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RÉSUMÉ
L’article donne la transcription, la traduction et le glossaire pour deux textes écrits en 1889 à Bârforush, dans le Mazanderân, et publiés en facsimilé par Jacques de Morgan. La langue des textes, le mazanderani ou le tabari moderne, est pour l’essentiel similaire à celle parlée aujourd’hui par plus de trois millions de locuteurs dans la province iranienne du Mazanderân (au sud de la Caspienne). On note cependant plusieurs mots aujourd’hui disparus, ainsi que certains traits grammaticaux identifiables uniquement grâce à l’existence d’autres documents en mazanderani de la même période. La présentation de ces textes contribue ainsi à l’étude de la langue du Mazanderân, une langue iranienne nord-occidentale, aujourd’hui encore assez méconnue. Documents historiques, les textes donnent plus de détails que les autres sources sur certains événements. Les textes sont suivis des remarques historiques circonstanciées.
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SUMMARY
This article transcribes, translates, and compiles a glossary for two Mazandarani texts written in 1889 in the town of Barforush and published as facsimiles by Jacques de Morgan. The language of the texts, Mazandaran or New Tabari, is fundamentally similar to that spoken today by more than three million people in the Persian province of Mazadaran, located south of the Caspian Sea. However, there are several extinct words and grammatical traits in the texts, which could be identified only by drawing on other surviving Mazandaran documents of the same period. The texts are meant to contribute to the study of the largely understudied language of Mazadaran, a northwestern Iranian language. They may also serve as historical documents, for they relate certain events in such details not found in other sources. Ample historical remarks follow the texts.

Keywords: New Tabari; Mazandaran language; Caspian dialects; Iranian languages; textual analysis; nineteenth century manuscripts; anti-Semitism; Persian history.

* I am indebted to my wife Maryam for her assistance in transcribing and translating the Mazandarani texts, I also want to thank Mr. Fakhr-al-Din Surtiji and Dr. Javâd Neyestâni for their valuable comments on the historical context as well as on certain words. My thanks go also to Ms. Dorothy Staub for her careful editing and to Dr. Douglas Val Ziegler for checking the Mazandarani texts against their translation and making significant comments.
During the nineteenth century several European scholars, travelers, and diplomats collected ethnographic and linguistic data from the Caspian provinces of Māzandarān and Gilān in northern Persia. Among their works stands out Jacques de Morgan’s five-volume *Mission scientifique en Perse*, with a wealth of information on the southern shores of the Caspian sea. Its fifth volume, dedicated to linguistics, covers several languages spoken in Persia, including Caspian dialects, for which a list of 877 glosses is tabulated for nine localities (Rehna, Bārforush, Sennān, Amol, Kelārsak, Tonekābon, Kojur, Rashī, and Menāra-bāzār). This glossary is followed by the facsimiles of two Mazandarani manuscripts which have neither been translated nor commented upon since their publication. The first text is a local account of the town of Sennān, the old provincial capital of Mazandaran, relating its glorious past and its monuments. The second text provides valuable information on Bārforush (now Bābol), the largest and chief commercial town of Mazandaran at the time of the composition of the text. This latter text depicts the establishment of the town’s historical monuments and holy shrines as well as two contemporary events, including a vivid account of a pogrom which occurred in the Jewish quarter of the town, and its consequences.

Apart from their contents, the texts are of considerable dialectological interest regarding the Mazandarani language, which remains greatly under-studied in spite of its large number of speakers and long literary tradition that rivals that of New Persian in age. The language’s peak can be found in the early Islamic centuries, when it thrived under the long reign of the independent and semi-independent provincial rulers of Tabaristan, commonly known as Ispahbads. Various eleventh- and twelfth-century works written in Tabari (the older form of Mazandarani), such as *Bāvand-nāma*, *Nēkī-numa*, *Šakara*, and, perhaps, *Marzbān-nāma* are lost in the original language; only a number of poems and individual verses are but poorly preserved by means of Persian works connected to the province. From the post-Ispahbad era survives the word-by-word Tabari translations added interlinearly to several manuscripts. After several centuries of silence, a new series of Mazandarani documents emerges in the nineteenth century, thanks to the efforts of European travelers and diplomats who aimed at documenting the language. Their resulting works are considerable; from among them stands out *Kanz al-asrār*, several collections of verses attributed to the legendary Mazandarani poet Amir Pāzvārī, compiled by

---

1 For an overview of the sources and studies on Old Tabari, see Borjian 2004a.
2 See Borjian and Borjian.
Boris Andreevich Dorn. Several other collections of popular poems and songs, as well as individual sentences and words, were published by Aleksander Borejko Chodžko (1842), Il’ya Nikolaevich Berezin (1853), and G. V. Melgunov (1868a). Also from the mid-nineteenth century has survived a versified Mazandarani-Persian dictionary, which was edited by Sādeq Kiā (1947). Moreover, there are a few works of prose, the most valuable of which are the texts of the present study, and an account of the Babi-state conflict at Shaikh Tabarsi published by Dorn (1865). These prose texts are essential to the study of the language as it was spoken in the nineteenth century.

De Morgan provides no explanation on the texts he collected other than they both are written in the dialect of Bārforush. Each text, however, has a colophon in Persian stating that it was written in 1889 as requested by de Morgan, who was lodging at the residence of Mirzā Yusof Khān, agent-e gonsul-e Rus, i.e. the resident commercial consul of Russia (Texts I.51-56, II.125-135). The scribe introduces himself as Ḥajjī ʿĂqā, the secretary of the consul. The first text (pp. 248-251) is in nastāʿliq pen and the second (pp. 252-260) in naskh, and both are vocalized by diacritic symbols. The manuscripts are composed of 13 to 16 lines per page, without any organization or punctuation.

Following are a transcription and translation of each text. The transcription recasts the texts in numbered paragraphs. The vertical bars signify the end of lines in the original script, and the numbers in raised parentheses refer to line numbers assigned on the facsimile of each text. The translation is meant to remain as close as possible to Mazandarani words and grammar. As the composition of the texts is not always self-explanatory, certain material is added in square brackets for clarification, while explanations are given in parentheses. The texts are followed by historical and linguistic commentaries and a glossary.

I. TEXTS (TRANSCRIPTION AND TRANSLATION)

I.1 Text I


3 See Borjian 2006a; id. 2006c.
4 See Borjian 2008.
5 See Borjian 2006b. Other Mazandarani prose works are those translated from Persian literature in Kanz al-āsrār I, pp. 1-12; and the Mazandarani translation of a passage from Tufān al-bokā, in Berezin, II, pp. 72-79 (studied in Borjian 2005a).
9. in آمال-ر اتّا کیژّ آباد هکارد، ونه اسم-ر گنونه "آمل". این ل بّیس باو که اسم-ر به‌هستان "آلام".
10. هار کاج-ر گنونه ۴۰ اتّار دار-ن | باّز مسیح، باّز حمامم، 
The beginning of §mol

1. In the text reads also kanna "they dig".

2. §mol has a bridge with twelve arches. Beyond the bridge there is a mosque from the old times. §mol has Payin Gonbad (lit. "Lower Dome"). The dome is made from bricks; it has three domes – one is big and two are small. Round about the Dome, wherever they dig, there comes out brick – whole bricks come into view.

3. There is a mosque from the old times, known as the mosque of Imam Hasan. §mol has been devastated by flood three times – and this mosque has survived [all disasters]. Now, when a digger excavates the

Translation

[§mol]

1. The beginning of §mol [is] Aspekalané, by which lays Sabza Maidan. [There] stands the old structure of Mir Bozorg’s [shrine]. They say: it is a building from [the time of] Shah ‘Abbáš, it is a fine place. He made it all from bricks and tiles.9 Right alongside Mir Bozorg lies a pool that is very big. Near Sabza Maidan there is a castle called Khandaq (‘moat’) which belonged to Jamshid the Yima.

