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I INTRODUCTION

English Verb Inflection: A Generative View, by Griggs and Rulon (1974) can be characterized, in so far as we are aware, as the first published description of an interestingly large syntactically-defined class of formatives in English within the framework of distinctive-feature phonology in a monograph. It includes a full and explicit account of how all forms of all standard English verbs achieve their observed phonetic shapes. Professor Griggs and I imply by the title that we intend for it (1974 1) "to invite comparison of our work with Bernard Bloch's 1947 'English Verb Inflection.'" Bloch's account, of course, was cast in an item and arrangement format. Comparison with an alternate item and process analysis can be accomplished by piecing together Hoard and Sloat (1971) and (1973). Their account renders Inland American English phonetic forms. Ours, which follows the phonological tenets of Chomsky and Halle (1968), renders what one might call General American English.

1.1 SYNTACTIC INPUT

Our account assumes the type of grammatical framework as set out by Chomsky (1965) in Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. We illustrate the deep structure that we envision in Figure 1, where all verbal affixes in question are included. For the corresponding surface structure, see Griggs and Rulon (1974 11).
Figure 1 Deep structure for sentence The troops shouldn't have been being wasted

1.2 PHONOLOGICAL COMPONENT

We follow with minor modification the phonological theory of Chomsky and Halle (1968), and we have incorporated many of the rules which they present in Chapter Five into our summary of rules. Also, we accept their boundary conventions.

1.3 SYSTEMATIC PHONETIC REPRESENTATION

The dialect which we describe is General American English of an 'r-ful' variety.

2 CONJUGATION OF REGULAR VERBS

In our view one must recognize four inflectional verbal suffixes, ING, Z, ED, AND EN. As we have suggested (1974 15) "In regular verbs, all four suffixes are joined to the stem by word /#/ boundary until that boundary is generally removed by a late phonetic rule."

3 CLASSES OF IRREGULAR VERBS

In this section we present a complete list of the various classes of English irregular verbs.
31 DEFINITIONS OF CLASSES

We recognize three classes of English irregular verbs, WEAK, STRONG and MIXED. A WEAK verb is one in which ED and EN alike are lexically underlying /d/. After a readjustment rule, these verbs are adjoined with formative boundary, hence /WEAK VERB#/ becomes /WEAK VERB+d/, whereas regular verbs retain the word boundary.

In general, a STRONG verb is one in which the EN suffix is underlying /n/ and the past tense suffix /d/ is deleted, additionally, for STRONG verbs, there is some kind of vowel gradation.

A MIXED verb is one in which the past tense form or past participle form is conjugated regularly, but the other form is regular. For example, consider dive-dove-dived and prove-proved-proven. Thus, the overall system of classification may be seen in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Conjugational classes of English verbs](image)

In our description, we view be and go as suppletive verbs because of their untowardly phonetic gyrations.

32 THE DATA

In the lists of irregular verbs which follow, the following conventions are used. Verbs which may have alternate regular conjugations are enclosed in parentheses, a parenthesized capital (W) indicates that a verb may have an alternate weak conjugation, the Roman numerals (I, II, III) identify the three different classes of strong verbs. Thus, for example, the notation (cleave (W)) means that the conjugations cleave-cleaved-cleaved, and cleave-cleft-cleft are possible, and so on.
Weaken Verbs

The weak verbs, 98 in number, are arranged into four groups which have phonological utility. The first two groups contain infinitives which terminate in segments which are voiceless, the infinitives in the last two groups terminate in segments which are voiced.

(a) (beseech), bet, bite (II), burst, cast, catch, cost, creep, cut, (fit), hit, hurt, keep, (knit), (leap), let, (light), meet, put, quit, seek, set, shut, shoot, shut, sleep, (slit), spit (II), split, (sweat), sweep, teach, think, thrust, weep, (wet), (work/wreak)

(b) make

(c) bend, (bereave), (blend), bring, build, (burn), buy, (cleave (II)), deal, (dream), (dwell), feel, (gild), (gird), (kneel), (lean), (learn), leave, lend, lose, may, mean, (pen), (rend), send, (smell), (spell), spend, (spill), (spoil), use, went

(d) bid(I), bleed, breed, can, (chide (II)), (clothe), feed, flee, have, hear, hide (II), lead, (plead), read, (rid), say, sell, shall, shed, (shoe), slide, (speed), spread, stand, tell, (tread (II)), (wed), will

Strong Verbs

We recognize three classes into which strong verbs fall. Those which we designate Roman I have infinitives and past participles which are the same if one ignores the tense/lax distinction of the tonic vowel. Roman II verbs have the same past tense and past participle forms and Roman III verbs have a different tonic vowel in each form.

