

Oleh Kshanovsky
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

TWO-VERB CHAINS IN MODERN PERSIAN WITH TYPOLOGICAL PARALLELS IN SLAVONIC LANGUAGES

Дієслівна серіалізація (або серійні дієслова) притаманна багатьом мовам у різних частинах світу, наприклад, мовам Західної Африки, Південно-Східної Азії, Нової Гвінеї, Океанії, Центральної Америки, а також різноманітним піджинам і креольським мовам. Зазвичай, серіалізацією називають явище, при якому два або більше дієслова у реченні йдуть одне за одним у тій самій видо-часовій формі, причому суб'єкт та об'єкт позначено лише у першому дієслові. Інакше кажучи, вживається низка, ланцюг дієслів, а виражають вони семантично єдиний предикат. У різних мовах це явище має доволі велику кількість специфічних лексико-семантичних і граматичних рис. У широкому розумінні синтаксичні конструкції з кількома (зазвичай, двома) ідентичними словоформами притаманні, мабуть, більшій кількості мов світу, ніж традиційно вважається і претендують на універсальний статус. Проаналізований матеріал свідчить про те, що дієслівна серіалізація в сучасній перській мові, незважаючи на цілковиту відсутність традиції її виокремлення, має місце: засвідчено дводієслівні серійні конструкції.

Ключові слова: серіалізація, дієслівні серії, типологія, перська мова, синтаксис, семантика.

Глагольная сериализация (или серийные глаголы) характерна для многих языков, например, Западной Африки, Юго-Восточной Азии, Новой Гвинеи, Океании, Центральной Америки, а также для разнообразных поджинов и креольских языков. Обычно, сериализацией называют явление, при котором два или более глагола в предложении идут друг за другом в одинаковой видо-временной форме, причем субъект и объект выражен лишь в первом глаголе. Иначе говоря, употребляется несколько глаголов, но выражают они семантически единый предикат. В разных языках это явление имеет довольно большое количество специфических лексико-семантических и грамматических черт. Проанализированный материал свидетельствует о том, что явление сериализации в современном персидском языке, несмотря на полное отсутствие традиции ее выделение, имеет место. На материале современного разговорного и книжного персидского языка выявлены двухглагольные серийные конструкции. Главные их черты – общая аргументная структура и финальная позиция главного глагола, который выражает фреймовое событие, – наглядно демонстрирует рассмотренный выше материал.

Ключевые слова: сериализация, глагольные цепочки, персидский язык,

The serialization (or verb chains) is considered a phenomenon in which two or more parts of speech in a sentence are following each other in the same form. For example, in a verb chain the subject and the object in such constructions are expressed only in the first verb. In different languages, this phenomenon has a fairly large number of specific lexical-semantic and grammatical features. Broadly speaking, the syntactic structures with several (usually two) identical word forms appear to be typical, perhaps, for more languages than traditionally considered, and they claim to a universal status. Despite the complete lack of tradition of the selection of the category of serialization in Persian language, our results demonstrate the existence of two-verb chains in modern colloquial Persian.

Key words: *serialization, verb-chains, typology, Persian language, syntax, semantics.*

Introduction. *Serialization (or serial verbs) is typical for languages in different parts of the world, notably West Africa, Southeast Asia, New Guinea, Oceania, Central America, as well as for a number of pidgins and creoles. In general, serialization means a phenomenon in which two or more verbs in a sentence follow each other in the same aspect and tense form, with the subject and the object only being expressed in the first verb. In other words, it is used with a few verbs, but they act as a single semantic predicate. In different languages, this phenomenon has a fairly large number of specific lexical-semantic and grammatical features. Broadly speaking, the syntactic structures with several (usually two) identical word forms appear to be typical, perhaps, for more languages than traditionally considered, and they claim to a universal status.*

The constructions with the doubling of the forms are widespread in the Russian spoken language. They are primarily the so-called double verbs and double case forms of nouns.

(*Poyd-u skaz-u*

1) a.

go:FUT-1SG tell:FUT-1SG

‘I will go and talk.’

Na stol-e na skatert-y

b.

on table-LOC on tablecloth-LOC

‘On the table and tablecloth’.

