THE ANCIENT LANGUAGE OF AZERBAIJAN [1]
By W. B. HENNING

WHEN I proposed the title of this paper to the officers of the Society, I imagined, in an optimistic mood, that I could offer a reasonable theory of the language once spoken in Azerbaijan. Further study, I regret to say, has convinced me that I cannot: our information is defective on all sides; and the information we do possess is affected by uncertainty in the most essential points. Although therefore it would be wise to keep silent, I hope I may be allowed to put the problem as an unsolved problem, as well as to add a little to the information hitherto available.

For several centuries now a form of Turkish has been the common language of the north-western provinces of Persia, Azerbaijan and Zenjan. The late Persian historian, Sayyid Aḥmed-i Kesravī, has traced the story of the gradual infiltration of Turkish tribes into those territories, and the attendant regression and final disappearance of the older population and their language; the process began in the 11th century and was completed by the beginning of the 16th. [2]

It is generally agreed, and indeed not subject to serious doubt, that before the advent of the Turks Iranian languages were spoken here in Azerbaijan and Zenjan, as elsewhere in Persia. From the distribution of the Iranian dialects one may infer the group of Iranian to which the lost language of Azerbaijan belonged. To the east of Azerbaijan, in the high mountains that enclose the southern edge of the Caspian Sea, and in the coastal plain itself, we have successively Tālišī, Gīlakī, and Māzandarānī, also called Tabarī; and beyond the mountain range, in the neighbourhood of Semnān, several further dialects. To the south-east of Azerbaijan, at a great distance, we find the Central Group of dialects in the neighbourhood of Isfahān, with branches eastwards towards Yezd

and southwards towards Sīvand. In the same direction, at less distance, a group of dialects was recently noticed in the neighbourhood of Vafs, half-way between Hamadān and Sāve.[1] In the south, Gūrānī survives in the Zagros mountains, which separate Persia from the plains of Iraq. And in the far west, beyond the limits of Persia, as far as the western border of classical Armenia, Zāzā, called *Dimlī* by its speakers, existed until quite recently and for all we know may exist even now. All these languages, which may be said to surround Azerbaijan, belong solidly to the north-western group of Iranian, and that was probably true also of the lost Azerbaijanian tongue.

The languages and dialects named just now constitute *all* the surviving forms of North-west-Iranian speech about which we have information, with the sole exception of Kurdish, which stands apart and is outside the range of the present subject. Several have attained full status as literary languages : for example Gūrānī, the language of an obscure religion, the Ahl-i Ḥaqq, with considerable literature ; Gurgānī,[2] from the south-eastern corner of the Caspian Sea, now defunct, once the language of a Muslimic sect, the Ḥurūfī ; and above all, Tabarī, with a literary history looking back almost as far as the Persian literary language.[3] Nevertheless, all of them have been receding before the onslaught of the official language of the country, Persian, which itself belongs to a different group, to South-western Iranian ; and now, under modern conditions,

[1] M. Muqaddam, *Gūyišhāyi Vafs ve Āštiyān ve Tafriš* (= *Irān-Kūde* No. 11). Tehran, 1318 Yezd./1949. This work also contains notices, deserving attention, of a local gypsy dialect, a Southern Kurdish language (Zand), and Khalaj Turkish.

[2] Our knowledge of that dialect, hitherto largely based on Huart, *Textes persans relatifs à la secte des Houroûfîs* (Gibb Mem. Ser. ix), 1909, has been deepened by S. Kiya, *Vāže-nāme-i Gurgānī* (*Intišārāt-i Dānišgāh-i Tehrān* 133), Tehran 1330/1951. An interesting survival is the optative (3rd sg. and pl.) *byndy/bndy*, which corresponds with Parthian *bwyndyy*. [See now further H. Ritter, *Die Anfänge der Ḥurūfīsekte*, Oriens vii, 1954, 1–54.]

[3] The older specimens were recently collected and analysed by S. Kiya (*Vāže-nāme-i Ṭabarī* [*Irān-Kūde* No. 9] Tehran, 1316 Yezd./1947), who also published the text of a Tabari "Niṣāb".

all the non-Persian languages and dialects are rapidly dying away.

Of the dialects still spoken in villages some may well disappear before they have been recorded. True, some areas have been fairly fully investigated ; but others have been neglected, most of all the north-western provinces. Not only is practically no information available about the few dialects known to have survived in remote corners of Azerbaijan itself ; but also the districts between that province and the capital, a stretch of some 250 miles, have remained disregarded, and this in spite of a hundred years' study of the dialects of Persia. It is probably due to such gaps in our knowledge that the task of determining the relationship of the north-western dialects to each other continues to present such great difficulty.

Thanks to a lucky chance I am able to say a little about a dialect spoken on the approaches to Azerbaijan, roughly halfway between Tehran and the present border of that province. I came upon it [1] three years ago at Tākistān, a village formerly known by the name of Siyah-dehān, some twenty miles to the south-west of Qazvīn, on the ancient high-road that joins Azerbaijan with the heart of Northern Persia. I had only two hours and a half for taking notes, and even this short period was not free from disturbances of various kinds. In the outcome, the material I collected is insufficient and defective ; regrettably there was no chance to check doubtful points and fill in the gaps that became manifest as soon as it was possible to read over my notes at leisure. In fact, one would be inclined to bury them quietly, were it not for the evident importance of this dialect, which may conveniently be called Tākistānī, for the comparative study of North-western Iranian.

At the time I did not know that the dialect had in fact been mentioned once before, namely by Professor Minorsky in the Encyclopaedia of Islam, in his article "Tāt". Professor

[1] I owe its acquaintance to the kindness of Mr. Hannibal, of Tehran, a very learned gentleman who invited me to pay a visit to Qazvīn, a town for which he had unbounded enthusiasm.

