La SK ha, in luogo di questo, due capitoli: uno comprende i §§ 1-12, con la chiara prāgīśīnām vihāhākiṣaṇām pārṇo 'vādīhī; il secondo i §§ 13-47, con la chiara prā-

   2. tāxā per lo specifico tāxā di P.

   3. prākā, dalla glosso kṛṣṇapakārāgha di SK al vidhāra di P.

   4. kastin pel nālīkā di P secondo SK: kastin bhiṣa, bhikṣaṣaṇa.

   5. dēvāya per dēvāya, dalla glosso SK, contro dēvāya da dēvāya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jaya jay
Besides the city of Yazd itself numbers of Zardushthis are living in its suburbs, such as Xayarābād, Ḥusaynābād, Qāsimābād, Márl-ābād, and in the villages Xurrāmūlūd, Kūzabālūd and Taft.

In the district of Kerman they are found also in Sar-āsābād, Dastgird, Jupār, Qanāt-Qasīn (or Qanāt-Qasum); also in Zarna, Rafsīnān, Shejān, and Xābis.

We may sum up here the bibliography of Gabri, which so far is not very rich, though Gabri has always attracted great interest on the part of Western scholars, who expected to see in it the form of Persian that might have preserved the most archaic peculiarities. Unfortunately, up to the present it has never been studied exhaustively.

The first work which gives some details of it is by I. Berésine, Recherches sur les Dialectes persans (Casan, 1853). Gabri is, however, dealt with here rather superficially, and the work is of very little use.


The first substantial work was published by F. Justi, Über die Mundart von Ḥesā (ZDMG, 1887, pp. 327–414). The work gives specimens of translations into Gabri of some portions from the Old and New Testament. The translation was prepared under the patronage of J. H. Petermann, in 1854; it is written in Arabic script, which is often misleading; many portions of the translation are unintelligible to the Gabri-speaking people now, and obviously contain many mistakes. F. Justi has provided a grammatical commentary, and a vocabulary, which are rather unreliable.

A. Houtum-Schindler in his Die Parsen in Persien, ihre Sprache und

1 Persians, with their passion for exaggeration, regard the rural dialects either as "silly gibberish of the village fools", or, on the contrary, represent them as the relics of great antiquity. Mann, with his idea about Achemenian Pāpōn, had many predecessors: C. Huart introduced the term "Pehlevi Mūsulman". Even the cautious V. Zhukovski made a strange mistake which has given the chance to more imaginative scholars to start remarkable theories. In his Materials, I, p. xxi, he mentions that an inhabitant of Qhorād called his dialect qahānī rā'ī. In this Zhukovski recognised the term ṭrā, or ṭrā, i.e. "of Ray". To all my inquiries made all over Persia, and in the localities near Qhorād, as to what is qahānī rā'ī, the reply invariably was: rā'ī - ã-ki rāνūḏ dādrad, i.e. "current", "common", māmāl. The Arabic form rāy surely has nothing to do with Ray. But cf. the most learned speculations of the editor of O. Mann's posthumous Part III, vol. I, pp. lxxvi–lxxxv, of the Erdtisch-persische Forschungen (1926).

2 It is absolutely erroneous to apply the term "Pariz" to the Zardushthis of Persia. According to many authoritative explanations of the term, such as given in different judgments in the Bombay High Court, Parsees are an Indian caste, belonging to the Zoroastrian religion. A Parsee can only be born, just as a member of any Hindu caste. The fact of professing the Zoroastrian religion does not make one a Parsi, he has no right to attend fire temples, etc. Persian Zardushthis in Bombay keep separate, and do not intermarry with Parsis normally.

---

3 The Gabri dialect spoken by the Zoroastrians of Persia

Einige ihrer Gebrauche (ZDMG, vol. XXXVI, pp. 54–88), gives practically no new or important information.


C. Huart, Notice d’un manuscrit pehlevi-musulman de la bibliothèque de Saint-Sophie à Constantinople (Journal Asiatique, 1889, pp. 238–270). The dialect which is dealt with in this paper is not Gabri, but some extinct form of an intermediary between Gabri and Nāiš, as one may see from its vocabulary.


All these articles were utilised by W. Geiger in his article, Centrale Dialekte in the Grundriss der iranischen Philologie, Vol. I, part II, pp. 381–406.

Since that publication there has appeared the most valuable paper by D. L. R. Lorimer, Notes on the Gabri Dialect of Modern Persian (JRAS, 1916, pp. 423–489), which contains important emendations and additions to the materials given in the Grundriss. This paper was followed in 1928 by another one, Is there a Gabri Dialect of Modern Persian? (JRAS, 1928, pp. 287–319). The first of these papers gives practically complete outlines of the Gabri grammar in its essential features, and requires only amplification and occasional emendations, as were found necessary in the course of the verification of the paper from the original sources. I have to acknowledge here also the most valuable help which Col. D. L. R. Lorimer kindly extended to me by going through the English of this paper, and giving many valuable suggestions.

The latest are two short articles by the author of this paper, containing emendations of the two articles mentioned above:

W. Ivanow, Late prof. E. G. Browne’s Specimen of the Gabri Dialect (JRAS, 1932, pp. 403–405), and


Rivista degli Studi orientali. — XVI.
TABLE OF TRANSLITERATION.

| 1 - a, i, u | ʃ - r | f - f |
| 1 - a | ʃ - r | q - q |
| ʃ - h | ʃ - ʃ | ʃ - k (g) |
| Ç - p | ʃ - ʃ | ʃ - g |
| ɔn - s | l - l |
| ɔ - ð | ɔ - ɔ |
| ɛ - j | ɛ - ɛ |
| ɔ - v, w, -d |
| e - h | e - i |
| e - ɔ |
| e - ɔ |

(The system of phonetical transcription is explained in this paper under the heading Description of Sounds).

TABLE OF ABBREVIATIONS.

Ar. - Arabic.
Av. - Avestan.
bašr - Colloquial Persian, spoken by the lower classes of the city population.
c. - century.
Farzand - The dialect of Farzand, a village in the district of Nahān, E from Isfahan, see A. Christensen, “Contributions à la Dialectologie Iranienne”, Copenhagen, 1910.
G. - Gabri.
Gas, or Gari - The dialect of the village Gas, one day’s journey from Isfahan, towards the East, see V. Zhukovski, “Materials for the study of Persian Dialects”, vol. II, St.-Petersburg, 1828.
I. Ph. A. - The system of phonetic transcription of the International Phonetic Association.
JRAS - Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
Kefran - The dialect of Kefran (Kafra), a village near Isfahan, see V. Zhukovski, “Materials”, Part II.
Kasha - The dialect of Kasha, a village in the Kashan district, see V. Zhukovski, “Materials”, Part I.
KG - Kirman Gabri, the form of Gabri as spoken in the city of Kirman, and its province.
Lor. or Lorimer - D. L R. Lorimer, “Notes on the Gabri Dialect of Modern Persian”, JRAS, 1916, pp. 423-489. Reference is to pages, but wherever no number is given it means that information was received in private letters.
LP - The language of the Persian Literature.
LPA - Words of Arabic origin, incorporated in LP.
LPT - The pre-LP dialect of Persian, in the fragments recently discovered in Turfan.
Natani - The dialect of the district of Natanz, near Na’in, see A. Christensen, “Contributions à la Dialectologie Iranienne”, Copenhagen, 1910.
neg. - negative form.
obs. - obsolete word.
SP - The supposed group of the Persian Dialects which were spoken in South or South-East of the Iranian world.
Sob - The dialect of Sob, a village near Qurâb, N from Isfahan. See under Qurâbul.
SP - The system of phonetic transcription of the International Phonetic Association.
WPT - The group of dialects spoken in the Western half of Persia.
WP - The ancient form of the WP dialects as represented in the Turfan fragments.
Zarâ - The dialect of the village Zarâ, NE from Isfahan, see V. Zhukovski, “Materials”, vol. I.
I.

INTRODUCTION

The Position of Gabri amongst the other Persian Dialects.

Before taking up the study of the phonology and morphology of Gabri, we have to form an idea as to the position which it occupies in the family of Persian dialects. This raises the most difficult question about the classification of these still so little known forms of Persian. Unfortunately, the want of space does not permit me to take up this subject in all its complexity here, and we have to be content with only a very brief summary.

W. Geiger's classification, introduced by him in his article in the Grundrisse der iran. Philologie (when the information about Persian dialects was still very scarce) was based on them on their territorial distribution. This principle at once proved to be inadequate, and the Iranian students readily accepted the theory offered by the late O. Mann, in the first issue of his Kurdisch-Persische Forschungen (1909) 1.

His principle of classification is based on the study of the phonetical features of the dialect, thus quite independent of territorial connections. But though the idea is quite sound, the way in which O. Mann has applied it to his linguistic materials is extremely unsatisfactory. First of all, it is impossible to take into consideration only the phonological observations, completely disregarding the morphological data, which in Persian dialects usually are much more stable indicators than the elusive ways of pronunciation. Mann aggravated this error by an amazing mistake: he accepted every word in his "dialects", which in reality were nothing but local variants of a debased form of ordinary colloquial Persian, as the most original, genuine and independent form, which must be "zum mindesten seit der Achämenidenepoche, heimisch Mundarten anzusehen" (p. xxx).

The materials, collected by him, on which his theories are based, are remarkably meagre, and often inaccurate. He had no ear for phonetical research, and his transcription of texts requires careful verification. In his search for Achemenian dialects and the boundaries of the ancient Persis he completely overlooks realities.

1 In my early papers I also followed Mann's theories, but gradually many suspicions arose, and, having a chance to re-visit Persia, I spent more than two months in Shiraz in 1928, verifying Mann's statements on the spot. These inquiries at once revealed the errors in his theory.

Thus what he really analyses is nothing but ordinary Persian, and he completely misunderstands the real nature of his patois which, as we will see presently, show clear traces of their being some time members of what he calls the "Nord-Westlich" group, exactly opposite to the "Süd-Westlich" of which the purest prototypes he makes them to be. Thus instead of improving matters his originally sound idea has become a source of endless misunderstanding, and as not every student can go to the bottom of the theories advanced by others, taking them at their "face value", many valuable works have been ruined by its misleading influence.

Languages do not develop in a vacuum. In Persia not only the ethnic milieu is extremely complex, but also the ordinary conditions of life in rural areas are quite different from those which one is accustomed to see in Europe and other fertile countries. Not only are large scale migrations of nomads of common occurrence in Persia, but there is also a continuous and normal circulation of the rural population on a small scale, as it was going on for centuries. This is connected with agricultural economics, revenue system, etc., not only the regular factors. Very rarely are the peasants the owners of the land (or of water, as they say), except in the hills. Usually the owner of the kārt enters into a contract with a company (= village) of agricultural workers, who cultivate the land, handing to the owner a fixed share in the produce. Whenever such contract for whatever reason ceases to be in force, the peasants move to another place, not necessarily near by, or even in the same district or province.

The only factor which preserves these dialects under such circumstances is the patriarchal custom of the village being regarded as a unit, or rather a large family, usually endogamous and economically independent of its neighbours. Thus there is nothing like a permanent connection of the rural population with the territory it actually occupies. Only great technical difficulties, poverty, illiteracy, absence of initiative, etc., make the process of such internal migrations slow. The case of the nomads is a complete parallel to that of the settled peasants.

In addition to these integrating and scattering tendencies in the rural life of Persia, which inevitably lead to intermixture of different dialects, and gradual absorption of one by the other, there is a powerful and con-
unfortunately, working source of deterioration and degeneration of the dialects in the influence of the colloquial language of the cities, or bazari Persian. Very few villages live so isolated a life as to avoid coming to the bazars, where they quickly pick up the “polished” and “correct” speech, which they gradually adopt. Ultimately, if the intercourse is continuous, bazari floods the dialect, and very little, in the form of local peculiarities, remains within a fairly short time. 1 It is remarkable that the process is exactly the same even when instead of Persian the language of the bazars is Turkish. Thus only a very careful study will help to detect traces of the dialect which the peasants, now speaking ordinary Persian, might have used one or two generations ago. Rural dialects possess no literature to preserve them, or to refer to in cases of doubt, and every corruption may remain to stay for ever. Persians, as a race, generally are very imitative in the matter of speech, and novelty of expression always attracts them. All these matters must be carefully considered by the student. Nothing is more erroneous than to imagine any Persian dialect as remaining unchanged, in a kind of air-tight envelope, from “Achemenian” times.

If we read the specimens of the patois studied by Mann, which he gives in his book, we may see that except for some local peculiarities in pronunciation, and local expressions, the vocabulary is exactly the same as in low class bazari all over Persia, and especially of Khorasan. 2 There are some Southern—Persian terms, such as pus (LP pūzar), paxia (LP pasha), bard (stone), magaz (LP magat) 3, khdād (brother), etc. All these are used as far as Yazd and Kerman, and by Lurs, not being in the least an exclusive feature of the «Persis» patois.

If we go through O. Mann’s analysis of the dialect (pp. xiii—xvii), we may see that all his examples are nothing but the ordinary Persian words, in their bazari pronunciation: dās for dast, bd for bdd, jām for jām, etc. Such examples as mībonām for mībnām are due to the peculiarities of Mann’s own ear rather than those of his Achemenian dialect,—he writes “Somghun”, while the local inhabitants clearly pronounce Simghūn. In other words, the terms which Mann analyses are ordinary low class Persian. There are, apparently, only two peculiar items which may by really important, they are not purely accidental borrowings: pab-—cattle, cf. Kurdish pas, which appears in the form pas, pēs, pēc, pāc in such remote dialects as Samnā; Zaza, Talishi, and Khuri (in Central desert). The phonetical indications of this term are counterbalanced by another term, mī-—for LP nīb-—(in nībdan). 4 Quite unique is the second peculiar term, apparently not found in any other Persian dialect, —mī- as the Aorist stem from the verb “to see”. These are isolated phenomena from which nothing can be inferred.

The Passive construction of the transitive verb in these patois is completely disregarded by O. Mann. It is true that in Pehlevi and in the Turfan texts both constructions are used, and that in the Turfan texts the Active construction is more common in the ancestor of the “Western” dialects while the Passive construction appears mostly in the dialect which is nearer to modern Literary Persian. This latter construction is occasionally found in the Shabdāna. But we have a definite fact that now it exists only in Kurdish and the “Western” dialects of Persian.

Seeing this Passive construction of the Transitive verb systematically used in these patois, we may ask whether this may be a trace of their origin, or at least of their having been exposed to the influence of the dialects which Mann calls the “Nord-Westlich”? And an examination of Mann’s own vocabulary reveals quite a surprising fact.

On p. 36 is given a strange sounding verb mīkārgām. Mann’s German i is the i in bird, not in b, and the enigmatic expression is nothing but ms kār gām, i.e. LP man birān (or bar, dialect. kār) zānam. This kār is the Adverb, meaning “out”, and is used in Gabri; apparently its variant is found in the dialects of Zafār, Sedeleh, Gaz, and Kafiran, in the form kā, and Kāshā kār.

On p. 39 the equivalent of the LP verb tavāndīstān is given as šd, Pret. šd. This is exactly the same as the Gabri šd, Pret. šdšt.

1. If dās is recognised as the WP form of LP dāh, then mī- for LP nīb- logically may be also regarded as a WP form.

2. It is not clear whether this strange Shrāri stem has anything to do with the old verb mīyūdām, which means “to hear” and also “to speak”. Persians usually say št-hā-št mī-yūdād = “look (= find out), what he says?” Why, by the law of contrast, cannot the meaning of “listening for”, develop into “looking for”?
On p. 39 again there is an equivalent for xwdstan, = om-, mā, Pret. mat-. It is obviously the same as the Gabri ṭu, ṭatā, as we know that m in some cases in Gabri is replaced by ṭ.

On p. 40, the verb xarīdān in Simgbūnd and Māsārīf has in the Preterite the form xardā, with a, not u, i. e. just as in Gabri, Mahallāt, Kafrānt; cf. Kurdish xewardin.

