

# BEITRÄGE ZUR IRANISTIK

Gegründet von Georges Redard, herausgegeben von Nicholas Sims-Williams

---

Band 34

Topics in Iranian Linguistics

Herausgegeben von Agnes Korn, Geoffrey Haig,  
Simin Karimi und Pollet Samvelian

WIESBADEN 2011  
DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG

Printed with the financial support  
of *Mondes iraniens et indiens* (UMR 7528, CNRS, Paris)

**Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek**

Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation  
in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten  
sind im Internet über <http://dnb.d-nb.de> abrufbar.

© 2011 Dr. Ludwig Reichert Verlag Wiesbaden

ISBN: 978-3-89500-826-9

[www.reichert-verlag.de](http://www.reichert-verlag.de)

Das Werk einschließlich aller seiner Teile ist urheberrechtlich geschützt.  
Jede Verwertung außerhalb der engen Grenzen des Urheberrechtsgesetzes ist ohne  
Zustimmung des Verlages unzulässig und strafbar.

Das gilt insbesondere für Vervielfältigungen, Übersetzungen, Mikroverfilmungen  
und die Speicherung und Verarbeitung in elektronischen Systemen.

Gedruckt auf säurefreiem Papier (alterungsbeständig pH7 -, neutral)

Printed in Germany

# Topics in Iranian Linguistics

Herausgegeben von Agnes Korn, Geoffrey Haig,  
Simin Karimi und Pollet Samvelian

WIESBADEN 2011

DR. LUDWIG REICHERT VERLAG

# The Emergence and Development of the Sogdian Perfect

Antje Wendtland

## 1. Introduction

A periphrastic perfect formed with a passive participle and the auxiliary *have* is considered to be one of the constituting features of "Standard Average European", a *Sprachbund* proposed by some typologists – who argue that European languages (predominantly the Western European languages) share a number of grammatical features not found anywhere else and which have come about through geographical proximity and language contact (cf. Map 1).<sup>1</sup> While a *have*- and a *be*-perfect are distinguished in the more central languages, a restriction to a *have*-perfect occurs in the westernmost European area.<sup>2</sup>

However, the *have* construction alone is also found e.g. in Romanian, and both the *have*- and *be*-forms also occur in Icelandic.<sup>3</sup> The distinction of a *have*- and a *be*-perfect has been held to be a feature which is restricted to some Romance and Germanic languages.<sup>4</sup> In the typological literature only European languages are mentioned. But there is also a non-European language showing a similar periphrastic perfect, viz. the Hittite construction consisting of a participle and the verbs *har(k)*- "have" and *eš*- "be".<sup>5</sup>

## 2. The periphrastic perfect with *have* – a characteristic of 'Standard Average European'?

### 2.1 *Have*- and *be*-perfect in Germanic

Many linguists argue that the development of a periphrastic perfect was brought about through areal diffusion in Europe.<sup>6</sup> The Germanic *have*-perfect is often claimed to have arisen through the influence of the Latin construction,<sup>7</sup> mainly because it emerged rather late in Germanic and was grammaticalised within a short period of time, especially in Old High German, where it came into being in the ninth century and was established around 1000 CE, whereas the periphrastic tenses in the Romance languages developed between the third and the seventh century. But in more recent literature, one can find the theory that the construction came about through parallel processes of grammaticalisation and syntactic re-analysis, a grammatical change which happened independently in Germanic and Romance languages.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. e.g. HASPELMATH 2001.

<sup>2</sup> BENVENISTE 1960.

<sup>3</sup> See ABRAHAM 2005:117.

<sup>4</sup> See HASPELMATH 2001:1496 on the *have*-perfect in Western European languages.

<sup>5</sup> See Section 2.2.

<sup>6</sup> Differently ABRAHAM 2005:124.

<sup>7</sup> Literature in which influence of Latin syntax is postulated is discussed by ÖHL 2009:266ff.

<sup>8</sup> ÖHL 2009.

Map 1: The distribution of the *have-* and *be-* perfect in Europe

Within Late Latin, one of the characteristics of the development of the periphrastic construction is the loss of agreement (see example 1).

- |     |                 |                 |              |  |
|-----|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--|
| (1) | <i>litteram</i> | <i>scriptam</i> | <i>habeo</i> | "I have a written letter"  |
|     | letter:ACC.F    | write:PSTPTC.F  | have:1SG     |  |
| ⇒   | <i>litteram</i> | <i>scriptum</i> | <i>habeo</i> | "I have written a letter" (ÖHL 2009:274;<br>BENVENISTE 1968:86-91) |
|     | letter:ACC.F    | write:PSTPTC    | have:1SG     |  |

In the first translation of the Old High German Bible, which dates from the beginning of the 9<sup>th</sup> century, the perfects and plusquamperfects of the Latin version are translated by preterites.<sup>9</sup> The German Luther-translation, in which periphrastic perfects are used, is given here for comparison.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> ÖHL 2009:267ff.

<sup>10</sup> For more examples see ÖHL 2009:268.

