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One of the poorly studied Iranian languages is Gurgān, the extinct language of Gurgān, the Persian province at the southeastern corner of the Caspian Sea. Gurgān is situated north of the Alburz watershed and consists of the broad plains and valleys watered by the rivers Gurgān and Atrak. Throughout history, the provincial capital of Gurgān was the city of Gurgān; under the Šafavids, however, the southwestern town of Astarābād gained prominence, and the province itself was constituted as that of Astarābād. The town of Astarābād was renamed Gurgān under Reza Shah Pahlavi, while the old town of Gurgān corresponds to the site of the present Gunbad-i Qābūs. Dašt-i Gurgān is now designated as “Turkmen Sahara” on the map, and, just to add to the confusion, the province itself has recently been renamed Gulistān “rose garden,” apparently after the trend in the Islamic Republic to replace toponyms that sound pagan, in this case gurgān “wolves.”

The only known extant documents in the Gurgān language are those associated with the Hurūfī sect of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries. Hence, Gurgān must have died out sometime after the fifteenth but certainly before the nineteenth century, for European travelers do not report anything distinctive about the language of Gurgān. The language shift came about through social and commercial interactions that affected the entirety of Iranian languages all over the plateau and ousted the dialects south of the Great Khurāsān Road as well as Gurgān north of the Alburz.

As is the case for many other Iranian dialects, one can find individual words attributed to the province of Gurgān in medieval Persian texts and dictionaries. A few lexemes are cited in al-Birūnī’s al-Ṣaydana (Kiyā and Rāsid: 69f.). In Zakhira-yi khwārazmšāhi and al-Aghrāż al-jībbiya, two major medical and pharmaceutical reference works compiled by Zayn al-Din Ismā‘īl Jurjānī, the author cites several words, mostly flora and fauna terms, from his hometown Gurgān (Qāsimi 2004). A manuscript of Dastūr al-adwiya, a fourteenth-century drug-prescription dictionary, cites three plant names from Gurgān (Ṣādiqi 2002: 40), most likely quoted from Jurjānī. Nevertheless, these words alone say little about the language of Gurgān with which they are identified; the language could simply be a variety of Persian.

I. THE HURŪFI DOCUMENTS

Hurūfīsm is one of a series of heretical sects that appeared on the Persian politico-religious scene in the past two millennia. It is a body of antinomian and incarnationist doctrines developed by Fazlallāh Astarābādī (740–796/1339–1394), and as its name indicates, the principal features of the cult were elaborate numerological interpretations of the letters of the Perso-Arabic alphabet and an attempt to correlate them with the human physiognomy as
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the manifestation of the divine essence. The movement that espoused these teachings was relatively short-lived in Persia, lasting for about fifty years after the death of Fażllallāh. Nonetheless, the emergence in Şafavīd times of the Nuqtāvī movement, an offshoot of Ḥurūfīsm dismissed as heretical by Shi’ī mainstream adherents, may suggest some degree of survival. On the other hand, Ḥurūfīsm persisted in Anatolia and the Balkans, primarily under the auspices of the Bektāshi order.¹

Major Ḥurūfī writings appear in Persian and Turkish as well as in Gurgānī, but few have been studied in any detail. The foundational Ḥurūfī text is Fażllallāh’s Jāvidān-nāma, of which there were two recensions: one subtitled kabīr in the Gurgānī language, and the other şaghīr in Persian. The two other prose works by Fażllallāh, Nawm-nāma and Muḥabbat-nāma, are also Gurgānī with substantial Persian mix. Other known Gurgānī works of the Ḥurūfīs are Maḥram-nāma and a vocabulary. The rest of the voluminous literature of the sect is in Persian and Turkish and remains largely in manuscript² kept in various libraries and private collections in Europe, Turkey, and Iran. Following is a list of known works in Gurgānī.


2. Nawm-nāma “Book of Dreams” is an account of Fażllallāh’s dreams, the source of his revelations, and those submitted to him for interpretation. The sketchy character of the text implies an unedited draft. The Gurgānī material used in the book is less mixed with Persian as compared to Jāvidān-nāma. It has certain unique Gurgānī dialect materials, some obscure. Extracts from Nawm-nāma are published by Kiyā (1951: 236–46).

3. Muḥabbat-nāma “Book of Affection” partly duplicates Jāvidān-nāma, but with even less dialect character. It does not add to the Gurgānī vocabulary of Jāvidān-nāma or Nawm-nāma, hence is the least interesting as a dialectal source.

4. Maḥram-nāma “Book of the Confidant” is authored by Amir Ishāq, the son-in-law of Fażllallāh, who oversaw the activities of the cult in Khurāsān and thus was known as the “mursīd of Khurāsān.” Maḥram-nāma is entirely Gurgānī with a lesser degree of blend with Persian than the works of Fażllallāh. The text was published by Clément Huart (1909: Ar. 13–58) with French translation (pp. 20–94). Huart’s edition is commented on by Kiyā (1951: 334–47).

5. Lughat-i astarābādī “Glossary of Astarābādī” was compiled by the Ḥurūfīs at an unknown date as an aid to understanding the Gurgānī language used in Ḥurūfī works. No further description of this lexicon is given by Kiyā, who used it in compiling his Gurgānī dictionary (see below).

II. STUDIES ON THE LANGUAGE

The study of Gurgānī is limited to two publications based on original works: Clément Huart (1909) and Ṣādiq Kiyā (1951). Of the Ḥurūfī texts studied by Huart, only one is Gur-

¹ For sources on Ḥurūfīsm, see Algar, “Ḥorufism,” in Elr; Bashir 2005.
² Some Persian texts are published in Huart 1909.
gānī, namely, *Mahram-nāma*. It was published in Perso-Arabic script with French translation (see I.4, above), a glossary (pp. 192–210), and brief grammatical notes (pp. 211–12).

In *Vāžanāma-yi gurgānī*, Kiyā used all the Gurgānī materials available to him for a study of the language, i.e., Huart’s publication of *Mahram-nāma* and the manuscripts of other Gurgānī texts he procured from private and public libraries in Iran. The main body of the *Vāžanāma*, as its title suggests, is a glossary (pp. 48–209), consisting of the Gurgānī words extracted from *Jāvidān-nāma, Nawm-nāma, Mahram-nāma*, and *Lughat-i astarābādī*.3

In this glossary, the source of each entry is noted unless it has been taken from *Jāvidān-nāma*, from which the bulk of headwords is obtained. Arranged in alphabetical order, the glossary is actually a compilation of orthographic forms (graphemes) rather than lexemes, with entries consisting of nouns with prepositions attached to them, conjugated forms of verbs, etc. Despite its claim to comprehensiveness, one finds a number of words missing in Kiyā’s vocabulary when one compares it with Huart’s glossary of *Mahram-nāma*. The book is supplemented by excerpts from *Jāvidān-nāma* and *Nawm-nāma* (pp. 210–46), a comparison of Gurgānī consonants with those of Persian (pp. 247–52), grammatical notes (pp. 253–79), and historical-comparative notes on several Gurgānī lexemes (pp. 314–33). There is also a very useful introduction to Gurgānī manuscripts and their characteristics (pp. 34–47), as well as to the history of the sect per se (pp. 9–33, 280–313).

Kiyā has avoided the Roman transcription of Gurgānī words. Instead he made an attempt to reproduce the exact script forms in vocalized Persian orthography, without speculating about probable pronunciation when the manuscript lacks diacritical marks (that is, in most cases). Notwithstanding the accuracy found in Kiyā’s study of Gurgānī, as is the case with his other linguistic publications, there still exist many ambiguous instances where it is not clear what letter the diacritical marks are meant to target or even what line (above or below) they belong to. The concluding sentences of the *Corrigenda* are exemplary of the confusion that arises: “In this booklet, whenever the letter گ is seen in Gurgānī words, it is incorrect; گ is correct, save for those words quoted from *Mahram-nāma*. Instead of ending گ in certain words in this booklet, the letter گ is sometimes printed.”4 (p. 350) Thus the accuracy of the work is significantly reduced by the constraints inherent in Persian print technology, true even today.

Consequently, the linguistic study of the ハウフィ corpus remains to be completed. Neither of the aforementioned works attempts to even identify the phonemes of the language. Notwithstanding its thoroughness, Kiyā’s study lacks an in-depth analytical investigation of the language, although it has set the stage for further study of Gurgānī.5

### III. THE EARLIEST MENTIONS OF GURGĀNĪ

The earliest mentions of the Gurgānī language, known also as Astarābādī, are in the early Muslim geographical works. The anonymous author of *Hudūd al-ʿālam* states:

*Astarābād šahr-e ʿst bar dāman-i kōh nihāda, bā niʿmat u xurrām, u ābhā-yi farāwān u hawā-yi durust. u ēsān ba du zabān saxun gōyand: yak-e ba lūtarā(-yi) astarābādī u dēgar-e ba pārsi-yi gurgānī.*6

---

3. *Muhābbat-nāma* is for the most part ignored, apparently because it does not add to the vocabulary of the other works.

4. The last sentence is unclear.

5. In addition to the works cited, Hellmut Ritter (1954) quotes some Gurgānī passages (pp. 24–25) in his comprehensive study of ハウフィ texts.

Astarabad is a town in the piedmont with wealth and flowing waters and good climate, and they speak two languages: one is the secret language (lūtarā) of Astarābād and the other is the Persian of Gurgān.

Another tenth-century geographer, al-Muqaddasi, notes:

wa-lisānu Qūmis wa-Jurjāna mutaqāribānī yastaʾmilāna ilahan yaqālūna hādīh wa-hākun, wa-lahu ḥalāwatun wa-lisānu ahlī Tabaristān muqāribun lahǎ illā ʿalā fi ʿalāliḥī.7

(The languages of Komisene and Hyrcania are similar; they use [ḥā-, as in ḥā-dih ["give!"] and ḥā-kun ["do!"]], and they are sweet. Related to them is the language of Tabaristan, save for its speediness.)

The statements above reveal important facts about the linguistic situation in Gurgān a millennium ago. The fact that Gurgān is compared to the language of Tabaristan, on the one hand, and to that of Qūmis/Komiš, on the other, conforms with the linguistic character of the Ḫurūfī documents, as all of these languages belong to the Caspian Sprachbund which embraces also Tabari/Māzandarānī and the Komisene dialects of the villages around the present town of Simnān, located within the boundaries of the medieval province Qūmis (ancient Komisene) on the southern foothills of the Alburz range.

