

7 Restriction and Delimitation (*qaṣr wa ḥaṣr*)

Summary 7.1 Restriction of the Scope of Predication. – 7.2 The Elements of Restriction. – 7.3 Restriction Accuracy. – 7.4 Restriction in Dialogue. – 7.5 Restriction Markers.

7.1 Restriction of the Scope of Predication

The chapter on *qaṣr* ‘restriction’ and *ḥaṣr* ‘delimitation’ considers the utterances in which the scope of predication is limited. We have seen that the predicative relationship consists of the speaker’s judgement on the relationship between predicand and predicate (see § 3.1). If you use a restriction technique, you mean that this relationship is exclusive, and you deny the possibility of associating a different predicand to the predicate or vice versa. For example, *šā'ir ǧuz 'Alī nīst* ‘There is no poet except ‘Alī’¹ affirms that the predicate ‘is no poet’ pertains to one person only and no one else. The utterance *'Alī faqaṭ niwīsanda ast* ‘Alī is only a writer’² states that only one predicate is valid and no other. The examples show that we have to do with contrastive focus mechanisms.

The title of this unit mentions two terms very close in meaning. It seems that *qaṣr* is a hypernym of *ḥaṣr*. The term *qaṣr* denotes all forms of contrastive focus in general. The term *ḥaṣr* seems to occur

¹ Quoted in Aḥmadnižād 2003, 144.

² Quoted in Aḥmadnižād 2003, 141.

more specifically to refer to the use of words whose semantic value is ‘only’. Hereafter, I will adopt the word *qaṣr* as a working term throughout.

Manuals offer insights into the many ways in which *qaṣr* occurs. In particular, it considers the elements of restriction, the validity of restriction in a literal sense, and the contexts of restriction according to the addressee’s beliefs. Based on such concerns, manuals recognise three different types of *qaṣr*. The following paragraphs will illustrate each with terminology and examples. The last section of the chapter considers restriction markers and techniques. These may be adverbial, as in the examples above, or based on other, usually non-prosodic, marking strategies.

7.2 The Elements of Restriction

Manuals define *qaṣr* as the particularisation (*taḥṣīṣ* ‘specialisation’) that binds in an exclusive relationship something (*čīz-ī*, *amr-ī*) with something else. What is meant by ‘something’ and ‘something else’ are two elements of the utterance. One is the restricted, and the other the restricted-to. Since forms of focalisation may occur at any level of the utterance (predicand, predicate, patient, or any other complement), the two terms define the elements of restriction regardless of their syntactic function in the sentence.

Depending on their role in the restriction, whether they represent a quality or a qualified element, the restricted and the restricted-to are described as *ṣifat* or as *mawṣūf*. The word *ṣifat*, which had a long linguistic and philosophical employment, is quite challenging to render in English here. Since a *ṣifat* may be an action, a state, or a characteristic, the dominant translation ‘adjective’ is reductive here. I will translate it as ‘quality’ or ‘attribute’. The *mawṣūf*, that is the ‘qualified element’, is anything described by that quality.

A first subdivision of the types of *qaṣr* considers how *ṣifat* and *mawṣūf* interrelate. There are two possibilities. The type *qaṣr-i ṣifat bar mawṣūf* ‘restriction of the quality to the qualified element’ relates the attribute exclusively to one person or thing (e.g. *nīwīsanda faqaṭ Zayd ast*³ ‘Only Zayd is a writer’, ‘There is no writer other than Zayd’). Conversely, the type *qaṣr-i mawṣūf bar ṣifat* ‘restriction of the qualified element to the quality’ describes the qualified element by one attribute, as opposed to all other attributes (e.g. *Zayd faqaṭ nīwīsanda ast*⁴ ‘Zayd is only a writer’, ‘Zayd is but a writer’).

³ Quoted in Šamīsā 1994, 100.

⁴ Quoted in Šamīsā 1994, 100.

7.3 Restriction Accuracy

A different taxonomy considers restriction from another perspective. Between the quality and the qualified element exists an exclusive relationship which can be valid in absolute or relative terms. This dichotomy offers the base for distinguishing between *qaṣr-i ḥaqīqī* ‘literal restriction’ and *qaṣr-i idāfī* ‘exceeding restriction’ (otherwise called *qaṣr-i ġayr-i ḥaqīqī* ‘non-literal restriction’).

The *qaṣr-i ḥaqīqī* establishes a restriction believed to be accurate in all situations. This type of *qaṣr* is frequent in the form of *qaṣr-i ṣīfat bar mawṣūf* to refer to the exclusive attributes of God. For example, a monotheist would say *Āfarīnanda-yi ‘ālam ġuz ḥudā nīst*⁵ ‘There is no Creator of the world except God’ because he firmly believes in this assumption. It is rare to find examples of literal expressions in the form of *qaṣr-i mawṣūf bar ṣīfat* because it is unlikely for a qualified element to have only one attribute.