Class I

be, bid(W), blow, come, do, draw, drive, eat, fall, forsake, give,

go, grow, know, ride, rise, run, see, shake, (shriVe), slay, smite (II), stride (II), strike (II), (strive), take, (thrive), throw, write
CLASS II
bear, beat, (bide), bind, bite (W), break, (chide (W)),
choose, (cleave (W)), cling, dig, (dive (M)), fight,
find, fling, freeze, get, grind, hang, (heave), hide (W),
hold, lie, (shear (M)), shine, shrink (III), sink (III),
sit, sling, slink, smite (I), speak, spin, spit (W),
spring (III), (stave), steal, stick, sting, stink (III),
stride (I), strike (I), (string), swear, (swell (M)),
swing (III), tear, (tread (W)), (wake), wear, weave, win,
wind, wring

CLASS III
begin, drink, fly, ring, shrink (II), sing, sink (II),
spring (II), stink (II), swim, swing (II)

3 5 MIXED VERBS
All of the mixed verbs listed below can be conjugated
regularly, they are, therefore, all enclosed in parentheses
(crow, dive (II), hew, lade, melt, mow, prove, rive,
saw, sew, shear (II), show, sow, strew, swell (II))

Since the phonological processes involved in the derivations
of strong, weak, and mixed verbs alike are amply illustrated in
Griggs and Rulon (1974), we content ourselves at this point to
present, following the summary, our alphabetized list of the
phonetic reflexes of the irregular verbs of modern General
American English

4 SUMMARY
In summary then, Professor Griggs and I invite comparison
of our grammar with Bloch's 1947 item and arrangement analysis
Those interested in an alternate analysis for Inland American
English should consult Hoard and Sloat (1971) and (1973)
SYSTEMATIC PHONETIC REPRESENTATIONS

[bær bõAr bõrn]
[brTyt bTyt(an)]
[barang barang barang]
[brænd bænt]
[barTyv bareft]
[baestyc bæsylt]
[baet bæt]
[bld bæd/bid/bɔyd bld(æn)]
[bɔyd bɔwd bɔwd]
[bæyd bɔwend bɔwend]
[bæyt bɪt]/[bæyt bɪt bɪtan]
[bLTyd bled]
[blend blent]
[blow blïw blïwn]
[brïyk brïwk brïwken]
[brTyd bred]
[brïŋ brïl̂t]
[bild bïlt]
[barn bɑɾnt]
[barst bɑrst]
[bay bɔlt]
[kɑn kud]
[kast kɑst]
[kæcz kɔlst]
[čäyd čid]/[čäyd čid čidan]
[čïwz čïwz čïwzan]
[klïTyv kleft]/[klïTyv klïwv klïwven]
[klïn kïl̂n kïln]
[kïlwïd kïlad]
[kam kɔym kãn]
[kïnst kɔast]
[krïTyp krept]
[kröw krïw krïwδ]
[kat kät]
[dïTyi delt]
[dig dag dag]
[däyv dɔwv dɔwv]/[däyv dɔwv däyvδ]
[dɔw dïd dän]
[dɾɔn dɾwv dɾɔn]
[dɾTym dremt]
[dɾïŋk dɾæŋk dɾæŋk]
[dɾæyv dɾɔwv driven]
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[.dwel dwelt]
[Tyt eyt Tytën]
[faAl fel faAlen]
[fTyd fed]
[fTyI felt]
[fäyt fänt]
[fäynd fäwnd fäwnd]
[fI t fit]
[fIty fled]
[fIlô fIñô fñô]
[fIäy flûw flöwn]
[fersëyk fersuk fersëykën]
[frTyz fröwz fröwzen]
[get gät gät(en)]
[gIld gIlI]
[gård gårt]
[gIYv gëyv givën]
[gÖw --- gÖn]
[gräynd gräwnd gröwn]
[gröw grûw gröwn]
[haâI haâ loâI]
[haâv haâd haâz]
[hIaã hIaã]
[hIYv hIöv höv]
[hYûw hYûwd hYûwn]
[häyd hîd]/[häyd hîd hîdën]
[hit hit]
[hôYld held held]
[hârt hârt]
[kTYp kept]
[nTyI neît]
[nIT nit]
[nôw nûw nöwn]
[löYd löYded löYden]
[lTYd leôd]
[lTYn leônt]
[lTYp leôpt]
[lârn lârnt]
[lTYv leôft]
[lênd leônt]
[leôt leôt]
[läY fêy lêyn]
[läyt lIt]
[lûzw lîsast]
[slāyd slid]
[släng slāŋ slāŋ]
[slīŋ slāŋk slāŋk]
[slīt slīt]
[smel smelt]
[smāyt smōwt smiten]
[sōw sōwd sōwn]
[spTyk spōwken]
[spTyd sped]
[spel spelt]
[spund spent]
[spilt spilt]
[spin spān span]
[spit spat spat]
[split split]
[spōy spōyt]
[spred spred]
[spren spran/spran spran]
[stand stud]
[steyv stōwv stōwv]
[stTyl stōwl stōlen]
[stik stak stak]
[stin slōn stān]
[stīgk stānk/stānk stānk]
[strūw strōwd strōwn]
[strāyd strōwd striden]/[strāyd strōwd strōwd]
[strāyk strāk striken]/[strāyk strāk strāk]
[strei strāng strāng]
[střeyv strōwv striven]
[swēār swōār swōārn]
[swet swet]
[swTy spelt]
[swel sweld swōwlən]/[swel swōwl swōwlən]
[swim swam swañ]
[swīng swāng/swāng swāng]
[tēyv tük tēyken]
[tīyč tōat]
[tōar tōar tōārn]
[tel tōwləd]
[tēŋk tēōat]
[trāyv tōwv triven]
[trōw tēōw tēōw]
[trōst trōst]
[tred tred]/[tred trād trād(ən)]
NOTES

