0. This paper provides a description of the Persian periphrastic verb (PV), pointing out the features that render it distinct from the compound verbs commonly found in many languages, and traces, to the extent that it is possible, the historical development of the PV formation process from Old to Modern Persian. It is shown that though PV formation undoubtedly played a productive role in the nativization of foreign vocabulary, it is also a productive device for generating verbs from native vocabulary. Speculations are offered as to how historical development of the PV structure accounts for certain peculiarities of the synchronic syntactic and derivational behavior of the PV.

1.0 The term PV is used to refer to morphologically complex verbs of the type \( \text{gu}d\text{adan} '\text{listen}' (\text{literally 'ear'} + '\text{give}') \) and \( \text{sar} \text{\ddot{a}r}\text{adan} '\text{overflow}' (\text{literally 'head'} + '\text{come}') \) which are found in great abundance in contemporary Persian. A rough survey (cf. Telegdi 1950-51:316) based on an arbitrarily selected, approximately four-hundred verb section of a German-Persian dictionary reveals that one out of every ten verbs in modern Persian consists of a pure Persian root and is of a non-periphrastic structure. The rest are PV's consisting of an indeclinable \( P \), Adj. \( P \), or Adv.\( P \), either loan or native, followed by a pure Persian single verb stem which serves as the auxiliary (AUX) in that it may be inflected, carrying all the syntactic features generally attached to the verb: tense, mood, negativity, person, and number. The choice of the AUX depends, to some extent, on properties of the verb such as transitivity, causativity, and voice. The class of periphrastic AUX includes over thirty of the most common pure Persian simple verbs, the most recurrent of which are \( \text{\ddot{a}r}\text{dan} '\text{become}', \text{kardan} '\text{do}', \text{d\ddot{a}dan} '\text{give}', \text{xordan} '\text{eat}', \text{and zadan} '\text{hit}' \).

The PV in Persian has not been discussed in great detail in the linguistic literature, though traditional grammarians (Jones, 1969; Lampton, 1957; Lavian, 1971) have always been aware of the abundance of what they call "compound verbs" in Persian.

1.1 PV's have the following structure.

\[
\begin{align*}
\{ \text{\( P \)}, \text{\( ADJ.\( P \)}, \text{\( ADV.\( P \)} & \text{ - AUX} \\
\end{align*}
\]
Examples from each of the PV types are gūs dādan 'listen', (literally 'ear' + 'give'), garm kardan 'heat' (literally 'hot' + 'do'), and dar raftan 'slip', (literally 'out' + 'go') respectively. The order of constituents within the PV follows the general pattern characterizing the V constituents of the language. Persian has an SOV (Subject Object Verb) word order, as shown in (2).

(2) parviz ketāb xānd. 'Parviz read a book.'
    'Parviz' 'book' 'read.'

The PV is recursive in that (a) it may be derived from another PV, and (b) it may be composed of the same constituents as the V containing it. Type (a) is illustrated by the PV faryād boland kardan 'scream' (literally 'cry' + 'high' + 'do') which is, in turn, derived from another PV, namely boland kardan 'raise', (literally 'high' + 'do') such that the former PV literally means 'cry' + 'raise'.

(3) [PV faryād + PV boland + kardan]

Type (b) is illustrated by the V kalame harf zadan 'speak' (literally 'word' + 'word' + 'hit'), both the V and the PV within it having the constituent structure IPV.

(4) [V kalame [PV harf + zadan]]

1.2 Compound verbs in many languages are different from their Persian equivalents, the PV's, in that the former do not play the role of a verbal unit syntactically. For example, a compound verb formed from a simple transitive verb and a direct object IP, cannot take a direct object of its own, even though its overall meaning is inherently transitive. Thus, unlike PV's, it is the simple verb alone that plays the role of the verbal unit within a compound verb construction. In order to make clear this difference, examples of compound verbs are taken from English, an Indo-European language, and from Hebrew, a Semitic language, are contrasted with Persian PV's.

In English the noun beating is derived from the verb beat which is a simple transitive verb that takes a direct object, as in the sentence:

(5) Dan beat Mary
    IP [V IP]
    V

The compound verb derived from the noun beating and the simple verb give, namely give a beating, though very similar in meaning to beat, is different from it in that it cannot take a direct object and is restricted to taking
the dative case only:

(6) Dan gave a beating to Mary 'Dan gave Mary a beating'

\[ \text{IP V IP dative IP marker(d.m.)} \]

In sentence (6) gave is the verb, taking at most one accusative and one dative IP, in this case beating and Mary respectively.

