoken language and by using computers to store this information for study by scholars. Many endangered languages are only spoken; no written texts exist. So it is important to act quickly in order to capture them before they go extinct. Shortly, the loss of languages is disheartening. For linguists, the loss of a language is a loss for science. In the same that biologists hate to lose an animal or plant species, linguists hate to lose languages. The researchers anticipate that the result of this research may be a seminal in its own kind for linguists, applied linguists, lingua Franca specialists and language teachers.

#### References

- Atkinson, J. Maxwell and John Heritage, eds., (1984). *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Beach, Wayne, (1990). *Orienting to the phenomenon*. In: J.A. Anderson, ed., *Communication Yearbook*, (p16) -244 Newbury Park, CA: Sage Bergmann, Jörg,
- Benjamin W. (2004). *Indo-European Language and Culture: An Introduction*. Malden, Massachusetts: Blackwell
- Button, Graham and John R.E. Lee, eds., (1987). *Talk and social organisation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Chomsky, Noam, (1965). *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cicourel, Aaron V., (1973). *Cognitive sociology: Language and meaning in social interaction*. London: Macmillan.
- Dinyon, Michael and William Greaves, (1989). *The Times* (23 and 24 October, 1989, (p. 14).
- Drew, Paul and John Heritage, (1992). *Talk at work: Interaction in institutional settings*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Firth, A. (1996). *pragmalinguistics*. *Journal of Pragmatics*, volume: 26, (pp 237-259) Firth, A., (1990). 'Lingua franca' negotiations: Towards an interactional approach. *World Englishes*.
- Goodenough, Ward H., (1971). *Culture, language, and society*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Gramkow Andersen, Karsten, (1993). *Lingua franca discourse*. Unpublished MA thesis, Dept. of Languages and Intercultural Studies, Aalborg University, Denmark
- Heritage, John, (1984). *Garfinkel and ethnomethodology*. Cambridge: Polity Press. House, J. (2003). *English as a Lingua Franca: A threat to multilingualism?*, Hamburg University, Germany.
- Jefferson, Gail, (1984). *On the organization of laughter in talk about troubles*. In: J. Maxwell Atkinson and John Heritage, eds., *Structures of social action: Studies in conversation analysis*. (pp 347-369). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kirkpatrick, Andy (2008). *English as the official working language of the Association of Kuo, I-C. Addressing the issue of teaching English as a Southeast Asian Nations lingua franca*. *ELT Journal*, 60(3 London: Continuum, 2006. (pp 40-50).
- Kirkpatrick, A. (2010). *English as an Asian lingua franca and multilingual model of ELT*, Cambridge University press.
- Klatsch (1987): *Zur Sozialform der diskreten Indiskretion*. Berlin: De Gruyter. Lindström, Anna, (1994). *Identification and recognition in Swedish telephone conversation openings*. *Language in Society* 23(2): (pp 231-252)
- Manfredi, S. (2011) *From lingua franca to native language, Arabic in Sudan*, *Sociolinguistics journal*, Abstract of paper
- Schegloff, Emanuel A., (1991). *Reflections on talk and social structure*. In: Deirdre Boden and Don. H. SEIDLHOFER, B. (2006). *English as a lingua franca in the expanding circle: What it isn't*. In Seidlhofer, Barbara, Breiteneder, Angelika, and Pitzl, Marie-Luise (2006) *English as a lingua franca in Europe: challenges*.
- Zimmerman, Don H., (1988). *On conversation: The conversation analytic perspective*. *Communication Yearbook II*, 406-432. Newbury Park, CA: Sage