1 I wish to here acknowledge that Professor Griggs is a major architect of our monograph.

2 For dialectological reasons, the reader might like to know that Professor Griggs is a native of Ft Worth, Texas, that I am a native of Topeka, Kansas.

3 We are presently at work on an up-dated grammar of English irregular verbs.
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Most students of Modern Persian grammar have recognized at least two types of verbs: simple and compound. The simple verbs, whose number is relatively small, consist of one word such as daštazan "to have", xordaen "to eat", zaedaen "to hit", etc. Compound verbs consist of a combination of one of a number of simple verbs and one or more lexical items: baer daštazan "to lift, to take", zaemixordaen "to fall", haerf zaedaen "to speak", etc. Furthermore, most grammarians have sub-classified the compound verbs on the basis of the part-of-speech, inherent or derived, classification of the lexical item (i.e., noun, adjective, preposition, or adverb) that combines with the simple verb.

Rubinehik (1971) divides the compound verbs into what he calls prefixed and compound verbs. Prefixed verbs are formed by joining different dependent words, mainly preposition to a simple verb: baer daštazan "to take, lift", baer-xordaen "to be offended", etc. Compound verbs, however, are formed by a combination of nouns or adjectives with simple verbs: zaemixordaen "to fall down", baer kærdaen "to open", haerf zaedaen "to speak", etc.

The main reason for differentiating a simple verb (with a complement) from a compound verb seems to lie in the fact that the meaning of a compound verb differs from the meaning of each element in that verb. For example, in sentence (1)

1 maen šam xordaem I ate supper

šam "supper" is a noun that functions as the object of the verb xordaen

But in sentence (2)

2 maen zaemizordaem I fell down

the noun zaemixordaeiz "earth" is not an object for the simple verb xordaen "to eat", rather zaemizordaen is a unitary semantic
concept, an intransitive verb, only distantly related to the meaning of its verb constituent.

The most recent studies on various aspects of Persian syntax are a few unpublished PhD dissertations (Palmer (1970), Moyne (1970), Stilo (1971). In their attempts to deal with Persian within the framework of Generative grammar, they have recognized the simple-compound distinction between verbs. They have tried to generate the two types of predicate constructions through formalized rules. While each of these studies has provided us with valuable bits of information on various aspects of Persian syntax, they have hardly any insightful thing to say about the actual syntactic-semantic processes involved in the formation of compound verbs. Moyne differentiates the simple transitive verb predicate construction from that of a compound verb by considering the latter as frozen structures in lexicon. They are not generated by any base rule (Moyne 1970:81). For example, he differentiates between sentences (1) and (2) by generating (1) through the base rules but not sentence (2). To consider the process of compound-verb formation as "frozen" is to disregard the productive nature of this syntactic phenomenon.