Minorsky there expressed the opinion that it resembled the dialects of the Central Group and quoted, from his own observation, a small number of the words he regarded as characteristic. Our notes are not always in agreement. For example, of the five verbal forms quoted by Professor Minorsky (*mīzǎnǎ* 'I know', *mīzǎnū* 'we know', *mīzǎnindǎ* 'they know', *biškǎs* 'look' [imp.], *šī* 'you should go') two differ materially from the forms I received, in which the first person of the singular ends in *-im* and the first person of the plural in *-um*. The full set of the endings of the present in Tākistānī is as follows : Sing. *-im, -ī, -e* ; Plur. *-um, -ā, -indā*.

A related dialect is known from another village in the neighbourhood of Tākistān, Ištihārd ; known, however, not by observation but through a written source. Žukovskiy found a copy of a Persian dictionary, the *Burhān-i Jāmi*, which was printed in Tabriz in 1844 : in the margins of that copy a Persian had written glosses in an otherwise unknown dialect, attributed to Ištihārd.[1] These glosses, which number about 180, are written in Arabic script, with fairly full vowel marks ; they are of restricted usefulness, chiefly because many of them merely serve to indicate a slightly deviating pronunciation of Persian words. Nevertheless, there is enough to show that this dialect is very near to Tākistānī. Two words may suffice here. The first, *titiye* or *titīye* 'daughter' (Tāk. *titīye*), is typical of the dialect group, with its initial *t-* ; the nearest form otherwise is Mahallātī *ditīye*. The second, *burbunistin* 'to weep' (Tāk. *birbanāstān*), has four characteristic points : the use of the prefix *bi-* with an infinitive ; the ending *-āstān* ; the metathesis *-rb-* ; and *-n-* in the place of *-m-*, the base being *bram-*.

Now I shall put before you a few of the points which define the position of Tākistānī in relation to the other North-western Iranian languages. The first is the survival of grammatical gender. I had been told that 'bull' is *gāv* and 'cow' *māgāve*, which in addition to the prefixed *mā-* (an old adjective meaning 'female') possesses a short vowel at the end, which

---

[1] Žukovskiy, *Materialī*, vol. i, p. ix. The Ištihārdī words are included in the glossary in vol. ii, part i.

could be a mark of gender. Towards the end of our session I was blessed with an intelligent informant and drew his attention to the difference, and he told me, almost in so many words, that his language possessed gender distinctions, and quoted as example, *märdäk bišö* ' the man went ', but *zeinīye bišīye* ' the woman went '. Here we have separate forms for the verb, the 3rd person singular of the intransitive preterite, which however is a nominal form by origin. Later, when I looked over my notes, I found several additional examples,[1] one of which shows that this distinction is not confined to words of natural gender : *varä būmīä* ' snow fell ' (literally ' snow came ') ; here both the noun and the verb have feminine endings.

Gender distinctions exist in comparatively few of the North-western languages ; of those reasonably near to Tākistān, in Semnani and in certain Central dialects, such as Farizandī and Jōšagānī.[2] In the details, Tākistānī agrees here most closely with Semnani. The Semnani equivalent of the sentence ' snow fell ' happens to occur in the texts collected by Christensen, *vara . . . biämiä*[3] ; it almost coincides with the Tākistānī version.

There are other points, some of them almost as weighty, in which Tākistānī agrees with Semnani. Semnan is situated about 200 miles to the east of Tākistān ; half-way between the two villages sprawls the modern capital of Persia, whose presence has extinguished the intervening dialects.

Yet Tākistānī has another face, and that is turned towards the North. The pronominal system shows that most clearly. Practically all the pronominal forms of the dialect are mentioned in the following table :—

Personal	*az*	*ta*	*av*	*amā*	*šumā*	*anā*
Enclitic	-*m*	-*i*	-*š*	-*mun*	-*yun*	-*šun*
Possessive	*čimi*	*ištä*	*šä*	*čumā*	*šumā*	*šanā*
[Tal.	*čịmị*	*ịštị*	*čai*	*čama*	*šịma*	*čavon*]

[1] *čimi numāzīye bišīye* ' my betrothed went ' ; *kärke bipārästī* ' the chicken flew (up) '.   [2] Lambton, *Three Persian dialects*, p. 44.
[3] *Le dialecte de Sämnän*, p. 62, line 3.

Here the possessive pronouns are by far the most interesting. Possessive pronouns are something of a rarity in the North-western Iranian languages ; they also do not exist in Persian, the language of communication used for talking with the villagers, so they attract one's attention immediately. It is true, they function occasionally also as oblique cases of the personal pronouns, as for example in the sentence *čimi ištä änidiyindä* 'they do not give me to you' (*čimi* 'me', *ištä* 'you', *ä(n)* verbal prefix, *ni* negation, *diyindä* 'they give'). Such use is compatible with their origin ; for they consist of an ancient preposition, Middle Iranian *ač* 'from', and oblique cases of the personal pronouns, themselves no longer in use.[1] But their characteristic function is that of possessive pronouns ; e.g. *čimi sīgār* 'my cigarette', *jä piyär*[2] *kälä* 'her father's head', *čumä gälbär* 'our gate'.

Comparable pronouns exist only in one of the North-western languages hitherto known, in Tālišī, the language of Tāliš, the district on the Caspian Sea which straddles the frontier between Persia and the Soviet Union. The Tālišī pronouns, which there are used exclusively as possessive pronouns, are given above ; they are in form almost identical with the Tākistānī series.

Another proof of the close relationship between Tākistānī and Tālišī is provided by the preterite of the verb. Below a full set of the normal forms has been given, successively the preterite of the intransitive verb, the preterite of the transitive verb, the preterite of 'to be' in post-sonantic position, and the pluperfect of a transitive verb, which involves the preterite of 'to be' :—

---

[1] Cf. the oblique cases of the pronouns for the 3rd person in Semnani, Christensen, p. 43.

[2] *piyär/piär* is oblique case of *piä* 'father', cf. *piärpiä* 'grandfather', *piärəmpiä* 'my grandfather'; similarly *mayä* 'mother', *mayum* 'my mother', *märəmayä* '(my) mother's mother'; *zänbərä* 'wife's brother', *bərärzän* 'brother's wife'. Cf. Christensen, *Sämnän*, § 80. Curious is *fir* 'son'.

