

E. JEREMIÁS

## ON THE GENESIS OF THE PERIPHRASTIC PROGRESSIVE IN IRANIAN LANGUAGES

### 1. Introduction

In this paper I shall discuss a special kind of aspect, the so-called progressive appearing in certain Iranian languages. In this frame of reference *progressive* means an aspectual nuance of the *imperfective* in its opposition to the *perfective*, as they are used in Slavonic languages and as they are defined by Comrie (1976).

In this terminology *perfective* means looking at the situation from outside, without distinguishing the internal structure of the situation (traditionally called “aoristic”), i.e. viewing it as a single whole event. *Imperfective* aspect shows the situation from inside with its internal temporal constituency. Thus the imperfective-perfective distinction is not necessarily an *objective* difference, but rather a different way of looking at the same situation (COMRIE 1976:4).

Consequently, when treating the aspect the most important questions are: – which grammatical categories do exist in the given language; – which are the semantic distinctions underlying these categories; – what kind of facts might influence the choice of aspectual forms. Further there is a question of how these underlying semantic distinctions can be detected in historical texts, which are limited in quantity and quality.

The historical reconstructions of grammatical levels differ from each other in this respect. In the case of phonology the material differences between two or more different stages of a given language can be described mainly by binary oppositions and the reconstruction of morphology mostly follows the reconstruction of phonology (SCHLERATH 1987:45). Regarding syntax and semantics the changes of the grammatical categories and of the underlying semantic systems are less obvious and, consequently, the reconstructions are more «theoretical» and arbitrary.

The traditional way of reconstructing syntactic and semantic patterns is to analyze the *inventory* of morphology. However, this can be misleading since morphology often represents the system of an earlier period. In the following I

shall attempt to reconstruct the development of some aspectual categories starting with the present-day situation. I will restrict my attention to the aspect, as expressed only by *periphrasis*, with reference to the verbal morphology, adverbs, non-finite and locative expressions excluded. The languages and dialects to be investigated are: Modern Persian with its closest dialectal variants and relatives, Western Iranian dialects (with occasional reference to some Eastern Iranian dialects) and, finally, the diachronic variants of Modern, Classical and Middle Persian.

## 2. Modern Persian

In Modern Persian the *formal* expression of the distinction between perfective and imperfective is restricted to the past tense (*kard-mikard*). This is a well-known fact. In many languages more differences can be expressed in the past than in other tenses. Here *imperfectivity* is expressed by a verbal prefix used already in earlier periods in the same function. In Modern Persian, however, its aspectual function is restricted to the past tense and when this prefix combines with the present-tense forms, it simply indicates *indicative*.

Moreover, in the *informal* register there is a periphrastic construction with progressive meaning<sup>1</sup>. It consists of an inflected form of the auxiliary *dâštan* ‘to have’ and an inflected form of the main verb. This progressive contrasts with continuous but non-progressive within imperfective as well as with non-continuous (perfective) forms (*dâšt mikard-mikard-kard*).

The use of this periphrastic progressive is restricted in several ways, namely *stylistically*: its use is optional, it is a hallmark of colloquial style; *syntactically*: it can be used only in indicative mood and in affirmative sentences; *lexically*: verbs form two disjoint sets according to their inherent aspectual properties, namely those which can appear in the progressive and those which cannot do it. The latter group (the so-called “stative” or “non-progressive” verbs) expresses the progressive by means of the *perfect* (*nešasteam* ‘I am sitting’) while the past perfect expresses their past progressive (*nešaste budam* ‘I was sitting’)<sup>2</sup>.

It follows that, on the one hand, the progressive can be combined with another, quite different, category: the *perfect*. On the other hand, the perfect forms, according to their lexical choice, can convey double function, the *resultative* and the *progressive*. Thus we have to extend the scope of one investigation to yet another aspect, namely to the *perfect*<sup>3</sup>. In fact, it is a semantically complex category of fairly wide applicability expressing different aspectual features of resultative character. Lazard (1985) reconstructed a “new” series of perfect forms by analyzing the underlying semantic distinctions. These forms, he says, have been developing a new aspectual meaning, viz. “inferential” (or: “distanced

past”)<sup>4</sup>. In his reconstruction the type *karde ast* has two slots in the semantic system with two different aspectual values: one resultative (in its “original” place) and one inferential (or: distanced past). This new aspectual value (with different nuances) has been derived from the original resultative meaning of perfect by recognizable processes (LAZARD 1985:42). They seem to be used in every register of Modern Persian.

To sum up: the morphological paradigm of Modern Persian in itself does not entirely reveal all the kinds of semantic distinction and stylistic usage which the verb forms cover. The meaning and the form of verbal phrases are highly determined by various factors, e.g. by *social context*<sup>5</sup>, lexical choice and the language users’ choice of modality, that is of that kind of aspectual nuance which they want to emphasize in a given situation.

At the same time these variations raise the question whether they represent the ongoing changes of the language or whether they are relicts of previous time, i.e. whether they are archaisms or innovations. Or, to put it differently: do socially used variations represent dialectal or diachronic variants of the same language? In the following I will try to answer this question by considering the dialectal evidence first and the facts of history next.

### 3. Other New Iranian dialects

In this short dialectal overview I will list, although only cursorily, those cases in which aspect (imperfective) is expressed by periphrasis and/or verbal prefix. However, this summary is bound to be incomplete. Except for certain descriptions of individual dialects (e.g. MAC-KENZIE, *The Dialect of Awroman* 1966) most of the work in this field is characterized by utmost conservatism. This means that the dialects are described by means of obsolete categories and under a strong influence of Formal Persian (Classical and Modern). Thus the (alleged) presence or absence of a given category often depends on the techniques used by the given linguist and, consequently, the descriptions are mostly artificially uniform<sup>6</sup>.