In Modern Persian, compound verbs are used to introduce new semantic concepts (e.g., telefon kaerdaen "to telephone"), to replace verbs of Arabic origin (e.g., daer xast kaerdaen for taelaebidaen "to ask"), or to provide new ways of expressing an already existing semantic concept (e.g., gil zaedaen for faeriftaen "to deceive") It is interesting to note how new compound verbs are formed for new concepts. Not too long ago the concept of airplanes flying was introduced to the Persian community. In their language, the Persians had a word for flying (paeridaen) as is seen in

3. kaebutaer aez deraext paerid The pigeon flew from the tree.

But when they saw the planes flying, they did not use the simple verb paeridaen to express the action performed by the plane, rather they formed a compound verb, paervaz kaerdaen, a combination of paervaz, a nominal derivative from paeridaen, and a simple verb, kaerdaen "to do." Therefore, sentence (4) is grammatical but (5) is not

4. haevapeyman daer aseman paervaz mikonaed
   The plane flies in the sky.

5. *haevapeyman daer aseman mipaerad.
Examples like telefon kaerdaen "to telephone" and paervaz kaerdaen show the productive nature of compound verb formation.

I maintain that the process of compound verb formation could be explained within Chafe's (1970) theory of linguistics. This study is an attempt to demonstrate the applicability of his theory with some modification to a limited number of Persian verbs, however, further research is necessary to account for the formation of all compound verbs.

According to Chafe (1970) the verb which is the central and controlling element in a sentence could be specified by various selectional semantic and inflectional units. Selectional units, that is, state, process, action, process-action, state-ambient, and action-ambient, determine not only the presence of accompanying nouns but also the choice of a verb root. These units may be inherent in a particular verb or derivationally added to it.

I believe the structure of compound verbs in Persian cannot be accounted for without an understanding of the function and the structure of simple verbs. In fact, I would claim that the process of compound verb formation is but a surface realization of the underlying semantic units and processes involved in the structure of simple verbs. Therefore, I will begin my analysis by describing the structure of a few simple verbs with the framework of Chafe (1970). Throughout this paper I will assume some familiarity with his theory.

Let us examine the different forms of the verb suxtaen "to burn" in the following sentences:

6 ketabaem suxt
My book burnt
7 morad ketabaemra suzand
Morad burnt my book
8 ketabaem suzteaste
My book is burnt

In (6) suxt, the 3rd person singular of the past tense of suxtaen, denotes the process that occurred to its patient, to ketabaem "my book". In (7) suzand "burnt" is the 3rd person singular form of the past tense of suzandaen "to burn", the so-called causative form of suxtaen. It requires an agent, Morad, to perform the action and a patient, ketabaem "my book", to undergo the process. The difference between the meaning of the verb in (6) and (7) is due to a semantic process that Chafe (1970 129) characterizes as...
Rule 1. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{process} \\ \text{root} \\
\end{array} \\
\rightarrow \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{action} \\
\text{root + causative}
\end{array}
\]

That is, a verb root which is process can optionally become a process-action verb through the addition of the derivational semantic unit \textit{causative}. This new semantic unit will require, in addition to a patient, the presence of an agent.

In the English translations of (6) and (7) there is not any morphological difference between \textit{burnt} as a process verb and as a process-action. But in the Persian sentences, \textit{suxt} and \textit{suzand} are morphologically different, perhaps an indication of the derivational relation characterized by Rule (1). However, this semantic change is not always accompanied by some overt morphological marking. In sentences (9) and (10), \textit{šekaestaen} "to break" does not exhibit any change, but in (11) and (12) one finds two different words \textit{mord} and \textit{košt} corresponding to the semantic units of process and process-action respectively.

9. \textit{paenjere šekaest.} \hspace{1cm} The window broke.
10. \textit{morad paenjerera šekaest.} \hspace{1cm} Morad broke the window.
11. \textit{morad mord.} \hspace{1cm} Morad died.
12. \textit{Mehdi moradra košt.} \hspace{1cm} Medhi killed Morad.

