LOANWORDS AND THEIR VARIATION IN KURDISH

AVEEN MOHAMMED HASAN

Aveen Mohammed Hasan, PhD, Assistant Professor
English Language Department
Faculty of Humanities
University of Zakho, Kurdistan Region-Iraq
e-mail: aveen.hasan@uoz.edu.krd
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9974-9665

Dr. Aveen Mohammed Hasan is an Assistant Professor in general linguistics and Head of English Language Department at the Faculty of the Humanities, University of Zakho-Duhok, Kurdistan region-Iraq. She holds a Master of Arts degree in English Language and Linguistics from University of Mosul, Iraq (2005) and PhD degree in general linguistics from University of Ulster, the United Kingdom (2012). She has taught different courses, such as phonetics, phonology, semantics, syntax, translation at graduate level and courses like academic writing, research methods, phonetics and phonology at the postgraduate level. She also supervised different graduate and postgraduate research projects in the fields of general and applied linguistics. She has published a number of scientific research articles in national and international scientific journals and participated in different local and international conferences, workshops and training courses within her own specialty. She is the editor of the "Journal of Comparative Studies" and a member of the Editorial Board of "Humanities Journal" of University of Zakho. Currently, she works and conducts researches in the fields of general linguistics, applied linguistics, phonetics and phonology.

ABSTRACT

Loanwords are the words that are borrowed from other languages to be incorporated into a recipient language to be part of its linguistic system. Using loanwords is influenced by different factors and differs from one language or dialect to another. The current study compares the usage of loanwords in the written texts of two dialects of Kurdish, namely, Northern Kurmanji dialect (NK) and Middle Kurmanji dialect (MK) to identify which dialect uses loanwords more frequently. "Avro" and "Khabat", the two local dailies, are used representing NK and MK respectively. The content of some of their articles are analysed according to the topics, i.e. politics, economics, law, science, arts and sport and the loanwords of each topic are categorized according to the number of occurrence, donor language and part of speech.

The results reveal that MK dialect uses loanwords more frequently compared to NK. There are inter and intra-dialectal variation according to factors such as the topic and donor language while no differences have been noted according to the part of speech. Thus, the current study reveals that adopting and using loanwords are significantly influenced by different factors such as dialect, topic, linguistic category and donor language.

Keywords: loanwords, Kurdish, NK dialect, MK dialect, linguistic variations

INTRODUCTION

When languages come into contact, borrowing words between languages becomes very common (Nkoro 2016). In borrowing, one language gives words while the other takes. As a result of these two different roles, special names are used to denote the roles of languages in borrowing. The language that takes foreign words is called recipient language while the language that the words are taken from is known as donor language. Other terms are also used for both such as source language/borrowing language, and model language/replica language (Haspelmath 2009). In the current study, Kurdish is the recipient language. Likewise, a borrowed word is referred to with different terms by different linguists. Borrowed words are called loanwords and the term, loanwords, is originally translated item by item from German word Lehnwort (Kang 2013). However, borrowed words are not restricted merely to this term but rather different terms are used by linguists. Occasionally, loanwords can be replaced by some other terms like lexical borrowings or just borrowings (Kang 2013). Technically, the process is more than just borrowing because once words are borrowed, they are not returned but become part of the lexical system of the language (Bajzova 2009; Yule 2010). This study uses the term loanwords.

Loanwords are defined as new lexicons that entered a language from other languages and then went through modifications in phonemic shape, grammar, spelling or meaning according to the linguistic system of the recipient language (Bajzova 2009). Generally, they are entered into the vocabulary of another language at some point of its history because of borrowing (Haspelmath 2009). In other words, loanwords are those words that are taken from one language or dialect and then, whether words undergo some linguistic changes or not, are incorporated into another language. Loanwords are not only found in one language or the other, but almost in all languages as well. For example, forty-one languages were checked and on the basis of a cross linguistic survey of lexical borrowings, Haspelmath (2009) declares that the languages that have been checked were not devoid of loanwords, and further they estimate that there is no language in the world that is pure from loanwords (Kang 2013). As a result of this widespread existence, it is given a great deal of importance by linguists. Different factors affect borrowability such as morpheme type, parts of speech, lexical semantic field (Haspelmath

2008) and factors such as regional neighbourhood, commercial relationships, educational background (Mohammed 2018, 52) and bilingualism (Haspelmath 2008).