In the Russian grammar such constructions are called *paratactic*, understanding parataxis as a syntactic relationship between two similar grammatical word forms associated with each other in meaning. They either occupy an independent position in the sentence, or depend on another word form. Paratactic constructions are different from subordinating because they lack a formal expression of the dependence of one form from the other. Besides, they cannot be called a subordinate either because: there is no intonation of enumerating between the members of the group; the group is limited to two terms only, but

from the semantic point of view, the members of the pair are heterogeneous; they come in a number of logical relations of subordination [2; 3]. The components of such structures can be verbs in different aspectual and temporal forms (see [2, p. 80–81]):

- Present tense, indefinite
Ya yemu uže khož-u zakazyvay-u bilet-y
- 2)
- I he:DAT already go:PRES-1SG order:PRES-1SG ticket-PL
‘I keep going to book tickets for him.’
- Past tense, imperfect
Ya v gorod yez-d-il-a poluch-al-a eti posylk-y
- 3)
- I into downtown go-PAST-FEM received-PAST-FEM these parcel-PL
‘I have been going downtown to receive these parcels.’
- Future tense, perfect
My dogovor-il-is’ chto ya zavtra prid-u podpish-u bumag-i
- 4)
- we agree-PAST-PL that I tomorrow come:FUT-1SG sign:FUT-1SG paper-PL
‘We’ve agreed that I would come and sign these papers tomorrow.’
- Past tense, perfect
On dogad-al-s’a kup-il tsvet-y
- 5)
- he guess-PAST-MASC:1SG buy-PAST(MASC:1SG) flower-PL
‘It occurred to him to buy flowers.’
- Imperatives
Ladno idi užynay
- 6)
- okey go:IMPER(2SG) have.supper:IMPER(2SG)
‘Ok, just go and have dinner.’
- Infinitives
Može-te poyekha-t’ posmotre-t’
- 7)
- may:PRES-PL go-INF see-INF
‘You may go and see for yourself.’
- Conditionals
Yesli by ty poshel zaraneye
- 8)
- if SUBJUNCT you:SG go:PAST(MASC:2SG) in.advance
uznal, to teper’ nie nado bylo by...
check:PAST(MASC:2SG) CONJ now NEG need

be:PAST(3SG) SUBJUNCT

‘If you had gone and checked in advance, now we would not have to...’

Among the most frequent lexical-semantic relations within these forms in Russian one can point out:

- action and its qualitative characteristics in the form of action

Khokhoch-et zalivay-et-s'a

9)

laugh:PRES-3SG trill:PRES-3SG-REFLEX

‘He is rolling with laughter.’

- Specific action, carried out while remaining in a particular state, that is two actions or states related to each other:

(10) a. *Siž-u pish-u*

sit:PRES-1SG write:PRES-1SG

‘I sit writing.’

Lež-yt sp-it

b.

lie:PRES-2SG sleep:PRES-2SG

‘He lies sleeping.’

- the intention to take a certain action (or the awareness of the need to implement it) and the action itself

(11) a. *Soobraz-il-a priviez-l-a*

Realize-PAST-FEM:3SG bring-PAST-FEM:3SG

‘It occurred to her to bring it.’

b. *Dogada-l-a-s' vymy-l-a pol*

realize-PAST-FEM:3SG-REFLEX wash-PAST-FEM:3SG

floor

‘She went and scrubbed the floor.’

c. *Soglasi-l-a-s' pieriediela-l-a*

agree-PAST-FEM:3SG-REFLEX

remake-PAST-

FEM:3SG

‘She agreed to modify it.’¹

The formal definition of the grammatical status of these units remains one of the main and still unsolved problems in the study of serial verb constructions with the data of the languages of different structures. If they present a monolith phrase of the sentence, should they be considered as one (complex) word or sentence? The predicate argument structure depends on this definition. It can be said in favor of the definition of such constructions as a single word-form pattern in many languages, firstly, that a serial construction represents a single indivisible action. This implies that the translation of these forms from exotic languages into languages of other structures (e.g. English) only needs one word in many cases. Secondly, all the verbs in the chain have, as a rule, both a common grammatical meaning of tense, aspect, modality, etc., and a common formant, which expresses

¹More on serial constructions in the Russian language see [5; 6; 7].

these meanings. Thirdly, these verbs also have a common argument. In general, as some researchers have noted (see [1, p. 31]), the languages in which the phenomenon of serialization is grammatically regulated, enable these forms to have a strong tendency either for lexicalization (verbal forms become one word-form, that is a complex word) or to grammaticalization (separate from the chain verb forms becomes auxiliary elements of the main verb form). In order to define a structure as a serial verbal (and other) structure, this phenomenon must be approached from the point of view of the rules of the human ability to conceptualize the semantic space and to structure concepts (to build the sequence of events).