In sentence (8) above, \textit{suxte} "burnt" is a state, it indicates the state of the patient \textit{ketabae} "my book". The change of the verb in (6) to that of (8) is characterized by Chafe (1970 124) as

Rule 2. \[
\begin{array}{c}
\text{process} \\ \text{root} \\
\end{array} \\
\rightarrow \\
\begin{array}{c}
\text{state} \\
\text{root + resultative}
\end{array}
\]

It should be noted that in (8) \textit{suxte} is the past participle of \textit{suxtaen} and is accompanied by the third person singular present form of the verb \textit{budaen} "to be". Rule (2) could account for the difference between the verbs in (9) and (13) and in (14) and (4)

13. \textit{paenjere šekaestae aest} \hspace{1cm} The window is broken.
14. \textit{morad morde aest.} \hspace{1cm} Morad is dead

Now let us examine some examples of verbs that are inherently process-action
In (15) borid, the 3rd person singular past tense of boridaen, is a process-action verb with Morad the agent. In (16) borid has derivationally become a process verb. Chafe (1970, 131) characterizes this semantic derivation by Rule 3:

\[
\text{process action} \longrightarrow \text{process root + deactivative root}
\]

That is, a process-action verb root could be converted into a process root by the addition of a derivational semantic unit, deactivative. Now if we apply Rule (2) to the result of (3) the result will be a derived state verb. Sentence (17) has precisely such a verb, and its semantic structure could be characterized by (18):

\[
V \text{state root + deactivative + resultative}
\]

The following sentences contain action verbs where the noun Morad acts as the agent of the verb:

19 morad daevid Morad ran
20 morad xaendid Morad laughed

Chafe's treatment of action verbs is rather sketchy. Besides the obligatory agent noun, he claims, some of these verbs may require the presence of other nouns such as, beneficiary, and complement. As far as the main selectional semantic units of state, process, action, and process-action are concerned, Chafe does not change the action verbs into any other verbs. He does not think that the inherently action verbs undergo any derivational processes similar to those of other verbs. In this section I would like to show that such is not true with Persian. Sentences (21) and (22) seem to be clearly derived from (19) and (20) respectively:

21 morad mehd1ra daevand Morad made Mehdi run
22 morad mehd1ra xaendand Morad made Mehdi laugh
Sentences (19) and (20) each have one noun Morad which bears an agent relation to the verb. Both sentences could be appropriate answers to:

23. Morad če kard kaerd. What did Morad do?

Sentences (21) and (22) which contain two nouns, Morad and Mehdi, could also be answers to sentences (23). While these sentences look like process-action ones, Mehdi does not seem to be a patient as one expects in process-action verbs.

Sentences (21) and (22) suggest that Chafe's outline of semantic structure for verbs needs some modification. Besides the fact that action verbs undergo some derivational changes, the resulting changed sentences seem to have two nouns, both of which could be considered to be agents. I have made certain suggestions to extend Chafe's proposal elsewhere. These modifications are necessary if one wants to account for the following English sentences:

24. Morad walked across the stage.
25. Morad walked the queen across the stage.

The Persian data clearly indicates that there is a difference between the role of Morad and Mehdi in (21) and (22). While Mehdi is the person who "ran" and "laughed", Morad is the person who caused Mehdi to undertake the action. Morad may or may not have participated in the same action, but he certainly caused or instigated the action. We are forced either to change our concept of the semantic unit "patient" or postulate an additional semantic unit called instigator besides those proposed by Chafe.

The action verbs do not seem to undergo any further derivational changes.

Now let us examine the state verbs. In all the above examples which dealt with state verbs, the verb was a derived one. They were the so-called past participle form of the verb followed by some form of the verb "to be". In Persian like those in English, except for a few experiencial and benefective verbs, most state verbs are what the traditional grammarians call adjective and participle, and are always accompanied by the verb "to be".
daer baz bud  The door was open
daer baz Ḟod  The door opened
morad daerra baz kaerd  Morad opened the door

Most grammars of Persian consider sentence (26) to contain a simple verb, but (27) and (28) each contain a compound verb Ḟodaen "to become" and kaerdaen "to do" are called auxiliaries, especially in sentences where instead of an adjective, such as baz "open" a participle like Ḟekaeste "broken" or raevan "going, flowing" is used

paenǰere Ḟekaeste bud  The window was broken
morad be maenzei raevan  Morad was going home

It is not at all clear why one should consider sentences (26), (27), and (28) to contain two different classes of verbs, in fact, they all seem to have the same class of verbs. If (26) contains a simple verb, (27) and (28) must also contain simple verbs, too. The verbs in these sentences differ from one another in the same way that verbs of the sentences (6), (7), and (8) differ. If we accept Chafe's hierarchical system and consider state as the highest semantic selectional unit, sentence (26) would then be the basic semantic concept from which sentence (27) could be derived by Rule 4.

