

# An Aspect Marking Construction Shared by Two Typologically Different Languages

Shinji Ido

PtoPA Ltd.

## 1. Introduction

A large number of linguistic features in Tajik, an Iranian language, are considered to have emerged or have been retained under the influence of Uzbek, the Turkic language with which Tajik has been in contact for many centuries.

In this paper, I focus on one linguistic feature in Tajik and try to demonstrate that it has emerged as a result of prolonged language contact between Tajik and Uzbek. I will describe the feature in the following sections, after which I will present data in support of my attempt to show that the feature is contact-induced.

## 2. Data

Iranian speakers and Turkic speakers have been in intensive contact with each other in Central Asia for many centuries<sup>1</sup>. Tajik and Uzbek are two languages that are representative of the languages that have co-existed in this Iranian-Turkic symbiosis.

Uzbek is a Turkic language that has Chaghatay<sup>2</sup> as its literary predecessor and is the official language<sup>3</sup> of the republic of Uzbekistan. Tajik, on the other hand, is a South-West Iranian language which is genetically closely related to such Iranian languages as Persian and Dari<sup>4</sup>. Most Tajik speakers are in Tajikistan and Uzbekistan<sup>5</sup>; within the latter Samarkand and Bukhara are particularly densely populated by Tajik speakers.

The co-habitancy of the same geographical area by Tajik and Uzbek speakers has made Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism the norm in much of this area. Moreover, language change in Tajik that this bilingualism appears to have induced is still in progress, which makes Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism a research topic with much currency. It is therefore not surprising that Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism has attracted a great deal of attention in Tajik dialectology as well as in Uzbek dialectology<sup>6</sup>. Research on

---

<sup>1</sup> A Turkic speaking tribe called Karluk was probably already present in Central Asia in the 10<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>2</sup> See Caferoğlu (1984:199), Eckmann (1988:vii-xvi) and Boeschoten and Vandamme (1998:166-169) for discussions on referential ambiguity of this term. See also Tursonov et al. (1995:104) who use not 'Chaghatay' (*chig'atoy tili*) but 'Old Uzbek Literary Language' (*eski o'zbek adabiy tili*) to refer to the literary language used between the end of the 14<sup>th</sup> century and the latter half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>3</sup> The term *davlat tili* 'state language' is used in some texts, e.g. in the constitutional law and Abdurahmonov (1996:5).

<sup>4</sup> The issue of whether Tajik and Persian are to be considered two dialects of a single language or two separate languages has political sides to it, with which I am not concerned in this paper.

<sup>5</sup> According to Akiner (1989:103), 35.8 per cent of the Tajiks were in Uzbek SSR when the National Delimitation of the Central Asian Republics took place in October 1924. See Lewis (1972:Chapter 5) for a description of changes in the ethnic structure and linguistic character of Soviet republics that ensued from the Delimitation.

<sup>6</sup> Uzbek dialectologist Shoabdurahmonov (1971:391) states that interaction "between Uzbek dialects and languages with different systems, among them Tajik" is "not related only to Uzbek linguistics but is an important theoretical issue that belongs to general linguistics".

Tajik dialects that are in contact with Uzbek has been particularly intensive in Tajik dialectology<sup>7</sup>, which is itself a very major area of research in Tajik linguistics<sup>8</sup>. This attention is reflected in Rastorgueva's comparative study of Tajik dialects (1964:129-142), where thirteen pages are devoted to her analysis of Tajik dialectal morphology that she considers exhibits influences of (Tajik-Uzbek) bilingualism<sup>9</sup>.

Most of the data in this paper are taken from this kind of dialectological work produced by Tajik and Uzbek linguists in the latter half of the twentieth century. Since the focus of the present study is on the influence Uzbek/Turkic have had on Tajik rather than the other way around, I use Tajik linguists' dialectological work as the main source of data. I also use my own small corpus of Bukharan Tajik compiled from personal e-mails, my field notes, Bukharan Tajik speech that I transcribed, and a diary kept by a young Bukharan.<sup>10</sup> Almost all data for the present paper are from the northern group of Tajik dialects<sup>11</sup>, into which most 'Uzbekicized' dialects, such as Čust and Kosonsoy dialects as well as Bukhara-Samarkand dialects are classified.

### 3. Terminology

In the preceding section, I did not distinguish between 'Uzbek influence' and 'Turkic influence' – I use in this paper these two expressions synonymously, because 1) in the majority of cases, Turkic influences on modern Tajik can be equated to influences of Uzbek (or its direct or indirect predecessors) on Tajik and 2) there are cases where features in Tajik that are (apparently) Turkic are not unique to Uzbek but common to Turkic languages in general.