This study focuses on loanwords that are borrowed from other languages by the Kurdish language and compare them across two main dialects of Kurdish, namely Northern Kurmanji dialect (NK) represented by Bahdini subdialect and Middle Kurmanji dialect (MK) represented by Sorani subdialect. Kurdish belongs to the Indo-European family of languages. It is a member of the north-western subgroups of Iranian languages which are subdivisions of the Indo-Iranic branch of this largest family of languages in the world. The Kurdish speech area is divided among five neighbouring countries of Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Syria and Russia. Kurdish is divided into a number of dialects, namely, Northern Kurdish dialects (NK), Middle Kurdish (MK), Southern Kurdish (SK), Dmili or Zaza and Hawrami (Hasan, Rasheed 2016).

A few studies have been conducted on the phenomenon of loanwords in Kurdish, and most of the research analysed them in only one dialect (in Bahdini such as Mosa 2016; Rasheed 2012 and in Sorani dialect such as Azeez and Awla 2016; Hasanpoor 1999). No studies have ever compared loanwords across two dialects of Kurdish.

This study compares the use of loanwords across the two sub-dialects of Kurdish, namely Sorani and Bahdini. Secondly, it aims to analyse the use of loanwords according to topics, donor language and linguistic categories within and across the two dialects. Thus, it is an attempt to answer the following research questions:

1. Is there any difference in the use of loanwords across the two Kurdish dialects?
2. What are the factors affecting the use of loanwords in these dialects?
3. What are the donor languages each dialect borrowed from?
4. Does the use of loanwords vary according to the subject matter?
5. What parts of speech of loanwords are used most commonly by each dialect?

The study is limited to the use of loanwords in written language only not the spoken one. Hopefully, the study is valuable to the students and teachers of language and linguistics as it sheds light on an important strategy of word formation and its purpose generally in Kurdish. Moreover, it helps to fill a gap in Kurdish linguistic studies and identify the extent of borrowing in Kurdish. Besides, it contributes to the loanwords typology by adding another language, i.e. Kurdish to those that are already studied.

This study is organised as follows: The second section presents a theoretical background and literature review of previous studies on loanwords in Kurdish. In the third section, the methodological issues used in the data collection and analysis are presented. The fourth section is devoted to the discussion of the results arrived at in the present study. The fifth section provides a summary of the main conclusions the present study arrived at.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND LITERATURE REVIEW

LANGUAGE BORROWING PROCESSES

Words are borrowed differently from one language to another. Sometimes borrowed words are partially or totally changed. However, in some cases, words may not undergo changes at all. Hockett (1958 cited in Hoffer 2005) identified different language borrowing processes: loanwords, loan-shifts, loan-translation and loan-blends. Accordingly, loanwords are considered as only one type. The different borrowing processes will be discussed in this section.

Loanwords are referred to by Pasali (2014) as phonetic borrowings which are those words that are taken with their meaning, pronunciation and spelling. In accordance with this expression, loanword, is restricted to terms in which not only the meanings of the borrowed words are taken but also the phonemic shape that belongs to them as well. However, sometimes the loanwords are adapted to the phonological system of the recipient language, for instance, the phonemes of the borrowed words may partially or completely be replaced by recipient language phonemes. So, it can be said that the phonemes are partially or totally substituted and occasionally they may not be substituted at all (Swe 2013). The following are some examples of English loanwords in Chinese:

1	Mai ke feng	(Microphone)	(from Tian and Backus 2013)
2	Shafa	(Sofa)	
3	Saobei	(Copy)	(from Chen 2000)

Loan-blends, in addition, are complex words that are made up of, at least, one native portion and one copied portion (Tian and Backus 2013). Thus, this happens only when a part of a word is imported and the other part is replaced by a native word (Chen 2000). In this case, words are imported and substituted, therefore, partial substitution and partial importation is found (Swe 2013). For

instance, the English word <ice-cream> is partially imported and partially substituted in the Chinese language to form the word <bingqilin>. The word <bing> is a native word of Chinese that replaces the English word <ice> while the word <qilin> is imported from <cream> (Chen 2000). Other examples of loan-blends include:

— English loanblends			
4	In Chinese:	Miniqun	(Mini-skirt)	
5	In Czech:	Sebekritika	(Self-criticism)	(from Chen 2000)
6	In German:	Bockabuch	(Pocketbook)	(from Haspelmath 2009)

Furthermore, in Loan-shifts words are substituted but are not imported and they are divided into two subtypes: loan translation and semantic loans (Swe 2013; Chen 2000). For better grasping the meaning of both subtypes, they will be explained separately.

Loan translation. It is also called calque, which is the direct translation of the words, and includes "rearranging words in the base language along a pattern provided by the other and thus create a new meaning" (Tian and Backus 2013). That is, foreign words are reorganized by the lexical units of the recipient language in accordance with the pattern that is given by the donor language; therefore, a new meaning comes to existence. Thus, two or more words of the receiving language, which are equivalent to the words of the source language, are joined together on the basis of the pattern of the source language (Tian and Backus 2013). In other words, translation loans are foreign words or expressions that are translated item by item with the equivalent words or expressions of the recipient language, that means, only the notion of the word is borrowed from a foreign language and not the word itself. Thus, this notion is expressed by the recipient language lexical items (Pasali 2014). Consider the following examples (adapted from Chen 2000 and Tian and Backus 2013).

— In Chinese			
7	Youtong	Post-box	English
8	Chaoren	Superman	English
9	Zuqiu	Football	English
— In English			
10	Adam's apple	Promme d' Adam	French
11	New wave	Nouvelle	French
12	Brainwashing	Xì năo	Chinese
13	Masterpiece	Meesterstuk	Dutch

Semantic loans. They are also known as free translation of words that are foreign. Therefore, it is not necessary to obey the model and arrangement of the original word but rather it is merely a procreation of the general meaning of the original one (Tian and Backus 2013). In semantic loans, only the new notions of the borrowed words are taken, and by native phonemes, new compounds are made (Chen 2000). For instance, the Chinese word <huo che> is freely translated from the English word, train, which literary means (fire vehicle) and because of not having a corresponding unit to the word train, this compound word is created to imply the object that is called, the train, in English. Moreover, semantic loans are slightly similar to semantic extension, which implies an indigenous (native) word of a language that does not have multiple meaning but makes an extension in its meaning by taking the meanings of a corresponding foreign word that has more than one meaning. Thus, the number of the meanings of the word, indigenous word, parallels to the number of the meanings of the equivalent foreign word (Tian and Backus 2013). For example, the Indian word <vidyut> which only meant lightening, is extended to mean electricity too. Consider also the following examples (from Tian and Backus 2013 and Haspelmath 2009).

— In Chinese				
14	bing du	(literal: Illness poison)	Virus	English
15	dian hua	(literal: Electronic conversation)	Telephone	English
16	huo che	(literal: Fire vehicle)	Train	English
— In German				
17	Um-welt	(literal: Around world)	Milieu (mid place)	French

REASONS FOR BORROWING

Borrowing is one of the major processes and the most prolific (fruitful) ways of enriching the vocabulary of a language to become more beautiful and more expressive. However, in the process of borrowing, several reasons are considered. According to Pasali (2014), there are two main reasons for borrowing which are: internal and external linguistic reasons. In addition, Mosa (2016) considers convenience as another reason for borrowing.

The internal linguistic reasons include the necessity of borrowing and finding a more accurate word.

With regards to the necessity of borrowing, when a language lacks to have words to refer to certain phenomenon, concepts and elements or objects, foreign words are borrowed to give a place to

the unavailable word or expression in the cognitive basis of language – receptor (Pasali 2014). These loans are called "loanwords by necessity" or "cultural borrowings" (Haspelmath 2009, 46). Thus, borrowing fills the gap existing in a language. The point that should always be taken into consideration is the new inventions, discovery and phenomenon by which new words and meanings come into existence to be referred to. Once they are available in a language, they can simply be borrowed by another language. For example, words like Google, Facebook, Youtube, Instagram, Viber, Whatsup, Telgram, selfie and many others have lately come into existence and then adopted by many languages.

