

Diglossia in Kabul Persian Phonology Author(s): Michael M. T. Henderson

Source: Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 95, No. 4 (Oct. - Dec., 1975), pp. 651-

654

Published by: American Oriental Society Stable URL: http://www.jstor.org/stable/601021

Accessed: 07/06/2009 16:39

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisher?publisher.code=aos.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Journal of the American Oriental Society.

DIGLOSSIA IN KABUL PERSIAN PHONOLOGY

MICHAEL M. T. HENDERSON

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The phonology of Kabul Persian shows three distinct levels or styles of speech: Formal, Deliberate, and Colloquial. Deliberate and Colloquial can be derived from formal by means of ordered rules, some of which recapitulate historical changes in the development of Persian. It is just this subset of the stylistic rules that young and illiterate speakers have the greatest success in applying "backwards"—that is, from the Colloquial forms, which they learn first, to the Formal forms, which they learn last.

Among the languages of south asia which exhibit instances of varying styles of speech within single speakers' idiolects, Persian provides examples of phonological rules which derive the informal styles, Deliberate (D) and Colloquial (C), from the Formal (F) style. The differences between formal and colloquial Tehran Persian (TP) have been discussed by Hodge, who distinguishes, within F, between "quotative" and "normal." Since this distinction seems to be limited to morphological and lexical variation,2 this discussion will be restricted to three styles: F, D, and C, in which phonological variation is apparent. It will also be restricted to Kabul Persian (KP), the dialect I have observed most closely, and which I have described elsewhere.3

F is heard in speeches, radio broadcasts, and the recitation of poetry. D is the style heard most commonly; it is typical of normal conversation among educated equals. C is heard in relaxed conversation among friends and relations. In general, it can be said that the stylistic rules take the F variants as their base forms, and apply with some restrictions in D, and with fewer restrictions in C.

My observation of KP speakers in various stages of linguistic development leads me to believe that children are first exposed to C, then to D, and finally, if they go to school, to F. This is, presumably, the natural order of acquisition of progres-

sively more formal styles in any language; in the linguistic description of the styles, however, we proceed in the opposite direction because the D and C forms are derivable from the F forms, and not vice versa. I shall return to this matter below.

The rules given in this paper are cited, for ease of exposition, in English. A summary appears at the end of the paper giving the rules in formal distinctive feature notation. The order of exposition follows the order of application of the rules. All rules have the F forms as their inputs except (2) and (8), which operate on underlying forms.

(1) In F, unstressed vowels are not reduced; but in D and C all unstressed vowels become lax and

¹ Carleton S. Hodge, "Aspects of Persian Style," Language 33.355-69 (1957).

² M. A. Jazayery, Review of A Short Sketch of the Grammar of Persian, by V. S. Rastorgueva, Language 41 (1965), p. 339.

³ M. Henderson, "Dari (Kabul Persian) Phonology," Diss. University of Wisconsin, 1972.

⁴ A. G. Farhâdi, Le persan parlé en Afghanistan: grammaire du kâboli (Paris: Klincksieck, 1955), p. 10. Old *ĭ and *ŭ have been lowered to ε and u in both KP and TP; the usual symbols for these vowels in publications about Persian are e and o, but I use these for the majhūl vowels.

unstressed high vowels are lowered, as in F širín \rightarrow D, C šerín 'sweet'; F durbín \rightarrow D, C durbín 'telescope'; F šerdón \rightarrow D, C šerdón 'faucet'; F šorbó \rightarrow D, C šurbó 'soup'; F særæk \rightarrow D, C saræk 'road'; F godí \rightarrow D, C godí 'carriage'.