Rule 4  state ——> process
        root
        root + incohesive

This rule changes a state verb into a process verb. Sentence (28) is further derived from the application of the Rule 1 to the verb of sentence (27).

Sentences (26), (27), and (28) are similar to (6), (7), and (8) or to (15), (16), and (17) in that in each set there is a verb intrinsically state (26), process (6) and process-action (15), and the other two sentences in each set are derived from them by the appropriate application of Rules 1, 2, 3, or 4. The difference between these sets of sentences lies in the fact that intrinsically state verbs, which have surface marker, budaen "to be", regularly use Ḟodaen and kaerdaen when they undergo semantic derivation. This is not always true of other types of verbs, even though when Ḟodaen and kaerdaen appear with the latter, they definitely indicate the derivative nature of that particular verb.
It is then reasonable to postulate that budaen, sodaen, and kaerdaen are surface representations of the semantic units, state, process, and process-action respectively. They appear with the so-called simple verbs as they undergo the semantic derivations. There is no reason to believe that their presence with other lexical items should be called compound verbs. In fact I would like to claim that the appearance of budaen, sodaen, and kaerdaen with other lexical items such as nouns, participles, adjectives, etc. indicate the selectional semantic units of the sentence. If the lexical item is an adjective, the verb budaen would show the inherent feature and the others the derived features. If it is non-adjective, the presence of these verbs indicates the semantic selectional feature of process, process-action, action, etc.

Consider the following sentences

31. in aenjomaen daer New York tae'sis 闪过.
This association was established in New York.

32. morad in aenjomaenra daer New York tae'sis kaerd.
Morad established this association in New York.

While the noun tae'sis "establishment" can form both a process and process-action, the following noun cannot

33. morad sabr kard Morad waited.

In fact (33) is an action verb. It should be noticed that the meaning of these verbs is the meaning of the noun, adjective, etc. sodaen or kaerdaen determine the semantic relationship between various parts of the sentence. The same arguments could be made for English sentences like

34. Morad made a speech.
35 Morad did a dance for us.

There are a number of other compound verbs where the verb used in their formation is not one of the so-called auxiliaries. They are simple verbs with their own semantic content such as

36. morad kaebab xord. Morad ate kabab
37 morad zaemin xord. Morad fell down.
38 morad qose-xord. Morad felt sorrowful
40. Morad jiq ke'sid Morad shouted.
41 Morad sigar ke'sid. Morad smoked a cigarette
I have discussed the above sentences in Sharifi (1973a, and 1973b) and we shall discuss similar sentences in connection to *gereftaen* "to get" in the next paper (Sheik and Sharifi) in this volume. The simple verbs, *xordaen* "to eat" and *kesidaen* "to pull" seem to change their original meanings in sentences (37, 38) and (40 and 41) when they appear in a compound form. It is this seeming disparity between the meaning of the simple verb and their meaning as they appear in the compound form that has given the strongest motivation to divide the verbs into two groups of simple and compound. I have argued that the basic meaning of the simple verb is present in all of the compound verbs. To native speakers in (37 and 38) the notion of "consumption and absorption" and in (40 and 41) the idea of "pulling and drawing" is present. In addition, the verbs *xordaen* and *kesidaen* reflect the semantic selectional units of action which is necessary to change the nouns in each sentence through a derivational process into an action verb. This is not much different from the function of the so-called auxilliary verbs, *sodaen* and *kaerdaen*. If sentences (26, 28) in fact, contain simple verbs there is no justification for considering (37, 38, 41, and 42) as different.

NOTES

1 For an example of the traditional classification see Elwell-Sutton, 1963, pages 94ff

2 These are the infinitive forms of the verbs. The mark of an infinitive is the final -an of the word

3 See Lambton 1961, pages 85ff

4 "Chafe's Action Verbs in Persian", a paper read before the Linguistics Section II of the 1974 Philological Association of the Pacific Coast, San Diego, California
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