I sat	I said	I was	I had said
aništim	*vātim*	*-veime*	*vātā-vīmä*
aništiš	*vātī*	*-veiše*	*vātā-vī*
aništ	*vātiš*	*-ve*	*vātā-vīšä*
aništimun	*vātimun*	*-veimun*	*vātā-vīmun*
aništeiyun	*vātiyun*	*-veiyun*	*vātā-vīyun*
aništinde	*vātišun*	*-vinde*	*vātā-višun*

Here the most striking feature is the threatening confusion of the second singular with the third singular: *aništiš* ' you sat ', but *vātiš* ' he said ', *veiše* ' you were ' but *vātā-vīšä* ' he had said '. What preserves the difference is merely the status of the verbs as either transitive or intransitive, but this distinction is in process of being reduced, as one can see from the 1st and 2nd persons of the plural, where the intransitive has borrowed the finals of the transitive; one may perhaps wonder how the contrast between *aništiš* ' you sat ' and *vātiš* ' he said ' is going to be resolved.

There is no difficulty about the *origin* of these forms. The intransitive, of course, consists of the perfect participle and the present of ' to be ', but the transitive of the perfect participle and the enclitic pronouns. What interests us here is the agreement of the intransitive with the corresponding forms in Tālišī. In that language the present of ' to be ', in combination with the negation (*ne*), has the following forms: *nim*, *niš*, *ni* (*niye*); *nimon*, *nion*, *nin*. There is substantial agreement, and that is most remarkable in the 2nd person of the singular, *-iš* ' you are '. Such a form is exceptional in Iranian. It is true, one finds it here and there, for example in Eastern Iranian in Sogdian; and in South-western Iranian among some dialects of Lāristān, on the coast of the Persian Gulf [1]: but in North-western Iranian it was hitherto known solely from Tālišī.

A considerable distance separates Tākistān from the Tālišī-speaking area, and the greater part of it is occupied by

[1] Mann, *Tājīk-Mundarten*, 127 sqq.; Ivanow, *Gabri dialect*, 77; Romaskevič, *Lar i ego dialekt (Iranskie Yaziki*, i, 1945), 41 *et passim*.

the most inaccessible mountain country in the whole of Persia.
There is every likelihood that Tāliśī and dialects close to it
extended much towards the south, into the mountains, prob-
ably as far as Khalkhāl and upper Tārom,[1] and we may
assume that dialects related to Tākistānī extended to the
north-west of its present location, towards the Zenjān valley,
so that there may have been a smooth transition from Tāliśī
to Tākistānī, just as there probably was a smooth transition,
through dialects now lost, from Tākistānī to Semnani in the
east, and to the Central dialects, or some of them, in the south.

Thus we may regard Tākistānī as the essential link, joining
the Northern, Eastern, and Southern groups. That it is in the
right and natural position is also indicated by certain traits it
shares with Gīlakī and Tabarī, the languages in its neighbour-
hood to the north and north-east. One could mention, e.g.,
the preference for -āstän as the secondary ending of the
infinitive [2] (an ending entirely absent from Tāliśī) ; or the
almost primeval word vūye ' water ', which has disappeared
from practically all Iranian languages, but was preserved in
Gilan, as biya,[3] in certain geographical names.[4]

We now leave Tākistān and turn to Azerbaijan proper. As
I mentioned at the beginning, in this province, where Turkish

---

[1] See below.

[2] bitašästän ' shave ', biškäsästän ' look ', bičäšästän ' taste ', birbanästän
' weep ', āgārdästän ' turn back ', ūvazästän ' dance '.

[3] Biya-piš and Biya-pas. It is doubtful whether any of the other dialect
forms with initial v/w may belong here, such as Sangisarī vö (Žukovskiy),
v°o (Christensen, ii) ; Yazdī wö/vöv etc. (Hadank, Khunsár, lxxvi n. ;
Andreas-Christensen 102 evôv ; Ivanow wuw) certainly represents āp-.

[4] Note also lūyas ' fox ' (Tab. luwäs, Gozarkhoni [Ivanow, A.O., ix, 367]
luwos) ; pilä ' big, great ', pilä-müš ' rat ' (Gozarkhoni pilo bowo ' grand-
father ' ; Gilaki pīle, pille ; Zaza pīl, pīli Hadank 163 ; often wrongly
confused with Pers. pīr ' old ' ; Dailemi name Pilesuvār, Minorsky, Domina-
tion des Dailamites, p. 3). A few further interesting Tāk. words may be
briefly mentioned here : āzīrä ' yesterday ' ; särä ' day after to-morrow ' ;
čüst ' boot ' ; vayä ' wedding ' ; čälū ' sparrow ' ; asbe ' dog ' ; gūyär ' calf ' ;
asīf ' apple ' ; üz ' walnut ' ; simär ' straw ' ; terizgä ' hail ' ; nimarif
' noon ' ; zärin ' child ' (pl. zärun ; cf. Kurd.) ; geisin ' plough ' (from

has been the dominating language for several centuries, a few islands of Iranian speech have survived in remote corners. Here our information is singularly defective: instead of knowing any of these surviving dialects, we merely know rumours of their existence. Three areas have been named :—

Firstly, the Harzan-Kūh in the north-western corner of the province, in the ancient borderland between Armenia and Persia, to the north-west of Tabrīz, between the northern shore of the Urmia lake and the River Aras (the ancient Araxes). In several villages here, in Harzan, Gälin-qaya, Bābra, and others, an Iranian dialect is spoken, which may conveniently be called Harzanī [1]; I shall say more about it presently.