Likewise, in Hebrew, the noun maka 'beating' is derived from the simple transitive verb lehakot 'beat', which takes a direct object as in sentence:

(7) dan hika et-meri 'Dan beat Mary.'

'Dan' 'beat' 'definite-Mary'

The compound verb derived from the noun maka and the simple verb latet 'to give', namely latet maka 'give a beating' cannot take a direct object, and is restricted to taking the dative case only:

(8) dan natan maka le-meri 'Dan gave Mary a beating.'

'Dan' 'give' 'beating' 'd.m.-Mary'

In sentence (8) natan 'give' alone plays the role of a verb, taking at most one accusative and one dative IP, maka and meri respectively.

In Persian, on the other hand, the noun kotak 'beating' combines with the simple transitive verb zadan 'hit' to form the PV kotak zadan 'beat' (literally 'beating' + 'hit'), which is transitive and capable of taking a direct object of its own. In Persian, unlike English, one can say:

(9) dan mari-rā kotak zād 'Dan beat Mary.'

'Dan' 'Mary' (d.a.c.m.) 'beating' 'hit'

where meri, as indicated by the definite accusative case marker-rā is the direct object of the PV kotak zād, which acts as a verb unit, and not of the simple verb zād which has a direct object of its own—kotak. One can thus conclude that in Persian a PV can be used alternately with its simple verb equivalent, if attested, while the compound verb in English and Hebrew cannot.

It is also interesting to note that Hindi compound verbs, including those which contain Arabic loans acquired through contact with Persian, are not all verbal units in the same way that Persian PV's are. A great number of Hindi compound verbs comprising Perso-Arabic loans differ from Persian PV's in that the former cannot take a direct object IP, even when their meanings are transitive, since the IP within the compound verb holds
the direct object position in relation to the AUX, which acts as the sentential verb. Thus, many Hindi compound verbs take a possessive NP in a context where a simple V equivalent would take an accusative NP. Consider the following example.

(10) mē jēn-ko sārāh rāha-hū 'I praise John.'

'I' 'John-animate accusative 'praise' -imperf.-1 Sg.

case marker (a.a.c.m.)

where sārāhrāhāhū 'praise' is a native simple verb.

A compound verb tā rif kārnā also meaning 'praise' (literally 'praise + 'do') with a Perso-Arabic compound ed NP tā rif 'praise', takes a genetival instead of an accusative NP; even though the verb is used to express the same transitive notion, since the direct object position is filled by the NP within the compound verb.

(11) mē jēn-kī tā rif kār-rāha-hū 'I praise John,'

'I' 'John-of' 'praise' 'do'

Notice that jēn-kī (11) is not accusative, but possessive indicating that the compound verb in Hindi is not a verbal unit.²

1.3 The periphrastic AUX can be classified into two types: (a) 'semi periphrastic AUX' and (b) 'fully periphrastic' or, simply speaking, 'periphrastic AUX.'³ The class of semi-periphrastic AUX includes the verbs whose only function is to reflect certain syntactic features associated with the verb, such as mood and voice, generally not expressed in a single-stem verb in Persian. The position of the semi-periphrastic AUX is after the participial form with which it combines. Thus the semi-periphrastic AUX is like the "regular" AUX in its functions, though structurally it is similar to the periphrastic AUX in that it does not combine with a declineable constituent. Its main difference from the periphrastic AUX is that the latter does not combine with the participial forms of pure Persian single-stem verbs, while the former invariably does. An example of the semi-periphrastic AUX is ŝodan 'become' which is used in the passive forms of simple verbs in Persian. The passive form of the simple verb xordan 'eat', for example, is:

(12) xorde ŝodan 'be eaten'

'eaten' 'become'

Ŝodan, however, can also be used as a periphrastic AUX in the formation of PV's such as pā ŝodan 'get up' (literally 'leg' + 'become') and niyāde ŝodan
'get off'. (literally 'on foot' + 'become'). Therefore an occurrence of \textit{\textodan} in a verbal compound is to be classified into either one of the two categories, semi-periphrastic or periphrastic AUX, according to its functions in that verbal expression.