As for finding a more accurate word, when an element in a language has a name to be referred to but is not precise enough and is more or less general, it needs a more specific name to be implied, that is why a foreign word or concept is adopted to call attention to that element more accurately. So, the meaning could be similar but the foreign word gives a specific name to the object while the native word becomes more general (Pasali 2014). These types of loans are called "core borrowings" (Haspelmath 2009, 48). In this case, the sense of the word being a borrowing from another language is totally lost or is not conceived in the recipient language.

The external linguistic reasons include the socio-psychological reason and strengthening the international relations.

The socio-psychological factor considers the prestige issue as the reason for borrowing, i.e. sometimes the recipient language adopts a foreign word because it is prestigious (Pasali 2014). The prestige issue implies those words that are thought to be the most correct and have a superior variety. For instance, the English word, cow flesh/ cow meat, are native terms but for creating the effect of prestige, the term, beef, is adopted from French word <boeuf>. The same is true with the word, pig flesh/pig meat, which has a prestigious word <pork> from the French term <porc>. The modish (stylish) words are always preferred from stylish foreign cultures by people for the purpose of engaging in the modern tendencies (Bajzova 2009).

Furthermore, borrowing can strengthen the international relations. In other words, a language may use those foreign words that are utilized by many other languages of the world for the purpose of internationalism and globalism (Pasali 2014).

Finally, Mosa (2016) points out another factor of borrowing which is convenience. It is argued that to adopt a word is much easier than to make up an original one from nothing. That is, coining a new word from nothing is harder compared to taking a word from

other languages. Thus, loanwords can be regarded as the easiest way for filling the gap of an unavailable word in a language.

PREVIOUS WORKS ON LOANWORDS IN KURDISH

The literature on Kurdish loanwords is limited both in scope and depth. A comprehensive study requires both diachronic and synchronic insights however the literature on the subject usually includes semantic and phonetic changes of loanwords. The majority of the Kurdish previous studies on loanwords analysed two subdialects, Bahdini (from NK) and Sorani (from MK), individually. No studies comparing the two dialects have been conducted.

For Sorani subdialect, different studies analysed loanwords from different perspectives. For example, Azeez and Awla (2016) surveyed lexical borrowings from English in Sorani. The investigation is based on a wordlist that consists of 358 English loanwords that were found in Sorani. The loanwords are categorized into three phonological-based patterns which are assimilated, partially assimilated and non-assimilated. The results show that Kurdish borrowed words from English are mostly assimilated because it takes the highest rate in their study i.e. 196 words are assimilated. While partially assimilated words are 128 and non-assimilated words are 34. Furthermore, Hasanpoor (1999) carried out an investigation on the dynamics of European, Persian and Arabic borrowed words in Sorani Kurdish. Also, his case study investigated borrowing as an aspect of language contact and linguistic change, and analysed the morphological and phonological aspects of loanwords. His study made a comparison between two distinctive periods of the Sorani Kurdish development. That is, adopting words from Persian, Turkish and Arabic was unproblematic in pre-modern times but it has become problematic in modern standard Sorani. His primary sources for data collection were the prose writings of Kurdish poet and essayist Hemin. The results this study arrived at showed that words were borrowed from other languages as needed by moderate purists and when there were no corresponding words in Kurdish. In his study, foreign words were borrowed with several strategies, like: coining, loan-shifting, loan-blending and dialect borrowing so that the vocabulary be modernized. Loanwords are also revealed to be gone through loan-blending, that involves compounding and derivational processes by suffixes. According to this study, loanwords show the intricacy of the Kurds linguistic lives classified by international borders, political movements, national-states, dialects, and the pressures of the dominant languages like, Arabic, Turkish and Persian. In addition, Sabir (2016) analysed

loanwords found in political programs on several Kurdish TV channels. The purpose was to identify the semantic classification and reasons behind utilizing English words in TV political programs in Sorani dialect. She distributed questionnaires to people who run political programs, like the editors, announcers and reporters. The results demonstrated that English words are used more frequently than Kurdish corresponding words regarding politics field. She also reported that English words had undergone phonological and morphological modifications. She documented five factors of borrowing: prestige, modernization, semantic flexibility of English loans, enriching, and showing off (cited in Mosa 2016).