It is not as clear, however, which of the two languages referred to by the Ḥudūd was Gurgānī: lūtarā(-yi) astarābādi or pārsī-yi gurgānī? On the one hand, “Gurgānī Persian” can indeed be interpreted as such, since the term pārsī “Persian” in those days corresponded not only to the literary language used in the Sāmānid court in Transoxiana but also to the languages and dialects belonging to the Iranian family in general. On the other hand, if we take “Persian” as we understand it today, then the lūtarā would mean the Gurgānī language.8 In this case, the implication is that the central town of Gurgān had already shifted to Persian, whereas Astarābād on the southwestern fringe of the province had preserved the original provincial vernacular. This may indeed be the case, since the Ḫurūfī documents are known to be written in the dialect of Astarābād, not Gurgān per se. By this time, the town of Gurgān, already a commercial and cultural center in the tenth century, had yielded to Persian, at least partially. The “Persian of Gurgān” mentioned in the Ḫudūd could then be a Persian dialect with such local forms as hādīh and hākun, mentioned by al-Muqaddasi.

Whatever the provenance may be, we may safely assume that the precursor to the Astarābādi/Gurgānī vernacular of the Ḫurūfī documents of the late fourteenth century corresponds to that cited by the tenth-century geographers as the language of the town of Astarābād, Gurgān, or both.

It should be added parenthetically that the penultimate prince of the Ziyārid dynasty of Tabaristan, ʿUnṣur-al-Māʿālī Kaykāvūs b. Iskandar b. Qābūs b. Vušmūr b. Ziyār, who resided in Gurgān in the eleventh century, made no mention of a Gurgānī language in his renowned Mirror of Princes, entitled Andarz-nāma or Qābūs-nāma, where we find verses in his mother tongue Ṭabarī.

IV. GURGĀNĪ THE POET AND THE GURGĀNĪ LANGUAGE

Although no literary work has survived in the Gurgānī language, Gurgān was the birthplace of the prominent Persian poet Fakhr al-Dīn Asʿad Gurgānī, as his nisba suggests.

7. al-Muqaddasi, 368.
8. In Persian dictionaries, lūtar(d) is glossed as an artificial language devised for secret use, but it is also glossed as a dialect or vernacular. See the Lughatnāmā, s.vv. “lūtār” and “lūtarā.”
Virtually all that is known about him is derived from his own scanty statements in the exordium to his verse romance Vis u Rāmin, completed in 447/1055 or shortly thereafter in the Saljūq capital city of Isfahān, where Gurgānī is believed to have resided for most of his adult life.

Is there any indication other than his nisba that Fakhr al-Dīn Gurgānī had knowledge of the vernacular of his birthplace? Let us first examine a curious statement in the Vis u Rāmin:

 zabān-i pahlavi har k-ā ṣināṣad,  
Xuṭrāsān ān bawad k-az way xʷar āsad.  
xʷar āsad—pahlavi bāṣad “xʷar āyad”:
 ʿIrāq u Pārs-rā xʷar z-ā bar-āyad.  
xʷarāsān-rā bawad maʿnā “xʷar-āyān,”  
kujā az way xʷar āyad söy-i Ėrān.  

(Whoever has knowledge of the Pahlavi language [would immediately know] that Khurāsān is where the sun rises.  
xʷar āsad is Pahlavi [for] “the sun comes”: [from the standpoint] of [the Persian] Iraq and Pārs the sun rises from there.  
xʷar-āsān [i.e., Khurāsān]10 means “the coming sun,” that is, whence the sun comes toward Persia.)

The question that poses itself is which Pahlavi language the poet is referring to. This is no place to enumerate the various interpretations of “Pahlavi” at different times in various literary sources;11 suffice to say here that this term was used in premodern times mainly to signify local vernaculars of the Northwestern Iranian stock spoken in many localities in western, central, and northern Persia, but especially those of the super-province known as Jībāl (ʿIrāq-i ʿajam or Persian Iraq since the fourteenth century), corresponding to ancient Media Major.12 The fact that the author resided in Isfahān, one of the three major urban centers of Jībāl (together with Hamadān and Rayy), and that the Pahlavi dialects of Isfahān and other regions of Jībāl are well attested in medieval Persian and Arabic texts, suggest that Gurgānī is referring to the dialect of the people among whom he was living, i.e., in Isfahān. This conjecture, however, can be contested on linguistic grounds. The Pahlavi-specific words that Fakhr al-Dīn cites in the abovementioned distiches are āsad, contrasting Persian āyad “it comes,” and the participle āsān, for Persian āyān “coming.” These forms, notwithstanding their likely Persianized inflections, lead us to the non-Persian stem ās- for the verb “to come” (in place of Pers. āy-). Which Iranian languages carry this verb stem? For the present stem of “to come” we have Gurgānī ās-, Parthian ās-, Balūch ās-, Sogdian ʿys-, and some Pāmīrī dialects es- “come.”13 Among these languages Parthian was already a dead language in the

10. The super-province of Khurāsān is normally written as خراسان in Persian orthographic tradition, but it appears also as خراسائی (Khwarāsān/Khurāsān) in the manuscripts of Mujmal al-tawārikh, 309, 316, 330, and Rāvandi, 10, 18, 181 (apud Kiyā 1951: 315), among others.
11. For an extensive discussion, see Lazard 1971.
12. The literature connected to these dialects is best known as Fahlaviyyāt, an appellation given especially to the quatrains composed in “Pahlavi.” The eleventh-century poet Bābā ʿṬahir of Hamadān says: zabān-i pahlavi-rā āstād-am // maqām-i āṣiqi-rā az-bar astam “I master the Pahlavi language // I know by heart the musical mode of Love.” The use of fahlā (< MP pahlaw) for designating Media goes back to the late Arsacid times; see Henning 1958: 95.
13. On the other hand, none of the living dialects spoken in central-western Iran, i.e., the province of ancient Media (Jībāl or Persian Iraq), shows any affinity in this respect. This may be demonstrated historically as well. Māfarrūkhī Isfahānī, who was a contemporary of the poet Fakhr al-Dīn Gurgānī and also lived in Isfahān, included
eleventh century; Sogdian, even if still spoken, belonged to lands far away from Persia proper; and the tribal Baluchi dialects could not be characterized as “Pahlavi.” Thus, the only tenable “Pahlavi” the poet is referring to would be the Gurgani language.

Even though the above argument concerns only a single word of Gurgani, it is still quite important because of the unavailability of more evidence of the language outside of the Hurufi corpus of the fifteenth century. Nonetheless, the argument can be contested on the grounds that the term “Pahlavi” has been used elsewhere in Fakhr al-Din Gurgani’s poems in the sense of Middle Persian. In order to further clarify the point we need to turn to the question of the sources used by the poet.

The probable sources of Vis u Ramin have long been a contentious subject among scholars of Persian literature. As for the origin of the poem, Vladimir Minorsky demonstrated in a series of well-argued articles that the narrative is almost certainly Parthian; the evidence is drawn primarily from the toponyms and the names of the poem’s characters. The question that remains, however, is the immediate source(s) of Gurgani in the versification of the story. The arguments are best summarized by Dick Davis:

[...]

Gurgani’s description of his sources for the poem appears credibly circumstantial but on closer examination turns out to be somewhat vague. [Muhammad Ja’far] Mahjub calls it “an ambiguous explanation” [...], referring, as it does, to sources in both Middle (“Pahlavi”) and New (“Farsi”) Persian, and to texts but also to oral recitations (“samar-ha” [= samarhâ]). Gurgani simultaneously evokes both oral and written sources, and implies that the poem is at once a translation of a work in Middle Persian, and a reworking of a translation from Middle Persian into New Persian that has been put together by a number of other scholars whose work the poet is now presenting in a more aesthetically pleasing form. His explanation bears some resemblance to Ferdowsi’s account of his sources at the opening of the Šah-nâma, by which it may be influenced. This suggests that it is, perhaps, to be read as a conventional trope rather than as fact. That the tale existed before Gurgani’s time is, however, certain, since it is mentioned by the 8th century Arab poet Abu Nowâs.15

Gurgani is at pains to demonstrate that he is familiar with Middle Persian, but whether his source was in Middle or New Persian is unclear, and has been the subject of some scholarly discussion (summarized by Mahjub [ed., Vis u Ramin, Tehran 1337/1959, pp. 18–22]). Most scholars have concluded that it was probably in New Persian. Mahjub (p. 20) points out that although Gurgani refers to the difficulty of understanding some Middle Persian terms, he never refers to the difficulty of reading its notoriously demanding script, which suggests that if he worked from a text, it was one written in the Arabic-New Persian script.16

All things considered, there remains little doubt that the “Pahlavi” language Gurgani cites as the source of Vis u Ramin is indeed literary or book Pahlavi, i.e., Middle Persian, and not “Pahlavi” as a local vernacular.17 Nonetheless, this argument is not relevant to the

in his otherwise Arabic work Kitâb Mahâsîn Isfahân (composed between 465 and 485 A.H., available also in Persian translation by Avi, composed in 729) many words and sentences in the local Pahlavi of Isfahân. One of the sentences reads ti biši u an bi ma-yây-d “you may go and he may not come” (Tafazzoli 1971) from which the present stem of “come” is deduced as -â(y).

15. “[...] the existence of a Middle-Persian poem (or poems) on the subject is evidently implied by Hamzah al-Isfahani when, in his commentary on the divân of Abû Nuwâs, he explains the Arabic poet’s phrase firjardât Râmin wa Wis by saying that ‘firjardât [= fargards] are like odes [...]’” (de Blois 1992: 163).
16. Davis, “Vis o Râmin.”
17. The proposition that “Pahlavi” should be interpreted as the vernacular dialects was once brought up by A.-H. Zarrinkub (Sukhan 11.10 [1337/1958]: 1015–18), but was refuted by Minorsky (1962: 278f.).
verses cited above for two reasons: first, it seems that the poet quotes the Pahlavi words as if Pahlavi was a living language: “whoever knows Pahlavi”; then, the words he cites do not belong to Middle Persian, where (a)madan “to come” has the present stem āy, as is the case in New Persian.

