E - ISSN: 2953-8203
P - ISSN: 2953-819X

YEREVAN STATE
UNIVERSITY

JOURNAL OF
IRANIAN LINGUISTICS

volume 1 | issue 1

JOURNAL OF IRANIAN LINGUISTICS

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

Vardan Voskanian, Yerevan State University, Armenia

Volume 1 | issue 1

YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY
PUBLISHING HOUSE

ASSOCCIATE EDITORS

Hakob Avchyan, Yerevan State University, Armenia
Artyom Tonoyan, Yerevan State University, Armenia

EDITORIAL BOARD

Chiara Barbati, University of Pisa, Italy
Desmond Durkin-Meisterernst, Freie Universität Berlin, Germany
Jila Ghomeshi, University of Manitoba, Canada
Geoffrey Haig, University of Bamberg, Germany
Arsalan Kahnemuyipour, University of Toronto Mississauga, Canada
Simin Karimi, University of Arizona, USA
Paola Orsatti, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy
Ludwig Paul, Hamburg University, Germany
Mohammad Rasekh-Mahand, Bu-Ali Sina University, Iran
Hassan Rezai Baghbidi, Osaka University, Japan
Pollet Samvelian, Université Sorbonne Nouvelle, France
Jaffer Sheyholislami, Carleton University, Canada

E - ISSN: 2953-8203
P - ISSN: 2953-819X

JOURNAL OF IRANIAN LINGUISTICS
VOLUME 1 | ISSUE 1

CONTENT

VARDAN VOSKANIAN

Foreword **5-7**

ENRICO MORANO

Where the Demons Fell: A Manichaean Sogdian Manuscript in Sogdian Script from Mani's Book of the Giants **8-20**

HASSAN REZAI BAGHBIDI

A New Possible Etymology for the Classical Persian Particle mar **21-34**

PAOLA ORSATTI

On the Syntax of the Persian Classical Narrative Poetry: Constructions with a Past Participle in the Shāhnāme **35-65**

SALMAN ALIYARI BABOLGHANI

About šekam and šotor: The Development of the Initial Vs/šC- in Middle and New Persian **66-89**

HABIB BORJIAN

The Khonji Dialect of Lārestān **90-117**

SONGÜL GÜNDOĞDU, ARSALAN KAHNEMUYIPOUR, MARCEL DEN DIKKEN

EZAFE IN THE CONTEXT OF CPS: Evidence from Three Iranian Languages **118-141**

Mohammad Rasekh-Mahand

Mirativity in Persian **142-162**

Mohsen Mahdavi Mazdeh, Sarah Nehzati

Low Vowel Dissimulation in Mazandarani **163-183**

YEREVAN STATE UNIVERSITY PUBLISHING HOUSE

JIL 1 (2024): 142-162

Journal of Iranian Linguistics

Mirativity in Persian

Mohammad Rasekh-Mahand
Bu-Ali Sina University

doi.org/ 10.46991/jil/2024.01.07

Abstract: Mirativity, as a distinct grammatical category, can be marked by different markers and strategies. In this paper, it is argued that, contrary to previous studies, Persian marks mirativity by using morphosyntactic forms. Three different grammatical tools are identified. First, it has a sentence final clitic '=*ā*' used as mirative marker on its own right. It indicates that the information is newsworthy, unexpected and surprising. Second, the sentence final particle '*ke*', among its different functions, marks mirativity, as well. Third, using different perfect verb forms in Persian is a mirative strategy, which is strongly connected to indirect evidentiality. The data from Persian widens our understanding of mirativity cross-linguistically, showing that a language can have different ways to mark it simultaneously.

Keywords: mirativity, evidentiality, perfect verb, focus, grammaticalization

Mohammad Rasekh-Mahand
E-mail: rasekh@basu.ac.ir

Received: 16.01.2024
Revised: 20.06.2024
Accepted: 14.07.2024



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License

1 Introduction

Mirativity, in typological studies, first appeared as a by-product of the studies on evidentiality and was defined as a category whose function is to report information which is new or surprising to the speaker (DeLancey 1997). DeLancey (1997) introduced mirativity as a new descriptive category distinct from evidentiality, providing examples from different languages. He argued

that his overview can contribute to more widespread documentation of mirativity in different languages. After two decades, typologists spotted many mirative markers cross-linguistically and widened our understanding of this category (e.g., Lazard 1999, Aikhenvald 2012, Delancey 2001, 2012, Hengeveld and Olbertz 2012, Fang 2018). They mostly tried to demonstrate how mirativity is different from evidentiality and other grammatical categories. Aikhenvald (2012) has probably conducted the broadest typological study of mirativity up to now. She emphasizes the independence of mirativity from evidentiality and other categories and argues that the in-depth studies of mirative marking in different languages show that the category embraces the following values: (i) sudden discovery, sudden revelation or realization, (ii) surprise, (iii) unprepared mind, (iv) counter-expectation and (v) new information. All these values can refer to (a) the speaker, (b) the addressee, or (c) the main character [of the story] (Aikhenvald 2012: 437). These different mirative meanings can be expressed formally by (a) a complex verbal construction, (b) a special verbal affix or a particle, and (c) a special series of pronouns and other means (Aikhenvald 2012: 438). Aikhenvald (2012) provides data from a variety of languages, showing different formal ways of expressing different values of mirativity. As an example, in Kham (Sino-Tibetan) a complex verbal construction marks mirativity (ex. 1). The context for this example is that the speaker had invited guests to his house, and Jhupurya also shows up uninvited or unanticipated. The host has uttered this sentence using a complex verbal construction to announce his arrival. The verbal suffix, *-wo*, marks the mirativity in this sentence.