The periphrastic AUX, described earlier, is a single-stem pure Persian verb that combines with a iP, ADJ.P., or ADV.P. to form a completely different lexical item of the verbal category—the PV. The periphrastic AUX, unlike semi-periphrastic ones, do not combine with participial forms of another verb in order to reflect a different syntactic aspect of it, such as voice. Another difference lies in the fact that the periphrastic AUX becomes partially reduced in its semantic contents, relative to its simple verb occurrences, while the semi-periphrastic AUX retains its full semantic load. Thus in \textit{\paso\textodan} the periphrastic AUX \textit{\textodan} is semantically reduced, to some extent, for \textit{\paso\textodan} does not mean 'become a leg' but 'get up' which implies 'stand on a leg', whereas in (12) the semi-periphrastic AUX \textit{\textodan} used with the past participial form of the active verb \textit{\textxordan} to generate the passive form, retains its semantic contents—'be eaten'. Other examples illustrating that the semantic contents of the periphrastic AUX is generally reduced, and that the non-verbal constituents of the PV "charge" it to a certain extent are:

(13) \textit{\textcešm} duxtàn 'watch closely'
\textit{\texteye} + \textit{\textsew}

(14) \textit{\textjāru} kardàn 'sweep'
\textit{\textbroom} + \textit{\textdo}

In (13) and (14) the periphrastic AUX's acquire an instrumental case feature from the general meaning of the iP's with which they combine. Thus in (13), duxtàn 'sew' takes on the meaning of 'use' so that \textit{\textcešm} duxtàn comes to mean 'use an eye (so see)'. Likewise in (14) kardàn 'do' takes on the semantic contents of 'use' such that \textit{\textjāru} kardàn takes on the meaning 'use a broom (to sweep)'. In general a periphrastic AUX acquires the meaning 'use' when combined with a semantically instrumental iP to form a PV.

Though the periphrastic AUX's lose most of their semantic contents, the choice of AUX is not an altogether arbitrary process. Different AUX's are used with the same non-verbal element to produce transitive vs. intransitive forms, active vs. passive forms, causative vs. reflexive forms, or stative
vs. active forms of a particular PV. For example, with the ADJ.

bidār 'awake', the use of the AUX šodan 'become' produces bidār šodan 'awaken' (literally 'awake' + 'become') in its intransitive, reflexive sense, while the use of the AUX kardan 'do' produces bidār kardan 'awaken' (literally 'awake' + 'do') with its transitive, causative reading.

Though the periphrastic AUX is highly reduced in semantic contents, no two auxiliaries are completely interchangeable. The AUX's kardan 'do', nemudan 'show', and farmudan 'order' seem to be used interchangeably in many PV's to form doublets or triplets such as soāl kardan (literally 'question' + 'do'), soāl nemudan (literally 'question' + 'show'), and soāl farmudan (literally 'question' + 'order'), all basically meaning 'ask'. However, the three PV's are not exact synonyms, for they reflect very fine shades in meaning. soāl farmudan, for example, expresses respect towards the "performer" of the action, and is used in sentences such as:

(15) šāh soāl farmud 'The king asked a question.'

'king' 'question' 'ordered'

soāl nemudan differs from soāl kardan in that it belongs to a more literary level of Persian; soāl kardan is more commonly used in the spoken language. When used with an ADJ.P. in a periphrastic construction, the three AUX's kardan, nemudan, and farmudan may not even be all grammatical, let alone interchangeable. For example Persian has the PV divānē kardan 'to make crazy' (literally 'crazy' + 'do'), but not the expressions *divānē nemudan (literally 'crazy' + 'show') and *divānē farmudan (literally 'crazy' + 'order').

2.0 PV formation is not exclusively a device to fill in semantic gaps in the verbal category, where there are no simple verbs to express a certain notion. There is evidence, throughout its history, that the process of PV formation is not only a process of compensation for the lack of certain verbs in the language, but also a deliberate process to supplement and eventually supplant single-stem verbs in Persian.

2.1 The PV pattern is attested in Avestan, spoken hundreds of years prior to the influence of Arabic on Persian, thus eliminating the possibility that this process was devised by the language solely for the purpose of borrowing Arabic verbs that had no lexical representation in Persian. Though many compound verbs are attested in Avestan, the variety of possible periphrastic AUX's is limited, and their combinations with nonverbal elements are greatly restricted. The simple verb šemārdan 'count', and its
PV derivative and synonym šemār kardan (literally 'count' + 'do') for example, can be traced back to Avestan. (cf. Telegdi, 1950-51:330-1). The few usages of such verbs in Avestan (cf. Reichelt, 1909:226) are:

(16) yō naram vīxrūmāntān x'arām jāinti

'who', 'somebody(acc)', 'bloody(acc)', 'wound(acc)', 'hits'

'Who gives somebody a bloody wound.'

(17) skāndān sē manō kārūnūiā

'destruction(acc)', 'his', 'mind(acc)', 'do'

'destroy his mind'

(18) āat tā hazā nivarūzāyān daēva

'then', 'them(acc)', 'force(acc)', 'committed', 'the daēvas'

'then those Devas committed force against them.'