Secondly: some villages in the Qaraǰa-dāγ, to the north-east of Tabrīz. Nothing is known about their language.[2]

Thirdly: several villages in Khalkhāl, at the eastern fringe of Azerbaijan. This is precisely the area in which we should expect to find dialects that provide a transition from Tāliśī to Tākistānī, and for this reason it is much to be regretted that we know nothing about them. There is at least a potential source of information. It is understood that the late Kesravī, in the second edition of his well-known book on the ancient language of Azerbaijan, quoted a few words in one of the Khalkhāl dialects; but this second edition, published in Tehran in 1317/1938, does not seem to have reached Western

---

gav-āsin); *isbārz* 'spleen'; *vak'* 'kidney' (cf. Tal. *vek*); *dīm* 'face'; *miǰik* 'eyelash'; *bär* 'door'; *xur* 'good'; *gūǰil* 'small'; *peinä* 'broad'; *zur* 'compost' (cf. Tal. *zír/zil*); *āsbune γurγuri* 'it thunders' (cf. Tal. *gurgur*); *bikätän* 'to fall', *miginim* 'I fall', *az mugu biginim* 'I shall fall'; *biǰundän* 'to chew', *mūǰünim* 'I chew'; *vīndän* 'to see'; *dast üsindän* 'to touch', *ünsinim* 'I touch', *ünsindim*(?) 'I touched'; *sozavīän* 'to grow', *sozambim, sozambī, sozambe, sozambeyum, -beyā, -bindä* 'I grow', *sozaveime* 'I grew' (cf. Pers. *sabz būdan*); *ädiyän* 'to give', *āndim, āndey, āndiye, āndeyum, āndeyā, āndiyindä* 'I give'; *eisäsindän* 'to light a fire', *eisämasīnim* 'I light it'.

[1] Dr. M. Navābī recently discovered and published a Persian deed dated in 791/1389, in which the name now generally known as *Harzand* is spelt *Harzan*; accordingly, Dr. Navabi prefers *Harzanī* as the name of the language (*Naśrīye-i Dāniśkade-i Adabīyāt-i Tabrīz*, V, No. ii, 29–38).

[2] See the additional note below, p. 177.

Europe [1]; at any rate, in spite of some search, I have not been able to see it.[2]

Twenty years ago a promising attempt was made to fill the great gap in our knowledge of these dialects, by a Swiss linguist, Dr. Emil Baer. In 1932/33 he visited Harzan and Khalkhāl [3] (but not the Qaraǰa-dāγ), and then went on to study the languages of Persian Tāliš, of Gīlān, and Māzendarān. To two successive Congresses of Orientalists, at Rome in 1935 [4] and at Brussels in 1938,[5] he read papers on the material he had collected and the method he had used. At the latter Congress (which I could not attend) he quoted examples from the languages he had investigated, but these examples were unfortunately omitted from the report printed in the Proceedings. In fact, not a single word or a single form, out of the clearly massive material he had brought together, has been made accessible to the public. It has been reported

---

[1] See the additional note below, p. 177.

[2] Meanwhile, thanks to the kindness of a friend in Tehran, I have secured the 3rd edition of Kesravi's *Āδarī* (Tehran 1325/1946). It is probably an unchanged reprint of the 2nd edition, regrettably printed in a most unsatisfactory fashion, often illegible and studded with misprints. The specimen of a dialect (unspecified, presumably *Šāhrūd*) of Khalkhāl is on pp. 61–62, in unvocalized Arabic script; its contents, a brief description of the linguistic situation in Khalkhāl, render it almost useless for our purposes; according to it, dialects (called *Tātī*) are spoken in the whole of *Šāhrūd* and in a few villages of *Kāyaδkunān* : all of them are close to *Tālišī*. As far as one can see, the latter opinion is partly borne out by the specimen, which shows some characteristic Tal. forms (*ištan* 'self'; *im* 'this'; antecedent genitive, sometimes in -*ī*; postpos. -*kū*; possessive pronoun *če* [*čh*] 'his'); but there are also considerable deviations from Tālišī, especially in the verb (e.g. *vōšin* [*wwšn*] 'they call', *gaf-žanin* 'they talk', *bera* [*brh*] 'it was', *šera* [*šr* ?] 'it went'). However, one fails to detect any resemblance to Tākistānī, in which the corresponding verbal forms are *māšindā*, *zānindā*, -*ve*, and (*bi*)*šō*.

[3] He worked *in due villaggi remoti, ma grandi e popolati, che han conservato anche essi il loro idioma iranico* (*Atti* p. 237) . . . *im Tale Shāhrūd, einem der 5 Māhāle des Berglands Khālkhāl* (*Actes* p. 153).

[4] Il metodo della geografia linguistica applicato all' investigazione dei dialetti iranici. *Atti del xix Congresso internazionale degli orientalisti*, Rome 1938, 233–239.

[5] Zur Dialektologie Nordirans. *Actes du xx⁴ Congrès International des Orientalistes*, Louvain, 1940, 153–157.

that towards the end of the war Dr. Baer was killed in Germany, and it was said that his material had disappeared; but recently I learned from Professor Minorsky that Dr. Georges Redard had succeeded in tracing his collections. There is now good hope that they will be published one day. Pending that, we must make do with what can be obtained in other ways.[1]

The only one of these dialects about which I can give information is Harzanī, or more precisely, the variety of it spoken in the village of Gälin-qaya. It was in this village that European scholars first became alive to the survival of Iranian languages in Azerbaijan. C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, who passed a night at Gälin-qaya in 1898, noticed its peculiar dialect, and drew attention to it in the report on his journey which was published in 1910.[2] He quoted there four or five separate words, only two of them significant (*hārä* ' three ', *isba* ' dog '), and a sentence of two words, *ospe bindor*, which he misunderstood: he thought it meant ' the horses are harnessed ',[3] while in fact it means ' tie up the horse ', *ospe* being singular and *bindor* the plural of the imperative.

This is all so far made known about the language of Gälin-qaya; in compensation, we have seven words from the neighbouring village of Harzan, which the late Mirza Muhammad-i Qazvīnī communicated to Professor Minorsky, who quoted them in the Encyclopaedia article mentioned above. These few words suffice to show that there are differences between Gälin-qaya and Harzan. Two of the forms supplied by Muhammad-i Qazvīnī, together with their Persian equivalents and the corresponding Gälin-qaya forms, may be adduced here, *berend* = Pers. *būdand* : Gäl. *berut* ; *šerīndū* = Pers. *šudand* : Gäl. *šerut*.