(1) *Juhpurya* ***u-hu:u-wo***
Jhupurya 3SG-come-PFV.NMLZ

o-le-o Kham (Aikhenvald 2012: 442)
3SG-be-NMLZ
'Jhupurya has arrived!'

Mirativity does not specify any information source, and it can be used with direct evidence, inference, etc. Aikhenvald (2012: 475) argues that mirativity, recognized as a separate concept by DeLancey (1997), is a valid notion, which allowed typologists and grammarians to study it cross-linguistically and identify different meanings and strategies for it.

While mirative meanings can be expressed by lexical means in any language, the number of languages that have grammaticalized it is much fewer (Aikhenvald 2012). Among the second group, some of them use a distinct marker to indicate it, such as a verbal affix, a particle, etc., but other languages have 'mirative strategies' (Aikhenvald 2012: 436), i.e., grammatical

markers whose main function is to show other categories but they express mirative meanings in certain contexts.

There have been some studies on evidentiality in Persian (Lazard 1999, 2001, Jahani 2000, Utas 2000), however, the literature on mirativity is not widespread (see section 2) and no grammatical means to mark mirativity is reported. Lazard (1999) is the only exception who refers to mirativity, but argues that this category is not grammaticalized in Persian. Studying mirativity in some South-Eastern Europe and Western Asia languages, he argues that Persian perfect, while showing evidentiality, is not a good candidate for marking mirativity.

The aim of this paper is to show that Persian has both a mirative marker and mirative strategies. Aikhenvald (2012:458) observes that it is possible for a language to have several forms which express different values of mirativity. Accordingly, I will show that Persian marks mirativity in more than one way. First, the sentence final clitic '*=ā'*, whose function is neglected in previous studies, acts as a mirative marker in this language in many contexts. Moreover, the particle *'ke'*, when appearing sentence-finally, can mark mirativity. In addition, the perfect verbal form marks mirativity, among its other functions. Identifying and documenting these markers and strategies will widen our understanding of mirativity cross-linguistically.

The organization of the paper is as follows. Section 2 reviews the related literature on Persian, especially on evidentiality. In section 3, I argue that a sentence final clitic, *=ā, (*also pronounced *=yā,* or *=hā),* is a bifunctional morpheme, which encodes mirativity, as one of its functions in Persian. In section 4, I show that the particle '*ke'*, among its different functions, is a mirative marker when it appears at the end of sentence. Section 5 is about perfect verbal form in Persian and its use as a mirative strategy. I show that this form, in addition to marking indirect evidentiality (contrary to Lazard 1999), marks new and unexpected information which causes surprise. Section 6 is the conclusion.

2 Previous literature on Persian

Linguists have studied evidntiality in Persian (e.g., Jahani 2000, Utas 2000) and other Iranian and neighboring languages (see Comrie 2000 for on an overview and papers in Johanson & Utas 2000). However, since mirativity is a new concept in linguistic studies, it is not discussed widely in Persian (Lazard 1999).

Lazard (1999) believes that in languages of South-Eastern Europe and Western Asia three values of hearsay, inference and unexpected observation fall within the cover category of mediative. For him mediatives "only interpose an unspecified reference to the origin of the information between speaker and his discourse" (Lazard 1999:96). However, he emphasizes that "no definite example of the mirative has been reported in Persian' (Lazard 1999: 99), and the mediatives always refer to past and they can be interpreted as resultatives and inferential, like example (3):

(2) *bārān qat šod-e ast*
rain cut become-PTCP be.3SG
'The rain has stopped.'

He believes that in example (2) the meaning associated with perfect form is not mirative, but evidential. He reasons that since mediative forms always refer to the past in Persian, they could be equally interpreted as resultative or inferential.

He finds this term mediative more appropriate than evidential or mirative; however, it has not been widely adopted. Regarding Persian, he observes that the mediative form, (in this case perfect verbs), "include not only hearsay and inference, but also the experiential (i.e., a retrospective view of past events, as distinct from the resultative) and what I have called the remote past or completed past, even in the 1st person" (Lazard 1999:99). He provides example (2):

(3) *man ālmāni harf mi-zad-e-am*
I German word DUR-beat-PTCP-be.1SG

ammā hālā farāmuš kard-e-am
but now forgetting do-PTCP-be.1SG
'I used to speak German, but now I have forgotten it'.

In example (2), the perfect verbs are not marking hearsay or inference, since the sentence refers to the first person. Hence, Lazard calls its function remote past. So, generally Lazard (1999) argues that (a) there is no specific mirative marker in Persian, and (b) the perfect verb form in this language does not mark mirativity. He argues that the use of perfect verb forms as evidential markers does not indicate the specific source of information, but is just in opposition to sentences that indicate nothing about the source of information (Lazard 2001: 362). He provides the following example to support his argument:

(4) *sob-e* *sahar* *Nane* *dide-bud=eš,*
morning-EZ dawn PN had.seen-3SG

bāzam *jelo* *xune* *rāh* *mirafte*
again before house way was.going
'At dawn Naneh had seen him, he was again walking in front of the house.'