2.2 Pahlavi, generally known as Middle Persian, spoken in 300 B.C. - 900 A.D.; also prior to the Mohammedan and Arab influence, has more compound verbs than do Old Persian and Avestan, though the frequency of PV's in Pahlavi texts is rather limited in comparison with Modern Persian. Grammars of Pahlavi discuss under the topic of "compound verbs" verbs of the type PARTICLE + V, and not PV's as defined in this paper. The failure on the part of Pahlavi grammarians to devote any substantial work to the description of the PV, even though scattered examples of PV's are attested, can be interpreted to be indicative of the following: a) PV formation was not productive enough in Pahlavi to be recorded in grammar books, and b) that the syntactic behavior of the PV's was not uniform enough (as in Modern Persian) to warrant analysis and discussion. One can therefore conclude that the productivity and syntactic patterns of this construction are relatively recent developments, the conclusion pending a more thorough examination of the PV's in Pahlavi.

3.0 It seems that contact with Arabic may have stimulated the spread of this construction, for the PV's in all Islamic languages and Yiddish almost always contain Semitic non-verbal elements (Wexler; 1971; 1974). Periphrastic constructions using Arabic are extremely popular in Iranian and Turkic languages which had contact with Arabic, from which the non-verbal components of the PV were borrowed. In Yiddish the non-verbal component of the PV is invariably taken from Hebrew. It is in such situations of large-scale borrowing that the PV construction becomes productive. The language borrows a foreign noun and derives a PV from
it, without subjecting the loan word to any of the inflections that a
native verb might take. PV formation, then, is a "strategy" of the language
to get around a general phenomenon observed in situations of language
contact, namely the unreadiness of verbs (as opposed to nouns) to be
borrowed and nativized.

A great majority of PV's in Persian contain a non-verbal constituent
borrowed from Arabic. The basic types of Arabic loans penetrating into
the Persian PV are verbal nouns, present active participles, and past
passive participles from all the Arabic verb patterns (cf. Rastorgueva
1964:65-6). See examples (19)-(21)

(19) Arabic verbal noun yalabé 'victory':
    yalabé kardan 'vanquish'
    'victory' + 'do'
(20) Arabic present active participle yaleb 'vanishing:
    yaleb kardan 'vanquish'
    'vanquish(ing)' + 'do'
(21) Arabic passive past participle maylub 'vanquished':
    maylub kardan 'vanquish'
    'vanquished' + 'do'

Two or more synonymous PV's can thus be formed, each time using a different
form of the same Arabic loan word, whereas for each PV containing a non-
verbal element of pure Persian origins, there are no synonymous PV's
using other derivatives of the same non-verb. There is no preference
as to which of the three forms of the verb is borrowed from Arabic;
sometimes the verbal noun and the two participles can be used in PV's to
convey the same semantic contents, as seen in examples (19-21), where the
periphrastic AUX has the power to "undo" the passive sense inherent in the
Arabic past passive participle. Persian PV's formed from Arabic loans,
therefore, involve a distortion of the Arabic syntactic norms. Persian
disregards the [+passive] feature of the past passive participial forms
of the Arabic verbs it borrows, as can be seen in example (21), where
maylub is used with the active AUX kardan 'do' to produce an active verb
maylub kardan 'vanquish'. In order to form a passive PV with maylub,
the Persian language has to combine the passive AUX sodan 'be' with it.

(22) maylub sodan 'be vanquished'
    'vanquished' + 'become'
Evidence that PV formation is not essentially a "borrowing" device is the fact that Arabic stems are borrowed to derive PV's even when there are no semantic gaps in the Persian language for that verb. The verbal noun hesāb 'account' is borrowed and "periphrased" by the language to yield the verb hesāb kardan 'count' (literally 'account' + 'do') when the native šemār kardan 'count' and its periphrastic derivative šemār kardan 'count' (literally 'counting' + 'do') already are part of the lexicon.

Another example is the borrowing of the Arabic verbal noun soāl 'question' to form the PV soāl kardan 'ask' (literally 'question' + 'do'), when there exists a native simple verb porsidan 'count' and its periphrastic derivative porsid kardan 'count' (literally 'counting' + 'do') already are part of the lexicon.

Arabic is not the only foreign source of the non-verbal component of the PV in Persian. There are verbal semantic gaps in Persian for which PV's are created by combining a Western European non-verbal component and a native periphrastic AUX. A recent modern example of such a verb is telefon kardan 'call up' (literally 'telephone + 'do') formed by combining the Western nominal loan telefon 'telephone' with the native periphrastic AUX kardan 'do'. telefon kardan, being a verb of calling, takes a dative iP introduced by the marker be - 'to':

(23) parviz be-meri telefon kard 'Parviz called Mary up.'
   'Parviz 'to-Mary' 'telephone' 'did'

There are also PV's such as rezerv kardan 'book' (literally 'reserve' + 'do') formed from European loans, and which take an accusative iP.