On p. 41 the verb dānistān is in some places written as dānām, dānt, etc. In reality it sounds quite like ẓanām, and it is quite possible that here we really have the form with ẓ.

On p. 42 the verb for “to go” is not from the root raw-, but from ṭw-, and even in many cases it preserves the prefix in the Present tense uh-, apparently corresponding to the Gabri prefix i-, or e-. On pp. 43 and 44 in the verbs with the group xi-, rixtan, sūxtan, x is reduced to h, again a feature of the Western dialects.

On p. 44 the verb “to become” is expressed by the root haw.

On p. 45 for the verb “to hear” is used the form of ḥūf-, in the Preterite even ḍũf-, the same as in Gabrī and other Western dialects.

On p. 46 the ancient prefix pr- in the verbs ḥīṣṭātan and ḥurīxtan becomes -br-, softened into -t-, a typical feature of the Western dialects.

On p. 47 the verb bīštan (not, as Mann writes, ḡūdštan), almost all through has the Western prefix al-, sometimes reduced to ‘l-.

On p. 49 for the verb “to sit” the root niy-,  ṭaw- is used. Thus though the Preterite has been already replaced by the LP form, the Pres. is still the Western form, niy-. It is interesting to note that it also retains the old prefix ṭaw-, u-.

These clear traces of a strong element of the “Nord-Westlich” type cannot be attributed to occasional local borrowings. The “Perside” villages Pāpūn, Simghūn, Būringūn and Māsārīf, and in addition also Ardaḵūn, Basakūn, Daḵtak, Gāwušak, Mebbūd, Dūsrūn, Kanda, Wārak, Sartab, and some other villages in the subdistricts of Mārīn, Daḵ (e. g. Gulmānūn, Bidekāl, Shahlūbd), in Kuhmārūl’ Pušī Kuh, and in Gīrā (or jīrā), all speak varieties of the same dialect. On the NW and N these villages are surrounded by continuous Turkish and Lurish nomad populations. To the SW and S live only Turks. On the NE and E side all villages speak only debased forms of barāizi. All the inhabitants of these villages frequent the bazaars of Shiraz and Kazerun. There is no place in which they come in touch with the people speaking one of the “Nord-Westlich” dialects of the Isfahān, Kashān, or Yazd group. Therefore there is no doubt that these traces of a different dialectic group are genuine and original.

If we systematize the information which is so far available, we may see that the question of the origin of these dialects is not so simple as Mann thinks.

We know that Persian literature of the Muḥammadan period was born in Khurāsan. The literati of Fars preferred to write in Arabic till about the VIth c. A. H. (XIII A. D.). Authors who obviously belong to Western Persia, while referring to rural poetry, the faḥlašiyyat, quote specimens which, though it is almost impossible to understand them owing to corruption in transcription, are nevertheless unmistakably written in dialects of the “Nord-Westlich” group. For the period later than this we have the well-known dialectical poems by Sa’dī and Hāfīz, most probably genuine. They are believed to be written in the language spoken by the lower classes of Shiraz population; it also belongs to the same group.

The latest poet of this kind, Bū Iṣḥāq, belongs to the period which immediately preceded the great rise in the cultural development of Western Persia under the Safavids. After him no other poems were composed in this dialectic form of Shirazi, most probably because it ceased to exist, being replaced by ordinary colloquial Persian.

The most interesting testimony can be derived from the most unexpected quarters, which have never been explored, namely the Jewish population of Persia. Though Jewish Persian literature is to some extent known, the real colloquial dialects of the different Jewish communities have never been properly studied. Their literature is in ordinary Persian, only here and there showing some peculiarities. But their colloquial, which they use in their private life, belongs to a different group, - again the same “Nord-Westlich” one. Though Jews of different cities speak different dialects, and often cannot easily understand each other, yet there is remarkable uniformity in the fact that the patois of the Western Persian Jews belong to the Western group (Hamadan, Kashan, Isfahan, Shiraz, most probably Yazd, etc.), while the Jews of Khorasan, Bukhara, etc., speak a patois of the LP origin, the Jews of Samarqand and other Turkestān cities speak a form of Tajiki, and the Jews of the Caspian provinces speak a form of Gilaki, Tati, etc. There is nothing like an all-Jewish jargon in Persia, and when the Jews from different corners of the country meet, they speak ordinary barāizi, as I was told.

Taking up the Western Jewish dialect we can see that the Kashani form is most closely connected with the dialect of the remote Qh Vive, while Shirazi Jewish has its nearest relative in Dastīk, not far from Arda-

1 Cf. Shamsi Qaysi, al-Murjan fi maṭṭir al-dīrī ‘l-Ājman (Gībī Mem. Series, 1909, pp. 80-82 and 142-144); ar-Rawandi, Rūhānī ‘l-qadd (Gībī Mem. Ser., 1921, pp. 181, 207, etc.); Shīwāna’t- qāf, by Tawakkul b. Iṣma‘īl, of the xivth c., contains many quotations in Adhārī, i. e. the ancient dialect of Adhārbāyān, which also belonged to the WP group.

2 Some specimens of these are given in E. G. Browne’s paper Some Notes on the Poetry of the Persian Dialects, JRAS, 1895, pp. 773-831.

3 See the same paper by E. G. Browne, referred to in the preceding note.
can, several days' journey from Shiraz; just as Gabri has its nearest relative in Na'ini and An'araki, also a considerable distance from the city. Such facts can be interpreted only in one way: the dialects which such conservative and isolated communities—Jews and Gabrs speak, were formerly spoken in the city and all over the country. Later on it was overwhelmed by bazari, first in the city, and then gradually in all the nearer villages, the radius of the area in which bazari is spoken growing longer with time.

It is very interesting to note that the dialect which is preserved in the poems attributed to Sadr, Hafiz, and Bö Ishan, as far as we can read them, is exactly the same as that which is still spoken by Shirazi Jews. We know also that Armenian borrowings from Persian, still in the Sasanian period, are also found from the same "Nord-Westlich" variety of the language. Thus there are serious reasons to believe that in the early middle ages the whole of the rural population of the Western Persia (probably to the West of the Central desert), including Fars, spoke only local varieties of one and the same Western Persian language, while the Eastern (from the Central desert) Persia spoke the various forms of the Eastern Persian language, which is the basis of Literary Persian. Curiously enough, there are indications that the same state of things prevailed much earlier in antiquity. Strabo (XV, 724) explicitly says that the language of Persis differed but little from that of Media (κυβαλοντος παρη μυκρον, as he says about Persians and Medians). If he were now living in Shiraz, he could scarcely say this about some "Median" dialects such as those of Gaz, or Farazand, etc.

Thus, though geographical connections are extremely undesirable in the designations of such widespread language as Persian, we may have much more right to divide it into two main groups, the Western Persian (WP), and the Eastern Persian, which we may regard as more or less identical with the Literary Persian (LP), cancelling the terms "Süd-Westlich" and "Nord-Westlich" together with Mann's ideas about pre-Aramaic origins of the few debased patois of his Persis villages. We must add that it is necessary to admit the existence of some other groups of Persian dialects also; and especially one of them which was suggested by Dr. G. Morgenstierne,* the South-Eastern, or simply Southern Persian (SP), which is connected with the evolution of both WP and LP, and which probably stands in a position towards Baluchi to some extent similar to that of WP towards Kurdish.

As the want of space does not permit us to go into these matters in detail, we may be content with offering here, tentatively and provisionally, a classification of known dialects:

I. — LP (or Eastern Persian) group:
1. The language of Modern Persian-Literature.
2. The Colloquial of the less educated classes of the town and rural population, or bazari.
3. The local forms of Khurasan, Kirmân, Badakhshan, Kûbûl, Tâjik, etc., with more pronounced peculiarities than those in the ordinary bazari.
4. Lur and Bakhtiyar, with their sub-dialects.
Hybrids: local dialects of Nihawand, Bihbihan, Shustar, and other towns where Luri and bazari meet.

II. — Western Persian:
1. The Yazd group: Gabri; Na'ini, Anarakki; Natanz.
2. The Kâshân group: Kasha; Zafra; Soh, Qubrud; Kâshân-Jewish; Yaran, Farazand, etc.
3. The Isfahan group: Gaz; Kafron; Khûnsar (Khûnsar); Vonishûn; Mahallat; (many sub-dialects); Sedeh, etc.
4. The Kâzîrân group: Arûkân, Daastak, Mâ'in, distr. of Daast; Simghûn, Pûpun, Borîngûn, Mâsûn, Gâwkûsl, Mehbûd, Dûsûrnûn, Kûnd, Wûrak, Sartaba; Shirazi Jewish, etc.
5. The Lâr group: Lâr, Bastak, Avâz, Girraût, Khunj, etc. Probably some of Tangistan dialects.
6. The Bandar-Abbâs group (apparently hybrid): Mûhab, Rûdûn, Bûlakird, Bandar-Abbâs, etc. (mixture of Lâr, bazari, and probably of Baluchi).

III. — Southern Persian (fragments):
1. Khûr and Mihrijan, in Biyûbnûn.
2. Ormûrî and Pârkûl, in Eastern Afghanistan (strongly influenced by Pashtu).

IV. — Complex Hybrids:
1. (SP + WP + LP): the Caspian group: Gilaki, Tâtî, Tâlisî, Mâzandarânî, Shemerezî, etc.
2. \( \text{SP} + \text{WP} + \text{LP} \): the Samnān group: Samnān, Lasgird, Sangsān, Surkhāki, etc.

Transition forms between groups 1 and 2: Alamūtī, Tajrīshī, etc.

3. \( \text{SP} + \text{Kurdish} + \text{LP} \): Gurani dialects.

4. \( \text{SP} + \text{WP} + \text{Luri} + \text{LP} \): the isolated patois of the village of Sīvand, North of Shiraz.

We may now take up the detailed definition of the position of Gabri, which is a typical member of its group, showing many affinities with the old Turfan texts. The best would be to follow the summary of an analysis of the latter, published by P. Tedesco, *Dialectologie der Westiranischen Turfanixien*, in *Le Monde Oriental*, vol. XV, pp. 184–238.

Before, however, we proceed any further, we may raise a question of methodological importance, which, unfortunately, is often completely disregarded.

The non-Semitic languages which, like, Persian, employ a Semitic system of writing, have great difficulty in denoting their vowels, as is quite well-known. Very often even in the highly developed and firmly established traditional orthography there are cases of a double way of spelling. When Persians of little education, and not well versed in this traditional orthography, start writing, one may see what extraordinary deviations from the standard rules appear. The difference between the so-called short and long vowels completely disappears, and sometimes even the shading of the vowel is changed. But this is not limited to the rendering of the vowels. The same unschooled Persians make an astonishing number of mistakes in consonants. Very often the sound is indifferently rendered either by the tense or the medium of the same group: t stands for d, or vice versa, e for j; z, ẓ, and ḥ are usually confused; p and f; q, ǧ and k appear as one and the same sound, etc.

This fluidity of the pronunciation, and, obviously, of the articulation, is not an innovation: the specimens of the medieval *fabhlaviyati* show all these variations as perfectly common. Even early Persian MSS are often not quite certain in some cases as to what to write: *zabdān*, *zabdān*, or *zafān* (which probably was pronounced with a strongly labio-dental v). The same early Persian MSS are also very inconsistent with their “long” and “short” vowels.

If so, and if it is generally admitted that we do not know the real pronunciation of the early vowels, not only of their real shading, but even of the timbre in general, and if, to a certain extent, such uncertainty exists about the consonants, are we right in, so-to-say, taking too seriously the minor variation of the orthographical usages in written documents? Is not it rather a precarious practice to forget about the possible great difference between the letter and the sound, which corresponded to it? And yet we very often meet, even in works of high scientific and critical acumen, with cases which suggest a complete equation between these, the letter and the sound. It is painful to mention here that the expression “Persian long d”, taken in general, is phonetically a pure fiction: this d of the standard orthography is pronounced in different parts of the country in many different ways; but assuredly, there were many more variations in its real pronunciation at the different periods; only of an insignificant proportion of them can we obtain some faint traces in occasional allusions. We must persistently ask ourselves, when speculating on the phonetic changes, as to how much right we have to identify the sounds, and their correspondence, especially if we deal with different languages, or groups of dialects.

If after more than a thousand years of uninterrupted development of Persian orthography of the Arabic alphabet we find still many irregularities, how much more inconsistent should be the spelling in the earlier periods of Persia, with the horrible Pehlevi alphabet, and parallel systems such as that of Syriac and Avestan.

In treating phonetical values in historical perspective the maximum material on which we can rely is the presence in each case of either the sound of “a-group”, or “u-group”, or “i-group”; all beyond is uncertain.

In analysing the phonetical and morphological features of Gabri to show its position amongst the other Persian dialects, we may go rapidly through the points of P. Tedesco’s paper:

1. “Avestan ژ, corresponding to AP ɗ, becomes in WP ژ against LP ɗ”.

2. “Avestan s, corresponding to AP š, becomes in WP s against LP h”.

3. “Iranian j becomes ژ in WP and ژ in LP” (unless, of course, they are not merely graphic variations, as they probably are): In Gabri there is now a great tendency to pronounce the sound ژ as j (probably due to Indian influence). What probably was an early ژ sound now as ژ, cf. yân, LP ژan.

4. “Ursprüngliches ژ”. We may have doubts as to what it really was phonetically. Though it is possible to collect a few examples of Gabri j corresponding with this ژ, and with LP ژ, as in ruj, viḱaḥ for LP râk, bdârī, we can scarcely put much reliance on them, because this may be merely a wrong pronunciation of ژ.

5. “Initial y becomes in WP ی, and in LP ی, rendered by ژ”. Again there may be any amount of confusion in writing. There are a few exam-
the influence of this labial element, prefers u, as in xad, LP xud or xartarw, LP xardan (in both cases u is orthographical). Perhaps traces of this may be recognised in the Pret. of the verb vyüstawn, to desire; is it the same as LP xwstwan, in which the guttural spirant could easily slacken into y?  

19. Frequent changes of m into v. These are very common in Gabri, as in qm in LP zamtn etc. They are quite irregular, but it seems that the majority of cases take place when m is intervocal. This, however, is not observed in other present WP dialects, and may be regarded as a peculiarity of Gabri.  

20. Cases like WPT handdm and LPT hanăm in the Turfan texts may simply be due to the absence of what in the Arabic alphabet is called thālīd, i.e. the sign of the duplication of the letter. The most usual example is gamnum, for gundum, but it is not uncommon in LP also.  

22-29. For the differences in the system of the Pronouns see the section on Grammar. The same as regards the ñddst, and the verbs.  

30. Preposition “with”, which in WPT appears as ‘ad, and in LPT as ‘ābd, is still preserved in WP dialects in the forms, with the omission of the dental, as bo, bē, bō. In Gabri, which has preserved more of the ancient d’s, this is adu, adu, adu, xat, xatdu; it is, however, interesting to mention that the preposition xud, with the same meaning, is common all over Khorasan and in Kerman bashari (Lor.). The same is the case with the adverb WPT kād which is here bōd or kōd. The WPT parwān, “before”, “to the front”, may be the same as Gabri bōd in the sense “out” (which the Gabri speakers in Bombay explain as Indian ḍhar), LP brān.  

With the present WP dialects Gabri has many expressions in common, but we have no means of finding out whether these are independent parallel developments, or are due to one and the same outside influence, which seems much more probable. At the same time we may note that even such close neighbours as Gabri and Nārī (or Anarak) have many differences in details of speech, while displaying an indubitable fundamental similarity. These will be as far as possible analysed in the Vocabulary.  