Lazard argues that the verb form mirafte functions as an evidential, indicating that the information was originally obtained from a source named Naneh. This information is not new to the speaker and he is not surprised by it or doubtful about its accuracy. The speaker is simply reporting it as hearsay. However, the other verb form dide bud, which likely also reflects Naneh's original words, is not an evidential. This means that the information conveyed by *dide bud* is considered equally old or new as the information conveyed by mirafte, but the speaker does not feel the need to mark it as hearsay because it is not significant. In the next sections, I will argue that both of Lazard's findings regarding Persian can be challenged.

Evidentiality in Persian is discussed (though under different names) by several scholars. Windfuhr (1987) is among the earliest scholars who states that some of the verb forms which refer to remote past in the literary register are used in colloquial language to express the category of inference, that is mainly second-hand knowledge, conclusion and reminiscence. Jahani (2000) argues similarly that perfect form of the verb is preferred form for the inferred and reported information, but for eye-witnessed information, both perfect and simple past are used. She concludes that perfect form is not fully grammaticalized, and among its other functions, it can indicate indirect evidence. Utas (2000) who calls the utterances which report non-witnessed action 'epistemic', admits that certain perfect form of verbs in Persian show this epistemic information, while they have other functions like resultative or aorist. However, he argues that in some of the derived forms, the epistemic component is dominant; such as "past perfect" (ex.5), and a "durative perfect" (ex. 6):

(5) *kard-e* *bud-e-* *ast.*
do.PPART be.- PPTCP AUX
'He had done.'

(6) *mi-kard-e* *ast*
IMP-do-PPTCP AUX
'He has had been doing.'

In the following example, the perfect verb form '*raft-e-ast*' (has gone) shows that the speaker has heard the news, not directly observed:

(7) *šenid-e-am* *ke* *ahmad* *diruz*
hear-PTCP-1SG that Ahmad yesterday

safar *raft-e-ast* (Utas 2000:232)
journey go-PTCP-be.3SG
'I've heard that Ahmad has gone on a trip yesterday.'

However, since the matrix verb is an evidential verb, which means "I have heard", it is not easy to argue that the perfect form of the embedded verb and not the matrix verb gives rise to the epistemic meaning.

With regard to mirativity, Perry (2000:236), in line with Lazard (1999), argues that among different varieties of Persian, the perfect is only used to mark this category in Tajiki Persian (spoken in Tajikistan). They clearly state that (Iranian) Persian perfect does not have mirative meaning (see section 5).

In sum, the scholars studying Persian morphosyntax have not identified any marker or strategy of mirativity. They generally believe that one of the functions of different perfect forms of the verbs is to mark hearsay or inferential evidence. In this paper, this proposal is challenged.

3 Sentence final clitic '=*ā*'

DeLancey (1997:49), on mirativity, states that "languages differ not in whether they have means to express it, but in the degree to which its expression is integrated into the grammar". One of the mirative markers which occurs in a number of languages is verbal affixes or particles (Aikhenvald 2012:446). Persian has a sentence-final clitic which in colloquial speech and takes the form *=ā* (*=hā/=yā* in postvocalic contexts). This form has remained understudied and unanalyzed. Since Persian is a verb-final language, in most cases *=ā* attaches to the verb, but in sentences which are not verb-final, it attaches to the last element of the sentence. This morpheme has more than one function and I argue that one of its functions is to act as a mirative marker. I will show that it is an emphatic marker, too, and there is another function for *=ā* to mark vocatives, e.g., *vālā hazrat=ā* (her majesty!) (Lazard 1957:103). It also used to be added to different words to mark sympathy or as an honorific marker in old texts of New Persian, but it is not used in this way anymore.

The following examples show that the sentence final *=ā* is a mirative marker and mirativity is integrated into the Persian grammar system. In the examples in (8), which involve change of state verbs, the meaning associated with *=ā* is newsworthiness and surprise.

(8) a. *barq qat' šod=ā*
power cut become.PST.3SG-MIR
'The power went off'

b. *belaxare qabul kard=ā*
finally accept do.PST.3SG-MIR
'Finally, he/she accepted (it).'

c. *bozorg šod-e=hā*
old become-PCPT-MIR
'He is grown up.'

In (8a), the speaker informs the addressee that some change of state happened. The presence of *=ā* here shows newsworthiness and surprise in being an unexpected situation. In (8b), the speaker did not expect the person referred to by the subject to accept (it), and now reports this as news, accompanied with surprise. And in (8c), the speaker shows surprise regarding the person referred to by the subject. All of the examples in (8) show a new state which is newsworthy and surprising to the speaker and/or the addressee.

In (9), no change of state is observed and the sentences simply report facts.

(9) a. *šenid-am āb*
hear.PST-1SG water

sard-e=hā, sarmā na-xor-i
cold-be.PRS.3SG=MIR cold NEG-eat.PRS-2SG

'I have heard the water is cold, be careful not to get cold."

b. *hendune širin-e=hā*
melon sweet-be.3SG-MIR

'The melon is sweet.'

In (9a), the speaker shows surprise, stating that the water (for shower) is unexpectedly cold and asks the addressee to be careful and not get cold. In (9b), the speaker is simply stating a fact about 'the melon' with surprise (and maybe inviting the addressee to eat it). In all of the examples in (8) and (9),

=ā indicates that the sentence carries a new information, with an overtone of surprise, whether the verb is a change of state verb or simply reporting a fact. So, *=ā* here marks mirativity. If it does not appear in these sentences, they lose the mirative meaning, but they remain grammatical. No other subtle meaning of tense, aspect, or modality is detected with its occurrence.