It will be clear from the foregoing remarks that I have had

[1] However, during the recent Congress of Orientalists (Cambridge, Aug., 1954) Professor Redard told me that only a part of Dr. Baer's collections had survived ; the notes on the dialects of Azerbaijan have disappeared.

[2] *Armenien einst und jetzt*, i, 185 sq.

[3] *Die Pferde sind ' gebunden ', angeschirrt.*

access to a fresh source of information, and this is happily a copious one.[1] I owe it to a Persian scholar, Dr. M. Navabi, a lecturer in the recently founded University of Tabrīz, the capital of Azerbaijan. Dr. Navabi, who studied for some time at the School of Oriental and African Studies, very generously allowed me the use of his field notes, as well as of a fair copy he had made of the larger part of his collections. Naturally, the publication of this material, which is fairly comprehensive, must be left to Dr. Navabi; but he has kindly permitted me to quote from it in this paper.

The dialect of Gälin-qaya has inevitably been strongly influenced by Turkish, which is also the second language of its speakers. There is a good deal of vowel assimilation: *ümüta* ' to teach ' corresponds with Persian *āmūχtan*, *vörör-* ' to pass by ' with Persian *guδar-*; in *zunusna*, *vörösna*, *beramesna*, respectively ' he knows ', ' it rains ', and ' he cries ', the vowel in the penultimate is one and the same by origin. The palatalized *k*-sounds are so strongly marked that they appear to be scarcely distinguishable from *č*-sounds; thus in Dr. Navabi's notes one finds both *ǩina* and *čina* for ' girl ', *ǩölla* and *čölla* for ' you made '. A preceding genitive is mostly resumed by the enclitic pronoun for the 3rd person, which is *-y* after a vowel, *ʃ* after a consonant, and *-yʃ-* between vowels; e.g. *ǩölö* = ' hat ', *yan* = ' wife ': ' his hat ' is *ǩölöy*, ' his wife ' is *yanʃ*, and *ǩölöyʃa* means ' it is his hat ' (the *-a* at the end being the word for ' is '). This pronoun now appears where

<hr/>

[1] The 3rd edition of Kesravī's *Āδarī* (see above p. 166, n. 2) also contains specimens of the *zabān-i Harzand*, 17 everyday sentences (pp. 63-64) and a brief word-list (pp. 62-63). Although owing to the orthography used (unvocalized Arabic script with somewhat haphazard *matres lectionis*) some points necessarily remain uncertain, one can say that the language of these specimens is substantially in agreement, indeed almost identical, with that of Dr. Navabi's collections. Curious is the uncertainty in the endings of the 1st pers. plur. (also of the 1st pers. sing.), e.g. subj. *šnm* ' let us go ' (Gäl. *šunum*); pres. (*n*)*kwndwm* ' we (do not) do ' (Gäl. *ǩöndum*), but (*n*)*znswn* ' we (do not) know ' (Gäl. *zunusnum*; prob. misprinted for **nznsnwn*); pret. (*hth*) *brwn* ' we were (asleep) ' (Gäl. *heta berum*); " trans." pret. *zwnwsm'n' wrtmwn* ' we knew (and) fled ' (Gäl. *-muna*); uncertainty in this very point is found also in Dr. Navabi's notes.

a genitive precedes, e.g. *merde kölöy* ' the man's hat ' or *brōri yanʃ* ' the brother's wife '—a construction doubtless due to Turkish influence. Similarly, the possessive pronouns (*čaman, ešde, avey*; *čama, šema, avaney*), which incidentally resemble the Tālišī and Tākistānī forms, are resumed by enclitic pronouns, e.g. *čaman yanma* ' it is my wife ', *ešde zunustar* ' your knowledge ' (the final *-r* being the enclitic pronoun of the 2nd person).

Here I have put down a scheme of the nominal inflexion, in which, however, one or two points are not entirely certain :—

	Sing.	Plur.
General Case	*merd*	*yanöy*
Oblique Case	*merde*	*yanun*
Determ. Acc.	*merde*	*yanune*
Locative	*merdenda*	(*yanunenda*)
Ablative	*merderi*	*yanuneri*
Instrumental	*merdehun*	(*yanunehun*)
Partitive	—	*yanunda*

It is always interesting to see how a language that has once shed an elaborate system of inflexion creates a fresh system that bears comparison with the original one. Actually, most of these cases are pseudo-cases, mere juxtaposition of noun and postposition. That becomes clear when an enclitic pronoun is affixed to the noun ; it precedes postpositions, but of course follows proper endings. Hence *dösmönda* ' in my hand ', *döslönda* ' in your hand ', *karʃiri* ' from his house ' (*kar* = house), *karlenda* ' in your house ', *hamayʃiri* ' from all of it '.

This consideration shows also that the determinative accusative, which in the singular often coincides with the oblique case, is in fact a pseudo-case. Actually, it is distinguished when a noun ends in a vowel ; then the accusative ends in *-re*, but the oblique case is identical with the general case ; e.g. *kina* ' girl ', oblique case also *kina*, but *kinare* is the determinative accusative. Now I have found two examples in which enclitic pronouns are involved, *grīle* ' his neck ', i.e. *giri* ' neck ' + *-y-* for the 3rd person + the dissimilated accusative ending ; and

xöyö ešde karille vörun kani ' may God ruin your house ', where *karille* ' your house ' is composed of *kar* ' house ', the enclitic pronoun of the 2nd person (-*r*, often -*l*), and the mark of the accusative.