#### 3.1. Tajik

The periphrastic progressive is most prominent in Tajik where it occurs throughout the whole verbal paradigm. This paradigm, in an idealized full system at least, is very rich in various aspectual forms. The most prominent distinctive features in comparison with Persian are as follows: both its auxiliary (*istodari*) and the techniques used in periphrasis are different; the auxiliary in *perfect* is accompanied by the (old) past participle of the main verb (*χonda istodaam* ‘I

am reading<sup>7</sup>); the most striking feature is that while the Persian construction is an extension of the *imperfective* (*mikard*), the Tajik one is an extension of the *perfect* (*karda ast*). Moreover, in Tajik the original perfect has fully developed a new aspectual value, the *inferential* (or: “non-evident” in Tajik terminology), whose meaning dominates the whole perfect category (this is what only now goes on in Modern Persian, cf. LAZARD 1985). The Tajik progressive has no stylistic value (at least not in the sense in which the Modern Persian one has it) and is not restricted syntactically<sup>7</sup>. Moreover, the full forms occur only in the literary (written) style, while Tajik dialects use only the contracted forms (ZARUBIN 1928:117; LAZARD 1956:157; RASTORGUEVA 1964:88-100). The techniques of contraction differ across dialects, but remain mostly invariant within each dialect. E.g. the indicative present and past tenses (the most commonly used forms) have a wide repertory of contracted forms ranging from two-word expressions to one morpheme or even a single phoneme (-s-):

*rafia istodaam* > *rafsodiyam, raftosiyam, raftostiyam, rafsosiyam, rafsem;*  
*istodan* > *-sod-, -sos-, -ost-, -os-, -sa-, -se-, -so-, -is-, -s-*.

### 3.2. *Dari*

The other Persian-type language, Dari, is half-way between Persian and Tajik as far as its use of the analytic progressive is concerned. There is a wide range of “auxiliaries” used in aspectual forms (FARHĀDI 1955:81), although the verb *raftan* ‘to go’ is dominant. As to the techniques of periphrasis, the PP of the main verb is accompanied by the inflected auxiliary (*zada mērawam / raftam / mēraftam / rafia būdām / rafia mēbūdām / zada rafiastam / zada rafia mēbāšam;* Jefimov et al. 1982:183)<sup>8</sup>.

### 3.3. *The rest of the Western New Iranian dialects*

The verbal prefix occurs in nearly all the dialects (except the Caspian-dialects). It seems to be the oldest and the most widespread grammatical device to express imperfective meaning or aspectual nuance in general. Although the prefixes and constructions can be materially different<sup>9</sup>, functionally they are nearly the same.

The periphrastic constructions, like those in Modern Persian and Tajik, serve to convey aspectual values. The dialects using periphrasis are divided into two different groups according to the auxiliary and the techniques employed: one group using the auxiliary *dāštan* with the inflected forms of the main verb (the Persian-type auxiliiation), and another one using the perfect forms of the auxiliary *istādan* with the PP of the main verb.

The heterogeneous group of the so-called Central dialects together with Mazandarani belongs to the first group. Here not only the auxiliary is the same as in Persian, but also the techniques of the auxiliation are nearly the same<sup>10</sup>.

The second group consists of dialects which either use a periphrasis with *istâdan* or the contracted versions of it. These may be either two-word forms, derivational or inflectional suffixes or else enclitics etymologically related to the auxiliary. Theoretically it seems to be unjustified to combine the periphrasis with its (etymological) equivalents in a synchronic description. Tajik dialectology, however, justifies this method. Here the periphrasis and its derivatives represent different stylistic and geographic variants of the same synchronic system.

On this basis the following dialects form a separate, although somewhat heterogeneous group: Tajik, the Fars-dialects, Lari and some dialects from the Eastern Iranian group (Waxi: *-əs(k)*, Ishkashmi *-(ə)s*, Yidgha *-(ə)st(ə)*, *-(e)ste*, Yaghnobi *-išt*).

In this group the Fars-dialects and Lari call for some explanation. The Fars-dialects are known only from Mann's edition (1909). This is the main source of Kerimova's description (1982). In the verbal paradigm Kerimova gives three series of perfect forms, each based on the PP of the main verb<sup>11</sup>. The first series (for intransitive verbs) is formed by a so-called auxiliary, which consists of an *s*-element plus the verb 'to be'. The second and the third series encompass the transitive verbs. They differ among each other by one element: the second series has a *sâ* element attached to the verb phrase (*eš-dâde-sâ*).

However, if we analyze Mann's text, Kerimova's reconstruction will appear to be incorrect because in the list of the verb-forms in Mann's edition the simple past and the perfect forms are apparently mixed up. This is obvious from the stress indicated. It is well-known from colloquial Persian (and other spoken dialects) that these forms vary only in the stress placement and so they are usually predisposed to be contracted<sup>12</sup>. This means that there may have been a perfect formed by the enclitic 'to be' but without the *-s*-element.

Moreover, there are doublet forms in pluperfect (*qandâ búdäm / andísâ búdäm* 'âmade budam', MANN 1909:35) which vary only by having or not having the *sâ* element. Consequently, there are doublets in all the perfect tenses: perfect transitive, perfect intransitive and pluperfect. Mann calls forms containing this element *perfectum secundum* and identifies them with the Classical Persian *perfectum secundum*. They seem to be innovations ("junge Neubildungen") to him, but he is uncertain about their function. However, if we compare the translations of one and the same sentence ('*Ein Schiraser war nach Isfahan gekommen, hatte gehört, dass dort die Taschendiebe zahlreich sind*') in three dialects, we can get at some conclusions. (In the fourth dialect recorded by Mann this text is missing and so we quote another example instead).