A restriction of the type *qaṣr-i idāfī* only makes sense in relative terms. That is, literally taken, it exceeds the extent of accuracy. However, it is acceptable once we have determined the set under consideration. For example, *niwīsanda faqaṭ Zayd ast* ‘Only Zayd is a writer’ holds valid only within a specific (and finite) number of individuals. In that group, Zayd is the only writer. Similarly, *Zayd faqaṭ niwīsanda ast* ‘Zayd is only a writer’ means that, among the many possible occupations, writing is Zayd’s exclusive profession.

Another type of *qaṣr*, called *qaṣr-i iddi‘ā‘ī* ‘restriction based on a pretence or a false display’, consists in the improper use of the restriction of the *ḥaqīqī* type. The speaker pretends that someone (or something) is the only one who has a certain quality (or, conversely, that someone or something has only one quality). He knows, however, that his claim does not correspond to reality. Since such a restriction is not limited to a specific group, it exceeds the definition of a *qaṣr-i idāfī*. What is subtly meant here is that the quality is so pronounced in this individual that all other qualities seem irrelevant in comparison. Phenomena of this kind involve hyperbole (*mubālaġa*) or exaggeration (*iġrāq*) and are particularly relevant to poetic language.

⁵ Quoted in Ārzū 2002, 150.

7.4 Restriction in Dialogue

The speaker may employ restriction strategies to rectify the addressee's opinions. Consequently, understanding the scope and meaning of a restriction depends on knowing what the addressee believes to be true. Three types of restriction are identified, depending on which inaccurate opinion the speaker is trying to correct. To illustrate them, I will consider the sample utterance *Zayd āmad na 'Amr* 'Zayd came, not 'Amr'. As shown below, the same sentence, according to situation, can take on one of three different enunciative meanings.

First, *qaṣr-i ifrād* (also called *ḥaṣr-i ifrād*) 'separating restriction, restriction denoting only one item' reestablishes that the quality applies only to one single person (or thing) and no more. In our example, the addressee believes that the two people have the same quality. The speaker knows that the quality is only found in one of them and aims to inform that 'Only Zayd came, and not also 'Amr'. An example from poetry is:

mardum-i dīda-yi mā ḡuz ba ruḥ-at nāzīr nīst
*dil-i sargašta-yi mā ḡayr-i tu-rā dākīr nīst*⁶

The pupil of our eye looks only at your cheek.
 Our bewildered heart says the litany for no one but you.

Second, *qaṣr-i ta'yīn* 'determining restriction' is a way to select one among the alternatives. It refers to a situation where the addressee cannot decide between two or more options. In the example *Zayd āmad na 'Amr* 'Zayd came, not 'Amr', a person has come, but the addressee does not know who. Then the speaker clarifies, 'Of 'Amr and Zayd, it was Zayd who came'.

Third, *qaṣr-i qalb* 'inversion, exchange, replacement restriction' corrects the opinion of someone who confuses one person with another. In the example, the addressee mistakes the identity of the person to whom the quality refers. Thus, the speaker corrects what he thinks is wrong and replaces the correct names in their proper roles, 'It was not 'Amr who came, but Zayd'.

6 Quoted in Kazzāzī 1991, 188. Ḥāfiẓ 1983, 158, *ḡazal* 71, v. 1. Avery 2007, 109.

7.5 Restriction Markers

The last section of this unit deals with techniques of restriction. The science of meanings groups them into four strategies, called *turuq-i qaṣr* ‘means of restriction’, each achieving restriction in a different way. I will give a description and an example of each below.

The use of linkers (*‘atf*)⁷ as a means of restriction covers the use of adversatives. While *na* ‘not’ occurs in positive sentences, negative sentences feature *balki* ‘but, instead’, *līk* ‘but’, and the like. For example:

īnki tu dārī qiyāmat ast na qāmat
*w-īn na tabassum ki mu‘ǧiz ast u karāmat*⁸

What you have is the Day of Resurrection, not a tall figure!
Also, this is not a smile, for it is a prodigy and a miracle!

man nakardam amr tā sūd-ī kunam
*balki tā bar bandaqān ǧūd-ī kunam*⁹

I did not command so that I might gain a profit,
But so that I might be generous to the servants.

The technique referred to as ‘negation and exception’ (*nafy wa istiṭnā*), on the other hand, consists of using a word whose meaning is ‘except, unless’ in a negative sentence. The devices suitable for the purpose are *magar* ‘except (perhaps), unless’, *ǧuz* ‘except, other than, apart from, but’ or *illā* ‘except’. For example:

nīst bar lawḥ-i dil-am ǧuz alif-i qāmat-i yār
*či kunam ḥarf-i digar yād nadād ustād-am*¹⁰

On the tablet of my heart there is nothing but the *alif* of the friend’s stature.