(2) Whereas formatives which are represented abstractly with initial consonant clusters have these clusters broken up by epenthetic vowels in F and D, no epenthetic vowel appears in C. In the following forms, the abstract underlying forms are cited between vertical bars. $|froxt| \rightarrow F$, D $fvr \acute{o}xt \rightarrow C fr oxt$ 'he sold'; $|\check{s}k\varepsilon st| \rightarrow F$, D $\check{s}\varepsilon k\check{\varepsilon}st \rightarrow$ C škest 'it broke'; $|draxt| \rightarrow F$, D $derext \rightarrow C$ dræxt 'tree'. The representation of the verb forms cited here with underlying initial clusters is justified by their alternation between tenses, in which the allomorphs with a cluster appear: past $\delta \epsilon k \dot{\epsilon} s t$ alternates with present $m\acute{\epsilon}\check{s}k\varepsilon næd$, and $fur\acute{o}xt$ with méfrušæd; and it seems reasonable to allow the epenthetic rule to apply to substantive forms like berodær 'brother', duróy 'lie', and šutúr 'camel', whose underlying forms are thus |brodær|, |droy|, and |stur|.6 The fact that no epenthetic vowel appears in C seems best explained by the presence of another, independently motivated, rule in the grammar (2a) that deletes vowels after initial consonants in some forms (vowels that have just been inserted in the derivational history, in these cases), as in F, D psser -> C psær 'boy'; F, D besybr → C bsybr 'very'; F, D jæwbn → C jwbn 'youth'.7

- (4) Unstressed nonlow vowels also become semi-vowels before other vowels and after any vowel other than x^{11} . This rule does not apply in F, applies within word boundaries in D, and applies across word boundaries in C: F $beb \rightarrow D$, C byb 'come!'; F, D $du xfydnt \rightarrow C dwxwydnt$ 'two Afghanis'. (The change of f to w in this example will be discussed in (9) below.)
- (5) Stressed lax vowels become tense before a glottal followed by a word boundary or a consonant, and the glottals are then deleted by rule (6), below, as in F $d\epsilon h \to D$, C de 'village'; F $\check{s}\epsilon$? $r \to D$, C $\check{s}er$ 'poem'; F zv? $f \to D$, C zof 'weakness'. Although ε is phonetically tense when stressed, this rule applies to it and changes it, moreover, to \mathfrak{b} , as in F $\check{s}\varepsilon hr \to D$, C $\check{s}Dr$ 'city'; F $n\varepsilon$? $l \to D$, C nDl 'horseshoe'. This lends still further support to the analysis of ε and \mathfrak{b} as underlying $|\mathfrak{a}|$ and $|\tilde{\mathfrak{a}}|$.
- (6) Any glottal which survives the glottal-semi-vowel conversion rule (3) above is dropped in D and C, as in the examples cited in (5) above and the following: F $sæb\acute{b}h \rightarrow D$, C $sæb\acute{b}$ 'tomorrow'; F $he\acute{c} \rightarrow D$, C $e\acute{c}$ 'nothing'. Initial glottals have a

⁵ The same phenomenon appears in trisyllabics: F sirini o D, C sereni 'candy'. The laxing of i and e to e, and of u and o to u, brings about the replacement of one contrastive vowel with another at the same level of representation. The same rule, applied to the low vowels e and e, produces lax [a] and [a] respectively. But the latter two vowels are not already members of the contrastive system. This, while it poses a problem in determining a unique level of phonemic representation in KP nonformal styles, will be ignored in the rest of this paper, and the low vowels will be represented as e and e, even when they are unstressed.

⁶ Actually, they are |brādar|, $|\text{drau}\gamma|$, and |štur|; but these forms, while providing striking examples of the way some stylistic rules recapitulate a language's history, will be cited here as they are above, since to get from the "real" underlying forms to those cited involves non-stylistic rules not germane to this discussion.

⁷ Farhâdi, pp. 28-29. While it may seem otiose to insert epenthetic vowels in D only to delete them again in C, both the insertion and the deletion rules are needed

for other parts of the grammar, and their use does away with the need for separate underlying forms.

⁸ In Arabic loans, \mathfrak{g} and ? are both represented by ?, and h and h by h in KP.