(a) Somghuni: *Yä shîrâzî a isfahûn andîsa, shishnúf-sâ, ki unjá jîbbûr bisyâr hân* (61);

(b) Masarmi: *Yäk shîrâzî ushtäsâ isfahûn, shishnúftäsâ ke únjâ jîbbur lô hân* (83);

(c) Papuni: *Yä shîrâzî be isfahûn andâ bî, ishnúftä bísh, k₂ unjá jîbbûr bisyâr hân* (90).

(d) Buringuni: *Díg ishtísûm a kó a shikâl* ‘Gestern sind wir in die Berge auf die Jagd gegangen’ (91)

The forms with *s(â)* are apparently used in order to convey the typical aspectual values of perfect (resultative, narrative), possibly with the value of the inferential (or: distanced past) of the modern Tajik and Persian usage. In this respect the dialects (a), (b), (d) represent the same usage, but (c) does not: in Papuni this form is never used. Therefore the occurrence of this form in the Fars-dialects seems to be a *dialectal* element with the same (or nearly the same) meaning as that of the perfect forms.

Lari has similar doublets in perfect and pluperfect with an *-ess-/-est-* and *-esson-* element (MOLČANOVA 1982:436). In the latest description of the Lari verbal morphology (KOLBĀSI 1988) these ‘perfect’ forms (*xate-ss-em* ‘xâbide-am’, *xate-sson-em* ‘xâbide budam’) are clearly contrasted with the forms conveying progressive meaning (*a-dedâ-’em* ‘dâram mibinam’).

Thus these doublet forms in the Fars-dialects and in Lari seem to represent the contracted version of an analytic expression with the auxiliary *istâdan* (KERIMOVA 1982:351). As for the way of contraction, some of them are very close to Tajik dialect forms (*karsos, karsode, kar da is todas*; ZARUBIN 1928:118), but there is a distinct difference of their functions: perfect or pluperfect in the Fars-dialects and progressive in Tajik. In the texts at our disposal, even if the contexts are in most cases not explicit enough, the double perfect forms seem to represent *dialectal* (or stylistically different) variants without any additional “overtone” which would make them similar to the Tajik forms.

#### 4. Historical evidence

In early New Persian the *imperfective* (continuous, progressive, iterative, etc.) is definitely marked by the adverb (*ha*)*mē* (grammaticalized later as a verbal prefix) in opposition to the *perfective*<sup>13</sup>. *Perfect* forms in it are apparently fully developed.

Let us quote some examples showing how the aspectual nuances could be expressed in the past tense. Most examples available are taken from early Koran-translations and commentaries; the following ones come all from Yâhaqi’s text (1976):

[a] simple past:

(1) *gufūm bigīrēd īn kitābhā ki šumā-rā dādīm* (11)

(2) *yād kunēd ān waqt-rā ki bidādīm Mūsā-rā Tōrīt* (9)

[b] perfect:

(3) *farmānburdār nabāšand badīn χudāy-i dēn-i musalmānī az ān kashā kī ēšān-rā dādaand Tōrīt u Injīl* (232)

[c] perfect (II):

(4) *ān kashā kī dādaštīm ēšān-rā Tōrīt u Injīl* (21)

(4a) *az ān kashā kī dādastand-išān Tōrīt u Injīl* (97)

(5) *ān kashā kī bidādaštīm-išān Tōrīt* (157)

[d] pluperfect:

(6) *ān kashā-rā k-išān dāda būdand Tōrīt u Injīl* (preface 81, but on the given page (26) the text runs as *dādaand*).

In these examples [a] clearly contrasts with [b], and [c] with [d]. The latter group distinctly expresses the continuing relevance of a past situation for the present one. (There is also an aspectual difference between (1)-(2) and (4)-(5), since the verbal prefix (or proverb?) *bi-* puts more emphasis on the completedness of action, but this is of no importance here). As for the groups [b], [c] and [d]: the difference between [b] and [d] is clearly that of tense, irrespective of the example being correct or not. The question now is whether there is any aspectual (or any other) difference between [b] and [c]. In fact it is the problem of the form traditionally called *perfectum secundum*.

It is generally agreed upon that this formation in New Persian is a neologism explainable etymologically either as an extension of the 3rd sing. perfect (*kardaast* cf. SALEMANN-SHUKOVSKI 1947:67, HORN 1895-1901:154, JENSEN 1931:158, JEFIMOV et al. 1982:161) or – more plausibly – as a contraction of the PP and the auxiliary *ēstādan*. In the latter case it could be a survival of the Middle Persian *kird ēstēm* (or *kird \*istēm* (?), MACKENZIE 1984:55) and an ancestor of the Tajik *karda istodaam* (SALEMANN 1895-1901:314, LIVŠIĆ 1954, CEJPEK 1956:177, BAHĀR 1958: I, 306).

This new form appears from time to time, although not very frequently, in early prose (Lazard 1963:341) and in a special register of early poetry. As Boldyrev (1946) observes, it is mostly used in less formal or less solemn style, usually in the first and second persons, and always with an emphatic intonation. This Khorasani *-s-* or Nishapuri (obsolete) verb (as it is called by the Iranians) is not unknown to the early tafsirs, but there is a remarkable difference of its frequency

in them. Two of the tafsirs (YĀHAQI 1976, RAWĀQI 1976) use these forms fairly frequently, other – seldom (MATINI 1970, ĴOWEYNI 1983, ROUŠAN 1972) or hardly ever.

In the following I shall try to define some characteristic features of the usage of this form based on examples from the “šnqšy“ tafsir (YĀHAQI 1976) – one of the most remarkable texts of this genre – in terms of morpho-syntax, stylistics and dialectology.