P. Tedesco completes his paper with an analysis of the affinities between the two groups (246–257). We are scarcely in a position to do this, beyond indicating such affinities in each case while reviewing the forms of Gabri, because it is very difficult to disintegrate the nucleus of the dialect from the great mass of the heterogeneous elements which it contains, and, also, because in a living language of the type of Gabri, which has no literature and no fixed and standard form, this would be a waste of time and labour. We may only add here with regard to the general tendencies of the phonoetical modifications that they probably entirely coincide with those which may be regarded as more or less universal in Persian Phonology.
II. PHONOLOGY AND MORPHOLOGY

A) Phonology

1. Description of Sounds.

The Gabri system of sounds differs very little from that of the ordinary colloquial Persian, except with regard to vowels. It avoids all emphatic sounds, and prefers the usual Persian relaxed articulation, which produces clear sounds only under the stress, or in a particularly favourable consonantal environment. The same remarkable fluidity of timbre which is observed in a great many dialects of most different groups is here prominent. Very often one and the same sound is given a different timbre or shading in one and the same breath, and, as there are no recognised standards, the people speaking Gabri often give one and the same word with different vocalisation. Gabri has the same great tendency to syncopate syllables wherever this is possible, to “drop” the endings, especially the consonant groups, and frequently to transpose the syllables.

The accent is fairly mobile, and, as in many dialects, it does not observe the rule of LP of falling on the end of the word. The local Yazdi form of hazari has its own peculiarity, keeping the accent on the first, instead of the last syllable, which sounds rather odd, though the accent is never sharp. Gabri has the accent on the first syllable only in some verbal forms. The accent seems to consist neither in merely raising the voice, nor in merely prolonging it, but in doing both, in a varying degree, depending on intonation, and, perhaps, on the rate of speech.

A real peculiarity of Gabri are the frequent cases in which the word begins with two consonants, contrary to the most inviolable rules of Persian phonology: *zwm, graptuwm*, etc. But still more peculiar and unique feature is the strange disruption of a syllable, mostly in the case of exclamative, in which one part of the word is detached and joined to the preceding one; this mostly happens with the verbs: instead of *mēm exūt* it is said *me mē wūt*; sometimes the same thing happens with the preposition *ā*, which corresponds to both LP *ba* and *az*; so, instead of *ūd ū* (LP *ū az*) simply *kr* is used. Many examples of these will be given in the section dealing with Pronouns and Verbs. The reason for this I could not discover.

Hiatus is quite frequent, but in the majority of cases in which the sound *i* is involved the glide *y* appears; sometimes, especially between other vowels than *a*, appears *b* (*bohe for bo*e*); apparently only with the forms of the Substantive Verb *u* is also used (see in the section on Verbs).

The division of vowels into “long” and “short” ones is even more difficult in Gabri than in many other dialects. The Gabri-speaking Persians are fast talkers; therefore many sounds that are really short, are here inaudible, cf. *kla, LP kulāb; qalafa, LP qalāfa; gēptār, LP gēptār*, etc. This is especially noticeable with YG; in the KG this feature is less prominent, though quite well developed.

There is not yet any precise method of measuring the duration of the vowels, independently from the duration of the whole syllable (by kymograph); the division into those short and long ones, as may be seen from the works of different students, is mostly concerned with the timbre, and the preconceived ideas derived from the usual school grammars and the mediaeval ideas about prosody. Hence come all sort of the “ursprüngliches” “Es”, etc., which are a great obstacle in the way of the critical study of Persian dialects.

It seems very valuable to note the observations of a highly qualified phonologist, who, however, is an outsider to Persian studies, Prof. Daniel Jones, of the University of London. His impression about the accent in Persian (ordinary colloquial, probably of educated circles), is that it is rather what is called “prominence” than real accent; “it is effected by a combination of stress and intonation, without much use of length” (as he writes in a private letter). But in a transcription of a Persian specimen, in his *L’Écriture phonétique internationale* (2nd ed., 1921), p. 15, he writes (in his transcription): *mīsardānd, miscarād*, etc., i.e. *mīsardānd, mīsīrdād*. This leaves no doubt that the accent really affects the length of the vowel, especially if combined with the complex consonant stops.

In the Gabri sounds the nature of the “bright” and “dull” vowels seems to be exactly the same. And it is obvious that the time required for relaxation of one muscular group and its rearrangement for pronunciation of another consonant, or group, which is “filled up” with the “coloured sound” of a definite timbre, is different in every particular case; therefore there cannot be two perfectly even moulds for the “long” and the “short” series. Therefore we may completely disregard this scholastic relic, and may understand by the term “long” really prolonged, under whatever influence it may be, over what may be fairly regarded as typical average duration. And we may call “short” vowels only those which are appreciably shorter than the same average, as far as an “unarmed” ear can notice.

I have to acknowledge my indebtedness to him for his most valuable suggestions in his letters touching on these subjects.

Rivista degli Studi orientali. — XVI.
We may proceed with the description of sounds:

a) Vowels.

The ə group, in all its indefinite outlines, has several principal shadings:

The sharp open Palato–Velar, or even purely Velar ə is, as everywhere in Persian, a comparatively rare sound, appearing only in association with the consonants of the guttural group. It may be “long”, i.e. slightly prolonged, probably only as the result of a syncope, cf. šdr, LP šahr.

Usually it is leaning towards what in the International Phonetic Alphabet is denoted by an inverted a, “half open”, in some cases sounding quite close to an open e. On the whole its sound is harder, more a- like than in many other parts of Persia. It may be “long” occasionally, but in such cases it probably becomes “softened”, or articulated slightly further to the front, and becomes more like a long ə. We may mark this softer shading of ə as á.

Thus we have two rows, such as in mas, vukta, bar etc. and pānji, even penj, seung, me (perhaps even bæ, LP man, “I”), etc.

The long form is as šdr, qdr, pddi (almost as pddi, with Arabic ‘ayn), šdl (almost as ta’d), etc., for LP šahr, qbar (Ar.), pabla, tals. A typical long á or é of this kind appears in már or mdr (mother), where it is due to contraction.

It is remarkable that sometimes the presence of the guttural element, which usually in Persian brings the a sound backwards, affects it in Gabri in an opposite direction: xem (KG), şem, şam (YG) for LP xam, şam. But the sound always becomes brighter in connection with palatal k (PhA e), and its corresponding shading of g. We may mark them as k and g, cf. gat, agar, though YG prefers ager, zarger.

What appears in the Persian orthography as a sound, or group of sounds, which are traditionally regarded as “long d”, and what in living Persian and dialects never sounds as a central palato–velar ə, is an open bi–labial d, varying much in its shadings as depending on the accompanying consonantal “support”. If the surroundings are chiefly of guttural nature, the sound acquires more of the pure a nature; if the place of articulation of the accompanying consonants is in the front of the mouth, the lips become tightened and the o–nature prevails; the presence of nasals which require a “stroke” upwards, affecting the jaw, and the lips, makes the latter much more closed, and it receives the timbre of almost pure u.

Turks, Armenians, Indians, in whose languages gutturals are more prominent than in Persian, pronounce it as an open long velar d, which real Persians cannot articulate. In some localities the sound is almost a pure open o. This sound often appears in Gabri, both in Yazdi and in Kermani;

the latter, however, in pronunciation of the educated, tends to become all–Persian á. In YG, on the contrary, it is mostly almost a clear u, or ə, a sound half way between o and u (pure), or a pronounced through lips closed for u. It appears also in KG, though not so much as in the YG. It is interesting to note that sometimes the same sound corresponds with what in LP is “short” u. Before the final nasal it always sounds as pure u. The most interesting feature of this sound in YG (only) is that whenever it appears in the beginning of the word, it always has a “starting” sound of bi–labial spirant w; this seems to be purely organic “satellite”, depending on the nature of the sound itself. Thus: wuwa, LP dh; wuwa, LP ddn; wuwa, LP drd; wuwaun, or wuwaun, LP ddrd, etc.

It is interesting that this initial w probably makes the sound a pure u. In my careful inquiries from Gabri speaking Yazdi and Kirmanis, I tried to note which particular sounds appear to their own ears as similiar, and which different. Thus, in spite of the presence of the labial element the vowel in wud (LP bdd) and bdr (LP bdr) is different from that of wuwa and wudam (LP bdam). An interesting difference appears in the examples: šdl (LP šdl), but šul (LP šdl, shawl); the word šul is the same as LP šul (loose). In KG everywhere there is ə. But while the KG does not make any difference between the ordinary n and the guttural ŋ, and pronounces this sound as pure u before the latter (cf. wuwaig, LP bnaig), the YG does, and leaves the original ŋ, -vñią. In the Khorasani forms of LP the difference is the same, and the word is pronounced bong. Sometimes very interesting phonetical developments can be observed in connection with Arabic words. The Arabic á before the final b should be expected to sound as u, under the influence of its labial nature; and so it is in YG, as in reuβ – riub; but in KG similar words tend to have i, as in raib, baiiib (or kib), basib, etc., as also in the Persian word xib, where xib or xeb. The LP d, the particle added after the Numerals, is often pronounced not only as YG t, ta, KG tə, but also ta and te.

We may note that, just as in Persian in general, the “short” a and the “long” á are sounds of quite different natures, and the prolongation of the “short” a does not make it sound as the “long” á. In Gabri this is equally the case: both may be short or long, but they sound quite differently.

(e) The ę-group also has many shadings, which form a scale of transitions between ğ and dull i. It is rarely a well articulated palatal ę but mostly tends to be a dull colourless central sound, usually very short and elusive; or it is merely the dull sound of i. Whether there is any uniformity or not, in the different cases of sounds rendered through ę, – is difficult to discover. We may offer here a comparative table of the YG and KG, noted at one and the same time from the representatives of both
communities (though we must note properly that the timbre of these vowels is very variable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YG</th>
<th>KG</th>
<th>LP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ęs</td>
<td>ęs</td>
<td>mıs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kęrm</td>
<td>kęrm</td>
<td>kęrm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sęrkıa</td>
<td>sęrkıa</td>
<td>sęrkıa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pęntır</td>
<td>pęntır</td>
<td>pęntır</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pęstun</td>
<td>pęstun (ę as in ager)</td>
<td>pıştın</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>męş</td>
<td>mış</td>
<td>mış</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ręş</td>
<td>rı</td>
<td>rı</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meyvı, mıya, meyva</td>
<td>meyva</td>
<td>mıya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lęver</td>
<td>lıdıır</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the same time there are obviously cases of ę corresponding to LP u, even after a guttural consonant: ġem (LP ġəmm), ager (LP āgar), etc.

It is difficult to find whether or not there is such a thing a as “long” ġ. If it exists, prolongation is insignificant. Why mix has i, and meş has ę (LP mix and miş), etc., is difficult to see. Anyhow, it seems to have nothing to do with the mediaeval scholastic theories about the ędyı majhāl: śćır is both in the pronunciation of the words meaning “lion” and “milk”.

(1) The sound of “short” i is sharp front palatal, sometimes even emphatic, not the dull i as in English or in German, which sounds more as a narrow ę. It probably never is articulated in the centre, with lateral expansion, as in many other dialects. It may sound long, i.e. sufficiently prolonged for the fact to be noticeable.

(2) The sound of indifferent narrow o, which is almost the same sound as the dull and slack u, is occasionally met in the pronunciation of some individuals, but is not common. So in YG one may pronounce gorg, but another says gurg, and so it is in KG. In other words the case is the opposite. But in the great majority of cases the sound is almost the same as ı, only perhaps shorter, as in ġıdäm, which is not so high as ġıdor, but not deep as ġıdor. In many cases, however, the sound that corresponds to the LP short u is ordinary u, and sometimes it may become i or e, as we will see further on.

(3) The stressed, or emphatic, or “long” u appears as a clear sound. It certainly never sounds as δ as is stated by some students, probably too willing to recognise the scholastic ędwedı majhāl, and which seems to be a pure fiction so far as the reality of the Persian dialects and of basari is concerned.

In ęrd, LP ġdr, force, u is pure and bright; and if we

pronounce ędr or ġdr, this means “wall”. ġıdī is unintelligible, it should be pronounced ġıdī. We may note further on the frequent cases of this sound’s being narrowed into i. It is interesting to note that the sound ġ does not exist in Gabri.

There is not the slightest difference in pronunciation between this emphatic u and the sound u which corresponds to LP ġ before the final nasal. My informers assured me that in words like nun, bım, etc., (LP ġın, ġın) u is exactly the same as ġıd. The same people assured me that in LP bıg, goat, and bıd, falcon, here pronounced as bıd, there is one and the same sound, and that it is exactly the same sound as in wıng (LP bıng), where this LP ġ stands before the guttural nasal n.

b) Consonants.

The general character of the Gabri consonants differs very little from that of basari, or Khorasani. The main feature is the absolute avoidance of all emphatic sounds; only educated people pronounce with a slight stress the uvular q, x and ġ.

We may review the groups systematically:

The Gloctal group is represented only by the fricative b, which usually is very light, sometimes inaudible. It often appears as a glide in YG, but rarely in KG. In Arabic words it sometimes takes the place of the ġ, which the Persians cannot pronounce properly.

Uvular: the plosive g rarely is emphatic, and sounds often like ordinary k, or x before a consonant: ġax, ġart. The fricative of the row, ġ, is also not emphatic, and almost resembles k or q, cf. ġulım or ġulm for LPA ġulım, or ġem, ġem, for LPA ġəmm, etc.

Frical plosives k and ġ are not very different from those in English. But they often are pronounced much further forward on the palate, so that they become what is noted in the L. Ph. A. as e and inverted f. Why they are articulated in this way, is difficult to find, as one and the same individual uses both indiscriminately.

The palatal articulation always appears in connection with the sound ġ, and never with other vowels. The fricative, or spirant of this group, x is not harsh, just as in basari of the Eastern part of Persia.

The nasal of this group, ġ, appears only immediately before k and ġ, and it is often not quite clear whether it is really guttural, or plain.

1 It is indisputable that there was some difference between the ędyı and the ędewedı majhāl, and the ordinary ędy and ędew, but it is extremely doubtful that they were exactly the ġ and ġ that they are supposed to have been. The tradition, accepted by Western scholars before the study of phonetics became a science, is based on theories advanced by Indian lexicographers, whose native language was quite different, and who scarcely could be trusted in this matter. One who knows what is called in India, and taught in Indian schools as “Persian” language cannot cherish any illusions on this point.
Palatal plosives \( l \) and \( j \) are the same as in English. Though the learned phoneticians regard them as combinations of \( l' \) and \( d' \), we may be excused for introducing them here on the same line as the other consonants, – they are, indeed, even if they are complex, so constant and inviolable that we may treat them as simpler items.

The fricative of the row, \( y \), does not require any special description. 

**Palato-velar** fricative \( \tilde{i} \) is not so hard as in English, and before \( d \) it may occasionally pass into the voiced class, taking the form of its corresponding fricative \( \tilde{x} \) by assimilation.

**Dental and alveolar** plosives \( t, d, \) and the nasal \( n \) are not so highly articulated as in English, and do not differ from those in the majority of Persian dialects.

The lateral non-fricative of this group, \( l \), never sounds so hard as the final English \( l \); the rolled, \( r \) more articulated than in English.

The first group of fricatives, \( \theta \) and \( \delta \) are very rare in Gabri, only in the pronunciation of some individuals, as defective \( \epsilon \) and \( \chi \). The latter two are just the same as all over Persia; it seems, however, that probably under the Indian influence the sound \( \chi \) becomes not quite so clean in articulation, being replaced by \( j \).

**Labio-dental** fricatives \( f \) and \( v \) are rather elusive. The first very often is replaced with \( p \), and the second is so similar to the bi-labial fricative \( w \), that it is often difficult to decide, which is which.

**Bi-labial** plosives \( p \) and \( b \) are the same as in English. They are not aspirated. The nasal \( m \) is simple; the bi-labial semi-vowel \( w \) is often, as stated above, very close to the labio-dental fricative \( v \). Perhaps we may suggest that there is a special sound between these two; this, perhaps, may be true of Persian \( v \)-sounds in general, because, though probably originally a real \( v \), it is often negligently articulated \( r \).

### 2. Alterations of Sounds.

We have already referred to those differences between Gabri and LP which depend on the original divergency of purely dialectical nature. Now we have to deal also with those which depend on two causes: adaptation of LP by the dialect-speaking people to their own ways of pronunciation, and occasional corruption which is introduced by individuals, and, for some reason, becomes imitated and perpetuated.