Since this paper is concerned mainly with language contact between Tajik in Uzbek, the term Tajik will be used in reference to literary Tajik and Northern Tajik dialects that are in contact with Uzbek, excluding Tajik dialects that exhibit little influence from Uzbek.

---

<sup>7</sup> This intensiveness may be ascribed to the fact that literary Tajik has its basis on Bukhara-Samarkand dialects, the speakers of which are bilingual in Tajik and Uzbek. Melex (1968:22) points to the phonetic, morphological, and lexical correspondence between literary Tajik and Ğižduvon dialect (a Bukhara-Samarkand dialect). (Ğižduvon is the birthplace of Sadriiddin Aynī, who was in a dominant position in the academia of Tajikistan during the standardization period of Tajik).

<sup>8</sup> Modern Tajik linguistics served mainly standardization (see Asimova 1982 for a detailed discussion) and pedagogy of Tajik in its early years, preceding (and during) which period there was a heated debate among Tajik intellectuals and writers on which Iranian language(s) or dialect(s) should be the basis of literary Tajik (e.g. many articles in Raxim-mim 1930). Not surprisingly, dialectology is one area where research by Tajik linguists has been particularly intensive. As a result of this intensive research, as Lazard (1970:73) stated in 1970, "Tajik dialects are by far better known than those spoken in the rest of the Persian area, and few of them remain unexplored".

<sup>9</sup> Lists of linguistic features (including calques) in literary Tajik and Tajik dialects that appear to be associated with Uzbek are available also in the Uzbek-related sections in Doerfer (1967) and Tursunova's (1979) analysis of *Qullar* and *Ğulomon*. (*Qullar* and *Ğulomon* are the same novel written in Uzbek and Tajik by Sadriiddin Aynī, who was bilingual in Tajik and Uzbek.) An enumeration of Uzbek/Turkic words, which abound in the lexicon of Tajik can be found in Doerfer (1967). For a list of Tajik/Persian (and Arabic) words in Uzbek, the reader is referred to Sapoev and Avezmetov's (1996) dictionary of Arab and Persian words in Uzbek.

<sup>10</sup> Since Bukharan Tajik does not have a writing system, Bukharan Tajik written by native speakers can be found in very restricted registers, such as email correspondence between native speakers and diaries, though even these are very often written in Uzbek, which, unlike Tajik, they know well as a written language. Written northern Tajik dialects sometimes serve as a medium of communication among Tajik speakers from Bukhara and Samarkand (e.g. in Uzbekistan Online Forum), despite lexical and phonological differences between them.

<sup>11</sup> Different classifications of Tajik dialects have been proposed by P. E. Kuznetsov (in 1915), M. S. Andreev (in 1930), and V. S. Rastorgueva (in 1952 and 1960). I use the term 'northern group' here in accordance with Rastorgueva's classification.

## 4. Preliminary discussion

Curnow (2001:422) writes:

"Given the existence of languages A and B in contact, where A and B share certain features, it may appear that these features have been transferred from one language to the other. If there is another dialect of B, called V, which is not in contact with A and which does not have the shared features of A and B, it would seem fairly definite that these features have been transferred from A to B. Unfortunately, this is not necessarily true, and without extensive historical records there is no way of knowing whether it is true or not."

and presents examples in support of this claim. Based on his analysis of those examples, he concludes that 'in the majority of cases we are simply not aware whether proposed contact-induced changes have alternative analyses or not' (ibid:423). I am strongly inclined to subscribe to this claim, which is why I will present as much evidence as possible to validate the claim that the particular feature I will discuss later in this paper is a product of contact-induced language change.

In fact, in Tajik dialectology, a well-known example exists where a linguistic feature in Tajik that may intuitively be considered to have been borrowed from Uzbek is disputed over its Uzbek origin. Many northern Tajik dialects, such as those in the viloyat of Andijon, have a possessive construction exemplified in the following examples taken from Muruvvatov (1970:274, the glosses and translations are mine):

- (1) *Axmad-a kitob-aš dada-m-a kord-aš*  
Axmad-a book-3sg father-1sg-a knife-3sg  
'Axmad's book' 'my father's knife'

which appear to be in one-to-one morphological correspondence with their Uzbek counterparts:

- (2) *Axmad-ning kitob-i dada-m-ning pichog'-i*  
Axmad-gen book-3sg father-1sg-gen knife-3sg  
'Axmad's book' 'my father's knife'