V. HYRCANIA, PARTHIA, AND ṬABARISTĀN

It seems fitting here to provide some historical background that would aid us in understanding various socio-political influences on the Gurgānī language and its diachronic stages. This inquiry gains more significance when we realize that Gurgān, or Hyrcania of the Classical writers (from Old Persian *Vṛkāna-, the province “of the wolves”), was considered more often than not to be a sub-province rather than a province by itself. It was often linked with either Parthia (renamed Khūrāsān since late antiquity) or with its western neighbor Ṭabaristān—two historical provinces with their own particular Iranian languages. As Gurgān is not named separately in the provincial lists of the Achaemenian kings, but only once together with Parthia (DB 2.92), it appears to have been administered as a sub-province of Parthia. This conjecture is supported by the fact that, toward the end of the Achaemenian reign, the satrapy of Hyrcania and Parthia was in the hands of one man named Phrataphernes, who was reinstated by the victorious Alexander the Great.

Hyrcania had an intimate association with Parthia during the long reign of the Parthians. It was one of the first lands the Arsacid kings acquired. Though the focus of the Arsacid domain continued to move west, first to Ecbatana/Hamadān in central Media and then to Ctesiphon in Mesopotamia, Hyrcania continued its historic role intermittently. It served occasionally as a royal retreat from Babylon, as when Mithradates I resided there in 141 B.C.E. Two years later, when the Seleucid Demetrius II Nicator attempted the re-conquest of Iran, he was eventually captured by the Parthians and sent to the Arsacid king in Hyrcania, where he was lodged and given Rhodogune, daughter of Mithradates, in marriage. A further link between Hyrcania and the Arsacid throne is the Hyrcanian origin of Himerus, the tyrannical governor of Babylonia under Phraates II (ca. 138–128 B.C.E.). Moreover, displaced by the Roman-backed Tiridates III, the Parthian king Artabanus III (r. ca. 12–38 C.E.) retired to Hyrcania, where he lived in poverty until recalled by popular acclaim. A similar situation arose three years later between the brothers Gotarzes II and Vardanes. After having been displaced by his brother on the throne, Gotarzes fled to the Dahae (tribesmen on the northern borders of Hyrcania), with whose help he fought a sporadic campaign against Vardanes, but eventually agreed to retire to Hyrcania. Given this extensive and close connection of Gurgān with Parthia and the Parthians, one should expect, as this linguistic study will confirm, a rather profound affiliation of Gurgān with the Parthian language.

In Sasanian times, Gurgān was considered administratively as part of Khūrāsān. We find in Šahristānīhā-ī Erānšahr, a Middle Persian treatise on the towns of Persia and their builders: andar Gurgān šahrīstān i Dahistān xwāneñd Narseh i Aškānān kard “In Gurgān, the town called Dahistān was built by Narseh the Arsacid.”20 Dahistān, now western Turkmenistan, was the northern neighbor and often part of Gurgān, across the Atrak river. Unlike Gurgān, which was protected against the nomadic invasions by a long fortified wall, Dahistān was open to nomadic influx, and thus its linguistic situation was never stable. The

19. See Cambridge History of Iran, 21ff.; EIr, s.v. “Gurgān.”
21. Dahistān took its name from the Dahae, a Saka branch from which the Parni tribe moved southeast to Parthia and established the Arsacid dynasty.
southern neighbor of Gurgân, however, fits very well into our linguistic quest: Komisene, the medieval Qūmis, is comparable to Gurgân not only in size but also in terms of affinity to both Parthia and Tabaristan throughout history. As the aforementioned Sāhrisṭānīhā puts it, mānišn i *Pahlawīgān ānōh ābūd “the abode of the Parthians was there,”22 i.e., in Komisene. Al-Muqaddasi’s statement on the linguistic kinship of Gurgân, Qūmis, and Tabaristan (see III, above) is verified by the available linguistic data from each province.

In medieval times Gurgân (Jurjān in Arabic) was connected to either Tabaristan or Khurāsān. For a century or so after the Arab conquest of Persia, Gurgân was a buffer region between the resisting Ispahbads of Tabaristan and the invading Arab armies based in Khurāsān. Subsequently, Gurgân became the center of the Ziyārid principality founded by the Daylamite adventurer Mardāvij b. Ziyār (317–323/928–935). His descendants, however, had to submit, often precariously, to the mightier dynasties of the Sāmānids, Būyids, Ghaznavids, and ultimately the Saljuqs. As long as the super-province of Khurāsān, Persianized by then, was the political and cultural hub of eastern Islamic lands, it kept influencing the neighboring areas, Gurgân included. The Mongol conquest of the thirteenth century left Khurāsān and the Caspian provinces in devastation, and the town of Gurgân never recovered its original prosperity. After the Mongols Gurgân province was annexed politically to Tabaristan. From this time onward, Astarābād replaced Gurgân as the most important town of the province.23 Astarābād was the birthplace of Fażlallāh, the founder of the Ḥürüfī sect, who used the local vernacular for his religious propaganda under the Timūrids.

As stated above, Gurgān, or more specifically the dialect of Astarābād, vanished sometime before the nineteenth century. The language shift might have occurred not long after Fażlallāh—within a half-century or so when the movement was still active in Persia—if one assumes that the Lughat-i āstarābādī was compiled to make sense of the scripture in Gurgān. But this does not have to be the case, for even a handful of surviving adherents would be able to compile the dictionary in the centuries that followed.

What socio-political events might have contributed to the language shift? The infiltration of substantial Turkmen elements into the eastern and central parts of the Gurgān province from the fourteenth century onward led to the language shift to Turkic, but not necessarily in Astarābād, lying as it does in the southwestern corner of the province, which possesses its own variety of Persian (see VI, below). By the seventeenth century, Astarābād was the base of the Qājār tribe of the Turkmen, and remained so until Āghā Muḥammad Khān, born in Astarābād, founded the Qājār dynasty. Under the Qājārs, Astarābād acquired the popular epithet of dār al-muʿminin for the large number of sayyids living there. The religious importance of Astarābād is suggested also by the large number of mosques, shrines, and madrasas that Rabino lists in the early twentieth century.24 The status of Astarābād as both a political and a religious center appears to be sufficient reason for the language shift to have taken place in this last stronghold of Gurgān.

VI. POSITION OF GURGĀNĪ AMONG IRANIAN LANGUAGES

The major division in Iranian languages is between Eastern and Western Iranian, while the latter is divided into Southwestern (SW) and Northwestern (NW) groups. The modern

22. Marquart 1931, par. 18.
members of the SW group include New Persian (NP), which descends from Old Persian (OP) through Middle Persian (MP). No such definite pedigree can be established for any of the NW Iranian languages, to which Gurgānī belongs. The NW group has only Parthian (Ph.) representing the Middle Iranian period, and for this language neither any ancestors nor descendants are as yet identified. Parthian, however, remains a major frame of reference with which the New NW Iranian dialects can be diachronically compared.

The New phase of Iranian languages conventionally begins with the advent of Islam but more realistically from the tenth century. The New Iranian tongues are either living or have lost currency after being identified and documented by modern linguists, with two exceptions: the medieval Khwārazmīan, a descendant of ancient Choresmian, and Gurgānī. Synchronically speaking, Gurgānī should be contrasted against other members of the New NW Iranian group, namely, the Caspian group of languages; the Tātīc group, consisting of the Talysh (Tal.), Āzarī (Āz.), and Tātī (Tāt.); the Central Plateau Dialects (CDs); Gūrānī (Gūr.) and Zāzā (or Dimli), within the Kurдophone area; and, ultimately, Kurdish (Kd.) and Balūchī (Bal.).

From a geographical perspective Gurgānī belongs to the Caspian Sprachbund. It consists of (1) Māzandarānī (Māz.), spoken to the southeast of the Caspian Sea, with many dialects and a long history of documentation known as Ṭabarī (Ṭab.); (2) Gilākī (Gil.) along the southwestern Caspian littoral, with transition dialects such as Lāhijānī, and upland vernaculars like Gālish and Daylāmī; (3) the ring of dialects around Simnān, south of Gurgānī, including Shāhmirzādī (a Ṭabarī dialect) and Sangisāri (Sang.), Aftārī (Aft.), Surkha’ī, and Lasgirdī, constituting the group I have designated as Komisenian. Talysh can also be included in the Caspian Sprachbund, and Gūrānī and Zāzā probably originated from the Caspian region.

The similarities Gurgānī shares with other members of the Caspian group include (1) a lack of ergative construction in the past conjugation of transitive verbs, as in Māzandarānī and Gilākī, which are perhaps influenced by Persian; (2) a prevalence of postpositions, an areal trait; (3) a lack of direct/oblique inflection in kinship terms such as mār and pīar, as against some other NW dialects; (4) a similar system of personal pronouns; and (5) common words such as xajir “fine,” talār “stable,” mazg?t “mosque,” barfa “brow” with Māzandarānī and Gilākī; a striking similarity is Gur. vār-, bāt- “say” corresponding to Māz. (v)āt-, bā(u)t-. This list is anything but exhaustive, and none of the items is unique enough to

25. In this article, NP stands for Classical New Persian, while “Pers.” refers to Modern New Persian.
26. The NW/SW distinction, however, is not as distinct a gauge in the classification of New Iranian languages as it applies to the Middle and Old Iranian periods. The majority of the modern dialects traditionally classified as NW show some degree of affinity with the SW or Perside group. For instance, Kurdish and Balūchī, in some of their most innate strata, share with Persian the isoglotic sound changes *kw > s, *tr > s, *d?w > d, corresponding to the characteristically NW sp, (h)tr, b, respectively. The strict binary classification has recently been contested by Ludwig Paul (1998b), who proposed a scale of “northern-ness” for Western Iranian languages. His model ranks Kurdish and Balūchī as comparatively “south” within the NW group, while Gūrānī and Āzarī constitute the northernmost end of the spectrum, for their isoglotic developments compare best with Parthian, the only known NW language from the Middle Iranian period.
27. The transition dialects between Gilākī and Māzandarānī may properly be called Rūyānī, after Rūyān, the medieval name of the region.
28. See Borjian 2008b.
29. Interesting also is the Gurgānī stem g.? “say,” which, though cited only once in the Ḫurūfī documents, shows that the verb “to say” could be derived from two distinct Old Iranian roots *wak and *gaub. See Borjian 2008a.
make a solid connection among the members of the Caspian group. A systematic comparison of Gurgāni against other NW Iranian languages will throw light on the history of their development.