Functional-typological definition of serialization. According to Leonard Talmy's (see [4, Chapters 1 and 3]) typological conception of the Event integration, the process of speech is the interaction of two independent but closely interrelated domains – semantic (inside) and lexical-grammatical (external). The semantic domain of events consists of categories such as Motion, Path, Figure, Ground, Manner and Cause. Lexical-grammatical domain of events consists of the word forms, prepositional and postpositional elements of phrases, and so on. The relationship between these two domains is not symmetrical: one semantic category can be expressed by a combination of lexical and grammatical elements; on the other hand, the combination of semantic categories can be transmitted by only one surface element. However, there is also a wide range of universal principles and typological patterns (i.e. regularities) that define the relationship of semantic categories and lexical-grammatical elements [Ibid, p. 21].

The idea of “event” is central to the cognitive-semantic theory of Leonard Talmy, and, according to the researcher, is the basic category of human cognition. He regards mind as a cognitive process, constantly aiming at the conceptual distribution (classification) of events and phenomena of reality and subsequently, at their description. The essence of this process lies in the demarcation of the continuum in the sphere of space, time, and quantity etc. This fact accounts for the existence of nouns in all languages of the world, that is, names for the objects in human environment.

“Event” is a subspecies of the conceptual partitioning which makes discrete space-temporal continuum in certain portions. This fact accounts for the existence of verbs, that is, names for portions of time, space and movement, in all languages of the world. Conceptually, the event can be unitary and complex [Ibid, p. 215]. In turn, a complex event can be expressed either by a subordinate clause in the complex sentence, or in one simple sentence:

The candle went out.

12)

The candle went out because something blew on it.

13)

The candle blew out.

14)

In the first sentence (12) the main idea (the candles stopped burning) is expressed as a single event (by a simple sentence). In the second sentence (13) the

idea of the end of the candle's burning supplemented by cause of it which is expressed as a complex event (by a complex sentence). In the third sentence (14) the complex event is expressed as a single event (by a simple sentence again). To denote the latter phenomenon (sentence 14), that is expressing of a complex event by a single predicate, L. Talmy coins the term **macro-event**. The macro-event contains two components: the **main**, or the **framing event**, for example, sentence (12), as well as a **subordinate event** or **co-event**, for example, sentence (13). The framing event is the main idea of complex (and single) events – Motion (of Agent or Patient) or four ideas metaphorically derived from it – Temporal contouring, State change, Action correlation and Realization. The five conceptual domains express the semantics of a predicate argument structure, which express the macro-event in the sentence [Ibid, p. 17–18]. The structure of the framing event which is the bearer of the idea of Motion consists of: **Figure**, that is, a moving entity (this can be either Agent or Patient, depending on the sentence type); **Ground** with respect to which Figure is moving; **Path** in which the figure moves, and that points to the place of its **Location** relative to the Ground [Ibid, p. 26].

On the other hand, the co-event in the structure of the macro-event makes the framing event more substantive or perceptually palpable. For instance, in the structure of the verb to *blow out* (a candle) there is the built-in frame-event “State change” (the state of burning has stopped) and also the subordinate event “Cause” (the movement of the air). The structure of such Russian verbs like: *vo-yti* ‘to come into; to enter’, *v-biežat* ‘to run into’, *v-yekhat* ‘to drive into’, *v-skochit* ‘to jump into’ and others, incorporates the frame-event “movement of the subject (Figure) with respect to the internal space (Ground) on the inward (Path), which determines the location of the subject” and the subordinate event “Manner” (walking on foot, by vehicle, etc.). Thus, these verbs express a complex event consisting of two (or more) of actions.

The idea of framing (main) event in the structure of a macro-event can be expressed either by the verb (stem, root), or by the auxiliary element, formant (L. Talmy coins the term satellite) (cf. [Ibid, p. 222]). Hence, L. Talmy introduces, proceeding from the behavior of verbs and satellites two main groups of languages – satellite-framed and verb-framed [Ibid, p. 221–224]. The languages within each group may be quite different both genetically and typologically. Thus, the verb-oriented languages are Romance, Semitic, Japanese, Tamil, Polynesian, Bantu and some others. Satellite-oriented are the Uralic, the Chinese, and most of Indo-European languages except for Romance. The frame schema of the event (Figure + [Background] + Path) in the structure of satellite-oriented languages is expressed without using a verb in the sentence structure and the structure of verb-oriented languages contains the verb and its arguments. Subordinate event in satellite-oriented languages is expressed by the main (semantically) verb (which is typical for the English verb phrase), and in verbal-oriented languages it is expressed by satellite elements, either individual (prefix, postposition, gerund) or in combination (formant + prefix / postfix), for example: Rus. *v-katit's'a* ‘to roll in’ (Path in framing event Motion is expressed by the prefix *v-* ‘-in’), *do-govorit* ‘to finish talking’ (Aspect in the framing event Temporal contouring is expressed