While mirativity and evidentiality are often connected cross-linguistically, these two categories are not universally expressed by one and the same morpheme (de Hann 2012). The Persian morpheme, *=ā,* does not inform the speaker on the evidence of the news in sentence and is not a marker of evidentiality. For example, while in (9b) the evidence is directly presented (the speaker is eating the melon), in (9a) the speaker has heard that the water is cold and not directly observed.

Peterson (2017) presents a test, to show if a form entails mirativity or not. It employs negation, and if a form like *=ā* marks mirativity, then it is not part of the propositional content of the sentence and thus the negation of the predicate will not affect the mirative meaning of the sentence. For example, the negation of (9b), presented in (10), shows clearly that the mirative meaning is retained, while the propositional meaning is reversed.

(10) *hendune* *širin* *nist=ā*
melon sweet NEG.be.3SG-MIR
'The melon is not sweet.'

In Persian, the mirative marker =ā can be accompanied with exclamative particle *vāy*, as in (11). De Haan (2012) regards this as a feature which shows that the sentence shows mirativity.

(11) *vāy* *sard šod-e=hā*
EXC. cold become-3SG-MIR
'It became cold.'

Newness and surprise go together. New information has some piece of surprise in itself. Normally, the newness of information is associated with time. Events that have happened in the present or recent past are better candidates of carrying new and unexpected information than those in the remote past. Therefore, mirativity is more frequent in sentences referring to present or recent past times. In (12) the time of happening is the very recent past and the speaker reports that the child ate too much and s/he got sick.

(12) *in hāleš* *xarāb* *šod=ā*
this health ruin become.PST.3SG-MIR
'S/he got sick!'

Marking mirativity is not the sole function of sentence final morpheme '*=ā*' in Persian. The second function of this clitic which needs to be distinguished from marking mirativity is that it adds emphasis to imperative and prohibitive sentences. In the following examples, the form of the sentences is imperative, and *=ā* does not change the propositional meaning, but adds emphasis in doing or not doing the action:

(13) a. *na-r-i=yā*
NEG-go-2SG-EMP
'Don't go.'
b. *qand* *na-xor-i=yā*
sugar NEG-eat-2SG-EMP
'Don't eat sugar.'

In the same line, Amoozade and Tavangar (2009) show that deontically-oriented past-tense forms can be used for the expression of direct orders in Persian. In this construction, '*=ā*' can be used again to show emphasis. Let us consider the following conversational exchange:

(14) a: *be-r-am* *kebrit* *be-xar-am?*
SUBJ-go-1SG matches SUBJ-buy-1SG
'May I go and buy matches?'

b: *raft-i* *umad-i=yā*
go.PST-2SG come.PST-2SG-EMP
'Go and come (soon).'

The function of '*=ā*' in this sentence is to add emphasis and to ask the addressee to do it 'very soon'. So, the function of '*=ā*' in imperative or prohibitive sentences or past-tense forms which express direct orders in Persian is not to show surprise or new information, but to emphasize and urge the addressee to do (soon) or not do the action. I have glossed it as EMP, instead of MIR.

There are some instances of sentences with '*=ā*' in which both of the functions discussed above are observed or at least difficult to separate. As an example, in a context in which a family is waiting for guests and are preparing food for them, they suddenly notice that the guests are very near. The daughter of the family utters example (15):

(15) *Ali* *inā* *resid-an=ā*
Ali others arrive.PST-3Pl-MIR.EMP
'Ali and others are arriving.'

Here, *=ā* can have two functions. The speaker gives the overtone of surprise to the family on early arrival of the guests. On the other hand, she urges the family to do their job fast and prepare the food.

In another occasion, the wife brings the empty bottle of jam and says the following sentence to her husband:

(16) *morabbā* *tamum* *šod=ā*
jam finish become.PST-MIR.EMP
'The jam has finished'.

The sentence has new information in it with surprise, and at the same time, it is an order for buying jam. So, in many cases, two functions of '*=ā'* occur together. This co-occurrence is not strange, since imperatives are orders which will be done in near future and normally, they have new (and sometimes unexpected) information for the addressee. These similar functions are achieved by a single form.

In sum, the sentence final clitic *=ā* in Persian is a mirative marker on its own right, which encodes the information as newsworthy or surprising and frequently refers to current situation. It has another function, namely to emphasize the order or avoidance in imperative sentences. These two functions sometimes occur simultaneously in this marker.

Before ending this section, it is noteworthy to show that *=ā* as a mirative marker is also found in other Iranian and non-Iranian languages of the area, yielding support for contact-induced copying of these neighboring languages. While there have been some studies on evidentiality and related matters in Iranian, Turkic and beyond (Johanson and utas 2000, Haig and Khan 2018), *=ā* or similar forms are not reported as mirative (or evidential) marker in these languages[1]. However, different forms similar to Persian *=ā* (or exactly the same form) are found in some of the Iranian and neighboring non-Iranian languages in Western Asia. For example, in Tati (17), Talyshi (18), Gilaki (19), Mazandarani (20) and Central Kurdish (21) which are spoken in north and north-west of Iran, this final marker is '*=(y)e'* or '*=(h)ā'*:

(17) *a dâr xəšk âbe-ye*
that tree dry become.3SG-MIR
'The tree dried out.'

[1] There are few studies on the languages of Western Asia which refer to mirativity. Van der Wal Anonby (2018:633) asserts that in Kumzari (an Iranian language spoken in Oman), one of the verb forms is mirative, which lacks any formal marker rewrite as this is unclear. Anonby and Taheri-Ardali (2018:757) report that in Bakhtiari (an Iranian language), the non-past can also be used with a mirative extension.