(2) Old High German: Tatian 149,5 (ÖHL 2009:268)

*mit diu gientota ther heilant thisu uuort*  
with this end:PRET the saviour these words

*cum consumasset Ihesus verba haec*

da Jesus diese Rede **vollendet hatte** (Luther: Matthew 7,28)

(3) Old High German: Tatian 43,3 (ÖHL 2009:268)

*uuanta thu ubar fohiu uuari gitriuuu, ubar managu thih gisezzu.*  
because you over few be:PRET faithful, over many you put  
*quia super pauca fuisti fidelis, super multa te constituiam.*

Du **bist** über wenigem getreu **gewesen**; ich will dich über viel setzen

(Luther: Matthew 25,23)

In Germanic a past participle with forms of the verb "to be" was used<sup>11</sup> before periphrastic forms with *have* arose. The first participles found in this construction are formed from transitive verbs which take a direct object. This use gradually spread to intransitive verbs. In Old High German this took place only around 1000 CE, whereas the development in Old Saxon started already more than 150 years earlier.<sup>12</sup>

(4) Old Saxon (ca. 840 CE): Heliand 3895 (ÖHL 2009:275)

*habde iru tho giholpan helag barn godes*

have:3SG she:DAT then help:PSTPTC holy child god:GEN

"had her then helped holy child of God [= then the holy child of God had helped her]"

(5) Old High German (around 1000 CE): Notker II: 15, 30 (ÖHL 2009:275)

*habe ich keweinet so filo*

have:1SG I cry:PSTPTC so much

"I cried so much"

## 2.2 *Have-* and *be-*perfect in Hittite

One argument against the *have / be* perfect being exclusively Western European is the existence of a parallel construction in Hittite. The Hittite construction is composed of with a participle and a form of the verb *har(k)-* "have" and *eš-* "be" is found. Morphologically the construction differs from that of the above mentioned European languages insofar as the Hittite participle ends in *-nt-*. But its function corresponds to the participle employed by the languages mentioned above, so the construction may quite well be compared with the perfect in European languages.<sup>13</sup>

In the *har(k)-*construction the participle is in the nominative-accusative neuter, in the *eš-*form the participle agrees with the subject in gender, number and case.<sup>14</sup> Transitive verbs and also some intransitive are used with *har(k)*, other intransitive verbs with *eš-*.<sup>14</sup>

<sup>11</sup> ÖHL 2009:269f.

<sup>12</sup> ÖHL 2009:272.

<sup>13</sup> HOFFNER / MELCHERT 2008:339. The *har(k)-*construction was first described as periphrastic perfect by BENVENISTE 1962:41-65.

<sup>14</sup> HOFFNER / MELCHERT 2008:310.

(6) Hittite: Cuneiform texts from Boghazköi 4.9 vi 6-8 (HOFFNER/MELCHERT 2008:311)

<i>ta</i>	<i>mān</i>	DUMU.MEŠ	È.GAL	<i>kuēzzi</i>	<i>paršnan</i>	<i>ḫarkanzi</i>
COJ	if, when	son.PL	palace	REL.PR:ABL	crouch:PTC	have:3PL
<i>n=at</i>		<i>apezza</i>		<i>peššiyazi</i>		
COJ=CL.PR.ACC.SG	DEM:ABL		throw:3SG			

"If he throws (it) to the side on which the palace officials have crouched"

(7) Hittite: Cuneiform tablets from Mašat-Höyük 25:15-19

(HOFFNER/MELCHERT 2008:311)

<i>nu=ššan</i>	<i>mān</i>	<i>ḫalkiēš</i>	<i>aranteš</i>
and=PART	if, when	grain:N.PL	arrive:PTC.N.PL
<i>n=aš=kan</i>		<i>arḫa</i>	<i>waršten</i>
COJ=CL.PR.ACC.PL=LOC.PART	(adv) off	harvest:IMPV.2PL	

"When the crops have ripened (lit. 'arrived'), harvest them!"

HOFFNER/MELCHERT mention that intransitive verbs which are used with *har(k)-* belong to the unergative class, whereas intransitives with *eš-* are unaccusative. This distinction is discussed in the following paragraph.<sup>14</sup>

### 3. The unaccusative hypothesis

Different models have been proposed to explain why some verbs take *have* and others *be* as an auxiliary.<sup>15</sup> For our purpose the unaccusative hypothesis appears to fit best. Two classes of intransitive verbs can be distinguished, so-called unaccusative and unergative verbs. Unergative verbs are characterised by having an underlying object (but no subject), unaccusative verbs on the other hand, have an underlying subject. There is also a tendency for unaccusative verbs to express a telic and dynamic change of state or location while unergative verbs denote an agentive activity not involving directed movement. Unaccusative verbs are formed with *be* in the perfect, whereas unergative verbs take *have*.

	(8) Unergative:	(9) Unaccusative:
Dutch	<i>De vrouw heeft lang gewerkt.</i>	<i>De kinderen zijn daar gebleven.</i>
French	<i>La femme a travaillé pour longtemps.</i>	<i>Les enfants sont restés là.</i>
	"The woman worked for a long time."	"The children remained there." <sup>16</sup>

In the following the Sogdian material will be examined to see if this also applies to non-European languages other than Hittite.<sup>17</sup>

### 4. Sogdian perfect forms

In Sogdian, an East Middle Iranian language, a construction of a past participle and forms of the verb "to have" and "to be" is found; its emergence and further development follow the same grammaticalisation process as in the European languages (cf. BENVENISTE 1952).

<sup>15</sup> For a discussion see SHANNON 1990:461-469.

<sup>16</sup> SHANNON 1990:464.

<sup>17</sup> For other Iranian languages see EDEL'MAN 1975.