Very often it is not easy to draw a line between the latter two forms of alteration. And, as, after all, our knowledge of the real nature and of the original standards of WP is incomplete, the possibility is not excluded that amongst the deviations from LP there may be found cases of genuine dialectal differences. Therefore, in order to be quite safe that nothing of importance is here omitted, we may give here a summary review of all phonetical differences between LP and Gabri, as it appears now. We may note that in Gabri itself there are many discrepancies between the two sub-dialects, the YG and KG; there are also many local petty differences in the pronunciation of the inhabitants of different villages. The main differences between YG and KG are:

- YG \( \dot{a} \) almost invariably is pronounced as \( \dot{a} \) in KG.
- YG \( e \) sometimes sounds as \( \dot{a} \) in KG.
- YG \( u \) (\( \sim \) LP \( u \) short) is more often pronounced in KG as \( o \) (though there are many cases of the reverse order).
- YG markedly avoids the glide \( y \), while KG introduces it whenever the sound of \( i \) is involved.

There is occasional difference in the accent in the two sub-dialects.

### General Variations.

- a) **Syncopation:** is very irregular, but is the rule when two sounds of the same or neighbouring groups meet (as, e. g., in the inflection of verbs).
- b) **Apocope:** especially in verbs, takes place occasionally, final consonant groups being often omitted in the Preterital stem, cf. \( ha \) for \( xart \), \( xa \) for \( xari \), etc. Also in Nouns: \( da \) for \( daht \), etc., all very irregular.
- c) **Assimilation:** happens often in case of the group \( na \), but rarely in \( st \) (cf. \( pes \), for \( past \)); the groups \( rd \), and \( it \) are very stable.
- d) **Metathesis:** is very frequent, cf. \( wuz \), for \( wzum \), LP \( zaw \); \( prin \), LP \( pan \); \( xudur \), LP \( tag \); \( mnak \) LP \( namak \); \( so\bar{r} \), LP \( barf \); \( vedarat \), LP \( vadarat \); \( penbari \), LP \( penbari \), etc.
- e) **Secondary developments:** \( m \) in \( balkum \), LP \( baki \); \( n \) in \( geren \), LP \( ger \); \( k \) in \( dinbadi \), LP \( d\bar{b} \) (occasional development of \( r \) after the final \( i \) is not uncommon in the Khurasani of Birjand).

It seems that there are no cases of the most usual (in bazari) increment of \( d \) after \( n \), as in \( Jabandam \), LP \( Jabannam \).

In order to facilitate reference, a list of all phonetical alterations, observed in the present material, is given here, with typical specimens. In order to have a generally acceptable starting point, all the alterations are shown here in comparison with the LP standards (in alphabetical order):
a) **Vowels.**

1) LP $a$ – becomes: $a$ before the nasal in a final or closed syllable, except in YG before the gutturo–nasal $a$ in the group $–n sécurité$ or $–n sécurité$; rarely other consonants, cf. kemû, LP kumî; with rare exceptions becomes $\tilde{u}u$ in YG, when in initial position, cf. wudum.

   Becomes $i$, in all positions except the initial: cf. xinúdwan, minúdwan, jeîx, kiûî, hesbî, teînî, teînî, kri, – LP xûndwan, mûndan, jahû, kiûî, biûdû, tanbû, $\tilde{u}lû, kûrdû$, etc.

   May become $e$: hekêl, LPA $kûbîl$, etc.

2) LP $a$, – is generally pronounced in YG as a rather narrow $e$; the same in KG, also $\tilde{a}$.

   May become $i$: cf. wudum, wudum, LP $\tilde{d}âdam$.

   May sound as $é$, – $n$ $r$, LP $nâr$.

   May be elided: bra, LP abra.

   Strange is $jêr$, LPA $jabr$ (noise, quarrel).

3) LP $i$, – often becomes $e$, cf. melî, resî, meva, – LP niš, rîš, miva, etc.

   May sound as $e$, as in meyva.

4) LP $i$, often sounds as $e$, cf. mesî, LP misî, kerm, LP kerm, etc.

5) LP $i$, – very often sounds as $i$, in all positions: dîd, mim, dir, dastîr, ein; ri, wuwari, etc. – LP dîd, mîm, dîr, dastîr, rîn; rî, abrî, etc.

   May sound as $i$ (probably dully $i$), cf. sejen, LP sêzam.

   Strange is the change into $a$ in bra, LP abra; $a$, LP tu; $a$, LP du.

6) LP $u$, – often becomes $i$ (or $e$), cf. dirist, derest, LP durust; beledû, LP buland, etc.

   Strange is the change into $a$: mašt, apparently for mašt (first, handful).

b) **Consonants.**

7) LP $b$, – often sounds as $b$, v $w$ in all positions vûd, vad, vahter; avr, avrišen, vourk, savor; tûw, tavan, xarow, etc. – LP bûd, bad, biblar; abr, abrisum, subûk, sabr; tâb, tab, xardû, etc.

   Strange is $b$ – $m$, as in semil, LP sibûl, moustache.

8) LP $b$, – $s$, as in hesbî, hesbî, etc., LP hitï–kas, hitï–der, etc.

   Strange is $s$ – $p$, as in pengûl, LP tangûl. This may be due to some jocular expression which was introduced on some particular occasion, and came to stay.

9) LP $d$, occasionally becomes $y$, as in mûya, LP mûda, ziye, LP zûdû, mèr, LP mûdar (through *mayer*).

   May be assimilated with the preceding $n$, cf. gemû, LP gandû; ganman, LP gandun, etc.

---
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May be hardened into $i$ in the final position, – gumbat, LP gumbat; zart, LP zard, etc.

May sound as $v$, cf. têver, LP têdir (probably as the result of the changes: $têdir$, teýir, teýir, and insertion of $v$ as a glide).

May sound as $r$, (ordinary) cf. YG xorîr, LP xûrîd.

May sound as $l$, cf. kalâ, LP kalâ.

May be assimilated with $x$, cf. gizum, LP gazzum.

May be replaced by the original dialectical $x$, as in zûnûdwan, zûmûd, LP dûnîsant, dûmad, etc.

10) LP $j$, both in Persian and Arabic words, is often, but very irregularly, pronounced as $p$.

   Initial $j$ (usually corresponding with the labial of the ancient preposition $pra$), becomes $b$: bra, LP farûb; berdû, LP farûd; hermûnûdwan, LP fûrmûdûn; herûtsûn, LP fûrûxtan, etc.

   Occasionally weakened into $w$, as in sewid, LP sofûd.

   Strange are: $f$ – $m$, as in nism, LP nisf (probably through nisf, nisf, nism).

   $f = q$ (?), as in qustûr, LP fiûr.

11) LP $h$ may be omitted, cf. akem LPA $hûktûn$; jeîx, LPA jabdûx; ta, LP tâh; ra, LP raûh, etc.

12) LP $j$ – $y$ apparently belongs to the purely dialectic peculiarities, cf. yûk, yûsga – LP jû, jagûb; yûro, LP jûdrû; yûs, LP jûs; yûc, LP jûk, etc.

13) LP $k$ – softened into $x$, cf. xuđumû, LP xûdûm; xadû, LP kâdû, etc.

   Accidental (?) $g$ in gar, LP kal. In this example $r$ appears instead of LP $l$.

14) LP $m$ very often becomes $w, v$ in an intervocal position as in zûwin, wûsewûn, tûwân, etc., for LP zanûn, dûndûn, tânûn, etc.

15) LP $n$, – on one occasion becomes $m$, cf. gumûn, LP gûmûn, suspicion.

16) LP $p$, – appears to sound as $b$ in bider, bider, LP pidar.

17) LP $q$, – sounds as $x$, in sendûx, wuxît, etc., LP sunûdug, waqît, etc.

18) LP $r$, – sometimes is omitted or becomes inaudible as in gam, LP garm.

19) LP $s$, – in the group $s$ often corresponds with the Gabrî original dialectical $s$, as in basîwûn, LP bastan, etc.

20) LP $s$, – occasionally corresponds with $s$, as in yûs, LP jûs; sur, LP sêr; sewîs, LP sipûs; sira (KG), LP sîrâ, etc.

21) LP $t$, – when intervocal, may be elided, as in sara, LP sidrû.

   May be softened into $d$, as in yûdûm, LPA yûstûm.

22) LP $x$, – weakens into $b$ in the initial position, as in haûk, burmû, biû, etc., LP xuûk, xurûd, xûl, etc.
The case of *navun*, - LP ndaxun most probably is the result of the changes as ndaxun, ndhun, ndun, navun, the *u* being evoked by the presence of *n*.

The same weakening occurs in the groups in which *x* participates; it becomes *h* and is often omitted leaving as its trace a slight prolongation of the vowel as: in dāt, LP, duxt, duxtar; sur, tāl, tār, etc., are surx, talx, tarx (pron. tarx by Persians).

23) LP ẓā, - may be elided, cf. boʾi, LP bāz; maʾsīs, LP zamīsītan (with metathesis).

On some occasions there is strange reappearance (?) of *m* where probably ẓ is omitted, as in hanum, LP hamāz; cām, LP tā (?).

B) Morphology

1. Substantives.

a) Suffixes of formation. In Gabri there are apparently only a few living suffixes used for the formation of Nouns, especially Substantives, which are not found in LP. Such is -ḥg, or -ug, -ak, or -uk, or -og, -ok, which seems to be nothing but the equivalent of the ordinary LP suffix -āk, which has primarily a diminutive and then a contemptuous, or rather disrespectful sense. In bazari and in Khorasani this suffix is usually found in a doubled form, as -aka, really -akak. For instance, mard implies a certain shading of respect or importance, while mardak, mardaka implies the shading of negligibility, "a man (of no importance)", "fellow". Similarly in the Gabri suffix -ḥg the shading of contempt, not necessarily emphatic, is implied, though there is no indication of smallness of the object. It seems that this suffix is rarely added to nouns which end with a vowel. Apparently there is no parallel form in other WP dialects, and this suffix may be merely the result of Khorasani influences.

Apparently another form of the same suffix is -k, like in misk (LP mās), and -kk, as in murik (LP mārās), but these seem to have only purely diminutive meaning. ¹

¹ The suffix -ak exists in Khorasani, as in xundak, kabolak, but has the sense of smallness only. It seems to be also double by nature, because the suffix -u already is sufficient for the formation of the diminutives.

² It is not easy to explain the suffix -a, which appears in the Gabri quotations given in the Khurda Avesta, and corresponds with LP -i of abstract nouns, cf. mardum–duxta, which obviously means LP dāxti mardum, see Part II, specimen No. 63. Another abstract suffix, -un, appears in orun, - LPA urist; it seems that this term is a loanword from Khorasani. It may be noted that though Yazd historically was usually connected with Fars, and that though Gabri uses some indubitably local expressions from Fars, the Khorasani element is very strong in it.

b) Suffixes of inflexion. There is probably no trace of the division of nouns according to gender in Gabri, nor consideration of the names applied to animate objects as distinct from those applied to the inanimate ones. The usual suffixes of the Plural in LP, viz. -ha and -du, appear here in the form of -ā, -a, -un, rarely -bā, -bō; in KG as -ā, -bā; as an exception appears -gun, which is an obvious borrowing from LP. There is really only one example of such suffix in the ordinary speech, - vaštagun, LP vashagān (mašgun, maš gun, mašgān–LP māh, mouth, is treated as Singular). But instead of this the ordinary form is vašā similar to bazari bašā–LP baša–bō; the form vašun, given by D. L. R. Lorimer (444), obviously is how vaštagun sounds in very rapid talk. All my informers could not remember any purely Gabri term which should have the suffix -gun in the Plural.

The suffixes -gal or -dā, which are common in Fars, in Luri, etc., and which appear in the dialect of Zāfrā, do not appear in Gabri.

Cases. LP -rā of the Oblique Case which has here the form -rā, -ru, in KG also -rā, rarely -ra (and probably never -ri or -re as in Khorasan), is used chiefly in KG, almost exclusively with the Accusative. In YG it is usually replaced by pronominal Suffixes.

It is not clear whether there is a special suffix -ā, -e to express the Accusative, as found in some dialects. Gabri, especially YG, prefers, like bazari, to omit all suffixes: agh yak kār bri me wekri–LP agh yak kār kār man kūs. But when some emphasis is put on the Accusative, in accordance with the rules of the dialect the noun is already given the definitive suffix, -ā or -e; besides, it is still more emphasised by the parallel Pronominal form, cf. miya vaštagun ī ko y bi? - LP in bašagān–rd hūd mībārd? Expression like YG dawāyī īm-rā biyār = LP dawāyī īm-rā biyār, seems to be not genuine.

The Datīn is usually expressed with the help of the prepositions ā and bā, sometimes adī, xade, adā, as in hakim adā nukar hā wūtā, - LP hakim nukar–rd gūf. Or: wūstā bā in baxšī hī dātā, LP usīd bā hā baxšī hī dātā ast; the preposition ā is the most common when it appears along with the Pronominal suffixes; in this case it is invariably joined with them in a peculiar way, the like of which is probably not found in other WP dialects: se grūn me gīr ēdā, - LP si gīr–am bā gīr mī–dyad. In KG the preposition ā is used more frequently than in YG instead of bā, cf. ā rī dirāste kār našen, - LP bā rāʾi dirāste kār nīkāst.
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2. Adjectives.

The Adjectives in Gabri follow exactly the same rules as in LP, with regard to their construction with the substantives. The Comparative degree is formed with the same suffix -tar, but the superlative degree is never formed with -tarin, but expressed through the comparative degree with the addition az hema.

Sometimes, just as in bazari, it is simply the positive degree with the same az hema. In the language of the people who try to show their being educated the LP forms are used.


The Gabri numerals are the same as in LP, and only in some cases differ in pronunciation. For LP yahk very often is used ya, and lli is pronounced laš; for LP pamñadh there is penji. The ordinals are the same as in LP. The particle LP ta here sounds very differently: ta, te, th, to.

Fractions are the same as in LP, i.e. all of Arabic origin, usually pronounced as in low bazari: nusf or nism for LPA nisf, etc.

Ordinal Numerals are the same as in LP, only some forms are slightly modified in pronunciation: yakun, duwunum, sezum, bârum, etc. Very often, just as in bazari, the suffix -i is added: isvounm, etc. In their construction they follow all the rules of LP.

4. Pronouns.

Personal Pronouns: YG me, ta, in, mā, lli, iye: KG me, ta, in, mà, lli (šmā), iye (iyl, inān). The table appended here shows the comparison between this set and those found in other dialects of the group.

In the 3rd p. Sing. the form u (or a, i) is rarely used. The Plural forms are sometimes emphasised by addition of the suffix -dā, KG -dā.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LP</th>
<th>Avestan</th>
<th>Ancient Persian</th>
<th>Gabri Gr.</th>
<th>Jewish Gr.</th>
<th>North Group</th>
<th>Southern Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>mana</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>mri</td>
<td>N.-W. of Isfahan-city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>N.-E. of Isfahan-city</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>District of Nāṣran</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Personal Pronouns**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P.1</th>
<th>tehd/a</th>
<th>tehd/ahakken</th>
<th>tehd/a</th>
<th>tehd/ahakken</th>
<th>Songhotan</th>
<th>Marwan</th>
<th>Buzdīm</th>
<th>Pāpūan</th>
<th>Arakūshan and Bakūshan</th>
<th>Delbūk</th>
<th>Lut</th>
<th>Awar, Zimāk</th>
<th>Mihrab</th>
<th>Kurdish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>man</td>
<td>mana</td>
<td>me</td>
<td>mri</td>
<td>N.-W. of Isfahan-city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>lai</td>
<td>N.-E. of Isfahan-city</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>dhi</td>
<td>District of Nāṣran</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proocl. Suffixes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.1</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Demonstratives**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.1</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
<th>-i</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
<td>-i</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The oblique case of these pronouns, formed by addition of the suffix -rā, KG -rā, is used very rarely; usually it is expressed through the suffixal forms.

The forms in KG vin, Pl. viye for the 3rd p., mentioned by Lorimer (447), as I was assured, are used only in some villages; similarly iθun, iθun, wīθun, in the Plural. In YG 3rd p. Pl. may be also unbā, though un in Sing. apparently is never used.