by the prefix *do-* ‘to finish’), *z̄a-dut* ‘blow out’ (Change in the framing event State change is expressed by the prefix *za-* ‘out’), *pere-pisat* ‘to rewrite; to copy out’ (Correspondence in the framing event Action correlation is expressed by the prefix *pere-* ‘re-’), *pri-khvatit* ‘to grab’ (Completeness in the framing event Realization is expressed by prefix *pri-* ‘over’). For example, the English sentence:

The bottle floated out (from the cave)

15)

indicates the framing event “Figure (bottle) + Path (out)” expressed without a verb (float), which, in turn, expresses the co-event, “Manner” (in water). The same is observed in the Russian translation:

Butylka vy-ply-l-a (iz pescher-y).

16)

bottle out-float-PAST:3SG-FEM (from cave-GEN)

‘The bottle floated out (from the cave).’

Thus, Slavic and Latin verb prefixes, English verb (adverbial) particles, German separable and inseparable verb prefixes, and Persian incorporated nouns in compound verbs exemplify, in principle, a functionally common linguistic phenomenon. However, in Spanish (a verb-oriented language) the same sentence has a fundamentally different cognitive-semantic structure.

La botella salio flotando (de la cueva)

17)

‘The bottle exited floating (from the cave).’

In (17) the framing event of Motion is manifested in the semantic verb *salir* ‘to exit’, and the co-event of Manner in the gerund *flotando* ‘floating’. Thus, if serialization is the process of verbal expression of the conceptually unitary complex of events, different parts of which are lexicalized in different verbs, it is obvious that the best conditions for a chain of semantic verbs expressing a macro-event, can be found in verb-oriented languages [1, p. 52] (in which these constructions are widely used and belong to the grammatical norm).

Verb serialization in Persian. The Persian language belongs to a mixed (satellite-verb-framed) type of languages with a strong satellite orientation, cf.: *birun raft* ‘He went **out**; He left’, *bālā raft* ‘He went **up**’, *foru raft* ‘He sink’ (where the verb *raftan* only has the idea of Motion, and the elements *birun*, *bālā*, *foru* have the idea of Manner). However, the agglutinative structure of Persian word forms and phrases makes it easy to integrate not only stems, but also the whole word forms (within the equal forms). Verb serialization occurs in the Persian spoken language fairly frequent, and even certain forms are an integral part thereof. Our data suggest that a sentence in the modern Persian language may contain two verbs in a row.

Two-verb chains. Two-verb chains contain the idea of Motion, as well as the metaphorical extension of Motion to the idea of State change.

[*Bā khod=ash*] *Yani kojā gozāsh-t-e raft-e?*

18)

[With *he=3SG:POSS*] So where leave:PAST(3SG)-PASTPART
go:PAST(3SG)-PASTPART?

‘[To himself] So where did he go to?’

Connecting the two verbs *gozāshtan* ‘to put; to lay; to place’ and *raftan* ‘to go’ is very common in modern Persian speech. Their approximate English equivalents are the verbs *to disappear*, *to dart off*, which convey the idea of an unexpected, unplanned or sudden leaving.

Jor’at ne-mi-kard-am beh=et chiz-i be-guy-am,

19)

courage NEG-CONT-do:PAST-1SG to=2SG thing-INDEF
SUBJ-say:PRES-1SG

mi-tars-id-am bā=hām qahr-i kon-i va

CONT-fear-PAST-1SG with=1SG:PERS anger-REL

do:SUBJ-2SG and

be-gozār-i be-rav-i

SUBJ-leave-2SG SUBJ-go-2SG

‘I did not dare to say anything to you, I was afraid you were not going to talk to me and would leave me.’

In this way one goes off after a quarrel, a dispute, as a result of injury or for some other important and unplanned reason.

Cherā bi khodāhafezi gozāsht-i raft-i?