There are two forms of the perfect in Sogdian:

1. Past participle + inflectional forms of the verb "to be" which are directly attached to the participle. The third singular has no ending with heavy stems, the light stem ends in  $-y$ , the feminine in  $-ʔ$ .
2. The past stem, originally ending in  $-w$  plus forms of the verb  $\deltaʔr-$  "hold, have".<sup>18</sup> In older texts the auxiliary is written separately, whereas the  $w$ -ending is lost later and the auxiliary is attached to the participle.

Table 1 lists forms of the periphrastic perfect. The variation in the orthography is due to the use of different scripts. Sogdian texts are written in three different scripts, which (although they are all of Aramaic origin) have different orthographic conventions and partly use heterographical writing. Buddhist, secular and part of the Manichaean texts are written in the so-called Sogdian script, for other Manichaean texts the Manichaean script is used and the Syriac (Nestorian) script is employed for the Christian material. A characteristic of the Sogdian grammar is a double system of inflection. For the nominal system this means that the majority of words distinguish only a direct and an oblique case, whereas words which consist of only one syllable with a short vowel still inflect for up to six cases. The latter are called "light stems" whereas all others are "heavy". A distinction of light and heavy stems also exists in the verbal system. Among the perfect forms the only difference is the form of the third singular masculine *be*-perfect. Light stems take the ending  $-y$ , e.g.  $q\tau y$  "has become", heavy stems have no ending, e.g.  $\text{ʔ}\gamma t$  "have come".

Table 1: Sogdian perfect forms<sup>19</sup>

	be: e.g. "I have come, etc."	have: e.g. "I have given, etc."
1sg.	$\text{ʔ}\gamma t^2 ym$ je suis venu	$\delta\beta rt(w) \deltaʔ r^2 m$ j'ai donné
2sg.	$\text{ʔ}\gamma t^2 y\check{s}$ tu es venu	$\delta\beta rt-\deltaʔ r^2 y$ tu as donné
3sg.	$\text{ʔ}\gamma t$ $\text{ʔ}\gamma t^2$ il est venu elle est venue	$\delta\beta rt(w) \deltaʔ rt$ il/elle a donné
1pl.	$\text{ʔ}\gamma t^2 ym$ nous sommes venus	$\theta br d^2 rym$ nous avons donné
2pl.	$\text{ʔ}\gamma ts\delta$ vous êtes venus	$\theta br d^2 ry\check{s}^2$ $q\theta^2 rtt$ vous avez donné vous avez fait
3pl.	$\text{ʔ}\gamma t^2 nt$ ils sont venus	$\theta br d^2 rnt$ ils ont donné

These forms have been classified in different ways by Iranologists. BENVENISTE calls the *be*-form "le temps passif et neutre".<sup>20</sup> In his *Essai de grammaire sogdienne*, he compares the *have*-form with the French and German equivalents: "Comme le français ou l'allemand, dans les tournures comme "j'ai fait", "ich habe gemacht", le sogdien se sert d'une forme composé pareille, mais où le participe précède l'auxiliaire."<sup>21</sup> Although BENVENISTE states that the *have*-form "exprime l'action dont l'achèvement est constaté", he still calls it a

<sup>18</sup> The distinction between a light stem ending  $-w$  and a heavy stem ending in  $-t$  described by GERSHEVITCH 1954, §§ 878 f. cannot be confirmed, as many verbs have both past stems.

<sup>19</sup> As English has lost the *be*-perfect, French translations are given for better comparison.

<sup>20</sup> BENVENISTE 1929:51.

<sup>21</sup> BENVENISTE 1929:48f.



preterite.<sup>22</sup> GERSHEVITCH in his *Grammar of Manichaean Sogdian* speaks of "intransitive and transitive preterite".<sup>23</sup> The term "perfect" is occasionally used for both forms, e.g. by LIVSHITZ / HROMOV in their grammatical description of Sogdian or by HENNING.<sup>24</sup> Others, like MACKENZIE and PAUL use "perfect" only for the *have*-forms.<sup>25</sup>

## 5. First stage: no *have*-perfect<sup>26</sup>

The beginning of the development of the periphrastic perfect can be observed in the oldest extant Sogdian texts, the so-called Ancient Letters. They were written in the first third of the fourth century CE. Whereas e.g. in Letter no. II no trace of a *have*-form is to be seen and the mere participle and an enclitic pronoun is used, in other Letters we find the first examples of a periphrastic form with  $\delta^{\circ}r$ - "hold, have".

### 5.1 Transitive verbs: the past participle with enclitic personal pronoun

- (10)  $\overset{\circ}{H}RZY$   $xw^{\circ}yn\beta$   $\overset{\circ}{s}t$   $\delta$   $sr\delta$   
 COJ sirs be.3SG 8 year  
 $\overset{\circ}{Y}KZY=m$   **$pry\dot{s}t$**   $cntry$   $s^{\circ}r$   $s^{\circ}\gamma r^{\circ}k$   $\overset{\circ}{P}ZY$   $prn^{\circ}\gamma t$   
 that=CL.PR.1SG send:PSTPTC inside to:POSTPOS PN and PN  
 "And, sirs, it is eight years since I sent Saghrak and Farn-āghat 'inside'"  
 (Ancient Letter II, 31-32, SIMS-WILLIAMS 2001:271)