(18) *Samad əšta bâɣi furutəša=ye.*
Samad his garden sell.PST.3SG-MIR
'Samad sold his garden.'

(19) *barf bame-ye*
snow came.3SG-MIR
'It has snowed.'

(20) *Ali burd= ā*
Ali go.PST.3SG-MIR
'Ali went!'

(20) *gešt=yān l-ena bu-mn-ā*
all=3PL Direct-Place-DEM be-3rd.PL-MIR
'Everyone was there.'

Among non-Iranian languages in Western Asia, the evidential (and/or mirative) marking is discussed vastly in Turkish varieties (Slobin & Aksu 1982, DeLancey 1997, Johanson 2012, Bulut 2018). They mostly refer to '*-mIš*' perfect, which shows resultative, inferential and mirativity in Turkish. But in Turkish studies literature, there is no mention of a separate mirative marker, like *=ā*, which appears in Persian. Bulut (2018:424) argues that while the Turkish perfect '*-mIš*' is used to mark indirect evidentials and also mirativity (DeLancey 1997), it only marks resultative in Turkic varieties of Iran (see also Kiral 2000 for the same observation in Khalaj). However, 'inferential or evidential connotations are expressed by the evidential/inferential '*-ImIš*', as in '*yatmiš-ImIš*', 'she had obviously gone sleep'". Johanson (1998) observes that the fact that '-mIš' forms do not signal inferentiality in Irano-Turkic varieties seems to be due to Persian influence (for a different view on Azeri Turkish see Lee 1996:49).

However, I found that *-ā* has the same function as it has in Persian, in a variety of Turkish spoken in southern parts of Hamedan in west of Iran. Among the Turkish varieties of Iran, Turkish speakers in south of Hamedan, which is genetically from South Oghuz or Afshār branch of Turkish language group (Bulut 2018), use the *-ā* form to express mirativity. The *-ā* form can be added to these constructions to show surprise, as in Azeri Turkish in (22):

(22) *Ali yāt-mIš-ImIš-ā*
Ali sleep-PRF-COP-MIR
'Ali has been sleeping.'

Another suffix which makes perfect in this area is *-ib* (Bulut 2018:424). This form also can accompany with *-ā* to mark mirativity, as in (23):

(23) *dost-om* *gal-ib-di-yā*
friend-1SG come-PRF-COP.3SG-MIR
'My friend has come.'

The *=ā* as mirative marker is not used only in perfect sentences. It can be used in other tenses, too (e.g. 24):

(24) *yāqor-o-yā*
rain-3SG-MIR
'It is raining.'

The interesting point is that *=ā* is also used in emphatic orders (25) and deontically-oriented past-tense forms which mean can be used as orders (26):

(25) *gal-ā*
come-MIR
'Come!'

(26) *gal-d-i-yā*
come-PST-2SG-MIR
'You came!'

It can be observed that the form *=ā* and its pattern is replicated in the Turkish variety spoken in this region.

Reportedly, the same form *'-(h)ā/-(h)a'* is used in Azeri Turkish, too, for a warning or admonition (27), or expressing surprise (28) (Lee 1996:89) :

(27) *olar-a* *bir söz* *de-mə-ha!*
they-DAT one word say-2S.NEG.IMP-MIR
'Don't say any thing to them, okay?'

(28) *Gözəl-di(r)* *ha!*
pretty-be.3S.PR MIR.
'Isn't it pretty?'

So, the same morpheme with the same function is found in some varieties of Turkish language in Iran. However, as far as I know, it is not reported in other varieties in other areas. It seems that Turkish varieties have replicated this mirative marker from Persian (or other Iranian languages).

4 *'ke'* in sentence final position

The word *ke* has a variety of grammatical functions in Persian. Its main function is to mark subordinate clauses. It functions as a relativizer in relative clauses (29), and as a complementizer in complement clauses (30).

(29) *pesar-i* *ke* *did-i* *mariz* *ast*
boy-RELM KE see.PST-2SG ill be.PRS.3SG
'The boy whom you saw is ill.'

(30) *mi-dān-am* *ke* *Ali* *raft-e-ast*
IND-know.PRS-1SG KE Ali go.PST-PRTC-be.PRS.3SG
'I know that Ali has gone.'

This word is also used as focus marker, appearing after different kinds of constituents in a sentence. In this function, *ke* focalizes the constituent which follows it and makes it prominent (Ghomeshi 2013, Oroji and Rezaei 2013:80).

(31) *man* *ke* *ketab* *ro* *be* *Ali* *ne-mi-da-m.*
I KE book OM to Ali NEG-IND-givePRS-1SG
'I won't give the book to Ali.'

(32) *man* *ketab* *ro* *ke* *be* *Ali* *ne-mi-da-m.*
I book OM KE to Ali NEG-IND-givePRS-1SG
'I won't give THE BOOK to Ali.'

(33) *man* *ketab* *ro* *be* *Ali* *ke* *ne-mi-dœ-m.*
I book OM to Ali KE NEG-IND-givePRS-1SG
'I won't give the book to ALI.'