Muruvvatov says that the view that assumes the (possessor-*a* + possessee-personal suffix<sup>12</sup>) construction in (1) to be the Tajik interpretation of the Turkic-Uzbek possessive construction is refuted by the fact that there are such examples as the following in the 9<sup>th</sup> century Persian poetry<sup>13</sup>. (*-a* in the Tajik examples in (1) is a dialectal equivalent of *-ro* in these examples.):

- (3) *Rūdaki-ro ġazal-aš Rūdaki-ro suxan-aš*  
Rudaki-ro gazel-3sg Rudaki-ro word-3sg  
'Rudaki's gazel' 'Rudaki's word/speech'

The existence of such examples prompts one to re-evaluate the synchronically and intuitively satisfying analysis that assumes the Tajik possessive construction in (1) to be Uzbek in origin. If we do not take for granted the Uzbek-origin theory of the possessive construction in (1), then its origin would be open to conjecture and interpretation – the construction may not have come into existence as a result of language contact but may have existed in Tajik (i.e. Central Asian Iranian) prior to its contact with Uzbek. If this had been the case, a question would also arise as to whether it could have survived for almost a millennium without Tajik's contact with Uzbek.

In short, language change or lack of it often defies intuitively reasonable explanations, and

---

<sup>12</sup> Or *bandakjonišin* 'enclitic pronoun', which may be preferred to 'personal suffix' by Tajik grammarians.

<sup>13</sup> "In the poetry language of the 9<sup>th</sup> century" in Muruvvatov's wording.

verifying whether the emergence or retention of (a) feature(s) in a language is contact-induced is difficult.

This said, it is also irrefutable that language change which various data strongly suggest to be contact-induced, exists. In the immediately following section, I describe a case of language change in Tajik that I think represents one of such cases. The case I describe involves an aspectual use of the *-a šudan* construction, which consists of a gerund and the Tajik equivalent of the verb 'to become'. I will provide pieces of evidence that support the theory that language contact was instrumental in the emergence of the use of *-a šudan* as an aspect marker in Tajik.

## 5. Tajik *-a šudan*

First, look at the following excerpt from the entry for *šudan* in Barakaeva's (1968) Tajik-English dictionary:

"fe"l. ěr. [...] *soxta šudan* to be<sup>+</sup> built."

The entry for *šudan* contains three articles, the last of which exemplifies some usages of *šudan* as an auxiliary verb or *fe"li ěridihanda* (abbreviated as *fe"l. ěr.* in the entry). The usage example is glossed below:

- (4) *soxt-a*            *šudan*  
built.gerund    become.infinitive  
'to be built'

As can be observed here, in Tajik, the passive construction is formed by combining the gerundive form of a verb with the auxiliary verb *šudan* 'to become'<sup>14</sup>. Now let us examine Rahimī and Uspenskaya's (1954:462) dictionary which has an additional article for *šudan* as an auxiliary verb. Observe the following usage example from that entry (*Šud-* is the past stem of the verb *šudan*):

- (5) *man*        *xond-a*        *šud-am*  
I            read.gerund    became-1sg  
'I have read (something)'

Here, the auxiliary verb *šudan* is used for marking the completive aspect. Thus, the *-a šudan* construction serves both passivization and completive aspect marking in Tajik (, though the latter appears to be given secondary importance in prescriptive grammars and dictionaries<sup>15</sup>). The latter of these two uses, as will be argued below, is very possibly associated with the contact of Tajik with Uzbek.

In fact, the completive aspect is frequently listed in the literature as one of a number of aspects that Tajik has in common with Uzbek, usually with the assumption that the (gerund + 'to become')

---

<sup>14</sup> This corresponds to Persian passive construction: *-e šodan*. Şahinoğlu (1997:254) writes that sometimes *a:madan* 'to come, to become' and *gærdi:dan/gæştan* 'to turn (around)' are used instead of *šodan*. See also Zehnī (1987:213) for examples of the passive construction in *Ta"rixi Bayhaqī*.

<sup>15</sup> The absence of an entry for this particular use in Barakaeva's dictionary may be a reflection of the relatively little attention paid to completive aspect marking *-a šudan*. In fact, in a number of textbooks and grammars such as Arzumanov (1951), Nięzmuhammadov et al (1955), Arzumanov and Sanginov (1988), *-a šudan* as a completive aspect marker is not mentioned. In the comprehensive grammar by Rustamov and Ğafforov (1985), one section (ibid:195-196) is devoted to passivizing *-a šudan*, whereas aspect marking *-a šudan* is mentioned only in passing (ibid:199). It is not without a reason that passivization appears to be given priority over completive aspect marking in dictionaries and grammars – the *-a šudan* construction in certain registers are mostly passivizing. In a small corpus (32,445 words) I compiled from news reports, there are 500 occurrences of the verb *šudan*. Of these 500 *šudans*, 115 are auxiliary and almost all of these 115 auxiliary *šudans* serve passivization.

construction as a completive aspect marker has been borrowed into Tajik from Uzbek.