Suffixed Pronouns. They play a very great part in Gabri, especially owing to the peculiar construction in which the oblique case of substantives is usually expressed by the addition of the pronoun. They are, both for the YG and KG: -m, -d (-ś), -i; -mū (rare -mūn), -dā, -ā, or -un, (in KG also -dā and -ā). Though apparently suffixal by their nature, these pronouns are quite commonly used as independent personal pronouns, especially with the "agental" meaning.

When used independently, they receive what may be called as "vowel support"; in case the next word begins with the consonant, the Singular forms have the vowel ā (rarer o) prefixed to them, thus becoming ām, ād, āi; but Plur. mū, dā, ā; if, however, the next word after them is a verb with a modal prefix, or if it is the preposition ā (LP ba or ac), they "attract" these to themselves, even detaching the modal prefix from the verbal form (which in Persian psychology of the language it detachable, as in LP, especially in the older language), and, in the Singular, assume the forms me, de, te, or, in some special cases (with the Perfect and Pluperfect of verbs) mi, di, nī. This does not happen with the Plural forms. Examples: te bārī xar ba (for tē ā bārī xar bārī) = LP ā ba bārī xar bārī. Sīsī i xarta? (for Sīsī d i-xarta-a) = LP tu ā xurdā? Yakh ā pī xwārt (for Yakh ā pī xwārt) = LP yakh ā ra [ba] pī xwārd. Šum ā xa (for Šum ā s xar) = LP ā xiš mū-mūrd. Gap ā xir ā (for Gap ā xir ā) = LP ā rīf ā xīdī ā rastī.

Butći de me na-aḍā (for bući d ā me na-aḍā) = LP tu bucī ba man na-aḍā.

On the other hand, whenever the next word begins with a consonant, the other form is used, as guī ās na-karte, LP ā gūs na-mū-kard.

It may be noted that such amalgamation mostly takes place when the Pronominal suffixes appear in their "agental" meaning. Such amalgamation may take place also when they are used as a substitute for the Accusative, Dative or Possessive, cf.: pūli sīyāh āś ten (KG), for pūli sīyāh āś in eten. - LP pūli sīyāh ba-āś mi-dībad; - here the case is Dative. For the Accusative: wūw-kaš āš hāżer veķren, wūw-kaš āš hāżer veķren, LP dū-kaš-rā hāzīr kūnand. When the amalgamation is with suffixes carrying Possessive force, it is usually accompanied by a peculiar transposition of the elements of the sentence, cf. YG ćemaš me pā nabo and KG ćemus me pā nabo, - for ćemaš ā pā-som nabo, - LP kaš ba pīyī man nabūd, or without transposition: tām de ri me ba (YG), for ām-od ā ri-i me ba, LP ās-āš be ri-i man as: (KG) āz yēga ā som ba, for āz yēga-āš ā som ba, = LP āz ās-āš būnād āšād.

Sometimes there is a difference in the meaning according as the amalgamation does or does not take place, cf. YG Xudā qadam-āš wi ūmū muθuθak veķren, - LP Xudd qadam-āś rā ba-ūmū muθuθak kūnand. If one says: Xudā qadam ūmū, etc., the suffix then becomes related not to the third person (him, as in the sentence), but to God Himself, and the meaning is: Xudā qadam Xud-āš ba-ūmūd, etc.

The suffix of the 3rd p. Sing., -ā may sometimes be phonetically modified under the influence of the following media into -āt, and the suffix of the 2nd p. Sing., -āt is quite frequently pronounced as -āt.

Demonstrative Pronouns. Gabri preserves some archaic pronouns of this class, which have already disappeared in the majority of the WP dialects.

It is very interesting also that Gabri, as an exception amongst the Persian dialects, has separate sets of forms for the Substantive-Pronouns and Adjective-Pr. They belong to two stems, obviously ascending to the AP ima-and hauw, WPT 'im and hauw; similar relics are found only in a few of the existing WP dialects, e.g. those of Quhrād (nim) and Kaša (me, Pl. medi, Zhuk, I, 65). The nasal, which appears in these forms, seems to be a feature common to all extant WP dialects, cf. Quhrādī, Shui, Naṭanī, Farāzandi, Yaranī, etc. It is interesting to note that ā, or o, " that ", has completely lost its meaning of "he, she", though it obviously descends from the ancient hauw, which had this meaning, and still preserves it, in the form of u in several WP dialects (e.g. those of Vonīšān, Kaša, Sedeḥ, Gāz, Kafron, omitting those which avoid nasal habitually as that of Zāfrā).

Thus we may draft a comparative table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subst. Pr.</th>
<th>Adject. Pr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This (sg.)</td>
<td>min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pl.)</td>
<td>mū, mo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That (sg.)</td>
<td>in, o, ā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pl.)</td>
<td>iye</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compound forms:

This same one: mamin, mamo

That same one: ma'min

These forms may undergo slight phonetical modifications, as in some rural pronunciation in iye, may have a slight "introducory" w or v, as in vin, viye. Or the same w/u may appear as a glide: mawu, mash. Occasionally, for the purpose of emphasis, and so-to-say "automatically",
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the usual suffix of the Plural of substantives, –ba, –a, –ə (KG), is added to the Plural forms, as in yekdā, miyedh; but this is considered as "vulgar".

The Plural of the Pronoun o or ū, "that", is also iye. The latter very rarely may be pronounced as ye especially after a preceding vowel.

In KG the expression mīh, and also mēy ki is often used pleonastically, in the sense: "here", "now", "and then", etc. This does not appear to be used in YG, at least not as spoken in the city itself.

The Persian Zardushthi, who speak Gabri, sometimes say that the difference in the use of the two classes of these demonstrative pronouns consists in their being applied only to animate beings (the Subst. Pr.), or inanimate things (the Adject. Pr.). This, however, is scarcely true, and the texts do not bear it out.

Though there is so close a resemblance between Gabri and Na'ini in many respects, it seems that there is no trace in Gabri of the Na'ini Demonstr. Pr. di.

Reflexive Pronouns. Only one is used, xad, WPT uxad, LP xād (xuad).

When used independently, it is pronounced usually as xa'; but in the majority of cases it is used only with the Pronounal Suffixes, as xadm, xadē, etc. This final d does not appear when the pronounal suffix begins with a consonant, as in the Plural: xamadh, xadadh, xakh. The form LP xedē apparently does not exist in Gabri.

Interrogative and Relative Pronouns are the same as in LP and in all dialects, – ki and _DEAD so they have no special form for the Plural, though an emphatic expression permits the use of the ordinary suffix of the Plural, which is used with Substantives, – as in kibā, kiyā, just as in bazi. In the Singular the emphatic form, also as in bazi, is kīh and nīh, nīgh (bazi). The Relative ki occasionally sounds as xu, probably when the syllable is in the "shadow".

"Which" is given by Lorimer (452) as kum, kon, kuni, komi, (LP kuddm). All my informers denied its existence and uniformly gave xudam, xudami, which also means "someone". There is not the slightest doubt that Colonel Lorimer is perfectly right, and thus we may see that here we have something like a changed "fashion", which came to stay during the last 15 years. My informers know the expression kom, kun, but insist that it is the bazi form of the LP kuddm, which is surely the same as xudam. The form kom is used in many WP dialects: Na'ini, Farbazd, Kasā, Fazrā, Kafād, etc.

Other Pronouns. The most interesting relic of the old WP form is ba, "other", "another", apparently the same in origin as the adverb bād, bedi, "again", the WPT bidēg, AP dawiyā. Cf. ebi in Sedeh, Gaz, Kafron, Qah, Kasā, Fazrā, Fizand, Yaran; in the latter two, and in Na'ini and Natanz also bi.

The LP kas, mentioned by Lorimer (453), is not used, and belongs to bazi; for LP har kas is used har xudami, or harke. For bēkha – bēkhi, LP hama is pronounced here as hama; LP hama kas here is – hama kha.

It may be noted that the Gabri speaking people are very fond of introducing purely LP pronouns into their Gabri conversation whenever this is necessary in order to make the meaning clearer.

5. Verbs.

The verb in Gabri has preserved more typical features than any of the other parts of speech. It has lost probably much of its independence, and the process of assimilation with the LP verb is progressing; but, on the whole, it seems that it preserves more of the original peculiarities of the WP group than any other WP dialect at the present day.

a) Stems. The phonetical changes which are connected with the normal "wear and tear" of the language are very difficult to distinguish from the fundamental differences in the dialectal ancient forms. We may maintain, for instance, that the correspondence of the group –t- in Gabri with the group –st- in LP is original and belongs to the difference of the dialect. But such changes as the pronunciation of j instead of LP z, p instead of f, o peculiarities in vocalisation, can scarcely be regarded as only and entirely due to such original causes. They may have easily been introduced by some temporary and local influences. For instance, the tendency to pronounce c as j, of f as p, contrary to all the ordinary tendencies of all the Persian dialects, seems very suspicious, and reminds at once of the pronunciation of low class Indians, who are unable to articulate properly these two sounds. Should not we think that some one, long ago, visiting India, and seeing "how the matters are in the wide world", could have brought this decadenct way of pronunciation which was picked up by his imitative fellow country-men?

We have already summarized the features of the Gabri phonetics which may be regarded as belonging to the dialect itself, and may be traced to the WP forms. Here we may simply examine those verbs which show marked difference from the local bazi and LP standards.

1. The stems of what originally are called the conjugations of the I and the X Classes, with the unchanged stem-vowel:
   "pah" - pah- - paxdaw, or paxdeh (Part. Perf. also pax-), - LP puxtan, to cook.
   "xax" - xax- - wuxdaw, to run (probably of the same stem as LP wux-).
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V' bar-: brin-, brid-, LP burtdan.
V' dar-: drin-, drid-, LP darridan.
V' bī': bān-, šīd-, LP bīdan.
V' sīr-: ašūr-, ašūrū-, LP šīrīdan.

It is interesting that some verbs, belonging to quite a different class, sometimes develop nasal increment, which does not exist in LP, as in:
V' ādī-: ādī-, LP āddān, has in the Imperative the form (YG) aden; this -n, however, is not retained in the Aorist. Similarly n-, nūd-, LP nūddān, has in the Imper. anen, and this -n is not retained in the Aor.

1. The class of the original inchoative verbs follows the same standards as in LP.

4. Verbs originally taking the suffix -āya-, or -āya:
V' grīt-: LP girītan; here gūr- (or gūr-), gāp-. The labial colouring of the Pres. stem is probably due to the -b element.

5. Verbs peculiar to Gabri:
 nīt-, nīst-, or nav-, nēst-, to send. Apparently is not found in any other dialect. The only approximate case of resemblance may be seen in the Ossetic (Digor) niftiš, i.e. from nā sēftiš, "to throw", "to put".

It is interesting that this similarity with Ossetic seems to be not so rare in the WP dialects. Cf. the list of stems which are not found in LP, given in Zhukovsky’s Materials, 1, pp. 246–247.

k-: kaft-, WPT qafstan, the usual verb for the idea of “to fall” in Kurdish and in all WP dialects, in Baluchi, some Samnani and Gurani dialects; no trace in Ancient Persian.

bremštuan, to weep, cry, the same in Na’ini (bremšt-), Vonishvan, Qurhrd, Kašk, Zāfia, Kafron, etc. This may probably be nothing but a denominativum, from the word burmā, burmā-, tear, which is found in the same dialects.

lerḵštuan (YG), to regret to deplore.

gimštuan, Pres. stem of the original gort-, not gis-, to turn, but gis- is used as a Causative.

nīg- (or nīk-): nāšt- to sit. The same stem of the Present is used in the dialects of Na’in, Sedeh, Gaz, and Kafron. The preterite stem is occasionally heard in Khorasan, as also laq, šī. What appears to be a “raised” form of the same stem is nāj-, or moj-: nāšt- or nābšt-, - to seat. It is apparently a complete analogy of what in Kafron sounds nēšt-, nēšt-, in Sedeh and Gaz nēšt-:- nēšt-, and in

This etymology is offered here only tentatively. It is to be noted that the Preterite of the verb ov, or ov, "must", is also ovat. As this ovat obviously comes from LP ovat (or some form similar to this), it is quite possible that the Preterite ovat corresponds to a pastetted form of LP ovat. It is quite possible that ov also is LP ovat, because in some cases it appears that in reality it is ov, KG ov. Perhaps this may have something to do with maω: maω- in the Kazirn dialects (cf. above), to which this verb can correspond, with the usual Gabri alteration of m into w.

1 In KG sometimes there appears a strange form ov̄v̄w̄m̄ for the Imperative, 2nd p. Sing.
Zafrā nām-: nāsh- (where n in the Pres. may be the suffix of Causat. -n-). In earlier works there is a verb for "to seat", senās-: senās-. This appears to me nothing but nāsh-: nāsh-, combined with the Pronoun śā: śā "to seat oneself". All my informers emphatically denied the existence of such a verb, - to them it conveyed no sense. I would personally be inclined to accept their statement, but Col. D. L. R. Lorimer insists on preserving the theory of senās- = ništā-, with metathesis. But how should we explain senās-? Though every student of Gabri knows Gabri-speaking people, whose memory very often is remarkably short, I would, nevertheless, in this case side with them, against Col. Lorimer. 3

We may add that there is still another form for "to seat", which seems to be double Causat. - ništā, and yet another, composite form, ništā, or ništā, which are as all given as the equivalents of LP ništā. The form ništā has the Pres. tense ništā, and is nothing but ništā, i.e. LP ništā ništā. But apparently this is not all, and I have the form of the Pres., 1st p. Sing. naštā, i.e. ništā. - LP ništā ništā (i).

mar-: mari, to strike, to hit; probably for bmari-: bmari- as it appears in all WP d-ts, except that of Gaz.
penor-: penort-, to seize, snatch, take (pertunw, pruntunw, pruntunw, pertunw, etc.). Is this a metathetic form of LP pardnīdān, - "to make to fly" (i.e. to disappear), - to snatch?

isl-: islād-, to shave, cut; apparently a modification of LP islādān;
cf. Bakhtiyari tāštān or tāštān.

wrāḍ-: wraḍ- or wroḍ-, or wroḍ-, wraḍ-, to shear, to pluck.

xcē-: xcēd-, to slip, LP jāxādān.
yē-: yor-, or yew-: yovād- (Lorimer), to chew, cf. LP jāvādan.
zhun-: zhunā-, to know, LP dānāstān.

We may add here a few defective (or impersonal) verbs:

wau-, apparently from the same origin as LP ēyād.

la-: lāsi (lori), to be able, cf. LP ēyād, ēysi, in the sense of LP tāvānāstān.

Many verbs differ but slightly from the forms of LP.

b) Causativus, are formed by infixing -n-, as in all WP dialects, cf. rasāni, - LP rasāni, rasāni, - LP rasāni. This is what may be regarded as "regular" formation of the Causative. The formation by "strengthening" the stem, as in LP, is extremely irregular, and no general rules can be given here.

c) Participles and Verbal Nouns. In Gabri, as in all WP dialects, the only real Participle is the Past one. We cannot enter here again into the discussion of the different stems, with their peculiar ways of forming the Preterite stem, on which this Participle is based, with the help of the ancient suffixes, of which now only -r (rdr-) is left. The regular formation of the Preterite stem corresponding with LP -dā, is with the suffix -rā (rod, -rā, KG also -rā). This difference is already complete in WPT texts, - pārās against pārās (Tol. 228).

There is no Present Participle, though the usual LP form of it from Persian verbs, used in bazari, here frequently appears in the sense of ordinary Adjective.

As in bazari, Gabri apparently permits the use of the pure Preterite stem as a kind of verbal noun. It is doubtful, whether the Present stem is similarly used. But it seems certain that there is no suffix of abstract verbal nouns similar to LP -dā.

d) The Infinitive is formed in the great majority of cases with the help of the suffix -wun, or -wun (suspiciously close to the corresponding suffix in Gujarati, spoken by Parsis of India); very rarely, mostly in KG, there is preserved the older form -mun; still rarer is the form -un. It is extremely interesting, however the fact is to be explained, that all students who deal with Gabri some 20, or more, years ago, give as the most common the suffix -mun; now Zardushis simply deny its existence. Is this again a trace of Indian influence?