As Māzandarāni (and its older form Ṭabarī) is geographically one of the closest languages to Gurgāni, an assessment would be fitting. A striking difference between the two languages is the development of OIr. ān to Ṭabarī ān and its retention in Gurgāni.30 This trait has been characteristic of Ṭabarī ever since its earliest documents from the tenth century, e.g., mar-думān, nihīn, kayhān in the surviving poems of Divāravaz31 and other specimens from subsequent centuries until the present. The fact that the current Persian of Gurgāni has exclusively ān, an inheritance from the extinct language of the Ḥurūfī scriptures, and that other living Iranian dialects, including those of Persian, use ān to various extents,32 compels us to place Māzandarāni and Gurgāni at the two ends of this isoglossic spectrum.

Some other differences between Gurgāni and Māzandarāni include: (1) the possessive marker: Gur. -en, Māz. -e; (2) Māz. past stem formants -i- and -ess- are not characteristic in Gurgāni; (3) personal endings are not geminated in Gurgāni as they are in Māzandarāni due to the shift of the old participial *-ant- from the stem to the ending;33 (4) the old first person singular verb ending -ān is present in Gurgāni but not in Ṭabarī; (5) the original /b/- weakens to /v/- in Māzandarāni but remains in Gurgāni: bi- (Māz. var-) “carry, take away,” band- (Māz. vand-) “tie,” b.rin- (Māz. verin-) “cut”; (6) Iranian *-ē- develops to Gurgāni ē and Māz. j; (7) the original back vowel u is occasionally fronted in Māzandarāni but not in Gurgāni: du (Māz. ā) “smoke,” šu (Māz. ši) “husband,” palu (Māz. pali) “at, near”; (8) the Māzandarāni assimilation nd > nn is absent in the available Gurgāni materials. This selective comparison could be both expanded and fine-tuned if the geographical varieties of Māzandarāni as well as its diachrony were taken into consideration.

VII. NOTES ON THE TRANSCRIPTION AND PHONOLOGY

The Gurgāni vowels remain obscure. The standard Persian orthography of the Ḥurūfī texts makes it impossible to establish the phonemic values of kasra (short /l/ ~ /l/), ẓamma (short /u/ ~ /o/), and the diphthongs (/lay/ ~ /ley/ and /aw/ ~ /ow/). To avoid the contrast between the long and short vowels, I have transcribed the vowels in agreement with current standard Persian; thus, ā, a, i, e, u, o, /ey/, and /e/, /ow/. This is indeed an arbitrary choice: the time of composition of the Ḥurūfī texts, namely, the late fourteenth century, roughly corresponds to the time when the great shift in the Persian vocalic system is supposed to have taken place.34 Nevertheless, the majhūl vowel /e/ is transcribed as such wherever it is deemed fit. A dot is used when the vowel is unknown, e.g., x-jir “fine.”

As for the consonants, the Ḥurūfī texts frequently follow the Persian orthographic tradition that renders both /b/ and /p/ as چ, /k/ and /g/ as گ, /z/ and /l/ as ژ, and /j/ and /l/ as چ. The cases with well-established etymology are adjusted. However, the confusion among the con-

30. An exception is xun-/xund-, which appear alongside the more frequent xʷ“ān-/xʷe̞nd- “read.” The book title Nawm-nāma, has also been cited as Nām(a)-nāma “Book of Names” (see I.2, above). The latter title sounds more Ṭabarī than Gurgāni, though the expected Ṭabarī form would be Nām(a)-nāma; cf. Nēki-nāma, an extinct Ṭabarī work of the eleventh or twelfth century.

31. Ibn Isfandiyār, 139.


33. See VIII.15, below, under the verb stem kar-.

34. The three pairs of short/long vowel sounds a/ā, i/i, u/ū of Classical Persian have developed, respectively, into the largely length-free æ/l, ã, u in Ṭibrāni Persian, and the Classical majhūls ē and ō into e and i, respectively.
sonants /č/, /ğ/, and /ž/ needs to be addressed here. The phoneme /č/ occurs etymologically only in the initial position, e.g., če(či) “what” and či “thing”; the corresponding scribal forms je(ji) and ji are due to the aforementioned orthographic habit. /ž/ has a high frequency; it is a characteristic development from the OIr. medial *-č-, as in andāž- “throw,” āmuž- “learn,” rīž- “pour, spill,” suž- “burn,” sāž- “make,” vāž- “under,” etc., as shown in VIII.6, below. /ğ/ has a rather low turnout; Gurgānī typically preserves the OIr. *j in words like jan “woman,” jinda “alive,” and jan-/ji- “strike” (see VIII.7); but /ğ/ appears also elsewhere, including as a variant of /ž/ where the latter is expected: ruj “day.” The reverse trend, in jinda ~ ženda “alive,” suggests the interchangeability of these two phonemes, a trait that is not unusual in other Iranian dialects of the same family. The idea of proposing more than one dialect for Gurgānī is not particularly attractive when the bulk of the Ḥurūfī materials is reportedly composed by two individuals, namely, Fāżllallāh and his son-in-law (see I, above).

Difficult to justify, however, is the alteration of /č/ with the other two consonants:

ruž, ruj, ruč “day” < OIr. *raucah-
jan, čan “woman, wife” < OIr. *jani-
jinda, ženda, čenda, činda “alive” < OIr. *jiwa-nła-ka-

The presence of /č/ in these words can be attributed to orthographic confusion between the letters ħ and č, differing only in the number of dots.36 It would have been possible to further investigate the case based on frequency of occurrence had Kiyā given the concordances in his Vāžanāma-yi gurgānī. One may be tempted to explain the form ruč “day” as retention of the OIr. *-č in this word, but this is untenable because there are ample examples, as given above, supporting the *-č- > /ž/ development. Another justification, this time synchronically, is that č stood for the dental affricate [dz], an ongoing development of the palatal [dž], while the latter phoneme was ousting [ž]. But this is hard to support since none of these trends is identified in current Gurgānī Persian.

Other anomalous orthographic forms include the occurrence of both zovān and źovān “tongue,” xʷāz- and xʷāř- “want,” and variz- and variz- “stand, rise”; in these pairs the words with /ž/ are untenable and should be attributed again to scribal incompetence. In the pair ažen and azen “thus,” however, the latter word is merely Persianized.

VIII. HISTORICAL PHONOLOGY

1. The development of Indo-Iranian palatals to fricatives, one of the oldest isoglossic splits among the Iranian languages, is rather poorly represented in Gurgānī, as is the case in most other NW Iranian languages.

35. The non-etymological presence of j in x-jir “fine” (for the expected ħ) and jovā “separate” (instead of y-; see VIII.4 and VIII.8.1, below) is justified by assuming that these words are loans. Note also tanjūk “elastic,” cited in Zakhira-yi khāramzāhī (see VIII.15, below).

36. This orthographic error is different than when the real č is stylistically scribed as j, as in čišī “thing.”

1.1. PIE (proto-Indo-European) *kʷ/*g(h) > proto-Ir. *ts/dz > NW s/z, SW θ (> h)/d:

zân- "know," cf. Av. zân-, Pth. zân-, Aft. zon-, STal. zon-, CDs zun-/zon-, Gür., Zâz., Kur-
mânji Kd., Bal. zân-; contrasting with OP dân-, Mâz. dün-, Gil. dân-. Also zâna "knowledgeable," cf. Pth. zânind "id."

As for the unvoiced phoneme *k > s, Gurgâni not only lacks more characteristic examples to support its NW lineage, but it shows the contrary in two noteworthy cases: mhin "large(s)," apparently a borrowing from Classical Persian meh-in ← MP mah-ist < OP mah-
išta- "biggest," cf. Av. mas-išta-, Pth. mas-ist, Aft. mas-in, Kd. maz-in, CDs mas; kâh- "re-
duce" < OIr. *kâs-a-.

1.2. PIE *kw/*gw > proto-Ir. *tsw/dzw > NW sp/zb, SW s/z:

espî(d) "white" (and espahi "whiteness") < Mlr. *spētak (> MP spēd), cf. Arm. (< Ir.) spitak, Mâz. espi, Tal. isbî/spi, Sedehtî espe, Kd. spi, etc. (see also 8.1).

zovân/zavân38 "tongue," cf. Av. hizuu-, OP hizân-, Mâz. zîvun, NTal. zîvon, Zâz. zîwân, Kûpâ. zun, J.İsf. ozun, etc.

2. OIr. *dw- > NW b, SW d-:

abi (adi)39 "again" < bîti40 < *dwitiyya-; cf. Av. dva-, be- "two," Pth. byd, MP bid "(an)other, again," Zâz. bin "other, this," Anârâki abi "again, anymore," Gabri be "(an)other," bdi "again;" Mâz. ay, adi, Aft. ayni "other," adi "again, then," NP digar "again, anymore; else, other," Gil. de, digar "else, other."41 This sole example may not be compelling enough to demonstrate this Middle Iranian development in Gurgâni. A typical example would be bar "door," as found in Parthian and New NW Iranian dialects (save for Kurdish, Balîchi, and most Caspian vernaculars); for this gloss Gurgâni seems to have shared the SW dar (< OIr. *dwar-) with Persian (and Mâzandarâni).

3. The fricative cluster *ðr (an Old Iranian split) and similar later developments of *xr and *fr, all yielding the NW hr.

3.1. OIr. *ðr > *hr > r (for the strident ζ in OP, and s in MP, Bal., Kd., Khûrî):

---

38. Also žovân; see VII, above.
39. Adi only in Mahram-nâma.
pur “son” < OIr. *puθra-, cf. Av. puθra-, Pth. puθr, Aft. pûr, Tab. pur,42 CDs por(a), pur, pûr, pir, etc.; OP puça-; MP pus, NP puθ(a)r), Rk. pis, Bal. pusag (with *ag < *-aka), Gil./Máz. pasar.

mâr “mother,” cf. Av. māṁrō-, genitive of mātar-; Zâz. mâr(i), etc. (cf. 8.1).

On the other hand, characteristic glosses such as “pregnant” (OIr. *ā-puθra-), “mill” (*arθra-), and “sickle” (*dâθra-) are absent in the Gurgâni texts. Nor is there an example of initial *θr > hr, found in the numeral “three” in some NW dialects. Yet pur alone seems to be sufficient to establish the Northwestern position of Gurgâni for this isogloss.