Let us examine below what prompts researchers to make this assumption. As can be seen below, it is not difficult to see commonalities between the completive aspect markers of Uzbek and Tajik – even a casual look at the following pair of examples taken from Rastorgueva (1964:134, the glosses and translation are mine) reveals what induces researchers to associate the completive aspect markers in Tajik and Uzbek with each other:

- |     |                 |   |           |                     |               |                  |
|-----|-----------------|---|-----------|---------------------|---------------|------------------|
| (6) | Tajik (dialect) | <i>man</i>  | <i>in</i> | <i>kitob-at-a</i>   | <i>xond-a</i> | <i>šud-am</i>    |
|     |                 | I   | this      | book-2sg-acc        | read.gerund   | became-1sg       |
|     |                 | 'I have read / finished reading this book of yours' |           |                     |               |                  |
|     | Uzbek           | <i>men</i>  | <i>bu</i> | <i>kitob-ing-ni</i> | <i>o'qi-b</i> | <i>bo'l-di-m</i> |
|     |                 | I   | this      | book-2sg-acc        | read.gerund   | become-past-1sg  |
|     |                 | 'I have read / finished reading this book of yours' |           |                     |               |                  |

These two sentences exhibit almost perfect morphological correspondence with each other. Some more examples like these from Xujand-Koni Bodom dialects can be found also in Rastorgueva (1956:95-96). Completive aspect markers extracted from the above examples are shown below:

- |     |       |              |  |
|-----|-------|--------------|--|
| (7) | Tajik | <i>-a</i>    | <i>šud-</i> (or its present stem <i>šav-</i> ) |
|     | Uzbek | <i>-(i)b</i> | <i>bo'l-</i>                                   |
|     |       | gerund       | to become                                      |

We can see clearly in this pair of examples correspondence between Tajik and Uzbek completive aspect marking constructions. An obvious correspondence such as this one naturally prompts one to assume Uzbek influence in the emergence, or at least retention, of Tajik aspect marking *-a šudan*. This morphological correspondence is, then, a piece of evidence for the involvement of language contact with aspect marking *-a šudan*.

The second piece of evidence for the contact-induced nature of aspect marking *-a šudan* is the fact that *šudan* is not the only verb that is used in correspondence with its equivalent Uzbek verb in aspect marking – the majority of the verbs listed as aspect-marking auxiliary verbs in descriptive grammars of both literary Tajik and (Northern) Tajik dialects are in correspondence with Uzbek aspect-marking auxiliary verbs. The fact that verbs used in the aspect-marking (gerund + auxiliary verb) construction such as:

- |     |                   |                          |                      |
|-----|-------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| (8) | <i>-a šudan</i>   | (gerund + 'to become')   | aspect: completion   |
|     | <i>-a istodan</i> | (gerund + 'to stand')    | aspect: continuation |
|     | <i>-a šištan</i>  | (gerund + 'to sit')      | aspect: duration     |
|     | <i>-a raftan</i>  | (gerund + 'to go/leave') | aspect: termination  |

(the aspect names are tentative) correspond to Uzbek auxiliary verbs in the same construction<sup>16</sup>:

- |     |                       |                          |                      |
|-----|-----------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| (9) | <i>-(i)b bo'lmoq</i>  | (gerund + 'to become')   | aspect: completion   |
|     | <i>-(i)b turmoq</i>   | (gerund + 'to stand')    | aspect: continuation |
|     | <i>-(i)b o'tirmoq</i> | (gerund + 'to sit')      | aspect: duration     |
|     | <i>-(i)b ketmoq</i>   | (gerund + 'to go/leave') | aspect: termination  |

is indicative of the contact-induced nature of the auxiliarization of these Tajik verbs.

The third piece of evidence for the contact-induced nature of aspect marking *-a šudan* comes from

---

<sup>16</sup> The gerundive *-a/-y* can also be used instead of *-(i)b* in some of these examples. A detailed description of Uzbek auxiliary verbs (*ko'makchi fe'llar*) can be found in Hojiev (1975:373-418).