In the text just mentioned all the six persons occur in the second perfect:

(7) *man āwurdastam šuma-rā nišān-ē* (72)

(7a) *būdastam yak rōz yā barxī az rōz-ē* (54)

(8) *čand rōzgār būdastī īnjā* (54)

(The 3rd person sing. forms coincide with the same perfect forms, so practically it is impossible to define them).

(9) *ḥarām nadārand ān-či ḥarām bikardast xudāy* (232)

(10) *Ay mu' minān bixwarēd az ḥalālḥā-ē ān-či rōzī dādastīm šumā-rā* (31)

(11) *ki-mā farmudastim andar Qur'ān* (117)

(12) *īn 'adāb badān ast kī šumā az pēš kirdastēd u guftastēd u xwastastēd andar kufr u širk-itān* (220)

(13) *ān-či farmūdastand-itān* (38)

As for their function they seem to have the same values as the perfect although sometimes slight differences occur in shades of meaning in keeping with the inherent aspectual properties of the lexical items used. In general, this form can be regarded as occurring mainly with the following verbs: *āfarīdan*, *awurdan*, *girawīdan*, *dādan*, *sigālīdan*, *fīristādan*, *farmūdan*, *kardan*, *giriŋtan*, *guzīdan*, *būdan*, *āmadan*, *šudan*, and chiefly in “set phrases” with the same context and content. I could find only one example in which this form expresses an aspectual shade of the perfect with a definitely continuous character:

(14) *xudāy guft cand rōzgār budastī īnjā? 'Azīr guft: būdastam yak rōz yā barxī az rōz-ē, guft načunīn ast šad sāl īnjā furōmurda budastī* (54)<sup>14</sup>

Now the question remains whether we can define this form stylistically. Boldyrev says that it has a definite stylistic value (and only this) in early poetry. In this tafsir I could find no significant stylistic difference in the use of this form. The language of this tafsir (as that of all the other ones) is fairly simple and colloquial if we consider the use of the pronominal enclitics and word-order to be some of the main characteristic of register:

(15) *ān-či farmūdastand-itān* (38)

(16) *ān-či-tān farmūdastand* (50)

(17) *ēšān-rā farmūdastand* (116)

(18) *nafarmūdastand ēšān-rā* (232)



Finally, there is a question whether these forms can be considered as dialect-elements belonging to a special area. It is well-known from Gilbert Lazard's excellent work (1963) how much the language of the early prose differs from that of the poetry of that time, the poetry itself exhibiting a remarkable heterogeneity. The prose texts (including the tafsirs and commentaries) are not homogeneous, neither in their vocabulary nor in their grammar. 'Ali Rawâqi, one of the finest experts in early Persian lexicography, observes that nearly all the prose texts of this genre display local differences and retain only 60-80% of the common core in their vocabulary (1985:10). These local differences might also have been preserved in morphology and syntax.

It is remarkable that the equivalents of this second perfect (if there are any) are usually rendered by passive forms in the text of the *Qor'ân-e qods* (one of the most interesting early texts) and in Nasafi's tafsir, e.g.:

(19a) *āfarīdastand mardum-rā bas za'īf u sust u bēcāra andar kār-i zanān* (YĀHAQI 1976:109)

(19b) *āfarīda šud insān sust* (RAWĀQI 1985:1,32)

(19c) *āfarīda šuda ast ādamī za'īf dar hama kār-hā* (JOWEYNI 1983:1,160)  
Ar. 4:28 "wa xuliqa 'I-insānu ḍa'īfan"

(20a) *ḥarām bikardastand bar šumā bar mādarān-itān-rā* (YĀHAQI 1976:107)

(20b) *ḥarām karda šud war sumā mādarān-i šumā* (RAWĀQI 1985:1,31)

(20c) *ḥarām karda [šud] bar šumā nikāh-i mādarān-i šumā* (JOWEYNI 1983:1,157) Ar. 4:23 "ḥurrimat 'alaikum 'ummahātukum"

(21a) *ārāsta kar dastand ēšān-rā zišt kirdār-hā-šān* (YĀHAQI 1976:234)

(21b) *ārāsta šud ēšān-rā gadī-i 'amalhā-i ēšān* (RAWĀQI 1985:1,112)

(21c) *ārāsta gardānīda šuda ast ba nazd-i ēšān badī-i kardār-i ēšān* (JOWEYNI 1983:1,365) Ar. 9:37 "zuyyina lahum sū'u a'mālihīm"

The second perfect forms of the "šnqšy" tafsir are all translated by passive forms in the two other texts. This seems to be a tendency, even if there are examples of equivalents in simple past, as e.g.:

(22a) *giriftastand dānišmandān-išān-rā... u nafarmūdastand ēšān-rā andar hama kitābhā maḡar ki-birawīda bāšand u farmānburdār bāšand yak xudāy-rā* (YĀHAQI 1976:232)

(22b) *giriftand dānišmandān-i ēšān ... u farmūda našuda bē<sup>15</sup> tā barastūn kunand yak xudāy-rā* (RAWĀQI 1985:1,111)

(22c) *giriftand 'ālimān-i xwēš ... farmūda našudand maḡar ki 'ibādāt ārand xudāy-rā* (JOWEYNI 1983:1,362)

The examples (22) raise yet another problem reflecting the intricate difficulties of early Persian dialectology, namely how the lexical and morpho-syntac-

tic archaisms correlate with each other, cf. the strikingly Arabized vocabulary of Nasafi's tafsir and its use of grammatical archaisms (*mar ... rā, andar*; cf. JOWEYNI 1983: preface 27). All in all, our conclusion is that the use of the second perfect in these texts should be defined as a *dialectal* element. Its area must have been even larger than Khorasan and the surrounding territories because forms similar to this second perfect are recorded even today in the southern Tajik dialects<sup>16</sup> and in Dari<sup>17</sup>. Its use is especially wide-spread in the southern Tajik dialects in which the analytic forms with *istodan* are used scarcely or hardly ever, but they never occur in the dialects northwards from the Zeravshan ridge.