20)

Why without goodbye leave:PAST-2SG go:PAST-2SG?

‘Why did you suddenly go away without saying goodbye?’

In (20) we have the classical macro-event - semantically unitary and complex at the same time. The framing event Motion is expressed by the verb *raftan*. The subordinate event is expressed by the verb *gozāshtan*. To cover the latter, L. Talmy coins the term Enablement. This event precedes the main one and makes it possible (but does not cause it), helping the main event to occur.

Mādarbozorg=am mowqe=e aqd gozāsht va

21)

grandmother=1SG:POSS time=GEN engagement

leave:PAST(3SG) and

raft Mashhad

go:PAST(3SG) Mashhad

‘My grandmother moved to Mashhad suddenly during the engagement.’

The subordinate event, expressed by *gozāshtan* ‘to put; to lay; to place’, as if completes the previous step (cf. Rus.: *stavit’ tochku*; *položyt’ konets* ‘to finish’, lit. ‘to place a full stop; to put an end’) and enables the beginning of another event, in this case, Motion. The uncompleted, transitional nature of the integration of these two events in one macro-event in the Persian language is illustrated by the ability of the optional use of the conjunction *va* ‘and’. Sometimes both variants – with and without conjunction – are used within one utterance.

Man che mi-dān-am zan=esh kojā gozāsht-e

22)

I what CONT-know-1SG woman=3SG:POSS where

leave:PAST(3SG)-PASTPART

raft-e. magar man be-pā=ye u bud-am?

go:PAST(3SG)-PASTPART. Whether I to-leg=GEN she
be:PAST-1SG?

ākher to=rā khodā in ham shod showhar?.. khob kār-i

at.last you=OBJ god this also become:PAST(3SG) husband?..

good job-INDEF

kard agar gozāsh t va raft!

do:PAST(3SG) if leave:PAST(3SG) and go:PAST(3SG)!

‘How can I know, where his wife has gone. I haven’t been put
to watch her? After all, Oh God, with the husband like hers? ...It’s a
good riddance for her!’

In general, the Motion event accompanied by the event which precedes and creates the conditions for it is most clearly expressed by the chains of verbs in the imperative form.

Chāyi var-dār bi-yār

23)

tea up-take:IMPER(2SG) IMPER-bring:PRES(2SG)

‘Bring some tea.’

In (23) the framing event Motion the Figure (a tea), is expressed by the verb *āvardan* ‘to bring’. The subordinate event Enablement is expressed by the prefixed verb *b(v)ar-dāsh tan* ‘to take, to pick up’. In order to bring the tea, one must first take it. Thus, the subordinate event occurs before the framing one, making it possible, but no way is a Cause of it.

In addition, the framing event Motion may be accompanied by a co-event which indicates the Manner it is being performed.

Qambari dav-id va raft

24)

Gambary run-PAST(3SG) and go:PAST(3SG)

‘Gambary went running.’

In (24) the framing event Motion has been expressed by the verb *raftan* ‘to go’. The subordinate event has been expressed by the verb *davidan* ‘to run’. L. Talmy uses the term Manner for the latter. The semantics of this verb doesn’t have a component which clearly points to the direction of motion (as well as its English equivalent).

The metaphor derived from the idea of Motion is the framing event State change. In modern spoken Persian two-verb chains can express a macro-event, the main (framing) event of which is precisely the State change.

Ba’d=esh zad pedar=e man mord

25)

after=3SG:DEMONSTR hit:PAST(3SG) father=GEN I
dead:PAST(3SG)

‘After that my father suddenly died.’

In (25) the framing event State change is expressed by the verb *mordan* ‘to die’ (the transition from one state to another). The subordinate event is expressed

by the verb *zadan* ‘to beat, to hit’. This verb gives the main event the effect of surprise (cf. bang!), that is, the main event is accompanied by the indication on the way of its course.

Tāze yek sāl az ezdevāj=eshān mi-gozasht ke ān-vaqt

26)

just one year from wedding=3PL:POSS CONT-
pass:PAST(3SG) when that-time

zad [va] *showhar-e oftād tu=ye hachal*

hit:PAST(3SG) [and] husband-DEF fell:PAST(3SG) in=GEN
awkward.situation

‘Just one year after their wedding passed as, then bang [and] the husband got in trouble.’