As for the NK dialect, Rasheed (2012) conducted a sociolinguistic study on Arabic words in NK. She collected the data by using two sources, interviews and mass media, written texts only. Regarding the interview, she took age, gender and education factors into consideration, and she used *Payv*, a monthly magazine (1993–2012), as a written source for collecting data for the purpose of discovering the changes that the Kurdish language had experienced since Kurdistan became an independent region. The findings demonstrated that males use more loanwords than females and uneducated speakers use fewer loanwords than educated speakers. Regarding the age, the middle-aged speakers, who were educated in Arabic, took the highest rate of loanword types. Furthermore, she also pointed out that nouns were borrowed more than other linguistic categories like verbs and adjectives. In addition, the study revealed that school/work and culture/tradition display the highest percentage of loanwords. Also, the study drew a comparison between Arabic and English as to the loans of which language were more frequently used during the years 1997–2002. It was revealed that the number of Arabic loans decreased while that of the English loans increased in Kurdish within these years.

METHODOLOGY

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study is based on the content analysis approach. Content analysis is a flexible research approach that is used with a wide variety of text sources. It is a research tool used to settle the existence of some specific words or concepts within texts or sets of texts. Moreover, this approach can be used with either quantitative or qualitative data. In addition, the way of using it can be deductive or inductive

(Elo and Kyngas 2007). This study involves written materials taken from newspapers on the basis of drawing a comparison across dialects of Kurdish. Furthermore, the comparison is associated with determining loanwords in selected texts of newspapers as to which one uses more loanwords in written materials than the other for the purpose of showing the dialectal variation of loanwords in Kurdish. For this reason, the study has made use of this approach.

THE STUDY DATA

The data of this study come from two different newspapers which are "Khabat" and "Avro". Moreover, each one of them is fundamentally used for a specific Kurdish dialect. "Avro" newspaper is specifically employed for analysing NK while "Khabat" newspaper is particularly used for MK. Furthermore, issue number 2244 of "Avro" and number 5404 for "Khabat" are used and both are in year 2017. These samples are randomly chosen. In addition, their articles are chosen and then analysed, for the purpose of determining loanwords in the articles, so that the two dialects can be compared.

PROCEDURE OF DATA ANALYSIS

The loanwords were picked from the newspaper articles which were related to different topics including: politics, economics, law, science, sport and arts. The part of speech of the selected loanwords, their donor language, number of occurrence as well as their meanings in English were also given. They were translated into English so that their meanings would be clear to the international readers. Furthermore, their parts of speech are given to identify what parts of speech of loanwords are used most commonly. Also, the donor languages have been indicated because loanwords have been adopted from several languages around the world so it is possible to tell from what donor language the words are mostly borrowed. More importantly, some loanwords have been used several times in the same text, so, their number was carefully recorded in the table. However, the real focus is on their number of occurrence as it is the one which shall draw a comparison within a dialect and across dialects. Table 1 shows the procedures of data analysis.

Table 1. Data analysis procedures

No	Topics	Article titles	Newspaper	Loanwords	No of occurrence	Meaning	Part of speech	Donor language
1	Politics	"Emrîka namek bû Qasim Silêman hinart"	(2017). "Avro" 2244	Retkir	1	Refuse	Verb	Arabic
2				Retkirin	1	Refuse	Noun	Arabic
3				Feylaq	1	Legion	Noun	Arabic
4				Syasî	1	Political	Adjective	Arabic
5				ḥeşid	1	Crowd	Noun	Arabic
6	Politics	"Şehîdbûn le pênawî nîştîmanda"	(2017). "Khabat" 5405	Şeref	1	honour	Noun	Arabic/ Turkish
7				Şehîd	8	martyr	Noun	Arabic
8				Şehidbû	9	martyred	Verb	Arabic
9				Şehîdbûn	3	martyring	Noun	Arabic
10				Dîmukrat	3	Democratic	Adjective	English