On inquiry I could note only these few verbs with the suffix -mun, in KG: sāmun, kāmum, xarādum, and xāiāmin; xartun has simply -un. But this does not mean that these particular verbs are always pronounced with the suffixes -mun or -un; in reality one and the same individual, who just mentioned them, would repeat them with the suffix -wun 1.

e) The Gerund, similar to that in LP, in -ant, formed from the Infinitive, is also used in Gabri, cf. amadwun, - LP amadāni, coming, which is to come. It is difficult to decide how far this form is genuine.

But there is almost certainly no parallel form to what may be called the LP Gerundive, and which is much used in bazari, e.g. dddagi, what is to be given; diddagi, to be seen (as against didant, what is possible to be seen).

f) Verbal Prefixes (separable) are practically the same as in LP, except the few which resemble those used in Kurdish. To the former

1 It appears that the Preteritul stem of certain verbs may be occasionally used for the Infinitive, or as a verbal noun, cf. wādi ms, or wādimi ms, which have the same meaning. But it is impossible, for instance, to say rastāli ms. The Present stem apparently is never used as a verbal noun. On one occasion, lārāmi, it appears that the suffix -mun gives a sense different from the usual Infinitive, which is lārāmān.
class belong such as dar, bar, bāz, or ud, pay, and different modifying adverbs. These appear in their phonetically altered form: dār, wār, ū, po, etc.

It must be noted that whenever the preposition changes the sense of the verb from that of Transitive to Intransitive, or vice versa, it is inflected according to its new meaning, cf. ar-xartan, though xartuwān is a Transitive verb.

Those Prefixes which are not found in LP are as follows:

ha, with its numerous variations, in which the vowel is changed, and the aspiration may or may not be audible: a, as in adn; u as in inuun, i as in imig, or umig); or baden, binig, etc.

bar, or ar, which seem to be exactly the same as in Kurdish, and has the same meaning, almost entirely coinciding with LP bar: cf. ar-gor, - LP bar gir; ar-vatun, ar-xindun, etc.

e-, ve-, as in xistāwun (cf. Zhuk. I, 222 and Lor. 485). It seems to me that this is nothing but a purely phonetical development, a kind of introductory glide, similar to ve- in YG in the case of initial u mentioned above. It would be interesting to find an example of its being prefixed to a verb, beginning with a consonant. The example of vedārit-wān is wrong, because this ancient ve- (corresponding with modern LP gu-) is not conceived as a prefix, and, as already pointed by Lorimer (485), is very often pronounced in an inverted way: devartwun, devor. Such a thing probably never happens in Persian with real prefixes.

hem-, in the meaning of LP Adverb bd-ham, seems to be rare, as in hem-xistāwun.

bdr, with the meaning “out”, LP birān, as in bar xodwun; this bar is never pronounced as bār or war, and a in it is emphatic, attracting the accent.

yā, as in yā xudwun, mentioned also by Zhukovski (I, 229) in the dialects of Zāfrā and Qahrā, as yā or yē, with the meaning “down”. But it is clear that this is nothing but yē- - LP jā, “place”; thus yānidwun means simply “to put on its place”, what in bāzari is quite common, LP jā guddīyan. Here obviously the substantive jā has lost its original preposition, and is used adverbially.

ker, kār (only KG), “out”, is apparently the same as mentioned in Zhuk. I, 229 (kār), in the dialects of Kāsā and Zāfrā; Sedej, Gaz, and Kafon - kū. Cf. kār xodwun, to go away.

tm, tūg, (LP tab) as also rī, (LP rū) which are mostly used as ordinary prepositions, may be used also with verbs, as in rī-nalxawuun.

pen- (Lor. 484), is obviously not a verbal prefix, even though it may accidentally coincide with rī. apa + ni, because, just as in the case of ve-, above, it is very frequently subjected to metathesis, and pen-xawun is heard as often as penārtwun. As I already mentioned, it seems to me that this verb is nothing but LP parāndītan.

h) Suffixes of Emphasis. There are some verbal suffixes which apparently cannot be explained unless we believe that they are intended to

| This verb is occasionally pronounced as lūddun, which is to be distinguished from
| Hādun, to accept, LP sisādan.
| What is the suffix -e in YG īn neyūnda, for īn neyūnda? Is it merely a euphonic addition?
| It would be interesting to know the origin of the suffix -e of the Imperfect of the
| Transitive verbs, and why it does not appear in the Intransitive verbs.
| This is especially noticeable in verbs beginning with a vowel, cf. neyūnda, from
| Amadun.
give the form more stress and emphasis. Such apparently is -e, which appears at the end of all negative forms of the Indicative Mood (and is apparently never used with the Subjunctive). The present general tendency is to drop it, but this is obviously due to the decadence of the language. It is difficult to find the rules which regulate its proper use: it may appear with one form, and not appear with the other. Thus it is often used with the Present tense, both of Transitive and Intransitive verbs: me na-raśnie, na-parśime. But while it may be added to the Preterite of the trans. verbs, - cf. me'm na-parśide, it appears only with Imperfect of the Intransitive, as in me na-rasūlime = LP man na-mī-rasūdam, while the Preterite is me na-rasūdide, na-bu'e = LP na-rasūdam, na-bādam, etc.

It is difficult, in the present state of our knowledge of WP dialects to suggest a satisfactory explanation of this suffix. There is a suffix -i, added to the 1st person Sing. and Plur., without changing the meaning of the form, in the Kashani dialects, cf. Zhuk. I, 233. It is added apparently chiefly, if not entirely, to the positive forms. Sometimes -i, is added, also without any serious change in the meaning of the verb, in Khorasani of Birjand, i ūi guyādī? - LP in ūi guyād. But, as this -i appears only in the 3rd p. Sing. (as far as I could see), it is possible that this is merely the emphatic particle do, dī, which is quite common in Gabri also. This -i also appears in the positive forms. Perhaps we may be nearer the truth if we think of the Kurdish verbal suffix -a in what is called Northern group of dialects: dekāūima, kāūima, etc. Though at present this suffix apparently does not convey any special shading of the sense, yet in some cases in the Kurdish of Khorasan there are some allusions to the fact that it could have an emphatic meaning. Or, perhaps, by a change, it may have some connection with the definitive suffix -a, -e of the substantives?

Another enigmatic verbal suffix is -re, appearing in a few verbs which in the 2nd p. Sing., of the Imperative end with a vowel. This form seems to be almost forgotten now, and is heard only in some villages near Kerman, as Qan'at Qasum, Jupār, etc. I collected only the following instances:

bure, neg. māzare, from lāmuwa (LP āmādan).
burē, neg. māburē, from budwān (LP būdān).
ve-lure, neg. ū from šātūwa (LP šādān).
ve-xure, KG ve-xurne (cf. also ve-xu), neg. ū from xartwān (LP šārdān).

All these forms mostly appear without -re, especially the latter three. The same -re apparently is found in the verb corresponding with LP āmādan in many WP dialects: of Nā'īn, Sedeh, Gaz, Kafrūn, Farīzand, Yaran, Na-
tanz, Vondūn, Qūhīd, Kāsā, Zāfrā, Mahallāt, Khūnsār, etc. In some cases this is -re, in other -ri, and even simply -r. Unfortunately, there are very few verbs in Gabri which have a vowel at the end of the Present stem, and it is difficult to verify in how far this practice is general with them. It may be noted that the imp. of kārtwa, is veē, Pl. veērī, and my informers told me that it is impossible to say veērē. This suffix seems to be preserved also in some dialects of Fars.

i) Personal suffixes. A comparative table of personal suffixes in all the known dialects of the Western Persian group is added here, so that the student can see at a glance the typical variations.

1st pers. Sing. -e, with the loss of the final nasal, is probably due to the general tendency of Gabri to avoid nasals. Quite probably there was originally -m, which was afterwards slacked into an indefinite nasal -n, as in the majority of the WP dialects at present, and this -n, was gradually reduced to nil. But as soon as there is a suffix to be added after it, the ancient -m reappears. This regularly happens in the Present tense, in the Imperfect, etc. (the latter only in intransitive verbs), whenever the verb is used with the negative particle na-. Thus from the positive form mek'e, the negative is me na'kime (LP man na mī-kunām).

2nd person Sing. -i. It seems to be completely assimilated with the corresponding suffix in the LP, or rather bazari. The ancient differences which still existed in Pehlevi, are gone. In WP the difference is observed (Ted. 234) between the suffix -th, and that in LPT -fy. The e's here are, indeed, purely conjunctual, built on the belief in the "yēi ma-
fhāl" being t, for which there is not much probability. And we, surely, do not know whether the final b in this -th was really pronounced, or was merely an orthographical device. In all WP dialects at present it is plain -i; but the fact that in bazari, especially in Khorasan, and from bazari in the petty patois studied by O. Mann in Fars, the 2nd p. Sing. often sounds as -ey, certainly cannot warrant our accepting it as "noch heute unverändertes -ey"; because the 2nd p. Plur. sounds similarly: i ēhuné may mean in Khorasan equally LP ti (mī-)kunt and ēi (mī-)kunt. Thus most probably it is a neologism, and is entirely due to what may be described as negligence in pronunciation, to which the sound of i, being generally emphatic in Persian, is particularly exposed. It remains as -i even when a vowel suffix is added, becoming -iye in the negative form: ta 'kri, - ta na'kriye, LP tu na mī-kunt.

3rd p. Sing. has different forms: the ordinary is -ū, -a, rarely -e, just as in bazari: ēta (LP mī-dhut); èparsa (LP mī-pūrsad); erassā (LP mī-rasād).

Some verbs retain -d or -z both in positive and negative forms; those which I noted are: budwān, -ebi, neg. na'date; lāmuwān, -etā, neg.
### II. Comparative Table of the Verbal Suffixes of the Western Persian Dialects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suffixes of the Future Stem</th>
<th>LP</th>
<th>Avestan</th>
<th>Pehlevi</th>
<th>WP</th>
<th>Turkish</th>
<th>Gabri</th>
<th>N.-W. of Isfahan-city</th>
<th>E. of Isfahan-city</th>
<th>district of Naqsh</th>
<th>Villages of the Kazerun District</th>
<th>Southern Fars</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal suffixes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. -lian</td>
<td></td>
<td>-d-mabi</td>
<td>-d-mahi</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-m</td>
<td>-m, -mi</td>
<td>-m, -mi</td>
<td>-m, -mi</td>
<td>-m, -mi</td>
<td>-m, -mi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. -id (-a-ta)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-a-ta</td>
<td>-a-ta</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d, -i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. -ad</td>
<td></td>
<td>-a-ti</td>
<td>-a-ti</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suffixes of the Past Tense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. -id</td>
<td></td>
<td>-id</td>
<td>-id</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d, -i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of the Passive Stem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. -id</td>
<td></td>
<td>-id</td>
<td>-id</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d</td>
<td>-d, -i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
<td>-i, -id</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

nate; ludwun, - eut, neg. na'ute. It is interesting that from ddudwun, LP ddadan, the neg. form is na'te.

An apparently separate form is found only in the intransitive verbs; it is -it, which probably is a relic either of the conjugation of the -yams-stems in Pehlevi, or, most probably, is inherited from the suffixes of the Middle Voice of the ancient language. In YG it is very rare, the tendency is to make any difference between transitive and intransitive verbs, but KG preserves it better. So, from rasudwun, LP rasidan, both have the 3rd p. S. of the Present tense, - erasa; but while YG in the negative form has na'rasa, KG has na'rasite. Some verbs have this form even in the positive form: evedrit, eminit, tdp-irt, dir-irt, etc., from vadradwun (LP guššatun); minirdwun (LP mândan); tdp-sodwun to tremble, and dir-roshun, to be prostrated.

1st p. Plur. is the usual -im; it does not change when the suffix -e is added in the negative.

2nd p. Plur., -idi, rarely -id, also does not change in the negative forms.

3rd p. Plur., -en, has lost its final -d irretrievably, and it does not reappear before the suffix -e, in the negative form: na'tene, LP na-ml-

The suffixes as given here are those of the Present tense, and of the Subjunctive Present; the Preterite and Imperfect of the intransitive verbs, as in all Persian dialects, have the same suffixes in all persons, except the 3rd p. Sing., in which there is no suffix at all. In the negative form only the suffix -e, is added.

The ancient suffixes of the Optative, found in WPT, as -am, -ab, -dd, etc., are completely lost; the Optative does not exist.

The Imperative has the same suffixes except for the 2nd p. Sing., where, as usual, there is no suffix; exceptions, when -re is added, are mentioned above.

j) Formation of the Tenses. The Gabrie verb in this respect closely resembles the usual LP scheme, as also is the case with all WP dialects, except, perhaps, the Lāri group. There is, however, a great difference between the corresponding forms of transitive and intransitive verbs, the former having the Passive construction (as it is called) in the Preterite, and generally in all Past tenses.

It may be noted, however, that a transitive verb, when it receives a preposition which changes its force from transitive to intransitive, is inflected according to the rules of the latter group.

Special tables of inflexion of intransitive and transitive verbs are given further on, and here only some general remarks are offered:

Present tense: it accepts the prefix e-, which is subject to elision on one side, and also to detachment from the verb, and adhesion to the preceding word, if it ends with a consonant. Thus what one hears is me 'pare, ta 'paris, but in the 3rd p. ine 'parsa, etc. The elision is possible even after a nasal, as in yaqin 'but, LP yaqin ml-’bawad.

Emphatic Aorist. The present tense, or Aorist, as it in fact is, has also the meaning of Future, - there is no special form for the Future in Gabrie. But, if this Future meaning is stressed, the prefix e- receives some stress, and may be not elided, even after a vowel, as in me epars (it does not attract the accent upon itself, however). In pronunciation, nevertheless, it is not always easy to detect which is which. For instance, me à mères (for mer epars) means: I ask the mother (now); but me à xer eparsa means: I generally ask the mother, or I will ask the mother in the future.

Subjunctive of the Present, is formed exactly as the Present, but instead of the prefix e- it has the prefix ve-, which is not elided or detached. This tense is used with the conjunction bi.

It may be noted that in case the Imperative of a verb has a prefix, like a-ba-, ha-, etc., it may not preserve it in the Present, but does preserves it in the Subj., which in such case receives no prefix ve-, as in the Imperative. In the case of detachable prefixes, which are really either prepositions or adverbs, the modal prefixes are added just in the usual way, immediately to the stem, cf. me bar ekre (pronounced as me bare 'kere), LP na man birin mi-’nam; me bar xere, LP (b) man birin bi-’nam.

The negative forms of the Present have already been described above; in the Subj. they are the same, as in the positive, but the prefix ve- is replaced, without leaving any trace, by na-.

Preterite of the intransitive verbs is formed from the Preterite stem, by addition of the personal suffixes, except that of the 3rd p. Sing. It may be noted that the negative form simply adds na-, but not the suffix -e, both in YG and KG.

Imperfect is the same as the Preterite, but with the addition of the prefix e-, the same as in the Present tense. In the negative form, in addition to na-, the suffix -e is added, and the personal endings are the same as those of the Present negative, except the 3rd p. Sing., in which there is always -e. The Transit. verbs add also a suffix -e.

Perfect tense has two forms, the full one and the syncopated one. It is difficult to find what is the difference between them in their meaning; probably there is little, or none.

1 It seems as if sometimes the e/ω of the prefix in the Subjunctive is pronounced so lightly as to become inaudible. Or this may mean that occasionally the Emphatic Aorist may take place of the Subjunctive.
The first, or full form, completely corresponds with the same form in LP: rasūdā-ē, rasūdā-ī, rasūdā (-me), etc. In the negative simply na- is added.

The second, or synocopated form, elides the final suffix -ā of the Participle, and thus the endings become similar to those of the Preterite, except for the 3rd p. Sing. in which there is the suffix -ā. But in the negative form there is a substantial difference, as the negative prefix takes the form ne- in YG, and even ney- in KG, pointing to the presence of the hidden prefix i-, which is characteristic of the composite tenses.