There is, however, another way of expressing aspectual nuances by means of "verbal elements". This type of verbal phrases consists of the PP accompanied by inflected "modifier" verbs like *dāštan, kardan, ēstādan, māndan*. The tafsir-texts abound in such constructions (especially with *dāštan*) and use them more often than other styles and genres of the same period. When reading the tafsirs one has the impression that there is an inclination to use such constructions as e.g.

***dāda dāštan:***

(23a) *ān kashā ki zakāt-i xwāsta dāda dārand* (MATINI 1973:282)

(23b) *dāda dārand zakāt-i xwastahā-rā* (MATINI 1970:1,162)

(23c) *zakāt-i māl-i xwad dāda dārī* (YĀHAQI 1976: preface 66)

***pōšīda dāštan:***

(24a) *xudāy āškārā bidānad az guftār u kiardār u āncī andar dilhā pōšīda dārand* (MATINI 1970:2,583)

(24b) *mēdānad ān-či pōšīda mēdārand* (RAWĀQI 1976:109)

***saxta dāštan:***

(25a) *bisāzēd u saxta dārēd* (YĀHAQI 1976:221)

(25b) *hamčunīn kī ēšān-rā kār-išān bar sāxta ast sāxta mēdārīm* (YĀHAQI 1976:156)

***bar gardānīda dāštan:***

(26) *bar gardānīda mēdārīm dilhā-šān-rā u čašmhā-šān-rā* (YĀHAQI 1976:156)

***pōšīda kardan:***

(27) *pōšīda kard az qaum-i xwēš* (MATINI 1970:1,4)

***ārāsta kardan:*** cf. (21a)

These expressions have a formal similarity with perfect forms, consisting of the PP and an inflected verb. Probably they were modelled as their analogy, but there is a substantial difference between them. In the latter group the PP has its (original) *passive* meaning<sup>18</sup>.

However, for want of more detailed studies we do not know whether the different tafsirs by using these constructions reveal divergencies of frequency or

any other characteristics of usage. True as it is, these “free syntactic groups” appear mostly in set phrases. Examples (29) and (30) show that e.g. the text of the *Qor’ân-e qods* does not use these forms there where the other two do<sup>19</sup>.

(29a) *īmān-rā andar dilhā-i šumā ārāsta karda ast* (MATINI 1970:2,252)

(29b) *xudāy dōst-i šumā-rā īmān u ārāsta kardast ān-rā dar dilhā-i šumā*  
(RAWĀQI 1976:281)

(29c) *biyārāst ān dar dilhā-i šumā* (RAWĀQI 1985:2,347)

Ar. 49:7-8 “wa ḥabbaba ilaikum al-īmāna wa zayyanahu fī qulūbikum”

(30a) *xudāy ārāsta u sāxta kirdast (!) kāfirān-i banī anmār-rā ‘aḏāb-ē*  
*xwār kunanda u saxt* (YĀHAQI 1976:126)

(30b) *xudāy bisāxt kāfirān-rā ‘aḏāb-ē xwār kunār* (RAWĀQI 1985:1,41)

Ar. 4:102 “a‘adda li-’l-kāfirīna ‘aḏāban muhīnan”

Finally, comparing these phrases with the forms of the second perfect we could say that the former ones are the “grammaticalized” members of the category of aspect, whereas the latter are the “lexicalized” ones.

If we look for parallels of this periphrasis in even earlier periods, we will come to texts in Middle Persian. Here aspect does not exist as a well-defined independent category in verbal morphology. It is mainly expressed by adverbs and preverbs. But in this respect MP texts vary significantly among themselves. The differences are not only in degree but in kind. In the Manichaean texts, there are only a few constructions where the verbs *ēstādan*, *mandan*, *dāštan* convey shades of aspectual meaning (HENNING 1933:246), e.g. *passāxt ēstēnd* ‘are added’ (BOYCE 1975:69). They are not frequent as “auxiliaries”<sup>20</sup>. In fact, they do not seem to be used as auxiliaries in the strict sense of the word at all. In those constructions in which they do appear they retain their original meaning conveying only aspectual shades to the verb phrases.

In Book Pahlavi from among the three “quasi-auxiliaries” mentioned above only *ēstādan* appears regularly in analytic constructions (*nibišt ēstēd/ēstād*, etc.). Here it serves as an *auxiliary* of perfect forms or, at least, shows a tendency towards this kind of usage<sup>21</sup>. It is remarkable, however, that the semantic and lexical properties of the constructions with *ēstādan* are similar to those of the second perfect forms in early New Persian: they have the same basic resultative meaning combined with various imperfective nuances (habitual, durative, progressive) and they are used mostly in set phrases (like *guft ēstēd*, *nišast ēstād*, *kird ēstād*, etc.). I suggest, therefore, that the constructions with *ēstādan* should be regarded as grammaticalized members of verbal morphology in Book Pahlavi (like the second perfect in New Persian is), but as “free syntactic constructions” in the Manichaean texts (like similar constructions in New Persian are).

## 5. Conclusion

We started our analysis with the present-day situation because modern texts are much richer in variation and they are at the disposal of linguists in unlimited quantity. Modern Persian and Tajik use two different ways for expressing the progressive with auxiliiation. Both their techniques and their auxiliaries are different, although the elements of the periphrasis are chosen from a common set. These divergencies seem to be in connection with the *historical* and *areal* background of these two languages. In Classical and Modern Formal Persian the use of the verbal prefix is dominant in conveying the imperfective aspect. Within this aspect a new shade is expressed by the progressive, formally based on imperfective forms. This Persian-type auxiliiation proved to be a common *North-Western Iranian isogloss* which Modern Persian has taken over from the surrounding or substratum dialects<sup>22</sup>. Although *dāštan* was abundantly used earlier in “free syntactic phrases”, the techniques and the meaning of the periphrasis have not been found in historical texts. This is an *innovation* of the latest times since this aspectual category is, in general, a comparatively recent development in many New Iranian and other modern Indo-European languages (English, Italian, etc.).