### 5.2 Intransitive verbs: past participles with a form of the verb "to be"

- (11)  $\overset{\circ}{H}RZY$   $\overset{\circ}{Y}K$   $\gamma^{\circ}wtws$   $\overset{\circ}{c}$   $kc^{\circ}n$   $wyt^{\circ}rt-\emptyset$   
 COJ when PN from Guzang go:PSTPTC-3SG  
 $\overset{\circ}{H}RZY=\dot{s}$   $py\dot{s}$   $wyt^{\circ}rt-\overset{\circ}{y}m$   
 and=CL.PR.3SG after go:PSTPTC-be.1SG  
 $\overset{\circ}{H}RZY$   $\overset{\circ}{\gamma}t-\overset{\circ}{y}m$   $\overset{\circ}{t}$   $\delta w^{\circ}n$   
 and come:PSTPTC-be.1SG to Dunhuang  
 "When Ghāwtus went (away) from Guzang I went after him,  
 and I came to Dunhuang" (Ancient Letter V, 10-12, SIMS-WILLIAMS et al. 1998:93)

## 6. First attestations of periphrastic constructions with *have*

The beginning of the formation of periphrastic forms can already be observed in the Ancient Letters. Periphrastic *have*-perfect forms are only found with verbs which take a direct object. Most examples can be found in Letter V, some of which can be seen in the following examples:

<sup>22</sup> BENVENISTE 1929:48-52.

<sup>23</sup> GERSHEVITCH 1954, §§ 861-879.

<sup>24</sup> LIVSHITZ / HROMOV 1981, 489f.; HENNING 1937:118-140 (glossary).

<sup>25</sup> MACKENZIE 1976; PAUL 1997. Note that PAUL 1997 uses the term "Präteritum" for the Sogdian imperfect and "Perfekt" for the *have*-forms.

<sup>26</sup> In the examples to follow, instances of the perfect forms are marked by bold type.

- (12) *xrstrnk ZY=t 20 styr n<sup>o</sup>krtk prt<sup>w</sup> δ<sup>o</sup>rt*  
 PN COJ=CL.PR.2SG 20 stater silver owe(?):PSTPTC have:3SG  
 "Kharstrang [owed(?)]<sup>27</sup> you 20 staters of silver"  
 (Ancient Letter V, 21, SIMS-WILLIAMS et al. 1998:93)
- (13) *ʰHRZY=m δβrtw δ<sup>o</sup>rt ZKw n<sup>o</sup>krtkw*  
 and=CL.PR.1SG give:PSTPTC have:3SG the:ACC silver  
 "He gave me the silver" (Ancient Letter V, 22, SIMS-WILLIAMS et al. 1998:93)
- (14) *kδ=ZY=m 20 styr prs<sup>t</sup>tw δ<sup>o</sup>rt*  
 if=COJ=CL.PR.1SG 20 stater send:PSTPTC have:3SG  
 "if he sent me 20 staters" (Ancient Letter V, 23, SIMS-WILLIAMS et al. 1998:93)
- (15) *ʰspnδ<sup>o</sup>t ZY=m ʰβyrtw δ<sup>o</sup>rt ʰwy r<sup>o</sup>δyH*  
 PN COJ=CL.PR.1SG find:PSTPTC have:3SG the:LOC way:LOC  
 "Aspandhāt found me on the way." (AL V, 25, SIMS-WILLIAMS et al. 1998:93)
- (16) *ʰHRZY=m δβrtw δ<sup>o</sup>rt*  
 and=CL.PR.1SG give:PSTPTC have:3SG  
*ʰHRZY KZNH wy<sup>t</sup>w δ<sup>o</sup>rt*  
 and thus say:PSTPTC have:3SG  
 "he gave (it) to me. He said thus"  
 (Ancient Letter V, 26, SIMS-WILLIAMS et al. 1998:93)

Constructions with participle and enclitic pronoun are still used in the Ancient Letters. The *have*-construction is not yet fully established in the Ancient Letters – and in Letter V there are still a few examples of past participles of transitive verbs, which still may occur alone, without auxiliary:

- (17) *ʰHRZY=m ʰc cntrs<sup>o</sup>r myδ myδ ʰβztrw ptywšt L<sup>o</sup> prtrw*  
 and=CL.PR.1SG from inside day day worse hear:PSTPTC not better  
 "[From] inside (China) [I] have heard worse—not better—(news) day (by) day"  
 (Ancient Letter V, 4-5, SIMS-WILLIAMS et al. 1998:93)

## 7. Buddhist texts: periphrastic perfect forms mainly in direct speech

The next stage of the development is represented by the Buddhist texts. These are mostly translations from Chinese and are characterised by a very formal style, complicated vocabulary and conservative grammatical forms. In these texts the perfect is rare and almost exclusively occurs in direct speech. For instance, only about 10 examples of the *have*-perfect are found in the six Buddhist Sogdian texts from the British Library published by MACKENZIE.

<sup>27</sup> In the following examples brackets, asterisks and other punctuation marks are adopted from the original text editions.

7.1 *Have*-perfect with transitive verbs in direct speech

- (18) *yw<sup>2</sup>r nys kβny ʔnβrt<sup>2</sup>kw prβyr<sup>2</sup>t δ<sup>2</sup>r<sup>2</sup>m*  
 but just a little in brief expound:PSTPTC have:1SG  
 "but I have just expounded a little in brief" (Intox. 31, MACKENZIE 1976:11)

7.2 *Be*-perfect with intransitive verbs in direct speech

- (19) *ZKZY tyw ʔwy prβtm ʔrny zn<sup>2</sup>kH*  
 who you the:GD last dhārānī knowledge  
*pw ptw<sup>2</sup>rt ʔyt-ʔyš*  
 without divergence enter:PSTPTC-be.2SG  
 "you who have entered the knowledge of the last dhārānī"<sup>28</sup>  
 (Dhūta-sūtra 69, MACKENZIE 1976:37)

In Buddhist texts transitive verbs in the past no longer occur without the auxiliary *δ<sup>2</sup>r*- which was common in the Ancient Letters.