What can I do? The Master has taught me no other letter.

Preposing what should be postposed (*taqdīm-i mā ḥaqqu-hu al-ta’ḥīr*) is the third strategy of restriction. Inversions in the standard word

⁷ On *‘atf*, see also § 4.9.

⁸ Quoted in Aḥmadniżād 2003, 143. Sa’dī 1939, 77, *ǧazal* 143t, [v. 1] (also quoted above, in § 4.9).

⁹ Quoted in Aḥmadniżād 2003, 143 (with some variation). Mawlawī [Rūmī] 1996, 1: 249, *daftar* 2, v. 1756.

¹⁰ Quoted in Kazzāzī 1991, 193. Ḥāfiz 1983, 636-7, *ǧazal* 310, v. 5. Avery 2007, 386.

order that emphasise one element over the others, in fact, can result in *qaṣr*. Word order is highly relevant to the science of meanings, and references to it appear scattered in different sections of the manuals. Previous sections on the *aḥwāl* ‘states’ of the various elements have already considered the standard (and non-standard) place of the components of the utterance. Here, the focus is on how restriction arises because of a change in the standard order of optional elements (complements and so on). For example, in the following line, the complement *mar ū rā* ‘to Him’ comes before the predicand *kibriyā wu manī* ‘Grandeur and Egotism’. Here, ‘what should be postponed’ is the complement, which appears at the beginning of the line, and the result according to Aḥmadniżād is a restriction:

mar ū rā rasad kibriyā wu manī
*ki mulk-aš qadīm ast u ḡāt-aš ḡanī*¹¹

To Him [only], Grandeur and Egotism suit.
 [He] whose kingdom is ancient, and nature independent.

Finally, the use of dedicated words (*adawāt-i qaṣr* ‘function tools for restriction’) whose meaning is ‘only’ provides restriction. Examples include *faqaṭ* ‘only’, *tanhā* ‘only’ and *wa/u bas* ‘and enough’. For example, compare the use of *u bas* in:

ḡahān ay barādar namānad ba kas
*dil andar ḡahānāfarīn band u bas*¹²

The world, O brother, does not remain for anyone.
 Set your heart upon the world-creator, and that is enough.

The four techniques above resemble those listed in the Arabic science of meanings¹³ but do not cover all the possible Persian means of restriction. Other relevant cases remain excluded. In addition, Persian scholars occasionally mention repetition (*tikrār*) (Šamīsā 1994, 104), suprasegmental features (*takya*) (Humāyī 1991, 127), preposing the subject pronoun + *rā* to the verb (126) and preposing the subject pronoun to the enclitic copula (126). The last two are of particular importance to poetry.

In Persian, a patient placed before the verb does not necessarily produce *qaṣr*. However, if the patient is a subject pronoun followed

¹¹ Quoted in Aḥmadniżād 2003, 142. Sa’dī 1937a, 2. Adapted from Clarke 1879, 3.

¹² Quoted in Aḥmadniżād 2003, 142. Sa’dī 1937b, 14. Thackston 2008, 12.

¹³ On the four Arabic means of restriction, see al-Taftāzānī 1911, 210-24; Simon 1993, 288-96; Jenssen 1998, 101-2.

by *rā*, restriction as an effect should not be excluded. Humāyī considers using *tu rā* ‘you-OBJECT’ before the verb may intend ‘no one but you’ (1991, 126). Some scholars consider this a sub-case of preposing what should be postposed.

Similarly, a subject pronoun followed immediately by the personal ending of the present of the verb ‘to be’ possibly offers a form of restriction. Examples of *qaṣr* of this type are *man-am* ‘I am’ or *tu-yī* ‘you are’ used in the sense of ‘I am the one who, it is me that... (and no one else)’ or ‘You are the one who, it is you who... (and no one else)’. For example:

*man-am ki šuhra-yi šahr-am ba ‘išq warzīdan*¹⁴

I am the one who is the talk of the town for love-making.

*ḥudāwand-i bālā wu pastī tu-yī*¹⁵

You are the Lord of heaven and earth [and no one else].

In this chapter on restriction, the informative utterance has been fully examined. How it is composed and how to manipulate it have been explored. The next chapter will focus on non-informative utterances.

¹⁴ Quoted in Šamīsā 1994, 104. Ḥāfiẓ 1983, 786, *ğazal* 385, v. 1. Avery 2007, 470.

¹⁵ Quoted in Humāyī 1991, 126 and credited to Firdawsī.