In (26) the framing event State change (acceptable state to unpleasant state) is expressed by the verb *oftādan* ‘to fall’. The subordinate event Manner is expressed by the verb *zadan*, which gives the main event the effect of surprise. As can be seen from the above example, the verb forms of such phrases can be located distantly. This fact points, as is noted above, to the phenomenon of serialization in the modern Persian language which has not yet been formed completely.

The framing event State change, which is expressed by two-verb chains, as in the following example, may have other subordinate events:

Hālā bi-yā [va] *dorost=esh kon*

27)

now IMPER-go:PRES(2SG) [and]
correct=3SG:DEMONSTR do:PRES(2SG)

‘Now go/come and do it correctly.’

Hālā bi-ya khub-i kon

28)

now IMPER-go:PRES(2SG) good-REL
(IMPER)do:PRES(2SG)

‘Now go/come and do it well.’

In (27) and (28) the framing event State change (from improperly done to properly done) is expressed by complex verbs *dorost kardan* and *khobi kardan* ‘to do properly, to amend’. The subordinate event is expressed by the verb *āmadan* ‘to come’, which (especially in the form of the imperative mood) can also refer to an event that precedes the main event and is the initial stage of it (without being its cause!), the so-called Precursion.

Āmad-am [va] *goft-am*

29)

come:PAST-1SG [and] speak:PAST-1SG

‘I went and spoke.’

The framing event State change (silent to speaking) is expressed by the verb *goftan* ‘to say, to speak’. The subordinate event Precursion, which is its initial stage, is expressed by the verb *āmadan* ‘to come’ (cf. the same function in Russian of the verb *vz’at’* ‘to take’). Such Precursion (previous) subordinate event can be expressed by the verbs like *to take*, *to get* and so on.

- 30) *hā*
Aqab=e doqqān yek tekke=ye zilu andākht-e bud. ba'zi vaqt-
 behind=GEN shop one piece=GEN carpet throw:PAST(3SG)-
 PASTPART. some time-PL
mi-gereft mi-khābid
 CONT-take:PAST(3SG) CONT-sleep:PAST(3SG)
 'Behind the shop he left a piece of doormat. Sometimes he slept there.'

In (30) the framing event State change (from staying awake to sleep) is expressed by the verb *khābidan* 'to sleep'. The subordinate event Precursion is expressed by the verb *gereftan* 'to take' (cf. the use of this verb in Russian: *vz'al zasnul* 'He dropped to sleep' (lit. 'took slept'); *kazdy den' beret spit* lit. 'Every day he will sleep'), cf.:

- 31) *Dar dars=e musiqi hasan eyn=e chub=e khoshk mi-gereft*
 in lesson=GEN music Hasan substance=GEN stick=GEN dry
 CONT-take:PAST(3SG)
mi-nes hast
 CONT-sit:PAST(3SG)
 'At the lessons of music Hasan would sit exactly like a dry stick.'

- 32) *Be-gir-im be-khāb-im, be-bin-im*
 IMPER-take:PRES-1PL IMPER-sleep:PRES-1PL IMPER-see:PRES-1PL
fardā che pish mi-yāy-ad
 tomorrow what forward CONT-come:PRES-3SG
 'Let us take some sleep and see tomorrow what will occur.'

In (32) the third verb *didan* 'to see, to look' tends to be a component of a verb chain, but its own argument structure separates it from the chain (incidentally, the author of the analyzed text separated the two-verb series from the next clause by a comma).

The subordinate verb *gereftan* can be used with a complement, that is, have its own arguments, which may apply to the main verb (the common argument structure, as noted above, is one of the main features of serial verbs).

- 33) *Rāh=eshān=rā gereft-and [va] raft-and*
 way=3PL:POSS=OBJ take:PAST-3PL [and] go:PAST-3PL
 'They took [and] went their own way.'
 34) *Gereft sar=esh=rā borid*
 take:PAST(3SG) head=3SG:POSS=OBJ cut:PAST(3SG)
 'He cut its [the lamb's] head.'

The same sense of Precursion can be expressed by the prefixed verb *b(v)ar-dāshtan* 'to take, to pick up'.

Dast=esh ne-mi-shekast agar bar-mi-dāsht

35)

hand=3SG:POSS NEG-CONT-break:PAST(3SG) up-CONT-
have:PAST(3SG)

do kalame mi-nevesht

two words CONT-write:PAST(3SG)

‘His hand would not brake if he took and wrote two words.’¹

The framing event State change may be accompanied by an action, which is its cause.

Negāh kard-am did-am

36)

look do:PAST-1SG see:PAST-1SG

‘I took a look and saw.’