In the second stage of data analysis, comparisons are made. Firstly, the number of occurrences of loanwords in one dialect is compared with that in the other dialect. This will help to identify the dialectal differences in the use of loanwords. Secondly, the number of occurrences of loanwords in one topic is compared with that in the other topics within a dialect and across the dialects. This comparison will help to identify the effect of topic on the number of loanwords within and across dialects. Thirdly, the number of occurrences of a specific part of speech is compared to the number of other parts of speech within a dialect and across dialects. This will help to provide information about the effect of the part of speech on the number of the occurrences of loanword within and across dialects. Finally, the number of occurrences of loanwords from a specific donor language is compared with other languages within a dialect and across dialects. This gives information about the language from which Kurdish makes borrowing mostly. The investigation was carried out on twenty-five articles of "Avro" and "Khabat" newspapers and the total number of words of the articles is 9594 words.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

DIALECT

"Avro" newspaper for NK and "Khabat" for MK were examined with respect to the number of occurrence of loanwords. Twelve articles from "Avro" and thirteen from "Khabat" were analysed. The total number of words of the articles for "Avro" was 4938 and for "Khabat" 4656. The total number of loanwords in NK was 312 and in MK 346. Table 1 summarises the total number of loanwords for both dialects.

Table 2. Number of loanwords and their percentages in NK and MK

Dialect	Total number words examined	Total number of loanwords	Percentage
NK	4938	312	6.31%
MK	4656	346	7.43%
Total	9594	658	6.85%

The results show that there is a difference between the two dialects with regard to the number of the loanwords. MK uses loanwords more frequently than NK dialect. This could be due to the fact that MK has accorded more official status than NK as it has been the second official language of Iraq since its creation after World War I and recently the first in Iraqi Kurdistan Region (Thackston 2006). It is the language of media, education and literary activity. Thus, it is a more prestigious and widely used variety of Kurdish that is why it needs to enhance its linguistic system. Additionally, MK used borrowing (especially from prestigious donor languages: Arabic (as the first official language of Iraq and the language of the religion) and English (as a global language) as a way to enhance its prestigious status and gain more social superiority. Field (2002, 4) has stated that borrowing is a sign of social superiority and education especially when it is from prestigious donor languages. NK is still far from being a unified, normalised or standardised language as it has not been the written means of communication in the largest areas in which it is spoken. It is only recently that NK has accorded some official status as it is used in the education, media but only in the NK speaking area in the Iraqi Kurdistan region (Ibid).

TOPICS

This section presents the rate of using loanwords according to the subject matters or the topics. In both dialects, the words of the articles of six topics have been analysed; however, the frequent use of loanwords is different from one dialect to another and one topic to another. The number of loanwords of each topic in NK and MK is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. The rate of occurrence of loanwords according to the topics in NK and MK

No	Topics	NK			MK		
		Number of words analysed	Total number of loanwords	Percentage	Number of words analysed	Total number of loanwords	Percentage
1	Economics	1128	97	8.59%	638	46	7.21%
2	Science	814	78	9.58%	1277	91	7.12%
3	Politics	928	56	6.03%	1277	91	7.12%
4	Arts	890	43	4.83%	798	66	8.27%
5	Law	759	24	3.16%	450	47	10.44%
6	Sport	419	14	3.34%	520	19	3.65%
	Total	4938	312	6.31%	4656	346	7.43%

The table shows that in NK, science has got the highest percentage of loanwords followed by economics; whereas law got the lowest percentage of occurrences of loanwords. In contrast in MK, law has got the highest number of loanwords followed by arts and similar to NK, sport got the lowest number of occurrences. It seems that in comparison with other fields, NK lacks specialised vocabularies related to science and MK related to law that is why loanwords are more frequently used in these two subjects.

DONOR LANGUAGES

In terms of donor languages, the analysis revealed that loanwords in both dialects have been borrowed from several languages including English, Arabic, French, Persian and Turkish. Table 4 shows the main percentages of borrowing from each language identified in the study.