⁹ h becomes a semivowel between two low vowels only at the boundary between verb stem and affix, as in F $m\acute{e}j\&h\&ed \rightarrow C m\acute{e}j\&h\&ed$ 'he jumps'.

Note that while b is phonetically round, it functions as a nonround vowel in rule (3), lending support to its analysis as underlying $|\bar{a}|$, in keeping with its history.

¹¹ After x, ε and v are changed to the majhūl vowels e and o, as in $|xonx+\varepsilon+xurd| \to xonexvirt$ 'large house'. This synchronic rule, which recapitulates the history of e and o, is thus one of the oldest surviving in the world, having first entered the language before A.D. 300. See Henderson, pp. 24-26, and James Darmesteter, Études iraniennes (Paris, 1883), pp. 99, 104-106.

tensing effect on a following vowel in only a few rare cases.¹² Rules (5) and (6) together have the effect, observed in many languages, of the process of loss and compensatory lengthening.

- (8) All dialects of Persian include an obstruent cluster assimilation rule by which the first member of the cluster assimilates to the second in voicing; (8a) furthermore, if the second is a stop, the first must be or become a continuant. In KP this rule applies in F only in verb stem alternations; in D it applies as described; and in C it is simplified so that the first obstruent becomes a continuant whether or not the second is a stop. Examples are: F $w w q t \rightarrow D$, C w w x t 'time'; F, D $r w q s \rightarrow C r w x s$ 'dance'; F $h w s d w h \rightarrow D$, C, $w s d h \rightarrow D$, C

- (10) In C, word-final nonnasal stops are devoiced after nonnasal sonorants, as in F, D $xurd \rightarrow C xurt$ 'small'; F, D $sxy \rightarrow C sxk$ 'dog'. After a nasal or an obstruent, there is no devoicing, as in rxyy 'color' or duzd 'thief' (but see (13) below). This rule also applies to word-final liquids, as in F, D $dur \rightarrow C$ [dur] 'far'.
- (11) Like many languages, KP has a rule which causes nasals to assimilate in point of articulation to an immediately following obstruent. This rule applies in F only when the obstruent is wordfinal, as in $|\text{sang}| \to F$, D, C $s \approx \eta g$ 'stone'. In D, it applies within word boundaries, and in C it applies across them, as in F $t \approx h \approx l \to D$, C $t \approx h \approx l \to l \to l$ 'lazy'; F, D $h \approx h \approx l \to l \to l \to l$ 'lazy'; F, D $h \approx h \approx l \to l \to l$ 'lazy' baker'.
- (12) In D and C, y is inserted between x and n, the nasal homorganic to ξj which is introduced by rule (11), as in F $pxnjym \to D$, C pxynjym 'fifth'. When the stop is word-final, as in pxynj 'five', the nasal assimilation rule will have applied in F as well, and the y is inserted.
- (13) A rule about whose extent I am not yet sure deletes some word-final coronal stops in C, as in F, D rxetalleftarrow f 'he went'; F, D $duzd \rightarrow C$ duz 'thief'; F, D xetalleftarrow f 'is'.\(^{15}\)
- (14) When rule (13) applies to a word-final alveolopalatal stop, the resulting word-final \check{n} is shifted to palatal \tilde{n} , as in C $pxy\tilde{n}$ 'five'.

It was noted above that while the derivation of D and C forms proceeds, in a linguistic description, from F forms as the basic variants, children learn KP in the opposite order. Careful analysis of a large corpus of utterances in KP, from speakers varying in age and education, might shed light on what is now only a hypothesis on my part: that the success with which young or illiterate KP speakers understand and produce an F form depends, in large part, on whether the F form represents an earlier stage in the development of the language or represents a relatively recently borrowed "foreign" form. 16 Young and/or illiterate KP speakers have no difficulty, for instance, understanding or producing F forms such as tænbæl 'lazy' or sæg 'dog'; but they tend, I have observed, to have more trouble with glottals (many of which represent borrowed Arabic segments), and they often insert them incorrectly, e.g., *sqhat for sp?æt 'hour' (from Arabic sasa), when at-

¹² Farhâdi, p. 20. The few cases should be considered a list class, or a class with "plus-rule" features.