(24) parviz otāq-rā rezerv kard 'Parviz reserved the room.'
   'Parviz' 'room-' 'reserve' 'did'
   d.a.c.m.

The gradual replacement of simple verbs by PV's is a prevalent trend in contemporary Persian. PV's are formed using native vocabulary even when their simple verb counterparts are still in usage. The periphrastic forms rather than the simple verbs expressing the same semantic contents are becoming dominant in the spoken language, pushing their simple form paraphrases into the level of the formal literary language. For example, yād gereftan 'learn' (literally 'memory' + 'take') is supplanting amuxtan 'learn', nešān dādan 'show' (literally 'sign' + 'give') is replacing nemudan, which is itself a productive periphrastic AUX, and farār kardan 'escape' (literally 'free' + 'do') is replacing
gorixtan 'escape'. In some cases the PV and the single verb it is supplanting are derivatives of the same stem, as is the case with ǰosteǰu kardan 'search' ('search' + 'do') and ǰostan 'search' and sanǰ kardan 'estimate' (literally 'estimate' + 'do') and sanǰid an 'estimate'; clearly indicating that the periphrastic constructions are not formed in order to fill the semantic gaps in the verbal lexicon.

4.3 Another aspect of the productiveness of the PV in Persian is that a different verb is generated for each verbal form such as active, passive, stative, causative, reflexive, etc. using the same non-verbal stem, combined with different periphrastic AUX's. For example, from the native noun stem yād 'memory' the following PV's are derived:

(25) yād gereftan (active, transitive) 'learn'
   'memory' + 'get'

(26) yād dādan (active, causative, transitive) 'teach'
   'memory' + 'give'

(27) yād dāštan (stative) 'know'
   'memory' + 'have'

(28) yād āvordan (active, transitive) 'remind'
   'memory' + 'bring'

(29) yād āmadan (passive) 'be remembered'
   'memory' + 'come'

(30) yād raftan (passive) 'be forgotten'
   'memory' + 'go'

4.4 Another aspect of the productivity of the PV formation process lies in the fact that a certain periphrastic AUX may be paired with different non-verb constituents to produce a variety of verbs. For example, using the simple native verb xordan 'eat' as the AUX, the following PV's, among others, can be formed:

(31) zamin xordan 'fall'
    'ground' + 'eat'

(32) čub xordan 'be beaten (with a rod)'
    'stick' + 'eat'

(33) qose xordan 'worry'
    'worry' + 'eat'

(34) qasam xordan 'swear'
    'swear' + 'eat'
In the above PV's part of the semantic contents inherent in the verb xordan 'eat' is reduced, and, as an AUX, it acquires a different semantic load from each of the different non-verbal constituents with which it combines.

The fact that the meanings of the PV's are not always absolutely predictable seems to indicate that the PV's are idiomatic. On the other hand, their recursiveness, their uniform structures, their syntactic behavior, and the predictability of their verbal features such as voice, causality, reflexivity, etc. argue for their productivity. The question remains open as to whether the PV's in Persian are "lexicalized" or whether they are to some extent genuinely productive.

5.1 Among the features that establish the PV formation as a productive process is the regular syntactic behavior of the PV's. The PV behaves as a single verbal unit, capable of taking a VP bearing the same grammatical relation to it as the one it includes. Further evidence in support of a V analysis of the PV comes from the inseparability of its components by other elements of the sentence. For example, the placement of the regular AUX is limited to pre-PV position as shown in (38) while the acceptability of (39) is rather marginal:

(38) bāce [VP dārad zamin mixorad] 'The child is falling.'
    'child' 'has' 'ground' 'eat'
(39) ?bāce [VP zamin dārad mixorad] 'The child is falling.'
    'child' 'ground' 'has' 'eat'

However, within a regular VP the regular AUX can appear either in the pre-verbal or the pre-object position, as examples (40)-(41) indicate:

(40) bāce [VP dārad sib mixorad] 'The child is eating an apple.'
    'child' 'has' 'apple' 'eat'
(41) bāce [VP sib dārad mixorad] 'The child is eating an apple.'
    'child' 'apple' 'has' 'eat'

A constituent that may interrupt a PV sequence, however, is a direct object or indirect object clitic. Object clitics are optionally placed in
Persian after the non-verbal element of a PV as in:

(42) parviz niz - rā [pāk-(e) kard] 'Parviz cleaned the table.'

which has the following syntactic variant, where the clitic is placed after the periphrastic AUX:

(43) parviz niz - rā [pāk kard - (e)]

With simple verbs the object clitic is generally placed after the verb.