The Tajik-type auxiliiation seems to be closer to the genuine Persian tradition. In this respect, Tajik agrees with the Fars-dialects and Lari by using the same auxiliary. But this is only a *formal* similarity. The meaning of the periphrasis is essentially different: progressive in Tajik and perfective in the other two. These latter dialects show the same usage as early New Persian (“second perfect” in the Khorasanian and surrounding areas).

The question still remains, however, as to how the Tajik progressive evolved from perfect. It is obvious – when aspect is dealt with – that the perfect constitutes the cardinal aspectual category apt to induce changes in the verbal system and to create new categories. There are at least two ways in which this can happen : either through *restructuring* or through *reinterpretation*. In the first case, the perfect forms may become contracted with the forms of simple past (cf. Classical and Modern Persian) or an auxiliary may be replaced by another aspectually more oriented one (cf. the “free syntactic groups” in Manichaean and early New Persian). In the second case, one of the possible aspectual shades of the perfect meaning becomes generalized. This is what happened in Tajik and is now happening in Modern Persian where the perfect develops a new aspectual meaning (inferential or distanced past)<sup>23</sup>. It is true that the North-Eastern area has always shown (or even shows today, cf. Lazard 1956:163) a deeper inclination towards the use of verbal phrases (grammaticalized or lexicalized). However, modern usage necessarily developed itself under the strong influence of the Uz-

bek linguistic surrounding which has modified the whole stock of verbal morphology. This may account for the fact that the Fars-dialects and Lari in their more isolated position have preserved the old usage.

Thus the second perfect, once a colloquial (early poetry) or dialectal (Khorasanian area) element, slowly became an “archaic stylistic feature” of literature appearing in the written language only. Mirza Ĵafar, a native speaker of Persian, confirmed this in his Persian grammar at the beginning of this century (cf. BOLDYREV 1946:490). For this reason we come to the conclusion that no sharp distinction can be drawn between stylistic, dialectal and diachronic variations or, in a broader sense, between synchronic and diachronic linguistics (LYONS 1972:620). This result seems to justify the growing conviction in linguistics during the last few decades that social, dialectal, areal and diachronic variations are ultimately inseparable.

#### NOTES

<sup>1</sup> Here *progressive* represents a situation not as simply existing, but as happening or developing through time (LYONS 1984:485).

<sup>2</sup> These “stative” verbs also have their “progressive” form, but with another modal implication, cf. the ingressive: *dāram minešinam* ‘I am going to sit down’ (AALAM 1977:122-123; HOMĀYUNFARROX s.a.: 468).

<sup>3</sup> The perfect in the sense used here has nothing to do with the *perfective*, which is a neutral, “aoristic” past. *Perfect* here indicates the present relevance of a past situation at least in its basic, original meaning and usage (COMRIE 1976:12).

<sup>4</sup> “Inferential” indicates here that the speaker is reporting an event which he has not witnessed himself and that his knowledge is from second hand. It is a well-known aspectual usage in Turkish languages and in some areas close to them. For Persian see LAZARD 1956:148; SĀDEQI-ARŽANG 1978:17; WINDFUHR 1982.

<sup>5</sup> E.g. *mikardam* in the formal register can cover more aspectual values (continuous, progressive) than the same form in the informal register (continuous).

<sup>6</sup> In 1926 K. HADANK expressed his opinion on that question clearly: the dialectal material is not homogeneous, stylistic and dialectal (sometimes also diachronic) variations being mixed up in the texts; the divergencies and “deviations” from the *Schriftsprache* do not always represent dialectal features. Many of them belong to the common core of the *spoken* language (s. his Preface).

<sup>7</sup> In fact some forms (subjunc. pres. progr. *karda istoda bošad*, inferential progr. *karda istoda budaam*, conditional *karda istodagistam*) are used seldom or hardly at all (RASTORGUEVA 1964:114, ID. 1963:75).

<sup>8</sup> It is uncertain, however, whether these forms are grammaticalized into a paradigm or form free syntactic phrases. Dari seems to use the verbal prefix *me* in the same function as Per-

sian does. This prefixal usage is in the process of restructuring both in Dari and Tajik, although on this point the grammars should not be relied upon.

<sup>9</sup> Central dialects: *ī-*, *ē*, *et-*, *t-*, *d-*, *a-*; Semnani: *ma-*, *mu-*, *mī-*; Talishi: *a-*; Tati: *mī-*; the Fars-dialects: *mī-*; Lari: *a-*, *da-*; Luri *ī-*, *mī-*; Kurdish: *dā-*, *d-*, *t-*, *a-*, etc.

<sup>10</sup> Esfahani *dōrū yūē* ‘miâyad’ (ŽUKOVSKIJ 1888), Kermani/Yazdi *dârin u charin* ‘dârand mičarand’ (BROWNE 1897:108); Zeynabadi *dorē vâie* ‘I am saying’; *doštē šoē* ‘I was going’ (SAMAREH s.a. 6); Sede’i *dârân(o) yâne* ‘dâram miâyam’ (FARAWAŠI 1963:321); Siwandi *dârune kenje mekarune* ‘ils sont en train de decouper la viande’ (LECOQ 1979:61); Mazandarani *dôrme neviseme* ‘ja pišu’, *dôšteme nevéšteme* ‘ja pisal’ (RASTORGUEVA-EDEL’MAN 1982:538). The oldest datum of this periphrasis comes from MELGOUNOF (1868:203): *kour, koué schouon dori* ‘Fille, où va tu?’. Geiger doubts whether this is a real form (GEIGER 1895-1901:367).