Rastorgueva (1964:131-135), who presents a number of diachronical and dialectological data, the most important of which for the present discussion is the absence of the (gerund + auxiliary verb) construction in the Classical Persian-Tajik literary language.<sup>17</sup> This absence naturally suggests non-Tajik/Iranian origin of the aspectual (gerund + auxiliary verb) construction and hence also Uzbek influence in the establishment of *-a šudan* as an aspect marker in Tajik.

In summary, the assumption that one of the two uses of the auxiliary *šudan*, namely completive aspect marking, is contact-induced seems to be reasonable. In the next section, I will present yet another fact that supports this assumption.

## 6. Bukharan Tajik *-a šudan*

The city of Bukhara, which is situated in Uzbekistan, is one of the cities where Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism is most pronounced – virtually every native Tajik speaker in Bukhara is bilingual in Tajik and Uzbek (Rastorgueva et al 1970:717). In this section, I present data from the Tajik language used by young Bukharans in their twenties who have had no formal education in/of Tajik. Hereafter, I will refer to this language simply as Bukharan Tajik.

As was explained in the preceding section, in Tajik, the *-a šudan* construction serves both passivization and completive aspect marking. However, in Bukharan Tajik, this does not appear to be always the case. I present in this section some Bukharan Tajik examples which seem to point to lack (or scarceness) of passivizing *-a šudan* in Bukharan Tajik.

First, observe some Bukharan Tajik examples in each of which there is one occurrence of *-a šudan* (*šav-* is the present stem of the verb *šudan*):

- (10) *xay, har či proekt-a tayor ka(r)d-a šud-am*  
interjection any what project-acc prepared.gerund became-1sg  
'well, anyway, I prepared (finished preparing) the project'
- (11) *xond-ašt-en...<sup>18</sup> se rüz-ba xond-a šav-an*  
read-continuous-3pl three day-in read-gerund become-3pl  
'(they) are reading (it)... let them finish reading (it) in 3 days'

The *-a šudan* constructions in these characteristically Bukharan Tajik examples mark the completive aspect. What is remarkable, though, may be the fact that I have found no occurrence of passivizing *-a šudan* in the data I compiled from emails and recording (35 minutes) of Bukharan Tajik.

This is, however, not the only reason to suspect that *-a šudan* is normally not used for passivization in Bukharan Tajik. Observe the following phrases taken from Arzumanov and Sanginov's (1988:197-198) textbook of Tajik:

- (12) *soxt-a šudan*  
made.gerund become.infinitive  
'to be made'

---

<sup>17</sup> Five stages of the development of (New) Persian are: Formative Period (7th-10th Century), during which Bukhara was a cultural and administrative centre in the Iranian-speaking world, Heroic Period (10th-12th Century), Classical Period (13th-15th Century), Post Classical (15th-19th Century), and Contemporary (19th Century to Present).

<sup>18</sup> Sentences that appear as if they lack some constituents are called *jumlahoi nopurra* 'incomplete sentences' by Tajik grammarians. Ido (2002a) tries to account for such sentences, which some scholars may analyze as resulting from deletion and pro-drop, from a semantic point of view, using the framework of Jackendoff's Lexical Conceptual Semantics (Jackendoff 1990).

- (13) *xond-a*            *šudan*  
 read.gerund    become.infinitive  
 'to be read'

Both of the two informants who were asked to translate these phrases in the passive voice into Uzbek provided the following translations:

- (14) *yasa-b*            *bo'l-ish*<sup>19</sup>  
 make.gerund    become-nominalize  
 'to finish making (something)'

- (15) *o'qi-b*            *bo'l-ish*  
 read.gerund    become-nominalize  
 'to finish reading (something)'

Note that *-a šudan* is interpreted in these examples as a completive aspect marker by the Bukharan informants. Neither of the informants, both of whom were 29 year-old at the time of my fieldwork, provided a passive interpretation for the *-a šudan* construction. Examine also the translation that two other informants provided when they were asked on different occasions how they say the following Uzbek sentence (in the passive voice) in their native language:

- (16) *kitob*        *o'qi-l-di*  
 book        read-passive-past.3sg  
 'the book was read'

The informants, both of whom were in their mid-twenties, invariably provided, initially instantly and also after very long reflection, the following sentence as the Bukharan Tajik equivalent of the above:

- (17) *kitob*        *xond-agi*  
 book        read.participle  
 '(someone) has read the book'

which is not in the passive voice. Perhaps it should also be noted that the informants provided this Bukharan Tajik translation in the full awareness that it is not in the passive voice, which is why they contemplated for a long time, trying to come up with a passive construction in their native language.