(44) parviz sīb - rā xord-(e) 'Parviz ate the apple.'
    'Parviz' 'apple-d.a.c.m.' 'ate'-(it)

Indirect object clitics in sentences containing PV's likewise appear in one of two possible positions:

(45) parviz [pv soāl eš kard] 'Parviz asked him (something)'
    'Parviz' 'question' '-him' 'did'

(46) parviz [pv soāl kard - eš] 'Parviz asked him something')
    'Parviz' 'question' 'did' 'him'

The indirect object clitics in the post-direct object position are less acceptable in Π's than in PV's. This difference in acceptability strengthens the claim that the underlying structure of PV's is different from the Π constituents of Persian sentences. Notice the sentences:

(47) parviz soāl [v porsid - eš] 'Parviz asked him a question.'
    'Parviz' 'question' 'asked' 'him'

(48) ?parviz soāl - eš [v porsid] 'Parviz asked him a question.'
    'Parviz' 'question' 'him' 'asked'

where porsid 'asked' is a simple transitive verb and soāl 'question' its direct object.

Another type of example supporting a V analysis for the PV comes from the inseparability of its components by modifiers as in example (49)

(49) *parviz gūs -e ziyād dād ('Parviz listened much')
    'Parviz' 'ear-adjectival' 'much' 'gave'
    liaison(a.l.)

However, there is a type of PV's that at first glance seem to violate the "inseparability restrictions" imposed on them. Consider (50):

(50) parviz harf - e ziyād zad 'Parviz spoke much.'
    'Parviz' 'word-a.l. 'much' 'hit'

Such examples seem to serve as counterevidence for the hypothesis that the PV is an inseparable unit belonging to the category V. However, a
critical examination of such examples reveals that separable PV's must be viewed to be \( \mathfrak{P} \)'s in their base form, containing PV's whose objects have been deleted in certain predictable environments. With the deletion of the second of the two morphologically identical \( \mathfrak{P} \)'s, the sequence becomes structurally similar to the PV. Thus (50) in which the PV sequence \textit{harf zad} 'speak' (literally 'word' + 'hit') seems to be interrupted by a modifier, can be shown to be underlyingly (51), from which the second occurrence of \textit{harf} is deleted under morphological identity to produce (50).

\[
\text{(51) parviz harf} \quad \text{- e ziy\=\d{a}d harf zad.} \\
\text{Parviz 'word - a.l. 'much' 'word' 'hit'} \\
\text{spoke}
\]

The fact that a sequence of morphologically identical \( \mathfrak{P} \)'s does not appear in sentences of Persian suggests that there must be some device that blocks an underlying \( \mathfrak{P} \) containing two identical nouns from appearing on the surface, most likely by deleting the second of two identical nouns. Thus one can say \textit{so\=\d{a}l porsidan} 'ask a question,' where \textit{so\=\d{a}l} is the direct object of \textit{porsidan}, a simple verb, but not \textit{\textquoteleft so\=\d{a}l so\=\d{a}l kardan}, where \textit{porsidan} has been replaced by its PV counterpart \textit{so\=\d{a}l kardan}.

More evidence can be brought for the hypothesis that the underlying constituent structure of "separable" PV's is that of a \( \mathfrak{P} \) containing a direct object morphologically identical to the noun within the periphrastic sequence. The grammaticality of phrases such as \textit{so\=\d{a}l-r\=a kard} 'asked the question' with a definite direct object marker-r\=a inserted after the direct object \( \mathfrak{P} \) within the PV \textit{so\=\d{a}l kardan} 'ask' (literally 'question' + 'do'), indicates that such an occurrence of \textit{so\=\d{a}l} plays the role of a direct object, rather than the noun of the PV.

\[
\text{(52) parviz so\=\d{a}l} \quad \text{- r\=a kard} \quad \text{'Parviz asked the question.'} \\
\text{'Parviz' 'question-d.a.c.m.' 'did'}
\]

Also the sequence \textit{so\=\d{a}l-r\=a kard} cannot take a direct object of its own.