It is not possible to discuss here all the problems connected with the *verb* of this dialect. The following table contains the principal forms of the preterite and the perfect :—

I saw	I have seen	I went	I have gone	I have not gone
vimma	vindama	šerin	šerama	nema šera
villa	vindara	šeri	šerara	nera šera
vinǰa	vindaya	šera	šeraya	niya šera
vimmuna	vindamuna	šerum	šeramuna	nemuna šera
vinnura	vindaruna	šerur	šeranura	nenura šera
vinǰuna	vindayna	šerut	šerayna	neyna šera

It shows the influence of the transitive verb upon the intransitive. The perfect of the latter (*šerama*) is entirely modelled on that of the former (*vindama*); similarly *behešdama* ' I have got up ', *nehetara* ' you have not slept ', *vin nani zülferangin gune parišun berama . . . hazrate Adam angin öso pašimun berama* ' see, how like your locks I have become tangled in (my) soul (?) . . . like Adam I have now become repentant '.[1] The intransitive preterite ordinarily preserves its distinct forms (*šerin*), even where the two kinds of verbs are in close contact, e.g. *šerim nāhāre hörma āmarim*[2] ' I went, ate lunch, came '; but occasionally we find forms adapted to the transitive, e.g. *vörörma* ' I passed by ', *mörǰa* ' he died '.

Of particular interest are the *verbal stems*, of which a fairly full list is given here. In Middle Iranian and in the majority of modern Iranian languages we find *two* verbal stems, a present stem and a preterite stem ; but in the dialect of Gälin-qaya there exist *three* stems, present, preterite, and subjunctive, and an additional form for the 2nd singular of the imperative :

---

[1] There is no translation of these verses in Dr. Navabi's notes ; the one above is therefore conjectural. -*angin* ' like ' (*spā vorgangin a* ' a dog is like a wolf ') represents earlier *angōn, cf. MPers. *hngwn*, Sogd. *'nγwn*.

[2] With regard to -*im* instead of -*in*, see above, p. 168, n. 1.

	Imp.	Subj.	Pret.	Pres.	Base
(a)	*še*	*šun-*	*šer-*	*šend-*	*šyaw*
(b)		*bun-*	*ber-*		*baw*
(c)	*da*	*dan-*	*dor-*	*dond-*	*dā*
(d)	*ka*	*kan-*	*körd-*	*könd-*	*kar*
(e)	*(bi)a*	*(bi)an-*	*ord-* [1]		*ā-bar*
(f)	—	*han-* [2]	*hörd-*		*xʷar*
(g)	*verar*	—	*vörörd-*		*wi-tar*
(h)	—	—	*vöžörd-* [3]	*vöžörn-*	*wi-čar*
(i)		*yan-*	*yar-*	*yand-*	*ǰan*
(j)	*āsta*	*āstān-*	*āstār-* [4]	*āstand-*	*ā-stan*
(k)	*vin*	*vin-*	*vind-*	*vinn-*	*wain*
(l)			*[hönd-]* [5]	*hönn-*	*xʷan*
(m)		*zun-*	*zunust-*	*zunusn-*	*zan*
(n)	—	*öš-*	*öt-*	*ötn-*	*wak*
(o)	—	*heraš-*	*höröt-*	*hörödd-*	*fra-wak*
(p)	*'ri*	—	*ret-* [6]	*rett-*	*raik*
(q)		*duž-* [7]		*dutn-*	*dauk*
(r)	—	*hes-*	*het-*	*hett-*	*xʷap*
(s)	*ǵen*	*ǵen-*	*got-*		*grab*
(t)	*[nšin]* [8]		*nešt-*	*nešn-*	*ni-had*
(u)	—	*fi-*	*fest-* [9]	*fesn-*	*vidʿ* ?
(v)	*[bend-]* [10]		*böst-*	*bösn-*	*band*
(w)			*nevešt-*	*nevešn-*	*ni-pais*
(x)			*höšt-*	*höšn-*	*xʷaz*
(y)	*be*	*bez-*	*behešt-*	*behešn-*	*bar + haiz*
(z)	—			*vašn-* [11]	*waxš*

[1] Preterite stems ending in two consonants are shortened in the " transitive " preterite, generally by the loss of the second consonant ; hence in Kesravī's material *'wrf'* = *orǰa* 'he brought' ; *zunust'* = *zunusta* ' you knew' ; cf. above *rimma*, *villa*, etc. (from *vind-ma*, *vind-la* etc.).

[2] In Kesravī's material *hynm* as 1st sing. Subj. (read *hnm* ?).

[3] ' To perform ' (a prayer, etc.), Pers. *guzārdan*.

[4] ' To buy.'   [5] Supplied from Kesravī (*hwnd-*).

[6] Cf. *vereta* (inf.) ' to flee '; Kesravī *wrtmwn* (above p. 168, n. 1) = *veret-muna*.   [7] ' To sew.'   [8] Supplied from Kesravī.

[9] ' To throw, spread (a rug over someone) ' and ' to scatter seed, to sow ', Pers. equivalents *andāχtan* and *gustardan*. Example, *ārtāndakiöy noxut festayna ya neyna festa* ' have the people there sown (chick-)peas or not ?' (*ārtā* ' thither ', *ārteyri* ' thence', *ārtānda* ' there', *ārtāndaki* ' (someone) being there ', *ārtāndakiöy* pl).

[10] Adapted from Lehmann-Haupt (*bind-*, above p. 167).

[11] ' To shine, be alight ' (*öšma vašna* ' the moon is shining ', *čore vašna* ' the lamp is lit ').

The preterite stem continues the ancient preterite stem and thus presents no difficulty. The old present stem is continued substantially by the subjunctive stem, and entirely by the imperative, which generally has strongly shortened forms. However, some of the subjunctive stems, those at the beginning of the list (a–f), have acquired a final -n, the origin of which is not clear. Here only those stems are affected, the base of which ended in a vowel or an unstable consonant. It is probable that these subjunctive stems are new formations built upon the imperative; for example, case (d), ' to make ', where the old present stem was *kar*, which in the imperative was shortened to *ka* : on this form the subjunctive stem was built by the addition of -n-. The first verb in the list shows that this formation is not entirely recent; for the subjunctive stem *šun*- must have been created at a time when the imperative was still *šu*.