3.2. OIr. *xr > *hr > r:


3.3. OIr. *fr- > *hr > h/-r-. This development is reflected in the preverbal hâ-43 in hâ-de- “give,” hâ-gîr- “get,” hâ-band- “tie up,” hâ-kar- “do,” etc.44 It compares with Máz. ha/hâ-, EGil. ha-, CDs ha-, Alviri and Vafsi (semi-Tatic languages) hâ-, corresponding to WGil. fa-, MP, NP f(ar)är-; thus from OIr. *frâ- “forth.”45 The preverb appears as the frozen part of the stem in the following verbs:


erš/-eršov- “send”46 (OIr. *fra-iš-ta-, cf. Pth. fra-šâw/-frašûd-, Máz. ras(s)-lrsi-; and the causative stems EMáz. rs-end/-rsendi-, Natanzi harasan-, Jawshaqâni arasn-, Sedehî feres-n-).48 See also 6.1, 8.5.

4. OIr. *y- and *wy- coalesced into y-, contrasting with SW j-:

yâgâh “place,” cf. Pth. wyâg, MP gyâg, S. Tâti yâga, Gûr. yâga, Gabrî yôga, Khunsârî yaya, Kûpâ. (as some other CDs) yâ, Sivandi gâ, yâ; but NP jây, Máz. jâ, Aft. jîgâ, Gil. jîga, Rk. jiag, ji, jê(ga), jaw.49

Subsequently, we encounter the problematic jovâ “separate,” cf. Pth. ywu, MP juḍ(āg), Zâz. jîyâ, Rk. jîhê, Bal. jîtâ. Gurgânî may have borrowed this word with the initial j- (see also 8.1). The Hûrûfî documents lack representative glosses such as “barley” (OIr. *yaw-), “find” (*yaud-), “boil” (*yauša-), and “chew” (*jyaw-), for which Parthian, Tatic, Gûrânî, and CDs

42. Only occasionally appears in the nineteenth-century Kanz al-asrâr 1860–64.
43. The preverb hâ- should not be confused with the durative verbal prefix he/-hi-/h.m.- (see Kiyâ 1951: 266f.).
44. Corresponding to EMáz. ha-de- “give,” hâ-gîr- “get,” hâ-band- “tie,” hâ-kar- “do.”
45. Alternatively, it is proposed that the preverb is ultimately derived from *hama-aiva-da “same time” or parts thereof. See Windfuhr, in CLI 256. See also idem 1975.
46. The conjugated forms are b-erš-ān “that I send,” eršov-an “to send,” (b-)eršov-ī “he sent,” n-eršov-ī “he sent not” (Huart 1909: 191; Kiyâ 1951: 69, 316).
47. Following the RUKI law of Ar. rs, us, ks, is > Ir. rš, uš, kš, iš, respectively.
48. For other CDs, see Krankhe 1976: 160f.
49. See also Kiyâ 1951: 333.
have retained the initial semivowel *y-. Nevertheless, this development is not straightforward among the rest of the Northwestern Iranian languages; Ṣabari, Aftari, and Zāzā have the typical SW j-, and Tatische y- is possibly due to the secondary change (as in yan “woman” < *jan in some dialects).50 Notwithstanding the absence of parallel words, yāgāh alone makes a strong case for Gurgāni to be placed on the conservative side of the isoglossic split.

5. Retention of Ori. *w- in many words.

5.1. v- instead of NP b-:

vā “wind” < Ori. *wāta-, cf. Pth., MP wād, Māz. vā, Gūr. wā, Zāz. wa(y)-, CDs vā(y); Kd. bā(h), Bal. gwāt.

vā(ž)-vāt- “say” (or bāzh- < *ba-vāz-) < Ori. *wācā-/wāxt-, cf. Pth. wāz-/wāxt-, Gūr. wāt-/wāč-, Kūpā. wāz-/wāt-, Māz. bāur-/bāut-,51 Gūr. wāč-, Zāz. vāj-, Old Āzari vāč-, Kd. bēž- (see also 6, 8.3).


vin- “see” < Ori. *wain-, cf. Pth. and MP wēn-, Māz. vin-, Zāz. vin-/vēn-en-, NTal. vin-; Kd. bin-, Bal. gind-.

vini “nose,” cf. Av. vaenā-, MP wēnig, NTal. vni, Simn. vāni, Māz. fen; NP bēnī.


MP abāz, NP bāz, vā, Kd. bāž-.

var “side” < Ori. warah-, cf. Av. varah- “bosom,” MP war, Māz. var; NP bar, Bal. gur, gwar. Also varābar for NP barābar “equal.”

var “to(ward), onto” (as in var man “to me”), cf. Māz. -vari, NP bar.

Note: For vin- and vāt- there are alternative forms bin- “see” and bāt- “say,” respectively. Bin- seems to be a Persianism, and bāt- can be a contraction of *ba-vāt-. Alternatively, one may consider the phoneme [β], which yields both orthographic forms <b> and <v>, but this conjecture needs more evidence.

5.2. *w- > v, for NP g-:


veša- “open” (see 15).

vesn- “rupture,” cf. EMāz. ves-end- (causative stem), ves- (past stem), bosse (p. p.) “ruptured”;

MP wisinn-/wisist- (< Ori. *wi-sind-/sis-ta-, from the root *said).

Given the abundance of instances in which the old *w- is retained in Gurgāni, the forms godār, godar “pass” must be borrowings from NP gušār (< Ori. *wi-ta/ār-ya- or *wi-čār-a-, respectively). Likewise, the past stem gozārd- “accomplish” (NP guzārd- < MP wizārd- < Ori. *wi-čār-ta-). See also 8.1.2, 8.2.


51. See Borjian 2008a.
6. PIE *w > OIr. *-č- > *j > ʒ (for SW z):


ruž “day” (see also VII, above) (and ruž “fasting”) < OIr. *raučah-; cf. Av. ravočah-, Sog. rōč, Pth. rōž, Pashto rwaaj, Kd. rōž, NTal. rūž, Záž. rōj, Máz. ruyja “morning star.”

andāža “measure” < OIr. *ham- táča-ka- (*tak-), cf. NP andāza.

andāž- “throw” < OIr. *ham- táča- (*tak), cf. NP andāz-.

āmuź- “learn” < *ā-mauč- < OIr. *ā-mauče- (*mauk), cf. NP āmōz-.

nāmāz “prayer,” cf. NTal. nūmōž; NP namāz.


vāţ “again” < OIr. *apāča-, cf. Pth. abāţ; MP abāz.

riż- “pour, spill” < OIr. *räčáva- (*raik); cf. Kúpā. reţ-, Gabri rij-, Kd. ɾiţ-.

suž- “burn” < OIr. *sauča- (*sauk), cf. Máz. sus-.

sāţ- “make” < OIr. *sāča- (*sak), cf. Pth. sāţ-; MP sāţ-.

vāţ(ż) “say” and váţzanda “speaker” (see 5.1).

a(ţ) “from” (also aţir “hence,” aţen “thus”), cf. Av. hača, OP hača, Pth. aţ, Old Țab. aj, ay52 (< *aţ), Āzari aj, Bal. aţ, aś; Máz. jefjā, Gil. jofja, Kd. ʐfje, aţ, Țaz. joy;53 MP az.

6.1. In the latter examples a tendency for the weakening of the final ʒ > *y > ʃ is evident. This process may also have occurred in the postposition -yā “to,” with54 (as in xodā rasul-yā vāta bi “God had said to the Prophet”)55 < ? *hača (cf. a(ţ), just above). A more interesting case is the preverb y- r-, as in y-r-āš/-āh- “descend,”56 comparable to žīr “down, under,” as listed above. Cf. the frozen preverb er- in er-šov- “send,” MP er “under” (see also 3.3).

6.2. Moreover, we have x-ţir “fine” < *hu-čhir, cf. Pth. huţhir “id.,” NP iţir “id.” (in Burhān-i qāti’), Jarquyi iţir “id.”; the unusual *č > j suggests that the Gurgānī lexeme is a borrowing from Máz. xojir/xajir (see also VII, above). We also encounter the clearly dialectal lexeme veriz- “flee,” with the NW v- (see 5.2) but SW -z-, as in NP gurēz- “flee.” Note also the causative var-angizan- “instigate”; cf. MP hangēz- < ? OIr. *ham-gaiz-a- (see Cheung, s.v. *gaiz).

7. PIE *g(w)(h) > OIr. *j > NW j (cf. SW z):

jan “woman, wife” (for orthographic variation, see VII, above) < OIr. *jani-, cf. Av. jaini/-janay-, Pth. țan. The living NW Iranian dialects exhibit various stages of the development chain j > ʒ > y: Zăz. jana, jin-ëk, Bal. jan, Kd. żin, Tal. ţen (but yen in Mășulă’i),

53. Apparently, a combination of *hača- and an old pronoun.
54. Cf. the ablative/instrumental postposition -jeʃa in Mășandăranī.
55. Kiyā 1951: 204.
56. yar-, in Huart’s transcription. This preverb is also used in the Ḥurūfi documents to imply the opposite meaning “up, above” but this case appears to be a scribal error due to confusion between ɾ and j (see Huart 1909: 210; Kiyā 1951: 206–9, 333). The preverb y- could indeed be used in both senses “under” and “above”—surely with different vowels—following the patterns in the related antonymic pairs in other languages: Máz. jer “under, below” = jurfjor “above, up,” Máz. yar “the far side (e.g., of a river)” = yurfjor “the near side,” Zăz. (a)jër ≠ (a)jōr “up(ward), above,” Sang. žir “under” ≠ žor “on, up,” Kd. žër ≠ žōr, MP azēr ≠ azabar. Cf. Jarquyi yevaron “this way.”
Āzari of Kiringān yan; CDs: Vrz. jan, Tārī. čin, Quhrūdi yan. The SW form is seen in MP zan, Māz. zanā.

jan-/ji- “strike”< Olr. *jan/*jata- (root *jan, PIE *gʷhwen “kill”), cf. Pth. żan-/žad-; Māz. zan-/zu-, Gil. zan-/zā-. See also 8.1.1.


8. Olr. *-t- lost its dental quality, except in the clusters *xt and *ft, which are reduced to t, and in *st, *nt.

8.1. *-t- > *d > ø, y, and, probably, v. The softening or total loss of the dental plosive in medial and final positions is the rule:


vā “wind” (see 5.1).


jovā “separate” (see 4).

espea, esp(î)d “white” (see 1.2). The abstract nominal espa hi “whiteness,” with the prothetic h, proves that the ending -d in this Gurgānī word is influenced by literary Persian.

kām-n “which (one),” cf. MP kaddām, NP kudām(ēn), Tājīk kādīm(ēh), Awr. kām(ēn).