The position of the indirect object in sentences of the language constitutes another piece of evidence for the hypothesis that the seemingly "separable" PV's should be considered \( \mathfrak{P} \)'s with deleted nouns. The relative linear order between the direct and indirect object in Persian is stylistically conditioned, such that both orderings are possible:

\[
\text{(53) parviz ket\=\d{a}b} \quad \text{- r\=a be-man d\=\d{a}.} \quad \text{'Parviz gave the} \\
\text{'Parviz' 'book-d.a.c.m.' 'to-me' 'gave' book to me.'}
\]
(54) parviz be-man ketāb - rā dād. 'Parviz gave the book to me.'
    'Parviz'?to-me' 'book - d.a.c.m.' 'gave'

An indirect object can interrupt a PV sequence of the type illustrated by
(50) and (52), to produce alternate structures such as (57) and (58), but
cannot interrupt PV's in general, as (55) and (56) indicate.

(55) parviz be - man [Py harf zad] 'Parviz spoke to me.'
    'Parviz' 'to - me' 'word' 'hit'
(56) "parviz [Py harf be - man zad] 'Parviz spoke to me'
    'Parviz' 'word' 'to - me' 'hit'
(57) parviz be - man [v harf e ziyād zad] 'Parviz spoke much
to me'
    'Parviz' 'to - me' 'word-a.l. 'much' 'hit'
(58) parviz [v harf - e ziyād be - man zad] 'Parviz spoke much
to me'
    'Parviz' 'word-a.l.' 'much' 'to - me' 'hit'

The variation in (57) and (58) can be explained in terms of free word
order between direct and indirect objects in Persian, if the surface
sequence harf-e ziyād zad is analyzed to be an underlying V.

5.2 The PV is syntactically distinct also from the grammatical category
V, for unlike the V, it does not participate in the native non-verbal
inflectional or derivational patterns. PV's behave differently from
simple verbs with respect to the non-verbal derivatives they possess.

Certain patterns of adjectival and nominal derivatives of verbs in Persian
are of the structure INF. + i-adjectives such as:

(59) [Adj xordan - i ] 'edible'
    'to eat - adjectival suffix'
    (a.s.)

and INF + i + hā - nouns such as:

(60) [IP xordan - i hā ] 'edible things'
    'to eat' - a.s. plural morpheme'

From the following table it can be seen that only simple verbs have
derivatives of the INF. -i and INF. -i - hā patterns: PV's are not
amenable to such patterns. Even the PV's gā kārdān 'hear' and harf
zadan 'speak,' which are paraphrasable by ḵēndān and goftān
respectively—both being simple verbs that have the above mentioned adjectival
and nominal derivatives—do not possess such derivatives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INFinitive</th>
<th>Verb Type</th>
<th>Adj[Inf-i] Pattern</th>
<th>Adj[Inf-i-hā] Pattern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>xordan</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>xordan - i</td>
<td>xordan - i - hā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to eat'</td>
<td></td>
<td>'edible'</td>
<td>'edible things'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>šenidan</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>šenidan - i</td>
<td>šenidan - i hā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to hear'</td>
<td></td>
<td>'audible'</td>
<td>'audible things'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>guš kordan</td>
<td>periphrastic</td>
<td>&quot;guš kordan - i&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;guš kordan - i - hā&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'ear' + 'to do'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unintelligible meaning</td>
<td>unintelligible meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to hear'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>goftan</td>
<td>simple</td>
<td>goftan - i</td>
<td>goftan - i - hā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to speak'</td>
<td></td>
<td>'speakable'</td>
<td>'sayings'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>harf zadan</td>
<td>periphrastic</td>
<td>&quot;harf zadan - i&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;harf zadan - i - hā&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'word' + 'to hit'</td>
<td></td>
<td>unintelligible meaning</td>
<td>unintelligible meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'to speak'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. In conclusion, it seems that PV formation in Persian got great impetus with the increasing number of Arabic verbs that had to be nativized. Because of the difference between the structures of the host and target languages, the direct borrowing of verbs from Arabic into the Persian declension patterns would have greatly violated the Arabic structure. PV formation appears to have been the ideal compromise between the two structures, for it kept the Arabic component indeclineable. At first PV formation may have been a conscious learned process, but its productiveness increased with usage to the extent that today PV's are used more often than simple V's in the colloquial language. The data in Table I corroborates with the fact that the PV's are not completely productive as simple V's in some ways, showing that the PV's have not yet been completely integrated into the verbal system of Persian.

It seems that one cannot give conclusive explanations for this general trend towards verbal prolixity in the Persian language. The speculations provided above, however, suggest directions for further research.
I would like to thank Hans Hock, Robert Lees, Paul Wexler, and Ladislav Zgusta for reading and commenting on an earlier version of this paper.