In (36) the framing event State change (from not seeing to seeing) has been expressed by the verb *didan* ‘to see, to look’ and the subordinate event has been expressed by the verb *negāh kardan* ‘to look, to take a look’ (lit. ‘to do a look’). This action causes the main event that occurs (there cannot be “to look” without “to see”).

In addition, State change may be accompanied by an action, which is not its cause, but only makes it possible, assists it.

Raft [va] zan=e digar-i gereft

37)

go:PAST(3SG) [and] woman=GEN another-INDEF
take:PAST(3SG)

‘He went [and] took (married) another woman (once more).’

In (37) the framing event State change (from absence to presence) is expressed by the verb *gereftan* ‘to take, to get’ and the subordinate event is expressed again by the verb *raftan* ‘to go’². This verb means the action which

¹The present and past progressive forms in Persian are built precisely on the principle of serialization. The macro-event combines the framing event, expressed by the main verb, and the subordinate event, expressed by the auxiliary verb:

(i) a. *Dār-am mi-rav-am*

have:PRES-1SG CONT-go:PRES-1SG

‘I am going;’

b. *Dāsht-am mi-raft-am*

have:PAST-1SG CONT-go:PAST-1SG

‘I was going.’

The framing event (in this case, Motion) is expressed by the main verb *raftan* ‘to go’, and the subordinate event is expressed by the auxiliary verb *dāshtan* ‘to have, to possess’ (cf. *to have* in English), both at the same aspectual and temporal forms.

²The existence of the stable set of the same verbs in different languages is noted by all researchers of the phenomenon “serialization” (cf., e.g. the frequency lists of verbs in Benue-Congo language Nizaa in [1, p. 22–33]). In Persian with these verbs only quite a large number of idioms is formed:

precedes the main event and helps it to occur, making it possible (without being its cause!).

Conclusions. The data analyzed in the article indicate that the phenomenon of serialization in the modern Persian language, despite the absence of tradition in its selection, is developing. Based on the material of the modern spoken Persian language, the two-verb series have been studied.

Two of five possible frame events in the structures of macro-events are only found in the Modern Persian. They are the main – Motion and the most important derivative of it – State change. The rest – Temporal contouring, Action correlation and Realization – are absent. The first four of eight possible co-events in the structures of macro-events are only identified (those that either precede the framing event or is its cause). They are – Precursion, Enablement, Cause and Manner. The rest – Concomitance, Subsequence, Concurrent result and Constitutiveness – are absent. It is possible to speak about the following features of this category in the Persian language:

1) A large number of syntactic constructions in the modern Persian language are based on the pattern which is very close to the serialization one:

Qambari, bo-ru be kadkhodā be-gu bi-yāy-ad

38)

Qambary, IMPER-go:PRES to headman IMPER-tell:PRES
CONJ-com:PRES-3SG

‘Qambary, go and tell the headman to come.’

In (38), the framing event State change (from silence to speaking) is expressed by the verb *goftan* ‘to talk; to tell’. The subordinate event Enablement is expressed by the verb *raftan* ‘to go’, which precedes the framing event, creates the conditions for its occurrence, but is not its cause. These verbs have a common argument: *boru pishē kadkhodā* ‘go to the headman’, *begu be kadkhodā* ‘tell the headman’. This testifies to the merging of two predicates in a single complex predicate. However, the main verb *goftan* ‘to talk; to tell’ has its own argument (*biyāyad*). The final merge predicate has not yet come, although the main features are already present. The number of these expressions in the modern spoken Persian is striking in fact. Such expressions are often hard to be distinguished from verb idioms. This indicates the prevalence of this phenomenon:

Khob shod shod na-shod

58)

(ii) a. *Na gozāshht [va] na bar-dāshht va goft ...*

not leave:PAST(3SG) [and] not up-take:PAST(3SG) and say:PAST(3SG) ...

‘For no reason, without shame, tactlessly.’

b. *U ham na gozāshht-e na bar-dāshht-e bud ...*

he also not leave:PAST-PASTPART not take:PAST-PASTPART be:PAST(3SG)...

‘He/she behaved ugly, as like as two peas’.

good become:PAST(3SG) become:PAST(3SG) NEG-
become:PAST(3SG)

na-shod, khod=esh ākhar=esh khub

NEG-become:PAST(3SG)

good=3SG:REFLEX

end=3SG:REFLEX good

mi-shav-ad

CONT-become:PRES-3SG

‘And the beginning was so good.’