2. §mol has a bridge with twelve arches. It is an old structure. There was a hajji, from the Mashá’i [clan], who rebuilt these arches ten times, [but every time they were] destroyed by flood. When his efforts proved unsuccessful, he [finally] reconstructed [the bridge] for the love of the twelve [Shi’i] Imams – thus it survived torrents.

3. Beyond the bridge, where old §mol was located [before] it was inundated, there is now [farm] lands, [where] people grow rice. [Once Persian] Iraqis buy that estate, plow and irrigate it, [and luckily] obtain gold, silver, pearls, and certain other items. When digging the land, there come out of the ground dwellings, bathhouses, mosques and burial chambers.

4. §mol has Payin Gonbad (lit. ‘Lower Dome’). The dome is made from bricks; it has three domes – one is big and two are small. Round about the Dome, wherever they dig, there comes out brick – whole bricks come into view.

5. There is a mosque from the old times, known as the mosque of Imam Hasan. §mol has been devastated by flood three times – and this mosque has survived [all disasters]. Now, when a digger excavates the

---

7 Sic! Cf. Pers. morakkabát.
8 The word reads also kanna “they dig”.
9 In the text: “brick tile”.
earth to obtain mud bricks, once he digs deep down, it becomes clear that Ámol has been flooded three times.

6. Ámol used to be a big town. One end of it was Salhār. In the direction of Mecca, to the south of Ámol, was the Alashā River. To the north was Chālapal. Below (i.e. north of) Ámol there used to be a Wednesday market. In olden times, [when] Ámol was big, a market was held there on Wednesdays; thus the name “Wednesday Market”.

7. There exist four shrines in Ámol: the shrines of Ebrāhim, Sayyed Sētan, Bibi Roqiya, and the shrine of ‘Ali. [...] The shrine of Ebrāhim is made from bricks; the interior of its dome is whitened with plaster. It has a [endowed?] cistern towards the [shrine] of Mir Bozorg. It was built together with the latter. In the spring its water is very cold and is consumed all over Ámol.

8. Inside Mir Bozorg, above the shrine, it is covered with inscriptions on tiles. Inside the building there is work of tile calligraphy all around. Indoors, there are tile murals, partly lost, partly [still] there. It has two large mosques; on two sides there are upper chambers, parts of which are still standing.

9. Ámol was founded by a girl named Ámla; that is why it was named Ámol.

10. Anywhere they dig, there emerge bricks – from the [buried] mosques, bathhouses, dwellings, and burial chambers. At most sites come into view cisterns and there are tombs. In the graves there are implements [like] swords [and] daggers; and female items [like] gold and silver bracelets turn up. Whoever builds a house in Ámol, they dig up the ground, out come mud bricks [with which] the house is built.

11. There is a royal garden in Ámol; from olden times, it was a royal garden. It used to have every kind of orange and citrus [trees]. One year it turned so cold that all trees withered. Now the people call it a garden.

12. At the outer edge of Ámol there is a Moṣallā. It is [founded on?] the footprints of Khidir (i.e. Elias). They call it “Gonbod-dār” (‘having a dome’ or ‘dome-tree’). Every Wednesday night Khidir comes and they read communal prayers. This is the sketch of Ámol’s dome (or: this is sketched on the Ámol’s dome).

Alternative reading: Emāmzāde Ebrāhim az ājār hass, vone sar-ruq ȥ; dālā gajr ُhāmrā ṣupe ḥāqārdan. ‘The shrine of Ebrāhim is made from bricks; it has a dome, the interior is whitened with plaster.’
Text I, continued (2).
Text I, continued (3).
Text I, cont. and end (4)
1.2. Text II

Hekāyat-e sābeqa-ye Bārforūš


5. Sabzā-f 30 Meydun-e va šast-haftād sāl-e piš attā l qand-ā-paj-xāna bāsātāna, jamī'-e asbāb-e qand-paʃi-ra az Orusīyā l bārdāna modat-i dar Bālforūş qand bāptāna barutāna. vone l saḥāb ke bāmūrā, hama asbāb-e qand-paʃi-ra mardām bāvardānā. l vone xasht čū-ra ham bāvardānā. al'ān ham ba'zi on asbāb f 35 hanuz kat; ke divon asa zabt hakardā.

6. Daz'ak-čāl-e ū-e dāla har l sāl-e zamāstun hama-jurā marqništ biā. mardām hama l śina oškār kardāna, vardāna xardāna. on sāl l ke šah biamūn Bālforūš, qaraq hakardā ke mardām tir l xāli nakaran; har kais-i tir xāli hakardā vone dast-e tafang-ra f 40 baarān. mardām az tars digar

---

11 Stands for the script form wa ‘and’ throughout the text.
12 The proper word order would be: jam bainā xana bāsātana.
13 For the written form b”-y-ā-r-d”-n". 
14 Note incompatibility of tenses: nakardə ‘did not, would not’ vs. ū-nda ‘he goes, he will go’.

15 Formally num ‘name’. The appenthesiss → is added arbitrarily and has no morphological value; e.g. ketāb-ə hāde or ketāb-ra hāde ‘give the book’.

16 bažənd ‘that they build’; the final d is superfluous for the 3rd person plural subjunctive ending in Mazandarani.

17 bār-ənd for the Mazandarani bār-ən ‘that they bring’. Again, the final d is added under Persian influence.
مانژال باوردا کیج-ه (۲۵) وانی-ه وار اوان دوحن-ه وار خون ام. هانتا بانائ ل کیج-را بههستا، کیج باماردا.


۱۴. یاهدیه l(۱۰۰) بادینا لیکه وارسون-را کوماک هاکاردانا، انحک ل ke مسالمن bain، ۲۳ ای بیامعنا بورداونا یاهدی ل bain، اسآ، یاهدیه sâر-منا-ه-ه خوب-ی az ایر ا ل بوساتنا. هامآ-را گاچ-ه یا اسپر کاری هاکاردانا. ل al آن هاما تاجارت کنندا.


۱۶. تا-ین-که l Šâzdeء Yaminodowlâ بایلفاروش بیامع Qâhârpoli Xan-ه l ataq مانژال هاکاردآ. اتی سی این Qâsâm Aliâbâdi ل اراق باویدا بیی.۲۵

۱۸ Spelled <d>-ه>.
۱۹ baina ‘they became’. The expected form is binآ ‘they were’.
۲۰ Written <س>-ه اسی-ه-مآ-ه، it was adjusted regarding another occurrence two lines down. Alternative reading: sâر-سمار ‘house counting’.
۲۱ sar- ‘each head/person’. It may also be read as sâر- ‘each house’.
۲۲ Here sâرسمار seems to be used as an adverb, meaning ‘via census’.
۲۳ Should read bai bina ‘they had become’; note that no periphrastic form is found in the texts.
۲۴ Written lutی-ه va.
۲۵ Spelled <ب-ی-یی-یهآ>.

17. Šāzdā hokm hākmda l ba vazir, ke hokman Qāsom Aliābādi-rā xāmmā, hāzār maʿrāk-šīvā l bazuna, Qāsom-rā bāita bārdānā Šāzdā-rā hadānā.

18. Šāzdā xāssā bakuš-e; Qāsom-e mansubun biamunā; ʿahārsad tāmān dānā (180) šāzdā-ra ke Qāsom Aliʿbādī-rā nakuš-e. qabul nākdā va-ra,l on fardā savāhī hokm hākmda mirqazāb vāra bakuš-e. farrāshā Qāsom-rā luš bākāšān bāvdānā Šohadā-bān l čalū-e piš daptunān. sā ruz Yahudihā kašīk l bākāšān. baʿd az sā ruz vāne mansubun bāitānā (129) dafn hākmdānā.