The most interesting of the three stems is the present stem. It is evidently built on the preterite stem ; in this point the dialect of Gälin-qaya differs from most Western Iranian languages. This origin of the present stem is quite clear in the forms in the second half of the list ; but some of those at the beginning of the list are again difficult. For example, if we consider case (i), at first sight one might assume that the present stem, *yand*-, was derived from the subjunctive stem, *yan*-, rather than from the preterite stem, *yar*-. However, it is in itself unlikely that in the weaker bases the formation should have been essentially different from that found in the stronger ones ; also, it is to be observed that the vowel of the present stem is in every case identical with the vowel of the preterite stem.

The rule for the formation of the present stem can be formulated in this way : if the Old Iranian preterite stem ended in -t- preceded by a sonant, then the Gälin-qaya present stem ends in -nd with loss of the old -t- ; and if the Old Iranian preterite stem ended in -t- preceded by a consonant, then the Gälin-qaya present stem ends in that consonant, if it was preserved, plus -n-, otherwise in -tn or -tt. The origin of these

stems may be found in the *-ant-* participle, which in Gälin-qaya
is regularly built on the preterite stem : *šeranda* 'going',
doranda 'giving', *kördanda* 'making', *yaranda* 'hitting', and
so forth. These forms may have been strongly shortened in
the creation of the present stem, so that the actual present
would be a composite tense by origin, 'I am going' in the
place of 'I go'. Thus one could account for the various finals,
-nd-, *-n-*, and *-d-* (often assimilated to *-t-*), all resulting from
-nd- at the end of clusters of consonants.

These few details will, I hope, give an idea of the distinctive
features of the dialect of Gälin-qaya, which we may regard as
representative of the Harzanī group. The question now arises :
is this Harzanī the last surviving form of the language once
spoken in Azerbaijan ? This question is not easily answered.
The first test to be applied concerns certain sound-changes
which must be presumed to have characterized the old
language of Azerbaijan, principally the change of Iranian *fr-*
to *hr-*, and the change of intervocalic *-d-* to *-r-* ; the Iranian
loanwords in Armenian, which entered Armenian from the
neighbouring province of Azerbaijan, prove the existence of
these changes. Now the first, *hr* from *fr*, is satisfactorily
present in Harzanī ; but it carries no weight, because it is also
present in at least half the North-western Iranian languages.
The second change, *-r-* from intervocalic *-d-*, is unfortunately
absent. It is true, intervocalic and post-vocalic *-t-* regularly
becomes *-r-* in Harzanī ; many of the words I have quoted
show it—but that should not be confused, though it often has
been confused, with the change we are seeking. Intervocalic
-d- has either disappeared in Harzanī, or been replaced by a
glide. There is only one certain case of *-r-* from *-d-*, *arina*
'Friday', and that word is probably a loan-word ; a doubtful
case is the word for 'under', which occurs in *ružare* 'west',
literally 'sun-down' (*ruž* 'sun'), and in *parare* 'below',
which contrasts with *parpe* 'above', so that *-are* meant 'under'
and may be referred to Old Iranian *adari* 'under' : that word,
however, already contained an *-r-*, so that we are not safe in
claiming that the Harzanī *-r-* in this word represents the old *-d-*.

We have now to consider the relationship between Harzanī and the other languages of the north-western group. It is obvious, and has already been pointed out by Dr. Baer,[1] that Harzanī is most closely related to Tālišī. This relationship would be even stronger if Tālišī, which now presents much abbreviated forms through the loss of interior -r-, all dentals, and other consonants as well, had once shared in the change from intervocalic -t- to -r-, which characterizes Harzanī; it has indeed been reported that words exhibiting that change occur in the southernmost dialect of Tālišī, that spoken in Assālim.[2] It should be noted that Tālišī, like Harzanī, possesses a present built on the preterite stem; the Tālišī forms have not been explained correctly,[3] and can in fact be explained only with the help of the Harzanī material.

On the other side, Harzanī is related to Zaza. One may instance the existence of two genuine plural cases in both languages; the ablative postposition -ri, Zaza -rā; the negative prefix in činī(ya) [4] 'it is not', Zaza činyō, činyā; many characteristic words, such as Harzanī öšma 'moon', Zaza āšma, the nearest related word [5] being Tālišī ovšịm; vašna 'it shines', Zaza vāšena; gen- both 'to take' and 'to fall' in Harzanī and Zaza; rau 'quick' in both languages [6]; vondor- 'to stand': Zaza vindār- [7] and Vafsī vender-,[8] a verb known

---

[1] *Anderseits erweisen sich das Härzändī und das Shāhrūdī Āzārbāijāns mit dem Tālyshī Kaspiens eng verwandt* (Actes, pp. 155 sq.).

[2] B. V. Miller, *Tālišskiy Yazik*, 1953, p. 261. Two of the words quoted above, p. 166, n. 2 (*šr* and *brh*) prove that this change als occurred in the Khalkhāl dialect from which Kesravī's specimen is derived.

[3] Thus B. V. Miller in his latest work explained the Tal. present (*votedam*, or shorter *vottam*, 'I say') as compounded of the infinitive (*vote*), the preposition *da* 'in' (used as postposition), and the present of 'to be' (*Tālišskiy Yazik*, p. 146). However, Miller himself does not attribute, in his discussion of the prepositions (*ibidem*, pp. 86–88), such a preposition to Tālišī (only *dị* 'with', and the postposition *ada* 'in', which would not produce the form required; there is, of course, a preverb *da*).

[4] Several times also in Kesravī's specimen, spelt *čynyh*.

[5] [Now: Keringānī *āšmā*.]   [6] [So also in Keringānī.]

[7] Hadank, *Zāzā*, 138, 273, 361, 378, *stehen bleiben, stillstehen, anhalten, bleiben, warten*. Similar forms (but with initial *m-*) occur also in Gurani.

[8] Muqaddam, *Vafs*, p. 97, inf. *venderdan*, imp. *häwender*, pret. *häwenderd*, and similarly in neighbouring villages (note also *vandarda*, p. 127 middle); Pers. equivalent *īstādan*. [Add Keringānī *vendārdan*.]

from Middle Iranian.[1] This is merely a small selection of the many coincidences, some of them exclusive, that can be quoted. They leave no doubt that Harzanī takes its place between Tālišī and Zaza.