-a(d), the pres. ending for third pers. sg., cf. Pth. -ēd.

8.1.1. This rule includes the past stems built on the Old Iranian participle formant *-ta-:

di- “see” (also vādi “appear,” see 12.1) < Olr. *di-ta-, cf. MP did-, Māz. di-, NTal. di-, Kd. di-.

ri- “buy” (see 3.2).

ji- “strike” (see 7).

bi-an “to be” < Olr. *būta-, cf. MP būdan, Māz. biu, Gil. boon, NTal. be.

Other attested past stems include: b-? “become,” d-? “give,” š(ov)-? “go,” n(eh)-? “put” (n-hān “to place,” p. p. nahā “placed”), zāy- “give birth,” nemu(y)- “show,” ras(i)-? “arrive,” kaš(i)-? “drag,” (a)šnow-? “hear,” āfari- “create,” etc. The fact that several verbs have present and past stems undistinguished (e.g., da-dam- “blow,” and, perhaps, some of the stems listed above) suggests that the Middle West Iranian formant -id- or -ād- has been reduced to semivowels and then absorbed into the past stem.

8.1.2. The profusion of the abovementioned examples implies that the words that have retained the postvocalic dental stop should be considered borrowings. Such are the following

57. Also ba-ham va-jī-an “to mix/stir” (Kiyā 1951: 177).
58. See Nyberg 1974: 12.
words which reflect the well-known secondary development in early New Persian: *-t- > d > ə (only postvocalic), yielding z in modern times.

**padir** “accepting, agreeable to” (as in qesmat-padir “dividable” and delpadir “pleasant”) < OIr. *patri-grbya- ("grab"), cf. Pth. paōgivr-, MP padir-, NP padir-/paōir-.

**godar** “pass, cross over,” cf. NP guwār- < MP wider- (widardan/widaštan) “pass (by, away), cross” and widar “passage, entrance” < OIr. *wi-tar-yə-; cf. J.Iṣf. vezer-/vezaš-. 59

**godār** “pass,” cf. NP guwār- < Pth./MP widar- (widārdan) “let pass, transport; endure, suffer” < OIr. *wi-tar-yə- (*tarH “cross over” < IE *terH2); NP guwār- < MP wizār- (wizārdan) “separate, explain, interpret; perform, fulfill, redeem,” wizār “separation; explanation” < OIr. *wi-ḵār-a- (*čarH “move” IE *kʰelH₁; for an alternative, see Cheung, 34). Note that these words are already shown to be borrowings in the past perfective which failed to pass the *w- > v test (5.2).

**ezen** “thus,” cf. Classical NP ēōn < MP ēdōn < OIr. *aia-gauna-. Kiyā60 conducted a comparative study of the lexeme by drawing parallels from the Persian pairs čunin ~ čunān in Central Dialects: Khūrī ezon ~ azon, Farrukhi ezen/ezo ~ azan/āzo, Khūnsārī izan ~ uzan; by analogy, then, the corresponding pair in Gurgānī may have been ezen ~ āzen/ezan. Further extending the analogy, Gurgānī ham(ā)zən would yield the pair ha'māzen ~ hamezen (for NP hamčunān ~ ḫumčunin).

8.2. Consequently, the OIr. sequence *rta > Mlr. *urd/ird > i(y) is attested in the following past stems (from the old participles in *-ta-):

āv(i)-? (ای) “bring” (with the pres. stem ār-) < OIr. *ā-br-ta- (*bar), cf. Pth. āwāy-/āwāst-, Pth., MP, NP āwurd-, Māz. (y)ār-/yārd-, NTal. vārd-.

bi?- “carry” (pres. stem bar-), cf. Pth. bar-/burd-; Māz. va(r)-/vərd-.

k(i)- “do” (pres. stem kar-), cf. Av. karta-, OP karta-, Pth. kird-; Māz. kard-; see also 15.

mi?- “die” (pres. stem mir-), cf. Av. mṛtā-, OP marta-, Pth. mir-/murd-; EMāz. mia(r)-/mərd-, NTal. mard-.

Therefore, (e)sprd-62 “hand over” (for NP ispurd/sipurda < MP abespurd- < OIr. *abi-spr-ta- (*sparr “let go”) should be a borrowing. Insufficient linguistic data make it difficult to establish whether this development is universal in Gurgānī or is limited to the morphonological process in the past stems of verbs. Note: OIr. *rta, where *r is a full consonant, is retained in gozārd- “accomplish” (*wi-čār-ta-) (proven to be a borrowing in 5.2), vā-gard- “return,” and gārdan- “make rotate.” Cf. also gerd āhian “to come round, to assemble.”

8.3. OIr. *xt > *ht > -t:

dot/dut “daughter, girl” < OIr. *duxta-, cf. Aft. dot, Māz. datr, Gil. datar, Kūpā. doti, Kd. dō(t); MP/NP dux(ar).

dut- “sew” < OIr. *duxta- (*dug), cf. Māz. dut-; MP dōxt-.

vāt- “say” (see 5.1).

rit- “poor, spill” < OIr. *raixta- (*raik), cf. Aft. rit-; MP/NP rēxt-.

---

59. For the historical development of this verb in various Iranian dialects, see Stílo, “Isfahan”: 100–101.


61. One may add Vafšī azin, āzān, kāzān (for Pers. intawr, ḍantawr, čitawr).

62. Cf. the entry <spry> in Kiyā 1951: 127, where the author has inserted this comment (without any further explanation): "<spry> is incorrect, and <sprdy> or <sprdy> is correct."
Therefore, words with -fi- should be treated with caution: eškāft- “split, unsew, burst” ← NP iškāft- < MP škāft- < Olr. *uz-kāf-ta- (*kaf); frefta “seduced” ← NP firēfta; yāft- “find” ← NP yāfi- < MP ayāfi- < Olr. *abi-āfta- from the root *āp (for the pres. stem, see 12.1).

8.5. Olr. *-st and št: NW št, SW st.65

ešt-, v(er)ašt- “stand, rise,”66 cf. Pth. ʿşt-, ʿyšt- “stay, be situated,” ʿwyšt- “be situated” (< *abi-hiesta-, *sta), ʿwyšt- “put,”67 MP ēšt- “stand, stay” (< *abi-), ōštā- “set out” (< *awa-), Kd. we-sta “tired,” Bal. ʾōšt- “stand” (< *awa-), Gil. viriz-/virišt- “stand up, rise,” Māz. essā-. For the present stem, see 9.


Other verbs containing the clusters are similar to those in Persian: hast- “be,” šost- “wash,” šekast- “break,” va-rošt- “grow up,” košt- “kill,” dāšt- “have,” nevešt- “write.”


9. x/h.


63. Occurs only once in the Ḥurūfī documents (Kiyā 1951: 75).
64. See Borjian 2008a.
65. For more details, see Hubschmann, 236; Tedesco, 203.
10. PIE *xw- > OIr. *hw/xw- (Av. *huu-, xw-, OP *huu-) > x (or, less likely, xw, corresponding to the orthographic form ḥ ).

xʷāz-/xʷāšt- “want, wish, desire” (see 15).

xʷāv “sleep” (see 12.1).

xʷostan (reflexive pronoun) < OIr. *hwapiadāia-.

xʷo “sun,” cf. NP xʷar.

Gurgānī shares this isogloss with the SW group, which retains OIr. *xw-. In the NW group, the Parthian form wx- (a metathesis of the original) is reduced either to h- (in Tatic) or to w- (in Zāzā, Gūrānī, Balūchī), or else the Median f- is present (in Khūrī, Sivandi).69

11. OIr. *-rd/*-rz > l characterizes SW languages since the Middle Iranian period, yet it is systematically met in Gurgānī (e.g., da-māl “rub,” yal “allow”), Māzandarānī, Gilakī, and Kurdish, contrasting with Zāzā, Gūrānī, and Tatic, which retain the old cluster in some words. Typical examples of this isogloss are OIr. *zrd- > Av. *zorād-, Pth. zirō, Bal. zird, MP dīl, Gūr. dīl, Kd. dīl, NTal. dīl. Gurgānī del “heart”; OIr. *wyda- > Pth. wār, Arm. (Ir.) vard, MP gul, Simn. vel, Zāz. wīl(īk), Awr. wīlī, Kd. gul, Gurgānī gol “rose.”

12. Old Iranian bilabials are characteristically retained in the initial position and softened postvocally.

12.1. Medial OIr. *-p/-*b- > β, ν


xʷāv “sleep” < OIr. *xwapa-, cf. Pth. xwamr, MP xwāp/b, NP xʷāb, Māz. xō, xū, Gūr. warm, NTal. han.

šu “night” < OIr. *xšapa-, cf. Pth./MP šab, Māz. šū, šō, Zāz. šau, Sedehi šō:, NTal. šav, Kd. šav.


lav “lip,” cf. MP lab, Awr. law.

avrīšm “silk” < OIr. *upa-raš(a)-ma-?, cf. MP/NP abrēšum, Simn. ōwrišun, NTal. avšum.

yāv “find,” cf. NP yāb- < MP ayāb- “obtain, acquire, attain” < OIr. *abi-āp-a- (*ap/af “achieve”). The Gurgānī past stem yāf- appears to be a borrowing; see 8.4.


vāya “desire, want” (see 15).

vāž/vāz “again” < OIr. *apāča-, Pth. abāz, MP abāz.

vā “with, to” < OIr. *upa-aka-, cf. MP abāg, NP bā, bāz (< *upāča-), Old Ṭab. vā,70 Bakhtiyrī wā.

vā-dī “appear” (as in vādī āhi = NP padid āmad), cf. NP bādīd, bāz-i did, padid, MP padid “at sight, apparent” < *upa-dītī- (*dai “see”; not attested in OIr.).


vā- (preverb: vākar- “do,” vāvin “examine”), corresponding to NP bā.

12.2 Note also:


āvī-? “bring” (see 8.2).

sep “apple,” cf. NP and Gil. sēb, Kd. sēv, Aft. sey, Māz. st(f), Sedehī sō.

13. Loss of consonants as secondary developments.


The final nasal appears to have been lost in a “that” (cf. NP ān), ače (for NP änči), ažaru “because of,” a-paś/pas “then, after,” aku “there,” iku “here,” but retained in en “this,” enku “here.” Note also the durative marker, which takes various forms: h-, hi-, hamī- (cf. MP hamē(w)- < *hama-aiwa-).