Translation
An account of the history of Bārforush

1. Bārforush, originally known as Bārforush village, was all [surrounded by] woods. [The quarters of] Āstānā and the Shohadā-bān used to be a water reservoir. [In Mazandaran, only] Āmol and Sāri were old towns.

2. Āstānā used to be simply a marshland with water; in the middle stood a hill. People who went back and forth would see (lit. ‘saw’) a lot of crows assemble on top of the hill, crowing. People would ask themselves, why the crows gathered round here. Eventually a man had a dream that this place was a shrine. Upon hearing this, people came here and built a tomb. Gradually people gathered in the area and built houses. Then, when the king realized that people gathered and built houses and erected a tomb, he constructed a dome on the mausoleum, which was named the Kalāj Mashhad (‘tomb of crows’). This splendid mausoleum was built 1,100 years ago.

3. Originally the Bābol [river] would flow through the present town. When the people gradually gathered and built houses, the Bābol [river] was diverted around the town.

4. At that time there was no Bāghshāh (royal garden) here. During the reign of Shah ʿAbbās a decree was issued to build a structure near Sabzā Maidan. They excavated round about the building and flooded it with the water brought from the Bābol river. It was named Dazzak-

chāl. Before it was flooded, another structure was laid out within

26 xātūn '(the) lady', is recorded in the text as xavātun, which can be a pseudo-historical orthography (xātūn). The word can also be understood as a proper name of a woman or a brothel.
Dazzakchāl. Seventeen piles were erected and a building was built on top [of them]. Once the construction was done, the surrounding area was flooded. Every time they wished to go to that building – a boat was always kept on the water – they would launch the boat to go to the building. Now the building is completely wrecked and only the seventeen piles are left.

5. A sugar mill was built near Sabza Maidan some sixty to seventy years ago. All the machinery was imported from Russia. For a while sugar cubes were made (lit. cooked) in Bārforush and put on the market. When its owner died, people looted (lit. took away) all the sugar-making apparatus. They even took its (i.e. the defunct mill’s) materials. Now there still lie around some equipment that was confiscated by the government.

6. Every winter Dazzakchāl’s water is the habitat of every kind of wild bird. Everybody used to go shooting prays and take [home] and consume [the birds]. In the year that the king visited Bārforush, he set a reservation policy preventing people from shooting [birds]; whoever fired a rifle would have his gun confiscated. People, scared, did not open gunfire any more. At present the preservation policy is still in force, but bullets are [still] fired occasionally in retired places.

7. At the same time as Bāghshāh was being built, a waterway was built along [a] line of the bazaar and was paved with bricks. Every year when the winter would arrive, water would be driven from the Bābol river and, for exactly two months, water would flow down into the [canal along the] bazaar, [so] the people’s cisterns would be cold. In summer [too] the water of those wells would be very cold. At the present time that bazaar’s canal is no longer operating, [another canal named] Shahu has been built. Every year they run water into the Shahu and the water flows into all private wells in the winter. In summertime people drink water from those wells; it is very cold.

8. In the vicinity of [the quarter of] Āqū, Bārforush also has a mosallā. Every time it doesn’t rain the imam goes there, [and] a large procession follows him. They say their prayers – it rains.

9. Bārforush has a mosque that is historical. It is called Maqbara. [When] they planned to build the mosque there, having built two or three times, it did not face the qebra. They failed [as] they tried to fix it and eventually quit. After three or four days they noticed that its twelve pillars were all erected and its direction was aligned to the precision of a hair. Everyone says that it was the twelve Imams who placed these twelve pillars so that the alignment became right.
Text II, continued (2)

LANGUES ET DIALECTES DU NORD DE LA PERSE.

323
Text II, continued (3)
Text II, continued (4)

LANGUES ET DIALECTES DU NORD DE LA PERSE.

255

[Text in Persian script]

(Text continues on the next page.)
Text II, continued (5)
Text II, continued (6)
ÉTUDES LINGUISTIQUES.
Text II, continued (8)
Text II, cont. and end (9).
10. Bārforush has a Jewish quarter that comes to seventy to eighty houses. Twenty years ago a man from [Persian] Iraq (i.e. the Iranian plateau) came to live in Bārforush. He had a daughter, and they were poor. He bought a piece of hat’s front-lace (?) for his daughter from a Jewish individual. As he took [it] home, his daughter noticed that the lace was defective. Both the girl and her father took [the lace back] to the Jewish quarter. The man assumed that one ought not to go inside a Jew’s house uninvited. He stood at the doorway and sent his daughter inside the house.

11. Having waited some half hour at the gateway, he saw that his daughter did not come out; but he heard his daughter’s groans. Suddenly he went to the Jew’s house and saw the Jews were (lit. ‘are’) kicking and beating his daughter who was tied up, and the girl was about to die. He put the girl on his shoulder, took [her] out of that house and carried [her] to his [own] house. His residence was at Kāzembek mosque. While taking [her] home, blood was (lit. ‘is’) running from the girl’s nose and mouth. As soon as he laid her on the floor, the girl died.

12. That night people assembled and noticed that the Jews [had] killed the girl for no good reason. Next morning all Bārforushis gathered round and all of a sudden swarmed into the Jewish quarter. From morning till noon (?) they killed fourteen Jews of both sexes, plundered whatever they possessed, and set to fire their houses. Daniel the Jew [was attacked] inside his house; they put gasoline on his quilt, wrapped Daniel in it, and set it to fire. Whatever they would ask him, “Where is your money?” he replied, “It’s in my butts.” To the end he did not disclose [where it was].

13. The Jews were somewhat frightened; they all ran away and swarmed into people’s houses, and fearfully they would say, “We have become Muslims!” They were (lit. ‘became’) Muslims for seven or eight months. Muslims in return would invite them over. Finally, the Shah sent a verdict [stating] that “whoever has taken the Jew’s properties [must] return [them].” Officials came from the court. First, a census was taken; from each they collected ten, twenty, and up to hundred tumans. They say the collection [?] was up to forty thousand tumans.

14. When the Jews realized that they were supported, those who had become Muslims returned to being Jewish. Currently, Jews have built fine brick houses; they are whitewashed all over with plaster. Now they all are doing business.
15. Before the Jewish [incident], there was a man named Qāsem ‘Aliābādī. He was rogue and bullheaded. There was [a certain] Mirzā Masih who was the vizier of Mazandaran; Qāsem ‘Aliābādī was his servant. Everybody was afraid of him. At night he would knock on the people’s doors, saying: “Give me such amount of money! I want [it].” Out of fear, people would give him money [but] would not report his name. People were fed up with him.

16. Finally, Prince Yamin-al-Dowla came to Bārforush and stayed in Qahhārqoli Khān’s residence. One night Qāsem ‘Aliābādī, having gotten drunk, was going [from] the lady’s [place?] to the vizier’s house. A sayyed from Lalevā was on his way home. At Afrādārban, Qāsem took a stone and crashed [it] into the sayyed’s head. The sayyed died.

17. The prince commanded the vizier, demanding Qāsem. [Only] after using a thousand tricks was Qāsem captured and handed over to the prince. The prince wanted to kill [him]. Qāsem’s relatives came [forward] to offer the prince 400 tumans to stop the execution. The prince refused it, and in the next morning upon his order the executioner killed him. The servants carried Qāsem’s corpse on their shoulders and tossed it in front of Shohadā-ban’s cistern. The Jews guarded [the dead body]; after three days his relatives buried [it].