2) The material of Persian two-verb and three-verb series discussed above demonstrates the existence the main features of verb serialization – the common argument structure and the final position of the main verb, which expresses the framing event;

3) The set of verbs which are the components of serial constructions in Persian correlate with similar sets of verbs in other languages where the verb serialization has the status of the grammatical category.

On the one hand, these features of serialization in Persian correspond to the same attributes of this category in other languages; on the other hand, they demonstrate the prevalence of this phenomenon in modern colloquial Persian, and one can conclude that this category in the Persian language has a strong potential for development. It must also be noted that other parts of speech in the Persian language can be subjected to this tendency too. Thus, the ability to be an integral part of a single unitary event in the written style of the modern Persian language is inherent in past participles.

Abbreviations

SG	Singular
PL	Plural
POSS	Possessive clitic
PAST	Past stem
PASTPART	Past participle
PRES	Present stem
NEG	Negative
CONT	Continuous
DEF	Definite article
INDEF	Indefinite article
SUBJ	Subject
PERS	Personal pronoun
DEMONSTR	Demonstrative pronoun
REFLEX	Reflexive pronoun
IMPER	Imperative mood
GEN	Genitive
REL	Relative clitic

REFERENCES

1. Kjelsvik B. Verb chains in Nizaa / B. Kjelsvik: Unpublished doctoral dissertation. – Oslo : University of Oslo, 2002. – 181 p.

2. Krasilnikova E.V. Konstrukcii s udvojeniyem v russkoy razgovornoj rechi (Double Constructions in Colloquial Russian) / E.V. Krasilnikova // Russkiy yazyk v shkole – №5. – 1971. – PP. 80–83.

3. Shvedova N.U. 1960. Ocherki po sintaksisu russkoy razgovornoj rechi (Notes on the Syntax of Colloquial Russian) / N.U. Shvedova – Moskow : Academy of Science of USSR. – 377 p.

4. Talmy L. 2000. Toward a Cognitive Semantics. Vol. 2. Typology and Process in Concept Structuring / L. Talmy– Cambridge/London : MIT Press, 2000. – 495 p.

5. Weiss D.₁. Double verbs in the Russian colloquial speech in the light of National corpus of the Russian language: the plural Imperative / Daniel Weiss // Contributions suisses au XV e congrès mondial des slavistes à Minsk, août 2013 / Ekaterina Velmezova (éd.). – Bern/Berlin/Bruxelles/Frankfurt am Main/New York/Oxford/Wien : PETER LANG, 2013. – PP. 319–341.

6. Weiss D.₂. Russian double verbs in the 1st plural Imperative / Daniel Weiss // Wiener Slawistischer Almanach. – №85. – 2013. – PP. 165–175.

7. Weiss, Daniel. Verb serialization in North East Europe: the case of Russian and its Finno-Ugric neighbors / Daniel Weiss // Wiemer, Björn; Wälchli, Bernhard; Hansen, Björn. Grammatical replication and grammatical borrowing in language contact. – Berlin/Boston, 2012. – PP. 611–646.

Стаття надійшла до редакції 20 лютого 2017 року

УДК 811.133.1'373.7:392

*Оксана Лабенко
(м. Київ, Україна)*

КОНЦЕПТУАЛІЗАЦІЯ ОБРАЗУ ХВОРОБИ В ТЕКСТАХ ЗАЧИНІВ УКРАЇНСЬКИХ, АНГЛІЙСЬКИХ ТА ФРАНЦУЗЬКИХ ЗАМОВЛЯНЬ: СТРУКТУРА, СЕМАНТИКА, СИМВОЛІЗМ

У статті досліджуються тексти зачинів українських, англійських та французьких лікувальних замовлянь. Виявлено основні домінуючі компоненти структури зачину замовляння, які наявні у всіх трьох мовах. Кожний зі згаданих компонентів поділено на семантичні типи, які є відносно стійкими у кожній окремій мові. У контексті міжмовного порівняння певні семантичні моделі можуть повторювати моделі інших мов, частково змінюватись або ж взагалі випадати. Такі компоненти зачину можуть бути факультативними, наділеними певними етноспецифічними рисами, над якими домінують символічні сфери притаманні представникам певної лінгвофольклорної традиції. Формули-звертання виконують одну із центральних функцій лікувального замовляння.

Ключові слова: замовляння, зачин, семантика, модель, символізм.