Pluperfect completely corresponds with that in LP, being formed by the Participle plus the Preterite of the substantive verb. In YG both prefixes na- and me- are used, being added to the stem; in KG they use either ney- with the main verb, or na- with the auxiliary verb.

Past Subjunctive completely corresponds with the form used in LP: (hi) man rasīda bāsām, - (hi) me rasīda be, etc. The negative form adds na- or ne- in YG, and ney- in KG, before the verb itself, or na- before the auxiliary verb.

In KG there is occasionally given the form of the Second Past Subjunctive, LP (hi) man rasīda bāda bāsām, - (hi) me rasīda ibāda be. This, however, seems to be a slavish imitation of the LP, and its existence is denied in YG.

Though the forms of expression of prolonged action are the same for the transitive and intransitive verbs, we may deal with them now in order to complete the account of the Intransitive Verb.

To express an action which is still continuing, or is just about to begin, Gabri uses the verb dārtwan, LP dōstant, just as in bazari, and almost all dialects.

The Present tense is formed by the Present tense of dārtwan, and the Present tense of the inflected verb: me dārtē 'rase, - man dāram ml-rasam; ta dārē rasi, - LP tā dārī ml-rast, etc.

The Transitive verbs are inflected exactly in the same way. The Preterite, or generally Past tense, is formed from the Imperfect, both of the verb dārtwan, and of the inflected verb. It is remarkable, that dārtwan, which is an ordinary Transitive verb, may be inflected both, as a transitive and as an Intransitive verb, apparently without any change in the meaning, and without any relation to the type of the main verb. Thus:

I. me dārtē rasīde, or me dārī rasīdē, ta dārī rasīdā, or ta de dārī rasīdā, ine dārī erasīdā, or in še dārī rasīdā, etc.

We may add here also a specimen of the Transitive verb:

II. me dārīe me parsādē, or me dārī me parsādē, ta dārī de parsādē, or ta de dārī de parsādē, ine dārī še parsādē, or in še dārī še parsādē, etc.

In the Transitive Preterit form of dārtwan the suffix -e may be added. Sometimes the verb, probably under the influence of bazari, becomes dārtwan: me me dāli me parsād, apparently without any difference in the meaning. The Preterite forms of this construction are very rarely used.

Transitive Verbs. The Past Tenses are formed in Gabri, as in all the WP dialects, in a way which substantially differs from that of the intransitive verbs, and from those used in LP. This formation is what is called the "Passive Construction". This is quite common in Pehlevi, where it is used side by side with the Active Construction. In the Turfan texts it seems to be more common in the LPT fragments than in WPT. Traces of it are occasionally found in the Shdīnamā. At present it forms a prominent feature of all the WP dialects, and of Kurdish, in which the Active Constr. of the transitive verbs is not used.

Usually it is regarded as being composed of the personal Pronoun, theagental Pronoun, and the apocopated form of the Past Passive Participle of the verb. The Pehlevi kard is supposed to be the same as AP kartah (cf. Salemam, 308). Thus it is expected to be an equivalent of "I, by me (it is) done". This seems to fit the case of the Perfect and Pluperfect, in which we find the auxiliary, verb, which forms an indispensable part of the expression.

The case with the Preterite seems to be different. Even in the group which preserves many archaic usages, the SP and Baluchi, the Past Passive Participle, in its full form, is joined with the personal endings which are not the forms of the Substantive verb, but with the Possessive Pronouns, as in Samani, or in Khor, cf. be-gutok-um, be-gutok-ēt be-gutok-ē, etc. Thus there is also no auxiliary verb added. It appears further on that in the older periods of LP (probably especially) in Khorasan, there was a strong tendency to omit the personal suffixes in the Preterite, especially when a modal suffix had to be added. Cases of such usage are many in the Shdīnamā and early poets (cf. Horn, Neuers. Schriftspr., 151-2: gul dādām-ū mast šud ba-bayl, etc.). There are many instances in the Tabaqat of Anarsi, cf. JRAS, 1923, pp. 342-3.

We may recall in connection with this the well-known fact that even a thousand years ago the form of the apocopated Past Passive Participle, like gut, xarlā, etc., was already used in the sense of a verbal noun, parallel with the Infinitive, but possessing less of verbal character (this may

---

2. It seems, however, that in Gabri the substantive verb may be omitted occasionally, cf. Part II, the specimen No. 14, in the beginning: bāri wurt-ēt šīhī me (though, indeed, it is quite possible that we have here the case of contraction: me-a). Such cases, anyhow, seem to be very rare.
be seen from the fact that it is never used with the modal particles, while the ordinary Infinitive occasionally is used). And the expressions of this kind imply not only the idea of the action, but also its object: xard is not so much "buying", as "bought", quite in agreement with the initial participial nature of the form.

It is extremely difficult to find any reliable information as to how the real Gabri-speaker "feels" this form. Apparently in the great majority of cases there is no special "feeling" whatever, because the people, being without exception bilingual, and probably using more bazari than their own dialect, very easily introduce the LP usage of giving the Object of the action in the Accusative, with the affix -rd. While such contaminated construction is usually avoided by more or less intelligent Gabri-speakers in Yazd, in Kerman it has rooted so deeply in conversation that it gradually becomes almost normal.

The instances are very numerous in KG specimens:

KG ri'ra-xub u di, LP rory-al-rad xub did.
KG tamuk-ra xe bar varri, LP kafis-rad dar dasti.
KG mije-rad aq me's girafi, LP in-bad-rd az man girifi.
KG xad-rad xe xarm kuli, LP xud-rad ba xub bad.
KG voa-rad am navaate, LP xala-rad na-ml-xanbam, etc.

In the Yazdi form there are also many instances:

YG xamnai x-a-rd xe ham nuid, LP alma-xad-rd ba-bam nihad.
YG mahi x-a-rd xe masraf ka, LP mida xad-rd sarf kard.
YG yamug-rad aq venid, LP zan-rd andad, etc.

It is extremely interesting that probably under the same bazari influence there are cases in which the main verb in the Preterite (transitive), sometimes receives the suffixal form of the auxiliary verb when the question is about the subject in the Plural:

YG ziina u vaqgum u talabat-en, LP zan wa ba-4-rd talabid.

In KG I noticed similar cases only in connection with the verb vdi, or vut (see further on, on defective verbs).

Imperfect of the Transitive verb is formed from the Preterite with the help of the prefix of duration e-. Thus me om eparsad, which becomes me'm eparsad, and is pronounced me me parsad.

There is also another form of the Imperfect, which is quite common in YG, and predominates in KG, - me me parsade, with a suffix - at the end. It seems that this suffix never appears in the Intransitive verbs. What is it really? The grammarians of LP know the suffix called ydi istimdr, or the suffix -d, similar in the meaning to the prefix mi. In my paper on the old form of the LP language from Herat, JRAS, 1923, pp. 348–352, I tried to show that in reality this suffix, as well as the -d of condition, seem to be merely suffixes of "verbal cohesion", and that they can appear only when there are two or more verbs in the sentence. Though I have not yet found materials which could annul this conclusion, it is quite probable that occasionally, or in some dialects, these suffixes could be used merely for emphasizing the participation in the narrative, or simply expressing still continuing action.

Perfect tense is formed from the Past Participle and (hidden) the 3rd p. Sing. of the substantive verb: me'm parsada, really me om parsade-a. It is remarkable that the prefix of duration (what apparently it is), e-, may be added, thus giving me me parsada (i. e. me om eparsada-a). Sometimes in YG, and almost always in KG, this prefix is stressed, and pronounced as -e-, thus giving me mi parsada. Traces of it are found in the YG chiefly in the negative form in which the usual na- becomes ne- (in KG ney-).

We may remember that in the old language in LP the Perfect tense quite frequently had the prefix mi or hami, as also had the Pluperfect.

Pluperfect tense is a full parallel of the Perfect, except that instead of adding the hidden 3rd p. Sing. of the substantive verb, in the Present tense, here the 3rd p. Sing. of the Preterite of the same verb is added openly: me'm parsada bu. There are also two forms, the second adding the prefix e- (or really i-): me mi parsada bu, or really me om i-parsada bu. In KG the negative particle na- may stand immediately before the auxiliary verb: me me parsada na-: In KG again the particle na- may be added to the auxiliary verb.

k) Imperative Mood, except in 2nd p. Sing., follows the same rules in its formation as the Present Subjunctive. The 2nd p. Sing. presents the pure Present stem, with the prefix ve-, which has sometimes an irregular form. In some cases the 2nd p. Sing. of the Imperative differs from the Present stem, cf. ve-ku, Pres. stem kr-, Preterite stem kari; or veza, for xar-, Pret. xart. It is mentioned above that some verbs, ending in -u in this form, receive an increment -re (or -r), which is found also in many WP dialects, especially in the same (cf. above, on suffixes) verb LP amadan, in its numerous phonetical variations. The negative form apparently never takes the particle na- which so often is found in such cases in bazari, but always ma-.

We may add that though the LP prefix bi- is represented here by ve-, we-, v-, u-, it appears as bi-, with a clear i in blire, blure, = LP biyd, and is sharply accented here.

Imperative of the Causative has in the 2nd p. Sing., as a rule, the suffix -en. Apparently the same suffix is added to some simple verbs, as
in the case of adén, from dāduwa (LP dddan), mén, from nādawn (LP nhddan), etc.

1) Passive Voice. It is very difficult to explain what is the Passive Voice even to educated individuals, and to obtain from them a reliable and genuine example, not merely a literal translation from LP. It seems that Passive forms are used on exceptional occasions only, direct construction being always preferred. In case the subject is not shown, as, for instance, in the expression "I was paid", the Gabri-speaking people would invariably say "they have paid to me". One meets occasionally with expressions like me kasti bo's = LP mana zada xundam, but it is intelligible only to the educated. The uneducated would accept it for the form of the Pluperfect, which has just the opposite meaning: I had hit

In the expressions which come near the Passive Voice, as the subject of the action is not mentioned, as in "they say", etc., but which by form are in the Active Voice, it is often expressed in Gabri by Active forms, with the verb standing in the 3rd p. Plural, as in bekhyāt th 'eurtā = "it is narrated".

m) The Auxiliary Verb, "to be" or "to become". The stem Yabh, as in LP, appears only in the Present tense, in an independent and in a suffixal form:

1. Independent form (both in YG and KG):

   Positive:
   Sing. 1. heh
   2. hi
   3. ha, or a
   Plur. 1. him
   2. hit
   3. hen

   Negative:
   Sing. 1. nehe
   2. ney
   3. naha, or na
   Plur. 1. nihim
   2. niti
   3. nehen

2. Suffixal form, both in YG and KG:

   Sing. 1. -e, (-ye)
   2. -i, (-yi)
   3. -un, (-uned) -eud; -na, -ne
   Plur. 1. -im, (-yim)
   2. -il, (-yil)
   3. -en, (-yen).

Examples of the Passive seem to be very rare: YG diwātī miyē paṭracus but, - LP dhūdī anū ba paṭracus jauvā; this is obviously a literal translation from LP; KG (kh) miyē-rā (sic) farzadī ta xundā vade, - LP kh miyan farzandī tə xunndā bīla; this also seems to be not quite genuine.

It may be noted that usually after a consonant the form of the 3rd p. Sing. -un is used, while after a vowel, -na, or -ne; it is not clear whether the form -uned, in which u is very short, and e is semi-accented (as the real accent rests on the word itself), - is simple or not.

It is remarkable that Gabri with regard to the auxiliary verb, or more particularly the 3rd p. Sing. containing a nasal, comes near the Farsi patic, in which it is -ān, while it is not preserved elsewhere. The Köhgilu -ni and Bakhtiarī -ne (Lor.) after a vowel are found in the Luri dialects; but this -ān scarcely is a trace of the Luri influence. It seems also that in the case of the form -na or -ne the n may be merely a glide. We have in Khorasani the forms like i kū-nū, - LP in k ast, instead of which one also hears occasionally i kū-wā, or in the most cases i kū-ya. Thus it is obvious that this is merely a glide. The most difficult to explain is the appearance of r or g before this -ne, and the reason why it should be used after a consonant.

There is yet another form, which is very rare now, of the 3rd p. Sing. -nit. It appears only after the vowels, and thus we may recognize in its initial n nothing but the glide. The -it itself obviously is the old form, AP aiti, Av. aiti, and what in Pelehi is written as 'ayit, and what was "Pazended" (or, really, translated) as ast. In my paper on ancient Herati Persian (JRAS, 1923, pp. 354-356) I have shown that this form was preserved in the colloquial Persian of Herat in the beg. of the XIIth c., and that the supposed ideogram 'ayit in Pelehi was really not an ideogram, but a phonetic transcription of a verbal form which was an equivalent of LP 'ast. This form appears in Petermann's texts, written as m-b-n-y-λ. Itob miyāndītā itarkāt because he could not read it properly. In reality it is exactly the combination in which this suffixal form of the substantive verb is usually found: mānī, or mā-n-it, - "this is" LP in ast. Just took into consideration the b which here is purely orthographical, to show the "short" n. Other examples: miyē ke-nit, LP in-ba kisandāt. Miye tārūdār-nī, LP tə-bā tārūdār ' and (here the word tārūdār is obviously a collective noun, treated as Singular). Sometimes, however, the form plainly refers to the Plural, cf. YG miyē viguṇa-nī, LP tə-bəğ-guṇa-ānd. This form appears probably only in YG; all my inquiries as to the Plural from it were fruitless.

It is interesting that in old Herati this form often appears in the sense of the Conditional. Is not the solution of the puzzle to be sought here? Perhaps it was originally nothing but the Conditional Mood of the stem Yabh?

The stem Ybu, Preterite bud, is inflected as an ordinary verb; it has, however, a special form of the Future or Optative, corresponding to LP bdiam, etc.
n) Paradigms of Gabri Verbs

I. Regular Verbs.

a) Intransitive.

"To arrive", LP rastādān.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inf.</th>
<th>Kermani:</th>
<th>Yazdi:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>rasīdāwān</td>
<td>rasīdāwān</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Imperat.</th>
<th>Yarząd</th>
<th>Kermani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vērās, vērāsīt</td>
<td>vērās, vērāsīt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aor. and Pres. Cont.</th>
<th>Yarząd</th>
<th>Kermani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) pos. Sng. 1. rēsā</td>
<td>rēsā</td>
<td>erēsā</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. rēsā</td>
<td>erēsā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. rēsā</td>
<td>erēsā</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pl. 1. rēsām</td>
<td>erēsām</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. rēsāb</td>
<td>erēsāb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. rēsāb</td>
<td>erēsāb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emph. Aor.  
Subj. Pres.  
Pret.  
| a) pos. nāsā | nāsā |
| b) neg. nāsā | nāsā |

Future and Optative (LP bilmān, etc.).  
| a) pos. bē | bē |
| b) neg. nābē | nābē |

Pret.  
| a) pos. Sng. 1. bēr, bērē, bērēb, bērēbē | The same as in YG. |
| 2. bēr, bērē, bērēb, bērēbē | The same as in YG. |
| 3. bē, bēb, bēbē, bēbēb | The same as in YG. |
| b) neg. nābēr, nābērē, nābērēb, nābērēbē | The same as in YG. |

| a) pos. nābērēb, nābērēbē | The same as in YG. |
| b) neg. nābērēb, nābērēbē | The same as in YG. |

| Pl. 1. nābērēbē | The same as in YG. |
| 2. nābērēbē | The same as in YG. |
| 3. nābērēbē | The same as in YG. |

Imperf.  
| a) pos. cēs, cēsē, cēsēb, cēsēbē | The same as in YG. |
| b) neg. nācēs, nācēsb, nācēsbē | The same as in YG. |

Pluperf.  
| a) pos. ibēs, ibēsb, ibēsbē | The same as in YG. |
| b) neg. nēbs, nēs, nēsbē | The same as in YG. |

Pluperf. Past.  
| a) pos. ibēs, ibēsb, ibēsbē | The same as in YG. |

Gerund.  