II. HISTORICAL REMARKS

The major towns of nineteenth-century Mazandaran were Āmol, Bārforush, and Sāri, all located on the East-West highway traversing the province and situated some 20 miles from one another. Sāri was still the provincial seat, though it had lost its ancient magnificence. Āmol, the other old capital, had also experienced a sharp decline in modern times. Bārforush, on the contrary, had emerged in the late seventeenth century and expanded rapidly as a major trade center with Russia. By the early nineteenth century, Bārforush had grown to one of the largest towns in Persia, with a population of some 100,000. In 1831, however, a plague, transmitted from Russia, ravaged the south Caspian littoral and, together with a subsequent outbreak of cholera, cut Bārforush’s population to less than a third. Nonetheless, the town recovered gradually, so well indeed that by 1887 (i.e. two years before our narratives were composed) it had regained its pre-plague population and became, once again, the commercial hub of the southeast Caspian. Its inhabitants were engaged in business and trade, and there was a Russian consul of trade in the town. Much

of the merchandise was imported from Mashhad-sar (later Bābolsar), the port of Bāforsūsh, at the mouth of the Bābol river.

II.1 Text I

§1. The most important monuments of Āmol were situated around Sabzā Ma‘dān, near Aspekālā, i.e. one of the eight quarters of the town (cf. Rabino 1928, p. 36). A prominent landscape was the shrine complex of Mir(e) Bozorg, a title for Mir Qavām-al-Din Mar‘ashi (r. 760-781/1359-1379), the founder of a dynasty of the sādāt, who reigned in Mazandaran from 760/1359 to ca. 989/1581. The present structure of the shrine was erected by the Safavid Shah ‘Abbās I (r. 995-1038/1587-1629), a matrilineal descendent of Mir-e Bozorg (Sotuda 1987, pp. 91-101). The fortification nearby is described by several travelers, including Fraser (Fraser 1826, part 3, p. 195). It was known for its huge moat (khandaq), constructed in the late fourteenth century (Zahir-al-Din, p. 271).

§2. The historical bridge spans the Harāz (see Sotuda 1987, pp. 61-63; illustrated in de Morgan 1894, I, p. 172). The Mash‘i’s (incorrectly spelled Maš‘i’, with an-empty e) were one of the “ten clans” of Amol (Rabino 1928, p. 36), whose summer abode was the valley of Mashā in the highland district of Lārijān, south of Amol (Kazembeysi 2003, p. 16). Gmelin, in 1771, cited the Mash‘i-mahalla as one of Amol’s eight quarters (Gmelin 1770-84, III, p. II 5). The Hājjī Mash‘i cited in the passage could be Aqā ‘Ali Ashraf Mash‘i, who, according to Rabino (1928, p. 37), rebuilt in 1225/1810 the western part of Amol’s congregational mosque, which had been destroyed in an earthquake (apparently the earthquake of 1809; cf. Enlr. VII, p. 637). Additionally, Rabino (1928, p. 156, n. 56) reports that the twelve-arch bridge was built originally by a former Sheyk Al-Eslām of Amol at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and that it was rebuilt in the early nineteenth century by Mirzā Shafī‘, the vizier of Fath ‘Ali Shāh Qājār.

§3. The town was originally located on the western bank of the Harāz, as shown in a topographic sketch by de Morgan (1894, I, p. 172). The appearance of underground structures due to flooding and washed-away soil has an old history: as early as 606/1209-10, Ebn Esfandiār (I, pp. 71f.) alludes to the resurfacing of structures and graves apparently due to a deluge. There were also excavations by treasure diggers all around Amol (E’temād-al-Saltāna, I, p. 6). Cf. excavations in 1860 of Gonbad-e Mohammad-e Amoli, from which numerous burial chambers were discovered (Melgunov 1868b; Rabino 1928, pp. 39f.). “Iraq”, or more
properly ‘Erāq-e ‘Ajam “Persian Iraq”, was a super-province corresponding to the medieval Jebāl and ancient Media Major. The Caspian author of the text appears to have used the word “Iraq” to mean the entire plateau beyond the Alborz range.

§§4-5. Pāyin Gonbad appears to be the Gonbad-ben area in the quarter of Pāyin Bāzār (cf. Sotuda 1987, pp. 48ff.). According to Rabino (1928, p. 39), the old structure of the Emām Ḥasan mosque was believed to have been built under the caliph Ḥārun al-Rashid, but as Imam Ḥasan was reported to have been seen praying there, the mosque was named after him. Amol was flooded repetitively, breaching the levees constructed at various times (Sotuda 1987, IV, p. 63).

§6. The size of Āmol was drastically reduced after the outbreak of pandemics of 1831-33, causing its population to shrink from ca. 35,000 before the plague to some 8,000 in the 1880s (Kazembeiki 2003, pp. 14f.). The text refers to the outskirts of the old town that had been deserted by the late nineteenth century: Salhār (Cf. Sotuda 1987, p. 29; cited as “Chillar” in Abbott ed. 1983, p. 7); Ālašrū, which appears to be the “Ali-sheroood” (Abbott ed. 1983, pp. 7, 11) and Šahr-rud (Sotuda 1987, pp. 29, 61); and Chālalapal, which I could not identify in or near Āmol, but there is a Chālalapal bridge at Ashraf (Rabino 1928, p. 62, 122; Sotuda 1987, p. 679). Mazandarans use the word pāyin ‘below’ to signify ‘north’, as the land slopes down northward towards the Caspian sea.

§§7-8. The shrines of Āmol are numerous, mostly in ruins, with vegetation growing abundantly on their typically octagonal domes (see Rabino 1928, pp. 37-40; idem, texts, pp. 12-14; Sotuda 1987, pp. 48ff., 73ff.; for illustrations, see Hutt and Harrow 1978, pl. 100). The shrine of Mir-e Bozorg (see also §1) is illustrated in de Morgan 1894, I, pp. 173-175; Hutt and Harrow 1978, pl. 102.

§9. Āmela/Āmola is spelled in the Arabic form ‘maker, builder’ for semantic justification. The old historians of the province (Ebn Esfandīr, I, p. 7); idem, English tr., pp. 20 f., 11 5; Zahir-al-Din, p. 20) have mentioned Āmola, the daughter of Ashtād, as the founder of Āmol. See also Rabino 1928, p. 33; Markwart 1931, p. 136.

§10. Regarding the underground structures, see de Morgan 1894, I, pp. 172 f. There is a similar statement about the availability of construction materials: “There is no need to procure construction materials for those who attempt to build houses in Amol ... old bricks surface in sufficient amount while digging for the foundation” (E’temād-al-Saltāna, I, p. 6). A type of excavated brick was locally known as gabri
“Zoroastrian” (Rabino 1928, p. 40). This term was used also for old monuments of uncertain origin, especially for many of the conical towers in Amol (Rabino 1928, p. 37; E’temâd-al-Saltâna, I, p. 6).

§11. The Royal Garden (Bâghshâh) appears to be the one built by Shâh ‘Abbâs I (Sotuda 1987, p. 64). In 1844, Holmes reports that the structure existed no more (Holmes 1845, p. 162). Shâh ‘Abbâs I (see §1 above) annexed the province in 1005/1597 and showed a particular liking for it; he constructed several palaces there.

§12. The ‘footprints of Khidir’ was a tower which stood near the Sabza Maidan in a cemetery known as Mosallâ ‘the place of public prayer or oratory’ (Rabino 1928, p. 39; Sotuda 1987, pp. 39, 70ff.). It is likely to be the old Mosallâ of Amol, as cited by the medieval historians of Mazandaran (Zahir-al-Din, p. 222; Owliâ’-Allâh, p. 80).