The following is a list of the productive periphrastic Aux's in Persian, complementing those listed in the text:

saxtan 'create'
nebudan 'show'
farmudan 'order'
dastan 'have'
didan 'see'
gerfetan 'get'
gozastan 'put'
baxtan 'lose'
bordan 'take'
bastan 'tie'
avordan 'bring'
raftan 'go'
âmadan 'come'
xastan 'want'
kesidan 'pull'
duxtan 'sew'
gardidan 'turn'
gardândan 'make turn'
resândan 'make reach'
goftan 'say'
k̠an 'pick'
xândan 'read'
gastan 'search'
yafťan 'find'
oftán 'fall'

Likewise a compound verb ṣtāhna kāṛna 'make praise' made up of
the native verbal noun ṣrāhna and the AUX kāṛna 'do' to express the same transitive notion, as in (I):

(i) mē jān - kī ṣrāhna kāṛ-ṛāhā-hū 'I praise John.'
'I' 'John - of' 'praise' 'do'

also takes a genetivalIP jān-kī. One explanation may be that the Persian PV tārif kardan 'relate' (literally 'relate' + 'do') may very well have served as a syntactic model for the Perso-Arabic compound verb in Hindi tārif kāṛna. The Persian PV tārif kardan means 'telling (good things)
about somebody/something'; it does not take an accusative IP, but an oblique one. It appears that "nativized" expressions such as tārif kāṛna, in turn serve as models for the Sanskrit or native calques such as ṣrāhna kāṛna, such that the latter expressions require the same type of IP's as their borrowed paraphrases. Further research, however, needs to be done to investigate the original uncalqued Hindi compound verbs in an effort to discover the distribution patterns of the types of IP's they can take.
The AUX of the PV construction should be properly differentiated from the so-called "regular" auxiliaries of the language, which generally precede another verbal component in a morphologically complex verb. An example of a regular auxiliary in Persian is xāstan 'want', used to indicate futurity.

(i) mixām be-rav-am 'I want to go.' 'want-lSg)' 'subjunctive-go-lSg.'

4(16) may have been formed after sentences with the pattern of (i):

(i) yo narām frazābaojānhām snaām ǰainti 'who''somebody(acc.)' 'Fr.(acc.)' - 'blow(acc)' 'hits'

where the verb in (i) equivalent to 'hit a blow' is clearly a "figuraa etymologia' of the type'dream adream'.

To assume, on the other hand, that the PV construction is essentially devised in order to borrow into the language verbs in which it is deficient would imply that simple verbs cannot be derived from loan words. This is not strictly true. There are Arabic loan verbal noun stems from which simple Persian verbs are formed, though such verbs are rare in the language. Examples are raqsidan 'dance', fah米兰dan 'comprehend', and talabidan 'request', which follow the inflectional patterns of the Persian simple verbs. However, even these verbs are supplemented by their corresponding periphrastic forms raqsid kardan (literally 'dance' + 'do'), fah米兰 dāstān (literally 'comprehension' + 'have') and talab kardan (literally 'request' + 'do'), which use the Arabic verbal noun as the non-verbal component. The rarity of simple verbs such as raqsidan is not surprising, considering the differences in the declension patterns between the Persian and Arabic verbal patterns. PV's do less violence to the structure of the foreign loan. The same phenomenon is true about Perso-Arabic loans in Hindi, which follow the hindi simple verb declension patterns. Some examples are gārnāna 'warm up,' from the Persian adjective gārn 'hot', nārnāna 'to soften' from the Persian adjective nārn 'soft', and ūjāna 'solidify' from the Perso-Arabic noun ūjā 'together', used to form the Persian PV ūjā kardan 'gather'.

6For the average speaker of Persian, hesāb kardan and ūjāārōndan are semantically equivalent—both meaning 'count', but the average so-called "learned" Persian detects a fine difference, namely that the former also has the sense of 'total up'.

Hindi PV's with English as the source of the non-verbal component, such as fon kārnā 'telephone' (literally 'telephone' + 'do'), expect kārnā 'expect' (literally 'expect' + 'do'), and fēyl kārnā 'fail' (literally 'fail' + 'do') introduced into the language over the past century do not seem to be calques on Perso-Arabic compounds, but rather productive unitary verbs with regular syntactic properties. Like their Persian counterparts, such PV's, if transitive in meaning, take accusative IP's, and not genetival IP's.
See, for example:

(i) mā : jān — ko əfōn kār → ṭāhā-hū 'I telephone John.'
'I' 'John-a.a.c.m.' 'telephone' 'do'

(ii) mā : jān — ko expect kār-ṭāhā-hū 'I expect John.'
'I' 'John-a.a.c.m.' 'expect' 'do'
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