## 8. The Vessantara Jātaka: frequent use of periphrastic perfect forms

The Vessantara Jātaka is a Buddhist text which, unlike most other Buddhist Sogdian texts, is not a direct translation from a Chinese source but an independent Sogdian version. It is composed in a style significantly different from that of the Sutra texts – a very simple, colloquial style. The periphrastic perfect is used very frequently. It is to be noted that the perfect forms do not occur in the narrative, only in direct speech. The use of the two forms is strictly distinguished in Buddhist texts.

## 8.1. Vessantara Jātaka: imperfect is used in the narrative

- (20) *rtY xwn<sup>2</sup>x myδβy ʔkyty ʔwyn swδ<sup>2</sup>šn*  
 COJ that minister REL.PR the:GD.SG.M PN  
*ZKw ʔzw<sup>2</sup>nH δ<sup>2</sup>βr rty ʔxw pr<sup>2</sup>yw<sup>2</sup>yδ zmnwH*  
 the:ACC life give:IMPF.3SG COJ PEPR.3SG.M at that time  
*cnn knδH βyks<sup>2</sup>r nyz<sup>2</sup>y*  
 from city outwards go out:IMPF.3SG  
 "That minister, who had given/gave the life to Suḍāṣan (= saved Suḍāṣan's life),  
 he went out of the city at that time."  
 (Vessantara Jātaka 1255-1258, BENVENISTE 1946:74)

## 8.2. Vessantara Jātaka: perfect is used in direct speech

- (21) *ʔzw ZY ʔβ<sup>2</sup>kH s<sup>2</sup>r mz<sup>2</sup>yx ʔrn ZY γw<sup>2</sup>nH ʔkrtw δ<sup>2</sup>r<sup>2</sup>m*  
 I COJ you:ACC towards great fault COJ sin make:PSTPTC have:1SG  
 "I have committed great faults and sin(s) against you"  
 (Vessantara Jātaka 1452, BENVENISTE 1946:83)

<sup>28</sup> *Dhārānī* (lit. "that through which something is maintained") is a type of ritual speech which serves to strengthen the mind (a knowledge gained through meditation or a contemplation).

9. Manichaean texts: first intransitive verbs with *have*-perfect

The first intransitive verbs which are used with the *have*-perfect are found in Manichaean texts, like the verb *rʹy-* "to cry":

- (22) *rtʹy xw zʹkw šyr rʹt=δʹrt*  
 and the boy very much cry:PSTPTC=have:3SG  
*ZKwy mʹty wʹnw pštʹw δʹrt*  
 the:GD mother:OBL thus ask:PSTPTC have:3SG  
 "The boy cried very much (and) asked the mother."  
 (KG 2, 9-10, SIMS-WILLIAMS 1990:284)

- (23) *rt=ms γrβ ky ZY cnn ʷyʹnpnyH ʷstwʹt δʹrʹnt*  
 and=also many who COJ from heresy convert:PSTPTC have:3PL  
 "and also many who have converted from heresy"  
 (KG 587-588, SUNDERMANN 1981a:49)

In the following sentence the *have*-perfect is used with the intransitive verb *ʷγš-* "to begin". The auxiliary is not only attached to the past participle but has already become morphologically merged with it. The ending of the participle, *-t*, is not written anymore.

- (24) *rtʹy ʷγšδʹrt ʹkw ʹBYw sʹr ZKn krn kʹt zʹky γzʹt*  
 and begin: HAVE PERF.3SG<sup>29</sup> to father to the:GD deaf dumb boy slander  
 "and she began to \*slander the deaf (and) dumb boy to his father"  
 (KG 2, 20, SIMS-WILLIAMS 1990:284)

In other texts, the *be*-perfect is used with the intransitive verb *ʷγš-* "to begin".

- (25) *(ʷ)γšt-Ø mrʹmw wyδβʹγ*  
 begin:BE PERF-3SG PN preaching  
 "It has begun the preaching of Mār Ammō." (KG 396, SUNDERMANN 1981a:39)

## 10. Perfects and imperfects used interchangeably

In several Manichaean texts perfects and imperfects are used in one sentence, without any perceptible difference.

- (26) *rt=xw kβryxβ pʹlyγwš*  
 COJ=the:N.SG.M PN hear:IMPF.3SG  
*rtʹy ywnʹyδ pr pδβʹr δβtyw wδʹyδ ʷyt*  
 COJ immediately in hurry again there come:BE PERF.3SG  
 "Gabryab heard (imperfect) it and immediately he came (perfect) there again"  
 (KG 595-597, SUNDERMANN 1981a:49)

<sup>29</sup> In this example the auxiliary cannot be distinguished from the participle anymore and not be glossed separately. The grammaticalisation of the construction has also taken place morphologically. Therefore, these forms are glossed as "HAVE PERFECT" and "BE PERFECT", respectively.