II.2. Text II

§§1-3. The present town of Bârforush was founded in the early sixteenth century on the site of the old city of Mâmtîr. Until the late seventeenth century, however, it was still a village called Bârforushi-deh, which then rapidly expanded in the ensuing century (Zayyâb 1992; Sotuda 1987, pp. 175ff.). Astâna (lit. ‘shrine’ and Shohadâ-ban (lit. ‘martyr-place’) were two quarters of the town (cf. Darb-e shohadâ29 in Rabino 1928, pp. 157f., n. 69), which were built in the place of a former water reservoir (for which, see Şâleh, pp. 100ff.). The hill in the midst of the swamp can be compared with the mount Azraq Dun, described by Zahir-al-Din as having been the site of the house of Azraq, from the Kiâ Jalâîlîd clan, who ruled Mazandaran for a short period in the mid-fourteenth century (Rabino 1928, p. 46). Kelâj Mashhad (‘tomb of the crows’), first cited by Mir Timur (passim), was also a quarter of Bârforush (Melgunov 1868b, p. 132). The structure (illustrated in de Morgan 1894, I, p. 162) has not survived (Sotuda 1987, p. 185). Thus, the statement by the author of the text claiming that the shrine was 1,010 years old (corresponding to the year 297/909-10) is not supported by the historical documents available to me.

§4. Bâghshâh stood on an island in the middle of a lake known as Dazzak-châl or Bahr-e Eram. The latter was linked to the Bâbol river in the South-East of the town. As was the Bâghshâh of Amol (see above, I, §II), the royal garden of Bârforush was built by Shâh ‘Abbâs I. By the mid-nineteenth century, however, only a few stone pillars of the Safavid man-

29 We may infer by comparing Darb-e shohadâ ‘martyrs’ gate’ with Shohadâ-ban that the latter may have originally been Shohadâ-bar, where bar ‘door’, the authentic NW Iranian word, has been replaced in Mazandarani by Persian dar ‘door’.
tion had survived (Holmes 1845, p. 171). The structure cited in the text (illustrated in de Morgan 1894, I, p. 171) belonged to the earlier Qajar period and was used as an inn by the royal family (Stuart 1854, p. 274; Holmes 1845, pp. 171 f.; Mirzâ Ebrâhim, pp. II 9f.; Nâser-al-Din Shâh, pp. 227f.; Rabino 1928, pp. II 9-121). In 1930, the encircling lake was drained and filled, and it eventually became a residential quarter of Bâbol (Sotuda 1987, p. 196).

§5. The sugar refinery was one of several industrial projects sponsored by the Persian government in the Caspian provinces during the nineteenth century. The plant was established in the early 1850s to process raw sugar from sugarcane, a major staple crop of the province. Its machinery was imported from Saint Petersburg. As the plant failed to be profitable, it was leased to local merchants, but was eventually shut down some time between 1864 and 1874 (Kazembeyki 2003, pp. 78–80; cf. Mahjuri, IV, p. 208).

§6. The lake Dazzakchâl (see above, §4) was a place for fishing and shooting birds (Bâbol, p. 164). Nâser-al-Din Shâh visited Bârforush in 1864 and 1875 (Nâser-al-Din Shâh, pp. 227ff.).

§7. The water of Bârforush came from the Bâbol river through a canal which branched out into cisterns located under residential houses. During wintertime, the water would be flown through this canal until it filled up the cisterns. The stored water would be consumed throughout the year (Moâammad-Taqi Khân Kalim, apud Bâbol, p. 175). The canal Shahru(d) (lit. ‘royal/great canal’) branched off from the left bank of the Harâz (Sotuda 1987, p. 29).

§8. Āqrū or Āqârud was an eastern tributary of the Bâbol river as well as a large quarter of Bârforush (Melgunov 1868b, p. 132; Rabino 1928, p. 157, n. 69; Kazembeyki 2003, p. 20). A moâllâ is a public praying field where, for the festival (‘id or ‘eid) prayers and prayers for rain, the whole population of the town may gather for communal worship (Concise Encyclopaedia of Islam, ed. C. Classe, London, 1989, p. 289).

§9. The Maqbara (‘mausoleum’) mosque could be the recently constructed mosque/mausoleum of Sa’id-al-‘olamâ (Sotuda 1987, p. 206; cf. Sâleh, p. 241), the renowned local clergy who cooperated with the authorities in suppressing the Babi uprising of the mid-nineteenth century; or else, it might be the mausoleum beside the mosque of Kâzembek (Sotuda 1987, pp. 227ff.).

30 The decade of 1820s is inferred from the text.
The Jewish community thrived in Bārforush as a result of trade expansion. According to the unpublished manuscript of Capitan F. Mackenzie (Report on the Persian Caspian Provinces), in 1859 the town had over 700 Jewish residences, whose chief (kadkhodā) believed that his colony had been founded by descendants of the Jewish colonies established in Mazandaran by Shah ‘Abbās I, who settled many Armenians and Jews in the province (apud Rabino 1928, p. 13).32 Curzon believed that the Jewish community dominated the commerce of Bārforush (apud Levi 1984, p. 765). In the early twentieth century, of the 25,000 inhabitants of the town, 750 were Jews (Rabino 1928, pp. 45). The Jewish population began to diminish after the Second World War due to immigration to Israel (Babol, p. 173). In the mid-1970s there were still two synagogues in Bābol (Sotuda 1987, p. 244).

The pogrom is reported to have occurred in 1287/1870-71 (Babol, p. 173)33 and 1281/1864 (Levi 1984, p. 641). There are two brief accounts of the incident in Jewish sources, which report the number of casualties – 18 and 60 –, and name Dāniāl Mokhtār as one of the casualties (Levi 1984, pp. 641, 699-700). They report also that the shah’s decree concerning restoration of the Jewish community in Bārforush was influenced by the British and French embassies in Tehran (ibid.).34

All we know about the antagonist of the story, Qāsem, is his hometown ‘Aliābād, renamed Shāhī in the twentieth century, and later Qā’emshahr. Other localities mentioned in the passages are Lālavā, perhaps a local village, and Afrādārbān, a quarter of Bārforush (Sotuda 1987, p. 180). In the Qajar period, Mazandaran was a royal governorate often ruled by a prince-governor, who would be accompanied by a vizier (in charge of collecting taxes) and a financial officer (mostowfi) (cf. Kazembeysi 2003, p. 233). Prince Yamin-al-Dowlâ appears to have been the province’s governor. The vizier, Mirzâ Masih Mostowfi (see Fig. 1), was also the owner of several boluks of Sāri at Kalijān-rostāq (Mirzâ Ebrâhîm, p. 100; Nâser-al-Dîn Shâh, p. 146). Qâhârqoli Khân was the ruler of Bārforush (Nâser-al-Dîn Shâh, pp. 226, 233). The involvement of the Jews in safeguarding the dead body of a criminal is not clear; apparently, it is a groundless statement meant to disgrace the Jewish community of the town.

32 In 1859, there were fifty Jewish households, 2 synagogues, and a Jewish school in Bārforush (Mirzâ Ebrâhîm, p. 118). According to a Jewish source, 150 Jewish households lived in Bārforush in 1864 (Levi 1984, p. 641).
33 Corresponds to the date calculated from the text: 1307 - 20 = 1287.
34 I am grateful to my colleague Ms. Haideh Sahim who brought the Jewish sources to my attention.
Fig. 1: Mirzâ Masiû Mostowfi, the vizier of Mazandaran (Text II.15), photographed in 1890s, probably by Sami’-al-Dowla the photographer of the Qajar court, Tehran (© Courtesy of Mr. Fakhr-al-Din Surtiji)

III. LINGUISTIC NOTES

Mazandarani is the mother tongue of three to four million people in the province of Mazandaran. Historically, Mazandarani belongs to the northwestern branch of Iranian, and, together with Gilaki, Talyshi, and the ring of dialects around Semnân forms the so-called Caspian Sprachbund. The dialects of Mazandarani are, by and large, mutually intelligible, at least in Mazandaran proper, but none is considered to be the standard or formal Mazandarani. The dialectal continuum varies in two geographical directions: east-west (valley variation) and north-south (lowland vs. highland). Almost every locale has its own subdialect, and even those of neighboring
villages may exhibit substantial phonological differences. The lexicon, however, is fairly uniform throughout the province (Borjian 2004a).