This result seems to be consonant with the present geographical location of the three languages, with Harzanī actually in the middle between Tālišī in the east and Zaza in the far west. But these appearances are deceptive; for it is certain that Zaza, now altogether out of contact with the languages to which it is related, has been carried to Eastern Turkey by some migration. It has been argued on historical and linguistic grounds, on converging lines, that Zaza is a branch of the ancient language of Dailam, an alpine country in the centre of the high mountains on the southern shore of the Caspian Sea.[2] If Zaza had its original place in Dailam (to the north and north-east of Tākistān), we are driven to the assumption that Harzanī, too, is a dislocated language and had its home to the south-east of Tāliš, somewhere between Tāliš and the ancient Zaza country. Such an assumption would give an answer to many difficult problems; for example, we should gain a perfect series of the languages that form their present stem with the help of an -n- or -nd- suffix, that is, Tālišī, Harzanī, Zaza, parts of Gīlakī, Tabari, and some dialects near Samnān.[3] Moreover, there has been a report, by the head of the American Presbyterian Mission in Tabrīz at the beginning of this century (S. G. Wilson), that the people of Harzan had been transferred there from the region of Tāliš by Nādir-Šāh, that is to say a little over two hundred years ago.[4] Ordinarily one might look upon such a report with

[1] Pahlavi Psalter wndlty = qayyāmā ' durans, permanens'; Inscr. of Shapur, Parthian 17 RB' y'ztn wyndrán 'BDt; with assimilation -nd- > -nn- Manich. MPers. wnyr- ' to remain (permanently), stay ' (so to be translated), from which its apparent causative wyn'r- ' to set, fix ' (also Pahlavi wyn'l-, Pahl. Ps. wn'lty, Inscr. wn'l-) cannot easily be separated. The derivation of wnyr- from a base nar- (cf. ZII., ix, 206 ; Bailey, JRAS., 1953, 106) can scarcely be maintained.

[2] See the full discussion in the introduction to Hadank, Zāzā ; cf. Minorsky, Domination des Dailamites, 17 ; BSOAS., xi (1943), 86–89.

[3] Cf. Hadank, ibidem, p. 23.   [4] See Hadank, ibidem, p. 5.

a critical eye[1] : but here, as it is in agreement with the linguistic evidence, we may accept it as corroboration.

That leaves us with empty hands. The dialects that were presumed to be the last remnants of the ancient language of Azerbaijan have proved to be recent imports from another province. We are similarly unfortunate with the literary evidence which the late Kesravī had collected from Persian works : there is nothing conclusive. The most considerable [2] is a set of 14th century dialect quatrains from Ardabīl [3] ; but Ardabīl is merely on the fringe of Azerbaijan, close to Tāliš, and the dialect of these quatrains has been shown to be akin to Tālišī.[4] In short, with all the dialects we have considered here, of Tāliš, Harzan, Khalkhāl, and Tākistān, we remain on the threshold of Azerbaijan ; but of the language once spoken in Azerbaijan itself we know nothing.[5]

ADDITIONAL NOTE

This paper has been dogged by misfortune. Important new

---

[1] For example, I was myself told in Tākistān that according to a local tradition the people of that village (the *Tāt*) were immigrants from *somewhere else* ; but no one could say from where they had come, or at what date.

[2] The 3rd edition of Kesravī's *Āδarī* contains additional dialect verses (some of them very interesting) taken from various *Jung-s* (pp. 54–59) ; unfortunately, they are not sufficiently closely localized.

[3] *Silsilatu 'nNasab-i Ṣafawīye*, pp. 29–32 ; Kesravī, *Āδarī*, 1st ed., pp. 31–42 (3rd ed., pp. 36–46).

[4] See Miller, *Tal. Yazīk*, 254–263. After seeing Miller's work (1953) I abandoned my intention to give a full analysis of the language of these quatrains. Note that *drd(h)-žr* continues Manich. Parthian *drdjd* 'suffering, in pain' (cf. *ž̌rmjd*) ; and *žyr* 'life' Manich. Parth. *jyd*. There is a possible case of *-d- > -r-* in *gwrym* (6) 'I am the ball', which reading, however, is secured only by emendation (required by the rhyme) ; *nwštym* (7) is mis-reading of *n-dštym*, cf. Tal. *daže* Miller, *Tal. Teksti*, 217 ; Gälin-qaya *dšdōm dašna* 'my hand hurts' ; probably Yaghnobi *daxš-*. The word for 'God', *'wy'n*, is surely of Turkish origin (= *oyan* Kāšyarī ; Houtsma, *Glossar*, p. 7 ; etc.).

[5] The 'Appendix' to the *Risāle* by Rūḥī of Anārajān (16th century), to which A. Iqbāl has drawn attention (*Yādgār*, ii, fasc. iii, pp. 43–50) and which was published in full by M. Muqaddam (*Yak sanad-i tārīχī az gūyiš-i āδarī-i Tabrīz = Irān-Kūde* 10, 1317 Yezd./1948), is not, as has been claimed, written in any "dialect", but in a vulgar (extremely vulgar !) and slangy type of colloquial Persian. It has no bearing on the problem of the ancient language of Azerbaijan.

publications, each requiring fresh adaptation of the views presented, kept coming in, either at the last minute or after the event. While the printing was in process, my friend and former student Dr. E. Yarshater, of the University of Tehran, presented me with (1) the second edition of Kesravī's *Ā δarī*, for which I had looked so long in vain (above, p. 165 ; it is indeed much superior to the third edition, which is merely a reprint) ; (2) M. Sutūde (Sotoodeh), *Farhang-i Gīlakī*, Tehran, 1954 (an admirable work) ; (3) Yahya Zoka, *The dialect of Keringan*, Tehran, 1332/1953–4 (the first glimpse of one of the unknown dialects of the Qaraja-dāγ, see above, p. 165 ; received too late, unfortunately, to be taken into account here).