In addition to these functions, when *ke* occurs sentence-finally, it plays different roles. If it appears after interrogative sentences, it adds some rhetorical nuances. For example, in (34) the speaker is not asking a real question, but he wants an affirmative response from the addressee:

(34) *šām* *xord-i* *ke* ?
supper eat.PAST-2SG KE
'You have had supper, haven't you?' (Clearly expecting a positive answer)

If *ke* appears at the end of declarative sentences, it marks an unexpected situation which surprises the speaker (and addressee). For example, in a context that the participants did not expect Ali to pass the exam, and one of them finds that he did, he utters the following sentence (35):

(35) *Ali pās kard ke!*
Ali pass do.PST.3SG MIR
'Ali passed the exam!'

The addressee did not expect Ali to pass the exam and this news has surprised him. In this sentence, *ke* can be omitted without affecting the grammaticality of the sentence. But, in that case, the sentence turns to a simple news and it loses the effect of additional surprise. If, as a test, we employ negation, the negation of the predicate will not affect the mirative meaning of the sentence and it shows that *ke* acts as a mirative marker in this sentence. The following are some more examples of using *ke* as a mirative marker. (37) is the negative form of (36) in which the mirative meaning is not affected.

(36) *'e barf umad-e ke*
wow snow come.PST-PTCP MIR
'Wow, it has snowed!'

(37) *'e barf na-yumad-e ke*
wow snow NEG-come.PST-PTCP MIR
'Wow, it hasn't snowed!'

(38) *barq qat šod ke*
power cut become.PST.3SG MIR
'The power cut off!'

In (36) and (37), the exclamative marker *e* appears at the beginning of the sentence, emphasizing the unexpectedness of the news, and (38) is an unexpected change of situation.

In this function, *ke* can be replaced with *=hā*, showing that they have the same function when used as mirative marker. In addition, they could not occur in the same sentence, representing another evidence that they have a similar function (35):

(39) **barq qat šod ke= hā*
power cut become.PST.3SG MIR-MIR
'The power cut off!'

With regard to the above discussion, I conclude that one of the functions of *ke* in Persian is to mark mirativity.

5 Perfect form of verbs

While a few languages have special marker for mirativity, languages express mirative meanings through other grammatical categories. DeLancey (1997, 2001) refers to these as “mirative as a semantic space”; and Aikhenvald (2012:463) uses “mirative strategies” to specify them, "that is, extensions of essentially non-mirative categories which acquire mirative meanings within a given context". Evidentials are among the frequently attested mirative strategies cross-linguistically. DeLancey (1997, 2001) argued that evidentials are associated with the mirative range of meanings. Similarly, Aikhenvald (2012:465) believes that “in small evidential systems, with firsthand (or eyewitness) evidential versus non-firsthand (or non-eyewitness evidential) evidential, non-firsthand typically acquires mirative meanings".

As discussed in section (2), scholars agree that different perfect forms of verbs in Persian, among other usages, can signal evidentiality (e.g., Lazard 1999, Jahani 2000, Bubenik and Ziamajidi 2020, Jügel 2020). They believe that Persian has a small (two-term) evidentiality system, first-hand/direct vs. non-first-hand/non-direct. Before discussing its function, it is needed to introduce its different forms. Persian perfects occur in present or past forms. Table (1) represents the paradigm of different perfects forms in Persian:

Table 1. Perfect forms in Persian

Present perfect	Past perfect
nevešt-e-am write.PST-PTCP-be.1SG	*nevešt-e-bud-e-am* write.PST-PTCP-be.PST-PTCP-be.1SG
nevešt-e-i write.PST-PTCP-be.2SG	*nevešt-e-bud-e-i* write.PST-PTCP-be.PST-PTCP-be.2SG
nevešt-e ast write.PST-PTCP be.3SG	*nevešt-e-bud-e ast* write.PST-PTCP-be.PST-PTCP be.3SG
nevešt-e-im write.PST-PTCP-be.1PL	*nevešt-e-bud-e-im* write.PST-PTCP-be.PST-PTCP-be.1PL
nevešt-e-id write.PST-PTCP-be.2PL	*nevešt-e-bud-e-id* write.PST-PTCP-be.PST-PTCP-be.2PL
nevešt-e-and write.PST-PTCP-be.3PL	*nevešt-e-bud-e-and* write.PST-PTCP-be.PST-PTCP-be.3PL

Different tenses above may omit the final BE-auxiliary in the 3SG subjects, as *'šode-ast > šode',* (become.PST-PTCP-be.3SG*), 'gofte bude-ast > gofte bude',* (say.PST-PTCP-be.PST-PTCP-be.3SG*).* The use of 'be' as an auxiliary in this complex construction in Persian is in line with Aikhenvald's (2012: 445) findings that "complex constructions with mirative meanings involve the verb 'be' or a grammaticalized copula (as in Kham and Magar), or the verb 'become', and 'discover' as in Northeast Caucasian languages, and in Tariana, accompanied by a nominalized verb". There is also a durative perfect form which is similar to other perfect forms, but it uses '*mi-'* to mark durativity (Mofidi & Petre 2022), as well, like (*mi-nevešt-e ast*, DUR-write.PST.PTCP be.3SG).

One of the functions of different perfect forms of the verbs is to mark hearsay or inferential evidence, i.e., non-first-hand (indirect) evidence (41). However, when the sentence is simple past, it means the speaker has direct evidence (40):

(40) *diruz dar jādey-e Tehrān tasadof-e bad-i šod*
yesterday in road-EZ Tehran accident-EZ bad-INDF become.PST.3SG
'A bad accident happened in road of Tehran yesterday.'