Judging by the style and linguistic traits of the texts, one comes to the conclusion that both belong to central-western Mazandaran, but that a different individual composed each narrative. The second text is less Persianized; it contains the authentic Mazandarani traits lacking in the first text, such as the reflexive pronoun še (occurring seven times), the ablative marker já (six times), and the postposition vāse (twice). Nevertheless, certain Mazandarani characteristics, such as the plural marker -un, are absent in both texts (with the exception of mansubun ‘relatives’ in II.11 9, 124). Furthermore, the texts differ in certain linguistic features, e.g. the preverb hā- and the demonstrative pronoun an in the first text correspond to ha- and on in the second text, respectively. This demonstrates dialectal differences between the two texts, which are said by de Morgan to have belonged to the town of Bārforush; but one must not forget that Bārforush, in those days, was a trade center and that, hence, its inhabitants were not necessarily indigenous.

As one may expect of a non-written language, the orthography of the texts is far from being accurate. The Mazandarani texts are written in a vocalized Perso-Arabic script, but the diacritic symbols (harakāt) are used neither completely nor consistently. Many words are spelled variously, e.g. اون <v-n> and an <o-n>, corresponding, respectively, to the possible pronunciations un and on ‘that’; do and da ‘two’; ajor and ājor ‘brick’; <j-m-> and <ja-m>, representing ja(ː)m (with a choice of short or long vowel) ‘assembly’; maydun and maydān ‘square’ (but not the expected Mazandarani midun!); the name of the town Bārforush is spelled variously, including Bālafaru·, a local pronunciation (cf. Holmes 1845, pp. 168f.). There is a pointless handling of the Arabic letter ح in the Mazandarani words such as حاکردن ‘to do’.

No attempt was made to render a consistent spelling in the transcription; instead, individual cases of corrections and reconstructions are explained in the footnotes. Yet my transcription includes two Mazandarani phonemes absent in the manuscripts: (1) g, in contradistinction with k (the scribe followed the obsolete Persian orthographic tradition that merges the two phonemes into the letter ك <k>); and (2) ə, formally a mid-low, front-center vowel, but with a broad allophonic range within and among dialects; its pronunciation varies throughout Mazandaran: while the phoneme is perceived as a kasra [e, ɛ] in eastern Mazandaran, the Babolis find it more relevant to render it a fatha [a,D] when writing their vernacular. Hence, the fatha mark in the text corresponds to two distinct phonemes: a and ə, as transcribed in baxris for the spelling <b¹-x-r-ə-h> ‘he bought’.
The form کتنه <k^n'-n'-h> is transcribed, according to context, as کانندا ‘they dig’, کانندا ‘they do’, or گاندا ‘they say’.

The texts are presented, as far as possible, in a normal phonemic transcription that seemed most likely to represent the central-western Mazandaraní, in which the accounts are written. As the texts are from more than a century ago, they exhibit certain differences with the dialect as spoken today. Many textual problems – phonological, morphological, and lexical – were tackled by drawing on the other nineteenth-century texts from Mazandaran. Moreover, there are cases where a plain phonemic transcription would disguise or conceal morphological processes. When an essential phoneme is unrealized, a superscript recovers it. Thus, بهشتانو indicates a pronunciation بهشتانا, but arises from a combination of the morphemes به-(ه)شت-ان ‘they let’; بهام ‘he came’ represents a pronunciation بهام, where the morpheme -ء, the 3rd person singular ending, is arbitrarily but predictably omitted. The superscript presents, also, the essential phonemes missing in the script, mostly the oblique marker -ء. Moreover, when i in verb stems is realized as a phoneme, it is retained in the transcription even when i turns to y due to verb stress shift, e.g. baja [bæjta, bæjta] ‘he grabbed,’ baiyan [bæjtan] ‘to grab,’ ba(i) [bæj] ‘grab!’ This rule generally holds for the verbs ‘to be,’ ‘to be in,’ and ‘to become,’ the pronunciation of which is a matter of choice, e.g. دايار [da'ja', da'jeja, daejja] ‘it was in’.

IV. GLOSSARY

This glossary excludes most words which are the same as Persian or have pronunciation only slightly different than in the Persian, namely those differing only in

- ə for o, a, e: درست for دورست ‘complete’, درست for دورست ‘thick’,
  زمستان for زمستان ‘winter’, مورق for مورق ‘bird’, بنان for
  بنان ‘construction’, etc.;
- u or o for å before nasals: نام for نام ‘name’, دیوان for دیوان
  ‘administration’, etc.;
- ü for ow: ہوڑ for ہوڑ ‘pool’, دیر for دیر ‘around’, نیکر for
  نیکر ‘retainer, soldier’.

Verbs are listed under present and/or past stems, separated by a semicolon, followed by the conjugations attested in the texts. Numbers in parentheses refer to text paragraphs.

35 In یئر, یئر, یئر, یئر, and یئر the euphonic glide y between the two vowels is implied.
### Abbreviations

| ab-annän | pond, pool (II. 2) |
| aśnuss- | (v.) listen – b-aśnuss-ə they listened (II. 8) |
| āstunə | sacred place, shrine (II. 8); also a toponym (II. 2, 3) |
| ay | then again (II. 101) |
| bai- | → bu- |
| bai- | → (g)ir- |
| bāşnuss- | → aśnuss- |
| bēhār-ə-māh | spring (I. 31) |
| -bən | (postp.) under, by, beside – used here as a suffix in the toponyms Šohadā-bən (II. 2, 122), Afā-dār-e-bən ‘under/by the maple tree’ (II. 2, 5) |
| bənə | ground (II. 80) |
| bə-on-var | across, far side of (I. 9)  
| bēxud | (adv.) for no good reason (II. 82) |
| bi- | (v.) be – bi-ə was (I. 5, 6, 21-24, 45, II. 1-4, 15, 36, 45, 47, 65, 70, 79, 106, 107, II 3); cf. hass-, dar- |
| biamu- | → e- |
| biār(d)- | → īr- |
| binj | rice (I. 10) |
| bu-; bai-; hai- | (v.) become – bu-ə it becomes (II. 64); bai-ə it became (I. 39, II. 7, 18, 25, 29, 57), bai-mi we became (II. 93), bai-ə they became (II. 10, II. 16, 27, 94, 101, 102), jam hai-ə it came together (II. 7), jam hai-ə they gathered (II. 83). See also na-venə |
| bur-; šu-; burd-; ši- | (v.) go – šu-ə it goes (II. 50, 53), šu-ənə they go (II. 54), bur-dən that they go (II. 26), burd-ən to go (II. 71), burd-ə he went (II. 75), burd-ənə they went (II. 92, 101), ši-ə he would go (II. 75) |

---

Note: Cf. ba-yər ‘the other side, across’, the antonym of ba-yər yer ‘this side’ (Kiä 1947, no. 852; Amirkolāyi 2002).
46, 108), ši-na they would go (II. 4, 28, 37), dāst- ši- they was going (II. 3, II 4; see also dār-).

cēši what (II. 6).
cēl-ū water-well, cistern (II. 46, 47, 49, 50, 123).
cū wood (II. 34).
dā- → de-.
da-, do- (preverb) → kəlss-, pit-, vann-, dapatanî-.
dai- → dar-.

dapatanî- (v.) hurl – dapatanî-na they threw (away) (II. 123).
dār tree – in the toponym 3frā-dār-e-bən ‘under/by the maple tree’ (II. II 5).
dar-; dai- (v.) be in, exist – dar- it is in (I. 42, II. 90); dai- there was (I. 6, II. 27, 104, 106); dar- mir-nə (aux.) he is dying (II. 77); cf. bi-, has-.dār-; dās-t- (v.) have – dār (pres. participle) in gonbod-dār ‘having a dome’ (I. 49 f.); dār-nə it has (I. 3-6, 14, 15, 17, 23, 29, 36, 37, 45, 49, II. 52, 55, 64), nār-nə it has not (I. 8); dāst- he had (I. 46, II. 3, 66, II 3), na-dāst- he had not (II. 17), dāst-ənə they had (II. 27), dāstənə-nadāstənə (II. 85) they had [or] had not; dāst- šiə (aux.) he was going (II. II 4).
dar-biamu- → dar-e-.
dar-biar- → iär-.

dar-e-; dar-iamu- (v. comp.) come out – dar-e-na it comes out (I. 13, 16, 40, 41, 43, 44), dar-biamu- it came out (II. 63); see also e-.
dar-əsar gate, doorway (II. 71, 73, 108).