Thus, the passive voice in Tajik and Uzbek was not or could not be transferred into Bukharan Tajik speakers' translations. Based on the data presented above, we can state with a reasonable amount of certainty that *šudan* as an auxiliary verb is primarily an aspect marker in Bukharan Tajik spoken by young Bukharans educated in (a) language(s) other than Tajik (usually Uzbek or/and Russian<sup>20</sup>). In other words, the two functions of *-a šudan* that were explained in the previous section seem to be largely singularized to completive aspect marking in the language of non-Tajik-educated young Bukharans.

Bukhara is one of the cities where Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism is most pronounced. It is linguistically characterised by intensive Tajik-Uzbek language contact and many of its residents' general lack of

---

<sup>19</sup> The reason why *bo'lish* instead of *bo'lmoq* which is the infinitive of the verb *bo'l-* is used probably has to do with the facts that 1) the infinitive form of the verb is used nominally in Tajik and 2) *-(i)sh* is a very common nominalizer in Uzbek.

<sup>20</sup> There is a Turkish high school in Bukhara new town, but Turkish is the medium of instruction in a limited number of subjects. Tajik-medium education exists in Bukhara, but according to a report (EurasiaNet 2001/08/20), Tajik-medium education in Uzbekistan is not on the increase.

contact with literary Tajik. It seems reasonable, then, to ascribe the prevalence of aspect marking *-a šudan* corresponding to Uzbek aspect marking *-(i)b bo'lmoq* in Bukharan Tajik to the wide-spread long-term Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism in Bukhara.

If this ascription is indeed reasonable, as it seems likely to be, the data provided in this section increase the feasibility of the assumption that the aspect marking use of *-a šudan* in Tajik is induced by Tajik-Uzbek bilingualism. The discussion in this section, then, serves as another piece of evidence that supports the assumption that the aspectual use of *-a šudan* is contact-induced.

It should be noted, however, that one young Bukharan in his mid-twenties, whose elder sister was educated in Tajik, was fully aware of the existence of passivizing *-a šudan* and insisted on the pervasion of the *-a šudan* passivization in Bukharan Tajik in general. This fact calls for a wide-scale survey to determine the extent of the prevalence of aspect marking *-a šudan* in Bukharan Tajik. However, in the absence of such a survey, I content myself with analysing the data available to me for the present paper.

## 7. Conclusion

In this paper, I have described and discussed the two uses of the *-a šudan* construction in Tajik, with reference to Bukharan Tajik where apparent prevalence of one of the two uses is observed.

It has been argued that the use of *-a šudan* as a completive aspect marker is fairly certain to have been induced by language contact between Tajik and Uzbek. We have also examined data from Bukharan Tajik where the contact-induced use prevails seemingly at the expense of the other use, namely passivization. Tajik, then, may present an interesting case of language change where the use of an existing auxiliary verb is strongly affected by contact-induced auxiliarization of the same verb.

The reader is reminded that passivizing *-a šudan* is an Iranian construction that exists not only in Tajik but also in other South-West Iranian languages such as Persian<sup>21</sup> and Dari<sup>22</sup>, whereas completive aspect marking *-a šudan* emerged, as we have seen in the preceding sections, very possibly under Uzbek/Turkic influence<sup>23</sup>.

The apparent prevalence of aspect-marking *-a šudan* in the language of some non-Tajik-educated young Bukharans is therefore interesting also from a cognitive point of view because it raises the issue of whether the apparently disparate uses of *-a šudan* in Tajik are motivated by the image schematic properties of the Tajik verb *šudan* or/and by those of the Uzbek verb *bo'lmoq*. The Bukharan Tajik case described in the present paper may offer an insight into how the image schematic properties of Tajik *šudan* 'to become' and Uzbek *bo'lmoq* 'to become' are utilized in the cognition of bilingual Tajik-Uzbek speakers.

## References

- Abdoraĥmonov, G'ani. 1996. *O'zbek tili grammatikasi: Sintaksis*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
- Aikhenvald, Alexandra Yurievna. / Dixon, Robert M. W. eds. 2001. *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Akiner, Shirin. 1989. Uzbekistan: Republic of many tongues. IN Kirkwood, Michael II. ed. 1989. 100-122.
- Arzumanov, Stepan D. 1951. *Zaboni tojikī*. Stalinabad: Tadžikgosizdat.
- Arzumanov, Stepan. / Sanginov, Axmadjon. 1988. *Zaboni tojikī*. Dušanbe: Maorif.
- Asimova, Bašorat Sajfitdinovna. 1982. *Jazykovoe stroitel'stvo v tadžikistane (1920-1940 gg.)*. Dušanbe: Doniš.
- Barakaeva, G. B. ed. 1968. *Luğati muxtasari tojikī-anglisī*. Dušanbe: Universiteti Davlatii Tojikiston ba nomi V. I.