11. Christian texts: common use of unergative intransitive verbs with *have*

In Christian texts periphrastic perfect forms occur quite often. The *have*-perfect forms are further grammaticalised. The auxiliary also morphologically "merges" with the past participle. Forms ending in *-w* are no longer found. The auxiliary is attached to the past participle and often cannot be segmented. Unergative intransitive verbs are now regularly used with *have*:

- (27) *yw<sup>2</sup>r*    *w<sup>2</sup>nt*    *dywt*    *qy*    ***cx<sup>2</sup>rd<sup>2</sup>rnt***  
 but    those    demon:PL    which    fight:HAVE PERF.3PL  
*dyw*    *prw*    *s<sup>2</sup>t*    *wyny*    *žw<sup>2</sup>ny*    *žmnw*  
 with it    in    all    POSS    life:OBL    time  
 "but of those demons which fought with it in all its lifetime"  
 (manuscript C 2, 40 v 17, SIMS-WILLIAMS 1985:81)

- (28) *ʔt*    *pw*    *dbn*    ***žw<sup>2</sup>d<sup>2</sup>rt***  
 and    without    fear    live:HAVE PERF.3SG (unergative)  
*c<sup>2</sup>fyd*    *pstn<sup>2</sup>*    ***byrd<sup>2</sup>rt***  
 in as much    respite    find:HAVE PERF.3SG (tr.)  
 "And has lived without fear, in as much as he has found respite!"  
 (manuscript C 2, 51 r 26-27, SIMS-WILLIAMS 1985:91)

Unaccusative intransitive verbs are still used with *be*:

- (29) *qy*    ***nyžty-Ø***    *cywyd*    *tw<sup>2</sup>*    *ptry*    *ʔdm*  
 which    go out:BE PERF-3SG    from that    you:GEN    father    Adam  
*c<sup>2</sup>nw*    *xyr*  
 when    transgress:IMPF.3SG  
 "From which your father Adam went out when he transgressed"  
 (manuscript C 2, 51 v 12, SIMS-WILLIAMS 1985:91)

The final stage of the development of the periphrastic perfect in Sogdian can be observed in some Christian texts in which it behaves like a simple past and replaces the imperfect:

- (30) *ʔt*    ***zywstnt***    *x<sup>2</sup>nt*    *xwšpnyt*    [...]    *c<sup>2</sup>nw*  
 and    turn:BE PERF.3PL    those    shepherd:PL    while  
***ptwysd<sup>2</sup>rnt***    *ʔfrywn*    *ʔt*    *γwbty<sup>2</sup>*    *qw*    *bγy*    *s<sup>2</sup>r*  
 recite:HAVE PERF.3PL    blessing    and    praise    to:PREP    god    to:POSTP  
 "The shepherds returned, while they recited blessings and praise for God."  
 (manuscript C 17 v 10-12: Luke 2,20, SUNDERMANN 1981b:200)
- (31) [...] ***w<sup>2</sup>bd<sup>2</sup>rnt***    *mrtxmyt*  
 [...] sleep:HAVE PERF.3PL    people:PL  
 "(but while) everyone was sleeping"  
 (manuscript C 16 v 6, fragment T II B 66: Matthew 13,25, unpublished)

## 12. Feminine forms of the *be*-perfect

In the third singular the *be*-perfect has no ending when it is a heavy stem and *-y* when it is a light stem. Examples of feminine forms are very rare. In the following Christian text, the Passion of St. George, feminine forms are attested.

- (32) *cn* *pcqwyry* *ʾmpstʾ* *pr* *šyrqty* *pʾdy*  
 from fear:OBL fall:BE PERF.F.3SG at saint foot:OBL  
 "Out of fear she fell at the saint's feet." (manuscript C 1, 123-124, HANSEN 1941:10)

- (33) *cʾnw* *ʾyrʾ* *xʾ* *xwny* *wydʾwc* *ʾync*  
 when come:BE-PF.F.3SG the:F that one (French: celle) widow:ADJ woman  
*qw* *xʾnʾ* *sʾr* *wydʾrt*  
 to house to see:HAVE PERF.3SG  
*xʾny* *wnʾ* *rwst*  
 house.OBL tree grow:BE PERF.3SG  
 "And when that widow came home, she saw that the tree of the house had grown."  
 (manuscript C 1, 118-120, HANSEN 1941:10)

## 13. Conclusion

In the extant Sogdian material we can observe several stages of the emergence and further development of the periphrastic perfect in Sogdian. In the oldest texts intransitive verbs are formed with the past participle and a form of the verb *to be*, whereas with transitive verbs only the past passive participle is used without an auxiliary but with an enclitic personal pronoun to express the logical subject.

The beginning of the development of a periphrastic perfect form can already be seen in the oldest texts. Several transitive verbs are used with a form of *šʾr-* "have" in the "Ancient Letters" especially in Letter V, whereas they are not found in Letter II.

In the next stage, represented by Buddhist texts, the periphrastic *have*-form has become obligatory, and past participles no longer occur without *šʾr-*. The perfect is restricted to direct speech while the imperfect is used in narratives. The use of these forms is strictly distinguished.

In Manichaean and several other texts the first intransitive verbs come to be used with *have*. Like in European languages and in Hittite, these are so-called unergative intransitives. Unaccusatives continue to be used with *be*. In Manichaean texts the distinction between perfect and imperfect is weakened. Both forms occur side by side and in the same phrase.