13.3 Loss of consonants in the medial position: -g- in diar “other” (NP digar, Tajik dialect ḍus), niā “look” (NP nigāh, dial. niā); -h- in nān, variant of nehān “to put.” It is hard to conclude whether palu “side” (cf. Māz. pali) is a reduction of MP pahlūg < OP *partūka-, or it is from the Avestan form parsu-; -v- in ni-tān, for NP na(mē) tavān.


14.1 As in most Western Iranian dialects, the majhūl vowel ē is retained in a limited number of lexemes and in apparently shortened form: ṭarek(i) “dark(ness)” (cf. NP ṭeρēk(i), Tājik mopek(u), kāmen (for NP kuštāmēn), en “this,” hamen “this same,” ezen (cf. NP ēdōn), f-refta “seduced” (NP fîtrefta, Tājik ḵarēftma). The numeral “one” appears as 〈hyy, hyy〉, implying the pronunciation ḥe, cf. Pth. ėw, Av. aēva-, OP aīva- (also in hē-ta “unique,” hē-bār “once, one time,” hē-diar “one another,” hē-sān “alike,” hē-shanbe “Sunday,” hē-shava “overnight”). The orthography 〈sph, 〈spy, 〈spyd〉 “white” strongly implies a pronunciation espē(d). But the reflexive pronoun xwoštan, cf. NP xwēštan, carries no majhūl, probably because of the influence of w (see 10).

14.2. The low vowels demonstrate shift (1) from long to short (i.e., back to front): van “roof” (< OIr. *pāna-), xoda “God” for NP xudā, ama “we” (cf. Pth. amaḥ, Tal. ama, Māz. amā), šama/shoma “you” (cf. Pth. aṣmāh, Māz. šamā), the causative marker -an- in verbs, t-lār (cf. Māz. tšlār, Pth. tšlāwr/talwār, NP tāl(ār), Arm. (< Ir.) talaur “tent, cabin,” Khot.

71. See also 6.1 for the weakening of the final ē and 8.1 for loss of OIr. *t, etc.
15. Some Gurgānī verbs.

**kar-/k(i)**- “do,” with the present stem without the nasal infix, an outstanding NW characteristic. The past stem is perhaps reduced from *kird- < Ofr. kr-ta- (see 8.2), cf. Pth. kar-/kird-, Simn. kar-/kard-, Kd. ka-/kird-, etc. On the other hand, we have NP pres. kun- (< OP kunau- < Ofr. *kr-naw-) and past kard- (< Ofr. *krt-ta-), and Māz. kən-/kard-, Gln. Kun-/kud-.

**ās-/āhi**- “come.” As in many other Iranian languages, the pres. stem is from *ai “go” < PIE H₂ei- “go” (with the inchoative marker *-sa- < PIE *sk(h)e) and the past stem from *gam “come” < PIE g*em- “go; come,” both with the prefix *-a-. Cf. Pth. ās-/āyad- (and *hwr-š’n “sunrise, east”), Sog. *ys-/yrt-, Bal. āsāy “rise of stars,” rōšāsān “sunrise.” On the other hand, NP āy- (< *ā-i-a-), āmad- (< *ā-gma-ta-). The past stem unites Gurgānī with Parthian, Balūchī, and Kurdish, and distinguishes it from other Caspian languages, Persian, and the Central Dialects.

**bus**- “look, watch,” in da-bus-i “that you look,” dabusa “that he looks,” hibusi “he would look,” dabusā bu “he may have looked.” Cf. Pth. bws- “wait for, look forward to,” dbws- “desire” (< *pati-baud-s-a- (inchoative stem), *baud “sense”), corresponding to MP bōy “sense, perception,” payōs- “desire,” respectively. From the same root comes NP bōs- “kiss.”

**say**- “look,” in basayi “that you look” (< *sand “appear, seem,” Av. sānd-, and OP ṣad-, from the zero grade), cf. Sog. sy- “seem, appear, show,” MP ṣah-/ṣahist- “seem; seem proper”; MP/NP pas(s)and- “approve, cherish” (< *pati-sand-a-), Zāz. ā-sen-/sāy-“appear,” Sedehi a:s- “look (at)” (e.g., ba:si “that you look at”), Pers. dialect es- “watch.” Note also Māz. eš- “look,” cf. Av. āši “the two eyes,” Lat. oc-ulus, German Auge.

**tanj**- “pul,” in tanjāk “elastic” (cited in Zakhira-yi Khārazmāsh; apud Qāsimi, 24). Cf. Av. ṭanji- “pul, draw,” Pth. ṭanj “draw up,” MP hnc-/hanj-/ “draw (water),” MMP ṭanj- “pul, draw,” Sogd. ānjo “pul out,” NP ā-hanj-, ā-hiz- “pul out,” Simn. -ta-/anj- “draw,” Oss. D. ānjo “to spread, stretch out” (Cheung, 391f.). This verb is comparable with a series of words in New Iranian languages, with meanings as diverse as “irrigate, sprinkle, drink,” in addition to “pul, draw.” However, as Donald Stilo (“Isfahan”): 107) has proposed, all these words are related not only phonologically but also semantically, through the shifts: “pul, draw > draw water > irrigate, water, sprinkle > drink.” The original meaning “pul” is retained in (Komesanian) Aft. anj-/a(n)n), Simn. enj-/h(e)nt, Sang. inj-/h(e)nt (and da-y)anj-/h(e)nt “swallow”), Khūrī hanj-/heid ~ het, Zāz. anj-/ānt; “irrigate, water, sprinkle” in So(h)i hanj-/het “sprinkle,” (S. Tāti) Khīyāraji hōnj-/hītor “water,” Gazi enj-/enjā- “irrigate”; “drink” in J.Iṣf., Shīrāzī Pers. dialect tanj- “drink,” Khūnī (C. Tāti) enj-/ent, Māsālī (S. Talys) hīnj-/hint, Māsūlāi xanj-/xont, and Kulūrī (C. Tāti) hanj-/hent. This semantic domain is now extended by Gurgānī tanjak “elastic.”

73. Cf. Horn, no. 23; more likely, however, korāśin stems from the root *san “to mount, ascend”; see Cheung, 331.
75. Ghilian 1939: 65, 80.
76. Kiyā 1951: 70, 321.
77. Personal communication from Gernot Windfuhr, to whom I am indebted for his generous comments on the etymology of the Māzandarānī verb.
vešā- and vasā- “open” < OIr. *wi-ša- (*hai- “chain, bind”), cf. MP wišā- “release, open,” Māz. vešā- “open, untie,” boš- “open (gunfire),” NP gušāy-/gušād-. The Gurgānī variant with the s is comparable with vesn- “rupture” (see 5.2).

**bat** (pat?) “open, generous” in seyom ake hanku tin mā bat bu, for Pers. sevvum ānki mēbāyad dast-i tu gušāda bāsād,76 cf. Yagh. pe(y)n-/peta “to open, uncover, unroll” (< *apa- + *hHai “chain, bind”; see Cheung, s.v.), NP pat u pahn “wide.” Similar forms with differing meanings are found in a number of languages, e.g., Māz. pemmet “covered.”79

xʷāz-/xʷāšt- “want, wish, desire” (see also 8.5), from OIr. root *xwād, which yields the thematic pres. stem *xwāḍ-a- and the participle *xwāṣ-ta-; cf. Pth. wxāz-/wxāšt-, Awr. wāz-/wāšt-, Māz. xa-/xāst- (but xāzendi “solicitation in marriage,” xāzekār “one who solicits in marriage”; and Šab. kēn-xʷāz “one who seeks revenge,” cited in the thirteenth-century Tārikh-i Šabaristān,80 xʷāz- in the Šabari translations of a Zaydi Qur’ān and of Maqāmāt al-Ḥarirī),81 Old Āzāri huzdān,82 Harzand. hōsn-/hōšt-, Gardāvīyost-, Jirūfī Pers. vāst-. The Ḫūrūfī texts have also the NP form xʷā-.

vāya “desire, want, aspire” (and dar-vāyest = NP dar-bāyist), attested also in a verse composed by Fakhr al-Dīn Asʿad Gurgānī: zi sarv-i in čaman sāya nabīne // zi rayhān-i saman vāya nabīne.83 From OIr. *upa-aya- (*ai “go”), cf. MP abāyēd “it is necessary, fitting; must” (NP bāyad) and the nominative verb abāy-/abāyist- “be necessary, fitting; desire, want”; Pth./MP abāyišīn “want, necessity”; Māz. vena, vessā “must, need, desire” (post-position and modal verb), Gil. va “must,” Pth. wasnād “for, on account of,” Ḫūrānī Pers. vāse(ey)/vāsi(e) “id”;84 Natanzi -pia, Ardest. pie-, Īl. pīda- “want, wish, desire.”85


kām- “want” < *kāma-; cf. MP denom. past stem kām-ist-, Sogd. -kām > -kān, Chor. -kām, CDs (Ḵāshān area) kom-/kam- .87

ši- “may, can”88 (as in sotarān na-šī kašān “camels cannot drag”) < OIr. *xšay-, cf. Pth. šah-, NP šayist-, šāhid-, Māz. šen, Gil. ša, Khʿarzūqi šā- “can,” etc.