Table 4. The rate of occurrence of loanwords according to the donor languages in NK

No	Donor languages	Number of loanwords in NK	Percentage	Number of loanwords in MK	Percentage
1	Arabic	154	49.35%	154	44.50%
2	English	141	45.19%	164	47.39%
3	Persian	10	3.20%	3	0.86%
4	French	6	1.92%	17	4.91%
5	Turkish	1	0.32%	8	2.31%
	Total	312		346	

The table illustrates that in both dialects the majority of the loanwords of NK come from Arabic and English with some differences. In NK the highest percentage of borrowing comes from Arabic followed by English, while in MK the highest percentage comes from English followed by Arabic. This shows that English and Arabic have a big influence on the two dialects of Kurdish: Arabic as the second language of the Kurdish Region and English as the foreign language that is studied in the schools of the region. In both dialects the other languages, namely, Persian, French and Turkish got the lowest percentages which indicates that they had less impact on these dialects.

These results are similar to Sabir (2016) who also found out that English loanwords are used more frequently in MK Kurdish. However, her study analysed only politics subject matter.

PARTS OF SPEECH

This part will analyse some linguistic categories of loanwords, i.e. noun, verb, and adjective. The result shows that nouns are the mostly borrowed category of words in both dialects. Adjectives and verbs are the least borrowed categories of words in the Kurdish dialects. Table 5 presents the rate of occurrence of loanwords according to the part of speech.

Table 5. The rate of occurrence of loanwords according to the linguistic categories in NK and MK

No	Part of speech	Number of loanwords in NK	Percentage	Number of loanwords in MK	Percentage
1	Noun	276	88.46%	281	81.21%
2	Adjective	31	9.93%	40	11.56%
3	Verb	5	1.60%	25	7.22%
	Total	312		346	

This result is supported by the findings of Rasheed (2012) in her sociolinguistic study on loanwords in NK dialect. She also demonstrated that nouns are the mostly borrowed words compared to verbs and adjectives. This result is also widely acknowledged in other studies (Hapeslmath 2008; Matras 2009). The primary motivation for lexical borrowing is to extend the referential potential of a language and because reference is established through nouns, these categories are borrowed more easily than other parts of speech (van Hout and Muysken 1994). "[I]t is the most differentiated domain for labelling concepts and role" (Matras 2009, 168). Meanwhile, verbs are difficult to be borrowed because it is not easy to incorporate them into the language. In Kurdish it is observed that the borrowed verbs seem to be borrowed as nouns, then Kurdish employs its verb formation strategies to turn the borrowed forms into verbs before using them. For instance, the words <rat, şehid> (refusal, martyr) are nouns borrowed from Arabic but they are used as verbs by adding the verb formation suffixes <kirin and bun> to get the verbs <ratkirin, şehidbûn> (to refuse, to be martyred).

CONCLUSION

This study has analysed loanwords in Kurdish and the way they differ across the two widely used dialects of Kurdish: NK and MK. The study is based on the content analysis of the articles of two newspapers, which are "Khabat" representing MK and "Avro" newspaper representing NK. The loanwords have been analysed according to topic, their number of occurrences, donor language and part of speech within and across the dialects.

The study showed that adopting and using loanwords are significantly influenced by different factors such as dialect, topic, linguistic category and donor language. It is established that MK utilizes loanwords more frequently than NK dialect as a means to gain more prestige and social superiority. Concerning topics, In NK dialect, science takes the highest percentage and sport the lowest. While in MK law displays the highest rate of loanwords and similarly to NK, sport the lowest. Both dialects are influenced by Arabic and English and surprisingly less by the neighbouring languages such as Persian and Turkish. It seems that the two dialects are influenced by these two languages because they are in direct contact with them: Arabic as the official language of the country and the language of religion, and English as a foreign language studied in the schools of the region. Regarding the grammatical categories of words, noun loanwords

are mostly used in both NK and MK dialects and verb loanwords are the least used in both dialects. This result is widely supported by previous studies in other languages.