In the following stage, represented by Christian texts, the unaccusative-unergative split becomes grammaticalised and more and more intransitive verbs occur with *have*. Whereas in the preceding stages, the periphrastic perfect forms are either used in letters or in direct speech, in the last stage, found in Christian gospels and saints' lives, the perfect is used as a simple past and partly replaces the imperfect.

The development of the Sogdian perfect is quite similar to that of the European languages which possess a *be-* and *have-*perfect, and follows the same paths of grammaticalisation. The periphrastic perfect can certainly not be seen as a characteristic feature of a European *Sprachbund*. This might be an argument for the possibility of the evolution of similar grammatical structures in Indo-European languages which are geographically remote.

Table 2: Stages of development of the *have-* and *be-*perfect in Sogdian

stage	verbs	patterns of the perfect	example	texts
1	itr tr	past participle + form of <i>be</i> attached past participle, no aux., enclitic pronoun	<sup>32</sup> γr <sup>2</sup> ym -m pṛwš <sup>2</sup> t	e.g. Ancient Letter II
2	itr tr	past participle + form of <i>be</i> attached past participle, no aux., enclitic pronoun past participle in -w + form of <i>have</i>	<sup>32</sup> γr <sup>2</sup> ym -m pṛwš <sup>2</sup> t δβrtw δ <sup>2</sup> rt	e.g. Ancient Letter V
3	itr tr	past participle + form of <i>be</i> attached past participle in -w + form of <i>have</i> regular	<sup>32</sup> γr <sup>2</sup> ym wyrtw δ <sup>2</sup> rt	Buddhist texts (mainly in direct speech)
4	itr tr	past participle + form of <i>be</i> attached first intransitive verbs with <i>have</i> past participle in -w or Ø + form of <i>have</i>	<sup>32</sup> γr <sup>2</sup> ym r <sup>2</sup> δ <sup>2</sup> rt pṛwš <sup>2</sup> w δ <sup>2</sup> rt	Manichaean texts (also used in the narrative)
5	itr unacc itr unerg tr	past participle + form of <i>be</i> attached past participle + form of <i>have</i> past participle without -w + <i>have</i> attached	<sup>32</sup> γr <sup>2</sup> ym žw <sup>2</sup> d <sup>2</sup> rt pṛwysd <sup>2</sup> rt	Christian texts (begins to replace the imperfect)
6	itr unacc itr unerg tr	past participle + form of <i>be</i> attached past participle + form of <i>have</i> past participle without -w + <i>have</i> attached	<sup>32</sup> γr <sup>2</sup> -ym wywsd <sup>2</sup> rt wyd <sup>2</sup> rt	Christian Gospels, KG 2 (used as simple past)

## Abbreviations

ABL	ablative	KG	Kirchengeschichte	PN	personal name
ACC	accusative		(Sogdian texts	POSS	possessive
ADJ	adjective		about Manichean	POSTPOS	postposition
AUX	auxiliary		church history)	PR	pronoun
CL.PR	clitic pronoun	LOC	locative	PREP	preposition
COJ	conjunction	ITR	intransitive	PRET	preterite
DEM	demonstrative	M	masculine	PTC	participle
F	feminine	N	nominative	PST	past
GD	genitive-dative	OBL	oblique	REL	relative
GEN	genitive	PART	particle	SG	singular
IMPF	imperfect	PEPR	personal pronoun	TR	transitive
IMPV	imperative	PERF	perfect	UNACC	unaccusative
Intox.	Sūtra of the condemnation of intoxicating drink	PL	plural	UNERG	unergative

## Literature

- ABRAHAM, Werner 2005: "Präteritumschwund und das Aufkommen des analytischen Perfekts in den europäischen Sprachen: Sprachbundausbreitung oder autonome Entfaltung?" In: Eckhard EGGERS, Jürgen Erich SCHMIDT, Dieter STELLMACHER (eds.): *Moderne Dialekte – Neue Dialektologie. Akten des 1. Kongresses der Internationalen Gesellschaft für Dialektologie des Deutschen (IGDD) am Forschungsinstitut für Deutsche Sprache "Deutscher Sprachatlas" der Philipps-Universität Marburg vom 5. - 8. März 2003*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, pp. 115-134.
- BENVENISTE, Émile 1929: *Essai de grammaire sogdienne. Deuxième partie: morphologie, syntaxe et glossaire*. Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- 1946: *Vessantara Jātaka [Mission Pelliot en Asie Centrale IV]*. Paris: Paul Geuthner.
- 1952: "La construction passive du parfait transitif." In: *Bulletin de la société linguistique* 48, pp. 52-62.
- 1960: "Être et avoir dans leurs fonctions linguistiques." In: *Bulletin de la société linguistique* 55, pp. 113-134.
- 1962: *Hittite et indo-européen. Études comparatives [Bibliothèque archéologique et historique de l'institut français d'archéologie d'Istanbul 5]*. Paris: Maisonneuve.
- 1968: "Mutations of linguistic categories." In: Winfred P. LEHMANN, Yakov MALKIEL (eds.): *Directions for Historical Linguistics*. Austin and London: University of Texas Press, pp. 85-95.
- EDEL'MAN, Joy I. 1975: "Les verbes 'être' et 'avoir' dans les langues iraniennes." In: François BADER et al. (eds.): *Mélanges linguistiques offerts à Émile Benveniste*. Louvain: Peeters, pp. 151-158.
- GERSHEVITCH, Ilya 1954: *A Grammar of Manichean Sogdian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- HANSEN, Olaf 1941: *Berliner soghdische Texte 1. Bruchstücke einer soghdischen Version der Georgs-passion (C 1) [Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Jahrgang 1941. Phil.-hist. Klasse Nr. 10]*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- HASPELMATH, Martin 2001: "The European linguistic area: Standard Average European." In: Martin HASPELMATH, Ekkehard KÖNIG, Wulf OESTERREICHER, Wolfgang RAIBLE (eds.): *Language typology and language universals [Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft]*. Berlin: de Gruyter, pp. 1492-1510.
- HENNING, Walter B. 1937: *Ein manichäisches Bet- und Beichtbuch [Abhandlungen der Preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Jahrgang 1936. Phil.-hist. Klasse Nr. 10]*. Berlin: de Gruyter (= id.: *Selected Papers I [Acta Iranica 14]*, pp. 417-557).
- HOFNER, Harry, A., and Craig H. MELCHERT: *A Grammar of the Hittite Language 1: Reference Grammar [Languages of the Ancient Near East 1]*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- LIVŠIĆ, Vladimir A., and Albert HROMOV L. 1981: "Sogdijskij jazyk." In: *Osnovy iranskogo jazykoznanija: sredneiranskije jazyky*. Moscow: Nauka, pp. 347-514.