¹³ It appears that, no word boundaries being involved, rule (6) applies before rule (7) in C, but after it in D. If this is true, it provides a striking example of "quasi-ordered rules", as described by John Fought, "Rule ordering, interference, and free alternation in phonology," Language 49.67-86 (1973).

¹⁴ This is another boary rule in the language: see H. Hübschmann, Persische Studien (Strassburg: Trübner, 1895), pp. 114-115.

¹⁵ Farhâdi, p. 30.

¹⁶ For an example of this linguistic phenomenon, see W., Bright, "Phonological Rules in Literary and Colloquial Kannada," *JAOS* 90.140-144 (1970).

tempting to speak "correctly". Further investigation into diglossia is needed; stylistic variation often provides the analyst with excellent clues to a language's structure. KP provides an example of a language with three easily observable stylistic levels, the control of which should perhaps better be called triglossia. 18

Summary of Rules

$$(1) \quad V \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} -high \\ -tense \end{bmatrix} / \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{-stress} \end{bmatrix}$$

(2)
$$\emptyset \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} V \\ -high \\ -low \\ -tense \\ \alpha back \end{bmatrix} / \#C _C \begin{bmatrix} V \\ \alpha round \end{bmatrix}$$

(2a)
$$\begin{bmatrix} V \\ -stress \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \emptyset / \#C _C$$

(3)
$$?, h \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} +\text{sonorant} \\ +\text{high} \\ \alpha \text{back} \end{bmatrix} / / V_{\underline{\hspace{1cm}}} \begin{bmatrix} V \\ -\text{low} \\ \alpha \text{round} \end{bmatrix}$$

(// indicates a mirror-image rule)

(3a)
$$\begin{bmatrix} V \\ -low \\ -stress \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \emptyset / / \underline{\qquad} \begin{bmatrix} -consonantal \\ +sonorant \\ -syllabic \\ +high \end{bmatrix}$$

(6) ?,
$$h \rightarrow \emptyset$$

¹⁸ I am very grateful to Gernot Windfuhr, William Bright, and Thomas Henderson for their comments and suggestions on earlier versions of this paper.

$$\begin{array}{c|c} (7) & \begin{bmatrix} V \\ +low \\ -back \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \emptyset / / \begin{bmatrix} V \\ +low \end{bmatrix}$$

(In D, the order or rules (6) and (7) is reversed.)

(10)
$$\begin{bmatrix} +consonantal \\ -nasal \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} voice \end{bmatrix} / \begin{bmatrix} +sonorant \\ -nasal \end{bmatrix} - #$$

 ε distributed

(12)
$$\emptyset \rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} +sonorant \\ -consonantal \\ -syllabic \\ -back \end{bmatrix}$$

$$\left| \begin{array}{c} V \\ +low \\ -back \end{array} \right|^{-} - \left| \begin{array}{c} +consonantal \\ +nasal \\ +high \\ -back \end{array} \right|$$

$$\begin{bmatrix} -sonorant \\ +consonantal \\ +coronal \\ -continuant \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \emptyset / \begin{bmatrix} +consonantal \\ [+continuant] \\ [+nasal] \end{bmatrix} - \#$$

(14)
$$\begin{bmatrix} +consonantal \\ +nasal \\ +high \\ -back \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow [-coronal] / \#$$

¹⁷ Such variations as $d\epsilon h \sim de$ and $d\epsilon h \sim db$, for example, show that the opposition ϵ : b is proportional, in Praguian terms, to the opposition ϵ : e. If the analyst were to consider only one stylistic level in KP, these variations would not appear, and a valuable insight might be lost. See also James W. Harris, Spanish Phonology (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1969), pp. 6-8.