šur- “wash” < OIr. *xšaʊd-a-, cf. Pth. šw(w)d-, Bal. šd-, MP/NP šy-, Kd. Šd-; NP dialect šur-, Māz. šur- (past stem šur-), Gil. šor-, Ntal. šir-, Awr. šor-, Ardes. šor-, as in most other NW Iranian languages. Therefore, the development of *d > r must have occurred quite early, probably as a distinct sound change or else due to analogy with verbs of high frequency such as dār-/dāšt-.

brin- “cut,” rin- “buy” are interesting because of the nasal element in the present stem, as is the case in many other Iranian languages.89

---

79. Kiyā 1947, no. 179, where an etymology is proposed.
82. Yarshater, “Azerbaijan vii.”
85. See also Bailey 1978: 381f., 385.
86. For the forms in CDs, see Krankhe 1976: 202ff.
88. Also “become; go”? Cf. Kiyā 1951: 312f.
89. Kiyā 1951: 319f.
GLOSSARY

The following glossary contains the Gurgānī words attested in Ĥūrūfī documents published in Șâdîq Kiya’s Vâžanâma and Clément Huart’s Textes persans. The numerical cross-references are made to the entries on historical phonology (VIII, above).

a that (13.1); ~če = Pers. änĉî; ~ku there; ~paš/-pas thereafter; ~vaqît then; see also ayan

ā(v) water (12.1)

abi (adi in Mahram-nâma) again (2)

āfari- (v.) create (8.1.1)

af(i)tá(v)a sun (12.1)

alyak break (Pers. šikast kardan)

ama we (14.2)

āmuż- (v.) learn (6)

an → en

andâţ-/andâţ- (v.) throw (6, 8.3, 8.6)

andâţa measure (6, 8.6)

andi so much, as much (cf. Mâz. andi, anni, anne, Khuns. endi, Awr. enna, NTâl. ānanda)

angiz- (v.)—var-~ instigate (6.2)

ās- : āhi- (v.) come (8.2, 15); di-~ come in? (13.2), var-~ come out, rise (12.1), y'r-~ descend (6.1)

asā → esā

(a)šno-? (v.) hear (8.1.1)

ašt- → xiz-

āv(i)?-? (v.) bring (8.2)

āvâž voice (6)

āvît-, avît- (v.) hang (8.3); ā/vîta (p. p.) hanged (8.3)

avriş-m silk

ayan (← a + an, with the epenthesis -y-) from that; →ku from here, thus āyina Friday (8.1)

āz (or az, a) from, of (6); -(a)rā therefore; ~aru because of (13.1) = Pers. az-ān-râ(y); ~enn thus (14.1) = Pers. ēnûn; ~irā because

b-? (v.) become (8.1.1)

band- (v.)—hâ-~ tie up (3.3)

bar- : bi-? (v.) carry (8.2)

barâ(r) brother (8.1)

barfa, b-fra brow (cf. Mâz. bêfra, bêrfa)

bat (pat?)? open (15) (for Pers. gušâda)

bây-t type, kind

bâţ- → vâţ-

bedâñay remorse (for Pers. puşaymâñî)

b-niâ secret (for Pers. pinhân)

b-zâ old men

b-rin- (v.) cut (15)

bi- → hast

bus- (v.) look, watch (15)

çakuš hammer

či, če(či) what (13.1)

či thing (13.1)

d-b girl

da in (13.1)

da(r)- (preverb) (13.2); → ās-, dam-, gir-, māl-, yâv-

dam- (v.)—da-~ blow (8.1.1)

dâr tree (cf. NP, Kd. dâr < OIr. *dâra-)

darafšân bright

darvâyest necessary, necessity (15)

dâšt- (v.) have (8.5)

de- : d-? (v.) (8.1.1), hâ-~ give (3.3)

d-mây nose

di- → vin
diar(ān) other(s) (13.1); ham-~ each other
dim face, surface (cf. Mâz., Tal. dim, Mâsûlahâ i dem, Pth, MP, dêm, Arm. dêm-k' < OIr. *dâma-)

dôdamâni family
dot/dut daughter (8.3)
du far (13.2)
du smoke (8.1, 13.1)
dut- (v.) sew (8.3)
elâhî divine

en, an this (14.1); enân these

en-ku here (13.1)
er- (preverb) (6.1)
erš- : ersöv- (v.) send (3.3, 6.1, 8.5); see also š-
esā now, this time; asā then, that time (cf. Mâz. isâ, Surkhâ'î esâ now, Simn. esa, Gil. hasa, NTâl. isa, Āshiyâñî isâ now; Lûri ise now, use then; Gabri usu then90)

espí(d), espá(h) white, espái whiteness
(1, 8.1)
(es)pírd- (v.) hand over (8.2)
eskáišt- (v.) split, unsew, burst (8.4)
esšt- → xšt-
ezen, ezán, ezín thus, this/that way
(8.1, 14.1)
f'efrica deceived (8.4, 14.1)
gard- (v.) → vá-~ return (8.2)
gârdan- (v.) make rotate (8.2, 14.2)
gari a measure of land (Pers. jarib) (13.1)
gerd gather (8.2)
gir-: git- (v.) seize (3.3, 8.4, 13.2); da-~ id. (13.2), hâ-~ id. (3.3), va-~ id. (12.1)
godâr, godâr pass (5.2, 8.1.2)
gozârd- (v.) accomplish (5.2, 8.2)
g'ît- (v.) say (8.4)
gu- → ku-
ha-, he- (preverb) (3.3); → band-, de-, gir-, kar-
hambâz partner (cf. MP hambâz, NP anbâz)
hamduna monkey (attested also in Classical NP)
hamen this same (14.1)
hast-: bi- (v.) be (8.1.1, 8.5)
hē <hay, hey> (14.1) one, same, together;
~bâr once; ~diar one another; ~sân alike; ~šanbe Sunday; ~šava overnight
herus- (v.) sell (3.3)
h'mâza(n) same way, resembling (Pers. hamčuân)
hîn this
i this
-i also
iku here (13.1); see also ku-
jan, čan woman (7)
jan-: ji- (v.) strike (7, 8.1.1); va-~ id. (12.1)
jinda, ženda, čenda, činda alive (7, 8.6)
jovâ, javâ separate (4, 8.1)
kâh- (v.) reduce (1.1)
kâm- (v.) want (15)
kâmen, kâmin which (14.1)
kand- (v.) dig (8.6)
kâr-: kl(i)-? (v.) do (8.2, 15); hâ-~ id. (3.3), vá-~ id. (12.1)
kâs person, somebody (14.2) (Pers. kas)
kasen someone (Pers. kas-i)
kaš(i)-? drag (8.1.1)
k-lâpšt a type of clothing
ki, ke who
kò(v)-: kat- (v.) fall (8.4, 12.1)
kôšt- (v.) kill (8.5)
ku- (also iku, vinku) (v. modal) must
(12.1, 15)
kû place; a~ there; ayan~ from here, thus;
en~ here; i~ here; ~~ where
lav lip (12.1)
mâ hand (?)
mâl- (v.) → dâ-~ rub (11)
mând- (v.) stay (8.6)
mâng moon (cf. Av. mâh-, OP mâha-,
Pth. mâh, NTal., Kd. mâng, Mâz. mung)
mâr mother (3.1, 8.1)
mâya female (8.1)
mazget mosque
m'hin large(r) (1.1)
mînâjî mediator
mîr-: mi-? (v.) die (8.2)
movâja face to face (Pers. muwâjîh)
n(eh)-? (v.) put (8.1.1, 13.3)
nâ no
namâž prayer (6)
nemuy-? (v.) show (8.1.1)
nevešt- (v.) write (8.5)
-n'mân like
niâ look (13.3)
nist- (v.) sit (8.5)
padir—del-~ pleasant (8.1.2)
palu side (13.3)
pâš then (cf. Av. pasca, Pth. paš, Sog. pšy,
CDs paš, Kd. paši, Bal. paš; but OP pasâ > MP/NP pas)
pâžumanda, bžuzhand strong?, illustrious?, dear?
pêndâr- (v.) presume (8.6)
piar father (8.1)
pišin noon
pišnâyâ more than that (Pers. bêštar az ân)
pur son (3.1)
ras(i)-? (v.) arrive (8.1.1)
re (?) path
rin-: ri- (v.) buy (3.2, 8.1.1, 15)
riž-: rît- (v.) pour, spill (6, 8.3); va-~ id. (12.1)
rost- (v.) → va-~ grow up (8.5)
ruc, ruž, ruč day (6)
ruža fast(ing) (6)
sara fine (?), whole (?)
say- (v.) look (15)
sâž- : sât- (v.) make (6, 8.3)
sep apple (12.2)
suž- : sut- (v.) burn (6, 8.3)
suzmâni burn (Pers. sõziš)
šama you (14.2)
šekast- (v.) break (8.5)
ši- (v. modal) may, can (15)
š(ov)-? (v.) go (8.1.1). See also erš-
šu husband
šu night (12.1), hēšava overnight
šur- : šost- (v.) wash (8.5, 15)
tâ̄r room (cf. Pers. tâlâr, Mâz. tâlâr) (14.2)
t(i)ân (v. modal) can (13.3) (NP tâvân)
tanjâk (in Zakhira-yi khvârazmšâhi) elastic (15)
târek(i) dark(ness) (14.1)
tâš- (v.) scrape, rasp (13.2)
tazumanda demander (for Pers. talab kunanda)
tâzYH whip (for Pers. tāzīyâna)
tud mulberry
vâ- (preverb) (12.1); → gard-, kar-, vin-
vâ open (5.1)
vâ wind (5.1, 8.1)
vâ with, to (12.1)
vâdi appear (8.1.1, 12.1)
van roof (12.2, 14.2)
vâng voice (5.1)
var- (prepos.) at, on
va(r)-, ver- (preverb) (12.1); → angiz-, ās-, gir-, ji-, ku-, riž-, rost-, xiz-
var side; toward (5.1)
varâbar equal (5.1)
vašt- → xiz-
vâya wish, desire (12.1, 15)
-vâz (postp.) since
vâž, vâz again (6, 12.1)
vâ(ž)- : vât- (or bâž-) (v.) say (5.1, 6, 8.3); vâžanda (pres. part.) speaker (6, 8.6)
veriz- (v.) flee (5.2, 6.2)
vešâ-, vasâ- (v.) open (5.2, 15)
vesn- (v.) rupture (5.2, 15)
vin- : di- (v.) see (5.1, 8.1.1); vâ- examine (12.1)
vinku → ku
vini nose (5.1)
vrirîz-, variz- → xiz-
(x)îz- : âšt-/ešt- (v.) → var-(x)îz-, variž-, virîz-; ver-âšt-, vašt- stand, rise (8.5, 9, 12.1)
x-jîr fine, pretty (6.2)
ox sun (10)
ox he (9)
oxonân they (9)
xâand- (or xund-) (v.) read (8.6)
xâv sleep (10, 12.1)
xâz- : xwâst- (v.) want, wish (8.5, 15)
y-r- (preverb) (6.1), → âs-
yâ to, with (6.1)
yâgâh place (4)
yal- (v.) allow (11)
yâv- : yäft- (v.) find (8.4, 12.1); dar-~ perceive (13.2)
zân- (v.) know (1.1)
zâna knowledgeable (1.1)
zây- (v.) give birth (8.1.1)
zovân, zavân, žovân tongue (1.2)
žîr under (6, 6.1)
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