(41) *diruz dar jādey-e Tehrān tasadof-e bad-i šod-e*
yesterday in road-EZ Tehran accident-EZ bad-INDF become.PST.PTCP.3SG

While many scholars argue that the perfect verb form shows indirect evidentiality, they do not assert that perfect forms can be among the mirative strategies in this language. Lazard (1999) explicitly asserts that this form makes no mirative overtones. I will argue in this section that Persian perfect verb is a mirative strategy and it is a verbal category which acquires "overtones to do with surprise and information unexpected to the speaker" (Aikhenvald 2012: 463).

In the following examples, the evidence is achieved visually, so the function of the perfect verb cannot signal indirect evidence; however, it is used to mark the surprise of the speaker by seeing an unexpected scene or event. The context for (42) is as follows. The speaker sleeps the night before while the sky was clear; he gets up and opens the window and sees that there is a lot of snow in the yard and says:

(42) *'e, barf umad-e*
Wow, snow come.PST-PTCP.3SG
'Wow, it has snowed (lit.).'

The use of present perfect in this sentence cannot be a strategy for indirect evidence marking, since he is seeing the snow; however, it shows that the speaker is surprised by discovering an unexpected scene.
In a similar context, two women meet each other after a while. One of the women has brought her child. Seeing the child, her friend says:

(43) *xodā jun, če qadr bozorg šode*
God dear, how much old become.PST-PTCP.3SG
'My god, s/he has so grown up.'

Again, the speaker is seeing the child, so the perfect is not used for providing indirect evidence, but for showing mirativity. These sentences show that perfect form can be used to show mirativity in Persian and it is not part of showing evidentiality. Mirativity can be an overtone of perfect forms, while evidentiality is absent. Of course, there are some contexts where the perfect verb can indicate both evidential and mirative meanings. For the following sentence, different contexts can force either of these meanings:

(44) *Ali umad-e*
Ali come.PST.PTCP.3SG
'Ali has come.'

The sentence can show inference or hearsay if the speaker has seen Ali's car in the yard or somebody has told him the news but he has not seen Ali himself. In these contexts, the perfect is used to mark indirect evidentiality. However, if the speaker opens the door and sees Ali unexpectedly, the sentence has mirative overtone. In this way, the perfect marker is very similar to often cited form in Turkish, -miš, which is used to do different functions (Slobin & Aksu 1983, DeLancey 1997). It is important to point out that this sentence is appropriate in context of seeing Ali's car in the yard or hearing from somebody else, but if the speaker hears Ali's car approaching, he cannot use this sentence and instead he should use simple past, Ali umad (Ali come.PST.3SG). When the speaker sees Ali's car approaching, it is direct evidence and the perfect could not be used. When he hears it from somebody else or sees the car in the yard, he gets the indirect evidence and the perfect is used to show indirect evidence. Here, the speaker is using auditory sensory experience as part of Ali's arrival and "his consciousness is involved in the process before its actualization" (Slobin & Aksu 19783: 192). So, in the mirative reading of sentence (44), while the speaker is seeing Ali, he can use perfect form to show the unexpectedness of the event, since the actualization of the arrival is done with no prior consciousness. In example (45), the speaker opens the door and sees Ali. Since his arrival is unexpected, he addresses Ali himself by uttering this sentence:

(45) *be-bin* *ki* *umad-e*
IMP-see who come.PST.PTCP.3SG
'See, who has come!'

This example shows that the perfect verb can be directed to the addressee to show the surprise of the speaker, while the evidence is direct. The examples presented in this section shows that, contrary to Lazard (1999), perfect form in Persian can be classified as a mirativity strategy. In some cases, one of the readings can have mirative value in a proper context, while there are some cases where the evidence is direct (visual), hence the perfect form could not mark indirect evidentiality, but it only has mirative overtone. I conclude that perfect form in Persian is both an evidential and mirative strategy.
The perfect forms in Persian can be used in mirative statements for a different person. While DeLancey (1997:50) asserts that using mirative for first person is odd since "information about the rest of the world may be surprising, but information about oneself should not be"; perfect miratives in Persian occur with first person, if speakers find something surprising for themselves:

(46) *man* *az* *in* *qazā* *xord-e-am*
I from this food eat.PST-PTCP-be.1SG
'I have eaten this food.'

In the above context, the speaker is in a new city and the host has brought him a local food. While eating, she finds that it is not new to her and she has already eaten it, unexpectedly.

6 Conclusion

Persian, like any other language, has different lexical ways to express range of mirative meanings. It uses some lexical items, like '*ta'ajjob kardan*' (to be surprised), exclamative clauses, interjections, like '*e*' and '*ajab*', both equal to English 'wow!', and exclamatory intonation. But, in this paper, I argued that mirativity is encoded in Persian grammar, as well. I showed that two sentence-final forms mark mirativity in this language. The clitic '=*hā*' and the particle '*ke*', among different functions, are mirative markers. In addition to these mirative markers, using the perfect form of the verbs in Persian is a mirative strategy. While this form has different functions, among them showing indirect evidentiality, it can show mirative meaning in specific contexts. These findings provide more evidence for the cross-linguistic finding that languages can use more than one grammatical form to mark mirativity.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2012), "The essence of mirativity", *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 16(3), pp. 435-485. https://doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0017

Anonby, E. & M. Taheri-Ardali (2018), "Bakhtiari", in: Haig, G. & G. Khan (eds.). *The languages and linguistics of Western Asia; an areal perspective*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. pp. 445-480.