---

<sup>21</sup> However, regarding the passive in Persian, Philot (1919:285 cited in Moyne 1974:249) writes: "(t)he general rule is not to use it, if it can be avoided". Chodzko (1852:59 cited in Ido 2002b:58) also writes that an illiterate speaker may have difficulty understanding the passive. Megerdoomian (2000:29) also writes: "it is more common in written and journalistic text".

<sup>22</sup> It existed also in Early New Persian.

<sup>23</sup> I deliberately avoid the term 'Uzbek-origin' here, because, as Johanson (1998:336) writes, "there are even reasons to suspect that the oldest form of New Persian is influenced by Turkic".

- Lenin.
- Boeschoten, Hendrik / Vandamme, Marc. 1998. Chaghatay. IN Johanson, Lars / Csató, Éva Ágnes. eds. 1998. 166-178.
- Caferoğlu, Ahmet. 1984. *Türk Dili Tarihi II 3. Baskı*. İstanbul: Enderun Kitabevi.
- Chodzko (Xodzko), Alexander. 1852. *Grammaire persane ou principes de l'iranien moderne, accompagnées de fac-similés pour servir de modèle d'écriture et de style pour la correspondance diplomatique et familière*. Paris. (2<sup>nd</sup> Edition published in 1883 as *Grammaire de la langue persane, 2ème édition, augmentée de textes persans inédits et d'un glossaire*. Paris: Maisonneuve & Cie.)
- Curnow, Timothy Jowan. 2001. What language features can be 'borrowed'? IN Aikhenvald, A. Y. / Dixon, R. M. W. eds. 2001. 412-436.
- Doerfer, Gerhard. 1967. *Türkische Lehnwörter im Tadschikischen*. Wiesbaden: Kommissionsverlag Franz Steiner GmbH.
- Eckmann, János. 1988. *Çağatayca El Kitabı*. İstanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi.
- EurasiaNet. 20 August 2001. Not enough Tajik-language educational establishments in Uzbekistan - Iran radio. <<http://www.eurasianet.org/resource/uzbekistan/hypermail/200108/0017.html>>.
- Ğafforov, Razzoq. / Juraev, Ğ. eds. 1970. *Mas"alahoı ševašinossı tojik (Jildi I)*. Dušanbe: Doniș.
- Halimov, S. 1974. *Sadriddin Aynı va ba"ze mas"alahoı inkișofi zaboni adabii tojik*. Dušanbe: Irfon.
- Hojiev, A. P. 1975. Fe"l. IN Kollektiv. 1975. 365-527.
- Ido, Shinji 2002a. An Analysis of 'Incomplete Sentences' in Agglutinative Languages: With some reference to LCS (Lexical Conceptual Semantics). Paper presented at the departmental seminar of SEAMELS, University of Sydney. 28 May 2002.
- İdo, Shinji. 2002b. Şimdiki Buharalı Gençlerin Tacikçesinin Sözdizimsel ve Şekilbilgisel Özellikleri. *İlmî Araştırmalar*, 13, spring. 51-65.
- Jackendoff, Ray. 1990. *Semantic Structures*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Johanson, Lars. 1998. Code-copying in Irano-Turkic. *Language Sciences*, 20, 3. 325-337.
- Johanson, Lars / Csató, Éva Ágnes. eds. 1998. *The Turkic Languages*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Kirkwood, Michael II. ed. 1989. *Language planning in the Soviet Union*. London: The Macmillan Press.
- Kollektiv. 1975. *O'zbek tili grammatikasi (I tom: Morfologiya)*. Toshkent: Fan.
- Lazard, Gilbert. 1970. Persian and Tajik. IN Seboek, Thomas A. ed. 1970. 64-96.
- Lewis, Glyn. 1972. *Multilingualism in the Soviet Union: Aspects of language policy and its implementation*. The Hague; Paris: Mouton.
- Megerdooian, Karine. 2000. *Persian computational morphology: A unification-based approach (Memoranda in computer and cognitive science MCCA-00-320)*. Las Cruces: New Mexico State University Computing Research Laboratory.
- Melex, N. A. 1968. *Ğiđdovanskij govor tadžikskogo jazyka (Avtoref. kand. diss.)*. Leningrad.
- Moyne, John A. 1974. The so-called passive in Persian. *Foundation of Language*, 12. 249-267.
- Muruvvatov, J. 1970. Doir ba munosibati zaboni tojikı va ũzbekı (Dar asosi materialı ševahoi tojikoni viloyati Andijon). IN Ğafforov, R. / Juraev, Ğ. eds. 1970. 258-274.
- Niëzmuhammadov, B. / Niëzi, Š. / Buzurgzoda, L. 1955. *Grammatikai zaboni tojikı (Qismi I)*. Stalinobod: Naşriëti Davlatii Tojikiston.
- Niëzmuhammadov, B. / Niëzi, Š. 1955. *Grammatikai zaboni tojikı (Qismi II)*. Stalinobod: Naşriëti Davlatii Tojikiston.
- Phillot, Douglos Craven. 1919. *Higher Persian Grammar for the Use of the Calcutta University, showing differences between Afghan and modern Persian with notes to rhetoric*. Calcutta: The University Press.
- Rahimı, M. V. / Uspenskaya, L. V. eds. 1954. *Luđati tojikı-rusı*. Moskva: Naşriyoti davlatii luğathoi xorijı va millı.
- Rastorgueva, Vera Sergeevna. 1956. *Očerki po tadžikskoj dialektologii Vypusk 3: Leninabadsko-kanibadamskaja grupp severnyx tadžikskix govorov*. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo adademii nauk SSSR.
- Rastorgueva, Vera Sergeevna. 1964. *Opyt sravnitel'nogo izučenija tadžikskix govorov*. Moskva: Nauka.
- Rastorgueva, Vera Sergeevna. / Bakaev, C. X. / Isaev, M. I. / Kerimova, A. A. / Pirejko, L. A. 1970. Different Types of Bilingualism among Iranian Peoples of the USSR. *International Congress of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences (7<sup>th</sup>, 1964, Moskva)*. Moskva: Nauka. 715-721.
- Raxim-mim (Rahim Haşim Mim) ed. 1930. *O tadžikskom literaturnom jazyke*. Stalinabad: Tağgiz.
- Rustamov, Şarofiddin / Ğafforov, Razzoq ed. 1985. *Grammatikai zaboni adabii hozirai tojik Jildi I: Fonetika va morfologiya*. Dušanbe: Doniș.
- Sapoev, Rustam / Avezmetov, Sherali eds. 1996. *O'zbek tilidagi arabcha va forscha so'zlar lug'ati*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
- Seboek, Thomas A. ed. 1970. *Current Issues in Linguistics, volume 6: Linguistics in South West Asia and North Africa*. The Hague; Paris: Mouton.

