

Post-Predicate Constituents in Iranian Languages within Iran, and in Early New Persian

Mohammad Dabir-Moghaddam
Allameh Tabataba'i University

Post-predicate elements in Iranian and neighboring languages: Inheritance, contact, and information structure
(September 6-7th, 2019 Bamberg University)

1. Questionnaire Design Outlook

2. Preliminary Remarks

the first two research questions:

- What is the range of cross-language variation, and what are the recurrent parallels across contemporary Iranian languages and their historically attested forerunners?
- Are the existing hierarchies of post-possibility viable for a more representative sample of varieties?

wider perspective

1. 1st and 2nd questions → observe
2. questions (c) and (d) → describe and analyze
3. more recent corpus → explain the post-predicate phenomena

Dabir-Moghaddam (1997)

“Descriptive and Theoretical Aspects of Word Order Status in Persian and Selected Iranian Languages”

- Persian has grammaticalized a mixed type (OV vs. VO)
- mixed type can last several centuries → viable type

Dabir-Moghaddam (2006)

“Internal and External Forces in Typology: Evidence from Iranian Languages”

- common typological parameters of word order in 12 contemporary Iranian languages
- parameters of variation in the word order typology of these languages

Dabir-Moghaddam (2011/ 1390 h.š.)

“review of J.R. Roberts (2009) *A Study of Persian Discourse Structure*”

- critically discussed and evaluated his analysis of the post-predicate constituents

- subcategorization frame
- semantic class

determine the (im)possibility of the occurrence of post-predicate constituents.

Dabir-Moghaddam (2011/ 1390 h.š.),

“review of J.R. Roberts (2009) *A Study of Persian Discourse Structure*”

- *šoru kærdæn* is an aspectual verb

1. *bæ:d šoru mi-kon-æd be hærf zæd-æn*
then start IPFV-do.PRES-3sg to word strike-INF

‘Then it begins to speak.’ [p. 133 ex. (4.54)]

Dabir-Moghaddam (2011/ 1390 h.š.),

“review of J.R. Roberts (2009) *A Study of Persian Discourse Structure*”

2. *væ* *šoru* *kærd* *be* *nevešt-æn*
and start do.PAST.3sg to write.PST-INF

‘and she started to write.’ [p. 133, ex. (4.55)]

Dabir-Moghaddam (2013/ 1392 h.š.)

Typology of Iranian Languages (in two volumes)

- analyzing a number of Iranian languages of Iran using Dryer (1992, 2007, 2011, and 2013) as theoretical framework
 - the word order typology
 - agreement
 - case systems

Dabir-Moghaddam (2018)

- the word order typology of Persian in its three historical stages
- role of non-Iranian contact languages in the grammaticalization of the mixed word order parameters of the Western Iranian languages.

Contemporary Iranian Languages Compared with Genera in EURASIA

(Dabir-Moghaddam (2013/ 1392: 1195))

Language	OV Correlations	VO Correlations
Persian	12	17
Baluchi (Iranshahr)	14	19
Davani	12	17
Larestani	12	16
Talyshi	17	16
Vafsi	14	17
Kurdish (Bane'i)	12	18
Kurdish (Kalhori)	11	16
Hawrami	13	17
Laki	11	17
Delvari	12	16
Naini	12	16
Shahmirzadi	17	16
Tati	16	15

3. Presentation and Analysis of the Data

3.1. Persian

3.1.1. Old Persian

V precedes S (emphasis)

3. *θātīy Dārayavauš xšāyaθiya*

Lit. 'Saith Darius the king.'

Kent (1953: 96, section 310, I)

3.1.1. Old Persian

Kent (1953: 96, section 310, VI)

- indirect O may follow the V (ex. 4)

4. *hya šiyātim adā martiyahyā*

‘Who created happiness for man.’

- both direct and indirect Os may follow the V (ex. 5).

5. *hya adadā šiyātim martiyahyā*

‘Who created happiness for man.’

3.1.1. Old Persian

- indefinite direct O follows the predicate in the first conjunct

6. *yadi°y vaināmiy hamiçiyam yaθā yadiy
nai°y vaināmiy*

‘When I see a rebel as well as when I see a not(rebel).