The study is important as it shows the rate of borrowing in two major dialects of Kurdish and how that rate varies according to factors such as dialects, topics, donor languages and word categories. It is necessary to investigate the rate of borrowing in other dialects as well.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Azeez, R. A. and Awla, H. A. (2016). "A Survey on Loanwords from English to Kurdish." *International Journal of Kurdish Studies* 2 (1), 11–28.

Bajzova, J. (2009). *English Loanwords in Czech Business Texts.* Bachelor Thesis. Thomas Bata University.

Chen, Sh. (2000). "A Study of Sanskrit Loanwords in Chinese." *Yuan-Ze University the Tsing Hua Journal of Chinese Studies* 30 (3), 375–426.

Elo, S. and Kunga, S. H. (2008). "The Qualitative Content Analysis Process." *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 62 (1), 107–115.

Field, F. W. (2002). *Linguistic Borrowing in Bilingual Context*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin's Publishing Co.

Hasan, A. M. (2012). *Kurdish Intonation with Reference to English.* PhD Thesis. University of Ulster, UK.

Hasan, A. M. and Rasheed, R. A. (2016). "Glide Insertion and Dialectal Variation in Kurdish." *European Scientific Journal* 12 (14) 289–307. Available at: <http://eujournal.org/index.php/esj/article/view/7451> (accessed May 2021).

Hasanpoor, J. (1999). *A Study of European, Persian and Arabic Loans in Standard Sorani.* PhD thesis. University of Uppsala, Sweden.

Haspelmath, M. (2008). "Loanword Typology: Steps toward a Systematic Cross-linguistic Study of Lexical Borrowability." In: Stolz, T., Bakker D. and Palomo R. S. (eds.) *Aspects of Language Contact: New*

Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special Focus on Romancisation Processes. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 43–62.

Haspelmath, M. (2009). "Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues." In: Haspelmath, R. and Tadmor, U. (eds.). *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook.* Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 35–54.

Hoffer, B. L. (2005). "Language Borrowing and the Indices of Adaptability and Receptivity." *Intercultural Communication Studies* XIV (2) Available at: https://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/05-Bates-L.-Hoffer.pdf (accessed May 2021).

Kang, Y. (2013). "Loanwords." *Oxford Bibliographies Online*. Doi: 10.1093/OBO/9780199772810-0027.

Matras, Y. (2009). *Language Contact.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mohammed, F. O. (2018). *An Analysis of the Use of Euphemisms in English and Kurdish texts.* PhD Thesis. University of Salahaddin.

Mosa, K. W. (2016). *A Morphosyntactic Analysis of Arabic Lexical Borrowings in Badhini Kurdish. MA Thesis*. University of Malaya.

Nkoro, I. O. (2016). "Literary Translation and Loanwords: A Study of English and Igbo Translations of Franz Kafka's *Brief an den Vater*." *Sino-US English Teaching* 13 (1), 63–71.

Pasali, N. (2014). "The Role of English Borrowings in Modern Russian Language." *Analele Ştiinţifice Ale Universităţii De Stat "B. P. Hasdeu" Din Cahul* X, 70–74.

Rasheed, R. A. (2012). *A Sociolinguistic Study of Arabic Loanwords in Northern Kurmanji Kurdish. MA Thesis.* University of Essex.

Sabir, P. H. S. (2016). "Borrowing, the Outcome of Language Contact." *Journal of University of Human Development* 2 (1), 456–464.

Swe, Th. (2003). "A Study of English Loanwords for Science and Technology in the Myanmar Language." *Dagon University Research Journal* 5, 5–13.

Thackston, W. M. (2006). *Kurmanji Kurdish: A Reference Grammar with Selected Readings.* Available at: <http: //www.fas.harvard.edu/ Iranian/kurmanji/kurmanji-complete.pdf/> (accessed May 2021).

Tian, A. and Backus, A. (2013). "Transliteration or Loan Translation: Constraints on English Loanwords' Integration into Mandarin Chinese." In: *Tilrburg Papers in Culture Studies*. Tilburg University Understanding Society.

Van Hout, R. and Muysken, P. (1994). "Modelling Lexical Borrowability." *Language Variation and Change* 6, 39–62.

Yule, G. (2010). *The Study of Language*. 4th ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.