- MACKENZIE, David Neil 1976: *The Buddhist Sogdian Texts of the British Library* [Acta Iranica 10]. Tehran/Liège: Brill.
- ÖHL, Peter 2009: "Die Entstehung des periphrastischen Perfekts mit *haben* und *sein* im Deutschen – eine längst beantwortete Frage?" In: *Zeitschrift für Sprachwissenschaft* 28/2, pp. 265-306 ([http://oehl.gesuss-info.de/UniWupp/Kurse/08\\_WiSe/.../02\\_diPetro.pdf](http://oehl.gesuss-info.de/UniWupp/Kurse/08_WiSe/.../02_diPetro.pdf)).
- PAUL, Ludwig 1997: "Präteritum und Perfekt im Soghdischen." In: *Indogermanische Forschungen* 102, pp. 199-205.
- SHANNON, Thomas F. 1990: "The Unaccusative Hypothesis and the History of the Perfect Auxiliary in Germanic and Romance." In: Henning ANDERSEN, Konrad KOERNER (eds.): *Historical Linguistics 1987. Papers from the 8<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Historical Linguistics (Lille, 31<sup>st</sup> August - 4<sup>th</sup> September 1987)*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, pp. 461-488.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas 1985: *The Christian Sogdian Manuscript C 2* [Berliner Turfantexte 12]. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- 1990: "The Sogdian Fragments of Leningrad II: Mani at the Court of Shahanshah." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 4, *In honor of Richard Nelson Frye. Aspects of Iranian Culture*, pp. 281-288.
- 2001: "The Sogdian Ancient Letter II." In: Maria Gabriela SCHMIDT, Walter BISANG (eds.): *Philologica et Linguistica. Historia, Pluralitas, Universitas. Festschrift für Helmut Humbach zum 80. Geburtstag am 4. Dezember 2001*. Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier, pp. 267-280.
- SIMS-WILLIAMS, Nicholas, Frantz GRENET, and Étienne DE LA VAISSIÈRE 1998: "The Sogdian Ancient Letter V." In: *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 12, *Alexander's Legacy in the East. Studies in Honor of Paul Bernard*, pp. 91-104.
- SUNDERMANN, Werner 1981a: *Mitteliranische Texte kirchengeschichtlichen Inhalts* [Berliner Turfantexte XI]. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- 1981b: "Nachlese zu F. W. K. Müllers 'Soghdischen Texten I' 3. Teil." In: *Altorientalische Forschungen* 8, pp. 169-225.

## Table of Contents

Editors' Preface .....	7
------------------------	---

### **Part I. Historical and Comparative Iranian Syntax**

Definite Articles in Bactrian SALOUMEH GHOLAMI .....	11
Differential Object Marking in Bactrian NICHOLAS SIMS-WILLIAMS .....	23
The Emergence and Development of the Sogdian Perfect ANTJE WENDTLAND .....	39
Pronouns as Verbs, Verbs as Pronouns: Demonstratives and the Copula in Iranian AGNES KORN .....	53
Counterfactual Mood in Iranian ARSENIY VYDRIN .....	71

### **Part II. The Morpho-Syntax of Lesser-known Iranian Languages**

A Glance at the Deixis of Nominal Demonstratives in Iranian Taleshi DANIEL PAUL .....	89
Valence Sensitivity in Pamirian Past-tense Inflection: A Realizational Analysis GREGORY STUMP, ANDREW HIPPISEY .....	103
Participle-Converbs in Iron Ossetic: Syntactic and Semantic Properties OLEG BELYAEV, ARSENIY VYDRIN .....	117
On Negation, Negative Concord, and Negative Imperatives in Digor Ossetic DAVID ERSCHLER, VITALY VOLK .....	135

**Part III. Linguistics of Modern Persian**

Reducing the Number of Farsi Epenthetic Consonants NAVID NADERI, MARC VAN OOSTENDORP .....	153
On Direct Objects in Persian: The Case of the Non- <i>râ</i> -Marked DOs SHADI GANJAVI .....	167
Finite Control in Persian MOHAMMADREZA PIROOZ .....	183
Bilingual Speech of Highly Proficient Persian-French Speakers FARZANEH DERAVID, JEAN-YVES DOMMERGUES .....	197
List of Contributors .....	213