-darun (postp.) inside (II. 74).
dāst- → dār-.

davəndi → vand-.

de-; də- (v.) give – ha-de give! (II. 109), pas ha-de-ən that they give back (II. 96); nə-də- they gave not (II. 91), də-nə they would give (II. 109, II 9), na-də-nə they would not give (II. II). sar də-nə they

The stem is obscure, but the form can be scanned as *dapast-und-i-na*, with the causative morpheme -V(d)- and the post-stem formant -i-; cf. Bârfourushi <dâptounî> dâptuni-ən, Semnânî <dâptounî> *‘habiser’* (de Morgan 1904, V, p. 226, no. 581), <dâbātinî> ‘jeter’ (Melgunov 1868a, p. 201), daftuni-na ‘they threw (away)’ (in Dom 1865, p. 390, line 11), dāpartuni-ya ‘he shot (an arrow) at’ (in Kanz al-əsrâr, I, p. 25, line 7).

Persianized form for Mazandaranî daia šiə, where the auxiliary verb is dar-; dai- (q.v.) ‘be in, exist’.
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would make flow (II. 45), hā-dā-na they gave (II. 87, 89, II 8), qarār hā-dā-na they placed (II. 17).

delo (adv.) inside (II. 71).

delo/-delo (postp.) inside (I. 29, 32, 42, II. 15, 22, 26, 27, 35, 72, 75, 84, 88-90).

d-e (v.) see – ba-di-o he saw (I. 8, II. 10, 68, 73, 75), ba-di-na they saw (II. 5, 59, 82, 100).

dohun mouth (II. 80).

dur-o-var round about, in the vicinity of (I. 16, II. 9, 19, 20, 25).

-e oblique marker (passim); ezāfa marker (passim).

-e one, each (I. 12, II. 97); cf. -i.

-e → hass-.

-e and (II. 13, 14, 34, 84); cf. o, -e-o.

-e connective in compound words: bāhā-r-e-māh (q.v.), dūr-o-var (q.v.), dar-o-sar (q.v.), qand-o-paj-xan (q.v.), Čāl-o-pš (I. 22f.), Kālāj-o-Mašhad (II. 13), Dāz-e-k-e-chāl (II. 21, 22), Āq-o-rū (II. 51); cf. o, o.

e-e; iamu- (v.) come – e-nā comes (I. 50, II. 74, 80), iamu-na they would come (II. 4), biamu-o it came (II. 38, 65, 97, III), niamu-o she came not (II. 73), biamu-na they came (II. 8, 9, 101, II 0, II 9); see also dar-e-o.

əmā (pers. pron.) we (II. 93).

ən-o → hass-.

əsā now (II. 35, 41, 47, 49, 102).

əskār game, prey (II. 37).

esmār → sarešmār.

aspe white (II. 29); compounded in aspe-kāri whitewashing (II. 103) and in the toponym Aspe-kalā (I. 1).

ešt- → hešt-.

əti this way (variant of inī) (II. 60); a bit (II. 91).

əttā one, few, little (passim); also əttə (II. 52).

əttā-əttā one by one (II. 41).

əttā-xale a lot of (II. 5, 53).

garj plaster (I. 29); but also gač (II. 103).

gat big (I. 4, 15, 24, 36); also gatə (I. 21).
gā-; gat- (v.) say – gā-nānā they say (I. 2, 4, 5, 21, 25, 28, 38, 48, 50, II. 55, 61); gat-ō he said (II. 90, 108), gat-ōnā they said (II. 6, 90, 92, 98, 105).

g′ezēst- (v.) pass, elapse – be-gzešt-ō it went by (II. 59).

(g)i'-; (g)i't- (v.) get – gir-nānā they take (I. 12), ba-ir-ōnā that they get (I. 19, II. 40); git-nō they would get (II. 94), ba-it-ō he took (II. II 5), ba-it-ōnā they took (II. II 8, 124), ha-it-ō he took (II. 77), ha-it-ōnā they took (II. 98, 99).

gom bod dome.

ha-, hā-, hō- (preverb) → bu-, de-, (g)i'-, kan-, hārassā-.

hamō jur(ō) every kind of (I. 46, II. 36).

hamu-ti likewise (II. 41).

hantā as soon as (II. 80).

hass-, ō (v.) be – is (passim; but also hast-ō (II. 55, 61), ō is (I. [1], 26, 33, 34, II. 35, 60),39-ōnā they are (II. 5); cf. bi-., dar-.

hārassā- (v.) stand – hārassā-ō he stood (II. 71, 73).

hešt- (v.) put – be-hšt-ō he placed (II. 62, 81), be-hešt-ōnā they put (I. 39, II. 13, 21, 59).

-i a(n), one (I. 5, II. 32, 39, 102); cf. -ē.

iār-; iārd- (v.) bring – b-iārd-ō he brought (II. 78), b-iārd-ōnā they brought (II. 20, 32, II 8); dar-biār-ōnā that they render/make (II. 58).

in-jō here (II. 7, 8, 9, II. 17).

ir-, it- → gir-.

-jā (postp.) from (II. 45, 67, 77, 103, 107), with (II. 44).

kan-; kanni-ō (v.) dig – kan-nā he digs (I. 19, 20) kan-nānā they dig (I. II. 13, 16, 39, 44); ba-kanni-nō they dig (II. 19).

kaši-/kōsi- (v.) pull, drag (or aux.) – kaši-ō it would pull (II. 46) ba-kōsi-nō they dragged (II. 122, 124).

kat- (v.) fall – kat (p. p.) fallen (in kāt ō it lies, there is) (I. 26, II. 35).

kōjā where (I. 39, II. 90).

-kolā (toponymic suffix) place – in 3spē-kolā (I. 1).

kolāj crow (II. 5, 7, 13).

kōless- (v.) pour – da-kōless-ōnā they swarmed (II. 83, 92).