Another Caspian dialect, Gilaki, also has a progressive, but both its auxiliary (*dâr-* ‘to be’) and its techniques (infinitive of the main verb) are different (*nivîštân dâram*; RASTORGUEVA et al. 1971:139, 152). The resemblance between the two auxiliaries (*dâr-*, *dâr-*) accounts for the fact that many linguists have identified the auxiliary of the Gilaki and the Semnani progressive with *dâstan* (DORN 1860:27; CHRISTENSEN 1935:38; PISTOSO 1974:302). In the most recent description of Mazandarani the form *da:štama baxunessama* ‘ich war gerade am Lesen’ is obscure (NAWATA 1984:23).

<sup>11</sup> (a) *-sâm*, *-sēi*, *-sâ*, *-sūm*, *-sīn*, *-sân*, e.g. *uštâsom/hošte sām* etc.; (b) *-eš dâde*; (c) *-eš dâde-sâ* (KERIMOVA 1982:351-5).

<sup>12</sup> The simple past has stress on the last syllable of the stem, the stress of the past participle is ultimate. Cf. MANN 1909:36: *uftâdom, uftadâ-i, uftâda*.

<sup>13</sup> The old preverb *bi-* is widely used but it has no definite aspectual value, cf. LAZARD 1956:144; ID. 1963:324.

<sup>14</sup> The same in the text of the *Qor’ân-e qods* runs as follows: *čand dirang kardī? guft: dirang kardam rōz-ē yâ barx rōz-ē. guft: bal dirang kardī šad sāl* (RAWÂQI 1985:1,8).

<sup>15</sup> Cf. LAZARD 1990:188.

<sup>16</sup> *raftastam, raftasti* (Čildar, Karategin, Darvaz) etc. In some southern dialects there is also a “second pluperfect”: *rafta bādest, rafta bestâs*, cf. RASTORGUEVA 1964:87, JEFIMOV et al. 1982:180.

<sup>17</sup> *zada-stum* (cf. *avurdastum, budastum*; YÂHAQI 1976:54, 72); DOROFEEVA 1960:50 calls this form “archaic perfect”.

<sup>18</sup> In some perfect forms the PP also preserves its passive meaning (cf. LAZARD 1963:343).

<sup>19</sup> The text of the *Qor’ân-e qods* may represent the dialect of Sistan, as supposes LAZARD (1990).

<sup>20</sup> “... in all the texts in the Reader there are at the most half a dozen examples of it [*ēstâdan*] in the present perfect tense» (MACKENZIE 1984:46).

<sup>21</sup> There is some fluctuation in the texts between the use of *ēstâdan* and the substantive verb in the perfect and the pluperfect, but it is not connected with the sentence-structure as has been suggested by Nyberg (1974:283).

<sup>22</sup> According to Dehghan, Modern Persian is responsible for the dissemination of this form (DEHGHAN 1972).

<sup>23</sup> As concerns the terminology, there is a difference between LAZARD (“inferential” or “distanced past”, formerly “auditive”) and RASTORGUEVA (“neočevidnoe naklonenije”), which represents in fact a deep conceptual difference. LAZARD rightly regards these forms as those of aspect, while RASTORGUEVA sees in them the category of mood (1964:107, JEFIMOV et al. 1982:179).

## REFERENCES

- AALAM, H. (1977), *An intensive course of Modern Persian for adult learners*, vol. I. General Department of Iranian Cultural Representatives Abroad (Tehrân, manuscript).
- BAHÂR, M.T. (1958), *Sabkšenâsi yâ târih-e taṭawwor-e naṣr-e fârsi*, vol. MIL Tehrân.
- BOLDYREV, A.N. (1946), *Perfekt II v novopersidskim literaturnom jazyke*, *Izv. AN SSSR OLKa V*, 6, p. 490-96.
- BOYCE, M. (1975), *A Reader in Manichaean Middle Persian and Parthian*, AI 9.
- BROWNE, E.G. (1987), *A specimen of the Gabri dialect of Persia*, *JRAS* p. 103-110.
- CEJPEK, J. (1956), *Die verbale Periphrase als ein wichtiges Unterscheidungsmerkmal zwischen Neupersisch und Tâğîkisch*, *ArOr* 24, p. 171-182.
- CHRISTENSEN, A. (1935), *Contribution à la dialectologie iranienne. II. Dialects de la région de Semnan*. København.
- COMRIE, B. (1976), *Aspect. An introduction to the study of verbal aspect and related problems*. Cambridge.
- DEHGHAN, I. (1972), *Dâštan as an auxiliary in contemporary Persian*, *AO* 40, p. 198-205.
- DORN, B. (1860), *Beiträge zur Kenntniss der iranischen Sprachen. I. Masender anische Sprache*. Sanct-Peterburg.
- DOROFEEVA, L.N. (1960), *Jazyk farsi-kabuli*, Moskva.
- FARAWAŠI, B. (1963), *Tahlil-e sistam-e fe'l dar lahje-ye sede'i*, *RFL Tabriz* 10, p. 311-323.
- FARHÂDI, A. (1955), *Le Persan parlé en Afghanistan. Grammaire du Kaboli*, Paris.
- GEIGER, W. (1895-1901), *Kleinere Dialekte und Dialektgruppen* [in:] *GIPh* I, 2, p. 287-427.
- HADANK, K. (1926), *Die Mundarten von Khunsar (etc.)* [in:] *KPF* III. Bd. 1.
- HENNING, W.B. (1933), *Das Verbum des Mittelpersischen der Turfan-fragmente*, *ZU* 9, p. 158-253.
- HOMÂYUNFARROX, R. (s.a.), *Dastur-e ĵâme'-e zabân-e fârsi*. (2nd ed.), Tehrân.
- HORN, P. (1895-1901), *Neupersische Schriftsprache*, [in:] *GIPh* I, 2, p. 1-198.
- JEFIMOV, V.A., RASTORGUEVA, V.S., SAROVA, E.N. (1982), *Persidskij, tajĵkskij, dari* [in:] *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija. Novoiranskije jazyki*, p. 5-230.
- JENSEN, H. (1931), *Neupersische Grammatik, mit Berücksichtigung der historischen Entwicklung*, Heidelberg.
- KERIMOVA, A.A. (1982), *Dialekty Farsa*, [in:] *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija, Novoiranskije jazyki*, p. 316-363.