Notes:  
1. The forms vērē and bērē are also used, only very rarely.
2. In YG sometimes the form nābērēb, etc., is also used, though it is not clear whether it really corresponds with LP na-bilmān, or is simply the negative form of the Aorist.
3. The 1st form of the Perfect is used only in KG, and is said to be absent in YG.
4. The form bēdēb perhaps may be used in some villages as local peculiarity, but never appears in YG, and is very rare in KG. According to Col. Lorimer, it was current about 20 years ago in Kerman.
5. This also was current about 20 years ago in Kerman (Lor.).
The Gabri dialect spoken by the Zoroastrians of Persia

Pluperf. 1. pos. me'm paršāda bu, etc. me'm paršāda ha, etc.
      me mi paršāda bu, etc.
      me mi nēy paršāda ha, etc.
Subj. Past. 1. pos. me me paršāda bu, etc. me'm (me me) p. bu, etc.
      me me nēy paršāda bu, etc.
      me me nēy paršāda bu, or
      me me paršāda nābu, etc.
Past Participle. paršādā, paršādūnu, paršādāvān, pasardā, pasardāvān,

Passive Voice: The Past Part. plus the forms from the Subst. Verb.

II. Irregular Verbs.

a) Intransitive.

1. "To come", LP amudān.

Inf. amudāwān, amudān.
Imperat. a) pos. bi'ah, bi'ārah, bi'ārāh;
        Pl. bi'ābā, bi'ābāt, bi'ābāt;
b) neg. man, manār, Pl. manās.

Aor. and Pres. Cont. 1. elā (elāb).
      a) pos. vēpars, vēparzīt.
      b) neg. nēpars, nēparzīt.

Emph. Aor. a) pos. vēpars, etc.
      b) neg. nēpars, etc.

Subj. Pres. a) pos. vēpars, etc.
      b) neg. nēpars, etc.

Pret. a) pos. Sing. 1. me'm paršād
      2. ta'd
      3. in a'ā
      Pl. 1. nō mā
      2. ūmā du
      3. šē le
      b) neg. me'm nēparsād, etc.

Imperf. a) pos. me me paršād, or
      me me paršād, etc.
      b) neg. me me nēparsād, or
      me me nēparsād, etc.

Perf. a) pos. me'm paršād, etc., or
      me me paršād, etc.
      b) neg. me me na-(ne-) paršād, etc.

Ilput. 1. pos. Sing. paršādā, paršādū, paršādūn, paršādāvān, paršādā, paršādāvān,

II. Syncop. form: 1. rāshādā, etc.
      2. rāshādā, etc.
      3. rāshādā, etc.

b) neg. me nēy paršādā ha, etc.

Pl. rāshādā, rāshādā, rāshādā, etc.

b) neg. me nēy paršādā ha, etc.

Past Participle. paršādā, paršādūnu, paršādāvān.

Passive Voice: the Past Part. plus the forms from the Subst. Verb.
2. "To go", LP raftan (also in old language Indan).

Inf.
- Jāduwān.

Imperat.
- a) pos. vētu (rarely vēšure), velīti.
- b) neg. māstu (rarely mašure), mālti.

Aor. and Pres. Cont.
- a) pos. Sng. 1st. sē
  2nd. sē
  3rd. sē, etc.
- b) neg. sačit, etc.

Emph. Aor.
- sē, etc., as in the preceding.

Subj. Pres.
- a) pos. udi, etc.
- b) neg. nā, etc.

Pret.
- a) pos. Sng. 1st. jā, jō
  2nd. jā, jō, jā
- b) neg. nā, etc.

Imperat.
- a) pos. sē, etc.
- b) neg. sačit, etc.

Perf. I.
- a) pos. sē, etc.
- b) neg. nā, etc.

II.
- a) pos. sē, etc.
- b) neg. nā, etc.

Pluperf.
- a) pos. dō, etc.
- b) neg. nā, etc.

Subj. Past.
- a) pos. dō, etc.
- b) neg. nā, etc.

Past Part.
- dō, etc.

Gerund.
- Jāduwānī.


Inf.
- vedārūwān, vedrēdūwān, devartōwān.

Imperat.
- a) pos. vedrēdū, vedrērīt.

1 Not used in YG.
2 Apparently quite artificial, purely imitation of LP. Not used in YG.
3 The full form of the Perfect is very rare, especially in YG. The forms like dō are used very rarely, only as local peculiarities of some villages. According to Col. Lorimer, this form also was quite common in Kerman about 20 years ago.
7. "To say, or tell", LP gūjān.

Inf. vātānun, vātānun.
Imperat. a) pos. vawaj (vawaj); vawajit.
b) neg. mawaj (mawaj); mawajit.
Aor. and Pres. Cont. a) pos. ewaj, etc.
b) neg. nawaj, etc.
3 p. S. ewaj.
3 p. S. nawaj.
Emph. Aor. ewaj, etc., as the preceding.
Subj. Pres. a) pos. ewa, etc.
b) neg. nawa, etc.
Pret. a) pos. me mewaj, etc.
b) neg. me mawaj, etc., or mawaj, etc., or mawaj, etc.
Imperf. a) pos. me me mewaj, etc., or mawaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
b) neg. me mawaj, etc., or mawaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
Perf. a) pos. me mewaj, etc., or me me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
b) neg. me mewaj, etc., or me me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
Pluperf. a) pos. me me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
b) neg. me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
Subj. Past. a) pos. me mewaj, etc., or me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
b) neg. me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
Past Part. tovā, svarā.
Gerund. xartāun.


Inf. xartāun, xartāun.
Imperat. a) pos. xaw (xawari), xawrit.
b) neg. maxu (maxuari), maxirit.
Aor. and Pres. Cont. a) pos. xara, etc.
b) neg. naxari, etc.; 3 p. xara.
Emph. Aor. xara, etc., as the preceding.
Subj. Pres. a) pos. xara, etc.
b) neg. xara, etc.
Pret. a) pos. me mewaj (xara), etc.
b) neg. me mewaj, etc., or me me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
Imperf. a) pos. me me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
b) neg. me mewaj, etc., or me me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
Perf. a) pos. me mewaj, etc., or me me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
b) neg. me mewaj, etc., or me me mewaj, etc., etc., or mawaj, etc.
Pluperf. The same as the preceding, only YG ba, and KG ba is added.
Subj. Past, the same as Perf., only but is added.
Passive Voice in YG has double expressions: xarta bible - xarta elbi,
xarta bu - xarta bu.
xarta iba - xarta elda, or xarta uma.

o) Defective and Impersonal Verbs:

1. xāt (KG xāt), to be able, corresponding with LP tavdnītān. Apparently it has much to do with ādīstān. It must not be confounded with its homonyme la kartāun, which means "to cry, weep". The verb has many amazing peculiarities in construction. It requires after it the verb in the Imperfect of the (always) intransitive form, even if the verb by itself is a Transitive one (!). This form expresses categorical possibility, like the English can:

me la 'xināde, - I can sing,
ta la 'xinādi,
in la 'xināde, etc.

For the expression of probable possibility, like English may, this la is used together with the Imperfect of the verb kartāun, to do, and requires after it the verb in the Subjunctive Present:

me la 'karta biyāye, - I may come;
ta la 'karta biyāyi,
in la 'karte biyāli, etc.

The negative form of la is nāle, nāštāte.

2. wu, wā (wā), Preterite vyāk; KG wā, wyāt, to wish, desire. The etymology of this verb, which seems very uncertain, was discussed above in detail. The negative forms are nāwātā, nāwyātā. The verb is constructed in the same style as the Preterite of the Transitive verbs, and requires after it the verb in the Subjunctive (or, if it has a noun as a direct object in
the Nominative). It is interesting that in KG very often this verb in the Present is used in the form vîth with what seems to be the 3rd p. Plur. of the substantive verb: KG mënaxîli rîx-rîx vîth-en, – "I like grapes very much"; KG pînî-îa a-x mû rûxvûd â bû vîth-es, "we want fifty of such ruined sites". This is apparently due to the tendency to imitate the construction in LP. In YG this is avoided, cf. pulli nu?qra 3e vîst-î, he wanted silver moneys.

With the verb: me me vîst-î ve=, - "I wanted to go" – is exactly the same construction as in the Present: me me vû ve=. Negative form: me me nîvate ve= and me me nîvate ve=.

3. waw, waw, wîw, vâ, vâ, Preterite vîst (KG vîst), apparently never wat or vat, – the same as LP bûyad, bûyast, – must. It is construed apparently always with the Imperfect, cf. me me waw tâmude, I must come; me me waw 'la (for eîrî), I must go, etc. Neg.-naw.

4. I have not met the verb xûtswâm in the sense of auxiliary or impersonal verb; it is occasionally used, in the sense "to beg for alma".

5. aî, Pret. suî, to be in (some place), to lie, xîddan, or, better, LP xîddan hâdan, as the Yazidis usually translate it. It is purely defective verb, which apparently is met with only in the 3rd p. Sing. and very rarely in the Preterite; it appears only in combinations with different adverbs and prepositions, and never (as I was told) independently. As a matter of fact, Gabri speaking people deny its separate existence, if mentioned to them:

dîr-esî, Pret. dîr-esît, he lies here;

tep-esî, " tep-est, " " down;

bar-esî, " bar-est, " out;

ri-esî, " ri-est, " on, over;

vîd-esî, " vîd-est, " out, etc.

For instance, it is impossible to say tep-esî, or dîr-esî, etc.

There are many other impersonal expressions, consisting of combinations of verbs and substantives, cf. me xarm mêîldî, – sleep overcomes me; me sard-lâm me 'but, I feel cold; me järnx-lâm me 'but, I feel hot; me tîng-lâm-a, I feel tired, uneasy, etc.

6. Adverbs.

There are apparently no living suffixes in Gabri for the formation of Adverbs; only once I met with the expression vi-xabarîdî, – being unaware. This, however, seems to be a clear imitation of bazari. In Gabri almost all LP living Adverbs are used, sometimes considerably modified in their phonetic appearance, as in bûlî, – LP bûlî; bûlî, – LPA bûlî; YG bûnî,

KG buni (like in Khorasan) – LP bûnî, etc. Those which are more or less peculiar to Gabri are:

Adverbs of Place:

کô, koî koî, KG koyî (rare), LP ku, kujîd, where; it is used in almost all WP dialects. Just as in LP there are as kujîd, ba-kujîd, etc., so in Gabri there are â koyî, ñ koyî, etc.

–né, which is never used separately, appears in mû-né (nu-né, mu-né, etc.), here, and ñmê, ñmlî, wann, KG ñmê, – there. It is interesting that apparently the same particle is used also for the formation of the Adverbs of time: me-né, – now, and mû-m-né, – just now.

tug, down, apparently the same as LP tab (probably with a diminutive suffix).

gâw, down, LP gawd (deep).

bû, out.

kar, âr (chiefly in KG), out.

tu, also used as a preposition, – in, inside; it is very common in bazari; sometimes used in the form u- or (very common in Kermani bazari, according to Lorimer) which obviously is nothing but the double preposition â (LP bo) + tu.

šî (also common in Khorasan and generally in bazari), – down.

Adverbs of Time:

bûdî, kûdî, LP koyî, WPT kadî, when; the ancient –d is lost in all present WP dialects, and is preserved here quite in analogy with the –d in ned, bud, etc.

beî, sâ, yesterday, common amongst WP.

inêdî, the day before yesterday.

bûrî, bûrî, KG bûrâlî, to-morrow, – apparently simply a phonetical modification of LP bardî (cf. bûrmûdân – LP bardâdî, etc.).

peî, pî, – to-morrow, the day after to-morrow; the presence of –Î seems very strange.

enî, âmîrî, enî, LP imîrî, – to-day.

emîsî, LP imîsîb, – to-night.

emîldî, LP imîldî this year.

nîdî (Lor. 486), “now”; seems to be very rare nowadays; my informers denied all knowledge of it.

pa, pas, LP pas, after, afterwards.

pe, LP pay, – again.

bûdî, bûdî, – again; cf. above, on the Pronoun be.

bû, Ar. as-dû, – now.

Adverbs of Manner:

mûsîlî, mûsîlî, in this way (âd here = LP sû).

nu-mûsîlî, in the same way.

în (rare), LP tîn, or, perhaps, tûnîn, how.
Prepositions.

Practically all LP, or rather bazari prepositions are used in Gabri; some of them, as in LP, are genuine prepositions, some other are originally substantives, and require after them the idāfat; some of them are also used as adverbs; many are phonetically modified, as e.g. ri, LP rāyi, etc. There are, however, genuine WP prepositions which are still much used in Gabri, though they are not numerous.

xad, xado, xadda, ado, adā, adu, – with, or to, corresponding with LP bā; it is the same as WPT ʾad, AP hadā, still much in use in WP dialects, where it appears in the forms of hu, hou, hude, xade, xey, etc., and conveys the same meaning, of not merely outward contact, as in case of bā, but much more concerned with the logical, or inner sense. Though not preserved in Kurdish, it is fairly common in Khorasan and in Kerman in the local forms of bazari, as xad, with idāfat. It is not only used in Gabri expressing a sociative action, but also action directed from the subject to the object: ado in om wāt, – I said to him.

āz, WPT ʾāz, AP hāz, LP āz, has here two forms, – the full, or emphatic one, and the shortened, ā; the latter is used mostly in combination with the Pronominal suffixes, when they appear in their “agental” rôle. In YG now it is rarely used independently, but in KG it is still quite common.

ā (or bā), the same as LP bā, is used in YG chiefly with the Pronominal suffixes in the same way as the preceding preposition, independently mostly in KG. In both YG and KG it is used in a way which may appear to us as pleonastic, being added to other prepositions, to adverbs, and sometimes added where no prepositions is required in LP. Cf. guk xāyil ʾe xās uma, i.e. ... xāyil ʾe xās uma, LP gardiya xayilt ʾxās omad. Or tūmī ʾe kam xheq, i.e. tūmī o ʾāz kam or bā kam xheq. Or geruni in-rā ʾe muhatx kā, LP girdi ʾe-rā [ba or ar?] muhatx kard.

dar “in”, apparently never appears in the bazari torm da, and never is used instead of bā (cf. Khorasanī dā ʾe bugu, – LP bā-ʾā bi-gā). It is also never used as a postposition.

Conjunctions.

There are apparently no genuine Gabri conjunctions, except two postpositions, –di and –ji, the first chiefly used in YG, and the second in KG. They mean approximately “also”, “and”, “as well as”, etc. All other conjunctions are the same as in local bazari. We may note here only these phonetic peculiarities:

– Ugar and mager are apparently never pronounced as ayer or mayer, ār, etc., not even maqār and agār.

– bri oyi ki, and māstī ki, – for, because.

– wāt, wa, o, u, va, ā, “and”, is often pronounced, as in bazari, quite similarly to the “dull” sound of the idāfat, –.

– ki sometimes may be used as a postposition, of explicative meaning; sometimes it is pronounced as xu: YG rūmandā xu bā xiyilī ki yāng mara ... LP rūmandi ki bā xayili ...; KG ʾās wāt māmū xu lānduni ba nā-ba, – LP gufī ki tāndin ki bad nīst.

(To follow: Part II, Texts; Part III, Vocabulary).
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W. IVANOW.
RIVISTA DEGLI STUDI ORIENTALI

A partire dal volume XII l’abbonamento è fissato ai prezzi sotto- segnati:

L. 60 per l’Italia — L. 75 per l’Estero.

Collezione completa (Voll. I-XI) L. 1500.
Volume arretrato L. 80 per l’Italia; L. 100 per l’Estero.
Fascicolo arretrato L. 20 » L. 25 »

Il volume IX (eccettuato il fascicolo 3), essendo quasi esaurito, non può essere venduto se non insieme con la collezione completa.

Per gli acquisti e gli abbonamenti rivolgersi alla

LIBRERIA DI SCIENZE E LETTERE

del Dott. GIOVANNI BARDI

PIAZZA MADAMA, 19-20

ROMA (219)