39 In all cases the copula -ō appears after a past participle: kat ō (I. 26, II. 35), banwešt ō (I. 33, 34), bɔsāt ō (II. 60).
40 The secondary past stem formant -i is added to the old past stem kanni- (< kand-) to avoid confusion with the present stem when the endings are employed.
kən-: kərd- (v.) do (mostly used as an auxiliary verb, e.g. binj kərənə ‘they cultivate rice’ I. 10) – kənə does (I. 43, II. 54), kənə they do (I. 10, II. 42, 104). na-kən-ən that they do not (II. 39); na-kərd-ə it would/did not (II. 52, 120). kərd-ən they would do (I. 25, 31, II. 6, 37, 43). há-kərd-ə he did (I. 3, 7, 9, 38, 47), ha-kərd-ə he did (II. 35, 38, 39, 66, 72, 95, II 2, II 6, 121), hə-kərd-ən they did (I. 29, 31, 35), ha-kərd-ən they did (II. 12, 14, 23, 44, 48, 81, 86, 91, 97, 100, 103, 125).

kəŋ anus (II. 90).

kərd- → ken-.

kijä girl, daughter (I. 38, II. 66, 68, 69, 72-74, 76, 77, 79, 81, 82).

kuş-; kušt- (v.) kill – ba-kuş-e that he kills (II. II 9), na-kuş-e that he kills not (II. 120); ba-kušt-ə he killed (II. 121), ba-kušt-ən they killed (II. 82, 85).

laʃəjär reed-bed, marsh (II. 3).

lu kick (II. 76).

luʃ corpse (II. 122).

mardi man (II. 7, 65, 70, 104).

me (pers. pron.) my (II. 90).

mən (pers. pron.) I (II. 109).

mərd- → mir-.

mi hair (II. 61).

mir-: mərd- (v.) die – daʃə mir-ə he is dying (II. 77), ba-mərd-ə (s)he died (II. 33, 81, II 6).

munəs- (v.) stay – ba-munəs-ə it stayed (II. 29).

nəro shout (II. 74).

na-venə (v. modal) should not (II. 71) (precedes the infinitive burden).

Cf. bu-.

nəvəʃ- (v.) write – ba-nəvəʃ (p. p.) written (I. 33, 34).

niʃt seat, abode (II. 36).

nū boat (II. 26, 27).

nūsə-ə (v.) they would/did not open (a gunfire) (II. 40).

ə and (I. 3, 4, II. II 2, 80, 95, 105); cf. a, -ə-.

ən that (II. 5, 26, 28, 34, 37, 47, 49, 50, 53, 56, 70, 75, 77, 81, 121); also un (I. 12).

The past stem can be buʃə- or veʃə- (Cf. Chodzko 1842, p. 577, no. 15; Kiä 1947, nos. 366, 794).
on-jā there (II. 54, 56); also un-jā (I. 24).
on-vāqti then (I. 9, II. 10, 17, 25); also un-vāqt (I. 7).
paj-: pēt- (v.) cook – pēj- (pres. stem) in the compounds qand-ō-paj-xōnā, qand-paji (qq.v.); ba-pēj-ōnā they cooked (II. 32).
pēllō arched span of a bridge (I. 6, 7).
per father (II. 69).
pēt- → paj-.
pil money (II. 90, 95, 108, 109).
-pīš (postp.) near, by, beside, in front of (II. 123).
pit- (v.) wrap – da-pit-ōnā they wrapped (II. 89).
qand-ō-paj-xōnā sugar factory (II. 31).
qand-paji sugar refining (II. 31, 33).
rāi traveler (II. 72).
(-r)ō (postp.) direct object marker (passim); indirect object marker:
Šāzd-ō-hadānā ‘they gave [him] to the Prince’ (II. II 8), baquō
Sāyyād-ē sarrī ‘he struck [the stone] on the man’s head’ (II. II 3f.);
note also on mardi-ō xiāl biō ke ... ‘that man thought that ...’ (II. 70).
rū stream, creek, canal (II. 48, 49); also in the hydronyms Ālāš-ē-rū (I. 22), Šāh-rū (II. 48, 49), and Aḡ-ē-rū (II. 51); see also ruxōnā.
rut- (v.) sell – ba-rut-ōnā they sold (II. 32).
ruxōnā canal (II. 43); see also rū.
-sar (postp.) above, over (II. 12).
sar-ēsmār census (II. 97, 99).
sar-rūzō dome (I. 28) (ružō < Ar.-Pers. rawzā?).
sāz-; sāt- (v.) make – bō-sāz-ōnā that they build (II. 56); bō-sāt-ā he
built (II. 12, 62), bō-sāt-ōnā they built (II. 9-11, 16, 19, 22, 24, 31, 43,
57, 103), bō-sāt (p. p.) built (II. 60).
še (pers. and reflexive pron.) self, his (II. 6, 67, 68, 71, 72, 78, II 4); cf.
xād.
sārī house (II. 70, 72, 74, 75, 77, 88, II 4).
sārī-xōnā house (II. 87, 92, 102); see also xōnā.
sāvāhī morning (II. 82, 84, 121).
šī-, šū → burg-.
šū night (I. 50 II. 81, 108, II 2).
tarsi-tarsi- (v.) be afraid – társī-ōnā they would be scared of (II. 107),
bā-tarsi-ōnā they were afraid (II. 91).
taš fire (II. 87, 89).
távštun summer (II. 47).
té (pers. pron.) your (sg.) (II. 90).
tunēss- (v.) be able to – na-tunēss-ēnē they would not be able to (II. 58).
ū water (I. 7, 9-II. 18, 20, 31, 32, II. 3, 4, 20, 21, 25, 27, 35, 45, 46, 48-51).
un- → on; on-ja; on-vaqt.
vann-; vəndi-, vəss- (v.) bind, tie; flood (when preceded by ū ‘water’) – ū van'-nēnē they flood (the land) (I. II. II. 49); da-vəndi (p. p.) wrapped (II. 76), ū da-vəss-ēnē they flooded (II. 20, 25), ū na-vəss-ēnē they did not flood (II. 22).
-vař (postp.) by, toward, at (I. 1, 3, 4, 30, II. 18, 30, 80, II 3).
vard-/vərd- (v.) carry (also aux.) – vard-ēnē they would take (II. 37), ba-vərd-ē it took (I. 7, 10, 18, 20, II. 68, 78, 79), na-vərd-ē it took not (I. 9, 18), ba-vərd-ēnē they took (II. 16, 33, 34, 69, 96, 122).
vārēs rain (II. 52, 54).
-vāsse (postp.) for (II. 6, 68); cf. -vař.
ve (pers. pron.) he, she, it (I. 45, II. 105, II 0); vərē (ve/və + ɾə) (I. II. 25, 31, 48, II. 89, 109, 120, 121); cf. vane.
vēne (pers. pron.) his, him, its (oblique case of ve) (I. 28, 31, 33, 38, II. 13, 21, 23, 25, 32, 34, 39, 53, 55, 57, 59, 60, 68, 69, 73, 74, 76, 78, 80, 88, 89, 105, 107, 109, 124).
vəni nose (II. 80).
-vər (postp.) for; in-e vər therefore (I. 25); cf. -vāsse.
vāss- → vann-.
vəšun (pers. pron.) they (II. 94, 100).
vəšvne (pers. pron.) their (II. 86).
və́; xə́ss- (v.) want – xə́-mmō I want (II. 109, II 7); xə́ss-ē he wanted (II. II 9), xə́ss-ēnē they wanted (II. 26, 56, 57).
xále many (I. 4, 19, 24, 31 II. 47, 51); see also attā-xale.
xarin-, xə́ri- (v.) buy – xarin-ēnē they buy (I. II ); ba-xə́ri-ē he bought (II. 67).
xəd self (reflexive pron.) (I. 3, II. 6); but also xud (II. 3); cf. še.
xənē house (II. 10, II. 16); see also sə́rexnē, qandəřaxnē, ruxnē.
chant; chant- (v.) eat, drink - chant-nan they drink (I. 32, II. 51); chant-nan they would eat (II. 37), bar-ham chant-o (aux.) it is destroyed (I. 35f., II. 48), ar-ay baxandar bi (past perfect tense) he had drunk vodka, or ar-ay-baxandar bi (p. p., adjective) he was drunk (II. ll 3).

xud → xad.

xun- (v.) read – namaz xun-nan they pray (I. 51, II. 54).

xu-nomā dream (II. 7).

zun-/zun-; zu- (v.) hit (or aux.) – zun-nan they are hitting (II. 76), nan-nan it does not hit (II. 61); zu-o he would knock (II. 108), ba-zu-o he struck (II. ll 6), ba-zu-nan they hit (II. 88, ll 8).
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