(Kent 1953: 139, lines 38-40)

3.1.1. Old Persian

- complement *kāma* occurs right after the copula *naimā*.

7. *naimā kāma tya mar°tiya vināθayaiš
naipatimā*

‘It is not my desire that a man should do harm.’

(Kent 1953: 138, lines 19 and 20)

3.1.2. Middle Persian

- between second and six centuries AD
- Sasanian dynasty
- lost most of the case marking traits
- had acquired peculiarities which are characteristic of an analytic language type

3.1.2. Middle Persian

- simple clauses is SOV
- other variations:

predicate is clause initial and the other constituents of the clause (direct O, an Adju, and S) follow it

8. *hyštwš'n pyd 'y pd gr'sm'n*

'They have abandoned the father in paradise.'

(Brunner 1977: 180 and 181)

3.1.2. Middle Persian

- embedded direct O clause in post-predicate position

9. *pāpak nē dānist kū sāsān hač
tōxmak i dārāBi dārāyān zāt ēstāt*

‘Papak did not know that Sasan is born from Daray
Darayan’s race.’

(Rastorgueva 1347 h.š/ 1968: 208 and 215)

3.1.3. New Persian

post-predicate constituents in one Early New Persian text
(*Samak-e Ayyar*) Findings:

- 1) simple main or embedded clauses whose verbs are final, 989 tokens (%92.68)
- 2) main or embedded clauses whose verbs are not final (without counting imperative sentences), 39 tokens (%3.65)
- 3) compound sentences with the s-v-o whose object is clausal, 39 token (%3.65)
- 4) simple main or embedded clauses whose verbs were medial and the direct object was a post-predicate constituent, zero

2) main or embedded clauses whose verbs are not final

10. *dær šæhr-e hælæb padšah-i bud-Ø
ba kæmal væ ba bæxt-i jævan*

‘In the city of Edleb, there was a king with manner and with a bright fortune.’ (p. 1)

11. *čare nist-Ø bejōz doʔa væ zari
kærdæn*

‘There is no remedy except praying and crying.’ (p. 2)

2) main or embedded clauses whose verbs are not final

12. *æmma mæ=ra mi-bayæd ke dær
tale?-e mæn negah kon-i æz hesab-e
fællæk væ tæ?sir-e setare-gan*

‘But I deserve [lit; it is necessary for me] that you look into my fortune based on heavenly calculation and the effect of the stars.’ (p. 2)

13. *væ xæl?æt-i xub færmud-Ø
jomhur=ra*

‘And ordered a good gift for Jomhur’ (p. 5)

2) main or embedded clauses whose verbs are not final

14. *væ æz hær soxæn-i mi-goft-Ø ba šervan*

‘And he used to speak about every matter with Shervan.’ (p. 6)

15. *šah-zad-e dastan gæšt-Ø dær hæme-y-e jæhan*

‘The prince became well-known all over the world.’
(p. 10)

2) main or embedded clauses whose verbs are not final

16. *pæhlevan-an=ra did-æm bær balin-e
mæn nešæst-e*

‘I saw the brave sitting around my bed.’ (p. 19)

17. *madær væ xahær-e šahzade madam
dær balin-e vey nešæst-e bud-ænd
geryan*

‘The mother and the sister of the prince had constantly sat in his bed tearful.’ (p. 23)

3) compound sentences with the s-v-o whose object is clausal

18. *væ hænuz ne-mi-danest-Ø ke ræsul
be če kar amæde æst*

‘And he did not yet know what for the delegate has come.’ (p. 5)

19. *šah-zad-e goft-Ø emruz šekar næ-
kon-im*

‘The prince said we better not do hunting today.’
(p. 11)

3) compound sentences with the s-v-o whose object is clausal

20. *pendašt-∅ ke næqqaš-an-e alæm
jæm? amæd-e-ænd væ in saxt-e-ænd*

‘He thought that all the paintists of the world have gathered and have made this.’ (p. 12)

3) compound sentences with the s-v-o whose object is clausal

21. *xoršid-šah čun be-šenid-Ø ke
pedær=æš=ra an hal mæ?lum gæšt-Ø
æz goftæn čare næ-did-Ø*

‘As king Khorshid heard that his father learned about that situation found no remedy but to say it.’ (p. 18)

22. *ke yek kæs næ-goft-Ø ke mæn in
tævan-æm xand*

‘That no one said that I can read this.’ (p. 20)

The general conclusion based on items (10) – (22):

(23) Post-predicate constituents in an Early New Persian text:

(a) Object complement clauses (e.g., ex. (18) – (22)).