Bubenik, V. and L. Ziamajidi (2020), "The rise of the analytic perfect aspect in West Iranian languages", in: Drinka, B. (ed.) *Historical Linguistics 2017. Selected papers from the 23rd International Conference on Historical Linguistics, San Antonio, Texas, 31 July – 4 August 2017*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 273-292.

Bulut, Ch. (2018), "The Turkic varieties of Iran", in: Haig, G. & G. Khan (eds.). *The languages and linguistics of Western Asia; an areal perspective*, Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 398-444.

Comrie, B. (2000), "Evidentials: semantics and history", in: Johanson L. & Bo Utas (eds.). *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 1-12.

de Haan, F. (2012), "Evidentiality and Mirativity." *Oxford Handbooks Online*.

Delancey, S. (1997), "Mirativity: The grammatical marking of unexpected information", *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 1(1), pp. 33-52.

Delancey, S. (201), "Still mirative after all these years", *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 16(3), pp. 529-564. https://doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0020

Fang, H. (2018), "Mirativity in Mandarin: the sentence-final particle *Le* (了)", *Open Linguistics*, vol. 4, pp. 589-607. https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2018-0029

Ghomeshi, J. (2013), "The syntax of pragmaticalization", in: *Proceedings of the 2013 annual conference of the Canadian Linguistic Association.* URL: https://cla-acl.ca/pdfs/actes-2013/Ghomeshi-2013.pdf. Retrieved 02 October, 2024.

Haig, G. & G. Khan (eds.) (2018), *The languages and linguistics of Western Asia; an areal perspective*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton.

Haig, G. & M. Rasekh-Mahand (2022), *HamBam: The Hamedan-Bamberg Corpus of Contemporary Spoken Persian*. Bamberg: University of Bamberg. (multicast.aspra.uni-bamberg.de/resources/hambam/) (date accessed).

Hengeveld, K. & H. Olbertz (2012), "Didn't you know? Mirativity does exist!", *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 16 (3), pp. 487-503. https://doi.org/10.1515/lity-2012-0018
https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.350.13bub
https://doi.org/10.1093/OXFORDHB/9780195381979.013.0036

Jahani, C. (2000), "Expressions of indirectivity in spoken modern Persian", in: Johanson L. & Bo Utas (eds.), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and*

Neighbouring Languages, Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 185-207.

Johanson, L. (1998), "Code-copying in Irano-Turkic", *Language Sciences*, vol. 20(3), pp. 325-337.

Johanson, L. & Bo Utas (eds.) (2000), *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages.* Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Jügel, Th. (2020), "The perfect in Middle and New Iranian languages", in: Crellin, R. & J. Thomas (eds.), *Perfects in Indo-European languages and beyond*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, pp. 279-310.

Kiral, F. (2000), "Reflections on -miš in Khalaj", in: Johanson L. & Bo Utas (eds.). *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 89-101.

Lazard, G. (1957), *Grammaire du persan contemporain*. Translated into Persian by Mahasti Bahreini (2018), Tehran: Hermes Publications.

Lazard, G. (1999), "Mirativity, evidentiality, mediativity, or other?", *Linguistic Typology*, vol. 3, pp. 91–110.

Lazard, G. (2001), "On the grammaticalization of evidentiality", *Journal of Pragmatics*, vol. 33, pp. 358– 368.

Lee, S. N. (1996), *A grammar of Iranian Azarbaijani*, Ph.D. dissertation, Linguistics COGS, University of Sussex.

Meshkinfam, M. (2020), *The grammaticalization of indefinite article in Persian; a Construction Grammar approach*, Ph.D. dissertation. Bu-Ali Sina University, Hamedan, Iran.

Mofidi, R. & P. Petré 2022. "Aspectual marking from a typologically uncommon origin: a quantitative account of the development of *hamē(w)* in Middle Persian", *Folia Linguistica*, vol. 56, pp. 97-127. https://doi.org/10.1515/flin-2022-2025

Oroji, M. R. & A. Rezae (2013), "Exploring 'ke' as a Focus Particle in Persian from both Form and Function Points of View", *Australian Journal of Linguistics*, vol. 33:1, pp. 76-84

Perry, J. R. (2000), "Epistemic verb forms of Iran, Afghanistan and Tajikistan", in: Johanson L. & Bo Utas (eds.). *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and Neighbouring Languages*, Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 229-258.

Peterson, T. (2017), "Problematizing mirativity", *Review of Cognitive Linguistics*, vol. 15(2), pp. 312-342.

Slobin, D. & A. Aksu (1982), "Tense, aspect, and modality in the use of the Turkish evidential", in: Hopper P. (ed.), *Tense-Aspect: Between Semantics and Pragmatics*, Amsterdam: Benjamins, pp. 185-200.

Tavangar, M. & M. Amouzadeh (2009), "Subjective modality and tense in Persian", *Language Sciences*, vol. 31, pp. 853-873.

Utas, Bo (2000), "Traces of evidentiality in Classical New Persian", in: Johanson L. & Bo Utas (eds.). *Evidentials: Turkic, Iranian and*

Neighbouring Languages. Berlin/ New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 259-274.

Van der Wal Anonby, Ch. (2018), "Kumzari", in: Haig, G. and G. Khan (eds.), *The languages and linguistics of Western Asia; an areal perspective*. Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter Mouton, pp. 625-658.

Windfuhr, G. (1987), "Persian", In Comrie, Bernard. (ed.), *The world's major languages.* London: Routledge, pp. 523-546.