- Shoabdurahmonov, Shonazar. 1971. O'zbek shevalari va ularni o'rganish haqida umumiy malumot. IN Shoabdurahmonov, Shonazar ed. 1971. 386-407.
- Shoabdurahmonov, Shonazar ed. 1971. *O'zbek xalq shevalari lug'ati*. Toshkent: Fan.
- Şahinoğlu, M. Nazif. 1997. *Farsça Grameri*. İstanbul: Kitabevi.
- Tursunov, Ulug' / O'rinboev, Bozor / Aliev, Abdug'ani 1995. *O'zbek adabiy tili tarixi*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
- Tursunova, Husniya. 1979. *Tadqiqi muqoisavii frazeologizmhoi paralleli zabonhoi tojikī va ūzbekī (dar asosi asari S. Aynī "Ġulomon"- "Qullar")*. Dušanbe: Doniś.
- Windfuhr, Gernot L. 1979. *Persian Grammar: History and State of its Study*. The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton Publishers.
- Zehnī, T. (Zexni, Turakul). 1987. *Az ta'rixi leksikai zaboni tojikī*. Dušanbe: Doniś.

# **ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism**

edited by James Cohen, Kara T. McAlister,  
Kellie Rolstad, and Jeff MacSwan

**Cascadilla Press   Somerville, MA   2005**

## **Copyright information**

ISB4: Proceedings of the 4th International Symposium on Bilingualism  
© 2005 Cascadilla Press, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-210-8 CD-ROM  
ISBN 978-1-57473-107-1 library binding (5-volume set)

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.  
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Press.

## **Ordering information**

To order a copy of the proceedings, contact:

Cascadilla Press  
P.O. Box 440355  
Somerville, MA 02144, USA

phone: 1-617-776-2370  
fax: 1-617-776-2271  
sales@cascadilla.com  
www.cascadilla.com

## **Web access and citation information**

This paper is available from [www.cascadilla.com/isb4.html](http://www.cascadilla.com/isb4.html) and is identical  
to the version published by Cascadilla Press on CD-ROM and in library binding.