(b) Adjuncts of various kinds (e.g., ex. (10), (11), (12) in the embedded clause, (14), (15), (16), and (17)).

(c) A clausal actant in a non-canonical subject construction (ex. (12)).

(d) A dative object (ex. (13)).

The general conclusion based on items (10) – (22):

24. Post-Predicate Occurrences Hypothesis:

(a) Verbal complement clauses are highly grammaticalized in post-predicate position.

(b) Adjuncts and dative objects can be scrambled to post-predicate position.

4. Suggestions

- a) In the selection of the predicates the subcategorization frame of the predicates needs to be taken into consideration

e.g., *ba kæsi **sohbæt kærdæn***

‘Lit. with someone to speak’

vs.

*šoru(?) **kærdæn be gelaye***

‘Lit. to begin to complaint’

4. Suggestions

baʔes šodæn [ke ...]

‘Lit. to cause that ...’;

čizi=ra be kæsi dadæn

‘Lit. something=RA to someone to give’

Vs.

dadæn [ke ...]

‘Lit. to give that ...’ which is a causative verb;

4. Suggestions

čizi=ra dær jayi gozaštæn

‘Lit. something=RA in somewhere to put’

Vs.

gozaštæn [*ke ...*]

‘Lit. let that’ which is a causative verb.

4. Suggestions

the semantics of the predicates plays an important role in the formation of their subcategorization frame.

4. Suggestions

b) having SOV linear order but at the same time having the verbal complement clause grammaticalized in pre-predicate or post-predicate position, will determine the degree of being verb-final.

- heaviness
- ease of processing
- newsworthiness

4. Suggestions

c) The possible scrambling of adjuncts and phrasal arguments (see item (24)b) have to do with the degree of discourse familiarity (namely discourse-old versus discourse-new) of the relevant constituent.

4. Suggestions

(d) Indexation, adposition, and flagging are the three mechanisms which motivate the very existence of scrambling in Iranian languages.

4. Suggestions

(e) Some Tense-Aspect Auxiliary verbs in contemporary Persian are grammaticalized in pre-predicate position (future tense marker and incomplete aspect auxiliary) whereas the past perfect auxiliary is grammaticalized in post-predicate position. This requires a diachronic explanation.

4. Suggestions

(f) The fact that in all the Iranian languages of Iran relative clauses are post-nominal, a peculiarity which is not expected in a strict SOV linear order language (e.g. in Japanese, relative clauses precede their nominal head), requires an explanation.

4. Suggestions

g) The inclusion of Sogdian and its contemporary variety Yaghnobi as well as other contemporary Eastern Iranian languages, e.g. Pashto and Ossetic, will enhance our understanding of the occurrence of the post-predicate elements in Iranian languages.

4. Suggestions

(h) Reliance on corpus can occasionally bring about a definitive result when both alternants are allowed.

e.g., *bozorg-tær æz mæryæm*

vs.

æz mæryæm bozorg-tær

which both mean ‘bigger than Maryam’).

4. Suggestions

Rasooli et al. (2013)

- 554 tokens of the adjective and standard of comparison
- 29982 sentences
- 498081 words

adjective before the standard of comparison was 485 tokens (equal to %87.55 of the occurrences)

the order of standard of comparison preceding the adjective was 69 tokens (equal to %12.45).

4. Suggestions

- (i) - the number of occurrences of the direct object with $=ra$ is 14903.
 - the number of occurrences of the direct object without $=ra$ is 5702.
 - The number of post-predicate direct objects with $=ra$ is 53 (%35)
 - the number of post-predicate direct objects without $=ra$ is 29 (%5).

Thanks

æz tævæjjohe šoma sepasgozaræm