- KOLBĀSI, I. (1988), *Dastgāh-e fe'l dar guyeš-e lāri*, RFL Mašhad, 21, p. 145-170.
- LAZARD, G. (1956), *Caractères distinctifs de la langue tadjik*, BSL, p. 117-186.
- LAZARD, G. (1957), *Grammaire du persan contemporain*, Paris.
- LAZARD, G. (1963), *La langue des plus anciens monuments de la prose persan*, Paris.
- LAZARD, G. (1985), *L'inférentiel ou passé dinstancié en persan*, StIr 14, p. 27-42.
- LAZARD, G. (1990), *Lumières nouvelles sur la formation de la langue persane: une traduction du Coran en persan dialectal et ses affinités avec le judéo-persan*, [in:] *Irano-Judaica II*, S. SHAKED, A. NETZER (eds.), Jerusalem, p. 184-198.
- LECOQ, P. (1979), *Le dialecte de Siwand*, Wiesbaden.
- LIVŠIĆ, V.A. (1954), *O vnutrennix zakonax razvitija tajikskogo jazyka*, Izv. AN Taj. SSR, 5, p. 87-102.
- LYONS, J. (1972), *Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*, Cambridge.
- LYONS, J. (1984), *Semantics*, Cambridge.
- MACKENZIE, D.N. (1984), *HWYTN: Stance and Existence*, [in:] *MIS*, p. 45-56.
- MANN, O. (1909), *Die Tajik-Mundarten der Provinz Fars*, [in:] *KPF*, I.
- MELGOUNOF, G. (1868), *Essai sur les dialectes de Mazanderan et de Ghilan*, ZDMG 22, p. 195-224.
- MOLČANOVA, E.K. (1982), *Larskij jazyk*, [in:] *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija, Novoiranskije jazyki*, 364-446.
- NAWATA, T. (1984), *Mazandarani. Asian and African Grammatical Manual, No. 17*. Institute for the Study of Language and Cultures of Asia and Africa, Tokyo University of Foreign Studies.
- NYBERG, H.S. (1974), *A Manual of Pahlavi. Part II: Glossary*, Wiesbaden.
- PISTOSO, M. (1974), *L'ausiliare dāštan in neo-persiano: un costrutto linguistico nord-iranico?*, *OM* 54, p. 298-303.
- RASTORGUEVA, V.S. (1963), *A short sketch of Tajik grammar*, transl. and ed. by H.H. PAPER, The Hague.
- RASTORGUEVA, V.S. (1964), *Opyt sravnitel'nogo izučenija tajikskix govorov*, Moskva.
- RASTORGUEVA, V.S. et al. (1971), *Giljanskij jazyk*, Moskva.
- RASTORGUEVA, V.S.-EDEL'MAN, D.I. (1982), *Prikaspijskie jazyki*, [in:] *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija. Novoiranskije jazyki*, 447-554.
- ŠĀDEQI, 'A.A., ARŽANG, Gh. (1978), *Dastur. Sāl-e cahārom*, Tehrān.
- SALEMANN, C. (1895-1901), *Mittelpersisch*, [in:] *GIPh*, I, 1, 3, 249-332.
- SALEMANN, C., SHUKOVSKI, V. (1947), *Persische Grammatik*, (4., unveränderte Auflage) Berlin.
- ŠAMAREH, Y. (s.a.), *The Verb System in Zeynabadi Dari*, p. 1-8.
- SCHLERATH, B. (1987), *On the reality and status of a reconstructed language*, *JIES*, 41-46.
- WINDFUHR, G. (1982), *The verbal category of inference in Persian*, [in:] *Monumentum Georg Morgenstierne II. AI* 22, p. 263-287.
- ZARUBIN, I.I. (1928), *Očerok razgovornogo jazyka samarkandskix evreev*, [in:] *Iran* II, p. 95-180, Leningrad.
- ŽUKOVSKIJ, V.A. (1888), *Osobennoe značenie glagola dāštan v persidskom razgovornom jazyke*, *ZVORAO* 3, p. 376-377.



## TEXTS

- ĴOWEYNI, 'A. (1983), *Tafsir-e nasafi* (2nd ed.), Tehrân.
- MATINI, Ĵ. (1970), *Tafsir-e Qor'ân-e majid*, vol. I-II., Tehrân.
- MATINI, Ĵ. (1973), *Tafsiri bar 'ošri az Qor'ân-e majid*, Tehrân.
- RAWÂQI, 'A. (1976), *Tarjome-ye Qor'ân-e muze-ye pârs*, Tehrân.
- RAWÂQI, 'A. (1985), *Qor'ân-e qods*, vol. I-II. Tehrân.
- ROUŠAN, M. (1972), *Baxši az tafsiri kohan*, Tehrân.
- YÂHAQI, M. (1976), *Gozâre-i az baxši az Qor'ân-e karim, Tafsir-e [šnqšy]*, Tehrân.

Eva M. JEREMIÁS

Eötvös Loránd Tudományegyetem (Iranian Dept.)

Pešti Barnabás u. 1

H – 1364 BUDAPEST V.